

L'antisémisme

Dans toute l'histoire de la chrétienté, ou de l'Europe, et jusqu'au XXe siècle non compris, le sentiment anti-juif et les persécutions et discriminations qui s'ensuivirent furent le fait de l'anti-judaïsme chrétien, même si l'antisémisme de Voltaire n'est pas de source chrétienne. Cependant, selon Hannah Arendt, au XVIIIe siècle, les hommes des Lumières, à l'exception de Denis Diderot, méprisent les Juifs comme trop attachés à leur religion, alors qu'ils sont mieux considérés par les conservateurs :

« Les hommes des Lumières qui préparèrent la Révolution française méprisaient tout naturellement les Juifs : ils voyaient en eux les survivants de l'obscurantisme médiéval, les odieux agents financiers de l'aristocratie. Leurs seuls défenseurs déclarés en France furent les écrivains conservateurs qui dénoncèrent l'hostilité envers les Juifs comme “ l'une des thèses favorites du XVIIIe siècle ” » (J. de Maistre) - Hannah Arendt, Sur l'antisémisme, Calmann-Lévy (1973) , page 110.

L'antisémisme n'était pas un sentiment général dans les milieux intellectuels du XIXe siècle comme on le voit notamment avec Friedrich Nietzsche qui écrit :

« Or, les juifs sont sans aucun doute la race la plus forte, la plus résistante, et la plus pure qui existe actuellement, ils savent s'imposer grâce à certaines vertus dont on aimerait faire des vices, grâce surtout à une foi résolue. C'est un fait que les juifs, s'ils le voulaient, pourraient dès maintenant exercer leur prépondérance et même littéralement leur domination sur l'Europe, c'est un fait qu'ils n'y travaillent pas et ne font pas de projet en ce sens. Ils aspirent à s'établir enfin quelque part où ils soient tolérés et respectés. »

Cet anti-judaïsme doit être distingué de l'antisémisme moderne qui va s'exacerbant avec la crise des États-nations, et qui pointe avec l'affaire Dreyfus en France, les théories de Houston Stewart Chamberlain en Allemagne et qui va exploser en racisme avec le Nazisme exterminateur (voir pour cette histoire et la périodisation des différentes formes de persécutions anti-juives, de Raul Hilberg : « L'extermination des Juifs d'Europe ») .

Dans le monde moderne, avec le développement des grands États européens, certains banquiers Juifs comme les frères Péreire ou la dynastie des Rothschild ont joué un rôle important dans le financement du développement industriel et de grands projets nationaux (chemins de fer) . Cette place est assortie de privilèges, comme l'anoblissement, qui fait que, d'une part, les Juifs privilégiés sont en quelque sorte des hors-caste, sans que cela soit vu comme une marque d'exclusion (mais ces privilèges n'en suscitent pas moins les jalousies) , d'autre part, ces Juifs privilégiés seront eux-mêmes défavorables à l'extension de leurs privilèges à ceux des Juifs qui pâtissent de ces mesures gouvernementales discriminatoires. Dans l'ensemble, les Juifs riches bénéficient de cette manière d'une protection politique (ce qui est fréquent dans leur histoire, comme on le voit au début de l'Islam qui protégea les Juifs et en fit des administrateurs) ,

qu'il s'agisse des Juifs de Cour, ou de certains financiers du XIXe siècle. Par exemple, Bismarck, qui tenait des propos antisémites dans sa jeunesse, y renoncera plus tard. Par la suite, des antisémites l'accuseront d'être à la solde des Juifs.

Il apparaît ainsi que le développement de l'Europe, déjà tributaire de leur culture et de leur religion, fut tributaire de la puissance financière des Juifs les plus riches ; mais, comme le remarque Hannah Arendt, cette puissance s'accompagne d'une grande réticence à s'engager dans les événements du monde, contrairement à ce que diront les antisémites par la suite, avec la théorie du complot juif. Outre le rôle financier des Juifs dans l'Europe moderne, il faut remarquer que, du fait de leur présence dans tous les pays d'Europe, les Juifs furent une communauté internationale, par opposition à la montée en puissance de l'isolement nationaliste des autres peuples. Pour Diderot, un des rares philosophes des Lumières à ne pas détester les Juifs : ceux-ci sont, selon lui, le ciment indispensable des nations européennes. Les Juifs étaient, en effet, parfois considérés comme les financiers des aristocrates ; des socialistes du XIXe siècle, adhérant à l'antisémitisme, reprendront un argument similaire. Selon Hannah Arendt, encore, la gauche est majoritairement antisémite jusqu'à l'Affaire Dreyfus, où, par opposition aux cléricaux majoritairement anti-dreyfusards, elle défendra Dreyfus :

« Les cléricaux se trouvant dans le camp antisémite, les socialistes français se déclarèrent finalement contre la propagande antisémite au moment de l'affaire Dreyfus. Jusque-là, les mouvements de gauche français du XIXe siècle avaient été ouvertement antisémites. » (Hannah Arendt. « Sur l'antisémitisme », Calmann-Lévy, 1973 ; page 111.)

C'est vers cette époque que débute le mouvement d'émancipation des Juifs d'Europe et au début du XIXe siècle. Dans certains pays, ils obtiennent l'égalité des droits, parce que la notion de citoyenneté est jugée plus importante et plus universelle que la question de savoir si un individu est juif ou non.

Mais ce caractère international fut interprété également dans le sens d'un complot (dont la famille Rothschild, installée en France, en Autriche, en Angleterre, aurait été le symbole), alors qu'il est lié, en réalité, à la plus grande importance chez les Juifs de la famille par rapport à la nation. Aussi, les antisémites ont-ils projeté sur les Juifs des catégories de pensée qui sont étrangères à ces derniers.

Par la suite, au cours du XIXe siècle, l'influence financière des Juifs diminue fortement, et c'est à ce moment de leur histoire où les Juifs ne sont presque plus influents économiquement en ce qui concerne les affaires politiques, que naîtra cette haine virulente les accusant d'intentions qu'ils n'ont jamais réalisées quand ils l'auraient pu, et qu'ils n'étaient de fait plus capables de réaliser, même au cas où ils l'auraient voulu. En revanche, c'est à ce moment que les Juifs obtiennent des postes en nombre plus importants, dans l'administration par exemple, ce qui sera encore une fois jugé comme une menace (France enjuivée). Ces accusations ne sont pas seulement des contre-vérités économiques et politiques, mais elles ignorent également cette tendance fréquente chez les Juifs à l'assimilation, à la dissolution même de la communauté juive d'un pays, tendance freinée soit par un regain d'hostilité à leur égard, soit par une politique d'État visant à conserver le statut de Juif, eu égard à son utilité indiquée plus haut. Paradoxalement, on reproche aux Juifs leur particularité, leur « isolement social ». Et on les réprime lorsqu'ils entament des processus d'ouverture, d'assimilation à la société environnante. Au moment où l'antisémitisme explose en Europe et s'organise

(vers 1870, après plusieurs vagues au cours du XIXe siècle) , les Juifs n'ont donc plus la même importance, et l'existence même de l'identité juive est en passe de disparaître, sans que la cause en soit une volonté délibérée de détruire leur culture.

L'organisation de l'antisémitisme commence donc dans les années 1870-1880. En Grande-Bretagne, l'afflux des réfugiés juifs originaires de Russie, où se multiplient les pogroms durant les années 1880, finit par provoquer des émeutes antisémites à Londres, cependant isolées et réprimées par la police. En Allemagne, les propos antisémites commencent à avoir du succès avec Adolf Stöcker, et avec Georg Ritter von Schönerer en Autriche, où la virulence de l'antisémitisme est plus grande du fait de l'opposition de la communauté allemande alors prépondérante contre l'État : le pan-germanisme y est particulièrement exacerbé, et les Juifs sont, on l'a vu, associés à l'État dans ce genre de propagande (le mouvement autrichien apparaît ainsi comme la véritable préfiguration du Nazisme) .

Un trait caractéristique de l'antisémitisme, à ce moment de son histoire, est son caractère supra-national, ce qui peut apparaître paradoxal. Le fait est cependant que les Partis antisémites allemands et autrichiens se présentant comme des Partis au-dessus des Partis (donc, des Partis qui ont vocation à contrôler totalement l'État, à incarner la nation) , se réunissent en congrès internationaux, et c'est à ce niveau qu'ils ont l'ambition de lutter contre les Juifs, qui sont alors le seul élément de dimension européenne. En somme, les antisémites imitent les Juifs tels qu'ils les imaginent, et projettent de prendre le pouvoir occulte qu'ils leur attribuent.

L'agitation antisémite n'est toutefois pas durable, et il n'y a pas d'intensification constante de cette idéologie jusqu'à l'avènement du Nazisme. Ainsi Stefan Zweig nota-t-il que la période 1900-1920 sembla un âge d'or pour les Juifs, au point que les précédentes agitations contre ces derniers ne semblaient plus qu'un mauvais souvenir.

Le 1er coup d'arrêt à l'antisémitisme en France fut la réaction à l'affaire Dreyfus (1894 à 1906) . L'Empire russe, lui, connaissait des vagues de pogroms successives, persécutions qui provoquèrent en réaction l'idée du projet sioniste créé par le journaliste, écrivain et homme politique Theodor Herzl afin de faire accéder les Juifs au rang de peuple politique, susceptibles enfin de bénéficier des mêmes droits politiques que tout autre peuple ou nation se donnant son organisation politique, ainsi que des Droits de l'homme que les États européens qui abritaient les Juifs durant la période nazie, n'avaient pas convoqués ni su faire jouer pour les protéger des persécutions du Nazisme. On lira à ce propos, avec intérêt, les analyses de Hannah Arendt, soulignant l'absence de contenu de la notion de « Droits de l'homme » en l'absence d'un État pour les faire valoir et les appliquer à une nation donnée. Avec les persécutions nazies, les Droits de l'Homme sont, en effet, apparus après-coup, comme étant équivalents aux « droits des peuples » dans le système de l'État-nation. Les peuples sans État (celui de leur nation) se trouvèrent là, démunis, privés de tous droits, et leurs droits, en tant qu'« hommes » n'étaient garantis par aucune institution. (« L'impérialisme » , Fayard, 1982.)

Des écrivains ont vivement pratiqué et encouragé l'antisémitisme : Charles Maurras, les Frères Goncourt, Édouard Drumont avec son pamphlet « La France juive » (1886) , Brasillach, Céline à l'époque où l'Europe sombra dans le fascisme. Charles Maurras donna à ses écrits une forme doctrinale, qui s'est développée dans le courant de l'Action française, entre 1899 et 1939, et fut condamnée à 2 reprises par le Vatican (en 1914 et en 1926) . Cette doctrine

rejetait les racines juives du christianisme. Mais, à l'inverse d'autres écrivains, parfois catholiques comme Léon Bloy, soutiennent le rôle historique et religieux du peuple juif et sa qualité. Bloy écrit dans ses mémoires « quelques-unes des plus nobles âmes que j'ai rencontrées étaient des âmes juives. La sainteté est inhérente à ce peuple exceptionnel, unique et impérissable » .

Historiquement, de nombreux motifs ont été utilisés pour justifier, perpétuer ou susciter l'antisémitisme, incluant des éléments sociaux, économiques, nationaux, politiques, raciaux et religieux. Notamment :

La théologie chrétienne du « Vetus Israël / Verus Israël » (ancien Israël contre véritable Israël) développée par Augustin d'Hippone au IV^e siècle. Selon elle, le peuple chrétien serait désormais le véritable peuple de l'Alliance, car Dieu se serait détourné des Juifs. De ce fait, le judaïsme serait condamné à disparaître et les Juifs à se convertir. Cette position théologique se nomme le super-sessionisme ou théologie de la substitution. Elle a contribué à l'anti-judaïsme chrétien, lien qui a été mis en évidence lors de la conférence de Seelisberg (1947) et que Jules Isaac appelait l'Enseignement du mépris, pouvant conduire à des persécutions et des conversions forcées se résolvant, dans le meilleur des cas, dans le marranisme. D'après Yeshayahou Leibowitz, seul cet enseignement du mépris, inhérent selon lui au messianisme chrétien du sauveur dégageant l'homme du « joug de la Torah et des mitsvot » , explique que les populations et les élites dirigeantes européennes aient laissé faire et souvent réalisé elles-mêmes l'assassinat des Juifs d'Europe pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

La « limpieza de sangre » (pureté du sang) qui se développe en Espagne après le décret de l'Alhambra (1492) et l'expulsion des Juifs. Pour obtenir certaines charges honorifiques, exercer certaines professions, entrer dans certains ordres religieux, il est nécessaire de prouver qu'aucun ancêtre n'était juif ou musulman : la « Reconquista » terminée, Grenade prise, il s'agit à présent de reconstruire l'identité nationale. Ce statut n'est progressivement adopté par les archevêchés que dès la fin des années 1520. En pratique, la « limpieza » est reconnue à un seuil de 3 générations ; au-delà, il est quasi-certain que l'ancêtre ait du sang juif ou musulman, étant donné le métissage de l'Espagne médiévale. La reconnaissance de la « limpieza de sangre » se fait par enquête de l'Inquisition, sur dénonciation : enquête par définition longue, et coûteuse. Ainsi, qui sort de ce filet se trouve lavé de tout soupçon, mais généralement ruiné.

À la fin du XIX^e siècle, 2 documents fallacieux apparaissent à quelques années de distance. D'une part, le prêtre Pranaitis publie « Le Talmud démasqué » (1892) , ouvrage rempli de fausses citations du Talmud et destiné à faire croire à une volonté meurtrière des juifs contre les chrétiens. Pranaitis sera confondu lors de l'affaire Beilis mais son livre continuera à être diffusé. D'autre part, moins de 10 ans plus tard, la théorie du complot juif international est diffusée principalement par « Les Protocoles des Sages de Sion » (1901) , un faux fabriqué par Matvei Golovinski pour le compte de la police secrète de la Russie tsariste (l' « Okhrana ») . Les Protocoles sont un pamphlet qui décrit les prétendus plans de conquête du monde par les Juifs. Ce faux fut utilisé par les Nazis comme instrument de propagande et figurent en bonne place parmi les prétextes invoqués pour justifier la persécution des Juifs et leur extermination, la Shoah. Ce faux a été réactualisé ces dernières années en forme de série télévisée, et diffusée dans quelques chaînes diffusant en langue arabe. Il a été, de facto, censuré par la plupart des pays arabes pour son contenu inapproprié. Il est de nouveau édité en Russie et en Ukraine.

L'Église catholique romaine, par la déclaration « Nostra Ætate » de 1965, le discours de Jean-Paul II à la grande synagogue de Rome, en 1986, puis lors des repentances de la fin du II^e millénaire, a finalement reconnu avoir véhiculé dans l'Histoire un discours et une culture anti-judaïques, illustrés entre autres par l'expression de « peuple déicide » ou la mention des « Juifs perfides », restée dans la prière du Vendredi Saint jusqu'aux réformes du Concile Vatican II sous les papes Jean XXIII et de Paul VI.

...

Anti-Semitism is a starting place for trying to understand the tragedy that would befall countless numbers of people during the Holocaust.

Throughout history, Jews have faced prejudice and discrimination, known as anti-Semitism. Driven nearly 2,000 years ago by the Romans from the land now called Israel, they spread throughout the globe and tried to retain their unique beliefs and culture while living as a minority. In some countries, Jews were welcomed, and they enjoyed long periods of peace with their neighbors. In European societies, where the population was primarily Christian, Jews found themselves increasingly isolated as outsiders. Jews do not share the Christian belief that Jesus is the Son of God, and many Christians considered this refusal to accept Jesus' divinity as arrogant. For centuries, the Church taught that Jews were responsible for Jesus' death, not recognizing, as most historians do today, that Jesus was executed by the Roman government because officials viewed him as a political threat to their rule. Added to religious conflicts were economic ones. Rulers placed restrictions on Jews, barring them from holding certain jobs and from owning land.

At the same time, since the early Church did not permit usury (lending money at interest), Jews came to fill the vital (but unpopular) role of money-lenders for the Christian majority. In more desperate times, Jews became scapegoats for many problems people suffered. For example, they were blamed for causing the « Black Death », the plague that killed thousands of people throughout Europe during the Middle-Ages. In Spain, in the 1400's, Jews were forced to convert to Christianity, leave the country, or be executed. In Russia and Poland, in the late- 1800's, the government organized or did not prevent violent attacks on Jewish neighborhoods, called pogroms, in which mobs murdered Jews and looted their homes and stores.

As ideas of political equality and freedom spread in Western Europe during the 1800's, Jews became almost equal citizens under the law. At the same time, however, new forms of anti-Semitism emerged. European leaders who wanted to establish colonies in Africa and Asia argued that whites were superior to other races and, therefore, had to spread and take-over the « weaker » and « less civilized » races. Some writers applied this argument to Jews, too, mistakenly defining Jews as a race of people called Semites who shared common blood and physical features.

This kind of racial anti-Semitism meant that Jews remained Jews, by race, even if they converted to Christianity. Some politicians began using the idea of racial superiority in their campaigns as a way to get votes. Karl Lueger (1844-1910) was one such politician. He became Mayor of Vienna, Austria, at the end of the 19th Century, through the use of anti-Semitism - he appealed to voters by blaming Jews for bad economic times. Lueger was a hero to a young man

named Adolf Hitler, who was born in Austria, in 1889. Hitler's ideas, including his views of Jews, were shaped during the years he lived in Vienna, where he studied Lueger's tactics and the anti-Semitic newspapers and pamphlets that multiplied during Lueger's long rule.

Key-Dates

1890's : A concocted Jewish Conspiracy.

In France, a member of the Russian secret police concocts the « Protocols of the Elders of Zion ». The Protocols promote claims that there exists a Jewish conspiracy to take-over the world. These forged documents are presented as the minutes of a supposed meeting of world Jewish leaders in which they finalized plans to dominate the world, and suggest that Jews have formed secret organizations and agencies through which they aim to control and manipulate political parties, the economy, the press, and public opinion. The Protocols are published in countries throughout the world, including the United States, and used by antisemites to re-inforce claims of a Jewish conspiracy. In the 1920's and 1930's, the Protocols are used to gain support for Nazi Party anti-Semitic ideology and policies.

1894 : The Dreyfus Affair Divides France.

Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish officer in the French army, is arrested and falsely accused of handing over to Germany documents involving the national defense of France. After a summary trial before a military Court, Dreyfus is found guilty of treason and sentenced to life imprisonment on Devil's Island, located off the coast of French Guiana. This case divides the French nation into 2 opposing groups : those who insist that Dreyfus is guilty (conservatives, nationalists, and anti-Semitic groups) , and those who insist that Dreyfus should receive a fair trial (Liberals and intellectuals) . In 1899, Dreyfus receives a new trial, but is again found guilty by a military Court. However, the president of the French Republic intervenes, granting him a pardon. Shortly before World War I, Dreyfus is fully vindicated by a civilian Court. The controversy surrounding the Dreyfus affair reflects latent anti-Semitism in the French officer corps and other conservative French groups.

April 1897 : Karl Lueger, anti-Semitic Mayor of Vienna.

Karl Lueger is elected mayor of Vienna. He holds this position for 13 years, until his death in 1910. Lueger, co-founder of the Christian-Socialist Party, uses economic anti-Semitism to gain support from the small businessmen and artisans who are suffering after the surge of capitalism during the industrial revolution in Austria. He claims that Jews have a monopoly on capitalism and that they, thus, compete unfairly in the economic arena. This form of anti-Semitism is used by other Right-wing Parties in Austria and Germany in the early 20th Century as a means to broaden their popular appeal. Adolf Hitler, a resident of Vienna during Lueger's mayoral reign, is greatly influenced both by Lueger's anti-Semitism and by his ability to rally public support. Lueger's ideas are reflected in the Nazi Party platform in 1920's Germany.

Le mouvement « völkisch »

Le mouvement « völkisch » est un courant intellectuel et politique de la Révolution conservatrice apparu en Allemagne à la fin du XIXe siècle et au début du XXe siècle, héritée des « Teutomanes », pour désigner un entrelacs de personnalités, et de conglomérat d'associations, dont l'élément commun est le projet de donner à l'ensemble des Allemands une spiritualité païenne, en général le paganisme germanique.

Ce courant d'idées puise ses sources dans le Romantisme allemand des années 1840 et dans les désillusions de la période 1849-1862, entre l'écrasement du printemps des peuples et l'arrivée de Bismarck au pouvoir en Prusse.

Important par le nombre de groupuscules, mais peu par celui de ses adhérents, et de par les évolutions sociétales, le mouvement idéologique s'est trouvé face à de nouveaux problèmes lui imposant une nouvelle définition.

Pour les uns, le courant « völkisch » découle d'une vocation raciste permanente, lié aux apports de la biologie et du « darwinisme social ». Pour d'autres, il représente un courant foncièrement antisémite, ravivant un passé germanique largement mythique soit occultiste et luttant contre le christianisme, et plus généralement contre les monothéismes.

« Völkisch », terme difficilement traduisible en français, peut revêtir plusieurs significations ; en allemand aussi, le terme « Volk » revêt plusieurs significations : la nation, le peuple, dans un sens ethnique. En droit, ce mot désigne « le peuple », au sens du détenteur de la souveraineté au sein de l'État (« Dem Deutschen Volke », Au peuple allemand, est inscrit au frontispice du « Reichstag » à Berlin) . Enfin, « Volk » peut aussi dire le contraire de monarchique ou de capitaliste, tous les citoyens, par exemple dans les expressions de « Volksstaat » pour « République » (« Volksstaat » Hessen, de 1919 à 1933) ou de « Volksarmee » pour les forces armées de la République démocratique allemande.

Au XIXe siècle, le terme « völkisch » met l'accent (entre autres, par le mouvement « völkisch ») sur le caractère spécifique, exceptionnel, mystique du peuple allemand et le maintien de ses traditions. C'est ensuite l'affirmation de l'idée et du concept de race, de la supériorité des germaniques, unis par des liens de sang, de langue et de culture.

Les termes « völkisch » et « Volk » partagent en commun une racine : le terme « Volk », qui renvoie au terme français de « Peuple ». Le « Volk » ne renvoie pas uniquement à une population donnée, mais aussi, pour les théoriciens de la nation allemande au XIXe siècle, à quelque chose de plus abstrait, un intermédiaire entre les individus et une entité supérieure : pour certains, la nature (perçue comme spécifique à un espace donnée, vivante et spontanée) ; pour d'autres, l'univers.

Le « Volk » est non seulement inscrit dans un cadre précis, la nature et ses manifestations, mais aussi dans une histoire longue et mythifiée. Ainsi, le « Volk » est une entité historique oubliée, qui resurgit à la faveur de la Révolution française : est ainsi idéalisé le « Volk » médiéval, tel que le perçoivent les Romantiques allemands. Pour tous les penseurs du « Volk », l'enracinement de celui-ci à un paysage, à un pays, constitue l'un des piliers du « Volkgeist », notion difficilement traduisible, mais qui rend indissociable l'histoire, le territoire, l'architecture et le paysage (ou la nature) dans une totalité indivisible.

De plus, le « Volk » est un tout unique, une communauté immuable que les évolutions de la société dans les années 1860 désorganisent et disloquent. Ainsi, pour Paul de Lagarde, les agents de division de la nation allemande sont les Libéraux et les Juifs : les uns car ils sont favorables à la liberté de circulation ; les autres car ils forment précisément un « Volk » uni, qui tend à diriger les autres nations et sont les propagateurs du Libéralisme, mais des Juifs peuvent individuellement être détachés de ce « Volk » et intégrés dans la communauté germanique. Au fil des réflexions sur le « Volk », les penseurs « völkisch » développent un antisémitisme de plus en plus virulent : Lagarde, par exemple, voit dans le peuple juif un autre « Volk », puis, à partir de 1873, souhaite exterminer les Juifs comme on extermine de la « vermine » et des « bacilles » contagieux.

Face aux évolutions politiques et économiques de l'Allemagne du dernier tiers du XIXe siècle, un certain nombre de penseurs se réfugient dans la nostalgie d'un passé mythifié et magnifié. Ces penseurs tentent de ressusciter un moment historique dans lequel le « Volk » était uni et non divisé en multiples catégories sociales. Ainsi, l'Empire allemand ne répond pas à ces attentes, car il n'est pas tourné vers le retour aux espaces ruraux, mais s'oriente vers l'industrialisation et ses corollaires économiques et sociaux.

Mais surtout, les conditions de l'Unité, qui contrairement à 1848, n'a pas été l'occasion de grands élans populaires, déçoivent fondamentalement les précurseurs du « Volk ». Ainsi, dans les débuts de l'Empire, Paul de Lagarde s'en prend constamment aux fondements de l'État nouvellement unifié. Il ne cesse de se proclamer le principal adversaire de Bismarck, qu'il accuse d'avoir mis en place une petite-Allemagne atrophiée, qui ne peut ainsi réaliser son destin, la conquête de la « Mitteleuropa », définie comme l'Empire d'Autriche ; en outre, conservateur, Lagarde s'oppose à la forme institutionnelle prise par le nouveau « Reich », essentiellement la mise en place d'une forme de parlementarisme. De plus, dans son obsession de retour aux origines du « Volk », Lagarde s'oppose aux Libéraux, perçus par les conservateurs dont il fait partie, comme des fauteurs de troubles. Les Libéraux sont, en effet, ceux par lesquels les conflits arrivent, qui remettent en cause l'unité et l'esprit du « Volk ».

Mais les réserves de Lagarde ne sont pas celles de la génération suivante, qui analyse le « Reich », une fois Bismarck parti, comme une république avec une tête couronnée ; il appelle donc de ses vœux la création d'une pompe impériale, avec la création d'un Empereur secret, doté des attributs à la fois de Martin Luther, qui serait à la fois législateur éclairé et « Führer » du peuple, mais qui ne serait, en aucun cas, un représentant de la dynastie prussienne.

Le mouvement « völkisch » se dote très tôt d'une série d'idées et de penseurs, et forme ainsi une nébuleuse intellectuelle très active dès les années 1860. De ce fourmillement d'idées, certaines lignes de forces se dégagent.

Tout d'abord, un certain intérêt pour la genèse de l'Allemagne et des Allemands, donc pour l'histoire se fait jour. Ainsi, dès la phase finale de l'unification allemande (1867-1871), les anciens Germains décrits par Tacite, puis les Goths par leur activité, sont magnifiés, car ils représentent, les uns, les « Allemands de leur jeunesse », les autres, une valeur absolue, car, par leurs victoires, liées à leur vitalité, ils accélèrent la chute de Rome. Ainsi, le « Volk » allemand se trouve le dépositaire, par ces racines, de toute l'énergie de ces peuples disparus.

Ensuite, les penseurs « völkisch », obsédés par les racines du « Volk » germanique, défendaient l'idée de pureté de la race germanique ; dans un contexte scientifique marqué par le développement de l'anthropologie et de la philologie, certains penseurs « völkisch » déterminent non seulement un certain nombre de traits physiques communs à tous les peuples partageant des racines germaniques, mais aussi insistent sur les liens de parenté entre certaines langues, donc entre certains peuples, plongeant eux aussi leurs racines dans le terreau germanique. Mais cette pureté n'est pas seulement avérée par l'étude de la philologie ou de l'anthropologie, elle est aussi avérée par certains par des critères de pureté de la race : pour Max Müller, les populations européennes de langues germaniques sont les descendants directs des populations aryennes qui ont essaimé depuis l'Inde ; dans la lignée d'Arthur de Gobineau, les penseurs « völkisch » défendent la nécessité de pureté de la race, sous peine de disparition.

Un certain nombre de penseurs « völkisch », dans la lignée du courant Romantique, magnifie le passé médiéval de l'Allemagne, et s'intéresse à l'histoire allemande. Pour Julius Langbehn, le modèle impérial allemand reste celui incarné par les Hohenstaufen, dont les Hohenzollern ne sont que la triste et pâle copie.

Cette exigence de pureté de la race germanique trouve son prolongement logique dans le développement de différentes formes d'antisémitisme. L'existence de ces différentes formes illustrent les différentes conceptions de la figure du Juif qui sont présentes au sein du mouvement « völkisch ». Dès le départ, le Juif, habitant mystérieux d'un ghetto fantasmé, est perçu comme un élément étranger au « Volk » ; il peut être appréhendé comme un déraciné, donc privé des hautes-qualités morales permises par l'intimité du lien entre le « Volk » et son territoire, ou bien comme un acteur entreprenant de complots ourdis contre les non-Juifs.

Dans les années 1850, la littérature populaire présente le Juif comme un archétype caractérisé par l'avarice, l'ambition, l'envie, la laideur et l'absence d'humanité : il ne peut donc connaître l'ascension sociale que s'il s'appuie sur des procédés déloyaux, et l'oppose à l'Allemand (ou au chrétien), membre d'un « Volk », droit et honnête, qui finit par triompher du malhonnête par sa droiture et sa grandeur d'âme. Dans le cadre de cette opposition, la question juive n'est plus, pour les membres des courants « völkisch », seulement une question de race ou de religion, mais aussi une question d'éthique.

Pour Julius Langbehn, les Juifs sont des représentants d'un « Volk » étranger, que le « Volk » allemand ne peut assimiler (à l'image d'une « pomme qui ne peut se transformer en prune ») qu'il divise en 2 catégories : les Juifs orthodoxes et les Juifs assimilés. La 1^{re} est acceptée, car elle n'a pas répudié sa spécificité et les traits qui rendent ses membres parties d'un « Volk » spécifique ; la seconde, les Juifs assimilés, doivent par contre être exterminés, comme un « I ». Cette approche eschatologique, qui voit dans l'extermination d'éléments étrangers au « Volk » une étape vers la réalisation d'un projet national allemand à l'échelle du continent, se place ainsi dans une perspective de régénération du « Volk » allemand, par la victoire remportée par une conception du monde sur une autre conception du monde.

Pour les penseurs « völkisch », tout ce qui fait référence à la société industrielle, alors en cours de formation, est rejeté ; mais cette opposition touche différents domaines selon les auteurs : pour Paul de Lagarde, l'incarnation du mal, c'est le Libéralisme ; pour Julius Langbehn, c'est la science. Ce refus de la modernité est en réalité le refus d'un

monde quantifiable, réductible à des équations mathématiques et à des phénomènes mécaniques, d'un monde physique composé uniquement d'atomes, c'est-à-dire de matière.

La modernité dans son ensemble est rejetée, car elle brise les liens qui unissent les membres du « Volk » , elle constitue la cause première du déclin de l'Allemagne ; corolaire de ce rejet, sont rejetés ceux qui apportent cette modernité, les Juifs, « peste et choléra passagers » selon le mot de Langbehn, peuple protéiforme, sans patrie, mais candidat à la domination sur les Allemands.

Ainsi est magnifiée l'image du paysan allemand. En effet, celui-ci n'est pas encore touché par la société moderne, qui est proche des racines du « Volk » germanique. Ces paysans ont leur aire de prédilection, la Basse-Allemagne, l'Allemagne du Nord-Ouest ; cette Allemagne authentique s'oppose à la Prusse, conglomérat de Slaves, de Juifs et de Français, mais fait cependant alliance avec elle pour faire renaître la germanité. C'est dans cette Allemagne du Nord-Ouest, l'ancienne Saxe d'avant la conquête carolingienne, que vivent les Allemands les plus authentiques, selon Langbehn : les paysans « Niederdeutsche » , dont le type même constitue l'incarnation du « Volk » germanique, non touché par la modernité, d'ascendance respectable, car enraciné sur un terroir.

Une partie importante de la nébuleuse « völkisch » souhaite un essor territorial de l'Allemagne bien au-delà des frontières du « Reich » . Les idéologues « völkisch » ne sont pas forcément favorable à une expansion outre-mer, mais plutôt à une expansion européenne, avec la création d'un vaste empire européen à coloniser par l'envoi de populations germaniques qui prendraient la place de populations non allemandes refoulées.

Ainsi, pour Paul de Lagarde, l'avenir de l'Allemagne est à l'Est, sur des territoires enlevés à l'Autriche ou à la Russie ; une fois annexée l'ensemble de l'Autriche, l'Allemagne devrait pouvoir librement coloniser le pourtour russe de la Mer Noire et l'Ukraine.

Julius Langbehn, dans la lignée de Paul de Lagarde, préconise la création d'un espace allemand d'Amsterdam à Riga, avec la réunification de tous les peuples du rameau germanique, dans le cadre de ce qu'il nomme une « I » .

Après la fondation dans les années 1890 des Ires associations « völkisch » comme le « Deutschbund » fondé en 1894, le mouvement « völkisch » , capable de souplesse en matière d'édition et de propagande, se créa au tournant du siècle en Allemagne sous la forme d'associations libres en étroit échange avec le nationalisme organisé, à savoir essentiellement l' « Alldeutscher Verband » . À côté de contacts soutenus entretenus avec le mouvement « Alldeutscher » autrichien qui leur était étroitement apparenté sur le plan des idées, des personnes et des institutions, il existait également de nombreux échanges formalisés avec les mouvements réformateurs qui avaient vu le jour en grand nombre depuis les années 1880. Dans le mouvement « völkisch » se retrouvaient des groupements qui divergeaient grandement tant sur leurs buts politiques, sociaux et culturels que sur le plan de leur forme organisationnelle et leur représentativité.

Dès ses débuts, les mouvements « völkisch » accordent une place importante à la jeunesse. En effet, déçus par l'âge des Épigones, comme on désigne le règne de Guillaume II, les intellectuels « völkisch » se représentent la jeunesse à

leur image, déçus par le « Reich » bourgeois et grandiloquent qui a succédé au « Reich » de 1871. Ainsi, les principaux penseurs « völkisch » développent des corpus pédagogiques, pour former la jeunesse allemande à leurs idées. Paul de Lagarde, précocement, s'en prend au système éducatif du 2e « Reich », qui, à ses yeux, participe à la mise en place d'un esprit mercantiliste, dispensant un savoir cloisonné, utilitaire et conformiste.

Langbehn, de son côté, incite la jeunesse à prendre la tête du combat contre les Juifs et les Libéraux, ce qu'elle fait, d'après lui, en excluant d'office les Juifs des associations étudiantes, prenant modèle sur le corps des officiers et la congrégation des Jésuites.

En 1919, Møller van Den Bruck met en place une structure : le Front de la Jeunesse. Ce front, qui regroupe un certain nombre d'intellectuels conservateurs exerce une influence conservatrice sur l'ensemble des acteurs de la Révolution conservatrice de la République de Weimar. Son objectif est de mettre en place des éléments cohérents d'éducation populaire conservatrice, en partie grâce au journal hebdomadaire « Conscience ». Journal Indépendant pour la culture du peuple (« Volksbildung ») que ce cercle édite. C'est également à la jeunesse qu'il dédie son ouvrage « Les Allemands », espérant lui donner la « Weltanschauung » qui lui manque.

Selon Louis Dupeux, les idées « völkisch » sont la métamorphose de la révolution conservatrice au nationalisme. Ils se situent entre le « Kulturpessimismus » et la révolution conservatrice.

Le mouvement présentait des caractères protestataires nationalistes-réformistes, corroborés par une vision du monde teintée de fusion entre mysticisme, idée de décadence (Oswald Spengler), restauration de l'idée et du concept de race, notamment du peuple german, du droit « allemand », du calendrier et des fêtes, des mythes et des tendances profondes de la société.

Sa clientèle majoritaire, masculine et d'origine protestante, fait montre d'un profil social essentiellement bourgeois, émanant de l'ancienne comme de la nouvelle classe moyenne.

Partant d'une base idéologique raciste (antisémite, anti-slave et anti-romaine), le mouvement aspirait à une société organisée sur des principes anti-égalitaires (parfois phalocrates, mais aussi « féministes » - influence probable de Johann Jakob Bachofen - d'une certaine façon, et corporatistes) qui devait être fondée sur un christianisme germanique ou sur une religion païenne propre. Il avait pour objectif de créer au centre de l'Europe, sur la base d'un système de valeurs fondé sur des idéologies germaniques, un État racial ou, éventuellement, une fédération d'États pan-germaniques.

Après 1918, le nombre d'organisations et de leurs affiliés allait dans un 1er temps clairement s'accroître. Avec le « Deutschvölkischer Schutz- und Trutzbund » (1919-1923), le mouvement disposa même pour une courte période d'un cartel influent d'associations « völkisch » et des personnes adhérant à ces idées furent élues aux parlements des « Länder » comme au « Reichstag ». À partir de 1924-1925, en raison de ses déficiences structurelles, le mouvement allait néanmoins se trouver progressivement mis à l'écart de la politique par l'idéologiquement proche National-Socialisme qui était devenu la nouvelle caisse de résonance de la droite radicale.

Cependant, son influence sur des pans entiers de la société allemande reste forte. Ainsi, par le biais de son influence dans le monde scolaire, les idées développées par la nébuleuse « völkisch » attirent à elles une part non négligeable de la jeunesse du « Reich », séduite par la perspective du changement révolutionnaire promis par les idéaux « völkisch », par l'identification d'un bouc-émissaire facilement identifiable et soumise aux pressions idéologiques radicales.

En effet, l'idéologie « völkisch » postérieure à la Grande Guerre, fournit à la jeunesse un archétype idéal, le Juif, rendu responsable de tous les échecs présents, passés en futurs et sur lequel déverser ses frustrations. Cet antisémitisme est inculqué dès le plus jeune âge dans le système éducatif, de manière insidieuse : si les manuels ne portent aucune mention directe au Juif, ils développent néanmoins les thèses « völkisch » de l'âge d'or pré-industriel.

Malgré ses succès dans le primaire et le secondaire, les succès rencontrés par les idéaux « völkisch » à l'université s'apparentent à un triomphe. Tout d'abord, la concurrence pour les postes entre universitaires Juifs et non-Juifs exacerbent les tensions ; ensuite, reprenant les pratiques d'avant-guerre, les associations étudiantes excluent systématiquement les étudiants Juifs de leurs rangs, en dépit des pressions exercées par certains gouvernements fédérés ; de plus, en 1931, le « Reich » et l'Autriche connaissent dans leurs campus des émeutes antisémites massivement suivies et, en 1932, les universités de Breslau et d'Heidelberg excluent les enseignants juifs de leur corps enseignant.

Cependant l'antisémitisme ne constituait pas l'apanage de la totalité des mouvements de jeunesse d'inspiration « völkisch ». Ainsi, le marginal mouvement de jeunesse, organisé en Thuringe sur des bases élitistes autour de Muck Lamberty, développent simplement l'idée que les Juifs constituent un « Volk » différent du « Volk » germanique, tout en affirmant l'idée qu'un autre « Volk » pouvait s'immerger dans le germanisme originel.

Un certain nombre d'autres groupes de jeunesse marginaux membres de la nébuleuse « völkisch » des années 1920 apparaissent, prospèrent, dans une certaine mesure, puis se fondent avec des réserves, plus ou moins affirmées, plus ou moins formulées, dans le mouvement nazi, le plus souvent dans la mouvance Straßer, moins inféodée selon eux aux intérêts industriels. Mais les succès de Adolf Hitler et sa prise du pouvoir rendent cette allégeance fragile, car ils finissent par se rallier à la vision adoptée par Hitler et ses proches.

Des mouvements chrétiens proches du paganisme s'enthousiasmèrent également pour le mouvement « völkisch ». Ainsi, Artur Dinter, politicien « völkisch », propagandiste et écrivain raciste, créa en 1927 la « Geistchristliche Religionsgemeinschaft », précurseur de l'Organisation pour l'État populaire national-socialiste pour les Chrétiens, renommée en 1934 « Deutsche Volkskirche » (Église populaire allemande). Ainsi, le mouvement « völkisch » a servi de base pour le développement du National-Socialisme.

Le NSDAP essaya par la suite de se profiler comme la force agissante du mouvement « völkisch » en vue de mettre en avant sa vision du monde.

Ainsi, dans « Mein Kampf », Hitler écrit :

« Le Parti national-socialiste des travailleurs allemands tire les caractères essentiels d'une conception " völkisch " de l'univers »

« Si aujourd'hui toutes les associations, tous les groupes, grands et petits (et, à mon avis, même de " grands Partis ") revendiquent le mot " völkisch ", c'est la conséquence de l'action du Parti national-socialiste. »

Le chef de la société Thulé, Rudolf Freiherr von Sebotendorff, fils de cheminot et aventurier haut en couleurs, devenu riche en faisant des affaires louches en Turquie et en épousant une riche héritière, offrit au mouvement « völkisch » de Munich son journal, le « Münchener Beobachter », rebaptisé en août 1919 le « Völkischer Beobachter ». Le Parti national-socialiste, au départ lui-même groupuscule « völkisch », le racheta en décembre 1920 pour en faire son organe de presse officiel.

À partir de 1933, les organisations subsistantes (et leurs dirigeants) perdirent rapidement de leur signification : certaines furent absorbées par les organisations national-socialistes, d'autres furent réprimées (cas du mouvement des époux Ludendorff dans les Ires années du régime), la plupart finirent par se dissoudre ou vivotèrent dans l'ombre jusqu'à leur interdiction par les Alliés après la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

...

The « völkisch » movement (originally, « völkische Bewegung ») is the German interpretation of the populist movement, with a Romantic focus on folklore and the « organic » (as : naturally grown community in unity - as opposed to a refined and sophisticated society characterized by diverging interests), characterized by the one-body-metaphor (« Volkskörper ») for the entire population. The term « völkisch » derives from the German word « Volk » (cognate with the English « folk »), corresponding to « people », with connotations in German of « people-powered », « folksy » and « folkloric ». According to the historian James Webb, the word also has « overtones of " nation ", " race " and " tribe " ». The term « völkisch » has no direct English equivalent, but it could be rendered as « ethno-nationalistic », « racial-nationalistic » or « ethno-racialist », or referred by some today as « folkish ».

The defining idea that the « völkisch » movement revolved around was that of a « Volkstum » (literally, « folkdom »), with a meaning similar to a combination of the terms « folklore » and « ethnicity », not to be confused with the « Volkssturm ». « Populist », or « popular », in this context would be « volkstümlich ».

The « " völkisch " movement » was not a unified movement but « a cauldron of beliefs, fears and hopes that found expression in various movements and were often articulated in an emotional tone », Petteri Pietikäinen observed in tracing « völkisch » influences on Carl Gustav Jung. The « völkisch » movement was « arguably the largest group » in the Conservative Revolutionary movement in Germany. However, like « conservative-revolutionary » or « fascist », « völkisch » is a complex term (« schillernder Begriff »). In a narrow definition, it can be used to designate only groups that consider human beings essentially preformed by blood, i.e. : by inherited characteristics.

The « völkisch » movement had its origins in Romantic nationalism, as it was expressed by early Romantics such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte in his « Addresses to the German Nation » published during the Napoleonic Wars, from 1808 onwards, especially the 8th address :

« What is a “ Volk ”, in the higher-sense of the term, and what is love of the fatherland ? »

... where he answered his question of what could warrant the noble individual's striving « and his belief in the eternity and the immortality of his work » , by replying that it could only be that « particular spiritual nature of the human environment out of which he himself, with all of his thought and action ... has arisen, namely the people from which he is descended and among which he has been formed and grown into that which he is » .

The movement combined sentimental patriotic interest in German folklore, local history and a « back-to-the-land » anti-urban populism with many parallels in the writings of William Morris.

A. J. Nicholls remarked :

« In part, this ideology was a revolt against modernity. »

The dream was for a self-sufficient life lived with a mystical relation to the land ; it was a reaction to the cultural alienation of the Industrial revolution and the « progressive » Liberalism of the later-19th Century and its urbane materialist banality. Similar feelings were expressed in the United States during the 1930's by the populist writers grouped as the Southern Agrarians.

In addition, the « völkisch » movement, as it evolved, sometimes combined the arcane and esoteric aspects of folkloric occultism alongside « racial adoration » and, in some circles, a type of anti-Semitism linked to exclusionary ethnic nationalism. The ideas of « völkisch » movements also included anti-Communist, anti-immigration, anti-Capitalist and anti-Parliamentarian principles. The « völkisch » ideas of « national community » (« Volksgemeinschaft ») came more and more to exclude Jews.

A number of the « völkisch » -populist movements that had evolved during the late-19th Century in the German Empire, under the impress of National Romanticism, developed along propagandistic lines after the German defeat in World War I, and the word « the people » (« Volk ») became increasingly politicized.

The same word « Volk » was used as a flag for new forms of ethnic nationalism, as well as by international socialist Parties as a synonym for the proletariat in the German lands. From the Left, elements of the folk-culture spread to the Parties of the middle-classes. But whereas « Volk » could mean « proletariat » among the Left, it meant more particularly « race » among the Center and Right.

Although the primary interest of the Germanic mystical movement was the revival of native pagan traditions and customs (often set in the context of a quasi-theosophical esotericism) , a marked preoccupation with purity of race

came to motivate its more politically oriented off-shoots, such as the « Germanenorden » (the Germanic or Teutonic Order) . This latter was a secret society (founded at Berlin, in 1912) which required its candidates to prove that they had no « non-Aryan » bloodlines and required from each a promise to maintain purity of his stock in marriage. Local groups of the sect met to celebrate the summer solstice, an important neo-pagan festivity in « völkisch » circles (and later, in Nazi Germany) , and more regularly to read the Eddas as well as some of the German mystics. This branch of the « völkisch » movement quickly developed a hyper-nationalist sentiment and allied itself with anti-Semitism, then rising. Another « völkisch » movement of the same time was the Tatkreis.

George Mosse identified some of the more « respectable » and centrist channels through which these sensibilities flowed : school texts that transmitted a Romantic view of a « pure » Germanic past, the nature-oriented German Youth Movement, and novels with an ideally ruthless « völkisch » hero, such as Hermann Löns' « Der Wehrwolf » (1910) .

Not all folkloric societies with connections to Romantic nationalism were located in Germany. The « völkisch » movement was a force as well in Austria. While the community of Monte Verità (Mount Truth) which emerged in 1900 at Ascona, Switzerland, is described by the Swiss art-critic Harald Szeemann as « the southernmost outpost of a far-reaching Nordic lifestyle-reform, that is, alternative movement » . It embraced a mix of anarchism, libertarian communism and various forms of artistic bohemianism and neo-paganism.

The « völkisch » ideologies were influential in the development of Nazism. Indeed, Josef Goebbels publicly asserted in the 1927 Nuremberg rally that if the populist (« völkisch ») movement had understood power and how to bring thousands out in the streets, it would have gained political power on 9 November 1918 (the outbreak of the SPD-led German Revolution of 1918-1919, end of the German monarchy) .

Adolf Hitler wrote in « Mein Kampf » (My Struggle) :

« The basic ideas of the National-Socialist movement are populist (“ völkisch ”) and the populist (“ völkisch ”) ideas are National-Socialist. »

Nazi racial understanding was couched in « völkisch » terms, as when Eugen Fischer delivered his inaugural address as Nazi rector, « The Conception of the “ Völkisch ” State » in the view of biology. (29 July 1933)

This connection can be over-stated, however. According to Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke an imaginative mythology has grown up around the supposed influence within the Nazi Party of a « völkisch » group, the « Thule-Gesellschaft » (Thule Society) , which was founded on 17 August 1918 by Rudolf von Sebottendorff. Its original name was « Studiengruppe für Germanisches Altertum » (Study Group for Germanic Antiquity) , but it soon started to disseminate anti-Republican and anti-Semitic propaganda. In January 1919, the Thule Society was instrumental in the foundation of the « Deutsche Arbeiter-Partei » (German Workers' Party, or DAP) which later became the National-Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP) , commonly called the Nazi Party. Thule members or visiting-guests that would later join the Nazi Party included Rudolf Heß, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Gottfried Feder, Dietrich Eckart and Karl Harrer, but notably not Adolf Hitler who never was a member of the Thule Society. Furthermore, the « Münchener Beobachter » (Munich

Observer) , owned by Sebottendorff, was the press organ of another small nationalist Party and later became the « Völkischer Beobachter » (People's Observer) .

On the other hand, it can be noted that Karl Harrer, the Thule member most directly involved in the creation of the DAP in 1919, was side-lined at the end of the year when Hitler drafted regulations against conspiratorial circles, and the Thule Society was dissolved a few years later (Goodrick-Clarke, 1985 ; pages 150, 221) . It had no members from the top-echelons of the Party and Nazi officials were forbidden any involvement in secret societies. Adolf Hitler was never a member, while Rudolf Heß and Alfred Rosenberg were only visiting-guests of the Thule Society in the early years before they came to prominence in the Nazi movement (Goodrick-Clarke, 1985 ; pages 149, 201) . However, the « völkisch » circles did hand-down one significant legacy : Friedrich Krohn, a Thule member, designed the original version of the Nazi swastika, in 1919.

Georg Ritter von Schönerer

Georg Ritter von Schönerer est né le 17 juillet 1842 à Vienne et est mort le 14 août 1921 au château de Rosenau près de Zwettl, en Basse-Autriche. Il était un homme politique autrichien actif à la fin du XIXe siècle et au début du XXe siècle. Son pan-germanisme, qu'il oppose notamment au catholicisme politique, a influencé la pensée d'Adolf Hitler qui le cite dans « Mein Kampf » .

D'abord Libéral, il est élu au parlement d'Autriche, en 1873. Il devient, par la suite, nationaliste et se situe à l'extrême-droite au sein du Mouvement national-allemand : il est alors pangermaniste et antisémite.

...

Georg Ritter von Schönerer was born on 17 July 1842 in Vienna and died on 14 August 1921 at his Rosenau manor near Zwettl, Lower-Austria) was an Austrian land-owner and politician of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, active in the late- 19th and early 20th Centuries. A major exponent of pan-Germanism and German nationalism in Austria, as well as a radical opponent of political Catholicism and fiercely thedesh, his agitation exerted much influence on the young Adolf Hitler.

He was born as Georg Heinrich Schönerer. His father, the wealthy railroad pioneer Matthias Schönerer (1807-1881) , was knighted by Emperor Franz-Josef, in 1860. He had a younger sister, Alexandrine, later director of the « Theater an der Wien » , who strongly repudiated her brother's attitudes.

From 1861, he studied agronomy at the Universities of Tübingen, Hohenheim and Magyaróvár (Ungarisch-Altenburg, today a campus of the University of West Hungary) . He went on conducting the business affairs of his father's Estate at Rosenau, near Zwettl, in the rural Waldviertel region of Lower-Austria, where he became known as a generous patriarch of the local peasants and great benefactor. Shaken by the Austrian defeat in the 1866 Austro-Prussian War, the dissolution of the German Confederation and the foundation of the German Empire, in 1871, young Schönerer became a political activist and ardent admirer of German chancellor Otto von Bismarck.

During the turmoil of the Panic of 1873, he got elected to Cisleithanian Austria's Imperial Council parliament as a Liberal representative but became more and more German nationalist as his career progressed. A great orator and firebrand in parliament, he broke with his Party 3 years later, agitating against « Jewish » capitalism, the ruling Catholic Habsburg dynasty and the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 1878, which he stigmatised as betrayal of German interests. Schönerer's attitudes and political talent were attractive for national Liberal sections of the German-speaking population contemplating the lost chance of a Greater German nation-State, ultimately squandered in the failed Revolutions of 1848.

Tensions rose in 1879 after the accession of Austrian minister-president Eduard Taaffe, whose monarchist politics Schönerer and his followers considered « anti-German ». By 1882, he, together with politicians like Viktor Adler and Heinrich Friedjung, had worked-out the Linz Program (« not Liberal, not Clerical, but National ») of the German national movement, which would become a considerable force in Austrian politics. The program aimed at the autonomy of the predominantly German-speaking Cisleithanian crown lands, including the split-off of « alien » Galicia, Bukovina and Dalmatia, and their affiliation with the German Empire ruled by the House of « Hohenzollern ». These plans even fit with the ideas of Polish, Hungarian and Croatian nationalists, but would have entailed the disempowerment of the House of Habsburg and the Germanisation of the Czech lands in Bohemia.

By the peak of his career, he had transformed into a far-Right politician, considered by Left-leaning Liberals to be even a conservative. Schönerer developed a political philosophy that featured elements of a violent racial opposition to Jews which disregarded religious affiliations. His campaigning became especially vocal upon the arrival of Jewish refugees during the Russian Empire's pogroms, starting in 1881. He fiercely denounced the influence of « exploitative international Jews » and, in 1885, had an Aryan paragraph added to the Linz program, which led to the ultimate breach between him, on the one hand, and Adler and Friedjung, on the other.

Schönerer's approach became the model for German national « Burschenschaften » student fraternities and numerous associations in Cisleithanian Austria. In turn, Jewish activists, like Theodor Herzl, began to adopt the idea of Zionism. Schönerer's authoritarianism, popular solidarity, nationalism, pan-Germanism, anti-Slavism, and anti-Catholicism appealed to many Viennese, mostly working-class. This appeal made him a powerful political figure in Austria and he considered himself leader of the Austrian Germans.

(Image) Schönerer was imprisoned for his raid on a newspaper office. While doing so, he allegedly was drunk, hence this caricature.

In 1888, he was temporarily imprisoned for ransacking a Jewish-owned newspaper office and assaulting its employees for reporting the imminent death of the admired German Emperor Wilhelm I, prematurely. This action increased Schönerer's popularity and helped members of his Party get elected to the Austrian Parliament. Nevertheless, the prison sentence also resulted not only in the loss of his status as a noble, but also of his mandate in parliament. Schönerer was not re-elected to the Imperial Council until 1897, while rivals like the Vienna mayor Karl Lueger and his Christian-Social Party had taken the chance to get ahead.

Later in 1897, Schönerer still was able to help orchestrate the expulsion of Minister president Kasimir Felix Graf Badeni from office. Badeni had proclaimed that civil servants in Austrian-controlled Bohemia would have to know the Czech language, an ordinance which prevented many ethnic German-speakers (the majority of whom could not speak Czech) in Bohemia, from applying for governmental jobs. Schönerer staged mass protests against the ordinance and disrupted parliamentary proceedings, actions which eventually caused Emperor Franz-Josef to dismiss Badeni.

During these years, while the « Kulturkampf » divided Imperial Germany, Schönerer founded the « Los von Rom ! » movement, which advocated the conversion of all Roman Catholic German-speaking people of Austria to Lutheran Protestantism, or, in some cases, to the Old Catholic Churches. Schönerer became even more powerful in 1901, when 21 members of his Party gained seats in the Parliament. His career crumbled rapidly thereafter, however, due to his forceful views and personality. His Party suffered as well, and had virtually disintegrated by 1907. But his views and philosophy, not to mention his great skill as an agitator, would go on to influence Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party as a whole.

Schönerer died at his Rosenau manor near Zwettl, Lower-Austria, on 14 August 1921. He had arranged to be buried near Bismarck's mausoleum on his Estate at Friedrichsruh, Lauenburg in present-day Schleswig-Holstein, northern Germany.

...

Georg Heinrich Ritter von Schönerer (geboren 17. Juli 1842 in Wien ; gestorben 14. August 1921 auf Schloß Rosenau, Niederösterreich) war ein österreichischer Gutsherr und Politiker. Schönerer hatte von 1879 bis zur Jahrhundertwende Bedeutung als Führer zunächst der Deutschnationalen und später der Alldeutschen Vereinigung. Er war ein heftiger Gegner des politischen Katholizismus, ein radikaler Antisemit und übte starken Einfluss auf den jungen Adolf Hitler aus, der ihn als eines seiner Vorbilder ansah.

Georg Schönerer wurde als Sohn des Eisenbahnunternehmers Mathias Schönerer (1807-1881) und dessen Ehefrau Marie Anna Antonia Rehmanns (1819-1884) geboren, er hatte eine Schwester, Alexandrine. Nachdem Mathias Schönerer 1860 von Kaiser Franz Joseph I. in den erblichen Ritterstand erhoben wurde, konnten sich auch seine Kinder dieses Titels bedienen.

Georg von Schönerer betrieb seit 1861 landwirtschaftliche Studien in Tübingen, besuchte 1861-1863 die Landwirtschaftliche Akademie in Hohenheim und 1863-1865 die Höhere Landwirtschaftliche Schule in Ungarisch-Altenburg. Schönerer heiratete im April 1878 Philippine Edle von Gschmeidler (1848-1913) . Aus dieser Ehe gingen Sohn Georg und drei Töchter hervor. Georg junior, kurz vor der Entlassung aus dem Militärdienst und bereit für die Übernahme des väterlichen Gutes, und dessen Frau starben am 3. Oktober 1918 in Wien an der Spanischen Grippe. Seit 1869 verwaltete Schönerer senior nun das väterliche Landgut in Rosenau bei Zwettl, wo er einen landwirtschaftlichen Musterbetrieb aufbaute und führte.

Seine damalige « Stammverbindung » war die Burschenschaft Libertas Wien und er wurde in mehreren Burschenschaften auch Ehrenmitglied : Burschenschaft Germania Innsbruck (1893) , Burschenschaft Teutonia Wien (1893) und Burschenschaft Gothia Wien (1919) .

1873 wurde er für die liberale deutsche Fortschrittspartei in das Abgeordnetenhaus des Reichsrats gewählt, trat 1876 aus dieser Partei aus und war seit 1879 Führer der Deutschnationalen Bewegung (der Alldeutschen) in Österreich. 1878-1883 gehörte er auch dem niederösterreichischen Landtag an.

Er vertrat eine völkisch-germanische Ideologie, die mit einem radikalen Antisemitismus Hand in Hand ging, der bei ihm konsequent « rassistisch » begründet wurde. Seine Alldeutsche Bewegung verlangte 1900 im Wiener Parlament, eine Prämie für jeden « niedergemachten » Juden auszusetzen. Schönerer verkündete damals völkisch-antisemitische Parolen wie durch Reinheit zur Einheit - Ohne Juda, ohne Rom / wird gebaut Germaniens Dom oder Die Religion ist einerlei / im Blute liegt die Schweinerei. Schönerer war heftiger Gegner des habsburgisch-österreichischen Patriotismus (« Volksrecht bricht Staatsrecht ») und des Liberalismus. Er kämpfte für die Auflösung der Monarchie und den Anschluß ihrer westlichen Teile an das Deutsche Reich. Als Gegner der staatstragenden katholischen Kirche war er ein Vorkämpfer der « Los-von-Rom-Bewegung » . Er trat selbst 1900 zum Protestantismus über und verkündete etwa im Jahr 1887 die Abschaffung des christlichen Kalenders. Als neuen Nullpunkt für die Zeitrechnung bestimmte er das Jahr 113 vor Christus, in welchem die Kimbern und Teutonen das römische Heer in der Schlacht bei Noreia besiegt hatten. 1882 bestimmte Schönerer das deutschnationale « Linzer Programm » maßgeblich mit, das nationalistische, soziale und antisemitische Elemente miteinander verknüpfte.

Schönerer zählt zu den Gründungsmitgliedern des 1880 gegründeten Deutschen Schulvereines, der die deutsche Bevölkerung in den Gebieten Österreichs, in denen sie nur eine Minderheit bildeten, mit dem Bau von Schulen und dem Ankauf von Gütern unterstützen wollte. Da der Schulverein Juden die Mitgliedschaft gestattete, legte Schönerer 1885 aus Protest seinen Posten im Aufsichtsrat nieder und trat aus dem Schulverein aus. Danach gründete Schönerer den antisemitischen « Schulverein für Deutsche » .

Am 8. März 1888 betrauerte er in einem Gasthof in Begleitung einiger Anhänger den bevorstehenden Tod Wilhelms I. In einer Extraausgabe des Neuen Wiener Tagblattes wurde der noch nicht eingetretene Tod bereits verkündet ; kurze Zeit später erfolgte eine neuerliche Extraausgabe, welche meldete, daß der Kaiser noch am Leben sei. Darauf gerieten Schönerer und seine Begleiter in Zorn, weil er den Herausgebern des Neuen Tagblattes unterstellte, aus dem Tod des Kaisers Profit zu machen. So drang er mit Gleichgesinnten in die Redaktion des Neuen Wiener Tagblattes ein und bedrohte die Redakteure. Es kam zu einer Anzeige und Beantragung eines Haftbefehls gegen Schönerer. Der Staatsanwalt forderte vom Reichsrat die Auslieferung Schönerers. In seinem Antrag verteidigte sich Schönerer, man solle sich mäßigen und ihn nicht ausliefern. Er sei bereits fünfmal ausgeliefert worden und jedes Mal freigesprochen oder die Anklage sei zurückgezogen worden. Die Abgeordneten stimmten jedoch gegen Schönerers Antrag und hoben seine Immunität auf.

Vor Gericht sagten die Angestellten der Redaktion aus, Schönerer hätte gerufen : « Der Tag der Rache ist gekommen ! » Er selbst hingegen behauptete, er habe lediglich die tatsächlichen Fakten ermitteln wollen. Weiters wurde behauptet,

daß Schönerer die Türe versperrt, die Angestellten mit einem Stock bedroht, dabei geschrien und zwei Redakteure festgehalten und mit Fäusten traktiert habe. Schönerer entgegnete dem Vorwurf, er habe sich über die Art und Weise dieses Pressegebarens Luft gemacht und dann den Raum verlassen. Eine große Anzahl von Zeugen bestätigte die Version der Journalisten, Schönerer nannte 19 Zeugen. Die widersprüchlichen Angaben und Fakten wurden vom Richter in seiner Begründung anerkannt, indem er bei weitem nicht das volle Strafausmaß von fünf Jahren ausschöpfte. Schönerer wurde am 5. Mai 1888 zu einer viermonatigen Kerkerstrafe verurteilt sowie des Abgeordnetenmandats für fünf Jahre und des Adelstitels verlustig erklärt. Deshalb mußte er die Führung der erstarkenden deutschnationalen Bewegung anderen überlassen. Ein großer Teil seiner Anhänger ging auch zu den Christlichsozialen Luegers über. 1897-1907 gehörte Schönerer als Außenseiter wieder dem Reichsrat an. Seine politischen Organe waren die 1881 gegründete Zeitschrift Deutsche Worte (seit 1883 Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte) und die Zeitungen Alldeutsches Tagblatt (1903 gegründet) und Grazer Wochenblatt.

Noch einmal erlangte Schönerer in den Jahren zwischen 1897 und 1901 eine gewisse Führungsrolle innerhalb des deutschnationalen Lagers aufgrund der Badeni-Krise. Als der österreichische Ministerpräsident Kasimir von Badeni 1897 im Parlament Verordnungen vorlegte, die für die künftige Einstellungen von Beamten in Böhmen und Mähren Kenntnisse der deutschen und der tschechischen Sprache vorsahen, konnte sich Schönerer an die Spitze der Protestbewegung gegen diese Maßnahme setzen. Über viele Monate wurde der österreichische Reichsrat durch eine gezielte Obstruktionspolitik arbeitsunfähig.

1901 wurden 21 Abgeordnete der Schönerer-Gruppe (oder Alldeutsche Vereinigung) in das Parlament gewählt. Doch innerhalb kurzer Zeit kam es zu einem innerparteilichen Streit zwischen Schönerer und seinem jüngeren Fraktionskollegen Karl Hermann Wolf. Die Alldeutsche Vereinigung zerfiel, Wolf gründete mit den meisten ehemaligen Abgeordneten der Schönerer-Gruppe die Deutschradikale Partei. Weitere Wahlerfolge erreichte Schönerer nicht mehr. 1907 wurde seine Partei auf drei Abgeordnete reduziert, er selbst scheiterte mit seiner Kandidatur, von da an blieb er eine politische Randfigur.

Über eine Massenbewegung gebot er nie. Am Höhepunkt 1885 hatte seine Monatszeitung Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte nicht einmal eine Auflage von 1700 Exemplaren. Die Mitgliederanzahl seines deutschnationalen Vereins betrug 1889 gerade 1.200 Personen.

1917 erhielt Schönerer durch eine Amnestie Kaiser Karls I. sein Adelsprädikat zurück. Auf seinen Wunsch hin wurde er, der Bismarck unter anderem aufgrund dessen vorbildlicher Sozialpolitik (gesetzliche Unfallversicherung, gesetzliche Krankenversicherung, deutsche Sozialversicherung) verehrte, 1922 in der Nähe von Bismarcks Gut Friedrichsruh im Sachsenwald bei Hamburg beigesetzt. Bismarck selbst hatte Schönerers Politik jedoch abgelehnt, da er an einer Destabilisierung Österreich-Ungarns kein Interesse hatte, sondern einen starken Bündnispartner wollte. Schönerers Grab befindet sich in Aumühle. Sein Grabstein trägt die Inschrift « ein Kämpfer für Alldeutschland » .

Schönerer entwickelte eine politische Symbolik, die sich teilweise noch heute in Österreich finden lässt. Als glühender Verehrer von Kaiser Wilhelm I. machte er die Kornblume zu einem der Parteisymbole. Ferner ließ er Lieder wie Die Wacht am Rhein singen und verschmähte österreichisch-patriotische Lieder. Auch ließ er in den Farben Schwarz-Rot-

Gold oder Schwarz-Weiß-Rot beflaggen und schmückte zu besonderen Anlässen die Bildnisse von Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm oder Moltke mit Lorbeerkränzen.

Mitgliedsurkunde des Floridsdorfer Turnvereins für Schönerer in Runenschrift. Transcription : « Durch Reinheit, zur Einheit » . Hochgeehrter Führer ! Der Deutschvölkliche Turnverein in Floridsdorf hat in seiner 31. Hauptversammlung den Beschluß gefaßt, Sie, werter Herr, in anbetracht Ihrer großen Verdienste um die gerechte Sache, die der Verein als Deutschvölklicher zu würdigen versteht, zu seinem Ehrenmitgliede zu ernennen. Floridsdorf, im Eis-Mond (Januar) 2009 (1896 nor Christus) , der Turnrath (Turnrat) .

Die andere Seite des Politikers Schönerer ist sein soziales Engagement, das er in seiner Position als Gutsherr zeigte. Vor allem in der Frühzeit seiner politischen Karriere spielten soziale Anliegen eine gewisse Rolle. Noch 1912 lobte die Arbeiter-Zeitung seine Standpunkte in der sozialen Frage, wenn sie auch seine politischen Ansichten ablehnte.

Schönerer stellte (im Gegensatz zu anderen Gutsbesitzern) überwiegend Ehepaare ein und begnügte sich mit 2,5 % Verzinsung aus seinen Gütern. Den Rosenauer Meierhof bewohnten nach Auskunft seiner Schwester 60 Menschen. Daneben besaß er noch zahlreiche Häuser, in denen er seine Angestellten und deren Familien unterbrachte. Er setzte sich im Reichsrat für Krankenkasse, Altersversicherung, Arbeitszeitbeschränkung, Sonn- und Feiertagsruhe und viele andere sozialen Errungenschaften ein. Schönerer gab seinen Beschäftigten, welche aus Alters- oder Krankheitsgründen nicht mehr arbeitsfähig waren die Möglichkeit, auf seinem Gut im sogenannten « Spital » (Altersheim) im Ausgedinge bis zu ihrem Tode zu verbleiben. Sein Motto war : « Für meine Ausgedienten Sorge ich ! » .

Bei existenzbedrohenden Brand- oder Viehschäden half Schönerer aus. Im Armenhaus der Doppelmonarchie, dem niederösterreichischen Waldviertel, hat er an die 200 Feuerwehren unterstützt oder begründet. Schönerer setzte sich persönlich für die Förderung der Raiffeisen-Darlehenskassen ein und gewährte seinen Leuten selbst Vorschüsse. Oftmals strich er selbst die Rückzahlung offener Lohnvorschüsse bei mangelnder Liquidität und ermöglichte so den Pächtern ein wirtschaftliches Arbeiten. Nachweislich fanden drei (von allen anderen Gutsbesitzern als untauglich abgelehnte) Taubstumme in seiner Gärtnerei Arbeit, zwei körperlich Versehrte verdingten sich als Esel führer des Milchfuhrwerks. « Auch sie haben Hunger » , pflegte er zu sagen.

Schönerer nahm außerdem Stellung gegen den auf Vor- und Nachmittag verteilten Unterricht in den Volksschulen auf dem Lande mit Rücksicht auf die langen Schulwege, außerdem forderte er im Interesse der Landwirtschaft eine Sommerbefreiung für Jugendliche. Von ihm wurde in Schloß Rosenau das Grundkapital für eine Suppenanstalt gestiftet, damit die Kinder mit langen Schulwegen im eisigen Winter des Waldviertels beim Wirt Suppe und damit auch einen warmen Aufenthaltsraum bekamen. Eine gleichartige Suppenanstalt befindet sich auch in der Hamerlinggemeinde Kirchberg. Von seinen Gutsverwaltern forderte er : « Geben Sie den Leuten, was rechtens ist ! » .

In Österreich-Ungarn bildeten zu Schönerers Zeit die Deutschen (deutsch sprechenden Bewohner) die Minderheit. Drei Viertel der Bevölkerung setzten sich aus anderen Völkern wie Ungarn, Tschechen, Polen und Serben und Kroaten zusammen. Die Furcht vor einer « Überfremdung » führte bei einigen Deutschsprachigen zum Wunsch, Österreich solle sich dem (gleichsprachigen) Deutschen Reich anschließen. Auch Schönerer vertrat diese Überzeugung, und mehr :

Österreich solle ausschließlich von deutschsprachigen Personen bewohnt sein. Schönerer ließ sich von seinen Anhängern mit « Führer » ansprechen und mit « Heil ! » -Rufen begrüßen.

Schönerers Wirken zeigte sich auch in der Gründung des « Neuen Richard-Wagner-Vereins », um « die deutsche Kunst aus Verfälschung und Verjudung zu befreien ». Er äußerte Propagandasprüche wie « Der unter kühlerem Himmel gereifte Mensch hat auch die Pflicht, die parasitären Rassen auszurotten, so wie man bedrohliche Giftschlangen und wilde Raubtiere eben ausrotten muß » oder Parolen wie « Ob Jud, ob Christ ist einerlei - in der Rasse liegt die Schweinerei » .

Schönerer verlangte die Entfernung von Juden aus dem Staatsdienst, aus Schulen, Universitäten, Vereinen und Zeitungen. 1888, im Jahr als er seine Haftstrafe verbüßte, reichte er eine « Antisemitische Petition » ein :

« In dem von uns bewohnten Viertel beginnt ganz allmählich eine nationale Umwandlung einzutreten, indem nicht nur slawische, sondern auch jüdische Unterwanderung überhand nimmt, und sogar auch Stellungen mit obrigkeitlichem Charakter mit Juden wiederholt besetzt wurden, was sich in auffälligster Weise bis auf die Kreise der Gendarmerie ins Waldviertel erstreckt hat. Durch das Slawentum könnte der deutsche Charakter unseres Landesteiles bedroht werden, durch das Judentum ist die Gefahr noch größer, denn dieses orientalische Volk trachtet unser heimisches Volk zu entnationalisieren. » (Friedrich Polleroß : Die Erinnerung tut zu weh.)

Adolf Hitlers Familie kam aus dem Waldviertel, nicht weit vom 120 Hektar großen Gutshof Schönerers entfernt, Hitler selbst verbrachte nur Ferien bei seinen dortigen Verwandten. An der Realschule in Linz begeisterten sich Realschüler, darunter auch Hitler, für die Thesen Schönerers, sie begrüßten sich mit « Heil ! » -Rufen und hefteten sich Kornblumen ans Revers.

Am 10. Oktober 1920 hielt Hitler im Waldviertel, im Kinosaal Gmünd, eine Versamlungsrede der NSDAP, gegen den Versailler Vertrag, gegen die sogenannte Zinsknechtschaft und gegen die Weimarer Republik. Bei der Nationalratswahl 1930 erreichte die NSDAP im Waldviertel bereits 10 % . Nach den Ende 1932 abgehaltenen Gemeinderatswahlen regierten in Stein, Zwettl, Gmünd und Krems nationalsozialistische Bürgermeister.

Während des NS-Regimes wurden auch einige Straßen und Plätze nach Schönerer benannt. So hieß der Münchner Habsburgerplatz zum Beispiel bis 1945 Schönererplatz. 1942 schrieb der Nationalsozialist Rudolf Lochner über das national und sozial gesinnte Vorbild :

« Mit Schönerer sich zu beschäftigen, heißt, großdeutsche Geschichte zu treiben. Schönerer einer der leidenschaftlichsten Deutschen, die je gelebt, ist der größte deutsche politische Erzieher nach Bismarck und vor Adolf Hitler. » (Rudolf Lochner : Georg von Schönerer, ein Erzieher zu Großdeutschland.)

Der nationalsozialistische Schriftsteller Otto Henke hob ebenfalls den Bezug hervor :

« Die Ahnenheimat des Führers wurde durch Georg Ritter von Schönerer zur Geistesheimat des erbitterten Kampfes

gegen das Judentum. » (Wolfgang Zdral : Die Hitlers. Die unbekannte Familie des Führers.)

Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg geriet der Einfluss Schönerers auf Hitler nicht in Vergessenheit. Von Hannah Arendt wurde Schönerer als « geistiger Vater » Hitlers bezeichnet.

...

Schönerer absolvierte nach der Realschulausbildung in Wien eine landwirtschaftliche Ausbildung in Tübingen, Hohenheim und Ungarisch-Altenburg (bis 1865) . Anschließend arbeitete er auf verschiedenen Gütern, unternahm Studienreisen und verwaltete seit 1869 das väterliche Gut Rosenau im Waldviertel. 1873 in das Abgeordnetenhaus gewählt, schloß er sich dem linken Flügel der liberalen Verfassungspartei (Fortschrittspartei) an. Schönerer radikalisierte die nach dem Börsenkrach 1873 weit verbreitete Kritik an den Geschäftsverbindungen des rechten Flügels der Partei (« Verwaltungspartei ») , nahm insbesondere auch die Verbindungen zwischen der liberalen Presse und korrupten Firmenleitungen aufs Korn und propagierte bald einen zumal im studentischen Milieu auf Widerhall stoßenden Antisemitismus, der in diesem antiklerikalen Umfeld aber nicht auf religiösen Kriterien aufgebaut war, sondern das Abstammungskriterium als ethnischen Ausschließungsgrund hervorhob (« Rassenantisemitismus ») .

Nach den Wahlen 1879 blieb Schönerer dem liberalen Dachverband fern und gründete als Zwei-Mann-Fraktion den « Verband der Deutschnationalen » . 1882 veröffentlichte er in Zusammenarbeit und andere mit Engelbert Pernerstorfer (1850-1918) das « Linzer Programm » (1885 von Schönerer um die sogenannten « Arierparagraphen » erweitert) , unter Berufung auch auf die Thronrede Wilhelms I. zur Sozialpolitik 1881. Er war Gründer der Wochenschriften « Deutsche Worte » (1881-1884) , « Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte » (1884-1918) und des « Alldeutschen Tagblatts » (1903-1914) . In den Debatten um die Verlängerung des Privilegs der Nordbahn errang er als Verfechter der Verstaatlichung eine gewisse Popularität, die 1887-1888 auch von Wahlerfolgen für seine « Vereinigten Christen » begleitet war, die auch spätere Christlichsoziale umfaßten. Schönerer wurde jedoch 1888 nach einem nächtlichen Handgemenge in einer Zeitungsredaktion zu drei Monaten Haft verurteilt, verlor seinen Adelstitel - und seine Wiener Anhängerschaft an Karl Lueger (1844-1910) .

Nach seiner Haft predigte Schönerer, der schon zuvor einen forcierten Bismarck-Kult betrieben hatte, einen kaum verhüllten « alldeutschen » Irredentismus. Politisch gewannen seine « Alldeutschen » erst 1897, als Schönerer wieder in den Reichsrat (Abgeordnete bis 1907) gewählt wurde, als Vehikel des Protests der Deutschböhmen gegen die Badenischen Sprachenverordnungen an Gewicht. Als Reaktion auf das Bündnis der katholisch Parteien mit den Slawen rief Schönerer 1898 die « Los-von-Rom » -Bewegung ins Leben, brach nach dem Konflikt mit Karl Hermann Wolf (1862-1941) 1902 und der Abspaltung der « Frei-Alldeutschen Partei » aber mit dem Großteil seiner deutsche böhmisch Anhänger. Die Alldeutschen Vereinigung im Parlament löste sich 1904 auf, im letzten Abgeordnetenhaus folgten nur vier von über hundert deutsche nationalen Abgeordneten der erraticen Führung Schönerers, der Jauch bei reichsdeutsche Alldeutschen vielfach auf Unverständnis stieß und seine Feindschaft zur Habsburgermonarchie auch im Zeichen der Kriegssolidarität nicht milderte, nach 1918 politisch aber nicht mehr hervortrat.

Schönerers « gesinnungstreuer » Starrsinn war für sein mehrfaches Scheitern als Politiker ebenso verantwortlich wie für

sein Weiterleben als Legende, die ihn rückblickend weit über seine tatsächliche Bedeutung hinaus als Symbolfigur des österreichische Deutschnationalismus erscheinen ließ, Adolf Hitler knüpfte ideologisch an Schönerers « Ausgrenzung » der Juden aus der Volksgemeinschaft an, hielt ihn aber politisch für kein Vorbild.

Ehrenbürger die Stadt Eger (1897, 1904 von Schönerer zurückgegeben) ; Gedenktafel am Geburtshaus in Wien.

...

Schönerer, Georg Ritter von (bis 1888) : geboren 17.07.1842 Wien ; gestorben 14. 8. 1921 Schloß Rosenau (Gemeinde Zwettl-Niederösterreich) , Gutsbesitzer, Politiker. Ab 1879 Führer der deutschnationalen Bewegung (der Alldeutschen) in Österreich ; heftiger Gegner des österreichischen Patriotismus, der katholischen Kirche und des Liberalismus. Vertrat einen radikalen Antisemitismus, kämpfte für engen Anschluß Österreichs an das Deutsche Reich, war ein Vorkämpfer der Los-von-Rom-Bewegung und trat selbst zum Protestantismus über. Seine autokratischen und terroristischen Methoden, sein nationalistischer Fanatismus waren typisch für seine Richtung. Seine Ideen haben später den jungen A. Hitler stark beeinflusst. Schönerer war 1882 an der Abfassung des deutschnationalen Linzer Programms maßgeblich beteiligt. Eine Gewaltaktion gegen politische Gegner (1888) brachte ihn ins Gefängnis und um Adelstitel, Reserveoffiziersrang und Abgeordnetenmandat. 1897-1907 war er wieder meist Abgeordneter. Er besaß zunächst auch auf Karl Lueger, E. Engelbert Pernerstorfer und Viktor Adler einen gewissen Einfluss, dem aufgrund seines Radikalismus Ablehnung folgte. Seine Anhänger (« Schönerianer ») waren insbesondere Burschenschaftler und Sudetendeutsche. Seine politische Organe waren die Zeitschrift « Unverfälschte deutsche Worte » (1890-1912) und die Zeitungen « Alldeutsches Tagblatt » und « Grazer Wochenblatt » .

31. August 1894 : Georg Schönerer verzichtet auf die Ehrenbürgerschaft von Zwettl

Die Vorgeschichte 1870 wird Georg Ritter von Schönerer Ehrenbürger von Zwettl

Georg Ritter von Schönerer mit 30 Jahren Mit dem « Reichsvolksschulgesetz » vom 14. Mai 1869 wurde neben zahlreichen anderen neuen Lehrgegenständen auch der Turnunterricht als obligatorisches Fach in Österreichs Pflichtschulen eingeführt. Von einer staatlich organisierten, flächendeckenden turnpädagogischen Ausbildung der Lehrer konnte bis zu diesem Zeitpunkt aber keine Rede sein. Es waren die nach 1861 entstandenen Turnvereine, allen voran der Erste Wiener Turn-Verein, die Kurse für interessierte Lehrer abhielten. Ab 1864 gewährte der Landtag von Niederösterreich immerhin erstmals acht Stipendien für Lehrer, die an diesen Kursen teilnahmen. 1870 gingen dann die niederösterreichische Statthalterei beziehungsweise der Landesausschuss daran, die Turnlehrausbildung zu institutionalisieren. Man kam überein, in jedem Landesviertel einen zentralen Ort auszuwählen, in dem Turnkurse für Lehrer abgehalten werden sollten. Neben Sankt Pölten, Wiener Neustadt und Korneuburg hatte man für das Waldviertel dabei an Zwettl gedacht.

Bezirkshauptmann Theodor Ritter von Kronenfels fragte im März 1870 bei der Stadtgemeinde Zwettl an, ob sie sich in der Lage sehe, die Voraussetzungen für solche Turnkurse zu schaffen. Die Stadtväter waren sich mit Sicherheit nicht bewusst, was da auf sie zukam, als sie sich dem Bezirkshauptmann gegenüber verpflichteten, die Turnkurse in Zwettl zu

organisieren, denn Mitte Juli erfuhren sie, daß sie für den am 15. September startenden Kurs auf Gemeindegeldern einen entsprechenden Turnapparat anzuschaffen hätten. Wie dieses Gerät aussehen sollte, ist leider nicht überliefert.

Wahrscheinlich handelte es sich um eine Gerätekombination, wie sie beim Jahn'schen Turnen Verwendung fand. Jedenfalls war in Zwettl ein derartiger Turnapparat nicht aufzutreiben. In Langenlois gab es zwei Tischler, die ein ähnliches Gerät bereits hergestellt hatten, einen neuen Turnapparat aber frühestens im Spätherbst liefern konnten. Außerdem ließen sich die Kosten für dieses Gerät nicht eindeutig zu beziffern. Die Angaben schwankten zwischen 193 und 400 Gulden.

So war guter Rat teuer. Einerseits wollten sich die Zwettler Gemeindeväter keinesfalls vor Bezirkshauptmann und Landesverwaltung blamieren, andererseits konnte man die geforderten Bedingungen aus eigener Kraft nicht erfüllen. In dieser peinlichen Situation wandte man sich an einen neuen Nachbar um Hilfe. Im nahen Schloß Rosenau wohnte seit 1869 Georg Ritter von Schönerer (1842-1921). Dieser stand wahrscheinlich schon damals in Kontakt zu Turnerkreisen. Jedenfalls sicherte er den Zwettler Gemeindevätern seine Hilfe zu, und er beauftragte sogleich sein Personal, allen voran den Forstmeister Steidl, für die Herstellung des gewünschten Turngerätes zu sorgen. Und tatsächlich, noch vor dem 15. September 1870 lieferten Rosenauer Fuhrleute den fertigen Turnapparat in Zwettl ab.

Die Kosten für Holz und Transport übernahm Schönerer zur Gänze selbst. Für Zimmermanns-, Schloßer-, Sattler-, Tischler- und Seilerarbeiten hatte er insgesamt 95 Gulden und 52 Kreuzer ausgegeben. In einem Brief vom 15. September teilte er der Stadtgemeinde Zwettl mit, daß er auf diese Summe verzichte, die Gemeinde möge diesen Betrag aber einem wohltätigen Zweck zuführen.

Am 22. Oktober 1870 beschloß die Gemeindevertretung der Stadt Zwettl einstimmig, Georg Ritter von Schönerer wegen dieser seiner Verdienste um die Gemeinde zum Ehrenbürger zu ernennen. (1) Schönerer bedankte sich für diese Auszeichnung in einem Dankschreiben vom 30. März 1871. (2)

Der Turnkurs in Zwettl fand tatsächlich statt. Der Lehrer Johann Schoenbauer aus Martinsberg leitete ihn. Er hatte 1867 an einem Turnlehrgang des Ersten Wiener Turn-Vereins unter Johann Hoffer (1823-1891) erfolgreich teilgenommen. Allerdings war das Interesse an diesen Turnkursen in den einzelnen Landesvierteln nicht allzu groß. In Zwettl nahmen beispielsweise nur acht Lehrer aus dem hiesigen Bezirk teil, aus den Nachbarbezirken hatte sich niemand gemeldet. Der Bezirkshauptmann von Korneuburg, wo, wie bereits erwähnt, ein ähnlicher Kurs stattfand, regte bei der Statthalterei brieflich an, diese Kurse in Zukunft möglichst an den Standorten der neu gegründeten Lehrerbildungsanstalten abzuhalten, was letztlich auch geschah, und so blieb die Turnlehrerausbildung in Zwettl im 19. Jahrhundert eine kurze Episode.

Schönerers Verzicht auf seine Ehrenbürgerschaft

In den folgenden Jahren entwickelte Georg Ritter von Schönerer neben seiner Tätigkeit als Gutsherr umfangreiche politische Aktivitäten. So war er zwischen 1873 und 1874 sowie von 1885 bis 1888 Mitglied des Zwettler Gemeindegeldausschusses (Gemeinderates). Vor allem zog er aber ebenfalls bereits 1873 als Abgeordneter in den Reichsrat ein. Er gründete die Alldeutsche Bewegung, war ein glühender Verehrer des deutschen Reichskanzlers Bismarck und von Kaiser Wilhelm I., gründete die Los-von-Rom-Bewegung in Österreich und gilt als der Gründer des politischen

Rassenantisemitismus. Seine politische Agitation trug wesentlich zur Vergiftung des Klimas zwischen den Völkerschaften der Donaumonarchie bei. Adolf Hitler erwähnte ihn in « Mein Kampf » als eines seiner Vorbilder ...

Schönerer hatte zwar im späten 19. Jahrhundert in der Zwettler Bevölkerung eine beachtliche Anhängerschar, ebenso wie im gesamten Waldviertel und in weiten Teilen der Monarchie. Sein Verhältnis zur Zwettler Stadtregierung war allerdings zu dieser Zeit keineswegs konfliktfrei. Die Mehrzahl der Mitglieder der Zwettler Gemeindevertretung war klerikalen oder liberalen Gruppierungen, nicht aber Schönerers deutschnationaler Partei zuzurechnen.

Am 28. und 29. August 1894 fanden in Zwettl Gemeinderatswahlen statt. Damals gab es in Österreich noch kein gleiches und allgemeines Wahlrecht. Die Wahlberechtigten wurden nach ihrer Steuerleistung in drei Wahlkörper eingeteilt. Die Stimmen vermögender Staatsbürger hatten deutlich mehr Gewicht als solche wenig Begüteter. Frauen und arme Leute hatten kein Wahlrecht. Schönerers Parteigänger kandidierten 1894 im 3. Wahlkörper, das waren die Wahlberechtigten mit der geringsten Steuerleistung. Jeder der drei Wahlkörper entsandte (unabhängig von der Zahl der Wahlberechtigten) sieben Mitglieder in den Gemeindevorstand. Für den 3. Wahlkörper waren 1894 in Zwettl 479 Männer wahlberechtigt, 303 von ihnen gaben ihre Stimme ab. Von den sieben aus diesem Wahlkörper gewählten Mitgliedern des Gemeindevorstandes gehörten sechs der liberalen Partei und nur einer, nämlich der Hammerschmied Josef Fürst, der deutschnationalen Partei Schönerers an, und auch dieser wurde nur mit einem denkbar knappen Überhang von 5 Stimmen gewählt. Auch die 14 vom ersten und zweiten Wahlkörper gewählten Ausschussmitglieder waren der liberalen Partei zuzurechnen. (3)

Ob dieser eindeutigen politischen Niederlage erbost, verfasste Schönerer ein Schreiben⁴ an den Zwettler Gemeindevorstand mit folgendem Inhalt :

Herrn Gemeindevorstand der I. f. (4) Stadt Zwettl

der Gefertigte ersucht zur Kenntnis zu nehmen und die löbliche Gemeindevertretung hievon zu verständigen, daß derselbe auf die ihm am 22. Oktober 1870 einstimmig verliehene Ehrenbürgerschaft Verzicht leistet und daher ersucht, seinen Namen aus dem I. Wahlkörper der Wählerliste zu streichen.

Achtungsvoll zeichnet

Georg Schönerer

Schloß Rosenau, 31. August 1894. (5)

Noten

(1) StAZ, Ratsprotokolle, Sign. 2-21, Protokoll vom 22. Oktober 1870.

(2) Stadtarchiv Zwettl (StAZ) , Karton 72, Unprotokollierte Akten, Dankschreiben Schönerers vom 30. März 1871.

(3) Zwettler Zeitung vom 1. Herbstmond (September) 1894, Seite 67 ; und vom 15. Herbstmond 1894, Seiten 70 und 71.

(4) l. f. = landesfürstliche.

(5) StAZ, Karton 85, Regierung Nummer 482/1894, Schreiben Georg Schönerers vom 31. August 1894.

Literatur

Friedel Moll. Zur Geschichte des Turnunterrichts in Zwettl, in : Ottomar Demal/Volker Hakala (Herausgegeben) , Festschrift zur Eröffnung der Turnhalle der Hauptschule Zwettl-NÖ, Zwettl (1993) ; hier Seiten 49-68.

Friedel Moll und Michaël Wladika. Georg Ritter von Schönerer (1842-1921) . Ein alldeutscher Politiker aus dem Waldviertel, in : Harald Hitz / Franz Pötscher / Erich Rabl / Thomas Winkelbauer. Waldviertler Biographien, Band 3 - Schriftenreihe des Waldviertler Heimatbundes Nr. 52, Horn-Waidhofen / Thaya (2010) ; Seiten 121-150.
www.daswaldviertel.at

Eduard Pichl (Pseudonym : Herwig) . Georg Schönerer und die Entwicklung des Alldeutschtums in der Ostmark, 6 Bände, Wien (1897 bis 1938) .

Friedrich Polleroß. 100 Jahre Antisemitismus im Waldviertel. Schriftenreihe des Waldviertler Heimatbundes Nr. 25, Krems (1983) ; www.daswaldviertel.at

Friedrich Polleroß (Herausgegeben) . « Die Erinnerung tut zu weh » . Jüdisches Leben und Antisemitismus im Waldviertel - Schriftenreihe des Waldviertler Heimatbundes Nr. 37, Horn-Waidhofen / Thaya (1996) ;
www.daswaldviertel.at

Andrew G. Whiteside. Georg Ritter von Schönerer. Alldeutschland und sein Prophet, Graz-Wien-Köln (1981) .

Michaël Wladika, Hitlers Vätergeneration. Die Ursprünge des Nationalsozialismus in der Kaiserlich und Königlich Monarchie, Wien-Köln-Weimar (2005) .

Nazi-Ehrenbürger am Pranger

Bezirksblätter-Recherchen : Kein Hitler als Ehrenbürger, dafür aber sein politischer Ziehvater Georg Schönerer.

Waidhofen / Zwettl (pez/schab) . Georg Ritter von Schönerer (1842-1921) war kein besonders sympathischer Kerl: Er forderte unter anderem schon um die Jahrhundertwende den Anschluß des deutschsprachigen Teils der Monarchie an das Deutsche Reich. Von seinen Anhängern ließ er sich als „Führer“ ansprechen und mit „Heil“ begrüßen. Einmal forderte der Abgeordnete der Gemeinden in den Bezirken Zwettl und Waidhofen sogar Prämien für getötete Juden.

Deshalb gilt Schönerer auch als eines der Vorbilder Hitlers.

Wie vergangene Woche bekannt wurde, behauptete der Grünen-Abgeordnete Karl Öllinger auf der Homepage www.stopptdierechten.at, daß eben jener Schönerer Ehrenbürger von Zwettl ist. Nachdem in ganz Österreich über die Aberkennung von Ehrenbürgerschaften von Nazi-Größen diskutiert wird, stellte der Bürgermeister der Stadtgemeinde Zwettl, Herbert Prinz, aber klar: Georg Heinrich Ritter von Schönerer wurde am 22. Oktober 1870 von der Zwettler Gemeindevertretung zum Ehrenbürger ernannt. 1894, nach der Gemeinderatswahl vom 28. und 29. August, bei der Schönerers Kandidaten in Zwettl sehr schlecht abschnitten, legte er seine Ehrenbürgerschaft verärgert zurück. Das entsprechende Dokument befindet sich im Stadtarchiv. In Waidhofen wurde Schönerer nie zum Ehrenbürger ernannt.

Keine unliebsamen Ehrenbürgerschaften in Archiven.

Ein Rundruf in den Gemeinden des Bezirks und einige Recherchen in angestaubten Archiven förderten keine weiteren Nazi-Größen als Ehrenbürger in den Gemeinden zu Tage. Ganz so wie man es am Gemeindeamt in Ludweis-Aigen ausdrückte :

« Bei uns sind nur ehrenwerte Leute Ehrenbürger. »

Georg Ritter von Schönerer

Geboren wurde Georg Schönerer 1842 auf Schloß Rosenau. Er war zuerst Vertreter der Gemeinden von Waidhofen und Zwettl im Reichsrat und später Führer der Deutschnationalen sowie der Alldeutschen Vereinigung. Er war radikaler Antisemit und damit eines der Vorbilder Hitlers.

Schönerer et l'antisémitisme

En 1882, pour le « Deutschnationaler Verein » fut rédigé le « programme de Linz », qui porta la signature, à côté de celle de Schönerer, de personnalités juives, comme Victor Adler et Heinrich Friedjung. Ce programme conciliait les aspirations de la démocratie politique, de la réforme sociale et du nationalisme allemand, ce qui ne paraissait nullement contradictoire à ses divers signataires. Sur le plan politique étaient exigés l'extension du suffrage, l'établissement d'un impôt progressif, le développement de l'école publique ; sur le plan social, la nationalisation de diverses entreprises, le respect du travail « honnête », la suppression du colportage à domicile (amplement pratiqué par les Juifs), une limite placée à la « puissance de l'argent » ; sur le plan national, la reconnaissance de l'allemand comme langue d'État, la pratique obligatoire de l'allemand pour les examens donnant accès aux fonctions publiques, l'abandon par l'Autriche de ses provinces non-allemandes, la fusion de l'Autriche avec l'espace douanier allemand.

Bien que le « programme de Linz » ne comportât encore que des clauses relevant de l'antisémitisme économique, il a pu paraître étonnant que Adler et Friedjung s'y soient alors associés. Il faut bien voir que ceux qui jouent dans la société viennoise un rôle de 1er plan (394 avocats israélites à Vienne sur 681, en 1890 ; 48 % d'étudiants juifs à la faculté de médecine, monopole presque complet de la presse), se sentent entièrement assimilés à la culture

allemande, ne croient pas à l'avènement de l'antisémitisme, n'ont que des paroles de mépris pour le sionisme, et, pour la plupart, partagent l'idéologie de la réunion de l'Autriche à l'Allemagne, qui est celle de Schönerer, parce qu'elle leur donnera des débouchés professionnels que ne peut leur fournir l'Autriche.

Bien que les premières manifestations de la popularité de Schönerer se soient déroulées au sein du « Reformverein », créé en 1881, qui rassemblait surtout des artisans et des petits commerçants et qui organisa à Vienne plusieurs réunions où furent acclamés les slogans antisémites, c'est incontestablement auprès des étudiants, bien qu'il n'ait jamais fait d'études universitaires, que Schönerer connut sa plus grande popularité, et qui contribuèrent à radicaliser son mouvement. C'est qu'au « Reichsrat » et en ville il fréquentait les « Alte Herren », c'est-à-dire les anciens membres des associations d'étudiants nationalistes et dont il fit ses principaux lieutenants : Engelbert Pernerstorfer et Anton Lenggaßner venaient de l'« Arminia », Otto Steinwender de la « Silesia », Julius Sylvester de la « Teutonia », et toutes ces personnalités gardaient des contacts étroits avec le monde des étudiants. Après la formation du gouvernement du comte Taaffe, en 1879, qui passait pour être beaucoup plus favorable aux Slaves, sous le couvert du fédéralisme, les sympathies des étudiants pour Schönerer se firent de plus en plus évidentes. L'institution qui permit aux groupes qui se disaient ouvertement « all-deutsch » de s'exprimer était celle des « Kommerse » ou toasts en l'honneur d'une certaine personnalité, suivis de libations et de discours.

Déjà, en 1881, la « Silesia » avait organisé à Vienne une grande manifestation en l'honneur du 10^e anniversaire de la fondation de l'Empire allemand. En mars 1883 eut lieu le « Kommers » en l'honneur de Richard Wagner, auquel participa Schönerer et où furent invités de nombreux membres de l'Université et du « Reichsrat » : l'Orchestre donna l'Ouverture de « Rienzi », « la Mort d'Yseult », et la fin du « Crépuscule des Dieux », à la suite de quoi l'on chanta le « Wacht am Rhein » et le « Deutschland über Alles », l'on lut une dépêche de Moltke qui regrettait de ne pas être présent, et l'on hissa les couleurs allemandes. La violence des propos tenus par Schönerer contre le gouvernement de l'Autriche entraîna la levée provisoire de son immunité parlementaire mais cette sanction provoqua une nouvelle agitation, notamment contre le recteur de l'Université, Friedrich Maaßen, que l'on accusa de trahir la cause allemande. Les réunions de cet ordre se multiplièrent au cours des mois suivants, notamment le « Luther-Kommers », auquel participèrent 2 éminents professeurs de l'Université, Adolf Exner et Ottokar Lorenz, et qui acclama la réunion des populations allemandes d'Autriche au « Reich » allemand. Parmi les étudiants les plus enthousiastes pour Schönerer se trouvait le jeune Hermann Bahr, qui devait devenir plus tard un patriote autrichien et dont la carrière devait le porter à la direction du « Burgtheater ». Mais dans son « Selbstbildnis », il explique ainsi son attitude comme étudiant viennois :

« Mon cœur était brisé : là-bas (en Allemagne) , il y avait Sedan, Bismarck, Richard Wagner, qu'avions-nous à leur opposer ? Quel homme était capable chez nous de réaliser une telle œuvre ? Je n'entendais qu'un nom, celui de Schönerer, l'homme du jour. J'avais besoin d'admirer quelque chose, il n'y avait rien d'autre en Autriche. »

Ou encore :

« Je ne pouvais penser qu'il y eût, parmi les étudiants autrichiens, des traîtres à leur patrie. En fait, ils avaient 2 patries : la petite dans laquelle ils vivaient, la grande par derrière. Ces traîtres à leur patrie étaient très résolus, leur

trahison était honorable, et ils étaient prêts à en payer les conséquences. La figure colossale de Bismarck faisait partie du rayon de lumière qui illuminait ces traîtres, alors que pour nos patriotes rien ne brillait. »

Étudiant duelliste et gros buveur, Hermann Bahr se fit exclure des Universités de Graz, Vienne et Czernowitz. Devant le Sénat académique de Vienne, il déclara :

« Oui, Messieurs, je suis un traître, nous le sommes tous : nous voulons être Allemands. »

À Czernowitz, il était resté ostensiblement assis au cours d'un toast porté à l'Empereur François-Joseph, et dans une beuverie en l'honneur de Martin Luther, vilipenda les Juifs et les Slaves et leva son verre en l'honneur de Schönerer : les autorités académiques lui permirent cependant, en fin de compte, de passer ses examens juridiques, à la condition de quitter aussitôt la ville. Son père, qui, bon bourgeois de Linz, déplorait ses orgies de paroles et de boisson, tenta une démarche auprès de Schönerer pour qu'il cessât d'exercer sur lui ses dangereux sortilèges. Bahr devait poursuivre ses études à Berlin, où il tenta vainement de se faire présenter à Bismarck, et évolua vers un « socialisme à la prussienne » .

Monsieur Bahr n'est pas un cas isolé : il est plus étonnant de trouver parmi les « Aldeutschen » , Theodor Herzl, le futur fondateur du mouvement sioniste, mais qui se trouvait, au début des années 1880, faire partie de la même « Burschenschaft » nationaliste surnommée « Albia » que Bahr, et qui éprouvait alors la même attirance pour le « Reich » bismarckien. Herzl considérait alors les Juifs dans leur ensemble avec dédain, estimant que leur vie de ghetto les avait abrutis physiquement et moralement. Bien que certains historiens aient mis en doute ses idées pan-germanistes, sa grande amitié avec Oswald Boxer, étudiant qui appartient au « Deutscher Klub » , formation parlementaire dirigée par Schönerer, ne permet guère d'en douter. Il dut pourtant s'exclure de la « Burschenschaft Albia » après les excès antisémites du « Kommerz Richard Wagner » . C'est l'époque, en effet, où les associations d'étudiants multiplient les paragraphes d' « arianité » : la « Silesia » à Vienne se vante d'avoir été la Ire à le faire en 1883 ; elle fut suivie par l' « Oppavia » , la « Teutonia » , la « Thuringia » , la « Germamia » ; à Graz, la « Styria » fut la Ire. L' « Oppavia » alla même jusqu'à placer l'antisémitisme comme le point central du programme national.

La popularité de Schönerer fut portée à son comble par la controverse, en 1884, sur l'affaire des Chemins de fer du Nord autrichien, dont la banque Rothschild possédait plus de la moitié des actions, et à qui Schönerer, qui dénonçait son administration, refusait que le renouvellement de la concession lui fût accordée. Cette affaire lui permit de concilier son anti-capitalisme, son antisémitisme et son anti-Libéralisme. En demandant la nationalisation de la « Nordbahn » , il mit toute la violente énergie de sa révolte œdipienne retardée à détourner l'animosité populaire contre la banque et la bourse dans le combat antisémite. Il accusa non seulement les Libéraux et les ministres mais, indirectement, la Cour elle-même de s' « agenouiller devant la puissance des Rothschild et de leurs compères » , et il menaça de tous les bouleversements populaires « colossaux et violents » si l'on ne mettait pas fin immédiatement à cette puissance.

Ce fut l'époque où, chez Schönerer, l'antisémitisme raciste se substitua à l'antisémitisme économique qu'il avait jusqu'alors professé.

« Écrasez la vipère et faites son sort au poison journalistique, si vous ne voulez pas que le peuple opprimé se fasse justice lui-même. »

Dès 1881, il avait fait allusion à la constitution des colonies pénitentiaires pour Juifs, en Bosnie-Herzégovine, et soutenu l'accusation de meurtre rituel contre un juif hongrois. En 1882, il avait demandé au « Reichsrat » que l'on interdise de séjour des Juifs russes qui fuyaient les pogromes. En 1887, il proposera avec ses amis Fürnkranz et Türck un projet de loi envisageant l'ouverture de prisons pour « les menteurs de la presse juive et les coupeurs de cheveux en 4 ». Il faisait savoir que, si son mouvement n'obtenait pas tout de suite ce qu'il voulait, « ceux qui nous vengeront naîtront du cosmos », et qu'à la terreur des oppresseurs sémites ils répondront par la loi du talion, œil pour œil, dent pour dent. Le leader nationaliste disposait au service de son agitation de moyens considérables : au « Reichsrat », il siégeait avec 7 députés qui constituaient le « Verband der Deutschnationalen », mais dont l'influence s'exerçait sur tous les groupes voisins, soit environ sur 80 à 90 députés ; dans son journal, « Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte », dont le tirage varie entre 3,000 et 50,000 exemplaires, l'anti-judaïsme agressif ne se porte plus seulement contre les errements de l'économie ou de la presse juive, mais contre le « sang » ou la « race » juive (« Ob Jude, ob Christ ist einerlei, In der Rasse liegt, die Schweinerei ! ») dans le « Deutscher Schulverein », organisation considérable qui comporta 100,000 membres, à qui Schönerer tenta de faire voter le paragraphe d'aryanité ; dans les sociétés de gymnastique (« Turnvereine ») au sein desquelles se dessine, à Vienne et en Basse-Autriche, une tendance (« Deutscher Turnerbund ») favorable à l'exclusion des Juifs et à l'appartenance à la citoyenneté allemande. Mais c'est toujours parmi les étudiants que se manifeste le plus grand enthousiasme pour Schönerer : le « Kommers » qui fut organisé en son honneur, en septembre 1884, par la « Burschenschaft Oppavia », à Vienne, et, 1 mois plus tard, par les étudiants allemands de Prague, à Brüx. En avril 1885, au cours d'un « Kommers » en l'honneur de Bismarck, 600 étudiants viennois chargeaient Hermann Bahr, qui étudiait alors à Berlin, de remettre une adresse au Chancelier. Les réactions des autorités académiques se montrent de plus en plus inefficaces : lorsque le Sénat viennois prend des mesures contre Josef Ursin, dont le père est député nationaliste au « Reichstag », celui-ci émigre à Innsbruck, où il fonde la « Burschenschaft Suevia », où il poursuit son agitation ; à Graz, Hermann Kinzl, fils d'un avocat Libéral de renom, mais en révolte contre lui, fonde la « Burschenschaft Styria », se fait 2 fois exclure de l'Université, pour devenir plus tard, comme directeur du « Grazer Volksblatt », l'un des principaux disciples de Schönerer. S'il est difficile de créer une fédération stable d'étudiants allemands, dont le particularisme s'oppose souvent au tempérament autoritaire de Schönerer, celui-ci dispose dans le « Waidhofener Verband wehrhafter Vereine » d'une organisation qui lui est entièrement dévouée.

Cette prodigieuse carrière politique fut brutalement interrompue par une espièglerie : au moment de l'agonie de Guillaume Ier, le journal « Neues Wiener Tag Blatt », dont le rédacteur principal était Moritz Szeps, ami intime de Rodolphe de Habsbourg, annonça prématurément la mort du souverain. Furieux, Schönerer décida d'aller châtier l'équipe de ce « torchon juif ». L'agression physique était patente. Schönerer fut condamné à une brève peine de prison, mais, ce qui était plus grave, à la suspension de ses droits politiques et à la perte de ses titres de noblesse. Il semblait que sa carrière politique était brisée.

Les années 1890 représentent pour Schönerer une époque, sinon d'oubli, mais de retraite. La Ire place revient au

Parti Chrétien-Social, qui édifie sur un programme réformateur et corporatif inspiré par les écrits de Karl von Vogelsang, mais auquel Karl Lueger donne un extraordinaire dynamisme et une vaste popularité auprès de la petite bourgeoisie viennoise. Antisémitisme comme Schönerer, Lueger l'était cependant avec moins de violence et sans racisme : il avait l'habitude de dire :

« Qui est juif, c'est moi qui en décide. »

Et il ne mettait pas en question l'existence de la monarchie des Habsbourg. Son élection à la mairie de Vienne (qui n'avait été ratifiée qu'à la 3^e fois, du fait de la résistance de l'Empereur) domina l'histoire des années 1890. Un certain nombre de lieutenants de Schönerer, comme Ernst Vergani et Robert Pattai passèrent à Lueger.

...

... tions du monde germanique, réhabiliterait les légendes païennes et délivrerait les Allemands de la « domination romano-juive » exercée par l'Église catholique. Cet aspect du mouvement « Los-von-Rom » a été particulièrement souligné par un ami de Schönerer, Adolf Lanz (appelé Lanz von Liebenfels), qui définit une religion reposant sur le culte des ancêtres et de la race, fonda lui-même dans son château de Westertein un ordre aristocratique dont il était le grand-Maître, utilisait l'emblème de la croix gammée et les caractères runiques, et préconisait dans sa revue « Ostara », du nom de la divinité germanique du printemps, la castration et la stérilisation des faibles. L'un de ses disciples, Guido von List, avait tenté de dégager de l'influence corruptrice du christianisme la pureté des mœurs germaniques originelles.

L'emprise de la pensée raciste dans l'Autriche, au tournant du siècle, a été retracée par l'historien de Schönerer, Eduard Pichl (pseudonyme : Herwig), qui contribua considérablement à répandre ses idées. Schönerer préconisait un nouveau calendrier, qui faisait commencer l'ère chrétienne en 133 avant Jésus-Christ, date où l'on célébrait une victoire des Germains sur le monde Romain, signant ses lettres en 1888 de l'an 2001. Il recommandait aussi l'« Edda » comme Bible pour les Germains et réhabilitait le salut « Heil ! », qui ne devait s'adresser ni aux Juifs ni aux Slaves. Les associations locales du Parti « Alldeutsch » avaient reçu les noms des héros germaniques (Odin, Kriemhild, Baldur, Siegfried) qui alternaient avec ceux de l'histoire de la Réforme (von Hutten, Wartburg). De nombreux journaux (« Odin », « Grobian », « Volksru », « Organ wider Römlinge », « Undeutsche Finsterlinge and soziale Pharisäer ») répandirent sur leurs adversaires des grossièretés dignes du « Der Stürmer » de l'éditeur nazi Julius Streicher. À Linz d'abord, au Tyrol plus tard, parut « Der Scherer » qui se réclamait d'anciennes figures de l'histoire allemande (Hermann le Chérusque, Martin Luther, Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, Karl Sand, Robert Blum et, bien entendu, Otto Bismarck), pour établir les bases d'un antisémitisme international, en publiant des adresses d'anti-Dreyfusards français, des textes de Giordano Bruno et de Richard Wagner, attaquant de façon indifférente l'émancipation des femmes, la dépravation des mœurs et les progrès de l'alcoolisme.

Quel fut le succès du mouvement « Los-von-Rom » ? Le nombre des conversions au protestantisme a été controversé : relativement élevé, entre 1899 et 1902, persistant jusqu'en 1910, puis disparaissant. L'on pense généralement qu'il y eut une quarantaine de mille de personnes qui se convertirent, auxquelles il faut ajouter une dizaine de mille qui

rejoignirent l' « Altkatholizismus » . Cependant des chiffres plus élevés ont été avancés : jusqu'à 75,000 conversions. Celles-ci ne se limitèrent pas aux pays frontaliers de la Bohême, mais s'étendirent aux pays alpins, touchant essentiellement les classes moyennes (instituteurs, médecins, avocats) mais, de façon imperceptible, paysans et ouvriers, ainsi que la noblesse. Quant aux étudiants, il est certain que nombre d'entre eux, à Vienne et à Prague surtout, l'étudiant Karl Horn, qui appartenait à l' « Akademische Burschenschaft » de Graz, présenta dans une brochure le cléricalisme ultra-montain comme le déchaînement de toutes les forces hostiles à l'Allemagne et l'instrument de la dégermanisation de l'Autriche. L'étudiant Sepp Strohmeyer, de l'école technique de Léoben, voit dans les catholiques « des traîtres par nature, toujours prêts à tirer dans le dos des Allemands, hostiles à l'unité de 1871, complices des slavophiles, dépourvus de toute fibre germanique puisqu'ils ne participent à aucune ligue nationale, à aucune ligue de défense du germanisme » . Mais peu d'entre eux se décidèrent à franchir le pas, 500 environ, et se recrutant dans une monde qui était déjà indifférent en matière religieuse. Il semble que nombre d'entre eux se soient heurtés à la résistance de leur famille : un chaud partisan de Schönerer, Jürgen Rekus, rapporte qu'un étudiant se vit répondre par son père : « Nicht mehr Rom, nichl mein Solm ! » . D'autre part, Schönerer n'obtint pas du pan-germanisme allemand le secours escompté : bien que le mouvement de conversion ait été soutenu par de puissantes organisations protestantes, l' « Evangelischer Bund » et le « Gustav-Adolf-Verein » , l'on pensait généralement dans les milieux nationalistes allemands qu'il ne fallait pas accroître le prestige d'un groupe politique qui avait comme fin la destruction de la monarchie des Habsbourg : c'était là également, depuis Bismarck, le point de vue du gouvernement allemand. Si quelques revues étudiantes de Munich firent écho à l'enseignement de Schönerer, celui-ci ne put établir de liens avec le pan-germanisme allemand.

Le mouvement « Los-von-Rom » a contribué à affaiblir la situation politique de Schönerer. Karl Hermann Wolf, son plus fidèle lieutenant (il s'était battu en duel avec le Comte Badeni, ministre de l'Intérieur, au moment des ordonnances) , fait dorénavant cavalier seul. Une partie influente du clergé populaire allemand, qui avait été touché par l'antisémitisme catholique de Josef Scheicher, se détourna de Schönerer quand celui-ci s'attaqua directement à la « débauche » des prêtres, aux crimes contre les mœurs dont ils se rendent coupables. Schönerer eut conscience que son mouvement se disloquait, qu'il n'en était plus le Maître incontesté. Dès lors, depuis 1902, il semble se désintéresser des affaires de son temps. Il demeure indifférent à la tentative pourtant prometteuse, de Walter Riehl, cependant soutenue par ses plus chauds partisans, de créer un Parti allemand des travailleurs, qui mettait au 1er plan, dans les districts industriels de la Bohême, la défense de la nationalité allemande contre la concurrence tchèque. Plus surprenant encore, Schönerer porta un désintérêt complet aux grands événements universitaires de la dernière décennie qui précéda la 1re Guerre : qu'il s'agit de la menace de la création d'une Université catholique à Salzbourg, du combat que menaient ses partisans contre le projet d'établir une faculté italienne de droit dans la ville « allemande d'Innsbruck, ou de l'affaire « Wahrmond » , suscitée par la révocation de la même Université d'Innsbruck d'un professeur de théologie dont les Partis catholiques dénonçaient les tendances modernistes : dans ces 3 affaires, qui pourtant touchaient de près, ou son attitude hostile à la religion romaine, ou la défense des intérêts allemands, il ne fit rien pour soutenir les thèses « All-deutsch » .

Aussi, sa popularité est-elle rapidement en déclin. Aux élections de 1907, les Ires qui eurent lieu au suffrage universel - il ne fut pas réélu à Eger et dut reconnaître que les partisans de Wolf avaient plus de voix que les siens. Après les élections de 1911, auxquelles il ne se présenta pas, les députés élus comme « All-deutsch » se répartirent dans les

Partis conservateurs voisins. En 1913, au cours d'une fête qui lui fut offerte, il répéta ce slogan :

« Ohne Juda, ohne Rom
Wird gebauet Deutschland Dom ! »

Puis, il poussa un triple « hurra » , en l'honneur de Bismarck. En fait, il est alors un homme fini. Ses partisans adoptèrent pendant la guerre une attitude ambiguë : l'assassinat de François-Ferdinand, qu'ils détestaient, ne leur parut pas être une cause valable pour entrer dans la guerre, qu'ils soutinrent pourtant, parce que l'Autriche-Hongrie était l'alliée du « Reich » allemand et qu'ils attendaient de la victoire de ce dernier l'annexion des Allemands d'Autriche. Ils n'exercèrent aucune influence, ni pendant la guerre ni sur les événements qui la suivirent. Quand mourut Schönerer, en juin 1921, ce n'était plus qu'un cadavre politique, que l'on enterra, selon son désir, en Allemagne, non loin de la tombe de Bismarck, à « Friedrichsruhe » .

Le recul du mouvement « All-deutsch » , après 1901, ne peut cependant pas s'expliquer par le vieillissement de Schönerer, mais plutôt par la dépolitisation que l'on note, surtout dans les milieux étudiants, et que signale, en particulier, l'historien Karl Knoll dans l'histoire qu'il a laissée de la puissante « Burschenschaft Oppavia » , à Vienne : le problème de l'appartenance au « Reich » allemand ne se pose plus guère à la veille de la guerre ; il est possible de faire la preuve que l'on peut être à la fois « bon Allemand » et loyal à l'égard de la dynastie des Habsbourg ; et il apparaît plus profitable, plutôt que de se raidir dans un radicalisme sans nuance, de collaborer avec les Partis de gouvernement, en particulier, les Chrétiens-Sociaux. Cette orientation est confirmée, à la suite de l'échec du mouvement « Los-von-Rom » , par le réveil des idées religieuses dans les associations d'étudiants : les « Burschenschaften » qui se créent après 1900 prennent le plus souvent le nom d' « Austria » , ou de personnalités qui ont illustré le passé catholique de l'Autriche, Rodolphe IV (« Rodolfiana ») , Charles II (« Carolina ») , Ferdinand II (« Ferdinandiana ») . Ce réveil religieux est en étroite relation avec la personnalité de Karl Lueger qui, alors en concordance de vue avec l'Archiduc François-Ferdinand, veut restaurer la mentalité « schwarz-gelb » et revenir aux sources catholiques de la mission des Habsbourg. La croyance dans la renaissance de l'idée autrichienne et du retour à la contre-Réforme se lit, à la veille de la guerre, dans l'œuvre du tyrolien Heinrich von Schullern, « Jung-Oesterreich » , dans les essais de Hermann Bahr, bien revenu de son borussisme de jeunesse, et surtout de Richard Kralik, dont l' « Histoire d'Autriche » (1913) , en accusant Frédéric II et Otto Bismarck, prend le contre-pied des idées de Schönerer.

Cependant ces remarques, qui valent surtout pour les sphères supérieures de la société viennoise, ne doivent pas dissimuler l'influence profonde qu'a exercée Schönerer, qui a eu, dans ses années de triomphe, sans doute 50 % de la population allemande de la Cisleithanie derrière lui. Le « Deutschnationalismus » s'est implanté dans les consciences, avec ses suites antisémites, anti-Slaves et anti-Catholiques, moins sous l'influence de Richard Wagner, de Houston Stewart Chamberlain ou de Julius Langbehn que par la diffusion d'innombrables feuillets, de revues, de courtes pièces, partiellement venues d'Allemagne comme « Der Gute Kamerad » , destiné aux jeunes, ou les romans de Felix Dahn, mais aussi publiés en Autriche, comme les nouvelles de Karl Hans Strobl et de Walter von Molo. Mais surtout dans les régions frontalières de la Bohême, de la Moravie et de la Slovénie s'est développée une littérature nationaliste allemande, dont les auteurs sont souvent, comme Anton Ohorn et Hans Kirchsteiger dans les pays sudètes, des prêtres ou des moines défrôqués, ou qui, comme Rudolph Hans Bartsch en Styrie du Sud, préconisent la conversion au

protestantisme. « Conserver le “ Volkstum ” des ancêtres, voilà la mission sacrée. », tel est le thème qui revient sans cesse.

Cette littérature de frontière, qui connut un succès énorme (le « Beichsiegel » de Hans Kirchsteiger, rempli de détails souvent pornographiques sur l'immoralité et les vices du Clergé, eut avant la guerre jusqu'à 36 éditions) fut parfaitement connue d'Adolf Hitler. Dans le pays où il est né, en Haute-Autriche, l'imprégnation des idées de Schönerer n'est pas moindre : il apparaît que l'école technique de Linz, où vit Hitler, de 1903 à 1908, est dans sa majorité conquise aux idées « All-deutsch », que les « Pennalie » prennent des dénominations de divinités germaniques, pratiquent le « boycott » des Juifs, vouent une haine irréductible à l'archiduc François-Ferdinand, dont on dénonce les visées catholicisantes. On lit le « Deutschvölkischer Zeitweiser », version améliorée dans le sens de l'antisémitisme du fameux « programme de Linz ». Le Maître d'Hitler, Leopold Pötsch, lui aussi un moine détroqué de Saint-Florian, enseigne au jeune Hitler le respect du « Volkstum », le mépris des Habsbourg et des Slaves :

« Aidons, dit-il, nos frères allemands dans les pays opprimés. »

Autant de signes, comme l'a lumineusement montré Friedrich Heer dans son livre « Der Kampf um die österreichische Identität » à quel point la pensée de Hitler était préfigurée par celle de Schönerer, bréviaire des haines sur lesquelles s'est plus tard édifié son diabolique pouvoir.

Le Programme de Linz (1882)

The « Linz Program » : expression of German nationalist radicalism within Austria-Hungary, named after its town of origin in Upper-Austria (« Oberösterreich ») . It was drafted, in 1882, by the extreme nationalist Georg Ritter von Schönerer and, subsequently, by Victor Adler, Engelbert Pernerstorfer, Robert Pattai, and Heinrich Friedjung. Their main hope was to centralize the administration under German leadership while removing Slavic areas from the Austrian Empire. They demanded autonomy for Galicia (the north-eastern most part of the Empire) under its Polish inhabitants and for Dalmatia (in part, the coastal territory of modern Croatia) under its Italian minority, though they were ready to add the 2 to Hungary if the Magyars, many of whom disliked the Dual Monarchy, supported the Germans in Austria. The Program degenerated into anti-Slav sentiment, specifically, a dispute over the administrative partition of Bohemia. Other demands of the « Linz Program » were for extended franchise, progressive taxation, and protective legislation for the poorer sections of the community.

The « Linz Program » in : « Parlament und Verfassung in Österreich » (Parliament and Constitution in Austria) , Volume 3, edited by Gustav Kolmer, « Kaiserlich und Königlich Hof-Buchdruckerei », Vienna (1905) ; pages 212-214. Translated by Jeremy King and Rachel Coll (2001) .

In June 1882, Representative Schönerer returned from Breslau (in the German Empire) and set to strengthening the organization of his Party on the basis of a Program that men of the most diverse political orientations had assembled 2 years previously, for a German People's Party that never came into being. Engelbert Pernerstorfer and Doctor Victor Adler had given the Program a socialist content, while Doctor Friedjung, Doctor Pattai, Doctor Sylvester, and Diet

Representative Krenmayr had incorporated progressive and German populist (« deutschvolkliche ») themes. Now, Schönerer, with his closest adherents, made the so-called Jewish Plank (aimed at fighting Jewish corruption and maintaining the purity of the Aryan race) an underpinning to the far-reaching national, political, and economic Program. The slogan was : « Through Purity to Unity » . For the constituting of the new Party, a meeting of like-minded people was planned in Linz, for August 24, 1882. The police forbade the meeting, which was then postponed until September 24, and forbidden again. Representative Schönerer published his Program, which received the name of « Linz Program » and consisted of 36 points - the essence of which read as follows :

I - In the interest of making those crownlands of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy which previously belonged to the German Confederation into a maximally independent and strictly unitary organized whole, the following goals are to be pursued :

(1) Personal union with Hungary (i.e. , the reduction of Austria's relationship with Hungary to nothing more than a sharing of the same Habsburg ruler) .

(2) The incorporation of Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina into Hungary.

(3) Either the unification of Galicia and the Bukovina with Hungary or the concession of a special status to those lands, similar to the status of Croatia « vis-a-vis » Hungary.

II - In the interest of preserving the German character of those crownlands which previously belonged to the German Confederation, a law is demanded that declares German to be the State language. It is to be decreed in particular that :

(4) The German language is to be the exclusive language of the military, representative bodies, and public offices and, accordingly, that all official internal communication is to be carried-out exclusively in German, and no one is to be allowed to hold a State position or any other public office unless he is completely fluent in German.

(5) In areas with a linguistically mixed population, at least one elementary school is to use German as the language of instruction, and the German language is to be an obligatory subject in all secondary schools, at the same time that no student may be forced to acquire another language, whether native to the crownland or the district.

(6) All State exams, the successful completion of which qualifies candidates for employment by the State or crownland, are to be administered exclusively in German.

III - In the interest of giving the fullest possible consideration to constitutional principles, the following goals are to be pursued :

(7) The current system of representation is to be transformed into a genuine popular assembly, through a progressive expansion of the right to vote.

(8) Only experienced men true to their principles and possessed of an uncompromising character and proven disinterestedness may be elected to the Parliament.

(9) Priests, State officials, and the presidents, members of the board, and directors of railroads or corporations that do business with the State, that are bankrupt, or are being liquidated may not be elected to the Parliament.

IV - The fullest possible implementation of the Liberal principles laid down in the Fundamental Laws of the State, and thus :

(10) Freedom of association and of assembly.

(11) Freedom of the press, the abolition of the newspaper stamp tax, security deposit, and legal restrictions, and the lifting of restrictions on the circulation of periodicals.

(12) Maintenance and complete implementation of the principles on which our elementary schools are built.

V - Serious efforts at establishing order in the State budget, and thus :

(13) A final settling of accounts with Hungary with regard to the shared debt and the debt of 80 million to the Austro-Hungarian Bank, as well as a shifting of the costs of occupation onto the occupied territories (i.e. , Bosnia and Herzegovina) .

(14) Regulation of the currency.

(15) The achievement of savings through simplification of the judiciary and administration, without endangering the defensive power of the Empire through a reduction of military expenditures, and the formation of a regular budget.

VI - Drastic changes to the current system of taxation, and thus :

(16) The introduction of a progressive income tax (the setting of a higher tax rate for income on investments.

(17) Reform of the inheritance tax, introduction of a luxury tax, taxation of stock market transactions.

(18) Reform of indirect taxes, such that the prices of indispensable food stuffs are affected little or not at all, while luxury items are affected considerably. Revision of the laws concerning administrative fees and stamps, as well as revision of tariffs.

VII - As a pre-condition for a prospering economy, the following goals are to be pursued :

(19) Creation of a common customs area with the German Empire, together with Hungary and the Balkan countries.

(20) Introduction of obligatory trade associations and workers' factory associations, and the creation of Chambers of Commerce with separate sections for commerce, the trades, agriculture, forestry, and the interests of the working-class.

(21) The creation of an Economic Council to which all legislative proposals and decrees having an economic content must be submitted for approval.

VIII - Economic undertakings of importance to all must be taken over by the State or regulated in such fashion that both public and private interests might be protected, thus :

(22) Nationalization of the railroads and regulation of transportation tariffs, as well as the creation of appropriate waterways, in particular the Danube-Oder Canal.

(23) Nationalization of the insurance industry.

(24) Passage of a law on corporations that provides protection against moral and economic threats.

IX - The support of domestic production and honest labor, and thus :

(25) Reform of trades regulations.

(26) Reform of factory legislation (establishment of standard working hours, employer liability for workers' injuries ; introduction of factory inspectors) .

(27) Creation of swift and equitable (« billig ») justice (introduction of oral and public proceedings, penal colonies for individuals who present a danger to the community) .

X - Maintenance of a strong peasantry, and thus :

(28) Creation of agricultural credit institutions.

(29) Effective intervention by the State to prevent further indebtedness and devaluation of farms, especially by providing-up to half of the legally assessed value (to the owner) in cases of foreclosure.

(30) Reform of rural inheritance rights, and creation of a homestead law.

XI - Protection of the Monarchy against external threats, and thus :

(31) Fortification of the eastern boundary of the Empire.

(32) Maintenance of the defensive capabilities of the Empire.

(33) Considerable expansion of the Navy.

XII - The devotion of special attention to foreign affairs, and thus :

(34) Support for a long-term strengthening of the alliance with Germany through a State treaty.

(35) Strong and purposeful policy in the Orient, in particular the defense of Austrian interests along the Lower-Danube and in the Balkan countries.

(36) Strong defense of Austria's maritime interests, especially in the Mediterranean and in the Mediterranean countries.

...

The « Linz Program » of 1882 was a political platform that called for the complete Germanization of the Austrian State. It was created in response to the rising social, economic and political position of the Slavic peoples within the Austria-Hungary Dual Monarchy. The framers of the Program were fearful that the Slavs were over-running the German element of the monarchy.

The « Linz Program » was created by 5 Austrian intellectuals of German descent :

Victor Adler : a Jewish physician, socialist and founder of the Social-Democratic Party in Austria. Ist associated with the Liberal German nationalist movement, he later became an activist for the Austrian working-class.

Georg Schönerer : a politician who began as a Liberal German nationalist only to, later in life, become a leading anti-Semite and supporter of an extreme Pan-German agenda.

Robert Pattai : a lawyer.

Heinrich Friedjung : a Jewish historian.

Engelbert Pernerstorfer : a writer and, later, Socialist activist.

The goal of the framers was to create a German-dominated Austrian State. They proposed ceding the regions of Galicia, Bukovina and Dalmatia to Hungary or giving the regions complete autonomy, and they wanted Austria's ties to Hungary to be only of a personal nature, with no administrative or legislative consequences. Additionally, German was to become the official language of Austria, and a proposed Customs union, which would be added to the monarchy's constitution, would provide strengthened ties to the German « Reich » .

Rather than being a blueprint for a political movement, the proposal was more rhetorical. The emotional inclinations of the framers are well-represented in the following excerpt from their manifesto :

« We protest against all attempts to convert Austria into a Slavic State. We shall continue to agitate for the maintenance of German as the official language and to oppose the extension of federalism. We are steadfast supporters of the alliance with Germany and the foreign policy now being followed by the Empire. » (Roman, page 512.)

Ultimately, Adler and the others wanted Austria to exist separate from the Habsburg Monarchy, which controlled much of central Europe at the time ; instead, they wanted to tie themselves as close as possible to Germany.

Following its creation, the « Linz Program » never gained much support in any influential political circles. Additionally, the framers eventually distanced themselves from the Program. This was due in large part to Schönerer's venomous anti-Semitic inclinations, which became associated with the Program, over time.

The German National movement from its beginnings up to the adoption of the Linz programme in 1882

The defeat of Austria by the Prussians at the Battle of Königgrätz, in 1866, and the subsequent withdrawal of the Habsburg Monarchy from the German Federation led to a major regrouping within the German National camp.

While the one group rejected the Habsburg State and espoused the cause of the unification of all Germans within a German nation State, the others accommodated themselves with the monarchy and focussed their policies on protecting German traditions against the increasing Slav influence.

Until well into the 1870's, the German National movement lacked political clout. At parliamentary level, it was initially only able to develop its ideas within the Liberal Constitutional Party. In 1871, this split into the Liberal Club and the Progressive Club with its German national orientation, whose members included the later German National leader, Georg Ritter von Schönerer. Although the latter's demagogic skills enabled him to spread the German national idea, his radical political style prevented him from acquiring any great significance. Nevertheless, Schönerer's ideological group became a gathering of all the national tendencies that were also to be seen in modified or weakened form in the other national groups.

Schönerer, a champion of the Smaller German idea, argued vehemently against the Habsburg State and pleaded in favour of the unification of the German-speaking territories of Austria with the German « Reich » . He pursued a radical German national course, inveighing against capitalists, Jews and the Catholic Church, with his « Away-from-Rome Movement » recommending conversion from Catholicism to the more German-friendly Protestantism. Aurelius Polzer, one of Schönerer's supporters, described the national ideology as follows :

« German and loyal, outright and true, / Free of Jews, free of Czechs, / Free of priests and free of foreigners, / In short, straight and pure. »

Schönerer succeeded in combining the reactionary solutions he advanced with democratic or even progressive ideas. He left the Liberal Party, at the end of the 1870's, creating his own 2 man Party together with Heinrich Fürnkranz, the mayor of Langenlois, in Lower-Austria. In 1882, the German National Association was founded, whose members included not only Schönerer but also the later Social-Democrats Engelbert Pernerstorfer and Victor Adler, the later Christian-Social Robert Pattai, the historian and journalist Heinrich Friedjung and the German National politician Otto Steinwender.

The 1882 « Linz Programme » set-out the most important principles of the German National Association. It included national demands, such as the wish for closer links with the German « Reich » and for the creation of a common customs territory. At the same time, it contained a number of social and democratic demands : the broadening of the suffrage ; the freedom of association and the press ; a progressive income tax ; regulated working hours ; and the reduction of child and women's labour. Since Jewish members were involved in the creation of the « Linz Programme » , it did not contain any Jewish clauses despite Schönerer's open espousal of anti-Semitism. It was only in 1885, when the list was increased by the addition of a demand for the « elimination of the Jewish influence on all fields of public life » that Adler, Friedjung and Pernerstorfer left the Association. Since in the House of Deputies, the programme was only supported by Schönerer and Fürnkranz, it had no direct consequences at parliamentary level. However, it became the most important programmatic manifesto of the German National movement.

...

Das Linzer Programm war ein 1882 in Linz erarbeitetes Grundsatzpapier des österreichischen Deutschnationalismus. Das Dokument stand unter dem Motto « nicht liberal, nicht klerikal, sondern national » und forderte die staatsrechtliche und wirtschaftliche Entflechtung der verschiedenen Völker Cisleithaniens, die engere Anbindung seiner deutschsprachigen Gebiete an das Deutsche Reich sowie Pressefreiheit, Versammlungsfreiheit und allgemeine Demokratisierung. Es enthielt darüber hinaus auch einige aus heutiger Sicht sozialistisch oder sozialdemokratisch scheinende sozialreformerische Vorschläge. Initiatoren und Leiter seiner Ausarbeitung waren die Politiker Victor Adler und Georg von Schönerer, der Politiker und Journalist Engelbert Pernerstorfer sowie der Historiker und Publizist Heinrich Friedjung.

War das Linzer Programm ursprünglich ein Dokument breiten Konsenses unter antiklerikalen Reformpolitikern unterschiedlichen sozialen und intellektuellen Hintergrunds, so wurde es nach der Auseinanderentwicklung Adlers und Schönerers und vor allem nach der 1885 von Schönerer vorgeschlagenen Hinzufügung eines sogenannten « Arierparagrafen » und anderer antisemitischer Regelungen praktisch nur noch von Anhängern Schönerers hochgehalten.

Kernforderung des Linzer Programms war die so gut wie vollständige Trennung von Cisleithanien und Transleithanien. Die beiden so genannten Reichshälften waren seit dem Österreichisch-Ungarischen Ausgleich von 1867 zwar formal voneinander unabhängige Staaten, hatten aber nicht nur ein gemeinsames Staatsoberhaupt und eine Gemeinsame Armee, sondern betrieben auch gemeinsame Außenpolitik und waren vor allem auch wirtschaftlich eng miteinander verflochten. Viele Österreicher empfanden die regelmäßigen Subventionszahlungen der österreichischen an die ungarische Reichshälfte

als grundsätzlich ungerecht oder zumindest unverhältnismäßig hoch, darüber hinaus führten stockende jährliche Neuverhandlungen wiederholt zu wirtschafts- und sicherheitspolitischen Blockaden. Gemäß dem Linzer Programm sollte die Doppelrolle als Kaiser von Österreich und König von Ungarn, die das jeweilige Oberhaupt der Habsburger seit 1867 ausfüllte, erhalten bleiben; abgesehen davon und von einer eher vagen militärischen Beistandsverpflichtung sollten die beiden Staaten komplett entkoppelt werden.

Ähnlich wie Ungarn sollten auch Galizien und die Bukowina, zwei wirtschaftlich besonders schwache Kronländer Österreichs, in die faktische wie formale Eigenverantwortlichkeit entlassen werden. Die Provinzen Dalmatien, Bosnien und Herzegowina sollten vorläufig an Ungarn zediert werden, langfristig sollten sie gemeinsam mit dem bisher ungarisch regierten Kroatien ein « Königreich der Südslawen » bilden und als solches ebenfalls emanzipiert werden. Eine Umsetzung dieser Forderungen hätte den verbliebenen Rumpf Cisleithaniens politisch wie wirtschaftlich wesentlich entlastet, insbesondere dadurch, daß sich der Staat mit ihr fast aller seiner Polen und der meisten seiner « Ostjuden » entledigt hätte - Menschen, deren Gemeinschaften vergleichsweise wenig zur Dynamik der österreichischen Volkswirtschaft beitrugen und unter anderen Österreichern ausgesprochen unbeliebt waren.

Österreich hätte im Wesentlichen nur aus seinen deutsch-, tschechisch- und slowenischsprachig dominierten Kronländern bestanden. Diese Gebiete waren nicht nur verhältnismäßig wohlhabend und politisch gut entwickelt, es war ihnen vor allem noch deutlich anzumerken, daß sie alle Teile des 1806 untergegangenen Heiligen Römischen Reichs gewesen waren. Die Umsetzung des Linzer Programms hätte eine engere Anbindung oder überhaupt einen Anschluß des deutschsprachigen Österreichs an das Deutsche Reich, das Fernziel des Deutschnationalismus, nach Ansicht seiner Autoren damit wesentlich erleichtert. Als ersten Schritt in Richtung Vereinigung sah das Linzer Programm eine Zollunion Österreichs mit dem deutschen Reich vor.

Zusätzlich zu seinem deutschnationalen Kern enthielt das Linzer Programm Forderungen nach Pressefreiheit, Versammlungsfreiheit, Säkularisierung und Ausweitung des Wahlrechts auf bisher davon ausgeschlossene soziale Schichten. Darüber hinaus forderte das Manifest eine umfassende Sozialreform; unter anderem sollten eine staatliche Pensions- und Unfallversicherung eingerichtet, Frauen- und Kinderarbeit weitgehend verboten werden. Das Linzer Programm enthielt damit fast alle zentralen Forderungen der in Österreich erst 1889 ausgeformten Sozialdemokratie, ohne sich aber als marxistisch oder sozialistisch inspiriert zu sehen.

In seiner ursprünglichen Form war das Linzer Programm eher allgemein chauvinistisch als spezifisch jüdenfeindlich. Seine Autoren bekannten sich zwar offen zu der Auffassung, daß es für Österreich vorteilhaft wäre, seine runde Million galizischer Juden aus dem Staatsverband auszustoßen, da diese kulturell zu fremdartig und wirtschaftlich zu wenig leistungsfähig seien, sie vertraten die gleiche Annahme aber auch bezüglich der katholischen Polen und der orthodoxen Ruthenen. Der Vorschlag, zwischen den nicht oder kaum assimilierten, großteils bitterarmen « Ostjuden » und dem restlichen Österreich eine neue Staatsgrenze zu errichten, fand darüber hinaus auch unter vielen jüdischen und jüdischstämmigen Einwohnern westlicherer Kronländer Unterstützung. Neben anderen Mitautoren waren auch Adler und Friedjung selbst jüdischer Abstammung.

Explizit antisemitisch war die 1885 veröffentlichte Überarbeitung durch Schönerer. Schönerer war zwischen 1882 und

1885 zu der Auffassung gelangt, daß der « jüdische Einfluss » auf das öffentliche Leben Österreichs vordringlichstes Problem, die « Beseitigung » dieses Einflusses « unerlässlich » sei. Schönerer erweiterte das Linzer Programm in diesem Sinne um eine Bestimmung, die jüdische und jüdischstämmige Menschen von jeglicher Mitgliedschaft in deutschnationalen Parteien und Vereinen ausschloss, da ihnen die charakterliche Befähigung zur Teilhabe an der deutschen Nation abgesprochen wurde. Schönerer brach damit nicht nur mit Adler und Friedjung, sondern auch mit vielen anderen Deutschnationalen. Selbst Lueger, der einen neuzeitlichen Antijudaismus vertrat, konnte sich mit Schönerers Arierparagraph nicht identifizieren.

Adler und Lueger lehnten nicht nur Schönerers Überarbeitung ab, sondern wandten sich im Lauf der 1880er auch von der ursprünglichen Fassung ab. Ab Ende der 1880er bekannten sich praktisch nur noch die so genannten Schönerianer zum Linzer Programm. Mit der Zeit geriet in Vergessenheit, daß das Linzer Programm ursprünglich auch von späteren Sozialdemokraten und Christlichsozialen mitgetragen worden war. In der Erinnerung der Öffentlichkeit wurde das Papier zu einer von Anfang an spezifisch schönerianischen Angelegenheit, anstelle der gemeinschaftlich erarbeiteten Fassung galt nun die eigenmächtig erweiterte Version Schönerers als das echte und eigentliche Linzer Programm.

Karl Lueger (II)

Karl Lueger was born in Vienna, in 1844, and, having completed his studies, he initially practiced as a lawyer before dedicating himself to a political career, in 1875. Over the years, Lueger was a Member of Parliament and a member of the Lower-Austrian Provincial Legislature though the core of his political activity was taken-up by Viennese municipal politics. He was a member of the Vienna City Council for over 30 years and mayor of the city, from 1897 till his death, in 1910.

Lueger, who, at 1st, tended towards Liberalism, founded the Christian-Socialist Party, in 1893. The Party regarded itself as serving the interests of the lower middle-classes and attempted to address their needs and fears during a period of rapid social change by using slogans that were anti-Capitalist, anti-Liberal and explicitly anti-Semitic. In order to capture the votes of these social classes, a new kind of politician came into being at all levels of politics. He was the « tribuns plebes » and could be characterized as someone who entered into direct contact with the people in pubs, beer halls and market places, who tried to speak « the language of the people » and was no longer an unapproachable representative of the ruling class.

Karl Lueger was an outstanding example of this new kind of politician : he attempted to get a feeling for the mood of « the people » ; he like to hold speeches in dialect, took account of the intellectual level of his listeners, made complex issues simple and tried to entertain his public with humorous remarks. He was especially successful when he attacked the supposed enemies of his listeners. He stoked antipathy to politicians with different points of view, as well as national and religious minorities. His polemical attacks, sometimes extremely drastically formulated, were not directed towards reason but consciously appealed to emotions and instincts. Thus, he understood how to use rousing speeches to win over the Viennese population to his cause, consciously invoking stereotypical images of alleged enemies and, in particular, making use of anti-Semitic prejudice. Every set-back was reduced to a simple formula : « The Jews are to blame. » and stirred-up hatred with statements such as : « We will prevent the oppression of Christians and a

new Palestine replacing the ancient Austrian Empire of Christians. » . In the process, he activated the traditional Catholic anti-Semitism directed against « the people who killed God » . He combined it with anti-Liberal and anti-Capitalist elements and thus addressed the widespread prejudice against « money and stock-market Jews » , « press Jews » , « ink Jews » (i.e. , Jewish intellectuals and businessmen) . Under his leadership, the Christian-Socialists regarded their main political task as the reduction of the « rapidly growing power of the Jews » and the reversal of their emancipation which had only taken place in 1867.

Around 1900, the accusations of ritual murder, a relict of the Middle-Ages, were, once again, revived. Catholic clergymen were prominent in disseminating many blood-curdling tales. Lueger was convinced that the Catholic Church was « protection and shield against Jewish oppression » and would « liberate Christian people from the shameful shackles of servitude to the Jews » . Lueger's championing of the man in the street's interests, his skill as a political speech-maker, as well as his ambitious programme of reforms led to his Party gaining the majority in the 1895 municipal elections. Lueger was elected to the office of mayor but Emperor Franz-Josef refused his consent because he considered that, in the light of Lueger's outspoken anti-Semitism, his confirmation would undermine the laws guaranteeing equality to all citizens. As a result, the elections had to be repeated 4 times before the monarch finally confirmed Lueger in the office of Mayor of Vienna.

During his period of office, as mayor of Vienna, he realized numerous large-scale projects such as the building of the 2nd Vienna mountain spring water pipeline, the municipalisation of the gas and electricity supply, the tramway system and the building of welfare institutions such as the almshouse in Lainz and the « Steinhof » psychiatric hospital. In addition to the problems that derived from the rapid social changes at the end of the 19th Century, Lueger's term as Mayor of Vienna was particularly influenced by national conflicts inside the Danube monarchy. Besides that, there were increases in unemployment and a wave of price increases so that people became increasingly receptive to radical nationalist slogans.

Lueger's oft-repeated principle was : « Vienna is German and must remain German. » . The vernacular, which, in the multi-ethnic State, was defined by nationality, formed the starting point for his political position : there was an energetic insistence that those Viennese who spoke no German be forced to communicate in that language.

Lueger also instigated changes in the Vienna naturalisation laws of 1890. The provisions stated that anyone who wished to become a citizen of Vienna had to have a spotless police and business record, have a fixed abode in Vienna for 10 years and be able to prove that they had paid their taxes for the same length of time. They had to be economically self-supporting and swear an oath to the mayor « that they would fulfill all the duties of a citizen as laid-out in the municipal laws and, to the best of their knowledge and abilities, they would work towards the well-being of the municipality » . An addition was made to this passage in the oath : « ... and to do everything in their power to uphold the German character of the city » . Furthermore, the ceremony of taking the citizen's oath in the City Hall was bound-up with a formal declaration of the principle that Vienna was a German city.

Even today, one can occasionally hear statements to the effect that although Lueger did utter Anti-Semitic slogans, he didn't mean them seriously. With his much quoted aphorism, « I decide who is a Jew ! » , he arrogated to himself the

freedom to make exceptions. This was all harmless compared to the concurrent political activity of Georg Ritter von Schönerer who represented a form of anti-Semitism based on the construct of « race » .

This ignores the fact that Lueger was the 1st politician to make anti-Semitism « socially acceptable » and who used it to forge a conventional political movement. Thereafter, anti-Semitism appeared to many people to be both normal and respectable and it soon found its way into the political programmes of other Parties. After Lueger's death, anti-Semitism became a significant factor in Austrian political life and it was to remain so in the coming decades.

In 1926, a statue was erected to Lueger's memory. It was designed was by Josef Müller who emerged victorious from a competition, in 1912. Due to the 1st World War and the general lack of funding and materials, the actual building had been postponed. In 1922, the 25th anniversary of Lueger's conformation as Mayor of Vienna, the Christian-Socialist municipal Party organisation revived and forced through the planned construction. In September of 1926, the re-designed square with its new monument was officially re-opened to the public.

...

Karl Lueger (1844-1910) , leader of the anti-Semitic Christian-Social Party, in Austria. Born in Vienna into a lower middle-class family, he qualified as a lawyer. He began his political career with the left-wing of the Progressive Party and was elected as its candidate to the city council, in 1875. There, he associated with Jewish members, among them Ignaz Mandl, a Jewish lawyer who remained his friend and political adviser even after Lueger had ousted him from the Democrats, in 1889. In 1884, he sponsored the Democrats' electoral demand for « equality of all faiths » . Elected to the parliament, in 1885, he cooperated with the political anti-Semite Georg von Schönerer but denied being himself an anti-Semite. A year later, he berated the Liberal majority in the City Council for refusing to deliver a congratulatory address to Adolf Fischhof, on the occasion of his 70th birthday. In spite of this, Lueger made a violently anti-Semitic speech, in 1887, in support of Schönerer's bill against Jewish immigration from Russia and Romania. After allying himself with Karl von Vogelsang, in 1893, he united the different Christian factions into the Christian-Social Party (CS) , which he led until his death. Lueger was extremely popular with the lower middle-classes, largely because of his folksy and vulgar speeches uniting popular economic and religious anti-Semitic prejudices. He succeeded in forging a Party which channeled social discontent, depicting Capitalism and Marxism alike as products of the Jewish mind and fusing these new themes with the Centuries-old hatred of the Jews stemming from Church doctrine. In 1897, Emperor Franz-Josef I confirmed Lueger as mayor of Vienna, after he had refused to do so on 3 previous occasions. In this office, which he held until his death, he effected many social reforms. His administration pursued discriminatory practices against Jews, mainly through not employing them in the city services and limiting their numbers in high-school and the University. Nevertheless, he was in the habit of doing petty favors for poor Jews, even appearing in a synagogue wearing the mayoral chain. In his administration, he employed, besides Mandl (who was baptized at the age of 72) , the partly Jewish vice-mayor Julius Porzer and the renegade Max Anton Loew. He accepted invitations to Jewish homes and is reported to have said :

« Werein Jude ist, bestimme ich. » (It is up to me to decide who is a Jew.)

A collection of Lueger's papers, translated and edited by R. S. Geehr, was titled after this notorious phrase : « I Decide Who Is a Jew ! » (1982) .

Lueger's anti-Semitism was opportunistic rather than racist, but he had a profound influence on the young Adolf Hitler in his formative years, and established on a firm footing the Viennese anti-Semitic tradition.

...

In a prescient article, published in 1900, the editor-in-chief of the Viennese socialist newspaper « Arbeiter-Zeitung » , Friedrich Austerlitz tried to explain, in Marxist terms, the extraordinary popularity of the lord mayor of Vienna, Karl Lueger, leader of the Christian-Social Party. With characteristic irony, he pointed-out that, the career of this former lawyer is truly one of the most interesting phenomena of our times. The key to following and understanding it is provided by a knowledge of the psychology of the « petite bourgeoisie » . Lueger enriched political science by a great discovery : he transformed democracy, a political orientation that was dying of boredom, into modern demagogy, into the art of fobbing people off with the appearance instead of the reality of the situation.

11 years later, following the death of the man who was widely known and loved by his followers as the « King of Vienna » , the Social-Democrat Austerlitz acknowledged that Lueger was indeed « the 1st “ bourgeois ” politician who recognized the importance of the masses in politics » . The Social-Democrats, by 1911, already the chief rivals of Christian-Socialism, could afford to be generous, for with Lueger's exit from the scene, his Party lost 35,000 votes in Vienna and held on to only 4 of the Imperial capital's 33 seats, in the general elections of that year. Although the set-back proved to be only temporary and it would be an exaggeration to present the Christian-Social Party as the work of one man, however commanding his presence, it is certainly true that Doctor Karl Lueger was the representative political phenomenon of his time and place.

It is, however, less easy to define precisely what constituted this representative character of his political personality and to assess his historic significance from the perspective of the late- 20th Century. Can he be viewed properly as a mentor of Adolf Hitler, as a proto-fascist leader or as a pioneer of « post-rational politics » , as one influential cultural historian has claimed ? Or should he rather be seen as an ex-radical, traditionalist Conservative, a Habsburg loyalist who restored the decaying fortunes of political Catholicism in Austria and, ultimately, substituted clerical for Liberal rule ? If so, what is one to make of his impressive record as the civic-minded architect of Viennese « municipal socialism » ; as a social reformer who expanded the water supply, built schools, hospitals, publicly-owned abattoirs, while transforming the topography of Vienna by providing it with new city gas, electricity, tramlines ...

Lueger's 1st Anti-Semitic Speech

« For my part, I like to ignore the small differences which might exist between one or other of the Parties about the method of the struggle. I have very little regard for words and names, and much more for the cause. Whether Democrat or anti-Semite, the matter really comes to one and the same thing. The Democrats, in their struggle against corruption, come-up against the Jews at every step, and the anti-Semites, if they want to carry-out their economic

programme, have to overcome not only the bad Jews but the bad Christians also.

All my Party comrades share my opinion that it is the 1st duty of a Democrat to take the side of the poor oppressed people and to take-up the fight with all determination against the unjustified and even harmful domination of a small fraction of the population. To be sure, the Manchester-Liberal papers have the habit of describing a Democrat in somewhat different terms. They aim, for instance, that it would be the duty of such a Democrat to come forward as an enemy of the Christian religion, to mock and ridicule its believers and priests. But we know that the motive of such a manœuvre is solely to mislead the people, which we may deduce from the remarkable fact that were anybody to come forward against the Jewish religion and ridicule its doctrines and believers he would be branded by the same organs as a reactionary obscurantist. However, this strange conception can be seen even more clearly in an economic question. Quite shamelessly, the Liberal organs threaten the confiscation of the property of the Church and claim that the goods of the “ dead hand ” are harmful. By this means, an attempt is made to divert the attention of the people from the property of the “ living hand ” which, in my view, harms the people in a most grievous way. But what a yell of rage would go up from the Liberal press if one were to substitute the slogan “ confiscation of Church property ” with the slogan “ confiscation of the goods of the conscious, living hand ” ! He who would dare this would risk, at once, being portrayed as injuring the sacred rights of property, as anarchist, a columnist who wanted to subvert the social order and destroy all existing things. And now, I ask : is the title of property of the conscious, living hand stronger or more sacred than the title to the property of the Church ? Surely not. And so, it is more than extraordinary if one were to confiscate the property of the comparatively poor priests and, through this help, the rich of another denomination to increase their wealth ! »

October 2, 1887. From Peter Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Antisemitism in Germany and Austria » (1964) .

Fragmentary draft of a speech presented in Moravia (about 1891)

« Gentlemen !

Citizens of this city have asked me, time and again, to deliver a talk in Iglau about the principles of the Christian-Social Party, and when I heeded this appeal, I considered this the fulfillment of a duty everyone has who represents the interests of the people.

Before I address the topic at hand, I want briefly to discuss two matters :

(1) I did not come to set citizen against citizen.

The Christian-Social Program does not aim to incite, but rather to reconcile ; it is not a fight of all against all, but rather a harmonious formation of different interest groups against the stratification of human society by professions and occupations.

(2) Press : here, too, as always in the Liberal press, abuses, invectives and the most insolent lies. After 15 years of

fighting with the Liberal press, I have developed a rather thick skin, thank goodness. Therefore, I shall limit my comments and simply say that the Liberal press, sometimes also called Jewish Liberal, or Jewish Press, is the most impudent press on this earth, that it was and is the ally and accomplice of all robberies and thefts that have been committed against the Christian people. In Vienna, only fools and those on the same moral level support it ; all decent and intelligent people reject it with disdain. Whether or not what the “ Maehrische Grenzbote ” has said about me is true, you will be able to decide for yourselves by attentively listening to my talk. You will be able to judge whether I speak the truth or not - therefore, whether I belong to the instructors or the corrupters of the people.

When the ideas of freedom swept victoriously from France throughout Europe, all people embraced them joyously. A new time of happiness had dawned ; the road was paved for mankind to achieve its highest ideal of perfection. Barriers erected through the wisdom of our forebears for the purpose of upholding order were impetuously torn down. Old and established institutions that constrained the titanic powers of mankind were ridiculed. People yearned for the splendid dawn of a new day rising from the ruins.

In Austria, too, Enlightenment. People waited and waited for the happiness that was to come.

But happiness did not come. On the contrary, one felt ever more uncomfortable.

Even more freedom ; perhaps, this will help.

More freedom came, but happiness did not.

Shares were printed, banks were founded, wildest speculations were carried on at the stock-market ; then, came the crash and behold : the people were left with printed paper while others prospered with money.

Of course, in Austria, the so-called freedom turned into an incredible fraud.

Representatives of the people became representatives of capital and oppressors. The representatives were the ones who participated in all the fraudulent activities and, when salvation was necessary, they proceeded on the premise of “ manus manum lavat ”. You bow to me, I'll bow to you.

Tremendous amount of justified embitterment among the people.

When particularly, in Bohemia and Moravia, there wasn't a breakthrough, this was because of the nationalities' problem.

The embitterment is the reason for new Parties.

A long period of strife.

Finally, “ Vereinigte Christen ” ; now, strife again, but people will know how to put the agitators in their proper place. Therefore, together : the Christian-Social Program.

Protection of honest work (i.e. , both physical and mental, against the oppression by international capital) .

Farmers

Suspension of land division.

Land tax relief and determination of a debt ceiling.

Protective tariffs. Promotion of farmer's district cooperatives.

Craftsmen

Development of a cooperative system, etc.

Workers

International protection, etc.

Suspension of work on Sundays and holidays - also for officials.

Improvement of civil servants' skills.

Private Officials against abuses of temporary office worker system.

Protection against arbitrary termination.

Nationalization.

Politics for support and development of peoples' freedoms.

Education

Christian school and, therefore, separation according to University (and) confessions.

State revenues for the benefit of citizens.

Criticisms : extra homework, military supplies.

Clericalism : hatred for priests.

Loss of countless German positions.

Jews to cherish their religion.

Nationalism : Bruenn, Germans in the Czech camp.

Anti-Semitism : Jews, the leaders of the Liberals Capital usurers. Exploiters of property. Incite the classes, incite the nations.

Jewish press against clergy and religion, therefore, we believe : the Jews have no right to become judges, political officials and officers, and must be pushed back.

Christians, again, have the upper-hand.

Indigenous property, indigenous labor. Then, peace and quiet will return. »

Karl Lueger's criticism of the Liberal press here anticipates Karl Kraus (Speech draft, around 1886)

Margarethen Meeting of the trade association. Thousands of posters. All voters. When they came, they were rudely insulted and depicted as disturbers of the peace and scandal mongers in the Liberal papers, and the papers lied about a reign of terror of the anti-Liberal League.

Friday, a meeting of the Democratic Club, in the 7th District was held.

Kronawetter, Doctor Lueger with his staff ? Doctor Leuger did not rise. Opponents and followers of Kronawetter. Naturally, you don't hear a whisper about those meetings attended by many thousands that proceed quietly, at which even our opponents can speak undisturbed - these meetings are simply ignored.

Whether these tactics will be useful ? I doubt it. For a while, the one or the other who gets his wisdom only from the daily press may let himself be deceived ; those, however, who know the truth only hate and resent this brood of liars all the more ; each one of them becomes an enthusiastic apostle of our teachings who will conquer for us more and more new territory among the people and who will undermine the ground on which the Liberal press carries on its doings.

But if you ask yourself : why has the Liberal press sunk to such depths ? There is only one answer : it sunk to this depth because the Party it serves had long since disappeared, and was replaced by lies and hypocrisy, corruption and thirst for power.

That is how it is with the « Presse » . In addition, it mostly belongs to Jews, and all events, therefore, are treated solely on the basis of whether they are useful or damaging to the Jew.

I said : lies and hypocrisy ; corruption and thirst for power.

That the Liberal press is full of lies needs no further proof.

It lies in editorials, reports, in local news, in municipal reports, in telegrams in the economic section ; it lies between the lines in the « feuilletons » ; it lies in novels ; it lies in advertisements.

It lies directly by inventing untruths, deliberate untruths.

It lies indirectly by ignoring important facts and, thereby, in readers to draw incorrect conclusions.

It is hypocritical. It flatters the powerful as long as it believes they are serving its interests. It does so, in order to deceive the powerful and the dangerous enemies who constantly work towards undermining the last vestiges of power.

It feigns reverence for the pope, because it believes it to be momentarily advantageous to throw sand into the eyes of the people. But it continues to ridicule Christianity, to undermine faith among people, solely so that the masses are robbed of any moral footing, that they become easy prey for big business and sink into slavery.

It feigns love for Vienna, lauds the golden Viennese heart, the good nature of the Viennese, and their cheerfulness, but it is the Liberal press that drove us Viennese out of the theatres, that made us suspicious and robbed us of our cheerfulness. It feigns love for the German nation ; but not the true national sentiment, rather only agitation against other nations. Any attempt to solve the national question is cunningly defeated ; anybody who views a Czech or a Slav as a human being is branded a traitor and encouraged to keep fighting ; all that, just so the sharks among the people can complete their destruction undisturbed.

It preaches love for property, but only insofar as it concerns its own property and that of its clients. It praises the great robbers who seize millions, even billions, in property of others, as the Masters of mankind ; and if one of these robbers has the misfortune of being accused by the public prosecutor, then, he is treated as kindly as if he had perished on the field of honour.

It is the great and overt opponent of the little lottery because its profit does not fill their pockets or those of certain bankers. On the other hand, it lauds certain minor lottery tickets and does everything possible to induce people to play the stock-market.

Now and then, they even oppose corruption, but only when they believe they can conceal their own corruption. They act like a thief who is being pursued and while trying to escape shouts with the rest « stop him » .

The Liberal press is corrupt ; it is corrupt because it exclusively serves high-finance.

Internal and external entanglements are created, in order to carry-out stock-market maneuvers ; telegrams are forged ; men with great influence on world affairs are left to become sicker and sicker and, then, they are made well again in a piquant way, however the press wishes. Pronouncements of monarchs are misquoted because the press knows very well that retractions are not requested pursuant to Article 19. But if an official paper prints a correction, then, the matter is twisted in such a clever way that the impression remains that the original article was true.

The way wages are paid is also corrupt. The exploited are being paid according to their cooperation.

It doesn't matter whether a company is solid and respectable or not. If the people are cheated, what does the press care so long as it profits ? The people are stupid, forget quickly, and are gladly taken in again by the sharks.

The Liberal press is immoral. Only piquant - that's the slogan. Whether family happiness is destroyed or people are sent to their death doesn't matter.

The Liberal press doesn't spare the family. It isolates the most intimate affairs, in order to publicize them, and if there is nothing, it simply fabricates stories. King Ludwig of Bavaria, and Crown Prince.

Reports about Court trials are corrupt, and the public literally has become a curse for the administration of justice.

The advertisement business is corrupt. Secret illnesses, fraudulent transactions, match-making ads.

Prying and merciless persecution mania.

Prying everywhere : Municipal Council, parliament, at all levels. If misfortune happens, janitor, Greissler. If he is thrown out, or he can't find-out anything, then he lies. If he is corrected, he says : the correction is wrong.

Conclusion : The Viennese Liberal press is the most corrupt and disgraceful press in the whole world. « Neues Wiener Tagblatt » - we do nothing ; we only shout, don't improve things. It is true ; we always want to fight these bandits on legal grounds, and we keep on believing that our call for help will be heard. We hope the State authorities not only will continue to enforce the present measures against the press, which we applaud, but also will vigorously proceed against the excesses of the Liberal press.

But I warn the Liberal press : it should not ridicule and scorn those whom it deceived, lied to, and exploited.

Farmer : cries for vengeance.

Tradesman : cries for vengeance.

Official : cries for vengeance.

Widows and Orphans : cry for vengeance.

Religion and fatherland cry out for liberation, and the day will come when these cries will be heard by the proper authority. The day of liberation for the Christian people from servitude, in which we now languish will come and the day of vengeance for the disgrace tolerated and suffered.

...

With his persuasive but polarizing rhetoric, Karl Lueger won a convincing victory in the elections for Mayor of Vienna. However, the Jewish population and Emperor Franz-Josef I were anything but pleased at the outcome.

Lueger's aggressive political anti-Semitism is clearly expressed in this extract from one of his speeches. From a speech given by Mayor Karl Lueger at a meeting of the Christian-Socialist Workers' Association, held on 20 July 1899, in Vienna :

« Here, in our Austrian fatherland, the situation is such that the Jews have seized a degree of influence which exceeds their number and importance. »

(Interjection : « Very true ! »)

« In Vienna, the poor craftsman has to go begging on Saturday afternoon, to turn the labour of his hands to account, he has to beg at the Jewish furniture dealer's. »

(« Quite right ! »)

« The influence on the masses, in our country, is in the hands of the Jews, the greater part of the press is in their hands, by far the largest part of all capital and, in particular, high-finance, is in Jewish hands, and, in this respect, the Jews operate a terrorism of a kind that could hardly be worse. For us, in Austria, it is a matter of liberating Christian people from the hegemony of Jewry. »

(In : « Weiningers Nacht » , Europa-Verlag, Vienna, 1989.)

The « Aulic Councillor of the Revolution », as Victor Adler was known, was opposed by the « Colossus of Vienna » , Karl Lueger. As leader of the Christian-Social Party, the latter drew his support from the small-scale traders who, particularly after the stock-market « krach » of 1873, felt themselves increasingly threatened by Capitalism. Lueger relied on anti-Capitalist, anti-Industrial and, above all, anti-Semitic propaganda. His extreme polarizing rhetoric was directed against those in power, Liberals, Capitalists and Aristocrats. In the hostile image of the « capitalist Jew » , he

saw the root of all evil. Many of the Jews living in Vienna had become established members of the educated and professional middle-classes.

Lueger's authoritarian and anti-Semitic style of leadership (which Adolf Hitler also emulated and whose fatal consequences are well-known) brought him victory in the 1895 election and, thus, the office of Mayor of Vienna. But he was only able to take-up the office, in 1897, after a number of repeated elections, since Emperor Franz-Josef had repeatedly refused to confirm his appointment because of his radical anti-Semitism.

Towards the end of the 19th Century, the influence of the mass Parties increasingly obliged Emperor Franz-Josef to acquiesce to the wishes of the population. Moreover, the conflicts between the various nationalities, within the Empire, became more and more aggressive. The Monarchy had become unstable, in terms of both foreign and domestic policy, and this was ultimately to lead to the outbreak of the 1st World War.

L'antisémitisme de Karl Lueger

« So far, as his anti-Semitism goes, Lueger became milder after his inauguration, and his verbal sallies against political dissidents more measured, more statesman-like. »

(Johannes Hawlik. « Der Bürgerkaiser »)

« Clerical anti-Semitism, which prevailed mainly in the Austro-Hungarian Empire must be regarded as a forerunner of the biological-racialist anti-Semitism that the Nazis were to perfect ; it represents a long-standing, sinister tradition from which Adolf Hitler demonstrably was unable, and indeed unwilling, to escape. »

(Gerald Fleming. « Hitler and the Final Solution »)

No single aspect of Karl Lueger's career has roused more controversy than his anti-Semitism. There are 2 poles of opinion about Lueger as anti-Semite and little neutral ground in between. For a Century now, Lueger has often been attacked as one of the principal instigators of political anti-Semitism, on the one hand, or defended as an actual friend of the Jewson, on the other. Somewhat incongruously, those belonging to the latter camp have occasionally suggested that Lueger's anti-Semitism was justified. His defenders have included Austrian Jews, such as Arthur Schnitzler and Stefan Zweig, prominent literary figures of Vienna's high-culture during the early years of the 20th Century, and his more recent Austrian biographers. In the other camp, post World War II historians, such as Peter G. J. Pulzer and Carl E. Schorske, have seen Lueger as an important progenitor of modern political anti-Semitism and as a proto-fascist. At the heart of the issue since 1945 has been the question whether Lueger influenced the developing ideology of Adolf Hitler, and, thus, contributed to the preparation for the Holocaust. Hitler praised Lueger in « Mein Kampf », during his World War II « table talks », and elsewhere. Although critical of Lueger's peculiar variety of anti-Semitism, Hitler nonetheless lauded him as a statesman, suggesting that he may have owed the Schonerian racial focus of his own anti-Semitism to the rejection of Lueger's alternative brand.

The reluctance of Lueger's recent Austrian biographers to confront his (and his nation's) anti-Semitism becomes understandable within the framework of recent events. In a country where 75 years after Lueger's death, and 40 years after the end of World War II, an SS war criminal was welcomed by a minister of defense ; where, during the same year, the interment of the remains of an alleged victim of a medieval ritual murder became the center of a national controversy ; where, later the same year, a bomb destroyed a Jewish shop in Vienna's 2nd District, the former Jewish ghetto, as during Lueger's mayoralty ; and, where as late as 1986, a slogan from « Mein Kampf » graced a World War II memorial in a building of the University of Vienna - in such a country, it is scarcely surprising that Lueger's anti-Semitism is considered to be of « distinctly secondary importance » in most Austrian Lueger biographies. Those of us who lived in Austria during the 1986 national presidential campaign in which Kurt Waldheim was elected, and who have followed the series of anti-Semitic incidents that ensued, know that anti-Semitism continues to thrive in Austria and that « the Lueger tradition » has emerged again to reveal the power of the past over the present.

Until the early 1980's, some Anglo historians held that, while Lueger had dampened his anti-Semitism after becoming mayor, « the widespread acceptance of mild, almost incidental, anti-Semitic opinions » was an element in the climate that nurtured Nazi barbarism. However, in 1981, John W. Boyer challenged some aspects of the prevailing opinion about Lueger's anti-Semitism and his influence on Adolf Hitler. Specifically, Boyer denies as false Hitler's « perception of Lueger as a dictatorial, charismatic “ Führer-type ” ». Boyer also asserts that « Lueger never disliked Jews personally », that « after 1897, he frequently encountered and occasionally even befriended influential and wealthy Jews », that he « wore his professed anti-Semitism lightly and used it principally in the realm of public propaganda ». Lueger, Boyer adds, dealt with Jews « with sobriety and respect ». When questioned about unfair personnel practices in the treatment of Jewish municipal employees, « Lueger declared that all personnel matters were a question for the “ Stadtrat ” (City Council) and that, personally, he had adopted a neutral stance on the issue ». « In his parliamentary speeches », Boyer continues, « Lueger was surprisingly sparing in his use of the anti-Semitic issue. Usually, only an adverse turn in political events or a vital tactical manoeuvre which required an anti-Semitic “ cover ” would motivate Lueger to bother with the Jewish issue. Beyond this, he confined his anti-Semitism to occasional jokes, innuendoes, personal slanders and comic interludes. » In this light-hearted vein, « Lueger's prejudices were cultural and class-oriented, but not racial ». Though Boyer admits that Lueger once « commented that, personally speaking, he believed that Austrian Jews should be deprived of their voting rights », this « statement was a palpable lie, intended to protect his flanks (to refute charges) that Lueger was “ going soft ” on the anti-Semitic issue ». Boyer adds that Lueger could hate Jews for the tendency to create a culturally pluralistic society and for their often superior educational and intellectual backgrounds (but he) could not help but respect them since they “ were ” well-educated and talented, especially in light of the fact that many Austrian Jews had risen from “ petit-bourgeois ” social disabilities to achieve through their own energies bourgeois prominence, a pattern of social mobility quite similar to Lueger's own ». Within the larger European context, « in light of the enormous fund of protests that European Liberalism was “ dead ” or that it had somehow “ failed ”, men were forced to experiment with new modes of political behaviour and new ideological conceptions to fill the civic cultural void ». In a word, Boyer's arguments bring Lueger's anti-Semitism into the same ultimate pragmatism which, Boyer suggests, marks Lueger's political personality - as another technique rather than a principle.

In some respects, Boyer's article elaborated on conclusions in his monograph on Viennese radicalism. Building on

Boyer's assertions, in both works, Robert Wistrich has suggested in writing about the ambiguities of Lueger's position that Lueger « partially succeeded in taming and domesticating Viennese anti-Semitism with a heavy dose of Austrian “ Gemütlichkeit ” » . In another work, Wistrich has stated that Lueger, « the anti-Semitic dragon-slayer of Austro-Liberalism became, in the twilight of his career, the conciliatory elder statesman of Habsburg loyalism and the civic-minded architect of Viennese “ municipal socialism ” » . Still more recently, Leon Poliakov in « The History of Anti-Semitism » , flatly states that « the enthusiastic tribute that Hitler paid (Lueger) in “ Mein Kampf ” does not seem justified, for the Jews did not suffer under his administration » , and Steven Beller adds that « Lueger was not a serious anti-Semite » .

No group of writers has been more fully in agreement with the assessments of Boyer, Wistrich, Poliakov, and Beller than most Lueger biographers since 1945. One post-1945 biographer virtually ignored Lueger's anti-Semitism altogether. This was Rudolf Kuppe, whose 1947 biography is a model of tactful historical reconstruction. Gone were the references to Lueger as a champion of « Aryan interests » that featured prominently in his 1933 biography. Gone, too, were the often lengthy quotations from Lueger's outspokenly anti-Jewish speeches. Another post-War Austrian biographer who has more to say about Lueger's anti-Semitism, but who, nonetheless, largely exonerates the mayor and Party leader from preparing for the Nazi era, is Kurt Skalnik :

« Doctor Karl Lueger is exonerated by the judgment of history. In 1880, 1890, 1900, life still proceeded along such a well-defined order, that one could afford to play with anti-Semitism without destroying human morality and descending into a demonic underworld. »

More recently, Johannes Hawlik has sketched the cultural-political environment of Lueger's anti-Semitism in one of the shortest, yet, most digressive chapters of a 1985 biography commemorating the 75th anniversary of Lueger's death. Hawlik does not completely dismiss the possibility of Lueger having influenced Hitler, but he nonetheless provides « a tiny defense » for Lueger's anti-Semitism :

« Under the influence of the Enlightenment and considering the belief in progress during the 19th Century, no one, not even the most virulent anti-Semite, conceived as possible a regression to the barbarism of the Middle-Ages (in the grand style of the 20th Century) as Hitler's “ Final Solution ”. »

Even Hawlik's « tiny defense » seems overstated, despite his qualification. In his futuristic work, « Aus dem Jahr 1920 » (1900) , Josef Scheicher, the Christian-Social politician and publicist priest, did « conceive as possible » the partial extermination of Austrian Jewry. Moreover, in December 1902, shortly before the Christmas recess, Hermann Bielohlawek, during a municipal council session presided over by Lueger, called for the destruction of the Jews and stated « that the Viennese population has as its program : the eradication (“ Ausmerzung ”) of Jewry. From that we shall not depart » . Bielohlawek's speech was received with « lively applause » and he was congratulated from all sides. Furthermore, another Christian-Social, Ernst Schneider, predicted, in 1901, a coming time when Jews would be « killed and burned. In Rumania, they're starting already to drive the Jews out, and with us, it will get to the point that we'll drive these parasites out of the country, which they only ravage. »

Boyer further refers to « the limitations of (Lueger's) power » , that even « had he wished to eliminate all discrimination against the Jews, the more anti-Semitic sub-elite of the Party would have expected some concessions » . It is the central argument of this chapter that far from « wish(ing) to eliminate all discrimination against the Jews » , through his continuing and malicious recourse to provocative anti-Semitism, and his overt or covert support for anti-Semitic legislation and other actively discriminatory measures, Lueger ensured the continuation and intensification of anti-Semitism as a central feature of Christian-Social politics throughout his mayoralty - and beyond. And only the limitations imposed on his power by the Imperial authority, and his own declining health, prevented a potentially more violent expression of anti-Semitism. It was the Imperial legal qualification on his power and its enforcement, in some cases, rather than any charitable attitude on the part of Lueger and his supporters toward the Jews, that prevented them from « suffer(ing) extensive material or cultural deprivations from Christian-Social rule » . Lueger made anti-Semitism respectable and, in so doing, made it more dangerous. After Lueger's death, younger Christian-Social politicians carried on his anti-Semitism in « the tradition of the Christian-Social Party » . Toward the end of the 1st Republic, they established a clerical fascist dictatorship. « Anti-Semitism flourished in the 1st Austrian Republic. Austrian anti-Semites may have been even more vicious toward the Jews, in the 1930's, than were their counterparts in Germany. » The roots of this variety of anti-Semitism were nurtured during the Lueger era.

Anti-Semitism was a constant instrument of Lueger's politics from 1887 until he became too ill to campaign. While his remarks were, sometimes, moderated in the public forums, anti-Jewish slurs remained frequent in his speeches to local constituencies. And, though anti-Semitism had penetrated the thinking of the highest officialdom by the time of Lueger's mayoralty, and was, therefore, not new (Kielmansegg referred to Gessmann as « an out and out "Judenstämmling" » (Jew) , with all the characteristic qualities, especially the intense acquisitive sense of this race » . Under Lueger, it became more comprehensive and more insidiously pervasive, in all aspects of cultural, social, and political life, than ever before. It remained an open feature of public life until 1945, and has continued if in, sometimes, more concealed or hypocritical forms. Although some Viennese refer to Schönenerer as the forerunner of Nazism and deplore his crude racist anti-Semitism, much as some Germans deplore that of Julius Streicher, Lueger is usually absolved by such Viennese from having contributed to the rise of Hitler. For them, Lueger remains « the respectable anti-Semite » .

When Lueger himself failed to initiate direct anti-Semitism, it was usually instigated by other Christian-Social leaders vying for his favor, a dependent group most of whom proved incapable of functioning politically once he was out of the picture. To them, Lueger was a sort of ultimate ideological authority for anti-Semitism, but not intimately involved in the details. « Lueger knew what he wanted, and everyone who knew him, knew it too. » , as Rudolf Spitzer observed in his 1988 Lueger study. Lueger was capable of hating, and probably did « hate Jews for the tendency to create a culturally pluralistic society, and for their often superior educational and intellectual backgrounds » , as Boyer has put it ; but there is little countervailing or contravening evidence to the speculation that he balanced this animosity with respect for their « education » and « talent » . Just the opposite seems to have been so. His stance goes beyond both political expediency and a theoretical preference for cultural unity. Lueger defended the most rabid Christian-Social anti-Semites, such as Father Joseph Deckert and Ernst Schneider. The mayor awarded a medal to Deckert, and silenced Liberal protests in parliament against Schneider, « the conscience of the Christian people » , according to Lueger, when Schneider proposed that a special police force supervise the Jews around Easter time « to prevent ritual murders » .

In the light of continuing Austrian anti-Semitism, it is not surprising that Austrian views of Lueger remain substantially unchanged, and that, recently, there has even been a return to some of the earlier pre-War emphases in Hawlik's biography. But the picture of Lueger as a man who, despite appearances, liked Jews or was, at least, indifferent, of Lueger the benign, of Lueger the closet philo-Semite, distorts and obscures his role and that of his Party in the development of 20th Century anti-Semitism and the violent form it took. Lueger's anti-Semitism, in reality, assumed several ominous if expedient shapes. His public remarks and the implications of his policies sometimes pointed to a racial bias, Boyer notwithstanding, but these were not the only indications of his attitudes.

Although it may be true, as Robert Wistrich has pointed-out, that « re-1914 Christian-Social agitation 1st synthesized hatred of socialists and Jews in Austria » , Lueger also, if in less original fashion, routinely linked anti-Semitism with hatred of Liberalism, Hungarians, and Freemasons. But, in all these hateful chimeras, « the Jew » was primary and constant : thus, « Judensozi » , « Judeolibemlismus » , « Judeo-Magyar » , « Judenfreimaurer » . Lueger also added another amalgam to the spurious alloys of anti-Semitism to describe Jewish journalists, « papierene Juden » . Toward this latter group, and especially the journalists of the Liberal press, Lueger directed his most implacable anti-Semitism. Even Kielmansegg, who denied that Lueger was authentically anti-Semitic, conceded that the mayor's anti-Semitism did extend to the offices of the « Neue Freie Presse » in the « Fichtegasse » (Lueger admitted this) , thereby suggesting Lueger's insight on the importance of propaganda and mind control.

Lueger made extreme and damaging anti-Jewish remarks before and after he became mayor. Thus, for example, in 1894 during a parliamentary session, he corrected a Liberal delegate, Heinrich Popper. Lueger denied having said at a mass meeting that it was immaterial to him whether one shot or hanged Jews. « Beheaded ! » , Lueger corrected the speaker. And before and after he became mayor, Lueger asserted in parliament that Jewish sects practiced ritual murder. Although Lueger's statements are remarkable in themselves, it is important to bear in mind their larger context as well. When he made them, European attention was occupied by the Dreyfus affair and, at the same time, a kind of ritual murder hysteria swept over parts of Eastern Europe. On one occasion, a Frenchman was mistakenly assaulted as a Jew by a group of brick-makers who thought he wanted to draw blood from their children. Referring to the Dreyfus affair, Lueger told an electoral meeting, in 1895, that the eyes of the French had been opened, « and even they will one day realize that the Jew has no fatherland and, therefore, knows no fatherland » .

For much of his later career, from the mid- 1890's until, at least, as late as 1907, Lueger attacked Jews in the University. Thus, for example, in 1899, he claimed in the Lower-Austrian Diet that « Rumanian and Galician Jews had reduced the Vienna medical school to a level that could not be thought of as lower » . It should be noted that Lueger's and his Party's anti-Semitism was not confined solely to verbal abuse. The Lueger regime tried to instill anti-Semitism in the youth by appropriating municipal funds for, and facilitating the printing and distribution of, « Wiener Kinder » in Vienna's elementary schools. This, outspokenly Christian-Social, and occasionally anti-Semitic children's periodical was printed by vice-Mayor Heinrich Hierhammer. Its contributors included Richard von Kralik and Josef Scheicher.

Under Lueger, Jewish representatives to elective bodies controlled by the Christian-Socials and presided over by him

were insulted and sometimes intimidated, usually without his saying a word. In fact, Lueger occasionally defended the insulter. When, on rare occasions, Gentiles objected to Christian-Social behavior, they received the same abuse as the Jews. Lueger's government discriminated against the hiring and promotion of Jewish municipal employees and, sometimes, fired Jewish teachers. During his mayoralty, Lueger himself was directly involved in anti-Semitic incidents and scandals.

Considering the long history of anti-Semitism in Austria, it is perhaps more, rather than less, surprising that Lueger did not become an outspoken anti-Semite before he did. Opportunism was doubtless a factor here, but Lueger's had been a deeply traditional upbringing and home environment. Among most Austrian Catholics, the Jew was the eternal alien. Though guaranteed religious equality by law, the Jews of Lueger's time were regarded by Catholic Austrians as nonetheless unequal, a group apart, « un-German », even racially separate, by extremists. Yet, Austrians who thought this way were not necessarily active anti-Semites. Lueger surely realized this. Some of his more off-handed remarks about Jews betrayed a popular and more general habit of thought, rather than cunning political calculation. Thus, Jews might be tolerated or not, as circumstances and the mood dictated. This outlook had its roots in Medieval and Baroque times, when earlier Habsburg rulers had exploited or persecuted or merely tolerated Jews, as they saw fit. But there were other, more modern aspects to Lueger's anti-Semitism, such as his occasional racism, sometimes distinguishing as he did between Aryans and Jews. Moreover, his stated wish on one occasion that Jews be « weeded out » of the University medical Faculty anticipates the euphemistic language which would later be used by others to conceal the more violent practices of totalitarianism.

If Lueger's anti-Semitism, before his mayoralty, reflected his ruthless drive for power, his continuing anti-Jewish agitation and anti-Semitism, from 1897, betrayed criminal irresponsibility, because his pronouncements and actions carried the authority of official sanction and the Party he led continued until 1907 to extend its power and, thus, its anti-Semitism into regional and national politics. The context of his remarks and actions are significant. This was the Europe of the Dreyfus affair, an affair used by Lueger and his followers, after 1897, to incite hatred. Ritual murder cases were a continuing feature of late Habsburg history, and the authenticity of ritual murder had been endorsed by the mayor and Party leader himself. 12 ritual murder trials took place in the Habsburg Empire, between 1867 and 1914, and a pogrom in Galicia, in 1898, a pogrom so violent that a general revolt threatened and martial law had to be declared. The physical safety of Jews in the multi-national realm, at least the safety of lower-class Jews, was not as secure as Stefan Zweig has implied, and there are recorded instances of anti-Semitic violence during Lueger's mayoralty. Lueger and some of his lieutenants routinely exploited anti-Jewish developments in neighboring countries for whatever advantage they might afford. Actual restraint, or the threat of restraint by the Imperial government, limited violence against Jews by the mayor and his followers. There were also the subtler restraints imposed by nearly a Century of peace. The aggressions released by World War I would destroy not only traditional obedience to higher authority, as well as the traditional authority itself, but also loosen customary moral inhibitions. The post-War increase in violence was an escalation of what had formerly been merely verbal hostility ; anti-Semites of the 1920's did not have to create any new arguments because these had already been legitimized by Lueger and the Christian-Social Party.

Lueger's brand of anti-Semitism had been, at least, partly anticipated. Almost precisely 2 Centuries earlier, Abraham a Sancta Clara (1644-1709) , an Augustinian monk, mastered « the complex instrument of mass appeal » as no one else

in Germany or Austria was to do until Lueger. A violent, though never opportunistic, anti-Semite unlike Lueger, Abraham nonetheless « responded to the pressure of the masses », and « became one of the chief carriers to spread (hatred of the Jews) in his Century ». Although the origins of Lueger's anti-Semitism are obscure (there is no indication that he was influenced by Abraham), anti-Semitism had re-appeared with periodical intensity in Austria during times of crisis. This recurring aspect of Austrian anti-Semitism sometimes also emerged in Lueger's behavior in times of crisis, thereby indicating that, here, he was completely traditional.

Richard S. Levy has suggested that a distinction between anti-Jewish sentiments and anti-Semitism ought to be drawn to clarify Lueger's significance :

« The 1st is endemic in Austria and Europe, in general ; the 2nd is a new phenomenon of the late- 1870's, and, even though it feeds-off tradition, it entails actions either directly against Jews or the exploitation of anti-Jewish sentiment for other political ends. The difference between action and sentiment is the difference between traditional suspicion, contempt, or hatred of Jews and anti-Semitism, the political harnessing and on-going cultivation of that feeling. The former can issue in an occasional pogrom, an occasional tract, or the retention of legal discrimination ; the latter can result in genocide. Lueger was an anti-Semite, not just a Jew-hater. His massive influence on Austrian politics has to do with the entrance of anti-Semitism into the political culture of Austrian life. It becomes a permanent institution embodied in Parties, propaganda Societies, its own press. In the modern era, it always entails a broader world-view and sees the Jewish question as insoluble unless other grievous problems are also faced - Liberalism, socialism, constitutionalism, vivisection, the gold standard, etc. Once its political potential has been demonstrated and, after a certain point, it possesses a dynamic and rationale of its own ; it can be relied upon to produce a certain kind of support for political ventures from the socially threatened. »

Although Lueger's University years marked the zenith of prosperous Liberalism and neo-Enlightenment influence, following the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, Pan-German members of, at least, one student fraternity attributed « Austrian patriotism to the dominance of " oriental elements " - that is, Jews ». Anti-Semitism spread and intensified during the hard times following the « krach » of 1873.

Ignaz Mandl had employed anti-Semitism during an 1877 election campaign and Lueger had been praised by the anti-Semite Karl von Zerboni, following the Fogerty affair of 1882. For the next few years, Lueger was evidently uncertain about supporting the anti-Semites. In 1886, in the municipal council, he praised a Jew, Adolf Fischhof, one of the famous revolutionary leaders of 1848 :

« No one of the gentlemen, here in this hall, can hold a candle to him and no one alive can compare to his political past, service to the city of Vienna and to his integrity. »

However, in 1887, Lueger placed himself squarely on the side of the anti-Semites by supporting Schönerer's anti-immigration bill in parliament. As Lueger drew closer to the clericals, the frequency and intensity of his anti-Semitic remarks increased. In February 1889, he broke with Mandl. A few months later, he was receiving advice from an anti-Liberal about how to achieve the maximum anti-Semitic effect in Northern Bohemia when he delivered a speech there,

on September 1st. By the following year, the anti-Semitism that was to be significant in Lueger's rise, and would mark significant aspects of his politics for the duration of his career, had become a feature of his public personality.

Already he had coined the word « Judeo-Magyar » , which won him thousands of votes. As time passed, Lueger's anti-Semitism assumed a more threatening form than name-calling. During the Centennial of the French Revolution, in 1889, the Panama Canal scandal broke in France. Sensational revelations about bribery and corruption among the highest officials, and about Jewish middle-men, were given prominent coverage in Viennese papers. Lueger was doubtlessly referring to this in parliament when, during a lengthy anti-Semitic speech, in February 1890, he stated that :

« If revolution should break-out in France, not the archbishop of Paris, and no longer poor monks would be shot, but it would become unpleasant for other people. »

Lueger was to perfect this sort of thinly veiled anti-Jewish threat over the next 15 years.

During the 1890's, Lueger and his Party also attacked the alleged preponderance of Jews in some professions and, particularly, in the University medical school. One of the few to oppose this aspect of anti-Semitism was the rabbi Doctor Joseph Samuel Bloch. A parliamentary representative from Galicia, Bloch had exposed both the fraudulence of « Der Talmudjude » , a book that « sought to prove the depravity of the Jews by means of extracts from the Talmud » and of its author, Canon August Rohling, who claimed expertise as a specialist on Judaism. In 1891, in parliament, Bloch also exposed the hypocrisy of Karl Türk, the German Nationalist who, together with his family, had been treated by a Jewish doctor after Türk had delivered an anti-Semitic diatribe. And, during the same session, Bloch called Lueger's attention to the upsetting effects of anti-Semitism on children, an outcome that Lueger denied, for he claimed that children didn't attend « our meetings » . Bloch also asserted that Christian children had on 2 occasions struck-out the eyes of Jewish students and had been sentenced by the Courts.

Anticipating Nazi rhetoric, Lueger accused Jews of being « the destructive element » in every country :

« Whenever a State has allowed the Jews to become powerful, the State has soon collapsed, while in those States where they understood enough to isolate the Jews, the monarchical principle was saved, the people were saved from many things they would otherwise have suffered. »

This un-original aspect of Lueger's anti-Semitism (it was common practice of anti-Semites to accuse Jews thus) remained relatively constant, though he sometimes moderated his words after he became mayor. If Jews wanted to live among non-Jews, they had to subordinate themselves. He stressed this in a speech to his inner-city constituents, in 1905. In the relatively early phase of his parliamentary career (1892) , Lueger had stated that the Jew was behind all that was negative in modern life. For Lueger, the Jew alone ruled ; for the Jew alone was there prosperity. In the early 1890's, Lueger also attacked Austrian schools as a training ground for Jewish professionals. Accordingly, the « Jewish Liberal » teacher, as well as the « Jewish press » , were the most dangerous enemies within the later Jewish menace, not only because of their secular and anti-Catholic bias, but also because they allegedly served the implicitly alien Jewish nation. Whether they were « concealed » as members of the Liberal German School Association (« Deutscher

Schulverein ») or occupied chairs at the University (almost no Jews had chairs at the University) , Jewish educators were singled-out, as individuals and as a group, as special targets of Christian-Social gibes. This aspect of his anti-Semitism, like the Jewish subordination theme, also remained constant. Although he sometimes trimmed his sails to obtain Jewish financial backing for one of his municipal building projects, sought the counsel of baptized Jewish financial advisers, such as August Lohnstein of the « Landerbank » , or even praised Baron Albert Rothschild after he had granted the city a free right-of-way through his property for water lines, Lueger never altered his opposition to Jews in Austrian education. A public statement to this effect, in November 1907, involved him in the last anti-Semitic controversy of his career, the Wahrmond affair.

No other aspect of Lueger's anti-Semitism resulted in more protracted or acrimonious disputes, for some of his adversaries, who often were not Jews, numbered among the Empire's most articulate people. They defended their positions with skill, carried the battle into the Christian-Social camp, and exposed Lueger and his Party for the unscrupulous manipulators they were. But the reasoned and often trenchant replies of oppositional intellectuals had little apparent effect on Lueger or on any of his followers, who continued to use anti-Semitism much as before, probably reckoning this as no more than another aspect of maintaining and extending their power. Only Lueger, and probably also Gessmann among the Party hierarchy, may have grasped the potentialities of modern political propaganda inherent in their insistence on Party, faith, and sometimes also on race, as pre-requisites for teaching, and for other appointments.

Lueger understood the importance of education, as a means to advancement and to control. He owed his 1st rise in no small measure to academic excellence, after all, and later to having applied his knowledge, though this was tempered by experience, a pragmatic knack, and often by intuitive understanding. And he had most certainly studied the Liberal management of teaching appointments in Vienna's Elementary and Secondary schools, and was thus prepared to refine such management techniques, once power was his. During his mayoralty campaign, in the mid-1890's, Lueger gave a foretaste of what was to come. The specific target of this Christian-Social attack was Hermann Nothnagel, a famous physician and teacher on the University medical staff. Though a non-Jew, Nothnagel was hated by leading Christian-Socials and, especially, by Lueger because he was a prominent defender of Jews. Nothnagel had probably become a marked man, as early as 1891, when he declared, « at the opening meeting of the Society to Combat Anti-Semitism, that anti-Semitism was a disgrace and that its consequences were degeneration and barbarism » . Both the name Nothnagel and the physical appearance of this Prussian lent themselves to the ridicule of his enemies. The name translates as make-shift, « “ stopgap ”, or “ emergency hook ” » , and his appearance was described by an astute observer. This was Sigmund Freud, who would abandon abstinence from tobacco when Emperor Franz-Josef refused to sanction Lueger's election to mayor, and « smoke a cigar to celebrate » . Freud characterized Nothnagel as :

« A germanic caveman, completely fair hair, head, cheeks, neck, eyebrows, all covered with hair and hardly any difference in color between skin and hair. 2 enormous warts : one on the cheek and one on the bridge of the nose ; no great beauty, but certainly unusual. »

Nothnagel remained a favourite target of Christian-Social abuse. Lueger once implied in the provincial Diet that only

Nothnagel's greed for profit made him oppose the moving of the clinics to the city's outskirts, because he could reach patients more swiftly in the center. On another occasion, Lueger withheld from Liberals the use of municipal assembly halls and schools for lectures, because they refused to « abandon » the lackey of the Jews : Nothnagel. Lueger demanded that all speakers and lecture topics be approved by the Christian-Social controlled City Council. Though Nothnagel had never even delivered lectures to this group of Liberals, their leaders refused to negotiate on the issue of censorship, in any case, and requested Lueger to reconsider his decision on the use of the halls. After all, he controlled the City Council. Smiling, Lueger replied :

« In all legal and technical-administrative matters, I am the cleverer, and allow no one else to intervene. But, so far as anti-Semitism goes, any old hand is as clever as I, or cleverer ! »

In this way, the Liberals were refused the use of the halls. At the time of Nothnagel's death, in 1905, Lueger's 1st vice-Mayor, Josef Neumayer, who, the same year, was quoted in the municipal Council as saying that « so far as he was concerned, all Jews could be burned alive » , remarked to Lueger that « we need not react to other “ great ” events (Nothnagel, etc.) » .

The occasion for Lueger's 1895 attack on Nothnagel was provided during a budgetary debate in the provincial Diet, over the amount of support to be given to the University medical schools. Following anti-Semitic slurs on University educators by Josef Gregorig, Lueger's supporters received a rebuff they long remembered. The remarkable feature of this incident was that the Jews were eloquently defended by Laurenz Müllner, a Catholic priest, who was, at the same time, Chancellor of the University of Vienna. Also remarkable was the fact that Müllner's speech was extemporaneous. On January 4, 1895, Müllner, a well-known teacher in his own right, lived-up to his title of « Rector Magnificus » , as well. Gregorig had ridiculed the University as « Jew-infested » . Punning on Nothnagel's name, Gregorig added :

« Only yesterday, I read that, once again, a new Jewish professor had just been appointed, and if you look at the whole business out there, you'll see how the holy halls have been transformed into a mumblatorium on an emergency hook. » (« in sin an einem Nothnagel hängendes Mauscholeum. »)

While Gregorig's remarks elicited mirth and applause from the anti-Semites, Müllner castigated him in his retort for making unsubstantiated generalizations and insulting the University and individual Faculty members. Even professional educators could no longer generalize about individual disciplines as Gregorig had done, Müllner added. There was no longer such a thing as « a doctor universalis » :

« Study itself makes one modest, and I expected here, least of all, to hear it flatly stated that we have retrogressed. A colleague was specifically named, Professor Nothnagel. I don't know what connection delegate Gregorig has to natural science. (Boisterous amusement : Gregorig was a shirt-maker.) But if he has such a connection, I recommend an easier book to read, though I think he may have a little trouble studying it, and this is the physiological psychology of Wundt. There, he can orientate himself, perhaps, about what is thought of Professor Nothnagel. Furthermore, I would like to say something as a Catholic scholar. I believe Dante was, perhaps, a Christian. I ask only that you examine his “ Divine Comedy ” and read Dante's remarks about a Semite, about Averroés. Dante's was a great spirit and Thomas

Aquinas was a man of high-nobility, and also a saint ; the tone of such men's remarks, even about Jewish scholars, is completely different, even where agreement is impossible. Every year, I necessarily refute Spinoza, but I say it here that, though I refute his system, I bow nonetheless before that great spirit and before that noble man. »

Müllner's words only irritated the anti-Semites. Lueger, who twice interrupted Müllner, and who was obviously stung by his remarks, revealed his racism and the « differential » aspect of his anti-Semitism by discounting Spinoza (for whom Lueger said he also had « great respect ») , as a typical Jew. Spinoza, Lueger informed his listeners, had been persecuted by his co-religionists and racial comrades, not by Christians. That, he added, was something « a priest of the Catholic religion should and must know » . The noble Jews had all vanished and those who remained were the ones Lueger fought. He implied that, as a Catholic priest, Müllner was a traitor for having defended them. Lueger's words were cheered by his followers. Ernst Schneider interjected that Müllner was an « honorary rabbi » and that he should get circumcised.

Having rejected humanistic considerations, Lueger suggested that the only values that truly counted were the ones that served palpable political goals, in this case to be determined by himself, and without reference to earlier mores or ethical considerations. And the tone of Lueger's remarks and the responses of his supporters suggested that the values themselves, which reflected a spontaneity, would be determined by an irrational interaction between speaker and audience. Lueger, the « artist and actor, unknowingly (fell) , more and more, into the mental attitude of the audience in the galleries » , as Bloch observed.

Such an interactive politics may have contributed to another significant anti-Semitic incident, again an attack on the Jewish members of the medical Faculty, in 1903. In any case, Lueger's behavior, in 1903, revealed that his demagogy remained undiminished. Moreover, the Christian-Socials then tried to extend their control over Vienna's hospitals, Kielmansegg's realm. In 1903, as in 1895, the budget was under debate. For some 2 weeks before the incident, Lueger's Party, in the provincial Diet, had been attacking the ostensible failure of Primary schools to deliver the educational goods. One of the central figures in the new incident was Hermann Bielohlawek, a merchant and something of a Court jester among the Christian-Socials, who flaunted his ignorance and Philistinism. According to Bielohlawek, students often left the schools with their heads stuffed full of useless knowledge and as ignorant of basic reading and arithmetic skills as when they had arrived. The fortunate ones received a more useful education only after they reached the University. As they had for some years, the Christian-Socials also criticized modern education for undermining religious faith. Bielohlawek implicated the Jews in the process, making it clear that his Party did not oppose them because of their religion. Instead, he shared with Schönerer the viewpoint that the race itself was at fault. In referring to the recent Hilsner ritual murder trial, in Bohemia, and the Dreyfus affair, Bielohlawek aroused « lively applause and amusement » when he announced that, deporting one Jew to Devil's Island where Dreyfus had been imprisoned, was insufficient ; only, after all, Jews had been sent there would « there be quiet in our fatherland Austria » . In a subsequent Diet session, Leopold Steiner, one of Lueger's closest friends, criticized the hospitals by painting the horrors of vivisection practices at the University anatomical institutes, to the growing indignation of his listeners. Steiner demanded that the government enforce an earlier decree prescribing control measures. He then described various malpractices against hospital patients by implicitly Jewish doctors, concluding that vivisection was responsible for inuring the doctors to patients' suffering. Only when administrative officials had replaced the doctors as leaders of

the hospitals would such abuses cease. It seemed clear which Party would provide the administrative officials, at least to Kielmansegg, who opposed Steiner's criticism by correcting technical points and suggesting that some aspects of it were exaggerated.

Steiner's vivisection criticism rallied the Christian-Socials to his support. Josef Scheicher said that he wished Steiner's proposal had included a demand for the abolition of vivisection « once and for all » but the University Chancellor, Ritter von Escherich, was indignant « over the grave insults » leveled at « the entire medical Faculty and the medical profession » . This, in turn, elicited a Christian-Social interpellation that included quotations from a 1902 pamphlet « Murder in the Service of Science » by Doctor Paul Forster. A Party anti-Semite in Germany who held a Ph.D. , Forster luridly depicted the horrors of vivisection on man and animals. The interpellation ended with a demand for the abolition of vivisection and the « strict surveillance of all hospitals » , and, in particular, those that predominantly treated the poor. On October 28, the Diet was the scene of Christian-Social attempts to hinder the promotion of a Jewish doctor over his « more deserving » Christian compatriots, and of further revelations about vivisection and medical malpractice allegedly perpetrated by Jewish doctors. With the support of anti-Semitic shouts of other Christian-Socials, Steiner denounced as mendacious and distorted the reports of « the Viennese Jewish press » about the vivisection affair, the Diet, and its individual members. 2 days later, Lueger delivered a speech in support of a motion of urgency begun by himself and signed by other leading Christian-Socials. In the motion, he rejected as « insolent » a declaration of the University medical College Faculty protesting the interference of the Diet in the vivisection matter, and its meddling in the affairs of the medical institute.

Denying that either the medical College or the doctors' profession had been attacked, Lueger stated that the entire incident had been blown-out of proportion so that « certain men and animal knackers can act as though they alone were the doctors » . « The College of professors » , he added, « should look to itself, and rather endeavor to weed-out certain elements from the doctor's profession which only injure it, so that finally, a Christian conviction will return to these circles. »

Lueger's words were cheered as usual in Christian-Social assemblies, and subsequent speakers supported his remarks. When they had finished, Lueger summarized his thoughts on the vivisection issue by remarking that it was the duty of the Diet to protect poor people in the hospitals from vivisection. The doctors placed too much trust in scientific progress by « so-called graduate doctors who learned in the medical Faculty » . Great progress in medicine, Lueger assured his listeners, « had actually been made by laymen » , just as progress in legal education had usually been achieved by the laity. When torture was abolished, this had been due to someone who had possessed « no more than a warm heart for mankind » . Scholars should practice modesty. « If a scholar is so haughty that he says that no one else has anything to say (interjection : Then, he's certainly a Jew !) , then I say : my dear scholar, if you can make a blade of grass one day that a cow can eat (amusement) , then I'll take my hat off to you ; but so long as you are unable, then you're a quack like the rest of us (amusement) . » Lueger concluded by adding an amendment to his motion that all the « proposals, inquiries and debates » about the issue at hand were to be printed and distributed among the people, thus suggesting his appreciation of the value of this topic as agitation. His original motion and amendment were unanimously approved and Lueger was heartily applauded, cheered, and congratulated for many minutes after his speech.

In 2 succeeding sessions, Kielmansegg and the Socialist Karl Seitz voiced the opinions of moderates who must have been appalled at the spectacle of the mayor of Vienna and leader of what was rapidly becoming the leading Imperial Party denigrating scholars, celebrating amateurs, and calling for the « weeding-out (of) certain elements from the doctor's profession » , by which Lueger had meant the Jews. The satirists and caricaturists had a field day. Kielmansegg made the important points that most of the abuses cited in the pamphlet « Murder in the Service of Science » referred to foreign incidents and that, considering the many patients treated each year, often with complicated diseases, complaints about malpractice were negligible. The reputation of Vienna's hospitals was deservedly high and would remain that way, as long as they were under his jurisdiction. While Kielmansegg was applauded and congratulated by many for seeming to uphold the majority opinion, Seitz, who spoke the following day, was heckled by Gessmann, Bielohlawek, and Lueger for defending vivisection. The great physician Christian Albert Theodor Billroth, Seitz reminded his listeners, could never have performed his miraculous operations had he not first experimented on thousands of animals. Moreover, the patients who had experienced successful operations owed their recovery in no small measure to the thousands who had lain on the operating table before them. The real reason the Christian-Socials had provoked this incident, Seitz added, was that rich Jews, who were symbolized by the learned doctors, were the most dangerous enemies of the Christian-Socials. Bielohlawek, who spoke after Seitz, questioned whether the Christian-Socials had agitated against science or the doctors at all, but Lueger agreed with Seitz that the whole issue revolved around the Jewish question. In speaking thus, Lueger gave form to the incoherent anxieties of his followers and, possibly also, to his own subconscious fears. In any case, Lueger's words distilled his feelings about Jews in higher-education and revealed dissatisfaction with Vienna's hospitals as he alleged they were controlled by the Jews :

« When, at last, Jewish corpses are dissected, perhaps the doctors will then learn still more than they can from dissecting ours. The medical school in Vienna won world fame at a time when only Christian professors, a Skoda, Oppolzer, or however they were called, laid the foundation for the medical school's fame of the University of Vienna. But, as soon as the Jews got in, the fame of this school in Vienna sank low (cry : So, it is !) and when the accusation is made that we're opponents of science, then I say, no, we're not opponents of science, but we do oppose science being misused merely for the advantage of isolated dissolute, brutish, and brutalized individuals.

The medical school will only thrive again and the hospitals once more become places of refuge, whether for rich or poor, when the principle (out with the Jews from the University and the hospitals) is enforced, so that we Christians can be humanely treated (hearty applause) . »

Despite Lueger's continuing demagogic sallies, the furor over the hospitals gradually subsided, and the whole incident served more to reinforce the image of Lueger and the Christian-Socials as Philistines, rather than as anti-Semites, at least among the Liberal cartoonists. Karl Kraus saw both aspects. He commented that the Liberal dialectic had given place to the Christian-Social, and that the new tone was doubtless worse. Uglier and lower than flaunting education, as the Liberals had done, was flaunting snobbery over ignorance. To be a leader of the people, in the Luegerian sense, meant opening the floodgates to mass instincts and inundating defenseless culture. 2 Christian-Social program points had emerged from the affair :

« The Jews should have anatomical equality the same as Christians, that is, should be dissected as well as Christians ; but, while preparing them for equality as objects of medical study, they should lose their equality as subjects of medical study, be driven from the University and the hospitals. »

By 1903, Lueger usually had the last word on political matters in Vienna, and thus it was with the hospital affair, though this particular utterance carried an unintentionally ironic ring. When later in November, during a municipal Council session, a Christian-Social, Karl Glössl, described the traffic in human skeletons of poor Catholics between the hospitals and private purchasers, thus depriving the deceased of Christian burials, Lueger agreed with Glössl that it was « downright depressing » :

« I certainly have nothing against it that corpses serve learning. But if that is right, and if that is so important, then all men should participate : the rich with the poor, the Jews with the Christians. Justice for all ! (lively applause) » .

Unlike the Lueger-Müllner exchange of 1895 or the hospital incident of October-November 1903, the Wahrmond affair, 4 years later, was triggered neither by a budgetary debate nor a legislative conflict, but by a Lueger welcoming speech. Privately, he claimed that his remarks had been prompted by the desire to please the many priests attending the 6th « Katholikentag » , in November 1907, whom he greeted in his official position as mayor. Publicly, he insisted that he had been misunderstood, that his words had been directed against nationalistic violence in the Universities. Yet, Lueger's remarks may not have been as extemporaneous as he would have liked some to believe. As early as July 22, 1907, « Reichsrat » member, Ernst Count Sylva-Tarouca, informed Lueger that Cardinal Gruscha had inquired whether Tarouca would organize the « Katholikentag » , « since this was the wish of the Austrian episcopacy » . Gruscha « intended to precede (the meeting) with a collective pastoral epistle against the “ Los-von-Rom ” Movement and the anti-dynastic and anti-Austrian tendencies of the radicals » . Tarouca expressly requested Lueger's support and advice « in this affair » , which he had already mentioned to him the preceding winter.

Whatever the true inspiration for his remarks, in the furor that followed, the anti-Semitism of his « Katholikentag » speech was largely obscured in a larger controversy over secular versus religious education. During his welcome, Lueger had stated that much had been achieved in the Viennese schools, secular and religious teaching had been successfully integrated. And yet, another great task remained, « the conquering of the University » . No longer should the Universities be a seedbed for revolution, upheaval, and atheism, no longer should teachers have to be armed with clubs and whips to impart knowledge, as he had read in the papers that it was necessary for them to do :

« But there will be a hard struggle. So long as it is possible that, among 8 newly appointed professors, there are 7 Jews (indignation) , a great struggle must follow until we have come so far that, among 8 appointed professors, there are 7 Christians (applause) . I don't believe that any of us will slacken. »

Socialists, Liberals, members of smaller Parties and their respective presses, and prestigious scholars such as Friedrich Jodl and Ernst Mach censured or ridiculed Lueger's remarks, Mach stating that Lueger wanted to turn the clock back to the 14th Century, and that he had no desire to share the fate of such a people and country. Yet, the indignation of the University Faculty and that of Lueger's other critics provided but a foretaste of what was to come.

On January 18, 1908, Ludwig Wahrmund, professor of ecclesiastical law at the University of Innsbruck, delivered a lecture in the large municipal hall in Innsbruck, subsequently published as « Catholic “ Weltanschauung ” and Free Science » . He repeated the lecture in Salzburg. The thrust of Wahrmund's remarks had been anticipated by his earlier criticism of the discrepancies between church dogma and modern scientific inquiry. This had already roused the ire of local Church leaders and University administrators, but his most recent attack was the last straw. Wahrmund's lecture was confiscated in many places by the government, and the controversy over clerical or secular education, which had been raging in Austria for many years, erupted anew, spilling-over into political life, once more. In the Tirol, a long-standing feud between the Christian-Socials and Catholic Conservatives prompted the Conservatives to distinguish between Catholics and Christian-Socials « in religious respects » . In Graz, student violence reached such proportions that the University had to be closed for the summer, an action repeated in Innsbruck when Wahrmund returned from a short trip. At length, Wahrmund was transferred to Prague. He secretly signed an agreement accepting an annual 10,000 « Kronen » research sabbatical from the government for up to 2 years, and an annual pension of 2,000 « Kronen » should he choose to retire thereafter. By agreeing, Wahrmund thus removed himself from the political scene, for the terms of the new arrangement leaked-out and discredited him. Though he soon relinquished the honoraria, he was, in any case, deprived of a University platform for his agitation.

The Wahrmund affair had at least 2 significant after-effects. In the autumn of 1908, Freiherr von Beck resigned as prime minister, in part because he had lost the support of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, who thought Beck had « let Wahrmund down too lightly » . In the literary realm, the Wahrmund affair helped inspire Arthur Schnitzler's play « Professor Bernhardi » , which characterized the ignoble actions of some of the principal actors in the original affair.

Lueger, who, by 1907, could do no wrong, at least in the opinion of Christian-Social publicists and apparently also in the eyes of the archduke, emerged with his reputation enhanced as a defender of Catholic education. At the height of the affair, he was kept posted by Alfred Ebenhoch, the minister of agriculture, who seemed both casual and irritated by it all. To him, the affair was a cloud in the sky that would soon pass away :

« Wahrmund on every corner. How will it end ? It drives one crazy. »

2 weeks after Lueger's remarks, a minor Christian-Social paper, the « Badener and Mödlinger Bezirksnachrichten » , published « the authentic meaning » of Lueger's speech, at least as it was intended to be understood by the Party rank and file. The editor of this political weekly, Hans Arnold Schwer, one of the younger generation of Christian-Socials, was municipal Councillor, sometime playwright and vigorous defender of « Christian culture » . He had also had a somewhat minor, if vociferous, role in the Hilsner case, having written a polemic intended to silence the demands of Thomas Masaryk for Hilsner's retrial. Schwer claimed that Hilsner had murdered not 1, but 2 Christian girls. In a front-page « Bezirksnachrichten » article, « A Jewish Trick » , such issues as educational philosophy, freedom of speech among educators, and the threat to freedom of scientific inquiry were subordinated to the « threatening character of the progressive Jewish infestation among University professors » . According to the article, Lueger « had emphasized nothing other than what he had had to emphasize in his entire anti-Semitic past » . The « Bezirksnachrichten » implied that Germans should maintain unity in the face of Jewish attempts to sow dissent.

In the municipal Council, Lueger brushed aside objections from the Socialists that he had exceeded his authority by welcoming the clerical Parties at the « Katholikentag », in his official position as mayor. The Socialists asserted that Lueger had not spoken for « many thousands of Viennese who did not belong to the clerical Party, but who, in opposition to the tendencies represented at the “ Katholikentag ”, were deeply disquieted by the serious threat to the development of the entire culture ». Ridiculing the author of this challenge, Lueger asserted that there were « many things » outside the official statutes that he was obliged to do as mayor. Had he not attended this Catholic occasion in which « cardinals, archbishops and bishops had participated », he would have been « a coward », and betrayed his Catholicism as well. He had greeted the participants in the name of the majority Catholic population as « a courteous mayor of Vienna, the Imperial capital and residence », and would continue to do so whether the Socialists liked it or not.

The Müllner-Lueger exchange, Vienna hospital incident, and Wahrmond affair revealed Lueger's anti-Semitism toward Jews in higher-education. Other, more casually anti-Semitic remarks underlined his fundamental assumptions about the extent to which Jews were to be tolerated, in which areas of endeavor, and in what capacities. Lueger stated that he respected pious Jews and Hermann Bielohlawek subsequently added that he respected the religion but despised the race. However, Lueger's distinction suggests that he was less tolerant of Jews who were inconspicuous about their religion. He was suspicious of those who tried partly to assimilate. Individuals with semi-Jewish parentage who had become baptized Christians and staunch Catholics, such as vice-Mayor Josef Porzer, or those of partly Jewish descent, such as Gessmann, but whose Catholicism was beyond question, were awarded Lueger's toleration. He needed such men regardless of their heritage because of their ability, and particularly Gessmann, who was a gifted and ruthless organizer. However, Lueger became uneasy when identities were blurred, whether culturally, religiously, or racially. « Authenticity » was the thing. Lueger wanted to know whether someone was a « Mandl Oder ein Weibl » (man or a woman) . Blurred identities created uncertainties and impaired his apparent need to categorize, to place people and things and qualities in « proper » relationships and order. This need, which may have developed during his upbringing, when social hierarchy was much clearer and more distinct than it would be in the changing, dynamic society of « fin-de-siècle » Austria, was reinforced by his formal education, profession, and experience : he was, after all, a lawyer and insisted on legalistic categories if the need presented itself. Lueger's insistence on clear-cut distinctions, particularly as they affected the Jews, was shared by other prominent Christian-Socials. This insistence sometimes manifested itself as hostility, which suggests the nature of the obstacle that impeded Jewish advancement in late- Imperial Austria and thereafter. Christian-Social leaders rejected Jews for allegedly lacking intrinsic qualities believed to be possessed by « Christians » or, to some Christian-Socials, possessed by « Aryans » . Dynastic loyalism, anti-Liberalism, and clericalism were defenses for some, to preserve a stable, traditional order. Jews, who could assimilate and become « hidden foes » , stood for the opposite.

And, yet, despite his open or veiled anti-Semitism, some Jews defended Lueger and his administration, fearing, perhaps, that worse was to come once he departed the scene. This impression is conveyed by an anonymous and ungrammatical letter to Lueger from a « good patriotic Hungarian Jew » who, though he was an opponent of the mayor « on principle » , nonetheless admired his « administrative talent » . The letter contained a home remedy and was evidently received by Lueger while he was on one of his periodic cures :

« I convey the feelings of all Israelite Hungarian Jews when I wish you complete recovery and still more decades at the helm of the Imperial city of Vienna as mayor. I have the conviction that Austrian Jews also think this way, for if someone like Bilohlawek (sic) comes to power, then, woe to Israel in Vienna. »

Here again, Lueger was different things to different people, and sometimes had it both ways.

When it came to discriminating against Jews, in cultural matters, Lueger was notably less successful than in the professional realm. Although the Christian-Socials might withhold promotions from deserving Jewish teachers and municipal officials and, thus, immediately achieve the desired effect, Lueger learned early in his mayoralty that cultural anti-Semitism (the exclusion of Jews from cultural affairs organized or run by the Christian-Social municipal government) posed thorny problems. Other Party members were slower to understand these problems and continued to pursue ineffectual cultural policies, long after these had been discredited or had failed altogether. The fact that they could continue to do so, without Lueger's interference, suggests his increasing caution toward cultural anti-Semitism or, perhaps, his growing indifference, or an expression of the divergent tendencies among the ruling Party that appear to have become more frequent as Lueger's health deteriorated. In any event, Lueger's control over the Christian-Socials was never perfect, and the Party machine sometimes functioned most inefficiently, if at all. The « Aryan Theater » fiasco illustrates several such failures.

This Theatre was, in part, a result of attempts by Adam Müller-Guttenbrunn, a writer and unsuccessful theatre director, to make good his earlier failure while, at the same time, trying to revive a more traditional Germanic culture. According to Müller-Guttenbrunn, German cultural decline in Austria had been precipitated by Jewish literary predominance. Another impetus toward the creation of the Theatre was the desire for quick profits, the speculation by private citizens that their investments in the Theatre, at a favourable rate of interest, would be speedily rewarded. Still, another impetus was the desire by outlying District residents to create a major « suburban » Theatre, for most of the principal playhouses were in the 1st District.

Both Müller-Guttenbrunn and the Theatre enthusiasts revealed their anti-Semitism by excluding Jews as actors or playwrights from the new undertaking. They, thereby, probably hoped to capitalize on the prevailing anti-Jewish feelings of the Christian-Socials and German Nationalists. Things went wrong from the start. Intended as an important event in the 50th anniversary celebration of Franz-Josef's ascension to the throne, the opening of the « Aryan Theater », or « Kaiserjubiläums-Stadttheater », as it was more formally called, was clouded by the recent assassination of Empress Elisabeth. Lueger had shown interest in a popular and implicitly anti-Semitic Theatre project, as early as 1890. Although he had been a member of the « Jubiläums » Theatre Association, since 1896, he criticized the opening night play, Heinrich von Kleist's « Die Hermannsschlacht », a Classical « Aryan work » by an « Aryan playwright », in the thinking of Müller-Guttenbrunn. At a banquet, after the premiere, Lueger told the guests that a play in which a wench threw her lover to a bear did not correspond to the tastes of the Viennese, that they did not want « a disgraceful play » like Kleist's « Hermannsschlacht ». Lueger's words were ridiculed, from Vienna to Königsberg, as proof of Christian-Social philistinism. Although the mayor and Party leader was much more cautious, thereafter, in his remarks about theatre matters, he still continued, for a time, openly to defend the enterprise. During the following summer, for

example, he boasted before an assembly of the Christian-Social Workers' Association that his Party had created its « own theatre to which Christian men can go and take their families, without fearing that the ears of their poor children will be dirtied by smut » , as he implied they were dirtied in theatres operated by Jews.

Lueger's biographer, Johannes Hawlik, has pointed-out that Jewish actors sometimes participated in « Jubiläumstheater » productions and that some « Jubiläumstheater » works were written by Jews. Whenever it became known that Jews were, overtly or covertly, participating in « Aryan Theater » productions, anti-Semitic papers would invariably call Müller-Guttenbrunn to task. Such incidents were comparatively few during his administration, and the toleration of Jewish collaboration may well have been calculated by Müller-Guttenbrunn to soften Jewish hostility toward himself, particularly after it became apparent that the Party Theatre was failing. The abandonment of the « Aryan clause » occurred during the administration of his successor, Rainer Simons, but only over the strident objections of some Christian-Socials. Anti-Jewish plays were, however, performed under Müller-Guttenbrunn, thereby, achieving one of the Party's central ideological purposes. Such works included « Der Rechtschaffene » , about the Offenheim corruption trial of the 1870's ; « Helden der Peder » , depicting Jewish influence-peddling in the Viennese literary world ; « Eigenthum » , portraying the victim of Jewish financial machinations ; and a mutilated version of « The Merchant of Venice » . These efforts were intended to proclaim the beliefs of « Aryan Theater » supporters, though they failed for artistic and other reasons. « The Merchant of Venice » , an early production, enjoyed the greatest agitational success of the 4 but was, in all other ways, fully unsuccessful. It created a « cause célèbre » and anticipated a similar agitational use of this work in Nazi Vienna.

The timing of Müller-Guttenbrunn's version, in October 1899, was a happy coincidence for the anti-Semites, taking place as it did a month after the 2nd conviction of Alfred Dreyfus for treason. This development, no doubt, intensified the critical controversy surrounding the play, for public opinion had become polarized : the Liberals condemned the injustice of the verdict in France ; the anti-Semites unanimously approved ! Lueger and many other leading Christian-Socials attended a performance. One Christian-Social observer remarked « that such a play would doubtless make a more powerful impression than an electoral meeting » , while a Liberal commented on the barbarousness of the audience, which « behaved as though Hilsner had been playing Shylock » . « The Merchant of Venice » might soon have disappeared from the critical scene had not a reviewer from the « Wiener Volksbothe » , a small Christian-Social paper that catered to the janitorial mind, mistakenly hailed Grillparzer as the author. This blunder prompted a sardonic letter to the « Volksbothe » from an unknown writer signing himself « William Shakespeare » , who demanded that his authorship be acknowledged. The « Volksbothe » promptly did so, and apologized for its error, adding that :

« No Freemason like Grillparzer (could have written) a play (of such obvious anti-Semitic tendencies) Grillparzer's body must, no doubt, (have been spinning) in its grave, but would now (come to rest in) its original position, because Mr. Shakespeare had so promptly corrected the " Volksbothe ". The publication of his letter had thus squared accounts. »

Responding to the original « Volksbothe » blunder, a Social-Democratic critic « rejoiced that the anti-Semitic and anti-English movement had been strong enough to refute the Jewish lies about Shakespeare being the author of the " Merchant " » . Word of the « Volksbothe » blunder spread as far as England, prompting the « Manchester Guardian »

to observe with disdain that Johann König, the editor of the Viennese paper, « was a Christian-Social member of a school board “ entrusted with the education of hundreds of children ”. » A Liberal paper provided the last well-aimed shot in the affair, with a telling revelation of the disgust many felt over the prostitution of art for Party purposes and over the attempt to capitalize on contemporary hatred. The deeper meaning of the play had been obscured. Shakespeare's Shylock had been cheated of his justice ...

« through bad sophistry. Although that justice may be reprehensible, the wrong done him is even more egregious. This old, greedy, hate-filled Shylock who insists upon his bond, who rejects 3 and even 10 times his money and, remorselessly, covets that overdue pound of flesh, this dogged struggler for his justice - what sort of an idealist is he compared to the “ pedlars ” who scorn him and applaud the trampling of his justice as a victory of the good cause ?

There was no reply from the Christian-Socials to this comment. So far, as they were concerned, « the quality of mercy » toward the Jews was always strained.

Müller-Guttenbrunn and others involved in the Aryan theatrical venture were dissatisfied with the « mildness » of his anti-Jewish productions. Accordingly, he tried to stage more venomously antagonistic plays. However, such out-and-out anti-Semitic works as « Harte Hände », « Söhne Israels », and « Die Büsserin », all of which pointed forward to one of the most violent Nazi films, « Jud Süß », were forbidden by the censor. A residue of restraint, it seems, existed at some governmental levels, at least before World War I. Not to be put-off by official prohibition, Müller-Guttenbrunn published the 1st 2 works out of his own pocket and distributed thousands of copies. He was convinced of the ineffectiveness of other anti-Semitic plays by such writers as Ernst Vergani and Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels, evidently one of Adolf Hitler's early intellectual mentors, lamenting to Vergani that his play was too honestly objective, and that objectivity was « our old illness », by which Müller-Guttenbrunn probably meant that the play was not anti-Semitic enough. In his last effort, as a racist director, Müller-Guttenbrunn proved with « Athara », depicting the failure of inter-marriage, the truth of Jorge Luis Borges's aphorism that « censorship is the mother of the metaphor ». In any case, Müller-Guttenbrunn's dissemination of the forbidden plays won him the support of some of the more extreme Christian-Social anti-Semites in the provincial Diet and was remembered by them as one of his better achievements when he resigned, in October 1903, shortly before he went bankrupt.

In the autumn of 1903, during the demise of the « Aryan Theater », some Christian-Socials proposed the creation of a literary prize of 2,000 « Kronen » to be awarded to an Austrian writer of « Aryan origin » for « an artistically important dramatic work ». Such a prize was created and conferred several times during Lueger's mayoralty, on Meinrad Sadil, for example, a Benedictine monk, 2 of whose plays had been produced in the « Aryan Theater », and on Karl Domanig and Eduard Hlatky, among others. That these last 2 recipients were Lueger partisans and members of Richard von Kralik's circle vindicated an earlier Socialist observation that Christian-Social measures to promote « Aryan culture » had fostered a 2nd literary clique no lovelier than its Liberal counterpart. In this way, even after 5 years of artistic mediocrity and cultural-political fiascoes, Müller-Guttenbrunn's ideas not only continued to win, at least tacit support among some Christian-Socials, but also found welcome implementation. A cartoon in the racially anti-Semitic « Kikeriki » commented on the literary prize proposal, and afforded a « psycho-gram » of the prize's authors. In this supposedly complimentary cartoon, a well-dressed Weiskirchner, who became the last Christian-Social mayor of Vienna

between 1912 and 1919, and Josef Sturm, another anti-Semitic member of the « Landtag », are shown trying to free Pegasus, the emblem of artistic inspiration, from a chariot representing the adverse Jewish influence over art and culture. Classical imagery is, thus, juxtaposed with the symbol of anti-Semitic racism in a blend of antique and contemporary. If one recalls Lueger's Classical references and elegant taste in clothing, one can see that, in some respects, this cartoon reflects his cultural predilections and racial prejudices, as well as those of Sturm and Weiskirchner.

Though Lueger became steadily disenchanted with the « Aryan Theater », Müller-Guttenbrunn continued to pursue his ideological convictions till the end. For those who had followed the development of the Theatre and knew about Müller-Guttenbrunn's racist preoccupations, the underlying intent of « Athara » would have been clear enough. It was well-received by the critics. After his bankruptcy, Müller-Guttenbrunn took to reflecting on his recent cultural failure. In one article, he proclaimed himself the prophet of a new socio-political salvation, whose Messiah had, perhaps, already been born, but who had not yet spoken. He then turned to writing novels. Among them was the anti-Semitic « Gärungen Klärungen ». Both the article and the novel were written under the pseudonym of Franz-Josef Gerhold. Müller-Guttenbrunn's career evinced a Péguyian blend of mysticism and cultural politics. Lueger was quintessentially political, by contrast, and far more practical. He never lost sight of the political cost of more adventurist cultural programs. Referring to the Theatre, he somewhat diffidently warned Müller-Guttenbrunn's successor to look at that bed before he lay down in it, and not to « be surprised if the fleas bite you ». This « bon mot » revealed another facet of Lueger's personality : his refusal to allow himself to be humiliated by failure, at least in public. This tendency, along with his apparently total indifference to contradictory behavior, was demonstrated on many an occasion. Once, for example, Lueger had delivered an anti-Semitic speech in the « Leopoldstadt ». A few days later, at a reception, he offered his hand to Alfred Stern, the chairman of the Israelite Religious Community. Stern refused to shake hands with Lueger, unless he took back his anti-Semitic remarks. « But you'll still give me your hand », said Lueger, jokingly. When Stern refused to extend his hand, Lueger simply moved on, joking all the while.

Some larger European developments should be sketched in, to provide a working context for Lueger's anti-Semitism. Although 1903 had been a quiet year for the great powers of Central and Eastern Europe, the calm was deceptive and soon to be shattered with far-reaching effects. In February 1904, War broke-out between Russia and Japan. Russian politics were transformed, not only because of the defeats suffered by that country, but also as a result of social and economic disruptions that culminated in an unsuccessful revolution the following year. These developments affected events in Austria-Hungary, as well. Emperor Franz-Josef, seeing the riots and strikes in Russia, and further disruption in major Habsburg industrial centers, had ordered his ministers to prepare legislation granting universal manhood suffrage. Well, did he recall the Revolution of 1848, which had brought him to power, and he was wise to have feared the 1905 specter of the earlier upheaval, which this time could have cost him his power. Granting the vote to the workers was intended to forestall this, just as the creation of a « Duma » in Russia, by Czar Nicholas II, was carried-out as a concession for much the same reason.

Alert to the consequences of the franchise reform, which meant a drastic increase in the number of worker voters, the Christian-Socials responded with their usual demagogic agitation, blaming Austria's ills on the insidious influence of « Jewish Social-Democracy », much as they had blamed « Jewish Liberals » for the woes of the Viennese lower middle-

class, in the 1890's. Here, as before, the Jew remained the constant target. However, a more strident note and, in a more threatening key, resonated through their agitation, because of the revolutionary activity in Russia and the racial tone of the czarist response. There, too, Jews were being blamed for Russia's various ills, but with more immediate and destructive results. Czarist-sponsored pogroms, carried-out by bands of thugs known as the « Black Hundreds » , terrorized thousands. Many fled and sought refuge in other countries.

Austrian anti-Semites warned of anarchy in the Habsburg Empire should the « Jewish Social-Democrats » get the upper-hand, in some cases applauding the activities of the « Black Hundreds » , and agitating to close Austrian borders to Russian Jews. They were seen literally as the carriers of disease, for a cholera epidemic raged across Russia, in the summer of 1905, and less objectively as the carriers of revolutionary contagion, for it seems unlikely that the average person who had escaped from one revolutionary situation with little more than his life would have sought another in a country that served as a haven. Although Lueger took no definite stand on the Russian disorders until late in 1905, waiting as usual for the optimum moment, his feelings could easily be inferred. Earlier that summer, he had responded to an inquiry in the municipal Council about the effectiveness of border and hostel controls affecting « certain immigrants » , by promising to caution the appropriate authorities to be especially watchful. When Franz Schuhmeier questioned Lueger's use of the phrase « certain immigrants » , the mayor replied :

« I used the same term (as in the inquiry) . I know that the Jews are meant thereby (amusement) . »

Yet, another contemporary development should also be outlined, insofar as it, too, perpetuated ill feeling between Lueger and the Jewish community. This was the long-standing Christian-Social agitation against ritual slaughter, which peaked during 1905, a most turbulent year in several ways. Sometimes linked to agitation for the municipal slaughterhouse, demands for prohibition of « kosher » butchering were ultimately defeated, though not before a lengthy struggle in the municipal Council, Diet, and even parliament. The defeat of the Christian-Socials meant that the rights of a religious minority had been upheld as previously guaranteed by the law. This re-affirmation, however, did little to improve relations between Lueger's Party and the Jews.

In the lurid fantasies of some of Lueger's more macabre followers, ritual slaughter was inextricably linked to ritual murder. One anti-Semitic cartoonist even pictured Lueger as the possible victim of such a « kosher » plot. By the end of 1905, caricatures of ritual slaughter, ritual murder, and violent Russian revolutionary Jews had merged in a gory synthesis. The Jew, in various guises, thus continued to be the exclusive target of hate, though in a still more protean form than when Lueger had identified him as a « Judeo-Magyar » , « Judenlibemler » , and « Judenfreimaurer » . Intentional or not, such agitation within the context of 1905 events could have led to violence. The way Jews were perceived changed drastically in the eyes of an increasing number of Viennese during Lueger's day, through such anti-Semitic caricatures as were appearing in periodicals like « Kikeriki » and « Figaro » .

Lueger himself embodied the wishes of the extremists, often focusing their hatreds and articulating their destructive desires on such occasions as an electoral assembly, in December 1905. The tone of the assembly had been set throughout the autumn by a series of sometimes violent Socialist demonstrations for the universal franchise. These reached a grand finale, on November 28, when 250,000 Socialists paraded before parliament, this time peaceably, for 5

hours. The Christian-Socials used these occasions as fresh justifications for anti-Semitic agitation. Lueger and other Party leaders singled-out « Jewish Social-Democracy » for the injuries inflicted on those it had ostensibly led astray. Lueger indicated that the Jews among the Social-Democrats were cowards : during a demonstration in Vienna, early in November, at the decisive moment the Jewish majority had withdrawn. Harm had befallen only their Christian followers, Ernst Schneider added. For the remainder of the month the Christian-Socials continued to denounce « Jewish-incited turbulence » in cities across the Empire. The climax of Christian-Social agitation came on December 4, during a Lueger speech in Primmer's Hall, « Zum Franz Josefsland » . As he was speaking, Lueger uttered what was arguably the most sharply worded warning he had delivered to the Vienna Jewish community since he had become mayor, 8 years before. He admonished the Jews of Vienna that, if they supported the Social-Democrats, « the same thing could perhaps happen as in Russia » .

Yet, even this admonition had been anticipated in April of the same year when he had told the Jews that, if they « want to live among us, (they) must modestly take the place that the Lord and history have reserved for them » . In December, however, he went much further. Lueger had been preceded on the rostrum by other speakers, one of whom equated « good Austrians and good Christians » with « good anti-Semites » . Pointing-out that government authorization for Lueger's 60th birthday celebration had been withheld, in 1904, though the Social-Democrats had been granted permission to demonstrate all the while, another speaker implied that the government favored the Socialists over the Christian-Socials. Unless Socialist agitation among the youth was halted, he added, the morale of the army would be undermined and the troops would mutiny, as they had in Russia. Perhaps, Doctor Lueger would rouse the Christian-Socials of Vienna and Lower-Austria and, then, the government would realize that other, « more commanding » classes than the Social-Democrats would have a say in things.

The tone of the meeting thus having been established, Lueger mounted the speaker's podium. During the 1st part of his speech, he justified his position on a 5 year residency requirement in Vienna for the proposed universal franchise, insisting somewhat disingenuously that such a demand did not amount to withholding the franchise. Native Viennese had the right « to determine their own fate » , he stated, and transients should be excluded from voting. No Bohemian, who had lived in the capital for a few months, should become a Viennese, he added. At length, Lueger spoke of the recent Socialist demonstrations in the Empire and the need « from our side » to create order. One cause of the fear of violence in Austria had arisen out of the czarist October « Manifesto » , which had created a « Duma » , and, only recently, had it occurred to some Russians that the turbulence in their country was a result of Jewish revolutionary agitation. As a result, « so-called Jewish persecutions » had ensued, and papers all over the world had demanded protection for Russian Jews. Liberating « certain people » was « an ideal » only when it came to liberating them from the czar, but not « from the tyrants and the revolutionary elements » . And then, Lueger stated :

« Especially warn the Jews in Vienna not to go as far as their co-religionists in Russia, and not to admit the Social-Democratic revolutionaries. I warn the Jews, most expressly ; for the same thing could perhaps happen as in Russia. We, in Vienna, are anti-Semites but are certainly not inclined to murder and violence. But if the Jews should threaten our fatherland, then we will show no mercy. I wanted to warn of these sad possibilities. » (Emphasis in original.)

Lueger's remarks were frequently interrupted by cheers and lengthy applause, and when he had finished, minutes

passed before the concluding speaker could be heard. His words seem to have produced a cathartic effect on his followers. 3 days later, Liberals and Socialists attacked Lueger's speech in 2 interpellations during a municipal council session :

« It would be a sad thing, if the security of an individual and / or property depended on political confession or on the grace of the lord mayor. » , said one.

Lueger's speech amounted to « legally prohibited incitement against a religious community » , added another.

Indignant at having been challenged, Lueger denied that the interpellations belonged within the competence of the municipal Council at all, since he had spoken, on December 4, « in (his) capacity as a Diet representative » . Lueger claimed he was accountable only to those municipal Councillors who had voted for him ; no one else had the right to criticize him :

« I am responsible to my electors alone. »

He then added that he had only permitted the interpellations to be read because he wanted to show how his opponents fought against him, so that all could see « how personal and political hate were joined in distorting everything » . Lueger defended his allegation that the Jews had aligned themselves with the Social-Democrats. When he looked at the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, he could plainly see ...

« As must anyone admit who was halfway able to distinguish races, that the leaders of Social-Democracy were almost exclusively Jewish (lively applause) . It may well be that one or the other of the gentlemen is baptized but it's certain that many are absolutely authentic Jews, and also that the one who is supposed to be baptized (Doctor Adler) is certainly recognizable to anyone as a Jew. »

During his remarks, Lueger identified as almost exclusively Jewish the leaders of the Russian revolution, which was closely connected with the recent turbulence in Vienna, and he presented himself as a patriot willing to defend his country if it was threatened. His speech had been « completely correct » , he insisted, but now it was being used against him to start « a highly-unfair campaign » . He ridiculed those who had begged the prime minister for protection from Doctor Lueger :

« I can only say to you : rarely is there a Party, in which the mildest, by far the mildest, is the leader. Here, in the representative body of the community of Vienna, justice rules for all (applause) . For the Jews, too. If a decision had to be made, I never asked for a baptismal certificate ; never have I distinguished between Christian and Jew, and because I have appealed to the Jews not to tie themselves to a revolutionary and turbulent Party ; for that, all of a sudden, a clamor is raised against me. »

Ignoring the question of a Liberal municipal Councillor, Donat Zifferer, about who decided whether or not Austria was threatened, Lueger denied ever having committed injustice toward any Jew, « never in my whole life » , a statement

that was palpably false, as some of the municipal Councillors must have known. Lueger then claimed to have protected Jews « very often often against the will of my Party. That's the truth about me and you know it, too, and should have considered that, before directing such interpellations at me. »

Though Lueger was cheered as usual, at the conclusion of his remarks, his opponents did not soon forget his December 4 speech. Moreover, his subsequent qualifications and defensive tone suggest that he suspected he had gone further than political prudence dictated. His pulling back was something even a hate-filled anti-Semitic article on the front page of the « Reichspost » could not conceal, and the Jews were warned by this paper, in much the same tone as they had been in Lueger's original speech. Some days later, in a municipal Council session, one of Lueger's old acquaintances, the Liberal Ferdinand Klebinder, tried a partial explanation of the man whom he had known for « about 40 years » . But the more Klebinder tried to conciliate, the more hostile other Councillors became. Lueger had « spoken to us from the heart ! It was high time that he spoke ! » , interjected one ; « The Jews robbed us blind ! » , shouted another. Another Councillor, Viktor Silberer, summed-up the feelings of the Christian-Social majority :

« One thing is clear: we have led a struggle against the Jews, and we shall lead it as long as God grants us life; so that in Vienna Christianity remains at the helm, so that the Christian people is master in its own house, and not foreign, alien Jews. »

Lueger had attracted many with such attitudes.

Despite what had appeared to be another anti-Semitic propagandistic victory for Lueger and his Party, early in December, the winners of the contest of autumn 1905 were the Socialists, though this would not become apparent until the next parliamentary elections in the spring of 1907. Socialist gains, at that time, surprised even Lueger. His plan had been to discredit the Socialists, but this had not to his consternation even slowed them. However, 1 or 2 things should have become apparent in 1905 to everyone. As Lueger approached the end of his career, his response to Socialist agitation had become mechanical. This suggests that he was beginning to lose touch with the lower-classes - their lack of representation, adequate housing, or a living wage for many workers. But, perhaps by this time, after nearly 10 years of power, he had grown indifferent to many immediate problems. He was more confident than ever of his popularity. What did he care if Jews were offended by his remarks ? By that time, by frequent application, anti-Semitism had been « normalized » as an agitational weapon, made « respectable » , thanks to him. And yet, the double-edged nature of his tactics was plain : Lueger dared not challenge the Imperial government and risk intervention by further incitement. Imperial Austria was not Imperial Russia. Although the czar followed the advice of his anti-Semitic advisers, with whose opinions he always agreed, Franz-Josef was not an anti-Semite, at least in his official position. The Emperor was the real bulwark against extreme anti-Semitism. Lueger knew this.

Lueger's remarks were often if not characteristically anti-Semitic. Another instance of anti-Semitism can be seen in an exchange with the Habsburg ambassador to Bucharest, János Markgraf von Pallavicini, where Lueger imputes a general cowardice to Jews. In the autumn of 1907, in a Christian-Social controlled parliament, Lueger informed the representatives that he had corrected Pallavicini about the number of Magyars in Bucharest. When Pallavicini had expressed concern about the possible effects of a more pro-Rumanian orientation by Austria, namely, that this would

result in a bloodbath in Bucharest because of the many Magyars living there, Lueger had replied :

« But excellency, how can you say that ; there are very few Magyars in Bucharest ; there are Hungarian Jews in Bucharest (amusement) , and they, you can rest assured, will not spill their blood (renewed amusement) ; before that happens, they'll run a little further, where perhaps they will be protected against bloodshed. »

But Lueger's anti-Semitism reached well beyond general cultural matters, personal slurs, demagoguery, opposition to « kosher » slaughter, and attacks on alleged Jewish hegemony in Universities. In at least one area, his anti-Semitism had more concrete objects. To be a Jew and a municipal official during the Lueger era was to be at a distinct disadvantage. Complaints that promotion of deserving and sometimes senior Jewish officials was being denied cropped-up throughout his regime. Boyer balances Lueger's policy in personnel matters against those of his predecessors :

« In fairness to the Christian-Socials, even under the Liberal regime before 1895, the number of Jews appointed to important positions in the Magistrat was very low. The anti-Semites simply made a virtue out of the Liberals' vice. »

Evasive irony aside, however, Ludwig Klaar, a Viennese District chief medical officer during the Lueger era, was acutely aware that he had been discriminated against, when without real reasons, he was refused a promotion to the city medical department. Klaar would not have considered such a policy to be a virtue at all. On June 25, 1907, the Liberal municipal Councillor, Oskar Hein, was convinced that Klaar, « who has, for some time, performed the relevant functions to everyone's satisfaction, though recommended by his colleagues, was not promoted because of his Jewish origins. Instead, the position went to a medical officer junior to him, who, however, is the fortunate holder of 2 papal decorations. »

When confronted with the complaint, Lueger resorted to a familiar tactic : he appealed to irrelevant procedure. He declared that he was unaccountable, for he had been absent when the promotion had been discussed. He, therefore, « refused to accept any responsibility whatsoever » . He had « nothing to justify as (he had been) absolutely innocent of the whole affair » . After a 5 year effort, Klaar was eventually promoted, in 1912, and thus « achieved the dignities he had wanted and deserved » . But this did not take place until 2 years after the real roadblock had been removed by death and, then, only after the intervention of 3 leading Christian-Socials, including a priest. In 1907, unable to intervene directly against Klaar, Lueger had chosen « to manipulate from behind the scene » .

Lueger was perfectly willing to appear to cooperate with Jews, as circumstances required. He sometimes tolerated baptized Jews who had attained wealth and power, such as Rudolf Sieghart, who denied that Lueger was an anti-Semite, and August Lohnstein. But Lueger warned his followers to be watchful : though Jews might appear to be Christians, by attending church, they were still Jews and, therefore, not to be trusted. And though an evidently cordial relationship existed between him and August Lohnstein, Lueger categorically denied as false the assertion that Lohnstein was his adviser during a municipal Council session ; yet, later, during the same interview, he hinted that he had been less than truthful in his denial. When it was no longer possible to deny Jewish financial support for his municipal projects, Lueger dismissed and doubtless perplexed Liberal and Socialist criticism, stating that he was happy that his opponents were vexed that he had « obtained the money this way » . Both Lueger, as mayor, and the Christian-Socials

happily embraced bequests from Jewish organizations and individuals. It was frequently stipulated by the donors that such bequests were to be bestowed on the municipality, or to charitable organizations and private persons, regardless of religious affiliation, to be determined by the leaders of the ruling Party.

In late October 1909, Lueger appeared at a mass rally, evidently for the last time. Both he and Kunschak spoke in Vienna's 13th District. Though Lueger's anti-Semitism was implicit (he remarked that he stood by his old principles as a « good German, good Christian, ever and evermore »), Kunschak fulminated against the Jews much as had his mentor years before, blaming them for sowing nationalistic strife. He became vitriolic in condemning the « Jewish press ». At another meeting, Kunschak ended an anti-Semitic harrangue with the words :

« Always and forever true to our German people, and battle Jewry till destruction ! » (thunderous applause)

At a provincial Diet session, chaired by Lueger the following February, 1910, only a few weeks before his death, anti-Semitic interjections by Bielohlawek and other Christian-Socials about alleged Jewish economic hegemony in Hungary prompted an irritated response from Karl Renner :

« I can't seem to drive it out of your heads : everywhere you see only Jews. You're so Jew-infested that you see Jews everywhere as an alcoholic can see only mice. You fail to see the great national economic facts and the determining factors ! »

Renner's words characterize Christian-Social anti-Semitism, at the time of Lueger's death : they saw only Jews. His admonition points to the growing imbalance and distortion of reality among Lueger's followers. The Party leader had both fostered and fed the delusions of the rank and file in what was a spiral of mutual re-inforcement. It remains, in this overview of Lueger's anti-Semitism, to glance at its effect on subsequent politics. Some of his biographers, even after 1945, argue that it was minimal. Prominent Austrian Jews are cited in support of their position. Although it cannot be denied that such authors as Arthur Schnitzler and Stefan Zweig largely discounted accusations of anti-Semitism against Lueger, the weight of their opinion must await a full appraisal of the depth of their knowledge of Lueger's politics. Schnitzler and Zweig were members of Vienna's Jewish upper middle-class who liked to think of themselves as assimilated, so secure that they could never be expelled. Such persons are often out of touch with the harsher realities of everyday politics and, sometimes, deny them, even when presented objective facts. This is a recurrent Austrian tendency. Schnitzler, who died in 1931, was spared witnessing the complete destruction of the world he had known, and of which he had been so penetrating a critic. Zweig was less fortunate. He committed suicide in 1942, mourning the loss of « the World of Yesterday » .

Another such Jewish writer is the Socialist Friedrich Austerlitz. Although he was not from the upper middle-class, he likewise dismissed Lueger as a serious anti-Semite. To him, Lueger « was a man who had not invented anti-Semitism but merely had given it political expression, in order to ventilate and exploit mass grievances against Liberal hegemony which, in Vienna, had acquired an unmistakably Jewish flavor in the late- 19th Century » . Austerlitz, like other Austrian Socialists of his time, dismissed anti-Semitism as « the Socialism of fools » and may have felt that, in time, those afflicted would come to their senses. This has not happened. And it should have been plain to Austerlitz that, far from

abandoning anti-Semitism once the Liberals had been defeated, Lueger continued to exploit it, especially against the Socialists. Like Schnitzler, Austerlitz died in 1931, and was likewise spared final disillusionment. All 3 writers viewed the past from the vantage point of the barbarism of the 1920's and 1930's. Lueger naturally looked « minor league », in comparison. At the time of his death, Viennese Jewish papers divided roughly along class lines : bourgeois journalists tended to minimize Lueger's effect as anti-Semite ; proletarians saw him as an opportunist who tolerated Jews only when it was advantageous for him to do so.

Some Jewish politicians have qualified their criticism of Lueger's anti-Semitism. Joseph Samuel Bloch, for one, struck a psychological note and stated that :

« Doctor Lueger was pious, in the same sense as he was anti-Semitic. Personally, it was not of much account, but it was useful. »

Yet, one might temper Bloch's opinion with his general statement that :

« Towards the end of our life, (one) remembers the peaceful and happy hours only, and with growing years they shine in growing radiance whereas every thing (sic) sad and melancholy gradually sinks into oblivion, as if covered by a grey veil. »

This general qualification balances his other judgments about Lueger's anti-Semitism. Another Jewish politician, Josef Redlich, defended Lueger's anti-Semitism and praised him for stimulating a « new and healthy » Austrian patriotism. Redlich, who never adjusted his Imperial outlook to the Republic, died in 1936, 2 years before the « Anschluß ». And yet another Jewish politician, Sigmund Mayer, surprisingly condemned Lueger, not for being an anti-Semite, but for not being one « in reality ». Mayer seems to have disapproved of Lueger's apparent want of sincerity on any level of this topic.

In evaluating such mild opinions about Lueger's anti-Semitism, it is well to recall that the Vienna of Lueger's day was also the Vienna of Otto Weininger, Arthur Trebitsch, and other problematic self-hating Jews, some of whom saw in Lueger and the Christian-Socials a welcome counter-balance to the predominating Jewish cultural influence. Extremists, such as Weininger, evinced the « Hermann Levi syndrome » : they would bear any insult, suffer any indignity, and in Weininger's case, commit suicide, to be purged of their Jewishness.

Theodor Herzl was still another kind of man, though he, too, had been an extreme assimilationist at one time, and dreamed of leading a mass conversion of Vienna's Jews in Saint-Stephen's Cathedral. During Lueger's campaign for the mayoralty, Herzl saw Lueger outside a polling place and may thereby have grasped something of his true significance :

« A man next to me said with tender warmth but in a quiet voice : " That is our ' Führer ' ! " Actually, these words showed me more than all declamation and abuse how deeply anti-Semitism is rooted in the hearts of these people. »

It may be true, as Boyer asserts, that Lueger's « political mode was Baroque ». Even if this is interpreted to mean

free-wheeling and eclectic, something more must be added : Lueger's supple responsiveness to the crowd and its passions and his willingness to swim in such perilous seas. In a word, pointedly, a distinction must be drawn between psychologizing his behavior and its hard reality. One judges a tree by the fruit it bears. It may well be that Lueger was even worse than an anti-Semite, that, given world enough and time, the rest of humanity would have been next. Such psychological questions may be interesting, but they remain academic in the arena of politics and people who die.

Did Lueger himself believe his anti-Jewish remarks ? We may never know. Over 40 years after Lueger's death, the last Imperial finance minister, Alexander Spitzmüller, asserted that Lueger told him, in April 1909, that anti-Semitism was a good means to get ahead in politics, but once one was on top, it was of no further use ; it was « the sport of the rabble » . If Lueger made this statement, it was shortly after having been elected mayor for the 7th time, after having received the most overwhelming vote of confidence in his career. He could afford to be generous, though such statements cost him little and had no effect on the Jews. There was a reflexive quality about all of Lueger's behavior - more than a touch of what J. Peter Stern has called « total immanence » . When Lueger delivered an anti-Semitic diatribe, no one may have believed ...

« in anything ; or rather, few if any believed in the man before them but all fully believed in the image they (had) created. »

No matter what he said, the public Lueger, the one that counts, did appeal to his listeners' « readiness to take part in the religious image-making, to connive at his self-dramatization as a messianic figure » .

In one respect, Lueger was consistently laudatory toward the Jews. Before and after he became mayor, he praised them for preserving the appearance and sanctity of their ancestors' graves and he added that he wished the Christians would be inspired with a similar spirit. In Vienna's otherwise carefully groomed Central Cemetery, dominated by the Lueger Memorial Church, the large old Jewish section is now overgrown and untended.

Vienna street severs anti-Semite link

« Anti-Semitic verbal incitement by politicians like Karl Lueger paved the way for the racial anti-Semitism of the Nazis. » (Oskar Deutsch, Head of Austrian Jewish community.)

The section of the « Ring » Boulevard contains some of Vienna's most famous buildings. The name of an anti-Semitic mayor is to be removed from a section of one of Vienna's most famous streets.

Part of the « Ring » Boulevard, in central Vienna, is currently named after Karl Lueger, who was mayor of the city from 1897 to 1910.

The decision to rename the street has been welcomed by Jewish groups and Left-wing Parties, but has been condemned by the far-Right.

Karl Lueger is often described as the father of modern political anti-Semitism.

A charismatic and popular leader known as « the Handsome Karl » , Lueger was a major influence on the young Adolf Hitler.

As mayor, he brought about extensive improvements to Vienna's infrastructure. He expanded the pipeline network that brings Alpine spring water to the city and he strengthened social welfare schemes and public transport. But his legacy is tarnished by his attacks on the city's Jewish minority.

His anti-Semitic campaigns were so notorious that when he was 1st elected mayor, in 1895, the Emperor Franz-Josef refused to endorse him. It took 2 years and a lot of pressure before he eventually gave way.

The part of the « Ring » Boulevard that bears his name contains some of Vienna's most prominent buildings, including the « Burgtheater » (one of Europe's largest theatres) and the headquarters of Vienna University.

It was named « Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring » , back in 1934, and has proved to be an embarrassing address for many of the city's academics.

Now, after years of debate, the city has decided to change the name to « Universitätsring » (University « Ring ») .

City officials say renaming streets is an unusual step to take, as the names reflect Vienna's history, good and bad.

But Vienna's Councillor for Cultural Affairs, Andreas Mailath-Pokorny, from the governing « Social-Democrat - Greens » coalition, said they were prepared to make an exception in this case.

Karl Lueger was considered by many a charismatic and popular mayor.

The head of Austria's Jewish Community, Oskar Deutsch, welcomed the move, which he said was long overdue.

« Anti-Semitic verbal incitement by politicians like Karl Lueger paved the way for the racial anti-Semitism of the Nazis » , he said.

Mr. Deutsch said it should « serve as a warning on our present politicians who frivolously and reprehensibly use anti-Semitic, racially motivated and xenophobic slogans » .

However the far-Right opposition Freedom Party, which is currently in 2nd place in the opinion polls, strongly criticised the decision.

Its leader, Heinz-Christian Strache, accused the Social-Democrats of setting-up a statue to « a foreign mass murderer

like Che Guevara » while they stripped « an excellent Viennese mayor of a street name » . « It is a scandal » , he said.

Despite the renaming of the « Ring » , Lueger will not disappear from Vienna's streets.

There are currently no plans to remove his name from « Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Platz » : a central square, which is dominated by a statue of the former mayor.

Vienne et les Juifs

Être juif en Autriche signifiait jusqu'en 1919 faire partie d'un immense Empire où se côtoyaient des identités fort différentes. Minorité parmi les minorités, les Juifs subirent au cours des siècles les dispersions imposées par les pogromes, les législations contraignantes, la misère économique, les changements de frontières et, finalement, les lois et les crimes nazis. Les plus favorisés ou les plus doués avaient formé à Vienne, à la fin du XIXe siècle, une élite intellectuelle, culturelle et sociale qui exerçait une influence considérable malgré sa faible importance numérique. La plupart d'entre eux avaient cependant payé pour cela leur billet d'entrée, en se convertissant au catholicisme, religion officielle de l'Empire des Habsbourg. Toutefois, malgré la position très minoritaire du protestantisme en Autriche, près d'un quart des Juifs convertis à cette époque préférèrent la religion réformée plus proche du judaïsme, notamment par l'importance attachée aux écrits vétéro-testamentaires. Tels furent les choix de Victor et Alfred Adler, Peter Altenberg, Arnold Schœnberg, Otto Weininger, du père de Ludwig Wittgenstein. Il y eut aussi à la fin du XIXe siècle un courant protestataire chez les intellectuels non juifs qui, voulant adhérer au christianisme, se firent baptiser protestants plutôt que catholiques pour marquer leur opposition au courant anti-Libéral et antisémite des Chrétiens-Sociaux de Karl Lueger, bourgmestre de Vienne à partir de 1897. Ayant beaucoup d'amis juifs, voire des collaborateurs qu'il aimait protéger, Lueger utilisa le 1er la formule, « C'est moi qui décide qui est juif. » , reprise ensuite dans un contexte bien plus dramatique par Hermann Göring. Malgré ses excès de langage, l'antisémitisme de Lueger cherchait une solution dans l'assimilation et la conversion.

Le Concordat conclu entre Franz-Josef et le pape Pie IX, en 1855, avait accordé à l'Église catholique la main-mise sur l'ensemble de l'enseignement. Celle-ci disposait ainsi d'une nouvelle arme discriminatoire pour réaliser les conversions indispensables à l'accès aux fonctions administratives, éducatives ou académiques dans l'Empire des Habsbourg. 40 ans plus tard, les Juifs constituaient 30 % de la population estudiantine de la faculté de médecine de l'Université de Vienne. Le corps professoral d'origine juive représentait la moitié du personnel académique de cette Faculté, environ un tiers de celui de la Faculté de droit et un cinquième de la Faculté de philosophie, nécessairement plus cléricalisée. Ces taux sont à comparer à la population viennoise qui, au début du XXe siècle, ne comptait guère plus de 8 % de Juifs.

On a opportunément ré-édité en 1980 un livre de 1922 de Hugo Bettauer, « Die Stadt ohne Jaden » (La Ville sans Juifs) , qui décrivait ce que serait Vienne si un gouvernement antisémite bannissait tous les Juifs, convertis ou non, de la vie économique, intellectuelle et artistique. Sans Juifs, la musique, le Théâtre, l'Opérette, les cafés littéraires, le mouvement « Jung-Wien » , devenaient des coquilles quasi-vides. Seuls l'Opéra, les arts plastiques (Gustav Klimt, Egon Schiele ...) et l'architecture (Adolf Loos, Otto Wagner ...) semblaient pouvoir mieux survivre mais quel serait leur avenir

dans un monde où leurs meilleurs soutiens - la bourgeoisie et les critiques juifs n'existeraient plus ? En présentant les choses de la sorte, Hugo Bettauer semble aujourd'hui enfoncer une porte ouverte, mais dans la Vienne du début des années '20, une telle constatation paraissait révolutionnaire, voire provocante, car elle allait à contre-courant de l'orgueil hérité de la « Kakanie » et des idées reçues, en particulier celles qui faisaient du Juif un créateur impuissant s'imposant par son habileté de copieur, jugement répété à satiété depuis plus d'un demi-siècle, notamment par Richard Wagner ou Hans Pfitzner et, côté latin, par Vincent d'Indy ou Ernest Ansermet.

3 ans après le livre de Bettauer, ces théories trouvaient leur généralisation délirante avec « Mein Kampf » . Le jeune Adolf Hitler s'était rendu une 1re fois à Vienne, en mai-juin 1906. Au « Staatsoper » , il avait assisté à la représentation de 3 Opéras de Wagner, dont « Tristan » le 8 mai, dirigé par Gustav Mahler. Lorsqu'il revint à Vienne, le 17 février 1908, pour s'installer définitivement, Mahler avait quitté son poste de directeur de l'Opéra pour occuper celui de chef-invité du « Metropolitan Opera » et de l'Orchestre philharmonique de New York. De retour à Vienne, le 11 mai 1911, il meurt quelques jours plus tard, mettant ainsi un terme à une longue errance puisque, né en Bohême, élevé d'abord en Moravie puis à Vienne comme musicien, il avait comme chef d'orchestre parcouru toute l'Europe (Prague, Budapest, Leipzig, Hambourg, Amsterdam, Paris, Londres) avant de franchir l'Atlantique. L'Europe avait surtout reconnu en lui un Juif, de plus, promenant un talent incontestable d'interprète mais dont les ambitions comme créateur ne pouvaient se situer au niveau de génie des grands artistes germaniques. L'année même de la mort de Mahler, une étude d'Arthur Ruppin publiée à Cologne, « Die Juden der Gegenwart » (Les Juifs d'aujourd'hui) , mettait cependant en doute ce lieu commun hérité de l'antisémitisme et de la littérature raciste pseudo-scientifique de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. Theodor Gomperz laissa après sa mort, en 1912, un essai sur les limites et qualités intellectuelles des Juifs dans lequel il faisait une sorte d'inventaire des artistes, penseurs, écrivains qu'il avait beaucoup fréquentés grâce à sa sœur, Josephine von Wertheimstein, et à son célèbre salon. Esprit positiviste, il situait l'excellence des Juifs dans la pure rationalité, dans l'habileté casuistique héritée du Talmud, et dans le talent pour l'imitation des grands interprètes, tant au théâtre (Sarah Bernhardt, Rachel) qu'au concert (Joseph Joachim, Arthur Rubinstein ...) . Cela ne suffisait évidemment pas à modifier le préjugé tenace selon lequel le génie leur aurait été racialement inaccessible. Personne n'en fera davantage l'expérience que Gustav Mahler puis, dans des temps plus dramatiques, Arnold Schönberg.

Le Parti Chrétien-Social et Vienne

Abstract

Title of Thesis :

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ANTI-SEMITISM IN VIENNA : A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF « DIE REICHSPOST » (1894-1897)

Adam Joshua Cohen, Master of Arts (2013) .

Thesis directed by :

Professor Marsha Rozenblit, Department of History.

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (2013) .

Advisory Committee :

Professor Marsha Rozenblit, Chair ; Professor Jeffrey Herf ; Professor John Lampe.

This Master's Thesis is a close textual analysis of the anti-Semitic argumentation of the « Reichspost » , a Catholic and anti-Semitic newspaper associated with the Christian-Social Party and published in Vienna, between 1894 and 1938. This micro study examines the newspaper, from January 1894 through April 1897. During its early years, the « Reichspost » used economic, social, and political anti-Semitism, religiously motivated Jew-hatred, and historical misrepresentations against Jews and Judaism. In addition, the newspaper justified (but did not call for) anti-Semitic violence. The « Reichspost » moderated itself by rejecting racial anti-Semitism and leaving the possibility of baptism and conversion open to Jews. Moreover, the newspaper demonstrated State patriotism, dynastic loyalty, and some aspects of « positive » Christianity. The « Reichspost » molded these seemingly discordant views into consistent ideology with demands for the « re-Christianization » and « de-Jewification » of public life, and doing so differentiated it from racial and radical anti-Semites of its time and of later decades.

Introduction

The « Reichspost » (1) was a Catholic and anti-Semitic newspaper published in Vienna, from 1894 until 1938. The newspaper associated with the Christian-Social Party until the Party's dissolution in 1934. On May 17, 1895, the « Reichspost » explained its views and the goals of the Christian-Social Party in its front-page feuilleton, « Our Goals and Means to Those Goals » . These goals included the « re-Christianization of society » (« Wiederverchristlichung ») and the return of public life to « the basis of positive Christianity » . (2) Diminished in public life, Christian principles had to prevail again in government, politics, and the economy. With the support of Pope Pius IX and then Pope Leo XIII, the « Reichspost » called on Christians to practice their faith not only in their private lives, but also in their public works. The « re-Christianization » of public life required the defeat of Liberals, Social-Democrats, Freemasons, and Jews, in order to end their un-Christian and un-Catholic influence in society. Rejecting racial anti-Semitism, the « Reichspost » declared its anti-Semitic mission :

« What we fight, is not the Semite as a person, but the pernicious influence (“ verderbliche Einfluß ”) of the Jews, and above all also the “ Jew-Press ” » , a press that the paper claimed, « represented, maintained and promoted Jewish spirit in all of public life » . (3)

This Master's Thesis is a close textual analysis of the anti-Semitic argumentation of the « Reichspost » , a newspaper not well studied by historians, from its 1st issue, in January 1894, through April 1897. What is new and important about this micro-study is that it allows for a better understanding of the early development of « Reichspost » anti-Semitism. Moreover, it is worthwhile to study the newspaper from January 1894 through April 1897 because this was

the period in which the Christian-Social Party became politically dominant in Vienna. Karl Lueger, the Party's anti-Semitic leader, became mayor of Vienna on April 8, 1897. (4) The « Reichspost » actively campaigned for the Christian-Social Party and Karl Lueger, and contributed to their electoral successes. This project helps us gain insight into the kinds of anti-Semitism that appealed to Viennese voters and the anti-Semitic views of the Christian-Social Party. Moreover, « Reichspost » anti-Semitic argumentation is worthy of study in its own right because it surely influenced its readers' attitudes towards Jews in late- 19th Century Vienna.

Throughout the period under study, the « Reichspost » used economic, social, and political anti-Semitism, religiously motivated Jew-hatred, and historical misrepresentations against Jews and Judaism. In addition, the newspaper justified (but did not call for) anti-Semitic violence. On the other hand, the « Reichspost » moderated its views by rejecting racial anti-Semitism and leaving the possibility of baptism and conversion open to Jews. Furthermore, the newspaper demonstrated State patriotism, dynastic loyalty, and some aspects of « positive » Christianity, therefore, distancing itself from radical German nationalism. The « Reichspost » molded these discordant views into a consistent ideology by grounding them in demands for the « re-Christianization » and « de-Jewification » of public life. What we learn here is this Catholic form of anti-Semitism in late- 19th Century Vienna demonstrated versatility and adapted both traditional religious Jew hatred and modern forms of anti-Semitism.

Historiography of Viennese and Christian-Social Anti-Semitism

Peter Pulzer, a British political historian, born in Vienna in 1929, published in 1964, « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria » . Pulzer explained the success of political anti-Semitism in Austria, as a reaction to Liberalism, capitalism, and Social-Democracy. He contended that in late- 19th Century Austria, certain sectors of society, especially artisans, peasants, and landowners perceived that Liberalism, capitalism, and Social-Democracy harmed them. These sectors of society, due to the economic, political, and social position of Jews, identified Jews with Liberalism, capitalism, and Social-Democracy. Therefore, in late- 19th Century Austria, anti-Semitism was a reaction to these 3 ideologies. The Christian-Social Party exploited this reaction and achieved political success. Moreover, pre-Liberal and pre-capitalist religious hatred of Jews played a role in the rise of political anti-Semitism. Pan-Germans such as Georg Ritter von Schönerer espoused racial anti-Semitism in reaction to Liberal values of equality and human rights, but his radical German nationalism was not popular in Vienna. (5) Speaking specifically to the anti-Semitism of Vienna and the Christian-Social Party, Pulzer argued that :

« In Vienna, anti-Semitism drew its strength from neither racial nor religious springs, but from economic springs. Neither Lueger nor his Party, nor the conservatives, nor the Church could afford to regard anti-Semitism as more than a means to an end. Racial anti-Semitism was out of the question. » (6)

In his 1981 book, « Political Radicalism in Late-Imperial Vienna : Origins of the Christian-Social Movement (1848-1897) », John Boyer contended that Christian-Social Party leader Karl Lueger and the majority of the Christian-Socials used anti-Semitism as an opportunistic weapon of politics. They used anti-Semitism to attack economic and political Liberalism, as well as Liberal anti-clericalism. Moreover, they presented anti-Semitism as a solution to real and perceived economic threats to the bourgeois classes, to increase Christian-Social voter participation and win elections. While some

Christian-Socials pursued more radical anti-Semitism, most radical anti-Semites were excluded from its top leadership over time. However, the Christian-Social leadership continued to tolerate radical anti-Semitism among sub-elite journalists, priests, and ward politicians. Nevertheless, Boyer argued anti-Semitism was only one plank of the Christian-Social platform and was not central to Christian-Social ideology. (7) Boyer explained the Christian-Socials made both outlandish anti-Semitic promises to constituents as well as those with more « objective considerations such as better credit facilities, higher tax rates on big industry, the abolition of peddling, laws regulating competitive sales, and the like ». (8) Note that these promises with « objective considerations » the Christian-Socials made to constituents clearly intended to diminish the influence of Jews in commerce.

Steven Beller, in direct opposition to Boyer, argued that anti-Semitism was central to Christian-Social ideology. In « Vienna and the Jews (1867-1938) : A Cultural History » (1989) , Beller declared anti-Semitism had successfully unified Democrats, independent Liberals, artisans' leaders, clerics, and German nationals under the banner of Christian-Socialism. (9) In « A Concise History of Austria » (2006) , Beller elaborated how Christian-Socials did not have a national identity to rely upon. In addition, clericalism could not unite the Christian-Socials, as many supporters were anti-clerical, especially in Vienna. For this reason, the Christian-Social Party did not use the word « Catholic » in its name but rather « Christian » , which meant in context « not Jewish » . Beller remarked :

« Antisemitism was at the core of Christian-Social identity. » (10)

Austrian scholarship has further elaborated on Viennese and Christian-Social anti-Semitism. In 1965, Hellmut Andics published « The Eternal Jew : Causes and History of Anti-Semitism » . Andics related how Karl Lueger embraced clerical petty-bourgeois anti-Semitism, but not racial anti-Semitism. Lueger argued for a « quota » (Latin : « numerus clausus ») against Jews to scale back the influence of Jews to a level matching their small proportion of the population. With his anti-Jewish politics, Lueger evoked emotion and brought men to the polls to vote for the Christian-Social Party. (11)

In a 1974 article, « Tolerance, Emancipation and Anti-Semitism » , Wolfgang Häusler explained that Viennese anti-Semitism made impossible the complete integration into bourgeois society, emancipation, and assimilation of Jews. Häusler characterized Christian-Social anti-Semitism as anti-Liberal, anti-socialist, anti-capitalist, and motivated by religious Jew-hatred. Moreover, he portrayed Christian-Social anti-Semitism as an integral part of Christian-Social Party propaganda and press, and as a « political instrument » for electoral success. (12)

Historians' characterizations of Christian-Social anti-Semitism are only partially correct as characterizations of « Reichspost » anti-Semitism. An examination of the newspaper reveals that it identified Jews with Liberalism, Capitalism, and Social-Democracy, and attacked Jews as identical with these 3 ideologies. Furthermore, it depicted Jews as a threat to artisans, peasants, and landowners. The « Reichspost » saw Jews as a threat to all of society and public life. The newspaper also utilized pre-Liberal and pre-Capitalist religious hatred of Jews. Pulzer argued that Viennese anti-Semitism drew its strength from « economic springs » . Indeed, the « Reichspost » made frequent use of economic anti-Semitism. However, the newspaper used just as much religiously motivated hatred of Jews, which Pulzer had downplayed. Yet, Pulzer was right :

« Racial anti-Semitism was out of the question. » , for the « Reichspost » .

The « Reichspost » often used anti-Semitism in the same manner as the Christian-Social Party, as a weapon of politics, especially during elections. The newspaper used anti-Semitism in attacks against Liberals and Social-Democrats, and to play-off economic threats to the bourgeoisie. The « Reichspost » editorial staff consisted of Christian-Social « sub-elite » of journalists and priests, to whom Boyer referred. Like the Christian-Social Party, the « Reichspost » used anti-Semitism as a weapon against Liberal and Social-Democratic anti-clericalism. The newspaper viewed Liberals, Social-Democrats, and Jews as enemies of Christians, Christianity, and the Catholic Church. It specifically targeted Jews in calls for legal regulations of peddling and competitive sales, 2 important Christian-Social objectives. Same as the Christian-Social Party, the « Reichspost » called for quotas against Jews in academic and professional positions. Note, however, that the « Reichspost » called for these quotas in the name of the « re-Christianization » and « de-Jewification » of public life, demonstrating religious motivations on par with economic ones.

As Beller and others argued, anti-Semitism constituted much of the core identity of the « Reichspost » . In contrast to Beller's claims, however, Catholicism and « clericalism » also constituted the core identity of the « Reichspost » . The high-frequency with which the newspaper portrayed Christians and Catholics, Christianity and Catholicism, and the Catholic clergy positively matched the high-frequency with which it portrayed Jews, Judaism, and rabbis negatively.

Similarly, German nationalism was not important to the « Reichspost » . The newspaper professed State patriotism and identification with Austria-Hungary and the Habsburg monarchy. The name « Reichspost » means Imperial Post. From January 1, 1894, until September 27, 1894, the newspaper labeled itself an « independent daily paper for the Christian people of Austria » . In the rest of the period under investigation, the « Reichspost » changed « Austria » to « Austria-Hungary » , extending its State patriotism to the entire Empire and reaching as wide a Christian and Catholic audience as possible. The « Reichspost » often declared loyalty to Empire and dynasty. The newspaper was not German nationalist. It saw itself as Austrian, not German. Thus, the newspaper distanced itself from Georg Ritter von Schönerer and the Pan-German movement.

The weight of the existing scholarship on the Christian-Social Party emphasizes economic and political anti-Semitism and de-emphasizes social anti-Semitism and religiously motivated Jew-hatred. On the contrary, this study of the « Reichspost » demonstrates that the newspaper emphasized all of these forms of anti-Semitism and Jew-hatred. Equally important, the newspaper often entwined them in its argumentation against Jews. At the same time, the « Reichspost » was not German nationalist, rejected racial anti-Semitism, allowed Jews to convert to Christianity, and professed State patriotism, dynastic loyalty, and « positive » Christianity. Moreover, the « Reichspost » selectively remembered historic events and figures in its argumentation against Jews. The newspaper also justified pogroms against Jews without « crossing the line » and inciting anti-Jewish violence.

Origins of the « Reichspost »

Christian-Social politicians, Catholic clergy and Catholic laymen founded the « Reichspost » . At the 3rd Austrian

Catholics Convention, in Linz, during summer 1892, the Christian-Socials presented their views, emphasizing anti-Semitism and the social rather than religious content of their program. This irritated Catholic conservatives and, consequently, the « Katholikentag » ended in disunity. Nevertheless, during this meeting the Christian-Socials founded the « Reichspost », which became a Christian-Social political organ more reliable than either Ernst Vergani's « Volksblatt » or Karl Freiherr von Vogelsang's « Das Vaterland ». (13)

Franz Martin Schindler (1847-1922), a Catholic cleric and professor of moral theology at the University of Vienna, from 1888 to 1917, led a committee that organized and obtained funding for the creation of the « Reichspost ». Roman Himmelbauer (1858-1929), an Augustinian cleric, political agitator, and editor of the Catholic « Correspondenzblatt », was an influential « Reichspost » committee member. By early 1893, funding was obtained for the « Reichspost » in the same manner as for the « Correspondenzblatt », by voluntary contributions from monks and clerics, as well as some investments by Catholic laymen such as Albert Gessmann. A Christian-Social politician, 2nd in command to Karl Lueger, Albert Gessmann, became « Reichspost » co-director. (14) With Gessmann as co-director, the newspaper probably had stronger ties to the Christian-Social Party than before him.

In a front-page article entitled, « To the Christian reader », on December 29, 1894 (more than 2 years after the « Katholikentag », in Linz), the « Reichspost » listed its owners. This included the aforementioned Albert Gessmann, Roman Himmelbauer, and Franz M. Schindler, as well as Adam Trabert, Ambros Opitz, Baron Vittinghoff-Schell, and Anton Weimar. (15) Adam Trabert (1822-1914) was a Catholic writer active in the Christian-Social movement, in the early 1890's. (16) Ambros Opitz (1846-1907) was chief editor for the « Reichspost » until 1903. A German cleric from northern Bohemia, Opitz had trained as a Jesuit and then became a priest in 1870. While « Reichspost » editor, he served as a member of the Bohemian Diet, from 1895-1901. A prolific publicist, Opitz founded several other Catholic newspapers as well. (17) Baron Vittinghoff-Schell was the organizer of the Austrian Catholics Convention, and a « Reichspost » co-publisher. (18)

During the period going from January 1894 through April 1897, the « Reichspost » listed its newspaper staff at the bottom of one of the last pages in each edition. Ambros Opitz, the newspaper's chief editor, was listed in every edition. Anton Weimar, also one of the newspaper owners, served alternately as publisher and / or responsible editor. Franz Winter and Hermann Hikisch, who were not listed as « Reichspost » owners, served as responsible editors. Friedrich Funder (1872-1959) became « Reichspost » feuilleton editor, in 1896. A traditional Catholic layman, he studied 3 semesters of theology in Graz, where he joined Catholic students in brawls against German nationalist fraternities. He studied law at the University of Vienna and received his « doctor juris », in 1898. In 1903, he succeeded Ambros Opitz as « Reichspost » chief editor. (19)

As Christian-Social politicians, Catholic clergy and Catholic laymen, the owners, editors, and publishers of the « Reichspost » demonstrated it was a Christian-Social and Catholic newspaper. Furthermore, the newspaper did not depend upon the church hierarchy for patronage. Of all the major Catholic newspapers in Austria-Hungary, the « Reichspost » was the only one with such independence. (20) In addition, the newspaper did not answer to Catholic conservatives, such as those irritated at the 3rd Austrian Catholics Convention by the Christian-Social display of anti-Semitism. These factors enabled and encouraged the overt display of anti-Semitism in the « Reichspost ». The

following 3 chapters examine how traditional religious Jew hatred and modern forms of anti-Semitism informed the newspaper's anti-Semitic arguments.

Use of Economic / Social Anti-Semitism, and Justifications of Expulsions / Riots Targeting Jews

Use of Economic Anti-Semitism

« Buy only from Christians ! » (« Kaufet nur bei Christen ! ») (21)

The « Reichspost » used economic and social anti-Semitic argumentation to attack Jews and their role in the economy and society. In terms of economic anti-Semitism, the newspaper denigrated Jews as fraudulent and exploitative usurers, peddlers, stock-brokers, businessmen, bankers, industrialists, and millionaires. It represented Jews as the embodiment of capitalistic excess and a threat to a traditional economy, especially to artisans, farmers, and small businesses. This led to « Reichspost » calls for regulations on usury (lending money at excessive interest rates) , peddling, and stock-broking. The newspaper blended religiously motivated Jew-hatred with its economic anti-Semitism ; it condemned Jews for selling Christian religious objects, while exhorting Christians to « Buy only from Christians ! » and called for the cessation of commerce on Sundays, in observance of the Christian Sabbath.

In an article entitled, « The harmful Jewish influence on working life » , the « Reichspost » declared that the « Jewish Question » was above all an economic policy question. The newspaper pledged itself to « fight as independent organ of the people against the exceedingly detrimental effect of Jewish business ethics on the entire economy, especially also on production » . (22) In support of this position, the « Reichspost » discussed Doctor Leopold Caro's 1892 essay, « The Jewish Question, an Ethical Question » . (23) Doctor Caro, born a Jew and descended from a Spanish-Jewish rabbinical-family, was a Christian convert. The « Reichspost » assured its readers of Caro's credibility. He had converted earlier and never insulted or neglected his fellow Christians. The « Reichspost » explicitly rejected racial anti-Semitism, which allowed it to cite Caro, a convert, as an authority on the « Jewish Question » . According to the newspaper, Caro's work proved Jews were « corrupt » usurers, stock-brokers, bankrupters, and journalists. In addition, the « Reichspost » cited Caro's statistics about usury. According to Caro, from 1880-1887, of 441 usurers prosecuted in Austria, 277 (62.9 %) were Jewish, while 164 (37.1 %) were Christian. In Galicia, of a total 192 usurers prosecuted, 168 (87.5 %) were Jewish (24) , (12.5 %) were Christian. The statistics Caro used, according to the « Reichspost » , came from the Imperial and Royal Statistical Central Commission for the Austrian Monarchy. The « Reichspost » then declared the criminal statistics proved Jews were criminals out of greed. (24) In many additional articles, the newspaper derided Jews as usurers and / or stock exchange speculators, and called upon the government to regulate such economic activity. (25)

In a similar vein, the « Reichspost » often declared Jewish peddlers negatively impacted the economy. In « Check Peddling ! » , the newspaper described the 1883 trade regulation on peddling as insufficient. This regulation required peddlers to obtain peddling permits. Despite the regulation, peddlers, most of them Jews, flourished. The « Reichspost » claimed this economic activity harmed legitimate artisans and salesmen. Competing with peddlers, they could no longer sell their wares directly. Peddlers undercut their prices. Furthermore, peddlers harmed consumers by selling wares of

varying quality and by offering installment loans. Nevertheless, the newspaper alleged, Liberal deputies who depended on Jewish votes defended peddling because there were 20,000 officially registered peddlers (mostly Jews) throughout Austria. In spite of Liberal opposition, the « Reichspost » called for further regulation. This included a minimum age for peddlers of 35 years and a requirement that a peddler must be a candidate for 1 year before becoming registered. The newspaper also called for prohibiting peddling from being a family business and children from working as peddlers. The « Reichspost » requested enforcement of observance of Sunday, as a day of rest. Furthermore, the newspaper called for excluding peddlers from selling herbs, meat and vinegar to prevent epidemics (implying Jews and their business practices were dirty) , as well as perfumes, pocket watches, and securities. The « Reichspost » desired a ban on peddling in local communities with more than 10,000 inhabitants. (26)

On many occasions, the « Reichspost » warned its readers that Jewish peddlers posed an economic and / or health threat. (27) In a report entitled, « Jewish brutality » , the newspaper recounted a scene on « Neubaugürtel » (a street in Vienna) where a « bow-legged haggler » led 1 donkey and 3 horses, all « run down and miserable » animals, along with a rope. When the animals no longer had the strength to continue, the haggler hit them with a stick. This aroused general indignation among passersby :

« To the allegations of some compassionate people ; the benevolent Hebrew responded (in a Yiddish accent) :“ What do you want, I lead them only so far to the butcher ! ” To slaughter such fagged animal stuff (“ Theirzeug ”) and offer it to the unsuspecting Viennese should then not be allowed. » (28)

The « Reichspost » used easily recognizable anti-Semitic stereotypes of the « bow-legged » Jew speaking German with a Yiddish accent. By recounting the Jew’s cruel treatment of the tired animals, his desire to slaughter them and sell their meat to unsuspecting Viennese customers, the newspaper meant to elicit anger and disgust from readers in support of its efforts to curb Jewish peddling.

In an article entitled, « Jews in the Food Trade » , the « Reichspost » noted Jews had expanded into the industry of butchering and called for regulation of Jews there as well. Here, the newspaper warned that Jewish butchers offered :

« The cheaper price at the expense of quality and sanitary requirements. Those familiar with the process of ritual slaughter (“ Schächtung ”) and the rigor in the selection of meat for specific Jewish purposes will understand well that the Jews have a very lively interest to sustain a meat trade between Galicia and Vienna. » (29)

The « Reichspost » did not explain how the process of Jewish ritual slaughter and meat selection affected meat quality. Uninformed readers were expected to imagine the worst. Note as well, here the newspaper used a mix of economic and religious arguments against Jews in the food trade.

The « Reichspost » contended bad Jewish business practices existed in all branches of trade. In « He’d have to earn » , a Jewish businessman and a Christian businessman came to an agreement. They helped each other sell goods at their respective shops to customers at the regular purchase price. The newspaper claimed that while the Christian sold the Jew’s wares honestly, the Jew over-charged the Christian’s customers slightly, and pocketed the difference. The «

Reichspost » claimed that the character of Jews explained his action :

« It is in the Jews' blood, he can't help it, to gain a little " profit " (" Rebbach ") . » (30)

In a series of articles, in March 1896, the « Reichspost » contended Jewish business owners exploited their workers to gain a competitive business advantage. Among cardboard producers, for example, Jewish industrialists employed 1,500 female and 200 male workers. The women workers were mostly younger than 30 years old. Bad working conditions, hours, wages, malnutrition and living standards caused high mortality rates. (31) The « Reichspost » described conditions in the feather adornment industry as well. Here, Jewish industrialists were fewer in number, yet, according to the newspaper, they exerted a negative influence due to their bad business practices. Highly-skilled women received better pay and could afford better living conditions. However, for the least experienced and lowest paid workers, « the main diet consists mainly of coffee and bread, in summer cherries and bread » . (32) In this series of articles on women at work, the « Reichspost » had attacked capitalistic excess, which it attributed to Jews.

The « Reichspost » depicted wealthy Jews as crafty and / or miserly. In « Beneficence in installments » (« Wohlthätigkeit auf Raten ») , the newspaper described the « beneficence » of the son of the deceased Jewish coal baron Wilhelm Guttman, who inherited millions of florins (« Gulden ») from his father. The « Reichspost » contended sarcastically that the son donated 20,000 florins to charities in installments to put himself in the best light :

« Every 2nd day, 1,000 florins, then comes the name of this " generous " donor, 20 times in the newspapers, and the world will cry-out in amazement : " Must have been a charitable person, this Guttman ! " This " beneficence in installments " is so genuinely Jewish. » (33)

In 2 reports on the Estate of Jay Gould (who died in 1892) , the American railway developer and speculator, the « Reichspost » negatively portrayed the deceased Gould and Jews who sought to profit from his Estate. In truth, Jay Gould was a Protestant. However, in « The Crazy Gold » (« Die meschuggenen Gold ») , the newspaper assumed Gould was a Jew from Hungary named Isaak Gold who migrated as a poor young man to America, where he changed his name to Jay Gould and made a fortune. The « Reichspost » declared :

« All Jews who listen to the precious name " Gold ", are, as a Jewish newspaper reported, become suddenly " crazy " . » (34)

Instead, it argued that many families in Austria-Hungary now carried the family name Gold and claimed familial relationship to the deceased. These claimants had formed a consortium and raised a 20,000 « Gulden » subscription to cover initial expenses :

« Provided with this money, an established lawyer in " Groß-Kanizsa " has already traveled to New York to represent the claims of the heirs. » (35)

By mislabeling Jay Gould a Jew, the « Reichspost » associated Jews with capitalism, and attacked both. Furthermore,

the newspaper depicted Jewish claimants to his Estate as both greedy and opportunistic.

The « Reichspost » engaged in a tirade against the Gould family. The newspaper declared derisively :

« But the thing gets even better ! The Gould's testament decreed that the son George would be paid from the Estate \$ 25,000,000 not as heir, but as a salary : the salary for 12 years working in the service of the company Gould ! This salary rate, per year, more than \$ 2,000,000 ! » (36)

While the American public viewed such a salary as too high, Judge Dillon upheld the salary rate as justified. The Gould family dodged the inheritance tax. The « Reichspost » sneered :

« As one sees, the Jew whether rich or poor, is dirty, and anxious to dig only to gain an advantage. » (37)

The newspaper depicted Jews, rich and poor, as deceitful to gain an economic advantage. This article was another attack on the excess of capitalism, which the « Reichspost » associated with Jews.

The « Reichspost » further derided Jews for their economic roles in a series of articles covering a defamation lawsuit between 2 Jewish firms. In « For what purpose does a Jew use anti-Semitism » , the newspaper reported that Würtemberg and Co. , a scythes mail-order company (« Sensen-Versandhaus ») , in the Rhineland, filed a defamation lawsuit against its competitor firm Münzer and Co. Würtemberg and Co. claimed Münzer and Co. had sent-out 300,000 circulars warning clientele against buying Würtemberg's scythes, as the company was « Polish-Jewish » (« polnisch-jüdisch ») . (38) The « Reichspost » commented :

« So, in order to defeat a “ Cohn-national ” competitor, even the Jewish scythe dealer used anti-Semitism. » (39)

In « Jew versus Jew » , the « Reichspost » recounted the brothers David and Lazar Münzer had come from Galicia to Vienna to trade in scythes. The Münzer brothers distributed circulars in the countryside warning that its competitors, possibly Würtemberg and Co. , did « farmer con tricks » (« Bauern-fängerei ») selling magnetic scythes to farmers. In addition, the Münzer brothers reportedly sent-out 10,000 circulars warning clients against buying from their Jewish cousin Adolf Münzer's scythe dealing house, in Cologne. The Münzer brothers' circulars warned « this Galician scoundrel » Adolf Münzer sent advertisements to farmers selling « honed scythes » , when he actually manufactured « miserable trash scythes » and defrauded his customers. The « Reichspost » commented :

« Of course, Adolf felt violated in his business and in his “ honour ” and sued his cousins for “ defamation ”. » (40)

Note that the newspaper, put « honour » and « defamation » in quotation marks. This demonstrated its belief that Adolf Münzer, as a Jew, lacked honour, made false claims of defamation, and had a fraudulent scythes business.

Moreover, Adolf Münzer had also sent-out circulars against his cousins, the Münzer brothers in Vienna as well. The « Reichspost » noted that, for this reason, the Münzer brothers might be absolved. The newspaper expressed regret for

the country people who had been enticed to buy from these scythe traders. (41) Alleging the bad business practices of these Jews implied that all Jews cheated. By recounting Jews' anti-Semitic accusations against Jews, the « Reichspost » meant to validate its economic anti-Semitism and portray Jews making petty attempts to gain economic advantages. The newspaper also made numerous accusations of Jewish fraud and swindling in all kinds of businesses and in banking. (42)

In particular, the « Reichspost » was upset that Jews sold Christian religious objects. In a front-page article, « The trade of Jewish businesses with Christian devotional or pilgrimage objects », the « Reichspost » reported that Jews had manufactured and sold Christian prayer books, holy pictures, and other Christian devotional objects. The newspaper claimed 4 Viennese Jewish firms made a profitable business selling pilgrimage objects to pilgrims. It lamented that enough Christians bought these items from Jews to cause Christian producers to struggle financially, and that Christian firms with weak capital needed assistance. Combining religiously motivated Jew-hatred and economic anti-Semitism, the « Reichspost » cited Rabbi Joseph Caro's 16th Century « Schulchan Aruch » (Code of Jewish Law) . The « Reichspost » claimed the « Schulchan Aruch » prohibited Jews from purchasing Jewish religious objects (« Cultusgegenstände ») from « Akums » (« Christen ») . (43) Here, the « Reichspost » translated « Akum » as Christian, for the sake of its anti-Semitic argumentation. « Akum » actually means « star worshipper » . (44)

Nevertheless, the « Reichspost » claimed that Jews should strictly observe their own laws, not sell Christian religious objects, and stated that it would reprove Christians for selling Jewish religious objects as well. The « Reichspost » noted that Jews and their press joked and sneered (« witzeln und höhnen ») at Christian veneration of Saints and pilgrimages, and ridiculed pious folk on pilgrimages. At the same time, Christians paid thousands of Crowns to Jewish businessmen when they visited Mariazell, Styria, and pilgrimage sites of Lower-Austria. The « Reichspost » exhorted readers :

« Buy only from Christians ! (« Kaufet nur bei Christen! ») (45) , which was also a leitmotif of the Christian-Social Party. It is the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter as well.

In « Buy only from Christians ! The confirmation business. » (« Kauft nur bei Christen ! Das Firmungsgeschäft. ») , the « Reichspost » claimed that Jewish merchants displaced Christian artisans in all branches of industry. Jewish merchants took their customers, reducing Master artisans to journeymen, and worse to « wage slaves » (« Lohnslaven ») of the Jews. The « Reichspost » warned its readers not to buy from Jews who, according to its reading of the « Schulchan Aruch » , debased prices and considered Christians as « domestic animals » . (46) The « Reichspost » then declared that, when Christians withdraw trade from Christian businesses, « we commit a crime against Christian national character » (« christlichen Volkstum ») . (47) The newspaper concluded with an emotional appeal :

« And now again, the request : buy from Christians ! Remember, that for thousands of poor craftsmen's children, there will be no festive joy, when your money enriches Jews. » (48)

The « Reichspost » emphasized the Christian-Social request « buy from Christians ! » by appealing to the reader's emotions with the image of Christian craftsmen's children made joyless (allegedly) by calculating and cold Jews and

their unfair business practices. The newspaper published a poem by Johann Anton Leib, entitled « Christmas ! » which continued the theme in its 2nd stanza :

« Christmas ! No feast of the Jews ? / Yes, but ! You fill their cash boxes (“ Cassen ”) / With the money of those - good / Christians, they let themselves be fooled. » (49)

The « Reichspost » also implored its readers to buy Christian-Social memorabilia from Christian rather than Jewish businesses. In « Anti-Semitic pieces of jewelry » (« Antisemitische Schmuckgegenstände »), the newspaper reported that, in the 17th District of Vienna (« Hernals »), one of the Jewish shops sold anti-Semitic gold and silver jewelry, including Bismarck-, Schönerer-, and Lueger pins, pendants and so on. The « Reichspost » recommended to its readers in « Hernals » that they only order and buy their anti-Semitic jewelry from the skilled goldsmith Josef Ungrad, a Christian-Social sympathizer and German Christian, on « Hernalser Hauptstraße Nr. 35 » . (50)

The « Reichspost » supported legislation closing businesses on Sundays, the Christian Sabbath. In « On the Sunday rest » (« Zur Sonntagsruhe »), the newspaper described as « unconscionable and outrageous » that the « Jew-Press » had complained about recent regulations concerning Sunday rest and its effects on commerce. The « Reichspost » remarked that Christians were not permitted Sunday rest because the Jews would allow neither their profit nor their « domination » (« Herrschaft ») to be diminished. (51) The « Reichspost » call for the closure of businesses on Sundays was a prime example of the coterminous « re-Christianization » and « de-Jewification » of public life. It would have allowed Christians to observe the Christian Sabbath without worry of economic competition from Jews keeping their businesses open. On the other hand, it would have damaged Jews economically, especially those who observed the Jewish Sabbath on Saturday by making commerce impossible for them over the weekend. Exhortations to buy Christian religious objects from Christians (not Jews), references to the « Schulchan Aruch », and calls to end Sunday commerce, were a blend of economic anti-Semitism and religiously motivated Jew-hatred.

Use of Social Anti-Semitism

« Jewish swindler, you are malingering. » (« Jüdischer Schwindler, Du simulirst. ») (52)

The « Reichspost » depicted Jews as unable to adhere to normal standards of behavior. They were deceitful, sexually depraved, and violent. The newspaper portrayed Jews misbehaving in Christian and Jewish houses of worship and in Jewish neighborhoods, where they fought one another and peddled their wares. It depicted Jews in public life allegedly beating and sexually preying on Christian women and girls. Extreme examples of « Reichspost » social anti-Semitic argumentation included depictions of Jews as the sole perpetrators of « White Slavery » and as murderers for economic gain. The newspaper generally characterized Jewish family life as driven by self-interest and deceit, not by love and mutual-respect.

The « Reichspost » presented hostile images of Jewish public behavior, including in Christian and Jewish houses of worship. The newspaper published a report submitted by Johann Stadler, a Christian-Social collaborator, Leopold Neuhold, a Master locksmith (« Schlossermeister »), and Johann Bischinger, a government official, entitled : « Rudeness

in the Hofburg Chapel » . Sunday Masses in the Hofburg chapel drew large crowds because of the wonderful musical performances. Due to the large crowds, some people who came late had to be turned away. The report submitters claimed they had witnessed Jews in attendance acting sacrilegiously, resting their hats, sticks, books, on the altar, and leaning themselves against the altar to listen comfortably to the music. Jews stood in groups talking Yiddish (« mauscheln ») (53) , criticizing the singing, and so on. This caused anger among the Christians and tested their patience. During consecration on Easter Monday, 2 giggling Jewish girls standing by the knees of Christians imitated them with mocking gestures. The report submitters lamented that Christians who came too late, and perhaps could not come earlier, were turned away, while Jews in attendance behaved so badly. They requested that a competent authority address the issue. (54) The « Reichspost » sought to demonstrate by publishing this submission that Jews disrespected Christianity and behaved badly, even in sacred spaces.

The « Reichspost » recounted Jews misbehaving in Jewish houses of worship too. In « Quarrel in the Jewish temple » (« Balgerei im Judentempel ») , the author noted :

« In the synagogue in Stryj (Galicia) , it came yesterday to bloody brawls between gymnasium students who wanted to organize a memorial service for a deceased colleague and the fanatical orthodox Party, who tried to prevent this devotion, as incompatible with the Orthodox traditions. As the local police could provide no assistance, the gendarmerie had to intervene in the synagogue. » (55)

The « Reichspost » portrayed Jews as violent and unruly, unable to adhere to norms of behavior in houses of worship. There was a tinge of religiously motivated Jew-hatred in the characterization of « the fanatical orthodox Party » as well.

The « Reichspost » was hostile to Jewish neighborhoods, especially those in the « Leopoldstadt » , a District of Vienna situated on an island on the Danube River. (56) In « Picture of a Mood » (« Stimmungsbild ») , the newspaper negatively represented « the Jew-island » (« Juden-insel ») of the « Leopoldstadt » , noting :

« Peace exists today on the wide plaza in the Jew-island, peace in the enchantingly beautiful Jew-lane (“ Judengassel ”) ! Anyone can now pass through this lane without risking his life. Quiet reigns in every house, no one will be by the melodic “ trade ” (“ Handleh ”) be shooed from his dreams. Even on the stock exchange, the traffic is weak, so that one might think : “ Oh, if only it always remains ! ” And what is the cause - that peace so deep prevails ? “ Tishrei 5655 ” - Jewish New Year. » (57)

The author insinuated that Jews were violent, that only by « risking one’s life » could one pass through the « Jew-island » of the « Leopoldstadt » . Furthermore, in remarking the « Jew-lane » was a noisy place marked by the sound of « melodic ‘ trade ’ » and the noise of the stock-exchange, the author implied Jews were neither polite nor genteel. Only during the Jewish New Year when most Jews were at synagogue could the author find peace and quiet in the « Leopoldstadt » . This passage was noteworthy for its combination of economic and social anti-Semitism and religiously motivated Jew-hatred.

In « From the ' ghetto ' of Vienna » (« Aus dem ' Ghetto ' Wiens ») , the « Reichspost » claimed the dark alleys of the « Glocken- » , « Blumauer- » , and « Novaragasse » (streets) in the « Leopoldstadt » were places where « light-shy, Jewish riff-raff » (« lichtscheuen, jüdischen Gesindels ») roamed and depraved women resided. Here, a brawl or public scandal among the Jewish families broke-out almost daily. The « Reichspost » reported :

« 2 Jewesses in the “ Glockengasse ”, Regina Löbl and Bertha Klimat, in accordance with the Jewish style (“ jüdischer Art ”) spat at each other, jabbed each other with umbrellas and pelted (each other) with plates and bowls, and then sued. » (58)

Brought before the criminal judge of the « Leopoldstadt » , Doctor Schuster, the Jewesses denied everything and mutually retracted their defamation claims. While an action for assault remained against Mrs. Löbl, the defendant managed to prove that Mrs. Klimat's injuries stemmed from an earlier incident. The « Reichspost » conjectured that the injuries likely came from a previous fight of this « heroine » (« Heldin ») , and noted the negotiation ended in acquittal. (59) The newspaper depicted these Jewish women as shameless and violent.

The « Reichspost » described acts of violence by Jewish men more often than by Jewish women. In « The Jews have, as is well-known, the intelligence » , the newspaper challenged the claim to Jewish intelligence in its account of a Jewish man beating a Christian woman and child. In a park in the 3rd District of Vienna (« Landstraße ») , the Christian charwoman Marie Mandl and her daughter walked their small dog. They then witnessed Jewish children beat the dog without cause. When the charwoman made them answer for their actions, they ran home to their father, the Jewish hemp dealer Max Kaufmann. The children complained to him that a Christian woman had rebuked them. Mr. Kaufmann then :

« rushed immediately to the park and gave the daughter of the charwoman 2 slaps with such force that she immediately began to bleed. The intelligent gentleman (“ intelligente Herr ”) had then still the audacity, when a watchman came, to slap in the face the mother of the abused child while the watchman stood by. Mr. Max Kaufmann, this model of “ quickwitted ” Jews, will have to stand trial soon because of this brutality. » (60)

The « Reichspost » depicted Jews as violent without cause against women, children, and animals. The newspaper also sought to demonstrate how Mr. Kaufmann, who it termed a « model of ' quick-witted ' Jews » , lacked well-known Jewish « intelligence » .

The « Reichspost » also represented cases where Jewish men were not only violent, but also sexually perverse. To catch the reader's eye, the newspaper printed « A naughty Jew » (« Ein frecher Jude ») in larger than normal type. The article reported that at « Berlin Alexanderplatz » , Alfonso Loewinsohn, a Jew, approached a young lady, Miss Selma Trost, « With the naughty words, “ Miss, I love you ! Do you (love) me ? ” » (61) Miss Trost, who was awaiting the arrival of a girlfriend, refused Loewinsohn. He then made a nastier remark to Miss Trost, openly doubted her « moral purity » , and gave her the impression of a « half-finished man » (« halbfertigen Menschen ») . (62) Miss Trost then remarked that she considered him « a dumb boy who should prefer to go home and do his homework » . (63) Loewinsohn acted offended and slapped her in the face. The young lady called a policeman who took statements and

had Loewinsohn answer for his actions in Court.

While the prosecutor sought 40 Marks, the Court ordered a 10 Mark fine. (64) The « Reichspost » often cautioned Christian women to beware of Jewish men, depicting them as depraved and violent.

The « Reichspost » took its social anti-Semitic propaganda a step further in portrayals of Jewish men as sexual predators. In « What a good girl can experience in Jewish stores », the newspaper reported that a Jewish goldsmith in the « Leopoldstadt » accosted a Christian girl in his store. The girl wanted to buy some jewelry but had no money. The child said she would come later with her mother, but the Jewish goldsmith offered the jewelry to her « for nothing » if she would follow him into his room. Outraged, the girl left the shop and told her parents what happened. The « Reichspost » represented this scene as a « warning to all Christian mothers before these “ clean ” Jew's shops » (« sauberen Judengeschäfte ») . (65)

The « Reichspost » made similar warnings concerning Jews and the practice of « White Slavery » (« Mädchenhandel») , the sex trafficking of women and girls. « White Slavery » was a real problem. Christians and Jews trafficked Christian and Jewish women and girls as prostitutes. State governments as well as Christian and Jewish organizations fought against this crime. (66) However, the « Reichspost » reported almost exclusively on Jewish men and women as perpetrators and Christian women and girls as victims. The newspaper described « White Slavery » in a number of articles. Reportedly, Jewish men and women with the promise of a good marriage, employment, or vacation lured unsuspecting Christian women and girls from throughout Europe to travel with them to destinations in South America. If the innocent women and girls did not come voluntarily, the « white slavers » forced them against their will. Having arrived in South America, the innocent women and children were forced into prostitution. The « Reichspost » and the « white slavers » both referred to the « white slaves » as « Waare » (merchandise) . The « Reichspost » could also refer to a « white slaver » as « Waarensensal » (merchandise broker) . (67) The use of these terms signified how « white slavers » commodified the sex of innocent women and girls. The newspaper characterized Jews as exploitative and sexually depraved people from whom Christians needed to guard themselves, a combined economic and social anti-Semitic argument. That the « Reichspost » failed to depict any Christians as « white slavers » should not come as a surprise ; the newspaper held no pretense about the absence of bias.

The « Reichspost » characterized Jews as deceptive and cowardly as well. In an article entitled « The Jew-Press » (« Die Judenpresse ») , the « Reichspost » claimed « Jew-Press » bias and false reporting against the officer class. The « Jew-Press » of Erlau (Eger, in Hungary) , had reported that Löw, a « 1 year volunteer » reserve officer, had reported feeling unwell to the military doctor. Löw requested that he recover in his private residence rather than the garrison hospital. The « Jew-Press » claimed the military doctor made an anti-Semitic remark to Löw, which is also the epigraph of this chapter, « Jewish swindler, you are malingering. » (« Jüdischer Schwindler, Du simulirst. ») . At 5:00 pm, Löw went to his private residence to recover. The military doctor never visited him, and Löw died at 2:00 am the next day. The « Reichspost » rejected these accusations against the military doctor, arguing he sought to maintain military discipline, which required soldiers to recover in the garrison hospital. Furthermore, the « Reichspost » claimed Löw was drunk, and should have had a Jewish doctor attend to him earlier, but did not. A Christian doctor came, but too late. The « Reichspost » scoffed :

Who knows, whether this 1 year volunteer was not well-known as a malingerer ? No one will argue the fact that the Jews have a particular weakness for military service. Reasons to be pretty quiet, « offended » Israel ! The military doctor has only done his duty, since if this broke-down, any Jewish mama's boy (« Muttersöhnchen ») , that happens to be a soldier, when he has toothache could go to the « Mothers' home, and when an officer would forbid, he would be a “ anti-Semite ” and a “ disgrace (Schandfleck) of the Century ” ! » (69)

The « Reichspost » prejudged Löw as a Jew to be a malingerer and « mama's boy » , who breached military protocol to recover at home with his mother. In short, the « Reichspost » used this narrative to demonstrate Jewish cowardice and deceit. (70)

The « Reichspost » frequently depicted baser Jewish family relations than that between the supposed « malingerer Löw » and his mother. In « A Jewish-patriarchal family life » , the newspaper depicted Jewish family life as neither exemplary nor « patriarchal » , but rather dominated by self-interest and greed. In the 3rd District of Vienna (« Landstraße ») , lived a « Mr. K(ohn) » and his wife with their 2 unmarried daughters and 1 unmarried son. 2 other daughters and 1 son were already married and resided outside the home. All family members got along well. When the mother died, the children mourned and everyone expected the family to continue its intimacy. However, shortly after the mother's burial, the children sold the household goods and moved away from home. They abandoned the old father in the large residence, with only one bed as furniture. The « Reichspost » posed a rhetorical question to Josef Samuel Bloch, Rabbi in Vienna, editor of a Jewish newspaper, deputy for Kolomea, and an outspoken critic of anti-Semitism :

« We ask now Reb Bloch :“ Is this family life also exemplary (“ musterhaft ”) and patriarchal, how (you) mostly described the family life of the Jews to be kept-up ? ” What says Reb Bloch about it ? » (71)

The reader could answer this for himself or herself ; the « Reichspost » depicted Jewish family life as antithesis to the exemplary and patriarchal family ideal.

The « Reichspost » presented further negative portrayals of Jewish family life in the article « Jewish sibling love » . Wolf Glücklich, a nearly blind Jew, on the « Stefaniebrücke » (a bridge across the Danube Canal, in Vienna) often requested charity from passersby. One « fine » (note the word is printed as « faine » in German to appear Yiddish phonetically) lady who walked across the bridge was angered by the beggar's behavior and had a nearby watchman arrest him. The judge determined that the accuser (the « Reichspost » again used the word « faine » to describe her) wished to revenge herself against the blind beggar because he owed her 25 « Gulden » . Impoverished, he could not repay. In fact, the « Jewess is the blind beggar's - loving sister » . (72) The irony in describing her as a « loving sister » was apparent. The judge reproved the accused for breaking the law by accepting charity from a passer by. The accused claimed he did so because he only received 4 Florins 50 « Krone » , each month, from official charity. He then proved his incapacity with a medical certificate, and the judge acquitted him. This time, the « Reichspost » asked a Mr. Nothnagel, a Jewish docent at the University of Vienna, a rhetorical question :

« Mr. von Nothnagel, are also the Jewesses without bad habits ? » (« Unarten ») (73)

To the reader, the answer must have been clear ; the newspaper portrayed Jews as the embodiment of bad habits. The « Reichspost » depicted Jews acting-out of self-interest and greed, even to take advantage of family members.

The « Reichspost » also harshly described cases of familial murder among Jews. The newspaper reported one such case in « Jewish assassins sentenced to death » . The « Reichspost » took its information from a newspaper identified as « G. N. » . In Przemyslow (Galicia) , a Jew named Springstein and his sister had poisoned Springstein's wife and 6 other close relatives for their life insurance. Springstein and his sister « were found guilty and sentenced to death by hanging » . (74) The « Reichspost » set-out to demonstrate that Jewish family life was less than ideal. As in public life, the newspaper depicted Jews in their family life rejecting norms of behavior, exploiting, hurting, and even killing others for economic gain. In summation, the « Reichspost » depicted Jews as a dangerous and corrupting influence in the economy and society. The newspaper utilized such economic and social anti-Semitic argumentation to justify contemporary expulsions and riots that targeted Jews.

Justifying Expulsions and Riots Targeting Jews

The « Reichspost » justified contemporary expulsions of and riots against Jews throughout Eastern Europe as a reaction to, in its view, usurious, exploitative and corrupting Jews. These « Reichspost » economic and social anti-Semitic arguments mirrored those levied against the Jews of Austria. In July 1896, in « Russians and Jews » , the newspaper explained why Russia had expelled Jews from its villages :

« As is known, about 2 years ago, all the Jews were expelled from the villages of Russia, since the government was forced to recognize the harm of Jews in the villages, because the Jews led the residents astray to drink liquor (“ Schnapstrinken ”) , get into debt and to (practice) an immoral way of life (“ unmoralischen Lebensweise ”) ; they bought stolen goods, they advised the sons, daughters and servants of the grain farmer's, etc. , to steal, for which they then got from the Jews liquor, fake jewelry (“ falsche Schmucksachen ”) , and so on. Only now was this sensible regulation carried-out thoroughly, so that the Russians can certainly assert their villages exist cleansed of Jews (“ judenrein ”) . And in Austria ? » (75)

This economic and social anti-Semitic propaganda concerning the position of Jews in Russian villages mirrored to a great extent « Reichspost » views towards Jews in Austria. Asking, « And in Austria ? » suggested the newspaper would have approved of expelling Jews from Austria.

In « The Russian Jewish question » (« Zur russischen Judenfrage ») , the « Reichspost » justified farmer's riots against Jews as « self-help » against Jewish usury and exploitation :

« On 3 March (1897) , in the afternoon, the small-town Spola in the governorate Kiev was raided by a large number of farmers who smashed and looted all shops and warehouses belonging solely to Jews. In just under 4 hours, more than 100 houses and all the shops, even merchant's stores, were totally devastated. Home and business equipment (“ Wirthschaftsgeräthe ”) , furniture and goods lie about smashed in the streets. »

Such self-help is and remains unjust in all circumstances. However, without deeper reason, the farmers would not have been so bitter. It is expected because, as usual, usury and exploitation lie behind it. (76) The « Reichspost » contended the Jews got what they deserved for their « usury and exploitation ». The newspaper justified the Spola riot as an « outbreak of people's indignation » at the « economic flood of Jews in the south and southwest of the Empire and rage against the Jews ». (77) In other articles, the « Reichspost » blamed riots on Jews without specifying why. In « Fighting between Christians and Jews », the newspaper noted :

« In the small-town Diatlowka (Grodno Gouvernement) bloody clashes have broken-out between Christian and Jewish residents. Only the intervention of the gendarmerie succeeded in putting an end to the incidents. Dozens of people were injured. 70 people who disturbed the peace were arrested. In any case, the Jews will have caused the indignation of the population. » (78)

The « Reichspost » must have expected readers to take for granted, « the Jews will have caused the indignation of the population ». The newspaper had already given readers countless reasons to do so.

In « Against the Jews » (« Gegen die Juden »), the « Reichspost » reported how on a Russian Easter Monday, in the city of Jekaterinoslaw, an « angry riot » occurred against the Jews. At about 4 PM, workers began mishandling Jewish merchants in various streets, and rioting broke-out in 1 locality. When gendarmes attempted to disperse the rioters, they became even more incensed and by evening the excesses had spread throughout the city. Rioters shattered the windows of Jewish homes, demolished Jewish inns and businesses, as well as smashed and set on fire a barrel of petroleum in a street inhabited by Jews. The efforts of police and gendarmes to quell the riots remained without success. The mob pelted them with stones, seriously wounding a police-inspector. When the military arrived and arrested 100 rioters, the excesses ended. A rumor spread around the city that, the next day, the riots would be repeated and 1,000 factory workers from Brjansk would appear in Jekaterinoslaw. Authorities planned accordingly and had the military surround the factory in Brjansk, permitting no workers to leave. The « Reichspost » commented :

« So, a formal encirclement to protect - the Jews. » (« Also eine förmliche Einschließung zum Schutze - der Juden ») . » (79)

The newspaper implied the workers needed to be protected from what it so often described as exploitative Jews. Again, the « Reichspost » had already given readers innumerable reasons to believe this was the case.

The 2 part front-page feuilleton, « The Jew of Rudnia », narrated graphic violence against the Jews, which the « Reichspost » justified as a reaction to Jewish guile. The story was told from the perspective of a post-man travelling through Rudnia (a city in present day Poland) with his coach-man. He witnessed the burning of a home of a Jewish ritual slaughterer while the non-Jews stood-by and watched with inner joy. With guilty pleasure, a Cossack declared the fire was not so bad. The Jew with the burning home despaired that his mother was still inside. The non-Jews laughed at him. (80) For the time being, the mother lived, as the flames did not take her. The Jewish son and his Jewish friend lacked courage to save her. The Jewish son offered a Cossack 5 silver Rubles (the « Reichspost » noted not a

kopek more) to save her. The Cossack said it was not enough to risk his life but he had no time to waste so he went to save her. After the Cossack saved the Jew's mother, the Jewish son took from a purse under his caftan 1 Ruble (he had promised 5) and gave it to the Cossack who saved his mother's life. This enraged the Cossack who then ripped the Jewish mother he just saved from her children and threw her into the flames :

« As he stands now, enveloped in smoke and flames, he calls-out to the terrified Jews :“ A ruble, dog - you'll get your mother now for free ! ” » (81)

The feuilleton portrayed the Jew as : a coward who would not risk his life to save his mother ; a businessman who placed a monetary value on her life ; and a cheap liar who promised 5 Rubles to the Cossack to save her but only paid 1. Just as the non-Jews who stood by witnessing the flames with inner joy, the « Reichspost » staff may have felt pleasure in publishing the feuilleton as well.

During the period under investigation (January 1894 to April 1897) , the « Reichspost » did not publish articles concerning Christians attacking Jews, in Vienna. Yet, minor incidents of anti-Semites beating-up Jews and attacking Jewish property did occur. (82) Nevertheless, these incidents did not rise to the level of pogroms (83) , such as in Eastern Europe. That the « Reichspost » reported often on Jews attacking Christians in Vienna and failed to report on Christians attacking Jews there was not a surprise ; as noted previously, the newspaper held no pretense about the absence of bias.

Use of Political Anti-Semitism and History in Anti-Semitic Argumentation

Use of Political Anti-Semitism

« We hate the Jews not on account of their religion, but rather we combat them, because we want to overthrow Jewish morality and Jewish exploiters. » (84)

The « Reichspost » utilized political anti-Semitism in its attacks against Social-Democrats, Liberals and Jews. This included charges that the Social-Democratic and Liberal Parties were controlled by Jews and served Jewish interests. The newspaper declared most of the leaders of these Parties and their capitalist financiers were Jews. Moreover, it depicted Social-Democrats, Liberals and Jews as waging a war against Christians, Christianity, law, order, and traditional values such as the family, especially through acts of voter fraud, intimidation, and violence. Thus, the « Reichspost » depicted itself and Christian-Socials as waging a war of self-defense against Social-Democrats, Liberals, and Jews. Moreover, the newspaper used political anti-Semitism to help Christian-Social candidates win elections and to increase Party membership. In politics, it used economic and social anti-Semitic attacks against Social-Democrats, Liberals, and Jews, depicting them as exploiting and corrupting Christian Austrians. Christian-Social politician Leopold Kunschak (85) directed the words in the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter to the Social-Democrats present at a political meeting of the « Christian Civic Association in Hernals » , in Vienna. This pronouncement revealed how political, social and economic anti-Semitism intertwined among the Christian-Socials. During the meeting, a Social Democrat named Krump spoke against Karl Lueger and the persecution of the Jews. Mr. Kunschak responded that, to avoid a scandal,

Christian-Socials could not allow any more Social-Democrats into the gathering. Furthermore :

« Would they behave themselves decently, they are always welcome. (loud applause.) “ Religion is a private matter.” (“ Religion ist Privatsache.”) , you say today, but otherwise you lead bitter combat against all Christians. We hate the Jews not on account of their religion, but rather we combat them, because we want to overthrow Jewish morality and Jewish exploiters. » (86)

Christian-Socials associated Social-Democrats and Jews. Kunschak's allegation that Social-Democrats could not « behave themselves decently » mirrored negative perceptions of Jewish behavior. Furthermore, Kunschak described as disingenuous the Social-Democrats' slogan « Religion is a private matter » . While claiming that Christian-Socials « hate the Jews not on account of their religion » , he nevertheless described Social-Democrats and Jews as waging « bitter combat against all Christians » . Kunschak cast political anti-Semitism as self-defense.

In an article entitled « Religion is a private matter » , the « Reichspost » provided its interpretation of the Social-Democratic slogan of the same name. The newspaper claimed that, in the cities, « religion is only then a private matter when it concerns the Jewish (religion) , the Christian religion is combated by all means at their disposal. » (87) Furthermore, it claimed workers were commanded to attend general meetings of the « free-thinkers » in Vienna, led by Victor Adler and his comrades. According to the « Reichspost » , whatever was left of the workers' faith (« Glauben ») would be torn-out at these meetings, making them more receptive to Social-Democratic ideas. (88)

That Jews were highly-visible in the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party provided grist for the mill of « Reichspost » political anti-Semitic propaganda. In the article « Jewish leadership ? » , the newspaper commented ironically :

« Say to me with whom you deal, and I will say to you who you are ! Social-Democracy will not be in Jewish hands, for in the Party leadership are only 11 Jews and 9 non-Jews. Jews include : Doctor Adler, Doctor Chonert, Doctor Kaliane, Doctor Ellenbogen, Doctor Ingwer, Ehrentraut, Leutner, Brod, Kaff, Feigl and comrade Glas. Honest workers (!!) , that “ earn ” their daily bread by the sweat of their brow ! » (89)

The « Reichspost » was making the case that, in its view, Social-Democracy really was in « Jewish hands » because Jews made-up the majority of the Social-Democratic leadership. In reference to the 11 Jews in the Social-Democratic leadership, the line « Honest workers (!!) , that “ earn ” their daily bread by the sweat of their brow ! » referred to the economic anti-Semitic argument that Jews earned money not by « the sweat of their brow » , the efforts of their own labors as the Bible commanded (90) , but through economic exploitation of Christians. The line also made fun of the fact that the Social-Democratic leaders were not workers.

The « Reichspost » depicted Jewish leaders of the Social-Democrats as corrupting Party members. The newspaper recounted the « Founding meetings of the Christian-Socialist Workers' Educational Association “ Unity ” » . Schmidt, the meeting initiator, called for the association to be a one in which members could develop themselves into good Christian workers and have entertainment. Schmidt contrasted it with the « Social-Democratic education associations »

where, he claimed, Social-Democrats denigrated the Christian religion and Christian priests, trained to be rabbis, and studied Talmud. Schmidt continued, the « chief rabbi (“ Oberrabbiner ”) of the Social-Democrats » allowed this because « the leading figures of the Social-Democrats are men, who are not workers, but rather Asiatics (“ Asiaten ”) , who view the movement as a retirement fund » . (91) Mr. Schmidt branded Social-Democracy as entirely Jewish. Use of the term « Asiatics » denigrated Jews as outsiders and demonstrated profound disgust with them. Schmidt was making the claim that Jewish leaders of the Social-Democrats did not look-out for the best interests of Party members, but in typical « Jewish fashion » used Party finances for personal economic gain. It was an effective use of anti-Semitic demagoguery for a Christian-Social and anti-Semitic audience.

The « Reichspost » and Christian-Socials used equally venomous political anti-Semitism in attacks against Liberals. The newspaper recounted a January 11, 1894, meeting in « The Christian-Social Club » in which Prince Alois Lichtenstein and Karl Lueger, Christian-Social Party leaders, presented their views on Liberalism. Both leaders utilized political anti-Semitic arguments characterizing the « Jewish-Liberals » and capitalism as mortal threats to modern civilization. Lichtenstein couched the contemporary relationship between « Jewish-Liberals » and capitalism in Biblical terms :

« As on Sinai, already the Jews performed a gold-dance until the admonition from above, written on stone tablets, ended the idolatry of the golden calf. Lord God, in the newly beginning year (1894) , make the Jewish-Liberals gold-dance end for the salvation of modern civilization. » (92)

Lichtenstein used religiously motivated Jew-hatred in his Biblical references to the « idolatry of the golden calf » , and economic anti-Semitism in his representation of the « Jewish-Liberals gold dance » . He depicted Jews as greedy and always only concerned with money. Lichtenstein prayed God would intervene, as God did on Mount-Sinai, to put an end to the idolatrous « Jewish-Liberals gold dance » , this time to save modern civilization. Lueger continued the theme, calling for :

« The unity of all Christian Parties against the common enemy, Liberalism. However, today's civilization stands on a precipice ; it will be saved before the fall if people would remember that God created them free. Let us therefore be not slaves of desire (“ Leidenschaft ”) nor of capitalism. » (93)

The « Reichspost » published several reports on the suicide and burial of Heinrich Jacques, a Jewish Liberal parliamentary deputy, which utilized political anti-Semitism and anti-Liberal ideology. In the front-page article, « The Death of Doctor Heinrich Jacques » , the newspaper insisted that Jacques committed suicide due to his loss of « belief in God and His love wielding Providence » , and its replacement with the « modern idols » of « Enlightenment » , « Education and Good Breeding » , and « Humanity » . (94) The Christian-Socials and « Reichspost » viewed these three features and « godlessness » in Liberalism as damning. Indeed, the « Reichspost » stated that, in Jacques' case, suicide was the last but also the best resort. The newspaper had no complaints about Doctor Jacques death :

« He was still one of the foremost representatives of the Liberal-Jewish-Capitalist movement, against which the Christian-Social movement increasingly agitated. It was also well-known that Doctor Jacques wanted to bless our Christian Austrians immediately with the planned Hungarian civil marriage (emphasis in the original) . » (95)

As a Catholic newspaper, the « Reichspost » opposed Jacques' proposal of civil marriage in Austria.

In « The Wolf in Sheepskin », the « Reichspost » condemned the Liberals for selecting Constantine Noske (a non-Jew) to fill Jacques' vacated position as parliamentary deputy for the « Innere Stadt ». The newspaper characterized Noske as a proud opponent of « the anti-Jewish aspirations of reactionaries » (« judenfeindlichen Bestrebungen der Reactionären entgegenstellt ») . (96) The « Reichspost » screamed that the Liberals defended the human rights of the Jews alone, and that Christian Austrians needed protection from the selfishness and brutality of Jews :

« The glory of Noske is an indictment of the Liberal Party and his courage testifies to their great dereliction of duty. Jews ! » (97)

In other articles, the « Reichspost » elaborated how Christian-Socials and anti-Semites defended themselves against perceived abuses by Jews. In « Christian Socialism and Anti-Semitism » (1895) , the newspaper lauded the growing support for Christian-Socialism and anti-Semitism among the Christians in Vienna and the provinces, especially among the economically weak, politically oppressed, and those without rights. The « Reichspost » explained the benefits of the early successes of Christian-Socialism and anti-Semitism :

« The Christian spirit lives again in Christian Vienna and in the provinces, nationality hatred (“ Nationalitätenhaß ”) has lost its sharpness, and with I accord, the people rise against those who until now exploited, incited, and criminalized them : Jewish capital, the Jewish liberal press, it (Christian-Socialism and anti-Semitism) is led by real Austrian patriotism ; it is above all the salvation of the Emperor and the Empire. They (Christian-Socials and anti-Semites) wrote on their banners reconciliation of classes and peoples' interests, these goals are pursued legally so they can be reassured as to their further development. The practice of the Christian-Socialist and anti-Semitic ideas is already just a matter of time, for this conclusion justified their development just last year, in 1895 ! » (98)

Revival of « Christian spirit » in Austria fulfilled the Christian-Social and « Reichspost » objective of the « re-Christianization » of public life. The newspaper declared « Jewish capital (and) the Jewish Liberal press » damaged the Austrian economy and society, and lauded Christians unified in opposition to them. The « reconciliation of classes and peoples' interests » excluded Jews. Nevertheless, expressions of loyalty to « the Emperor and the Empire » demonstrated that the Christian-Socials and the « Reichspost » rejected Pan-Germanism.

The « Reichspost » railed against Social-Democrats, Liberals, and Jews in both political camps who, the newspaper claimed, participated in voter agitation, fraud, and violence. In « Do not be deterred ! » , the « Reichspost » advised its readers not to let Social-Democrats' threats deter them from voting :

« Every Christian voter come, on 9 March (1897) , to do his voting duty in the 5th Curia and not let himself by any chance be deterred by the crude threats of the Social-Democrats. All precautionary measures are taken so that no one will harm a hair. The women, in particular, are requested to not hold back their men for fear of the Reds (“ Rothen ”) . On the contrary, they should admonish their family members eligible to vote to contribute to the victory of the

Christian people over revolution and Jew-money (“ Umsturz und Judengeld ”) ! » (99)

The 5th Curia (electoral constituency) comprised all voting age males. 5th Curia voters elected a small number of delegates. (100) The « Reichspost » exhorted its male readers in the 5th Curia to vote, promising Christian-Social protection from Social-Democratic violence. The assertion that Christian-Social victory would be a « victory of the Christian people over (Social-Democratic) revolution and Jew-money » connected Jews with Social-Democratic revolution and capitalism. In a front-page article « A perfidious manœuver », the « Reichspost » accused Social-Democrats (including Jews) of calling for or abetting violence on an Election Day (March 9, 1897) . As 5th Curia voters went to the polls, members of Social-Democratic clubs demonstrated with the slogan : « Fight unto blood » (« Kampf bis auf's Blut ») . (101) The « Jew-Press » and « Red Party-Press » (« rothen Parteipresse ») did not speak of « benevolent neutrality » or oppose « appeals to violence » . (102) The « Reichspost » reported on additional Social-Democratic demonstrations against the anti-Liberals and their leader, Karl Lueger, and called for the police and military to ensure security for free and fair voting. (103)

2 days after the 5th Curia elections of March 9, 1897, the « Reichspost » gleefully declared in its front page article, « But still anti-Semitic » (« Doch antisemitisch ») , and in several pages of election results that Christian-Social candidates won all available mandates : 5 from the electoral Districts of Vienna, and 4 from the vicinity of Vienna. (104) These Christian-Social candidates, according to the « Reichspost » , prevailed over the Social-Democrats and Liberals, as well as Jews in both political camps despite their « terrorism » and lies. The newspaper interpreted events thus :

« The harder the struggle, the more brilliant the victory, the same applies here, and the almost unprecedented voter turn-out (“ Wahlbetheiligung ”) teaches how brave and fearless the Christian conscript fulfills his duty, as the anti-Liberals are the only ones able to defend successfully State, family and religion against the “ Jewified ” revolution-preacher (“ jüdelnden Umsturzprediger ”) . » (105)

The « Reichspost » described combat against Social-Democrats, Liberals, and Jews in both camps as a defensive war against « the “ Jewified ” revolution-preacher » who sought to overthrow the Empire, as well as traditional family values and Christian religion.

In « The 2nd Ballot on 22 March, in Vienna » , the « Reichspost » alleged the few Liberal candidates who won elections did so through massive voter fraud. Successful Liberal candidates included Constantin Noske, Carl Wrabetz, Ferdinand Kronawetter, and Josef Kopp in the « Innere Stadt » , and Kareis in the « Leopoldstadt » . According to the « Reichspost » :

« The success of the united Jews was conditional on an unprecedented kind of voter agitation that worked with the extensive swindle-experiment. » (106)

The newspaper accused Liberals of buying votes at 20 florins a vote. It claimed that 80 arrests were made because of such voting drives (« Wahlumtreiben ») , and that all those arrested were Jews. (107) For the « Reichspost » , the

anti-Liberals either won because they could overcome Liberal and Jewish treachery or lost because it was too great.

The « Reichspost » alleged encounters in which Jews used political violence, both verbal and physical, against Christian-Socials. This involved social anti-Semitic representations of Jews acting outside expected norms of public life. The « Reichspost » recounted one such incidence in « What the Jews permit themselves ! » (« Was sich die Juden erlauben ! ») . According to the newspaper, 2 Jews at a café on the « Praterstraße » in the « Leopoldstadt » watched participants in the Christian Women's Assembly marching home and cheering for Doctor Lueger. When one of the Jews asked the other what was wrong, he replied :

« These are “ Huren ” (whores) . They allow to give cheers to Lueger. » (108)

The « Reichspost » lamented how, « a greasy (“ schmieriger ”) Hebrew may insult the Christian civil women of Vienna in such a way. » (109)

In « Jewish impudence » (« Jüdische Frechheit ») , the newspaper stated, one midnight, a group of gentlemen travelled homeward from the Kaiser-Festival in the « Wiener Prater » , a large public park in the « Leopoldstadt » , carrying lanterns adorned with Lueger's image. 40 « viceless » (« Unartenlosen » , note the sarcasm) Jews surrounded them, cried-out « Today is not a Lueger-Festival ! » (« Hait is nix a Lueger-Fest ! » , printed in German as if Jews spoke with a Yiddish accent) beat the lanterns out of their hands and behaved wildly. The « Reichspost » concluded :

« Only the intervention of the security guard brought frenzied (“ rasende ”) Israel to its senses, and only after the impudent lantern heroes (frechen Lampionshelden) had been arrested, could Christian people continue on their path. » (110)

The « Reichspost » reported several more instances of Jews reacting violently to Christian-Social political activities. In « He wants to hear no Lueger marching song » , the newspaper recounted such a scene occurred in a « Prater » restaurant named Traxler. When chapel clergymen sang a Lueger march, Carl Toch (a Jew) flew into a rage. He threw mugs of beer at the band-Master to make them stop singing and, thus, aroused Christian indignation. Chief mechanic Carl Kober brandished an unloaded revolver. Both Toch and Kober were brought before the « Leopoldstadt » District Court. Witnesses testified that Kober's revolver was not loaded, and he was acquitted. The prosecutor charged Toch with violating the band-Master's expression, and Toch was transferred to the Regional Courts. (111)

The « Reichspost » claimed a Jew made an « assassination attempt on a Christian voter » , on the day of an election (March 22, 1897) , in the « Jew-Island » (« Judeninsel ») of the « Leopoldstadt » . That evening, the event occurred at the entrance of a house on the « Rotensterngasse » . According to witnesses, the Jewish Master shoe-maker Gustav Raffel hit Johann Nejedlik on the back, because Nejedlik had cheered for Lueger and Dittrich. 5 days later, Nejedlik remained in a doctor's care and had initiated legal steps against Mr. Raffel. (112)

For the « Reichspost » , the « re-Christianization » of Austrian public life necessitated its « de-Jewification » . (113)
The newspaper often decried what it viewed as the over-representation of Jews in the professions. In « The Jewification

of the Viennese legal profession » (« Die Verjudung die Wiener Advocatie ») , the « Reichspost » bemoaned the list of newly added Viennese lawyers, in 1895, as it estimated, based on the names, that 20 % were Christian and 80 % were Jewish. The newspaper conjectured that, within 10 years, the pace of the « Jewification » of the lawyers would make it so that a Christian lawyer would be as rare as a « white raven » (« weißer Rabe ») or a Christian clothing manufacturer (« Confectionär ») . (114) By implication, Jews had displaced Christians in that occupation.

The « Reichspost » detested Jews at the University of Vienna. In the front-page article, « Nothnagel in Danger » , the newspaper described « Israel's invasion » (« Einmarsch Israels ») into the University of Vienna. It declared that, in the Law Faculty, of 46 professors and lecturers (« Dozenten ») , 15 were Jews or 37.5 % of the total. Among the Medicine Faculty of 127 professors and lecturers, 55 were Jews or 44 % of the total. Among the Philosophy Faculty, of 121 professors and lecturers, 31 were Jews or 26.5 % of the total. (115) The « Reichspost » conflated professors and lecturers. However, such distinction was important. Jews were barred by anti-Semitic prejudice from rising into the professorial ranks. The newspaper also noted high proportions of Jews among the student body at the University of Vienna. During the 1892 winter semester, Jews made-up 38 % and Christians 62 % of the student body. During the 1892 summer semester, Jews made-up 36 % and Christians 64 % of the student body. The « Reichspost » stated that, in Austria, the number of Jews amounted only to 5 % of the number of Catholics. The newspaper then characterized as disproportional the number of Jews at the University of Vienna, especially in medicine where Jews made-up 44 % of the teachers and more than 50 % of the students. (116)

Jews were not well-represented in the civil service, and the « Reichspost » resolved to keep it that way. In a page 1 article, « Too Few Jewish Civil Servants in Austria ?! » , the newspaper argued that the number of Jewish civil servants in Austria needed to be kept low. It wrote in response to Emil Byk, a Jewish Member of Parliament from Galicia, who claimed there were not enough Jews in the civil service, and Mr. Rappaport Ritter von Porada, Secretary of the National Bank, who found that Galician Jews faced difficulty acquiring civil service positions. The « Reichspost » sneered that Galician Jews who tried to acquire civil service positions were « usurers » and « tavern keepers » (« Branntweinschenker ») , and declared the civil service an honourable profession that should not be corrupted by Jews. Furthermore, the newspaper declared that the Austrian Fundamental Law opened all positions to Jews. The « Reichspost » claimed only Jews cared that there were few Jewish civil servants. The newspaper was content that a « Jewish invasion » of the civil service had not occurred and deemed it necessary to keep it that way. (117)

« Reichspost » political anti-Semitism had a practical use : helping Christian-Socials win elections and new Party members. However, it did much more than that as well. « Reichspost » political anti-Semitism contributed to a negative image of the Jew, which the newspaper created. With its political anti-Semitism, the newspaper portrayed Jews as godless and treacherous Liberals and Social-Democrats. In a modern age of mass politics, the « Reichspost » represented Jews not just as an economic, social, and religious threat to Christians and Christianity, but also a politically powerful one. With calls for restrictions on the number of lawyer, lecturer, student, and civil servant positions open to Jews, the « Reichspost » mirrored Karl Lueger and Christian-Socials' calls for quotas against Jews.

Use of History in Anti-Semitic Argumentation

« I know of no greater danger to the Empire and its peoples, than the horrible properties of these (Jews) , who by fraud, usury, and money transactions enriched themselves and destroyed the population. »

(« Reichspost » quotation of Empress Maria Theresa's Cabinet Order of June 19, 1777.) (118)

The « Reichspost » utilized a combination of economic, social, and political anti-Semitism to interpret historic events and figures. The newspaper idolized Emperor Leopold I (who reigned from 1658 to 1705) , Empress Maria Theresa (who reigned from 1740 to 1780) , and Emperor Joseph II (who reigned from 1780 to 1790) , and specifically any of their anti-Jewish rhetoric and / or policies. It also looked kindly on historic expulsions of and / or bans on Jews in Vienna depicting Jews as anti-dynastic and anti-Austrian participants in the 1848 Revolution. « Reichspost » interpretations of history demeaned Jews while demonstrating the newspaper's own State patriotism and dynastic loyalty. The newspaper omitted historical facts that could have cast doubt on its interpretations. However, as noted previously, it held no pretense about the absence of bias, and such omissions should not have come as a surprise.

In an article entitled « Szeps is proud of his forefathers » , the « Reichspost » reported on a speech of Moritz Szeps, a Jewish journalist and publisher of the « Wiener Tagblatt » . Szeps delivered the speech at the unveiling ceremony of the monument celebrating the defeat of the Ottoman Empire at the Battle of Vienna (in 1683) . Szeps reportedly said :

« And raising this monument to the heroic deeds of our ancestors (" Heldentaten unserer Ahnen ") may also have a (positive) effect for the future. » (119)

The « Reichspost » reminded Szeps and his editorial staff that, in 1679, Emperor Leopold I « had asked (the Jews) to move away from our town » , tore down their synagogue, and built the parish church of « Sankt Leopold » in its place. 4 years later, the Turks besieged Vienna. The « Reichspost » asked :

« Should the Jews, dismissed-out of Vienna with polite words, have come back as " volunteers " for the army defending Vienna just during the siege ? Possible - but it is not likely ! » (120)

In reality, Leopold I had not in 1679 « dismissed with polite words » the Jews from Vienna, as the « Reichspost » claimed. The newspaper downplayed the actions of Leopold I. In 1670, during the Catholic Counter-Reformation, Leopold I expelled all 3,000 to 4,000 Jews of Vienna who had refused baptism. Furthermore, he expelled the Jews at the behest of his Spanish wife, his Court preacher Abraham a Sancta Clara, Bishop Kollonitsch of « Wiener Neustadt » , Christian merchants and the municipal government of Vienna. They viewed Jews as godless, the cause of great misfortunes, or as economic competition. (121) The « Reichspost » had faulted Jews for not rushing to aid Vienna against the Turks, when they had been forcibly expelled more than a decade previously.

The « Reichspost » described, in « A historical memory » , the Cabinet-Order of Empress Maria Theresa of June 19, 1777. In it, Empress Maria Theresa ordered and explained her expulsion of Jews from Vienna. Only Jews who had her written permission would be allowed to remain. The « Reichspost » quoted this Cabinets-Order :

« My concern for the welfare of the Empire and its peoples is my most sacred duty - and inasmuch as I see leads me to ban all Jews without my written permission to stay in Vienna, because “ I know of no greater danger to the Empire and its peoples, than the horrible properties of these (Jews) , who by fraud, usury, and money transactions enriched themselves and destroyed the population ”. » (122)

This quote was chosen for this chapter's epigraph as it clearly represented how the « Reichspost » viewed Jews as a negative force in the Empire, especially in the economic arena. Ironically, Maria Theresa's policies pushed Jews to engage in commerce by limiting their employment to money changing, jewel trading, financial operations, and trade in domestic manufactured goods. Moreover, Maria Theresa never managed to expel the Jews of Vienna. However, Maria Theresa expelled the Jews of Prague, in December 1744. Maria Theresa suspected the Jews of Prague had helped Frederick the Great conquer Silesia during the War of Austrian Succession, which began in 1740. The Jews were allowed to return in August 1748 because influential city and guild representatives intervened on their behalf and the « Toleration Tax » on Jews was raised. In addition, Maria Theresa mandated that Jews remove themselves from public view during Christian processions, on the morning of the Christian Sabbath (Sundays) , and on Christian holidays. Maria Theresa also refused to speak to Jews in person. (123) With her anti-Jewish sentiment and policies, Maria Theresa was an important role model for the « Reichspost » .

In « Characteristic » (« Bezeichnend ») , the « Reichspost » cited Emperor Joseph II decree of August 3, 1786, concerning the conduct of the Jews. The « Reichspost » quoted :

« His Majesty has deigned to instruct the extremely corrupt morality of the Jews (“ Se. Majestät haben rücksichtlich der äußerst verdorbenen Moralität der Juden anzubefehlen geruht ”) so that the tolerated Jews (“ tolerirte Judenschaft ”) and, especially, the morality of their character will be elevated. » (124)

Clearly, the « Reichspost » felt that Jews did not know how to conduct themselves in public life. Yet, Joseph II did not provide a clear-cut model of anti-Jewish sentiment and policy, which the « Reichspost » made him appear to be.

In line with Enlightenment ideals, Joseph II had removed many anti-Jewish restrictions and given Jews many rights. On January 2, 1782, Joseph II issued the « Patent of Tolerance » (« Toleranzpatent ») in order to bring Jews out of cultural, occupational, and social isolation. It required Jewish children to attend German-language schools, allowed Jews to establish factories, employ Christians, engage in manual labor, discard their identifying Jewish dress and yellow emblem, and much more. The « Patent of Tolerance » was one of many reforms Joseph II directed at Jews to make them more economically and socially useful to the State. Nevertheless, Joseph II kept in place a number of restrictions on Jews. These included bans on Jews from the civil service, land ownership, and settlement in some parts of the Empire. Communal taxes and a limit on the Jewish population were maintained. In Vienna, where no Jewish communal organization was permitted, « tolerated Jews » had to pay their own dues. (125) Furthermore, in his August 3, 1786, decree, Joseph II revealed distaste for Jews by describing their morality as « extremely corrupt » and in need of instruction to be elevated. On balance, this proved sufficient for the « Reichspost » to cite Joseph II as an authority on (alleged) bad Jewish behavior.

The « Reichspost » in « A little comparison » (« Ein kleiner Vergleich ») demonstrated its negative attitudes towards the 1848-1849 Revolution and the role Jews had in it. The article cited « Austriacus » of the « Sonn und Montagszeitung » , who wrote :

« The same elements which propagate anti-Semitism also write anti-Austrianness on their banner. » (126)

To refute this claim, the « Reichspost » asked Austriacus and readers of the « Reichspost » to compare the answers to several questions concerning the 1848-1849 Revolution :

« 1) Who incited the anti-dynastic orgies of 1848 and participated (in them) most eagerly ? The anti-Semites or the Semites of Vienna ? 2) In the same year after the taking of Vienna, who cowardly had fled-out from Vienna or furthermore swindled-out (“ feige ”) , even in coffins (“ sogar in Särgen ”) ? Was it anti-Semites or Semites ? 3) Who participated most zealously in the Kossuth-scandals and all anti-dynastic rallies in Hungary ? The anti-Semitic or Semitic male youths ? 4) Who celebrated too lustily (“ aus vollem Halse zu ”) these anti-Austrian and anti-dynastic rallies ? The anti-Semitic or the Semitic press ? » (127)

The « Reichspost » expected its readers and « Austriacus » to answer that the « Semites » (Jews) and the « Semitic press » (« Jew-Press ») undermined both Empire and dynasty, in Austria and Hungary, and economically exploited Vienna during the 1848-1849 Revolution. In « Comparison » (reference the article title) , the anti-Semites, anti-Semitic Press, and anti-Semitic Parties were portrayed as loyal and true to Empire and dynasty. Concerning the claims of « Austriacus » , the « Reichspost » warned :

« He who lives in a glass house shouldn't throw stones ! » (128)

The Jews did have a predominant role in the 1848-1849 Revolution. However, while portraying Jews as anti-dynastic and un-patriotic, the « Reichspost » refused to recognize that revolutionary Jews fought for a better world. In March 1848, in Vienna, Liberal and radical Jews (academicians, doctors, medical students, journalists, and writers) fought alongside Christians to topple the authoritarian regime of State Chancellor Clemens von Metternich, who resigned and went into exile. Afterwards, revolutionary Jews and Christians killed in battle were buried together. Prominent in the revolutionary tribunes, student guard, and later the newly elected Parliament, Jews demanded for themselves and Christians greater civil and political rights, freedom of assembly, press, speech, and scientific research. Jews also circulated petitions for Jewish emancipation and published revolutionary newspapers. Catholics, conservatives and anti-Semites opposed to Jewish emancipation wrote anti-Jewish petitions, pamphlets, and newspapers. The « Reichspost » failed to mention that, in March, April, and May of 1848, there were violent anti-Jewish riots in « Preßburg » (today, Bratislava) and other Hungarian towns, as well as in Prague. Anti-Jewish mobs in Vienna limited attacks to Jewish property. In October 1848, an army under Prince Windischgrätz put down the revolution in Vienna. Again, Jewish and Christian revolutionaries died fighting side by side in battle. On March 4, 1849, a newly elected « Reichstag » passed a new constitution that emancipated Jews, enabled them to own property (mines excluded) , enter any legal employment, and marry non-Jews. In Hungary, many Jews participated in the resistance against the Austrian army. This led the

Hungarian revolutionary government on July 29, 1849, 2 weeks before its military collapse, to proclaim the full emancipation of Jews. (129) Perhaps, Jewish emancipation in Austria and Hungary gave the « Reichspost » further cause to condemn Jewish participation in the 1848-1849 Revolution. Moreover, the « Reichspost » did not mention that Jews had fought for the betterment of all peoples ; that fact failed to comport with the newspaper's negative depictions of Jews.

In summation, the « Reichspost » had a selective awareness of the past, and misused history to strengthen its arguments against Jews. The newspaper idealized and depicted itself as belonging to an old and « venerable » tradition of Jew-hatred, which Austrian Emperors and Empresses practiced going back more than 200 years. Moreover, the « Reichspost » misrepresented the involvement of Jews in the 1848-1849 Revolution to further its economic, social, and political anti-Semitic arguments. We will keep in mind this selective awareness of the past in our consideration of « Reichspost » religiously motivated Jew-hatred.

Use of Religiously Motivated Jew-hatred and Rejection of Racial Anti-Semitism

« The Jews are the sworn enemies of Christianity, (and) of Christians. » (130)

The « Reichspost » used the Bible, teachings of the Church Fathers, and sermons of Christian theologians, past and present, in support of its religiously motivated Jew-hatred and anti-Jewish arguments. « Reichspost » staff members, many of whom were Catholic priests and theologians, saw themselves as belonging to the tradition of the Church Fathers. They took it upon themselves to assume what they described as a traditional role for the Catholic Church and clergy : defenders against the enemies of Christians and Christianity, enemies including (they claimed) the Jews. The « Reichspost » regularly labeled the Jews as « Christ killers » and « Witness People » (living testaments to the truth of Christ) . Furthermore, the newspaper attacked on religious grounds Judaism and Jewish religious texts, including the Old Testament, Talmud, and « Schulchan Aruch » , characterizing them as outmoded and / or morally corrupting. Equally significant, the « Reichspost » blended traditional religious Jew-hatred with modern economic, social, and political anti-Semitism in its arguments against Jews. In addition, the newspaper distorted the history of religion and Christian-Jewish relations during the Middle-Ages to make a case for revoking Jewish emancipation. The « Reichspost » idealized the medieval ghettoization of Jews. Moreover, the newspaper downplayed the real extent of anti-Jewish violence during the Middle-Ages ; it claimed only a few Jews were burned to death and failed to recount countless Jews killed in pogroms, often due to religiously motivated violence. Yet, the « Reichspost » moderated its Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism by rejecting racial anti-Semitism and, in traditional fashion, leaving open to Jews the possibility of conversion.

Over the course of 2 days, in March 1894, the « Reichspost » invoked the medieval German Franciscan monk Berthold von Regensburg (aka : Berthold Lech who died in 1272) . Berthold made missionary trips to Switzerland, Swabia, Thuringia, Bavaria, Bohemia, Moravia, Austria and Hungary. The newspaper claimed that his sermons were well-received, and that up to 200,000 people could have listened to them. The « Reichspost » looked to Berthold for guidance on the current « burning Jewish Question » . (131) To do so, it used Göbel's edition of Berthold's sermons. (132)

The « Reichspost » quoted Berthold, a 13th Century Franciscan monk, on the « Jewish Question » because, the

newspaper claimed, Jews were neither better nor worse in its time than in Berthold's time ; Jews had always been « great sinners » (« große Sünder ») . (133) Berthold observed Jews as misers, usurers, businessmen, and tax collectors. He portrayed Jewish tax collectors as intermediaries between the State treasury (« Fiscus ») and its Christian victims, consequently driving Christians to Jewish usurers, which further victimized them. Berthold had stated the cycle led on occasion to « bloody Jew-baiting » (« Judenhetzen ») , and Christians to « always want to have war with the Jews » . (134)

The « Reichspost » demonstrated its view that Jewish women were immoral both in Berthold's time and contemporaneously. The newspaper claimed that in the late- 19th Century, there were comparatively more Jewish than Christian prostitutes. To prove its point, it quoted the « Archives Israélites de France » , a French Jewish periodical from 1857. The « Reichspost » then quoted Berthold to show it was the same in the 13th Century, when Jewish prostitutes wore in their hair recognizable « yellow ribbons » (« gelbes Gebände ») and plied their trade on the lane around the castle. (135)

As an expression of its economic, social, political anti-Semitism, and religiously motivated Jew-hatred, the « Reichspost » declared :

« The Jews are the sworn enemies of Christianity, (and) of Christians. »

And then, asked why Christians should tolerate them in a Christian State. (136) The newspaper quoted Berthold's 2 answers to this question :

« The 1st because they are witnesses, that our Lord was oppressed by them. And when a Christian man sees a Jew, he should be moved to prayer :“ Oh ”, he should think,“ You are the one from which our Lord Jesus-Christ was martyred, and suffered for our sins ! ” and the Christian people should thank God for their martyr when they see a Jew ; they should never forget their martyr, then He never forgets us also, and (Christians) should be warned of the Jews. The 2nd is : what of (the Jews) survives the Anti-Christ, they become before Judgment Day all to Christian people. » (137)

The « Reichspost » commented :

« So, the Jews are tolerated, protected as they are taken in ‘ peace ’. » (138)

As adherents to Catholic dogma, Berthold and the « Reichspost » believed Jews were « Christ-killers » , hence the line :

« You are the one from which our Lord Jesus-Christ was martyred, and suffered for our sins. »

Even so, Christians tolerated Jews as reminder to Christians of this evil act as well as a reminder to thank God for the martyred Lord Jesus-Christ. Furthermore, Berthold and the « Reichspost » believed :

« What of (the Jews) survives the Anti-Christ, they become before Judgment Day all to Christian people. »

This was a variation of the idea of Jews as the « Witness People » .

Beginning with Bishop Augustine of Hippo (354-430) in North Africa, Christian theologians developed the doctrine of « witness » . The doctrine was meant to explain the continued survival and existence of the Jewish people Centuries after the destruction of the 2nd Temple in Jerusalem, in 70 CE. Christian theologians saw continuities between Old Israel and New Israel. They argued that, because Jews continued to preserve the Old Testament, they bore witness to the truth of the New. Therefore, the doctrine of « witness » was meant to legitimize Christianity ; it provided a counterpoint to pagans who claimed Christianity was an invented religion. The doctrine of « witness » held that, upon witnessing the 2nd Coming of Christ, the Jews would recognize the truth of Christ and convert to Christianity, providing the ultimate testament to the truth of Christ as Messiah. (139)

Berthold argued that Jews and Christians should live together in peace, and that secular powers had a mandate to protect Jews and Christians from harming one another. He contended Christian education was necessary for Christians to recognize the enemies of Christianity and defend themselves against them. He made the case that :

« Because popes cannot be in every land, there are the patriarchs, cardinals, archbishops, other bishops, high-priests, abbots, and provosts (“ Pröpsten ”) , deans (“ Dechanten ”) , pastors, and under-pastors (“ Unterpfarren ”) given and awarded the power to protect the Christian people. » (140)

This important passage represented the view of the « Reichspost » that Catholic clergy, such as many on the « Reichspost » staff, needed to actively participate in the defense of Christians against enemies such as (allegedly) the Jews.

For Berthold, there were limits to toleration. He warned that when, « There are so many Jews that they want to gain from us the upper-hand, then one must fight them as heathens (“ Heiden ”) . » (141)

On treating Jews as « heathens » , the « Reichspost » quoted Franz Dingelstedt (who died in 1881) , a German poet, dramatist, and theatre manager, who said about the Jews :

« Go, lock them again in the old streets (the Jewish ghetto) , before they lock you in a Christian Quarter (“ Christenviertel ”) . » (142)

In addition, the « Reichspost » quoted from German Protestant anti-Semite Julius Langbehn's 1892 work, « The Rembrandt-German » :

« From a Friend of Truth :

At the present time, in which hundreds of thousands of German workers are slowly tortured to death and tens of thousands of German women and girls quickly handed misery as well as shame - this time has the least reason to weep for a few Jews burned in the Middle-Ages. This same Middle Ages was the most consistently healthy, brave and pious - though, here and there, still raw and violent. » (143)

The « Reichspost » glorified ghettoization and burning of Jews during the Middle-Ages, as defensive acts by Christians against a (perceived) Jewish threat. Such rhetoric demonstrated the newspaper was nostalgic for the Pre-Modern Era, wanted to undo Jewish emancipation, and rejected the Liberal values of equality and human rights. Moreover, the « Reichspost » proved selective in its use of history by citing Langbehn. Claiming only « a few Jews burned in the Middle-Ages » , Langbehn understated medieval violence against Jews. He disingenuously claimed the Middle-Ages was a wonderful period, only « here and there still raw and violent » .

A short catalogue of violence against Jews in Western and Central Europe, from the 11th to the 15th Century, discredits Langbehn's claims. During the 1st Crusade, in the late- 11th Century, a number of crusaders on their way through to the Rhine forcibly converted and killed Jews. While some bishops and other Christians sheltered Jews, the crusaders massacred Jews in the cities of Cologne, Mainz, Metz, Speyer, and Worms. From the 12th Century onward, « blood libel » accusations that Jews murdered Christians for their blood to bake « matzos » for Passover led to massacres of Jews in England, France, Germany, and Spain. In 1298, the Jews of Röttingen, Franconia were accused of desecrating the consecrated host, the communion bread used in Mass believed to have become the body of Jesus-Christ. Claiming divine inspiration, a minor nobleman named Rindfleisch assembled and led an army against the Jews of Röttingen, Rothenburg, Nuremburg, and elsewhere in Bavaria, Franconia, and neighboring Austria. The « Rindfleisch » massacres killed as many as 20,000 Jews. From 1336-1339, the « Armleder » , a band of peasants claiming divine inspiration, attacked about 120 Jewish communities in Alsace, Bavaria, and Swabia. Despite Christians who defended the Jews, the « Armleder » murdered thousands. From 1348-1350, throughout Central and Western Europe, mobs attacked and killed thousands of Jews accused of being « Christ-killers » , poisoning wells, causing the « Black Death » , « blood libels » , and usury. In one such instance, in 1349, with the approval of Emperor Charles IV (who reigned from 1346 to 1378) , the city magistrate and government of Nuremburg organized a mob that massacred thousands of Jews in the city. There were expulsions of Jews from England (1290) , France (1394) , and Spain (1492) . In Vienna, in 1421, charges of « Host » desecration led to more than 200 Jewish men and women being burned to death. Their children were spared, converted, and then sent to convents and monasteries to be raised. Any remaining Jews, in Vienna, were banned. (144)

Ironically, in « Jews and persecution of Christians » (« Juden-und Christenverfolgung ») , the « Reichspost » portrayed Jews as historic persecutors of Christians, rather than the other way around. The newspaper described Georg Rösels « Jews and the Persecution of Christians to the 1st Centuries of the Middle-Ages » (1893) , thus :

« In the current brochure, he seeks to show that the Jews were always the 1st and most zealous when it came to Christian persecution. Thus, have the Church Fathers already complained. When the Jews had power, they themselves killed (Christians) ; when they had no power, they sought to make themselves executioners subservient to the heathen world (“ suchten sie sich dem Henkerarm der Heidenwelt dienstbar zu machen ”) . (145)

In its recommendation of Rösels's work, the « Reichspost » demonstrated its conviction that Jews had been historic enemies of Christians and Christianity. The newspaper omitted that, between the 11th and 15th Centuries, Christians in Western and Central Europe had slaughtered tens of thousands of Jews in anti-Jewish riots. The « Reichspost » mis-used medieval religious history to strengthen its religious arguments against Jews. The newspaper idealized the violent Jew-hatred of the past, without admitting its true destructiveness. In addition, it mis-represented Jews as historically « the 1st and most zealous when it came to Christian persecution » .

The « Reichspost » justified and encouraged the participation of priests in Christian-Social and anti-Semitic movements. In an article about a political meeting in the 7th District (« Neubau ») , the newspaper approvingly quoted speaker G. R. Latschka :

« That we (Christian-Socials) stand in opposition against Liberalism, on the same ground as the popes and bishops. And, as we always meet the Jews in this struggle, anti-Semitism is justified and the priest forced to stand in the Christian-Social movement on the side of the people. » (146)

Simply put, the « Reichspost » exhorted priests to become involved in the Christian-Social movement, in order to help defend « the people » from the (perceived) excesses of Jews. Berthold had also argued church leaders had the power and authority to protect Christian people.

The « Reichspost » printed a series of sermons and articles about the Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Christ during Lent, Good Friday and Easter, which demonstrated its religious and / or economic arguments against Jews. The newspaper reprinted a sermon Father Heinrich Josef Maria Abel (147) delivered at Saint-Augustine's Church in Vienna, on March 16, 1894, 2 days before Palm Sunday. His sermon was on Jesus's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday and how people welcomed him, which enraged the Pharisees, members of an ancient Jewish sect. Jesus turned-out the bankers, money-changers, and traders from the temple, and incensed the Pharisee high-priest.

The Jews advocating for the bankers asked Jesus :

« Where from have you the power, (to) drive them out of the temple ? »

And Father Abel commented :

« In those days, as today, these Jews made business with the bankers. » (148)

This scene of Jews defending bankers was one of many Father Abel used to demonstrate the eternally negative characteristics of Jews.

Father Abel continued :

« On the next day, Monday, Jesus taught people in the temple to guard themselves against the scribes and the Pharisees. When Jesus did so, the Jewish High-Priest Caiaphas. »

According to Father Abel, thought :

« It would be better that Jesus die, than the political nation of the Jews perish by the Romans. However, the Lord God had also endorsed his words, in another sense : It is better that Jesus-Christ, alone, perishes than the poor people, than the workers. Better he than that we all perish, whether Catholic, or Protestant, or Jewish (because also, Jews are safe here) whether believing Catholics and Protestants, or unbelieving, whether Orthodox or Reform-Jew. So had God understood the word of Caiaphas. » (149)

For his contemporary audience, Father Abel conflated past and present. He made biblical references to a « political nation » of Jews, as well as Reform Jews and Protestants, none of which existed at the time. Father Abel then described the hiring of « the traitor Judas » , on Tuesday, and the imprisonment of Jesus on Thursday. Father Abel pronounced the « terrorism of the Jews against the people began at this time » . (150) By implication, it continued to the present. With Jesus before Pilate, Father Abel proclaimed : the scribes and Pharisees ran about the crowd calling for the crucifixion of Jesus, for the people to vote for the freedom of the murderer Barabbas instead. Then, Father Abel made a number of connections between Jewish « terrorism » , past and present. Concerning what he termed the « terrorism of the phrase » , which included labels such as « clerical » and « ultramontane » against Catholics, Father Abel declared :

« We are not subject to the terrorism of the slogans of the phrase ! » (151)

Regarding what he termed the « terrorism of the press » , Father Abel declared the « Divine Savior Jesus-Christ » had said :

« The apostate Catholic, the apostate Christian is twofold worse than the Jew. Therefore, Christian men, again (we) request : Support the Christian Press ! » (152)

Father Abel, here, equated Christians abandoning the « Christian Press » and turning to the « Jew-Press » with apostasy. With regard to « terrorism of the majority » (in Father Abel's time, the Liberals) , Father Abel stated that :

« Not the majority makes truth ; when only few are for it, this can also be something true. »

And he narrated how only Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, in the Sanhedrin, took the (good) word for him (for Jesus) , Christ was done in with the whole Sanhedrin, with the majority of the Jewish people, who wander (« irrt ») around now the world-over as living witness (« lebender Zeuge ») , that our Lord Jesus-Christ is truly God. (153)

Father Abel, following in the tradition of the Church Fathers, believed the Jews to be both « Christ killers » and « Witness People » . In « Easter » , a front-page article, the « Reichspost » explicitly connected the Jews' (alleged)

crucifixion of Christ and the actions of present day Jews. They (the Jews) have crucified him. He was laid in a grave and a heavy stone sealed the tomb. And watchmen watched over the grave. So did the Jews more than 1,800 years ago, and the enemies of Christ and of Christianity, the enemies of the Christian people have through 1,800 years followed this example. The Christian people's spirit was scourged with scorn and ridicule even in last Century, and every revolution was, at the same time, a new crucifixion of Christ and his people. (154) The « Reichspost » compared Christ's corpse to Christian consciousness (« christliche Bewußtsein ») and the watchmen to Jewish newspapers and magazines. Christ was resurrected after 3 days, the stone rolled away, and the watchmen fell-down blinded by the light. The « Reichspost » commented :

« Now, in the 19th Century, the Christian people have awakened and thrown-off their death sleep and now stand mighty before the blinded watchmen. » (155)

The newspaper warned its readers that the Jews still brandished their weapons against the « life force » of the people : Christianity. From present day, Judases and Pharisees, « again drool scorn and ridicule, again roll the silver coins, and again (they) will betray and sell Christ and his people, but the effort shall be vain, because Christianity shall overcome all » . (156) The article called for Christian-Social reform, « re-Christianization » of public life, and « awakening of Christian spirit » , in the people. (157)

On April 13, 1897, the « Reichspost » reprinted another sermon by Father Abel at Saint-Augustine's Church, in Vienna, on the Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Christ. At its conclusion, Father Abel exhorted his audience to « return to practical Christianity » . (158) The recommendations for the observance of « practical Christianity » were specific and concrete, and reflected the desire for a « re-Christianization » of public life and re-awakening of Christian spirit. Father Abel recommended observance of the Easter holiday and rest on Sundays, « avoidance of non-Christians » , supporting the Christian-Press, and joining Catholic clubs. He exhorted civil servants to attend the « Sankt-Vincenz » Conference, as they were not permitted to join political clubs. He urged Catholic youths to join Catholic worker's clubs and attend Catholic schools. He also recommended that Catholics avoid non-Christians, that is, Jews. (159)

In its Sunday Supplement, the « Reichspost » published August Schiffmacher's poem, « Easter Solace » (« Ostertröst ») . The 3 stanza poem encapsulated « Reichspost » views of Jews both as « Christ killers » and eternal enemies of Christianity and Christians :

Sie haben den Heiland getödtet
In ihrer blinden Wuth
Da ist er siegend erstanden
In gold'ner Morgengluth
Nun möchten sie seine Lehre
Vernichten und entweih'n,
Und seine treue Heerde
In alle Winde zerstreu'n.
Doch laßt sie nur toben und wüthen,

Sie werden wie Dunst vergeh'n,
Und immer und immer wieder
Wird Christus aufersteh'n.

They (Jews) have killed the Saviour
In their blind fury,
Because he is risen victorious
In the golden glow of morning.
Now they want to
Destroy and desecrate his teaching,
And scatter to all the winds
His faithful flock.
But just let them rant and rage,
They will vanish like mist,
And time and time again
Christ will be resurrected. (160)

The title of the poem, « Easter Solace » , signified that the poet wished to comfort Christians saddened by Jews' (alleged) Crucifixion of Christ and put them at ease. Even though Jews (purportedly) continued to attack Christ and Christianity, they did so in vain :

« They (Jews) will vanish like mist, / And time and time again / Christ will be resurrected. »

The « Reichspost » directed its hatred not only at the Jews, but also at Judaism itself. In « Rabbinical Wisdom » , the « Reichspost » responded to claims by the « Jüdische Chronik » (Jewish Chronicle) , which the « Reichspost » claimed Bohemian rabbis published. The « Jüdische Chronik » described Jews as the people of God with a « world-historical calling » to develop Judaism into a « world religion » . (161) The « Reichspost » labeled such claims « arrogance » and responded that :

« Judaism has lost for 1,800 years temple, altar and sacrifice, these most important features of its confession, as today's Judaism split completely with Talmudism and modern Reform Judaism actually stands on the positions of atheism and materialism. Why now did the Jew-Press busy itself with such rabbinical wisdom ? » (162)

The « Reichspost » rejected claims by the « Jüdische Chronik » that Judaism was meant to be a « world religion » . Instead, the « Reichspost » asserted Judaism had lost credibility after the Romans destroyed the 2nd Temple in Jerusalem, in 70 CE. The « Reichspost » also took a swipe at Reform Judaism, declaring how its split from « Talmudism » reflected its « atheism and materialism » . These ideologies were anathema to the « re-Christianization » of public life.

The « Reichspost » attacked Jewish religious texts as well. Berthold von Regensburg, the 13th Century German

Franciscan monk had insisted :

« The Old Testament is the night, the New Testament is the day. » (163)

Berthold also inveighed against the Talmud and declared it a heretical text. (164)

The « Reichspost » attacked Joseph Caro's 16th Century « Schulchan Aruch » (Code of Jewish Law) more than any other Jewish text. Indeed, it saw the « Schulchan Aruch » as the text Jews used to justify (alleged) economic exploitation of Christians. (165) The « Reichspost » had received reports of « Talmud Torah Schools » , Jewish supplementary schools that provided basic Hebrew and Bible instruction, educating pupils with the « Schulchan Aruch » . In response, the « Reichspost » (falsely) claimed the Grand Duchy of Baden had banned the « Schulchan Aruch » for promoting Jews' immoral acts against « Akum » (as previously noted, the « Reichspost » translated « Akum » as Christian for the sake of its anti-Semitic argumentation, but « Akum » actually means « star worshipper ») . The « Reichspost » noted that there was hardly a school in Vienna where the « Schulchan Aruch » was in use, except perhaps the Talmud Torah School, in the « Leopoldstadt » . The « Reichspost » then requested that the appropriate authorities conduct an inquiry concerning the use of the « Schulchan Aruch » at this school as well as the « hundreds of Talmud Torah Schools » , in Galicia and Bukovina. The « Reichspost » claimed the « Schulchan Aruch » compared « Akum » to dogs. The newspaper challenged defenders of the « Schulchan Aruch » who claimed that « Akum » meant only « star worshippers » (« Sternanbeter ») . While this translation could perhaps apply to the Talmud, to a certain extent, surely it did not to the 16th Century « Schulchan Aruch » . The « Reichspost » declared :

« About the meaning of the word “ Akum ” in the Talmud, (one) can argue ; in the “ Schulchan Aruch ”, “ Akum ” means Christians and only Christians because, at that time, heathens (“ Heiden ”, except the Moslems) , were no longer anywhere in Europe. We, therefore, want the high Imperial and Royal Ministry of Education to act the way Karlsruhe behaved. Ban from the schools a book with dubious morality, and (which) excused or justified most vicious actions if committed against Christians ! When a catechism or any other text book remotely contained an anti-Semitic passage, immediately the relevant text book would be suppressed ! Why should the “ Schulchan Aruch ” enjoy such exceptional preferences ? » (166)

In « Again, the “ Schulchan Aruch ” » , the « Reichspost » reported the « Schulchan Aruch » was found in not one, but 2 schools in Baden, despite the (falsely alleged) ban. The newspaper assumed there would be more elsewhere, considering there were 27,000 Jews in Baden and more than 1.5 million Christians, and in Austria 1.25 million Jews and 24 million (sic) Christians. The « Reichspost » demanded to know where else in Austria this « immoral » book was being used. (167) It is probable the newspaper hated the « Schulchan Aruch » so much because it fit its view that Jews were excessively legalistic.

The « Reichspost » used specious arguments about the « Schulchan Aruch » to condemn the Jews. Its arguments hinged entirely on a false definition of « Akum » . In addition, the newspaper failed to consider that by the late-19th Century most Jews did not abide by the « Schulchan Aruch » . Moreover, the « Reichspost » neglected a significant modernized « Schulchan Aruch » that further simplified « Torah knowledge » and made it applicable to

everyday life. In 1864, in Uzhorod, Hungary, Rabbi Schlomo Ganzfried published his « Kitzur Schulchan Aruch » , an abridgement and update of Joseph Caro's 16th Century « Schulchan Aruch » . It disproved « Reichspost » claims that the « Schulchan Aruch » encouraged immoral business practices. In « Chapter 62 : Commerce and Trade » , the « Kitzur Schulchan Aruch » directed Jewish businessmen to deal honestly with both Jews and Gentiles. A Jew who cheated or deceived a Jew or Gentile when purchasing or selling goods, hiring or contracting labor, or exchanging currency violated Torah prohibitions. The « Kitzur Schulchan Aruch » recommended punishments for such violations ranging from beatings and fines, to being cursed in Court. **(168)**

Despite its intense hostility to Jews, the « Reichspost » nevertheless rejected racial anti-Semitism because it compromised the efficacy of baptism, which as good Catholics, the newspaper's editors upheld. A baptism could allow a person of any faith or nationality to wash away his or her sins (even the « sin » of being Jewish) and become Christian. Racial anti-Semites such as Georg Ritter von Schönerer believed in the primacy of biological origins. For them, Jews could not become Christians through baptism and a baptized Jew was still a Jew. On the other hand, the « Reichspost » acknowledged that Jews could become Christians through baptism.

On numerous occasions the « Reichspost » explicitly rejected racial anti-Semitism. In « Very true ! » (« Sehr Wahr ! ») , the newspaper declared :

« Certainly in love and unity may we already live with the Jews - but what is anti-Semitism other than a defensive war ? Christian anti-Semitism is not founded on religion (and race) hatred. » **(169)**

In the front-page article « Anti-Semitic and Christian-Social » , the « Reichspost » declared :

« Racial-anti-Semitism is un-Christian and unacceptable. » **(170)**

To emphasize the efficacy of baptism, in « Anti-Semitic and Christian-Social » the « Reichspost » proclaimed :

« Only Christian anti-Semitism has a reasonable content, moral efficacy and duration. » **(171)**

The newspaper justified this because, « Christian anti-Semitism does not forget that the Jews are human beings does not deny them equality after genuine acceptance of baptism and of the Christian faith only fights in the Orientals (Jews) the degeneracy of one to us foreign Semitic culture and against their attacks seeks to effectively protect the Christian state and social order. » **(172)**

The « Reichspost » criticized Martin Luther (1483-1546) , the Protestant Reformer, for warning against attempts to baptize Jews (while Luther believed in the efficacy of baptism, he made this warning because of the difficulty he had trying to convert Jews) . The newspaper quoted Luther's work « On the Jews and Their Lies » , in which Luther warned « German Christians » « not to convert the Jews, which is as impossible as to teach the devil » . **(173)** The « Reichspost » declared :

« Everyone has a right to it (baptism) , if they desire it honestly, and so too the Jew » . (174)

Along with State patriotism, dynastic loyalty, aspects of « positive » Christianity, and refraining from calls to physically attack Jews, the importance of the « Reichspost » 's rejection of racial anti-Semitism and allowing Jews to convert cannot be over-stated. These features of Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism differentiated the « Reichspost » from racial and radical anti-Semites of its time and of later decades. (175)

Conclusion

In its early years, January 1894 to April 1897, the « Reichspost » used economic, social, and political anti-Semitism, religiously motivated Jew-hatred, and distorted history to call for the « re-Christianization » and « de-Jewification » of public life. As demonstrated by close textual analysis, the newspaper utilized a wide-range of positive depictions of Christians, Christianity, and Christian clergy juxtaposed against negative depictions of Jews and Judaism. Moreover, the « Reichspost » proposed and / or supported anti-Jewish legislation. Nevertheless, the newspaper moderated its views by keeping open to Jews the possibility of conversion to Christianity, rejecting racial anti-Semitism, professing State patriotism and dynastic loyalty, and the rule of law. The « Reichspost » justified expulsion and violence against Jews past and present, and demonstrated bias in its reporting of contemporary Christian and Jewish violence in Vienna. However, the newspaper recognized when to draw the line and did not exhort its readers to pursue such « self-help » against the Jews.

So, what do we learn about anti-Semitism in Vienna ? Anti-Semitism in Vienna of the « Reichspost » variety, Catholic and Christian-Social, was multi-faceted. Moreover, traditional religious Jew-hatred and modern anti-Semitism co-existed, side by side. More than 4 decades after writing « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism » , in 2005, Peter Pulzer published an article entitled « 3rd Thoughts on German and Austrian Anti-Semitism » . In this article, Pulzer detailed the historiography of German and Austrian anti-Semitism and noted that historians have long debated « the ever-recurring question of continuity between the “ traditional ” and “ modern ” forms of Jew-hatred » . (176) The « Reichspost » was founded and run by traditional Catholic clergy and Catholic laymen associated with the Christian-Socials in modern Vienna, on the cusp of the 20th Century. For the « Reichspost » , traditional religiously motivated Jew-hatred and modern anti-Semitism went hand in hand. The newspaper did not hide this fact. In « The Wolf in Sheepskin » (« Der Wolf im Schafspelz ») , the « Reichspost » declared :

« It was not dead, the old Jew hatred, it had changed names and is now called : anti-Semitism and has become modern. » (177)

For economic, social, political, and religious ends, the « Reichspost » recognized and demonstrated the continuity between traditional Jew hatred and modern anti-Semitism in Vienna, at the turn of the 20th Century.

Notes

(I) All references to the « Reichspost » are to the main (morning) editions, unless otherwise indicated. All translations

are the author's unless otherwise indicated. The Austrian National Library has digitized the « Reichspost » newspapers from 1894 to 1938, which are found at : <http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgicontent/anno?aid=rpt>.

(2) « Reichspost » (17 May 1895) ; pages 1-2.

(3) Ibid. According to Daniel Vyleta, anti-Semitic labels such as « Jew-Press » signified : « The anti-Semites' dismissal of these papers as “ Judenzeitungen ”, (it) presumes, a priori, that a journalist's Judaism would fully determine his language. » . Daniel Vyleta. « Crime, Jews and News : Vienna (1895-1914) » , Berghahn Books, New York (2007) ; page 129.

(4) In Vienna, from the early to mid 1890's, the anti-Semitic Parties scored successive victories against the Liberals. By 1895, they gained majority representation in the City Council (« Gemeinderat ») . Karl Lueger was nominated mayor of Vienna several times, thereafter. However, Emperor Franz-Josef (who reigned from 1848 to 1916) , the Austrian government, bureaucracy, and hierarchy, resisted Lueger's appointment. Franz-Josef, who was unsympathetic to anti-Semitism, used the Imperial veto 4 times, against Lueger. It was not until April 8, 1897, that Franz-Josef relented and permitted Lueger to become mayor of Vienna. Wolfgang Häusler. « Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Das österreichische Judentum des bürgerlichen Zeitalters (1782-1918) » , in : « Das österreichische Judentum : Voraussetzungen und Geschichte » , edited by Nikolaus Vielmetti, « Jugend und Volk » , Vienna (1974) ; pages 117-118. Robert S. Wistrich. « The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz-Joseph » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (1989) ; page 179.

(5) Peter Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria » , 2nd edition, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (1988) .

(6) Peter Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism » ; page 200.

(7) John W. Boyer. « Political Radicalism in Late-Imperial Vienna : Origins of the Christian-Social Movement (1848-1897) » , The University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1981) .

(8) John W. Boyer. « Political Radicalism » ; page 51.

(9) Steven Beller. « Vienna and the Jews (1867-1938) : a Cultural History » , Cambridge University Press, New York (1989) ; page 193.

(10) Steven Beller. « A Concise History of Austria » , Cambridge University Press, New York (2006) ; page 157.

(11) Hellmut Andics. « Der ewige Jude : Ursachen und Geschichte des Antisemitismus » , Verlag Fritz Molden, Vienna (1965) ; pages 240-241.

(12) Wolfgang Häusler. « Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Das österreichische Judentum des bürgerlichen

Zeitalters (1782-1918) » , in : « Das österreichische Judentum : Voraussetzungen und Geschichte » , edited by Nikolaus Vielmetti, « Jugend und Volk » , Vienna (1974) ; pages 109, 115-118.

(13) Richard S. Geehr. « Karl Lueger : Mayor of “ Fin-de-Siècle ” Vienna » , Wayne State University Press, Detroit (1990) ; page 85. Daniel Vyleta characterized the « Deutsches Volksblatt » as a « Radically and dedicatedly anti-Semitic paper » , both « German-nationalist and racist » , and the « Vaterland » as « The monarchy’s leading Catholic who opposed extreme nationalism » . « Competed with the “ Reichspost ” for readers, though less populist in nature. » Vyleta. « Crime, Jews, and News » ; page 75. Reinhold Knoll stated that the « Vaterland » forfeited its position as the representative Catholic newspaper to the « Reichspost » . Reinhold Knoll. « Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei : Ihre Früh-und Entwicklungsgeschichte bis zu den Reichsratswahlen (1907) » , Böhlau Verlag, Vienna (1973) ; page 178.

(14) John W. Boyer. « Political Radicalism » ; pages 70, 140, 339-340. Boyer. « Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna : Christian-Socialism in Power (1897-1918) » , The University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1995) ; pages 37-39, 169, 304.

(15) « Reichspost » (29 December 1894) ; page 1.

(16) Boyer. « Culture and Political Crisis » ; page 318.

(17) Ibid. ; page 41. Wilhelm Kosch. « Opitz, Ambros » , in : « Biographisches Staatshandbuch : Lexicon der Politik, Presse und Publizistik, Fortgeführt von Eugen Kuri, Zweiter Band » , A. Francke AG Verlag, Bern and Munich (1963) ; page 944. Elisabeth Lebensaft. « Opitz, Ambros (1846-1907) , Journalist, Verleger und Politiker » , in : « Österreichisches Biographisches Lexicon (1815-1950) » , « Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften » , Vienna (2003-2011) ; pages 233-234 - accessed March 23, 2013 :

http://www.biographien.ac.at/oebl/oebl_0/Opitz_Ambros_1846_1907.xml?frames=yes.

(18) Reinhold Knoll. « Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei » ; page 318.

(19) Wilhelm Kosch. « Funder, Friedrich » , in : « Biographisches Staatshandbuch » , I. Band ; page 367. Kurt Skalnik. « Funder, Friedrich » , in : « Neue Deutsche Biographie » , 5. Band, « Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften » , Munich (1961) ; page 730 - accessed March 23, 2013 :

<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118536869.html>.

(20) Boyer. « Political Radicalism » ; pages 339-340.

(21) « Reichspost » (17 April 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(22) « Reichspost » (4 March 1894) ; page 4.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid.

(25) For additional examples of Jews seen as usurers and / or speculators, see : « Reichspost » (1 February 1894) ; page 1 - (May 1894) ; page 3 - (10 May 1894) ; page 4 - (26 July 1895) ; page 5 - (2 April 1897) ; page 3.

(26) « Reichspost » (25 February 1894) ; page 9.

(27) For additional examples of Jews seen as peddlers, see : « Reichspost » , (1 May 1894) ; page 3 - (22 July 1894) ; page 1 - (10 August 1894) ; page 5 - (6 March 1895) ; page 4 - (7 March 1895) ; page 4 - (8 March 1895) ; page 6 - (9 March 1895) ; page 4 - (12 March 1895) ; page 5 - (17 December 1895) ; page 5.

(28) « Reichspost » (24 September 1896) ; page 5.

(29) « Reichspost » (5 June 1894) ; page 4.

(30) « Reichspost » (6 January 1895) ; page 6.

(31) « Reichspost » (« Abendblatt ») , (3 March 1896) ; page 3.

(32) « Reichspost » (« Abendblatt ») , (5 March 1896) ; page 4.

(33) « Reichspost » (18 July 1895) ; page 3.

(34) « Reichspost » (30 October 1895) ; page 6.

(35) Ibid.

(36) « Reichspost » (13 August 1896) ; page 10.

(37) Ibid.

(38) « Reichspost » (12 Januar 1895) ; page 5.

(39) Ibid.

(40) « Reichspost » (30 January 1895) ; pages 5-6.

(41) Ibid. The « Reichspost » documented additional Münzer defamation lawsuits in 2 articles entitled « Jews among

themselves » (« Juden unter sich ») on 10 June 1896 (page 7) ; and on 11 June 1896 (page 9) .

(42) For additional examples of Jews depicted as frauds / swindlers in business and banking, see : « Reichspost » (26 January 1894) ; page 6 - (30 January 1894) ; page 3 - (10 February 1894) ; page 6 - (18 January 1895) ; page 5 - (6 May 1896) ; page 3.

(43) « Reichspost » (17 April 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(44) John W. Bowker. « Akum » , in : « The Concise Oxford Dictionary of World Religions » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (1997) , accessed March 22, 2013 : <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/10101-Akum.html>.

(45) « Reichspost » (17 April 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(46) « Reichspost » (10 May 1894) ; page 4.

(47) Ibid.

(48) Ibid. For additional examples of the « Reichspost » and Christian-Social motto « Buy only from Christians ! » being used, see : « Reichspost » (22 March 1894) ; page 5 - (2 May 1894) ; page 1. For an example of « Reichspost » calls for boycotts against the « Jew-Press » motivated by religious Jew-hatred and economic anti-Semitism, see : « Reichspost » (13 March 1897) ; page 4.

(49) « Reichspost » (23 December 1894) ; page 12.

(50) « Reichspost » (27 October 1895) ; page 6.

(51) « Reichspost » (31 May 1894) ; page 5.

(52) « Reichspost » (22 August 1895) ; page 6.

(53) Mauschel was the western Yiddish of Bohemia and Moravia imitated by anti-Semites. Vyleta. « Crime, Jews, and News » ; page 120.

(54) « Reichspost » (31 March 1894) ; page 10.

(55) « Reichspost » (20 December 1896) ; page 12.

(56) Jews created their own neighborhoods in Vienna because they desired to live among co-religionists. This residential behavior increased social contact and opportunities to form personal relationships between Jews, limited contacts with non-Jews, and re-inforced Jewish identity. Jews preferred residence among Jews more than among non-Jews even of

their same class or from the same regions of Austria-Hungary. The District with the greatest proportion of Jewish residents was the « Leopoldstadt » ; in 1890, 31 % of residents were Jewish and, in 1900, 36.4 % . Marsha L. Rozenblit. « The Jews of Vienna (1867-1914) : Assimilation and Identity » , State University of New York Press, Albany, New York (1983) ; pages 74-94.

(57) « Reichspost » (2 October 1894) ; page 6.

(58) « Reichspost » (7 September 1895) ; page 5.

(59) Ibid.

(60) « Reichspost » (4 October 1895) ; page 6.

(61) « Reichspost » (8 May 1896) ; page 5.

(62) Ibid.

(63) Ibid.

(64) Ibid.

(65) « Reichspost » (17 December 1895) ; page 5.

(66) Studies demonstrated that the proportion of Jewish prostitutes in Buenos Aires brothels was as high as 90 % . See : Vyleta. « Crime Jews and News » ; pages 57-58, 68. For more information on « White Slavery » and Jewish efforts to combat it, see : Marion Kaplan. « The Jewish Feminist Movement in Germany : The Campaigns of the Jüdischer Frauenbund (1904-1938) » , Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut (1979) .

(67) See, also : the « Reichspost » articles « White Slaver » (« Mädchenhändler ») (28 June 1894) ; page 6 - and « White Slavery » (« Mädchenhandel ») (11 January 1896) ; page 4.

(68) « Reichspost » (22 August 1895) ; page 6.

(69) Ibid.

(70) For another example of an alleged deceitful Jewish officer in the military, see : « Reichspost » (5 April 1895) ; page 5.

(71) « Reichspost » (18 August 1894) ; page 5.

(72) « Reichspost » (21 September 1894) ; page 6.

(73) Ibid.

(74) « Reichspost » (12 November 1895) ; page 6.

(75) « Reichspost » (10 July 1896) ; page 10.

(76) « Reichspost » (14 March 1897) ; page 4.

(77) « Reichspost » (21 March 1897) ; pages 1-2.

(78) « Reichspost » (26 September 1896) ; page 10.

(79) « Reichspost » (22 May 1894) ; page 5.

(80) « Reichspost » (27 March 1897) ; pages 1-2.

(81) Ibid.

(82) Steven Beller. « Vienna and the Jews » ; pages 196-197.

(83) Robert S. Wistrich noted : « In spite of its vulgarity, Christian-Social anti-Semitism did not generate any pogroms in Vienna. It remained within the limits of a conciliatory, supra-national Habsburg State with a political culture based on respect for the law and mutual accommodation between ethnic groups. » .Wistrich. « The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz-Joseph » ; pages 236-237.

(84) « Reichspost » (4 January 1894) ; page 2.

(85) Leopold Kunschak (1871-1953) , founder of the « Christian Workers Movement » (« christlichen Arbeiterbewegung ») , see : Reinhold Knoll. « Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei » ; page 311.

(86) Ibid.

(87) « Reichspost » (7 February 1894) ; page 3.

(88) Ibid.

(89) « Reichspost » (13 February 1894) ; page 3. Peter Pulzer noted : « The prominence of Jews in the Social-Democratic leadership provided ammunition for both anti-Semitism and anti-Socialism » , and furthermore : « Social

Democratic ideology was determined to a considerable extent by Jewish influence » . Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism » ; page 252.

(90) « In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground ; for out of it wast thou taken : for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. » Genesis 3:19, King James Version.

(91) « Reichspost » (16 January 1894) ; page 3.

(92) « Reichspost » (13 January 1894) ; page 6. On the « Sin of the Calf » , see : Exodus :24.

(93) Ibid.

(94) « Reichspost » (27 January 1894) ; pages 1-2. Peter Pulzer summarized the « institutional aspects » of « 19th Century European Liberalism as parliamentary government, the rule of law, the absence of legally established class privileges, a “ laissez-faire ” economy, and freedom of speech and association » . Moreover, Liberalism was « a set of moral qualities, those of rationalism, humanism, and (to give it its German context) “ Aufklärung ” » . The anti-Semites combated « the institutions of Liberalism, its whole moral system, and its whole concept of human existence » . Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism » ; pages 29-30.

(95) « Reichspost » (27 January 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(96) « Reichspost » (28 March 1894) ; page 2.

(97) Ibid.

(98) « Reichspost » (1 January 1896) ; pages 2-3.

(99) « Reichspost » (6 March 1897) ; page 5.

(100) For more information on the 5th Curia and the general elections of March 1897, see : Boyer. « Political Radicalism » ; pages 406-407, 529.

(101) « Reichspost » (9 March 1897) ; page 1.

(102) Ibid.

(103) Ibid.

(104) « Reichspost » (11 March 1897) ; pages 1-3.

(105) « Reichspost » (11 March 1897) ; page 1.

(106) « Reichspost » (24 March 1897) ; pages 3-4.

(107) Ibid.

(108) « Reichspost » (4 December 1895) ; page 6.

(109) Ibid.

(110) « Reichspost » (30 August 1896) ; page 6.

(111) « Reichspost » (4 October 1896) ; page 10.

(112) « Reichspost » (27 March 1897) ; page 4.

(113) Peter Pulzer detailed how in Vienna Jews predominated in finance, medicine, journalism, law, academic professions, intelligentsia, cultural achievements and business. He stated : « There is no doubt that Jews were “ over-represented ” (if one accepts such a concept) in the educated classes and the professions » . Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism » ; page 11.

(114) « Reichspost » (16 December 1895) ; page 3.

(115) « Reichspost » (3 July 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(116) Ibid.

(117) « Reichspost » (12 April 1894) ; page 1.

(118) « Reichspost » (23 April 1896) ; page 3.

(119) « Reichspost » (16 September 1894) ; page 2.

(120) Ibid. Grand Vizier Kara Mustapha led the Ottoman army that besieged Vienna from July 4 to September 12, 1683. The people of Vienna defended the city until a rescue army of Duke Charles V of Lorraine, King Jan Sobieski of Poland, and Prince Eugene of Savoy defeated the Turks and lifted the siege. Peter Csendes. « Historical Dictionary of Vienna » , The Scarecrow Press, Inc. , Lanham, Maryland (1999) ; pages 200, 209.

(121) Bruce F. Pauley. « From Prejudice to Persecution : A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism » , The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1992) ; pages 15-16.

(122) « Reichspost » (23 April 1896) ; page 3.

(123) Arno Parik. « Prague » , translated from Czech by Stephen Hattersley, in : « The YIVO Encyclopædia of Jews in Eastern Europe » , YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, accessed May 9, 2013 : <http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Prague>. Pauley. « From Prejudice to Persecution » ; pages 16-17.

(124) « Reichspost » (21 January 1896) ; page 3.

(125) Jacob Katz. « Out of the Ghetto : The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation (1770-1870) » , Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York (1998) ; pages 162-164. Pauley. « From Prejudice to Persecution » ; pages 17-18.

(126) « Reichspost » (14 August 1894) ; page 2. « Austriacus » in his remark (as it is reported) and the « Reichspost » in its response failed to make an important distinction between the Pan-German and Christian-Social anti-Semites. Pan-German anti-Semites would quite possibly « write anti-Austrianness on their banner » , while the Christian-Social anti-Semites, State-patriots and loyal to the dynasty, would not.

(127) « Reichspost » (14 August 1894) ; page 2.

(128) Ibid.

(129) Häusler. « Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus » ; pages 97-103. William O. McCagg, Junior. « A History of Habsburg Jews (1670-1918) » , University Press, Indianapolis, Indiana (1989) ; pages 83-101. Pauley. « From Prejudice to Persecution » ; pages 20-21.

(130) « Reichspost » (10 March 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(131) « Reichspost » (9 March 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(132) The « Reichspost » cited Göbel : « Franciscan missionary sermons of Berthold von Regensburg » . Foreword by A. Stolz, 3rd enlarged and revised edition, Regensburg (1873) (« Missionspredigten des Franciskaner Berthold von Regensburg, mit einem Vorwort von A. Stolz, dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Regensburg 1873 ») .

(133) Ibid.

(134) Ibid.

(135) « Reichspost » (10 March 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(136) Ibid. Note that the « Reichspost » considered Austria a Christian State.

(137) Ibid.

(138) Ibid.

(139) Mark R. Cohen. « Under Crescent and Cross : The Jews in the Middle-Ages » Princeton University Press, (Princeton (1994) ; pages 20-21, 139.

(140) « Reichspost » (10 March 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(141) Ibid.

(142) Ibid.

(143) Ibid.

(144) Leonard B. Glick. « Abraham's Heirs : Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe » , Syracuse University Press, New York (1999) ; pages 258-259, 268, 273. Lynn Hunt et al. « The Making of the West : Peoples and Cultures, A Concise History » Bedford / Saint-Martin's, New York (2003) ; pages 358-360, 450-452.

(145) « Reichspost » (13 December 1894) ; page 3.

(146) « Reichspost » (21 April 1894) ; page 5.

(147) Father Abel was the founder of the Marian Congregation in Vienna and the organizer of the pilgrimages to Mariazell. See : Reinhold Knoll. « Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei » ; page 305.

(148) « Reichspost » (17 March 1894) ; pages 4-5.

(149) Ibid.

(150) Ibid.

(151) Ibid.

(152) Ibid.

(153) Ibid.

(154) « Reichspost » (25 March 1894) ; page 1.

(155) Ibid.

(156) Ibid.

(157) Ibid.

(158) « Reichspost » (13 April 1897) ; page 6.

(159) Ibid.

(160) « Sonntags-Beilage. Illustriertes Unterhaltungsblatt der “ Reichspost ” » (18 April 1897) ; page 121.

(161) « Reichspost » (29 July 1896) ; page 7.

(162) Ibid.

(163) « Reichspost » (10 March 1894) ; pages 1-2.

(164) Ibid.

(165) See, also : References to the « Schulchan Aruch » , in the MA Thesis section on the « Use of Economic Anti-Semitism » .

(166) « Reichspost » (21 July 1894) ; page 1.

(167) « Reichspost » (24 July 1894) ; pages 2-3.

(168) Shlomo Ganzfried. « “ Kitzur Schulchan Oruch ” : The Classic Guide to the Everyday Observance of Jewish Law » , translated by Eliyahu Touger, Moznaim Publishing Corporation, New York (1991) ; pages xvii-xix, 265-270.

(169) « Reichspost » (2 July 1894) ; page 2.

(170) « Reichspost » (25 July 1896) ; pages 1-2.

(171) Ibid.

(172) Ibid.

(173) Ibid.

(174) Ibid.

(175) This distinction, though important, is not a justification of the vulgar hydra-headed anti-Semitism and Jew-hatred of the « Reichspost » .

(176) Peter Pulzer. « 3rd Thoughts on German and Austrian Anti-Semitism » , « Modern Jewish Studies » , Volume 4, No. 2 (July 2005) ; page 140.

(177) « Reichspost » (28 March 1894) ; page 2.

Bibliography

1. Newspapers « Reichspost » , Vienna (1894-1897) , « Sonntags-Beilage » , « Illustriertes Unterhaltungsblatt der Reichspost » , Vienna (1897) .

2. Secondary Sources Andics, Hellmut. « Der ewige Jude : Ursachen und Geschichte des Antisemitismus » , Verlag Fritz Molden, Vienna (1965) .

Steven Beller. « A Concise History of Austria » , Cambridge University Press, New York (2006) .

Steven Beller. « Vienna and the Jews (1867-1938) : a Cultural History » , Cambridge University Press, New York (1989) .

John W. Boyer. « Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna : Christian-Socialism in Power (1897-1918) » , The University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1995) .

John W. Boyer. « Political Radicalism in Late-Imperial Vienna : Origins of the Christian-Social Movement (1848-1897) » , The University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1981) .

Mark R. Cohen. « Under Crescent and Cross : The Jews in the Middle-Ages » , Princeton University Press, Princeton (1994) .

Peter Csendes. « Historical Dictionary of Vienna » , The Scarecrow Press, Inc. , Lanham, Maryland (1999) .

Peter Ganzfried. « “ Shlomo. Kitzur Schulchan Oruch ” : The Classic Guide to the Everyday Observance of Jewish Law » , translated by Eliyahu Touger, Moznaim Publishing Corporation, New York (1991) .

Richard S. Geehr. « Karl Lueger : Mayor of “ Fin-de-Siècle ” Vienna » , Wayne State University Press, Detroit (1990) .

Leonard B. Glick. « Abraham's Heirs : Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe » , Syracuse University Press, New York (1999) .

Wolfgang Häusler. « Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Das österreichische Judentum des bürgerlichen Zeitalters (1782-1918) » , In : « Das österreichische Judentum : Voraussetzungen und Geschichte » , edited by Nikolaus Vielmetti, « Jugend und Volk » , Vienna (1974) ; pages 83-140.

Lynn Hunt, Thomas R. Martin, Barbara H. Rosenwein, R. Po-Chia Hsia, and Bonnie G. Smith. « The Making of the West : Peoples and Cultures, A Concise History » , Bedford / Saint-Martin's, New York (2003) .

Jacob Katz. « Out of the Ghetto : The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation (1770-1870) » , Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York (1998) .

Reinhold Knoll. « Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei : Ihre Früh-und Entwicklungsgeschichte bis zu den Reichsratswahlen (1907) » , Böhlau Verlag, Vienna (1973) .

William O. McCagg, Junior. « A History of Habsburg Jews (1670-1918) » , Indiana University Press, Bloomington (1989) .

Bruce F. Pauley. « From Prejudice to Persecution : A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism » , The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1992) .

Peter Pulzer. « The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria » , 2nd edition, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (1988) .

Peter Pulzer. « 3rd Thoughts on German and Austrian Antisemitism » , « Modern Jewish Studies » , Volume 4, No. 2 (July 2005) ; pages 137-178.

Marsha L. Rozenblit. « The Jews of Vienna (1867-1914) : Assimilation and Identity » , State University of New York Press, Albany, New York (1983) .

Daniel Vyleta. « Crime, Jews and News : Vienna (1895-1914) » , Berghahn Books, New York (2007) .

Robert S. Wistrich. « The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz-Joseph » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (1989) .

Le pan-germanisme

Le pan-germanisme est un mouvement politique irrédentiste du XIXe siècle visant l'unité de tous les germanophones d'Europe, ou identifiés comme tels par les penseurs de cette théorie : lui correspond la volonté de mettre en place la Grande Allemagne, c'est l'expression traduite de « Großdeutschland » (du latin : « Magna Germania ») qui désigne la

Germanie antique.

Les origines du pan-germanisme remonteraient au début des années 1800, suite aux guerres napoléoniennes. Ces guerres déclenchèrent un mouvement social, né en France, même suite à la Révolution française : le nationalisme. Le nationalisme était une menace sérieuse pour les anciens régimes aristocratiques. En effet, la plupart des groupes ethniques de l'Europe centrale étaient divisés par les frontières des Empires des vieilles dynasties des Romanov et des Habsbourg. Les Allemands, de leur côté, étaient un peuple sans unité politique depuis la Réforme, lorsque le Saint-Empire Romain germanique fut divisé en une série de petits États indépendants. Les nouveaux nationalistes allemands, principalement de jeunes réformistes, désiraient réunir l'ensemble du peuple partageant l'« übertragungsfactor » et la langue allemande, les « Volksdeutschen » .

Dans une Europe dominée par Napoléon Ier se regroupent autour de la Prusse des patriotes allemands dans une guerre patriotique et nationale que l'on appelle très vite guerre de libération (« Befreiungskriege ») . Apparaissent alors toute une série de libelles et de textes réclamant la constitution d'un État allemand groupant tous les peuples parlant la langue allemande, incluant au besoin des peuples en dehors de ce qui était, jusqu'en 1806, le Saint-Empire. Ainsi se développe le « Volkstum » , rassemblement de tous les hommes de même langue, de même culture.

Johann Gottlieb Fichte évoque dans ses « Discours à la nation allemande » la « puissante nationalité allemande » et le « Volkgeist » (esprit du peuple) allemand.

On trouve les sources intellectuelles dans les discours de quelques penseurs, comme :

Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) : Il développe la conception du « Volk » (peuple) , comprenant tous les hommes du même sang, quels que soient leur nationalité, leurs opinions ou leur habitat. Le « Volk » est un être en soi, qu'il cite comme une « force organique vivante » . Il estime que ces « caractéristiques nationales marquent profondément les vieux peuples et elles apparaissent, de manière indiscutable, dans toutes les manifestations de ces peuples sur terre » .

Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) : « Or voici ce qu'est un peuple au sens supérieur du mot, sens qu'il a si on admet l'existence d'un monde de l'esprit : un peuple, c'est l'ensemble des peuples qui vivent en commun travers les âges et se perpétuent entre eux sans adultération, physiquement et moralement, selon des lois particulières au développement du divin. »

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) : « L'erreur la plus fatale pour un peuple, est d'abandonner ses caractères biologiques. » « L'Allemagne, proprement dite, s'est gardée pure de tout mélange, sauf sur sa frontière méridionale et occidentale où la bande de territoire en bordure du Danube et du Rhin fut soumise aux Romains. La région d'entre l'Elbe et le Rhin est restée absolument indigène. »

Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775-1854) : « La création organique des États est ce qui permet à une masse d'êtres humains d'atteindre l'union de cœur et d'esprit, c'est-à-dire de devenir un « Volk ». »

Lorsque la concrétisation du pan-germanisme à l'Est enclenche l'esprit de revanche à l'Ouest : le contentieux principal entre les 2 nations était territorial : l'intégration de l'Alsace et de la Moselle dans l'Empire allemand, que le successeur Guillaume II d'Allemagne entérine par la restauration dans le style médiéval du château du Haut-Königsbourg, sur lequel sont placées ses armoiries. Symboliquement, cette place forte garde les marches de l'Empire. Côté français, la cession liée à la paix de 1871 porte atteinte à l'intégrité territoriale nationale, l'esprit de revanche se forge sur cette perception d'une amputation qui ne doit pas perdurer.

Dans les années 1860, les 2 plus puissants États germanophones étaient la Prusse et l'Autriche, et ces 2 puissances cherchaient à étendre leurs territoires et leur influence. La structure multi-ethnique de l'Empire autrichien était toutefois critiquée par des germanophones vivant à l'intérieur comme à l'extérieur des frontières de l'Empire. C'est pour affirmer sa multi-ethnicité que l'Empire s'est redéfini comme l'Empire Austro-Hongrois. La Prusse, sous Otto von Bismarck, utilisa, de son côté, le nationalisme pour réunir l'ensemble du territoire qui forme l'Allemagne moderne. L'Empire germanique, le 2e « Reich » , fut achevé en 1871, suite au couronnement de Guillaume Ier à la tête d'une union d'États germanophones.

Cependant, de nombreux Allemands habitaient toujours à l'extérieur du nouvel Empire. Ces groupes utilisèrent le sentiment nationaliste germanique pour tenter une unification de leur territoire avec la mère-patrie. L'Autriche et les Sudètes devinrent donc au centre de la controverse.

De nombreux Autrichiens commencèrent à avoir du ressentiment pour la diversité ethnique de leur propre Empire. Se définissant eux-mêmes comme les descendants des Bavarois, qui conquérèrent et s'établirent dans la région, de nombreux d'entre eux appuyèrent la séparation de l'Empire des Habsbourg pour rejoindre le nouvel Empire germanique.

Le pan-germanisme, à proprement parler, prend corps dans les années 1890. L'une des expressions politiques majeures en Allemagne lors de cette phase est l'émergence du Parti s'intitulant « Ligue Pangermanique » . Ce Parti qui défend le « Volkstum » (l'esprit de la race) , influence le jeune Adolf Hitler. Ce Parti extrémiste resta toutefois très minoritaire en Allemagne.

Selon certains, il ne faut pas confondre le « sursaut national » de 1814 et même la politique bismarckienne, plus prussienne que germanique, avec le pan-germanisme. Ce mouvement prend d'ailleurs corps en réaction à la pensée bismarckienne, centrée avant tout sur la Prusse. Bismarck s'appuyait de plus sur des alliances à l'Est qui lui interdisaient toute velléité d'expansion en Europe centrale et orientale.

On ne doit pas non plus associer le pan-germanisme à l'expansionnisme colonial allemand, fortement voulu par l'Empereur Guillaume II en vue de rivaliser avec les Empires britanniques et français. En effet, à l'image des autres grandes nations européennes, l'Allemagne veut se doter d'un Empire colonial.

En 1905, Joseph-Ludwig Reimer édite « Une Allemagne pangermaniste » , ouvrage référentiel de 400 pages. En

interprétant l'histoire dans l'intérêt du pan-germanisme, il tente de prouver la supériorité de la race allemande par ses apports culturels et historiques au sein des nations voisines, comme la France, la Belgique ou les Pays-Bas. L'étude raciale et ethnographique y tient une grande place. Concernant la France, Reimer, s'inquiétant de sa « dégermanisation » grandissante, approuve la solution d'une colonisation de ce pays, en commençant par le Nord et l'Est. Cette conquête passant d'ailleurs, dans un 1er temps, par un retour aux frontières médiévales de la Lotharingie.

En 1911, Otto Richard Tannenberg développe les thèses pangermanistes dans un livre capital pour cette doctrine : « La Plus Grande Allemagne ». Il y expose clairement tous les arguments qui deviendront politique d'État avec Adolf Hitler, tel ce passage :

« Quelle situation pitoyable que la nôtre, si l'on considère que, pas moins de 25 millions d'Allemands, c'est-à-dire 28 % de la race, vivent au-delà des limites de l'Empire allemand ! C'est là un chiffre colossal, et un fait pareil ne saurait se produire dans un autre État quelconque sans susciter la plus vive indignation de tous les citoyens et l'effort le plus passionné pour remédier au mal sans plus attendre. Qui pourrait empêcher 87 millions d'hommes de former un Empire, s'ils en faisaient le serment ? »

Après la Première Guerre mondiale, l'influence de l'Allemagne en Europe fut considérablement réduite et ébranla les rêves d'Empire colonial pour les pangermanistes. L'Allemagne était humiliée et l'Empire austro-hongrois fut divisé en de nombreux États. La création de la Pologne, de la Tchécoslovaquie, de la Hongrie, ainsi que l'expansion de la Roumanie séparèrent de nouveau le peuple allemand, après avoir été presque entièrement réuni sous les 2 Empires autrichien et allemand. De nombreux États slaves nouvellement formés étaient préjudicieux envers leurs minorités germanophones, spécialement dans les territoires contrôlés anciennement par l'Empire austro-hongrois. Des actes de racisme et d'oppression furent recensés.

L'idée pan-germanique n'en a pas pour autant disparu et des penseurs et écrivains s'efforcent de la définir et de l'expliquer. En 1915, Friedrich Naumann publie la fameux « Mittel Europa ». En 1916, André Chéradame, dans l'ouvrage intitulé « Le Plan pangermaniste démasqué », décrit avec précision une autre vision du pan-germanisme. En effet, d'après cet auteur, le pan-germanisme n'a pas pour but de réunir des populations qui ont une langue germanique mais il vise, en dehors de toute question de langue ou de race, à absorber les diverses régions dont la possession est considérée comme utile à la puissance des « Hohenzollern ». En 1926, Hans Grimm vulgarise l'expression d' « espace vital » (« Lebensraum »). Adolf Hitler est en phase avec cette famille de pensée, comme le montre clairement « Mein Kampf » (Mon Combat, 1925). En 1927, il a d'ailleurs révisé lui-même le programme en 25 points commandé sur son ordre, en 1920, à Gottfried Feder, économiste du NSDAP. Dès les 1ers mots, ce programme demandait l'union de tous les allemands, afin de former un unique Grand « Reich » sur la base du droit des peuples à disposer d'eux-mêmes.

Adolf Hitler, après avoir pris le pouvoir, entama une politique radicale appliquant le pan-germanisme en faisant main basse sur tous les territoires décrétés « germaniques ». Les Sudètes, une région de l'actuelle République tchèque, étaient au centre de la controverse. En effet, majoritairement germanophone, le territoire avait été donné à la Tchécoslovaquie comme zone tampon afin de prévenir une future agression allemande. Hitler utilisa « l'oppression »

des Allemands en Europe de l'Est pour justifier une invasion. À la fin de 1938, le sort des Sudètes fut débattu lors de la conférence de Munich. La région, où vivaient environ 3 millions d'Allemands, fut finalement cédée au 3e « Reich » .

Au cours de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les Autrichiens, Sudètes, Alsaciens-Lorrains, Allemands de Transylvanie et Allemands de la Mer Baltique furent tous sous le contrôle du 3e « Reich » et le rêve pan-germanique fut finalement réalisé. Mais cet état de fait ne comportait pas que des avantages aux populations germaniques. En effet, les Nazis réinstallèrent des Allemands à travers toute l'Europe à leur guise, déroulant un plan (« Generalplan Ost ») qu'ils avaient conçu sans tenir compte de l'avis et des désirs de ces Allemands de l'Est.

La défaite de 1945 mit fin aux rêves de pan-germanisme de la même façon que la Première Guerre mondiale provoqua la disparition du pan-slavisme. Les Allemands d'Europe de l'Est furent expulsés brutalement et l'Allemagne même fut dévastée, puis divisée politiquement entre République fédérale d'Allemagne (Ouest) et République démocratique allemande (Est) . Nationalisme et pan-germanisme devinrent des sujets tabous en raison de leur connotation nazie. Mais la réunification du pays, en 1990, après la chute du mur de Berlin a ravivé les vieux débats. La peur du passé demeure toutefois forte et explique la crainte que les Allemands eux-mêmes ont d'un « Volksdeutschen » uni.

Il existe actuellement d'importantes populations germanophones à l'extérieur de l'Autriche et de l'Allemagne : en Suisse, en Belgique, en France, en Europe de l'Est et dans l'ex-Union soviétique, même si de nombreux germanophones ont recherché la citoyenneté allemande après l'écroulement du bloc communiste. Aujourd'hui, l'idée même d'unification de l'Autriche et de l'Allemagne ravive le douloureux souvenir du Nazisme et rend peu probable une telle union dans un avenir proche.

...

Pan-Germanism was highly-influential in German politics in the 19th Century during the unification of Germany when the German Empire was proclaimed in as a nation-State, in 1871, without Austria (« Kleindeutsche Lösung » : Lesser Germany) , and the 1st half of the 20th Century in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the German Empire. From the late- 19th Century, many Pan-Germanist thinkers, since 1891, organized in the Pan-German League, had adopted openly ethno-centric and racist ideologies and, ultimately, gave rise to the foreign policy « Heim ins Reich » pursued by Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler, from 1938, one of the primary factors leading to the outbreak of World War II. As a result of the disaster of World War II, Pan-Germanism was mostly seen as a taboo ideology in the post-War period, in both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Pan-Germanism remains practically extinct as an ideology, at most limited to some fringe groups of Neo-Nazism, in Germany and Austria.

The word « pan » is a Greek word element meaning « all, every, whole, all-inclusive » . The word « German » , in this context, derives from Latin « Germani » originally used by Julius Cæsar referring to tribes or a single tribe in north-eastern Gaul. In the late- Middle-Ages, it acquired a loose meaning referring to the speakers of Germanic languages (alongside « Almain » and « Teuton ») most of whom spoke dialects ancestral to modern German. In English, « Pan-German » was 1st attested, in 1892. In German, there exists a synonym, « Alldeutsche Bewegung » ,

which is a calque using German instead of Latin and Greek roots.

Pan-Germanism's origins began with the birth of Romantic nationalism during the Napoleonic Wars, with Friedrich Ludwig Jahn and Ernst Moritz Arndt being early proponents. Germans, for the most part, had been a loose and disunited people since the Reformation, when the Holy Roman Empire was shattered into a patchwork of States, following the end of the 30 Years' War with the Peace of Westphalia.

Advocates of the « Großdeutschland » (Greater Germany) solution sought to unite all the German-speaking people in Europe, under leadership of the Austrian Germans from the Austrian Empire. Pan-Germanism was widespread among the revolutionaries of 1848, notably among Richard Wagner and the Brothers Grimm. Writers such as Friedrich List and Paul Anton Lagarde argued for German hegemony in Central and Eastern Europe, where German domination, in some areas, had begun as early as the 9th Century AD with the « Ostsiedlung », Germanic expansion into Slavic and Baltic lands. For the Pan-Germanists, this movement was seen as a « Drang nach Osten », in which Germans would be naturally inclined to seek « Lebensraum » by moving eastwards to reunite with the German minorities there.

The « Deutschlandlied » (Song of Germany) , written in 1841 by Hoffmann von Fallersleben, in its 1st stanza, defines « Deutschland » as reaching « From the Meuse to the Memel / From the Adige to the Belt » , i.e. , as including East Prussia and South Tyrol.

Reflecting upon the 1st Schleswig War, in 1848, Karl Marx noted that :

« By quarrelling amongst themselves, instead of confederating, Germans and Scandinavians, both of them belonging to the same great race, only prepare the way for their hereditary enemy, the Slav. »

There is, in political geography, no Germany proper to speak of. There are Kingdoms and Grand Duchies, and Duchies and Principalities, inhabited by Germans, and each separately ruled by an independent sovereign with all the machinery of State. Yet, there is a natural undercurrent tending to a national feeling and toward a union of the Germans into one great nation, ruled by one common head as a national unit.

(Article from « The New York Times » , published on 1 July 1866.)

By the 1860's, the Kingdom of Prussia and the Austrian Empire were the 2 most powerful nations dominated by German-speaking elites. Both sought to expand their influence and territory. The Austrian Empire (like the Holy Roman Empire) was a multi-ethnic State, but the German-speaking people there did not have an absolute numerical majority ; the creation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was one result of the growing nationalism of other ethnicities especially the Hungarians. Under Prussian leadership, Otto von Bismarck would ride on the coat-tails of nationalism to unite all of modern-day Germany. After Bismarck excluded Austria and the Austrian Germans from Germany, in the German War, and following a few other events over the next few years, the unification of Germany, created the Prussian-dominated German Empire (2nd « Reich ») , in 1871, following the proclamation of Wilhelm I as head of a union of German-speaking States, while disregarding millions of its non-German subjects who desired self-determination from German

rule. After World War I, the Pan-Germanism Philosophy changed drastically during the reign of Adolf Hitler. Pan-Germanists originally sought to unify all the German-speaking populations of Europe in a single nation-State known as « Großdeutschland » (Greater Germany) , where « German-speaking » was sometimes taken as synonymous with Germanic-speaking, to the inclusion of the Frisian and Dutch-speaking populations of the Low-Countries, and Scandinavia.

Integrating the Austrian Germans nevertheless remained a strong desire for many people of Germany and Austria, especially among the Liberals, the Social-Democrats and also the Catholics who were a minority in Germany. Georg Schönerer and Karl Hermann Wolf articulated Pan-Germanist sentiments in Austria-Hungary. There was also a rejection of Roman Catholicism with the « Away from Rome ! » movement calling for German speakers to identify with Lutheran or Old Catholic churches. The Pan-German Movement was officially founded in 1891, when Ernst Hasse, a professor at the University of Leipzig and a member of the « Reichstag » , organized the Pan-German League an ultra-nationalist political interest organization which promoted Imperialism, anti-Semitism, and support for ethnic German minorities in other countries. The organization achieved great support among the educated middle- and upper-class ; the organization promoted German nationalist consciousness, especially among ethnic Germans outside Germany. In his 3 volume work, « Deutsche Politik » (1905-1907) , Hasse called for German Imperialist expansion in Europe. Similar expansionist policies were preached by Munich professor Karl Haushofer, Ewald Banse, and Hans Grimm, author of « Volk ohne Raum » and his brother Jacob, who published a treaty about German « Volksrecht » .

After the Revolutions of 1848-1849, in which the Liberal nationalistic revolutionaries advocated the Greater German solution, the Austrian defeat in the Austro-Prussian War (in 1866) with the effect that Austria was now excluded from Germany, and increasing ethnic conflicts in the multi-national Habsburg Monarchy, a German national movement evolved in Austria. Led by the thoughtful and theish German nationalist Georg von Schönerer, organisations as the Pan-German Society demanded the link-up of all German-speaking territories of the Danube Monarchy to the German Empire, and decidedly rejected Austrian patriotism. Schönerer's « völkisch » and identitarian German nationalism was an inspiration to Adolf Hitler's ideology.

In 1933, Austrian Nazis and the national-Liberal Greater German People's Party formed an action group, fighting together against the Austro-fascist regime which imposed a distinct Austrian national identity and in accordance said that Austrians were « better Germans » , while Kurt Schuschnigg adopted a policy of appeasement towards Austrian-born Hitler's annexing of Austria to the 3rd « Reich » and called Austria the « better German State » , he still struggled to keep Austria independent. With the « Anschluß » of Austria, in 1938, the historic aim of Austria's German nationalists was achieved. After 1945, the German national camp was revived in the Federation of Independents and the Freedom Party of Austria.

The idea of including the North Germanic-speaking Scandinavians into a Pan-German State, sometimes referred to as Pan-Germanicism, was promoted alongside mainstream pan-German ideas. Jacob Grimm adopted Peter Andreas Munch's anti-Danish Pan-Germanism and argued that the entire peninsula of « Jutland » had been populated by Germans before the arrival of the Danes and that, thus, it could justifiably be reclaimed by Germany, whereas the rest of Denmark should be incorporated into Sweden. This line of thinking was countered by Jens Jacob Asmussen Worsaae, an

archaeologist who had excavated parts of Danevirke, who argued that there was no way of knowing the language of the earliest inhabitants of Danish territory. He also pointed-out that Germany had more solid historical claims to large parts of France and England, and that Slavs (by the same reasoning) could annex parts of Eastern Germany. Regardless of the strength of Worsaae's arguments, pan-Germanism spurred on the German nationalists of Schleswig and Holstein and led to the 1st Schleswig War, in 1848. In turn, this likely contributed to the fact that Pan-Germanism never caught on in Denmark as much as it did in Norway. Pan-Germanic tendencies were particularly widespread among the Norwegian independence movement. Prominent supporters included Peter Andreas Munch, Christopher Bruun, Knut Hamsun, Henrik Ibsen and Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. Bjørnson, who wrote the lyrics for the Norwegian national anthem, proclaimed in 1901 :

« I'm a Pan-Germanist, I'm a Teuton, and the greatest dream of my life is for the South Germanic peoples and the North Germanic peoples and their brothers in diaspora to unite in a fellow confederation. »

(Bjørnson.)

In the 20th Century, the German Nazi Party sought to create a Greater Germanic « Reich » that would include most of the Germanic peoples of Europe within it under the leadership of Germany, including peoples such as the Danes, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Norwegians, and the Flemish within it, with the exception of the English.

Anti-German Scandinavism surged in Denmark in the 1930's and 1940's, in response to the pan-Germanic ambitions of Nazi Germany.

World War I became the 1st attempt to carry-out the Pan-German ideology in practice, and the Pan-German movement argued forcefully for an expansionist Imperialism.

Following the defeat in World War I, influence of German-speaking elites, over Central and Eastern Europe, was greatly limited. At the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was substantially reduced in size. Austria-Hungary was split-up. A Rump-Austria, which to a certain extent corresponded to the German-speaking areas of Austria-Hungary (a complete split into language groups was impossible due to multi-lingual areas and language-exclaves) adopted the name « German Austria » (« Deutschösterreich ») in hope for union with the Germany. Union with Germany and the name « German Austria » was forbidden by the Treaty of Saint-Germain and the name had to be changed back to Austria.

It was in the post-WWI period that the Austrian-born Adolf Hitler, under the influence of the stab-in-the-back myth, 1st took-up German nationalist ideas in his « Mein Kampf » . Hitler met Heinrich Class, in 1918, and Class provided Hitler with support for the 1923 « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » . Hitler and his National-Socialist friends shared most of the basic pan-German visions with the Pan-German League but, nonetheless, differences in political style led the 2 groups to open rivalry. The German Workers Party of Bohemia cut its ties to the pan-German movement, which was seen as being too dominated by the upper-classes, and joined forces with the German Workers Party led by Anton Drexler, which later became the National-Socialist German Workers Party (Nazi Party) that was to be headed by Adolf Hitler, from 1921.

Nazi propaganda also used the political slogan « Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer » (One people, one « Reich » , one leader) , in order to enforce pan-German sentiment in Austria for the « Anschluß » .

The « Heim ins Reich » initiative (literally : Home into the Empire, meaning Back to the « Reich ») was a policy pursued by the Nazis which attempted to convince the ethnic Germans living outside of the 3rd « Reich » (such as in Austria and the « Sudetenland ») that they should strive to bring these regions « home » into a Greater Germany. This notion also led the way for an even more expansive State to be envisioned, the Greater Germanic « Reich » , which Nazi Germany tried to establish. This pan-Germanic Empire was expected to assimilate practically all of Germanic Europe into an enormously expanded Greater Germanic « Reich » . Territorially speaking, this encompassed the already-enlarged « Reich » itself (consisting of pre-1938 Germany plus the areas annexed into the « Großdeutsche Reich ») , the Netherlands ; Belgium ; areas in north-eastern France considered to be, historically and ethnically, Germanic ; Denmark ; Norway ; Sweden ; Iceland ; at least, the German-speaking parts of Switzerland ; and Liechtenstein. The most notable exception was the predominantly Anglo-Saxon United Kingdom, which was not projected as having to be reduced to a German province but to, instead, become an allied seafaring partner of the Germans.

The eastern « Reichskommissariats » in the vast stretches of Ukraine and Russia were also intended for future integration, with plans for them stretching to the Volga or even beyond the Urals. They were deemed of vital interest for the survival of the German nation, as it was a core tenet of National-Socialist ideology that it needed « living space » (« Lebensraum ») , creating a « pull towards the East » (« Drang nach Osten ») where that could be found and colonized, in a model that the Nazis explicitly derived from the American Manifest Destiny in the Far-West and its clearing of native inhabitants.

World War II brought about the decline of Pan-Germanism, much as World War I had led to the demise of Pan-Slavism. Parts of Germany itself were devastated, and the country was divided, Istly into Soviet, French, American, and British zones and, then, into West Germany and East Germany. To add to the disaster, Germany suffered even larger territorial losses than it did in the 1st World War, with huge portions of Eastern Germany directly annexed by the Soviet Union and Poland. The scale of the Germans' defeat was unprecedented. Pan-Germanism became almost taboo because it had been tied so blatantly and self-destructively to racist concepts of the « Master race » and « Untermenschen » (sub-humans) by the Nazis. Indeed, racist terms such as « Volksdeutscher » , in reference to ethnic Germans in other countries manipulated by the Nazis during World War II, later developed into a mild epithet among Hungarians. However, reunification of Germany, in 1990, revived the old debates, and those who advocate a « Greater Germany » today are often labeled Fascist and / or neo-Nazi.

Le jeune Hitler : des provinces à la capitale

Adolf Hitler est né le 20 avril 1889 à Braunau-am-Inn, en Haute-Autriche, dans l'Empire austro-hongrois. Il est le 4e d'une fratrie de 5, d'une famille qui n'est pas allemande mais autrichienne.

Son père, Alois Hitler, est un fonctionnaire des douanes qui vit dans le confort. Il a épousé en 3es noces sa cousine

Klara, plus jeune que lui de 22 ans.

Adolf jouit d'une enfance heureuse si ce n'est que son père veut le diriger vers la fonction publique tandis que lui souhaiterait s'épanouir dans les Beaux-arts (peinture ou architecture) .

Adolf connaît des années heureuses, parsemées de flâneries et de rêveries.

Le père d'Adolf Hitler meurt d'une hémorragie cérébrale en 1903, à l'âge de 65 ans. Sa veuve s'installe alors à Linz, au nord de l'Autriche avec ses 2 enfants survivants : Adolf (13 ans) et Paula (7 ans) .

La scolarité du jeune homme se révèle moyenne.

Impatient de se lancer dans l'art, il quitte le domicile maternel en 1907, à dix-huit ans, et gagne la capitale de l'empire, Vienne.

Le 3 octobre 1908, il subit son deuxième échec à l'examen d'entrée à l'École des Beaux-Arts de Vienne. Trois mois plus tard, le 21 décembre 1908, sa mère meurt. Les années qui suivent seront les plus pénibles de sa jeunesse.

Grâce aux quelques économies laissées par son père, le jeune homme mène une vie oisive et dilapide rapidement cette petite fortune. Il fréquente les théâtres, découvre la musique de Wagner, se passionne pour l'architecture et pratique de petits gagne-pains.

Sans le sou, il découvre la misère et les refuges pour sans-abri. Clochardisé, sans amis, il rumine sa haine de la bourgeoisie viennoise, joyeuse et prospère.

Ses loisirs se passent dans la lecture de livres de vulgarisation qui exaltent la nation germanique. Il vivote en vendant des tableaux (vues) de Vienne.

C'est ici que se forge son antisémitisme par ses lectures et ses rares fréquentations.

En 1912, il s'établit à Munich.

...

« Hitler » est une variante de « Hüttler » , de l'allemand « Hüttle » signifiant « petite cabane » (peut avoir désigné un homme vivant près d'une cabane ; en Bavière, désignait un charpentier) .

Les sources traitant des Ires années d'Adolf Hitler sont « extrêmement lacunaires et subjectives » . Les fonds d'archives, les témoins et Hitler lui-même donnent des interprétations très différentes de cette période qui s'étale de 1889 à 1919. De nombreux historiens se sont même penchés sur la possibilité d'une origine juive de Hitler, en

concluant néanmoins la plupart du temps à de simples rumeurs infondées.

Adolf Hitler naît le 20 avril 1889, à 18h30, à Braunau am Inn, une petite ville de Haute-Autriche près de la frontière austro-allemande ; il est baptisé 2 jours plus tard à l'église de Braunau. Il est le 4e enfant d'Aloïs Hitler (1837-1903) et de Klara Pözl (1860-1907) . Ses parents, unis par le mariage depuis le 6 janvier 1885, sont originaires de la région rurale du Waldviertel, pauvre et frontalière de la Bohême.

En 1894, la famille Hitler déménage à Passau, du côté allemand de la frontière. L'an plus tard, Aloïs prend sa retraite et achète une petite ferme à Fischlham, près de Lambach, pour se consacrer à l'apiculture.

Adolf fait son entrée à l'école du village, le 2 mai 1895. Son Maître d'école, Karl Mittermaier, témoigne :

« Je me souviens combien ses affaires de classe étaient toujours rangées dans un ordre exemplaire. »

Au cours de l'été 1897, le patriarche décide de revendre sa ferme et installe sa famille à Lambach. Adolf devient élève au monastère du village où ses résultats restent bons. Il y devient enfant de chœur. En novembre 1898, Aloïs acquiert dans le village de Leonding, une maison à proximité de l'église et du cimetière. Selon des témoins de l'époque, Adolf est un enfant qui aime le grand-air et jouer aux Cowboys et aux Indiens comme de nombreux enfants de son âge. Sa sœur Paula déclarera à ce sujet :

« Quand on jouait aux Indiens, Adolf faisait toujours le chef. Tous ses camarades devaient obéir à ses ordres. Ils devaient sentir que sa volonté était la plus forte. »

À l'âge de 11 ans, en septembre 1900, Aloïs Hitler inscrit son fils à la « Realschule » de Linz, située à 4 kilomètres au nord-est de Leonding. C'est alors que ses résultats scolaires s'effondrent. Il finit par redoubler, le conflit entre Adolf et son père devient inévitable. En effet, le père veut que son fils devienne fonctionnaire comme lui alors que le jeune garçon souhaite devenir artiste-peintre.

« Pour la 1re fois de ma vie, je pris place dans l'opposition. Aussi obstiné que put l'être mon père pour réaliser les plans qu'il avait conçus, son fils ne fut pas moins résolu à refuser une idée dont il n'attendait rien. Je ne voulais pas être fonctionnaire. Ni discours, ni sévères représentations ne purent réduire cette résistance. Je ne serai pas fonctionnaire, non, et encore non ! »

(Adolf Hitler, « Mein Kampf » , 1925.)

Le 3 janvier 1903, Aloïs Hitler succombe à une crise cardiaque, un verre de vin à la main, à la brasserie Wiesinger, à Leonding. C'est un véritable tournant dans la vie du jeune Hitler. Mais les spécialistes sont divisés sur le sentiment d'Adolf Hitler vis-à-vis du décès de son père.

Klara, devenue veuve, devient de fait la tutrice d'Adolf et de Paula Hitler, âgés respectivement de 14 et 7 ans. Elle

reçoit une aide de l'État de 600 Couronnes et, mensuellement, la moitié de la pension de son défunt mari (soit 100 Couronnes) , puis 20 Couronnes par enfant scolarisé. Son fils porte toujours la photographie de sa mère sur lui. Au printemps de 1903, Klara place Adolf en pension à Linz afin qu'il réussisse dans ses études. Léopold Pötsch, son professeur d'histoire, est un partisan du pan-germanisme mais aucun document ne peut attester un militantisme nationaliste de la part d'Adolf Hitler, à cette époque. En revanche, il baigne dans une société autrichienne d'esprit pan-germaniste. Voici le portrait du collégien Hitler qu'en brosse son professeur principal lors du procès du « “ Putsch ” de la Brasserie » , en 1923 :

« Il était incontestablement doué, quoique d'un caractère buté. Il avait du mal à se maîtriser, ou passait du moins pour un récalcitrant, autoritaire, voulant toujours avoir le dernier mot, irascible, et il lui était visiblement difficile de se plier au cadre d'une école. Il n'était pas non plus travailleur car, sinon, il aurait dû parvenir à des résultats bien meilleurs. Hitler n'était pas simplement un dessinateur qui avait un beau brin de crayon, mais il était capable aussi, à l'occasion, de se distinguer dans les matières scientifiques. »

(Eduard Hümer, 1923.)

À la rentrée scolaire de l'année 1904, pour une raison obscure, Hitler quitte l'école de Linz pour l'établissement de Steyr, à 45 kilomètres de là. Ses résultats scolaires ne s'améliorent pas et il ne termine pas sa 3e. Il prétexte une mauvaise santé, simulée ou exagérée, et finit par abandonner définitivement l'école. De ces années 1904-1905, le seul document authentique connu est un portrait de Hitler fait par son camarade Sturmlechner. On y distingue « un visage maigre d'adolescent avec un duvet de moustache et l'air rêveur » .

La politique antisémite de Karl Lueger, alors maire de Vienne, influença le jeune Hitler.

Au cours de l'été de 1905, Klara Hitler vend la maison de Leonding pour s'installer, en famille, dans un appartement loué dans le centre de Linz au numéro 31 de la « Humboldtstraße » . Adolf reçoit de l'argent de poche de sa tante Johanna qu'il utilise pour le cinéma et le théâtre. Il y rencontre, en novembre 1905, un apprenti tapissier : August Kubizek, passionné de musique. À en croire son ami, bien que sans emploi, Hitler se comporte en véritable « dandy » : fine moustache, manteau et chapeau noirs et canne au pommeau d'ivoire. Il boit de l'alcool, fume beaucoup et adhère à l'Association des Amis du musée de Linz. En mai 1906, sa mère lui offre un séjour à Vienne où il assiste à 2 Opéras de Richard Wagner : « Tristan und Isolde » « Der fliegende Holländer » . Il contemple la capitale Impériale qui, à la fois, le fascine et le met mal à l'aise : l'Empereur Franz-Josef représente à ses yeux le symbole du vieillissement de l'Empire. Il finit par revenir à Linz, début-juin. Ses discussions avec Kubizek lui donnent envie de devenir compositeur ; il convainc sa mère d'entamer des études de musique avant d'abandonner rapidement.

En janvier 1907, le médecin de famille, le docteur Eduard Bloch, examine Klara et diagnostique une tumeur à un sein qui est opérée à temps. Diminuée physiquement, Klara déménage de son appartement pour un logement à l'extérieur de Linz, à Urfahr. Adolf possède sa propre chambre tandis que Klara, Paula et Johanna, la tante d'Hitler, se partagent les 2 autres pièces. Durant l'automne, il décide enfin de se présenter à l'examen d'entrée de l'Académie des Beaux-arts de Vienne ; sa mère cède à contre-cœur. Hitler est refusé ; son travail est jugé « insuffisant » .

« J'étais si persuadé du succès que l'annonce de mon échec me frappa comme un coup de foudre dans un ciel clair. »

(Adolf Hitler, « Mein Kampf » , 1925.)

En octobre, le docteur Bloch déclare solennellement à la famille Hitler que l'état de Klara est irréversible : sa dernière volonté est de reposer aux côtés de son mari, Aloïs, à Leonding. Elle meurt le 21 décembre 1907, à 2 heures du matin.

Selon le docteur Bloch :

« Klara Hitler était une femme simple, modeste et pleine de bonté. Grande, elle avait des cheveux bruns soigneusement tressés et un long visage ovale avec de beaux yeux gris-bleu expressifs. Jamais je n'ai vu quiconque aussi terrassé par le chagrin qu'Adolf Hitler. »

(Eduard Bloch, médecin de la famille de Hitler.)

Lorsqu'il était revenu à Linz, au chevet de sa mère mourante, il n'avait pas osé lui avouer son échec à l'École des Beaux-arts. Âgé de 19 ans, Adolf Hitler est désormais un jeune homme mesurant 1,72 mètres et pesant 68 kilos. Entêté, il décide qu'il sera artiste-peintre ou architecte et retente l'examen d'entrée à Vienne. Apparemment, Hitler n'est pas, à cette époque, vraiment un nationaliste fanatique comme il le prétend dans « Mein Kampf ». En effet, pourquoi rejoindre une ville cosmopolite comme Vienne, aux nombreuses nationalités, plutôt que de rejoindre directement l'Allemagne ? Vienne représente, à ses yeux, un défi, une porte vers une ascension sociale. Hitler est subjugué par les représentations du chef d'orchestre Felix Weingartner, puis de Gustav Mahler à l'Opéra. Depuis 1897, Vienne est dirigée par Karl Lueger (1844-1910) , le fondateur du Parti Chrétien-Social. Le maire est violemment antisémite et rassemble une bonne partie de l'électorat catholique. Il favorise néanmoins le rayonnement de la ville : représentations musicales de Richard Strauß, picturales de Paul Gauguin et Gustav Klimt, littéraires avec Arthur Schnitzler, etc.

Au cours du printemps de 1908, August Kubizek rejoint Hitler à Vienne où il loue un piano à queue pour parfaire ses gammes. Selon son témoignage, Hitler se prive régulièrement de nourriture afin de se rendre plusieurs fois au Théâtre ou à l'Opéra. Il prétend également qu'Hitler ne s'intéresse guère aux filles, exceptée une jeune bourgeoise prénommée Stéphanie. Appelé par le service militaire, le musicien rentre à Linz, en juillet. Durant l'été, Hitler rompt les liens à la fois avec Kubizek et avec le reste de sa famille résidant à Spital. En octobre 1908, l'École des Beaux-arts recense 96 élèves dont Adolf Hitler qui « n'a pas été autorisé à passer l'épreuve ». Non pas qu'il soit mauvais dessinateur mais parce qu'il ne travaille pas assez, il est incapable de se soumettre à une discipline. Il déménage en août 1909, rue Felbert, puis rue Sechshauser et, enfin, rue Simon-Denk. Faute d'argent il est mis à la rue.

Les registres de police de Vienne indiquent qu'à partir du 8 février 1910, Hitler est domicilié dans un foyer pour hommes au numéro 27 de la rue Meldermann. Grâce à Reinhold Hanisch, un jeune homme de 5 ans son aîné, rencontré quelques mois plus tôt dans un foyer d'accueil pour sans-abris, il gagne un peu d'argent en déblayant la neige ou en portant les valises des voyageurs encombrés de la gare de l'Ouest (« Westbahnhof »). La nourriture se limite à une soupe le matin, et à un croûton de pain le soir. Selon « Mein Kampf », il aurait été manœuvre et aide-maçon mais aucun document ne le prouve. Certains témoins (dont Hanisch) insistent sur l'oisiveté d'Hitler qui refuse de travailler. Grâce aux 50 Couronnes envoyées par sa tante Johanna, il fait l'acquisition du matériel d'artiste-peintre : Hanisch se charge de vendre les peintures de Hitler en format de carte postale. Le 4 mai 1911, Angela Raubal réclame au tribunal de Linz la pension de Hitler afin d'élever dignement Paula, ce qu'il doit accepter malgré lui.

Après avoir touché le fond au cours de l'hiver 1909, le marginal Hitler vit toujours, en 1912, de ses peintures vendues sur la rue.

Selon Jacob Altenberg, l'un de ses marchands d'art juifs :

« Il avait pris l'habitude de se raser, il se faisait régulièrement les cheveux et portait des vêtements qui, pour être vieux et usés, n'en étaient pas moins propres. »

Hitler participe aux débats politiques qui éclatent dans le foyer. 2 sujets le mettent hors de lui : le Parti Social-Démocrate au pouvoir, et la Maison de Habsbourg-Lorraine. Aucun témoin ne fait état de propos antisémites de sa part. Selon « Mein Kampf », il serait devenu antisémite à son arrivée à Vienne :

« Un jour où je traversais la vieille ville, je rencontrais tout à coup un personnage en long caftan avec des boucles de cheveux noirs. Est-ce là aussi un Juif ? Telle fut ma 1^{re} pensée. À Linz, ils n'avaient pas cet aspect-là. »

(Adolf Hitler, « Mein Kampf », 1925.)

Or, les autres sources ne confirment pas cet état des choses. Kubizek affirme que son ami était déjà « farouchement antisémite » en arrivant à Vienne. Pourtant, de nombreuses anecdotes qu'il rapporte sont clairement douteuses.

Selon Reinhold Hanisch :

« À cette époque, Hitler n'était aucunement antisémite. Il l'est devenu plus tard. »

Il insiste sur son amitié avec Joseph Neumann, un jeune Juif rencontré à Vienne, au foyer pour hommes de la rue Meldermann. Kershaw doute de la véracité des dires de Hanisch.

Outre des brochures antisémites, Hitler lit alors très probablement la revue « Ostara » de Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels :

Selon Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke :

« L'hypothèse d'une influence idéologique de Lanz sur Hitler peut être acceptée. »

Ce dernier aurait « assimilé l'essentiel de l'aryosophie de Lanz : le désir d'une théocratie aryenne prenant la forme d'une dictature de droit divin des Germains aux cheveux blonds et aux yeux bleus sur les races inférieures ; la croyance dans une conspiration, continue à travers l'histoire, de ces dernières contre les héroïques Germains, et l'attente d'une apocalypse dont serait issu un millénium consacrant la suprématie mondiale des Aryens » .

Ian Kershaw, pour sa part, penche également en faveur de la présence de la revue parmi les lectures courantes d'Hitler à cette époque, mais conclut plus prudemment sur la nature précise de l'influence de Lanz sur ses convictions. Par ailleurs, il est en revanche improbable qu'Hitler ait connu alors l'aryosophe Guido von List et, s'il a pu être attiré par les aspects politiques de la pensée de List les plus similaires à celle de Lanz, il n'a jamais manifesté d'intérêt pour ses théories occultistes.

Au printemps de 1913, Adolf Hitler caresse l'espoir d'aller étudier à l'Académie de Munich. Pour ses 24 ans, il attend la perception de son héritage paternel (819 Couronnes) . De plus, ayant omis de s'inscrire en 1909 pour effectuer son service militaire, il pense à présent que l'administration autrichienne l'a oublié et qu'il peut passer la frontière tranquillement. Le 24 mai, habillé correctement, portant une valise et accompagné d'un homme, le commis Rudolf Häusler, il quitte le foyer pour la gare. En plus d'être une ville d'art, Munich lui paraît familière car proche de sa région natale. Arrivés sur place, Häusler et Hitler louent une chambre au numéro 34 de la rue Schleissheim. Häusler montre ses papiers autrichiens, Hitler se déclare apatride.

En janvier 1914, Hitler reçoit l'ordre de se rendre au consulat d'Autriche dans les plus brefs délais pour rendre compte de sa désertion. Il explique qu'il se serait présenté à l'Hôtel-de-ville de Vienne où il s'est fait enregistrer mais la convocation ne serait jamais arrivée. Qui plus est, il a peu de ressources et est affaibli par une infection. Le Consul croit en sa bonne foi et, le 5 février, Hitler est définitivement ajourné devant la Commission militaire de Salzbourg. Pendant longtemps, la présence d'Häusler aux côtés d'Hitler à Munich sera gommée, car il est l'un des rares témoins à connaître le rappel à l'ordre de l'armée autrichienne à Adolf Hitler qui n'a toujours pas fait son service militaire. Hitler ne souhaitait pas dévoiler cet épisode embarrassant. En réalité, il avait fui l'Autriche en refusant de porter les armes pour les Habsbourg.

Comme à Vienne, Hitler vit de ses peintures. Il aime reproduire l'Hôtel-de-ville, des rues, des brasseries, des magasins. Il vend chaque tableau entre 5 et 20 Marks, soit une centaine de Marks par mois. Dans « Mein Kampf », Hitler déclare avoir beaucoup lu et appris en politique à cette époque, mais aucun document ne le prouve. Peut-être fréquente-t-il les bars et les brasseries où il discute de politique.

Le 28 juin 1914, l'archiduc François-Ferdinand, l'héritier du trône Austro-Hongrois, est assassiné à Sarajevo par un étudiant serbe. Le 31 juillet, la mobilisation générale est proclamée à Berlin. Le Roi de Bavière, Louis III, envoie un télégramme à Guillaume II pour l'assurer de son soutien militaire.

Le 2 août 1914, au lendemain de la déclaration de guerre du « Kaiser », des milliers de Munichois se pressent sur l'« Odeonsplatz » pour applaudir le Roi de Bavière. Une photographie immortalise l'événement et Hitler y figure. Dans « Mein Kampf », il se déclare heureux de partir en guerre. C'est pourtant oublier qu'il a tenté de se dérober à l'armée autrichienne, quelques années plus tôt. D'après son livret militaire, il ne se serait présenté que le 5 août au bureau de recrutement. Il est définitivement incorporé le 16 août comme « volontaire » dans le 1er bataillon du 2e régiment d'infanterie de l'armée bavaroise (régiment « List », du nom du général qui le commandait). Le départ du 16e régiment bavarois pour le front, dans lequel il vient d'être incorporé, est fixé au 8 octobre. Le train atteint la frontière belge le 22 octobre, puis arrive à Lille le 23.

Le soldat Hitler connaît son baptême du feu le 28 octobre 1914, près d'Ypres. Au 1er novembre, son bataillon est décimé : sur 3,600 hommes, 611 seulement restent opérationnels. Pour récompenser son courage, Hitler est proposé par l'adjudant Gutmann à la décoration de la Croix de fer. Il a la position d'estafette auprès de l'état-major de son régiment : il va chercher les ordres des officiers pour les transmettre aux bataillons. En période de calme relatif, l'estafette Hitler sillonne la campagne des environs de Fournes pour peindre des aquarelles. Durant toute la durée de la guerre, Hitler n'est resté qu'au grade de caporal. Réputé pour son caractère difficile, il est néanmoins apprécié de ses camarades. Lui proposer de « coucher avec des Françaises » le met hors de lui, puisque « contraire à l'honneur allemand ». Il ne fume pas, il ne boit pas, il ne fréquente pas le bordel. Le soldat Hitler s'isole pour réfléchir ou lire. Les quelques photographies connues de cette période présentent un homme pâle, moustachu, maigre souvent à l'écart du groupe. Son véritable compagnon est son chien, « Foxl » et, un jour, il s'angoisse à l'idée de ne pas le retrouver :

« Le salaud qui me l'a enlevé ne sait pas ce qu'il m'a fait. »

Hitler est un véritable guerrier fanatique, aucune fraternité, aucun défaitisme ne doit être toléré. Il écrit :

« Chacun d'entre nous n'a qu'un seul désir, celui d'en découdre définitivement avec la bande, d'en arriver à l'épreuve de force, quoi qu'il en coûte, et que ceux d'entre nous qui auront la chance de revoir leur patrie la retrouvent plus propre et purifiée de toute influence étrangère, qu'à travers les sacrifices et les souffrances consentis chaque jour par des centaines de milliers d'entre nous, qu'à travers le fleuve de sang qui coule chaque jour dans notre lutte contre un monde international d'ennemis, non seulement les ennemis extérieurs de l'Allemagne soient écrasés, mais les ennemis intérieurs soient aussi brisés. Cela aurait plus de prix à mes yeux que tous les gains territoriaux. »

(Adolf Hitler, lettre à Ernst Hepp, 5 février 1915.)

The Dream of Linz

One of the last photographs of Adolf Hitler depicts him, shortly before his suicide, as he sits in the bunker of his Chancellery. While the Red Army advanced into the ruins of Berlin outside, he pondered a pompous architectural model of the Upper-Austrian provincial capital of Linz, the gigantic buildings illuminated by a sophisticated arrangement of spotlights : Linz, in the morning sun, at midday, at sunset glow, and at night. « No matter at what time, whether during the day or at night, whenever he had the opportunity during those weeks, he was sitting in front of this model

» , the architect Hermann Giesler reported, saying that Hitler stared at it as if at « a promised land into which we would gain entrance » .

Visitors to whom he showed the model, often at the most unusual hours of the night, were confused and horrified : the man who had reduced Europe to ashes and ruins had clearly lost his sense of reality and hardly noticed how many people were still dying in these last weeks, in his name, and according to his will, as he continued to refuse to capitulate and end the horror.

Hitler dreamed of Linz, his home-town, which he had appointed « the “ Führer ” 's sister city » and had wanted to make the Greater German « Reich » 's cultural capital, the « most beautiful city on the Danube » , the « metropolis » , the petrified glorification of his person and his policies : Linz owes everything it has and is, yet, to obtain to the « Reich » . Therefore, this city must become the carrier of the idea of the « Reich » . Every building in Linz should have the inscription « Gift from the German “ Reich ” » .

On the left bank of the Danube, in « Urfahr » , opposite the old part of town, a Party and administration center had been planned with an assembly area for 100,000 and grounds for celebrations accommodating 30,000 people, an exposition area with a Bismarck monument, and a technical University. According to the plan, a « District center » (with a new city hall, the « Reich » governor's house, the District and Party center, and the Linz community center) was to be built around a national commemorative site : Hitler's parents' tomb, with its steeple, visible from far away, whose chimes were to play (albeit, not every day) a motif from Anton Bruckner's « Romantic » 4th Symphony. This steeple was planned to be higher than that of Vienna's Saint-Stephen's Cathedral. Thus, Hitler said, he was making-up for an old injustice ; for, to the Linzers' vexation, during the construction of the neo-Gothic Linz cathedral, Vienna had reduced the height of the steeple so that the Stephen's Tower would remain the highest steeple in the country. A monument « to the foundation of the Greater German Empire » was to be built too, along with a large stadium. Hitler told the Upper-Danube District director, August Eigruber : The stones for this will be shipped by the Mauthausen concentration camp.

On the opposite side of the Danube, in « Alt-Linz » (the old part of town) , a boulevard was to be built under arcades, « wider than the “ Ring ” Boulevard, in Vienna » . A hotel was to be constructed for more than 2,000 guests, with a direct subway connection to the train station ; there, were also to be built the most modern hospitals and schools, among them an « Adolf Hitler School » , a District music school, and a « Reich » Motor Flying School for the « Luftwaffe » . There were projects for model settlements for workers and artists, 2 homes for SS and SA invalids, new streets, and an access road to the « autobahn » . In order to make Linz rich, Hitler advanced industrialization, bringing steel and chemical factories to Linz. Transforming the farm town into an industrial city was almost the only thing that was actually realized. The « Hermann Göring Factory » still exists as the Væst factory.

The planned cultural center was to have metropolitan proportions, in particular, the Linz art museum, which Hitler mentioned in his last will, the day before his death :

« I collected the paintings in the collections. I have bought, over the years, never for private purposes, but always

exclusively for enlarging a gallery in my home-town of Linz, on the Danube. It would be my most fervent wish for this legacy to be realized. »

In fact, money for this project was always available, even when there was a shortage of foreign currency during the War. From April 1943 to March 1944 alone, Hitler purchased 881 works of art, among them 395 Dutch pieces from the 17th and 18th Centuries. By the end of June 1944, the museum had cost 92.6 million « Reichsmark ». Josef Goebbels wrote in his diary :

« Linz costs us a lot of money. But it means so much to the “ Führer ”. And it probably is good too to support Linz as a cultural competitor to Vienna. For, as Hitler remarked emphatically : “ I won't give Vienna a pfennig, and the ' Reich ' won't give it anything either ”. »

The most distinguished pieces for the Linz museum were requisitioned from private galleries, museums, and churches in the parts of Europe Hitler's army had occupied (for example, the « Veit Stoss Altar », in Cracow, or the « Van Eyck Altar », in the cathedral of Ghent) . Hitler derived particular satisfaction from transferring holdings from Vienna, for example from such « un-German » Viennese collections as those of Baron Nathaniel Rothschild. The formerly Imperial Art History Museum also gave pieces to Linz, which, as Hitler remarked, in 1942, his dear Viennese didn't like at all ; his dear Viennese, whom he knows so well after all, were so stodgy that when he was looking at some of the requisitioned Rembrandts, they tried to let him know, in their genial way, that all genuine paintings should really remain in Vienna, but that they would be glad to let galleries in Linz or Innsbruck have paintings by anonymous Masters. When he decided differently, it hit the Viennese between the eyes.

Hitler planned to spend his retirement on Mount-Frein above the old part of town, in a building modeled after an Upper-Austrian farm :

« I climbed these rocks when I was young. On this hilltop, looking over the Danube, I daydreamed. This is where I want to live when I'm old. And : I won't take anyone along except Miss Braun ; Miss Braun and my dog. »

Albert Speer (after 1945, to be sure) ironically characterized Hitler's exaggerated love for Vienna as a « provincial mentality », adding that :

« Hitler always remained one of the small-town people, an insecure stranger in the large metropolises. While he was almost obsessively thinking and planning in huge proportions, it was in a town like Linz, where he had gone to school and where everything was on a manageable scale, that he felt at home socially. »

The nature of this love, Speer claimed, was « one of escape » .

Yet, the point here is a lot more than the contrast between province and capital : it is the nationally homogenous, « German » Linz, on the one side, and multi-national Vienna, on the other. Furthermore, Hitler experienced the rural character of the provincial town as honest and rooted in the soil compared to the sophisticated, intellectual, and self-

confident metropolis. Thus Goebbels, functioning as his Master's mouthpiece, remarked after a visit to Linz :

« Genuine German men. Not Viennese scoundrels. »

From a biographical perspective, Linz represented for Hitler the backdrop for an orderly, clean, « petit-bourgeois » time of his youth, which he spent with his beloved mother, whereas Vienna was witness to lonely, unsuccessful, and wretched years. However, most important from a political angle was Hitler's goal to dethrone the Hapsburg Empire's old capital and to subjugate it to the German capital of Berlin. Vienna, he said, exuded a huge, even gigantic fluidum. Therefore, it was a tremendous task to break Vienna's cultural preponderance in the Alpine and Danube districts.

Complicated Family Relations

Linz, Upper-Austria's rural capital, episcopal see, and educational center, situated in a bright landscape on the right bank of the Danube, had almost 68,000 inhabitants at the time of Hitler's youth, and thus (after Vienna, Prague, Trieste, Lemberg, Graz, Brünn, Cracaw, Pilsen, and Czernowitz) , was the 10th largest city in Cisleithania, as the western part of the Dual Monarchy was called.

Although he called it his « home-town » , Hitler lived in Linz only a short while, from ages 16 to 18, 1905 until February 1908. Until then, his life as the son of Austrian customs officer, Alois Hitler, had been unsteady. The border town of Braunau on the Inn, where he was born on April 20, 1889, and which he left when he was 3 years old, did not gain any significance until later, when Hitler could interpret it as fate :

« For this little town lies on the boundary between 2 German States which we, of the younger generation at least, have made it our life work to reunite by every means at our disposal. »

Family relations were complicated. Adolf was the product of his father's 3rd marriage, to Klara « née » Pölzl, who was 23 years her husband's junior. Adolf, his mother's 4th child, was the 1st one to survive. In the household were also 2 half-siblings from the father's 2nd marriage, Alois Junior, born in 1882 ; and Angela, born in 1883. In addition, there was « Haniaunt » , Johanna Pölzl, mother's hunchbacked and apparently feeble-minded sister, who helped with the household chores.

Family life was not peaceful : the father had fits of rage and battered his oldest son, Alois, who in turn was jealous of Adolf, pampered by his young mother. The half-brother remarked about Adolf :

« He was spoiled from early in the morning until late at night, and the step-children had to listen to endless stories about how wonderful Adolf was. »

But Adolf, too, was beaten by his father. According to Alois Junior, once Alois was even afraid he had killed Adolf.

Between 1892 and 1895 Alois went to work in Passau, on the German side of the border, during which time the 3 to

6 year old boy acquired his peculiar Bavarian accent :

« The German of my youth was the dialect of Lower-Bavaria. I could neither forget it, nor learn the Viennese jargon. »

In 1895, the 58 year old Alois Hitler retired after 40 years of service. He bought a remote Estate in the hamlet of Hafeld, in the community of Fischlham, near Lambach in Upper-Austria, to try to make a living as a farmer and bee-keeper. His son recalled, in 1942 :

« Bee stings were as normal as anything at home. Mother often took 45, 55 stings out of my old man when he returned from emptying the honeycombs. His father, he said, had protected himself against the bees only by smoking. »

After a fierce fight with his father, 14 year old Alois Junior left the home in Hafeld and was disinherited. 13 year old Angela, Adolf, and Edmund, born in 1894, remained at home. In 1896, Paula, the youngest child of the family, was born.

In May 1895, 6 year old Adolf entered the 1 room village school of Fischlham, which had 1 class. Hitler recalled :

« From the small ante-chamber, I used to listen, while I was in the lowest-grade, to what the pupils of the 2nd grade were doing, and later on, the pupils of the 3rd and 4th grades. Thank God, I left there. Otherwise, I would have had to go to the last grade for 2 or 3 years. »

Because the rundown farm could not be managed on a civil servant's pension and Alois's abilities as a farmer were insufficient, he sold the Estate, in 1897. The family moved into temporary quarters in the town of Lambach. Now, the 8 year old entered grade school in Lambach and, for a short time, also joined the Benedictine boys' choir school. There, he said, he had an excellent opportunity to intoxicate myself with the solemn splendor of the brilliant church Festivals. What, with all his criticism of the church, even later, Hitler would praise it for wonderfully exercising man's natural need for something super-natural. It had, he said, known how to work on people with its mystical cult, its large sublime cathedrals, with blessed music, solemn rites, and incense.

The Hitler family was not pious. Only Klara went to Sunday Mass, regularly. The anti-clerical father kept his distance and at most accompanied his family to services on holidays and on the Emperor's birthday, on August 18. For that was the only opportunity where he could don and display his civil servant's uniform, which the rest of the year hung in the closet unused.

At the end of 1898, the family moved to the village of Leonding, south of Linz where, for 7,700 Kronen, Alois Hitler acquired a small house next to the cemetery. In 1938, Josef Goebbels said about his visit to this place, which had become « the entire German people's place of honour » :

« Quite tiny and primitive. I am led to the room which was his realm. Small and low-ceilinged. This is where he designed plans and dreamed of the future. Then, there's the kitchen, where his good mother used to cook. Behind that,

the garden, where little Adolf picked apples and pears at night. So, this is where a genius developed. I'm beginning to feel quite sublime and solemn. »

The 9 year old entered the village school in Leonding, where he was a happy rogue and saw himself as a young scamp :

« Even as a boy, I was no “ pacifist ”, and all attempts to educate me, in this direction, came to nothing. »

One of his schoolmates from Leonding, later Abbot Balduin of Wilhering, recalled and, by no means, unkindly :

« Playing war, always nothing but playing war. Even we, kids, found that boring after a while, but he always found some children, particularly among the younger ones, who would play with him. »

Otherwise, young Hitler practiced his « favourite sport » : shooting at rats with his hand-gun, in the cemetery next to his parents' house.

Around 1900, the Boer War, when the southern African Boer Republics tried to fight-off their English conquerors, excited many Austrians. The German nationalists firmly endorsed, even enthusiastically welcomed, « David's fight against Goliath » , the « poor farmers' freedom fight » against British Imperialism. Signatures and money were collected in support of the Boers. Boer marches and Boer songs were composed. Boer bats, herrings, and sausages (still popular in Vienna) became fashionable.

For young Hitler, the Boer War was « bonafide » summer lightning :

« Every day, I waited impatiently for the newspapers and devoured dispatches and news reports, happy at the privilege of witnessing this heroic struggle, even at a distance. The boys now preferred the game “ Boers against the English ”, with no one wanting to be an Englishman and everybody wanting to be a Boer. »

As late as 1923, Hitler would say :

« On the side of the Boers, the just will to liberty ; on the side of England, greed for money and diamonds. »

In 1900, 6 year old brother Edmund died in Leonding of the measles, and 11 year old Adolf was left the only son of the family. The difficulties with his father began to increase. Hitler's schoolmates described him as « hardly an engaging person, neither in his external appearance nor in his character » :

« Old Mr. Alois demanded absolute obedience. Frequently, he put 2 fingers in his mouth, let out a piercing whistle, and Adolf, no matter where he may have been, would quickly rush to his father. He often berated him, and Adolf suffered greatly from his father's harshness. Adolf liked to read, but the old man was a spendthrift and didn't hand-out any money for books. »

Alois Hitler's only book is said to have been a volume on the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871 :

« Adolf liked looking at the pictures in that book and was a Bismarck enthusiast. »

In « Mein Kampf » , however, Hitler himself mentions his father's library.

All witnesses portray Klara Hitler as a calm, loving mother and good housewife. A female fellow pupil from Leonding who passed the Hitlers' house daily remembers (after 1945, to be sure) that, when little Paula left for school, Klara would always walk her « to the fence door and gave her a kiss ; I noticed that because that was not what typically happened to us farm girls, but I liked it a lot, I almost envied Paula a little » .

Alois determined that his son should become a civil servant. After Adolf had had 5 years of grade school, in fall of 1900, Alois sent him to high-school (« Realschule » , a lower-level « Gymnasium ») in Linz, an hour's walk from Leonding. The 11 year old who, every day, had to switch from the roughness of country life to the strictness of the small-town school, could not adapt and did not do well. In his 1st year, he earned « unsatisfactory » marks in mathematics and natural history, and was kept back. In addition, according to school records, every year, he received a reprimand, alternately in general conduct and homework. Still, his tuition was waived, which indicates that his family was indigent.

In 1924, the well-meaning French teacher Doctor Hümer said of his former pupil :

« He was decidedly gifted, if one-sided, but had difficulty controlling his temper. He was considered intractable and willful, always had to be right and easily flew-off the handle, and he clearly found it difficult to accommodate himself to the limits of a school. He demanded “ unconditional subordination from his schoolmates ”, had enjoyed “ the role of the leader ”, and apparently had been “ influenced by Karl May stories and tales about Red Indians ”. »

Later, Hitler would frequently enjoy talking about his favourite author, Karl May :

« I read him by candlelight and with a large magnifying glass at moonlight. He thanked May for introducing me to geography. In 1943, he proudly showed his companions the “ Hotel Roter Krebs ”, in Linz, where the revered writer stayed in 1901, for a length of time. »

Young Hitler made no effort at advancing in school. According to a schoolmate, Klara frequently had to go to school « to check on him » . In « Mein Kampf » , Hitler states that he deliberately did not apply himself in school so that he would not have to become a civil servant. Later, he would criticize those parents who prematurely determine their children's careers, and then, if something goes wrong, start talking about their prodigal or ill-bred son. His father had dragged him at the age of 13 into Linz's main customs office, a genuine State cage where those old men had sat on top of one another, like monkeys. Thus, he had learned to deplore thoroughly the career of a civil servant.

His relationship with his father was coming to a head. His sister Paula remembered :

« Every night, Adolf got a thrashing because he came home late. »

Hitler summarized that period as follows :

« I was forced into opposition, for the 1st time in my life. Hard and determined as father might be in putting through plans and purposes once conceived, his son was just as persistent and recalcitrant in rejecting an idea which appealed to him not at all, or in any case very little. »

Among friends, Hitler would later paint a negative picture of his father. An entry in Josef Gœbbels's diary reads :

« Hitler suffered almost the same youth as I did. Father, a domestic tyrant, mother, a source of kindness and love. »

Supposedly, Hitler was to tell his lawyer Hans Frank that even, as a 10 to 12 year old, he had to take his drunk father home from the bar :

« That was the most horrible shame I have ever felt. Oh, Frank, I know what a devil alcohol is ! It really was (via my father) the worst enemy of my youth. »

Having retired, Alois Hitler had nothing to do and distracted himself by going to bars every day. Frequently, he met with the farmer Josef Mayrhofer, with whom he worked for the German nationalists. This might have been one of the « table Societies », those tiny party factions among the circle of family and friends that some German nationalist Parties entertained. Mayrhofer said of Hitler senior :

« He was a curmudgeonly, taciturn old man, a smart libertine, and like all libertines in those days, a staunch German-National, a Pan-German, but still, strangely enough, loyal to the Emperor. »

In Upper-Austria, at that time, it was the governing « Deutsche Volkspartei » (« DVP » : German People's Party) that was libertine, German-national, and loyal to the Emperor. Grown-out of the circle around the extremist German nationalist Georg Schönerer, it had a moderate German-national platform and accepted Jews as members. There is no reason to believe that Hitler misstated the truth in « Mein Kampf » when he said about his father that he had viewed anti-Semitism as cultural backwardness and that he had adopted more or less cosmopolitan views ... despite his pronounced national sentiments.

Politics at School

The atmosphere at the Linz high-school was politically turbulent. Together, « clericalists » and Hapsburg loyalists fought against libertines and German nationalists. Pupils eagerly collected and displayed their colors : while the high-school, students, loyal to the Emperor, collected « black and yellow » ribbons and badges, photographs of the Imperial family,

and coffee cups depicting Empress Elizabeth and Emperor Franz-Josef, the German nationalists collected devotional objects such as Otto Bismarck busts made of plaster, beer mugs with inscriptions of heroic maxims about Germany's past, and, above all, ribbons, pencils, and pins with the « greater German » colors of 1848 : black, red, and gold. In « Mein Kampf », Hitler states that he too took part in the struggle of nationalities in old Austria. Collections were taken for the « Südmark » (i.e., Austria viewed as part of the Greater German Empire) and the school association ; we emphasized our convictions by wearing corn-flowers (the emblem of Austria's Pan-Germans) and red, black, and gold colors ; « Heil » was our greeting and, instead of the Imperial anthem, we sang « Deutschland über Alles », despite warnings and punishments.

The German-national associations « Deutscher Schulverein » (German School Association) and « Südmark » (South Mark) sold « defense treasury coupons » to finance the « protection against the Czechization » and the « preservation and spreading of Germandom ». The profits from these collections were used to finance German « kindergartens » and schools in mixed-language areas. The South Mark mainly supported German farmers in linguistic enclaves and also bought land for new settlements. These collections, which involved the entire population, were very popular - and probably served as the model for the National-Socialists' « Winter Relief » .

Cornflowers, the « Heil » greeting, and the colors « black, red, and gold » belonged to the Pan-Germans, those extreme German nationalists under the leadership of Georg Ritter von Schönerer who fought for German Austria's « Anschluß » to the German « Reich ». Thus, in their German nationalism, the high-school students were more radical than their teachers, who, as civil servants, had to remain loyal to the Emperor.

Most teachers at the high-school were German-national in outlook. They incited the youths' enthusiasm « for fighting for German soil at the border to Bohemia » - and, according to a schoolmate, did so doubtless « with pedagogic intent :

« You have to study diligently lest. We, in Austria, lose our leading role and so that you can prove yourselves in the national struggle ! »

Hitler reported something similar about his favourite teacher, Doctor Leopold Pötsch :

« He used our budding nationalistic fanaticism as a means of educating us, frequently appealing to our sense of national honour. By this alone, he was able to discipline us, little ruffians, more easily than would have been possible by any other means. »

Pötsch was Hitler's teacher from 1st through 3rd grade (1901-1904) , in geography ; and in 2nd and 3d grade, in history. He also ran the school library, where Hitler checked-out his books. As a special privilege, Hitler was allowed to bring his teacher maps, which put him in particularly close contact with him. Aside from his service at the school, Pötsch was a sought-after official speaker. He spoke at German-national associations, but also on the occasion of the Emperor's anniversary, in 1908. Thus he was, like Hitler's father, simultaneously German-national and a Hapsburg loyalist, which was in line with his chosen Party : in 1905, he joined the Linz city Council as a representative of the

German People's Party.

Pötsch gave popular slide lectures entitled « Images of German History ». In them, he strongly emphasized the Germanic era and the time of the early German Emperors (that is to say, before the Hapsburgs) and proceeded to pinpoint the Germans' « national awakening » up until the Franco-Prussian War :

« Since the great days of the magnificent German victories of the years 1870-1871, we have become increasingly conscious of our Germanic identity and, now, thumb more ardently through the books of German myths, legends, and history. »

In the Hapsburg monarchy, the « Sedan celebrations » in commemoration of Prussia's victory over France were officially prohibited. The students celebrated clandestinely, invariably ending with the « Wacht am Rhein » (Guard on the Rhine) , the Prussian-German battle song against the « archenemy » , France and the German nationalists' anthem. In his speech after the « Anschluß » , in March 1938, Hitler mentioned another song of his youth :

« When these soldiers marched in, I again heard a song of my youth. Once upon a time, I sang it so often with a heart full of belief, that proud battle song :“ Das Volk steht auf, der Sturm bricht los. ” (The people are rising-up, the storm is breaking loose.) . And it was, indeed, the uprising of a people and the breaking loose of a storm. »

The students' actions against « black-yellow » teacher of religion, Schwarz, also clearly had a pan-German twist. Later, Hitler would relate with unabashed pride how, during religious instruction, he had spread pencils before him with the greater German colors black, red, and gold. The teacher said :

« You will immediately get rid of these pencils with those disgusting colors ! »

« Huh ! » , said the whole class.

« Those are the national ideals ! »

« You needn't have any national ideals in your hearts but only one ideal, and that is our fatherland and our house of Hapsburg. He who isn't for the house of Hapsburg isn't for the Church, and he who isn't for the Church, is not for God. Sit down, Hitler ! »

According to Hitler, there had been a generally revolutionary atmosphere at school, an assessment other former schoolmates confirmed.

Another example : When Linz's students were supposed to cheer Emperor Franz-Josef during his annual ride to his summer vacation in Ischl, their teacher found it necessary to advise them :

« You have to yell “ Hoch ! ” I don't want anyone to yell “ Heit ! ” »

« Heil » was the greeting of the German nationalists ; « Hoch » (up) , the shout for the house of Hapsburg.

Later, Hitler liked to emphasize that, on account of their experiences in the multi-national Empire, the German-Austrians had developed a much more alert and progressive form of nationalism than had the « “ Reich ” Germans » , even early on, when they still attended school. In this way, the child received political training in a period when, as a rule, the subject of a so-called national State knew little more of his nationality than its language. At the age of 15, Hitler reported, he had already realized the distinction between dynastic « patriotism » and folkish « nationalism » . At any rate, even at that early age, he clearly joined the camp of the radical « folkish nationalists » , rejecting the multi-national State as did the Schönererians. On this important issue, he thus distinguished himself from his father and his favourite teacher, Pötsch.

It is understandable, then, that Pötsch was annoyed when he, the Austrian patriot, discovered that, in « Mein Kampf » , he received high-praise as a teacher but, at the same time, was denounced as an enemy of Austria. For who could have studied German history under such a teacher without becoming an enemy of the State which, through its ruling house, exerted so disastrous an influence on the destinies of the nation ? And who could retain a loyalty to a dynasty that betrayed the needs of the German people, again and again, for shameless private advantage ?

When, in 1936, some teachers in Linz sent their now famous pupil photos to remind him of them, and they asked Pötsch to join them, he refused, arguing « that he did not agree with Hitler in his defamation of Austria ; he had sworn an official oath for Austria » . However, « the “ Führer ” 's beloved teacher » could no longer protect himself from a national funeral.

Jews and Czechs in Linz

The high-school in Linz apparently had a good reputation, for almost 1/3 of its students came from out of town. 50 pupils were from Lower-Austria, including Vienna ; 21 from Salzburg, Tyrol, Styria, and Carinthia ; another 21 from Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia ; 2 apiece from Galicia and Hungary ; 7 from the German « Reich » ; and 1 each from Italy, France, and Bosnia.

One of the Viennese students, from 1903 until his graduation in 1906, was Ludwig Wittgenstein, the son of the industrialist Karl Wittgenstein. He was only a few days Hitler's junior but, instructed by private tutors, was 2 grades ahead of him. Hitler is bound to have, at least, laid eyes on Wittgenstein for, in Linz, the latter was a conspicuously bizarre fellow : he spoke an unusually pure High-German, albeit with a slight stutter, wore very elegant clothes, and was highly-sensitive and extremely unsociable. It was one of his idiosyncracies to use the formal form of address with his schoolmates and to demand that they too (with the exception of a single friend) address him formally, with : « Sie » and « Herr Ludwig » . He did not love school (his 1st impression, recorded in his notebook, was : « Crap ») and he was frequently absent and had an average record. When he went to Berlin, in 1906, to attend University, his spelling was scarcely better than Hitler's.

As Hitler's schoolmates would later affirm, pupils of Jewish descent, like Wittgenstein, had no trouble at the high-school in Linz, especially not if, like Wittgenstein, they participated in religious instruction as Catholics. According to statistics, at that time, only 17 pupils in the school were Jewish, next to 323 Catholics, 19 Protestants, and a visiting Bosnian student who was Greek Orthodox.

Indeed, anti-Semitism can hardly have played a major role, and Hitler's statement in « Mein Kampf » is probably correct : at the « Realschule » , to be sure, I did meet one Jewish boy who was treated by all of us with caution ... but neither I nor the others had any thoughts on the matter. Only at the age of 14 or 15 had he encountered the word Jew with more frequency, partly in connection with political discussions.

Around 1900, only 1,102 Jews lived in all of Upper-Austria, 587 of them in Linz (in other words, less than 1 % of the city's population) and 184 in Urfahr. The numbers for 1910 were : 1,215 in Upper-Austria ; 608 in Linz ; 172 in Urfahr. The Linz Jews, for the most part, came from Furth, in Bavaria, or from Bohemia and were assimilated into the rest of society. Most of the 224 Jewish heads of household, living in Linz at the time, were merchants, professionals, or manufacturers. Some were esteemed as patrons and held honorary federal posts ; April 7, 1907, the Upper-Austrian governor gave Rabbi Moriz Friedmann the Franz-Josef Medal in appreciation of Friedmann's 25 years as a member of the Austrian District school board.

The number of Jews in Linz, then, stayed approximately the same and Eastern Jews did not immigrate into the little provincial city. In the meantime, more and more Czechs came to town. Most of them were seasonal workers who were not included in official statistics. In any case, the « fight against Slavization » , and thus against the Czechs, dominated the almost uniformly German-speaking town far more than anti-Semitism against the German-speaking Jews. In the 20 years before 1914, the « Czech question » was the main topic for discussion in the Linz City Council as well as the Linz newspapers - and the schools.

The Linz newspapers fanned the native Linzers' fear of over-alienation, of losing their jobs on account of cheap competition, of « selling-out » their native soil, and of a soaring crime rate. According to the pan-German « Linzer Fliegende » , Linz's main-square had long been a « reservoir » of « Czech boys » :

« Every night, you can see a number of Czechs on the asphalt pavement - who speak Czech rather loudly and march up and down in tight circles. That way, they simply want to prove that they have already conquered downtown Linz. »

The « defense battle against advancing Slavdom » was a « central topic » among students, according to a former classmate of Hitler :

« To be sure, we didn't look at the Slavs as an inferior ethnic group, but we fought against the curtailing of our rights. Frequently, we are told, there was some wrangling between young “ Slavic ” and “ Germanic ” men. »

Another schoolmate stated :

« The competition between the languages and the frictions in Parliament made a great impression on us pupils. We were totally against the Czechs and the ethnic Babel. »

Hitler was to tell Albert Speer that almost all his Linz schoolmates had rejected « Czech immigration to German Austria ». He hadn't recognized the « danger of Jewry » until he was in Vienna. And, in Munich, in 1929, he said :

« I lived my youth enmeshed in the border struggle for German language, culture, and thought, of which the great majority of the German people had no idea during peace time. Even when I was 13, that fight incessantly pushed itself on us, and it was fought in every high-school class. »

Yet, the Linz « Realschule » did not really have a nationality problem : of 359 pupils in the academic year 1902-1903, 357 named German as their mother tongue, and only 2 Czech. It was not much different at the other schools of higher-education in Linz : the Czech inhabitants of Linz were almost exclusively railroad workers who could not afford to send their children to advanced schools, or seasonal workers whose children lived in Bohemia.

Hitler was 14 when, in 1903, a language fight broke-out in Linz. When the Bishop permitted a Czech sermon in a Linz church, the city Council requested in a unanimous, urgent motion « to cancel the Czech service, which has been misused for Czech demonstrations » and, at the same time, advised all Linz businessmen, in the future, only to hire « German assistants and apprentices ». In March 1904, German national pupils and students broke-up a concert by Czech violinist Jan Kubelík. Thus the national question continued to be pushed into the foreground.

The question of whether someone was « Germanic » or « Slavic » played an important role even among the high-school students of Linz. According to a statement by his schoolmate Josef Keplinger, young Hitler diligently studied the alleged differences between races. One day, he apparently told Keplinger :

« You are not Germanic, you have dark eyes and dark hair ! »

Another time, he is said to have divided his classmates at the entrance of their classroom into 2 groups, left and right, « Aryans and Non-Aryans », according to purely external characteristics. What group the dark-haired Hitler joined we do not know.

Alois's Death

On January 3, 1903, at 10 A.M. , 65 year old Alois Hitler suddenly died of pulmonary bleeding. He was sitting in a tavern, at the time.

The obituary in the « Linz Tagespost » described him as « a thoroughly progressive man » and a « true friend of the free school », an allusion to the deceased's anti-clerical tendencies, his involvement in the association « Free School », and an argument he had had with the local priest. Socially (in other words, in the tavern) , he had « always (been) happy, of a downright youthful joyfulness event », and also « a friend of song ». Plus : « Even though

a rough word may have escaped his lips once in a while, a good heart was hiding behind a rough exterior. » This discreet way of putting things seems to indicate that he was cheerful in the bar but tough at home. Hitler's future guardian Josef Mayrhofer confirms this :

« In the bar, he always had to be right and had a quick temper. At home, he was strict, not a gentle man ; his wife didn't have an easy life. »

At least, the 13 year old boy must have felt relief at his tyrannical father's death. Hitler was to tell his secretary a great deal « about his mother's love » , which he returned. « I didn't love my father » , he used to say, « but I was all the more afraid of him. He had tantrums and immediately became physically violent. My poor mother would always be very scared for me. »

Still, there was no improvement in school. On account of continued bad grades, Hitler was asked to leave the Linz high-school, in 1904. Yet, his mother was not ready to give-up and sent him to the next closest « Realschule » , to Steyr, an industrial town with a population of 17,600, where he lived with a couple who boarded him. This was a great financial sacrifice for the civil servant's widow. She sold the house in Leonding and moved to Linz, to the 3rd floor of a house at number 31 « Humboldtstraße » .

The separation from his mother was very hard on the 15 year old. Josef Gœbbels would note :

« The “ Führer ” talks about his childhood. And how he was longing and pining away when his mother sent him to Steyr. And almost became ill over it. And how he still hates Steyr as a city, to this day. »

While the Hitlers lived in Steyr, the Russo-Japanese War broke-out. Hitler would later say that his class was divided into 2 camps : the « Slavs » had been for Russia, and the others for Japan :

« When, during the Russo-Japanese War, the news of Russia's defeat arrived, the Czech boys in my class cried, while we others cheered. Even then, Hitler, just like the German nationalists in Linz, suspected school children of harboring pan-Slavic convictions. »

At Whitsuntide, in 1904, the pubescent Hitler, who still did not want to study, was confirmed at the Linz cathedral. His godfather would later say :

« Among all my candidates, there was not one who was as gruff and obstinate as this one, you had to climb inside him for every word. »

The boy had not appreciated his confirmation present, a prayer-book. Neither had the expensive ride from Linz to Leonding in a carriage excited him :

« I had the impression that he found the whole confirmation disgusting. »

In Leonding, a « pack of boys » was already waiting for him, and he « quickly took-off » . The godfather's wife added :

« They behaved like Red Indians. »

To be sure, such conduct was not unusual for a 15 year old. In 1942, Hitler would say, in retrospect :

« At 13, 14, 15, I no longer believed in anything, certainly none of my friends still believed in the so-called communion, only a few totally stupid honour students ! Except, at the time, I thought everything should be blown-up. »

With 3 unsatisfactory grades (in German, math, and stenography) , Hitler was again kept back :

« This idiot of a professor spoiled the German language for me, this bungling, pathetic gnome. I would never be able to write a proper letter ! Imagine ! With a D minus from that buffoon, I never could have become a technician. »

In this situation, he would write, suddenly an illness came to his help, my serious lung ailment, which ultimately decided the eternal domestic quarrel. He was allowed to abandon his career at school and return home to his mother.

According to relatives, the sick boy let himself be pampered by his mother during the following summer in Waldviertel, having her bring him a big mug of warm milk every morning. He lived like a recluse, avoiding almost all contact with his various cousins.

This alleged serious illness must have been a temporary indisposition ; otherwise, the new family doctor, Doctor Eduard Bloch from Linz, would have known about it. After checking his files, the doctor later maintained that he treated the boy only for minor ailments, colds, or tonsilitis, and that Hitler had been neither robust nor sickly. He certainly did not have any serious illness whatsoever, let alone a lung disease.

Doctor Bloch, a Jew, was born in Frauenburg in Southern Bohemia, in 1872. After attending school in Prague, he served as an army doctor and, from 1899 on, was stationed in Linz, where he settled after his discharge. In 1901, he opened his office in the Baroque house at 12 « Landstraße » , where he also lived with his family : his wife Emilie, « née » Kafka, and their daughter Trude, born in 1903. According to Linz's future mayor Ernst Koref, Doctor Bloch was held « in high-regard, particularly among the lower and indigent social classes. It was generally known that, even at any time at night, he was willing to call on patients. He used to go on his visits in his hansom, wearing a conspicuously broad-brimmed hat » .

As an old man, in American exile, Doctor Bloch published his memoirs, in which he painted a remarkably positive picture of young Hitler, saying he had been neither a ruffian nor untidy nor fresh :

« This simply is not true. As a youth, he was quiet, well-mannered, and neatly dressed. »

He had patiently waited in the waiting room until it was his turn, then, like every well-behaved 14 or 15 year old boy, made a bow, and always thanked the doctor politely. Like the other boys in Linz, he had worn short lederhosen and a green woolen hat with a feather, he had been tall and pale and looked older than he was :

« His eyes (inherited from his mother) were large, melancholy and thoughtful. To a very large extent, this boy lived within himself. What dreams he dreamed I do not know. »

The boy's most striking feature was his love for his mother :

« While he was not a “ mother's boy ”, in the usual sense, I have never witnessed a closer attachment. »

This love had been mutual :

« Klara Hitler adored her son. She allowed him his own way wherever possible. »

For example, she admired his watercolor paintings and drawings and supported his artistic ambitions, in opposition to his father ; « at what cost to herself, one may guess » . However, the doctor expressly denies the claim that Hitler's love for his mother was pathological.

According to Doctor Bloch, the family's financial resources were scarce. He mentions that Klara Hitler had not even indulged in « the smallest extravagance » and lived extremely modestly and frugally. We have some data on the Hitlers' family budget : Klara Hitler's widow's pension amounted to 100 Kronen per month, plus 40 Kronen in federal aid for Adolf's and Paula's education. The sale of the house in Leonding yielded 10,000 Kronen, minus mortgage, taxes, expenses, and the inheritance for Adolf and Paula (frozen until their 24th birthdays) of 652 Kronen each.

At 4 % interest, the remaining approximately 5,500 Kronen may have netted some 220 Kronen annually. In addition, Klara was permitted to dispose of the interest for Adolf's and Paula's inheritance, up to their 18th year, which yielded another 52 Kronen per annum. However, the interest total of no more than 23 Kronen per month did not cover the current rent. The family of 4, who now no longer even had the Leonding fruit and vegetable garden at its disposal, had to live very modestly, particularly because around 1905 inflation had become noticeable and Klara had fallen ill. Even if « Haniaunt » contributed to the family's expenses, from then on, Klara Hitler had to fall-back on her savings. Even though their apartment was small, she acquired an additional boarder, 12 year old Wilhelm Hagemuller, the Leonding baker's son, who on schooldays ate lunch with the family.

16 year old Adolf, by now « the only man » in the family, acted just as if he were a son of a better family. He had his own room, the cabinet (which means that the 3 women shared the only remaining room and the kitchen) . He spent his days taking walks, with nightly entertainments, reading, and drawing. Thus, in « Mein Kampf » , he pays tribute to the 2 ensuing years in Linz as the happiest days of my life, which seemed to me almost a dream. He says

he had lived as his mother's darling in the hollowness of comfortable life and on a soft downy bed. After the unpleasant period in Steyr, he now enjoyed the attractions of the provincial capital. At 15 or 16, he would say in 1942, he went to all the wax works and everywhere it said, « Adults Only » .

During that time, the young man began to devour newspapers. There was a large number of papers in Linz, among them off-shoots of the large Viennese Party organs that brought such Viennese topics to Linz as anti-Semitism. For example, the Christian-Social « Linzer Post » advocated the slogan « Don't buy from Jews ! » and commented :

« If money supply is cut-off from the Jews, then, they themselves have to retreat and Austria will be rid of the disgusting lice infestation. »

« The Jews » were portrayed as seducers of girls, as a danger to the State, and as Socialists, for « always and everywhere, the fellow tribesmen of these workers' tormentors are the tried leaders of Social-Democracy » .

The « Linzer Fliegenden » , on the other hand, subtitled « Volkisches Witzblattl » (folkish joke journal) , propagated ethnic anti-Semitism, in the manner of the pan-Germans. The journal was anti-clerical, rejected the multi-national State, and made propaganda against the Hungarians (the « Huns ») , the Czechs, and the Jews. There was a great deal of publicity for the « Alldeutsches Tagblatt » , whose writers, including Guido von List and Jorg Lanz von Liebenfels, were quoted frequently.

The paper distributed pan-German brochures, including the speeches of Georg Ritter von Schönerer, and « Jew coupons » - sheets of 40 coupon-like stamps at 10 Heller each with, more or less fabricated anti-Semitic utterances, by famous people, such as Helmuth Count of Moltke :

« The Jews form a State within the State ; following their own laws, they know how to bypass those of the country » ; or even Tacitus :

« The Jews are the abomination of the human race. Everything that to us is sacrosanct, is contemptible to them ; while they are permitted to do anything that is an outrage to us. They are the lowliest of all peoples. » (« deterrima gens »)

When these sayings reappeared on doors and windows of Jewish shops in Linz ; Linz's Austrian Israelite Union retaliated on October 16, 1907, by pressing criminal charges.

One of the readers of the « Linzer Fliegenden » is said to have been young Hitler. Even at that early age, he had fallen under the influence of the pan-Germans, whose main enemy were the Social-Democrats.

In a 1929 speech, Hitler would brag about being one of the early fighters against the « Reds » :

« When I was a boy, I wore the black, red, and gold badge and, like innumerable of my early friends, was seriously

beaten-up by Marxists. They tore-up the black, red, and gold flag and kicked it in the mud. »

Theatre and 1st Love

In Linz, young Hitler discovered his love for the theatre. Linz's regional Theatre performed Operas, Operettas, and plays from the typical repertoire for the educated : from Mozart's « Magic Flute » to Strauß Operettas and comedies of manners. Standing room only, in the 3rd gallery, cost just 50 Heller, hardly more than a ticket for a concert by the army Orchestra or the extremely popular movies.

In 1905, the 100th anniversary of Schiller's death, the German nationalists celebrated their « freedom poet » . In the regional Theatre, Schiller's plays were at the center of the program, above all, « William Tell » . Krackowizer wrote on May 4, 1905 :

« Anniversary celebrations wherever German hearts are beating. »

The most popular official speaker was Leopold Pötsch.

Richard Wagner's œuvre was also being cultivated, for Linz's music director August Göllerich (Anton Bruckner's student and biographer) was old enough to have known the Mæstro personally. Among the regional Theatre's repertoire was « Lohengrin » and, since January 3, 1905, also the early Opera « Rienzi », which received particular notice as the town's gymnastics club took part in the famous « sword dance » .

Later, Klara Hitler's boarder Hagmüller would relate that young Hitler frequented the regional Theatre and even outlined plans for its reconstruction. According to Hagmüller, Hitler preferred Wagner Operas and Schiller plays and liked to sing « Du Schwan zieh hin » from « Lohengrin » while walking back and forth in his room. When, in 1938, an emissary of the NSDAP archive collected biographical material on the « Führer » in Linz, he learned much to his amazement that « funnily enough » , Hitler's favourite actors in Linz (that is to say, his Wagner and Schiller heroes) , were « almost exclusively Jews » .

In 1905, in the regional Theatre's standing room, Hitler met August (« Gustl ») Kubizek, who was almost the same age. They became friends. Kubizek worked as an upholsterer's apprentice in his father's shop ; his father was happy that « Gustl » had such a well-behaved and polite friend as Adolf Hitler. He profited from Kubizek's excellent training in music. The 2 shared their enthusiasm for Wagner. In his memoirs, Kubizek describes in detail the outstanding impression « Rienzi, der letzte der Tribunen » (Rienzi, the last of the tribunes) made on young Hitler. The pompous work required a large Orchestra with a great deal of brass and drums, and contained thrilling scenes with large crowds ; the endings of its acts were over-powering, and it was full of roaring shouts of « Heil » .

In the 14th Century, Cola di Rienzi rose from being the son of a Roman bartender to the people's tribune, unifying splintered Italy into a powerful Republic after a Classical model, but he was subsequently toppled by the people and died during an uprising. In the 19th century, the age of national unification, his story was romantically glorified in a

much-read novel by Edward George Bulwer-Lytton. During the preliminaries of the revolution of 1848, young Richard Wagner also tried his hand at this national material. For him, « Rienzi » was the hero who saved and liberated the people, in Wagner's words, an « extreme enthusiast who, like a flashing beam of light, appeared among a people that had sunk low and was degenerated but which, he believed, he was called upon to enlighten and lift-up high » .

After the Opera, Kubizek later wrote, 16 year old Hitler walked with him in a « totally transported state » to Linz's Frein Mountain, until the early hours of the morning. « In grand, infectious images, he outlined to me the future of the German people » . Kubizek quoted at length verses that had « touched (their) hearts » , such as when « Rienzi » sings, « doch wählet ihr zum Schützer reich / der Rechte, die dem Volk erkannt, / so blickt auf eure Ahnen hin : / Und nennt mich euren Volkstribun ! » (and if you choose me as your protector of the people's rights, look at your ancestors and call me your people's tribune !) The masses reply : « Rienzi, Heil ! Heil, people's tribune ! » .

Later, it was important to Hitler to be looked on as « Rienzi » re-incarnate. Among the Kubizek family, his alleged statement, « I want to become a people's tribune » , was passed on. The spirited « Rienzi » Overture became the secret anthem of the 3rd « Reich » , well-known as the introduction to the Nuremberg Party conventions.

According to Kubizek, 16 year old Hitler was a puny, pale, serious young man, always simply, but neatly and properly attired :

« Adolf made much of polite conduct and strict, proper form. »

With his only suit, pepper-and-salt with perfect creases, he wore white shirts ironed by his mother and black kid gloves, as well as a special touch, a little black ebony cane and sometimes even a top hat, an outfit like a college student's. Kubizek wrote :

« Since Linz didn't have a University, the young people of all classes and strata of society all the more eagerly emulated students' customs. »

Young Hitler's manner of speaking, Kubizek noted, was « very choice » . In other words, contrary to those around him, he did not speak a dialect but High-German. In addition, he had a « well-developed sense of performing » . The young man displayed his desire to be the center of attention by being given to talking much and persistently, always in the form of monologues. He did not permit anyone to contradict him :

« Sometimes, when he became entirely lost in his fantasies, I got the suspicion that everything he said was nothing but an exercise in oratory. »

Kubizek was surprised that his friend avoided all contact with his former schoolmates. Once, he reported, they ran into a former classmate of Hitler, on the promenade in Linz. To the question, « How are you ? » Hitler only brusquely replied that : « that was none of his business, just as Adolf himself couldn't care less what the other one was up to » .

It was probably in the spring of 1906 that the 17 year old Ist fell in love. To be sure, the blonde Linz beauty of higher-standing, 2 years his senior, never noticed her shy admirer, who watched her from afar as she walked in the Linz main street with her mother. Stefanie had already graduated and then been to Munich and Geneva for professional training, and was now back in her home-town of Linz. She had many admirers, a fact Hitler jealously observed during the strolls, particularly if they were officers. He called them « lazybones » and got flustered about their social standing, « but particularly about the opportunities these airheads had with the ladies » . According to Kubizek, Hitler only lived for « that woman who possessed all of his passionate affection, without being aware of it » .

And, « he envisions Stefanie as his wife, he is building the house in which she lives with him, surrounds it with a magnificent park » , and so on. Yet, according to Kubizek, he did not exchange a single word with this « being in his dream world » .

Ist Time in Vienna

Even though his guardian urged him to alleviate some of the burden in his mother's household, Hitler did not accept any jobs nor start an apprenticeship. Instead, he announced his desire to become an artist, an aspiration his mother supported. She even paid for a trip to Vienna so he could go to the Imperial art gallery, an unusual and expensive undertaking for the son of a civil servant's widow. In May 1906, after a 6 hour trip on an accommodation train, the 17 year old arrived in the Imperial capital and residence for the 1st time.

The size, the tumult, and the brightness of the metropolis impressed and confused anyone arriving from the provinces. Nowhere in the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy was traffic as heavy as it was in Vienna. In 1907, 1,458 automobiles, more than half the total number registered in the whole Empire, were in the capital. They caused 354 accidents per year, even with a speed limit of 15 miles per hour in the city. More important still were horsedrawn carriages : there were 997 hansoms drawn by 2 horses ; 1,754 1 horse carriages ; and 1,101 cabs, which altogether caused 982 accidents.

The 10 inner Districts were already electrified, so in the streets, there were no longer any gas lights. The Westbahnhof (the western station, where trains arrived from Linz) was illuminated by electric lights too. Electrification of tenement buildings was progressing rapidly : in 1908, in non-official buildings alone, there already were 176 arc lamps and 657,625 incandescent lamps - 1 incandescent lamp per person. Linz, on the other hand, had only 6 electric arc lamps on the main square and 1 on the bridge between Linz and Urfahr ; otherwise, it had only gas and kerosene lamps.

We do not know where, in Vienna, Hitler lived. That he found lodgings with his godfather Johann Prinz, as is frequently claimed, does not seem possible. In a document from 1885, Mr. and Mrs. Prinz are mentioned as « a married couple, the husband being a swimming pool attendant at the “ Sofienbad ”, in Vienna » , living in the 3rd District, 28 « Löwengasse » . That they were still at that address, in 1906, is not documented, and there is no other information about this either. According to Kubizek, Hitler never visited relatives ; « even later, this never came-up during conversation » .

Hitler's 1st visit to Vienna, he later says in « Mein Kampf », triggered his enthusiasm for the architecture of the « Ring » Boulevard :

« The purpose of my trip was to study the picture gallery in the Court Museum, but I had eyes for scarcely anything but the museum itself. From morning until late at night, I ran from one object of interest to another, but it was always the buildings that held my primary interest. For hours, I could stand in front of the Opera ; for hours, I could gaze at the Parliament ; the whole “ Ring ” Boulevard seemed to me like an enchantment out of “ The 1,001 Nights ”. »

The only sources concerning this first trip to Vienna are 4 picture postcards to Kubizek. They are the earliest-known autographs of Hitler to date.

Not even the post-office stamps reveal how long the trip lasted. (In « Mein Kampf », Hitler suggests 2 weeks.) One card, post-marked May 7, 1906, contains a 3 part view of the « Karlsplatz », where Hitler marked the music club building with an « X » : to indicate the place of the Conservatory school, which Kubizek dreamed of attending one day. The card reads :

« Sending you this card, I must, at the same time, apologize to you for not having written sooner. So, I did arrive all right and now walk around busily. Tomorrow, I will go to the Opera to hear “ Tristan ”, the day after tomorrow, “ The Flying Dutchman ”, etc. Even though I like everything fine, I am still looking forward to being back in Linz. Today, to the City Theatre. With best regards, Your friend Adolf Hitler. »

The 17 year old, having been taught by his mother to be polite, does not forget to ask Kubizek to give his regards to his parents.

What Hitler mentioned matches perfectly with the program : on Tuesday, May 8, 1906, there was a performance of « Tristan und Isolde », from 7 to 11:30 , with Erik Schmedes as « Tristan », Anna von Mildenburg as « Isolde », and Richard Mayr as « King Marke » . On Wednesday, May 9, « The Flying Dutchman » was scheduled. On May 7, 1906, the City Theatre performed a rural farce by Ludwig Anzengruber. The other postcards depict views of the outside and inside of the Opera and Parliament.

At any rate, on at least 2 evenings, the young man experienced the ultimate of contemporary Wagner interpretation at the Court Opera : the Wagnerian « total work of art », constructed by Court Opera director Gustav Mahler and his stage director Alfred Roller and « cleared » of tradition. What is most important is this : for the 1st time in his life, young Hitler witnessed Gustav Mahler as a Wagner conductor - in the May 8 performance of « Tristan » .

After this 1st sojourn in Vienna, the capital attracted the young man like a magnet. Kubizek observed :

« In his thoughts, he frequently was no longer in Linz but was already living right in the center of Vienna. »

But even if the provincial town may have become too small for him, it still offered quite a few attractions : on May 26, 1906, the « Buffalo Bill Circus Show » performed a spectacle entitled « Wild West » , involving 800 performers in costumes, among them 100 American Indians, plus 500 horses. On June 7, the young people in Linz marveled at 150 luxury cars and their noble « gentleman drivers » , who were making a stop in Linz during their race. On September 28, the performances by the American cinema group « The Royal Video » started in the « Volksfesthalle » (people's Party hall) , and according to Krackowizer, performances were « jam-packed every day, netting a fortune » .

On October 13, the State Theatre, for the 1st time, performed the greatest music hit of the era, Franz Lehár's Operetta « The Merry Widow » . Via gramophones, the tunes spread « ad nauseam » into cafés and bars. Hitler remained faithful to this favourite Operetta of his until the end : in 1943-1944, at the Wolf Entrenchment in East-Prussia, he was not listening to Wagner, but « never anything but “ The Merry Widow ” » , as an earwitness reported with a moan.

From October 1906 on, Hitler took piano lessons with Kubizek's teacher, for no less than 5 Kronen a month. He did not get very far. The teacher visibly cringed when, in 1938, he was supposed to tell the NSDAP's main archive his memories of the « Führer » :

« As far as the lessons are concerned, he was never distracted, and (as for other conversations, before or after the lessons) rather reserved. In short, at the time, I wouldn't have had the slightest idea as to what a great Statesman was taking lessons with me. »

In January 1907, when his life was about to take a turn, Hitler decided to discontinue his lessons. On January 14, 1907, Klara Hitler, who was in excruciating pain, consulted with the family physician, Doctor Bloch. He detected a breast tumor and advised an operation, which was performed 4 days later, at the Hospital of the Sisters of Mercy, in Linz. Because she had no health insurance, such a hospital stay posed an enormous financial burden, particularly because the daily rate, was set at 5 Kronen instead of the usual 2. In addition, there were various other invoices, such as the surgeon's bill. For the 20 day stay (from January 17 to February 5) , the hospital charged 100 Kronen, which, according to the bill, was paid by « the son » who, at the time, was 17 years old. Furthermore, Klara needed after-care by the family doctor, Bloch, and this was getting more and more costly. Apparently, 17 year old Hitler made the necessary decisions by himself. His 17 year old sister Paula was too young, and his married half-sister Angela Raubal was no longer part of the common household. Besides, she was only Klara's step-daughter. « Haniaunt » was not up to such tasks and kept so much in the background that neither Doctor Bloch nor Kubizek mentioned her.

It was the spring of the 1st national elections since the introduction of the general, direct, and equal suffrage for men. Krackowizer wrote on May 2 1907 :

« Those interested get extremely excited during national elections : flyers, assemblies, etc. , galore. »

The right to vote invigorated the Social-Democrats, who were now serious competitors against the Nationals and

Clericals. They gained all of Linz's 3 parliamentary mandates. It is certainly possible that Hitler's hatred for the « Reds » goes back, in part, to this bitter and, in the end, lost election campaign of what had been Linz's main Parties - fought and lost especially by the German People's Party (DVP) .

After a brief recuperation period, 46 year old Klara Hitler had difficulty climbing the stairs to the 3rd floor. In early May 1907, the family moved to the small-town of Urfahr, across the Danube, to 46 « Hauptstraße » . Financial difficulties may have been a factor too. In any case, Urfahr, which was not incorporated into Linz until 1917, was said to be particularly cheap, for one thing, because of its agrarian markets, but also because it was free of the consumption tax that made all goods more expensive in Linz. According to Kubizek, even before that time, Hitler had done the family's major shopping in Urfahr.

After only 2 weeks, the family moved once again, this time to nearby 9 « Blütenstraße » , in Urfahr. At 50 Kronen, rent on the 1st floor of this nice, even elegant house was very high for Urfahr, amounting to almost half of Klara's widow's pension, which was certainly more than the family could afford. Thus, it continued to be necessary to tap the small capital acquired from the sale of the house. Klara, who was seriously ill, lived another few comfortable months there.

According to Doctor Bloch, the apartment had 3 small rooms. The windows offered a magnificent view of Mount Postling :

« My predominant impression of the simple furnished apartment was its cleanliness. It glistened ; not a speck of dust on the chairs or tables, not a stray fleck of mud on the scrubbed floor, not a smudge on the panes in the windows. “ Frau ” Hitler was a superb house-keeper. »

The house belonged to the widow of a District Court judge, Magdalena Hanisch, who lived in an adjoining apartment on the 1st floor and showed great concern for Klara Hitler. In the house also, lived a retired post-Master with his wife, a retired professor, and (apparently, in the basement rooms) 2 day-laborers.

According to Doctor Bloch's cash book, Klara Hitler visited his office on July 3 and did not return until September 2. It is not clear whether the doctor's office was closed during the summer (in which case, however, he would have noted the name of his substitute, Doctor Kren) or if the patient had left once more for Waldviertel with her family to recuperate there. Considering travel conditions at the time, the ride was relatively comfortable ; the train went from Linz to Gmund and, from there, a pair of oxen took the family to Klara's parent's house in the village of Spital, near Weitra.

August Kubizek

Le chef d'orchestre autrichien August Kubizek est né le 3 août 1888 à Linz, en Haute-Autriche ; et est mort le 23 octobre 1956 à Linz.

Surnommé « Gustl », il était l'ami et le co-locataire d'Adolf Hitler à Linz et à Vienne, entre 1904 et 1908.

Les parents d'August Kubizek sont des Autrichiens d'origine tchèque. Après des études élémentaires, August travaille comme apprenti-tapissier dans l'entreprise de son père. En outre, sa véritable passion est la musique. À la Toussaint de l'année 1904, il fait la rencontre d'Adolf Hitler à l'Opéra de Linz. Les 2 jeunes gens sont mélomanes et particulièrement attirés par les grands compositeurs germaniques en vogue à la fin du XIXe siècle : Richard Wagner, Gustav Mahler ou encore Felix Mendelssohn.

À la même époque, Hitler, qui suit encore un enseignement, est renvoyé de la « Realschule » de Linz, où il s'ennuie. Son professeur d'histoire, Léopold Pötsch, est un fervent pan-germaniste. D'ailleurs, entre les 2 jeunes gens, c'est Hitler qui dirige les discussions politiques et artistiques. Il habite avec sa mère Klara Pözl, à « Urfahr », dans la banlieue, alors qu'August vit chez ses parents à Linz même. Les 2 adolescents flânent régulièrement dans les rues de la ville, jusqu'au jour où Hitler tombe amoureux d'une jeune bourgeoise, nommée Stéphanie, rencontrée sur la « Landstraße », alors qu'elle se promenait avec sa mère. On a la mention qu'Hitler aurait voulu se suicider dans le Danube, ne parvenant pas à séduire la jeune fille au cours du printemps 1906. Klara Pözl, désormais convaincue que son fils ne fera rien de bon au collège, accepte qu'il tente son entrée aux Beaux-arts.

Hitler s'apprête à tenter le concours d'entrée aux Beaux-arts de Vienne, en octobre 1907, il déménage dans la capitale autrichienne. Lorsqu'Adolf Hitler échoue une 1re fois, il ne prévient pas Kubizek ni sa mère et continue d'étudier le dessin. En décembre 1907, il apprend l'hospitalisation de sa mère et court à son chevet à Linz : elle succombe à un cancer du sein, le 21. La famille Kubizek a alors proposé à Hitler de passer les fêtes de Noël avec eux, ce dernier refuse. D'après le témoignage de Kubizek, Hitler aurait réussi à convaincre le père de ce dernier de lui permettre de tenter le Conservatoire de Vienne (en février 1908) . Ils louent une petite chambre avec un piano dans la « Stumpergasse » . August apprend le violon et réussit son entrée au Conservatoire. Ils ont peu d'argent pour vivre, bien que l'un reçoive de l'argent de poche de Linz et que l'autre perçoive une pension d'orphelin. Le 8 octobre 1908, Hitler retente son entrée aux Beaux-arts, c'est un nouvel échec. On ne sait pas exactement pour quelle raison, peut-être qu'il effectuait son service militaire, Kubizek était absent à cette période-là. Il reçoit des cartes postales d'Hitler et lorsqu'il revient à Vienne au mois de novembre, il retrouve la chambre vide, Hitler est parti.

August Kubizek ne retrouve pas Hitler, qui vit pourtant toujours à Vienne. Kubizek poursuit ses études et devient, à partir d'octobre 1912 et jusqu'à l'éclatement de la Première Guerre mondiale, chef d'orchestre au théâtre de Marburg sur Drau (aujourd'hui, Maribor) . En août 1914, Kubizek est enrôlé dans l'armée austro-hongroise. Après la démobilisation de 1918, il accepte un poste de chef d'orchestre au théâtre d'Eferding (à 30 kilomètres de Linz, en Haute-Autriche) , la musique continue à être sa passion. Il se marie, deux 2 sont nés de cette union. En 1933, il félicite personnellement Adolf Hitler pour sa nomination à la Chancellerie. Les Nazis lui demandent d'écrire un ouvrage sur la jeunesse du « Führer » (« Réminiscences », 2 tomes, 1938) . Entre 1938 et 1940, il est l'invité personnel au Festival de Bayreuth aux côtés du « Führer » . Entre 1945 et 1946, il est emprisonné par les Américains qui l'accusent d'avoir été proche d'Hitler, mais il est finalement libéré et rédige un ouvrage sur cette amitié en 1953, sous le titre : « Adolf Hitler, mein Jugendfreund » (Adolf Hitler, mon ami d'enfance, Gallimard, 1954) .

Il décède à Linz en octobre 1956 à l'âge de 68 ans.

Dans les années 1950 et cela jusqu'à une date récente, les historiens, en particulier les américains, remettaient sérieusement en doute les informations données par Kubizek, en l'accusant d'inventer la plupart des anecdotes. Brigitte Hamann, puis d'autres, ont proposé de revaloriser son témoignage. En y regardant de plus près, on se rend compte finalement qu'il a fourni des détails authentiques. À partir de là, Lothar Machtan s'est demandé si Kubizek n'avait pas eu une relation homosexuelle avec Hitler, ce que rejette fermement Ian Kershaw. Pourtant, Kubizek note dans ses mémoires qu'à l'époque où ils cohabitaient à Vienne, et même à Linz, Hitler a toujours eu des avances de filles ou de femmes, ce qu'il ne supportait pas. Il note également que son ami était fou amoureux de Stéphanie qu'il voulait épouser. Kubizek fait une longue description de cette relation à distance entre Hitler et la jeune fille. Dans les années 1950, cette personne était devenue la veuve du colonel Rabatsch. Installée en banlieue viennoise, elle fut très sollicitée.

Elle finit par rédiger une note :

« Je ne me souviens pas d'Adolf Hitler. Ce qu'a dit Monsieur Kubizek de l'amour qu'il m'aurait porté est possible ; les indications qu'il a données sur les lieux de mes promenades avec ma mère, sur ma famille, sur moi-même sont exactes sauf sur un point : mes cheveux n'étaient pas coiffés en longues tresses. C'était interdit au collège. Je me souviens avoir reçu, vers l'âge de 20 ans, une lettre d'un garçon inconnu. Il m'écrivait qu'il partait pour Vienne, où il allait entrer à l'Académie des Beaux-arts, mais qu'il reviendrait m'épouser. Je ne sais plus si c'était signé ni de quel nom. À l'époque, les jeunes filles ne s'intéressaient pas à des garçons plus jeunes qu'elles. »

(Stéphanie Rabatsch)

Cela révèle donc que les informations données par Kubizek sont exactes. En fait, selon François Delpla, il n'a même pas commis d'erreur puisqu'il ne dit pas que Stéphanie a porté des tresses sur le chemin du collège, mais seulement sur une photo que lui-même a connu beaucoup plus tard. On pense aujourd'hui que la veuve a essayé de dissimuler une relation qui aurait peut-être pu voir le jour si Hitler n'avait pas été timide et s'il n'avait pas connu la pauvreté à la suite de son second échec à l'examen d'entrée aux Beaux-arts, en 1908.

Par contre, les historiens doutent toujours aujourd'hui de Kubizek au sujet de l'émergence de l'antisémitisme chez le jeune Hitler. D'ailleurs, il est assez confus dans ses informations. Selon lui, Adolf Hitler était un jeune homme soigné, posé, qui détestait la guerre jusqu'à critiquer les frères Wright d'avoir expérimenté le tir aérien. A contrario, Brigitte Hamann, affirme, en se fondant sur un discours qu'il a donné en 1923, à Munich, sur la Seconde Guerre des Boers, qu'Hitler adorait la guerre depuis son enfance. Kubizek note également que son ami nourrissait une vocation de dictateur qu'il aurait trouvée dans l'Opéra « Rienzi » , de Richard Wagner, qui raconte l'ascension d'un chef politique en s'appuyant sur les masses. On ne sait pas vraiment si le jeune Hitler, qui vivait à Vienne en 1908, était antisémite ou non comme il l'affirme lui-même dans « Mein Kampf » . Kubizek, quant à lui, fait remonter l'antisémitisme d'Hitler à l'époque de Linz (donc, avant 1908) . Il explique que, lors d'une balade, Hitler et lui seraient passés devant une synagogue et que Hitler aurait fait remarquer que cela ne faisait pas partie de Linz. Puis, une autre fois, à Vienne, Hitler aurait dénoncé à la police un mendiant juif qui arnaquait les passants. Ces informations ne peuvent pas être

vérifiées et reposent donc seulement sur les dires de Kubizek. Les historiens tendent aujourd'hui à expliquer la « période de Linz » plutôt comme une approche du pan-germanisme ; Hitler se serait déclaré plutôt patriote allemand comme le lui a enseigné le professeur Pötsch. Quant à l'émergence de sa haine des Juifs, elle est probablement à situer lorsqu'il devint manœuvre et petit-peintre (hiver 1908-1909) dans une ville où il était normal de détester les Juifs, comme le soulignait avec virulence le maire antisémite de Vienne, Karl Lueger.

...

August (« Gustl ») Kubizek was born on 3 August 1888 in Linz ; and died on 23 October 1956 in Linz.

He was a close friend of Adolf Hitler when both were in their late-teens. He later wrote about their friendship in his book : « The Young Hitler I knew » (1955) .

August was born into a middle-class Austrian family with Czech roots, he was the 1st born and only surviving child of Michael and Maria Kubizek. His sisters Maria, Therese and Karoline died in early childhood. Kubizek later wrote that this was a striking parallel between his own life and that of Adolf Hitler, whose mother had lost 4 children prematurely. As the surviving sons of grief-stricken mothers, August and Adolf could not help but feel they had been spared or « chosen » by fate.

Kubizek and Hitler 1st met while competing for standing room in the « Landestheater » in Linz, Upper-Austria. Because of their shared passion for the Operas of Richard Wagner, they quickly became close friends and later room-mates in Vienna while both sought admission into college. The 2 shared a small-room at number 29/2 « Stumpergasse » , Door 17, in the 6th district of Vienna, from 22 February to early July 1908.

As the only son of a self-employed upholsterer, August was expected to someday take-over his father's business, but he secretly harboured dreams of becoming a conductor. With Adolf's encouragement, he devoted more and more of his time to this passion, completing all the musical training available to him in Linz. However, to achieve his goal, he would require higher-education in music which was offered only in Vienna.

It was Adolf Hitler who, at the age of 18, successfully persuaded Kubizek's father to let his son go to the metropolis to attend the Conservatory. This, Kubizek wrote, changed the course of his life for good.

He was immediately accepted into the Vienna Conservatory where he quickly made a name for himself. Hitler, however, was twice denied entrance into Vienna's art academy, a fact which he kept hidden from his friend for some time. In 1908, Hitler abruptly broke-off the friendship and drifted into homelessness. Kubizek completed his studies in 1912 and was hired as conductor of the Orchestra in Marburg on the Drau, in Lower-Styria (called : Maribor, in Slovenia, after 1918) . He was later offered a position at the « Stadttheater » in Klagenfurt, but this job and his musical career were cut short by the beginning of World War I. Before leaving for the front, he married Anna Funke (born on 7 October 1887 ; and died on 4 October 1976) , a violinist from Vienna with whom he had 3 sons : Augustin, Karl Maria and Rudolf.

From August 1914 until November 1918, Kubizek served as a reservist in Regiment No. 2 of the Austro-Hungarian Infantry. In the Carpathian winter campaign of 1915, he was wounded at Eperjes, in Hungary (now, Prešov in Slovakia), and later evacuated to Budapest in an ambulance train. After months of convalescence, he returned to the front and was attached to a mechanized corps in Vienna. After the War, Kubizek accepted a position as an official in the municipal council of Eferding, Upper-Austria and music became his hobby.

After seeing Hitler on the front-page of the « Münchner Illustrierte » (around 1920), Kubizek followed his friend's career with some interest, although he did not attempt to contact him until 1933 when he wrote to congratulate him on having become Chancellor of Germany. On 4 August of that year, Kubizek received an unexpected reply from Hitler, who wrote to his old friend :

« “ Gustl ”, I should be very glad to revive, once more with you, those memories of the best years of my life. »

30 years after Hitler had broken-off contact with Kubizek, the 2 friends were re-united on 9 April 1938, during one of Hitler's visits in Linz. The 2 spoke for over an hour at the Hotel Weinzinger and Hitler offered Kubizek the conductorship of one of Germany's leading Orchestra, which Kubizek politely refused. Upon learning of his friend's 3 sons, Hitler insisted on financing their educations at the Anton Bruckner Conservatory, in Linz. Hitler later invited Kubizek to attend the Bayreuth Festival as his guest in 1939 and, again, in 1940, experiences described by Kubizek as « the happiest hours of my earthly existence » .

In 1938, Kubizek was hired by the Nazi Party to write 2 short propaganda booklets called « Reminiscences » about his youth with Hitler. In one episode, Kubizek said that Hitler had a great love for a girl named « Stefanie » and wrote her many love poems but never sent them. Hitler biographer John Toland noted that when Stefanie learned she had been an early object of Hitler's affection, she was stunned.

Kubizek saw Hitler for the last time on 23 July 1940, although, as late as 1944, Hitler sent Kubizek's mother a food basket for her 80th birthday.

Hitler told Kubizek :

« This War will set us back many years in our building programme. It is a tragedy. I did not become Chancellor of the Greater German “ Reich ” to fight wars. »

Hitler was speaking after the successful campaigns in Poland and France that he, as « Führer » , had led.

When the tide began to turn against Hitler's favour, Kubizek, who had avoided politics all his life, became a member of the Nazi Party in 1942 as a gesture of loyalty to his friend.

In December 1945, Kubizek gathered the collection of post-cards and other keepsakes given to him by Hitler during

their youth and concealed them carefully in the basement of his house, in Eferding. He was arrested shortly afterwards and held at Glasenbach, where he was imprisoned and interrogated by the U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command for 16 months. His home was searched, but the Hitler correspondence and drawings were not found. He was released on 8 April 1947, after over 12 months imprisonment by American authorities without ever being accused of breaking any law.

In 1951, Kubizek, who had rejected other post-War offers for his memoirs, agreed to publish « Adolf Hitler, mein Jugendfreund » (Adolf Hitler, My Childhood Friend) through the « Leopold Stocker Verlag ». The original manuscript was 293 pages long and included several pictures, many of which showed post-cards and sketches given to the author by the young Hitler, between the years 1906 and 1908. The book is divided into 3 parts and consists of a prologue, 24 chapters and an epilogue.

It caused a stir when it was released in 1953 and was later translated into several languages. In the epilogue, Kubizek wrote :

« Even though I, a fundamentally un-political individual, had always kept aloof from the political events of the period which ended forever in 1945, nevertheless, no power on earth could compel me to deny my friendship with Adolf Hitler. »

Kubizek's 2nd wife and widow Pauline (1906-2001) was credited with having provided the « Stocker Verlag » with additional photographs for the book's 4th edition, in 1975.

On 8 January 1956, Kubizek was named the 1st honorary member of the « Musikverein », in Eferding. He died on 23 October 1956, aged 68, in Linz and is buried in Eferding, Upper-Austria.

...

August Kubizek, the only surviving child of Michæl and Maria Kubizek, was born on 3rd August 1888. He had 3 sisters but they all died in childhood. After leaving school, he found work with a upholsterer in Linz, Upper-Austria.

Kubizek met Adolf Hitler at a Opera House, in 1904.

As Louis L. Snyder has pointed-out :

« Before long, August began to regard his chance acquaintance as his best friend. The 2 subsequently became room-mates and took frequent walks through the town and went on country excursions. The serious, tense, and meticulous Adolf dominated his friend, who served as a kind of audience. »

August later claimed that Hitler felt very strongly about political issues :

« It seemed like a volcano erupting. It was as though something quite apart from him was bursting out of him. »

Hitler's mother, Klara, was operated on for breast cancer in February, 1907.

Kubizek went to visit her :

« “ Frau ” Klara seemed more careworn than ever. Her face was deeply lined. Her eyes were lifeless, her voice sounded tired and resigned. I had the impression that, now that Adolf was no longer there, she had let herself go, and looked older and more ailing than ever. She certainly had concealed her condition from her son to make the parting easier for him. Or, perhaps, it was Adolf's impulsive nature that had kept-up her vitality. Now, on her own, she seemed to me an old, sick woman. »

Kubizek dreamt of becoming a conductor and, in 1908, Kubizek left his upholsterer's shop and journeyed to Vienna to study the viola at the Academy of Music. Hitler joined him as he intended to study art in the city. The 2 men roomed together at number 29/2 « Stumper Alley » (« Stumpergasse ») , Door 17, in the 6th district of Vienna. However, Hitler was rejected by the Academy of Fine-Arts, a blow from which he never recovered.

Kubizek claims that Hitler took the news very badly :

« Choking with his catalogue of hates, he would pour his fury over everything, against mankind in general who did not understand him, who did not appreciate him and by whom he was persecuted and cheated. I had the impression that Adolf Hitler became unbalanced. »

Kubizek completed his studies in 1912 and was hired as conductor of the Orchestra in Marburg. In 1914, he married Anna Funke and, over the next few years, she gave birth to 3 sons (Augustin, Karl Maria and Rudolf) . On the outbreak of the First World War, he joined the Austro-Hungarian Infantry. He was wounded in 1915 and, after making a full-recovery, he returned to action.

After the War, he became an official in the municipal council of Eferding, in Upper-Austria. In 1933, Kubizek sent Adolf Hitler a letter congratulating him on becoming Chancellor of Germany. Hitler replied but did not meet Kubizek until 9th April 1938, during a visit to Linz. Hitler offered to arrange for Kubizek to conduct one of Germany's leading Orchestra. When his friend politely refused, Hitler insisted on financing Kubizek's 3 sons education at the Anton Bruckner Conservatory. Hitler also hired Kubizek to write 2 short propaganda booklets about Hitler's early life.

Kubizek was arrested in December 1945 and was imprisoned and interrogated by United States Army officers. He was not released until 8th April 1947. His book, « The Young Hitler I Knew » , was published in 1953.

Ian Kershaw has argued in « Hitler 1889-1936 » (published in 1998) :

« Kubizek's post-War memoirs need to be treated with care, both in factual detail and in interpretation. They are a

lengthened and embellished version of recollections he had originally been commissioned by the Nazi Party to compile. However, for all their weaknesses, his recollections have been shown to be a more credible source on Hitler's youth than was once thought. There can be no doubt that, whatever their deficiencies, they do contain important reflections of the young Hitler's personality, showing features in embryo which were to be all too prominent in later years. »

August Kubizek died on 23rd October 1956.

...

Aside from Opera, Adolf Hitler had little interest in Classical music. Sometimes, his friend musician August Kubizek got free tickets at the Vienna Conservatory for concerts performed in the « Goldensaal » of the « Musikverein » . There, Hitler, for the 1st time, listened to the music - more precisely, the 4th Symphony (the « Romantic ») of his Upper-Austrian compatriot, Anton Bruckner, which was still rarely played at the time and, according to Kubizek, was « intoxicated in every respect » . In later years, Hitler would proudly mention Bruckner ; for example, in 1942, after a performance of the 7th Symphony :

« Everything, folk-tunes from Upper-Austria, none of them adopted literally, but still, piece by piece, slow regional waltzes and other tunes I've been familiar with since my youth. What that man made out of the primitive material ! You can imagine what a rough time that little farmer had when he arrived in Vienna, in that metropolitan, decadent society. »

...

Adolf Hitler was obsessed with buildings and was constantly planning new living spaces, bridges, stations and museums. He also planned plays and endlessly discussed with August Kubizek the Operas they had seen together. Kubizek had genuine musical skills and could more than keep-up on this front. Richard Wagner, Franz Lehár and Anton Bruckner were their favourite composers. Adolf was always somewhat inscrutable, Kubizek says, but when faced with great art, fired by « his enthusiasm for beauty » , he would lower his defences. Adolf, however, was « a deeply serious man » who showed a « deadly earnestness, he never ceased to attack new problems, a care-free letting-go of himself was alien to him » .

...

No biographer can claim that August Kubizek was anything but an intimate and expert commentator on Adolf Hitler and his association with music.

Kubizek gives us a brief portrait of the teenager recalled half a Century later when he decided to write about his extraordinary friendship with the young Hitler. Music was the single common factor that most linked them together, and Kubizek remains superbly qualified to tell us about Hitler's interest, knowledge, and talent in music. Kubizek's account supports a view that Hitler, with or without his friend, attended an extraordinary number of Opera and music

performances in numerous Opera Houses, including the Linz Opera House, the Vienna « Hofoper » , and the « Volksooper » in the Viennese district of Währing where performances featured the likes of Gustav Mahler and Anton Bruckner as conductors. Both Kubizek and Hitler considered Richard Wagner as their « nec plus ultra » composer and « just as other people quote their Gœthe and Schiller, we would quote Wagner, preferably “ Die Meistersinger ” » . And, « we studied, with the libretto and the music-score, those works we had not seen in Linz » . In precious 1st hand detail, Kubizek recalls some of the musical performances that Adolf and he attended, and the list is impressive :

In Vienna :

« The Flying Dutchman » , « Lohengrin » , « Tannhäuser » , « Tristan und Isolde » , « Die Meistersinger » have remained unforgettable as has « The Ring » and even « Parsifal » .

Earlier in Linz, in addition to performances of Richard Wagner, they had seen together « a surprisingly good “ Figaro ” » and « The Magic Flute » by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and « Der Freischütz » by Carl Maria von Weber.

These details of Hitler's romance with Classical music, out of childhood and youth, suggest that he had considerable knowledge about Classical music, in general, and formidable knowledge of Wagnerian Opera and similar grand Opera by the time he was only 18. We must suspect that he had begun attending serious music performances earlier, around ages 13 or 14.

Later, in the early stages of the Nazi movement, Hitler developed a friendly and even relaxed personal relationship and political association with the urbane, upper-class art reproduction scion Ernst Hanfstængl who was well-educated and talented in music. Hanfstængl noted in his memoir that he had acquired something of a reputation at Harvard University in piano.

He elaborated :

« My teachers in Munich had been August Schmid-Lindner and Bernhard Stavenhagen, the last pupil of Liszt, and my hands had given me a Mastery of the Romantic school. »

Hanfstængl's son, Egon, commented in the 1994 afterword to the memoir that one of his father's teachers of musicology, Schmid-Lindner, had said that, in his long career as a pedagogue, he had « never known anyone as naturally at home on the keyboard as this Ernst Hanfstængl » . Hanfstængl commented that at his « Pienzenauerstraße » house, in Munich, after a performance of « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » at the « Hof-Theater » , in January 1933, Hitler and he discussed the experience. Hitler was « in his most benign mood. The conductor, that evening, had been Hans Knappertsbusch and Hitler had not liked his “ tempi ” and interpretation and was expatiating on the subject. He could really do so with good sense and would hum or whistle many of the passages, the words of which he knew by heart, in order to show what he meant » .

The most recent great biographer, however, with casual disparagement, dismisses Hitler's capabilities to understand

Wagner in the following words :

« Many attending the Wagner performances including Kubizek himself, were more skilled than Hitler, with his self-taught, amateurish, opinionated approach, in understanding and interpreting Wagner's music. »

And the denigration does not stop here but shifts to a different plane :

« Hitler, the non-entity, the mediocrity, the failure who wanted to live like a Wagnerian hero. »

Bombarded with so critical a view of Hitler, readers might ask :

How is it possible that such a man could even recognize a Wagnerian hero ?

Yet, the opinionated, amateurish non-entity would ultimately march through the vaunted Wagnerian themes of betrayal, sacrifice, redemption, and heroic death more closely and with greater effect than any man in life or myth. Hitler would make this latter-day, up-country march inspired significantly by Wagner's Operas.

Hitler's 2 favourite Operas were « Lohengrin » and « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » , and his own character comprised elements of Lohengrin (chasteness) , « Meistersinger » 's Hans Sachs (paragon of the supremacy of German song) , Walter von Stolzing (artistic, noble competitor for the love of a pure and beautiful woman) , and the Flying Dutchman (doomed to wander the world's oceans seeking the love of a special woman faithful unto death) .

These figures are all actors in Wagner Operas and we can begin to sense the young man with the ineradicable artistic temperament developing into a many-sided human being and actor in a Wagnerian-styled Opera. Such a performer does not require a beautiful soul to perform beautifully, but rather « the actor must have the actor's facility for dramatization, momentary self-hypnosis » . Hitler, by late- 1908, was becoming not only a potential lead-voice in a Wagner-like Opera, but also, through his ambition in architecture, the designer of the stage-setting and the Opera House itself. And if this were not enough, Hitler, through his « studies » of Germanic myth and history, could also be imagined as both composer and director. Finally, through some as-then undiscovered talent, he would be the lead-voice in the whole drama. It would take Hitler, from 1908 to 1914, to develop a more intense nationalist outlook, and a Great War, from 1914 through 1918, to provide motive and opportunity to project himself into German nationalist politics in 1919. But when Hitler entered the German political scene at that time, it was not so much that he entered as an actor in a Wagner-like spectacle but that he, himself, began to compose what could be likened to a vast German political Opera.

The great biographers note that Hitler attempted to compose an Opera, in 1908, inspired by his discovery that Wagner had left behind an outline of a musical-drama about a mythical German hero, Wieland the Smith. Hitler would embrace the project based on his driving interest in and general knowledge of Opera and German mythology. To supplement his technical musical knowledge, Hitler made the effort an involuntary joint project with the gifted Kubizek. The biographers characterize the effort as contemptible, utopian, and trivial, and use it to show Hitler ineffectually

scattering his efforts among chimerical schemes. In a work of over 800 pages, one of the great biographers would dismiss the episode of the Opera in a single contemptuous sentence, noting that « he took-up an idea that Wagner had dropped, and began writing an Opera about Wieland the Smith, full of bloody and incestuous nonsense » . Kubizek spent an entire chapter on the project, however, and continued to be affected by the artistic results. He commented in 1954 that :

« I still have before my eyes the Wolf Lake, where the 1st scene of the Opera was laid. From the Edda (old Norse epic) , a book that was sacred to him, he knew Iceland, the rugged island of the north. There, he laid the scene of his Opera. »

The intense work on the Opera brought the 2 friends closer together, and Kubizek remarked in an invaluable summary of 19 year old Hitler's character that :

« There was an incredible earnestness in him, a true passionate interest in everything that happened, and most important, an unflinching devotion to the “ grandeur ” of art. »

Pregnant with consequence for comprehending a future Hitler in politics, his friend of early manhood would point-out that :

« When a self-imposed task engrossed him completely and forced him to unceasing activity, it was as though a demon had taken possession of him. Oblivious of his surroundings, he never tired, he never slept. He ate nothing never before had I been so deeply impressed by this ecstatic creativeness. »

The great biographers portray Hitler in Vienna, in 1908, as indolent, lazy, and directionless-factors that apply to him but scarcely dominated his character.

Kubizek presents insights into the special imagination of the artistically tempered young Hitler in, yet, another remarkable paragraph ignored or missed by the biographers. Concerning music, Hitler remarked at this time in Vienna that it was not professors' wisdom in Conservatories that counted for creating Opera, but genius. This ambition to genius led him to a most extraordinary experiment. According to Kubizek, naturally gifted in music and with serious formal training :

« Adolf harked-back to the elementary possibilities of musical expression. Words seemed to him too complicated for this purpose (in Opera) and he tried to discover how isolated sounds could be linked to notes of music ; and, with this musical language, he combined certain colours. »

Quite remarkably, Hitler conceptualized an Opera in terms of sound, not words sung, and colour which would be merged and would become the foundation of what would finally appear on stage. Kubizek ends this nagging remembrance by noting that he was reminded of Hitler's essays, in this type of « composition » , a few years later when a « Russian composer caused some sensation in Vienna by similar experiments » .

Kubizek claimed that Hitler suddenly realized, during a free-seat attendance at the Vienna Concert Hall, that immortal music being presented should be available to the rural masses and the urban lower-classes, not given exclusively at one hall in Vienna to only 500 people. He was listening specifically to Beethoven's Violin Concerto in D major, at the time. There already existed some pioneers of the idea of bringing art to « the people », but while the pioneers applied modest measures and approached their goal haltingly, Hitler, in a way that would characterize him as an adult and as leader of Germany, disdained half measures and conceptualized total solutions.

In the 1908 affair of bringing art to the people, Hitler 1st gave an indication that he had a fresh idea on the world of music by using a peculiar new expression with Kubizek : « that Orchestra which tours the provinces » . Soon, Hitler used the words « mobile Orchestra » because the word « touring » reminded him of 2nd rate theatrical companies. Finally, Hitler referred to his new instrument of mass-culture as a « mobile “ Reich ” Orchestra », eerily reminiscent of his later exploitation of automobile and airplane for political campaigning and his backing of the motorization of the German army of the 1930's. The basic idea of a mobile « Reich » Orchestra illustrates Hitler's artistic imagination. Kubizek recalled the project in so much detail because of his own interest and technical superiority in music and commented that :

« Adolf's solution was both brilliant and simple : an Orchestra under a gifted conductor would be organized, capable of performing Classic, Romantic, and modern Symphonic music and sent-out to the country. »

The problem of getting beyond the span of the railway would be solved by using the newly-emergent motor-car. Hitler's imagination triumphed again when faced with the fundamental problem of just where such an Orchestra would present its program in the numerous small-towns of the Empire. He informed Kubizek that there were churches everywhere with a propiate cover, variable but reasonable dimensions, and effective acoustics, therefore, the Operas and Symphonies should be presented in them.

2 additional confrontations between Kubizek and Hitler highlight the latter's style of action and are invaluable for understanding his future political actions. In a scene ridiculous for intense argument over a fantasy project but sublime for insight into Hitler's mindcast of final solutions and lack of ordinary sense of proportion, note the following collision over the subject of instruments for the Orchestra in which Hitler outlandishly insisted on 3 large and expensive double-action harps ...

Kubizek :

« To what purpose an experienced conductor can manage with only one ? »

Hitler :

« Ridiculous. How can you play the “ Fire Music ” with only 1 double-action harp in the Orchestra ? »

Kubizek :

« Then, the “ Fire Music ” won't be included in the repertoire. »

Hitler :

« You bet it will. »

« Adolf Hitler - My Boyhood Friend »

« He alone knows Hitler, the “ Führer ”, who knows Hitler, the boy. »

In 1951, August Kubizek, who had rejected other post-War offers for his memoirs, agreed to publish « Adolf Hitler, mein Jugendfreund » (Adolf Hitler, My Boyhood Friend) through the « Leopold Stocker Verlag » .

It caused a stir when it was released in 1953 and was later translated into several languages.

In the epilogue, Kubizek wrote :

« Even though I, a fundamentally unpolitical individual, had always kept aloof from the political events of the period which ended forever in 1945, nevertheless, no power on earth could compel me to deny my friendship with Adolf Hitler. »

Editor's Note

Kubizek wrote « Adolf Hitler, mein Jugendfreund » in German, for a mainly German and Austrian readership.

The world that he describes in his account is the world of central Europe, (« Mittel-Europa ») , as it was at the end of the 19th Century, and the beginning of the 20th Century.

He assumes a knowledge, on the part of his readers, of the politics, culture, and personalities of that particular place and time.

For English readers, who may not be familiar with the particular period of history in question, the editor has provided copious notes, plus a brief « Foreword » and a short biography of August Kubizek.

FOREWORD

Adolf Hitler is undoubtedly the most enigmatic figure of the 20th Century or, possibly, of any Century in recorded history.

Here is a man, un-remarkable in most ways in his youth and early manhood, who eventually was looked upon, quite literally, as a god by most Germans and Austrians, and who held an entire society, from aristocrats to generals, intellectuals, university professors, captains of industry, artists, architects, engineers, philosophers (in fact, almost all levels of society) in his sway, captivating them in a way that no other person has been able to captivate whole generations.

And when defeat and annihilation faced these same people, the vast majority continued to be held by this man's strange power right to the end, and to the very gates of death.

But this man had only one friend (a friend from his boyhood) and, even then, it was a one-sided relationship with Hitler, as always, dominating.

And so, here we have the recollections of this friend (biased undoubtedly) but giving us a fascinating insight into the personality of Adolf Hitler.

August Kubizek : a brief biography

August (« Gustl ») Kubizek (born on 3 August 1888, in Linz ; died on 23 October 1956, in Eferding) .

This account deals with the darkest, perhaps, the most formative and, therefore, in some sense, the most interesting period of Hitler's life.

His public life is now fully-indeed oppressively-documented ; his mature character is now, seemingly, fully-known.

But his crucial early years, the years between leaving school and joining the Bavarian army are, in the language of one of his biographers (Thomas Orr. « Das War Hitler-Revue » , Munich, 1952, No. 4) , « impenetrable » .

And, yet, those are the years in which that character, that unparalleled « will power » , that relentless systematic mind was formed.

Any light on those undocumented years is welcome.

The light shed by this account is more than that : it penetrates and reveals the character of the young Hitler as no other study has done.

But, before showing this, let us examine the meagre framework of fact into which it is fitted.

August was the 1st born and only surviving child of Michael and Maria Kubizek.

His sisters Maria, Therese and Karoline died in early childhood.

Kubizek later wrote that this was a striking parallel between his own life and that of Adolf Hitler, whose mother had lost 4 children prematurely.

As the surviving sons of grief stricken mothers, August and Adolf could not help but feel they had been spared or « chosen » by fate.

Kubizek and Hitler 1st met while competing for standing room in the « Landestheater » in Linz, Upper-Austria.

Because of their shared passion for the Operas of Richard Wagner, they quickly became close friends and, later, room-mates in Vienna while both sought admission into college.

Editor's Note

Wilhelm Richard Wagner (born on 22 May 1813 ; died on 13 February 1883) was a German composer, conductor, theatre director, philosopher, music theorist, poet, essayist and writer, primarily known for his Operas (or « music-dramas » , as they were later called) .

Wagner's compositions, particularly those of his later-period, are notable for their complex texture, rich harmonies and orchestration, and the elaborate use of leitmotifs : musical themes associated with individual characters, places, ideas or plot elements.

Unlike most other Opera composers, Wagner wrote both the music and the libretto for every one of his stage-works. Perhaps, the 2 most well-known extracts from his works are the « Ride of the Valkyries » from the Opera « Die Walküre » , and the Wedding March (Bridal Chorus) from the Opera « Lohengrin » .

...

The 2 shared a small-room at number 29/2 « Stumpergasse » , Door 17, in the 6th district of Vienna, from 22 February to early July 1908.

Editor's Note

In 1804, during the Napoleonic Wars, Vienna became the capital of the Austrian Empire and continued to play a major role in European and world politics, including hosting the 1814 Congress of Vienna.

After the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, Vienna remained the capital of what was, then, the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The city was a centre of Classical music, for which the title of the First Viennese School is sometimes applied.

During the latter half of the 19th Century, the city developed what had previously been the bastions and glacis into the « Ringstraße », a new boulevard surrounding the historical town and a major prestige project.

Former suburbs were incorporated, and the city of Vienna grew dramatically.

In 1918, after World War I, Vienna became capital of the First Austrian Republic.

From the late- 19th Century to 1938, the city remained a centre of high-culture and modernism.

A world capital of music, the city played host to composers such as Johannes Brahms, Anton Bruckner, Gustav Mahler and Richard Strauß.

The city's cultural contributions in the 1st half of the 20th Century included, amongst many, the Vienna Secession movement, psychoanalysis, the Second Viennese School, the architecture of Adolf Loos and the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein.

...

As the only son of a self-employed upholsterer, August was expected to, someday, take-over his father's business, but he secretly harboured dreams of becoming a conductor.

With Adolf's encouragement, he devoted more and more of his time to this passion, completing all the musical training available to him in Linz, however, to achieve his goal, he would require higher-education in music which was only offered in Vienna.

It was Adolf Hitler who, at the age of 18, successfully persuaded Kubizek's father to let his son go to the metropolis to attend the Conservatory.

This, Kubizek wrote, changed the course of his life for good.

He was immediately accepted into the Vienna Conservatory where he quickly made a name for himself.

Hitler, however, was twice denied entrance into Vienna's art academy, a fact which he kept hidden from his friend for some time.

Then, quite suddenly, on November 20th, 1908, Kubizek returned to Vienna and, arriving at number 29 « Stumpergasse », found that his friend had disappeared, leaving no address.

It was only 40 years later that Kubizek was to learn what had happened :

« My friend had moved-out of the “ Stumpergasse ” because the rent was too much for him and had found much cheaper accommodation at a so-called Men's Hostel on the “ Meldemannstrasse ”. »

Adolf had disappeared into the shady depths of the Metropolis.

Then, began for him, those years of bitterest misery of which he himself says little and of which there is no reliable witness.

Kubizek completed his studies in 1912 and was hired as conductor of the Orchestra in Marburg an der Drau, in Lower-Styria (called : Maribor in Slovenia, after 1918) .

He was later offered a position at the « Stadttheater » in Klagenfurt, but this job and his musical career were cut short by the beginning of World War I.

Before leaving for the front, he married Anna Funke (born on 7 October 1887 ; died on 4 October 1976) , a violinist from Vienna with whom he had 3 sons : Augustin, Karl Maria and Rudolf.

From August 1914 until November 1918, Kubizek served as a reservist in Regiment No. 2 of the Austro-Hungarian Infantry.

In the Carpathian winter campaign of 1915, he was wounded at Eperjes, in Hungary (now, Prešov, in Slovakia) , and later, evacuated to Budapest in an ambulance train.

After months of convalescence, he returned to the front and was attached to a mechanized corps in Vienna.

After the War, Kubizek accepted a position as an official in the municipal council of Eferding, in Upper-Austria, and music became his hobby.

After seeing Hitler on the front-page of the « Münchner Illustrierte » (around 1920) , Kubizek followed his friend's career with some interest, although he did not attempt to contact him until 1933 when he wrote to congratulate him on having become Chancellor of Germany.

6 months later, Kubizek received an unexpected reply from Hitler, who wrote to his old friend :

« “ Gustl ”, I should be very glad to revive once more with you those memories of the best years of my life. »

30 years after Hitler had broken-off contact with Kubizek, the 2 friends were reunited on April 9th, 1938, during one of Hitler's visits in Linz.

The 2 spoke for over 1 hour at the Hotel Weinzinger and Hitler offered Kubizek the conductorship of an Orchestra, which Kubizek politely refused.

Upon learning of his friend's 3 sons, Hitler did, however, insist on financing their educations at the Anton Bruckner Conservatory in Linz.

Hitler later invited Kubizek to attend the Bayreuth Festival as his guest, in 1939, and, again, in 1940. Experiences described by Kubizek as :

« The happiest hours of my earthly existence. »

Editor's Note

The Bayreuth Festival (« Bayreuther Festspiele ») is a music Festival held annually in Bayreuth, Germany, at which performances of Operas by the 19th Century German composer, Richard Wagner, are presented.

Wagner himself conceived of and promoted the idea of a special Festival to showcase his own works, in particular, his monumental cycle « Der Ring des Nibelungen » and « Parsifal » .

Performances take place in a specially designed theatre, the « Bayreuth Festspielhaus » .

Wagner personally supervised the design and construction of the theatre, which contained many architectural innovations to accommodate the huge Orchestras for which Wagner wrote as well as the composer's particular vision about the staging of his works.

In the 1920's, well before the rise of the Nazi Party, Winifred Wagner became a strong supporter and close personal friend of Adolf Hitler ; her correspondence with Hitler has never been released by the Wagner family.

She and other Festival leaders were members of Nazi chief ideologue Alfred Rosenberg's « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (Fighting League for German Culture) which actively suppressed modernist music and works by « degenerate » artists.

The Festival maintained some artistic independence under the 3rd « Reich » .

It was under the 3rd « Reich » that the Festival made its 1st break from tradition, abandoning the deteriorating 19th Century sets created by Richard Wagner.

Many protested at the changes, including prominent conductors such as Arturo Toscanini and Richard Strauß, and even some members of the Wagner family.

In their view, any change to the Festival was a profanation against « the Master » (Wagner) .

Nevertheless, Hitler approved of the changes, thus, paving the way for more innovations in the decades to come.

...

Kubizek saw Hitler for the last time on 23 July 1940, although as late as 1944, Hitler sent Kubizek's mother a food basket for her 80th birthday.

His friend told him :

« This War will set us back many years in our building programme. It is a tragedy. I did not become Chancellor of the Greater German “ Reich ” to fight wars. »

The « Führer » was speaking after the successful campaigns in Poland and France.

When the tide began to turn against Hitler's favour, Kubizek, who had avoided politics all his life, became a member of the NSDAP, in 1942, as a gesture of loyalty to his friend.

In December 1945, Kubizek gathered the collection of post-cards and other keepsakes given to him by Hitler during their youth and concealed them carefully in the basement of his house, in Eferding.

He was arrested shortly afterwards and held at Glaserbach, where he was imprisoned and interrogated by the U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command for 16 months.

His home was searched, but the Hitler correspondence and drawings were not found.

On 8 January 1956, Kubizek was named the 1st honorary member of the « Musikverein » , in Eferding.

He died on 23 October 1956, aged 68, in Linz and is buried in Eferding, Upper-Austria.

And what is the character which Hitler showed to Kubizek in these 4 years of friendship ?

Externally, Hitler appears a drifting character : he has failed at school, has no employment, has been rejected by the Academy, is in Vienna for no clearly stated purpose, and lives on a pittance eked-out by painting post-cards.

But behind this shiftless exterior, Kubizek constructs what must have been there, although it was not apparent to casual acquaintances : the character of the man who, from these beginnings, without any other natural advantages besides his own personality, became the most powerful ruler and conqueror of modern history.

Here, we see along with the incipient monomania, the repetitive « clichés », and the Wagnerian Romanticism of his later years - the early evidence of that unbreakable will power, that extraordinary self-confidence.

We see the penniless, unemployed, unemployable young Hitler, at 16, confidently re-building in his imagination the city of Linz, as he was afterwards to rebuild it in fact and, never for a moment, doubting that he would one day carry-out these improbable plans ; we see him exercising over an elderly Austrian upholsterer that irresistible hypnotic power with which he was, afterwards, to seduce a whole nation ; we see him, in Vienna, fortifying himself against a corrupt and purposeless society by adopting an iron asceticism, like some ancient crusader guarding himself against corruption in a pagan world.

And then, turning to detail, we see in Vienna, when Kubizek was closest to him, the working of Hitler's mind as it feels its way towards the beginnings of National-Socialism : his voracious but systematic reading ; his sudden discovery of politics ; his hatred of the social injustice of urban life represented to him, the architect, by squalid slum buildings ; his fear - the fear which he was afterwards to exploit among millions of lower-middle-class Germans of sinking into proletarian status.

Behind the outward meaninglessness of his hand-to-mouth existence, we see the inner purposefulness of his studies, his experiences, his reasoning.

The account may sometimes be romanticized, but not, I think, much, or more than is legitimate and indeed inevitable in the recollections of youth.

By all external checks, Kubizek's account is reliable, and to anyone who has studied the mind and character of Hitler, it is also inherently plausible.

Hitler's character, in the years after 1908, undoubtedly became harder.

In some respects, it also changed, not its quality but its direction.

We learn casually from Kubizek that, in his Vienna days, Hitler was a pacifist ; and, certainly, the ruthlessness of his later worship of war becomes more comprehensible when we realize that it was the religion of a convert.

But, fundamentally, we see here what we have never seen before, and what superficial observers have never shown : the formation of that positive character which, afterwards, achieved the dreadful miracle of 20th Century ; the character of the man who, in circumstances of apparent hopelessness, resolved not to rest till he had found an answer not only to his problem, but to the problem of a continent.

Kubizek says :

« He did not know what resignation meant. He who resigned, he thought, lost his right to live. »

Thanks to the experience and the harsh thought of those years, Hitler was afterwards able, in circumstances which he could not then have envisaged, to mobilise, some of the best as well as some of the worst instincts of a defeated people :

« What though the field be lost ?
All is not lost ; the unconquerable Will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate.
And courage never to submit or yield :
And what is else not to be overcome ? »

The Austro-Hungarian Empire

The setting for Kubizek's description of the early life of Adolf Hitler is the Austro-Hungarian Empire : an Empire which disappeared at the conclusion of the Great War of 1914-1918.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire, more formally known as the Kingdoms and Lands Represented in the Imperial Council and the Lands of the Holy Hungarian Crown of Saint-Stephen, was a constitutional monarchic union between the crowns of the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of Hungary in Central Europe.

The union was a result of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, under which the House of Habsburg agreed to share power with the separate Hungarian government, dividing the territory of the former Austrian Empire between them.

The Austrian and the Hungarian lands became independent entities enjoying equal status. Austria-Hungary was a multi-national realm and one of the world's great powers at the time.

The dual monarchy had existed for 51 years until it dissolved, on 31st October 1918, before a military defeat on the Italian front of the First World War.

The realm comprised modern-day Austria : Hungary, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, and parts of Italy, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Serbia, and Ukraine.

The Habsburg monarch ruled as Emperor of Austria over the western and northern half of the country that was the Austrian Empire (Cisleithania or Lands represented in the Imperial Council) , and as King of Hungary over the Kingdom of Hungary (see small arms left) (Transleithania or Lands of the Crown of Saint Stephen) which enjoyed a great deal of sovereignty with only a few joint affairs (principally, foreign relations and defence) .

The division was so marked in fact that there was no common citizenship : a person was either an Austrian or a

Hungarian citizen (legally, it wasn't allowed to hold both citizenships at the same time) .

The 2 capitals of the Monarchy were Vienna for Austria and Buda for Hungary, the latter united with neighbouring Pest as Budapest from 1870.

Vienna, however, would serve as the nation's primary capital.

Austria-Hungary was geographically the 2nd largest country in Europe after the Russian Empire (621,538 square kilometres - 239,977 square miles - in 1905) , and the 3rd most populous (after Russia and the German Empire) . As a multi-national Empire and great power in an era of national awakening, it found its political life dominated by disputes among the 11 principal national groups.

The Monarchy bore the name internationally of « Österreichisch-Ungarische Monarchie » (on decision by Franz-Josef I, in 1868) .

Empire of Austria (Cisleithania) : 1. Bohemia, 2. Bukovina, 3. Carinthia, 4. Carniola, 5. Dalmatia, 6. Galicia, 7. Küstenland, 8. Lower-Austria, 9. Moravia, 10. Salzburg, 11. Silesia, 12. Styria, 13. Tyrol, 14. Upper-Austria, 15. Vorarlberg.

Kingdom of Hungary (Transleithania) : 16. Hungary, proper 17. Croatia-Slavonia.

Austrian-Hungarian Condominium : 18. Bosnia and Herzegovina.

During the period covered by Kubizek's account, the ruler of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was Franz-Josef I.

Franz-Josef I (in Hungarian, I. Ferenc József) born on 18 August 1830, and died on 21 November 1916. He was Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, King of Croatia, Apostolic King of Hungary, King of Galicia and Lodomeria and Grand Duke of Cracow, from 1848 until his death in 1916.

In December of 1848, Emperor Ferdinand I of Austria abdicated the throne as part of « Ministerpräsident » Felix zu Schwarzenberg's plan to end the Revolutions of 1848 in Austria, which allowed Ferdinand's nephew Franz-Josef to ascend to the throne.

Largely considered to be a reactionary, Franz-Josef spent his early reign resisting constitutionalism in his domains.

The Austrian Empire was forced to cede most of its claim to Lombardy-Venetia to the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia following the conclusion of the Second Italian War of Independence, in 1859 ; and the 3rd Italian War of Independence, in 1866.

Although Franz-Josef ceded no territory to the Kingdom of Prussia after the Austrian defeat in the Austro-Prussian War, the Peace of Prague (23 August 1866) settled the German question in favour of Prussia, which prevented the

unification of Germany under the House of Habsburg (« Großdeutsche Lösung ») .

Franz-Josef was troubled by nationalism during his entire reign.

He concluded the « Ausgleich » of 1867, which granted greater autonomy to Hungary, hence, transforming the Austrian Empire into the Austro-Hungarian Empire under his Dual Monarchy.

His domains were, then, ruled peacefully for the next 45 years, although Franz-Josef's personal life became increasingly tragic after the suicide of his son, the Crown Prince Rudolf, in 1889, and the assassination of his wife, the Empress Elisabeth, in 1898.

Franz-Josef died on 21 November 1916, after ruling his domains for almost 68 years.

He was succeeded by his grandnephew Karl.

INTRODUCTION

« I was born in Linz on the 3rd of August, 1888. »

« Before his marriage, my father had been an upholsterer's assistant at a furniture manufacturer's in Linz. »

Editor's Note

Linz is the 3rd largest city of Austria and capital of the State of Upper-Austria (« Oberösterreich ») .

It is located in the north centre of Austria, approximately 30 kilometres (19 miles) south of the Czech border, on both sides of the river Danube.

The city was founded by the Romans, who called it « Lentia » .

The name « Linz » was 1st recorded in the year 799 A.D. , after Bavarians expanded south and Linz became a center of trade.

It was a provincial and local government city of the Holy Roman Empire, and an important trading-point connecting several routes, on either side of the river Danube from the East to the West and Bohemia and Poland from north to the Balkans and Italy to the south.

Being the city where the Habsburg Emperor Friedrich III spent his last years, it was, for a short period of time, the most important city in the Empire.

It lost its status to Vienna and Prague after the death of the Emperor, in 1493.

One important inhabitant of the city was Johannes Kepler, who spent several years of his life in the city teaching mathematics.

He discovered, on 15 May 1618, the distance-cubed-over-time-squared (or « 3rd ») law of planetary motion.

The local public university, Johannes Kepler University, is named after him.

Another famous citizen was Anton Bruckner, who spent the years between 1855 and 1868 working as a local composer and church organist in the city.

The local concert-hall, the « Brucknerhaus », and a local private music and arts university are named after him.

...

My father used to have his mid-day meal in a little “ café ” and it was there he met my mother who was working as a waitress.

They fell in love, and were married in July, 1887.

At 1st, the young couple lived in the house of my mother's parents.

My father's wages were low, the work was hard, and my mother had to give-up her job when she was expecting me. Thus, I was born in rather miserable circumstances.

1 year later, my sister Maria was born, but died at a tender age.

The following year, Therese appeared ; she died at the age of 4.

My 3rd sister, Karoline, fell desperately ill, lingered-on for some years, and died when she was 8. My mother's grief was boundless. Throughout her life, she suffered from the fear of losing me, too ; for I was the only one left to her of her 4 children.

Consequently, all my mother's love was concentrated upon me.

Meanwhile, my father had set-up on his own and had opened an upholsterer's business at number 9 « Klammsstraße » .

The old « Baernreiterhaus », heavy and ungainly, which still stands there unaltered, became the home of my

childhood and youth.

The narrow, sombre « Klamstraße » looked rather poor in comparison with its continuation, the broad and airy promenade, with its lawns and trees.

Our unhealthy housing conditions had certainly contributed to the early death of my sisters.

In the « Baernreiterhaus » , things were different. On the ground-floor, there was the work-shop and, on the 1st floor, our apartment, which consisted of 2 rooms and a kitchen. But now, my father was never free from money troubles. Business was bad.

More than once, he contemplated closing-down the business and, again, taking a job with the furniture-makers. Yet, each time, he managed to overcome his difficulties at the last moment.

I started school, a very unpleasant experience.

My mother wept over the bad reports I brought home. Her sorrow was the only thing that could persuade me to work harder. Whereas for my father, there was no question but that I should, in due course, take-over his business (why else did he slave from morning till night ?) , it was my mother's desire that I should study in spite of my bad reports ; 1st, I should have 4 years at the Grammar School, then, perhaps, go to the Teachers' Training College (« Präparandie ») .

But I would not hear of it, I was glad when my father put his foot down and, when I was 10, sent me to the Council School. In this way, my father thought, my future was finally decided.

For a long time, however, there had been another influence in my life for which I would have sold my soul : music. This love was given full-expression when, at 9 years of age, I was given a violin as a Christmas present.

I remember distinctly every single detail of that Christmas, and when today, in my old age, I think back, my conscious life seems to have started with that event. The eldest son of our neighbour was a young pupil-teacher and he gave me violin lessons. I learned fast and well.

When my 1st violin teacher took a job in the country, I entered the lower-grade of the Linz School of Music, but I did not like it there very much, perhaps, because I was much more advanced than the other pupils.

After the holidays, I once more had private lessons, this time with an old Sergeant-Major of the Austro-Hungarian Army Music Corps, who straightway made clear to me that I knew nothing and, then, began to teach me the elements of violin playing « in the military fashion » . It was real barrack-square drill with old Kopetzky.

Sometimes when I got fed-up with his rough sergeant-major manners, he consoled me by assuring me that, with more

progress, I should certainly be taken as apprentice-musician into the army, in his opinion, the peak of a musician's glory.

I gave-up my study with Kopetzky and entered the intermediate class of the School of Music where I was taught by Professor Heinrich Dessauer, a gifted, efficient and sensitive teacher. At the same time, I studied the trumpet, trombone and musical theory, and played in the students' Orchestra.

I was already playing with the idea of making music my life's work when hard reality made itself felt. I had hardly left the Council School when I had to join my father's business as an apprentice. Formerly, when there was a shortage of labour, I had had to lend a hand in the work-shop and, so, was familiar with the work.

It is a repulsive job to re-upholster old furniture by unravelling and remaking the stuffing. The work goes-on in clouds of dust in which the poor apprentice is smothered. What rubbishy old mattresses were brought to our work-shop !

All the illnesses that had been overcome (and some of them not overcome) left their mark on these old beds. No wonder that upholsterers do not live long. But soon, I also learnt the more pleasant aspects of my work : personal taste and a feeling for art are necessary in it, and it is not too far removed from interior decorating. One would visit well-to-do homes, one saw and heard a lot and, above all, in winter there was little or nothing to do.

And this leisure, naturally, I devoted to music.

When I had successfully passed my journeyman's test, my father wanted to take on jobs in other workshops. I saw his point, but for me the essential thing was, not to improve my craftsmanship, but to advance my musical studies.

Thus, I chose to stay on in my father's work-shop, since I could dispose of my time with more freedom there than under another Master.

« There are generally too many violins in an orchestra, but never enough violas. »

To this day, I am grateful to Professor Dessauer for having applied this maxim and turned me into a good viola player.

Musical life in Linz, in those days, was on a remarkably high-level ; August Göllerich was the Director of the Music Society (« Musikverein ») .

Being a disciple of Franz Liszt's and a collaborator of Richard Wagner's at Bayreuth, Göllerich was the very man to be the musical leader of Linz, so much maligned as a « peasants' town » .

Editor's Note

The 19th Century Hungarian composer, pianist, conductor, and teacher Franz Liszt was born on 22 October 1811 and died on 31 July 1886.

Liszt became renowned in Europe during the 19th Century for his virtuosic skill as a pianist.

He was said by his contemporaries to have been the most technically advanced pianist of his age.

In the 1840's, he was considered by some to be, perhaps, the greatest pianist of all time.

He was also a well-known composer, piano teacher, and conductor.

He was a benefactor to other composers, including Richard Wagner, Hector Berlioz, Camille Saint-Saëns, Edvard Grieg and Alexander Borodin.

As a composer, Liszt was one of the most prominent representatives of the « Neudeutsche Schule » (New German School) .

He left behind an extensive and diverse body of work in which he influenced his contemporaries.

Some of his most notable contributions were the invention of the Symphonic poem, developing the concept of thematic transformation as part of his experiments in musical form and making radical departures in harmony.

...

Every year, the Music Society gave 2 Symphonic concerts and 1 Special concert, when usually a choral work was performed, with orchestra.

My mother, in spite of her humble origin, loved music, and hardly ever missed one of these performances.

While still a small boy, I was taken to concerts.

My mother explained everything to me, and, as I came to master several instruments, my appreciation of these concerts grew.

My highest aim in life was to play in the orchestra, either on the viola or the trumpet.

But, for the time being, it was still a matter of remaking dusty old mattresses and papering walls. In those years, my father suffered much from the usual occupational diseases of an upholsterer. When persistent lung trouble once kept him in bed for 6 months, I had to run the work-shop alone.

Thus, the 2 things existed side by side in my young life : work, which made calls on my strength and even on my lungs ; and music, which was my whole love.

I should never have thought that there could be a connection between the 2.

And, yet, there was.

One of my father's customers was a member of the Provincial Government, which also controlled the Theatre.

One day, they came to us for repair the cushions of a set of Rococo furniture.

When the work was done, my father sent me to deliver them to the Theatre.

The stage-manager directed me to the stage, where I was to replace the cushions in their frames. A rehearsal was in progress. I don't know which piece was being rehearsed, but it was certainly an Opera.

What I remember still is the enchantment which came over me as I stood there on the stage, in the midst of the singers.

I was transformed as though now, for the 1st time, I had discovered myself.

Theatre ! What a world !

A man stood there, magnificently attired. He seemed to me like a creature from another planet. He sang so gloriously that I could not imagine this man could ever speak in the ordinary way. The Orchestra responded to his mighty voice. Here I was on more familiar ground but, in this moment, everything that music had hitherto meant to me seemed to be trifling. Only in conjunction with the stage did music seem to reach a higher, more solemn plane, the highest imaginable.

But there I stood, a miserable little upholsterer, and fitted the cushions back into their place in the Rococo suite. What a lamentable job ! What a wretched existence !

Theatre, that was the word that I had searched for. Play and reality became confused in my excited mind. That awkward fellow with ruffled hair, apron and rolled-up shirt sleeves who stood in the wings and fumbled with his cushions as though to justify his presence - was he really only a poor upholsterer ? A poor, despised simpleton, pushed from pillar to post and treated by the customer as if he were a step-ladder, placed here, placed there according to the moment's need and, then, its usefulness over, put aside ?

It would have been absolutely natural if that little upholsterer with his tools in his hand had stepped forward to the footlights and, at a sign from the conductor, had sung his part only to prove to the audience in the stalls, nay to an

attentive world, that, in reality, he was not that pale, lanky fellow from the upholsterer's shop on the « Klammsstraße » , but that his place was really on the stage in the Theatre !

Ever since that moment, I have remained under the spell of the Theatre.

Washing down the walls in a customer's house, slapping on the paste, affixing the undercoat of newspaper and, then, pasting on the wallpaper, I was all the time dreaming of roaring applause in the Theatre, seeing myself as conductor in front of an Orchestra.

Such dreaming did not really help my work, and, at times, it would happen that the pieces of wallpaper were sadly out of position.

But, once back in the work-shop, my sick father soon made me realize what responsibilities faced me.

Thus, I swayed between dream and reality.

At home, nobody had any inkling of my state of mind ; for rather than utter a word about my secret ambitions, I would have bitten-off my tongue.

Even from my mother, I hid my hopes and plans, but she, perhaps, guessed what was occupying my thoughts. But should I have added to her many worries ? Thus, there was no one to whom I could unburden myself.

I felt terribly lonely, like an outcast, as lonely as only a young man can be to whom is revealed, for the 1st time, life's beauty and its danger.

The Theatre gave me new courage.

I didn't miss a single Opera performance. However tired I was after my work, nothing could keep me from the theatre. Naturally, with the small wages that my father paid me, I could only afford a ticket for standing-room.

Therefore, I used to go regularly into the so-called « Promenade » , from which one had the best view ; and, moreover, I found no other place had better acoustics. Just above the « Promenade » was the Royal box supported by 2 wooden columns.

These columns were very popular with the « habitués » of the « Promenade » as they were the only places where one could prop oneself up with an undisturbed view of the stage. For if you leaned against the walls, these very columns were always in your field of vision.

I was happy to be able to rest my weary back against the smooth pillars, after having spent a hard day on the top of the stepladder ! Of course, you had to be there early to be sure to get that place.

Often it is the trivial things which make a lasting impression on one's memory. I can still see myself rushing into the Theatre, undecided whether to choose the left - or the right-hand pillar. Often, however, one of the 2 columns, the right-hand one, was already taken ; somebody was even more enthusiastic than I was.

Half-annoyed, half-surprised, I glanced at my rival.

He was a remarkably pale, skinny youth, about my own age, who was following the performance with glistening eyes. I surmised that he came from a better-class home, for he was always dressed with meticulous care and was very reserved.

We took note of each other without exchanging a word.

During the interval of a performance, some time later, we started talking, as apparently neither of us approved of the casting of one of the parts. We discussed it together and rejoiced in our common adverse criticism.

I marvelled at the quick, sure grasp of the other.

In this, he was undoubtedly my superior.

On the other hand, when it came to talking of purely musical matters, I felt my own superiority. I cannot give the exact date of this 1st meeting ; but I am sure it was around All Saints' Day, in 1904.

This went on for some time - he revealing nothing of his own affairs, nor did I think it necessary to talk about myself. But all the more intensely did we occupy ourselves with whatever performance there happened to be and sensed that we both had the same enthusiasm for the Theatre.

Once, after the performance, I accompanied him home to number 31 « Humboldtstraße » .When we took leave of each other, he gave me his name : Adolf Hitler.

FIRST MEETING

From now on, we saw each other at every Opera performance and, also, met outside the Theatre and, on most evenings, we would go for a stroll together along the « Landstraße » .

While Linz, in the last decade, has become a modern industrial town and attracted people from all parts of the Danube region, it was then only a country town.

In the suburbs, there were still the substantial, fortress-like farm-houses, and tenement houses were springing-up in the surrounding fields where cattle were still grazing.

In the little taverns, the people sat drinking the local wine ; everywhere, you could hear the broad country dialect. There was only horse-drawn traffic in the town and the carriers took care to see that Linz remained « in the country » . The townspeople, though largely themselves of peasant origin and often closely related to the country folk, tended to draw away from the latter the more intimately they were connected with them.

Almost all the influential families of the town knew each other ; the business world, the civil servants and the military determined the tone of society.

Everybody who was anybody took his evening stroll along the main-street of the city, which leads from the railway station to the bridge over the Danube and is called significantly « Landstraße » .

As Linz had no university, the young people in every walk of life were all the more eager to imitate the habits of university students.

Social life on the « Landstraße » could almost compete with that of Vienna's « Ringstraße » . At least, the Linzers thought so.

Patience did not seem to be one of Adolf's outstanding characteristics ; whenever I was late for an appointment, he came at once to the work-shop to fetch me, no matter whether I was repairing an old, black horse-hair sofa or an old-fashioned wing chair, or anything else.

My work was to him nothing but a tiresome hindrance to our personal relationship. Impatiently, he would twirl the small black cane which he always carried. I was surprised that he had so much spare time and asked innocently whether he had a job.

« Of course not. » , was his gruff reply.

This answer, which I thought very peculiar, he elaborated at some length.

He did not consider that any particular work, a « bread-and-butter job » , as he called it, was necessary for him.

Such an opinion I had never heard from anybody before. It contradicted every principle which had so far governed my life. At 1st, I saw in his talk nothing more than youthful bragging, although Adolf's bearing and his serious and assured manner of speaking did not strike me at all as that of a braggart. In any case, I was very surprised at his opinions but refrained from asking, for the time being, at least, any further questions, because he seemed to be very sensitive about questions that did not suit him ; that much I had already discovered. So, it was more reasonable to talk about « Lohengrin » , the Opera which enchanted us more than any other, than about our personal affairs.

Perhaps, he was the son of rich parents, I thought, perhaps, he had just come into a fortune and could afford to live

without a « bread-and-butter job » - in his mouth, that expression sounded full of contempt. By no means, did I imagine he was work-shy, for there was not even a grain of the superficial, care-free idler in him.

When we passed by the « Café Baumgartner » , he would get wildly worked-up about the young men who were exhibiting themselves at marble-topped tables behind the big window-panes and wasting their time in idle gossip, without apparently realizing how much this indignation was contradicted by his own way of life. Perhaps, some of those who were sitting « in the shop window » already had a good job and a secure income.

Perhaps, this Adolf is a student ? This had been my 1st impression.

The black ebony cane, topped by an elegant ivory shoe, was essentially a student's attribute.

On the other hand, it seemed strange that he had chosen as his friend just a simple upholsterer, who was always afraid that people would smell the glue with which he had been working during the day. If Adolf were a student, he had to be at school somewhere.

Suddenly, I brought the conversation round to school.

« School ? » This was the 1st outburst of temper that I had experienced with him. He didn't wish to hear anything about school. School was no longer his concern, he said.

Editor's Note

Empress Maria Theresa instituted the « General School Regulations » , in 1774, creating the Austrian educational system.

8 compulsory education was introduced in 1869.

4 years of elementary school (« Volksschule » for ages 6 to 10) are followed by secondary education in a « Hauptschule » , or the 1st 4 years of « Gymnasium » as intermediate school.

It has to be noted that, in particular in the rural areas, there is quite often no « Gymnasium » available, so everyone attends the « Hauptschule » .

After the age of 14, students have their 1st real choice to make, no matter which they have attended until then. They can spend 1 year at the polytechnic school which qualifies them for vocational school as part of an apprenticeship. Or they can go to the « Höhere Technische Lehranstalt » , which are technically-orientated higher-colleges and a unique feature of the Austrian educational system within Europe.

Finalising the « Höhere Technische Lehranstalt » permits to use the title « Ing. » or « Ingénieur » (Engineer) .

Another option would be the « Handelsakademie » with a focus on accounting and business administration.

Finally, there is the « Gymnasium » which ends with the « Matura » examination as the ultimate preparation for a further education at a university.

...

He hated the teachers and did not even greet them any more, and he also hated his schoolmates whom, he said, the school was turning into idlers. No, school I was not allowed to mention. I told him how little success I had had at school myself.

« Why no success ? » , he wanted to know.

He did not like it at all that I had done so badly at school, in spite of all the contempt he expressed for schooling. I was confused by this contradiction. But so much I could gather from our conversation, that he must have been at school until recently, probably a grammar school or, perhaps, a technical school, and that this presumably had ended in disaster. Otherwise, this complete rejection would hardly have been possible.

For the rest, he presented me with ever recurring contradictions and riddles. Sometimes, he seemed to me almost sinister.

One day when we were taking a walk, he suddenly stopped, produced from his pocket a little black notebook (I still see it before me and could describe it minutely) and read me a poem he had written.

I do not remember the poem itself any longer ; to be precise, I can no longer distinguish it from the other poems which Adolf read to me in later days. But I do remember distinctly how much it impressed me that my friend wrote poetry and carried his poems around with him in the same way that I carried my tools.

When Adolf later showed me his drawings and designs which he had sketched (somewhat confused and confusing designs which were really beyond me) when he told me that he had much more and better work in his room and was determined to devote his whole life to art, then, it dawned on me what kind of person my friend really was.

He belonged to that particular species of people of which I had dreamed myself in my more expansive moments ; an artist, who despised the mere bread-and-butter job, and devoted himself to writing poetry, to drawing, painting and to going to the Theatre.

This impressed me enormously. I was thrilled by the « grandeur » which I saw here. My ideas of an artist were then still very hazy - probably as hazy as were Hitler's. But that made it all the more alluring.

Adolf spoke but rarely of his family. He used to say that it was advisable not to mix too much with grown-ups, as these people with their peculiar ideas would only divert one from one's own plans. For instance, his guardian, a peasant in Leonding called Mayrhofer, had got it into his head that he, Adolf, should learn a craft. His brother-in-law, too, was of this opinion.

I could only conclude that Adolf's relations with his family must have been rather peculiar. Apparently among all the grown-ups he accepted, only one person, his mother.

And, yet, he was only 16 years old ; 9 months younger than I.

However much his ideas differed from « bourgeois » conceptions, it did not worry me at all - on the contrary ! It was this very fact, that he was out of the ordinary, that attracted me even more. To devote his life to the arts was, in my opinion, the greatest resolution that a young man could take ; for secretly, I, too, played with the idea of exchanging the dusty and noisy upholsterer's work-shop for the pure and lofty fields of art, to give my life to music. For young people, it is by no means insignificant in what surroundings their friendship 1st begins. It seemed to me a symbol that our friendship had been born in the Theatre, in the midst of brilliant scenes and to the mighty sound of great music. In a certain sense, our friendship itself existed in this happy atmosphere.

Moreover, my own position was not dissimilar to Adolf's. School lay behind me and could give me nothing more. In spite of my love and devotion to my parents, the grown-ups did not mean very much to me. And, above all, in spite of the many problems that beset me, there was nobody in whom I could confide.

Nevertheless, it was at 1st a difficult friendship because our characters were utterly different. Whereas I was a quiet, somewhat dreamy youth, very sensitive and adaptable and, therefore, always willing to yield, so to speak, a « musical character » , Adolf was exceedingly violent and high-strung. Quite trivial things, such as a few thoughtless words, could produce in him outbursts of temper which I thought were quite out of proportion to the significance of the matter. But, probably, I misunderstood Adolf in this respect. Perhaps, the difference between us was that he took things seriously which seemed to me quite unimportant. Yes, this was one of his typical traits ; everything aroused his interest and disturbed him - to nothing was he indifferent.

But, in spite of all the difficulties arising-out of our varying temperaments, our friendship itself was never in serious danger. Nor did we, as so many other youngsters, grow cool and indifferent with time. On the contrary ! In everyday matters, we took great care not to clash. It seems strange, but he who could stick so obstinately to his point of view could also be so considerate that, sometimes, he made me feel quite ashamed. So, as time went on, we got more and more used to each other.

Soon, I came to understand that our friendship endured largely for the reason that I was a patient listener. But I was not dissatisfied with this passive role, for it made me realize how much my friend needed me. He, too, was completely alone. His father had been dead for 2 years. However much he loved his mother, she could not help him with his problems. I remember how he used to give me long lectures about things that did not interest me at all, as for

example, the excise duty levied at the Danube bridge, or a collection in the streets for a charity lottery. He just had to talk and needed somebody who would listen to him. I was often startled when he would make a speech to me, accompanied by vivid gestures, for my benefit alone. He was never worried by the fact that I was the sole audience. But a young man who, like my friend, was passionately interested in everything he saw and experienced had to find an outlet for his tempestuous feelings. The tension he felt was relieved by his holding forth on these things. These speeches, usually delivered somewhere in the open, seemed to be like a volcano erupting. It was as though something quite apart from him was bursting out of him.

Such rapture I had only witnessed so far in the Theatre, when an actor had to express some violent emotions and, at 1st, confronted by such eruptions, I could only stand gaping and passive, forgetting to applaud.

But, soon, I realised that this was not play-acting. No, this was not acting, not exaggeration, this was really felt, and I saw that he was in dead earnest. Again and again, I was filled with astonishment at how fluently he expressed himself, how vividly he managed to convey his feelings, how easily the words flowed from his mouth when he was completely carried-away by his own emotions.

Not what he said impressed me first, but how he said it. This to me was something new, magnificent. I had never imagined that a man could produce such an effect with mere words. All he wanted from me, however, was one thing -- agreement. I soon came to realise this. Nor was it hard for me to agree with him, because I had never given any thought to the many problems which he raised.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that our friendship confined itself to this unilateral relationship only. This would have been too cheap for Adolf and too little for me. The important thing was that we were complementary to each other. In him, everything brought forth a strong reaction and forced him to take a stand ; for his emotional outbursts were only a sign of his passionate interest in everything. I, on the other hand, being of a contemplative nature, accepted unreservedly all his arguments on things that interested him and yielded to them, always excepting musical matters.

Of course, I must admit that Adolf's claims on me were boundless and took-up all my spare time. As he himself did not have to keep to a regular time-table, I had to be at his beck and call. He demanded everything from me, but was also prepared to do everything for me. In fact, I had no alternative. My friendship with him did not leave me any time for cultivating other friends ; nor did I feel the need of them, Adolf was as much to me as a dozen other ordinary friends. Only one thing might have separated us - if we had both fallen in love with the same girl ; this would have been serious. As I was 17 at the time, this might well have happened. But it was precisely in this respect that fate had a special solution in store for us.

Such a unique solution (I describe it later, in the chapter called « Stefanie ») that, rather than upsetting our friendship, served to deepen it.

I knew that he, too, had no other friends besides me. I remember in this connection a quite trivial detail. We were

strolling along the « Landstraße » when it happened. A young man, about our age, came around the corner, a plump, rather dandified young gentleman. He recognized Adolf as a former class-mate, stopped, and grinning all over his face, called out :

« Hello, Hitler ! »

He took him familiarly by the arm and asked him quite sincerely how he was getting on. I expected Adolf to respond in the same friendly manner, as he always set great store by correct and courteous behaviour. But my friend went red with rage. I knew from former experience that this change of expression boded ill.

« What the devil is that to do with you ? » , he threw at him excitedly, and pushed him sharply away.

Then, he took my arm and went with me on his way without bothering about the young man whose flushed and baffled face I can still see before me.

« All future civil servants and, with this lot, I had to sit in the same class. » , said Adolf, still furious.

It was a long time before he calmed down.

Another experience sticks-out in my memory. My venerated violin teacher, Heinrich Dessauer, had died. Adolf went to the funeral with me, which rather surprised me as he did not know Professor Dessauer at all. When I expressed my surprise, he said :

« I can't bear it that you should mix with other young people and talk to them. »

There was no end to the things, even trivial ones, that could upset him. But he lost his temper most of all when it was suggested that he should become a civil servant. Whenever he heard the word « civil servant » , even without any connection with his own career, he fell into a rage. I discovered that these outbursts of fury were, in a certain sense, still quarrels with his long-dead father, whose greatest desire it had been to turn him into a civil servant. So to speak, a « posthumous defence » .

It was an essential part of our friendship at that time, that my opinion of civil servants should be as low as his. Knowing his violent rejection of a career in the civil service, I could now appreciate that he preferred the friendship of a simple upholsterer to that of one of those spoilt darlings who were assured of patronage by their good connections and knew, in advance, the exact course their life would follow. Hitler was just the opposite.

With him, everything was uncertain. There was another positive factor which made me seem, in Adolf's eyes, pre-destined to be his friend : like him, I considered art to be the greatest thing in man's life. Of course, in those days, we were not able to express this sentiment in such highfalutin words. But, in practice, we conformed to this principle, because, in my life, music had long since become the decisive factor - I worked in the work-shop only to make my

living.

For my friend, art was even more. His intense way of absorbing, scrutinizing, rejecting, his terrific seriousness, his ever active mind needed a counterpoise. And only art could provide this.

Thus, I fulfilled all the requirements he would look for in a friend : I had nothing in common with his former class-mate, I had nothing to do with the civil service and I lived entirely for art. In addition, I knew a lot about music. The similarity of our inclinations welded us closely together as did the dissimilarity of our temperaments.

I leave it to others to judge whether people who, like Adolf, find their way with a sleepwalker's sureness, pick-up at random the companion that they need for that particular part of their path, or whether fate chooses for them. All I can say is that, from our 1st meeting in the Theatre up to his decline into misery in Vienna, I was that companion for Adolf Hitler.

DESCRIPTION OF HITLER

Adolf was of middle-height and slender, at that time, already taller than his mother.

His physique was far from sturdy, rather too thin for its height, and he was not at all strong.

His health, in fact, was rather poor, which he was the 1st to regret.

He had to take special care of himself during the foggy and damp winters which prevailed in Linz.

He was ill, from time to time, during that period and coughed a lot. In short, he had weak lungs.

His nose was quite straight and well-proportioned, but in no way remarkable. His forehead was high and receded a little. I was always sorry that, even in those days, he had the habit of combing his hair straight-down over his forehead.

Yet, this traditional forehead-nose-mouth description seems rather ridiculous to me.

For in this countenance, the eyes were so outstanding that one didn't notice anything else. Never in my life have I seen any other person whose appearance (how shall I put it) was so completely dominated by the eyes.

They were the light eyes of his mother, but her somewhat staring, penetrating gaze was even more marked in the son and had even more force and expressiveness.

It was uncanny how these eyes could change their expression, especially when Adolf was speaking.

Editor's Note

Professor Trevor-Roper concurs :

« Hitler had the eyes of a hypnotist which seduced the wits and affections of all who yielded to their power. »

One does not acquire such power by accident !

Josef Gœbbels wrote about his 1st meeting with Hitler :

« I was fascinated by Hitler's blue eyes. »

Traudl Junge, his last secretary, often told in interviews, that :

« People were amazed about Hitler's blue eyes. »

Martha Dodd writes in her book that :

« Hitler's eyes were startling and unforgettable. They seemed pale blue in colour. They were intense, unwavering, hypnotic. »

One only acquires such power of the eyes by patient training, and undoubtedly Hitler's ability to use his eyes in such a way resulted from his time with Lodz and Eckart - and does the nickname of « Wolf » for Hitler come from this pseudo-canine dominance trait of the eyes ?

...

However, even when he was young, Hitler's eyes were remarkable.

To me, his sonorous voice meant much less than the expression of his eyes.

In fact, Adolf spoke with his eyes and, even when his lips were silent, one knew what he wanted to say.

When he 1st came to our house and I introduced him to my mother, she said to me in the evening :

« What eyes your friend has ! »

And I remember quite distinctly that there was more fear than admiration in her words.

If I am asked where one could perceive, in his youth, this man's exceptional qualities, I can only answer :

« In the eyes. »

Naturally, his extraordinary eloquence, also, was striking. But I was, then, too inexperienced to attach to it any special significance for the future.

I, for one, was certain that Hitler, some day, would be a great artist, a poet I thought at 1st, then, a great painter ; until later, in Vienna, he convinced me that his real talent was in the field of architecture. For these artistic ambitions, his eloquence was of no use, rather a hindrance. Nevertheless, I always liked to listen to him. His language was very refined.

He disliked dialect, in particular Viennese, the soft melodiousness of which was utterly repulsive to him.

To be sure, Hitler did not speak Austrian in the true sense.

It was rather that in his diction, especially in the rhythm of his speech, there was something Bavarian.

Perhaps, this was due to the fact that, from his 3rd to his 6th year, the real formative years for speech, he lived in Passau, where his father was then a customs official.

There is no doubt that my friend Adolf had shown a gift for oratory from his earliest youth. And he knew it. He liked to talk, and talked without pause.

Sometimes, when he soared too high in his fantasies, I couldn't help suspecting that all this was nothing but an exercise in oratory.

Then, again, I thought otherwise.

Did I not take everything for gospel that he said ?

Sometimes, Adolf would try-out his powers of oratory on me or on others.

It always stuck in my memory how, when not yet eighteen, he convinced my father that he should release me from his work-shop and send me to Vienna to the Conservatory. In view of the awkward and unforthcoming nature of my father this was a considerable achievement.

From the moment I had this proof of his talent -- for me so decisive -- I considered that there was nothing that Hitler could not achieve by a convincing speech.

He was in the habit of emphasizing his words by measured and studied gestures.

Now and then, when he was speaking on one of his favourite subjects, such as the bridge over the Danube, the rebuilding of the Museum or even the subterranean railway station which he had planned for Linz, I would interrupt him and ask him how he imagined he would ever carry-out these projects - we were only poor devils.

Then, he would throw at me a strange and hostile glance as though he had not understood my question at all. I never got an answer ; at the most, he would shut me up with a wave of his hand. Later, I got used to it and ceased to find it ridiculous that the 16 or 17 year old boy should develop gigantic projects and expound them to me down to the last detail.

If I had listened only to his words, the whole thing would have appeared to be either idle fantasy or sheer lunacy ; but the eyes convinced me that he was in deadly earnest.

Adolf set great store by good manners and correct behaviour.

He observed with painstaking punctiliousness the rules of social conduct, however little he thought of society itself.

He always emphasized the position of his father, who as a customs official ranked more or less with a captain in the army.

Hearing him speak of his father, one would never have imagined how violently he disliked the idea of being a civil servant.

Nevertheless, there was in his bearing something very precise.

He would never forget to send regards to my people, and every post-card bore greetings to my « esteemed parents » . When we lodged together in Vienna, I discovered that, every evening, he would put his trousers carefully under the mattress so that, the next morning, he could rejoice in a faultless crease.

Adolf realized the value of a good appearance, and, in spite of his lack of vanity, knew how to make the best of himself. He made excellent use of his undoubted histrionic talents, which he cleverly combined with his gift for oratory.

I used to ask myself why Adolf, in spite of all these pronounced capabilities, did not get on better in Vienna ; only later, did I realize that professional success was not at all his ambition.

People who knew him in Vienna could not understand the contradiction between his well-groomed appearance, his educated speech and his self-assured bearing, on the one hand ; and the starveling existence that he led on the other, and judged him either haughty or pretentious. He was neither. He just didn't fit into any « bourgeois » order.

Adolf had brought starvation to a fine-art, though he ate very well when occasion offered.

To be sure, in Vienna, he generally lacked the money for food. But, even if he had it, he would prefer to starve and spend it on a Theatre seat.

He had no comprehension of enjoyment of life as others knew it. He did not smoke, he did not drink, and, in Vienna, for instance, he lived for days on milk and bread only.

With his contempt for everything pertaining to the body, sport, which was, then, coming into fashion, meant nothing to him. I read somewhere of how audaciously the young Hitler had swum across the Danube. I do not recollect anything of the sort ; the most swimming we did was an occasional dip in the Rodel stream.

He showed some interest in the bicycle club, mainly because they ran an ice-rink in the winter. And this only because the girl he adored used to practise skating there.

Walking was the only exercise that really appealed to Adolf.

He walked always and everywhere and, even in my work-shop and in my room, he would stride-up and down. I recall him always on the go. He could walk for hours without getting tired.

We used to explore the surroundings of Linz in all directions.

His love of nature was pronounced, but in a very personal way.

Unlike other subjects, nature never attracted him as a matter for study ; I hardly ever remember seeing him with a book on the subject. Here was the limit of his thirst for knowledge.

Details did not interest him, but only nature as a whole. He referred to it as « in the open » . This expression sounded as familiar on his lips as the word « home » .

And, in fact, he did feel at home with nature.

As early as in the 1st years of our friendship, I discovered his peculiar preference for nocturnal excursions, or even for staying overnight in some unfamiliar district.

Being in the open had an extraordinary effect upon him.

He was, then, quite a different person from what he was in town.

Certain sides of his character revealed themselves nowhere else.

He was never so collected and concentrated as when walking along the quiet paths in the beech woods of the Mühlviertel, or at night when we took a quick walk on the Freinberg.

To the rhythm of his steps, his thoughts would flow more smoothly and to better purpose than elsewhere.

For a long time, I could not understand one peculiar contradiction in him.

When the sun shone brightly in the streets and a fresh, revivifying wind brought the smell of the woods into the town, an irresistible force drove him out of the narrow, stuffy streets into the woods and fields. But hardly had we reached the open country, than, he would assure me that it would be impossible for him to live in the country again. It would be terrible for him to have to live in a village.

For all his love of nature, he was always glad when we got-back to the town.

As I grew to know him better, I also came to understand this apparent contradiction. He needed the town, the variety and abundance of its impressions, experiences and events ; he felt there that he had his share in everything ; that there was nothing in which his interest was not engaged. He needed people with their contrasting interests, their ambitions, intentions, plans and desires. Only in this problem-laden atmosphere did he feel at home.

From this point of view, the village was altogether too simple, too insignificant, too unimportant, and did not provide enough scope for his limitless need to take an interest in everything. Besides, for him, a town was interesting in itself as an agglomeration of houses and buildings.

It was understandable that he should want to live only in a town.

On the other hand, he needed an effective counter-weight to the town, which always troubled and excited him and made constant demands on his interests and his talents.

He found this in nature, which even he could not try to change and improve because its eternal laws are beyond the reach of the human will.

Here, he could once more find his own self, since here he was not obliged, as he was in town, eternally to be taking sides.

My friend had a special way of making nature serve him. He used to seek out a lonely spot outside the town, which he would visit again and again. Every bush and every tree was familiar to him. There was nothing to disturb his contemplative mood. Nature surrounded him like the walls of a quiet, friendly room in which he could cultivate undisturbed his passionate plans and ideas.

For some time, on fine days, he used to frequent a bench on the « Turmleitenweg » where he established a kind of open-air study.

There, he would read his books, sketch and paint in watercolours.

Here were born his 1st poems.

Another spot, which later became a favourite, was even more lonely and secluded. We would sit on a high, overhanging rock looking down on the Danube.

The sight of the gently flowing river always moved Adolf.

How often did my friend tell me of his plans up there ! Sometimes, he would be overcome by his feelings and give free reign to his imagination.

I remember him, once, describing to me so vividly Kriemhild's journey to the country of the Huns that I imagined I could see the mighty ships of the kings of Burgundy drifting down the river.

Quite different were our far-ranging excursions.

Not much preparation was necessary - a strong walking stick was the only requisite. With his everyday clothes, Adolf would wear a coloured shirt and, as a sign of his intention to undertake a long trip, would sport instead of the usual tie a silk cord with 2 tassels hanging down.

We wouldn't take any food with us but, somewhere, would manage to find a bit of dry bread and a glass of milk. What wonderful, carefree times those were !

We despised railways and coaches and went everywhere on foot.

Whenever we combined our Sunday trip with an outing for my parents, which for us had the advantage that my father treated us to a good meal in a country-inn, we started-out early enough to meet them at our destination, to which they had come by train.

My father was particularly fond of a little village called Walding, which attracted us because, nearby, was the Rodel stream in which we liked to bathe on warm summer days.

A little incident stands-out in my memory.

Adolf and I had left the inn for a bathe.

We were both fairly good swimmers, but my mother, nevertheless, was nervous. She followed us and stood on a protruding rock to watch us. The rock sloped-down to the water and was covered with moss. My poor mother, while she was anxiously watching us, slipped on the smooth moss and slid into the water. I was too far away to help her at once, but Adolf immediately jumped in after her and dragged her out. He always remained attached to my parents. As late as 1944, on my mother's 80th birthday, he sent her a food parcel, and I never discovered how he came to know about it.

Adolf was particularly fond of the Mühlviertel.

From the Pöstlingberg, we would walk across the Holzpoldl and the Elendsimmerl to Gramastetten or wander through the woods round the Lichtenhag Ruins.

Adolf measured the walls, though not much of them remained, and entered the measurements in his sketch-book, which he always carried with him.

Then, with a few strokes, he sketched the original castle, drew in the moat and the drawbridge and adorned the walls with fanciful pinnacles and turrets.

He exclaimed there once to my surprise :

« This is the ideal setting for my sonnet ! »

But when I wanted to know more about it, he said :

« I must Ist see what I make of it. »

And, on our way home, he confessed that he was going to try to extend the material into a play.

We would go to Sankt Georgen, on the Gusen, to find-out what relics of that famous battle in the Peasants' War still remained.

When we were unsuccessful, Adolf had a strange idea.

He was convinced that the people who lived there would have some faint memory of that great battle.

The following day, he went again alone, after a vain attempt to get my father to give me the day off. He spent 2 days and 2 nights there, but I don't remember with what result.

For the sole reason that Adolf wanted, for a change, to see his beloved Linz from the east, I had to make with him the unattractive climb up the Pfennigberg, in which the Linzers, as he complained, didn't show enough interest.

I also liked the view of the city but, least of all, from this side. Nevertheless, Adolf remained for hours in this uninviting spot, sketching.

On the other hand, Saint-Florian became for me, too, a place of pilgrimage, for here, where Anton Bruckner had worked and hallowed the surroundings by his memory, we imagined that we actually met « God's musician » and heard his inspired improvisations on the great organ in the magnificent church.

Then, we would stand in front of the simple grave-stone let into the floor beneath the choir, where the great Master had been buried 10 years earlier.

Editor's Note

Anton Bruckner (born on 4 September 1824 ; died on 11 October 1896) was an Austrian composer known for his Symphonies, Masses, and Motets.

The 1st are considered emblematic of the final stage of Austro-German Romanticism because of their rich harmonic language, complex polyphony, and considerable length.

Bruckner's compositions helped to define contemporary musical radicalism, owing to their dissonances, unprepared modulations, and roving harmonies.

Unlike other radicals, such as Richard Wagner or Hugo Wolf who fit the « enfant terrible » mould, Bruckner showed extreme humility before other musicians, Wagner in particular.

This apparent dichotomy between Bruckner, the man, and Bruckner, the composer, hampers efforts to describe his life in a way that gives a straightforward context for his music.

His works, the Symphonies in particular, had detractors, most notably the influential Austrian music-critic Eduard Hanslick, and other supporters of Johannes Brahms, who pointed to their large size, use of repetition, and Bruckner's propensity to revise many of his works, often with the assistance of colleagues, and his apparent indecision about which versions he preferred.

On the other hand, Bruckner was greatly admired by subsequent composers, including his friend Gustav Mahler, who described him as « half simpleton, half God » .

...

The wonderful monastery had aroused my friend to the heights of enthusiasm.

He had stood in front of the glorious staircase for an hour or more - at any rate, much too long for me.

And how much did he admire the splendour of the library !

But the deepest impression was made on him by the contrast between the over-decorated apartments of the monastery and Bruckner's simple-room.

When he saw its humble furniture, he was strengthened in his belief that on this earth genius almost always goes hand in hand with poverty.

Such visits were revealing to me, for Adolf was by nature very reserved.

There was always a certain element in his personality into which he would allow nobody to penetrate.

He had his inscrutable secrets and, in many respects, always remained a riddle to me.

But there was one key that opened the door to much that would have remained hidden : his enthusiasm for beauty. All that separated us disappeared when we stood in front of such a magnificent work of art as the Monastery of Saint-Florian.

Editor's Note

The monastery, named after Saint-Florian, was founded in the Carolingian period.

From 1071, it has housed a community of Augustinian Canons, and is thus one of the oldest operational monasteries in the world following the Rule of Saint-Augustine.

Between 1686 and 1708, the monastery complex was reconstructed in Baroque style by Carlo Antonio Carlone, of whom Saint-Florian's is reckoned the Masterpiece.

After his death, the work was continued by Jakob Prandtauer.

The result is the biggest Baroque monastery in Upper-Austria.

The frescoes were created by Bartolomeo Altomonte.

Construction of the library wing was not begun until 1744, by Johann Gotthard Hayberger.

The library comprises about 130,000 items, including many manuscripts.

The gallery contains numerous works of the 16th and 17th Centuries, but also some late-medieval works of the Danube School, particularly by Albrecht Altdorfer.

Saint-Florian's Priory possesses 2 organs, the larger one of which is known as the « Bruckner organ » (« Brucknerorgel ») of more than 7,000 organ pipes.

It was played by composer and organist Anton Bruckner, previously a choir-boy at the monastery, when he was the organist, between 1848 and 1855.

He is buried beneath the organ inside the church.

Saint-Florian is also known for its boys' choir (« Sankt Florianer Sängerknaben »), founded in 1071.

This choir has been a traditional part of the monastic worship from its foundation.

...

Then, fired by enthusiasm, Adolf would lower all his defences and I felt to the full the joy of our friendship.

I have often been asked, and even by Rudolf Heß, who once invited me to visit him in Linz, whether Adolf, when I knew him, had any sense of humour.

One feels the lack of it, people of his entourage said. After all, he was an Austrian and should have had his share of the famous Austrian sense of humour. Certainly one's impression of Hitler, especially after a short and superficial acquaintance, was that of a deeply serious man. This enormous seriousness seemed to overshadow everything else. It was the same when he was young. He approached the problems with which he was concerned with a deadly earnestness which ill suited his 16 or 17 years. He was capable of loving and admiring, hating and despising, all with the greatest seriousness. One thing he could not do was to pass-over something with a smile.

Even with a subject in which he did not take a personal interest, such as sport, this was, nevertheless, as a phenomenon of modern times, just as important to him as any other. He never came to the end of his problems.

His profound earnestness never ceased to attack new problems, and if he did not find any in the present, he would brood at home for hours over his books and burrow into the problems of the past. This extraordinary earnestness was his most striking quality.

Many other qualities which are characteristic of youth were lacking in him : a care-free letting go of himself, living only for the day - the happy attitude of « What is to be, will be » . Even « going off the rails » , in the coarse exuberance of youth, was alien to him.

His idea, strange to say, was that these were things that did not become a young man. And because of this, humour was confined to the most intimate sphere as if it were something taboo. His humour was usually aimed at people in his immediate circle, in other words, a sphere in which problems no longer existed for him.

For this reason, his grim and sour humour was often mixed with irony, but always an irony with friendly intent. Thus, he saw me once at a concert where I was playing the trumpet. He got enormous amusement out of imitating me and insisted that with my blown-out cheeks I looked like one of Rubens' angels.

I cannot conclude this without mentioning one of Hitler's qualities which, I freely admit, seems paradoxical to talk about now.

Hitler was full of deep understanding and sympathy.

He took a most touching interest in me.

Without my telling him, he knew exactly how I felt. How often this helped me in difficult times !

He always knew what I needed and what I wanted.

However intensely he was occupied with himself, he would always have time for the affairs of those people in whom he was interested.

It was not by chance that he was the one who persuaded my father to let me study music and, thereby, influenced my life in a decisive way. Rather, this was the outcome of his general attitude of sharing in all the things that were of concern to me.

Sometimes, I had a feeling that he was living my life as well as his own.

Thus, I have drawn the portrait of the young Hitler as well as I can from memory.

But for the question, then unknown and unexpressed, which hung above our friendship, I have not to this day found any answer :

« What were God's intentions when he created this man ? »

HITLER'S MOTHER

When I first met her, Klara Hitler was already 45 years old and a widow of 2 years' standing.

Whenever I saw her, I had (I don't know why) a feeling of sympathy for her, and felt that I wanted to do something

for her.

She was glad that Adolf had found a friend whom he liked and trusted and, for this reason, « Frau » Hitler liked me, too. How often did she unburden to me the worries which Adolf caused her. And how fervently did she hope to enlist my help in persuading her son to follow his father's wishes in the choice of a career !

I had to disappoint her, yet, she did not blame me, for she must have felt that the reasons for Adolf's behaviour were much too deep, far beyond the reach of my influence.

Just as Adolf often enjoyed the hospitality of my parents' home, I went often to see his mother and on taking leave was unfailingly asked by « Frau » Hitler to come again. I considered myself as part of the family - there was hardly anybody else who visited them.

Number 31 « Humboldtstraße » is a 3 storied, not unpleasant tenement building. The Hitlers lived on the 3rd floor. I can still visualise the humble apartment.

The small kitchen, with green painted furniture, had only one window, which looked-out on to the court-yard. The living-room, with the 2 beds of his mother and little Paula, overlooked the street.

On the side-wall hung a portrait of his father, with a typical civil servant's face, impressive and dignified, whose rather grim expression was mitigated by the carefully groomed whiskers « à la » Emperor Franz-Josef.

Adolf lived and studied in the closet, off the bedroom.

Paula, Adolf's little sister, was 9 when I 1st met the family.

She was a rather pretty girl, quiet and reserved. I never saw her gay.

We got on rather well with each other but Adolf was not particularly close to her.

This was due, perhaps, to the difference in age - he always referred to her as « the kid » .

Paula never married and later lived in Königssee, near Berchtesgaden.

Another acquaintance I made in the Hitler family was a striking-looking young woman of just over 20, called Angela, whose place in the family puzzled me at 1st, although she addressed Klara Hitler as « Mother » , just as Paula did. Later, I learned the solution of the mystery.

Angela, born on the 28th July, 1883, that is to say 6 years before Adolf, was a child of the father's previous marriage. Her mother, Franziska Matzelsberger, died the year after her birth. 5 months later, the father married Klara Pözl.

Angela, who naturally had no recollection of her own mother, looked upon Klara as her mother.

In September 1903, 1 year before I became acquainted with Adolf, Angela had married a revenue official called Raubal. She lived with her husband nearby and often came to visit her step-mother, but never brought him with her ; at any rate, I never met Raubal. Angela was quite unlike « Frau » Hitler, a jolly person who enjoyed life and loved to laugh. She brought some life into the family.

She was very handsome with her regular features, and her beautiful hair which was as dark as Adolf's.

From Adolf's description, but also from some hints of his mother's, I gathered that Raubal was a drunkard.

Adolf hated him.

He saw in him a personification of everything he despised in a man.

He spent his time in the pub, drank and smoked, gambled his money away and, on top of that ... he was a civil servant.

And as though that were not enough, Raubal thought it was his duty to support his father-in-law's views by urging Adolf to become a civil servant himself.

This was enough to antagonize Adolf completely.

When Adolf talked of Raubal, his face assumed a truly threatening aspect.

Perhaps, it was Adolf's pronounced hatred of his half sister's husband that kept Raubal away from the « Humboldtstraße » .

At the time of Raubal's death, only a few years after his marriage to Angela, the break between him and Adolf was already complete.

Angela re-married later, an architect in Dresden, and died in Munich in 1949.

I learned from Adolf that, from his father's 2nd marriage, there was also a son, Alois, who spent his childhood with the Hitler family but left them while they were living in Lambach.

This half brother of Adolf's (born on December 13th, 1882, in Braunau) was 7 years older than Adolf.

While his father was alive, he still came to Leonding a couple of times but, as far as I know, he never appeared in

the « Humboldtstraße » .

He never played any important part in Hitler's life, nor did he take any interest in Adolf's political career.

He turned-up once in Paris, then, in Vienna, and, later, in Berlin.

His 1st marriage was to a Dutch woman and they had a son, William Patrick Hitler, who, in August 1939, published a pamphlet, « My Uncle Adolf » ; a son by his 2nd wife, Heinz Hitler, fell as an officer on the Eastern Front.

« Frau » Hitler did not like to talk about herself and her worries, yet, she found relief in telling me of her doubts about Adolf.

Naturally, she didn't get much satisfaction from the vague and, for her, meaningless utterances of Adolf about his future as an artist.

The preoccupation with the well-being of her only surviving son depressed her increasingly.

She used to say to Adolf :

« Our poor father cannot rest in his grave because you will flout his wishes. Obedience is what distinguishes a good son, but you don't know the meaning of the word. That's why you did so badly at school and why you're not getting anywhere now. »

Gradually, I learned to understand the suffering this woman endured.

She never complained, but she told me about the hard time she had had in her youth.

So, I came to know, partly by experience, partly by what I was told, the circumstances of the Hitler family.

Occasionally mention was made of some relations in the Waldviertel, but it was difficult for me to understand whether these were his father's relations or his mother's.

Editor's Note

The « Waldviertel » (Forest Quarter) is the north-western region of the Austrian State of Lower-Austria.

It is bounded to the south by the Danube, to the south-west by Upper-Austria, to the north-west and the north by the Czech Republic and to the east by the Manhartsberg (537 miles) , which is the survey-point dividing Waldviertel from Weinviertel.

In any case, the Hitler family had relations only in the Waldviertel, quite unlike other Austrian civil servants, who had relatives scattered all over the country.

Only later, did I come to realize that Hitler's paternal and maternal lineage already merged in the 2nd generation, so that, from the grandfather upwards, Adolf had only one set of forebears. I remember that Adolf did visit some relatives in the Waldviertel.

Once he sent me a picture post-card from Weitra, which is in the part of the Waldviertel nearest to Bohemia.

Editor's Note

Weitra is a small-town in the district of Gmünd in the Austrian State of Lower Austria.

It is located within the rural Waldviertel region on the upper Lužnice (Lainsitz) river, near the border with the Czech Republic.

The municipality consists of the Katastralgemeinden Brühl, Großwolfgrers, Oberwindhag, Reinprechts, Spital, Sankt Wolfgang, Sulz, Waltersschlag, Weitra and Wetzles.

...

I do not know what had taken him there.

He never spoke very willingly about his relations in that part of the country, but preferred to describe the landscape ; poor, barren country, a striking contrast to the rich and fertile Danube valley of the Wachau.

This raw, hard peasant country was the homeland of both his maternal and paternal ancestors.

« Frau » Klara Hitler, « née » Pölzl, was born on August 12th, 1860, in Spital, a poor village in the Waldviertel.

Her father, Johann Baptist Pölzl, was a simple peasant.

Her mother's maiden name was Johanna Hüttler.

The name Hitler is spelt differently in the various documents.

There is the spelling Hiedler and Hüttler, while Hitler is used for the 1st time by Adolf's father.

This Johanna Hüttler, Adolf's maternal grandmother, was, according to the documents, a daughter of Johann Nepomuk Hiedler.

Thus, Klara Pölzl was directly related to the Hüttler-Hiedler family, for Johann Nepomuk Hiedler was the brother of that Johann Georg Hiedler who appears in the baptismal register of Döllersheim as Adolf's father's father.

Klara Pölzl was, therefore, a 2nd cousin of her husband.

Alois Hitler always referred to her before their marriage simply as his niece.

Klara Pölzl had a miserable childhood in the poor and wretched home where there were so many children.

In 1875, when she was 15 years old, her relative, the customs official Alois Schicklgruber at Braunau, invited her to come and help his wife in the house.

Alois Schicklgruber who, only in the following year, assumed the name Hiedler, which he changed into Hitler, was then married to Anna Glasl-Hörer.

This 1st marriage of Alois Hitler with a woman 14 years older than himself remained without issue and they finally separated.

When his wife died in 1883, Alois Hitler married Franziska Matzelsberger, who was 24 years his junior.

The children of this marriage were Adolf's half-brother, Alois, and half-sister, Angela. Klara, who had continued living in the house during the time he was separated from his 1st wife, left on the 2nd marriage and went to Vienna.

As Franziska, the 2nd wife, fell gravely ill after the birth of her 2nd child, Alois Hitler called his niece back to Braunau.

Editor's Note

Braunau-am-Inn is a town in the Innviertel region of Upper-Austria (« Oberösterreich ») , the north-western State of Austria.

It lies about 90 kilometres west of Linz and about 60 kilometres north of Salzburg, on the border with the German State of Bavaria.

A port of entry, it is connected by bridges over the River Inn with its Bavarian counterpart, Simbach-am-Inn.

The town was 1st mentioned around the year 810 and received a statute in 1260, which makes it one of the oldest towns in Austria. It became a fortress-town and important trading-route junction, dealing with the salt trade and with ship traffic on the River Inn.

Throughout its history, it changed hands 4 times.

It was Bavarian until 1779 and became an Austrian town under the terms of the treaty of Teschen, which settled the War of the Bavarian Succession.

As a major Bavarian settlement, the town played an outstanding role in the Bavarian uprising against the Austrian occupation during the War of the Spanish Succession, when it hosted the Braunau Parliament, a provisional Bavarian Parliament in 1705 headed by Georg Sebastian Plinganser (born in 1680, in Pfarrkirchen ; and died 7 May 1738, in Augsburg) .

Under the terms of the treaty of Pressburg, Braunau became Bavarian again, in 1809.

In 1816, during re-organization of Europe after the Napoleonic Wars, Bavaria ceded the town to Austria and was compensated by the gain of Aschaffenburg. Braunau has been Austrian ever since.

...

Franziska died on August 10th, 1884, barely 2 years after her marriage. (Alois, the 1st child of this union, had been born-out of wedlock and adopted by his father.)

On January 7, 1885, 6 months after the death of his 2nd wife, Alois Hitler married his « niece » Klara, who was already expecting a child by him, the 1st son, Gustav, who was born on May 17th, 1885, that is to say 5 months after the marriage, and who died on December 9th, 1887.

Although Klara Pözl was only a 2nd cousin, the couple needed an ecclesiastical dispensation for their marriage.

The application for this, in the clean, copper-plate hand-writing of an Austro-Hungarian civil servant, still exists in the archives of the Episcopate in Linz under the number : 6.911/11/2 1884. The documents read as follows :

Application of Alois Hitler and his « fiancée » , Klara Pözl, for permission to marry.

Most Reverend Episcopate !

Those, in humblest devotion undersigned, have decided to marry. According to the enclosed family tree, they are prevented by the canonical impediment of collateral affinity in the 3rd degree touching the 2nd. They, therefore, humbly request the Reverend Episcopate to graciously procure them dispensation on the following grounds :

According to the enclosed death certificate, the bridegroom has been a widower since 10th August of this year and is father of 2 infant children, a boy of 2 and a half (Alois) and a girl of 1 year and 2 months (Angela) for whose care

he needs a woman-help as he, being a customs official, is away from his home the whole day and also often at night, and, therefore, hardly able to supervise the education and up-bringing of the children. The bride has looked after the children ever since the death of the mother and they are very fond of her, so that it may be justifiably assumed that the up-bringing would be successful and the marriage a happy one. Moreover, the bride is without means and it is, therefore, unlikely that she will ever have another opportunity of a good marriage.

For these reasons, the undersigned repeat their humble petition for the gracious procurement of dispensation from the impediment of affinity.

Braunau, 27th October, 1884.

ALOIS HITLER, Bridegroom - KLARA PÖLZL, Bride

The Linz Episcopate declared itself not competent to issue the dispensation and forwarded the application to Rome where it was granted by papal decree.

Alois Hitler's marriage with Klara was described by various acquaintances as very happy, which was presumably due to the submissive and accommodating nature of the wife.

Once she said to me, in this respect :

« What I hoped and dreamed of, as a young girl, has not been fulfilled in my marriage. »

And added resignedly :

« But does such a thing ever happen ? »

The birth of the children in quick succession was a heavy psychological and physical burden for the frail woman : in 1885, the son Gustav was born ; in 1886, a daughter, Ida, who died after 2 years ; in 1887, another son, Otto, who only lived 3 days ; and, on April 20th, 1889, again a son, Adolf.

How much suffering is hidden behind these bare figures !

When Adolf was born, the 3 other children were already dead. With what care the sorely tried mother must have looked after this 4th child !

She told me, once, that Adolf was a very weak child and that she always lived in fear of losing him, too.

Perhaps, the early death of the 3 children was due to the fact that the parents were blood relations.

I leave it to the experts to give the final verdict.

But, in this connection, I would like to draw attention to one point to which, in my opinion, greatest importance should be attached.

The most outstanding trait in my friend's character was, as I had experienced myself, the unparalleled consistency in everything that he said and did.

There was in his nature something firm, inflexible, immovable, obstinately rigid, which manifested itself in his profound seriousness and was, at the bottom of all, his other characteristics. Adolf simply could not change his mind or his nature.

Everything that lay in these rigid precincts of his being remained unaltered for ever. How often did I experience this ! I remember what he said to me when we met again, in 1938, after an interval of 30 years.

« You haven't changed, Kubizek, you have only grown older. »

If this was true of me, how much more was it of him ! He never changed.

I have tried to find an explanation for this fundamental trait in his character. Influence of surroundings and education can hardly account for it, but I could imagine (although a complete layman in the field of genetics) that the biological effect of the inter-marriage in the family was to fix certain spheres and that those « arrested complexes » have produced that particular type of character. It was just this inflexibility that was responsible for Adolf Hitler's causing such innumerable sorrows to his mother.

Once more, the mother's heart was sorely tried by destiny.

5 years after Adolf's birth, on March 24th, 1894, she gave birth to a 5th child, a son, Edmund, who also died young, on June 29th, 1900, in Leonding.

Although Adolf had no recollection of the 1st 3 children in Braunau, and never spoke of them, he could clearly remember his brother Edmund, at the time of whose death he was already 11 years old.

He told me once the Edmund had died of diphtheria. The youngest child, a girl called Paula, born on January 21st, 1896, survived.

Thus, an early death had deprived Klara Hitler of 4 of her 6 children. Perhaps, her mother's heart was broken by these terrible trials.

Only one thing remained, the care of the 2 surviving children, a care which she had to bear alone after the death of

her husband. Small comfort that Paula was a quiet, easily led child ; all the greater was the anxiety over the only son, an anxiety that only ended with her death.

Adolf really loved his mother. I swear to it before God and man.

I remember many occasions when he showed this love for his mother, most deeply and movingly during her last illness ; he never spoke of his mother but with deep affection. He was a good son. It was beyond his power to fulfil her most heartfelt wish to see him started on a safe career. When we lived together in Vienna, he always carried his mother's portrait with him.

HITLER'S FATHER

Although his father had been dead nearly 2 years when I 1st met Adolf he was still « ever present » to his family. The mother perpetuated his personality in every way, for with her malleable nature she had almost entirely lost her own, and what she thought, said and did was all in the spirit of the dead father. But she lacked the strength and energy to put into effect the father's will.

She, who forgave everything, was handicapped in the up-bringing of her son by, her boundless love for him. I could imagine how complete and enduring the influence of this man had been on his family, a real patriarchal father-of-the-family, whose authority was unquestioningly respected. Now, his picture hung in the best position in the room. On the kitchen shelves, I still remember, there were carefully arrayed the long pipes which he used to smoke. They were almost a symbol in the family of his absolute power.

Many a time, when talking of him, « Frau » Hitler would emphasize her words by pointing to these pipes as though they should bear witness how faithfully she carried on the father's tradition.

Adolf spoke of his father with great respect.

I never heard him say anything against him, in spite of their differences of opinion about his career. In fact, he respected him more as time went on. Adolf did not take it amiss that his father had autocratically decided on his son's future career ; for this was considered his right, even his duty.

It was quite a different matter when Raubal, his step-sister's husband, this un-educated person, who was himself only a little revenue official, arrogated to himself this right.

Adolf would certainly not permit him to interfere in his personal affairs. But the authority of his father still remained, even after his death, the force in the struggle with which Adolf developed his own powers.

His father's attitude had provoked him 1st to secret, then, to open rebellion.

There were violent scenes, which often ended in the father giving him a good hiding, as Adolf told me himself.

But Adolf matched this violence with his own youthful obstinacy, and the antagonism between father and son grew sharper.

The customs official Alois Hitler showed a marked sense of ceremony all his life.

Consequently, we have good pictures showing him at various stages of his life. Not so much at his weddings, which were always under an unlucky star, but at the various promotions in his career, did he have his picture taken.

Most of the pictures show him, with his dignified civil servant's face, in gala uniform of white trousers and dark tunic, on which the double row of highly-polished buttons gleamed. The man's face is impressive. A broad, massive head, the most notable feature being the side-whiskers, modelled on those of his supreme Master, the Emperor.

The expression of the eyes is penetrating and incorruptible, the eyes of a man who, as a customs official, is obliged to view everything with suspicion. But, in most pictures, dignity prevails over the « inquisitiveness » of the gaze. Even the pictures taken at the time when Alois Hitler had already retired show that this man was, in spirit, still on duty.

Although he was past 60, he didn't show any of the typical signs of age.

One of the pictures, probably the last one, which can also be seen on his grave in Leonding, shows Alois Hitler as a man whose life consisted of service and duty.

To be sure there is also an earlier photograph, dating from his Leonding days, which, emphasizing his private life, depicts him as a comfortable, well-to-do citizen, fond of good living.

Alois Hitler's rise from being the illegitimate son of a poor servant girl to the position of a respected civil servant is the path from insignificance and inferior status to the highest-rank open to him in the service of the State.

His colleagues in the Customs Service describe him as a precise, dutiful official who was very strict and had his « weak spots » .

As a superior, Alois Hitler was not very popular. Out of office, he was considered a Liberal-minded man who did not conceal his convictions.

He was very proud of his rank. Every day, he would pay his morning visit to the inn with an official's punctuality. His regular drinking companions found him good company but he could flare-up over trifles and become rude, displaying both his in-born violence and the sternness that he had acquired in his job.

His illegitimate birth is conclusively proved by the Church register of the Parish of Strones. According to this, the 42

year old servant maid, Anna Maria Schicklgruber, gave birth to a son on July 7th, 1837, who was christened Alois.

The godfather was her employer, the peasant Johann Trummelschlager, in Strones. As far as is known, the child was the 1st and the only one. The identity of the father was not revealed by the mother.

Anna Maria Schicklgruber married the mill-worker Johann Georg Hiedler, in 1842, when the illegitimate child was already 5 years old.

The Church Register of Döllersheim contains the following entry :

« The undersigned hereby confirm that Johann Georg Hiedler, who is well-known to the undersigned witnesses, has acknowledged paternity of the child Alois of Anna Maria Schicklgruber and requests that his name be entered in the Baptismal Register. »

The entry is signed by the Parish priest and 4 witnesses.

Johann Georg Hiedler again acknowledged his paternity in an official document concerning some inheritance in 1876, before the Notary in Weitra. He was then 84 years old and the child's mother had been dead for over 36 years. Alois Schicklgruber had been a customs official in Braunau, for many years.

As the boy was not officially adopted after his mother's wedding, his name remained Schicklgruber. He would have kept this name throughout his life had not Johann Nepomuk Hiedler, Johann Georg's younger brother, made a will and left a modest sum to the illegitimate son of his brother. But he made the condition that Alois should assume the name Hiedler, and on June 4th, 1876, the name Alois Schicklgruber in the Church Register of the Parish of Döllersheim was altered to Alois Hiedler ; the local government authority in Mistelbach ratifying this alteration on January 6th, 1877. From now on, Alois Schicklgruber called himself Alois Hitler, a name which meant as little as the other, but which secured him his legacy.

Once when we were talking about his relatives Adolf told me the story of his father's change of names. Nothing his « old man » ever did pleased him as much as this ; for Schicklgruber seemed to him so uncouth, so boorish, apart from being so clumsy and unpractical. He found « Hiedler » too boring, too soft ; but « Hitler » sounded nice and was easy to remember.

It is typical of his father that, instead of accepting the version « Hiedler » , as did the rest of his relations, he invented the new spelling, « Hitler » .

It was in keeping with his mania for ceaseless change.

His superiors had nothing to do with this ; for in all his 40 years of service, he was transferred only 4 times.

The towns to which he was posted, Saalfelden, Braunau, Passau and Linz, are so favourably situated that they form the ideal setting for a customs official's career.

But hardly had he settled-down in one of these places, when he began to move house.

During his period of service in Braunau, there are recorded 12 changes of address ; probably, there were more.

During the 2 years in Passau, he moved twice.

Soon after his retirement, he moved from Linz to Hafeld, from there to Lambach - 1st in the Leingartner-Inn, then, to a mill, that is to say, 2 changes in 1 year - then, to Leonding. When I met Adolf, he remembered 7 removals and had been to 5 different schools.

It would not be true to say that these constant changes were due to bad housing conditions. Surely, the Pommer-Inn (Alois Hitler was very fond of living in inns) , where Adolf was born, was one of the finest and most presentable buildings in the whole of Braunau.

Nevertheless, the father left there soon after Adolf's birth. Actually, he often moved from a decent dwelling into a poorer one. The house was not the important thing ; rather, the moving. How can one explain this strange mania ? Perhaps, Alois Hitler simply hated to remain in one spot ; and as his service forced on him a certain stability, he, at least, wanted some change in his own sphere.

As soon as he had got used to certain surroundings, he grew weary of them. To live meant to change one's conditions, a trait which I experienced in Adolf too.

3 times, Alois re-modelled his family. It is, perhaps, true that this was due to outside circumstances. But if so, certainly fate played strangely into his hands.

We know that his 1st wife, Anna, suffered very much from his restlessness, which eventually led to their separation and was partly responsible for her unexpected death.

For while his 1st wife was still alive, Alois Hitler already had a child by the woman who became his 2nd wife. And, again, when the 2nd wife fell gravely ill and died, Klara, the 3rd, was already expecting a child of his. Just sufficient time elapsed for the child to be born in wedlock. Alois Hitler was not an easy husband. Even more than from « Frau » Hitler's occasional hints could one gather this from her weary, drawn face. This lack of inner-harmony was, perhaps, partly due to the fact that Alois Hitler never married a woman his own age. Anna was 14 years older, Franziska, 24 years younger, and Klara, 23 years younger.

This strange and unusual habit of the father's, always to change his circumstances, is all the more remarkable as those were peaceful, comfortable times without any justification for such change. I see in the father's character an

explanation of the strange behaviour of the son, whose constant restlessness puzzled me for so long.

When Adolf and I strolled through the familiar streets of the good, old town (all peace, quiet and harmony) , my friend would sometimes be taken by a certain mood and begin to change everything he saw. That house there was in a wrong position ; it would have to be demolished. There was an empty plot which could be built-up instead. That street needed a correction in order to give a more compact impression. Away with this horrible, completely bungled tenement block ! Let's have a free vista to the Castle.

Thus, he was always rebuilding the town. But it wasn't only a matter of building.

A beggar, standing before the church, would be an occasion for him to hold forth on the need for a State scheme for the old, which would do away with begging.

A peasant woman coming along with her milk cart drawn by a miserable dog - occasion to criticize the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals for their lack of initiative.

2 young lieutenants sauntering through the streets, their sabres proudly clanking - sufficient reason for him to inveigh against the short-comings of a military service which permitted such idleness.

This inclination to be dissatisfied with things as they were, always to change and improve them, was ineradicable in him.

And this was, by no means, a peculiarity which he had acquired through external influences, by his up-bringing at home or at school, but an innate quality that was also apparent in his father's unsettled character. It was a supernatural force, comparable to a motor driving a thousand wheels.

Nevertheless, father and son were affected by this quality in different ways. The father's unruly nature was bridled by one steady factor : his position. The discipline of his office gave his volatile character purpose and direction. Again and again, he was saved from complications by the hard exigencies of his duties.

The uniform of the customs official served as a cover for anything that may have gone on in the stormy sphere of his private life. In particular, being in the service, he unreservedly accepted the authority on which the service was built. Although Alois Hitler was inclined to Liberal views (an inclination not un-common in the Austrian Civil Service) , he would never have questioned the authority of the State, epitomized in the person of the Emperor. By fully-submitting to this accepted authority, Alois Hitler was able to steer safely through all the dangerous reefs and sand-banks of his life, on which otherwise he might have foundered.

This also throws a different light on his obstinate efforts to make a civil servant of Adolf.

It was for him more than a father's usual preoccupation with his son's future. His purpose was rather to direct his

son into a position which necessitated submission to authority. It is quite possible that the father did not himself realize the inner-reason of his attitude, but his determination in insisting on his point of view shows that he must have felt how much was at stake for his son. So well did he know him.

With equal determination Adolf refused to comply with his father's wishes, although he himself had only very hazy ideas about his future. To become a painter would have been the worst possible insult to his father, for it would have meant just that aimless wandering to which he (the father) was so much opposed.

With his refusal to enter the Civil Service, Adolf Hitler's path diverges sharply from that of his father ; it takes a different course, final and irrevocable. It was, indeed, the great decision of his life. The years that followed it, I spent at his side.

I could observe how earnestly he tried to find the right path for his future, not merely a job that would provide a livelihood, but real tasks for which his talents were fitted.

Alois Hitler died suddenly.

On January 3rd, 1903 (he was 65 and still strong and active) , he went, as usual, punctually at 10 o'clock in the morning to have his drink.

Without warning, he collapsed in his chair. Before a doctor or a priest could be called, he was dead.

When the 14 year old son saw his dead father he burst out into uncontrollable weeping.

SCHOOL

When I 1st knew Adolf Hitler he had, as far as he was concerned, already finished with school.

To be sure, he was still attending the technical school in Steyr and frequently came home, usually every Sunday.

Editor's Note

Steyr is a town, located in the Austrian Federal State of Upper-Austria. The town is situated at the confluence of the rivers Steyr and Enns. Steyr is Austria's 12th most populated town and, simultaneously, the 3rd largest town in Upper-Austria.

It has a long history as a manufacturing center and has given its name to several manufacturers headquartered there, such as « Steyr Mannlicher » (a fire-arms manufacturer best known for the Steyr AUG) , Steyr Tractor, and Steyr Automobile.

Historically, Steyr has had a number of well-known residents or visitors, including Franz Schubert who wrote his « Trout Quintet » there while on holiday, composer Anton Bruckner, was the organist at the local « pfarrkirche » (parish church) .

Adolf Hitler spent a brief period there, while in his teens. Hitler, who lived in a room at the « Grünmarkt » , went to the high-school of Steyr, in 1904. The school is located in the same building as the famous Saint-Michael's Church.

Only for his mother's sake had he (as he put it) consented to this « last of all attempts » .

His report from the 3rd form of the technical school in Linz had indeed been so bad that « Frau » Hitler had been advised to let Adolf continue his studies at another school.

To put it bluntly, the difficult pupil had been promoted only on the condition that he left. In this manner, the school in the capital of the Province got rid of its less satisfactory pupils by pushing them off into the schools of the smaller towns.

Adolf himself was infuriated by this sly method and from the very start regarded his attempt in the 4th form of the technical school in Steyr as a failure.

By this time, he knew all that there was to know about schools and had come to the conclusion that in view of his own plans for his future, school was of no more use to him.

The knowledge that he lacked, he would make-up by studying by himself.

Art had long since captured him. To art, he dedicated himself with youthful passion, convinced that this was his true vocation. Compared with art, school with its routine appeared grey and monotonous.

At long last, he wanted to be free and go his own way, and despised those young men who did not think likewise. As he emancipated himself from the hated atmosphere of school, so did our friendship gain in value and importance. What his old class-mates in all their insignificance had not been able to give him, he expected from his new friend.

At the elementary school, Hitler was always one of the best pupils. He was quick to learn and made progress even without working very hard. His 1st teacher, Karl Mittermaier, gave him a report :

« Full marks in every subject. »

Mittermaier lived till 1938, when he was naturally asked to tell what he remembered of his former pupil. Although he still remembered the pale and sickly boy, he had little to say about him. The little Adolf had been very docile, his school things always in perfect order.

For the rest, there was nothing outstanding about him, either good or bad. Incidentally, when Adolf Hitler was Chancellor, in 1939, he visited that school, again, and seated himself at the same desk at which he had learned to read and write.

As usual, he made good use of his visit and changed everything possible. He personally bought the old school building and ordered the construction of a fine new school. The teacher who had succeeded old Mittermaier was invited to Obersalzburg, together with her pupils.

But things altered when Adolf Hitler, in September 1900, entered the technical school at Linz. He, himself, writes about those years :

Only one thing was certain, my obvious failure at school. I learned what I liked - in particular, all that which I considered would be useful to me, as a painter later. What I thought was unimportant in this respect or what did not attract me, I neglected completely. My marks in this period show extremes, varying according to the subject and my regard for it : there is « Praiseworthy » and « Excellent » but also « Fair » and « Unsatisfactory » . By far, my best efforts were in geography and even more in history, my favourite subjects, in which I was far ahead of the rest of the class.

One is apt to get a wrong picture of Adolf's school-days from his own words. Although Adolf spoke to me of his school-days with reluctance and always with a curious indignation, nevertheless our friendship was, so to speak, overshadowed by them. In this way, I got quite a different impression from the one he conveys in his writings of 15 years later.

In the 1st place, the 11 year old boy found it difficult to adapt himself to the new surroundings. Every day, he had to make the long journey from Leonding into the town to school. He often told me that, nevertheless, this daily walk was one of the nicest things he could remember of those years. At least, this hour's journey to school assured him a bit of freedom, which he appreciated all the more as until then he had always lived in the country. Everything in town seemed strange and unfriendly to him. His class-mates, mostly from rich homes, did not accept as an equal the queer youngster who came daily to town « from the peasants » . His teachers' interest in him was confined to their classes. All this had been so different at the elementary school, where the easy-going teacher knew all his pupils intimately and used to take his regular drink with their fathers in the evening. At the elementary school, the boy had been accustomed to passing-up each year, without any special effort. At his new school, to start with, he also tried improvisation at which he was a Master. He had to do it all the more as he found little pleasure in learning by heart, so much valued by his teachers. But here, the trick did not work. So, he started to sulk and let things drift. Nobody took much notice of him in class ; he had no friends and did not want any. Sometimes, some of his spoiled classmates would make him feel that they did not accept as one of them this village boy - a sufficient reason for him to withdraw even more. It is significant that not one of his many schoolmates could claim any close relationship or friendship with him.

Thus, after his 1st year at the technical school, Hitler brought home to his father a report bearing twice «

Unsatisfactory » and the verdict that the pupil would not pass-up into the next class.

Adolf never told me how his father reacted to this, but it can be imagined.

Now, he had to start all over again.

His form Master was now Professor Eduard Hümer, who besides German, also taught French, the only foreign language taught in the lower-forms of the technical school and also, to my knowledge, the only foreign language which Adolf Hitler ever studied, or rather was made to study.

But, in the meantime, he had « acclimatized » himself.

His 2nd year in the 1st form was more successful and he was promoted to the 2nd form. But, from there, again, he passed only by the skin of his teeth.

Again, his father had to acknowledge a report which showed « Unsatisfactory » in mathematics. Obviously, this judgment was not due to ill-will on the part of the teachers.

Hitler hated mathematics because it was too dry and required hard, systematic work.

We often talked about it.

Later, in Vienna, Hitler realized that he would need mathematics if he wanted to become an architect. But this made no difference to his violent aversion.

He finished the 3rd form again with 2 « Unsatisfactory » reports, again in mathematics and in addition in German, although Professor Hümer was one of the teachers whom, he later admitted, he respected.

This was the year of his father's death.

Professor Hümer explained to his mother that promotion to the 4th form was only possible if he went to another school. It is, therefore, not correct to say that Adolf Hitler was thrown-out of the Linz technical school. He was only moved « to the country » .

If, up till now, it was by his father's order that he stayed at school, so now, it was mother's love which urged him to continue his studies. He did not like his transfer to Steyr.

After reading Dante's « Divine Comedy » , he talked to me of the school as « Purgatory » .

In Steyr, Hitler lodged with a Court official by the name of Edler von Cichini at number 19 « Grünmarkt » , but

whenever he had a moment's spare time, he would come to Linz.

As could be foreseen, the result was bad and remained so when he repeated his examination between September 1st and 15th, 1905.

As well as the usual « Unsatisfactory » for mathematics, there appeared another « Unsatisfactory » for practical geometry.

When Professor Hümer, who had been Hitler's form Master for 3 years, gave evidence as to his pupil's character at the Treason Trial after the unsuccessful « Putsch » of November 1923, he said :

« Hitler was certainly gifted, although only for particular subjects, but he lacked self-control and, to say the least, he was considered argumentative, autocratic, self-opinionated and bad-tempered, and unable to submit to school discipline. Nor was he industrious ; otherwise, he would have achieved much better results, gifted as he was. »

Having passed this rather negative judgment Professor Hümer, in a more sentimental mood, added :

« Yet, as experience shows, what happens at school has not much bearing on life, and while model pupils sink from view without leaving a trace, the difficult boys develop only when they have the elbow room they need.

My former pupil Hitler seems to belong to this latter species and I hope from the bottom of my heart that he will recover from his recent hardships and upsets and live to see the fulfillment of those ideals which he harbours in his bosom, which do credit to him, as they do to any German. »

These words, written in 1924, are certainly not influenced by wisdom after the event.

They show remarkable solidarity between teacher and former pupil.

In an indirect way, Professor Hümer proclaims that the ideals for which Adolf Hitler was, then, standing his trial were indeed the ideals of his school.

And this, in spite of the fact that in the subject which Doctor Hümer taught, German, Hitler by no means excelled ; which is borne-out by the many spelling mistakes in the letters and cards which he sent to me.

Among the teachers who, although their subject did not appeal to him, were favourably looked upon by Hitler for their personality was the science Master, Professor Theodor Gissinger, who replaced Professor Engstler.

Gissinger was very fond of the open-air, a hardy walker and mountaineer and enthusiastic about gymnastics. He was the most rabid of all the Nationalist teachers.

The political differences of that period were also evident within the teaching body, indeed, even more so than in the general public. This atmosphere charged with political tension was more important for the intellectual development of the young Hitler than anything he was taught.

As is generally the case, not the subjects taught, but the atmosphere of a school determines its value.

Incidentally, Professor Gissinger too has in later years given his judgment on his former pupil, Hitler. This remarkable document reads :

« As far as I was concerned, Hitler left neither a favourable nor an unfavourable impression in Linz. He was, by no means, a leader of the class. He was slender and erect, his face pallid and very thin, almost like that of a consumptive, his gaze unusually open, his eyes brilliant. »

The history teacher, Doctor Leopold Pötsch, was the 3rd and last of those teachers who found favour in Hitler's eyes. He is the only one of almost a dozen teachers of whom Hitler, already at that time, approved. However reluctant, Hitler was to talk to me of his former teachers, he made an exception of Pötsch.

The words which Hitler dedicated to his former history teacher are well-known :

« It was, perhaps, decisive for my whole life that chance gave me a history teacher who understood, as few others did, the paramount importance of this principle in teaching and examining (namely, to retain the essential and to forget the inessential) . My teacher, « Herr » Doktor Leopold Pötsch of the Technical School in Linz, fulfilled this condition in truly ideal manner. An old gentleman, kind but, at the same time firm, he was able not only to hold our attention by his brilliant eloquence but to fire us with enthusiasm. I am still touched when I think of the grey-haired man, the fire of whose words sometimes made us forget the present and, as though by magic, transported us into the past, and out of the mists of time transformed the dry historical facts into vivid reality. There we sat, wildly enthusiastic, sometimes moved to tears. »

Undoubtedly, this subsequent judgment is exaggerated.

This is borne-out by the fact that Hitler's last school report in Linz shows only a « Fair » for history, although perhaps, the change of school had something to do with it.

Nevertheless, this teacher's influence on the very sensitive boy should not be underestimated. If it is true to say that the greatest value of the study of history is the enthusiasm which it arouses, then Doctor Pötsch has achieved his end. Pötsch was a native of the southern border region and, before he came to Linz, had taught in Marburg and other places near the German language border. He, therefore, had a vivid experience of the struggle among the nationalities. I believe that the absolute love for everything that was German which Pötsch combined with his aversion to the Hapsburg Monarchy was the decisive revelation for the young Hitler. This fervent devotion to the German people gave him a firm foundation for the rest of his life.

Adolf Hitler remained grateful to his old history teacher throughout his life, indeed, his attachment to school and teacher grew with the passing of the years. In 1938, Hitler came to Klagenfurt and met Pötsch again. He spent more than an hour in a room alone with the frail old man, when he left the room he said to those accompanying him :

« You cannot imagine how much I owe to that old man. »

Editor's Note

Leopold Pötsch (born on 18 November 1853 ; and died on 16 October 1942) was an Austrian history teacher.

He was a high-school teacher of Adolf Hitler and influenced the future leader's later views.

Doctor Leopold Pötsch came from the southern German border regions.

There, political struggles between Slavs and ethnic Germans angered him and turned him into a loud and fiery proponent of the Pan-German movement.

He began teaching in Maribor, and later moved to Linz to teach history.

Pötsch was Hitler's teacher from 1st through 3rd grade (1901-1904) in geography, and in 2nd and 3rd grade in history. He also ran the school library.

...

As a special privilege, Hitler was allowed to bring his teacher maps, which put him in particularly close contact with him.

Aside from his service at the school, Pötsch was a much sought after official speaker.

He spoke at German national associations but, also, on the occasion of the Emperor's anniversary, in 1908. In 1905, he joined the Linz City Council as a representative of the German People's Party.

Hitler became enamored of Pötsch as a teenager, captivated by the professor's fiery speeches.

Pötsch was a fervent pan-German.

Pötsch despised the Habsburgs and forcefully argued that all ethnic Germans should be united by a single government. Like many Austro-Germans, Pötsch wanted to see the old Empire break-up and Austria join Germany, to the north.

He asserted that the Aryan race was stronger, healthier, and more fit to rule than any other people. Pötsch declared that Jews and Slavs were what he termed « inferior races » . (This position was not un-common among impoverished Germans after World War I.)

Hitler hated all his classes except Pötsch's history class.

Hitler was captivated by Pötsch's teachings and began regularly reading a local anti-Semitic newspaper.

Pötsch captured the imagination of his young students with heroic tales of the ancient Teutons and German victories. In his later years, Hitler spoke of Pötsch as a « great man » .

As dictator of Germany, Hitler attempted to unite all German-speaking people, just as Pötsch's lectures had demanded, and persecuted Slavs, Jews, Gypsies, and other minorities, eventually attempting to exterminate them in the « Final Solution » .

Hitler stated that :

« Pötsch used our budding nationalistic fanaticism as a means of educating us, frequently appealing to us our sense of national honour. »

Under Pötsch, Hitler came to the realization that :

« Germanism could be safe-guarded only by the destruction of Austria, and, furthermore, the national sentiment is in no sense identical with dynastic patriotism ; that, above all, the house of Habsburg was destined to be the misfortune of the German national. »

Pötsch gave popular slide lectures entitled « Images of German History » . In them, he strongly emphasized the Germanic era and the time of the early German Emperors before the rule of the Habsburgs and proceeded to pinpoint the German national awakening-up until the Franco-Prussian War.

The following is a quote from one of his speeches :

Since the great days of the magnificent German victories of the years 1870-1871, we have become increasingly conscious of our German identity and, now, thumb more ardently through the books of German myth, legends and history.

However, during those Hitler's teenage years while he may have been inspired by Leopold Pötsch's class, he was not motivated enough to become involved in politics. His only obsession was to become an artist.

Though a fervent pan-German, Pötsch was also an Austrian patriot at the same time.

Later in life, Pötsch was very annoyed when he discovered that, in « Mein Kampf », he received high-praise as a teacher but, at the same time, was denounced as an enemy of Austria. In reference to Pötsch, Hitler wrote :

« For who could have studied German history under such a teacher without becoming an enemy of the State which, through its ruling house, exerted so disastrous an influence on the destinies of the nation. And who could retain a loyalty to a dynasty that ... betrayed the needs of the German people, again and again, for shameless private advantage. »

In 1936, when some teachers in Linz sent their now-famous pupil photos to remind him of them, and they asked Pötsch to join them, he refused, arguing that he did not agree with Hitler in his defamation of Austria as he had sworn an official oath for Austria.

But these subsequent opinions of Hitler's about his teachers should not falsify the real picture of his school-days anymore than the subsequent opinions of the teachers about their former pupil - not to speak of the very contradictory opinions of his numerous class-mates.

The truth is (and I am witness to it) that Adolf left school with a fundamental hatred for it. I would take care not to bring the conversation round to the subject ; but he, sometimes, would be seized by the necessity to hold forth against it violently.

He never tried to keep in touch with any of the teachers, not even with Pötsch. On the contrary, he avoided them and pretended not to recognize them when he met them in the street.

His quarrel with school was going on at the same time as another conflict, which was much more important to him : his settling of accounts with his mother. This expression should not be misunderstood.

Adolf tried to spare his mother as much as he could. But this became impossible when he finally failed at school and so gave-up the career which his father had envisaged for him. Adolf was much more preoccupied with this psychological conflict than with the eternal guerrilla war with the teachers. What did he care about bad reports ? But to his mother, they meant that Adolf would not reach his goal.

I myself witnessed how Adolf tried to spare his mother during the last school year and, yet, he could not spare her because it was impossible to convince her that his future lay elsewhere. Where, he did not yet know himself ; and not for many years after his mother's death. So, she took this, her greatest worry, the future of her son, with her into the grave.

In those gloomy days of autumn, 1905, Adolf was on the razor's edge.

Superficially, the decision the 16 year old had to take was whether to repeat the 4th form in the technical school at

Steyr, or leave school forever. But its meaning for him was graver : should he, for his mother's sake, continue on a path which he knew was mistaken and hopeless for him ; or should he ignore the grief that he would cause his mother and choose the other way, of which he could only say that it was the path towards art, a word which, one can understand, didn't offer much comfort to his mother ?

But, in view of his nature, this was not for Adolf really a decision in the true sense of the word ; for, in reality, there was no dilemma at all. He simply could not do otherwise and, leaving school, he embarked on the 2nd path without looking back. But he knew how upset his mother was by this decision and this, I know, caused him immeasurable grief.

In those months Adolf passed through a grave crisis, the gravest during the years of our friendship. It manifested itself by his falling seriously ill.

He describes it in his book as lung trouble.

His sister Paula mentions a hemorrhage. Others, again, assert that it was some gastric trouble brought on by auto-suggestion.

I visited him almost every day during his illness, because I had to give him regular reports about Stefanie who, even at that time, he worshiped.

As far as I can remember, his illness was actually some lung trouble. I know that, for a long time afterwards, he was plagued by coughs and nasty catarrhs, especially on damp, foggy days.

Also, in his mother's eyes, he was released by this illness from continuing school. Thus, it just suited his decision. To what extent this illness was auto-suggestion, to what extent it was the natural consequence of his inner-crisis, to what extent it was purely constitutional, I cannot say.

When Adolf rose from his sick-bed, he had made-up his mind. He had definitely finished with school and without the slightest doubt or inhibition he steered his way towards the career of an artist.

The 2 years of his life that followed were without any visible aim.

« In the hollowness of the life of leisure » is the title he gave to this phase when, in compiling « Mein Kampf » , he discovered with some un-easiness this gap in his career.

Superficially, this title is correct.

He did not go to school, he did not bother about any practical training, he lived with his mother and let her keep him.

In reality, this chapter of his life was filled with unceasing activity.

He sketched, he painted, he wrote poems and he read.

I cannot remember that Adolf was ever idle or felt bored even for a single hour. If, by chance, he got fed-up with something, as for instance, a play that we saw, his boredom made him condemn the play so vehemently that, in this way, he roused himself to highest-activity.

To be sure, he was as yet not very systematic. There was no apparent purpose, no clear goal. He only accumulated with unbounded energy impressions, experience and material. What would ever become of it all remained an open question. He did nothing but search, he searched everywhere and always.

Meanwhile, Adolf found a way of proving to his mother how useless any further schooling would have been for him. He proved it (how typical of his way of tackling problems) by convincing his mother of the futility of the whole school system.

He told her :

« One can learn much better by oneself. »

He subscribed to the library of the Adult Education.

He joined the Museum Society and borrowed books from its library. He also used some lending libraries. From that moment, I remember Adolf as always surrounded by books, especially by the volumes of his favourite work, with which he never parted, the German Mythology. How often did he persuade me, when I came from my work, to take with me and study this or that book which he had just read so that he could discuss it with me. Now, suddenly, he had all the qualities which he had lacked at school ; application, interest and pleasure in learning. He had, as he said, beaten the school at its own game.

Stefanie

To tell the truth, it is not very agreeable for me to be the only witness (apart from Stefanie herself) who can tell of my friend's youthful love, which lasted 4 years from the beginning of his 16th year.

I fear that by giving a picture of the actual facts, I shall disappoint those who are expecting sensational disclosures. Adolf's relations with this girl from a much respected family were confined to those permitted by the prevailing code of morals and were absolutely normal, unless today's conception of sexual morality is so upside-down that one considers it abnormal if 2 young people have an affair and (to put it briefly) « nothing happens » .

I must ask to be excused from mentioning this girl's surname, as well as her later married name. Occasionally, I have revealed it to persons engaged in research on Hitler's youth, who had satisfied me as to their good faith.

Stefanie, who was one, or perhaps, 2 years older than Adolf, later married a high-ranking officer and now lives, a widow, in Vienna.

The reader will, therefore, understand my discretion.

One evening, in the spring of 1905, as we were taking our usual stroll, Adolf gripped my arm and asked me excitedly what I thought of that slim blonde girl walking along the « Landstraße », arm-in-arm with her mother.

He added resolutely :

« You must know, I'm in love with her. »

Stefanie was a distinguished-looking girl, tall and slim.

She had thick fair hair, which she mostly wore swept back in a bun. Her eyes were very beautiful - bright and expressive. She was exceptionally well-dressed and even her bearing indicated that she came from a good, well-to-do family.

Editor's Note

The young girl named was Stephanie Rabatsch, to whom Hitler sent 1 anonymous love-letter, in 1908, just before to depart for Vienna : in it, he asked her to wait for him to graduate from Art School and they would get married.

He never dared to approach her and was always satisfied with a quick glance from her. He even wrote a poem about her entitled « Hymn to the beloved » .

Urged by Kubizek to be more decisive and bolder, Hitler shunned-away, arguing he was not yet in a position to conquer the heart of his beloved.

She got engaged to a Captain from the Hessian command in Linz, soon after.

After the War, this woman confirmed to have been the recipient of an anonymous love-letter in the 1900's, but always maintained she was unaware of the identity of the writer.

The photograph by Hans Zivny, taken in Urfahr, on her leaving school, was somewhat earlier than this meeting and Stefanie could only have been then 17, or, at the most, 18 years old. It shows a young girl with pretty, regular features.

The expression of the face is completely natural and open. The abundant hair, still worn in the Gretel fashion, serves to strengthen this impression. A freshness and lack of affectation show in the girl's healthy countenance.

The evening stroll along the « Landstraße » was, in those years, a favourite habit with the Linzers.

The ladies looked at the shop-windows and made little purchases. Friends met - and the younger generation amused themselves in innocent ways. There was a lot of flirting and the young army officers were particularly good at it. It seemed to us that Stefanie must live in Urfahr, for she always came from the bridge up the main-square, and strolled-down the « Landstraße », arm-in-arm with her mother. At 5 o'clock, almost precisely, mother and daughter appeared - we stood waiting at the Schmiedtoreck. It would have been improper to salute Stefanie, as neither of us had been introduced to the young lady. A glance had to take the place of a greeting.

From then on, Adolf did not take his eyes off Stefanie. In that moment, he was changed, no longer his own-self.

I found-out that Stefanie's mother was a widow and did, indeed, live in Urfahr, and that a young man who occasionally accompanied them, to Adolf's great irritation, was her brother, a law student in Vienna.

This information eased Adolf's mind considerably. But, from time to time, the 2 ladies were to be seen in the company of young officers. Poor, pallid youngsters like Adolf naturally could not hope to compete with these young lieutenants in their smart uniforms.

Adolf felt this intensely and gave vent to his feelings with eloquence. His anger, in the end, led him into uncompromising enmity towards the officer class as a whole, and everything military in general.

He used to call them :

« Conceited block-heads. »

It annoyed him immensely that Stefanie mixed with such idlers who, he insisted, wore corsets and used scent.

To be sure, Stefanie had no idea how deeply Adolf was in love with her ; she regarded him as a somewhat shy but, nevertheless, remarkably tenacious and faithful admirer.

When she responded with a smile to his inquiring glance, he was happy, and his mood became unlike anything I had ever observed in him ; everything in the world was good and beautiful and well-ordered, and he was content.

When Stefanie, as happened just as often, coldly ignored his gaze, he was crushed and ready to destroy himself and the whole world.

Certainly, such phenomena are typical of every 1st great love, and one might, perhaps, be tempted to dismiss Adolf's feelings for Stefanie as calf love.

This may have been true as far as Stefanie's own conception of them was concerned, but for Adolf himself, his relation to Stefanie was more than calf love.

The mere fact that it lasted more than 4 years, and even cast its splendour over the subsequent years of misery in Vienna, shows that Adolf's feelings were deep and true, and real love. Proof of the depth of his feelings is that for Adolf, throughout these years, no other woman but Stefanie existed - how unlike the usual boy's love, which is always changing its object. I cannot remember that Adolf ever gave any thought to another girl.

Later, in Vienna, when Lucie Weidt roused his enthusiasm in the part of Elsa, in « Lohengrin », the highest-praise he could give her was that she reminded him of Stefanie.

Editor's Note

Lohengrin is a character in German Arthurian literature.

The son of Parzival (Percival) , he is a knight of the Holy-Grail sent in a boat pulled by swans to rescue a maiden who can never ask his identity.

His story, which 1st appears in Wolfram von Eschenbach's « Parzival » , is a version of the Knight of the Swan legend known from a variety of medieval sources.

Wolfram's story was expanded in 2 later romances.

In 1848, Richard Wagner adapted the medieval tale into his popular Opera, « Lohengrin » .

...

In appearance, Stefanie was ideally suited for the part of Elsa, and other female roles of Wagner's Operas, and we spent much time wondering whether she had the necessary voice and musical talent. Adolf was inclined to take it for granted.

Just her « Valkyrie » -like appearance never failed to attract him, and to fire him with un-bounded enthusiasm.

Editor's Note

In Norse mythology, a valkyrie (from Old Norse « valkyrja » : « chooser of the slain ») is one of a host of female figures who decides who dies in battle. Selecting among half of those who die in battle (the other half go to the

goddess Freyja's after-life field, called « Fólkvangr ») , the valkyries bring their chosen to the after-life hall of the slain, Valhalla, ruled-over by the god Odin. There, the deceased warriors become « einherjar » .When the « einherjar » are not preparing for the events of Ragnarök, the valkyries bear them mead. Valkyries also appear as lovers of heroes and other mortals, where they are sometimes described as the daughters of royalty, sometimes accompanied by ravens, and sometimes connected to swans or horses.

...

He wrote countless love poems to Stefanie.

« Hymn to the Beloved » was the title of one of them, which he read to me from his little black notebook.

Stefanie, a high-born damsel, in a dark-blue, flowing velvet gown, rode on a white steed over the flowering meadows, her loose hair fell in golden waves on her shoulders.

A clear spring sky was above. Everything was pure, radiant joy.

I can still see Adolf's face, glowing with fervent ecstasy, and hear his voice reciting these verses. Stefanie filled his thoughts so completely that everything he said, or did, or planned for the future, was centred around her.

With his growing estrangement from his home, Stefanie gained more and more influence over my friend, although he never spoke a word to her.

My ideas about these things were much more prosaic, and I remember very well our repeated arguments on the subject - and my recollections of Adolf's relationship to Stefanie are particularly distinct.

He used to insist that, once he met Stefanie, everything would become clear without as much as a word being exchanged. For such exceptional human beings as himself and Stefanie, he said, there was no need for the usual communication by word of mouth ; extraordinary human beings would understand each other by intuition.

Whatever the subject, we might discuss at any time, Adolf was always sure that Stefanie not only knew his ideas exactly, but that she shared them enthusiastically.

If I dared to comment that he hadn't spoken to Stefanie about them, and to express my doubts as to whether she was at all interested in such things, he became furious and shouted at me :

« You simply don't understand, because you can't understand the true meaning of extraordinary love. »

In order to quiet him down, I asked him if he could transmit to Stefanie the knowledge of such complicated problems simply by gazing at her.

He only replied :

« It's possible ! These things cannot be explained. What is in me, is in Stefanie too. »

Of course, I took great care not to push these delicate matters too far.

But I was pleased that Adolf trusted me so much, for to nobody else, not even to his mother, had he talked about Stefanie.

He expected Stefanie to reciprocate his love for her to the exclusion of all others. For a long time, he put-up with the interest she took in other young men, especially the officers, because he regarded it as a sort of deliberate diversion to conceal her own tempestuous feelings for him. But this attitude often gave way to fits of raging jealousy ; then, Adolf would be desperate when Stefanie ignored the pale youth who was waiting for her, and concentrated her attention instead on the young lieutenant escorting her. Why, indeed, should a lively young girl have been satisfied with the anxious glances of a secret admirer, while others expressed their admiration so much more gracefully ?

But I, of course, would never have dared to express such a thought in Adolf's presence.

One day he asked me :

« What shall I do ? »

Never before had he asked for my advice and I was extremely proud that he did ; at last, for a change, I could feel superior to him.

I explained :

« It's quite simple. You approach the 2 ladies and, raising your hat, introduce yourself to the mother by giving your name, and ask her permission to address the daughter and to escort them. »

Adolf looked at me doubtfully and pondered my suggestion for quite a while. In the end, however, he rejected it.

« What am I to say if the mother wants to know my profession ? After all, I have to mention my profession straightway ; it would be best to add it to my name - “ Adolf Hitler, academic painter ”, or something similar. But I am not yet an academic painter, and I can't introduce myself till I am. For the mama, the profession is even more important than the name. »

I thought for a long time that Adolf was simply too shy to approach Stefanie.

And, yet, it was not shyness that held him back.

His conception of the relationship between the sexes was already, then, so high that the usual way of making the acquaintance of a girl seemed to him undignified.

As he was opposed to flirting in any form, he was convinced that Stefanie had no other desire but to wait until he should come to ask her to marry him.

I did not share this conviction at all ; but Adolf, as was his habit with all problems that agitated him, had already made an elaborate plan.

And this girl, who was a stranger to him and had never exchanged a word with him, succeeded where his father, the school and even his mother had failed : he drew-up an exact program for his future which would enable him, after 4 years, to ask for Stefanie's hand.

We discussed this difficult problem for hours, with the result that Adolf commissioned me to collect further information about Stefanie.

In the Music Society, there was a cellist whom I had occasionally seen talking to Stefanie's brother.

Through him, I learned that Stefanie's father, a higher-government official, had died some years earlier. The mother had a comfortable home and was in receipt of a widow's pension, which she used to give her 2 children the best possible education.

Stefanie had attended the Girl's High-School and had already matriculated. She had a great number of admirers - small wonder, beautiful as she was.

She was fond of dancing and, the previous winter, had gone with her mother to all the important dances of the town. As far as he knew, the cellist added, she was not engaged.

Adolf was highly-satisfied with the result of my investigations - that she was not engaged he had, anyhow, taken for granted.

There was only one point in my report that disturbed him greatly : Stefanie danced, and, according to the cellist's assurance, she danced well, and enjoyed it. This did not fit at all into Adolf's own image of Stefanie.

A Valkyrie who waltzed round the ballroom in the arms of some « block-head » of a lieutenant, was for him too terrible to be contemplated.

What was the origin of this strange, almost ascetic trait in him which made him reject all the pleasures of youth ?

Adolf's father, after all, had been a man who enjoyed life and who, as a good-looking custom's official, had certainly turned many a girl's head.

Why was Adolf so different ? After all, he was a most presentable young man, well-built, slender, and his somewhat severe and exaggeratedly serious features were enlivened by his extraordinary eyes, whose peculiar brilliance made one forget the sickly pallor of his face.

And, yet - dancing was as contrary to his nature as smoking or drinking beer at a pub.

These things simply did not exist for him, although nobody, not even his mother, encouraged him in this attitude. After having been his butt for so long, at last, I had a chance of pulling his leg.

I proclaimed, with a straight face :

« You must take dancing lessons, Adolf. »

Dancing immediately became one of his problems. I well-remember that our lonely perambulations were no longer punctuated by discussions on « The Theatre » or « Reconstruction of the Danube Bridge » , but were dominated by one subject : dancing.

As with everything that he couldn't tackle at once, he indulged in generalizations.

He said once to me :

« Visualize a crowded ballroom, and imagine that you were deaf. You can't hear the music to which these people are moving and, then, take a look at their senseless progress, which leads nowhere. Aren't these people raving mad ? »

I replied :

« All this is no good, Adolf, Stefanie is fond of dancing. If you want to conquer her, you will have to dance around just as aimlessly and idiotically as the others. »

That was all that was needed to set him off raving.

He screamed at me :

« No, no, never ! I shall never dance ! Do you understand ! Stefanie only dances because she is forced to by society on which she unfortunately depends. Once she is my wife, she won't have the slightest desire to dance ! »

Contrary to the rule, this time, his own words did not convince him ; for he brought-up the question of dancing, again and again.

I rather suspected that, secretly at home, he practised a few cautious steps with his little sister. « Frau » Hitler had bought a piano for Adolf.

Perhaps, I thought, I might soon be asked to play a waltz on it and, then, I would chaff Adolf about being deaf while he danced.

He did not need music for his movements. I also intended to point-out to him the harmony between music and bodily movements, of which he did not seem to have any conception. But it never got as far as this.

Adolf went on, brooding for days and weeks, trying to find a solution.

In his depressed mood, he hit on a crazy idea : he seriously contemplated kidnaping Stefanie. He expounded his plan to me in all its details and assigned me my role, which was not a very rewarding one ; for I had to keep the mother engaged in conversation, while he seized the girl.

I asked prosaically :

« And what are you both going to live on ? »

My question sobered him up a little, and the audacious plan was abandoned.

To make matters worse, Stefanie was, at that time, in an unfriendly mood.

She would pass the Schmiedtoreck with her face averted, as though Adolf didn't exist at all.

This brought him to the verge of despair.

He exclaimed :

« I can't stand it any longer ! I will make an end of it ! »

It was the 1st and, as far as I know, the last time that Adolf contemplated suicide seriously.

He would jump into the river from the Danube bridge, he told me and, then, it would be over and done with.

But Stefanie would have to die with him - he insisted on that.

Once more, a plan was thought-up, in all its details.

Every single phase of the horrifying tragedy was minutely described, including the part I would have to play ; even my conduct as the sole survivor was ordained.

This sombre scene was with me, even in my dreams.

Soon, the sky was blue again and, for Adolf, came that happiest of days in June 1906 which I am sure remained in his memory as clearly as it did in mine.

Summer was approaching and a flower festival was held in Linz. As usual, Adolf waited for me outside the Carmelite Church, where I used to go every Sunday with my parents ; then, we took-up our stand at the Schmiedtoreck.

The position was extremely favourable, as the street there is narrow and the carriages in the parade had to pass quite close to the pavement.

The regimental band led the string of flower-decked carriages, from which young girls and ladies waved to the spectators. But Adolf had no eye nor ears for any of this ; he waited feverishly for Stefanie to appear. I was already giving-up hope of seeing her when Adolf gripped my arm so violently that it hurt. Seated in a handsome carriage, decorated with flowers, mother and daughter turned into the « Schmiedtorstraße » . I still have the picture clearly, in my mind. The mother, in a light-grey silk dress, holds a red sunshade over her head, through which the rays of the sun seemed to cast, as though by magic, a rosy glow over the countenance of Stefanie, wearing a pretty silk frock.

Stefanie has adorned her carriage, not with roses as most of the others, but with simple, wild blossoms : red poppies, white marguerites and blue corn-flowers. Stefanie holds a bunch of the same flowers in her hand. The carriage approaches Adolf is floating on air.

Never before has he seen Stefanie so enchanting. Now, the carriage is quite close to us. A bright glance falls on Adolf. Stefanie sends him a beaming smile and, picking a flower from her bouquet, throws it to him.

Never again, did I see Adolf as happy as he was at that moment.

When the carriage had passed, he dragged me aside and, with emotion, he gazed at the flower, this visible pledge of her love. I can still hear his voice, trembling with excitement :

« She loves me ! You have seen ! She loves me ! »

During the following months, when his decision to leave school had caused a conflict with his mother, and he was ill, his love for Stefanie was his only comfort and he always kept her flower in his locket.

Adolf was never in greater need of my friendship ; for as I was the only person who shared his secret, it was only through me that he could get news about her.

I had to go every day to the usual spot at the Schmiedtoreck and to report to him all my observations and tell him, in particular, who had spoken to mother and daughter.

That I stood alone at the familiar corner, Adolf felt, would naturally upset Stefanie immeasurably. It did not, but I kept it from him.

Fortunately, it had never occurred to Adolf that I might fall in love with Stefanie, for his slightest suspicion in this respect would have meant the end of our friendship ; and, as there was no real reason for it, I was able to give my reports to my poor friend wholly disinterestedly.

Adolf's mother had been aware for a long time of the change in her son.

One evening (I remember it well because it embarrassed me considerably) , she asked me straight out :

« What's the matter with Adolf ? He's so impatient to see you. »

I muttered some excuse and hurried into Adolf's room.

He was happy when I brought him some new facts concerning Stefanie.

I told him one day :

« She has a good soprano voice. »

He jumped-up :

« How do you know that ? I followed her very closely, for some time, and I heard her speak. I know enough music to be able to tell that somebody with such a clear and pure voice must be a good soprano. »

How happy this made Adolf. And I was pleased that he, languishing in his bed, had a moment of happiness.

Every evening, I had to get back to the « Humboldtstraße » from the evening stroll by the quickest route.

I would often find Adolf sketching a big blueprint.

He said, in dead earnest, after having heard my report :

« Now, I have made-up my mind. I have decided to build the house for Stefanie in Renaissance style. »

And, then, I had to give my opinion, especially as to whether I was satisfied with the shape and size of the music-room. He had paid special attention to the acoustics of the room, he said, and asked me to say where the piano should go, and so on, and so on.

All this, in a manner as though there were not the slightest doubt that the plans would be carried-out.

A timid inquiry about the money brought forth the rude reply :

« Oh, to hell with the money ! » , an expression which he frequently employed.

We had some arguments as to where this villa would be built ; as a musician, I was all for Italy. Adolf insisted that it could only be built in Germany, in the neighbourhood of a big city so that he and Stefanie could go to the Opera and concerts.

As soon as he could leave, his bed he went down and took-up his position at the Schmiedtoreck ; he was still very pale and ill.

Punctually, as usual, Stefanie and her mother appeared. Seeing Adolf, pale-faced and hollow-eyed, she smiled at him.

He asked me happily :

« Did you notice ? »

From that moment on, his health improved rapidly.

In spring 1906, when Adolf left for Vienna, he gave me detailed instructions how I should behave « vis-à-vis » Stefanie ; for he was convinced that she would soon ask me whether my friend, was ill again, as I was there alone.

Then, I was to answer as follows :

« My friend is not ill, but he had to go to Vienna to take-up his studies at the Academy of Art. When his studies are finished, he will spend 1 year travelling, abroad, of course. »

(I insisted on being allowed to say « in Italy » . Very well, then, Italy.)

« In 4 years time, he will return and ask for your hand in marriage. In case of an affirmative answer, the preparations for the wedding would be put in hand forthwith. »

While Adolf was in Vienna, I naturally had to send him regular written reports about Stefanie.

As it was cheaper to send post-cards than letters, Adolf gave me a code word for Stefanie before he left.

It was « Benkieser » , the name of a former class-mate.

A picture post-card which he sent me on May 8th, from Vienna, shows how much this « Benkieser » was still on his mind in spite of his many new and varied impressions in Vienna.

It reads :

« I am longing to return to my beloved Linz and Urfahr. »

The word « Urfahr » is underlined, alluding, of course, to Stefanie, who lived there.

« I have to see Benkieser again. I wonder what he's doing. »

A few weeks later, Adolf returned from Vienna and I met him at the station.

I still remember how we took turns carrying his bag and he urged me to tell him all about Stefanie, at once.

We were in a hurry because the evening stroll would begin in an hour's time.

Adolf would not believe that Stefanie had not asked after him, for he took it for granted that she was longing for him just as much as he was for her.

But, at heart, he was glad that I had not had the opportunity to tell Stefanie about his grandiose plans for the future, as his prospects at the moment were not very bright.

We hardly stopped in the « Humboldtstraße » to greet his mother before we hurried-off to the Schmiedtoreck.

Full of excitement, Adolf waited.

Punctually, Stefanie and her mother appeared. She threw him a surprised glance. That was sufficient - he did not want more. But I became impatient.

I said to my friend :

« You can see that she wants you to talk to her. »

He answered :

« Tomorrow. »

But the morrow never came, and weeks, months and years passed without his taking any steps to change this state of affairs which caused him so much unrest.

It was natural that Stefanie did nothing beyond that 1st phase of exchanging glances.

The most Adolf could have expected of her was the flower thrown at him with a roguish smile in the care-free atmosphere of the Flower Festival. Besides, any move of hers beyond the rigid limits of convention would have destroyed the picture of her which Adolf kept in his heart. Perhaps, even his strange timidity was prompted by the fear that any closer acquaintance might destroy this ideal. For, to him, Stefanie was not only the incarnation of all womanly virtues, but also the woman who took the greatest interest in all his wide and varied plans. There was no other person, apart from himself, whom he credited with so much knowledge and so many interests. The slightest divergence from this picture would have filled him with unspeakable disappointment.

Of course, I am convinced the 1st words he exchanged with Stefanie would have caused that very disappointment, because she was fundamentally a young, happy girl, like thousands of others, and certainly had the same kind of interests.

Adolf would have sought in vain for those grandiose thoughts and ideas with which he had surrounded her to such an extent as to make her the female image of himself.

Only the most rigid separation could preserve his idol.

It is most revealing that the young Hitler, who so thoroughly despised « bourgeois » society, nevertheless, as far as his love-affair was concerned, observed its codes and « étiquette » more strictly than many a member of the « bourgeoisie » itself. The rules of « bourgeois » conduct and « étiquette » became for him the barricade behind which he built-up his relationship to Stefanie.

« I have not been introduced to her. »

How often have I heard him say these words, although ordinarily he would make light of such obstacles. This strict observance of social customs was part of his whole nature.

It was apparent in his neat dress and in his correct behaviour as much as in his natural courtesy, which my mother liked so much about him.

I never heard him use an ambiguous expression or tell a doubtful story.

So, in spite of all apparent contradictions, this strange love of Hitler for Stefanie falls into the pattern of his character. Love was a field where the unforeseeable might happen, and which might become dangerous. How many men who had set-out with great intentions had been forced-off their path by irregular and complicated love-affairs.

It was imperative to be on one's guard ! Instinctively, the young Hitler found the only correct attitude in his love for Stefanie : he possessed a being whom he loved and, at the same time, he did not possess her.

He arranged his whole life as though he possessed this beloved creature entirely. But, as he himself avoided any personal meeting, this girl, although he could see that she walked the earth, remained nevertheless a creature of his dream-world, towards whom he could project his desires, plans and ideas.

And, thus, he kept himself from deviating from his own path ; indeed, this strange relationship, through the power of love, increased his own will.

He imagines Stefanie as his wife, builds the house in which they live together, surrounds it with a magnificent garden and arranges his home with Stefanie, just as, in fact, he did later on the Ober-Salzburg, though without her.

This mixing of dream and reality is characteristic of the young Hitler.

And, whenever there is a danger that the beloved would entirely escape into the realm of fantasy, he hurries to the Schmiedtoreck and makes sure that she really walks the earth.

Hitler was confirmed in the choice of his path, not by what Stefanie actually was, but by what his imagination made of her.

Thus, Stefanie was 2 things for him : 1 part reality, and 1 part wish and imagination.

Be that as it may, Stefanie was the most beautiful, the most fertile and purest dream of his life.

HITLER THE NATIONALIST

As I begin to describe the young Hitler's political beliefs and ideas, I seem to hear his voice again, saying :

« You don't understand it. »

or,

« These are matters I can't discuss with you. »

Sometimes, he was even more scathing, as for instance when listening to some of his political observations, I would nod assent, instead of expressing disgust, as he had expected :

« In politics, “ Gustl ”, you are nothing but a fool. »

After all, I had only one interest in life : music.

To begin with, Adolf agreed with me about the supremacy of art. But, during the years we spent together, his interest in politics gradually became paramount, although he never lost sight of his artistic aspirations.

One could put it this way : the years in Linz were dominated by art ; the following years in Vienna, by politics.

I was fully aware that it was only in artistic matters I counted for him.

And the more he became interested in politics, the less our friendship mattered. Not that he showed it to me ; for one thing, he took our friendship too seriously and, for another, perhaps, he didn't even realize it himself.

Politics had always been the critical point in our relationship. Having no political ideas of my own, or where I did have, not feeling strongly enough about them to defend them or to impose them on others, I was an unsatisfactory partner for Adolf in our discussions. He would rather have converted me than convinced me. But in fact, I accepted everything he said readily and uncritically, and even retained something so that I could occasionally throw in a clever remark, But to contradict, as he would have liked, I was not capable. I just was not fertile soil for politics. I was like a deaf-mute in front of an orchestra, who sees that the musicians are playing, but hears nothing. I had simply no political sense.

This reduced Adolf to despair.

It seemed inconceivable to him that there should be on earth a specimen so absolutely innocent of politics. He tried all means to prove to me that this was impossible. And he was none too gentle with me. In Vienna he compelled me repeatedly to go with him to Parliament, although I did not like it at all and would have preferred to spend the time at the piano. But Adolf did not yield. I had to go with him, although he knew very well that I was always terribly bored by this Parliament business. But Heaven help me if I had said so.

It is generally believed that politicians come from politically conscious circles. This was certainly not so in the case of my friend. On the contrary !

Here, again, is one of Hitler's innumerable contradictions.

The father was rather fond of talking politics and never hid his Liberal opinions. But he would not hear a word against the Monarchy : this old, faithful civil servant would never go as far as that.

When on the Emperor's birthday, on the 18th of August, he put on his gala uniform, he was a loyal servant of his Imperial and Royal Majesty.

Probably, Adolf, when little, never heard much talk of politics from his father, for politics, the father believed, was not a matter to be discussed in the family circle, but in the pub. And I cannot remember that Adolf had ever quoted his father for any one of his political opinions.

Still less was there any sign of it in the quiet home at number 31 « Humboldtstraße ». Adolf's mother was a simple, devout woman, far removed from politics. When the father was still alive, she might have heard him grumble occasionally about the political situation, but it had not sunk-in and, certainly, she had not passed it on to the children.

After his death, they never had visitors who might have introduced politics and I cannot remember ever hearing any political discussion in « Frau » Hitler's house.

Even when some political event was agitating the whole town, nothing of it would penetrate into this quiet household, for even Adolf would not mention such things at home. Their life flowed quietly on.

The only change I ever saw in the family was that « Frau » Klara, towards the end of 1906, moved from the « Humboldtstraße » to Urfahr.

Editor's Note

Urfahr received, on 16 December 1808, the legal market and, on 4 November 1882, became a town.

Since 1888, the « Mühlkreisbahn » connects the Linz-Urfahr train-station with the one of Aigen-Schlägl, in Upper-Mühlviertel. In 1919, the 1st community of Pöstlingberg, located near the pilgrimage church, was incorporated to Urfahr, shortly afterwards, and was even incorporated to Linz.

At the time of incorporation, Urfahr counted approximately 15,000 residents.

The name evolved from the word crossing, which was necessary to get from Linz there.

...

This was, by no means, an after-effect of the father's restlessness, it was rather the result of purely practical considerations.

In those days, Urfahr, which is now a part of Linz, was still a separate parish of mainly rural character, a favourite

residence for retired people.

As no excise duties were levied there, many things, for instance meat, were cheaper than in town. « Frau » Klara hoped to be able to manage better with her modest pension of 140 Crowns (90 for herself, and 25 each for Adolf and Paula) . And she was glad to be living among meadows and fields again.

The quiet house at number 9 « Blütengasse » still stands as it was and, sometimes, when I pass by, I think I can see « Frau » Klara standing on the little balcony.

For Adolf, it was a special source of satisfaction to live « on the same bank » as Stefanie.

Our nightly journey home was made longer because of the move to Urfahr. But this suited us well, for the problems which we tackled had become more profound and numerous. The way across the bridge was, sometimes, too short for us, so that if we were particularly concerned with a problem we had to walk to and fro across the Danube until our subject was exhausted. To be exact, Adolf needed the time for talking, and I for listening.

In studying the political career of such an extraordinary man as Adolf Hitler, one has to distinguish between external influences and the man's own predispositions, for I believe that the latter are much more important than the external events. After all, many other young people had the same teachers as Adolf, experienced the same political incidents, rejoicing or getting angry over them and, yet, these very same people have become worthy businessmen, technicians or manufacturers and never rose to political significance.

The spirit of nationalism dominated the Linz Technical School.

The class was secretly opposed to all traditional institutions, such as patriotic plays, dynastic manifestations and festivals, to Divine Service in school and to « Corpus Christi » processions. Adolf Hitler describes in his book this atmosphere which to him was more important than the lessons.

Money was collected for « Sudmark » and « Schulverein » , one's sentiments were manifested by wearing corn-flowers and black-red-gold colours, we used « Heil » as a greeting and sang « Deutschland über Alles » , instead of the Hapsburg Imperial Hymn.

All this, in spite of warnings and punishment.

The struggle for existence of the German population in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy agitated the younger generation in those days ; understandably, for Austria's German population stood alone in the midst of the Slav, Magyar and Italian nations of Austria-Hungary.

Linz, to be sure, was remote from the racial border and was entirely German. But there was always trouble in neighbouring Bohemia.

In Prague, one street demonstration after another took place.

Even in Linz, much indignation was caused by the fact that the Imperial and Royal police were not capable of protecting German houses from the Czech mob, so that it was necessary to proclaim a state of siege in Prague, in peace time.

Budweis was then still a German town with German administration and a German majority in the Town Council. Those of Adolf's class-mates who came from Prague, Budweis or Prachatitz used to weep with rage when they were jokingly called « Bohemians » ; for they wanted to be solely German, like the others. Soon, there was even unrest in Linz.

A few hundred Czechs lived there, as quiet and modest workmen and artisans, without anybody taking much notice of them.

Now, a Capucine Monk, a Czech named Jurasek, founded a Sokol Club, preached in Saint-Martin's Church in Czech, and collected money for the building of a Czech school.

This caused a great sensation in the town and some worthy Nationalists already saw in the action of the fanatic monk the preparation of a Czech invasion. Of course, that was exaggerated. Nevertheless, just this Czech activity made the indolent Linzers feel that they were threatened, with the result that, almost unanimously, they joined in the Nationalist struggle.

Those teachers of the Technical School, who were nationalists, led the struggle. Doctor Leopold Pötsch, the history teacher, was an active politician.

As a member of the Town Council, he was one of the leading lights of the Nationalist Party. He hated the Hapsburg multi-racial State (which today, what a change, seems to us to be the very model of a supra-national community) and all the enthusiastic young Nationalists took-up his watch-word.

« Who could remain loyal to a dynasty which, again and again, vilely betrayed, past and present, the interests of the German people for their own advantage ? »

Thus, Hitler definitely and irrevocably had abandoned his father's ways in favour of a pan-German program. When Adolf, raging on, let himself go on this train of thought, I could hardly keep-up with what he was saying, let alone take an active part in the discussion.

Yet, one word, which regularly cropped-up in his discourse, always struck me : the « Reich » .

With this word, he used to wind-up his long out-pourings. Whenever he had talked himself into a blind alley and was at a loss how to continue, he would say categorically :

« This problem will be solved by the “ Reich ”. »

If I asked, for instance, who would finance all these gigantic building projects which he sketched on his drawing-board, his brief answer was :

« The “ Reich ”. »

Even trivialities were left to the care of the « Reich ». There was a « “ Reich ” 's Stage-Designer », who would improve the unsatisfactory equipment of provincial theatres. (It is well-known that, after 1933, there really was a man who filled that post. I remember that Adolf Hitler coined that term as far back as his Linz days, when he was 16 or 17.) Even the care of the blind, or the protection of animals belonged, in his opinion, to the jurisdiction of the « Reich » !

The word « Reich » is used in Austria for the territory of Germany ; its inhabitants are called « Reich » 's Germans. But my friend's use of the term, meant more than merely the German State, though he carefully avoided any more exact definition. For, to him, the word was simply a « porte-manteau » expression, which comprised everything that was politically important for him - and that was a lot.

With the same fanaticism with which he loved the German people, and this « Reich », did he reject everything foreign. He had no desire to know other countries. That longing for distant lands so typical of all open-minded young people was utterly alien to him - even the artist's Classical enthusiasm for Italy. There was only one place for his plans and ideas : the « Reich » .

His violent nationalism, which was unequivocally directed against the Hapsburg Monarchy, showed all the particular predispositions of his character, especially the iron consistency with which he stuck to everything he had once accepted as correct.

The Nationalist ideology became his political creed and formed an unalterable element of his nature. No failure or setback would change him. He remained till his death what he had been at 16 : a Nationalist.

With this end firmly fixed before his eyes, he observed and studied the existing political conditions. Nothing was too unimportant ; he gave his attention to even the most trivial things. He took a stand in regard to everything - the less it concerned him, the more heatedly. He made-up for the utter-insignificance of his own existence by taking an interest in all public affairs, thus, giving aim and direction to his urge to change things.

With all his all-embracing interests, he had so much against him, and he saw everywhere only obstacles and hostility. And, yet, nobody had ever heard of him.

Sometimes, I was even sorry for him. With his undoubted gifts, what a happy life he could have led ; and how difficult

he made things for himself !

He was always up against something and at odds with the world. Just that healthy, care-free spirit which distinguishes most young people was utterly alien to him.

I never saw him take anything lightly ; everything had to be thoroughly studied and tested for how it would fit into his great political design. Tradition, in the political sense, meant nothing to him. To sum-up : the world had to be radically changed in all its aspects.

Yet, it would be wrong to conclude that the young Hitler threw himself heart and soul into the political struggle of the day.

A pale, sickly, lanky youth, quite unknown and inexperienced in the ways of the city, shy and reticent rather than pushing, he carried on this intense activity all on his own. Only the most important ideas and solutions, that needed an audience, would he propound in the evening to me, an equally insignificant and lonely figure.

The young Hitler's relationship to politics is similar to his attitude to love - if I may be permitted this rather indelicate comparison.

The more intensely he was intellectually occupied with politics, the more did he refrain from taking part in practical, political activity.

He did not join any Party or organization, did not take part in Party manifestations, and took care not to spread his own ideas outside of our friendship.

What I noticed then in him, in Linz (to stick to my metaphor) , may be described as a 1st ogling with politics, nothing more, as though he had had a presentiment of what politics would come to mean to him.

For the time being, politics remained for him only an exercise in the realm of ideas. This striking reticence shows a trait in his character that seems to contradict his impatience : his ability to wait.

Politics remained for him for some years a matter of watching, of criticising social conditions, of study, gathering experience; it remained a matter private to himself, and consequently without any importance for the public life of that day.

It is interesting to note that the young Hitler, in those years, was strongly opposed to everything military. This seems to be contradicted by a passage in « Mein Kampf » .

While going through my father's library, I came across several books on military subjects, among them, a popular edition of the history of the Franco-German War of 1870-1871 ; 2 volumes of an illustrated magazine of those years

now became my favourite reading and, before long, this heroic struggle had become my greatest intellectual experience. From now on, I grew increasingly enthusiastic for everything that had anything to do with war or soldiers.

I suspect that this recollection owes its existence to the circumstances of his imprisonment in Landsberg, where his book was written ; for when I knew Adolf Hitler, he was utterly averse to « anything to do with war or soldiers » .

Of course, he was annoyed by the young lieutenants who fluttered around Stefanie. But his aversion was deeper.

Even the idea of compulsory military service could infuriate him. No, he would never let himself be forced into being a soldier. If he ever became a soldier, he would do it of his own free will, and certainly never in the Austrian army. Before concluding on Adolf Hitler's political development, I would like to deal with 2 questions, which seem to me to be more important than anything else there is to say about politics : the young Hitler's attitude to Jewry and to the church. Adolf Hitler himself writes about his attitude to the Jewish problem during the years in Linz :

It is difficult, if not impossible, for me, today, to say when the word « Jew » Ist gave me food for thought.

At home, in my father's lifetime, I cannot remember ever having heard the word. I believe that the old gentleman would have thought it a cultural retrogression to give this word any special emphasis. In the course of his life, he had acquired some more or less cosmopolitan ideas, which not only co-existed with his strong nationalism, but influenced me too. And, at school, nothing led me to change this inherited conception.

It is true that, at the Technical School, I met a Jewish boy, whom we all handled with care, but only because owing to various experiences, we couldn't rely on him not to give us away. But we didn't give the matter any thought.

Not before I was 14 or 15 years old did I occasionally hear the word « Jew » , partly in the course of political conversations. I felt a slight resentment against it and the usual unpleasant feeling that overcame me when people quibbled about religious matters in my presence.

That was all I knew about it. There were not many Jews in Linz.

All this sounds very plausible, but it doesn't correspond to my impressions.

To begin with, it seems to me that the character sketch of his father had been touched-up to emphasise his Liberal ideas. The circle in which he moved in Linz already subscribed to the ideas of Georg Ritter von Schönerer, and it can, therefore, be presumed that his father was also against Jews.

In describing the school years, Hitler omits to mention that some of the teachers of the Technical School were openly anti-Semitic and made no bones about acknowledging their hatred of the Jews in front of their pupils ; and Hitler, at the Technical School, must certainly have been aware of the political aspects of the Jewish problem. It cannot have been otherwise, for when I met Adolf Hitler first, his anti-Semitism was already pronounced.

I remember distinctly that, once, when we were going along the « Bethlehemstraße » and passed the little synagogue, he said to me :

« This shouldn't be here. »

As far as I know, Adolf Hitler was already a confirmed anti-Semite when he went to Vienna. And although his experiences in Vienna might have deepened this feeling, they certainly did not give birth to it.

In my opinion, Adolf Hitler's own version seeks to convey the following :

In Linz, where the number of Jews was negligible, the question did not concern me. It was only in Vienna, where the Jews were more numerous, that I was forced to face this problem.

His attitude to the church is a somewhat different matter. « Mein Kampf » hardly mentions it at all, except for a description of his childhood experiences in Lambach.

As I had singing lessons at the Monastery in Lambach, in my spare time, I had an excellent opportunity of revelling, again and again, in the festive splendour of the magnificent church ceremonies.

Nothing was more natural than that I should see a most desirable ideal in the Abbot, as once my father had done in the little parish priest. This was so, at any rate, for some time.

Hitler's forebears were certainly religious, church-going people, as is natural with peasant folk.

But Hitler's own parents were divided in this respect ; his mother was pious and devout, his father Liberal, a lukewarm Christian.

It is certain that the question of the church interested his father more than the Jewish problem. As a servant of the State, in view of the close connection between State and Church, he could not afford to be openly anti-clerical.

As long as the little Adolf remained close to his mother, he was completely influenced by her devout behaviour and receptive to all the « grandeur » and beauty of the church.

The pale little choir boy was absorbed by his faith.

Though Hitler devotes only a few words to the subject, what he does say means a lot. The magnificent monastery had become familiar to him.

In his childish susceptibility, he was attracted by the church and his mother certainly encouraged him.

As he grew away from his childhood experience, with the passing of the years, and became closer to his father, the latter's Liberalism gained in influence.

The school in Linz also helped.

Franz Sales Schwarz, who taught religion at the Technical School, was not the man to have any effect on these young people, for the pupils did not take him seriously.

My own recollections can be summed-up in a few sentences : as long as I knew Adolf Hitler, I never remember his going to church.

He knew that I used to go every Sunday with my parents, and accepted this fact. He never tried to persuade me not to go, though he said occasionally that he couldn't understand me - his mother was also a religious woman but, nevertheless, he would not let her drag him to church. Moreover, he made these comments only by the way, with a certain tolerance and patience, which was not usual with him. But, in this case, apparently, he was not even interested in imposing his own idea. I cannot remember that, when he used to meet me at the close of the Sunday service, he ever made any derogatory remarks about this Sunday church-going, or behaved improperly. To my astonishment, he never made this an occasion for an argument.

Yet, one day, he came to me full of excitement and showed me a book about witch trials and, another time, about the Inquisition. But however worked-up he got about the events described in these books, he never drew any political conclusions from them. Perhaps, this was a case in which he did not consider me the right audience.

Every Sunday, his mother went, with little Paula, to Mass.

I can't remember that Adolf ever accompanied her, or that Frau Klara would have asked him to. Devout as she was herself, she was resigned to the fact that her son was different.

It may be that, in this case, she was held back by the different attitudes of the father, whose precept and example was still her model for her son.

In conclusion, I would describe Hitler's attitude towards the church, at that time, as follows : he was, by no means, indifferent to the church, but the church could give him nothing.

To sum-up, it can be said : Adolf Hitler became a Nationalist.

I have seen with what absolute dedication, even as early as that, he gave himself to the people whom he loved.

Only in this people could he live. He knew nothing other than this people.

HITLER AND ART

While I was undecided whether to list my friend among the great musicians or the great poets of the future, he sprang on me the announcement that he intended to become a painter.

I immediately remembered that I had seen him sketching, both at home and on our excursions.

As our friendship progressed, I saw many samples of his work. In my job as an upholsterer, I had occasionally to do some sketches, which I always found difficult, so the more was I astonished by my friend's facility.

He habitually carried with him various types of paper.

The start had always been the worst part for me ; for him, it was the other way round. He would take his pencil, and throwing a few bold strokes on the paper, would express his meaning.

Where words failed him, the pencil would do the job.

There was something attractive about these 1st rough lines - it thrilled me to see a recognisable design gradually emerge from their confusion. However, he wasn't so keen on finishing the rough draft.

The 1st time I went to visit him at home, his room was littered with sketches, drawings, blueprints.

Here was « The New Theatre » ; there, the Mountain Hotel on the Lichtenberg.

It was like an architect's office.

Watching him at work, at the drawing board (he was more careful then, and more precise in details than he used to be in moments of happy improvisation) , I was convinced that he must long since have acquired all the technical and specialized skill necessary for his work. I simply could not believe that it was possible to set-down such difficult things on the spur of the moment, and that everything I saw was improvised.

The number of these works is sufficient to allow one to form a judgment of Adolf Hitler's talents. There is, in the 1st place, a watercolour - rather, watercolour is not the right term, as it is a simple pencil drawing coloured with tempera.

But just the rapid catching of an atmosphere, of a certain mood, which is so typical of a watercolour and which, with its delicate touch, imparts to it freshness and liveliness - this was missing completely in Adolf's work. Just here, where he might have worked with fast, intuitive strokes, he has painted with painstaking precision.

All I can say about Adolf's artistic activity refers to his 1st attempts, and the only watercolour of his I possess is one of these.

It is still very clumsy, impersonal and really primitive though, perhaps, this gives it a special attraction. In vivid colours, it depicts the Pöstlingberg, the landmark of Linz. I still remember when Adolf gave it to me.

One cannot expect any artistic revelations from this watercolour and the hundreds which followed it.

His intention was not to express any of his own emotions, but just to paint pleasant little pictures. So, he chose popular subjects, for preference architecture and, rarely, landscapes. If these post-cards and pictures had not been painted by Adolf Hitler, no one would have bothered about them.

His drawings are a different matter, but there are only a few of them in existence.

Although he gave me several, only one of them is left, a purely architectural drawing with little meaning.

It shows a villa at number 7 « Stockbauerstraße » .

It had just been built and it appealed to Adolf. So, he drew it and made me a present of it.

Apart from revealing his love for architecture, it is of no significance.

Casting my thoughts back to those years, I have to say this : Adolf never took painting seriously ; it remained rather a hobby outside his more serious aspirations.

But building meant much more to him. He gave his whole self to his imaginary building and was completely carried away by it. Once, he had conceived an idea he was like one possessed. Nothing else existed for him - he was oblivious to time, sleep and hunger. Although it was a strain for me to follow him, those moments remain unforgettable.

There, he stood with me, in front of the new Cathedral, this pallid, skinny youth, with the 1st dark brown showing on his upper-lip, in his shabby pepper-and-salt suit, threadbare at the elbows and collar, with his eyes glued to some architectural detail, analyzing the style, criticizing or praising the work, disapproving of the material - all this with such thoroughness and such expert knowledge as though he were the builder and would have to pay for every short-coming out of his own pocket.

Then, he would get-out his drawing pad and the pencil would fly over the paper. This way, and no other, was the manner of solving this problem, he would say. I had to compare his idea with the actual work, had to approve or disapprove, and all this with a passion as though both our lives depended on it.

Here, he could give full vent to his mania for changing everything, because a city always has good buildings and bad.

He could never walk through the streets without being provoked by what he saw.

Usually, he carried around in his head half a dozen different building projects and, sometimes, I could not help feeling that all the buildings of the town were lined-up in his brain like a giant panorama. As soon as he had selected one detail, he concentrated on this with all his energy.

I remember, one day, when the old building of the bank for Upper-Austria and Salzburg, on the central square, was demolished.

With feverish impatience he followed the re-building.

He was terribly worried lest the new building should not fit into its surroundings. When, in the middle of the re-building, he had to leave for Vienna he asked me to give him periodical reports on the progress of the work. In his letter of July 21st, 1908, he wrote :

« As soon as the Bank is completed, please send me a picture post-card. »

As there was no picture post-card available, I got-out of it by procuring a photograph of the new building and sending it to him. Incidentally, the building met with his approval.

There were a lot of such houses in which he took a constant interest. He dragged me along wherever there was a building going-up. He felt responsible for everything that was being built. But, even more than with these concrete examples was, he taken-up with the vast schemes that he himself originated.

Here, his mania for change knew no limit. At 1st, I watched these goings-on with some misgiving and wondered why he so obstinately occupied himself with plans which, I thought, would never come to anything. The more remote the realisation of a project was, the more did he steep himself in it. To him, these projects were, in every detail, as actual as though they were already executed and the whole town rebuilt according to his design. I often got confused and could not distinguish whether he was talking about a building that existed or one that was to be created. But, to him, it did not make any difference ; the actual construction was a matter of only secondary importance.

Nowhere is his unshakable consistency more evident. What the 15 year old planned, the 50 year old carried-out, often, as for instance in the case of the new bridge over the Danube, as faithfully as though only a few weeks, instead of decades, lay between planning and execution. The plan existed ; then, came influence and power and the plan became reality. This happened with uncanny regularity, as though the 15 year old had taken it for granted that, one day, he would possess the necessary power and means. This is just too much for me to take in. I cannot conceive that such a thing is possible. One is tempted to use the word « miracle » , because there is no rational explanation for it.

Indeed, the plans which that unknown boy had drawn-up for the re-building of his home town Linz are identical to the last detail with the town planning scheme which was inaugurated after 1938. I am almost afraid of giving, in the

following pages, my account of these early plans, lest my veracity should be suspected. And, yet, every single syllable of what I am going to recount is true.

On my 18th birthday, August 3rd, 1906, my friend presented me with a sketch of a villa. Similar to that planned for Stefanie, it was in his favourite Italian Renaissance style. By good luck, I have preserved the sketches. They show an imposing, Palazzo-like building, whose frontage is broken-up by a built-in tower. The ground plan reveals a well-thoughtout arrangement of rooms, which are pleasantly grouped around the music-room. The spiral staircase, a delicate architectural problem, is shown in a separate drawing and, so, is the entrance-hall, with its heavy beamed ceiling. The entrance is outlined with a few brisk strokes in a separate sketch. Adolf and I also selected a fitting site for my birthday present ; it was to stand on the « Bauernberg » . When, later, I met Hitler in Bayreuth, I took good care not to remind him of this imaginary house. He would have been capable of actually giving me a villa on the « Bauernberg » , which presumably would have been finer than the original idea, and very much in the taste of the epoch. More impressive are 2 sketches still in my possession, samples of his numerous designs for a new concert-hall, in Linz. The old theatre was inadequate in every respect, and some art-lovers in Linz had founded a Society to promote the construction of a modern theatre. Adolf immediately joined this Society and took part in a competition for ideas. He worked for months on his plans and drafts and was seriously convinced that his suggestions would be accepted. His anger was beyond measure when the Society smashed all his hopes by giving-up the idea of a new building and, instead, had the old one renovated.

I refer to his biting remarks in the letters he sent me on August 17th, 1908 :

« It seems they intend to patch-up, once more, the old junk heap. »

Full of fury, he said that what he would like to do best would be to wrap-up his manual of architecture and send it off to the address of this « Theatre - Rebuilding - Society - Committee - for - the - Execution - of - the - Project - for - the - Rebuilding - of - the - Theatre » . How well did this monster title express his rage !

My 2 sketches, on either side of one sheet, date from that period. The one side shows the auditorium. Columns break up the walls and the boxes are placed in between them. The balustrade is adorned by various statues. A mighty domed ceiling covers the hall. On the back of this bold project, Adolf explained to me the acoustic conditions of the intended building, in which I, as a musician, was particularly interested. It clearly shows how the sound waves, rising from the orchestra, are reflected from the ceiling in such a way as to be, so to speak, poured-over the audience below. Adolf took a great interest in acoustic problems. I remember, for instance, his suggestion to remodel the « Volksgarten » Hall, whose bad acoustics always annoyed us, by structural alterations of the ceiling.

And, now, for the re-building of Linz ! Here, his ideas were legion, yet, he did not change them indiscriminately and, indeed, held fast to his decisions once they were taken. That is why I remember so much about it. Every time we passed one spot or another, all his plans were ready immediately.

The wonderfully compact main-square was a constant delight to Adolf, and his only regret was that the 2 houses,

nearest to the Danube, disturbed the free vista on to the river and the range of hills beyond. On his plans, the 2 houses were pushed apart sufficiently to allow a free-view on to the new, widened bridge without, however, substantially altering the former aspect of the square, a solution which later he actually carried-out. The Town Hall, which stood on the square, he thought unworthy of a rising town like Linz. He visualized a new, stately Town Hall, to be built in a modern style, far removed from that neo-Gothic style which, at that time, was the vogue for town-halls, in Vienna and Munich, for instance. In a different way, Hitler proceeded in the re-modeling of the old Castle, an ugly, box-like pile which over-looked the old city. He had discovered an old print by Merian depicting the castle as it was before the great fire. Its original appearance should be restored and the castle turned into a museum.

Another building which never failed to rouse his enthusiasm was the Museum, built in 1892. We often stood and looked at the marble frieze which was 110 metres long and reproduced scenes from the history of the country in relief. He never got tired of gazing at it. He extended the Museum beyond the adjoining convent garden and enlarged the frieze to 220 metres to make it, as he asserted, the biggest relief frieze on the Continent. The new Cathedral, then, in course of construction, occupied him constantly. The Gothic revival was, in his opinion, a hopeless enterprise, and he was angry that the Linzers could not stand-up to the Viennese. For the height of the Linz spire was limited to 134 metres, out of respect for the 138 metre high Saint-Stephen's spire in Vienna. Adolf was greatly pleased with the new Corporation of Masons which had been founded in connection with the building of the Cathedral, as he hoped this would result in the training of a number of capable masons for the town. The railway station was too near the town, and, with its network of tracks, impeded the traffic as well as the town's development. Here, Adolf found an ingenious solution which was far ahead of his time. He removed the station out of the town into the open country and ran the tracks underground across the town. The space gained by the demolition of the old station was designated for an extension of the public park. Reading this, one must not forget that the time was 1907, and that it was an unknown youth of 18, without training or qualification, who propounded these projects which revolutionized town planning, and which proved how capable he was, even then, of brushing aside existing ideas.

In a similar way, Hitler also reconstructed the surroundings of Linz. An interesting idea dominated his plans for the re-building of Wildberg Castle. Its original state was to be restored and it was to be developed as a kind of open-air museum with a permanent population - quite a new idea. Certain types of artisans and workmen were to be attracted to the place. Their trades had to be partly in the medieval tradition, but should also partly serve modern purposes, a tourist industry, for instance. These inhabitants of the Castle were to dress in ancient fashion. The traditions of the old guilds should rule, and a Master Singer School was to be established. « This Island where the Centuries had stood still » (these were his very words) would become a place of pilgrimage for all those who wanted to study life as it was lived in a medieval stronghold. Improving upon Dinkelsbühl and Rothenburg, Wildberg would not only show architecture but real life. Visitors would have to pay a toll at the gates and, so, contribute to the up-keep of the local inhabitants. Adolf gave much thought to the choice of suitable artisans and I remember that we discussed the subject at great length. After all, I was just about to take my Master's examination and was, therefore, entitled to have my say.

Quite a different project, of absolutely modern design, was the tower on the Lichtenberg. A mountain railway should run-up to the peak, where a comfortable hotel would stand. The whole was dominated by a tower 300 metres high, a steel construction which kept him very busy. The gilded eagle on the top of Saint-Stephen's in Vienna could be seen

on clear days through a telescope from the highest-platform of the tower. I think I remember seeing a sketch of this project.

The boldest project, however, which put all the others in the shade, was the building of a grandiose bridge which would span the Danube at a great height. For this purpose, he planned the construction of a high-level road. This would start at the Gugl, then, still an ugly sand-pit, which could be filled in with the town's refuse and rubbish, and provide the space for a new park. From there, in a broad sweep, the new road would lead-up to the « Stadtwald » . (Incidentally, the city engineers went, thus, far some time ago, without knowing Hitler's plans. The road which has meanwhile been built corresponds exactly to Hitler's projects.)

The « Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Warte » in the « Jagermayerwald » (it is still standing) was to be demolished and replaced by a proud monument. In a Hall of Fame, there would be assembled the portrait busts of all the great men who had deserved well of the Province of Upper-Austria ; from the top of the hall, one would have a magnificent view over a vast expanse of country ; and the whole edifice was to be crowned by a statue of Siegfried, raising aloft his sword, « Nothung » . (The Hall of Liberation at Kehlheim and the Hermann Monument in the « Teutoburger Wald » were obvious models.) From this spot, the bridge sweeps in one arch to the steep slope of the opposite bank. Adolf got his inspiration for this from the legend of a daring horseman who, pursued by his enemies, is said to have jumped from this point into the appalling depths below, to swim across the Danube and reach the other side. My imagination boggled at the dimensions of this bridge. The span of the arch was calculated to be more than 500 metres. The summit was 90 metres above the level of the river. I much regret that no sketches of this really unique project survive. This bridge, across the deep valley, my friend declared, would give Linz an edifice without rival in the whole world. When we stood on one bank of the river, or the other, Adolf would explain to me all the details of the scheme. These bold, far-reaching plans made a strange impression on me, as I still clearly remember. Although I saw in the whole thing nothing but a figment of the imagination, I could, nevertheless, not resist its peculiar fascination. What exercised my friend's mind, and was hastily jotted-down on scraps of paper, was more than nebulous fantasticism ; these apparently absurd conceptions contained something compelling and convincing : a sort of superior logic.

Each idea had its natural sequel in another, and the whole was a clear and rational chain of thought.

Purely Romantic conceptions, such as the « Medieval Revival of Wildberg Castle » , obviously betrayed Richard Wagner's paternity. They were linked to extremely modern technical devices, such as the replacement of level crossings by underground railway tracks. This was no unbridled wallowing in sheer fantasy, but a well-disciplined, almost systematic process.

This « Architecture set to Music » attracted me, perhaps, just because it seemed fully-feasible - although we 2 poor devils had no possibility of realizing these plans. But this did not disturb my friend in the least. His belief that, one day, he would carry-out all his tremendous projects, was unshakable. Money was of no importance - it was only a matter of time, of living long enough. This absolute faith was too much for my rational way of thinking.

What was our future ? I might become, at best, a well-known conductor. And Adolf ? A gifted painter or draughtsman,

perhaps, a famous architect. But how far distant were these professional goals from that standing and reputation, those riches and power necessary for the re-building of an entire city ! And who knows whether my friend, with his incredible flights of fancy and impulsive temperament, would stop at the re-building of Linz, for he was incapable of keeping his hands off anything within reach. Consequently, I had grave doubts and, occasionally, I dared to remind him of the undeniable fact that all our worldly possessions put together did not amount to more than a few crowns - hardly enough to buy drawing paper.

Usually, Adolf brushed my objections impatiently aside, and I still remember his grim expression and his disdainful gesture on such occasions. He took it for granted that, one day, the plans would be executed with the greatest of exactitude, and prepared for this moment accordingly.

Even the most fantastic idea was thought out in the greatest detail. How was the material to be transported for the bridge across the Danube ? Should it be stone or steel ? How were the foundations for the end abutments to be laid ? Would the rock stand the weight ?

These questions were, in part, quite irrelevant for the expert, in part, however, very much to the point. Adolf lived so much in his vision of the future Linz that he adapted his day-to-day habits to it ; for instance, we would visit the Hall of Fame, the Memorial Temple or our « Medieval Open-air Museum » .

One day, when I interrupted the bold flow of his ideas for the National Monument and asked him soberly how he proposed to finance this project, his 1st reply was a brusque :

« Oh, to hell with money ! »

But, apparently, my query had disturbed him. And he did what other people do who want to get rich quickly - he bought a lottery ticket. And, yet, there was a difference between the way Adolf bought a lottery ticket and the way other people did. For other people, only hope, or rather, dream of getting the 1st prize, but Adolf was sure he had won from the moment of buying the ticket and had only forgotten to collect the money. His only possible worry was how to spend this not inconsiderable sum to the best advantage.

It was typical of him that he often mingled his most fantastic ideas with the coolest calculations, and the same thing happened with the purchase of the lottery ticket. While he was already, in his imagination, spending his winnings, he carefully studied the lottery conditions and worked-out our chance with the greatest precision. Adolf invited me to go shares with him in this venture. He was quite systematic about it. The price of the ticket was 10 Crowns, of which I had to find 5. He stipulated, however, that these 5 Crowns should not be given to me by my parents, but I had to earn them myself. At that time, I earned some pocket money and also got occasional tips from the customers.

Adolf insisted on knowing exactly where these five crowns came from, and when he was satisfied that my contribution was really my own, we went together to the office of the State Lottery to buy the ticket. It took him a long time to make up his mind, and I still don't know what considerations prompted his choice.

In the end, he found his winner.

He said :

« Here, it is ! » , and put the ticket carefully away in the little, black notebook in which he wrote his poems.

The time that elapsed before the draw was for me the happiest period of our friendship. Love and enthusiasm, great thoughts, lofty ideas, all that we had already. The only thing that was lacking was money. Now, we had that, too. What more could we want ?

Although the 1st prize represented a lot of money, my friend was, by no means, tempted to spend it thoughtlessly. On the contrary. He went about it, in the most calculating and economical way. It would have been senseless to invest the whole sum in one of the projects, say the re-building of the Museum, for this would only have been a small part within the framework of the great town-planning scheme. It was more reasonable to use the money for our own benefit, to help us to a standing in public life which would enable us to progress further towards our ultimate aims. It would have been too expensive to build a villa for ourselves ; it would have swallowed-up so much of our fortune that we would have moved into this splendour quite penniless. Adolf suggested a compromise : we should rent a flat, he said, and adapt it to our purpose.

After long and careful examination of the various possibilities, we selected the 2nd floor of number 2 « Kirchengasse » , in Urfahr ; for this house was in a quite exceptional position.

Near the bank of the Danube, it had a view over the pleasant green fields which culminated in the Pöstlingberg. We crept into the house secretly, looked at the view from the staircase window, and Adolf made a sketch of the ground plan.

Then, we moved in, so to speak. The larger wing of the flat should be for my friend, the smaller one was reserved for me.

Adolf arranged the rooms so that his study was as far removed as possible from mine, so that he, at his drawing board, would not be disturbed by my practising.

My friend also saw to the furnishing of the rooms, drawing each single piece of furniture to scale on the ground plan. The furniture was of most beautiful and superior quality, made by the town's leading craftsmen, by no means cheap, mass-produced stuff. Even the decorations for the walls of each single-room were designed by Adolf. I was only allowed to have a say about the curtains and draperies, and I had to show him how. I suggested dealing with the rooms he had given me. He was certainly pleased with the self-assured manner in which I co-operated with the arrangement of the flat.

We had no doubt that the 1st prize was ours. Adolf's own faith had bewitched me into believing as he did. I, too, expected to move into number 2 « Kirchengasse » very soon.

Although simplicity was to be the key-note of our home, it was nevertheless imbued with a refined, personal taste. Adolf proposed to make our home the centre of a circle of art-lovers. I would provide the musical entertainment. He would recite something, or read aloud, or expound his latest work. We would make regular trips to Vienna to attend lectures and concerts, and to go to the Theatre. (I realized, then, that Vienna played an important part in my friend's world of ideas. Strange that he had opted for the « Kirchengasse » , in Urfahr.)

Winning the 1st prize would not alter our mode of life. We would remain simple people, wearing clothes of good quality, but certainly not ostentatious. With regard to our dress, Adolf had a delicious idea which delighted me immeasurably. We should both dress in exactly the same way, he suggested, so that people would take us for brothers. I believe that, for me, this idea alone made it worthwhile to win the Lottery. It shows how our mere Theatre acquaintance had ripened into a deep, Romantic friendship.

Of course, I would have to leave my parents' home and give-up my trade. My future musical studies would leave me no time for such things ; for, as our studies progressed, our understanding for artistic experiences increased and engrossed us completely.

Adolf thought of everything, even the running of the household, which was necessary as the day of the draw was approaching.

A refined lady should preside over our home and run it. It had to be an elderly lady, to rule-out any expectations or intentions which might interfere with our artistic vocation. We also agreed on the staff that this big household would need. Thus, everything was prepared.

This image remained with me for a long time to come : an elderly lady, with greying hair, but incredibly distinguished, standing in the brilliantly lit hall, welcoming, on behalf of her 2 young, gifted gentlemen of 17 and 18 years, the guests who formed their circle of select, lofty-minded friends.

During the summer months, we were to travel.

The 1st and foremost destination was Bayreuth, where we were to enjoy the perfect performances of the great Master's music-dramas.

After Bayreuth, we were to visit famous cities, magnificent cathedrals, palaces and castles, but also industrial centres, ship-yards and ports.

Adolf said :

« It shall be the whole of Germany. »

This was one of his favourite sayings.

The day of the draw arrived.

Adolf came rushing wildly round to the work-shop with the list of results. I have rarely heard him rage so madly as then.

1st, he fumed over the State Lottery, this officially organized exploitation of human credulity, this open fraud at the expense of docile citizens.

Then, his fury turned against the State itself, this patchwork of 10 or 12, or God knows how many nations, this monster built-up by Hapsburg marriages. Could one expect other than that 2 poor devils should be cheated-out of their last few Crowns ?

Never did it occur to Adolf to reproach himself for having taken it for granted that the 1st prize belonged to him by right ; and this, in spite of the fact that he had brooded for hours over the conditions of the Lottery and calculated exactly how small our chances were in view of the number of tickets in existence and the number of prizes offered. I could find no explanation for this contradiction in his character. But, there it was.

For the 1st time, he had been deserted by his will power which always seemed to move matters that concerned him in the desired direction. This he could not bear, for it was worse than the loss of the money and having to give-up the flat and the lady-housekeeper receiving our guests with distinguished « nonchalance » .

It seemed to Adolf more reasonable to rely on himself and build his own future, rather than trust government institutions like lotteries. This would spare him from such set-backs.

Thus, after a short period of utter-depression, he returned to his earlier projects.

One of his favourite plans was the replacement of the bridge which linked Linz and Urfahr.

We used to cross this bridge daily, and Adolf was particularly fond of this walk. When the floods of May 1868 destroyed 5 supports of the old wooden bridge, it was decided to build an iron bridge, which was completed in 1872. This rather ugly bridge was far too narrow for the traffic, although, in those days, there were not even any motor-cars ; and it was always over-crowded to a frightening degree.

Adolf liked to listen to the cursing drivers, who with wild oaths and much cracking of the whip, would try to make a way for themselves.

Although, generally, he showed little interest in the thing at hand and preferred to take the long-view for his projects, he suggested, here, a provisional solution to remedy the existing state of affairs. Without altering the bridge itself, to either side should be added a foot-path, 2 metres wide, which would carry the pedestrian traffic and, thus, relieve the roadway.

Naturally, nobody in Linz listened to the suggestions this young dreamer, who could not even produce decent school reports. All the more enthusiastically did Adolf now occupy himself with the complete re-building of the bridge.

The ugly iron structure must be demolished. The new bridge must be so proportioned as to give the visitor who approached the Danube from the main-square the impression of seeing, not a bridge, but a broad, impressive street. Mighty statues would underline the artistic aspect of the whole.

It is greatly to be regretted that, so far as I know, none of the numerous sketches which Hitler, then, made for the new bridge has been preserved ; for it would be very interesting to compare these sketches with the plans which, 30 years later, Adolf Hitler prepared for this bridge and ordered to be executed.

We owe it to his impatience to see the new Linz built that, in spite of the out-break of War, in 1939, that structure, being the central project of the Linz town-planning, actually was completed.

THE BEGINNING

It was the most impressive hour I ever lived through with my friend.

So unforgettable is it, that even the most trivial things, the clothes Adolf wore that evening, the weather, are still present in my mind as though the experience were exempt from the passing of time.

Adolf stood outside my house, in his black over-coat, his dark hat pulled-down over his face.

It was a cold, unpleasant November evening.

He waved to me impatiently. I was just cleaning myself-up from the work-shop and getting ready to go to the Theatre.

« Rienzi » was being given that night.

We had never seen this Wagner Opera and looked forward to it with great excitement. In order to secure the pillars in the « Promenade » , we had to be early.

Adolf whistled, to hurry me up.

Editor's Note

« Rienzi, der Letzte der Tribunen » (WWV 49) , « Rienzi, the Last of the Tribunes » is an early Opera by Richard Wagner in 5 acts, with the libretto written by the composer after Bulwer-Lytton's novel of the same name (1835) . The title is commonly shortened to « Rienzi » . Written between July 1838 and November 1840, it was 1st performed at the « Hofoper » , in Dresden, on October 20th, 1842, and was the composer's 1st success.

The Opera is set in Rome and is based on the life of Cola di Rienzi (1313-1354) , a medieval Italian populist figure who succeeds in out-witting and, then, defeating the nobles and their followers, and in raising the power of the people. Magnanimous at 1st, he is forced by events to crush the nobles' rebellion against the people's power, but popular opinion changes and even the Church, which had urged him to assert himself, turns against him.

In the end the populace burns the Capitol, in which Rienzi and a few adherents have made a last stand.

...

Now, we were in the Theatre, burning with enthusiasm, and living breathlessly through Rienzi's rise to be the Tribune of the people of Rome and his subsequent down-fall.

When, at last, it was over, it was past midnight.

My friend, his hands thrust into his coat pockets, silent and withdrawn, strode through the streets and out of the city. Usually, after an artistic experience that had moved him, he would start talking straight away, sharply criticizing the performance but, after « Rienzi » , he remained quiet a long while. This surprised me, and I asked him what he thought of it. He threw me a strange, almost hostile glance.

He said brusquely :

« Shut-up ! »

The cold, damp mist lay oppressively over the narrow streets.

Our solitary steps resounded on the pavement. Adolf took the road that led-up to the Freinberg. Without speaking a word, he strode forward. He looked almost sinister, and paler than ever. His turned-up coat collar increased this impression.

I wanted to ask him :

« Where are you going ? »

But his pallid face looked so forbidding that I suppressed the question.

As if propelled by an invisible force, Adolf climbed-up to the top of the Freinberg.

And only now did I realize that we were no longer in solitude and darkness, for the stars shone brilliantly above us. Adolf stood in front of me ; and, now, he gripped both my hands and held them tight. He had never made such a gesture before. I felt from the grasp of his hands how deeply moved he was. His eyes were feverish with excitement. The words did not come smoothly from his mouth as they usually did, but rather erupted, hoarse and raucous. From his voice, I could tell even more how much this experience had shaken him.

Gradually, his speech loosened, and the words flowed more freely. Never before and never again have I heard Adolf Hitler speak as he did in that hour, as we stood there alone under the stars, as though we were the only creatures in the world.

I cannot repeat every word that my friend uttered.

I was struck by something strange, which I had never noticed before, even when he had talked to me in moments of the greatest excitement.

It was as if another being spoke-out of his body, and moved him as much as it did me.

It wasn't at all a case of a speaker being carried-away by his own words. On the contrary ; I rather felt as though he himself listened with astonishment and emotion to what burst forth from him with elementary force.

I will not attempt to interpret this phenomenon, but it was a state of complete ecstasy and rapture, in which he transferred the character of Rienzi, without even mentioning him as a model or example, with visionary power to the plane of his own ambitions.

But it was more than a cheap adaptation. Indeed, the impact of the Opera was rather a sheer external impulse which compelled him to speak. Like flood waters breaking their dikes, his words burst forth from him. He conjured-up in grandiose, inspiring pictures his own future and that of his people.

Hitherto, I had been convinced that my friend wanted to become an artist, a painter or, perhaps, an architect. Now, this was no longer the case.

Now, he aspired to something higher, which I could not yet fully grasp.

It rather surprised me, as I thought that the vocation of the artist was for him the highest, most desirable goal. But, now, he was talking of a mandate which, one day, he would receive from the people, to lead them out of servitude to the heights of freedom.

It was an unknown youth who spoke to me in that strange hour.

He spoke of a special mission which, one day, would be entrusted to him, and I, his only listener, could hardly understand what he meant.

Many years had to pass before I realized the significance of this enraptured hour for my friend.

His words were followed by silence.

We descended into the town. The clock struck 3. We parted in front of my house. Adolf shook hands with me, and I was astonished to see that he did not go in the direction of his home, but turned again towards the mountains.

I asked him, surprised :

« Where are you going now ? »

He replied briefly :

« I want to be alone. »

In the following weeks and months, he never again mentioned this hour on the Freinberg.

At 1st, it struck me as odd and I could find no explanation for his strange behaviour, for I could not believe that he had forgotten it altogether. Indeed, he never did forget it, as I discovered 33 years later. But he kept silent about it because he wanted to keep that hour entirely to himself. That I could understand, and I respected his silence. After all, it was his hour, not mine. I had played only the modest role of a sympathetic friend.

In 1939, shortly before War broke-out, when I, for the 1st time, visited Bayreuth as the guest of the « Reich » Chancellor, I thought I would please my host by reminding him of that nocturnal hour on the Freinberg, so I told Adolf Hitler what I remembered of it, assuming that the enormous multitude of impressions and events, which had filled these past decades, would have pushed into the background the experience of a 17 year old youth.

But, after a few words, I sensed that he vividly recalled that hour and had retained all its details in his memory.

He was visibly pleased that my account confirmed his own recollections.

I was also present when Adolf Hitler retold this sequel to the performance of « Rienzi » , in Linz, to « Frau » Winifred Wagner, at whose home we were both guests.

Thus, my own memory was doubly confirmed.

The words with which Hitler concluded his story to « Frau » Wagner are also unforgettable for me.

He said solemnly :

« In that hour, it began. »

Editor's Note

Winifred Wagner (born on 23 June 1897 ; died on 5 March 1980) was an English-born Welsh woman married to Siegfried Wagner, Richard Wagner's son.

She was the effective head of the Wagner family, from 1930 to 1945, and a close friend of German dictator Adolf Hitler.

Winifred Williams was born Winifred Marjorie Williams, in Hastings, England, the daughter of John Williams, a writer, and his wife, the former Emily Florence Karop.

Winifred lost both her parents before the age of 2 and was initially raised in a series of homes. 8 years later, she was adopted by a distant German relative of her mother, Henrietta Karop, and her husband Karl Klindworth, a musician and a friend of Richard Wagner.

The Bayreuth Festival was envisioned as a family business, with the leadership to be passed from Richard Wagner to his son Siegfried Wagner, but Siegfried, who was secretly homosexual, showed little interest in marriage.

It was arranged that Winifred Klindworth, as she was called at the time, aged 17, would meet Siegfried Wagner, aged 45, at the Bayreuth Festival in 1914. 1 year later, they were married.

It was hoped that the marriage would end Siegfried's homosexual encounters and the associated costly scandals, and provide an heir to carry-on the family business.

Following their marriage, on 22 September 1915, they had 4 children in rapid succession :

Wieland (1917-1966) ; Friedelind (1918-1991) ; Wolfgang (1919-2010) ; and Verena (born in 1920) .

After the death of Siegfried Wagner, in 1930, Winifred Wagner took-over the Bayreuth Festival, running it until the end of World War II.

In 1923, Winifred met Adolf Hitler who, as we have seen earlier, greatly admired Wagner's music.

When Hitler was jailed for his part in the Munich « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » , Winifred sent him food parcels and stationery on which Hitler's autobiography « Mein Kampf » may have been written.

In the late 1930's, she served as Hitler's personal translator during treaty negotiations with England.

Although Winifred remained personally faithful to Hitler, she denied that she had ever supported the Nazi Party. Her relationship with Hitler grew so close that, by 1933, there were rumours of impending marriage.

« Haus Wahnfried » , the Wagner home in Bayreuth, became Hitler's favourite retreat, and he had his own separate accommodation in the grounds of « Wahnfried » , known as the « Führerbau » .

Hitler gave the Festival government assistance and tax exempt status, and treated Winifred's children, particularly Wieland and Wolfgang, solicitously.

According to biographer Brigitte Hamann, Winifred Wagner was reported to be « disgusted » by Hitler's persecution of the Jews. In one notable incident, in the late- 1930's, a letter from her to Hitler prevented Hedwig and Alfred Pringsheim (their daughter Katia was married to Thomas Mann) from being arrested by the « Gestapo » .

According to Gottfried Wagner, Winifred's grandson, she never admitted the error of her ways.

After the War, her posthumous devotion to the man she cryptically referred to as « USA » (« Unser Seliger Adolf » : our blessed Adolf) remained undimmed.

She corresponded with Hitler for nearly 2 decades.

Scholars have not been allowed to see the letters which are kept locked away by one of Winifred's grandchildren, Amélie Lafferentz.

VIENNA

I had been noticing for along time that Adolf, whether he was talking about art, politics or his own future, was no longer satisfied with friendly and familiar, though Philistine Linz, and cast his eyes more and more frequently towards Vienna.

Vienna, still a resplendent Imperial city and the metropolis of a State of 45 million people, promised him fulfillment of all his hopes for the future.

At the time of which I speak, the summer of 1907, Adolf knew Vienna from a visit he had paid it in the previous year.

In May and June, 1906, he had stayed there long enough to grow enthusiastic about everything that had specially attracted him : the « Hofmuseum », the « Hofoper », the « Burgtheater », the magnificent buildings on the « Ring » - but not long enough to observe the distress and misery which were concealed by the magnificent façade of the city.

This deceptive picture, largely produced by his artistic imagination, held a powerful attraction for him.

In his thoughts, he was often no longer in Linz but already in Vienna, and his incredible capacity for ignoring the reality in front of him, and for accepting as real what existed only in his imagination, now came here into full-play. I have to correct, here, a small error which Adolf Hitler made in « Mein Kampf », in regard to his 1st stay in Vienna.

He is wrong when he says that he was, then, not yet 16 years old, for actually, he had just had his 17th birthday. For the rest, his account of it corresponds entirely with my own.

I well remember the enthusiasm with which my friend spoke of his impressions of Vienna. Details of his account, however, escape my memory.

It is all the more fortunate that the post-cards he wrote to me, on this 1st visit, are still preserved. There are, altogether, 4 post-cards which, apart from their biographical interest, are important graphological documents ; for they are the earliest substantial examples of Adolf Hitler's hand-writing still existing.

It is a strangely mature, rather flowing hand, which one would hardly connect with a youth of barely 18, while the incorrect spelling not only bears witness to patchy schooling but, also, to a certain indifference in such matters. All the picture post-cards he sent me were, significantly enough, of buildings. A different kind of young man of his age would certainly have chosen a different kind of picture post-card for his friend.

The 1st of these cards (dated May 7th, 1906) is a Masterpiece of the post-card production of the period and must have cost him a pretty penny : it opens-out into a kind of triptych, with a full-view of the « Karlsplatz », with the church (the « Karlskirche »), in the centre.

The text is :

« In sending you this post-card, I have to apologize for not having written sooner. Well, I have safely arrived and am going around everywhere. Tomorrow, I am going to the Opera : “ Tristan ” and, the day after, “ The Flying Dutchman ”, etc. Although I find everything very beautiful, I am longing for Linz. Tonight, “ Stadt-Theatre ”. Greetings, your friend, Adolf Hitler. »

On the picture-side of the card, the Conservatory is expressly marked, probably the reason for his choice of this particular view, for he was already playing with the idea that, someday, we would study together in Vienna, and never missed an opportunity of reminding me of this possibility in the most alluring form.

On the lower-margin of the picture, he adds :

« Greetings to your esteemed parents. »

I would like to mention that the words :

« Although I find everything very beautiful, I am longing for Linz. » do not refer to Linz but to Stefanie, for whom his love was all the greater the farther from her he was.

It certainly satisfied his impetuous longing for her that he, a lonely stranger in this heartless metropolis, could write these words which only his friend who shared his secrets would understand.

On the same day, Adolf sent me a 2nd post-card which depicts the stage of the « Hofoper » .

Presumably, this particularly successful photograph, which shows a part of the decor, had appealed to him.

On it, he wrote :

« The interior of the edifice is not very stirring. If the exterior is mighty majesty, which gives the building the seriousness of an artistic monument, the inside, though commanding admiration, does not impress one with its dignity. Only when the mighty sound waves flow through the hall and when the whispering of the wind gives way to the terrible roaring of the sound waves, then, one feels the “ grandeur ” and forgets the gold and velvet with which the interior is overloaded. Adolf H. »

On the front of the card, there is again added :

« Greetings to your esteemed parents. »

Adolf is completely in his element, here.

The friend is forgotten, even Stefanie is forgotten ; no greeting, not even a hint, so overwhelmed is he by his recent experience.

His clumsy style clearly reveals that his power of expression is not sufficient to do justice to the depth of his feelings. But even his poor style, which sounds like the ecstatic stammering of an enthusiast, reveals the magnitude of his experience. After all, it had been the greatest dream of our boyhood in Linz to see, someday, a perfect production at the Vienna Opera House instead of the performances in our provincial Theatre, which left so much to be desired. Certainly, Adolf, with his glowing description, aimed at my own art-loving heart. For what could make Vienna more attractive to me than the enthusiastic echo of such artistic impressions ?

On the very next day, May 8th, 1906, he wrote again ; it is rather surprising that he wrote 3 times in the space of 2 days.

His motive becomes clear from the contents of the post-card, which shows the exterior of the Vienna Opera House.

He wrote :

« I am really longing for my dear Linz and Urf(h)ar. Want and must see “ Benkieser ”, again. What might he be doing, so, I am arriving on Thursday at 3h55, in Linz. If you have time and permission, meet me. Greetings to your esteemed parents ! Your friend, Adolf Hitler. »

The word « Urfar » (misspelt in the hurry) is underlined, although Adolf's mother was still living on « Humboldtstraße » , and not in Urfahr.

Of course, that remark referred to Stefanie (i.e. , and, so, did the agreed code-word : « Benkieser » . The phrase : « Want and must see “ Benkieser ” » is typical of Adolf's style and character.

Also significant are the words :

« If you have time and permission, meet me. »

Although it was a matter of urgency for him, he respects my duty of obedience towards my parents, nor does he omit to greet them on this card.

Unfortunately, I cannot verify whether Adolf really returned to Linz on the following Thursday, or if this indication was only intended to satisfy his unappeasable longing for Stefanie.

His remark in « Mein Kampf » that his sojourn in Vienna lasted only a fortnight is incorrect.

Actually, he stayed there about 4 weeks, as is evidenced by the post-card of June 6th, 1906. This card, which shows the « Franzensring » and House of Parliament, is on conventional lines :

« To you and to your esteemed parents, I send herewith best wishes for the Holidays and kind regards. Respectfully, Adolf Hitler. »

With this memory of his 1st stay in Vienna, transfigured by his yearning for Stefanie, Adolf entered the critical summer of 1907.

What he suffered in those weeks was, in many respects, similar to the grave crisis of 2 years earlier. Then, after much

heart-searching, he had finally settled his accounts with the school and made an end of it, however painful this might be for his mother.

A grave illness had rendered the transition easier for him. But this transition led him only to the « hollowness of the life of leisure » .

Without school, with no career in mind, he had spent 2 years living with his mother and not earning a penny.

These were, by no means, idle years.

Having had daily contact with Adolf, I can testify how intensely my friend, studied and worked in those days, but this private study, as well as his artistic activity, had no determined goal.

He felt himself that it couldn't continue. Something had to happen, a profound change would give a clear direction to his aimless, day-to-day mode of life.

Outwardly, this seeking for a new path showed itself in dangerous fits of depression. I knew only too well those moods of his, which were in sharp contrast to his ecstatic dedication and activity, and realized that I couldn't help him.

At such times, he was inaccessible, un-communicative and distant.

It might happen that we didn't meet at all for 1 day or 2.

If I tried to see him at home, his mother would receive me with great surprise.

She would say :

« Adolf has gone-out, he must be looking for you. »

Actually, Adolf would wander around aimlessly and alone for days and nights in the fields and forests surrounding the town.

When I met him at last, he was obviously glad to have me with him. But, when I asked him what was wrong, his only answer would be :

« Leave me alone. »

Or a brusque :

« I don't know myself. »

And, if I insisted, he would understand my sympathy and, then, say in a milder tone :

« Never mind, “ Gustl ”, but not even you can help me. »

This state lasted several weeks.

One fine summer evening, however, when we were strolling beside the Danube, the tension began to ease.

Adolf reverted to his old, familiar tone. I remember this moment exactly. As usual, we had been to see Stefanie pass by arm-in-arm with her mother. Adolf was still under her spell. Even though he saw her, at this time, almost every day, these meetings never became something common place for him.

While Stefanie had probably long since become bored by the silent, but strictly conventional adulation of the pale, thin youth, my friend lost himself increasingly in his wishful dreams the more he saw her. Yet, he was past those Romantic ideas of elopement or suicide.

He explained to me, in eloquent words, his state of mind : the vision of the beloved pursued him day and night ; he was unable to work or even to think clearly ; he feared he would go mad if this state of affairs went on much longer, though he saw no way of altering the situation, for which Stefanie was not to blame, either.

He cried :

« There is only one thing to be done. I must go away - far away from Stefanie. »

On our way home, he explained his decision in greater detail.

His relationship with Stefanie would become more bearable for him, once he was living at a distance and could not meet her every day. It did not occur to him that, in this way, he might lose Stefanie altogether - so, deeply convinced was he that he had won her forever.

The true situation was different.

Adolf, perhaps, already realized that if he wanted to win Stefanie, he would have to speak to her or take some such decisive step - it is probable that even he began to find the exchange of glances on the « Landstraße » a little childish.

Nevertheless, he felt instinctively that it would abruptly destroy his life's dream if he actually made Stefanie's acquaintance. Indeed, as he said to me :

« If I introduce myself to Stefanie and her mother, I will have to tell her, at once, what I am, what I have and what I want. My statement would bring our relations abruptly to an end. »

This awareness, and the simultaneous realisation that he had to put his relationship with Stefanie on a firm basis to avoid ridicule, were the horns of a dilemma for him, from which he saw only one way out : flight.

He started, at once, to expound his plan to the last detail.

I received precise instructions what to tell Stefanie if she asked, full of astonishment, what had become of my friend. (She never did !)

Adolf himself realized that if he wanted to marry her, he would have to offer her a secure existence.

But this unsolved and, for a person of my friend's nature, insoluble problem of his relationship with Stefanie was only one of the many reasons which prompted him to quit Linz, although the most personal and, therefore, decisive.

Another reason was that he was anxious to escape the atmosphere that prevailed at home.

The idea that he, a young man of 18, should continue to be kept by his mother had become unbearable to him.

It was a painful dilemma which, as I could see for myself, made him almost physically ill. On the one hand, he loved his mother above everything ; she was the only person on earth to whom he felt really close, and she reciprocated his feeling to the same extent, although she was deeply disturbed by her son's unusual nature, however proud she was at times of him.

She used to say :

« He is different from us. »

On the other hand, she felt it to be her duty to carry-out the wishes of her late husband, and to prevail on Adolf to embark on a safe career.

But what was « safe » , in view of the peculiar character of her son ?

He had failed at school and had ignored all his mother's wishes and suggestions. A painter - that's what he had said he wanted to become.

This could not seem very satisfactory to his mother, for, simple soul that she was, anything connected with art and artists appeared to her frivolous and insecure.

Adolf tried to change her mind by telling her of his intention to study at the Academy. That sounded better ; after all, the Academy, of which Adolf spoke with increasing enthusiasm, was really a kind of school, where his mother thought he might make-up for what he had missed in the Technical School.

When listening to these domestic discussions, I was always surprised by the sympathetic understanding and patience with which Adolf tried to convince his mother of his artistic vocation. Contrary to his habit, he never became cross or violent on these occasions.

Often « Frau » Klara would also un-burden herself to me, for she saw in me, too, an artistically gifted young man with high-aims.

Having a better understanding of musical matters than of her son's dabbling in drawing and painting, she frequently found my opinions more convincing than his, and Adolf was very grateful for my support. But, in « Frau » Klara's eyes, there was one important difference between Adolf and me : I had learnt an honest trade, finished my apprenticeship and passed my journeyman's examination. I would always have a safe haven to shelter in, whereas Adolf was just steering into the unknown.

This vision tormented his mother unceasingly. Nevertheless, he succeeded in convincing her that it was essential for him to go to the Academy and study painting.

I still remember distinctly how pleased he was over it.

He told me, one day :

« Now, mother will not raise any more objections. I definitely go to Vienna at the beginning of September. »

Adolf had also settled with his mother the financial side of his plan.

His living expenses and the Academy fees were to be paid-out of the small legacy left him by his father and now administered by his guardian.

Adolf hoped that, with great economy, he would be able to manage on this for a year. What would happen afterwards remained to be seen, he said. Perhaps, he would earn something by the sale of some drawings and pictures.

The main opponent of this plan was his brother-in-law, Raubal, who, with his limited revenue official's horizon, was incapable of understanding Adolf's thoughts.

That was rubbish, he said ; it was high-time that Adolf learned something respectable. Although Raubal, after some violent altercations with Adolf, in which he always came-off worst, avoided any further argument with him, he tried all the harder to influence « Frau » Klara. Adolf found-out most of this from « the kid » , as he used to call his I I

year old sister.

When Paula told him that Raubal had been to see his mother, Adolf would fall into a rage.

He once remarked to me furiously :

« This Pharisee is ruining my home for me. »

Apparently, Raubal had also got in touch with Adolf's guardian, for one day the worthy peasant Mayrhofer, who would have liked best to make a baker out of Adolf and had already found an apprenticeship for him, came from Leonding to see « Frau » Klara.

Adolf was afraid that his guardian might induce her to hold back the legacy.

This would have put a stop to his moving to Vienna. But the plan did not get so far, though for some time the decision was very much in doubt.

By the end of this tough struggle, everybody was against Adolf - even, as happens in tenement buildings, the other tenants.

« Frau » Klara listened to this more or less well-meant chatter and became completely confused by it all.

Often, when Adolf had his fits of depression and was wandering through the woods, I used to sit with her in her little kitchen, listening sympathetically to her laments, trying hard to comfort the wretched woman without being unfair to my friend and, at the same time, helping him where I could.

I could easily put myself in Adolf's shoes. It would have been simple enough for him, with his great energy, just to pack-up and go, if consideration for his mother had not prevented him. He had come to hate the Philistine world in which he had to live.

He could hardly bear to return to that narrow world after lonely hours spent in the open. He was always in a ferment of rage, hard and intractable. I had a lot to put-up with in those weeks. But the secret of Stefanie, which we shared, bound us inseparably together.

The sweet magic which she, the unattainable, radiated calmed the stormy waves. So, as his mother was so easily influenced, the matter remained undecided, although Adolf had long since made-up his mind.

On the other hand, Vienna was calling.

That city had a thousand possibilities for an eager young man like Adolf, opportunities which might lead to the most

sublime heights or to the most sombre depths.

A city magnificent and, at the same time, cruel, promising everything and denying everything - that was Vienna. She demanded the highest-stake from everyone who pledged himself to her. And that is what Adolf wanted.

No doubt, Adolf had his father's example before him.

What would he have become if he hadn't gone to Vienna ?

A poor, haggard cobbler somewhere in the poverty-stricken Waldviertel. And see what Vienna made of this poor, orphaned cobbler's boy !

Ever since his 1st visit in the spring of 1906, these rather vague ideas had assumed concrete form in Adolf's mind. He who had dedicated his life to art could develop his talents only in Vienna, for in that city were concentrated its most perfect achievements in every field.

During his 1st short stay, there he had already been to the « Hofoper » and seen « The Flying Dutchman », « Tristan », and « Lohengrin » .

By these standards, the performance in the Linz Theatre appeared provincial and inadequate.

In Vienna, the « Burgtheater » , with its Classic productions, awaited the young man.

There was also the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra which, with justification, was then considered the best in the world.

Then, the museums, with their immeasurable treasures, the picture galleries, the « Hofbibliothek » , provided unending possibilities for study and self-improvement.

Linz had little more to offer Adolf.

What re-building had to be done in this city he had already done, mentally, and no more large tempting problems were left for him to solve. And I was always there to report any further alterations to the town, such as the new building of the Bank of Upper-Austria and Salzburg on the main-square, or the projected new theatre.

But he wanted to look at grander things (the magnificent buildings of the centre of Vienna, the vast, truly Imperial layout of the « Ringstraße ») rather than the humble little « Landstraße » , in Linz. Moreover, his growing interest in politics found no outlet in conservative Linz, where political life ran in well-defined grooves.

Simply nothing happened that might have had any political interest for a young man ; there was no tension, no conflict, no unrest. It was a great adventure to move from this absolute calm into the centre of the storm. All the

energies of the Hapsburg State were concentrated in Vienna. 30 nations struggled for their national existence and independence and, thus, created an atmosphere like that of a volcano. How the young heart would rejoice at throwing itself unrestrainedly into this struggle !

At long last, the great moment arrived.

Adolf, beaming with delight, came to see me at the work-shop, where we were very busy at that time.

He said briefly :

« I'm leaving tomorrow. »

He asked me to accompany him to the station, as he didn't want his mother to come. I knew how painful it would have been for Adolf to take leave of his mother in front of other people. He disliked nothing more than showing his feelings in public. I promised him to come and to help him with his luggage.

Next day, I took time-off and went to the « Blütengasse » to collect my friend.

Adolf had prepared everything. I took his suitcase, which was rather heavy with books he did not want to leave behind, and hurried away to avoid being present at the farewells. Yet, I couldn't avoid them entirely.

His mother was crying and little Paula, whom Adolf never bothered with much, was sobbing heart-rendingly.

When Adolf caught-up with me on the stairs and helped me with the suitcase, I saw that his eyes, too, were wet.

We took the tram to the railway station, chatting about trivialities, as often happens when one wants to hide one's feelings. It moved me deeply to say goodbye to Adolf, and I felt miserable going home alone. It was a good thing that there was so much work waiting for me at the work-shop.

Unfortunately, our correspondence of that period is lost.

I only remember that, for several weeks, I had no news at all from him. And it was during those days that I felt most deeply how much he meant to me.

Other young people of my age did not interest me, as I knew in advance that they would only turn-out to be disappointing, with few interests other than their own shallow and superficial doings. Adolf was much more serious and mature than most people of his age.

His horizon was wide and his passionate interest in everything had carried me along with it.

Now, I felt very lonely and miserable, and to find some comfort I went to the « Blütengasse » to see « Frau » Klara.

Talking to somebody so fond of Adolf would certainly make me feel better.

I thought that Adolf would already have written to his mother, for after all, it was a fortnight since he had left ; and I would get his address and write to him, according to instructions, of all that had happened meanwhile.

Actually, not much had happened, but for Adolf, every detail was important.

I had seen Stefanie at the Schmiedtoreck and, indeed, she was surprised when she saw me there alone, for that much she knew about us that, in this « affair » , I played only a secondary role. The chief protagonist was missing.

That seemed strange to her. What could it mean ?

Though Adolf was only a silent admirer, he was more persistent and tenacious than all the others. She did not want to lose this faithful adorer. Her enquiring glance caught me so unexpectedly, that I was almost tempted to address her. But Stefanie was not alone, being, as usual, accompanied by her mother, and moreover my friend had given me strict instructions to wait until Stefanie, herself asked me.

Surely, as soon as she realized that he had gone for good, she would take the 1st opportunity of running-over the bridge alone to entreat me impetuously to tell her what had become of my friend.

Perhaps, he had had an accident, or he was ill again as he was that time 2 years ago or, perhaps, even dead. Unthinkable ! Anyhow, though that conversation had not yet taken place, I had enough material to fill 4 pages of a letter. But what on earth had happened to Adolf ?

Not a line from him.

« Frau » Klara opened the door to me and greeted me warmly, and I could see that she had been longing for me to come.

She asked me, still at the door :

« Have you heard from Adolf ? »

So he hadn't written to his mother either, and this made me feel anxious.

Something out of the ordinary must have happened.

Perhaps, things hadn't gone according to plan in Vienna.

« Frau » Klara offered me a chair. I saw how much good it did her to be able to un-burden herself. Ah, the old lament, which I had come to know by heart ! But I listened patiently.

« If only he had studied properly at the technical school, he would almost be ready to matriculate. But he won't listen to anybody. »

And she added :

« He's as pig-headed as his father. Why this crazy journey to Vienna ? Instead of holding on to his little legacy, it's just being frittered away. And after that ? Nothing will come of his painting. And story-writing doesn't earn anything either. And I can't help him - I've got the little one to look after. You know yourself what a sickly child she is, but just the same she must get some decent training. Adolf doesn't give it a thought, he goes his way, just as if he were alone in the world. I shall not live to see him making an independent position for himself. »

« Frau » Klara seemed more care-worn than ever.

Her face was deeply lined. Her eyes were lifeless, her voice sounded tired and resigned.

I had the impression that, now that Adolf was no longer there, she had let herself go, and looked older and more ailing than ever.

She certainly had concealed her condition from her son to make the parting easier for him - or, perhaps, it was Adolf's impulsive nature that had kept-up her vitality.

Now, on her own, she seemed to me an old, sick woman.

I forget, unfortunately, what happened during the course of the following weeks.

Adolf had briefly informed me of his address.

He was living in the 6th District, at number 29 « Stumpergasse » , Staircase II, 2nd floor, Door number 17, in the flat of a woman with the curious name of Zakreys.

That was all he wrote. But I guessed that there was more behind this obstinate silence, for I knew that Adolf's silences usually meant that he was too proud to talk.

I quote, therefore, from his own description in « Mein Kampf » of his 2nd sojourn in Vienna which, by general consent, is entirely truthful :

« I had gone to Vienna with the intention of taking the entrance examination for the Academy. I had set-out, armed with a thick wad of drawings, convinced that it would be child's play to pass. At the technical school, I had been by far the best in my class at drawing and, since then, my ability had developed quite extraordinarily ; so, I was quite satisfied with myself and this made me proudly and happily hope for the best. »

So, here I was for the 2nd time in the beautiful city, waiting impatiently but, hopefully, for the result of the entrance examination. I was so sure of success that the news of my rejection hit me like a bolt from the blue. Yet, that was what happened. When I went to see the Rector and asked to know the reasons why I had not been admitted to the general painting school of the Academy, I was told by this gentleman that the drawings I had submitted showed clearly that I had no aptitude for painting, my ability seemed rather to lie in the field of architecture, and I should not go to the painting school, but rather to the school of architecture of the Academy. That I had never been to a school for building, nor received any training in architecture, seemed to him hard to believe.

Defeated, I left the monumental building on the Schiller Square, for the 1st time in my young life at variance with myself. For what I had been told about my ability seemed to me to disclose in a flash of lightning a discord from which I had long suffered without, hitherto, clearly realizing the why and wherefore.

In a few days, I knew myself that I would become an architect. Yet, this was an incredibly difficult path, for what I had missed, out of obstinacy, in the technical school, now took its bitter revenge. The attendance at the school of architecture of the Academy was dependent on the attendance at a technical school for building, and entrance to the latter required one to have passed the matriculation examination at a secondary school. I didn't fulfil any one of these conditions. As far as could be foreseen, therefore, the fulfilment of my dream to become an artist was impossible.

He had been refused by the Academy, he had failed even before he had got a footing in Vienna. Nothing more terrible could have happened to him.

But he was too proud to talk about it, and so he concealed from me what had happened.

He concealed it from his mother, too.

When, later, we met again, he had to some extent already lived-down this hard verdict. He did not mention it at all. I respected his silence and didn't ask him any questions, because I suspected that something had gone wrong with his plans.

Not until the next year, when we were living together in Vienna, did all these circumstances gradually become clear to me.

Adolf's talent for architecture was so obvious that it would have justified an exception - how many less talented students were to be found at the Academy !

This decision was, therefore, as biased and bureaucratic as it was unjust.

Yet, Adolf's reaction to this humiliating treatment was typical.

He made no attempt to obtain exceptional treatment, or to humiliate himself in front of people who did not understand him. There were neither revolt nor rebellion ; instead, came a radical withdrawal into himself, an obstinate resolve to cope alone with adversity, an embittered « Now, more than ever ! » which he flung at the gentlemen of the « Schillerplatz » , just as, 2 years earlier, he had settled his account with his school teachers.

Whatever disappointments life brought him, they were but a spur for him to brave all obstacles, and to continue on the path on which he had embarked.

In his book « Mein Kampf » , he writes

« As the Goddess of Misery took me in her arms and so often threatened to break me, the Will to Resist grew, and in the end, the Will triumphed. »

DEATH OF HITLER'S MOTHER

I remember that Adolf's mother had to undergo a serious operation at the beginning of 1907.

She was, then, in the Hospital of the Sisters of Mercy on the « Herrenstraße » , and he visited her there daily.

I forget what her illness was, but it was probably cancer of the breast. Although « Frau » Klara recovered sufficiently to run her household again, she remained very weak and ailing, and every now and then she had to take to her bed. Yet, a few weeks after Adolf had left for Vienna, she seemed to be better, for I met her by chance on the « Promenade » , where, at that time, a street-market used to be held, peasant women coming in from the country to sell eggs, butter and vegetables.

She told me contentedly :

« Adolf is right. If only I knew what on earth he is studying ! Unfortunately, he does not mention that at all. However, I imagine that he is very busy. »

That was good news, which pleased me, too, for Adolf had not written to me about his activities in Vienna.

Our correspondence was mainly concerned with « Benkieser » - otherwise, Stefanie.

But his mother, of course, must not be told of that.

I asked « Frau » Klara how she was.

Not at all well, she said ; she had a lot of bad pain, and very often could not sleep at night. But she warned me not to write to Adolf about it for, perhaps, she would soon be better. When we parted, she asked me to come to see her soon.

We were then very busy in the work-shop, indeed business had never before been as good as in that year, and orders came in regularly and often.

Yet, in spite of this heavy work, I devoted every moment of leisure to my musical training, I played the viola both in the « Musikverein » and the « Große-Symphonieorchester » .

So, the weeks passed, and it was late in November when, at last, I found time to visit « Frau » Hitler.

I was shocked when I saw her.

How wilted and worn was her kind, gentle face !

She was lying in bed and stretched-out her pale, thin hand to me.

Little Paula pushed a chair up beside her.

She started, at once, to talk about Adolf and was happy about the hopeful tone of his letters.

I asked her if she had informed him of her illness, and offered to do so for her, in case writing was too great an effort. But she hastily refused. If her condition did not improve, she said, she would have to send for Adolf from Vienna.

She was sorry she had to tear him away from his hard work - but what else could she do ?

The little one had to go to school every day, Angela had enough worries of her own (she was expecting a 2nd baby) and on her son-in-law, Raubal, she could not rely at all.

Since she had taken Adolf's side and supported him in his decision to go to Vienna, Raubal had been angry with her and, now, never showed-up ; he had even prevented his wife from looking after her. So, she said, there was nothing left but to go to the hospital - as the doctor had advised.

The Hitlers' family doctor was the very popular Doctor Eduard Bloch, known in the town as the « poor people's doctor » , an excellent physician and a man of great kindness, who sacrificed himself for his patients.

Editor's Note

Eduard Bloch was an assimilated Austrian-Jewish physician who first came into contact with the Hitler family in the town of Leonding on the outskirts of Linz when he treated Adolf's father, Alois Hitler, shortly before his death, in 1903.

According to Bloch, young Adolf was quiet, well-mannered and neatly dressed.

He had patiently waited in the waiting-room until it was his turn, then, like every 14 or 15 year old boy, made a bow, and always thanked the doctor politely.

In 1907, Bloch diagnosed his mother Klara with breast cancer.

Adolf was devastated.

Bloch noted that the young man was utterly devoted to his mother, but not in any unwholesome way.

« He slept in the tiny bedroom adjoining that of his mother so that he could be summoned at any time during the night. During the day, he hovered about the large bed in which she lay. »

Upon Klara's death, Doctor Bloch asked for only a modest fee from the struggling family and refused to charge them for house-calls and extra-medications.

A few days after the funeral, Adolf and his sisters came to visit the doctor at his office, in Linz.

Adolf wore a dark-suit and a loosely knotted cravat.

Then, as now, a shock of hair tumbled over his forehead.

His eyes were on the floor while his sisters were talking.

Then, came his turn. He stepped forward and took my hand. Looking into my eyes, he said :

« I shall be grateful to you forever. »

That was all.

Then, he bowed. I wonder if today he recalls this scene. I am quite sure that he does, for in a sparing sense Adolf Hitler has kept to his promise of gratitude. Favours were granted me which I feel sure were accorded no other Jew in

all Germany or Austria.

Bloch stated that, during Hitler's Vienna days, when the frustrated artist was supposedly already a convinced anti-Semite, he mailed Bloch a post-card with the words :

« From Vienna, I send you my greetings. Yours, always faithfully, Adolf Hitler. »

Hitler also, once, sent New Year's wishes on one of his own self-painted post-cards and even presented the doctor with one of his paintings.

Many years later, « Gestapo » agents came to Bloch's home and politely confiscated the 2 post-cards. He had lost track of the painting long before.

Doctor Bloch recalls Hitler's youth :

Bloch tells us that the young Hitler enjoyed walks in the mountains, swimming in the Danube, free-concerts, and attending Wagnerian Opera at Linz's local « Schauspielhaus » (Theatre) .

An avid reader, Hitler was « fascinated » with the stories about American Indians written by James Fenimore Cooper and German author, Karl May.

The Hitlers were poor and ate the same food as other families in their situation.

Meat was a twice-weekly affair, and most meals included potato or cabbage-soup, bread, dumplings, and a pitcher of apple and pear cider.

The family wore clothing made of « Loden » , a rough woolen cloth.

Like the other boys in Linz, he had worn short « Lederhosen » and a green woolen hat with a feather.

He had been tall and pale and looked older than he was.

His eyes which were inherited from his mother were large, melancholy and thoughtful.

To a very large extent, this boy lived within himself. What dreams he dreamed I do not know.

His love for his mother was intense.

Doctor Bloch had never seen a mother and son as close as Klara and her boy Adolf.

« Frau » Hitler encouraged her son's desire to become an artist.

Well-bred boy, after his visits to Doctor Bloch, he would bow and thank him respectfully.

If Doctor Bloch had advised « Frau » Hitler to go to the hospital, her condition must be grave.

I was wondering whether it was not, after all, my duty to inform Adolf.

« Frau » Klara said how awful it was for her that Adolf was so far away.

I never realized as clearly as on that visit how devoted she was to her son. She thought and planned for his welfare with all the strength that was left to her. In the end, she promised me that she would tell Adolf of her condition.

When I took leave of her that evening, I was very dissatisfied with myself.

Was there no way of helping the poor woman ?

I knew how devoted Adolf was to his mother ; something had to be done.

If his mother really needed help, little Paula was too clumsy, too frightened to be of any use. When I got home, I talked to my mother. She offered, at once, to look after « Frau » Hitler, although she was a complete stranger. But this was vetoed by my father who, with his exaggerated ideas of correct behaviour, thought it was bad manners to offer one's help without being asked.

A few days later, I went again to see « Frau » Klara.

I found her up, busy in the kitchen.

She felt somewhat better and she was already regretting that she had told Adolf about her illness.

I stayed with her a long time that evening ; she was more talkative than usual and, quite contrary to her habit, she began to tell me about her life.

Some of it, I understood, and a lot I guessed at, though much was left unsaid ; nevertheless, the story of a life of suffering was disclosed to a young man then in the full hopes of his 19 years.

But in the work-shop, time was pressing, and my father was a strict boss.

Even concerning my artistic ambitions, he used to say : Work 1st - then, music. And with a special performance coming on, there was one orchestral rehearsal after another.

Sometimes, I literally didn't know how to cram in everything.

Then, one morning, as I was energetically filling a mattress, Adolf suddenly appeared in the room.

He looked terrible. His face was so pale as to be almost transparent, his eyes were dull and his voice hoarse. I felt that a storm of suffering must be hidden behind his icy demeanour. He gave me the impression that he was fighting for life against a hostile fate.

There was hardly a greeting, no question about Stefanie, nothing about what he had been doing in Vienna.

« Incurable, the doctor says. »

This was all he could utter.

I was shocked by the unequivocal diagnosis.

Probably, Doctor Bloch had told him of his mother's condition. Perhaps, he had called in another doctor for consultation ; and he couldn't reconcile himself to this cruel verdict.

His eyes blazed, his temper flared-up.

He screamed :

« Incurable, what do they mean by that ? Not that the malady is incurable, but that the doctors aren't capable of curing it. My mother isn't even old. 47 isn't an age where you give-up hope. But, as soon as the doctors can't do anything, they call it incurable. »

I was familiar with my friend's habit of turning everything he came across into a problem. But never had he spoken with such bitterness, with such passion as now.

Suddenly, it seemed to me as though Adolf, pale, excited, shaken to the core, stood there arguing and bargaining with Death, who remorselessly claimed his victim.

I asked Adolf if I could help him. He didn't hear me - he was too busy with this settling of accounts.

Then, he interrupted himself and declared in a sober, matter-of-fact voice :

« I shall stay in Linz and keep house for my mother. »

I asked :

« Can you do that ? »

« One can do anything, when one has to. »

And he said no more.

I went with him as far as the street.

Now, I thought, he would certainly ask after Stefanie ; perhaps, he had not liked to mention her in the work-shop. I would have been glad if he had, because I had carried-out my instructions faithfully and could tell him a good deal, even though the expected conversation had not taken place.

I also hoped that Adolf, in his deep spiritual affliction, would find comfort in the thought of Stefanie. And it certainly was so.

Stefanie meant more to him in those dark weeks than ever before. But he stifled any mention of her, so deeply engrossed was he in his preoccupation with his mother.

I cannot recollect exactly when Adolf returned from Vienna. It was, perhaps, late in November, but possibly even December.

But the weeks that follow remain indelibly in my memory ; they were in a certain sense the most beautiful, the most intimate weeks of our friendship.

How deeply these days impressed me can be gathered from the mere fact that, from no other period of our association, do so many details stand-out in my memory.

He was as though transformed.

So far, I had been certain that I knew him thoroughly and in all his aspects. After all, we had lived together for more than 3 years in an exclusive friendship that did not permit of any secrets. Yet, in those weeks, it seemed to me that my friend had become a different person.

Gone were the problems and ideas which used to agitate him so much, gone all thoughts of politics. Even his artistic interests were hardly noticeable. He was nothing but his mother's faithful and helpful son.

I had not taken Adolf very seriously when he said that he would now take-over the household at the « Blütengasse » , for I knew Adolf's low-opinion of such monotonous chores, necessary though they were. And so, I was skeptical as to

his good intentions and imagined that they would not exceed a few well-meant gestures.

But I was profoundly mistaken.

I did not understand that side of Adolf sufficiently, and had not realized that his unbounded love for his mother would enable him to carry-out this unaccustomed domestic work so efficiently that she could not praise him enough for it.

Thus, one day, on my arrival at the « Blütengasse » , I found Adolf kneeling on the floor.

He was wearing a blue apron and scrubbing-out the kitchen, which had not been cleaned for a long time.

I was really immensely surprised and I must have shown it, for « Frau » Klara smiled in spite of her pain and said to me :

« There, you see, Adolf can do anything. »

Then, I noticed that Adolf had changed the furniture around.

His mother's bed now stood in the kitchen because that was heated during the day.

The kitchen cup-board had been moved into the living-room and, in its place, was the couch, on which Adolf slept, so that he could be near her during the night as well.

The little one slept in the living-room.

I could not refrain from asking how he managed the cooking.

Adolf said :

« As soon as I've finished the scrubbing, you can see for yourself. »

But, before I did, « Frau » Klara told me that, every morning, she discussed the dinner with Adolf.

He always chose her favourite dishes, and prepared them so well that she herself couldn't have done better. She enjoyed her food immensely, she insisted, and she had never eaten with such good appetite as since Adolf came home, I looked at « Frau » Klara, who had sat-up in bed.

The fervour of her words had coloured her usually pale cheeks.

The pleasure of having her son back and his devotion to her had transfigured the serious, worn face. But, behind this mother's joy, were the unmistakable signs of suffering. The deep lines, the drawn mouth and the sunken eyes showed how right the doctor had been.

To be sure, I should have known that my friend would not fail, even in this out-of-the-ordinary task, for whatever he did, he did thoroughly.

Seeing the seriousness with which he carried-out the running of the household, I suppressed a chaffing remark, although Adolf, who was always so punctilious about his neat dress, certainly looked comical in his old clothes with the apron tied around him.

Nor did I utter a word of appreciation, so touched was I by his changed attitude, knowing how much self-restraint this work was costing him.

« Frau » Klara's condition was changeable.

Her son's presence improved her general state and cheered her up.

Sometimes, she would even get-up in the afternoon and sit in the arm-chair. Adolf anticipated her every wish and took the most tender care of her. I had never before seen in him such loving tenderness.

I didn't trust my own eyes and ears.

Not a cross word, not an impatient remark, no violent insistence on having his own way.

He forgot himself entirely in those weeks, and lived only for his mother. Although Adolf, according to « Frau » Klara, had inherited many of his father's traits, I realized then how much his nature resembled his mother's.

Certainly, this was partly due to the fact that he had spent the last 4 years of his life alone with her. But, over and above that, there was a peculiar spiritual harmony between mother and son which I have never since come across. All that separated them was pushed into the background. Adolf never mentioned the disappointment which he had suffered in Vienna. For the time being, cares for the future no longer seemed to exist. An atmosphere of relaxed, almost serene contentment surrounded the dying woman.

Adolf, too, seemed to have forgotten everything that had preoccupied him.

Only once, after I had said goodbye to « Frau » Klara, did he come to the door with me and ask me if I had seen Stefanie.

But this question was now put in a different tone. It no longer expressed the impatience of the impetuous lover, but

the secret anxiety of a young man who feared that fate would now deprive him of the last thing that made life worth living. I gathered from his hasty question how much this girl meant to him in those grave days, more perhaps than if she had actually been as close to him as he would have wished. I reassured him ; I often met Stefanie, with her mother, going over the bridge, and everything seemed unaltered.

December was cold and unfriendly.

For days on end, damp, heavy mist hung over the Danube ; the sun shone rarely, and when it did, so feebly as to give no warmth at all.

His mother's condition deteriorated visibly and Adolf asked me to come only every other day. As often as I entered the kitchen, « Frau » Klara greeted me by lifting her hand a little and stretching it out towards me, and a faint smile would pass over her face, now distorted with pain.

I remember a small but significant incident.

Going through Paula's exercise books, Adolf had noticed that she was not getting on in school as well as her mother expected. Adolf took her by the hand and led her to their mother's bed and there made her swear always to be a diligent and well-behaved pupil.

Perhaps, Adolf wanted to show his mother by this little scene that he had meanwhile realized his own faults.

If he had stayed on at the Technical School until matriculation, he would have avoided the disaster in Vienna. No doubt this decisive event which, as he said later, had for the 1st time put him at variance with himself was at the back of his mind during those terrible days and added to his depression.

When I returned to the « Blütengasse » , 2 days later, and knocked softly on the door, Adolf opened it immediately, came-out into the corridor and closed the door behind him.

He told me that his mother was not at all well and was in terrible pain. Even more than his words, his emotion made me realize the seriousness of the situation. I thought it better to leave and Adolf agreed with me. We silently shook hands, and I departed.

Christmas was approaching. Snow had fallen at last and the town had assumed a festive garb. But I didn't feel like Christmas.

I walked across the Danube bridge to Urfahr.

I learned from the people in the house that « Frau » Hitler had already received Extreme-Unction.

I wanted to make my visit as short as possible.

I knocked, and Paula opened the door. I entered hesitantly. « Frau » Klara was sitting-up in bed. Adolf had his arm around her shoulders to support her, as, while she was sitting-up, the terrible pain was less severe.

I remained standing by the door. Adolf signed to me to go.

As I was opening the door, « Frau » Klara waved to me with her out-stretched hand. I shall never forget the words which the dying woman then uttered in a whisper.

She said :

« “ Gustl ”, go-on being a good friend to my son when I'm no longer here. He has no one else. »

Usually, she called me « Herr » Kubizek but, in that hour, she used the name by which Adolf always called me.

With tears in my eyes, I promised, and, then, I went.

This was the evening of December 20th.

The next day, Adolf came to see us at home.

He looked worn-out and we could tell from his distraught face what had happened.

His mother had died in the early hours of the morning, he said. It was her last wish to be buried by the side of her husband, in Leonding. Adolf could hardly speak, so deeply shaken was he by the loss of his mother.

My parents expressed their sympathy, but my mother realized that the best thing was to turn to practical matters straight away.

Arrangements had to be made for the funeral.

Adolf had already seen the undertakers and the funeral was fixed for December 23rd, at 9 am. But there was much else to be seen to.

The removal of the body to Leonding had to be arranged, the necessary documents procured and the funeral announcements printed.

All this helped Adolf to get over his emotional shock, and he calmly made the necessary preparations.

On December 23rd, 1907, I went with my mother to the house of mourning.

The weather had changed ; it was thawing and the streets were covered in slush. The day was damp and misty, and one could hardly see the river.

We entered the apartment to take leave of the dead with flowers, as was customary.

« Frau » Klara was laid-out on her bed. Her waxen face was transfigured. I felt that death had come to the dead woman as a relief from terrible pain.

Little Paula was sobbing, but Adolf restrained himself. Yet, a glance at his face was sufficient to know how he had suffered in those hours. Not only had he now lost both his parents but, with his mother, he had lost the only creature on earth on whom he had concentrated his love, and who had loved him in return.

My mother and I went down into the street. The priest came.

The body had been laid in the coffin, which was brought-down to the hall. The priest blessed the dead and, then, the small « cortège » moved-off. Adolf followed the coffin.

He wore a long black over-coat, black gloves, and carried in his hand, as was customary, a black top hat.

The dark clothing made his white face seem even paler. He looked stern and composed.

On his left, also in black, was his brother-in-law, Raubal, and, between them, the 11 year old Paula. Angela, who was well-advanced in pregnancy, followed the mourners in a closed carriage.

The whole funeral made a wretched impression on me.

In addition to my mother and myself, there were only a few tenants of number 9 « Blütengasse » , and a few neighbours and acquaintances from their former home on the « Humboldtstraße » .

My mother, too, felt how miserable this « cortège » was but, in the kindness of her heart, she immediately defended those who had stayed-away. Tomorrow was Christmas, she said, and it was quite impossible for many women, with the best will in the world, to get away.

At the church door, the coffin was taken from the hearse and carried inside.

After the Mass, the 2nd blessing took place.

As the body was to be taken to Leonding, the funeral « cortège » , then, went through the Urfahr « Hauptstraße » .

The church bells were ringing as it approached.

Instinctively, I raised my eyes to the windows of the house where Stefanie lived.

Perhaps, my ardent wish that she should not desert my friend in this, his gravest hour had called her. I can still see how the window opened, a young girl appeared, and Stefanie looked down, interestedly, at the little procession that was passing beneath.

I glanced at Adolf ; his face remained unchanged, but I did not doubt that he, too, had seen Stefanie.

He told me, later, that this was indeed so, and confessed how much in that painful hour the sight of the beloved had comforted him.

Was it by intention or was it by chance that Stefanie came to the window at that moment ? Perhaps, it was just that she had heard the church bells and wondered why they were ringing so early in the morning.

Adolf, of course, was convinced that she wanted to show him her sympathy.

On the « Hauptstraße » , a 2nd closed carriage was waiting, which Adolf and Paula entered, while the procession broke-up. Raubal joined his wife. Then, the hearse and the 2 carriages started-off to Leonding for the interment.

On the following morning, December 24th, Adolf came to my house.

He looked worn-out, as though, any minute, he might collapse.

He seemed to be desperate, quite empty, with no spark of life in him. As he felt how worried my mother was about him, he explained that he had not slept for days. My mother asked him where he was going to spend Christmas Eve. He said that the Raubals had invited him and his sister ; Paula had already left, but he had not made-up his mind yet whether he would go or not.

My mother exhorted him to help to make Christmas a peaceful occasion, now that all the members of the family had suffered the same loss, Adolf listened to her in silence. But when we were alone he said to me brusquely :

« I shall not go to Raubal's. »

I asked him impatiently :

« Where else will you go ? After all, it's Christmas Eve. »

I wanted to ask him to join us. But he did not even let me finish, and shut me up quite energetically, in spite of his

sorrow.

Suddenly, he pulled himself together and his eyes became bright.

He said :

« Perhaps, I shall go to Stefanie. »

This answer was doubly characteristic of my friend : 1st, because he was capable of forgetting completely in such moments that his relationship with Stefanie was nothing but wishful thinking, a beautiful illusion, and, 2ndly, because even when he realized this he would, after sober reflection, prefer to stick to his wishful thinking rather than unbosom himself with real people.

Later, he confessed to me that he had really been determined to go to Stefanie, although he knew very well that such a sudden visit, without a previous appointment, without even having been introduced to her, and moreover on Christmas Eve, was contrary to good manners and social convention and would probably have meant the end of his relationship with her.

But, he told me, on his way he had seen Richard, Stefanie's brother, who was spending his Christmas holiday in Linz. This unexpected meeting had made him give-up the idea, for it would have been painful for him if Richard, as was inevitable, had been present at the interview.

I did not ask any more questions ; it really did not matter whether Adolf was deceiving himself with this pretext, or whether he only offered it to me as an excuse for his behaviour.

Certainly I, too, had seen Stefanie at the window, and the sympathy which showed on her face was undoubtedly genuine. However, I doubt very much if she recognized Adolf at all in his extraordinary attire and in these peculiar circumstances.

But, of course, I did not express this doubt to him, because I knew that it would only have robbed my friend of his last hope.

I can well imagine what Adolf's Christmas Eve, in the year 1907, was really like.

That he did not want to go to Raubal, I could understand.

I could also understand that he did not want to disturb our quiet little family celebration, to which I had invited him. The serene harmony of our home would have made him feel his loneliness even more. Compared with Adolf, I considered myself fortune's favourite, for I had everything that he had lost : a father who provided for me, a mother who loved me and a quiet home which welcomed me into its peace.

But he ? Where should he have gone that Christmas Eve ?

He had no acquaintances, no friends, nobody who would have received him with open arms. For him, the world was hostile and empty.

So he went - to Stefanie. That is to say - to his dream.

All he ever told me of that Christmas Eve was that he had wandered around for hours.

Only towards morning had he returned to his mother's home and gone to sleep.

What he thought, felt and suffered, I never knew.

HITLER AND « GUSTL » IN VIENNA

Adolf had often said these words jestingly when speaking of his intention of going to live in Vienna. But, later-on, when he realized how impressed I was by his remarks, the idea grew in his mind that we would go there together, he to attend the Academy of Arts, and I the Conservatory.

With his magnificent imagination, he produced such a colourful picture of this life, so clear and so detailed, that I often did not know whether it was just wishful thinking or reality.

For me, such fantasies had a more practical aspect. To be sure, I had learned my trade well and satisfied my father as well as our customers by my efforts. But the hours in the dusty workshop had impaired my health, and our doctor, my secret ally, advised emphatically against my continuing to work as an upholsterer. This meant for me that I would try to make my beloved music my profession, a desire which assumed a more and more concrete shape, although the obstacles were many. I had learned all that there was to be learned in Linz.

My teachers, too, encouraged me in my decision to devote my life to music, but this meant my going to live in Vienna.

Thus, the « Come with me, “ Gustl ” » which my friend had at last uttered so lightheartedly took on the character of a firm invitation and a definite goal.

Nevertheless, I feel that, without Adolf's determined intervention, my unadventurous nature would not have allowed me to change my profession and go to live in Vienna.

Yet, my friend certainly thought primarily of himself.

He had a horror of going alone, because this, his 3rd journey to Vienna, was a quite different proposition from his earlier visits.

Then, he still had his mother, and though he was away, his home still existed. He was not, then, taking a step into the unknown, for the knowledge that his mother was waiting to welcome him with open arms at any time and, in any circumstances, gave a firm and reliable substance to his insecure life. His home was the quiet centre round which his stormy existence revolved.

Now, he had lost it.

Going to Vienna would be the last and final decision from which there was no turning back - a jump into the dark. During the months he had spent there, last autumn, he had not succeeded in making any friends ; perhaps, he had no desire to do so.

Relatives of his mother were living there with whom he had formerly had some contact and, unless I am mistaken, he had even stayed with them during his 1st visit.

He never went to see them again and did not even mention them.

It was quite understandable that he should have avoided his relatives, because he was afraid that they might question him about his work and livelihood.

They would certainly have discovered, then, that the Academy had rejected him, and he would have suffered starvation and misery rather than have appeared to be in need of help.

Nothing, therefore, was more natural than that he should take me with him, as I was not only his friend but, also, the only person with whom he shared the secret of his great love.

Since his mother's death, Adolf's « Come with me, “ Gustl ” » had begun to sound more like a friendly entreaty.

After New Year's Day, 1908, I went with Adolf to visit the grave of his parents.

It was a fine winter-day, cold and clear, which has forever remained in my memory. Snow covered all the familiar landmarks. Adolf knew every inch of our route, as for years, this had been his way to school.

He was very composed, a change that surprised me for I knew that his mother's death had shaken him deeply, and had even caused him physical suffering that had brought him near to collapse from exhaustion. My mother had invited him to share our meals during Christmas, in order that he might recover his strength and leave for a while the empty, cold house in which everything reminded him of his mother.

He had come, but had sat silent and serious at our table. It was not, yet, time to talk to him of future plans.

Now, as he walked solemnly by my side, looking much older than I, much more mature and manly, he was still deeply immersed in his own affairs.

Yet, I was surprised how clearly and detachedly he spoke of them, almost as if it were of someone else's business.

Angela had let him know that Paula could now live with them. Her husband had agreed to that, but had refused to receive Adolf into his family as he, Adolf, had behaved disrespectfully to him. Thus, he was relieved of his greatest worry, for the child at least had a secure home.

He, himself, had never intended to seek asylum with the Raubals.

He had expressed his gratitude to Angela and had informed her that all his parents' furniture would go to Paula.

The funeral expenses were paid-out of his mother's estate.

Incidentally, Angela had had a baby girl the day before, who was also to be christened Angela, and his guardian, he added, the Mayor of Leonding, had promised to settle the affairs connected with the inheritance and also to help him to apply for an orphan's pension.

All this sounded very sober and sensible.

Afterwards, he began to talk of Stefanie.

He was determined, he said, to bring the present state of affairs to an end. At the next opportunity, he would introduce himself to Stefanie and her mother, as this had not been possible during the Christmas holidays. It was high-time, he said, to bring matters to a head.

We were walking through the snow-covered village.

There was a small one-storied house, number 61, which had once belonged to Adolf's father ; the big bee-hive, of which his father had been so proud, was still there but, now, it was owned by strangers. Next to it was the cemetery. His father's grave, in which his mother had now been buried, was near the eastern wall, and the fresh little mound was covered with snow. Adolf stood in front of it with a stern, set face ; he looked hard and severe, and there were no tears in his eyes. His thoughts were with his beloved mother. I stood by his side and prayed.

On our way back, Adolf said that he would probably stay in Linz throughout the month of January until the home was finally disposed of and the estate settled. He foresaw, he said, some heated arguments with his guardian. Certainly, his guardian wanted to do his best for Adolf, but what use was this to him if the « best » was nothing more than

an apprenticeship to a Master-baker in Leonding ?

Old Josef Mayrhofer, Hitler's guardian, now well-advanced in years, still lives in Leonding. Naturally, he has often been asked about his experiences with the young Hitler, and his impressions of him. In his simple, disinterested manner, he has replied to all questioners (1st the enemies ; then, the friends ; and, then, again, the enemies of his ward) and his replies have always been the same, irrespective of the questioner's opinions.

One day, in January, 1908, he would say, the Hitler-Adi, grown tall, with dark down on his upper lip and a deep voice, almost a grown man, came to see him to discuss the question of his inheritance. But his 1st sentence was :

« I am going to Vienna again. »

All attempts to dissuade him failed - a stubborn fellow, like his father, the old Hitler.

Josef Mayrhofer still has in his possession the documents relating to these discussions. The application for an orphan's pension for himself and his sister, which Adolf made at his guardian's request, reads as follows :

« To the Respected Imperial and Royal Finance Administration.

The respectfully undersigned herewith request the kind allocation of the Orphans' Pension due to them. Both of these applicants, after the death of their mother, widow of an Imperial and Royal Customs Official, on December 21st, 1907, are now without either of their parents, are minors, and are incapable of earning their own living. The guardian of both applicants -(Adolf Hitler, born on the 20th April, 1889, in Braunau-on-Inn ; and Paula Hitler, born on the 21st January, 1898, in Fischlham, near Lambach, Upper-Austria) is “ Herr ” Joseph Mayrhofer, of Leonding, near Linz. Both applicants are domiciled in Linz.

ADOLF HITLER - PAULA HITLER »

Incidentally, Adolf obviously signed the application for his sister Paula, for the name « Hitler » in both signatures shows the same downward-sloping tendency which was so characteristic of his signature in later years. Besides, he made a mistake in the date of birth of his sister ; Paula was not born in 1898, but in 1896.

According to the legislation, then, in force regarding State officials, orphans of under 24 years of age, with no means of their own, were entitled to claim an orphan's pension amounting to one half of the widow's pension which their mother had been receiving.

« Frau » Hitler had received a pension of 100 Crowns a month since her husband's death ; therefore, Adolf and Paula were entitled to a total of 50 Crowns a month, and Adolf's share was, thus, 25 Crowns a month. This, of course, was not enough for him to live-on : for example, he had to pay 10 Crowns a month for his room at Mrs. Zakreys'.

The application was granted, and the 1st payment was made on February 12th, 1908, when Adolf was already in Vienna.

Incidentally, 3 years later, he renounced his share in favour of his sister Paula, although he could have continued to claim it until he reached the age of 24 (i.e. , in April, 1913) .

The document of renunciation, dated May 4th, 1911, is still in the possession of his guardian, Joseph Mayrhofer.

The document concerning the inheritance, which Adolf signed in the presence of his guardian before he left for Vienna, also mentioned his share in his father's estate, amounting to about 700 Crowns.

It is possible that he had already spent part of this money during his previous stay in Vienna but, in view of his very economical way of life (the only large item in his budget was books) , he was left with enough to tide him over, at least the beginning of his new sojourn there.

As regards our future together, Adolf was more fortunate than I, not only because he had some capital and a fixed monthly income, however small (a matter which I had still to arrange with my parents) but also because, having prevailed over his guardian, he was free to make his own decisions, whereas my decisions were subject to my parents' confirmation.

For me, moreover, moving to Vienna meant giving-up the trade I had learned, whereas Adolf could continue to lead there more or less his previous life.

All these circumstances made it increasingly difficult for me to come to a decision ; Adolf could not understand this for some time, although, from the beginning, he had taken the lead in this whole difficult affair.

As far back as the beginning of our friendship, when I could still only visualize my future in the dusty, upholsterer's work-shop, Adolf, though nearly 1 year younger than I, had made it abundantly clear to me that I ought to become a musician.

Having put this idea into my head, he never gave-up his efforts to persuade me.

He comforted me when I despaired, he bolstered-up my self-confidence when I was in danger of losing it, he praised, he criticized, he was occasionally rude and violent and railed at me furiously, but he never lost sight of the goal which he had set for me ; and, if sometimes we had such furious rows that I believed it was the end of everything, we would enthusiastically renew our friendship after a concert performance in which I had taken part.

By God, nobody on earth, not even my mother who loved me so much and knew me so well, was as capable of bringing my secret desires into the open and making them come true as my friend, although he had never had any systematic musical training.

In the winter of 1907, when work in our business was slackening and I had more time to myself, I took lessons in harmonics from the conductor of the Linz Theatre.

My studies were as thorough as they were successful, and filled me with enthusiasm. Unfortunately, there was no scope in Linz for studying the other special subjects of musical theory, such as counterpoint, orchestration and the history of music.

Nor was there a seminary for training in conducting and composition, much less any stimulus for free composition. This sort of training was only available at the Vienna Conservatory ; besides, there, I would have the opportunity of hearing 1st class performances of Operas and concerts. Though I had made-up my mind to go to Vienna, unlike my friend, I lacked the necessary determination to carry-out my decision against all odds.

But Adolf had already prepared the ground.

Without my knowledge, he had succeeded in convincing my mother of my musical vocation ; for what mother does not like to hear a brilliant career prophesied for her son as a conductor, especially when she, herself, is so devoted to music ? Thus, she soon became our ally.

And there was also her justifiable anxiety about my health, as my lungs could no longer stand the perpetual dust in the work-shop.

So, my mother, who had grown fond of Adolf just as « Frau » Klara had become fond of me, was won over, and everything now depended on my father's consent.

Not that he openly opposed my wish. My father was in every respect the opposite of Adolf's father, as he had been described to me by my friend.

He was always quiet, and apparently took no interest in what was going on around him.

All his thoughts were devoted to the business which he had created out of nothing, had successfully steered through grave crises, and had now built-up into a reputable, prosperous enterprise. He regarded my musical tastes as idle dilettantism, as he could not believe that it was possible to build a secure existence on more or less useless fiddling and strumming. To the last, he could not understand that I, knowing poverty and distress, was willing to renounce security in favour of a vague future.

How often did I hear him say :

« A bird in the hand is worth 2 in the bush. »

Or bitterly :

« What was the use of all my drudgery ? »

I was working harder than ever in the work-shop, as I did not want it said that I was neglecting my trade for the sake of my musical studies.

My father saw in my industry a sign that I wanted to remain in the trade and take-over his business someday. My mother knew how devoted my father was to his work and, so, kept silent in order not to upset him. So, at the time when my musical future depended absolutely on my attending the Vienna Conservatory, things seemed to have reached a dead-lock within our domestic circle : I worked feverishly in the work-shop, and said nothing. My mother also said nothing, and my father, thinking that I had finally abandoned the plan, did the same.

At this juncture, Adolf came to see us.

At one glance, he realized what the situation was, and intervened immediately.

To begin with, he brought me back into « form » .

During his stay in Vienna, he had made detailed enquiries about the study of music and, now, he gave me exact information on the subject, telling me, in his tempting way, how much he had enjoyed attending Operas and concerts. My mother's imagination was also fired by these vivid descriptions and, so, a decision became more and more imperative. It was, however, essential that Adolf himself should convince my father.

A difficult enterprise ! What use was the most brilliant eloquence if the old Master upholsterer had no regard for any thing connected with art ? He was quite fond of Adolf but, after all, he only saw in him a young man who had failed at school and thought too highly of himself to learn a trade.

My father had tolerated our friendship but, actually, would have preferred a more sound companion for me.

Adolf was, therefore, in a decidedly unfavourable position, and it is astonishing that he nevertheless managed to win over my father to our plan in so comparatively short a time.

I would have understood it if there had been a violent clash of opinions ; in that case, Adolf would have been in his element and able to play all the trump cards which he held.

But that was not the case.

I cannot recollect that any argument in the usual sense took place at all.

Adolf treated the whole matter as of no great importance and, in particular, implied that the decision rested with my father alone.

He accepted the fact that my father only half gave his consent, suggesting a temporary solution : as the current scholastic year at the Conservatory had already started in the previous autumn, I should go to Vienna for a trial period only to look around for a while. If the facilities for training came-up to my expectations, I could, then, make a final decision, but failing this, I could return home and enter my father's business.

Adolf, who hated compromise and with whom it was usually all or nothing, was, surprisingly enough, agreeable to this course. I was blissfully happy as never before in my life, for now, I had achieved my purpose without up-setting my father, and my mother shared my joy.

At the beginning of February, Adolf returned to Vienna.

His address remained the same, he told me when he left, as he had continued to pay his rent to Mrs. Zakreys, and I should write to him in good time announcing my arrival.

I helped him carry his luggage to the station, 4 cases altogether unless I am mistaken, every one of them very heavy.

I asked him what they contained, and he answered :

« All my belongings. »

They were almost entirely books.

At the station Adolf once again spoke of Stefanie.

Unfortunately, he had had no opportunity to talk to her, he said, for he had never met her unaccompanied.

What he had to tell Stefanie was for her ears only.

He added, in conclusion :

« Perhaps, I shall write to her. »

But I thought that this idea, expressed by Adolf for the 1st time, was merely a sign of embarrassment, or at the most, a cheap consolation.

My friend entered the train and, standing at the window, shook me by the hand.

As the train moved-off, he called-out to me :

« Follow me soon, “ Gustl ”. »

My good mother had already started preparing my clothes and linen for my journey to great, unknown Vienna. In the end, even my father wanted to contribute something ; he made me a big wooden box which was re-inforced with strong iron bands. I put into it my music, and my mother filled the remaining space with clothes and shoes.

In the meantime, a post-card arrived from Adolf, dated February 18th, 1908, showing a view of the Armour Collection at the Vienna Museum of the History of Art.

It began with :

« Dear Friend »

This form of address proved how much our relationship had deepened since his mother's death.

« Dear Friend, am anxiously expecting news of your arrival. Write soon so that I can prepare everything for your festive welcome. The whole of Vienna is awaiting you, therefore, come soon. I will, of course, come and meet you. »

On the back of the post-card, he wrote :

« Now, the weather here is improving. I hope you will have better weather too. Well, as I said before, at 1st, you will stay with me. Later, we shall see. One can get a piano here in the so-called “ Dorotheum ” for as little as 50 to 60 Florins. Well, many regards to you and your esteemed parents, from your friend, Adolf Hitler. »

Then, a postscript :

« Beg you again, come soon. »

Adolf had addressed the card as usual to « Gustav » Kubizek.

He spelt Gustav sometimes with a « v » , and sometimes with a « ph » .

He heartily disliked my 1st name, August, and always called me « Gustl » , which was more like Gustav than August.

He would probably have preferred it had I formally changed my 1st name.

He even addressed me as Gustav when he wrote to me on my Saint's Day, the feast of Saint-Augustine, on August 28th.

Under my name, there is the abbreviation « Stud. » (« Studium ») , and I remember that he liked to refer to me as « Stud. Mus. » (« Studium Musik ») .

This post-card, unlike the previous ones, is much more cheerful.

Typical of Adolf's mood is his humour, which permeates it.

He says :

« The whole of Vienna is awaiting you. »

And he intends to prepare a « festive welcome » .

All this indicates that, after the dark and depressing days which he had spent in Linz following his mother's death, he was feeling relaxed and free in Vienna, however uncertain the future might be.

Nevertheless, he must have been very lonely. The « anxiously » in the 1st sentence of his card was no doubt meant seriously, and the fact that he repeats the « come soon » , even in the form « beg you again to come soon » , proves how much he was looking forward to my arrival.

Even the information as to the cheap piano was intended to encourage me to come without delay. He may have feared secretly that my vacillating father would change his mind at the last moment.

The day of my departure arrived. In the morning, I went to church with my mother ; I felt how painful my departure was for her, although she stuck tenaciously to her resolve.

Yet, I also remember a typical remark which my father made when he saw my mother weeping.

He said :

« I can't understand why you are so depressed, Mother. We haven't asked “ Gustl ” to leave his home ; he wanted to himself. »

My mother, in her grief at our parting, concentrated on my creature comforts, giving me a nice piece of roast pork ; and the dripping, which was to be spread on my bread, was put into a special container. She baked some buns for me, gave me a large piece of cheese, a jar of jam and a bottle of coffee. My brown canvas bag was full to overflowing with food.

So, off I went to the station after my last dinner at home, well-provided for in every respect. My parents saw me off ;

my father shook my hand and said :

« Always remain honest. »

But my mother, with tears in her eyes, kissed me and, as the train started, made the sign of the Cross on my forehead.

For a long time, I felt her tender fingers there as they traced the Cross.

IMPRESSIONS OF VIENNA

My 1st impression on arriving in Vienna was one of noisy and excited confusion.

I stood there, holding my heavy case, so bewildered that I did not know which way to turn. All these people ! And this noise and tumult ! This was terrible.

I was almost inclined to turn tail and go straight home again.

But the crowds, thrusting and complaining, were jostling me through the barrier where the ticket inspectors and police stood, till I found myself in the Station Hall looking round for my friend.

I shall always remember this 1st welcome in Vienna.

While I stood there, still overwhelmed by all the shouting and hustling, recognizable from a mile away as a country bumpkin, Adolf behaved as a perfectly acclimatised city dweller. In his dark, good-quality over-coat, dark hat and the walking stick with the ivory handle, he appeared almost elegant.

He was obviously delighted to see me and greeted me warmly and, as was then the custom, kissed me lightly on the cheek.

The 1st problem was the transport of my bag for, thanks to my mother's presents, this weighed very heavily.

As I was looking around for a porter, Adolf grabbed one of the handles and I took the other.

We crossed the « Mariahilferstraße » with people everywhere, coming and going about their affairs, and such a terrible noise that one could not hear oneself speak ; but how thrilling were the electric arc-lights that made the station yard as bright as day.

I still remember how glad I was when Adolf soon turned into a side-street, the « Stumpergasse » .

Here, it was quiet and dark. Adolf stopped in front of a fairly new-looking house on the right-side, number 29. As far as I could see, it was a very fine house, most imposing and distinguished looking, perhaps, too distinguished for such youngsters as we were, I thought. But Adolf went straight through the entrance and crossed a small court-yard.

The house on the far-side of this court-yard was much humbler. We went-up a dark staircase to the 2nd floor. There were several doors opening on this floor - ours was number 17.

Adolf unlocked the door.

An unpleasant smell of kerosene greeted me and, ever since, this smell has been connected, for me, with the memory of that apartment. We seemed to be in a kitchen, but the landlady was not about. Adolf opened a 2nd door. In the small room that he occupied, a miserable kerosene lamp was burning. I looked around me.

The 1st thing that struck me were the sketches that lay around on the table, on the bed, everywhere.

Adolf cleared the table, spread a piece of newspaper on it and fetched a bottle of milk from the window. Then, he brought sausage and bread.

But I can still see his white, earnest face as I pushed all these things aside and opened the bag. Cold roast pork, stuffed buns, and other lovely things to eat.

All he said was :

« Yes, that's what it is to have a mother ! »

We ate like kings. Everything tasted like « home » .

After all the commotion, I began to collect myself.

Then came the inevitable question about Stefanie.

When I had to confess that I had not been for the evening stroll on the « Landstraße » for some considerable time, Adolf told me that I ought to have gone for his sake. Before I could reply there was a knock on the door. A little old woman, withered, and altogether of a rather comic appearance slipped inside.

Adolf rose and introduced me in his most formal manner :

« My friend, Gustav Kubizek, of Linz, a music student. »

The old woman repeated several times :

« Pleased to meet you, pleased to meet you. »

And announced her own name : Maria Zakreys.

From the sing-song tone and the peculiar accent, I realized that « Frau » Zakreys was not a real Viennese. Or rather, she was a Viennese, perhaps even a typical one, but she had not Ist seen the light of day in Hernals or Lerchenfeld but rather in Stanislau or Neutitschein.

I never asked and never found-out and, after all, it made no difference. In any case, « Frau » Zakreys was the only person in this city of millions with whom Adolf and I ever had any dealings.

Tired as I was during this Ist evening, I remember that Adolf showed me around the city.

How could a person who had just come to Vienna go to bed without having seen the Opera House ?

So, I was dragged to the Opera House.

The performmace was not yet over.

I admired the entrance-hall, the magnificent staircase, the marble balustrade, the deep, soft carpets and the gilded decorations on the ceiling.

Once away from the humble abode on the « Stumpergasse » , I felt as though I had been transported to another planet, so overwhelming was the impression.

Now, it was I who insisted on seeing the Saint-Stephen's Spire.

We turned into the « Kärntnerstraße » . But the evening mist was so thick that the spire was lost to view. I could just see the heavy, dark mass of the nave stretching-up into the grey monotony of the mist, almost unearthly, as though not built by human hands.

In order to show me something else special, Adolf took me to the « Maria am Gestade » Church, which, compared with the over-powering bulk of Saint-Stephen's, seemed to me like a delicate Gothic chapel.

When we got home, we each had to pay the grumpy concierge whom we had awakened a « Sperrsechserl » (a penny for unlocking) for opening the big door of the house.

Mrs. Zakreys had made me up a primitive bed on the floor of Adolf's room.

Although midnight was long past, Adolf still kept talking excitedly. But I stopped listening - it was just too much for me.

The moving farewell from my home, my mother's sad face, the journey, the arrival, the noise, the clamour, the Vienna of the « Stumpergasse », the Vienna of the Opera House - worn out, I fell asleep.

Of course, I could not stay at « Frau » Zakreys'.

Anyhow, it was impossible to put a grand piano in the little room. So, the next morning, when Adolf finally got-up, we set-out to look for a room.

As I wanted to stay as near as possible to my friend, we wandered, at 1st, along the nearby streets.

Once more, I saw this alluring city, Vienna, from the « other side » .

Gloomy court-yards, narrow, ill-lit tenements and stairs, ever more and more stairs.

Adolf paid « Frau » Zakreys 10 Crowns, and that was what I reckoned to pay. But the rooms we were shown at that price were mostly so small and wretched that it would have been impossible to get a grand piano into them, and when we did find a room that would have been big enough, the landlady would not hear of having a lodger who played the piano.

I was very depressed and low-spirited and full of home sickness.

What kind of big city was this Vienna ?

Full of indifferent, un-sympathetic people - it must be awful to live here.

I walked, despairing and miserable, with Adolf along the « Zollergasse » .

Once more, we saw a notice : « Room to Let » .

We rang the bell and the door was opened by a neatly dressed maid, who showed us into an elegantly furnished room containing magnificent twin beds.

The maid said, curtsied,

« Madame is coming immediately. »

And vanished.

We both knew, at once, that it was too stylish for us. Then, « Madame » appeared in the door-way, very much a lady, not so young, but very elegant.

She wore a silk dressing gown and slippers trimmed with fur.

She greeted us smilingly, inspected Adolf, then me, and asked us to sit-down.

My friend asked which room was to let.

She answered :

« This one. » , and pointed to the 2 beds.

Adolf shook his head and said curtly :

« Then, one of the beds will have to come-out, because my friend must have room for a piano. »

The lady was obviously disappointed that it was I and not Adolf who wanted a room, and asked whether Adolf already had a room. When he answered in the affirmative, she suggested that I, together with the piano I needed, should move into his room and he should take this one.

While she was animatedly suggesting this to Adolf, through a sudden movement the belt which kept the dressing gown together came undone.

The lady exclaimed :

« Oh, excuse me, gentlemen. »

And immediately fastened the dressing gown together, again. But that second had sufficed to show us that, under her silk covering, she wore nothing but a brief pair of panties.

Adolf turned as red as a peony, gripped my arm, and said :

« Come, “ Gustl ”. »

I do not remember how we got-out of the house. All I remember is Adolf furiously exclaiming as we got into the street again :

« What a Mrs. Potiphar. »

Apparently, such experiences, too, were part of Vienna.

Adolf must have realized how hard it was for me to find my way around in this bewildering city and, on our way home, he suggested that we should take a room together. He would speak to « Frau » Zakreys ; perhaps, she would fix-up something in her own house.

In the end, he succeeded in persuading « Frau » Zakreys to move into his little room and let us take-over the somewhat bigger room that she occupied.

We agreed on a rent of 20 Crowns a month. She had nothing against my playing the piano, so, this was an excellent solution for me.

The next morning, while Adolf was still asleep, I went to register at the Conservatory.

I produced my references from the Linz Music School and was immediately examined.

Ist, came an oral examination, then, I had to sing something at sight, and finally, a test in harmony.

All went well, and I was asked to go to the Administration Office, Director « Kaiser » - and, for me, he was really the Emperor-congratulated me, and told me about the curriculum.

He advised me to register as an extra-mural student at the University and to attend lectures in the history of music. Then, he introduced me to the conductor, Gustav Gutheil, with whom I should study, among other things, the practical side of conducting. In addition to this, I was accepted as viola player in the Conservatory's Orchestra.

All this was quite straightforward and, soon, in spite of the initial bewilderment, I felt on firm ground. As so often happened in my life, I found help and consolation in music ; even more, it now became my whole life. I had finally escaped from the dusty upholsterer's work-shop and could devote myself entirely to my art.

In the nearby « Liniengasse » , I discovered a piano store, called « Feigl » . I inspected the instruments for hire ; of course, they were not particularly good ones, but I did finally find a grand piano that was fairly good and I hired it for 10 Crowns a month.

When Adolf came home in the evening (I did not, yet, know how he spent his days) , he was astonished to see the grand piano. For that comparatively small room, an upright model would have been more suitable. But how was I to become a conductor without a grand piano ! Admittedly, it was not as easy as I had thought.

Adolf immediately took a hand to try-out the best place to put it. He agreed that, to get enough light, the piano had to stand near the window.

After much experiment, the contents of the room - 2 beds, 1 night chest, 1 wardrobe, 1 washstand, 1 table and 2 chairs, were distributed to the best advantage. In spite of this, the instrument took-up the whole space of the right-hand window. The table was pushed into the other window enclosure. The space between the beds and the piano, as well as that between the beds and the table, was hardly more than 1 foot wide. And, for Adolf, room to stride-up and down was every bit as important as playing the piano was for me. At once, he tried it out. From the door to the curve of the piano - 3 steps ! That was enough, because 3 steps one way, and 3 steps the other made 6, even though Adolf in his continual pacing, up and down, had to turn so often that it became almost a case of moving around his own axis.

The bare, sooty rear-side of the house in front was all we could see from our room. Only if you stood very close to the free window, and looked sharply upwards, would you see a narrow slice of the firmament, but even this modest bit of sky was generally hidden by smoke, dust or fog. On exceptionally lucky days, the sun would shine through. To be sure, it shone hardly at all on our house, much less in our room. But, on the rear of the house in front, streaks of sunshine were to be seen for a couple of hours, and this had to compensate us for the sun that we so sorely missed. I told Adolf that I had got through the entrance examination at the Conservatory quite well and was glad that I was now firmly settled-down to my studies. Adolf remarked baldly :

« I had no idea I had such a clever friend. »

This did not sound very flattering, but I was used to such remarks from him.

Apparently, he was at a very critical period, was very irritable, and shut me up brusquely when I began to talk about my studies.

He finally reconciled himself to the piano. He could practise a bit too, he remarked. I said I was willing to teach him - but here, again, I had put my foot into it. Ill-temperedly, he snarled at me :

« You can keep your scales and such rubbish. I'll get on by myself. »

Then, he calmed down again and said, in a propitiating tone :

« Why should I become a musician, “ Gustl ” ? After all, I have you ! »

Our circumstances were modest in the extreme. I certainly could not do much with the monthly allowance my father made me.

Regularly, at the beginning of each month, Adolf received a certain sum from his guardian. I do not know how much this was, perhaps, only the 25 Crowns orphan's pension, of which he had immediately to pay-out 10 to « Frau » Zakreys ; perhaps, it was more, if his guardian was paying-out of capital in installments whatever his parents may have

left. Perhaps, relatives helped to support him, for instance, the humpbacked Aunt Johanna ; but I do not know. I only know that, even then, Adolf often went hungry, although he would not admit this to me.

What did Adolf have for an ordinary day's meals ? A bottle of milk, a loaf of bread, some butter. For lunch, he often bought a piece of poppy-seed cake or nut-cake to add to it. That is what he made do with.

Every fortnight, my mother sent a food parcel and, then, we feasted. But, in money matters, Adolf was very precise. I never knew how much, or rather, how little, money he had. Doubtless, he was secretly ashamed of it. Occasionally, anger got the better of him and he would shout with fury :

« Isn't this a dog's life ? »

Nevertheless, he was happy and contented when we could go, once more, to the Opera, or listen to a concert, or read an interesting book.

For a long time, I could not find-out where he ate his lunch. Any enquiries about it he would crossly dismiss - these were not subjects one discussed. As I had some spare time in the afternoon, sometimes I used to come home directly after lunch ; but I never found Adolf at home. Perhaps, he was sitting in the « Soup-Kitchen » on the « Liniengasse » where I sometimes had my mid-day meal. No, he was not there, I went to the « Auge Gottes » . Neither was he there. When I asked him, in the evening, why he never came to the « Soup-Kitchen » , he made a long speech about the contemptible institution of these « Soup-Kitchens » which only symbolize the segregation of the social classes.

As an extra-mural student of the university, I was permitted to eat in the canteen (it was still the old canteen, for the new one erected by the German Schools Society did not, then, exist) and I could also procure cheap meal tickets for Adolf and, finally, he consented to come with me. I knew how much he liked sweets, so, as well as the main dish, I got some cakes. I thought he would enjoy this because you could see from his face how hungry he was, but as he sulkily gulped it down, he venomously hissed at me :

« I don't understand how you can enjoy anything among such people ! »

Of course, there used to gather in the canteen students from all the nations of the realm, together with several Jewish students. That was reason enough to stop him going there. But, to tell the truth, in spite of all his determination, he let hunger get the better of him. He squeezed himself in next to me in the canteen, turned his back on the rest and greedily wolfed-down his favourite nut-cake. Many a time, in my political indifference, was I secretly amused to see him swinging between anti-Semitism and his passion for nut-cake.

For days on end, he could live on milk and bread and butter only. I certainly was not spoiled, but this was beyond me. We did not make any acquaintances. Adolf would never have permitted me time for anybody but himself.

More than ever did he regard our friendship as one that excluded any other relationship. Once, as a result of pure

chance, he treated me to a very explicit reproof in this respect.

Harmony was my hobby-horse ; in Linz, too, I had shone at it, and here I got on swimmingly.

One day, Professor Boschetti called me to the office and asked me whether I would like to do some coaching in the subject. Then, he introduced me to my future pupils. The 2 daughters of a brewer in Kolomea, the daughter of a land-owner in Radautz ; and, also, the daughter of a businessman in Spalato.

I was most depressed by the startling differences between the good-class boarding-house in which these young ladies lived and our wretched hole that always stank of kerosene.

Usually, at the end of the lesson, I took tea so substantially that it served me for supper as well. When was added to the group the daughter of a cloth manufacturer from Jägerndorf, in Silesia, and the daughter of a magistrate in Agram, my half-dozen pupils together represented every corner of the wide-spread Hapsburg Empire.

And, then, the unexpected happened. One of them, the girl from Silesia, found she could not get on with a piece of written homework, and came round to me on the « Stumpergasse » to ask for my help.

Our good old landlady raised her eyebrows when she saw the pretty young girl. But that was all right ; I was, indeed, only concerned with the musical example which she had not understood, and I explained it to her.

As she copied it down quickly, Adolf came in.

I introduced him to my pupil :

« My friend from Linz, Adolf Hitler. »

Adolf said nothing. But hardly had the girl got outside when he went for me wildly - for since his unfortunate experience with Stefanie, he was a woman hater.

Was our room, already spoilt by that monster, that grand piano, to become the « rendez-vous » for this crew of musical women, he asked me furiously ?

I had a job to convince him that the poor girl was not suffering from the pangs of love, but from examination-pains. The result was a detailed speech about the senselessness of women studying. Like blows the words fell upon me, as though I were the cloth-manufacturer or the brewer who had sent his daughter to the Conservatory.

Adolf got himself more and more involved in a general criticism of social conditions.

I cowered silently on the piano stool while he, enraged, strode the 3 steps along and the 3 steps back and hurled his

indignation in the bitterest terms, 1st against the door ; and, then, against the piano.

Altogether, in these early days in Vienna, I had the impression that Adolf had become un-balanced.

He would fly into a temper at the slightest thing.

There were days when nothing I could do seemed right to him, and he made our life together very hard to bear.

But I had known Adolf now for over 3 years.

I had gone through terrible days with him after the wreck of his scholastic career, and also after his mother's death. I did not know to what this present mood of deep depression was due, but I thought that, sooner or later, it would improve.

He was at odds with the world.

Wherever he looked, he saw injustice, hate and enmity.

Nothing was free from his criticism ; nothing found favour in his eyes.

Only music was able to cheer him up a little, as, for instance, when we went on Sundays to the performances of sacred music in the « Burgkapelle » .

Here, one could hear, at no expense, soloists from the Vienna Opera House and the Vienna Boys' Choir.

Adolf was particularly fond of this famous Boys' Choir, and he told me, again and again, how grateful he was for that early musical training he had received at Lambach.

But, in other ways, to remember, just at that time, his care-free childhood was particularly painful to him.

All this time, he was ceaselessly busy.

I had no idea what a student at the Academy of Arts was supposed to do.

In any case, the subjects must have been exceedingly varied ; one day, he would be sitting for hours over books, then, again, he would sit writing till the small hours or, another day, would see the piano, the table, his bed and mine, and even the floor, completely covered with designs.

He would stand, staring tensely down at his work, move stealthily on tip-toe among the drawings, improve something here, correct something there, muttering to himself all the time and underlining his rapid words with violent gestures.

Woe betide me if I disturbed him on these occasions. I had great respect for this difficult and detailed work, and said I liked what I saw of it.

When, getting impatient, I would open the piano, he would shuffle the sheets quickly together, put them in a cupboard, grab-up a hook and make-off to Schönbrunn.

He had found a quiet bench there, among the lawns and trees, where no one ever disturbed him. Whatever progress he made with his studies in the open-air was accomplished on this seat. I, too, was fond of this quiet spot, where one could forget one lived in a metropolis. Often, in later years, I visited this lonely bench.

It would seem that a student in architecture could spend much more time in the open-air and work more independently than could a Conservatory student.

On one occasion, when he had, once more, written till all hours of the night (the ugly little smoky kerosene lamp had nearly burnt-out and I was still awake) , I asked him bluntly what was going to be the end of all this work.

Instead of answering, he handed me a couple of hastily scribbled sheets. Astounded, I read :

« Holy Mountain in the background, before it, the mighty sacrificial block surrounded by huge oaks ; 2 powerful warriors hold the black bull, which is to be sacrificed, firmly by the horns, and press the beast's mighty head against the hollow in the sacrificial block. Behind them, erect in light-coloured robes, stands the priest. He holds the sword with which he will slaughter the bull. All around, solemn, bearded men, leaning on their shields, their lances ready, are watching the ceremony intently. »

I could not see any connection between this extraordinary description and the study of architecture, so I asked what it was supposed to be.

« A play. » , replied Adolf.

Then, in stirring words, he described the action to me.

Unfortunately, I have long since forgotten it. I only remember that it was set in the Bavarian mountains, at the time of the bringing of Christianity to those parts.

The men who lived on the mountain did not want to accept the new faith. On the contrary ! They had bound themselves by oath to kill the Christian missionaries. On this was based the conflict of the drama.

I would have liked to have asked Adolf whether his studies in the Academy left him so much free-time that he could write dramas, too, but I knew how sensitive he was about everything appertaining to his chosen profession.

I could appreciate his attitude because, certainly, he had struggled hard enough to get his chance to study. I suppose that is what made him so touchy in this respect. But, nevertheless, there seemed to me something not quite right about it all.

His mood worried me more and more as the days went by. I had never known him torment himself in this way before.

On the contrary ! In my opinion, he possessed rather too much than too little self-confidence. But, now, things seemed to have changed round. He wallowed deeper and deeper in self-criticism. Yet, it only needed the slightest touch (as when one flicks on the electric light and everything becomes brilliantly clear) for his self-accusation to become an accusation against the times, against the whole world ; choking with his catalogue of hates, he would pour his fury over everything, against mankind in general who did not understand him, who did not appreciate him and by whom he was persecuted. I see him before me, striding up and down the small space in boundless anger, shaken to his very depths.

I sat at the piano with my fingers motionless on the key-board and listened to him, upset by his hymn of hate and, yet, worried about him, for his ranting at the bare walls was heard only by me and, perhaps, by « Frau » Zakreys working in the kitchen, who would be worrying about whether the crazed young man would be able to produce his next month's rent.

But those at whom these burning words were directed, they did not hear him at all. So, of what use was all the great display ?

Suddenly, however, in the middle of this hate-ridden harangue where he challenged a whole epoch, one sentence revealed to me how deep was the abyss on whose edge he was tottering :

« I shall give-up Stefanie. »

These were the most terrible words he could utter, for Stefanie was the only creature on God's earth whom he excepted from this infamous humanity - a being who, made radiant by his glowing love, gave his tormented existence sense and purpose.

His father dead, his mother dead, his only sister still a child, what was there left to him ?

He had no family, no home ; only his love, only Stefanie in the midst of all his sufferings and catastrophes had remained steadfastly by his side - admittedly, only in his imagination.

Until now, this imagination had been strong enough to be a help to him. But, in the spiritual convulsion through which he was now passing, apparently even this obstinately held conviction had broken-down.

Meaning to help him by this suggestion, I interposed :

« I thought you were going to write to her ? »

He brushed my remark away with an impatient gesture (it was only 40 years later that I learned that he really had written to her, then) and, then, came words that I had never before heard him utter :

« It's mad to wait for her. Certainly, " Mama " has already picked-out the man for Stefanie to marry. Love ? They won't worry about that. A good match, that's all that matters. And I'm a poor match, at least, in the eyes of " Mama ". »

Then, came a furious reckoning with the « Mama » , with everybody who belonged to these fine circles who, through cleverly arranged marriages among themselves, continue to enjoy their un-merited social privileges.

I gave-up the attempt to practise the piano, and went to bed, while Adolf became absorbed in his books.

I still remember how shocked I was, then. If Adolf could no longer cling to the thought of Stefanie, whatever would become of him ?

My feelings were divided : on the one hand, I was glad that he was finally released from this hopeless love for Stefanie ; and on the other hand, I knew that Stefanie was his only ideal, the only thing that kept him going and gave his life an aim.

The next day, for a trifling reason, there was a bitter row between us.

I had to practise, Adolf wanted to read. As it was raining, he could not go off to Schönbrunn.

He shouted at me :

« This eternal strumming. One's never safe from it. »

I answered :

« It's quite simple. » I answered.

I got-up, took my time-table out of my music case and, with a drawing-pin, fixed it on the cup-board door. Now, he could see exactly when I was out, when not, and just when my hours for practising were.

I added :

« And, now, hang your time-table under it. »

Timetable ! He didn't need any such thing. He kept his time-table in his head. That was good enough for him and it had to be good enough for me.

I shrugged my shoulders doubtfully. His work was anything but systematic. He worked practically only at night ; in the morning, he slept.

I had quickly settled into the life of the Conservatory, and my teachers were satisfied with my work - more than satisfied, as was shown by their offering me the extra-coaching. Naturally, I was proud of it, and certainly a bit conceited.

Music is, perhaps, the one art where a lack of formal education does not seem to matter so much. So, pleased with myself, and contented, I set-off happily every morning for the Conservatory. But just this sureness of purpose, this certainty of success, awoke in Adolf the most bitter comparisons, although he never mentioned it.

So now, the sight of the time-table stuck on the wall, which must have seemed to him like an officially accredited guarantee for my future, brought about an explosion.

He screamed :

« This Academy, a lot of old-fashioned fossilized civil servants, bureaucrats, devoid of understanding, stupid lumps of officials. The whole Academy ought to be blown-up ! »

His face was livid, the mouth quite small, the lips almost white. But the eyes glittered. There was something sinister about them. As if all the hate of which he was capable lay in those glowing eyes !

I was just going to point-out that those men of the Academy on whom he so lightly passed judgment in his measureless hatred were, after all, his teachers and professors, from whom he could certainly learn something. But he forestalled me.

« They rejected me, they threw me out, they turned me down. »

I was shocked. So, that was it. Adolf did not go to the Academy at all.

Now, I understood a good deal that had puzzled me about him.

I felt his hard luck deeply, and asked him whether he had told his mother that the Academy had not accepted him.

He replied :

« What are you thinking of ? How could I burden my dying mother with this worry ? »

I could not help but agree.

For a while, we were both silent.

Perhaps, Adolf was thinking of his mother.

Then, I tried to give the conversation a practical turn.

I asked him :

« And what now ? »

He repeated irritably :

« What now, what now. Are you starting too - what now ? »

He must have asked himself this question a hundred times and more, because he had certainly not discussed it with anyone else.

He mocked my anxious inquiry, again :

« What now ? »

Instead of answering, he sat himself down at the table and surrounded himself with his books.

« What now ? »

Then, he adjusted the lamp, took-up one of the books, opened it and began to read.

I made to take the time-table down from the cup-board door.

He raised his head, saw it and said calmly :

« Never mind. »

VIENNA

We often saw the old Emperor when he rode in his carriage from Schönbrunn through the « Mariahilferstraße » to the « Hofburg » .

On such occasions, Adolf did not make much ado about it, neither did he refer to it later, for he was not interested in the Emperor as a person but only in the State which he represented, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

All my recollections of life in Vienna are sharpened by contrasts, and are, thus, more clearly etched in my memory. Indeed, in the course of the turbulent year 1908, there took place 2 political events which agitated the people.

On the one hand, there was the Emperor's Diamond Jubilee.

On the other, there was the annexation of Bosnia, decreed in connection with the Jubilee, a matter which caused heated arguments among the citizens.

This extension of the external power of the country only revealed its weakness within and, soon, all the signs were of War. In fact, the events which took place in 1914 might easily have happened then, 6 years earlier.

It was no mere coincidence that the 1914-1918 War actually had its origins in Sarajevo.

The people of Vienna, among whom we, 2 unknown youngsters, were living, were, at that time, torn between loyalty to the old Emperor and anxiety about the threatening War.

Everywhere, we noticed a deep chasm between the social classes.

There was the vast mass of the lower-classes who often had not enough to eat and merely existed in miserable dwellings without light or sun. In view of our standards of living, we unhesitatingly included ourselves in this category. It was not necessary for us to go out to study the mass-misery of the city - it was brought into our own home. Our own damp and crumbling walls, bug-infested furniture and the un-pleasant odour of kerosene were typical of the surroundings in which hundreds of thousands of people in this city lived.

When we went with empty stomachs into the centre of the city, we saw the splendid mansions of the nobility with garishly attired servants in front, and the sumptuous hotels in which Vienna's rich society (the old nobility, the captains of industry, land-owners and magnates) held their lavish parties ; poverty, need, hunger on the one side, and reckless enjoyment of life, sensuality and prodigal luxury on the other.

I was too home-sick to draw any political inferences from these contrasts. But Adolf, homeless, rejected by the Academy, without any chance of changing his miserable position, developed during this period an ever growing sense of rebellion.

The obvious social injustice which caused him almost physical suffering also roused in him a demoniacal hatred of that

un-earned wealth, presumptuous and arrogant, which we saw around us.

Only by violently protesting against this state of affairs was he able to bear his own « dog's life ». To be sure, it was largely his own fault that he was in this position ; but this he would never admit. Even more than from hunger, he suffered from the lack of cleanliness, as he was almost pathologically sensitive about anything concerning the body. At all costs, he would keep his linen and clothing clean.

No one, meeting this carefully dressed young man in the street, would have thought that he went hungry every day, and lived in a hopelessly bug-infested back-room in the 6th District.

It was more the lack of cleanliness in the surroundings in which he was forced to live than the lack of food which provoked his inner-protests against the prevailing social conditions.

The old Imperial City, with its atmosphere of false glamour and spurious Romance and its, now, evident inner-decay, was the ground on which his social and political opinions grew.

All that, he later became, was born of this dying Imperial Vienna.

Although he wrote later :

« The name of this city of lotus eaters represents for me 5 years of misery and distress. »

This statement shows only the negative side of his experience in Vienna. The positive side was that his constant revolt against the existing social order produced his political philosophy to which little was added in later years.

In spite of his sympathetic interest in the poverty of the masses, he never sought direct contact with the inhabitants of the Imperial City.

He profoundly disliked the typical Viennese.

To begin with, he could not stand their soft, though melodious accent, and he even preferred the clumsy German spoken by « Frau » Zakreys.

Above all, he hated the subservience and dumb indifference of the Viennese, their eternal muddling through, their reckless improvidence.

His own character was just the opposite.

As far as I can remember, Adolf was always very reserved, simply because he disliked any physical contact with people ; but, within him, everything was in a ferment and urged him on to radical and total solutions.

How sarcastic he was about the Viennese partiality to wine, and how he despised them for it ! Only once, did we go to the « Prater » Pleasure Gardens, and this, only out of curiosity.

He could not understand why people wasted their precious time with such nonsense. When he heard people laughing uproariously at some side-show, he would shake his head, full of indignation at so much stupidity, and ask me angrily if I could understand it.

In his opinion, they must have been laughing at themselves, which he could well-understand. In addition, he was disgusted at the medley of Viennese, Czechs, Magyars, Slovaks, Rumanians, Croats, Italians and God knows what else which surged through the « Prater » . To him, the « Prater » was nothing but a Viennese Babel. There was, here, a strange contradiction which always struck me : all his thoughts and ambitions were directed towards the problem of how to help the masses, the simple, decent, but under-privileged people, with whom he identified himself - they were ever-present in his thoughts.

But, in actual fact, he always avoided any contact with people. The motley crowd in the « Prater » was physically repugnant to him ; however much he felt for the little man, he always kept him at the greatest possible distance. On the other hand, the arrogance of the ruling classes was equally alien to him, and he understood even less the apathy and resignation which in those years was gaining a hold on the leading intellectuals.

The knowledge that the end of the Hapsburg State was inevitable had bred, especially among the traditional upholders of the Monarchy, a kind of fatalism which accepted whatever might befall, with the typically Viennese :

« There's nothing one can do about it. »

This bitter-sweet tone of resignation prevailed also among Vienna's poets ; for instance, Hofmannstahl, Wildgans : names which never reached us, not because we had no appreciation of the words of a poet, but because the mood which prompted the work of those poets was foreign to us ; we had come from the country and were nearer to nature than were the townfolk.

In addition, we were of a different generation from those weary and resigned people.

While the hopeless social conditions in their apparent inevitability produced in the older generation nothing but apathy and complete indifference, they forced the younger generation into racial criticism and violent opposition.

And Adolf, too, felt the urgent need to criticize and counter-attack.

He did not know what resignation meant.

He who resigned, he thought, lost his right to live.

But he dissociated himself from his contemporaries who were, at that time, very arrogant and turbulent, and went his own way, refusing to join any of the, then, existing political parties. Although he always felt a sense of responsibility for everything that happened he was always a lonely and solitary man, determined to rely upon himself only, and to reach his goal.

One other thing should be mentioned : Adolf's visit to the typical working-class district of Meidling.

Although he never told me exactly why he went there, I knew that he wanted to study personally the housing and living conditions of the workers' families.

He was not interested in any individual ; he only wanted to know the ways of the class as a whole. He, therefore, made no acquaintances in Meidling, his aim being to study a cross-section of the community quite impersonally. However much he avoided close contact with people, he had nevertheless grown fond of Vienna as a city ; he could have lived quite happily without the people, but never without the city.

Small wonder, then, that the few people whom he came later to know in Vienna thought of him as a lone wolf and an eccentric, and regarded as pretence or arrogance his refined speech, his distinguished manners and his elegant bearing, which belied his obvious poverty. In fact, the young Hitler made no friends in Vienna.

All the more enthusiastic was he about what people had built in Vienna.

Think only of the « Ringstraße » !

When he saw it for the 1st time, with its fabulous buildings, it seemed to him the realisation of his boldest artistic dreams, and it took him a long time to digest this overwhelming impression. Only gradually did he find his way about this magnificent exhibition of modern architecture. I often had to accompany him on his strolls along the « Ring » .

Then, he would describe to me, at some length, this or that building, pointing-out certain details, or he would explain to me its origins.

He would literally spend hours in front of it, forgetting not only the time but all that went on around him. I could not understand the reason for these long drawn-out and complicated inspections ; after all, he had seen everything before, and already knew more about it than most of the inhabitants of the city.

When I occasionally became impatient, he shouted at me rudely, asking whether I was his real friend or not ; if I was, I should share his interests. Then, he continued with his dissertation.

At home, he would draw for me ground plans and sectional plans, or enlarge upon some interesting detail.

He borrowed books on the origin of various buildings, the « Hofoper », the House of Parliament, the « Burgtheater », the « Karlskirche », the « Hof-Museums », the Town Hall ; he brought home more and more books, among them, a general hand-book of architecture. He showed me the various architectural styles, and particularly pointed-out to me that some of the details on the buildings of the « Ringstraße » demonstrated the excellent workmanship of local craftsmen.

When he wished to study a certain building, the external appearance alone did not satisfy him. I was always astonished how well-informed he was about side-doors, staircases, and even back-doors and little-known means of access.

He approached a building from all sides ; he hated nothing more than splendid and ostentatious façades intended to conceal some fault in the layout.

Beautiful façades were always suspect.

Plaster, he thought, was an inferior material that no architect should use.

He was never deceived and, often, was able to show me that some construction, which aimed at mere visual effect, was just bluff.

Thus, the « Ringstraße » became for him an object by which he could measure his architectural knowledge and demonstrate his opinions.

At that time also, his 1st schemes for the re-planning of large squares emerged. I distinctly remember his expositions : for instance, he regarded the « Heldenplatz », between the « Hofburg » and the « Volksgarten », as an almost ideal spot for mass-meetings, not only because the semi-circle of the adjacent buildings lent itself in a unique way to holding the assembled multitude but, also, because every individual in the crowd would receive a great monumental impression whichever way he looked.

I thought these observations were the idle play of an over-heated imagination but, nevertheless, I always had to take part in such experiments.

The « Schwarzenbergplatz » was also very much beloved by Adolf.

We sometimes went there, during an interval at the « Hofoper », in order to admire in the darkness the fantastically illuminated fountains. That was a spectacle after our own hearts. Incessantly, the foaming water rose, coloured red, yellow and blue, in turn, by the various spotlights. Colour and movement combined to produce an incredible abundance of light effects, casting an unreal and unearthly spell-over the whole square.

To be sure, Adolf, influenced by the « Ringstraße » architecture, was also interested in great projects during his time

in Vienna : concert-halls, theatres, museums, palaces, exhibitions. But, gradually, his style of planning changed.

In the 1st place, these monumental buildings were, in a certain sense, so perfect that even he, with his un-bridled will to build, could find no room for change or improvement. Linz had been quite different in this respect.

With the exception of the massive pile of the old Castle, he had been completely dissatisfied with every building he had seen in Linz.

Small wonder, therefore, that he planned a new and more dignified successor to the old Town Hall of Linz which was rather narrow and, squeezed in among the houses of the main-square, was not very imposing ; and that, in the end, during our strolls through the town, he rebuilt the whole city.

Vienna was different, not only because it was difficult for him to conceive as a unit the enormous dimensions of the city but, also, because with growing political understanding, he became increasingly aware of the necessity for healthy and suitable housing for the masses of the population.

In Linz, it had never been a matter of great concern to him how these people, who would be affected by his great building projects, would react to them.

In Vienna, however, he began to build for people. What he explained to me in long, nocturnal discussions, what he drew and planned, was no longer, as it had been in Linz, building for building's sake, but conscientious planning which took into account the needs and requirements of the occupiers.

In Linz, it was still purely architectural building ; in Vienna, social building ; that is how one could describe his progress. This was also due to the merely external factor that Adolf had been fairly comfortable in Linz, especially in the pleasant apartment in Urfahr.

Now, in contrast, in the gloomy sunless back-room of the « Stumpergasse » , in Vienna, he felt every morning when he awoke, looking at the bare walls and depressing view, that building was not, as he had thought hitherto, mostly a matter of show and prestige, but rather a problem of public health, of how to remove the masses from their miserable hovels.

Adolf had told me that, during the past winter when he was still alone in Vienna, he had often been to warmed public rooms in order to save fuel, of which his inadequate stove consumed large quantities without giving much heat.

There, one could sit in a warmed room without payment, and there were plenty of newspapers available. I suppose that Adolf, in his conversations with the people who frequented these places, gained his 1st depressing insight into the scandalous housing conditions of the metropolis.

In our hunt for lodgings which, so to speak, heralded my entry into Vienna, I had had a foretaste of the misery,

distress and filth that awaited us.

Through dark, foul-smelling back-yards, up and down stairs, through sordid and filthy hallways, past doors behind which adults and children huddled together in a small sunless room, the human beings as decayed and miserable as their surroundings - this impression has remained unforgettably with me, just as the reverse side of the medal that, in the one house which might have come-up to our sanitary and æsthetic standards, we met that acme of viciousness which, in the person of the seductive « Mrs. Potiphar » , seemed to us more repulsive than the wretchedness of the poor people.

There followed those nocturnal hours in which Adolf, striding up and down between door and piano, explained to me in powerful words the causes of these squalid housing conditions.

He started with the house in which we ourselves were living. On an area which was hardly large enough for an ordinary garden, there were tightly packed 3 buildings, each in the others' way and robbing each other of light, air and elbow room.

And why ? Because the man who bought the ground wanted to make as large a profit as possible. He, therefore, had to build as compactly as possible and as high as possible, because the more of these box-like compartments he could pile one on top of the other, the more income he received. The tenant, in his turn, has to get from his apartment as much value as he can and, therefore, sub-lets some of the rooms, usually, the best ones ; take, for instance, our good « Frau » Zakreys. And the sub-tenants crowd together, in order to have room available for a lodger. So, each one wants to make a profit out of the other, and the result is that all except the landlord have not enough living space. The basement flats are also a scandal, getting no light, sun or air. If this is un-bearable for grown-ups, for children it is deadly.

Adolf's lecture ended in a furious attack on the real estate speculators and the exploiting landlords.

One word which I heard for the 1st time on that occasion still rings in my ears : These « professional landlords » who make a living from the awful housing condition of the masses. The poor tenant usually never meets his landlord, as the latter does not live in these tenements he owns (God forbids) but somewhere in the suburbs, in Hietzing or Grinzing, in luxurious villas where they enjoy in abundance that of which they deprive others.

Another day, Adolf made his observations from the tenant's angle.

What were such a poor devil's minimum needs for a decent home ? Light : the houses must be detached. There must be gardens, playgrounds for the children. Air : the sky must be visible ; something green, a modest piece of nature. But look at our back-building, he said. The sun shines only on the roof. The air - of that we would rather not speak. The water : there is one single tap outside on the landing, to which 8 families have to come with their pails and jugs. The whole floor has one highly-unsanitary lavatory in common, and it is almost necessary to take one's turn in a queue. And on top of all that, the bugs !

When, during the weeks that followed (I had learned in the meantime that he had been rejected by the Academy) , I asked Adolf occasionally where he was during the day, he answered :

« I am working on the solution of the housing problem in Vienna, and I am doing certain research for this purpose ; I, therefore, have to go around a lot. »

During that period, he would often pore-over his plans and drawings throughout the night, but he never spoke about it, nor did I ask him any more questions. But, suddenly, I think it was towards the end of March, he said :

« I shall be away for 3 days. »

He returned on the 4th day, dead tired.

Goodness knows where he had been, where he had slept and how hungry he had been ! From his scanty reports, I gathered that he had approached Vienna from some outlying point, perhaps, from Stockerau or from the Marchfeld, to gain an idea of the land available for the purpose of relieving the city's congestion.

He worked all night again and, then, at long last, he showed me the project.

In the 1st place, some simple ground plans, workers' flats with the minimum requirements : kitchen, living-room, separate bedrooms for parents and children, water laid on in the kitchen, lavatory and, at that time, an unheard-of innovation : a bath.

Then, Adolf showed me his plans for various types of houses, neatly sketched in India ink.

I remember them so clearly because, for weeks, these sketches were hanging on our walls, and Adolf returned repeatedly to the subject.

In our airless and sunless subtenants' existence, I realized more sharply the contrast between our own surroundings and Adolf's attractive light and airy houses. For, as my glance wandered away from these pretty sketches, it fell on the crumbling, badly distempered wall which still showed traces of our nightly bug hunt. This vivid contrast has indelibly printed on my memory the vast and grandiose plans of my friend.

« The tenements will be demolished. »

With this pithy pronouncement, Adolf began his work.

I should have been surprised had it been otherwise, as in everything he planned, he went all out and detested half measures and compromise - life itself would bring these. But his task was to solve the problem radically - that is to

say, from the roots.

Private speculation in land would be forbidden. Areas along both banks of the Danube would be added to the open spaces resulting from the demolition of the working-class districts, and wide roads would be laid across the whole. The vast building area would be provided with a network of railway lines. Instead of big railway stations, there would be suitably scattered over the whole territory, and connected with the town centre, a series of small local stations which would cater for specified districts and offer favourable speedy communication between home and place of work. The motor-car, at that time, had not been envisaged as an important means of transport. The streets of Vienna were still dominated by the horse-drawn fiacre. The bicycle was only slowly becoming a cheap and practical means of travel. Only the railways were, in those days, able to provide transport for the masses.

Adolf's design was by no means concerned with the one family or owner-occupier type of house, as is being built today, nor was he interested in « settlement » .

His idea was still based on the old type of tenement house, carved-up into fractions.

Thus, came into being as his smallest unit the 4-family house, a one-storied, well-proportioned structure, containing 2 flats on the ground-floor and 2 on the 1st floor.

This basic unit was the prevailing type. Where conditions required, from 4 to 8 of these units were to be combined to form housing blocks for 8 or 16 families, but these blocks, too, remained « near the ground » , that is to say, they still consisted of 1 story only, and were surrounded by gardens, playing-grounds and groups of trees. The 16-family house was the limit.

Having designed the types of house necessary to relieve the congestion in the town, my friend could now turn his attention to the problem itself.

On a big map of the town, which was too large for the table and had to be spread-out on the piano, Adolf laid-out the network of railways and roads. Industrial centres were marked, residential districts suitably located. I was always in his way when he was engaged on this vast planning job.

There was, indeed, not a square-foot of space in the room that was not utilised for this task. If Adolf had not pursued his course with such grim determination, I would have regarded the whole thing as an interesting but idle pastime. Actually, I was so depressed by our own bad housing that I became almost as fanatical as my friend, and that is no doubt the reason why so many details have remained in my memory.

In his way, Adolf thought of everything. I still remember that he was preoccupied with the problem of whether inns would be necessary or not in this new Vienna. Adolf was as radically opposed to alcohol as he was to nicotine. If one neither smoked nor drank, why should one go to an inn ? In any case, he found for this new Vienna a solution which was as radical as it was bold : a new popular drink !

On one occasion, in Linz, I had to re-decorate some rooms in the office building of the firm of Franck, who manufactured a coffee substitute.

Adolf came to see me, there.

The firm provided the workers with an excellent iced beverage which cost only one heller a glass. Adolf liked this drink so much that he mentioned it, again and again.

If one could provide every household, he said, with this cheap and wholesome beverage, or with similar non-alcoholic drinks, one could do without the inns.

When I remonstrated that the Viennese, from my knowledge of them, would be most unlikely to give-up their wine, he replied brusquely, « You won't be asked ! » as much as to say in other words « Nor will the Viennese either. »

Adolf was particularly critical of those countries, and Austria was one of them, which had established a tobacco monopoly.

In this way, he argued, the State ruined the health of its own subjects ; therefore, all tobacco factories must be closed and the import of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes forbidden. But he did not find a substitute for tobacco as a companion to his « People's Drink » .

Altogether, the nearer Adolf came in his imagination to the realisation of his projects, the more utopian did the whole business become.

As long as it was only a matter of the basic principles of his planning, everything was quite reasonable ; but when he thought out the details of its execution, Adolf juggled with ideas which seemed to me completely nebulous.

Having to pay 10 of my father's hard-earned Crowns for a half-share in a bug-ridden room, I had the fullest sympathy with the idea that in his new Vienna there should be no landlords and tenants.

The ground was to be owned by the State, and the houses were to be not private property but administered by a sort of housing cooperative.

One would pay no rent but instead a contribution to the building costs of the house, or a kind of housing tax. So far, I could follow him.

But when I timidly asked him :

« Yes, but in this way you cannot finance such an expensive building project. Who is going to pay for it ? »

I provoked his most violent opposition.

Furiously, Adolf flung replies at me, of which I understood but little. Besides, I can hardly remember details of these explanations, which consisted almost entirely of abstract conceptions. But what remains in my memory were certain regularly recurring expressions which, the less they actually meant, the more they impressed me.

The principal problems of the whole project were to be solved, as Adolf put it :

« In the Storm of the Revolution. »

It was the 1st time that in our wretched dwelling this ponderous word was uttered.

I do not know if Adolf picked it up from his copious reading. At any rate, at the moment when his flight of ideas would come to a standstill, regularly the bold words « Storm of the Revolution » would crop-up and give a new fillip to his thoughts, though he never paused to explain the phrase. It could mean, I found-out, either nothing or everything.

For Adolf, it was « everything » , but for me « nothing » , until he, with his hypnotic eloquence, had convinced me, too, that it only needed a tremendous revolutionary storm to break-over the tired old earth to bring about all that which had long since been ready in his thoughts and plans, just as a mild rain in late-summer brings the mushrooms springing-up everywhere.

Another ever recurring expression was the « German Ideal State » , which, together with the conception of the « Reich » , was the dominating factor in his thinking.

This « Ideal State » was in its basic principles, both national and social, social above all in respect of the poverty of the masses of the working-class.

More and more thoroughly, Adolf worked on the idea of a State which would give its due to the social requirements of our times.

But the idea remained vague and was largely determined by his reading.

Thus, he chose the term, « Ideal State » (most likely, he had read it in one of his many books) and left it to the future to develop the details of this ideal State, for the time being only sketched in general outline, but, of course, with the « Reich » as its final aim.

Also, in connection with his bold building projects, Adolf 1st adopted a 3rd expression which had already become a familiar formula in that period : « Social Reform » .

This expression, too, embraced much that was still swirling around in his brain in a very un-formed State.

But the eager study of political literature and visits to the House of Parliament, to which he dragged me, too, gradually lent the expression « Social Reform » a concrete meaning.

One day, when the « Storm of the Revolution » broke and the « Ideal State » was born, the long overdue Social Reform would become reality.

This would be the moment to tear-down the tenements of the « professional landlords » , and to begin with the building of his model houses in the beautiful meadows behind Nussdorf.

I have dwelt so long on these plans of my friend's because I regard them as typical of the development of his character and his ideas during his sojourn in Vienna.

To be sure, I realized from the beginning that my friend would not remain indifferent to the misery of the masses of the metropolis, for I knew that he did not close his eyes to anything and that it was quite contrary to his nature to ignore any important phenomenon.

Yet, I would never have believed that these experiences in the suburbs of Vienna would have stirred-up his whole personality so enormously. For I had always thought of my friend as, basically, an artist, and would have understood if he had grown indignant in the face of the masses, who appeared to be hopelessly perishing in their misery, yet, remained aloof from all this, so as not to be dragged down into the abyss by the city's inexorable fate.

I reckoned with his susceptibility, his æstheticism, his constant fear of physical contact with strangers (he shook hands rarely and, then, only with a few people) and I thought this would be sufficient to keep him at a distance from the masses.

This was only true of personal contacts. But with his whole, over-flowing heart, he stood then in the ranks of the under-privileged.

It was not sympathy, in the ordinary sense, he felt for the disinherited.

That would not have been sufficient. He not only suffered with them, he lived for them and devoted all his thoughts to the salvation of these people from distress and poverty. No doubt this ardent desire for a total re-organisation of life was his personal response to his own fate, which had led him, step by step into misery. Only by his noble and grandiose work, which was intended « for everybody » and appealed to « all » , did he find again his inner-equilibrium.

The weeks of dark visions and grave depressions were past ; he was, again, full of hope and courage.

But, for the time being, good old Maria Zakreys was the only person who occupied herself with these plans.

To be exact, she did not really occupy herself with them, for she had given it up as a bad job to try to bring order into this mess of plans, drawings and sketches. She was satisfied as long as the 2 students from Linz paid their rent punctually.

As far as Linz was concerned, Adolf had not contemplated more than to transform it into a fine, attractive town whose distinguished buildings should raise it from its low, provincial standing. But Vienna he wanted to transform into a modern residential town in which distinction and prestige did not matter - this, he left to the Imperial Vienna : what mattered was that the uprooted masses, who had become estranged from their own soil and their own people, should again settle-down on firm ground.

The old Imperial City changed, on the drawing-board of a 19 year old youth who lived in a dark back-room of the Mariahilf suburb, into a spacious, sunlit and exuberant city, which consisted of 4, 8, and 16-family houses.

HITLER AND CULTURE

There can be no doubt that Adolf was, at that time, convinced that he was destined to become an architect.

How he would ever find his way into practice, even with this thorough private study, unable as he was to produce any testimonials and diplomas - this never caused him any worry. We hardly ever spoke about it, for my friend was absolutely sure that, by the time he had concluded his studies, circumstances would have changed (either peacefully or with violence, as a consequence of his « Storm of the Revolution ») to such an extent that formal qualifications would no longer matter, but only actual ability.

Thus, Adolf saw his future clearly before him.

Back in Linz, he had already defeated what he called his school's biased, unjust and idiotic treatment of him, by throwing himself heart and soul into the study of a subject of his own choosing, so he had no difficulty in doing the same here, in Vienna, where a similar situation confronted him. He cursed the old-fashioned, fossilized bureaucracy of the Academy where there was no understanding for true artistry. He spoke of the trip-wires which had been cunningly laid (I remember his very words !) for the sole purpose of ruining his career. But he would show these incompetent, senile fools that he could go ahead without them ! From his salvos of abuse of the Academy, I gained the impression that these teachers, by rejecting the young man, had involuntarily engendered in him more eagerness and energy than their teaching would ever have done.

But my friend had to face another problem : What was he to live on during his years of study ? Many years would pass before he could make himself a position as an architect. Personally, I doubted if, indeed, anything would ever come of my friend's private studies. Admittedly, he studied with incredible industry and a determination which one

would have thought beyond the strength of his under-nourished and weakened body. But his pursuits were not directed towards any practical goal. On the contrary, every now and again, he got lost in vast plans and speculations. Drawing a comparison with my musical studies, which were progressing absolutely according to plan, I could only conclude that Adolf was casting his nets far too wide and dragging in anything that had even the remotest connection with architecture ; and he did it, moreover, with the greatest thoroughness and precision. How could all that ever lead to any conclusion - not to mention the fact that more and more new ideas assailed him and distracted him from his professional training.

The contrast between his boundless, un-systematic labours and my precisely regulated studies at the Conservatory did nothing to help our friendship, if only because our respective work at home necessarily led to friction. When, on top of this, Professor Boschetti sent me some private pupils, our disagreements became sharper. Now, one could see, he said, that bad luck was pursuing him ; there was a great conspiracy against him - he had no possibility of earning any money.

One evening (I suppose it was after a pupil of mine had been in for a lesson) , I seized the opportunity to try to persuade him to look around for some remunerative work. Of course, if one is lucky, one can give lessons to young ladies, he began. I told him that without my taking the initiative, Professor Boschetti had sent me these pupils - it was a pity that they had to be taught harmonics rather than architecture. Incidentally, I went on more firmly, if I were as gifted as he was, I would have long since looked around for some part-time job.

He listened with interest, almost as though the whole thing did not refer to him at all, and then I let him have it : drawing, for instance, that was something he really could do, as even his teachers had admitted. What about looking for a job with a newspaper or in a publishing firm ? Perhaps, he could illustrate books, or do sketches for newspapers. He answered evasively that he was glad I credited him with such skill, but anyhow this kind of newspaper illustration was best left to the photographers, for not even the best artist could be as quick as a photographer.

Then, what about a job as a dramatic critic, I continued ?

This was a job which he was actually doing because, after every visit to the Theatre, he came home to me with a very severe and radical, yet, interesting and comprehensive review.

Why should I remain the only inhabitant of Vienna ever to hear his opinions ? He should try to get in touch with an influential paper. But he would have to take care not to show too much bias. What did I mean by that, he wanted to know ?

The Italian, Russian and French Operas, too, had their right to exist, I replied.

One had to accept foreign composers as well, for art has no national frontiers.

We started a heated argument, as whenever music was the topic under discussion I stood my ground ; for I did not

speaking for myself alone, but felt that I was the representative of the Institute whose pupil I was.

Although I fully shared Adolf's enthusiasm for Richard Wagner, I could nevertheless not bring myself to reject all the rest. But he stuck uncompromisingly to his point.

I still remember well that, in my excitement, I flung at Adolf the words from the final Chorus of Beethoven's 9th Symphony, « Seid umschlungen Millionen, diesen Kuss der ganzen Welt. » (Oh you millions I embrace you - this kiss I give to the world !)

The work of the artist must belong to the whole world.

So, there was trouble even before he took the job of an Opera-critic, remarked Adolf.

And so, this plan, too, was buried.

Adolf wrote a great deal during this period.

I had discovered that it was mainly plays, dramas actually.

He took the plots from the Germanic Mythology or German history.

But hardly any of these plays were really finished. Nevertheless, it might have been possible to make some money out of them.

Adolf showed me some of his drafts, and I was struck by the fact that he attributed much importance to magnificent staging.

Except for the drama about the coming of Christianity, I cannot remember any one of these plays, but only that they all required an enormous production.

Wagner had accustomed us to the idea of pretentious productions, but Adolph's ideas dwarfed anything devised by the Master.

I knew a thing or two about Operatic production and was not slow to utter my doubts.

With his settings ranging through Heaven and Hell, I explained to him, no producer would accept any one of his plays. He should be much more modest in all that concerned his scenery. Altogether, it would be best for him not to write Operas at all, but rather simple plays, comedies perhaps, which were popular with the public. The most profitable thing would be to write some unpretentious comedy. Unpretentious ? This was all that was needed to make him furious. So, this attempt, too, ended in failure.

Gradually, I came to realize all my efforts were wasted.

Even if I had managed to persuade Adolf to submit his drawings or his literary work to a newspaper editor or a publisher, he would soon have quarreled with his employer, for he could never tolerate any interference with his work, and it would presumably make no difference that he was getting paid for it.

He simply could not bear taking orders from people, for he received enough orders from himself.

So, I chose another way.

Through the generosity of my parents and through the private lessons I gave, I was financially better off than he was, and, therefore, I helped him wherever I could, preferably without his realising it at all, for he was very touchy and sensitive in these matters.

Only on our walks and excursions did he consent to be my guest.

Later, when we had already parted, Adolf found, in Vienna, a very characteristic solution for this problem, which enabled him to make a modest living and still remain his own Master.

As his talent was best suited to drawing works of architecture rather than the human figure, he made most accurate and neat sketches of famous Vienna buildings, such as the « Karlskirche », the House of Parliament and similar subjects, coloured them and sold them whenever he could.

Having no expert knowledge, I cannot give any opinion on the special studies Adolf was, then, pursuing.

Moreover, I was too busy myself to get any real idea of his work. What I noticed, however, was that he surrounded himself increasingly with technical books.

I recall especially a big history of architecture because he loved to choose one of its pictures at random, cover the caption, and tell me what it was, Chartres Cathedral, for instance, or the « Palazzo Pitti » in Florence.

His memory was prodigious ; it never failed him and was, of course, a great advantage in his work.

He worked tirelessly on his drawings. I had the impression that he had already learnt, in Linz, the basic principles of draughtsmanship, though only from books. I do not remember Adolf ever having tried to apply in practice what he had learnt, or ever attending classes in architectural drawing.

He never showed any desire to mix with people who shared his own professional interests, or to discuss with them common problems.

Rather than meet people of specialized knowledge, he would sit alone on his bench in the Schönbrunn Park, holding imaginary conversations with himself about the subject matter of his books.

This extraordinary habit of studying a certain subject and penetrating deeply into its very essence, while anxiously avoiding any contact with its practical application, this peculiar self-sufficiency, reminded me of Adolf's relationship with Stefanie.

His boundless love of architecture, his passionate interest in building remained fundamentally a mere intellectual pastime. Just as he used to rush to the « Landstraße » to see Stefanie when he needed some tangible confirmation of his feelings, so he would escape from the over-powering effects of his theoretical studies into the « Ringstraße » , and recover his inner-equilibrium among its splendours.

As time went on, I came to understand my friend's one-sided preference for the « Ringstraße » , although, to my mind, the impact of such buildings as Saint-Stephen's, or the Belvedere (older and more original in their style) was stronger and more convincing.

But Adolf, altogether, disliked Baroque, as it was too ornate for his taste.

The « Ringstraße » buildings had been constructed after the demolition of the city's fortifications ; that is to say, in the 2nd half of the past Century, and were anything but uniform in style.

On the contrary ! Almost every style was represented.

The House of Parliament was in the Classic, or rather pseudo-Hellenic style, the Town Hall neo-Gothic, and the « Burgtheater » , an object of Adolf's special admiration, late-Renaissance. Yet, they had one thing in common which was especially attractive for my friend-their ostentation.

But the real motive for his unceasing preoccupation with these buildings, his use of the « Ringstraße » as his professional training-ground, was the fact that these buildings of the preceding generation enabled him to study without difficulty the history of their construction, to redraw their plans, to re-erect, so to speak, by his own effort every single structure, and to recall the life and achievements of the great architects of that epoch : Theophil Hansen, Gottfried Semper, Karl von Hasenauer, August Sicard von Sicardsburg and Eduard van der Nüll.

I discovered with apprehension that new ideas, experiences and projects disorganised my friend's professional studies. As long as these new interests had some connection with architecture, they became just part of his general education, but there was much that was diametrically opposed to his professional plans, and, moreover, politics gained an increasingly firm hold on him.

I asked Adolf, occasionally, what connection there was between the remote problems which we encountered during our

visits to Parliament and his professional preparation.

He would answer :

« You can build only when you have 1st created the political conditions for it. »

Sometimes, his answers were rather rude.

Thus, I remember him, once, answering my question as to how he proposed to solve a certain problem :

« Even if I had found the solution to this problem, I wouldn't tell it to you because you wouldn't understand it. »

But although he was often brusque, moody, unreliable and far from conciliatory, I could never be angry with him because these unpleasant sides of his character were over-shadowed by the pure fire of an exalted soul.

I stopped asking him questions about his profession. It was much better for me to go quietly my own way and show him my own ideas of how to reach one's goal. After all, I had not even reached the lower-classes of the technical school and had only been to a council school, but just the same, I was now a student at the Conservatory, as good as any boy who had matriculated. But my friend's studies took just the opposite course to mine.

While normally, training for a profession grows more and more specialized in the course of time, Adolf's studies became more general, more diffuse, more abstract and remote from anything practical.

The more tenaciously he repeated his own slogan, « I want to become an architect. » , the more nebulous did this goal become in reality.

It was the typical attitude of a young man who would actually be hindered by a profession in reaching what he feels is his true vocation. That was always the case with my friend.

Books were his whole world. In Linz, in order to procure the books he wanted, he had subscribed to 3 libraries. In Vienna, he used the « Hofbibliothek » so industriously that I asked him once, in all seriousness, whether he intended to read the whole library through which, of course, earned me some rude remarks. One day, he took me to the library and showed me the big reading-room. I was almost overwhelmed by these enormous masses of books, and I asked him how he managed to get what he wanted. He began to explain to me the use of the catalogue, which confused me even more.

Hardly anything would disturb him when he was reading. But sometimes he disturbed himself, for as soon as he opened a book he started talking about it, and I had to listen patiently whether I was interested in the subject or not.

Every now and then, in Linz even more frequently than in Vienna, he would thrust a book into my hands and demand that I, as his friend, should read it. It did not matter so much to him that I should widen my own horizon as that he should have somebody with whom he could discuss the book, even though that somebody was only a listener.

As I have mentioned before, outstanding among his books were the German heroic legends. Whatever his mood or external circumstances, he always came-back to them and read them again, although he already knew them all by heart.

The volume which he had in Vienna was, I believe, entitled : « Legends of Gods and Heroes : the Treasures of Germanic Mythology » .

Already in Linz, Adolf had started to read the Classics.

Of Goethe's « Faust » , he once remarked that it contained more than « the human mind could grasp » .

Once he saw, at the « Burgtheater » , the rarely-performed 2nd part, with Joseph Kainz in the title-role.

Adolf was very moved and spoke of it for a long time.

It is natural that, of Schiller's works, « Wilhelm Tell » affected him most deeply.

On the other hand, strange to relate, he did not like « Die Räuber » very much. He was profoundly impressed by Dante's « Divine Comedy » although, to my mind, he was much too young when he read it.

I know that he was interested in Herder, and we saw together Lessing's « Minna von Barnhelm » . He liked Stifter, partly perhaps because he encountered in his writings the familiar picture of his native landscape, while Rosegger struck him, as he once put it, as too « popular » .

Every now and then, he would choose books which were then in vogue but, in order to form a judgment of those who read them, rather than of the books themselves.

Ganghofer meant nothing to him, while he greatly praised Otto Ernst, with whose works he was familiar.

Of modern plays we saw Frank Wedekind's « Frühlingserwachen » , and « Der Meister von Palmyra » by Wilbrandt.

Adolf read Ibsen's plays in Vienna without being very much impressed by them.

As for philosophical works, he always had his Schopenhauer by him, later Nietzsche, too.

Yet, I knew little about these, for he regarded these philosophers as, so to speak, his own personal affair - private

property which he would not share with anybody.

This reticence was possibly also due to the fact that we shared a love of music and this provided us with common ground more rewarding than that of philosophy, which for me was rather a remote subject.

In conclusion, I should like to stress the same point with regard to my friend's reading that I have mentioned before, in describing his professional studies : he read prodigiously and, with the help of his extraordinary memory, stored-up an amount of knowledge which was far above the normal standard of a 20 year old - but he avoided any factual discussion about it.

When he urged me to read a certain book, he knew in advance that I would never be his equal in any argument, and it is even possible that he selected the books which he recommended me to read with this thought in mind.

He was not interested in « another opinion » , nor in any discussion of the book.

His attitude to books was the same as his attitude to the world in general. He absorbed with fervour everything he could lay his hands on, but he took great care to keep at a safe distance from anything that might put him to the test.

He was a seeker, certainly, but even in his books, he found only what suited him.

One day, when I asked him if he really intended to complete his studies by the aid of books alone, he looked at me, surprised, and barked :

« Of course, you need teachers, I can see that. But for me they are superfluous. »

In the further course of this conversation, he called me an « intellectual scrounger » and a « parasite at other people's tables » .

I never felt, and particularly not in those days when we were living together in Vienna, that he was seeking anything concrete in his piles of books, such as principles and ideas for his own conduct ; on the contrary, he was looking only for confirmation of those principles and ideas he already had.

For this reason, his reading, except perhaps the German Mythology, was not a matter of edification, but a sort of check-up on himself.

I remember him, in Vienna, expounding his many problems and usually winding-up with a reference to some book :

« You see, the man who wrote this is of exactly the same opinion. »

HITLER AND THE OPERA

The high-spots of our friendship were our visits together to the « Hofoper » , and memories of my friend are inseparably connected with these wonderful experiences.

The Theatre in Linz saw the beginning of our youthful friendship, and this was re-affirmed whenever we visited the foremost Opera House in Europe.

As we grew older, the contrasts between us made themselves increasingly noticeable and the difference in our family backgrounds, our professional aspirations and our attitude to public and political life separated us more and more. Yet, our fervent enthusiasm for everything that was beautiful and noble, which found its highest-artistic expression in the performances of the Vienna Opera, linked us ever more closely.

In Linz, our relationship had been smooth and harmonious. But, in Vienna, the conflicts and tensions grew, largely owing to our living together in a single-room.

It was fortunate that, at the same time, the influence of our common artistic experience fortified our friendship.

True to tradition, we humble poverty-stricken students had to fight hard for the chance of seeing those performances. It is true that, in theory, there existed cheap tickets for the « Promenade » which, in Vienna, as in Linz, used to be our aim ; but we never got one, not even through the Conservatory. So, we had to pay the full-price (2 Crowns) a lot of money, when one thinks that Adolf, after having paid his rent, was left with 15 Crowns for the whole month. And although we paid full-price, we had to fight hard to get these tickets, the sale of which started only 1 hour before the performance began.

Having finally secured the ticket, there started a rush towards the « Promenade » , which fortunately was not far from the box-office.

It was below the Imperial box and one could hear excellently.

Women were not admitted to the « Promenade » , which pleased Adolf hugely but, on the other hand, it had the disadvantage of being split-up into 2 halves by a bronze railing ; one for civilians, one for the military.

These young lieutenants who, according to my friend, came to the Opera less for the sake of the music than, for social reasons, paid only 10 Hellers for their tickets, while we, poor students, were fleeced 20 times that amount.

This always made Adolf very wild.

Looking at these elegant lieutenants who, ceaselessly yawning, could hardly wait for the interval to display themselves in the foyer as though they had just come out of their box, he said that among the visitors to the « Promenade » ,

artistic understanding varied in inverse proportion to the price of the tickets. Moreover, the military half of the « Promenade » was never full, while in the civilian half students, young employees and artisans trod on each others' toes.

One disadvantage was that the « Promenade » was usually the haunt of the claque, and this often spoiled our pleasure.

The usual procedure was very simple : a singer who wanted to be applauded at a certain point would hire a claque for the evening.

Its leader would buy their tickets for his men and, in addition, pay them a sum of money. There existed professional claqueurs who « worked » at a fixed rate. So, it would often happen that, at a most unsuitable moment, roars of applause would break-out around us. This made us boil with indignation.

I remember once, during « Tannhäuser » , that we silenced a group of claqueurs by our hissing.

One of them, who continued to shout « Bravo » although the Orchestra was still playing, was punched in the side by Adolf.

On leaving the Theatre, we found the leader of the claque waiting for us with a policeman.

Adolf was interrogated on the spot and defended himself so brilliantly that the policeman let him go, but he was in time to catch-up with the claqueur in question in the street and give him a sound box on the ears.

As nobody was admitted to the « Promenade » in hat and coat, we left them behind when we went to the Opera, to save the cloak-room fee.

To be sure, it was often bitterly cold, coming-out of the over-heated Theatre into the night. But what did that matter after « Lohengrin » or « Tristan » ?

What was most annoying for us was that we had to be home by 10 o'clock, at the latest, if we wanted to save the « Sperrsechserl » (the tip for the concierge) . It took us, according to Adolf's precise calculations, at least 15 minutes to walk home from the Opera and, so, we had to leave there at a quarter to 10. The consequence was, that Adolf never succeeded in hearing the end of those Operas which finished later and I had to play for him on the piano what he had missed.

Richard Wagner's music dreams were still the object of our undivided love and enthusiasm.

For Adolf, nothing could compete with the great mystical world that the Master conjured-up for us.

Thus, for instance, when I wanted to see some magnificent Verdi production in the « Hofoper » , he would bully me until I gave-up my Verdi and went with him to the « Volksoper » , in Währing, where they were doing Wagner.

He preferred a mediocre Wagner performance a 100 times to a 1st class Verdi.

I thought differently, but what was the use ? I had to yield, as usual, for when it was a question of a Wagner performance, Adolf would tolerate no opposition. No doubt, he had heard a much better performance of his work in question (I do not remember whether it was « Lohengrin » or « Tristan ») , at the « Hofoper » . But this was not the point at issue.

Listening to Wagner meant to him, not a simple visit to the Theatre, but the opportunity of being transported into that extraordinary state which Wagner's music produced in him, that trance, that escape into a mystical dream-world which he needed in order to endure the tensions of his turbulent nature.

The standard of the cast and Orchestra at the « Volksoper » was remarkably high and much superior to anything we had been accustomed to in Linz.

Another advantage was that one could get a cheap seat there without having to line-up at the box-office.

What displeased us was the cold, modernistic style of the building, and the dull, un-imaginative inside of the Theatre, which was matched by the lack of glamour in its productions.

Adolf used to call this Theatre : the « Soup-Kitchen » .

Our Theatre-going in Linz had given us the grounding for the full-enjoyment in Vienna of the immortal Master's work. We were thoroughly familiar with his Operas, without having been spoiled and, consequently, the « Hofoper » and even the more modest Theatre in Währing seemed to create anew for us Richard Wagner's world.

Of course, we knew by heart « Lohengrin » , Adolf's favourite Opera (I believe he saw it 10 times during our time together in Vienna) , and the same is true of « Die Meistersinger » . Just as other people quote their Goethe or Schiller, we would quote Wagner, preferably « Die Meistersinger » . We know, of course, that Wagner intended to immortalize his friend Franz Liszt in the figure of Hans Sachs, and to attack his bitter enemy Eduard Hanslick, in the person of Beckmesser.

Adolf often quoted from the 3rd Scene of the 2nd Act :

« And still I don't succeed.
I feel it and, yet, I cannot understand it.
I can't retain it, nor forget it,
And if I grasp it, I cannot measure it. »

In this, my friend saw the unique, eternal formula with which Richard Wagner castigated the want of comprehension of his contemporaries and which, so to speak, applied to his own fate ; for his father, his family, his teachers, although they certainly had « felt » that there was something outstanding about him, for the love of God could not understand it.

And when people had, at long last, grasped what he wanted, they still remained incapable of « measuring » the extent of his will.

These lines were for him a daily exhortation, a never failing comfort which helped him in his dark hours.

We studied, with libretto and score, those works of Wagner that we had not seen in Linz.

So, Wagnerian Vienna found us well-prepared and, naturally enough, we entered at once the ranks of his worshipers, and, wherever we could, we acclaimed the work of the Master of Bayreuth with fervent enthusiasm.

What had been for us the height of artistic experience in Linz was reduced to the level of poor, well-intentioned provincial performances after we had seen the perfect Wagner interpretations by Gustav Mahler at the Vienna « Hofoper » . But Adolf would not have been Adolf if he had contented himself with regretful memories.

He loved Linz, which he always thought of as his home-town, although both his parents were dead and there was only one human being left there to whom he was passionately devoted, Stefanie, who still did not know what she meant to the pale youth who had stood and waited for her, day after day, at the Schmiedtoreck.

The cultural life of Linz had to be brought to a level commensurate with that of Vienna : with savage determination Adolf set to work.

On leaving Linz, he had put great hopes in the Theatre Building Society, of which he had become an enthusiastic member. But these worthies who had got together to give Linz a new, dignified Theatre apparently were making no headway. Nothing was ever heard of it and Adolf's impatience grew. So, he started working on his own.

He took pleasure in applying to his own home-town that style of monumental architecture that he had become familiar with in Imperial Vienna.

He had already removed from the central area of the town the railway station with its ugly work-shops, smoke-stained sheds and cumbersome railway tracks and transferred it to the outskirts. This enabled him to enlarge the Park and add a Zoo, a Palm House and, of course, an illuminated fountain. It was in the centre of this well-tended park that the new Linz Opera House should be erected, smaller in size than the Vienna « Hofoper » , but its equal in technical equipment. The old Theatre was to become a Playhouse and was to be put under the same direction as the Opera. In this way, my friend got over the deplorable conditions of his home-town and all the greater was the enjoyment

that he derived from Vienna's artistic attractions.

We saw almost all Richard Wagner's works.

« The Flying Dutchman », « Lohengrin », « Tannhäuser », « Tristan und Isolde », « Die Meistersinger » have remained unforgettable to me, as has « The Ring », and even « Parsifal » .

Occasionally, of course, Adolf saw other Operas as well, but they never meant as much to him as Wagner's.

In Linz, we had already seen a surprisingly good « Figaro », which had filled Adolf with delight. I still remember him saying, on our way home, that the Linz Theatre should in future concentrate on Operas which, like « Figaro », were within their scope.

A production of Mozart's « The Magic Flute », on the other hand, was a complete failure, and Weber's « Freischütz » was so bad that Adolf never wanted to see it again.

But in Vienna, of course, every thing was different.

We saw perfect performances, not only of the Mozart Operas, but also of Beethoven's « Fidelio ». Italian Opera never attracted Adolf, although Italian composers like Donizetti, Rossini, Bellini and especially Verdi, as well as Puccini, who was then still very modern, were highly-appreciated in Vienna and played to full-houses.

The Verdi Operas we saw together were « The Masked Ball », « Il Trovatore », « Rigoletto » and « La Traviata », but « Aïda » was the only one which he liked at all.

For him, the plots of Italian Operas laid too much emphasis upon theatrical effect. He objected to trickery, knavery and deception as the basic elements of a dramatic situation.

He said to me, once :

« What would these Italians do if they had no daggers ? »

He found Verdi's music too un-pretentious, relying too much on melody.

How rich and varied by comparison was Wagner's range ! One day, when we heard an organ grinder playing « La donna e mobile », Adolf said :

« There's your Verdi ! »

When I replied that no composer was safe from such profanation of his works, he barked at me furiously :

« Can you imagine “ Lohengrin ” 's narration on a barrel organ ? »

Neither Gounod, whose « Faust » he regarded as vulgar, nor Tchaikovsky, nor Smetana met with his approval.

No doubt, he was handicapped here by his obsession with German mythology.

He rejected my contention that music should appeal to all races and nations.

For him, nothing counted but German ways, German feeling and German thought.

He accepted none but the German Masters. How often did he tell me that he was proud to belong to a people who had produced such Masters.

When he listened to Wagner's music, he was a changed man ; his violence left him, he became quiet, yielding and tractable.

His gaze lost its restlessness ; his own destiny, however heavily it may have weighed upon him, became unimportant. He no longer felt lonely and outlawed, and misjudged by society. He was intoxicated and bewitched.

Willingly, he let himself be carried away into that mystical universe which was more real to him than the actual work-a-day world. From the stale, musty prison of his back-room, he was transported into the blissful regions of Germanic antiquity, that ideal world which was the lofty goal for all his endeavours.

30 years later, when he met me again, in Linz, his friend whom he had last seen as a student of the Vienna Conservatory, he was convinced that I had become an important conductor ; but, when I appeared before him as a humble municipal employee, Hitler, then, « Reich » Chancellor, said to me :

« So, you have become a pen-pusher ? But you are an artist. We'll talk about it. »

With these words, he was probably alluding to the possibility of my assuming the direction of an Orchestra.

I declined, gratefully. I no longer felt-up to the task.

When he realized that he could not help his friend with this generous offer, he recalled our common experiences in the Linz Theatre and in the Vienna « Hofoper » , which had elevated our friendship from the common-place to the sacred sphere of his own world, and invited me to come to Bayreuth.

I should never have thought that those outstanding artistic experiences of my Vienna student days could still be surpassed. And, yet, this was the case.

For what I experienced in Bayreuth as the guest of the friend of my youth was the culmination of everything that Richard Wagner had ever meant in my life.

ORCHESTRAL MUSIC

My friend's interest in music was gratifyingly broadened in Vienna.

Having previously been interested in Opera only, he now turned increasingly to concerts.

To be sure, even in Linz, he had frequented the Symphony concerts organized by the « Musikverein » , and must have heard in those years altogether, say, 6 or 7 concerts. But he came less for the sake of the music than for my sake, as I was playing in the Orchestra, a fact that was important to him. With my quiet, compliant nature, he did not think me capable of playing in public and, each time, he was eager to see the result. At any rate, I remember that, after the performances, he used to speak much more about me than about the concert.

Vienna changed all this, helped by the fact that, at the Conservatory, I was given 2 or sometimes 3 concert tickets every week. Adolf always got one of these, sometimes even 2 or all 3, when I was prevented from going by my evening practice. As these free-tickets were usually for good seats, this was not such a strain as going to the « Hofoper » .

In discussing these concerts with him, I noticed to my surprise that Adolf was developing a taste for Symphonic music. This pleased me because it created for us a new common interest.

The head of the Conductors' School of the Conservatory, Gustav Gutheil, was also the conductor of the Vienna Concert Society. But our special favourite was Ferdinand Löwe, the director of the Conservatory, who occasionally conducted the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra ; he was a great admirer of Anton Bruckner. The musical life of Vienna, at that time, was still dominated by the Brahms-Bruckner controversy, although both Masters had been dead for over 10 years. Eduard Hanslick, the formidable music-critic, whom we always called « Beckmesser » , was also dead, but his pernicious influence was still noticeable. Hanslick who was our declared enemy, if only because he had attacked Richard Wagner violently and not always fairly, had firmly supported Brahms and fought furiously against Bruckner. In Ferdinand Löwe, on the other hand, Bruckner had an inspired partisan ; and, also, Franz Schalk, later director of the Vienna Opera, was a Bruckner supporter.

For our part, we had no difficulty in making-up our minds in this controversy. I loved Bruckner and Adolf, too, was thrilled and moved by his Symphonies. Besides, Bruckner came from our part of the country and, in exalting his work, we were exalting our homeland. Yet, this was no reason for us to reject Brahms. In this dispute, we regarded ourselves as representatives of the younger generation, paid our tribute to both Masters and smiled at the zeal of the older people, which seemed to us utterly superfluous. As for Adolf, he went even further. Just as Bayreuth had become the centre of Richard Wagner's most impressive work, he said, so Linz should become the shrine of Anton Bruckner's works.

The Linz Concert-Hall, plans for which he had just finished, should be consecrated to Bruckner's memory.

Apart from the great Symphonies by the Classical Masters, Adolf liked especially the music of the Romanticists, Carl Maria von Weber, Franz Schubert, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and Robert Schumann. He was sorry that Richard Wagner had written only for the stage and not for the concert-hall, so that usually only the Overtures or some of his Operas were performed.

I must not forget Edward Grieg, of whom Adolf was particularly fond and whose Piano Concerto in A minor always delighted him.

In general, Adolf was not very partial to virtuoso performances by soloists.

But certain Concertos he never missed, such as Mozart and Beethoven's Piano and Violin Concertos, Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto in E minor and, above all, Schumann's Piano Concerto in A minor.

EPILOGUE

« I believe that it was the will of God to send a boy from here into the “ Reich ”, to make him great, to raise him up to be the “ Führer ” of the nation. »

(Adolf Hitler)

Later contact with Hitler

After seeing Hitler on the front-page of the « Münchner Illustrierte » (around 1920), Kubizek followed his friend's career with some interest, although he did not attempt to contact him until 1933 when he wrote to congratulate him on having become Chancellor of Germany. 6 months later, Kubizek received an unexpected reply from Hitler, who wrote to his old friend « Gustl », saying :

« I should be very glad to revive, once more, with you those memories of the best years of my life. »

30 After Hitler had broken-off contact with Kubizek, the 2 friends were re-united on April 9th, 1938, during one of Hitler's visits in Linz. The 2 spoke for over an hour at the Hotel Weinzinger and Hitler offered Kubizek the conductorship of an Orchestra, which Kubizek politely refused. Upon learning of his friend's 3 sons, Hitler did, however, insist on financing their educations at the Anton Bruckner Conservatory in Linz. Hitler later invited Kubizek to attend the Bayreuth Festival as his guest, in 1939, and again, in 1940, experiences described by Kubizek as :

« The happiest hours of my earthly existence. »

In 1938, Kubizek was hired by the Nazi Party to write 2 short propaganda booklets called « Reminiscences » about

his youth with Hitler. In one episode, Kubizek said Hitler had a great love for a girl named « Stefanie » and wrote her many love-poems but never sent them. Hitler biographer, John Toland, noted that, when Stefanie learned she had been an early object of Hitler's affection, she was stunned.

Kubizek saw Hitler for the last time on July 23rd, 1940, although as late as 1944, Hitler sent Kubizek's mother a food-basket for her 80th birthday.

His friend told him :

« This War will set us back many years in our building programme. It is a tragedy. I did not become Chancellor of the Greater German “ Reich ” to fight wars. »

The « Führer » was speaking after the successful campaigns in Poland and France.

When the tide began to turn against Hitler's favour, Kubizek, who had avoided politics all his life, became a member of the NSDAP in 1942, as a gesture of loyalty to his friend.

After a course of 4 years intensive study at the Vienna Conservatory, I was engaged as assistant-conductor by the Municipal Theatre in Marburg an der Drau and opened my career there with Lortzing's « Der Waffenschmied » .

I was very happy about this 1st, independent job. Although the town was smaller than Linz, it was very interested in art. I produced several good light Operas, of which, in particular, Flotow's « Martha » had a great success.

At the end of the season, I moved, with my Orchestra, to Bad Pystian to conduct the music there for the summer season.

My engagement in Marburg continued for the following season and I was already completely at home in that bright little town.

The support which I encountered on all sides increased my youthful self-assurance and spurred on my enthusiasm. One night, after a 1st performance of « Eva » , the director called me to his box and introduced me to the Head of the Klagenfurt Municipal Theatre, who was looking for an Opera conductor. He was, apparently, so impressed by my performance that he engaged me on the spot for the next season.

So, in the early summer of 1914, at the close of the season in Marburg, on my way home to Linz, I broke my journey in Klagenfurt and made some enquiries about my future sphere of activities.

A good Orchestra, 40 strong, a nice house, a modern stage, and all this in the capital city of Carinthia, renowned for its love of music.

Here, I could give « Lohengrin » , perhaps, even « Die Meistersinger » .

What more could I ask ? Truly, the heavenly violins were, almost literally, already playing for me.

Then, so near to their fulfillment, my youthful dreams disappeared in the fire of the Russian batteries when, a few months later, as a reservist of the Austro-Hungarian Infantry Regiment No. 2, I experienced my baptism of fire on the Galician front.

This was not the music I had dreamed of. Although I was so unsuited to soldiering, I tried, like all my comrades, to do my duty.

This endeavour brought me, after the frightful winter of 1915 in the Carpathians, to the wretched field hospital of Eperjes, in Hungary.

The sick and severely wounded were taken to Budapest, a terrible journey of 7 days ; at all the larger stations, the dead were unloaded.

I had given-up hope and had already calculated at which station they would dump me.

By a miracle, I survived all the horrors and miseries of this journey - but my strength was gone forever.

When, after months of sickness, I was so much improved as to be able to visit my parents again, there too, I found everything changed.

My father, worn-out by work and betrayed in his fond hope of handing-over to his only son the firm he had so painstakingly built-up had given-up the business in 1916 and had bought a small farm at Fraham, near Eferding.

There, he sought to regain his health but, in vain, and, while I was at the front for a 2nd time, in September 1918, he died in all the misery and despair that filled those days.

How I wish I could have made his old age happier !

The end of the War came while I was with a transport formation in Vienna and, here, on November 8, 1918, I was demobilized. What should I do now ?

All the provincial Theatres were closed, so, I travelled to Vienna to look for some kind of job.

To be sure, both the State Theatres were still open, but it was hopeless to try to get a position in one.

The Orchestra in which, for many years, while studying, I had earned my keep as a cellist had been disbanded. Nothing

remained but a few dance bands in the big « cafés » .

No, that was no good for me. For some while, I conducted a 6 piece band in one of the new cinemas, a band that was supposed to « provide the musical illustration » for the silent-films, but I got no satisfaction out of this. I tried to get a job as a cellist or, at least, to get some occasional engagements of this kind, but with no success. Nor was there any demand for private lessons.

I was at the end of my tether when a letter came from my mother.

She wrote me that, in the town of Eferding, they were advertising for a Secretary to the Council.

With all her mother's guile, she knew how to make this far from attractive job seem more palatable to me.

She had told the Mayor of my musical ability and added that, in addition, they would like the future Council Secretary to re-organize the « Musikverein » that had broken-up during the War and to undertake its direction.

I went home and looked into the proposition ; the salary was small and the artistic possibilities seemed very limited. But, meanwhile, I had given-up hope of becoming a professional conductor and, mainly to please my mother, I sent in my application. Then, I returned to Vienna still hoping to get into an Orchestra.

There, in January 1920, I received a notification from the Mayor advising me that the job of Secretary to the Council had been awarded to me out of a list of 38 applicants.

Thus, I became a civil servant.

Gradually, I became familiar with the work and, some years later, I passed the Upper-Austrian State examination for municipal employees.

It was a humble job but it left me free to give myself up to my music. I built-up a respectable Orchestra and, soon, the musical life of the little town began to develop very well indeed.

What with the quiet chamber music of a string quartet, the open-air performances of the brass band and the gala performances of the Choral Society there was much satisfying and successful work for me.

Throughout all this period, I never succeeded in getting any news of the friend of my earlier years who had deserted me in such a strange fashion and I had finally given-up trying. Besides, I had no idea how to try to find-out about him.

His brother-in-law, Raubal, was long since dead.

Angela, his sister, was no longer living in Linz. Anything might have happened to my friend.

That he was a better soldier than I had been, I was convinced ; perhaps he, like so many of our generation, had been killed.

Now and again, I would hear talk of a German politician who was called Adolf Hitler. But I thought it must refer to some other man who happened to have the same name.

After all, the name of Hitler was not so un-common. I imagined that if, ever again, I heard of my erstwhile friend it would be to learn that he had become an important architect or, at least, an artist, not just some insignificant politician, least of all in Munich.

Then one evening, as I was crossing our quiet market-square, for no particular reason, I stopped to look into the book-shop.

There, in the show window lay the « Münchner Illustrierte » .

On the front-page was the picture of a man in about the middle 1930's with small, pale features - I recognized him the very first moment.

That was Adolf ; he had hardly changed at all.

I reckoned how long it was since the days when we had lived together on the « Stumpergasse » - 50 years !

The face seemed to have become sterner, more mature, more manly, but hardly any older.

The caption read :

« The well-known National-Socialist orator, Adolf Hitler. »

So, my friend was, in fact, one and the same as that politician of whom there was so much talk. I was very sorry that he, like myself, had not been able to achieve an artistic career. I knew only too well what it meant to bury all one's hopes and dreams.

And, now, he had to earn his living by making speeches at meetings.

A hard job, although he was indeed a good and convincing speaker - I had had proof of that often enough.

I could also understand his interest in politics, but politics was a thankless task as well as being dangerous. I was glad that, if only through my professional position, I was obliged to hold myself aloof from political events as, now,

being Town Clerk, I had to work in the interests of all the townfolk alike, without any distinction.

But my friend went full-steam ahead into politics and I was not at all surprised that his stormy activities of which I read in the papers landed him in jail, at Landsberg.

But he turned-up again and the press gave him more space than ever. His political ideas, which gradually found supporters in Austria too, did not surprise me in the least because, fundamentally, they were the same as those he used to expound to me, admittedly still confused and exaggerated, in Vienna.

When I read his speeches, I could actually see him in front of me, striding up and down in the gloomy back-room in the « Stumpergasse », between the door and the piano, holding forth unceasingly.

In those days, I was his only listener ; now, his audience was counted in thousands.

One heard his name everywhere and, soon, they were asking :

« Where does he come from, this Hitler ? »

Well, I was certainly in a better position than many others to tell them.

Did I not still have letters and drawings of his ?

I had forgotten all about them but, now, I climbed-up to the loft and there it still stood, the old wooden chest that had remained in my parents' house, at Fraham, until the time my mother sold the little farm and moved in with me, bringing it with her.

I found the key and unlocked the chest. And, in fact, there lay a large blue envelope bearing the name « Adolf Hitler », written in my hand.

I could not recollect this envelope. In the frightful happenings of the War and the misery that followed I had completely forgotten about it, just as my friend, too, would have faded slowly from my mind if he had not appeared again, as a politician.

I opened the envelope ; there were my friend's post-cards, letters and drawings, though certainly only a part of those I had received from him. But, nevertheless, some well worthy of interest ; I re-read his cards and letters.

What should I do with them ?

Should I send him back the whole correspondence. But why ? He had other things to do now than to warm-up old boyhood memories.

Perhaps, he had long since forgotten the lanky, music-mad carpenter's apprentice whom he had met in the Linz Theatre.

Should I write to him ?

That, too, seemed to me pointless, as even in those days, he had scorned me for my feeble interest in politics and, now, he would be more than ever disappointed in me.

So, I contented myself with reading what the newspapers said about him.

His supporters could now be counted by the million.

Without stepping onto Austrian soil he managed, with his radical conceptions and ideas, to bring excitement and unrest to our shrunken little Austria, and this was even more reason for me to keep quiet.

It might seem incomprehensible that, after Adolf had made himself a name as a politician, I did not immediately try to get in touch with him.

But, yet, looking back, I must say this : our boyhood friendship had sprung from our common interest in art ; politics had no attraction for me and, so, I no longer felt drawn towards Adolf who, in turn, could not be expected to have any interest in me.

Then, on January 30th, 1933, I heard the news that Adolf Hitler had become « Reich » Chancellor. Immediately, I thought back to that night on the Freinberg when Adolf had described to me how he, like Rienzi, would rise to be the Tribune of the people.

What the 16 year old had seen then, in a visionary's trance, had really come to pass.

So, I sat-down and wrote a few lines to « The “ Reich ” Chancellor Adolf Hitler, in Berlin. »

I didn't expect any reply.

A Chancellor had more important things to do than to answer the letter of one August Kubizek, from Eferding, with whom he had been friendly a quarter of a Century earlier.

But it seemed to me, politics apart, the right thing to do as a former friend to congratulate him on the position he had reached.

But, one day, to my great astonishment, I received the following letter :

To the Town Clerk « Herr » AUGUST KUBIZEK, Eferding, Upper-Austria.

ADOLF HITLER

Munich, August 4th, 1933 The Brown House

My dear Kubizek,

I have only just been shown your letter of February 2nd.

In view of the hundreds of thousands of letters I have received since January, this is not to be wondered at.

So much the greater was my pleasure to receive news of you after so many years and to have your address.

I should be very glad (once the period of my hardest struggles is past) to revive, once more with you, those memories of the best years of my life.

Perhaps, you could come to visit me. With all good wishes to you and your mother, I remain, in memory of our old friendship.

Yours, ADOLF HITLER

So, he had not forgotten me.

That, in spite of all the strain of his work, he remembered me made me very happy. He called the years we had spent together the « best years » of his life.

So, he had already forgotten the misery that went with them and only the exuberance of his youth remained a fond memory. But the end of the letter caused me some embarrassment.

He wrote :

« Perhaps, you could come to visit me. »

That was easier said than done. I couldn't just simply go up to his house on the Obersalzberg and say :

« Here, I am. »

Besides, this reunion would only have been a nuisance to him.

What could I have told him ?

My own life, compared with his, was un-important and un-interesting ; to tell him about Eferding would only bore him.

And for the rest, I had nothing to relate.

So, I let the matter rest and persuaded myself that this friendly invitation was just a formal courtesy, like the stereotyped greetings at the end of his letters ; 25 years ago to my parents, now only for my mother.

Of course, it is very nice when a friend is so consistent in his behaviour, but I thought it was nonsense to be equally consistent in the continuance of our friendship, as fate had only too obviously cast us into paths so widely divergent. On March 12th, 1938, however, on the very spot where his father had once served as a customs official, Adolf Hitler crossed the frontier.

The German Army marched into Austria. On the evening of March 12th, Adolf Hitler addressed the assembled populace from the balcony of the Linz Town Hall, which was still as modest and as shabby as it had been in our youth.

I should have liked to have gone to hear him speak, but I was so busy with the billeting of the German troops that I could not leave Eferding.

But, when Hitler came again to Linz, on April 8th, and stayed at the Hotel Weinzinger after a political demonstration at the Kraus locomotive works, I did make an attempt to see him.

The Square, in front of the hotel, was crammed with people, but I made my way through to the cordon of S.A. men and told them that I would like to speak to the Chancellor.

At 1st, they gave me a queer look, probably thinking I was mad.

Only after I had shown them one of Hitler's letters did they prick-up their ears.

They called over an officer and, when he too had seen the letter, he let me through immediately and conducted me to the entrance-hall of the hotel but, in there, it was like a bee-hive ; generals were standing around in groups waiting and discussing events.

Ministers of State whom I recognized from the illustrated papers, high-up Party leaders and other uniformed personalities came and went. A.D.C.s, recognizable by their gleaming shoulder tabs, strode busily about.

And all this exciting activity centred around the man to whom I, too, wished to speak. I became quite giddy and

realized that it had been foolish of me to come.

I had to accept the fact that my erstwhile friend had become « Reich » Chancellor and this highest-position in the State had created between us an un-bridgeable gulf.

The years when I had been the only one to whom he gave his friendship and when he had confided to me the most intimate affairs of his heart, were definitely over.

Therefore, the best thing I could do was to disappear quietly and not be a nuisance to these high-ranking gentlemen who un-doubtedly were there on most important missions.

One of the senior A.D.C.s, Albert Bormann to whom I had confided my request, soon approached me and told me that the « Reich » Chancellor was not very well and would not be receiving anybody else that day ; would I come again tomorrow at lunch-time. Bormann, then, invited me to sit-down for a moment as there were things he wished to ask me. Had the Chancellor in his youth always gone to bed so late ? he inquired plaintively ; he never went to bed before midnight and slept far into the morning, whereas his entourage who were obliged to stay-up late with him in the evening had to be up and about early the next day.

Bormann went on to complain about Hitler's outbursts of temper which nobody could cope with and about his queer diet, which consisted of meatless dishes, puddings and fruit juices.

Had the Chancellor always eaten thus ?

I said yes, only adding that, in his youth, he had still been fond of meat.

With this, I took my leave. This Albert Bormann was a brother of the well-known Martin Bormann.

The next day, again, I went to Linz.

Everybody was out in the streets, which were packed with people, and the closer I got to the Hotel Weininger the thicker became the throng.

Finally, I managed to fight my way through to the hotel and, once more, took-up my obscure position in the foyer.

The excitement and agitation was even greater than the previous day.

For this was the eve of the plebiscite in Austria.

It can be imagined that all big decisions had to be taken by Hitler himself.

At any rate, I could not have chosen a more unfortunate moment for our reunion than this.

I recalled that, at the beginning of July, 1908, we had said goodbye in the hall of the « Westbahnhof » ; today was April 9th, 1938. So, almost exactly 30 years had passed between our abrupt separation and today's meeting - always supposing this did take place. 30 years : a whole lifetime ! And what world-shaking events these 30 years had brought.

I had no illusions about what would happen if Hitler did see me.

A brief hand-shake, perhaps, a familiar clap on the shoulder, a few friendly, hasty words in passing - I would have to be satisfied with this modest portion.

For my part, I had prepared a few suitable words but I was somewhat worried about the form of address.

I couldn't possibly call the « Reich » Chancellor, « Adolf » . I knew what a stickler for form he was. It would be best to keep to the formal mode of address.

But, then, I didn't even know if I would get as far as making the little speech.

The memory of what really did happen is naturally influenced by my deep emotional feelings at the time.

As Hitler suddenly came-out of one of the hotel rooms, he recognized me immediately and with the joyful cry, « Gustl ! » , he left his entourage standing there and came and took me by the arm. I still remember how he took my out-stretched right-hand in both of his and held it firmly and how his eyes, which were still as bright and as piercing as ever, gazed into mine.

He was obviously moved, just as I was. I could hear it in his voice.

The worthy gentlemen in the hall looked at each other.

Nobody knew this curious civilian whom the « Führer » and Chancellor greeted with such warmth.

Then, I pulled myself together and delivered myself of the speech I had prepared. He listened attentively, smiling slightly.

When I had finished he nodded at me, as if to say, « You've learnt it well, “ Gustl ” » or, perhaps even, « And, now, my boyhood friend talks to me just like all the others » .

But to me, any familiarity on my part seemed out of place.

After a little pause he said, « Come with me » , using the formal mode of address, « Sie » . Perhaps, through my prepared speech, I had forfeited that familiar « Du » which he had used in his letter of 1933.

But, to tell the truth, I was relieved to hear him use « Sie » .

The Chancellor preceded me to the lift.

We went-up to the 2nd floor where he had his rooms ; the A.D.C. opened the door.

We entered ; the A.D.C. left. We were alone.

Once more, Hitler took my hand, gazed at me for a long time and said :

« You are just the same as you always were, Kubizek. I should have recognized you immediately anywhere. You have not changed at all, just got older. »

Then, he led me to the table and invited me to take a seat. He assured me how glad he was to see me, once again, after so long.

He had been particularly pleased with my congratulations, as nobody knew better than I what a hard fight he had had.

The present moment was not suitable for a heart-to-heart talk, but he hoped to have an opportunity for it in the future.

He would let me know ; it was not advisable to write to him direct as such letters often never even reached him, and all had to be carefully gone through to save his time.

« I no longer have a private life as in those days, and can't do just what I want like other people. »

With these words, he rose and went over to the window which looked-out onto the Danube. The old iron bridge which, even in his boyhood, used to annoy him still stood there. As was to be expected, he started immediately :

He exclaimed :

« That ugly thing, still there ! But not for much longer, you can be sure of that, Kubizek. »

And, then, he turned to me again and smiled :

« Just the same I'd like to stroll across the old bridge with you, once again. But that's no longer possible. Wherever I

go, I'm surrounded. But, believe me, Kubizek, I've got a lot of plans for Linz. »

Nobody knew that better than I.

As I expected, he propounded, once again, all the plans which had occupied him in his youth as though not 30 years, but, at the most, 3 years had passed since then.

Shortly before he received me, he had driven through the streets of the town to find-out what alterations there had been. Now, he went through each single plan.

The new Danube bridge, which was to be called the Nibelungs Bridge, was to be a Masterpiece. He described to me in detail the shape of the 2 bridge-heads.

Then, he went on to talk (I knew in advance in which order he would discuss things) of the Theatre which, above everything, was going to be equipped with a modern stage.

When the new Opera House, to be built on the site of the ugly station, was ready, that Theatre would only be used for plays and Operettas.

In addition to this, Linz needed a modern concert-hall if it were to be worthy to be known as the « City of Bruckner » :

« I want Linz to have a leading place in culture and I will see that everything is done to this end. »

I thought that, now, the interview was finished.

But, then, Hitler began to speak of setting-up a grand Symphony Orchestra in Linz and, with this, the conversation suddenly took a more personal turn :

« Now, tell me, Kubizek, what have you become ? »

I told him that, since 1920, I had been a municipal employee and, at that moment, had the job of Town Clerk.

He asked :

« Town Clerk, what's that ? »

I was a bit embarrassed.

How could I describe to him briefly what this job really involved ?

While I was still searching for suitable words, he broke-in :

« So, you've become a civil servant, a pen-pusher ! That's not the right thing for you. What has happened to your music ? »

I answered truthfully that the War we had lost had completely ruined my career. I had to get a different job, or starve.

He nodded grimly and said :

« Yes, the War we lost. »

Then, looking at me, he said :

« You won't end your days as a pen-pusher, Kubizek. »

Moreover, he would like once to have a look at this Eferding place I had mentioned.

I asked him if he really meant it.

He remarked :

« Of course, I will come to see you, Kubizek, but my visit will be for you alone. Then, we will go strolling along the Danube. I can't manage it here - they don't leave me alone. »

He wanted to know if I was still so keen on music.

And, now, I was off on my hobby-horse and I told him at length of the musical activities in our little town. Considering the weighty and world-shaking problems that he had to deal with, I was afraid that my recital would bore him ; but I was mistaken. If, to save time, I mentioned something only cursorily, he interrupted me immediately :

« What, Kubizek, you even give Symphonies in this little Eferding ! But that's marvellous. Which Symphonies have you played ? »

I recounted, Schubert's « Unfinished » , Beethoven's 3rd, Mozart's « Jupiter » Symphony, Beethoven's 5th.

He wanted to know how many strong my Orchestra was and how it was composed, was amazed at the details I gave him and congratulated me on my success.

He exclaimed :

« This is where I must help you, Kubizek. Make me out a report and tell me what you need. And how are you getting on, personally ; you are not hard-up ? »

I replied that, while my job brought in only a modest income, it was enough for my needs and, consequently, I had no personal requests.

Astonished, he glanced-up ; it was obviously new to him that one should have no personal wishes.

« Have you any children, Kubizek ? »

« Yes, 3 sons. »

He shouted, impressed :

« 3 sons. »

He repeated it several times with a most earnest expression :

« So, you've got 3 sons, Kubizek. I have no family. I am alone. But I should like to look after your sons. »

I had to tell him all about my boys - he wanted to know every detail. He was pleased that they were all 3 musically gifted and that 2 of them were also clever draughtsmen.

He said to me :

« I shall make myself responsible for the training of your 3 sons, Kubizek. I don't want gifted young people to have such a hard time of it as we had. You know best what we had to go through in Vienna. But the worst time came for me later on, after we had parted. Young talent must no longer be allowed to perish through sheer poverty. Wherever I can help personally, I do, and all the more when it's a question of your children, Kubizek ! »

I hasten to add here that the Chancellor did, indeed, arrange for the musical studies of my 3 sons at the Bruckner Conservatory, in Linz, to be paid through his office and, on his orders, the drawings of my son Rudolf were examined by a Professor of the Academy, in Munich.

I had reckoned on a hasty hand-shake and, here, we were sitting together for a good hour.

The Chancellor rose. I thought the interview was now at an end, and I rose too.

But he only called in his A.D.C. and gave him instructions concerning my sons ; the A.D.C. took the opportunity of reminding him of his youthful letters which were still in my possession.

And, now, I had to spread the letters, post-cards and drawings out on the table. He was greatly surprised to see the number of mementoes I had and asked how these papers had come to be preserved.

I told him of the black-painted trunk in the attic with the pocket in the lid and the envelope bearing the words, « Adolf Hitler » .

He paid particular attention to the watercolour of the Pöstlingberg.

He explained to me that there were certain clever painters who could copy his watercolours, so, exactly that they couldn't be distinguished from the original.

These people carried-on a flourishing business and could always find fools ready to be taken in ; the safest thing was never to let the original out of my hands.

As there had already been attempts to get this material from me, I asked the Chancellor his opinion.

He answered :

« These documents are your own personal property, Kubizek. No one can claim them. »

This led him to speak of Rabitsch's book. Rabitsch had attended the Linz Technical School, a couple of years after Hitler and, certainly with the best of intentions, had written a book about Hitler's school years.

But Hitler was very angry about it because Rabitsch had never known him personally.

He added :

« You see, Kubizek, from the very beginning, I was not in favour of this book being written ; only those who really know me should write about me. If anybody is indicated for it, it is you, Kubizek. »

And turning to his A.D.C. , he added :

« Make a note of that immediately. »

Then, he once more gripped my hand :

« See, Kubizek, it's really necessary that we should meet more often. As soon as it's possible, I will send for you. »

The meeting was over ; in a state of numbness, I left the hotel.

Unrest entered into my quiet, retired life during the following days and I was to discover that it was not all honey to have been the boyhood friend of such a famous man.

Although I had told hardly anybody about it and was determined to be even more discreet in the future, I was soon to experience the draw-backs of having been a friend of Hitler's.

Already in the previous March, I had had a taste of what was in store for me.

Hardly had Austria become part of the German « Reich » , than, one day, a motor-car drew-up at my house in Eferding.

The 3 men in uniform who got-out of it had come direct from Berlin.

They had instructions from the « Führer » to collect from me all the documents relative to his youth and to take them to the Chancellery so that they could be kept in safety.

Luckily, I did not allow myself to be taken in.

As was now clear to me, Hitler, at the time that attempt at confiscation had been made, had no idea that I was in possession of these papers.

It was the independent move of some Party Office which had learned of my existence. In any case, I refused to hand over the papers to the three S.S. men, which seemed to them hardly believable. Evidently, they had expected to find the people in Austria more pliable than I was.

Their brusque manner did not make the desired impression - and to make matters worse this obstinate civilian wasn't even a member of the Party !

Extraordinary what queer fish the « Führer » had chosen for friends in his youth, they must have thought, as they went-off with empty hands.

It was lucky that I had stood firm against this 1st attack.

Those that followed were easier to parry as I could quote Hitler's own words, that these documents were my own personal property.

In the following months, the various Party Offices tried to out-do each other.

As I now learned, often, when among his intimates the conversation turned on his youth, Hitler would refer them to me. « Ask “ Gustl ” » was the stereotyped reply they would get for anything that concerned his youthful experiences. But, now, this « Gustl » , who had previously been more or less out of reach, had with the « Anschluß » suddenly become a German citizen and well within the grasp of all the political departments.

« Reich » Minister Josef Gœbbels sent a very likable young man to me.

His name was Karl Cerff, but his rank and position I have forgotten. Cerff explained to me that they were preparing the publication of a great biography of the « Führer » , of which I was to be in charge of the period 1904-1908. At the appropriate time, I would be called to Berlin so that I could carry-out this work with the help of acknowledged specialists, meanwhile, they would like me to make a start with detailed notes of my memoirs.

I explained to the young man that I could not possibly find the time then as, since the « Anschluß » , we, municipal employees, were overwhelmed with work. He realized that I didn't wish to bind myself and was very, amused at my way of putting it.

But he exhorted me not to underrate my « unique responsibility to History » , as he expressed it. If I so wished, he could easily get me leave of absence.

This, I refused definitely.

So, he departed, promising to come at a « better moment » . But, as the future only brought « worse moments » , I never saw Karl Cerff again. In any case, he had tried to carry-out his ticklish job with tact and charm.

Much more insistent and unpleasant were the instructions that reached me from Martin Bormann, who seemed to feel himself solely responsible for me and my affairs and kept an anxious watch that no one else should come in contact with me.

His letters and orders read as though he had taken a lease on the life of Adolf Hitler and nobody must say or write one word about it without its being examined and agreed on by him.

When he failed in his attempts to get these documents from me to deposit them with the Party Central Office « where they belonged » , as he wrote, he sent me strict orders that these papers should never be given-up without his permission and that no outsider should be permitted a glimpse of them. For this, I certainly didn't need Martin Bormann's admonition - this had always been my intention.

But, when he instructed me to write-out immediately the memoirs of my youthful friendship with Adolf Hitler and submit the draft to him, then, I replied that I should have Ist to talk this over with Hitler himself. This method was a decided success.

In the future, when I was being pressed by any of these bullying gentlemen, I had only to say :

« Excuse me, but I must first discuss your suggestions with the Chancellor personally. What was the name again ? »

This changed their attitude completely and I was, then, handled with the utmost delicacy and care.

In contrast to this, I recollect my meeting with Rudolf Heß with pleasure. He had come to Linz and invited me to call on him ; he sent a car for me which took me to the « Bergbahn » Hotel on the Pöstlingberg.

« Reich » Minister Heß greeted me warmly.

He exclaimed, beaming :

« So, this is Kubizek ! The “ Führer ” has told me so much about you. »

I sensed immediately that this friendliness was really genuine and heartfelt.

Also, through this visit, I was able to confirm an impression I had that, the closer to the Chancellor a person stood, the more he had been told about me.

Rudolf Heß and « Frau » Winifred Wagner were the most fully-informed about Hitler's youth and, consequently, about me.

The Minister invited me to lunch which was served on the beautiful terrace of the hotel.

After the meal, I had to recount to him all my memories in great detail. He frequently commented and, again and again, asked me questions.

I had the feeling that, in a real, human way, Rudolf Heß was much closer to Hitler than many others and I was glad about this. The other gentlemen, too, who were at the table joined-in and we had an animated and unrestrained conversation, markedly different from those dealings with the officials of the Party Central Office.

I was particularly glad that, from this wonderful spot high above the city, I could point-out to the Minister the position of all the places of which we spoke as they lay before us.

Rudolf Heß made a good impression on me with his simple, straightforward manner which differed so much from the behaviour of other, far less important political personalities.

I was only sorry that he appeared so ill.

Meanwhile, in my own country, too, they seemed to have become aware of me.

To be sure I was still not a Party member, which seemed strange to many, as in their opinion, the boyhood friend of Hitler's should actually have been Party member No. 2.

But, even in those days, politically, I had always been a dubious supporter of my friend, not exactly because I actively disagreed with his politics, but politics did not interest me ; or, rather, I did not understand them.

Naturally, too, I was soon flooded with requests for help and support from people who, for one reason or another, were in trouble and wanted me to intercede for them.

I was willing to help, although I had no illusion about my actual influence over political decisions and it was soon made clear to me that being « a boyhood friend of Adolf Hitler's » was not sufficient title to warrant an active interference in these affairs.

It was pointed-out to me, politely but firmly, that this or that particular matter was quite outside my sphere.

As I expected, the visit to Eferding that Hitler had planned did not take place.

Then, suddenly, my state of resignation, induced more by common sense than by sentiment, was broken into by the unexpected arrival of a registered letter from the « Reich » Chancellery. My heart was thudding as I opened the envelope.

There, in its full-glory, printed on the finest hand-made paper stood what was to become the greatest joy of my whole life.

By the command of the « Reich » Chancellor, I was invited to be present at this year's Richard Wagner Festival, in Bayreuth.

I was to report to « Herr » Kannenberg in « Haus Wahnfried » , on July 25th, 1939.

It had always been my greatest desire to make the pilgrimage to Bayreuth to experience a performance of the great Master, there.

But I was not well-off and with my humble position could never even contemplate such a journey.

And, now, suddenly, I was going !

I arrived in good time for the performance ; the Festival, in 1939, opened with « The Flying Dutchman » . An

Orchestra 132 strong - I was bewitched.

The next day, they gave « Tristan und Isolde » , an unforgettable performance.

Thursday, July 27th, « Parsifal » was presented. I had already prepared myself for this, at home, had studied the piano-score and read all the relative literature.

The soft strains of the « Abendmahl » motif were heard, the world around me changed and I lived through the most happy hours of my earthly existence.

With « Götterdämmerung » , on Wednesday, August 2nd, my stay in Bayreuth came to an end. I prepared for my journey home and went, once more, to « Herr » Kannenberg to thank him for his care of me.

He asked me with a meaning smile :

« Must you really leave ? It would be a good idea if you could stay another day. »

I understood his hint immediately and stayed in Bayreuth, till August 3rd.

At 2 o'clock in the afternoon, an S.S. officer came to fetch me ; it was not far to « Haus Wahnfried » .

In the hall, « Obergruppenführer » Julius Schaub was waiting for me and he led me to a large salon where many people, whom I recognized from the former Linz visit or from the illustrated papers, were present.

There stood « Frau » Winifred Wagner in lively conversation with « Reich » Minister Heß.

« Obergruppenführer » Brückner was chatting with « Herr » von Neurath and several generals.

Indeed, there was a preponderance of military personalities present and it struck me that the general situation was very strained, in particular with regard to Poland, and there was even talk of a resort to arms.

I felt very out of place in this tense atmosphere and the same sinking feeling, like stage-fright, that I had experienced in the Hotel Weininger, in Linz, came-back to me. Probably, the « Reich » Chancellor wanted to exchange a few friendly words with me before he went-back to the capital.

With my heart beating wildly, I prepared a few words of thanks. On the far-side of the hall, were large double folding doors.

Suddenly, the A.D.C. standing by these doors signals to « Obergruppenführer » Schaub, whereupon he leads me forward. The A.D.C. opens both doors and steps aside. « Obergruppenführer » Schaub steps in with me and announces :

« “ Mein Führer ”, here is “ Herr ” Kubizek. »

Saying which, he steps-back and closes the doors behind him.

I am alone with the « Reich » Chancellor.

His bright eyes shine with the pleasure of seeing me again and he comes towards me with a beaming face.

Nothing in his behaviour betrays the immense responsibility which rests on his shoulders ; he seems to me just like any ordinary visitor to the Festival.

He, too, shares that happy atmosphere which pervades Bayreuth.

Now, he takes my right-hand in both of his and wishes me welcome.

This heartfelt greeting on this holy spot moves me so much that I can hardly speak.

My expressions of gratitude must have sounded very awkward and I was much relieved when his friendly, « Well, let's sit-down » , released me from my confusion.

I had to tell him all about my journey to Bayreuth, my visits to the various places associated with Wagner and, of course, in the greatest detail, what I thought of the Festival performances.

In doing this, I recovered my self-control and, now, we were talking in just the same way as we had done in our youth about all that enchanted us.

And this brought him round to the Wagner performances we had seen in Linz and Vienna and he exposed to me his plan to make the work of Richard Wagner available to the greatest possible number of the German people.

Ah, how well I knew these plans from long ago ! In his talks of nearly 35 years ago, their fundamentals were already determined. But, now, it was no longer mere fantasy.

6,000 people, he told me, who had previously never been able to afford it were, this year, as a result of excellent organization, among the guests at the Bayreuth Festival. I replied that I, myself, was among the number. He laughed and said (I remember his words exactly) :

« Now, I have you as my witness in Bayreuth, Kubizek, for you were the only one present when as a poor, unknown person, I first gave utterance to these ideas. In those days, you used to ask me how these plans could be realized. And, now, you can see what has come of it. »

He went on to describe to me all that had been done up till then, and what was still going to be done for Bayreuth, almost as though he had to render account to me.

But, now, I had a very concrete problem. In my pocket was a large bundle of post-cards, bearing his picture.

In Eferding and Linz, there were a great number of worthy people whom I could make happy with a photograph with Hitler's autograph.

For some time, I hesitated to bring-out the cards as my desire seemed, then, very common-place.

On the other hand, Hitler was just sitting there at his desk ; if I missed this opportunity, perhaps, I should never get such a one, again. I thought of the people at home and plucked-up courage.

He took the cards and, as he looked for his glasses, I handed him my fountain pen. Then, he signed and I helped him by drying the signatures with the blotting pad.

In the middle of signing the cards, he looked-up, and seeing me standing by with the up-lifted blotter, said smilingly :

« One can see that you're a pen-pusher, Kubizek. But I just don't understand how you can stick to that job. In your place, I'd have cut loose long ago. And, incidentally, why didn't you come and see me much earlier ? »

I was very embarrassed and searched for a suitable excuse.

I said :

« Seeing that you wrote me on the 4th of August, 1933, that you would like to revive our common memories but only when the period of sternest struggle was over. I wanted to wait until then. Besides, until 1938, as an Austrian subject, I would have needed a passport to come to Germany. And I certainly should not have got that if I had revealed the true purpose of my visit. »

He laughed heartily and answered :

« Yes, politically, you were always a child. »

I, too, laughed now because I had expected him to use a different word.

The « fool » of the « Stumpergasse » had, meanwhile, become a « child » .

Then, the « Reich » Chancellor packed the cards together, and got-up.

I thanked him and put them carefully in my coat pocket. Now, I thought, the interview was at an end. Then, he said solemnly :

« Come ! »

He opened the french windows and preceded me into the garden, down the stone steps. Well-tended paths brought us to a high, wrought-iron gate. He opened it.

There, were flowers and shrubs in full-bloom, and the mighty trees, forming a roof above us, threw the place into semi-darkness.

A few more paces and we stood in front of Richard Wagner's tomb.

Hitler took my hand and I could feel how moved he was.

It was quite still ; nothing disturbed the solemn peace.

Hitler broke the silence :

« I am happy that we have met, once more, on this spot which always was the most venerable place for us both. »

I pondered on the inscrutable ways of destiny.

Whoever had known us both, in those days in Vienna, must have been certain that my future was, to all intents and purposes, predictable.

After finishing at the Conservatory, I would start my career as an Opera conductor, a career to which my early successes pointed.

It must have seemed equally certain that Adolf, with his purposeless studies and his disdain for all professional training, would turn-out a failure.

Now, fate had given its verdict.

Here, at Richard Wagner's tomb stood, hand in hand, the 2 poor unknown students from the dark back-room of the « Stumpergasse » .

And what were they now ? The « dead cert » was a little insignificant clerk in a small Austrian town who also dabbled in music ; and the other whose future had been so much in doubt had risen to be the Chancellor of the « Reich » .

And what did the future have in store for us ?

Only one thing could be safely predicted : while the one would remain in his obscurity, whatever might happen the other would go down in history.

Afterwards, the « Reich » Chancellor showed me around « Haus Wahnfried » .

Wieland Wagner, « Frau » Winifred's son and the Master's grandson, was waiting for us at the garden entrance.

He unlocked the various rooms for us and the Chancellor showed me all the relics.

We started our tour with the old building, whose rooms were already familiar to me from pictures.

In the music-room, there was the grand piano at which the Master had worked ; it was left open, a gesture which moved me deeply. I saw also the magnificent library.

Then, Wieland left us and the Chancellor introduced me to « Frau » Wagner, who was obviously pleased to meet me. When our conversation turned on the youthful enthusiasm with which we had dedicated ourselves to the works of the Master, I recalled again that memorable « Rienzi » performance, in Linz. And, now, Hitler evoked for « Frau » Wagner the unique experience of that night, concluding with the words that have remained engraved in my memory :

« In that hour, it began. »

Before we parted, Hitler gave me a few more words of advice.

On my way home, he said, I should stop in Munich and hear the « Reich » Symphony Orchestra, which had been so much on our minds when we were young, and I should also visit the great German Art Exhibition.

He thought it would not be a good thing for us to meet in his home on the Obersalzberg, so he had given orders that I should always be able to come to Bayreuth when he was there.

He said :

« I should like you to be always here, with me. »

And shook me by the hand.

He stood at the garden gate and waved to me as I went.

Soon, I heard the cheers of the crowds greeting him on the « Richard-Wagner-Straße » - the Chancellor was leaving Bayreuth to fly to Berlin.

When, on July 8th, 1940, I received the tickets for the 1st cycle of the Richard Wagner Festival which the Chancellor's office had sent me, I was faced with a dilemma.

War had brought changes to our service and duties at home, too ; would it not be irresponsible of me to leave my urgent tasks to go to Bayreuth ?

True, the Chancellor had expressed the desire to have me, there, with him.

But there was a War on, and nobody was more occupied with it than Hitler himself. Would he even be able to come ? Unlike the previous year, apart from « The Flying Dutchman » , only « The Ring » was performed.

« Frau » Wagner informed me that she had spoken to the « Führer » on the telephone and confirmed that he would be flying straight from his Head-quarters to the performance of « Götterdämmerung » but had to return immediately afterwards.

She added :

« He asked me whether you were here, “ Herr ” Kubizek. He wants to talk to you during the interval. »

On Tuesday, July 23rd, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the trumpets (provided for the occasion by the « Wehrmacht ») sounded the Siegfried motif, announcing the beginning of the Opera. I took my seat and, shortly after, Hitler entered his box.

The « Awakening Motif » , the solemn, fateful tones swelled-out. I forgot my surroundings and gave myself up to the magic of the wonderful work.

During the 1st interval, Wolfgang Wagner came hurriedly to tell me that the « Führer » wanted to see me.

We went to the drawing-room where there were about 20 people standing around in groups engaged in lively conversation.

I could not spot Hitler immediately as he was no longer in civilian clothes but in uniform.

But his personal A.D.C. had already told him of my presence and he came towards me with both hands out-stretched.

He wore a simple grey-green tunic and his face was fresh and sunburnt.

His delight at seeing me seemed to be even deeper, more heartfelt. Perhaps, the War had made him even more serious.

And I represented for him one who had known his youth, a friend who had been at his side during one period of his life.

Hitler took me aside and we stood alone while the other guests continued their conversations at a distance.

He said :

« This year, this is the only performance which I can see. But it can't be helped, there's a War on. »

And, then, with an undertone of anger in his voice :

« This War is holding-up our work of reconstruction for many years. It is a shame. After all, I have not become the Chancellor of the Greater German " Reich " to make war. »

I was astonished to hear the Chancellor speak in this way after the great military victories in Poland and France. Perhaps, he was influenced by the fact that my presence reminded him of his age ; for we had been young together and, as he noticed in me the unmistakable signs of the advancing years, he must have realized that the years must also have left their mark on him, although, in all the time of our acquaintance, I had never seen him looking so strong and healthy.

« This War is robbing me of my best years. You know my plans, Kubizek, you know how much I still want to build. That's what I want to see in my lifetime, you understand ?

You know best how many projects I have made ever since I was young. And only a few of them have I been able to realize so far. I still have so infinitely much to do. Who else is there to do it ?

And, here, I have to stand by and watch the War robbing me of my best years. It is a shame. Time doesn't stand still. We are growing older, Kubizek. Not many more years - and it will be too late to do what remains to be done. »

And with that strangely excited voice so familiar to me from our early years, vibrating with impatience, he began to detail for me his great plans for the future, the development of the « Autobahnen » , of canals, the modernisation of the railways and much else. I was hardly able to follow.

But, once again, as in the previous year, I felt that he wanted to justify himself before me, the witness of his youthful ideas.

I tried to turn the conversation to the experiences we had shared in our youth.

He immediately picked-up a remark of mine and said :

« Poor students, that's what we were. And, Heaven knows, we starved. Off, we used to go with only a crust of bread in our pocket. But all this has changed now. It was only last year that young people went to Madeira in our ships. »

And, so, Hitler came to speak of his cultural plans.

The crowds in front of the Festival Theatre were wanting to see him.

But he had worked himself up to such a state that it was not possible to interrupt him, perhaps, because he felt, just as in our conversations in the gloomy room of « Frau » Zakreys, that I followed him with full-enthusiasm whenever he spoke of art and its problems.

He concluded :

« I am still tied-up by the War. But, I hope it won't last much longer and, then, I'll be able to build again and to carry-out what remains to be done. When that moment comes, I shall call you, Kubizek, and, then, you must stay with me always. »

Outside the trumpets sounded to remind us that the performance was about to continue. I thanked the Chancellor for this demonstration of his friendship and wished him luck and success for the future.

The « Götterdämmerung » came to an end ; it was a performance that moved me to the core.

I walked slowly down the drive leading from the Theatre and noticed that the street was roped-off.

I stopped at the corner of « Adolf-Hitler-Straße » to see the Chancellor, once more.

A few minutes later, a motor column approached along the street. Hitler stood erect in his car ; on either side, close to the ropes, moved the cars of his entourage.

I shall never forget what happened during the next few moments. « Generalmusikdirektor » Karl Elmendorf with « Frau » Lange and Sister Susi, and an old lady, a painter, whose name I don't remember (she was living in the « Haus Wahnfried ») stood with me and congratulated me. I didn't really know why. But, now, the motor column had reached us and was passing at a slow pace.

I was standing near the cordon and I saluted.

At this moment, the Chancellor recognized me and made a sign to the driver.

The column halted and his car approached me.

Hitler smiled at me, leaned-out of his car and, taking my hand, shook it heartily, saying :

« Auf Wiedersehen. »

And as the car moved-off, Hitler turned round and waved farewell.

Then, the column proceeded to the air-field.

Pandemonium broke-out around me.

The by-standers wanted to know who that strange civilian was to whom Hitler had paid so much attention in public. I myself was hardly able to utter a word.

The shouting and pushing grew frightening. Up to this moment, my meetings with the Chancellor had always been in private or, at the most, in the presence of a limited number of people, which had preserved the personal and intimate character of our friendship.

But, now, it had become, so to speak, a matter of public interest and, only now, did I fully understand how much this friendship of my youth really meant.

Everybody wanted to shake hands with me.

My friends tried to give some explanations to the crowd - in vain ! They were unable to make themselves heard.

I was being pushed and knocked about - everybody wanted to see me. Heaven knows what the people thought I was. Perhaps, a foreign diplomat who had come to offer peace - this, at least, would have made the pushing worth while. At long last, I could breathe more freely.

I shouted :

« Ladies and gentlemen, let me go - I'm only a boyhood friend of his ! »

On that 23rd of July, 1940, I saw Hitler for the last time.

Eduard Bloch

Le docteur juif autrichien Eduard Bloch est né le 30 janvier 1872 à Frauenberg, en Bohême du Sud (aujourd'hui,

Hluboká nad Vltavou, en République tchèque) ; et est mort 1er juin 1945 dans le Bronx, New York. Il a pratiqué la médecine à Linz, capitale de la Haute-Autriche. Jusqu'en 1907, Bloch est le médecin de la famille d'Adolf Hitler. Plus tard, après l'annexion de l'Autriche par les Nazis, Hitler assurera une protection spéciale pour Bloch.

Eduard Bloch étudie la médecine à Prague, puis sert comme médecin-officier dans l'armée autrichienne. En 1899, il est en poste à Linz, où il ouvre en 1901, après sa démobilisation, un cabinet médical privé au n° 12 de la « Landstraße », dans une maison de style Baroque, qui sert aussi d'habitation pour lui et sa petite famille : sa femme Emilie (née Kafka) et leur fille Gertrude (« Trude »), née en 1903.

Selon le futur maire de Linz, Ernst Koref, Bloch est particulièrement apprécié par ses patients, principalement par ceux des classes sociales inférieures et les indigents. Il est connu pour se déplacer, même au milieu de la nuit, pour visiter ses malades, en utilisant pour ses visites son « hansom cab » et portant un ostensible chapeau à large bord. Comme la plupart des Juifs de Linz, la famille Bloch est parfaitement assimilée.

Le 1er membre de la famille Hitler que Bloch va voir est le jeune Adolf. En 1904, Hitler est sérieusement malade et est alité avec une sérieuse infection des poumons. Pour cette raison, Hitler est autorisé à abandonner ses études à l'école et à rester chez lui. Cependant, plus tard, en consultant le dossier médical d'Hitler, Bloch affirmera qu'il ne l'a alors soigné que pour des maladies bénignes, rhumes ou angines, et qu'Hitler n'était ni robuste ni chétif. Il affirmera aussi qu'Hitler n'a jamais eu aucune maladie grave quelle qu'elle soit, et encore moins de maladie pulmonaire.

En 1907, la mère d'Hitler, Klara, est diagnostiquée avec un cancer du sein. Elle meurt le 21 décembre dans de grandes souffrances, qui nécessitent des sédatifs souvent donnés par Bloch. En raison de la situation économique de la famille d'Hitler à cette époque, Bloch a travaillé en réduisant ses honoraires, et même parfois sans se faire payer. Hitler qui a alors 18 ans, lui accorde sa gratitude éternelle (« Ich werde Ihnen ewig dankbar sein ») . Il le confirmera dans une carte postale de 1908 écrite à Bloch. Le jeune Hitler exprimera aussi sa gratitude et son respect en offrant à Bloch un de ses tableaux, qui, d'après la fille de Bloch, Gertrude Kren (née en 1903, en Autriche ; décédée en 1992, aux États-Unis) , a été perdu lors des différents déménagements. Même en 1937, Hitler se renseigne sur la situation de Bloch et l'appelle « Edeljude » (noble Juif) .

Bloch aussi a apparemment une certaine affection pour la famille d'Hitler, ce qui va lui servir dans le futur.

Après l'« Anschluß » (l'annexion de l'Autriche par le 3e « Reich ») , en mars 1938, la vie devient très difficile pour les Juifs autrichiens. Le cabinet de Bloch est fermé le 1er octobre. La fille et le gendre de Bloch (son jeune assistant, le docteur Franz Kren : né en 1893, en Autriche ; décédé en 1976, aux États-Unis) émigrent vers les États-Unis.

Bloch, qui a alors 66 ans, écrit à Hitler pour lui demander de l'aide. En réponse, il est mis sous la protection spéciale de la « Gestapo » . C'est le seul Juif de Linz avec ce statut. Bloch reste à la maison avec sa femme, sans être importuné, jusqu'à ce que toutes les formalités pour son émigration aux États-Unis soient réglées.

Sans aucune ingérence des autorités, ils vendent leur maison pour une somme assez importante. Cependant, ils ne sont

autorisés à sortir d'Autriche que la somme de 16 « Reichsmark » ; normalement pour les Juifs, la somme maximale était fixée à 10 « Reichsmark » .

En 1940, Bloch émigre en Amérique et s'installe dans le Bronx, au 2755 Creston Avenue, New York City, mais ne peut exercer en tant que médecin car son diplôme médical n'est pas reconnu. Il meurt d'un cancer de l'estomac à 73 ans, en 1945, pratiquement 1 mois après la mort d'Hitler. Il est enterré au cimetière juif « Beth David » (section D, bloc 3) , à Elmont, New York.

En 1941 et en 1943, Bloch est interrogé par l' « Office of Strategic Services » , l'ancêtre de la « Central Intelligence Agency » , qui désire obtenir des informations sur la jeunesse d'Hitler.

Bloch publie aussi ses mémoires sur sa rencontre avec celui qui deviendra plus tard, le « Führer » , dans la revue « Collier's Weekly » dans lesquelles il fait un tableau remarquablement positif du jeune Hitler, affirmant qu'il se comportait très correctement et qu'il n'était pas un voyou :

« Ceci n'est simplement pas vrai. Quand il était jeune, il était calme, se comportait bien et était habillé avec soin. Il attendait patiemment dans la salle d'attente jusqu'à ce que ce soit son tour puis, comme tous garçons de 14 ou 15 ans, s'inclinait et toujours remerciait le docteur poliment. Comme les autres garçons de Linz, il portait un “ Lederhose ” court et un chapeau vert en laine avec une plume. Il était grand et pâle et paraissait plus grand que son âge. Ses yeux qu'il avait hérités de sa mère, étaient grands, mélancoliques et méditatifs. Dans une certaine mesure, ce garçon vivait renfermé sur lui-même. Quels rêves rêvait-il, je ne sais pas. »

Il indique aussi que le trait le plus frappant d'Hitler, était son amour pour sa mère :

« Bien qu'Hitler ne soit pas dans le sens usuel du terme un garçon à sa maman, je n'ai jamais été témoin d'un attachement aussi profond. Son amour était mutuel. Klara Hitler adorait son fils. Elle l'encourageait à suivre sa propre voie chaque fois que c'était possible. Par exemple, elle admirait ses peintures à l'eau et ses dessins et soutenait ses ambitions artistiques, à l'opposé de son père, quel qu'en soit le coût pour elle-même comme on pouvait le supposer. »

Cependant, Bloch conteste expressément que l'amour d'Hitler pour sa mère soit pathologique.

Dans ses mémoires, il mentionne qu'Hitler était « l'homme le plus triste qu'il n'ai jamais vu » lorsqu'il apprit la mort imminente de sa mère. Il se souvient que Klara Hitler était une femme pieuse et bienveillante. « Elle se retournerait dans sa tombe si elle savait ce qu'il est devenu. » Selon Bloch, après la mort de son père, les ressources financières de la famille étaient maigres. Il écrit que Klara Hitler ne se permettait pas la moindre extravagance et vivait frugalement.

En dépit de l'affection évidente qu'Hitler montrait pour Bloch, l'historien Rudolph Binion croit qu'il fut l'un des facteurs contribuant à l'antisémitisme d'Hitler, qui conduisit plus tard à la « Shoah » . À l'opposé, l'historienne Brigitte

Hamann soutient que l'antisémitisme d'Hitler s'est forgé plus tard, durant les années à Vienne du futur dictateur.

Parmi les autres connaissances de Bloch, on trouve Hedda Wagner, auteure et militante pour les droits des femmes, qui écrivit un livre qui lui est dédié.

Le roman « 1940 » de l'écrivain Jay Neugeboren se passe dans le Bronx et traite d'événements autour d'Eduard Bloch.

...

The Austrian doctor Eduard Bloch was born on 30 January 1872 in Frauenberg, Southern Bohemia (today, Hluboká nad Vltavou, in the Czech Republic) ; and died on 1 June 1945, in Bronx County, New York. He practiced in Linz, the capital of Upper-Austria. Until 1907, Bloch was the physician of Adolf Hitler's family. Hitler later awarded Bloch special protection after the Nazi union of Austria and Germany (« Anschluß ») .

Bloch studied medicine in Prague and, then, served as a medical officer in the Austrian army. In 1899, he was stationed in Linz and opened a private doctor's practice after his discharge in 1901, in the Baroque house at number 12 on the « Landstraße » , where he also lived with his family : his wife, Emilie (« née » Kafka) and their daughter Gertrude, born in 1903. According to Linz's future mayor Ernst Koref, Bloch was held in high-regard, particularly among the lower and indigent social classes. It was generally known that, at any time at night, he was willing to call on patients. He used to go on visits in his hansom, wearing a conspicuous broad brimmed hat. Like most Jews in Linz, at the time, the Bloch family were assimilated.

The 1st member of the Hitler family Bloch was to see was little Adolf. In 1904, Hitler had become seriously ill and was bedridden due to a serious lung ailment. Due to this, he was allowed to abandon his school career and return home. However, after checking Hitler's files, Bloch later maintained that he had treated the youth for only minor ailments, cold or tonsillitis and that Hitler had been neither robust nor sickly. He also stated that Hitler did not have any illness whatsoever, let alone a lung disease.

In 1907, Hitler's mother, Klara, was diagnosed with breast cancer. She died on 21 December after intense suffering involving daily medication with iodoform, a foul-smelling and painful corrosive treatment typically used at the time, and administered by Bloch. Because of the poor economic situation of the Hitler family, Bloch charged reduced prices, sometimes taking no fee at all. The, then, 18 year old Hitler granted him his « everlasting gratitude » for this (« Ich werde Ihnen ewig dankbar sein ») . This showed in 1908 when Hitler wrote Bloch a postcard assuring him of his gratitude and reverence which he expressed with hand-made gifts, as for example, a large wall painting which, according to Bloch's daughter Gertrude (« Trude ») Kren (born in 1903, in Austria ; died 1992, in the United States) was lost in the course of time. Even in 1937, Hitler inquired about Bloch's well-being and called him an « Edeljude » (noble Jew) . Bloch also apparently had a special fondness for the Hitler family which was to serve him well in the future.

After Germany's union with Austria (« Anschluß ») , in March 1938, life became harder for Austrian Jews. After Bloch's medical practice was closed on 1 October 1938, his daughter and son-in-law, Bloch's young colleague Doctor Franz Kren (born in 1893, in Austria ; died in 1976, in the United States) , emigrated overseas.

The 62 year old Bloch, then, wrote a letter to Hitler asking for help and was as a consequence put under special protection by the « Gestapo » . He was the only Jew in Linz with this status. Bloch stayed in his house with his wife undisturbed until the formalities for his emigration to the United States were completed. Without any interference from the authorities, they were able to sell their family home at market value, highly-unusual with the distress sales of emigrating Jews at the time. However, they were allowed to take only the equivalent of 16 « Reichsmark » out of the country ; the usual amount allowed to Jews was a mere 10 « Reichsmark » .

In 1940, Bloch emigrated to the United States and settled in the Bronx, at 2755 Creston Avenue, New York City, but was no longer able to practice medicine as his medical degree from Austria-Hungary was not recognized. He died of stomach cancer in 1945, at age 73, barely 1 month after Hitler's death. He is buried in « Beth David » Cemetery (Section D, Block 3) , Elmont, New York.

In 1941 and 1943, Bloch was interviewed by the Office of Strategic Services (a predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency) to get information about Hitler's childhood.

He also published his memories about the encounter with the later « Führer » in the « Collier's Weekly » in which he painted a remarkably positive picture of young Hitler, saying that he was neither a ruffian nor untidy nor impolite :

« This simply is not true. As a youth, he was quiet, well-mannered and neatly dressed. He waited patiently in the waiting-room until it was his turn, then, like every 14 or 15 year old boy, bowed as a sign of respect, and always thanked the doctor politely. Like many other youngsters of Linz, he wore short “ lederhosen ” and a green woolen hat with a feather. He was tall and pale and looked older than his age. His eyes, which he inherited from his mother, were large, melancholic and thoughtful. To a very large extent, this boy lived within himself. What dreams he dreamed, I do not know. »

Bloch also said that Hitler's most striking feature was his love for his mother :

« While Hitler was not a mother's boy in the usual sense, I never witnessed a closer attachment. Their love had been mutual. Klara Hitler adored her son. She allowed him his own way whenever possible. For example, she admired his watercolor paintings and drawings and supported his artistic ambitions in opposition to his father at what cost to herself one may guess. »

However, Bloch expressly denies the claim that Hitler's love for his mother was pathological.

In his memory, Hitler was the « saddest man I had ever seen » when he was informed about his mother's imminent

death. He remembered Klara, Hitler's mother, as a very « pious and kind » woman.

« Sie würde sich im Grabe herumdrehen, wenn sie wüßte, was aus ihm geworden ist. »

(She would turn in her grave if she knew what became of him.)

According to Bloch, after Alois Hitler's death, the family's financial resources were scarce. He mentioned that Klara had lived frugally and had not indulged in even the smallest extravagance.

Despite the obvious affection Hitler showed to Bloch, the historian Rudolph Binion believes that he was one of the contributing factors to Hitler's anti-Semitism that, later, resulted in the Holocaust. Historian Brigitte Hamann takes the opposite view, arguing that Hitler's anti-Semitism coalesced later, after Hitler's years in Vienna.

Among the other acquaintances of Bloch was Hedda Wagner, an author and supporter of women's rights, who wrote a book dedicated to him. Writer Jay Neugeboren set his novel « 1940 » in the Bronx and focuses on events surrounding Eduard Bloch.

Resumee of interview with Doctor Eduard Bloch (March 5th, 1943)

It was definitely established that Doctor Eduard Bloch treated the Hitler family, in 1906 and 1907 (possibly, also, previous to this date) .

At that time, Hitler's father was dead already. Doctor Bloch's impressions of the family life, « quiet, the only bone of contention being Adolf, who refused to become an official and wanted to become an artist ; his mother backing him against his father » seem to be based on his reading of Heiden's biography rather than on actual knowledge.

The mother was a big, stoutish woman, very pious and kind.

« Sie würde sich im Grab umdrehen, wenn sic wüßte, was aus ihm geworden ist. »

Adolf was a source of worry to her, yet, she seems to have complied with all his deficiencies.

« Wißen Sie, Herr Doktor, der Adolf ist halt noch zu jung. »

The sisters were married already, at that time, and did not live at home any more.

Mother and son lived in a rented apartment, small place, rather poor ; the pension afforded a modest income on which they could just manage to live.

« Eines ist sicher : er (Adolf) hat seine Mutter abgoettisch geliebt ! »

Doctor Bloch stresses that the relationship between mother and son, their reciprocal adoration, was unusual.

Klara Hitler was her husband's 2nd cousin ; daughter of a cousin (?) ; she had been brought-up in his house and seems to have taken care of the household during, at least, his 2nd marriage, possibly also during his 1st ; after his 2nd wife's death, he married her and changed his name. Allegedly for an inheritance (Heiden ??) . She had been her husband's foster daughter since she had been an orphan.

She died from a cancer in her breast ; she was operated on, but it was too late since there were already metastases in the pleura.

Her illness was very painful ; during the last months, Doctor Bloch gave her an injection every day.

No physical deformity ; definitely no tuberculosis ; though tuberculosis was hereditary in the family from the father's side.

Not afraid of the Doctor.

Very good behaviour towards the Doctor. But difficulties at school, always quarrels with school-mates. Allegedly got a hiding from a class-mate, name of Hatschek (Eternit-Hatschek) , who, according to Doctor Bloch, was very much afraid of retaliation when Hitler annexed Austria. Made a gift to the « Gestapo » of his villa (??) .

Difficulties at school obviously a fact. Here, Doctor Bloch speaks of something he knows and he was familiar with, at the time. Adolf did not learn anything ; except drawing and history.

« Das hat mir sein Professor selbst erzählt ... »

During his mother's illness, he had been in Vienna for the 1st time. Post-cards to Doctor Bloch « Ihr ewig dankbarer A.H. » One of them a drawing, obviously copied from a well-known picture, monk with wine-glass. The other (sent from his 2nd and decisive sojourn in Vienna ?) , ordinary post-card.

Reason for going to Vienna : wanted to attend Academy. Was refused. (Here, Doctor Bloch's memories obviously get very much mixed-up with his reading.)

Queer enough, Doctor Bloch mentions a 3rd sister, but no 2nd brother. He had a vague memory that there had been other children who had died in their infancy.

Doctor Bloch :

I knew Adolf Hitler as a boy and as a young man. I treated him many times and was intimately familiar with the

modest surroundings in which he grew to manhood. I attended, in her final illness, the person nearer and dearer to him than all others : his mother.

Ist, I might introduce myself. I was born in Frauenburg, a tiny village in southern Bohemia which, in the course of my lifetime, has been under 3 flags : Austrian, Czechoslovakian and German. I am 69 years old. I studied medicine in Prague, then, joined the Austrian army as a military doctor. In 1899, I was ordered to Linz, capital of Upper-Austria, and the 3rd largest city in the country. When I completed my army service, in 1901, I decided to remain in Linz and practice medicine.

As a city, Linz has always been as quiet and reserved, as Vienna was gay and noisy. In the period of which we are about to speak (when Adolf Hitler was a boy of 13) , Linz was a city of 80,000 people.

The Hitler family moved to Linz in 1903, because, I believe, of the good schools there. The family background is well-known. Alois Schicklgruber Hitler was the son of a poor peasant girl. When he was old enough to work, he got a job as a cobbler's apprentice, worked his way into the government service and became a customs inspector at Braunau, a tiny frontier-town between Bavaria and Austria. Braunau is 50 miles from Linz. At 56, Alois Hitler became eligible for a pension and retired. Proud of his own success, he was anxious for his son to enter government service. Young Adolf violently opposed the idea. He would be an artist. Father and son fought-over this, while the mother, Klara Hitler, tried to maintain peace.

As long as he lived, Alois Hitler persevered in trying to shape his son's destiny to his own desires. His son would have the education which had been denied him ; an education which would secure him a good government job. So, Father Alois prepared to leave the hamlet of Braunau for the city of Linz. Because of his government service, he would not be required to pay the full-tuition for his son at the « Realschule » . With all this in mind, he bought a small farm in Leonding, a Linz suburb.

The family was rather large. In later life, Adolf has so over-shadowed the others that they are, for the better part, forgotten. There was a half-brother Alois, whom I never met. He left home at an early age, got a job as a waiter in London and, later, opened his own restaurant in Berlin. He was never friendly with his younger brother.

Then, there was Paula, the oldest of the girls. She later married « Herr » Rubal, an official in the tax-bureau in Linz. Later still, after her husband's death and her brother's rise to power, she went to Berchtesgaden to become house-keeper at Hitler's villa. Sister Klara, for a while, managed a restaurant for Jewish students at the University of Vienna ; and sister Angela, youngest of the girls, married a Professor Hamitsch at Dresden, where she still lives.

The family had barely settled in their new home, outside of Linz, when Alois, the father, died suddenly from an apoplectic stroke.

At the time, « Frau » Hitler was in her early 40's. She was a simple modest, kindly woman. She was tall, had brownish hair which she kept neatly plaited, and a long, oval face with beautifully expressive gray-blue eyes. She was

desperately worried about the responsibilities thrust upon her by her husband's death. Alois, 23 years her senior, had always managed the family. Now, the job was hers.

It was readily apparent that son Adolf was too young and, altogether, too frail to become a farmer. So, her best move seemed to be to sell the place and rent a small apartment. This she did, soon after her husband's death. With the proceeds of this sale and the small pension which came to her because of her husband's government position, she managed to hold her family together.

In a small town in Austria, poverty doesn't force upon one the indignities that it does in a large city. There are no slums and no serious over-crowding. I do not know the exact income of the Hitler family but, being familiar with the scale of government pensions, I should estimate it at \$ 25 a month. This small sum allowed them to live quietly and decently unnoticed little people in an out-of-the-way-town.

Their apartment consisted of 3 small rooms in the 2 story house at number 9 « Blütenstraße » , which is across the Danube from the main-portion of Linz. Its windows gave an excellent view of the mountains.

My predominant impression of the simple furnished apartment was its cleanliness. It glistened ; not a speck of dust on the chairs or tables, not a stray fleck of mud on the scrubbed floor, not a smudge on the panes in the windows. « Frau » Hitler was a superb house-keeper.

The Hitlers had only a few friends. One stood-out above the others ; the widow of the post-Master who lived in the same house.

The limited budget allowed not even the smallest extravagance. We had the usual provincial Opera in Linz ; not good, and not bad. Those who would hear the best went to Vienna. Seats in the gallery of our Theater, the « Schauspielhaus » , sold for the equivalent of 10 to 15 cents, in American money. Yet, occupying one of those seats to hear an indifferent troupe sing « Lohengrin » was such a memorable occasion that Hitler records it in « Mein Kampf » !

For the most part, the boy's recreations were limited to those things which were free ; walks in the mountains, a swim in the Danube, a free band concert. He read extensively and was particularly fascinated by stories about American Indians. He devoured the books of James Fenimore Cooper, and the German writer Karl May - who never visited America and never saw an Indian.

The family diet was, of necessity, simple and rugged. Food was cheap and plentiful in Linz ; and the Hitler family ate much the same diet as other people in their circumstances. Meat would be served, perhaps, twice a week. Most of the meals they sat-down to consisted of cabbage or potato-soup, bread, dumplings and a pitcher of pear and apple cider.

For clothing, they wore the rough woolen cloth we call « Loden » . Adolf, of course, dressed in the uniform of all small boys ; leather shorts, embroidered suspenders, a small green hat with a feather in its band.

What kind of boy was Adolf Hitler ? Many biographers have put him down as harsh-voiced, defiant, untidy ; as a young ruffian who personified all that is unattractive. This simply is not true. As a youth, he was quiet, well-mannered and neatly dressed.

He was tall, sallow, old for his age. He was neither robust nor sickly. Perhaps, « frail looking » would best describe him. His eyes (inherited from his mother) were large, melancholy and thoughtful. To a very large extent, this boy lived within himself. What dreams he dreamed, I do not know.

Outwardly, his love for his mother was his most striking feature. While he was not a « mother's boy » in the usual sense, I have never witnessed a closer attachment. Some insist that this love verged on the pathological. As a former intimate of the family, I do not believe this is true.

Klara Hitler adored her son, the youngest of the family. She allowed him his own way wherever possible. His father had insisted that he become an official. He rebelled and won his mother to his side. He soon tired of school, so, his mother allowed him to drop his studies.

All friends of the family know how « Frau » Hitler encouraged his boyish efforts to become an artist ; at what cost to herself, one may guess. Despite her poverty, she permitted him to reject a job which was offered in the Post-office, so that he could continue his painting. She admired his watercolours and his sketches of the country-side. Whether this was honest admiration or whether it was merely an effort to encourage his talent, I do not know.

She did her best to raise her boy well. She saw that he was neat, clean, and as well fed as her purse would permit. Whenever he came to my consultation-room, this strange boy would sit among the other patients, awaiting his turn.

There was never anything seriously wrong. Possibly, his tonsils would be inflamed. He would stand obedient and unflinching while I depressed his tongue and swabbed the trouble spots. Or, possibly, he would be suffering with a cold. I would treat him and send him on his way. Like any well-bred boy of 14 or 15, he would bow and thank me courteously.

I, of course, know of the stomach trouble that beset him later in life largely as a result of bad diet while working as a common labourer in Vienna. I cannot understand the many references to his lung trouble as a youth. I was the only Doctor treating him during the period in which he is supposed to have suffered from this. My records show nothing of the sort. To be sure, he didn't have the rosy cheeks and the robust good health of most of the other youngsters ; but, at the same time, he was not sickly.

At the « Realschule » , young Adolf's work was anything but brilliant. Authority for this, I have the word of his former teacher, Doctor Karl Hümer, an old acquaintance of mine. I was « Frau » Hümer's physician. In « Mein Kampf » , Hitler records that he was an indifferent student in most subjects, but that he loved history. This agrees with the recollections of Professor Hümer.

Desiring additional training in painting, Hitler decided he would go to Vienna to study at the Academy. This was a momentous decision for a member of a poor family. His mother worried about how he would get along, I understand that she even suggested pinching the family budget a little tighter to enable her to send him a tiny allowance. Credit to the boy, he refused. He even went farther ; he signed his minute inheritance over to his sisters. He was 18 at the time.

I am not sure of the exact details of what happened on that trip to Vienna. Some contend that he was not admitted to the Academy because of his unsatisfactory artwork. Others accept Hitler's statement that his rejection was due to his failure to graduate from the « Realschule » . In any case, he was home again within a few weeks. It was later in this year (1908) that it became my duty to give Hitler what was, perhaps, the saddest news of his life.

One day, « Frau » Hitler came to visit me during my morning office hours. She complained of a pain in her chest. She spoke in a quiet, hushed voice ; almost a whisper. The pain she said, had been great ; enough to keep her awake nights on end. She had been busy with her household so had neglected to seek medical aid. Besides, she thought the pain would pass away. An examination showed that « Frau » Hitler had an extensive tumour of the breast. I did not tell her of my diagnosis.

I summoned the children to my office, on next day, and stated the case frankly. Their mother, I told them, was a gravely ill woman. Without surgery, I explained, there was absolutely no hope of recovery. Even with surgery, there was but the slightest chance that she would live. In family council, they must decide what was to be done.

Adolf Hitler's reaction to this news was touching. His long, sallow face was contorted. Tears flowed from his eyes. Did his mother, he asked, have no chance ? Only, then, did I realize the magnitude of the attachment that existed between mother and son. I explained that she did have a chance ; but a small one. Even this, shred of hope gave him some comfort.

The children carried my message to their mother. She accepted the verdict as I was sure she would - with fortitude. Deeply religious, she assumed that her fate was God's will. It would never have occurred to her to complain. She would submit to the operation as soon as I could make preparations.

I explained the case to Doctor Karl Urban, the chief of the surgical staff at the Hospital of the Sisters of Mercy, in Linz. Urban was one of the best-known surgeons in Upper-Austria. He was (and is) a generous man, a credit to his profession. He willingly agreed to undertake the operation on any basis I suggested. After examination, he concurred in my belief that « Frau » Hitler had very little chance of surviving but that surgery offered the only hope.

« Frau » Hitler arrived at the hospital one evening, in the early summer of 1908. I do not have the exact date, for my records of the case were placed in the archives of the Nazi Party, in Munich.

In any case, « Frau » Hitler spent the night in the hospital and was operated on the following morning. At the request of this gentle, harried soul, I remained beside the operating table while Doctor Urban and his assistant

performed the surgery.

2 hours later, I drove in my carriage across the Danube to the little house at number 9 « Blütenstraße », in the section of the city known as Urfahr. There, the children awaited me.

The girls received the word I brought with calm and reserve. The face of the boy was streaked with tears, and his eyes were tired and red. He listened until I had finished speaking. He had but one question. In a choked voice, he asked :

« Does my mother suffer ? »

As weeks and months passed after the operation, « Frau » Hitler's strength began visibly to fail. At most, she could be out of bed for 1 hour or 2 a day. During this period, Adolf spent most of his time around the house, to which his mother had returned.

He slept in the tiny bedroom adjoining that of his mother so that he could be summoned at any time during the night. During the day, he hovered about the large bed in which she lay.

An illness such as that suffered by « Frau » Hitler, there is usually a great amount of pain. She bore her burden well ; unflinching and uncomplaining. But it seemed to torture her son. An anguished grimace would come over him when he saw pain contract her face. There was little that could be done. An injection of morphine, from time to time, would give temporary relief ; but nothing lasting. Yet, Adolf seemed enormously grateful even for these short periods of release.

I shall never forget Klara Hitler during those days. She was 48 at the time ; tall, slender and rather handsome, yet, wasted by disease. She was soft-spoken, patient ; more concerned about what would happen to her family than she was about her approaching death. She made no secret of these worries ; or about the fact that most of her thoughts were for her son.

She said repeatedly :

« Adolf is still so young. »

On the day of December 20th, I made 2 calls. The end was approaching. So, the word that Angela Hitler brought me the following morning came as no surprise. Her mother had died quietly in the night. The children had decided not to disturb me, knowing that their mother was beyond all medical aid. But, she asked, could I come now ? Someone in an official position would have to sign the death certificate.

The post-Master's widow, their closest friend, was with the children, having more or less taken charge of things. Adolf, his face showing the weariness of a sleepless night, sat beside his mother. In order to preserve a last impression, he

had sketched her as she lay on her deathbed.

I sat with the family for a while, trying to ease their grief. I explained that, in this case, death had been a saviour. They understood. In the practice of my profession, it is natural that I should have witnessed many scenes such as this one, yet, none of them left me with quite the same impression. In all my career, I have never seen anyone so prostrate with grief as Adolf Hitler.

I did not attend Klara Hitler's funeral, which was held on Christmas Eve. The body was taken from Urfahr to Leonding, only a few miles distant. Klara Hitler was buried beside her husband in the Catholic cemetery, behind the small yellow stucco church. After the others (the girls, and the post-Master's widow) had left, Adolf remained behind ; unable to tear himself away from the freshly filled grave.

A few days after the funeral, the family came to my office. They wished to thank me for the help I had given them. There was Paula, fair and stocky ; Angela, slender, pretty but rather anemic ; Klara and Adolf. The girls spoke what was in their hearts while Adolf remained silent. I recall this particular scene as vividly as I might recall something that took place last week.

Adolf wore a dark suit and a loosely knotted cravat. Then, as now, a shock of hair tumbled over his forehead. His eyes were on the floor while his sisters were talking. Then, came his turn. He stepped forward and took my hand. Looking into my eyes, he said :

« I shall be grateful to you forever. »

That was all. Then, he bowed. I wonder if, today, he recalls this scene. I am quite sure that he does, for in a sparing sense, Adolf Hitler has kept to his promise of gratitude. Favours were granted me which I feel sure were accorded no other Jew, in all Germany or Austria.

During this period (1st years in Vienna) , he took time-out to send me a penny post-card. On the back was a message :

« From Vienna, I send you my greetings. Yours, always faithfully, Adolf Hitler. »

Official Nazi publications also record that I received one of Hitler's paintings : a small landscape. If I did, I am not aware of it. But it is quite possible that he sent me one and that I have forgotten the matter. In Austria, patients frequently send paintings or other gifts to their physicians as a mark of gratitude.

I did, however, preserve one piece of Hitler's artwork. This came during the period in Vienna when he was painting post-cards, posters, etc. , making enough money to support himself. Hitler sent me one of these cards. It showed a hooded Capuchin monk hoisting a glass of bubbling champagne.

Under the picture was a caption :

« Prosit Neujahr. »

On the reverse-side, he had written a message :

« The Hitler family sends you the best wishes for a Happy New Year. In everlasting thankfulness, Adolf Hitler. »

(Reports about confiscation of these souvenirs by the « Gestapo » who issued receipt for them.)

When he left for Vienna, Adolf Hitler was destined to disappear from our lives for a great many years. Not until the beginning of his political career, in 1920, were we, again, to get news of this quiet, polite boy who grew-up among us.

In 1937, a number of local Nazis attended the Party conference at Nürnberg. After the conference, Hitler invited several of these people to come with him to his mountain villa at Berchtesgaden. The « Führer » asked for news of Linz. How was the town ? Were people there supporting him ? He asked for news of me. Was I still alive, still practicing ? Then, he made a statement irritating to local Nazis.

He said :

« Doctor Bloch is an “ Edeljude ” (a noble Jew) . If all Jews were like him, there would be no “ Jewish Question ”. »

About Hitler's return to Linz :

It was a moment of tense excitement. For years, Hitler had been denied the right to visit the country of his birth. Now, that country belonged to him. The elation that he felt was written on his features. He smiled, waved, gave the Nazi salute to the people that crowded the street. Then, for a moment, he glanced-up at my window. I doubt that he saw me but he must have had a moment of reflection. Here was the home of the « Edeljude » who had diagnosed his mother's fatal cancer ; here was the consulting-room of the man who had treated his sisters ; here was the place he had gone as a boy to have his minor ailments attended.

It was a brief moment, then, the procession was gone.

Hitler established himself in the Weinzinger Hotel, particularly requesting an apartment with a view of the Bestling Mountain. This scene had been visible from the windows of his modest apartment where he had spent his boyhood.

The following day, he called in a few old acquaintances : Oberhammer, a loyal Party functionary ; Kubitschek, the musician. Liedel, the watch-maker ; Doctor Hümer, his former history teacher. It was understandable that he couldn't ask me, a Jew, to such a meeting ; yet, he did inquire after me.

Hitler arrived Saturday evening. Sunday, he visited his mother's grave, and reviewed local Nazis as they marched before him. On Monday, Hitler departed for Vienna.

Reports about special treatment by the « Gestapo » . Yellow star removed from home and office of Doctor Bloch. He also was allowed to remain in his apartment (did not have to vacate Linz) . Matter apparently handled « by Berlin » .

About trying to get favour to take life savings with them :

I knew that I could not see Adolf Hitler. Yet, I felt that if I could get a message to him this would, perhaps, give us some help.

If Hitler, himself, was inaccessible, perhaps, one of his sisters would aid us. Klara was the nearest : she lived in Vienna. Her husband had died and she lived alone in a modest apartment in a quiet residential district. Plans were made for my daughter, Gertrude, to make the trip to Vienna to see her. She went to the apartment, knocked, but got no answer. Yet, she was sure that there was someone at home.

She sought the aid of a neighbour. « Frau » Wolf (Klara Hitler) received no one, the neighbour said, except a few intimate friends. But this kind woman agreed to carry a message and report « Frau » Wolf's reply. My daughter waited. Soon, the answer came-back. « Frau » Wolf sent greetings and would do whatever she could. By good fortune, Hitler was in Vienna that night, for one of his frequent but unheralded visits to the Opera. « Frau » Wolf saw him and , I feel sure, gave him the message. But no exception was made in our case.

...

Eduard Bloch (geboren 30. Januar 1872 in Frauenberg , Böhmen ; gestorben 1. Juni 1945 in Bronx, New York City, USA) war der Hausarzt von Adolf Hitlers Eltern.

Bloch studierte als Schüler von Alfred Pribram Medizin in Prag und ging darauf als Arzt zur österreichischen Armee. 1899 wurde er nach Linz in Oberösterreich beordert, wo er im Anschluß an seine Militärzeit 1901 eine Privatpraxis eröffnete. Er heiratete 1902 Lilli Kafka. Sie hatte eine Tochter, Trude. In diese Praxis kam aus der Linzer Vorstadt Leonding zwei Jahre später die Familie Alois Hitlers, der kurz darauf verstarb.

Er war unter anderem der Hausarzt von Adolf Hitlers Mutter Klara. Nachdem 1907 ein Tumor in ihrer Brust diagnostiziert worden war, wurde sie im Linzer Krankenhaus Die Barmherzigen Schwestern behandelt. Die Chancen standen allerdings von vornherein schlecht und Bloch eröffnete dem 18-jährigen Hitler den Ernst der Lage. Eine langwierige Therapie konnte das Leben Klara Hitlers nur noch verlängern, aber nicht mehr retten. Sie verstarb am 21. Dezember 1907. Der Arzt erinnerte sich später, er habe in seiner ganzen Laufbahn noch nie jemanden so leiderfüllt gesehen wie Hitler, der zu seiner Mutter stets eine enge Bindung gehabt hatte.

Deren Tod soll gemäß Rudolph Binion Hitlers Judenhass mit ausgelöst haben, da der Jude Bloch ihren Krebs nicht heilen konnte. Die Tatsachen sprechen jedoch gegen diese These. Bloch hatte mit 300 Kronen ein relativ bescheidenes Honorar verlangt und verzichtete auf einen Zuschlag für die unzähligen Hausvisiten und Behandlungen mit Iodoform und Morphin. Als die Familie am 24. Dezember 1907 zu ihm fuhr, um die Rechnung zu bezahlen und ihm zu danken, verbeugte sich Hitler sogar vor dem Arzt mit den Worten « Ich werde Ihnen ewig dankbar sein » . 1908 schrieb er ihm eine Karte, in der er sich nochmals für seine Bemühungen bedankte. 1937 erkundigte sich Hitler in Berlin bei Besuchern aus Linz nach Bloch, und als er 1938 im Zuge des Einmarsches in Linz Station machte, fragte er bei Hofrat Adolf Eigl sofort nach « seinem guten alten Doctor Bloch » und nannte ihn einen « Edeljuden » .

Nach dem Anschluß Österreichs an Deutschland 1938 wurde Bloch zuerst wie alle anderen jüdischen Ärzte in der Ausübung seines Berufs eingeschränkt ; schon kurze Zeit später erkannte er aber, daß er anscheinend bevorzugt behandelt wurde. Er durfte seine Innenstadtwohnung behalten, bekam kein J in seinen Pass gestempelt und mußte seine Praxis nicht als « jüdisch » kennzeichnen. Die Gestapo konfiszierte allerdings die zwei von Hitler geschriebenen Dankeskarten ; obwohl Bloch sich bemühte, bekam er diese nie zurück. Bei der Gestapo bedeutete man ihm, daß sein Fall von Berlin aus « behandelt » werde. Die Nationalsozialisten wollten Eduard Bloch in der Folge zum « Ehrenarier » machen, was ihm und seiner Familie ein weiteres Leben in Deutschland ermöglicht hätte. Doch Doctor Bloch lehnte diese seltene Auszeichnung ab, da er nicht bereit war, seinen Glauben zu verraten. Daraufhin begnügte die Gestapo sich damit, ihn zu überwachen.

Da die Lebensbedingungen aber immer schlechter wurden und Bloch aus den Reaktionen auf seine Bitte, ihm die beiden Karten von Hitler zurückzugeben, zu erkennen meinte, daß die Protektion durch den Diktator begrenzt war, entschloß er sich zur Emigration. Im November 1940 wanderte das Ehepaar in die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika aus, nachdem andere Mitglieder seiner Familie schon ein Jahr vorher Deutschland verlassen hatten. In den USA übte Bloch seinen Beruf nicht mehr aus, da seine Approbation dort nicht anerkannt war.

Von US-amerikanischen Dienststellen wurde er in den Jahren 1941 und 1943 vernommen, um tiefere Einblicke in die Entwicklung Adolf Hitlers zu bekommen. Bloch selbst veröffentlichte bereits 1941 seine Erinnerungen an Hitler in « Collier's Weekly » .

Er war bekannt mit Hedda Wagner, die eine Patientin war und ihm einen Roman widmete. Er selbst interessierte sich für Bücher von James Fenimore Cooper und Karl May.

...

Soon, the procession arrived - the great, black Mercedes car, a 6 wheeled affair, flanked by motor-cycles. The frail boy I had treated so often (whom I had not seen for 30 years) stood in the car. I had accorded him only kindness ; what was he now to do to the people I loved ? I peered-over the heads of the crowd at Adolf Hitler.

It was a moment of tense excitement. For years, Hitler had been denied the right to visit the country of his birth. Now, that country belonged to him. The elation that he felt was written on his features. He smiled, waved, gave the

Nazi salute to the people that crowded the street. Then, for a moment, he glanced-up at my window. I doubt that he saw me, but he must have had a moment of reflection. Here was the home of the « Edeljude » who had diagnosed his mother's fatal cancer ; here was the consultation-room of the man who had treated his sisters ; here was the place he had gone as a boy to have his minor ailments attended.

It was a brief moment. Then, the procession was gone. It moved slowly into the town square - once, « Franz-Josef-Platz » , soon to be renamed « Adolf-Hitler-Platz » . He spoke from the balcony of the town-hall (« Rathaus ») . I listened on the radio. Historic words : Germany and Austria were now one.

Hitler established himself at the Weinzinger Hotel, particularly requesting an apartment with a view of the Pöstling Mountain. This scene had been visible from the windows of the modest apartment where he spent his boyhood.

The following day, he called in a few old acquaintances : Oberhammer, a local Party functionary ; Kubitschek (Kubizek) , the musician ; Liedel, the watch-maker ; Doctor Hümer, his former history teacher. It was understandable that he couldn't ask me, a Jew, to such a meeting ; yet, he did inquire after me. For a while, I thought of asking for an audience, then, decided this would be unwise.

Hitler arrived Saturday evening. Sunday, he visited his mother's grave, and reviewed local Nazis as they marched before him. Not equipped with uniforms, they wore knicker-bockers, ski pants or leather shorts. On Monday, Hitler departed for Vienna.

Soon, we were brought to a sharp realization of how different things were to be. There were 700 Jews in Linz. Shops, homes and offices of all these people were marked with the yellow-paper banners now visible throughout Germany : « JUDE » (Jew) .

The 1st suggestion that I was to receive special favours came one day when the local « Gestapo » telephoned. I was to remove the yellow signs from my office and home. Then, a 2nd thing happened : my landlord, an Aryan, went to the « Gestapo » headquarters to ask if I were to be allowed to remain in my apartment.

He was told :

« We wouldn't dare touch that matter. It will be handled by Berlin. »

Hitler, apparently, had remembered. Then, something happened that made me doubt.

For no reason whatsoever, my son-in-law, a young physician, was jailed. No one was allowed to see him, and we received no news of him. My daughter went to the « Gestapo » .

She asked :

« Would the “ Führer ” like to know that the son-in-law of his old physician had been sent to prison ? »

She was treated rudely and brusquely for her temerity. Had not the signs been removed from her father's house ? Was not that enough ? Yet, her visit must have had some effect. Within 3 weeks, her husband was released.

My practice, which I believe was one of the largest in Linz, had begun to dwindle as long as 1 year before the arrival of Hitler. In this, I might have seen a portent of things to come. Faithful older patients were quite frank in their explanations. The hatred preached by the Nazis was taking hold with the younger people. They would no longer patronize a Jew.

By decree, my active practice was limited to Jewish patients. This was another way of saying that I was to cease work altogether. For plans were in the making for ridding the town of all Jews. On November 10, 1938, the ruling was issued that all Jews were to leave Linz within 48 hours. They were to go to Vienna. The shock that attended this edict may be imagined. People who had lived all their lives in Linz were to sell their property, pack and depart in the space of 2 days.

I called at the « Gestapo » . Was I to leave ? I was informed that an exception had been made in my case. I could remain. My daughter and her husband ? Since they had already signified their intention of emigrating to America, they also could stay. But they would have to vacate their house. If there was room in my apartment, they would be permitted to move there.

After 37 years of active work, my practice was at an end. I was permitted to treat only Jews. After the evacuation order, there were but 7 members of this race left in Linz. All were over 80 years of age.

It is understandable that my daughter and her husband would wish to take their life savings with them when they departed for America. So would I, when my turn came to depart. Getting any local ruling on such a matter was out of the question. I knew that I couldn't see Adolf Hitler. Yet, I felt that if I could get a message to him he would, perhaps, give us some help.

If Hitler himself was inaccessible, perhaps, one of his sisters would aid us. Klara was the nearest ; she lived in Vienna. Her husband had died and she lived alone in a modest apartment in a quiet residential district. Plans were made for my daughter, Gertrude, to make the trip to Vienna to see her. She went to the apartment, knocked, but got no answer. Yet, she was sure that there was someone at home.

She sought the aid of a neighbour. « Frau » Wolf (Klara Hitler) received no one, the neighbor said, except a few intimate friends. But this kind woman agreed to carry a message and report « Frau » Wolf's reply. My daughter waited. Soon, the answer came-back. « Frau » Wolf sent greetings and would do whatever she could. By good fortune, Hitler was in Vienna that night, for one of his frequent but unheralded visits to the Opera. « Frau » Wolf saw him and, I feel sure, gave him the message. But no exception was made in our case. When our turn came, we were forced to go penniless, like so many thousands of others.

How has Hitler treated an old friend - one who cared for his family with patience, consideration and charity ? Let's sum-up the favours :

I don't believe that another Jew in all Austria was allowed to keep his passport. No « J » (Jew) was stamped on my ration card, once food became scarce. This was most helpful because Jews, today, are allowed to shop only during restricted hours which are often inconvenient. Without the « J » on my card, I could buy at any time. I was even given a ration card for clothes - something generally denied Jews.

If my relations with the « Gestapo » were not precisely cordial, I at least didn't suffer at their hands as did so many others. I was told on good authority, and I can well-believe it, that the bureau in Linz had received special instructions from the Chancellery, in Berlin, that I was to be accorded any reasonable favour.

It is possible, but unlikely, that my War record was particularly responsible for these small considerations. During the War, I had charge of a 1,000 bed military hospital, and my wife supervised welfare work among the sick. I was twice decorated for this service.

« My Patient, Hitler » : A Memoir of Hitler's Jewish Physician

(By Doctor Eduard Bloch.)

« My Patient, Hitler, as told to J. D. Ratcliff » , originally appeared in 2 parts in the March 15th and March 22nd, 1941, issues of Collier's magazine. In those pre-television days, Collier's was one of the most influential and widely-read periodicals in the United States. Regarded by serious historians as an important primary historical source about Hitler's youth, this essay is cited, for example, in the bibliography and reference notes of John Toland's acclaimed biography, « Adolf Hitler » (Doubleday, 1976) . It is also cited as a source in Robert Payne's study, « The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler » (Präger, 1973) and in Louis Snyder's « Encyclopædia of the 3rd “ Reich ” » (McGraw Hill, 1976) . While frankly describing the devastating impact of Hitler's anti-Jewish measures on his own life and career, Doctor Bloch also writes about the teenage Hitler with an honesty and sensitivity that would be almost unthinkable in any large-circulation American magazine today. The complete text of the original 2 part essay, including original sub-titles, is reprinted here, with only a few minor additions in brackets.

We were 3 days out of Lisbon, bound west for New York. The storm on Saturday had been bad but, on Sunday, the sea had subsided. A little before 11 o'clock that night, our ship, the small Spanish liner « Marques de Comillas » , got orders to stop. British control officers, aboard a trawler, wanted to examine the passengers. Everyone was told to line-up in the main lounge.

4 British officers, wearing life jackets, entered. Without comment, they worked their way down the line, scrutinizing passports. There was a feeling of tenseness. Many of those aboard the ship were fleeing ; they thought they had made good their escape from Europe once anchor was hoisted in Lisbon. Now ? No one knew. Perhaps, some of us would be

taken-off the ship.

Finally, it was my turn. The officer in charge took my passport, glanced at it and looked-up, smiling.

He asked :

« You were Hitler's physician, weren't you ? »

This was correct. It would also have been correct for him to add that I am a Jew.

I knew Adolf Hitler as a boy and as a young man. I treated him many times and was intimately familiar with the modest surroundings in which he grew to manhood. I attended, in her final illness, the person nearer and dearer to him than all others : his mother.

Most biographers (both sympathetic and unsympathetic) have avoided the youth of Adolf Hitler. The unsympathetic ones have done this of necessity. They could lay their hands on only the most meager facts. The official Party biographies have skipped-over this period because of the dictator's wishes. Why this abnormal sensitivity about his youth ? I do not know. There are no scandalous chapters which Hitler might wish to hide, unless one goes back over 100 years to the birth of his father. Some biographers say that Alois Hitler was an illegitimate child. I cannot speak for the accuracy of this statement.

What of those early years in Linz, Upper-Austria, where Hitler spent his formative years ? What kind of boy was he ? What kind of a life did he lead ? It is of these things that we shall speak here.

Ist, I might introduce myself. I was born in Frauenburg, a tiny village in southern Bohemia which, in the course of my lifetime, had been under 3 flags : Austrian, Czechoslovakian and German. I am 69 years old. I studied medicine in Prague, then, joined the Austrian army as a military doctor. In 1899, I was ordered to Linz, capital of Upper-Austria, and the 3rd largest city in the country. When I completed my army service, in 1901, I decided to remain in Linz and practice medicine.

As a city, Linz has always been as quiet and reserved, as Vienna was gay and noisy. In the period of which we are about to speak (when Adolf Hitler was a boy of 13 - actually, 14) , Linz was a city of 80,000 people. My consultation rooms and home were in the same house, an ancient Baroque structure on « Landstraße » , the main thoroughfare of the city.

The Hitler family moved to Linz in 1903, because, I believe, of the good schools there. The family background is well-known. Alois Schicklgruber Hitler was the son of a poor peasant girl. When he was old enough to work, he got a job as a cobbler's apprentice, worked his way into the government service and became a customs inspector at Braunau, a tiny frontier town between Bavaria and Austria. Braunau is 50 miles from Linz. At 56, Alois Hitler became eligible for a pension and retired. Proud of his own success, he was anxious for his son to enter government service. Young Adolf

violently opposed the idea. He would be an artist. Father and son fought over this while the mother, Klara, tried to maintain peace.

As long as he lived, Alois Hitler persevered in trying to shape his son's destiny to his own desires. His son would have the education which had been denied him ; an education which would secure him a good government job. So, Father Alois prepared to leave the hamlet of Braunau for the city of Linz. Because of his government service, he would not be required to pay the full-tuition for his son at the « Realschule » . With all this in mind, he bought a small farm in Leonding, a Linz suburb.

The family was rather large. In later life, Adolf has so overshadowed the others that they are, for the better part, forgotten. There was half-brother Alois, whom I never met. He left home at an early age, got a job as a waiter in London and later opened his own restaurant in Berlin. He was never friendly with his younger brother.

Then, there was Paula, the oldest of the girls. She later married « Herr » Rubal, an official in the tax-bureau in Linz. Later still, after her husband's death and her brother's rise to power, she went to Berchtesgaden to become house-keeper at Hitler's villa. Sister Klara, for a while, managed a restaurant for Jewish students at the University of Vienna ; and sister Angela, youngest of the girls, married a Professor Hamitsch at Dresden, where she still lives.

The family had barely settled in their new home outside of Linz when Alois, the father, died suddenly from an apoplectic stroke.

At the time, « Frau » Hitler was in her early 40's. She was a simple, modest, kindly woman. She was tall, had brownish hair which she kept neatly plaited, and a long, oval face with beautifully expressive gray-blue eyes. She was desperately worried about the responsibilities thrust upon her by her husband's death. Alois, 23 years her senior, had always managed the family. Now, the job was hers.

It was readily apparent that son Adolf was too young and, altogether, too fragile to become a farmer. So, her best move seemed to be to sell the place and rent a small apartment. This she did, soon after her husband's death. With the proceeds of this sale and the small pension which came to her because of her husband's government position, she managed to hold her family together.

In a small-town in Austria, poverty doesn't force upon one the indignities that it does in a large city. There are no slums and no serious over-crowding. I do not know the exact income of the Hitler family but, being familiar with the scale of government pensions, I should estimate it at \$ 25 a month. This small sum allowed them to live quietly and decently - unnoticed little people in an out-of-the-way town.

Doctor Eduard Bloch, who was Jewish, treated Hitler as a young man, along with his mother and other members of the Hitler family. This picture of Doctor Bloch in his office in Linz was taken in 1938, on order of Martin Bormann for Hitler's « personal film file » .

The inscription reads :

« The “ Führer ” often sat on the chair beside the desk. »

Their apartment consisted of 3 small rooms in the 2 story house at No. 9 « Blütenstraße », which is across the Danube from the main portion of Linz. Its windows gave an excellent view of the mountains.

My predominant impression of the simple furnished apartment was its cleanliness. It glistened ; not a speck of dust on the chairs or tables, not a stray fleck of mud on the scrubbed floor, not a smudge on the panes in the windows. « Frau » Hitler was a superb house-keeper.

The Hitlers had only a few friends. One stood-out above the others ; the widow of the post-Master who lived in the same house.

The limited budget allowed not even the smallest extravagance. We had the usual provincial Opera in Linz : not good, and not bad. Those who would hear the best went to Vienna. Seats in the gallery of our theater, the « Schauspielhaus », sold for the equivalent of 10 to 15 cents, in American money. Yet, occupying one of these seats to hear an indifferent troupe sing « Lohengrin » was such a memorable occasion that Hitler records it in « Mein Kampf » !

For the most part, the boy's recreations were limited to those things which were free : walks in the mountains, a swim in the Danube, a free band concert. He read extensively and was particularly fascinated by stories about American Indians. He devoured the books of James Fenimore Cooper, and the German writer Karl May (who never visited America and never saw an Indian) .

The family diet was, of necessity, simple and rugged. Food was cheap and plentiful in Linz ; and the Hitler family ate much the same diet as other people in their circumstance. Meat would be served, perhaps, twice a week. Most of the meals they sat-down to consisted of cabbage or potato soup, bread, dumplings and a pitcher of pear and apple cider.

For clothing, they wore the rough woolen cloth we call « Loden » . Adolf, of course, dressed in the uniform of all small boys : leather shorts, embroidered suspenders, a small green hat with a feather in its band.

What kind of boy was Adolf Hitler ? Many biographers have put him down as harsh-voiced, defiant, untidy ; as a young ruffian who personified all that is unattractive. This simply is not true. As a youth, he was quiet, well-mannered and neatly dressed.

He records that, at the age of 15, he regarded himself as a political revolutionary. Possibly. But let us look at Adolf Hitler as he impressed people about him, not as he impressed himself.

He was tall, sallow, old for his age. He was neither robust nor sickly. Perhaps, « frail looking » would best describe

him. His eyes (inherited from his mother) were large, melancholy and thoughtful. To a very large extent, this boy lived within himself. What dreams he dreamed, I do not know.

Outwardly, his love for his mother was his most striking feature. While he was not a « mother's boy », in the usual sense, I have never witnessed a closer attachment. Some insist that this love verged on the pathological. As a former intimate of the family, I do not believe this is true.

Klara Hitler adored her son, the youngest of the family. She allowed him his own way wherever possible. His father had insisted that he become an official. He rebelled and won his mother to his side. He soon tired of school, so his mother allowed him to drop his studies.

All friends of the family know how « Frau » Hitler encouraged his boyish efforts to become an artist ; at what cost to herself, one may guess. Despite their poverty, she permitted him to reject a job which was offered in the post-office, so that he could continue his painting. She admired his watercolours and his sketches of the country-side. Whether this was honest admiration or whether it was merely an effort to encourage his talent, I do not know.

She did her best to raise her boy well. She saw that he was neat, clean and as well-fed as her purse would permit. Whenever he came to my consultation-room, this strange boy would sit among the other patients, awaiting his turn.

There was never anything seriously wrong. Possibly, his tonsils would be inflamed. He would stand obedient and unflinching while I depressed his tongue and swabbed the trouble spots. Or, possibly, he would be suffering with a cold. I would treat him and send him on his way. Like any well-bred boy of 14 or 15, he would bow and thank me courteously.

I, of course, know of the stomach trouble that beset him later in life, largely as a result of bad diet while working as a common labourer in Vienna. I cannot understand the many references to his lung trouble as a youth. I was the only doctor treating him during the period in which he is supposed to have suffered from this. My records show nothing of the sort. To be sure, he didn't have the rosy cheeks and the robust good health of most of the other youngsters ; but, at the same time, he was not sickly.

At the « Realschule » , young Adolf's work was anything but brilliant. As authority for this, I have the word of his former teacher, Doctor Karl Hümer, an old acquaintance of mine. I was « Frau » Hümer's physician. In « Mein Kampf » , Hitler records that he was an indifferent student in most subjects, but that he loved history. This agrees with the recollections of Professor Hümer.

Desiring additional training in painting, Hitler decided he would go to Vienna to study at the Academy. This was a momentous decision for a member of a poor family. His mother worried about how he would get along. I understand that she even suggested pinching the family budget a little tighter to enable her to send him a tiny allowance. Credit to the boy, he refused. He even went further : he signed his minute inheritance over to his sisters. He was 18, at the time.

I am not sure of the exact details of what happened on that trip to Vienna. Some contend that he was not admitted to the Academy because of his unsatisfactory artwork. Others accept Hitler's statement that his rejection was due to his failure to graduate from the « Realschule » - the equivalent of an American high-school. In any case, he was home again within a few weeks. It was later in this year (1908 ; 1907 according to some sources) that it became my duty to give Hitler what was, perhaps, the saddest news of his life.

One day, « Frau » Hitler came to visit me during my morning office hours. She complained of a pain in her chest. She spoke in a quiet, hushed voice ; almost a whisper. The pain, she said, had been great ; enough to keep her awake nights on end. She had been busy with her household so had neglected to seek medical aid. Besides, she thought the pain would pass away. When a physician hears such a story, he almost automatically thinks of cancer. An examination showed that « Frau » Hitler had an extensive tumour of the breast. I did not tell her of my diagnosis.

I summoned the children to my office the next day and stated the case frankly. Their mother, I told them, was a gravely ill woman. A malignant tumour is serious enough today, but it was even more serious 30 years ago. Surgical techniques were not so advanced and knowledge of cancer not so extensive.

Without surgery, I explained, there was absolutely no hope of recovery. Even with surgery, there was but the slightest chance that she would live. In family council, they must decide what was to be done.

Adolf Hitler's reaction to this news was touching. His long, sallow face was contorted. Tears flowed from his eyes. Did his mother, he asked, have no chance ? Only then, did I realize the magnitude of the attachment that existed between mother and son. I explained that she did have a chance ; but a small one. Even this shred of hope gave him some comfort.

The children carried my message to their mother. She accepted the verdict as I was sure she would - with fortitude. Deeply religious, she assumed that her fate was God's will. It would never have occurred to her to complain. She would submit to the operation as soon as I could make preparations.

I explained the case to Doctor Karl Urban, the chief of the surgical staff at the Hospital of the Sisters of Mercy, in Linz. Urban was one of the best-known surgeons in Upper-Austria. He was (and is) a generous man, a credit to his profession. He willingly agreed to undertake the operation on any basis I suggested. After examination, he concurred in my belief that « Frau » Hitler had very little chance of surviving but that surgery offered the only hope.

It is interesting to note what happened to this generous man nearly 3 decades later - after « Anschluß » (union) with Germany. Because of his political connections, he was forced to abandon his position at the hospital. His son, who pioneered in brain surgery, was likewise forced from several offices.

« Frau » Hitler arrived at the hospital one evening, in the early summer of 1908 (1907 ?) . I do not have the exact date, for my records of the case were placed in the archives of the Nazi Party, in Munich. In any case, « Frau » Hitler

spent the night in the hospital and was operated on the following morning. At the request of this gentle, harried soul, I remained beside the operating table while Doctor Urban and his assistant performed the surgery.

2 hours later, I drove in my carriage across the Danube to the little house at No. 9 « Bluetenstraße », in the section of the city known as « Urfahr ». There, the children awaited me.

The girls received the word I brought with calm and reserve. The face of the boy was streaked with tears, and his eyes were tired and red. He listened until I had finished speaking. He has but one question. In a choked voice, he asked :

« Does my mother suffer ? »

As weeks and months passed after the operation, « Frau » Hitler's strength began visibly to fail. At most, she could be out of bed for 1 hour or 2 a day. During this period, Adolf spent most of his time around the house, to which his mother had returned.

He slept in the tiny bedroom adjoining that of his mother so that he could be summoned at any time during the night. During the day, he hovered about the large bed in which she lay.

In illness such as that suffered by « Frau » Hitler, there is usually a great amount of pain. She bore her burden well ; unflinching and uncomplaining. But it seemed to torture her son. An anguished grimace would come over him when he saw pain contract her face. There was little that could be done. An injection of morphine, from time to time, would give temporary relief ; but nothing lasting. Yet, Adolf seemed enormously grateful even for these short periods of release.

I shall never forget Klara Hitler during those days. She was 48, at the time ; tall, slender and rather handsome, yet, wasted by disease. She was soft-spoken, patient ; more concerned about what would happen to her family than she was about her approaching death. She made no secret of these worries ; or about the fact that most of her thoughts were for her son.

She said repeatedly :

« Adolf is still so young. »

On the day of December 20th, 1908 (or 1907) , I made 2 calls. The end was approaching and I wanted this good woman to be as comfortable as I could make her. I didn't know whether she would live another week, or another month ; or whether death would come in a matter of hours.

So, the word that Angela Hitler brought me the following morning came as no surprise. Her mother had died quietly in the night. The children had decided not to disturb me, knowing that their mother was beyond all medical aid. But,

she asked, could I come now ? Someone in an official position would have to sign the death certificate. I put on my coat and drove with her to the grief-stricken cottage.

The post-Master's widow, their closest friend, was with the children, having more or less taken charge of things. Adolf, his face showing the weariness of a sleepless night, sat beside his mother. In order to preserve a last impression, he had sketched her as she lay on her death-bed.

I sat with the family for a while, trying to ease their grief. I explained that, in this case, death had been a saviour. They understood.

In the practice of my profession, it is natural that I should have witnessed many scenes such as this one, yet, none of them left me with quite the same impression. In all my career, I have never seen anyone so prostrate with grief as Adolf Hitler.

I did not attend Klara Hitler's funeral, which was held on Christmas Eve. The body was taken from « Urfahr » to Leonding, only a few miles distant. Klara Hitler was buried beside her husband in the Catholic cemetery, behind the small, yellow stucco church. After the others (the girls, and the post-Master's widow) had left, Adolf remained behind ; unable to tear himself away from the freshly-filled grave.

And so, this gaunt, pale young man stood alone in the cold. Alone with his thoughts on Christmas Eve while the rest of the world was gay and happy.

A few days after the funeral, the family came to my office. They wished to thank me for the help I had given them. There was Paula, fair and stocky ; Angela, slender, pretty but rather anemic ; Klara and Adolf. The girls spoke what was in their hearts while Adolf remained silent. I recall this particular scene as vividly as I might recall something that took place last week.

Adolf wore a dark suit and a loosely knotted cravat. Then, as now, a shock of hair tumbled over his forehead. His eyes were on the floor while his sisters were talking. Then, came his turn. He stepped forward and took my hand. Looking into my eyes, he said :

« I shall be grateful to you forever. »

That was all. Then, he bowed. I wonder if, today, he recalls this scene. I am quite sure that he does, for in a sparing sense, Adolf Hitler had kept to his promise of gratitude. Favours were granted me which I feel sure were accorded no other Jew in all Germany or Austria.

Almost immediately after his mother's funeral, Hitler left for Vienna, to attempt once more a career as an artist. His growth to manhood had been a painful experience for this boy who lived within himself. But ever more trying days were coming. Poor as the family was, he had at least been assured food and shelter while living at home. This

couldn't be said of the days in Vienna. Hitler was entirely engrossed with the business of keeping body and soul together.

We all know something of his life there - how he worked as a hod-carrier on building-construction jobs until workmen threatened to push him off a scaffold. And we know that he shoveled snow and took any other job he could find. During this period, for 3 years, in fact, Hitler lived in a man's hostel, the equivalent of a flop-house in any large American city. It was here that he began to dream of a world remade to his pattern.

While living in the hostel, surrounded by the human dregs of the large city, Hitler says :

« I became dissatisfied with myself for the 1st time in my life. »

This dissatisfaction with himself was followed by dissatisfaction with everything about him - and the desire to alter things to his own liking.

The vitriol of hate began to creep through his body. The grim realities of the life he lived encouraged him to hate the government, labour unions, the very men he lived with. But he had not yet begun to hate the Jews.

During this period, he took time-out to send me a penny postcard. On the back was a message :

« From Vienna, I send you my greetings. Yours, always faithfully, Adolf Hitler. »

It was a small thing, yet, I appreciated it. I had spent a great deal of time treating the Hitler family and it was nice to know that this effort on my part had not been forgotten.

Official Nazi publications also record that I received one of Hitler's paintings : a small landscape. If I did, I am not aware of it. But it is quite possible that he sent me one and that I have forgotten the matter. In Austria, patients frequently send paintings or other gifts to their physicians as a mark of gratitude. Even now, I have half a dozen of these oils and watercolours which I have saved ; but none painted by Hitler among them.

I did, however, preserve one piece of Hitler's artwork. This came during the period in Vienna when he was painting post-cards, posters, etc. , making enough money to support himself. This was the one time in his life that Hitler was able to make successful use of his talent.

He would paint these cards and dry them in front of a hot fire, which would give them a rather pleasing antique quality. Then, other inmates of the hostel would peddle them. Today, in Germany, the few remaining samples of this work are more highly-prized and sought after than the works of Picasso, Gauguin and Cézanne !

Hitler sent me one of these cards. It showed a hooded Capuchin monk hoisting a glass of bubbling champagne. Under the picture was a caption :

« Prosit Neujahr - A toast to the New Year. »

On the reverse side, he had written a message :

« The Hitler family sends you the best wishes for a Happy New Year. In everlasting thankfulness, Adolf Hitler. »

Why I put these cards aside to be saved, I do not know. Possibly, it was because of the impression made upon me by that unhappy boy. Even today, I cannot help thinking of him in terms of his grief and not in terms of what he has done to the world.

Those postal cards had a curious history. They indicated the extent to which Hitler has captured the imagination of some people. A rich Viennese industrialist (I do not know his name because he dealt through an intermediary) later made me an astonishing offer. He wanted to buy those 2 cards and was willing to pay 20,000 Marks for them ! I rejected the offer on the ground that I could not ethically make such a sale.

There is still another story in those 2 cards. 17 days after the collapse of the Schuschnigg government and the occupation of Austria by German troops, an agent of the « Gestapo » called at my home. At the time, I was making a professional call, but my wife received him.

He said :

« I am informed that you have some souvenirs of the “ Führer ”. I should like to see them. »

Acting sensibly, my wife made no protest. She didn't wish to have her home torn apart as so many Jewish homes had been. She found the 2 cards and handed them over.

The agent scribbled a receipt which read :

« Certificate for the safe-keeping of 2 post-cards (one of them painted by the hand of Adolf Hitler) confiscated in the house of Doctor Eduard Bloch. »

It was signed by the agent, named Grömer, who was previously unknown to us. He said I was to come to headquarters the following morning.

Almost as soon as the Nazis entered the city, the « Gestapo » took-over the small hotel on « Gesellenhausstraße » , formally patronized by traveling clergymen. I went to this place and was received almost immediately. I was greeted courteously by Doctor Rasch, head of the local bureau. I asked him why these bits of property had been taken.

Those were busy days for the « Gestapo » . There were many things to be looked after in a town of 120,000 people.

It developed that Doctor Rasch was not familiar with my case. He asked if I were under suspicion for any political activity unfavorable to the Nazis. I replied that I was not ; that I was a professional man with no political connections.

Apparently as an afterthought, he asked if I were a non-Aryan. I answered without compromise :

« I am a 100 % Jew. »

The change that came-over him was instantaneous. Previously, he had been business-like but courteous. Now, he became distant.

The cards, he said, would be retained for safe-keeping. Then, he dismissed me, neither rising nor shaking hands as he had when I entered. So far, as I know, the cards are still in the hands of the « Gestapo » . I never saw them again.

When he left for Vienna, Adolf Hitler was destined to disappear from our lives for a great many years. He had no friends in Linz to whom he might return to visit and few with whom he might exchange correspondence. So, it was much later that we learned of his wretched poverty on those days, and of his subsequent moving to Munich, in 1912 (actually, in May 1913) .

No news came-back of the way in which he fell on his knees and thanked God when War was declared in 1914 ; and no news of his War service as a corporal with the 16th Bavarian Reserve Infantry. We heard nothing of his being wounded and gassed. Not until the beginning of his political career, in 1920, were we again to get news of this quiet, polite boy who grew-up among us.

Occasionally, the local newspapers would run items about the group of political supporters that Hitler was gathering about himself in Munich ; stories of their hatred of the Jews, of the Versailles Peace Treaty, of nearly everything else. But no particular importance was attached to these activities. Not until 20 people died in the « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » of November 8, 1923, did Hitler achieve local notoriety. Was it possible, I asked myself, that the man behind these things was the quiet boy I had known - the son of the gentle Klara Hitler ?

Eventually, even the mention of Hitler's name in the Austrian press was prohibited ; still, we continued to get word-of-mouth news of our former townsman : stories of the persecutions he had launched ; of German re-armament ; of War to come. This smuggled news reached responsive ears. A local Nazi Party sprang-up.

In theory, such a Party could not exist ; it had been outlawed by the government. In practice, authorities gave it their blessings. Denied uniforms, local Nazis adopted methods of identifying themselves to everyone. They wore white stockings. On their coats, they wore a small wild flower, very much like the American daisy and, at Christmas time, they burned blue candles in their homes.

We all knew these things, but nothing was done. From time to time, local authorities would find a Nazi flag on Klara

Hitler's grave, in Leonding, and would remove it without ceremony. Still, the gathering storm in Germany seemed remote. It was quite a while before I got any 1st hand word from Adolf Hitler. Then, in 1937, a number of local Nazis attended the Party conference in Nuremberg. After the conference, Hitler invited several of these people to come with him to his mountain villa at Berchtesgaden. The « Führer » asked for news of Linz. How was the town ? Were people there supporting him ? He asked for news of me. Was I still alive, still practicing ? Then, he made a statement irritating to local Nazis.

Hitler said :

« Doctor Bloch is an “ Edeljude ” (a noble Jew) . If all Jews were like him, there would be no “ Jewish Question ”. »

It was strange and, in a way, flattering that Adolf Hitler could see good in, at least, one member of my race.

It is curious now to look back on the feeling of security that we had by virtue of living on the right side of an imaginary line, the international boundary. Surely, Germany would not chance invading Austria. France was friendly. Occupation of Austria would be inimical to the interests of Italy. Oh, but we were blind, in those days ! Then, we were caught-up in a breathless rush of events. It was with hope that we read of Austrian Chancellor Schuschnigg's trip to Berchtesgaden ; his plebiscite ; his inclusion of Seyß-Inquart in his cabinet. Possibly, we would ride through this crisis untouched. But hope was doomed to death within a very few hours. As soon as Seyß-Inquart was taken into the cabinet, buttons sprouted in every lapel :

« One People, One Realm, One Leader. »

On Friday, March 11th, 1938, the Vienna radio was broadcasting a program of light-music. It was 7:45 at night. Suddenly, the announcer broke in. The Chancellor would speak. Schuschnigg came on the air and said that, to prevent bloodshed, he was capitulating to the wishes of Hitler. The frontiers would be opened, he ended his address with the words :

« Gott schütze Österreich. » (May God protect Austria.)

Hitler was coming home to Linz.

In the sleepless days that followed, we clung to our radios. Troops were pouring over the border at Passau, Kufstein, Mittenwalde, and elsewhere. Hitler, himself, was crossing the Inn River at Braunau, his birthplace. Breathlessly, the announcer told us the story of the march. The « Führer », himself, would pause in Linz. The town went mad with joy. The reader should have no doubts about the popularity of « Anschluß » with Germany. The people favoured it. They greeted the onrushing tide of German troops with flowers, cheers and songs. Church bells rang. Austrian troops and police fraternized with the invaders and there was general rejoicing.

The public square in Linz, a block from my home, was a turmoil. All afternoon, it rang with the « Horst Wessel » song

and « Deutschland über Alles » . Planes droned overhead, and advance units of the German army were given deafening cheers. Finally, the radio announced that Hitler was in Linz.

Advance instructions had been given to the townspeople. All windows along the procession route were to be closed. Each should be lighted. I stood at the window of my home facing the « Landstraße » . Hitler would pass before me.

Soon the procession arrived - the great, black Mercedes car, a 6 wheeled affair, flanked by motorcycles. The frail boy I had treated so often (and whom I had not seen for 30 years) stood in the car. I had accorded him only kindness ; what was he now to do to the people I loved ? I peered over the heads of the crowd at Adolf Hitler.

It was a moment of tense excitement. For years, Hitler had been denied the right to visit the country of his birth. Now, that country belonged to him. The elation that he felt was written on his features. He smiled, waved, gave the Nazi salute to the people that crowded the street. Then, for a moment, he glanced-up at my window. I doubt that he saw me, but he must have had a moment of reflection. Here was the home of the « Edeljude » who had diagnosed his mother's fatal cancer ; here was the consultation-room of the man who had treated his sisters ; here was the place he had gone as a boy to have his minor ailments attended.

It was a brief moment. Then, the procession was gone. It moved slowly into the town-square - once, « Franz-Josef-Platz » , soon to be renamed « Adolf-Hitler-Platz » . He spoke from the balcony of the town-hall. I listened on the radio. Historic words : Germany and Austria were now one.

Hitler established himself in the Weinzinger Hotel, particularly requesting an apartment with a view of the Pöstling Mountain. This scene had been visible from the windows of the modest apartment where he spent his boyhood.

The following day, he called in a few old acquaintances : Oberhammer, a local Party functionary ; Kubitschek (Kubizek) , the musician ; Liedel, the watch-maker ; Doctor Hümer, his former history teacher. It was understandable that he couldn't ask me, a Jew, to such a meeting ; yet, he did inquire after me. For a while, I thought of asking for an audience, then, decided this would be unwise.

Hitler arrived Saturday evening. Sunday, he visited his mother's grave, and reviewed local Nazis as they marched before him. Not equipped with uniforms, they wore knicker-bockers, ski pants or leather shorts. On Monday, Hitler departed for Vienna.

Soon, we were brought to a sharp realization of how different things were to be. There were 700 Jews in Linz. Shops, homes and offices of all these people were marked with the yellow-paper banners now visible throughout Germany : « JUDE » (Jew) .

The 1st suggestion that I was to receive special favours came one day when the local « Gestapo » telephoned. I was to remove the yellow signs from my office and home. Then, a 2nd thing happened : my landlord, an Aryan, went to « Gestapo » headquarters to ask if I were to be allowed to remain in my apartment.

He was told :

« We wouldn't dare touch that matter. It will be handled by Berlin. »

Hitler, apparently, had remembered. Then, something happened that made me doubt.

For no reason whatsoever, my son-in-law, a young physician, was jailed. No one was allowed to see him, and we received no news of him. My daughter went to the « Gestapo » .

She asked :

« Would the “ Führer ” like to know that the son-in-law of his old physician had been sent to prison ? »

She was treated rudely and brusquely for her temerity. Had not the signs been removed from her father's house ? Was not that enough ? Yet, her visit must have had some effect. Within 3 weeks, her husband was released.

My practice, which I believe was one of the largest in Linz, had begun to dwindle as long as 1 year before the arrival of Hitler. In this, I might have seen a portent of things to come. Faithful older patients were quite frank in their explanations. The hatred preached by the Nazis was taking hold with the younger people. They would no longer patronize a Jew.

By decree, my active practice was limited to Jewish patients. This was another way of saying that I was to cease work altogether. For plans were in the making for ridding the town of all Jews. On November 10th, 1938, the ruling was issued that all Jews were to leave Linz within 48 hours. They were to go to Vienna. The shock that attended this edict may be imagined. People who had lived all their lives in Linz were to sell their property, pack and depart in the space of 2 days.

I called at the « Gestapo » . Was I to leave ? I was informed that an exception had been made in my case. I could remain. My daughter and her husband ? Since they had already signified their intention of emigrating to America, they also could stay. But they would have to vacate their house. If there was room in my apartment, they would be permitted to move there.

After 37 years of active work, my practice was at an end. I was permitted to treat only Jews. After the evacuation order, there were but 7 members of this race left in Linz. All were over 80 years of age.

It is understandable that my daughter and her husband would wish to take their life savings with them when they departed for America. So would I, when my turn came to depart. Getting any local ruling on such a matter was out of the question. I knew that I couldn't see Adolf Hitler. Yet, I felt that, if I could get a message to him, he would perhaps give us some help.

If Hitler himself was inaccessible, perhaps, one of his sisters would aid us. Klara was the nearest ; she lived in Vienna. Her husband had died and she lived alone in a modest apartment in a quiet residential district. Plans were made for my daughter, Gertrude, to make the trip to Vienna to see her. She went to the apartment, knocked, but got no answer. Yet, she was sure that there was someone at home.

She sought the aid of a neighbour. « Frau Wolf » (Klara Hitler) received no one, the neighbour said, except a few intimate friends. But this kind woman agreed to carry a message and report « Frau » Wolf's reply. My daughter waited. Soon, the answer came-back. « Frau » Wolf sent greetings and would do whatever she could. By good fortune, Hitler was in Vienna that night, for one of his frequent but unheralded visits to the Opera. « Frau » Wolf saw him and, I feel sure, gave him the message. But no exception was made in our case. When our turn came, we were forced to go penniless, like so many thousands of others.

How has Hitler treated an old friend - one who cared for his family with patience, consideration and charity ? Let's sum-up the favours :

I don't believe that another Jew in all Austria was allowed to keep his passport. No « J » was stamped on my ration card, once food became scarce. This was most helpful because Jews today are allowed to shop only during restricted hours which are often inconvenient. Without the « J » on my card, I could buy at any time. I was even given a ration card for clothes - something generally denied Jews.

If my relations with the « Gestapo » were not precisely cordial, I at least didn't suffer at their hands as did so many others. I was told on good authority, and I can well believe it, that the bureau in Linz had received special instructions from the Chancellery in Berlin that I was to be accorded any reasonable favour.

It is possible, but unlikely, that my War record was particularly responsible for these small considerations. During the War, I had charge of a 1,000 bed military hospital, and my wife supervised welfare work among the sick. I was twice decorated for this service.

Hitler still regards Linz as his true home, and the changes he has wrought are astonishing. The once quiet, sleepy town had been transformed by its « godfather » - an honorary title particularly dear to Hitler. Whole blocks of old houses have been pulled-down to make way for modern apartment houses ; thereby, causing an acute but temporary housing shortage. A new theater has gone-up and a new bridge has been built over the Danube. The bridge, according to local legend, was designed by Hitler himself and plans were already completed at the time of « Anschluß » . The vast « Hermann Göring Iron Works » , built in the past 2 years, is just starting operations. To carry-on, this program of reconstruction whole train-loads of labourers have been imported : Czechs, Poles, Belgians.

Hitler has visited the city twice since the « Anschluß » , once, at the time of the election which was to approve union with Germany ; a 2nd time secretly to see how reconstruction of the town was progressing. Each time had stayed at the Weininger Hotel.

On the 2nd visit, the proprietor of the hotel was informed that Hitler's presence in town was not to be announced ; that he would make his inspection tour in the morning. Delighted at having such an important personage in his house, the proprietor could not resist boasting. He telephoned several friends to give them the news. For this breach of discipline, he paid heavily. His hotel was confiscated.

Many times, I have been approached by Hitler biographers for notes on his youth. In most instances, I have refused to speak. But I did talk to one of these men. He was a pleasant middle-aged gentleman from Vienna, who came from the government department headed by Rudolf Heß, of the Nazi inner-circle. He was writing an official biography. I gave him such details as I could recall, and my medical records which he subsequently sent to the Nazi Party headquarters, in Munich. He stayed in Linz and Braunau for several weeks ; then, the project terminated abruptly. I was told he had been sent to the silence of the concentration camp. Why, I do not know.

When it finally became my turn to leave Linz for America, I knew that it would be impossible for me to take my savings with me. But the « Gestapo » had one more favour for me. I was to be allowed to take 16 Marks from the country instead of the customary 10 !

The Nazi organization of physicians gave me a letter, of what value I do not know, which states that I was « worthy of recommendation » . It went on to say that, because of my « character, medical knowledge and readiness to help the sick » , I had won « the appreciation and esteem of my fellow men » .

A Party official suggested that I was expected to show some gratitude for all these favours. Perhaps, a letter to the « Führer » ? Before I left Linz on a cold, foggy November morning, I wrote it. I wonder if it was ever received. It read :

Your Excellency :

Before passing the border, I want to express my thanks for the protection which I have received. In material poverty, I am now leaving the town where I have lived for 41 years ; but I leave conscious of having lived in the most exact fulfillment of my duty. At 69, I will start my life anew in a strange country where my daughter is working hard to support her family.

Yours faithfully,

Eduard Bloch

Guido von List

Le journaliste, dramaturge, romancier et occultiste autrichien, théoricien de l'armanisme intégral (forme d'aryanisme) , Guido Karl Anton List (mieux connu sous le nom de Guido von List) , est né le 5 octobre 1848 à Vienne et est mort le 17 mai 1919 à Berlin. Auteur d'ouvrages romanesques sur fond de néo-paganisme germanique, et à l'origine de

l'ésotérisme nazi, cher à Heinrich Himmler. D'après l'historien Ian Kershaw, il aurait été le 1er à faire de la croix gammée un symbole aryen. L'alphabet à 18 runes qu'il va inventer, se basant sur les « futhark » récents, a servi de base pour tous les symboles du Nazisme (symboles des divisions SS, etc.) . Il est également à la base de l'idéologie raciale nazie, plaçant les aryens au-dessus des autres peuples.

La Société Guido von List, créée en 1908, est parfois confondue avec la Société Thulé, dont il aurait aussi été membre. Parmi ses membres, on peut citer Karl Heise, figure majeure à Zürich du culte mystico-végétarien Mazdaznan.

...

The Austrian occultist, journalist, playwright, and novelist Guido Karl Anton List (better known as Guido von List) was born on 5 October 1848 in Vienna, then part of the Austrian Empire ; and died on 17 May 1919 in Berlin. He expounded a modern Pagan new religious movement known as Wotanism, which he claimed was the revival of the religion of the ancient German race, and which included an inner set of Ariosophical teachings that he termed Armanism.

Born to a prosperous middle-class family, he was the eldest son of Karl Anton List, a leather goods dealer who was the son of Karl List, a publican and vintner. Guido's mother, Marian List, was the daughter of builder's merchant Franz Anton Killian. List was raised in the city's 2nd District, on the eastern-side of the Danube canal. Like most Austrians at the time, his family were members of the Roman Catholic denomination of Christianity, with List being christened into this faith at Saint-Peter's Church in Vienna. Reflecting the family's wealth and bourgeoisie status, in 1851, a watercolour portrait of List was painted by the artist Anton von Anreiter.

Accounts suggest that List had a happy childhood. Developing a preference for rural areas rather than urban ones, he enjoyed family visits to the countryside of Lower-Austria and Moravia, and (encouraged by his father) , he began to sketch and paint the castles, prehistoric monuments, and natural scenery of these areas. According to his later account, he developed an early interest in the pre-Christian religions of Austria, coming to believe that the catacombs beneath Saint-Stephen's Cathedral, in Vienna, had once been a shrine devoted to a pagan deity. He claimed that, on an 1862 visit to the catacombs with his father, he knelt before a ruined altar and swore that when an adult he would construct a temple to the ancient god Wotan.

Although List wanted to become an artist and scholar, he reluctantly agreed to his father's insistence that he enter the family's leather goods business. During his leisure time, he devoted himself to writing and sketching as well as rambling, riding, or rowing in the countryside, becoming both a member of the Viennese rowing club Donauhört and the secretary of the Austrian Alpine Association (« Österreichischer Alpenverein ») . He was involved in both solitary and group expeditions into the Austrian Alps, and it was on one of the latter journeys that he left his mountaineering group to spend Midsummer night alone atop the Geiselberg hillfort. On 24 June 1875, he and four friends rowed down the Danube before camping for the night at the site of the ancient Roman fortification of « Carnuntum » to commemorate the 1500th anniversary of the Battle of Carnuntum, in which Germanic tribes defeated the Roman Army. List later claimed that while his friends caroused, he celebrated the event with a fire and by burying 8 bottles of wine

in the shape of a Swastika beneath the arch of the monument's Pagan Gate.

In 1877, List's father died. List soon abandoned the leather goods business that he inherited, intent on devoting himself to literary endeavours as a journalist, even if this meant a significant reduction in his income. On 26 September 1878, he married his 1st wife, Helene Förster-Peters. From 1877 to 1887, he wrote for the nationalist magazines « Neue Welt » (New World) ; « Heimat » (Homeland) ; « Deutsche Zeitung » (German Newspaper) ; and the « Neue Deutsche Alpenzeitung » (New German Alpine Newspaper) , with his articles being devoted to the Austrian countryside and the folk-customs of its inhabitants. His interpretations emphasised what he believed were the pagan origins of Austrian place-names, customs, and legends, describing the landscape as being embodied by « genius loci » , and expressing clear German nationalist and « Völkisch » sentiment.

In 1888, List published his 1st novel, « Carnuntum » , in 2 volumes. Set in the late- 4th Century CE, the narrative focused on a romance set against the background of the conflict between Germanic tribes and the Roman Empire around the area of the eponymous Roman fort. The novel established List as a recognized figure within Austria's Pan-German community, a movement of individuals unified in their belief that the majority German-speaking areas of the multi-linguistic and multi-ethnic Austro-Hungarian State should cede and join with the newly-established German Empire. The book also brought him to the attention of Friedrich Wannieck, a wealthy industrialist who was the chairman of both the Prague Iron Company and the 1st Brno Engineering Company. Wannieck was also president of the « Verein “ Deutsches Haus ” » (German House Association) , a nationalist organisation of linguistically German inhabitants of Brno who felt encircled by the largely Czech population of South Moravia. List and Wannieck began corresponding, resulting in a lifelong friendship between the 2 men. The « Verein “ Deutsches Haus ” » subsequently published 3 of List's works in its series on German nationalist studies of history and literature.

List began regularly writing for a weekly newspaper, the « Ostdeutsche Rundschau » (East German Review) , which had been established in 1890 by the Austrian Pan-German parliamentary deputy Karl Wolf. In 1891, List anthologized many of the magazine articles that he had written over the previous decades in his book « Deutsch-Mythologische Landschaftsbilder » (German Mythological Landscape Scenes) , extracts of which were then published in the « Ostdeutsche Rundschau » . Further « Völkisch » articles on various topics pertaining to Austria's folk-culture and to its ancient Germanic tribes followed during the 1890's, although mid-way through that decade his work took on an explicitly anti-Semitic nature with articles such as « Die Juden als Staat und Nation » . Other Austrian German nationalist newspapers which published his articles during this period included the « Bote aus dem Waldviertel » (The Waldviertel Herald) and « Kyffhäuser » .

List began lecturing on these subjects ; for instance, in February 1893, he spoke to the nationalist « Verein “ Deutsches Geschichte ” » (German History Association) on the ancient priesthood of Wotan. He also worked as a playwright and, in December 1894, his play « Der Wala Erweckung » (The Wala's Awakening) was premiered at an event organized by the « Bund der Germanen » (Germanic League) which was devoted to the German nationalist cause, with Jews being explicitly banned from attending the event. Alongside his affiliation with the « Bund » , List was also a member of the « Deutscher Turnverein » (Germanic Gymnastic League) , a strongly nationalistic group to whom he contributed literary works for their events.

In 1893, List and Fanny Wschiansky founded a belletristic society devoted to encouraging German nationalist and neo-Romantic literature in Vienna, the « Literarische Donaugesellschaft » (Danubian Literary Society) . The group was partly based upon the 15th Century « Litteraria Sodalita Danubiana » created by the Viennese humanist Conrad Celte, about whom List authored a brief biography in 1893. He also authored 2 further novels during the 1890's, both of which were historical romances set in Iron Age Germany. The 1st appeared in 1894 as « Jung Diethers Heimkehr » (Young Diether's Homecoming) , which told the story of a young Teuton living in the 5th Century who has been forcefully converted to Christianity but who returns to his original solar cult. The 2nd was « Pipara » , a 2 volume story published in 1895 which told the story of an eponymous Quadi maiden who escaped captivity from the Romans to become an Empress. In 1898, he then authored a catechism exhibiting a form of pagan deism titled « Der Unbesiegbare » (The Invincible) .

List's activities had made him a celebrity within the Austrian Pan-German movement, with the editors of the « Ostdeutsche Rundschau » convening a Guido List evening, in April 1895 ; and South Vienna's Wieden Singers' Club holding a List Festival, in April 1897. Having divorced his previous wife, in August 1899, List married Anna Wittek, who was from Stecky in Bohemia. Despite List's modern Pagan faith, the wedding was held in an evangelical Protestant church, reflecting the growing popularity of Protestantism among Austria's Pan-German community, who perceived it as a more authentically German form of Christianity than the Catholicism that was popular among Austria-Hungary's other ethnic and linguistic communities. Wittek had previously appeared in a performance of List's « Der Wala Erweckung » and had publicly recited some of his poetry. Following their marriage, List devoted himself fully to drama, authoring the plays « König Vannius » (King Vannius) , in 1899 ; « Sommer-Sonnwend-Feuerzauber » (Summer Solstice Fire Magic) , in 1901 ; and « Das Goldstück » (The Gold Coin) , in 1903. He also authored a pamphlet titled « Der Wiederaufbau von Carnuntum » (The Reconstruction of Carnuntum) , in 1900, in which he called for the reconstruction of the ancient Roman amphitheatre at Carnuntum, as an open-air stage through which Wotanism could be promoted.

« List belonged to an older generation than most of his pre-War fellow ideologues and, thus, became a cult-figure on the Eastern edge of the German world. He was regarded by his readers and followers as a bearded old patriarch and a mystical nationalist guru whose clairvoyant gaze had lifted the glorious Aryan and Germanic past of Austria into full-view from beneath the debris of foreign influences and Christian culture. In his books and lectures, List invited true Germans to behold the clearly discernible remains of a wonderful theocratic Ario-German State, wisely governed by priest-kings and gnostic initiates, in the archaeology, folklore, and landscape of his homeland. »

(Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, Historian of esotericism.)

According to the historian Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, the year 1902 marked « a fundamental change in the character of List's ideas : occult ideas now entered his fantasy of the ancient Germanic faith » . This began when he received an operation to remove a cataract from his eye, after which he was left blind for 11 months. During this period of rest and recuperation, he contemplated questions surrounding the origins of the German language and the use of runes. He subsequently produced a manuscript detailing what he deemed to be a proto-language of the Aryan race, in which he claimed that occult insight had enabled him to interpret the letters and sounds of both runes and emblems

and glyphs found on ancient inscriptions. Terming it « a monumental pseudo-science » , Goodrick-Clarke also noted that it constituted « the Masterpiece of his occult-nationalist researches » . List sent a copy to the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna, but they declined to publish it. In 1903, List published an article in « Die Gnosis » magazine, which reflected a clear influence from the ideas of the Theosophical Society.

List had occasionally used the title of « von » in his name, from 1903 onward ; but began using it permanently in 1907. The term was used to denote that an individual was a member of the nobility, and when the nobility archive ordered an official enquiry into List's use of the term, he was called before magistrates in October 1907. He defended his usage of the term with the claim that he was the descendant of aristocrats from Lower-Austria and Styria, and that his great-grandfather had abandoned the title to become an inn-keeper. Goodrick-Clarke noted that whatever the legitimacy of List's unproven claims, claiming the title of von was « an integral part of List's religious fantasy » because, in his mind, it connected him to the ancient Wotanist priesthood, from whom he believed Austria's aristocrats were descended. It is possible that List decided to adopt the usage of the term after his friend, the fellow prominent Ariosophist Lanz von Liebenfels, had done so in 1903.

List's popularity among the Pan-Germanist movement resulted in suggestions that a Society devoted to the promotion of List's work be established. This materialized as the « Guido-von-List-Gesellschaft » , in March 1908, which was largely funded by the Wannieck family but which also included many prominent figures from middle and upper-class Austrian and German society. At Midsummer 1911, List founded the High Armanen Order (« Hoher Armanen-Ordem ») , or HAO, as an inner-group of Armanist practitioners within the List Society with whom he went on pilgrimages to various places that he believed had been ancient cultic sites associated with the worship of Wotan. He operated as leader of this group, using the title of Grand Master. The List Society also produced 6 booklets authored by List himself, between 1908 and 1911. Titled « Ario-Germanic research reports » , they covered List's opinions on the meaning and magical power of runes, the ancient Wotanic priesthood, Austrian folklore and place-names, and the secret messages within heraldic devices. In 1914, the Society then published List's work on runes and language that the Imperial Academy had turned down. The 1st 3 of these publications furthered List's reputation across both the « Völkisch » and nationalist sub-cultures within both Austria and Germany. Many other writers were inspired by List, with a number of works being specifically dedicated to him. The editor of Prana, Johannes Balzli, authored a biography of List that was published in 1917.

During World War I, List erroneously proclaimed that there would be victory for the Central Powers of Germany and Austria-Hungary, claiming to have learned this information from a vision that he experienced in 1917. By 1918, List was in declining health, furthered by the food shortages experienced in Vienna as a result of the War. In the spring of 1919, at the age of 71, List and his wife set-off to recuperate and meet followers at the manor house of Eberhard von Brockhusen, a List Society patron who lived at Langen in Brandenburg, Germany. On arrival at the Anhalter Station at Berlin, List felt too exhausted to continue the journey. After a doctor had diagnosed a lung inflammation, his health deteriorated quickly, and he died in a Berlin guest-house on the morning of 17 May 1919. He was cremated in Leipzig and his ashes laid in an urn and then buried at the Vienna Central Cemetery (« Zentralfriedhof ») . An obituary of List authored by Berlin journalist Philipp Stauff, then, appeared in the « Münchener Beobachter » .

List promoted a religion termed « Wotanism », which he saw as the exoteric, outer-form of pre-Christian Germanic religion, while « Armanism » was the term he applied to what he believed were the esoteric, secret teachings of this ancient belief system. He believed that while Wotanism expounded polytheism for the wider population, those who were members of the Armanist elite were aware of the reality of monotheism. List's Armanism would later be classified as a form of « Ariosophy », a term which was coined by Lanz von Liebenfels in 1915. Goodrick-Clarke considered List's ideas to be a « unique amalgam of nationalist mythology and esotericism ». Religious studies scholar Olav Hammer noted that List's Wotanism « increasingly came to consist of an original synthesis of his reading of Germanic mythology with Theosophy ». List's early Theosophical influence came largely from the writings of German Theosophist Max Ferdinand Sebaldt von Werth, who had combined Theosophical ideas with his own interpretations of Germanic mythology and emphasis on racial doctrines, thus, anticipating Ariosophy. In later work, this Theosophical influence over List's thinking grew, and he began referencing works such as Helena Blavatsky's « Die Geheimlehre » and William Scott Elliot's « The Lost Lemuria » in his publications. He expressed the view that Norse mythology accorded with (and thus proved) the cosmogonical teachings of Theosophy.

Much of List's understanding of the ancient past was based not on empirical research into historical, archaeological, and folkloric sources, but rather on ideas that he claimed to have received as a result of clairvoyant illumination. Later writer Richard Rudgley, thus, characterized List's understanding of the « pagan past » as an « imaginative reconstruction ». List's Wotanism was constructed largely on the Prose Edda and the Poetic Edda, 2 Old Norse textual sources which had been composed in Iceland during the late Middle-Ages ; he nevertheless believed that they accurately reflected the belief systems of Germany, having been authored by « Wotanist » refugees fleeing Christianity. He believed that, prior to the spread of Christianity into Northern Europe, there had once been a culturally unified German civilisation that had been spread across much of Europe, which came to be degraded and divided under the impact of Christianity. He believed that the Danubian region of modern Austria had, thus, been part of this unified German civilisation before the growth of the Roman Empire, an idea in contrast to the view accepted by historians of the time that linguistically German communities only settled in the area during the reign of the Frankish King Charlemagne in the 9th Century CE, pushing-out the pre-existing linguistically Celtic groups.

List believed that the basic teachings of Wotanism were found in the runic alphabet, believing that they could be deciphered by linking these letters with particular runic spells which appear in the Old Norse Havamal. He claimed to have deciphered these secret meanings himself, translating them as statements such as « Know yourself, then you know everything », « Do not fear death, he cannot kill you », « Marriage is the root of the Aryan race ! », and « Man is one with God ! ». List emphasized the importance of a mystical union between humans and the universe, viewing divinity as being immanent in nature, with all life being an emanation of it. Connected to this, he believed in a close identification between the racial group (the « Volk », or folk) and the natural world. List believed that human beings had an immortal soul, and that it would be re-incarnated according to the laws of karma until eventually uniting with divinity.

In the 1890's, List initially devised the idea that ancient German society had been led by a hierarchical system of initiates, the « Armanenschaft », an idea which had developed into a key-part of his thinking by 1908. List's image of the « Armanenschaft » 's structure was based largely on his knowledge of Freemasonry. He claimed that the ancient

brotherhood had consisted of 3 degrees, each with their own secret signs, grips, and passwords. He believed that the « Armanenschaft » had societal control over the ancient German people, acting as teachers, priests, and judges. In List's interpretation of history, the Christian missionaries persecuted the « Armanenschaft » , resulting in many fleeing northward into Scandinavia and Iceland. He believed that they developed a secretive language for transmitting their teachings, known as « kala » .

List claimed that he abandoned his family's Roman Catholic faith in childhood, instead devoting himself to the pre-Christian god Wotan. Spending much time in the Austrian countryside, he engaged in rowing, hiking, and sketching the landscape. From 1877, he began a career as a journalist, primarily authoring articles on the Austrian countryside for nationalist newspapers and magazines. In these, he placed a « Völkisch » emphasis on the folk-culture and customs of rural people, believing that many of them were survivals of pre-Christian, pagan religion. He published 3 novels : « Carnuntum » (1888) ; « Jung Diethers Heimkehr » (1894) ; and « Pipara » (1895) , each set among the German tribes of the Iron Age, as well as authoring several plays. During the 1890's, he continued writing « Völkisch » articles, now largely for the nationalist « Ostdeutsche Rundschau » newspaper, with his works taking on an anti-Semitic dimension half-way through that decade. In 1893, he co-founded the « Literarische Donaugesellschaft » literary Society, and involved himself in Austria's Pan-German nationalist movement, a « milieu » which sought the integration of Austria into the German Empire.

During an 11 month period of blindness, in 1902, List became increasingly interested in occultism, in particular coming under the influence of the Theosophical Society, resulting in an expansion of his Wotanic beliefs to incorporate Runology and the « Armanen Futharkh » . The popularity of his work among the « Völkisch » and nationalist communities resulted in the establishment of a List Society, in 1908 ; attracting significant middle and upper-class support, the Society published List's writings and included an Ariosophist inner-group, the High Armanen Order, over whom List presided as Grand Master. Through these ventures, he promoted the millenarian view that modern society was degenerate, but that it would be cleansed through an apocalyptic event resulting in the establishment of a new Pan-German Empire that would embrace Wotanism. Having erroneously prophesied that this Empire would be established by victory for the Central Powers in World War I, List died on a visit to Berlin in 1919.

List claimed that, after the Christianisation of Northern Europe, the Armanist teachings were passed down in secret, thus, resulting in their transmission through later esoteric traditions such as Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism. He also claimed that the Medieval Knights Templar had been keepers of these Armanist secrets, and that they had been persecuted by the Christian establishment as a result of this ; he believed that the deity they were accused of worshipping, Baphomet, was actually a sigil of the Maltese Cross representing Armanist teachings. According to List, a number of prominent Renaissance humanists (including Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Giordano Bruno, Johannes Trithemius, Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa, and Johann Reuchlin) were also aware of this ancient Armanist teaching, with List claiming that he was actually the re-incarnation of Reuchlin. In addition, List claimed that in the 8th Century, Armanists had imparted their secret teachings to the Jewish rabbis of Cologne in the hope of preserving them from Christian persecution ; he believed that these teachings became the « Kabbalah » , which he therefore reasoned was an ancient German and not Jewish innovation, thus legitimising its usage in his own teachings. Rudgley stated that this « tortuous argument » was used to support List's anti-Semitic agenda.

List generally saw the world in which he was living as one of degeneration, comparing it with the societies of the Late Roman and Byzantine Empires. He bemoaned the decline of the rural peasantry through urbanisation, having witnessed how Vienna's population tripled between 1870 and 1890, resulting in over-crowding, a growth in diseases like tuberculosis, and a severe strain on the city's resources. A staunch monarchist, he opposed all forms of democracy, feminism, and modern trends in the arts, such as those of the Vienna Secessionists. Influenced by the Pan-Germanist politician Georg Ritter von Schönerer and his « Away from Rome ! » movement, List decried the growing influence of linguistically Slavic communities within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He was opposed to « laissez-faire » Capitalism and large-scale enterprise, instead favouring an economic system based on small-scale artisans and craftsmen, being particularly unhappy with the decline in tradesmen's guilds. He was similarly opposed to the modern banking sector and financial institutions, deeming it to be dominated by Jews ; in criticizing these institutions, he expressed anti-Semitic sentiments. Such views of the country's economic situation were not uncommon in Austria at the time, having become particularly widespread following the Panic (« Krach ») of 1873. The later Heathen and runologist Edred Thorsson noted that List's « theories were to some degree based on the anti-Semitic dogmas of the day » , while Hammer stated that the Ariosophic tradition promulgated by List and others was « unambiguously racist and anti-Semitic » .

List believed that the degradation of modern Western society was as a result of a conspiracy orchestrated by a secret organisation known as the Great International Party, an idea influenced by anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. Adopting a millenarianist perspective, he believed in the imminent defeat of this enemy and the establishment of a better future for the Ario-German race. In April 1915, he welcomed the start of World War I as a conflict that would bring about the defeat of Germany's enemies and the establishment of a golden age for the new Ario-German Empire. Toward the War's end, he believed that the German War dead would be re-incarnated as a generation who would push through with a national revolution and establish this new, better society. For List, this better future would be intricately connected to the ancient past, reflecting his belief in the cyclical nature of time, something which he had adopted both from a reading of Norse mythology and from Theosophy. Reflecting his monarchist beliefs, he envisioned this future state as being governed by the House of Hapsburg, with a revived feudal system of land ownership being introduced through which land would be inherited by a man's eldest son. In List's opinion, this new Empire would be highly-hierarchical, with non-Aryans being subjugated under the Aryan population and opportunities for education and jobs in public service being restricted to those deemed racially pure. He envisioned this Empire following the Wotanic religion which he promoted.

During his lifetime, List became a well-known figure among the nationalist and « Völkisch » sub-cultures of Austria and Germany, influencing the work of many others operating in this « milieu » . His work, propagated through the List Society, influenced later « Völkisch » groups such as the « Reichshammerbund » and « Germanenorden » , and through those exerted an influence on both the burgeoning Nazi Party and the SS. After World War II, his work continued to influence an array of Ariosophic and Heathen practitioners in Europe, Australia, and North America.

« It was Guido von List, a Viennese mythomaniac who, more than anyone else, laid the foundations for the Romantic blend of ideas that links these proto-Nazis uncannily with the Greens and New-Agers of today : an interest in natural

living, vegetarianism, anti-industrialism, an appreciation of prehistoric monuments and the wisdom of those who built them ; a feeling for astrology, earth energies, and natural cycles ; a religious outlook vaguely resembling that of Theosophy. »

(Joscelyn Godwin, *Historian of esotericism*, 1996.)

Writing in 2003, the historian of religion Mattias Gardell believed that List had become the « revered guru of Ariosophic paganism » . Gardell considered the Austrian esotericist to have been « a legend in his lifetime » , with List's ideas being embraced by many « Völkisch » groups in Germany. German members of the List Society included Philipp Stauff, Karl Hellwig, Georg Hauerstein, Bernhard Koerner, and Eberhard von Brockhusen, who were founding members of the « Reichshammerbund » and « Germanen-Orden » ; through the « Germanen-Orden » 's Munich offshoot, the Thule Society, a lineage can be drawn between the List Society and the early Nazi Party as it was established after World War I. Goodrick-Clarke opined that « this channel of influence certainly carries most weight in any assessment of List's historical importance » . The scholar of Western esotericism Joscelyn Godwin expressed the view that List was one of the « 3 godfathers of Nazi Thule » alongside Lanz von Liebenfels and Rudolf von Sebottendorff, while Richard Rudgley went further by claiming that List's vision of a future German Empire constituted « a blueprint for the Nazi regime » .

Other German « Völkisch » figures promoted Listian ideas to the wider public during and after the First World War. Further individuals (notably Rudolf John Gorsleben, Werner von Bülow, Friedrich Bernhard Marby, Herbert Reichstein, and Frodi Ingolfson Werhmann) took List's Ariosophical ideas alongside those of Liebenfels and built upon them further, resulting in a flourishing Ariosophical movement in the late- 1920's and 1930's, with some of these individuals being within the coterie of prominent Nazi Heinrich Himmler and influencing the symbolism and rituals of the SS. His was also exerted an influence on the Australian Odinit and Ariosophist Alexander Rud Mills.

Both Goodrick-Clarke and, later, the religious studies scholar Stefanie von Schnurbein described List as « the pioneer of “ Völkisch ” rune occultism » , with the latter adding that « the roots of modern esoteric runology are found in Guido List's visions » . In 1984, Edred Thorsson expressed the view that List's impact was such that he was « able to shape the runic theories of German magicians (although not necessarily their political ones) from that time to the present day » . In 1976, 2 longstanding activists in the « Völkisch » and far-Right « milieu » , Adolf and Sigrun Schleipfer, established the « Armanen-Orden » , in order to revive List's ideas, adopting a strong anti-modernist stance and a desire to revive pre-Christian religion. It was through the « Armanen-Orden » that Thorsson, who joined it, learned about List's work. Thorsson then spearheaded « the post-War runic revival » , founding an initiatory organisation known as the « Rune Gild » in 1980. Thorsson was responsible for translating a number of List's works into English, alongside those of other « Völkisch » mystics like Siegfried Adolf Kummer. These publications brought awareness of List to an English-speaking readership, with his 1988 translation of List's « The Secret of the Runes » initiating a surge of interest in Ariosophy among the Heathen community of the United States. List's runology also made an appearance in Stephan Grundy's 1990 book, « Teutonic Magic » . List's Armanist ideas have been cited as an inspiration for the American Odinit militant David Lane, with « Wotansvolk » , a group that List was involved in establishing, viewing their own activism as a continuation of that begun by List. List was also of interest to the

Heathen Michael Moynihan, who spent time visiting the places in Austria that are associated with List's life.

Société Thulé

La Société Thulé ou l'Ordre de Thulé (« Thule-Gesellschaft ») fut une société secrète allemande de Munich qui, à l'origine, était un groupe d'études ethnologiques s'intéressant tout spécialement à l'Antiquité germanique et au pan-germanisme aryen. Ses mythes racistes et occultistes inspirèrent le mysticisme nazi et l'idéologie nazie.

Elle tire son nom de Thulé, partie la plus septentrionale d'Europe et lieu mythique pour les anciens Grecs et Romains, dans lequel le dieu Apollon viendrait passer une partie de l'hiver. Le nom de Thulé figure notamment dans l'Énéide du poète romain Virgile, et il est généralement admis que l'« Ultima Thule » des Grecs de l'Antiquité désignait les terres les plus au nord, et tout particulièrement la Scandinavie. Certains discours de la fin du XIXe siècle, abondamment repris par la suite, affirment que Thulé aurait été le nom magique d'une civilisation germanique avancée, mais disparue. Cette idée est reprise par les membres de la Société Thulé, qui pensaient que Thulé était ce qui subsistait d'un continent aujourd'hui disparu, appelé Hyperborée, et que ce continent était le berceau de la race aryenne. « Ultima Thule » aurait été la capitale du 1er continent colonisé par les Aryens.

Au départ simple loge au sein d'une société secrète pan-germaniste, « Völkisch » et antisémite, la Société Thulé a été constituée par Rudolf Glauer, qui se prétend baron Rudolf von Sebottendorf, le 17 août 1918. Diffusée à Munich, l'idéologie de cette société prônait l'antisémitisme, l'anti-républicanisme, le paganisme et le racisme. Son symbole, la croix de Wotan, divinité pré-germanique, n'est pas sans rappeler la croix gammée. Le salut de Thulé « Heil und Sieg » (Salut et victoire) fut repris par Adolf Hitler qui le transforma en « Sieg Heil ». Ce salut, en liaison avec le bras levé, était un rituel magique utilisé pour la formation de voltes.

Vers 1923, Rudolf Heß, revenu à Munich, devient l'un des animateurs de l'Ordre de Thulé, dont Hermann Göring est l'un des membres les plus célèbres.

Autour de cette société secrète gravitent un certain nombre de groupuscules, dont est issu le NSDAP, le « Deutsche Arbeiterverein » de Karl Harrer, qui devient le « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei », fondé par Anton Drexler et Harrer ; pour bien marquer leur filiation, les fondateurs du « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » reprennent la croix gammée.

Expulsé du « Reich » en 1934, Sebottendorf se serait suicidé en se jetant dans le Bosphore en 1945, mais il a été retrouvé par les services secrets britanniques et a fini sa vie en 1950, en Égypte.

L'idéologie de l'Ordre était fondée sur la croyance en l'existence de surhommes et d'une race humaine supérieure : les Aryens qui auraient vu le jour dans l'hypothétique Hyperborée. L'un de ses textes de référence est les « Protocoles des Sages de Sion ». Ce texte fut repris par Adolf Hitler comme pièce maîtresse de la propagande antisémite du 3e « Reich » et par Alfred Rosenberg dans son ouvrage « Le Mythe du XXe siècle ».

L'idéologie professée par la Société Thulé s'inspire d'un corpus d'éléments ésotériques et mystiques puisés dans

l'Ariosophie de Guido von List, chez Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels, un autre faux-baron s'appelant simplement Lanz, Rudolf von Sebottendorf, Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, Arthur de Gobineau, et des théories aryano-centristes de certains archéologues allemands. List se propose de diriger les Aryens vers une société paysanne, patriarcale et esclavagiste.

Selon plusieurs auteurs grecs et latins, il aurait existé dans des temps très reculés un continent situé à l'Extrême-Nord, qu'ils appelaient Hyperborée (« Ultima Thule »), lequel aurait été peuplé d'hommes transparents. Ceux-ci, en s'alliant aux autres hommes, auraient donné naissance à des êtres humains de plus en plus opaques, mais leurs descendants auraient néanmoins conservé leurs facultés, supérieures à celles des humains ordinaires (voir Ánd).

Un des paradoxes de cette société est que plusieurs membres lisaient le Talmud dans le but de pratiquer l'occultisme et de formuler une théosophie anti-juive, alors que le Talmud est pourtant essentiel à la religion juive.

La plupart des membres sont ariosophes ; certains sont initiés à la Franc-maçonnerie, même si certaines de leurs idées s'opposent radicalement, comme celle de la fraternité universelle : l'aryen est dit d'une race humaine d'origine divine, tandis que le Juif est considéré être un sous-homme.

Comme les multiples groupuscules « Völkisch » qui fleurissent en Allemagne après la défaite de 1918, la Société Thulé développe une rhétorique antisémite, raciste et nationaliste, tout en prêtant son nom à un groupe de combat antisémite engagé dans la répression de la République des Conseils à Munich.

Ses liens avec le mouvement nazi sont nombreux, mais leur nature réelle largement ignorée aujourd'hui encore.

Propriétaire du journal, le « Völkischer Beobachter », la société a revendu le titre au « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei », et a accueilli la rédaction du journal après l'avoir revendu.

Le Svastika dextrogyre, la croix gammée, utilisée par les occultistes depuis le XVIIIe siècle, a été proposée comme emblème du « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » par un militant membre de la société, lors du congrès de Salzbourg : il a néanmoins été modifié par Hitler, peu après.

Personne ne connaît exactement la liste complète des membres, ce qui a amené certains auteurs à échafauder des théories diverses sur l'adhésion de personnalités à une section secrète de la Société Thulé notamment au sein de l'élite SS.

Des auteurs comme Werner Gerson dans l'ouvrage cité ci-après, Jacques Bergier dans le « Matin des Magiciens », et Trevor Ravenscroft dans la « Lance du Destin », rapportent que les membres de Thulé, considéraient Rudolf Steiner et ses disciples comme leurs pires ennemis. Steiner a été secrétaire-général de la section allemande de la Société théosophique, avant la fondation de la Société Thulé. Comme certains membres de la Société Thulé auraient aussi été membres de la Société théosophique, l'amalgame était facile.

René Alleau affirme avoir découvert en Allemagne la liste des membres de la Société Thulé, publiée en 1933 par Rudolf

von Sebottendorf, laquelle comprend 226 noms, mais pas celui de Rudolf Steiner. Dans sa liste, von Sebottendorf ne mentionne pas Hitler comme membre de la Société Thulé, mais écrit en 1933, qu'il fut fréquemment « l'hôte de la Thulé » .

Quelques-uns des autres membres cités par divers auteurs sont : Rudolf von Sebottendorf, Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels, Guido von List, Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß, Alfred Rosenberg, Julius Streicher, Hans Frank, Bernhard Stempfle, Theo Morell.

Dès les années 1930, et plus encore après sa dissolution, la Société Thulé exerce une forte fascination dans certains milieux, notamment les groupes occultistes et les associations d'extrême-droite nostalgique du 3e « Reich » .

On crédite cette société d'une forte influence non seulement sur les dirigeants du 3e « Reich » , mais aussi dans les premiers moments du mouvement nazi, mais il semblerait, que, sur ce dernier point, les chercheurs soient incapables de se prononcer clairement dans un sens ou dans un autre, ce qui génère de nombreuses spéculations sur la question, aujourd'hui encore.

Durant les années 1960, certains auteurs proches des milieux occultistes, Jan van Helsing, notamment, défend, sur la base du témoignage largement remis en cause de Hermann Rauschning, l'idée que Hitler serait un initié, membre important de la Société Thulé, transformée pour la cause en société initiatique.

...

The Thule Society (« Thule-Gesellschaft ») , originally the « Studiengruppe für germanisches Altertum » (Study Group for Germanic Antiquity) , was a German occultist and « Völkisch » group in Munich, named after a mythical northern country from Greek legend. The Society is notable chiefly as the organization that sponsored the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » (DAP ; German Workers' Party) , which was later re-organized by Adolf Hitler into the National-Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP or Nazi Party) . According to Hitler biographer Ian Kershaw, the organization's « membership list reads like a Who's Who of early Nazi sympathizers and leading figures in Munich » , including Rudolf Heß, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Julius Lehmann, Gottfried Feder, Dietrich Eckart, and Karl Harrer.

However, Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke contends that Hans Frank and Rudolf Heß had been Thule members, but other leading Nazis had only been invited to speak at Thule meetings or were entirely unconnected with it.

According to Johannes Hering :

« There is no evidence that Hitler ever attended the Thule Society. »

The Thule Society was originally a « German study group » headed by Walter Nauhaus, a wounded World War I veteran turned art-student from Berlin who had become a keeper of pedigrees for the « Germanenorden » (Order of Teutons) , a secret society founded in 1911, and formally named in the following year. In 1917, Nauhaus moved to

Munich ; his Thule Society was to be a cover-name for the Munich branch of the « Germanenorden » , but events developed differently as a result of a schism in the Order. In 1918, Nauhaus was contacted in Munich by Rudolf von Sebottendorf (or Sebottendorff) , an occultist and newly-elected head of the Bavarian province of the schismatic offshoot known as the « Germanenorden Walvater » of the Holy Grail. The 2 men became associates in a recruitment campaign, and Sebottendorff adopted Nauhaus's Thule Society as a cover-name for his Munich lodge of the « Germanenorden Walvater » at its formal dedication on 18 August 1918.

A primary focus of the Thule Society was a claim concerning the origins of the Aryan race. In 1917, people who wanted to join the « Germanic Order » , out of which the Thule Society developed in 1918, had to sign a special « blood declaration of faith » concerning their lineage :

« The signer, hereby, swears to the best of his knowledge and belief that no Jewish or coloured blood flows in either his or in his wife's veins, and that among their ancestors are no members of the coloured races. »

« Thule » (Greek : Θούλη) was a land located by Greco-Roman geographers in the farthest north (often displayed as Iceland) . The term « Ultima Thule » (Latin : most distant Thule) is also mentioned by Roman poet Virgil in his pastoral poems called the Georgics. Thule originally was probably the name for Scandinavia, although Virgil simply uses it as a proverbial expression for the edge of the known world, and his mention should not be taken as a substantial reference to Scandinavia.

The Thule Society identified « Ultima Thule » as a lost ancient landmass in the extreme north, near Greenland or Iceland, said by Nazi mystics to be the capital of ancient Hyperborea. These ideas were derived from earlier speculation by Ignatius Loyola Donnelly that a lost landmass had once existed in the Atlantic, and that it was the home of the Aryan race, a theory which he supported by reference to the distribution of Swastika motifs. He identified this with Plato's Atlantis, a theory further developed by Helena Blavatsky, an occultist during the 2nd part of the 19th Century.

The Thule Society attracted about 250 followers in Munich, and about 1,500 elsewhere in Bavaria. Its meetings were often held in the luxury « Hotel Vierjahreszeiten » (4 Seasons Hotel) in Munich.

The followers of the Thule Society were very interested in racial theory and, in particular, in combating Jews and Communists. Sebottendorff planned but failed to kidnap Bavarian Socialist prime minister Kurt Eisner, in December 1918. During the Bavarian revolution of April 1919, Thulists were accused of trying to infiltrate its government and of attempting a « coup » . On 26 April, the Communist government in Munich raided the Society's premises and took 7 of its members into custody, executing them on 30 April. Amongst them were Walter Nauhaus and 4 well-known aristocrats, including Countess Heila von Westarp who functioned as the group's secretary, and Prince Gustav of Thurn and Taxis who was related to several European Royal families. In response, the Thule organized a citizens' up-rising as White troops entered the city, on 1 May.

In 1918, the Thule Society bought a local weekly newspaper, the « Münchener Beobachter » (Munich Observer) , and changed its name to « Münchener Beobachter und Sportblatt » (Munich Observer and Sports Paper) in an attempt to

improve its circulation. The « Münchener Beobachter » later became the « Völkischer Beobachter » (People's Observer) , the main Nazi newspaper. It was edited by Karl Harrer.

Anton Drexler had developed links between the Thule Society and various extreme-Right workers' organizations in Munich. He established the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » (German Workers' Party) , or DAP, on 5 January 1919, together with the Thule Society's Karl Harrer. Adolf Hitler joined this Party, in September the same year. By the end of February 1920, the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » had been reconstituted as the « Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » (National Socialist German Workers' Party) , or NSDAP, often referred to as the Nazi Party.

Sebottendorff, by then, had left the Thule Society, and never joined the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » or the Nazi Party. Dietrich Bronder (« Bevor Hitler kam » , 1964) alleged that other members of the Thule Society were later prominent in Nazi Germany : the list includes Dietrich Eckart (who coached Hitler on his public speaking skills, along with Erik Jan Hanussen, and had « Mein Kampf » dedicated to him) , as well as Gottfried Feder, Hans Frank, Hermann Göring, Karl Haushofer, Rudolf Heß, Heinrich Himmler, and Alfred Rosenberg. Historian Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke has described this membership roll and similar claims as « spurious » and « fanciful » , noting that Feder, Eckart, and Rosenberg were never more than guests to whom the Thule Society extended hospitality during the Bavarian revolution of 1918, although he has more recently acknowledged that Heß and Frank were members of the Society before they came to prominence in the Nazi Party. It has also been claimed that Adolf Hitler himself was a member. Evidence on the contrary shows that he never attended a meeting, as attested to by Johannes Hering's diary of Society meetings. It is quite clear that Hitler himself had little interest in, and made little time for, « esoteric » matters. (See also Hitler's Nuremberg speech of 6 September 1938 on his disapproval of occultism.)

Wilhelm Laforce and Max Sesselmann (staff on the « Münchener Beobachter ») were Thule members who later joined the « Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » .

Early, in 1920, Karl Harrer was forced-out of the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » as Hitler moved to sever the Party's link with the Thule Society, which subsequently fell into decline and was dissolved about 5 years later, well before Hitler came to power.

Rudolf von Sebottendorff had withdrawn from the Thule Society in 1919, but he returned to Germany in 1933 in the hope of reviving it. In that year, he published a book entitled « Bevor Hitler kam » (Before Hitler Came) , in which he claimed that the Thule Society had paved the way for the « Führer » :

« Thulers were the ones to whom Hitler Ist came, and Thulers were the Ist to unite themselves with Hitler. »

This claim was not favourably received by the Nazi authorities : after 1933, esoteric organisations were suppressed (including « Völkisch » occultists) , many closed down by anti-Masonic legislation in 1935. Sebottendorff's book was prohibited and he, himself, was arrested and imprisoned for a short period in 1934, afterwards departing into exile in Turkey.

Nonetheless, it has been argued that some Thule members and their ideas were incorporated into the 3rd « Reich » . Some of the Thule Society's teachings were expressed in the books of Alfred Rosenberg. Many occult ideas found favour with Heinrich Himmler, who had a great interest in mysticism, unlike Hitler, but the « Schutzstaffel » (SS) under Himmler emulated the structure of Ignatius Loyola's Jesuit order rather than the Thule Society, according to Heinz Höhne.

The Thule Society has become the center of many conspiracy theories concerning Nazi Germany, due to its occult background (like the « Ahnenerbe » section of the SS) . Such theories include the creation of vril-powered Nazi UFOs.

La Société Thulé et Hitler

The planning of the Second World War started when Adolf Hitler joined a secret society called the Thule Society in 1919. It was in this group that he found the perverted beliefs that were later to lead him in his control of the German government.

In the Thule Society :

« The sun played a prime role as a sacred symbol of the Aryans, in contrast to the moon, revered by the Semitic peoples. The “ Führer ” saw in the Jewish people, with their black hair and swarthy complexions, the dark side of the human species, whilst the blond and blue-eyed Aryans constituted the light side of humanity. Hitler undertook to extirpate from the material world its impure elements. »

In addition to sun (or light) worship, the Thule Society also practiced Satan worship :

« The inner-core within the Thule Society were all Satanists who practiced Black Magic. »

The Society was not a working-man's group as it included amongst its members :

« Judges, police-chiefs, barristers, lawyers, university professors and lecturers, aristocratic families, leading industrialists, surgeons, physicians, scientists, as well as a host of rich and influential bourgeois. »

The membership of the Thule Society also became the foundation of the Nazi Party :

« The Committee and the 40 original members of the New German Workers' Party were all drawn from the most powerful occult society in Germany - the Thule Society. »

One of the founders of both groups, the Nazi Party and the Thule Society, was Dietrich Eckart :

« A dedicated Satanist, the supreme adept of the arts and rituals of Black Magic and the central figure in a powerful and wide-spread circle of occultists - the Thule Group. He was one of the 7 founder members of the Nazi Party. »

Eckart claimed to be the initiator of Hitler into the secrets of Satan worship. He is quoted as saying on his deathbed :

« Follow Hitler. He will dance, but it is I who have called the tune ! I have initiated him into the “ Secret Doctrine ” ; opened his centres in vision and given him the means to communicate with the Powers. Do not mourn for me : I shall have influenced history more than any German. »

But it was not just the Thule Society that gave Hitler the support he needed to become the leader of the German government. There were additional sources of Hitler's strength. One who offered an explanation of Hitler's easy rise to power was Walter Langer, a noted psychoanalyst. Langer wrote in his book « The Mind of Adolf Hitler » that it was his theory that Hitler was himself one-quarter Jewish and the grandson of a Rothschild.

He wrote :

« There is a great deal of confusion in studying Hitler's family tree. Adolf's father, Alois Hitler, was the illegitimate son of Maria Anna Schicklgruber. It was generally supposed that the father of Alois Hitler was Johann Georg Hiedler. Alois, however, was not legitimized, and he bore his mother's name until he was 40 years of age when he changed it to Hitler. »

A peculiar series of events, prior to Hitler's birth, furnishes plenty of food for speculation.

There are some people who seriously doubt that Johann Georg Hiedler was the father of Alois. Thyssen and Kœhler, for example, claim that Chancellor Dolfuss (the Chancellor of Austria) had ordered the Austrian police to conduct a thorough investigation into the Hitler family. As a result of this investigation a secret document was prepared that proved Maria Anna Schicklgruber was living in Vienna at the time she conceived.

At that time, she was employed as a servant in the home of Baron Rothschild. As soon as the family discovered her pregnancy, she was sent-back to her home in Spital where Alois was born.

In a postscript in Langer's book, Robert G. L. Waite adds this comment :

« But even when Langer is mistaken and his guesses prove incorrect, he is often on the right track. »

Consider his hint that Hitler's grandfather might have been a Jew. There is no reason to believe the unlikely story told by Langer's informant that Hitler's grandmother Maria Anna Schickelgruber, a peasant woman in her 40's from the Waldviertel of rural Austria, had had an intimate « liaison » with a Baron Rothschild in Vienna.

But Hitler had worried that he might be black-mailed over a Jewish grandfather and ordered his private lawyer, Hans Frank, to investigate his paternal lineage.

Frank did so and told the « Führer » that his grandmother had become pregnant while working as a domestic servant in a Jewish household in Graz.

The facts of this matter are in dispute - and a very lengthy dispute it has been. The point of overriding psychological and historical importance is not whether it is true that Hitler had a Jewish grandfather, but whether he believed that it might be true.

He did so believe and the fact shaped both his personality and his public policy.

It is possible that Hitler discovered his Jewish background and his relation to the Rothschilds, and aware of their enormous power to make or break European governments, re-established contact with the family. This would partially explain the enormous support he received from the international banking fraternity, closely entwined with the Rothschild family, as he rose to power.

One thing is certain, however. Hitler started World War II by moving into Austria 1st. It has been theorized that he moved into this country for 2 reasons. 1st, he wanted to silence Dolfuss who Hitler believed knew that he was a descendant of the Rothschilds, and 2ndly, he wished to remove all traces of his ancestry from the Austrian records.

...

« When I first knew Adolf Hitler in Munich, in 1921 and 1922, he was in touch with a circle that believed firmly in the portents of the stars. », remembered prominent American journalist Karl H. von Wiegand in an interview with « Cosmopolitan » magazine in 1939.

The « circle » mentioned here by the chief correspondent from Hearst International News Service was a Society listed in the Munich Register of Associations as a harmless study group that researched early German history. Members were affluent, influential people from Munich society : professors, noblemen, manufacturers, senior officials, business people. Before Hitler came into contact with the Thule Society, in 1919, the group had already been organising public talks on various Celtic and Teutonic cultural topics for some time. However, the public was not aware of what took place at the secret meetings, to which only Thule members were invited.

In reality, the Thule Society was much more than an innocent study group : it was a secret brotherhood. The emblem of the Thule Society was the Swastika (facing counter-clockwise like the Nazi symbol) and a dagger. The name Thule referred to the old « Ultima Thule », the Land of the North, the mythological homeland of the Teutons. Like Atlantis, legend had it that Thule was a vanished civilisation. The members of the Thule Society believed that the lost civilisation of the Teutons had possessed psychic abilities that were far beyond the technical achievements of the twentieth century. They hoped to rediscover the secrets of this legendary civilisation through occult practises.

There were « Teutonic » secret societies of this kind in Austria and Germany from the mid- 19th Century. The spiritual concepts of these factions can be grouped under the term « Ariosophy », coined by the Austrian seer Guido von List.

These Ariosophic groups were independent of each other organisationally, although many of them were more or less closely linked through personal friendships and mutual members. The notions of the Ariosophes referred to Hindu, Gnostic and hermetic ideas. Magical practises from early and medieval Teutonic times played an important part and the different groups were influenced variously by the Pythagorists, the Neoplatonics, the British mystic Madame Helena Blavatsky, the Rosicrucians, Jakob Böhme, Paracelsus and others. As different as the mystic-magical concepts of the individual groups were, they were linked by their belief in the racist philosophy of Guido von List, which asserted the superiority of the Aryans. In their organisational structure, rituals and terminology, the Ariosophic groups resembled the Freemasons, whom they nevertheless rejected due to their supposed « infiltration by Jews » . As with the Freemasons, there were different levels of initiation in the Ariosophes. The members were gradually introduced to the practises of ritual magic. In these rituals, light, colours, rhythms, symbols or aromas were used to focus mental powers and channel them in a specific direction. The Ariosophes believed this would enable them to bring about changes on the material plane.

The Thule Society was the Bavarian branch of the Ariosophic « Germanenorden » (Teutonic Order) , an association of occultists formed in Leipzig, in 1912, by the esoteric and anti-Semite Theodor Fritsch. In 1916, after a meeting with Fritsch, Baron Rudolf von Sebottendorff assumed leadership of the Bavarian arm, calling it the Thule Society. Sebottendorff was an adventurer and occultist, born in Hoyerswerda, Saxony, in 1875 under the name Ernst Rudolf Glauer. In his autobiography « Der Talisman des Rosenkreuzers » (The Talisman of the Rosicrucian) , Sebottendorff discusses his life, which Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke has researched in more detail. Glauer-Sebottendorff had worked on ships, travelling to New York, Sydney, Cairo and Constantinople. He eventually settled in Turkey and, there, he became involved with occultism. He established contact with the Mevlevi sect of the Whirling Dervishes and was acquainted with the teaching of the Sufis. In his studies, Glauer-Sebottendorff came to the conclusion that Islamic mysticism had Aryan roots. This opinion linked him with Guido von List. The forefather of Ariosophy proclaimed that not just Islam but all religious systems were derived from one single original religion, the religion of the Aryans. In 1910, Glauer-Sebottendorff founded a mystic lodge in Constantinople. 1 year later, he was adopted by Baron Heinrich von Sebottendorff, and so, became a baron himself. He returned to Germany in 1913 and married the daughter of a prosperous Berlin businessman. 3 years later, he assumed leadership of the Thule Society in Munich.

Women were scarcely represented in the Thule Society, the higher-levels of initiation being reserved exclusively for men. Those wishing to join had to complete a questionnaire and submit a photograph, which was examined for purity of race. The following « blood declaration » also had to be filed :

« The undersigned assures to the best of his knowledge and conscience that no Jewish or coloured blood flows through his veins or those of his wife and that there are no family members of coloured race among his forefathers. »

Unlike most other Ariosophic groups, the Thule Society was not content merely with influencing material circumstances through visualisations and ritual magic : the group was also politically active. When the Bavarian King was deposed and the Communists took power in November 1918, the opulent meeting place of the Thule Society, the luxury « 4 Seasons » Hotel, became a centre of counter-revolutionary activities. The Thule Society also set-up a fighting division

that took an active part in the power struggle during the revolution in Munich. In April 1919, it enlisted volunteers, who were smuggled by train in their hundreds to Eichstätt to participate in the attack against the Communist regime from there. After the overthrow of the Communist government, in May 1919, the Thule Society shifted its political activities to the field of propaganda. In October 1918, when German defeat in the First World War was imminent, the Thule Society established a Political Workers' Union, from which the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » (German Workers' Party) , or DAP, arose. Individual Thule members, then, appeared as speakers in the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » . Adolf Hitler came across the small, insignificant Party during a lecture, in September 1919. Soon afterwards, he became the 55th member of the Party. Hitler must have quickly realized who was behind the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » , because he promptly demanded an end to the influence of the Thule Society over the Party. 2 months after Hitler joined, he set-down points of order that stated :

« Excludes all forms of dictation (for the Party committee) by a superior or lateral government, whether it be a circle or lodge, once and for all. »

This put an end to the Thule Society's influence over the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » . Thule Party chairman Karl Harrer resigned. However, some Thule members maintained close contact with Hitler after separation of the Thule Society and the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » , most notably the eventual Deputy « Führer » , Rudolf Heß, and the subsequent editor-in-chief of the most important Nazi paper, the « Völkischer Beobachter » (Nationalist Observer) , Dietrich Eckart. It is known that Eckart soon came to see Hitler as the long-awaited « saviour » . Rudolf Heß also seems to have been mesmerised by Hitler. Most Thules saw Hitler as the « drummer » , the herald, the prophet of who was to come. Some, like Rudolf Heß, might have seen him from the very beginning as being « the one » . But certainly, there were also other opinions of Hitler in the Thule Society. It is very likely that the ex-DAP chairman Harrer was not the only one to reject the monopolisation of the Party by Hitler. It seems reasonable to assume that Hitler would have been the cause of disagreements and divisions within the Thule Society.

At any rate, after Hitler joined the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » , the Thule Society fell quiet. It was not involved in the power struggles between the different radical Right-wing groups and splinter groups in Munich at the start of the 1920's. It is not proven that Hitler ever set foot in the meeting rooms of the Thule Society in the « 4 Seasons » Hotel. Johannes Hering's notes on meetings of the Thule Society, between 1920 and 1923, mention the presence of several Nazi leaders but never Hitler himself. Hitler certainly knew how to use his contacts with influential Thule members to his advantage. Their patronage and financial support was of decisive importance during the initial period of his rise. Dietrich Eckart put Hitler in contact with affluent Munich residents, and Thule sympathiser Wilhelm Frick, advisor of Munich's Chief of Police, guarded his Party protectively.

Driven by Hitler's relentless propaganda, the DAP (which Hitler renamed the NSDAP) rapidly developed into a mass movement. The National-Socialist movement no longer had anything in common with the conspiratorial gatherings of the Thule members. The dignified atmosphere of the « 4 Seasons » with talks on the early Teutonic age and magic initiation rituals as outlined by Guido von List was in stark contrast to the Party meetings in beer cellars, where drunkenness, raucousness and often brawls were common-place. The mass deployments of the SA (Stormtroopers) were also a world apart from the rarefied atmosphere of the luxury hotel. It is hardly surprising that the number of Thule

members who joined the NSDAP was relatively low. However, some of those who did join the Party later took-up important positions.

After 1926, there were no further signs of life from the Thule Society, but it reappeared with the triumph of the Nazis in 1933. Sebottendorff, who had lived abroad since 1919, re-emerged in Munich and published a book entitled « Bevor Hitler kam » (Before Hitler Came) . He also published a magazine, the « Thule Bote » (Thule Herald) , and organized Thule meetings at the « 4 Seasons » Hotel again. However, the rebirth of the Thule Society was short-lived. When the 2nd edition of Sebottendorff's book was about to appear in 1934, it was seized by the Nazis and the author was imprisoned. His fate had been sealed when he claimed that Hitler owed his initial successes to the Thule Society. Hitler, who never mentioned the Thule Society in « Mein Kampf » or elsewhere, knew that it could only harm him politically if it were to emerge that such a close link existed between an obscure society of spiritualists and the start of his movement. There are contradictory accounts of Sebottendorff's eventual fate. Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke reports that Sebottendorff travelled through Switzerland to Turkey, where he committed suicide in 1945 after Germany's defeat. Reginald H. Phelps quotes Sebottendorff's publisher, H. G. Grassinger Verlag, who claims that Sebottendorff was killed by the Nazis. The Thule Society continued to exist officially until 1937 and, then, quietly disbanded.

The Thule Society is significant to the Nazi movement not just because Hitler assumed control of the « Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » from it. Sebottendorff, the Grandmaster of the Thule Society, was also the owner of the Eher publishing house, which Hitler bought in 1920 and turned the newspaper produced there into the « Völkischer Beobachter » (Nationalist Observer) , which quickly became the most important weapon in the Nazi propaganda arsenal. Additionally, evidence suggests that Hitler also appropriated the Thule Society's emblem, the Swastika, as well as the « Sieg Heil » form of greeting.

Hitler took the Party, his 1st supporters, the newspaper, the gestures and the Swastika from the Thule Society and used these external aspects as a « suit of armour » (in the words of Sebottendorff) . The Grand Master of the Thule brotherhood is not exaggerating when he claims that it was this « suit of armour » that helped Hitler to gain power in a period of time that would, otherwise, seem unnaturally short. The many links between Hitler and the Thule Society have been proven incontrovertibly by historical research. The counter-revolutionary activities of the Thule members during the revolutionary period in Munich have been examined and documented in detail. Conversely, the occult background of this secret society (the rituals and esoteric teachings of the Ariosophes) is barely acknowledged in serious historical texts and is often not even mentioned. There are, however, countless non-scientific books that deal mainly with the occult aspect of the Thule Society. As the correlation between the Thule Society and the beginnings of the Nazi movement is not disputed, the fact that the Thule Society was also an occult lodge opens-up a virtually endless realm of possible speculation. Some « Nazi occult » authors come to the conclusion that the roots of National-Socialism can be found in the occult philosophies of the Thule Society. However, this is not strictly accurate.

Historical science may never have addressed the theories of Nazi occult authors seriously, but the flood of Nazi occult publications has created its own reality over time. In the world of these theories, National-Socialism becomes a movement controlled by higher-powers. Some authors claim that Hitler was used by the Thule members for their purposes. Hidden Masters of the Thule Society allegedly manipulated Hitler using telepathy and turned him into a

medium. Other authors claim that Hitler was instructed in magical practises by the Thule Society. However, there is not the slightest evidence of the secret command group that was supposed to have controlled Hitler, or of Hitler's occult leanings. What can be said with great certainty on the basis of historically proven fact is that Hitler exploited the Thules, and not vice versa. He maintained the necessary contact as long as it was advantageous to him. Once he no longer needed the Thule Society, he ignored it and denied it. However, that does not mean that the mystic notions of the Thules did not play a significant part in Hitler's rise. On the contrary : what would have become of Hitler if he had not come across this Society ? What would have become of his delusions if certain members of this group of influential people had not validated them ? This, in turn, could only happen because the spiritual beliefs of the Thules led them to expect a messianic figure, a saviour, referred to as « der Starke von Oben » (the Strong One from above) . The myth that immediately formed around Hitler and was instrumental in his meteoric rise to power has its origin in the beliefs of the faithful disciples of Thule.

Paul de Lagarde

Le bibliste, orientaliste et polymathe allemand Paul Anton Bötticher (dit Paul de Lagarde) est né le 2 novembre 1827 à Berlin et est mort le 22 décembre 1891 à Göttingen. Il est un orientaliste et un théoricien politique allemand du mouvement « Völkisch », conservateur et contre le judaïsme.

Il change de nom en hommage à sa grand-tante maternelle, Ernestine de Lagarde, qui l'avait élevé après le décès de sa mère.

Il entame des études de théologie, de philosophie et de langues orientales : d'abord dans sa ville natale Berlin (1844-1846) puis à Halle (1846-1847) , mais aussi à Londres (1852-1853) et à Paris (1853) .

En 1854, il devient enseignant dans une école publique berlinoise.

En 1869, il succède à Heinrich Ewald au poste de professeur de langues orientales à l'Université de Göttingen. Il y publie des travaux de philologie sémitique notamment « Septuaginta Studien » (1891-1892) .

Il exerce une grande influence dans l'Allemagne contemporaine par ses écrits nationalistes et antisémites compilés dans les « Deutsche Schriften » (Écrits allemands, 1878-1881) . Certaines de ses idées seront reprises a posteriori par les Nazis comme :

L'espace vital à l'Est.

La construction d'une « Mitteleuropa » (Europe centrale) sous la domination germanique.

L'aspiration à un « christianisme allemand » expurgé de ses éléments juifs (notamment, Saint-Paul) qui influencera directement Alfred Rosenberg dans son livre « Le Mythe du XXe siècle » (1930) .

Son nationalisme se base essentiellement sur la religion. Selon Paul de Lagarde, la germanité est fondée sur « l'âme » plutôt que la pureté d'une race germanique, prenant l'exemple d'illustres allemands comme Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing ou Emmanuel Kant qui étaient d'origine slave ou écossaise. Toujours selon lui, les Juifs doivent impérativement choisir entre leur religion ou devenir tout de suite des Allemands à part entière et il ne mâche pas ses mots à leur égard dans ses « Écrits allemands ». Nette radicalisation de l'anti-judaïsme qui annonce l'antisémitisme virulent du mouvement « Völkisch » et du Parti nazi (qui saluera d'ailleurs Lagarde comme l'un de ses inspireurs) .

Les idées de Paul de Lagarde illustrent la lente transition au cours du XIXe siècle en Allemagne, d'un nationalisme Libéral et Romantique, au lendemain de l'aventure napoléonienne, à un nationalisme racial.

...

The German polymath, biblical scholar and orientalist Paul Anton de Lagarde was born on 2 November 1827 in Berlin as Paul Bötticher ; and died on 22 December 1891 in Göttingen. He has been cited as one of the greatest orientalists of the 19th Century.

In early adulthood, he legally adopted the family name « de Lagarde » of his maternal line, out of respect for his great-aunt who raised him. At Humboldt University of Berlin (1844-1846) and University of Halle-Wittenberg (1846-1847) , he studied theology, philosophy and Oriental languages.

In 1852, his studies took him to London and Paris. In 1854, he became a teacher at a Berlin public school, but this did not interrupt his biblical studies. In 1866, he received 3 years leave of absence to collect fresh materials and, in 1869, succeeded German orientalist and theologian Heinrich Ewald as professor of oriental languages at the University of Göttingen. Like Ewald, Lagarde was an active worker in a variety of subjects and languages ; but his chief aim, the elucidation of the Bible, was almost always kept in view. Lagarde was easily the most renowned Septuagint scholar of the 19th Century, and he devoted himself ardently to Oriental studies.

His great learning and gifts were curiously mixed with dogmatism and distrust in the activities of others. In politics, he belonged to the Prussian Conservative Party.

Parallel to his academic work, he attempted to establish a German national religion whose most striking manifestations were an aggressive anti-Semitism and expansionism. He held few concrete religious beliefs at the ready for his postulated national religion as his 1st political treatise « Über das Verhältnis des deutschen Staates zu Theologie, Kirche und Religion. Ein Versuch Nicht-Theologen zu orientieren » (On the Relationship between the German State to Theology, Church and Religion : A Non-Theological Essay) demonstrates. In regard to the State, he called for its initial and most important task to be to create a climate in which a national religion could flourish. Meanwhile, he obliged those who had faith in God to a radical morality wherein they distinguish solely between « duty or sin » in their every action. In addition, 1st a formal language must be developed for the religiosity of these new-born men. In the 2nd part of his 1875 book, « Über die gegenwärtige Lage des deutschen Reichs. Ein Bericht » (On the Current Situation of the

German « Reich » : A Report) , he connected thereto and specified as follows :

« Germany is the totality of all German-feeling, German-thinking, German-willing Germans : In this sense, every one of us is a traitor if he does not consider himself personally accountable in every moment of his life for the existence, fortune and future of the fatherland, and each is a hero and liberator if he does. »

The historian Ulrich Sieg classifies his position as follows :

« He despised the Christianity that he considered bland and lukewarm and hoped for a folkish religion of the future. »

Lagarde was conversant with Adolf Stöcker, the founder of the anti-Semitic Berlin Movement. He also showed interest in folkish-anti-Semitic Societies such as the « Deutscher Volksverein » of Bernhard Förster and Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg, as well as the « Deutschsoziale Partei » of Theodor Fritsch. To the latter, he established contact in 1886 by sending his treatise « Die nächsten Pflichten deutscher Politik » (The Coming Tasks of German Politics) , at the core of which he considered to be a German policy of settlement in Eastern Europe. In « German Writings » , in which he compiled his previously published political essays, there can be found numerous anti-Semitic passages in which we learn, among other things, that he considered Jews to be the greatest barrier to German unification, whereas he simultaneously avowed the concept of a German colonization of southeastern Europe and proposed that the Jewish population settled there at the time be resettled to Palestine or Madagascar. The only alternatives for Lagarde were the total assimilation or emigration of the Jews.

In his 1887 essay « Jews and Indo-Germanics » , he wrote :

« One would have to have a heart of steel to not feel sympathy for the poor Germans and, by the same token, to not hate the Jews, to not hate and despise those who (out of humanity !) advocate for the Jews or are too cowardly to crush these vermin. Trichinella and bacilli would not be negotiated with. Trichinella and bacilli would also not be nurtured. They would be destroyed as quickly and as thoroughly as possible. »

In addition to his influence on anti-Semitism, Lagarde is also of importance to the formation of German Imperialist thought. In this regard, he concentrated on German border colonization within Europe rather than the acquisition of overseas colonies. This bears a close resemblance to the later concept of German « Lebensraum » most notably espoused by Friedrich Ratzel. In 1875, Lagarde maintained that the primary objective of German politics was the « gradual Germanization of Poland » . Since he was concerned about how many Germans emigrated in their search for land, he advocated a border colonizing land acquisition for the peasantry, which he considered the « true foundation of the State » . This land acquisition aimed to create a « Mitteleuropa » under German leadership « that reaches from the Ems to the mouth of the Danube, from the Neman to Trieste, from Metz to about the Bug » .

In his 1918 book, « The New Europe » , Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk regards Lagarde as one of the leading philosophical and theological spokesmen of Pan-Germanism, and furthermore describes Heinrich von Treitschke as its historian,

Wilhelm II as its politician and Friedrich Ratzel as its geopolitical geographer. In all of them, he saw the representatives of the imperialistic « German “ Drang nach Osten ” » that threatened the Slavic countries.

Lagarde's anti-Semitism laid the foundations for aspects of National-Socialist ideology, in particular that of Alfred Rosenberg. He argued that Germany should create a « national » form of Christianity purged of Semitic elements and insisted that Jews were « pests and parasites » who should be destroyed « as speedily and thoroughly as possible » . His library now belongs to the New York University.

Lagarde edited the « Didascalia apostolorum syriace » (1854) and other Syriac texts collected in the British Museum and in Paris. He edited the Aramaic translation (known as the « Targum ») of the Prophets according to the Codex Reuchlinianus preserved at Karlsruhe ; « Prophetæ chaldaice » (1872) ; the « Hagiographa chaldaice » (1874) , an Arabic translation of the Gospels ; « Die vier Evangelien, arabisch aus der Wiener Handschrift herausgegeben » (1864) , a Syriac translation of the Old Testament ; « Apocrypha, Libri V. T. apocryphi syriace » (1865) , a Coptic translation of the « Pentateuch » ; « Der Pentateuch koptisch » (1867) ; and a part of the Lucianic text of the Septuagint, which he was able to reconstruct from manuscripts for nearly half the Old Testament.

Of the Armenians, he published « Zur Urgeschichte der Armenier » (1854) and « Armenische Studien » (1877) . He was also a student of Persian, publishing « Isaias persice » (1883) and « Persische Studien » (1884) . He followed-up his Coptic studies with « Ægyptiaca » (1883) , and published many minor contributions to the study of oriental languages in « Gesammelte Abhandlungen » (1866) ; « Symmicta » (I. 1877, ii. 1880) ; « Semitica » (i. 1878, ii. 1879) ; « Orientalia » (1879-1880) ; and « Mittheilungen » (1884) . Mention should also be made of the valuable « Onomastica sacra » (1870 ; 2nd edition, 1887) .

In « Deutsche Schriften » (1878-1881 ; 4th edition, Göttingen, 1903) , he attempted to involve himself in politics. It deals with the position of the German State relative to theology, the church and religion. It became a nationalist text.

...

Paul Anton de Lagarde, ursprünglich Paul Anton Bötticher, üblich Paul de Lagarde (geboren 2. November 1827 in Berlin ; gestorben 22. Dezember 1891 in Göttingen) , war ein deutscher Kulturphilosoph und Orientalist. In seinen politischen Ansichten war er Vertreter des « modernen Antisemitismus » und Propagandist einer expansionistischen Grenzkolonisation sowie einer entschiedenen Gegnerschaft zur Frauenemanzipation.

Lagarde war der Sohn des Oberlehrers Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Bötticher und dessen Ehefrau Luise Klebe. Die Mutter starb noch im Jahr seiner Geburt. 1831 heiratete der Vater Pauline Seegert. Als 1854 auch seine Stiefmutter starb, ließ sich Lagarde von seiner Großtante mütterlicherseits, Ernestine de Lagarde, adoptieren.

Lagarde's schulische Ausbildung erfolgte am Friedrich-Wilhelm-Gymnasium in Berlin, ab 1844 studierte er evangelische Theologie bei den Professoren Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg und August Neander sowie Orientalistik bei Friedrich Rückert. Im Wintersemester 1844-1845 belegte er zusammen mit Max Müller bei Rückert Persisch. 1849 beendete Lagarde sein

Studium mit der Dissertation *Initia chromatologiæ arabicæ*. Er wechselte an die Universität Halle zu August Tholuck und konnte sich 1851 mit der Arbeit *Arica* habilitieren.

Lagardes berufliche Tätigkeit war heftig umstritten. Auch unter seinen Wissenschaftskollegen war er « wegen seines antiquierten Weltbilds und mangelnden Methodenbewusstseins » unbeliebt und hatte viele Feinde. Seine Streitsucht wurde als so notorisch eingeschätzt, daß sie in Meyers Konversationslexikon von 1897 thematisiert wurde.

Zunächst machten ihn seine lexikologisch-grammatischen und textkritischen Arbeiten unter den Fachkollegen durchaus positiv bekannt. Theodor Benfey bezeichnete ihn in diesem Zusammenhang als « schwarzer Husar unter den jungen Orientalisten ». Der preußische Botschafter Christian von Bunsen förderte ihn und vermittelte ihm für die Jahre 1852-1853 einen Studienaufenthalt in London.

1853 ging Lagarde (wiederum mit Bunsens Unterstützung) nach Paris und machte die Bekanntschaft von Ernest Renan. Ende 1853 kehrte er nach Deutschland zurück, da er sich Hoffnung auf einen Lehrstuhl an der Universität Halle machte. Diese Hoffnungen zerschlugen sich, und Lagarde nahm eine Anstellung am Köllnischen Realgymnasium an. 1858 wechselte er an das Friedrichwerdersche Gymnasium in Berlin, wo er bis 1866 unterrichtete.

Während seiner Zeit als Gymnasiallehrer forschte und veröffentlichte Lagarde ; 1866 wurde ihm durch König Wilhelm I. ein dreijähriger bezahlter Forschungsurlaub gewährt. Bis 1869 ließ sich Lagarde in Schleusingen (Provinz Sachsen) nieder. In dieser Zeit entstand eine kritische Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung der Genesis, für die er 1868 durch die Universität Halle mit dem Titel Doktor der Philosophie *Honoris Causa* geehrt wurde.

Im März 1869 wurde Lagarde als Nachfolger von Heinrich Ewald an die Universität Göttingen berufen. Dort übernahm er den Lehrstuhl für orientalische Sprachen und wurde (nach anfänglichen Anfeindungen) als Mitglied in die Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen aufgenommen. Dort wirkte er bis zu seinem Tod, wobei sein wissenschaftliches Werk schnell hinter seinen Arbeiten zur Auseinandersetzung mit der Rolle Deutschlands zurücktrat. Am 1. Dezember 1890 wurde er als korrespondierendes Mitglied in die Russische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Sankt Petersburg aufgenommen.

Lagarde stand im Briefwechsel mit Moritz von Egidy, Julius Langbehn, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, Ferdinand Tönnies und Richard Wagner. Der einzig bedeutende Schüler Lagardes ist Alfred Rahlfs.

Lagarde erlag kurz nach Rückkehr von einer Studienreise nach Italien am 22. Dezember 1891 im Göttinger Mariahilf-Krankenhaus einem Krebsleiden. Sein Nachlaß wird von der Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen betreut. Seine große Privatbibliothek, deren Katalog 1892 publiziert wurde, kaufte die New York University als Ganzes. 1897 veröffentlichte seine Witwe Anna de Lagarde eine Gesamtausgabe seiner Gedichte.

Parallel zu seinem wissenschaftlichen Werk versuchte er, eine deutsche Nationalreligion zu gründen, deren auffälligste Äußerungsformen ein aggressiver Antisemitismus und expansionistisches Denken waren. Denn für die geforderte Nationalreligion hielt er wenig konkret Religiöses oder gar ein Glaubensbekenntnis bereit, wie seine erste politische

Schrift Über das Verhältnis des deutschen Staates zu Theologie, Kirche und Religion. Ein Versuch Nicht-Theologen zu orientieren von 1873 zeigt. Vom Staat verlangt er zunächst als dessen wichtigste Aufgabe, daß er ein Klima schaffe, in dem eine nationale Religion gedeihen könne. Die auf Gott hoffenden Menschen verpflichtet er einstweilen, in radikaler Moralität bei jeder Handlung ausschließlich zwischen « Pflicht oder Sünde » zu unterscheiden. Denn für die Religiosität des neugeborenen Menschen selbst müße erst noch eine Formensprache entwickelt werden. Im zweiten Teil seines 1875 erscheinenden Buches Über die gegenwärtige Lage des deutschen Reichs. Ein Bericht schließt er daran an und konkretisiert folgendermaßen :

« Deutschland ist die Gesamtheit aller deutsch empfindenden, deutsch denkenden, deutsch wollenden Deutschen : jeder Einzelne von uns ein Landesverräter, wenn er nicht in dieser Einsicht sich für die Existenz, das Glück, die Zukunft des Vaterlandes in jedem Augenblicke seines Lebens persönlich verantwortlich erachtet, jeder Einzelne ein Held und Befreier, wenn er es tut. »

Der Historiker Ulrich Sieg ordnet seine Position wie folgt ein :

« Er verachtete das seiner Ansicht nach fade und halbherzige Christentum und hoffte auf eine völkisch gefärbte Religion der Zukunft. »

Bekannt war Lagarde mit dem Gründer der antisemitischen Berliner Bewegung, Adolf Stöcker. Interesse zeigte er auch für völkisch-antisemitische Vereinigungen wie den Deutschen Volksverein von Bernhard Förster und Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg, und für die Deutschsoziale Partei von Theodor Fritsch. Diesem schickte er 1886 zur Kontaktaufnahme seine Schrift Die nächsten Pflichten deutscher Politik, als deren Kern er eine deutsche Siedlungspolitik in Osteuropa ansah. In seinen Deutschen Schriften, in denen er in den ab 1878 erfolgenden Auflagen seine bereits publizierten politischen Aufsätze zusammenstellte, finden sich zahlreiche judenfeindliche Passagen, aus denen unter anderem hervorgeht, daß er Juden als größte Barriere für die deutsche Einigung ansah, während er gleichzeitig das Konzept einer deutschen Besiedlung Südosteuropas weiterverfolgte und die dort ansässige jüdische Bevölkerung nach Palästina oder Madagaskar umzusiedeln vorschlug. Denn es gab für ihn nur die Alternative der völligen Assimilation oder Auswanderung der Juden.

In seiner Schrift « Juden und Indogermanen » 1887 schrieb er :

« Es gehört ein Herz von der Härte der Krokodilhaut dazu, um mit den armen ausgesogenen Deutschen nicht Mitleid zu empfinden und (was daßelbe ist) um die Juden nicht zu hassen, um diejenigen nicht zu hassen und zu verachten, die (aus Humanität !) diesen Juden das Wort reden oder die zu feige sind, dies Ungeziefer zu zertreten. Mit Trichinen und Bazillen wird nicht verhandelt, Trichinen und Bazillen werden auch nicht erzogen, sie werden so rasch und so gründlich wie möglich vernichtet. »

Aus diesem Grund zählt er zu den Wegbereitern des modernen Antisemitismus.

Neben seinem Einfluß auf den Antisemitismus ist Lagardes Denken für das sich formierende deutsche imperialistische Denken von Bedeutung. Diesbezüglich konzentrierte er sich im Sinne eines Deutschen Grenzkolonialismus auf Europa

und dachte nicht an den Erwerb von Kolonien in Übersee. Das kommt den später vor allem von Friedrich Ratzel entworfenen deutschen Lebensraumvorstellungen in Richtung Osteuropa nahe. 1875 hielt Lagarde die « allmähliche Germanisierung Polens » für das Hauptziel deutscher Politik. Da er besorgt darüber war, wie viele Deutsche bei ihrer Landsuche auswanderten, ging es ihm um einen grenznahen kolonisierenden Landerwerb für einen Bauernstand, den er als « wirkliche Grundlage des Staates » ansah. Dieser Landerwerb zielte auf ein Mitteleuropa unter deutscher Führung, « das von der Ems- zur Donaumündung, von der Memel bis Triest, von Metz bis etwa zum Bug reicht » .

In seinem 1918 in den USA abgeschlossenen Buch Das neue Europa zählt Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk Lagarde zu den führenden philosophischen und theologischen Wortführern des Pangermanismus, wobei er weiterhin Heinrich von Treitschke als dessen Historiker, Wilhelm II. als dessen Politiker und Friedrich Ratzel als dessen geopolitischen Geographen bezeichnet. In ihnen allen sieht er Vertreter des « deutschen Dranges nach Osten » , der die slawischen Länder imperialistisch bedroht.

Das Handbuch der Frauenbewegung von 1901 nannte Paul de Lagarde als einen der führenden Gegner der Frauenrechte.

Über die Bildungsmöglichkeiten von Mädchen schrieb er :

« Jedes Weib lernt wirklich nur von dem Manne, den es liebt, und es lernt dasjenige, was und soviel wie der geliebte Mann durch seine Liebe als ihn erfreuend haben will. »

Während Paul de Lagarde heute mehr oder weniger vergessen ist, waren sein unmittelbares Nachleben und sein Nachruhm bis in die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus von intensiver Breitenwirkung im deutschen Bürgertum. Über den Verlag Eugen Diederichs, ab 1921 mit Erlöschen der Schutzfrist für seine Werke über die Verlage Bärenreiter (Augsburg) ; Langenscheidt (Berlin) ; den Insel Verlag, den Alfred Kröner Verlag, den Reclam-Verlag und Bernhard G. Teubner (Leipzig) ; den Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh (Paderborn) ; besonders über Julius Friedrich Lehmann und seinen Münchener Verlag erfuhren seine kulturphilosophischen Werke, vor allem die Ideen aus den Deutschen Schriften, in Anthologien weite Verbreitung.

Zu seinen bekanntesten Lesern zählten Houston Stewart Chamberlain, der in Lagarde einen seiner wichtigsten Gewährsmänner sah, der Vorsitzende des Alldeutschen Verbandes Heinrich Claß, Adolf Hitler, Karl Lamprecht, Julius Langbehn, Friedrich Nietzsche, Alfred Rosenberg, der von Lagarde die Idee zum so genannten Madagaskarplan übernahm, Artur Dinter, der ihm seinen Roman Die Sünde wider die Liebe (1922) widmete, Hans Rothfels, Richard Wagner, aber auch Thomas Mann (vergleiche « Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen ») und Martin Buber. Auch an den 180 Lagarde-Feiern, die zu seinem 50. Todestag am 22. Dezember 1941 deutschlandweit stattgefunden haben sollen, lässt sich sein posthumer Erfolg ablesen.

Schriften

Initia chromatologiæ arabicæ (1849) .

Arica (1851) .

Konservativ ? (1853) .

Über die gegenwärtigen Aufgaben der deutschen Politik (1853) .

Didascalia apostolorum syriace (1854) .

Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien (1863) .

Gesammelte Abhandlungen (1866) .

Genesis græce (1868) .

Über das Verhältnis des deutschen Staates zu Theologie, Kirche und Religion. Ein Versuch Nicht-Theologen zu orientieren (1873) .

Über die gegenwärtige Lage des deutschen Reichs. Ein Bericht (1875) .

Armenische Studien (1877) .

Symmicta (Januar 1877 - Februar 1889) .

Semitica (1878) .

Deutsche Schriften (1878, 5. Auflage 1920, versammelt fortlaufend alle politischen Schriften) .

Orientalia (Januar 1879 - Februar 1880) .

Persische Studien (1884) .

Juden und Indogermanen (1887) .

Übersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina (Januar 1889 - Februar 1891) .

Posthume Ausgaben

Erinnerungen aus seinem Leben für die Freunde zusammengestellt von Anna de Lagarde. Kæstner, Göttingen (1894) .

Gedichte. Gesamtausgabe, besorgt von Anna de Lagarde. Horstmann, Göttingen (1897) .

Erinnerungen an Friedrich Rückert. Dieterich, Göttingen (1897) .

Schriften für Deutschland. August Messer (Herausgeber) . Alfred Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart (1933) .

Bekenntnis zu Deutschland. Auswahl aus seinen Schriften. Friedrich Daab (Herausgeber) . Diederich, Jena (1933) .

Nationale Religion. Georg Dost (Herausgeber) . Diederichs, Jena (1934) .

Franz Overbecks Briefwechsel mit Paul de Lagarde. Niklaus Peter und Andreas Urs Sommer (Herausgeber) , in : Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte, Band 3 (1996) ; Seiten 127-171.

Theodor Fritsch

L'écrivain allemand antisémite Theodor Fritsch est né le 28 octobre 1852 à Wiesenena, en Saxe ; et est mort le 8 septembre 1933 à Gautzsch (aujourd'hui Markkleeberg) , en Saxe. Il est persuadé de la supériorité de la race et du peuple allemand. Il a écrit sous les pseudonymes de Thomas Frey, Fritz Thor et Ferdinand Roderich-Stoltheim.

Disciple de Wilhelm Marr (à qui l'on doit la création du terme « antisémitisme ») , il publia en 1887, le « Antisemiten-Katechismus » (Catéchisme des antisémites) . Il fut le 1er traducteur allemand des Protocoles des Sages de Sion, un faux-document antisémite attribué à Mathieu Golovinski. Il était membre de la Ligue allemande.

Nietzsche écrivit à son propos :

« Il n'est vraiment pas en Allemagne de clique plus effrontée et plus stupide que ces antisémites. Cette racaille ose avoir dans la bouche le nom Zarathoustra. Dégoût ! Dégoût ! Dégoût ! »

...

The German publisher and journalist Theodor Fritsch was born on 28 October 1852, in Wiedemar, Saxony ; and died on 8 September 1933, in Markkleeberg, also in Saxony. His anti-semitic writings did much to influence popular German opinion against Jews in the late- 19th and early- 20th Centuries. His writings also appeared under the pen names Thomas Frey, Fritz Thor, and Ferdinand Roderich-Stoltheim.

He is not to be confused with his son, also Theodor Fritsch (1895-1946) , likewise a book-seller and member of the SA.

Fritsch (born Emil Theodor Fritsche) was the 6th of 7 children to Johann Friedrich and August Wilhelmine (« née »

Ohme) Fritsche. 4 of his siblings died in childhood. He attended vocational school in Delitzsch where he learned casting and machine building. He then undertook study at the Berlin Institute of Technology, graduating as a technician in 1875. In the same year, he found employment in a Berlin factory. He gained independence in 1879 through the founding of a technical bureau associated with a publishing firm. In 1880, he founded the « Deutsche Müllerbund » (the Miller's League) which issued the publication « Der Deutsche Müller » (the German Miller) . In 1905, he founded the « Saxon Small Business Association » . He devoted himself to this organization and to the interests of crafts and small businesses (« Mittelstand ») , as well as to the spread of anti-Semitic propaganda. When he changed his name to Fritsch is unclear.

Fritsch created an early discussion forum, « Antisemitic Correspondence » , in 1885, for anti-Semites of various political persuasions. He offered editorship of it to Right-wing politician Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg in 1894, where it became an organ for Sonnenberg's Party under the name « German Social Articles » .

Fritsch founded a Leipzig publishing firm, « Hammer-Verlag » , in 1902, whose flagship publication was « The Hammer : pages for German Sense » (1902-1940) . The firm issued German translations of the « Protocols of the Elders of Zion » and « The International Jew » (collected writings of Henry Ford from « The Dearborn Independent ») as well as many of Fritsch's own works.

In 1890, Fritsch became, along with Otto Böckel, one of the 1st deputies of the « Antisemitic People's Party » , founded by Böckel and Oswald Zimmermann, to the « Reichstag » . The Party was renamed the Reform Party in 1893, achieving 16 seats. The Party failed, however, to achieve significant public recognition. One of Fritsch's major goals was to unite all anti-semitic political parties under a single banner ; he wished for anti-semitism to permeate the agenda of every German social and political organization. This effort proved largely to be a failure, as, by 1890, there were over 190 various anti-semitic Parties in Germany. He also had a powerful rival for the leadership of the anti-semites in Otto Böckel, with whom he had a strong personal rivalry.

Fritsch founded the « Reichshammerbund » (« Reich » 's Hammer League) , in 1912, one of the 1st political groups to adopt the Swastika. He also founded the secret « Germanenorden » in that year. Members of these groups formed the Thule Society, in 1918, which eventually sponsored the creation of the Nazi Party. The « Reichhammerbund » was eventually folded into the « Deutschvölkischer Schutz und Trutzbund » , on whose advisory board Fritsch sat. He later became a member of the German « Völkisch » Freedom Party. In the general election of May, 1924, Fritsch was elected to serve as a member of the National-Socialist Freedom Movement, a Party formed in alliance with the « Völkisch » Freedom Party by the Nazis as a legal means to election after the Nazi Party had been banned in the aftermath of the Munich « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » . He only served until the next election in December, 1924.

A believer in the absolute superiority of the Aryan race, Fritsch was upset by the changes brought on by rapid industrialization and urbanization, and called for a return to the traditional peasant values and customs of the distant past, which he believed exemplified the essence of the « Volk » .

In 1893, Fritsch published his most famous work, « The Handbook of the Jewish Question » , also known as the «

Anti-Semitic Catechism » which leveled a number of conspiratorial charges at European Jews and called upon Germans to refrain from intermingling with them. Vastly popular, the book was read by millions and was in its 49th edition by 1944 (330,000 copies) . The ideas espoused by the work greatly influenced Adolf Hitler and the Nazis during their rise to power after World War I. Fritsch also founded, in 1902, an anti-Semitic journal, « the Hammer » and this became, in 1912, the basis of a movement, the « Reichshammerbund » .

Another work, « The Riddle of the Jew's Success » , was published in English in 1927 under the pseudonym : Ferdinand Roderich-Stoltheim.

...

Theodor Fritsch, whose father was an agriculturist, was born in Wiesenena (in the Delitzsch district) on October 28, 1852. After his schooling, Fritsch absolved an apprenticeship in machine design and attended the Vocational Institute in Halle (Saale) , after which he studied at the Technical University of Berlin. Fritsch aspired to self-employment and, in the late 1870's, he settled in Leipzig, where he opened a mill machinery business. Along with his business activities, he became active in industry association politics and with journalistic endeavors. Fritsch founded the German Association of Millers and, later, published the technical journal, « Der deutsche Müller » (The German Miller) . His involvement in the millers' association sparked his concern for problems faced by small and medium-sized businesses in Germany. During the crisis years of the German Empire, around 1900, Fritsch became one of the founding members of the « Deutsche Mittelstandsvereinigung » (German Alliance of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses) , whose purpose was to represent the interests of existing and new businesses, along with those of diverse segments of the economy, from small retailers to large landlords.

By the end of the 1870's, Fritsch had become a radical anti-Semite and an advocate of politically-sanctioned anti-Semitism. He blamed the Jews for the economic difficulties being suffered by small and medium-sized businesses. In November 1905, Fritsch became chairman of the « Mittelstandsvereinigung » (Alliance of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses) of the Kingdom of Saxony. Fritsch was a « Freiheitspartei » (Freedom Party) representative to the « Reichstag » . He was motivated by strong populist-socialistic convictions, and was one of the 1st Germans to draft plans for a utopian « Garden City » .

Fritsch viewed Social-Democracy as an arch political threat, and viewed its rise to be the direct result of a Jewish-funded subversive movement. He continually intensified his efforts against this perceived Jewish threat. In 1880, he founded the « Hammer Publishing House » in Leipzig and, under the pseudonym « Thomas Frey » , sporadically published anti-Semitic leaflets. In 1885, he began publishing anti-Semitic correspondence. Fritsch became increasingly well-known as a writer and publisher, and expanded his anti-Semitic activities within the professional associations to which he belonged. He became head of the German Reform Party and, in 1886, founded the German Anti-Semitic Alliance. In 1887, he published a book under the title « Antisemiten-Katechismus » (The Anti-Semitic Catechism) . This publication, which, in 1907, was re-named « The Handbook of the Jewish Question » became the standard reference for the « Völkische Bewegung » (the nationalist Right-wing) during the German Empire. When the « Antisemitische Deutschsoziale Partei » (Anti-Semitic German-Socialist Party) , or DSP, came into being in 1891, Fritsch was among its

founding members. A few years later, he withdrew from the anti-Semitic political movement. In 1900, Fritsch purchased a parcel of land in Gautzsch, known today as Markkleeberg-West.

Fritsch conceived the idea for a new anti-democratic journal, which would scrutinize the many subversive emancipatory movements of the day. In 1902, he published « Hammer. Blätter für deutschen Sinn », an anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-freemason magazine. In 1912, he founded the « Reichshammerbund » (National Hammer League) , with which he hoped to usher in a new era of non-partisan anti-Semitism. His anti-Semitic tirades landed Fritsch in Court on more than one occasion, but he generally got away with only a light sentence.

Fritsch died on September 8, 1933, in Gautzsch. The National-Socialists named him the « Architect of Anti-Semitism » and saw him as an important contributor to Nazi doctrine.

His funeral, on September 12, 1933, had all the trappings of a State funeral and was staged as a major propaganda event by the new power-holders. His burial was attended by : « NSDAP Gauleiter und Saxon Reichsstatthalter » Martin Mutschmann ; « Reich » Minister of the Interior Wilhelm Frick ; Leipzig « NSDAP Kreisleiter » Walter Dönicke and the National-Socialist Protestant Bishop, Friedrich Coch.

...

Theodor Fritsch (Geburtsname Emil Theodor Fritsche ; geboren 28. Oktober 1852 in Wiesenena ; gestorben 8. September 1933 in Gautzsch) war ein deutscher Publizist und Verleger, der eine treibende Rolle bei der Gartenstadt-Bewegung der Jahrhundertwende um 1900 hatte. Er schrieb und verlegte auch eine Reihe antisemitischer Schriften. Fritsch schrieb auch unter den Pseudonymen Thomas Frey, Fritz Thor und Ferdinand Roderich-Stoltheim.

Sein gleichnamiger Sohn (1895-1946) war ebenfalls Buchhändler sowie SA-Mitglied, Mitglied des Aktionsausschusses des Börsenvereins Deutscher Buchhändler und Mitglied des Präsidialrats der Reichsschrifttumskammer.

Theodor Fritsch wurde als Emil Theodor Fritsche im heutigen Wiedemar (Kreis Delitzsch) geboren. Seine Eltern waren der Bauer Johann Friedrich Fritsche und Auguste Wilhelmine, geborene Ohme. Er war das sechste von sieben Kindern. Vier seiner Geschwister starben im Kindesalter. Nach dem Besuch der Realschule in Delitzsch lernte er Gießer und Maschinenbauer. Danach nahm er ein technisches Studium an der Berliner Gewerbeakademie auf, das er 1875 als Techniker abschloß. Im gleichen Jahr trat er in eine Berliner Maschinenfabrik ein und machte sich 1879 durch Gründung eines technischen Büros, das mit einer Verlagsanstalt verbunden war, selbstständig. 1880 gründete Fritsch den Deutschen Müllerbund und gab dessen Zeitschrift Der Deutsche Müller heraus. 1898 gründete er die « Mittelstandsvereinigung im Königreiche Sachsen ». Er widmete sich der Artikulation und Organisation der Interessen von Handwerk und Mittelstand, aber auch der Verbreitung antisemitischer Propagandaschriften. Wann er seinen Namen in « Fritsch » geändert hat, ist nicht eindeutig geklärt.

Die Stadt der Zukunft (1896) wurde zum Vorbild einer Reihe von Siedlungsbauten der Gartenstadtbewegung, die wie unter anderem Heimland von der Vegetarierkolonie Eden bei Oranienburg inspiriert wurden.

In seinem 1902 in Leipzig gegründeten Hammer-Verlag erschienen neben der Zeitschrift Der Hammer - Blätter für deutschen Sinn (1902-1940) zahlreiche antisemitische Propagandaschriften, darunter auch deutsche Übersetzungen der Protokolle der Weisen von Zion und der von Henry Ford unter dem Titel Der internationale Jude herausgegebenen Zeitschriftenaufsätze des Dearborn Independent. Mit der Antisemitischen Correspondenz schuf Fritsch 1885 eine Art Diskussionsforum für Antisemiten verschiedener politischer Richtungen. 1894 gab Fritsch die Redaktion der Zeitschrift an Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg ab, der sie unter dem Namen Deutsch-soziale Blätter zum Organ seiner Partei machte.

In seinen zahlreichen eigenen Publikationen untersuchte Fritsch die angebliche « Verjudung » der christlichen Religion, des Adels, des Landbesitzes, der Presse, der Richterschaft und diverser anderer Berufsgruppen. Seine ultraradikalen Ansichten zur « Judenfrage » brachten ihm Geld- und Gefängnisstrafen ein. Öffentliches Aufsehen erregten vor allem die Gotteslästerungsprozesse zwischen 1910 und 1913. Im Hammer und in seinen Büchern Mein Beweis-Material gegen Jahwe (1911) und Der falsche Gott (1916) hatte Fritsch die sittliche Minderwertigkeit der jüdischen Religion zu erweisen versucht. Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (CV) zeigte ihn daraufhin wegen Beleidigung einer Religionsgemeinschaft und Störung der öffentlichen Ordnung an. In den ersten beiden Prozessen wurde Fritsch zu Gefängnisstrafen verurteilt, im dritten Prozess aufgrund eines umstrittenen theologischen Gutachtens Rudolf Kittels freigesprochen.

Fritsch widmete sich auch anderen Themenkomplexen wie zum Beispiel der auch von der völkischen Bewegung popularisierten Gartenstadtidee, zu der er bereits durch sein 1896 erschienenes Buch Die Stadt der Zukunft beitrug, und der Mittelstandsfrage.

Fritschs Antisemiten-Catechismus erschien erstmals 1887 im Verlag von Hermann Beyer. Eine aktualisierte und erweiterte Fassung gab Fritsch unter dem Titel Handbuch der Judenfrage ab 1907 heraus. Das Buch besteht aus mehreren Teilen, die einen hohen Gebrauchswert für Antisemiten haben sollten. So findet sich etwa eine antisemitische Zitate-, Literatur- und Argumentsammlung, antisemitische Forderungen und Statistiken (zum Beispiel Anteile von Juden an bestimmten Bevölkerungsgruppen), Angaben über die Größe der jüdischen Gemeinden einzelner Städte, umstrittene Auszüge aus dem Talmud. Daneben findet sich das Parteiprogramm der antisemitischen Deutschsozialen Partei oder Listen, die antisemitische Buchhandlungen, Verlage oder Zeitschriften aufzählen oder « judenfreie » Geschäfte (« Verzeichnis empfehlenswerter deutscher Firmen ») zum Beispiel für den Bezug von Apfelwein oder Olivenöl benennen. Unter den empfohlenen Tageszeitungen finden sich nicht nur Parteiblätter der Antisemiten, sondern auch zahlreiche (besonders katholische) Regionalzeitungen des deutschsprachigen Raumes, die aufgrund ihres Antisemitismus ausgewählt wurden. Die antisemitische Polemik geht dabei nahtlos in die offene und ausdrückliche Bekämpfung des Christentums und besonders des Katholizismus (« in seiner Substanz jüdisch ») über. Die Schriftleitung übergab Theodor Fritsch an Ludwig Franz Gengler. Das Buch erlebte bis 1945 insgesamt 49 Auflagen, in denen auch neuere Ereignisse in Fritschs antisemitisches Deutungsmuster integriert wurden. So behauptete er nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg, Preußen-Deutschland habe seinen Wohlstand durch ehrliche, nationale Arbeit erwirtschaftet. Dadurch sei es ein Hindernis für die Weltherrschaftspläne des internationalen Judentums gewesen, das es daher durch die Niederlage im Krieg und die Novemberrevolution unterworfen habe. Diese Verschwörungstheorie wurde 1924 von Adolf Hitler in seiner Programmschrift Mein Kampf

übernommen.

Fritschs Handbuch der Judenfrage bildet, teilweise bis heute, eine Fundgrube für Nationalsozialisten, Neonazis und Revisionisten.

Auch im parlamentarischen Bereich ist Theodor Fritschs Einfluß festzustellen. 1890 brachte Fritsch über die von ihm, Otto Böckel und Oswald Zimmermann gegründete Antisemitische Volkspartei mit Otto Böckel den ersten Programm-Antisemiten als Abgeordneten in den Reichstag. Die 1893 in Deutsche Reformpartei umbenannte Gruppierung erreichte in diesem Jahr 16 Reichstagsmandate. Sieht man von politischen Skandalen ab, hat diese Partei jedoch eine erkennbare politische Wirkung oder eine nennenswerte öffentliche Anerkennung nicht erreicht. Fritsch verfolgte parteipolitisch auch mehr das Ziel, den Antisemitismus in allen Reichstagsfraktionen zu verankern und ihn durch Vereine und Verbände zu verbreiten, zum Beispiel durch die Sächsische Mittelstandsvereinigung, an deren Gründung (1905) und Leitung er maßgeblich beteiligt war. Auch an der Gründung des Reichsdeutschen Mittelstandsverbandes wirkte er als Ideengeber maßgeblich mit. Auch an der Gründung des Kartell der schaffenden Stände war er beteiligt.

Fritsch gründete 1912 den Reichshammerbund, der die Leser seiner Zeitschrift in Diskussionszirkeln zusammenfasste, gleichzeitig den Germanenorden als geheime Zwillingsorganisation. Mitglieder des Germanenordens gründeten 1918 die Thule-Gesellschaft für wiederum öffentliche politische Treffen. Der Reichshammerbund ging im Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbund auf, in dessen Beirat Fritsch später saß. Im Frühjahr 1919 hatte Fritsch zudem zu den Unterzeichnern des Aufrufes zur Gründung des Deutschen Schutz- und Trutzbundes gehört, der ebenfalls im Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbund aufging. Später wurde er Mitglied in der Deutschvölkischen Freiheitspartei (DVFP) .

Bei der Reichstagswahl Mai 1924 wurde Fritsch für die Nationalsozialistische Freiheitspartei, einer gemeinsamen Liste der DVFP und der verbotenen NSDAP, in den Reichstag gewählt und gehörte ihm bis zur nächsten Wahl im Dezember 1924 an. Ab 1925 gehörte er der Reichsleitung der DVFP-Nachfolgeorganisation Deutschvölkische Freiheitsbewegung (DVFB) an. Fritsch verließ die DVFB im Februar 1927 im Zuge von Auseinandersetzungen um ein stärker an den Interessen der Arbeitnehmer ausgerichtetes Programm.

Fritsch verstarb 1933 in Gautzsch im Alter von 80 Jahren nach einem Schlaganfall. 1935 setzten die Nationalsozialisten Theodor Fritsch in Berlin-Zehlendorf ein Denkmal. Es wurde um 1942 aus Kriegsgründen eingeschmolzen.

Im Frühjahr 1887 sandte Fritsch einige Nummern seiner Antisemitischen Correspondenz dem Philosophen Friedrich Nietzsche zu. Dieser schickte sie zurück und verspottete in einem Begleitbrief :

« Dieses abscheuliche Mitredenwollen noiser Dilettanten über den Werth von Menschen und Rassen, diese Unterwerfung unter “ Autoritäten ”, welche von jedem besonneneren Geiste mit kalter Verachtung abgelehnt werden (zum Beispiel Eugen Dühring, Richard Wagner, Johannes Heinrich August Ebrard, Adolf Wahrmund, Paul de Lagarde - wer von ihnen ist in Fragen der Moral und Historie der unberechtigtste, ungerechteste ?) , diese beständigen absurden Fälschungen und Zurechtmachungen der vagen Begriffe “ germanisch ”, “ semitisch ”, “ arisch ”, “ christlich ”, “ deutsch ”. »

Privat notierte sich Nietzsche :

« Neulich hat ein Herr Theodor Fritsch aus Leipzig an mich geschrieben. Es giebt gar keine unverschämtere und stupidere Bande in Deutschland als diese Antisemiten. Ich habe ihm brieflich zum Danke einen ordentlichen Fußtritt versetzt. Dies Gesindel wagt es, den Namen Zarathustra in den Mund zu nehmen ! Ekel ! Ekel ! Ekel ! »

Le « Deutsche Zentrumspartei »

Le « Deutsche Zentrumspartei » (« Zentrum » : Centre) est un des principaux Partis politiques de l'Empire allemand puis de la République de Weimar. Fondé en 1870 et dissous le 5 juillet 1933, il représente les idées des catholiques, minoritaires en Allemagne. Le Parti est refondé après la Seconde Guerre mondiale mais est marginalisé rapidement par la CDU qui devient le principal Parti de la démocratie chrétienne en Allemagne.

Le « Zentrum » est le représentant politique du catholicisme. La politisation de l'Église catholique est un processus lent et irrégulier. Avec le recès d'Empire de 1803, le titre de prince-évêque disparaît. Cela marque une rupture pour le catholicisme, qui a joué un rôle structurant important au sein du Saint-Empire germanique. En 1815, avec le Congrès de Vienne et la fin de la domination napoléonienne sur l'Allemagne, l'anti-cléricalisme est associé à la Révolution. En réaction, on assiste à un réveil religieux dans la population, ainsi le Romantisme remet en valeur l'inconscient et l'irrationnel, tandis que le mouvement nationaliste allemand est fondamentalement chrétien.

La politisation a plusieurs aspects : d'abord, le mouvement ultramontain, en faveur de la toute-puissance du pape, ce qui culmine avec la proclamation du dogme de l'infaillibilité papale, met fin à la théologie influencée par les Lumières. Ensuite, elle doit faire face aux princes allemands, qui ne veulent pas perdre leur pouvoir, et au mouvement Libéral. Dans les années 1830, le conflit qui oppose le royaume de Prusse à l'Église catholique, à Cologne notamment, est à son paroxysme. L'archevêque Clément-Auguste Droste zu Vischering est emprisonné en 1837, ce qui provoque une vague de protestations dans toute l'Allemagne catholique.

L'opposition des Libéraux et de l'État permet aux catholiques de se souder. Ainsi, au parlement de Francfort de 1848, ils se rassemblent dans le club des catholiques, qui est un groupe lâche de députés issus de différents groupes parlementaires ayant en commun de vouloir protéger l'Église contre l'État. En 1852, un groupe parlementaire catholique est fondé au parlement prussien. Il est dissout en 1867 dans les parlements d'autres États allemands, également des groupes parlementaires catholiques.

Les conférences qui ont lieu à Søest à partir du 12 janvier 1864, et qui rassemblent les frères Georg et Hermann von Mallinckrodt, Alfred Hüffer, Wilderich von Ketteler, Friedrich Wilhelm Weber et Eduard Klein jouent un rôle important dans la formation du « Zentrum ». Les réunions sont organisées à intervalles irréguliers jusqu'en 1866 et jusqu'à la Guerre austro-prussienne. La défaite autrichienne, protectrice historique des catholiques en Allemagne, est également une défaite pour ces derniers. Le catholicisme continue toutefois de se politiser, le clergé local soutient fortement ce mouvement. Cela est notamment confirmé par un rapport administratif des années 1860 dans le Sauerland. Le mouvement est partagé entre une aile pro-prussienne dans le nord de l'Allemagne menée par Ketteler ; dans le sud

de l'Allemagne, l'anti-borussisme domine. Au sein du « Zollparlament » , Ludwig Windthorst, jusque là ambivalent, se ligue avec les seconds et influence la suite des événements en faveur du particularisme.

Ce n'est malgré tout qu'en 1869, l'an avant les élections de la Chambre des représentants de Prusse, que les projets de création d'un Parti catholique se concrétisent. Des rencontres à Ahlen en Westphalie, Münster et à Essen permettent à Hermann von Mallinckrodt et Peter Reichensperger de s'accorder sur un programme politique.

L'indépendance de l'Église et de ses institutions est revendiquée. Les écoles confessionnelles doivent être préservées. L'unification de l'Allemagne doit se faire selon un principe fédéral avec une autonomie importante pour les États fédérés.

Des revendications allant dans le sens d'une politique sociale sont également présentes dans le programme d'Essen du 30 juin 1870. Afin d'alléger la charge pesant sur le peuple, le budget militaire ne doit plus être augmenté, la répartition des recettes fiscales doit également être plus équitable afin de limiter les inégalités les plus flagrantes. Le programme de Søest du 28 octobre 1870 prévoit que les meneurs du futur Parti doivent être issus des rangs de la Chambre des représentants de Prusse. Le 13 décembre 1870, le groupe parlementaire du « Zentrum » est fondé, il a 48 membres et, pour président, Karl Friedrich von Savigny. Les autres membres influents sont Peter et August Reichensperger, Hermann von Mallinckrodt, Ludwig Windthorst, Friedrich Wilhelm Weber, Ernst Lieber et Eduard Müller.

Aux élections législatives du 3 mars 1871, le Parti obtient 18,6 % des suffrages et 63 mandats. Cela en fait le second groupe parlementaire au « Reichstag » derrière celui du Parti National-Libéral.

Le « Zentrum » est dans l'opposition du gouvernement Bismarck, sa politique économique Libérale et ses tentatives d'imposer le pouvoir politique à l'Église étant contraire aux positions du Parti. L'oppression que fait subir le chancelier aux minorités, qu'elles soient polonaise, d'Alsace-Lorraine ou autres, et donc majoritairement catholique, est également vivement rejetée par le Parti qui rassemble en son sein toutes ces minorités. Le Parti est par ailleurs très attaché à la notion d'État de droit et constitutionnel. Le fédéralisme est également un de ses crédos. À l'inverse, le suffrage universel ne fait pas partie des revendications du « Zentrum » . Par ailleurs, le Parti est comme son nom l'indique centriste.

Dans la 1^{re} décennie d'existence de l'Empire allemand, la politique intérieure du chancelier impérial est orientée contre les catholiques, ceux-ci ne semblant pas soutenir l'unité au moyen de la solution « petite-allemande » qui les a mis en minorité face aux protestants. Bismarck parvient à obtenir le soutien à la fois des Libéraux et des conservateurs et a donc les mains libres afin de lutter contre les ultramontains et l'influence du pape dans l'Empire. Il tente ainsi d'affaiblir l'Église catholique et, surtout, son Parti politique qu'est le « Zentrum » . Les conservateurs participent à cette lutte parce qu'ils s'opposent à toute influence étrangère sur la politique allemande ; quant aux Libéraux, ils voient dans le Vatican une force réactionnaire, un sentiment alors renforcé par le « Syllabus » et le 1^{er} concile œcuménique du Vatican ayant affirmé l'infaillibilité pontificale.

Au début des années 1870, la politique dite du « Kulturkampf » fait des catholiques allemands des « ennemis de

l'Empire » . Un autre objectif de la manœuvre est de détourner l'attention de la crise économique. Le « Zentrum » , ennemi de l'Empire par extension, se ligue alors aux autres minorités que sont les Polonais, les Alsaciens, les Danois et les partisans des Welf afin de lutter contre la politique du chancelier.

Windthorst, meneur incontesté du Parti, répond à cette politique en prenant des positions à la fois conservatrices et Libérales. D'un côté, il lutte contre le mariage civil et l'école laïque en cherchant à s'attirer la sympathie des conservateurs. De l'autre, il réaffirme les droits du parlement, que ce soit lors du vote de la loi sur le septennat en 1874 ou sur celle censurant les députés en 1879, la liberté de la presse et la limitation du pouvoir militaire. Il va plus loin, en apportant son soutien aux propositions des Libéraux en faveur d'un gouvernement parlementaire, d'un salaire pour les députés et d'une réforme électorale dans le royaume de Prusse ce qui plutôt contraire à l'esprit du « Zentrum » et de ses électeurs.

Le « Kulturkampf » ne remplit toutefois pas ses objectifs. Certes, il enregistre quelques succès comme la création d'un état civil communal, le mariage civil et une certaine laïcité à l'école, mais il renforce surtout la solidarité entre catholiques. Le « Zentrum » s'en trouve renforcé à son tour, il devient le Parti des catholiques contre la domination prusso-protestante dans l'Empire. Aux élections de 1874, au plus fort de la politique anti-Catholique, il réalise le score de 28 % des suffrages. Lors des élections suivantes, sa part est semblable ce qui se traduit par entre 90 et 100 sièges au « Reichstag » .

Il est le Parti du centre et des catholiques. Ceux-ci, indépendamment de leur position sociale votent massivement en sa faveur. Ainsi dans les années 1880, environ 80 % des catholiques votent « Zentrum » .

Bismarck marque un tournant dans sa politique, il se distance de la politique économique Libérale et adhère au protectionnisme. Cela permet au « Zentrum » de voter pour la 1re fois pour une loi gouvernementale avec le tarif douanier de 1879. Il commence à mener une politique sociale dictée en partie par le Parti du centre. La période est également le début de la lutte contre la Sociale-Démocratie avec lois anti-Socialistes que le Parti rejette en bloc. En bref, le chancelier et son gouvernement se rapprochent du Parti. La fin du « Kulturkampf » , avec pas moins de 5 lois entre 1880 et 1887, réchauffe également ces relations. Le Parti en ressort renforcé, il a le plus grand groupe parlementaire de l'assemblée allemande, de 1881 à 1912. Il a un rôle important dans l'introduction de la sécurité sociale en Allemagne, notamment avec la loi Galen en 1877.

Le retrait de Bismarck en 1890 marque un recul de la partie catholique et confessionnelle dans le programme du Parti au profit de la politique sociale. La création en 1890 de l'association populaire pour l'Allemagne catholique, ayant des idées plus à Gauche que le Parti, comptant parmi ses membres de nombreux de ses militants et qui diffusent des tracts et organisent des réunions afin de soutenir la politique sociale permet au Parti d'élargir sa base électorale chez les ouvriers.

Après la mort de Windthorst, en 1891, Ernst Lieber devient le meneur au parlement allemand.

Les chanceliers impériaux suivants Bismarck sont globalement soutenus par le Parti que ce soit en matière de

politique intérieure, extérieure, coloniale ou sur la question très symbolique de la marine impériale allemande à partir de 1898. Il est donc clairement devenu un Parti de la majorité. Ainsi, il vote le « Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch » en 1896 alors que celui-ci entérine le mariage civil. Il commence également à coopérer avec le Parti National-Libéral, ennemi pendant le « Kulturkampf ». Malgré le rejet du Parti de la « Zuchthausvorlage », loi dirigée contre les Socialistes et les syndicats, la coopération se renforce avec le vote du tarif douanier de 1902, le soutien de la politique sociale et économique de Arthur von Posadowsky-Wehner jusqu'en 1906. En contre-partie, le gouvernement renonce à lutter contre la Sociale-Démocratie par la voie légale. Le Parti dispose alors de la réalité du pouvoir et aucune décision ne peut se faire sans lui.

Les catholiques n'en restent pas moins des citoyens de second rang, auxquels les plus hauts postes restent inaccessibles.

À l're vue, le Parti est relativement stable pendant le règne de Guillaume II, néanmoins, de nombreux conflits internes divisent le Parti. La fin du « Kulturkampf » marque en effet la fin de l'union sacrée au sein du Parti. Jusqu'alors, son aile gauche proche du Parti progressiste dominait les débats comme le montre le refus des députés de voter en faveur du septennat alors même que le pape les y avait invité. Des courants internes se développent ; par exemple, l'aile conservatrice et agricole, l'aile populiste, soutenue par les paysans et les artisans, l'aile bourgeoise et, enfin, l'aile ouvrière qui gagne en influence au fil des ans. Les différences sociales créent également des tensions. Ainsi, alors que le Parti est fondamentalement monarchiste depuis ses débuts, les ouvriers et les populistes montrent des tendances démocratiques. Ces conflits peuvent être plus forts en région, parfois. Par exemple, après la mort de Peter Reichensperger, le Sauerland, véritable bastion du Parti, plusieurs candidats se réclamant du Parti luttent entre eux pendant plus de 10 ans. De manière générale, le Parti est divisé entre ses penchants pour la protection de la religion à l'école, le protectionnisme, la méfiance contre les lois du marché et la défense de la ruralité qui le rapprochent des conservateurs d'un côté, et son attachement à la constitution ainsi qu'aux droits des minorités de l'autre, qui sont des idées Libérales.

Le développement industriel est défavorable sur le long terme au Parti. Même si le milieu catholique tente de séduire les ouvriers, notamment avec une politique d'endiguement de la Sociale-Démocratie avec la protection des ouvriers en programme, le Parti perd des électeurs potentiels dans les grandes villes et les régions industrielles. Les appels à la sécularisation jouent un rôle important dans ce phénomène, qui ne touche, bien sûr, ni les petites villes ni les campagnes. Ainsi, dans le Sauerland, 90 % des électeurs votent pour le « Zentrum ». Cette stagnation du Parti entrouvre la porte à sa transformation en un Parti populaire ouvert également aux protestants. Ce projet, défendu par le journaliste Julius Bachem en 1906, mène à de graves dissensions dans le Parti (dite « Zentrumstreit ») et n'est finalement pas suivi d'effet.

Le Parti reste certes opposé au SPD, mais une première brèche est faite en 1899 avec une alliance électorale avec ce dernier Parti pour démocratiser le droit de vote en Bavière, à Munich, et dans le Palatinat, puis, en 1905, lors des élections régionales bavaroises. Au niveau national, les critiques de Matthias Erzberger au sujet de la politique coloniale et l'augmentation des impôts décidée par le chancelier von Bülow conduisent ce dernier, en 1906, à dissoudre le parlement. Malgré tout, le Parti ne s'allie ni aux Libéraux, ni aux Sociaux-Démocrates, mais aux conservateurs avec la

formation du Bloc Noir-Bleu.

L'Alsace-Lorraine pose également un problème : bien que 3/4 de sa population est catholique, les revendications autonomistes de ses députés en désaccord avec la ligne du Parti les poussent à prendre leur distance avec le groupe parlementaire centriste. En 1906, le Parti du centre d'Alsace-Lorraine est fondé et devient le 1er Parti du « Land » .

Pendant la Première Guerre mondiale, le Parti participe à la paix des forteresses, l'équivalent de l'union sacrée en Allemagne, et soutient ainsi la politique extérieure et de guerre de l'Empereur et de l'OHL. À un tel point, que le Parti cesse quasiment toute activité dans certaines régions.

Toutefois, le Parti se lasse rapidement de la Guerre. En 1917, il se ligue au SPD et au Parti Populaire Progressiste, 3 Partis stigmatisés dans l'Empire allemand, pour former le comité inter-groupe parlementaire et coordonner leurs actions. Le 19 juillet 1917, cela mène au vote d'une résolution de paix au « Reichstag » . Cette résolution qui cherche une motion de paix, reste néanmoins sans effet direct à cause de la dictature qu'exerce « de facto » le duo de dirigeants de l'OHL : Paul von Hindenburg et Erich Ludendorff. Par contre, elle pose les bases de la coalition de Weimar. Graf Georg von Hertling, membre du Parti, devient chancelier impérial de novembre 1917 à septembre 1918, c'est le 1er chancelier issu des rangs du « Zentrum » . La réforme d'octobre impose le régime parlementaire, le Parti est représenté dans le cabinet de Max von Baden par 3 secrétaires d'État.

Le « Zentrum » ne soutient pas la Révolution de novembre. Sur le plan régional, le débat pour savoir si le système politique à choisir est la Monarchie ou la République fait rage avec des partisans des 2 solutions. Dans certaines communes, les dirigeants du Parti sont représentés dans les conseils d'ouvriers et de soldats. Le Parti est cependant réticent devant cette politique de l'action accomplie. Il soutient finalement après de longs débats internes la République appelée par Philipp Scheidemann et prend contact avec ses partenaires de l'ancien comité inter-groupe parlementaire.

Afin de protester contre la politique centralisatrice de Matthias Erzberger, l'aile agricole bavaroise se sépare du Parti en 1920 pour fonder le « Bayerische Volkspartei » (BVP) .

Le « Zentrum » joue un rôle déterminant dans la République de Weimar à cause de sa position centrale. Il peut en principe faire alliance avec les Partis du parlement allant du SPD au DNVP, toutefois, il doit ménager ses dissensions internes. Le Parti est présidé par Felix Porsch qui aide à maintenir l'équilibre interne. Le Parti a ainsi une forte influence au sein de l'assemblée nationale de Weimar et du gouvernement de la République.

Il fait partie des coalitions suivantes durant la République de Weimar : coalition de Weimar avec le SPD et le DDP ; la grande coalition avec le SPD, le DDP et le DVP ; et, enfin, le « Bürgerblock » avec le DDP, le BVP, le DVP et le DNVP. À quelques exceptions près, il est représenté dans tous les gouvernements de la République de Weimar, et 5 chanceliers impériaux sont issus de ses rangs : Konstantin Fehrenbach, de 1920 à 1921 ; Joseph Wirth, de 1921 à 1922 ; Wilhelm Marx, de 1923 à 1925 puis de 1926 à 1928 ; et Heinrich Brüning, de 1930 à 1932. Aux élections présidentielles de 1925, le candidat du Parti, Wilhelm Marx, est défait par Paul von Hindenburg.

Matthias Erzberger est assassiné par un militant d'extrême-droite, le 26 août 1921. Sous sa présidence puis celle de Marx, le Parti défend la constitution de la République de Weimar et tente de faire progresser l'État-providence. Une assurance-chômage est ainsi créée, principalement grâce au Parti. Le milieu des années 1920 marque un tournant vers plus de conservatisme et de nationalisme. Ainsi, l'élection de Ludwig Kaas à la présidence du Parti, en 1928, contre le meneur syndical Adam Stegerwald montre clairement cette tendance.

Cette élection est également une réaction aux résultats des élections législatives de 1928 qui sont un véritable revers pour le Parti : il a perdu des voix non seulement dans les grandes villes, mais également dans les petites et à la campagne. Une partie du « Zentrum » pense que seul un retour du clergé permettrait d'éviter cette perte d'influence.

Le « Zentrum » lutte lors des élections suivantes contre les Partis des extrêmes, en particulier contre le KPD et les Nazis. L'arrivée de Brüning à la chancellerie marque le passage définitif du Parti à une politique conservatrice. En menant une politique de déflations et de rigueur, il n'a pas seulement pour but d'assainir les finances publiques mais également de démontrer aux pays vainqueur de la Première Guerre mondiale que l'Allemagne n'est pas en mesure de remplir économiquement ses obligations liées au Traité de Versailles. Elle a un besoin impérieux d'un report de paiement, voire d'une annulation de dette.

Le 13 avril 1932, Brüning interdit les organisations nationales-socialistes que sont les SA et les SS en utilisant la découverte des documents de Boxheimer, dans lesquels des plans de coups d'État sont fait. Le NSDAP est déclaré ennemi d'État. Brüning est cependant renvoyé par Hindenburg avant que l'interdiction ait été suivie d'effet.

Le dernier chancelier impérial membre du « Zentrum » est Franz von Papen. Il est néanmoins « de facto » dans l'opposition au Parti depuis qu'il s'est rangé du côté d'Hindenburg après son élection en 1925. Il quitte d'ailleurs le Parti 2 jours après avoir été nommé chancelier, anticipant une décision du comité du Parti. Ce dernier combat par la suite avec acharnement le cabinet du Baron comme les membres du « Zentrum » le surnomment.

Le 30 janvier 1933, Hitler est nommé Chancelier. Le NSDAP et le Parti national (DNVP) forment une coalition gouvernementale. Cependant, Franz von Papen est nommé vice-Chancelier de ce gouvernement dans le groupe du Parti national.

Suite à l'incendie du « Reichstag » du 28 février 1933, les députés du KPD sont emprisonnés en masse. Le 9 mars 1933, le général von Epp, avec l'aide des SA, renverse le gouvernement catholique de Bavière. Afin d'obtenir les pleins pouvoirs, le NSDAP et Hitler ont besoin d'une majorité de 2/3 sans prendre en compte les communistes. Leurs menaces envers les députés du SPD et du « Zentrum » ainsi qu'un accord avec ce dernier permet à la loi d'être votée le 23 mars 1933. Hitler a fait oralement différentes promesses à Ludwig Kaas afin d'obtenir son consentement : le président fédéral doit garder ses droits ; le « Reichstag » et le « Reichsrat » seraient maintenus ; la politique sur l'éducation et le rapport entre l'État et la religion doivent être préservés et ne pas être affectés par la loi. Les espoirs de signature d'un concordat entre l'Allemagne et le Vatican influencent fortement la position du Parti. Le vote de la loi est également une dernière tentative d'exercer un contrôle sur Hitler et sur les Nationaux-Socialistes et, ainsi, de protéger

pense-t-on le pays et le parlement d'une prise de pouvoir total. Cela se révèle totalement illusoire.

Le 5 mai, la présidence du Parti passe de Kaas à Heinrich Brüning, le 1er est à Rome pour préparer le concordat. Il espère pouvoir préserver le « Zentrum » grâce à une collaboration avec le NSDAP, cependant, il doit rapidement se rendre à l'évidence. Le concordat rédigé par von Papen est fortement critiqué par Brüning, le Parti perd alors également l'appui du Saint-Siège. Les menaces du NSDAP deviennent plus palpables, certains membres du Parti sont emprisonnés. Josef Goebbels demande le 28 juin à Brüning de « fermer son magasin dans les plus brefs délais ». La majorité des députés du « Reichstag » et du parlement prussien se prononcent alors pour une dissolution spontanée du Parti ; parmi eux : Brüning, Ernst Grass et Karl Hettlage. Finalement, le Parti cesse d'exister le 5 juillet 1933.

Malgré cette collaboration lors du vote de la loi des pleins pouvoirs, le « Zentrum » n'est en rien un allié du NSDAP sur le plan local. Ainsi, les régions où le « Zentrum » a ses bases votent très peu pour les Nazis. Les électeurs du Parti, principalement catholique, jouent un rôle important dans la formation de la résistance contre le Nazisme.

Ceci explique que les Nazis se méfient des membres de l'ancien Parti après leur prise de pouvoir, beaucoup sont discriminés, emprisonnés, ou envoyés dans les camps de concentration. Cela concerne aussi bien les hauts-fonctionnaires que les simples militants. Ainsi, dès 1933, le camp de Osthofen détient des membres du Parti. Le NSDAP voit dans l'Église catholique et ses représentants un danger ; en représaille, les évêques refusent de donner les sacrements aux membres du Parti nazi. L'Église interdit d'ailleurs expressément à ses fidèles de soutenir et voter pour le Parti nazi. Avec la prise de pouvoir de ce dernier, elle est toutefois obligée, conformément aux règles chrétiennes, de reconnaître l'autorité en place le 28 mars. Par la suite, le concordat est signé, les prêtres et fidèles catholiques ne doivent pas être persécutés massivement, contrairement à ce qui est alors en vigueur en URSS, la liberté de culte doit être garantie.

Cependant, à partir de 1935, l'Église catholique devient de l'avis que le concordat est un échec : il n'a pas permis de protéger ses fidèles. En conséquence, nombreux sont les catholiques à rejoindre les rangs de la résistance face au 3e « Reich » ; parmi eux, beaucoup sont d'anciens membres du « Zentrum » .

Après l'attentat du 20 juillet 1944, les persécutions contre les membres du « Zentrum » s'intensifient. Par exemple, Franz von Galen, frère de l'évêque Clemens August Graf von Galen qui est un opposant aux Nazis, est emprisonné dans un camp de concentration.

...

Au départ, malgré son électorat populaire, les députés du Parti « Zentrum » sont des notables, des avocats et des journalistes. Le Parti ne possède alors pas de structure. La progression du Parti lors des Ires élections mène à la reconduction des députés. Ce n'est qu'à partir de la seconde moitié des années 1880 que des candidats plus populistes font leur apparition. Le Parti peut s'appuyer sur les associations catholiques, qui sont de fait également des associations de militants, pour sa représentation locale.

Le Parti est intimement lié à l'Église catholique, et la fidélité au pape est fondamental en son sein. Cela conduit parfois à des frictions entre les dirigeants du Parti et ceux du clergé, même si celles-ci ne sont souvent pas exposées au grand jour. Ainsi, le pape Léon XIII fait des concessions à Bismarck sur les lois anti-Socialistes en 1878 et 1880 et sur le septennat en 1887 afin de faciliter la fin du « Kulturkampf », le tout sans que les dirigeants du Parti ne soient impliqués dans les négociations.

L'association populaire pour l'Allemagne catholique, fondée en 1890, forme une sorte d'association de masse pour le Parti, surtout dans l'ouest du pays.

Les électeurs du « Zentrum » sont surtout des catholiques. Le Parti ne cible pas une classe en particulier : son électorat va des nobles aux paysans en passant par les bourgeois et les artisans. Toutefois, la population catholique allemande est légèrement différente du reste de la population : elle est surtout constituée de petites gens, d'une population pré-industrielle et de ce qui deviendra par la suite le prolétariat. Le Parti a ainsi ses bases dans les campagnes et les petites villes. La Ruhr est certes catholique mais la grande proportion d'ouvriers la rend instable. Le Parti y est menacé par le Parti National-Libéral, puis par la suite par le SPD.

Les années 1870 sont des années de grands succès électoraux pour le « Zentrum ». Le climat politique et les associations créant un état de mobilisation permanent de l'électorat. Le Parti n'a presque pas besoin de faire campagne pour que les catholiques votent massivement pour lui. Ses électeurs sont donc d'une grande fidélité.

Par la suite, si le nombre d'électeurs du Parti augmente plus rapidement à la fois que la population allemande et le nombre d'électeurs potentiels, l'augmentation de la participation aux élections fait baisser au fil de celles-ci la part des voix du Parti. Par ailleurs, la part des catholiques votant « Zentrum » passe d'environ 83 % en 1874 à 54,6 % en 1912. Au niveau du nombre de sièges, le bilan est meilleur ; le Parti a un pourcentage de mandats plus élevé que celui de ses voix à partir de 1878 à cause de sa forte représentation dans les campagnes, qui sont sur-représentées des suites du découpage électoral. Il a également le plus grand nombre de circonscriptions imprenables de tous les Partis.

Au niveau des parlements régionaux, le Parti détient entre 20,4 % et 23,3 % des mandats à la chambre des représentants de Prusse, entre 1872 et 1914. Au parlement de Bavière, il obtient entre 50,6 % et 53,4 % des sièges, entre 1875 et 1912. Dans le Wurtemberg, où il ne fait son apparition que dans les années 1890, il a entre 25,7 % et 28,3 % des sièges. Dans le pays de Bade, environ 33 % .

En 1912, avec la fin du Bloc Noir-Bleu constitué avec les conservateurs, le Parti essuie une défaite, perdant 14 mandats et 3 % des suffrages.

...

The German Centre Party (« Deutsche Zentrumspartei » or « Zentrum ») is a lay Catholic political Party in Germany during the « Kaiserreich » and the Weimar Republic. In English, it is often called the Catholic Centre Party. Formed in

1870, it battled the « Kulturkampf » which the Prussian government launched to reduce the power of the Catholic Church. It soon won a quarter of the seats in the « Reichstag » (Imperial Parliament) , and its middle position on most issues allowed it to play a decisive role in the formation of majorities. Its support for the Nazi Party was decisive in the passage of the Enabling Act, whereby Adolf Hitler assumed dictatorial powers.

After World War II, the Party was re-founded, but could not rise again to its former importance, as most of its members joined the new Christian Democratic Union (CDU) . The Centre Party was represented in the German parliament until 1957. It exists as a marginal Party, mainly based in the State of North Rhine-Westphalia.

The Centre Party belongs to the political spectrum of « Political Catholicism » that, emerging in the early-19th Century after the turmoil of the Napoleonic Wars, had changed the political face of Germany. Many Catholics found themselves in Protestant dominated States.

The 1st major conflict between the Roman Catholic Church and a Protestant State was the « Colonial Church conflict » , when the Prussian government interfered in the question of mixed marriages and the religious affiliation of children resulting from these. This led to serious aggressions against the Catholic population of the Rhineland and Westphalia and culminated in the arrest of the Archbishop of Cologne.

At that time, one of the founding fathers of Political Catholicism was journalist Joseph Görres, who called upon Catholics to « stand united » for their common goals, « religious liberty and political and civil equality of the denominations » . The conflict relaxed after 1840, with Frederick William IV's accession to the throne.

The Revolution of 1848 brought new opportunities for German Catholics. In October, the Bishops had their 1st meeting in 40 years in Würzburg and the local « Catholic Federations » assembled in Mainz to found the « Catholic Federation of Germany » . In the National Assembly, which was convened to draw-up a German constitution, a « Catholic club » was formed. This was not yet a comprehensive Party, but a loose union aimed at protecting the Church's liberties in a future Germany, supported by many petitions from the « Pius federations for religious liberty » . The later demise of the National Assembly proved to be a major set-back for Political Catholicism.

In Prussia, the revised Constitution of 1850 granted liberties, which in parts even exceeded those of the Frankfurt draft constitution, yet, 2 years later, the Minister for culture, Hans Friedrich Wilhem Ernst von Raumer, issued decrees directed mainly against the Jesuits. In reaction, this led to a doubling of Catholic representatives in the subsequent elections and the formation of a Catholic club in the Prussian Diet. In 1858, when the « New Era » governments of Wilhelm I adopted more lenient policies, the club renamed itself « Fraction of the Centre » in order to open itself up to include non-Catholics. This name stemmed from the fact that in the Prussian Diet the Catholic representatives were seated in the centre, between the Conservatives on the right and the Liberals on the left. Faced with military and constitutional issues, where there was no definite Church position, the group soon disintegrated and disappeared from parliament after 1867.

Growing anti-Catholic sentiment and policies, including plans for dissolving all monasteries in Prussia, made it clear

that a re-organisation of the group was urgently needed in order to protect Catholic minority rights, enshrined in the 1850 Constitution, and to bring them over to the emerging nation State.

In June 1870, Peter Reichersberger called on Catholics to unite and, in October, priests, representatives of Catholic federations and the Catholic gentry met at Søst and drew-up an election programme. The main-points were :

Preservation of the Church's autonomy and rights, as accepted by the constitution. Defense against any attack on the independence of Church bodies, on the development of religious life and on the practice of Christian charity.

Effectual implementation of parity for recognised denominations.

Rejection of any attempt to de-Christianise marriage.

Preservation or founding of denominational schools.

There were also more general demands such as for a more federal, decentralized State, a limitation of State expenditure, a just distribution of taxes, the financial strengthening of the middle-classes and the legal « removal of such evil States, that threaten the worker with moral or bodily ruin » .

With such a manifesto, the number of Catholic representatives in the Prussian Diet rose considerably and, in December 1870, they formed a new « Centre » faction, also called the « Constitution Party » to emphasize its adherence to constitutional liberties.

3 months later, early in 1871, the Catholic representatives to the new national parliament, the « Reichstag » , also formed a « Centre » faction. The Party not only defended the Church's liberties, but also supported representative government and minority rights in general, in particular those of German Poles, Alsatians and Hannoverians. The Centre's main-leader was the Hannoverian advocate Ludwig Windthorst and other major figures included Karl Friedrich von Savigny, Hermann von Mallinckrodt, Burghard Freiherr von Schorlemer-Alst, the brothers August Reichensperger and Peter Reichensperger, and Georg Count Hertling.

Also in other German States, Catholic Parties were formed, cooperating with the Prussian Centre Party in the « Reichstag » :

In Bavaria, the « Bavarian Patriotic Party » , with a particularistic-conservative bent, since 1887 called the « Bavarian Centre » .

In Baden, the « Catholic People's Party » ; since 1881, formally linked to the national « Centre Party » ; and, since 1888, adopting the name « Centre Party » .

In the age of nationalism, Protestant Germans, whether Conservative (like Otto von Bismarck) or Liberal, accused the

Centre of Ultramontanism or having a greater loyalty towards the Pope than to their own nation. After the First Vatican Council, Bismarck launched the « Kulturkampf » (cultural struggle) against the Catholic Church. But the Catholics fought back vigorously and with near-unanimity. The Centre Party gained greater support from the Catholic population. Following Bismarck's 1878 turn from free-trade to protectionism, and from the National Liberal Party to the Conservative Parties, he also abandoned the unsuccessful « Kulturkampf » .

The Centre Party remained a Party of opposition to Bismarck, but after his resignation in 1890, it frequently supported the following administrations' policies in the « Reichstag » , particularly in the field of social security.

The « Kulturkampf » had re-inforced the Catholic character of the Centre Party, but even during it Ludwig Windthorst had defended the Party against Bismarck's accusation of being a « denominational Party » in describing the Centre as « a political Party with a comprehensive political programme and open to anyone, who accepts it » . However, few Protestants took-up this offer and the Centre remained - by the composition of its members, politicians and voters, an essentially Catholic Party.

Loyal to the Pope in church matters, the Centre Party steered a course independent of the Holy-See on secular matters. This became apparent in the « septennat dispute » of 1886. Since the Centre Party rejected Bismarck's military budget, the Chancellor negotiated with the Holy-See and promised to abolish some « Kulturkampf » related laws and to support the Pope in the Roman question, if the Vatican persuaded the Centre Party to accept his bill. Despite this agreement, the Centre Party rejected the budget and Bismarck called new elections. He also published the letters with the Vatican, intending to drive a wedge between Catholic voters loyal to the Pope and the Centre Party with the slogan :

« The Pope against the Centre ! »

Windthorst managed to avert this by re-affirming the Party's autonomy, which the Pope had accepted, and by interpreting the published letters as expressions of papal confidence in the Party.

As the « Kulturkampf » declined, debates about the character of the Party emerged culminating in the Centre dispute, in 1906, after Julius Bachem had published the article « We must get-out of the tower ! » He called upon Catholic politicians to fulfill Windthorst's word and get-out of their perpetual minority position by an effort to increase Protestant numbers among their representatives in parliament. His proposal was met with passionate opposition by the greater part of Catholic public, especially since it also included the Christian trade-unions and other Catholic organizations. No side could win the upper-hand, when the outbreak of World War I ended the dispute.

After the War, Adam Stegerwald, leader of the Christian trade-unions, made another attempt at transcending the Party's exclusively Catholic character and uniting Germany's fragmented Party spectrum. In 1920, he advocated the formation of a broad Christian middle-Party, that would transcend denominations and social classes and which could push-back the Social-Democrats' influence.

The Polish minority in the German Empire formed one of the largest Catholic groups, but the Centre Party pursued a steady anti-Polish course in its politics and even as members of opposition, the enmity between it and Poles remained.

The Party boldly supported the Imperial government in the years prior to World War I openly declaring Germany's « great political and moral mission » in the world. With the outbreak of World War I, the Party also used the debates about War bonds to push for a repeal of the last remnants of anti-Jesuit laws. As the War continued, many of the leaders of the Centre's Left-wing, particularly Matthias Erzberger, came to support a negotiated settlement, and Erzberger was key in the passage of the « Reichstag » Peace Resolution of 1917.

The same year, the Centre's Georg Count Hertling, formerly Ministers-President of Bavaria, was appointed Chancellor, but he could not overcome the dominance of the military leadership of Hindenburg and Ludendorff. When a parliamentary system of government was introduced in October 1918, the new chancellor Max von Baden appointed representatives from the Centre Party, the Social-Democrats and the Left-Liberals as ministers.

After the fall of the monarchy, conflict arose between the Party and the new Social-Democratic government. Adolf Hofmann, the Prussian minister for culture, attempted to decree a total separation of Church and State, forcing religion out of schools. This stirred-up a wave of protest among the Catholic population, and Bishops, Catholic organizations and the Centre Party itself united to combat the « Red Danger ». This conflict bridged internal tensions within the Party and secured its continual existence despite the turmoil of the revolution.

The Party, however, was weakened by its Bavarian wing splitting-off and forming the Bavarian People's Party (BVP) , which emphasized autonomy of the States and also took a more conservative course.

In the 1919 elections for the National Assembly, the Centre Party gained 91 representatives, being the 2nd largest Party after the Social-Democratic Party (SPD) . The Centre's Konstantin Fehrenbach was elected president of the National Assembly. The Party actively cooperated with Social-Democrats and Left-Liberal German Democratic Party (DDP) in drawing-up the Weimar Constitution, which guaranteed what the Centre had been fighting for since its founding : equality for Catholics and autonomy for Roman Catholic Church throughout Germany. The Party was less successful in the school question. Although religious education remained an ordinary subject in most schools, the comprehensive, inter-denominational schools became default.

The Centre Party, whose pragmatic principles generally left it open to supporting either a Monarchical or Republican form of government, proved one of the main-stays of the Weimar Republic, continuing the cooperation with SPD and DDP in the Weimar Coalition. This combination, however, lost its majority in the 1920 elections.

The Party was a polyglot coalition of Catholic politicians, ranging from Leftists like Matthias Erzberger and Joseph Wirth to Right-wingers like Franz von Papen. As a result of the Party's flexibility, it was a member of nearly every government coalition in the Weimar Republic, both with the Left and Right. However, this also damaged the Party's prospects because it was increasingly associated with all of the conflicts, problems, and failures of the Republic.

The Centre had a share of the odium attached to the so-called « Weimar Establishment » which was blamed, especially on the Right, for the « stab in the back » of the German army at the end of World War I as well as for the humiliations of the Versailles Treaty and reparations. Erzberger himself, who had signed the armistice, was assassinated by Right-wing extremists in 1920.

Although the Parties of the Weimar Coalition remained the base of the Weimar Republic, they could not agree to resume a formal coalition government, especially because of disagreements between the Centre Party and the Social-Democrats on issues like religious schools or a nation-wide Concordat with the Holy-See. Between 1919 and 1932, the Centre participated in all administrations, providing mainly the ministers for finance and labour and, on 4 occasions, the Chancellor.

After the break-up of the Weimar Coalition, in June 1920, the Centre's Konstantin Fehrenbach formed a new cabinet that also included the Left-Liberal DDP and the National-Liberal German People's Party (DVP) .

In May 1921, the Weimar Coalition, once again, resumed government under the Centre's Joseph Wirth as Chancellor, but this Coalition collapsed again in November 1922. After this, the Centre participated in the non-affiliated Wilhelm Cuno's « government of the economy » , together with both Liberal Parties and the Bavarian People's Party (BVP) .

In August 1923, the DVP's Gustav Stresemann formed a Grand Coalition administration, comprising the Centre, both Liberal Parties and the Social-Democrats, which lasted until November, when the Social-Democrats left the coalition and the Centre's Wilhelm Marx became chancellor of a cabinet of the remaining Parties.

In January 1925, the non-affiliated Hans Luther was appointed chancellor and formed a coalition between the Centre, both Liberal Parties, the BVP and, for the 1st time, the Right-wing German National People's Party (DNVP) . The Centre, the BVP and the DNVP jointly supported legislation to expand religious schools.

In the same year, Wilhelm Marx was the Centre's candidate in the presidential elections. In the 2nd round, combining the support of the Weimar coalition Parties, he gained 45.3 % of the vote and finished a close 2nd to the victorious Right-wing candidate Paul von Hindenburg with 48.3 % .

In May 1926, Chancellor Luther resigned and Marx again assumed his former office.

In June 1928, the general elections had resulted in losses for the government Parties and in gains for the Social-Democrats and the Communists. The Grand Coalition of 1923 was resumed, this time including the BVP and the Social-Democrat Hermann Müller became chancellor.

During the years of the Weimar Republic, debates about the Catholic character of the Party, as described above, persisted. The Left-wing of the Party, led by Erzberger and Wirth, had close ties to the Christian trade-unions led by Adam Stegerwald. The Right-wing advocated a move towards the Right and a closer cooperation with the national movements. The middle-ground emphasized their loyalty to the Church and rejected both extremes. To mediate the

tension between the wings and to strengthen their ties with the Bishops, the Party, in September 1928, did not elect the 2 favourites Joseph Joos and Adam Stegerwald, but rather the cleric Ludwig Kaas as chairman.

In 1930, the Grand Coalition fell apart and Heinrich Brüning, from the moderate-conservative wing of the Party, was appointed as Chancellor. Brüning was confronted with economic crises exacerbated by the Great Depression and had to tackle the difficult tasks of consolidating both budget and currency when faced with rising unemployment, and of also negotiating changes to the War reparations payments. His course of strict budget discipline, with severe cuts in public expenditure, and tax increases made him extremely unpopular among the lower- and middle-classes as well as among the Prussian Junkers.

In the 1930 elections, the Parties of the Grand coalition lost their majority, forcing Brüning to base his administration not on the support of a Party coalition but on that of the presidential decree (« Notverordnung ») of article 48 of the Constitution. This provided for the circumventing of parliament, and the informal toleration of this practice by the Parties. For this way of government based on both the President and cooperation of parliament, Brüning coined the term « authoritative (or authoritarian) democracy » .

The Centre consistently supported Brüning's government and, in 1932, vigorously campaigned for the re-election of Paul von Hindenburg, calling him a « venerate historical personality » and « the keeper of the constitution » . Hindenburg was re-elected against Adolf Hitler, but his moving further to the Right shortly afterwards resulted in Brüning's resignation on 30 May 1932.

President Hindenburg, advised by General Kurt von Schleicher, appointed the Catholic nobleman Franz von Papen as Chancellor, a member of the Centre's Right-wing and former cavalry captain. The intention was to break the connection of the Centre with the other Republican Parties or to split the Party and integrate it into a comprehensive conservative movement. However, the Centre refused to support Papen's government in any way and criticized him for « distorting and abusing good old ideals of the Centre, acting as the representative of reactionary circles » . Papen forestalled being expelled by leaving the Party.

Following Brüning's resignation, the Centre Party entered the opposition. Though they also opposed the National-Socialists, their energies were directed mainly against the renegade Papen. Some Centre politicians were soothed by Hitler's strategy of legality into downplaying the Nazi threat. This hampered their ability of being a bulwark of the Republic against the rising National-Socialists.

In regard to the government, the Centre Party rejected a « temporal solution » , such as Papen's presidial cabinets, and rather advocated a « total solution » - i.e. : a government according to the rules of the constitution. Since the Centre considered Papen's administration of being « in a dangerous way dependent on radical Right-wing Parties » , chairman Ludwig Kaas advised the President to recognize this connection by basing the government on a coalition with the rising Right-wing Parties, the « logical result of current development » . This would force the radicals to « take their share in responsibility » and « acquainting them with international politics » . The Centre would then act as the Party of opposition to this administration.

As Papen was faced with almost uniform opposition by the Parties, he had the « Reichstag » dissolved. In the subsequent elections, the Centre Party campaigned on 2 fronts, against both the Papen government and National-Socialists and re-affirmed their stance as the « constitution Party » opposed to « any measure contrary to constitution, justice and law » and « unwilling to yield to terror » . The July 1932 elections brought further losses to the mainstream Parties and gains to the extremist Parties. The National-Socialists supplanted the Social-Democrats as the largest Party in parliament.

As Communists and National-Socialists together had won the majority of seats, no government coalition could be formed without one of them. Papen tried to justify his authoritarian style of government by pointing-out that parliament could no longer function properly. Countering this reasoning, the Centre and the BVP tried to re-establish a working parliament by cooperation with the National-Socialists, since the 3 Parties together had attained 53 % of the seats. When Papen called upon the people to « reject the dictatorship of a single Party » , the Centre Party agreed « without reservation » , but it also stated that « with the same resolution, we reject the dictatorship of the nameless Party, now in power, even if cloaked with the illusion of non-partisanship » .

After Papen's attempts to attain Adolf Hitler's support for his administration had failed, the Centre began their own negotiations with the National-Socialists. They started in the State of Prussia, where the Weimar Coalition had lost its majority. An alternative majority could be not found and the Papen administration had seized this opportunity to assume control of Germany's largest State in the « Prussian coup » via presidential decree. Now, the National-Socialists proposed to end this direct rule by forming a coalition with the Centre Party, promising an equal share in government. Since this went too far for the Centre's national leadership, the negotiations were transferred to the national level, where Heinrich Brüning conferred with Gregor Straßer. During that period, the anti-Nazi polemics ceased in order not to disturb the negotiations. Since the NSDAP was the larger Party, the Centre was willing to accept a Nazi as Chancellor, provided he could gain the trust of the President which, at that time, seemed quite a difficult task.

The negotiations were bound for failure, since the aims of the 2 groups were largely incompatible. The Centre argued that the vote of July had « called Hitler not to dictatorship but to responsibility, to getting in line with law and constitution » . They hoped to « build a strong government without touching the substance of the constitution » , to create « clear responsibilities » and to « preclude anti-constitutional experiments » . The Centre advocated a return to Brüning's « authoritarian democracy » , which they considered up to the times and tested by experience, against Papen's « omnipotent State and independent leadership » , while the Nazis would only accept a coalition that would serve their purpose of achieving total dominance. Not expecting a successful conclusion, Hitler used the Centre negotiations in order to put pressure on the Papen administration.

The negotiations were also met with criticism from within the Centre Party. Some rejected them as « currying favour with the National-Socialists » and giving credence to Hitler's strategy of legality. The journalists Fritz Gerlich and Ingbert Naab dismissed as « illusionary » the attempt to « uphold the constitution and the legal order » with a man such as Hitler with his « unconditional propensity to evil » . Instead of « driving-out the devil by Belzebug » , the Centre should act as the parliament's conscience. The Party leadership answered their critics by calling it a « duty of

conscience » to try to achieve a constitutional government.

Though Papen did not expect the negotiations to succeed, he was nonetheless concerned as a success would have led to a presidential crisis, as Hindenburg was unwilling to have a coalition Parties dictate the administration. In September, he ended all speculations by dissolving the « Reichstag » again, almost immediately after its 1st meeting.

Papen's act did not end the negotiations between Centre and NSDAP. In fact, it made further meetings possible, since the Centre Party's leadership blamed the failure not on the Parties' incompatibility but on Papen calling for new elections. Since the NSDAP vote dropped again in the elections of November 1932, the Centre Party considered their strategy successful and resumed negotiations, this time under the slogan of forming a « Notgemeinschaft » (Community of need) , even though the Centre, BVP, and NSDAP together no longer formed a majority in parliament.

Chairman Ludwig Kaas advised President von Hindenburg not to continue Papen's « administration of conflict » ; he advocated « national concentration including the National-Socialists » , but did not comment on an alternative Chancellor, since he considered that the « personal prerogative of President » . Hindenburg's negotiations with Hitler failed, however, as did Kaas' attempt to form a coalition in parliament. By avoiding a clear statement, Hitler managed to pin the blame for this failure on the DNVP's Alfred Hugenberg, who had rejected Kaas' proposals.

In December, the President appointed General Kurt von Schleicher Chancellor, since the cabinet had refused to support Papen's planned « coup d'État » , a permanent dissolution of the « Reichstag » . The Centre Party contributed to the failure of Kurt von Schleicher's « Querfront » policy, since it could not bring itself to supporting the new administration actively. This pushed the General-Chancellor further in the direction of Papen's proposed « coup d'État » , a move the Centre Party, as well as the other Parties, refused to condone. Under these circumstances, President Hindenburg refused to back the « coup » and Schleicher accordingly resigned on 28 January 1933.

Meanwhile, von Papen had formed an intrigue to oust his successor. He conferred with Hugenberg and industrial magnates and bankers and after a feverish night, in which the outcome was unclear to all participants. On 30 January 1933, Hitler was appointed Chancellor with Franz von Papen as Vice-Chancellor and Hugenberg as minister for economics. President of the « Reichsbank » under the Weimar Republic was Hjalmar Schacht.

Though seeing their adversaries Papen and Hugenberg join forces with Hitler, the Centre Party still did not give-up building a broad coalition government. Since the new administration was still lacking a majority in parliament, the Centre was ready to support it, either by toleration or by coalition. Hitler intended to minimize non-Nazi participation, but feigned a willingness to cooperate with the Centre and blamed Papen and Hugenberg for denying cabinet posts to the Centre. When Kaas requested a broad outline of his government's objectives, Hitler used his questionnaire to declare the talks a failure and obtain the President's approval for calling for new elections, for the 3rd time in about half a year.

These elections, in March 1933, were already marred by the SA's terror, after the « Reichstag » fire and civil rights had been suspended by President Hindenburg through the « Reichstag » Fire Decree. Still the Centre Party campaigned

hard against the Hitler administration and managed to preserve their former vote of roughly 11 %. The government Parties NSDAP and DNVP however jointly won 52 % of the vote.

This result shattered the Centre Party's hopes of being indispensable for obtaining a majority in parliament. The Party was now faced with 2 alternatives : either to persist in protesting and suffer reprisals like Communists and Social-Democrats ; or to declare their loyal cooperation, in order to protect their members. As shown by subsequent events, the Party, though deeply uncomfortable with the new government, opted for the latter alternative.

The government confronted the newly-elected « Reichstag » with the Enabling Act that would have vested the government with legislative powers for a period of 4 years. As the bill required a 2/3 majority in order to pass and the coalition Parties only controlled 340 of the 647 seats (52.5 %) , the government needed the support of other Parties.

The Centre Party, whose vote was going to be decisive, was split on the issue of the Enabling Act. Chairman Kaas advocated supporting the bill in parliament in return for government guarantees. These mainly included respecting the President's Office retaining veto power, religious liberty, its involvement in culture, schools and education, the concordats signed by German States and the existence of the Centre Party. Via von Papen, Hitler responded positively and personally addressed the issues in his « Reichstag » speech but he repeatedly put-off signing a written letter of agreement.

Kaas was aware of the doubtful nature of such guarantees but when the Centre Party assembled on 23 March to decide on their vote, Kaas advised his fellow Party members to support the bill, given the « precarious state of the Party » .

He described his reasons as follows :

« On the one hand, we must preserve our soul but, on the other hand, a rejection of the Enabling Act would result in unpleasant consequences for faction and Party. What is left is only to guard us against the worst. Were a 2/3 majority not obtained, the government's plans would be carried through by other means. The President has acquiesced in the Enabling Act. From the DNVP no attempt of relieving the situation is to be expected. »

A considerable number of parliamentarians opposed the chairman's course, among these former Chancellors Heinrich Brüning, Joseph Wirth and former minister Adam Stegerwald.

Brüning called the Act the « most monstrous resolution ever demanded of a parliament » and was sceptical about Kaas' efforts :

« The Party has difficult years ahead, no matter how it would decide. Sureties for the government fulfilling its promises have not been given. Without a doubt, the future of the Centre Party is in danger and, once it is destroyed, it cannot be revived again. »

The opponents also argued that Catholic social teaching ruled-out participating in acts of revolution. The proponents argued that a « national revolution » had already occurred with Hitler's appointment and the presidential decree suspending civil rights. The Enabling Act would contain the revolutionary forces and move the government back to a legal order. Both groupings were not unaffected by Hitler's self-portrayal as a moderate seeking cooperation as opposed to the more revolutionary SA, led by Ernst Röhm. Even Brüning thought it would be « decisive which groups of the NSDAP will be in power in the future. Will Hitler's power increase or will he fail, that is the question. »

In the end, the majority of Centre parliamentarians supported Kaas' proposal. Brüning and his followers agreed to respect Party discipline by also voting in favour of the bill. The « Reichstag » assembled under turbulent circumstances. SA men served as guards and crowded outside the building to intimidate any opposition while the Communist and some Social-Democratic members of the « Reichstag » had been imprisoned and were, thus, prevented from voting. In the end, the Centre voted as planned in favour of the Enabling Act, as did all the other Parties apart from the SPD, which was also the only Party to speak against the Act. The support of the Centre Party proved to be decisive and the Act was passed on 23 March 1933.

With the passing of the Enabling Act, the Centre Party had set in motion its own demise. As promised during the negotiations, a working committee chaired by Hitler and Kaas and supposed to inform about further legislative measures, met 3 times (31 March ; 2 April ; 7 April) without any major impact.

At that time, the Centre Party was weakened by massive defections by Party members. Loyal Party members, in particular civil servants, and other Catholic organizations were subject to increasing reprisals, despite Hitler's previous guarantees. The Party was also hurt by a declaration of the German Bishops that, while maintaining their opposition to Nazi ideology, modified the ban on cooperation with the new authorities.

The issue of the concordat prolonged Kaas' stay in Rome, leaving the Party without a chairman, and, on 5 May, Kaas finally resigned from his post. The Party now elected Brüning as chairman. The Party adopted a tempered version of the leadership principle ; pro-Centre papers now declared that the Party's members, or « retinue » , would fully-submit itself to Brüning. It was not enough, however, to relieve the growing pressure that it and other Parties faced in the wake of the process of « Gleichschaltung » . Prominent members were frequently arrested and beaten, and pro-Centre civil servants were fired. As the summer of 1933 wore on, several government officials (including von Papen) demanded that the Centre either dissolve or be closed-down by the government.

By July, the Centre was the only non-Nazi Party that had not been browbeaten into dissolving itself (or had been banned outright, like the SPD) . On 1 July, von Papen and Kaas agreed that as part of the concordat, German priests would stay-out of politics. Earlier, as part of negotiations, it was agreed that the Party would dissolve as soon as the concordat had been concluded. As it turned-out, the Party dissolved on 5 July - much to the dismay of Cardinal Pacelli, who felt the Party should at least have waited until after the conclusion of negotiations. The day after, the government issued a law declaring the NSDAP the only legally permitted party in the German State.

Les Chrétiens allemands

Les Chrétiens allemands (« Deutsche Christen », ou DC) étaient un mouvement raciste et antisémite au sein du protestantisme allemand. En 1933, ils prennent le pouvoir au sein de l'Église protestante du « Reich » nouvellement constituée. Les opposants se regroupent alors dans l'Église confessante.

Fondés en 1932, ils gagnent à partir de juin 1933, la direction de quelques églises. Ces protestants et chefs d'églises protestantes ont salué l'élection de Adolf Hitler à la Chancellerie du « Reich », le 30 janvier 1933, comme étant la rédemption de la nation et la venue de temps nouveaux.

En 1933, dans le cadre de la politique de « mise au pas » (« Gleichschaltung »), le pouvoir nazi contraint les Églises protestantes à fusionner dans l'Église protestante du « Reich ». En juillet 1933, les Chrétiens allemands remportent la victoire aux élections ecclésiastiques.

Le symbole du groupe est une croix chrétienne traditionnelle avec une croix gammée en son centre et les initiales du groupe : « DC ». Les Nazis se sont servis des Chrétiens allemands pour consolider leur pouvoir, mais ils perdront leur importance dès 1935.

Cependant, bien qu'Hitler cherche à garder certaines apparences, le National-Socialisme, et particulièrement son élite, s'oppose clairement à l'ensemble du christianisme, même remodelé. Malgré l'obséquiosité des Chrétiens allemands à se plier au Nazisme, ceux-ci ne gagnèrent jamais l'estime de l'élite du Parti.

« Les Chrétiens allemands avaient comme but de purifier la Bible (et, par conséquent, la foi chrétienne) de tous les aspects juifs qu'elle contenait. Ils écartaient l'Ancien Testament, voulaient éliminer l'Apôtre Paul du Nouveau Testament, voulaient un Jésus aryen, non-juif. »

Le mouvement des Chrétiens allemands présentait de fortes tendances syncrétistes. Il s'alignait sur les tendances intellectuelles et culturelles de l'époque. Sa théologie était très politique et sécularisée. Le mouvement évolua vers le « Völkisme », l'adoration du « Führer » et l'antisémitisme racial.

Ainsi, un de ses principaux penseurs, Emmanuel Hirsch, est un théologien dialectique et existentialiste, reflet inversé du théologien Paul Tillich.

La conception des « Deutsche Christen » impliquait un Christ fort en se basant sur des versets du type « Je ne suis pas venu apporter la paix, mais l'épée. » (Marc, 10). Alors que ces versets sont généralement compris à l'aune du reste de la Bible, les « Deutsche Christen » interprétaient la Bible à l'aune de ces versets. Les versets qui parlent ainsi de violence, de force ne sont pas majoritaires, mais pas négligeables non-plus, ils ont ainsi basé leur théologie dessus pour développer une compréhension d'un Christ glorieux, d'un Dieu fort et puissant dont on peut remarquer la puissance et l'action ici-bas.

Ils se basaient sur la possibilité de reconnaître l'action de Dieu dans l'histoire, telle que de nombreux théologiens l'avaient développée depuis la fin du XIXe siècle, et notamment pendant la Première Guerre mondiale. Ainsi, Hitler a pu être reconnu comme tel : un envoyé de Dieu pour sauver l'Allemagne. C'est du fait de ce fondement que Barth s'opposera à toute théologie naturelle et se méfiera du principe de l'expérience religieuse. Barth participera à la fondation de l'Église confessante, un mouvement plus ou moins caché et secret au sein de l'Église allemande, afin de s'opposer à cette conception pervertie de l'Évangile. Tillich a, par exemple, refusé de signer la confession de foi de Barmen (confession de foi de l'Église confessante) non parce qu'il adhérerait au « Deutsche Christen », mais parce qu'il refusait l'impossibilité stricte de connaître Dieu en dehors de la raison. Or, ce point était indispensable selon Barth afin de renforcer l'impossibilité de reconnaître l'action de Dieu dans l'histoire. Le but de Barth était ici de protéger la théologie contre toute tentative séculière d'en prendre le pouvoir en se basant sur la révélation seule. Dieu n'est ainsi, selon lui, connaissable qu'en Christ crucifié. On peut regretter que ce faisant, Barth ait exclu des théologiens qui n'avaient rien à voir avec les « Deutsche Christen », mais qui avaient un différend théologique avec lui. Ainsi Paul Tillich ou Emil Brunner.

La crucifixion du Christ est, dans la lignée de la théologie chrétienne, une partie importante et inséparable de la révélation. Alors que pour les « Deutsche Christen », il s'agissait d'un crime des Juifs à l'encontre de Dieu. Selon eux, Dieu se révèle dans les actes de puissance, et certainement pas dans la faiblesse d'un crucifié. C'est également là la raison de leur refus du corpus paulinien, puisque ce dernier accentuait justement le paradoxe de la force dans la faiblesse et faisait de la crucifixion le cœur de la foi chrétienne :

« C'est pourquoi je me plais dans les faiblesses, dans les outrages, dans les privations, dans les persécutions, dans les angoisses, pour Christ ; en effet, quand je suis faible, c'est alors que je suis fort. »

...

The « Deutsche Christen » (« German Christians ») were a pressure group and movement within German Protestantism aligned towards the anti-Semitic and « Führerprinzip » ideological principles of Nazism with the goal to align German Protestantism as a whole towards those principles. Their advocacy of these principles led to a schism within 23 of the initially 28 regional church bodies (« Landeskirchen ») in Germany and the attendant foundation of the Confessing Church.

During the period of the German Empire, before the Weimar Republic, the Protestant churches (« Landeskirchen ») in Germany were divided along State and provincial borders. Each State or provincial church was supported by and affiliated with the regnal house (if it was Protestant) of its particular region ; the crown provided financial and institutional support for its church. Church and State were, therefore, to a large extent, combined on a regional basis. Monarchies of Roman Catholic dynasties also organized church bodies territorially defined by their State borders. The same was true for the 3 Republican German States within the pre-1918 Empire. In Alsace-Lorraine, the Napoleonic system of « établissements publics du culte » for the Calvinist, Jewish, Lutheran and Roman Catholic congregations and umbrellas remained in effect.

With the end of World War I and the resulting political and social turmoil, the regional churches lost their secular rulers. With revolutionary fervour in the air, the conservative church leaders had to contend with Socialists who favoured disestablishment.

After considerable political maneuvering, State churches were abolished (in name) under Weimar, but the anti-disestablishmentarians prevailed in substance : churches remained public corporations and retained their subsidies from government. Religious instruction in the schools continued, as did the theological faculties in the universities. The rights formerly held by the princes in the German Empire simply devolved to church councils.

Accordingly, in this initial period of the Weimar Republic, the Protestant Church in Germany now operated as a federation of 28 regional (or provincial) churches. The federation operated officially through the representative German Evangelical Church Confederation (« Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenbund » , or DEKB) ; the League was itself established in 1922 by the rather loose annual convention called Church General Assembly (« Kirchentag ») , which was composed of the members of the various regional churches. The League was governed and administered by a 36 member Executive Committee (« Kirchengeschäft ») which was responsible for ongoing governance between the annual conventions of the « Kirchentag » .

Save for the organizational matters under the jurisdiction of the national League, the regional churches remained independent in other matters, including theology, and the federal system allowed for a great deal of regional autonomy.

The « Deutsche Christen » were, for the most part, a « group of fanatically Nazi Protestants » . They began as an interest group and eventually came to represent one of the schismatic factions of German Protestantism.

Their movement was sustained and encouraged by factors such as :

The 400th anniversary (in 1917) of Martin Luther's posting of the « 95 Theses » in 1517, an event which served to endorse German nationalism, to emphasize that Germany had a preferred place in the Protestant tradition, and to legitimize anti-Semitism. This was re-inforced by the Luther Renaissance Movement of Professor Emmanuel Hirsch.

The revival of « völkisch » traditions.

The de-emphasis of the Old Testament in Protestant theology, and the removal of parts deemed « too Jewish » .

The respect for temporal (secular) authority, which had been emphasized by Luther. The movement used scriptural support (Romans, 13) to justify this position.

The « Deutsche Christen » were sympathetic to the Nazi regime's goal of « co-ordinating » the individual Protestant churches into a single and uniform « Reich » church, consistent with the « Volk » ethos and the « Führerprinzip » .

The « Deutsche Christen » were organized as a « Kirchenpartei » (Church Party ; meaning a nominating group) in 1931 to help win elections of presbyteries and synods (i.e. : legislating church assemblies) in the Evangelical Church of the old-Prussian Union, the largest of the independent « Landeskirchen » . They were led by Ludwig Müller, a rather incompetent « old fighter » who had no particular leadership skills or qualifications, except having been a longtime faithful Nazi. He was advised by Emanuel Hirsch. The group achieved no particular notoriety before the Nazi assumption of political power in January 1933. In the Prussian church elections of November 1932, « Deutsche Christen » won 1/3 of the vote.

Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor on 30 January 1933 and the process of « Gleichschaltung » was in its full-sway in the 1st few months of the regime. In late-April 1933, the leadership of the 1922 founded German Evangelical Church Confederation, in the spirit of the new regime, agreed to write a new constitution for a brand new, unitary « national » church, which would be called the German Evangelical Church (« Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » , or DEK) . The new and unified national « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » would completely replace and supersede the old federated church with its representative league.

This church re-organization had been a goal of the « Deutsche Christen » for some time, as such a centralization would enhance the coordination of Church and State, as a part of the overall Nazi process of « Gleichschaltung » . The « Deutsche Christen » agitated for Müller to be elected as the new Church's Bishop (« Reichsbischof ») .

Unfortunately for the Nazis, Müller had poor political skills, little political support within the Church and no real qualifications for the job, other than his commitment to Nazism and a desire to exercise power. When the federation council met in May 1933 to approve the new constitution, it elected Friedrich von Bodelschwingh as « Reichsbischof » of the new Protestant « Reich » Church by a wide-margin, largely on the advice and support of the church leadership.

Needless to say, Hitler was infuriated with the rejection of his candidate, and things began to change. By June 1933, the « Deutsche Christen » had gained leadership of some « Landeskirchen » within the « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » and were, of course, supported by Nazi propaganda in their efforts to reverse the humiliating loss to Bodelschwingh. After a series of Nazi-directed political maneuvers, Bodelschwingh resigned and Müller was appointed as the new « Reichsbischof » in July 1933.

Further pro-Nazi developments followed the elevation of Müller to the « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » bishopric : in late-summer, the old-Prussian general synod (led by Müller) adopted the Aryan Paragraph, effectively defrocking clergy of Jewish descent and even clergy married to non-Aryans.

With their « Gleichschaltungspolitik » and their attempts to incorporate the Aryan Paragraph into the church constitution so as to exclude Jewish Christians, the « Deutsche Christen » entered into a « Kirchenkampf » with other evangelical Christians. Their opponents founded the Confessing Church in 1934, which condemned the « Deutsche Christen » as heretics and claimed to be the true German Protestant Church.

The Nazis found the « Deutsche Christen » group useful during the initial consolidation of power, but removed most of

its leaders from their posts shortly afterwards ; « Reichsbishop » Müller continued until 1945, but his power was effectively removed in favour of a government agency as a result of his obvious incompetence.

The « Deutsche Christen » were supportive of the Nazi ideas about race. They issued public statements that Christians in Germany with Jewish ancestors « remain Christians in a New Testament sense, but are not “ German Christians ” ». Also, they supported the call from the Nazi Party platform for a « positive Christianity » that does not stress human sinfulness. Some went so far as to call for removal of the « Jewish » Old Testament from the Bible. Their symbol was a traditional Christian cross with a swastika in the middle and the group's German initials « D » and « C » . It was claimed and remembered, as a « fact » , that the Jews had killed Christ, thus, appealing to and actively encouraging existing anti-Semitic sentiment among Christians in Germany.

The fore-runner of the « Deutsche Christen » ideology came from certain Protestant groups of the German Empire. These groups sought a return to perceived « völkisch » , nationalistic and racist ideas within traditional Christianity, and looked to turn Christianity in Germany into a reformed intrinsic folk-religion (« arteigene Volksreligion ») . They found their model in the Berlin « Hofprediger » Adolf Stoecker, who was politically active and tried to position the Christian working-classes and lower middle-classes against what he perceived as Jewish « Überfremdung » .

The « Bayreuther Blätter » devoted its June 1892 issue to a memorial of Paul Lagarde and it emphatically recommended his work to its readers.

Ludwig Schemann, one of the most prolific of Bayreuth Germanics and racists, and, later, the author of a full-length biography of Lagarde, summarized his life and work and concluded that :

« For the comprehension of Lagarde's whole being, one must above all remember that he always considered himself the prophet and guide of his people - which, of course, he actually was. »

For Schemann, his legacy consisted largely of his struggle against the Jews :

« Not since the days of Schopenhauer and Wagner is the German thinker so mightily opposed this alien people, which desecrates our holy possessions, poisons our people, and seeks to rest our property from us so as to completely trample on us, as Lagarde has. »

It was this image of Lagarde, the anti-Semitic prophet of a purified and heroic Germany, which the political Wagnerites and the « Bayreuther Blätter » and kept alive.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Richard Wagner's son-in-law and intellectual disciple, wrote :

« For us, the “ Deutsche Schriften ” have for a long time belonged to our most precious books, and we consider Lagarde's unabashed exposure of the inferiority of Semitic religious instincts and the pernicious effects on Christianity as an achievement that deserves our admiration and gratitude. »

(Houston Stewart Chamberlain. « Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts » , 5th edition, Munich, 1904 ; page lxii.)

In 1896, Arthur Bonus advocated a « Germanization of Christianity » . Max Beyer alleged in his 1907 book, « Der deutsche Christus » (The German Christ) , Jesus stemmed from German soldiers in the Roman garrison in Galilee and his preaching showed the influence of « German blood » . He concluded that the Germans were the best Christians among all peoples, only prevented from the full-flowering of their spiritual faculties by the materialistic Jews. Julius Bode, however, concluded that the Christianization of the Germans was the imposition of an « un-German » religious understanding, and that Germanic feeling remained alien to it and so should remain exempt from it.

On the 400th anniversary of the Protestant Reformation, in 1917, the Flensburg pastor Friedrich Andersen, the writer Adolf Bartels and Hans Paul Freiherr von Wolzogen presented « 95 Thesen » on which a « German Christianity on a Protestant basis » should be founded.

It stated :

« The newer racial research has finally opened our eyes to the pernicious effects of the blood mixture between Germanic and un-German peoples and urges us, with all our forces, to strive to keep our “ Volkstum ” pure and closed. Religion is the inner-strength and finest flower in the intellectual life of a people, but it can only strongly affect expression in popular culture. A deep connection between Christianity and Germanness can only be achieved when it is released from this un-natural connection, wherever it stands nakedly approached by the Jewish religion. »

For the authors of the « Thesen » , the « angry thunder-god » Jehovah was the same as the « Father » and « Holy Ghost » , that Christ preached and that the Germans would have guessed. Child-like confidence in God and selfless love was, to them, the essence of the Germanic « people's soul » in contrast to Jewish « menial fear of God » and « materialistic morality » . Church was not an « institution for the dissemination of Judaism » , and they felt religious and confirmation materials should no longer teach the Old Testament and the 10 Commandments, nor even the New Testament, which they held to be of Jewish influence that had to be « cleaned » so that the child Jesus could be used as a model for « self-sacrifice » and « male heroism » .

In 1921, Andersen wrote « Der deutsche Heiland » (The German Saviour) , in which he opposed Jewish migration as an apocalyptic decision :

« Who will win, the 6 cornered star or the Cross ?

The question is, for now, not yet evident. The Jew goes on his way purposefully, in any case, his deadly hatred will defeat his opponent. When the Christian Good Friday is celebrated, it should at least not weigh in his dreams ; otherwise, there could come a whole lot of terrible Golgothas, where Jews across the whole world dance their jubilee songs on the grave of Christianity as heirs of a murdering people, singing to the Jahu they destroyed. »

Against the « contamination by Jewish ideas » , mainly from the Old Testament, the Churches and Germany should (he argued) be « mutually benefits and supports » , and then, Christianity would win back its status as « a religion of the “ Volk ” and of the struggle » and « the great exploiter of humanity, the evil enemy of our “ Volk ” would finally be destroyed » .

In the same year, 1921, the Protestant-dominated and « völkisch » oriented League for German Churches (« Bund für deutsche Kirche ») was founded in Berlin. Andersen, pastor Ernst Bublitz and teacher Kurd Joachim Niedlich brought out the twice-monthly « The German Church » (« Die Deutsche Kirche ») magazine, which in 12,000 articles advanced the Bund's ideas. Jesus should be a « tragic-Nordic figure » against the Old Testament's « religious idea » , with the Old Testament replaced by a « German myth » . Each biblical story was to be « measured under German feelings, so that German Christianity escapes from Semitic influence as Beelzebub did before the Cross » .

In 1925, groups such as the « Bund » united with 10 « völkisch » , Germanophile and anti-Semitic organizations to form the German Christian Working Group (« deutschchristliche Arbeitsgemeinschaft ») . The Christian-Spirit Religious Society (« Geistchristliche Religionsgesellschaft ») , founded in 1927 in Nuremberg by Artur Dinter, saw more effect in the churches, striving for the « de-Judification » (« Entjudung ») and the building of a non-denominational People's Church (« Volkskirche ») .

The proposed abolition of the Old Testament was, in part, fiercely opposed among Christian German nationalists, seeing it as a racist attack on the foundations of their faith from inside and outside.

The theologian Johannes Schneider, a member of the German National People's Party (« Deutschnationale Volkspartei ») , or DNVP - a Party fairly close to the political aims of the NSDAP) , wrote in 1925 :

« Whoever cheapens the Old Testament will soon also lose the New. »

In 1927, the Protestant Church League (« Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenbund ») reacted to the growing radicalization of German Christian groups with a « Churches Day » in Königsberg, aiming to clarify Christianity's relation to « Fatherland » , « Nation » , « Volkstum » , « Blood » and « Race » . Many local church-officers tried to delineate, such as with regards to racism, but this only served to show how deeply it had intruded into their thinking.

Paul Althaus, for example, wrote :

« “ Volkstum ” is a spiritual reality. Certainly, there will never be a “ Volkstum ” without the pre-condition of, for example, the blood unit. But, once a “ Volkstum ” is begotten, it may exist as a spiritual reality ; even foreign blood may be lent in to it. How great the significance of blood might be in intellectual history, but the rule is, even if one is born into a “ Volkstum ”, the spirit and not the blood. »

On this basis, the radical « German Christians » ideas were hardly slowed-down. In 1928, they gathered in Thuringia

to found the Thuringian « German Christians' » Church Movement (« Thüringer Kirchenbewegung Deutsche Christen ») , seeking contact with the Nazi Party and naming their newsletter « Letters to “ German Christians ” » (« Briefe an Deutsche Christen ») .

Alfred Rosenberg's book, « The Myth of the 20th Century » (« Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts ») resonated in these circles and gave them re-newed impetus. His polemic against all « un-German » and « root-stock » elements in Christianity was directed against the Christianity and the denominational organizations of the time. Marxism and Catholic Internationalism were attacked as 2 facets of the Jewish spirit, and Rosenberg stated the need for a new national religion to complete the Reformation.

The Associated German Religious Movement (« Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutsche Glaubensbewegung ») , founded in Eisenach at the end of 1933, was also an attempt to create a national religion outside and against the churches. It combined 6 earlier Nordic « völkisch » oriented groups and a further 5 groups were represented by individual members. Jakob Wilhelm Hauer became the group's « leader and representative » by acclamation, and other members included the philosopher Ernst Bergmann (1881-1945) , the racial ideologue Hans Friedrich Karl Günther, the writer Ernst Graf zu Reventlow, the historian Herman Wirth, Ludwig Fahrenkrog and Lothar Stengel-von Rutkowski.

Some churches remained led by « German Christians » until 1945. In 1939, with the approval of 75 % of the German Protestant churches, the Eisenacher « Institute for Research and the Elimination of Jewish influence on German Church Life » was founded, led by Walter Grundmann. One of its main-tasks was to compile a « People's Testament » (« Volkstestament ») in the sense of what Alfred Rosenberg called a « 5th Gospel » , to announce the myth of the « Aryan Jesus » . It became clear in 1994 that the Testament's poetic text was written by the famous ballad-poet and proprietor of the « Eugen-Diederichs-Verlag » , Lulu von Strauß und Torney. Despite broad church support for it (even many Confessing Christians advocated such an approach, in the hope that the disaffiliation of 1937 to 1940 could be curbed) , the 1st edition of the text did not meet with the expected enthusiastic response.

After 1945, the remaining German Christian currents formed smaller communities and circles distanced from the newly-formed umbrella of the independent church bodies Evangelical Church in Germany. German Christian related Parties sought to influence the historiography of the « Kirchenkampf » in the so-called « church-historical working group » , but they had little effect, from then on, in theology and politics. Other former members of the « German Christians » moved into the numerically insignificant religious communities known as the Free People's Christian Church (« Freie Christliche Volkskirche ») and the People's Movement of Free Church Christians (« Volkskirchenbewegung Freie Christen ») after 1945.

...

German Christian, any of the Protestants who attempted to subordinate church policy to the political initiatives of the German Nazi Party. The « German Christians' » Faith Movement, organized in 1932, was nationalistic and so anti-Semitic that extremists wished to repudiate the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible) and the « Pauline Letters » because of their Jewish authorship. The movement acceded to the Nazi definition of a Jew based on the religion of his or her

grandparents and to the racist principles embodied in the Nürnberg Laws of 1935. Thus, many practising Christians whose families had converted a generation before were defined as Jews and excluded from the church.

In July 1933, the Protestant churches of the various German Federal States merged to form the German Evangelical Church, and, in September, the German Christian candidate, Ludwig Müller, assumed leadership of the church as « Reichsbischof » (« Reich » Bishop) . Müller's efforts to make the church an instrument of Nazi policy were resisted by the Confessing Church, under the leadership of Martin Niemöller. After World War II, the German Christian Church Party was banned.

...

In 1932, the German Christian movement (« Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen ») established itself as an important National-Socialist splinter group within the Protestant Church. It was organized in strict accordance with the « Führer Principle » and promoted the synthesis of racial and ecclesiastical doctrines. Among other things, « German Christians » demanded racial purity within the church and the « Entjudung » (de-Judification) of religion through the abolition of the Old Testament. After Adolf Hitler became Chancellor, the movement's membership greatly increased. It won the church elections for the new, unified German Protestant Church (« Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » or DEK : « Reich » Church) on July 23, 1933, occupied the new church's most important ecclesiastical offices, and tried to bring the church into doctrinal and institutional alignment with Nazi ideology (« Gleichschaltung ») . Sermons, for example, were supposed to emphasize the theological foundations of racial theories and the allegedly « Nordic » character of Christ. Churches were decorated with swastikas, and a series of new symbols and rituals aimed to demonstrate the unity between the church and the Nazi State. When the « German Christians » introduced rules restricting church offices to Aryans, a group of Protestant theologians and clergymen centered around around Pastor Martin Niemöller protested by founding the Pastors' Emergency League, out of which the « Confessing Church » (« Bekennende Kirche ») developed. This internal protest movement challenged the competence and legitimacy of the « Reich » Church and the « German Christians » , and declared itself the only legitimate Protestant Church. Thus, instead of creating uniformity and unity, the « German Christians » actually divided the church more than ever before and steadily lost influence in the following years. Total State control and « coordination » of the Protestant Church would never be achieved.

« Kirchenkampf »

Par « Kirchenkampf » , pris au sens strict, l'on désigne le conflit qui opposa en Allemagne, entre 1933 et le début de la Seconde Guerre mondiale en 1939, d'une part les Chrétiens évangéliques allemands appartenant à la « Bekennende Kirche » (ou BK : l'Église confessante) , et d'autre part, les « Deutsche Christen » (ou DC : Chrétiens allemands) , mouvement raciste et antisémite orchestré par les Nazis, qui visait à créer un « nouveau christianisme » rejetant l'Ancien Testament et les épîtres de l'Apôtre Paul. Dans un sens plus large, le terme sert à désigner, de façon plus générale, la période dans l'histoire des églises d'Allemagne correspondant à l'époque nazie ; dans cette dernière acception, le terme de « Kirchenkampf » englobe :

La lutte menée par le pouvoir national-socialiste contre l'Église évangélique et, dans une certaine mesure aussi, contre

l'Église catholique, et contre leurs structures d'organisation traditionnelles, aux fins de réalisation de la « Gleichschaltung » (mise au pas) .

La lutte menée par les Nazis, au-dedans et en dehors des églises, contre le christianisme confessionnel, afin de rendre celui-ci compatible, par « déjudaïsation » (« Entjudung ») , avec l'idéologie nazie, ou, à défaut, de lui substituer une religiosité en accord avec le génie propre allemand (« Arteigen ») .

La résistance de l'Église confessante et de la frange conservatrice des églises à ces tentatives.

Le point de vue du National-Socialisme sur le christianisme est ainsi résumé par Martin Bormann en 1942 dans un mémorandum confidentiel à des « Gauleiter » que le pouvoir de l'Église « doit être finalement et absolument détruit » , car le Nazisme est totalement incompatible avec le christianisme.

Le terme « Kirchenkampf » apparut dès 1933 et servit à désigner le conflit qui opposa les « Deutsche Christen » et les cercles qui, en 1934, s'étaient regroupés dans la « Bekennende Kirche » (l'Église confessante) . Dans les travaux d'historiographie religieuse de l'après-Guerre, on tend à rassembler sous ce terme toute l'histoire de l'église protestante en Allemagne de 1933 à 1945.

Aujourd'hui, cette acception est controversée, car elle suscite la fausse impression que les églises évangéliques auraient, dans leur totalité, « combattu » le régime nazi. Certes, il y avait, tant du côté évangélique que du côté catholique, des dignitaires ecclésiastiques et des groupes de croyants qui, individuellement, s'enhardirent à critiquer ouvertement le régime hitlérien, voire à pratiquer une résistance politique clandestine. Cependant, il n'y eut point, de la part des églises, d'opposition soudée contre le National-Socialisme et sa politique.

Au cœur du « Kirchenkampf » (celui mené au sein même de l'église évangélique) se trouvait un désaccord sur la manière de comprendre et d'interpréter les évangiles. Cette discussion théologique a pu prendre l'allure d'une opposition politique indirecte contre l'État, dans la mesure où elle conduisait à rejeter toute immixtion du régime dans le contenu de la foi et le mode d'organisation de l'Église, ce qui en soi déjà contredisait les ambitions totalitaires inhérentes à l'idéologie nazie. Mais cette opposition politique n'était pas pour autant proprement intentionnelle, ni ne découlait de la dite discussion, abstraction faite de quelques exceptions. Nombre de Chrétiens confessants étaient en même temps antisémites, votaient pour le NSDAP, voire en étaient membres actifs, et leur contestation de l'action du pouvoir se limitait expressément à celles qui concernaient les affaires intérieures de l'Église.

Néanmoins, le terme de « Kirchenkampf » a réussi à s'imposer au sein du protestantisme, car l'enjeu de ce combat était la manière dont l'Église se concevait elle-même. En effet, le groupe, assez restreint, des Chrétiens confessants parmi les chrétiens évangéliques se réclamait des fondements mêmes de la foi, tels qu'on les trouve dans la Bible et dans la profession de foi, et pouvait donc se dire habilité à représenter la chrétienté évangélique tout entière. À cette revendication, il fut fait droit par l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne après 1945, la « Bekennende Kirche » ayant en effet été reconnue Église véritable (« wahre Kirche ») et les documents produits par elle (au 1er rang desquels la Déclaration théologique, dite Déclaration de Barmen) ayant été intégrés dans les professions de foi de plusieurs

sections régionales de l'Église protestante.

L'élément déclencheur et l'objet du « Kirchenkampf » fut la tentative entreprise par le régime nazi de faire adopter par les églises, avec l'aide des « Deutsche Christen », des conceptions racistes et de décider de leur mode d'organisation. Si le pouvoir y voyait un conflit politique, les Chrétiens confessants y voyaient un conflit d'ordre théologique. Ainsi, le « Kirchenkampf » ne se laisse-t-il appréhender comme conflit entre État et Église qu'avec cette restriction qu'il portait initialement sur la manière dont l'Église évangélique entendait se définir elle-même, discussion produisant secondairement des effets politiques. Du reste, le « Kirchenkampf », pris ainsi au sens de réforme, ne fut pas clos avec la fin du régime nazi, mais s'est poursuivi jusqu'à nos jours.

Les tentatives d'étendre le terme de façon à englober les conflits entre les Églises et les États socialistes sont restées sans effet.

Le protestantisme Libéral du XIXe siècle, lequel s'était, en Allemagne plus particulièrement, associé à l'idéalisme philosophique ou au Romantisme, partait, par induction, de l'expérience religieuse pour la porter à la conscience des individus et l'affermir par la prédication de l'Église (Friedrich Schleiermacher). Elle affirme l'autonomie des domaines de vie, en tant que source indépendante de connaissance révélée, et dit sa foi dans le constant progrès moral et culturel de l'Homme : les finalités historiques furent ainsi élevées au rang de points de référence obligés du discours et de l'action religieux.

L'orthodoxie luthérienne, en revanche, demeurait étroitement liée à la noblesse et à la monarchie et représentait depuis 1789 un bastion conservateur contre le rationalisme et le Libéralisme. Des théologiens influents, tels que Richard Rothe (1799-1867), acclamèrent avec enthousiasme la réunification allemande de 1871 et virent en Otto von Bismarck celui qui allait parachever la Réforme. Toutefois, si la plupart des églises régionales se virent imposer une constitution synodale qui prévoyait de renforcer le droit de codécision des communes, elles gardèrent leurs liens confessionnels propres et leurs structures de fonctionnement. En tant que souverain, l'Empereur était, comme dans d'autres monarchies, également l'évêque du « Reich », habilité à édicter ou à abolir les lois ecclésiastiques.

Les fêtes commémoratives de Martin Luther qui eurent lieu en 1883 et 1917 suscitérent un renouveau luthérien : les progrès de la civilisation étaient considérés avec scepticisme et vus sous l'angle de la peccabilité de principe de toute entreprise humaine. L'on s'efforçait de cultiver une certaine image de Luther, en mettant en évidence tels de ses traits confessionnels et nationaux propres à le démarquer de Rome et de Paris, c'est-à-dire de la tradition catholique et de la philosophie des Droits de l'homme.

La Première Guerre mondiale mit durablement à mal la croyance au progrès humain. D'autre part, la Révolution allemande mit fin à l'alliance du trône et de l'autel, entre pouvoir prussien et luthéranisme. Néanmoins, dès janvier 1919, Friedrich Ebert donna aux églises évangéliques des assurances que la nouvelle constitution en gestation ne remettrait pas en cause leurs privilèges, en particulier la perception par l'État de l'impôt d'église. Ce nonobstant, le protestantisme fit à nouveau figure, durant la République de Weimar, de haut-lieu d'un nationalisme anti-démocratique. Après que des Sociaux-Démocrates eurent fait leur entrée dans le gouvernement, c'est la nation qui tint lieu désormais,

pour beaucoup de Chrétiens évangéliques, d'autorité publique. Ils considéraient la fin de la Guerre en 1918 comme une défaite, et la démocratie et le socialisme comme des ennemis du christianisme.

Après la promulgation de la constitution de Weimar, le président du Conseil supérieur des églises évangéliques, Reinhard Möller (1855-1927), adressa ses « sincères remerciements à notre souverain protecteur », c'est-à-dire à l'Empereur destitué ; les chefs ecclésiastiques, comme Detlev von Arnim-Kröchlendorff (1878-1947), par ailleurs jubilaient : « Notre Église est restée hors du champ des bouleversements politiques. » La continuité des églises régionales, compétentes, à titre d'église du peuple (« Volkskirche »), à remplir tous les besoins religieux des Allemands baptisés, avait été préservée.

Seules quelques personnalités en marge considéraient la question sociale dès avant 1914 comme un problème devant aussi intéresser le christianisme. À cette époque, être à la fois chrétien et membre du SPD était pour ainsi dire impensable. Le cas du piétiste souabe Christoph Blumhardt était à cet égard une rare exception. Cependant, après 1918, le Socialisme chrétien gagna en audience également en Allemagne, jusqu'à atteindre à un certain moment quelque 10,000 partisans. La Ligue des socialistes religieux d'Allemagne (« Bund religiöser Sozialisten Deutschlands »), fondée en 1926, animée par Georg Fritze et Georg Wunsch, fut parmi les Iers et parmi les plus fermes à mettre en garde contre le National-Socialisme émergent.

La Théologie dialectique (mouvement, au sein du protestantisme allemand, qui pose l'impossibilité d'une approche rationnelle ou naturelle de Dieu, inaccessible dans une perspective humaine) modifia, à partir de 1919, le paysage spirituel et religieux, en posant énergiquement la question de la responsabilité de l'Église devant la parole de Dieu et, partant, devant le monde. Le théologien suisse Karl Barth remit radicalement en question les théologies dites de trait-d'union (« Bindestrich-Theologien »), qui prétendent pouvoir relier entre eux des desseins temporels et éternels, ainsi que l'idée, passant pour allant de soi, que le « protestantisme de civilisation » (« Kulturprotestantismus ») aurait été la « grande institutrice » de la société.

Cependant, dans la pratique, ces avertissements restèrent sans effet sur la politique conduite par les églises protestantes. C'étaient alors plutôt les diplomates des églises qui donnaient le ton, tels qu'Otto Dibelius (1880-1967), surintendant-général de la « Kurmark », qui écrivit dans son ouvrage « Das Jahrhundert der Kirche » (1926) :

« L'église évangélique se trouve au commencement d'une ère nouvelle. D'immenses possibilités s'élèvent devant nous ! D'immenses tâches ! »

Les églises ne furent guère touchées par la crise financière mondiale grâce à la sécurité de leurs avoirs financiers garantie par l'État ; la crise fut même perçue comme une occasion d'augmenter leur pouvoir d'influence. Le « Kirchliches Jahrbuch » (Annuaire de l'Église) de 1930 annonça triomphalement que l'Église avait, dans un contexte d'inflation généralisée, « accru sa valeur ».

À l'encontre de cette auto-satisfaction, Karl Barth écrivit en 1930 une cinglante réplique, l'essai « Quousque tandem ? », où il déclare :

« ... où de telles paroles sont prononcées, là est Catilina, là gît la conjuration véritable et dangereuse contre l'essence même de l'Église évangélique. L'essence de l'Église est la promesse faite à elle, et la foi dans cette promesse. Quand donc cette promesse ne serait-elle pas devenue, sous l'effet d'un réel défi du dehors, plus grande, plus claire, plus lumineuse ? Lorsqu'elle dit " Jésus-Christ ", et le dirait-elle encore un millier de fois, l'on entendra, et l'on devra entendre, sa propre suffisance et sa propre assurance, et elle ne devra s'étonner si, en dépit de tout son " Jésus-Christ " jeté au vent, ses paroles passent à côté des besoins réels des gens réels, de la même façon que, passant à côté de la parole de Dieu, elle a fait des exhortations, consolations et enseignements de la Bible et des réformateurs, de l'eau à ses propres petits moulins. »

En 1930, les églises évangéliques régionales se dotèrent d'une structure commune assez lâche, le « Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenbund » (DEK) . En outre, elles conclurent le 11 mai 1931 un accord avec l'État libre de Prusse, accord que de nombreux dirigeants des églises ressentirent comme une victoire sur la spoliation de droits par la Constitution de Weimar. Cet accord leur assurait l'enseignement de la religion et des moyens financiers publics. En même temps, les droits des synodes, en tant que parlements au sein de l'Église, furent renforcés, ce qui favorisa l'émergence de camps antagonistes à l'intérieur des églises.

Le National-Socialisme montant avait placé au centre de son programme politique la lutte pour l'hégémonie de la race de seigneur aryenne, la conquête d'espace vital dans l'est de l'Europe sous l'aspect d'une croisade anti-Bolchévique, et l'extermination des Juifs. Ces objectifs ne pouvaient être atteints que si l'on pouvait s'appuyer sur une population dressée dans l'esprit national-socialiste, prête à se détourner de la morale juive compassionnelle propre au christianisme. L'idéologie nazie devait donc s'affirmer comme une conception du monde qui fût globale et ne laissât aucune place à des interprétations ou systèmes de sens religieux ou politiques concurrents. Un Parti unique devait être le moyen politique d'imposer cette idéologie en en faisant une doctrine d'État.

Après l'échec du « " Putsch " de la Brasserie » de Munich, conscient du besoin de rassembler la population et les forces politiques, Adolf Hitler tempore avec l'anti-Christianisme fervent de son Parti.

Ainsi, il répond à Erich Ludendorff qui lui reprochait son manque de virulence anti-Chrétienne :

« Je suis entièrement d'accord avec Son excellence, mais son Excellence peut se permettre d'annoncer à ses adversaires qu'il va les frapper à mort. Mais j'ai besoin, pour la construction d'un grand Parti politique, des Catholiques bavarois autant que des protestants de Prusse. Le reste peut venir ensuite. »

Il évite ainsi de s'attaquer directement au christianisme, et dans « Mein Kampf » , et dans le « Programme en 25 Points » , dont l'Article 24 prône de façon ambiguë la liberté religieuse. Cette stratégie permettra effectivement de rallier une grande partie des chrétiens allemands.

Ce n'est qu'avec la publication du livre d'Alfred Rosenberg, « Le Mythe du XXe siècle » et sa définition du christianisme positif, que les églises commencèrent à s'inquiéter. Si beaucoup de fidèles se retrouvaient dans le

nationalisme et l'anti-Communisme nazis, de nombreuses voix s'élevèrent contre le National-Socialisme. Ainsi, à la tête des catholiques allemands, le cardinal Adolf Bertram, annonça dans son message de la Nouvelle Année 1931 que le nationalisme extrême, le racisme et la glorification de la race étaient le fait d'agitateurs et de faux-prophètes, contraires à l'enseignement de Dieu. Ainsi, lors de la conférence épiscopale de Fulda en 1932, il fut interdit aux catholiques d'adhérer au NSDAP et aux Nazis d'assister aux cérémonies religieuses.

Le « Zentrum », Parti catholique cherchant à jouer un rôle modéré et médiateur, s' alarma de la droitisation et la montée du nationalisme dans l'électorat catholique. Il s'allia dans les années 1920 avec le Parti Social-Démocrate d'Allemagne afin d'essayer d'empêcher l'effondrement de la République de Weimar et de la démocratie. Cependant, ce Parti était de moins en moins bien perçu par l'épiscopat allemand. Celui-ci, sous l'influence d'Eugenio Pacelli, décourageait les tendances socialistes dans l'Église. Certains prêtres encourageaient leurs fidèles à rejoindre le NSDAP et sa croisade nationaliste contre le Bolchévisme pour le christianiser de l'intérieur.

Face aux églises, le NSDAP mit donc en œuvre une stratégie double, de séduction et de confrontation directe. Jusqu'en 1930, il les laissa en dehors de son champ d'action. Son programme portait de tenter d'abord d'attirer les chrétiens en propageant un « christianisme positif » sans attache confessionnelle ; un ajout, passant la plupart du temps inaperçu, y apportait cependant cette restriction : « pour autant qu'ils ne heurtent pas les mœurs et le sens moral de la race germanique ». La religion ne devait être possible que dans les limites du sentiment national ; aussi une foi allemande n'était-elle en mesure de trouver Dieu que dans l'Histoire allemande. La révolution nationale était donnée pour l'accomplissement de toutes les aspirations religieuses.

S'y ajoutait un antisémitisme militant, pour lequel du reste le terrain avait été déblayé depuis longtemps du côté chrétien. Adolf Stöcker (1835-1909) déjà le fit figurer en 1880 au programme politique de son parti, le Parti Chrétien-Social (« Christlich-soziale Partei »), programme avec lequel de nombreux chrétiens luthériens conservateurs pouvaient s'identifier. Ainsi, trouvaient-ils dans l'idéologie nazie quantité de choses familières.

Hitler lui-même avait écrit dans « Mein Kampf », en 1923 :

« En me défendant contre les Juifs, j'accomplis l'œuvre du Seigneur. »

Après la signature de l'accord sur les églises de 1930, le NSDAP commença à mener une campagne offensive visant à ce que les chrétiens évangéliques se joignissent à sa lutte contre le « système de Weimar », dont les ingrédients seraient « le Marxisme, les Juifs et le Centrisme » : des troupes de SA assistaient en groupe aux offices évangéliques et montaient des factions dissuasives (« Mahnwachen ») devant les églises, pour intimider les pasteurs aux idées pacifistes ou social-religieuses. L'on réussit ainsi, par exemple, à empêcher, en provoquant un mouvement d'indignation, le pasteur berlinois Günther Dehn (1882-1970) d'assumer ses fonctions d'enseignant à Halle. En effet, Dehn avait justifié devant une assemblée de fidèles, lors d'une conférence prononcée en 1928 intitulée : « Der Christ und der Krieg » (le Chrétien et la Guerre), bible à l'appui, le refus de service militaire comme étant un choix chrétien.

En 1932, fut en outre fondé la « Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen » (Mouvement de foi des Chrétiens allemands,

ou DC) , par lequel les Nationaux-Socialistes chrétiens évangélistes baptisés se constituaient en association. Après avoir donné à l'idéologie nazie droit de cité dans leur église, ils voulurent, après qu'en 1930 les « Deutschnationalen » ou le « Christlich-soziale Volksdienst » eut remporté l'élection au sein de l'église en Prusse, en faire l'idéologie unique. Ils voulaient pratiquer un christianisme spécifiquement allemand (« Arteigen ») , rénové par une religiosité néo-Paganiste enracinée dans le peuple allemand. Ils entendaient que le « Principe du " Führer " » fût ancré dans l'Église et s'efforçaient d'unifier les églises régionales, jusque-là réparties selon les différentes confessions, en une seule « Église du " Reich " » (« Reichskirche ») . La « Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen » était dirigée par Joachim Gustav Wilhelm Hossfelder (1899-1976) , pasteur originaire de Breslau, et appuyée par des théologiens de renom, tel que Emanuel Hirsch (1888-1972) qui, dès 1920, avait préparé l'idéologie de la « Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen » par le biais de son ouvrage « Deutschlands Schicksal » (la Destinée de l'Allemagne) . Paul de Lagarde (1827-1891) et Artur Dinter (1876-1948) ont joué également un rôle de précurseur, en condamnant, comme le faisait la « Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen » Saint-Paul de Tarse comme corrupteur du christianisme, en présentant le Christ comme un « prophète anti-juif » , et en préconisant une religion allemande nationale.

L'Église confessante avait ainsi, en tant que mouvement rénovateur au sein de l'Église créé après 1933, à lutter sur plusieurs fronts à la fois : contre la politisation, la « Gleichschaltung » et l'instrumentalisation de l'Église imposées par les Nazis, et contre les tendances à l'accommodement venant de l'intérieur, contre les parcours confessionnels singuliers, et aussi, et surtout, contre la propre peur, lâcheté et inconséquence, qui contrariaient une résistance efficace.

La nomination d'Adolf Hitler comme chancelier du « Reich » , le 30 janvier 1933, fut acclamé par la majorité des chrétiens comme le salut de la patrie.

Par l'Ordonnance du 28 février 1933 pour la protection du peuple et de l'État (« Verordnung zum Schutz von Volk und Staat vom 28. Februar 1933 ») , dite aussi : « Reichstagsbrandverordnung ») , Hitler supprima le 28 février 1933 (1 jour seulement après l'incendie du « Reichstag ») toutes les libertés individuelles inscrites dans la Constitution de Weimar ; par la suite, cette même loi autorisait également la surveillance et l'emprisonnement de personnalités ecclésiastiques. Cependant, c'est à peine si les églises y perçurent un quelconque danger ; au contraire, lors de la journée de Potsdam (le 21 mars, où eut lieu une mise en scène grandiose de la prise de pouvoir par Hitler) , Otto Dibelius célébra, dans l'église de la Garnison (« Garnisonkirche ») à Potsdam, la victoire électorale de Hitler du 5 mars par une messe d'action de grâces pour le « rétablissement de l'ordre » . Le même jour fut promulguée la Loi contre les attaques sournoises à l'encontre de l'État et du Parti et protégeant les uniformes du Parti (« Gesetz gegen heimtückische Angriffe auf Staat und Partei und zum Schutz der Parteiuniformen ») , mieux connue sous l'appellation : « Heimtückegesetz ») , laquelle loi menaçait d'emprisonnement quiconque critiquait le gouvernement de Hitler à l'attention de l'étranger.

Le 23 mars, 1 jour avant la promulgation de la loi des pleins pouvoirs, Hitler rassura les églises par une déclaration gouvernementale, dans laquelle il promit :

« Le gouvernement national voit dans les 2 confessions chrétiennes les facteurs les plus importants pour la préservation de notre caractère national (Volkstum) . »

Il y affirme qu'il « leur accordera l'influence qui leur revient et les consolidera » et qu'il voit « dans le christianisme les fondements inébranlables des mœurs et de la morale de notre peuple » .

Le 30 mars, de nombreux œcuménistes de haut-rang des églises protestantes et des églises libres donnèrent suite à la « recommandation » du NSDAP les incitant à écrire des lettres à leurs interlocuteurs étrangers, dans lesquelles ils priaient ceux-ci de s'inscrire en faux contre la « campagne de dénigrement » (« Hetze ») de l'ordre nouveau en Allemagne. Tout se passe, était-il ainsi affirmé, dans une « tranquille discipline » et « va dans le sens de la paix » . Dibelius déclara dans une émission de radio aux États-Unis, par exemple que les détenus dans les prisons étaient « traités correctement » . 2 jours après fut instauré, en partie par la violence, le boycott des commerces juifs, ce que Dibelius s'efforça de légitimer comme « rétablissement de l'ordre » de l'État et « légitime défense » . De même, il qualifiait les réactions déclenchées au sein du Mouvement œcuménique par la persécution des Juifs de campagne de dénigrement de l'étranger (« Auslandshetze ») , qu'il mit sur le compte d'influences juives internationales.

Les 3 et 4 avril se tint à Berlin un congrès (« Reichstagung ») des « Deutsche Christen » : y participèrent, à côté de représentants du NSDAP comme Hermann Göring, des théologiens universitaires tels que Karl Fezer ; ce dernier voulait mettre à profit la faveur de l'heure pour accomplir une « mission nationale intérieure » (« innere Volksmission ») . Les orateurs plus radicaux cependant voulaient transposer le principe du « Führer » et l'impératif de conformité au génie national (« Artgemäßheit ») directement sur l'Église tout entière, réclamaient l'exclusion des Juifs baptisés, et menaçaient de faire intervenir, y compris au sein de l'Église, des commissaires de l'État (« Staatskommissare ») - ce qui se produisit pour la 1re fois le 22 avril dans l'église régionale du Mecklembourg.

Le 7 avril fut adoptée la 1re loi sur les « non aryens » en vue du redressement de la fonction publique (« Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums ») . Le paragraphe relatif aux aryens contenu dans cette loi menaçait de licenciement les fonctionnaires, professeurs d'université et même les pasteurs d'origine juive. Dietrich Bonhoeffer fut un des 1ers à réagir, par le biais de son article « Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage » (l'Église face à la question juive ; article achevé le 15 avril, publié en juin) . Il y posait sans équivoque que ce qui était mis en jeu, par l'exclusion des Juifs, était l'existence même de l'Église en tant que communauté de foi.

Mais l'Église doit, écrivait-il, protéger contre les abus de l'État non seulement les Juifs baptisés, mais aussi tous les Juifs, quels qu'ils soient :

« L'Église a des devoirs inconditionnels vis-à-vis des victimes de l'ordre social quel qu'il soit, même lorsque ces victimes n'appartiennent pas à la communauté chrétienne. »

Elle a le devoir de demander à l'État les raisons qui l'autorisent à déposséder de ses droits une minorité ; si, à cette requête, celui-ci répond en continuant à user de violence, elle a le devoir « non seulement de panser les victimes sous la roue, mais encore de se précipiter dans les rayons de la roue elle-même » .

Pour Bonhoeffer, la relation avec les Juifs était donc le point central du « Kirchenkampf » . Il en venait déjà à

revendiquer le droit à la résistance, alors que la plupart des chrétiens prenaient le parti d'ignorer la violence dont usait l'État contre les Juifs, voire montraient pour elle de la compréhension.

À cela, il rétorque de manière incisive :

« Le devoir de la prédication chrétienne est de dire : ici, où Juif et Allemand se tiennent ensemble sous la parole de Dieu, c'est l'Église, et c'est aussi là que se vérifie si l'Église est encore Église ou non. »

De même, en mai, 11 prêtres westphaliens, parmi lesquels Hans Ehrenberg et le futur martyr Ludwig Steil, rejetèrent l'exclusion des Juifs, la déclarant une hérésie. Le mouvement Jeune-Réformateur (« Jungreformatorische Bewegung ») également déclara dans ses Principes de la Refondation de l'Église (« Grundsätze zur neuen Gestaltung der Kirche »), au point 7 :

« Nous faisons profession de notre foi en l'Esprit-Saint et, pour cette raison, rejetons par principe que des non-aryens soient exclus de l'Église ; car une telle exclusion repose sur une confusion entre État et Église. Le rôle de l'État est d'orienter, celui de l'Église, de sauver. »

Les lois étaient ainsi condamnées qui faisaient obligation à l'Église d'exclure les personnes d'origine juive. Ce point de vue était sous-tendu par la vision luthérienne traditionnelle des 2 Royaumes, selon laquelle l'État pouvait définir par ses propres lois le contenu qu'il entend donner au Droit et son application, tandis que l'Église devait se borner à œuvrer pour le salut des âmes. En conséquence, il n'y eut pas d'opposition de la part de l'Église contre les futures lois raciales de Nuremberg.

La conclusion suivante, à laquelle parvint en août 1933 le rapport de la faculté de théologie évangélique de l'université de Marbourg, ne souffrait aucune restriction :

« C'est pourquoi le paragraphe sur les aryens est une hérésie de l'Église, propre à détruire son essence même. »

Selon le rapport, prétendre élever une loi politique au rang de loi religieuse, constitue une hérésie, que tout chrétien se doit de rejeter absolument. Les auteurs du rapport insistaient que cette loi soit, en tout état de cause, rejetée comme inique et appelaient à s'opposer à l'État sur ce point particulier. Ce nonobstant, il n'y eut guère, de la part des chrétiens confessants, de prise de position mettant en cause la légitimité des mesures prises par l'État contre les Juifs.

À la tête des Églises, l'on ne se préoccupait guère du sort des Juifs, mais plutôt du mode d'organisation des Églises elles-mêmes : les chefs ecclésiastiques, dans l'espoir de reprendre l'initiative et de refouler les « Deutsche Christen », se saisirent à leur tour de l'appel à réformer les Églises. Le projet de constitution de Wilhelm Zöllner (1860-1937) du 13 avril (un parmi de nombreux autres) prévoyait une « Église évangélique de la Nation allemande », au sein de laquelle une Église luthérienne et une Église réformée officielles (« Reichskirche ») co-existeraient.

Avant même que cette constitution eût pu être rédigée, Hitler nomma le 25 avril l'aumônier militaire Ludwig Müller (1883-1945), national-socialiste convaincu, « homme de confiance et plénipotentiaire pour les questions relatives à l'église évangélique ». Aussitôt, les « Deutsche Christen » désignèrent Müller comme leur tuteur et exigèrent des élections afin de faire de lui l'évêque du « Reich » (« Reichsbischof »). Au cours des concertations avec Müller qui suivirent, Hermann Kapler (1867-1941), August Friedrich Karl Marahrens (1875-1947) et Hermann Klugkist HeBe (1884-1949) en étaient déjà venus à considérer matière négociable la notion d'Église nationale (« Reichskirche ») et le « Principe du “ Führer ” » ; seule la conformité au génie national allemand (« Artgemäßheit ») fut écartée par eux du débat. Le paragraphe sur les aryens ne touchant que peu de membres ecclésiastiques (quelque 110 prêtres, ainsi qu'un nombre inconnu d'étudiants en théologie d'ascendance juive), la disposition à céder, sur ce point également, à la pression du Parti et des « Deutsche Christen » allait croissant.

En même temps se constituait, à partir de plusieurs groupes déjà existants et ayant concernant l'Église des aspirations rénovatrices différentes (par exemple : le mouvement de Berneuchen, « Berneuchener Bewegung »), la confrérie de Sydow (« Sydower Bruderschaft »), la « Neuwerkbewegung » - un Mouvement Jeune-Réformé (« Jungreformatrische Bewegung »), lequel, s'il réclamait lui aussi une Église unifiée, demeurait attaché aux professions de foi réformées et favorisait la candidature de Friedrich von Bodelschwingh comme leur évêque. Les directions des Églises régionales avaient déjà entamé leur transformation en une Église évangélique allemande (« Deutsche Evangelische Kirche », ou DEK) et, le 27 mai, élurent Bodelschwingh évêque national (« Reichsbischof »), avant même que cette fonction ne fût inscrite dans la constitution de cette Église.

Sur ce, le ministre prussien du Culte, invoquant une violation du contrat d'État, entreprit de transformer l'appareil de direction de l'Église. Le 24 juin, sous la pression du pouvoir, Bodelschwingh dut se démettre. Le 14 juillet, il fut imposé à la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche », par une loi, une nouvelle constitution, et de nouvelles élections synodales furent annoncées pour le 23 juillet. Après que Hitler eut pris parti, la veille de l'élection, par la radio, en faveur des « Deutsche Christen », ceux-ci remportèrent avec le slogan « ein Volk, ein Reich, eine Kirche » (« un peuple, un État, une Église ») une victoire écrasante sur le groupe « Evangelium und Kirche » (Évangile et Église), fondé par les Jeunes Réformateurs. En vue de créer une Église assujettie à l'État, les « Deutsche Christen » s'employèrent à occuper les instances dirigeantes des églises et à remodeler les églises régionales selon le principe du Führer et suivant les diocèses historiques. Le 27 septembre, leurs directions élurent Müller évêque national. Les représentants battus à l'élection votèrent eux aussi pour Müller. L'opposition obtint cependant que la référence aux professions de foi de la Réforme soit inscrite dans la nouvelle constitution de l'Église.

Les forces radicales au sein des « Deutsche Christen », fortes de leur succès électoral, réclamèrent toutefois, par analogie avec la Révolution nationale, le « parachèvement de la Réforme », impliquant que fût éliminé du culte et de la foi tout élément non-allemand, que l'évangile fût « déjudaisé » et que fût instauré un christianisme « en accord avec le génie propre (de l'Allemagne) » (artgemäß), où serait vénéré un « Christ héroïque » (heldischer Jesus). Ce programme fut exposé le 13 novembre au Palais des Sports de Berlin, puis adopté avec une seule voix contre. Le discours du représentant des « Deutsche Christen » Reinhard Krause déclencha cependant un scandale et poussa de nombreux « Deutsche Christen » modérés à se détourner de ce parti, et certains même à démissionner de leurs fonctions. Par la suite, le groupe des « Deutsche Christen » se désagrégea en plusieurs groupuscules.

Le 20 décembre, l'évêque national Müller entreprit d'incorporer dans les Jeunesses hitlériennes les fédérations de jeunesse évangéliques, qui s'étaient auparavant réunies dans le Evangelisches Jugendwerk Deutschlands, et cela sans concertation avec leurs dirigeants et à l'encontre de leur volonté expresse. Si Müller croyait avoir fait ainsi à Hitler son « plus beau cadeau de Noël », il avait en revanche largement perdu la confiance de la jeunesse évangélique, laquelle commença à s'organiser elle-même de diverses manières. Même Hitler laissa choir Müller à partir de 1934.

Attitude des catholiques face au régime national-socialiste

Côté catholique, compte tenu du Concordat conclu en juillet 1933, le terme de *Kirchenkampf* n'est pas utilisé pour la période 1933–1945, ce terme étant réservé pour désigner le *Kulturkampf* pendant l'ère bismarckienne. La population catholique préférerait garder depuis lors une attitude distante vis-à-vis des innovations politiques. Les évêques catholiques d'Allemagne avaient du reste formulé des mises en garde répétées contre l'idéologie nazie. C'est ce qui explique pourquoi le Parti du Centre obtint lors des élections parlementaires de mars 1933 une nouvelle fois 13,9 pour cent des voix. En Rhénanie et en Bavière, régions à prédominance catholique, le NSDAP n'obtint guère plus de 20 pour cent des voix émises, contre plus de 60 pour cent par endroits dans les contrées protestantes.

Dès avant la prise de pouvoir par les Nazis, l'épiscopat allemand avait pris ses distances d'avec le national-socialisme, en interdisant aux catholiques de s'engager dans le NSDAP et en interdisant aux groupements nazis de se joindre aux processions religieuses. L'ensemble des diocèses sera amené en 1932 à déclarer « incompatible avec la foi chrétienne » l'appartenance au NSDAP.

À la suite de la déclaration gouvernementale de Hitler, laquelle promettait une politique modérée en matière d'églises, les évêques révoquèrent leur déclaration d'incompatibilité. Lorsque la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » se fut constituée, beaucoup de catholiques allemands souhaitèrent ne plus rester à l'écart de la Révolution nationale. Beaucoup d'entre eux espéraient la reconstitution d'une Allemagne chrétienne-nationale, attitude dans laquelle l'anticommunisme traditionnel joua un rôle. Ceci contribue à expliquer pourquoi une opposition chrétienne conjointe contre l'idéologie nazie ne vit pas le jour.

Le 20 juillet 1933, la Curie, de façon inopinée, signa le Concordat du Reich, ce que Hitler fit ensuite valoir comme un succès diplomatique : son régime acquit ainsi une caution morale et de la crédibilité au niveau international. De l'autre côté, les évêques catholiques purent grâce à ce Concordat garder une certaine influence sur la société, dont ils usèrent aussi contre les injustices et exactions commises par le pouvoir. Néanmoins, les catholiques n'échappèrent pas à la politique de *Gleichschaltung* des nationaux-socialistes. Le Parti du Centre fut interdit à l'automne 1933, au même titre que tous les autres partis démocratiques, les syndicats chrétiens furent dissous, les écoles et ordres catholiques ne purent préserver qu'à grand peine leur autonomie. La SA agressait, dans des combats de rue, les membres d'associations catholiques, telles que la *Kolpingjugend*. Bien que ces conflits missent à mal les relations avec le régime nazi, ils furent, eu égard au Concordat, pour la plupart résolus dans la discrétion et ne donnèrent lieu qu'à des protestations privées. Ce ne sera qu'en 1937 que l'encyclique *Mit brennender Sorge* protestera contre les exactions et établira l'incompatibilité entre racisme et christianisme.

Ce nonobstant, certains théologiens catholiques comme Karl Eschweiler (1886—1936) ou Hans Barion saluèrent l'idéologie nazie et adhérèrent au NSDAP. Les deux se virent temporairement privés par la Curie de l'autorisation d'enseigner en raison de leur approbation, en 1934, de la loi sur la stérilisation forcée des malades héréditaires ; mais la loi en tant que telle ne fut point critiquée. Certes, quelques individualités comme l'évêque Clemens August Graf von Galen ou le cardinal Michæl von Faulhaber s'exprimaient dans leurs sermons ouvertement contre de telles mesures de l'État ; von Galen obtint même la suspension pendant un temps du programme d'euthanasie national-socialiste, l'Action T4.

En 1939, c'est, avec Pie XII, un des principaux initiateurs du Concordat qui accéda au pontificat suprême. Selon les sources disponibles à l'heure actuelle, il plaçait tout son espoir dans la diplomatie, en vue de minimiser les dégâts et de sauver des gens par des actions clandestines. Cette attitude eut pour effet de restreindre la marge de manœuvre des catholiques en Allemagne. Les protestations non publiques demeuraient ainsi l'affaire du Vatican, et il n'y eut donc point d'opposition déclarée contre l'Holocauste. Mais, en ce cas également, des individualités mirent leur vie en jeu pour des Juifs et devinrent des martyrs, parmi lesquels les prêtres Alfred Delp, Maximilien Kolbe, Rupert Mayer et Bernhard Lichtenberg. Le clergé polonais en particulier eut de nombreuses victimes dans ses rangs après 1939.

Dans l'ensemble, l'attitude des catholiques en Allemagne était plus unitaire et peu embarrassée par des conflits internes : s'ils ne se plièrent pas au national-socialisme idéologiquement, ils ne le combattirent pas davantage. En tant qu'église universelle, sa direction tenta au premier chef de protéger ses propres structures et membres. Il s'ensuit que le terme de Kirchenkampf n'est pas appliqué à l'Église catholique dans le Troisième Reich.

Apparition de la Bekennende Kirche

Le Pfarrernotbund

Le 21 septembre 1933, une Ligue de secours pour pasteurs (Pfarrernotbund) s'était formée à Wittenberg sous la direction de Martin Niemöller ; parmi les dirigeants de la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche », seuls y figuraient le président westphalien Jakob Emil Karl Koch (1876—1951) et Otto Dibelius. La Ligue obligeait ses membres, par son règlement interne, à s'opposer à l'application, au sein de l'Église réformée, du paragraphe sur les Aryens, celui-ci impliquant en effet une « violation de l'état de confession » (en latin : status confessionis), et s'efforçait d'aider financièrement les pasteurs d'origine juive menacés d'exclusion de l'Église.

Ce faisant, les auteurs (Bonhœffer und Niemöller) plaçaient la question juive au même rang d'importance théologique que les thèmes qui passaient aux yeux des réformateurs du XVI^e siècle pour l'essence inaliénable de la foi évangélique. L'appel à se déclarer publiquement opposé à la majorité opprimante, ecclésiastique et sociale, renfermait en lui un engagement implicite de défendre ce crédo jusqu'à la mort, s'il y a lieu. « Seulement avec les Juifs » était, aux yeux de ces confessants, équivalents au quadruple « sola scriptura », « sola fide », « sola gratia », « solus Christus » de Martin Luther, lequel avait lui aussi, comme individu, mis en jeu sa propre vie.

C'est le point de départ de l'opposition à l'infiltration, au sein de l'Église évangélique allemande, des idées nationales-socialistes dans la doctrine chrétienne. Désormais, partout dans le Reich, se constituaient éparses des « communes confessantes ». Début 1934, la Ligue de secours se réunit avec ses représentants, afin de se porter à la défense de «

l'Évangile ».

Communauté confessante et déclaration théologique de Barmen

Müller tenta d'étouffer la discussion qui s'amplifiait au sein de la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » au moyen d'un « décret Muselière » et par de nombreuses mesures disciplinaires. Cependant les plaintes à son endroit ne cessaient de se multiplier, à tel point qu'une réunion eut finalement lieu le 25 janvier 1934 entre Hitler et les dirigeants de l'Église. Ceux-ci l'assurèrent de leur loyauté ; la chute de Müller toutefois ne vint pas. Celui-ci s'attacha alors à réorganiser les autres églises régionales.

En réaction, les forces d'opposition internes de l'Église se groupèrent au niveau national. En mars, ils se liguèrent en une Communauté confessante de la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » (« Bekenntnisgemeinschaft der DEK ») et mirent à sa tête un Conseil confrérial national (« Reichsbruderrat ») chargé de la diriger. Lors d'une réunion à Ulm le 22 avril, elle exprima, contre la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » « occupée » par les « Deutsche Christen », la revendication d'être l'« Église évangélique légitime d'Allemagne ». Du 29 au 31 mai se déroula ensuite à Barmen le 1er synode confessant, auquel les Luthériens, les Réformés et les Unifiés dépêchèrent des représentants de leurs communes. Ils y fondèrent l'Église confessante (« Bekennende Kirche »).

Dans leur déclaration fondatrice, rédigée par Karl Barth, il est affirmé :

« Jésus-Christ, tel qu'il est attesté dans les Saintes-Écritures, est l'unique parole de Dieu à laquelle nous ayons à obéir, à laquelle nous devons faire confiance dans la vie et dans la mort.

Nous rejetons la fausse doctrine selon laquelle l'Église peut et doit reconnaître, pour source de sa prédication, en dehors et en sus de cette unique parole de Dieu, des événements et des puissances, figures et vérités autres que la révélation divine.

Nous rejetons la fausse doctrine selon laquelle l'Église a le droit de laisser son propre bon vouloir ou le jeu changeant des convictions philosophiques et politiques du jour déterminer le contenu de son message et la forme de son organisation.

Nous rejetons la fausse doctrine selon laquelle l'Église est habilitée et autorisée à se donner ou à se laisser donner, en dehors des nécessités de son service, des dirigeants particuliers, doté de compétences décisionnelles.

Nous rejetons la fausse doctrine selon laquelle l'État doit et peut, en sus de sa mission spécifique, se poser en ordonnateur unique et total de la vie humaine et, par là, prendre aussi en charge la destinée de l'Église.

Nous rejetons la fausse doctrine selon laquelle l'Église doit et peut, au-delà de sa mission spécifique, s'appropriier la manière d'être, les attributions et les prérogatives d'un État et devenir de ce fait elle-même un organisme de l'État.

Nous rejetons la fausse doctrine selon laquelle l'Église peut, par sa seule autorité humaine, mettre la parole et l'œuvre

du Seigneur au service de quelconques souhaits, buts et desseins qu'elle aurait définis elle-même. »

Ce positionnement (l'allégeance au Christ seul) était à la base de toutes les négations ; celles-ci traçaient, par le biais des « rejets », les contours d'une hérésie, qu'il y avait lieu d'exclure du champ de l'Église. Ces négations permettaient de se démarquer :

De la théologie des « Deutsche Christen », mais aussi de la théologie Libérale, qui posaient comme divinités, en plus du Christ, d'autres incarnations (« andere Gestalten »), telles que le génie national (« Volkstum »), l'État, le sang, la race, le chef (« Führer »).

De la politisation de l'Église, telle que la concevait l'idéologie nazie.

Du « Principe du " Führer " », que l'Église se voyait imposer de l'intérieur (à travers l'obéissance par provision) ou de l'extérieur (par la « Gleichschaltung »).

De l'État total, prédefinisant une certaine conception du monde.

De l'Église d'État en tant qu'organisme et prolongement de l'État.

De la subordination de la parole chrétienne à quelque intérêt social ou revendication sociale que ce soit.

Pour la 1^{re} fois, la théologie dialectique de la Parole de Dieu, que Barth avait développée depuis 1918, se fit opérante sur le plan de la politique religieuse, et par là même indirectement, sur le plan politique.

L'interprétation des thèses de Barmen et leur traduction en situation donna lieu ensuite à des dissensions au sein même de la « Bekennende Kirche ». La plus grande lacune de la déclaration était le défaut d'engagement à une inébranlable solidarité pan-chrétienne avec les Juifs persécutés. L'effet s'en révéla funeste : très peu de chrétiens, en effet, exercèrent une résistance directe aux mesures prises par le pouvoir contre les Juifs, résistance qui pourtant allait être, au plus tard après les pogroms de novembre 1938, impérative. Ces résistants ne furent guère soutenus, pas même par l'Église confessante elle-même. Seules quelques individualités entendaient la résistance au régime nazi comme découlant, de façon nécessaire et incontournable, de la foi chrétienne.

La déclaration de Barmen eut pour effet tout d'abord d'intensifier la résistance contre la politique d'embrigadement de Müller, surtout dans les communes évangéliques du Wurtemberg et de Bavière. De nombreux procès firent apparaître le caractère illégal de l'action de Müller. Lorsque, le 23 septembre, il se fit installer en qualité d'évêque national (« Reichsbischof ») à la cathédrale de Berlin, il avait manqué son objectif d'une Église protestante pilotée par le pouvoir politique.

Le 20 octobre, lors du 2^e synode des confessants à Berlin-Dahlem, le Droit ecclésiastique d'exception (« Kirchliches Notrecht ») de Dahlem, déjà appliqué en Prusse, fut proclamé applicable dans toute l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne,

cependant que fut constitué un Conseil confrérial national (« Reichsbruderrat ») , pour faire contrepoids aux dirigeants des « Deutsche Christen » . Cela revenait quasiment à une administration à part, et donc à une scission. L'avoué de Müller, August Jäger, démissionna le 26 octobre. Les demandes de démission à l'adresse de Müller se multipliaient, à la suite de quoi le pouvoir résolut de lever l'ensemble de la législation sur les églises de 1934. Hitler reçut une nouvelle fois quelques évêques (Theophil Wurm, Hans Meiser, Marahrens) et indiqua que l'idée d'une Église nationale (« Reichskirche ») avait cessé de l'intéresser.

L'Église évangélique allemande s'était ainsi désagrégé en plusieurs groupes, qui se côtoyaient dans une situation juridiquement incertaine :

Les diocèses déjà restructurés, dirigés par des Deutsche Christen (DC), et qui se voyaient comme faisant partie de l'Église unifiée.

Les Églises régionales restées intactes (Hanovre e.a.), qui continuaient à appartenir à l'Église unifiée, mais rejetaient Müller pour leur chef.

Les Églises régionales démantelées, dont les communes confessantes refusaient d'adhérer à l'Église unifiée.

La « Bekennende Kirche » , qui se considérait comme la « vraie » Église évangélique et dans laquelle des communes luthériennes et réformées luttèrent conjointement contre la Gleichschaltung. Avec les dirigeants des Églises régionales intactes (par exemple : la Bavière et le Wurtemberg) elle forma, à partir du 20 novembre, une Direction provisoire des Églises protestantes (« Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » , ou VKL) , laquelle revendiquait la direction de l'Église évangélique allemande tout entière.

Au sein de la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » surgirent rapidement des divergences dans les attitudes vis-à-vis des instances ecclésiastiques officielles. Alors que les dirigeants des églises régionales restées intactes souhaitaient préserver la continuité des accords, toujours en vigueur, avec l'État prussien, et s'efforçaient d'obtenir une reconnaissance officielle, les Dahlémites radicaux (parmi lesquels Dietrich Bonhoeffer) voulaient rompre avec la mise sous tutelle par l'État, voyant dans une telle rupture la conséquence logique de la déclaration de Barmen. Les dissensions amenèrent Barth, Niemöller, Karl Immer et Hermann Albert Heße à se retirer du Conseil confrérial, ce qui eut pour effet d'affaiblir la « Bekennende Kirche » et de lui faire perdre, en dépit de la montée en puissance de ses communes, son orientation.

En 1935 fut lancée, à l'instigation du pouvoir, une nouvelle campagne de propagande au sein de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne : le Mouvement allemand de la Foi (« Deutsche Glaubensbewegung ») se mit à répandre des idées néo-païennes similaires à celles des « Deutsche Christen » . Dans le même temps, Müller interdit que des questions de politique religieuse fussent mises en débat public. Les pasteurs de la « Bekennende Kirche » ayant passé outre cette interdiction dans leur prêches dominicaux furent temporairement détenus. Les sections financières prussiennes prirent le contrôle sur l'administration de l'Église protestante, tandis qu'un service de décision (« Beschlussstelle ») surveillait les recours juridiques des partisans de la « Bekennende Kirche » .

Cela conduisit le synode de l'Église de l'Union de la Vieille Prusse (« Kirche der Altpreußischen Union »), la plus importante des églises régionales évangéliques autonomes à avoir rejoint la « Bekennende Kirche », à adresser en mars un avis, affirmant :

« Nous voyons notre peuple menacé d'un mortel péril. Le péril consiste en une religion nouvelle. En elle, les conceptions raciale-ethniques sont élevées au rang de mythe. En elle, le sang et la race, le génie national, l'honneur et la liberté ont valeur d'idoles. »

Le racisme, comme idéologie globale, était repoussé, mais l'on continuait à faire silence sur les conséquences concrètes de celui-ci pour les Juifs.

Du 4 au 6 juin se réunit le 3^e synode de la « Bekennende Kirche » à Augsburg : la rupture avec les autorités ecclésiastiques fut évitée et il fut décidé de suivre la ligne conservatrice des Églises régionales luthériennes. Mais, d'autre part, le synode chargea le Conseil confrérial national de mettre en œuvre ses décisions, de sorte que Niemöller, Heße et Immer ré-intégrèrent la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » .

Le 16 juillet, Hitler nomma Hanns Kerrl ministre des Affaires religieuses. Une loi du 24 septembre, destinée à « garantir » l'unité de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne, servit à légitimer de nombreuses ordonnances prises dans les années suivantes. Un Comité national des Églises (« Reichskirchenausschuß », ou RKA), nouvellement créé, sous la houlette de Wilhelm Zoellner, prit la direction de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne, en lieu et place de Müller, et dès lors bénéficia dans l'année qui suivit d'un soutien croissant de la part des églises régionales intactes ainsi que de quelques Conseils confrériaux.

En conséquence, la « Bekennende Kirche » se scinda lors du 4^e synode de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne tenu à Bad Oeynhausen du 17 au 22 février 1936. La Ire « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » démissionna unanimement ; une nouvelle « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » fut investie le 12 mars par le Conseil confrérial national. Cela aboutit à la formation de différents camps : le 18 mars, les églises luthériennes régionales restées intactes de Bavière et du Wurtemberg, et les conseils confrériaux luthériens de la « Bekennende Kirche » se groupèrent en un Conseil de l'Église évangélique-luthérienne d'Allemagne (« Rat der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands »), dit aussi « Lutherrat » .

La résistance contre les tentatives de main-mise du pouvoir n'était plus désormais portée que par la nouvelle « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » et la « Bekennende Kirche » prussienne. Le 4 juin, celle-ci adressa à Hitler un mémorandum, qui, en des termes d'une limpidité et d'une simplicité jamais plus atteintes avant 1945, dénonçait l'action de l'État totalitaire, tout en fondant cette critique sur une base théologique :

« Si le sang, la race, le génie national et l'honneur acquièrent ici le statut de valeurs éternelles, le chrétien évangélique sera contraint, de par le 1^{er} commandement, à rejeter cette échelle de valeurs. Si, dans le cadre des conceptions nationales-socialistes, un antisémitisme est imposé de force aux chrétiens, leur faisant obligation de haïr les Juifs, il se doit de lui opposer l'impératif chrétien de la charité. »

Le devoir religieux met des limites à l'obéissance chrétienne au pouvoir politique : quand celui-ci tente d'empêcher la transmission de l'évangile, il menace de détruire l'œuvre de l'Église, voire l'Église elle-même. La conséquence, à savoir la résistance directe, nécessaire en ce cas, des chrétiens contre le pouvoir, était évidente, mais demeura inexprimée comme telle.

Le mémorandum devait rester secret, mais, par des voies inconnues, fut révélé et publié à l'étranger. Il fut ensuite recommandé à toutes les communes confessantes comme paroles à prononcer du haut de la chaire pour le 23 août, il est vrai avec omission des phrases particulièrement critiques citées ci-haut. Ce nonobstant, l'aile conservatrice de la « Bekennende Kirche » répudia aussitôt cette « haute-trahison » .

Le 20 novembre 1936, elle déclara :

« Nous appuyons, aux côtés du “ Reichskirchenausschuß ”, le “ Führer ” dans sa lutte pour la survie du peuple allemand contre le Bolchévisme. »

Cet anti-Communisme était le lien idéologique décisif entre, d'une part, les chrétiens imprégnés de la vision luthérienne-nationaliste, quel que soit leur camp ; et, d'autre part, le régime nazi ; ce lien idéologique concourait avec la traditionnelle loyauté luthérienne à l'égard de l'autorité pour empêcher une résistance plus affirmée de l'Église dans son ensemble. Seule une minorité, y compris dans la « Bekennende Kirche » elle-même, rejetait la collaboration avec le régime.

Mais la « Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen » se scinda à son tour en une aile modérée, prête à coopérer avec le « Reichskirchenausschuß » , et le groupe radical « Nationalkirchliche Einigung » , dont le centre se situait en Thuringe. La déconfessionnalisation, hostile aux Églises, pour laquelle œuvrait ce dernier groupe avait pour but de supprimer la référence à la profession de foi chrétienne comme fondement doctrinaire des Églises évangéliques et d'effacer leur influence dans la vie publique. À cela s'attachaient également, en vain, tant le « Reichskirchenausschuß » que le ministre des affaires religieuses Kerrl, ce qui eut pour effet de renforcer, au sein de la « Bekennende Kirche » , le soupçon que pour le pouvoir il ne s'agissait pas, en réalité, de la préservation, mais du délabrement organisationnel (selon les termes d'Alfred Rosenberg) des Églises, et de leur future éviction. La « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » , invoquant la Ire thèse de la déclaration de Barmen, continua donc de décliner toute collaboration avec le « Reichskirchenausschuß » .

Les relations que l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne entretenait avec le mouvement œcuménique venaient interagir avec le conflit de politique intérieure allemande autour de l'organisation et des droits des églises ; en effet, le mouvement œcuménique avait dès 1934 reconnu la « Bekennende Kirche » comme une des représentantes de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne et établi des contacts avec elle, en investissant le président Koch comme membre du Conseil œcuménique des Églises. Mais le mouvement œcuménique considérait d'autre part qu'il n'était pas en son pouvoir de prendre une résolution en faveur de la « Bekennende Kirche » , contre l'Église « officielle » . Cela permit au Bureau international sous la direction de Theodor Heckel de garder son influence sur l'évolution du mouvement œcuménique. La «

Bekennende Kirche » ne parvint pas, en dépit de ses contacts personnels, à développer sa propre action internationale. En dépit des protestations de Bonhoeffer et d'autres, des représentants du « Reichskirchenausschuß » furent également invités à l'assemblée œcuménique de Chambly. Les représentants de la « Bekennende Kirche » renoncèrent, quoique invités, à assister aux conférences consécutives, à Oxford puis Édimbourg en 1937, craignant d'être destitués de leur fonction et appréhendant leur arrestation. Zœllner démissionna le 12 février 1937, lorsque lui aussi fut empêché de voyager à l'étranger. Cela signa l'échec de l'offre de médiation officielle du « Reichskirchenausschuß » .

Le successeur de Zœllner, Hermann Muhs, membre du NSDAP, vint réintégrer « ad hoc » l'Église, afin de piloter celle-ci par voie d'ordonnances. Un arrêté de Hitler du 15 février instituant de nouvelles élections pour le synode général de la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » ne fut pas mis à exécution. Une conférence des dirigeants des Églises régionales ne réussit pas à se mettre d'accord sur une nouvelle direction commune de la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » . Muhs entreprit alors de dissoudre les administrations ecclésiastiques encore existantes, tandis que la « Bekennende Kirche » et le Conseil luthérien (« Lutherrat ») construisaient chacune leur propre administration.

Dans le même temps, Heinrich Himmler interdit que des pasteurs fussent encore formés par la « Bekennende Kirche » ; cependant, ces formations furent poursuivies dans l'illégalité. Dès 1935 fut fondée à cet effet à Elberfeld la clandestine École ecclésiastique supérieure (« Kirchliche Hochschule ») . La « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » publiait, sur les sujets d'actualité, des prises de position imprimées clandestinement, notamment sur la persécution des opposants au système politique et des Juifs, sur l'idéologie raciale et le danger de guerre.

Cela conduisit, le 1er juillet 1937, à l'arrestation de Martin Niemöller, le dirigeant officieux de la « Bekennende Kirche » . Son procès eut lieu en mars 1938 ; bien qu'aucune activité contre la sécurité de l'État ne put être retenue contre lui, il fut emmené comme « prisonnier personnel » de Hitler au camp de concentration de Sachsenhausen, où il survécut jusqu'à la fin de la Guerre. À cette issue heureuse avaient contribué les nombreuses protestations venues de l'étranger, en particulier celles exprimées au Royaume-Uni par l'évêque anglican George Bell, qui présidait à l'époque le Conseil œcuménique « Life and Work » et était lié d'amitié avec Bonhoeffer, qui le tenait en permanence au courant de l'évolution de la situation dans le « Reich » allemand. Ces relations internationales entre la « Bekennende Kirche » et le mouvement œcuménique permit, dans quelques cas individuels, de sauver des vies.

En octobre, ce fut le tour à un autre militant « Bekennende Kirche » de la 1re heure à se faire arrêter : Paul Schneider, qui se fera connaître dans le camp de concentration comme prédicateur de Buchenwald. Il avait rejeté radicalement, dès le départ, les conceptions nazies et s'était solidarisé avec les Juifs persécutés. Même depuis sa cellule d'isolement, il s'appliquait à contredire, par des apostrophes et des encouragements lancés aux détenus, et sous l'invocation de l'Évangile, la terreur nazie. Il fut assassiné le 18 juillet 1939 au camp de Buchenwald. Dietrich Bonhoeffer le qualifia de 1er martyr chrétien de la lutte contre le National-Socialisme.

En juillet 1937, la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » , la conférence des dirigeants des Églises et le Conseil luthérien tentèrent une nouvelle fois de parvenir à un consensus sur la direction de la « Bekennende Kirche » . Le seul résultat en fut la publication, le 31 octobre 1937, d'un nouveau memorandum contre les pamphlets « Dunkelmänner » (Hommes de ténèbres) et « Rompilger » (Pèlerins de Rome) , très hostiles aux églises, qu'avait rédigés Rosenberg. Le

10 décembre, Kerrl dépêcha vers les Églises régionales détruites et vers la « Deutsche Evangelische Kirche » dans son ensemble un nouveau dirigeant, Werner, membre du consistoire suprême.

Après l'« Anschluß », de nouvelles tensions se firent jour au sein de l'Église évangélique allemande. Cela incita le ministère des Affaires religieuses de Kerrl à exiger le 20 avril 1938 de tous les prêtres un serment de fidélité au « Führer ». Cette prestation de serment fut soutenue par la plupart des Églises régionales, y compris la « Bekennende Kirche » prussienne. Il est apparu par la suite que l'ordre en ce sens n'émanait pas de Hitler lui-même. À partir de juillet, Kerrl tenta en outre de faire appliquer la réforme administrative engagée par Müller et Zœllner.

Lorsque la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung », à l'occasion de la crise tchèque, édita le 30 septembre une liturgie de prière (« Gebetsliturgie ») qui recelait une intercession en faveur des Tchèques, Kerrl incita les évêques des Églises régionales intactes à rompre avec la « Bekennende Kirche » « pour raisons religieuses et patriotiques ». Ce qui avait motivé cette injonction était surtout la lettre de Karl Barth adressée à Josef Hromádka (1889-1965), qui se trouvait à la tête de la faculté théologique de l'Université Charles de Prague, lettre dans laquelle Barth appelait tous les Tchèques à la résistance armée contre l'entrée des troupes nationales-socialistes, en la justifiant explicitement comme une résistance nécessaire aussi pour l'Église, en ce qu'elle découle du 1er commandement.

Cependant, même la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » désavoua cette lettre, la taxant de « politique ». La « Bekennende Kirche » perdit ainsi tout lien avec les Églises régionales et s'engagea dans sa crise la plus grave. En même temps, Kerrl déclina les nouvelles propositions de conciliation de la Conférence des dirigeants des Églises et forma au contraire, en avril 1939, un front unitaire (« Einheitsfront ») composé de « Deutsche Christen » de Thuringe et de représentants modérés des Églises régionales. Leur objectif demeurerait la création d'une Église nationale. Finirent pas s'y rallier aussi les évêques d'Hanovre, de Brunswick et de HeBe électorale-Waldeck. Seuls les Conseils confrériques de la « Bekennende Kirche » et les Églises de Bavière et du Wurtemberg repoussèrent ces avances, à la suite de quoi ils furent presque exclus du Conseil luthérien.

Entretiens, Werner s'employait à mettre l'activité des autorités ecclésiastiques au diapason du projet fondamental d'une « Reichskirche », et c'est donc en fonction de cet objectif qu'il distribuait les postes, infligeait des sanctions disciplinaires, décidait de la répartition de l'impôt culturel et des buts de collecte. Il fut protesté contre cet état de fait lors du 8e synode de la « Bekennende Kirche » de Prusse tenu à Steglitz les 21 et 22 mai. Kerrl tenta une conciliation, en réduisant la portée de ces mesures. Le 29 août, il forma, à l'intention de la l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne, un Conseil spirituel de confiance (« Geistlicher Vertrauensrat »), qui devait garder la direction théologique et dont les représentants devaient être désignés par les Églises elles-mêmes, cependant que l'administration financière serait entièrement assumée par des représentants de l'État et des « Deutsche Christen ». Mais le processus de décomposition de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne était désormais inexorable.

Après la « Nuit de Cristal », le 9 novembre 1938, ni la direction de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne, ni la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » n'eurent le moindre mot de protestation. Seuls quelques pasteurs tels que Helmut Gollwitzer, le successeur de Niemöller à Berlin-Dahlem, et Julius von Jan dans le Wurtemberg, prirent position dans leur sermons contre cette action. Ils furent mis en accusation pour agitation hostile au peuple (« volksfeindliche Hetze »). Ce ne

furent pas alors les Juifs, mais seulement leurs défenseurs malmenés par le pouvoir, que la « Bekennende Kirche » prit alors en protection dans son intercession. L'évêque Theophil Wurm écrivit au ministre de la Justice qu'il ne contestait nullement au pouvoir le droit de combattre les Juifs comme un « élément dangereux » ; toutefois, le fait que « des actes tels que l'incendie volontaire et des mauvais traitements physiques, çà et là aussi des vols, aient pu être commis sous les yeux des autorités » était de nature à affliger profondément la population. Il garda le silence sur la « Nuit de Cristal » de même que sur l'incarcération de 30,000 Juifs dans des camps de concentration à partir du 10 novembre 1938.

À partir de décembre 1938, le bureau Grüber commença, pour le compte de la « Bekennende Kirche », à aider les non-aryens (c'est-à-dire chrétiens juifs) évangéliques persécutés, pour leurs affaires juridiques et scolaires et dans leurs démarches d'émigration. À cet effet fut mis en place un réseau de 22 bureaux d'aide dans 20 grandes villes. Ces bureaux d'aide travaillaient en étroite collaboration avec les bureaux similaires de l'Église catholique, des quakers et de l'Association nationale (« Reichsvereinigung ») des Juifs allemands.

Afin d'éradiquer « l'influence juive » de la théologie et de la Bible fut fondé en mai 1939 à Eisenach un Institut de recherche et d'élimination de l'influence juive sur la vie religieuse allemande (« Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben ») . Les Églises régionales dominées par les « Deutsche Christen » avaient commencé dès cette année-là à mettre à exécution le paragraphe sur les aryens et à écarter du service religieux les titulaires de poste « non aryens » .

Contre cela furent amenés à protester 27 pasteurs de la « Bekennende Kirche » de l'Église évangélique de la province ecclésiastique de Saxe et 131 du Mecklembourg, soulignant que la loi portant exclusion des Juifs chrétiens équivalait à une annulation des vœux d'ordination et à mettre en cause l'unité de l'Église. De son côté, le Conseil œcuménique des Églises protesta également et souligna, en se référant à Jean 4,22, que le salut vient des Juifs, attendu que le Christ est le Messie d'Israël. Le bureau extérieur de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne désavoua cette déclaration et en exigea le retrait immédiat. Il apparut clair dès lors que les représentants des luthériens modérés dans les Églises régionales restées intactes et les « Deutsche Christen » se situaient sur la même ligne raciste.

Dès le début de la Guerre, le « Vertrauensrat » , dont faisait partie Marahrens, n'émettait plus quère que des appels patriotiques. Un décret d'amnistie visant les procès en cours devant des juridictions ecclésiastiques et les procédures contre des fonctionnaires de l'Église était destinée à rassérer les membres de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne durant la Guerre. Entretemps, la propagande anti-chrétienne du NSDAP, patente déjà dès le congrès national du Parti à Nuremberg, fut poursuivie.

Depuis 1937, et surtout entre 1939 et 1945, les « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » , les Conseils confrériques ainsi que de nombreux prêtres, y compris une partie parmi eux qui n'appartenait pas à la « Bekennende Kirche » , devinrent plus fréquemment la cible de mesures de la part des Églises régionales et de la « Gestapo » . La « Bekennende Kirche » s'appliquait à faire connaître dans ses communes, à travers ses demandes de prières d'intercession, les abus de pouvoir de l'État les plus graves.

Depuis le début de la Guerre, la partie de l'Église évangélique qui n'appartenait pas aux « Deutsche Christen » avait été affaiblie par l'appel sélectif sous les drapeaux de chrétiens critiques. En nombre d'endroits, cette situation amena les femmes, en particulier les épouses de pasteur, à assumer pour la 1^{re} fois dans l'histoire de l'Église évangélique, des tâches de prédication et de direction.

En 1940 débuta l'« Action T4 », c'est-à-dire l'euthanasie de « vie indigne de vivre », décidée comme découlant des nécessités de la Guerre. Elle fut perpétrée dans des instituts convertis en instituts de mise à mort, parmi lesquels aussi des infrastructures du diaconat réquisitionnées. Protestèrent à cette occasion, côté évangélique, les évêques Theophil Wurm, Friedrich Bodelschwingh et le pasteur Paul Braune à Lobetal, et côté catholique, l'évêque Clemens August Graf von Galen, qui obtinrent dans cette affaire un succès partiel.

Les échanges épistolaires à l'intérieur de l'Église furent, en raison d'une prétendue pénurie de papier due à la guerre, presque entièrement interrompus. Les cérémonies du baptême, du mariage, de la confirmation, des funérailles devaient obligatoirement être remplacées par les célébrations du Parti ; cette consigne ne pouvant être mise à exécution que sous réserve, les manifestations obligatoires des Jeunesses hitlériennes et des Jeunesses allemandes (« Deutsches Jungvolk ») étaient délibérément programmées les dimanches avant-midi, pour retenir les enfants et les jeunes de se rendre à l'église. Pendant les offices religieux, les Jeunesses hitlériennes faisaient leurs exercices directement à côté des églises.

C'est en l'année 1941 que furent prises à l'encontre de la « Bekennende Kirche » les mesures de persécution jusque-là les plus dures : l'Église nationale, à laquelle appartenaient désormais les chefs de 7 églises régionales intactes, déstitua le 17 décembre 1941 tous les Juifs baptisés de leurs fonctions et finit donc par faire appliquer dans les églises le paragraphe sur les Aryens. La « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung », l'évêque régional du Wurtemberg Wurm et le consistoire prussien protestèrent contre cette déstitution, celle-ci étant, selon eux, « incompatible avec la profession de foi de l'Église ». Le commandement du baptême du Christ ne reconnaît pas de limites de race ; si la loi était appliquée, il faudrait exclure de l'Église tous les Apôtres et le Christ lui-même. À cause de la Guerre, et vu la scission intervenue entretemps, la vague de protestation n'était pas comparable, tant s'en faut, aux protestations de 1933.

Le 6 juillet parut une circulaire confidentielle de Martin Bormann, ordonnant l'élimination complète de tout moyen d'influence de l'Église. Les représentants de la « Vorläufige Kirchenleitung » furent tous temporairement détenus. 18 pasteurs de la « Bekennende Kirche » trouvèrent la mort dans des camps de concentration ou furent assassinés lors d'interrogatoires ou d'autre façon. De même, les directeurs du bureau d'entraide Grüber pour Juifs et Juifs chrétiens, Heinrich Grüber (1891-1975) et son successeur Werner Sylten (1893-1942), un Juif chrétien, furent tour à tour, en 1940 et en 1941, enfermés dans des camps de concentration. Sylten fut tué le 26 février 1942 dans le centre d'extermination de Hartheim, près de Linz, vraisemblablement gazé en même temps que d'autres Juifs.

Dans le pays de la Warthe occupé (région de Poznań), Alfred Rosenberg entreprit de convertir, sur ordre du Pouvoir, et en guise d'essai, la structure de l'Église protestante en une structure assujettie au droit d'association. Quelque 2,000 prêtres catholiques polonais furent incarcérés, dont 1,300 environ périrent dans des camps de concentration allemands ou y furent assassinés.

Après le décès de Kerll, le 14 décembre 1941, Muhs acquit un pouvoir accru sur la gestion financière de l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne. Il fit geler le salaire de beaucoup de pasteurs, de telle façon qu'en fussent touchés surtout les titulaires de la « Bekennende Kirche », de sorte que ceux-ci ne pouvaient plus que fort péniblement, moyennant des dons volontaires, poursuivre leur travail. Au cours de cette phase apparurent, dans les communes de la « Bekennende Kirche », des formes nouvelles de prédication autonome, comportant des soutiens aux sermons illégaux, des feuillets pour l'instruction des catéchumènes, des activités de jeunesse, etc. Une partie des pasteurs « Bekennende Kirche » travaillant illégalement obtint après mutation un nouveau poste légal dans l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne.

À partir de 1942, les Juifs vivant parmi les chrétiens dans le cadre de mariages mixtes furent à leur tour persécutés ; les bureaux d'aide intensifièrent leur activité consultative. En 1944, il apparut qu'un de leurs collaborateurs dirigeants, le Docteur Erwin Goldmann, était un mouchard de la SS, en conséquence de quoi les bureaux furent fermés.

Après 1943, le travail ecclésial tout entier ne pouvait plus être maintenu en ordre de marche qu'avec des laïcs, lesquels déployaient dorénavant une activité considérable. Les vicaires devinrent des pasteurs de plein exercice. À l'automne 1944, un rapprochement organisationnel eut lieu entre ce qui restait de la « Bekennende Kirche » et la conférence des Dirigeants des Églises, qui jeta le germe d'une refondation de l'Église évangélique après la Guerre.

Depuis la conférence de Wannsee de janvier 1942, la rumeur de l'existence de camps d'extermination à l'est se répandait progressivement dans le « Reich ». L'évêque Wurm garde publiquement le silence à ce sujet et s'abstint de dénier toute légitimité à la persécution des Juifs organisée par le Pouvoir.

Mais il dénonce, dans de nombreuses lettres et requêtes aux autorités nazies, l'injustice commise :

« Le fait de tuer sans nécessité militaire et sans sentence préalable est contraire au commandement de Dieu, même si l'ordre en émane des autorités légales. »

En juillet 1943, il écrit à Hitler personnellement, le priant de s'opposer à la « persécution et l'extermination de non aryens » :

« Ces desseins, de même que les autres mesures de destruction prises à l'encontre d'autres non-aryens, sont en contradiction absolue avec le commandement de Dieu. »

Il est à craindre sinon, estime Wurm, que les « aryens privilégiés » ne finissent aussi par être traités de semblable façon. Wurm croyait manifestement, avec naïveté, comme beaucoup à cette époque, que le « Führer » était totalement ignorant des camps d'extermination.

Le synode de l'Église confessante de la Vieille Prusse fut seul à souligner publiquement, lors de sa conférence annuelle à Breslau, le 17 octobre 1943, que le commandement de Dieu « Tu ne tueras point » doit s'appliquer également en temps de guerre. Cela vaut aussi pour « la manière indirecte de tuer, consistant à priver son prochain de l'espace

nécessaire pour vivre » ; par exemple : « par la déprivation de nourriture et de vêtements » .

La justice divine ne connaît pas de notions telles que « exterminer » , « liquider » et « vie sans valeur » :

« Détruire des Hommes, pour la seule raison qu'ils appartiennent à la famille d'un criminel, sont âgés ou souffrent de maladie mentale, ou font partie d'une autre race, ce n'est pas faire bon usage du glaive que Dieu a mis à la disposition des autorités. »

Pour la journée de Pénitence et de Prière, ce synode écrivit à ses communes :

« Malheur à nous et à notre peuple, si celui-ci tient pour légitime de tuer des gens au motif qu'ils seraient à considérer comme indignes de vivre ou qu'ils appartiennent à une autre race, lorsque se répandent la haine et la cruauté. »

Ces 2 paroles furent jusqu'à la fin de la Guerre les seules prises de position publiques de la « Bekennende Kirche » relatives à l'Holocauste. Elle non plus ne nommait les Juifs directement et ne mettait en question en tant que telle la notion de race, mais était cependant sans équivoque à condamner l'extermination sur base raciale.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer joua un rôle particulier dans le « Kirchenkampf » : s'il professait, lors des formations clandestines de pasteurs de la « Bekennende Kirche » , au séminaire de Finkenwalde, une stricte imitation du Christ, il prit néanmoins part dans le même temps dès 1937 aux préparatifs conspirateurs visant à assassiner Hitler. Sa motivation était (à la différence de celle de la plupart des résistants regroupés dans le « Kreisauer Kreis » autour de Hans Oster et Hans von Dohnanyi) de stopper l'Holocauste des Juifs. À cette fin, il était aussi en faveur de l'emploi de la violence contre les autorités de l'État. Après son incarcération, la direction de la « Bekennende Kirche » ne l'inclut point dans les prières en faveur des membres incarcérés de la « Bekennende Kirche » , et prit strictement ses distances d'avec lui après que fut connue sa participation à l'attentat du 20 juillet 1944.

Outre ceux qui agissaient dans le « Kirchenkampf » de façon plus ou moins ouverte, il y avait d'autre part en de nombreux endroits une désobéissance d'inspiration biblique. En particulier, dans les milieux piétistes et dans le cadre du YMCA, des cours bibliques et des activités de jeunesse se tenaient dans la clandestinité dans toute une série de communes jusqu'au printemps 1945. Mais dès avant la Guerre, l'on assista à un certain nombre de désobéissances isolées. Un exemple de désobéissant était Theodor Roller de Tübingen. En tant que chrétien, il refusa systématiquement de prêter le serment de fidélité au drapeau pour Hitler et qualifiait celui-ci de menteur. Cela lui valut d'être interné pendant 6 ans dans l'établissement psychiatrique de Weißenau.

À travers l'aveu de culpabilité de Stuttgart d'octobre 1945, les églises régionales évangéliques s'efforcèrent de trouver la base d'une refondation commune. Les autorités d'occupation laissèrent aux Églises elles-mêmes le soin de la dénazification interne, de sorte que l'on assista, dans l'immédiat après-Guerre, à une ample vague de réhabilitation des chrétiens naguère nazis ou simples suiveurs. La parole de Darmstadt de 1947 fut promptement oubliée et n'eut pas au sein de la l'Église évangélique d'Allemagne d'effet en largeur.

Dans l'église évangélique d'Essen-Werden se trouve une verrière remarquable, la Fenêtre du « Kirchenkampf » , qui fut créée puis installée dans la conque nord de cette église par les anciens membres de la Commune confessante après leur retour dans leur communauté religieuse, après que celle-ci eut cessé d'être dominée par les « Deutsche Christen »

Cette fenêtre contient une référence au I Timothée 6,125,6 :

« Combats le bon combat de la foi, assure-toi la vie éternelle en vue de laquelle tu as été appelé et as fait la belle confession de foi devant un grand nombre de témoins. »

D'un point de vue ecclésiologique, le « Kirchenkampf » représente un tournant dans la conception évangélique de ce qu'est l'Église et le droit ecclésiastique. L'on avait généralement fait jusque-là, dans la théologie évangélique, une stricte séparation entre d'une part l'Église en tant que Communauté des Saints et Corps du Christ sur terre, et d'autre part l'Église en tant qu'institution. La conviction qu'il importe grandement de savoir qui dirige les Églises régionales et dans quel esprit a gagné en importance dans la lutte contre la « Gleichschaltung » et contre les « Deutsche Christen » . La conception ecclésiologique des Églises évangéliques tend depuis lors à emprunter un chemin mitoyen entre la vision catholique, selon laquelle l'institution est constitutive de l'Église, et une représentation de l'Église totalement spiritualisée.

C'est par les activités œcuméniques de Dietrich Bonhoeffer et de quelques conspirateurs du 20 juillet 1944 qu'existaient des contacts avec les Églises d'autres pays, en particulier chez les Alliés. Grâce à cela, les Églises d'Allemagne purent à l'issue du « Kirchenkampf » se réintégrer relativement vite dans la communauté œcuménique mondiale.

...

« Kirchenkampf » (Church Struggle) is a German term pertaining to the situation of the Christian churches in Germany during the Nazi period (1933-1945) . Sometimes used ambiguously, the term may refer to one or more of the following different « church struggles » : the internal dispute between the « German Christians » (« Deutsche Christen ») and the Confessing Church (« Bekennende Kirche ») over control of the Protestant churches ; the battle between the Nazi regime and the Protestant church bodies ; and the battle between the Nazi regime and the Roman Catholic Church. Around 2/3 of Germans were Protestant, and 1/3 Catholic when the Nazis took power. Many historians maintain that Hitler's goal in the « Kirchenkampf » entailed not only ideological struggle, but ultimately the eradication of the churches. Other historians maintain no such plan existed. The Salvation Army, Christian Saints and 7th Day Adventist Church all disappeared from Germany during the Nazi era.

Nazi ideology was hostile to traditional Christianity in various respects and the Nazi Party saw the « Church Struggle » as an important ideological battleground. Hitler biographer Ian Kershaw wrote of the « Struggle » in terms of an ongoing and escalating conflict between the Nazi State and the Christian churches. Historian Susannah Heschel wrote that the « Kirchenkampf » refers only to an internal dispute between members of the Confessing Church and members

of the Nazi-backed « German Christians » over control of the Protestant church. Pierre Aycoberry wrote that for Catholics the phrase « Kirchenkampf » was reminiscent of the « Kulturkampf » of Otto von Bismarck's time - a campaign which had sought to destroy the influence of Catholicism in majority Protestant Germany.

Nazism wanted to transform the subjective consciousness of the German people (their attitudes, values and mentalities) into a single-minded, obedient « national community ». According to Ian Kershaw, in order to achieve this, the Nazis believed they would have to replace class, religious and regional allegiances by a « massively enhanced national self-awareness to mobilize the German people psychologically for the coming struggle and to boost their morale during the inevitable War ». The Nazis disliked universities, intellectuals and the Catholic and Protestant churches. According to Gill, their long term plan was to « de-Christianise Germany after the final victory » .

The Nazis co-opted the term « Gleichschaltung » (Coordination) to mean conformity and subservience to the National-Socialist German Workers' Party line :

« There was to be no law but Hitler, and ultimately no god but Hitler. »

Nazi ideology conflicted with traditional Christian beliefs in various respects - Nazis criticized Christian notions of « meekness and guilt » on the basis that they « repressed the violent instincts necessary to prevent inferior races from dominating Aryans ». Aggressive anti-Church radicals like Josef Goebbels and Martin Bormann saw the conflict with the Churches as a priority concern, and anti-Church and anti-Clerical sentiments were strong among grass-roots Party activists.

East Prussian Party « Gauleiter » Erich Koch on the other hand, said that :

« Nazism had to develop from a basic Prussian-Protestant attitude and from Luther's unfinished Reformation. »

Hitler himself disdained Christianity :

« In Hitler's eyes, Christianity was a religion fit only for slaves ; he detested its ethics in particular. Its teaching, he declared, was a rebellion against the natural law of selection by struggle and the survival of the fittest. »

(Extract from « Hitler a Study in Tyranny » , by Alan Bullock.)

Though raised a Catholic, Hitler rejected the Judeo-Christian conception of God and religion. Though he retained some regard for the organisational power of Catholicism, he had utter contempt for its central teachings, which he said, if taken to their conclusion, « would mean the systematic cultivation of the human failure ». Hitler ultimately believed « one is either a Christian or a German » - to be both was impossible. However, important German conservative elements, such as the officer corps, opposed Nazi persecution of the churches and, in office, Hitler restrained his anti-Clerical instincts out of political considerations.

Hitler biographer Ian Kershaw wrote that, while many ordinary people were apathetic, after years of warning from Catholic clergy, Germany's Catholic population greeted the Nazi take-over with apprehension and uncertainty, while among German Protestants, many were optimistic a strengthened Germany might bring with it « inner, moral revitalisation ». However, within a short period, the Nazi government's conflict with the churches was to become a source of great bitterness.

The « Kirchenkampf » can be divided into 5 stages.

1st (spring to fall 1933) :

Hitler makes efforts to assimilate the churches into the culture of National-Socialism.

Hitler moves to eliminate Political Catholicism : dissolution of Catholic aligned political Parties and signing of « Reichskonkordat » with Vatican. Sporadic persecution of Catholics.

Preparation to create unified single « Reichskirche » from the 28 regional Protestant churches : Hitler installs pro-Nazi chaplain Ludwig Müller as « Reich » Bishop ; splitting German Protestants.

2nd (fall 1933 - fall 1934) :

Regime attempts to bring churches under control of the Nazi State (« Gleichschaltung ») .

Nazi breaches of Concordat commence immediately after signing : sterilization law promulgated, Catholic Youth Leagues dissolved ; clergy, nuns and lay leaders harassed.

Heretical views of « Reich » Bishop and « German Christians » , leads Martin Neimoller to found Pastors' Emergency League which grows into Confessing Church, which reasserts authority of Bible and from which some clergymen oppose regime.

3rd (fall 1934 - February 1937) :

Regime tries to bring the Protestant churches under its control by taking charge of church finances and governance structures.

Failure of Müller to unite Protestants in Nazified Church sees Hitler appoint Hans Kerrl as Minister for Church Affairs.

1936 : Nazis remove crucifixes in schools. Catholic Bishop of Münster August von Galen protests and public demonstrations follow.

1936 : Confessing Church protest to Hitler against anti-Semitism, « anti-Christian » tendencies of regime, and

interference in church affairs. Hundreds of pastors arrested, funds of the church confiscated, collections forbidden.

Martin Niemöller was sent to the Concentration camps in 1937. He founded the Confessing Church after the Nazis attempted to subjugate Protestants in a « Reich » Church.

4th (February 1937 - 1939) :

More open conflict based on « Nazism itself and its anti-Christian world-views » . Regime increases imprisonment of resistant clergy.

March 1937 : Pope Pius XI issues « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical, denouncing aspects of Nazi ideology, protesting regime's violations of Concordat and treatment of Catholics, and abuse of human rights.

Regime responds with intensification of « Church Struggle » . Trumped-up « immorality trials » against clergy and anti-Church propaganda campaign. Christmas 1937 address, Pope tells cardinals « rarely has there been a persecution so grave » .

1 July 1937 : Confessing Church banned. Martin Niemöller arrested. Theological universities closed, pastors and theologians arrested.

5th stage (1939-1945) :

More clergy were imprisoned - Clergy Barracks established at Dachau.

July-August 1941 : Bishop von Galen's sermons denounce lawlessness of « Gestapo » , confiscations of church properties and Nazi euthanasia. Government takes program underground.

Clergy were drafted into the military.

Church publications were censored or banned.

Services and functions restricted or banned.

22 March 1942 : The German Catholic Bishops issued a pastoral letter on « The Struggle against Christianity and the Church » :

Nazi assault on churches and « Christian conscience » motivates many of the « July Plot » participants in failed 1944 « coup » against Hitler. Leading clerical resisters Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Alfred Delp are implicated. Both executed in 1945.

The Nazi persecution of the Christian Churches.

The Nazi propaganda minister, Josef Goebbels, among the most aggressive anti-Church Nazis, wrote that there was « an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view » .

Prior to the « Reichstag » vote for the Enabling Act under which Hitler gained the « temporary » dictatorial powers with which he went on to permanently dismantle the Weimar Republic, Hitler promised the « Reichstag » , on 23 March 1933, that he would not interfere with the rights of the churches. However, with power secured in Germany, Hitler quickly broke this promise. He divided the Lutheran Church (Germany's main Protestant denomination) and instigated a brutal persecution of the Jehovah's Witnesses. He dishonoured a Concordat signed with the Vatican and permitted a persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany. A special Priests Barracks was established at Dachau Concentration Camp for clergy who had opposed the Hitler regime - its occupants were mainly Polish Catholic clergy. Martin Bormann, Hitler's « deputy » from April 1941, also saw Nazism and Christianity as « incompatible » and had a particular loathing for the Semitic origins of Christianity.

To Alfred Rosenberg, a neo-Pagan, and the official Nazi Philosopher, Catholicism was one of Nazism's chief enemies. He planned the « extermination of the foreign Christian faiths imported into Germany » , and for the Bible and Christian cross to be replaced with « Mein Kampf » and the swastika.

Leading Nazis varied in the importance they attached to the « Church Struggle » .

Kershaw wrote that, to the new Nazi government, Race policy and the « Church Struggle » were among the most important ideological spheres :

« In both areas, the Party had no difficulty in mobilizing its activists, whose radicalism in turn forced the government into legislative action. In fact, the Party leadership often found itself compelled to respond to pressures from below, stirred-up by the “ Gauleiter ” playing their own game, or emanating sometimes from radical activists at a local level. »

As time went on, anti-Clericalism and anti-Church sentiment among grass-roots Party activists « simply couldn't be eradicated » and they could « draw on the verbal violence of Party leaders towards the churches for their encouragement » .

Hitler himself possessed radical instincts in relation to the continuing conflict with the Catholic and Protestant Churches in Germany. Though he occasionally spoke of wanting to delay the « Church Struggle » and was prepared to restrain his anti-Clericalism out of political considerations, his « own inflammatory comments gave his immediate underlings all the license they needed to turn-up the heat in the “ Church Struggle ”, confident that they were “ working towards the ' Führer ' ” » .

Bullock wrote that the Churches and the army were the only 2 institutions to retain some independence in Nazi

Germany and « among the most courageous demonstrations of opposition during the War were the sermons preached by the Catholic Bishop of Münster and the Protestant Pastor, Doctor Niemöller » but that :

« Neither the Catholic Church nor the Evangelical Church, however, as institutions, felt it possible to take-up an attitude of open opposition to the regime. »

In the Nazi police State, the ability of the Church and its members to oppose Nazi policy was severely restricted. In 1935, when Protestant pastors read a protest statement from the pulpits of Confessing churches, the Nazi authorities briefly arrested over 700 pastors and the « Gestapo » confiscated copies of Pius XI's 1937 anti-Nazi papal Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » from diocesan offices throughout Germany. For refusing to declare loyalty to the « Reich », or be conscripted into the army, Jehovah's Witnesses were declared « enemies », with 6,000 of a total population of 30,000 sent to the concentration camps.

Alfred Rosenberg, an « outspoken pagan », held among offices the title of « the “ Führer's ” Delegate for the Entire Intellectual and Philosophical Education and Instruction for the National-Socialist Party ». He also saw Nazism and Christianity as incompatible. In his « Myth of the 20th Century » (1930), Rosenberg wrote that the main enemies of the Germans were the « Russian Tartars » and « Semites » - with « Semites » including Christians, especially the Catholic Church.

Josef Goebbels, the Nazi Minister for Propaganda, was among the most aggressive anti-Church Nazi radicals. Goebbels led the Nazi persecution of the German clergy and, as the War progressed, on the « Church Question », he wrote :

« After the War, it has to be generally solved. There is, namely, an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view. »

Worried about the dissension caused by the « Kirchenkampf », Hitler told Goebbels in the summer of 1935 he sought « peace with the Churches » - « at least for a period of time ». As with the « Jewish Question », the radicals nonetheless pushed the « Church Struggle » forward, especially in Catholic areas, so that by the winter of 1935-1936 there was growing dissatisfaction with the Nazis in those areas. Kershaw noted that, in early 1937, Hitler again told his inner-circle that he « did not want a “ Church struggle ” at this juncture », he expected « the great world struggle in a few years' time ». Nevertheless, Hitler's impatience with the churches « prompted frequent outbursts of hostility ». In early 1937, he was declaring that « Christianity was ripe for destruction », and that the Churches must yield to the « primacy of the State », railing against any compromise with « the most horrible institution imaginable ».

Martin Bormann became Hitler's private secretary and, « de facto », « deputy “ Führer ” » in April 1941. He was a leading advocate of the « Kirchenkampf ». Bormann was a rigid guardian of National-Socialist orthodoxy and saw Christianity and Nazism as « incompatible » (mainly because of its Jewish origins). He said publicly in 1941 that « National-Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable ». Bormann's view of Christianity was epitomized in a confidential memo to « Gauleiters » in 1942 ; it reignited the fight against Christianity which had been in a «

détente » , stating that the power of the churches « must absolutely and finally be broken » as Nazism « was completely incompatible with Christianity » .

William Shirer wrote that the German people were not greatly aroused by the persecution of the churches by the Nazi Government. The great majority were not moved to face death or imprisonment for the sake of freedom of worship, being too impressed by Hitler's early foreign policy successes and the restoration of the German economy. Few paused to reflect « that under the leadership of Rosenberg, Bormann and Himmler, who were backed by Hitler, the Nazi regime intended to destroy Christianity in Germany, if it could, and substitute the old paganism of the early tribal Germanic gods and the new paganism of the Nazi extremists » .

Because the Nazi « Gleichschaltung » policy of forced coordination encountered such forceful opposition from the churches, Hitler decided to postpone the struggle until after the War. During the War, Rosenberg, the Party's official ideologist outlined the future envisioned for religion in Germany, with a « 30 point » program for the future of the German churches.

Among its articles :

(1) The National « Reich » Church of Germany was to claim exclusive control over all churches in the « Reich » .

(5) Foreign faiths imported to Germany in 800 AD were to be exterminated.

(7) Priests and pastors were to be replaced with National « Reich » Orators.

(13) Publication of the Bible was to cease.

(14) « Mein Kampf » was to be considered the foremost source of ethics.

(18) Crucifixes, Bibles and Saints to be removed from altars.

(19) « Mein Kampf » was to be placed on altars « to the German nation and, therefore, to God the most sacred book » .

(30) The Christian Cross to be removed from all churches and replaced with the swastika.

A threatening, though initially mainly sporadic persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany followed the Nazi take-over. Hitler moved quickly to eliminate Political Catholicism. 2,000 functionaries of the Bavarian People's Party were rounded-up by police in late-June 1933, and it, along with the national Catholic Centre Party, ceased to exist in early July. Vice-Chancellor Franz von Papen meanwhile negotiated the « Reichskonkordat » Treaty with the Vatican, which prohibited clergy from participating in politics. Kershaw wrote that the Vatican was anxious to reach agreement with the new government, despite « continuing molestation of Catholic clergy, and other outrages committed by Nazi

radicals against the Church and its organisations » .

The Concordat was signed at the Vatican on 20 July 1933, by Germany's Deputy « Reich » Chancellor Franz von Papen, and Cardinal Secretary of State Eugenio Pacelli (later, Pope Pius XII) . In his 1937 anti-Nazi Encyclical, Pope Pius XI said that the Holy-See had signed the Concordat « In spite of many serious misgivings » and in the hope it might « safeguard the liberty of the church in her mission of salvation in Germany » . The treaty consisted of 34 articles and a supplementary protocol. Article 1 guaranteed « freedom of profession and public practice of the Catholic religion » and acknowledged the right of the Church to regulate its own affairs. Within 3 months of the signing of the document, Cardinal Bertram, head of the German Catholic Bishops Conference, was writing in a Pastoral Letter of « grievous and gnawing anxiety » with regard to the government's actions towards Catholic organisations, charitable institutions, youth groups, press, Catholic Action and the mistreatment of Catholics for their political beliefs. According to Paul O'Shea, Hitler had a « blatant disregard » for the Concordat, and its signing was to him merely a 1st step in the « gradual suppression of the Catholic Church in Germany » .

Anton Gill wrote that « with his usual irresistible, bullying technique, Hitler then proceeded to take a mile where he had been given an inch » and closed all Catholic institutions whose functions weren't strictly religious :

« It quickly became clear that Hitler intended to imprison the Catholics, as it were, in their own churches. They could celebrate mass and retain their rituals as much as they liked, but they could have nothing at all to do with German society otherwise. Catholic schools and newspapers were closed, and a propaganda campaign against the Catholics was launched. »

(Extract from « An Honourable Defeat » by Anton Gill.)

William Shirer wrote :

« The Concordat was hardly put to paper before it was being broken by the Nazi Government. »

On 25 July, the Nazis promulgated their sterilization law, an offensive policy in the eyes of the Catholic Church. 5 days later, moves began to dissolve the Catholic Youth League. Clergy, nuns and lay leaders began to be targeted, leading to thousands of arrests over the ensuing years, often on trumped-up charges of currency smuggling or « immorality » .

In Adolf Hitler's bloody « Night of the Long Knives » purge of 1934, Erich Klausener, the head of Catholic Action, was assassinated by the « Gestapo » . Catholic publications were shut-down. The « Gestapo » began to violate the sanctity of the confessional.

In January 1934, Hitler appointed Alfred Rosenberg as the cultural and educational leader of the « Reich » . Rosenberg was a neo-Pagan and notoriously anti-Catholic. In his « Myth of the 20th Century » (1930) , Rosenberg had described the Catholic Church as one of the main enemies of Nazism. The Church responded on 16 February 1934 with the banning of Rosenberg's book. The « Sanctum Officium » recommended that Rosenberg's book be put on the « Index

Librorum Prohibitorum » (forbidden books list of the Catholic Church) for scorning and rejecting « all dogmas of the Catholic Church, indeed, the very fundamentals of the Christian religion » . Clemens August Graf von Galen, the Bishop of Münster, derided the neo-Pagan theories of Rosenberg as perhaps no more than « an occasion for laughter in the educated world » , but warned that « his immense importance lies in the acceptance of his basic notions as the authentic philosophy of National-Socialism and in his almost unlimited power in the field of German education. “ Herr » Rosenberg must be taken seriously if the German situation is to be understood. »

Under Nazi Youth leader Baldur von Schirach, Catholic youth organizations were disbanded and Catholic children corralled into the Hitler Youth. Pope Pius XI issued a message to the youth of Germany on 2 April 1934, noting propaganda and pressure being exerted to point German youth « away from Christ and back to paganism » . The Pope again condemned the new paganism to 5,000 German pilgrims in Rome in May, and in other addresses later that year.

In January 1935, Nazi interior minister Wilhelm Frick urged « putting an end to Church influence over public life » . In April, the daily publication of religious papers was banned and, soon after, censorship of weekly periodicals was introduced. The American National Catholic Welfare Conference complained that anti-Church songs were chanted by Hitler Youth and « anti-Christian slogans were chanted from trucks, which bore on their sides scurrilous cartoons of priests and nuns » while Catholic Youth organisations were « accused of the palpable absurdity of communist plotting » . On 12 May, members of the Hitler Youth attacked Caspar Klein, the Archbishop of Paderborn.

Hermann Göring issued a decree against Political Catholicism in July. In August, Nazi storm-troopers held anti-Clerical protests in Munich and Freiberg-im-Breisgau. Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher accused clergy and nuns of sexual perversion. The « morality trials » of Catholic clergy and nuns began in the summer of 1935 and the « threat of criminal prosecution on charges designed by the Propaganda Ministry as a goad to drive the clergy to accept the subversion of Christian teachings in the “ Reich ” » . In the 1936 campaign against the monasteries and convents, the authorities charged 276 members of religious orders with the offence of « homosexuality » .

Under Reinhard Heydrich and Heinrich Himmler, the Security Police and the SD were responsible for suppressing internal and external enemies of the Nazi State. Among those enemies were « political churches » - such as Lutheran and Catholic clergy who opposed the Hitler regime. Such dissidents were arrested and sent to concentration camps. According to Himmler biographer Peter Longerich, Himmler was vehemently opposed to Christian sexual morality and the « principle of Christian mercy » , both of which he saw as a dangerous obstacle to his plans battle with « sub-humans » .

In 1937, he wrote :

« We live in an era of the ultimate conflict with Christianity. It is part of the mission of the SS to give the German people in the next half Century the non-Christian ideological foundations on which to lead and shape their lives. This task does not consist solely in overcoming an ideological opponent but must be accompanied at every step by a positive impetus : in this case, that means the reconstruction of the German heritage in the widest and most

comprehensive sense. »

(Heinrich Himmler, 1937.)

Himmler saw the main-task of his « Schutzstaffel » (SS) organisation to be that of « acting as the vanguard in overcoming Christianity and restoring a “ Germanic ” way of living » in order to prepare for the coming conflict between « humans and sub-humans » : Longerich wrote that, while the Nazi movement as a whole launched itself against Jews and Communists, « by linking de-Christianisation with re-Germanization, Himmler had provided the SS with a goal and purpose all of its own » . He set about making his SS the focus of a « cult of the Teutons » .

Josef Gœbbels noted the mood of Hitler in his diary, on 25 October 1936 :

« Trials against the Catholic Church temporarily stopped. Possibly wants peace, at least temporarily. Now, a battle with Bolshevism. Wants to speak with Faulhaber. »

On 4 November 1936, Hitler met Faulhaber. Hitler spoke for the 1st hour, then, Faulhaber told him that the Nazi government had been waging War on the Church for 3 years (600 religious teachers had lost their jobs in Bavaria alone) and the number was set to rise to 1,700 and the government had instituted laws the Church could not accept - like the sterilization of criminals and the handicapped. While the Catholic Church respected the notion of authority, nevertheless, « when your officials or your laws offend Church dogma or the laws of morality, and, in so doing, offend our conscience, then, we must be able to articulate this as responsible defenders of moral laws » . Hitler told Faulhaber that the radical Nazis could not be contained until there was peace with the Church and that, either the Nazis and the Church would fight Bolshevism together, or there would be war against the Church. Kershaw cites the meeting as an example of Hitler's ability to « pull the wool over the eyes even of hardened critics » for « Faulhaber (a man of sharp acumen, who had often courageously criticized the Nazi attacks on the Catholic Church) went away convinced that Hitler was deeply religious » .

By early 1937, the Church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, had become highly-disillusioned. In March, Pope Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » (With burning concern) Encyclical. The Pope asserted the inviolability of human rights and expressed deep concern at the Nazi regime's flouting of the 1933 Concordat, its treatment of Catholics and abuse of Christian values. It accused the government of « systematic hostility leveled at the Church » and of sowing the « tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » and Pius noted on the horizon the « threatening storm clouds » of religious Wars of extermination over Germany.

The Vatican had the text smuggled into Germany and printed and distributed in secret. Written in German, not the usual Latin, it was read from the pulpits of all German Catholic churches on one of the Church's busiest Sundays, Palm Sunday.

According to Gill :

« Hitler was beside himself with rage. 12 presses were seized, and hundreds of people sent either to prison or the camps. »

This despite Article 4 of the Concordat giving a guarantee of freedom of correspondence between the Vatican and the German clergy.

The Nazis responded with, an intensification of the « Church Struggle » , beginning around April. Josef Goebbels noted heightened verbal attacks on the clergy from Hitler in his diary and wrote that Hitler had approved the start of trumped-up « immorality trials » against clergy and anti-Church propaganda campaign. Goebbels' orchestrated attack included a staged « morality trial » of 37 Franciscans.

In his Christmas Eve 1937 address, Pope Pius XI told the College of Cardinals, that despite what « some people » had been saying :

« In Germany, in fact, there is religious persecution indeed rarely has there been a persecution so grave, so terrible, so painful, so sad in its deep effects. Our protest, therefore, could not be more explicit or more resolute before the whole world. »

In March 1938, Nazi Minister of State Adolf Wagner spoke of the need to continue the fight against Political Catholicism and Alfred Rosenberg said that the churches of Germany « as they exist at present, must vanish from the life of our people » . In the space of a few months, Bishop Sproll of Rothenberg, Cardinal von Faulhaber of Munich and Cardinal Innitzer of Vienna were physically attacked by Nazis.

After initially offering support to the « Anschluß » , Austria's Cardinal Innitzer became a critic of the Nazis and was subject to violent intimidation from them. With power secured in Austria, the Nazis repeated their persecution of the Church and, in October, a Nazi mob ransacked Innitzer's residence, after he had denounced Nazi persecution of the Church. « L'Osservatore Romano » reported on 15 October that Hitler Youth and the SA had gathered at Innitzer's Cathedral during a service Catholic Youth and started « counter-shouts and whistlings » :

« Down with Innitzer ! Our faith is Germany. »

The mob later gathered at the Cardinal's residence and, the following day, stoned the building, broke in and ransacked it - bashing a secretary unconscious, and storming another house of the cathedral curia and throwing its curate out the window. The American National Catholic Welfare Conference wrote that Pope Pius, « again protested against the violence of the Nazis, in language recalling Nero and Judas the Betrayer, comparing Hitler with Julian the Apostate » .

On 10 February 1939, Pope Pius XI died. Eugenio Pacelli was elected his successor 3 weeks later and became Pius XII.

« Summi Pontificatus » (On the Limitations of the Authority of the State) , issued 20 October 1939, was the 1st papal

Encyclical issued by Pope Pius XII, and established some of the themes of his papacy. During the drafting of the letter, the Second World War commenced with the Nazi-Soviet invasion of Catholic Poland. Couched in diplomatic language, Pius endorses Catholic resistance, and states his disapproval of the War, racism, anti-Semitism, the Nazi-Soviet invasion of Poland and the persecutions of the Church.

In March 1941, Vatican Radio decried the War-time position of the Catholic Church in Germany :

« The religious situation in Germany is pathetic. All young men that feel their vocation is to take Holy Orders must forego this desire. The number of monasteries and convents which have been dissolved has become even larger. The development and maintenance of the Christian life has been rendered difficult. All that remains of the once great Catholic press in Germany are a few Parish magazines. The threat of a national religion is looming increasingly over all religious life. This national religion is based solely on the “ Führer's ” will. »

On 26 July 1941, Bishop von Galen wrote to the government to complain :

« The Secret Police has continued to rob the property of highly-respected German men and women merely because they belonged to Catholic orders. »

Often Galen directly protested to Hitler over violations of the Concordat. When, in 1936, Nazis removed crucifixes in school, protest by Galen led to public demonstration. Like Konrad von Preysing, he assisted with the drafting of the 1937 papal Encyclical. His 3 powerful sermons of July and August 1941 earned him the nickname of the « Lion of Münster » . The sermons were printed and distributed illegally. He denounced the lawlessness of the « Gestapo » , the confiscations of Church properties and the cruel program of Nazi euthanasia. He attacked the « Gestapo » for seizing Church properties and converting them to their own purposes - including use as cinemas and brothels.

On 26 June 1941, the German Bishops drafted a pastoral letter from their Fulda Conference, to be read from all pulpits on 6 July :

« Again and again have the Bishops brought their justified claims and complaints before the proper authorities. Through this pastoral declaration, the Bishops want you to see the real situation of the Church. »

The Bishops wrote that the Church faced « restrictions and limitations put on the teaching of their religion and on church life » and of great obstacles in the fields of Catholic education, freedom of service and religious festivals, the practice of charity by religious orders and the role of preaching morals. Catholic presses had been silenced and kindergartens closed and religious instruction in schools nearly stamped-out :

« Dear Members of the dioceses : We, Bishops, feel an ever great sorrow about the existence of powers working to dissolve the blessed union between Christ and the German people. The existence of Christianity in Germany is at stake. »

(Pastoral letter of the German Bishops, read on 6 July 1941.)

The following year, on 22 March 1942, the German Bishops issued a pastoral letter on « The Struggle against Christianity and the Church » : The letter launched a defence of human rights and the rule of law and accused the « Reich » Government of « unjust oppression and hated struggle against Christianity and the Church » , despite the loyalty of German Catholics to the Fatherland, and brave service of Catholics soldiers. It accused the regime of seeking to rid Germany of Christianity :

« For years a war has raged in our Fatherland against Christianity and the Church, and has never been conducted with such bitterness. Repeatedly, the German Bishops have asked the “ Reich ” Government to discontinue this fatal struggle ; but, unfortunately, our appeals and our endeavours were without success. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops, dated 22 March 1942.)

The letter outlined serial breaches of the 1933 Concordat, reiterated complaints of the suffocation of Catholic schooling, presses and hospitals and said that the « Catholic faith has been restricted to such a degree that it has disappeared almost entirely from public life » and even worship within churches in Germany « is frequently restricted or oppressed » , while in the conquered territories (and even in the Old « Reich ») , churches had been « closed by force and even used for profane purposes » . The freedom of speech of clergymen had been suppressed and priests were being « watched constantly » and punished for fulfilling « priestly duties » and incarcerated in concentration camps without legal process. Religious orders had been expelled from schools, and their properties seized, while seminaries had been confiscated « to deprive the Catholic priesthood of successors » .

The Bishops denounced the Nazi euthanasia program and declared their support for human rights and personal freedom under God and « just laws » of all people :

« We demand juridical proof of all sentences and release of all fellow citizens who have been deprived of their liberty without proof. We, the German Bishops, shall not cease to protest against the killing of innocent persons. Nobody's life is safe unless the Commandment, “ Thous shalt not kill ” is observed. We, the Bishops, in the name of the Catholic people, demand the return of all unlawfully confiscated and, in some cases, sequestered property for what happens today to Church property may tomorrow happen to any lawful property. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops, dated 22 March 1942.)

(Image) Ludwig Müller, Hitler's choice for « Reich » Bishop of the German Evangelical Church, which sought to subordinate German Protestantism to the Nazi Government.

Kershaw wrote that the subjugation of the Protestant churches proved more difficult than Hitler had envisaged. With 28 separate regional churches, his bid to create a unified « Reich » Church through « Gleichschaltung » ultimately failed, and Hitler became disinterested in supporting the so-called « German Christians » Nazi aligned movement.

Historian Susannah Heschel wrote that the « Kirchenkampf » is « sometimes mistakenly understood as referring to the Protestant churches' resistance to National-Socialism, but the term in fact refers to the internal dispute between members of the “ Bekennende Kirche ” Confessing Church and members of the Nazi-backed “ Deutsche Christen ” (“ German Christians ”) for control of the Protestant church. »

In 1933, the « German Christians » wanted Nazi doctrines on race and leadership to be applied to a « Reich » Church, but had only around 3,000 of Germany's 17,000 pastors. In July, Church leaders submitted a constitution for a « Reich » Church, which the « Reichstag » approved. The Church Federation proposed the well-qualified Pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh to be the new « Reich » Bishop, but Hitler endorsed his friend Ludwig Müller, a Nazi and former naval chaplain, to serve as « Reich » Bishop. The Nazis terrorized supporters of Bodelschwingh, and dissolved various church organisations, ensuring the election of Müller as « Reich » Bishop. But Müller's heretical views against Saint-Paul and the Semitic origins of Christ and the Bible quickly alienated sections of the Protestant church. Pastor Martin Neimoller responded with the Pastors Emergency League which re-affirmed the Bible. The movement grew into the Confessing Church, from which some clergymen opposed the Nazi regime.

By 1934, the Confessional Church had declared itself the legitimate Protestant Church of Germany. Despite his closeness to Hitler, Müller had failed to united Protestantism behind the National-Socialist Party. In response to the regime's attempt to establish a State Church, in March 1935, the Confessing Church Synod announced :

« We see our nation threatened with mortal danger ; the danger lies in a new religion. The Church has been ordered by its Master to see that Christ is honoured by our nation in a manner befitting the Judge of the world. The Church knows that it will be called to account if the German nation turns its back on Christ without being forewarned. »

(Confessing Church Synod, 1935.)

The Nazis response to this synod announcement was to arrest 700 Confessing pastors. Müller resigned. To instigate a new effort at coordinating the Protestant churches, Hitler appointed another friend, Hans Kerrl to the position of Minister for Church Affairs. A relative moderate, Kerrl initially had some success in this regard, but amid continuing protests by the Confessing Church against Nazi policies, he accused churchmen of failing to appreciate the Nazi doctrine of « Race, blood and soil » and gave the following explanation of the Nazi conception of « Positive Christianity » , telling a group of submissive clergy :

« The Party stands on the basis of Positive Christianity, and positive Christianity is National-Socialism. National-Socialism is the doing of God's will. God's will reveals itself in German blood. Doctor Zœllner and Catholic Bishop of Münster, Count Galen, have tried to make clear to me that Christianity consists in faith in Christ as the son of God. That makes me laugh. No, Christianity is not dependent upon the Apostle's Creed. True, Christianity is represented by the Party, and the German people are now called by the Party, and especially the “ Führer ”, to a real Christianity. The “ Führer ” is the herald of a new revelation. »

(Hans Kerrl, Nazi Minister for Church Affairs, 1937.)

At the end of 1935, the Nazis arrested 700 of Confessional Church pastors. When, in May 1936, the Confessing Church sent Hitler a memorandum courteously objecting to the « anti-Christian » tendencies of his regime, condemning anti-Semitism and asking for an end to interference in Church affairs.

Paul Berben wrote :

« A Church envoy was sent to Hitler to protest against the religious persecutions, the concentration camps, and the activities of the “ Gestapo ”, and to demand freedom of speech, particularly in the press. »

The Nazi Minister of the Interior, Wilhelm Frick responded harshly. Hundreds of pastors were arrested, Doctor Weissler, a signatory to the memorandum, was killed at Sachsenhausen concentration camp and the funds of the Church were confiscated and collections forbidden. Church resistance stiffened and, by early 1937, Hitler had abandoned his hope of uniting the Protestant churches.

The Confessing Church was banned on 1 July 1937. Neimoller was arrested by the « Gestapo » , and sent to the Concentration Camps. He remained mainly at Dachau until the fall of the regime. Theological universities were closed, and other pastors and theologians arrested.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, another leading spokesman for the Confessing Church, was from the outset a critic of the Hitler regime's racism and became active in the German Resistance - calling for Christians to speak-out against Nazi atrocities. Arrested in 1943, he was implicated in the 1944 « July Plot » to assassinate Hitler and executed.

The Nazi policy of interference in Protestantism did not achieve its aims. A majority of German Protestants sided neither with « Deutsche Christen » , nor with the Confessing Church. Both groups also faced significant internal disagreements and division.

Mary Fulbrook wrote in her history of Germany :

« The Nazis eventually gave-up their attempt to co-opt Christianity, and made little pretence at concealing their contempt for Christian beliefs, ethics and morality. Unable to comprehend that some Germans genuinely wanted to combine commitment to Christianity and Nazism, some members of the SS even came to view “ German Christians ” as almost more of a threat than the Confessing Church. »

(Extract from the « Fontana History of Germany » , 1991.)

Some historians maintain that Hitler's goal in the « Kirchenkampf » entailed not only ideological struggle, but ultimately the eradication of the Church. Other historians maintain no such plan existed.

Alan Bullock wrote that :

« Once the War was over, Hitler promised himself, he would root-out and destroy the influence of the Christian Churches, but until then he would be circumspect. »

According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, Hitler believed Christianity and Nazism were « incompatible » and intended to replace Christianity with a « racist form of warrior paganism » .

...

The « Church Struggle » (« Kirchenkampf ») describes a tumultuous period for the churches in Nazi Germany under Hitler from 1933-1945. This involved the conflict between Hitler's Nazi regime and Protestant churches, as well as the Roman Catholic Church. We can divide the « Kirchenkampf » into 5 major stages that led to its horrific and bloody finale. Hitler initially caused internal qualm within German Protestants camps by his promotion of the pro-Nazi chaplain Ludwig Müller. He made Müller, a Nazi and former naval chaplain, the « Reich » Bishop in 1933. Subsequently, 1 year later, the Nazi regime would inevitably try to suppress churches and place them under their control. At this stage, there was some resistance, and many pious Christians were pressured, and harassed. Stage 3 involved the imprisonment of many pastors, and the crucifix, as a symbol of Christ's death on the cross (which is the heart of Christian theism) , was to be removed from schools. Many Christians protested against this, but ultimately to no avail. From 1937 to 1939, the Church increased its protest against the regime, however such was met with force, and, in retaliation many theological universities were forcefully shut-down, as well as many pastors and theologians arrested. Expectedly, the final stage, from 1939 to 1945, was the bloodiest as clergy camps were erected at Dachau, and churches were seized by the State. Some clergy were forced to join the military, and it was at this time in 1945 that the widely-known priests Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Alfred Delp were martyred for their resistance to Hitler.

Furthermore, it's widely thought, although debated, that the primary goal of « Kirchenkampf » was the intentional obliteration of churches, and their presence in Germany, as well as Christianity as a whole.

Expert on German history Joseph Bendersky tells us that :

« It was Hitler's long range goal to eliminate the churches once he had consolidated control over his European empire. »

It was Hitler's ideological goal to alter the minds of his people, and such would entail a deliberate modifying of the attitudes, values and mentalities. Such was intended to transform the German people into one national community. Disdain by the Nazis was conspicuously present in their intense dislike of universities, and especially of the churches. Around this time, Hitler was very much in control, and total allegiance to the National-Socialist German Workers' Party was set in place. Subsequently, clashes between traditional Christian beliefs and the imposed Nazi ideology became manifest. Hitler's henchmen Martin Bormann and the infamous Josef Goebbels, the Nazi Minister for Propaganda, were explicitly anti-Christianity, and, thus, made the forced eradication of churches in the country a main priority. Goebbels was to lead the violent persecution of the clergy as the War progressed. He would go on to write that « There is,

namely, an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view » , thus, making his malicious intentions vivid. Something Hitler was to agree upon as in his view « Christianity was ripe for destruction » .

Hitler's manifest disdain for Christianity became ever more apparent as he « detested its ethics in particular » , as well as declared its teachings « a rebellion » . However, he was shrewdly strategic and hid his contempt due to political tactics. In fact, he was so good at hiding his true intentions towards Christianity that many went away convinced that he was a deeply religious man. Hitler even promised not to meddle in the business of the churches ; however, this was an obvious tactic he implemented to gain favour with this German public. Not soon after, he gained considerable strength did he go-back on this very promise. This was no limited effort on his part as he would go on to persecute many of faith ranging from Catholics, Protestants, and Jehovah Witnesses. Inevitably, this effort would lead to the incarceration of many priests in barracks and concentration camps, as established in stage 5 of the « Kirchenkampf » . At this time, the « Gestapo » , the German secret police, arrested over 700 pastors, as well as over 6,000 Jehovah's Witnesses for their expressed refusal to declare loyalty to the « Reich » , as well as because of their refusal to enter the military.

Martin Bormann, Hitler's private secretary, was another fore-runner of the « Kirchenkampf » , who writes that « National-Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable » , and that any power the churches had « must absolutely and finally be broken » . The historian William Shirer tells us that « the Nazi regime intended to destroy Christianity in Germany, if it could ... »

The infamous military commander Heinrich Himmler was specifically opposed to Christian sexual morality as well as their belief in mercy.

In 1937, he writes :

« We live in an era of the ultimate conflict with Christianity. It is part of the mission of the SS to give the German people in the next half Century the non-Christian ideological foundations on which to lead and shape their lives. This task does not consist solely in overcoming an ideological opponent but must be accompanied at every step by a positive impetus : in this case, that means the reconstruction of the German heritage in the widest and most comprehensive sense. »

Himmler's « Schutzstaffel » , also known as the SS, were to be the « vanguard in overcoming Christianity » in Germany, as well to provide preparation of the inevitable conflict between the « humans and sub-humans » . This was not met by ignorance by those in the Church. One pastoral letter of the German Bishops voices that the « existence of Christianity in Germany is at stake » , and that the authorities under the regime were soon to « dissolve the blessed union between Christ and the German people » .

Another letter, written in 1942, reveals the intense struggle and upheaval of the Church :

« Repeatedly, the German Bishops have asked the “ Reich ” Government to discontinue this fatal struggle ; but,

unfortunately, our appeals and our endeavours were without success. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops, dated 22 March 1942.)

Ultimately, the Catholic Church had faced intense restriction, and had no say in the public life, almost as if it disappeared altogether from its once formidable position. Churches were being closed, Catholic schools spurned-out of existence, and clergymen were watched and harassed. The Church refused to condone euthanasia under the Nazi regime because of their support for human rights and personal freedom under God.

« The Bishops shall not cease to protest against the killing of innocent persons. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops, 22 March 1942.)

All this was likely to lead to one chilling conclusion :

« Had the Nazis won the War, their ecclesiastical policies would have gone beyond those of the “ German Christians ”, to the utter destruction of both the Protestant and the Catholic Church. »

La « Gleichschaltung »

La « Gleichschaltung » (« mise au pas ») est le processus mis en œuvre par Adolf Hitler et par le Parti nazi pour accéder au pouvoir total en Allemagne et pour mettre la société au pas, afin de concrétiser le mythe de la « communauté populaire » (« Volksgemeinschaft ») . Elle s'est déroulée de mars 1933 à août 1934.

Ce processus vise toutes les sphères de la société, politique, économique, religieuse et culturelle, et concerne l'ensemble de la population. Il a notamment pour objectif d'éliminer toute opposition réelle ou potentielle et comporte un important volet antisémite. La « Gleichschaltung » est mise en œuvre, dès l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir, via le développement d'un appareil répressif, des outils législatifs et réglementaires et la création d'organisations de masse destinées à encadrer tous les secteurs de la société. Les moyens employés étaient la séduction, l'intimidation ou la terreur.

Victor Klemperer souligne que le verbe « gleichschalten » est, au sens propre, surtout employé en électricité, dans le sens de synchroniser ; pour cet auteur, l'utilisation du terme « Gleichschaltung » est la création la plus caractéristique et probablement la plus précoce de la langue du 3e « Reich » (LTI) , dont l'apanage est la mécanisation flagrante de la personne elle-même, « un mot monstrueusement représentatif des convictions fondamentales du Nazisme » . « Dans la LTI, aucun autre terme technique, en empiétant sur un domaine qui n'est pas le sien, ne saurait révéler aussi crûment la tendance à la mécanisation et à l'automatisation. »

Pour Pierre Ayçoberry, l'expression la plus fréquente en français, « mise au pas » , « rend bien compte de la discipline imposée par les nouveaux Maîtres et acceptée plus ou moins volontairement par les divers corps pré-

existants, mais elles sacrifie les connotations technologiques du mot allemand » ; « Synchronisation ou normalisation seraient des traductions plus appropriées (plus fidèles à l'aspect technolâtre du régime) , mais mise au pas est devenu d'usage courant, et il vaut mieux s'en tenir là. »

La mise en place des instruments juridiques et réglementaires de la « Gleichschaltung » se base sur 2 textes fondamentaux : le « Reichstagsbrandverordnung » (Décret de l'incendie du « Reichstag ») et la Loi des pleins pouvoirs.

Après l'incendie du « Reichstag » , dans la nuit du 27 au 28 février, Hitler convainc le président Hindenburg de signer un décret d'urgence. Basé sur l'article 48, 2e alinéa de la Constitution, le « Reichstagsbrandverordnung » permet de restreindre en dépassant les normes légales normalement applicables, la liberté individuelle, la liberté d'expression, notamment la liberté de la presse, du droit de réunion et d'association.

Le 23 mars 1933, la Loi des pleins pouvoirs porte le coup de grâce à la Constitution de Weimar :

« Elle décide tout simplement l'abrogation de la séparation des pouvoirs et l'auto-affirmation du gouvernement en matière législative, ce qui infirme “ de facto ” les compétences inchangées du président et du Parlement jusqu'au déni de tout appareil constitutionnel au bénéfice du seul Führer. »

Avec son entrée en vigueur, le « Reichstag » devient inutile et Hitler gouverne par décrets, avec ou sans la caution du président Hindenburg, sans devoir formellement modifier la Constitution : la domination de Hitler est institutionnellement sécurisée. En 1933 et 1934, les lois et décrets destinés à mettre la société allemande au pas se succèdent à un rythme effréné.

Le 1er texte législatif qui se réfère à la notion de « Gleichschaltung » est la loi provisoire sur l'alignement des « Länder » avec le « Reich » , du 31 mars 1933 :

« Celle-ci porte un coup décisif au fédéralisme, en dissolvant les parlement régionaux, qui seront recomposés (sauf en Prusse) proportionnellement aux résultats des dernières élections au Reichstag. »

Elle est suivie, le 7 avril, par une seconde loi d'alignement qui transpose au niveau des « Länder » les dispositions de la Loi des pleins pouvoirs et nomme à la tête de chaque « Land » un « Reichsstatthalter » (gouverneur du « Reich ») , fonction généralement confiée à un « Gauleiter » .

La loi sur la restauration de la fonction publique (« Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums » , ou GWB) , du 7 avril 1933, permet aux dirigeants nazis de destituer les fonctionnaires juifs ou considérés comme politiquement hostiles.

La Confédération générale des syndicats allemands (« Allgemeiner Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund » , ou ADGB) fut dissoute le 2 mai 1933, le lendemain de la Fête du Travail, quand les unités SA et du NSBO (« Nationalsozialistische

Betriebszellenorganisation ») occupèrent les unions syndicalistes ; les chefs du ADGB furent emprisonnés. De nombreuses associations furent forcées de fusionner avec le « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » (DAF), substitut nazi de l'AGBD, les mois suivants.

La loi contre la formation de Partis politiques (« Gesetz gegen die Neubildung von Parteien ») du 14 juillet 1933 empêcha toute création d'un nouveau Parti politique.

La loi de reconstruction du « Reich » (« Gesetz über den Neuaufbau des Reiches »), du 30 janvier 1934, abandonnait le fédéralisme. Au lieu de cela, les établissements politiques des « Länder » ont été pratiquement entièrement supprimés, transférant tous les pouvoirs au gouvernement central. En conséquence, une autre loi datant du 14 février 1934 dissout le « Reichsrat », la représentation des « Länder » au niveau fédéral.

Le 2 août 1934, à 9 heures du matin, le président du « Reich » (« Reichspräsident ») Paul von Hindenburg meurt à l'âge de 87 ans. 3 heures avant, le gouvernement avait voté une loi qui prendrait effet lors de sa mort : celle-ci prescrivait que les fonctions de président du « Reich » devaient être unies avec celles du chancelier du « Reich » et que les compétences du précédent gouvernement devaient être transférées au « “ Führer ” et chancelier du “ Reich ” » (« Führer und Reichskanzler »), Adolf Hitler, qui demanda l'application de cet article.

De mars à mai 1933, les militants du KPD et du SPD sont les premiers détenus des camps de concentration. Catégorisés comme « opposants politiques », 25,000 sont envoyés dans les premiers camps gardés par des SA (Dachau, Oranienburg-Sachsenhausen, Papenburg). Le 22 juin 1933, il n'y a plus de Parti de gauche en Allemagne. Bien qu'allié au premier gouvernement Hitler, Alfred Hugenberg démissionne le 27 juin 1933 et le Parti conservateur DNVP est dissous ; ses militants rejoignent le NSDAP. Le « Deutsche Staatspartei » est dissous le 28 juin.

Le 5 juillet, le « Zentrum » catholique procède à sa propre dissolution, à la suite de la disparition de sa branche bavaroise.

La loi du 14 juillet 1933 instaure le NSDAP comme Parti unique ; la création de tout nouveau Parti politique est prohibée. Ceci a lieu 6 mois après que Hitler a été nommé chancelier.

Le 22 septembre 1933, Josef Goebbels instaure la « Reichskulturkammer ». Le statut de l'artiste est redéfini ; il doit se charger désormais d'éduquer politiquement la nation.

Par un décret du 22 juin 1933, le Comité national des associations de jeunesse allemande est dissous. Les adhérents des associations dissoutes sont rattachés soit à la « Hitler-Jugend », qui atteint 3,5 millions de membres à la fin de l'année 1934, soit à la « Bund Deutscher Mädel ».

La jeunesse hitlérienne subira une propagande nazie très forte dans un sens de domination, de force et d'exaltation de la nation allemande. L'école ne devait alors avoir que le rôle de complément.

Les fonctionnaires font l'objet d'une épuration idéologique, permettant de s'assurer le concours de l'ensemble des services publics ; à la suite de quoi, tous les secteurs professionnels privés sont encadrés par des membres du Parti nazi.

Les organisations para-militaires non-nazies sont supprimées :

Bannière du « Reich » : 3,5 millions de membres.

Para-militaires du DNVP.

Les membres du « Stahlhelm » rejoignent massivement les SA ; en 1935 le « Stahlhelm » a cessé d'exister.

« Front rouge des combattants » qui était l'armée officieuse du KPD et comptait 150 000 membres.

Dernière organisation para-militaire avec la SS, la SA elle-même est purgée, fin-juin 1934, lors de la « Nuit des Longs Couteaux » .

La « Reichswehr » est ré-organisée en « Wehrmacht » par la loi du 21 mars 1935, qui ré-introduit la conscription.

...

In Nazi terminology, « Gleichschaltung » (bringing into line) was the process by which Nazi Germany successively established a system of totalitarian control and coordination over all aspects of society, « from the economy and trade associations to the media, culture and education » .

The apex of the Nazification of Germany was in the resolutions approved during the Nuremberg Rally of 1935, when the symbols of the Party and the State were fused and the German Jews were deprived of citizenship, paving the way for the Holocaust.

The period from 1933 to 1937 was characterized by the systematic elimination of non-Nazi organizations that could potentially influence people, such as trade-unions and political Parties. Those critical of Adolf Hitler's agenda were suppressed, intimidated or murdered. The regime also assailed the influence of the churches, for example, by instituting the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs under Hanns Kerrl. Organizations that the administration could not eliminate, such as the education system, came under its direct control.

The « Gleichschaltung » also included the formation of various organizations with compulsory membership for segments of the population, in particular the youth. Boys first served as apprentices in the « Pimpfen » (Cubs) , beginning at the age of 6, and, at age 10, entered the « Deutsches Jungvolk » (Young German Boys) and served there until entering the Hitler Youth proper at age 14. Boys remained there until age 18, at which time they entered into the « Arbeitsdienst » (Labour Service) and the armed forces. Girls became part of the « Jungmädel » (Young Maidens)

at age 10 and, at age 14, were enrolled in the « Bund Deutscher Mädel » (League of German Maidens) . At 18, « Bund Deutscher Mädel » members went generally to the eastern territory for their « Pflichtdienst » , or « Landjahr » , 1 year of labour on a farm. In 1936, membership of the Hitler Youth numbered just under 6 million.

For workers, an all-embracing recreational organization called « Kraft durch Freude » (Strength through Joy) was set-up. In Nazi Germany, even hobbies were regimented, all private clubs (whether they be for chess, football, or wood-working) were brought under the control of the « Kraft durch Freude » and the Nazi Party. The « Kraft durch Freude » organization provided vacation trips (skiing, swimming, concerts and ocean cruises) . With some 25 million members, the « Kraft durch Freude » was the largest of the many organizations established by the Nazis. Workers were also brought in line with the Party, through activities such as the « Reichsberufswettkampf » , a national vocational competition.

Koonz writes of how this intense racism came about, despite relatively little attention given to popularizing racial hate. Newsreels, propaganda, films and Hitler's political campaign devoted very little attention to popularizing the racism at the heart of the regime. To be credible, racist propaganda had to emanate from apparently objective sources, with the appearance of knowledge, which had the power to change attitudes.

Josef Gœbbels said :

« The best propaganda is that which, as it were, works invisibly, penetrates the whole of life without the public having any knowledge of the propagandistic initiative. »

Further claiming on another occasion that :

« Good propaganda does not need to lie, indeed, it may not lie. It has no reason to fear the truth. It is a mistake to believe that the people cannot take the truth. They can. It is only a matter of presenting the truth to people in a way that they will be able to understand. »

In a more specific sense, « Gleichschaltung » refers to the legal measures taken by the government during the 20 months following 30 January 1933, when Adolf Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. It was, in this sense, that the term was used by the Nazis themselves.

1 day after the « Reichstag » fire, on 27 February 1933, President of Germany, Paul von Hindenburg, acting at Adolf Hitler's request and on the basis of the emergency powers in article 48 of the Weimar Constitution, issued the « Reichstag » Fire Decree. This decree suspended most citizen rights provided for by the constitution and, thus, allowed for the arrest of political adversaries, mostly Communists, and for terrorizing of other electors by the SA (the Nazi para-military force) before the upcoming election.

In this atmosphere, the « Reichstag » general election of 5 March 1933 took place. The Nazis had hoped to win an outright majority and push aside their coalition partners, the German National People's Party. However, the Nazis won

only 43 % of the vote, well short of a majority. The Nazi-DNVP coalition did enjoy a slim majority, just enough to conduct the ordinary business of government.

When the newly-elected « Reichstag » 1st convened on 23 March 1933 (not including the Communist delegates because their Party had been banned on 6 March) , it passed the Enabling Act (« Ermächtigungsgesetz ») . This law gave the government (in practice, Hitler) the right to make laws without the involvement of the « Reichstag » . For all intents and purposes, the entire Weimar constitution was rendered void. Soon afterwards, the government banned the Social-Democratic Party, which had voted against the Act. By midsummer, the other Parties had been intimidated into dissolving themselves rather than face arrests and concentration camp imprisonment.

The « 1st “ Gleichschaltung ” Law » (« Erstes Gleichschaltungsgesetz » , passed on 31 March 1933) , the 1st passed using the Enabling Act, dissolved the diets of all « Länder » , except Prussia, and ordered them reconstituted on the basis of the votes in the last « Reichstag » election (with the exception of Communist seats) . It also gave the State governments the same powers the « Reich » government possessed under the Enabling Act.

A « 2nd “ Gleichschaltung ” Law » (« Zweites Gleichschaltungsgesetz » , passed on 7 April 1933) deployed 1 « Reichsstatthalter » (« Reich » Governor) in each State, apart from Prussia. These officers, responsible to Interior Minister Wilhelm Frick, were supposed to act as local proconsuls in each State, with near-complete control over the State governments. For Prussia, which in any event constituted the bulk of Germany, Hitler reserved these rights for himself and delegated them to Prussian minister-president Hermann Göring. This law effectively de-federalized the « Reich » for the 1st time ever.

The trade-union association ADGB (« Allgemeiner Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund ») was shattered on 2 May 1933 (the day after Labour Day) , when ADGB leaders were imprisoned and SA and NSBO units occupied union facilities. Other important associations, including trade-unions, were dissolved and replaced by the German Labour Front (« Deutsche Arbeitsfront » , or DAF) , to which all workers had to belong.

The « Gesetz gegen die Neubildung von Parteien » (Law against the establishment of political Parties, passed on 14 July 1933) declared the Nazi Party to be the country's only legal Party. However, for all practical purposes, Germany had been a One Party State since the passage of the Enabling Act.

The « Gesetz über den Neuaufbau des Reiches » (Law concerning the reconstruction of the « Reich » , passed on 30 January 1934) formally did away with the concept of a Federal Republic, converting Germany into a highly-centralized State. The States were reduced to mere provinces, as their institutions were practically abolished altogether. All of their powers passed to the central government. It can be argued that this law violated the Enabling Act, since it effectively neutered the « Reichsrat » , the representation of the « Länder » at the Federal level. Article 2 of the Enabling Act stated that the institutions of both legislative chambers could not be altered. A law passed on 14 February formally abolished the « Reichsrat » . This law indisputably violated the Enabling Act, since Article 2 explicitly protected the existence of both chambers. However, there was no remedy for violations of Article 2, and no challenge was ever mounted in court.

In the summer of 1934, Hitler instructed the SS to kill Ernst Röhm and other leaders of the Nazi Party's SA, former Chancellor Kurt von Schleicher and several aides to former Chancellor Franz von Papen in the so-called « Night of the Long Knives » (between 30 June and 2 July 1934) . These measures received retroactive sanction in a special One Article Law Regarding Measures of State Self-Defense (« Gesetz über Maßnahmen der Staatsnotwehr » , passed on 3 July 1934) .

The Law Concerning the Highest State Office of the « Reich » , passed on 1 August 1934, prescribed that upon the death of the incumbent president, that office would be merged with the office of the chancellor, and that the competencies of the former should be transferred to the « Führer und Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler » , as the law stated. Hindenburg died at 9 o'clock the next morning, making Hitler head of State as well as head of government. Like the law abolishing the « Reichsrat » , this law actually violated the Enabling Act, which specifically forbade Hitler from tampering with the presidency. Additionally, in 1932, the constitution had been amended to make the president of the High Court of Justice, not the chancellor, acting president pending new elections. However, no one raised any objections. This law abolished the last remedy by which Hitler could be legally dismissed - and, with it, the last check on his power. From this point onward, Hitler can be described as the absolute dictator of Germany until his suicide in 1945.

L'Allemagne nazie : de la prise de pouvoir à la dictature

À la faveur de la crise économique de 1929, le NSDAP (Parti national-socialiste des travailleurs allemands) , prend de l'ampleur et progresse au fil des scrutins électoraux. Adolf Hitler à la tête du Parti depuis 1921, tire partie des échecs de la République de Weimar et exploite le nationalisme engendré par le Traité de Versailles signé à l'issue de la Première Guerre mondiale (28 juin 1919) . Orateur d'exception, Hitler développe, sur un terreau où se mêlent conservatisme, nationalisme frustré et ressentiment social, une propagande qui use d'arguments à la fois nouveaux et séculaires. En 1930, aux élections législatives, le Parti obtient 18,37 % des voix devenant le 2e Parti d'Allemagne et, le 30 janvier 1933, Hitler devient Chancelier. Il prend alors la tête d'un gouvernement à majorité national-conservatrice dans lequel les Nazis sont minoritaires face à des conservateurs bien décidés à les utiliser pour liquider la République de Weimar au profit d'un régime autoritaire traditionnel.

Il ne faut pourtant que quelques mois à Hitler pour s'emparer sans partage du pouvoir. L'incendie du « Reichstag » , le 27 février 1933, est le prétexte pour interdire le Parti communiste dont les leaders et 10,000 militants sont internés. Il permet à Hitler d'obtenir du maréchal von Hindenburg, encore président du « Reich » (appellation officielle de la République) , la promulgation « du décret pour la protection du peuple et de l'État » , le 28 février 1933, et d'obtenir également des pouvoirs de police exceptionnels dans les « Länder » . Dans ce climat politique, les Nazis emportent 44 % des suffrages aux élections parlementaires du 5 mars 1933, soit 288 sièges sur 640 au « Reichstag » . Les députés du centre (« Zentrum ») rejoignent les Nazis et les nationaux-allemands pour voter, le 23 mars 1933, la loi d'habilitation (promulguée le 24 mars) qui confère à Hitler les pleins pouvoirs pour 4 ans, renouvelables en cas de besoin.

Nazification de l'Allemagne

Le 14 juillet 1933, toutes les formations politiques sont interdites au profit du Parti nazi, déclaré Parti unique. Les syndicats sont remplacés par un nouvel organisme corporatiste, le « Front du travail », contrôlé par les Nazis. La propagande habile et intensive de Joseph Goebbels, nommé le 11 mars 1933 ministre de la Propagande, se met en œuvre. Le 10 mai 1933, des étudiants et bibliothécaires « nettoient » les bibliothèques des villes universitaires, des ouvrages littéraires et des auteurs « indésirables » - Libéraux, pacifistes socialistes et juifs. Face à cette menace directe de nombreux écrivains et artistes prennent le chemin de l'exil. La presse, la radio et le cinéma sont strictement surveillés et utilisés par la propagande nazie. À partir de 1934, les fonctionnaires sont contraints de prêter serment de loyauté à Hitler. La jeunesse fait l'objet d'un soin particulier : sous l'égide de la Ligue nationale socialiste de l'enseignement, l'école devient un lieu d'endoctrinement. Les mouvements de jeunesse, aux premiers rangs desquels figurent les Jeunesses Hitlériennes, enrôlent et mobilisent les jeunes dès l'adolescence, Heinrich Himmler, chef de la SS (groupe de protection) est investi des pleins pouvoirs de police. Prenant de plus en plus d'importance depuis la « Nuit des longs couteaux » (liquidation de la SA par la SS), la SS pénètre tous les secteurs de la vie publique et privée et s'efforce de mettre en place par tous les moyens, y compris la terreur, un modèle d'homme nouveau conforme aux références biologiques nazies.

Les mesures contre les Juifs entrent en vigueur 2 mois après que le maréchal von Hindenburg eut confié à Adolf Hitler la constitution du gouvernement.

L'exclusion économique

Le 1er avril 1933, un comité officieux organise un immense boycott des commerces, cabinets d'avocats et de médecins juifs. Cette campagne est présentée comme une réponse aux réactions de protestation survenues à l'étranger « à l'initiative des Juifs » contre la politique du gouvernement allemand. Les SA montent la garde devant les magasins, les cabinets de médecins et d'avocats juifs. Cette journée marque symboliquement le début de l'éviction des Juifs de la vie économique. Le 7 avril 1933, 2 lois excluent les Juifs de la fonction publique et du barreau. Les Juifs d'Allemagne sont progressivement chassés des professions libérales, de l'armée, de la justice, des métiers de la culture et de la presse. Un « numerus clausus » est instauré dans les universités et, à partir de 1938, les enfants juifs doivent quitter l'école. Le Parti nazi et ses militants s'investissent dans l'« aryansisation » de biens appartenant à des Juifs en intimidant la population juive : 41,000 des 50,000 commerces de détail sont « volontairement » vendus par leurs propriétaires juifs, entre 1933 et 1938.

Les lois de Nuremberg

Le 15 septembre 1935, la loi civile du « Reich » et la loi « pour la protection du sang et de l'honneur allemand » interdisent les unions et les relations sexuelles entre Juifs et « non-Juifs », « génératrices de souillures ».

Les Juifs sont privés de leur citoyenneté et deviennent des sujets de statut inférieur, auxquels il est même interdit de « pavoiser aux couleurs nationales allemandes ». Parallèlement, le décret d'application du 14 novembre 1935 définit qui est juif : « est juif celui qui est issu d'au moins 3 grands-parents juifs ; est juif celui qui appartient à la

communauté religieuse juive » . Le critère racial et l'appartenance religieuse sont donc, l'un et l'autre, pris en compte. Des ordonnances d'application, des dispositions relatives au cas des « Mischlinge » (métis) ou demi-Juifs, suivent quelques semaines plus tard. Ces lois déclenchent une série de dénonciations : dans la seule ville de Hambourg, environ 5,000 personnes sont arrêtées puis interrogées tandis que 1,150 procédures d'instruction sont ouvertes. Après avoir purgé une peine pour infraction à la loi sur la protection du sang, ces personnes sont généralement internées dans des camps de concentration.

Le Concordat du 20 juillet 1933

Le concordat du 20 juillet 1933 est un accord signé entre le Saint-Siège, représenté par le cardinal Eugenio Pacelli (futur pape Pie XII) , secrétaire d'État, et le « Reich » allemand, représenté par le vice-chancelier Franz von Papen. Ayant vu sa validité confirmée en 1957, il est encore en vigueur de nos jours.

Le pape Pie XI mène une politique très active de négociation et de signature de concordats ; 18 seront signés au cours de son pontificat. Il en négocie avec tous types de régimes : autoritaires, démocratiques, socialistes (comme l'URSS) ou fascistes (comme l'Italie) , en parvenant souvent à un accord. Par cette politique, il cherche à protéger les catholiques et préserver les institutions de l'Église (en évitant notamment l'ingérence des États dans les nominations d'évêques) et de la famille chrétienne, dans 2 domaines en particulier : l'éducation et le mariage.

Pie XI a une bonne connaissance de l'Allemagne. Il n'ignore pas les difficultés posées par les séquelles du « Kulturkampf » dans un pays majoritairement protestant : les catholiques ne représentent que 32 % de la population, concentrés en Bavière et en Rhénanie. Néanmoins, cette importante minorité est active, en particulier, s'agissant des mouvements de jeunesse. Elle compte 20,000 prêtres, 100,000 religieux et un Parti politique catholique centriste : le « Zentrum » .

Pie XI demande donc à Monseigneur Eugenio Pacelli, nonce apostolique en Allemagne et futur Pie XII, d'engager des négociations avec la République de Weimar. Celui-ci rencontre Friedrich Ebert. Cependant, le gouvernement fédéral ne souhaite pas entretenir des relations directement avec une religion. L'article 137 de la Constitution de Weimar proscribit ainsi toute « Église d'État » . En revanche, il permet des négociations au niveau des « Länder » . En conséquence, des concordats sont signés avec la Bavière (29 mars 1924) ; la Prusse (24 juin 1929) ; ou encore le pays de Bade (12 décembre 1932) , tous dans des conditions globalement favorables à l'Église catholique romaine.

L'arrivée du Parti nazi au pouvoir, en janvier 1933, change la donne. Le catholique conservateur Franz von Papen est nommé vice-chancelier. Le programme de restauration de la grandeur allemande séduit une partie des catholiques. De son côté, Pie XI est traumatisé par les événements de la Russie soviétique. Il relance les négociations au mois de mars, cette fois au niveau de l'Allemagne tout entière. Il s'appuie sur Monseigneur Pacelli, devenu secrétaire d'État ; Monseigneur Gröber, archevêque de Fribourg ; et Monseigneur Kaas, président du « Zentrum » . Hitler lui-même est peu convaincu par l'idée d'un tel accord, mais von Papen le convainc : il lui fait miroiter le ralliement de l'électorat catholique.

Les négociations se déroulent très rapidement. Le 20 juillet, la convention est signée. Von Papen y voit une grande victoire contre le bolchévisme ; Pie XI un accord « inattendu et inespéré » (M. Agostino) , évitant un nouveau « Kulturkampf » . Si le Parti « Zentrum » disparaît, l'Église catholique romaine est reconnue pour la 1^{re} fois dans l'ensemble du « Reich » ; les associations, les œuvres de jeunesse, l'école confessionnelle se voient accorder des garanties ; les biens confisqués sont restitués.

Les catholiques allemands accueillent le concordat d'un œil plutôt favorable ; ainsi, du cardinal Bertram, qui avait pourtant présidé la conférence de Fulda, en 1932, interdisant aux catholiques d'adhérer au NSDAP. De fait, le gouvernement nazi paraît un interlocuteur plus digne de confiance que la République de Weimar, accusée de tous les maux. Du côté des Nazis, on se satisfait de la disparition du « Zentrum » .

De plus, l'article 14 du concordat stipulait :

« Les nominations d'archevêques, d'évêques et toute autre nomination ne deviendront définitives que lorsque le représentant du Reich aura donné son accord pour ce qui est de savoir si ces nominations ne présentent pas d'inconvénients au point de vue politique générale. »

Adolf Hitler déclarera :

« La conclusion du concordat me paraît apporter la garantie suffisante que les citoyens du “ Reich ”, de confession catholique, se mettront dorénavant sans réserve au service du nouvel État national-socialiste. »

Très vite, l'Église doit perdre ses illusions : comme en Italie, le concordat n'est pas respecté. À la fin du mois de juin, lors de la « Nuit des Longs Couteaux » , les dirigeants des mouvements de jeunesse catholique sont exécutés par les SS. À partir du mois d'octobre, les Nazis persécutent le clergé. Au cours de l'été 1934, le chancelier autrichien Dolfuss, fervent catholique, est assassiné. Toutefois, le concordat permet à l'Église catholique de garder une certaine indépendance de fonctionnement face au régime, tout comme les « Églises libres » protestantes indépendantes, ce qui n'est pas le cas des Églises protestantes principales, subventionnées par l'État, qui se voient dirigées par les Chrétiens allemands, mouvement chrétien lié au National-Socialisme.

Rome réagit en mettant à l'Index « Le Mythe du XX^e siècle » , de l'idéologue nazi Alfred Rosenberg. Pacelli adresse 55 notes de protestations, de 1933 à 1939, au gouvernement allemand. Enfin, le 14 mars 1937, Pie XI publie l'encyclique « Mit brennender Sorge » , condamnant le paganisme et le racisme. Pour autant, le concordat n'est dénoncé par aucune des parties.

En mai 1938, Eugenio Pacelli s'absenta ostensiblement du Vatican lors de la visite d'Hitler. Le 6 septembre 1938, prenant position contre la législation antisémite italienne, il déclara à un groupe de pèlerins belges cette phrase célèbre :

« Nous, chrétiens, sommes spirituellement des sémites. »

Il ordonna également aux universités catholiques d'organiser un enseignement contre l'antisémitisme et le racisme. Juste avant son décès, il avait fait préparer une encyclique contre le Nazisme et un discours dénonçant les écoutes et les déformations des propos de l'église par les Fascistes.

Après la Seconde Guerre mondiale, le sort du concordat est suspendu. Le 26 mars 1957, la Cour constitutionnelle allemande reconnaît sa validité.

Dans les années 1950 eurent lieu les discussions sur la validité du concordat. La question se pose alors des conditions dans lesquelles cet accord a pu se réaliser. Il y a de fait une séquence entre le vote de la Loi des pleins pouvoirs, le 24 mars, auquel participe le Parti catholique « Zentrum », la déclaration des évêques allemands à Fulda, le 28 mars, relevant l'interdiction pour les catholiques d'adhérer au Parti national-socialiste et le début des négociations du concordat début avril. Certains historiens allemands, et notamment Karl Dietrich Bracher ou Klaus Scholder, considèrent que ces événements sont intimement liés et qu'il y a donc eu un marchandage entre la Curie romaine et l'Allemagne nazie. D'autres, comme Konrad Repgen, réfutent cette thèse, considérant que les initiatives du Parti et des évêques allemands n'ont pas été téléguidées par la Curie. L'ouverture des archives vaticanes ces dernières années ne permet pas de trancher le débat.

...

The « Reichskonkordat » (Concordat between the Holy-See and the German « Reich ») is a treaty negotiated between the Vatican and the emergent Nazi Germany. It was signed on 20 July 1933 by Cardinal Secretary of State (and later Pope Pius XII) Eugenio Pacelli, on behalf of Pope Pius XI, and Vice-Chancellor Franz von Papen, on behalf of President Paul von Hindenburg and the German government. It was ratified on 10 September 1933 and it has been in force from that date right-up until the current-day. The treaty guarantees the rights of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany. When Bishops take office, Article 16 states they're required to take an oath of loyalty to the Governor or President of the German « Reich » established according to the constitution. The treaty also requires all clergy to abstain from working in and for political Parties. Nazi breaches of the agreement began almost as soon as it had been signed and intensified afterwards leading to protest from the Church including in the 1937 « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical of Pope Pius XI. The Nazis planned to eliminate the Church's influence by restricting its organizations to purely religious activities.

The « Reichskonkordat » is the most controversial of several concordats that the Vatican negotiated during the pontificate of Pius XI. It is frequently discussed in works that deal with the rise of Adolf Hitler in the early-1930's and the Holocaust. The concordat has been described by some as giving moral legitimacy to the Nazi regime soon after Hitler had acquired quasi-dictatorial powers through the Enabling Act of 1933, though « Reichskanzler » Hitler himself is not a signatory to the treaty and the treaty does not make mention of Hitler, or the Nazi Party.

The treaty places constraints on the political activity of German clergy of the Catholic Church. This contributed to a decrease in the previously vocal criticism of Nazism by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Germany, after

September 1933 when the treaty was ratified. From a Roman Catholic church perspective, it has been argued that the concordat prevented even greater evils being unleashed against the Church, although critics like Gregory Paul call it a « Classic political kick-back scheme » . Though some German Bishops were un-enthusiastic, and the Allies, at the end of World War II, felt it inappropriate, Pope Pius XII successfully argued to keep the concordat in force. It is still in force today.

The « Reichskonkordat » between Germany and the Holy-See was signed on 20 July 1933, and ratified in September of that year. The treaty was an extension of existing concordats already signed with Prussia and Bavaria. A « concordat » is the equivalent of a treaty when the agreement is between the Catholic Church and a State. « Treaty » is a general term applied to any agreement between subjects of international law. Concordats have been used to create binding agreements to safe-guard church interests and its freedom to act, particularly in countries that do not have strong jurisprudence guaranteeing government non-interference in religious matters or in countries where the church seeks a privileged position under government patronage.

Accounts of 20th Century diplomatic relations between Germany and the Vatican commonly take as their starting-point the political scene in the late-19th Century. German Chancellor Bismarck's « Kulturkampf » (Battle for Culture) of 1871-1878 saw an attempt to assert a Protestant vision of nationalism over the new German Empire, and fused anti-Clericalism with suspicion of the Catholic population, whose loyalty was presumed to lie with Austria and France. The Catholic Centre Party had formed in 1870, initially to represent the religious interests of Catholics and Protestants, but was transformed by the « Kulturkampf » into the « political voice of Catholics » . Bismarck's Culture Struggle was largely a failure.

Bismarck sought to restrict the power of the Catholic Church in Germany. He regarded the Roman Church as « the enemy within » . His « Kulturkampf » included the disbanding of Catholic organizations, confiscation of church property, banishment or imprisonment of clergy and an ongoing feud with the Vatican.

According to novelist James Carroll, the end of « Kulturkampf » signaled that :

« The Church had successfully resisted to his face the man (Bismarck) who, according to an admiring Henry Kissinger, was “ out-maneuvered ” by nobody. »

The Catholic Church's firm resistance to Bismarck and « Kulturkampf » , including passive resistance by the Church in general and the excommunication of collaborating priests, has been used as benchmark for assessing the Church's response to the Nazis, from the early-1930's through World War II.

A formal re-alignment of Church and State relationships was considered desirable in the aftermath of the political instability of 1918 and the adoption of the Weimar constitution for the « Reich » along with the new constitutions in the German States, in 1919. Key-issues that the Church hoped to resolve related to State subsidies to the Church, support for Catholic schools, the appointment of Bishops and the legal position of the clergy. The « Reich » government, in turn, wished for reasons of foreign policy to have friendly relations with the Holy-See. Also, Germany

wanted to prevent new diocesan boundaries being established which would dilute Germany's ties to ceded German territories in the east such as Danzig and Upper Silesia.

Negotiations relating to specific points, rather than a general concordat, took place between 1919 and 1922. But, even after subsequent feelers were put-out between the 2 Parties, the negotiations failed, primarily because both the « Reichstag » and « Reichsrat » were dominated by non-Catholic majorities who, for a variety of reasons, did not want a formal pact with the Vatican. In the absence of an agreement relating to particular areas of concern with the « Reich » , the Holy-See concluded more wide-ranging concordats with 3 German States where Catholics were concentrated : Bavaria (1924) ; Prussia (1929) ; Baden (1932) .

Pius XI was elected Pope in 1922. His pontificate coincided with the early aftermath of the First World War. The old European monarchies had been largely swept away and a new and precarious order formed across the continent. In the East, the Soviet Union arose. In Italy, the Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini took power, while in Germany, the fragile Weimar Republic collapsed with the Nazi seizure of power. Pope Pius's major diplomatic approach was to make concordats. However, wrote Hebblethwaite, these concordats did not prove « durable or creditable » and « wholly failed in their aim of safe-guarding the institutional rights of the Church » for « Europe was entering a period in which such agreements were regarded as mere scraps of paper » .

In 1929, Pius signed the Lateran Treaty and a concordat with Italy, confirming the existence of an independent Vatican City state, in return for recognition of the Kingdom of Italy and an undertaking for the papacy to be neutral in world conflicts. In Article 24 of the Concordat, the papacy undertook « to remain outside temporal conflicts unless the Parties concerned jointly appealed for the pacifying mission of the Holy-See » . Other major concordats included those signed with Germany (1933) ; Austria (1935) ; Yugoslavia (1935) ; and Latvia (1938) . The concordats were generally observed by the countries involved, with the exception of Germany.

In October 1929, General Grøener pushed the German Foreign Ministry to resolve an issue with the Vatican regarding military chaplains who lacked the ability to administer the sacraments of baptism or matrimony without first obtaining the permission of the local priest or Bishop. Grøener wanted the military to have their own Bishop rather than rely on local ordinaries and it was this particular issue that was to mark an important step in the discussions that would ultimately be realized in the concordat with the Vatican. In March 1930, the new Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, gave indications that the Vatican would be interested in a concordat with the « Reich » in the event of any reforms of the « Reich's » constitution having an adverse effect on the validity of the concordats already agreed between the German States and the Vatican.

Discussions between the 2 Parties took place between 1931 and 1932 and, at one point, representatives of the « Reich » pointed-out that Italy had an army Archbishop with Cardinal Pacelli indicating that was because Italy had signed a comprehensive concordat with the Vatican. The German negotiators continued to discuss solely on the basis of particular points rather than a general concordat during 1931 but even these were felt to be unlikely to be passed by the « Reichstag » or the « Reichsrat » , no matter their political or theological leanings.

In January 1933, Adolf Hitler became Chancellor. The passing of the Enabling Act, on 23 March, in part, removed the « Reichstag » as an obstacle to concluding a concordat with the Vatican. Hitler offered the possibility of friendly co-operation, promising not to threaten the « Reichstag », the President, the States or the Churches if granted the emergency powers.

With Nazi para-military encircling the building, he said :

« It is for you, gentlemen of the “ Reichstag ” to decide between War and Peace. »

The Act, allowed Hitler and his Cabinet to rule by emergency decree for 4 years, though Hindenberg remained President. German Catholics were wary of the new government :

« The Catholic Church had generally viewed the Nazi Party with fear and suspicion. It had felt threatened by a radical ultra-nationalist ideology that regarded the papacy as a sinister, alien institution, that opposed denominational separatism in education and culture, and that at times appeared to promote a return to Nordic paganism. The establishment of the 3rd “ Reich ” seemed to portend the coming of a bitter conflict between Church and State. »

(Extract from Theodore S. Hamerow's « On the Road to the Wolf's Lair : German Resistance to Hitler » .

In early 1933, Hitler told Hermann Rauschning that Bismarck had been stupid in starting a « Kulturkampf » and outlined his own strategy for dealing with the clergy which would be based initially on a policy of toleration :

« We should trap the priests by their notorious greed and self-indulgence. We shall, thus, be able to settle everything with them in perfect peace and harmony. I shall give them a few years reprieve. Why should we quarrel ? They will swallow anything in order to keep their material advantages. Matters will never come to a head. They will recognize a firm will, and we need only show them once or twice who is the master. They will know which way the wind blows. »

An initially mainly sporadic persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany followed the Nazi take-over. Hitler was hostile to the Catholic Church, but for political reasons, was prepared to restrain his anti-Clericalism and did not allow himself to be drawn into attacking the Church publicly as other Nazis would have liked him to do. Kershaw wrote that, following the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor by President von Hindenberg, the Vatican was anxious to reach agreement with the new government, despite « continuing molestation of Catholic clergy, and other outrages committed by Nazi radicals against the Church and its organisations » .

In March 1933, the British Roman Catholic periodical « The Tablet » in an article titled « The Ides of March » asserted :

« Hitler's Dictatorship is a usurpation and his enforcement of it is a brutality. While we write these lines, with news of more arrests and repressions coming to us every hour, we remember that we have reached the “ Ides of March ” and the anniversary of a never forgotten assassination. But Nazism's daggers cannot slay what is noblest and best in

Germany. The Church, now that the Centre is no longer the key-group in German politics, may be persecuted ; but HITLER will not succeed where BISMARCK failed. »

Robert Ventresca wrote that because of increasing harassment of Catholics and Catholic clergy, Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli sought a quick ratification of a treaty with the government, seeking in this way to protect the German Church. When Vice-Chancellor von Papen and Ambassador Diego von Bergen met Pacelli in late-June 1933, they found him « visibly influenced » by reports of actions being taken against German Catholic interests.

There were some thoughts that the Church was keen on coming to terms with Hitler as he represented a strong resistance against Communism : the Papal Nuncio in Berlin (Cesare Osenigo) is reported to have been « jubilant » about Hitler's rise to power and that the new government would soon be offering the same concessions to the Church that Mussolini thought necessary to do previously in Italy. Historian, Michæl Phayer, balances Günter Lewy and author journalist, John Cornwell stating :

« John Cornwell in “ Hitler's Pope ” argues that the Concordat was the result of a deal that delivered the parliamentary votes to Hitler, thereby, giving him dictatorial power (Enabling Act of 1933) . This is historically inaccurate. But there is no question about Pius XII's tenacious insistence on the Concordat retention before, during and after the Second World War. »

(Michæl Phayer)

The Catholic Bishops in Germany had generally shown opposition to Hitler from the beginning of his rise to power. When the Nazi Party polled 6 million votes during the 14 September 1930 election, the Catholic hierarchy called on its people to examine their consciences. During the next 2 years, though there had been softening by some, the Bishops continued to pronounce against unacceptable policies of the Nazi Party. When Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor on 30 January 1933, the Bishops maintained support for the Catholic Centre Party (« Zentrum ») which, in turn, refused to assent to a proposal that would allow Hitler to assume full-power. On 12 March 1933, Pope Pius XI received the German Cardinal Faulhaber in Rome.

On his return, Faulhaber reported :

« After my recent experience in Rome in the highest-circles, which I cannot reveal here, I must say that I found, despite everything, a greater tolerance with regard to the new government. Let us meditate on the words of the Holy Father, who in a consistory, without mentioning his name, indicated before the whole world in Adolf Hitler the statesman who Ist, after the Pope himself, has raised his voice against Bolshevism. »

At a cabinet meeting, on 20 March 1933, Hitler « confidently reported » that the Centre Party had now seen the necessity of the Enabling Act and that « the acceptance of the Enabling Act also by the “ Zentrum ” would signify a strengthening prestige with regard to foreign countries » . Early, in March 1933, the Bishops recommended that Catholics vote for the Centre Party in the elections scheduled for 5 March 1933. However, 2 weeks later, the Catholic

hierarchy reversed its previous policy - the Bishops now allowed the Centre Party and the Bavarian Catholic Party to vote for the Enabling Act which gave Hitler dictatorial powers on 23 March. German Catholic theologian Robert Grosche described the Enabling Act in terms of the 1870 decree on the infallibility of the Pope, and stated that the Church had « anticipated on a higher-level, that historical decision which is made today on the political level : for the Pope and against the sovereignty of the Council ; for the “ Führer ” and against the Parliament » . On 29 March 1933, Cardinal Pacelli sent word to the German Bishops to the effect that they must now change their position with regard to National-Socialism. On 28 March 1933, the Bishops themselves took-up a position favourable to Hitler. According to Falconi (1966) , the about-turn came through the influence and instructions of the Vatican. Pope Pius XI indicated in « Mit brennender Sorge » (1937) that the Germans had asked for the Concordat, and Pope Pius XII affirmed this in 1945.

Falconi viewed the Church's re-alignment as motivated by the desire to avoid being left alone in opposition and to avert reprisals. After the leader of the Centre Party, Monsignor Kaas, had persuaded the Party members to vote for Hitler and the Enabling Act, he left immediately for Rome and, on his return on 31 March, he was received by Hitler. He returned to Rome accompanied by the Catholic Vice-chancellor von Papen on 7 April with a mandate from Hitler to sound out a concordat with the Vatican. On the day they set-out for Rome to prepare the way for the Concordat, the 1st 2 anti-Semitic laws (excluding non-Aryans from public office and from the legal profession) were issued in Germany, but this did not impede the discussions. Von Papen recorded in his memoirs that, on his arrival in Rome, the Pope « greeted me with paternal affection, expressing his pleasure that at the head of the German State was a man like Hitler, on whose banner the un-compromising struggle against Communism and Nihilism was inscribed » . In Falconi's opinion, the Concordat was the price paid by Hitler in order to obtain the support of the German episcopate and the Catholic Parties. Ian Kershaw viewed the loss of political Catholicism as the sacrifice needed to protect the position of the Catholic Church in Germany.

According to historian Michael Phayer :

« The view that the Concordat was the result of a deal that delivered the parliamentary vote of the Catholic Center Party to Hitler, thereby, giving him dictatorial power (the Enabling Act of March 1933) is historically inaccurate. »

Cardinal Faulhaber wrote to Cardinal Pacelli on 10 April 1933 advising that defending the Jews would be wrong « because that would transform the attack on the Jews into an attack on the Church ; and because the Jews are able to look after themselves. »

The latter assertion based on the outcome of the April boycott, which was seen as a defeat for the Nazis.

On 22 April 1933, the British Minister to the Vatican recounted what the Vatican Under-Secretary of State had told him :

« The Holy-See is not interested in the Centre Party. We are more concerned with the mass of Catholic voters in Germany than in the Catholic deputies who represent them in the Reichstag. »

Previously, as part of the agreement surrounding the 1929 Lateran Treaty with the Fascist government in Italy, the Vatican had consented to the dissolution of the Catholic political « Partito Popolare » Party which dissolved in 1926.

At a 26 April meeting with Bishop Wilhelm Berning of Osnabrück, representative of the German Bishops' Conference, Adolf Hitler declared :

« I have been attacked because of my handling of the “ Jewish Question ”. The Catholic Church considered the Jews pestilent for 1,500 years, put them in ghettos, etc. , because it recognized the Jews for what they were. In the epoch of Liberalism, the danger was no longer recognized. I am moving back toward the time in which a 1,500 long tradition was implemented. I do not set race over religion, but I recognize the representatives of this race as pestilent for the State and for the Church, and, perhaps, I am thereby doing Christianity a great service by pushing them out of schools and public functions. »

The notes of the meeting do not record any response by Bishop Berning.

In the opinion of Martin Rhonheimer, who cites the above transcript :

« This is hardly surprising : for a Catholic Bishop, in 1933, there was really nothing terribly objectionable in this historically correct reminder. And, on this occasion, as always, Hitler was concealing his true intentions. »

Saul Friedländer interpreted Hitler's comments as an attempt to « blunt possible Catholic criticism of his anti-Jewish policies and to shift the burden of the arguments onto the Church itself » .

Edith Stein wrote to Pius XI in April 1933 asking if he would issue an anti- anti-Semitism Encyclical in view of « the indifference of Catholics to the growing vexations against the Jews » . Pinchas Lapide thought that this wasn't actioned as the letter arrived when the Concordat negotiations were taking place.

(Edith Stein died in the gas chamber at Auschwitz, in 1942.)

The issue of the Concordat prolonged Kaas's stay in Rome, leaving the Centre Party without a chairman, and, on 5 May, Kaas finally resigned from his post. The Party then elected Heinrich Brüning as its chairman. At that time, the Centre Party was subject to increasing pressure in the wake of the process of « Gleichschaltung » and after all the other Parties had dissolved (or were banned, like the SPD) . The Centre Party dissolved itself on 5 July 1933, as the Concordat between the Vatican and the Nazis had dealt it a decisive blow by exchanging a ban on the political activities of priests for the continuation of Catholic education. Cardinal Pacelli and Franz von Papen initialled the Concordat in Rome 3 days later, with signing taking place on 20 July. On 2 July, the Vatican daily newspaper « L'Osservatore Romano » insisted that the concordat wasn't an endorsement of Nazi teachings.

On 13 July, a British Minister had an interview with Cardinal Pacelli and reported :

« His Eminence said that the Vatican really viewed with indifference the dissolution of the Centre Party. »

At the 14 July, cabinet meeting Hitler brushed aside any debate on the details of the Concordat, expressing the view « that one should only consider it as a great achievement. The concordat gave Germany an opportunity and created an area of trust which was particularly significant in the developing struggle against international Jewry » . Saul Friedländer speculates that Hitler may have countenanced in this « area of trust » what he perceived as the Christian Church's traditional theological antipathy towards Jews, (see Hitler's comments above to Berning on 26 April) , converging with Nazi aims. Hitler « underlined the triumph » that the Concordat meant for the Nazi regime. Only a short time earlier, he had expressed doubts that « the church would be ready to commit the Bishops to this State. That this has happened, was without doubt an unreserved recognition of the present regime. »

On 22 July 1933, von Papen attended a meeting of the Catholic Academic Union, during which he first made the connection between the dissolution of the Centre Party and the Concordat. He said the Pope was particularly pleased at the promised destruction of Bolshevism and that Pius XI had agreed to the treaty « in the recognition that the new Germany had fought a decisive battle against Bolshevism and the atheist movement » . Papen noted that there was « an undeniable inner-connection between the dissolution of the German Center Party that has just taken place and the conclusion of the Concordat » and ended his speech with a call for German Catholicism to put away former resentments and to help build the 3rd « Reich » .

Abbot Herwegen told the meeting :

« What the liturgical movement is to the religious realm, Fascism is to the political realm. The German stands and acts under authority, under leadership - whoever does not follow endangers society. Let us say “ yes ” wholeheartedly to the new form of the total State, which is analogous throughout to the incarnation of the Church. The Church stands in the world as Germany stands in politics today. »

On 23 July, a British Minister met Cardinal Pacelli, who appeared « very satisfied » with the signing of the Concordat. The Cardinal expressed the view that, with the guarantees given relating to Catholic education, this Concordat was an improvement over the 1929 agreement with Prussia. Cardinal Pacelli did sound a note of caution in that his satisfaction was based on the assumption that the German Government « remained true to its undertaking » , but noted also that Hitler « was becoming increasingly moderate » .

On 24 July, Cardinal Faulhaber sent a hand-written letter to Hitler, noting that :

« For Germany's prestige in the East and the West and before the whole world, this hand-shake with the papacy, the greatest moral power in the history of the world, is a feat of immeasurable importance. »

On 4 August 1933, the British Minister reported « in conversations I have had with Cardinal Pacelli and Monsignor Pizzardo, neither gave me the feeling of the slightest regret at the eclipse of the Centre Party, and its consequent loss

of influence in German politics » . On 19 August, Kirkpatrick had a further discussion with Cardinal Pacelli in which he expressed his « disgust and abhorrence » at Hitler's reign of terror to the diplomat.

Pacelli said :

« I had to choose between an agreement on their lines and the virtual elimination of the Catholic Church in the “ Reich ”. »

Pacelli also told Kirkpatrick that he deplored the persecution of the Jews, but a pistol had been held to his head and that he had no alternative, being given only 1 week to decide. Pinchas Lapide notes that whilst negotiations for Concordat were taking place, pressure had been put on the Vatican by the arrest of 92 priests, the searching of Catholic youth-club premises, and the closing-down of 9 Catholic publications.

The Nazi newspaper « Völkischer Beobachter » wrote :

« By her signature the Catholic Church has recognized National-Socialism in the most solemn manner. This fact constitutes an enormous moral strengthening of our government and its prestige. »

The Concordat was ratified on 10 September 1933 and Cardinal Pacelli took the opportunity to send a note to the Germans raising the topic of the social and economic condition of Jews who had converted to Catholicism but of not Jews in general.

Meanwhile, although the Protestant churches, being local congregations, remained unaffected by restrictions on foreign support, Hitler's government negotiated other agreements with them which in essence put Nazi officials, most of whom were Catholics, into positions of influence or outright authority over Protestant churches. Foreseeing the potential for outright State control of their churches which these agreements portended, many Protestant church leaders simply re-organized their congregations out of the agreements, causing a schism within the Protestant Churches. These Protestant resisters attempted to rally Catholic prelates to the dangers portended by these agreements but were simply rebuffed when the « Reichskonkordat » was ratified. Many of the Protestant clergy who opposed the Nazi religious program (« Bekennende Kirche » : Confessing Church) , later suffered imprisonment or execution.

Church leaders were realistic about the Concordat's supposed protections.

Cardinal Faulhaber is reported to have said :

« With the concordat we are hanged, without the concordat we are hanged, drawn and quartered. »

After the signing of the Concordat, the Papal Nuncio exhorted the German Bishops to support Hitler's regime. The Bishops told their flocks to try to get along with the Nazi regime. According to Michael Phayer, the Concordat prevented Pius XI from speaking-out against the Nazi Nuremberg Laws in 1935, and though he did intend to speak

out after the nation-wide pogrom of 1938, Cardinal Pacelli dissuaded him from doing so.

On 20 August 1935, the Catholic Bishops conference at Fulda reminded Hitler that Pius XI had :

« ... exchanged the hand-shake of trust with you through the concordat - the 1st foreign sovereign to do so. Pope Pius spoke high praise of you. Millions in foreign countries, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, have overcome their original mistrust because of this expression of papal trust, and have placed their trust in your regime. »

In a sermon given in Munich during 1937, Cardinal Faulhaber declared :

« At a time when the heads of the major nations in the world faced the new Germany with reserve and considerable suspicion, the Catholic Church, the greatest moral power on earth, through the Concordat, expressed its confidence in the new German government. This was a deed of immeasurable significance for the reputation of the new government abroad. »

The « Treaty with Additional Protocol » was signed July 20th, 1933. It was ratified and in force starting on 10 September 1933 and remains in force today. The text of the Concordat was released 22 July 1933 and began with a preamble that set-out the common desire of both parties for friendly relations set-out in a solemn agreement.

His Holiness Pope Pius XI and the President of the German « Reich » (Paul von Hindenburg) , led by their common desire to consolidate and enhance the existing friendly relations between the Catholic Church and the State in the whole territory of the German « Reich » in a stable and satisfactory manner for both parties, have decided to conclude a solemn agreement which will supplement the concordats already concluded with some particular German States (« Länder ») and secure for the others the principles of a uniform treatment of the questions involved.

His Holiness Pope Pius XI has appointed as his pleni-potentiary (a diplomat granted full-power to represent) His Eminence the Most Revered Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, His Holiness' Secretary of State ; and the President of the German « Reich » (Paul von Hindenburg) has appointed as pleni-potentiary the Vice-Chairman of the German « Reich » , « Herr » Franz von Papen ; who, having exchanged their proper form have agreed to the following articles.

« Additional Protocol »

When the signing of the concordat concluded today between the Holy-See and the German « Reich » , the undersigned, being duly empowered to do so, have formulated the following explanations which form an integral part of the concordat itself.

Article I : The German « Reich » guarantees freedom of profession and public practice of the Catholic religion. It recognizes the right of the Catholic Church to regulate and manage her own affairs independently within the limits of the law applicable to all and to issue (within the framework of her own competence) laws and ordinances binding on her members.

The vagueness of the article would later lead to contradictory interpretations.

Article 2 : The concordats concluded with Bavaria (1924) , Prussia (1929) , and Baden (1932) and the rights and privileges of the Catholic Church recognized therein remain unchanged within the territory of the States (« Länder ») concerned. For the rest of the States, provisions of the present concordat shall be fully applicable. These provisions shall also be binding for the said 3 States in so far as they are relative to matters not regulated by the concordats concluded with those States, or in so far as they complete the arrangements already made.

Affirms the State concordats, « Länderkonkordate » , with Bavaria (1924) , Prussia (1929) , and Baden (1932) remain valid.

Article 3 : In order to foster good relations between the Holy-See and the German « Reich » , an apostolic Nuncio will continue to reside, as hitherto, in the capital of the German « Reich » and an ambassador of the German « Reich » will reside with the Holy-See.

(With regard to Article 3 : In accordance to the exchange between the apostolic nunciature and the « Reich » foreign office on the 11 and 12 March respectively, the apostolic Nuncio to the German « Reich » shall be the dean of the diplomatic corps accredited in Berlin.)

Confirms the Vatican having a Papal Nuncio (diplomat) in Berlin and the German government having an ambassador in Rome.

Article 4 : The Holy-See shall enjoy full freedom in its contact and correspondence with the Bishops, clergy and all other members of the Catholic Church in Germany. The same applies to the Bishops and other diocesan authorities in their contact with the faithful in all matters of their pastoral office. Instructions, ordinances, pastoral letters, official diocesan gazettes and other enactments concerning the spiritual guidance of the faithful, issued by the ecclesiastical authorities within the framework of their competence, may be published without hindrance and made known to the faithful in the ways heretofore usual.

Article 4 assures the Holy-See of full freedom to communicate with the German clergy and for the German Bishops to communicate with the laity « in all matters of their pastoral office » . The words of qualification in this clause would later be interpreted by the Nazis in its most narrow meaning to limit the Church communications to worship and ritual only.

Article 5 : The clergy enjoy in the discharge of their spiritual activities the same protection of the State as State officials. The State will proceed according to general provisions of its law in case of any outrage directed against any clergy personally or against their ecclesiastical character or in case of any interference with duties of their office and, if necessary, will provide official protection.

Article 6 : Clerics and religious are exempt from the obligation to undertake public offices and such obligations as are incompatible with their clerical or religious status. This applies particularly to the office of magistrate, member of a jury in law courts, membership of taxation committees or membership of the fiscal tribunal.

Article 7 : A member of the clergy can accept an official function or appointment in the State or in any publicly constituted corporation dependent on the State only after having received the « Nihil obstat » of his diocesan ordinary (Bishop) , as well as that of the ordinary competent for the place where the seat of the corporation is situated. For important reasons in which the interests of the Church are involved, the « Nihil obstat » can be withdrawn at any time.

Article 8 : The official income of the clergy is exempt from distraint to the same extent as the official salary of the civil servants of the « Reich » and of the States.

Article 9 : The judicial and other authorities cannot ask the clergy to give information about matters which have been entrusted to them while exercising the care of souls and which are consequently covered by the obligation of pastoral secrecy.

Article 10 : The wearing of clerical dress or of a religious habit by lay persons or by clerics or religious who have been forbidden to wear it on the strength of a final and valid decision of the competent Church authority (officially communicated to the State authorities) shall be punished by the State with the same penalties as the misuse of a military uniform.

Articles 5 to 10 dealt with the status of the clergy under German law. Priests were given protection against any interference in their spiritual activities as well as protection against malicious slander or misuse of clerical dress. Exemption from jury service, and like obligations, was guaranteed and the secrecy of the confessional guaranteed. Members of the clergy could only accept a State appointment so long as the Bishop approved and this permission could be withdrawn at any time for important reasons.

Article 11 : The present organization and delimitation (boundaries) of the Roman Catholic dioceses in the German « Reich » remains at it is. If, however, the re-arrangement of a bishopric or of an ecclesiastical province, or any other changes in the delimitation of diocese appear necessary in the future, they will be subject to agreement with the government of the State concerned in case that they involve changes only with boundaries of one German State (« Land ») . In case of re-arrangement of changes which exceed the boundaries of one German State, the agreement is to be made with the « Reich » government, to whose care it shall be left secure the consent of the State governments in question. The same applies to the establishment of new ecclesiastical provinces or alterations therein if these involve several German States. The foregoing provisions are not applicable to the shifting of boundaries which is made only with regard to the local care of souls. In case of a wider re-organization within the German « Reich » , the « Reich » government shall consult with the Holy-See with a view to such regrouping of dioceses and to their delimitation.

Article 12 : Without prejudice to the provisions of Article 11, ecclesiastical offices can be freely established and altered if no subsidy is asked for from the State funds. The co-operation of the State in establishing and changing the parish communities shall proceed according to the rules which have been arranged with the diocesan Bishops ; the « Reich » government will endeavor to achieve a uniform formulation by the State governments of their rules as far as possible.

Articles 11-12 specified that diocesan boundaries had to be made subject to government approval and that ecclesiastical offices could be established if no State funding was involved.

Article 13 : Catholic parishes and diocesan associations, episcopal sees, bishoprics and chapters, religious orders and congregations, as well as institutions, foundations and property of the Catholic Church administered by ecclesiastical authorities, shall retain or acquire respectively juridical personality, recognized by the State according to the general provisions of civil law. They shall remain publicly recognized corporations as far as they have been such hitherto ; the same rights may be granted to the others in accordance with the general law applicable to all.

(With regard to Article 13 : It is understood that the right of the Church to levy taxes is guaranteed.)

Article 13 gave to parishes, Episcopal sees, religious orders etc. juridical personality and granted the same rights as any other publicly recognised body « in accordance with the general law as applicable to all » which subjected the church's prerogatives' to legal regulation under civil law. Günter Lewy viewed this qualification as establishing « a Pandora's box of troubles » when the law was effectively in the hands of a regime who wanted to control the church.

Article 14 : As a rule, the Church has the right to appoint freely to all the Church dignities and benefices without any co-operation on the part of the State or of the civil corporations, unless any other arrangement has been made in previous concordats mentioned in Article 2. As far as the appointment to the metropolitan see of Freiburg, in the diocese of the Upper-Rhine, shall be applicable to the 2 suffragan (subordinate) bishoprics of Rottenburg and Mainz, as well as to the bishoprics of Meissen. The same applies in the said 2 suffragan bishoprics as regards the appointments to the cathedral chapters and the settlement of the rights of patronage. Furthermore, agreement has been reached on the following points.

(i) Catholic clerics who enjoy a spiritual office in Germany or exercise there a pastoral or educational activity, must :

(a) be German citizens,

(b) have obtained a school certificate (certificate of maturity) entitling them to study at a higher-German school,

(c) have studied philosophy and theology for at least 3 years at a German State university, an academic ecclesiastical college in Germany or a papal high-school in Rome.

(ii) The Bulls containing appointments of archbishops, Bishops, co-adjutors « cum iure successionis » (right of succession) or of a « prelati nullis » (a Bishop who has jurisdiction independent of a diocese) will not be issued

before the name of the selected has been communicated to the « Reichsstatthalter » in the State (« Land ») in question, and before it has been ascertained that there are no objections of a general political nature against such a person. The conditions laid down above (i) par (a) , (b) , (c) , can be discarded by mutual agreement between Church and State.

(With regard to Article 14, paragraph 2, section 2 : It is understood that if objection of a general political nature exist, they shall be presented as soon as possible. Should they not be presented within 20 days, the Holy-See will be entitled to believe there are no objections against the candidate in question. Before an official announcement of the appointment is made, secrecy shall be kept about the candidates concerned. This article does not establish for the State a right to veto.)

Article 14 specified appointments of a Bishop by the Pope was subject to mutual agreement and communication with the regime that no general political impediment existed, while affirming appointments are free to make without any co-operation on the part of the State or civil corporations.

Article 15 : Religious orders and congregations are not subject, on the part of the State, to any particular restrictions as far as their foundation, their various establishments, the number of their members and their qualifications (save, however, for the provisions of Article 15, paragraph 2) , their pastoral or educational activity, their care of the sick and charitable work, the management of their affairs and the administration of their property are concerned. Superiors of religious orders who have their official residence, within the German « Reich » must have German citizenship. Provincials and superiors whose official residence is situated outside the German territory have the right of visitation of their establishments in Germany, even if they have a foreign citizenship. The Holy-See will see to it that the organization of the provinces of various religious orders, as regards their establishments in Germany, should be such as to avoid (so far as it can be done) the subordination of German establishments to foreign provincials. Exceptions therefrom may be admitted by mutual agreement with the « Reich » government, particularly in cases where the small number of establishments in Germany makes the formation of German province impracticable or where special reasons exist for the maintenance of a provincial organization rooted in history and working well in practice.

Article 15 guaranteed religious orders freedom for pastoral, charitable and educational work.

Article 16 : Before taking possession of their diocese, the Bishops shall take an oath of loyalty either between the hands of the « Reichsstatthalter » in the State (« Land ») in question or between those of the president of the « Reich » , the formula of which shall be the following :

« Before God and on the Holy Gospel, I swear and promise, as becomes a Bishop, loyalty to the German « Reich » and to the « Land » of ... I swear and promise to respect the government established according to the constitution and to cause the clergy of my diocese to respect it. In the due solicitude for the welfare and the interests of the German « Reich » , I will endeavor, while performing the spiritual office bestowed upon me, to prevent anything which might threaten to be detrimental to it. »

Article 16 specified Bishops must take an oath of loyalty and respect to either the « Reich » governor of the State concerned or to the President of the « Reich » , as established by the constitution. When the treaty was signed and ratified, the word « Reich » , or the phrase, « German “ Reich ” » , is not in reference to the 3rd « Reich » , but rather, as it applies to the period of the Weimar Republic which did not officially and fully collapse until the death of President Paul von Hindenburg on 2 August 1934 with the passing of a national referendum vote on 19 August 1934 consolidating the Office of Chancellor and President, thereby, declaring Adolf Hitler « Führer » of Germany.

Article 17 : The property and all other proprietary rights of the publicly recognized corporations, institutions, foundations and associations of the Catholic Church will be guaranteed according to the common law of the State. No building used for public worship can be demolished under any pretext or for any reason whatsoever, except if a mutual agreement has been reached beforehand with the competent ecclesiastical authority.

(With regard to Article 17 : In so far as building or land belonging to the State have been devoted to ecclesiastical purposes, they will continue to be devoted to them, with due regard, however, to the contracts which might have been concluded about them.)

Article 17 guaranteed, according to the common law, the properties of the church.

Article 18 : Should the State payments in kind or money, which are made to the Catholic Church, whether based on law, contract, or any other special legal title, be discontinued, the Holy-See and the « Reich » will proceed in due time beforehand to set-up amicable agreement the principles according to which the discontinuation is to be carried-out. In this connection, a right derived from a legitimate traditional custom is to be considered as a special legal title. Such discontinuation, implying the cessation of a State payment or obligation, must be adequately compensated in favor of the claimant.

Article 18 assured the Church that it would be consulted should the Nazi regime (or existing government) try to discontinue its subsidies to the German Catholic church, or other legal title without compensation as specified in Article 138 of the Weimar Constitution for all religious organizations.

Article 19 : Catholic theological faculties in State universities shall be maintained. Their relationship to the Church authorities will be regulated by the provisions of the respective concordats and by the protocols annexed to them, with due regard to the ecclesiastical laws relative to these faculties. The « Reich » will endeavor to secure for all German Catholic faculties in question a uniform regime in accordance with the general spirit of the regulations concerned.

(With regard to Article 19, sentence 2 : The basis referred to consists, at the time when this concordat is being concluded, especially of the Apostolic Constitution « Deus scienitarum dominus » of 24 May 1931, and the Instruction of 7 May-July 1932.)

Article 20 : The Church has the right unless there is some other agreement, to establish theological and philosophical colleges for the training of clergy ; if no State subsidies are claimed for these institutions, they will be dependent solely

on the ecclesiastical authorities. The establishment, management and administration of seminaries and hostels for clerical students pertains exclusively, within the limits of the law applicable to all, to ecclesiastical authorities.

(With regard to Article 20 : Hostels connected with high and secondary schools and administered by the Church will be recognized, from the taxation stand-point, as being in practice ecclesiastical institutions in the proper sense of the word, and as of diocesan origin.)

Article 21 : Catholic religious instruction in primary, vocational, secondary and higher-schools is a regular subject of tuition and is to be taught in accordance with the principles of the Catholic Church. In religious instruction the patriotic, civic and social consciousness and sense of duty will be particularly stressed and cultivated, as this is generally done in the school training. The teaching program of religious education and the selection of text-books will be settled with by agreement with the higher-ecclesiastical authorities. These authorities will be given the opportunity to control, in harmony with the school authorities, whether pupils are receiving religious instruction in accordance with the teaching and requirements of the Church.

Article 22 : Mutual agreements shall be arrived at between the Bishops and the governments of German States (« Länder ») with regard to the appointment of the teachers of religion. Teachers who have been declared by the Bishop unfit for the further exercise of their teaching function, either for pedagogical reasons or on account of their moral behaviour, must not be employed as teachers of religion as long as the obstacle remains.

Article 23 : The maintenance of the existing Catholic confessional schools and the establishment of new ones is hereby guaranteed. In all localities where parents or guardians request it, Catholic primary schools will be established if the number of their prospective pupils, considered from the point of view of the local school conditions, appears to be sufficient for the establishment of a school corresponding to the standards prescribed by the State legislation.

Article 24 : Only members of the Catholic Church who can be trusted that they will correspond to the special requirements of a Catholic confessional school, can be employed as teachers in all Catholic primary schools. Within the framework of the professional training of teachers, arrangements will be made to guarantee the education and training of Catholic teachers capable of fulfilling the special requirements of Catholic confessional schools.

(With regard to Article 24 : In so far, private institutions are able to satisfy, after the new regulations regarding the education of teachers, the general applicable requirements of the State, the existing establishments of religious orders and congregations will be given due consideration in the accordance of recognition.)

Article 25 : Religious orders and congregations have the right to establish and run private schools within the limits of the general legislation and conditions laid down by the law. The same qualifications as in State schools can be acquired in these private schools if they follow the teaching program prescribed for State schools. Members of religious orders and congregations are subject, with regard to their employment in private schools, to the general conditions applicable to all.

Articles 19 to 25 gave protection to the Catholic educational system (Hitler, in due course, would disregard them) .

Article 26 : Pending a later and more detail settlement of matters regarding matrimonial law, it is understood that a church wedding may proceed the civil marriage ceremony not only in the case of a grave illness of one of the finances which does not permit any delay, but in the case of great moral emergency (which, however, must be confirmed by the competent episcopal authority) . In such cases, the parish priest is bound to report the matter at once to the registrar's office.

(With regard to Article 26 : A great moral emergency is considered existing if the procuring of time of documents necessary for the wedding meets with obstacles which are either insuperable or whose removal would be disproportionately costly.)

Article 26 allowed that a church wedding could precede a civil marriage ceremony.

Article 27 : A special and exempt pastoral ministry is conceded to the officers, employees and men of the Germany army and to their families. An army Bishop will be in charge of this pastoral care. His ecclesiastical appointment will be effected by the Holy-See after contact has been made with the « Reich » government in order to select, by mutual agreement, a suitable candidate. The ecclesiastical appointment of the military chaplains and other military clergy will be made by the military Bishop after previous consultation with the competent authorities of the « Reich » . The army Bishop can, however, appoint as military chaplains only such priest who have obtained, from their ordinary, permission to engage in military pastoral work and who have obtained an appropriate certificate of fitness. Military chaplains have the rights of parish priests with regard to the troops and other army personnel assigned to their care. An apostolic brief will be issued to regulate in detail the Catholic care of souls in the army. Regulations about the position of army chaplains as State officials will be issued by the « Reich » government.

(With regard to Article 27, sentence 2 : Catholic army officers, personnel and men, as well as their families, do not belong to the local parish communities and are not to contribute to their maintenance. With regard to sentence 4 : The apostolic brief will be issued in agreement of the « Reich » government.)

Article 27 regulated the appointment of military chaplains.

Article 28 : The Church will be admitted to pastoral visits and to the holding of divine service in hospitals, prisons, and similar public institutions. If a regular care of souls, requiring appointment of clergy as State or public officials, is introduced in such institutions, this will be made by agreement with the higher-Church authorities.

Article 28 assured the Church the right to pastoral care in hospitals, prisons and like institutions, which would be violated later by the Nazi regime when it refused the Church's request to carry-out services in concentration camps.

Article 29 : Catholic members of non-German national minorities living within the « Reich » will not be placed in a worse status with regard to the use of their mother tongue in divine service, religious instruction and Church societies,

than is the corresponding legal and practical position of the population of German origin and speech living in the territory of the corresponding foreign State.

(With regard to Article 29 : Since the « Reich » government has shown itself ready to make concessions with regard to non-German minorities, the Holy-See declares - confirming hereby the principles which it has constantly maintained regarding the right of using the vernacular in the pastoral ministry, religious instruction and in the activities of Catholic associations - that it will keep in mind, when concluding future concordats with other countries, the inclusion in them of provisions of a similar value for the rights of German minorities there.)

Article 29 granted the same rights to national minorities, with respect to the use of the mother tongue in divine services, as were enjoyed by the German population in the corresponding foreign State.

Article 30 : On Sundays and Holy Days, a prayer will be said for the welfare of the German « Reich » and its people in episcopal, parish, affiliated and conventional churches in the German « Reich » , immediately after the High-Mass and according to the rules of the Church liturgy.

Article 31 : Catholic organizations and associations whose activity is devoted exclusively to religious, purely cultural and charitable purposes and which are, as such, subordinated to Church authorities, are protected as to their institution and activities. Catholic organizations which, apart from religious cultural or charitable purposes, have other tasks such as social or professional aims, shall also enjoy the protection of this Article 31, paragraph 1, even though their organization may be disposed in associations corresponding to States (« Länder ») , provided they guarantee to develop their activities outside political Parties. It is reserved to the « Reich » government and the German episcopate (Bishops) to determine by mutual agreement, the organizations and associations which fall within the provisions of this article.

(With regard to Article 31, paragraph 4 : The principles laid down in paragraph 4 of this article are equally valid for the labour service.)

Article 32 : With regard to the special conditions existing in Germany and with regard to the provisions of the present concordat guaranteeing legislation to protect the rights and privileges of the Catholic Church in the « Reich » and its States (« Länder ») , the Holy-See will issue ordinances by which the clergy and the religious will be forbidden to be members of political Parties or to be active on their behalf.

(With regard to Article 32 : It is understood that the same provisions, regarding activity in political Parties, will be enacted by the « Reich » for the non-Catholic confessions. The conduct which has been stipulated as a duty for the German clergy and members of religious in Article 32 does not mean any restriction on their preaching and exposition of the dogmatic and moral teachings and principles of the Church, as it is their duty to do.)

Articles 31 and 32 relate to the issue of Catholic organizations « devoted exclusively to religious, cultural and charitable purposes » and empowered the « Reich » government and German episcopate to « determine, by mutual

agreement, the organizations and associations which fall within the provisions of this article » . Organizations (sponsored by the Catholic Church) that had any political aims no longer had any place in the new Germany ; this went without saying and not even mentioned. Article 32 gave to Hitler one of his principal objectives : the exclusion of the clergy from politics such that « the Holy-See will issue ordinances by which the clergy and the religious will be forbidden to be members of political Parties or to be active on their behalf » . Catholic laity, however, were free to form, engage and propagate political Parties and seek political office. The « Additional Protocol » provisions make clear this prohibition of clergy from political activism does not mean they can not preach on moral teachings and principles of the Church « as it is their duty to do » .

Article 33 : All matters regarding clerical persons or Church affairs which have not been mentioned in the preceding articles will be settled, for the sphere of the Church, according to canon law in force. Should a divergence arise, in the future, as to the interpretation or application of any provisions of this concordat, the Holy-See and the German « Reich » will arrive at an amicable solution by mutual agreement.

Article 34 : This Concordat, whose German and Italian texts shall have equal binding force, shall be ratified and the certificates of ratification shall be exchanged as soon as possible. It will be enforced from the day of exchange. In witness hereof the plenipotentiaries (representatives) have signed this Concordat. Signed in the 2 original exemplars, in the Vatican City, on 30 July 1933. Signed : Eugenio, Cardinal Pacelli. Signed : Franz von Papen.

Article 33 makes provision for settling any difficulties in interpretation of the concordat through « amicable solution by mutual agreement » . Article 34 calls for the speedy ratification of the concordat. As the document states : It was not in force until its ratification on 10 September 1933.

Additional protocol was added at its signing. When the concordat was ratified on 10 September 1933, it granted Catholic clergy certain exemptions from any future universal army conscription call-ups.

As Article 27 states :

« A special and exempt ministry is conceded ... »

As the Treaty of Versailles had forbidden Germany from raising a large army. This provision may have been seen by Hitler as the Vatican giving its tacit approval to German re-armament.

Von Papen wrote to Hitler regarding this secret provision and concluded his brief with « I hope this agreement will therefore be pleasing to you » . The provisions of the annexe were inserted at the request of the German Bishops' Fulda Conference and the contents were kept so secret that Ernst von Weizsacker, State Secretary in the Foreign Ministry from 1938, did not know of it until informed by the Papal Nuncio Orsenigo in 1939.

The British Roman Catholic periodical « The Tablet » reported the signing of the Concordat :

« Already, it is being said that THE POPE OF ROME thinks of nobody save his own adherents and that he does not care how Lutherans are dragooned and how Jews are harried so long as Popish Bishops, monastic orders, confessional schools, and Catholic associations are allowed full-freedom. We beg our Protestant and Jewish friends to put away such suspicions. As we suggested at the outset of this brief article, the Catholic Church could have done little for other denominations in Germany if she had begun thrusting-out wild hands to help them while her own feet were slipping under her. By patience and reasonableness, she has succeeded in re-establishing herself, more firmly than before, on a Concordat which does not surrender one feather's weight of essential Catholic principle. She will straightway set about her sacred task, an important part of which will be the casting-out of those devils which have been raging (and are raging still) in the " Reich ". But " this sort " of devil is not cast-out save by prayer. Political action (from which the German clergy are debarred under the Concordat) by the Church would drive matters from bad to worse. We are confident, however, that Catholics will abhor the idea of enjoying complete toleration while Protestants and Jews are under the harrow, and that, quietly but strongly, the Catholic influence will be exerted in the right direction. 1 German out of 3 is a Catholic ; and Catholic prestige is high in Germany's public life. »

Criticism of the Concordat was initially from those countries who viewed Germany as a potential threat.

« Le Temps » wrote :

« This is a triumph for the National-Socialist government. It took Mussolini 5 years to achieve this ; Germany has done it in a week. »

« L'Ère Nouvelle » wrote :

« The contradiction of a system preaching universalism making an agreement with a highly-nationalistic State has been repeated throughout Vatican history. The Church never attacks existing institutions, even if they are bad. It prefers to wait for their collapse, hoping for the emergence of a higher-morality. »

The Polish newspaper « Kurjer Poranny » wrote on 19 July 1933 :

« Once again, we see the methods of the Vatican - intransigent with the passive and amenable, but accommodating with the high-handed and ruthless. In the last Century, it rewarded its persecutor, Bismarck, with the highest Papal decoration, the Order of Christ. The Centre Party, which most courageously resisted the Nazis, has been disowned by the Vatican. Ex-Chancellor Heinrich Brüning reported that 300 Protestant pastors who had been on the verge of joining the Catholic Church on account of the stand it had taken against the Nazis abandoned the plan after the signing of the Concordat. »

On 24 July, the Nazi newspaper « Völkischer Beobachter » commented :

« The provocative agitation which for years was conducted against the NSDAP because of its alleged hostility to religion has now been refuted by the Church itself. This fact signifies a tremendous moral strengthening of the

National-Socialist government of the “ Reich ” and its reputation. »

On 26 and 27 July 1933, the Vatican daily newspaper « L'Osservatore Romano » stressed the advantages gained by the Church through the Concordat but also insisted that the Church had not given-up her traditional neutrality towards different forms of political government nor did it endorse a « specific trend of political doctrines or ideas » . The Nazis replied through the German press on 30 July by correcting perceived false interpretations of the Concordat and « reminding the Vatican » that the Concordat had been signed with the German « Reich » which « as Rome should know, is completely dominated by the National-Socialist trend » and, therefore, « the “ de facto ” and “ de jure ” recognition of the National-Socialist government » was signaled by the Concordat. The Vatican demanded that the German government dissociate itself from these remarks but agreed eventually to forget its complaints so long as the German press refrained from any further « harping on the great victory » achieved by Nazi Germany.

Nazi violations of the Concordat commenced almost immediately after it was signed. The Nazis claimed jurisdiction over all collective and social activity, interfering with Catholic schooling, youth groups, workers' clubs and cultural societies. Hitler had a « blatant disregard » for the Concordat, wrote Paul O'Shea, and its signing was to him merely a 1st step in the « gradual suppression of the Catholic Church in Germany » . Anton Gill wrote that « with his usual irresistible, bullying technique, Hitler then proceeded to take a mile where he had been given an inch » and closed all Catholic institutions whose functions weren't strictly religious :

« It quickly became clear that Hitler intended to imprison the Catholics, as it were, in their own churches. They could celebrate mass and retain their rituals as much as they liked, but they could have nothing at all to do with German society otherwise. Catholic schools and newspapers were closed, and a propaganda campaign against the Catholics was launched. »

(Extract from « An Honourable Defeat » by Anton Gill.)

According to Paul O'Shea, Hitler had a « blatant disregard » for the Concordat, and its signing was to him merely a 1st step in the « gradual suppression of the Catholic Church in Germany » . Almost immediately after signing the Concordat, the Nazis promulgated their sterilization law (the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Off-spring) an offensive policy in the eyes of the Catholic Church. Days later, moves began to dissolve the Catholic Youth League. Clergy, nuns and lay leaders began to be targeted, leading to thousands of arrests over the ensuing years, often on trumped-up charges of currency smuggling or « immorality » . Priests were watched closely and frequently denounced, arrested and sent to concentration camps. From 1940, a dedicated Clergy Barracks had been established at Dachau concentration camp. Intimidation of clergy was wide-spread. Cardinal Faulhaber was shot at. Cardinal Innitzer had his Vienna residence ransacked in October 1938 and Bishop Sproll of Rottenburg was jostled and his home vandalised.

William Shirer wrote that :

« The German people were not greatly aroused by the persecution of the churches by the Nazi Government. The great majority were not moved to face death or imprisonment for the sake of freedom of worship, being too impressed by

Hitler's early foreign policy successes and the restoration of the German economy. Few, he said, paused to reflect that the Nazi regime intended to destroy Christianity in Germany, if it could, and substitute the old paganism of the early tribal Germanic gods and the new paganism of the Nazi extremists. »

Anti-Nazi sentiment grew in Catholic circles as the Nazi government increased its repressive measures against their activities.

In his history of the German Resistance, Hoffmann writes that, from the beginning :

« The Catholic Church could not silently accept the general persecution, regimentation or oppression, nor in particular the sterilization law of summer 1933. Over the years, until the outbreak of War, Catholic resistance stiffened until finally its most eminent spokesman was the Pope himself with his Encyclical “ Mit brennender Sorge ” of 14 March 1937, read from all German Catholic pulpits. »

(Extract from « The History of the German Resistance 1933-1945 » by Peter Hoffmann.)

After constant confrontations, by late-1935, Bishop August von Galen of Munich was urging a joint pastoral letter protesting an « underground War » against the church. By early 1937, the church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, had become highly-disillusioned. In March, Pope Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical - accusing the Nazi Government of violations of the 1933 Concordat, and further that it was sowing the « tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » . The Nazis responded with, an intensification of the « Church Struggle » , beginning around April.

When the Nazi government violated the concordat (in particular, Article 31) , the Bishops and the Papacy protested against these violations. Pius XI considered terminating the concordat, but his Secretary of State and members of the curia, who feared the impact upon German Catholics, dissuaded him, as they believed it would result in the loss of a protective shield. Cardinal Pacelli acknowledged his role in its retention after the War.

The flourishing Catholic press of Germany faced censorship and closure. Finally, in March 1941, Josef Gœbbels banned all Church press, on the pretext of a « paper shortage » . Catholic schools were a major battle-ground in the « Kirchenkampf » campaign against the Church. When, in 1933, the Nazi school superintendent of Münster issued a decree that religious instruction be combined with discussion of the « demoralising power » of the « people of Israel » , Bishop August von Galen of Munich refused, writing that such interference « in curriculum » was a breach of the Concordat and that he feared children would be confused as to their « obligation to act with charity to all men » and as to the historical mission of the people of Israel. Often, Galen protested directly to Hitler over violations of the Concordat. When, in 1936, Nazis removed crucifixes in school, protest by Galen led to public demonstration. Church kindergartens were closed, crucifixes were removed from schools and Catholic welfare programs were restricted on the basis they assisted the « racially unfit » . Parents were coerced into removing their children from Catholic schools. In Bavaria, teaching positions formerly allotted to nuns were awarded to secular teachers and denominational schools

transformed into « Community schools ». When, in 1937, the authorities in Upper-Bavaria attempted to replace Catholic schools with « common schools », Cardinal Faulhaber offered fierce resistance. By 1939, all Catholic denominational schools had been disbanded or converted to public facilities.

From 1940, the « Gestapo » launched an intense persecution of the monasteries ; invading, searching and appropriating them. The Provincial of the Dominican Province of Teutonia, Laurentius Siemer, a spiritual leader of the German Resistance was influential in the Committee for Matters Relating to the Orders, which formed in response to Nazi attacks against Catholic monasteries and aimed to encourage the Bishops to intercede on behalf of the Orders and oppose the Nazi State more emphatically.

With the expansion of the War in the East from 1941, there came also an expansion of the regime's attack on the churches. Monasteries and convents were targeted and expropriation of Church properties surged. The Nazi authorities claimed that the properties were needed for War-time necessities such as hospitals, or accommodation for refugees or children, but, in fact, used them for their own purposes. « Hostility to the State » was another common cause give for the confiscations, and the action of a single member of a monastery could result in seizure of the whole. The Jesuits were especially targeted. The Papal Nuncio Cesare Orsenigo and Cardinal Bertram complained constantly to the authorities but were told to expect more requisitions owing to War-time needs.

Figures like Bishops August von Galen and Konrad von Preysing attempted to protect German priests from arrest. In Galen's famous 1941 anti-euthanasia sermons, he denounced the confiscations of church properties. He attacked the « Gestapo » for converting church properties to their own purposes - including use as cinemas and brothels. He protested the mistreatment of Catholics in Germany : the arrests and imprisonment without legal process, the suppression of the monasteries and the expulsion of religious orders.

On 22 March 1942, the German Bishops issued a pastoral letter on « The Struggle against Christianity and the Church ». The letter launched a defence of human rights and the rule of law and accused the « Reich » Government of « unjust oppression and hated struggle against Christianity and the Church », despite the loyalty of German Catholics to the Fatherland, and brave service of Catholic soldiers :

« For years, a War has raged in our Fatherland against Christianity and the Church, and has never been conducted with such bitterness. Repeatedly the German Bishops have asked the “ Reich ” Government to discontinue this fatal struggle ; but, unfortunately, our appeals and our endeavours were without success. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops, dated 22 March 1942.)

In July 1942, Hitler said he viewed the Concordat as obsolete, and intended to abolish it after the War, and only hesitated to withdraw Germany's representative from the Vatican out of « military reasons connected with the War » :

« Once the War is over, we will put a swift end to the Concordat. It will give me the greatest personal pleasure to point out to the Church all those occasions on which it has broken the terms of it. One need only recall the close co-

operation between the Church and the murderers of Heydrich. Catholic priests not only allowed them to hide in a church on the outskirts of Prague, but even allowed them to entrench themselves in the sanctuary of the altar. »

(Adolf Hitler, from a transcript in « Hitler's Table Talk » , dated 4 July 1942.)

(This accusation by Hitler is unjustified, as the protectors of Heydrich's killers were actually Orthodox.)

Pius XII put a high-priority on preserving the Concordat from the Nazi era, although the Bishops were un-enthusiastic about it and the Allies considered the request inappropriate. After the War, the Concordat remained in place and the Church was restored to its previous position.

When Lower-Saxony adopted a new school law, the Holy-See complained that it violated the terms of the concordat. The federal government called upon the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany (« Bundesverfassungsgericht ») for clarification. In its ruling on 26 March 1957, the Court decided that the circumstances surrounding the conclusion of the concordat did not invalidate it.

Declaring itself incompetent in matters of public international law and considering the fact that the Basic Law grants authority in school matters to the States of Germany, it ruled that the federal government had no authority to intervene. So, while the federal government was obligated by the concordat, it could not enforce its application in all areas as it lacks legal authority to do so.

Critics also allege that the concordat undermined the separation of Church and State. The Weimar constitution (some of whose regulations, namely Articles 136 to 139 and 141, have been included into today's Basic Law by Article 140) does not speak of a « separation » , but rather rules-out any State religion while protecting religious freedom, religious holidays and leaving open the possibility of cooperation. However, there is an on-going conflict between Article 18 of the concordat and Article 138 of the Weimar constitution.

L'Église catholique d'Allemagne face au Nazisme

L'Église catholique d'Allemagne et le Nazisme traite des relations entre l'Église catholique allemande (notamment le clergé) et le pouvoir nazi depuis la période qui précède l'arrivée au pouvoir du Parti national-socialiste des travailleurs allemands, en janvier 1933, jusqu'à la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, en mai 1945.

Jusqu'en 1930, la hiérarchie épiscopale s'exprime peu sur le mouvement nazi en expansion. Peu à peu, la contagion des esprits par le néo-paganisme nazi et les succès électoraux du NSDAP, à partir de 1930, font apparaître l'urgence du danger aux yeux des catholiques.

Les évêques, par la voix de la Conférence Épiscopale de Fulda, sont alors amenés à prendre officiellement position en déclarant qu'on ne peut être à la fois catholique et nazi (1931) .

Arrivé au pouvoir en janvier 1933, Adolf Hitler signe dès le 20 juillet un concordat définissant les relations de l'État allemand avec l'Église catholique ce que l'ancien nonce apostolique à Berlin et futur Pie XII n'avait pu obtenir de la part de la République de Weimar, entraînant l'illusion chez beaucoup de catholiques d'un respect des Nazis pour les institutions catholiques.

Dès lors, l'attitude de l'Église catholique sera un mélange d'accommodement, de tentatives d'intégration à l'intérieur du système nazi d'une part (levée de l'interdiction faite en 1931 aux catholiques d'appartenir au Parti nazi en 1934) , et de résistances aux empiétements du pouvoir qui violaient le concordat, d'autre part.

En effet, pour le chancelier Hitler, le concordat doit être un moyen de neutraliser l'Église catholique.

Le concordat, signé « en dépit de nombreuses et graves considérations » afin d' « épargner à Nos fidèles fils et filles d'Allemagne, dans la mesure des possibilités humaines, les angoisses et les souffrances que dans l'autre hypothèse les circonstances du temps faisaient prévoir avec pleine certitude » et afin de ne pas refuser de « tendre la main pacifique et maternelle de l'Église à quiconque ne la repousse pas » (introduction de l'encyclique « Mit brennender Sorge » condamnant l'attitude du gouvernement nazi et son idéologie) , devient vite une pomme de discorde entre le 3^e « Reich » , le Vatican et la hiérarchie ecclésiastique allemande.

En moins de 4 ans, les évêques allemands enverront 55 protestations au chancelier (devenu président en 1935) .

L'incompatibilité de la doctrine nazie avec celle de l'Église est au cœur de l'encyclique « Mit brennender Sorge » rédigée pour le pape Pie XI en 1937 par Eugenio Pacelli, futur Pie XII et ancien nonce en Bavière. Il s'agit du 1^{er} texte condamnant officiellement l'idéologie nationale-socialiste écrit par un chef religieux.

Écrite en allemand (et non en latin comme le veut l'usage) , introduite clandestinement en Allemagne, elle est lue en chaire par tous les curés d'Allemagne le 21 mars à l'occasion du Dimanche des rameaux.

À la suite de sa lecture publique dans les églises, 1,100 prêtres sont arrêtés.

Face aux persécutions puis à la déportation et à l'extermination des Juifs, l'Église d'Allemagne intervient en faveur des Juifs convertis au christianisme ou mariés à des catholiques, mais reste pratiquement silencieuse publiquement concernant les Juifs non catholiques.

Pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les catholiques allemands se montrent de bons patriotes.

Finalement, ce n'est qu'au sujet de l'eugénisme que l'Église catholique d'Allemagne parvient à faire reculer le pouvoir nazi. En tout, on dénombre 3 à 4 fois plus de prêtres catholiques envoyés en camp de concentration que de pasteurs protestants, alors que ces derniers étaient, à l'époque, 3 fois plus nombreux que les prêtres.

Dans le courant des années 1870, un conflit, le « Kulturkampf » , avait opposé les catholiques au chancelier Otto von

Bismarck qui présentait les catholiques comme un corps étranger à la nation allemande. À partir de 1880, le conflit s'était apaisé, mais les catholiques allemands, minoritaires dans un pays à majorité protestante, en ont gardé une sorte de complexe d'infériorité qui les pousse à prouver sans cesse qu'ils sont de bons et loyaux patriotes allemands.

Dans l'Allemagne de l'après-guerre, vaincue et humiliée, les catholiques et, en particulier, les mouvements de jeunesse participent à la montée du nationalisme et se plaisent à rêver d'un Empire allemand (« Reich ») dans lequel les principes chrétiens occuperaient une place importante.

Les catholiques sont 20 millions, concentrés en Bavière et en Rhénanie, minoritaires vis-à-vis des 40 millions de protestants. C'est une minorité que l'on peut qualifier d'active et de vigoureuse si l'on prend en compte ses 20,000 prêtres et ses 100,000 religieux (qui se comparent aux 16,000 pasteurs protestants), ainsi que ses organisations de masse comme la Ligue populaire des catholiques allemands (« Volksverein für das Katholische Deutschland ») qui regroupe 500,000 membres et 4,500 associations affiliées, ou encore ses mouvements de jeunesse (« Jugend Deutschland ») qui compte 1,500,000 adhérents en 1933.

À cela, il faut ajouter une presse, des écoles confessionnelles, et un Parti, le « Zentrum », qui recueillait plus de 80 % des suffrages catholiques au moment du « Kulturkampf », mais qui, sous la République de Weimar, n'en recueille plus que 60 %. Cependant, une disposition héritée du « Kulturkampf » interdit aux ecclésiastiques, sous peine d'un emprisonnement pouvant aller jusqu'à 2 ans, de prendre des positions politiques dans le cadre de leurs fonctions (donc notamment lors des sermons) : c'est le « Kanzelparagraph » , en vigueur depuis 1871.

Au début des années 1920, les évêques allemands sont majoritairement conservateurs et monarchistes. En 1922, lors de l'ouverture d'un Congrès national de catholiques, le cardinal von Faulhaber, archevêque de Munich qualifie la révolution de novembre 1918 qui avait renversé la monarchie d'« acte de haute trahison ».

Tout au long des années 1920, une minorité de catholiques fait corps avec le Parti national-socialiste (NSDAP) naissant. Ils sont attirés par l'anti-communisme, l'anti-libéralisme, l'anti-parlementarisme et l'anti-pacifisme du nouveau Parti.

Aux prêtres engagés dans l'aventure hitlérienne, la hiérarchie conseille de se montrer prudents. La hiérarchie épiscopale s'exprime peu sur le mouvement nazi en expansion. L'article 24 du programme du NSDAP demande « la liberté pour toutes les religions constituées dans la mesure où elles ne représentent pas un danger pour l'État ; le Parti soutient le christianisme positif » .

Interrogé par les journalistes catalans Eugenio Xammar et Josep Pla dans la journée du 8 novembre 1923 précédant le « Putsch de la brasserie », Adolf Hitler fait grief à Gustav von Kahr d'être trop timide dans le domaine des mesures anti-juives et attribue cette attitude au catholicisme de Gustav von Kahr, à la position du Vatican et à la « conspiration catholico-juive » .

En 1930, dans « le Mythe du XXe siècle », le théoricien nazi Alfred Rosenberg explique ce qu'il faut entendre par Christianisme positif : Il s'agit de créer une Église allemande, ancrée dans les forces issues du sang, de la race et du

sol, fondée sur un Nouveau Testament expurgé de superstitions, et libérée de l'Ancien Testament. Les écrits et les discours d'Adolf Hitler lui-même se montrent modérés vis-à-vis du catholicisme, entretenant ainsi aux yeux des catholiques une vision du « bon Führer » entouré de mauvais conseillers.

Aux élections de 1930, le NSDAP obtient, avec 18,5 % des voix, son 1^{er} succès électoral important. Le succès des Nazis est plus faible dans les régions à majorité catholique. Il n'empêche, le Parti nazi apparaît maintenant aux yeux des catholiques comme un rival du « Zentrum » et les évêques sont amenés à prendre position contre le Nazisme.

En novembre 1930, l'évêque de Mayence Monseigneur Ludwig Maria Hugo apporte son soutien à l'un de ses prêtres qui avait expliqué à ses paroissiens qu'il était interdit d'appartenir au Parti nazi, mais le même mois, Monseigneur Schreiber, évêque de Berlin, soutient la proposition inverse.

Le 5 mars 1931, une déclaration signée des 6 évêques de la province de Cologne assimile les erreurs du National-Socialisme à celles de l'Action française. Les évêques de Cologne ne soulèvent pas la question des conséquences pour un catholique d'adhérer au NSDAP. Toujours en mars 1931, les 3 évêques de la province de Paderborn déclarent inadmissible pour un catholique l'adhésion au Parti nazi et les évêques de Haute-Rhénanie adoptent une position similaire.

Les évêques allemands avaient l'habitude de se réunir régulièrement dans la petite ville de Fulda. La conférence de Fulda d'août 1931 n'adopte pas un amendement qui propose d'étendre au Parti nazi une directive de 1921 qui interdisait au catholique l'adhésion à des organisations qui poursuivaient des objectifs hostiles au christianisme : socialisme, franc-maçonnerie ou tout autre mouvement. La conférence de Fulda d'août 1931 adopte le texte suivant qui prend position contre le Nazisme :

« La lutte contre l'extrémisme, c'est-à-dire aussi bien contre l'extrémisme nationaliste que contre le socialisme et le communisme, doit être menée avec les données de la foi. »

Parallèlement à la prise de position des évêques, les représentants de toutes les grandes organisations catholiques se réunissent sous les auspices du VKD pour discuter des moyens d'endiguer la marée brune.

Les résultats des délibérations, publiés en 1931, reflètent une sorte de surenchère au nationalisme : le souhait est émis de créer un vaste mouvement populaire qui appuierait la campagne menée pour libérer le pays des chaînes du traité de Versailles, qui placerait les valeurs éducatives et nationales au centre des activités éducatives, qui accorderait plus d'attention aux minorités allemandes d'Europe centrale. Il est également noté que le peuple allemand doit se libérer de son assouvissement « à la ploutocratie et au capitalisme financier » .

Günter Lewy note :

« Il semble que ces dirigeants catholiques n'aient pas songé un seul instant qu'ils essayaient d'exorciser le démon avec l'aide de Belzébuth. »

Le monde catholique allemand n'est pas uniforme, et il a existé en son sein des critiques totales du Nazisme, mais la majorité des polémistes catholiques dirigent leurs coups contre le communisme. La plupart des critiques catholiques voient dans le Nazisme un fond sain, celui du nationalisme et de l'anti-bolchévisme, perverti par des éléments anti-chrétiens. Ils regrettent qu'il ait pris le caractère d'une philosophie de la vie, d'une « Weltanschauung » au lieu de rester un mouvement patriotique. La menace contre la démocratie n'inquiète pas vraiment les prélats catholiques qui sont souvent restés hostiles à la République de Weimar. L'opposition du Parti nazi aux écoles confessionnelles inquiète davantage l'Église que la menace dictatoriale.

En dehors des prises de position plus ou moins philosophiques, la participation des SA en uniforme est un motif de conflit entre l'Église catholique et les Nazis.

Les évêques bavarois, réunis à Freising le 12 février 1931, interdisent aux prêtres de prendre part au mouvement nazi, interdisent la présence de formations national-socialistes en uniforme dans les offices et mettent en garde les fidèles contre le National-Socialisme « aussi longtemps qu'il adhérera à un programme religieux et culturel incompatible avec la doctrine catholique » .

Entre 1928 et 1931, le Parti du centre catholique qui est la charnière des majorités parlementaires de la République de Weimar bascule du côté de son aile droite. Ludwig Kaas, un ecclésiastique, est élu à la tête du Parti. Avec son aide, Heinrich Brüning devient chef du groupe parlementaire et sa nomination comme chancelier en 1930 signifie la dislocation de la grande coalition qui en réunissant avec le Parti du Centre, les Sociaux-Démocrates, et le Parti du Peuple qui avait formé l'ossature de la République de Weimar. Brüning qui déclare être responsable devant la Nation davantage que devant le Parlement gouverne souvent par décret et conformément à la stratégie catholique, mène une politique étrangère nationaliste pour ne pas laisser ce terrain aux seuls Nazis. Aux élections de juillet 1932, ces derniers obtiennent 37,4 % des voix. Le Parti du Centre et son allié bavarois en obtiennent 15 % , soit 13 millions de voix, ce qui n'est pas un mauvais résultat, mais on estime que 2 millions de catholiques ont quand même voté pour les Nazis. La conférence des évêques de Fulda confirme quand même qu'il est « inexcusable que beaucoup de catholiques rejoignent le Parti national-socialiste » .

Le 30 mai 1932, le président Hindenburg renvoie Heinrich Brüning et le remplace par Franz von Papen, un catholique intrigant, membre du Parti du Centre et immédiatement exclu du Parti, mais des négociations se poursuivent entre Adolf Hitler et Brüning en vue de former un gouvernement d'union nationale. Ces contacts aboutissent dans un lers temps à l'élection du Nazi Hermann Göring à la présidence du « Reichstag » .

Ces négociations sèment la consternation parmi beaucoup de catholiques, notamment les membres du clergé qui voient de plus en plus de Nazis assister ostensiblement, en uniforme, aux offices catholiques.

Le 30 janvier 1933, appelé par Hindenburg et soutenu par von Papen, Hitler devient le dernier chancelier de la République de Weimar. En quelques mois, tous les éléments de la vie démocratique allemande sont démontés. Le processus par lequel le Nazisme s'attache à éradiquer toutes les formes d'expression indépendantes de la société

s'appelle la « Gleichschaltung » . Les diverses institutions catholiques seront naturellement concernées. Aux élections de mars 1933, le NSDAP, avec 44 % des voix, n'a pas encore la majorité absolue. Pour s'opposer à Hitler, une alliance entre tous les autres Partis, incluant, entre autres, le Centre et les communistes du KPD est, à cette époque, complètement inenvisageable. Le 23 mars, les députés du Centre votent les pleins pouvoirs à Hitler.

Un courant dans le Nazisme représenté par exemple par Alfred Rosenberg, nourrit des projets de fonder un « christianisme allemand » , projets qui sont condamnés en 1937 dans le chapitre « Vraie Foi en Dieu » de l'encyclique « Mit brennender Sorge » :

« Prenez garde, Vénérables Frères, qu'avant toute autre chose la foi en Dieu, premier et irremplaçable fondement de toute religion, soit conservée en Allemagne, pure et sans falsification. Ne croit pas en Dieu celui qui se contente de faire usage du mot Dieu dans ses discours, mais celui-là seulement qui à ce mot sacré unit le vrai et digne concept de la Divinité. Quiconque identifie, dans une confusion panthéistique, Dieu et l'univers, abaissant Dieu aux dimensions du monde ou élevant le monde à celles de Dieu, n'est pas de ceux qui croient en Dieu. » , écrit le pape condamnant ainsi l'idée d'un dieu « national » avant de brocarder « une prétendue conception des anciens Germains » .

Personnellement, Hitler se moque du christianisme plus encore que Rosenberg. Il préférera encourager l'établissement d'une mythologie encore assez vague de la « germanité. »

Hitler déclare au financier Hjalmar Schacht :

« J'ai toujours dit à Rosenberg qu'on ne s'attaque ni aux soutanes, ni aux jupons. »

Le pape Pie XI mène une politique très active de négociation et de signature de concordats ; 18 seront signés au cours de son pontificat. Il en négocie avec tous types de régimes : autoritaires, démocratiques, socialistes (comme l'URSS) ou fascistes (comme l'Italie) , en parvenant souvent à un accord. Par cette politique, il cherche à protéger les catholiques et préserver les institutions de l'Église et de la famille chrétienne, dans 2 domaines en particulier : l'éducation et le mariage.

La recherche d'un concordat avec l'Allemagne s'inscrit dans la continuité de concordats signés avec plusieurs « Länder » : la Bavière (29 mars 1924) ; la Prusse (24 juin 1929) ; et le pays de Bade (12 décembre 1932) , tous dans des conditions globalement favorables à l'Église catholique. Le nonce apostolique en Allemagne, Monseigneur Pacelli, acteur des concordats précédents, avait engagé des négociations avec la République de Weimar dès le début des années 1920 pour obtenir un accord au niveau fédéral, mais les différents projets n'ont jamais pu faire l'objet d'un consensus parmi les Partis non catholiques du « Reichstag » .

L'arrivée du Parti nazi au pouvoir, en janvier 1933, change la donne. Aux côtés d'Hitler, Franz von Papen est nommé vice-chancelier. Pie XI relance les négociations au mois de mars, pour un accord au niveau fédéral. Il s'appuie sur Monseigneur Pacelli, devenu secrétaire d'État du Vatican ; Monseigneur Gröber, archevêque de Fribourg ; et Monseigneur Kaas, président du « Zentrum » . Les négociations se déroulent très rapidement. Le 20 juillet, la convention est signée.

Von Papen y voit une grande victoire contre le bolchévisme ; Pie XI un accord « inattendu et inespéré » évitant un nouveau « Kulturkampf » .

Si le « Zentrum » disparaît, l'Église catholique romaine est reconnue pour la 1re fois dans l'ensemble du « Reich » ; les associations, les œuvres de jeunesse, l'école confessionnelle se voient accorder des garanties ; les biens confisqués sont restitués.

Autour du concordat s'articule ce que Günter Lewy a appelé la « grande réconciliation » des catholiques et des Nazis. Après une période qui avait vu l'Église se positionner contre le NSDAP, par exemple, en interdisant l'adhésion à ses fidèles, les années 1933-1934 sont celles de la levée des interdits. En juin 1933, juste avant la signature officielle du concordat, une nouvelle conférence épiscopale se tient à Fulda et aboutit à une lettre pastorale signée de 3 cardinaux (Bertram, Faulhaber, Schulte) , d'un archevêque (Gröber) et de 2 évêques (Ehrenfried et Preysing) .

Cette lettre situe la gravité du contexte, de vieilles institutions qui disparaissent et un nouvel État qui prend forme, rappelle l'amour que les catholiques allemands ont toujours porté à leur patrie, font une analyse plutôt positive du nouveau régime :

« Notre Sainte Église catholique attache une valeur et une signification particulière au principe d'autorité. Nous autres, catholiques, nous n'éprouvons aucune difficulté à rendre hommage à la manière nouvelle et vigoureuse dont on insiste sur le principe d'autorité dans l'État allemand. »

La lettre émet bien une petite réserve en forme de souhait que l'État, prenant exemple sur l'Église, « ne limiterait la liberté humaine que dans la mesure où l'exigerait le bien commun » , mais finalement, les évêques se réjouissent des efforts des nouvelles autorités pour libérer le peuple allemand :

« Après des années de servitude, la nation allemande doit de nouveau avoir, dans la famille des nations la liberté et la place d'honneur qui lui sont dues, à cause de son importance numérique, de ces capacités et de ses réalisations culturelles. »

Ainsi, les évêques catholiques, pris en corps constitué, ne réagissent pas à l'instauration d'un régime à Parti unique, ils parlent d'un renouveau moral au moment où se déchaîne la terreur brune. À cette époque, il est vrai, les églises protestantes, la plupart des intellectuels, et bien des gens à l'étranger ne montrent pas plus de flair politique.

C'est cet aveuglement (parallèle à de nombreuses résistances, il est vrai) que dénonce le pape en 1937 lorsqu'il écrit :

« Mais la franchise qui convient à Notre charge apostolique, si pleine de responsabilités, et la décision de mettre sous vos yeux et sous les yeux de tout l'univers chrétien la réalité dans toute sa gravité Nous obligent d'ajouter :

“ Il n'est pas de plus grand chagrin, ni de douleur plus amère à Notre cœur de Pasteur, que d'apprendre que beaucoup abandonnent le chemin de la vérité. ” »

(Encyclique « Mit brennender Sorge » ; page 17.)

Dans les années 1933-1938, l'établissement de l'État totalitaire nazi va nécessairement aller à l'encontre de l'indépendance des Églises et des dispositions prévues par le concordat. Face à cette situation, l'attitude de l'Église catholique sera un mélange d'accommodement, de tentatives d'intégration à l'intérieur du système nazi, d'une part ; et de résistances aux empiètements du pouvoir qui violaient le concordat, d'autre part.

Les motifs de conflits apparaissent dès l'année 1933 où la terreur à laquelle sont soumis tous les ennemis des Nazis et opposants potentiels n'épargnent pas les prêtres, nombreux à être arrêtés. À Munich, pour stopper l'arrestation de prêtres, le délégué spécial SA exige à la fois la réhabilitation d'un prêtre suspendu pour avoir publié un article pro-nazi et la destitution du Docteur Emil Mulher, un anti-Nazi qui est à la tête de l'action catholique. Le cardinal Faulhaber cède sur les 2 points. Mulher sera finalement arrêté le 29 novembre 1933 pour avoir répandu des récits sur les atrocités commises dans les nouveaux camps de concentration de Dachau.

Le 28 juin 1933, une vague d'arrestations déferle sur la Bavière, 1,900 personnes sont arrêtées parmi lesquelles beaucoup de notabilités catholiques. Ce n'est qu'après que le Parti du Peuple (Parti catholique bavarois) proclame sa dissolution, le 4 juillet, que les prisonniers sont relâchés.

La signature du concordat et sa ratification le 10 septembre marque une détente dans les relations entre l'Église et le nouveau pouvoir, mais le démantèlement d'une grande partie des organisations catholiques va créer une situation de contentieux permanent. Les « Jeunesses hitlériennes » (« Hitler-Jugend »), créées en 1933, ont vocation à accueillir tous les jeunes Allemands. Leur chef Baldur von Schirach avait interdit la double appartenance aux « Jeunesses hitlériennes » et aux Jeunesses catholiques. Des négociations se déroulent jusqu'au mois de juin 1934 pour parvenir à un accord sur l'application de l'article 31 du concordat : toutes les associations sportives et ouvrières gravitant autour de l'Église sont incorporées à l'Action catholique qui est censée limiter ses actions au domaine purement religieux, culturels ou charitables. Les dirigeants possédant un passé politique doivent être remplacés. Pendant tout le temps des négociations, les « Jeunesses hitlériennes » avaient entrepris une vaste campagne de recrutement en appelant les jeunes catholiques à abandonner leurs dirigeants.

Au lendemain de cet accord surviennent les événements du 30 juin connus sous le nom de « Nuit des Longs Couteaux » et qui ne sont pas seulement un règlement de comptes contre le chef des SA, Ernst Röhm. Des personnalités catholiques sont assassinées : Erich Klausener, chef de l'Action Catholique de Berlin ; Adalbert Probst, chef de l'organisation sportive catholique ; Kuno Kamphausen, ancien membre du « Zentrum » ; Edgar J. Jung, avocat munichois qui œuvrait à la destitution du nouveau chancelier et voulait rétablir un « Reich » chrétien et fédéral ; Fritz Gerlich, calviniste converti au catholicisme, dont le journal était en possession de documents compromettants pour les Nazis.

Le 27 avril 1934, le chef de la « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » (Front allemand du travail, sorte de syndicat officiel) interdit la double appartenance à la « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » et aux organisations catholiques ouvrières. Comme il est indispensable d'appartenir à la « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » pour trouver un emploi, cette décision implique la mort de

toutes les associations ouvrières catholiques.

En juillet 1935, le ministre de l'intérieur Wilhelm Frick lance une nouvelle campagne contre les organisations catholiques. Les évêques envoient une lettre à Adolf Hitler, menacent de recommander aux fidèles de ne plus envoyer leurs enfants aux « Jeunesses hitlériennes », ce qui s'avère impossible, car les pressions exercées sur les parents sont bien trop fortes. La dissolution des associations d'étudiants catholiques devra attendre 1938.

Tout au long des incessantes négociations entre l'Église allemande et le pouvoir, la position de l'Église peut se formuler ainsi :

« Les dirigeants des associations catholiques servent le peuple allemand et la patrie avec courage, abnégation et fidélité, ils refusent toute conduite subversive, s'abstiennent de toute activité politique, se montrent résolu à repousser les avances que pourraient tenter les communistes. Les catholiques ne fomentent pas de révoltes et n'offrent pas de résistance violente. »

Toutes les restrictions imposées par les Nazis aux associations catholiques et les violations du concordat étaient un motif de conflit entre les autorités du 3e « Reich » et l'Église, et d'une façon générale, les évêques auraient été plus enclins au compromis que Monseigneur Pacelli, secrétaire d'État, c'est-à-dire chef de la diplomatie du Vatican et signataire du concordat de 1933. Pour ce dernier, le concordat est un traité entre l'Allemagne et l'Église catholique qu'il convient de faire respecter avec fermeté. Une autre source de conflit entre l'Église et les Nazis est de nature doctrinale : des évêques allemands s'étaient plu à voir dans le chancelier Hitler un homme de dialogue, et dans Rosenberg un idéologue que l'on pouvait espérer marginaliser. Rosenberg avait publié en 1930 « le Mythe du XXe siècle » qui donnait des bases théoriques à l'idéologie raciste nazie et développait des idées néo-paganistes et ne concevait la religion que comme devant être fondée sur le sang et la race.

Le 20 janvier 1934, Rosenberg est nommé représentant du « Führer », chargé de superviser la vie spirituelle et idéologique du Parti national-socialiste. Tout en prétendant ne pas critiquer l'État, mais simplement le néo-paganisme de certains dirigeants du Parti, les évêques allemands répliquent aux thèses de Rosenberg, d'abord dans une lettre pastorale de juin 1934, mais la « Gestapo » confisque les invendus et en interdit la publication dans la presse sous prétexte qu'elle est de nature à troubler l'ordre public, ensuite, dans un supplément de la Gazette diocésaine d'octobre de Münster, le diocèse de Monseigneur von Galen qui, dans la préface, recommande explicitement cet ouvrage au clergé. Les auteurs de ce supplément intitulé « Studien zum Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts » restent dans l'anonymat, mais soumettent le livre de Rosenberg à une critique érudite et sévère. Des extraits des « Studien » sont également publiés dans la Gazette diocésaine du cardinal Schulte, à Cologne. La brochure, en tirant à 100,000 exemplaires peut toucher un vaste public. Dans les mois qui suivent, le débat se poursuit de diverses façons : lettres pastorales, lettre à Hitler, mise à l'index des ouvrages de Rosenberg.

En guise de compromis, pour enrayer une possible défection des catholiques, la « Gestapo » interdit des réunions du mouvement néo-païen de Ludendorf, marginal vis-à-vis du NSDAP, mais les doctrines de Rosenberg continuent d'être propagées à une grande échelle et, en outre, le régime intensifie ses attaques contre les ordres religieux en ordonnant

des poursuites pour perversions sexuelles. Simultanément, les parents catholiques font l'objet de pressions considérables pour ne plus envoyer leurs enfants dans les écoles confessionnelles, ce qui entraîne la liquidation de la plupart d'entre elles.

En 1935, le théologien Erik Peterson, récemment converti au catholicisme, publie l'étude « Le monothéisme comme problème politique », dans laquelle il s'oppose à la théologie politique de Carl Schmitt, devenu à cette époque le principal porte-parole d'une sorte de Nazisme théologique.

C'est dans ce contexte qu'est élaborée par le cardinal Pacelli et plusieurs évêques allemands l'encyclique, « Mit brennender Sorge ». Au printemps 1937, elle est signée par le pape Pie XI, introduite clandestinement en Allemagne, imprimée secrètement, distribuée par messagers, et finalement lue en chaire le 21 mars, dimanche des Rameaux, dans toutes les églises du « Reich ».

La croyance en un Dieu national, le rejet de l'Ancien Testament et l'établissement d'une église nationale sont désignés comme des erreurs, le Dieu chrétien ne peut pas être emprisonné « dans les frontières d'un peuple particulier, dans les origines d'une race particulière ». Le texte condamne essentiellement le néo-paganisme, le mythe du « Sang et de la Race », le culte du chef et le déni de liberté religieuse. Écrire que les lois humaines contraires à la loi naturelle ne sont pas « obligatoires en conscience » a évidemment été considéré comme une attaque contre le régime, mais le totalitarisme politique et social n'est pas explicitement condamné.

Monseigneur Pacelli s'en expliquera plus tard avec le gouvernement allemand :

« Le Saint-Siège entretient des rapports amicaux, corrects ou au moins passables avec des États possédant diverses formes et orientations constitutionnelles. En ce qui concerne l'Allemagne, il est constamment demeuré fidèle à ce principe et entend continuer à l'être. »

Pie XI souligne que :

« Nous ne souhaitons, ni Nous rendre coupable, par un silence inopportun, de n'avoir point clarifié la situation, ni endurcir par une excessive sévérité le cœur de ceux qui sont placés sous Notre responsabilité pastorale, bien qu'actuellement, ils s'éloignent de nous. »

C'est qu'effectivement, la propagande anti-catholique menée par les Nazis obtient des résultats. Les défections, si elles ne sont pas catastrophiques sont quand même substantielles.

En avril 1938, La Sacrée congrégation des séminaires et universités publie à la demande de Pie XI un Syllabus condamnant les théories racistes qui est adressé aux établissements catholiques du monde entier. Philippe Chenaux qui fait référence au syllabus ne précise pas comment il a été diffusé en Allemagne.

Relativement fermes sur le plan doctrinal, et soutenus en cela par le pape, les catholiques allemands prennent le risque

d'un affrontement avec le pouvoir, mais d'un autre côté, ils revendiquent un patriotisme sans faille, et en tant qu'Allemands, se montrent vis-à-vis du même pouvoir comme les plus loyaux des sujets. Les évêques approuvent pratiquement toutes les actions d'Hitler en matière de politique étrangère : non seulement les évêques applaudissent la remilitarisation de la Rhénanie, mais dans une lettre pastorale collective le 19 août 1936, ils approuvent l'intervention de l'Allemagne dans la guerre d'Espagne :

« Puisse notre “ Führer ”, avec l'aide de Dieu, mener à bien cette entreprise terriblement ardue. »

Ils acceptent, et certains, joyeusement, de faire sonner les cloches le 10 avril 1938 pour célébrer l' « Anschluß » qui regroupe à l'intérieur du « Reich » les Autrichiens en majorité catholiques. L'évêque autrichien Theodor Innitzer est allé tellement loin dans son soutien à l' « Anschluß », qu'il est convoqué à Rome pour y être réprimandé et signer une mise au point.

Le 1er octobre 1938, conformément aux accords de Munich, les troupes allemandes pénètrent en Tchécoslovaquie et occupent le territoire des Sudètes. Ce même jour, sur proposition du Cardinal Faulhaber, au nom de tous les cardinaux allemands, le Cardinal Bertram envoie un télégramme de félicitations à Hitler :

« Le haut-fait d'avoir sauvé la paix internationale incite l'épiscopat allemand à offrir respectueusement ses félicitations et ses remerciements, et à ordonner un carillon de fête pour ce dimanche. »

Le patriotisme des catholiques allemands ne faiblit pas tout au long de la Guerre de 1939-1945. Juste après le début des hostilités, en septembre 1939, une lettre pastorale invite les catholiques allemands à faire leur devoir de soldats :

« Nous exhortons les catholiques à faire leur devoir de soldats et à tout sacrifier d'eux-mêmes, en obéissance au “ Führer ”. Nous faisons appel aux fidèles pour qu'ils prient ardemment la divine Providence afin qu'elle conduise la patrie et le peuple à un bienheureux succès et à la paix. »

Le 30 septembre, les évêques obéissent à l'injonction du ministre des Affaires Ecclésiastiques de faire sonner les cloches pendant 7 jours pour célébrer la victoire sur la Pologne. Au même moment, Radio Vatican et l' « Osservatore Romano » diffusent dans le monde entier des informations sur les atrocités commises par les Allemands en Pologne. Quelques mois plus tard, en juin 1940, les cloches carillonnent à nouveau pendant une semaine pour fêter la victoire sur la France.

À la fin de l'année, le ministère de la Propagande fait savoir à l'épiscopat allemand que l'État compte sur un soutien plus enthousiaste de la part des ecclésiastiques. Pendant les mois qui suivent, certains évêques ne se contentent plus de demander à prier « pour une victoire profitable à l'Allemagne », mais « pour la victoire de l'Allemagne » .

Après l'invasion de l'URSS, en juin 1941, l'épiscopat se fait de nouveau rappeler à l'ordre par Kerrle, ministre de Affaires ecclésiastiques, qui s'attendait un soutien plus énergique à la « lutte contre le bolchévisme ». La lettre pastorale collective des évêques allemands réunis à Fulda, lue dans toutes les églises du « Reich », le 26 juin 1941,

qui prône la désobéissance civile provoque la fureur des autorités :

« Jamais, en aucune circonstance, un homme ne peut, sauf en cas de guerre ou de légitime défense, mettre à mort une personne innocente. »

Cette lettre est suivie des 2 sermons de l'évêque de Münster Monseigneur von Galen (du 6 juillet et du 3 août) contre la politique eugéniste du pouvoir. Cependant le même Monseigneur Galen exprime à plusieurs reprises son espoir en une victoire allemande.

En 1942, Adolf Hitler déclare :

« Si, à Poitiers, Charles Martel avait été battu, le monde aurait changé de face. Puisque le monde était déjà condamné à l'influence judaïque (et à son sous-produit le christianisme, une chose si insipide) , il aurait mieux valu que l'islam triomphe. Cette religion récompense l'héroïsme, promet au guerrier les joies du 7e Ciel. Animé d'un esprit semblable, les Germains auraient conquis le monde. Ils en ont été empêchés par le christianisme. »

À partir de 1943, de nombreux fonctionnaires allemands consignent dans leurs rapports la tiédeur de l'Église et se plaignent que l'Église ne prie plus pour la victoire, mais seulement pour une paix prochaine. La tiédeur de l'Église allemande vis-à-vis de l'effort de guerre nazi n'empêche pas Monseigneur Jäger, évêque de Paderborn, de demander à ses fidèles de contribuer à la lutte engagée contre les 2 grands ennemis de l'Allemagne : le Libéralisme et l'individualisme, d'une part ; le collectivisme, d'autre part.

La question des aumôniers militaires avait été une pierre d'achoppement au moment de la signature du concordat de 1933. Les Nazis étaient, a priori, peu favorables à la présence de l'Église dans l'armée, et l'Église entendait bien que les aumôniers conservent une indépendance vis-à-vis de la hiérarchie militaire. À l'approche de la Guerre, les Nazis se montrent plus conciliants.

En novembre 1936, au cours d'un entretien, Adolf Hitler avait déclaré au Cardinal von Faulhaber :

« Un homme n'existe pas s'il ne croit pas en Dieu. Un soldat qui subit un bombardement intense pendant 4 jours a besoin de croire en Dieu. »

Ce n'est qu'en février 1938 qu'intervient la nomination d'un aumônier général de l'armée qui doit, selon le concordat, faire l'objet d'un accord mutuel. À leur corps défendant, les évêques ont dû accepter le nom de Franz Josef Rarkowski et lui donner rang d'évêque. Rarkowski faisait déjà fonction de chef de l'aumônerie militaire depuis 1929 et il affichait des opinions très proches de celles des Nazis. Les évêques le considéraient comme un arriviste d'un niveau intellectuel inférieur au leur. Pendant toute la durée de la Guerre, la loyauté de Rarkowski au « Führer » sera sans faille.

Lors de son incorporation, tout soldat doit prononcer un serment d'allégeance à Hitler :

« Je jure solennellement devant Dieu d'obéir inconditionnellement au " Führer " du " Reich " et du peuple allemand, Adolf Hitler. »

Selon la doctrine catholique, que soutenaient les évêques, un serment ne peut pas justifier ce qui est par ailleurs moralement condamnable, et un chrétien se trouve délié de son serment si ce dernier entre en conflit avec ce qui est dû à Dieu. Dans ses lettres pastorales, Rarkowski maintient une position toute différente selon laquelle le soldat catholique est tenu par son serment. Dans une de ces lettres, Rarkowski admet que la lutte contre l' « Untermenschen » (sous-homme) bolchévique soumet l'âme du soldat allemand à de sévères épreuves, et demande aux combattants de se préserver de toute perversion et de toute dégradation. Ces restrictions mentales n'ont pas cours lors des offices divins célébrés dans les camps militaires où la soumission au « Führer » est considérée comme un devoir sacré.

Dans tout le « Reich » allemand, seuls 7 catholiques refusent de servir militairement leur pays. 6 sont exécutés et le 7e est déclaré fou. Parmi les 6 exécutés, il y a un prêtre, Franz Reinisch. L'aumônier de la prison lui refuse la communion sous le prétexte qu'il a violé son devoir de chrétien en refusant de prêter le serment d'allégeance à Hitler.

Une politique eugénique a été prônée par les nazis dès les années 1920 :

« Si chaque année, l'Allemagne avait 1 million d'enfants et en éliminait 7 ou 8 cent mille parmi les plus faibles, le résultat final serait probablement un accroissement de notre force nationale. »

L'eugénisme mis en œuvre par les Nazis est un sujet d'affrontement permanent avec l'Église catholique allemande qui la déclare contraire à l'encyclique « Casti Conubii » publiée par Pie XI, le 31 décembre 1930. La promulgation de la Ire loi eugénique ordonnant la stérilisation obligatoire de toutes les personnes affligées de certaines maladies ou infirmités est différée après la signature du concordat, mais elle entre en vigueur dès le 1er janvier 1934. 32,268 stérilisations sont effectuées en 1934 ; 73,174 en 1935 ; et 63,547 en 1936. Des négociations menées entre l'épiscopat et le ministère de l'Intérieur aboutissent à exempter les directeurs d'établissements catholiques de solliciter la stérilisation de malades confiés à leurs soins. Le Cardinal Bertram, représentant naturel de l'épiscopat allemand en tant que président de la conférence de Fulda, renonce à un projet de lettre pastorale sous la pression du vice-chancelier Franz von Papen. Finalement, en janvier 1934, une lettre est lue dans les églises d'Allemagne, expliquant, sans toutefois faire allusion à la nouvelle loi, qu'il était défendu de se faire stériliser volontairement ou de provoquer la stérilisation d'autrui. Dans sa lettre pastorale de janvier 1934, Monseigneur von Galen, évêque de Münster, attaque plus explicitement et plus violemment la loi nazie. Face au ministre de l'Intérieur Frick, rendu furieux contre cette incitation pour les citoyens à pratiquer la désobéissance, le Cardinal Faulhaber assume l'attitude contestatrice de l'Église.

Dans la pratique, cette attitude relativement claire soulève un certain nombre de problèmes : par exemple, quelle doit être l'attitude des confesseurs face à des fonctionnaires ayant participé à l'application de la loi ? Les évêques apportent à ces questions une réponse moins claire que ne l'aurait souhaité le Vatican. Une laborieuse casuistique octroie le droit de signaler aux autorités les malades devant être stérilisés aux médecins catholiques et aux employés des services sociaux qui peuvent ainsi garder leur emploi. Par contre, établir un dossier demandant la stérilisation de

quelqu'un est un acte de « collaboration formelle », réprouvé. En 1940, le Saint-Office tolère la participation d'infirmiers à des opérations de stérilisation s'ils sont menacés de perdre leur emploi et si un autre infirmier le ferait s'ils ne le faisaient pas.

Le 1er septembre 1939, Adolf Hitler franchit la limite qui sépare l'eugénisme de l'euthanasie en donnant l'ordre de tuer toutes les personnes atteintes de maladies incurables. De septembre 1939 à août 1941, environ 70,000 malades, souvent des déficients mentaux ou des déments incurables, seront gazés.

Le programme d'euthanasie est classé ultra-secret, mais des informations filtrent assez rapidement, entraînant des protestations du Cardinal Bertram auprès des autorités en août 1940, et du Cardinal Faulhaber quelques mois plus tard. Des ecclésiastiques protestants élèvent également des protestations, mais le gouvernement poursuit son programme de massacre.

Une nouvelle fois, c'est de Monseigneur von Galen que vient la réaction la plus ferme. Dans un sermon prononcé à l'église Saint-Lambert de Münster, le 3 août 1941, il explique en détail comment on tue les malades innocents et comment on trompe les familles par des avis de décès falsifiés. Des copies du sermon sont distribuées dans toutes l'Allemagne et sur le front, parmi les soldats. Des officiels reçoivent l'accord de Martin Bormann, secrétaire particulier de Hitler, pour que l'on pend Galen, mais finalement, aucune action n'est intentée contre lui pour ne pas le transformer en martyr.

Le ministre de la Propagande Josef Gœbbels s'y était opposé en ces termes :

« Si quoi que ce soit était tenté contre l'évêque, il serait à craindre que la population de Münster ne doive être perdue pour toute la durée de la Guerre, et il serait à craindre que soit perdue, à coup sûr, la Westphalie tout entière. »

Peu après le sermon du 3 août, Hitler donne l'ordre d'arrêter le programme d'euthanasie.

Au début du XXe siècle, les Juifs représentent 1,04 % de la population allemande, ce qui est moins que la Pologne (16 %) ou des pays d'Europe centrale comme l'Autriche ou la Hongrie (4 %) , mais beaucoup plus que la France (0,22 %) . Après des mesures d'exclusion qui évoquent le Moyen-âge de l'Europe chrétienne, les Juifs d'Allemagne connaissent l'émancipation au cours du XIXe siècle, c'est-à-dire qu'ils obtiennent les mêmes droits que les autres Allemands. Cette régularisation est effective en Prusse, dans le Hanovre et le Nassau, en 1848 ; dans le Holstein en 1863 ; en Saxe en 1868.

À la différence de l'antisémitisme racial nazi qui catégorise les êtres humains en peuples supérieurs et en peuples inférieurs, l'anti-judaïsme catholique traditionnel repose sur certaines conceptions théologiques élaborées dans les 3 Iers siècles du christianisme. Les églises chrétiennes ont généralement toujours accepté des Juifs convertis sans tenir compte de leur origine raciale. Dans les années 1870, aiguillonnée par le fait que nombre de Juifs connus participaient au mouvement anti-catholique du « Kulturkampf » , le Parti du Centre, catholique, avait lancé une vigoureuse campagne

antisémite au cours de l'été 1875. De cette époque, les catholiques allemands conservent une hostilité vis-à-vis du Libéralisme juif mais ils ne cultivent pas l'antisémitisme racial, tel qu'il a pu se développer chez des catholiques autrichiens comme Karl Lueger et qui sera l'un des fondements de l'idéologie nazie. Karl Marx étant d'ascendance juive tout comme le révolutionnaire communiste Karl Liebknecht, l'hostilité viscérale de l'Église vis-à-vis du communisme a pu rejaillir également sur les Juifs. Ainsi, dans le « Handbuch » de Monseigneur Gröber, publié en 1937, le marxisme est-il défini comme « le socialisme matérialiste fondé, à l'origine, par le Juif Karl Marx », et le bolchévisme comme « un despotisme d'État, asiatique, en réalité au service d'un groupe de terroristes menés par les Juifs ».

L'antisémitisme raciste est un élément de la doctrine nazie qui ne cesse de s'affirmer entre 1920 et 1945. Selon Raul Hilberg, une fois que les Nazis sont au pouvoir, à partir de 1933, ils vont mener de 1933 à 1940 une politique de persécution des Juifs visant plus ou moins à les inciter à l'émigration, et une politique d'annihilation, de 1941 à 1945.

De 1920 à 1933, les catholiques, clercs ou laïcs qui luttent contre la montée de l'antisémitisme sont très peu nombreux. Une association comme le « Verein für die Abwehr der Antisemitismus » qui regroupe chrétiens et Juifs pour lutter contre l'antisémitisme ne compte que 2 prêtres catholiques dans son comité de patronage. Si les évêques allemands dénoncent dans la doctrine nazie la glorification de la race et du sang, ils ne s'expriment pratiquement pas sur la propagande antisémite et les violences qu'elle engendre.

Le 2 avril 1928, le Saint-Office publie un décret dans lequel il condamne l'antisémitisme, défini comme « haine contre le peuple de Dieu », et renouvelle la volonté du Saint-Siège de protéger le peuple juif contre l'« oppression injuste » :

« Comme il réproche toutes les haines et les animosités entre les peuples, le Saint-Siège condamne résolument la haine contre un peuple déjà élu par Dieu, haine qu'aujourd'hui on désigne communément sous le nom d'« antisémitisme ».

À partir de 1933, les violences physiques auxquelles les SA se livraient sur les Juifs cèdent peu à peu le pas à des mesures plus bureaucratiques : des lois d'exclusion interdisent aux Juifs d'exercer un emploi dans la fonction publique et dans un certain nombre de professions para-publiques et culturelles. En septembre 1935, les lois de Nuremberg interdisent les mariages entre Juifs et Aryens. Dans les années qui suivent, une série de mesures visent à exproprier les Juifs et à les spolier de plus en plus durement. Le 9 novembre 1938, la « Nuit de Cristal » marque une reprise des agressions physiques et le commencement de la déportation : 20,000 Juifs sont internés dans des camps de concentration comme Dachau.

Pendant cette période, de 1933 à 1939, certains évêques catholiques se montrent complaisants vis-à-vis des valeurs de la race.

On peut ainsi lire dans le « Handbuch » de Monseigneur Gröber :

« Chaque peuple est en lui-même responsable de la réussite de son existence, et l'apport d'un sang totalement

étranger représentera toujours un risque pour la nation qui a prouvé sa valeur historique. C'est pourquoi, on ne peut refuser à aucun peuple le droit de maintenir la pureté de son origine raciale et de prendre des garanties dans ce but. La religion chrétienne demande simplement que les moyens utilisés ne pêchent pas contre la loi morale et la justice naturelle. »

Au cours de l'été 1934, un journal social-démocrate de Prague publie le texte d'un sermon contre la haine raciale attribué au Cardinal Faulhaber qui ne l'avait en fait jamais prononcé.

Dans une mise au point, le secrétaire du Cardinal expliquait que, dans ses sermons prononcés à l'occasion de l'Avent :

« Le Cardinal avait défendu l'Ancien Testament des Enfants d'Israël, mais n'avait pas pris position en ce qui concerne l'actuelle Question juive. »

C'est qu'en effet l'Église prend des positions relativement ferme concernant la fidélité à l'Ancien Testament, c'est-à-dire la Bible des Juifs, que des Nazis comme Alfred Rosenberg attaquent violemment. Elle est ferme également sur la « non-aryanité » du Christ, mais elle ne fait pas de la défense des Juifs opprimés un cheval de bataille.

La question des Juifs convertis et des « Mischlinge » catholiques sera la source de conflits récurrents entre l'Église catholique et le pouvoir. « Mischlinge » est le nom donné à ceux que les Nazis considèrent d'un point de vue racial comme des « demi-Juifs » ou « quart-Juifs ». D'après un recensement de 1939, il y a environ 72,000 « Mischlinge » au 1er degré (2 grands-parents juifs) et quelque 39,000 « Mischlinge » au second degré (un seul grand-parent juif). Ces personnes sont souvent des catholiques : dans le courant du XIXe siècle, un nombre appréciable de Juifs s'étaient convertis au christianisme, et dans pratiquement tous les cas, il s'agissait du catholicisme. Il y a donc beaucoup de catholiques ayant un Juif parmi leurs ancêtres. Les évêques cherchent à protéger ces catholiques avec des origines juives. En 1937, l'Église oppose ainsi un refus à la demande du ministère des Affaires ecclésiastiques de consulter les dossiers diocésains concernant les conversions et les mariages mixtes. 2 associations catholiques s'occupent spécifiquement des convertis et des catholiques non aryens : le « Sankt Raphaelsverein » et le « Paulus Bund ». En 1938, le « Sankt Raphaelsverein » permet l'émigration de 1,850 d'entre eux.

Des catholiques soutiennent les Juifs sans lien avec le catholicisme. Ce sont des exceptions. Après la « Nuit de Cristal », le doyen de la cathédrale de Berlin, Bernhard Lichtenberg, décide de prier publiquement pour les Juifs à chaque prière du soir. En 1941, il proteste également contre l'euthanasie. Il est condamné à 2 ans de prison et, à sa sortie, la « Gestapo » le dirige vers Dachau. Il meurt pendant le voyage.

Le 1er septembre 1941, le port de l'étoile juive, qui était déjà en vigueur en Pologne, devient obligatoire en Allemagne. Cette mesure concerne aussi les Juifs convertis au catholicisme après 1935. Les non-Aryens mariés à un conjoint aryen sont dispensés du port de l'étoile. Faut-il prévoir dans les églises des bancs spéciaux pour les Juifs ? Dans une lettre à ses confrères, datée du 17 septembre, le Cardinal Bertram conseille d'éviter les « mesures précipitées qui pourraient blesser les Juifs ». Les évêques de Berlin interviennent, en vain, auprès de la « Gestapo » pour dispenser les Juifs catholiques de porter l'étoile.

Les déportations massives de Juifs allemands vers l'est commencent le 15 octobre 1941. Les catholiques non-aryens ne sont pas épargnés, contrairement à de vagues promesses qui avaient été faites. Les évêques interviennent encore pour que des prêtres et des religieuses non-aryens puissent se porter volontaires pour accompagner les déportés pour célébrer des offices et faire le catéchisme aux enfants. Mais bien vite, des informations sur le sort qui attend les Juifs déportés remontent jusqu'aux évêques en même temps que les soldats qui reviennent du front russe racontent les atrocités dont ils ont été témoins : des civils juifs sont tués par milliers à la mitrailleuse. En août 1942, un officier nazi, Kurt Gerstein, tente d'alerter le nonce apostolique, Monseigneur Orsenigo sur les faits dont il a été témoin dans les Iers camps d'extermination. Comme le nonce refuse de le recevoir, il raconte son histoire au conseiller juridique de Monseigneur Preysing, évêque de Berlin. Les évêques ont d'autres informateurs issus de l'armée ou de l'administration.

En 1942, on trouve encore dans le « Reich » plus de 150,000 « Mischlinge » ou non-Aryens mariés à des Aryens, qui ne sont pas tenus de porter l'étoile jaune, mais en mars, il est décidé que les mariages inter-raciaux doivent être dissous. Au nom des évêques allemands, Monseigneur Bertram proteste auprès du ministère des Affaires ecclésiastiques. En février 1943, la « Gestapo » s'empare à Berlin de plusieurs milliers de Juifs catholiques mariés à des Aryennes. Les épouses aryennes suivent leurs maris jusqu'à leur lieu de détention et les réclament en hurlant pendant des heures. La « Gestapo » cède. En cas de promulgation du décret cassant les mariages inter-raciaux, les évêques avaient prévu de faire lire une déclaration dans toutes les églises pour rappeler l'indissolubilité du mariage. Le décret est finalement ajourné. Au cours de toutes les interventions qu'ils font auprès des autorités pour protéger les Juifs chrétiens et les « Mischlinge », les évêques n'abordent pas le sujet des Juifs non-chrétiens. Ils font bien quelques déclarations contestant les injustices dont sont victimes les races étrangères, mais ces déclarations sont conçues dans un langage très général. De même, il n'y a en Allemagne qu'une poignée de Juifs cachés par le clergé.

Pendant toute la période nazie, l'Église catholique d'Allemagne a pu subsister en tant qu'institution indépendante, avec des évêques qui pouvaient communiquer librement entre eux et avec les échelons inférieurs du clergé, et des fidèles qui pouvaient se rendre à peu près librement dans les églises. Les interventions et les lettres pastorales des évêques ont, de ce fait, été archivées de façon tout à fait correcte et forment un corpus d'où l'on peut dégager de grandes lignes : depuis le début de la prise du pouvoir par les Nazis et le concordat qui a suivi, l'Église est en négociation permanente avec les autorités pour défendre le concordat, c'est-à-dire l'indépendance de l'Église dans le domaine religieux, en échange de quoi, elle ne conteste pas le gouvernement en place et soutient, par patriotisme, ses orientations nationalistes jusque dans la folie de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Concernant les aspects moraux, elle a su s'opposer vigoureusement dans l'affaire de l'eugénisme. Elle est restée presque muette vis-à-vis la persécution et l'extermination des Juifs, tout en défendant avec quelque succès les « non-Aryens » catholiques (comme le succès de Monseigneur von Galen, évêque de Münster, et Monseigneur von Preysing, évêque de Berlin contre le Programme « Aktion T4 ») .

Cet accommodement a pu être taxé de « capitulation ». Aucun élément ne permet d'imputer cette attitude aux seuls évêques : comme le note Lewy, aucun dirigeant, qu'il soit laïc ou ecclésiastique, ne peut à la fois s'opposer longtemps aux valeurs, aux modes de pensée adoptés par le groupe qu'il dirige et s'attendre à conserver son poste de direction et son influence et il cite à ce propos Carl Amery :

« La capitulation fut non pas le fait de évêques, des prélats du Parti du Centre ou des Monsignori, mais le fait du juste milieu du catholicisme allemand. »

L'épiscopat allemand a fait au cours de la Guerre des déclarations critiquant les injustices dont les races étrangères sont victimes. Ainsi, en décembre 1942, Joseph Frings, nouvel archevêque de Cologne, rappelle dans une lettre pastorale que tous les hommes ont droit à la vie, à la liberté, à la propriété et au mariage et il souligne que ces droits ne peuvent être refusés « à ceux qui ne sont pas de notre sang » . D'autres déclarations similaires sont faites mais ces déclarations conçues en termes très généraux n'ont guère d'impact sur le programme d'extermination des Juifs perpétré par un « Reich » de la Grande Allemagne qui, avec l'annexion de l'Autriche et de la Bohême-Moravie, est constitué d'une population dont 43,1 % est de confession catholique. Au sein même des SS, le pourcentage des catholiques est de 22,7 % .

Malgré la répression féroce qui s'exerçait sur les opposants, il y a eu une Résistance allemande au Nazisme, au sein de laquelle on compte beaucoup de catholiques. Günter Lewy note que non seulement les évêques n'ont jamais encouragé la Résistance, mais ils l'ont toujours condamnée. Jusqu'à la chute du Nazisme, ils clament que le gouvernement du « Führer » Adolf Hitler est l'autorité légitime auquel chacun doit obéissance.

Dans leur système concentrationnaire, les Nazis rassemblèrent peu à peu, à Dachau, tous les prêtres arrêtés. Ils étaient emprisonnés dans un certain nombre de baraquements connus sous le nom de « baraque des prêtres » . 447 prêtres allemands transitèrent par Dachau ; 94 y moururent. Sans doute tous n'étaient-ils pas des Résistants et avaient pu être arrêtés pour de simples propos imprudents, comme par exemple Karl Leisner. Ce nombre montre quand même que, pour un certain nombre de catholiques courageux, l'accommodement avait des limites.

...

Popes Pius XI (1922-1939) and Pius XII (1939-1958) led the Roman Catholic Church through the rise and fall of Nazi Germany. Around 1/3 of Germans were Catholic in the 1930's. The Church in Germany had spoken against the rise of Nazism, but the Catholic aligned Centre Party capitulated in 1933 and was banned. Several key-Nazis, including Adolf Hitler, had been raised Catholic, but became hostile to the Church in adulthood. While Article 24 of the NSDAP Party platform called for conditional toleration of Christian denominations and the 1933 « Reichskonkordat » treaty with the Vatican purported to guarantee religious freedom for Catholics, the Nazis were essentially hostile to Christianity and the Catholic Church faced persecution in Nazi Germany. Its press, schools and youth organisations were closed, much property confiscated and around 1/3 of its clergy faced reprisals from authorities. Catholic lay leaders were targeted during the « Night of the Long Knives » purge. The Church hierarchy attempted to co-operate with the new government but, in 1937, the Papal Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » accused the government of « fundamental hostility » to the church.

Among the most courageous demonstrations of opposition inside Germany were the 1941 sermons of Bishop August von Galen of Münster.

Nevertheless, wrote Alan Bullock :

« Neither the Catholic Church nor the Evangelical Church, as institutions, felt it possible to take-up an attitude of open opposition to the regime. »

In every country under German occupation, priests played a major part in rescuing Jews, but Catholic resistance to mistreatment of Jews in Germany was generally limited to fragmented and largely individual efforts. Mary Fulbrook wrote that when politics encroached on the church, Catholics were prepared to resist, but that the record was otherwise patchy and uneven, and that, with notable exceptions :

« It seems that, for many Germans, adherence to the Christian faith proved compatible with at least passive acquiescence in, if not active support for, the Nazi dictatorship. »

Catholics fought on both sides in the Second World War. Adolf Hitler's invasion of predominantly Catholic Poland ignited the conflict in 1939. Here, especially in the areas of Poland annexed to the « Reich » (as in other annexed regions of Slovenia and Austria) , Nazi persecution of the church was intense. Many clergy were targeted for extermination. Elsewhere, the Nazi aligned Independent State of Croatia gave privileges to the church. Through his links to the German Resistance, Pope Pius XII warned the Allies of the planned Nazi invasion of the Low-Countries in 1940. From that year, the Nazis gathered priest-dissidents in a dedicated clergy barracks at Dachau, where (95 %) of its 2,720 inmates were Catholic (mostly Poles, and 411 Germans) and 1,034 priests died there. Expropriation of church properties surged from 1941.

The Vatican, surrounded by Fascist Italy, was officially neutral during the War, but used diplomacy to aid victims and lobby for peace. Vatican Radio and other media spoke-out against atrocities. While Nazi anti-Semitism embraced modern pseudo-scientific racial principles, ancient antipathies between Christianity and Judaism contributed to European anti-Semitism. During the Nazi era, the church rescued many thousands of Jews by issuing false documents, lobbying Axis officials, hiding them in monasteries, convents, schools and elsewhere ; including in the Vatican and papal residence at Castel Gandolfo. The Pope's role during this period is contested. The « Reich » Security Main Office called Pius XII a « mouthpiece » of the Jews. His 1st Encyclical, « Summi Pontificatus » , called the invasion of Poland an « hour of darkness » , his 1942 Christmas address denounced race murders and his « Mystici corporis Christi » Encyclical (1943) denounced the murder of the handicapped.

In the 1930's, Catholics constituted 1/3 of the population of Germany and « Political Catholicism » was a major force in the inter-War Weimar Republic. Prior to 1933, Catholic leaders denounced Nazi doctrines while Catholic regions generally did not vote Nazi. Though hostility between the Nazi Party and the Catholic Church was real, the Nazi Party 1st developed in largely Catholic Munich, where many Catholics, lay and clerical, offered enthusiastic support. This early (minority) affinity lessened after 1923. By 1925, Nazism had embarked on a different path following its reconstitution in 1920 taking a decidedly anti-Catholic / anti-Christian identity. In early 1931, the German Bishops issued an edict excommunicating all Nazi leadership and banned Catholics from membership. The ban was conditionally modified in the

Spring of 1933 under pressure to address State law requiring all Civil Servants and Trade Union workers be members of the Nazi Party, while retaining condemnation of core Nazi ideology. In early 1933, following Nazi successes in the 1932 elections, lay Catholic monarchist Franz von Papen, and acting Chancellor and Presidential advisor, General Kurt von Schleicher, assisted Adolf Hitler's appointment as « Reich » Chancellor by President Paul von Hindenburg. In March, amidst the intimidating atmosphere of Nazi terror tactics and negotiation following the « Reichstag » Fire Decree, the lay Catholic Centre Party (led by prelate Ludwig Kaas), on condition demand of a written commitment the President's veto power be retained, the allied BNVP and the monarchists DNVP voted for the Enabling Act. The Center Party's attitude had become crucial since the act could not be passed by the Nazi and DNVP coalition alone. It marked the transition in Adolf Hitler's reign from democratic to dictatorial power. By June 1933, the only institutions not under Nazi domination were the military and the churches. The « Reichskonkordat » treaty of July 1933, signed between Germany and the Holy-See, pledged to respect the autonomy of the Catholic Church, but required clerics to refrain from politics. Hitler welcomed the treaty, though he routinely violated it in the Nazi struggle with the churches. When president Hindenburg died in August 1934, the Nazis claimed jurisdiction over all levels of government and a referendum confirmed Hitler as sole « Führer » (leader) of Germany. A Nazi program known as « Gleichschaltung » sought control of all collective and social activity and interfered with Catholic schooling, youth groups, workers and cultural groups. The church insisted on its loyalty to the nation, but resisted regimentation and oppression of church organizations and contraventions of doctrine such as the sterilization law of 1933.

Hitler's ideologues Josef Gœbbels, Heinrich Himmler, Alfred Rosenberg and Martin Bormann hoped to de-Christianize Germany or, at least, distort its theology to their point of view. The government moved to close all Catholic institutions which were not strictly religious. Catholic schools were shut by 1939; the Catholic press by 1941. Clergy, women and men religious, and lay leaders were targeted. During the course of Hitler's rule, thousands were arrested, often on trumped-up charges of currency smuggling or « immorality ». Germany's senior cleric, Cardinal Bertram, developed an ineffectual protest system, leaving broader Catholic resistance to individual conscience. By 1937, the church hierarchy, which initially sought « détente », was highly-disillusioned. Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical. It condemned racism, accused the Nazis of violations of the Concordat and « fundamental hostility » to the church. The State responded by renewing its crackdown and propaganda against Catholics. Despite violence against Catholic Poland, some German priests offered prayers for the German cause at the outbreak of War. Nevertheless, security chief Reinhard Heydrich soon orchestrated an intensification of restrictions on church activities. Expropriation of monasteries, convents and church properties surged from 1941. Bishop August von Galen's ensuing 1941 denunciation of Nazi euthanasia and defence of human rights roused rare popular dissent. The German bishops denounced Nazi policy towards the church in pastoral letters, calling it « unjust oppression ».

Pius XII, former Nuncio to Germany, became Pope on the eve of War. His legacy is contested. As Vatican Secretary of State, he advocated « détente » via the « Reich » Concordat, hoping it would build trust and respect within Hitler's government, and assisted in drafting the anti-Nazi « Mit brennender Sorge ». His 1st Encyclical, « Summi Pontificatus », called the invasion of Poland an « hour of darkness ». He affirmed the policy of Vatican neutrality, but maintained links to the German Resistance. Controversy surrounding his reluctance to speak publicly in explicit terms about Nazi crimes continues. He used diplomacy to aid War victims, lobbied for peace, shared intelligence with the Allies, and employed Vatican Radio and other media to speak-out against atrocities like race murders. In « Mystici

corporis Christi » (1943) , he denounced the murder of the handicapped. A denunciation from German Bishops of the murder of the « innocent and defenceless » , including « people of a foreign race or descent » , followed. While Nazi anti-Semitism embraced modern pseudo-scientific racial principles, ancient antipathies between Christianity and Judaism contributed to European anti-Semitism. Under Pius XII, the church rescued many thousands of Jews by issuing false documents, lobbying Axis officials, hiding them in monasteries, convents, schools and elsewhere ; including the Vatican and Castel Gandolfo.

In regions of Poland, Slovenia and Austria annexed by Nazi Germany, Nazi persecution of the Church was at its harshest. In Germany and its conquests, Catholic responses to Nazism varied. The Papal Nuncio in Berlin, Cesare Orsenigo, was timid in protesting Nazi crimes and had sympathies with Italian Fascism. German priests, in general, were closely watched and often denounced, imprisoned or executed, such as German priest-philosopher, Alfred Delp. From 1940, the Nazis gathered priest-dissidents in dedicated clergy barracks at Dachau, where 95 % of its 2,720 inmates were Catholic (mostly Poles, and 411 Germans) ; 1034 died there. In Polish areas annexed by Nazi Germany, the Nazis attempted to eradicate the church and over 1,800 Polish Catholic clergy died in concentration camps ; most notably, Saint-Maximilian Kolbe. Influential members of the German Resistance included Jesuits of the « Kreisau Circle » and laymen such as July plotters Klaus von Stauffenberg, Jakob Kaiser and Bernhard Letterhaus, whose faith inspired resistance. Elsewhere, vigorous resistance from Bishops such as Johannes de Jong and Jules-Géraud Saliège, papal diplomats such as Angelo Rotta, and nuns such as Margit Slachta, can be contrasted with the apathy of others and the outright collaboration of Catholic politicians such as Slovakia's Monsignor Jozef Tiso and fanatical Croat nationalists. From within the Vatican, Monsignor Hugh O'Flaherty coordinated the rescue of thousands of Allied POWs, and civilians, including Jews. A rogue Austrian Bishop, Alois Hudal, of the College for German priests in Rome, was an informant for Nazi intelligence. After the War, he and Monsignor Krunoslav Draganovic of the Croatian College assisted the so-called « ratlines » facilitating fugitive Nazis to flee Europe.

Roman Catholicism in Germany dates back to the missionary work of Columbanus and Saint-Boniface in the 6th to 8th Centuries but, by the 20th Century, Catholics were a minority. The Reformation, initiated by Martin Luther in 1517, divided « German Christians » between Protestantism and Catholicism. The south and west remained mainly Catholic, while north and east became mainly Protestant. Bismarck's « Kulturkampf » (Battle for Culture) of 1871-1878 saw an attempt to assert a Protestant vision of nationalism over the new German Empire, and fused anti-Clericalism and suspicion of the Catholic population, whose loyalty was presumed to lie with Austria and France. The Catholic Centre Party had formed in 1870, initially to represent the religious interests of Catholics and Protestants, but was transformed by the « Kulturkampf » into the « political voice of Catholics » . By the late-1870's, it was clear that the « Kulturkampf » was largely a failure, and many of its edicts were undone.

The Catholic Church enjoyed a degree of privilege in the Bavarian region, the Rhineland and Westphalia as well as parts of the south-west, while in the Protestant North, Catholics suffered some discrimination. In the 1930's, the episcopate of the Catholic Church of Germany comprised 6 archbishops and 19 bishops while German Catholics comprised around 1/3 of the population, served by 20,000 priests. The Revolution of 1918 and the Weimar constitution of 1919 had thoroughly reformed the former relationship between State and churches. By law, Germany's Protestant and Catholic churches received tax-supported subsidies based on church census data, therefore, were

dependent on State support, causing them to be vulnerable to government influence and the political atmosphere of Germany.

The Catholic Centre Party (« Zentrum ») was a social and political force in predominantly Protestant Germany. It assisted the framing of the Weimar constitution at the end of World War I and participated in various Coalition governments of the Weimar Republic (1919 to 1933-1934). It aligned with both Social-Democrats and the Leftist German Democratic Party, while maintaining the centre ground against the rise of extremist Parties both Left and Right. Historically, the Centre Party had the strength to defy Bismarck's « Kulturkampf » and was a bulwark of the Republic. Yet, according to Bullock, from summer 1932, the Party became « notoriously a Party whose 1st concern was to make accommodation with any government in power in order to secure the protection of its particular interests ». It remained relatively moderate during the radicalisation of German politics with the onset of the Great Depression, but Party deputies voted (with most other Parties) for the Enabling Act of March 1933, offering Hitler plenary powers.

In the 1920's and 1930's, Catholic leaders made a number of forthright attacks on Nazi ideology, and the main Christian opposition to Nazism in Germany arose from the Catholic Church. Prior to Hitler's rise, German Bishops warned Catholics against Nazi racism. Some dioceses banned membership in the Nazi Party and Catholic press condemned Nazism.

John Cornwell wrote of the early Nazi period that :

« Into the early 1930's, the German Centre Party, the German Catholic Bishops, and the Catholic media had been mainly solid in their rejection of National-Socialism. They denied Nazis the sacraments and church burials, and Catholic journalists excoriated National-Socialism daily in Germany's 400 Catholic newspapers. The hierarchy instructed priests to combat National-Socialism at a local level whenever it attacked Christianity. »

Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber was appalled by the totalitarianism, neo-Paganism, and racism of the Nazi movement and, as Archbishop of Munich and Freising, contributed to the failure of the Nazi Munich « Putsch » of 1923. In early 1931, the Cologne Bishops Conference condemned National-Socialism. Followed by the Bishops of Paderborn and Freiburg. With ongoing hostility toward the Nazis by Catholic press and Centre Party, few Catholics voted Nazi in elections preceding the Nazi take-over in 1933. As in other German churches, there were some clergy and lay people who openly supported the Nazi administration.

5 Centre Party politicians served as Chancellor of Weimar Germany : Konstantin Fehrenbach, Joseph Wirth, Wilhelm Marx, Heinrich Brüning, and Franz von Papen. With Germany facing the Great Depression, Brüning was appointed chancellor by Hindenburg and was Foreign minister shortly before Hitler came to power. Brüning was appointed to form a new, more conservative ministry on 28 March 1930, but did not have a « Reichstag » majority. On July 16, unable to have key-points of his agenda pass parliament, Brüning used Article 48 of the Constitution governing by presidential emergency decree and dissolving the « Reichstag » on 18 July. New elections were set for September, in which, the Communist and Nazi representation greatly increased, hastening Germany's drift toward Rightist dictatorship. Brüning backed Hindenburg over Hitler in the 1932 presidential election, but lost Hindenburg's support as Chancellor.

He resigned in May of that year. According to Ventresca, Vatican Secretary of State Eugenio Pacelli was always nervous of Brüning's reliance on Social-Democrats for political survival. A sentiment shared by Ludwig Kaas and many German Catholics. Ventresca wrote that Brüning never forgave Pacelli for what he saw as betrayal of Catholic political tradition and his leadership.

Karl Marx writings against religion pitted Communist movements against the Catholic Church. The church denounced Communism in May 1891 with Leo XIII's Encyclical « Rerum novarum ». The church feared Communist conquest or revolution in Europe. « German Christians » were alarmed by the spread of militant Marxist-Leninist atheism, which took hold in Russia following the 1917 Revolution and involved a systematic effort to eradicate Christianity. Seminaries were closed and teaching the faith to the young was criminalized. In 1922, the Bolsheviks arrested the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church.

In 1919, Communists, initially led by the moderate Kurt Eisner, briefly attained power in Bavaria. The revolt was seized by the radical Eugen Leviné by force to establish the Bavarian Socialist Republic. This drew reaction across Germany to Bavaria from the Right ; ranging, moderate to radical. This brief but violent Soviet experiment in Munich radicalized anti-Marxist and anti-Semitic sentiment among some in Munich's largely Catholic population. In this atmosphere, the Nazi movement 1st emerged. Hitler and the Nazis were able to garner some modicum of support. Some « German Christians » thought he would be a bulwark against Communism. While serving as Apostolic Nuncio to Bavaria, Eugenio Pacelli (later, Pius XII) was in Munich during the Spartacist Uprising of 1919, which saw Communists burst into his residence brandishing guns. An experience which contributed to Pacelli's lifelong distrust of Communism. According to historian Derek Hastings many Catholics felt threatened by the possibilities of radical socialism driven, they perceived, by a cabal of Jews and atheists.

Robert Ventresca wrote :

« After witnessing the turmoil in Munich, Pacelli reserved his harshest criticism for Kurt Eisner. »

Pacelli saw Eisner as an atheist, radical Socialist, with ties to Russian nihilists as embodying the revolution in Bavaria.

Pacelli told his superiors :

« What is more, Eisner was a Galician Jew. A threat to Bavaria's religious, political, and social life. »

The Catholic priest Anton Braun, in a well-publicized sermon in December 1918, called Eisner a sleazy Jew and his administration a pack of unbelieving Jews. Pius XI saw the rising tide of Totalitarianism in Europe with alarm. He delivered papal encyclicals challenging the new creeds, including « Divini redemptoris » (Divine Redeemer) against atheistic Communism in 1937.

Nazi ideology could not accept an autonomous establishment whose legitimacy did not spring from the government. It desired the subordination of the church to the State. While the Article 24 of the NSDAP Party platform called for

conditional toleration of Christian denominations and a « Reichskonkordat » (« Reich » Concordat) treaty with the Vatican was signed in 1933, purporting to guarantee religious freedom for Catholics, Hitler believed religion was fundamentally incompatible with National-Socialism. Out of political expediency, the dictator intended to postpone the elimination of the Christian churches until after the War. However, his repeated hostile statements against the church indicated to his subordinates that continuation of the « Kirchenkampf » (Church Struggle) would be tolerated and even encouraged.

Many Nazis suspected Catholics of insufficient patriotism, or even of disloyalty to the Fatherland, and of serving the interests of « sinister alien forces » .

Shirer wrote that :

« Under the leadership of Rosenberg, Bormann and Himmler (backed by Hitler) , the Nazi regime intended to destroy Christianity in Germany, if it could, and substitute the old paganism of the early tribal Germanic gods and the new paganism of the Nazi extremists. »

Anti-Church and anti-Clerical sentiments were strong among grassroots Party activists.

Raised a Catholic, Hitler retained some regard for the organisational power of the Catholic church, but had utter contempt for its central teachings which, he said, if taken to their conclusion « would mean the systematic cultivation of the human failure » . Hitler was aware Bismarck's « Kulturkampf » of the 1870's was defeated by the unity of Catholics behind the Centre Party and was convinced Nazism could only succeed if Political Catholicism, and its democratic networks, were eliminated. Important conservative elements, such as the officer corps, opposed Nazi persecution of the churches.

Because of such political considerations, Hitler occasionally spoke of wanting to delay the « Church Struggle » and was prepared to restrain his anti-Clericalism. But, his own inflammatory remarks to his inner-circle encouraged underlings to continue their battle with the churches. He declared that science would destroy the last vestiges of superstition and that, in the long run, Nazism and religion could not co-exist. Germany couldn't tolerate intervention of foreign influences like the Vatican ; and priests, he said, were « black bugs » and « abortions in black cassocks » . The Nazi Propaganda Minister, Josef Gœbbels, led persecution of Catholic clergy in Germany.

« In Hitler's eyes, Christianity was a religion fit only for slaves; he detested its ethics in particular. Its teaching, he declared, was a rebellion against the natural law of selection by struggle and the survival of the fittest. »

(Extract from « Hitler : a Study in Tyranny » , by Alan Bullock.)

Josef Gœbbels, the Minister of Propaganda, was among the most aggressive anti-Church radicals and saw the conflict with the churches as a priority concern. Born to a Catholic family, he became one of the government's most relentless Jew-baiters.

On the « Church Question », he wrote :

« After the War, it has to be generally solved. There is, namely, an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view. »

He led the persecution of Catholic clergy.

Heinrich Himmler and Reinhard Heydrich headed the Nazi security forces and were key-architects of the « Final Solution ». Both believed Christian values were among the enemies of Nazism : the enemies were « eternally the same », wrote Heydrich : « The Jew, the Freemason, and the politically-oriented cleric. » Modes of thinking like Christian and Liberal individualism he considered residue of inherited racial characteristics, biologically sourced to Jewry - who must, therefore, be exterminated. According to Himmler biographer Peter Longerich, Himmler was vehemently opposed to Christian sexual morality and the « principle of Christian mercy », both of which he saw as a dangerous obstacle to his plans battle with « sub-humans » .

In 1937, he wrote :

« We live in an era of the ultimate conflict with Christianity. It is part of the mission of the SS to give the German people in the next half Century the non-Christian ideological foundations on which to lead and shape their lives. This task does not consist solely in overcoming an ideological opponent but must be accompanied at every step by a positive impetus : in this case, that means the reconstruction of the German heritage in the widest and most comprehensive sense. »

(Heinrich Himmler, 1937.)

Himmler saw the main task of his « Schutzstaffel » (SS) organisation to be that of « acting as the vanguard in overcoming Christianity and restoring a “ Germanic ” way of living » in order to prepare for the coming conflict between « humans and sub-humans » : Longerich wrote that, while the Nazi movement as a whole launched itself against Jews and Communists, « by linking de-Christianisation with re-Germanization, Himmler had provided the SS with a goal and purpose all of its own ». He set about making his SS the focus of a « cult of the Teutons » .

Martin Bormann, Hitler's « deputy » from 1941, saw Nazism and Christianity as « incompatible » and was a leading proponent of the anti- « Church Struggle » .

Hitler's chosen deputy and private secretary from 1941, Martin Bormann, was a militant anti-Church radical. He had a particular loathing for the Semitic origins of Christianity. He was one of the leading proponents of the ongoing persecution of the Christian churches. When the Bishop of Münster lead public protest against Nazi euthanasia, Bormann called for him to be hanged. Strongly anti-Christian, he stated publicly in 1941 that « National-Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable » .

Alfred Rosenberg, the official Nazi philosopher, wanted the extermination of the Christian faiths imported into Germany. His influence on the Nazi Party's course was limited.

In January 1934, Hitler appointed Alfred Rosenberg the cultural and educational leader of the « Reich ». Rosenberg was a neo-Pagan and notoriously anti-Catholic. Rosenberg was initially the editor of the young Nazi Party's newspaper, the « Völkischer Beobachter ». In 1924, Hitler chose Rosenberg to oversee the Nazi movement while he was in prison (this may have been because he was unsuitable for the task and unlikely to emerge a rival) . In « Myth of the 20th Century » (1930) , Rosenberg described the Catholic Church as one of the main enemies of Nazism. Rosenberg proposed to replace traditional Christianity with the neo-Pagan « myth of the blood » .

He wrote in « The Myth of the 20th Century » in 1930 :

« We now realize that the central supreme values of the Roman and the Protestant Churches hinder the organic powers of the peoples determined by their Nordic race. They will have to be remodeled " »

Church officials were perturbed by Hitler's appointment of Rosenberg as the State's official philosopher. The indication being, Hitler was endorsing his anti-Jewish, anti-Christian, and neo-Pagan philosophy. The Vatican directed the Holy Office to place Rosenberg's « Myth of the 20th Century » on the « Index of Forbidden Books » on February 7, 1934. Joachim Fest wrote of Rosenberg having little, or no, political influence in making government decisions, and thoroughly marginalized. Hitler called his book « derivative, pastiche, illogical rubbish ! »

Following the failure of the pro-Nazi Ludwig Müller to unite Protestants behind the Nazi Party in 1933, Hitler appointed his friend Hans Kerrl Minister for Church Affairs in 1935. A relative moderate among Nazis, Kerrl confirmed Nazi hostility to the Catholic and Protestant creeds in a 1937 address during an intense phase of the Nazi « Kirchenkampf » :

« The Party stands on the basis of Positive Christianity, and positive Christianity is National-Socialism. National-Socialism is the doing of God's will. God's will reveals itself in German blood. Doctor Zœllner and Count Galen have tried to make clear to me that Christianity consists in faith in Christ as the son of God. That makes me laugh. No, Christianity is not dependent upon the Apostle's Creed. True Christianity is represented by the Party, and the German people are now called by the Party and especially the “ Führer ” to a real Christianity. The “ Führer ” is the herald of a new revelation. »

(Hans Kerrl, Nazi Minister for Church Affairs, 1937.)

After World War I, Hitler became involved with the fledgling Nazi Party. He set the violent tone of the movement early, forming the « Sturmabteilung » (SA) para-military. Catholic Bavaria resented rule from Protestant Berlin, and Hitler initially saw the revolution in Bavaria as a means to power, but an early attempt proved fruitless. He was imprisoned after the 1923 Munich « Beer-Hall Putsch » . He used the time to produce « Mein Kampf » , in which he claimed

that an effeminate Jewish-Christian ethic was enfeebling Europe, and Germany needed a man of iron to restore itself to build an Empire. He decided on the tactic of pursuing power through « legal » means.

Following the Wall Street Crash of 1929, the Nazis and Communists made great gains at the 1930 Election. Greatest gains for the Nazis came in the Protestant, rural towns of the North, while Catholic areas remained loyal to the Centre Party (« Zentrum ») . Both Nazis and Communists pledged to eliminate democracy ; between them, they secured over 50 % of « Reichstag » seats . Germany's political system made it difficult for chancellors to govern with a stable parliamentary majority. Successive chancellors, instead, relied on the president's emergency powers to govern. From 1931 to 1933, Nazis combined terror tactics with conventional campaigning. Hitler criss-crossed the nation by air, while SA troops paraded in the streets, beat-up opponents, and broke-up their meetings. A middle-class Liberal Party strong enough to block the Nazis did not exist : the Social-Democrats were essentially a conservative trade-union Party, with ineffectual leadership ; the Centre Party maintained its voting block, but was preoccupied defending its own particular interests ; and the Communists, meanwhile, were engaging in violent clashes with Nazis on the streets. Moscow had directed the Communist Party to prioritise destruction of the Social-Democrats, seeing more danger in them as a rival. But it was the German Right who made Hitler their partner in a coalition government.

This coalition did not come about immediately : the Centre Party's Heinrich Brüning, Chancellor from 1930 to 1932, was unable to reach terms with Hitler, and increasingly governed with the support of the President and Army over that of the parliament. With the backing of Kurt von Schleicher and Hitler's stated approval, the 84 year old President von Hindenburg, a conservative monarchist, appointed the Catholic monarchist Franz von Papen to replace Brüning as Chancellor in June 1932. Von Papen was active in the resurgence of the Harzburg Front, and had fallen-out with the Centre Party. He hoped, ultimately, to outmaneuver Hitler.

At the July 1932 elections, the Nazis became the largest Party in the « Reichstag » . Hitler withdrew his support for von Papen and demanded the chancellorship. Hindenburg refused. In return, the Nazis approached the Centre Party to sound-out a coalition but no agreement was reached. Von Papen dissolved Parliament, and the Nazi vote declined in the November Election. Hindenburg appointed Schleicher as chancellor, whereupon the aggrieved von Papen opened negotiations with Hitler, and came to an agreement. Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor on 30 January 1933, in a coalition arrangement between the Nazis and the Nationalist-Conservatives. Von Papen was to serve as Vice-Chancellor in a majority conservative Cabinets, falsely believing he could « tame » Hitler. Initially, Papen did speak-out against some Nazi excesses and only narrowly escaped death in the « Night of the Long Knives » , whereafter he ceased to openly criticize the Hitler government. German Catholics met the Nazi take-over with apprehension, as leading clergy had been warning against Nazism for years. A threatening though at 1st sporadic persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany commenced.

Following the « Reichstag » fire, the Nazis began to suspend civil liberties and eliminate political opposition, excluding the Communists from the « Reichstag » . At the March 1933 elections, again no single Party secured a majority. Hitler required the « Reichstag » votes of the Centre Party and Conservatives. He told the « Reichstag » on March 23rd that Positive Christianity was the « unshakeable foundation of the moral and ethical life of our people » , and promised not to threaten the churches or the institutions of the Republic if granted plenary powers. Employing a

characteristic mix of negotiation and intimidation, the Nazis called on the Centre Party, led by Ludwig Kaas, and all other Parties in the « Reichstag », to vote for the Enabling Act on 24 March 1933. The law was to give Hitler the freedom to act without parliamentary consent or constitutional limitations.

Hitler offered the possibility of friendly co-operation, promising not to threaten the « Reichstag », the President, the States, or the churches if granted emergency powers.

With Nazi para-military encircling the building, he said :

« It is for you, gentlemen of the “ Reichstag ” to decide between War and Peace. »

Hitler offered Kaas oral guarantees of the Centre Party's continued existence, autonomy of the Church, her educational and cultural institutions. Kaas was aware of the doubtful nature of such guarantees, but told members to support the bill, given the « precarious state of the Party ». A number opposed the chairman's course, among them former Chancellors Brüning and Joseph Wirth and former minister Adam Stegerwald. Brüning called the Act « the most monstrous resolution ever demanded of a parliament », and was sceptical about Kaas' efforts. The Centre Party, having obtained promises of non-interference in religion, joined with conservatives in voting for the Act (only the Social-Democrats voted against) . Hoffman wrote that the Centre Party and Bavarian People's Party, along with other groups between the Nazis and the Social-Democrats « voted for their own emasculation in the paradoxical hope of saving their existence thereby » . Hitler immediately set about abolishing the powers of the States, the existence of non-Nazi political Parties and organisations. The Act, allowed Hitler and his Cabinet to rule by emergency decree for 4 years, though Hindenberg remained President. The Act did not infringe upon the powers of the President, and Hitler would not fully achieve full dictatorial power until after the death of Hindenberg, in August 1934. Hindenberg remained Commander and Chief of the military and retained the power to negotiate foreign treaties. On 28 March, the German Bishops' Conference conditionally revised prohibition of Nazi Party membership.

Through the winter-spring of 1933, Hitler ordered the wholesale dismissal of Catholic civil servants. The leader of the Catholic Trade Unions was beaten by Brownshirts and a Catholic politician sought protection after SA troopers wounded a number of followers at a rally. In this threatening atmosphere, Hitler called for a re-organization of Church and State relations of both Catholic and Protestant churches. By June, thousands of Centre Party members were incarcerated in concentration camps. 2,000 functionaries of the Bavarian People's Party were rounded-up by police in late-June 1933 ; along with the Centre Party, it ceased to exist by early-July. Lacking public ecclesial support, the Center Party voluntary dissolved on July 5. Non-Nazi Parties were formally outlawed on 14 July, and the « Reichstag » abdicated its democratic responsibilities.

Diplomatic policy under Pius XI saw the Catholic Church conclude 18 concordats, starting in the 1920's. The aim of the church was to safeguard its institutional rights. Historians note the treaties were unsuccessful since, « Europe was entering a period in which such agreements were regarded as mere scraps of paper » . The « Reich » concordat (« Reichskonkordat ») was signed on July 20, 1933, and ratified in September of that year. The treaty remains in force to the present-day. It was an extension of existing concordats with Prussia and Bavaria, Ist realized via the diplomacy of

Nuncio Eugenio Pacelli with a State level concordat with Bavaria (1924) .

Peter Hebblethwaite wrote :

« It was more like a surrender than anything else : it involved the suicide of the Centre Party. »

Signed by President Hindenburg and Vice-Chancellor von Papen, it was a realization of a long-standing program of the Catholic Church to secure a nation-wide Concordat, dating back to the 1st year of the Weimar Republic. Breaches of the treaty by the State commenced almost immediately. The church continually protested throughout the Nazi era and preserved diplomatic ties with the German Government through the 3rd « Reich » .

Between 1930 and 1933, the church initiated negotiations with successive German governments with limited success while a federal treaty proved elusive. Catholic politicians of the Centre Party repeatedly pushed for a concordat with the German Republic. In February 1930, Pacelli became the Vatican's Secretary of State responsible for the Church's global foreign policy. In this position, he continued to work towards the « great goal » of securing a treaty with Germany. Kershaw wrote that the Vatican was anxious to reach agreement with the new government, despite « continuing molestation of Catholic clergy, and other outrages committed by Nazis against the Church and its organisations » .

Biographer of Pius XII, Robert Ventresca, wrote :

« Because of increasing harassment of Catholics and Catholic clergy, Pacelli sought a quick ratification of a treaty, seeking, in this way, to protect the German Church. »

When Vice-Chancellor von Papen and Ambassador Diego von Bergen met Pacelli in late-June 1933, they found him « visibly influenced » by reports of actions being taken against German Catholic interests. Hitler wanted to end all Catholic political life. The church wanted protection of its schools and organisations, recognition of canon law regarding marriage and the right of the Pope to select Bishops. The non-Nazi Vice-Chancellor von Papen was chosen by the new government to negotiate with the Vatican. The Bishops announced on April 6 negotiations toward a concordat would begin in Rome.

On April 10, Francis Stratmann O.P. , a chaplain to students in Berlin, wrote to Cardinal Faulhaber :

« The souls of the well-intentioned are deflated by the National-Socialist seizure of power - the Bishops' authority is weakened among countless Catholics and non-Catholics because of their quasi-approbation of the National-Socialist movement. »

Some Catholic critics of the Nazis soon chose to emigrate. Among them, Waldemar Gurian, Dietrich von Hildebrand, and Hans A. Reinhold. Hitler began enacting laws restricting movement of funds (making it impossible for German Catholics to send money to missionaries) , restricting religious institutions, education, and mandating attendance at Hitler Youth

functions (held on Sunday mornings) .

On 8 April, Vice-Chancellor von Papen, went to Rome. On behalf of Cardinal Pacelli, Ludwig Kaas, the out-going chairman of the Centre Party, negotiated a draft with Papen. Kaas arrived in Rome shortly before Papen because of his expertise in Church-State relations. He was authorized by Cardinal Pacelli to negotiate terms with von Papen, but pressure by the German government forced him to withdraw from visibly participating. The concordat prolonged Kaas' stay in Rome, leaving the Party without a chairman. On 5 May, Kaas resigned his post. In his place, the Party elected Heinrich Brüning. Congruently, the Centre Party was subjected to increasing pressure under the Nazi campaign of « Gleichschaltung » . The Bishops saw a draft on 30 May 1933 as they assembled for a joint-meeting of the Fulda Bishops conference, led by Breslau's Cardinal Bertram. And, the Bavarian Bishops' conference, led by its president, Munich's Michæl von Faulhaber) . Bishop's Wilhelm Berning of Osnabruck, and Archbishop Conrad Gröber of Freiburg presented the document to the Bishops. Weeks of escalating anti-Catholic violence preceded the conference. Many Catholic Bishops feared for the safety of the church if Hitler's demands were not met. The strongest critics of the concordat were Cologne's Cardinal Karl Schulte and Eichstatt's Bishop Konrad von Preysing. They pointed-out the Enabling Act established a quasi-dictatorship, while the church lacked legal recourse if Hitler decided to disregard the concordat. The Bishops approved the draft and delegated Gröber, a friend of Cardinal Pacelli and Monsignor Kaas, to present the episcopacy's concerns to Pacelli and Kaas. On 3 June, the Bishops issued a statement, drafted by Gröber, that announced their support for the concordat. After all, the other Parties had dissolved, or banned by the NSDAP, the Centre Party dissolved itself on 6 July.

On 14 July 1933, the Weimar government accepted the « Reichskonkordat » . It was signed by Pacelli for the Vatican and von Papen for Germany, on 20 July ; subsequently, President Hindenburg signed, and it was ratified in September. Article 16 required Bishops to make an oath of loyalty to the State. Article 31 acknowledged while the church would continue to sponsor charitable organisations, it would not support political organisations or political causes. Article 31 was supposed to be supplemented by a list of protected catholic agencies, but this list was never agreed upon. Article 32 gave Hitler what he was seeking : exclusion of clergy and members of religious orders from politics. Yet, it was a gratuitous, according to Günter Lewy's interpretation. In theory, Lewy reasons, members of the clergy could join or remain in the NSDAP without transgressing church discipline.

Lewy states :

« An ordinance of the Holy-See forbidding priests to be members of a political Party was never issued. »

The Nazis State allowed such membership reasoning, « the movement sustaining the State cannot be equated with the political Parties of the parliamentary multi-Party State in the sense of Article 32 » . The day after, the government issued a law banning the founding of new political Parties, thus, turning Germany into a One Party State.

Most historians state it offered international acceptance of Adolf Hitler's government. Günter Lewy, political scientist and author of « The Catholic Church » and Nazi Germany, wrote :

« There is general agreement that the Concordat increased substantially the prestige of Hitler's regime around the world. As Cardinal Faulhaber put it in a sermon delivered in 1937 :

“ At a time when the heads of the major nations in the world faced the new Germany with cool reserve and considerable suspicion, the Catholic Church, the greatest moral power on earth, through the Concordat expressed its confidence in the new German government. This was a deed of immeasurable significance for the reputation of the new government abroad. ” »

The Catholic Church was not alone in signing treaties with the Nazi government at this point. The concordat was preceded by the 4 Power Pact Hitler had signed in June 1933. After the signing of the treaty, on 14 July, the Cabinet minutes record Hitler as saying that the concordat had created an atmosphere of confidence that would be « especially significant in the struggle against international Jewry » .

« John Cornwell in “ Hitler's Pope ” argues that the Concordat was the result of a deal that delivered the parliamentary votes of the Catholic Center Party to Hitler, thereby, giving him dictatorial power (the Enabling Act of March 1933) . This is historically inaccurate. But there is no doubt Pius XII's tenacious insistence on the Concordat retention before, during and after the Second World War. »

(Michaël Phayer)

Historian Robert Ventresca wrote that the « Reichskonkordat » left German Catholics with no « meaningful electoral opposition to the Nazis » , while the « benefits and vaunted diplomatic entente of the “ Reichskonkordat ” with the German State were neither clear nor certain » . In the « Reichskonkordat » , the German government achieved a complete proscription of all clerical interference in the political field (Articles 16 and 32) . It also ensured the Bishops' loyalty to the State by an oath of fidelity. Restrictions were also placed on the Catholic organizations.

In a 2 page article in the « L'Osservatore Romano » , on 26 July and 27 July, Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli said that the purpose of the « Reichskonkordat » was :

« Not only the official recognition (by the “ Reich ”) of the legislation of the Church (its Code of Canon Law) , but the adoption of many provisions of this legislation and the protection of all Church legislation. »

Pacelli told an English representative that the Holy-See had only made the agreement to preserve the Catholic Church in Germany ; he also expressed his aversion to anti-Semitism. According to John Jay Hughes, church leaders were realistic about the Concordat's supposed protections.

Cardinal Faulhaber is reported to have said :

« With the concordat we are hanged, without the concordat we are hanged, drawn and quartered. »

In Rome, the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli (later Pius XII) , told the British minister to the Holy-See that he had signed the treaty with a pistol at his head. Hitler was sure to violate the agreement, Pacelli said - adding with gallows humour he would probably not violate all its provisions at once. According to Paul O'Shea, Hitler had a « blatant disregard » for the Concordat, and its signing was to him merely a 1st step in the « gradual suppression of the Catholic Church in Germany » . In 1942, Hitler stated he viewed the Concordat as obsolete, and intended to abolish it after the War, and only hesitated to withdraw Germany's representative from the Vatican for « military reasons connected with the War » : At the Wars end, we will put a swift end to the Concordat. When the Nazi government violated the concordat (in particular Article 31) , German Bishops and the Holy-See protested against these violations. Between September 1933 and March 1937, Pacelli issued over 70 notes and memoranda protesting such violations. When Nazi violations of the « Reichskonkordat » escalated to include physical violence, Pope Pius XI issued the 1937 Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » .

A threatening, initially sporadic, persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany followed the Nazi take-over. The Nazis claimed jurisdiction over all collective and social activity, interfering with Catholic schooling, youth groups, workers' clubs and cultural societies.

Phayer wrote :

« By the latter part of the decade of the 30's, church officials were well-aware that the ultimate aim of Hitler and other Nazis was the total elimination of Catholicism and of the Christian religion. Since the vast majority of Germans were either Catholic or Protestant, this goal was a long-term rather than short-term Nazi objective. »

Hitler moved quickly to eliminate Political Catholicism. The Nazis arrested thousands of members of the German Centre Party. The Catholic Bavarian People's Party government had been overthrown in Bavaria by a Nazi « coup » on 9 March 1933. 2,000 functionaries of the Party were rounded-up by police in late-June. The national Centre Party, dissolved themselves in early-July. The dissolution of the Centre Party left modern Germany without a Catholic Party for the 1st time and the « Reich » Concordat prohibited clergy from participating in politics. Kershaw wrote that the Vatican was anxious to reach agreement with the new government, despite « continuing molestation of Catholic clergy, and other outrages committed by Nazi radicals against the Church and its organisations » . Hitler had a « blatant disregard » for the Concordat, wrote Paul O'Shea, and its signing was to him merely a 1st step in the « gradual suppression of the Catholic Church in Germany » . Anton Gill wrote that « with his usual irresistible, bullying technique, Hitler proceeded to “ take a mile where he had been given an inch ” and closed all Catholic institutions whose functions weren't strictly religious » :

Adalbert Probst, the national director of the Catholic Youth Sports Association, was murdered in the « Night of the Long Knives » purge. The Nazis interfered with Catholic schooling, youth groups, workers' clubs and cultural societies.

« It quickly became clear that Hitler intended to imprison the Catholics, as it were, in their own churches. They could celebrate mass and retain their rituals as much as they liked, but they could have nothing at all to do with German society otherwise. Catholic schools and newspapers were closed, and a propaganda campaign against the Catholics was

launched. »

(Extract from « An Honourable Defeat by Anton Gill.)

Almost immediately after signing the Concordat, the Nazis promulgated the sterilization law (the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Off-spring) , an offensive policy in the eyes of the Catholic Church. Days later, moves began to dissolve the Catholic Youth League. Political Catholicism was also among the targets of Hitler's 1934 « Long Knives » purge : the head of Catholic Action, Erich Klausener, Papen's speech writer and advisor Edgar Jung (also a Catholic Action worker) ; and the national director of the Catholic Youth Sports Association, Adalbert Probst. Former Centre Party Chancellor, Heinrich Brüning narrowly escaped execution. William Shirer wrote that the German people were not greatly aroused by the persecution of the churches by the Nazi Government. The majority were not moved to face death or imprisonment for the sake of freedom of worship, being too impressed by Hitler's early foreign policy successes and the restoration of the German economy. Few, he said, paused to reflect that the Nazis intended to destroy Christianity in Germany, and substitute old paganism of tribal Germanic gods and the new paganism of the Nazi extremists. Anti-Nazi sentiment grew in Catholic circles as the Nazi government increased its repressive measures against their activities.

Clergy as well as members of male and female religious orders and lay leaders began to be targeted, leading to thousands of arrests over the ensuing years, often on trumped-up charges of currency smuggling or « immorality » . Priests were watched closely and frequently denounced, arrested and sent to concentration camps. From 1940, a dedicated Clergy Barracks had been established at Dachau concentration camp. Intimidation of clergy was wide-spread and Cardinal Faulhaber was shot at. Cardinal Innitzer had his Vienna residence ransacked in October 1938 and Bishop Sproll of Rottenburg was jostled and his home vandalised. In 1937, « The New York Times » reported that Christmas would see « several thousand Catholic clergymen in prison » . Propaganda satirized the clergy, including Anderl Kern's play « The Last Peasant » . Under Reinhard Heydrich and Heinrich Himmler, the Security Police and the SD were responsible for suppressing internal and external enemies of the Nazi State. Among those enemies were « political churches » - such as Lutheran and Catholic clergy who opposed Hitler. Such dissidents were arrested and sent to concentration camps. In the 1936 campaign against the monasteries and convents, the authorities charged 276 members of religious orders with the offence of « homosexuality » . 1935-1936 was the height of the « immorality » trials against priests, monks, lay-brothers and nuns. In the United States, protests were organized in response to the sham trials, including a June 1936 petition signed by 48 clergymen, including rabbis and Protestant pastors :

« We lodge a solemn protest against the almost unique brutality of the attacks launched by the German government charging Catholic clergy with gross immorality ... in the hope that the ultimate suppression of all Jewish and Christian beliefs by the totalitarian State can be effected. »

Winston Churchill wrote disapprovingly in the British press of Germany's treatment of « the Jews, Protestants and Catholics of Germany » .

Since senior clerics could rely on a degree of popular support from the faithful the German government had to

consider the possibility of nation-wide protests. While hundreds of ordinary priests and members of monastic orders were sent to concentration camps throughout the Nazi period, only one German Catholic Bishop was briefly imprisoned in a concentration camp and another expelled from his diocese. From 1940, the « Gestapo » launched an intense persecution of the monasteries invading, searching and seizing them. The Provincial of the Dominican Province of Teutonia, Laurentius Siemer, a spiritual leader of the German Resistance was influential in the Committee for Matters Relating to the Orders, which formed in response to Nazi attacks against Catholic monasteries and aimed to encourage the Bishops to intercede on behalf of the Orders and oppose the Nazi State more emphatically. Figures like Galen and Preysing attempted to protect German priests from arrest.

Fritz Gerlich, editor of Munich's Catholic weekly, was murdered in the « Night of the Long Knives » . The Catholic press was muzzled in Nazi Germany.

The flourishing Catholic press of Germany faced censorship and closure. In March 1941, Josef Gœbbels banned all church press, on the pretext of a « paper shortage » . In 1933, the Nazis established a « Reich » Chamber of Authorship and « Reich » Press Chamber under the « Reich » Cultural Chamber of the Ministry for Propaganda. Dissident writers were terrorised. The June-July 1934 « Night of the Long Knives » purge was the culmination of this early campaign. Fritz Gerlich, the editor of Munich's Catholic weekly, « Der Gerade Weg » , was killed in the purge for his strident criticism of the Nazis. Writer and theologian Dietrich von Hildebrand was forced to flee Germany. The poet Ernst Wiechert protested the government's attitudes to the arts, calling them « spiritual murder » . He was arrested and taken to Dachau Concentration Camp. Hundreds of arrests and closure of Catholic presses followed the issuing of Pope Pius XI's « Mit brennender Sorge » anti-Nazi Encyclical. Nikolaus Groß, a Christian Trade-Unionist, and director of the West German Workers' Newspaper « Westdeutschen Arbeiterzeitung » , was declared a martyr and beatified by Pope John Paul II, in 2001. Declared an enemy of the State in 1938, his a newspaper was shut-down. He was arrested in the « July Plot » round-up, and executed on 23 January 1945.

Catholic schools were a major battle-ground in the « Church Struggle » . In 1933, the Nazi school superintendent of Münster issued a decree religious instruction be combined with discussion of the « demoralising power » of the « people of Israel » , Bishop August von Galen of Munich refused, writing that such interference in curriculum was a breach of the Concordat and he feared children would be confused as to their « obligation to act with charity to all men » and as to the historical mission of the people of Israel. Often Galen directly protested to Hitler over violations of the Concordat. In 1936, Nazis removed crucifixes in school. Protest by Galen led to public demonstration. Hitler sometimes allowed pressure to be placed on German parents to remove children from religious classes to be given ideological instruction in its place, while in elite Nazi schools, Christian prayers were replaced with Teutonic rituals and sun-worship. Church kindergartens were closed and Catholic welfare programs were restricted on the basis they assisted the « racially unfit » . Parents were coerced into removing their children from Catholic schools. In Bavaria, teaching positions formerly allotted to nuns were awarded to secular teachers and denominational schools transformed into « Community schools » . In 1937, authorities in Upper-Bavaria attempted to replace Catholic schools with « common schools » . Cardinal Faulhaber offered fierce resistance. By 1939, all Catholic denominational schools had been disbanded or converted to public facilities.

After constant confrontations, by late-1935, Bishop August von Galen of Munich was urging a joint pastoral letter protesting an « underground War » against the church. By early 1937, the church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, became highly-disillusioned. In March, Pope Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical - accusing the Nazi Government of violations of the 1933 Concordat, and it was sowing the « tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » . The Nazis responded with an intensification of the « Church Struggle » beginning around April. Goebbels noted heightened verbal attacks on the clergy from Hitler in his diary and wrote that Hitler had approved the trumped-up « immorality trials » against clergy and anti-Church propaganda campaign. Goebbels' orchestrated attack included a staged « morality trial » of 37 Franciscans. At the outbreak of World War II, Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda issued threats and applied intense pressure on the Churches to voice support for the War, and the « Gestapo » banned church meetings for a few weeks. In the 1st few months of the War, the German churches complied. No denunciations of the invasion of Poland, nor the « Blitzkrieg » were issued.

The Catholic Bishops stated :

« We appeal to the faithful to join in ardent prayer that God's providence may lead this War to blessed success for Fatherland and people. »

Despite such protestation of loyalty to the Fatherland, the anti-Church radical Reinhard Heydrich determined that support from church leaders could not be expected because of the nature of their doctrines and internationalism, and wanted to cripple the political activities of clergy. He devised measures to restrict the operation of the churches under cover of War-time exigencies, such as reducing resources available to church presses on the basis of rationing, prohibiting pilgrimages and large church gatherings on the basis of transportation difficulties. Churches were closed for being « too far from bomb shelters » . Bells were melted-down and presses were closed.

With the expansion of the War in the East from 1941 came an expansion of Germany's attack on the churches. Monasteries and convents were targeted and expropriation of church properties surged. Nazi authorities claimed the properties were needed for War-time necessities such as hospitals, or accommodation for refugees or children, but, in fact, used them for their own purposes. « Hostility to the State » was a common cause given for the confiscations, and the action of a single member of a monastery could result in seizure. The Jesuits were especially targeted. The Papal Nuncio Cesare Orsenigo and Cardinal Bertram complained constantly to the authorities but were told to expect more requisitions owing to War-time needs. Nazi authorities decreed the dissolution of all monasteries and abbeys, many of them effectively being occupied and secularized by the Allgemeine SS under Heinrich Himmler. However, on 30 July 1941, the « Aktion Klostersturm » (Operation Monastery) was ended by a decree of Hitler, who feared the increasing protests by the Catholic population might result in passive rebellions, harming the Nazi War effort at the Eastern front. Over 300 monasteries and other institutions were expropriated by the SS. On 22 March 1942, the German Bishops issued a pastoral letter on « The Struggle against Christianity and the Church » . The letter launched a defence of human rights, the rule of law and accused the « Reich » Government of « unjust oppression and hated struggle against Christianity and the Church » , despite the loyalty of German Catholics to the Fatherland, and brave service of Catholics soldiers.

In January 1934, Hitler had appointed neo-Pagan and anti-Catholic Alfred Rosenberg as the cultural and educational leader of the « Reich ». In 1934, the « Sanctum Officium » in Rome recommended that Rosenberg's book be put on the « Index Librorum Prohibitorum » for scorning and rejecting « all dogmas of the Catholic Church, indeed, the very fundamentals of the Christian religion ». During the War, Rosenberg outlined the future envisioned by the Hitler government for religion in Germany, with a 30 point program for the future of the German churches. Among its articles : the National « Reich » Church of Germany was to claim exclusive control over all churches ; publication of the Bible was to cease ; crucifixes, Bibles and Saints were to be removed from altars ; and « Mein Kampf » was to be placed on altars as « to the German nation and, therefore, to God the most sacred book » ; and the Christian Cross was to be removed from all churches and replaced with the swastika.

The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) saw Nationalists (aided by Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany) and Republicans (aided by the Soviet Union, Mexico as well as International Brigades of volunteers, most of whom were under the command of the Comintern) . The Republican president, Manuel Azaña, was anti-Clerical, while the Nationalist « Generalissimo » Francisco Franco, established a long-standing Fascist dictatorship which restored some privileges to the Church.

In a « Table Talk » of 7 June 1942, Hitler said he believed that Franco's accommodation of the Church was an error :

« One makes a great mistake if one thinks that one can make a collaborator of the Church by accepting a compromise. The whole international outlook and political interest of the Catholic Church in Spain render inevitable conflict between the Church and Franco regime. »

The Nazis portrayed the War as a contest between civilization and Bolshevism. According to historian, Beth Griech-Polelle, many church leaders « implicitly embraced the idea that behind the Republican forces stood a vast Judeo-Bolshevik conspiracy intent on destroying Christian civilization » .

Josef Gœbbels' Ministry of Propaganda served as the main-source of German domestic coverage of the War. Gœbbels, like Hitler, frequently mentioned the so-called link between Jewishness and Communism. Gœbbels instructed the press to call the Republican side simply Bolsheviks - and not to mention German military involvement. Against this backdrop, in August 1936, the German Bishops met for their annual conference at Fulda.

The Bishops produced a joint pastoral letter regarding the Spanish Civil War :

« Therefore, German unity should not be sacrificed to religious antagonism, quarrels, contempt, and struggles. Rather our national power of resistance must be increased and strengthened so that not only may Europe be freed from Bolshevism by us, but also that the whole civilized world may be indebted to us. »

Gœbbels noted the mood of Hitler in his diary on 25 October :

« Trials against the Catholic Church temporarily stopped. Possibly wants peace, at least temporarily. Now, a battle with

Bolshevism. Wants to speak with Faulhaber. »

As Nuncio, Cesare Orsenigo arranged for Cardinal Faulhaber to have a private meeting with Hitler. On November 4, 1936, Hitler met Faulhaber. Hitler spoke for the 1st hour, then, Faulhaber told him the Nazi government had been waging War on the church for 3 years (600 religious teachers had lost their jobs in Bavaria alone) and the number rose to 1,700. The government instituted laws the Church could not accept - like the sterilization of criminals and the handicapped.

Faulhaber stated :

« When your officials or your laws offend Church dogma or the laws of morality, and, in so doing, offend our conscience, then, we must be able to articulate this as responsible defenders of moral laws. »

Hitler told Faulhaber religion was critical for the State, his goal was to protect the German people from congenitally afflicted criminals such as now wreak havoc in Spain.

Faulhaber replied :

« The Church would not refuse the State the right to keep these pests away from the national community within the framework of moral law. »

Hitler argued the radical Nazis could not be contained until there was peace with the Church and that either the Nazis and the Church would fight Bolshevism together, or there would be War against the Church. Kershaw cites the meeting as an example of Hitler's ability to « pull the wool over the eyes even of hardened critics » .

« Faulhaber - a man of sharp acumen, who often courageously criticized the Nazi attacks on the Catholic Church, went away convinced Hitler was deeply religious. »

On 18 November, Faulhaber met with leading members of the German hierarchy to ask them to remind parishioners of the errors of Communism outlined in Leo XIII's 1891 Encyclical « Rerum novarum » . On 19 November, Pius XI announced Communism had moved to the head of the list of « errors » and a clear statement was needed.

On 25 November, Faulhaber told the Bavarian Bishops that he promised Hitler the Bishops would issue pastoral letter to condemn ...

« Bolshevism which represents the greatest danger for the peace of Europe and the Christian civilization of our country. »

He stated :

« The letter will, once again, affirm our loyalty and positive attitude, demanded by the 4th Commandment, toward today's form of government and the “ Führer ”. »

On 24 December 1936, the hierarchy ordered its priests to read the pastoral letter, « On the Defense against Bolshevism » , from all the pulpits on 7 January 1937.

The letter included the statement :

« The fateful hour has come for our nation and for the Christian culture of the western world. The “ Führer ” saw the march of Bolshevism from afar and turned his mind and energies towards averting this enormous danger from the German people and the whole western world. The German Bishops consider it their duty to do their utmost to support the leader of the “ Reich ” with every available means in this defense. »

Hitler's promise to Faulhaber, to clear-up small problems between the Catholic Church and the Nazi State, never materialized. Faulhaber, Galen, and Pius XI, continued to oppose Communism throughout their tenure as anxieties reached a high-point in the 1930's with what the Vatican termed the « Red triangle » , formed by the USSR, the Republican Spain and the revolutionary Mexico. A series of Encyclicals followed : « Bona Sana » (1920) ; « Miserentissimus Redemptor » (1928) ; « Caritate Christi Compusli » (1932) ; and, most importantly, « Divini redemptoris » (1937) . All of which condemned Communism.

The 1933 Concordat between Germany and the Vatican prohibited clergy from participating in politics, weakening the opposition offered by German Catholic leaders. Still, the clergy were among the first major components of the German Resistance.

Hamerow wrote :

« From the very beginning, some churchmen expressed, quite directly at times, their reservations about the new order. In fact, those reservations gradually came to form a coherent, systematic critique of many of the teachings of National-Socialism. »

Later, the most trenchant public criticism of the 3rd « Reich » came from some of Germany's religious leaders. The government was reluctant to move against them since they could claim to merely attend the spiritual welfare of their flocks, « what they had to say was, at times, so critical of the central doctrines of National-Socialism that to say it required great boldness » , and became resisters. Their resistance was directed not only against intrusions by the government into church governance, arrests of clergy, and expropriation of church property, but also, matters like euthanasia and eugenics, the fundamentals of human rights and justice as the foundation of a political system.

Neither the Catholic or Protestant churches were prepared to openly oppose the Nazi State. While offering, in the words of Kershaw, « something less than fundamental resistance to Nazism » , the churches « engaged in a bitter War of attrition with the regime, receiving the demonstrative backing of millions of church-goers. Applause for Church

leaders whenever they appeared in public, swollen attendances at events such as “ Corpus Christi ” Day processions, and packed church services were outward signs of the struggle especially of the Catholic Church against Nazi oppression ». While the Church ultimately failed to protect its youth organisations and schools, it did have some successes in mobilizing public opinion to alter government policies. As in the case of the attempt to remove crucifixes from class-rooms. The churches did provide the earliest and most enduring centres of systematic opposition to Nazi policies. Christian morality and the anti-Church policies of the Nazis motivated many German resisters and provided impetus for the « moral revolt » of individuals in their efforts to overthrow Hitler. Institutionally, the Catholic Church in Germany offered organized, systematic and consistent resistance to government policies which infringed on ecclesiastical autonomy.

In his « History of the German Resistance », Hoffmann writes, from the beginning :

« The Catholic Church could not silently accept the general persecution, regimentation or oppression, nor in particular the sterilization law of summer 1933. Over the years until the outbreak of War, Catholic resistance stiffened until finally its most eminent spokesman was the Pope himself with his Encyclical “ Mit brennender Sorge ” of 14 March 1937, read from all German Catholic pulpits. Clemens August Graf von Galen, Bishop of Münster, was typical of the many fearless Catholic speakers. In general terms, therefore, the churches were the only major organisations to offer comparatively early and open resistance : they remained so in later years. »

(Extract from « The History of the German Resistance 1933-1945 » by Peter Hoffmann.)

Erich Klausener, the head of Catholic Action, was assassinated in Hitler's bloody « Night of the Long Knives » purge of 1934.

Political Catholicism was a target of the Hitler government. The formerly influential Centre Party and Bavarian People's Party were dissolved under terrorisation. Following « Hitler's seizure of power », opposition politicians began planning how he might be overthrown. Old political opponents faced a final opportunity to halt the Nazification of Germany, however non-Nazi Parties were prohibited under the proclamation of the « Unity of Party and State ». Former Centre Party leader and « Reich » Chancellor, Heinrich Brüning, looked to oust Hitler, along with military chiefs Kurt von Schleicher and Kurt von Hammerstein-Equord. Erich Klausener, an influential civil servant and president of Berlin's Catholic Action group organized Catholic conventions in Berlin in 1933-1934. At the 1934 rally, he spoke against political oppression to a crowd of 60,000 following mass ; just 6 nights before Hitler struck in a bloody purge. The Conservative Catholic nobleman Franz von Papen, who had helped Hitler to power and was serving as the Deputy « Reich » Chancellor, delivered an indictment of the Nazi government in his Marburg speech of 17 June 1934. Papen's speech writer and advisor, Edgar Jung, a Catholic Action worker, seized the opportunity to re-assert the Christian foundation of the State and the need to avoid agitation and propaganda. Jung's speech pleaded for religious freedom, and rejected totalitarian aspirations in the field of religion. It was hoped the speech might spur a rising, centred on Hindenberg, Papen and the army.

Edgar Jung of Catholic Action, was an advisor to Vice-Chancellor von Papen. He drafted the Marburg speech of 17 June

1934, which rejected Nazi totalitarianism. He was murdered a few days later in the « Night of the Long Knives » purge.

Hitler decided to kill his chief political opponents in the « Night of the Long Knives » purge. It lasted 2 days over 30 June - 1 July 1934. His leading rivals in the Nazi movement were murdered, along with over 100 opposition figures, including high-profile Catholics. Klausener became the 1st Catholic martyr, while Hitler personally ordered the arrest of Jung and his transfer to « Gestapo » headquarters in Berlin where he too was killed. The Church had resisted attempts by the new Government to close its youth organisations and Adalbert Probst, the national director of the Catholic Youth Sports Association, was also killed. The Catholic press was targeted too, with anti-Nazi journalist Fritz Gerlich among those murdered. On 2 August 1934, the aged President von Hindenberg died. The offices of President and Chancellor were combined, and Hitler ordered the Army to swear an oath directly to him. Hitler declared his « revolution » complete.

Historian of the German Resistance, Joachim Fest wrote that, at 1st, the Church had been quite hostile to Nazism and « its Bishops energetically denounced the “ false doctrines ” of the Nazis » , however, its opposition weakened considerably after the Concordat. Cardinal Bertram « developed an ineffectual protest system » to satisfy the demands of other Bishops, without annoying the authorities. Firmer resistance by Catholic leaders gradually re-asserted itself by the individual actions of leading churchmen like Joseph Frings, Konrad von Preysing, August von Galen, Conrad Gröber and Michæl von Faulhaber. According to Fest, the government responded with « occasional arrests, the withdrawal of teaching privileges, and the seizure of church publishing houses and printing facilities » and « Resistance remained largely a matter of individual conscience. In general, they (both churches) attempted merely to assert their own rights and only rarely issued pastoral letters or declarations indicating any fundamental objection to Nazi ideology. » Nevertheless, wrote Fest, the churches, more than any other institutions, « provided a forum in which individuals could distance themselves from the regime » .

The Nazis never felt strong enough to arrest or execute senior office holders of the Catholic Church in Germany. Thus, Bishops were able to criticise aspects of Nazi totalitarianism. Lesser senior figures faced imprisonment or execution. An estimated 1/3 of German priests faced some form of reprisal from the Nazi Government and 400 German priests were sent the dedicated Priest Barracks of Dachau Concentration Camp alone. Among the best-known German priest martyrs were the Jesuit Alfred Delp and Friar Bernhard Lichtenberg. Friar Max Josef Metzger, founder of the German Catholics' Peace Association, was arrested for the last time in June 1943 after being denounced by a mail courier for attempting to send a memorandum on the re-organization of the German State and its integration into a future system of world peace. He was executed on 17 April 1944. Laurentius Siemer, provincial of the Provincial of the Dominican Province of Teutonia, and Augustin Rösch, Jesuit Provincial of Bavaria, were among the high-ranking members of orders who became active in the Resistance - both only narrowly survived the War, following discovery of their knowledge of the « July Plot » . Bernhard Lichtenberg, and the Jesuit Rupert Mayer are among the priest resisters posthumously honoured with beatification. While hundreds of ordinary priests and members of monastic orders were sent to concentration camps, just one German Catholic Bishop was briefly imprisoned in a concentration camp, and just one other expelled from his diocese. This reflected also the cautious approach adopted by the hierarchy, who felt secure only in commenting on matters which transgressed on the ecclesiastical sphere. Albert Speer wrote that when Hitler was read

passages from a defiant sermon or pastoral letter, he would become furious, and the fact that he « could not immediately retaliate raised him to a white heat » .

Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber gained an early reputation as a critic of the Nazi movement. Soon after, the Nazi take-over, his 3 Advent sermons of 1933, entitled Judaism, Christianity, and Germany, affirmed the Jewish origins of Christ and the Bible. Though cautiously framed as a discussion of historical Judaism, his sermons denounced the Nazi extremists who were calling for the Bible to be purged of the « Jewish » Old Testament, which he saw as undermining « the basis of Catholicism » . Hamerow wrote that Faulhaber would look to avoid conflict with the State over issues not strictly pertaining to the Church, but on issues involving the defence of Catholics he « refused to compromise or retreat » . On 4 November 1936, Hitler and Faulhaber met. Faulhaber told Hitler that the Nazi government had been waging War on the Church for 3 years and had instituted laws the Church could not accept - like the sterilization of criminals and the handicapped. While the Catholic Church respected the notion of authority, he told the Dictator, « when your officials or your laws offend Church dogma or the laws of morality, and in so doing offend our conscience, then, we must be able to articulate this as responsible defenders of moral laws » . Attempts on his life were made in 1934 and in 1938. He worked with American occupation forces after the War, and received the West German Republic's highest-award, the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit. Among the most firm and consistent of senior Catholics to oppose the Nazis was Konrad von Preysing. Preysing was appointed as Bishop of Berlin in 1935. He was loathed by Hitler. He opposed the appeasing attitudes of Bertram towards the Nazis and worked with leading members of the resistance Carl Gørdeler and Helmuth James Graf von Moltke. He was part of the 5 member commission that prepared the 1937 « Mit brennender Sorge » anti-Nazi Encyclical of Pius XI, and sought to block the Nazi closure of Catholic schools and arrests of church officials. In 1938, he became one of the co-founders of the « Hilfswerk beim Bischöflichen Ordinariat Berlin » (Welfare Office of the Berlin Diocese Office) . He extended care to Jews and protested the Nazi euthanasia programme. His Advent Pastoral Letters of 1942-1943 on the nature of human rights reflected the anti-Nazi theology of the Barmen Declaration of the Confessing Church, leading one to be broadcast in German by the BBC. In 1944, Preysing met with and gave a blessing to Claus von Stauffenberg, in the lead-up to the « July Plot » to assassinate Hitler, and spoke with the resistance leader on whether the need for radical change could justify tyrannicide. Despite Preysing's open opposition, the Nazis did not dare arrest him and, several months after the War, he was named a cardinal by Pope Pius XII.

The Bishop of Münster, August von Galen was Preysing's cousin - conservative nationalist. In January 1934, he criticized Nazi racial policy in a sermon and subsequent homilies. He equated unquestioning loyalty to the « Reich » with « slavery » and spoke against Hitler's theory of the purity of German blood. Often, Galen directly protested to Hitler over violations of the Concordat. When, in 1936, Nazis removed crucifixes in school, protest by Galen led to public demonstration. Like Preysing, he assisted with the drafting of the 1937 papal Encyclical. In 1941, with the « Wehrmacht » marching on Moscow, denounced the lawlessness of the « Gestapo » , the confiscations of church properties and the cruel program of Nazi euthanasia. He protested the mistreatment of Catholics in Germany : the arrests and imprisonment without legal process, the suppression of the monasteries and the expulsion of religious orders. But, his sermons went further than defending the church.

He spoke of a moral danger to Germany from the government's violations of basic human rights :

« The right to life, to inviolability, and to freedom is an indispensable parts of any moral social order. »

He said any government that punishes without court proceedings « undermines its own authority and respect for its sovereignty within the conscience of its citizens » . His 3 powerful sermons of July and August 1941 earned him the nickname of the « Lion of Münster » . The sermons were printed and distributed illegally. Hitler wanted to have Galen removed, but Josef Goebbels told him this would result in the loss of the loyalty of Westphalia. Documents suggest the Nazis intended to hang von Galen at the end of the War. Von Galen was among the German conservatives who had criticized Weimar Germany, and initially hoped the Nazi government might restore German prestige, but quickly became disenchanted with the anti-Catholicism and racism of the Hitler administration. According to Griech-Poelle, he believed the « Dolchstoßlegende » explained the German army's defeat in 1918. Hamerow characterized the resistance approach of senior Catholic clergy like Galen as « trying to influence the 3rd “ Reich ” from within » . While some clergymen refused ever to feign support for the Hitler government, in the Church's conflict with the State over ecclesiastical autonomy, the Catholic hierarchy adopted a strategy of « seeming acceptance of the 3rd “ Reich ” » , by couching their criticisms as motivated merely by a desire to « point-out mistakes that some of its over-zealous followers committed » in order to strengthen the government. Josef Frings became Archbishop of Cologne in 1942. His consecration was used as a demonstration of Catholic self-assertion. In his sermons, he repeatedly spoke in support of persecuted peoples and against State repression. In March 1944, Frings attacked arbitrary arrests, racial persecution and forced divorces. That autumn, he protested to the « Gestapo » against the deportations of Jews from Cologne and surrounds. In 1943, the German Bishops had debated whether to directly confront Hitler collectively over what they knew of the murdering of Jews. Frings wrote a pastoral letter cautioning his diocese not to violate the inherent rights of others to life, even those « not of our blood » and, even during War, and preached in a sermon that « no one may take the property or life of an innocent person just because he is a member of a foreign race » . Following War's end, Frings succeeded Bertram as chairman of the Fulda Bishops' Conference in July 1945 and, in 1946, he was appointed a cardinal by Pius XII.

The « Final Solution » murdering of the Jews took place primarily on Polish territory. Murder of invalids took place on German soil. It involved interference in Catholic (and Protestant) welfare institutions. Awareness of the murderous programme became wide-spread and the Church leaders who opposed it (chiefly, the Catholic Bishop of Münster, August von Galen and Doctor Theophil Wurm, the Protestant Bishop of Wurttemberg) were able to rouse wide-spread public opposition. From 1939, Germany began its program of « euthanasia » , under which those deemed « racially unfit » were to be « euthanised » . The senile, the mentally handicapped and mentally ill, epileptics, cripples, children with Down's Syndrome and people with similar afflictions were to be killed. The program involved the systematic murder of more than 70,000 people. The program deeply offended Catholic morality. Protests were issued by Pope Pius XII, and were led in Germany by Bishop von Galen of Münster, whose 1941 intervention, according to Richard J. Evans, led to « the strongest, most explicit and most wide-spread protest movement against any policy since the beginning of the 3rd “ Reich ” » .

The Papacy and German Bishops previously protested against the Eugenics inspired Nazi sterilization of the « racially unfit » . Catholic protests against the escalation of this policy into « euthanasia » began in the summer of 1940.

Despite Nazi efforts to transfer hospitals to State control, large numbers of handicapped people were still under the care of the Churches. After Protestant welfare activists took a stand at the Bethel Hospital in August von Galen's diocese, Galen wrote to Bertram in July 1940 urging the Church to take up a moral position. Bertram urged caution. Archbishop Conrad Gröber of Freiburg wrote to the head of the « Reich » Chancellery, and offered to pay all costs being incurred by the State for the « care of mentally people intended for death » . The Fulda Bishops' Conference sent a protest letter to the « Reich » Chancellery on 11 August, then, sent Bishop Heinrich Wienken of « Caritas » to discuss the matter. Wienken cited the commandment « thou shalt not kill » and warned officials to halt the program or face public protest from the Church. Wienken subsequently wavered, fearing this might jeopardize his efforts to have Catholic priests released from Dachau, but was urged to stand firm by Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber. The government refused to give a written undertaking to halt the program, and the Vatican declared on 2 December that the policy was contrary to natural and positive Divine law :

« The direct killing of an innocent person because of mental or physical defects is not allowed. »

Subsequent arrests of priests and seizure of Jesuit properties by the « Gestapo » in his home city of Münster, convinced Galen that the caution advised by his superior had become pointless. On 6, 13 and 20 July 1941, Galen spoke against the seizure of properties, and expulsions of nuns, monks and religious and criticized the euthanasia programme. The police raided his sister's convent, and detained her in the cellar. She escaped, and Galen launched his most audacious challenge on the government in a 3 August sermon. He declared the murders to be illegal, and said he formally accused those responsible in a letter to the public prosecutor. The policy opened the way to the murder of all « unproductive people » , like old horses or cows, including invalid war veterans : « Who can trust his doctor anymore ? » , he asked. Galen said it was the duty of all Christians to oppose the taking of human life. Even it meant losing their own. Galen spoke of a moral danger to Germany from the government's violations of basic human rights.

Evans wrote :

« The sensation created by the sermons was enormous. »

Kershaw called the sermons a « vigorous denunciation of Nazi inhumanity and barbarism » .

Gill wrote :

« Galen used his condemnation of this appalling policy to draw wider conclusions about the nature of the Nazi State. »

The sermons were printed and distributed illegally. Galen had the sermons read in parish churches. The British broadcast excerpts over the BBC German service, dropped leaflets over Germany, and distributed the sermons in occupied countries.

Bishop Antonius Hilfrich of Limburg wrote to the Justice Minister, denouncing the murders. Bishop Albert Stohr of Mainz condemned the taking of life from the pulpit. Some of the priests who distributed the sermons were among those arrested and sent to the concentration camps amid the public reaction to the sermons. Bishop von Preysing's Cathedral Administrator, Friar Bernhard Lichtenberg met his demise for protesting by letter directly to Doctor Conti, the Nazi State Medical Director. He was arrested soon after and later died en route to Dachau. Griech-Polelle wrote that Galen's protest came after he had been provided with the physical, verifiable proof of killings, that he demanded before he would issue a public statement and that Galen advised his listeners that passive disobedience to specific Nazi laws was all he expected of them. He never endorsed active resistance against the government, wrote Griech-Polelle, and was himself not interrogated or arrested by State authorities after delivering the 1941 sermons. The speeches angered Hitler.

In a 1942 « Table Talk », he said :

« The fact that I remain silent in public over Church affairs is not in the least misunderstood by the sly foxes of the Catholic Church, and I am quite sure that a man like Bishop von Galen knows full well that, after the War, I shall extract retribution to the last farthing. »

Hitler wanted to have Galen removed, but Josef Gœbbels told him this would result in the loss of the loyalty of Westphalia. The regional Nazi leader, and Hitler's deputy Martin Bormann called for Galen to be hanged, but Hitler and Gœbbels urged a delay in retribution till War's end. With the programme now public knowledge, nurses and staff (particularly in Catholics institutions) , increasingly sought to obstruct implementation of the policy. Under pressure from growing protests, Hitler halted the main euthanasia program on 24 August 1941, though less systematic murder of the handicapped continued. The techniques learnt on the Nazi euthanasia program were later transferred for use in the genocide of the Holocaust. In 1943, Pius XII issued the « Mystici corporis Christi » Encyclical, in which he condemned the practice of killing the disabled. He stated his « profound grief » at the murder of the deformed, the insane, and those suffering from hereditary disease as though they were a useless burden to Society, in condemnation of the ongoing Nazi euthanasia program. The Encyclical was followed, on 26 September 1943, by an open condemnation by the German Bishops which, from every German pulpit, denounced the killing of « innocent and defenceless mentally handicapped, incurably infirm and fatally wounded, innocent hostages, and disarmed prisoners of war and criminal offenders, people of a foreign race or descent » .

In his 1937 Encyclical, « Mit brennender Sorge » , Pope Pius XI accused the Nazi administration of sowing « fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » and noted on the horizon the « threatening storm clouds » of religious wars of extermination over Germany.

By early 1937, the Church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, became highly-disillusioned. In March, Pius XI issued the Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » (With burning concern) . Smuggled into Germany to avoid censorship, it was read from the pulpits of all German Catholic churches on Palm Sunday 1937. It condemned Nazi ideology and accused the Nazi government of violating the 1933 Concordat and promoting « suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and

His Church » . Although there is some difference of opinion as to its impact, it is generally recognized as the « 1st official public document to criticize Nazism » . Bokenkotter describes it as « one of the greatest such condemnations ever issued by the Vatican » . Despite the efforts of the « Gestapo » to block its distribution, the Church distributed thousands to the parishes of Germany. Hundreds were arrested for handing-out copies, and Goebbels increased anti-Catholic propaganda, including a show trial of 170 Franciscans at Koblenz. The « infuriated » Nazis increased their persecution of Catholics and the Church.

Gerald Fogarty asserts :

« In the end, the Encyclical had little positive effect, and if anything only exacerbated the crisis. »

According to Frank J. Coppa, the Nazis saw the Encyclical as « a call to battle against the “ Reich ” » . Hitler was furious and « vowed revenge against the Church » .

Thomas Bokenkotter writes :

« The Nazis were infuriated. In retaliation, they closed and sealed all the presses that printed it. They took numerous vindictive measures against the Church, including staging a long series of immorality trials of the Catholic clergy. »

The German police confiscated as many copies as they could, and the « Gestapo » confiscated 12 printing presses. According to Owen Chadwick, John Vidmar, and other scholars, Nazi reprisals against the Church in Germany followed thereafter, including « staged prosecutions of monks for homosexuality, with the maximum of publicity » .

Shirer reports that :

« During the next years, thousands of Catholic priests, nuns and lay leaders were arrested, many of them on trumped-up charges of “ immorality ” or “ smuggling foreign currency ”. »

In an effort to counter the influence of spiritual resistance, Nazi security services monitored Catholic clergy closely. They instructed agents be placed in every diocese, the Bishops' reports to the Vatican obtained and the Bishops' areas of activity be found-out. A « vast network » was established to monitor the activities of ordinary clergy.

Nazi security agents wrote that :

« The importance of this enemy is such that inspectors of security police and of the security service will make this group of people and the questions discussed by them their special concern. »

Priests were watched closely, frequently denounced, arrested and sent to concentration camps. Often, simply on the basis of being « suspected of activities hostile to the State » . Or, there was reason to « suppose that his dealings might harm society » . Dachau was established in March 1933 as the 1st Nazi Concentration Camp. Chiefly a political

camp, it was here that the Nazis established dedicated Clergy Barracks. Of a total of 2,720 clergy recorded as imprisoned at Dachau, some 2,579 (or 94.88 %) were Catholic. A total of 1,034 clergy were recorded as dying in the camp, with 132 « transferred or liquidated » during that time - although R. Schnabel's 1966 investigation found an alternative total of 2,771, with 692 noted as deceased, 336 sent-out on « invalid trainloads » and, therefore, presumed dead. By far, the greatest number of priest prisoners came from Poland. In all, some 1,748 Polish Catholic clerics. Of whom, some 868 died in the camp. Germans constituted the next largest group. 411 German Catholic priests, of whom, 94 died in the camp. 100 were « transferred or liquidated ». The French accounted for 153 Catholic clerics. Among who, 10 died at the camp. Other Catholic priests were sent from Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Hungary and Rumania. From outside the Nazi Empire, 2 British and 1 Spaniard were incarcerated at Dachau, as well as one « stateless » priest.

In December 1935, Wilhelm Braun, a Catholic theologian from Munich, became the 1st churchman imprisoned at Dachau. The annexation of Austria saw an increase in clerical inmates.

Berben wrote :

« The commandant at the time, Loritz, persecuted them with ferocious hatred, and, unfortunately, he found some prisoners to help the guards in their sinister work. »

Despite SS hostility to religious observance, the Vatican and German Bishops successfully lobbied the government to concentrate clergy at one camp and obtained permission to build a chapel, for the priests to live communally and for time to be allotted to them for the religious and intellectual activity. From December 1940, priests were gathered in Blocks 26, 28 and 30, though only temporarily. 26 became the international Block and 28 was reserved for Poles - the most numerous group. Conditions varied for prisoners in the camp. The Nazis introduced a racial hierarchy - keeping Poles in harsh conditions, while favouring German priests. Many Polish priests simply died of the cold, not given sufficient clothing. A large number were chosen for Nazi medical experiments. In November 1942, 20 were given phlegmons. 120 were used by Doctor Schilling for malaria experiments between July 1942 and May 1944. Several Poles met their deaths via the « invalid trains » sent-out from the camp, others were liquidated in the camp and given bogus death certificates. Some died of cruel punishment for misdemeanor, beaten to death or worked to exhaustion. Religious activity outside the chapel was totally forbidden, and priests would secretly take confessions and distribute the Eucharist among other prisoners.

Amid the Nazi persecution of the Tirolian Catholics, the Blessed Otto Neururer, a parish priest was sent to Dachau for « slander to the detriment of German marriage », after he advised a girl against marrying the friend of a senior Nazi. He was cruelly executed at Buchenwald, in 1940, for conducting a baptism there. He was the 1st priest killed in the concentration camps. The Blessed Bernhard Lichtenberg died en route to Dachau, in 1943. In December 1944, the Blessed Karl Leisner, a deacon from Münster who was dying of tuberculosis received his ordination at Dachau. His fellow prisoner Gabriel Piguët, the Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand presided at the secret ceremony. Leisner died soon after the liberation of the camp. Among other notable Catholic clerics sent to Dachau were : Father Jean Bernard of Luxembourg ; the Dutch Carmelite Titus Brandsma (died in 1942) ; Friars Stefan Wincenty Frelichowski (died in 1945) ;

Hilary Paweł Januszewski (died in 1945) ; Lawrence Wnuk, Ignacy Jeż and Adam Kozłowiecki of Poland ; Friars Josef Lenzel, and August Frœhlich of Germany. Following the War, the Mortal Agony of Christ Chapel and a Carmelite Convent were built at Dachau in commemoration.

The German Resistance to Adolf Hitler comprised various small opposition groups and individuals, at different stages, to plot, or attempted, the overthrow of the « Führer » . They were motivated by such factors as the mistreatment of Jews, harassment of the churches, and the harsh actions of Heinrich Himmler and the « Gestapo » . Christian morality and the anti-Church policies of the Nazis were a motivating factor driving many German resisters providing impetus for the « moral revolt » of individuals. Neither the Catholic nor Protestant Churches, as institutions, were prepared to shift themselves to open opposition to the State. Yet, Wolf cites events such as the « July Plot » of 1944 having been « inconceivable without the spiritual support of Church resistance » . For many of the committed Catholics in the German Resistance - including the Jesuit Provincial of Bavaria, Augustin Rösch, the Catholic trade-unionists Jakob Kaiser, Bernhard Letterhaus and the « July Plot » leader Klaus von Stauffenberg, « religious motives and the determination to resist would seem to have developed hand in hand » . In the winter of 1939-1940, with Poland overrun, but France and Low-Countries yet to be attacked, early German military Resistance sought the Pope's assistance in preparations for a « coup » . Colonel Hans Oster of the Abwehr sent lawyer and devout Catholic, Josef Müller, on a clandestine trip to Rome to seek Papal assistance in the plot. The Vatican considered Müller to be a representative of Colonel-General Ludwig Beck and agreed to offer the machinery for mediation. Pius, communicating with Britain's Francis d'Arcy Osborne, channelled communications in secrecy. The British government was non-committal. Hitler's swift victories over France Low-Countries deflated the will of the German military to resist. Müller was arrested in 1st raid on Military Intelligence, in 1943. He spent the rest of the War in concentration camps, ending-up at Dachau. Pius retained his contact with the German Resistance and continued to lobby for peace.

Old guard national-conservatives aligned to Carl Friedrich Gœrdeler broke with Hitler in the mid-1930's.

According to Kershaw :

« They despised the barbarism of the Nazi regime. But, were keen to re-establish Germany's status as a major power. Essentially authoritarian, they favoured monarchy and limited electoral rights resting on Christian family values. »

Laurentius Siemer, Provincial of the Dominican Province of Teutonia, spoke to resistance circles on the subject of Catholic social teaching as the starting-point for the reconstruction of Germany, and worked with Carl Gœrdeler and others in planning for a post-coup Germany. Following the failure of the 1944 « July Plot » to assassinate Hitler, Siemer evaded capture by the « Gestapo » at his Oldenberg monastery, and hid-out until the end of the War, thus, remaining one of the few conspirators to survive the purge. A younger group, dubbed the « Kreisau Circle » by the « Gestapo » , did not look to German Imperialism for inspiration. Though multi-denominational, it had a strongly Christian orientation, and looked for a general Christian revival, and re-awakening of awareness of the transcendental. Its outlook was rooted both in German Romantic and idealist tradition and in the Catholic doctrine of natural law. It had around 20 core members. Among the central membership of the Circle were the Jesuit Fathers Augustin Rösch, Alfred Delp and Lothar König. Bishop von Preysing also had contact with the group.

According to Gill :

« Delp's role was to sound-out for Moltke the possibilities in the Catholic Community of support for a new, post-War Germany. »

Rösch and Delp also explored the possibilities for common-ground between Christian and Socialist trade-unions. Lothar König became an important intermediary between the Circle and Bishops Conrad Gröber of Freiberg and Presying of Berlin. The « Kreisau Circle » combined conservative notions of reform with socialist strains of thought. A symbiosis expressed by Delp's notion of « personal Socialism » . The group rejected Western models, but wanted to « associate conservative and socialist values, aristocracy and workers, in a new democratic synthesis which would include the churches. In « Die dritte Idee » (The 3rd Idea) , Delp expounded on the notion of a 3rd way, which, as opposed to Communism and Capitalism, might restore the unity of the person and society. The Circle pressed for a « coup » against Adolf Hitler, but being un-armed, was dependent on persuading military figures to take action.

Christian worker's activist and Centre Party politician Friar Otto Müller was among those who argued for a firm line from the German Bishops against legal violations of the Nazis. In contact with the German military opposition before the outbreak of War, he later allowed individual opposition figures the use of the « Ketteler-Haus » in Cologne for their discussions and was involved with « July Plotters » Jakob Kaiser, Nikolaus Groß and Bernhard Letterhaus in planning a post Nazi-Germany. After the failure of the « July Plot » , the « Gestapo » arrested Müller, who was imprisoned in the Berlin Police Hospital, where he died.

Smaller groups were heavily influenced by Christian morality. The « White Rose » student resistance group were partly inspired by August von Galen's anti-euthanasia homilies, as were the Lübeck martyrs. From 1942, « White Rose » published leaflets to influence people against Nazism and militarism. They criticized the « anti-Christian » and « anti-social » nature of the War. The leaders of the group were caught and executed in 1943. Parish priests such as the Lübeck martyrs - Johannes Prassek, Eduard Müller and Hermann Lange, and the Lutheran Pastor Karl Friedrich Stellbrink also participated in localised resistance. They shared disapproval of the Nazis, and the 4 priests spoke publicly against the Nazis ; initially, discreetly distributing pamphlets to friends and congregants. They distributed information from British radio and from leaflets with the sermons of Bishop von Galen. They were arrested in 1942 and executed. The so-called « Frau Solf Tea Party » group included another Jesuit, Friar Friedrich Erxleben. The purpose of the Solf Circle was to seek-out humanitarian ways of countering the Nazis. It met at either Frau Solf or Elizabeth von Thadden's home. They were all arrested in 1944, and some executed.

Catholic politician Eugen Bolz at the People's Court. « Staatspräsident » of Württemberg in 1933, he was overthrown by the Nazis. Later arrested for his role in the « 20th July Plot » to overthrow Hitler, he was beheaded in January 1945.

On 20 July 1944, an attempt was made to assassinate Adolf Hitler, inside his Wolf's Lair field headquarters in East Prussia. The « July Plot » was the culmination of the efforts of several groups in the German Resistance to overthrow

the Nazi-led German government. During interrogations, or their show trials, a number of the conspirators cited the Nazi assault on the churches as one of the motivating factors for their involvement. The Protestant clergyman Eugen Gerstenmaier said the key to the entire resistance flowed from Hitler's evil and the « Christian duty » to combat it. The leader of the plot, Catholic nobleman Claus von Stauffenberg, initially looked favourably on the arrival of the Nazis in power, but came to oppose them because of their persecution of the Jews and oppression of the church. He led the « 20th July Plot » (« Operation Valkyrie ») to assassinate Hitler. In 1943, he joined the resistance and commenced planning the unsuccessful Valkyrie assassination and « coup », in which he personally placed a time bomb under Hitler's conference table. Killing Hitler would absolve the German military of the moral conundrum of breaking their oath to the « Führer ». Faced with the moral and theological question of tyrannicide, Stauffenberg conferred with Bishop Konrad von Preysing and found affirmation in early Catholicism, and through Martin Luther. The planned Cabinet which was to replace the Nazi government included Catholic politicians Eugen Bolz, Bernhard Letterhaus, Andreas Hermes and Josef Wirmer. Wirmer was a member of the Left of the Centre Party, had worked to forge ties between the civilian resistance and the trade-unions and was a confidant of Jakob Kaiser - a leader of the Christian trade-union movement, which Hitler had banned after taking office. Letterhaus was also trade-union leader. As a captain in the « Oberkommando der Wehrmacht » (Supreme Command), he had gathered information and become a leading member of the resistance. The « Declaration of Government » that was to be broadcast following the « coup » on 20 July 1944 appealed unambiguously to Christian sensibilities : following the failure of the plot, Stauffenberg was shot, the « Kreisau Circle » dissolved and Moltke, Yorck and Delp, among others, were executed.

« The shattered freedom of spirit, conscience, faith and opinion will be restored. The churches will, once again, be given the right to work for their confessions. In future, they will exist quite separately from the State. The working of the State is to be inspired, both in word and deed by the Christian outlook. »

(Intended « Broadcast of Government » of the 1944 « July Plot » conspirators.)

Cardinal Adolf Bertram, « ex-officio » head of the German Church from 1920 to 1945. He generally favoured a non-confrontational policy by the Church towards the Nazi government.

Kershaw wrote that : while « detestation of Nazism was overwhelming within the Catholic Church », it did not preclude Church leaders approving of areas of government policy, particularly, where Nazism « blended into “ mainstream ” national aspirations » - like support for « patriotic » foreign policy, or War aims, obedience to State authority (where this did not contravene divine law) ; and destruction of atheistic Marxism and Soviet Bolshevism. Traditional Christian anti-Judaism was « no bulwark » against Nazi biological anti-Semitism. On these issues, « the churches as institutions fell on uncertain grounds », and opposition was generally left to fragmented and largely individual efforts. According to Shirer, the Catholic hierarchy in Germany first tried to co-operate with the Nazi Government, but, by 1937, had become highly-disillusioned. The Vatican, therefore, issued « Mit brennender Sorge » outlining Nazi transgressions. Few ordinary Germans, wrote Shirer, paused to reflect on the Nazis' intention to destroy Christianity in Germany.

According to Doctor Harry Schnitker, Kevin Spicer's « Hitler's Priests » found around 0.5 % of German priests (138 of

42,000 - including Austrians) might be considered Nazis. One such priest was Karl Eschweiler, an opponent of the Weimar Republic, was suspended from priestly duties by Cardinal Pacelli (the future Pius XII) for writing Nazi pamphlets in support of eugenics. Cardinal Bertram, « ex-officio » head of the German episcopate, sent Hitler birthday greetings in 1939 in the name of all German Catholic Bishops, an act that angered Bishop Konrad von Preysing. Bertram was the leading advocate of accommodation as well as the leader of the German Church, a combination that reined in other would-be opponents of Nazism.

In 1943, Gröber expressed the opinion Bishops should remain loyal to the « beloved folk and Fatherland » , despite abuses of the « Reichskonkordat » . Yet, Gröber was among those in the hierarchy in Germany who came to articulate and support resistance to the Nazis. He protested the religious persecution of Catholics in Germany. He supported German resistance worker Gertrud Luckner's « Office for Religious War Relief » (« Kirchliche Kriegshilfsstelle ») under the auspices of the Catholic aid agency, « Caritas » . The office became the instrument through which Freiburg Catholics helped racially persecuted « non-Aryans » (both Jews and Christians) . Luckner used funds received from the Archbishop to help Jews. After the War, Gröber said he was such an opponent of the Nazis they planned to crucify him on the door for the Freiburg Cathedral. Mary Fulbrook wrote that when politics encroached on the Church, Catholics were prepared to resist, but the record was otherwise patchy and uneven with notable exceptions, « it seems that, for many Germans, adherence to the Christian faith proved compatible with at least passive acquiescence in, if not active support for, the Nazi dictatorship » .

Hamerow characterized the resistance approach of senior Catholic clergy like August von Galen of Munich as « trying to influence the 3rd “ Reich ” from within » . While some clergymen refused ever to feign support for the government in the Church's conflict with the State over ecclesiastical autonomy, the Catholic hierarchy adopted a strategy of « seeming acceptance of the 3rd “ Reich ” » , by couching their criticisms as motivated merely by a desire to « point-out mistakes that some of its over-zealous followers committed » in order to strengthen the government. Griech-Poelle wrote Galen had argued that good Catholics could support a government whose aim was to destroy a « Judeo-Bolshevik conspiracy » . When Galen delivered his famous 1941 denunciations of Nazi euthanasia and the lawlessness of the « Gestapo » , he also said that the Church had never sought the overthrow of the government.

The pontificate of Pius XI coincided with the early aftermath of the First World War. The old European monarchies had been largely swept away and a new and precarious order formed across the continent. In the East, the Soviet Union arose. In Italy, the Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini took power, while in Germany, the fragile Weimar Republic collapsed with the Nazi seizure of power.

Pius's major diplomatic approach was to make Concordats. He concluded 18 such treaties during the course of his pontificate. However, wrote Hebblethwaite, these Concordats did not prove « durable or creditable » and « wholly failed in their aim of safe-guarding the institutional rights of the Church » for « Europe was entering a period in which such agreements were regarded as mere scraps of paper » . In 1929, Pius signed the Lateran Treaty and a concordat with Italy, confirming the existence of an independent Vatican City State, in return for recognition of the Kingdom of Italy and an undertaking for the papacy to be neutral in world conflicts. In Article 24 of the Concordat, the papacy undertook « to remain outside temporal conflicts unless the parties concerned jointly appealed for the

pacifying mission of the Holy-See » .

In 1933, Pius signed the « Reich » concordat with Germany - hoping to protect the rights of Catholics under the Nazi government. The treaty was an extension of existing concordats already signed with Prussia and Bavaria, but wrote Hebblethwaite, it seemed « more like a surrender than anything else : it involved the suicide of the Centre Party » . A persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany had followed the Nazi take-over. The Vatican was anxious to conclude the concordat with the new government, despite the ongoing attacks. Nazi breaches of the agreement began almost as soon as it had been signed. From 1933 to 1936, Pius wrote several protests against the Nazis, while his attitude to Mussolini's Italy changed dramatically in 1938, after Nazi racial policies were adopted in Italy. Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli (future Pius XII) served as Pius XI's Secretary of State, in which capacity he made some 55 protests against Nazi policies, including its « ideology of race » . In England over the period, there was a revival of interest in the notion of « Christendom » , which it was hoped, would serve as a counter to Fascism and Communism. Gilbert Keith Chesterton had written and spoken on the subject and was appointed a Knight of Saint-Gregory by the Holy-See in 1934.

Pius XI watched the rising tide of Totalitarianism with alarm and delivered 3 papal Encyclicals challenging the new creeds : against Italian Fascism « Non abbiamo bisogno » (1931 ; « We do not need (to acquaint you) ») ; against Nazism « Mit brennender Sorge » (1937 ; « With deep concern ») and against atheist Communist « Divini redemptoris » (1937 ; « Divine Redeemer ») . He also challenged the extremist nationalism of the « Action Française » movement and anti-Semitism in the United States. 1931's « Non abbiamo bisogno » condemned Italian Fascism's « pagan worship of the State » and « revolution which snatches the young from the Church and from Jesus-Christ, and which inculcates in its own young people hatred, violence and irreverence » . In 1936, with the Church in Germany facing clear persecution, Italy and Germany agreed the Berlin-Rome Axis. By early 1937, the Church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, had become highly-disillusioned. Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber drafted the Holy-See's response in January 1937, and, in March, Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical. It accused the Nazi Government of violations of the 1933 Concordat, and further that it was sowing the « tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » . The Pope noted on the horizon the « threatening storm clouds » of religious Wars of extermination over Germany. Pius XI commissioned the American Jesuit John Lafarge to prepare a draft for an Encyclical, « Humani generis unitas » (The Unity of the Human Race) , demonstrating the incompatibility of Catholicism and racism. However, Pius XI did not issue the proposed Encyclical before his death, nor did his successor Pius XII, partly fearing it might antagonize Italy and Germany at a time where he hoped to act as an impartial peace broker.

From the earliest days of the Nazi take-over in Germany, the Vatican was taking diplomatic action to attempt to defend the Jews of Germany. In the spring of 1933, Pope Pius XI urged Mussolini to ask Hitler to restrain the anti-Semitic actions taking place in Germany. Pius XI asserted to a group of pilgrims that anti-Semitism is incompatible with Christianity :

« Mark well that in the Catholic Mass, Abraham is our Patriarch and forefather. Anti-Semitism is incompatible with the lofty thought which that fact expresses. It is a movement with which we Christians can have nothing to do. No, no, I

say to you it is impossible for a Christian to take part in anti-Semitism. It is inadmissible. Through Christ and, in Christ, we are the spiritual progeny of Abraham. Spiritually, we are all Semites. »

(Pope Pius XI, 1933.)

As the newly-installed Nazi Government began to instigate its program of anti-Semitism, Pope Pius XI, through Pacelli, ordered the Papal Nuncio in Berlin, Cesare Orsenigo, to « look into whether and how it may be possible to become involved » in their aid. Orsenigo proved a poor instrument in this regard, concerned more with the anti-Church policies of the Nazis and how these might effect German Catholics, than with taking action to help German Jews. Cardinal Innitzer called him timid and ineffectual with respect to the worsening situation for German Jewry. Appearing before 250,000 pilgrims at Lourdes, in April 1935, Cardinal Pacelli said :

« The Nazis are, in reality, only miserable plagiarists who dress-up old errors with new tinsel. It does not make any difference whether they flock to the banners of the social revolution, whether they are guided by a false conception of the world and of life, or whether they are possessed by the superstition of a race and blood cult. »

(Cardinal Secretary of State Eugenio Pacelli, Lourdes, April 1935.)

In 1936, Nuncio Orsenigo asked Cardinal Secretary of State Pacelli for instructions regarding an invitation from Hitler to attend a Nazi Party meeting in Nuremberg, along with the entire diplomatic corps.

Pacelli replied :

« The Holy Father thinks it is preferable that your Excellency abstain, taking a few days' vacation. »

In 1937, Orsenigo was invited along with the diplomatic corps to a reception for Hitler's birthday. Orsenigo, again, asked the Vatican if he should attend.

Pacelli's reply was :

« The Holy Father thinks not. Also because of the position of this Embassy, the Holy Father believes it is preferable in the present situation if your Excellency abstains from taking part in manifestations of homage toward the Lord Chancellor. »

During Hitler's visit to Rome in 1938, Pius XI and Pacelli avoided meeting with him by leaving Rome a month early for the papal summer residence of Castel Gandolfo. The Vatican was closed, and the priests and religious brothers and sisters left in Rome were told not to participate in the festivities and celebrations surrounding Hitler's Visit.

On the Feast of the Holy Cross, Pius XI said from Castel Gandolfo :

« It saddens me to think that today in Rome the cross that is worshipped is not the Cross of our Saviour. »

Eugenio Pacelli was elected to succeed Pope Pius XI at the papal conclave of March 1939. Taking the name of his predecessor as a sign of continuity, he became Pius XII. In the lead-up to War, he sought to act as a peace broker. As the Holy-See had done during the pontificate of Benedict XV (1914-1922) during World War I, the Vatican under, Pius XII (February 1939 - September 1958), pursued a policy of diplomatic neutrality through World War II - Pius XII, like Benedict XV, described the position as « impartiality », rather than « neutrality ». A cautious diplomat, he did not name the Nazis in his War-time condemnations of racism and genocide, but intervened to save the lives of thousands of Jews through sheltering them in Church institutions and ordering his Church to offer discreet aid. Upon his death in 1958, he was praised by world-leaders and Jewish groups for his actions during World War II, but his not specifically condemning what was later termed the « Nazi Holocaust », has become a matter of controversy.

Pius XII's relations with the Axis and Allied forces may have been impartial, and his policies tinged with uncompromising anti-Communism, but, early in the War, he shared intelligence with the Allies about the German Resistance and planned invasion of the Low-Countries and lobbied Mussolini to stay neutral.

With Poland overrun, but France and the Low-Countries yet to be attacked, Pius continued to hope for a negotiated peace to prevent the spread of the conflict. The similarly minded U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt re-established American diplomatic relations with the Vatican after a 70 year hiatus by dispatching Myron C. Taylor as his personal representative. Pius warmly welcomed Roosevelt's envoy. Taylor urged Pius XII to explicitly condemn Nazi atrocities. Instead, Pius XII spoke against the « evils of modern warfare », but did not go further. This may have been so for fear of Nazi retaliation experienced previously with the issuance of the Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » in 1937.

Pius allowed national hierarchies to assess and respond to their local situations and utilized Vatican Radio to promote aid to thousands of War refugees, and saved further thousands of lives by instructing the Church to provide discreet aid to Jews. To confidantes, Hitler scorned Pius XII as a black-mailer on his back, who constricted his ally Mussolini and leaked confidential German correspondence to the world. For opposition from the Church, he vowed « retribution to the last farthing » after the conclusion of the War.

The Nazi authorities disapproved of Pacelli's election as Pope. Historian of the Holocaust Martin Gilbert wrote :

« So outspoken were Pacelli's criticisms that Hitler's government lobbied against him, trying to prevent his becoming the successor to Pius XI. When he did become Pope, as Pius XII, in March 1939, Nazi Germany was the only government not to send a representative to his coronation. »

Göebbels noted in his diary, on 4 March 1939, that Hitler was considering whether to abrogate the Concordat with Rome in light of Pacelli's election as Pope, adding :

« This will surely happen when Pacelli undertakes his 1st hostile act. »

Joseph Lichten wrote :

Pacelli had obviously established his position clearly, for the Fascist governments of both Italy and Germany spoke-out vigorously against the possibility of his election to succeed Pius XI, in March 1939, though the Cardinal Secretary of State had served as Papal Nuncio in Germany, from 1917 to 1929.

The day after Pacelli's election, the « Berlin Morgenpost » said :

« The election of Cardinal Pacelli is not accepted with favour in Germany because he was always opposed to Nazism and practically determined the policies of the Vatican under his predecessor. »

« Der Angriff » , the Nazi Party organ, warned that Pius' policies would lead to a « crusade against the totalitarian States » . According to Karol Jozef Gajewski, Heinrich Himmler's « Das Schwarze Korps » (The Black Corps) , house newspaper of the SS, had formerly labelled Pacelli a « co-conspirator with Jews and Communists against Nazism » and decried his election as « the Chief Rabbi of the Christians, boss of the firm of Judah-Rome » .

Pius selected Cardinal Luigi Maglione as his Secretary of State, and retained Domenico Tardini and Giovanni Montini (future Pope Paul VI) as Under-Secretaries of State. According to Hebblethwaite, Maglione was pro-democracy and anti-dictatorship, « detested Hitler and thought Mussolini a clown » , but the career-diplomat Pope largely reserved diplomatic matters for himself. The new Pope hoped to stop Hitler's War, and inaugurated his reign with a message of peace to Germany, and, the day after Hitler and Stalin signed their secret pact, sealing the fate of Poland, Pius delivered a 24 August appeal for peace :

« I speak to all of you, leaders of nations, in the name of God ... lay aside threats and accusations ... It is by force of reason and not by force of arms that justice makes progress. Empires not founded on justice are not blessed by God. Immoral policy is not successful policy. »

(Pope Pius XII, 24 August 1939.)

Some historians have argued that Pacelli, as Cardinal Secretary of State, dissuaded Pope Pius XI (who was nearing death at the time) from condemning « Kristallnacht » in November 1938, when he was informed of it by the Papal Nuncio in Berlin. Likewise, the draft for the preposed Encyclical « Humani generis unitas » (On the Unity of Human Society) , which was ready in September 1938, was, according to the 2 publishers of the draft text and other sources, not forwarded to the Vatican by the Jesuit General Wlodimir Ledochowski. On 28 January 1939, 11 days before the death of Pope Pius XI, a disappointed Gundlach informed author LaFarge :

« It cannot continue like this. The text has not been forwarded to the Vatican. »

He had talked to the American assistant to Father General, who promised to look into the matter in December 1938, but did not report back. It contained an open and clear condemnation of colonialism, racism and anti-Semitism. Some

historians have argued that Pacelli learned about its existence only after the death of Pius XI and did not promulgate it as Pope. He did however use parts of it in his inaugural Encyclical « Summi Pontificatus », which he titled « On the Unity of Human Society. »

Pope Pius XII lobbied world-leaders to prevent the outbreak of World War II, up to the very last day of peace. On 24 August 1939, he made a public broadcast appealing for peace, and, on 31 August, the last day before the War, the Pope wrote to the German, Polish, Italian, British and French governments saying that he was unwilling to abandon hope that pending negotiations might lead to « a just pacific solution » and beseeching the Germans and Polish « in the name of God » to avoid « any incident » and for the British, French and Italians to support his appeal. The « pending negotiations » turned-out to be a mere Nazi propaganda trick. The following day, Hitler invaded Poland.

« Summi Pontificatus » (On the Limitations of the Authority of the State) , issued 20 October 1939, was the 1st papal Encyclical issued by Pius, and established some of the themes of his papacy. Couched in diplomatic language, Pius endorses Catholic resistance and states his disapproval of the War, racism, anti-Semitism, the invasion of Poland, and the persecutions of the Church. With Italy not yet an ally of Hitler in the War, Italians were called upon to remain faithful to the Church. Pius avoided accusing Hitler and Stalin, establishing the « impartial » public tone which critics have used against him in later assessments of his pontificate :

« A full statement of the doctrinal stand to be taken in face of the errors of today, if necessary, can be put-off to another time unless there is disturbance by calamitous external events ; for the moment We limit Ourselves to some fundamental observations. »

Pius wrote of « anti-Christian movements » bringing forth a crop « poignant disasters » and called for love, mercy and compassion against the « deluge of discord » . Following themes addressed in « Non abbiamo bisogno » (1931) ; « Mit brennender Sorge » (1937) and « Divini redemptoris » (1937) , Pius wrote of a need to bring back to the Church those who were following « a false standard misled by error, passion, temptation and prejudice, who have strayed away from faith in the true God » . He wrote of « Christians unfortunately more in name than in fact » showing « cowardice » in the face of persecution by these creeds, and endorsed resistance.

In a further rejection of Nazi ideology, Pius reiterated Catholic opposition to racism and anti-Semitism, saying that man « is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all and in all » .

Pius commented on the invasion of Poland as well :

« The blood of countless human beings, even non-combatants, raises a piteous dirge over a nation such as Our dear Poland, which, for its fidelity to the Church, for its services in the defense of Christian civilization, written in indelible characters in the annals of history, has a right to the generous and brotherly sympathy of the whole world. In Poland, the Nazis murdered over 2,500 monks and priests and even more were imprisoned. »

With War underway, the focus of Holy-See policy became the prevention of Mussolini from bringing Italy into the War. In April 1940, the Italian Foreign Minister, Count Ciano, officially complained to Cardinal Secretary of State Maglione, that so many churches were offering « sermons about peace and peace demonstrations, perhaps inspired by the Vatican » , and the Italian Ambassador to the Holy-See complained that « L'Osservatore Romano » was too favourable to the democracies.

With Poland overrun but France and the Low-Countries yet to be attacked, the German Resistance sought the Pope's assistance in preparations for a « coup » to oust Hitler. Pius advised the British in 1940 of the readiness of certain German generals to overthrow Hitler if they could be assured of an honourable peace, offered assistance to the German resistance in the event of a « coup » and warned the Allies of the planned German invasion of the Low-Countries in 1940.

Colonel Hans Oster of the « Abwehr » sent Munich lawyer and devout Catholic, Josef Müller, on a clandestine trip to Rome to seek Papal assistance in the developing plot. The Pope's Private Secretary, Robert Leiber acted at the intermediary between Pius and the Resistance. He met with Müller, who visited Rome in 1939 and 1940. The Vatican considered Müller to be a representative of Colonel-General Ludwig Beck and agreed to assist mediation. Pius, communicating with Britain's Francis d'Arcy Osborne, channelled communications back and forth in secrecy. The Vatican agreed to send a letter outlining the bases for peace with England and the participation of the Pope was used to try to persuade senior German Generals Halder and Brauchitsch to act against Hitler. Hoffmann wrote that, when the Venlo Incident stalled the talks, the British agreed to resume discussions primarily because of the « efforts of the Pope and the respect in which he was held. Chamberlain and Halifax set great store by the Pope's readiness to mediate. » Pius, advised Osbourne that a German offensive was planned for February, but that this could be averted if the German generals could be assured of peace with Britain, and not on punitive terms. The British government was non-committal, nevertheless, the resistance were encouraged by the talks, and Müller told Leiber that a « coup » would occur in February. Pius appeared to continue to hope for a « coup » in Germany into March 1940.

On 4 May 1940, the Vatican advised the Netherlands envoy to the Vatican that the Germans planned to invade France through the Netherlands and Belgium on 10 May. On 7 May, Alfred Jodl noted in his diary that the Germans knew the Belgian envoy to the Vatican had been tipped-off, and the « Führer » was greatly agitated by the danger of treachery. Following the Fall of France, peace overtures continued to emanate from the Vatican as well as Sweden and the United States, to which Churchill responded resolutely that Germany would have to free its conquered territories. In Rome in 1942, U.S. envoy Myron C. Taylor, thanked the Holy-See for the « forthright and heroic expressions of indignation made by Pope Pius XII when Germany invaded the Low-Countries » . Müller was arrested in a 1943 raid on the « Abwehr » and spent the rest of the War in concentration camps, ending-up at Dachau. The raid marked a serious blow to the Resistance. Following the arrests, Beck's 1st order was for an account of the incidents to be sent to the Pope. Hans Bernd Gisevius was sent in place of Müller to advise of the developments and met with Friar Leiber.

Unsuccessfully, Pius attempted to dissuade the Italian Dictator Benito Mussolini from joining Nazi Germany in the War. Following the Fall of France, Pius XII wrote confidentially to Hitler, Churchill and Mussolini proposing to offer to mediate a « just and honourable peace » , but asking to receive confidential advice in advance of how such an offer

would be received. When, by 1943, the War had turned against the Axis Powers, and Mussolini's Foreign Minister Count Ciano was relieved of his post and sent to the Vatican as ambassador, Hitler suspected that he had been sent to arrange a separate peace with the Allies. On July 25, the Italian King dismissed Mussolini. Hitler's told Alfred Jodl to organize for a German force to go to Rome and arrest the Government and restore Mussolini.

Asked about the Vatican, Hitler said :

« I'll go right into the Vatican. Do you think the Vatican embarrasses me ? We'll take that over right away ... later we can make apologies. »

His generals urged caution.

After Mussolini was rescued by the Nazis and installed as leader in Northern Italy, the Vatican feared a Communist take-over, but refused to recognize Mussolini's new State. As Italy lurched towards civil war, the Vatican urged moderation. At Easter 1944, Italian Bishops were directed to « stigmatise every form of hatred, of vendetta, reprisal and violence, from wherever it comes » . 191 priests were killed by Fascists and 125 by the Germans, while 109 were killed by partisans. Though some joined pro-Fascist bands, the Vatican backed the so-called anti-Fascist « partisan chaplains » and « red priests » , hoping that they would provide religious guidance to partisans being exposed to Communist propaganda.

At the close of his predecessor's pontificate, Pacelli received word from nuncios of increasing persecution of the Jews in the 3rd « Reich » . According to Gordon Thomas, he already conceived of a strategy to work behind the scenes to help the Jews, because he believed « any form of denunciation in the name of the Vatican would inevitably provoke further reprisals against the Jews » . During his pontificate Pius XII, Catholic institutions across Europe were opened as shelter for Jews, and the institutions of the Vatican itself were employed in this purpose. Pius allowed the national hierarchies of the Church to assess and respond to their local situation under Nazi rule, but himself established the Vatican Information Service to provide aid to, and information about, war refugees and saved thousands of Jewish by directing the church to discreetly provide aid. According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, Pius chose to « use diplomacy to aid the persecuted » . Upon his death he was « praised effusively by world-leaders especially by Jewish groups for his actions during World War II on behalf of the persecuted » . The Israeli historian Pinchas Lapide interviewed war survivors concluded that Pius XII « was instrumental in saving at least 700,000, but probably as many as 860,000 Jews from certain death at Nazi hands » . Deák writes that most historians dispute this estimate while Rabbi David Dalin called Pinchas Lapide's work « the definitive work by a Jewish scholar » on the holocaust.

According to Thomas, of the 44 speeches Pacelli gave as Nuncio, 40 denounced aspects of Nazi ideology. In an open letter to the Bishop of Cologne, Pacelli described Hitler as a « false prophet of Lucifer » , while Hitler ordered the Nazi press to refer to Pacelli as a « Jew lover in the Vatican » . Following the « Kristalnacht » pogrom of 1938, the Vatican took steps to find refuge for Jews. « L'Osservatore Romano » (the Holy-See's newspaper) reported that Pacelli (as Vatican Secretary of State) condemned the pogrom. On 30 November, Pacelli issued an encoded message to Archbishops around the world, instructing them to apply for visas for « non-Aryan Catholics » for departure from

Germany. The Concordat of 1933 had expressly provided for protection of converts to Christianity, but Pacelli intended the visas to be extended to all Jews. According to Thomas, some 200,000 Jews escaped the 3rd « Reich » under the scheme.

From 1939-1944, Pius XII supplied passports, money, tickets and letters of recommendation to foreign governments so Jewish refugees could receive visas. Through these actions, another 4,000 to 6,000 Jews reached safety. On 2 January 1940, the United Jewish Appeal for Refugees and Overseas Needs in Chicago sent the Pope a contribution of \$ 125,000 toward the Vatican's efforts to save « all those persecuted because of religion or race ». The papal emigration program helped Jews gain admittance to Brazil. From 1939 to 1941, 3,000 Jews reached safety in South America. Giovanni Ferrofino is credited with saving 10,000 Jews. Acting on secret orders from Pius XII, Ferrofino obtained visas from the Portuguese Government and the Dominican Republic to secure their escape from Europe and sanctuary in the Americas. In response to Mussolini's anti-Jewish legislation, Pacelli arranged for Jewish friends and eminent Jewish doctors, scholars and scientists to emigrate safely to Palestine and the Americas. 23 were appointed to positions in Vatican educational institutions. At the outbreak of the War, local Bishops were instructed to assist those in need. In his first Encyclical, « Summi Pontificatus », Pius XII rejected anti-Semitism, stating that in the Catholic Church there is « neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision » .

In 1940, the Nazi Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop led the only senior Nazi delegation permitted an audience with Pius XII asked why the Pope had sided with the Allies, Pius replied with a list of recent Nazi atrocities and religious persecutions committed against Christians and Jews, in Germany, and in Poland, leading « The New York Times » to headline its report « Jews Rights Defended » and write of « burning words he spoke to “ Herr ” Ribbentrop about religious persecution » . Cardinal Secretary of State Luigi Maglione received a request from Chief Rabbi of Palestine Isaac Herzog, in the Spring of 1940, to intercede on behalf of Lithuanian Jews about to be deported to Germany. Pius called Ribbentrop on 11 March, repeatedly protesting against the treatment of Jews.

In 1942, Pius XII delivered a Christmas message over Vatican Radio which expressed sympathy for the victims of the Nazis' genocidal policies. From May 1942, the Nazis had commenced their industrialized slaughter of the Jews of Europe - the « Final Solution » . Gypsies and others were also marked for extermination.

The Pope addressed the racial persecutions in the following terms :

« Humanity owes this vow to those hundreds of thousands who, without any fault on their part, sometimes only because of their nationality or race, have been consigned to death or to a slow decline. » [also translated : « marked down for death or gradual extinction »]

« The New York Times » called Pius « a lonely voice crying-out of the silence of a continent » . The speech was made in the context of the near total domination of Europe by the armies of Nazi Germany at a time were the War had not yet turned in favour of the Allies.

According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, Pius refused to say more « fearing that public papal denunciations might

provoke the Hitler regime to brutalize further those subject to Nazi terror (as it had when Dutch Bishops publicly protested earlier in the year) while jeopardizing the future of the church » .

Holocaust historian, Sir Martin Gilbert, assesses the response of the Reich Security Main Office calling Pius a « mouthpiece » of the Jews in response to his Christmas address, as clear evidence that all sides knew that Pius was one who was raising his voice for the victims of Nazi terror. Pius protested the deportations of Slovakian Jews to the Bratislava government from 1942.

In 1943, he protested that :

« The Holy-See would fail in its Divine Mandate if it did not deplore these measures, which gravely damage man in his natural right, mainly for the reason that these people belong to a certain race. »

Following the capitulation of Italy in September 1943, the Nazis occupied Rome. Pius held a secret meeting to plan how to save the Jews of the city and the many Allied PoWs, then, taking refuge in Rome. Monsignor Angelo Dell'Acqua acted as liaison with relief groups. When news of the 15 October 1943 round-up of Roman Jews reached the Pope, he instructed the Holy-See's Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione to protest to the German Ambassador to « save these innocent people » . The Pope then ordered Rome's Catholic institutions to open themselves to the Jews, sheltering 4,715 of the 5,715 listed for deportation by the Nazis were sheltered in 150 institutions - 477 in the Vatican itself. As German round-ups continued in Northern Italy, the Pope opened his summer residence, Castel Gandolfo, to take in thousands of Jews and authorised institutions across the north to do the same.

Assessing Pius' role as a protector of Jews during the War, David Klinghoffer wrote for the « Jewish Journal » in 2005 that :

« I'm not sure it's true, as Dalin argues, that Pius saved more Jews than any other Righteous Gentile in World War II. But it seems fairly certain that he was, overall, a strenuous defender of Jews who saved tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands. While 80 % of European Jews were murdered in the Holocaust, 85 % of Italian Jews survived, thanks in large part to the Vatican's efforts. »

In August 1944, Pius met British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who was visiting Rome. During the meeting, and with the War ongoing, the Pope acknowledged the justice of punishing War criminals, but expressed a hope that the people of Italy would not be punished, preferring that they be made « full allies » .

In Croatia, the Vatican used a Benedictine abbot, Giuseppe Marcone, as its Apostolic Visitor (together with Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac of Zagreb) to pressure its leader Pavelić to cease its facilitation of race murders.

In the newly-formed Slovak Republic, the Apostolic Delegate to Bratislava Giuseppe Burzio protested the anti-Semitism and totalitarianism of the pro-nazi State. From 1942 onwards, the Vatican protested the deportations of Jews by the Nazi allied Slovakian government.

From 1943, Pius instructed his Bulgarian representative to take « all necessary steps » to support Bulgarian Jews facing deportation and his Turkish Nuncio, Angelo Roncalli (later, Pope John XXIII) arranged for the transfer of thousands of children out of Bulgaria to Palestine. Roncalli also advised the Pope of Jewish concentration camps in Romanian occupied Transnistria. The Pope protested to the Romanian government and authorized for funds to be sent to the camps. Roncalli saved a number of Croatian, Bulgarian and Hungarian Jews by assisting their migration to Palestine. He succeeded Pius XII as Pope John XXIII, and always said that he had been acting on the orders of Pius XII in his actions to rescue Jews. In 1944, Pius appealed directly to the Hungarian government to halt the deportation of the Jews of Hungary and his Nuncio, Angelo Rotta, led a city-wide rescue scheme in Budapest. Rotta been recognized as Righteous among the Nations by Yad Vashem, Israel's Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority. Andrea Cassulo, the Papal Nuncio to Bucharest and the Ion Antonescu government had also been honoured as Righteous among the Nations by Yad Vashem.

In 1944, the Chief Rabbi of Bucharest praised the work of Cassulo on behalf of Romania's Jews :

« The generous assistance of the Holy-See was decisive and salutary. It is not easy for us to find the right words to express the warmth and consolation we experienced because of the concern of the supreme Pontiff, who offered a large sum to relieve the sufferings of deported Jews - sufferings which had been pointed-out to him by you after your visit to Transnistria. The Jews of Romania will never forget these facts of historic importance. »

In public, Pius XII spoke cautiously in relation to Nazi crimes, though under his leadership, thousands of Jews were offered refuge in monasteries, convents and the Vatican itself. According to Hitler biographer John Toland, the church saved more Jews than all other churches and rescue organizations combined. When Myron C. Taylor, U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt's personal representative to the Vatican, urged him to condemn Nazi atrocities - Pius « obliquely referred to the evils of modern warfare » , fearing that to go further would provoke Hitler into brutal action, as occurred following the 1942 protest by Dutch Bishops against the deportation of Jews.

In a conversation with Archbishop Giovanni Battista Montini (later, Pope Paul VI) , Pius said :

« We would like to utter words of fire against such actions ; and the only thing restraining Us from speaking is the fear of making the plight of the victims worse. »

In June 1943, Pope Pius XII told the Sacred College of Cardinals in a secret address that :

« Every word We address to the competent authority on this subject, and all Our public utterances have to be carefully weighed and measured by Us in the interests of the victims themselves, lest, contrary to Our intentions, We make their situation worse and harder to bear. »

Catholic clergy, religious and laity, especially converted Jews, all suffered persecution under the Nazis. Such Nazi brutality made an enormous impression on Pius XII.

Doctor Peter Gumpel writes :

« The action of the Dutch Bishops had important repercussions. Pius XII had already prepared the text of a public protest against the persecution of the Jews. Shortly before this text was sent to “ L'Osservatore Romano ”, news reached him of the disastrous consequences of the Dutch Bishops' initiative. He concluded that public protests, far from alleviating the fate of the Jews, aggravated their persecution and he decided that he could not take the responsibility of his own intervention having similar and probably even much more serious consequences. Therefore, he burnt the text he had prepared. The International Red Cross, the nascent World Council of Churches and other Christian Churches were fully aware of such consequences of vehement public protests and, like Pius XII, they wisely avoided them. »

In Poland, the Nazis murdered over 2,500 monks and priests and even more were imprisoned. In an 30 April 1943 letter to Bishop von Preysing of Berlin, Pius referred to the Nazi retribution in the Netherlands as one reason for muted criticism in his public statements :

« If the Pope had protested publicly, what then ? Hitler did as he liked. »

Leiber (speaking in 1966) concluded Pius XII clung to this « firm conviction : that it was better to keep silent » .

« We give to the pastors who are working on the local level the duty of determining if and to what degree the danger of reprisals and of various forms of oppression occasioned by episcopal declarations ... “ ad maiora mala vitanda ” (to avoid worse) ... seem to advise caution. Here lies one of the reasons, why We impose self-restraint on Ourselves in our speeches ; the experience, that we made in 1942 with papal addresses, which We authorized to be forwarded to the Believers, justifies our opinion, as far as We see ... The Holy-See has done whatever was in its power, with charitable, financial and moral assistance. To say nothing of the substantial sums which we spent in American money for the fares of immigrants. »

(Pius XII, letter to Bishop von Preysing of Berlin, 1943.)

Furthermore, without being even-handed and condemning Stalin's atrocities against Soviet and Polish citizens, the Pope would be vulnerable to accusations of bias ; which could have seriously undermined the influence the Vatican might have with Germany. The Allies were exceedingly anxious to prevent a Papal condemnation of Stalin, which would have hurt the Allied effort. According to Piotrowski, Pius XII also never publicly condemned the Nazi massacre of 1.8 to 1.9 million mainly Catholic Poles (including 2,935 members of the Catholic Clergy) , nor did he ever publicly condemn the Soviet Union for the deaths of 1,000,000 mainly Catholic Polish citizens including an untold number of clergy. In December 1942, when Tittman asked Cardinal Secretary of State Maglione if Pius would issue a proclamation similar to the Allied declaration « German Policy of Extermination of the Jewish Race » , Maglione replied that the Vatican was « unable to denounce publicly particular atrocities » . However, in his 1942 Christmas address, the Pope proceeded to voice concerns for the « hundreds of thousands who, through no fault of their own, and solely because of their nation or race, have been condemned to death or progressive extinction » .

I month later, Joachim von Ribbentrop wrote to Germany's Vatican ambassador :

« There are signs that the Vatican is likely to renounce its traditional neutral attitude and take-up a political position against Germany. You are to inform him (the Pope) that in that event Germany does not lack physical means of retaliation. »

The Ambassador reported that Pius indicated that :

« He did not care what happened to himself, but that a struggle between Church and State could have only one outcome - the defeat of the State. I replied that I was of the contrary opinion ... an open battle could bring some very unpleasant surprises for the Church ... Pacelli (Pius XII) is no more sensible to threats than we are. In event of an open breach with us, he now calculates that some German Catholics will leave the Church but he is convinced that the majority will remain true to their Faith. And that the German Catholic clergy will screw-up its courage, prepared for the greatest sacrifices. »

Assessments of Pius's role during World War II were initially positive ; however, following his death, some have been more critical. Early on the Soviets were keen to discredit Pius in the eyes of Catholics in the Eastern Bloc. Some historians argue the Pope did not « do enough » to prevent the Holocaust. Commentators said he was « silent » in the face of the Holocaust. Others have accused the Church and Pius of anti-Semitism. These accusations are strongly contested. According to historian William Doyno (author of « The Pius War : Responses to the Critics of Pius XII ») , Pius XII was « emphatically not “ silent ”, and did condemn the Nazis' horrific crimes through Vatican Radio, his 1st Encyclical, “ Summi Pontificatus ”, major addresses (especially, his Christmas allocutions) , the “ L'Osservatore Romano ” » and he « intervened, time and time again, for persecuted Jews, particularly, during the German occupation of Rome. He was cited and hailed by the Catholic rescuers as their leader and director. »

David Kertzer accuses the Church of « encouraging Centuries of anti-Semitism » , and Pius XII of not doing enough to stop Nazi atrocities. Many scholars dispute Kertzer. Jose Sanchez, of Saint-Louis University criticized Kertzer's work as polemical exaggerating the papacy's role in anti-Semitism. Scholar of Jewish-Christian relations Rabbi David G. Dalin criticized Kertzer for using evidence selectively to support his thesis. Ronald J. Rychlak, lawyer and author of « Hitler, the War, and the Pope » decried Kertzer's work for omitting strong evidence the Church was not anti-Semitic. Others, including prominent members of the Jewish community, have refuted criticisms and written highly of Pius' efforts to protect Jews. Among the prominent Jews to praise Pius after the War was Rabbi Isaac Herzog. Other prominent members of the Jewish community have also defended Pius. Lichten, Lapide, and other Jewish historians report that the Catholic Church provided funds totalling in the millions of dollars to assist Jews during World War II. In the summer of 1942, Pius explained to his college of Cardinals the reasons for the great gulf that existed between Jews and Christians at the theological level :

« Jerusalem has responded to His call and to His grace with the same rigid blindness and stubborn ingratitude that has led it along the path of guilt to the murder of God. »

Historian Guido Knopp describes these comments of Pius as being « incomprehensible » at a time when « Jerusalem was being murdered by the million » .

In 1999, British writer John Cornwell published the highly-controversial *Hitler's Pope*, which charged Pius assisted the legitimization of the Nazis by agreeing to the 1933 « Reichskonkordat » . The book is critical of Pius, arguing, he did not « do enough » , or « speak-out enough » , against the Holocaust. Cornwell wrote that Pius' entire career was characterized by a desire to increase and centralize the power of the Papacy, and subordinated opposition to the Nazis to that goal. He further argued Pius was anti-Semitic and this stance prevented him from caring about the European Jews. The Encyclopædia Britannica assesses Cornwell's depiction of Pius as anti-Semitic and indifferent to the Holocaust as lacking « credible substantiation » . Various commentators have subsequently characterized his book as having been « debunked » .

Cornwell, himself, has since retracted his accusations in substantial part, saying that it is « impossible to judge the motives » of the Pope but that :

« Nevertheless, due to his ineffectual and diplomatic language in respect of the Nazis and the Jews, I still believe that it was incumbent on him to explain his failure to speak-out after the War. This he never did. »

Historian John Toland noted :

« The Church, under the Pope's guidance ... saved the lives of more Jews than all other churches, religious institutions and rescue organizations combined ... hiding thousands of Jews in its monasteries, convents and the Vatican itself. The record of the Allies was far more shameful. »

In 1963, *The Deputy*, a fictional play by German playwright Rolf Hochhuth contained an unhistorical depiction of the Pope as indifferent to the Nazi genocide. John Cornwell, depicted the Pope as an anti-Semite. In an assessment by the Encyclopædia Britannica :

« Both depictions, however, lack credible substantiation » and « though Pius's War-time public condemnations of racism and genocide were cloaked in generalities, he did not turn a blind eye to the suffering but chose to use diplomacy to aid the persecuted. It is impossible to know if a more forthright condemnation of the Holocaust would have proved more effective in saving lives, though it probably would have better assured his reputation. »

The conversion of Jews to Catholicism during the Holocaust is one of the most controversial aspects of the record of Pius XII.

According to Roth and Ritner :

« This is a key-point because, in debates about Pius XII, his defenders regularly point to denunciations of racism and

defense of Jewish converts as evidence of opposition to anti-Semitism of all sorts. The Holocaust is one of the most acute examples of the “ recurrent and acutely painful issue in the Catholic-Jewish dialogue ”, namely “ Christian efforts to convert Jews ”. »

In his study of the rescuers of the Jews, Martin Gilbert noted the heavy involvement of the Christian Churches, and wrote that many of the rescued eventually converted to Christianity, and were absorbed into the faith and a « sense of belonging to the religion of the rescuers. It was the price (the penalty, from a strictly Orthodox Jewish perspective) that was paid hundreds, even thousands, of times for the gift of life. »

After the War, clandestine networks smuggled fugitive Axis officials out of Europe. The U.S. code named the activity the « Ratline » . In Rome, pro-Nazi Austrian Bishop, Alois Hudal, was linked to the chain, and the Croatian College offered refuge to Croatian fugitives, guided by Monsignor Krunoslav Draganovic. Catholics and non-Nazi Catholic leaders were being arrested as potential sources of dissent in the new Communist Republics being formed across Eastern Europe and sought to emigrate. This migration was exploited by some Axis fugitives. Potential anti-Communist leaders were being framed by anti-Catholic governments, as with the anti-Nazi Archbishop József Mindszenty in Hungary, the Żegota Jewish aid council in Poland, and the Croatian Archbishop of Zagreb, Aloysius Stepinac.

Bishop Alois Hudal, the former rector of the pan-Germanic college in Rome training German priests, was secretly a member of the Nazi Party and informant for German Intelligence. Gerald Steinacher wrote that Hudal enjoyed close personal relations with Pius XII for many years prior and was an influential figure in the process of escape. The Vatican Refugee Committees for Croats, Slovenes, Ukrainians and Hungarians aided former Fascists and Nazi collaborators to escape those countries.

Rome had been advised the new Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was threatening to destroy Catholicism within its territory. In this climate, wrote Hebblethwaite, the Church faced the prospect that the risk of handing over the innocent could be « greater than the danger that some of the guilty should escape » . Croatian priest Krunoslav Draganovic aided Croatian Fascists to escape through Rome. Ventresca wrote that there is evidence to suggest that Pius XII gave tacit approval to his work and that, according to reports from the CIC (Counter Intelligence Corps) agent, Robert Mudd, some 100 Ustasa were in hiding at the Saint-Jerome seminary hoping to reach Argentina in due course through Vatican channels, and with the full-knowledge of the Vatican. Within days of Pius XII's death (1958) , Vatican officials asked Draganovic to leave the College of Saint-Jerome from where he operated since the latter part of the War. According to Hebblethwaite however, Draganovic « was a law unto himself and ran his own show » . In 1948, Draganovic brought the Nazi collaborator, and wanted war criminal, Ante Pavelić, to the Collegio Pio Latino Americano disguised as a priest until Argentine President Juan Perón invited him to the country.

Since the end of the Second World War, the Catholic Church has moved to honour Catholic resisters, victims of Nazism, canonisation of Saints, beatification of the virtuous and recognition of martyrs. The Church has also issued statements of repentance for its failings and that of its membership during the Nazi Era. Pius XII elevated a number of high-profile resisters of Nazism to the College of Cardinals, in 1946. Among them, Bishop Joseph Frings of Cologne who succeeded the more passive Cardinal Bertram as chairman of the Fulda Bishops' Conference, in July 1945. August von

Galen of Munich and Konrad von Preysing of Berlin. Elsewhere in the liberated Nazi Empire, Pius selected other resisters : Dutch Archbishop Johannes de Jong ; Hungarian Bishop József Mindszenty ; Polish Archbishop Adam Stefan Sapieha ; and French Archbishop Jules-Géraud Saliège. Italian Papal diplomat Angelo Roncalli (later, Pope John XXIII) and Polish Archbishop Stefan Wyszyński were among those elevated in 1953.

Of the post-War popes, the Italians John XXIII and Pope Paul VI were actively involved in the protection of Jews during the War. Pope Benedict XVI had 1st hand experience of life in Nazi Germany. As a boy, he was forced to join the Hitler Youth, drafted into the anti-aircraft corps and trained as a child soldier. At the end of the War, he deserted, was briefly held as a POW and released.

...

The Church in Nazi Germany was subjected to as much pressure as any other organisation in Germany. Any perceived threat to Hitler could not be tolerated - and the churches of Germany potentially presented the Nazis with numerous threats.

In 1933, the Catholic Church had viewed the Nazis as a barrier to the spread of Communism from Russia. In this year, Hitler and the Catholic Church signed an agreement that he would not interfere with the Catholic Church while the Church would not comment on politics. However, this only lasted until 1937, when Hitler started a concerted attack on the Catholic Church arresting priests, etc. In 1937, the pope, Pius XI, issued his « Mit brennender Sorge » statement (With burning anxiety) over what was going on in Germany. However, there was never a total clamp-down on the Catholic Church in Germany. It was a world-wide movement with much international support.

The Protestant Church was really a collection of a number of churches - hence, they were easier to deal with. The Protestants themselves were split. The « German Christians » were lead by Ludwig Müller who believed that any member of the church who had Jewish ancestry should be sacked from the church. Müller supported Hitler and, in 1933, he was given the title of « Reich Bishop » .

Those who opposed the views of Müller were called the « Confessing Church » . This was led by Martin Niemöller. He was famous in Germany as he had been a World War I U-Boat captain. Therefore, he was potentially an embarrassing foe to the Nazis. Regardless of this, he was not safe from the « Gestapo » who arrested him for opposing Hitler. Niemöller was sent to a concentration camp for 7 years where he was kept in solitary confinement. Many other Confessional Church members suffered the same fate.

In 1936, the « Reich » Church was created. This did not have the Christian cross as its symbol but the swastika. The Bible was replaced by « Mein Kampf » which was placed on the altar. By it was a sword. Only invited Nazis were allowed to give sermons in a « Reich » Church.

In 1941, a secret report compiled by Protestants stated that children in Germany were being brought-up minus a Christian education. It stated that the Nazis confiscated vast areas of church property and that the Catholic Church in

Germany was suffering from the same fate.

Christianity in Nazi Germany

It is estimated that at the beginning of the 20th Century about 67 % of the population in Germany were Protestants. However, the Catholics were strong in some areas such as in Bavaria. The Jews formed just under 1 % of the total population of Germany.

In the original programme of the Nazi Party drawn-up by Adolf Hitler, Anton Drexler and Gottfried Feder, in February 1920, promised religious freedom for all those religions except those which endangered the German race.

However, it soon became clear that Hitler had a deep hatred of Jews and appeared to believe they controlled all aspects of German life.

Konrad Heiden, who worked as a journalist in Germany, reported on a speech he made in 1922 :

« Jewry took a step which showed political genius. This capitalist people, which had brought the most unscrupulous exploitation into the world, found a way to lay hands on the leadership of the 4th estate (news media) . The Jew founded the Social-Democratic Party and the Communist movement. And with extraordinary dexterity, he gathered the leadership little by little into his own hands. »

The Christian Church and Adolf Hitler

These views were often shared by Christian leaders in Germany. In 1928, Bishop Otto Dibelius wrote about the « solution » to the « Jewish Problem » . He argued that all Jewish immigration from eastern Europe should be prohibited. As soon as this prohibition takes effect, the decline of Jewry would set in.

« The number of children of the Jewish families is small. The process of dying-out occurs surprisingly rapidly. »

It has been claimed by one historian that Bishop Dibelius' anti-Semitic sentiments were « well nigh representative of German Christendom » at the time.

The Protestant Church had a long history of anti-Semitism that dated back to Martin Luther. In 1543, Luther published « On the Jews and Their Lies » . In the final section of the book, Luther addressed himself to the question of how Christian rulers should treat their Jewish subjects.

« What shall we, Christians, do with this rejected and condemned people, the Jews ? Since they live among us, we dare not tolerate their conduct, now that we are aware of their lying and reviling and blaspheming. If we do, we become sharers in their lies, cursing and blasphemy. Ist to set fire to their synagogues or schools and to bury and cover with dirt whatever will not burn, so that no man will ever again see a stone or cinder of them. 2nd, I advise that their

houses also be razed and destroyed. 3rd, I advise that all their prayer books and Talmudic writings, in which such idolatry, lies, cursing and blasphemy are taught, be taken from them. 4th, I advise that their rabbis be forbidden to teach, henceforth, on pain of loss of life and limb. »

As Derek Wilson pointed-out :

« Attitudes to his harsh and uncompromising advice have inevitably been coloured by the appalling events of later Centuries and predominately by the Holocaust. »

Ludwig Müller was an early supporter of the Nazi Party and openly expressed anti-Semitic views. In 1931, he helped establish the German Christian movement.

The following year, the group issued the statement :

« We stand on the ground of positive Christianity. We profess an affirmative faith in Christ, fitting our race and being in accordance with the German Lutheran mind and heroic piety. Mere compassion is charity and leads to presumption, paired with bad conscience, and effeminates a nation. We know something about Christian obligation and charity towards the helpless, but we also demand the protection of the nation from the unfit and inferior. We see a great danger to our nationality in the Jewish Mission. It promises to allow foreign blood into our nation. Marriages between Jews and Germans must be prohibited. »

As Adolf Hitler was brought-up as a Catholic, some Protestants were reluctant to vote for him. Otto Dibelius, the Bishop of Kurmark, had emerged as one of his strongest supporters. Before the 1932 Presidential election, Bishop Dibelius stated that in the past he had always encouraged people to vote for Protestant candidates.

However, this time he urged the people to vote for Adolf Hitler :

« Among the candidates there is once again a Catholic, namely Hitler. But he is not a candidate of the Roman Catholic Church, rather the leader of the great national movement, to which millions of the Protestants belong. »

Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany

Once in power, Hitler began to openly express anti-Semitic ideas. Based on his readings of how blacks were denied civil rights in the southern States in America, Hitler attempted to make life so unpleasant for Jews in Germany that they would emigrate. The day after the March 1933 election, storm-troopers hunted-down Jews in Berlin and gave them savage beatings. Synagogues were trashed and all over Germany gangs of brownshirts attacked Jews. In the 1st 3 months of Hitler rule, over 40 Jews were murdered.

August von Galen, the Bishop of Münster and a supporter of Hitler because of his anti-Communism, criticized those religious figures who were quick to attack the new government. Von Galen spoke against those scholars who had

criticized the Nazi government and called for « a just and objective evaluation of Hitler's new political movement » .

The campaign started on 1st April, 1933, when a one-day boycott of Jewish-owned shops took place. Members of the Sturm Abteilung (SA) picketed the shops to ensure the boycott was successful. Bishop Otto Dibelius, stated that he had always been « an anti-Semite » and that « one cannot fail to appreciate that in all of the corrosive manifestations of modern civilization Jewry plays a leading role » . It has been claimed that Dibelius' anti-Semitic sentiments were « well nigh representative of German Christendom in the beginning of 1933 » .

Michael von Faulhaber, the Archbishop of Munich and the author of « Judenum, Christentum, Germanentum » , that defended the principles of racial tolerance and humanity and called for the people of Germany to respect the Jewish religion. On 12 March 1933, Faulhaber went to see Pope Pius XI.

On his return, he made the following statement :

« After my recent experience in Rome in the highest-circles, which I cannot reveal here, I must say that I found, despite everything, a greater tolerance with regard to the new government. Let us meditate on the words of the Holy Father, who in a consistory, without mentioning his name, indicated before the whole world in Adolf Hitler the statesmen who 1st, after the Pope himself, has raised his voice against Bolshevism. »

On 24 April 1933, it was reported that :

« Cardinal Faulhaber had issued an order to the clergy to support the new regime in which he (Faulhaber) had confidence. »

In the 1st few months of the new government, no Church leaders spoke against the persecution of the Jews. The Concordat between the Nazis and the Catholic Church was signed in July 1933. It gave them the right to hold Catholic services and provided protection for its other organisations such as schools, youth groups and newspapers.

However, there was a clause in the agreement that said :

« Catholic clerics who hold an ecclesiastical office in Germany or who exercise pastoral or educational functions must be a German citizen. »

The reason for this is that with the rapid rise in anti-Semitism in Germany, some Jews had joined the Catholic Church for protection. When the Nuremberg Laws were passed, Jews lost the rights of citizenship and could no longer seek protection from the Catholic Church.

The lack of protests led to the claims that the church was unconcerned about anything except its own welfare. However, this was not true of all Catholics. Erich Klausener, the leader of the Berlin's Catholic Action movement, was an outspoken critic of Hitler's racial policies. A meeting held at Hoppegarten race-course, on 24 June 1934, where he

spoke-out against political oppression, attracted 60,000 people. 6 days later, he was shot dead in his office by SS officer Kurt Gildisch. Not one German Cardinal or Bishop protested about this savage act.

Ludwig Müller the Bishop of the Reich

In July 1933, Pastor Ludwig Müller, a long-term supporter of Hitler was elected as « Reich » Bishop. His work was supported by Professor Ernst Bergmann who, in 1934, issued the 25 Points of the German Religion. This included the following :

The Jewish Old Testament as well as parts of the New Testament are not suitable for the new Germany.

Christ was not Jewish but a Nordic martyr put to death by the Jews, a warrior whose death rescued the world from Jewish influence.

Adolf Hitler is the new Messiah sent to earth to save the world from the Jews.

Susan Ottaway has argued that many Protestants saw Bergmann's theories as « utter drivel » .

She points out :

« The 2nd point alone high-lights the inconsistency of the doctrine. If Christ's death rescued the world from Jewish influence, why did the Nazis find it necessary to persecute them ? The entire document was complete non-sense and utterly at odds with any conventional view of Christianity. In spite of this it had its supporters. »

The « German Christians » became a pressure group and movement within German Protestantism. Bergmann became the most important academic involved in the movement. The « German Christians » ardently supported the Nazi doctrines of race and the leadership principle. By the time Hitler came to power, the movement had some 3,000 out of a total of 17,000 pastors, though their lay followers probably represented a larger percentage of church-goers.

The movement was popular with young pastors from lower middle-class backgrounds or non-academic families :

« Such men desired a Church whose members were soldiers from Jesus and the Fatherland, tough, hard and uncompromising. Muscular Christianity of this kind appealed particularly to young men who despised the feminization of religion through the involvement in charity, welfare and acts of compassion. »

Martin Niemöller was the pastor of the Church of Jesus-Christ at Dahlem. He was a long-term supporter of Hitler and he made speeches where he argued that Germany needed a « Führer » . In his sermons, he also espoused Hitler's views on race and nationality. During the 1933 General Election, he described the programme of the Nazi Party as a « renewal movement based on a Christian moral foundation » . However, he objected to the election of Müller and, on 21 September, he wrote to all German pastors inviting them to join him in his newly-formed Pastors' Emergency

League. An estimated 7,000 pastors joined him including Dietrich Bonhoeffer in what was later called the Confessing Church.

Niemöller established himself as the leader of the Protestant resistance to Hitler. However, as he admitted later, he remained a committed member of the Nazi Party. Niemöller pointed-out that his group « acted as if we had only to sustain the church » and did not accept that they had a « responsibility for the whole nation » . Niemöller, therefore, did not criticize the Nazi Party for putting its political opponents into concentration camps.

Niemöller wrote after the War :

« Ist they came for the Communists, and I did not speak-out - because I was not a Communist. Then, they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak-out - because I was not a Socialist. Then, they came for the trade-unionists, and I did not speak-out - because I was not a trade-unionist. Then, they came for the Jews, and I did not speak-out - because I was not a Jew. Then, they came for me - and there was no one left to speak-out for me. »

Although religious leaders did little to resist Hitler, that is not true of the general population. Between 1933 and 1939, the ordinary courts sentenced 225,000 people to a total of 600,000 years' imprisonment for political and religious offences. During the Nazi period of power, 3 million Germans were held at one time or another in prison or in the concentration camps on political and religious grounds.

Bishop August von Galen became more critical of the Nazi government in 1934 and attacked the writings of Alfred Rosenberg. In his book, « The Myth of the 20th Century » , Rosenberg had claimed that Catholicism was the « creation of Jewish clericalism » .

Von Galen responded by claiming that Rosenberg's book illustrated that :

« There are heathens again in Germany. »

Josef Gœbbels and his Ministry of Propaganda, tried to influence the debate by « releasing a flood of accusations against Catholic organizations for financial corruption » .

Despite this, he retained his nationalistic views and, in 1936, he blessed the troops before they marched into the Rhineland. In 1937, Bishop August von Galen, Michæl von Faulhaber, the Archbishop of Munich and Konrad von Preysing, Bishop of Eichstätt, helped draft the Pope's anti-Nazi Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » (With Burning Concern) . The Encyclical addressed the problems being experienced by German Catholics and detailed the Pope's grave concerns about the way the Nazi government had ignored the terms of the Concordat of 1933.

Bishop Otto Dibelius was one of those who refused to accept the leadership of Bishop Ludwig Müller that was described as « Nazified Christianity » . He made it clear that he would not submit to control by the government in the exercise of his spiritual and pastoral functions. Over the next few years, he became associated with what became

known as the Confessing Church. Leaders of this movement included Martin Niemöller and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. During this period, he also met Kurt Gerstein, who later claimed that he worked as a spy within the SS for the movement.

In March 1937, Bishop Dibelius wrote an open letter to Hans Kerrl, the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs :

« The Church must be a church and not a state within the State. But the doctrine which you proclaim would have the effect of making the State into the Church in so far as the State, supported by its coercive powers, comes to decision with regard to the sermons that are preached and the faith that is confessed. Here lies the root of the whole struggle between the State and the Evangelical Church. As soon as the State endeavors to become Church and assumes power over the souls of men, then, we are bound by Luther's word to offer resistance in God's name. And that is what we shall do. »

Bishop Dibelius was brought before a special court, on a charge of treasonable attacks on the government. His acquittal upset the leaders of the German Christian movement. Adolf Hitler asked the court for a copy of its reasons for the judgment, but decided not to take action against his former ally.

The Church and « Kristallnacht »

Ernst vom Rath was murdered by Herschel Grynszpan, a young Jewish refugee in Paris on 9 November 1938. At a meeting of Nazi Party leaders that evening, Josef Goebbels suggested that there should be « spontaneous » anti-Jewish riots. Reinhard Heydrich sent urgent guide-lines to all police headquarters suggesting how they could start these disturbances. He ordered the destruction of all Jewish places of worship in Germany. Heydrich also gave instructions that the police should not interfere with demonstrations and surrounding buildings must not be damaged when burning synagogues.

Heinrich Müller, head of the Secret Political Police, sent-out an order to all regional and local commanders of the State police :

« Operations against Jews, in particular against their synagogues will commence very soon throughout Germany. There must be no interference. However, arrangements should be made, in consultation with the General Police, to prevent looting and other excesses.

Any vital archival material that might be in the synagogues must be secured by the fastest possible means.

Preparations must be made for the arrest of from 20,000 to 30,000 Jews within the “ Reich ”. In particular, affluent Jews are to be selected. Further directives will be forthcoming during the course of the night.

Should Jews be found in the possession of weapons during the impending operations the most severe measures must be taken. “ SS Verfügungstruppen ” and general SS may be called in for the overall operations. The State Police must under all circumstances maintain control of the operations by taking appropriate measures. »

Reinhard Heydrich ordered members of the « Gestapo » to make arrests following « Kristallnacht » :

As soon as the course of events during the night permits the release of the officials required, as many Jews in all districts, especially the rich, as can be accommodated in existing prisons are to be arrested. For the time being, only healthy male Jews, who are not too old, are to be detained. After the detentions have been carried-out the appropriate concentration camps are to be contracted immediately for the prompt accommodation of the Jews in the camps.

Josef Gœbbels wrote an article for the « Völkischer Beobachter » where he claimed that « Kristallnacht » was a spontaneous outbreak of feeling :

« The outbreak of fury by the people on the night of 9-10 November shows the patience of the German people has now been exhausted. It was neither organized nor prepared but it broke-out spontaneously. »

« Kristallnacht » (Crystal Night)

On 11 November 1938, Reinhard Heydrich reported to Hermann Göring, details of the night of terror :

« 74 Jews killed or seriously injured ; 20,000 arrested ; 815 shops and 171 homes destroyed ; 191 synagogues set on fire ; total damage costing 25 million marks, of which over 5 million was for broken glass. »

It was decided that :

« The Jews would have to pay for the damage they had provoked. A fine of 1 billion marks was levied for the slaying of vom Rath. »

Lucy S. Dawidowicz, the author of « The War Against the Jews » (1975) has pointed-out that a representative of the German insurance companies was invited to report on compensation for damages caused by the demonstrations :

« After a lengthy discussion, it was decided that the insurance companies had to pay the damages to retain their credibility. Where compensation was paid to Jews, the German government would arrange to confiscate those payments. »

The leaders of the Protestant and Catholic religions decided to stay silent and did not protest about the events of « Kristallnacht » . Even the breakaway Confessing Church took no stand on the issue. Richard Evans has pointed-out that much had changed since, when in 1933, Cardinal Michæl von Faulhaber had spoken-out « openly against pride in one's own race degenerating into hatred of another seemed to be long gone » .

Bishop Martin Sasse, head of the Protestant church of Thuringia, responded to « Kristallnacht » by publishing on 15 November, a pamphlet entitled « Martin Luther on the Jews : Away with Them ! » , in which he reprinted excerpts

from Luther's notorious 1,543 pamphlet, « Against the Jews and Their Lies » , urging the destruction of Jewish property. Sasse claimed that the persecution of the Jews were fulfilling the goals of Luther.

Sasse stated this his objective was remove the church of Jewishness :

« Not only were baptized Jewish pastors, religion teachers and organists to be fired and baptized Jews excluded from church congregations ; not only were pastors forbidden to minister to baptized Jews ; not only was the Old Testament no longer to be presented in church to couples celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary ; not only was knowledge of biblical Hebrew, henceforth, eliminated as a requirement for ordination ; now, any traces of Jewishness in the New Testament, liturgy, music and theology of the church were to be hunted-down, exposed and eradicated. »

The Quakers had the best record for standing-up for the Jews following « Kristallnacht » and printed leaflets advocating « Decency over Patriotism » . According to Henning Mielke :

« The Berlin office of the Society of Friends worked on behalf of Jewish people who were not affiliated with a Jewish congregation, and also some of the political refugees. They were able at the last minute to evacuate 10,000 Jewish children to England in the so-called “ Kindertransporte ”. Quaker families in England and the United States took in the children. »

The Catholic Church and Euthanasia

Adolf Hitler made several speeches in favour of a euthanasia programme that would help to improve the quality of the German « race » .

He stated that if War came, he would implement the idea of euthanasia :

« Because I am of the opinion that such a program could be put into effect more smoothly and readily in time of War, that in the general upheaval of War the open resistance to be anticipated on the part of the Church would not play the part that might be expected. »

On 18 August 1939, the « Reich » Committee for the Scientific Registration of Serious Hereditary and Congenitally Based Diseases was set-up. Registration of all malformed children was now compulsory. In September, a circular was sent-out to all asylums and clinics in the « Reich » calling for registration of those suffering from illnesses which prevented their employment. Known as T-4, the euthanasia programme was run from the « Tiergarten » area of Berlin.

October 1939 : Adolf Hitler signed a « euthanasia decree » that authorized « Reichsleiter » Philipp Bouhler, the chief of his Chancellery, and Doctor Karl Brandt, Hitler's personal physician, to carry-out the programme of involuntary euthanasia :

« “ Reich ” Leader Bouhler and Doctor Brandt are entrusted with the responsibility of extending the authority of

physicians, designated by name, so that patients who, on the basis of human judgment, are considered incurable, can be granted mercy death after a definitive diagnosis. »

Attempts were made to keep the T-4 programme a secret. It is estimated that about 70,000 patients died over the next 12 months. News of the sudden deaths of handicapped children began to spread in 1940.

Pope Pius XI issued a statement that :

« The direct killing of an innocent person because of mental or physical defects is not allowed. »

In 1941, Kurt Gerstein, an active opponent of Hitler, discovered that his sister-in-law, Bertha Ebeling, was a victim of the euthanasia program directed at the mentally ill. Gerstein was able to pass this information to several church leaders.

On 3 August, 1941, August von Galen, the Archbishop of Münster, spoke-out in a sermon against the Nazi practice of euthanasia :

« If the principle that man is entitled to kill his unproductive fellow man is established and applied, then, woe to all of us when we become aged and infirm ! Then, no man will be safe : some committee or other will be able to put him on the list of “ unproductive ” persons, who in their judgment have become “ unworthy to live ”. And there will be no police to protect him, no court to avenge his murder and bring his murderers to justice. Who could then have any confidence in a doctor ? He might report a patient as unproductive and, then, be given instructions to kill him ! It does not bear thinking of, the moral depravity, the universal mistrust, which will spread even in the bosom of the family, if this terrible doctrine is tolerated, accepted and put into practice. Woe to mankind ! Woe to our German people, if the divine commandment “ Thou shalt not kill ”, which the Lord proclaimed on Sinai amid thunder and lightning, which God our Creator wrote into man's conscience from the beginning, if this commandment is not merely violated but the violation is tolerated and remains unpunished ! »

It was reported that one woman who had attended the sermon hurried home to guard her elderly mother in case the « Gestapo » took her away to be murdered. Other people refused to undergo X-rays because they feared it was connected to the euthanasia programme. Details of the sermon were sent-out of the country. The BBC made broadcasts concerning it and the Royal Air Force dropped copies of it over Germany.

Brishop Galen also attacked the « Gestapo » habit of seizing Church buildings and converting them to their own uses - which included cinemas and even brothels. The contents of these sermons were printed and distributed throughout the country. Adolf Hitler wanted Galen arrested but Josef Gœbbels warned against this as Galen was a popular religious leader.

Hitler accepted that it was not a good idea to make martyrs of well-known Church leaders. However, people who were caught with copies of the sermon, or who discussed it with colleagues, were arrested and sent to concentration camps.

Richard Grunberger, the author of « A Social History of the 3rd “ Reich ” » (1971) has pointed-out :

« The regime took no action against Galen, but significantly, executed 3 Catholic priests at Lübeck who had distributed the text of Galen's sermon among soldiers. »

Bishop August von Galen did not give anymore sermons against the Nazi government.

In September 1941, he stated publicly that :

« We, Christians, do not make revolution. »

Hitler did not bring a halt to the programme. Instead, he changed his strategy :

« Thenceforth, patients would be killed by starvation and lethal medication in a larger number of extermination centres located within several asylums. This would be easier to conceal than the sudden removal and simultaneous disappearance of big groups of people. »

Although he had decided not to play any part in the resistance to Hitler his sermons did inspire others. A copy arrived at the home of Robert Scholl. 2 of his children, Hans Scholl and Sophie Scholl, organized the « White Rose » group. They joined forces with Christoph Probst, Alexander Schmorell, Willi Graf and Jugen Wittenstein and began distributing anti-nazi leaflets in Munich. They were caught and executed in April 1943.

The Holocaust

During the Second World War, a member of the Confessing Church, Kurt Gerstein, joined the Waffen SS in order « to see things from the inside » , to try to change the direction of policies, and to publicize the crimes being committed. In a letter to his wife, he told her that he had joined the SS as an « agent of the Confessing Church » . Gerstein later claimed he was working for Martin Niemöller.

Gerstein was sent to Belzec Extermination Camp to meet with Christian Wirth.

While there, he witnessed the killing of an entire trainload of Jews :

« When the train arrived, many were already dead, having been packed into the train with no room to move or lie down. The survivors were told that they were being sent to the bathhouse to be disinfected. They were assured that they would come to no harm and that they should breathe deeply to ensure that infectious diseases were prevented. The people were herded naked into the gas chamber. Families still clung together, children holding their parents' hands, husbands putting protective arms around their wives. The doors were slammed shut and the diesel pumping engine was started. Almost immediately, it broke-down. The minutes passed while engineers were brought in to mend

the faulty engine. From inside, the gas chamber the sound of crying could be heard. Periodically, an SS officer peered through the glass-window in the door of the chamber to see what was happening inside. He reported that they were wailing like they did in the synagogue. This officer seemed to feel no sorrow or pity for the wretched souls squashed inside the small chamber, bodies pressed so tightly together that there was no room to turn or shift their weight from one leg to the other ; no room for a mother to bend to comfort the small child clinging to her legs. Eventually, after being trapped for more than 2 hours, the diesel engine croaked into life, but it took another 30 minutes of pumping the deadly carbon monoxide into the chamber before everyone inside was dead. »

Gerstein also told his contacts in the Confessional Church. This included Bishop Otto Dibelius and Martin Niemöller. He also passed the information to Diego Cesare Orsenigo, the representative of the Vatican in Berlin. However, he was a supporter of Adolf Hitler and refused to take any action. He told Pope Pius XI that he advocated conciliation out of a fear that if the Church came into conflict with the Nazi government it would lead to « lapsed religiosity among German Catholics » .

He argued that :

« Unless the clergy appeased the regime and relieved members of the church of a conflict of conscience. »

Gerstein later reported :

« My attempt to report all this to the head of the Legation of the Holy-See had no great success. I was asked if I was a soldier. Then, I was denied any kind of interview and was requested to leave the legation forthwith. I relate this to show how difficult it was, even for a German who was a bitter enemy of the Nazis, to succeed in discrediting this criminal government. I continued to inform hundreds of people of these horrible massacres. Among them, were the Niemöller family ; Doctor Hochstraßer, the press “ attaché ” at the Swiss legation in Berlin ; Doctor Winter, the co-adjutor of the Catholic Bishop of Berlin - so that he could transmit my information to the Bishop and to the Pope ; Doctor Dibelius, and many others. In this way, thousands of people were informed by me. »

Bishop Dibelius did nothing with this information. After the War, he claimed that he was not aware of the « full-implications » of the « final solution » :

« There was no evidence which would have stood-up in a court of law ; no Cardinal or Bishop was ever permitted to visit Auschwitz, Sobibor or Treblinka. Their knowledge was based on hearsay, but it is unlikely that they had any doubts as to the authoritative character of this information. »

Martin Niemöller spent the Second World War in Dachau Concentration Camp. As he was a First World War hero, Adolf Hitler gave orders for him to be left alive. His colleague, Dietrich Bonhoffer, was arrested in April 1943 and was charged with planning the « July Plot » . He was held in Buchenwald Concentration Camp until being executed in April 1945.

The Role of the Churches : Compliance and Confrontation

Churches throughout Europe were mostly silent while Jews were persecuted, deported and murdered by the Nazis. Churches, especially those in Nazi Germany, sought to act, as institutions tend to do, in their own best interests - narrowly defined, short-sighted interests.

The list of « by-standers » (those who declined to challenge the 3rd “ Reich ” in any way) that emerges from any study of the Holocaust is long and depressing. Few organizations, in or outside Nazi Germany, did much to resist Nazism or aid its victims.

« It has become abundantly clear that the Churches' failure to respond to the horrid events was not due to ignorance ; they knew what was happening. Ultimately, the Churches' lapses during the Nazi era were lapses of vision and determination. »

Assisting European Jews was not a high-priority of the Allied governments as they sought to defeat Hitler militarily. The courageous acts of individual rescuers and resistance members proved to be the exception, not the norm.

To a great extent, this inertia defined the organized Christian community as well. Churches throughout Europe were mostly silent while Jews were persecuted, deported and murdered. In Nazi Germany, in September 1935, there were a few Christians in the Protestant Confessing Church who demanded that their Church take a public stand in defense of the Jews. Their efforts, however, were over-ruled by Church leaders who wanted to avoid any conflict with the Nazi regime. Internationally, some Church leaders in Europe and North America did condemn the Nazis' measures against the Jews, and there were many debates about how Christians outside Nazi Germany and Nazi-occupied territory should best respond to Adolf Hitler's brutal policies. These discussions, however, tended to become focused more on secondary strategic considerations (like maintaining good relations with colleagues in the German Churches) than on the central humanitarian issues that were really at stake.

Churches throughout the world began to address their failures after 1945. Confessions of guilt have been issued by Catholic Churches in France and Germany, and most major Protestant denominations, beginning with the German Evangelical Church's Stuttgart Declaration of Guilt, in August 1945 (3 months after the War in Europe ended) . The early statements were vague, often referring only to the Churches' general lack of decisiveness in opposing Nazism. More recently, however, the Christian Churches have been far more specific - recognizing that they not only failed to resist Nazism, but actually helped prepare the way for the mass destruction of Europe's Jews through Centuries of proselytization, attacks on Judaism, and tacit or overt support for pogroms and other anti-Jewish violence.

These admissions of guilt are part of a difficult process, which still continues, in which Christians try to grasp exactly what happened to their Churches during the Holocaust. The examinations raise a number of questions :

Were the Churches, by and large, passive while millions of innocent people were murdered ?

To what extent can we say they resisted ?

To what extent were they guilty of active complicity ?

Most importantly : Why did the Churches respond as they did ?

These are, obviously, complex questions, historically and theologically.

Factors Shaping Behavior of Christian Churches

3 main factors shaped the behavior of the Christian Churches during the Nazi reign of terror in Germany and abroad. The 1st was the theological and doctrinal anti-Judaism that existed in parts of the Christian tradition. Long before 1933, the anti-Judaism that existed within the Churches (ranging from latent prejudice to the virulent diatribes of people like Martin Luther) lent legitimacy to the racial anti-Semitism that emerged in the late-19th Century. The 2nd factor was the Churches' historical role in creating « Christendom » - the Western European culture that, since the era of the Roman Emperor Constantine, had been explicitly and deliberately « Christian ». The Churches' advocacy of a « Christian culture » led to a « sacralization of cultural identity » (as the theologian Miroslav Volf puts it), in which dominant, positive values were seen as « Christian » ones, while developments viewed negatively (such as secularism and Marxism) were attributed to « Jewish » influences. Moreover, particularly in the German Evangelical Church (the largest Protestant Church in Germany), the allegiance to the concept of « Christendom » was linked to a strong nationalism, symbolized by German Protestantism's « Throne and Altar » alliance with State authority. The 3rd factor was the Churches' understanding of their institutional role. While most Christian religious leaders in Germany welcomed the end of the Weimar Republic and the resurgence of nationalism, they became increasingly uneasy about their institutions' future in what was clearly becoming a totalitarian State. (Moreover, many of the leading Nazis were overtly anti-Christian.) The Churches in Nazi Germany, while wanting to retain their prominent place in society, opposed any State control of their affairs. The Catholic Church and the Protestant Churches sought to maintain some degree of independence by entering into certain arrangements with the Nazi regime. The 1933 concordat, signed by representatives of the Nazi regime and the Vatican, ostensibly secured independence for Catholic schools and other Catholic institutions in Nazi Germany. The Protestant Churches, which were divided regionally, behaved cautiously (avoiding public confrontation and negotiating privately with Nazi authorities) in the hope that this would ensure institutional independence from direct Nazi control. Throughout Hitler's Germany, Bishops and other Christian religious leaders deliberately avoided antagonizing Nazi officials. When Christian clergymen and Christian women deplored Nazi policies, they often felt constrained to oppose those policies in a muted fashion. Even in the Protestant Confessing Church (the Church group in Germany that was most critical of Nazism), there was little support for official public criticism of the Nazi regime, particularly when it came to such central and risky issues as the persecution of Jews.

Anti-Judaism in Germany's Churches

The role of anti-Judaism in Germany's Churches during the Nazi era was a complicated one. Throughout the 1930's, there was ample evidence of anti-Semitism in many of the sermons and articles that appeared in the German

Churches' publications. Some German Church leaders proudly announced that they were anti-Semites. Others, who weren't anti-Semitic, nevertheless warned their colleagues against any public show of support for the Jewish victims of the Nazi regime. Christian anti-Semitism often complemented other factors - notably, the strong nationalism in the German Protestant Churches. The most extreme example of this combination of anti-Semitism and nationalism was the so-called German Christian Movement, a Protestant group that embraced Nazism and tried to « Nazify » Christianity by suppressing the Old Testament, revising liturgies and hymns, and promoting Jesus as an Aryan hero who embodied the ideals of the new Germany.

It must be said that the Churches' theological attitudes about Jews did not always take the form of anti-Jewish diatribes, or other kinds of explicit anti-Semitism. Often they manifested themselves in their determination to convert Jews, and so Nazi policies confronted the Christian Churches with an unresolvable theological problem : in a society that was determined to eradicate the Jews, the Christian Gospel claimed that the Jews were God's chosen people and should be the special objects of Christian proselytizing. This led to deep divisions among German clergy about what they really believed and what they were supposed to do in their new situation.

For the most part, the influences that motivated and guided the German Churches in the 1930's and 1940's essentially paralyzed these institutions' potential challenges to Nazism, or led them to implicitly (though reluctantly) support Hitler's regime. The German Churches stumbled, and they stumbled badly. The leaders of the Churches spent a great deal of time delineating a « viable » position : one that would conform to Christian doctrine, prevent their Church from dividing into opposing factions, and avoid antagonizing the Nazi authorities. In any examination of the German Churches' statements from this era, what is most striking is their painstaking attempt to say, publicly, neither too much nor too little about what is happening around them. Needless to say, this ruled-out any consistent or emphatic response to the Nazis' persecution of Jews and others. And institutional inaction gave individual Christians throughout Germany an alibi for passivity. More tragically, individual Christians who did express solidarity with the persecuted Jews (such as the Catholic priest Bernhard Lichtenberg and the Protestant deaconess Marga Meusel) received no public (and little private) support from their respective Churches.

Christian Opposition to the Hitler Regime Outside of Germany

The story recounted in this article up to this point has been, for the most part, a dismal one, but some Christian Churches and organizations outside of Germany did evince vigorous opposition to the Nazi State in the 1930's and 1940's. From the beginning of Hitler's regime, the ecumenical Christian movement (its central offices were located in Geneva, London and New York) strongly condemned developments in Nazi Germany that threatened the independence of Christian Churches and the safety of Jews. On May 26 and 29, 1933, 1,200 American clergymen from 26 different Christian denominations sponsored an advertisement in « The New York Times » condemning anti-Jewish activities in Nazi Germany. Leaders of the Federal Council of Churches (a Protestant group) , located in the United States, sent angry letters in 1933 to their colleagues in the German Churches, demanding public statements denouncing Nazi policies. Between 1933 and 1945, there were six major statements from the leaders of Churches in this country and in Europe (outside the 3rd « Reich ») that specifically condemned anti-Semitism and the Nazi persecution of Jews. (Among the officials involved were the Archbishop of Canterbury and Samuel Cavert and Henry Smith Leiper of the

Federal Council of Churches in New York.) In November 1938, the 3 leading Protestant ecumenical organizations in Geneva, Switzerland, issued a statement castigating « anti-Semitism in all its forms » and urging governments to permit more Jewish refugees to enter their countries. In the United States, in December 1938, the Federal Council of Churches and the U.S. Catholic Bishops issued a joint condemnation of « Kristallnacht », which had occurred a month earlier. (It was the 1st Protestant-Catholic joint statement on a social issue in this country.) In December 1942, after reports of genocide began to reach the Allied countries, the Federal Council of Churches passed a resolution protesting the « virtual massacre » of Europe's Jews. This was followed by similar protests from the Anglican Church in England and a joint statement by Protestant ecumenical leaders and the World Jewish Congress in Geneva. In Great Britain, the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, gave an impassioned speech in March 1943 in the House of Lords, demanding an immediate end to immigration quotas and an increase in Allied aid to countries that offered refuge to Jews. In a 1983 speech delivered at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Gerhardt Riegner, the director of the World Jewish Congress in Geneva during the War (and a man who had participated in efforts to rescue Jews from the Nazis), said that, during the Holocaust, « the human understanding, friendship, and the helping hand » of his Protestant ecumenical colleagues « were the only signs of light in the darkness that surrounded us » .

These aspects of the Christian Churches' opposition to the 3rd « Reich » did not, of course, impede the workings of the Holocaust, or even lead to the rescue of significant numbers of endangered Jews. The actions and pronouncements described here were not part of any long-term, comprehensive and coordinated program. The Christian leaders outside of Germany who spoke-out against the persecution of the Jews and against genocide were a minority in the Christian world. They failed to win significant support from their own Church members. There were early attempts (in 1933 and 1934, in the United States and Britain) to establish an interfaith Catholic, Jewish and Protestant network to help refugees from Nazi Germany. These efforts failed, in part, because of the lack of wide-spread support in the Christian Churches. Throughout the 1930's and 1940's, the major Christian refugee offices in Europe and the U.S. received far more financial support from Jewish organizations like the United Jewish Appeal than from their own member Churches.

German Churches Actions Based on Institutional Interests

Throughout the Nazi era, ardent debates took place within the German Churches about where to stand firm against Hitler's regime and where to compromise, when to speak-out and when to remain silent. Ecumenical documents show that, from 1933 to 1945, there were Christian leaders inside and outside Germany who agonized about what they could do to stop Nazism and help its victims. The historical complexities suggested by these factors should never lead us to condone the Churches' failures during the 1930's and 1940's ; they can, however, help us to understand the specific nature of those failures so that we may learn from them.

Perhaps, at the heart of those failures was the fact that the Churches, especially in Nazi Germany, sought to act, as institutions tend to do, in their own best interests - narrowly defined, short-sighted interests. There was little desire on the part of the Churches for self-sacrifice or heroism, and much emphasis on « pragmatic » and « strategic » measures that would supposedly protect these institutions' autonomy in the 3rd « Reich » . Public institutional circumspection carried to the point of near numbness ; an acute lack of insight : these are the aspects of the Churches' behaviour during the Nazi era that are so damning in retrospect. The minutes of German Protestant synodal

meetings, in 1942, reveal how oblivious the participants were to what was happening in the world around them. While innocent victims throughout Europe were being brutally murdered, Christian leaders were debating what points of doctrine and policy were tenable. This is especially haunting, of course, because the Christian clergy and laity never thought of their respective Churches as a mere institution, but as a religious body witnessing in the world to certain values, including love of neighbours, the sanctity of life and the power of moral conscience.

Reflecting on the failure of the Churches to challenge the Nazis should prompt us to ponder all the others (individuals, governments and institutions) that passively acquiesced to the 3rd « Reich's » tyranny. Even the wisest and most perceptive of them, it seems, failed to develop adequate moral and political responses to Nazi genocide, failed to recognize that something new was demanded of them by the barbarism of Hitler's regime. Moreover, it has become abundantly clear that their failure to respond to the horrid events in Europe in the 1930's and 1940's was not due to ignorance ; they knew what was happening.

Ultimately, the Churches' lapses during the Nazi era were lapses of vision and determination. Protestant and Catholic religious leaders loyal to creeds professing that love can withstand and conquer evil, were unable or unwilling to defy one of the great evils in human history. And so, the Holocaust will continue to haunt the Christian Churches for a very, very long time to come.

The Great Scandal : Christianity's Role in the Rise of the Nazis

Together with interior minister Wilhelm Frick and propaganda minister Josef Goebbels, Catholic Bishops Franz Rudolf Bornewasser (Bishop of Trier) and Ludwig Sebastian (Bishop of Speyer) raise their hands in the Nazi salute at an official ceremony in Saarbrücken City Hall marking the re-incorporation of the Saarland into the German « Reich » .

« You know what happens when atheists take-over - remember Nazi Germany ? »

Many Christians point to Nazism, alongside Stalinism, to illustrate the perils of atheism in power. (1) At the other extreme, some authors paint the Vatican as Hitler's eager ally. Meanwhile, the Nazis are generally portrayed as using terror to bend a modern civilization to their agenda ; yet, we recognize that Hitler was initially popular. Amid these contradictions, where is the truth ?

A growing body of scholarly research, some based on careful analysis of Nazi records, is clarifying this complex history. (2) It reveals a convoluted pattern of religious and moral failure in which atheism and the non-religious played little role, except as victims of the Nazis and their allies. In contrast, Christianity had the capacity to stop Nazism before it came to power, and to reduce or moderate its practices afterwards, but repeatedly failed to do so because the principal churches were complicit with (indeed, in the pay of) the Nazis.

Most « German Christians » supported the « Reich » ; many continued to do so in the face of mounting evidence that the dictatorship was depraved and murderously cruel. Elsewhere in Europe the story was often the same. Only with Christianity's forbearance and frequent cooperation could fascist movements gain majority support in Christian

nations. European Fascism was the fruit of a Christian culture. Millions of Christians actively supported these notorious regimes. Thousands participated in their atrocities.

What, in God's name, were they thinking ?

Before we can consider the Nazis, we need to examine the historical and cultural religious context that would give rise to them.

Christian Foundations

Early Christian sects promoted loyalty to authoritarian rulers so long they were not intolerably anti-Christian or, worse, atheistic. Christian anti-Semitism sprang from one of the Church's 1st efforts to forge an accommodation with power. Re-interpreting the Gospels to shift blame for the Crucifixion from the Romans to the Jews (the « Christ killer » story) courted favour with Rome, an early example of Christian complicity for political purposes. Added energy came from Christians' anger over most Jews' refusal to convert. (3)

Christian anti-Semitism was only intermittently violent, but when violence occurred it was devastating. The 1st outright extermination of Jews occurred in 414 c.e. It would have innumerable successors, the worst nearly genocidal in scope. At standard rates of population growth, Diaspora Jewry should now number in the hundreds of millions. That there are only an estimated 13 million Jews in the world (4) is largely the result of Christian violence and forced conversion. (5)

Anti-Semitic practices pioneered by Catholics included the forced wearing of yellow identification, ghettoization, confiscation of Jews' property, and bans on inter-marriage with Christians. European Protestantism bore the fierce impress of Martin Luther, whose 1543 tract « On the Jews and Their Lies » was a principal inspiration for « Mein Kampf ». (6) In addition to his anti-Semitism, Luther was also a fervent authoritarian. Against the « Robbing and Murdering Peasants », his vituperative commentary on a contemporary rebellion, contributed to the deaths of perhaps 100,000 Christians and helped to lay the ground-work for an increasingly severe Germono-Christian autocracy. (7)

With the Enlightenment, deistic and secular thinkers seeded Western culture with Greco-Roman notions of democracy and free expression. The feudal aristocracies and the churches counter-attacked, couching their reactionary defense of privilege in self-consciously biblical language. This controversy would shape centuries of European history. As late as 1870, the Roman Catholic Church reaffirmed a reactionary program at the 1st Vatican Council. Convened by the ultra-conservative Pope Pius IX (reigned 1846-1878), Vatican I stridently condemned modernism, democracy, capitalism, usury, and Marxism. (8) Anti-Semitism was also part of the mix ; well into the 20th Century, mainstream Catholic publications set an intolerant tone that later Nazi propaganda would imitate. Anti-Semitism remained conspicuous in main-stream Catholic literature even after Pope Pius XI (reigned 1922-1939) officially condemned it.

Protestantism, too, was largely hostile toward modernism and democracy during this period (with a few exceptions in northern Europe) . Because Jews were seen as materialists who promoted and benefited from Enlightenment modernism, most Protestant denominations remained anti-Semitic.

With the 19th Century came a European movement that viewed Judaism as a racial curse. Attracting both Protestant and Catholic dissidents within Germanic populations, Aryan Christianity differed from traditional Christianity in denying both that Christ was a Jew and that Christianity had grown-out of Judaism. (9) Adherents viewed Christ as a divine Aryan warrior who brought the sword to cleanse the earth of Jews. (10) Aryans were held to be the only true humans, specially created by God through Adam and Eve ; all other peoples were soulless sub-humans, descended from apes or created by Satan with no hope of salvation. (11) Most non-Aryans were considered suitable for subservient roles including slavery, but not the Jews. Spiritless yet clever and devious, Jews were seen as a satanic disease to be quarantined or eliminated.

During the same years, neo-Pagan and occult movements gained adherents and incubated their own form of Aryanism. Unlike Aryan Christians, neo-Pagan Aryans acknowledged that Christ was a Jew - and, for that reason, rejected Christianity. They believed themselves descended from demi-gods whose divinity had degraded through Centuries of inter-breeding with lesser races. The Norse gods and even the Atlantis myth sometimes decorated Aryan mythology.

Attempting to deny that Nazi anti-Semitism had a Christian component, Christian apologists exaggerate the influence of Aryan neo-Paganism. Actually, neo-Paganism never had a large following.

German Aryanism, whether Christian or pagan, became known as « Volkism » . « Volkism » prophesied the emergence of a great God-chosen Aryan who would lead the people (« Volk ») to their grand destiny through the conquest of « Lebensraum » (living space) . A common motto was « God and Volk » . Disregarding obvious theological contradictions, growing numbers of German nationalists managed to work Aryanism into their Protestant or Catholic confessions, much as contemporary adherents of Voudoun or Santería blend the occult with their Christian beliefs. Darwinian theory sometimes entered « Volkism » as a belief in the divinely intended survival of the fittest peoples. Democracy had no place, but Nietzschean philosophy had some influence - a point Christian apologists make much of. Yet, Nietzsche's influence was modest, as « Volkists » found his skepticism toward religion unacceptable. (12)

Though traceable to the ancient world, atheism 1st emerged as a major social movement in the mid-1800's. (13) It would be associated with both pro- and anti-democratic world-views. Strongly influenced by science, atheists tended to view all humans as descended in common from apes. There was no inherent anti-Semitic tradition. Some atheists accepted then-popular pseudoscientific racist views that the races exhibited varying levels of intellect due to differing genetic heritages. Some went further, embracing various forms of eugenics as a means of improving the human condition. But neither of these positions was uniquely or characteristically atheistic. « Scientific » racism is actually better understood as a tool by which Christians could perpetuate their own cultural prejudices - it was no accident that the races deemed inferior by Western Christian societies and « science » were the same !

When we seek precursors of Nazi anti-Semitism and authoritarianism, it is among European Christians, not among the atheists, that we must search.

Following World War I, the religious situation in Europe was complex. Scientific findings about the age of the Earth,

Darwin's theory of evolution, and biblical criticism had fueled the 1st major expansion of nontheism at Christianity's expense among ordinary Europeans. The churches' support for the catastrophic Great War further fueled public disaffection, as did (in Germany) the flight of the « Kaiser », in whom both Protestant and Catholic clergy had vested heavily. (14) But religion was not everywhere in retreat : post-War Germany experienced a Christian spiritual renaissance outside the traditional churches. (15) Religious freedom was unprecedented, but the established churches enjoyed wide-spread State support and controlled their own education systems. They were far more influential than today.

Roughly 2/3 of Germans were Protestant, almost all of the rest Catholic. The pagan minority claimed at most 5 % . Explicit nontheism was limited to an intellectual elite and to committed socialists. Just 1.5 % of Germans identified themselves as unbelievers in a 1939 census, which means either that very few Nazis and National-Socialist German Worker's Party supporters were atheists, or that atheists feared to identify themselves to the pro-theistic regime.

Most religious Germans detested the impiety, secularism, and hedonistic decadence that they associated with such modernist ideas as democracy and free speech. If they feared democracy, they were terrified by Communism, to the point of being willing to accept extreme counter-methods.

Thus, it was a largely Christian, deeply racist, often anti-democratic, and, in many respects, dangerously primitive Western culture into which Nazism would arise. It was a theistic powder keg ready to explode.

Nazi Leaders, Theism, and Family Values

According to standard biographies, the principal Nazi leaders were all born, baptized, and raised Christian. Most grew-up in strict, pious households where tolerance and democratic values were disparaged. Nazi leaders of Catholic background included Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, Reinhard Heydrich, and Josef Gœbbels.

Hitler did well in monastery school. He sang in the choir, found High-Mass and other ceremonies intoxicating, and idolized priests. Impressed by their power, he, at one time, considered entering the priesthood.

Rudolf Höss, who as commandant at Auschwitz-Birkinau pioneered the use of the « Zyklon-B » gas that killed half of all Holocaust victims, had strict Catholic parents. Hermann Gœring had mixed Catholic-Protestant parentage, while Rudolf Heß, Martin Bormann, Albert Speer, and Adolf Eichmann had Protestant backgrounds. Not one of the top Nazi leaders was raised in a Liberal or atheistic family - no doubt, the parents of any of them would have found such views scandalous. Traditionalists would never think to deprive their off-spring of the faith-based moral foundations that they would need to grow into ethical adults.

So much for the Nazi leaders' religious backgrounds. Assessing their religious views as adults is more difficult. On ancillary issues such as religion, Party doctrine was a deliberate tangle of contradictions. (16) For Hitler consistency mattered less than having a statement at hand for any situation that might arise. History records many things that Hitler wrote or said about religion, but they too are sometimes contradictory. Many were crafted for a particular

audience or moment and have limited value for illuminating Hitler's true opinion ; in any case, neither Hitler nor any other key Nazi leader was a trained theologian with carefully thought-out views.

Accuracy of transcription is another concern. Hitler's public speeches were recorded reliably, but were often propagandistic. His private statements seem more likely to reflect his actual views, but their reliability varies widely. (17) The passages Christian apologists cite most often to prove Hitler's atheism are of questionable accuracy. Apologists often brandish them without noting historians' reservations. Hitler's personal library has been partly preserved, and a good deal is known about his reading habits, another possible window onto Hitler's beliefs. (18) Also important, and often ignored by apologists, are statements made by religious figures of the time, who generally (at least for public consumption) viewed Hitler as a Christian and a Catholic in good standing. Meanwhile, the silent testimony of photographs is irrefutable, much as apologists struggle to evade this damning visual evidence.

Despite these difficulties, enough is known to build a reasonable picture of what Hitler and other top Nazis believed.

Hitler was a Christian, but his Christ was no Jew. In his youth, he dabbled with occult thinking but never became a devotee. As a young man, he grew increasingly bohemian and stopped attending church. Initially, no more anti-Semitic than the norm, in the years before the Great War, he fell under the anti-Semitic influence of the « Völkish » Christian Social Party and other Aryan movements. After Germany's stunning defeat and the ruinous terms of peace, Hitler became a full-blown Aryanist and anti-Semite. He grew obsessed with racial issues, which he unfailingly embedded in a religious context.

Apologists often suggest that Hitler did not hold a traditional belief in God because he believed that he was God. True, Hitler thought himself God's chosen leader for the Aryan race. But he never claimed to be divine, and never presented himself in that manner to his followers.

Members of the « Wehrmacht » swore this loyalty oath :

« I swear by God this holy oath to the “ Führer ” of the German “ Reich ” and the German people, Adolf Hitler. »

For « Schutzstaffel » (SS) members it was :

« I pledge to you, Adolf Hitler, my obedience unto death, so help me God. »

Hitler repeatedly thanked God or Providence for his survival on the western front during the Great War, his safe escape from multiple assassination attempts, his seemingly miraculous rise from homelessness to influence and power, and his amazing international successes. He never tired of proclaiming that all of this was beyond the power of any mere mortal. Later, in the War, Hitler portrayed German defeats as part of an epic test : God would reward his true chosen people with the final victory they deserved so long as they never gave-up the struggle.

Hitler openly admired Martin Luther, whom he considered a brilliant reformer. (19) Yet, he said in several private

conversations that he considered himself a Catholic. He said publicly on several occasions that Christ was his saviour. As late as 1944, planning the last-ditch offensive the world would know as the Battle of the Bulge, he code-named it « Operation Christrose » .

Among his Nazi cronies, Hitler criticized the established churches harshly and often. Some of these alleged statements must be treated with skepticism, (20) but clearly he viewed the traditional Christian faiths as weak and contaminated by Judaism. Still, there is no warrant for the claim that he became anti-Christian or anti-religious after coming to power. No reliably attributed quote reveals Hitler to be an atheist or in any way sympathetic to atheism. On the contrary, he often condemned atheism, as he did Christians who collaborated with such atheistic forces as Bolshevism. He consistently denied that the State could replace faith and instructed Albert Speer to include churches in his beloved plans for a rebuilt Berlin. The Nazi-era constitution explicitly evoked God. Calculating that his victories over Europe and Bolshevism would make him so popular that people would be willing to abandon their traditional faiths, Hitler entertained plans to replace Protestantism and Catholicism with a reformed Christian church that would include all Aryans while removing foreign (Rome-based) influence. German Protestants had already rejected a more modest effort along these lines, as will be seen below. How Germans as a whole would have received this reform after a Nazi victory is open to question. In any case, Hitler saw himself as Christianity's ultimate reformer, not its dedicated enemy.

Hitler was a complex figure, but based on the available evidence we can conclude our inquiry into his personal religious convictions by describing him as an Aryan « Völkist » Christian who had deep Catholic roots, strongly influenced by Protestantism, touched by strands of neo-Paganism and Darwinism, and minimally influenced by the occult. Though Hitler pontificated about God and religion at great length, he considered politics more important than religion as the means to achieve his agenda.

None of the leaders immediately beneath Hitler was a pious traditional Christian. But there is no compelling evidence that any top-Nazi was non-theistic. Any so accused denied the charge with vehemence.

« Reich-Führer » Heinrich Himmler regularly attended Catholic services until he lurched into an increasingly bizarre Aryanism. He authorized searches for the Holy Grail and other supposedly powerful Christian and Cathar relics. A believer in reincarnation, he sent expeditions to Tibet and the American tropics in search of the original Aryans and even Atlantians. He and Reinhard Heydrich modeled the SS after the disciplined and secretive Jesuits ; it would not accept atheists as members. (21) Hermann Göring, least ideological among top-Nazis, sometimes endorsed both Protestant and Catholic traditions. On other occasions, he criticized them. Josef Goebbels turned against Catholicism in favour of a reformed Aryan faith ; both his and Göring's children were baptized. Martin Bormann was stridently opposed to contemporary organized Christianity ; he was a leader of the « Church Struggle » , the inconsistently applied Nazi campaign to oppose the influence of established churches. (22)

The Nazis championed traditional family values : their ideology was conservative, bourgeois, patriarchal, and strongly anti-feminist. Discipline and conformity were emphasized, marriage promoted, abortion and homosexuality despised. (23)

Traditionalism also dominated Nazi philosophy, such as it was. Though science and technology were lauded, the overall

thrust opposed the Enlightenment, modernism, intellectualism, and rationality. It is hard to imagine how a movement with that agenda could have been friendly toward atheism, and the Nazis were not. « Völkism » was inherently hostile toward atheism : free-thinkers clashed frequently with Nazis in the late 1920's and early 1930's. On taking power, Hitler banned free-thought organizations and launched an « anti-godless » movement.

In a 1933 speech, he declared :

« We have undertaken the fight against the atheistic movement, and that not merely with a few theoretical declarations : we have stamped it out. »

This forthright hostility was far more straightforward than the Nazis' complex, often contradictory stance toward traditional Christian faith.

Destroying Democracy : a Political-Religious Collaboration

As detailed by historian Ian Kershaw, Hitler made no secret of his intent to destroy democracy. Yet, he came to power largely legally ; in no sense was he a tyrant imposed upon the German people.

The Nazi take-over climaxed a lengthy, ironic rejection of democracy at the hands of a majority of German voters. By the early 1930's, ordinary Germans had lost patience with democracy ; growing numbers hoped an authoritarian strongman would restore order and prosperity and return Germany to great-power status. Roughly 2/3 of « German Christians » repeatedly voted for candidates who promised to overthrow democracy. Authoritarianism was all but inevitable ; at issue was merely who the new strongman would be.

What made democracy so fragile ? Historian Klaus Scholder explains that Germany lacked a deep democratic tradition, and would have had difficulty in forming one because German society was so thoroughly divided into opposing Protestant and Catholic blocs. This division created a climate of competition, fear and prejudice between the confessions, which burdened all German domestic and foreign policies with an ideological element of incalculable weight and extent. This climate erected an almost insurmountable barrier to the formation of broad democratic center. And it favoured the rise of Hitler, since ultimately both churches courted his favour - each fearing that the other would complete the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation through Hitler. (24)

Carefully plotting his strategy, Hitler purged some of the « Völkish » Nazi radicals most belligerent toward the traditional Christian churches. In this way, he lessened the risk of ecclesiastical opposition. At the same time, he knew that the presence of both Catholics and Protestants among the Nazi leadership would ease churchmen's fears that the Party might engage in sectarianism.

Though it had many Catholic leaders (including Hitler) , the Nazi Party relied heavily on Protestant support. Protestants had given the Party its principal backing during the years leading-up to 1933 at a level disproportionate to their national majority. (25) Evangelical youth was especially pro-Nazi. It has been estimated that as many as 90 %

of Protestant university theologians supported the Party. Indeed, the participation of so many respected Protestants gave an early, comforting air of legitimacy to the often-thuggish Party. So did the frequent sight of « Sturmabteilung » (SA) units marching in uniform to church.

As German life between the Wars grew more desperate, some Protestant pastors explicitly defended Nazi murders of « traitors to the “ Volk ” » from the pulpit. Anti-Fascist Protestants found themselves marginalized. The once-unlikely topic of « Völkist » Protestant compatibility became the leading theological subject of the day. (26) This is less surprising when we consider that « Völkism » and German Protestantism were both strongly nationalistic ; Lutheranism, in particular, had German roots.

This mirage of harmony enticed Hitler into a naïve attempt to unite the German Protestant churches into a single « Völkish » body under Nazi control. Launched shortly after the Nazis came to power, this project failed immediately. The evangelical sects proved as unwilling as ever to get along with one another, though much of their clergy eventually Nazified.

Catholicism and the Nazi Take-over

Ironically (but, as we shall see, for obvious reasons) , Chancellor Hitler had greater initial success reaching accommodation with Roman Catholic leaders than with the Protestants. The irony lay in the fact that the Catholic « Zentrum » (Center) Party had been principally responsible for denying majorities to the Nazis in early elections. Although Teutonic in outlook, German Catholics had close emotional ties to Rome. As a group, they were somewhat less nationalistic than most Protestants. Catholics were correspondingly more likely than Protestants to view Hitler (incorrectly) as godless, or as a neo-heathen anti-Christian. Catholic clergy consistently denounced Nazism, though they often undercut themselves by preaching traditional anti-Semitism at the same time.

Even so, and despite Catholicism's minority status, it would be German Catholics and the Roman Catholic Church whose actions would at last put total power within the Nazis' reach.

Though it was not without anti-modernists, the Catholic « Zentrum » Party had antagonized the Vatican during the 1920's by forming governing coalitions with the secularized, moderate Left-oriented Social-Democrats. This changed in 1928, when the priest Ludwig Kaas became the 1st cleric to head the Party. To the dismay of some Catholics, Kaas and other Catholic politicians participated both actively and passively in destroying democratic rule, and, in particular, the « Zentrum » .

The devoutly Catholic chancellor Franz von Papen, not a Fascist but stoutly Right-wing, engineered the key electoral victory that brought Hitler to power. Disastrously, Papen dissolved the « Reichstag » in 1932, then, formed a « Zentrum-Nazi » coalition in violation of all previous principles. It was Papen who, in 1933, made Hitler chancellor, Papen stepping-down to the vice-chancellorship.

The common claim that Papen acted in the hope that the Nazis could be controlled and ultimately discredited may be

true, partly true, or false ; but without Papen's reckless aid, Hitler would not have become Germany's leader.

The church congratulated Hitler on his assumption of power. German Bishops released a statement that wiped-out past criticism of Nazism by proclaiming the new regime acceptable, then, followed doctrine by ordering the laity to be loyal to this regime just as they had commanded loyalty to previous regimes. Since Catholics had been instrumental in bringing Hitler to power and served in his cabinet, the Bishops had little choice but to collaborate.

German Catholics were stunned by the magnitude and suddenness of this realignment. The rigidly conformist Church had flipped from ordering its flock to oppose the Nazis to commanding cooperation. A minority among German Catholics was appalled and disheartened. But most « received the statement with relief (indeed, with rejoicing) because it finally also cleared the way into the 3rd " Reich " for Catholic Christians » alongside millions of Protestants, who joined in exulting that the dream of a Nazi-Catholic-Protestant nationalist alliance had been achieved. (27) The Catholic vote for the Nazis increased in the last multi-Party elections after Hitler assumed control, doubling in some areas, inspiring a mass Catholic exodus from the « Zentrum » to the Fascists. After the « Reichstag » fire, the « Zentrum » voted « en masse » to support the infamous Enabling Act, which would give the Hitler-Papen cabinet executive and legislative authority independent of the German Parliament. « Zentrum's » bloc-vote cemented the 2/3 majority needed to pass the Act.

Why did the Church direct its Party to provide the critical swing-vote ? It had its agenda, as we shall see below.

Deal Making with the Devil

Even after the Enabling Act, Hitler's position remained tenuous. The Nazis needed to deepen majority popular support and cement relations with a skeptical German military. Hitler needed to ally all Aryans under the swastika while he undermined and demoralized regime opponents. What would solidify Hitler's position ? A foreign policy « coup » : the Concordat of 1933 between Nazi Germany and the Vatican.

The national and international legitimacy Hitler would gain through this treaty was incalculable. Failure to secure it after intense and openly promoted effort could have been a crushing humiliation. Hitler put exceptional effort into the project. He courted the Holy-See, emphasizing his own Christianity, simultaneously striving to intimidate the Vatican with demonstrations of his swelling power.

Catholic apologists describe the Concordat of 1933 as a necessary move by a Church desperate to protect itself against a violent regime which forced the accord upon it - passing over the contradiction at the heart of this argument. Actually, having failed in repeated attempts to negotiate the ardently desired concordat with a skeptical Weimar democracy, Kaas, Papen, the future Pius XII (who reigned from 1939 to 1958) , the sitting Pius XI, and other leading Catholics saw their chance to get what they had been seeking from an agreeable member of the Church (that is, Adolf Hitler) at an historical moment when he and Fascism in general were regarded as a natural ally by many Catholic leaders. (28) Negotiations were initiated by both sides, modeled on the mutually advantageous 1929 concordat between Benito Mussolini and the Vatican.

Now, « Zentrum's » pivotal role in assuring passage of the Enabling Act can be seen in context. It was part of the tacit Nazi-Vatican deal for a future concordat. (29) The Enabling Act vote hollowed « Zentrum » , leaving little more than a shell. Thus, a clergy far more interested in church power than democratic politics could take control on both sides of the negotiating table. In a flagrant conflict of interest, the devout Papen helped to represent the German State. Concordat negotiations were largely held in Rome, so that Kaas could leave his vanishing Party, yet, more rudderless. Papen, Kaas, and the future Pius XII worked overtime to finalize a treaty that would, among other things, put an end to the « Zentrum » . In negotiating away the Party he led, Kaas eliminated the last political entity that might have opposed the new « Führer » . (30) Nor did the Vatican protect Germany's Catholic Party. Contrary to the contention of some, evidence indicates that the Vatican was pleased to negotiate away all traces of the « Zentrum » , for which it had no more use save as a bargaining chip. In this, the Holy-See treated « Zentrum » no differently than it had the Italian Catholic Party, which it negotiated away in the Concordat with Mussolini.

Hitler sought to eliminate Catholic opposition in favour of obligatory loyalty to his regime. For its part, the Church was obsessed with its educational privileges, (31) and especially with securing fresh sources of income. It would willingly sacrifice political power to protect them. As both sides worked in haste to produce a treaty that would normally have required years to complete, Hitler took masterful advantage of Vatican over eagerness. Filled with « certainty that Rome neither could nor would turn back, Hitler was now able to steer the negotiations almost as he wanted. The records prove he exploited the situation to the full. » (32) Indeed, Hitler was so confident that he had the Church in his lap that he went ahead and promulgated his notorious sterilization decree before the Concordat's final signing. Hitler's project for involuntary sterilization of minorities and the mentally ill was an direct affront to Catholic teaching. But, as Hitler surmised, not even this provocation could deflect the Holy-See in its rush toward the Concordat. Because ordinary Catholics largely supported the Nazis, the Party even felt free to use violence against the remaining politically active Catholics, frequently disrupting their rallies.

Signed on 20 July 1933, the Concordat was a « fait accompli » , the negotiations having been conducted largely in secret. Most German Bishops gave their loyal, though impotent, approval to the pact that would strip away their power. A few Bishops objected, criticizing the Nazi regime's lack of morality (but never its lack of democracy) .

The Concordat was a Classic political kick-back scheme. The Church supported the new dictatorship by endorsing the end of democracy and free-speech. In addition, it bound its Bishops to Hitler's « Reich » by means of a loyalty oath. In exchange, the Church received enormous tax-income and protection for Church privileges. Religious instruction and prayer in school were re-instated. Criticism of the Church was forbidden. Of course, nothing in the Concordat protected the rights of non-Catholics.

If Catholic officials were disappointed with the Concordat's terms, they did not show it, sending messages of congratulation to the dictator. In Rome, a celebratory mass followed the treaty's signing by Papen and the future Pius XII amid great pomp and circumstance. In Germany, the Church and the Berlin government held a joint service of thanksgiving that featured a mix of Catholic, « Reich » , and swastika banners and flags. The musical program mixed hymns with a rousing performance of the repugnant Nazi anthem « Horst Wessel » - which was set, by the way, to

the traditional hymn « How Great Thou Art » . All of this was projected by loudspeaker to the enthusiastic crowd outside ; as most German Catholics welcomed the Concordat, the thanksgiving service drew far more than Berlin's cathedral could hold.

Scholder comments that « anyone who saw things from the Roman perspective could come to the conclusion that the treaty was an indescribable success for Catholicism. Even 1 year before, the Holy-See had only been able to dream of the concessions which the concordat contained. On the Catholic side, the concordat was accordingly described as “ something very great ”, indeed as nothing short of a “ Masterpiece ”. » (33) Catholic response was so exuberant that Hitler felt it necessary to defend himself to Protestant clerics and Nazi radicals who viewed this sudden amity with Rome as a betrayal.

The practical results of the collaboration were clear enough. Most Catholics « soon adjusted to the dictatorship » (34) ; indeed, they flocked to the Party. Post-Concordat voting patterns suggest that Catholics, on average, even outdid Protestants in supporting the regime, further undermining any efforts by the clergy to challenge Nazi policies. In any case, much of the Catholic clergy was Nazifying. Even the idiosyncratic SS welcomed Catholics, who would ultimately compose a quarter of its membership.

The Concordat's disastrous consequences cannot be exaggerated. It bound all devout German Catholics to the State - the clergy through an oath and income, the laity through the authority of the Church. If at any time, the regime chose not to honour the agreement, Catholics had no open legal right to oppose it or its policies. Opponents of Nazism, Catholic and non-Catholic, were further discouraged and marginalized because the church had shown such want of moral fiber and consistency.

Apologists have insisted that the Church had no choice but to accept the Concordat for the modest protections it provided. But those provisions were never needed. Major Protestant denominations suffered no more than Catholicism, though the Protestant churches lacked protective agreements and had snubbed Hitler's early attempt to unite them. Apologists make much of Vatican « resistance » to Nazism, but the net-effect of Vatican policy toward Hitler was collaborative.

Indeed, the 1933 Concordat stands as one of the most unethical, corrupt, duplicitous, and dangerous agreements ever forged between 2 authoritarian powers. Perhaps, the Catholic strategy was to outlast the Nazi's frankly popular tyranny rather than try to bring it down. But the Catholic Church made no attempt to revoke the Concordat and its loyalty clause during the Nazi regime. Indeed, the 1933 Concordat is the only diplomatic accord negotiated with the Nazi regime that remains in force anywhere in the world.

Germany's Protestant sects were too decentralized to be coopted by a single document. To this extent, Protestants who disputed Nazi policies could be said to enjoy a more favourable position than Catholics. But opposition was rare among Protestants too. Hitler cynically courted the major denominations even as they cynically courted him. Most smaller traditional Christian sects did little better. For example, Germany's Mormons and 7th-Day Adventists bent-over backwards to accommodate National-Socialism. (35)

Christian Comfort with the Rising Regime

Catholics and Protestants at 1st embraced the new German order. Germany was regaining international prestige, the economy improving thanks to growing overseas support. (36) Industrialists like Henry Ford invested heavily in the new « Reich ». « German Christians » also looked to the Nazis for a revival of « Christian » values to help counter the rise of non-theism. Most welcomed the Nazis' elimination of chronic public strife by terrorizing, imprisoning, and killing the fast-shrinking German Left. The Leftists had long been despised by traditionalists, who composed 4/5 of the population. The State purged a far higher-proportion of atheists than traditional Christians. In newspapers and newsreels, the Nazis proudly publicized their new concentration camps. Reports sanitized the camps' true nature, but no one could mistake that they were part of a new police State - to which most German followers of Jesus raised no objection. The very high-rate of « legal » executions reported in the press also met with mass indifference or positive approval.

Far from being hapless victims, the great bulk of « German Christians » joined, eagerly supported, collaborated with, or accommodated to a greater or lesser degree, the new tyranny.

Hitler : the Popular Oppressor

Apologists for Christian conduct during the Nazi era imagine that the regime suppressed dissent ruthlessly, no matter whom (or how many) it needed to slaughter to achieve its ends. Hitler's regime is portrayed as Stalinesque in its response to dissent. This simplistic view reveals a failure to understand the complicated actuality of a popular terror State. The key-word is « popular » : Hitler was Europe's most popular leader, and his goal was universal Aryan support. The Party obsessively tracked public opinion, something never seen in the USSR. (37) Before the War, foreign tourism was encouraged ; Hitler knew most Germans would speak well of the « Reich » to visitors, in sharp contrast to the USSR, whose leaders prudently feared inter-action between foreigners and a citizenry of dubious loyalty. During most of the « Reich » , any unprovoked attempt to liberate Germany would have met fierce majority resistance.

Though there were assassination attempts, the top-Nazis had little to fear from ordinary Germans. (38) Hitler's personal security was shockingly lax ; Hermann Gøering regularly drove his open convertible around Berlin.

If the apologists were right, we should expect the « Gestapo » to have been a massive organization, relentlessly searching-out and crushing wide-spread dissent. Analysis of surviving « Gestapo » records reveals that, in fact, it was surprisingly small. (39) Germany's Christian population being largely satisfied, there was little resistance to suppress. Most cases the « Gestapo » handled were initiated by ordinary citizens looking to settle petty disputes and had no ideological content.

The « Führer » had been successful in buying-off his Aryans with false egalitarian prosperity, stolen Jewish wealth, and his refusal to put « Deutschland » on a full-War footing until well into the War. During the early War years, civilians were under much tighter control in submarine-blockaded England than in Germany. Since nearly all Aryans were

Protestant and Catholic, Hitler had to keep both sects reasonably happy, and he did. After all, the main-focus of Nationalist-Socialism was to make the divinely favoured Aryan « Volk » , both Protestant and Catholic, thrive in order to transform the German population into a unified machine of domination over the lesser peoples. Contrary to Catholic apologists, the nominally Catholic Hitler had not the slightest desire to slaughter masses of the very Aryan people to whom he belonged, and whom he wanted to elevate to supreme power. Leaving aside the fact that doing so would have been ideological and racial suicide, the record makes clear that Hitler's intention was to reform and standardize Aryans' political, social, and ultimately their religious beliefs, not to purge them or to kill-off groups of Aryans. Doing that would have grossly violated Nazi doctrine, undermined the myth of Aryan solidarity, grievously weakened the State, and risked religious civil war. Disloyalty of the Catholic 3rd of the population would have been disastrous to a modest-sized nation trying to expand its resources in preparation for epic Wars of conquest ; it was this fact, not the Concordat, that would be the main-constraint on Nazi actions. For that reason, apologist claims that thousands or millions of Catholics and Protestants would have joined the Jews had they protested Nazis policies are false. The proof is found in the historical record.

« Rosenstraße » : the Power of Resistance

Far from exercising absolute power at home, Hitler often discontinued, modified, or concealed initiatives that threatened his regime's precious popular approval. Stout public objection could and repeatedly did alter Nazi behaviour. Flummoxed when the Protestant churches refused to unite, Hitler deferred his grand effort to reform German Christianity to a dream-like utopian future. Later attempts by Nazi authorities to hamper church activities were often frustrated by sizeable demonstrations. (40) When Party elements stripped Bavarian schools of their crucifixes without Hitler's approval, vigorous protests by, among others, the mothers of school children quickly brought about their replacement. (41) When Hitler denounced Protestant opposition, Bishops Hans Meiser and Theophil Wurm and ordered their ouster, public anger boiled-over. One protest drew 7,000 demonstrators. Hitler reversed course and re-instated « Meiser and Wurm » with fulsome praise. Strong opposition to the mass-killing of the mentally disabled, around 1941, drove it further underground, saving many lives, even though this program too enjoyed the « Führer's » approval.

This is not to say that protesters courted no danger. Opposition figures were frequently harassed, sometimes killed. But the top-Nazis knew how limited their power was.

When regime officials contemplated forcing the removal of Münster's Catholic Bishop, Clemens Galen, Josef Gøebbels warned that :

« The population of Münster could be regarded as lost during the War if anything were done against the Bishop. Indeed, the whole of the State of Westphalia. » (42)

Though Galen suffered harassment, he remained active throughout the War and held his office.

In occupied countries from Norway to Italy, residents successfully opposed Nazi racial policies and saved hundreds of thousands of Jews. In Denmark, political and ecclesiastical leaders forcefully protested Nazi policies ; the whole nation

worked under the noses of the « Gestapo » to save almost all of Denmark's Jews. Neither leaders or citizens suffered severe retaliation. French Bishops who opposed Nazi actions against Jews likewise survived the War.

Most extraordinary and telling is the « Rosenstraße » incident. (43) Some 30,000 Jews lived openly in Germany as the spouses of Christians. 9 in 10 such marriages remained intact despite ceaseless harassment. Oriented toward family values as they were, the Nazis could not decide how to handle these Jews without violating the sanctity of marriage. Early in 1943, Goebbels, then in charge of Berlin, decided it was time to cleanse the capital by rounding-up these last Jews. Hitler agreed. Some 2,000 Jewish men from mixed-marriages were seized and taken to a large downtown building on the « Rosenstraße » , from which they would be deported to the camps.

For a week, their Gentile wives stood in the winter cold, chanting « We want our husbands back ! » . Ordinary Germans sometimes joined them. All told, the protests involved about 6,000 people. They continued in the face of SS and « Gestapo » threats, even threats to use machine guns. They continued though British bombers pounded the city by night. But the Nazis dared not fire upon these defenseless, un-organized Aryan women. Berliners saw the protests directly. Foreign diplomats spread word of it to the world press. The British Broadcasting Company broadcast the story back into Germany.

What was the outcome of Nazi Germany's only mass-demonstration to save Jews ? The 2,000 Jewish husbands were released with Hitler's approval. 2 dozen who had already been sent to Auschwitz were returned. Jewish-Christian couples continued to live openly and survived the War. They would comprise the great majority of German Jewish survivors.

Goebbels later commented to an associate that the regime relented « in order to eliminate the protest from the world, so that others didn't begin to do the same » . Sadly, this strategy was successful : during the rest of the War, no similar action would ever be taken in defense of Jews in general.

Nor does this exhaust the catalogue of successful opposition. When Goebbels called for mass-employment of housewives in War industries, also early in 1943, refusal was wide-spread. Again, reprisals were rare, partly because of the regime's established emphasis on traditional roles for women. On a broader scale, Germans who refused to participate in atrocities (even if they were soldiers, Party members, or SS men) almost never suffered retaliation. This was so well-known that, after the War, Nazis accused of War crimes were forbidden to claim fear of retaliation as a defense.

These incidents suggest that the Nazi regime was at root cowardly, happy to pick on the weak and disorganized but intimidated by public demonstrations. When it came to the « Volk » , Nazi leaders preferred propaganda, education, persuasion, and social pressure to terror. They knew that terror worked best when its objective was supported by many and opposed by few. Only toward the end of the War was wide-spread domestic terror resorted to in Germany, and it was often ineffective.

Clearly ordinary citizens could oppose and alter State policy, all the more so if powerful non-governmental institutions supported them. (44)

As Sarah Gordon comments :

« The failure of German churches to speak-out against racial persecution is a disgrace because the Nazis feared the propaganda or political power of the churches, it is almost certain that Church leaders could have spoken-out more vehemently against racial persecution. » (45)

The apologist claim that Germany's traditional Christians were impotent in the face of Nazi terror is an exaggeration on a scale that Goebbels might have appreciated. As the wives of Berlin discovered, Christians had the power to protect the lives and well-being of others and the potential to confound Hitler and his minions. Had they wished to, they need only have applied it.

Notes

(1) Nazism and Fascism are considered secular, atheistic, or both, in, among other sources, David Barrett, George Kurian, and Todd Johnson, editors, *World Christian Encyclopædia : A Comparative Study of Churches and Religions in the Modern World*, Oxford University Press (2001) .

(2) Seminal studies by main-stream, non-polemical researchers include Robert Gellately, *Backing Hitler : Consent and Coercion in Nazi Germany*, Oxford University Press (2001) ; Ian Kershaw, *Hitler : 1889-1936 : Hubris*, W.W. Norton, New York (1998) and *Hitler : 1936-1945 : Nemesis*, Allen Lane, London (2000) ; Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the 3rd « Reich »* , volumes 1 and 2, Fortress Press, Philadelphia (1979) , English version (1988) ; Nathan Stoltzfus, *Resistance of the Heart : The Rosenstraße Protest and Inter-marriage in Nazi Germany*, W.W. Norton, New York (1997) ; Beth Griech-Polelle, *Bishop von Galen : German Catholicism and National-Socialism*, Yale University Press, New Haven (2002) ; and Sarah Gordon, *Hitler, Germans, and the « Jewish Question »* , Princeton University Press (1984) . Also see : John Patrick Michael Murphy, « Hitler Was Not an Atheist » , *Free Inquiry*, Volume 19, No. 2 (Spring 1999) .

(3) See James Carroll, *Constantine's Sword : The Church and the Jews*, Houghton Mifflin, New York (2001) and David Kertzer, *The Pope Against the Jews : The Vatican's Role in the Rise of Modern Anti-Semitism*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York (2001) .

(4) <http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/Judaism/jewpop.html>.

(5) Viewed in the context of more than 1,500 years of Christian violence against Jews, the enormity of the Holocaust may as much reflect the large populations and relatively advanced technologies of the time as it does the virulence of Nazi anti-Semitism. Other Christian groups might have done the same thing earlier, had the technical means and a large enough pool of potential victims been available.

(6) Nowadays, Islamic anti-Semites reprint Martin Luther's work.

(7) Prior to World War I, many religious Germans viewed dying for the Fatherland as being on a par with Christian

martyrdom ; reluctance to die in battle was considered blasphemous.

(8) After Vatican I, the Roman Catholic clergy was required to take an oath against modernity.

(9) Aryan Christianity continues to exist ; contemporary US examples include : Christian Identity, Aryan Nation, and other extremist racist sects.

(10) In Aryan Christian doctrine, Christ was non-Semitic because he did not have a Jewish father. His assault on the Temple was taken as evidence of his anti-Semitism. Christianity's false association with Judaism was blamed on Saint-Paul.

(11) Thus, the extremist Christian term mud people. Jews' lack of a soul was held to explain their supposed lack of interest in spirituality and the after-life and their focus on material gain.

(12) For example, the Catholic « Völkist » Dietrich Eckart, later a friend and mentor to Hitler, wrote in 1917 that :

« To be an Aryan and to sense transcendence is one and the same thing. »

Yet, he described Nietzsche as the « crazy despiser of our religious foundations » .

(13) Gregory Paul, « The Secular Revolution of the West : It's Passed America By - So Far » , Free Inquiry, Volume 22, No. 3 (Summer 2002) .

(14) Ibid.

(15) See : Scholder, Volume 1. ; page 12.

(16) Richard Steigmann-Gall, The Holy « Reich » : Nazi Conceptions of Christianity 1919-1945, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom (2003) is the 1st attempt to detail the religious beliefs of the Nazis.

(17) Christian defenders frequently cite « Table Talk » , which presents some of Hitler's most vehement anti-Christian statements. But main-stream historians find « Table Talk » unreliable. It consists of private conversations recorded in the 1940's by 2 secretaries, one of whom later said that « no confidence » should be placed in the final volume because the compiler (Martin Bormann, even by Nazi standards a deceptive opportunist and much more anti-Christian than Hitler) destroyed the original transcripts. Still, even as presented in « Table Talk » , Hitler usually attacks Judeo-Christianity, not Christ. Hitler lauds Christ as a divine Aryan.

(18) Timothy Ryback, « Hitler's Forgotten Library » , Atlantic Monthly, Volume 29, No. 4 (May 2003) , expresses naïve surprise at how interested Hitler was in reading about religion. Oddly, Ryback's conclusion, that Hitler saw himself as God, is contrary to the quote Ryback cites in support of his hypothesis.

(19) The regime put an original edition of « On the Jews and Their Lies » on display and celebrated Martin Luther's 450th birthday, in 1933, on massive scale.

(20) See : Steigman-Gall.

(21) Neo-Paganism was far more prevalent in the SS than in German society as a whole ; even according to Party statistics, Paganism never claimed more than 5 % of the general population.

(22) See : Steigman-Gall.

(23) Contrary to common belief, the Nazis never operated State sex-for-procreation facilities. On the other hand, Nazi « culture » was not exceptionally prudish ; home movies of the era show young women lying topless on the beach, and « kitsch » nudity was common in Nazi art.

(24) Scholder, Volume I ; page 130.

(25) See : Scholder, Volumes I and 2 ; Kershaw pages 488-490 and 324 ; and Gellately page 14, whose « Backing Hitler » is a precedent-setting historical examination based in part on examination of surviving « Gestapo » records. Religion was not a primary focus of the study, but what Gellately includes on this topic is damning. See also Gordon, who gives a balanced account of church collaboration and resistance.

(26) See : Scholder, Volume I ; pages 37-51 and 74-87.

(27) Ibid. ; page 253.

(28) Ronald Rychlak, « Goldhagen von Pius XII » , First Things (June-July 2002) , pages 37-54, offers a typically convoluted example of pro-Vatican spin when he asserts that the concordat « was a Nazi proposition. The Nazis accepted terms that the Church had previously proposed to Weimar, but which Weimar had rejected. »

(29) See : Scholder, Volume I ; page 241.

(30) Ibid. ; pages 241-243.

(31) A concordat already negotiated with Bavaria gave the Church control of the schools.

(32) See : Scholder, Volume I ; page 386.

(33) Ibid. ; page 405.

(34) Gellately, page 14.

(35) See : Christine Elizabeth King, *The Nazi State and the New Religions*, Edwin Mellen Press, New York (1982) .

(36) Hitler and his fellow thugs had no idea how to run a modern economy. The Nazi economic « miracle » was a Potemkin-village scheme kept going, prior to the take-overs of other nations, by selling-off Germany's gold reserves and taking-out international loans that could never be paid back.

(37) See : Gellately.

(38) Hitler missed by minutes being killed by a bomb a few months after invading Poland. Pope Pius XII sent the « Führer » his « special personal congratulations » .

(39) See : Gellately ; page 39.

(40) See : Griech-Poelle ; pages 36-37.

(41) Nazi politics were as peculiar as its theology. Hitler avoided committing himself on tangential issues to protect his popularity and keep his options open. This, coupled with Hitler's harsh survival-of-the-fittest view of power, fueled chronic, often vicious intra-Party battles that contributed to the chaos of the regime. In « working towards the Führer » , Party functionaries often went beyond what Hitler wanted done, at least in the short term ; the Bavarian crucifix « débâcle » is a good example of this tendency.

(42) Cited in : Gellately, Kershaw, page 429 ; and Gordon.

(43) See : Stoltzfus ; pages 209-257.

(44) Hitler fared little better in international affairs ; even when he was Master of continental Europe, his power had limits. His supposed ally, Franco, politely told the vexed « Führer » to take a hike when he pressed for Spain to enter the War against the Allies. Hitler found himself forced to negotiate with the Vichy French government he had helped to install over the same matter, and it too refused to budge.

(45) Gordon, page 261.

La résistance du catholicisme face à l'Allemagne nazi

Catholic resistance to Nazism was a component of German resistance to Nazism and of Resistance during World War II. The Church in Germany had spoken against the rise of Nazism, but the Catholic aligned Centre Party capitulated and was banned in 1933. After the Nazi seizure of power, the Church attempted to cooperate with the new government, but Catholics soon faced persecution under Hitler, and were offended by moves such as the sterilization law of 1933.

The Church challenged efforts to undermine various Christian institutions, practices and beliefs and though it ultimately failed to protect its youth organizations and schools, it did have some successes in mobilizing public opinion to alter some government policies. Among the most courageous demonstrations of opposition were the 1941 sermons of Bishop August von Galen of Münster.

Nevertheless, wrote Alan Bullock :

« Neither the Catholic Church nor the Evangelical Church, as institutions, felt it possible to take-up an attitude of open opposition to the regime. »

An estimated 1/3 of German priests faced some form of reprisal from the authorities. Thousands of Catholic dissidents of all hierarchical ranks were sent to concentration camps. 400 Germans were among the 2,579 Catholic priests imprisoned in the dedicated clergy barracks at Dachau. Many ordinary German Catholics offered at least passive acquiescence in, if not active support for, the Nazi dictatorship. Head of the German Bishops' Conference, Adolf Bertram, generally sought to avoid confrontation, but the activities of Bishops such as Preysing, Frings and von Galen came to form a coherent, systematic critique of aspects of Nazism. Bishop von Galen led protests against « euthanasia » . Catholic notions of natural law heavily influenced the outlook of the German Resistance and religious motives inspired the actions of lay leaders of the movement, including the « July Plot » leader Claus von Stauffenberg, « Caritas » activists Gertrud Luckner and Margarete Sommer, Catholic Action leader Erich Klausener and Catholic Youth leader Adalbert Probst, who were among the Catholic leaders who died for challenging the regime.

Papal protest against Nazism included the 1937 Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » . The Church faced severe persecution in Poland, where Catholicism was integral to much Polish resistance. The Church was similarly persecuted in the annexed Czech, Austrian and Slovene regions, yet, in the small Nazi puppet States of Slovakia and Croatia, nationalist churchmen collaborated with the Fascists, though here too there was Catholic resistance. Catholic resistance was « armed » in the case of partisans like the Italian Fiamme Verdi guerrilla campaigns. Catholic resistance to mistreatment of Jews in Germany was generally limited to fragmented and largely individual efforts.

Anti-Judaism on religious grounds had a long history in Catholicism, but where Nazi ideology preached of a « Master race » , Catholicism preached instead the « unity of the human race » . Jewish historian Sir Martin Gilbert wrote that, in every country under German occupation, priests played a major part in rescuing Jews.

Michaël Phayer estimates that :

« Rescuers and perpetrators were but a slight minority of Europe's Catholic population » during the Holocaust.

Among the notable Catholic networks to rescue Jews and others from Nazi death camps were Hugh O'Flaherty's « Rome Escape Line » , the Assisi Network and Poland's Żegota. Bishops such as the Netherlands' Johannes de Jong, Belgium's Jozef-Ernest van Roey and France's Jules-Géraud Saliège issued major denunciations of Nazi treatment of the Jews. Papal diplomats such as Angelo Roncalli, Andrea Cassulo, Filippo Bernardini and Angelo Rotta engaged in vigorous

diplomatic lobbying and clandestine activities. Convents also played a significant role under the leadership of nuns like Margit Slachta and Matylda Getter.

The Nazis disliked universities, intellectuals and the Catholic and Protestant churches. According to historian of the German Resistance, Theodore S. Hamerow, many Nazis suspected Catholics of insufficient patriotism, or even of disloyalty to the Fatherland, and of serving the interests of « sinister alien forces ». Various historians surmise that the long term plan of the Nazis was to de-Christianise Germany after final victory in the War. Their ideology could not accept an autonomous establishment, whose legitimacy did not spring from the government, and they desired the subordination of the Church to the State.

Aggressive anti-Church radicals like Josef Goebbels and Martin Bormann saw the conflict with the Churches as a priority concern, and anti-Church and anti-Clerical sentiments were strong among grass-roots Party activists. But Catholics constituted about 1/3 of the population, and in the short term, and from political considerations, Hitler was prepared to restrain his anti-Clericalism, seeing danger in strengthening the Church by persecution, though he intended a show-down after the War: In his semi-autobiographical « Mein Kampf », Hitler presented a nihilistic vision, in which the universe is ordered around principles of struggle between weak and strong, rather than on conventional Christian notions long prominent in Germany.

In the 1920's and 1930's, Catholic leaders made a number of forthright attacks on Nazi ideology and the main Christian opposition to Nazism had come from the Catholic Church. German Bishops were hostile to the emerging movement and energetically denounced its « false doctrines ». They warned Catholics against Nazi racism and some dioceses banned membership of the Nazi Party, while the Catholic press criticized the Nazi movement. Figures like Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber, appalled by the totalitarianism, neo-Paganism, and racism of the Nazi movement, had contributed to the failure of the Nazi Munich « Putsch » of 1923.

With ongoing hostility to the Nazis from the Catholic press and the Catholic Center Party, few German Catholics voted Nazi in the elections preceding the Nazi take-over. Catholic regions stayed largely loyal to the Centre Party. In his history of the German Resistance, Hamerow wrote :

« The Catholic Church had generally viewed the Nazi Party with fear and suspicion. It had felt threatened by a radical ultra-nationalist ideology that regarded the papacy as a sinister, alien institution, that opposed denominational separatism in education and culture, and that at times appeared to promote a return to Nordic paganism. The establishment of the 3rd " Reich " seemed to portend the coming of a bitter conflict between Church and State. »

(Extract from Theodore S. Hamerow's « On the Road to the Wolf's Lair - German Resistance to Hitler »)

Following the Wall Street Crash of 1929, the Nazis and Communists made great gains at the 1930 Election. Greatest gains for the Nazis came in the Protestant, rural towns of the North, while Catholic areas remained loyal to the Catholic Centre Party. Both Nazis and Communists pledged to eliminate democracy ; and between them, they secured over 50 % of « Reichstag » seats. At the March 1933 elections, no single Party secured a majority. A middle-class

Liberal Party strong enough to block the Nazis did not exist : the Centre Party maintained its voting block, but was preoccupied defending its own particular interests.

Requiring the votes of the Centre Party and Conservatives, Hitler told the « Reichstag » on March 23 that Positive Christianity was the « unshakeable foundation of the moral and ethical life of our people » , and promised not to threaten the churches or the institutions of the Republic if granted plenary powers. Employing a characteristic mix of negotiation and intimidation, the Nazis called on the « Reichstag » to vote for the Enabling Act on 24 March 1933. The law was to give Hitler the freedom to act without parliamentary consent. The Centre Party, having obtained promises of non-interference in religion, joined with Conservatives in voting for the Act (only the Social-Democrats voted against) .

When the Nazis came to power in Coalition with the Conservatives in early 1933, German Catholics were apprehensive. Parliamentary opposition by Parties like the Catholic aligned Centre Party and Bavarian People's Party was rendered impossible by the abolition of all non Nazi Parties and proclamation of the « Unity of Party and State » . But the new regime treated the churches with circumspection in its 1st months, having no wish to open an ideological battle with them that precarious moment. The Fulda Bishops Conference expressed a degree of confidence in the new government, though still noting certain « religious and moral lapses » . Clerical opposition to Nazism diminished following the 1933 « Reich » concordat between Germany and the Holy-See, amid a cautious rapprochement.

The Nazi propaganda minister, Josef Goebbels, among the most aggressive anti-Church Nazis, wrote that :

« There was an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view. »

Josef Goebbels, the Minister for Propaganda, became one of the leaders of the Nazi persecution of the clergy and wrote that there was « an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view » . Hitler's chosen deputy and private secretary, Martin Bormann, was a rigid guardian of National-Socialist orthodoxy and saw Christianity and Nazism as « incompatible » , as did the official Nazi philosopher, Alfred Rosenberg. In his « Myth of the 20th Century » , published in 1930, Rosenberg wrote that Germans were entitled to dominate Europe and that their enemies were Russian Tartars and Semites. Semites included Jews, Latins, and Christianity - especially, the Catholic Church. In 1934, the « Sanctum Officium » in Rome recommended that Rosenberg's book be put on the « Index Librorum Prohibitorum » (forbidden books list of the Catholic Church) for scorning and rejecting « all dogmas of the Catholic Church, indeed the very fundamentals of the Christian religion » .

A threatening, though initially mainly sporadic persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany followed the Nazi take-over. The Nazis claimed jurisdiction over all collective and social activity, interfering with Catholic schooling, youth groups, workers' clubs and cultural societies. Hitler moved quickly to eliminate Political Catholicism. 2,000 functionaries of the Bavarian People's Party were rounded-up by police in late-June 1933, and it, along with the national Catholic Centre Party, ceased to exist in early July. Vice-Chancellor Papen meanwhile negotiated a « Reich » concordat with the Holy-See, which prohibited clergy from participating in politics. Kershaw wrote that the Vatican was anxious to reach agreement with the new government, despite « continuing molestation of Catholic clergy, and other outrages committed

by Nazi radicals against the Church and its organisations » . Hitler had a « blatant disregard » for the Concordat, wrote Paul O'Shea, and its signing was to him merely a 1st step in the « gradual suppression of the Catholic Church in Germany » .

Anton Gill wrote that :

« With his usual irresistible, bullying technique, Hitler then proceeded to take a mile where he had been given an inch. » , and closed all Catholic institutions whose functions weren't strictly religious :

« It quickly became clear that Hitler intended to imprison the Catholics, as it were, in their own churches. They could celebrate mass and retain their rituals as much as they liked, but they could have nothing at all to do with German society otherwise. Catholic schools and newspapers were closed, and a propaganda campaign against the Catholics was launched. »

(Extract from « An Honourable Defeat » by Anton Gill.)

William Shirer wrote :

« The agreement was hardly put to paper before it was being broken by the Nazi Government. »

On 25 July, the Nazis promulgated their sterilization law, an offensive policy in the eyes of the Catholic Church. 5 days later, moves began to dissolve the Catholic Youth League. Clergy, nuns and lay leaders began to be targeted, leading to thousands of arrests over the ensuing years, often on trumped-up charges of currency smuggling or « immorality » . In Hitler's bloody « Night of the Long Knives » purge of 1934, Erich Klausener, the head of Catholic Action, was assassinated by the « Gestapo » . Adalbert Probst, national director of the Catholic Youth Sports Association, Fritz Gerlich, editor of Munich's Catholic weekly and Edgar Jung, one of the authors of the Marburg speech, were among the other high-profile Catholic opposition figures targeted for assassination in the purge. Catholic publications were shut-down. The « Gestapo » began to violate the sanctity of the confessional.

Under Reinhard Heydrich and Heinrich Himmler, the Security Police and the SD were responsible for suppressing internal and external enemies of the Nazi State. Among those enemies were « political churches » - such as Lutheran and Catholic clergy who opposed the Hitler regime. Such dissidents were arrested and sent to concentration camps. In the 1936 campaign against the monasteries and convents, the authorities charged 276 members of religious orders with the offence of « homosexuality » .

Rosenberg and Bormann actively collaborated in the Nazi program to eliminate Church influence - a program which included the abolition of religious services in schools ; the confiscation of religious property ; circulating anti-religious material to soldiers ; and the closing of theological faculties. As the War wore on, Hitler feared the idealism of Christians and said that while « bourgeois and Marxists » would not risk their lives, the truly dangerous people were « assassins whipped-up by the black crows in confessionals (i.e. : priests) or patriots from other countries now

occupied » . These « dunderheads » , as Hitler called them, numbered a few hundred thousand in Germany and included « all leaders of opposition tendencies and particularly those of political Catholicism » , and could be rounded-up and shot within 3 days in the event of a mutiny.

Though neither the Catholic nor Protestant churches as institutions were prepared to openly oppose the Nazi State, the churches provided the earliest and most enduring centres of systematic opposition to Nazi policies, and Christian morality and the anti-Church policies of the Nazis motivated many German resistors and provided impetus for the « moral revolt » of individuals in their efforts to overthrow Hitler. From the outset of Nazi rule in 1933, issues emerged which brought the Catholic church into conflict with the regime, and the historian Wolf cites events such as the « July Plot » of 1944 as having been « inconceivable without the spiritual support of church resistance » . The German Opposition saw National-Socialism as standing in « radical opposition to the Western, Christian tradition » .

Hoffmann writes that, from the beginning :

« The Catholic Church could not silently accept the general persecution, regimentation or oppression, nor in particular the sterilization law of summer 1933. Over the years until the outbreak of War, Catholic resistance stiffened until finally its most eminent spokesman was the Pope himself with his Encyclical “ Mit brennender Sorge ” of 14 March 1937, read from all German Catholic pulpits. Clemens August Graf von Galen, Bishop of Münster, was typical of the many fearless Catholic speakers. In general terms, therefore, the churches were the only major organisations to offer comparatively early and open resistance : they remained so in later years. »

(Extract from « The History of the German Resistance 1933-1945 » by Peter Hoffmann.)

Ernst Wolf wrote that some credit must be given to the resistance of the churches, for providing « moral stimulus and guidance for the political Resistance » . Virtually all of the military conspirators in the « July Plot » were religious men. Among the Social-Democrat political conspirators, the Christian influence was also strong, though humanism also played a significant foundational role - and among the wider-circle there were other political, military and nationalist motivations at play. The « Kreisau Circle » leader Helmuth James Graf von Moltke declared in one of his final letters before execution that the essence of the July revolt was « outrage of the Christian conscience » . The « Declaration of Government » that was to be broadcast following the « coup » on 20 July 1944 appealed unambiguously to Christian sensibility :

« The shattered freedom of spirit, conscience, faith and opinion will be restored. The churches will, once again, be given the right to work for their confessions. In future, they will exist quite separately from the State. The working of the State is to be inspired, both in word and deed by the Christian outlook. »

(Intended « Broadcast of Government » of the 1944 « July Plot » conspirators.)

The German Episcopate had various disagreements with the Nazi government, but it never declared an official sanction of the various attempts to overthrow the Hitler regime. The German Bishops hoped for a « quid pro quo » that

would protect Catholic schools, organisations, publications and religious observance. The Vatican too persisted in seeking to maintain a « legal modus vivendi » with the regime.

Clergy in the German Resistance had some independence from the State apparatus, and could thus criticize it, while not being close enough to the centre of power to take steps to overthrow it.

Theodore S. Hamerow wrote :

« Clerical resisters could indirectly at least, articulate political dissent in the guise of pastoral stricture. »

But the problem for them lay in determining how far they should go in their criticism :

« Should they confine themselves to religious and moral issues or should they deal with political and racial issues as well. »

Faced with such questions, the German clergy generally determined that their 1st duty lay in the protection of their own church and its members, remaining within the limits of formal legality. Thus, during the early years of Nazi Germany, clerical dissenters usually spoke-out not against the established system, but « only against specific policies that it had mistakenly adopted and that it should, therefore, properly correct » .

Before moving toward resistance, German Catholics and Protestants were also faced with overcoming nationalist sentiment, and an instinct to respect authority which was the inheritance of their religious and national outlooks. In predominantly Protestant Germany, many Catholics were determined to prove that they were « good Germans » too, and avoid the trauma of another « Kulturkampf » . Thus, when Bishop August von Galen of Munich delivered his famous 1941 denunciations of Nazi euthanasia and the lawlessness of the « Gestapo » , he also said that the church had never sought the « overthrow » of the regime. Yet, from the early stages of Nazism, the Nazis moved early against the church's organisational interests - attacking Catholic schools and the Catholic press.

Hastings wrote that the early Nazi movement founded in Munich was essentially Catholic in religious orientation with Catholic student groups being influential in the founding of the movement and Catholic priests providing spiritual guidance. The events surrounding the « Beer-Hall Putsch » in 1923 caused a rift between Catholic and Protestant members and, thereafter, the movement became predominantly Protestant. Archbishop Betram sought to join the Nazi Party in 1932 with Archbishop Conrad Gröber joining the SS as a promotive member in 1933 and Bishop Hudal helping Nazi war criminals to escape after the War.

According to Kershaw, the German church leadership expended considerable energies in opposing government interference in the churches and « attempts to ride roughshod over Christian doctrine and values » , but this vigour, was not matched against all areas of « Nazi barbarism » . Thus, for example, what protests the Bishops did make regarding anti-Jewish policies, tended to be by way of private letters to government ministers. Kershaw wrote that, while the « detestation of Nazism was overwhelming within the Catholic Church » , it did not preclude church leaders

approving of areas of the regime's policies, particularly where Nazism « blended into “ main-stream ” national aspirations » - like support for « patriotic » foreign policy or War aims, obedience to State authority (where this did not contravene divine law) ; and destruction of atheistic Marxism and Soviet Bolshevism. Traditional Christian anti-Judaism was « no bulwark » against Nazi biological anti-Semitism, wrote Kershaw, and on these issues « the churches as institutions felt on uncertain grounds » . Opposition was generally left to fragmented and largely individual efforts.

Historian Karl Dietrich Bracher has called « the idea that the Catholic Church almost universally opposed Nazism, “ as questionable as the contrary thesis of a Communist mass movement against Hitler ”, and attributed the Centre Party's paralysis to Catholicism's “ flirtation with the new regime ”. »

Mary Fulbrook wrote that when politics encroached on the church, Catholics were prepared to resist, but that the record was otherwise patchy and uneven, and that, with notable exceptions, « it seems that, for many Germans, adherence to the Christian faith proved compatible with at least passive acquiescence in, if not active support for, the Nazi dictatorship » .

Pinchas Lapidé wrote that, in 1939, close to half the population of the Greater German « Reich » was Catholic and despite pressure to leave 22.7 % of the SS were Catholics.

By early 1937, the church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, had become highly-disillusioned. In March, Pope Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical - accusing the Nazi Government of violations of the 1933 Concordat, and further that it was sowing the « tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » . The Pope noted on the horizon the « threatening storm clouds » of religious wars of extermination over Germany. The Nazis responded with, an intensification of the « Church Struggle » , beginning around April. There were mass arrests of clergy and church presses were expropriated. Goebbels noted heightened verbal attacks on the clergy from Hitler in his diary and wrote that Hitler had approved the start of trumped-up « immorality trials » against clergy and anti-Church propaganda campaign. Goebbels' orchestrated attack included a staged « morality trial » of 37 Franciscans.

Institutionally, the Catholic Church in Germany offered organised, systematic and consistent resistance to the policies of the 3rd « Reich » which infringed on ecclesiastical autonomy. As one of the few German institutions to retain some independence from the State, it was able to continue to co-ordinate a level of opposition to Government, and the churches, more than any other institutions, continued to provide a « forum in which individuals could distance themselves from the regime » .

In the words of Kershaw :

« The churches engaged in a bitter war of attrition with the regime, receiving the demonstrative backing of millions of church-goers. Applause for Church leaders whenever they appeared in public, swollen attendances at events such as “ Corpus Christi ” Day processions, and packed church services were outward signs of the struggle of ... especially of the Catholic Church - against Nazi oppression. »

While the Church ultimately failed to protect its youth organisations and schools, it did have some successes in mobilizing public opinion to alter government policies. The churches challenged Nazi efforts to undermine various Christian institutions, practices and beliefs.

Bullock wrote that :

« Among the most courageous demonstrations of opposition during the War were the sermons preached by the Catholic Bishop of Münster and the Protestant Pastor, Doctor Niemoller ... »

But that nevertheless :

« Neither the Catholic Church nor the Evangelical Church as institutions, felt it possible to take-up an attitude of open opposition to the regime. »

The 1933 « Reich » concordat between Germany and the Vatican prohibited clergy from participating in politics and in the aftermath of the Nazi take-over and signing of the Concordat, the outspoken nature of opposition by German Catholic leaders towards the Nazi movement weakened considerably. But it was from the clergy that the 1st major component of the German Resistance to the policies of the 3rd « Reich » emerged.

Hamerow wrote :

« From the very beginning, some churchmen expressed, quite directly at times, their reservations about the new order. In fact, those reservations gradually came to form a coherent, systematic critique of many of the teachings of National-Socialism. »

Later, the most trenchant public criticism of the 3rd « Reich » came from some of Germany's religious leaders, as the government was reluctant to move against them, and though they could claim to be merely attending to the spiritual welfare of their flocks, « what they had to say was at times so critical of the central doctrines of National-Socialism that to say it required great boldness » , and they became resisters. Their resistance was directed not only against intrusions by the government into church governance and to arrests of clergy and expropriation of church property, but also to matters like Nazi euthanasia and eugenics and to the fundamentals of human rights and justice as the foundation of a political system.

A senior cleric could rely on a degree of popular support from the faithful, and thus the regime had to consider the possibility of nation-wide protests if such figures were arrested. While hundreds of ordinary priests and members of monastic orders were sent to concentration camps throughout the Nazi period, just one German Catholic Bishop was briefly imprisoned in a concentration camp, and just one other expelled from his diocese. This reflected also the cautious approach adopted by the hierarchy, who felt secure only in commenting on matters which transgressed on the ecclesiastical sphere.

While some clergymen refused ever to feign support for the regime, in the Church's conflict with the State over ecclesiastical autonomy, the Catholic hierarchy adopted a strategy of « seeming acceptance of the 3rd “ Reich ” » , by couching their criticisms as motivated merely by a desire to « point-out mistakes that some of its over-zealous followers committed » in order to strengthen the government. Cardinal Bertram of Breslau, the chairman of the German Conference of Bishops, developed a protest system which « satisfied the demands of the other Bishops without annoying the regime » . Firmer resistance by Catholic leaders gradually reasserted itself by the individual actions of leading churchmen like Joseph Frings, Konrad von Preysing, August von Galen and Michæl von Faulhaber. But the German Episcopate was divided over relations with the Nazi regime - figures like Cardinal Bertram, favoured a policy of concessions, while figures like Bishop Preysing called for more concerted opposition. According to Michæl Phayer, in relation to the mistreatment of Jews, « no other German Bishops spoke as pointedly as Preysing and Frings » . Fest nominates Preysing and Galen, but also Archbishop Conrad Gröber among the individual clerics who led broader Catholic resistance.

On 22 March 1942, the German Bishops issued a pastoral letter on « The Struggle against Christianity and the Church » . The letter launched a defence of human rights and the rule of law and accused the « Reich » Government of « unjust oppression and hated struggle against Christianity and the Church » , despite the loyalty of German Catholics to the Fatherland, and brave service of Catholics soldiers. It accused the regime of seeking to rid Germany of Christianity :

« For years, a War has raged in our Fatherland against Christianity and the Church, and has never been conducted with such bitterness. Repeatedly, the German Bishops have asked the “ Reich ” Government to discontinue this fatal struggle ; but unfortunately our appeals and our endeavours were without success. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops dated 22 March 1942.)

The letter outlined serial breaches of the 1933 Concordat, reiterated complaints of the suffocation of Catholic schooling, presses and hospitals and said that the « Catholic faith has been restricted to such a degree that it has disappeared almost entirely from public life » and even worship within churches in Germany « is frequently restricted or oppressed » , while in the conquered territories (and even in the « Old “ Reich ” ») , churches had been « closed by force and even used for profane purposes » . The freedom of speech of clergymen had been suppressed and priests were being « watched constantly » and punished for fulfilling « priestly duties » and incarcerated in concentration camps without legal process. Religious orders had been expelled from schools, and their properties seized, while seminaries had been confiscated « to deprive the Catholic priesthood of successors » . The Bishops denounced the Nazi euthanasia program and declared their support for human rights and personal freedom under God and « just laws » of all people :

« We demand juridical proof of all sentences and release of all fellow citizens who have been deprived of their liberty without proof. We the German Bishops shall not cease to protest against the killing of innocent persons. Nobody's life is safe unless the Commandment, “ Thous shalt not kill ” is observed. We, the Bishops, in the name of the Catholic

people demand the return of all unlawfully confiscated and, in some cases, sequestered property for what happens today to church property may tomorrow happen to any lawful property. »

(Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops dated 22 March 1942.)

Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber gained an early reputation as a critic of the Nazi movement. Soon after the Nazi take-over, his 3 Advent sermons of 1933, entitled « Judaism, Christianity, and Germany » , affirmed the Jewish origins of the Christian religion, the continuity of the Old and New Testaments of the Bible, and the importance of the Christian tradition to Germany. Though Faulhaber's words were cautiously framed as a discussion of historical Judaism, his sermons denounced the Nazi extremists who were calling for the Bible to be purged of the « Jewish » Old Testament as a grave threat to Christianity : in seeking to adhere to the central tenet of Nazism, « The anti-Semitic zealots ... » wrote Hamerow, were also undermining « the basis of Catholicism. Neither accommodation, nor acquiescence was possible any longer ; the Cardinal had to face the enemy head on. »

Hamerow wrote that Faulhaber would look to avoid conflict with the State over issues not strictly pertaining to the church, but on issues involving the defence of Catholics he « refused to compromise or retreat » . On 4 November 1936, Hitler and Faulhaber met. Faulhaber told Hitler that the Nazi government had been waging War on the church for 3 years and had instituted laws the Church could not accept - like the sterilization of criminals and the handicapped.

While the Catholic Church respected the notion of authority, he told the Dictator :

« When your officials or your laws offend Church dogma or the laws of morality, and, in so doing, offend our conscience, then we must be able to articulate this as responsible defenders of moral laws. »

When, in 1937, the authorities in Upper-Bavaria attempted to replace Catholic schools with « common schools » , he offered fierce resistance.

During the 1938 « Kristallnacht » , Faulhaber supplied a truck to rabbi of the Ohel Yaakov Synagogue, to rescue sacred objects before the building was torn down. Following mass-demonstrations against Jews and Catholics, a Nazi mob attacked Faulhaber's palace, and smashed its windows. While Hamerow viewed Faulhaber as essentially a defender of « Catholic interests » , other sources credit him with greater defiance.

According to the Encyclopædia Britannica :

« Throughout his sermons until the collapse of the 3rd “ Reich ” (1945) , Faulhaber vigorously criticized Nazism, despite governmental opposition. Attempts on his life were made in 1934 and in 1938. He worked with American occupation forces after the War, and received the West German Republic's highest-award : the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit. »

Among the most firm and consistent of senior Catholics to oppose the Nazis was Konrad von Preysing. Preysing served as Bishop of Eichstatt from 1932 to 1935 and, in 1935, was appointed as Bishop of Berlin : the capital of Nazi Germany.

Preysing was loathed by Hitler, who said :

« The foulest of carrion are those who come clothed in the cloak of humility and the foulest of these Count Presying ! What a beast ! »

Von Preysing opposed the appeasing attitudes of Bertram towards the Nazis and was one of the most firm and consistent church opponents of Hitler. He spoke-out in public sermons and argued the case for firm opposition at Bishops' conferences. He also worked with leading members of the resistance Carl Gærdeler and Helmuth James Graf von Moltke. He was part of the 5 member commission that prepared the anti-Nazi Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » of March 1937 and sought to block the Nazi closure of Catholic schools and arrests of church officials. In 1938, he became one of the co-founders of the « Hilfswerk beim Bischöflichen Ordinariat Berlin » (Welfare Office of the Berlin Diocese Office) . He extended care to both baptised and un-baptised Jews and protested the Nazi euthanasia programme. His Advent Pastoral Letters of 1942 and 1943, on the nature of human rights, reflected the anti-Nazi theology of the Barmen Declaration of the Confessing Church, leading one to be broadcast in German by the BBC. In 1944, Preysing met with and gave a blessing to Claus von Stauffenberg, in the lead-up to the « July Plot » to assassinate Hitler, and spoke with the resistance leader on whether the need for radical change could justify tyrannicide. Despite Preysing's open opposition, the Nazis did not dare arrest him and, several months after the end of the War, he was named a Cardinal by Pope Pius XII.

The Bishop of Münster, August von Galen, was Preysing's cousin. Himself a German conservative and nationalist, in January 1934, he criticized Nazi racial policy in a sermon and in subsequent homilies, equated unquestioning loyalty to the « Reich » with « slavery » and spoke against Hitler's theory of the purity of German blood. Galen derided the neo-Pagan theories of Rosenberg as, perhaps, no more than « an occasion for laughter in the educated world » , but warned that « his immense importance lies in the acceptance of his basic notions as the authentic philosophy of National-Socialism and in his almost unlimited power in the field of German education. “ Herr ” Rosenberg must be taken seriously if the German situation is to be understood. »

When, in 1933, the Nazi school superintendent of Münster issued a decree that religious instruction be combined with discussion of the « demoralising power » of the « people of Israel » , Galen refused, writing that such interference in curriculum was a breach of the Concordat and that he feared children would be confused as to their « obligation to act with charity to all men » and as to the historical mission of the people of Israel. Often, Galen directly protested to Hitler over violations of the Concordat. After constant confrontations, by late-1935, Bishop August von Galen of Munich was urging a joint pastoral letter protesting an « underground war » against the Church. Hamerow characterized the resistance approach of senior Catholic clergy like August von Galen of Munich as « trying to influence the 3rd “ Reich ” from within » . When, in 1936, Nazis removed crucifixes in school, protest by Galen led to public demonstration. Like Presying, he assisted with the drafting of the 1937 papal Encyclical.

In 1941, with the « Wehrmacht » still marching on Moscow, Galen, the old nationalist, denounced the lawlessness of the « Gestapo » , and the confiscations of Church properties. He attacked the « Gestapo » for converting Church properties to their own purposes - including use as cinemas and brothels. Galen protested the mistreatment of Catholics in Germany : the arrests and imprisonment without legal process, the suppression of the monasteries, the expulsion of religious orders. But his sermons went further than defending the Church, he spoke of a moral danger to Germany from the regime's violations of basic human rights.

He said :

« The right to life , to inviolability, and to freedom is an indispensable part of any moral social order. »

And any government that punishes without court proceedings « undermines its own authority and respect for its sovereignty within the conscience of its citizens » . Bishop von Galen led denunciation of Nazi euthanasia and the most wide-spread public protests against any Nazi policy up to that time.

« There are sacred obligations of conscience from which no one has the power to release us and which we must fulfil even if it costs us our lives. »

(Extract from 1941 sermon by August von Galen, Bishop of Munich.)

His 3 powerful sermons of July and August 1941 earned him the nickname of the « Lion of Münster » . Galen's sermons appealed to Christian conscience as the well for opposition. The sermons were printed and distributed illegally. Hitler wanted to have Galen removed, but Josef Gœbbels told him this would result in the loss of the loyalty of Westphalia. Documents suggest the Nazis intended to hang von Galen at the end of the War.

In a « Table Talk » from 1942, Hitler is quoted as having said :

« The fact that I remain silent in public over Church affairs is not in the least misunderstood by the sly foxes of the Catholic Church, and I am quite sure that a man like Bishop von Galen knows full well that, after the War, I shall extract retribution to the last farthing. »

Josef Frings became Archbishop of Cologne in 1942 and his consecration was used as a demonstration of Catholic self-assertion. In his sermons, he repeatedly spoke in support of persecuted peoples and against State repression. In March 1944, Frings attacked arbitrary arrests, racial persecution and forced divorces. That autumn, he protested to the « Gestapo » against the deportations of Jews from Cologne and surrounds. In 1943, the German Bishops had debated whether to directly confront Hitler collectively over what they knew of the murdering of Jews. Frings wrote a pastoral letter cautioning his diocese not to violate the inherent rights of others to life, even those « not of our blood » and even during War, and preached in a sermon that « no one may take the property or life of an innocent person just because he is a member of a foreign race » . Following War's end, Frings succeeded Bertram as chairman of the Fulda

Bishops' Conference in July 1945 and, in 1946, he was appointed a cardinal by Pius XII.

The Blessed Clemens August Graf von Galen, Bishop of Münster spoke-out against euthanasia in Nazi Germany.

From 1934, forced sterilisation of the hereditarily diseased had commenced in Germany. Based on eugenic theories, it proposed to cleanse the German nation of « unhealthy breeding stock » and was taken a step further in 1939, when the regime commenced its « euthanasia ». This was the 1st of the regime's infamous series of mass-extermination programs, which saw the Nazis attempt to eliminate « life unworthy of life » from Europe : 1st the handicapped ; then, Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, Jehovah's Witnesses ; and others deemed « sub-normal ». Ultimately, the Jews suffered most in numerical terms, while Gypsies suffered the greatest proportional loss.

While the Nazi « Final Solution » liquidation of the Jews took place primarily on Polish territory, the murder of invalids took place on German soil, and involved interference in Catholic (and Protestant) welfare institutions. Awareness of the murderous programme therefore became wide-spread, and the Church leaders who opposed it (chiefly, the Catholic Bishop of Münster, August von Galen and Doctor Theophil Wurm, the Protestant Bishop of Wurttemberg) were, therefore, able to rouse wide-spread public opposition.

The intervention led to, in the words of Evans :

« The strongest, most explicit and most wide-spread protest movement against any policy since the beginning of the 3rd “ Reich ”. »

From 1939, the regime began its program of euthanasia, under which those deemed « racially unfit » were to be « euthanased ». Hitler's order for the « Aktion T4 » Euthanasia Program was dated 1 September, the day Germany invaded Poland. The senile, the mentally handicapped and mentally ill, epileptics, cripples, children with Down's Syndrome and people with similar afflictions were all were to be killed. The program ultimately involved the systematic murder of more than 70,000 people.

The Papacy and German Bishops had already protested against the Nazi sterilization of the « racially unfit ». Catholic protests against the escalation of this policy into « euthanasia » began in the summer of 1940. Despite Nazi efforts to transfer hospitals to State control, large numbers of handicapped people were still under the care of the Churches. « Caritas » was the chief organisation running such care services for the Catholic Church. After Protestant welfare activists took a stand at the Bethel Hospital in August von Galen's diocese, Galen wrote to Bertram, in July 1940, urging the Church to take-up a moral position. Bertram urged caution. Archbishop Conrad Gröber of Freiburg wrote to the head of the « Reich » Chancellery, and offered to pay all costs being incurred by the State for the « care of mentally people intended for death ». « Caritas » directors sought urgent direction from the Bishops, and the Fulda Bishops Conference sent a protest letter to the « Reich » Chancellery, on 11 August, then, sent Bishop Heinrich Wienken of « Caritas » to discuss the matter. Wienken cited the commandment « thou shalt not kill » to officials and warned them to halt the program or face public protest from the Church. Wienken subsequently wavered, fearing a firm line might jeopardize his efforts to have Catholic priests released from Dachau, but was urged to stand firm by

Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber. The government refused to give a written undertaking to halt the program, and the Vatican declared on 2 December that the policy was contrary to natural and positive Divine law :

« The direct killing of an innocent person because of mental or physical defects is not allowed. »

Bishop von Galen had the decree printed in his newspaper on 9 March 1941. Subsequent arrests of priests and seizure of Jesuit properties by the « Gestapo » , in his home city of Münster, convinced Galen that the caution advised by his superior had become pointless. On 6, 13 and 20 July 1941, Galen spoke against the seizure of properties, and expulsions of nuns, monks and religious and criticized the euthanasia programme. In an attempt to cow Galen, the police raided his sister's convent, and detained her in the cellar. She escaped the confinement, and Galen, who had also received news of the imminent removal of further patients, launched his most audacious challenge on the regime in a 3 August sermon. As word of the program spread, protest grew, until finally, Bishop August von Galen delivered his famous 1941 sermons denouncing the program as « murder » . He declared the murders to be illegal, and said that he had formally accused those responsible for murders in his diocese in a letter to the public prosecutor. The policy opened the way to the murder of all « unproductive people » , like old horses or cows, including invalid war veterans.

He asked :

« Who can trust his doctor anymore ? »

On 3 August 1941, in one of his series of denunciations, Galen declared :

« Thou shalt not kill.

God engraved this commandment on the souls of men long before any penal code. God has engraved these commandments in our hearts. They are the unchangeable and fundamental truths of our social life. Where in Germany and where, here, is obedience to the precepts of God ? As for the 1st commandment, “ Thou shalt not have strange gods before me ”, instead of the “ One, True, Eternal God ”, men have created at the dictates of their whim, their own gods to adore : Nature, the State, the Nation, or the Race. »

Evans wrote :

« He declared that Catholics must “ avoid those who blasphemed, attacked their religion, or brought about the death of innocent men and women. Otherwise, they would become involved in their guilt. ” »

Galen said that it was the duty of Christians to resist the taking of human life, even if it meant losing their own lives. Thousands of copies of the sermons were circulated across Germany.

Evans wrote :

« The sensation created by the sermons was enormous. »

Kershaw characterized von Galen's 1941 « open attack » on the government's euthanasia program as a « vigorous denunciation of Nazi inhumanity and barbarism » .

According to Gill :

« Galen used his condemnation of this appalling policy to draw wider conclusions about the nature of the Nazi State. Galen had the sermons read in parish churches. The British broadcast excerpts over the BBC German service, dropped leaflets over Germany, and distributed the sermons in occupied countries. »

There were demonstrations across Catholic Germany - Hitler himself faced angry demonstrators at Nuremberg, the only time he was confronted with such resistance by ordinary Germans. The regime did not halt the murders, but took the program underground. Bishop Antonius Hilfrich of Limburg wrote to the Justice Minister, denouncing the murders. Bishop Albert Stohr of Mainz condemned the taking of life from the pulpit. Some of the priests who distributed the sermons were among those arrested and sent to the concentration camps amid the public reaction to the sermons. The regional Nazi leader, and Hitler's deputy, Martin Bormann, called for Galen to be hanged, but Hitler and Goebbels urged a delay in retribution till War's end. With the programme now public knowledge, nurses and staff (particularly in Catholic institutions) , now increasingly seeking to obstruct implementation of the policy, Hitler ordered a halt to the killing of adults (though maintained the easier to conceal murder of children) . Following the War, Pope Pius XII hailed von Galen a hero and promoted him to Cardinal.

In 1943, Pius issued the « Mystici corporis Christi » Encyclical, in which he condemned the practice of killing the disabled. He stated his « profound grief » at the murder of the deformed, the insane, and those suffering from hereditary disease as though they were a useless burden to Society » , in condemnation of the ongoing Nazi euthanasia program. The Encyclical was followed, on 26 September 1943, by an open condemnation by the German Bishops which, from every German pulpit, denounced the killing of « innocent and defenceless mentally handicapped, incurably infirm and fatally wounded, innocent hostages, and disarmed prisoners of War and criminal offenders, people of a foreign race or descent » .

While Hitler did not feel powerful enough to arrest senior clergy before the end of the War, an estimated 1/3 of German priests faced some form of reprisal from the Nazi government. Bishop von Preysing was protected from Nazi retaliation by his position, his cathedral administrator and confidant, Provost Blessed Bernard Lichtenberg, was not. A strong opponent of Nazism, Lichtenberg had been active with the Catholic Centre Party. Lichtenberg served at Saint-Hedwig's Cathedral from 1932, and was under the watch of the « Gestapo » by 1933, for his courageous support of prisoners and Jews. He became a confidante of Bishop von Preysing from 1935. He ran Preysing's aid unit (the « Hilfswerke beim Bischöflichen Ordinariat Berlin ») which secretly gave assistance to those who were being persecuted by the regime. From the « Kristallnacht » pogrom of November 1938 onward, Lichtenberg closed each nightly service with a prayer for « the Jews, and the poor prisoners in the concentration camps » , including « my fellow priests there » . Lichtenberg met his demise for protesting the Nazi policy regarding euthanasia directly to Doctor Conti, the

Nazi State Medical Director. On 28 August 1941, he endorsed Galen's sermons in a letter to Conti, pointing to the German constitution which defined euthanasia as an act of murder. On 23 October 1942, he offered a prayer for the Jews being deported to the East, telling his congregation to extend to the Jews the commandment of Christ to « Love thy neighbour » . For preaching against Nazi propaganda and writing a letter of protest concerning Nazi euthanasia, he was arrested in 1941, sentenced to 2 years' penal servitude, and died en route to Dachau Concentration Camp in 1943. He was subsequently honoured by Yad Vashem as Righteous among the Nations.

The Blessed Rupert Mayer, a Bavarian Jesuit and World War I army chaplain, had clashed with the National-Socialists as early as 1923. Continuing his critique following Hitler's rise to power, Mayer was imprisoned in 1939 and sent to Sachsenhausen concentration camp. As his health declined, the Nazis feared the creation of a martyr and sent him to the Abbey of Ettal, but Myer died in 1945.

Laurentius Siemer, Provincial of the Dominican Province of Teutonia, became a steadfast opponent of the Nazi regime and had contacts with the Resistance. The « Gestapo » arrested Siemer in Cologne, in 1935, as part of the « Currency Fraud Cases » targeting Catholic clergy, and held him in custody for several months. He was influential in the Committee for Matters Relating to the Orders, which formed in response to Nazi attacks against Catholic monasteries and aimed to encourage the Bishops to intercede on behalf of the Orders and oppose the Nazi State more emphatically. He spoke to resistance circles on the subject of Catholic social teaching as the starting-point for the reconstruction of Germany, and worked with Carl Gørdeler and others in planning for a post-coup Germany. Following the failure of the « July Plot » , Siemer evaded capture and hid-out until the end of the War.

Also involved in the German Resistance was Christian workers' movement activist and Centre Party politician Friar Otto Müller. Müller was among those who argued for a firm line from the German Bishops against legal violations of the Nazis. In contact with the German military opposition before the outbreak of War, he later allowed individual opposition figures the use of the « Ketteler-Haus » in Cologne for their discussions and was involved with Catholic politicians and « July Plotters » Jakob Kaiser, Nikolaus Groß and Bernhard Letterhaus in planning a post Nazi-Germany. After the failure of the « July Plot » , the « Gestapo » arrested Müller, who was imprisoned in the Berlin Police Hospital, where he died.

Parish priests such as the Lübeck martyrs, Johannes Prassek, Eduard Müller and Hermann Lange, and the Lutheran pastor Karl Friedrich Stellbrink were partly inspired by August von Galen's anti-euthanasia homilies. They shared disapproval of the Nazi regime, and the 4 priests spoke publicly against the Nazis (initially discreetly) distributing pamphlets to friends and congregants. Although Church federation work with young people was banned, Müller worked with youth groups and led a discussion circle whose topics included National-Socialism, political events and the military situation - using information from British radio and from leaflets including the sermons of Bishop Clemens August von Galen, which he duplicated with Lange and Prassek. Then, following a March 1942 Royal Air Force raid, after which Stellbrink tended wounded, he delivered a Palm Sunday sermon which attributed the bombing to divine punishment. Stellbrink was arrested, followed by the 3 Catholic priests, and each was sentenced to death. Resigned to martyrdom, Prassek wrote to his family : « Who can oppress one who dies. » The mingling of the blood of the 4 guillotined martyrs has become a symbol of German Ecumenism.

Friar Max Josef Metzger, a World War I military chaplain and holder of the Iron Cross, had founded the German Catholics' Peace Association in 1919 and sought links to the international pacifist movement. As a leading German pacifist, he was targeted by the Nazi authorities and arrested on several occasions by the « Gestapo ». He was arrested for the last time, in June 1943, after being denounced by a mail-courier for attempting to send a memorandum on the re-organisation of the German State and its integration into a future system of world peace to Erling Eidem, the Swedish Archbishop of Uppsala. Sentenced to death, he was executed on 17 April 1944.

An old guard of national-conservatives aligned to Carl Friedrich Gørdeler broke with Hitler in the mid-1930's.

According to Kershaw :

« They despised the barbarism of the Nazi regime. But were keen to re-establish Germany's status as a major power. »

Essentially authoritarian, they favoured monarchy and limited electoral rights « resting on Christian family values » .

Gørdeler wrote :

« Hitlerism is poison for the German soul. Hitler is determined to destroy Christianity. »

A younger group, dubbed the « Kreisau Circle » by the « Gestapo », did not look to German Imperialism for inspiration. Religious motivations were particularly strong in the « Kreisau Circle » of the Resistance. Formed in 1937, though multi-denominational, it had a strongly Christian orientation, and looked for a general Christian revival, and re-awakening of awareness of the transcendental. Its outlook was rooted both in German Romantic and idealist tradition and in the Catholic doctrine of natural law. The « Circle » looked to a federalized Europe along the lines of the United States as the desirable « new order », resting heavily on German Christian and social ideals, with self-governing communities rooted in social justice. The « Circle » pressed for a « coup » against Hitler, but being unarmed was dependent on persuading military figures to take action.

Among the central membership of the « Circle » were the Jesuit Fathers Augustin Rösch, Alfred Delp and Lothar König. Bishop von Preysing had contact with the group. The Catholic conservative Karl Ludwig von Guttenberg brought the Jesuit Provincial of Southern Germany Augustin Rösch into the « Kreisau Circle », along with Alfred Delp. For figures like Rösch, the Catholic trade-unionists Jakob Kaiser and Bernhard Letterhaus and the « July Plot » leader Klaus von Stauffenberg, « religious motives and the determination to resist would seem to have developed hand in hand ». The Jesuit Alfred Delp was an influential member of the « Kreisau Circle » - one of the few clandestine German Resistance groups operating inside Nazi Germany. He was executed in February 1945.

According to Gill :

« Delp's role was to sound out for Moltke the possibilities in the Catholic Community of support for a new, post-War Germany. »

Rösch and Delp also explored the possibilities for common ground between Christian and Socialist trade-unions. Lothar König SJ became an important intermediary between the « Circle » and Bishops Gröber of Freiberg and Presying of Berlin.

The « Kreisau Circle » combined conservative notions of reform with socialist strains of thought - a symbiosis expressed by Delp's notion of « personal socialism ». The group rejected Western models, but wanted to « associate conservative and socialist values, aristocracy and workers, in a new democratic synthesis which would include the churches » .

Delp wrote :

« It is time the 20th Century revolution was given a definitive theme, and the opportunity to create new and lasting horizons for humanity. » , by which he meant, social security and the basics for individual intellectual and religious development. So long as people lacked dignity, they would be incapable of prayer or thought. In « Die dritte Idee » (The 3rd Idea) , Delp expounded on the notion of a 3rd way, which, as opposed to Communism and Capitalism, might restore the unity of the person and society.

Another non-military German Resistance group, dubbed the « “ Frau ” Solf Tea Party » by « Gestapo » , included the Jesuit Friar Friedrich Erxleben. The purpose of the « Solf Circle » was to seek-out humanitarian ways of countering the Nazi regime. It met at either « Frau » Solf or Elizabeth von Thadden's home. Von Thadden was a Christian educational reformer and Red Cross worker. Otto Kiep and most of the group were arrested in 1941 and executed.

In effort to counter the strength and influence of spiritual resistance, Nazi security services monitored Catholic clergy very closely - instructing that agents be set-up in every diocese, that the Bishops' reports to the Vatican should be obtained and that the Bishops' areas of activity must be found-out. A « vast network » was established to monitor the activities of ordinary clergy.

Nazi security agents wrote :

« The importance of this enemy is such that inspectors of security police and of the security service will make this group of people and the questions discussed by them their special concern. »

Priests were frequently denounced, arrested and sent to concentration camps, often simply on the basis of being « suspected of activities hostile to the State » or that there was reason to « suppose that his dealings might harm society » .

Dachau was established in March 1933 as the 1st Nazi Concentration Camp. Chiefly a political camp, it was here that

the Nazis established in 1940 a dedicated Clergy Barracks. Of a total of 2,720 clergy recorded as imprisoned at Dachau, some 2,579 (or 94.88 %) were Catholic and a total of 1,034 clergy were recorded overall as dying in the camp, with 132 « transferred or liquidated » during that time - although Reimund Schnabel's 1966 investigation found an alternative total of 2,771, with 692 noted as deceased and 336 sent-out on « invalid trainloads » and, therefore, presumed dead.

By far, the greatest number of priest prisoners came from Poland - in all some 1,748 Polish Catholic clerics, of whom some 868 died in the camp. Germans constituted the next largest group - 411 German Catholic priests were sent to Dachau, of whom 94 died in the camp and 100 were « transferred or liquidated » . France contributed the next main group, with 153 Catholic clerics, among whom 10 died at the camp. Other Catholic priests were sent from Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Hungary and Rumania, while from outside the Nazi Empire - 2 British and 1 Spaniard were incarcerated at Dachau, as well as 1 « stateless » priest.

In December 1935, Wilhelm Braun, a Catholic theologian from Munich, became the 1st churchman imprisoned at Dachau. The annexation of Austria saw an increase in clerical inmates.

Berben wrote :

« The commandant at the time, Lortz, persecuted them with ferocious hatred, and, unfortunately, he found some prisoners to help the guards in their sinister work. »

Despite SS hostility to religious observance, the Vatican and German Bishops successfully lobbied the regime to concentrate clergy at 1 camp and obtained permission to build a chapel, for the priests to live communally and, for time, to be allotted to them for the religious and intellectual activity. From December 1940, priests were gathered in Blocks 26, 28 - and 30, though only temporarily. 26 became the international Block and 28 was reserved for Poles - the most numerous group.

Conditions varied for prisoners in the camp. The Nazis introduced a racial hierarchy - keeping Poles in harsh conditions, while favouring German priests. Many Polish priests simply died of the cold, not given sufficient clothing. A large number died in horrific Nazi medical experiments. Several Poles met their deaths via the « invalid trains » sent out from the camp, others were liquidated in the camp and given bogus death certificates. Some died of cruel punishment for misdemeanors - beaten to death or worked to exhaustion.

Religious activity outside the chapel was totally forbidden. Priests would secretly take confessions and distribute the Eucharist among other prisoners.

Amid the Nazi persecution of the Tirolian Catholics, the Blessed Otto Neururer, a parish priest was sent to Dachau for « slander to the detriment of German marriage » , after he advised a girl against marrying the friend of a senior Nazi. After agreeing to perform a forbidden baptism at Buchenwald, Neururer was sent to the punishment block, where he was hanged upside down until he died on 30 May 1940. This was reportedly conducted at the orders of the

sadistic « SS Hauptscharführer » Martin Sommer : the « Hangman of Buchenwald » . He was the 1st priest killed in the concentration camps.

Among the priest-martyrs who died at Dachau were many of the 108 Polish Martyrs of World War II. The Blessed Gerhard Hirschfelder died of hunger and illness in 1942. The Blessed Titus Brandsma, a Dutch Carmelite, died of a lethal injection in 1942. Blessed Alois Andritzki, a German priest, was given a lethal injection in 1943. The Venerable Engelmar Unzeitig, a Czech priest died of typhoid in 1945. The Venerable Giuseppe Girotti died at the camp in April 1945.

In December 1944, the Blessed Karl Leisner, a deacon from Münster who was dying of tuberculosis received his ordination at Dachau. Leisner had been active in the Christian Youth Movement under Bishop von Galen, bringing him to the attention of the « Gestapo » . His fellow prisoner Gabriel Piguet, the Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand presided at the secret ceremony. Leisner died soon after the liberation of the camp.

Among other notable Catholic clerics sent to Dachau were : Father Jean Bernard of Luxembourg, Hilary Paweł Januszewski (died in 1945) , Lawrence Wnuk, Ignacy Jeż and Adam Kozłowiecki of Poland ; Friars Josef Lenzel, August Fröhlich, Blessed Georg Häfner and Bernhard Heinzmann of Germany. Following the War, the Mortal Agony of Christ Chapel and a Carmelite Convent were built at Dachau in commemoration.

In his history of the German Resistance to Hitler, Anton Gill wrote that « more than anyone else, the Catholics showed their disapproval of the regime by huge gatherings » but that « this was the only collective resistance Catholics showed » . In 1935, in Hagen, Catholics gathered to protest against a performance of the Nazi playwright Edmund Kiss's anti-Christian play « Wittekind » . Police crushed the riot. In November 1936, the Oldenburg Nazis removed crucifixes from schools. Bishop Galen protested, which led to a public demonstration, and the cancellation of the order. In 1937, amidst harassment of the Church and following the hundreds of arrests and closure of Catholic presses that followed the issuing of Pope Pius XI's « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical, at least 800,000 people attended a pilgrimage centred on Aachen (a massive demonstration by the standards of the day) and some 60,000 attended the 700th anniversary of the bishopric of Franconia - about equal to the city's entire population.

In the year following Hitler's « seizure of power » , political players in Germany began wondering how the regime might be overthrown. The old political opponents of Nazism faced their final opportunity to halt the Nazification of Germany. The formerly influential Catholic aligned Centre Party and Bavarian People's Party were dissolved under terrorisation, and non-Nazi Parties were prohibited under the proclamation of the « Unity of Party and State » . The former Centre Party leader and « Reich » Chancellor, Heinrich Brüning, looked for a way to oust Hitler, along with military chiefs Kurt von Schleicher and Kurt von Hammerstein-Equord. Erich Klausener, an influential civil servant and president of Berlin's Catholic Action group organized Catholic conventions in Berlin, in 1933 and 1934. At the 1934 rally, he spoke against political oppression to a crowd of 60,000 following mass - just 6 nights before Hitler struck in a bloody purge.

The political temperature was also raised when the Conservative Catholic nobleman Franz von Papen, who had helped

Hitler to power and was serving as the Deputy « Reich » Chancellor, delivered an indictment of the Nazi government in his Marburg speech of 17 June 1934. Papen's speech writer and advisor Edgar Jung, a Catholic Action worker, seized the opportunity to re-assert the Christian foundation of the State and the need to avoid agitation and propaganda.

The speech declared :

« It is time to join together in fraternal friendship and respect for all our fellow countrymen, to avoid disturbing the labours of serious men and to silence fanatics. »

The speech was banned from the press. Jung had been a tireless opponent of the Nazis, and took every opportunity to undermine them. His speech pleaded for religious freedom, and rejected totalitarian aspirations in the field of religion. It was hoped the speech might spur a rising, centred on Hindenberg, Papen and the army.

Hitler decided to strike at his chief political opponents, both within and without the Nazi movement in a bloody purge : « The Night of the Long Knives » . The purge lasted 2 days, over 30 June and 1 July 1934. Leading rivals of Hitler in the Nazi movement were murdered, along with over 100 opposition figures, including high-profile Catholic resisters. Erich Klausener became the 1st Catholic martyr. Hitler personally ordered the arrest of Jung and his transfer to « Gestapo » headquarters in Berlin. Like Klausener, he was murdered in « The Long Knives » purge. Papen, who was probably also listed for execution, protested, but fell-back in line and did not challenge Hitler again.

The Church had resisted attempts by the new Nazi Government to close its youth organisations and Adalbert Probst, the national director of the Catholic Youth Sports Association, was also eliminated in the purge - abducted and later found dead, allegedly « shot while trying to escape » .

On 2 August 1934, the aged President von Hindenberg died. The offices of President and Chancellor were combined, and Hitler ordered the Army to swear an oath directly to him. Hitler declared his « revolution » complete.

The flourishing Catholic press of Germany faced censorship and closure under the Nazis. In 1933, the Nazis established a « Reich » Chamber of Authorship and « Reich » Press Chamber under the « Reich » Cultural Chamber of the Ministry for Propaganda. Writers had to be registered with the relevant chamber. On 10 May, « degenerate literary works » were burned by the thousand at the public squares of Berlin and other cities. As the Nazis asserted themselves, non-conformist writers were terrorised, their works burned, and fear pervaded. The June-July 1934 « Night of the Long Knives » purge was the culmination of this early campaign. Fritz Gerlich, the editor of Munich's Catholic weekly, « Der Gerade Weg » , was killed in the purge for his strident criticism of the Nazi movement.

The poet Ernst Wiechert delivered a speech at Munich University, calling for love, compassion, truth, freedom and the law. He protested the government's attitudes to the arts, calling them « spiritual murder » . He was arrested and taken to Dachau Concentration Camp.

The Blessed Nikolaus Groß was a Christian trade-unionist, member of the Centre Party and director of the West

German Workers' Newspaper « Westdeutschen Arbeiterzeitung » , the newspaper of the Catholic Workers' movement. From early days an opponent of Nazism, he was declared an enemy of the State in 1938, and his newspaper was shut-down. He continued to publish an underground edition and worked to rouse resistance among Catholic workers. Arrested in the « July Plot » round-up, he was executed on 23 January 1945. He was declared a martyr.

Writer and theologian Dietrich von Hildebrand was a vocal opponent of Hitler and Nazism. Black-listed by the Nazi movement in the 1920's, he ran religious discussions in his Munich home from 1924 to 1930, which were attended by distinguished theologians such as Erich Przywara, S.J. , Monsignors Martin Grabmann and Konrad von Preysing. Following Hitler's seizure of power, he fled from Germany, 1st to Italy, and then to Vienna, Austria, where, with the support of Austrian Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss, he founded and edited an anti-Nazi weekly paper, « Der Christliche Ständestaat » (The Christian Corporative State) . For this, he was sentenced to death in absentia by the Nazis. When Hitler annexed Austria in 1938, von Hildebrand was once again forced to flee, spending time in Switzerland, France (where he taught at the Catholic University of Toulouse until the Nazis invaded France in 1940) , then, to Portugal and finally to New York in 1940. There, he taught philosophy at the Jesuit Fordham University.

Members of Catholic aid agencies such as « Caritas » provided relief to victims of the Nazis and gathered intelligence on the fate of prisoners of the regime. Among the German laity, Gertrud Luckner, was among the 1st to sense the genocidal inclinations of the Hitler regime and to take national action. A pacifist and member of the German Catholics' Peace Association, she had been supporting victims of political persecution since 1933 and, from 1938, worked at the head-office of the German Association of Catholic Charitable Organizations, « Caritas » . Using international contacts, she secured safe passage abroad for many refugees. She organized aid circles for Jews, assisted many to escape. She cooperated with the priests Bernhard Lichtenberg and Alfred Delp. Following the outbreak of the War, she continued her work for the Jews through « Caritas' » Rar relief office - attempting to establish a national underground network through « Caritas » cells. She personally investigated the fate of the Jews being transported to the East and managed to obtain information on prisoners in concentration camps, and obtain clothing, food and money for forced labourers and prisoners of War. « Caritas » secured safe emigration for hundreds of converted Jews, but Luckner was unable to organize an effective national underground network. She was arrested in 1943 and only narrowly escaped death in the concentration camps.

Social worker Margarete Sommer had been sacked from her welfare institute for refusing to teach the Nazi line on sterilization. In 1935, she took-up a position at the Episcopal Diocesan Authority in Berlin, counselling victims of racial persecution for « Caritas » Emergency Relief. In 1941, she became director of the Welfare Office of the Berlin Diocesan Authority, under Bernhard Lichtenberg. Following Lichtenberg's arrest, Sommer reported to Bishop Konrad von Preysing. While working for the Welfare Office, Sommer coordinated Catholic aid for victims of racial persecution - giving spiritual comfort, food, clothing, and money. She gathered intelligence on the deportations of the Jews, and living conditions in concentration camps, as well as on SS firing squads, writing several reports on these topics from 1942, including an August 1942 report which reached Rome under the title « Report on the Exodus of the Jews » .

The « White Rose » group was formed by Munich University students and advocated non-violent resistance against the Hitler regime. From 1942, « White Rose » published leaflets to influence people against Nazism and militarism. They

criticized the « anti-Christian » and « anti-social » nature of the War. Among the leaders of the group, Willi Graf had been involved with the banned Catholic Youth movement and Christoph Probst was baptised into the church on the day of his execution. The Lutheran Hans Scholl had read Bishop von Galen's 1941 sermons and had worked for Professor Carl Muth, editor of the Catholic Magazine « High-Land », which had been banned in 1941. His sister Sophie Scholl had been influenced by Theodor Haecker to read John Henry Newman's writings on conscience, sentiments echoed by Galen. The Scholl siblings, Kurt Huber, Willi Graf and Alexander Schmorell were caught and executed in 1943.

Though Catholics were prominent in the German Resistance, according to Fest, it essentially consisted of a « motley collection of individuals who differed greatly in their social origins, habits of thought, political attitudes and methods of action » and was by and large slow to accept the need for violence to displace Hitler. A few civilian resistance groups developed, but the Army was the only organisation with the capacity to overthrow the government, and, from within, it a small number of officers came to present the most serious threat posed to the Nazi regime. The Foreign Office and the « Abwehr » (Military Intelligence) also provided vital support to the movement. But many of those in the military who ultimately chose to seek to overthrow Hitler had initially supported the regime, if not all of its methods. Hitler's 1938 purge of the military was accompanied by increased militancy in the Nazification of Germany, a sharp intensification of the persecution of Jews, and daring foreign policy exploits, bringing Germany to the brink of War and it was at this time that the German Resistance emerged.

The Resistance members were motivated by such factors as the mistreatment of Jews, harassment of the churches, and the harsh actions of Heinrich Himmler and the « Gestapo » .

In his history of the German Resistance, Peter Hoffmann wrote that :

« National-Socialism was not simply a Party like any other ; with its total acceptance of criminality, it was an incarnation of evil, so that all those whose minds were attuned to democracy, Christianity, freedom, humanity or even mere legality found themselves forced into alliance. »

The Nazi policy of « Gleichschaltung » (forced conformity to the Nazi Party) met with such forceful opposition from the German churches, that Hitler decided to delay confrontation until the end of the War. The truce constituted a rare win of sorts for an opposition movement in Nazi Germany. The stand-off fed the will of many German resisters, but the Churches as institutions stopped short of ever offering a general resistance to Nazi rule.

During the summer of 1938, wrote Hamerow, small groups of dissidents from the armed forces and civil service began to meet informally, the most prominent figure in these early days being Ludwig Beck, the Army Chief of Staff, who began to contemplate a palace « coup » against Hitler. He wanted, among other Liberal aims, to avoid War and bring-back « peace with the Church » . The back-down of the Western Powers over the Sudeten crisis was a diplomatic triumph for Hitler, and the conspiracy did not progress. Carl Gørdeler wondered if anything could now oppose « the growing dangers to our Christian world » , and the dispirited would-be conspirators were muted when Hitler marched into the remainder of Czechoslovakia in 1939. The early course of War stirred some of the conspirators back into

action. But many resisters rallied to the cause of Germany when Hitler invaded Poland, Bishop Galen among them, who offered a patriotic benediction. But with the defeat of Poland, and undoing of the last « injustices » of Versailles, many Opposition members could no longer see a need to continue the War, and looked to ways to negotiate a peace, and to oust Hitler. Hamerow wrote that the « decline of the anti-Nazi movement during the period of German military successes from 1939 to 1941, and its revival during the period of German military reverses from 1942 to 1944 reflected the primary concern of most of the resisters for the security of their nation » .

In Rome, the Pope had continued to lobby world-leaders for the avoidance of a conflict up until the very eve of War, and expressed his dismay that War had come in his October 1939 « Summi Pontificatus » Encyclical. With Poland overrun but France and the Low-Countries, yet, to be attacked, Colonel Hans Oster of the « Abwehr » sent Munich lawyer and devout Catholic, Josef Müller, on a clandestine trip to Rome to seek Papal assistance in the developing plot by the German military opposition to oust Hitler. The Pope's Private Secretary, Robert Leiber acted as the intermediary between Pius and the Resistance. He met with Müller, who visited Rome in 1939 and 1940. Later in the War, Leiber remained the point of contact for communications from Colonel-General Ludwig Beck in the lead-up to the 1944 « July Plot » .

The Vatican considered Müller to be a representative of Colonel-General von Beck and agreed to offer the machinery for mediation. Oster, Wilhelm Canaris and Hans von Dohnányi, backed by Beck, told Müller to ask Pius to ascertain whether the British would enter negotiations with the German opposition which wanted to overthrow Hitler. The British agreed to negotiate, provided the Vatican could vouch for the opposition's representative. Pius, communicating with Britain's Francis d'Arcy Osborne, channelled communications back and forth in secrecy. The Vatican agreed to send a letter outlining the bases for peace with England and the participation of the Pope was used to try to persuade senior German Generals Halder and Brauchitsch to act against Hitler.

Negotiations were tense, with a Western offensive expected, and on the basis that substantive negotiations could only follow the replacement of the Hitler regime. Hoffmann wrote that, when the Venlo Incident stalled the talks, the British agreed to resume discussions primarily because of the « efforts of the Pope and the respect in which he was held. Chamberlain and Halifax set great store by the Pope's readiness to mediate. » Pius, without offering endorsement, advised Osbourne on 11 January 1940 that the German opposition had said that a German offensive was planned for February, but that this could be averted if the German generals could be assured of peace with Britain, and not on punitive terms. If this could be assured, then, they were willing to move to replace Hitler. The Pope admitted to « discomfort » at his role as mediator, but advised that the Germans involved were not Nazis. The British government had doubts as to the capacity of the conspirators. On 7 February, the Pope updated Osbourne that the opposition wanted to replace the Nazi regime with a democratic federation, but hoped to retain Austria and the Sudetenland. The British government was non-committal, and said that while the federal model was of interest, the promises and sources of the opposition were too vague. Nevertheless, the resistance was encouraged by the talks, and Müller told Leiber that a coup would occur in February. Pius appeared to continue to hope for a « coup » in Germany into March 1940.

The negotiations ultimately proved fruitless. Hitler's swift victories over France and the Low-Countries deflated the will of the German military to resist Hitler. Müller was arrested during the Nazis 1st raid on Military Intelligence, in 1943.

He spent the rest of the War in concentration camps, ending-up at Dachau.

On 20 July 1944, an attempt was made to assassinate Adolf Hitler, inside his Wolf's Lair field headquarters in East Prussia. The plot was the culmination of the efforts of several groups in the German Resistance to overthrow the Nazi-led German government. The failure of both the assassination and the military « coup d'état » which was planned to follow it led to the arrest of at least 7,000 people by the « Gestapo ». According to records of the « Führer » Conferences on Naval Affairs, 4,980 of these were executed. During interrogations or their show trials a number of the conspirators cited the Nazi assault on the churches as one of the motivating factors for their involvement. The Protestant clergyman Eugen Gerstenmaier said that the key to the entire resistance flowed from Hitler's evil and the « Christian duty » to combat it.

The Bavarian Catholic Count Claus von Stauffenberg, had initially looked favourably on the arrival of the Nazis in power, but came to oppose the regime because of its persecution of the Jews and oppression of the Church. In 1944, he led the 20th « July Plot » (Operation Valkyrie) to assassinate Hitler. He had joined the resistance in 1943, and commenced planning « coup » , in which he personally placed a time bomb under Hitler's conference table. Killing Hitler would absolve the German military of the moral conundrum of breaking their oath to the « Führer » . Faced with the moral and theological question of tyrannicide, Stauffenberg conferred with Bishop Konrad von Preysing and found affirmation in early Catholicism, and through Martin Luther. In the lead-up to the assassination, Stauffenberg had taken to reciting Stefan George's poem « The Antichrist » , which, wrote Fest, suggested he had elevated « resistance into a sacred deed » .

The planned Cabinet which was to replace the Nazi regime included Catholic politicians Eugen Bolz, Bernhard Letterhaus, Andreas Hermes and Josef Wirmer. Wirmer was a member of the Left of the Centre Party, had worked to forge ties between the civilian resistance and the trade-unions and was a confidant of Jakob Kaiser - a leader of the Christian trade-union movement, which Hitler had banned after taking office. Letterhaus was also trade-union leader. As a captain in the « Oberkommando der Wehrmacht » (Supreme Command) , he had gathered information and become a leading member of the resistance. The proposed radio announcement of the failed « July Putsch » of 1944 revealed the Godly outlook of the leading conspirators :

« Let us once again tread the path of justice, decency and mutual respect ! In this spirit each of us will do his duty. Let us follow the commands of God which are engraved on our conscience, even when they seem hard to us : let us do everything to heal wounded souls and alleviate suffering. »

(Proposed radio broadcast to follow the « July Plot » against Hitler of 1944.)

Following the failure of the plot, Stauffenberg was shot and Moltke, Yorck and Delp, among others, were executed. Philipp von Boeselager, the last surviving member of the conspiracy, wrote that Catholicism influenced anti-Nazi feeling in the German army - to such an extent that Christmas celebrations in the army were banned in 1943. Author Nigel Jones believed that Catholicism and Christian conscience were central to Stauffenberg's decision to move against Hitler. 5,000 people were tortured and killed over the plot - and the « Gestapo » linked a number of Bishops to knowledge

of the German Resistance : von Galen, von Faulhaber, Frings, and Johannes Dietz of Fulda - though did not arrest the men.

The Catholic Church resisted the Holocaust by rejecting the racial ideology underpinning the mass exterminations ; making public pronouncements against racial persecutions ; and, by lobbying officials, providing false documents, and hiding people in monasteries, convents, schools, among families and the institutions of the Vatican itself, leading many leading Jews to offer thanks to the Roman Church at the completion of the War. In every country under German occupation, priests played a major part in rescuing Jews.

Catholic historian Michæl Phayer wrote that :

« Rescuers and perpetrators were but a slight minority of Europe's Catholic population. »

On 11 November 1938, following « Kristallnacht » , Pope Pius XI joined Western leaders in condemning the pogrom. In response, the Nazis organized mass demonstrations against Catholics and Jews in Munich, and the Bavarian « Gauleiter » Adolf Wagner declared before 5,000 protesters :

« Every utterance the Pope makes in Rome is an incitement of the Jews throughout the world to agitate against Germany. »

On 21 November, in an address to the world's Catholics, the Pope rejected the Nazi claim of racial superiority, and insisted instead that there was only a single human race.

Robert Ley, the Nazi Minister of Labour declared the following day in Vienna :

« No compassion will be tolerated for the Jews. We deny the Pope's statement that there is but one human race. The Jews are parasites. »

Catholic leaders including Cardinal Schuster of Milan, Cardinal van Roey in Belgium and Cardinal Verdier in Paris backed the Pope's strong condemnation of « Kristallnacht » .

Unlike the Nazi euthanasia murder of invalids, which the Church led protests against, the « Final Solution » liquidation of the Jews did not primarily take place on German soil, but rather in Polish territory. Awareness of the murderous campaign was, therefore, less wide-spread. Such protests as were made by the Catholic Bishops in Germany regarding anti-Semitic policies of the regime, tended to be by way of private letters to government ministers. But the Church had already rejected the racial ideology underpinning the Nazi Holocaust.

The Nazi Concentration Camps had been established in 1933, as political prisons, but it was not until the invasion of Russia that the death camps opened, and techniques learned in the aborted euthanasia program were transported to the East for the racial exterminations. The process of gassing commenced in December 1941.

« Theories began to appear which denied the unity of the human race, affirming an original diversity of races. In the 20th Century, National-Socialism in Germany used these ideas as a pseudo-scientific basis for a distinction between so called Nordic-Aryan races and supposedly inferior races. Furthermore, an extremist form of nationalism was heightened in Germany by the defeat of 1918 and the demanding conditions imposed by the victors, with the consequence that many saw in National-Socialism a solution to their country's problems and cooperated politically with this movement. The Church in Germany replied by condemning racism. »

(From « We Remember : A Reflection on the Shoah » , 1998.)

In the 1930's, Pope Pius XI urged Benito Mussolini to ask Adolf Hitler to restrain the anti-Semitic actions taking place in Germany. In 1937, he issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » (With burning concern) Encyclical, in which he asserted the inviolability of human rights. It was written partly in response to the Nuremberg Laws, and condemned racial theories and the mistreatment of people based on race. It repudiated Nazi racial theory and the « so-called myth of race and blood » .

It denounced :

« Whom ever exalts race, or the people, or the State above their standard value and divinizes them to an idolatrous level. » , spoke of divine values independent of « space country and race » and a Church for « all races » .

And said :

« None but superficial minds could stumble into concepts of a national God, of a national religion ; or attempt to lock within the frontiers of a single people, within the narrow limits of a single race, God, the Creator of the universe. »

Following the « Anschluß » and the extension of anti-Semitic laws in Germany, Jewish refugees sought sanctuary outside the « Reich » .

In Rome, Pius XI told a group of Belgian pilgrims on 6 September 1938 :

« It is not possible for Christians to participate in anti-Semitism. Spiritually we are Semites. »

Following the November « Kristallnacht » of that year, Pius XI condemned the pogrom, sparking mass demonstrations against Catholics and Jews in Munich, where the Bavarian « Gauleiter » Adolf Wagner declared :

« Every utterance the Pope makes in Rome is an incitement of the Jews throughout the world to agitate against Germany. »

The Vatican took steps to find refuge for Jews. On 21 November, in an address to the world's Catholics, Pius XI rejected the Nazi claim of racial superiority, and insisted instead that there was only a single human race.

Pius XI's Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli, made some 55 protests against Nazi policies, including its « ideology of race » . Pacelli succeeded Pius XI on the eve of War in 1939. Taking the name Pius XII, he also employed diplomacy to aid the victims of Nazi persecution, and directed his Church to provide discreet aid to Jews. His Encyclicals such as « Summi Pontificatus » and « Mystici corporis » spoke against racism - with specific reference to Jews :

« There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision. »

His « Summi Pontificatus » 1st papal Encyclical followed the Nazi-Soviet invasion of Poland, and reiterated Catholic teaching against racism and anti-Semitism and affirmed the ethical principles of the « Revelation on Sinai » . Pius reiterated Church teaching on the « principle of equality » - with specific reference to Jews :

« There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision. »

The forgetting of solidarity « imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men » was called « pernicious error » . Catholics everywhere were called upon to offer « compassion and help » to the victims of the War. The letter also decried the deaths of non-combatants. Local Bishops were instructed to assist those in need. Pius went on to make a series of general condemnations of racism and genocide through the course of the War.

After the invasion of the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany commenced its industrialized mass-murder of the Jews, around late-1941 / early-1942. At Christmas 1942, once evidence of the mass-slaughter of the Jews had emerged, Pius XII voiced concern at the murder of « hundreds of thousands » of « faultless » people because of their « nationality or race » and intervened to attempt to block Nazi deportations of Jews in various countries. According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, he refused to say more « fearing that public papal denunciations might provoke the Hitler regime to brutalize further those subject to Nazi terror (as it had when Dutch Bishops publicly protested earlier in the year) while jeopardizing the future of the church » .

Regardless, the Nazi authorities were distressed by the papal intervention. The « Reich » Security Main Office, responsible for the deportation of Jews, noted :

« In a manner never known before, the Pope has repudiated the National-Socialist New European Order. Here, he is virtually accusing the German people of injustice towards the Jews and makes himself the mouthpiece of the Jewish War criminals. »

(« Reich » Security Main Office, following Pope Pius XII's 1942 Christmas address.)

Eugenio Pacelli (later, Pope Pius XII) served as Pius XI's diplomatic representative in Germany (1917-1929) and, then, as Vatican Secretary of State (1929-1939) , during which period he delivered multiple denunciations of Nazi racial

ideology. As the newly-installed Nazi Government began to instigate its program of anti- anti-Semitism, Pope Pius XI, through Cardinal Pacelli, who was by then serving as Vatican Secretary of State, ordered the successor Papal Nuncio in Berlin, Cesare Orsenigo, to « look into whether and how it may be possible to become involved » in their aid. Orsenigo generally proved a poor instrument in this regard, concerned more with the anti-Church policies of the Nazis and how these might effect German Catholics, than with taking action to help German Jews. In the assessment of historian Michæl Phayer, Orsenigo did intervene on behalf of the Jews, but only seldom, and apart from his attempt to halt a plan to « resettle » Jews married to Christians, when directed by the Holy-See to protest against mistreatment of Jews, he did so « timidly » .

Pacelli was among those who helped draft the 1937 Papal anti-Nazi Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » , repudiating Nazi racial theory and the « so-called myth of race and blood » . Pacelli became Pope in 1939, and told Vatican officials that he intended to reserve the all important handling of diplomacy with Germany for himself. He issued « Summi Pontificatus » with spoke of the equality of races, and of Jew and Gentile. Following a 21 June 1943 Vatican Radio broadcast to Germany which spoke in defence of Yugoslav Jews, Pius XII instructed the Papal Nuncio to Germany, Cesare Orsenigo to speak directly with Hitler about the persecution of the Jews. Orsenigo later met with Hitler at Berchtesgaden, but when the subject of the Jews was raised, Hitler reportedly turned his back, and smashed a glass on the floor.

In Italy, where the Pope's direct influence was strongest, the Pope ordered Catholic institutions to open themselves to the Jews, when the Nazi round-ups finally came to the country, following Fascist Italy's capitulation. Anti-Semitism had not been a founding principle of Italian Fascism, although Benito Mussolini's regime moved closer to Hitler with time.

On 27 June 1943, Vatican Radio is reported to have broadcast a papal injunction :

« He who makes a distinction between Jews and other men is being unfaithful to God and is in conflict with God's commands. »

In July 1943, with the Allies advancing from the south, Mussolini was overthrown, and, on 1 September, the new government agreed an armistice with the Allies. The Germans occupied much of the country, commencing an effort to deport the nation's Jews. The Pope had helped the Jews of Rome in September, by offering whatever amounts of gold might be needed towards the 50 kilograms ransom demanded by the Nazis.

According to Martin Gilbert, when the Nazis commenced the round-up of Roman Jews of 16 October, Pius had already ...

« A few days earlier personally ordered the Vatican clergy to open the sanctuaries of the Vatican City to all “ non-Aryans ” in need of refuge. By morning of October 16, a total of 477 Jews had been given shelter in the Vatican and its enclaves, while another 4,238 had been given sanctuary in the many monasteries and convents of in Rome. Only 1,015 of Rome's 6,730 Jews were seized that morning. »

Upon receiving news of the round-ups on the morning of 16 October, the Pope immediately instructed Cardinal Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, to make a protest to the German Ambassador to the Vatican, Ernst von Weizsacker.

« Maglione did so that morning, making it clear to the ambassador that the deportation of Jews was offensive to the Pope. In urging Weizsacker “ to try to save these innocent people ”, Maglione added :

“ It is sad for the Holy Father, sad beyond imagination, that here in Rome, under the very eyes of the Common Father, that so many people should suffer only because they belong to a specific race. ” »

...

2 Popes served through the Nazi period: Pope Pius XI (1922-1939) and Pope Pius XII (1939-1958) . The Holy-See strongly condemned Nazism through the late-1920's and throughout the 1930's, with Cardinal Pacelli (later, Pope Pius XII) being a particularly outspoken critic. However, following the outbreak of War, Vatican pronouncements became more guarded and Rome pursued its ancient policy of neutrality and openness to the role of peace-broker. During the War, Pius XII was praised by Western media as a « lonely voice » against tyranny in Europe and scorned by Hitler as a « Jew lover » and a black-mailer on his back, whom he believed constricted his ally Mussolini and leaked confidential German correspondence to the world.

The pontificate of Pius XI coincided with the early aftermath of the First World War. The old European monarchies had been largely swept away and a new and precarious order formed across the continent. In the East, the Soviet Union arose. In Italy, the Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini took power, while in Germany, the fragile Weimar Republic collapsed with the Nazi seizure of power.

In 1929, Pius signed the Lateran Treaty and a concordat with Italy, confirming the existence of an independent Vatican City State, in return for recognition of the Kingdom of Italy and an undertaking for the papacy to be neutral in world conflicts. In 1933, Pius signed a Concordat with the Germany - hoping to protect the rights of Catholics under the Nazi government. The terms of the Treaty were not kept by Hitler.

According to the Encyclopædia Britannica :

« From 1933 to 1936, Pius XI wrote several protests against the 3rd “ Reich ”, and his attitude toward Fascist Italy changed dramatically after Nazi racial policies were introduced into Italy in 1938. »

Pius XI saw the rising tide of Totalitarianism with alarm and delivered 3 Papal Encyclicals challenging the new creeds : against Italian Fascism « Non abbiamo bisogno » (We Do Not Need to Acquaint You, 1931) ; against Nazism « Mit brennender Sorge » (With Deep Anxiety, 1937) and against atheist Communist « Divini redemptoris » (Divine Redeemer, 1937) . He also challenged the extremist nationalism of the « Action Française » movement and anti-Semitism in the United States.

« Non abbiamo bisogno » condemned Italian Fascism's « pagan worship of the State » and « revolution which snatches the young from the Church and from Jesus-Christ, and which inculcates in its own young people hatred, violence and irreverence » .

Pius XI's Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli (future Pius XII) , made some 55 protests against Nazi policies, including its « ideology of race » . As Cardinal Pacelli, Pope Pius XII had assisted Pius XI, draft the « Mit brennender Sorge » Encyclical powerful critique of Nazi ideology. Pius XI commissioned the American Jesuit John La Farge to draft an Encyclical demonstrating the incompatibility of Catholicism and racism : « Humani generis unitas » (The Unity of the Human Race) . Following the death of Pius XI however, the less confrontational Pius XII did not issue the Encyclical. He feared it would antagonize Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany at a time where he hoped to act as an impartial peace broker.

By early 1937, the Church hierarchy in Germany, which had initially attempted to co-operate with the new government, had become highly-disillusioned. In March, Pope Pius XI issued the « Mit brennender Sorge » (With burning concern) Encyclical. The Pope asserted the inviolability of human rights and expressed deep concern at the Nazi regime's flouting of the 1933 Concordat, its treatment of Catholics and abuse of Christian values. It accused the government of « systematic hostility leveled at the Church » and of sowing the « tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His Church » and Pius noted on the horizon the « threatening storm clouds » of religious wars of extermination over Germany.

The Vatican had the text smuggled into Germany and printed and distributed in secret. Bishop Konrad von Preysing was an advisor in the drafting of the document. Cardinal Pacelli (later, Pope Pius XII) also helped draft the Encyclical, which was written partly in response to the Nuremberg Laws. The document does not refer to Hitler or the Nazis by name, but condemned racial theories and the mistreatment of people based on race.

Written in German, not the usual Latin, it was read from the pulpits of all German Catholic churches on one of the Church's busiest Sundays, Palm Sunday.

According to Gill :

« Hitler was beside himself with rage. 12 presses were seized, and hundreds of people sent either to prison or the camps. »

With Europe on the brink of War, Pius XI died on 10 February 1939, and Cardinal Pacelli was elected to succeed him as Pope Pius XII. As Vatican Secretary of State, Pacelli had been a critic of Nazism and the Nazi Government was the only government not to send a representative to his coronation. Pius, a cautious diplomat, pursued the course of diplomacy to attempt to convince European leaders to avoid War. In his 1st Encyclical, « Summi Pontificatus » , which came only 1 month into the War, Pius condemned the War against Poland and looked to its « resurrection » .

« Summi Pontificatus » was the 1st papal Encyclical issued by Pope Pius XII, in October 1939, and established some of the themes of his pontificate. During the drafting of the letter, the Second World War commenced with the Nazi-Soviet invasion of Catholic Poland : the « dread tempest of War is already raging despite all Our efforts to avert it » . In a challenge to Nazism, the papal letter denounced racism, anti-Semitism, War, totalitarianism, the attack on Poland and the persecution of the Church. Pius reiterated Church teaching on the « principle of equality » - with specific reference to Jews :

« There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision. »

The forgetting of solidarity « imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men » was called « pernicious error » . Catholics everywhere were called upon to offer « compassion and help » to the victims of the War. The Pope declared determination to work to hasten the return of peace and trust in prayers for justice, love and mercy, to prevail against the scourge of War. The letter also decried the deaths of non-combatants.

Following themes addressed in « Non abbiamo bisogno » (1931) ; « Mit brennender Sorge » (1937) ; and « Divini Redemptoris » (1937) , Pius wrote of a need to bring-back to the Church those who were following « a false standard misled by error, passion, temptation and prejudice, who have strayed away from faith in the true God » . Pius wrote of « Christians unfortunately more in name than in fact » showing « cowardice » in the face of persecution by these creeds, and called for resistance :

« Who among “ the Soldiers of Christ ” (ecclesiastic or layman) does not feel himself incited and spurred on to a greater vigilance, to a more determined resistance, by the sight of the ever-increasing host of Christ's enemies who wantonly break the Tables of God's Commandments to substitute other tables and other standards stripped of the ethical content of the Revelation on Sinai, standards in which the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount and of the Cross has no place ? »

(« Summi Pontificatus » , Pope Pius XII, October 1939.)

Pius wrote of a persecuted Church and a time requiring « charity » for victims who had a « right » to compassion. Against the invasion of Poland and killing of civilians he wrote :

« This is an “ Hour of Darkness ” in which the spirit of violence and of discord brings indescribable suffering on mankind. The nations swept into the tragic whirlpool of war are, perhaps, as yet only at the “ beginnings of sorrows ” but even now there reigns in thousands of families death and desolation, lamentation and misery. The blood of countless human beings, even non-combatants, raises a piteous dirge over a nation such as Our dear Poland, which, for its fidelity to the Church, for its services in the defense of Christian civilization, written in indelible characters in the annals of history, has a right to the generous and brotherly sympathy of the whole world, while it awaits, relying on the powerful intercession of Mary, Help of Christians, the hour of a resurrection in harmony with the principles of justice and true peace. »

(« Summi Pontificatus » , Pope Pius XII, October 1939.)

With Italy not yet an ally of Hitler in the War, Italians were called upon to remain faithful to the Church. Pius avoided explicit denunciations of Hitlerism or Stalinism, establishing the « impartial » public tone which would become controversial in later assessment of his pontificate :

« A full statement of the doctrinal stand to be taken in face of the errors of today, if necessary, can be put-off to another time unless there is disturbance by calamitous external events ; for the moment, We limit Ourselves to some fundamental observations. »

Later in the War, Pius issued « Mystici corporis Christi » (29 June 1943) on the subject of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. It followed the commencement of Nazi Germany's programs of « euthanasia » of the handicapped, and race-based murders of Jews and other minorities, and is therefore significant for its reiteration of Church teachings against racism and the killings of people with disabilities.

Pius' statement of « profound grief » at the murder of the deformed, the insane, and those suffering from hereditary disease as though they were a « useless burden to Society » was a condemnation of the ongoing Nazi euthanasia program, under which disabled Germans were being removed from care facilities and murdered by the State as « life unworthy of life » . It built upon the high-profile condemnations offered by the Archbishop of Münster, August von Galen and others. It was followed, on 26 September 1943, by an open condemnation by the German Bishops which, from every German pulpit, denounced the killing of « innocent and defenceless mentally handicapped, incurably infirm and fatally wounded, innocent hostages, and disarmed prisoners of War and criminal offenders, people of a foreign race or descent » .

Pope Pius used the Vatican newspaper, « L'Osservatore Romano » and the new medium of radio to preach peace, and infuriated the Axis Powers. He established the Vatican Information Service to provide aid to, and information about, War refugees. He used radio to preach against selfish nationalism and the evils of modern warfare. The Nazis considered Vatican Radio to be anti-German, and Germans were forbidden to listen to it. At the outbreak of the War, Guido Gonella, the chief-columnist of the Vatican newspaper, « L'Osservatore Romano » , was arrested. Following strenuous protests by the Vatican Secretary of State, he was released and given Vatican citizenship, but spent the rest of the War under close surveillance.

Vatican Radio was the mouthpiece of the Vatican, but was officially run by the Jesuits, who were in turn commanded by the Polish count Wladimir Ledóchowski. Hebblethwaite wrote that the Nazis « regarded the German Jesuits to be their main-enemy within, as Pius's Secretary, the German Jesuit Robert Leiber, as a traitor » . In January 1940, the Pope authorized for details of the Polish situation to be broadcast on Vatican Radio's German service. The German ambassador protested the German language broadcasts, and the Pope directed a pause. Other language services were still more explicit, leading the British press to hail Vatican Radio as « tortured Poland's » powerful advocate.

Following the Pope's 1st War time Christmas address of 1939, Josef Gæbbels noted in his diary :

« The Pope has made a Christmas speech. Full of bitter, covert attacks against us, against the “ Reich ”, and against National-Socialism. All the forces of internationalism are against us. We must break them. »

The Nazis considered Vatican Radio to be anti-German, and Germans were forbidden to listen to it. In broadcasts to Spain and France, it denounced the « wickedness of Hitler » and Nazi racial theories and lies. In his Easter 1941 radio address, the Pope denounced « atrocious forms of fighting and mistreatment of prisoners and civilians » . Following the Pope's 1941 Christmas address, « The New York Times » editorial wrote that Pius had placed himself squarely against Hitlerism :

« The voice of Pius XII is a lonely voice in the silence and darkness enveloping Europe this Christmas. »

By 1942, the Nazis had commenced their industrialized slaughter of the Jews of Europe : the « Final Solution » . Gypsies and others were also marked for extermination. In his Christmas address of that year, Pius acknowledged the genocide. He again warned against the evils of worshipping the State, and forced labour and addressed the racial persecutions in the following terms :

« Humanity owes this vow to those hundreds of thousands who, without any fault on their part, sometimes only because of their nationality or race, have been consigned to death or to a slow decline. »

« The New York Times » called Pius « a lonely voice crying-out of the silence of a continent » . The speech was made in the context of the near total domination of Europe by the armies of Nazi Germany at a time when the War had not yet turned in favour of the Allies. Holocaust historian, Sir Martin Gilbert, assesses the response of the « Reich » Security Main Office calling Pius a « mouthpiece » of the Jews in response to his Christmas address, as clear evidence that all sides knew that Pius was one who was raising his voice for the victims of Nazi terror. Colonel General Ludwig Beck, a key-figure in the German Resistance, secretly advised the Pope of plots against Hitler through emissaries.

Following Archbishop Jules-Géraud Saliège's pastoral letter condemning Nazi anti-Semitism, « L'Osservatore Romano » praised Saliège, and Vatican Radio broadcast the letter. Bishop Pierre-Marie Théas's expression of outrage at « The present anti-Semitic measures » and the French Bishops' joint protest against Jewish deportations received full-coverage in « L'Osservatore Romano » and on Vatican Radio.

In June 1943, Vatican Radio broadcast to France :

« He who distinguishes between Jews and other men is unfaithful to God and is in conflict with God's command. » , and to Germany on the rights of Jews under natural law and a defence of Yugoslav Jews.

Following the outbreak of War, Pius followed Vatican precedent and pursued a policy of « impartiality » and sought to act as an intermediary peace-broker. Despite this official policy, Pius passed intelligence to the Allies and made a series

of condemnations of racism and genocide through the course of the War. Germany regarded Pius as an Allied sympathizer who had violated his own policy of neutrality.

With Poland overrun but France and the Low-Countries yet to be attacked, Colonel Hans Oster of the « Abwehr » sent Munich lawyer and devout Catholic, Josef Müller, on a clandestine trip to Rome to seek Papal assistance in the developing plot by the German military opposition to oust Hitler. The Pope's Private Secretary, Robert Leiber acted as the intermediary between Pius and the Resistance. He met with Müller, who visited Rome in 1939 and 1940. Later in the War, Leiber remained the point of contact for communications from Colonel-General Ludwig Beck in the lead up to the 1944 « July Plot ». The Vatican considered Müller to be a representative of Colonel-General von Beck and agreed to offer the machinery for mediation. The British agreed to negotiate, provided the Vatican could vouch for the opposition's representative. Pius, communicating with Britain's Francis d'Arcy Osborne, channelled communications back and forth in secrecy. The Vatican agreed to send a letter outlining the bases for peace with England and the participation of the Pope was used to try to persuade senior German Generals Halder and Brauchitsch to act against Hitler.

Hoffmann wrote that, when the Venlo Incident stalled the talks, the British agreed to resume discussions primarily because of the « efforts of the Pope and the respect in which he was held. Chamberlain and Halifax set great store by the Pope's readiness to mediate. » The British government had doubts as to the capacity of the conspirators and was non-committal. Nevertheless, the resistance were encouraged by the talks, and Müller told Leiber that a « coup » would occur in February. The negotiations ultimately proved fruitless. Hitler's swift victories over France and the Low-Countries deflated the will of the German military to resist Hitler. Müller was arrested during the Nazis 1st raid on Military Intelligence in 1943. He spent the rest of the War in concentration camps, ending-up at Dachau. Général Charles de Gaulle, leader of the Free French, and admirer of Pope Pius XII, met with the pontiff following the Liberation of Rome.

At a special mass at Saint-Peters for the victims of the War, held in November 1940, soon after the commencement of the London Blitz bombing by the « Luftwaffe », Pius preached in his homily :

« May the whirlwinds, that in the light of day or the dark of night, scatter terror, fire, destruction, and slaughter on helpless folk cease. May justice and charity on one side and on the other be in perfect balance, so that all injustice be repaired, the reign of right restored. »

Later, he appealed to the Allies to spare Rome from aerial bombing, and visited wounded victims of the Allied bombing of 19 July 1943.

Through the early stages of the War, Pius continued to hope for a negotiated peace to prevent the spread of the conflict. The similarly minded U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt re-established American diplomatic relations with the Vatican after a 70 year hiatus and dispatched Myron C. Taylor as his personal representative. Pius warmly welcomed Roosevelt's envoy and peace initiative, calling it « an exemplary act of fraternal and hearty solidarity in defence against the chilling breath of aggressive and deadly godless anti-Christian tendencies » .

On 4 May 1940, the Vatican advised the Netherlands envoy to the Vatican that the Germans planned to invade France through the Netherlands and Belgium on 10 May. In Rome, in 1942, U.S. envoy Myron C. Taylor, thanked the Holy-See for the « forthright and heroic expressions of indignation made by Pope Pius XII when Germany invaded the Low-Countries » .

When, in 1940, the Nazi Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop led the only senior Nazi delegation permitted an audience with Pius XII and asked why the Pope had sided with the Allies, Pius replied with a list of recent Nazi atrocities and religious persecutions committed against Christians and Jews, in Germany, and in Poland, leading « The New York Times » to headline its report « Jews Rights Defended » and write of « burning words he spoke to “ Herr ” Ribbentrop about religious persecution » .

Unsuccessfully, Pius attempted to dissuade the Italian Dictator Benito Mussolini from joining Nazi Germany in the War. Following the Fall of France, Pius XII wrote confidentially to Hitler, Churchill and Mussolini proposing to offer to mediate a « just and honourable peace, but asking to receive confidential advice in advance of how such an offer would be received » . When, by 1943, the War had turned against the Axis Powers, and Mussolini's Foreign Minister Count Ciano was relieved of his post and sent to the Vatican as ambassador, Hitler suspected that he had been sent to arrange a separate peace with the Allies. On 25 July, the Italian King dismissed Mussolini. Hitler's told Alfred Jodl to organise for a German force to go to Rome and arrest the Government and restore Mussolini.

Asked about the Vatican, Hitler said :

« I'll go right into the Vatican. Do you think the Vatican embarrasses me ? We'll take that over right away later we can make apologies. »

His Generals urged caution, and the plot was not carried-out.

Pius had met President Roosevelt before the War. Despite profound fears of Stalinist Totalitarianism, Pius assured American Catholics working in armaments factories that it was acceptable to assist Russia with armaments, as the Russian people had been attacked. Pius feared the consequences of the Yalta Agreement which secured a sphere of Soviet influence in Europe and his Church became the target of Communist repression in Eastern Europe, following the War. When Italy surrendered to the Allies in 1943, German troops occupied Rome. Thousands of anti-Fascists and Jews took refuge in Church buildings during the occupation. Pius declared Rome an « open city » , coming to be known as « defensor civitatis » (defender of the city) .

Following the Liberation of Rome and prior to the collapse of Vichy France, Pius met Général Charles de Gaulle, leader of the Free French. At this time, he also held an audience with the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill. Despite his long career in Germany, and as a Vatican diplomat, he never once met Adolf Hitler. Following the 4 June 1944, Liberation of Rome by the Allies, Cardinal Tisserant delivered a letter from De Gaulle, assuring the Pontiff of the filial respect and attachment of the French people, and noting that their long War-time suffering had been attenuated by

the Pope's « testimonies of paternal affection » . Pius thanked De Gaulle for his recognition of the charity works of the papacy for the victims of the War, and offered an Apostolic blessing upon De Gaulle and his nation. De Gaulle himself came to meet the Pope on 30 June, following which, the French leader wrote of great admiration for Pius, and assessed him to be a pious, compassionate and thoughtful figure, upon whom the problems of world situation weighed heavily. De Gaulle's visit was reported by the Vatican Press in the manner of a head of State, though the Vichy Regime had not yet been toppled.

Austria was overwhelmingly Catholic. At the direction of Cardinal Theodor Innitzer, the churches of Vienna pealed their bells and flew swastikas for Hitler's arrival in the city on 14 March. Cardinal Innitzer was called to Rome, where the Pope rebuked him for his show of enthusiasm. Austrian Bishop Alois Hudal published a book in 1937 praising the German ideal of racial unity. With power secured in Austria, the Nazis repeated their persecution of the Church and, in October, a Nazi mob ransacked Innitzer's residence, after he had denounced Nazi persecution of the Church. In Britain, the « Catholic Herald » provided the following contemporary account on 14 October 1938 :

« The Blessed Maria Restituta was among the church dissidents arrested in Austria and executed by the Nazi regime. Friedrich Hoffman, a Czech priest, testifies at the trial of former camp personnel from Dachau, where over a thousand clergy died. 122 Czechoslovak priests were imprisoned there, but Poles constituted the largest proportion of those imprisoned in the dedicated Clergy Barracks.

The invasion was a reply to a courageous sermon the Cardinal had preached in the Cathedral earlier in the evening, in which the Cardinal told his packed congregation that “ in the last few months you have lost everything ! ” This sermon marked the end of Cardinal Innitzer's attempt to establish a religious peace with the Nazis. The attempt has failed. Cardinal Innitzer is now in line with his German brothers openly urging Catholics to resist anti-Catholic measures. »

(Extract from Britain's « Catholic Herald » , October 1938.)

In a « Table Talk » of July 1942, discussing his problems with the Catholic Church, Hitler singles-out Innitzer's early gestures of cordiality as evidence of the extreme caution with which Church diplomats must be treated :

« There appeared a man who addressed me with such self-assurance and beaming countenance, just as if, throughout the whole of the Austrian Republic he had never even touched a hair of the head of any National Socialist ! »

Following the Nazi annexation of Austria, many priests were arrested. The Austrian priests Jakob Gapp and Otto Neururer, both executed during the 3rd « Reich » were beatified in the 1996. Neururer was tortured and hanged at Buchenwald and Jakob Gapp was guillotined in Berlin.

The Blessed Maria Restituta, a Franciscan nun working as a nurse at the Mödling hospital was outspoken in her opposition to the new Nazi regime, and refused to remove crucifixes from her hospital walls. Arrested by the « Gestapo » in 1942, she was beheaded in March 1943 in Vienna.

Catholicism had had a strong institutional presence in the region under the Habsburg Dynasty, but Bohemian Czechs in particular had had a troubled relationship with the Church of their Habsburg rulers.

Despite this, according to Schnitker :

« The Church managed to gain a deep-seated appreciation for the role it played in resisting the common Nazi enemy. »

...

On 30 January 1933, Adolf Hitler, leader of the National-Socialist German Workers' Party, came to power in Germany. His aim was to mould Germany's political and community life to fit in with his own ideas. This totalitarian approach left no room for deviant views or independent organizations and institutions ; the whole of public life was to be controlled or, as the fashionable term put it, « co-ordinated » by the Nazi Party. The 2 major Churches (Lutheran and Catholic) to which almost every German belonged, were no exception to this general control.

But National-Socialism also had a particular interest in the churches, and it was inevitable that conflict would arise. Nazism saw itself not just as a political Party, but as a philosophy - based on extreme-racism. Only the Aryan race was acceptable, and the Aryans' worst enemy was the Jewish people - hence, they must be exterminated. This racism led to the infamous death camps of Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Ravensbruck.

Closely linked with Nazi racism was Imperialism. Among Aryans, the Germans were the superior people and were, therefore, called to rule the world. The German people, German blood and the German fatherland were held-up by the Nazis as the highest-good. Known as « der Führer » (the Leader) , Adolf Hitler himself was the incarnation of the Nazi philosophy. People greeted each other with and in his name - a practice to which Christians could not conform.

Nazism was a challenge as well as a threat to the churches : it disturbed their security and forced them to ask fundamental questions : What is the Church ? What does it mean to be a Christian ? What is so basic to the nature of the Church and to being a Christian that it cannot under any circumstances be surrendered ?

The process of discussion and exploration which gradually evolved during the 3rd « Reich » centred on 3 areas :

The Church began to establish itself as a separate entity, independent of the State, and to criticize the State and even actively oppose it.

The German Church became more open to the international Church community, from which it received help and support.

The Church began to combat racism by involving the whole Christian community in a united struggle for human

rights.

Stand-up and be counted

For the anti-Nazi cause, people in Germany not only risked their lives but lost them. 2 men were of particular importance in urging the Church forward on its way through the 3rd « Reich » : Martin Niemoller and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.

Martin Niemoller played a major part in gathering clergy and congregations of the Lutheran Church into what came to be known as the « Confessing Church ». He was born in 1892, in Westphalia, the son of a minister whose ancestors had been farmers. In the First World War, he became a U-boat commander. When the War was over, he planned to emigrate to South America, as a reaction to the Treaty of Versailles which placed the whole blame for the War on Germany's shoulders. To Niemoller, Germany seemed to be so humiliated by this that he felt he could no longer love his country or its people. However, while he was making his emigration plans, he served an apprenticeship on a farm. Here, he experienced a change of heart : he resolved to stay in Germany and serve his fellow-countrymen by going into the ministry of the Church.

The establishment of the Weimar Republic in 1919 was greeted by Niemoller with extreme suspicion. In this, he was typical of the great majority of German Protestants. He was loyal to the « Kaiser » and nostalgic for the close relationship between Church and State which had existed under the Imperial government. When the National-Socialists came to power in 1933, with the slogan « Wipe-out the shame of Versailles » , Niemoller was wholly in agreement. Nazi foreign policy was greeted with great enthusiasm by the overwhelming majority of the German nation.

The Nazis also set about « co-ordinating » the churches. As early as 1932, an organization known as the « German Christians » had been established. This was a religious movement led by Nazi clergy whose goal was to bring the Lutheran Church into line with the political and ideological goals of National-Socialism. In the summer of 1933, the « German Christians » seized power in the Lutheran Church, aided by massive support from Hitler and the Nazi Party. They elected a Federal Bishop and began to govern the Church on the « Führer's Principles » . First, the 28 provincial churches, which had been largely autonomous, were to be amalgamated into a single Federal Church under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bishop. Then, all non-Aryans (first the clergy and, then, Church members) were to be excluded from the German Lutheran Federal Church.

This raised a storm of indignation, and fierce opposition sprang-up. Such measures were a betrayal of the gospel of Jesus-Christ ! The imperturbable and pragmatic Niemoller, who was a minister in the Dahlem area of Berlin, promptly organized the « Pastors' Emergency League » . By the end of 1933, this had recruited 1/3 of the German Clergy. Congregations joined their Clergy in protesting against the dictatorship of the « German Christians » and their betrayal of Bible and creed.

Through independent « confessing synods » , Christians in Germany attempted to establish what were the basic, inviolable principles of the Church and the Christian faith. In a famous theological declaration which took its name

from the meeting-place of the 1st « confessing synod » in Barmen, Wuppertal, the Swiss theologian, Karl Barth helped to draw-up a statement of fundamental principles.

A fierce battle flared-up - primarily, a battle between 2 opposing groups in the Lutheran Church. The Confessing Church set its face against the « German Christians » and their planned « co-ordination » of the Church. The Church must remain the church ! « was the battle-cry of the Confessing Church, while the “ German Christians ” saw themselves as the “ Storm-Troopers of Jesus-Christ ” » .

The provincial churches who had been brought under the rule of the « German Christians » were referred to by the Confessing Church as « liquidated churches » ; those led by Bishops who were not associated with the « German Christians » such as Hanover, Württemberg and Bavaria, were « intact » churches. Even in the « liquidated » churches, pastors belonged to the Confessing Church and confessing congregations were formed.

But the Party and the State saw the Confessing Church as a resistance organization. They attempted to destroy it by keeping its members under surveillance, imprisoning them or sending them to concentration camps. In spite of this direct persecution, many people had the courage to launch-out into a relatively independent church life by applying for the « red card » which signified membership of the Confessing Church. The official German Christian authorities stopped the salaries of ministers who joined the Confessing Church, and from then on, they had to live on funds provided by the Confessing Church itself. Various methods of resistance were developed : censorship was flouted by a flood of underground pamphlets ; laws against public assembly resulted in private meetings ; censorship of the post and telephone service was made unworkable by word-of-mouth communication and a system of messengers.

This day-to-day subversion strengthened the solidarity of the members of the Confessing Church. In the novel circumstances of an underground church, outdated and traditional structures collapsed. Commitment, willingness to help and heroism were needed equally from men and women, clergy and laypeople. Important tasks often had to be taken over by women or the laity, since the activities of officials and clergy were closely watched by the police.

To begin with, the Confessing Church intended to criticize only the « German Christians » , not the Nazi Party or the State. It wanted to stay loyal to the State, to be recognized by the State as the true church. But, gradually, the members of the Confessing Church were forced to recognize that National-Socialism was deeply anti-Christian.

The trial of Martin Niemöller played a significant part in this realization. In 1932, a trumped-up charge of treason was pinned on Niemöller in his role as a leader of the Confessing Church, but he escaped with only a light sentence. However, immediately after the announcement of this lenient judgement, Niemöller was made a « personal prisoner of Adolf Hitler » and spent the whole duration of the 3rd « Reich » in various concentration camps. During this period, living with people who were persecuted by the Nazis on religious, political or racial grounds, Niemöller came to abandon many traditional prejudices.

The insights he gained led to personal convictions which he declared in the public discussions on Church and State after the War. For a Christian, he believed, the command « Thou shalt not kill » is unequivocal. There is no such thing

as the « just War » , especially in the age of nuclear weapons. Every human being is my brother ; and an « anti » mentality, even « anti-Communism » , has no part in Christian thinking.

Resistance, suffering and unity

As it became clearer that National-Socialism and Christianity were irreconcilable, the Confessing Church was ever more ready to see itself as independent of the State. It based its life on the essential foundation of the Bible, dissociated itself as far as possible from government measures and opposed the policies of the State.

These attitudes grew directly out of the Church's own experience of persecution, and indirectly out of the responses to its situation of churches in other countries. It was the Confessing Church to which other churches sought to relate in ecumenical ventures, and to which the English Church (particularly, Bishop George Bell of Chichester) , other European and American Churches offered solidarity and help.

A central figure in the Confessing Church's ecumenical involvement was Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who became a symbol of Christian resistance to the Nazis. Bonhoeffer was born in Breslau, in 1906, the son of a professor of psychiatry. After university, he embarked on his career as a lecturer in theology in Berlin. In 1930-1931, he spent 1 year studying and teaching in New York, then continued his teaching career in Germany. At the same time, he became a student pastor in Berlin and youth secretary of an international Church friendship organization.

In the autumn of 1933, Bonhoeffer went to London as a visiting pastor, and became closely associated with Bishop Bell. In 1935, he returned to Germany and became the director of the « illegal » seminary for ministers set-up by the Confessing Church in Pommerania. Berlin University revoked his teaching permit in 1936 ; in 1937, the seminary was temporarily closed, and, in 1938, Bonhoeffer was expelled from Berlin, his parental home. When the seminary was permanently closed in 1940, Bonhoeffer was forbidden to speak in public, and, the following year, was forbidden to write.

Bonhoeffer, however, continued his academic work ; he kept-up his links with the Confessing Church and also joined the political resistance movement. In 1942, through Bishop Bell, he unsuccessfully attempted to pass information to the British government about the German resistance movement. He was arrested in April 1943 for his involvement in smuggling Jews into Switzerland and was hanged by the Nazis in the last days of the War.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer collected his experiences as a Christian in Nazi Germany and reflected on them in the light of the Christian gospel. His thought and example continue to exert a wide influence in both Christian and secular circles through his writings. His prison letters, written during the last 2 years of his life, are perhaps the best-known of his works. He called for mature, credible Christian faith to be lived-out in an increasingly secular, irreligious world. He struggled with the problem of how the biblical message of liberation and redemption can be announced to a world which has « come of age » . The Church does not live for itself - it is the Church of Jesus-Christ for others. He firmly believed that the good news of Jesus-Christ breaks through denominational and national barriers.

Bonhoeffer himself was a pioneer of the ecumenical movement and experienced it at 1st hand. He deserves much of the credit for the fact that, after 1945, in spite of all that the nations of Europe had suffered at the hands of the Germans, churches in other countries sought fellowship with the German churches and showed a renewed desire to cooperate with them.

The « Jewish Question »

Bonhoeffer was one of the 1st Christians in the Confessing Church to recognize clearly the significance of the « Jewish Question » in Nazi Germany. As early as spring 1933, he pointed-out that the Jews were becoming victims of the State's policies - but his was a lone voice. He saw that the age-old policy of confrontation, which Christians had practised towards the Jews from the Church Fathers through to Martin Luther, and later, had made Christians in Germany passive, blind and indifferent to the fate of the Jews.

Bonhoeffer wanted to awaken the Church to the fact that a monstrous injustice was being done to the Jews, and that the place of Christians was alongside their persecuted Jewish brothers. He challenged Christians to regard the Jews as the « neighbour fallen among thieves » , as in Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan. He saw that the Jewish Bible, the Old Testament, is part of the Christian Bible too ; that Christians and Jews believe in the same God ; that the Bible concept of « the people of God » refers to both. But he could not persuade the Confessing Church to make a public statement on behalf of the Jews. As the Second World War progressed, the growing persecution of the Confessing Church by the Nazi authorities crippled the Church's ability to help others.

Many church agencies engaged in vigorous protest against the so-called « euthanasia measures » by which those considered « unfit to live » were exterminated. In 1939-1940, after the outbreak of War, hundreds of thousands of mentally ill, old, mentally and physically handicapped people were murdered by the Nazis. On this issue, the Church spoke-out clearly. But, on the « Jewish Question » , only a few shared Bonhoeffer's insights and opinions. Only a few were able to put behind them the institutionalized anti-Semitism of the Christian Church. Only a few spoke-up for the Jews who were deprived of their rights, humiliated, stripped of human dignity, driven-out of Germany and eventually killed in their millions in the holocaust of the gas chambers.

Among these few was Bishop Wurm of Württemberg. He wrote to the government and Party officials at the highest-level to protest against the extermination of Jews, Poles and Russians. Against the racist ideas of National-Socialism, he held-up the vision of a community of faith in which the command « Thou shalt not kill » would be absolute. Against the Nazi policies of « Total War » and genocide he held-up the will of God that not one of his children should perish. So, a prophetic witness, a « call to conversion » , rang-out even in these dark days of Nazi Germany.

...

The population of Germany in 1933 was around 60 million. Almost all Germans were Christian, belonging either to the Roman Catholic (around 20 million members) or the Protestant (around 40 million members) churches. The Jewish community in Germany, in 1933, was less than 1 % of the total population of the country.

How did Christians and their churches in Germany respond to the Nazi regime and its laws, particularly to the persecution of the Jews ? The racialized anti-Jewish Nazi ideology converged with anti-Semitism that was historically wide-spread throughout Europe at the time and had deep roots in Christian history. For all too many Christians, traditional interpretations of religious scriptures seemed to support these prejudices.

The attitudes and actions of German Catholics and Protestants during the Nazi era were shaped not only by their religious beliefs, but by other factors as well, including :

Back-lash against the Weimar Republic and the political, economic, and social changes in Germany that occurred during the 1920's.

Anti-Communism

Nationalism.

Resentment toward the international community in the wake of World War I, which Germany lost and for which it was forced to pay heavy reparations.

These were some of the reasons why most Christians in Germany welcomed the rise of Nazism in 1933. They were also persuaded by the statement on « positive Christianity » in Article 24 of the 1920 Nazi Party Platform, which read :

« We demand the freedom of all religious confessions in the State, insofar as they do not jeopardize the State's existence or conflict with the manners and moral sentiments of the Germanic race. The Party, as such, upholds the point of view of a positive Christianity without tying itself confessionally to any one confession. It combats the Jewish-materialistic spirit, at home and abroad, and is convinced that a permanent recovery of our people can only be achieved from within on the basis of the common good before individual good. »

Despite the open anti-Semitism of this statement and its linkage between confessional « freedom » and a nationalistic, racialized understanding of morality, many Christians in Germany, at the time, read this as an affirmation of Christian values.

Protestant Churches in Nazi Germany

The largest Protestant Church in Germany in the 1930's was the German Evangelical Church, comprised of 28 regional churches (« Landeskirchen ») that included the 3 major theological traditions that had emerged from the Reformation : Lutheran, Reformed, and United. Most of Germany's 40 million Protestants were members of this Church, although there were smaller so-called « free » Protestant Churches, such as Methodist and Baptist Churches.

Historically, the German Evangelical Church viewed itself as one of the pillars of German culture and society, with a

theologically grounded tradition of loyalty to the State. During the 1920's, a movement emerged within the German Evangelical Church called the « Deutsche Christen » (« German Christians ») . The « German Christians » embraced many of the nationalistic and racial aspects of Nazi ideology. Once the Nazis came to power, this group sought the creation of a national « “ Reich ” Church » and supported a « nazified » version of Christianity.

The « Bekennende Kirche » (Confessing Church) emerged in opposition to the « German Christians » . Its founding document, the Barmen Confession of Faith, declared that the Church's allegiance was to God and scripture, not a worldly « Führer » . Both the Confessing Church and the « German Christians » remained part of the German Evangelical Church, and the result was a « Kirchenkampf » (« Church Struggle ») within German Protestantism - an on-going debate and struggle for control between those who sought a « nazified » Church, those who opposed it, and the so-called « neutral » Church leaders whose priority was the avoidance both of Church schism and any kind of conflict with the Nazi State.

The most famous members of the Confessing Church were the theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer, executed for his role in the conspiracy to overthrow the regime, and Pastor Martin Niemöller, who spent 7 years in concentration camps for his criticisms of Adolf Hitler. Yet, these clergymen were not typical of the Confessing Church ; despite their examples, the Protestant « Kirchenkampf » was mostly an internal Church matter, not a fight against National-Socialism. Even in the Confessing Church, most Church leaders were primarily concerned with blocking State and ideological interference in Church affairs. Yet, there were certainly members of the clergy and laity who opposed and resisted the regime, including some who aided and hid Jews.

The Roman Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

The Catholic Church was not as sharply divided by different ideological factions as the Protestant Church, and it never underwent an internal « Kirchenkampf » between these different factions. Catholic leaders were initially more suspicious of National-Socialism than their Protestant counter-parts. Nationalism was not as deeply embedded in the German Catholic Church, and the rabid anti-Catholicism of figures such as Alfred Rosenberg, a leading Nazi ideologue during the Nazi rise to power, raised early concerns among Catholic leaders in Germany and at the Vatican. In addition, the Catholic Centre (« Zentrum ») Party had been a key-coalition governmental partner in the Weimar Republic during the 1920's and was aligned with both the Social-Democrats and Leftist German Democratic Party, pitting it politically against Right-wing Parties like the Nazis.

Before 1933, in fact, some Bishops prohibited Catholics in their dioceses from joining the Nazi Party. This ban was dropped after Hitler's March 23, 1933, speech to the « Reichstag » in which he described Christianity as the « foundation » for German values. The Centre Party was dissolved as part of the signing of a 1933 Concordat between the Vatican and Nazi governmental representatives, and several of its leaders were murdered in the Ernst Röhm purge (the « Night of the Long Knives ») in June-July of 1934.

Summary

In both German Churches, there were members, including clergy and leading theologians, who openly supported the Nazi regime. With time, anti-Nazi sentiment grew in both Protestant and Catholic Church circles, as the Nazi regime exerted greater pressure on them. In turn, the Nazi regime saw a potential for dissent in Church criticism of State measures. When a protest statement was read from the pulpits of Confessing Churches in March 1935, for example, Nazi authorities reacted forcefully by briefly arresting over 700 pastors. After the 1937 Papal Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » (With burning concern) was read from Catholic pulpits, the « Gestapo » confiscated copies from diocesan offices throughout the country.

The general tactic by the leadership of both Protestant and Catholic Churches in Germany was caution with respect to protest and compromise with the Nazi State leadership where possible. There was criticism within both Churches of Nazi racialized ideology and notions of « Aryanism », and movements emerged in both Churches to defend Church members who were considered « non-Aryan » under Nazi racial laws (meaning Jews who had converted) . Yet, throughout this period, there was virtually no public opposition to anti-Semitism or any readiness by Church leaders to publicly oppose the regime on the issues of anti-Semitism and State-sanctioned violence against the Jews. There were individual Catholics and Protestants who spoke-out on behalf of Jews, and small groups within both Churches that became involved in rescue and resistance activities (for example, the « White Rose » and Herman Maas) .

After 1945, the silence of the Church leadership and the wide-spread complicity of « ordinary Christians » compelled leaders of both Churches to address issues of guilt and complicity during the Holocaust - a process that continues internationally to this day.

Religions sous le 3e « Reich »

In 1933, prior to the annexation of Austria into Germany, the population of Germany was approximately 67 % Protestant and 33 % Catholic ; Jews made-up less than 1 % of the population. A census in May 1939, 6 years into the Nazi era and incorporating the annexation of mostly Catholic Austria into Germany, indicates that 54 % considered themselves Protestant, 40 % Catholic, 3.5 % self-identified as « gottgläubig » (« believers in god ») , often described as predominately creationist and deistic) , and 1.5 % as non-religious.

There was some diversity of personal views among the Nazi leadership as to the future of religion in Germany. Anti-Church radicals included Adolf Hitler's Personal Secretary Martin Bormann ; Minister for Propaganda Josef Goebbels ; Neo-Pagan Nazi Philosopher Alfred Rosenberg ; and Neo-Pagan Occultist « Reichsführer-SS » Heinrich Himmler. Some Nazis, such as Hans Kerrl, who served as Hitler's Minister for Church Affairs, believed Christianity could be Nazified into « Positive Christianity » , by renouncing its Jewish origins, the Old Testament and Apostle's Creed, and holding Hitler as a new « Messiah » .

Nazism wanted to transform the subjective consciousness of the German people (their attitudes, values and mentalities) into a single-minded, obedient « national community » . The Nazis believed they would, therefore, have to replace class, religious and regional allegiances. Under the « Gleichschaltung » process, Hitler attempted to create a unified Protestant « Reich » Church from Germany's 28 existing Protestant Churches. The plan failed, and was resisted by the

Confessing Church. Persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany followed the Nazi take-over. Hitler moved quickly to eliminate Political Catholicism. Amid harassment of the Church, the « Reich » Concordat treaty with the Vatican was signed in 1933, and promised to respect Church autonomy. Hitler routinely disregarded the Concordat, closing all Catholic institutions whose functions were not strictly religious. Clergy, nuns, and lay leaders were targeted, with thousands of arrests over the ensuing years. The Church accused the regime of « fundamental hostility to Christ and his Church » . Smaller religious minorities such as the Jehovah's Witnesses and Bahá'í Faith were banned in Germany, while the eradication of Judaism by the genocide of its adherents was attempted. The Salvation Army, Christian Saints and Seventh Day Adventist Church all disappeared from Germany, while astrologers, healers and fortune tellers were banned. The small pagan « German Faith Movement » , which worshipped the sun and seasons, supported the Nazis. Many historians believed that Hitler and the Nazis intended to eradicate Christianity in Germany after winning victory in the War.

Christianity has ancient roots among Germanic peoples dating to the missionary work of Columbanus and Saint-Boniface in the 6th to 8th Centuries. The Reformation, initiated by Martin Luther in 1517, divided German Christians between a majority of Protestants and a minority of Roman Catholics. The south and west remained mainly Catholic, while north and east became mainly Protestant. The Catholic Church enjoyed a degree of privilege in the Bavarian region, the Rhineland and Westphalia as well as parts in south-west Germany, while in the Protestant North, Catholics suffered some discrimination.

Chancellor Otto von Bismarck's « Kulturkampf » (Battle for Culture) of 1871-1878 had seen an attempt to assert a Protestant vision of German nationalism over Germany, and fused anti-Clericalism and suspicion of the Catholic population, whose loyalty was presumed to lie with Austria and France, rather than the new German Empire. The Centre (« Zentrum ») Party had formed in 1870, initially to represent the religious interests of Catholics and Protestants, but was transformed by the « Kulturkampf » into the « political voice of Catholics » . Bismarck's « Culture Struggle » failed in its attempt to eliminate Catholic institutions in Germany, or their strong connections outside of Germany, particularly various international missions and Rome.

Christianity in Germany has, since the Protestant Reformation, been divided into Catholicism and Protestantism. As a specific outcome of the Reformation in Germany, the large Protestant denominations are organized into « Landeskirchen » (Provincial Churches) . The German word for denomination is « Konfession » . For the large churches in Germany (Catholic ; « Evangelisch » , meaning Protestant) the German government collects the Church tax, which is then given to the Churches. For this reason, membership in the Catholic or Protestant (« Evangelische ») Church is officially registered. It is apparent they were politically motivated.

For this reason, Historian Richard Steigmann-Gall argues that :

« Nominal Church membership is a very unreliable gauge of actual piety in this context. » , and determining someone's actual religious convictions should be based on other criteria.

It is important to keep this « official aspect » in mind when turning to such questions as the religious beliefs of

Adolf Hitler or Josef Goebbels. Both men had ceased to attend Catholic mass or to go to Confession long before 1933, but neither had officially left the Church and neither of them refused to pay his Church taxes.

Historians have taken a look at the numbers of people who left their church in Germany during the 1933-1945 period. The option to be taken-off the Church rolls (« Kirchenaustritt ») has existed in Germany since 1873, when Otto von Bismarck had introduced it as part of the « Kulturkampf » aimed against Catholicism. For parity, this was made possible for Protestants too, and, for the next 40 years, it was mostly they who took advantage of it. Statistics exist since 1884 for the Protestant Churches, and since 1917 for the Catholic Church.

An analysis of this data for the time of the Nazis' rule is available in a paper by Sven Granzow and al. , published in a collection edited by Götz Aly. Altogether, more Protestants than Catholics left their church, however, overall Protestants and Catholics decided similarly. The spike in the numbers from 1937-1938 is the result of the Annexation of Austria in 1938, and other territories. The number of « Kirchenaustritte » reached its « historical high » in 1939 when it peaked at 480,000. Granzow and al. see the numbers not only in relation to the Nazi policy towards the churches (which changed drastically from 1935 onwards) but also as indicator of the trust in the « Führer » and the Nazi leadership. The decline in the number of people who left the Church after 1942 is explained as resulting from a loss of confidence in the future of Nazi Germany. People tended to keep their ties to the Church, because they feared an uncertain future.

The historian Richard J Evans wrote that, by 1939, 95 % of Germans still called themselves Protestant or Catholic, while 3.5 % identified as « gottgläubig » (« believers in god » : a non-denominational nazified outlook on god beliefs, often described as predominately based on creationist and deistic views) and 1.5 % atheist. According to Evans, those members of the affiliation « gottgläubig » « were convinced Nazis who had left their Church at the behest of the Party, which had been trying since the mid-1930's to reduce the influence of Christianity in society » . Heinrich Himmler, who himself was fascinated with Germanic paganism, was a strong promoter of the « gottgläubig » movement and didn't allow atheists into the SS, arguing that their « refusal to acknowledge higher powers » would be a « potential source of indiscipline » . The majority of the 3 million Nazi Party members continued to pay their Church taxes and register as either Roman Catholic or Evangelical Protestant Christians. According to the BBC, the Salvation Army, Christian Saints and Seventh Day Adventist Church all disappeared from Germany during the Nazi era.

« Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers-SS » (SD members) withdrew from their Christian denominations, changing their religious affiliation to « gottgläubig » , while nearly 70 % of the officers of the « Schutzstaffel » SS did the same.

Nazi ideology could not accept an autonomous establishment whose legitimacy did not spring from the government. It desired the subordination of the Church to the State. Although the broader membership of the Nazi Party after 1933 came to include many Catholics and Protestants, aggressive anti-Church radicals like Josef Goebbels, Martin Bormann and Heinrich Himmler saw the « Kirchenkampf » campaign against the Churches as a priority concern, and anti-Church and anti-Clerical sentiments were strong among grass-roots Party activists.

The Nazi propaganda minister, Josef Goebbels, among the most aggressive anti-Church Nazis, wrote that :

« There was an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view. »

The « Führer » angered the churches by appointing Alfred Rosenberg, an outspoken pagan, as official Nazi ideologist in 1934. Heinrich Himmler, saw the main-task of his « Schutzstaffel SS » organisation to be that of acting as the vanguard in overcoming Christianity and restoring a « Germanic » way of living.

Hitler's chosen Deputy, Martin Bormann, advised Nazi officials in 1941 that :

« National-Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable. »

Hitler himself possessed radical instincts in relation to the conflict with the Churches in Germany. Though he occasionally spoke of wanting to delay the « Church Struggle » and was prepared to restrain his anti-Clericalism out of political considerations, according to Kershaw, his « own inflammatory comments gave his immediate underlings all the license they needed to turn-up the heat in the “ Church Struggle ”, confident that they were “ working towards the ' Führer ' ” » . In public speeches, he did not portray himself and the Nazi movement to the German people as outspoken proponents of atheism, but rather as faithful Christians.

In 1928, Hitler said in a speech :

« We tolerate no one in our ranks who attacks the ideas of Christianity. In fact, our movement is Christian. »

As a measure in the struggle for power against the influence of the churches (« Kirchenkampf ») , the Nazis tried to establish a « 3rd denomination » called « Positive Christianity » , aiming to replace the established churches to reduce their influence. Historians have suspected this was an attempt to start a cult worshipping Hitler as the new « Messiah » .

However, in a diary entry of 28 December 1939, Josef Gœbbels wrote that :

« The “ Führer ” passionately rejects any thought of founding a religion. He has no intention of becoming a priest. His sole exclusive role is that of a politician. »

In Hitler's political relations dealing with religion he readily adopted a strategy « that suited his immediate political purposes » .

Christianity remained the dominant religion in Germany through the Nazi period, and its influence over Germans displeased the Nazi hierarchy. Evans wrote that Hitler believed that in the long run National-Socialism and religion would not be able to co-exist, and stressed repeatedly that Nazism was a secular ideology, founded on modern science .

He declared :

« Science would easily destroy the last remaining vestiges of superstition. »

Germany could not tolerate the intervention of foreign influences such as the Pope. He said :

« Priests were “ black bugs ”, “ abortions in black cassocks ”. »

During Hitler's dictatorship, more than 6,000 clergymen, on the charge of treasonable activity, were imprisoned or executed. The same measures were taken in the occupied territories ; in French Lorraine, the Nazis forbade religious youth movements, parish meetings, and scout meetings. Church assets were taken, Church schools were closed, and teachers in religious institutes were dismissed. The episcopal seminary was closed, and the SA and SS desecrated churches, religious statues and pictures. 300 clergy were expelled from the Lorraine region, monks and nuns were deported or forced to renounce their vows.

Hanns Kerrl was a relative moderate, as « Reichsminister » of Church Affairs. He described Hitler as :

« The herald of a new revelation. »

And said that :

« Nazi-backed “ Positive Christianity ” was not dependent on the Apostle's Creed or belief in Christ as the son of God. »

The Nazi leadership made use of indigenous Germanic pagan imagery and ancient Roman symbolism in their propaganda. However, the use of pagan symbolism worried some Protestants. Many Nazi leaders, including Adolf Hitler, subscribed either to a mixture of pseudo-scientific theories, particularly Social-Darwinism, or to mysticism and occultism, which was especially strong in the SS. Central to both groupings was the belief in Germanic (white Nordic) racial superiority. The existence of a Ministry of Church Affairs, instituted in 1935 and headed by Hanns Kerrl, was hardly recognized by ideologists such as Alfred Rosenberg or by other political decision-makers. A relative moderate, Kerrl accused dissident church-men of failing to appreciate the Nazi doctrine of « Race, Blood and Soil » and gave the following explanation of the Nazi conception of « Positive Christianity », telling a group of submissive clergy in 1937 :

« Doctor Wilhelm Zöllner and the Catholic Bishop of Münster, Count Galen, have tried to make clear to me that Christianity consists in faith in Christ as the son of God. That makes me laugh. No, Christianity is not dependent upon the Apostle's Creed. True Christianity is represented by the Party, and the German people are now called by the Party, and especially the “ Führer ”, to a real Christianity : the “ Führer ” is the herald of a new revelation. »

(Hans Kerrl, Nazi Minister for Church Affairs, 1937.)

During the War, Alfred Rosenberg formulated a 30 Point Program for the National « Reich » Church, which included :

The National « Reich » Church claims exclusive right and control over all Churches.

The National « Reich » Church is determined to exterminate foreign Christian faiths imported into Germany in the ill-omened year 800.

The National « Reich » Church demands immediate cessation of the publishing and dissemination of the Bible.

The National « Reich » Church will clear away from its altars all Crucifixes, Bibles and pictures of Saints.

On the altars, there must be nothing but « Mein Kampf » and, to the left of the altar, a sword.

When exploring the Nazi Party's public speeches and writings, Steigmann-Gall notes that they can provide insight into their « untempered » ideas :

« We are no theologians, no representatives of the teaching profession in this sense, put forth no theology. But we claim one thing for ourselves : that we place the great fundamental idea of Christianity in the center of our ideology (“ Ideenwelt ”) - the hero and sufferer Christ himself stands in the center. »

(Hans Schemm, Nazi « Gauleiter » .)

Prior to the « Reichstag » vote for the Enabling Act under which Hitler gained the « temporary » dictatorial powers with which he went on to permanently dismantle the Weimar Republic, Hitler promised the « Reichstag » , on 23 March 1933, that he would not interfere with the rights of the Churches. However, with power secured in Germany, Hitler quickly broke this promise. Various historians have written that the goal of the Nazi « Kirchenkampf » (« Church Struggle ») entailed not only ideological struggle, but ultimately the eradication of the Churches. However, leading Nazis varied in the importance they attached to the « Church Struggle » .

William Shirer wrote that :

« Under the leadership of Rosenberg, Bormann and Himmler, who were backed by Hitler, the Nazi regime intended to destroy Christianity in Germany, if it could, and substitute the old paganism of the early tribal Germanic gods and the new paganism of the Nazi extremists. »

But, according to Steigman-Gall, some Nazis, like Dietrich Eckart (died in 1923) and Walter Buch, saw Nazism and Christianity as part of the same movement. Aggressive anti-Church radicals like Josef Goebbels and Martin Bormann saw the conflict with the Churches as a priority concern, and anti-Church and anti-Clerical sentiments were strong among grass-roots Party activists.

Hitler himself possessed radical instincts in relation to the continuing conflict with the Catholic and Protestant Churches in Germany. Though he occasionally spoke of wanting to delay the « Church Struggle » and was prepared to restrain his anti-Clericalism out of political considerations, his « own inflammatory comments gave his immediate underlings all the license they needed to turn-up the heat in the “ Church Struggle ”, confident that they were “ working towards the ' Führer ' ” » . According to the « Gœbbels Diaries » , Hitler hated Christianity.

In an 8 April 1941 entry, Gœbbels wrote :

« He hates Christianity, because it has crippled all that is noble in humanity. »

In Bullock's assessment, though raised a Catholic, Hitler « believed neither in God nor in conscience » , retained some regard for the organisational power of Catholicism, but had contempt for its central teachings, which he said, if taken to their conclusion, « would mean the systematic cultivation of the human failure » .

Bullock wrote :

« In Hitler's eyes, Christianity was a religion fit only for slaves; he detested its ethics in particular. Its teaching, he declared, was a rebellion against the natural law of selection by struggle and the survival of the fittest.

(Extract from « Hitler : A Study in Tyranny » , by Alan Bullock.)

Writing for Yad Vashem, the historian Michæl Phayer wrote that by the latter-1930's, Church officials knew that the long-term aim of Hitler was the « total elimination of Catholicism and of the Christian religion » , but that given the prominence of Christianity in Germany, this was necessarily a long-term goal. According to Bullock, Hitler intended to destroy the influence of the Christian churches in Germany after the War. In his memoirs, Hitler's chief-architect Albert Speer recalled that when drafting his plans for the « new Berlin » , he consulted Protestant and Catholic authorities, but was « curtly informed » by Hitler's private secretary Martin Bormann that Churches were not to receive building sites. Kershaw wrote that, in Hitler's scheme for the Germanization of Eastern Europe, he made clear that there would be « no place in this utopia for the Christian Churches » .

Geoffrey Blainey wrote that Hitler and his Fascist ally Benito Mussolini were atheists, but that Hitler courted and benefited from fear among « German Christians » of militant Communist atheism. (Other historians have characterized Hitler's mature religious position as a form of deism.)

Blainey wrote :

« The aggressive spread of atheism in the Soviet Union alarmed many “ German Christians ”. »

With the National-Socialists becoming the main-opponent of Communism in Germany :

« Hitler himself saw Christianity as a temporary ally, for in his opinion “ one is either a Christian or a German ”. To be both was impossible. Nazism itself was a religion, a pagan religion, and Hitler was its high-priest. Its high-altar was Germany itself and the German people, their soil and forests and language and traditions. »

According to Kershaw, following the Nazi take-over, Race policy and the « Church Struggle » were among the most important ideological spheres :

« In both areas, the Party had no difficulty in mobilizing its activists, whose radicalism in turn forced the government into legislative action. In fact, the Party leadership often found itself compelled to respond to pressures from below, stirred-up by the “ Gauleiter ” playing their own game, or emanating sometimes from radical activists at a local level. »

As time went on, anti-Clericalism and anti-Church sentiment among grass-roots Party activists « simply couldn't be eradicated », wrote Kershaw, and they could « draw on the verbal violence of Party leaders towards the Churches for their encouragement. Unlike some other Fascist movements of the era, Nazi ideology was essentially hostile to Christianity and clashed with Christian beliefs in many respects. Nazism saw the Christian ideals of meekness and conscience as obstacles to the violent instincts required to defeat other races. From the mid-1930's, anti-Christian elements within the Nazi Party became more prominent ; however, they were restrained by Hitler because of the negative press their actions were receiving, and, by 1934, the Nazi Party pretended a neutral position in regard to the Protestant Churches.

The official Nazi philosopher Alfred Rosenberg, a proponent of « Positive Christianity » , planned the « extermination of the foreign Christian faiths imported into Germany » , and for the Bible and Christian cross to be replaced with « Mein Kampf » and the swastika.

Alfred Rosenberg, an « outspoken pagan » , held among offices the title of « the “ Führer's ” Delegate for the Entire Intellectual and Philosophical Education and Instruction for the National-Socialist Party » . In his « Myth of the 20th Century » (1930) , Rosenberg wrote that the main-enemies of the Germans were the « Russian Tartars » and « Semites » - with « Semites » including Christians, especially the Catholic Church : Josef Gœbbels, the Nazi Minister for Propaganda, was among the most aggressive anti-Church Nazi radicals.

Gœbbels led the Nazi persecution of the German clergy and, as the War progressed, he wrote on the « Church Question » :

« After the War, it has to be generally solved. There is, namely, an insoluble opposition between the Christian and a heroic-German world-view. »

Martin Bormann became Hitler's private secretary and, « de facto » , Deputy « Führer » from 1941. He was a leading advocate of the « Kirchenkampf » , a project which Hitler for the most part wished to keep until after the War.

Bormann was a rigid guardian of National-Socialist orthodoxy and saw Christianity and Nazism as « incompatible » .

In a confidential message to the « Gauleiter » , on 9 June 1941, Martin Bormann, had declared :

« National-Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable. »

He also declared that the Churches' influence in the leadership of the people « must absolutely and finally be broken » . Bormann believed Nazism was based on a « scientific » world-view, and was completely incompatible with Christianity.

Bormann stated :

« When we National-Socialists speak of belief in God, we do not mean, like the naive Christians and their spiritual exploiters, a man-like being sitting around somewhere in the universe. The force governed by natural law by which all these countless planets move in the universe, we call omnipotence or God. The assertion that this universal force can trouble itself about the destiny of each individual being, every smallest earthly bacillus, can be influenced by so-called prayers or other surprising things, depends upon a requisite dose of naivety or else upon shameless professional self-interest. »

As the Nazi Party began its take-over of power in Germany in 1933, the struggling, but still nominally functioning Weimar government, led by its President, Paul von Hindenburg, and represented by his appointed Vice-Chancellor, Franz von Papen, initiated talks with the Holy-See concerning the establishment of a concordat. The talks lasted 3 and half months while Hitler consolidated his hold on power. This attempt achieved the signing of the « Reichskonkordat » , on 20 July 1933, which protected the freedom of the Catholic Church and restricted priests and Bishops from political activity.

Like the idea of the « Reichskonkordat » , the notion of a Protestant « Reich » Church, which would unify the Protestant Churches, also had been considered previously. Hitler had discussed the matter as early as 1927 with Ludwig Müller, who was at that time the military chaplain of Königsberg.

The Catholic Church was particularly suppressed in Poland : between 1939 and 1945, an estimated 3,000 members (18 %) of the Polish clergy, were murdered ; of these, 1,992 died in concentration camps. In the annexed territory of Reichsgau Wartheland, it was even more harsh : churches were systematically closed and most priests were either killed, imprisoned, or deported to the General Government. 80 % of the Catholic clergy and 5 Bishops of Warthegau were sent to concentration camps in 1939 ; 108 of them are regarded as blessed martyrs. Religious persecution was not confined to Poland : in Dachau concentration camp alone, 2,600 Catholic priests from 24 different countries were killed.

A number of historians maintain that the Nazis had a general covert plan, which some argue existed before the Nazis' rose to power, to destroy Christianity within the « Reich » . To what extent a plan to subordinate the Churches and

limit their role in the country's life existed before the Nazi rise to power, and exactly who among the Nazi leadership supported such a move remains contested. However, a minority of historians maintain, against consensus, no such plan existed. Summarizing a 1945 Office of Strategic Services report, « The New York Times » columnist Joe Sharkey stated that the Nazis had a plan to « subvert and destroy German Christianity », which was to be accomplished through control and subversion of the Churches and to be completed after the War. However, the report stated this goal was limited to a « sector of the National-Socialist Party », namely Alfred Rosenberg and Baldur von Schirach.

Historian Roger Griffin maintains :

« There is no doubt that, in the long run, Nazi leaders such as Hitler and Himmler intended to eradicate Christianity just as ruthlessly as any other rival ideology, even if in the short term they had to be content to make compromises with it. »

In his study « The Holy “ Reich ” », the historian Richard Steigmann-Gall comes to the opposite conclusion :

« Totally absent, besides Hitler's vague ranting, is any firm evidence that Hitler or the Nazis were going to “ destroy ” or “ eliminate ” the Churches once the War was over. »

Regarding his wider thesis that, « leading Nazis in fact considered themselves Christian » or at least understood their movement « within a Christian frame of reference », Steigmann-Gall admits he « argues against the consensus that Nazism, as a whole, was either unrelated to Christianity or actively opposed to it » .

Although there are high-profile cases of individual Lutherans and Catholics who died in prison or in concentration camps, the largest number of Christians who died would have been Jewish Christians or « Mischlinge » who were sent to death camps for their race rather than their religion. In 1999, Kahane cites an estimate that there were approximately 200,000 Christians of Jewish descent in Nazi Germany. Among the Gentile Christians, 11,300 Jehovah's Witnesses were placed in camps, and about 1,490 died, of whom 270 were executed as conscientious objectors. Dachau had a special « priest block » . Of the 2,720 priests (among them, 2,579 Catholic) held in Dachau, 1,034 did not survive the camp. The majority of these priests were Polish (1,780) , of whom 868 died in Dachau.

During the First and Second World War, German Protestant leaders used the writings of Martin Luther to support the cause of German nationalism. At the 450th anniversary of Luther's birth, which took place only a few months after the Nazi Party began its seizure of power in 1933, there were celebrations conducted on a large scale both by the Protestant Churches and the Nazi Party. At a celebration at Königsberg, Erich Koch, at that time « Gauleiter » of East Prussia, made a speech which, among other things, compared Adolf Hitler and Martin Luther and claimed that the Nazis fought with Luther's spirit.

Such a speech might be dismissed as mere propaganda, but, as Steigmann-Gall points-out :

« Contemporaries regarded Koch as a “ bona fide ” Christian who had attained his position of the elected president of

a provincial Church synod through a genuine commitment to Protestantism and its institutions. »

Even so, Steigmann-Gail states that the Nazis were not a Christian movement.

The prominent Protestant theologian Karl Barth, of the Swiss Reformed, opposed this appropriation of Luther in the German Empire and Nazi Germany, when he stated in 1939 that the writings of Martin Luther were used by the Nazis to glorify the State and state absolutism :

« The German people suffer under his error of the relation between Law and Bible, between secular and spiritual power » , in which Luther divided the temporal State from the inward focusing spiritual, thus, limiting the ability of the individual or the Church to question the actions of the State, which was seen as a God ordained instrument.

In February 1940, Barth accused German Lutherans specifically of separating Biblical teachings from its teachings of the State and, thus, legitimizing the Nazi State ideology. He was not alone with his view. A few years earlier, on 5 October 1933, Pastor Wilhelm Rehm from Reutlingen declared publicly that « Hitler would not have been possible without Martin Luther » , though many have also made this same statement about other influences in Hitler's rise to power.

Anti-Communist historian Paul Johnson has said :

« Without Lenin, Hitler would not have been possible. »

Different German States possessed regional social variations as to class densities and religious denomination. Richard Steigmann-Gall alleges a linkage between several Protestant Churches and Nazism. The « German Christians » (« Deutsche Christen ») were a movement within the Protestant Church of Germany with the aim of changing traditional Christian teachings to align with the ideology of National-Socialism and its anti-Jewish policies. The « Deutsche Christen » factions were united in the goal of establishing a National-Socialist Protestantism and abolishing what they considered to be Jewish traditions in Christianity, and some but not all rejected the Old Testament and the teaching of the Apostle Paul. In November 1933, A Protestant mass rally of the « Deutsche Christen » , which brought together a record 20,000 people, passed 3 resolutions :

Adolf Hitler is the completion of the Reformation.

Baptized Jews are to be dismissed from the Church.

The Old Testament is to be excluded from Sacred Scriptures.

The « German Christians » selected Ludwig Müller (1883-1945) as their candidate for « Reich » Bishop in 1933. In response to Hitler's campaigning, 2/3 of those Protestants who voted elected Ludwig Müller, a neo-Pagan candidate, to govern the Protestant Churches. Müller was convinced that he had a divine responsibility to promote Hitler and his

ideals, and, together with Hitler, he favoured a unified « Reichskirche » of Protestants and Catholics. This « Reichskirche » was to be a loose federation in the form of a council, but subordinated to the National-Socialist State.

The level of ties between Nazism and the Protestant Churches has been a contentious issue for decades. One difficulty is that Protestantism includes a number of religious bodies many of whom had little relation to each other. Added to that, Protestantism tends to allow more variation among individual congregations than Catholicism or Eastern Orthodox Christianity, which makes statements about « official positions » of denominations problematic. The « German Christians » were a minority within the Protestant population, numbering 1/3 to 1/4 of the 40 million Protestants in Germany. With Bishop Müller's efforts and Hitler's support « The German Evangelical Church » was formed and recognized by the State as a legal entity on 14 July 1933, with the aim of melting State, People and Church into one single body. Dissenters were silenced by expulsion or violence.

The support of the « German Christian » movement within the churches was opposed by many adherents of traditional Christian teachings. Other groups within the Protestant Church included members of the Confessing Church, prominent members of the « Bekennende Kirche » (« Confessing Church »), included Martin Niemöller and Dietrich Bonhoeffer; both rejected the Nazi efforts to meld « völkisch » principles with traditional Lutheran doctrine. Martin Niemöller organized the Pastors' Emergency League which was supported by nearly 40 % of the Evangelical pastors. They were, however (as of 1932), in the minority within the Protestant Church bodies in Germany. But, in 1933, a number of « Deutsche Christen » left the movement after a November speech by Reinhold Krause that urged, among other things, the rejection of the Old Testament as Jewish superstition. So, when Ludwig Müller could not deliver on conforming all Christians to National-Socialism, and after some of the « German Christian » rallies and more radical ideas generated a back-lash, Hitler's condescending attitudes toward Protestants increased and he lost all interest in Protestant church affairs.

The resistance within the Churches to Nazi ideology was the longest lasting and most bitter of any German institution. The Nazis weakened the Churches' resistance from within but the Nazis had not yet succeeded in taking full-control of the Churches, evidenced by the thousands of clergy sent to concentration camps. Reverend Martin Niemöller was imprisoned in 1937, charged with « misuse of the pulpit to vilify the State and the Party and attack the authority of the Government ». After a failed assassination on Hitler's life, in 1943, by members of the military and members of the German Resistance movement, of which Dietrich Bonhoeffer and others in the « Confessing Church » movement belonged to, Hitler ordered the arrest of Protestant, mainly Lutheran clergy. However, even the « “ Confessing Church ” made frequent declarations of loyalty to Hitler ». But later, many Protestants were solidly opposed to Nazism after the nature of the movement was better understood but a number also maintained until the end of the War that Nazism was compatible with the Church.

The small Methodist population at times was deemed foreign; this stemmed from the fact that Methodism began in England, while it did not develop in Germany until the 19th Century with Christoph Gottlob Müller and Louis Jacoby. Because of this history, they felt the urge to be « more German than the Germans » to avoid suspicion. Methodist Bishop John L. Nelsen toured the U.S. on Hitler's behalf to protect his Church, but in private letters indicated that he feared and hated Nazism, and so, retired by flying to Switzerland. Methodist Bishop F. H. Otto Melle took a far more

collaborationist position that included apparently sincere support for Nazism. He was also committed to an asylum near the War's end. To show his gratitude to the latter Bishop, Hitler made a gift of 10,000 « Reichsmarks » in 1939 to a Methodist congregation to purchase an organ. The money was never used. Outside of Germany, Melle's views were overwhelmingly rejected by most Methodists. The leader of pro-Nazi segment of Baptists was Paul Schmidt. The idea of a « national church » was possible in the history of main-stream German Protestantism, but National Churches devoted primarily to the State were generally forbidden among the Anabaptists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and the Catholic Church. The forms or off-shoots of Protestantism that advocated pacifism, anti-nationalism, or racial equality tended to oppose the Nazi State in the strongest terms. Prominent Protestant, or Protestant off-shoot, groups known for their efforts against Nazism include the Jehovah's Witnesses.

« The neutrality of this section is disputed. Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. Please do not remove this message until conditions to do so are met. (June 2014) (Learn how and when to remove this template message) Main article: Persecution of Jehovah's Witnesses in Nazi Germany

The nature of the Nazi Party's relations with the Catholic Church was also complicated. As Hitler rose to power, many Catholic Bishops, priests, religious and lay leaders vociferously opposed Nazism on the grounds of its incompatibility with Christian morals. In early 1931, the German Bishops issued an edict excommunicating all leaders of the Nazi Party and banned Catholics from membership. The ban was conditionally modified in 1933 when State law mandated all Trade-Union workers and Civil Servants must be members of the Nazi Party. In July 1933, a « Reichskonkordat » was signed with the Vatican which prevented political activity by the Church in Germany ; however, the Vatican continued to speak-out on issues of faith and morals opposing Nazi philosophy. In 1937, Pope Pius XI issued the Encyclical « Mit brennender Sorge » condemning Nazi ideology, notably the « Gleichschaltung » policy directed against religious influence upon education, as well as Nazi racism and anti-Semitism. His death prevented the issuing of a planned Encyclical « Humani generis unitas » , but the similar « Summi Pontificatus » was the 1st Encyclical released by his successor (Pius XII) , in October 1939. This Encyclical strongly condemned both racism and totalitarianism, without the anti-Judaism present in the draft presented to Pope Pius XI for « Humani generis unitas » . The massive Catholic opposition to the euthanasia programs led them to be quieted on 28 August 1941 (according to Spielvogel, on pages 257-258) . Catholics, on occasion, actively and openly protested Nazi anti-Semitism through several Bishops and priests such as Bishop Clemens von Galen of Münster. In Nazi Germany, political dissenters were imprisoned, and some German priests were sent to the concentration camps for their opposition, including the pastor of Berlin's Catholic Cathedral Bernhard Lichtenberg and the seminarian Karl Leisner.

Criticism arose that the Vatican headed by Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII had remained circumspect about the national-scale race hatred before 1937 (« Mit brennender Sorge ») . In 1937, just before the publishing of the anti-Nazi Encyclical, Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli in Lourdes (France) condemned discrimination against Jews and the neo-Paganism of the Nazi regime. A statement by Pius XI, on 8 September 1938, spoke of the « inadmissibility » of anti-Semitism, but Pius XII is criticized by people like John Cornwell for being unspecific.

In 1941 the Nazi authorities decreed the dissolution of all monasteries and abbeys in the German « Reich » , many of them effectively being occupied and secularized by the « Allgemeine SS » under Heinrich Himmler. However, on 30

July 1941, the « Aktion Klostersturm » (Operation Monastery) was put to an end by a decree of Hitler, who feared the increasing protests by the Catholic part of German population might result in passive rebellions and, thereby, harm the Nazi War effort at the eastern front.

Historian Heinz Hürten (professor « emeritus » at the Catholic University of Eichstätt) noted that the Nazi Party had plans for the Roman Catholic Church, according to which the Church was supposed to « eat from the hands of the government » . The sequence of these plans, he states, follow this sequence : an abolition of the priestly celibacy and a nationalisation of all Church property, the dissolution of monastic religious institutes, and an end to the influence of the Catholic Church upon education. Hütten states that Hitler proposed to reduce vocations to the priesthood by forbidding seminaries from receiving applicants before their 25th birthdays, and, thus, had hoped that these men would marry beforehand, during the time (18-25 years) in which they were obliged to work in military or labour service. Also, along with this process, the Church's sacraments would be revised and changed to so-called « Lebensfeiern » , the non-Christian celebrations of different periods of life.

There existed some considerable differences among officials within the Nazi Party on the question of Christianity. Josef Goebbels is purported to have feared the creation of a 3rd front of Catholics against their regime in Germany itself. In his diary, Goebbels wrote about the « traitors of the Black International who again stabbed our glorious government in the back by their criticism » , by which Hütten states meant the indirectly or actively resisting Catholic clergymen « who wore black cassocks » .

Hitler called a truce in the Church conflict with the outbreak of War, wanting to back-away from policies likely to cause internal friction in Germany. He decreed at the outset of War that « no further action should be taken against the Evangelical and Catholic Churches for the duration of the War » .

According to John Conway :

« The Nazis had to reckon with the fact that, despite all Rosenberg's efforts, only 5 % of the population registered themselves at the 1930 census as no longer connected with Christian Churches. »

The support of millions of « German Christians » was needed in order for Hitler's plans to come to fruition. It was Hitler's belief that if religion is a help, « it can only be an advantage » . Most of the 3 million Nazi Party members « still paid the Church taxes » and considered themselves Christians. Regardless, a number of Nazi radicals in the hierarchy determined that the « Church Struggle » should be continued. Following victory in Poland, the repression of the Churches was extended, despite their early protestations of loyalty to the cause.

Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda issued threats and applied intense pressure on the Churches to voice support for the War, and the « Gestapo » banned Church meetings for a few weeks. In the 1st few months of the War, the German Churches complied. No denunciations of the invasion of Poland, nor the « Blitzkrieg » were issued. On the contrary, Bishop Marahrens gave thanks to God that the Polish conflict was over, and « that He has granted our armies a quick victory » . The Ministry for Church Affairs suggested Church bells across Germany ring for a week in celebration, and

pastors and priests « flocked to volunteer as chaplains » for the German forces.

The Catholic Bishops asked their followers to support the War effort :

« We appeal to the faithful to join in ardent prayer that God's providence may lead this War to blessed success for Fatherland and people. »

Likewise, the Evangelicals proclaimed :

« We unite in this hour with our people in intercession for our “ Führer ” and “ Reich ”, for all the armed forces, and for all who do their duty for the fatherland. »

Even in the face of evidence of Nazi atrocities against Catholic priests and lay people in Poland, which were broadcast on Vatican Radio, German Catholic religious leaders continued their support of the Nazi War effort. They urged their Catholic followers to « fulfill their duty to the “ Führer ” ». Nazi War actions, in 1940 and 1941, similarly prompted the Church to voice its support. The Bishops declared that the Church « assents to the just War, especially one designed for the safe-guarding to the State and the People » and wanted a « peace beneficial to Germany and Europe » and called the faithful to « fulfill their civil and military virtues ». But the Nazis strongly disapproved of the sentiments against War expressed by the Pope through his 1st Encyclical, « Summi Pontificatus » and his 1939 Christmas message, and were angry at his support for Poland and the « provocative » use of Vatican Radio by Cardinal Hlond of Poland. Distribution of the Encyclical was banned.

Conway wrote that anti-Church radical Reinhard Heydrich estimated in a report to Hitler of October 1939, that the majority of Church people were supporting the War effort - though a few « well-known agitators among the pastors needed to be dealt with ». Heydrich determined that support from Church leaders could not be expected because of the nature of their doctrines and internationalism, so, he devised measures to restrict the operation of the Churches under cover of War-time exigencies, such as reducing resources available to Church presses on the basis of rationing, and prohibiting pilgrimages and large church gatherings on the basis of transportation difficulties. Churches were closed for being « too far from bomb shelters ». Bells were melted-down. Presses were closed.

With the expansion of the War in the East from 1941, there came also an expansion of the regime's attack on the Churches. Monasteries and convents were targeted and expropriation of Church properties surged. The Nazi authorities claimed that the properties were needed for War-time necessities such as hospitals, or accommodation for refugees or children, but, in fact, used them for their own purposes. « Hostility to the State » was another common-cause give for the confiscations, and the action of a single member of a monastery could result in seizure of the whole. The Jesuits were especially targeted. The Papal Nuncio Cesare Orsenigo and Cardinal Bertram complained constantly to the authorities but were told to expect more requisitions owing to War-time needs.

Rather than focusing on religious differentiation, Hitler maintained it was important to promote « an anti-Semitism of reason », one that acknowledged the racial basis of Jewry. Interviews with Nazis by other historians show that the

Nazis thought that their views were rooted in biology, not historical prejudices.

For example :

« S. became a missionary for this bio-medical vision. As for anti-Semitic attitudes and actions, he insisted that “ the racial question and resentment of the Jewish race had nothing to do with medieval anti-Semitism.” That is, it was all a matter of scientific biology and of community. »

In his history of Christianity, Geoffrey Blainey wrote :

« Christianity could not escape some indirect blame for the terrible Holocaust. The Jews and Christians had been rivals and sometimes enemies for a long period of history. Furthermore, it was traditional for Christians to blame Jewish leaders for the crucifixion of Christ. »

But Blainey noted :

« At the same time, Christians showed devotion and respect. They were conscious of their debt to the Jews. Jesus and all the disciples and all the authors of his Gospels were of the Jewish race. Christians viewed the Old Testament, the Holy Book of the synagogues as equally a Holy Book for them. »

Laurence Rees noted that « emphasis on Christianity » was absent from the vision expressed by Hitler in « Mein Kampf » and his « bleak and violent vision » and visceral hatred of the Jews had been influenced by quite different sources : the notion of life as struggle he drew from Social Darwinism, the notion of the superiority of the « Aryan race » he drew from Arthur de Gobineau's « The Inequality of the Human Races » ; and, from Alfred Rosenberg, he took the idea of a link between Judaism and Bolshevism. Hitler espoused a ruthless policy of « negative eugenic selection » , believing that world history consisted of a struggle for survival between races, in which the Jews plotted to undermine the Germans, and inferior groups like Slavs and defective individuals in the German gene pool, threatened the Aryan « Master race » . Richard J. Evans wrote that his views on these subjects have often been called « Social Darwinist » , but that there is little agreement among historians as to what the term may mean.

According to Evans :

« Hitler used his own version of the language of Social Darwinism as a central element in the discursive practice of extermination. »

The language of Social Darwinism, in its Nazi variant, helped to remove all restraint from the directors of the « terroristic and exterminatory » policies of the regime, by « persuading them that what they were doing was justified by history, science and nature » .

In the « Appendix of The Nazi Persecution of the Churches » , Conway has included a document : « List of sects

prohibited by the “ Gestapo ” up to December 1938 » . It mentions the « International Jehovah's Witness » under No. 1, but also includes a so-called « Study group for Psychic Research » and even the « Bahai Sect » .

Astrologers, healers and fortune-tellers were banned under the Nazis, while the small pagan « German Faith Movement » , which worshipped the sun and seasons, supported the Nazis.

On 13 October 1933, Deputy « Führer » Rudolf Heß issued a decree stating :

« No National-Socialist may suffer any detriment on the ground that he does not profess any particular faith or confession, or on the ground that he does not make any religious profession at all. »

However, the regime strongly opposed « godless Communism » and all of Germany's free-thinking (« freigeist ») , atheist, and largely Left-wing organizations were banned the same year.

In a speech made during the negotiations for the Nazi-Vatican Concordant of 1933, Hitler argued against secular schools, stating :

« Secular schools can never be tolerated because such schools have no religious instruction, and a general moral instruction without a religious foundation is built on air ; consequently, all character training and religion must be derived from faith. »

One of the groups closed-down by the Nazi regime was the German Free-thinkers League. Christians appealed to Hitler to end anti-religious and anti-Church propaganda promulgated by Free-Thinkers, and within Hitler's Nazi Party, some atheists were quite vocal in their anti-Christian views, especially Martin Bormann. Heinrich Himmler, who himself was fascinated with Germanic paganism, was a strong promoter of the « gottgläubig » movement and didn't allow atheists into the SS, arguing that their « refusal to acknowledge higher-powers » would be a « potential source of indiscipline » .

In the 1930's, there already existed an esoteric scene in Germany and Austria. The organisations of this spectrum were suppressed, but, unlike Free-Masonry in Nazi Germany, not persecuted. The only secure case in which an occultist might have been sent to a concentration camp for his beliefs is that of Friedrich Bernhard Marby.

Also, some Nazi leaders had an interest in esotericism. Rudolf Heß had an interest in Anthroposophy. Heinrich Himmler showed a strong interest in esoteric matters.

The esoteric Thule Society lent support to the German Workers' Party, which was eventually transformed into the Nazi Party in 1920. Dietrich Eckart, a remote associate of the Thule Society, actually coached Hitler on his public speaking skills, and while Hitler has not been shown to have been a member of Thule, he received support from the group. Hitler later-on dedicated the 2nd volume of « Mein Kampf » to Eckart. The racist-occult doctrines of Ariosophy contributed to the atmosphere of the « völkisch » movement in the Weimar Republic that eventually led to rise of

Nazism.

Several elements of Nazism were quasi-religious in nature. The cult around Hitler as the « Führer », the « huge congregations, banners, sacred flames, processions, a style of popular and radical preachings, prayers-and-responses, memorials and funeral marches » have been described by historian of Esotericism, Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, as « essential props for the cult of race and nation, the mission of Aryan Germany and victory over her enemies ». These kinds of religious aspects of Nazism have led some scholars to consider Nazism, like Communism, a kind of political religion.

Hitler's plans, for example, to erect a magnificent new capital at Berlin (« Welthauptstadt Germania »), has been described as attempting to build a version of the New Jerusalem. Since Fritz Stern's Classical study « The Politics of Cultural Despair », most historians have viewed the relation of Nazism and religion in this way. Some historians see the Nazi movement and Adolf Hitler as fundamentally hostile to Christianity, though not irreligious. In the 1st Chapter of « The Nazi Persecution of the Churches », historian John S. Conway elaborates that Christian Churches in Germany had lost their appeal in the time of the Weimar Republic, and that Hitler offered « what appeared to be a vital secular faith in place of the discredited creeds of Christianity ».

Hitler's chief-architect, Albert Speer, wrote in his memoirs that Hitler himself had a negative view toward the mystical notions pushed by Heinrich Himmler and Alfred Rosenberg.

Speer quotes Hitler as having said of Himmler's attempt to mythologize the SS :

« What non-sense ! Here we have at last reached an age that has left all mysticism behind it, and now, Himmler wants to start that all over again. We might just as well have stayed with the Church. At least, it had tradition. To think that I may some day be turned into an SS saint ! Can you imagine it ? I would turn over in my grave. »

(Adolf Hitler quoted in Albert Speer's « Inside the 3rd Reich » .)

Scholar of Fascism, Stanley Payne, notes that fundamental to Fascism was the foundation of a purely materialistic « civic religion » that would « displace preceding structures of belief and relegate super-natural religion to a secondary role, or to none at all », and that « though there were specific examples of religious or would-be “ Christian Fascists ”, Fascism pre-supposed a post-Christian, post-religious, secular, and immanent frame of reference ». One theory is that religion and Fascism could never have a lasting connection because both are a « holistic “ weltanschauung ” » claiming the whole of the person. Along these lines, Yale political scientist Juan Linz and others have noted that secularization had created a void which could be filled by another total ideology, making secular totalitarianism possible, and Roger Griffin has characterized Fascism as a type of anti-religious political religion.

However, Robert Paxton finds that « Fascists often cursed materialist secularism » and adds that the circumstances of past Fascism does not mean that future Fascisms can not « build upon a religion in place of a nation, or as the expression of national identity. Even in Europe, religion-based Fascisms were not unknown : the Falange Española,

Belgian Rexism, the Finnish Lapua Movement, and the Romanian Legion of the Archangel Michael are all good examples » . Separately, Richard L. Rubenstein maintains that the religious dimensions of the Holocaust and Nazi Fascism were decidedly unique.

There has been significant literature on the potential religious aspects of Nazism. Wilfried Daim suggests Hitler and the Nazi leadership planned to replace Christianity in Germany with a new religion in which Hitler would be considered a « Messiah » . In his book on the connection between Lanz von Liebenfels and Hitler, Daim published a reprint of an alleged document of a session on « the unconditional abolishment of all religious commitments (“ Religionsbekenntnisse ”) after the final victory (“ Endsieg ”) with a simultaneous proclamation of Adolf Hitler as the new “ Messiah ” » . This session report came from a private collection.

Thuringian « German Christian » Prayer for Adolf Hitler :

Schütze, Herr, mit starker Hand
unser Volk und Vaterland !
Laß' auf unsres Führers Pfade
leuchten Deine Huld und Gnade !
Weck' in unserem Herz aufs neue
deutscher Ahnen Kraft und Treue !
Und so laß' uns stark und rein
Deine deutschen Kinder sein !

...

Protect, O Lord, with strength of hand,
Our people and our fatherland !
Allow upon our leader's course
To shine your mercy and your grace !
Awaken in our hearts anew
Our German bloodline, loyalty, and strength !
And so allow us, strong and pure,
To be your German youth !

Alban Schachleiter

The Roman Catholic Benedictine monk and musicologist Alban Schachleiter was born on 20 January 1861 in Mainz and died on 20 June 1937 in Feilnbach, Upper-Bavaria. He was closely associated with the Nazis, and with Adolf Hitler personally.

Schachleiter Ist became closely associated with the NSDAP, and with Hitler, in late-1922. Originally from Mainz, he

served as the long-time abbot of the Emmaus monastery in Prague before being forced-out of that position in late-1918 following the establishment of the new Czechoslovak State. After brief stays at several Austrian monasteries, including Saint-Florian near Linz, by early 1920, he was at Munich's Saint-Boniface's Abbey. By September 1922, he was noticed for the radicalism of his anti-Semitic agitation and his involvement with groups like the « völkisch » « Bund Bayern und Reich » . He cultivated connections with members of Munich's Catholic elite, including Karl Alexander von Müller, professor of history at the University of Munich and Helene Raff, whose father was the composer Joachim Raff. With Müller, he discussed politics and Gregorian chant. Through these connections, he first met Hitler in late-1922 ; the pair were observed by both Müller and Ernst Hanfstängl engaging in lively and lengthy conversation. It was the beginning of a relationship that ended only with Schachleiter's death, in 1937. The meeting opened the way for Schachleiter to play an important propagandist role on behalf of the NSDAP in the summer of 1923.

Following the commemorative activities of 10 June 1923, which included a massive rally in honour of Albert Leo Schlageter, staged on Munich's « Königplatz » and attended by 20,000 to 30,000 activists - a Catholic memorial mass was held immediately after the rally in Saint-Boniface Abbey, organized exclusively by the NSDAP which was presided over by Schachleiter. Hanfstängl had sketched-out for Hitler the symbolic impact a related Catholic-Nazi mass for Schlageter would have on Munich's Catholic population - Schachleiter could also consecrate the standards of the SA. Hitler quickly agreed. Schachleiter delivered a eulogistic sermon that was remembered as having a powerful impact - a young and devoutly pious Heinrich Himmler joined the NSDAP in the wake of Schachleiter's eulogy.

1 year later however, Schachleiter was writing to Oswald Spengler lamenting the impact of Erich Ludendorff and his anti-Catholic followers on the movement - following the refounding of the NSDAP in early-1925, the stronghold of the Nazi movement in Bavaria would no longer be Munich but rather the Protestant regions of Mittel- and Oberfranken. Schachleiter increasingly distanced himself from the NSDAP in the mid-1920's, although he maintained an idealized image of Hitler personally.

Schachleiter continued for years to be angry at Ludendorff's anti-Catholic crusade following the « Putsch » of November 1923 - after maintaining his weekly « Schola Gregoriana » at the « Allerheiligen-Hofkirche » in Munich until 1930, he then moved to a newly-built country-house in Bad Feilnbach where he was still living when Hitler came to power in 1933.

In late-spring, Schachleiter wrote to Cardinal Faulhaber :

« It seems to me to be a catastrophe that the Holy Church stands aloof from the new freedom movement, whose triumph I foresaw, and that the massive uprising of the “ volk ”, which is now lifting our poor fatherland out of its misery and shame, may well go down in history as a triumph of Protestantism. »

Faulhaber forbade Schachleiter from performing masses within the archdiocese, and Schachleiter reluctantly refused Hitler's request for him to come to Berlin, on 20 March 1933, to perform a personal mass for the « Führer » . Hitler visited in mid-May to personally congratulate Schachleiter on his 50th anniversary as a Benedictine. His invitation to sit among the Nazi dignitaries at the Nuremberg Party rally, in 1934, which he accepted, (and an enduring image

through Leni Riefenstahl's « Triumph of the Will ») , showed him « on the sidelines as the Nazis' striking, yet, thoroughly secularized, performative æsthetic played-out before him » .

From 1933 to 1936, Schachleiter spent much energy campaigning against what he saw as peripheral Nazi personalities directing the Nazis in an anti-Catholic and anti-Christian direction - and, particularly, the ideology advanced by Alfred Rosenberg. Schachleiter regarded this as a restraint on a renewal of wide-ranging Catholic support for the NSDAP. Schachleiter eventually wrote more than 2 dozen appeals to a variety of Nazi officials, including Hans Lammers, but was ignored. In September 1936, he admitted privately to a friend that, « a believing Christian can no longer participate in the NSDAP ; they do not want believing Christians in the Party » . Publicly, he continued to profess loyalty to the « Führer » and to the church.

Following his death, in June 1937 the Nazis ordered a State funeral arranged by Bavarian minister-president Ludwig Siebert. 1 year later, the editorial leadership of the « Völkischen Beobachter » refused attempts to publish official commemorations. According to historian Derek Hastings, by 1937, Schachleiter's vision of a renewed Catholic-Nazi synthesis had become increasingly marginal.

...

Albanus Schachleiter OSB (auch Alban Schachleiter ; eigentlicher Name Jakob Schachleiter ; geboren 20. Januar 1861 in Mainz ; gestorben 20. Juni 1937 in Feilnbach, Oberbayern) war ein deutscher Abt des Prager Emausklosters. Er war einer der wenigen katholischen Geistlichen, die schon vor Hitlers Machtantritt 1933 Kontakte zur nationalsozialistischen Bewegung unterhielten.

Nach dem Studium der Philosophie, Kunstgeschichte und Musik an der Universität Leipzig trat Schachleiter 1881 in die Benediktiner-Abtei Emaus in Prag ein, die von der Beuronener Kongregation besiedelt war. 1883 legte er die Ordensgelübde ab, 1886 wurde er zum Priester geweiht. Von Anfang an war er ein Förderer des klösterlichen Musiklebens. Auf seine Initiative wurde eine große Orgel gebaut und Konzerte mit namhaften Musikern veranstaltet. Seine wichtigste Aktivität war jedoch der Kampf gegen die antikatholische Los-von-Rom-Bewegung. Deshalb initiierte er die Gründung des Bonifatius-Vereins, mit dem die religiöse Bildung breiter Bevölkerungsschichten gefördert werden sollte. Als Verteidiger des katholischen Glaubens trat er, zusammen mit dem späteren Leitmeritzer Bischof Josef Groß, vor allem gegen Freidenker und Freimaurer auf. 1906 verlieh ihm Papst Pius X. eine silberne Medaille.

Nach dem Tod des Abtes Benedikt Sauter 1908 wurde Alban Schachleiter zu dessen Nachfolger gewählt. Nachfolgend entwickelte sich das Kloster sowohl zu einem geistlichen als auch zu einem politischen Zentrum. Zum Thronfolger Franz Ferdinand d'Este, der ebenfalls scharf gegen die Los-von-Rom-Bewegung auftrat, hatte Schachleiter ein vertrauensvolles Verhältnis. Beide bemühten sich um mehr Einfluß für den Katholizismus und hielten das Deutschtum für ein verbindendes Element Österreichs. Nach Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkriegs 1914 richtete Schachleiter eine Suppen- und Armenküche sowie ein Lazarett in den Klosterräumen ein. Zudem wurden jüngere Ordensangehörige als Sanitätshelfer des Kaiserlich und Königlich Krankenzuges PK 45 eingesetzt, der aus sechzehn Krankenwagen bestand, die zu allen Kriegsschauplätzen führten.

Nach dem Auseinanderbrechen der Kaiserlich und Königlich Monarchie und der Gründung der Tschechoslowakei 1918 mußten die deutschen Beuroner Benediktiner 1919 Prag verlassen. Alban Schachleiter wurde wegen seiner deutschnationalen Gesinnung ausgewiesen. Danach hielt er sich im Stift Sankt Florian in Oberösterreich und in Sankt Bonifaz in München auf, wo er Leiter der Schola Gregoriana für katholische Kirchenmusik wurde. Erst 1924 resignierte er auf das Amt des Abtes des Emmausklosters, erhielt jedoch die Würde eines Titularabts von Spanheim.

Bereits im Jahre 1923 begegnete Schachleiter in der Wohnung des Historikers Karl Alexander von Müller Adolf Hitler. Die Kirchenleitung belegte Schachleiters militant nationalistische Haltung und sein Bekenntnis zum Nationalsozialismus 1926 mit einem Verbot öffentlicher politischer Äußerungen und der Weisung, eine klösterliche Wohnung zu beziehen. Beides ignorierte er. Als er im Völkischen Beobachter vom 1. Februar 1933 schließlich Adolf Hitlers Machtergreifung begrüßte, wurde er im März 1933 suspendiert sowie aus allen diözesanen Ehrenämtern ausgeschlossen. Die NSDAP unterstützte ihn daraufhin mit einer monatlichen Rente ; Hitler selbst besuchte ihn am 13. Mai 1933. Nach Schachleiters scheinbarer Unterwerfung hob der Vatikan die Suspension im September 1933 auf. Dennoch war er 1934 und 1935 Ehrengast bei den Nürnberger NSDAP-Parteitag - trotz römischer Proteste gegen seine politische Stellungnahme. Zu seinem 75. Geburtstag 1936 erhielt er vom Führer ein Glückwunschtelegramm, und die Universität München verlieh ihm die Ehrendoktorwürde für « Choralpflege und Deutschtum » .

Schachleiter starb am 20. Juni 1937 in Feilnbach. Er wurde am Waldfriedhof in München mit einem Staatsakt beigesetzt, an dem Hitlers Stellvertreter Rudolf Heß teilnahm. Auf dem Sarg lag eine Nazi-Flagge mit dem Hakenkreuz. Die Anwesenden wurden zum Nazigruß gezwungen. Obwohl acht Benediktineräbte anwesend waren, wurden keine Reden gehalten. Sein Nachfolger Arnošt Vykoukal ließ im Prager Emauskloster ein Requiem zelebrieren. Das Grab auf dem Münchner Waldfriedhof wurde nach einer Kontroverse 1987 eingeebnet.

« Klostersturm » : Dissolution des monastères par les Nazis

Heinrich Himmler et la religion

Pour Heinrich Himmler, les membres de la SS doivent être des croyants : pour lui, comme il le déclare en 1943, il croit en l'existence d'une force infinie au-dessus de l'humanité, force à laquelle il donne le nom de « Waralda » , désignant l'Ancien dans la mythologie germanique, qu'il souhaite honorer. Cependant, les croyances que doivent avoir ses subordonnés restent vagues, centrées autour du culte des ancêtres, garant de la fécondité du peuple.

Fasciné par le panthéon germanique et viking, sous l'influence de Karl Wiligut dans ce domaine (ce dernier se montrait partisan de la mise en place d'une religion germanique destinée à se substituer au christianisme) , il s'intéresse cependant aux représentations d'Odin et de certains de ses attributs, comme les éclairs, qu'il analyse comme la preuve matérielle d'une maîtrise importante de l'électricité et d'une technologie militaire avancée : pour étayer cette croyance, il ordonne des recherches dans les représentations germaniques à sa disposition.

Mais il sait se montrer pragmatique au gré des circonstances. Ainsi, lors de la création d'une unité SS composée de

soldats musulmans, non seulement il accepte la présence d'un imam, mais il salue en l'Islam une « religion sympathique et pratique pour les soldats », car elle promet le paradis aux soldats qui se sont vaillamment comportés.

Pour les populations soumises au joug du « Reich », il a aussi des idées sur les religions dont il considère qu'il faut encourager le développement : en juillet 1944, dans une lettre à Ernst Kaltenbrunner, il ordonne inutilement du fait de la perte des territoires sur lesquels ces mesures étaient censées s'appliquer) à ce dernier de développer l'enseignement du Bouddhisme chez les peuples turcs et la religiosité des témoins de Jéhovah chez les peuples slaves. Cependant, à l'égard de ces derniers, Himmler développe des sentiments ambivalents : il les fait pourchasser, déporter, mais ne peut s'empêcher de les admirer : en effet, pour ce dernier, ils ont des convictions pacifistes très ancrées, qui s'incarnent dans une farouche volonté de résistance aux idéaux nazis et aux mesures que le « Reich » a pris à leur encontre, volonté de résistance, certes taxée de fanatisme, mais qu'il aimerait bien voir étendue au peuple allemand.

Bien qu'issu d'une famille catholique, Himmler devient, au fil de sa conversion au National-Socialisme, un adversaire acharné du christianisme. Peter Longerich, dans sa biographie du chef des SS, décrit en détail les multiples raisons de cette haine que Himmler théorisa dans de nombreux discours et écrits. D'un point de vue personnel, Himmler rejette avec violence la morale sexuelle de l'Église catholique dans laquelle il perçoit l'origine de plusieurs de ses incapacités, notamment son développement sexuel tardif et ses difficultés matrimoniales. Il l'accuse également d'engendrer des tentations homosexuelles auxquelles il aurait été lui-même soumis dans sa jeunesse.

À ses yeux, le christianisme est paré de nombreux inconvénients pour la race aryenne : tout d'abord, il a été prêché par un Juif. Ensuite, il est issu du monde méditerranéen, sorte de magma racial antique, opposé à la pureté nordique. Par tous ces défauts, le christianisme n'est pas compatible avec l'héritage germanique qu'il entend magnifier.

Ainsi, à partir du milieu des années 1930, il analyse le 3e « Reich » comme un moment de confrontation ultime entre le christianisme et la germanité. Dans cette optique, il définit les modalités de cette confrontation : la SS est appelée à y jouer un rôle prépondérant, et, fidèle à lui-même, il organise les étapes de cette lutte, qui doit être menée par 2 générations : tout d'abord, il ordonne la publication d'une collection d'une cinquantaine de volumes, qui rassemblerait les sources du « patrimoine germanique », puis il serait nécessaire de rechercher les formes spécifiquement germaniques du Moyen-âge ; au terme de cette lutte, les habitants du « Reich » disposeraient de vertus de substitution aux vertus chrétiennes.

Une autre raison pour Himmler d'éradiquer le christianisme est son projet racial aryen et de défense de la germanité. Aux yeux de Himmler, la race germanique a été pervertie par sa conversion au christianisme : ainsi, il voue Boniface, le missionnaire chrétien, aux gémonies, et reproche à Charlemagne, Charles le Franc dans ses discours, d'avoir massacré les Saxons païens. Le combat mortel contre les « sous-hommes » (Juifs et Slaves) nécessite de libérer les Allemands des principes chrétiens comme la charité ou l'amour du prochain pour mieux faire émerger les « vertus » germaniques.

Germanisation et déchristianisation appartiennent, pour Himmler, au même processus.

Selon Peter Longerich, ce combat antichrétien est la « mission de sa vie » et la « vocation première » de la SS :

« L'anticommunisme et l'antisémitisme d'Himmler ne font aucun doute, et il extermina sans pitié ces 2 groupes d'opposants. Mais fondamentalement, il s'intéressait beaucoup plus au christianisme. »

Himmler vilipendait l'action néfaste de Charlemagne et de Saint-Boniface qu'il rendait responsables de la christianisation des Germains. Il espérait remplacer les références chrétiennes de la société allemande par des références au culte païen ancestral qui seul pouvait régénérer le monde allemand. Par exemple, il souhaite débaptiser Noël en fête du solstice d'hiver ou de « luz » , et faire du solstice d'été une fête de l'accouplement. Dans la SS, le baptême des enfants est déjà remplacé par une simple bénédiction du nom.

Selon Albert Speer, Adolf Hitler, tout autant hostile au christianisme qu'Himmler, était par contre peu favorable à la recréation d'un culte païen et se félicitait de vivre à une époque de libération de toute mystique ; Hitler regrettait la conversion des Germains au christianisme et préférait l'Islam, religion qu'il percevait comme fanatique et guerrière, mais il voulait attendre la fin de la Guerre pour régler leurs comptes aux églises chrétiennes, ce qui le conduisit à refréner certaines ardeurs antichrétiennes et mystiques du chef des SS.

Pour contrebalancer le christianisme au sein de la SS, Himmler entend proposer un mode de vie germanique et païen à la SS. Ainsi, il est influencé par Karl Maria Wiligut, dont il assure la promotion dans la SS, et avec lequel il conserve des rapports malgré la disgrâce de ce dernier, en 1939.

Il propose aux membres de la SS un rituel de substitution au christianisme, rituel rythmé par des fêtes païennes, autant d'occasions de distribuer des cadeaux à forte charge symbolique : la fête solsticiale constitue la plus importante des fêtes à célébrer dans la SS. Ainsi, la fête de Noël est remplacée par la célébration du solstice d'hiver, occasion non seulement de compétitions intellectuelles, mais aussi de commémoration des ancêtres et du passé germanique. Durant cette fête, le « Reichsführer » donne aux participants des chandeliers de « luz » , chandelier à 3 branches - symbole de renouveau lié au début de l'année. Le rituel de cette fête est très précisément défini et doit inculquer au participant l'idée qu'il ne peut rien s'il ne s'insère pas dans la « chaîne sans fin de sa race » . À partir de 1937, il ordonne aux SS de se faire accompagner de leur épouse ou de leur fiancée, les jeunes couples se voyant offrir de la part du « Reichsführer SS » un chandelier de « luz » .

Mais le solstice d'été constitue la grande fête de la SS, qu'il suit avec ferveur, exigeant des rapports sur leur déroulement dans l'ensemble du « Reich » à partir de 1938. Défendant l'idée que, dans certaines tribus germaniques, les enfants ne sont conçus que durant cette fête, il fait de cette fête une fête de l'accouplement. Non seulement, il se fait un devoir d'assister chaque année aux fêtes solsticiales (sauf à celles de 1937, les obsèques de Ludendorff se tenant à la même date) , mais il intervient régulièrement dans l'organisation du rituel qui doit se tenir durant cette fête, qui doit aussi prendre la forme de compétitions sportives.

Il met aussi en place des cérémonies de passage sur le modèle des cérémonies chrétiennes : le baptême devient la « bénédiction du nom » , dont nous avons une idée précise du déroulement grâce à des textes. Dans une salle de

bénédiction, devant un autel recouvert d'un drapeau à croix gammée, la cérémonie est organisée autour de la personne de Hitler, présent par un portait et par la lecture psalmodiée d'extraits choisis de « Mein Kampf » et est présidée par un « consécrateur ». L'enfant se voit doté d'un parrain : quand le parrain est Himmler, il offre un gobelet en argent, une cuillère, et à partir de 1936, un « ruban de vie de soie bleue » .

Il souhaite aussi intervenir dans l'organisation d'un culte des morts spécifique à la SS. Dans un 1er temps, il intervient dans le protocole qui doit présider aux funérailles des membres de la SS ; citant l'exemple des funérailles de son père, il souhaite alors simplement une cérémonie distincte de la Messe des morts chrétienne. De même, en 1936, il demande à ses services de lui soumettre des modèles de cercueils, et définit les végétaux qui doivent être déposés sur le cercueil, l'été comme l'hiver.

Pour toutes ces cérémonies, il tente de remplacer les chants chrétiens : il ordonne à la SS de commander à de jeunes auteurs allemands de nouveaux chants pour les fêtes de la SS, du Parti et de l'ensemble des organisations nazies.

De même, il souhaite matérialiser la camaraderie liant entre eux les plus anciens membres de la SS : ainsi, il distribue des anneaux à tête de mort aux SS les plus anciens dans l'organisation, et oblige ces derniers, souvent responsables au sein de la SS, à le porter constamment. Aux officiers généraux de la SS, il octroie à vie une épée d'apparat, qui doit retourner à la SS à la mort du porteur, ou lorsqu'elle lui est retirée.

Cependant, s'il propose pour la SS un modèle à base religieuse, il demeure farouchement opposé à la mise en place d'une hiérarchie de prêtres ; pour tenter d'éviter ce qu'il voit comme une dérive, il souhaite confier les responsabilités des cérémonies aux commandants de la SS, souvent les « Gruppenführer », au sein de leur domaine de compétence. De plus, à partir de 1936, il souhaite que ces cérémonies prennent le caractère d'une fête privée, qui doit se tenir au domicile du soldat concerné, à la fois pour éviter un retentissement dans la presse, mais aussi pour éviter les commentaires ironiques de Hitler et de certains de ses proches.

Admont

1939-1945 : L'Abbaye d'Admont est expropriée par le régime national-socialiste.

Le monastère bénédictin d'Admont fut, dès sa fondation, un centre intellectuel important : au XIVe siècle, sa bibliothèque comptait autant de manuscrits que celle des papes, un siècle plus tard. L'incendie qui détruisit le couvent en 1865 épargna miraculeusement ce trésor ; le Nazisme faillit lui être fatal. L'abbaye avait été totalement expropriée en novembre 1939 au profit de l'État allemand ; les richesses de la bibliothèque furent transférées à Graz, capitale de la Styrie, et, en 1941, les SS emportèrent plus de 3,000 volumes de médecine et de botanique destinés à la « station allemande d'essais alimentaires » du camp de concentration de Dachau. Diabolique inversion des travaux et des efforts des religieux ! À la fin de la Guerre, les salles mêmes de la bibliothèque servirent d'infirmerie militaire et ne souffrirent pas peu de cette nouvelle affectation. Tout est heureusement rentré dans l'ordre aujourd'hui. La bibliothèque compte environ 130,000 volumes, 1,400 manuscrits et 600 incunables.

Lambach

Les autorités nationales-socialistes expulsent les moines de l'Abbaye de Lambach en 1941 pour y installer une NAPOLA (internat du Parti) . Les moines reviennent après la Guerre.

Stams

En 1939, l'an après l' « Anschluß » , les Nazis ferment l'Abbaye de Stams, qui ne rouvre qu'en 1945.

Wilhering

En 1940, les Nazis prennent possession de l'Abbaye de Wilhering. L'abbé Bernhard Burgstaller meurt en prison l'année suivante. Les moines reviennent après la Guerre.

...

The Nazis saw themselves as a replacement of Catholicism that would coopt its cohesion and respect for hierarchy. In 1941, the Nazi authorities began to dissolve all monasteries and abbeys through occupation and secularization by the « Allgemeine SS » . In 1941, this « Aktion Klostersturm » (Operation « Storm the Monasteries ») was stopped because Adolf Hitler feared the increasing protests by the Catholic part of the German population. If these were to result in passive rebellions, the Nazi War effort at the eastern front would be harmed.

...

The Nazi Party had plans for the Roman Catholic Church, according to which the Church was supposed to « eat from the hands of the government » . The sequence of these plans follow this sequence : an abolition of the priestly celibacy and a nationalisation of all church property, the dissolution of monastic religious institutes, and an end to the influence of the Catholic Church upon education.

Nazi authorities decreed the dissolution of all monasteries and abbeys, many of them effectively being occupied and secularized by the « Allgemeine SS » under Heinrich Himmler. However, on 30 July 1941, the « Aktion Klostersturm » (Operation Monastery) was ended by a decree of Hitler, who feared the increasing protests by the Catholic population might result in passive rebellions, harming the Nazi War effort at the Eastern front.

Admont

The economic crises of the 1930's forced the Admont Abbey (a Benedictine monastery) to sell-off many of its art treasures, and, during the period of the National-Socialist government, the monastery was dissolved and the monks evicted. They were able to return in 1946.

Altenburg

During the Second World War, the building of the Altenburg monastery was seized by the Nazis and, later, by the Soviet troops. In 1942, the Skat Fountain was melted down by the Nazis for War use.

Klosterneuburg

The « Anschluß » of 1938 brought devastation to the Klosterneuburg community. In 1941, the Nazis suppressed the canonry and confiscated the buildings and properties. Only a few canons were permitted to remain and continue ministering to the faithful. Some canons went-out into the parishes, others were drafted into the army, and many lost their lives because of their involvement in the resistance movement. Immediately after the War, some canons were murdered for standing-up against the Russian soldiers who preyed on Austrian women and girls. Provost Alipius Linda, elected in 1937, guided the community wisely through both the Nazi period and the subsequent Communist occupation.

During the post-War period, Provost Gebhard Koberger presided over the rebuilding of the abbey's financial condition, as well as the reconstruction of several of the monastery's churches which had been damaged or destroyed by the bombing.

...

The advent of National-Socialism in Austria was devastating for the Klosterneuburg monastery. The Nazis suppressed the canonry in 1941 and confiscated the buildings and properties. This process had already begun with the « Anschluß » . Only a few canons were permitted to remain in the house and continue ministering to the faithful of the city. Many went out into the « Stift's » parishes, while some were drafted into the army. One member of the community, Roman Scholz, was hanged in 1944 for being involved in the resistance movement. Moreover, the pastor of Tattendorf, one of the most remote of the « Stift's » parishes south of Vienna, was murdered by the Russians in 1945. Alois Kremar was killed because he stood-up against the Russian soldiers desired to prey on Austrian women and girls, a terrifying and frequent enough occurrence after the War.

It was Provost Alipius Linda, elected in 1937, who guided the community wisely through both the Nazi period as well as the subsequent Communist occupation. After his death followed the « interregnum » of the interdict, which was largely resolved through the ministrations of Canon Gebhard Koberger, who was elected Linda's successor in 1954.

Provost Gebhard presided over the rebuilding of the abbey's economic situation in the post-War period, as well as the reconstruction of several rectories and churches belonging to the « Stift » which had been damaged or destroyed by the bombing.

Kremsmünster

The Kremsmünster Abbey played a role in the end of World War II, as it was here that on May 8th, 1945, the exiled Slovak government capitulated to General Walton Walker leading the XX Corps of the 3rd U.S. Army.

Lambach

Lambach escaped the dissolution of the monasteries of Emperor Joseph II in the 1780's. It was however dissolved by the National-Socialists in 1941, in the « Operation Klostersturm » , and the premises were used for the accommodation of a Nazi school and training institution.

Maria Laach

The Maria Laach Abbey has been at the center of a controversy over its relations with the Nazi regime between 1933 and 1945. In particular Heinrich Böll, depicting in « Billiards at Half-past Nine » , a Benedictine monastery whose monks actively and voluntarily collaborated with the Nazis, is generally considered to have had Maria Laach in mind.

In 2004, researcher Marcel Albert published « Die Benediktinerabtei Maria Laach und der Nationalsozialismus » (The Maria Laach Benedictine Abbey and National-Socialism) .

In reviewing the book, Doctor Mark Edward Ruff of Saint-Louis University wrote :

« The Benedictine abbey, Maria Laach, poses a number of interpretative challenges for historians writing on Roman Catholicism during the 3rd “ Reich ”. This influential monastery in the Eifel became known as a center for Right-wing Catholicism already during the Weimar Republic. Its leaders enthusiastically greeted the Nazi seizure of power in 1933.

It was the only Benedictine monastery in the Rhineland not to be confiscated by the Nazi regime, even if part of the facility was converted into a hospital for wounded soldiers. Yet, at the same time, it provided a sanctuary for Konrad Adenauer in 1934, who had been unceremoniously removed from his position as mayor of Cologne. In addition, its leaders became the target of numerous “ Gestapo ” interrogations, even as rumors spread that the monastery was to be appropriated by the State. »

Marcel Albert's book relies heavily on the unpublished memoirs of Ildefons Herwegen, a conservative monarchist who served as abbot of Maria Laach until his death, in 1946. At times self-serving, these memoirs provide the narrative thread for this book.

Albert quotes extensively from these, all the while commenting on the accuracy and reliability of Herwegen's account. He also makes extensive use of the archival holdings of the monastery itself, supplementing these with official State and police reports.

Maria Laach became a focal-point in the Weimar Republic for those Right-wing Catholics disillusioned by the collapse of the Hohenzollern monarchy and outraged at the Catholic Centre Party's coalitions with the Social-Democrats (SPD) .

The monks, politicians, businessmen, theologians and students who gathered there were strongly influenced by the idea of a coming « Reich », hoping to build a 3rd Holy Roman Empire.

Such prominent conservatives as Emil Ritter, Carl Schmitt (later to gain notoriety as the « Crown Jurist of the 3rd “ Reich ” ») and Charles Edward, Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, renegade member of the British aristocracy, all participated in events sponsored by the monastery. The Benedictines here attracted members of the Catholic aristocracy, those who were more receptive to the Right-wing nationalist movements of the time.

Not surprisingly, both Herwegen and many others at Maria Laach embraced Adolf Hitler's regime and even chided other Catholics for failing to work with the new State.

Herwegen avowed :

« Blood, soil and fate are the appropriate expressions for the fundamental powers of the time. The rise of the 3rd “ Reich ” was part of the workings and designs of God. Hitler's promise to build Germany on a Christian foundation on March 21st, 1933, led several monks to hang a picture of Hitler in the abbey and to unfurl the black-white-red flag of the bygone “ Kaiserreich ”. »

As late as 1939, one of the members of the abbey, an artist who had converted to Catholicism, P. Theodor Bogler, published a « Briefe an einen jungen Soldaten » (Letters to a young soldier) in which he let loose a virulently anti-Jewish polemic.

This openness to National-Socialism by many at Maria Laach did not go un-noticed by the Nazi press.

Robert Ley's « Westdeutsche Beobachter » reported that :

« One knows that the spiritual-religious educational work of the Benedictines of Maria-Laach, for years, has increasingly viewed itself responsible for all of the duties to renew the national conscience. »

Yet, the Nazis did not always reciprocate the embrace of the monks. Instead, the « Gestapo » began to interrogate the monks, arresting one monk on charges of homosexuality. The printing of Alfred Rosenberg's « Myth of the 20th Century » (advocating Positive Christianity, which was actually based on pantheistic pagan nature worship and Teutonic Gods) , as well as the political demotion of Franz von Papen, forced Herwegen, already in 1934, to temper his hopes of exerting a Christian influence on the new State.

Although the monastery was not closed-down, as were all other Benedictine abbeys in the area, its members had become a regular target of State attacks. Albert makes it clear, however, that it was only the Nazi persecution of the churches, and not the attacks on the Jews or Nazi military aggression, that forced Herwegen to see the regime in a new light.

Similarly, Herwegen housed Adenauer for almost a year in his abbey not necessarily because he agreed with the Center Party politician's « Weltanschauung », but because Adenauer was a childhood friend from his days at school.

In its closing chapters, the book shows that the abbey cultivated a positive relationship to Adenauer and the CDU after 1945, but retained its monarchist beliefs. However, the post-War parts of the book are less extensive, and this part of the monastery's history seems to await further research.

Melk

The Melk abbey survived a threat during the Napoleonic Wars when Napoleon made Melk his headquarters in his campaign against Austria and probably used the abbey for a look-out. It survived the period following the Nazi « Anschluß », in 1938, when the school and a large part of the abbey were confiscated by the State.

Sankt Lambrecht

After the Austrian « Anschluß » of 1938, the Benedictine abbey of Sankt Lambrecht was seized by the National-Socialist authorities. From 1942 to 1945, it was used as an external storage facility, housing 2 sub-camps of the infamous Mauthausen-Gusen concentration camp : one for male inmates and one for females. The monks were able to return in 1946.

Wilhering

In 1940, Wilhering Abbey was expropriated by the Nazis, and the monks were expelled ; some were arrested and sent to concentration camps, while others were forced into military service. The abbot, Doctor Bernhard Burgstaller, was imprisoned and died of starvation in 1941. The buildings were used at Ist to accommodate the seminary from Linz, and, then, from 1944, for displaced Germans from Bessarabia and as a military hospital. In 1945, American troops took over the premises. The monks returned in the same year to resume monastic life and to re-open the school.

...

Admont

Die Weltwirtschaftskrise 1930 zwang das Stift zum Verkauf von Kunstschätzen, darunter die berühmte Admonter Madonna (entstanden um 1310) . Während der NS-Zeit wurde das Kloster aufgehoben und der Besitz beschlagnahmt. Nach Kriegsende kehrte der Konvent zurück.

Göttweig

1939 wurde das Stift zugunsten der kreisfreien Stadt Krems enteignet und der Konvent nach kurzer Inhaftierung in Unternalb konfiniert. Das Stiftsgebäude diente nun als Umsiedlungslager, Kriegsgefangenenlager und von 1943 bis 1945

als Nationalpolitische Erziehungsanstalt, bevor es zu Kriegsende verwüstet und Kaserne der sowjetischen Besatzungstruppen wurde. Nach der Rückkehr des Konvents im August 1945 und dem Tod von Abt Hartmann Strohsacker (1930-1946) drohte dem Kloster die Aufhebung, weil es mangels Eintritt und nach den zahlreichen Todesfällen in und nach den Kriegsjahren als nicht mehr lebensfähig angesehen wurde.

Kremsmünster

« Das Stift wurde durch eine Verfügung der Gestapo vom 3. April 1941 beschlagnahmt. Am Freitag, den 4. April 1941, wurde dem Abt die Verfügung mitgeteilt, daß er vom Gau Oberdonau verwiesen und das Stift beschlagnahmt sei. In der Haustradition der Mönchsgemeinschaft benannte man diesen Tag (Anmerkung : der Tag wird nicht am 4. April begangen, sondern ist immer der Freitag vor dem Palmsonntag) daher als den schmerzhaften Freitag. »

Aus : Rudolf Hundstorfer. Das Stift unterm Hakenkreuz. Sonderabdruck aus dem 104. Jahresbericht des Öffentl. Gymnasiums der Benediktiner zu Kremsmünster (1961) ; Seite 40f.

Abt Oddo berichtet in der äußerst interessanten Publikation « Kremsmünster um 1945 » :

« Ich war daheim, meine Mutter war geschockt, das sehe ich heute noch : “ Sie haben das Stift aufgehoben ! ” Nachdem die Nazis gekommen sind, kamen alle Mitglieder des Konvents weg ; außer die in der Seelsorge. Auch die Mönche haben von den Lebensmittelkarten gelebt ; alles war enteignet. Die Michälskapelle war ein Weinkeller, dann hat man darin einen Altar gebaut und den Raum zu einer Kapelle gemacht. Das Kloster hat diesen Raum schnell zur Kirche dazugenommen. Hier fanden Messen für die Jugend statt. »

Maria Laach

Im Jahre 1933 fand der von den Nationalsozialisten seines Amtes als Kölner Oberbürgermeister enthobene, spätere deutsche Bundeskanzler Konrad Adenauer für ein Jahr Zuflucht im Kloster, das damals von seinem Schulfreund Ildefons Herwegen geleitet wurde, und lebte dort als « Bruder Konrad » . Am 12. April 1933 legte der mit Ildefons Herwegen befreundete Theologe Johannes Pinski die Profess als Benediktineroblate der Abtei ab. Dieser baute nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg seine durch einen Bombenangriff zerstörte Pfarrkirche Mater Dolorosa in Berlin-Lankwitz nach dem Vorbild der Klosterkirche Maria Laach wieder auf, indem er das ursprüngliche Hauptschiff der Kirche als Vorhof zum neu überdachten Querschiff gestaltete.

Die größte Mitgliederzahl von 182 (1934) und auch die Gründung des Klosterverlages « ars liturgica » fällt in diese Zeit. Unter Abt Ildefons Herwegen begann sich die Klostersgemeinschaft intensiv mit der Liturgieforschung auseinanderzusetzen. 1948 wurde ein eigenes Institut für diese theologische Disziplin eingerichtet.

Melk

Nach dem Anschluß Österreichs 1938 wurde das Stiftsgymnasium von den Nationalsozialisten geschlossen und der

größere Teil des Stiftsgebäudes für eine staatliche Oberschule beschlagnahmt. Eine vollständige Schließung durch die Nationalsozialisten wurde befürchtet, blieb dem Kloster aber erspart. Das Kloster überstand den Krieg und die nachfolgende Besatzungszeit, abgesehen von Weinplünderungen, fast unversehrt.

Sankt Lambrecht

Nach dem Anschluß im Mai 1938 wurde das Kloster durch die Nationalsozialisten beschlagnahmt und von SS-Obersturmbannführer Hubert Erhart verwaltet. Die Abtei verlegte ihren Sitz nach Mariazell. Der gesamte Inkunabelbestand der Bibliothek sowie Drucke des 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts und eine Reihe älterer Styriaca, insgesamt 2.100 Titel, kamen an die Steiermärkische Landesbibliothek in Graz. Der Rest hat an Ort und Stelle die Aufhebung und den Krieg überstanden. Nach Rückstellung der beschlagnahmten Bestände im Jahre 1946 wurde der Gesamtbestand von rund 30.000 Bänden in der systematischen Ordnung des 19. Jahrhunderts wiederaufgestellt.

Am 13. Mai 1942 traf ein erster Transport von circa 90 KZ-Häftlingen aus Dachau ein, das Stift wurde zum Außenlager des KZ-Dachau. Ungefähr ein Jahr später trafen dann 30 Bibelforscherinnen (Zeugen Jehovas) aus Ravensbrück ein, für die ein zweites Außenlager eingerichtet wurde, da Frauen und Männer nach den Richtlinien der SS zu trennen waren. Ab dem 20. November 1942 bis zur Befreiung im Mai 1945 unterstand das Männerlager dem KZ-Mauthausen und wurde somit ein Außenlager des KZ-Mauthausen. Dies bedeutete eine Verschlechterung der Haftbedingungen, da der Rücktransport ins Stammlager (Mauthausen war ein Lager der Stufe III-« Rückkehr unerwünscht ») den sicheren Tod bedeutete. Das Frauenlager blieb bis zur Gründung des Frauenlagers in Mauthausen am 15. September 1944 unter der Verwaltung des KZ-Ravensbrück. Die inhaftierten Männer mußten hier neben Arbeiten in der Forst- und Landwirtschaft eine Siedlung in Sankt Lambrecht errichten, deren Häuser heute noch vom Kloster vermietet werden. Der Bau einer Villa nordwestlich des Stifts für Erharts Familie wurde begonnen, aber nicht mehr fertiggestellt. Die weiblichen Häftlinge wurden hauptsächlich für Haushaltsdienste herangezogen. Der Stiftshof diente als Apellplatz und war somit für die Bevölkerung einsehbar, die Stiftskirche behielt dagegen ihre Funktion als Pfarrkirche.

1946 kehrten die Mönche zurück. Heute verwaltet und bewirtschaftet das Kloster insgesamt rund 4.000 Hektar land- und forstwirtschaftlichen Besitz. Daneben bemühen sich die Mönche um die wirtschaftliche Sicherung des Klosters für die Zukunft. In Zusammenarbeit mit den umliegenden Bauernhöfen wird eine lokale, mit Hackgut betriebene Fernwärmanlage betrieben, die den ganzen Ort versorgt. Ferner betreibt das Kloster eine « Schule des Daseins », ein Seminarzentrum mit geistlicher und kreativer Richtung und einer Managementschule. Man versucht auch, den Kulturtourismus und den religiösen der Pilger zu steigern und die eigenen Produkte zu vermarkten.

...

Von den Nazis beschlagnahmtes Stift Sankt Lambrecht fungierte jahrelang als Konzentrationslager (Geschichte nun rekonstruiert Graz) Das von den Nationalsozialisten beschlagnahmte obersteirische Stift Sankt Lambrecht fungierte jahrelang als Konzentrationslager - auch für Frauen. Neben bis zu 115 Häftlingen gab es bis zu 30 weibliche Internierte, die wegen ihre Zugehörigkeit zu den Zeugen Jehovas Zwangsarbeit leisten mußten. Für sie war es die letzte Station einer oft jahrelangen Odyssee durch die Lager des Dritten Reichs. Die steirische Psychologin Anita Farkas hat

die Geschichte des KZ Sankt Lambrecht und die Biografien der Insassinnen rekonstruiert. Daß es in der Steiermark neben sechs Außenlagern von Mauthausen für Männer auch ein KZ für Frauen gegeben hat, das als Nebenlager von Ravensbrück gegründet worden war, ist nahezu unbekannt, so Farkas. Tatsächlich wurde das Benediktinerstift Sankt Lambrecht zu einem « Ort des Traumas » : Im Mai 1938 wurde es aufgehoben und als « SS-Wirtschaftsgut » beschlagnahmt. 1942 wurde dort ein Außenlager für Männer des KZ-Dachau (später auch des KZ-Mauthausen) mit bis zu 115 Häftlingen errichtet. Sie wurden in der Land- und Forstwirtschaft ebenso eingesetzt wie zum Bau einer Siedlung. Im Südflügel, dem heutigen Pfarrtrakt, kam im Frühjahr 1943 ein Frauen-KZ hinzu. Die Opfer Die Häftlinge gehören einer Opfergruppe an, die lange zu den « vergessenen Opfern » des Nationalsozialismus zählte : den « Bibelforschern » , wie die Zeugen Jehovas von den Nationalsozialisten genannt wurden. Die religiöse Überzeugung gebot ihnen strikte Gewaltlosigkeit mit einem Fokus, der sich auf die einer einzigen Autorität, ihres Gottes Jehova, richtete. « Damit gerieten sie mit dem Regime in Konflikt » , so Farkas. Sie sieht vor allem im « gestiegenen Arbeitsbedarf » den Grund für die Einrichtung des weiblichen Häftlingkommandos. Die Frauen übernahmen Arbeiten in der Küche, im Reinigungsdienst, in der Gärtnerei und in der Land- und Forstwirtschaft. Man habe sie ausgewählt, weil sie bei der SS als « überaus fleißiges, williges und verlässliches Arbeitspotenzial » galten. In ihrer Publikation, die aus ihrer Dissertation an der Uni Klagenfurt hervorgegangen ist, schildert Farkas die Geschichte des Stiftes seit 1938 und bringt sie mit den Biografien von 23 ehemaligen Insassinnen in Einklang. Sie stellt aber auch die Geschichte der Verfolgung der Religionsgemeinschaft dar und rekonstruiert den speziellen Mikrokosmos der KZ-Situation.

Stams

1938-1939 wurde das Stift von den nationalsozialistischen Machthabern aufgelöst und beschlagnahmt und diente als Umsiedlungsheim für Auswanderer aus Südtirol. Nach Kriegsende 1945 wurde es von Zisterziensermönchen wieder übernommen. Sie brachten Bildungseinrichtungen in den Klostergebäuden unter und übereigneten Pachtgründe an die Siedler.

Klostersturm

Unter Klostersturm versteht man die planmäßige Aufhebung von Klöstern durch die weltliche Macht aus politischen oder wirtschaftlichen Gründen.

Einen Klostersturm gab es zum Beispiel in der französischen Revolution, in der Säkularisation des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts, im Kulturkampf des späten 19. Jahrhunderts und 1941 durch die nationalsozialistischen Machthaber. Klostersturm während des nationalsozialistischen Regimes.

In der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus beschlagnahmten staatliche Stellen sowie die nationalsozialistische Partei weit über 200 Klöster. Der nationalsozialistische Raubzug gegen die katholischen Ordensgemeinschaften in Deutschland startete aufgrund eines Geheimerlasses des NSDAP-Reichsleiters Martin Bormann vom 13. Januar 1941.

Bereits seit Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs betrieben die SS unter Heinrich Himmler und die Wehrmacht (zunächst in den « angeschlossenen » , annektierten und militärisch besetzten Nachbarländern Deutschlands) eigene Beschlagnahmen

von Einrichtungen und Gebäuden. Während die Wehrmacht die beschlagnahmten Klöster und Einrichtungen vorwiegend als Lazarette, Erholungsheime, Schuleinrichtungen für Soldaten nutzte, beanspruchte die SS diese vor allem als Erstunterkünfte für « Volksdeutsche », die unter der Devise Heim ins Reich durch die Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle der SS in das nationalsozialistische Deutschland umgesiedelt werden sollten.

Anfangs wurden auch evangelische und nicht kirchliche Sozialeinrichtungen (und andere Psychiatrische Kliniken, Pflegeheime für Behinderte) beschlagnahmt und zwangsgeräumt. Später verschob sich das Gleichgewicht zuungunsten der katholischen Klöster und Einrichtungen. Die bisherigen Bewohner wurden meist nicht nur aus ihren Unterkünften, von ihren Arbeitsplätzen und Wirkungsstätten vertrieben, sondern häufig erhielten die Ordensleute zusätzlich ein Aufenthaltsverbot in der örtlichen Umgebung ihrer Ordenshäuser. Ordensangehörige, die sich den Zwangsmaßnahmen widersetzen, wurden beschuldigt, Straftaten begangen zu haben und von der Gestapo in Schutzhaft genommen.

Für viele psychisch kranke und/oder körperlich behinderte, schwer pflegebedürftige Betreute aus den beschlagnahmten kirchlichen und weltlichen Hospitälern und Pflegeheimen führten die Zwangsräumungen unmittelbar zum Abtransport in NS-Tötungsanstalten.

Nicht immer wurden die Klöster in die ihre Beschlagnahme begründende Bestimmung überführt. Oft übernahm die NSDAP die Klöster, Ordenshäuser und kirchlichen Einrichtungen für ihre eigenen Zwecke. Auch fanden häufig die vorher für den Verlust der Gebäude in Aussicht gestellten Entschädigungszahlungen nicht statt. Die katholischen Bischöfe Deutschlands verfassten mehrere Hirtenbriefe und erhoben öffentlich Einspruch. Hitler verbot am 30. Juli 1941 weitere Beschlagnahmen, da diese Aktion bei der kirchlich gebundenen Bevölkerung große Unruhe ausgelöst hatte.

Klostersturm im Rheinland 1940-1942

Einleitung

Mehr als 300 katholische Klöster und andere kirchliche Einrichtungen wurden in den Jahren 1940 bis 1942 von der nationalsozialistischen Regierung beschlagnahmt und enteignet. Die Bewohner wurden zumeist vertrieben, der Klosterbetrieb mußte eingestellt werden. Dieser Raubzug des NS-Regimes, den die Betroffenen selbst als « Klostersturm » bezeichneten, bildete einen Höhepunkt der Kirchenverfolgung durch die Nationalsozialisten. Besonders stark betroffen war das Rheinland : Allein im Erzbistum Köln fielen 20 Klöster und ähnliche Einrichtungen dem Klostersturm zum Opfer.

Die katholischen Klöster im Feindbild der Nationalsozialisten

Die katholische Kirche stellte für die Nationalsozialisten eine Gegnerin dar, die es zu bekämpfen galt. Der christliche Glaube widersprach der nationalsozialistischen Weltanschauung, und die Kirche übte durch ihre zahlreichen Kindergärten und Schulen, Vereine und Verbände einen so starken gesellschaftlichen Einfluss aus, daß sie der Regierung ein Dorn im Auge sein mußte.

In diesem Feindbild von der katholischen Kirche spielten die Ordensgemeinschaften eine besondere Rolle : An kaum einen Ort konnte die NS-Weltanschauung so schwer vordringen wie hinter dicke Klostermauern. Alles, was die katholische Lehre ausmachte, schien in den Klöstern besonders stark ausgeprägt zu sein. Sie galten den Nationalsozialisten deshalb als der « Lebensnerv der katholischen Kirche » . « Wer die Klöster angreift, greift immer auch die Gesamtkirche an, heißt es in einer Ausarbeitung der SS aus dem Jahr 1935. »

Dabei spielten jahrhundertealte ordensfeindliche Klischees eine Rolle: Völlerei, sexuelle Ausschweifungen und das Anhäufen immenser Reichtümer hinter der Fassade der Armut gehörten zu den traditionellen Vorwürfen, derer sich auch die Nationalsozialisten gern bedienten. Zudem galt die zölibatäre (ehelose) Lebensweise als undeutsch, da sie die Ordensleute zu « biologischen Blindgängern » mache. Den kontemplativ (beschaulich) lebenden Ordensgemeinschaften wurde vorgeworfen, daß sie « nur beten und nichts arbeiten » . Noch gefährlicher schienen dem NS-Regime jedoch jene Orden, die durch Unterricht, Exerzitien und Predigten öffentlich tätig waren und dadurch die Möglichkeit zu regierungsfeindlicher Propaganda hatten. Aus diesem Grund gehörte die Bekämpfung der Orden, die als « beste und gefährlichste Kampftruppe » und als der « militante Arm der katholischen Kirche » galten, von Anfang an zu den zentralen Zielen der NS-Kirchenpolitik.

Hass und Faszination

Doch die Orden lösten bei den Nationalsozialisten nicht nur Haß, sondern zugleich auch eine starke Faszination aus : So orientierte sich nicht zuletzt die SS in ihrem Aufbau am Vorbild des Jesuitenordens, und NS-Eliteschulen wurden als « Ordensschulen » bezeichnet. Das Bild, das sich die Regierungsstellen von den Orden zeichneten, war also ein zwiespältiges, und ebenso zwiespältig war die Betrachtungsweise der Nationalsozialisten : Einerseits investierten die Überwachungsorgane wie der SD (Sicherheitsdienst) viel Zeit und Energie in die sorgfältige Beobachtung des Ordenswesens und erstellten detaillierte Berichte ; andererseits wurden Klischees und Vorurteile gepflegt und immer weiter verbreitet.

Erste Verfolgungsmaßnahmen

Schon in den ersten Jahren ihrer Herrschaft machte die NS-Regierung verschiedene Ansätze, um das Ordenswesen zu bekämpfen. Ein möglicher Ansatzpunkt wurde dabei in wirtschaftlichen Maßnahmen gesehen. Schon 1934 machte das Schatzamt der NSDAP den ersten Versuch, sich einen Überblick über die tatsächlichen wirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse der Klöster zu verschaffen. Die Aufstellung blieb allerdings bruchstückhaft, und zur Umsetzung der Ergebnisse in politische Maßnahmen kam es vorerst nicht.

Devisenprozesse

Stattdessen wurde ab Mitte der 1930er Jahre eine andere Strategie verfolgt, um die Orden zu bekämpfen : Durch Diffamierung sollte ihr Ansehen in der katholischen Bevölkerung geschädigt werden. Diesem Zweck dienten die Devisen- und Sittlichkeitsprozesse.

1935 wurden mehrere Ordensleute an der deutsch-niederländischen Grenze des Devisenschmuggels überführt, der gegen die verschärfte Devisengesetzgebung des « Dritten Reiches » verstieß. Die Entdeckung lieferte den Anlaß für eine ganze Welle von Prozessen gegen Priester und Ordensangehörige, denen Devisenschleberei vorgeworfen wurde. Beinahe 100 Personen wurden verurteilt, darunter der Kölner Dominikaner-Provinzial Laurentius Siemer (1888-1956) . Sein Urteil lautete zunächst auf 15 Monate Haft, in der Berufungsverhandlung wurde er dann aber frei gesprochen.

Zu einer Verfolgungsmaßnahme wurden die Devisenprozesse nicht durch die Verurteilung überführter Straftäter, sondern dadurch, daß sie den Charakter politischer Schauprozesse annahmen. Dafür sorgte die gezielte Einflussnahme der Partei auf die Ermittlungen der Staatsanwaltschaft und vor allem die intensive Propaganda in der NS-Presse, mit der die Prozesse einhergingen.

Sittlichkeitsprozesse

Die Devisenverfahren waren noch nicht ganz abgeschlossen, als bereits eine neue Prozesswelle gegen die Klöster anrollte : Die Sittlichkeitsprozesse, die mit Anzeigen gegen Mitglieder der Laienkongregation der Franziskanerbrüder in Waldbreitbach begannen. Dort war es wiederholt zu homosexuellen Handlungen gekommen. 31 Brüder wurden aus der Kongregation ausgeschlossen, und der zuständige Bischof von Trier, Franz Rudolf Bornwasser, sah sich veranlaßt, in Rom die Auflösung der Kongregation zu beantragen, die 1937 tatsächlich erfolgte. Ähnlich wie bei den Devisenprozessen kam es nach den Vorfällen in Waldbreitbach zu einer ganzen Serie von Ermittlungsverfahren gegen Priester und Ordensleute wegen Sittlichkeitsvergehen. Gemessen an der Zahl der Verurteilungen, fiel die Bilanz der Prozesse wiederum weit weniger spektakulär aus als die damit einhergehende NS-Propaganda. So gelang es den katholischen Bischöfen, durch gezielte Gegeninformation zu verhindern, daß die Diffamierungskampagne die Katholiken insgesamt von den Orden entfremdete. Ausdrücklich distanzierten sie sich von den nachgewiesenen Vergehen einzelner Ordensleute, betrieben aber gleichzeitig Vorwärtsverteidigung gegen das Regime, indem sie die Zahlenverhältnisse zurechtrückten : Von allen katholischen Geistlichen in Deutschland (innerhalb und außerhalb der Klöster) seien gerade 0,23 % von den Sittlichkeitsprozessen betroffen, von denen wiederum rund drei Viertel freigesprochen werden mußten : Von einem flächendeckenden moralischen Sumpf im katholischen Klerus konnte also keine Rede sein.

Die Devisen- und Sittlichkeitsprozesse wirkten als Nadelstiche, konnten das Ordenswesen insgesamt aber nicht erschüttern. Zu einer systematischen Bekämpfung der Klöster kam es in den Jahren vor dem Zweiten Weltkrieg noch nicht. Dies lag zum einen daran, daß es der Regierung an geeigneten Konzepten hierzu mangelte. Zum anderen lenkten die Nationalsozialisten ihre Hauptaufmerksamkeit zunächst noch auf andere Gegner innerhalb der katholischen Kirche : Die wichtigsten Angriffsziele waren vor 1939 das Schulwesen sowie die katholischen Verbände und Vereine. Dadurch wurde die Kirche mehr und mehr aus ihren gesellschaftlichen Positionen verdrängt und auf eine rein religiöse Betätigung reduziert.

Zudem spielten taktische Erwägungen in der Kirchenpolitik eine wichtige Rolle. Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) verfolgte zwar langfristig das Ziel der Vernichtung der Kirche, wollte dies jedoch erst nach dem erhofften « Endsieg » verwirklichen. Um die Stimmung in der Bevölkerung nicht zu gefährden, mahnte er in kirchenpolitischen Angelegenheiten wiederholt zur Zurückhaltung. So wurden zum Beispiel die Sittlichkeitsprozesse im Sommer 1936 vorübergehend ausgesetzt, um

während der Olympischen Spiele in Berlin das Bild vom Deutschen Reich im Ausland nicht zu beeinträchtigen.

Kirchenkampf im Zweiten Weltkrieg

Kirchenpolitische Akteure

Nach dem Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs änderten sich die Rahmenbedingungen der nationalsozialistischen Kirchenpolitik grundlegend. Der gemeinsame Kampf gegen die äußeren Kriegsgegner schien zwar einen « Burgfrieden » im Innern nach dem Vorbild des Ersten Weltkriegs nahe zu legen, doch stattdessen zeigte der Nationalsozialismus erst unter den Bedingungen des Krieges sein wahres Gesicht : Der Terror gegen die inneren Gegner verschärfte sich und gipfelte in dem millionenfachen Mord an den europäischen Juden. Auch die Kirchenverfolgung erreichte im Krieg einen neuen Höhepunkt.

Der « Führer » konzentrierte seine Aufmerksamkeit zunehmend auf das äußere Kriegsgeschehen und schritt nur noch selten gegen die von ihm so bezeichneten « Parteiheißsporne » ein, die eine radikalere Kirchenpolitik betrieben. Formal war in erster Linie Reichskirchenminister Hanns Kerrl (1887-1941) für die Kirchenpolitik zuständig. Er gehörte zu den gemäßigten kirchenpolitischen Kräften, doch seine Stellung innerhalb der NS-Führungsriege war so schwach, daß er sich kaum gegen politische Rivalen durchsetzen oder eigenständige Politik betreiben konnte. Hinzu kamen gesundheitliche Gründe, die ihn dazu bewogen, sich nach dem Beginn des Krieges mehr und mehr aus der aktiven Politik zurückzuziehen. Als Hanns Kerrl Ende 1941 starb, wurde kein neuer Reichskirchenminister ernannt.

Davon profitierte vor allem der Leiter der Parteikanzlei, Martin Bormann (1900-1945) , der schon seit 1938 die Expansion des Reiches ausnutzte, um kirchenpolitische Kompetenzen in den neuen Reichsteilen an sich zu reißen. Jetzt konnte er auch im « Altreich » zunehmend Einfluß auf die Kirchenpolitik nehmen. Bormann war einer der radikalsten Kirchengegner in der NS-Führungsriege. Seine Macht beruhte vor allem auf seinem engen Kontakt zum « Führer » . Es war häufig Bormann, der Äußerungen und Anordnungen Hitlers an die unteren Behörden weitergab und dabei häufig durch seine eigene Interpretation beeinflusste.

Bormanns stärkster Rivale um die Position des zweitstärksten Mannes im Reich war der Reichsführer-SS und Chef der deutschen Polizei Heinrich Himmler (1900-1945) . Er verfügte über den Oberbefehl über SS und Gestapo und damit auch über das Reichssicherheitshauptamt (RSHA) , das 1939 eingerichtet wurde. Es ging aus dem Hauptamt Sicherheitspolizei, dem Geheimen Staatspolizeiamt und dem SD-Hauptamt (Sicherheitsdienst-Hauptamt) hervor. Nach und nach baute Himmler sich ein ganzes Imperium auf, das von der SS beherrscht wurde und Einfluß auf immer größere Machtbereiche ausübte. Dazu zählten sowohl die Beobachtung von Gegnern durch den Sicherheitsdienst der SS als auch deren Bekämpfung durch die Polizeiorgane.

Deutsche Katholiken im Zweiten Weltkrieg

Die Beteiligung am Zweiten Weltkrieg war für die Katholiken ebenso selbstverständlich wie für fast alle anderen Deutschen : Als die deutschen Bischöfe sich im Herbst 1939 zum Kriegsbeginn äußerten, taten sie dies zwar ohne

Kriegsbegeisterung wie noch 1918, erhoben aber auch keinerlei Zweifel an der Legitimität des Krieges. Die Beteiligung daran galt als selbstverständliche vaterländische Pflicht. In der damals herrschenden Theologie wurde Krieg nicht grundsätzlich als etwas Schlechtes betrachtet, sondern konnte unter bestimmten Bedingungen auch von Gott gewollt sein. Der Einsatz katholischer Soldaten in einem solchen Krieg wurde demnach als gottgewollte Bewährungsprobe interpretiert. Der Krieg, der 1939 begann, erschien der katholischen Kirche als nationale Herausforderung, nicht als nationalsozialistisches Verbrechen. Auch als im Verlauf des Krieges dessen verbrecherischer Charakter immer deutlicher wurde, kam es nicht zu einer grundsätzlichen Revision der Haltung der Bischöfe.

Das Reichsleistungsgesetz

Den Nationalsozialisten lieferte das Kriegsgeschehen willkommene Vorwände, um lang gehegte Pläne zur Bekämpfung der Kirche in die Realität umzusetzen. Das Druckmittel lag im Begriff der « Reichsaufgaben ». Die nationalen Pflichten, die der Krieg auch für die Katholiken mit sich brachte, bestanden nicht nur im Militärdienst an der Front, sondern auch im Dienst an der « Heimatfront ». Dazu gehörten für katholische Ordenseinrichtungen traditionell die Betreuung verwundeter Soldaten in ordenseigenen Lazaretten und auch die Aufnahme von Flüchtlingen in ihren Häusern. Diese « Reichsaufgaben » wurden für das nationalsozialistische Regime zum Schlüssel für den Angriff auf die Klöster.

Die Beanspruchung von Gebäuden für kriegswichtige Aufgaben war im Reichsleistungsgesetz vom 1. September 1939 geregelt. Es erlaubte bestimmten « Bedarfsstellen » (in erster Linie der Wehrmacht) Räume und Gebäude für militärische Zwecke zu beschlagnahmen. Das Gesetz sah Entschädigungszahlungen für die Eigentümer der betroffenen Gebäude vor und schützte außerdem deren Eigenbedarf. Nur Räume, die vom Eigentümer nicht unbedingt benötigt wurden, durften laut Gesetz beschlagnahmt werden. Die Buchstaben des Gesetzes und dessen tatsächliche Anwendung klafften jedoch weit auseinander. Es gab kein Gericht und keine Aufsichtsbehörde, die über die Einhaltung der gesetzlichen Bestimmungen gewacht hätte. So konnten NS-Stellen das Gesetz als Blankovollmacht zum Übergriff auf fremdes, insbesondere kirchliches Eigentum nutzen. Dies machte sich vor allem Himmlers SS zunutze.

Der Beginn des Klostersturms

Unter der Parole « Heim ins Reich » begann die nationalsozialistische Regierung 1939 damit, deutsche Minderheiten aus ost- und südosteuropäischen Ländern ins Deutsche Reich umzusiedeln. Bis 1942 wurden mehr als eine halbe Million « Volksdeutsche » umgesiedelt und nach ihrer Ankunft im Reich zunächst in Lagern untergebracht. Die vermeintlichen Übergangslager blieben oftmals jahrelang die Heimat der Volksdeutschen. Mit der Durchführung der Umsiedlungsaktion war die « Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle » beauftragt. Sie war zwar offiziell eine Parteidienststelle, kam faktisch aber einer staatlichen Behörde nahe und war personell eng mit der SS verflochten war. Den Oberbefehl über die Umsiedlungsaktion hatte Heinrich Himmler in seiner Funktion als « Reichskommissar für die Festigung deutschen Volkstums », die ihm im Oktober 1939 verliehen worden war.

Zur Einrichtung der Umsiedlerlager (insgesamt wurden 1.500 bis 1.800 Lager eingerichtet) benötigte die Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle eine Vielzahl an Gebäuden. Mit deren Beschaffung waren die Gaeinsatzführer der Volksdeutschen Mittelstelle betraut. Sie hatten dafür die klare Vorgabe « vor allem die Klöster und anderweitigen konfessionellen Gebäude (zum

Beispiel Exerzitenhäuser) heranzuziehen » . So formulierte es die Gauleitung München-Oberbayern in einem Rundschreiben an die Kreisleiter des Gaus vom 31. August 1940 ; ähnliche Anweisungen galten auch in den anderen Gauen. Die Unterbringung der Umsiedler in den Ordenshäusern sollte der erste Schritt zur dauerhaften Beschlagnahme der Gebäude sein. Die Rückgabe der Häuser nach Abschluß der Umsiedlungsaktion war ausdrücklich nicht geplant. Die « Reichsaufgabe » der Unterbringung der Umsiedler diente lediglich als willkommener Vorwand für die Enteignung der kirchlichen Eigentümer.

Für die betroffenen Ordenseinrichtungen bedeutete die Einrichtung der Lager in vielen Fällen die Beschlagnahme der kompletten Gebäude und die Vertreibung der Bewohner. Pflege- und Erziehungsheime, Kindergärten und ähnliche Einrichtungen, die in den Ordenshäusern betrieben wurden, mussten aufgelöst, der Klosterbetrieb konnte nicht weitergeführt werden. Als scheinbare Rechtsgrundlage diente das Reichsleistungsgesetz. Mehr als 100 Klöster und andere katholische Einrichtungen fielen seit 1940 dieser ersten Welle zum Opfer.

Klostersturm im Rheinland

Verschärfung des Klostersturms 1940-1941

Die Beschlagnahmen durch die Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle waren jedoch nur der Auftakt zum Kampf gegen die Klöster. Es scheint, als habe der « Erfolg » der ersten Beschlagnahmewelle die Raublust des Regimes erst richtig angefacht. Hitler hatte die « Parteilichkeit » gewähren lassen. Die betroffenen Ordensleute und die katholischen Bischöfe versuchten zwar angestrengt, sich gegen die Übergriffe zu wehren, doch sie taten das lediglich in Form schriftlicher Proteste, in denen sie auf die Einhaltung der gesetzlichen Bestimmungen pochten. Damit konnten sie gegen die Gewalt des Regimes nichts ausrichten. So ging der Klostersturm gegen Ende des Jahres 1940 in eine zweite, noch radikalere Phase über.

Statt der Volksdeutschen Mittelstelle war nunmehr die Gestapo der Hauptakteur, und als Vorwand für den Raub der Klöster dienten nicht länger vermeintliche « Reichsaufgaben » , sondern die angeblich « volks- und staatsfeindliche » Betätigung der Ordensleute. An Stelle des Reichsleistungsgesetzes diente nun die « Reichstagsbrandverordnung » vom 28. Februar 1933 als scheinbare Rechtsgrundlage. Gestapo-Beamte beschlagnahmten reihenweise Klöster, auch ohne daß den Bewohnern Gesetzesverstöße nachgewiesen werden konnten. In den meisten Fällen wurde dies gar nicht erst versucht. Der Einfluß der Gestapo hatte sich inzwischen so verselbständigt, daß sie fast uneingeschränkte Macht ausüben konnte.

Beschlagnahme von Klöstern im Erzbistum Köln

Diese zweite, radikalere Phase des Klostersturms traf insbesondere den Westen des Reiches. Im Erzbistum Köln fielen innerhalb von rund vier Monaten (von April bis Juli 1941) 18 Ordenshäuser, das Erzbischöfliche Priesterseminar in Bensberg und das Exerzitenheim des Erzbischöflichen Stuhls in Altenberg zum Opfer. Betroffen waren insbesondere große, bekannte Klöster, was in der Bevölkerung den Eindruck erweckte, das gesamte Ordenswesen stehe kurz vor der Vernichtung. Das Benediktinerkloster auf dem Siegburger Michaelsberg, das Kloster und Studienhaus der Steyler Patres in Sankt Augustin, die Dominikanerklöster in Köln und Walberberg (heute Stadt Bornheim) , die Redemptoristenklöster in

Hennef und Bonn, das Kloster der Väter vom Heiligen Geist in Knechtsteden und mehrere Niederlassungen der Jesuiten wurden zu Opfern des Klostersturms. Auch Frauenklöster blieben nicht verschont : Es traf die Benediktinerinnen von Bonn-Endenich ebenso wie die Karmeliterinnen von Pützchen (heute Stadt Bonn) .

Für die betroffenen Ordensleute bedeutete die Beschlagnahme der Häuser, daß eines Tages unangemeldet zwei bis sechs Gestapo-Beamte vor der Tür standen und das Haus für beschlagnahmt erklärten. In den meisten Fällen mußten die Bewohner die Gebäude innerhalb weniger Stunden oder Tage verlassen, in der Regel wurden sie auch aus dem Rheinland ausgewiesen. Die Beschlagnahmen erfolgten als reiner Gewaltakt : Die Beamten konnten weder schriftliche Verfügungen vorlegen noch Gründe für die Maßnahme nennen. Wenn überhaupt, beriefen sie sich auf « Wunsch und Willen des Führers » (so der Bericht eines Siegburger Benediktinerpaters) oder pauschal auf die angeblich staatsabträgliche Tätigkeit der Ordensleute.

Die Bewohner der Klöster fühlten sich der Gestapo gegenüber ohnmächtig. Gerade für die kontemplativ lebenden Ordensgemeinschaften war die Ausweisung ein schockierendes Erlebnis. « So standen wir, die wir bei unserer strengen Klausur 20, 30, ja 40 Jahre die Straße nicht betreten hatten, nun wieder mitten im Getriebe der Welt » , schrieb die Priorin der Endenicher Benediktinerinnen dazu in ihren Erinnerungen. Immerhin kam die Aufhebung ihres Klosters für sie nicht völlig überraschend, denn die Schwestern hatten natürlich von der Beschlagnahme anderer Klöster gehört. Sie hatten sich zivile, « weltliche » Kleidung besorgen und für die Unterbringung der rund 150 Schwestern Vorbereitungen treffen können. Dies erwies sich mitten im Krieg als sehr schwieriges Unterfangen, doch es gelang, die Schwestern auf mehrere Krankenhäuser, Altersheime und andere Benediktinerinnenklöster aufzuteilen. Drei Monate nach der Beschlagnahme erfolgte die Ausweisung der Schwestern aus der Stadt und dem Kreis Bonn, so daß sich das Unterkunftsproblem ein zweites Mal stellte.

Besonders gründlich hatten sich die Steyler Patres von Sankt Augustin auf die drohende Beschlagnahme ihres Klosters vorbereitet : Auf ihren täglichen Gängen nahmen die Patres regelmäßig Bücher, liturgisches Gerät, andere Wertgegenstände und auch Bargeld aus dem Kloster mit und verschickten es per Post oder Bahn, um es so vor dem Zugriff der Gestapo zu schützen. Das Missionshaus gehörte schließlich zu den letzten Ordenshäusern, die der Beschlagnahme zum Opfer fielen. Trotz der gründlichen Vorbereitung konnte allerdings nur ein kleiner Teil des Klosterinventars vor der Gestapo gerettet werden, nicht zuletzt verblieb das gesamte Mobiliar im Kloster.

Nach der Vertreibung der Ordensleute wurden die Gebäude zu sehr unterschiedlichen Zwecken genutzt. In vielen Fällen rivalisierten verschiedene Wehrmacht- und Parteidienststellen um das Nutzungsrecht. In mehreren beschlagnahmten Klöstern wurden Bombenflüchtlinge untergebracht, in anderen Militärdienststellen. So diente das Missionspriesterseminar in Sankt Augustin (das im offiziellen NS-Sprachgebrauch nur noch « Augustin » heißen durfte) zunächst einer Unteroffiziersschule der Marine, später einer Dolmetscherschule der Luftwaffe als Unterkunft. Zeitweise lebten bis zu 1.500 Personen in dem Gebäude. Auch zivile Behörden profitierten vom Klostersturm : So zogen in das Bonner Paulushaus der Jesuiten das Fliegerschadenamt der Stadt Bonn und das Prüfungsamt der Universität ein.

Zu besonders trauriger Berühmtheit brachte es das Kloster der Endenicher Benediktinerinnen, das von Juni 1941 bis Juli 1942 als Internierungslager für die Bonner Juden diente. Mindestens 479 Menschen wurden dort gefangen gehalten,

zu schwerer Arbeit zwangsverpflichtet und schließlich nach Theresienstadt deportiert und dort ermordet.

In anderen Klöstern änderte sich die Nutzung der Gebäude durch die Beschlagnahme nur unwesentlich, denn schon vor dem Klostersturm waren in vielen Klöstern Lazarette eingerichtet worden. Dies geschah durchaus nicht nur unter Zwang, sondern für viele Orden war es eine selbstverständliche Pflicht, auf diese Weise ihren Beitrag zum Krieg zu leisten. « Wir haben in diesen Kriegszeiten unsere Gemeinschaft als solche in den besonderen Dienst des Vaterlandes zu stellen, auch unter großen Opfern », schrieb zum Beispiel der Dominikanerprovinzial Laurentius Siemer im September 1939 an seine Mitbrüder. Um so zynischer mußte es auf die Ordensleute daher wirken, wenn die spätere Enteignung ihrer Gebäude mit ihrer « volks- und staatsfeindlichen Tätigkeit » begründet wurde.

Im weiteren Verlauf des Krieges, als die ordensfeindlichen Absichten des Regimes immer deutlicher wurden, wurde die Bereitstellung von Klöstern als Lazarette deshalb immer mehr zu einem Mittel der Vorwärtsverteidigung : Durch die Kooperation mit der als « anständig » geltenden Wehrmacht hofften die Ordensleute, sich vor Übergriffen durch die Gestapo schützen zu können. In einigen, aber nicht in allen Fällen bewahrheitete sich diese Hoffnung : So konnte zum Beispiel Pater Siemer die Gestapo davon überzeugen, daß der Betrieb des in Walberberg eingerichteten Lazaretts nur weitergeführt werden könne, wenn die Dominikaner dort blieben. Ähnlich erging es den Herz-Jesu-Schwestern in Pützchen. Doch auch in diesen Fällen schützten die Lazarette schließlich nicht vor der Enteignung der Gebäude.

Diese Beobachtungen verdeutlichen, daß der Klostersturm unsystematische, auch irrationale Züge trug : Der Angriff richtete sich nicht gezielt gegen solche Klöster, die sich etwa durch besondere Aktivitäten im Widerstand hervorgetan hätten. Es wurden auch nicht konsequent alle Niederlassungen bestimmter Orden aufgelöst - wenn auch im Rheinland ein Schwerpunkt des Angriffs auf den Niederlassungen der Priesterorden, insbesondere der Jesuiten, lag. Der Angriff richtete sich weniger gegen einzelne Ordensniederlassungen als gegen das Ordenswesen im Allgemeinen.

Die oftmals unsystematische Vorgehensweise der Gestapo-Beamten hat zur Folge, daß oft kaum nachzuweisen ist, warum ein bestimmtes Kloster vom Klostersturm verschont blieb. In Einzelfällen trugen sicherlich gute Kontakte der Ordensangehörigen zu einflußreichen Persönlichkeiten aus der Wehrmacht dazu bei, ein Kloster zu schützen. Dies trifft zum Beispiel auf die Benediktinerabtei Maria Laach im Bistum Trier zu, die von dem General Friedrich von Rabenau (1884-1945) , protegiert wurde. Aufgrund seiner Fürsprache blieb den Laacher Patres die Beschlagnahme ihrer Abtei erspart.

Vermögenseinziehungen

Auf die Beschlagnahme der Gebäude folgte jeweils einige Monate später deren Einziehung zugunsten des Staates, der im Grundbuch als neuer Eigentümer eingetragen wurde. Unter die Enteignung fiel in der Regel auch das gesamte Inventar der Gebäude. Als formale Grundlage für die Vermögenseinziehungen diente das « Gesetz über die Einziehung kommunistischen Vermögens » vom 26. Mai 1933 beziehungsweise dessen Erweiterung im « Gesetz über die Einziehung volks- und staatsfeindlichen Vermögens » vom 14. Juli 1933. Anders als die Beschlagnahmen, die sich vor den Augen der benachbarten Bevölkerung abspielten und nicht selten erhebliches Aufsehen erregten, war die Enteignung ein reiner Schreibtischakt, von dem die Öffentlichkeit nichts erfuhr. Daran beteiligt waren neben der Gestapo auch das

Reichsministerium des Innern, das jeweils den Tatbestand der « Volks- und Staatsfeindlichkeit » zu bestätigen hatte, und der jeweils zuständige Regierungspräsident, der die Vermögenseinziehung schließlich vornahm. Die verschiedenen Behörden arbeiteten weitgehend reibungslos zusammen.

Öffentliche Proteste und das Ende der Beschlagnahmen

Der Klostersturm der Nationalsozialisten ist oft als « Nacht- und Nebel-Aktion » bezeichnet worden. Tatsächlich fanden die Beschlagnahmen und die Vertreibung der Ordensleute aber nicht bei Nacht und Nebel, sondern am helllichten Tag in aller Öffentlichkeit statt. Im Januar 1941 konnte Martin Bormann noch triumphierend verkünden, « daß die Bevölkerung keinerlei Unwillen zeige, wenn Klöster einer allgemein geeignet erscheinenden Verwendung zugeführt werden » . In den folgenden Monaten kam es jedoch an verschiedenen Orten zu öffentlichen Protesten gegen die Beschlagnahmen. Laut einem Bericht der Sicherheitspolizei bildete der Klostersturm « zum Teil sogar das Hauptgesprächsthema » in der katholischen Bevölkerung.

Josef Flesch (1899-1962) , der Provinzial der Kölner Provinz der Redemptoristen, berichtete über die Beschlagnahme des Klosters in Hennef-Geistingen :

« Wie ein Lauffeuer verbreitete sich die Nachricht draußen von der Aufhebung des Klosters. Um 12 Uhr waren Hunderte vor dem Kloster versammelt, mehrere Lastautos kamen angefahren, viele brachten ihre Koffer mit und boten sie zum Einpacken an. »

Für das diktatorische NS-Regime, das die Stimmung in der Bevölkerung gerade im Krieg sehr intensiv beobachtete, konnte diese öffentliche Anteilnahme gefährlich werden.

Die größte Wirkung erzielte schließlich der Protest des Bischofs von Münster, Clemens August Graf von Galen (Episkopat 1943-1946) . An drei Sonntagen im Juli und August 1941 hielt er in Münsteraner Kirchen Predigten, in denen er die nationalsozialistischen Verbrechen in deutlichen Worten benannte und anprangerte. Sein Protest richtete sich vor allem gegen den Klostersturm und gegen den Mord an Behinderten und psychisch Kranken unter dem Decknamen der « Euthanasie » . Diese berühmt gewordenen Predigten wurden weit über Münster hinaus bekannt. Galen selbst hatte für ihre Verbreitung gesorgt. Als Flugblätter und in vielen Abschriften kursierten sie in ganz Deutschland.

Aus Sorge um die Stimmung in der Bevölkerung setzte Hitler schließlich den Beschlagnahmen ein Ende. Am 30. Juli 1941 ordnete er an :

« Ab sofort haben Beschlagnahmen von kirchlichem und klösterlichem Vermögen bis auf weiteres zu unterbleiben. »

In der Folgezeit kam es nur noch vereinzelt zu Beschlagnahmen. Fortgesetzt wurde jedoch die Einziehung des Vermögens der bereits betroffenen Klöster, die als reiner Verwaltungsakt unter Ausschluß der Öffentlichkeit stattfand.

Bis zu Hitlers « Stopp-Erlass » vom 30. Juli 1941 waren dem Klostersturm mehr als 300 Ordenshäuser und kirchliche

Einrichtungen zum Opfer gefallen. Zweifellos wäre die Ausbeute von Gestapo und SS noch reicher ausgefallen, wenn Hitler nicht die Einstellung der Aktion befohlen hätte.

Wer gab den Befehl zum Klostersturm ?

Das Ende der Beschlagnahmewelle wurde von Hitler in einem unmissverständlichen Befehl angeordnet. Dagegen gab es keinen Befehl des « Führers », der die Raubaktion ausgelöst hätte. Es stellt sich daher die Frage, auf wessen Anordnung die staatspolizeiliche Beschlagnahme der Klöster erfolgte. In seiner zweiten Phase scheint sich der Raubzug gegen die Klöster mehr und mehr verselbständigt zu haben.

Die beteiligten Beamten äußerten sich nach dem Krieg nur unpräzise zur Frage der Befehlslage. Von einem « Befehl des RSHA » sprach der Leiter der Bonner Gestapo, Walter Proll (1879-1969), in seinem Spruchgerichtsverfahren 1949, konnte den Befehl aber nicht genauer benennen. Ein anderer Kölner Gestapo-Beamter sagte aus, er habe gewußt, « daß der allgemeine Kurs dahin ging, namentlich die katholische Kirche zu bekämpfen ». An diesem « allgemeinen Kurs » konnte freilich im Frühjahr 1941 kein Zweifel mehr bestehen.

Das Beispiel des Klostersturms zeigt eindrucksvoll, wie die Verfolgungsmaßnahmen des NS-Regimes auch ohne einen ausdrücklichen Befehl funktionieren konnten. Es genügten der « allgemeine Kurs » und das Pflichtbewußtsein der beteiligten Beamten. Dabei mußten es nicht einmal besonders Regime nahe oder ideologisch überzeugte Beamte sein, die für die Radikalisierung des Klostersturms sorgten. Dies zeigt das Beispiel der Beschlagnahmen im Rheinland.

Bei den Kölner und Bonner Gestapo-Beamten, die die Beschlagnahmen durchführten, handelte es sich weder um « alte Kämpfer » der NSDAP, noch um jene radikalen, meist jüngeren Polizeimitarbeiter, die vor allem in den späteren Jahren des « Dritten Reiches » zu den Polizeidienststellen stießen. Vielmehr waren es Mitarbeiter, die aus der Zeit vor 1933 übernommen worden, teilweise sogar schon vor 1918 bei der Polizei tätig gewesen waren. Sie waren weder überzeugt nationalsozialistisch (der Leiter der Bonner Gestapo hatte sich vor 1939 für die demokratische DDP engagiert) noch entschieden kirchenfeindlich, sondern gehörten vielmehr zu den « ganz normalen Männern » (Christopher Browning). In vielen Fällen stellte die Kirche ihnen nach dem Krieg sogar ausdrücklich positive Beurteilungen aus. Obwohl diese Beamten keine persönliche oder politische Motivation hatten, gegen die Klöster vorzugehen, wurden sie im Klostersturm in vorausgehendem Gehorsam tätig, auch ohne daß der Befehl zur Aufhebung eines Klosters vorlag. Die Kölner Gestapo korrespondierte in der Angelegenheit der Klöster mit dem Reichssicherheitshauptamt in Berlin, ihrer vorgesetzten Behörde. Oftmals ordnete das Reichssicherheitshauptamt aber zunächst lediglich die Beobachtung eines Klosters an oder forderte einen Bericht über dessen Tätigkeit. Die Kölner Beamten meldeten daraufhin jedoch häufig schon wenig später die Beschlagnahme des betreffenden Gebäudes und gingen damit einen entscheidenden Schritt weiter, als das Reichssicherheitshauptamt gefordert hatte.

Der Klostersturm wurde also nicht allein vom Reichssicherheitshauptamt gesteuert und kontrolliert, vielmehr hatte auch die Eigeninitiative der regionalen Polizeidienststellen einen erheblichen Anteil an seinem Verlauf. Ohne den vorausgehenden Gehorsam der örtlichen Polizeidienststellen hätte der Klostersturm vermutlich gar nicht in derselben Radikalität stattfinden können, denn die Handlungsfähigkeit des Reichssicherheitshauptamts war begrenzt : Zwar war die

Absicht, das katholische Ordenswesen zu zerschlagen, zweifellos vorhanden, doch die Realisierung dieses Ziels war mit großen Schwierigkeiten verbunden. Seit den 1930er Jahren wurde mit großem Aufwand umfangreiches Material über das Ordenswesen in Deutschland gesammelt, doch die systematische Auswertung dieser Informationen und ihre Umsetzung in politische Maßnahmen warfen große Probleme auf. Dies lag nicht zuletzt am mangelnden Fachwissen der Bearbeiter. In der Führungsriege des Reichssicherheitshauptamts war zwar eine Reihe ehemaliger Priester und Ordensangehöriger als « Überläufer » tätig, doch in den unteren Hierarchiestufen mangelte es häufig am grundlegenden Wissen über Orden und Klöster.

Sand im Getriebe : Die Rolle des Oberpräsidiums Koblenz

Daß es auch möglich war, dem « allgemeinen Kurs » der NS-Kirchenpolitik nicht zu folgen, zeigt das Beispiel von Oberregierungsrat Alois Becker (1898-1982) , der beim Oberpräsidium Koblenz für die Verwertung des eingezogenen kirchlichen und klösterlichen Vermögens zuständig war. Der Katholik und promovierte Jurist war seit 1936 als Referent unter anderem für « Geistige Angelegenheiten der Rheinprovinz » tätig. Nach seiner Rückkehr von der Front 1942 übernahm er zusätzlich das Referat für Kommunale Angelegenheiten. Becker war seit 1937 Mitglied der NSDAP, unterhielt aber zugleich Kontakte zu Katholiken im politischen Widerstand wie Josef Wirmer (1901-1944) , Josef Müller (1889-1979) , Augustin Rösch (1893-1961) und Laurentius Siemer.

Die Verwaltung und Verwertung des von den Regierungspräsidenten eingezogenen « volks- und staatsfeindlichen » kirchlichen und klösterlichen Vermögens oblag dem Oberpräsidium der Rheinprovinz in Koblenz und fiel dort in den Aufgabenbereich des Referats für Kommunale Angelegenheiten. Becker war dafür zuständig, die Anträge der Gemeinden und Kommunen zu bearbeiten, die an der Übertragung der Grundstücke interessiert waren, und auf der Grundlage der Anträge dem Reichsinnenminister Vorschläge zur Verwertung des Vermögens zu unterbreiten. Anstatt aber die Verwertung voranzutreiben, verzögerte Becker sie absichtlich, um zu verhindern, daß kirchliches Eigentum verschleudert wurde oder in den Besitz von Parteidienststellen übergang. Er hoffte, daß das Ende des Krieges die Rückgabe der Grundstücke an ihre Eigentümer ermöglichen werde, setzte daher auf Zeitgewinn und schob die Entscheidung über die Übertragung der eingezogenen Vermögenswerte so lange wie möglich auf. Beckers Vorgesetzter, der stellvertretende Oberpräsident und SS-Oberführer Karl Eugen Dellenbusch (1901-1959) , beließ Becker in den kirchenpolitischen Angelegenheiten weitestgehende Handlungsfreiheit. Becker kooperierte mit verschiedenen anderen staatlichen Behörden und auch mit den Leitungen der Klöster.

Seine Verzögerungstaktik hatte Erfolg : In den meisten Fällen konnte er verhindern, daß das Vermögen der enteigneten Klöster und kirchlichen Einrichtungen in der Erzdiözese Köln « verwertet » wurde. Die Anträge von verschiedenen Städten und Gemeinden, von Landwirtschaftsverbänden, der Deutschen Arbeitsfront und der Universität Bonn blieben unberücksichtigt. Lediglich in Altenberg und Knechtsteden konnte Becker die Verwertung des Vermögens nicht verhindern.

Becker bemühte sich nicht nur um die Verzögerung der Vermögensverwertung, sondern setzte sich auch für die akuten Belange der Ordensangehörigen ein. So veranlaßte er den Leiter der Bonner Gestapo dazu, den Ordensleuten in den von ihm verwalteten Klöstern Pützchen, Siegburg und Walberberg größere Handlungsfreiheit einzuräumen, und sorgte dafür, daß die Mitgiften der Endericher Benediktinerinnen von der Einziehung ausgenommen wurden. Die Gestapo hatte

sie zunächst für das Reich eingefordert. Mehrfach stellte Becker den Vertretern der Klöster beziehungsweise der Erzdiözese Akten zur Verfügung, die ihnen bei der Formulierung von Protestschreiben hilfreich waren, und setzte sich außerdem für die Rettung der Klosterbibliotheken ein.

Durch sein Engagement brachte Becker sich allmählich selbst in Gefahr. Zweimal wurde er bei der Gestapo angezeigt, konnte sich aber beide Male aus der Affäre ziehen, weil als politisch zuverlässig geltende Personen zu seinen Gunsten aussagten. Als das Reichsinnenministerium jedoch wenig später mit Nachdruck die Verwertung der Klöster in der Rheinprovinz forderte, konnte Dellenbusch Becker nicht länger decken. Während die Verwertung in den übrigen preußischen Provinzen bereits abgeschlossen war, hatte sie in der Rheinprovinz kaum begonnen. Becker entschloß sich zur Flucht : Er ließ sich ein ärztliches Gutachten ausstellen, das es ihm erlaubte, einen Erholungsurlaub anzutreten, und meldete sich anschließend freiwillig zu Schanzarbeiten am Westwall. Bis zum Ende des Krieges kehrte er nicht auf seinen Posten zurück und erhielt auch keinen Nachfolger.

Unter den Behörden, die mit der Beschlagnahme und Enteignung der rheinischen Klöster befaßt waren, spielte das Oberpräsidium Koblenz eine zu geringe Rolle, als daß Becker die Klöster vor dem Klostersturm hätte bewahren können. Dennoch rettete er, was noch zu retten war, konnte in vielen einzelnen Belangen Abhilfe schaffen und vor allem das eingezogene Vermögen vor der Zerstückelung schützen. Für die Rückerstattungsprozesse nach dem Krieg bedeutete dies eine entscheidende Erleichterung.

Die Klöster nach dem Klostersturm

Für die betroffenen Ordensleute war der Klostersturm mit Adolf Hitlers « Stopp-Erlass » vom 30. Juli 1941 nicht zu Ende. Bis zum Ende des Krieges blieben sie vertrieben und konnten erst 1945 einen Neuanfang machen. Vielerorts fanden die zurückkehrenden Ordensleute völlig zerstörte Gebäude vor. Dafür hatten nicht nur die alliierten Bombenangriffe gesorgt, sondern auch mutwillige Zerstörungsaktionen wie in Sankt Augustin, wo ein Wehrmachtangehöriger ein Munitionsdepot zur Explosion gebracht hatte. Hinzu kamen immense Schäden durch die jahrelange Überbelegung der Häuser. Viele beschlagnahmte Klostergebäude waren auch bei Kriegsende noch von Flüchtlingen oder Umsiedlern bewohnt oder wurden weiterhin als Lazarette genutzt. Der Klosterbetrieb konnte deshalb nur nach und nach wieder aufgenommen werden.

Einige Klöster hatten zudem den Verlust großer Teile ihrer Bibliotheken zu beklagen, darunter auch wertvoller mittelalterlicher Bände. Die Nationalsozialisten hatten das Ziel verfolgt, eine zentrale Bibliothek zur Gegnerforschung einzurichten und zu diesem Zweck die Klosterbibliotheken ausgeräumt. Der Aufbau der Zentralbibliothek ging jedoch nur schleppend voran. Die Bestände der rheinischen Klosterbibliotheken wurden auseinander gerissen und fanden sich nach dem Krieg teilweise in Kellern, Stadtbibliotheken oder Antiquariaten wieder.

Die Wiedergutmachungsprozesse um die Rückerstattung des geraubten Eigentums und die Entschädigung der Eigentümer gestalteten sich kompliziert und langwierig. Sie zogen sich bis in die 1970er Jahre hin. Unter den zahllosen Verfolgten des NS-Regimes machten die Klöster nur einen verschwindend geringen Anteil aus und wurden folglich bei den Wiedergutmachungsprozessen nicht vorrangig behandelt.

Gravierender als die materiellen Schäden wirkte sich in den Nachkriegsjahrzehnten jedoch der Einbruch der Nachwuchszahlen aus, die der Nationalsozialismus mit sich gebracht hatte. Durch verschiedene Gesetze und Verordnungen hatte die NS-Regierung den Ordensnachwuchs schon vor dem Klostersturm stark beschnitten, und nach den Beschlagnahmen konnte so gut wie gar kein Nachwuchs mehr aufgenommen und ausgebildet werden. Die Orden und Kongregationen haben sich von diesem Rückschlag nie wieder ganz erholt. Die Folgen der NS-Herrschaft wirkten nach dem Krieg mit allgemeinen Tendenzen der Säkularisierung und Entkirchlichung in der deutschen Gesellschaft zusammen. Von den 18 Klöstern, die im Erzbistum Köln dem Klostersturm zum Opfer fielen, mussten sieben inzwischen geschlossen werden, auch die übrigen haben sich stark verkleinert. So bildete Himmlers Klostersturm eine tiefe Zäsur in der Ordensgeschichte, deren Folgen bis heute spürbar sind.

Les Nazis au couvent

Nazis in the nunnery

On 2 July 1936, an impressive ceremony was held in a small city in Saxony. Heinrich Himmler, the leader of the SS, led a procession of Nazi officials through the streets, past ranks of SS troopers and « Hitler Youth », winding their way-up to the 10th Century monastery that sat on a hill in the middle of the city. There, in the crypt of the monastery, Himmler and his other guests took part in a solemn ritual.

The reason for their gathering in this monastery was one which is very familiar to medieval historians - they were there to commemorate a dead king on the anniversary of his death. The king in question was Henry I (aka : Henry the Fowler) , who had died 1,000 years earlier, on 2 July 936. Henry was a member of the Liudolfings, a family of Saxon aristocrats who had been steadily gaining power in the years after the collapse of the Carolingian Empire, in 888. After the death of Conrad I in 918, Henry was able to take the throne himself. With his rise to the throne, Henry founded a new dynasty of Kings and Emperors : the Ottonians. Under his descendants, the eastern regions of the former Carolingian Empire would be reformed into a new Empire : the 1st German « Reich » .

Henry, believed to be the 1st king of the medieval German State, was unsurprisingly an evocative figure in Nazi Germany. Himmler, who already was keenly interested in the origins of the German people, was particularly fascinated by this dead King. To Himmler, Henry was the founder of the 1st « Reich » , the inspiration for the 3rd « Reich » , and a heroic ancestral figure who embodied German potential.

This meant he, and his body, was of great symbolic significance. Henry's tomb was housed in the female monastery of Quedlinburg. Henry was buried in a stone sarcophagus alongside his wife, Queen Mathilda, and their granddaughter, Abbess Mathilda of Quedlinburg. Their tombs sat in the east end of the church, perched on a knuckle of rock which looked-out over the plains stretching to the eastern border of the Empire and the lands of the Hungarians beyond it.

Quedlinburg was not just a monastery, it was a powerful political centre in the 10th Century. It was a former fortress which looked-out towards the border of the Empire, and it was a monastery filled with women dedicated to serving

God. It was a place where a dead ruler was buried and where other rulers came to hold political meetings and to celebrate Christian Festivals. Quedlinburg was full of contradictions and it was those contradictions which made it such a powerful symbolic place for the Ottonians.

The symbolism of this wasn't just important in the 10th Century - Himmler tried to capitalize on it in the 20th Century too. He provided funding for a new sarcophagus for Henry, resplendent in Nazi imagery. He financed research into the grave inscription on Abbess Mathilda's tomb (which handily concluded that Poland was definitively brought into the German Empire under Otto III) . And, to top all this off, he turned Quedlinburg itself into a new cult centre for the SS.

Rather than continue as a Christian church, Himmler wanted Quedlinburg, one of the spiritual hearts of the 1st German Empire, to be the spiritual heart for the SS, the elite of the new « Reich » . From 1936 onwards, the anniversary of Henry I's death saw new commemorations for the King at in the crypt at Quedlinburg, decorated with massive banners featuring the SS symbol.

In the 10th Century, Quedlinburg was a place whose symbolic nature meant it could stand for a whole host of different ideas about power, legitimacy and Imperial rule. It was this wealth of symbolic meaning which made Quedlinburg particularly valuable to the Ottonian Emperors. It was also these meanings which, a millennium later, drew the attention of those looking to gain legitimacy and Imperial rule in Germany for themselves - even if it was under very different circumstances.

Évian, Munich et leurs conséquences

La conférence d'Évian

Le 23 mars 1938, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, président des États-Unis, prend l'initiative de convoquer une conférence internationale sur la question des réfugiés en provenance du « Reich » . Avant la conférence, Roosevelt prend ses précautions à l'égard des 32 États convoqués affirmant qu'il ne s'agit pas d'augmenter les quotas d'immigration ou de financer l'accueil des réfugiés. L'Allemagne n'est pas invitée, la présence du Portugal n'est pas jugée utile. L'URSS et la Tchécoslovaquie ne dépêchent pas de représentants, l'Italie, solidaire de l'Allemagne, refuse l'invitation. La Hongrie, la Roumanie, la Pologne et l'Afrique du Sud envoient des observateurs. Le Royaume-Uni accepte l'invitation non sans s'être assuré auparavant que les États-Unis ne tenteraient pas d'obtenir de sa part une augmentation des immigrants juifs dans les territoires sous mandat britannique.

Les représentants des 32 États qui siègent finalement du 6 au 15 juillet à l'hôtel Royal à Évian (France) expriment leur sympathie aux victimes des persécutions tout en affirmant que la situation économique et sociale de leur pays ne leur permet pas d'accroître les contingents d'immigration. Une sous-commission auditionne en une après-midi, les représentants de 40 organisations de réfugiés et les organisations juives, dont celles du « Reich » . La conférence n'aboutit à aucun résultat concret, sinon à créer un Comité intergouvernemental pour les réfugiés siégeant à Londres et destiné à donner une suite à cette rencontre.

Les Juifs allemands et autrichiens voient tous leurs espoirs s'effondrer. Les dirigeants nazis, assurés que les gouvernements occidentaux ne viendront pas faire obstacle à leur politique, intensifient les mesures forçant les Juifs à émigrer. Mais l'absence de pays d'accueil empêche ces derniers de quitter l'Allemagne.

Les Accords de Munich

Signés dans la nuit du 29 au 30 septembre 1938 par l'Allemagne, la France, le Royaume-Uni et l'Italie, ces accords conviennent des dispositions et conditions réglementant la cession des territoires des Sudètes où résident des populations allemandes, à l'Allemagne.

L'expulsion des Juifs des Sudètes

Moins d'un mois après la signature des Accords de Munich, en septembre 1938, Hitler expulse vers la Tchécoslovaquie plusieurs milliers de Juifs qui vivent dans la région des Sudètes. Les Tchécoslovaques refusant de les laisser entrer, ceux-ci tentent de se réfugier en Hongrie. Mais ils sont renvoyés en Allemagne par les autorités hongroises puis à nouveau dirigés vers la Tchécoslovaquie par les autorités nazies. Ils sont finalement conduits de force vers des camps de toile improvisés installés dans un « no man's land » séparant la Hongrie et la Tchécoslovaquie, comme à Mischdorf, à une vingtaine de kilomètres de Bratislava.

L'expulsion des Juifs polonais

Le 31 mars 1938, le Parlement polonais vote une loi définissant toute une série de cas dans lesquels un ressortissant polonais vivant à l'étranger peut être privé de sa nationalité. En octobre 1938, un nouveau décret annonce l'annulation des passeports des Polonais résidant à l'étranger qui n'auront pas obtenu une autorisation spéciale d'entrer en Pologne avant la fin du mois. Or, plus de 40 % des Juifs vivant dans le « Reich » sont nés en Pologne. Le 27 et 28 octobre 1938, la police et les SS arrêtent et regroupent tous les Juifs polonais de sexe masculin, les transportent aux environs de Zbaszyn, ville polonaise, où ils leur font franchir la rivière qui sépare les 2 pays. Les femmes et les enfants privés de tout moyen de subsistance sont obligés de suivre les hommes. La majorité d'entre eux arrive en train, munie seulement de quelques affaires et d'une somme d'argent limitée à 10 Marks par personnes. Les Grynszpan, une famille juive originaire de Hanovre fait partie des 16,000 juifs polonais reconduits à la frontière, leur fils Herschel se trouve à Paris dans la clandestinité. Dès leur arrivée en Pologne, conformément aux instructions reçues les gardes frontières polonais les refoulent.

La « Nuit de Cristal »

Après 5 années de national-socialisme, les chefs du régime constatent que, malgré les menaces et les brimades, les 3/4 de la population juive du « Reich » ont choisi de rester. Situation d'autant plus préoccupante que presque 200,000 Juifs résidants en Autriche tombent sous l'autorité du « Reich » après l'« Anschluß ». 1938 sera l'année d'une radicalisation et d'une accélération des mesures antisémites visant à éliminer toute présence juive, en particulier dans

l'économie, et à encourager une émigration massive. Ces mesures législatives s'accompagnent d'actes de violence dont le point culminant sera la « Nuit de Cristal » .

L'assassinat de Ernst vom Rath par Herschel Grynszpan

Le 7 novembre 1938, Herschel Grynszpan, Juif polonais d'origine allemande qui habite Paris et veut protester contre la récente expulsion des Juifs polonais vivant en Allemagne par-delà la frontière polonaise, se présente à l'ambassade d'Allemagne et blesse mortellement Ernst vom Rath, secrétaire d'ambassade.

En France, Grynszpan est inculpé par le juge Tesnière de tentative d'assassinat et de meurtre avec préméditation. Transféré à Berlin, Grynszpan est interrogé puis incarcéré à Sachsenhausen, le 18 janvier 1941, et fait plusieurs séjours à la prison de la « Gestapo » . Personne n'a jamais su avec certitude ce qu'il advint de Grynszpan. Si, en février 1936, le meurtre de Wilhelm Gustloff, chef d'une branche suisse du Parti nazi, par David Frankfurter, étudiant juif d'origine yougoslave était passé inaperçu en raison des Jeux olympiques de Berlin celui de vom Rath est, pour les Nazis, le prétexte au déclenchement de la « Nuit de Cristal » .

Le pogrom anti-juifs

À l'annonce de l'attentat contre vom Rath, la presse allemande développe à l'envi le thème de la conspiration juive mondiale et menace de sévères représailles. C'est le prétexte idéal pour faire la chasse aux Juifs et les contraindre à quitter massivement l'Allemagne. Le 9 novembre au soir à Munich, Josef Goebbels prononce un discours violent d'incitation aux représailles devant les chefs nazis réunis à l'ancien Hôtel de Ville de Munich pour la commémoration du « Putsch » de 1923 et annonce que des pogroms anti-juifs ont éclaté dans les districts de Kurhessen (Heße-Cassel) et de Magdeburg-Anhalt. Il ajoute que, sur sa suggestion, Hitler a décidé de ne rien faire pour empêcher un mouvement qui s'étendrait spontanément à l'ensemble du « Reich » .

À l'annonce du décès de vom Rath, l'émeute se propage avec une rapidité foudroyante. La SA donne ordre à ses troupes d'incendier systématiquement toutes les synagogues du pays. Informé des événements dans la nuit, Heinrich Himmler a une réaction relativement modérée, ordonnant à ses troupes d'entrer en action pour empêcher un pillage généralisé et pour interner une vingtaine de milliers de Juifs dans les camps de concentration. Les agresseurs se ruent à l'assaut des symboles de la vie juive.

Près d'une centaine de Juifs sont assassinés, plusieurs sont gravement blessés, des femmes sont violées. En Autriche, le pogrom est plus violent encore : 42 synagogues sont détruites, 27 Juifs tués, une centaine est gravement blessée. 6 500 personnes sont arrêtées et transférées principalement aux camps de concentration de Dachau et Buchenwald. La grande majorité des internés Juifs allemands et Juifs autrichiens, lors de la « Nuit de Cristal » , est progressivement libérée entre le 18 novembre 1938 et le printemps 1939 s'ils s'engagent à émigrer sans tarder et à abandonner la majeure partie de leurs biens. Parmi eux, les vieillards, les grands malades, ceux qui peuvent prouver qu'ils vont émigrer ou accepter de céder leurs entreprises à un Aryen pour un prix dérisoire, sont les lers libérés. Le froid, les mauvais traitements et les maladies provoquent la mort de plusieurs centaines « de Juifs de novembre » . La

communauté juive est condamnée à payer une amende de un milliard de Marks pour avoir causé ces dommages « en provoquant la juste colère du peuple allemand ». Elle sera prélevée sur les 7 milliards d'avoirs juifs bloqués depuis avril 1938.

Le déchaînement de violence donne à tort l'impression d'une émeute spontanée. En fait, à l'exception d'une minorité, la population est restée spectatrice. Peu de voix s'élèvent pour protester officiellement. Les Églises restent silencieuses.

Dans la journée du 10, les violences cessent. Le bilan est très lourd : destruction de 267 synagogues en Allemagne, de nombreuses maisons communautaires, de milliers de lieux privés (maisons, appartements et commerces) . À ces destructions matérielles s'est ajouté l'assassinat de 91 Juifs, l'arrestation et la déportation de 30,000 hommes à Dachau et Buchenwald. Dans les semaines qui suivent, la communauté juive est secouée par une vague de suicides sans précédents (680 dans la seule ville de Vienne) , et la vague d'émigration vers l'Europe occidentale et la Palestine s'accélère.

Conscient du retentissement à l'échelle nationale et internationale de cet événement (condamnation de l'opinion publique et politique au Royaume-Uni et aux États-Unis, boycott des entreprises en France, Canada, Pays-Bas) , le régime nazi décide de ne pas renouveler d'actions similaires au grand jour.

L'indifférence des Nations

Des réfugiés pris au piège

La « Nuit de Cristal » suscite l'indignation et de vives protestations dans un grand nombre de pays occidentaux, sans pour autant provoquer de modifications de la politique d'immigration de ces États.

« Le monde semble être divisé en 2 parties : les endroits où les Juifs ne peuvent pas vivre et ceux où ils ne peuvent pas entrer » déclare déjà en 1936, Haim Weizmann, chef de file du mouvement sioniste. En 1938, les frontières se ferment encore un peu plus.

En France

Si les critiques de la « Nuit de Cristal » sont vives dans la presse, le gouvernement Daladier reste muet afin de ne pas compromettre le rapprochement en cours avec l'Allemagne nazie (les accords Ribbentrop-Bonnet) . De 1933 à 1937, la France a accueilli plusieurs dizaines de milliers de réfugiés provenant essentiellement d'Allemagne et d'Autriche. Cependant, le gouvernement du Front populaire crée un sous-secrétariat d'état à l'immigration en 1937 et le droit d'asile est restreint en 1938. En février 1939, le pays est submergé par l'arrivée de 500,000 réfugiés espagnols.

En Allemagne

La terreur vécue pendant la « Nuit de Cristal », les arrestations massives et la vague de nouvelles lois, transforment le flot migratoire en exode massif. Le 24 janvier 1939, Hermann Göring charge Wilhelm Frick, ministre de l'intérieur, de « réaliser par tous les moyens l'émigration des Juifs hors d'Allemagne ». Ce même mois de janvier, l'Office central pour l'émigration juive est fondé à Berlin sous la direction de Reinhard Heydrich. Sur le plan intérieur, Göring prend la relève de Josef Goebbels pour l'organisation des suites du pogrom. La réunion des principaux responsables nazis du 12 novembre 1938, décide de la multiplication des mesures anti-juives : dissolution des organisations juives (à l'exception du « Reichsvertretung », organe représentatif des Juifs d'Allemagne, du « Kulturbund », organisation culturelle et de l'office palestinien de l'organisation sioniste), suppression de la presse juive, restriction des déplacements des Juifs dans les lieux publics, expulsion des Juifs de leurs logements et concentration dans des « maisons juives ».

La Palestine fermée par le « Livre Blanc »

En mai 1939, le Royaume-Uni décide de limiter strictement l'immigration en Palestine en annonçant la mise en place d'un « Livre blanc » réduisant l'accueil des réfugiés à 75,000 Juifs pour 5 ans.

Soucieux de préserver leurs intérêts dans la région, les Anglais préférèrent maintenir le statu quo. Les forces navales britanniques n'hésitent pas à intercepter et à renvoyer à leurs ports de départ, généralement Constanza en Roumanie, les bateaux chargés de Juifs pour lesquels la Palestine est le dernier espoir : le 25 mars 1939, le Sandru avec 269 réfugiés ; le 6 avril 1939, l'Astir avec 698 réfugiés ; le 23 avril 1939, l'Assimi avec 250 réfugiés.

AB 106 : La propagande nazie

La propagande nazie faisait partie des attributions du Ministère du « Reich » à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande, dirigé par Josef Goebbels. Le Parti nazi avait lui aussi son officine de promotion : la « Reichspropagandaleitung der NSDAP », également dirigé par Goebbels.

La propagande nazie commença dès les années 1920. Mais avec l'accession au pouvoir d'Adolf Hitler, elle pouvait faire appel à tous les moyens possibles, attachant une importance particulière au sport et au cinéma. Celle-ci devint ainsi un élément fondamental de la « Gleichschaltung » (mise-au-pas) de la société allemande, et devint un élément central du caractère totalitaire du régime.

L'efficacité de cette prise de pouvoir sur les consciences du peuple est plus ambiguë que ce que les images ont pu suggérer, une distanciation s'opérant : l'auteur anonyme du récit « Une femme à Berlin » évoque les réflexions des Berlinoises aux dernières heures de la guerre, coincés dans les caves alors que l'Armée rouge envahit la ville, se remémorant les ultimes appels des leaders du régime à la radio.

Cinéma

Dès le 12 septembre 1933, Adolf Hitler crée un Département du Film au sein du Bureau central de la propagande du parti du NSDAP dirigé par Josef Goebbels. Le Département, mené par le « Reichsamtsleiter » Karl Neumann, aurait

participé à la production d'entre 1,150 et 1,350 films de propagande, tels que « le Juif éternel » (1939) de Fritz Hippler, réalisateur également responsable du cinéma au Ministère du « Reich » à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande. Dès 1933, et avant même la création du « Reichsfilmkammer » (Chambre du film « Reich »), corporation à laquelle l'adhésion est obligatoire pour pouvoir réaliser un film, le Ministère de la Propagande exclut tout Juif et/ou étranger de la production cinématographique allemande. Une censure préventive était organisée par le « Reichsfilm dramaturg » .

L'ensemble de la production cinématographique est progressivement nationalisée. Le « holding » Cautio Treuhand, instrument du ministère de Goebbels et dirigé par Max Winkler, achète en 1937 Universum Film AG, qui tourne en 1943 « les Aventures fantastiques du baron Münchhausen » afin de fêter, conformément aux souhaits de Goebbels, les 25 ans d'existence de la Société. Ce film fut évoqué comme exemple de propagande nazie par Joseph Joffo dans « un Sac de billes » (1973) . En 1942, après plusieurs fusions importantes (dont celle avec la firme autrichienne Wien-Film, qui avait donné son nom au genre apolitique, souvent proche de la comédie, dit Wiener Film) , ce « holding » créa l'Ufi-Group, lequel monopolisait la production cinématographique.

Les actualités hebdomadaires des Nazis sont projetées dans toutes les salles de cinéma. Outre les films de Leni Riefenstahl (dont « le Triomphe de la volonté » , qui dépeint le congrès de Nuremberg du NSDAP de 1934) qui encensent le régime nazi, certains documentaires poursuivent des objectifs de propagande adressée à l'ennemi davantage encore qu'aux Allemands. C'est le cas du documentaire non achevé « Theresienstadt » , tourné à l'été 1944 au camp de concentration de Theresienstadt et qui visait à faire croire à la Croix-Rouge danoise que les détenus juifs y étaient bien traités. Son réalisateur, Kurt Gerron, fut ensuite gazé à Auschwitz, comme la plupart des membres de l'équipe de tournage, enrôlés contre leur gré.

La plupart des films produits sous le Nazisme visent cependant à divertir les masses : seul 1/6 de la production cinématographique traitent explicitement de la politique. Ainsi, sur les 1,350 longs-métrages produits entre 1933 et 1945, on compte 1,200 divertissements.

Affiche

Comme tous les mouvements politiques de l'époque, la propagande nazie a abondamment recouru aux affiches. Theo Matejko fut l'un des illustrateurs les plus réputés enrôlés dans cette production d'art militant.

Presse

Le 2 février 1933, les journaux d'avis contraires au régime sont interdits de parution.

En 1940, le magazine couleur « Signal » est introduit par le régime comme vecteur de propagande à l'échelle européenne.

Le Mouvement « Völkisch »

Le Mouvement « Völkisch » est un courant intellectuel et politique de la Révolution conservatrice apparu en Allemagne à la fin du XIXe siècle et au début du XXe siècle, héritée des « Teutomanes », pour désigner un entrelacs de personnalités, et de conglomérat d'associations, dont l'élément commun est le projet de donner à l'ensemble des Allemands une spiritualité païenne ; en général, le paganisme germanique.

Ce courant d'idées puise ses sources dans le Romantisme allemand des années 1840 et dans les désillusions de la période 1849-1862, entre l'écrasement du printemps des peuples et l'arrivée de Bismarck au pouvoir en Prusse.

Important par le nombre de groupuscules, mais peu par celui de ses adhérents, et de par les évolutions sociétales, le mouvement idéologique s'est trouvé face à de nouveaux problèmes lui imposant une nouvelle définition.

Pour les uns, le courant « völkisch » découle d'une vocation raciste permanente, lié aux apports de la biologie et du « darwinisme social ». Pour d'autres, il représente un courant foncièrement antisémite, ou ravivant un passé germanique largement mythique soit occultiste et luttant contre le christianisme, plus généralement les monothéismes.

« Völkisch », terme difficilement traduisible en français, peut revêtir plusieurs significations ; en allemand aussi, le terme « Volk » revêt plusieurs significations : la nation, le peuple, dans un sens ethnique. En droit, ce mot désigne « le peuple », au sens du détenteur de la souveraineté au sein de l'État (« Dem Deutschen Volke » : « Au peuple allemand » est inscrit au frontispice du « Reichstag », à Berlin) .

Au XIXe siècle, le terme « völkisch » met l'accent (entre autres, par le Mouvement « Völkisch ») sur le caractère spécifique, exceptionnel, mystique du peuple allemand et le maintien de ses traditions. C'est ensuite l'affirmation de l'idée et du concept de race, de la supériorité des germaniques, unis par des liens de sang, de langue et de culture.

Les termes « völkisch » et « Volk » partagent en commun une racine : le terme « Volk », qui renvoie au terme français de « Peuple ». Le « Volk » ne renvoie pas uniquement à une population donnée, mais aussi, pour les théoriciens de la nation allemande au XIXe siècle, à quelque chose de plus abstrait, un intermédiaire entre les individus et une entité supérieure. Pour certains, la nature (perçue comme spécifique à un espace donnée, vivante et spontanée) ; pour d'autres, l'univers.

Le « Volk » est non seulement inscrit dans un cadre précis, la nature et ses manifestations, mais aussi dans une histoire longue et mythifiée. Ainsi, le « Volk » est une entité historique oubliée, qui resurgit à la faveur de la Révolution française : est ainsi idéalisé le « Volk » médiéval, tel que le perçoivent les Romantiques allemands. Pour tous les penseurs du « Volk », l'enracinement de celui-ci à un paysage, à un pays, constitue l'un des piliers du « Volksgeist », notion difficilement traduisible, mais qui rend indissociable l'histoire, le territoire, l'architecture et le paysage (ou la nature) dans une totalité indivisible.

De plus, le « Volk » est un tout unique, une communauté immuable que les évolutions de la société dans les années 1860 désorganisent et disloquent. Ainsi, pour Paul de Lagarde, les agents de division de la nation allemande sont les Libéraux et les Juifs : les uns, car ils sont favorables à la liberté de circulation ; les autres, car ils forment précisément

un « Volk » uni, qui tend à diriger les autres nations et sont les propagateurs du Libéralisme, mais des Juifs peuvent individuellement être détachés de ce « Volk » et intégrés dans la communauté germanique. Au fil des réflexions sur le « Volk », les penseurs « völkisch » développent un antisémitisme de plus en plus virulent. Lagarde, par exemple, voit dans le peuple juif un autre « Volk » ; puis, à partir de 1873, souhaite exterminer les Juifs comme on extermine de la vermine et des bacilles contagieux.

Face aux évolutions politiques et économiques de l'Allemagne du dernier tiers du XIXe siècle, un certain nombre de penseurs se réfugient dans la nostalgie d'un passé mythifié et magnifié. Ces penseurs tentent de ressusciter un moment historique dans lequel le « Volk » était uni et non divisé en multiples catégories sociales. Ainsi, l'Empire allemand ne répond pas à ces attentes, car il n'est pas tourné vers le retour aux espaces ruraux, mais s'oriente vers l'industrialisation et ses corollaires économiques et sociaux.

Mais surtout, les conditions de l'Unité, qui contrairement à 1848, n'a pas été l'occasion de grands élans populaires, déçoivent fondamentalement les précurseurs du « Volk ». Ainsi, dans les débuts de l'Empire, Paul de Lagarde s'en prend constamment aux fondements de l'État nouvellement unifié. Il ne cesse de se proclamer le principal adversaire de Bismarck, qu'il accuse d'avoir mis en place une « petite Allemagne » atrophie, qui ne peut ainsi réaliser son destin, la conquête de la « Mitteleuropa », définie comme l'Empire d'Autriche ; en outre, conservateur, Lagarde s'oppose à la forme institutionnelle prise par le nouveau « Reich », essentiellement la mise en place d'une forme de parlementarisme. De plus, dans son obsession de retour aux origines du « Volk », Lagarde s'oppose aux Libéraux, perçus par les conservateurs dont il fait partie, comme des fauteurs de troubles. Les Libéraux sont, en effet, ceux par lesquels les conflits arrivent, qui remettent en cause l'unité et l'esprit du « Volk » .

Mais les réserves de Lagarde ne sont pas celles de la génération suivante, qui analyse le « Reich », une fois Bismarck parti, comme une république avec une tête couronnée ; il appelle donc de ses vœux la création d'une pompe Impériale, avec la création d'un Empereur secret, doté des attributs à la fois de Martin Luther, qui serait à la fois législateur éclairé et « Führer » du peuple, mais qui ne serait en aucun cas un représentant de la dynastie prussienne.

Le Mouvement « Völkisch » se dote très tôt d'une série d'idées et de penseurs, et forme ainsi une nébuleuse intellectuelle très active dès les années 1860. De ce fourmillement d'idées, certaines lignes de forces se dégagent.

Tout d'abord, un certain intérêt pour la genèse de l'Allemagne et des Allemands, donc pour l'histoire se fait jour. Ainsi, dès la phase finale de l'unification allemande (1867-1871), les anciens Germains décrits par Tacite, puis les Goths par leur activité, sont magnifiés, car ils représentent, les uns, les « Allemands de leur jeunesse », les autres, une valeur absolue, car, par leurs victoires, liées à leur vitalité, ils accélèrent la chute de Rome. Ainsi, le « Volk » allemand se trouve le dépositaire, par ces racines, de toute l'énergie de ces peuples disparus.

Ensuite, les penseurs « völkisch », obsédés par les racines du « Volk » germanique, défendaient l'idée de pureté de la race germanique ; dans un contexte scientifique marqué par le développement de l'anthropologie et de la philologie, certains penseurs « völkisch » déterminent non seulement un certain nombre de traits physiques communs à tous les

peuples partageant des racines germaniques, mais aussi insistent sur les liens de parenté entre certaines langues, donc entre certains peuples, plongeant eux aussi leurs racines dans le terreau germanique. Mais cette pureté n'est pas seulement avérée par l'étude de la philologie ou de l'anthropologie, elle est aussi avérée par certains par des critères de pureté de la race : pour Max Müller, les populations européennes de langues germaniques sont les descendants directs des populations aryennes qui ont essaimé depuis l'Inde ; dans la lignée d'Arthur de Gobineau, les penseurs « völkisch » défendent la nécessité de pureté de la race, sous peine de disparition.

Un certain nombre de penseurs « völkisch », dans la lignée du courant Romantique, magnifie le passé médiéval de l'Allemagne, et s'intéresse à l'histoire allemande. Pour Julius Langbehn, le modèle Impérial allemand reste celui incarné par les « Hohenstaufen », dont les « Hohenzollern » ne sont que la triste et pâle copie.

Cette exigence de pureté de la race germanique trouve son prolongement logique dans le développement de différentes formes d'antisémitisme. L'existence de ces différentes formes illustrent les différentes conceptions de la figure du Juif qui sont présentes au sein du Mouvement « Völkisch ». Dès le départ, le Juif, habitant mystérieux d'un ghetto fantasmé, est perçu comme un élément étranger au « Volk » ; il peut être appréhendé comme un déraciné, donc privé des hautes qualités morales permises par l'intimité du lien entre le « Volk » et son territoire, ou bien comme un acteur entreprenant de complots ourdis contre les non-Juifs.

Dans les années 1850, la littérature populaire présente le Juif comme un archétype caractérisé par l'avarice, l'ambition, l'envie, la laideur et l'absence d'humanité : il ne peut donc connaître l'ascension sociale que s'il s'appuie sur des procédés déloyaux, et l'oppose à l'Allemand (ou au chrétien), membre d'un « Volk », droit et honnête, qui finit par triompher du malhonnête par sa droiture et sa grandeur d'âme. Dans le cadre de cette opposition, la question juive n'est plus, pour les membres des courants « völkisch », seulement une question de race ou de religion, mais aussi une question d'éthique.

Pour Julius Langbehn, les Juifs sont des représentants d'un « Volk » étranger, que le « Volk » allemand ne peut assimiler (à l'image d'une « pomme qui ne peut se transformer en prune ») qu'il divise en 2 catégories : les Juifs orthodoxes et les Juifs assimilés. La Ire est acceptée, car elle n'a pas répudié sa spécificité et les traits qui rendent ses membres parties d'un « Volk » spécifique ; la seconde, les Juifs assimilés, doivent par contre être exterminés, comme un poison. Cette approche eschatologique, qui voit dans l'extermination d'éléments étrangers au « Volk » une étape vers la réalisation d'un projet national allemand à l'échelle du continent, se place ainsi dans une perspective de régénération du « Volk » allemand, par la victoire remportée par une conception du monde sur une autre conception du monde.

Pour les penseurs « völkisch », tout ce qui fait référence à la société industrielle, alors en cours de formation, est rejeté ; mais cette opposition touche différents domaines selon les auteurs. Pour Paul de Lagarde, l'incarnation du mal, c'est le Libéralisme. Pour Julius Langbehn, c'est la science. Ce refus de la modernité est, en réalité, le refus d'un monde quantifiable, réductible à des équations mathématiques et à des phénomènes mécaniques, d'un monde physique composé uniquement d'atomes, c'est-à-dire de matière.

La modernité dans son ensemble est rejetée, car elle brise les liens qui unissent les membres du « Volk », elle constitue la cause première du déclin de l'Allemagne ; corollaire de ce rejet, sont rejetés ceux qui apportent cette modernité, les Juifs, « peste et choléra passagers » selon le mot de Langbehn, peuple protéiforme, sans patrie, mais candidat à la domination sur les Allemands.

Ainsi est magnifiée l'image du paysan allemand. En effet, celui-ci n'est pas encore touché par la société moderne, qui est proche des racines du « Volk » germanique. Ces paysans ont leur aire de prédilection, la Basse-Allemagne, l'Allemagne du Nord-Ouest ; cette Allemagne authentique s'oppose à la Prusse, conglomérat de Slaves, de Juifs et de Français, mais fait cependant alliance avec elle pour faire renaître la germanité. C'est dans cette Allemagne du Nord-Ouest, l'ancienne Saxe d'avant la conquête carolingienne, que vivent les Allemands les plus authentiques, selon Langbehn : les paysans « Niederdeutsche », dont le type même constitue l'incarnation du « Volk » germanique, non touché par la modernité, d'ascendance respectable, car enraciné sur un terroir.

Une partie importante de la nébuleuse « Völkisch » souhaite un essor territorial de l'Allemagne bien au-delà des frontières du « Reich ». Les idéologues « Völkisch » ne sont pas forcément favorable à une expansion outre-mer mais, plutôt, à une expansion européenne, avec la création d'un vaste Empire européen à coloniser par l'envoi de populations germaniques qui prendraient la place de populations non allemandes refoulées.

Ainsi, pour Paul de Lagarde, l'avenir de l'Allemagne est à l'Est, sur des territoires enlevés à l'Autriche ou à la Russie ; une fois annexée l'ensemble de l'Autriche, l'Allemagne devrait pouvoir librement coloniser le pourtour russe de la Mer Noire et l'Ukraine.

Julius Langbehn, dans la lignée Paul de Lagarde, préconise la création d'un espace allemand d'Amsterdam à Riga, avec la réunification de tous les peuples du rameau germanique, dans le cadre de ce qu'il nomme une « politique familiale » .

Après la fondation, dans les années 1890, des premières associations « völkisch » comme le « Deutschbund », fondé en 1894, le Mouvement « Völkisch », capable de souplesse en matière d'édition et de propagande, se créa au tournant du siècle en Allemagne sous la forme d'associations libres en étroite relation avec le nationalisme organisé, à savoir essentiellement l'« Alldeutscher Verband ». À côté de contacts soutenus entretenus avec le Mouvement « Alldeutscher » autrichien qui leur était étroitement apparenté sur le plan des idées, des personnes et des institutions, il existait également de nombreux échanges formalisés avec les mouvements réformateurs qui avaient vu le jour en grand nombre depuis les années 1880. Dans le Mouvement « Völkisch » se retrouvaient des groupements qui divergeaient grandement tant sur leurs buts politiques, sociaux et culturels que sur le plan de leur forme organisationnelle et leur représentativité.

Dès ses débuts, les mouvements « Völkisch » accordent une place importante à la jeunesse. En effet, déçus par l'âge des Épigones, comme on désigne le règne de Guillaume II, les intellectuels « Völkisch » se représentent la jeunesse à leur image, déçus par le « Reich » bourgeois et grandiloquent qui a succédé au « Reich » de 1871. Ainsi, les principaux penseurs « Völkisch » développent des corpus pédagogiques, pour former la jeunesse allemande à leurs

idées. Paul de Lagarde, précocement, s'en prend au système éducatif du 2e « Reich », qui, à ses yeux, participe à la mise-en-place d'un esprit mercantiliste, dispensant un savoir cloisonné, utilitaire et conformiste.

Langbehn, de son côté, incite la jeunesse à prendre la tête du combat contre les Juifs et les Libéraux, ce qu'elle fait, d'après lui, en excluant d'office les Juifs des associations étudiantes, prenant modèle sur le corps des officiers et la congrégation des Jésuites.

En 1919, Moeller van Den Bruck met en place une structure, le « Front de la Jeunesse ». Ce front, qui regroupe un certain nombre d'intellectuels conservateurs exerce une influence conservatrice sur l'ensemble des acteurs de la Révolution conservatrice de la République de Weimar. Son objectif est de mettre en place des éléments cohérents d'éducation populaire conservatrice, en partie grâce au journal hebdomadaire « Conscience ». « Journal Indépendant pour la culture du peuple » (« Volksbildung ») que ce cercle édite. C'est également à la jeunesse qu'il dédie son ouvrage « Les Allemands », espérant lui donner la « Weltanschauung » qui lui manque.

Selon Louis Dupeux, les idées « völkisch » sont la métamorphose de la révolution conservatrice au nationalisme. Ils se situent entre le « Kulturpessimismus » et la révolution conservatrice.

Le mouvement présentait des caractères protestataires nationalistes-réformistes, corroborés par une vision du monde teintée de fusion entre mysticisme, idée de décadence (Oswald Spengler), restauration de l'idée et du concept de race, notamment du peuple german, du droit « allemand », du calendrier et des fêtes, des mythes et des tendances profondes de la société.

Sa clientèle majoritaire, masculine et d'origine protestante, fait montre d'un profil social essentiellement bourgeois, émanant de l'ancienne comme de la nouvelle classe moyenne.

Partant d'une base idéologique raciste (antisémite, anti-slave et anti-romaine), le mouvement aspirait à une société organisée sur des principes anti-égalitaires (parfois phalocrates, mais aussi « féministes » - influence probable de Johann Jakob Bachofen - d'une certaine façon, et corporatistes) qui devait être fondée sur un christianisme germanique ou sur une religion païenne propre. Il avait pour objectif de créer au centre de l'Europe, sur la base d'un système de valeurs fondé sur des idéologies germaniques, un État racial ou, éventuellement, une fédération d'États pan-germaniques.

Après 1918, le nombre d'organisations et de leurs affiliés allait, dans un 1er temps, clairement s'accroître. Avec le « Deutschvölkischer Schutz- und Trutzbund » (1919-1923), le mouvement disposa même pour une courte période d'un cartel influent d'associations « völkisch » et des personnes adhérant à ces idées furent élues aux parlements des « Länder » comme au « Reichstag ». À partir de 1924-1925, en raison de ses déficiences structurelles, le mouvement allait néanmoins se trouver progressivement mis à l'écart de la politique par l'idéologiquement proche National-Socialisme qui était devenu la nouvelle caisse de résonance de la Droite radicale.

Cependant, son influence sur des pans entiers de la société allemande reste forte. Ainsi, par le biais de son influence

dans le monde scolaire, les idées développées par la nébuleuse « völkisch » attirent à elles une part non négligeable de la jeunesse du « Reich », séduite par la perspective du changement révolutionnaire promis par les idéaux « völkisch », par l'identification d'un bouc-émissaire facilement identifiable et soumise aux pressions idéologiques radicales.

En effet, l'idéologie « völkisch » d'après la Grande Guerre, fournit à la jeunesse un archétype idéal, le Juif, rendu responsable de tous les échecs présents, passés en futurs et sur lequel déverser ses frustrations. Cet antisémitisme est inculqué, dès le plus jeune âge, dans le système éducatif, de manière insidieuse : si les manuels ne portent aucune mention directe au Juif, ils développent néanmoins les thèses « völkisch » de l'âge d'or pré-industrie.

Malgré ses succès aux niveaux primaire et secondaire, les succès rencontrés par les idéaux « völkisch » à l'Université s'apparentent à un triomphe. Tout d'abord, la concurrence pour les postes entre universitaires Juifs et non-Juifs exacerbent les tensions ; ensuite, reprenant les pratiques d'avant-guerre, les associations étudiantes excluent systématiquement les étudiants Juifs de leurs rangs, en dépit des pressions exercées par certains gouvernements fédérés ; de plus, en 1931, le « Reich » et l'Autriche connaissent dans leurs campus des émeutes antisémites massivement suivies, et en 1932, les Universités de Breslau et d'Heidelberg excluent les enseignants juifs de leur corps enseignant.

Cependant l'antisémitisme ne constituait pas l'apanage de la totalité des mouvements de jeunesse d'inspiration « völkisch ». Ainsi, le marginal « Mouvement de Jeunesse », organisé en Thuringe sur des bases élitistes autour de Muck Lamberty, développent simplement l'idée que les Juifs constituent un « Volk » différent du « Volk » germanique, tout en affirmant l'idée qu'un autre « Volk » pouvait s'immerger dans le germanisme origine.

Un certain nombre d'autres groupes de jeunesse marginaux membres de la nébuleuse « völkisch » des années 1920 apparaissent, prospèrent, dans une certaine mesure, puis se fondent avec des réserves, plus ou moins affirmées, plus ou moins formulées, dans le mouvement nazi, le plus souvent dans la mouvance Straßer, moins inféodée selon eux aux intérêts industriels. Mais les succès de Hitler et sa prise du pouvoir rendent cette allégeance fragile, car ils finissent par se rallier à la vision adoptée par Hitler et ses proches.

Des mouvements chrétiens proches du paganisme s'enthousiasmèrent également pour le Mouvement « Völkisch ». Ainsi, Artur Dinter, politicien « völkisch », propagandiste et écrivain raciste, créa en 1927 la « Geistchristliche Religionsgemeinschaft », précurseur de l'« organisation pour l'État populaire national-socialiste pour les Chrétiens », renommée en 1934 « Deutsche Volkskirche » (église populaire allemande). Ainsi, le Mouvement « Völkisch » a servi nombreuses de fois de base pour le développement du National-Socialisme.

Le NSDAP essaya, par la suite, de se profiler comme la force agissante du Mouvement « Völkisch » en vue de mettre en avant sa vision du monde. Ainsi, dans « Mein Kampf », Adolf Hitler écrit :

« Le Parti national-socialiste des travailleurs allemands tire les caractères essentiels d'une conception " völkisch " de l'univers. »

« Si, aujourd'hui, toutes les associations, tous les groupes, grands et petits (et, à mon avis, même de " grands Partis ") revendiquent le mot " völkisch ", c'est la conséquence de l'action du Parti national-socialiste » .

Le chef de la Société Thulé, Rudolf Freiherr von Sebotendorff, fils de cheminot et aventurier haut en couleurs, devenu riche en faisant des affaires louches en Turquie et en épousant une riche héritière, offrit au Mouvement « Völkisch » de Munich son journal, le « Münchener Beobachter » , rebaptisé en août 1919 « Völkischer Beobachter » . Le Parti national-socialiste, au départ lui-même groupuscule « völkisch » , le racheta en décembre 1920 pour en faire son organe de presse officiel.

À partir de 1933, les organisations subsistantes (et leurs dirigeants) perdirent rapidement de leur signification : certaines furent absorbées par les organisations national-socialistes ; d'autres furent réprimées (cas du mouvement des époux Ludendorff dans les Ires années du régime) , la plupart finirent par se dissoudre ou vivotèrent dans l'ombre jusqu'à leur interdiction par les Alliés après la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Après 1945, des tentatives isolées de lancer une renaissance organisationnelle ne rencontrèrent aucun succès, si ce n'est marginalement au travers de petits mouvements relevant du néo-paganisme et des mouvements religieux « völkisch » comme la « Deutschgläubige Gemeinschaft » ou la « Germanische Glaubensgemeinschaft » . Certains aspects du mouvement se retrouvent également dans l'extrémisme de Droite international auprès d'associations comme l' « Allgermanische Heidnische Front » et aussi, partiellement, dans différents mouvements et sous-cultures alternatifs, comme la branche « völkisch » de la religion Asatru. Toutefois, de nombreuses communautés Asatru nient catégoriquement toute relation avec le National-Socialisme et la scène néo-nazie (« le paganisme contre la haine ») . En France, l'association « Terre et Peuple » est parfois considérée comme héritière du courant « völkisch » .

Au sein du genre musical « neo-folk » les décorations « völkisch » sont également utilisées massivement. La question de savoir si des idées « völkisch » y sont liées fait l'objet de discussion tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur du mouvement.

...

The « völkisch » movement (« völkische Bewegung ») is the German interpretation of the populist movement, with a Romantic focus on folklore and the « organic » . The term « völkisch » derives from the German word « Volk » (cognate with the English « folk ») , corresponding to « people » , with connotations in German of « people-powered » , « folksy » and « folkloric » . According to the historian James Webb, the word also has « overtones of " nation " , " race " and " tribe " » . A direct translation would somehow be « ethnic » with, however, very different connotations in English. Therefore, this term cannot be used for translation. Strictly speaking, the term « völkisch » has no direct translation in English, as no existing term corresponds to its exact meaning, but it could be rendered as « ethno-nationalistic » , « racial-nationalistic » , « ethno-racialist » or similar, which comes close to the actual meaning and use of the word.

The defining idea that the « völkisch » movement revolved around was that of a « Volkstum » (literary : « folkdom »)

, with a meaning similar to a combination of the terms « folklore » and « ethnicity »), not to be confused with the « Volkssturm » . « Populist », or « popular », in this context would be « volkstümlich » .

The « völkisch » « movement » was not a unified movement but « a cauldron of beliefs, fears and hopes that found expression in various movements and were often articulated in an emotional tone », Petteri Pietikäinen observed in tracing « völkisch » influences on Carl Gustav Jung. The « völkisch » movement was « arguably the largest group » in the Conservative Revolutionary movement in Germany. However, like « conservative-revolutionary » or « fascist », « völkisch » is a complex term (« schillernder Begriff ») . In a narrow definition, it can be used to designate only groups that consider human beings essentially pre-formed by blood ; i.e. , by inherited characteristics.

The « völkisch » movement had its origins in Romantic nationalism, as it was expressed by early Romantics such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte in his « Addresses to the German Nation » published during the Napoleonic Wars, from 1808 onwards, especially the 8th address, « What is a “ Volk ”, in the higher sense of the term, and what is love of the fatherland ? » , where he answered his question of what could warrant the noble individual's striving « and his belief in the eternity and the immortality of his work » , by replying that it could only be that « particular spiritual nature of the human environment out of which he himself, with all of his thought and action has arisen, namely the people from which he is descended and among which he has been formed and grown into that which he is » .

The movement combined sentimental patriotic interest in German folklore, local history and a « back to the land » anti-urban populism with many parallels in the writings of William Morris. « In part, this ideology was a revolt against modernity » , A. J. Nicholls remarked. The dream was for a self-sufficient life lived with a mystical relation to the land ; it was a reaction to the cultural alienation of the Industrial revolution and the « progressive » Liberalism of the later 19th Century and its urbane materialist banality. Similar feelings were expressed in the United States, during the 1930's, by the populist writers grouped as the Southern Agrarians.

In addition, the « völkisch » movement, as it evolved, sometimes combined the arcane and esoteric aspects of folkloric occultism alongside « racial adoration » and, in some circles, a type of anti-Semitism linked to exclusionary ethnic nationalism. The ideas of « völkisch » movements also included anti-communist, anti-immigration, anti-capitalist and anti-Parliamentarian principles. The « völkisch » ideas of « national community » (« Volksgemeinschaft ») came more and more to exclude Jews.

A number of the « völkisch » populist movements that had developed during the late- 19th Century, in the German Empire, under the impress of National Romanticism, were re-organized along propagandistic lines after the German defeat in World War I, as the word « the People » (« Volk ») became increasingly politicized as a flag for new forms of ethnic nationalism.

Yet, at the same time, « Volk » was also used by the international socialist Parties, in the German lands, as a synonym for the proletariat. The « Völkisch » movement was a force as well in Austria. From the Left, elements of the folk-culture spread to the Parties of the middle-classes. But whereas « Volk » could mean « proletariat » among the Left, it meant more particularly « race » among the Center and Right. Although the primary interest of the Germanic

mystical movement was the revival of native pagan traditions and customs (often set in the context of a quasi-theosophical esotericism) , a marked preoccupation with purity of race came to motivate its more politically oriented off-shoots such as the « Germanenorden » : the Germanic or Teutonic Order. This latter was a secret Society (founded in Berlin, in 1912) which required its candidates to prove that they had no « non-Aryan » bloodlines and required from each a promise to maintain purity of his stock in marriage. Local groups of the sect met to celebrate the summer solstice, an important neo-pagan festivity in « völkisch » Circles and, later, in Nazi Germany, and more regularly to read the Eddas, as well as some of the German mystics. This branch of the « völkisch » movement quickly developed a hyper-nationalist sentiment and allied itself with anti-Semitism, then rising throughout the Western world.

George Mosse identified some of the more « respectable » and centrist channels through which these sensibilities flowed : school texts that transmitted a Romantic view of a « pure » Germanic past, the nature-oriented German Youth Movement, and novels with an ideally ruthless « völkisch » hero, such as Hermann Löns' « Der Wehrwolf » (1910) . Another « völkisch » movement of the same time was the « Tatkreis » .

Not all folkloric Societies with connections to Romantic nationalism were located in Germany. The community of « Monte Verità » (« Mount Truth ») which emerged in 1900 at Ascona, Switzerland, is described by the Swiss art critic Harald Szeemann as « the Southern-most outpost of a far-reaching Nordic lifestyle reform, that is, alternative movement » . It embraced a mix of anarchism, libertarian communism and various forms of artistic bohemianism and neo-paganism.

The « völkisch » ideologies were influential in the development of Nazism. Indeed, Josef Goebbels publicly asserted, in the 1927 Nuremberg rally, that if the populist (« völkisch ») movement had understood power and how to bring thousands out in the streets, it would have gained political power on 9 November 1918 (the outbreak of the SPD-led German Revolution of 1918-1919, end of the German monarchy) . Adolf Hitler wrote in « Mein Kampf » (« My Struggle ») :

« The basic ideas of the National-Socialist movement are populist (“ völkisch ”) and the populist (“ völkisch ”) ideas are National-Socialist. »

Nazi racial understanding was couched in « Völkisch » terms, as when Eugen Fischer delivered his inaugural address as Nazi rector, « The Conception of the Völkisch State in the view of biology » (29 July 1933) .

This connection can be overstated, however. According to Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, an imaginative mythology has grown up around the supposed influence within the Nazi Party of a « völkisch » group, the « Thule-Gesellschaft » (Thule Society) , which was founded on August 17, 1918, by Rudolf von Sebottendorff. Its original name was « Studiengruppe für Germanisches Altertum » (Study Group for Germanic Antiquity) , but it soon started to disseminate anti-Republican and anti-Semitic propaganda. In January 1919, the Thule Society was instrumental in the foundation of the « Deutsche Arbeiter-Partei » (German Workers' Party, or DAP) which later became the NSDAP (Nazi Party) . Thule members or visiting guests that would later join the Nazi Party included Rudolf Heß, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Gottfried Feder,

Dietrich Eckart and Karl Harrer, but notably not Adolf Hitler who never was a member of the Thule Society. Furthermore, the « Münchener Beobachter » (Munich Observer) , owned by Sebottendorff, was the press organ of another small nationalist Party and later became the « Völkischer Beobachter » (People's Observer) .

On the other hand, it can be noted that Karl Harrer, the Thule member most directly involved in the creation of the DAP, in 1919, was sidelined at the end of the year when Hitler drafted regulations against conspiratorial Circles, and the Thule Society was dissolved a few years later (Goodrick-Clarke, 1985 : pages 150, 221) . It had no members from the top echelons of the Party and Nazi officials were forbidden any involvement in Secret Societies. Adolf Hitler was never a member, while Rudolf Heß and Alfred Rosenberg were only visiting guests of the Thule Society, in the early years before they came to prominence in the Nazi movement (Goodrick-Clarke, 1985 : pages 149, 201) . However, the « völkisch » Circles did hand-down one significant legacy : Friedrich Krohn, a Thule member, designed the original version of the Nazi swastika, in 1919.

...

While the newspaper implied its support for « Germanic Christianity » , it managed to do so without directly attacking the Catholic tradition that was so important in Southern German territories. Thus, while applauding Johannes Brahms' « German religiosity without confessional directions and conditions » , the paper simultaneously praised Anton Bruckner as having been « filled with genuine, naive piety which was rooted deeply in his religion : Catholicism » . For the « Völkischer Beobachter » , Bruckner was above all a naive genius who embodied « Volkstümlichkeit » more than any other composer. Assessing Bruckner's origins (« since they interest us more than ever before in the age of “ Family-and-Race-Research ” ») , musicologist Karl Grunsky emphasized that the composer had come from a modest farming background : the son of an Upper-Austrian teacher, who had Lower-Austrian farmers as ancestors, and who could be proud that one of them ascended to such heights and achieved world significance. Emphasizing his « kind, wonderfully deep blue eyes » , musicologist Josef Stolzing considered Bruckner to be « next to Franz Liszt, the greatest German Symphonist after Beethoven » . This strong 3rd place ranking was founded largely on Bruckner's simple, « völkisch » characteristics. According to Stolzing, « being of farming origins, the composer remained a simple man who never posed » . In his music, as in his character, Grunsky asserted, « genuinely “ volkstümlich ” features were indisputable » . Most intensively, the « Völkischer Beobachter » contributors applauded Bruckner's « relatively limited education, his indifference to the society and culture of the rest of the world, and the natural, farmer-like, primitive nature of his background » . In the realm of tones, Bruckner was « a ruler graced by God » but, otherwise, he was a man of « touching naivety, clumsiness, and timidity » . As a result, this « heaven bound, unworldly (“ Weltfremd ”) artist was no formalist » . His works were not the product of « isolated artistic conception, æsthetic taste, momentary mood, or agitated feeling » , but rather the « language of his soul, the confession of his world-view, and the self-expression of his innermost being » .

Contributors provided a number of anecdotes to fill-out the picture of Bruckner as a naively « völkisch » genius, some of which involved descriptions of his drinking habits. According to Stolzing, the composer « definitely had one weakness : he loved to drink » . But the National-Socialist cultural critic did not seem to consider this much of a problem ; indeed, in one instance, he wrote without reservation about Bruckner vomiting after drinking excessively, complete with

details about the nearby devotee, who kept as a memento of this brush with the « völkisch » genius a set of clothes which had been splattered by the composer. Stolzing also related an occasion when Bruckner asked Richard Wagner, while drinking beers with him, to select one of 2 Symphonies that would be dedicated to him. The « Master » made the choice, but Bruckner woke-up simply too hung-over to remember which one Wagner had chosen. Another sign of Bruckner's simple nature that impressed Stolzing was the low-fees he charged students :

« How refreshing that for such modest prices one could get music lessons from a genius before whose immortal works the whole Aryan world looks on in respect. »

The newspaper even compared Bruckner with the Romantic character of Kannitverstan, who learns important lessons in Holland though he cannot understand a word of Dutch :

« How remarkable it was when “ Master ” Anton (who, similar to the model created by Hebel, did not understand the outside world) climbed to the conductor's podium in order to take in the cheers of his listeners. »

At that moment, it seemed as if he were « still the former teaching assistant and part-time church organist standing there helplessly, done-up in a ridiculous suit that looked like it was thrown together by the village tailor, bowing awkwardly, holding-up his hands as if protecting himself from the public, and finally blowing a kiss to the house - like a big kid » .

Reinhold Freiherr von Lichtenberg, a professor at Berlin University who wrote about « The Homeland of the Aryans » (1913) and made contributions to the « Bayreuther Blätter » , reminded the « Völkischer Beobachter » readers about the best-known story of Bruckner's child-like enthusiasm. When Beethoven's remains were moved in 1888, Bruckner went into the church and actually picked-up the skull. Scolded for doing so, he said that he was the « only one who really understood him » . Absolutely loyal to his favourite predecessors, Bruckner paid a price for his association with Wagner « at the hands of the Jewish press » , according to Stolzing. In particular, the « music-critic at the Jewish “ Neue freie Presse ” » , Eduard Hanslick, « attacked Bruckner along with Wagner » , especially after Wagner had accused Hanslick of « hiding his Jewish origins » . In Stolzing's opinion, Hanslick's criticisms of Bruckner's 7th Symphony proved how « Jewish criticism has been striving since time immemorial to spoil the joy that the German “ Volk ” derives from the creations of its great German Masters » . When Bruckner and Hanslick met, however, the composer bowed and treated the critic with respect.

Stolzing recalled :

« We were utterly astounded. »

Erwin Bauer explained the Nazi attention to Bruckner's music in terms of its « Romantic naturalism » : in his Symphonies, « gigantic oaks rustle, powerful streams roar, and the rejoicing, but often also longing sound of the horn penetrates through everything » . Bruckner's 4th Symphony, particularly, was a « Nature Symphony » akin to Beethoven's 6th. Comparing them in concert, Bauer stated, was pleasurable and worthwhile : on the one hand, a «

bright, magical confession about idyllic life in the country » ; on the other, a « trembling soul exuding incomparable praise for the expanse and beauty of the cosmos » . The 1st was a « complete collection of feelings » ; while the 2nd was marked by « wonderful melancholy and magnificent outbreaks of the soul » . But for Karl Grunsky, Bruckner's music was important mainly because it exhibited « völkisch » naivety : a German Master who stood on the shoulders of other greats, he did not « speak to us in gibberish and mishmash with Negroid grimaces, but in a language drawn from a natural source that reaches into the deepest interior of the unrefined German mind : the pure spirit of German child-likeness » .

As reported in the « Völkischer Beobachter » , Bruckner compositions were performed at numerous Nazi organized events, including the 1st concert and concert tour of the National-Socialist Symphony Orchestra, in SS concerts, at a Bruckner Festival in the composer's small Austrian home-town (« a rare pleasure in the troubled times » of 1932, as Max Morold-Millenkovich, who covered cultural affairs in Vienna for the paper, as early as 1920 and strongly advocated Bruckner's music, put it) and at the 1st Greater German Bruckner Festival in 1939. Significant Party officials attended the Festival last mentioned, including among them Arthur Seyß-Inquart (previously « Reichsstatthalter » of the « Ostmark » and « Reichsminister » without portfolio after May 1939) and August Eigruber (« Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria, who helped to establish the concentration camp at Mauthausen) . As the newspaper related it, the opening festivities of the « Brucknerfest » were a « great cultural achievement on the part of National-Socialism » . There, the regime announced that it would provide an annual grant toward the preparation of a complete edition of Bruckner's works and, thereby, « secure the life work of the “ Master ” for the German nation and the whole music world beyond » . This, along with a tribute to the « Master » during the Regensburg Music Festival on the occasion of his « solemn entrance into “ Walhalla ” as a national hero » , were touted as 2 « Official Acts of the German Head of State » that « clearly indicated how much cultural historical significance the “ Führer ” attributed to the works of his compatriot » .

Another Austrian compatriot of Adolf Hitler whose works were performed at SS concerts and received attention in the « Völkischer Beobachter » was Hugo Wolf (1860-1903) . The newspaper saw him as the « Wagner of Song » and as a victim of a Jewish conspiracy precisely because of his association with the « Master » . A circle of Wagnerians and a few individual patrons had enabled his ascent and, not disappointing, « he clearly upheld German style » . But difficulties triggered by his support of Wagner made him very unpopular in Vienna :

« For his whole life, Wolf had the Hanslick press working against him - of course. »

For instance, according to the paper, « their representatives » once forced a well-known singer who wanted to introduce Wolf's Lieder to demur under threat of a sustained boycott by the press. Such malicious maneuvering was just another indication that Vienna, « the city that should have been the capital of the German “ Ostmark ”, was really the center of an Eastern-oriented cosmopolitan world ! » . But « nothing held back Wolf's triumphant course : his Lieder will be remembered with German consciousness » .

One more composer whom the « Völkischer Beobachter » felt the re-newed German race should appreciate more keenly was Max Reger (1873-1916) . Like other favourites, the paper considered him the « spiritual son of the old

world that the November Revolution and the subsequent Americanization of Weimar culture had eradicated » . The fact that he had done a year's military service, in 1897, was important to Hans Buchner, Reger's most vocal champion in the pages of the « Völkischer Beobachter » : though Reger was, perhaps, not an ideal soldier in the sense of infantry regulations, he « enjoyed and was proud of his service » . Moreover, before his death in 1916, he tried to enlist for the First World War, but was deemed unsuitable for active service, and Buchner was sure it « pained him deeply that he could only consecrate in art the patriotism he felt burning in his soul » .

...

Die völkische Bewegung umfasste deutschnationale und antisemitisch-rassistische Vereine, Parteien, Publikationen und weitere Gruppen und Individuen, die ab dem letzten Viertel des 19. Jahrhunderts großen Einfluss auf die Öffentlichkeit im Deutschen Reich und in Österreich-Ungarn gewannen.

Ihrem Charakter einer heterogenen nationalistisch-reformistischen Protestbewegung entsprach die synkretistische völkische Weltanschauung. Die überwiegend männliche und protestantische Klientel zeigt ein vornehmlich bürgerliches, vom alten wie neuen Mittelstand geprägtes Sozialprofil.

Die Bewegung strebte auf rassenideologischer Grundlage (antisemitisch, antislawisch, antiziganistisch, antiromanisch) nach einer antiegalitären, militaristischen, männerzentrierten, (berufs-)ständisch organisierten Gesellschaft, die in einer « germanisch-christlichen » oder neuheidnischen « arteiligen » Religion fundiert sein sollte. Sie hatte in vielen Fällen (basierend auf einem germanenideologischen Wertesystem) einen « Rassestaat » mitteleuropäischen oder einen Staatenbund pangermanischen Zuschnitts zum Ziel.

Zentral für die völkische Weltanschauung war die Forderung nach einer arteiligen, das heißt einer Rasse und Volk wesensgemäßen Religion. Entsprechend der heterogenen ideologischen und organisatorischen Struktur der Bewegung gab es aber keine gemeinsamen religiösen Überzeugungen, sondern sehr unterschiedliche religiöse Entwürfe. Sie reichen von einem arisierten und germanisierten Christentum bis zur entschiedenen Ablehnung des Christentums und dem Versuch der Wiederbelebung vermeintlich vorchristlicher germanischer Glaubensvorstellungen. Teilweise wurden auch Elemente der Esoterik aufgenommen.

Die völkisch-religiösen Gemeinschaften waren überwiegend von dem Wunsch nach einer autochthonen, nicht durch irgendwelche Fremdeinflüsse verformten nationalen Kultur getragen, weniger vom Willen zur Restauration der paganen germanischen Götterwelt. Diese Suche war verbunden mit der Suche nach den heimischen Götter- und Heldensagen und der germanischen Mythologie und damit einer Aufwertung der germanischen Zeugnisse wie Runen und der Edda.

Nur ein kleiner Teil der Völkischen wandte sich ganz vom Christentum ab. Die germanisch- und deutschgläubigen Gemeinschaften gehören zur Peripherie der völkischen Bewegung und waren sehr klein. So hatte die größte dieser Gemeinschaften, die Germanische Glaubens-Gemeinschaft Ludwig Fahrenkrogs, zu Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs gerade 120 bis 150 Mitglieder. Der größere Teil der Völkischen hielt am (protestantischen) Christentum fest. Zahlenmäßig bedeutender war der Versuch, das Christentum zu germanisieren und zu « entjuden » .

In der Sichtweise des Deutschchristentums war Christus nicht Jude, sondern Arier. Die Wurzeln des Christentums wurden auf eine (indo-)germanische Urreligion zurückgeführt. Das Christentum sei ursprünglich eine arische Religion, die dem germanischen und deutschen Wesen entspreche und deren arischer Charakter zu bewahren und von fremden Einflüssen zu reinigen sei.

Zur völkischen Bewegung zählt die eklektische Lehre der Ariosophie des Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels, in die neben rassistischen Vorstellungen Elemente der Esoterik aufgenommen wurden. Von der Ariosophie war auch die Ideologie der von Rudolf von Sebottendorf am Ende des Ersten Weltkriegs 1917-1918 gegründeten Thule-Gesellschaft beeinflusst. Der britische Esoterik-Forscher Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke verwendet die Bezeichnung Ariosophie in einem erweiterten Sinn für esoterisch geprägte Strömungen der völkischen Bewegung.

Die NSDAP versuchte später, sich selbst als treibende Kraft der völkischen Bewegung zu stilisieren, um die vermeintliche Originalität der eigenen Weltanschauung hervorzuheben. So heißt es etwa in Mein Kampf : Wenn heute alle möglichen Verbände und Verbändchen, Gruppen und Grüppchen und meinetwegen auch « große Parteien » das Wort « völkisch » für sich in Anspruch nehmen, so ist dies selbst schon eine Folge des Wirkens der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung. (Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf) . Die Parteizeitung hieß vom Anfang bis zum Ende der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus « Völkischer Beobachter » .

In der Geschichtswissenschaft wird zum einen « völkisch » als Sammelbezeichnung für die sich seit den 1890er Jahren politisch und kulturell formierende nationalistisch-antisemitische Rechte in Deutschland verstanden. So findet es sich zum Beispiel im Handbuch zur völkischen Bewegung (1996) einer Autorengruppe um Uwe Puschner. Uwe Puschner erkennt das Spezifische der völkischen Bewegung in der Verbindung von Nationalismus und Rassismus mit religiösen Reformideen.

Daneben steht eine engere Begriffsdefinition, die die völkische Bewegung als Teilphänomen der radikalen Rechten begreift. Stefan Breuer erklärt die Entstehung der Völkischen Bewegung aus dem Antisemitismus der Kaiserzeit. Neben diesem seien Mittelstandsideologie, Rechtsnationalismus und partieller Antimodernismus (Ablehnung der « massendemokratischen » bei Bejahung der « bürgerlich-liberalen Moderne ») Kennzeichen der Völkischen gewesen. Rassismus und Antisemitismus seien aber keinesfalls nur bei Völkischen anzutreffen gewesen, sondern auch in anderen Bereichen der Politik. Ziel sei die Herstellung einer ethnisch geschlossenen Bevölkerung (« deutsches Volk ») in einem ethnisch definierten Nationalstaat gewesen. Dem hätten rassistische und antisemitische Positionen gedient.

Thomas Gräfe wiederum sieht in radikalnationalistischen Purifikationsphantasien und im Antisemitismus den gemeinsamen Nenner der konkurrierenden völkischen Gruppierungen und weltanschaulichen Entwürfe. Im ersten Teil seiner Studie geht er der Entstehung und Entwicklung der völkischen Bewegung im Kaiserreich nach, wobei er sich jedoch unter diesem Begriff mit genau jener Bewegung beschäftigt, die in der historischen Forschung als antisemitische bezeichnet wird.

Gemeinsam ist diesen Autoren, daß sie die völkische Bewegung als rassistisch und antisemitisch definieren.

Nach der Gründung erster völkischer Vereinigungen in den 1890er Jahren, wie dem 1894 gegründeten Deutschbund, formierte sich seit der Jahrhundertwende in engem Austausch mit dem organisierten Nationalismus, vor allem dem Alldeutschen Verband, die publizistisch und propagandistisch agile völkische Bewegung in Deutschland als eine lose Sammlungsbewegung. Neben engen Kontakten zu der ihr ideell, personell und institutionell eng verbundenen Alldeutschen Bewegung Österreichs bestanden rege Austauschprozesse mit den seit den 1880er Jahren entstandenen bürgerlichen Reformbewegungen und den antisemitischen Splitterparteien. In der völkischen Bewegung fanden sich sowohl in ihren politischen, gesellschaftlichen und kulturellen Zielen als auch ihrer Organisationsform und Mitgliederstärke erheblich voneinander abweichende Gruppierungen zusammen. Seit der Jahrhundertwende entstanden zahlreiche völkisch-religiöse Vereine, Bünde und Orden, die sich in eine deutschchristliche und eine neopagane Richtung aufspalteten. Wichtige Publikationsorgane der Völkischen waren die von Hans von Wolzogen herausgegebenen Bayreuther Blätter, Theodor Fritschs Zeitschrift Hammer und Wilhelm Schwaners Volkserzieher. Um diese Zeitschriften entstanden Lesegemeinden wie der Reichshammerbund. Die Gründung von Dachverbänden am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkriegs änderte nichts daran, daß die völkische Bewegung zersplittert und mitgliederschwach blieb. Allerdings entfaltete ihr Gedankengut über Multiplikatoren wie den Deutschnationalen Handlungsgehilfenverband, das studentische Vereins- und Verbindungswesen und die Jugendbewegung sowie über die auflagenstarken Werke Paul de Lagardes, Julius Langbehn und Houston Stewart Chamberlains schon vor 1914 eine erhebliche gesellschaftliche Breitenwirkung.

Der Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs führte zu einem Bedeutungsverlust der völkischen Bewegung ; viele Publikationsorgane gerieten unter Präventivzensur und wurden auch immer wieder verboten, wie zum Beispiel der Hammer, die Deutschvölkischen Blätter und die Staatsbürger-Zeitung. Trotz des Krieges richtete sich ihre vorrangige Aufmerksamkeit auf den inneren Feind. Mit dem Krieg rückte in Deutschland die Außenpolitik in den Vordergrund des Interesses, wozu von Seiten der Völkischen wenig Eigenes hervorgebracht wurde. Soweit Ideen zur außenpolitischen Orientierung Deutschlands geäußert wurden, waren diese widersprüchlich und nicht konsensfähig. Die Völkischen suchten daher im Ersten Weltkrieg den Schulterchluss mit dem alten Nationalismus.

Die Völkischen lehnten alles ab, was in der Weimarer Republik als Fortschritt gepriesen wurde. Sie lehnten sowohl den Marxismus der linken Parteien wie auch die Demokratie ab. Obwohl die Völkischen offiziell politische Gewalt verurteilten, unterhielten sie Verbindungen zu rechtsradikalen Wehrverbänden, beteiligten sich am Kapp-Putsch und am Hitler-Putsch und waren in Attentate und Fememorde verstrickt. Zur Radikalisierung der Völkischen dürfte neben dem politischen Systemwechsel auch der Zustrom demobilisierter Soldaten in ihre Organisationen beigetragen haben.

Nachdem die Zahl völkischer Organisationen und Anhänger nach 1918 zunächst deutlich zugenommen hatte, mit dem Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbund (1919-1923) kurzzeitig auch ein einflussreiches Kartell völkischer Vereinigungen bestand und Völkische in Länderparlamente und Reichstag einzogen, wurde die völkische Bewegung seit 1924-1925 aufgrund ihrer strukturellen Defizite vom ideologisch nahen Nationalsozialismus, dem neuen Sammelbecken der radikalen Rechten, allmählich ins politische Abseits gedrängt. In dieser Zeit, vor allem nach der Wiedegründung der NSDAP, wurden von beiden Seiten Gegensätze betont. Sie äußerten sich vielfach als Generationenkonflikt zwischen « alten » Völkischen und « jungen » Nationalsozialisten. Dennoch bestanden (vor allem ideologisch) enge Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen beiden Bewegungen. Die deutlichsten personellen Überschneidungen zwischen Völkischen und Nationalsozialisten

bestanden bei der 1926 gegründeten Siedlungsbewegung der Artamanen.

Obgleich sich einzelne völkische Organisationen und Führungspersönlichkeiten dem Nationalsozialismus (unterschiedlich eng) anschlossen und die Machtübertragung an Hitler von völkischer Seite mehrheitlich begrüßt wurde, verloren die nach 1933 fortbestehenden völkischen Organisationen (und ihre Führung) rasch an Bedeutung : Einzelne gingen im nationalsozialistischen Organisationsgefüge auf, die Mehrzahl löste sich auf oder fristete bis zum Verbot durch die Siegermächte nach Kriegsende eine der Auflösung gleichkommende Schattenexistenz.

Vereinzelte Versuche eines organisatorischen Neuanfangs nach 1945 blieben mit Ausnahme bis in die Gegenwart bestehender neuheidnischer Kleinunternehmen der völkischreligiösen Teilbewegung wie der « Deutschgläubigen Gemeinschaft » oder der Artgemeinschaft - Germanische Glaubens-Gemeinschaft wesensgemäßer Lebensgestaltung erfolglos.

Versatzstücke völkischer Religion und Weltanschauungen finden sich auch über diese deutschen neugermanisch-heidnischen Gruppen hinaus ; sie sind Teil der internationalen neopaganen Bewegungen, gemischt mit Ideologien anderer Herkunft und in vielfach vermittelter Form und häufig nicht mehr unmittelbar als völkisch erkennbar. Diese Reste völkischen Denkens sind nicht auf kleine Subkulturen beschränkt, sondern finden durch ihre mediale Vermittlung, womit ihre Popularisierung einhergeht, Eingang in weitere gesellschaftliche Kreise und weite Verbreitung durch populäre Genres. Am Anfang dieser Popularisierung steht insbesondere die Fantasyliteratur, die sich nach dem Muster John Ronald Reuel Tolkiens Der Herr der Ringe gebildet hat. Zu dieser Fantasyliteratur gehört beispielsweise der Roman Rheingold des US-amerikanischen Autors Stephan Grundy, der ein internationaler Bestseller geworden ist.

Ideologische Elemente der Bewegung finden sich auch im internationalen Rechtsextremismus sowie bei Vereinigungen wie der Allgermanischen Heidnischen Front, teils auch in verschiedenen alternativen Bewegungen und Subkulturen, wie dem völkischen Zweig innerhalb des Asatru-Glaubens. Mehrere neuheidnische Asatru-Glaubensgemeinschaften lehnen Beziehungen zum Nationalsozialismus und der Neonazi-Szene kategorisch ab, was die Verbreitung von Elementen völkischer Herkunft nicht ausschließt.

Die esoterischen Traditionslinien einer völkischen « rechten Esoterik » werden aktuell von einigen rechtsextremen Gruppierungen zur Legitimation ihres Rassismus aufgegriffen. So beziehen sich beispielsweise in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern Rechtsextreme auf die historischen Artamanen. Auch innerhalb der Musikgenres Neofolk oder Pagan Metal werden häufig völkische Versatzstücke verwendet.

Zu den wichtigsten Vordenkern, Verlegern und Agitatoren der völkischen Bewegung zählen :

Paul de Lagarde.

Julius Langbehn.

Friedrich Lienhard.

Ludwig Fahrenkrog.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain.

Adolf Bartels.

Philipp Stauff.

Friedrich Lange.

Max Robert Gerstenhauer.

Wilhelm Schwaner.

Ernst Hunkel.

Theodor Fritsch.

Willibald Hentschel.

Max Bewer.

Heinrich Pudor.

Bruno Tanzmann.

Alfred Roth.

Erich Ludendorff.

Mathilde Ludendorff.

Julius Friedrich Lehmann.

Eugen Diederichs.

Le « Völkischer Beobachter »

Le « Völkischer Beobachter » (L'Observateur populaire) fut l'organe de presse officiel du Parti national-socialiste des

travailleurs allemands, de 1920 à 1945.

Paru à l'origine sous le titre : « Münchener Beobachter » (L'Observateur de Munich) , le journal devient, en 1919, le « Völkischer Beobachter » (L'Observateur populaire) . En grandes difficultés financières, l'hebdomadaire est racheté, en décembre 1920, par le NSDAP à travers l'acquisition du « Franz-Eher-Verlag » , une maison d'édition dont dépendait le journal et grâce à des fonds de l'armée fournis par l'officier Franz von Epp. Adolf Hitler en fait l'organe officiel du Parti : la gestion du journal est contrôlée, de 1921 à 1923, par Max Amann, intime d'Hitler et trésorier du Parti, qui dirigera plus tard la Chambre de la presse du « Reich » (« Reichspressekammer ») . Dietrich Eckart en dirige la rédaction jusqu'à son décès, en 1923. Lui succèdent Alfred Rosenberg (1923-1938) , puis Wilhelm Weiß (1938-1945) .

À partir du 8 février 1923, le journal devient un quotidien. Après le « “ Putsch ” de la Brasserie » , le 8 novembre 1923, il cesse de paraître jusqu'au 26 février 1925. Il disparaît définitivement à la fin avril 1945, quelques jours avant la capitulation allemande. Ainsi, son édition du Sud du « Reich » paraît pour la dernière fois, le 28 avril.

Jusque dans ses dernières éditions, à la fin du mois d'avril 1945, le journal exalte le rôle de Hitler dans le conflit et dans la défense de l'Allemagne : durant le mois d'avril 1945, des éditoriaux et des titres en Ire page rappellent le rôle de Hitler dans la défense du « Reich » et de sa capitale. En effet, ce dernier est perçu par le journal comme assumant complètement son rôle, « enflammant l'esprit combatif » régnant dans la ville, ce qui laisse pourtant sceptique les habitants restés sur place.

À la fin du 3e « Reich » , le journal publie de nombreuses séries d'articles pour dénoncer des aspects spécifiques du danger que les Juifs feraient peser sur le « Reich » . Cette menace est présentée dans les colonnes du journal de différentes manières : ordonnateurs du complot visant à dominer le monde et dont l'Allemagne serait la victime, les Juifs sont rendus responsables de l'ensemble des maux qui frappent le « Reich » .

Il publie ainsi des reportages antisémites, en nombre variable, par année de guerre : 2, en 1939 ; 17, en 1941 ; 4, en 1942 ; 50, en 1943 ; 10, en 1944 ; et 4, en 1945. La publication de ces reportages permet de définir 4 grandes campagnes antisémites dans ses colonnes : à l'été de 1941 ; au printemps puis à l'automne de 1943 ; et enfin, au printemps de 1944.

Ainsi, à l'automne de 1943, entre septembre et novembre, le journal dénonce à nouveau le rôle des Juifs dans la Guerre dans une série de 13 articles. Les vœux adressés par le Président américain à la communauté juive pour « Roch Hachana » , point de départ de la campagne de presse de l'automne de 1943, confirment selon le journal que Franklin Delano Roosevelt est un instrument dans les mains des Juifs pour la domination mondiale.

Le journal s'interroge également durant cette période sur la conférence de Moscou de 1943, à laquelle ont participé Anthony Eden, Cordell Hull et Viatcheslav Molotov, qui aboutirait, selon les articles publiés dans les colonnes du journal, à livrer l'Europe à Joseph Staline.

La campagne de presse du printemps de 1944, dans le contexte de la prise de contrôle de la Hongrie, et des défaites

allemandes sur le front de l'Est est l'occasion de dénoncer un danger juif qui déferlerait sur l'Europe. Dans ce contexte, le « Völkischer Beobachter » suit à la lettre les consignes émises par les services de contrôle de la presse, lorsque, le 12 mai 1944, la une du journal rapproche les termes « antisémitisme » et « anti-bolchévisme », en informant son lectorat du soutien prétendument apporté par l'URSS à l'établissement de colons juifs en Palestine. La constitution de ce foyer de colonisation en Palestine serait, selon le journal, la preuve de la collusion entre les Juifs et le bolchévisme. Puis, 2 jours plus tard, un long article intitulé, « Staline et les Juifs », insiste sur le rôle supposé des Juifs dans la prise du pouvoir, puis dans sa conservation par Staline, celui-ci étant présenté comme au service exclusif des « Juifs moscovites » qui détiendraient le pouvoir depuis 1917.

Le 3e anniversaire de l'invasion de l'URSS fournit au journal une occasion supplémentaire de dénoncer un complot judéo-bolchévique qui menacerait le « Reich », dans le contexte de la bataille de Normandie et des attaques aériennes.

Mais ces campagnes ne doivent pas rejeter dans l'ombre certains thèmes antisémites utilisés à loisir, comme celui du soi-disant projet juif de domination du monde. En effet, la défaite de Stalingrad, en février 1943, fournit une occasion supplémentaire de mentionner une collusion entre les Juifs et le bolchévisme : le sacrifice consenti constituerait le gage de la résistance allemande à ce double danger : à plusieurs reprises dans le courant des mois de janvier et février 1943, le journal exploite les résultats de la conférence de Casablanca, destinée à préparer l'après-Guerre, et la présente comme un plan de partage de l'Europe au seul profit des Juifs.

Rapidement, la propagande nationale-socialiste met en avant une menace : le projet d'annihilation du « Reich » et de sa puissance. Entre 1939 et 1945, une douzaine d'articles, au milieu de très nombreux autres articles antisémites, sont explicitement consacrés au sort du « Reich », en cas de défaite. L'exploitation de l'incursion soviétique en Prusse orientale, durant l'automne de 1944, donne l'occasion au journal de dénoncer le danger « bolchevik » qui planerait sur le « Reich » : à la fin du mois d'octobre, des photos des massacres de civils et des récits de viols et de pillages perpétrés par les soldats de l'Armée Rouge, durant la percée soviétique, sont publiées dans le journal.

Les succès soviétiques de l'hiver de 1945, dans un 1er temps dissimulés, puis édulcorés, et leurs conséquences sur les populations allemandes habitant l'Est de l'Oder sont présentées avant tout comme des éléments destinés à confirmer le tableau dressé depuis des années : les troupes soviétiques sont ainsi présentées comme des barbares qui se déchaînent sur l'Est du « Reich » dans l'édition du 9 février.

L'éditorial du 22 mars 1945 en constitue un avatar tardif : la défaite du « Reich » serait non seulement une défaite militaire et politique, mais aussi un échec dans la lutte pour la survie du peuple allemand. La perspective de l'asservissement du peuple allemand doit justifier, aux yeux des rédacteurs du journal, une résistance acharnée.

À mesure que la situation militaire de l'Allemagne nazie se dégrade, le journal tente d'insuffler à la population du « Reich » une volonté fanatique de résistance, conforme au souhait de Hitler, notamment après le 20 juillet. La menace de l'extermination du « Volk » doit permettre de justifier une résistance fanatique contre les Alliés, tout en anticipant sur une des dernières directives du bureau de presse du « Reich » (4 avril 1945), ordonnant à la presse de renforcer

dans la population le sentiment de résistance face aux envahisseurs, aussi bien ceux venus de l'Ouest que ceux venus de l'Est. Le 28 avril 1945, la dernière édition du journal, circulant dans le Sud du « Reich », est titrée : « La forteresse bavaroise » .

...

The « Völkischer Beobachter » (« “ Völkisch ” Observer ») was the newspaper of the National-Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP, or Nazi Party) from 1920. It first appeared weekly, then daily from 8 February 1923. For 25 years, it formed part of the official public face of the Nazi Party.

The « fighting paper of the National-Socialist movement of Greater Germany » (« Kampfblatt der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung Großdeutschlands ») had its origin in the « Münchener Beobachter » (« Munich Observer ») which, in 1918, was acquired by the Thule Society and, in August 1919, was renamed « Völkischer Beobachter » .

Major Ernst Röhm and Dietrich Eckart persuaded Röhm's commanding officer, Major General Franz Ritter von Epp to purchase the « Völkischer Beobachter » , in December 1920, for the NSDAP from the Thule Society for 60,000 « Reichsmarks » . The money came from wealthy friends and secret army funds.

After acquiring the paper, Dietrich Eckart along with Chase Bauduin, became the first editors.

In 1921, Adolf Hitler acquired all shares in the company, making him the sole owner of the publication.

The circulation of the paper was initially about 8,000 but increased to 25,000, in autumn 1923, due to strong demand during the Occupation of the Ruhr. In that year, Alfred Rosenberg became editor. With the prohibition of the NSDAP after the « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » of 9 November 1923, the paper also had to cease publication, which resumed however on the Party's re-foundation, on 26 February 1925. The circulation rose along with the success of the Nazi movement, reaching more than 120,000, in 1931 ; and 1.7 million, by 1944.

During the rise to power, it reported general news but also Party activities, presenting them as almost constant success. Guidelines for propagandists urged that all posters, insofar as the police allowed, contain propaganda for it, and all meetings should be announced in it, although reports should be sent to the Propaganda Department, which would then forward corrected versions to the paper. Posters did indeed urge reading it. When Hitler was banned from public speaking, it was the main vehicle to propagate his views.

Josef Goebbels published articles in it to attack the United States for criticizing anti-Jewish measures, and to describe Russia.

The final issues from April and May 1945 were not distributed.

...

« Völkischer Beobachter » (People's Observer) : daily newspaper published by the Nazi Party in Germany from the 1920's until the fall of the 3rd « Reich » , in 1945. The paper was originally founded in 1887 as a 4 page Munich weekly, the « Münchner Beobachter » . It had become a daily anti-Semitic gossip sheet with a circulation of about 7,000 when it was bought by Adolf Hitler, in 1923, to serve as the propaganda organ of his Nazi Party. In 1941, its circulation had passed 1.1 million.

Publication of the « Völkischer Beobachter » was suspended 3 times, in the early 1920's, by the pre-Hitler German government because of anti-Semitic articles and attacks on government policies and officials. After the 3rd suspension, it resumed publication as a weekly, in 1925, and became a daily again, 1 month later. Hitler had made Alfred Rosenberg its editor, and the latter continued the anti-Semitic thrust of the paper while making it a forum for Hitler and propaganda minister Josef Goebbels. The « Völkischer Beobachter » launched Berlin and South German editions, in 1930, and, in 1933, the paper opened a new editorial and printing headquarters in Berlin. A Vienna edition began to appear following Germany's annexation of Austria, in 1938. Foreign correspondents and diplomats from the rest of the world followed it for indications of Nazi policy shifts and propaganda objectives, making allowances for its usual exaggeration and hyperbole.

...

Die Zeitung Völkischer Beobachter war von Dezember 1920 bis zum 30. April 1945 das publizistische Parteiorgan der NSDAP. Die Zeitung erschien zunächst zweimal wöchentlich, ab dem 8. Februar 1923 täglich im Franz-Eher-Verlag. Sie wurde nach den Anfangsjahren reichsweit vertrieben.

Das « Kampfblatt der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung Großdeutschlands » ging aus dem 1887 mit einem Umfang von vier Seiten gegründeten Vorstadtblatt Münchner Beobachter hervor, das 1918 in den Besitz der Thule-Gesellschaft überging, nachdem am 22. Juni 1918 der bisherige Verleger Franz Eher gestorben war. Rudolf von Sebottendorf erwarb von dessen Witwe Käthe Bierbaumer für 5.000 Reichsmark die Herausgeberlizenz für die Zeitung. Ab Juli 1918 übernahm von Sebottendorf die Schriftleitung. Die Zeitung wurde zunächst mit demselben Titel herausgegeben, jedoch mit dem Untertitel Sportblatt. Im August 1919 wurde das Blatt in Völkischer Beobachter umbenannt. Der Kauf durch die NSDAP erfolgte dann 1920 auf Initiative von Dietrich Eckart. Erster von der NSDAP eingesetzter Chefredakteur der Zeitung war Hugo Machhaus (25. Dezember 1920 bis 15. Mai 1921) , dem kurzzeitig Hermann Esser folgte (15. Mai 1921 bis 12. August 1921) , bevor Eckart selbst zum 12. August 1921 die Leitung der Redaktion übernahm.

Die Auflage des Blattes lag zunächst bei circa 8.000 und steigerte sich, bedingt durch die starke Nachfrage während der Ruhrbesetzung, bis Herbst 1923 auf 25.000 Exemplare. Durch das Parteiverbot der NSDAP infolge des Hitlerputsches am 9. November 1923 mußte die Zeitung ihr Erscheinen einstellen, mit Neugründung der NSDAP am 26. Februar 1925 erschien sie wieder.

Der in München aufgelegte Völkische Beobachter erschien ab 1. Januar 1933 regelmäßig als Berliner Ausgabe. Ein erster Versuch, das Blatt in der Hauptstadt zu etablieren, war im März 1931 gescheitert. Des Weiteren gab es eine

süddeutsche, eine norddeutsche und ab 1938 eine Wiener Ausgabe.

Die Auflage steigerte sich mit dem Erfolg der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung enorm, 1931 erreichte sie über 120.000 und steigerte sich bis zum Jahr 1944 auf 1,7 Millionen Exemplare.

Wenige Tage vor der deutschen Kapitulation stellte der Völkische Beobachter Ende April 1945 sein Erscheinen ein. Die letzte Ausgabe vom 30. April 1945 wurde nicht mehr ausgeliefert.

Geschäftsführer war seit April 1922 der Reichsleiter der NSDAP für die Presse, Max Amann.

Die Einnahmen aus dem Verkauf allein trugen das Blatt nicht. Es hielt sich durch den Verkauf unverzinslicher Schuldscheine an Parteimitglieder und erhielt Darlehen und Zuschüsse von wohlhabenden Gönnern wie Helene Bechstein. Finanzielles Rückgrat war später der von Amann erfolgreich ausgebaute Buchverlag. Auch der 1926 gegründete « Illustrierte Beobachter » war ein Erfolg. Daneben wurde die Anhängerschaft immer wieder an ihre Pflicht erinnert, Abonnent zu werden und solche zu werben.

Hauptschriftleiter :

Bis 25. Dezember 1920 : Hansjörg Maurer.

25. Dezember 1920 bis 15. Mai 1921 : Hugo Machhaus.

15. Mai 1921 bis 12. August 1921 : Hermann Esser.

12. August 1921 bis März 1923 : Dietrich Eckart.

März 1923 bis 1938 : Alfred Rosenberg.

1938 bis 1945 : Wilhelm Weiß.

...

Parteiorgan der NSDAP, erschienen im Franz Eher Nachf. Verlag. Die NSDAP erwarb die Zeitung am 17. Dezember 1920 von der Thule-Gesellschaft. Ihre Hauptaufgabe war die Verbreitung der NS-Ideologie und die Vermittlung von Informationen an die Parteimitglieder. Nach dem Hitlerputsch zunächst verboten, wurde die Zeitung ab 1925 zum politisch-propagandistischen Massenblatt. Geschäftsführer war seit April 1922 der Reichsleiter der NSDAP für die Presse, Max Amann. Hauptschriftleiter waren Dietrich Eckart (1921-1923) , Alfred Rosenberg (1923-1938) und Wilhelm Weiß (1938-1945) . Ab 1933 war der Völkische Beobachter quasi Regierungsorgan. Die letzte Ausgabe wurde am 30. April 1945 gedruckt, aber nicht mehr ausgeliefert.

Vorläufer war der « Münchener Beobachter », dessen überregionale Ausgabe seit 9. August 1919 « Völkischer Beobachter » hieß. Die Zeitung erschien im Franz Eher Nachf. Verlag. Der Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterverein (NSDAV) unter dem Vorsitz von Anton Drexler (1884-1942) kaufte Verlag und Zeitung am 20. Dezember 1920 für 120.000 Mark. Treibende Kraft beim Kauf des hochverschuldeten Verlags war der Schriftsteller Dietrich Eckart (1868-1923) ; Geldgeber waren einige wohlhabende Privatpersonen und vermutlich auch die Reichswehr in Bayern. Eckart war von August 1921 bis März 1923 redaktioneller Leiter ; auf ihn folgte Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946) . Der Sitz der Redaktion befand sich in der Schellingstraße 39-41 in München. Der Untertitel des bis zum 8. Februar 1923 nur zweimal wöchentlich und erst dann als Tageszeitung erscheinenden Parteiorgans lautete jetzt « Kampfblatt der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung Großdeutschlands » .

Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) war seit 29. Juli 1921 Vorsitzender der Partei und verfügte damit auch über sämtliche Anteile der Verlagsholding. Verlagsleiter war seit April 1922 der spätere Präsident der Reichspressekammer, Max Amann (1891-1957) .

Gedruckt wurde der Völkische Beobachter beim « Münchner Buchgewerbehaus M. Müller & Sohn » in der Schellingstraße. Ab 29. August 1923 hatte er ein übergroßes Format, nachdem der Verlag eine gebrauchte amerikanische Rotationsmaschine erworben hatte. Dadurch sowie durch die in Rotdruck unterstrichene Hauptschlagzeile und die Kopfleiste in Antiqua-Lettern unterschied er sich auffällig von anderen Zeitungen. Die Auflage schwankte von 1920 bis 1922 zwischen 8.000 und 10.000 Stück, 1923 stieg sie auf 30.000. Die Einnahmen aus Anzeigen und Verkauf allein trugen das Blatt nicht ; es hielt sich durch den Verkauf unverzinslicher Schuldscheine an Parteimitglieder sowie Darlehen und Zuschüsse wohlhabender Gönner über Wasser.

Bis 1922 schrieb Hitler selbst viele Artikel. Grundzüge der Agitation des Blatts waren in vulgärem Ton und plakativem Stil vorgebrachter Antisemitismus und Antikommunismus, aber auch antikapitalistische Anklänge, übersteigter Nationalismus und Antiparlamentarismus, verbunden mit hemmungslosen Angriffen auf demokratische Politiker. Sie brachten ihm mehrfach Verbote ein, darunter eines, das im Oktober 1923 zu einer schweren Krise zwischen Reichs- und bayerischer Staatsregierung führte, da diese den Vollzug des vom Reich verhängten Verbots verweigerte und so die Atmosphäre aufheizte, die sich im folgenden Putschversuch Hitlers gewaltsam entlud.

Das nach dem Scheitern des Hitlerputsches am 9. November 1923 verbotene Blatt erschien erstmals wieder am 26. Februar 1925 nach Hitlers Entlassung aus der Festungshaft. Durch seine Nähe zu Hitler und der Parteizentrale hatte der Völkische Beobachter im Vergleich zu den übrigen parteioffiziellen oder parteinahen « Kampfblättern » eine Leitfunktion.

Hitler war bis zum 30. April 1933 Herausgeber des Völkischen Beobachters, schrieb allerdings nur noch wenige Artikel selbst. Die redaktionelle Leitung hatte wiederum Rosenberg, dessen Stellvertreter, der ehemalige Hauptmann Wilhelm Weiß (1892-1950) , für die praktische Arbeit zuständig war. Rosenbergs Position wurde immer wieder erschüttert, besonders auch, da sich Amann als Verlagsleiter aus geschäftlichen Gründen auch in redaktionelle Angelegenheiten einmischte.

Wegen seiner Angriffe auf Politiker der demokratischen Parteien und Institutionen der Republik wurde der Völkische Beobachter erneut mehrfach verboten und in Prozesse verwickelt. Im Feuilleton kam nun als weiterer wichtiger Grundzug der Kampf gegen die als « Kulturbolschewismus » verteilte moderne Kunst aller Art zum Tragen.

Bis 1929 lag die Auflage unter 20.000, 1930 knapp unter 40.000 ; nach den Reichstagswahlen vom 14. September 1930 überschritt sie die Grenze von 100.000. Damit reihte sich der Völkische Beobachter zwar nicht der Qualität, aber der Auflagenhöhe nach unter die bedeutendsten Zeitungen im Reich ein. Nach wie vor diente das Blatt in erster Linie der Kommunikation mit den Mitgliedern. Finanzielles Rückgrat war der von Amann erfolgreich ausgebaut Buchverlag. Auch der 1926 gegründete « Illustrierte Beobachter » war ein Erfolg. Daneben wurde die Anhängerschaft immer wieder an ihre Pflicht erinnert, Abonnenten zu werben.

Seit 1. Februar 1927 erschien der Völkische Beobachter in einer Reichs- und in einer Bayernausgabe. Ende 1932 errichtete die Druckerei eine Zweigstelle in Berlin, so daß ab 1. Januar 1933 sowohl eine Berliner als auch eine Norddeutsche Ausgabe existierten. Daneben gab es eine Münchner und eine Süddeutsche Ausgabe.

Während der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft fand der « Völkische Beobachter » ideale Bedingungen zur weiteren Ausbreitung. Die parteipolitische Konkurrenz wurde verboten oder durch wirtschaftlichen Druck zum Aufgeben beziehungsweise zum Verkauf an den Parteiverlag gezwungen. Werber in SA-Uniform gingen von Haus zu Haus und nötigten Leute zum Abonnement.

Der propagandistische Kampfcharakter blieb auch nach 1933 bestehen, verbunden mit ständiger Glorifizierung der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft. Weiß stellte aber jetzt auch qualifiziertere Journalisten ein und hob das Niveau des Blatts und seiner neuen Beilagen. Mit seinen Versuchen, auch einen gut ausgebauten Auslandsdienst zu schaffen, scheiterte er allerdings an der Knausrigkeit Amanns. Nach dem Einmarsch in Österreich 1938 kam auch eine eigene Wiener Ausgabe heraus. Der Anteil der Bilder im Blatt vergrößerte sich erheblich ; ab Februar 1941 druckte man die ganze Zeitung in Antiqua statt in Fraktur. Dank seiner führenden Stellung hatte der Völkische Beobachter jetzt auch einen üppigen Anzeigenteil. Die Druckauflage stieg von 127.500 im Jahr 1933 auf über 313.000 im folgenden Jahr und nahm jedes Jahr um rund 100.000 zu. Keine andere Zeitung im Reich konnte damit nur annähernd mithalten. 1941 wurde die Millionengrenze überschritten.

Die Redakteure des Blatts versuchten gegenüber Propagandaministerium und Pressekonferenz eine gewisse Unabhängigkeit zu bewahren. Sie konnten aber bei unerwünschten Formulierungen durchaus in das Visier der Gestapo geraten. Der Völkische Beobachter wurde des öfteren auf den Pressekonferenzen gerügt und unterlag auch der Überwachung durch Reichspressechef Doktor Otto Dietrich (1897-1952) . Im Kulturteil kamen bisweilen sogar konservative Regimegegner mit verhüllter Kritik am Nationalsozialismus zu Wort.

Wegen Materialknappheit mußte der Völkische Beobachter wie alle Zeitungen im Krieg seinen Umfang erheblich verringern. Die letzte Nummer erschien in der Süddeutschen Ausgabe am 30. April 1945, wurde jedoch wegen des Vormarsches amerikanischer Truppen nicht mehr ausgeliefert.

Karl Grunsky

Le critique musical et écrivain sur la musique Karl (Carl) Grunsky est né le 5 mars 1871 à Schornbach, et est mort le 2 août 1943 à Vaihingen an der Enz. Il fut un fervent partisan de Richard Wagner et d'Anton Bruckner.

Grunsky a écrit des transcriptions pour 2 pianos (4 mains) des Symphonies du « Maître de Saint-Florian » .

Déjà auteur d'un ouvrage intitulé : « Wagner et les Juifs » (« Richard Wagner und die Juden ») , écrit en 1920, Karl Grunsky devint un professionnel de la dénonciation, frappant jusqu'aux chefs d'orchestre Wilhelm Furtwängler et Felix Weingartner pour avoir accompagné des solistes juifs. Il dénonça les compositeurs allemands comme Wolfgang Fortner, coupables d'avoir utilisé des textes juifs, et les musicologues pour avoir écrit trop longuement sur Felix Mendelssohn et pas assez sur Anton Bruckner. Grunsky collabora en 1940 au « Lexikon der Juden in Musik » , véritable catalogue préparatoire à la déportation.

...

Leading music-critic, writer on music and æsthetician Karl (Carl) Grunsky was born on 5 March 1871 in Schornbach, and died on 2 August 1943 in Vaihingen an der Enz. He was a strong supporter of Richard Wagner and Anton Bruckner.

Grunsky wrote transcriptions for 2 pianos (4 hands) of the Symphonies of Anton Bruckner.

Grunsky announced in 1907 :

« Music, an expression of mental life, is today admitted, defended, demanded from nearly all sides, since we barely pay attention to Eduard Hanslick any longer. »

Grunsky joined the NSDAP sometime between July 1930 (when his son Hans Alfred joined) and November 1923 (when Alfred Lorenz joined) .

Grunsky published his influential « Musikästhetik » in 1907, which went through many editions, also « Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts » (published by Georg Joachim Göschen in Leipzig, in : 1902 ; February 1908 ; and April 1923) , and « Musikgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts » (published by Georg Joachim Göschen in Leipzig, in : 1905 ; and March 1925) , and a number of articles on the music-dramas of Richard Wagner, in 1906-1908 (e.g. : « Die Rhythmik im Parsifal » ; « Richard Wagner-Jahrbuch » , 1908, pages 276-370) . See also his contributions to Anton Bruckner's « Symphonien erläutert mit Notenbeispielen » (published by Schlesinger in Berlin) . Helmut Federhofer speaks of « a dispute between Schenker and Grunsky » , in 1908, regarding August Halm and Anton Bruckner (in : « Nach Tagebüchern und Briefen » ; page 134) .

Works

Die Instrumentierung der Meistersinger (1900) .

Anton Bruckner als Kirchenkomponist (1900) .

Über Geselligkeit (1902) .

Bruckners Symphonien (1902) .

Hugo Wolfs Spanisches Liederbuch (1902) .

Alte Klaviermusik für die Gegenwart (1903) .

Klavier und musikalische Bildung (1904) .

Deutsche Musik in Paris (1905) .

Klaviermusik und musikalische Bildung, 2 (1905) .

Natur und Musik (1905) .

Anton Bruckners Symphonien, Schlesinger, Berlin (1908) .

Richard Wagner und die Juden, Deutscher Volksverlag, München (1920) .

Karl Grunsky, Otto Erhardt, Hermann Keller. Brucknerfestbuch, Bayreuther Bund, Stuttgart (1921) .

Anton Bruckner, Engelhorn's Nachfolger, Stuttgart (1922) .

Die Einheit der Tonkunst (1927) .

Über den musikalischen Rhythmus (1927) .

Kampf um Deutsche Musik ! , Erhard Walther Verlag, Stuttgart (1933) .

Fragen der Bruckner-Auffassung, Alfred Heyder Verlag, Stuttgart (1936)

...

Studies by Karl Grunsky, a Stuttgart journalist who wrote extensively on musical matters, are ubiquitous in the

publications of the Bayreuth circle. A regular contributor to both the « Bayreuther Festspielführer » and the « Bayreuther Blätter », Grunsky was one of Alfred Lorenz's earliest and most enthusiastic proponents. In addition to arrangements of Bruckner's Symphonies for 2 pianos, he wrote 3 books about the composer. The 1st, from 1908, sees Bruckner in typically Romantic terms as an unworldly genius, full of naive faith. Bruckner, to his credit, learned from Richard Wagner, but had a sufficiently original nature to be able to keep these Wagnerian impressions in check : the line separating Wagner from Bruckner is, in fact, a cleft - not to be bridged even by friendship.

Grunsky's 1922 study begins a shift in perception. The 2 composers are closer together. Now, Grunsky observes that, in Bruckner's works, the tools are often Wagnerian, but the end result is not. In a discussion of why Bruckner's music is not formless, he argues that one ought to value formal innovation in Bruckner Symphonies just as one values formal innovation in Wagnerian music-drama. More important, in the wake of Germany's defeat in the First World War, Bruckner is presented in nationalistic terms. His is a soul rooted directly in God and in the « Volk » ; the God invoked in a Brucknerian « Adagio » is that of the medieval German mystics, not necessarily that of the church. Grunsky also compares Bruckner's Symphonies with Gothic cathedrals, arguing that the Gothic style reached its peak in Germany as in no other land. Nationalism turns vaguely threatening when resistance to Bruckner is made into a manifestation of decadence : « in the manner of struggle against Bruckner, we see a sign of decay in the air long before the War » .

The alleged devaluation of Bruckner as a symptom of Germany's decline is more explicit in Grunsky's « Kampf um deutsche Musik ! » (1933) . Here, Beethoven, Wagner, and Bruckner, unproblematically linked together, are regarded as the culmination of German music, which, in Schopenhauerian terms, provides the listener direct access to the will. Grunsky traces the deterioration of German music in both the rise of modern music (derided as spiritual masturbation and depicted in sexually threatening terms) and in the waning reputation of Wagner. Throughout the book, « modern » and « Jewish » are linked in opposition to « German » , and Grunsky argues that these « non-Germans » are incapable of understanding Bruckner :

« These others face the immense waves of intensification (" Steigerungswogen ") of Bruckner's music with puzzlement because their souls do not vibrate continually along with them, whereas for us the reverberation is so great that it continually sets new representations into motion. »

By 1936, political ideology has replaced musical nuance in Grunsky's work. Gone completely is his earlier concern to differentiate between Bruckner and Wagner. To see Bruckner as influenced only by Wagner's orchestral magic (and, thus, to devalue the music-dramas as mere theater music) is impossible :

« Bruckner's life is inseparably connected with Wagner. Through music, Bruckner felt himself to be internally bound with Wagner. »

According to Grunsky, Bruckner heard Wagner's works as absolute music ; he was concerned with their pure form, not just their unfolding action or « Klang » . In other words, he heard them just like Alfred Lorenz, but « avant la lettre » :

« Now, if Bruckner recognized the characteristic value of Wagnerian music from the beginning, this is proof that even at that time he heard almost in a Lorenzian manner (“ lorenzisch ”) , and that he had an equal understanding of the secret of Wagner’s musical form. »

Grunsky suggests that Bruckner instinctively grasped Wagnerian form and was completely convinced of the worth, value, and logical consistency of the music-dramas. For Grunsky, the Wagnerian « Klang » did not obscure but rather revealed form and logic ; the same was true in Bruckner’s Symphonies. Anti-Wagnerian opinion in the new Bruckner movement contradicted the facts : should Bruckner be ashamed to have followed in the steps of the Bayreuth Master ? On the contrary, according to Grunsky, Bruckner was truest to himself when he held with Wagner.

Grunsky, like Lorenz, allowed his National-Socialist sentiments to infiltrate his scholarly work and was not averse to using his Party connections for personal gain. In a letter to the « Reichsschrifttumskammer » (RSK) , dated 10 May 1943, he requested permission to publish a new monograph on Bruckner outside of Germany, as his usual printer was at the front. According to the letter, the new work connected Bruckner with present-day concerns, undoubtedly political. Grunsky regarded it as his best work, containing the « experience of a lifetime » . His death, 3 months later, must have prevented the book’s appearance.

The work of Grunsky’s son, Hans Alfred, provides an even more interesting example of the juxtaposition of Wagner, Lorenzian analysis, Bruckner, and National-Socialism. A philosopher, not a musicologist, he was professor at Munich University from 1935 to 1944 (Ordinarius from 1937) , and concurrently held a research position with the « Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands » . He was also associated with Alfred Rosenberg’s ideological bureau, the « NS-Kulturgemeinde » . The younger Grunsky’s major preoccupation, during the 1930’s and 1940’s, was with National-Socialist philosophy : its history, clarification, and (not incidentally) its promulgation.

During the 1920’s Hans Alfred Grunsky was a student of Alfred Lorenz’s and, like his father, an enthusiastic proponent of the latter’s work. Virtually, all of his articles about music refer to Lorenz’s type of dynamic formal analysis. Many of the parallels with National-Socialism, latent in Lorenz’s writings, are more evident ; in fact, Grunsky is the only contemporary of Lorenz who makes the connection between Nazism and Lorenzian analysis explicit. In an article entitled « Form und Erlebnis » , Grunsky writes :

« The most wonderful thing about this new science of form is that it corresponds completely to the ideal that the most recent academic works demand : it is not lifeless, but is intimately entwined with art, with life, and with the “ Volk ” : Lorenz’s work finds its true niche in the “ Volk ”, for it leads from the recognition of form (“ Formerkennen ”) to the experience of form (“ Formerleben ”) . »

...

In 1934, Karl Grunsky published a similar Lorenzian primer under the title of « Neues zur Formenlehre » , proposing the addition of 4 « Mischformen » . These are derived from combinations of Bars and « Bogen » (as shown below) ,

and are Grunsky's Germanized permutations of binary form :

Hans Alfred Grunsky's Mischformen

Bar + Bogen = Reprisesbar (m-m-n-m) .

Bogen + Gegenbar = Echobogen (m-n-m-m) .

Bar + Gegenbar = Echobar (m-m-n-n) .

Gegenbar + Bar = Doppelbar (m-n-n-m or m-n-n-o) .

Bogen + Bogen = 4-teilige Bogenreihe (m-n-n-m) .

Lorenzian analysis and National-Socialist concerns continued to intersect in Grunsky's life. In a letter of 5 May 1933 to the « Kultusministerium », he attempted to exploit his Nazi ties to obtain a position at Munich University, proposing the foundation of a chair in National-Socialist philosophy. Although the letter deals primarily with philosophical issues, Grunsky not only proposes a series of lectures on « Richard Wagner's works as the source of a Germanic world-view » , but also links Anton Bruckner and National-Socialist ideology in a quite direct manner :

« National-Socialism as the source and subject of philosophical consciousness : that may appear bizarre to Liberal dabblers in philosophy (" liberalistischen Bücherphilosophen ") . All further thoughts can only be a necessary consequence of that sentence : that true philosophy is always, and always will be created out of life. However, not only the destiny of peoples or individuals, but also " myths ", " fairy-tales ", " poems ", and " art-works " of all types can become the subject of philosophical contemplation and interpretation ; often deeper metaphysical content lurks in these last ... In this sense, over many years, with the support of the " Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft ", I have developed an entirely new æsthetic theory of form and rhythm and applied it to Anton Bruckner's Symphonic works at the same time. »

Grunsky saw an obvious connection between Lorenzian formal analysis and National-Socialism and regarded his work on Bruckner as appropriate for the times.

A final illustration of the interpenetration of art and politics in Grunsky's work is found in a lecture delivered in Munich, in 1938, on « Jacob Böhme as the Creator of a Teutonic Philosophy of the Will » . He claims to find in Böhme the « formal world and intellectual structure » of a Bruckner Symphony. While Grunsky's comment is surely intended only as an illustrative analogy- albeit one « of deepest significance to our race » , it is striking that Grunsky should light on Bruckner. As an adherent of the expressive æsthetic, Grunsky regarded all music as the direct expression of the will of the composer ; music is will. There is an important slippage in meaning inherent in the evocation of « will » by the National-Socialists, however, whereby the central concept of Schopenhauerian philosophy is coarsened and celebrated as an instinctive and brutal will to power.

The case of Hans Alfred Grunsky is particularly clear. Considered in conjunction with the writings of his father, Karl, and his teacher, Alfred Lorenz, his work on Bruckner offers a compelling example of the difficulty of separating the aesthetic from the political during the 1920's and 1930's. Recent developments in literary theory have suggested that works of interpretation or criticism are no less subjective or « artistic » than the objects of interpretation themselves. Often unconscious subjectivity surfaces as ideology in the sense described by Louis Althusser. There is a connection between musical aesthetics and political myth-making, whether in terms of a focus on Germanizing musical terminology (deriving all form from the Bar form, for example) , or through emphasis on the power of will. The intersection of National-Socialist ideology, Lorenzian formal analysis, and Bruckner, while perhaps only coincidental, is all the more significant because it is not unique. While Bruckner played an important role in National-Socialist « Kulturpolitik » , the figure of Richard Wagner is ever present. It is with Wagner and his Bayreuth followers that we must begin if we are to take-up the challenge of trying to separate the intertwining threads of aesthetics, philosophy, and politics in fascist Germany.

The notion that purely instrumental music could be expressive was really never in question. As Karl Grunsky argued in his « Musikästhetik » of 1907, the differences between absolute, program, and vocal music were ultimately minimal : all music is expressive. Grunsky's treatise captures the paradoxical fact that, by the beginning of the 20th Century, Eduard Hanslick's thought, dismissed as old-fashioned, was so deeply engrained in discourse that the ideas he had promoted were no longer necessarily associated with him. Grunsky notes that « it is conceded, maintained, and expected that music is the expression of the soul's life » , because « hardly anyone pays attention to Hanslick anymore » . The account of musical expression that follows, however, is deeply indebted to « Vom Musikalisch-Schönen » . Grunsky encourages his readers to think about musical expression in terms of its dynamic, not in terms of representation or emotion :

« Music provides only the moving tones, not the motivational foundations behind them. »

Yet, Grunsky never cites Hanslick by name. In a similar fashion, Eugen Schmitz began his « Musikästhetik » of 1915 by outlining the history of the opposition between the aesthetics of form (as represented by Hanslick) and the aesthetics of content (as represented by Wagner) , accused both of parties of one-sidedness and, then, described their fusion in the aesthetic thought of more recent times.

...

Doktor Karl Grunsky (geboren 5. März 1871 z Schorndorf ; gestorben 2. August 1943 em Stuegerter Stadtteil Vaihenga) ischt a deutscher Philolog, Hischdoriker ond Musikschriftsteller gwää.

Doktor Karl Grunsky ischt am 5. März 1871 em wirdabergischa Städtle Schorndorf uff d Welt komma. Nôch seim Abidur hôt'r Philosophie studiirt ond 1893 uff sellem Gebiet au promoviirt. Bekannt wôrra isch der Môô abr uff ganz andre Gebiet : Zerscht hôt'r sich z Stuegert als Litradurkridiker an Nama gmacht. Neabahter hôt'r sich als Autodidakt umfangreiche Kenntnis uff-em Gebiet vo dr Musik ôûgeignet, wo-nem ermeglicht hend, umfangreiche Schrifda ibr seine

Liablengskombonischda Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt, Anton Bruckner ond Hugo Wolf zo vrfassa. Vom Bruckner seine Sinfonia hôt dr Grunsky au a baar Ausziig fir zwoi Klaviir bearbeitet, wo gheerich zor Vordiafong vo deam Kombonischda seine Werk beitruga hend.

Am 2. Auguscht 1943 hôt dr Grunsky em Stuegerter Stadtdoil Vaihenga seine Auga fir emmer geschlossa. 72 Jôhr alt ischt'r wôrra.

A kloina Auswahl vo seine Schrifda

Musikästhetik (1907) .

Musikgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts (1914 isch des Werk en dr zwoida Ufflag rauskomma) .

Musikgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts (dô gilt s gleiche wie oba) .

Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts (dô drvoo ischt scho 1908 de zwoid Ufflag erschiina) .

Die Technik des Klavierauszuges (1911) .

Richard Wagner und die Juden (1920) .

Das Christusideal in der Tonkunst (1920) .

Anton Bruckner (1922) .

Hans Alfred Grunsky

Hans Alfred Grunsky (geboren 31. Juli 1902 in Stuttgart ; gestorben 20. Mai 1988 in Sibichhausen) war ein nationalsozialistischer deutscher Philosoph, der und andere über Jakob Böhme arbeitete.

Hans Grunsky war der Sohn des Stuttgarter Historikers und Musikschriftstellers Karl Grunsky, der über Martin Luther, Richard Wagner und Anton Bruckner gearbeitet hat. Der Vater trat 1930 der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung bei und agitierte ebenfalls dezidiert in deren Sinne.

Hans Alfred Grunsky besuchte das Karls-Gymnasium in Stuttgart, mußte infolge einer spinalen Kinderlähmung 1917 den Schulbesuch aufgeben. Er war von da an Rollstuhlfahrer. Der NSDAP trat er am 1. Juni 1930 bei (Mitglieds-Nummer 264.685) . Er war ein fanatischer Nationalsozialist und lehrte eine antisemitische, rassistische und antikatholische Philosophie. Sein Ziel war es, eine Philosophie im nationalsozialistischen Sinne zu etablieren. So hielt er eine Vorlesung über « Blutwelt und Freiheit » und ein « Seminar der philosophierenden Mannschaft » . Daneben war er Autor und Herausgeber der NS-Schulungsbrieft.

Walter Frank holte Grunsky 1935 an sein Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland. Von 1937 bis 1940 war Grunsky Hauptlektor für Philosophie im Amt Rosenberg, seit 1938 « Hauptreferent für konfessionelle Fragen und Fragen des politischen Katholizismus » im Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands.

Im September 1935 erhielt er die Lehrstuhlvertretung für Alexander Pfänder an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und wurde am 26. Mai 1937 auf diesem Lehrstuhl für Philosophie und Psychologie ordiniert. Die philosophische Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität hatte sich geweigert, ihn als Hochschullehrer zu berufen, da Grunsky ihr fachlich ungeeignet erschien. Doch Adolf Hitler persönlich berief ihn zum Ordinarius für Philosophie, ein in der deutschen Universitätsgeschichte auch damals unerhörter Vorgang.

Grunskys erste Aktion war (« in einer Manier, die selbst im 3. Reich ihresgleichen sucht ») ein Gutachten über seine Fachkollegen. Darin teilte er dem Kultusminister Bernhard Rust mit, welche Kollegen Juden waren. Diese wurden umgehend aus dem Hochschuldienst entlassen :

« Um die Berufung von Herbert Cysarz zu verhindern, schickte Grunsky ein Sitzungsprotokoll der philosophischen Fakultät an Winifred Wagner und fügte hinzu, Cysarz habe sich in seinen Schriften herablassend über Wagner geäußert. »

Zu Grunskys Stil gehörte die Charakterisierung jüdischer Philosophie als « Talmudisierung » von Philosophie und von Baruch Spinoza als « Talmudjuden » , dies ist auch Thema seines Vortrags zur Berliner Ausstellung Der ewige Jude : Baruch Spinoza. Sein Leben und Werk im Lichte der Judenfrage.

Ein Doktorand von Grunsky war der später an den vertraulichen « Teegesprächen » von Konrad Adenauer teilnehmende Journalist Max Nitzsche.

Am 15. November 1941 wurde er wegen übler Nachrede und Verletzung des Dienstgeheimnisses vom Dienst enthoben. Die Beurlaubung wurde aber nach einem Verweis am 10. Mai 1943 wieder aufgehoben.

Das Gutachten des Reichsministeriums für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung nannte ihn einen « vollständigen Versager in menschlicher und wissenschaftlicher Hinsicht » . Am 12. Juli 1945 wurde er auf Weisung der US-Militärregierung entlassen. Im Entnazifizierungsverfahren wurde er zunächst als « Minderbelasteter » , dann als « Mitläufer » eingestuft.

Nach 1945 lebte Grunsky als Privatgelehrter in Sibichhausen am Starnberger See. Er setzte seine Arbeit innerhalb der Freien Akademie fort, die er zusammen mit Jakob Wilhelm Hauer gründete. Die Tagungen der Akademie fanden seit 1952 auf Burg Ludwigstein bei Kassel statt.

Der Einbruch des Judentums in die Philosophie

(Hans Alfred Grunsky)

Im Jahre 1907 schrieb der Marburger Ordinarius für Philosophie, Hermann Cohen, an einen Rassegenossen, einen Rabbiner :

« Sie wissen, wie sehr ich mit den tiefsten Regungen meines Herzens und den innigsten Gefühlen meines Geistes mit dem inneren Leben unserer Religion verknüpft bin. »

Dieser Mann war im damaligen Deutschland (und weit darüber hinaus) die fast unumschränkt herrschende Autorität auf dem Gebiet der Philosophie. Als Führer und Begründer der sogenannten neukantianischen Schule erhob er den Anspruch, Erneuerer und Weiterbildner des kantischen Denkens zu sein. Gleichzeitig war er Lehrer an der Jüdischen Hochschule in Berlin. Er selbst bezeichnet sich als Baal teschuwa seit 1880, in welchem Jahr der damals 38jährige zuerst ein literarisches Bekenntnis zum Judentum abgelegt hatte. Baal teschuwa - das heißt Büber, dessen Verdienst noch größer ist als das des Gerechten. Seit dem Beginn der 90er Jahre (ich zitiere die Darstellung des jüdischen Philosophie-Historikers Guttman) hat Cohen weiterhin « in einer Fülle von Vorträgen und Abhandlungen den sittlichen Gehalt des Judentums zur Darstellung gebracht ; nicht in objektiver Kühle, sondern in der glühenden Begeisterung des Bekenntners » . Er ist dann, wie ebenfalls eine jüdische Quelle bezeugt, mit zunehmendem Alter immer jüdischer geworden. 1910 ist dieser Vorgang so weit gediehen, daß er sogar seinem großen Rassegenossen Spinoza aus tiefster Seele gram geworden ist, weil dieser, wie er in einer Veröffentlichung schreibt, « die Juden verlassen habe, und zwar bevor diese ihn verließen » .

Solches Bekenntnis zur eigenen Art wird an sich niemand lächerlich oder schlecht finden. Merkwürdig freilich, daß es sich um jemand handelt, der damals allgemein als repräsentativer Vertreter gerade der deutschen Philosophie galt. Aber etwas anderes ist noch viel merkwürdiger. Gehen wir von dem letzten Bekenntnis Cohens fünf Jahre weiter. Das deutsche Volk ringt im furchtbarsten aller Kriege um Sein oder Nichtsein. Wachgerüttelt durch dieses elementare Erleben schreibt ein deutschblütiger Philosophieprofessor, der in der Leitung der Kant-Gesellschaft, der damals maßgebenden philosophischen Vereinigung, tätig ist, einen Aufsatz über den Begriff der Nation. Er kommt darin unter anderem zu dem Ergebnis, daß dieser Begriff auch etwas mit Abstammungsgemeinschaft zu tun habe. « Ohne daß ich selber » , schreibt er, « auch nur ein Wort zu reden brauche, bieten mir im Auslande die Zeitungsausträger deutsche Zeitungen an, und wenn es anders wäre, so käme ich mir wahrhaft kümmerlich und von Mutter Natur stiefmütterlich behandelt vor » . An zwei Stellen dieses Aufsatzes ist nun auch kurz vom Judentum die Rede. An der einen Stelle weist er auf die nationale, im Zionismus zum Ausdruck kommende « Sehnsucht des Judentums » hin, die « nicht bloß Beachtung, sondern auch Achtung » verdiene. An der anderen sagt er, daß es aus der Liebe zur Scholle heraus « psychologisch und historisch durchaus verständlich sei, wenn Angehörigen des jüdischen Volkes der Erwerb deutschen Bodens von unseren Stammesvätern versagt ward » . Zur selben Zeit erschien von demselben deutschblütigen Professor eine andere Veröffentlichung, in der er es wagte, unterscheidend vom deutschen Denker Kant und vom jüdischen Denker Cohen zu sprechen, wobei er sich beeilt, dieses Wagnis aus seiner durchaus liberalen Haltung heraus (er selbst stand mit einem jüdischen Kollegen auf gutem Fuß) dadurch abzuschwächen, daß er Cohen als « eine der ehrwürdigsten Gestalten des modernen Judentums » bezeichnet.

Allein, er hatte zuviel gewagt. Ich muß dabei ausdrücklich bemerken, daß ich die Verbrechen des deutschblütigen Professors vollständig aufgezählt habe und daß er sich vordem auch niemals etwas hat zuschulden kommen lassen. Aber trotzdem : sie mußten gesühnt werden. Ein Sturm der Entrüstung, der Empörung und der Erbitterung ging durch die Kant-Gesellschaft, die zu einem hohen Prozentsatz aus Juden bestand und an deren Spitze Arthur Liebert, natürlich ebenfalls ein Jude, amtierte. « Hermann Cohen in unerhörter Weise beleidigt ! » - so hagelte es Protestschreiben und Austrittserklärungen. Liebert, der Vorsitzende, fährt eigens zu dem Sünder, um ihn zur Vernunft zu bringen. Dieser erklärt sich bereit, eine Entgegnung in die von ihm geleitete Zeitschrift unter der Voraussetzung aufzunehmen, daß sie in sachlichem Ton gehalten sei. Der Neukantianer Cassirer (bis 1933 philosophischer Ordinarius in Hamburg, jetzt in Oxford Emigrantenprofessor) wird mit dieser Aufgabe betraut. Seine Entgegnung fällt indessen derart gehässig und unsachlich aus, daß der deutschblütige Professor, der diesen Sturm heraufbeschworen hatte, sich weigert, sie aufzunehmen. Jetzt eröffnet ihm die in Aufruhr geratene Judenschaft drei Möglichkeiten : entweder er gibt eine öffentliche Ehrenerklärung für Cohen ab oder er nimmt wegen einer schon weit zurückliegenden Operation ein Jahr Urlaub oder er tritt stillschweigend zurück und verschwindet damit aus der Leitung der Kant-Gesellschaft. « Eine öffentliche Ehrenerklärung für Cohen » , meint der harmlose Deutsche, der ebenso verständniswie fassungslos vor den Folgen seiner Untat steht, « könnte ich darum nicht abgeben, weil ich nicht einmal in meinen geheimsten Gedanken eine Ehrenkränkung Cohens begangen habe » . Auch den zweiten Vorschlag mit der Operation lehnt er aus Gründen der Wahrheit ab. So tritt er denn einfach von seinem Amt in der Kant-Gesellschaft zurück.

Das also war jene Freiheit der Wissenschaft, die im Jahre 1933 ihr Ende gefunden hat, die Freiheit nämlich, Kriterien wissenschaftlicher Wahrheit willkürlich festzusetzen je nach dem Maß, ob sich dadurch ein Jude gekränkt fühlt oder nicht. Das Eigentümlichste ist aber, was hier als Beleidigung aufgefaßt wird. Machen wir uns doch das Ungeheuerliche einmal klar : In der Notzeit nationalen Ringens, wo gerade erst recht die Waffen des Geistes sich mit den Waffen der Armee zu einheitlicher Wirkung hätten vereinigen müßen, war es einem deutschen Philosophieprofessor nicht gestattet, von einem jüdischen Philosophen zu sagen, daß er ein « ehrwürdiger Vertreter des Judentums » sei, obwohl dieser Jude selbst seit Jahrzehnten immer und immer wieder flammende Bekenntnisse zum Judentum abgelegt hatte. Was bedeutet dieses Phänomen ? Nach unserem Empfinden hatte der deutschblütige liberale Professor seinen jüdischen Kollegen ja nicht beleidigen wollen, im Gegenteil war er ihm mit Achtung und Ehrerbietung gegenübergetreten. Aber was nützt den Juden eine solche Achtung, wenn sie (das ist nämlich hier des Pudels Kern) nicht gleichzeitig das Zugeständnis einschließt, daß auch Kant im Grunde ein jüdischer Denker, gewissermaßen ein kleiner Cohen gewesen sei.

« Der Mensch » (ich gebrauche absichtlich wieder die Worte des Juden Guttmann) ist nach Cohens Ethik « nicht das Individuum in den Zufälligkeiten seines natürlichen und sozialen Daseins » . Dem Begriff des Menschen könne vielmehr nur der Gedanke der menschlichen Allheit genügen. Die « Idee des Menschen » finde seine « Realisierung in der Gemeinschaft der Menschheit » . « Der Sittlichkeit gegenüber ist es undenkbar » , sagt Cohen in seiner Ethik des reinen Willens, « daß es einen Unterschied in der sittlichen Kraft der Menschen geben könnte. Der Gedanke des Übermenschen ist einfach deshalb widersittlich, weil er unzertrennlich verbunden ist mit dem Gedanken des Untermenschen. » Oder noch ärgerlicher : « Die Herrenmoral ist nichts als Teufelei. »

Als Kronzeugen für diese Menschheitsethik, in der jede blutmäßige Bindung verneint und vernichtet ist, führt Cohen nun die Lehre Kants ins Feld. Diese bedarf freilich einer wichtigen Ergänzung und Erweiterung, des Nachweises nämlich, daß

jene höchsten sittlichen Menschheitsziele mit der Idee der jüdischen Religion identisch seien. Dies ist der Angelpunkt der Cohenschen Ethik. Was wohl unser großer deutscher Denker zu dieser Interpretation seiner Philosophie gesagt hätte ? Jedenfalls hat Kant Respektlosigkeiten begangen, die ihm als Zeitgenossen Cohens einen noch ganz anderen und kräftigeren Hinausschmiß aus der Kant-Gesellschaft eingetragen hätten, als sie jenem deutschen Philosophieprofessor zuteil wurde, der schüchtern von Nation zu sprechen wagte, von einem deutschen Denken und dem « ehrwürdigsten Vertreter des Judentums » . Aber da Kant eben kein Zeitgenosse Cohens war, sondern ein höchstes Ansehen in der Philosophie genießt, so wird ihm verziehen, daß er den nach Cohen « ungeheuerlichen Satz » aufstellte, das Judentum sei eigentlich gar keine Religion, sondern der Inbegriff bloß statuarischer Gesetze. Das waren freilich Entgleisungen Kants. Sie stören den eigentlichen Gehalt seiner Philosophie nicht, der nach Cohens Meinung in einer Ethik der reinen Menschheitsgesinnung bestehen soll ; wobei Kant allerdings noch nicht merkte, daß sich die Verwirklichung der « der Menschheit auferlegten sittlichen Forderung » mit der jüdischen Messiasidee deckt.

Da die Tugend der Bescheidenheit nach Cohen der Tapferkeit vorangeht, verfährt er bei der Schilderung des Verhältnisses, das zwischen Menschheit, Sittlichkeit und Messianismus waltet, mit echt jüdischer Bescheidenheit. « Alle diejenigen » , sagt er, « welche in der Politik für ihr Volk und die Menschheit kämpfen und leiden, sind die Jünger der jüdischen Propheten » . Diese sind die eigentlichen « Heroen » . Wobei heroische Tapferkeit natürlich keineswegs mit soldatischen Eigenschaften verwechselt werden darf. « Wirkliche Helden des Geistes » , witzelt der Jude, « sind keineswegs immer Gardefiguren » . « Das wahre Schlachtfeld der Tapferkeit ist vielmehr die - Kultur. » « Der Fleiß der Arbeit für die Kultur ist der eigentlichste Sinn und Wert der Tapferkeit. » Und da geben « die Propheten das ewige Vorbild ab. Ihr Patriotismus war der edelste, der erhabenste, aber die Menschheit ging ihnen über ihr Volk. Ihre Politik war nichts anderes, als was wir heutzutage Sozialismus nennen. »

Hier schließt sich der Ring, und ich glaube, es ist fast überflüssig, hinzuzufügen, daß Cohen Marxist und Freimaurer war. Jedenfalls danken wir ihm das eine, daß er den Zusammenhang zwischen Marxismus und jüdischem Messianismus mit einer Deutlichkeit hervorgehoben hat, die nichts zu wünschen übrig läßt. Seine Lehre ist gewissermaßen Schlüssel und Kommentar zu dem Wort, das der jüdische Historiker Heinrich Grætz vor 90 Jahren niederschrieb :

« Der Endzweck des Judentums ist kein anderer als die geistige und materielle Vervollkommnung und Veredlung des Menschen. »

Freilich, Cohen wurde etwas allzu deutlich. Man rückt ein wenig von ihm ab. Man nennt ihn mit größter Ehrerbietung, aber gibt doch zu verstehen, daß er auf dem falschen Wege war. « In der Nacht der Gegenwart » (nämlich im Jahre 1935) äußert sich ein Jude elegisch über Cohen (der 1917 starb) : « sein Messias war falsch, sein Messianismus war echt » . Das deutsche Volk, soll das heißen, hat es Cohen übel gelohnt, daß dieser ihm die Ehre antat, Kant zum jüdischen Messias oder wenigstens zu dessen Vorläufer zu erheben. Der Versuch, durch eine Umbiegung und Umfälschung eines großen deutschen Philosophen die jüdischen Pläne ihrer Verwirklichung näherzubringen, ist gründlich mißglückt.

Aber wie kommt Kant dazu, als Wegbahner des jüdischen Messianismus proklamiert zu werden ? Nun, wir werden sehen, daß diese Ehre jedem großen Geist der Menschheit zuteil geworden ist. Und wir werden die Arten, Methoden und den Zweck solcher Umfälschungen noch näher zu betrachten haben.

Viel wäre, um auf Kant zurückzukommen, für das Judentum schon gewonnen, wenn wir aus Ekel vor der jüdischen Mißdeutung eine Abneigung gegen den deutschen Denker Kant als solchen fassen würden. Gewiß, es waren immer die schwächsten Stellen, an denen solche Mißdeutungen einhaken. So auch bei Kant. Der schwache Punkt seiner Ethik liegt darin, daß sie sich noch nicht aus gewissen Traditionen, die wie Meltau über der Entwicklung des germanischen Denkens liegen, freimachen kann. Da wäre und andere die Abhängigkeit zu nennen, in der Kants Sittlichkeitsbegriff vom Stoizismus steht. Diese Abhängigkeit ist nicht eine Sonderschwäche Kants, sondern eine viel allgemeinere Einwirkung, die sich von der Renaissance bis zur ihrem Gipfel in der Aufklärung wie ein roter Faden durch die Jahrhunderte zieht. Der Stoizismus hat in der Antike zum erstenmal in größerem Umfang eine Sittenlehre aufgestellt, die die Menschheit oder, was dasselbe ist, das aus allen völkischen und rassischen Bindungen losgelöste Individuum in den Mittelpunkt ihrer Betrachtung stellt. Es war jene Zeit der zerfallenden Blutsbindungen, des beginnenden Völkerchaos, als der stoische Weise die Idee einer reinen Menschheitsittlichkeit auf seine Fahne schrieb. Das Lehrreichste daran ist, daß diese Bewegung, rassisch gesehen, in vielem schon außerhalb des Griechentums steht und typisch orientalischsemitische Züge in sich aufnimmt, die sich dann eigentümlich mit einer nordischen Willenhaftigkeit vermischen, die sich verzweifelt aus dem zerfallenden politischen Leben in sich zurückgezogen hat und sich nun gleichsam als gegenstandsloses Pflichtgefühl um sich selber dreht. Gleich der Begründer der stoischen Schule, Zenon, hat semitisches Blut und die Griechen empfanden das Artfremde dieses Pœnulus, dieses kleinen Phöniziers, wie sie ihn nannten, sehr wohl. So ist es also nicht zu kühn, wenn wir sagen, daß die Fernwirkung dieses Phöniziers auf Kant es möglich machte, daß ein Jahrhundert nach Kant sich der Jude Cohen über diesen deutschen Denker hermachen konnte (wie dasselbe übrigens schon eine ganze Anzahl von Juden vorher getan hatte ; zu Kants Lebzeiten bereits Salomon Maimon, Marcus Herz und Lazarus Bendavid und später im 19. Jahrhundert zum Beispiel Otto Liebmann) .

Andererseits ist in diesem Zusammenhang nicht außer acht zu lassen, daß der negative Einfluß des Stoizismus auf Kant ja durch die deutsche Umbildung des stoischen Standpunkts, die man die preußischfriderizianische nennen könnte, ganz wesentlich abgeschwächt wird. Und selbst wenn wir den ursprünglichen Stoizismus betrachten, so hat auch der mit jüdischem Messianismus jedenfalls nichts zu tun. Wenn die stoische Menschheitsidee auch von dem jüdischen Ideal des Weisen durchschnitten wird, so ist das doch weit harmloser, als die Umbildung, die der Gedanke der Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit erleidet, wenn er sich, wie beispielsweise gegenwärtig in Rußland, mit dem messianischen Willen zur jüdischen Vorherrschaft vereinigt. Die Linie Zenon-Cohen schneidet also die Riesengestalt Kants nur an einer einzigen und in bezug auf das, was Kant uns Deutschen zu sagen hat, nicht einmal wesentlichen Stelle. Cohen aber versetzt diese Linie durch das Zauberspiel seiner Sophistik in rotierenden Schwung, so daß sie nun wie ein Strahlenkegel, dessen Ausgangspunkt Cohen selbst ist, um die Gestalt des großen deutschen Denkers flimmert und ihn uns am Schluß unter dem Zerrbild eines alten Juden an die Wand wirft.

Nur ein Beispiel dafür : Ein Kardinalpunkt von Kants Lehre ist seine Einsicht, daß Anschauung und Begriff unzertrennlich zusammengehören und nichts ohne einander sind. « Gedanken ohne Inhalt sind leer, Anschauungen ohne Begriffe sind blind » : diese berühmte Formulierung bringt eine jener zentralen Erkenntnisse zum Ausdruck, die uns über alles Zeitbedingte seines Systems voranleuchten wird. Sie entspringt dem germanischdeutschen Streben nach spannungsgeladener Einheit. Der Jude hat nichts Eiligeres zu tun, als diese Einheit auseinanderzuschlagen. Cohen streicht aus der notwendigen Zusammenspannung von Denken und Anschauung den Faktor der Anschauung weg und stellt damit

die Erkenntnistheorie Kants auf den Kopf. Und ebensowenig hat er etwas von dem Metaphysiker Kant begriffen.

Nicht besser als Kant ergeht es dem größten griechischen Denker Platon. Auch ihn verzerren Cohen und die Neukantianer in jüdischer Richtung. So will uns zum Beispiel (um eine Einzelheit zu nennen, die an vorhin Erwähntes anknüpft) Cohen weismachen, Platon habe den Begriff der Tapferkeit in seinem (Cohens) Sinne verstanden. Er, Platon, schreibt Cohen, scheut nicht « die Anlehnung an die Volksmoral, welche in der Tapferkeit von jeher die vornehmste Tugend erkannte. Aber er schlägt sie jetzt mit ihren eigenen Waffen, indem er sie aufnimmt und umdeutet. » - « Schlägt sie mit eigenen Waffen, indem er sie aufnimmt und umdeutet » : das ist wie ein unbewußtes Geständnis der eigenen Methode, nicht bloß der Methode Cohens, nein, der jüdischen Methode überhaupt, der Methode dessen, was sich jüdische Philosophie nennt und nannte.

Man muß nämlich wissen, daß der Eintritt des Judentums in die Philosophie glorreich damit begann, daß etwas vor der Wende unserer Zeitrechnung der Jude Aristobulos griechische Texte bewußt und systematisch fälschte, um ihre Übereinstimmung mit dem Alten Testament nachzuweisen. Der alexandrinische Jude Philo, der erste jüdische Philosoph, hat dann bescheiden erklärt, daß Platon seine Philosophie aus Moses geschöpft habe. Wir sehen, wie Kant seinen Cohen, so hat Platon seinen Philo gehabt. Nun könnte man ja sagen, jene Zeit des Hellenismus ist ganz allgemein dadurch gekennzeichnet, daß alle möglichen Systeme und Religionen durcheinander gerührt und in unschöpferischer Weise miteinander vermischt werden. So kam auch der alexandrinische Jude Philo dazu, Platonismus und Judentum miteinander zu vermengen. Allein die Tatsache, daß Philo Platon zum Schüler des Moses macht, deutet doch auf etwas Besonderes hin. Unser Zeitgenosse, der Jude Adler, würde uns den Fall vielleicht so erklären können, daß der arme Jude Philo in Alexandria angesichts der Überlegenheit der griechischen Wissenschaft von Minderwertigkeitskomplexen befallen wurde und sich deshalb nach dem Gesetz der Überkompensation die größtenwahnsinnige Geschichte mit Moses zurechtlegte. Mag dem nun sein, wie ihm wolle, wir gedenken hier nicht psychoanalytische Untersuchungen anzustellen, sondern müßen nach wirklich wesentlichen Zusammenhängen suchen.

Zunächst muß es uns auffallen, daß sowohl Philo wie Cohen, die in ganz verschiedenen Zeiten lebten, beide darin übereinstimmen, daß sie große arische Denker mit dem jüdischen Prophetentum in Verbindung bringen, und unser Erstaunen wächst, wenn wir auch den bedeutendsten jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters, den im 12. Jahrhundert lebenden spanischen Juden Maimonides, dieselben Wege gehen sehen. In der Tat ist das Problem des Verhältnisses von Platon und Prophetentum zwar nicht für uns, wohl aber für die Erkenntnis der jüdischen Philosophie und ihrer Fälschmünzereien von entscheidender Wichtigkeit.

Der zum Führen und Herrschen Berufene, der nach Platon Philosoph und Staatsmann in einem sein muß, steigt in das Reich der ewigen Wirklichkeit, in das Ideenreich auf und holt sich von dort die Voraussetzungen für sein Vorhaben, nun in irdischem Gebiet einen vollkommenen Staat aufzubauen. Der jüdische Prophet tritt vor seinen Gott und überbringt dessen Botschaft den Menschen. Über dieser formalen Gleichheit des Emporsteigens zum Göttlichen als Vorbedingung einer darauf folgenden politischen Tätigkeit dürfen wir indessen nicht übersehen, daß beide Fälle ganz verschieden liegen, ja unvereinbar miteinander sind. Ein grundlegender Unterschied besteht darin, daß dem Propheten befohlen wird und er Befehle empfängt, wogegen die platonische Hinwendung zu den Ideen eine freie innere Tat des menschlichen Geistes ist. Aber hinter diesem Gegensatz von Befehl und Freiheit steckt noch ein viel tieferer. Wir brauchen bloß

Platons Ausführungen über das Wesen des Staatsmannes in seinem gleichnamigen Dialog nachzulesen, um zu erkennen, wie nahe Platon hier den Vorstellungen vom Politischen kommt, die uns heute im Nationalsozialismus gegenwärtig sind. Nicht durch starre Gesetze und Vorschriften, sondern aus der lebendigen schöpferischen Kraft des genialen Staatsmannes wird ein Staat richtig aufgebaut. Natürlich sind Gesetze nötig, meint Platon, aber der Herrscher darf sich nicht zu ihrem Sklaven machen, auch nicht zum Sklaven seiner eigenen Gesetze. Wie ein Arzt, führt Platon aus, die Vorschriften, die er etwa vor einer Reise seinem Patienten schriftlich zurückgelassen hat, nicht weiter beachten wird, wenn er nach seiner Rückkehr dessen Zustand verändert findet, so wird auch der Gesetzgeber die Vorschriften, mögen sie von ihm oder von einem Vorgänger stammen, ohne weiteres preisgeben, wenn sie seinen Zwecken nicht mehr entsprechen. Schon diese Stelle allein beweist, was durch ein genaueres Erfassen der Ideenlehre nach allen Seiten bestätigt wird : daß Platons philosophischer Staatsmann sich aus dem ewigen Ideenreich nicht etwa ein fertiges Gesetz holt. Vielmehr ist dieser Aufstieg und Abstieg ein schöpferischer Denkprozeß, aus dem nach Platon dann die freie Tätigkeit des Staatsmannes hervorquillt. Dies widerspricht nicht dem ruhenden Charakter der ewig seienden Urbilder, als die sich Platons Ideen darstellen. Gerade weil dieses ewige Sein ruht, kann sich der Mensch frei schöpferisch betätigen, während ein aufs äußerste gesteigerter Aktivismus eines vom Menschen getrennten Gottes den Menschen zu unfruchtbarer Passivität verurteilt.

Gewiß auch Platons Ideenlehre hat ihre schwache Stelle, und so nach dieser große Denker in vielem gerade unserer deutschen Gegenwart ist, so wenig werden wir ihm im ganzen folgen können. Ich glaube sogar, daß eine völkische Philosophie die wichtige Aufgabe hat, über Platons Ideenlehre hinauszukommen. Allein, das steht auf einem anderen Blatt.

Hier kam es mir lediglich darauf an, Ihnen den unüberwindlichen Gegensatz anzudeuten, der zwischen Platons Lehre und dem jüdischen Prophetismus herrscht. Sie verstehen jetzt, wie groß die Umfälschung ist, wenn es die jüdische Philosophie zu einem ihrer Lieblingsthemen macht, Platon im Sinne des jüdischen Prophetismus mißzudeuten, oder wie man sagt, zu ergänzen. Platon stellt die Gleichung zwischen Staatsmann und Philosophen auf. Er hat dabei den jüdischen Propheten einzubeziehen vergessen. So denkt Cohen, so denkt Maimonides, so macht Philo den Platon zum Schüler des Moses, so erklärt es uns der Jude Leo Strauß in seinem 1935 erschienenen MaimonidesBuch « Philosophie und Gesetz » folgendermaßen :

« Was Platon gefordert hat, daß die Philosophie unter einer höheren Instanz, unter dem Staat, unter dem Gesetz stehe, das ist im offenbarungsgläubigen Zeitalter erfüllt. »

Bündiger läßt sich die Umfälschung Platons wohl nicht mehr formulieren. Dabei ist sich Strauß sehr wohl bewußt, daß der Begriff des Propheten kein platonischer ist, eben weil er die Platon gänzlich fremde Vorstellung der Offenbarung voraussetzt. Um so dreister die Behauptung, Platon habe das gefordert, also gewissermaßen vorbereitet, was sich dann im jüdischen Gesetz erfüllt hat.

Diese Art, nichtjüdisches Geistesgut, das einem den Juden gänzlich fremden und gegensätzlichen Wirklichkeitszusammenhang angehört, in die jüdische Gesetzesvorstellung hineinzuziehen und ihr unterzuordnen, ist eine für die jüdische Philosophie und für das Judentum überhaupt grundlegende Methode. Sie ist dieselbe, ob sie um die

Wende unserer Zeitrechnung der Alexandriner Philo oder im Mittelalter Maimonides oder im 20. Jahrhundert Cohen anwendet.

Sie ganz durchschauen, heißt den Schlüssel zur jüdischen Philosophie und darüber hinaus zur Judenfrage im ganzen in der Hand haben.

Wir müssen zu diesem Zweck einen Augenblick näher auf den Begriff der jüdischen Gesetzesvorstellung eingehen. Das Gesetz ist als Thora in Form des biblischen Textes von Gott gegeben und muß bis ins letzte erfüllt werden. Die Thora ist Wort für Wort und Buchstabe für Buchstabe präexistent, das heißt also vor Erschaffung der Welt vorhanden. Es kann daraus kein Tütelchen weggenommen, keines hinzugefügt werden, ohne daß der Wille Gottes dadurch mißachtet würde. Gott selbst sitzt im Himmel und studiert die Thora. Wer das Gesetz übertritt, macht sich vor Gott schuldig. Folglich muß das gesamte soziale Leben so geregelt werden, daß Gesetzesübertretungen nach Möglichkeit nicht vorkommen können.

Das ist besonders schwierig für die in der Diaspora lebenden Juden, die ja unter fremden Lebensbedingungen stehen. Die Diaspora wird übrigens schon in der Antike zu einem wesentlichen Merkmal des Judentums und man muß wissen, daß nur die babylonische Diaspora zunächst eine gewaltsame war, nicht aber die ägyptische (in Alexandria) und die kleinasiatisch-syrische, wobei auch bei der babylonischen Gefangenschaft das Erstaunliche das ist, daß später nur ein winziger Bruchteil der Juden von der Erlaubnis, in die Heimat zurückzukehren, Gebrauch machte.

Um nun zu wissen, was eine Gesetzesübertretung ist, braucht man den Schriftgelehrten, den Rabbi, der einem sagt, wie die Thora in jedem einzelnen Fall zu interpretieren ist. Diese Interpretationen der Thora werden zunächst mündlich gepflegt und dann in den ersten 5 Jahrhunderten nach Beginn unserer Zeitrechnung im sog. Talmud endgültig fixiert. Der Talmud ist also die bindende Interpretation der Thora, die die Schriftgelehrten geben.

Da besteht zum Beispiel das Gesetz, daß sich der Jude am Sabbat nicht mehr als 2.000 Ellen vom Wohnsitz entfernen darf, eine Bestimmung, die in vielen Fällen einzuhalten ganz unmöglich ist, und dennoch muß sie eingehalten werden. Das läßt sich auf folgende Weise bewerkstelligen : Wohnsitz, das ist soviel wie der Ort, wo man etwas zu essen zu sich nimmt. Wenn man nun am Tage vor dem Sabbat in der Richtung, in der man an diesem zu gehen wünscht, alle 2.000 Ellen etwas zu essen niederlegt, so schlägt man an solchen Punkten einen neuen Wohnsitz auf und kann dann so weit gehen, wie es einem beliebt. Eine etwas umständliche Methode, die sich der Ostjude dadurch vereinfacht, daß er einen großen Topf voll Essen mit in die Eisenbahn nimmt und unter die Bank stellt, auf welche Weise er seinen Wohnsitz im Abteil aufgeschlagen hat und nun viele Kilometer weit fahren kann, ohne das Gesetz verletzt zu haben.

Oder es war am Sabbat das Hinaustragen eines Gegenstandes aus einem Privatbereich, zum Beispiel einem Wohnhaus, in einen öffentlichen Bezirk, zum Beispiel auf eine Straße, als Arbeit streng untersagt. Hierzu heißt es nun im Talmud :

« Wer etwas hinaus trägt, sei es in seiner rechten, sei es in seiner linken Hand, in seinem Busen oder auf seiner Schulter, der ist schuldig. Trägt er es aber hinaus auf der Rückseite (oberen Seite) seiner Hand, mit seinem Fuß, mit seinem Mund oder mit seinem Ellbogen, an seinem Ohr oder in seinem Haar oder in seinem Geldbeutel mit der

Öffnung nach unten, zwischen dem Geldbeutel und seinem Hemd oder am oder im Saum seines Hemdes, in seinem Schuh, an seiner Sandale, so ist er frei, weil er nicht hinausträgt, wie man hinauszutragen pflegt. »

Sie sehen, die Möglichkeit zur Übertretung des Gesetzes ist hier im Gesetz selbst schon vorgesehen. Die Neigung, Gesetze zu umgehen, findet sich wohl bei den asozialen Individuen aller Völker. Das Bestreben aber, ein Gesetz faktisch zu übertreten und dann mit allen Mitteln eines uns freilich nicht mehr verständlichen Scharfsinns den Beweis zu führen, daß das Gesetz eingehalten wurde, das ist das einzigartig Jüdische, eines der kennzeichnenden Merkmale der Welt des Talmud.

Und ein anderes Merkmal des Talmud ist die besondere Form des Denkens, durch die dieser Zweck erreicht wird. Betrachten Sie das zuletzt genannte Beispiel : Hier wird der Begriff der Arbeit in einem ganz bestimmten formalen Sinn genommen. Was außerhalb dieses formalen Sinnes liegt, fällt nicht mehr darunter, bietet also die Möglichkeit, das Gesetz zu umgehen und doch einzuhalten ; obwohl inhaltlich für unser Empfinden, wenn schon bestimmte Tätigkeiten als solche verboten sein sollen, kein Unterschied einzusehen ist, ob ich einen Topf auf dem Handrücken oder auf der Handfläche zur Türe hinaustrage. Dem Talmud aber kommt es darauf an, den Begriff der Arbeit (um einen Lieblingsausdruck der modernen jüdischen Physiker vom Schlage Einsteins und Reichenbachs zu gebrauchen) « geeignet zu definieren » .

Dieses « geeignete Definieren » ist aber nur ein kleiner Anfang und Ansatz der Methoden, auf denen das talmudische Denken beruht. Für unser Gefühl unfaßbar ist die Umkehrung dessen, was wir unter wissenschaftlichem Verfahren verstehen : Wir suchen mit Hilfe bestimmter Methoden eine zunächst offene Frage zu beantworten. So könnten wir etwa die Frage aufwerfen, ob Moses Platon irgendwie beeinflußt habe, um dann mit Hilfe der philologischen und historischen Methodik als Ergebnis festzustellen, daß ein solcher Zusammenhang nicht bestanden haben kann. Für das talmudische Denken dagegen steht das Ergebnis von vornherein fest und es handelt sich jetzt umgekehrt darum, geeignete Methoden ausfindig zu machen, mit deren Hilfe man zu diesem Ergebnis gelangen kann. So steht es für Aristobulos von vornherein fest, daß Platon der Schüler Moses' war. Als Methode, dies zu beweisen, bedient er sich, etwas plump, einfach der Textfälschung.

Der Talmud hat dafür raffiniertere Wege zur Verfügung. Zu einem bestimmten Zweck, das heißt um irgendeine Behauptung zu beweisen, ist es zum Beispiel nötig, zwei Thora-Stellen miteinander in Verbindung zu setzen, die sich innerlich gar nicht aufeinander beziehen lassen. Nun haben die hebräischen Konsonanten gleichzeitig die Bedeutung von Zahlen, so daß jedes Wort je nach den darin vorkommenden Buchstaben gewissermaßen eine bestimmte Quersumme besitzt. Um nun die gewünschte Verbindung zwischen jenen beiden Thora-Stellen zu stiften, genügt es unter Umständen durchaus, nachzuweisen, daß gewisse Wörter dieser Stellen, die an sich nicht das mindeste miteinander zu tun haben, den gleichen Zahlenwert besitzen.

Oder ein anderes Beispiel aus dem Talmud : Wenn sich in einem Raume eine Leiche befindet, so ist der Raum unrein, ein davon abgetrennter Nebenraum dagegen rein. Was für eine schwere Unreinheit, wie es eine Leiche darstellt, gilt, das gilt auch für eine leichte Unreinheit, zum Beispiel ein Kriechtier. Das ist der Schluß vom Leichten auf das Schwere, wie er an sich nach den Gesetzen der Logik verständlich ist. In diesem Sinne führt ihn in einer komplizierten theologischen

Auseinandersetzung auch ein Rabbi unter Hinweis auf jenen Sachverhalt mit dem Kriechtief und der Leiche an, um den Satz zu beweisen : « wenn Heiliges durch Heiliges entweiht wird, um wieviel mehr durch Profanes » . Nein, sagt der andere Rabbi, das ist nicht richtig, und weist dem ersteren nach, daß er im Irrtum ist, denn aus der ThoraStelle : « Sie sollen die heiligen Gaben der Kinder Israels nicht entweihen, was sie für den Herrn abheben » folgert er auf eine uns nicht mehr verständliche Weise den Satz :

« Heiliges kann Heiliges entweihen, Profanes aber kann Heiliges nicht entweihen. »

Demnach hebt, heißt es dann, jener Schriftvers den Schluß vom Leichten auf das Schwere auf. Folglich ... Und die endlos ineinandergeschachtelten Diskussionen über die richtige Interpretation der Thora-Stellen gehen weiter.

Ein Grundprinzip dieser Interpretation ist nun aber auch folgendes : Jedes Wort der Thora hat seinen bestimmten Sinn. Gott kann nämlich nicht zweimal dasselbe gesagt haben. Folglich meint er, wenn zweimal verschiedene Sätze wörtlich oder doch mit scheinbar gleichem Sinn vorliegen, dennoch jedesmal etwas anderes. Was er damit gemeint hat herauszubringen, ist Sache der Rabbiner. Beispielsweise wird in der Thora eine Übung beschrieben, durch die sich besondere Heiligkeit erlangen läßt und bei der es und andere darauf ankommt, für längere Zeit die Haare nicht zu scheren. Das wird in einer etwas farbigen Weise von der Thora ausgemalt, wobei die Ausdrücke des Heiligseins und des Haarscherens in mehreren Sätzen mehrmals wiederholt werden, so daß also in verschiedenen Sätzen scheinbar das gleiche gesagt wird. Das ist bei Gott aber nicht möglich, denn es ist kein Wort der Thora überflüssig. Das eine Mal hat Gott, so interpretieren die Rabbis, den gewöhnlichen Verlauf der Prozedur gemeint. In der anderen Stelle hat Gott in seiner Weisheit auch gleich den Fall in Betracht gezogen, daß einer gar keine Haare hat. Soll er deshalb des Segens der Bußübung verlustig gehen ? Nein, daß auch ein solcher heilig sei, wollte Gott mit der Wiederholung jener Stelle sagen. Eine dritte Wiederholung soll sich dann auf den Fall beziehen, daß der seine Haare wachsen Lassende während der vorgeschriebenen Zeit in die Hände von Räubern fällt und diese ihm die Haare mit Gewalt scheren. Daß auch dieser durch solches Mißgeschick Betroffene die versprochene Heiligkeit erlangt, wollte Gott mit der dritten Wiederholung des ähnlichen Ausdrucks sagen. Und so geht es fort. Oder es können sich endlose Diskussionen darüber entspinnen, warum an einer Stelle das Wort « und » dasteht oder nicht dasteht, denn auch dies muß seinen Grund haben, da kein Wort der Thora überflüssig ist.

Wir sagen von einer organischen Gestalt oder auch von einem Kunstwerk oder von der Welt als Ganzem, wenn wir sie unter dem Bild eines Organismus oder eines Kunstwerks betrachten, diese Gebilde seien vollkommen, weil an ihnen nichts überflüssig sei, alles an der rechten Stelle stehe, und sprechen damit das Prinzip des durchgängigen Zusammenhangs aus, das nichts in der Vereinzelung läßt ; denn uns wäre eben das Vereinzelte überflüssig. Der talmudische Grundsatz der Einzigkeit der Thor-Worte hat eine genau entgegengesetzte Bedeutung. Hier handelt es sich gewissermaßen um ein Prinzip der absoluten Zusammenhanglosigkeit. Ein Prinzip, das die Möglichkeit eröffnet, jede einzelne Stelle, jedes Wort zu isolieren und ihm einen besonderen, das heißt willkürlichen Sinn zuzuweisen.

Trotzdem die wenigen Beispiele, die ich anführen konnte, manche von Ihnen verwundert haben werden, können sie doch nur einen ganz schwachen Begriff geben von der Absurdität des talmudischen Denkens, die in Wirklichkeit alles übersteigt, was auch beim besten Willen noch in einen arischen Kopf hineingeht. Wollen wir das Wesen dieses Denkens

auf einen Begriff bringen, so können wir vielleicht sagen, es handelt sich um einen absolut widersinnigen Formalismus, der von jedem konkreten Sinn, von jeder gegebenen Wirklichkeit absieht. Das heißt : es handelt sich nicht etwa um bloße Abstraktionen, die vom Konkreten zu immer dünneren Begriffsgespinnsten aufsteigen - nein, hier werden Stricke formalistischer Betrachtungsweise ganz ohne Berührung mit der Wirklichkeit sozusagen nur unter Verwendung jenes Zaubermittels, das sich Thora nennt, hergestellt und zu Lassos verarbeitet, mit denen man rücklings und willkürlich ein Stück Wirklichkeit einfängt, es abwürgt und aus seinem lebendigen Zusammenhang herausreißt.

Natürlich müßen die wildesten Methoden, die der Talmud verwendet, einigermaßen gemildert und nichtjüdischen Denkgebräuchen angeglichen werden, wo die Juden in engere Berührung mit dem Kulturgut anderer Völker kommen. Trotzdem bleibt der Kern des talmudischen Denkens, der in jenem eigentümlichen Absehen von konkretem Sinn, von der Wirklichkeit besteht, auch dort der gleiche, wo der Jude gelernt hat, sich der logischen, der mathematischen, der wissenschaftlichen Methoden, wie sie von den Ariern ausgebildet wurden, virtuos zu bedienen.

Derjenige Jude, der die Erbschaft Cohens in Deutschland antrat und, als der Stern der Neukantianer zu sinken begann, eine neue Parole in die deutsche Philosophie hineinwarf, Edmund Husserl, der Schöpfer der Phänomenologie, kann uns hierfür als typisches Beispiel dienen. Die neue Parole heißt hier : zu den Sachen selbst ! Kein schlechter Gedanke, besonders wenn der philosophierfreudige Mensch von dem endlosen Geschwätz der neukantianischen Erkenntnistheorie Cohens herkommt. Wie aber stellt sich der Jude Husserl dieses Vordringen zu den Sachen selbst vor ? Man höre und staune : Er klammert zu diesem Zweck, wie er sagt, die Wirklichkeit ein, das heißt er sieht von der Wirklichkeit ab. Das ist ein ausgesprochen talmudischer Ansatz. Zur wahren Wesensschau gelangt man nach ihm, wenn man sich um die Wirklichkeit nicht kümmert.

Auch der ganze Husserl besteht übrigens in einer bezeichnenden Umfälschung Platons. Platon richtet wie jeder Philosoph, und das heißt gleichzeitig wie jeder arische Philosoph, sein ganzes Bemühen auf eine Erfassung der Wirklichkeit, die er nun in einem tieferen metaphysischen Sinn in dem zu entdecken glaubt, was er Ideen nennt. Mögen wir die Wirklichkeit der Ideen heute auch nicht mehr im platonischen Sinne anerkennen können, das hindert nicht, daß Platon gegen Husserl auch heute noch tausendmal recht hat. Husserl löst die platonische Ideenlehre in einem reinen Formalismus auf. Er macht sie, worauf er natürlich stolz ist, metaphysikfrei, « wissenschaftlich » im jüdischen Sinn des Wortes. Das Reich der Denkgegenstände, auf die sich nach Husserl das Denken richtet, gleichviel ob es sich um Wirkliches oder Abstraktes oder Mathematisches handelt, hat etwas Gespensterhaftes, gerade weil er von der Wirklichkeit absieht, gerade weil er unplatonisch die Unterscheidung zwischen realem und ideellem Sinn rein formal nimmt. Das Sein dieser Denkgegenstände in ihrer starren Gegebenheit, der sich das Denken einfach hinnehmend zu fügen hat, ohne daß es im platonischen Sinne von einer metaphysischen Sonne bestrahlt würde, dieses dem Empfinden unserer Rasse nicht greifbare Sein kann uns nur im Bild der präexistenten Thora deutbar werden. So setzt Husserl gleichsam die Thora an die Stelle der platonischen Ideenwelt, während Cohen, wie wir sahen, den philosophischen Staatsmann Platons in den jüdischen Propheten umzeichnet.

Mögen sich jüdische Neukantianer und jüdische Phänomenologen auch untereinander aufs heftigste bekämpfen - in ihrem jüdischen Charakter bilden sie eine Einheit. Beide fälschen Platons Lehre um. Beide stehen auch in einem ähnlichen Verhältnis zu Kant, sofern sie nämlich beide jene kantische Grunderkenntnis mißachten, von der ich vorhin

sprach. Anschauung und aktiv formendes Denken gehören nach Kant unlösbar zusammen. Cohen streicht, wie wir sahen, den Faktor der Anschauung : was übrig bleibt, ist eine talmudische Form des Denkens. Husserl verfährt polar entgegengesetzt. Er beseitigt die Aktivität des Denkens und verzerrt dadurch das Schauen zum passiven Kenntnisnehmen einer thoraähnlichen starren Welt von Gegenständen.

Man könnte hier einwenden, die Theorie dieser starren Denkgegenstände sei ja wesentlich von dem katholischen Denker Bolzano und dessen Lehre von den sogenannten « Sätzen an sich » beeinflusst worden, zum mindesten eng damit verwandt : Bolzano aber sein kein Jude gewesen. Damit berühren wir einen wichtigen geistesgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang, der noch seiner restlosen Aufklärung harret. Eine überaus merkwürdige Tatsache, die zunächst unerklärlich scheint, liegt nämlich in der engen Verbindung der Husserlschen Phänomenologie mit gewissen Richtungen der katholischen Neuscholastik. Das Bindeglied bildet vor allem der Halbjude Max Scheler. Diese Beziehungen zwischen jüdischer und scholastischer Geisteshaltung gehen ohne Zweifel tiefer, als man auf den ersten Blick glauben möchte. Sie betreffen das Wesen der Scholastik selbst. Und zwar sind es weniger die jüdischen Einflüsse, die im Mittelalter zu jener Zeit mit einströmten, als die Araber der christlichen Scholastik neues Erbgut der Antike übermittelten ; weit eher müßte man gewisse talmudische Züge annehmen, die der Scholastik von Anfang an anhafteten. Und in der Tat - nur ein Befangener könnte sie übersehen ! Sie liegen in der Bindung der philosophischen Forschung an eine textlich gegebene Offenbarung. Sie liegen weiterhin in den Methoden, mit denen man philosophische Behauptungen durch Berufung auf Autoritäten und Interpretation von Schriftstellen zu unterstützen suchte. Und wirklich hat ja auch Philo, der Jude, nicht bloß einen großen Einfluß auf die Bildung der christlichen Dogmatik ausgeübt, er hat der christlichen Theologie auch die Methode der sog. allegorischen Bibelinterpretation geliefert, die für ihn ein Mittel war, das hellenistische Gedankengut in seine jüdische Welt einzugliedern.

Manche werden hier behaupten, man könne ebensogut sagen, der Hellenismus habe den Juden Philo beeinflusst und umgewandelt und eine Berührung zwischen zwei verschiedenen Kulturkreisen in diesem Sinne sei doch nichts so Auffälliges oder gar Schlimmes. Diese Betrachtung übersieht das Eigentümliche des jüdischen Wesens vollkommen, woraus dann weiter der Irrtum entsteht, als würde sich der bessere Teil des Judentums sozusagen aus den talmudischen Umstrickungen freimachen und zu einem Sein entwickeln, das mit dem Talmud, der hier gewissermaßen als eine Sackgasse der jüdischen Entwicklung erscheint, nichts mehr zu tun habe.

Bei solchen Streitfragen ist es immer das beste, die Juden selbst zu Rate zu ziehen. Hören Sie also, was der schon mehrfach erwähnte Historiker Heinrich Grætz, dessen « Konstruktion der jüdischen Geschichte » ein jüdischer Verlag eben neu herausgegeben hat, zu diesem Thema zu sagen weiß :

« Der Talmudismus » (läßt sich diese jüdische Autorität ersten Ranges vernehmen) « ist nicht als etwas Fremdes, dem Judentum gewaltsam Aufgezwungenes, ist nicht als ein Auswuchs des jüdischen Geschichtslebens, eine Trübung des jüdischen Geistes anzusehen, sondern ist eine folgerichtige Konsequenz aus der Prämisse der judentümlichen Grundidee. Er bildet den Gegensatz des freien sittlichen Geistes gegen die unsittliche Gebundenheit der Natürlichkeit. Der Talmudismus ist demnach das wirksamste Gegengewicht zu dem notwendig gewordenen Allerweltsleben des Judentums. Das eine ist das schaffende, das andere das erhaltende Prinzip. »

Wir haben hier eines der wertvollsten jüdischen Selbstzeugnisse vor uns. Das Allerweltsleben, das heißt also die Diaspora, mit ihrem grundsätzlichen Verzicht auf Staatenbildung, dieses Allerweltslebens einerseits und der Talmudismus andererseits als die beiden zusammengehörigen Grundprinzipien des Judentums : ein richtigerer Ansatz für die Erkenntnis jüdischen Wesens läßt sich schwer denken. Daß der Talmudismus das erhaltende Prinzip sei, ist auch vollkommen einleuchtend. Mit Recht sagt Grætz :

« Die talmudischen Umzäunungen machen in der Welt aus jedem jüdischen Haus ein scharf umgrenztes Palästina. »

Daß Grætz allerdings das andere Prinzip, das Allerweltsleben, als das schaffende bezeichnet, ist eine überaus eigentümliche Ausdrucksweise. In nichtjüdischer Terminologie bezeichnet man im allgemeinen das Bestreben nach Angleichung an Fremdes nicht als etwas Schöpferisches. Aber vielleicht hat Grætz mit dem Schaffen die Ausbeutung des Fremden gemeint.

Wenn wir die Sache genau betrachten, so ist das einander bedingende Wechselspiel jener beiden Prinzipien, von denen Grætz spricht, im Keime bereits in der talmudischen Methode selbst, die wir kennen lernten, enthalten. Die faktischen Übertretungen sind ja einerseits schon Angleichungen an die fremde Sitte und andererseits (sagen wir es offen) Hebel zur Ausbeutung der Fremden und zum hemmungslosen Ausleben der Triebe. Dieser Ausweitung folgt aber sofort der Rückgang in jenes sogenannte erhaltende Prinzip, das die Übertretung durch den Beweis zunichte macht, daß ja das Gesetz formal eingehalten worden ist. (Wobei das Wort formal übrigens jeweils arische Zutat ist ; rein jüdisch müßte es heißen : das Gesetz ist schlechthin erfüllt, und damit fertig !)

Diese Gesetzestreue im ausgesprochen talmudischen Sinne ist für Grætz der freie sittliche Geist, der sich gegen die unsittliche Gebundenheit der Natürlichkeit wendet, wie wir hörten. Geist im Gegensatz zur unsittlichen Gebundenheit der Natürlichkeit ! Dieses jüdische Selbstzeugnis beweist, daß der Jude ewig unfähig sein wird, sowohl das tiefste Wesen des Geistes wie des Blutes zu erfassen. Geist und Blut gehören für uns untrennbar zusammen. Was daraus wird, wenn diese Verbundenheit sich löst, dafür ist uns eben das Judentum der fürchterlichste Anschauungsunterricht. Geist ohne Blut, das ist jener von Grætz gepriesene freie Geist, der von jeder Wirklichkeit ferne und in sich erstarrte Geist der Thora und des Talmuds. Und Blut ohne Geist umgekehrt ist jene schrankenlose, von keinem Gesetz gezügelte jüdische Triebhaftigkeit, die schließlich in Ausbeuterei und Verbrechertum mündet.

Nirgends sehen wir diese beiden Faktoren so kraß und deutlich beieinander wie im jüdischen Bolschewismus, im heutigen Rußland. Auf der einen Seite das Verbrechertum, auf der anderen Seite eine geistige Verfassung, die auf ein Haar der jüdischtalmudischen Rabulistik gleicht. In seinem Buch « Das rote Rußland » schreibt der gewiß unverdächtige Theodor Seibert, der jeden ursächlichen Zusammenhang zwischen Judentum und Bolschewismus leugnet, folgendes :

« Wenn man die wändefüllenden Berichtsbände der verschiedenen Kongresse und ZentralkomiteeSitzungen durchblättert, hat man nicht etwa den Eindruck, die Geschichte der regierenden Partei eines der größten Länder der Erde zu lesen, sondern die Protokolle eines Kongresses von Schriftgelehrten, die Protokolle eines Pharisäer-Konzils. Das wimmelt nur so von Zitaten aus dem 5. , 11. , 27. Band, Absatz 5, Satz 3 von Lenins Werken. Das donnert von Bannflüchen über Sünder, die einen solchen Satz anders auszulegen wagten, als es der 15. Parteikongreß, Resolution 43 getan hat und so weiter.

»

Freilich, wenn die lebendige Einheit von Geist und Blut, die uns der Nationalsozialismus wieder geschenkt hat, zerfällt, so hat das an sich noch nichts mit Judentum zu tun. Wir finden einen solchen Zerfall zum Beispiel schon in der Antike, bevor die Juden in jene Welt eintreten. Es laufen dann die beiden polar entgegengesetzten Zerfallsrichtungen Geist ohne Blut und Blut ohne Geist selbständig und zunächst unverbunden nebeneinander her. Das jüdische Wesen besteht nun darin, diese beiden Pole des Zerfalls miteinander in Beziehung zu setzen. Wenn der blutlose Geist die keiner geistig geformten Blutwelt mehr angehörenden Triebe sozusagen organisiert, dann haben wir das, was die Atmosphäre des Talmud ausmacht. Die nicht mehr durch den wahren Geist in einer Gemeinschaft des Blutes harmonisch geordneten Triebe können hier an sich tun, was sie wollen, aber sie sind gleichzeitig durch ein pseudogeistiges, rein formales Gesetz gebunden. Das führt zu der Doppellage, daß das Gesetz gleichzeitig jederzeit übertreten werden kann und doch gehalten wird. Wären die Triebe nicht durch dieses Gesetz des blutlosen Geistes in einer höchst eigentümlichen Weise formal gebunden, so würde dies zum Untergang führen. Wären sie andererseits nicht vorhanden, so würde die trostlose Starrheit des Gesetzes, also des blutlosen Geistes jedes Leben ersticken. Vielleicht meint Gesetz die Vitalität dieser Triebe, die sich vor allem im Verhältnis zu den Gastvölkern auswirkt, mit seinem schaffenden Prinzip, das in der Diaspora liege. Es ist also das Geheimnis des Judentums, daß es zwei Entartungen, die einzeln unweigerlich zum Untergang führen, zu einer Synthese vereinigt, deren Dauerhaftigkeit in der Geschichte einzig dasteht. Es ist zugleich das Geheimnis der talmudischen Seelenverfassung, das Geheimnis des schweifenden Ewigen Juden.

Auch der nordische Arier, auch der Germane wandert durch die Welt, es zieht ihn in die Ferne, er erschaut staunend fremde Welten und nun ist es für ihn eine Lebensfrage : bleibt er sich selber treu oder wird er seinem Wesen untreu ? Bleibt er sich treu, so gestaltet er das, was er aufgenommen hat, aus dem Mittelpunkt seines Wesens heraus zu einem Neuen um, er drückt den Stempel seiner Art der fremden Welt auf, er schafft Staaten und gründet gewaltige Reiche ; oft erliegt er der Übermacht. Ganz untergehen kann er aber nur, wenn er sich selber untreu wird. Darum gilt für ihn als oberstes Gesetz das Shakespearesche Wort :

« Dies über alles : sei dir selber treu ! »

So sind wir stark, wenn wir uns selbst treu bleiben.

So gehen wir unter, wenn wir uns untreu werden.

Der Jude aber wird sich untreu, indem er sich treu bleibt und bleibt sich treu, indem er sich untreu wird.

Er übertritt das Gesetz, indem er es erfüllt und er erfüllt das Gesetz, indem er es übertritt - wahrhaftig eine uns ewig unfaßbare Wesensart !

Jetzt erst begreifen wir, welch ungeheures Ausleseprinzip der Talmud darstellt. Wer auf ihn positiv reagiert, der ist Jude oder rettungslos verjudet. Und gleichzeitig wird uns nun auch das Verhältnis zwischen gläubigen und liberalen Juden mit einem Schlage klar. So wie der gläubige TalmudJude dem Gesetz fortwährend untreu wird und ihm doch treu bleibt, so kann der Jude auch dem ganzen Talmud untreu werden und doch ihm im Innersten treu bleiben. Diese Haltung des liberalen Juden ist im eigentlichen Sinne talmudisch. Um sie ihm auszutreiben, müßte man, mit Fichte zu reden, ihm den Kopf abschlagen und einen neuen nichtjüdischen aufsetzen. Denken Sie an den philosophisch so emanzipierten

Juden Cohen zurück. Er ist liberaler Jude und Prophetengestalt in einem. Und gerade in dieser für uns paradoxen Verbindung erweist er sich als echter TalmudJude, denn auch der TalmudJude im engeren Sinn ist ja schon in dem Augenblick gewissermaßen ein liberaler, als er das Gesetz übertritt, etwa um sich den Sitten seines Gastvolkes nutzbringend anzupassen. Im selben Atem ist er aber gesetzestreu, denn er hat auf Grund der talmudischen Methoden das Gesetz trotzdem erfüllt. Wenn wir diese Urbeziehung zwischen Gesetzestreue und Liberalität durchschaut haben, so werden wir nicht mehr daran zweifeln, daß auch der liberalste Jude noch im vollen Umfange dieser Beziehung unterliegt, auch der, der dem Judentum abgeschworen hat, ja, ihm feindlich gegenübersteht.

Das welthistorische Beispiel hierfür auf dem Gebiet der Philosophie bietet der Jude Baruch de Spinoza. Er wurde von der jüdischen Gemeinde ausgeschlossen. Daraufhin wollte er (der, man vergesse das nie, Schüler eines berühmten Talmudlehrers gewesen war) nichts mehr vom Judentum wissen und hat es in harten Worten gezeißelt. Aber gerade darin erwies er sich als ein genialer Jude, daß er instinktiv erkannte, daß man im 17. Jahrhundert die jüdische Art nicht mehr mit dem lächerlichen Gebaren der Amsterdamer Rabbinerschaft durchsetzen könne, und so beglückte er das europäische Denken mit einem jüdischen Kuckucksei, das in der Tat in seiner historischen Entfaltung für die Wirtsvölker gefährlicher wurde, als es jene Rabbiner in ihren kühnsten messianischen Träumen sich hätten ausmalen können. Was jene noch nicht einsahen, was auch der eigensinnige Cohen nicht begreifen wollte - heute dankt es ihm die ganze Judenschaft.

Anfang 1933 kam in einem deutschen Verlag eine SpinozaFestschrift heraus, die jeder in die Hand nehmen sollte, der noch irgendwelchen Zweifel an dem jüdischen Charakter des Spinozismus hat. Unter 22 Verfassern, die Beiträge lieferten, befinden sich hoch gegriffen vier bis fünf Nichtjuden, darunter der EhrenBolschewist Romain Rolland.

« Gleich wie von den Brüdern in Christo eine Nachfolge Christi anerkannt wird, ebenso wollen wir Brüder in Spinoza deiner (Spinozas) Erkenntnis und Liebe Gefolgschaft leisten ! » ruft der herausgebende Jude Siegfried Hessing in seiner groteskgeschmacklosen Lobrede auf Spinoza aus.

Der berüchtigte Jude Jakob Klatzkin macht sich ganz offen darüber lustig, daß die dummen Christen in Spinozas Lebensführung ein Vorbild an Genügsamkeit und Askese sehen. Er belehrt uns demgegenüber, daß es lediglich in den Sitten und Bräuchen des Judentums, aus dem Spinoza herauswuchs, seine selbstverständliche Wurzel habe, wenn er zum Beispiel einmal einen ganzen Tag lang nur Milchsuppe mit Butter zu sich nahm und Ähnliches. Daß es also ganz fehl am Platze sei, wenn die Nichtjuden derartige Beispiele, die in Wirklichkeit nichts Besonderes auf sich hätten, zur Verherrlichung von Spinozas Lebensführung (im christlichen Sinn, wie er spottet) benützen.

Die größte Offenbarung, die uns das Buch zu bieten hat, ist aber ohne Zweifel der Aufsatz des Juden Josef Klausner über den jüdischen Charakter der Lehre Spinozas. Neben dem nachdrücklichen Hinweis darauf, daß Spinoza viel stärker als von Descartes und Giordano Bruno von den jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters beeinflußt worden sei, finden wir als Zentralgedanken folgende Argumentation :

Als Grundbestandteile von Spinozas Lehre werden folgende Faktoren angesetzt :

« Gott oder die Natur », das sei eigentlich « Atheismus », meint Klausner, und fährt dann fort :

« Und die Seele des Menschen ist bloß die Idee seines Körpers. » Das sei « Materialismus » .

« Es gibt keinen Zweck in der Natur und keinen Zweck beim Menschen », das sei « Mechanismus » .

« Es gibt keinen freien Willen », das sei « Determinismus » .

« Es gibt kein Gut und Böse », das sei « Utilitarismus » .

« Recht ist nichts als Kraft », das sei « Machiavellismus » .

Jetzt kommt für uns die kaum glaubliche Offenbarung der jüdischen Seele, von der ich eben sprach. Denn Klausner fährt nun, nachdem er solchermaßen die Bausteine von Spinozas Lehre bestimmt hat, ganz verzückt wörtlich fort :

« Und wie wunderbar ist es, daß all diese mangelhaften Elemente am Ende ihrer Entfaltung gerade das Gegenteil hervorbringen, eine ideale und positive Weltanschauung, die nicht ihresgleichen in der Welt hat. »

Ist es uns bei diesen Worten nicht, als sähen wir den kleinen Juden seinen Topf auf dem Handrücken zur Tür hinaustragen ? Er lacht uns spöttisch und vergnügt an. Wer nicht genau hinschaute, könnte ja meinen, daß er gesündigt hätte. Aber er hat den Topf glücklich herausgebracht und doch das Gesetz nicht übertreten. Spinoza ist Atheist, Materialist, Mechanist, Determinist, Utilitarist und Machiavellist und trotzdem hat er das Gesetz erfüllt, die erhabenste religiöse Weltanschauung und geschenkt, die es gibt.

Was der Kern dieser Weltanschauung ist, darüber werden wir in jener Festschrift dann noch von vielen Seiten eingehend belehrt. « Freiheit, Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit bleiben unnahbare Ideale, solange nicht zu ihrer Verwirklichung im Sinne Spinozas geschritten wird », schreibt der jüdische Herausgeber, und Ignacy Myslicki aus Warschau, vormals der Ostjude Halpern, ergänzt dies durch die Feststellung, daß « die ganze Lehre Spinozas auf die Bildung der Idee des Menschen als des Musterbildes der menschlichen Natur gerichtet ist ». Die Idee des Menschen, das war ja auch das Ziel des Juden Cohen, und so enthüllt sich uns die Meinungsverschiedenheit zwischen diesem und Spinoza schließlich nur als der Streit zweier Rabbis von der Art, wie der ganze Talmud voll davon ist. Im Grunde sind sie sich doch alle einig. Hören wir Maimonides, den mittelalterlichen Judenphilosophen. « Jeder Mensch », sagt er, « kann ein Gerechter werden wie Mosche, unser Lehrer, oder ein Frevler wie Jerobam. Er kann werden weise oder beschränkt, barmherzig oder grausam, geizig oder vornehm. Und so ist es mit all den Eigenschaften. » Das ist wiederum die « Idee des Menschen », wir sagen dazu eine Idee desjenigen Menschen, der für den Talmud reif geworden ist. Die talmudisierte Menschheit, das ist die Form, in der die Juden ihre Gastvölker zu sehen wünschen. Die Form, die ihren messianischen Hoffnungen Wirklichkeit verleihen soll.

Bei Maimonides taucht denn auch zum erstenmal der Gedanke einer reinen Vernunftreligion auf. Wir wundern uns jetzt nicht mehr, daß ihn das in keiner Weise hindert, gleichzeitig glühender Anhänger der Thora zu sein. Das ThoraStudium ist für ihn überhaupt das Höchste, was es gibt. Zuerst zwar muß man den kleinen ThoraSchüler durch Nüsse und Feigen zum Lernen bewegen, dann durch das Versprechen, daß er schöne Schuhe bekomme, dann durch einen Denar « oder zwei », später durch die Vorstellung, daß er ein geehrter Rabbi werde, endlich aber gelangt er zum höchsten Lebensziel : nämlich die Thora um ihrer selbst willen zu studieren. Was das heißt, davon können Sie sich nun vielleicht

eine kleine Vorstellung machen, wenn Sie sich an das über den Talmud Gesagte erinnern. Immerhin, es entsteht auf diese Art der jüdische Weise, den Maimonides feierlich also kennzeichnet :

« Wie der Weise an seiner Weisheit und an seinem Charakter zu erkennen ist und sich dadurch vom übrigen Volke unterscheidet, also muß er auch in seinen Handlungen zu erkennen sein, in seinem Essen und Trinken, in seinem Eheleben, in der Verrichtung seiner Notdurft, in Sprache, Gang und Kleidung. »

Doch wir wollen nicht kleinlich sein. Gibt es nicht auch noch wirklich erhabenerere Dinge in der jüdischen Philosophie ? Gibt es nicht eine jüdische Mystik ? Ist nicht Spinoza im Grunde ein solcher Mystiker ?

Diese Fragen eingehend zu erörtern, würde hier viel zu weit führen, ich will Sie nur noch auf eine Einzelheit aufmerksam machen, die sinnbildlich für das Ganze stehen möge. Für Spinoza ist die Freude der Übergang zu größerer Vollkommenheit, also Gottähnlichkeit. Betrübnis aber grundsätzlich das Gegenteil. Und wie sehr er das Gefühl intellektualisiert, das geht aus seiner Lehre hervor, man müsse eine Sache nur verstehen, um ihr gegenüber als etwas selbst Gebilligtem und selbst Gewolltem frei zu sein. Gerade hierin offenbart sich eine typisch jüdische Seelenhaltung. Eine Haltung, die das Leid mit Hilfe der Kühle eines vom Gemüt abgelösten Intellekts von sich schiebt.

Welch andere Welt leuchtet uns aus dem Spruch Meister Eckharts, eines wirklichen Mystikers, entgegen, daß das Leid das schnellste Roß sei, das zur Vollkommenheit führt. Wie anders klingen die Worte des Führers von seinen drei Freunden : Not, Leid und Sorge ! Es ist also ein anderes, ob wir auf solchem Hintergrund das Wort Freude emporsteigen sehen oder ob es Spinoza in den Mund nimmt.

Deshalb dürfen wir auch nicht gleich an das, was wir Freude nennen, denken, wenn wir hören, daß eine jüdische Nebenrichtung mystischer Natur, der so genannt Chassidismus, diesen Begriff, den Begriff der Freude, in den Mittelpunkt seiner Lehre stellt. Und wir sind damit um so vorsichtiger, wenn wir hören, daß Isaak Lurja und Baal Schem, welcher letzterer den Chassidismus im 17. Jahrhundert begründete, ihre tiefsten Geheimnisse dem Sohar verdanken wollen, dessen Lektüre im chassidischen Judentum Pflicht ist. Sohar, so heißt das Hauptbuch der sog. Kabbala, die eine vollkommen talmudisierte neuplatonische Mystik darstellt. Aus der Kabbala also wächst der Chassidismus heraus und dieser wiederum bildet nach jüdischem Zeugnis die innere Haltung, in der der französische Jude Bergson mit seiner Lebensphilosophie wurzelt.

Aber gleichviel,
ob mystizistische Kabbala, Chassidismus oder Talmud,
ob thoragläubig oder liberal,
ob Philo, Maimonides oder Spinoza,
ob Cohen oder Husserl oder Bergson,
ob Marx, Sigmund Freud oder Albert Einstein, es gibt nur eine einzige jüdische Philosophie.

Der große Tondichter Franz Liszt hat in seiner Faustsymphonie den genialen Gedanken gehabt, das Wesen Fausts durch eine Anzahl von plastischen Themen zu schildern, das Wesen des Mephistopheles aber dadurch auszudrücken, daß dieser,

unfähig zu einem eigenen Thema, sich darin erschöpft, die Themen Fausts nach einer bestimmten Richtung hin zu Dissonanzen zu verzerren. So hat auch die jüdische Philosophie kein einziges Thema, aber sie hat alle Themen der großen arischen Philosophen talmudisiert und darin eben besteht das eigentümliche Wesen ihres substanzlosen Daseins.

Es ist nun die Zeit Moses Mendelsohns, von dem Grätz so schön sagt, er habe als Geschäftsführer einer Seidenhandlung die Philosophie « in die Wohnungen der Menschen eingeführt, sie beweglich und genußreich gemacht » - es ist die Zeit Moses Mendelsohns, da beginnen sich die Dissonanzen in der gewaltigen Symphonie deutschen Denkens zu mehren. Sie wachsen und wachsen, bis am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts die Mißklänge alles überfluten und aus dem Faustsatz ein Mephistophelessatz geworden ist. Die Juden sind jetzt nicht nur zahlenmäßig in kaum glaublichen Mengen in die deutsche Philosophie eingebrochen (Sie werden mir hier die Aufzählung von mehr als 200 Namen, die ich Ihnen nennen könnte, ersparen) , nein, sie haben jetzt auch alle Themen, die es überhaupt gibt, endgültig in der Hand. Sie haben in jeder Richtung und in jedem Teilgebiet die Schlüsselstellungen besetzt. Und die Kakophonie wird nun so ohrenbetäubend, daß auch die meisten der Deutschblütigen mitzumusizieren beginnen.

Heute haben wir den Juden ihre Instrumente aus der Hand genommen. Aber ihre Dissonanzen schweben noch in der Luft, und es gibt noch immer Leute, die nach diesen Weisen weitermusizieren möchten. Ihnen gilt unsere unbarmherzige Kampfansage. Denn wir wollen wieder die ursprünglichen wohlgestalteten Themen, die enttalmudisierten Themen unserer Philosophie hören.

Aber wir wollen noch mehr, wir wollen die alten Themen in einem neuen Gipfel lassen, das so erhaben sein wird, daß Mephistopheles seine Hand davon lassen muß.

Wenn Platon seinen Philo gehabt hat,

Aristoteles seinen Maimonides,

Descartes und Giordano Bruno ihren Spinoza,

Newton seinen Einstein,

Kant seinen Cohen,

Hegel seinen Marx,

Nietzsche seinen Sigmund Freud,

so wird unsere nationalsozialistische Philosophie so klar und ungetrübt das Wesen unserer Rasse spiegeln, daß kein Jude mehr sich daran zu vergreifen vermag.

« Lexikon der Juden in der Musik »

The Encyclopædia of Jews in Music (« Lexikon der Juden in der Musik ») was a Nazi-sponsored encyclopedia. It was published in Germany in 1940, which listed individuals involved in the music industry who were defined under Nazi racial laws as « Jewish » or « half-Jewish ». It was edited by Herbert Gerigk and Theophil Stengel and published in Berlin in 1940 by Bernhard Hahnefeld, with official support from the Nazi Party's « Institute for Study of the Jewish

Question » . The book's sub-title declared that it was produced « on behalf of the national leadership of the Nazi Party for official reasons, partly officially certified documents » .

The encyclopedia appeared in the context of Nazi policies which repressed Jewish individuals involved in music and forbade the performance of works by Jewish composers. A similar encyclopedia by Hans Brückner, entitled « Musical ABC of Jews » , had previously been published in 1935.

The encyclopedia's coverage was very broad, covering musicians, musicologists, librettists, conductors, music-publishers and other people linked to music who were considered « Jewish » or « Half-Jewish » , as well as listing forbidden « Jewish » works. It was kept-up to date via informers and the staff of the « Sonderstab Musik » of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) . According to the Eva Weissweiler's 1999 book, the encyclopedia appeared in 5 editions : the 1st had 380 pages ; the 3rd (1941) had 394 pages ; the 4th (1943) ; and the 5th edition (12,000 to 14,000 printed copies) had 404 pages of listings.

It was one of the proscribed books in the Soviet occupation zone.

...

Das « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » wurde erstmals 1940 von Herbert Gerigk und Theophil Stengel im Verlag Bernhard Hahnfeld herausgegeben. Das Buch, das als Band 2 der Reihe « Veröffentlichungen des Instituts der NSDAP zur Erforschung der Judenfrage » erschien, wurde laut Untertitel « im Auftrag der Reichsleitung der NSDAP auf Grund behördlicher, parteiamtlich geprüfter Unterlagen » zusammengestellt.

Musiker, Musikwissenschaftler, Librettisten, Regisseure, Musikverleger und andere Personen, die mit Musik zu tun hatten und die nach der antisemitischen, nationalsozialistischen Definition der Nürnberger Gesetze als « jüdisch » oder « halbjüdisch » galten, sind darin verzeichnet. Darüber hinaus enthält es ein Titelverzeichnis mit « jüdischen » Werken, die nicht aufgeführt werden durften.

Durch die Mitarbeiter von Gerigks « Sonderstab Musik » des Einsatzstabs Reichsleiter Rosenberg und durch Denunzianten wurde das Lexikon ständig aktualisiert. Es erschien in fünf Auflagen ; die erste umfasste 380, die dritte (1941) enthielt bereits 394 und die letzte (1943) 404 Seiten.

Das Lexikon wurde in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone auf die Liste der auszusondernden Literatur gesetzt.

Ein von der Germanistin Elisabeth Frenzel für das Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage geplantes entsprechendes Lexikon jüdischer Schriftsteller, das ebenso der Ausgrenzung der aufgenommenen Künstler dienen sollte, kam über die Planungsphase nicht hinaus.

Contrôle de la radio par Josef Goebbels

Après l'arrivée au pouvoir du Parti nazi, en 1933, Adolf Hitler fonda un Ministère à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande du « Reich » dirigé par Josef Gœbbels. Ce Ministère avait pour mission de véhiculer la doctrine nazie par l'intermédiaire des arts, de la musique, du théâtre, des films, des livres, de la radio, des documents pédagogiques et de la presse. Gœbbels fait preuve d'invention dès sa nomination et n'hésite pas à recourir à des techniques modernes pour appuyer ses idées. La voix d'Hitler ne passant pas bien à la radio (débit haché et fade), il a l'idée de la faire modifier par un ingénieur du son pour qu'elle porte mieux. L'opération est un succès et le procédé sera ré-employé par la suite.

Gœbbels s'inspire des théoriciens de la propagande qui l'ont précédé, notamment Gustave Le Bon et son ouvrage « Psychologie des foules » qui expose des moyens d'influencer les masses à leur insu. Il connaît également les recherches menées par les différents acteurs de la Première Guerre mondiale, conflit riche en expériences diverses en la matière. Pour lui, la propagande est un art, qui nécessite pour faire passer son message, d'envelopper intelligemment les propos pour qu'on ne les perçoive plus consciemment, au risque de pervertir la vérité :

« Le détail n'est absolument pas ce qui compte, est vrai ce qui sert à mon peuple. »

Propagande militaire

L'effort de propagande de la « Wehrmacht » a été très important et du ressort du « Abteilung Wehrmacht Propaganda » regroupant les « Propaganda Kompanien » sous la houlette du Ministère du « Reich » à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande de Josef Gœbbels, à partir de l'été 1939. En 1942, au plus fort de ses effectifs, la « Abteilung Wehrmacht Propaganda » comptera 15,000 personnes. Parmi eux, 285 cameramen, 1,329 photographes ainsi que des journalistes et des radio-reporters. Elle a été diffusée notamment par le magazine « Signal », dont les illustrations, particulièrement celles en couleur, sont d'une grande qualité et qui publie, durant l'occupation de la France, une version en français.

La propagande au crépuscule du « Reich »

À compter de juin 1944, les médias du « Reich » mettent l'accent sur l'usage des « Vergeltungswaffen » (armes de représailles) que sont la bombe volante V1 puis la fusée balistique V2, destinées à écraser Londres. La population des villes allemandes, qui subit les bombardements stratégiques alliés de plus en plus intenses, a besoin d'être galvanisée, au moment où les unités de la « Luftwaffe » affectées à la défense du « Reich » périssent.

Peu avant la chute du régime, la propagande cinématographique grossissait par des effets de « travelling » les unités de l'industrie de l'armement pour donner l'impression d'effectifs pléthoriques : par exemple, la projection en décembre 1944 du « Deutsche Wochenschau » des 50 Tigre II royaux du bataillon de chars lourds s.H.Pz.Abteilung 503, regroupa 10 % de la production totale du « Reich » pour ce modèle.

Jusqu'aux derniers jours précédant la chute de Berlin, Josef Gœbbels continua par les ondes, même s'il n'avait plus d'images, à effectuer une manipulation de masse sur la population, en exaltant à la radio les « Wunderwaffen »

(armes miracle) sorties des laboratoires scientifiques militaires, qui auraient inversé le cours de la guerre au dernier moment .

Radio broadcasts were announced with the trumpet theme that opens Bruckner's 3rd Symphony.

Le « thème à la trompette » qui commence la 3e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner (dédiée au « Maître des maîtres » , Richard Wagner) servait d'indicatif d'ouverture aux transmissions radiophoniques du régime.

La production industrielle de postes de radio baptisés « Volksempfänger » (récepteurs du peuple) , dont 25 % de foyers sont équipés en 1933 et 65 % en 1941, permet une couverture efficace des messages politiques jusqu'à la fin du régime.

La radio diffuse la fanfare « Die Wacht am Rhein » lors de la capitulation française.

La radio diffuse le poème symphonique « les Préludes » de Franz Liszt lors de l'entrée de la « Wehrmacht » en URSS.

Un enregistrement par Wilhelm Furtwängler à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin de l'Adagio de la 7e Symphonie de Anton Bruckner (mouvement achevé au moment du décès de Richard Wagner) sera joué sur les ondes de « Radio Berlin » lors de l'annonce de la défaite de Stalingrad, le 31 janvier 1943, de même que lors de l'annonce, par l'Amiral Karl Dönitz, de la mort d'Adolf Hitler, le 1er mai 1945 (ce qui sera suivi de la 8e Symphonie dite « l'Inachevée » de Franz Schubert) .

AB 107 : Nazi Propaganda

Propaganda was used by the Nazi Party in the years leading-up to and during Adolf Hitler's leadership of Germany (1933-1945) . National-Socialist propaganda provided a crucial instrument for acquiring and maintaining power, and for the implementation of their policies, including the pursuit of « Total War » and the extermination of millions of people in the « Holocaust » .

The pervasive use of propaganda by the Nazis is largely responsible for the word « propaganda » itself acquiring its present negative connotations.

In opposition (1919-1933)

Nazi leader Adolf Hitler devoted 3 Chapters of his 1925-1926 book, « Mein Kampf » , itself a propaganda tool, to the study and practice of propaganda. He claimed to have learnt the value of propaganda as a World War I infantryman exposed to very effective British and ineffectual German propaganda. The argument that Germany lost the War largely because of British propaganda efforts, expounded at length in « Mein Kampf » , reflected then-common German nationalist claims. Although untrue (German propaganda during World War I was mostly more advanced than that of

the British) , it became the official truth of Nazi Germany thanks to its reception by Hitler.

« Mein Kampf » contains the blueprint of later Nazi propaganda efforts. Assessing his audience, Hitler writes in Chapter VI :

« Propaganda must always address itself to the broad masses of the people. All propaganda must be presented in a popular form and must fix its intellectual level so as not to be above the heads of the least intellectual of those to whom it is directed. The art of propaganda consists precisely in being able to awaken the imagination of the public through an appeal to their feelings, in finding the appropriate psychological form that will arrest the attention and appeal to the hearts of the national masses. The broad masses of the people are not made-up of diplomats or professors of public jurisprudence nor simply of persons who are able to form reasoned judgment in given cases, but a vacillating crowd of human children who are constantly wavering between one idea and another. The great majority of a nation is so feminine in its character and outlook that its thought and conduct are ruled by sentiment rather than by sober reasoning. This sentiment, however, is not complex, but simple and consistent. It is not highly-differentiated, but has only the negative and positive notions of love and hatred, right and wrong, truth and falsehood. »

As to the methods to be employed, he explains :

« Propaganda must not investigate the truth objectively and, in so far as it is favourable to the other side, present it according to the theoretical rules of justice ; yet, it must present only that aspect of the truth which is favourable to its own side. The receptive powers of the masses are very restricted, and their understanding is feeble. On the other hand, they quickly forget. Such being the case, all effective propaganda must be confined to a few bare essentials and those must be expressed as far as possible in stereotyped formulas. These slogans should be persistently repeated until the very last individual has come to grasp the idea that has been put forward. Every change that is made in the subject of a propagandist message must always emphasize the same conclusion. The leading slogan must of course be illustrated in many ways and from several angles, but in the end one must always return to the assertion of the same formula. »

Hitler put these ideas into practice with the re-establishment of the « Völkischer Beobachter » , a daily newspaper published by the Nazi Party (NSDAP) , from February 1925 on, whose circulation reached 26,175 in 1929. It was joined, in 1926, by Josef Gœbbels's « Der Angriff » , another unabashedly and crudely propagandistic paper.

During most of the Nazis' time in opposition, their means of propaganda remained limited. With little access to mass-media, the Party continued to rely heavily on Hitler and a few others speaking at public meetings until 1929. In April 1930, Hitler appointed Gœbbels head of Party propaganda. Gœbbels, a former journalist and Nazi Party officer in Berlin, soon proved his skills. Among his 1st successes was the organization of riotous demonstrations that succeeded in having the American anti-war film « All Quiet on the Western Front » , banned in Germany.

In power (1933-1939)

On 13 March 1933, the 3rd « Reich » established a Ministry of Propaganda, appointing Josef Goebbels as its Minister. Goals were to establish external enemies (countries that allegedly inflicted the Treaty of Versailles on Germany - by territorial claims and ethnocentrism) and internal enemies, such as Jews, Romani, homosexuals, Bolsheviks and topics like Degenerate Art (« Entartete Kunst ») .

A major political and ideological cornerstone of Nazi policy was the unification of all ethnic Germans living outside of the « Reich » 's borders under one Greater Germany (e.g. : Austria and Czechoslovakia) . In « Mein Kampf » , Hitler made a direct remark to those outside of Germany. He stated that pain and misery were being forced upon ethnic Germans outside of Germany, and that they dream of common fatherland. He finished by stating they needed to fight for one's nationality. Throughout « Mein Kampf » , he pushed Germans world-wide to make the struggle for political power and independence their main focus. Nazi propaganda used the « Heim ins Reich » policy for this, which began in 1938.

For months prior to the beginning of World War II, in 1939, German newspapers and leaders had carried-out a national and international propaganda campaign accusing Polish authorities of organizing or tolerating violent ethnic cleansing of ethnic Germans living in Poland. On 22 August, Adolf Hitler told his generals :

« I will provide a propagandistic casus belli. Its credibility doesn't matter. The victor will not be asked whether he told the truth. »

The main part of this propaganda campaign was the false flag project, « Operation Himmler » , which was designed to create the appearance of Polish aggression against Germany, which was subsequently used to justify the invasion of Poland.

At War (1939-1945)

Until the conclusion of the Battle of Stalingrad, on 4 February 1943, German propaganda emphasized the prowess of German arms and the humanity German soldiers had shown to the peoples of occupied territories. Pilots of the Allied bombing fleets were depicted as cowardly murderers, and Americans, in particular, as gangsters in the style of Al Capone. At the same time, German propaganda sought to alienate Americans and British from each other, and both these Western nations from the Soviets. One of the primary sources for propaganda was the « Wehrmachtbericht » , a daily radio broadcast that described the military situation on all fronts. Nazi victories lent themselves easily to propaganda broadcasts and were at this point difficult to mishandle. Satires on the defeated, accounts of attacks, and praise for the fallen all were useful for Nazis. Still, failures were not easily handled even at this stage ; when the « Ark Royal » proved to have survived an attack that German propaganda had hyped, considerable embarrassment resulted.

After Stalingrad, the main theme changed to Germany as the sole defender of what they called « Western European culture » against the « Bolshevik hordes » . The introduction of the V-1 and V-2 « vengeance weapons » was emphasized to convince Britons of the hopelessness of defeating Germany.

Problems in propaganda arose easily in this stage ; expectations of success were raised too high and too quickly, which required explanation if they were not fulfilled, and blunted the effects of success, and the hushing of blunders and failures caused mistrust. The increasing hardship of the war for the German people also called forth more propaganda that the war had been forced on the German people by the refusal of foreign powers to accept their strength and independence. Goebbels called for propaganda to toughen-up the German people and not make victory look easy.

On 23 June 1944, the Nazis permitted the Red Cross to visit the concentration camp of Theresienstadt to dispel rumors about the « Final Solution » , which was intended to kill every Jew. In reality, Theresienstadt was a transit camp for Jews « en route » to extermination camps, but in a sophisticated propaganda effort, fake shops and cafés were erected to imply that the Jews lived in relative comfort. The guests enjoyed the performance of a children's Opera, « Brundibar » , written by inmate Hans Krása. The hoax was so successful for the Nazis that they went on to make a propaganda film (« Theresienstadt ») , at Theresienstadt. Shooting of the film began on 26 February 1944. Directed by Kurt Gerron, it was meant to show how well the Jews lived under the « benevolent » protection of the 3rd « Reich » . After the shooting, most of the cast, and even the film maker himself, were deported to the concentration camp of Auschwitz where they were murdered. Hans Fritzsche, who had been head of the Radio Chamber, was tried and acquitted by the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal.

Mass cult and rituals

The Nazis crafted a mass cult, through large orchestrated political military « rallies » , or highly-organized events with banners and marching bands. The goal was to appeal to the patriotism of the German people.

Music and mass publicity in Weimar and Nazi Germany

Brian Currid. « A National Acoustics : Music and Mass Publicity in Weimar and Nazi Germany » , University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis (2006) ; x - 279 pages. ISBN : 978-0-8166-4042-3.

Reviewed by Jonathan Wiesen (Department of History, Southern Illinois University Carbondale) .

Published on H-German (April, 2007) .

Music, the Masses, and Modern Subjectivity

This is an extremely ambitious book. Brian Currid, a scholar of German music and media studies, in Berlin, uses an examination of Weimar and Nazi era « acoustics » to address a range of theoretical concerns that scholars have been grappling with for decades : the history of ideology ; the nature of totalitarianism ; the public / private divide ; resistance and racism under Nazism ; the workings of capitalist hegemony ; and the meanings of mass culture. The reader who is not steeped in cultural studies might be overwhelmed by the breadth of Currid's project. But with some

patience, readers will garner fascinating insights into the commercial and ideological functions of music in Germany during the Weimar Republic and the 3rd « Reich » .

Currid's diffuse argument runs along the following lines : Scholars of Weimar and National-Socialist Germany have tended to see the « masses » as easily manipulated objects of State propaganda or commercial culture. They have presented the public as without agency, either suffering from a false consciousness through the allures of commodity culture or taking refuge in popular culture, such as music, as a form of escapism or even resistance to State oppression. Currid rejects such readings of mass culture in Weimar and Nazi Germany by locating moments of individual subjectivity through the formation of a self-conscious listening public. Currid is not interested in the production or form of musical works. Rather, his concern is with consumption. How did people hear music in their homes or at movie theatres, and what does this say about the nature of publics and « publicity » during this period ?

To answer these questions, Currid presents four cases studies that focus on the emergence of radio and the formation of radio audiences, the consumption and criticism of Schlager or « hit songs » , narratives about « Opus music » or « serious » (Classical) music, and the popularity of « Gypsy » music, in Nazi Germany. Using product advertisements and the sound-tracks and screenplays of big production films like « Heimat » (1938) ; « Wunschkonzert » (1940) ; and « Traummusik » (1940) , Currid reveals the close relationship between visual and aural experiences. Radio advertisements presented images of listeners alone with their headphones but, also, as part of an emerging collectivity of radio consumers. Movie plots revolved around a struggle between Classical music and cabaret. And Germans hummed hit songs from revue films, thus contributing to an ever-shifting understanding of what was « popular » . In other words, emerging forms of mass-media mobilized music in ways that allowed Germans, at once, to discover a modern subjectivity and to feel a part of the nation or, as the Nazis would have it, the « Volksgemeinschaft » .

In making this point, Currid draws upon Benedict Anderson's well-known notion of « imagined communities » , according to which individuals across the space of the nation engage simultaneously in public and private rituals - whether singing the national anthem or reading the newspaper. Currid, however, wants to make a broader political point about music's potential as a source of opposition. The emergence of self-conscious listening publics did not represent a « resistance » to Nazism, as Detlev Peukert argued with respect to German youth who listened to forbidden music or changed the lyrics of Nazi songs. But, Currid argues, it did allow for the possibility of resistance (page 118) and, thus, for challenging fascist, and capitalist, hegemony. The daily interaction with music was part of an individual's self-understanding as an active subject within a « mass » society. In making this abstract claim, Currid leaves it up to the reader to determine how, in fact, this might have political ramifications. He is interested in neither formal challenges to Nazi power nor a street-level youth culture that mocked the Nazis. This begs the question :

« What kind of political subjectivity did participation in a mass musical culture enable ? »

Currid moves to firmer ground in his most interesting chapter on « Gypsy » music in Nazi Germany. On the one hand, the National-Socialist government denounced « Sinti and Roma » as a rootless, wandering peoples, condemning them to death through a brutal genocidal policy. On the other, so-called « Gypsy » music was celebrated in films and

concerts as authentic, thus, appealing to the thirst for the exotic and to Germans' « wanderlust ». Here, Currid exposes the contradictions in the musical culture of the Nazi years with horrifying clarity.

Scholars of mass culture and music will find tantalizing material in this book, especially in Currid's sophisticated readings of popular films and their sound-tracks. His nuanced explanations of how musical audiences are formed are also worth noting. Drawing on the works of Walter Benjamin, Siegfried Kracauer, Theodor W. Adorno, Jürgen Habermas, Louis Althusser, and Slavoj Žižek, Currid utilizes a rich body of cultural criticism. He does so, however, to the detriment of some of his historio-graphical claims. Currid seems to be creating a straw man in his dismissal of prior approaches to inter-War and War-time culture as simply reducing the public to a passive, unformed mass. While he is right to challenge the « mass culture-as-manipulation » model, he does not sufficiently acknowledge that a scholarly consensus behind such a top-heavy view has never existed. Moreover, Currid's collapsing of the Weimar and Nazi years into 1 period is unsettling. While historians are effectively challenging the boundary of 1933 and discovering multiple continuities, Currid would have lent more weight to his observations by forthrightly explaining his broad periodization, rather than uncritically juxtaposing Weimar critiques of mass culture with World War II era films. In his desire to ground mass culture in its historical setting, Currid actually removes Germans from their political and ideological surroundings. His disinclination to see 1933 as a « caesura » is potentially exciting, but without exploring the mechanics of coercion and consent in the 3rd « Reich », we are left wondering how this book's rich analyses broaden our understanding of culture and politics before and during a violent dictatorship. While Currid's research is sound and his individual revelations about musical mass culture compelling, we may still question whether « national acoustics » is a viable vehicle for understanding German culture during a time of political upheaval, War, and genocide.

« Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur »

The Militant League for German Culture (« Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur », or KfdK), was a nationalistic anti-Semitic political Society during the Weimar Republic and the Nazi era. It was founded in 1928 as the « Nationalsozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur » (NGDK) (National-Socialist Society for German Culture) by Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg and remained under his leadership until it was re-organized and renamed, in 1934, to (« Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde » (National-Socialist Culture Community). The aim of the Association was to make a significant imprint on cultural life in Germany based on the aims and objectives of the inner-circles of the Nazi Party. Upon its re-organization, the Club was merged with the German Stage Association (« Deutsche Bühne »). This was connected with the establishment of the official body for cultural surveillance, the « Dienststelle Rosenberg » (Drbg), later known as the « Amt Rosenberg ».

The number of members, who were organized in local chapters, rose from approximately 300 in 25 chapters, in April 1929, to about 38,000 in 450 chapters, by October 1933.

The members and supporters included representatives of the extreme-right wing of the National-Socialist movement. These included : anti-Semitic literary historians Adolf Bartels, Ludwig Polland, Gustaf Kossinna ; physicist and Albert Einstein opponent, Philipp Lenard ; publishers Hugo Bruckmann and Julius Friedrich Lehmann ; the leaders of the

Bayreuth Society Winifred Wagner, Daniela Thode, Hans « Freiherr » von Wolzogen, the widow of racial ideologist Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Eva Chamberlain, the composer Paul Græner ; the philosophers Otto Friedrich Bollnow, and Eugen Herrigel ; the poet and later president of the « Reichsschrifttumskammer » Hanns Johst ; the architect Paul Schulze-Naumburg, who edited the periodical « Kunst und Rasse » (Art and Breed) , and who spoke at many events ; Gustav Havemann, a violinist and later leader of the « Reichsmusikkammer » (who founded and lead a « Kampfbund » Orchestra) ; the theater director Karl von Schirach ; Fritz Kloppe who led the « Werwolf » , a para-military organization ; and the theologian and nationalist musicologist Fritz Stein ; Othmar Spann, Austrian political philosopher and a teacher of Friedrich Hayek. After an ad on April 20, 1933, Edwin Werner, Ph.D. , founded his own Association in Passau.

Corporate and organizational members included : the Association of German Fraternities (« Deutsche Burschenschaften ») ; the German Homeland Association (« Deutsche Landsmannschaft ») ; the Association of German Parochial Colleges (« Turnerschaften an deutschen Hochschulen ») ; the Association of German Guilds (« Deutsche Gildenschaften ») ; the Association of German Glee Clubs (« Deutsche Sängerschaft ») ; the German College Music Society (« Sondershäuser Verband ») ; and German College Art Society (« Deutscher Hochschulring ») .

The Society published the periodical « Mitteilung des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur » (Proceeds of the KfdK) , from 1929 to 1931. Under the heading « Signs of the Times » , they listed their enemies : Erich Kästner, Kurt Tucholsky, Thomas Mann, Bertolt Brecht, Walter Mehring, and the Berlin Institute for Sexual Research. Later, the most frequently mentioned were : Paul Klee, Vassily Kandinsky, Kurt Schwitters, the « Bauhaus » Movement, Emil Nolde, Karl Hofer, Max Beckmann, and Georg Grosz. Books by Ernst Toller, Arnold Zweig, Jakob Wassermann, Lion Feuchtwanger, Arnolt Bronnen, Leonhard Frank, Emil Ludwig, and Alfred Neumann were dismissed as not properly German. In 1930, the Society directed a campaign against Ernst Barlach and the so-called « Hetzkunst » (Hate Art) of Käthe Kollwitz.

In October 1932, the Society published « German Culture Watch : Journal of the KfdK » reprinted in 1933, under the editorship of Hans Hinkel.

Their activities had a nation-wide impact. In 1930, Wilhelm Frick, the Nazi Interior and Cultural minister of Thuringia and « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » regional leader, named Hans Severus Ziegler of the Schultze-Naumburg firm as director of the Weimar Architecture Institute. He immediately dismissed all practitioners of the « Bauhaus » style. Frick ordered artworks by « degenerate artists » (« Künstler der Entarteten Kunst ») to be removed from the « Schloßmuseum » in Weimar. These included works by Otto Dix, Lyonel Feininger, Vassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, Ernst Barlach, Oskar Kokoschka, Franz Marc, and Emil Nolde, although the latter was himself a Nazi. Works by modernist composers Igor Stravinsky and Paul Hindemith were struck from State-subsidized concert programs, and books by Erich Maria Remarque, and films by Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, and Georg Wilhelm Pabst were banned outright.

The « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » , under Wilhelm Frick's auspices, arranged its 1st major youth conference on Pentecost, in 1930. It presented Nazi leaders Baldur von Schirach, Josef Gœbbels, Hermann Göring, and Richard Walther Darré. Referencing Weimar's « spiritual heroes » a resolution called for « strengthening German military will » and, in reference to the arts, « resistance against all populist harmful influences in the area of theatre, literature and fine-arts,

and against alien architecture » . The following Pentecost, in 1931, saw a youth and cultural meeting in Potsdam, where Alfred Rosenberg gave a lectures on « Blood and Honour » , and « Race and Personality » , and Göring on the theme « Readiness to fight to protect our culture » .

...

The « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (KfdK, or Fighting League for German Culture) was founded in 1929 by Alfred Rosenberg, with the aim of promoting German culture while fighting the cultural threat of Liberalism. Ironically, this organisation (best known for disrupting concerts and music classes, insulting and threatening artists, and distributing inflammatory and anti-Semitic pamphlets) was originally aimed at the nation's elite. Adolf Hitler and other early Nazi leaders were searching for a way beyond mob-style violence, and decided to create a cultural organization as a way to court the intelligentsia.

During the 1st years of its existence, the relatively small and regionally-organized « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » attracted many intellectuals and, increasingly, musicians. With its conservative agenda of fighting « degenerative Jewish and Negro » influences, it spent much energy promoting the « cleansing » of museums, University faculties, and concert programmes of unwanted artists. In general, the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » appealed to radical nationalists and anti-Semites, to those who felt betrayed by defeat in World War I and by the Treaty of Versailles, and to those who felt outraged by the Leftist, modernizing and « cosmopolitan » tendencies of the Weimar Republic.

The « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » was initially not very aggressive, relying instead on lectures, intimidation and propaganda. After Hitler's rise to power, in 1933, it became increasingly violent, with the support of the « Stormabteilung » (SA, Storm Troopers, or brown shirts) changing both its techniques and its membership pool. The « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » had its own Orchestra, which was selected to perform a special concert for Hitler's birthday. It also acquired control over the important music journal, « Die Musik » , which gave it an official outlet for racist and nationalist opinions on music.

Alfred Rosenberg, the leading figure behind the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » , expected to be rewarded for his success. However, Josef Goebbels persuaded Hitler to give him control over the new « Reichskulturkammer » (RKK, or « Reich » Cultural Chamber) , which was a serious threat to the « Kampfbund » 's function as cultural arbiter of the « Reich » . Rosenberg was gradually marginalized, given the smaller job of running the official cultural organization of the Nazi Party, and the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » was ultimately absorbed into the « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF, Strength through Joy) movement. In this phase of its existence, the « Kampfbund » acted primarily as a music and theatre lobby, fighting for the rights of « Aryan » artists and for the exclusion of non-Aryans. Even this small gesture of independence was short-lived and, by 1937, the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » was entirely dissolved, assimilated into the many cultural organizations of the NSDAP.

...

Der Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (KfdK) , der in seiner Gründungsphase zunächst den Namen Nationalsozialistische

Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur (NGDK) erhielt, war ein völkisch gesinnter, antisemitisch ausgerichteter und politisch tätiger Verein während der Weimarer Republik und des nationalsozialistischen Regimes. Der Verein wurde 1928 von dem NS-Chefideologen Alfred Rosenberg gegründet und stand bis zu seiner Auflösung 1934 unter dessen Führung. Ziel des Vereins war eine maßgebliche Prägung des Kulturlebens in Deutschland, nicht zuletzt innerhalb der NSDAP. 1934 wurde der Verein aufgelöst und mit dem Reichsverband « Deutsche Bühne » zur Nationalsozialistischen Kulturgemeinde (« NS-Kulturgemeinde ») zusammengefasst. Verbunden war der Auflösungsprozess mit der Errichtung der « Dienststelle Rosenberg » (Drbg), dem späteren « Amt Rosenberg » (ARo).

Die Gründungsphase des Kampfbunds stand im engsten Zusammenhang mit dem Nürnberger Reichsparteitag der NSDAP im August 1927. Nach Abschluß des Parteitags teilte der Völkische Beobachter den Beschluß zur Gründung einer Kulturorganisation mit, die « durch Veranstaltung von Vortragsabenden im gesellschaftlichen Rahmen » den « nationalsozialistischen Gedanken in Kreise ... tragen » solle, « die durch Massenveranstaltungen im allgemeinen nicht gefasst werden können ».

Aus einem nachfolgenden Rundschreiben von Alfred Rosenberg, Hauptschriftleiter des Völkischen Beobachters, an alle führenden Partei-Funktionäre der Ortsgruppen der NSDAP sowie an renommierte Vertreter der völkisch-nationalen Kulturszene im Oktober 1927 geht hervor, daß Hitler ihn mit der Gründung beauftragt hatte.

In dem Schreiben wies Rosenberg auf seine Bemühungen hin, « 20-30 bester deutscher Namen dafür zu gewinnen, sich als Förderer dieser Sache öffentlich nennen zu lassen ». Seine Parteigenossen auf kommunaler Ebene bat er um Unterstützung bei der Suche nach sämtlichen « irgendwie als national bekannten Persönlichkeiten Ihrer Stadt », die für eine materielle Unterstützung und für Verträge der Gesellschaft in Frage kämen.

Die offizielle Gründung des Vereins als « Nationalsozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur » (NGDK) geschah am 4. Januar 1928. Gründer waren neben Rosenberg der Reichsorganisationsleiter der NSDAP Gregor Straßer, der Reichsgeschäftsführer Philipp Bouhler, der Reichspropagandaleiter Heinrich Himmler, der Reichsschatzmeister Franz Xaver Schwarz und der Unternehmer Wilhelm Weiß.

« Führer » der NGDK wurde Rosenberg, Gotthard Urban, ein Freund von Baldur von Schirach, Reichsgeschäftsführer. Die Leitung der verschiedensten Abteilungen (wie Musik, Film und Rundfunk) übernahm Hans Buchner.

Am 19. Dezember 1928 wurde die NGDK in « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur eingetragener Verein » (KfdK) umbenannt und erhielt eine Vereinssatzung.

Die Stadt Karlsruhe wurde durch die Hans-Thoma-Schule zu einem Zentrum deutschtümeler Strömungen. Es handelte sich um völkisch gesinnte Kreise, die zu ihrer antisemitischen Tradition nach 1918 auch eine antikapitalistische Ausrichtung angenommen hatten und sich für die Heimatkunst interessierten. Rainer Maria Rilke, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Max Liebermann galten ihnen aufgrund vorgegeblicher « internationalistischer » Denkweisen als Feindbilder; Vorbilder war der wiederentdeckte Romantiker Caspar David Friedrich. Die ersten nationalsozialistischen Bilderstürme sollten von der Kampfbund-Gruppe in Karlsruhe unter der Führung des Thoma-Nachfolgers Hans Adolf Bühler und von

Weimar ausgehen.

Der Kampfbund beschrieb sich als einen Zusammenschluss aller Kräfte, die bereit seien, den « Wiederaufbau der deutschen Kultur » gegenüber der Weimarer « Novemberkultur » zu betreiben. Das war ein Kampfbegriff : das gegenwärtige Theater wurde als « abgrundtief lasterhaft » empfunden, die Musik als « entartet » , als eine « jazzende Verniggerung » . Man wandte sich generell gegen « Entartung » , « Kulturverfall » , « Kulturbolschewismus » , « Amerikanismus » , « Schmutz und Schund » . Die kulturpessimistische, kulturkämpferische Abwehr der Moderne hatte ferner eine « deutlich antisemitische Note » .

Pangermanische Tendenzen vertraten die in und um den Alldeutschen Verband konzentrierten Anhänger eines großdeutschen Kulturimperialismus, die eine stark ausgeprägte antisemitische Tradition hatten. Die nordischen Völker besäßen einen Führungsauftrag, ihr Volkstum sollte die kulturellen Kolonisationsfaktoren liefern. Die Expansionsbestrebungen richteten sich vor allem nach Osteuropa. Paul de Lagarde, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Othmar Spann waren die Autoren dieser Kreise, deren Chauvinismus im gebildeten Bürgertum weit verbreitet war.

Ein im Mai 1928 veröffentlichter Gründungsaufruf des Kampfbunds mit starken antisemitischen und rassistischen Akzenten erklärte, man stehe vor einem « von volksfeindlichen Kräften geförderten politischen Niedergang » , der einen « planmäßigen Kampf gegen sämtliche deutschen Kulturwerte » beinhalte. « Rassefremdes Literatentum » habe sich « mit den Abfällen der Großstädte » verbündet. Man wolle nun im Kampf gegen « Verbastardisierung und Vernegerung unseres Daseins » willensstarke und opferbereite deutsche Männer und Frauen an sich binden, um « artbewußte » Zeitungen und Zeitschriften, bisher « unterdrückte » Gelehrte und Künstler zu fördern, Ausstellungen zu veranstalten und auf die Theaterspielpläne Einfluß zu nehmen. Eine Liste von wohlbekannten Namen, die sich bereit erklärten, die Gründung öffentlich zu unterstützen, zeigt die bildungsbürgerliche Ausrichtung : Acht der achtzehn Förderer waren Hochschullehrer, die übrigen, meist aus dem Richard-Wagner-Kreis, waren Verleger, Theaterintendant, Schriftsteller, Pfarrer.

Der Kampfbund bemühte sich lange nach außen um eine formale Distanz zu der ihn führenden Partei. So war er keine der Gliederungen der NSDAP, wiewohl ihn das Hauptarchiv der NSDAP als « Organisation innerhalb der NSDAP » führte und ihn eine « rein nationalsozialistische Gründung » nannte. Er beschrieb sich als kulturpolitische Einrichtung « völkisch Kulturschaffender » , die « alle Abwehrkräfte gegen die heute herrschenden Mächte der Zersetzung auf kulturellem Gebiet in Deutschland » sammeln und « Boden für die Idee Adolf Hitlers auf kulturellem Felde gewinnen » sollte. Erst seit dem Herbst 1932 scheint er sich offen als nationalsozialistisch ausgewiesen zu haben, « obwohl sein parteipolitischer Standpunkt ... schon lange kein Geheimnis mehr war » .

An der ersten öffentlichen Veranstaltung des Kampfbundes in der Universität München am 23. Februar 1929, bei der Othmar Spann über Die Kulturkrise der Gegenwart einen Vortrag hielt, nahm Hitler mit zahlreichen Anhängern teil.

Die Zahl der Mitglieder, die in so genannten Stützpunkten (Ortsgruppen) organisiert waren, stieg vom April 1929 von circa 300 in 25 Ortsgruppen auf circa 38.000 in 450 Ortsgruppen im Oktober 1933.

Unter den Mitgliedern und Förderern des Kampfbundes war alles vertreten, was im extremen Flügel der völkischen

Bewegung Rang und Namen hatte, so der antisemitische Literaturhistoriker Adolf Bartels, Ludwig Polland, Gustaf Kossinna und der Physiker und Einstein-Gegner Philipp Lenard, die Verleger Hugo Bruckmann und Julius Friedrich Lehmann, die führenden Persönlichkeiten der Bayreuther Gesellschaft Winifred Wagner, Daniela Thode, Hans von Wolzogen und die Witwe Eva Chamberlain des Rasseideologen Houston Stewart Chamberlain, der Komponist Paul Gräner, der Schriftsteller und spätere Präsident der Reichsschrifttumskammer Hanns Johst, der Architekt Paul Schultze-Naumburg, der die Schrift Kunst und Rasse herausgab und besonders häufig auf Veranstaltungen sprach, Gustav Havemann (Gründer und Leiter des Kampfbund-Orchesters), der Generalintendant an Doktor Karl von Schirach, der Bundesführer des paramilitärischen Wehrwolf. Bund deutscher Männer und Frontkrieger Fritz Kloppe und der Theologe und Musikwissenschaftler Fritz Stein. Landesleiter für Hessen und Hessen-Nassau war Friedrich Krebs.

Zu den korporativ beigetretenen akademischen Mitgliedern gehörten die Deutsche Burschenschaft, die Deutsche Landsmannschaft, der Vertreter-Convent der Turnerschaften an deutschen Hochschulen, die Deutsche Gildenschaft, die Deutsche Sängerschaft, der Sondershäuser Verband, der Hochschulring deutscher Art.

Von 1929 bis 1931 gab der Kampfbund die Zeitschrift Mitteilungen des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur heraus. In der Rubrik « Zeichen der Zeit » wurden Feinde zitiert : Erich Kästner, Kurt Tucholsky, Thomas Mann, Bertolt Brecht, Walter Mehring, das Berliner Institut für Sexualwissenschaft, weiterhin Paul Klee, Wassily Kandinsky, Kurt Schwitters, das Bauhaus, Emil Nolde, Karl Hofer, Max Beckmann, George Grosz zählen zu den meistgenannten. Die Bücher von Ernst Toller, Arnold Zweig, Jakob Wassermann, Lion Feuchtwanger, Arnolt Bronnen, Leonhard Frank, Emil Ludwig, Alfred Neumann sollten die Bezeichnung « deutsch » nicht führen dürfen. Eine Kampagne richtete sich 1930 gegen Ernst Barlach und die sogenannte « Hetzkunst » von Käthe Kollwitz. Zum einen sammelten sich hier Künstler und Schriftsteller, die mit den künstlerischen und literarischen Entwicklungen in der Weimarer Republik nicht Schritt halten konnten, zum zweiten « finden sich in unzähligen Pamphleten und Pressemitteilungen » bereits früh die Kategorien « deutscher » und « undeutscher » Literatur vor, wie sie in demonstrativer Symbolik mit den Bücherverbrennungen im Mai 1933 umgesetzt wurden.

Im Oktober 1932 wurde unter der Schriftleitung von Hans Hinkel die « Deutsche Kultur-Wacht. Blätter des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur » publiziert, die jedoch schon 1933 wieder eingestellt wurde.

Verschiedene Aktivitäten hatten ein großes überregionales Echo : 1930 setzte der von dem nationalsozialistischen Thüringer Innen- und Kulturminister Wilhelm Frick zum « Kultur-, Kunst- und Theaterreferenten » ernannte Landesleiter des KfdK, Hans Severus Ziegler, den völkischen Architekten Schultze-Naumburg als Direktor der Weimarer Bauhochschule ein und entließ zugleich alle Dozenten des « Bauhaus » -Stils. Er ordnete die Entfernung der Werke von Otto Dix, Lyonel Feininger, Wassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, Ernst Barlach, Oskar Kokoschka, Franz Marc, Emil Nolde und anderen als « entartet » geltenden Künstlern aus den Ausstellungsräumen des Weimarer Schloßmuseums an. Aus staatlich subventionierten Konzertprogrammen strich er die Werke von Paul Hindemith und Igor Strawinsky. Verboten wurden die Werke von Erich Maria Remarque und die Filme von Sergej Eisenstein, Wsewolod Illarionowitsch Pudowkin und Georg Wilhelm Pabst.

Pfingsten 1930 veranstaltete der Kampfbund in Weimar seine erste große Jugendtagung, die unter der Schirmherrschaft

von Frick stand. Erstmals wurden hier mit dem Hinweis auf Weimars « unsterbliche Geistesheroen » nationalsozialistische Führungsfiguren vorgestellt : Baldur von Schirach, Josef Gœbbels, Hermann Göring, Richard Walther Darré. Eine gemeinsame EntschlieÙung forderte « vor allem die Stärkung des deutschen Wehrwillens » , und für die Künste hieß es :

« Wir rufen auf zum Widerstand gegen alle volksschädigenden Einflüsse auf dem Gebiet des Theaters in Literatur und bildender Kunst gegen eine wesensfremde Baukunst. »

Unter dem Motto « Es ist nicht nötig, daß ich lebe, wohl aber, daß ich meine Pflicht tue ! » veranstaltete der Kampfbund Pfingsten 1931 eine Jugend- und Kulturtagung in Potsdam, auf der Rosenberg einen Vortrag über « Blut und Ehre » , « Rasse und Persönlichkeit » hielt, und Göring, Fliegerhauptmann, zum Thema « Wehrwille sichert die Kultur » sprach.

Nach der Machtübernahme durch die Nationalsozialisten und ihre deutschnationalen Bündnispartner 1933 beteiligten sich lokale Gruppen des KfdK zunächst an der im Mai 1933 unter der Federführung der Deutschen Studentenschaft stattfindenden « Aktion wider den undeutschen Geist » , in deren Verlauf « undeutsche » Literatur aus Bibliotheken entfernt und in öffentlichen rituellen Bücherverbrennungen vernichtet wurde.

Organisatorisch erzwang der Kfdk den Zusammenschluss des Verbands der freien Volksbühnen und des Bühnenvolksbunds zu einer Nebenorganisation, dem Reichsverband Deutsche Bühne eingetragener Verein. In der weiteren Folge übernahm er weitere Berufszusammenschlüsse.

In der Einflußkonkurrenz zwischen Alfred Rosenberg, Josef Gœbbels und Robert Ley als dem Leiter der Deutsche Arbeitfront und deren Freizeiteinrichtung « Kraft durch Freude » kam es schließlich am 6. Juni 1934 zu einer Verschmelzung von KfdK und Reichsverband Deutsche Bühne zur Nationalsozialistischen Kulturgemeinde (NSKG) , die unmittelbar nach der Gründung « körperschaftlich in die Organisation “ Kraft durch Freude ” » eintrat. Einerseits sollte die NS-Kulturgemeinde fortan die Führung bei der Prägung des Kulturlebens in der politischen NS-Gemeinschaft « Kraft durch Freude » übernehmen ; andererseits verband Rosenberg mit dieser Zusammenfassung das Ziel, die Programmgestaltung für das von ihr getragene Kunst- und Kulturleben auch im Rahmen der gesamten NSDAP zu übernehmen, insbesondere hinsichtlich der Jugendorganisationen.

Auf dem Gebiet des Films gehörte zum Bereich des Kampfbundes die Dekafilm in Berlin, die Abkürzung bedeutet aufgelöst Deutsche Kampffilm.

...

Nationalsozialistische Organisation, gegründet am 4. Januar 1928 mit Sitz in München. Vorsitzender war Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946) . Der Bund, dem eine Reihe prominenter Mitglieder angehörte, wandte sich heftig gegen die künstlerische Moderne. Er wurde 1934 in die NS-Kulturgemeinde überführt.

Der dritte Reichsparteitag der NSDAP verabschiedete im August 1927 « kulturelle Richtlinien zur Gewinnung der geistig Schaffenden ». Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946), der sich bereits 1919 Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) und seiner Partei angeschlossen hatte, Herausgeber des « Völkischen Beobachters » und vieler anderer Parteizeitschriften war und die Rolle des Chefideologen der NSDAP innehatte, erhielt den Auftrag, eine neue Organisation aufzubauen. Am 4. Januar 1928 wurde zunächst die « Nationalsozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur » gegründet. Vorsitzender war Alfred Rosenberg, Schatzmeister Franz Xaver Schwarz (1875-1947), Schriftführer Philipp Bouhler (1899-1945). Weitere Gründungsmitglieder waren Heinrich Himmler (1900-1945) und Gregor Straßer (1892-1934). Ab dem 19. Dezember 1928 firmierte die Gesellschaft als « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur ». Sie hatte ihren Sitz in München in der Schellingstraße 50, schräg gegenüber der Redaktion des « Völkischen Beobachters », die Rosenberg ebenfalls leitete.

Der Kampfbund war der organisatorische Ausdruck einer Kunstabwehrgesinnung. Er wandte sich heftig, zum Teil auch mit gewaltsamen Mitteln, gegen die künstlerische Moderne. Er sprach das konservative und reaktionäre Bürgertum an und versuchte dabei auch, als überparteiliche Organisation aufzutreten. Zugleich war er eine politische Sozialisationsagentur für die NSDAP. Den Reihen des Kampfbundes entstammten zum Beispiel der spätere Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung Bernhard Rust (1893-1945) und der Staatskommissar für die thüringischen Landestheater Hans Severus Ziegler (1893-1978). Von 1929 bis 1933 wuchs die Mitgliederzahl des Kampfbundes nur von 300 auf etwa 6.000, versechsfachte sich dann allerdings im Jahr der « Machtergreifung ».

Seinen Schwerpunkt hatte der KfdK in München, wo auch sieben der elf Vorstandsmitglieder ansässig waren, darunter die Verleger Hugo Bruckmann (1863-1941) und Friedrich Julius Lehmann (1864-1935), die auch frühe Förderer von Adolf Hitler waren. Einen weiteren geographischen Schwerpunkt bildete Bayreuth, das und andere durch Winifred Wagner (1897-1980) sowie weitere Mitglieder der Familie Wagner präsent war.

In München hielt der Kampfbund zwischen Februar 1929 und Februar 1932 insgesamt 21 Veranstaltungen ab. Die erste fand im Auditorium Maximum der Universität statt, wo der austro-faschistische Philosoph Othmar Spann (1878-1950) über « Die Kulturkrise der Gegenwart » sprach. Ein Höhepunkt in der öffentlichen Wahrnehmung wurde mit Paul Schultze-Naumburgs (1869-1949) Vortrag « Der Kampf um die Kunst » erreicht, der am 30. Januar 1931 im Auditorium der TH München stattfand. Die Veranstaltung war so überfüllt, daß sie einen Monat später im Theatersaal des Hotel Union wiederholt wurde.

Der Architekt und Theoretiker Schultze-Naumburg, Polemiker gegen das « jüdisch-bolschewistische Flachdach » und Proponent des Heimatschutzstils, war der Starredner des Kampfbundes. Er trat mit seinem Vortrag, der zentral auf die Auseinandersetzung um die künstlerische Moderne zielte, anschließend im ganzen Deutschen Reich auf. Kurz nach Schultze-Naumburg sprach Walter Stang (1895-1945) über den « Kampf um das deutsche Theater » in dem populären Steinecke-Saal in der Amalienstraße. Stang war Dramaturg bei der Münchner Theatergemeinde und Theaterreferent des Kampfbundes. Nach 1933 wurde er Amtsleiter in der Dienststelle des Überwachungsbeauftragten Rosenberg.

1934 wurde der Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur mit den zur Deutschen Bühne eingetragener Verein zwangsvereinigten Organisationen Bühnenvolksbund und Verband der deutschen Volksbühne zur NS-Kulturgemeinde zusammengeführt, die der nationalsozialistischen Freizeitorganisation « Kraft durch Freude » unterstand.

Alfred Rosenberg

L'homme politique, architecte et essayiste allemand Alfred Rosenberg est né le 12 janvier 1893 à Reval (Empire russe) et est mort le 16 octobre 1946 à Nuremberg. Il devient membre du Parti national-socialiste des travailleurs allemands et théoricien du Nazisme. Durant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, il occupe le poste de ministre du « Reich » aux Territoires occupés de l'Est. Condamné à mort lors du procès de Nuremberg, il est exécuté par pendaison.

Rosenberg est issu d'une famille germano-balte. Un temps protégé du mystique russe Dimitri Merejkovski, il entreprend des études d'ingénieur-architecte à l'École Impériale technique de Moscou, aujourd'hui l'Université Bauman. Il fuit la révolution bolchévique et s'établit à Munich en 1918, où il fréquente l'Ordre de Thulé se ralliant alors aux doctrines raciales de Dietrich Eckart (1868-1923) qui le présente à Adolf Hitler.

Le NSDAP exerce alors une forte attraction sur les Allemands de l'étranger, ces derniers, en retour, jouaient un rôle essentiel dans son développement.

Ayant fréquenté la société de Thulé, il devient un des plus fervents partisans du National-Socialisme. Dès 1920, alors qu'il a reçu une formation en architecture, il est ainsi rédacteur en chef du « Völkischer Beobachter », organe du Parti nazi. Il publie, en 1922, « Peste en Russie ! le bolchévisme, ses dirigeants, ses exécutants et ses victimes », ouvrage qui, en identifiant bolchévisme et Juifs, marque Hitler. Il participe au « Putsch » manqué de la brasserie à Munich, en 1923.

Il contribue à attirer au sein du NSDAP ceux qui, à droite, développent un sentiment de pessimisme culturel et racial.

Hitler, emprisonné, le désigne pour le remplacer à la tête du Parti. Il rend visite à Hitler en prison et aurait influencé certaines parties de « Mein Kampf ». Devenu idéologue du Parti national-socialiste, il diffuse l'antisémitisme par le biais des « Protocoles des Sages de Sion ». Durant cette période, il exerce les fonctions qu'Hitler ne peut prendre en charge en raison de sa condamnation et joue un rôle important dans la marginalisation de l'aile gauche du Parti, regroupée autour de Gottfried Feder : il ne discute pas les points formulés par ce dernier et ses proches, autour notamment de la participation des employés aux bénéfices et de la place des sociétés anonymes dans le programme du NSDAP.

À partir de 1929, date de sa création, il anime le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » .

Après la prise de pouvoir en 1933, il subit l'inimitié personnelle de la part de Hermann Göring, de Heinrich Himmler et de Josef Goebbels, qui l'écartent de tous les postes ministériels, et il doit alors se contenter d'un rôle secondaire aux Affaires étrangères du Parti.

Nommé en 1934 à la tête de la recherche au sein du NSDAP, il développe la recherche nazie vers l'archéologie et l'ethnographie. Avec l'appui de Hans Reinerth, il développe au sein de son bureau, l'« Amt Rosenberg », une

fédération de la Préhistoire allemande du « Reich » (« Reichsbund für deutsche Vorgechichte ») , confiée à Hans Reinerth. Jusqu'en 1937, cette fédération connaît, sous la houlette de Rosenberg, des succès indéniables, cependant, Rosenberg et son protégé doivent, à partir de ce moment, compter avec l'influence grandissante de l' « Ahnenerbe » de la SS, et doit, surtout après 1940, céder le pas devant cette institution.

Responsable du « Kampfband für deutsche Kultur » , il développe également ce qu'il estime être le programme nazi en matière de politique culturelle éducative, mais il doit composer avec les tenants d'un « christianisme positif du National-Socialiste » , comme il doit s'entendre avec Goebbels. En 1939, il tente à nouveau de prendre pied dans ce domaine, à la faveur d'une disgrâce passagère de Goebbels.

Cependant, malgré cet échec, il met en place, au cours des années qui suivent, l'institut pour l'étude de la question juive, qui démarre ses activités en 1938, présidées par un ancien proche de Hans Frank, brouillé avec ce dernier pour tenter de prendre le contrôle de la propagande antisémite dans le Parti.

Souhaitant prendre le contrôle des affaires étrangères allemandes, il tente de prendre pied par le biais d'un bureau, l' « Aussenpolitisches Amt » , créé le 1er avril 1933, mais rapidement écarté en raison de l'échec d'une mission à Londres, en mai 1933.

Il tente de mettre à profit les contacts dont il dispose auprès de Partis étrangers, il tente de mener une sorte de diplomatie parallèle. Cependant, sa 1re mission, à Londres, en mai 1933, mélange de diplomatie parallèle et de rapprochements personnels, tourne au fiasco. L' « Aussenpolitisches Amt » continue cependant d'exister, mais son chef ne parvient pas à imprimer sa marque dans le domaine des affaires étrangères.

Parallèlement à ce bureau, il organise, pour contrer la montée en puissance de Joachim von Ribbentrop, une école, à destination des membres du NSDAP, destinée à devenir une pépinière de futurs diplomates. Globalement, cette école se révèle, comme toutes les écoles mise en place par le NSDAP, un échec, par manque de débouchés. Parmi les anciens élèves de cette école a cependant été recruté un certain nombre de diplomates affectés en Europe de l'Est.

Il tente encore, en dépit de ses échecs, de s'immiscer dans le domaine des affaires étrangères, notamment en prenant régulièrement la parole au nom du « Reich » , en 1936, par exemple, en félicitant un prélat autrichien, Alois Hudal, pour ses prises de positions hostiles à l'Union Soviétique.

En 1938, la nomination de Joachim von Ribbentrop au ministère des Affaires étrangères, puis, en 1939, la signature du pacte germano-soviétique, sonnent le glas de ces ambitions.

Membre historique du NSDAP, il participe à la confiscation du pouvoir par le Parti, dès les années 1930.

Il est chargé, à partir de 1940, de la confiscation des œuvres d'art et des bibliothèques volées aux Juifs à travers l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) , dirigé, à Vilnius, par le Docteur Müller. Il reçoit également, dans ce cadre, la responsabilité du mobilier confisqué aux Juifs déportés : celui-ci doit être acheminé dans le « Reich » puis vendu

ou donné aux Allemands du « Reich » .

En France, 15 jours après l'armistice, Wilhelm Keitel communique au général Volland-Beckenberg commandant la place de Paris, « une note ordonnant de recenser et de mettre en sûreté les objets d'art et documents historiques appartenant à l'État français ou à des particuliers, notamment à des Juifs » , précisant que « cette mesure ne doit pas constituer une appropriation » . Quelques jours après, Hitler charge Rosenberg de récupérer et d'acheminer vers l'Allemagne toutes les œuvres d'art « sans propriétaires » . La première collection visée, d'une valeur estimée à plus de 2 milliards, est celle des Rothschild, cachée dans les domaines de Château Lafite et de Château Mouton Rothschild, dénoncée par un nommé Jurschewitz qui reçoit une prime de 65,000 francs. En mars 1941, un convoi de 28 wagons, contenant près de 4,000 œuvres d'art saisies en France, arrive à Neuschwanstein.

En 1941, après la campagne de Grèce, le « Sonderkommando Griechenland » (commando spécial, Grèce) , placé sous la responsabilité de l' « Einsatzstab » , se livre au pillage des biens juifs et entreprend certaines fouilles, hors de tout accord avec les institutions archéologiques universitaires et dans un contexte de concurrence directe avec les équipes de recherche commandées par Himmler. Contesté par la SS, il doit aussi défendre les actions de son institut face aux menées hostiles des universités du « Reich » , dès les années 1930.

Le 16 avril 1943, Alfred Rosenberg transmet servilement à Adolf Hitler un rapport synthétisant l'ensemble des 20,000 œuvres d'art saisis à l'Ouest par ses subordonnés.

Par un décret de Hitler, il est nommé ministre des territoires occupés à l'Est, le 16 juillet 1941. Mais, rapidement, les compétences dont il dispose sont rognées par l'action de certains de ses concurrents, Himmler et Göring notamment, tandis que ses représentants en Ukraine et dans l' « Ostland » ne tiennent pas compte de ses directives. De ce fait, il joue un rôle important dans la politique génocidaire mise en place de façon systématique à partir de l'invasion de l'Union Soviétique.

Dans les mois qui suivent la campagne de France, il multiplie les déclarations annonçant le déclenchement du conflit contre l'Union Soviétique. Au cours du mois de mars 1941, il apparaît clairement aux principaux responsables du « Reich » que Rosenberg semble sur le point de connaître un accroissement sans précédent des pouvoirs dont il dispose.

Nommé en mars 1941 conseiller spécial pour les territoires occupés à l'Est, il est nommé le 20 avril 1941 « Bevollmächtigter für die zentrale Bearbeitung der Fragen des osteuropäischen Raumes » , malgré de fortes réserves de Himmler notamment.

De ce fait, il joue un rôle certain dans la préparation idéologique et pratique de l'invasion de l'URSS, ce qui n'échappe pas aux services de renseignements soviétiques dans les semaines qui précèdent immédiatement l'intervention allemande. Ainsi, il soutient, même s'il ne participe pas à la réunion du 2 mai 1941 relative à la préparation économique de l'invasion et de l'occupation des territoires conquis, à la fois les projets d'exploitation économiques préparés par les services de Herbert Backe, mais aussi les projets de réduction de la population soviétique par la famine et la déportation en Sibérie. Dans les jours qui suivent, il présente, dans les instructions destinées à ses futurs

subordonnés, sa formulation des conclusions de la réunion du 2 mai.

Ainsi, durant cette période précédant immédiatement l'invasion, il expose dans un certain nombre de mémoires destinés à Hitler sa vision de ce que doit être l'Union soviétique occupée par le « Reich » ; dans son 1er mémoire, daté du 2 avril 1941, il présente comme nécessaire la destruction de l'État soviétique, par l'extermination de ses représentants, et le déplacement de populations entières. Dans son mémoire du 29 avril, il préconise une politique de ghéttoïsation des Juifs d'Ukraine, puis, dans son mémoire du 8 mai, une politique de colonisation des pays baltes.

Le 16 juillet 1941, lors d'une conférence réunissant Adolf Hitler, Hans Lammers, Hermann Göring, Martin Bormann et lui-même, il est nommé sur décret d'Hitler « ministre du « Reich » pour les territoires occupés de l'Est » (« Minister für die besetzten Ostgebiete ») , et supervise l'administration civile à travers les « Reichskommissariat » .

Néanmoins, Rosenberg apparaît comme un ministre privé de son domaine de compétence, ses compétences ministérielles étant réduites à peau de chagrin : passant pour un illuminé, mais entouré d'une administration compétente, composée pour une part non négligeable de Germano-Baltes, il doit composer avec les services de Göring qui détient la charge de l'économie et qui cherche à l'évincer dès sa prise de poste ; de Himmler, dont les compétences policières sont définies clairement le 17 juillet ; ainsi qu'avec les hauts-commandements militaires (OKW et OKH) .

Ainsi, dès sa nomination, il trouve face à lui des commissaires qu'il n'a pas choisis et dont l'indépendance est garantie par Göring et Hitler en personne, ce dernier lui ayant signifié lors de sa nomination le peu d'importance qu'il accordait aux décrets que son nouveau ministre pouvait prendre pour les territoires sur lesquels celui-ci était compétent ; Göring, à cette même occasion, lui a rappelé l'indépendance de fait des « Reichskommissaren » dans leur circonscription. Parallèlement à cette faiblesse politique, le nouveau ministre doit constamment affronter les empiètements de Himmler sur ses propres prérogative.

Ainsi, il tente par exemple de lutter contre la corruption des fonctionnaires allemands en poste dans ces commissariats, sans grand succès, Erich Koch et Hinrich Lohse, chacun dans leur circonscription, vivant dans le luxe.

Dès sa nomination, Rosenberg tente de mener une politique autonome dans les territoires à l'intérieur desquels son administration est compétente.

Son administration prend le relais de la gestion de la « Wehrmacht » à partir du 1er septembre 1941, et fournit un vernis de légalité aux réglementations en cours de mise en place dans les territoires dont il a la charge, devant, selon le mot même de Hitler, gouverner de vastes zones avec « une poignée de gens » .

Ainsi, le 16 juillet, il propose la mise en place d'une politique favorable aux intérêts des Ukrainiens, supposés favorables au « Reich » , mais se heurte à l'indifférence de Göring et à l'opposition de Koch, commissaire nouvellement nommé.

De même, il tente d'exclure le clergé catholique des territoires qu'il contrôle, en limitant l'accès des régions placées

sous sa juridiction aux seuls clercs originaires de ces régions.

Dans le même temps, il tente de coordonner l'action des différents acteurs de la politique allemande à l'Est, encourageant des actions génocidaires coordonnées.

De par ses compétences, Alfred Rosenberg révèle rapidement l'un des principaux acteurs du génocide juif dans les territoires de l'Est sur lesquels il exerce son autorité.

Lors des préparatifs de la guerre à l'Est, les territoires qu'il est censé administrer quelques semaines après le déclenchement des opérations militaires sont ainsi prévus pour accueillir les Juifs du « Reich » et des régions limitrophes.

Ainsi, en octobre 1941, il est interpellé par Hans Frank, le gouverneur général de Pologne, au sujet de la déportation des Juifs du Gouvernement général dans les territoires placés sous sa responsabilité, mais à ce moment, il se montre réticent à cette déportation systématique, impossible à réaliser, selon lui. De même, peu de temps après, le 15 novembre, Rosenberg rencontre Himmler afin de savoir si la politique génocidaire est du ressort de la police, placée ainsi dans le domaine de compétence du « Reichsführer SS », ou peut être assimilée à un « élément de la politique générale », donc sous sa propre compétence.

Ainsi, durant l'hiver 1941-1942, il tente de prendre le contrôle de la gestion des Juifs vivant dans les territoires conquis sur l'URSS ; ou encore, en juillet 1942, face à Himmler, lorsqu'il propose une définition du Juif dans les territoires dont il a la responsabilité.

De plus, l'absence d'accès direct à Hitler, dont les visiteurs sont sévèrement contrôlés par Lammers et la présence de Bormann, le prive dans les faits d'une partie de ses prérogatives : entre avril 1941 et le 17 octobre 1943, date de la dernière visite attestée, Rosenberg rencontre Hitler 16 fois ; de plus, à partir de mars 1943, il n'a plus de représentant personnel auprès de Hitler pour faire valoir le point de vue de l'administration qu'il dirige.

Cette relégation est également le fruit de l'hostilité de Hans Lammers et Martin Bormann, un de ses plus farouches opposants parmi les proches de Hitler, et de l'inimitié profonde que lui porte Himmler.

Soutenu cependant par les cadres territoriaux mis en place dans les districts et par des officiers en poste, Rosenberg voit ses vues politiques clairement désavouées par Hitler, à de nombreuses reprises, en mai puis en juillet 1941, lors de la conférence du 16 juillet, puis, pour la dernière fois, le 19 mai 1943.

Rosenberg démissionne le 12 octobre 1944, mais tout porte à croire qu'il n'a reçu aucune réponse, ce qui témoigne une nouvelle fois de l'inexistence de son influence politique.

Rosenberg est, dans les années 1930, un familier de Hitler, l'un de ses lers « compagnons de route », auquel il confie durant ces années, à de nombreuses reprises, ses objectifs pour le conflit qui se déclenche en 1939 ou ses

considérations raciales et antisémites, en 1939 ou en 1941.

Cependant, à l'image de l'autre idéologue du NSDAP, Gottfried Feder, il est peu à peu évincé de toute responsabilité importante. Ainsi, sa relative proximité avec Hitler n'empêche pas les nombreux déboires et déconvenues qui jalonnent sa carrière au sein du 3^e « Reich » .

Ainsi, dès 1934, il est écarté des responsabilités les plus importantes dans le domaine des Affaires étrangères, suite à son échec londonien de l'année précédente, et surtout en raison de la montée en puissance de Joachim von Ribbentrop.

En effet, colérique, piètre administrateur, il est peu apprécié au sein des principaux responsables nazis, comme l'atteste la coalition, montée contre lui durant l'automne 1939, regroupant l'ensemble des acteurs du NSDAP et de l'État compétents dans le domaine idéologique.

De plus, ses écrits sont peu lus par les membres du NSDAP, Hitler lui-même ayant confessé à Albert Speer ne jamais l'avoir lu dans son intégralité, tout comme les « Gauleiter », mais lui attirent l'inimitié profonde des membres chrétiens du NSDAP.

L'historien Joachim Fest écrit :

« Les compétences de Rosenberg furent, dès le commencement, sérieusement limitées. Göring était muni des pleins pouvoirs pour la réalisation du plan primordial ; Himmler, envoyé extraordinaire dans le secteur opérationnel de l'armée, exerçait en même temps les fonctions de chef de la police, de « Reichsführer SS », de commissaire du « Reich » chargé des problèmes de transfert des populations et de la consolidation du « Volksstum » allemand ; Sauckel assumait la responsabilité des problèmes de main-d'œuvre et Keitel la direction de la « Wehrmacht » ; toutes ces instances grignotaient si bien les compétences de Rosenberg qu'il ne lui restait guère que son titre. De fait, la tâche du ministre du « Reich » se réduisit bientôt à rédiger des textes que personne ne lisait, des mémorandums qui ne franchissaient pas les portes de ses services, des protestations dont nul ne prenait plus connaissance : un compagnon oublié à la tête d'un service non moins oublié. »

Au procès de Nuremberg, le 1er octobre 1946, Rosenberg est condamné à mort après avoir été reconnu responsable des massacres organisés dans les pays à l'Est de l'Allemagne, pour plan concerté ou complot, crimes contre la paix, crimes de guerre et crimes contre l'humanité. Il est pendu le 16 octobre suivant. Quand il lui est demandé s'il a quelque chose à déclarer avant son exécution, il répond d'un simple « Non ».

Après son exécution, les principaux acteurs de la mise en œuvre de la politique de ré-organisation de l'Est du continent européen utilisent sa position pour se disculper eux-mêmes.

Rapidement, Rosenberg s'affirme comme l'un des principaux acteurs de la mise en place du corpus théorique du National-Socialisme. En effet, il se considère comme le « gardien du temple du National-Socialisme », notamment de

son idéologie ; à ce titre, il fait l'objet, tout au long de sa carrière, de railleries de la part des autres dignitaires du régime, pour son « intellectualisation » de la doctrine du Parti, qui, en définitive, comme le note Joachim Fest, « résidait dans l'exercice du pouvoir », et non dans une « façade idéologique » .

Rosenberg est connu pour son rejet du christianisme, et pour avoir joué un rôle important dans le développement du paganisme qu'il percevait comme une transition vers une nouvelle foi nazie ainsi que pour son anti-maçonnisme.

En effet, idéologue du NSDAP dans les années 1920, en concurrence dans un 1er temps avec Gottfried Feder, puis avec Josef Gœbbels dans ce domaine, il développe au sein du mouvement une approche intellectuelle du National-Socialisme qui suscite l'incompréhension, voire l'amusement, de nombreux membres du Parti.

Pour un mouvement comme le NSDAP, le contrôle de l'idéologie, entre autres par le contrôle de l'Histoire, est déterminant pour asseoir le pouvoir de Rosenberg sur l'idéologie du Parti, et au-delà, sur les domaines dans lesquels son bureau exerce une compétence, sans cesse remise en question par d'autres membres de la « nébuleuse » nationale-socialiste.

S'il essuie des échecs dans sa lutte pour le contrôle de l'agitation antisémite, il parvient cependant à imposer la ligne idéologique la plus radicale sur les questions raciales et culturelles, jusqu'à faire modifier un certain nombre de textes religieux mis en musique par Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart ou Georg Friedrich Händel. Cependant, cette influence sur l'idéologie du NSDAP ne doit pas masquer sa relégation, en dépit des publications régulières de ces textes, marqué par la relative mise à l'écart à partir de 1933, notamment à la suite de ses démêlés avec la hiérarchie catholique ; cette mise à l'écart est renforcé au fil des années 1930 par l'arrivée, dans les rangs du NSDAP et de ses organismes de recherche, de jeunes gens dotés d'un bagage universitaire plus important que le sien.

Fortement marquée par le darwinisme social, dont l'introduction dans le « Reich » est contemporaine de ses études, il est fortement influencé par le « pessimisme racial », emprunté à Joseph Arthur de Gobineau.

À ses yeux, le combat des races constitue la raison d'être de l'Histoire humaine. En cela, il fait totalement siennes les conceptions historicistes de Hitler : une lutte gigantesque, qui prend la forme d'une gigantomachie, oppose la race aryenne à la race sémitique depuis une longue éternité, les Indogermains ne faisant que se défendre contre un danger oriental. Il est cependant peu suivi dans les milieux académiques allemands et doit compter avec la réserve des milieux universitaires.

Ainsi, il développe une conception déterministe de l'Histoire selon 2 principes : tout d'abord, l'existence d'une loi de l'Histoire, la lutte des races pour leur survie, qui serait intangible ; ensuite, cet affrontement racial met aux prises 2 mêmes races, malgré les oripeaux extérieurs, pouvant connaître des modifications de forme.

Sa conception est développée dans son ouvrage le plus important, « le Mythe du XXe siècle », texte indigeste de plus de 700 pages, et repose sur un fort pessimisme : la pureté raciale originelle et le génie qui en découle, est constamment menacée par les Juifs, ennemis millénaires et protéiformes des populations nordiques.

Ainsi, il emprunte à Herman Wirth le thème de l'origine nordique de la race aryenne, et va jusqu'à adhérer à l'hypothèse d'une race partie à la fois en direction de l'Amérique du Nord et de l'Europe, depuis une île au milieu de l'océan Atlantique, qu'il situe plus au Nord que l'Atlantide, dans l'archipel d'Heligoland ou dans la Thulé des Hyperboréens décrits par Pythéas.

À côté de la lutte des races, Rosenberg développe aussi l'idée de l'opposition des sexes constitue un puissant facteur explicatif de l'Histoire humaine ; en effet, selon lui, la société étrusque est organisée sur des bases matriarcales, opposées en cela à la société nordiques, appuyée sur des bases patriarcales.

Parallèlement à cette discussion sur le mythe des origines de la race nordique, Rosenberg expose dans ses divers écrits sa propre conception de l'histoire grecque et romaine, l'analysant comme un processus de décadence-régénération. Ainsi, il développe une conception de l'histoire antique très personnelle. À ses yeux, tout peuple qui a renoncé à une pureté raciale a été balayé par un peuple dans lesquels les éléments indogermaniques n'ont pas encore perdu l'essentiel de leur force.

Pour l'auteur du « Mythe du XXe Siècle », Alexandre le Grand ne veut pas réaliser la monarchie universelle, mais souhaite réaliser la fusion de 2 aristocraties, 2 élites, la grecque et la perse, « racialement » parentes : aux yeux de Rosenberg, Alexandre jouit du supposé de la bonne foi raciale, en écartant de manière systématique les Sémites, les Babyloniens et les Syriens de la direction de l'Empire qu'il édifie. Cependant, le bilan de son règne reste négatif car, selon Rosenberg, Alexandre n'a pas été en mesure de léguer un héritage durable, les races asiatiques qui avaient plié sous le joug indo-germanique perso-macédonien ayant rapidement repris le dessus.

Ainsi, c'est seulement après la défaite raciale et politique des Grecs que Rome participe de façon importante à la lutte des races, dans un 1er temps en s'opposant à la sémitique Carthage : pour Rosenberg, cette série de guerres représente aussi un choc entre 2 races antagonistes et son issue a sauvé l'Occident de l'essor dans ses contrées de la civilisation phénicienne et de ses « miasmes ». Ainsi, il donne au discours de Caton une signification raciale : il lui confère le sens d'un appel à la destruction de la race punique ; il regrette malgré tout que Rome n'ait pas poussé son avantage jusqu'au bout et entrepris une campagne dans l'est du bassin méditerranéen pour éradiquer de façon définitive les foyers de peuplement sémitiques.

De même il regrette que les guerres menées par Vespasien et Titus, en Judée, ne se soient pas soldées par l'extermination du peuple juif ; cependant, conscient que cette mesure n'était pas nécessaire du point de vue stratégique, il développe l'idée qu'elle est néanmoins nécessaire d'un point de vue racial car, à la suite de la diaspora, la figure du Juif fait alors son entrée dans la guerre des races, qu'il ne mène ouvertement qu'en de très rares occasions, notamment pendant la révolte juive : en effet, aux yeux de Rosenberg, le peuple juif mène la guerre raciale de façon insidieuse : l'ayant perdue du point de vue militaire et politique, il va la gagner, en s'appuyant sur le christianisme en général, et plus spécifiquement, sur la lecture de Saint-Paul.

Rosenberg développe aussi des idées sur les peuples antiques disparus ; bizarrement, les Étrusques, des Orientaux, des

Sémites selon lui suscitent son ire. En effet, présenté dans les années 1930 comme un contre-modèle, ce peuple installé en Italie centrale constitue, selon l'auteur du « Mythe du XXe siècle », l'archétype des populations proche-orientales, que les Nordiques doivent combattre ; en effet, il présente la société étrusque comme une société matriarcale, contrôlée par des prêtres-magiciens, dépravée, tant chez les femmes, toujours à la recherche du plaisir sexuel, que chez les hommes volontiers accusés de pédérastie, d'homosexualité et d'onanisme.

Il partage avec Himmler un engouement pour le duc de Saxe Henri le Lion, opposant germanique à la politique méditerranéenne de Frédéric Barberousse.

Dans son principal ouvrage, « le Mythe du XXe siècle », édité en 1930, Rosenberg se montre très fortement hostile au christianisme.

Comme Hitler, Rosenberg ne développe de rhétorique anti-chrétienne que parce que, à ses yeux, la religion mise en place à partir de Saint-Paul a contaminé le christianisme naissant et lui a donné une dimension de réaction contre la domination indo-germanique des Romains. Cependant, la publication de cet ouvrage suscite, de la part de Hitler, d'importantes réserves, essentiellement pour des raisons tactiques, celui-ci souhaitant mettre en place les conditions d'un rapprochement entre le NSDAP et les Partis catholiques.

Ainsi, Rome s'est écroulée sous les coups d'un assaut venu du Sud et de l'Est ; de la sorte, Rosenberg reprend les thèses d'une abondante littérature antisémite, prônant l'idée d'une défense de la romanité, et de sa forme politique, l'Empire romain, rendue possible par l'apport des populations germaniques à partir du IIIe siècle, mais tenue en échec par les influences méridionales. De plus, les idées véhiculées par le christianisme, constituent, selon Rosenberg, la preuve que le peuple romain avait perdu sa vitalité raciale : pour ce dernier, la honte du péché, notamment celui de la chair, entraîne la honte vis-à-vis de la conscience raciale, qui a pour conséquence la perte de la confiance en soi et l'irrésolution dans l'action.

De plus, non contente de développer des thèses anti-chrétiennes, Rosenberg rend public ses réflexions sur les religions antiques. Ainsi, il expose son hostilité à la religion étrusque. En effet, il présente la religion étrusque comme une agglomération de rites destinés à satisfaire les Enfers : ces rites, organisés par des prêtres, qui seraient également magiciens, seraient émaillés de sacrifices humains, dont les Étrusques se seraient rendus spécialistes. De plus, basée sur des rites initiatiques, la religion étrusque se caractériserait, selon Rosenberg, par son caractère indécent et amoral.

Cette hostilité envers le christianisme l'incite à encourager, d'accord avec Himmler, un culte spécifiquement germanique : en effet, il souhaite la renaissance du culte d'Odin, afin de favoriser, pour les Allemands, le retour aux valeurs nordiques. Ainsi, il préconise la mise en place d'un culte spécifiquement national-socialiste : ces célébrations, encouragées auprès des membres du Parti nazi, ces « *Lebenfeiern* », sont mises en avant par Rosenberg comme un nouveau calendrier, destiné à se substituer au calendrier chrétien : le soin apporté à l'organisation de ces fêtes publiques et privées témoigne de la politisation de la vie privée, mais l'agencement bureaucratique de Rosenberg, pour tenter d'encadrer certains excès, fait craindre à ce dernier, ainsi qu'à Himmler, autre ordonnateur du culte néo-païen national-socialiste, la mise en place d'un nouveau clergé ; pour éviter cet écueil, il préconise de donner à ces

célébrations un caractère privé. La mise en place de nouveau culte à visée très clairement politique rencontre peu de succès, en dehors des cercles nationaux-socialistes. Cette tentative ne rencontre pas le succès escompté chez les principaux dirigeants du « Reich » qui souhaitent ne pas heurter de front les églises établies ou qui voient leur attention absorbée par la guerre, mais inspire fortement Himmler dans ses efforts pour mettre en place une religiosité spécifique dans la SS.

À partir du début de l'année 1934, ses positions anti-chrétiennes lui valent l'hostilité du Vatican, son ouvrage étant mis à l'Index.

Dans « le Mythe du XXe Siècle », l'auteur prophétise la plongée du monde dans le chaos en cas de défaite de la race aryenne dans la lutte l'opposant au monde asiatique, qui a pris la forme du bolchévisme juif. La lutte, il l'annonce dès 1935 dans un discours devant une société savante, la « Nordische Gesellschaft », et en définit les principaux caractères : elle sera décisive, terrible et sans pitié, elle aura les traits d'une guerre raciale et idéologique et se soldera par la victoire ou la défaite totale de l'un des protagonistes. En cas de défaite des Aryens, le sort serait terrible : le métissage et la submersion du sang aryen, réputé pur, dans le sang impur des races inférieures.

Lors du procès de Rosenberg, le Tribunal Militaire International avait décidé, le 19 août 1945, de donner à la défense accès au journal que l'inculpé avait tenu avant et pendant la guerre, mais Alfred Thoma, avocat de Rosenberg, nota :

« Kempner ne nous le remet pas. »

Selon Thoma, l'accusation lui déclara que le journal était introuvable. En fait, le substitut Robert Kempner détourna frauduleusement de nombreuses pièces du procès, parmi lesquelles le journal, et, quand sa mission à Nuremberg fut terminée, emporta ces pièces avec lui aux États-Unis. Le journal fut récupéré par des agents de la « U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement », en juin 2013, auprès de l'ancienne secrétaire de Kempner, et, tout en restant propriété du gouvernement américain, fut déposé le 17 décembre 2013 au « United States Holocaust Memorial Museum » .

Selon le « United States Holocaust Memorial Museum », le bureau du procureur avait donné à Kempner l'autorisation d'emporter les pièces, mais selon la « U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement », la soustraction des documents par Kempner était contraire à la loi et à une procédure correcte.

D'après Jurgen Matthaus, directeur de recherches au « Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies » du « United States Holocaust Memorial Museum », Rosenberg était obsédé par les Juifs, mais cela n'apparaît guère dans son journal. Il aborde parfois le sujet, par exemple le 28 mars 1941, pour dire que cette race doit être séparée de toute l'Europe (« diese Rasse aus ganz Europa auszusondern »), mais le journal ne contient rien sur l'extermination des Juifs. Jurgen Matthaus conjecture que le motif de ce silence est que Rosenberg n'avait pas de raison d'entrer dans des détails sur les buts fondamentaux du Nazisme parce que, pour lui, ils allaient de soi.

Le journal de Rosenberg est consultable sur le site du « United States Holocaust Memorial Museum ». Il est publié en France, en 2015, chez l'éditeur Flammarion.

...

The Baltic German theorist and influential ideologue of the Nazi Party Alfred Ernst Rosenberg was born on 12 January 1893 in Reval in the Russian Empire (today known as Tallinn, the capital of modern Estonia) ; and died on 16 October 1946. He was 1st introduced to Adolf Hitler by Dietrich Eckart ; he later held several important posts in the Nazi government. He is considered one of the main authors of key National-Socialist ideological creeds, including its racial theory, persecution of the Jews, « Lebensraum » , abrogation of the Treaty of Versailles, and opposition to degenerate modern art. He is known for his rejection of and hatred for Christianity, having played an important role in the development of German Nationalist Positive Christianity. At Nuremberg, he was sentenced to death and executed by hanging as a War criminal and for crimes against humanity.

Rosenberg came from a family of Baltic Germans : his father, Waldemar Wilhelm Rosenberg, was a wealthy merchant from Latvia, his mother, Elfriede (« née » Siré) , was from Estonia. (Tallinn archivist J. Rajandi claimed in the 1930's that Rosenberg's family had Estonian origins.) According to the newest research, based on birth and death records from Estonian and Latvian parishes, Rosenberg's father Wilhelm was half-Estonian and half-Latvian in origin, and his mother Elfriede was German with an initially French background.

The young Rosenberg graduated from the « Petri-Realschule » (currently, « Tallinna Reaalkool ») in Reval and went on to study architecture at the Riga Polytechnical Institute and engineering at Moscow's Highest Technical School completing his Ph.D. studies in 1917. During his stays at home, in Reval, he attended the art-studio of the famed painter Ants Laikmaa, but even though he showed promise, there are no records that he ever exhibited. During the Russian Revolution of 1917, Rosenberg supported the counter-revolutionaries ; following their failure, he emigrated to Germany, in 1918, along with Max Scheubner-Richter who served as something of a mentor to Rosenberg and to his ideology. Arriving in Munich, he contributed to Dietrich Eckart's publication, the « Völkischer Beobachter » (Ethnic-Nationalist Observer) . By this time, he was both an antisemite (influenced by Houston Stewart Chamberlain's book « The Foundations of the 19th Century » : one of the key proto-Nazi books of racial theory) and an anti-bolshevik. Rosenberg became one of the earliest members of the German Workers' Party (later, the National-Socialist German Workers' Party, better known as the Nazi Party) , joining in January 1919 ; Adolf Hitler did not join until September 1919. Rosenberg had also been a member of the Thule Society, with Eckart. After the « Völkischer Beobachter » became the Nazi Party newspaper, on December 1920, Rosenberg became its editor in 1923. Rosenberg was a leading member of the « Aufbau Vereinigung » (Reconstruction Organization) a conspiratorial organization of White Russian « émigrés » which had a critical influence on early Nazi policy.

In 1923, after the failed Munich « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » , Hitler, who had been imprisoned for treason, appointed Rosenberg as a leader of the National-Socialist movement, a position he held until Hitler's release. Hitler remarked privately, in later years, that his choice of Rosenberg, whom he regarded as weak and lazy, was strategic ; Hitler did not want the temporary leader of the Nazis to become too popular or hungry for power, because a person with either of those 2 qualities might not want to cede the Party leadership after Hitler's release. However, at the time of the appointment, Hitler had no reason to believe that he would soon be released, and Rosenberg had not appeared weak,

so this may have been Hitler reading-back into history his dissatisfaction with Rosenberg for the job he did.

In 1929, Rosenberg founded the Militant League for German Culture (« Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur ») . He later formed the « Institute for the « Study of the Jewish Question » , dedicated to identifying and attacking Jewish influence in German culture and to recording the history of Judaism from a radical nationalist perspective. He became a « Reichstag » Deputy in 1930 and published his book on racial theory, « The Myth of the 20th Century » (« Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts ») which deals with key-issues in the National-Socialist ideology, such as the « Jewish Question » . Rosenberg intended his book as a sequel to Houston Stewart Chamberlain's above-cited book. Despite selling more than a million copies, by 1945, its influence within Nazism remains doubtful. It is often said to have been a book that was officially venerated within Nazism, but one that few had actually read beyond the 1st chapter or even found comprehensible. Hitler called it « stuff nobody can understand » and disapproved of its pseudo-religious tone.

Rosenberg convinced Hitler that communism was an international threat due to the fragility of the Soviet Union's internal political structure. « Jewish-Bolshevism » was accepted as a target for Nazism during the early 1920's.

In Rome, during November 1932, Rosenberg participated in the Volta Conference. British historian Sir Charles Petrie met him there and regarded him with great distaste, Petrie was a Catholic and strongly objected to Rosenberg's anti-Jewish and anti-Catholic sentiments.

The following year, once Hitler had become Chancellor, Rosenberg was named leader of the Nazi Party's foreign political office, but he played little practical part in the role. Another event of 1933 was Rosenberg's visit to Britain, intended to give the impression that the Nazis would not be a threat and to encourage links between the new regime and the British Empire. It was a notable failure. When Rosenberg laid a wreath bearing a swastika at the Cenotaph, a Labour Party candidate slashed it and later threw it in the Thames and was fined 40 shillings for willful damage at Bow Street magistrate's Court. In January 1934, Hitler granted Rosenberg responsibility for the spiritual and philosophical education of the Party and all related organizations.

As the Nazi Party's chief racial theorist, Rosenberg oversaw the construction of a human racial « ladder » that justified Hitler's racial and ethnic policies. Rosenberg built on the works of Arthur de Gobineau, Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Madison Grant, as well as on the beliefs of Hitler. He placed Blacks and Jews at the very bottom of the ladder, while at the very top stood the white « Aryan » race. Rosenberg promoted the Nordic theory which regarded Nordics as the « Master race » , superior to all others, including to other Aryans (Indo-Europeans) .

Rosenberg re-shaped Nazi racial policy over the years, but it always consisted of Aryan supremacy, extreme German nationalism and rabid anti-Semitism. Rosenberg also outspokenly opposed homosexuality (notably in his 1927 pamphlet, « Der Sumpf » : The Swamp) , he viewed homosexuality (particularly, lesbianism) as a hindrance to the expansion of the Nordic population.

Rosenberg's attitude towards Slavs was flexible and depended on the particular nation involved. As a result of the

ideology of « Drang nach Osten », Rosenberg saw his mission as the conquest and colonization of the Slavic East. In « Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts », Rosenberg describes Russian Slavs as being overwhelmed by bolshevism. Regarding Ukrainians, he favoured setting-up a buffer State to ease pressure on the German eastern frontier, while agreeing with the notion of the exploitation of Russia for the benefit of Germany.

Rosenberg argued for a new « religion of the blood », based on the supposed innate promptings of the Nordic soul to defend its noble character against racial and cultural degeneration. He believed that this had been embodied in early Indo-European religions, notably ancient European (Celtic, Germanic, Greek, Roman) paganism, Zoroastrianism, and Vedic Hinduism.

He rejected Christianity for its universality, for its doctrine of original sin (at least, for Germans whom he declared on one occasion were born noble), and for its teachings on the immortality of the soul. Indeed, absorbing Christianity enfeebled a people. Publicly, Rosenberg affected to deplore Christianity's degeneration owing to Jewish influence. Following Chamberlain's ideas, he condemned what he called « negative Christianity » (the orthodox beliefs of Protestant and Catholic churches), arguing instead for a so-called « positive » Christianity based on Chamberlain's claim that Jesus was a member of an Indo-European, Nordic enclave resident in ancient Galilee who struggled against Judaism. Significantly, in his work explicating the Nazi intellectual belief system, « The Myth of the 20th Century », Rosenberg cryptically alludes to and lauds the anti-Judaic arch-heretic Marcion and the Manichæan-inspired, « Aryo-Iranian » Cathari, as being the more authentic interpreters of Christianity versus historically dominant Judæo-Christianity; moreover, these ancient, externally Christian metaphysical forms were more « organically compatible with the Nordic sense of the spiritual and the Nordic “ blood-soul ” ». For Rosenberg, the anti-intellectual intellectual, religious doctrine was inseparable, from serving the interests of the Nordic race, connecting the individual to his racial nature.

Rosenberg stated that :

« The general ideas of the Roman and of the Protestant churches are negative Christianity and do not, therefore, accord with our (German) soul. »

His support for Martin Luther as a great German figure was always ambivalent.

In January 1934, Hitler had appointed Rosenberg as the cultural and educational leader of the « Reich ». The « Sanctum Officium », in Rome, recommended that Rosenberg's « Myth of the 20th Century » be put on the « Index Librorum Prohibitorum » (list of books forbidden by the Catholic Church) for scorning and rejecting « all dogmas of the Catholic Church, indeed, the very fundamentals of the Christian religion ». During World War II, Rosenberg outlined the future envisioned by the Hitler government for religion in Germany, with a 30 point program for the future of the German churches. Among its articles :

The National « Reich » Church of Germany would claim exclusive control over all churches publication of the Bible would cease crucifixes, Bibles and saints were to be removed from altars.

« Mein Kampf » would be placed on altars as « to the German nation and, therefore, to God the most sacred book »

The Christian Cross would be removed from all churches and replaced with the swastika.

In 1940, Rosenberg was made head of the « Hohe Schule » (literally : « High School » , but the German phrase refers to a College) , the Centre of National-Socialist Ideological and Educational Research, out of which the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) developed for the purpose of looting art and cultural goods. The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » were especially active in Paris in looting art stolen from famous Jewish families such as the Rothschilds and that of Paul Rosenberg. Hermann Göring used the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » to collect art for his own personal gratification. He created a « Special Task Force for Music » (« Sonderstab Musik ») to collect the best musical instruments and scores for use in a University to be built in Hitler's hometown of Linz, Austria. The orders given the « Sonderstab Musik » were to loot all forms of Jewish property in Germany and of those found in any country taken-over by the German army and any musical instruments or scores were to be immediately shipped to Berlin.

Following the invasion of the USSR, Rosenberg was appointed head of the « Reich » Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories (« Reichsministerium für die besetzten Ostgebiete ») . Alfred Meyer served as his deputy and represented him at the Wannsee Conference. Another official of the Ministry, Georg Leibbrandt, also attended the conference, at Rosenberg's request.

Rosenberg had presented Hitler with his plan for the organization of the conquered Eastern territories, suggesting the establishment of new administrative districts, to replace the previously Soviet-controlled territories with new « Reichskommissariats » .

These would be :

« Ostland » (Baltic countries and Belarus) .

Ukraine (Ukraine and nearest territories) .

« Kaukasus » (Caucasus area) .

« Moskau » (Moscow metropolitan area and the rest of nearest Russian European areas) .

Although Rosenberg regarded all the Soviet peoples as sub-humans for their communistic beliefs, such suggestions were intended to encourage certain non-Russian nationalism and to promote German interests for the benefit of future Aryan generations, in accord with geo-political « Lebensraum im Osten » plans. They would provide a buffer against Soviet expansion in preparation for the total eradication of Communism and Bolshevism by decisive pre-emptive

military action.

Following these plans, when the « Wehrmacht » forces invaded Soviet-controlled territory, they immediately implemented the 1st of the proposed « Reichskommissariats » of « Ostland » and Ukraine, under the leadership of Hinrich Lohse and Erich Koch, respectively. The organization of these administrative territories led to conflict between Rosenberg and the SS over the treatment of Slavs under German occupation. As Nazi Germany's chief racial theorist, Rosenberg considered Slavs, though lesser than Germans, to be Aryan. Rosenberg often complained to Hitler and Himmler about the treatment of non-Jewish occupied peoples. He proposed creation of buffer satellite States made-out of Greater Finland, Baltica, Ukraine, Caucasus.

In a 1941 conference speaking about the Jewish Question, he said :

« Some 6 million Jews still live in the East, and this question can only be solved by a biological extermination of the whole of Jewry in Europe. The “ Jewish Question ” will only be solved for Germany when the last Jew has left German territory, and for Europe when not a single Jew stands on the European continent as far as the Urals. And to this end, it is necessary to force them beyond the Urals or, otherwise, bring about their eradication. »

He made no complaints about the murders of Jews. At the Nuremberg Trials, he claimed to be ignorant of the Holocaust, despite the fact that Georg Leibbrandt and Alfred Meyer were present at the Wannsee Conference.

Since the invasion of the Soviet Union intended to impose the « New Order » , it was essentially a War of conquest. German propaganda efforts designed to win-over Russian opinion were, at best, patchy and inconsistent. Alfred Rosenberg was one of the few in the Nazi hierarchy who advocated a policy designed to encourage anti-Communist opinion among the population of the occupied territories. His interest, here, was mainly in the non-Russian areas such as the Ukraine and the Baltic States ; however, supporters of the Russian Liberation Army were somewhat able to win him over.

Amongst other things, Rosenberg issued a series of posters announcing the end of the Soviet collective farms (« Kolkhoz ») . He also issued an Agrarian Law, in February 1942, annulling all Soviet legislation on farming, restoring family farms for those willing to collaborate with the occupiers. But de-collectivisation conflicted with the wider demands of War-time food production, and Hermann Göring demanded that the collective farms be retained, save for a change of name. Hitler, himself, denounced the re-distribution of land as « stupid » .

There were numerous German armed forces (« Wehrmacht ») posters asking for assistance in the « Bandenkrieg » , the War against the Soviet partisans, though, once again, German policy had the effect of adding to their problems. Posters for « volunteer » labour, with inscriptions like « Come work with us to shorten the War » , hid the appalling realities faced by Russian workers in Germany. Many people joined the partisans rather than risk being sent to an unknown fate in the West.

Another of Rosenberg's initiatives, the « Free Caucasus » campaign, was rather more successful, attracting various

nationalities into the so-called Eastern Legion (« Ostlegionen ») , though, in the end, this made little difference in the outcome of the War on the Eastern Front.

Rosenberg was captured by Allied troops, at the end of the War, in Flensburg-Mürwik. He was tried at Nuremberg and found guilty of all 4 counts : conspiracy to commit crimes against peace ; planning, initiating and waging wars of aggression ; War crimes ; and crimes against humanity. The final judgment against him named him one of the principal planners of the invasions of Norway and the Soviet Union. It also held him directly responsible for the systematic plunder of the occupied countries of Europe, as well as the brutal conditions in Eastern Europe. During his trial, he wrote his memoirs, which were published posthumously and with analytical commentary by Serge Lang and Ernst von Schenk.

He was sentenced to death and executed with other condemned co-defendants at Nuremberg, on the morning of 16 October 1946. His body, as those of the other 9 executed men and the corpse of Hermann Göring, was cremated at the « Ostfriedhof » , in Munich, and the ashes were scattered in the river Isar.

Throughout the trial, it was agreed that Rosenberg had a decisive role in shaping Nazi philosophy and ideology. Examples include : his book, « Myth of the 20th Century » , which was published in 1930, where he incited hatred against « Liberal Imperialism » and « Bolshevik Marxism » ; furthering the influence of the « Lebensraum » idea in Germany during the War ; facilitating the persecution of Christian churches and the Jews, in particular ; and opposition to the Versailles Treaty.

According to Joseph Kingsbury-Smith, who covered the executions for the International News Service, Rosenberg was the only condemned man who, when asked at the gallows if he had any last statement to make, replied with only one word : « No » .

Adolf Hitler was a leader oriented towards practical politics, whereas, for Rosenberg, religion and philosophy were key and culturally he was the most influential within the Party. Several accounts of the time, before the Nazi ascension to power, indeed, speak of Hitler as being a mouthpiece for Rosenberg's views, and he clearly exerted a great deal of intellectual influence.

Rosenberg's influence in the Nazi Party is controversial. He was perceived as lacking the charisma and political skills of the other Nazi leaders, and was somewhat isolated. In some of his speeches, Hitler appeared to be close to Rosenberg's views : rejecting traditional Christianity as a religion based on Jewish culture, preferring an ethnically and culturally pure « Race » whose destiny was supposed to be assigned to the German people by « Providence » . In others, he adhered to the Nazi Party line, which advocated a « positive Christianity » .

After Hitler's assumption of power, he moved to re-assure the Protestant and Catholic churches that the Party was not intending to re-institute Germanic paganism. He placed himself in the position of being the man to save « positive Christianity » from utter-destruction at the hands of the atheistic antitheist Communists of the Soviet Union. This was especially true immediately before and after the elections of 1932 ; Hitler wanted to appear non-threatening to major

Christian faiths and consolidate his power. Further, Hitler felt that Catholic-Protestant in-fighting had been a major factor in weakening the German State and allowing its dominance by foreign powers.

Some Nazi leaders, such as Martin Bormann, were anti-Christian and sympathetic to Rosenberg. Once in power, Hitler and most Nazi leaders sought to unify the Christian denominations in favour of « positive Christianity ». Hitler privately condemned mystical and pseudo-religious interests as « nonsense ». However, he and Goebbels agreed that, after the « Endsieg » (Final Victory) , the « Reich » Church should be pressed into evolving into a German social evolutionist organization proclaiming the cult of race, blood and battle, instead of Redemption and the 10 Commandments of Moses, which they deemed outdated and Jewish.

Heinrich Himmler's views were among the closest to Rosenberg's, and their estrangement was, perhaps, created by Himmler's abilities to put into action what Rosenberg had only written. Also, while Rosenberg thought Christianity should be allowed to die-out, Himmler actively set-out to create countering pagan rituals.

Lieutenant Colonel William Harold Dunn (1898-1955) wrote a medical and psychiatric report on him in prison to evaluate him as a suicide risk :

« He gave the impression of clinging to his own theories in a fanatical and unyielding fashion and to have been little influenced by the unfolding during the trial of the cruelty and crimes of the Party. »

Summarizing the unresolved conflict between the personal views of Rosenberg and the pragmatism of the Nazi elite :

« The ruthless pursuit of Nazi aims turned-out to mean not, as Rosenberg had hoped, the permeation of German life with the new ideology ; it meant concentration of the combined resources of Party and State on “ Total War ”. »

Rosenberg was married twice : in 1915 to Hilda Leesmann, an ethnic Estonian (divorced in 1923) ; and, in 1925, to Hedwig Kramer with whom he was married until his execution. He and Kramer had 2 children : a son who died in infancy and a daughter, Irene, who was born in 1930. His daughter has refused contact with anyone seeking information about her father.

...

Nazism was not an intellectual movement : it courted the masses rather than the intelligentsia, film was its favourite form of propaganda, and it relied on dramatic spectacles and performances rather than appeals to rationality. Famed for book-burning rather than book-writing, the Nazi Party did, however, rely on a few texts to consolidate and spread its vision. Some examples are Adolf Hitler's « Mein Kampf » (My Struggle) , written while he was in prison, in 1925, and Houston Stewart Chamberlain's « Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts » (The Foundations of the 19th Century, in 1899) . Another was Alfred Rosenberg's « Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts » (The Myth of the 20th Century, in 1934) , which argued for the supremacy of the « Aryan » race and the threat posed by the Jew. During his involvement with the Party, Rosenberg was embroiled in countless official intrigues and back-stabbing, and his

struggle for power with Josef Gœbbels remains one of the most carefully analyzed conflicts between upper-level Nazi officials. As the head of the « Reich » Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories, he was involved in the formulation of Nazi policy in the East. Perhaps less well-known is his central role in Nazi Germany's musical history.

The child of Baltic Germans, Alfred Rosenberg was born on 12 January 1893 in Estonia. As an ethnic German who later returned « home » to Germany, Rosenberg fashioned himself as a representative of the « völkisch » (folk) movement, which focused on blood and race as defining attributes of identity. Like many Germans, he blamed the Jews for Germany's defeat in World War I, as well as for the Russian Revolution, and perceived them as being a major threat to the strength of the « Aryan » race.

Seeking involvement in various radical Right and anti-Semitic organizations, Rosenberg was an editor of the newspaper « Völkische Beobachter », one of the Nazi Party's most important mouthpieces. He came into contact with Adolf Hitler as early as 1919, recognizing in him a leader who would strengthen Germany. Hitler, in turn, saw in Rosenberg a passionate and loyal follower, who had neither the charisma nor the vision to threaten his leadership.

In 1929, Rosenberg founded the « Kampfbund für Deutsche Kultur » (Combat League for German Culture, or KfdK) , one of the most active early Nazi organizations. With the goal of strengthening « suppressed » Aryan artists and eliminating « degenerate » ones, the « Kampfbund für Deutsche Kultur » published inflammatory brochures and reviews of Jewish and modernist musicians, funded like-minded artists, and pursued practices of disrupting concerts, threatening undesirable performers and intimidating audiences.

Following his success with the « Kampfbund », Rosenberg worked on « Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts ». The book cast the history of the world as an eternal struggle between « Aryans » and Jews, Africans and other « inferior » peoples. Although criticized by some for being overly theoretical and abstract, it was a best-seller. Given the success of his book and the substantial impact of the « Kampfbund », Rosenberg expected to take control of cultural affairs when Hitler came to power. He was sorely disappointed, however, when Gœbbels was appointed « Reich » Minister of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda. Rosenberg also saw competition in Hermann Göring, who controlled the Theatre scene ; Bernhard Rust, a music fan and the Minister of Education ; and Robert Ley, leader of the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront », which controlled the « Deutsche Musikerverband », the largest professional musicians' union in Germany.

Rosenberg's conflict with Gœbbels continued for years, strategically nurtured by Hitler, who frequently exploited such rivalries to his own benefit. The struggle extended into competition between overlapping offices and assignments. At Gœbbels' request, Hitler created a « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Cultural Chamber, or RKK) , in September 1933, which included a branch responsible for music (« Reichsmusikkammer », or RMK). Around the same time, Robert Ley created the « Kraft durch Freude » (Strength through Joy, or KdF) movement, which was largely a cultural organization. Rosenberg perceived these new organizations as a direct attack on his authority and, indeed, his « Kampfbund » was soon absorbed into Ley's organization.

He was later declared Commissioner for the Entire Intellectual and Ideological Training and Education of the Party, but

this lengthy title did not bring with it a substantial amount of power. His office had its impact mostly on the German music world. Rosenberg's organization actively encouraged the involvement of German musicologists in Nazi activities and the expansion of the « Reich ». His office was an important source of funding for musicological research on the subject of race. He also created a special « task force » for music (« Sonderstab Musik ») that was responsible for plundering the musical treasures of deported and murdered Jewish communities, as well as those of occupied lands.

After the invasion of the Soviet Union, in 1941, Rosenberg acquired the new position of « Reich » Minister of the Occupied Eastern Territories. It was his War-time activities that were central to his judgment at the Nuremberg Trials, where he was found guilty of crimes against humanity and executed alongside other high-ranking Nazi officials.

« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg »

L'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR), Équipe d'intervention du « Reichsleiter » Rosenberg, était une section du bureau de politique étrangère du NSDAP, dirigée dès 1933 par Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946). L'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » se voulait être l'organe exécutif de la « Hoher Schule » (École supérieure) de Rosenberg.

L'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » a effectué, à partir de 1940, d'importantes confiscations de biens appartenant à des Juifs et des Franc-maçons dans les territoires occupés par la « Wehrmacht ».

Par un ordre du « Führer » du 5 juillet 1940, Adolf Hitler autorise l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » à confisquer :

Les bibliothèques d'État et les archives des manuscrits précieux pour l'Allemagne.

Les greffes des autorités ecclésiastiques et des loges maçonniques.

Tous les autres biens culturels de valeur appartenant à des Juifs.

En juillet 1940, l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » a été mis en place à Paris. L'administration centrale a toutefois été transférée à Berlin, le 1er mars 1941. D'avril 1941 à juillet 1944, 29 convois ont transporté des biens saisis de Paris jusqu'au château de Neuschwanstein, en Allemagne, où l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » avait constitué son principal lieu d'entreposage. Jusqu'au 17 octobre 1944, selon l'estimation de l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » elle-même, 1,418,000 wagons de chemin de fer contenant des livres et des œuvres d'art (ainsi que 427,000 tonnes par bateau) ont ainsi transité vers l'Allemagne.

Instauré à Paris, en juillet 1940, il est dirigé par le baron Kurt von Behr (1890-1945) assisté de Bruno Lohse (1911-2007). Des objets d'art ont été confisqués dans plus de 50 lieux différents et exposés lors de 7 expositions au « Jeu de Paume », surtout dans le but de montrer à Alfred Rosenberg et Hermann Göring, avec lequel l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » collabore étroitement à Paris, une vue d'ensemble des objets précieux confisqués. Les bibliothèques ayant fait l'objet de saisies, dont la « Bibliothèque polonaise », la « Bibliothèque Turgenjev » et les bibliothèques de nombreuses loges parisiennes devaient alimenter la bibliothèque centre de l'École supérieure. Mi-1941,

le travail de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » en France était pratiquement achevé. Selon le rapport de travail, 203 collectes avaient concerné 21,903 objets. Rose Valland, attachée de conservation au « Jeu de Paume », a fait l'inventaire détaillé des œuvres transférées, et de leur déplacement de 1940 à 1944.

L' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » a créé de nombreuses antennes en Europe de l'Est. Elle était en concurrence avec d'autres institutions nazies, notamment le « Sonderkommando » Künsberg et la Communauté de recherche et d'enseignement « Ahnenerbe » sous la tutelle de Heinrich Himmler. Les 3 organisations s'occupaient en collaboration avec la « Wehrmacht » et la SS de détecter, de classer et d'évacuer (ou de détruire) des œuvres d'art et des archives.

Berlin

Le Bureau central de Berlin, sous la direction de Georg Ebert (jusqu'en 1941) et, plus tard, de Gerhard Utikal, se divisait en 3 sections :

Département III : Missions spéciales.

Département IIIa : Organisation de la mise en sécurité des biens juifs

Département IIIb : Gestion commerciale pour l'équipe des arts figuratifs.

Équipes spécialisées de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » en France

Sous la direction de Gerhard Utikal, des docteurs Gerhard Wunder et Karl Brethauer, de Franz Seiboth et de l'inspecteur Hans Hagemeyer, 5 équipes spéciales coordonnaient l'activité de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » à Paris :

Équipe musique (Docteur Herbert Gerigk) .

Équipe arts figuratifs (Kurt von Behr, Robert Scholz) .

Équipe bibliothèques des grandes écoles (Docteur Walter Grothe) .

Équipe préhistoire (Professeur Hans Reinerth) .

Équipe églises (Anton Deinert) .

L' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » avait des représentations à Amsterdam, Bruxelles, Belgrade, Riga, Reval, Vilnius, Dorpat, Minsk, Horki, Smolensk, Kiev, Kharkov, Dniepropetrovsk, Simferopol et Hohenschwangau.

...

The « Reichsleiter » Rosenberg Task-force (« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , or ERR) was a Nazi Party

organization dedicated to appropriating cultural property during the Second World War. It was led by the chief-ideologue of the Nazi Party, Alfred Rosenberg, from within the NSDAP Office of Foreign Affairs (« Außenpolitischen Amt der NSDAP » , or APA) . Between 1940 and 1945, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » operated in France, the Benelux countries, Poland, the Baltic States, Greece, Italy and on the territory of the Soviet Union in the « Reichskommissariat Ostland » and « Reichskommissariat Ukraine » . Much of the looted material was recovered by the Allies after the War, and returned to rightful owners, but there remains a substantial part which either has been lost or remains with the Allied powers.

The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » was initially a project of the « Hohe Schule der NSDAP » , a Nazi-oriented elite university, which was subordinate to Alfred Rosenberg. Rosenberg wanted it to be a research institute filled with cultural material on the opponents of the Nazi ideology. These included Jewish, Masonic, Communist and Democratic organizations from throughout Germany and from the occupied countries. Plans to build monumental buildings for the University on the shores of Lake Chiemsee failed to materialize after the outbreak of World War II.

Shortly after the occupation of France, the staff of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » joined the SS in the search for books, archival material, and huge stocks of artifacts that were in the possession of people of Jewish descent. Soon after, the German Embassy in Paris and « SS-Einsatzgruppen » also began to steal the most valuable paintings from prominent national museums, galleries, and non-Jewish private collections. Rosenberg and his organization wanted to be involved in these art-raids. He was able to get full authority from Hitler to be the only official art procurement organization acting in the occupied countries. For this reason, in a « Führer » Directive of 5 July 1940, Adolf Hitler authorized the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » to confiscate :

Precious manuscripts and books from national libraries and archives.

Important artifacts of ecclesiastical authorities and Masonic lodges.

All valuable cultural property belonging to Jews.

The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » was officially established in « Office West » in Paris and was divided into different functional departments. The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » central administration was transferred to Berlin, on 1 March 1941, where it became formal subdivision of the German Foreign Office.

The Nazis were so eager to acquire valuable Masterpieces that art theft became the most important field of work of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » . In addition to art, many libraries were looted for the Institute for the Study of the « Jewish Question » , in Frankfurt, but especially for the library of the « Hohe Schule » . The operations staff had 8 main regional task-forces and 5 technical task-forces (music, visual arts, history, libraries, churches) . Raids connected with the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » also plundered the belongings of people deported to Nazi concentration camps. Between April 1941 to July 1944, 29 convoys transported goods seized from Paris to Neuschwanstein Castle, in Germany, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » 's principal place of storage. Until 17 October 1944, as estimated by the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » itself, 1,418,000 railway wagons containing books and works of art (as well as 427,000 tonnes by ship) were transitioned to Germany.

Belarus

« More than 200 libraries of Belarus, especially the State (now, National) library, suffered irreparable damage during the occupation. An associate of the national library, T. Roshchina, calculated that 83 % of the library's collection was plundered and destroyed. After the War, some 600,000 volumes from the library were found in Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and were subsequently returned. About 1 million books, however, including rare and old printed volumes, have still not been located. »

« Day-by-day, for 26 months, the Hitlerites systematically destroyed one of the most ancient Russian cities, Smolensk. The Soviet Prosecution has presented to the Tribunal a document as Document Number USSR-56, containing the report of the Extraordinary State Commission of the Soviet Union. I shall not quote this document ; but I shall only refer to it and endeavor, in my own words, to emphasize the fundamental points of this document, dealing with the reported theme now. In Smolensk, the German Fascist invaders plundered and destroyed the most valuable collections in the museums. They desecrated and burned-down ancient monuments ; they destroyed schools and institutes, libraries, and sanatoriums. The report also mentions the fact that, in April 1943, the Germans needed rubble to pave the roads. For this purpose, they blew-up the intermediate school. The Germans burned-down all the libraries of the city and 22 schools ; 646,000 volumes perished in the library fires. »

Belgium

By the middle of 1941, most of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » work in Belgium concentrated on small collections in Jewish homes. Larger operations involved the Jesuit convent, in Enghien, involved removing 200 crates of books and archives, and looting the « École des Hautes-Études » , in Ghent, which involved transporting 56 crates of books.

« Both institutions were considered outposts of French culture on Flemish soil and unfriendly to Nazism. »

The Jesuit collection was considered a treasure trove of information on the politics of Catholicism in Belgium, and of Catholic procedures to thwart the Germans. The Jesuit College in Leuven and the regional office in Brussels, for example, acted as a refuge for library materials.

« Libraries and archives seen as enemy and international were confiscated outright by the “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ”, as indicated by the following 3 examples. The contents of the Communist book-shop OBLA, Brussels, were sent to Racibórz, Poland. The records of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning were confiscated and brought to Germany. A similar fate overtook the archives and library of the international Jesuit College at Enghien, which was called a “ Zentrale der anti-Deutschland speziell anti-National-Sozialistischen Information ” (Center for anti-German and anti-National Socialist Information) . »

Czechoslovakia

« The 700,000 volumes of the Charles University Library, in Prague, were stolen as a unit. »

A library was created in the Theresienstadt ghetto, about 40 miles from Prague. Books were brought in by many of the people deported to this camp as part of their personal possessions, but also books from the collections of the Rabbinical Seminary Libraries of Berlin and Breslau, and the Jewish communities of Berlin and Vienna were also shipped there as well. Part of the German effort also included having the prisoners translate and catalog many Hebrew books, to be added to the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » « Museum of the Extinct Race » envisioned by Alfred Rosenberg. Almost 30,000 Hebrew and Judaica volumes had catalog cards created by the ghetto inmates.

In 1935, there were 17,148 public, school and university libraries in Czechoslovakia, having a book stock of 8,528,744 volumes. Many of these items were confiscated by the Germans, especially any Czech books dealing with geography, biography or history. Works by any Czech writers were taken away, many burned, most others taken directly to the paper pulp mills. Special libraries were devastated, and suffered a loss of about 2,000,000 volumes.

France

Georg Ebert, who was a member of Rosenberg's « Aussenpolitisches Amt » (NSDAP Bureau for Foreign Affairs, also referred to as the APA) , discovered that a Masonic lodge, the Grand Orient, had been abandoned in Paris. This was one of the most important Masonic lodges in Europe. Ebert personally guarded the building, with its library collection and archives, until he could turn it over to the army. This was one point in the origin of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , which eventually developed into a central headquarters in Berlin, with subsidiary offices (« Hauptarbeitsgruppen » : Main Work Groups) in Paris, Amsterdam, Brussels, Belgrade, Riga and other cities.

« In January 1940, Hitler gave Rosenberg his task : to loot Jewish and Masonic cultural treasures, including synagogues, libraries, and archives in western Europe. By fall 1940, Hitler ordered Rosenberg to confiscate all Jewish art-collections since these materials were now deemed “ ownerless ” by Nazi decree. Jews in France, as in most of Europe, were now labeled “ Stateless ” and no longer had property rights. With France part of the German-occupied territories, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » and Alfred Rosenberg now fell under Hermann Göring's authority and control, with the « Gestapo » seeking-out Jewish houses, apartments, and shops in the hopes of finding valuable pieces. »

« Alfred Rosenberg reported to Dolf Hitler that his “ Einsatzstab ” had commenced confiscations in Paris, by October 1940, with the assistance of the “ Service de la Sûreté ” (SD) and the “ Police Secrète Militaire ” (“ Geheime Feldpolizei ”) . »

The « Sonderstab Bildende Kunst » (Special Arts Staff) , a section of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , confiscated numerous Jewish art-collections, often of international renown (for instance, the Rothschild collection) . In the Netherlands, this « Sonderstab » did not seize much more than about 1,000 works of art. The « Sonderstab Musik, Kirchen, Osten, Bibliothekenaufbau der Hohen Schule und Rassenpolititische Fragen » (Special Staffs for Music, Churches, the East, the High-School Library and Race-political Questions) each fought for its own corner. By 1942, no fewer than 3,500 collections, libraries and archives had been « secured » by the « Hauptarbeitsgruppe Frankreich » (Main Working Group, France) of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » - France having been divided into 5 Districts. The libraries of the « Alliance Israélite Universelle » (AIU) and the French Rabbinical Seminary (SIF) were high on the list of German locations to loot. The « Alliance Israélite Universelle » had built a new library in 1937, including an 8

story high tower and reading-room, and boasting of 50,000 books. By March 1940, 647 crates of books had been removed from the « Alliance Israélite Universelle », and 243 crates of books from the French Rabbinical Seminary. A list by the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg », dated March 1941, indicated that 81 libraries had been looted in Paris alone, and a later supplemental list included another 30 libraries of Jewish, Masonic, Socialist and « émigré » collections had been seized.

« These albums were created by the staff of the 3d “ Reich ” ’s “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ” (ERR) . This special unit was organized in the summer of 1940 under “ Reich ” Leader Alfred Rosenberg, initially to collect political material in occupied countries for exploitation in the “ struggle against Jewry and Freemasonry ”. »

The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » established its base of operations in Paris, in July 1940, and, on November 5, Hermann Göring assigned the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » the responsibility for the confiscation of « ownerless » Jewish art-collections. On November 18 of that year, Adolf Hitler ordered that all confiscated works of art be brought to Germany and placed at his personal disposal.

Pre-War Paris was the world's largest and most important art-market. This was where well-off French, European and American collectors bought and sold their best pieces. From the beginning of the 20th Century, Jewish « marchands d'art » had established themselves as the best art-dealers and experts, resultantly shaping and influencing global taste. Dealers included : the Wildensteins, where Georges Wildenstein dealt in Old Masters ; the Bernheim-Jeunes who specialized in Impressionists and post-Impressionists painters (in 1901, it had opened the 1st Van Gogh show) ; and Paul Rosenberg, the contracted dealer of Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque.

During the next several years, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » would be engaged in an extensive and elaborate art-looting operation in France that was part of Hitler's much larger premeditated scheme to steal art-treasures from conquered nations. Soon after the German occupation of France, in 1940, the German military and, subsequently, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg », focused their art-confiscations on the world-renowned Jewish-owned art-collections from families such as the Rothschilds, and the Veil-Picards, Alphonse Kann, and Jewish dealers such as the Seligmanns. According to the German « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » documents from 1944, the art-seizures in France totaled 21,903 objects from 203 collections. There were 5,009 items confiscated from the Rothschild family collections ; 2,687 items from the David-Weill collection ; and 1,202 from Alphonse Kann's collection. French officials, at the end of the War, estimated that 1/3 of all art in French private hands had been confiscated.

Galerie nationale du Jeu de Paume

All looted and confiscated artworks were initially shipped by truck to the « Galerie nationale du Jeu de Paume », where Nazi art-historians, experts, photographers, maintenance and administrative personnel appraised, filed, photographed and packed the now decreed « ownerless cultural goods » for transport to Germany. The 1st shipment artworks sent to Germany from Paris required 30 rail-cars and consisted primarily of Rothschild paintings intended for the « Führermuseum » (European Museum of Art) in Linz, Austria. Among the 1st 53 paintings shipped to Adolf Hitler was Vermeer's « Astronome » from the Édouard de Rothschild collection, today in the « Musée du Louvre » in Paris. As the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » staff looted and catalogued the French collections, they created

photograph albums specifically intended for the « Reichskanzlei » (« Reich » Chancellery) and Hitler in an effort to keep them apprised of their work in France, and more importantly, to provide a catalogue of items from which Hitler and his curators could choose art treasures for « Führermuseum » . A group of these photograph albums were presented to Hitler on the occasion of his birthday, on April 20, 1943, by Alfred Rosenberg to « send a ray of beauty and joy into his revered life » . « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » staff stated that nearly 100 such volumes were created during the years of their art-looting operation.

« The latest advices from authentic neutral sources said that the “ Gestapo ” had seized the libraries of all the Masonic organizations in France. The “ Bibliothèque Nationale ” (the French National Library) there upon put in a claim for these books, but the latest word was that the Germans declined to hand over them over, saying the material would be sent to Germany for purposes of study. The library of the “ Alliance Israélite ” in Paris, worth several million Francs, also was said to have been seized and sent to Germany. From the “ Bibliothèque Nationale ” (one of the world’s leading libraries) , the Germans were reported to have received an inventory of manuscripts, rare books and similar material that had been stored elsewhere in France for security during the War. German officials, according to the information received here, have been exercising close supervision over the French publishing industry. They have also taken-over the “ Maison du Livre Français ”, the most important French book exporting agency. »

So-called « degenerate art » was legally banned by the Nazis from entering Germany, and so, once designated, was held in what was called the « Martyr's Room » at the « Jeu de Paume » . Much of Paul Rosenberg's professional dealership and personal collection were so subsequently designated by the Nazis. Following Josef Goebbels earlier private decree to sell these « degenerate » works for foreign currency to fund the building of the « Führermuseum » and the wider War effort, Hermann Göring personally appointed a series of « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » approved dealers to liquidate these assets and, then, pass the funds to swell his personal art-collection, including Hildebrand Gurlitt. With the looted « degenerate art » sold onwards via Switzerland, Rosenberg's collection was scattered across Europe. Today, some 70 of his paintings are missing, including : the large Picasso watercolour « Naked Woman on the Beach » , painted in Provence in 1923 ; 7 works by Henri Matisse ; and the « Portrait of Gabrielle Diot » by Edgar Degas.

After the War, many of the books hidden by the Germans were collected by the Monuments, Fine-Arts and Archives section of the American military government, and collected at the Offenbach Depot. There, many of the larger collections were identified and eventually returned to their owners.

By the end of 1948 :

« The French regained the archives of the Paris bank of “ Rothschild Frères ” ; the Libschutz “ Librairie de Paris ” ; the library of the “ Alliance Israélite Universelle de Paris ” ; the library of the “ École Rabbiniqque de Paris ” ; and the “ Bibliothèque de Chinon ”. »

Greece

Greece was also visited by the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » after the country's fall, in April 1941. A special unit headed by Doctor Johannes Pohl, chief of the Hebraica collection at the Frankfurt Institute's library, appeared in Salonica, where he had the Alfred Rosenberg agents seal the yeshiva collections, in which the city abounded. However, members of the community were able to hide or disguise many of the collections from the Germans. A later visit, in September 1942, by a scholar named Mærtsch, likewise resulted in no new additions to the Frankfurt library. However, a 1943 report does show that 10,000 volumes had been received from Greece.

Before the War, Greece was rich in libraries. The National Library, which included the Public and University libraries in Athens, contained more than 400,000 volumes.

« Reports reaching American authorities, in Cairo, have told of the pillaging of libraries, laboratories and work-shops of the Universities of Athens and Salonika. A large part of the University of Athens library is reported to be lost. The libraries of 3 American Colleges were reported to have been used as fuel in the central heating system used by the Germans. »

Italy

« The “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ” were also active in the West. After the German occupations of Rome, in 1943, “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ” officers inspected the contents of the Roman Synagogue's 2 great libraries, which contained extraordinary collections gathered over the 2,000 year history of Jewish life, in Rome. They demanded the libraries' catalogs ; just days before the 1st deportation of Roman Jews to Auschwitz, 2 specially ordered rail-cars destined for Alfred Rosenberg's institute in Frankfurt were loaded with 10,000 books from these libraries. »

« 2 archaeological libraries, the Hertziana Library of History and Art, and the German Archaeological Institute's library of the history, topography, art and customs of ancient Rome, were removed from Rome and taken to Germany by the Nazis. At the end of the War, the 2 library collections were discovered in 2 Austrian salt mines, packed away in 1,985 wooden cases. The German Library's collection was unharmed, but some of the Hertziana collection and the card catalog were damaged by water when part of the mine flooded. They were returned to Rome, where they became part of the Gallery of Modern Art, where both collections will be in the care of the new International Union for the study of Archaeology, Art and History in Rome. »

After the War, many of the major collections looted from Italy were identified by the Monuments, Fine-Arts and Archives service of the American military government and returned to their owners. The « Collegio Rabbinico Italiano » , the « Kunsthistorische Institut Florenz » , and the « Deutsche Historische Bibliothek Rom » were all returned, although not all were intact, to their owners in Italy.

« These last 2 collections were seized by Hitler with the idea of re-establishing them in Germany. »

Lithuania

In Vilna (Vilnius, Vilno, Wilno) , the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » set-up a collecting point for Lithuania. Doctor

Gotthard of the Berlin headquarters arrived in August 1941, and began looting the Strashun library. He conscripted the labor of 2 « Gestapo » prisoners, including A.Y. Goldschmidt, librarian of the Hispanic-Ethnographic Society. Eventually, he committed suicide rather than assist the looting of the libraries. Doctor Johannes Pohl appeared in January 1942, and ordered that the city be made a collecting point for the region, and concentrated at the « Yidisher Visenshaftlikker Institut » (Institute for Jewish Research) . Materials were brought-in from the private collections from Kovno, Shavle, Mariapol, Volozhn and other towns, and included books from over 300 synagogues and personal libraries. Some of the Jewish workers were able to smuggle-out and hide some of the most valuable books in the ghetto, which was stopped when the ghetto was liquidated in July 1943. The accumulated collection of over 100,000 volumes were separated into piles by Century of publication, and about 20,000 were selected for shipment to Germany. The remaining materials were pulped to avoid storage and transportation costs, and to make a small profit. One incident involved an assistant of Doctor Pohl dumping-out 5 cases of rare books, in order to make room for an illegal shipment of hogs.

The Netherlands

« The “ Einsatzstab Reichleiter Rosenberg ” (ERR) , established by Alfred Rosenberg, in 1939, was represented in the Netherlands by an Amsterdam office. In 1940, the “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ” confiscated all property belonging to the Freemasons, among which was the famous “ Biblioteca Klossiana ”. This library had been bought by Prince Hendrik (1876-1934) (Duke Henry of Mecklenburg-Schwerin) , husband of Queen Wilhemina (Wilhelmina of the Netherlands) , and had been presented by him to the order of Freemasons. It contained important “ incunabula ” and books on the occult, which were not available anywhere else in the Netherlands. Other parts of the library and the order’s archive were of importance as well. The library of the International Institute for Social History, in Amsterdam, was closed, and the “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ” took-over the building for its offices. In July 1940, the Institute’s very important collection of newspapers and the library of approximately 160,000 volumes were confiscated. German arguments over their final destination kept the materials in Amsterdam until the winter of 1944, when they were transported to Germany in 11 ships. The International Archives of the Women’s Movement, established in Amsterdam, in 1935, lost its whole collection after the institute was closed by the “ Sicherheitspolizei ” (Security Police) , in June 1940. In August 1942, 499 crates containing books and archives taken from, among others, Jewish antiquarian book-dealers and theosophical Societies were transported to Berlin. »

Most of the looted Jewish property, especially books, was sent to Rosenberg’s « Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage » , in Frankfurt. Established in March 1941, the Institute served as the core research library for the planned « Hohe Schule » . Some of the other « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » research institutes that received looted books included the « Institut für Biologie und Rassenlehre » , in Stuttgart, the « Institut für Religionswissenschaft » , and the « Institut für Deutsche Volkskunde » . In the Netherlands, where Seeligmann’s library was looted, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » enjoyed a monopoly on cultural property confiscation, between 1940 and 1944. A particularly large number of books were seized, with an estimated value of 30 to 40 million « Reichsmarks » . However, not all of those books were sent to the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » ’s research institutes. Certain collections, including Seeligmann’s, were sent to other Nazi agencies, such as the « Reich » Security Main-Office (« Reichssicherheitshauptamt » , or RSHA) in Berlin. The « Reichssicherheitshauptamt » was interested specifically in information about those they perceived to be the prime enemies of the « Reich » . Accordingly, the « Reichssicherheitshauptamt » in Berlin received

looted library and archival materials relating to « enemies » such as the Jews. The « Reichssicherheitshauptamt » Office 7 (« Amt VII ») , which specialized in ideological research, established a center for the evaluation of looted documents. By August 1943, it contained more than 500,000 catalogued volumes. Most of the Jewish materials collected by « Amt VII » related to Zionist groups, rescue agencies, communities, and cultural organizations. Materials pertaining to Jewish political, economic, cultural, and intellectual leaders were also collected. Seeligmann, who founded the « Genootschap voor Joodsche Wetenschap in Nederland » (Society for the Science of Judaism in the Netherlands) and served as president of the Dutch Zionist Organization, likely would have been of great interest to the « Reichssicherheitshauptamt » . By August 1943, his library became part of the « Amt VII » library and archive center.

Norway

In Norway, there were 150 school libraries and 50 public libraries that were destroyed by the Germans. Most of these libraries were in the province of Finnmark, where there was wide-spread destruction during the evacuation of the German armies. Interestingly enough, the Norwegians did not burn the German propaganda works that had filled their shelves when the original Norwegian books were removed. They will be kept for the study by future generations who will want to study the period of the German occupation.

Poland

« From the very beginning of the establishment of the “ Staatsbibliothek Krakau ”, special importance was given to materials related to the natural sciences, mathematics, geography and medicine. In the fiscal year 1940-1941, the amount of money spent on book purchases was surprisingly high. »

The Germans recognized the value of the scientific collection and, from 1941 through 1944, 35,599 books were borrowed by 2,621 patrons, mostly German civil servants and military personnel. Polish civilians were not allowed access to the library during the occupation. Gustav Abb, the German overseer of libraries, decided to send much of the reference collection to Germany, in 1944.

« Abb decided to send the major part of the reference collection, as well as most of the books bought by the “ Staatsbibliothek ” to Germany (altogether, about 25,000 volumes) . Polish librarians, charged with the task of filling boxes with books, tried to sabotage Abb’s orders. They hid a large number of books and stuffed boxes with old newspapers. Despite those heroic efforts to save the collection, the Germans were still able to send a great number of books to Adelsdorf (Adelin) , in Silesia. Fortunately, after the War, the library was able to recover most of the books that Abb had evacuated from the library. »

Later in the War, the main reading-room was used as sleeping quarters for German soldiers, and other parts of the library were used as a hospital for Germans.

From the « Frankfurter Zeitung » , Wochen-Ausgabe, 28 March 1941 :

« For us, it is a matter of special pride to destroy the Talmudic Academy which has been known as the greatest in

Poland. We threw-out of the building the great Talmudic Library and carted it to market. There, we set fire to the books. The fire lasted for 20 hours. The Jews of Lublin were assembled around and cried bitterly. The cries almost silenced us. Then, we summoned a military band, and the joyful shouts of the soldiers silenced the sounds of Jewish cries. »

Soviet Union

Alfred Rosenberg commanded the « Einsatzstab Reichleiter Rosenberg für die Besetzten Gebiete » (ERR) that was responsible for collecting art, books and cultural objects from invaded countries, also returned their captured library collection back to Berlin during the retreat from Soviet Union. The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » stands for « Einsatzstab Reichleiter Rosenberg für die Besetzten Gebiete » which means the « Reich » Leader Rosenberg Task-Force for Occupied Territories. « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » dispatches note they had to abandon their offices before the removal of the materials on hand could be completed « due to lack of loading spaces » and the fact that German artillery, located in the center of the city (Kiev) , was firing continually over their heads. Still, they managed to send on both their paintings and prehistoric materials, which had come from Kharkov, their own library and office furniture, and the materials collected by the Department of Seizures, amounting to some 10,000 books and nearly a 100 cases of Bolshevik paintings, documents and archives.

In the note of Vyacheslav M. Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, dated 27 April 1942, presented before the International Military Tribunal, it was recorded that the Germans burned the library of 40,000 volumes belonging to one of the oldest agricultural libraries in the USSR, the Shatilov selection station in the Orel district. Also submitted to the International Military Tribunal was the statement following :

« There was no limit to the desecration of the Hitlerite vandals of the monuments and homes representing Ukrainian history, culture and art. Suffice to mention, as an example of the constant attempts to humiliate the national dignity of the Ukrainian people that, after plundering the Korolenko Library in Kharkov, the occupiers used the books as paving stones for the muddy street in order to facilitate the passage of motor vehicles. »

1941-1944, Soviet Union : As a result of the German invasion, heavy damage was done to Russian libraries. It has been estimated that more than 100 million books have been destroyed, mainly from public libraries.

« At Pskov, 1,026 church books were removed from the “ Kremlin ” (fortress) , including 16th to 18th Century manuscripts and 17th Century printed books. Nearly 35,000 volumes were removed from the Pskov pedagogical institute, including 25,000 works of Russian scholars. At Novgorod, the library of the historical museum which was “ displaced ”, contained rare periodicals such as “ Russkaia rech' ” of 1880 and “ Bibliograf ” of 1860. Books removed included editions of Voltaire, of 1785 ; and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, of 1796. All in all, 35,000 volumes were removed. Unique editions of archaeology, including 51 books on the history of ancient Russia, were removed from the Novgorod library for the German professor Engel. Publications on ethnology were removed for Professor Thiele. The above-mentioned “ Sonderkommando Künsberg ” was active in removing the Czars' libraries from the suburbs of Leningrad ; and the contents of museums and libraries from Rostov and Taganrog. In addition to the “ Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ”, Künsberg's clients were : the main-branch of the “ Reich ” Security Agency ; RSHA (“

Reichssicherheitshauptamt ") ; the geographic service of the ministry of Foreign Affairs ; the State Library ; the Slavic Studies seminar ; and the Hermann Göring economic library. »

Heinrich Himmler sent a secret message to the SS and SD troops in order to ensure their cooperation with the main troops in the total destruction and devastation of the parts of the Ukraine to be evacuated :

« The aim to be achieved is that when the areas in the Ukraine are evacuated, not a human being, not a single head of cattle, not a hundredweight of cereals, and not a railway line remains behind ; that not a house remains standing, not a mine exists that is not ruined for years to come, that there is no well left un-poisoned. The enemy must really find a land completely burnt and destroyed. »

« Sonderstab Musik »

« SONDERSTAB MUSIK » ou « Les confiscations menées dans le monde musical en Europe de l'Ouest par les Nazis sous la direction du « Reichsleiter » - Gouverneur Alfred Rosenberg. »

Herbert Gerigk ne se contenta pas de dénoncer les 3 % de Juifs qui corrompaient la vie musicale allemande : muni de sa liste de noms et d'adresses, il devint le grand responsable de la spoliation de leurs biens dans les pays occupés. Dès l'invasion et l'occupation de la France, Alfred Rosenberg avait, en effet, créé une unité appelée ERR (« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg ») en vue de s'emparer des documents et biens ayant appartenu à des ennemis idéologiques de l'Allemagne, notamment les Juifs et les Francs-maçons. Ceci s'étendit très vite aux œuvres d'art, livres, archives, manuscrits. À ces fins, 7 groupes opérationnels appelés « Sandersth » (Équipe spéciale) furent mis sur pied, spécialisés respectivement dans es œuvres d'art, les églises, les bibliothèques, la musique, les pays de l'Est, la préhistoire, les questions racistes. Dans le domaine de la musique, le docteur en musicologie Herbert Gerigk et ses collaborateurs bardés de diplômes du « Sonderstab Musik » devinrent, dès 1940, les pilleurs et receleurs de tous les biens musicaux qui leur tombaient sous la main tant en France qu'en Belgique ou aux Pays-Bas et dans les Pays Baltes, l'Ukraine et la Biélorussie l'année suivante.

Le 1er critère utilisé était apparemment culturel, celui de « bien allemand devant retourner en Allemagne » , permettant par ce biais de s'emparer de manuscrits ou de lettres de musiciens allemands en arguant que ces témoignages de la culture allemande n'auraient jamais dû quitter leur pays d'origine. Les recherches s'appliquaient également aux Conservatoires, maisons d'Opéras, bibliothèques et archives des pays occupés afin d'en dresser dans une 1re phase l'inventaire et d'en réaliser des copies photographiques. Dès le 30 septembre 1940, Gerigk remettait un rapport sur « Les trésors musicaux d'origine allemande en France » dans lequel il mentionnait, entre autres, l'existence de lettres de Richard Wagner à l'éditeur juif Schlesinger et de travaux humiliants (sans doute des transcriptions) imposés à Wagner en 1841-1842 par celui-ci. Aussi recommanda-t-il « d'envoyer aussitôt ces pièces pour éviter tout usage futur qu'on pourrait en faire contre nous » . Entre-temps, le pillage des biens des Juifs battait son plein. En février 1941, le bilan s'élevait déjà à 150 caisses d'instruments et de documents, 30,000 disques, 50,000 livres. Des listes accompagnant ces envois ont été retrouvées par l'historien néerlandais Willem De Vries dans les archives allemandes concernant les biens de musiciens juifs qui avaient quitté la France. La nationalité française ne les protégeait plus à la suite d'une loi du régime de Vichy datant de juillet 1940, qui l'ôtait à toute personne ayant

quitté la France, entre le 10 mai et le 30 juin 1940, et confisquait ses biens si elle n'était pas de retour dans les 6 mois. Ceci concernait, de toute évidence, les Juifs dont Vichy voulait soustraire les biens au pillage des Allemands qui n'en tinrent aucun compte. C'est ainsi que, le 20 septembre, Gerigk en personne, avec 15 déménageurs, vida la maison de Wanda Landowska à Saint-Leu-la-Forêt. Au total, 54 caisses furent remplies. On n'oublia rien, ni les savons ni le vin, mais l'essentiel était constitué d'une vingtaine d'instruments dont plusieurs clavecins des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècle, d'un piano que Frédéric Chopin avait acheté à Palma, en vue de son séjour à Valdemosa, et d'une bibliothèque de 10,000 volumes dont des éditions et manuscrits précieux. Alerté par la secrétaire de Wanda Landowska, le gouvernement français protesta, demandant le retour des biens enlevés. Renvoyé d'un service à l'autre, d'une réponse évasive à une autre arrogante, il échoua complètement. Le Docteur Wolfgang Boetticher, musicologue des services d'Alfred Rosenberg, écrivit le 13 janvier 1941 aux autorités françaises que Wanda Landowska était juive et polonaise (parmi les documents saisis se trouvait son ancien passeport polonais mais elle avait acquis la nationalité française) et que les objets avaient été confisqués comme propriété juive abandonnée, conformément aux ordres du « Führer », Adolf Hitler. Pour ces raisons, la démarche française était inacceptable. Dans un autre cas, Boetticher utilisa l'argument que, les Juifs étant des ennemis de l'Allemagne, leurs biens étaient saisis comme biens ennemis, conformément aux règles internationales. Finalement, les caisses envoyées à Berlin furent, par la suite, dispersées entre Leipzig, des châteaux isolés et des monastères comme celui de Raitenhaslach, près de Munich. Une dizaine de caisses seulement et le piano de Chopin purent être récupérés après la Guerre.

Parmi les autres victimes des actions du « Sandersth Musik », il y eut encore Darius Milhaud (6 caisses) ; Gregor Piatigorsky (23 caisses) ; Arthur Rubinstein (toute sa bibliothèque) ; et même Ida Rubinstein qui n'était pas juive.

En 1944, d'autres biens de Darius Milhaud furent saisis à Aix-en-Provence, la ville de son enfance, en particulier, des manuscrits. Le « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » de Herbert Gerigk contenait une description particulièrement haineuse de sa musique « inadéquate et anti-allemande, beaucoup trop jouée en Allemagne avant 1933 », allusion à l'Opéra « Christophe Colomb » qui avait été monté à l'Opéra de Berlin, en 1930, « pour la somme exorbitante de 130,000 “ Deutschmarks ” aux dépens des œuvres des compositeurs allemands ». Jusqu'en 1992, on ne retrouva aucune trace des biens enlevés. Grâce à la reconstitution, en 1988, par le Docteur Albrecht Dümling de l'exposition « “ Entartete Musik ” de Düsseldorf de 1938 », et sa présentation à Nuremberg l'année suivante, un couple de cette ville prêta un manuscrit de Milhaud qu'elle possédait. Sur la base de cette information, Willem De Vries mena une enquête à Nuremberg, en 1992, et obtint finalement que 3 manuscrits soient rendus à Madeleine Milhaud, la veuve du compositeur. Par la même occasion, il découvrit au « Germanisches Nationalmuseum » 2 lettres de Manuel de Falla à Wanda Landowska qui furent rendues, après de longues négociations, au « Landowska Center » de Lakeville, au Connecticut. Ce ne sont là que quelques gouttes d'un océan car l'opération « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » avait été étendue en 1942 à ce que l'on appela pudiquement la « M-Aktion ». « M » voulant dire « Möbel », c'est-à-dire tous les biens mobiliers.

En juin 1944, un total de 68,441 immeubles et appartements juifs avaient été vidés, nécessitant 669 convois et le chargement de 26,769 wagons. Des milliers de pianos furent saisis et l'on créa, à Paris, un grand atelier pour leur vérification et leur remise en état à raison de quelque 200 pianos par mois. Une liste de l'un des convois mentionne 67 caisses de harpes ! Ce qui devait initialement « mettre à l'abri » les biens culturels des Juifs ou d'origine

allemande se termina par un complet désastre. Jusqu'à la fin de 1944, toute l'équipe des professeurs-docteurs continua son travail comme si la victoire allemande restait certaine et permettrait de réaliser les 2 projets mégalomaniacs du gigantesque Musée des Arts de Linz, ville natale du « Führer », et de l'immense « Hohe Schule » (Collège), conçue en 1938, comme « institution suprême de la recherche nationale-socialiste » et « centre d'éducation spirituelle et d'inspiration pour tout le peuple allemand ». Si le siège de cette « Hohe Schule » ne dépassa pas la maquette d'un projet babylonien, une Ire section fut cependant inaugurée le 26 mars 1941, à Francfort, l'« Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage » (Institut de recherche sur le problème juif). C'est là que devaient aboutir les collections Rothschild, Lipschutz, David Weill et Calmann-Lévy ainsi que celles de l'alliance israélite et de l'école rabbinique confisquées à Paris (plus de 200,000 livres). Les instruments de musique anciens devaient aller à Linz, les lettres et manuscrits dans de grandes bibliothèques existantes ou à créer. En attendant, tout fut d'abord envoyé à Berlin ; le flux se révéla tellement important que l'on dut multiplier les entrepôts de passage à Paris, Amsterdam et Bruxelles ainsi que les locaux de stockage et Berlin. Lorsque les bombardements de Berlin s'intensifièrent, endommageant plusieurs entrepôts, les déménagements se succédèrent et, finalement, l'évacuation en direction de l'Est fut décidée durant l'été 1943, notamment à Ratibor et Pless, en Silésie, comme si l'on ignorait que, depuis 6 mois, l'armée allemande battait en retraite vers l'Ouest, talonnée par l'Armée Rouge. Une pagaille générale s'installa : les caisses furent dispersées, les documents perdus, sans parler des destructions causées par les bombardements. Au début de 1945, on décida d'évacuer la Silésie et les caisses repartirent vers l'Ouest dans un désordre accru. Beaucoup furent rattrapées par l'Armée Rouge et disparurent vers l'Est où l'on commence seulement aujourd'hui à en retrouver des bribes et morceaux. Ainsi s'achevaient les méfaits de ce bataillon de musicologues dont le zèle fanatique dépassa tout ce que l'on peut imaginer : à la fin de juillet 1944, à quelques semaines de la libération de Paris, 46 pianos et 280 caisses étaient encore prêts à l'envoi.

La Guerre terminée, quelques années de silence et une dénazification laxiste, rapide et bâclée, permirent à la plupart des noms de refaire rapidement surface. Il fallut, en revanche, de nombreuses décennies pour que la mémoire reprenne ses droits sur l'oubli, la vérité sur la duplicité, la justice sur la spoliation.

Le cas de Wanda Landowska

Wanda Landowska (1879-1959) pianiste et claveciniste d'origine polonaise et juive arriva à Paris, en 1900, et s'installa dans les environs à Saint-Leu-la-Forêt, en 1925. Au-delà de ses interprétations célèbres de la musique des 17e et 18e siècles, Wanda est surtout renommée pour son rôle dans la remise au goût du jour des compositions pour clavecin sans oublier la création avec la firme Pleyel d'instruments rénovés. « L'École de Musique Ancienne » qu'elle fonda à Saint-Leu-la-Forêt fut rapidement réputée dans le monde entier. Elle rassembla une large collection d'instruments anciens ainsi qu'une bibliothèque de plus de 10,000 ouvrages ; la grande majorité d'entre eux traitant de musique.

Le 10 juin 1940, face à l'avance de troupes nazies, elle fuit vers la zone-sud accompagnée par son assistante Denise Restout. Elle abandonne alors la quasi-totalité de ses biens (lettre à Denise Restout, du 24 octobre 1992). Après une étape à Banyuls-sur-mer (chez Maillol), elles embarquent toutes les 2 vers les États Unis. Elles s'installent d'abord à New-York puis à Lakeville dans l'État du Connecticut.

Enregistrée comme musicienne juive dans le « Lexikon der Juden in Musik », il est alors évident que Herbert Gerigk, conseiller musical de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) à Berlin, ne pouvait ignorer l'existence de sa collection d'instruments. Ceux-ci étaient parfaits pour enrichir la future collection de la « Hohe Schule » (Collège) .

La propriété de Wanda Landowska était probablement l'une des cibles visées par le « Sonderstab Musik » . Vers le 20 septembre 1940 (3 jours seulement après l'ordre du « Führer » , du 17 septembre, s'appuyant sur une loi du régime de Vichy intimant de prendre possession de toute propriété artistique française appartenant à une personne juive afin de les répertorier) , Gerigk arrive avec une équipe d'une quinzaine de manutentionnaires expérimentés appartenant à la société de transport TAM (AMT) afin de vider la maison du 88 de la rue du Pontoise, à Saint-Leu-la-Forêt. Le processus de démontage et d'emballage ne demanda pas plus de 2 semaines.

Le 29 septembre, la plupart des 54 caisses préparées étaient déjà en attente de départ. Avec l'accord de l'administration militaire allemande en France (« Militärverwaltung des Militärbefehlshaben in Frankreich » , ou MVF) , elles furent transférées en attente de décision dans une aile du Musée du Louvre. Le jour de son départ pour Berlin, Gerigk donna des instructions impératives à sa secrétaire Kuhn et à son assistant Busse de ne remettre le matériel à personne. Cependant, le « SS-Sturmbahnführer » Heil appartenant à l' « Organization Todt » (Fritz Todt) prit l'initiative de faire transporter les caisses à Berlin, par camion, le 7 octobre. À son retour le 10 octobre, Gerigk ne cacha pas son mécontentement lorsqu'il apprit cet événement et s'étonna vivement dans un mémo daté du 15 octobre qu'un autre service ait pu prendre une telle décision de manière unilatérale.

Heil avait visiblement outrepassé ses pouvoirs et violé le délicat « modus vivendi » établi entre l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » et le « Militärverwaltung des Militärbefehlshaben in Frankreich » (le MVF prétendant toujours s'opposer à la conception maladroite de son rôle que l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » appliquait lors de ses interventions) .

Le 19 octobre, le « Stabsführer » Gerhard Utikal est mis en cause dans l'affaire Heil :

« Toujours l'affaire Heil. Il est devenu complètement fou et va se mettre dans une situation impossible s'il reste plus longtemps. Si les faits sont révélés, le scandale va être terrible. »

À ce stade des confiscations, les responsabilités demeurent à déterminer. Visiblement, les institutions nazies étaient en concurrence dans la recherche des objets d'art les plus remarquables afin d'enrichir leurs collections.

La liste des objets saisis chez Wanda Landowska est disponible (Centre de Documentation juive contemporaine) .

Bien que le mémo correspondant soit daté du 19 février 1941, il s'agit bien de l'inventaire du contenu des caisses (cette date correspond à une période-clef des inventaires globaux réalisés par l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » pour l'ensemble de ses saisies) .

Nous ne savons cependant pas si les caisses marquées « œuvres littéraires » contenaient la totalité de la bibliothèque musicale de Wanda Landowska. La liste ne mentionne pas non plus de nombreux objets personnels tels que peintures

et mobilier. Le reste de ce que contenait la maison disparut lors d'interventions ultérieures exécutées par le « Sicherheitsdienst » .

Par cette action majeure de pillage à l'égard d'un citoyen français, Herbert Gerigk contraria le gouvernement français même s'il pouvait se prévaloir des 2 « Führerbefehle » pour justifier son intervention dans la propriété de Wanda Landowska. Il n'empêche que les protestations officielles contre le transfert de ces biens culturels nationaux ne furent pas émises immédiatement.

Le 5 décembre 1940, la Délégation générale du Gouvernement en zone occupée, sous la plume du général Alain De Boissieu, soumit une lettre de protestation au Colonel Otzen du « Militärverwaltung des Militärbefehlshaben in Frankreich » au sujet de la saisie des instruments et autres biens de Wanda Landowska. Ce document est le premier connu, adressé en réaction à une confiscation chez une personne privée. De Boissieu écrivit cette lettre à la suite d'une plainte déposée par Denise Restout (sa lettre datée du 20 octobre 1940) . Le 4 octobre, faisant preuve d'un extraordinaire courage, Denise revint de Banyuls-sur-mer à Saint-Leu-la-Forêt. après qu'elle eut été informée de la saisie. Elle trouva la propriété sous scellés et fut mise au courant du détail des événements par la gardienne. Dans sa lettre officielle, De Boissieu écrivit au sujet des collections de Wanda Landowska :

« Il est tout particulièrement question du piano de Chopin et d'une série d'autres instruments. Une telle perte porterait au patrimoine artistique français une atteinte irréparable. »

Ses informateurs lui avaient indiqué la présence des instruments au Louvre. Il demanda leur retour, écrivant :

« Plusieurs raisons morales et artistiques justifient le retour des instruments et musiques de Madame Landowska. »

Le « Militärverwaltung des Militärbefehlshaben in Frankreich » et l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » furent amenés à échanger plusieurs courriers et mémos à la suite de cette réclamation. Le 10 janvier 1941, la « Feldkommandantur » locale, n° 758, envoya au « Militärverwaltung des Militärbefehlshaben in Frankreich » un rapport détaillé sur les circonstances de la confiscation, telles qu'elles lui furent décrites par le maire (préfet ?) dans sa lettre du 19 décembre 1940.

Le général de la Laurencie, représentant du gouvernement français dans les territoires occupés, informait le maire (préfet ?) que des allemands en civil (membres du « Sonderstab Musik » qui opéraient en civil pour détourner l'attention (le port de l'uniforme deviendra obligatoire après cette opération) avaient emporté 15 instruments de valeur. Ils avaient également pillé le mobilier et des livres anciens comprenant notamment des partitions et œuvres musicales.

La « Kommandantur » rattachée à la circonscription d'Enghien-les-Bains entama une enquête et convoqua Mademoiselle Mathot, assistante de Wanda demeurée à Saint-Leu, le 16 décembre. Un procès-verbal de son témoignage décrit ainsi les faits :

« Fin septembre 1940, des allemands en civil se présentèrent pour saisir les œuvres d'art et les œuvres musicales se

trouvant dans la propriété. Ils apposèrent le scellé officiel des autorités militaires, n° 03265. Ils emportèrent les pianos droits ci-dessus mentionnés, les partitions, les livres mais aussi le savon, les machines à écrire, le vin et chargèrent le tout dans des camions. La gardienne, une vieille femme, protesta vainement. Elle demanda un reçu officiel qui lui fut refusé, se voyant opposée la réponse suivante : “ Nous ne délivrons pas ce genre de chose.” »

Il fallait que la saisie et l'enlèvement des objets demeurent secrets.

La « Feldkommandantur » rapporta aussi que le scellé apposé sur la maison de Wanda Landowska, portant le n° 03265, correspondait au code normalement utilisé par la « Geheime Feldpolizei » (GFP) du groupe 610.

La « Feldkommandantur » s'offusqua des insinuations des témoins au sujet de la prétendue disparition du savon, des machines à écrire, du vin et autres objets personnels, allant jusqu'à menacer la gardienne et Mademoiselle Mathot de diffamer une division de l'armée allemande.

« Durant l'hiver 1940-1941, la maison fut vidée de fond en comble (jusqu'au dernier morceau de savon !) . »

(Témoignage de Denise Restout de septembre 1945.)

Avant de poursuivre plus avant, un rapport fut demandé au groupement 610. Le 8 janvier 1941, la « Geheime Feldpolizei » , groupement 610, justifia l'opération menée par Gerigk en s'appuyant à nouveau sur les « Führerbefehle » des 5 juillet et 17 septembre 1940. Il s'agissait bien, en l'occurrence, de possessions abandonnées par une citoyenne polonaise et juive. Et, ce qui rendait l'affaire encore plus critique, c'est qu'elle était une juive germanophobe. Ainsi en attestait le concert qu'elle avait organisé avec le violoniste polonais Bronisław Huberman, à l'Opéra de Paris, au profit des aviateurs français et polonais. De toute façon, les instruments, livres, manuscrits, tableaux et disques microsillons n'avaient pas quitté la France.

Le rapport rejetait le témoignage de Mademoiselle Mathot. Il n'y avait pas eu dissimulation de la saisie. Bien plus, Mademoiselle Mathot n'était pas présente lors de cette opération. En plus des proches du Docteur Gergk, 15 professionnels français mirent à peu près 2 semaines pour emballer les marchandises et n'utilisèrent le savon que pour se laver les mains. De même, le vin ne fut utilisé que comme « ration » . La « Geheime Feldpolizei » citait ainsi une lettre du 13 janvier 1941 de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , adressée au Gouverneur militaire du District de Paris. Cette lettre (sans doute post-datée ?) révèle que la « Geheime Feldpolizei » reçut des instructions précises de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » concernant la position politique à adopter en cas de protestations des autorités françaises.

Par l'intermédiaire de Wolfgang Boetticher, du « Sonderstab Musik » à Berlin, l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » fut mise en cause dans cette controverse. Dans sa lettre du 13 janvier, Boetticher reprend les mêmes arguments et utilise les mêmes formulations que la « Geheime Feldpolizei » :

Landowska n'est pas française, mais juive. Elle possède un passeport polonais saisi par Gerigk. Il était expiré et c'est pourquoi elle le laisse à Saint-Leu (lettre de Denise Restout datant du 1er décembre 1995) . Ses biens ont donc été

confisqués à juste titre et ils ne peuvent, en aucun cas, être considérés comme biens culturels français.

Même si l'affaire Landowska continue d'être examinée jusqu'à la fin de l'année 1941, elle ne manque pas d'être très tôt considérée comme en voie d'être classée sans suite.

Les 54 caisses contenant les biens de Wanda Landowska arrivèrent à Berlin dans les entrepôts du transporteur Edmund Franz Kowak. Le 15 août 1941, elles sont transférées au 79 de la « Oranienburgstraße », siège de l'« AMT Musik » où il fut procédé à un inventaire. Les instruments et la plupart des livres furent ensuite transportés à Leipzig dans les locaux de la « Hohe Schule Sachgebiet Musik » avant de gagner, en septembre 1943, les bâtiments de l'ancienne École Supérieure Israélite où l'« AMT Musik » se replia après l'évacuation de Berlin (lettre de Max Unger datée du 27 juin 1946) .

Après les Iers bombardements sur Leipzig, en décembre 1943, les collections furent évacuées vers Ratibor, Pless et Langenau, en Haute-Silésie, ou, à chaque fois que c'était techniquement possible, cachées dans des lieux pré-déterminés de la campagne. En janvier 1945, Walter Bargatzky, Directeur de la Division juridique du « Militärverwaltung des Militärbefehlshaben in Frankreich », à Paris, rassembla les mémoires secrets dans lesquels il avait répertorié ce qu'il connaissait des archives du Groupe de Conservation Artistique qui avaient disparu. On y trouve de nombreux détails sur le sort réservé aux biens de Wanda Landowska, un ensemble d'éléments repris dans un mémo non daté du Service de Protection des Œuvres d'Art à Paris (et que l'on retrouve dans les archives de Denise Restout) . Il y est notamment indiqué 2 destinations finales des biens de Landowska : le château de Langenau, à Hirschberg, pour les partitions et œuvres musicales (c'est là que s'installèrent Herbert Gerigk et l'« AMT München » , de fin 1943 au printemps 1945) ; et le monastère de Raitenhaslach, près de Munich, pour les instruments.

Après la Guerre, Max Unger, expert spécialiste de Beethoven, qui avait appartenu à l'« AMT Musik » , en septembre 1943, déclarera que la bibliothèque musicale de Wanda Landowska avait quitté Leipzig pour Langenau, en février 1944. Unger avait lui-même référencé les ouvrages en question. Il attesta que les Iers bombardements sur Leipzig atteignirent les bâtiments de la « Hohe Schule » , en décembre 1943. La section qui contenait les instruments fut en grande partie détruite. À sa connaissance, « seuls quelques-uns d'entre eux en sortirent intacts » . Selon Unger, arrivèrent à Langenau les livres et partitions en grande quantité, regroupés avec d'autres provenant de Russie ou de Belgique, les instruments demeurés intacts et, notamment, un grand nombre de grands pianos et de « piano-forte » .

Après la Guerre, les Alliés rassemblèrent les objets retrouvés aux différents points de collecte en vue d'en assurer le retour. Rose Valland et Doda Conrad s'efforcèrent que les biens français retrouvés soient amenés rapidement au point de collecte de Munich ou aux dépôts spécialisés de la Division militaire des États Unis dans les domaines des monuments, des Beaux-Arts et des Archives. Ils trouvèrent une petite partie des instruments de Wanda Landowska entreposés dans le dépôt de l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » du monastère de Raitenharlach.

« En septembre 1992, je (l'auteur) pris contact par courrier, pour la Ire fois, avec Denise Restout qui fut la secrétaire et l'héritière de Wanda Landowska. Elle dirigea le Centre musical Landowska à Lakeville, dans le Connecticut. Elle me fournit alors les documents relatifs à la période du départ vers les États Unis, les lettres de protestation contre la confiscation et les éléments concernant les actions entamées après la Guerre pour retrouver ou réclamer les biens

volés aux autorités allemandes. En échange, je lui fis parvenir les documents extraits des archives de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » évoquant la confiscation afin qu'elle puisse en tenir compte dans son projet de biographie sur Wanda Landowska. »

Elle me répondit :

« En ce qui concerne la restitution des biens volés, seuls quelques-uns des instruments anciens furent retracés et retournés à Saint-Leu. Tous, à l'exception du piano de Chopin, étaient dans un état lamentable (je vis certains d'entre eux sur place lors de mon voyage en France, en 1954) . Pour ce qui concerne les clavecins Pleyel, un seul d'entre eux fut retrouvé après la Guerre dans une maison privée d'un village, près de Munich. Ultérieurement, le fonds Bach de la bibliothèque considérable de Wanda fut retourné à Paris. »

En ligne avec les informations fournies par Denise, seules les caisses suivantes numérotées, et déclarées contenir dans l'inventaire du 19 février 1941, furent retournées à Saint-Leu (lettre de Denise datant du 28 septembre 1992) :

P30 (Clavecin 30463/192665/51) .

P39 (Clavecin du 17e siècle) .

P40 (Clavecin du facteur Rùckers de 1642) .

P42 (Piano-forte du facteur Carl Magnus Nordqvist, de Stockholm) .

P43 (Clavecin avec peinture intérieure de Andrea del Verrocchio) .

P49 (Piano-forte du facteur Olof Granfeldt, de Stockholm) .

P55 (Orgue de salon de 1757) .

P56 (Piano du facteur Joan Bauzà Palma) .

P57 (Clavicorde) .

P58 (Support) .

Dans les archives fédérales de Koblenz, on trouve un dossier de documents qui contient un catalogue détaillé des restitutions (« Restitutionkartei ») . Ce catalogue énumère les pièces enregistrées au point de collecte de Munich sous la forme de « property-cards » relatives aux objets d'art rassemblés par les troupes d'occupation américaines dans leur zone d'occupation. Ces cartes décrivent le bien et indiquent les conditions de retour aux propriétaires. 29 cartes au nom de Wanda Landowska détaillent précisément les instruments provenant du monastère de Raitenhaslach (qu'ils soient intacts ou en plusieurs morceaux) . Les instruments arrivèrent au point de collecte de Munich, le 13 septembre 1945. En plus des instruments retrouvés dont Denise a donné, ci-dessus, la liste des caisses selon la numérotation de

l'inventaire de 1941, ce catalogue permet de confirmer la présence de 2 autres références : P46 et P47. Le piano de Frédéric Chopin (P56) fut expédié vers Paris, le 9 janvier 1946. Les autres instruments suivirent le 31 juillet 1947.

Plusieurs cartes de propriété décrivent 5 caisses arrivées à Munich en provenance de Raitenhaslach et contenant des biens ayant appartenu à Wanda Landowska, Halfen et Kalman (ainsi que le décrivent leurs étiquettes) .

Leur contenu comprenait des compositions musicales de Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart et de Jean Sébastien Bach, des partitions de musique du 18^e siècle, des correspondances et pièces diverses, un volume de musique de Christoph Willibald Gluck, 12 volumes de musique de Mozart, 16 volumes de littérature, 14 volumes de lettres et pièces de musique, un grand nombre de partitions d'Opéra de Bach et de Heinrich Schütz, des livres de musiques diverses. Enfin, une caisse authentique des biens de Wanda Landowska, restée en l'état d'origine, retrouvée à Raitenhaslach et décrite comme suit :

« Une caisse en bois vide ayant contenu un instrument , France, Wanda Landowska, identification selon les étiquettes. »

Selon l'information fournie par Denise (lettre datant du 25 juillet 1994) , tous les instruments retournés à Saint-Leu devinrent la propriété d'Elsa Schunicke, ancienne secrétaire de Wanda Landowska et son héritière pour partie. Il est probable que plusieurs furent vendus aux enchères ou furent l'objet de ventes privées à des collectionneurs ou musées en Belgique, au Canada et en Australie.

Une indication complémentaire permet de mieux suivre le trajet sinueux des 2 grands clavecins Pleyel commandés par Wanda Landowska (dont l'un fut retrouvé à Munich) . Dans un mémo datant du 27 mars 1942 (actuellement aux archives de Koblenz) , il est indiqué que Heinz Tietjen, directeur-général du Théâtre national de Prusse, a formulé la demande d'acquérir les 2 Pleyel. Apparemment, Herbert Gerigk les avait déjà achetés pour la « Hohe Schule » , au prix de 60,000 Francs chacun. Herman Göring voulait aussi donner l'un des 2 à l'Opéra de Budapest. Il est possible que cette somme ait servi à indemniser la firme Pleyel qui les avait prêtés à Wanda Landowska. Dans un mémo datant du 19 octobre 1942, Gerigk indique aussi l'achat d'un autre clavecin Pleyel à Paris destiné à l'Opéra National de Prusse.

Les matériels déplacés de l' « AMT München » vers la campagne allemande ont eu aussi une autre destination : le château de Banz. En 1992, j'ai (l'auteur) trouvé au Musée National de Nuremberg 2 lettres de Manuel de Falla à Wanda Landowska, propriété de cette dernière, et qui avaient appartenu à la même famille allemande.

Cette découverte amène à établir une hypothèse concernant le sort des biens volés à Wanda Landowska. Il est probable que la bibliothèque musicale (d'environ 10,000 volumes) ait été saisie par l'armée russe et transportée dans le château de Langenau près d'Hirschberg, un territoire situé dans la zone d'occupation soviétique. Les témoignages du Docteur Karl Brethauer et du Docteur Gerhard Wunder, en charge pendant la Guerre de la gestion des collections pour le compte de l' « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » à Paris et à Berlin (puis à Ratibor) , semblent le confirmer :

« Ils avaient le sentiment que les livres déplacés à Langenau y demeurèrent. »

« Le retour du fonds Bach est probablement lié à la mention sur les étiquettes, au moment de la saisie, d'une seconde adresse de destination. »

Certains instruments de Wanda Landowska ont probablement été détruits lors des bombardements de Leipzig. Quelques autres qui étaient stockés au château de Langenau ont probablement été transférés ailleurs en Allemagne (comme ce fut le cas de ceux déplacés vers le monastère de Raitenhaslach, en Bavière) afin d'échapper à l'avance des troupes russes. C'est à la suite du même processus que fut retrouvé le clavecin Pleyel, à Munich.

Il se peut aussi que l'influence des officiels de l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » appartenant au « Sonderstab Musik » ou à l'« AMT München » leur ait permis une nouvelle attribution de certains instruments mais, cette fois, pour leur usage personnel. D'autre part, Brethauer et Wunder mentionnent aussi que certains objets « devant être transférés des Instituts locaux de la " Hohe Schule " vers la Silésie (c'est-à-dire vers Langenau) auraient pu finalement être laissés sur place » .

La plus évidente des hypothèses permet de suggérer que certains biens de Wanda Landowska (et de beaucoup d'autres propriétaires moins célèbres) sont demeurés en Allemagne entre les mains de personnes privées. Le Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, à Paris, conserve copie d'une circulaire adressée à Herbert Gerigk, le 20 janvier 1944. Dans ce document, Gerhard Utikal, « Stabsführer » de l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg », autorise Kurt von Behr à permettre aux membres de la direction de l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » à prendre part au processus de « M-Aktion » qui concerne mobilier et autres objets. C'est ouvrir la voie pour les employés des différentes instances du « Sonderstab Musik » et autres services de l'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (« AMT Musik » et « Sonderstab Musik » inclus) au lancement d'opérations de pillage à titre personnel.

Denise m'a fourni quelques détails supplémentaires sur la confiscation de septembre 1940, notamment des extraits de sa lettre datant du 20 octobre 1940 adressée à la Délégation générale du Gouvernement français dans les Territoires occupés :

« Vers le 20 septembre, des officiers allemands en civil se sont présentés et ont ordonné au personnel de les laisser pénétrer dans la propriété. Ils dressèrent l'inventaire de tous les biens de Madame Landowska tels qu'ils étaient détenus depuis le sous-sol jusqu'aux combles. Ils examinèrent ses disques, ses archives, sa correspondance et apposèrent des scellés après avoir emporté les 2 postes de TSF. 4 jours plus tard, une douzaine de civils allemands (dont une femme) revinrent avec une équipe de déménageurs afin d'emballer tous les instruments anciens et modernes, la totalité de la bibliothèque musicale, la plus grande partie de la bibliothèque littéraire, la collection complète de disques, peintures et autres objets similaires. Ils emportèrent le tout. Comme ces individus remirent des scellés après leur passage, je ne suis pas en mesure de dresser la liste détaillée des objets qu'ils emportèrent. »

Après la Guerre (plus précisément le 10 septembre 1945) , Denise établit un état fournissant plus de détails afin de faciliter la tâche des autorités françaises en charge de la recherche et de la restitution. C'est alors seulement qu'elle révéla la disparition de ses propres biens personnels (livres, partitions, etc.) .

Les officiers allemands (vraisemblablement membres de la « Gestapo ») avaient mis la maison sens dessus dessous en

consacrant plusieurs jours à l'emballage et au transport de l'ensemble de ce que contenait la propriété.

« J'appris à ce sujet 2 choses. Les voisins immédiats qui avaient suivi les allées et venues avaient entendu qu'on clouait les caisses et constaté le chargement puis le départ des saisies. D'autre part, après avoir appris le pillage des biens de Madame Landowska, la firme Pleyel a émis une protestation auprès des autorités allemandes au sujet des instruments leur appartenant. »

Sur ce point, il semble que Pleyel a reçu compensation pour ses instruments.

Lorsqu'elle revint à Saint-Leu, Denise ne put pénétrer dans la maison qu'après plusieurs jours d'attente (le 4 octobre 1940) . Après leur dernier passage, les Allemands avaient retiré les scellés et rendu les clés à la gardienne. C'est à ce moment qu'il fut clairement établi le pillage de l'ensemble des biens de Wanda Landowska :

« Parmi les biens personnels figurait une coupe de tissu de velours de soie Bordeaux destinée à la confection d'une robe de concert. Le secrétaire et l'armoire contenant mes objets personnels (musiques, livres, correspondance et notes diverses) étaient également vides. »

Cependant, la confiscation n'était pas terminée. La présence de Denise à Saint-Leu (qu'elle quitta définitivement le 14 mars 1941) n'empêcha pas les Nazis d'achever leur besogne.

« Durant l'hiver 1940-1941, des officiers de l'armée d'occupation vinrent plusieurs fois chez Madame Landowska accompagnés d'un représentant de la Mairie de Saint-Leu et emportèrent les tables, chaises, lustres et autres objets même ceux de valeur négligeable. »

Les lettres échangées entre Manuel de Falla et Wanda Landowska, retrouvées à Nuremberg en 1991 (2 lettres de De Falla, de 1924 et de 1925, au sujet du concert de clavecin organisé par Wanda ; et une lettre complémentaire de 1926) ont été remises au Centre Musical Landowska de Lakeville (Connecticut) , début-avril 1993, soit plus d'un demi-siècle après leur confiscation à Saint-Leu (une des lettres était encore dans son enveloppe d'origine) . Une copie fut également transmise aux Archives de Falla à Madrid.

...

« Sonderstab Musik » : Music Confiscation the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) under the Nazi Occupation of Western Europe.

Author : Willem De Vries.

Translation : Lee K. Mitzman.

Publisher : Amsterdam University Press (1996) .

Distributor : University of Michigan Press (271 pages) .

This title, the work of the Dutch scholar Willem De Vries, represents a significant tributary to the streams of investigation now identified as Holocaust Studies, Music in Exile, and Antiphilosemitism, amongst others. Hitherto, research in these fields has tended to emphasize such features as the means and motives of poetical and cultural oppression and their instruments of implementation. The personal and institutional impact of such policies included the varying degrees of emigration - whether external into other regions or continents, internal (« innere Emigration » ; i.e. , total withdrawal into oneself and the refusal to accept sustenance from the ruling totalitarian regime) , pragmatic « neutrality » , voluntary or involuntary collaboration, and various intermediate accents between several of these categories. It is worth recalling the interdisciplinary impetus to generate these regions of investigation, in which musicological initiatives have lagged approximately a decade behind those in social history, art history and theory, and comparative literature.

...

During the Second World War, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) was set-up, an organization which aimed for the elimination of Jewish cultural life in the rest of Europe. A « Sonderstab Musik » was also established, staffed by distinguished German musicologists whose task was to locate musical manuscripts, books and instruments. Its initial target was the possessions of Jewish musicians and composers who had fled the Nazi regime but, in the end, it boiled-down to a general confiscation and removal of Jewish possessions, including those connected with music-making. This book describes the activities of the « Sonderstab Musik » in France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

...

In 1996, revelations about gold seized from Jews by the Nazi government have filled headlines. Not only do these discoveries pose serious questions about the roles of allegedly neutral countries during World War II, but they also remind us of the vast amount of property illegally seized from Jews and other « enemies of the “ Reich ” » under German occupation that still remains unaccounted for. In the same year, the art-world has been stirred by disturbing discoveries about confiscated artwork and its re-sale : the tabloid coverage of the Wildenstein divorce indirectly drew attention to the family's possible involvement in purchasing rare artworks that the Nazis had seized from Jewish-owned collections in Paris. Here, again, the mysteries of ownership remain an unsettling problem.

The complex mechanism of Nazi art-policy, including the confiscation and re-sale of valuable artworks, has been exhaustively investigated and analyzed in the excellent work of Jonathan Petropoulos (Art as Politics in the 3rd « Reich ») and amplified by the case studies published by Hector Feliciano (The Lost Museum) . These new studies are useful not only for historical interest but also for clues that may assist in clarifying the legal issues raised by recent inquiries into the rightful ownership of seized property. « Sonderstab Musik » by Willem De Vries performs a similar function in the area of music.

It may surprise some readers to learn that music held such a prominent position in the Nazis' program of plundering. Cultural historians investigating the Nazi period have ignored music for a long time, focusing their attention on architecture, painting, literature, and film, but shying away from the art-form Josef Gœbbels had dubbed « the most German of the Arts » . This gap could be explained, in part, by the uninterrupted success of prominent musical figures,

before and after 1945, and their efforts to suppress investigations into their rules under Adolf Hitler. It was also due to the reluctance of music historians to confront the complexity of the inter-connections between music and politics in the 3rd « Reich ». The lacuna has begun to be filled only in the last 15 years, starting with the detailed spadework of Fred K. Prieberg (« Musik im NS-Staat ») and enriched most recently by the excellent comprehensive study by Michael H. Kater (The Twisted Muse) . We are now learning just how central music was not only to the Nazi cultural policy but to Germany's artistic contributions to Western civilization. De Vries's study helps to fill-out this picture by revealing how the Nazis plundered not only art but also musical treasures from the countries under occupation, enriching Germany's musical arsenal with stolen instruments, recordings, and rare musical scores.

In the 1st months of the regime, Josef Goebbels, Alfred Rosenberg, and other parties struggled over cultural jurisdiction. After Adolf Hitler entrusted Goebbels with the new Propaganda Ministry ...

...

In Göttingen wird ein Wissenschaftler mit seiner Vergangenheit im NS-Amt Rosenberg konfrontiert.

Die jüdische Cembalistin Wanda Landowska floh aus Paris, als die Nazis einmarschierten. Nach dem Krieg war ihre Sammlung kostbarer historischer Instrumente verschwunden, ebenso die Musikbibliothek mit 10.000 Bänden und MusikerInnenautographen. Die Plünderung war das Werk einer eigens für solche Aktionen gegründeten Institution des NS-Staats : Des « Amtes Musik » beim Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg der NSDAP, kurz auch « Sonderstab Musik » genannt.

In seinem jüngst erschienenen Buch « Sonderstab Musik - die organisierte Plünderung jüdischen Eigentums in der NS-Zeit » beleuchtet der niederländische Musikwissenschaftler Willem De Vries die Aktivitäten dieses Sonderstabs. Gegründet wurde er 1940 vom NS-Chefideologen Alfred Rosenberg. Zu seinen Aufgaben gehörten Konfiszierungen in den besetzten Ländern Belgien, Frankreich und Niederlande, vor allem von jüdischem Eigentum.

Zur Beute aus den Plünderungen gehörten wie bei Wanda Landowska vor allem Musikinstrumente und Kompositionen, die bei Tausenden jüdischer KomponistInnen, MusikerInnen, Verlage und Musikbibliotheken beschlagnahmt wurden. Neben der physischen Vernichtung der Jüdinnen und Juden Europas sollte die Plünderung von Musikalien, bildender Kunst und Malerei jegliche Form jüdischer Identität vernichten. Die Musikalien wurden « arisiert » , also sogenannten arischen Deutschen zur Verwendung überlassen. Bis heute wurde nichts davon den eigentlichen EigentümerInnen zurückgegeben. Als De Vries sein Buch Ende November in der Universitätsstadt Göttingen vorstellte, verursachte er einen Eklat. Denn bei seinen Recherchen war er immer wieder auf den Namen eines Göttinger Musikwissenschaftlers gestoßen : Professor Doktor Wolfgang Boetticher. Bis 1944 war der SS-Mann Boetticher maßgeblicher Mitarbeiter im Sonderstab Musik gewesen. Unter anderem wirkte er an dem 1940 herausgegebenen « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » mit, das sämtliche im Musikbereich tätigen Juden und Jüdinnen erfaßte und ab 1940 systematische und gezielte Plünderungen bei ihnen ermöglichte.

Nach 1945 habilitierte sich Boetticher an der Universität Göttingen, er wurde Dozent am Musikwissenschaftlichen Institut. In den siebziger Jahren war er Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät, wo der 84-jährige bis heute

Lehrveranstaltungen hält. Boetticher wurde zu einer Göttinger Persönlichkeit; auch die Volkshochschule feierte jüngst sein hundertstes Veranstaltungsangebot.

Dabei war Boettichers Geschichte auch der Universitätsleitung kein Geheimnis : Nach Aussagen eines Mitarbeiters des Musikwissenschaftlichen Seminars war die NS-Vergangenheit des Professors bereits seit den fünfziger Jahren allgemein bekannt - sowohl an der Universität wie im Göttinger Bildungsbürgertum.

Mit den Vorwürfen aus De Vries' Buch konfrontiert, rechtfertigte sich Boetticher in einem Memorandum und erklärte, er habe dem Sonderstab nie angehört. Er sei diesem nur « als Wehrmachtangehöriger und dienstpflichtiger Soldat mit unterem Mannschaftsgrad zugeteilt » gewesen, « um als Zivilist Quellenstudien zur älteren Musikgeschichte auch in den besetzten Gebieten betreiben zu dürfen » . Ob Boetticher nun « Gast » des Sonderstabs war, wie er selbst behauptet, oder Leiter : Die Verbrechen des Amtes Musik erwähnt er in seinem Memorandum noch nicht einmal - geschweige denn, daß er sie bedauern würde.

Die Universitätsleitung beruft sich heute darauf, die Vorwürfe gegen Boetticher seien neu und ihr bisher nicht bekannt gewesen. Doch bereits 1982 sind in der « New York Times » und der Frankfurter Rundschau Artikel erschienen, die Boettichers Vergangenheit beleuchteten. Seitdem konnte Boetticher sich auf keinem internationalen Symposium mehr blicken lassen. Nur in der BRD blieben die Konsequenzen bis heute aus. Die deutsche Musikwissenschaft hat noch nicht einmal angefangen, ihre Rolle im Nationalsozialismus aufzuarbeiten ; die Monographie des Niederländers De Vries wurde im deutschsprachigen Raum sofort zum Standardwerk.

Doch auch nach dem Erscheinen des Buches hält sich die Universitätsleitung bedeckt : Zwar wurde Boetticher nahegelegt, seine Veranstaltungen bis zur Klärung der Lage einzustellen. In einer offiziellen Stellungnahme beruft sich die Uni-Leitung aber darauf, « daß eine Mitwirkung Boettichers an Verbrechen der bezeichneten Art sowohl straf- als auch disziplinarrechtlich verjährt » sei. Außerdem seien « die Indizien, die auf eine Schuld Boettichers im Zusammenhang mit Kunstraubzügen des Amtes Rosenberg hinweisen, aufgrund der historischen Distanz nicht mehr verifizierbar » . Anrufe beim Bundesarchiv in Koblenz oder beim jüdischen Dokumentationszentrum in Paris (« Centre de documentation juive contemporaine ») hätten freilich genügt, um rund ein Dutzend Dokumente anzufordern, die Boettichers Beteiligung am Sonderstab Musik bestätigen.

Die Universitätsleitung scheut das Thema Nationalsozialismus aus gutem Grunde ; fehlt es doch auch in vielen anderen Fachbereichen an Aufarbeitung. Boetticher ist kein schwarzes Schaf, sondern ein Wissenschaftler unter vielen, die ihre Karriere, trotz ihrer NS-Vergangenheit, nach 1945 fortsetzen konnten - bis heute. Der Jura-Professor Ludwig Schreiber, der sich, kurz bevor er sein Amt als Universitätspräsident aufgab, mit dem Fall Boetticher beschäftigte, kam zu dem Schluß :

« Wenn wir mit der NS-Zeit aufzuräumen begännen, könnten wir die gesamte Universität schließen. »

Gustav Havemann

Gustav Havemann was born in Güstrow, Germany, on March 15, 1882. He studied the violin with his father, and played

in the Court Orchestra in Schwerin, before enrolling in the « Berlin Hochschule für Musik », Still a young man, he was the Concert-Master in several cities, including Hamburg.

In 1911, he was invited to join the faculty of the Leipzig Consortium and, between 1915 and 1920, became the Concert-Master at the Dresden State Opera. From 1920 to 1945, he was a professor at his « alma matter », the « Berlin Hochschule » .

In the early-1920's Gustav Havemann founded the Havemann String Quartet. Gustav was the 1st violin, with Georg Kühnau as the 2nd violin. Hans Mahlke played the viola, while Adolf Steiner accompanied on the violoncello.

Over time, the Quartet earned a reputation as a prestigious group, playing in such locales as Berlin's « Volksbühne » and even in Czechoslovakia. They performed both Classical and modern music, some of it considered « avant-garde » at that time, including pieces by Alban Berg and Alois Hába (considered « the most distinctive figure in 20th Century modern Czech music ») .

The Quartet performed Alban Berg's String Quartet, Opus 3, at the Chamber Music Festival of the International Society for Contemporary Music, on August 2, 1923.

Berg wrote to his wife :

« I reveled in the sound and the solemn sweetness of my own music. You cannot imagine it from what you have heard of the piece. The so-called wildest and riskiest passages were pure euphony in the Classic sense. »

Gustav himself composed a Violin Concerto in 1938. He authored « Was ein Geiger Wissen Muß » (What a Violinist Needs to Know) in 1921, as well as « Die Violintechnik bis zur Vollendung » (Mastering Violin Techniques) in 1928.

Apparently, by 1931, Georg Kühnau was no longer with the group ; the Havemann Trio performed in Coburg, on June 7 of that year, rendering Adolf Brunner's String Trio for violin, viola and violoncello.

The era of the Nazis left its mark on Gustav Havemann. An undated tobacco card states that Havemann was « Professor, member of the Presidium (?) of the « Reich » Music Chamber, leader of the National-Socialist musicians » . It appears that, while he toed the Party's anti-Semitic line in the early 1930's (as head of the « Kampfbund » Orchestra) , he finally rebelled.

According to « The New York Times » of July 18, 1935, Professor Havemann was removed as the leader of the « Reich » 's Musicians Club because of his intervention in behalf of Jewish composer :

« A further development in the anti-Semitic campaign, disclosed today, was the ousting of Professor Gustav Havemann as leader of the “ Reich ” Musicians' Club. He incurred Minister of Propaganda Josef Gœbbels's displeasure when he intervened in behalf of Paul Hindemith, composer under the Nazi ban.

Professor Havemann sided with Wilhelm Furtwängler, who resigned last December as leader of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and conductor of the Municipal Opera, in opposing the Nazi boycott of Mister Hindemith's works for his alleged Jewish affiliations. »

Gustav Havemann died in Schöneiche on January 2, 1960.

...

The story of Gustav Havemann is one of the more remarkable, if little-known, narratives of 20th Century German music history. A man plagued by self-doubt and eager to curry favour with whoever was in power at the time, this talented violinist and conductor followed the remarkable shifts in German political and cultural life, moving smoothly from modernist musician and friend of radical Jewish composers in the Weimar era, to being a committed Nazi music ideologue. Perhaps, most remarkably, after the War, he built a successful career in socialist East Germany with a reputation for being a « committed anti-Fascist » .

Before his conversion to Nazism, Havemann was well-known as a Leftist. Born in Güstrow, Germany, on 15 March 1882, to a musical family, he studied violin from an early age. He was appointed to the position of Concert Master in Lübeck while still a teenager, then, moved on to positions in Hamburg, Leipzig, and Dresden before accepting a teaching post at the Berlin Academy of Music (a position he held until the end of the War) . During the Liberal inter-War years, Havemann was also the founder and leader of one of the most important String Quartets in the musically blossoming Weimar Germany, the Havemann String Quartet. The ensemble, which quickly earned a reputation as one of the most important promoters of modern and avant-garde music, helped to popularize the works of composers like Paul Hindemith and Arnold Schönberg.

Havemann's conversion to Nazism is, perhaps, not as surprising as it must have seemed at the time. Joining Alfred Rosenberg's « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (Combat League for German Culture, or KfdK) , Havemann became the leading musician in its central Berlin branch, founding its Orchestra, in 1932, and serving as conductor. When a 1932 Hamburg celebration of the birthday of Johannes Brahms included some Jewish performers, Havemann agreed to participate only if they were removed from the programme. It is important to remember that this ideological shifting was taking place before the Nazis had actually seized power ; that racial cleansing was still unofficial ; and that the violinist and conductor was not acting in accordance with official policy. A contemporary of Havemann's commented that :

« He is performing in absolutely empty halls ; it is a laughable event artificially propped-up by yawning Brownshirts (Nazis) . »

The 1933 Nazi seizure of power strengthened Havemann's commitment to removing Jews from German musical life. He was one of the foremost members of the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » and the official « Reichsmusikkammer » , and also worked with the Party and the « Kampfbund » to restructure and reorganize the Berlin Academy of Music.

Although successfully forcing composer Franz Schreker and Georg Schunemann from their positions as director and vice-director of the Academy, he never achieved his ultimate goal of himself becoming director. However, he did retain considerable influence in appointing others to positions, especially those positions vacated by Jews and foreigners. There was also an official change in the purpose of the school.

As one director stated in his appointment speech :

« We are interested not in cultivating artistes, but in training German artists who consider their profession as a holy and “ volkhaft ” (populist) task grounded both spiritually and in terms of a world-view. »

Celebrating his success at purifying and centralizing the musical world of Nazi Germany, and paying tribute to the successes of Adolf Hitler, Havemann declared that :

« The German musician enjoys a privileged position in comparison to musicians in other countries because he is constituted as a member of a public and legal corporation in the “ Reichsmusikkammer ”. »

Despite these successes, however, Havemann's career under the Nazis was also marked by scandal and failure. In the early 1930's, Havemann had initiated the dismissal of countless German musicians, both Jewish and not, and forced the closure of many Jewish and « Jewish-influenced » institutions. Nonetheless, his commitment to anti-Semitism did not allow him to overcome the burden of his earlier leftist credentials ; he was continuously accused of being a « Jew-lover » , particularly due to an infamous affair with a Jewish woman. His controversial reputation came to a head during the famous « Hindemith Affair » . Despite Paul Hindemith's modernist sound, Havemann's support had allowed the composer to keep his position at the Berlin Academy - but the scandal over his Opera, « Mathis der Maler » (Mathis, the Painter) , was to have major ramifications for Havemann, as well as Furtwängler and Hindemith himself. Havemann, probably not realizing the political significance of the conflict, sided with composer Richard Strauß and conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, defending the modernist composer against charges of being « un-German » . Josef Goebbels turned on Havemann, leading to the un-official black-listing of Hindemith, and the dismissal of Havemann from his leading position in the « Reichsmusikkammer » , in late-1934.

Havemann's dismissal following the Hindemith scandal worked to preserve his reputation after the War. He successfully inflated the incident to a commitment to defending « Jewish-associated » musicians (Hindemith, himself, was not Jewish) . Havemann managed to gloss-over his role in the « Reichsmusikkammer » and the long list of Jews and non-Jews he had personally had fired. After the War, he represented himself as a « consistent anti-Fascist » , who had actively resisted the Nazi regime. This ideological chameleon was to die in the small town of Schöneiche, on 2 January 1960.

...

Gustav Havemann, deutscher Violinist und Leiter der Reichsmusikkammer : geboren 15. März 1882 in Güstrow ; gestorben 2. Januar 1960 in Schöneiche.

Er lernte zuerst Geigespielen bei seinem Vater, dem Militärmusiker Johann Havemann. Bereits bevor er die Schule besuchte, trat er in einem Konzert auf. Nach dem Tode des Vaters wurde er durch den Mann seiner Schwester Frieda, Musikdirektor Ernst Parlow, dem Sohn von Albert Parlow, sowie Bruno Ahner weiter ausgebildet, und spielte am Hoforchester in Schwerin, bevor er 1898 an die Berliner Hochschule für Musik ging, wo einer seiner bedeutenden Lehrer Joseph Joachim war. Ab 1900 war er Konzertmeister in Lübeck, 1905 Hofkonzertmeister in Darmstadt und Hamburg, 1911 wurde er Lehrer am Leipziger Konservatorium und war von 1915 bis 1921 Konzertmeister an der Dresdner Hofoper. 1914 wurde sein Sohn Wolfgang Havemann geboren, der später in der antifaschistischen Widerstandsorganisation Rote Kapelle aktiv war. 1916 wurde er mit dem Orden für Kunst und Wissenschaft von Mecklenburg-Strelitz ausgezeichnet. Von 1921 bis 1945 hatte er eine Professur an der Berliner Hochschule inne, 1951-1959 lehrte er an der Deutschen Hochschule für Musik in Berlin (DDR) .

In den frühen 1920er Jahren gründete er mit Georg Kühnau, Hans Mahlke und Adolf Steiner das Havemann-Streichquartett und konzertierte international. Das Repertoire war klassisch bis modern, etwa Stücke von Alban Berg (Streichquartett, Opus 3 am 2. August 1923 - Uraufführung ?) oder Alois Hába. Nachdem Georg Kühnau 1931 das Quartett verließ, spielte das nun sogenannte Havemann-Trio am 7. Juni desselben Jahres in Coburg Adolf Brunners Streichtrio. 1925 war Havemann Mitglied der Künstlervereinigung Novembergruppe.

1931 heiratete Havemann die von dem Künstler Johannes Ilmari Auerbach frisch geschiedene, 22 Jahre jüngere Ingeborg Harnack, die Schwester der späteren Widerstandskämpfer Arvid und Falk Harnack. Havemann war Mitglied im völkisch gesinnten, antisemitischen Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur. 1932 trat er der NSDAP bei (Mitglieds-Nummer I.179.504) . Mit seinem Schwager Arvid Harnack kam es häufig zu Auseinandersetzungen wegen Havemanns « Überzeugung von der Mission Hitlers » . 1932-1935 leitete Havemann das von ihm gegründete Berliner Kampfbund-Orchester, das 1934 in Landesorchester des Gaues Berlin umbenannt wurde.

Nach der « Machtergreifung » der Nationalsozialisten schrieb er am 2. April 1933 an den Deutschen Konzertgeberbund :

« Der Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur wird zu verhindern wissen, daß noch irgendwie jüdischer Einfluß im Musikleben Deutschlands verbleibt. »

Daneben arbeitete er intensiv an der Gleichschaltung des deutschen Musiklebens, insbesondere, seit er im November 1933 Mitglied des Präsidialrats der Reichsmusikkammer geworden war. Nach dem Tod des Reichspräsidenten Paul von Hindenburg gehörte er im August 1934 zu den Unterzeichnern des Aufrufs der Kulturschaffenden zur « Volksabstimmung » über die Zusammenlegung des Reichspräsidenten- und Reichskanzleramts. Zudem war er in Das Deutsche Führerlexikon 1934-1935 gelistet, dem offiziellen Handbuch der NS-Prominenz.

Nach einer Tagebucheintragung von Josef Gœbbels vom 5. Juli 1935 erfolgte an diesem Tag jedoch Havemanns Absetzung :

« Havemann abgesetzt wegen Stellungnahme für Hindemith. »

Anschließend wurde Havemann in die Liste der Musikbolschewisten der NS-Kulturgemeinde aufgenommen.

Eine andere Darstellung der Vorfälle besagt, daß Havemann keineswegs vom Reichspropagandaministerium abgesetzt wurde. Nachdem sich Havemann nicht nur für Hindemith eingesetzt hatte, sondern auch für Musiker jüdischer Herkunft, die sehr zu seinem Verdruß aus seinem Orchester entfernt und durch parteikonforme, zweitklassige Musiker ersetzt worden waren, soll er 1935 wutentbrannt Josef Gæbbels sein « Amt » vor die Füße geschmissen haben. Da dies nicht publik werden durfte, ließ der Propaganda-Minister am Tage darauf in den Zeitungen die Version veröffentlichen, daß Professor Havemann wegen Unfähigkeit (ähnlicher Wortlaut) seines Amtes enthoben wurde.

Nach noch einer anderen Version schied Gustav Havemann im Februar 1936 aus der Reichsmusikkammer mit der offiziellen Begründung, daß dies « in keiner Weise ehrenrührig, sondern rein sachlicher Art » sei. Der Kommentar sei notwendig geworden, da Havemann Alkoholismus zum Vorwurf gemacht worden war. Vor allem war seine Entlassung aber durch sein Engagement für Hindemith begründet, was zuvor auch Wilhelm Furtwängler zum Verhängnis geworden war.

Ab 1942 schrieb Havemann verschiedene Beiträge für die von Gæbbels kontrollierte NS-Zeitschrift Das Reich.

Seit 1950 lehrte Havemann an der Musikfachschule Cottbus, seit 1951 an der Musikhochschule Ostberlin. Er starb am 2. Januar 1960 in Schöneiche bei Berlin.

Werke

Havemann schrieb ein Violinkonzert, Opus 3 (1939) und gab mehrere violindidaktische Werke heraus :

« Was ein Geiger wissen muß » (1921) .

« Die Violintechnik bis zur Vollendung » (1928) .

Heinz Drewes

The German conductor Heinz Drewes was born on 24 October 1903 in Gelsenkirchen and died on 16 June 1980 in Nuremberg. From 1937 to 1944, he was head of the « Division X » (Music) of the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » at the time when the « Reichsmusikkammer » was led by Peter Raabe, from 1935 onwards. He was one of the most influential people in German music-world, at that time. Drewes was head of « Division X » (Music) subordinated divisions : the « Reich » Music Examination Office, consisting of the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » , « Auslandsstelle für Musik » , and « Amt für Konzertwesen » .

Drewes and Raabe struggled on « the leadership in music » , and this made Josef Gæbbels happy, as he could use their words as a threat to one or the other.

Heinz Drewes worked at the « Deutsches Nationaltheater und Staatskapelle Weimar » as a « répétiteur » and conductor. In 1930, he went to the « Landestheater » in Altenburg (« Theater und Philharmonie Thüringen ») as a conductor. He started, there, a local Chapter for the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (KfdK) and, the same year, he joined the NSDAP and wrote articles in the « NS-Zeitung and Völkischer Beobachter ». The « Deutscher Musiker-Kalender » tells that, in 1943, he was « Generalintendant » and « Generalmusikdirektor » .

Denazified, Drewes worked after the War at the Nuremberg Conservatory. Later, a story emerged that Drewes used pseudonyms as he conducted when working in the Propaganda Ministry. He conducted only with the Radio Orchestras. It was he who hired and fired the conductors. He may have used the name « Hermann DeBer » when he conducted Felix Dræseke's « Symphonia Tragica » (Symphony No. 3, Opus 40) with the Berlin Symphony Orchestra (published in 1955 by « Urania Records ») . Alan Krueck says there is no such conductor as « Hermann DeBer » , and the music was typical for the 3rd « Reich » . On the other hand, the quality of the recording was consistent with that achievable at the time. Later, Christoph Schlüren also identifies Drewes.

Heinz Drewes appreciated the composer Jean Sibelius and was the president of the German Sibelius Society (« Deutsche Sibelius Gesellschaft ») . He wrote a preface to Ernst Tanzberger's dissertation, « Die symphonischen Dichtungen, von Jean Sibelius, eine inhalts- und formanalytische Studie » (published by Konrad Tritsch Verlag, in 1943) . Tommi Mäkelä writes in his Sibelius biography that it was explicitly meant to be a greeting « to our Finnish friends and comrades-in-arm » .

Drewes, himself, writes about the Symphonic sagas of Sibelius :

« While the Finnish “ volk ” could be counted racially among the Finno-Ugric tribe, it turned happily, over the Centuries, towards the German world. »

Heinz Drewes was a close friend of Richard Strauß. Strauß asked Drewes to extend protection for his libretist Joseph Gregor. In 1939, Strauß asked again protection for his non-Aryan daughter-in-law and grandchildren.

The Concert-Master of the « Philharmonischen Orchester Landestheater » , Coburg Ralph Braun, says the significance of Heinz Drewes was unknown until today.

...

Heinz Drewes, deutscher Dirigent und Kulturfunktionär : geboren 24. Oktober 1903 in Gelsenkirchen ; gestorben 16. Juni 1980 in Nürnberg. Von 1937 bis 1944 war er Leiter der Abteilung X (Musik) im Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda. Ihm unterstanden damit die Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen, die Auslandsstelle für Musik und das Amt für Konzertwesen. Zugleich war er einer von zwei Vizepräsidenten der Reichskulturkammer.

Studium bei Heinz Tiessen. Eintritt in die NSDAP 1930. Drewes war Kapellmeister am Landestheater Altenburg/Thüringen und gründete dort eine Ortsgruppe des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur. 1932 wurde er dort Generalmusikdirektor und ein Jahr später Generalintendant (1933-1937) . 1933 promovierte er in Köln mit einer Arbeit über die

Komponistin Maria Antonia Walpurgis zum Doktor der Philosophie. Von 1937 bis 1944 leitete er die neugegründete Abteilung X für Musik im Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda und war damit einer der wichtigsten Funktionäre für Musikpolitik während der NS-Zeit. 1937 Ernennung zum Reichskultursenator. Drewes war mitverantwortlich für die Ausstellung Entartete Musik 1938 in Düsseldorf. Mit dem Reichsmusikkammerpräsidenten Peter Raabe bestand ein ständiges Konkurrenzverhältnis. 1942 wurde er Vorsitzender der neugegründeten deutschen Jean Sibelius Gesellschaft. Trotz uk-Stellung meldete er sich 1944 zum Kriegseinsatz. Nach erfolgter Entnazifizierung lebte er nach 1945 in Nürnberg und schrieb Musikkritiken für das Nürnberger Abendblatt.

Werke

Heinz Drewes. Maria Antonia Walpurgis als Komponistin, Zugelassene Dissertation, Köln (1933) ; Borna-Leipzig (1934) .

Bernhard Rust

Bernhard Rust est né le 30 septembre 1883 à Hanovre et est mort le 8 mai 1945 à Berend / Nübel, Kreis Schleswig. Il a été, de 1934 à 1945, pendant le 3e Reich, ministre (« Reichsminister ») de la Science et de l'Éducation.

Professeur dans un lycée de Hanovre, il entra au Parti national-socialiste en 1922 ; parallèlement à son activité d'enseignement, il fut « Gauleiter » pour le Parti nazi, de 1925 à 1930, dans la région de Hanovre. Il fut élu au « Reichstag » en 1930. Nommé en février 1933 (après l'arrivée au pouvoir d'Adolf Hitler) commissaire à l'éducation pour la Prusse, il accéda le 1er juin 1934 à l'importante fonction de ministre de la Science et de l'Éducation et à la Formation du peuple (« Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung ») .

Il avait défini sa politique d'éducation par la phrase suivante :

« Nous avons besoin d'une nouvelle race aryenne dans nos universités car, sinon, nous perdrons la bataille du futur. La tâche principale de l'éducation est de former des Nationaux-Socialistes. »

Un des quelques dignitaires nazis à être resté au pouvoir pendant toute la durée du régime, il y a joué un rôle important, notamment pour l'application des lois raciales de 1933 à l'Université. Toutefois, il n'était pas prisé par les plus hauts-dignitaires du régime, comme Josef Gœbbels, Heinrich Himmler ou Alfred Rosenberg, qui interféraient fréquemment dans son domaine de responsabilité et le considéraient comme quantité négligeable. Il fut constamment sous la pression et la direction de Gœbbels.

En 1945, il fit un plan pour essayer de simplifier l'orthographe allemande.

Apprenant la capitulation allemande, le 8 mai 1945, il se suicida.

...

Bernhard Rust was born on 30 September 1883 in Hanover and died on 8 May 1945 in Berend / Nübel, Kreis Schleswig. He was Minister of Science, Education and National Culture (« Reichserziehungsminister ») in Nazi Germany. A

combination of school administrator and zealous Nazi, he issued decrees, often bizarre, at every level of the German educational system to immerse German youth in the National-Socialist philosophy.

Rust obtained in Hanover a doctorate in German philology and philosophy. After passing the State teaching examination, in 1908, with the grade « gut », he became a high-school teacher at Hanover's « Ratsgymnasium », then served in the army during World War I. He reached the rank of lieutenant and was awarded the Iron Cross for bravery.

Rust joined the NSDAP in 1922, and eventually became the « Gauleiter » for the « Gau » of Süd-Hannover-Braunschweig. In 1930, he was elected to the « Reichstag ». When Adolf Hitler became Chancellor, in 1933, Rust was appointed as the Prussian Minister for Cultural Affairs. On 1 June 1934, he was selected as Minister of Science, Education and National Culture (« Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung »), and set about to reshape the German educational system to conform to his ideals of National-Socialism. Considered by many to be mentally unstable, Rust would spuriously create new regulations and, then, repeal them just as quickly. One noted example was in 1935, when he changed the traditional 6 day school week to 5 days, with Saturday to be « “ Reich ” 's Youth Day » when children in the Hitler Youth and the League of German Girls would be out of school for study and testing. He, then, ordered the creation of a « rolling week », with 6 days for study, followed by the « youth day » and a rest-day, in 8 day periods. Thus, a rolling week starting on Monday would end with rest on the following Monday ; the next rolling week would start on Tuesday and end 8 days later, on the next Tuesday. When the 8 day week proved unworkable, Rust went back to the former system.

It was Rust who, in 1933, issued a rule that students and teachers should greet each other with the Nazi salute « as a symbol of the new Germany ». He added his opinion that it was « expected of every German » regardless of membership in the Party. Rust was instrumental in purging German universities of Jews and others regarded as enemies of the State, most notably at the University of Göttingen. Nazi Germany's future leaders received their instruction elsewhere, in an NPEA or «Napola » (Nationalpolitische erziehungsanstalten), of which there were 30 in the nation, where they would receive training to become administrators of conquered provinces.

He bluntly informed teachers that their aim was to educate ethnically aware Germans. Rust also believed that non-Aryan science (such as Albert Einstein's « Jewish physics ») was flawed, and had what he felt to be a rational explanation for this view.

In an address to scientists, he said :

« The problems of science do not present themselves in the same way to all men. The Negro or the Jew will view the same world in a different light from the German investigator. »

Erika Mann, the daughter of Thomas Mann, wrote an « exposé » of the Rust system, in 1938, entitled : « School for Barbarians » ; followed, in 1941, by Gregor Ziemer's « Education for Death » .

Rust reportedly committed suicide on 8 May 1945 when Germany surrendered to Allied forces.

Rust prepared a reform of German orthography, and his fairly extensive version corresponded to the ideas of the spelling reformers of the 1970's (lower-case common nouns, elimination of lengthening-symbols) . This attempt met internal resistance of the « Reich » 's Ministry. The German orthography reform of 1944 also failed.

Before these failures, the rules of the reform were printed in millions of copies intended for classroom use and published in numerous newspapers. The 1944 reform was postponed on the orders of Hitler because it was « not important for the War effort » . Some of Rust's innovations had, however, found their way into the 1942 « Duden » , such as the spelling of the word « Kautsch » for Couch, which persisted into the 1980's.

Many of the proposed changes were finally implemented with the German orthography reform of 1996.

...

Bernhard Rust (geboren 30. September 1883 in Hannover ; gestorben 8. Mai 1945 in der Gemeinde Berend/Nübel, Kreis Schleswig) war ein deutscher Politiker (NSDAP) , MdL und MdR. 1933-1934 leitete er das preußische Kultusministerium und von 1934 bis 1945 das Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung. Rust war ein Hauptvertreter der nationalsozialistischen Erziehung.

Rust wurde als einziges Kind katholischer Eltern geboren. Franz Rust, sein Vater, von Haus aus Zimmermann kam durch Spekulationen mit Mietshäusern in Hannover zu einigem Wohlstand. Nach dem Besuch des Lyzeums II in Hannover studierte Rust von 1904 bis 1908 Germanistik, Klassische Philologie, Kunstgeschichte, Philosophie und Musik und arbeitete von 1911 bis 1930 als Studienrat am Ratsgymnasium in Hannover. Rust war zweimal verheiratet. Seine erste Frau, mit der Rust von 1910 bis 1919 verheiratet war, verstarb 1919. 1920 heiratete Rust Anna-Sofie Dietlein. Rust hatte einen Sohn aus erster Ehe und drei Töchter in der zweiten Ehe.

Während des Ersten Weltkrieges erlitt er als Infanterieleutnant eine schwere Kopfverletzung und wurde zweimal verschüttet. Im Dezember 1918 verließ Rust im Rang eines Oberstleutnant in Reserve und hoch dekoriert das Militär. Ob die Verwundungen dauerhafte Beeinträchtigungen hinterließen ist unklar. Im Schuldienst fiel er immer wieder gesundheitsbedingt aus ; 1933 wurde eine Trigeminusneuralgie diagnostiziert. Rust trank daraufhin regelmäßig Alkohol und wurde von Außenstehenden als alkoholsüchtig eingestuft.

Nach dem Krieg wandte sich Rust der völkischen Bewegung zu. Politisch prägend waren vor allem Paul de Lagarde, Arthur Møller van den Bruck, Houston Stewart Chamberlain und Oswald Spengler. Rust trat dem rechtsradikalen Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbund bei. Nach dem Verbot der NSDAP in Preußen gründete Rust 1922 zusammen mit seinem Schwiegervater und weiteren Gleichgesinnten in Hannover eine Ortsgruppe der Deutschvölkischen Freiheitspartei. Zudem war Rust Mitglied im Bund ehemaliger Frontkämpfer und im Stahlhelm. 1924 wurde Rust für die Deutschvölkische Freiheitspartei in das hannoversche Stadtparlament gewählt. Im Mai 1925 trat Rust der NSDAP und der SA bei.

Vom 22. März 1925 bis 30. September 1928 war er Gauleiter von Lüneburg-Stade (später Ost-Hannover/Hannover-Ost) . Nach der Neugliederung der Gaugrenzen wurde er am 1. Oktober 1928 zum Gauleiter des neu gegründeten Gau

Südhanover-Braunschweig ernannt. Ebenso wurde er Gauleiter der völkisch gesinnten, antisemitischen Nationalsozialistischen Gesellschaft für Deutsche Kultur. 1929 wurde Ruste in den preußischen Provinziallandtag gewählt, 1930, am 14. September gewann Rust im Wahlkreis Hannover-Süd ein Reichstagsmandat für die NSDAP.

Am 2. Februar 1933 wurde er kommissarischer preußischer Kultusminister und 1934 mit Bildung des Reichsministeriums für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung in Personalunion Reichsminister. Auf Grund des Gesetzes zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums verloren unter Rusts Leitung etwa tausend Hochschullehrer, vor allem Juden, Sozialdemokraten und Liberale, Stellung und Beruf. Dieses hatte für die deutsche bislang sehr starke Stellung im Bereich Naturwissenschaften gravierende Folgen. Ungezählte hochrangige Wissenschaftler emigrierten aus Deutschland meist nach Amerika, unter ihnen etwa ein Dutzend Nobelpreisträger.

Rust selber äußerte sich zu diesem Prozess :

« Wir brauchen eine neue arische Rasse an den Universitäten, oder wir werden die Zukunft verlieren. Die Hauptaufgabe der Erziehung ist es, Nationalsozialisten zu bilden. »

Zu seinen frühen Aktionen gehört auch die Entlassung des Berliner Reformpädagogen Fritz Karsen am 21. Februar 1933 und die beginnende Gleichschaltung der von Karsen geleiteten Karl-Marx-Schule (Berlin-Neukölln) .

Die neue Verfassung für die deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen vom April 1935 zielte auf die Zentralisierung und vor allem Beschränkung der akademischen Selbstverwaltung. Die Rektoren waren fortan « Führer der Hochschule » und direkt Rust unterstellt. Auf die Frage, warum die Ausbildung der Lehrer nur an eigens geschaffenen Lehrerbildungsanstalten (zum Beispiel Bernhard-Rust-Hochschule in Braunschweig) und nicht an Universitäten stattfinden solle, antwortete Rust, er könne nicht dulden, « daß die künftigen Erzieher des Volkes ihre Ausbildung an diesen liberalistischen Irrgärten erhielten » .

Rust setzte die Ideologisierung des Fachunterrichts (zum Beispiel im Erlaß Vererbungslehre und Rassenkunde im Unterricht vom 15. Januar 1935) durch und erwirkte unter Bruch des Reichskonkordats das Verbot der katholischen Schulen mit dem Schuljahr 1939-1940. In allen Schulen wurden Elternbeiräte und Schülermitverwaltung abgeschafft.

Daneben war Rust am 1. Juli 1935 Gründer des rassenideologischen Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands, das am 19. Oktober 1935 eröffnet wurde. Seit 1940 war er SA-Gruppenführer.

In der Nacht vom 7. zum 8. Mai 1945, dem Tag der bedingungslosen Kapitulation, erschoss sich Rust in der Nähe des Dorfes Nübel in Schleswig-Holstein selbst. Er wurde in Nübel bestattet.

Rust bereitete eine Reform der deutschen Rechtschreibung vor. Eine recht weitgehende Version, die in manchem den Vorstellungen der Rechtschreibreformer der 1970er entsprach (gemäßigte Kleinschreibung, Weglassung der Dehnungszeichen) scheiterte bereits intern am Widerstand des Reichsinnenministeriums. Ein weiterer Versuch 1944 scheiterte ebenfalls. Die Regeln der Reform der deutschen Rechtschreibung lagen bereits in einer Million Exemplaren für den Schulgebrauch gedruckt vor, in verschiedenen Zeitungen erschienen Einführungsartikel. Die Reform wurde jedoch

nicht offiziell eingeführt, weil sie nicht kriegswichtig sei. Einige der von Rust geplanten Schreibungen fanden allerdings Eingang in den Duden. Die Schreibung Kautsch für Couch beispielsweise stand dort bis in die 1980er Jahre verzeichnet. Ein guter Teil der geplanten Änderungen wurde in der Reform der deutschen Rechtschreibung von 1996 wieder aufgegriffen.

Rust hatte im Ämterchaos des nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Reiches geringen Einfluß und mußte immer mehr Zuständigkeiten an konkurrierende Organisationen abtreten, etwa an die SS, die Hitlerjugend oder die Deutsche Arbeitsfront. Sein Vorhaben, das deutsche Schulsystem im nationalsozialistischen Geiste grundlegend umzugestalten, scheiterte nicht zuletzt an den kriegsbedingten Unterrichtsbeeinträchtigungen wie Kinderlandverschickung, Lehrkräfte- und Raummangel.

Rusts geringer Einfluß war auch eine Folge des schlechten Ansehens, in dem er bei konkurrierenden nationalsozialistischen Amtsträgern stand. Er wurde von manchen verachtet. Alfred Rosenberg bezeichnete ihn als « haltlos, alt und krank », Josef Goebbels, der sich durch Hitler bei der Vergabe des Kultusministeriums hintergangen fühlte - « Nun bekommt der Rust den Kultus. Ich schau in den Mond. Das ist so demütigend. », nannte seinen Ministerkollegen einen « absoluten Hohlkopf », der « nicht ganz zurechnungsfähig » sei.

Robert Ley

L'homme politique allemand, membre du NSDAP, Robert Ley est né le 15 février 1890 à Niederbreidenbach et est mort à 55 ans, le 25 octobre 1945, à Nuremberg. Il est un Directeur du Front allemand du travail et Organisateur du Parti nazi (« Reichsorganisationsleiter »), il s'est suicidé avant d'être jugé pour crimes de guerre.

Issu d'une famille d'agriculteurs ruinés, fils de Friedrich et Émilie Ley (née Wald), Robert Ley est le 7e d'une fratrie de 12 enfants. Marqué par la condamnation pour dettes de son père, il étudie la chimie aux Universités d'Iéna et de Bonn en travaillant durant les vacances universitaires.

Lorsque la Première Guerre mondiale éclate, Ley s'engage comme volontaire dans l'armée allemande. Il est affecté durant 2 années dans un régiment d'artillerie, avant de suivre une formation d'aviateur. En juillet 1917, son avion est abattu au-dessus de la France. Lors de l'écrasement, Ley est victime d'un traumatisme crânien et de multiples contusions aux jambes, nécessitant 6 opérations chirurgicales. Il en garde à vie un léger bégaiement et une certaine propension à la nervosité. Il est fait prisonnier par les Français et interné dans un camp pendant 2 ans. Il n'est libéré qu'en 1920.

Ley reprend ses cours à l'Université et obtient un doctorat de chimie alimentaire. Il est embauché dans une filiale alimentaire du géant industriel IG Farben, à Leverkusen dans la Ruhr. En 1924, opposé à l'occupation française de la Ruhr, et présentant des positions ultra-nationalistes après avoir lu des extraits de la défense présentée par Adolf Hitler à son procès du « “ Putsch ” de la Brasserie », il rejoint le NSDAP.

Dès son adhésion, Ley a un rôle important non seulement dans l'implantation du NSDAP en Rhénanie, mais aussi dans

la reprise en main du Parti par Hitler après sa libération. Orateur, démagogue, il jouit à ces titres de la protection de Hitler contre ses subordonnés et ses concurrents au sein du Parti. En 1925, Ley devient « Gauleiter » en Rhénanie et éditeur d'un journal, le « Westdeutsche Beobachter », dont les attaques antisémites lui valent de multiples condamnations. En 1925, lors du débat, interne au NSDAP, sur l'opportunité d'exproprier les familles princières du « Reich », il s'oppose aux choix politiques des frères Gregor et Otto Straßer, partisans de l'expropriation. Il se retrouve isolé parmi les « Gauleiter » du Nord du « Reich » et doit affronter leur hostilité, mais cette position fait de lui l'un des principaux soutiens à Hitler au Nord du Main.

En 1931, invité par Hitler, il commence à fréquenter le groupe de Munich, groupe d'intimes de Hitler, qui forme le vrai centre du pouvoir au NSDAP. En décembre 1932, Gregor Straßer est démis de ses fonctions à la suite d'un différend avec Hitler, Ley lui succède alors en tant que « Reichsorganisationsleiter » (responsable de l'organisation du Parti) .

L'expérience de Ley acquise alors qu'il était à la tête de la région ouvrière de la Ruhr (« Gauleiter ») le rend populaire dans l'aile socialiste du Parti nazi, même s'il définit le socialisme du NSDAP comme étant opposé à la pitié, ou proche du lien qui existe entre les soldats des tranchées.

Quand Hitler devient chancelier du « Reich », en janvier 1933, Ley le suit à Berlin : il participe à la restructuration des organisations ouvrières allemandes au printemps 1933. Après la promulgation de la loi du 19 mai 1933, les syndicats sont dissous pour être remplacés par le Front allemand du travail (« Deutsche Arbeitsfront », ou DAF) et Ley est nommé « Führer » de cette nouvelle organisation. Cette loi est précisée le 20 janvier 1934. Proche de Hitler, il est associé aux campagnes de propagande dès 1934, notamment celle liée à la construction des autoroutes en mars 1934.

Ley transforme le « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » en organisation totalement inféodée au Parti, ce même avant la purge de 1934.

Sous sa tutelle, le Front du Travail devient non seulement l'administration la plus corrompue du « Reich », mais aussi développe un discours révolutionnaire. Prévaricateur, Ley détourne à son profit des sommes très importantes issues à la fois des syndicats interdits, de la vente d'ouvrages dont il est l'auteur, du journal du Front du travail et s'octroie des salaires excessivement élevés. Il mène grand train, vit dans le luxe, est amateur de jolies femmes, habite de fastueuses demeures. Son mode de vie contamine celui de ses subordonnés, qui s'empressent de s'enrichir également par tous les biais possibles. Ils « s'achètent une immunité » en finançant l'embellissement des propriétés de la SS ou de proches de Hitler.

À la tête d'une organisation regroupant des centaines de milliers de membres et collectant de gigantesques masses d'argent par le biais de cotisations obligatoires, Ley jouit d'une autonomie et d'une impunité de fait. Il tente de prendre le contrôle de la production de la Volkswagen, dont le financement, organisé par son administration, constitue une manière de gruger les souscripteurs.

Ley devient progressivement dépendant à l'alcool : en 1933, sa dépendance est déjà de notoriété publique et, en 1943,

sous l'emprise de l'alcool, il se montre favorable à la mise en application de tous les moyens disponibles pour accroître la production de charbon.

Il encourage, parfois contre d'autres organes du Parti, la création de centres de formation spécifiques, non seulement pour les futurs cadres de son organisation, mais aussi pour les Allemands membres du « Jungvolk », organisation proposant l'encadrement des jeunes gens préalable à leur admission dans la Jeunesse hitlérienne. Ainsi, à partir de 1935, il organise les « Ordenburgen », des centres de formation destinés à des jeunes gens âgés de plus de 25 ans, ayant suivi l'intégralité du cursus national-socialiste : jeunesses hitlériennes, armée, « Deutsche Arbeitsfront ». Conçus comme des « Universités du Parti », ces centres sont destinés à être la pépinière des futurs dirigeants du « Reich ». Néanmoins, le succès de ces écoles est mitigé car les critères de sélection sont jugés trop draconiens, et les élèves sont souvent recrutés parmi les fils des permanents du « Deutsche Arbeitsfront ».

Chef du Front allemand du travail, il joue un rôle important : notamment, il prend le contrôle de la construction de logements dès le début des hostilités, puis, tente, à partir de l'automne 1940, de prendre le contrôle de la production de charbon dans le « Reich », en plaçant l'un de ses proches ou en proposant une réforme des rémunérations des mineurs, tout en affirmant la nécessité de traiter durement les travailleurs étrangers travaillant dans le « Reich », dont il partage la gestion avec Fritz Sauckel.

En juillet 1944, il participe au déferlement de haine des membres du Parti contre les responsables de la tentative d'attentat contre Hitler et, par extension, contre les aristocrates et les militaires de haut-rang.

À partir d'août 1944, il se montre favorable à la directive de Hitler qui ordonne d'ériger des fortifications le long des frontières du « Reich », destinées à contenir l'invasion alliée. En effet, il a l'ambition de parvenir à contrôler l'ensemble des travaux de construction projetés.

À l'automne 1944, lorsque de nombreuses régions du « Reich » sont directement menacées, il suggère la mise en place d'une milice populaire, mais il est discrédité par Heinrich Himmler, Martin Bormann et d'autres chefs nazis.

En mars 1945, en accord avec Josef Goebbels et certains « Gauleiter » des régions occidentales envahies, il propose la mise en place d'organisations de partisans, la « Werwolf », puis celle de brigades de jeunes gens, armés de « Panzerfaust », se déplaçant à bicyclette : l'objectif illusoire recherché est d'arrêter les divisions blindées alliées qui se dirigent vers le centre du « Reich ».

À la fin de la Guerre, Robert Ley change d'identité et prend le pseudonyme d'Ernst Dostelmaier. Il est cependant arrêté et confronté à des témoins qui le reconnaissent : il est incarcéré à Nuremberg. Le 25 octobre 1945, il est retrouvé pendu à la tuyauterie des toilettes de sa cellule au moyen d'une corde de fortune faite de lambeaux de serviette assemblés. Le psychiatre américain Douglas Kelley, de Nuremberg, est persuadé que Ley souffrait de démence : il fait alors envoyer son cerveau pour analyse dans un laboratoire du Professeur Webb Haymaker qui confirme son hypothèse, mais celle-ci est, par la suite, infirmée par un autre laboratoire de San Francisco.

Ce suicide incite les autorités alliées à renforcer leur surveillance des accusés, ce qui pourtant n'empêchera pas le suicide de Hermann Göring, le 15 octobre 1946, par ingestion d'une capsule d'acide cyanhydrique.

...

The Nazi politician Robert Ley was born 15 February 1890 in Niederbreidenbach (now, a part of Nümbrecht) , in the Rhine Province ; and died on 25 October 1945. He became head of the German Labour Front, from 1933 to 1945. He committed suicide while awaiting trial at Nuremberg for War crimes.

Ley was the 7th of 11 children of a heavily indebted farmer, Friedrich Ley, and his wife Emilie (« née » Wald) . He studied chemistry at the Universities of Jena, Bonn, and Münster. He volunteered for the army on the outbreak of World War I, in 1914, and spent 2 years in the artillery before training as an aerial artillery spotter with Field Artillery Detachment 202. In July 1917, his aircraft was shot-down over France and he was taken prisoner. It has been suggested that he suffered a brain injury in the crash ; for the rest of his life, he spoke with a stammer and suffered bouts of erratic behaviour, aggravated by heavy drinking.

After the War, Ley returned to University, gaining a doctorate in 1920. He was employed as a food chemist by a branch of the giant IG Farben company, based in Leverkusen in the Ruhr. Enraged by the French occupation of the Ruhr, in 1924, Ley became an ultra-nationalist and joined the Nazi Party soon after reading Adolf Hitler's speech at his trial following the « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » , in Munich. By 1925, he was « Gauleiter » of the Southern Rhineland district and editor of a virulently anti-Semitic Nazi newspaper, the « Westdeutsche Beobachter » . Ley proved unswervingly loyal to Hitler, which led the Party leader to ignore complaints about his arrogance, incompetence and drunkenness.

In 1931, Ley was brought to the Nazi Party's Munich headquarters to take-over as head of the Party organization (« Reichsorganisationsleiter ») following Hitler's dismissal of Gregor Straßer in an internal dispute. Ley's impoverished upbringing and his experience as head of the largely working-class Ruhr Party region meant that he was sympathetic to those elements in the Party who were open to socialism, which Hitler opposed, but he always sided with Hitler in inner Party disputes. This helped him survive the hostility of other Party officials such as the Party treasurer, Franz Xaver Schwarz, who regarded him as a drunken incompetent. When Hitler became Chancellor, in January 1933, Ley accompanied him to Berlin. In April, when the trade-union movement was taken-over by the State, Hitler appointed him head of the German Labour Front (« Deutsche Arbeitsfront » , or DAF) .

The « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » took-over the existing Nazi trade-union formation, the National-Socialist Factory Cell Organisation (« Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation » , or NSBO) as well as the main trade-union federation. But Ley's lack of administrative ability meant that the « Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation » leader, Reinhold Muchow, a member of the socialist wing of the Nazi Party, soon became the dominant figure in the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » , overshadowing Ley. Muchow began a purge of the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » administration, rooting-out ex- Social-Democrats and ex- Communists and placing his own militants in their place. The « Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation » cells continued to agitate in the factories on issues of wages and

conditions, annoying the employers, who soon complained to Hitler and other Nazi leaders that the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » was as bad as the Communists had been.

Hitler had no sympathy with the syndicalist tendencies of the « Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation » and, in January 1934, a new Law for the Ordering of National Labour effectively suppressed independent working-class factory organizations, even Nazi ones, and put questions of wages and conditions in the hands of the Trustees of Labour (« Treuhänder der Arbeit »), dominated by the employers. At the same time Muchow was purged and Ley's control over the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » re-established. The « Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation » was completely suppressed and the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » became little more than an arm of the State for the more efficient deployment and disciplining of labour to serve the needs of the regime, particularly its massive expansion of the arms industry.

Once his power was established, Ley began to abuse it in a way that was conspicuous even by the standards of the Nazi regime. On top of his generous salaries as « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » head, « Reichsorganisationsleiter », and « Reichstag » Deputy, he pocketed the large profits of the « Westdeutsche Beobachter », and freely embezzled « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » funds for his personal use. By 1938, he owned a luxurious estate near Cologne, a string of villas in other cities, a fleet of cars, a private railway carriage and a large art-collection. He increasingly devoted his time to « womanizing and heavy drinking, both of which often led to embarrassing scenes in public ». On 29 December 1942, his 2nd wife Inge (1916-1942) shot herself after a drunken brawl. Ley's subordinates took their lead from him, and the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » became a notorious centre of corruption, all paid for with the compulsory dues paid by German workers.

One historian says :

« The “ Deutsche Arbeitsfront ” quickly began to gain a reputation as, perhaps, the most corrupt of all the major institutions of the 3rd “ Reich ”. For this, Ley himself had to shoulder a large part of the blame. »

Hitler and Ley were aware that the suppression of the trade-unions and the prevention of wage increases by the Trustees of Labour system, when coupled with their relentless demands for increased productivity to hasten German re-armament, created a real risk of working-class discontent. In November 1933, as a means of preventing labour disaffection, the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » established « Strength through Joy » (« Kraft durch Freude », KdF), to provide a range of benefits and amenities to the German working-class and their families. These included subsidized holidays both at resorts across Germany and in « safe » countries abroad (particularly, Italy). Some of the world's 1st purpose built cruise-liners, the Wilhelm Gustloff and the Robert Ley, were built to take « Kraft durch Freude » members on Mediterranean cruises.

Other « Kraft durch Freude » programs included concerts, Opera and other forms of entertainment in factories and other work-places, free physical education and gymnastics training and coaching in sports such as football, tennis and sailing. All this was paid for by the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront », at a cost of 29 million « Reichsmarks » a year, by 1937, and ultimately by the workers themselves through their dues, although the employers also contributed. « Kraft

durch Freude » was one of the Nazi regime's most popular programs, and played a large part in reconciling the working-class to the regime, at least before 1939.

The « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » and « Kraft durch Freude » 's most ambitious program was the « people's car » , the Volkswagen, originally a project undertaken at Hitler's request by the car-maker Ferdinand Porsche. When the German car industry was unable to meet Hitler's demand that the Volkswagen be sold at 1,000 « Reichsmarks » or less, the project was taken-over by the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » . This brought Ley's old socialist tendencies back into prominence. The Party, he said, had taken-over where private industry had failed, because of the « short-sightedness, malevolence, profiteering and stupidity » of the business class. Now working for the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » , Porsche built a new Volkswagen factory at Fallersleben, at a huge cost which was partly met by raiding the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » 's accumulated assets and misappropriating the dues paid by « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » members. The Volkswagen was sold to German workers on an installment plan, and the 1st models appeared in February 1939. The outbreak of War, however, meant that none of the 340,000 workers who paid for a car ever received one. The entire project was financially unsound, and only the corruption and lack of accountability of the Nazi regime made it possible.

Ley said in a speech, in 1939 :

« We, National-Socialists, have monopolized all resources and all our energies during the past 7 years so as to be able to be equipped for the supreme effort of battle. »

With the outbreak of World War II, in September 1939, Ley's importance declined. The militarization of the work-force and the diversion of resources to the War greatly reduced the role of the « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » , and the « Kraft durch Freude » was largely curtailed. Ley's drunkenness and erratic behaviour were less tolerated in War-time, and he was supplanted by Armaments Minister Fritz Todt and his successor Albert Speer as the czar of the German work-force (the head of the « Organization Todt » , or OT) . As German workers were increasingly conscripted, foreign workers, 1st « guest-workers » from France and, later, slave labourers from Poland, Ukraine and other Eastern countries, were brought in to replace them. Ley played some role in this program, but was overshadowed by Fritz Sauckel, General Plenipotentiary for the Distribution of Labour (« Generalbevollmächtigter für den Arbeitseinsatz ») , in 1942.

Nevertheless, Ley was deeply implicated in the mistreatment of foreign slave workers. In October 1942, he attended a meeting in Essen with Paul Plieger (head of the giant « Hermann Göring Works » industrial combine) and leaders of the German coal industry. A verbatim account of the meeting was kept by one of the managers.

A recent historian writes :

« The key-item on the agenda was the question of “ how to treat the Russians ”. Robert Ley, as usual, was drunk. And when Ley got drunk he was prone to speak his mind. With so much at stake, there was no room for compassion or civility. No degree of coercion was too much, and Ley expected the mine managers to back-up their foremen in meting, out the necessary discipline. As Ley put it : “ When a Russian pig has to be beaten, it would be the ordinary

German worker who would have to do it. ” »

Despite his failings, Ley retained Hitler's favour ; until the last months of the War, he was part of Hitler's inner-circle along with Martin Bormann and Josef Gœbbels. In November 1941, he was given a new role, as « Reich » Commissioner for Social House-Building (« Reichskommissar für den sozialen Wohnungsbau ») , later shortened to « Reich » Housing Commissioner (« Reichswohnungskommissar ») . Here, his job was to prepare for the effects on German housing of the expected Allied air-attacks on German cities, which began to increase in intensity from 1941 onwards. In this role, he became a key-ally of Armaments Minister Albert Speer, who recognized that German workers must be adequately housed if productivity was to be maintained. As the air-war against Germany increased from 1943, « dehousing » German workers became an objective of the Allied area bombing campaign, and Ley's organization was increasingly unable to cope with the resulting housing crisis.

He was aware, in general terms, of the Nazi regime's programme of extermination of the Jews of Europe. Ley encouraged it through the virulent anti-Semitism of his publications and speeches. In February 1941, he was present at a meeting along with Speer, Bormann and Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel at which Hitler had set-out his views on the « Jewish Question » at some length, making it clear that he intended the « disappearance » of the Jews, one way or another.

As the 3rd « Reich » collapsed, in early 1945, Ley was among the government figures who remained fanatically loyal to Hitler. He last saw Hitler, on 20 April 1945, Hitler's birthday, in the « Führerbunker » , in central Berlin. The next day, he left for southern Bavaria, in the expectation that Hitler would make his last stand in the « National Redoubt » , in the alpine areas. When Hitler refused to leave Berlin, this idea was abandoned which then left Ley effectively unemployed. On 16 May, he was captured by American para-troopers of the 101st Airborne Division in a shoe-maker's house in the village of Schleching. Ley told them he was « Doctor Ernst Distelmeyer » , but he was identified by Franz Xaver Schwarz, the treasurer of the Nazi Party and a long-time enemy.

At the Nuremberg Trials, Ley was indicted under Count 1 (« The Common Plan or Conspiracy to wage an aggressive war in violation of international law or treaties ») ; Count 3 (War Crimes, including among other things « mistreatment of prisoners of war or civilian populations ») ; and Count 4 (« Crimes Against Humanity : murder, extermination, enslavement of civilian populations ; persecution on the basis of racial, religions or political grounds ») .

Ley was apparently indignant at being regarded as a war criminal, telling the American psychiatrist Douglas Kelley and psychologist Gustave Gilbert who had seen and tested him in prison :

« Stand us against a wall and shoot us, well and good, you are victors. But why should I be brought before a Tribunal like a c-c-c- ... I can't even get the word out ! »

On 24 October, 3 days after receiving the indictment, Ley strangled himself in his prison cell using a noose made by tearing a towel into strips, fastened to the toilet pipe in his cell.

Baldur von Schirach

Le chef des Jeunesses hitlériennes et « Gauleiter » de Vienne Baldur von Schirach est né le 9 mai 1907 à Berlin et est mort le 8 août 1974 à Kröv-an-der-Mosel. Il fut condamné à 20 ans de prison à la suite du procès de Nuremberg et emprisonné à la prison de Spandau.

Schirach est issu d'une riche famille noble d'officiers et le dernier de 4 frères. Son père, l'officier Carl von Schirach épouse Emma, la fille d'un avocat américain. En 1908, Carl démissionne de l'armée pour devenir directeur du théâtre de la Cour grand-ducale de Weimar. Baldur connaît une enfance privilégiée, marquée par la musique, le théâtre et la littérature, il sera l'un des rares dirigeants nazis à parler couramment l'anglais. Très tôt, il fait preuve d'un talent de poète et aime particulièrement Goethe. Malheureusement, la Première Guerre mondiale met vite fin à cette vie sans souci. À 10 ans, le jeune Schirach devient membre de la « Ligue des Jeunes Allemands », une organisation nationaliste et raciste.

Au lendemain de la défaite allemande de 1918, son père est révoqué et reste quelque temps sans emploi. Les désordres qui agitent alors l'Allemagne traumatisent durablement la famille Schirach. Le fils-aîné ne supportant pas le déshonneur de sa patrie met fin à ses jours. Désenchanté, Carl von Schirach se tourne vers l'extrême-droite et devient l'un des partisans du Parti national-socialiste.

Durant son adolescence, Baldur est marqué par la haine de son père envers la République de Weimar. Au cours d'un voyage qu'il effectue avec sa mère aux États-Unis, sa famille américaine lui propose de s'y installer pour entamer une carrière. Mais Baldur choisit de retourner en Allemagne. Le 29 août 1925, lors d'un dîner organisé dans la maison familiale, il fait la connaissance d'Adolf Hitler. L'adolescent profondément impressionné par cette rencontre adhère peu après au NSDAP. Il compose un poème sur Hitler qui est publié dans un recueil en 1929 ; pour le féliciter, ce dernier lui envoie une photographie signée. En 1927, Baldur entre à la SA et s'installe à Munich, où il s'inscrit à l'université pour y suivre des cours d'histoire de l'art, d'anglais et de littérature allemande.

En dépit de son jeune âge, Schirach fait très rapidement partie du cercle intime des dirigeants du NSDAP. Ainsi, le 20 juillet 1928, il est nommé à la tête de l'Union des étudiants hitlériens. En 1929, son engagement politique le pousse à abandonner ses études. Propagandiste et organisateur remarquable du mouvement étudiant, il inspire chez ses compagnons les idéaux de la camaraderie, du sacrifice, de la discipline, du courage et de l'honneur. Il gagne ainsi à la cause nazie des centaines de milliers de jeunes.

L'efficacité de son action auprès de la jeunesse et la dévotion aveugle qu'il exprime dans ses poèmes lui valent l'estime d'Adolf Hitler. Le 30 octobre 1931, celui-ci le nomme chef des Jeunesses hitlériennes, poste qu'Hitler crée spécialement pour lui. Baldur, qui n'a que 24 ans, devient ainsi colonel SA. À peine nommé au rang de chef des Jeunesses hitlériennes, il exclut les révolutionnaires de cette organisation et rédige des éléments de programme en matière de politique universitaire : l'introduction d'un quota d'étudiants juifs, la création de nouvelles disciplines comme les études raciales, les sciences militaires, dans le cadre d'une université définie par sa place dans la communauté nationale. Dans le même temps, il présente des listes aux élections de représentants étudiants, ces listes

obtiennent des résultats si importants que la Fédération nationale des comités étudiants vote en 1932 l'abolition des élections, et l'adoption du « Führerprinzip » .

En mars 1932, il épouse Henriette Hoffmann, la fille du photographe personnel de Hitler, Heinrich Hoffmann. Hitler est témoin du mariage et leur offre un chien. Le couple aura 4 enfants, 3 garçons et 1 fille. Le 31 juillet, Schirach devient député au « Reichstag » . Quelques mois plus tard, début octobre 1932, il organise une monumentale marche de la jeunesse nazie. Des dizaines de milliers de jeunes, venus à pied de toute l'Allemagne, rendent ainsi hommage à Hitler au cours d'un défilé qui dure près de 7 heures. Hitler est lui-même très impressionné.

À partir de janvier 1933, Schirach travaille d'arrache-pied pour atteindre son objectif : inculquer à la jeunesse allemande les idéaux nazis. Il prend ainsi possession, par la force, des bureaux du comité des associations de jeunesse du « Reich » , puis de l'organisation des auberges de jeunesse. Le 17 juin 1933, lors d'une cérémonie en présence de Hitler, Schirach devient chef des Jeunesses du « Reich » allemand. La « Hitlerjugend » est ainsi libérée de la tutelle SA et devient autonome vis-à-vis du Parti.

Entre janvier 1933 et 1934, les Jeunesses hitlériennes passent de 1 million à 3,5 millions de membres. À la suite du décret du 1er décembre 1936 qui en fait une organisation d'État, les adhérents sont de plus en plus nombreux. Schirach devient alors secrétaire d'État à la jeunesse. Désormais, il ne dépend plus que de Hitler et est « entièrement responsable de l'éducation physique, idéologique et morale de la jeunesse allemande » .

En janvier 1937, avec l'aide du docteur Robert Ley, il ouvre les « écoles Adolf Hitler » pour former l'élite du IIIe « Reich » . Son organisation travaille en étroite collaboration avec le ministère de la Propagande, dirigé par Josef Goebbels. Présenté comme une sorte de héros, adulé par les jeunes Nazis comme un dieu, les photographies du chef des jeunesses hitlériennes sont diffusées en nombre dans l'ensemble du « Reich » .

En 1938, Schirach déclare :

« Le combat pour l'unification de la jeunesse allemande est terminé. Je considère comme de mon devoir de la conduire d'une manière dure et intransigeante et je promets au peuple allemand que la jeunesse du “ Reich ”, la jeunesse d'Adolf Hitler, accomplira son devoir suivant l'esprit de l'homme à qui seul leurs vies appartiennent. »

Le 25 mars 1939, l'adhésion aux Jeunesses hitlériennes devient obligatoire pour les jeunes voulant pratiquer des activités sportives ou encore aller à l'école. Elles regroupent alors 12 millions de jeunes. Schirach transforme ainsi la jeunesse allemande en « objet de propagande vivante » , permettant ainsi l'embrigadement des parents par leurs enfants.

C'est à cette époque que Schirach prononce la célèbre phrase dans un meeting, joignant le geste à la parole :

« Quand j'entends le mot “ culture ”, je sors mon revolver ! »

Cette phrase est en fait due à l'écrivain nazi Hanns Johst qui l'a placée comme réplique d'un personnage de l'une de ses pièces de théâtre intitulée « Schlageter » (1933) (la phrase exacte de la pièce originale de Hanns Johst est « Wenn ich Kultur höre ... entsichere ich meinen Browning ! » ; « Quand j'entends parler de culture ... je relâche la sécurité de mon Browning ! » ; Acte I, Scène I) . Attribuée à tort indifféremment à Hermann Göring, Josef Gœbbels ou Schirach lui-même, c'est l'une des plus célèbres citations apocryphes du XXe siècle.

Terrain d'entraînement des futurs officiers, les Jeunesses hitlériennes deviennent également, à partir du 26 août 1938, le vivier de la SS : à la suite d'un 1er accord conclu entre Schirach et Heinrich Himmler, les meilleures recrues sont orientées vers « l'Ordre noir » après avoir suivi un entraînement particulier. Un bureau de liaison entre la SS et la « Hitlerjugend » est mis en place le 1er octobre, et un nouvel accord renforçant cette collaboration est signé le 17 décembre 1938. Quant à la coopération avec l'armée, elle est renforcée à compter du 11 août 1939 : Schirach signe, en effet, une nouvelle convention avec Wilhelm Keitel, commandant en chef de la « Wehrmacht » , suivant laquelle la « Hitlerjugend » effectuera un entraînement pré-militaire suivant les règles fixées par l'armée, cette dernière, en contre-partie, s'engageant à former chaque année 30,000 instructeurs destinés aux Jeunesses hitlériennes.

Cependant, le « Jugendführer » n'a pas que des amis au sein du NSDAP. L'un de ses principaux ennemis, Martin Bormann, fait en sorte de nuire à sa réputation par des plaisanteries sur son comportement. Il est vrai que Schirach n'apprécie guère la vie spartiate qu'il fait régner dans les camps de la « Hitlerjugend » , et il se montre distant envers ses troupes lors de ses déplacements. Quelque temps après le déclenchement de la Guerre, en décembre 1939, sans doute pour couper court aux insinuations de ses opposants, Schirach rejoint volontairement l'armée. Après avoir subi un entraînement adéquat, il sert sur le front de l'Ouest, à partir d'avril 1940, et participe à la campagne de France. En juin 1940, promu lieutenant, il reçoit la Croix de fer de seconde classe, avant d'être rappelé à Berlin par Hitler.

Son opposition à la Guerre et des litiges internes le conduisent à être remplacé à la tête des Jeunesses hitlériennes ; il reste néanmoins « Reichsleiter » , chargé de l'éducation de la jeunesse allemande.

Déçu par son protégé, Hitler l'écarte en le nommant en 1940 gouverneur de la région de Vienne et commissaire du « Reich » à la défense civile. À partir de septembre 1940, il est également chargé de l'évacuation des enfants des villes pour les protéger des bombardements britanniques. Dans la métropole viennoise, Schirach donne de somptueuses fêtes. Sur place, ses responsabilités couvrent l'économie de guerre, l'administration de Vienne et celle du « Gau » sous la supervision du ministre de l'Intérieur. Il y est ainsi responsable du programme de travail forcé.

Surtout, dès sa prise de fonction, Schirach précipite la déportation des Juifs de la région de Vienne. Le 2 octobre 1940, alors qu'il participe à une réunion dans le bureau de Hitler, il demande au chef du Gouvernement Général de se charger des Juifs qui sont encore présents à Vienne. Le 3 décembre, à la suite de ses rapports, il reçoit une lettre lui annonçant que Hitler a décidé de déporter les 60,000 Juifs restants à Vienne vers le Gouvernement Général. Au total, il participe directement à l'envoi à l'Est de 185,000 Juifs, expulsions qu'il juge, dans l'un de ses discours, comme étant « une contribution active à la culture européenne » .

Schirach n'a désormais plus de réelle influence au sein du « Reich ». Ses rapports avec son « Führer » iront en se dégradant jusqu'à la fin du conflit. Bormann fait d'ailleurs en sorte d'envenimer leurs relations. Après le 17 novembre 1942, une nouvelle répartition administrative le décharge de la responsabilité du Danube inférieur et du Danube supérieur.

En 1943, il s'attire les foudres de Hitler pour avoir organisé à Vienne une exposition sur « l'art décadent ». La même année, le 24 juin, lors d'une soirée au Berghof, peu après le départ d'Eva Braun, une dispute entre son épouse Henriette et Hitler précipite la rupture. Selon les 2 époux, Henriette aurait reproché à Hitler le traitement des femmes juives en Hollande, et indirectement le génocide des Juifs : Hitler qui ne parlait jamais de ce sujet en public, aurait déclaré, en formant symboliquement avec ses mains la représentation de 2 coupes, que le sang de 10,000 Allemands coulait chaque jour et qu'il fallait rétablir un « équilibre » ; il aurait ajouté qu'elle devait « apprendre à haïr », comme lui l'avait fait. Henriette aurait répliqué, citant l'« Iphigénie » de Goethe :

« Je ne suis pas là pour partager la haine (“ Mithassen ”) mais l'amour (“ Mitlieben ”) . »

L'historien François Delpla pense que les époux Schirach ont attendu la sortie de prison de Baldur pour révéler cette anecdote ; en effet, elle aurait sinon contribué à établir que ce dernier était au courant du génocide, ce qu'il a contesté lors de son procès.

Au moment de la prise de Vienne par l'Armée rouge, le 13 avril 1945, Schirach tente dans un 1er temps d'échapper à la capture. Sous le nom de Falk, il parvient ainsi à travailler comme interprète pour l'armée américaine, à Schwaz dans le Tyrol. Cependant, quelques jours avant la capitulation allemande, le 5 mai, il dévoile son identité par une lettre remise aux Américains et se constitue prisonnier. Le 20 novembre, il est mis en accusation par le tribunal de Nuremberg pour « plan concerté ou complot » et « crimes contre l'humanité ». Le principal acte d'accusation repose sur sa participation aux déportations des Juifs d'Autriche.

Au cours du procès de Nuremberg, Schirach est le seul, avec Albert Speer et Hans Frank, à reconnaître la culpabilité du régime nazi et à faire preuve de quelque repentance.

Il déclare :

« Devant Dieu, devant la nation allemande, devant le peuple allemand, je porte seul la culpabilité d'avoir entraîné la jeunesse à soutenir un homme qui durant de longues années a été considéré comme étant irréprochable et qui a assassiné des millions de gens. »

Il apporte la preuve qu'il avait protesté auprès de Martin Bormann contre le traitement inhumain infligé aux Juifs et, déclarant que les crimes commis resteront pour des siècles une tache dans l'histoire allemande, il assure ne pas avoir eu connaissance de l'existence des camps d'extermination. Cette affirmation est fort douteuse puisque ses fonctions lui valaient de recevoir les rapports du SD sur l'application de la « Solution finale ». Il se défend en affirmant que ses « principales activités à Vienne étaient sociales et culturelles » .

Le 1er octobre 1946, disculpé du 1er chef d'accusation, Schirach est reconnu coupable de crime contre l'humanité et condamné à 20 ans de prison. Au cours de ses années d'incarcération, il commence à écrire secrètement ses mémoires. En 1950, les époux Schirach divorcent. La même année, ses enfants demandent sa grâce, en vain.

C'est un homme malade et prématurément vieilli qui sort de la prison de Spandau, le 30 septembre 1966. Jusqu'à son décès, il vit retiré dans le Sud-Ouest de la République fédérale d'Allemagne. En 1967, il publie « Ich glaubte an Hitler » (J'ai cru en Hitler) , tentant d'expliquer la fascination que le « Führer » avait exercée sur lui et la jeunesse allemande.

Il meurt dans son sommeil dans un petit hôtel de Kröv-an-der-Mosel, âgé de 67 ans.

...

Baldur Benedikt von Schirach (born on 9 May 1907 ; died on 8 August 1974) was a Nazi youth leader later convicted of crimes against humanity. He was the head of the « Hitler-Jugend » (HJ : the Hitler Youth) and, later, « Gauleiter » and « Reichsstatthalter » (« Reich » Governor) of Vienna.

Schirach was born in Berlin, the youngest of 4 children of theatre director « Rittmeister » Carl Baily Norris von Schirach (1873-1948) and his American wife Emma Middleton Lynah Tillou (1872-1944) . A member of the noble Schirach family, of Wendish West Slavic origins, 3 of his 4 grandparents were from the United States, chiefly from Pennsylvania. Through his mother, Schirach was a descendant of Thomas Heyward, Junior, and an indirect descendant of Arthur Middleton, 2 signatories of the United States Declaration of Independence. English was the 1st language he learned at home and he did not learn to speak German until the age of 5. He had 2 sisters, Viktoria and Rosalind von Schirach, and a brother, Karl Benedict von Schirach. His brother committed suicide in 1919, at the age of 19.

On 31 March 1932, Schirach married the 19 year old Henriette Hoffmann, the daughter of Heinrich Hoffmann, Adolf Hitler's personal photographer and close friend. Schirach's family was vehemently opposed to this marriage, but Hitler insisted. Gregor Straßer dismissively described Schirach as « a young effeminate aristocrat » upon whom Hitler bestowed both Henriette and the Hitler Youth position. Through this relationship, Schirach became part of Hitler's inner-circle. The young couple were welcome guests at Hitler's « Berghof » . Henriette von Schirach gave birth to 4 children : Angelika Benedikta von Schirach (born on 1933) ; Klaus von Schirach (born on 1935) ; Robert von Schirach (born on 1938) ; and Richard von Schirach (born on 1942) . The lawyer and best-selling German crime writer Ferdinand von Schirach is the couple's grandson.

Schirach was a published author, contributing to literature journals, and an influential patron of the arts.

Schirach joined a « Wehrjugendgruppe » (military cadet group) at the age of 10, and became a member of the Nazi Party (NSDAP) in 1925. He was soon transferred to Munich and, in 1929, became leader of the National-Socialist German Students' League (« Nationalsozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund » , or NSDStB) . In 1931, he was named

as « Reichsjugendführer » (Youth Leader) of the Nazi Party and, in 1933, was made head of the Hitler Youth (« Hitlerjugend ») and given an SA rank of « Gruppenführer ». He was made a State secretary in 1936.

Schirach appeared frequently at rallies, such as the Nuremberg rally of 1934, when he appeared with Hitler in rousing the « Hitlerjugend » audience. The event was filmed for « Triumph of the Will » the propaganda film made by Leni Riefenstahl for the Nazi Party. Schirach set the militaristic tone of the youth organization, which participated in military style exercises, as well as practising use of military equipment, such as rifles. When older, the members would become « Wehrmacht » soldiers but, in the final years of the Second World War, they were recruited as young as 12 to fight in depleted army units. An entire division, the 12th « SS Panzer Division Hitlerjugend », was recruited almost entirely from the « Hitlerjugend », fought in Normandy in 1944, and committed several War crimes.

In July 1939, Schirach paid Passau a formal visit. In July 1940, when a new play by Hans Baumann was staged there, Schirach insisted that 2,000 local Hitler Youth members be part of that performance.

In 1940, Schirach organized the evacuation of 5 million children from cities threatened by Allied bombing. Later that year, he joined the army and volunteered for service in France, where he was awarded the Iron Cross before being recalled. He served with the 4th (Machine Gun) Company of Infantry Regiment « Großdeutschland » in the rank of « Gefreiter ». During the French Campaign, he was promoted to « Leutnant » and decorated for bravery. Schirach lost control of the Hitler Youth to Artur Axmann, and was appointed Governor (« Gauleiter » or « Reichsstatthalter ») of the « Reichsgau » Vienna, a post in which he remained until the end of the War.

An anti-Semite and an anti-Christian, Schirach was responsible over the next few years for sending Jews from Vienna to German death camps. During his tenure, 65,000 Jews were deported. In a speech on 15 September 1942, he said that their deportation was a « contribution to European culture ». Later during the War, Schirach pleaded for a moderate treatment of the eastern European peoples and criticized the conditions in which Jews were being deported. He fell into disfavour with Hitler, in 1943, but remained at his post in Vienna.

Schirach was notoriously anxious about air-raids. He had the cellars of the Hofburg Palace in the Vienna city centre refurbished and adapted as a bomb shelter, and the lower-level of the extensive subterranean Vienna air-defence coordination centre in the forests to the west of Vienna held personal facilities for him, as well. The Viennese promptly dubbed this C&C centre the « Schirach-Bunker » .

Schirach surrendered in 1945 and was one of the officials put on trial at Nuremberg. At the trial, Schirach was one of only 2 men to denounce Hitler (the other was Albert Speer) . He said that he did not know about the extermination camps. He provided evidence that he had protested to Martin Bormann about the inhumane treatment of the Jews. Schirach claimed at the trials that the roots of his anti-Semitism could be found in the readings of Henry Ford's « The International Jew » . He was originally indicted for crimes against peace for his role in building-up the Hitler Youth, but was acquitted on that charge. However, he was found guilty on 1 October 1946 of crimes against humanity for his role in the deportation of the Viennese Jews to certain death in German Nazi concentration camps located in Poland. He was sentenced and served 20 years as a prisoner in Spandau Prison, Berlin.

On 20 July 1949, his wife Henriette von Schirach (3 February 1913 - 27 January 1992) divorced him while he was in prison.

He was released on 30 September 1966 after carrying-out his full-sentence, and retired quietly to southern Germany. He published his memoirs in 1967, « Ich glaubte an Hitler » (I believed in Hitler) , and died on 8 August 1974 in Kröv.

...

Baldur von Schirach, the eldest of 4 children, was born in Berlin on 9 March 1907. His father, Carl Bailer-Norris von Schirach, was an army officer who resigned in 1908 to become a theatre director in Weimar and, then, in Vienna. His mother, Emma Tillou, had been born in the United States and had 2 signers of the Declaration of Independence among her ancestors. His great-grandfather was a Union Army officer who lost his leg at Bull Run.

According to Ian Kershaw, the author of « Hitler 1889-1936 » (1998) :

« Baldur von Schirach came from a highly-cultured bourgeois family, based in Weimar (Germany's literary capital) where his father had been a highly-regarded director of the Court Theatre. He spoke excellent English ; his American mother, with imperfect command of the language of her adopted country, had spoken only English to him in his childhood, so that, at the age of 6, he spoke, so he later said, not a word of German. »

After the First World War, his father lost his job and his brother committed suicide, despairing at the block on his officer's career as a consequence of the Versailles Treaty.

His biographer, Louis L. Snyder, has commented :

« Baldur von Schirach grew-up in a milieu of music, theater, and literature and early showed talent for poetry. A Romantic and sentimental lad, somewhat plump in physique, he longed for adventure. He joined the Young German League at the age of 10 and took much joy in its hikes, camp life, and singing sessions. »

Von Schirach later admitted that he developed anti-Semite views at 17 after reading a book called « The International Jew » by Henry Ford.

He later recalled :

« We saw in Henry Ford the representative of success, also the exponent of a progressive social policy. In the poverty-stricken and wretched Germany of the time, youth looked toward America, and apart from the great benefactor, Herbert Hoover, it was Henry Ford who to us represented America. »

Von Schirach was also inspired by « The Foundations of the 19th Century » by Houston Stewart Chamberlain. He was especially impressed by the following passage :

« Certain anthropologists would fain teach us that all races are equally gifted ; we point to history and answer : that is a lie ! The races of mankind are markedly different in the nature and also in the extent of their gifts, and the Germanic races belong to the most highly-gifted group, the group usually termed Aryan. Physically and mentally, the Aryans are pre-eminent among all peoples ; for that reason, they are by right the lords of the world. »

In 1924, von Schirach went to Munich where he studied art history and Germanic folklore. He heard Adolf Hitler speak in March 1925. He purchased « Mein Kampf » which he claimed he read in a single evening. In May, aged 18, he joined the National-Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP) and served in the « Sturm Abteilung » (SA) unit. He became known as the Party's poet laureate. In one poem, he described Hitler as « Germany's greatest son » and « a genius grazing the stars » . In another, he claimed « in him rest the roots of our world » .

Hitler appreciated von Schirach's poetry and referred to him as « a true follower and a dependable lad » and advised him to move to Munich. In 1929, Hitler appointed von Schirach as head of the National-Socialist Students' Union and gave him the task of bringing the entire university system under Nazi control. Satisfied with his work, Hitler promoted him to the post of « Reich » youth leader of the Nazi Party, a post in which he proved himself to be a Master organizer. The following year, he directed a massive youth demonstration in Potsdam, at which more than 100,000 youngsters marched past the « Führer » for 7 hours.

Von Schirach married the 19 years old Henriette (« Henny ») Hoffmann, the daughter of Heinrich Hoffmann, Hitler's personal and official photographer, in Munich, on 31st March 1932. Hitler and SA leader Ernst Röhm both acted as best men. Over the next 10 years, Henriette gave birth to 4 children ; 3 sons and 1 daughter - Klaus, Robert, Richard and Angelika Benedikta.

On 1st June 1933, Baldur von Schirach was made leader of the Hitler Youth. His main objective was to re-educate German youth in the spirit of National-Socialism. As Louis L. Snyder has pointed-out :

« Von Schirach would permit no opposition to his plans. As early as February 1933, he had led a surprise raid of 50 boys on the office of the rival Central Committee of Youth Organizations and confiscated its records. »

Von Schirach wrote prayers that praised Hitler and had to be read by members of the various Nazi youth organizations before they had their meals.

Cate Haste, the author of « Nazi Women » (2001) has argued :

« The leadership immediately set about organizing youth into a coherent body of loyal supporters. Under Baldur von Schirach, himself only 25 at the time, the organization was to net all young people from ages 10 to 18 to be schooled in Nazi ideology and trained to be the future valuable members of the “ Reich ”. From the start, the Nazis

pitched their appeal as the Party of youth, building a New Germany. Hitler intended to inspire youth with a mission, appealing to their idealism and hope. »

At the 1934 Nuremberg Rally, described as the Rally of Youth, Adolf Hitler told Germany's young people :

« Regardless of what we create and do, we shall pass away but, in Germany, you will live on. And I know it cannot be otherwise for you are the flesh of our flesh, blood of our blood, and your young minds are filled with the same will that dominates us. And when the great columns of our movement march through Germany today, I know that you will join these columns. And we know that Germany is before us, within us and behind us. »

Herman Rauschning claimed Hitler told him :

« In my great educative work, I am beginning with the young. We older ones are used-up. Yes, we are old already. We are rotten to the marrow. We have no unrestrained instincts left. We are cowardly and sentimental. We are bearing the burden of a humiliating past, and have in our blood the dull recollection of serfdom and servility. But my magnificent youngsters ! Are there finer ones anywhere in the world ? Look at these young men and boys ! What material ! With them, I can make a new world. My teaching is hard. Weakness has to be knocked-out of them. In my “ Ordensburg », a youth will grow-up before which the world will shrink back. A violently active dominating, intrepid, brutal youth - that is what I am after. Youth must be all those things. It must be indifferent to pain. There must be no weakness or tenderness in it. I want to see, once more, in its eyes the gleam of pride and independence of the beast of prey. Strong and handsome must my young men be. I will have them fully-trained in all physical exercises. I intend to have an athletic youth - that is the 1st and the chief thing. In this way, I shall eradicate the thousands of years of human domestication. Then, I shall have in front of me the pure and noble natural material. With that I can create the new order. »

In 1936, Hitler banned all youth organizations other than the Hitler Youth and decreed all German boys aged 15 and 18. He called on Baldur von Schirach « to project National-Socialism through German youth into eternity » . Von Schirach carried-out a massive drive to recruit all 10 year olds. For boys aged between 10 and 14 years, von Schirach set-up the « Jungvolk » . The boys had to learn semaphore, arms drill, and take part in 2 day cross-country hikes. They also had to learn Nazi dogma and, once they passed the necessary tests, they were given a special dagger marked « Blood and Honour » . The main objective of the organization was to provide Adolf Hitler with loyal supporters. Reluctant parents could be imprisoned ; before then, they might be threatened with losing their jobs.

By 1938, there were 8,000 full-time leaders of the Hitler Youth. There were also 720,000 part-time leaders, often school teachers, who had been trained in National-Socialist principles.

One teacher, who was hostile to Hitler, wrote to a friend :

« In the schools, it is not the teacher, but the pupils, who exercise authority. Party functionaries train their children to be spies and agent provocateurs. The youth organizations, particularly the Hitler Youth, have been accorded powers of

control which enable every boy and girl to exercise authority backed-up by threats. Children have been deliberately taken away from parents who refused to acknowledge their belief in National-Socialism. The refusal of parents to “ allow their children to join the youth organization ” is regarded as an adequate reason for taking the children away.
»

Pictures of Baldur von Schirach were second only to Hitler's in displays throughout Germany and were used more widely than those of either Hermann Göring or Rudolf Heß. However, this gave him powerful enemies and they started a campaign of vilification against him.

According to his biographer :

« Jokes about his effeminate behaviour, especially concerning his preference for a “ girlish ” bedroom in white, became a national pastime. He was ridiculed as a transplanted Berliner in Bavarian leather breeches. »

Bernhard Rust, the Education Minister, complained :

« There is, indeed, twofold evidence to show that something was wrong with education. In the 1st place, the high-level of popular enlightenment had failed to protect the German people against the poisonous effects of Marxist teaching and other false doctrines. The attainment of high intellectual standards will certainly continue to be urged upon the young people ; but they will be taught at the same time that their achievements must be of benefit to the national community to which they belong. As a consequence of the demand, thus, clearly formulated by the Nuremberg Laws, Jewish teachers and Jewish pupils have had to quit German schools, and schools of their own have been provided by and for them as far as possible. In this way, the natural race instincts of German boys and girls are preserved ; and the young people are made aware of their duty to maintain their racial purity and to bequeath it to succeeding generations. »

Baldur von Schirach responded to this by producing his book, « Revolution in Education » (1938) .

In 1940, von Schirach joined the German Army and won the Iron Cross in France. In July 1941, Hitler appointed him as the « Gauleiter » of Vienna. Over the next few years, von Schirach was responsible for moving Jews to Poland. On 25th July 1942, von Schirach made a speech defending the deportation of thousands of Jews to the ghettos of the East as « a contribution to European culture » .

Schirach was captured by Allied troops at the end of the Second World War. At the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, he underwent a change of heart, recognizing that he had misled German youth and contributed to poisoning a whole generation.

He stated :

« I put my morals to the side when, out of misplaced faith in the “ Führer ”, I took part in this action. I did it. I

cannot undo it. »

He said that he did not know about the extermination camps, providing evidence that he had protested to Martin Bormann about the inhumane treatment of the Jews.

He now considered it his duty to destroy any belief in the rebirth of Nazism and blamed himself before history for not having done more to prevent the concentration camps.

Along with Albert Speer, von Schirach denounced Adolf Hitler before the tribunal.

With regard to Auschwitz :

« It was the most all-encompassing and diabolical genocide ever committed by man. Adolf Hitler gave the order. Hitler and Himmler, together, started this crime against humanity which will remain a blot on our history for Centuries. »

SCHIRACH'S NSDAP MEMBERSHIP, NSDAP POSITIONS, AND GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

In an affidavit (3302-PS) , Baldur von Schirach has declared that he held the following positions :

Positions in the Nazi Party

(1) NSDAP member, from 1925 to 1945.

(2) Leader of the National-Socialist Students League, from 1929 to 1931.

(3) Leader of the Hitler Youth organization, from 1931 to 1940.

(4) « Reich » Youth Leader (« Reichsjugendführer ») on the Staff of the SA Supreme Command under Ernst Röhm, in 1931-1932.

(5) « Reich » Youth Leader (« Reichsjugendführer ») of the NSDAP, from 1931 to 1940 ; in 1932, Schirach became an independent « Reich » Leader (« Reichsleiter ») , and no longer remained on the Staff of the SA Supreme Command.

(6) Lieutenant General (« Gruppenführer ») of the SA, from 1931 to 1941.

(7) « Reich » Leader (« Reichsleiter ») for Youth Education in the NSDAP, from 1932 to 1945.

(8) « Gau » Leader (« Gauleiter ») of the « Reichsgau Wien » , from 1940 to 1945.

(9) General (« Obergruppenführer ») of the SA, from 1941 to 1945.

Governmental Positions

(1) « Reich » Youth Leader, from 1933 to 1940.

(2) « Reich » Governor (« Reichsstatthalter ») of the « Reichsgau Wien » .

(3) « Reich » Defence Commission of Vienna, from 1940 to 1945.

(4) Deputy to the « Führer » for the Inspection of the Hitler Youth (« Beauftragter der Führer fuer die Inspektion der Gesamten Hitler Jugend ») , from 1940 to 1945.

Schirach was also a member of the « Reichstag » , from 1932 to 1945.

INTIMATE AND SLAVISH FOLLOWER OF ADOLF HITLER SINCE 1925

As early as 1925, Baldur von Schirach, then 18 years old, joined the Nazi conspirators. Upon special request of Adolf Hitler, he went to Munich in order to study Party affairs. After having joined the NSDAP, in 1925, he became active in converting students to National-Socialism (3302-PS) . This was the start of Schirach's conspiratorial activities, which he continued for 2 decades in the spirit of unbending loyalty to Hitler and to the principles of National-Socialism.

Schirach shows his slavish loyalty to Hitler in his principal book, « The Hitler Youth » , published in 1934 :

« We were not yet able to account for our conception in detail, we simply believed. And when Hitler's book, “ Mein Kampf ”, was published it was our bible which we almost learned by heart in order to answer the questions of the doubters and superior critics. Almost everyone today who is leading youth in a responsible position joined us in those years. »

« In my apartment on “ Königin-Straße ”, I was lucky enough to be able to express my apprehensions about Straßer to the “ Führer ”, otherwise, I never discussed these things with anybody with the exception of Julius Streicher. »
(1458-PS)

SCHIRACH WAS THE LEADING NAZI CONSPIRATOR IN DESTROYING INDEPENDENT YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS AND IN BUILDING THE NAZI YOUTH MOVEMENT

(Reference is made at this point to section 8 of Chapter VII on « Reshaping of Education and Training of Youth » . See also 3054-PS.)

It was Schirach's task to perpetuate the Nazi regime through generations by poisoning the mind of youth and, thereby, the mind of the German people, and to prepare the German nation for aggressive wars.

The basic law concerning the Hitler Youth, which under Schirach's tutelage became an instrument of the Nazi State, declares :

« The future of the German Nation depends on its youth, and the German youth shall have to be prepared for its future duties. »

« All German youth in the “ Reich ” is organized within the Hitler Youth. »

« The German youth besides being reared within the family and school, shall be educated physically, intellectually, and morally in the spirit of National-Socialism to serve the people and the community, through the Hitler Youth. »

« The task of educating the German Youth through the Hitler Youth is being entrusted to the “ Reich ” Leader of German Youth in the NSDAP. » (1392-PS)

For the 5 years preceding the promulgation of this law, Schirach had been leader of the Hitler Youth and « Reich » Youth Leader of the NSDAP. He continued in these positions until the Nazis launched their aggressive wars. As late as 4 December 1945, Schirach declared his own feeling of responsibility for Nazi policies concerning youth :

« I feel myself responsible for the policy of the youth movement in the Party and later within the “ Reich ”. » (3302-PS)

(1) Schirach actively promoted the NSDAP and its affiliated youth organizations before the Nazis seized power. In 1929, Hitler appointed Schirach leader of the National-Socialist German Students League and, in 1931, leader of the « Hitler Jugend ». After 1931, Schirach devoted his full-time to Party work (3302-PS) . Before 1933, Schirach moved throughout Germany, leading demonstrations and summoning German youth to the Hitler Youth. When this organization and the wearing of its uniform were forbidden by law, Schirach continued by illegal means. Of this period he writes :

« Whoever came to us during this illegal time, boy or girl, risked everything. With pistols in our belts, we drove through the Ruhr district while stones came flying after us. » (1458-PS)

Schirach admits that Alfred Rosenberg and he were not successful before 1933 in efforts to reach « an understanding » with other youth organizations. Schirach states that he thereupon arrived at a conclusion which later was to spell the doom of independent youth groups :

« I realized, at that time, that an understanding with the leaders of the League would never be possible and devoted myself to the principle of the totality (“ Totalitlät ”) of the Hitler Youth which, in the year 1933, cost all those leagues their independent existence. » (1458-PS)

(2) Schirach, on behalf of the Nazi conspirators, destroyed all independent youth organizations or caused them to be

absorbed within the Hitler Youth (« Hitler Jugend ») . After the Nazi conspirators seized political control of Germany, Schirach was aggressive in bringing the entire German youth within the Nazi orbit of control and domination. Referring to the period immediately following 30 January 1933, Schirach declared :

« Now the problem was to apply the victory of the movement to the entire youth. Our cabinet ministers were overburdened with their new tasks and were working day and night. We could not wait until they could find time to solve the youth question by their own initiative. Therefore, we had to act ourselves. My co-workers met in my Munich apartment and advised me to occupy the “ Reich ” Committee (“ Reichsausschuß ”) of the German Youth Leagues (“ Jugendverbände ”) . I commissioned General (“ Obergebietsführer ”) Nabsberg with 50 members of the Berlin “ Hitler Jugend ” to make a surprise raid on the “ Reich ” Committee on the “ Alsenstraße ” early the next morning. This was done and, at noon, the press had the report that the Hitler Youth had taken-over the leadership of the “ Reich ” Committee. »

By a 2nd surprise raid, Schirach took-over the Youth Hostels. Of this, Schirach writes in the same book :

« In the meantime, I gained control over the “ Reich ” League for German Youth Hostels (“ Reichsverband für deutsche Jugendherbergen ”) in similar manner to the one employed with the “ Reich ” Committee. » (1458-PS)

By using the records of the seized « Reich » Committee, Schirach states that he obtained knowledge of the strength and influential personalities of all the German youth groups.

« From this point, I recognized the necessity of coming to grips with the Greater German Union (“ Großdeutscher Bund ”) . » (1458-PS)

In June 1933, Schirach was appointed Youth Leader of the German « Reich » (« Jugendführer des Deutschen Reiches ») in a solemn ceremony before Hitler. Concerning the period immediately following, Schirach writes in the same book :

« The 1st thing I did was to dissolve the Greater German Union (“ Großdeutscher Bund ”) . Since I headed all German youth organizations and I had the right to decide on their leadership, I did not hesitate for a moment to take this step, which was for the Hitler Youth the elimination of an unbearable state of affairs. » (1458-PS)

The dissolution of this and other youth organizations was accomplished by orders issued by Schirach as Youth Leader of the German « Reich » . (2229-PS)

In this position, Schirach also appointed Deputies to the various German States (« Landesbeauftragte ») « to carry-out my instructions, and I appointed District leaders (“ Gebietsführer ”) to these positions in all of the States in execution of my right » (1458-PS) . In this book, Schirach also admits directing the further assimilation or destruction of other youth organizations :

« I prohibited the Marxist youth as well as all political youth organizations after the occupation of the “ Reich ” Committee. The 1 million members of the “ Hitler Jugend ” which we had, on 30 January 1933, had grown to a round 3,000,000. Only the 2 large professional groups, the Protestant and Catholic youth, were opposed to us. » (1458-PS)

Schirach proceeded to hold discussions with the Hitler-appointed « Reich » Bishop Ludwig Müller :

« And, in December 1933, the “ Reich ” Bishop and myself were able to inform the “ Führer ” that incorporation of the Protestant youth into the “ Hitler Jugend ” had become a reality. » (1458-PS)

When this book was written, Schirach had not yet accomplished the complete coordination of Catholic youth into the Hitler Youth, though he argued that :

« No reasonable man in Germany can give a reason for the necessity of the existence of Catholic youth organizations in their present form. » (1458-PS)

Schirach's objective of forcing all German youth into the Hitler Youth was finally accomplished by a decree in December 1936. (1392-PS)

(3) Schirach was mainly responsible for the indoctrination and training of German youth outside home and school. The law making compulsory the organization of all German Youth within the Hitler Youth declared that :

« The task of educating the German Youth through the Hitler Youth is being entrusted to the “ Reich ” Youth Leader in the NSDAP. »

To make Schirach's sole competence even clearer, the 1st executive order concerning the basic youth law stated :

« The youth leader of the German “ Reich ” is solely competent for all missions of the physical, ideological, and moral education of the entire German youth outside of the house of the parents and the school. » (1462-PS)

(4) Schirach was the principal Nazi conspirator in applying the Leadership principle to German youth. As a « Reich » Leader (« Reichsleiter ») in the NSDAP, Schirach was responsible only to Hitler or his Deputy (« Stellvertreter ») , Rudolf Heß. In youth affairs, he was at the top of the Nazi leadership pyramid, and under him German youth was directed by and completely subjected to the Leadership Principle. The Leadership Principle, one of the principal control-techniques of the Nazis was explained and glorified by Schirach as it applied to German youth :

« A single will leads the “ Hitler Jugend ”. The power of authority of the “ Hitler Jugend ” leaders, that of the smallest as well as of the largest unit, is absolute, i.e. , he has the unlimited right to give orders because he bears the unlimited responsibility. He knows that the responsibility of the higher one comes before that of the lower ones. Therefore, he submits silently to the instructions of his leaders even if they are directed against him personally. To him, as well as to all young Germany, the history of the “ Hitler Jugend ” is proof of the fact that a youth community also

can only be successful if it unconditionally recognizes the authority of leadership. The success of National-Socialism is a success of discipline. The structure of National-Socialist Youth is built on the foundation of discipline and obedience. The teachings of the time of persecution apply even more to the period of victory and power. » (1458-PS)

(5) Schirach indoctrinated youth with the Nazi ideology. Schirach states that :

« It was my task to educate the youth in the aims, ideology and directives of the NSDAP and, beyond this, to direct and to shape them. » (3302-PS)

For this purpose, the Hitler Youth had an elaborate propaganda apparatus which published numerous periodicals, ranging from a daily press service to monthly magazines. Through liaison agents the Hitler Youth Propaganda Office had permanent contact with Doctor Goebbels' Propaganda Office of the NSDAP and with the Ministry of People's Enlightenment and Propaganda. (3349-PS)

Schirach, together with Doctor Robert Ley, established the Adolf Hitler Schools in January 1937. These schools, according to the joint statement of « Reich » Leaders (« Reichsleiter ») Schirach and Ley, were open to outstanding and proven members of the Youth Folk (« Jungvolk »), the junior section of the Hitler Youth organization. The Adolf Hitler Schools were destined to train youth free of charge for responsible positions in National-Socialist Germany. These schools were units of and under the jurisdiction of the Hitler Youth. Schirach shared with « Reich » Organization Leader (« Reichsorganisationsleiter ») Ley the general supervision of the contents of the teaching, the curriculum, and the staff of the Adolf Hitler Schools (2653-PS). Schirach encouraged a close relation between members of the Hitler Youth and the German League for Germanism abroad (« Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland »), or VDA). An agreement between Schirach and the leaders of the VDA in 1933 states :

« 1) With a complete respect for the important racial-political task, the Hitler Youth recommends to its members membership in collaboration with the “ Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland ”. »

« 3) The school groups of the “ Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland ” (racial-German work cells) assist the Hitler Youth in their work. » (L-360- H)

Schirach, thus, subscribed to the « racial-political task » of the NSDAP and extended his jurisdiction even beyond the border of the German « Reich ». His encouragement and approval of anti-Jewish terror by youth is discussed below.

(6) Through the Hitler Youth, Schirach assisted the Nazi conspirators in developing leaders and members of the NSDAP and its affiliated organizations, including the SA and the SS. Sometime before the launching of aggressive wars, the Hitler Youth had become the principal source of zealous members for the NSDAP and its affiliated organizations. Orders of the Party Chancellery concerned with « successor problems » of the Party emphasize constant attention to Hitler Youth members as future Nazi leaders, thus, attempting the perpetuation of the Nazi regime and Nazi ideology for the immediate future and even into future generations. Only Hitler Youth members who distinguished themselves were to be admitted to the Party. Nazi leaders were instructed to use « properly qualified full-time Hitler Youth leaders for the

continuation of their political work in the Party service » , so that a necessary succession of full-time leaders in the Leader Corps (« Führerkorps ») of the Party would be secured.

The Party manual also discusses the Hitler Youth as a recruitment agency for future Nazi leaders and members of affiliated organizations of the NSDAP :

« To secure for the Party valuable and trained recruits for leadership, suitable “ Hitler Jugend ” boys of over 17 can be assigned for education and training to leaders from local unit leaders on upwards. »

« Besides the above mentioned conditions for selections in general, a process of elimination results from the fact that from youth on the German is cared for, guided, and educated by the Party. Ist, they are assembled in the Young Folk (“ Jungvolk ”) from which the young people are transferred into the “ Hitler Jugend ”. The boy of the “ Hitler Jugend ” enters the SA, the SS, the NSKK or the NSFK, or participates in the work of the affiliated organizations of the Party. After labour and army service, he returns for service to the Party and its affiliates, respectively. »

Special arrangements existed between Heinrich Himmler's SS and Schirach's Hitler Youth concerning the recruiting of members of the « Hitler Jugend » for later service in the SS. Within the Hitler Youth was a special group called the « Streifendienst » (Patrol Service) . Concerning this special group, an official hand-book on youth laws states :

« Organization of the “ Streifendienst ”.

1) Since the Streifendienst in the “ Hitler Jugend ” has to perform tasks similar to those of the SS for the whole movement, it is organized as a special unit for the purpose of securing recruits for the general SS ; however, as much as possible, recruits for the SS special troops, for the SS Death Head Troops, and for the officer candidate schools should also be taken from these formations. »

4a) The selection of “ Streifendienst ” members is made according to the principles of racial selection of the “ Schutzstaffel ” (SS) ; the competent officials of the SS, primarily unit leaders, race authorities, and SS physicians, will be consulted for the admission test.

5) To insure from the beginning a good understanding between “ Reich ” youth leadership and “ Reich ” SS leadership, a liaison office will be ordered from the “ Reich ” youth leadership to the SS main office, starting 1 October 1938. The appointment of other leaders to the SS sections is a subject for a future agreement.

6) After the organization is completed, the SS takes its replacement primarily from these “ Streifendienst ” members. Admission of youths of German blood who are not members of the “ Hitler Jugend ” is, then, possible only after information and advice of the competent “ Bann ” leader. » (2396-PS)

Shortly afterwards, on 17 December 1938, Schirach and Himmler entered into and signed another agreement for recruiting SS members from the ranks of the Hitler Youth :

« To secure full success for the common effort of the SS and the Hitler Youth by strict cooperation, to stem the flight from the land, to build a new peasant class, to bring the best part of the people into contact with the earth of the homeland, the following arrangement has been made in connection with the agreement of 26 August 1938.

1) The farm service of the Hitler Youth is according to education and aim, particularly well-suited as a recruiting organization for the “ Schutzstaffel ” (general SS and the armed sections of the SS ; SS special troops and SS death head battalions) .

2) Boys who suit the special demands of the SS according to physical conditions and moral attitude are preferably admitted into the farm service of the Hitler Youth.

5) All farm service members who pass the general admission test of the SS will be taken-over into the general SS after leaving the farm service. » (2567-PS)

Thus, by the end of 1938, the Hitler Youth had become the main source for future SS members. (For the criminal activities the SS formations for which Hitler Youth members were recruited, see Section 5 of Chapter XV of the « Schutzstaffel » .)

(7) Schirach actively engaged in militarizing the Hitler Youth. In June 1933, under an agreement between Hitler and Franz Seldte, which was negotiated in the presence of the « Reich » Minister of War, the « Steel Helmet League of Front Line Soldiers » (« Stahlhelm, Bund der Frontsoldaten ») was incorporated into the Nazi movement. The « Scharnhorst » , the youth organization of the « Stahlhelm » , was integrated into the Hitler Youth. (2260-PS)

The Hitler Youth was generally set-up along military lines with uniforms, ranks, and titles. It contained divisions called Naval Hitler Youth, Motorized Hitler Youth, Hitler Youth Flyers, and Signal Hitler Youth. According to an official document published by the « Reich » Youth Leadership under Schirach, the object of these divisions within the Hitler Youth was to prepare boys, respectively, for the German merchant marine and Navy, the National-Socialist Motorized Corps (NSKK) , for civil and military aviation, and for service with signal troops. (2654-PS)

On or around 11 August 1939, just before the invasion of Poland, an agreement was entered into between Schirach and Wilhelm Keitel, then, Chief of the High-Command of the « Wehrmacht » , which was declared by « Das Archiv » to represent « the result of close cooperation » between these 2 conspirators. The agreement itself stated :

« While it is exclusively the task of the Hitler Youth to attend to the training of their units in this direction, it is suitable in the sense of a uniform training corresponding to the demands of the “ Wehrmacht ” to support the leadership of the Hitler Youth for their responsible task as trainers and educators in all fields of training for defence by special courses. A great number of courses are in progress. » (2398-PS)

The agreement stated that it « gives the possibility of roughly re-doubling the same 30,000 leaders in the Hitler Youth

schools for directing shooting practice and field training. Under the agreement, specific arrangements were made for messing and billeting the Hitler Youth leaders at “ Wehrmacht ” installations. » Former Hitler Youth leaders in the « Wehrmacht » , who were specially selected volunteers, were to be assigned as liaison officers and deputies for carrying out this military training. (2398-PS)

Hitler, in a speech in February 1938, represented that thousands of German boys had received specialized training in naval, aviation, and motorized groups within the Hitler Youth, and that over 1 million Hitler Youth members had received instructions in rifle shooting from 7,000 instructors. (2454-PS)

SCHIRACH PROMOTED THE ACCESSION TO POWER OF THE NAZI CONSPIRATORS

This allegation of the Indictment is born-out by Schirach's activities in converting students to National-Socialism and by his Leadership of the Hitler Youth before the Nazis' seizure of political power. These activities are described above.

SCHIRACH PROMOTED THE CONSOLIDATION OF POWER OF THE NAZI CONSPIRATORS

Schirach's acts in accomplishing the Nazis' complete control over German youth are described above. These acts were of notable assistance to the Nazi conspirators in acquiring complete control of Germany during the pre-War years. Schirach's own words in 1938 leave no doubt as to his own feeling of personal responsibility in this connection :

« The struggle for the unification of the German youth is finished. I consider it as my duty to conduct it in a hard and uncompromising manner. Many might not have realized why we went through so much trouble for the sake of the youth. And yet : The National-Socialist German Workers' Party, whose trustee I felt I always was and always will be, this Party considered the struggle for the youth as the decisive element for the future of the German nation.

And I promise the German public that the youth of the German “ Reich ”, the youth of Adolf Hitler, will accomplish its duty in the spirit of the man to whom alone their lives belong. » (2306-PS)

SCHIRACH PROMOTED THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL PREPARATIONS FOR AGGRESSIVE WAR AND THE MILITARIZATION OF NAZI-DOMINATED ORGANIZATIONS

A general outline of Schirach's acts bearing on this allegation of the Indictment appears above. By his own admission, Schirach was the principal Nazi responsible for driving the entire Nazi ideology into the minds of German youths, many of whom grew-up to be fanatical Nazis like Schirach himself. From Hitler, in 1938, came boastings of the accomplishments of the Hitler Youth in military training. Through the vast propaganda work of the « Reich » Youth Leadership, through the Adolf Hitler Schools, through the minute regimentation of youth and its subjection to the Leadership Principle, and through the military training of German youth, Schirach fulfilled the edict of the basic law concerning the Hitler Youth :

« The future of the German nation depends on its youth, and the German youth shall have to be prepared for its

future duties. »

It has been demonstrated that the future duties of the youth entrusted to Schirach were participation in aggressive wars.

SCHIRACH'S GENERAL FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AS PARTY AND GOVERNMENT LEADER IN THE REICHSGAU VIENNA

(1) « Gau » Leader (« Gauleiter ») Schirach was « Gau » Leader of the NSDAP for the « Reichsgau Wien » , from July 1940 to 1945. In common with all other « Gau » Leaders, Schirach was the highest-representative of Hitler, the supreme Party Leader, in his « Gau » , he was the bearer of sovereignty (« Hoheitsträger ») of the Party for this regional division of the Party. As such, he possessed « sovereign political rights » he represented the Party with « Gau » ; and he was « responsible for the entire political situation within » this « Gau » . (1893-PS)

The Party manual makes it mandatory-that each « Gau » Leader meet, at least once a month, with leaders of the affiliated organizations of the NSDAP, including the SA and the SS, « for the purpose of mutual orientation » and authorizes the « Gau » Leader to call upon SA leaders and SS leaders as « needed for the execution of a political mission » . As a « Gau » Leader, Schirach was appointed by Hitler and was « directly subordinate » to him. He was responsible for coordinating activities of the NSDAP with various State authorities, including the police and the « Gestapo » . (1893-PS)

(2) « Reich » Governor (« Reichsstatthalter ») Schirach was « Reich » Governor of the « Reichsgau Wien » , from July 1940 to 1945. After the « Anschluß » , the Nazi conspirators abolished the State of Austria as a sovereign State and divided Austria into 7 « Reich Gaus » , the most important of which was the « Reichsgau Wien » . Schirach, in his capacity as « Reich » Governor, was the lieutenant of the head of the German State, Hitler, in his « Gau » . As « Reich » Governor, he was authorized to make decrees and issue orders within the limitations set by the supreme « Reich » authorities (« Oberste Reichsbehörden ») . He was especially under the administrative supervision of Wilhelm Frick, « Reich » Minister of Interior. The « Reich » Governor was also 1st mayor (« Erster Bürgermeister ») of Vienna. (3301-PS)

Schirach was also « Reich » Defence Commissar of Vienna, from 1940 to 1945. These government positions, along with his leadership of the Party in Vienna, made Schirach the most important representative of the Nazi conspirators in the « Reichsgau Wien » . Schirach himself states that as « Reich » Governor his « field was the direction of the general administration » in Vienna. (3302-PS)

As the highest Party and State leader in the « Reichsgau Wien » , Schirach was responsible for all the crimes of the Nazi conspirators in the « Reichsgau Wien » on the ground that he either initiated, approved, executed, or abetted them. Specific examples, described below, demonstrate that, in fact, he was actively and personally engaged in Nazi crimes.

SCHIRACH PARTICIPATED IN THE CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, PARTICULARLY ANTI-SEMITIC MEASURES

Schirach bears responsibility for providing many, if not most, of the Death Head (« Totenkopf ») members of the SS, who, in the main, administered the concentration camps. As particularized above, the SS, by agreement between Himmler and Schirach, took « its replacement primarily » from « Streifendienst » members of the Hitler Youth and, only upon special permission, could a non Hitler Youth become an SS man. Nor can Schirach escape responsibility for his assistance in implanting in youth the Nazi ideology, with its tenets of a Master race, « sub-human » peoples, and world domination. For such notions were the psychological prerequisites for the instigation and toleration of the atrocities which zealous Nazis committed throughout Germany and the occupied countries.

(I) Schirach directed and participated in the Nazi conspirators' slave labour program.

Vienna was one of the principal cities and an independent « Reichsgau » of Greater Germany. Schirach, as « Gau » Leader and « Reich » Governor, was delegated far-reaching responsibilities concerning the slave labour program and, hence, shares responsibility for crimes of slave labour. (3552-PS)

This document proves that the « Gau » Leaders were required to be the supreme integrating and coordinating agents of the Nazi conspirators in executing the entire man-power program. A circular of the Party Chancellery of 22 March 1942 states that Hermann Göring, upon the suggestion of Fritz Sauckel, had agreed that the « Gau » Leaders were to become active as Sauckel's special Plenipotentiaries (« Bevollmaechtigte ») in order that ...

« By the leadership of the Party in full appreciation of the competence of the corresponding « Reich » authorities, the highest-efficiency in the field of man-power shall be guaranteed. » (3352-PS)

Göring gave Sauckel authority to issue orders to « the agencies of the Party, its member organizations and affiliated organizations » as well as to governmental authorities. By an order of 6 April 1942, Sauckel appointed the « Gau » Leaders as his « plenipotentiaries for man-power within their respective Gaus », and charged them with the ...

« establishment of a harmonious cooperation of all agencies of the State, of the Party, of the Armed Forces, and of the Economy, charged with problems of man-power and, thus, to create agreement between the different conceptions and requirements to obtain the highest-efficiency in the field of man-power. » (3352- PS)

To insure that the « Gau » Leaders could efficiently perform their man-power tasks, the entire staff of the Provincial Labour Offices were ...

« directed to be at the disposal of the “ Gau ” Leaders for information and advice and to fulfill the suggestions and demands of the “ Gau ” Leader for the purpose of improvements or man-power. »

In this same order, Sauckel said :

« By the above mentioned commission of the “ Gau ” Leaders of the NSDAP, I intend to lead man-power utilization to the greatest success. »

Thus, Sauckel, himself an experienced « Gau » Leader, bears witness to the involvement after 1942 of the « Gau » Leaders, including Schirach, in the man-power utilization program of the Nazi conspirators.

Furthermore, a circular from the Party Chancellery of 4 August 1942, shows that « Bearers of Sovereignty » (« Hoheitsträger ») of the NSDAP (which included the « Gau » Leaders and, hence, Schirach) were to familiarize themselves with the execution of man-power directives on Eastern workers. One of the purposes of this directive was to prevent « inept Factory heads » from giving « too much consideration for the care of the Eastern Workers and, thereby, causing justified annoyance among the German workers » (3352-PS) .

(2) Schirach participated in the conspiracy to persecute the Churches. The activity of Schirach in persecuting churches by dissolving religious youth organizations or by incorporating them in the Hitler Youth has been set forth above.

Official letters of Martin Bormann and Hans Lammers, in March 1941, show that church properties in Austria had been confiscated for various pretexts after Schirach had become « Gau » Leader and « Reich » Governor of the « Reichsgau Wien » . Upon a visit of Hitler to Vienna, Schirach and 2 other officials raised with him a complaint that the confiscations should be made in favour of « Gaus » rather than of the « Reich » . Thereafter, all « Gauleiters » were notified that the decision had been made in favour of the position Schirach had taken before Hitler, namely in favor of the « Gaus » . (R-146)

(3) Schirach participated in the Conspiracy to persecute the Jews. Even before assuming his Governmental functions in the « Reichsgau Wien » , Schirach was responsible for encouraging anti-Jewish terror. Before 1939, at a meeting of Heidelberg students of the National-Socialist German Students « Bund » (NSDStB) , Schirach was chief-speaker. After praising the students for devoting so much of their time to the affairs of the Party, ...

« he declared that the most important phase of German University life in the 3rd “ Reich ” was the program of the NSDStB. He extolled various activities of the “ Bund ”. He reminded the boys of the service they had rendered during the Jewish purge. Dramatically, he pointed across the river to the old University town of Heidelberg where several burnt-out synagogues were mute witnesses of the efficiency of Heidelberg students. Those skeleton buildings would remain there for Centuries, as inspiration for future students, as warning to enemies of the State. » (2441-PS)

Immediately after becoming « Gau » Leader and « Reich » Governor of the « Reichsgau Wien » , Schirach's anti-Jewish measures assumed more formidable proportions. As early as 7 November 1940, one Doctor Fischer, « by order » of the « Reich » Governor Schirach stated that ...

« Investigations are being made at present by the “ Gestapo ”, to find-out how many able-bodied Jews are still available in order to make plans for the contemplated mass-projects. It is assumed that there are not many more Jews

available. If some still should be available, however, the “ Gestapo ” has no scruples to use the Jews even for the removal of the destroyed synagogues. SS Colonel Huber will report personally to the “ Regierungspräsident ” in this matter. » (1948-PS)

The « Regierungspräsident » was « Reich » Governor Schirach's personal representative « within the governmental administration » (« in der staatlichen Verwaltung ») of the « Reichsgau » . (3301-PS)

The above letter indicates that Schirach and his immediate subordinates not only knew of the atrocities which had been committed against the Jews by the Nazi conspirators in the « Reichsgau » , but also that they endorsed further forced labour of Jews and worked intimately with the « Gestapo » and the SS in their measures of persecution. Within 6 months after Schirach became « Gau » Leader and « Reich » Governor of Vienna, Doctor Hans Lammers informed Schirach that ...

« The “ Führer ” has decided after receipt of one of the reports made by you, that the 60,000 Jews still residing in the “ Reichsgau Wien ”, will be deported most rapidly, that is still during the War, to the General Government because of the housing shortage prevalent in Vienna. » (1950-PS)

Lammers' letter, dated 3 December 1940, informed Schirach that the Governor General of Poland, Hans Frank, and the « Reichsführer SS » , Heinrich Himmler, had been informed of the « Führer » 's decision. (1950-PS)

Schirach's guilt in this connection, by his own admission, however, runs even deeper. In a statement to the so called European Youth League in Vienna, in 1942, Schirach stated :

« Every Jew who exerts influence in Europe is a danger to European culture. If anyone reproaches me with having driven from this city, which was once the European metropolis of Jewry, tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of Jews into the ghetto of the East, I feel myself compelled to reply : I see in this an action contributing to European culture. » (3048-PS)

(4) Conclusion. Schirach bears responsibility for rendering significant aid to the Nazi conspirators in each major phase of the conspiracy ; winning Nazi supporters before the seizure of power ; consolidating the Nazis' control of Germany after the seizure of power ; preparing for aggressive wars ; and conducting aggressive wars. From the beginning, he held important policy-making and administrative positions. From 1931 to the Nazis' downfall, he was one of the small group of « Reich » Leaders (« Reichsleiter ») of the NSDAP who consorted together, directly subordinate only to Adolf Hitler himself, and who provided the inner-most leaven of the Leadership Corps of the Party. For nearly a decade, he was fully in charge of perpetrating the Nazi regime by poisoning the minds of the young generation. Although his principal assistance to the conspiracy was given by his commission of German youth to the conspirators' objectives, still he also conspired to wage crimes against humanity as a Party and governmental administrator of high-standing after the conspiracy had reached its inevitable involvement in war of aggression.

...

Baldur von Schirach was the leader of the Hitler Youth and, later, the « Gauleiter » of Vienna. He was charged with « Crimes Against Peace », but was correctly found « Not Guilty ». He was convicted of « Crimes Against Humanity » for his actions in Vienna concerning the Jewish population. The evidence that he had actual knowledge of the ultimate fate awaiting the Jews he allowed to be herded-out of Vienna was mostly circumstantial, but more compelling than that against Julius Streicher.

Any objective observer hearing just the evidence presented would be forced to conclude that von Schirach's degree of guilt was greater than Streicher's. Then, why was von Schirach sentenced to 20 years imprisonment while Streicher was executed ? This disparity can be entirely explained by a lack of blind justice resulting from the courts consideration of mitigating factors and cosmetic intangibles.

There were 3 big differences between von Schirach and Streicher :

Streicher was a publisher and private citizen. Von Schirach had an official position and, thus, was in the loop, receiving official reports and signing orders.

Streicher's anti-Semitism was virulent and prolific, while von Schirach's was rare and relatively moderate.

Streicher was defiant, repulsive, and completely un-repentant, while von Schirach was cooperative, personable, and repentant.

The following piece of testimony from Baldur von Schirach is an example of the sort of statements the Nuremberg Court accepted. Because it suited the narrative desired to do so, and the Prosecution failed to present very much evidence to dispute it.

From Schirach's International Military Tribunal testimony :

« I did not make any inflammatory anti-Semitic speeches, since I attempted, both as “ Reich ” Youth Leader and youth educator, not to add fuel to the fire ; for neither in my books nor in my speeches (with the exception of one speech in Vienna, to which I shall refer later on and which was not made at the time when I was “ Reich ” Youth Leader) have I made any inflammatory statements of an anti-Semitic nature. I will not make myself ridiculous by stating here that I was not an anti-Semite ; I was - although I never addressed myself to the youth in that sense. »

Next, an excerpt from the same speech von Schirach and, in fact, is the most damaging piece of documentation against him ...

From a speech by Schirach before the European Youth Congress in Vienna (15 September 1942) :

« Every Jew who exerts influence in Europe is a danger to European culture. If anyone reproaches me with having

driven from this city, which was once the European metropolis of Jewry, tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of Jews into the ghetto of the East, I feel myself compelled to reply, " I see in this an action contributing to European culture ". »

Julius Streicher said worse before breakfast. He would have laughed had he been confronted with a similar quote attributed to himself, and would no doubt have opined that he had only been speaking the truth. In contrast, here is how Schirach responded when confronted with this quote ...

From Schirach's International Military Tribunal testimony :

« Ist, I want to say that I did make that speech. The quotation is correct. I said that. I must stand by what I have said. Although the plan of the deportation of the Jews was Hitler's plan and I was not charged with its execution, I did utter those words, which I now sincerely regret ; but I must say that I identified myself morally with that action only out of a feeling of misplaced loyalty to the " Führer ". That I have done, and that cannot be undone. If I am to explain how I came to do this, I can only reply that, at that time, I was already " between the Devil and the deep sea ".

I believe it will also become clear from my later statements that, from a certain moment on, I had Hitler against me, the Party Chancellery against me, and very many members of the Party itself against me. Constantly, I heard from officials of the Party Chancellery who expressed that to the " Gauleiter " of Vienna, and from statements made in Hitler's entourage, that one was under the impression (and that this could be clearly recognized from my attitude and my actions) that I was no longer expressing myself publicly in the usual anti-Semitic manner or in other ways, either ; and I just have no excuse. But it may perhaps serve as an explanation, that I was trying to extricate myself from this painful situation by speaking in a manner which today I can no longer justify to myself. »

This is a far cry from Streicher's usual manner of spitting in the courts eye during testimony. But is it proper that a court should weigh questions of style ? Most would say yes, it is. The court considered von Schirach's expressions of regret and remorse, combined with his frank admission of guilt, mitigating factors, and this sort of consideration is traditional and expected.

Another circumstance the court seemed to feel was obviously mitigating was the relationship of the accused with Hitler. Such occurrences as Hjalmar Schacht's incarceration in a concentration camp, Albert Speer's supposed plot to kill Hitler, and Erich Ræder's dismissal, carried much weight with the judges ; too much, in my view. Below is some documentation of an incident the court found nearly as fascinating as Speer's tales of assassination plots foiled ...

24 June 1943 : During a visit to the Berghof by von Schirach and his wife, von Schirach falls-out with Hitler. He will spend the final days of Hitler's « Reich » in fear of arrest, or worse.

From Schirach's International Military Tribunal testimony :

« The difference between Hitler and myself arose primarily over an art exhibition, and the breach between Hitler and myself, in 1943, was in the beginning the result of differences of opinion over the cultural policy. In 1943, I was ordered to the Berghof where Hitler, in the presence of Bormann, criticized me violently on account of my cultural work and literally said that I was leading the cultural opposition against him in Germany. And further, in the course of the conversation, he said that I was mobilizing the spiritual forces of Vienna and Austria and the spiritual forces of the young people against him in cultural spheres. He said he knew it very well indeed. He had read some of my speeches, primarily the Düsseldorf speech ; he had discovered that I had authorized in Weimar and in Vienna art exhibitions of a decadent nature ; and he offered me the alternative, either to end this kind of opposition work immediately (then, for the time being, everything could remain as in the past) or he would stop all Government subsidies for Vienna.

This scene made a frightful impression on me, for it represented to me a breach of Hitler's promised word, since he had granted me absolute freedom of action when he appointed me to the Vienna mission. I, then, recognized that he nourished an icy hatred toward me, and that behind these statements on cultural policies something else was concealed. Whether he was dissatisfied in every detail with the way I conducted my office in Vienna at the time, I do not know. He rarely expressed himself directly about such matters. From his entourage, I learned only of occasional happenings.

I then (and that led to the complete and final break between Hitler and myself a few weeks after I had received this order, if I may call it so) received a strange invitation for myself and my wife to spend some time on the Berghof. At that time, I innocently believed that Hitler wished to bridge the gap between us and to let me know, in one way or another, that he had gone too far. In any case, at the end of a 3 days' visit (I cut my stay short) , I discovered that this was a fundamental error on my part. Here, I will limit myself to a few points only. I had intended (and I also carried-out my intention) to mention at least 3 points during my visit. One was the policy toward Russia, the 2nd was the " Jewish Question ", and the 3rd was Hitler's attitude toward Vienna.

I must state, to begin with, that Bormann had issued a decree addressed to me, and probably to all the other " Gauleiter " 's, prohibiting any intervention on our part in the " Jewish Question ". That is to say, we could not intervene with Hitler in favour of any Jew or half-Jew. That too was stated in the decree. I have to mention this, since it makes matters clearer.

On the 1st evening of my stay at the Berghof, on what appeared to me a propitious occasion, I told Hitler that I was of the opinion that a free and autonomous Ukraine would serve the " Reich " better than a Ukraine ruled by the violence of " Herr " Koch. That was all I said, nothing more, nothing less. Knowing Hitler as I did, it was extremely difficult even to hazard such a remark. Hitler answered comparatively quietly but with pronounced sharpness. On the same evening, or possibly the next one, the " Jewish Question " was broached according to a plan I made with my wife. Since I was forbidden to mention these things even in conversation, my wife gave the " Führer " a description of an experience she had had in Holland. She had witnessed one night, from the bedroom of her hotel, the deportation of Jewish women by the " Gestapo ". We were both of the opinion that this experience during her journey and the description of it might possibly result in a change of Hitler's attitude toward the entire " Jewish Question " and in the

treatment of the Jews. My wife gave a very drastic description, a description such as we can now read in the papers.

Hitler was silent. All the other witnesses to this conversation, including my own father-in-law, Professor Hoffmann, were also silent. The silence was icy, and after a short time Hitler merely said, " This is pure sentimentality. " That was all. No further conversation took place that evening. Hitler retired earlier than usual. I was under the impression that a perfectly untenable situation had now arisen. Then, the men of Hitler's entourage told my father-in-law that, from now on, I would have to fear for my safety. I endeavoured to get away from the Berghof as quickly as possible without letting matters come to an open break, but I did not succeed.

Then Goebbels arrived on the next evening and there, in my presence and without my starting it, the subject of Vienna was broached. I was naturally compelled to protest against the statements that Goebbels at 1st made about the Viennese. Then, the " Führer " began with, I might say, incredible and unlimited hatred to speak against the people of Vienna. I have to admit, here and now, that even if the people of Vienna are cursing me today, I have always felt very friendly toward them. I have felt closely attached to those people. I will not say more than that Joseph Weinheber was one of my closest friends. During that discussion, I, in accordance with my duty and my feelings, spoke in favour of the people under my authority in Vienna.

At 4 o'clock in the morning, among other things, Hitler suddenly said something that I should now like to repeat for historical reasons. He said, " Vienna should never have been admitted into the Union of Greater Germany. " Hitler never loved Vienna. He hated its people. I believe that he had a liking for the city because he appreciated the architectural design of the buildings on the " Ring ". But everybody who knows Vienna knows that the true Vienna is architecturally Gothic, and that the buildings on the " Ring " are not really representative.

I only want to say that so total a break resulted from that discussion (or, rather explosion) of Hitler's that on that, very night at about 4:30, I took my leave and left the Berghof a few hours later. Since then, I had no further conversations with Hitler. »

Nicolaus von Below, Hitler's long-time adjutant, wrote of the split from Hitler's perspective. Hitler had told Below that, while the above disputes with Schirach were annoying, what really set him off was that Schirach had insisted that the War was lost and that a way should be found to put an end to it.

From Below's memoirs :

« How does Schirach imagine that ending the War can be done ?

Hitler indignantly told me : " He knows just as well as I that there is no way out anymore, other of course than my shooting myself. " Hitler was very put-out over this conversation with Schirach, and made very plain that he wanted nothing more to do with him. And, indeed, it was their last encounter. »

The court considered such insider gossip compelling, and took what can only be considered undue notice of such tales.

In von Schirach's case, other Defendants were more than willing to contribute to the narrative ...

Summer 1943 : Schirach writes one last letter to Hitler.

From Hermann Göring's International Military Tribunal testimony :

« At that time, the “ Führer ” had not been kindly disposed to von Schirach for several months and had repeatedly considered withdrawing him from office. He said on this occasion - and that is how I came into possession of this letter, for he handed it to me : “ Schirach seems to plan for his future protection. I have a certain suspicion. ” Then, in the presence of Bormann, I told the “ Führer ” very clearly and definitely that this was entirely unfounded ; that I could not understand his attitude toward Schirach, and that Schirach had done the only possible and decent thing when, before dismissing any of his collaborators or subordinates for such reasons, he demanded the clarification of his own position, since his connections were known ; and that, in my opinion, this letter had no other purpose. I know that Bormann and Himmler were opposed to Schirach. Whether they wanted to give this letter an entirely different interpretation in order to induce the “ Führer ” to recall Schirach and eliminate him, and how far Himmler's suggestion went, whether protective custody was considered, I do not know. But I heard about these things from other sources later on. »

From Schirach's International Military Tribunal testimony :

« I must now refer to something else in this connection. “ Reich ” Marshal Göring, in the witness box, mentioned a letter of mine which Hitler had shown him, and “ Herr ” von Ribbentrop has stated here that he was present at a conversation during which Himmler suggested to Hitler that I be indicted before the People's Court, which meant in reality that I should be hanged. I must add one thing more : What Göring said about this letter is mainly true. I wrote in quite a proper manner about family relations in that letter. I also wrote one sentence to the effect that I considered War with America a disaster.

The letter was correct. It was written by hand, and no secretary read it. It went by courier to the head of the State. It is also possible that it was addressed in care of Bormann. I cannot remember exactly. It went by courier, and that letter contained nothing else but the clarification required for replying to questions put to me in a circular which Göring mentioned in his statement here. That letter caused Hitler to have an absolute loathing for me ; and, at about the same time, a file was started against me in the “ Reich ” Security Main Office. That was due to the fact that I had described in a small circle of political leaders (of high-ranking political leaders) the foreign political situation such as I saw it, as I was accustomed to do from the days of my youth. One of these leaders was an SS intelligence officer and reported what I said, and then the file was started. The material was compiled in order to eventually bring me to trial. That I was never brought to trial I owe solely and exclusively to the circumstance that both, in the Army and at home, my comrades from the Youth Leadership stood solidly behind me, and any proceedings against me would have led to trouble. After 20 July 1944, my situation became very precarious. My friends in the Army, therefore, placed a company of hand-picked men at my disposal. They were under the orders of the former adjutant of “ Generaloberst ” Fromm. The company was directly subordinate to me. It took-over the protection of my person and remained with me

to the end. »

Even more than tales of gossip and intrigue in Hitler's inner-circle, the Tribunal appreciated any testimony that confirmed the legitimacy of the court. One of the main behind-the-scenes undercurrents of the trial was the battle for the hearts and minds of the defeated German populace. The Trial was broadcast live throughout Germany, and the Judges and Prosecutors were mindful of the propaganda aspect of the proceedings and its impact on occupied Germany. Statements such as von Schirach's one item below were comparatively rare, and each and every one was a godsend to Allied occupation authorities.

From The Nuremberg Trial by Ann and John Tusa :

« Gilbert had gone on to say that Schirach's early rise to power had gone “ to his Romantic head ” and that he was now “ disillusioned at what he feels to be the betrayal of German youth by the elder leaders ”. Gilbert had actively nurtured this disillusionment in recent months. It is hard to believe that Gilbert was acting purely on his own initiative. Others beside must have seen an advantage in persuading the former leader of those young people to reject the training they had received and set them on a less dangerous path for the future. Should German youth come to share Schirach's disillusion, Germany would be easier to settle and incorporate into the European community. But there is no evidence to show that Gilbert discussed his strategy with others. Nor is there a hint anywhere that a bargain was considered. On the contrary, the prosecution records suggest that every effort was made to secure the maximum sentence. Gilbert's diary shows Schirach struggling with his conscience, until deciding in early May that he had one last mission to the young people of Germany - to denounce Hitler before he died. He got his courage to the sticking point in the witness box around mid-morning on 24 May. He was noticeably ashen-faced. »

The testimony that probably saved von Schirach's life ...

From Schirach's International Military Tribunal testimony :

« It [Auschwitz] is the greatest, the most devilish mass-murder known to history. But that murder was not committed by Höß ; Höß was merely the executioner. The murder was ordered by Adolf Hitler, as is obvious from his last will and testament. The will is genuine. I have held the photostat copy of that will in my hands. He and Himmler jointly committed that crime which, for all time, will be a stain in the annals of our history. It is a crime which fills every German with shame.

The youth of Germany is guiltless. Our youth was anti-Semitic ally inclined, but it did not call for the extermination of Jewry. It neither realized nor imagined that Hitler had carried-out this extermination by the daily murder of thousands of innocent people. The youth of Germany who, today, stand perplexed among the ruins of their native land, knew nothing of these crimes, nor did they desire them. They are innocent of all that Hitler has done to the Jewish and to the German people.

I should like to say the following in connection with Höß' case. I have educated this generation in faith and loyalty to

Hitler. The Youth Organization which I built-up bore his name. I believed that I was serving a leader who would make our people and the youth of our country great and happy and free. Millions of young people believed this, together with me, and saw their ultimate ideal in National-Socialism. Many died for it. Before God, before the German nation, and before my German people, I alone bear the guilt of having trained our young people for a man whom I, for many long years, had considered unimpeachable, both as a leader and as the head of the State, of creating for him a generation who saw him as I did. The guilt is mine in that I educated the youth of Germany for a man who murdered by the millions. I believed in this man, that is all I can say for my excuse and for the characterization of my attitude. This is my own - my own personal guilt.

I was responsible for the youth of the country. I was placed in authority over the young people, and the guilt is mine alone. The younger generation is guiltless. It grew-up in an anti-Semitic State, ruled by anti-Semitic laws. Our youth was bound by these laws and saw nothing criminal in racial politics. But if anti-Semitism and racial laws could lead to an Auschwitz, then, Auschwitz must mark the end of racial politics and the death of anti-Semitism. Hitler is dead. I never betrayed him ; I never tried to overthrow him ; I remained true to my oath as an officer, a youth leader, and an official. I was no blind collaborator of his ; neither was I an opportunist. I was a convinced National-Socialist from my earliest days - as such, I was also an anti-Semite. Hitler's racial policy was a crime which led to disaster for 5,000,000 Jews and for all the Germans. The younger generation bears no guilt. But he who, after Auschwitz, still clings to racial politics has rendered himself guilty. That is what I consider my duty to State in connection with the Höß case. »

From The Nuremberg Trial by Ann and John Tusa :

« During the statement Gilbert had noticed the tension in the dock : Frank, Funk and Ræder dabbing their eyes, Streicher sneering. When Schirach went down to lunch he was congratulated by Fritzsche, Funk and Speer, and in their own room Papen, Neurath and Schacht agreed he was perfectly right in his judgement of Hitler. Göring had not been in court ; he was excused on grounds of indisposition. Gilbert suspected that Göring was unwilling to sit through the embarrassment of hearing what Schirach was going to say. That evening Göring complained in equal measure of “ treachery ” and “ sciata ” - evidently, suffering from all kinds of stabs in the back.

During the weekend, Schirach mulled-over what he had said. He talked now of Hitler's ingratitude, the way he himself had been rejected from 1943 and put in constant fear of arrest. He hinted that Hitler had never been at ease among women. He was pleased that Gilbert had taken the notes for his statement to 2 former Hitler Youth leaders who were being held in the witness wing of the jail and that they had been impressed, and promised to circulate it among former members. Speer was delighted by what had happened. He suggested that he and Schirach should now call each other by the intimate “ du ”. This invitation held-out the prospect of an additional pleasure : “ Göring will have a stroke. ” “ The Times ” considered that Schirach's statement had been expressed in “ the bitterest terms the court has heard yet ”.

Conclusion : If one accepts that von Schirach was guiltier than Streicher, then, the only logical reason that the youth leader managed to salvage his existence was that the court considered his admission of guilt, and his expressions of

remorse, the ultimate in mitigating testimony. It confirmed aspects of the Prosecutions case and validated the Tribunal's mission. It was in this manner that he avoided the noose. Whether or not Justice was served in the process is debatable, but the Judges no doubt felt that the sentence of 20 years was a fair one under the circumstances. »

The official judgment pronounced by Major-General Iona Timofeevich Nikitchenko

Von Schirach is indicted under Counts 1 and 4. He joined the Nazi Party and the SA in 1925. In 1929, he became the Leader of the National-Socialist Students Union. In 1931, he was made « Reich » Youth Leader of the Nazi Party with control over all Nazi youth organizations including the « Hitler Jugend ». In 1933, after the Nazis had obtained control of the Government, von Schirach was made Leader of Youth in the German « Reich », originally a position within the Ministry of the Interior, but, after 1st December, 1936, an office in the « Reich » Cabinet. In 1940, von Schirach resigned as head of the « Hitler Jugend » and Leader of Youth in the German « Reich », but retained his position as « Reichsleiter » with control over Youth Education. In 1940, he was appointed « Gauleiter » of Vienna, « Reich » Governor of Vienna, and « Reich » Defence Commissioner for that territory.

Crimes against Peace

After the Nazis had come to power von Schirach, utilising both physical violence and official pressure, either drove-out of existence or took-over all youth groups which competed with the « Hitler Jugend ». A Hitler decree of 1st December, 1936, incorporated all German youth within the « Hitler Jugend ». By the time formal conscription was introduced in 1940. 97 % of those eligible were already members.

Von Schirach used the « Hitler Jugend » to educate German Youth « in the spirit of National-Socialism » and subjected them to an intensive programme of Nazi propaganda. He established the « Hitler Jugend » as a source of replacements for the Nazi Party formations. In October 1938, he entered into an agreement with Himmler under which members of the « Hitler Jugend » who met SS standards would be considered as the primary source of replacements for the SS.

Von Schirach also used the « Hitler Jugend » for pre-military training. Special units were set-up whose primary purpose was training specialists for the various branches of the service. On 11th August 1939, he entered into an agreement with Keitel under which the « Hitler Jugend » agreed to carry-out its pre-military activities under standards laid down by the « Wehrmacht » and the « Wehrmacht » agreed to train 30,000 « Hitler Jugend » instructors each year. The « Hitler Jugend » placed particular emphasis on the military spirit and its training programme stressed the importance of return of the colonies, the necessity for « Lebensraum » and the noble destiny of German youth to die for Hitler.

Despite the War-like nature of the activities of the « Hitler Jugend », however, it does not appear that von Schirach was involved in the development of Hitler's plan for territorial expansion by means of aggressive War, or that he participated in the planning or preparation of any of the Wars of aggression.

In July 1940, von Schirach was appointed « Gauleiter » of Vienna. At the same time, he was appointed « Reich » Governor for Vienna and « Reich » Defence Commissioner originally for Military District 17, including the « Gaus » of Vienna, Upper-Danube and Lower-Danube and, after 17th November 1942, for the « Gau » of Vienna alone. As « Reich » Defence Commissioner, he had control of the civilian war economy. As « Reich » Governor he was head of the municipal administration of the city of Vienna, and, under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior in charge of the governmental administration of the « Reich » in Vienna.

Von Schirach is not charged with the commission of War crimes in Vienna, only with the commission of crimes against humanity. As has already been seen, Austria was occupied pursuant to a common plan of aggression. Its occupation is, therefore, a « crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal », as that term is used in Article 6 (c) of the Charter. As a result, « murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhumane acts » and « persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds » in connection with this occupation constitute a crime against humanity under that Article.

As « Gauleiter » of Vienna, von Schirach came under the Sauckel decree dated 6th April, 1942, making the « Gauleiters » Sauckel's plenipotentiaries for man-power with authority to supervise the utilization and treatment of man-power within their « Gaus ». Sauckel's directives provided that the forced labourers were to be fed, sheltered and treated so as to exploit them to the highest possible degree at the lowest possible expense.

When von Schirach became « Gauleiter » of Vienna the deportation of the Jews had already been begun, and Only 60,000 out of Vienna's original 190,000 Jews remained. On 2nd October 1940, he attended a conference at Hitler's office and told Frank that he had 50,000 Jews in Vienna which the General Government would have to take-over from him. On 3rd December 1940, von Schirach received a letter from Lammers stating that after the receipt of the reports made by von Schirach, Hitler had decided to deport the 60,000 Jews still remaining in Vienna to the General Government because of the housing shortage in Vienna. The deportation of the Jews from Vienna was, then, begun and continued until the early fall of 1942. On 15th September 1942, von Schirach made a speech in which he defended his action in having driven « tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of Jews into the Ghetto of the East » as « contributing to European culture » .

While the Jews were being deported from Vienna reports, addressed to him in his official capacity, were received in von Schirach's office from the office of the Chief of the Security Police and SD which contained a description of the activities of « Einsatzgruppen » in exterminating Jews. Many of these reports were initialled by one of von Schirach's principal deputies. On 30th June 1944, von Schirach's office also received a letter from Kaltenbrunner informing him that a shipment of 12,000 Jews was on its way to Vienna for essential War work and that all those who were incapable of work would have to be kept in readiness for « special action » .

The Tribunal finds that von Schirach, while he did not originate the policy of deporting Jews from Vienna, participated in this deportation after he had become « Gauleiter » of Vienna. He knew that the best the Jews could hope for was a miserable existence in the Ghettos of the East. Bulletins describing the Jewish extermination were in his office.

While « Gauleiter » of Vienna, von Schirach continued to function as « Reichsleiter » for Youth Education and, in this capacity, he was informed of the « Hitler Jugend » 's participation in the plan put into effect in the fall of 1944 under which 50,000 young people between the ages of 10 and 20 were evacuated into Germany from areas recaptured by the Soviet forces and used as apprentices in German industry and as auxiliaries in units of the German armed forces. In the summer of 1942, von Schirach telegraphed Bormann urging that a bombing attack on an English cultural town be carried-out in retaliation for the assassination of Heydrich which, he claimed, had been Planned by the British.

Conclusion

The Tribunal finds that von Schirach is not guilty on Count 1. He is guilty under Count 4.

...

So, Baldur von Schirach was found guilty of War crimes against humanity and was sentenced to 20 years of imprisonment in which he served-out in Spandau, Berlin, in the company of Rudolf Heß and Albert Speer.

On 20 July 1949, whilst von Schirach was imprisoned, Henriette von Schirach filed for divorce because of another man, but still tried to get Baldur free from prison, without result. Asserted is that von Schirach was bisexual.

The divorce was granted a year later, in July 1950. She continued to campaign for his release but he remained in prison until September 1966.

Schirach was released from prison on 1 October 1966, after precisely 20 years of imprisonment. The former leader of the Hitler Youth was destined to spend the rest of his secluded life (for less than 10 years) in Kröv-an-der-Mösel, in south-west Germany.

In his memoirs, « Ich Glaubte an Hitler » (I Believed in Hitler) (1967) , published 1 year after his release from prison, von Schirach tried to explain the fatal fascination which Hitler had exerted on him and on the younger generation, and also denied all charges of his knowledge of the murder and tortures in the concentration and extermination camps.

Schirach died lonely in his sleep, on 8 August 1974 (aged 66) , in a small hotel of Kröv, owned by a former leader of the « Bund Deutscher Mäde » (BDM) . He was, then, almost totally blind as a result of an eye disease.

The hotel was pulled-down after his death. Baldur von Schirach is buried in all stillness close-by on the local cemetery of Kröv.

On his stone the inscription :

« Ich war Einer von Euch. » (I was one of you.)

Peter Quiess reported on 25 May 2015 that the gravestone of Schirach is removed.

A grandson named Ferdinand von Schirach (born in 1964, in Munich) looks like his grandfather. He is a German lawyer and writer.

...

Baldur von Schirach was born in Berlin on the 9 March 1907, the son of an aristocratic German father and an American mother whose ancestors included 2 signatories of the Declaration of Independence. On his father's side descended from an officers' family with artistic tendencies and a cosmopolitan background, Baldur grew-up in a pampered, well-to-do environment.

One of the earliest members of the Nazi Party, he entered the Party in 1924 while attending the University of Munich, where he briefly studied German folklore and art history, he was soon a member of its inner-most circle, despite his youth.

Von Schirach became a convinced anti-Semite after reading Henry Ford's « The International Jew » and writings by Houston S. Chamberlain and Adolf Bartels. The aristocratic von Schirach was also a militant opponent of Christianity and of his own caste.

Throwing himself body and soul into organizing high-school and university students for the Nazi Party, von Schirach proved himself an outstanding organizer and propagandist of National-Socialism.

With his infectious enthusiasm and power to inspire youth with the ideals of comradeship, sacrifice, courage and honour, von Schirach was highly-regarded by Adolf Hitler who also appreciated his blind devotion as expressed in hero-worshipping verses and sycophantic sayings.

In 1929, von Schirach was put in charge of the National-Socialist German Students League and, 2 years later, he was appointed « Reich » Youth Leader of the NSDAP, a post he held until 1940.

In 1933, he organized the gigantic youth march in Potsdam, in which wave upon wave of youngsters greeted Hitler. Already before the Nazi seizure of power, von Schirach ceaseless propaganda, his idealism and organizational flair for mobilizing youth had succeeded in winning over hundreds of thousands of young Germans to Hitler's cause.

In May 1933, he was made Leader of the Youth of the German « Reich » at the age of 26 and, in the next few years, his cult seemed 2nd only to that of Hitler himself. He married Henriette Hoffmann, daughter of Hitler's official photographer. Placed in control of the Hitler Youth, which by 1936 already comprised of 6 million members, von Schirach used a powerful mixture of pagan Romanticism, militarism and naïve patriotism to build-up recruits for

Hitler's War machine.

Young Germans were to be drilled into acceptance of Nazi concepts of character, discipline, obedience and leadership as set-out in von Schirach's book, « Die Hitler-Jugend », published in 1934, they were to be moulded into a new race of « Supermen » .

Von Schirach who fancied himself as a writer and poet, published 2 books which were best-sellers in 1932 : « Hitler wie ihn Keiner Kennt » , with photographs by his father-in-law, Heinrich Hoffmann (Hitler's official photographer) ; and « Triumph des Willens » .

The following year, his collection of poems, « Die Fahne der Verfolgten » and the short-biographies of Nazi leaders, « Die Pioniere des Dritten Reiches » , were published. Von Schirach taught German youth that their blood was better than that of any nation and devoted his lyricism to hollow worship of the « Führer » 's genius.

Towards the outbreak of the Second World War, his position was being undermined by the intrigues of Martin Bormann and other enemies. Jokes about his effeminate behaviour and his allegedly white bedroom furnished in a girlish manner, were legion and he was never quite able to live-up to his own ideal type of the hard, tough quick Hitler youth.

At the beginning of 1940, von Schirach enlisted as a volunteer in the German army, serving in France for a few months as an infantry officer and receiving the Iron Cross - 2nd Class. In 1940, he organized the evacuation of 5 million children from cities threatened by Allied bombing.

Later that year, he joined the army and volunteered for service in France, where he was awarded the Iron Cross before being recalled. Schirach lost control of the Hitler Youth to Artur Axmann, and was appointed « Gauleiter » of the « Reichsgau Wien » , a post in which he remained until the end of the War.

His unorthodox cultural policies in Austria soon aroused Hitler's distrust, with promptings from Bormann, and after a visit to the Berghof in 1943, where he pleaded for a more moderate treatment of the Eastern European peoples and criticized the conditions in which Jews were being deported, he lost all real influence.

Nevertheless, he was on record in a speech on the 15 September 1942 as saying that the « removal » of Jews to the East would « contribute » to European culture. The deportation of 65,000 Jews from Vienna to Poland, during his tenure as Governor, was a major indictment against von Schirach at the Nuremberg Trials.

The War crimes tribunal conceded that he did not originate the policy but had participated in the deportations from Vienna, though he knew that the best the Jews could hope for was a miserable existence in the ghetto's in the East.

During his trial, von Schirach admitted that he had approved the « resettlement » but denied all knowledge of genocide, denouncing Hitler from the dock as a « million-fold murderer » , and calling Auschwitz « the most devilish

mass-murder in history » .

...

Baldur von Schirach was arguably the most successful organizers of youth group's in history. In the space of a few years, he had shaped German youth into young men willing to prosecute the most destructive War in history as well as to engage or acquiesce in the most brutal atrocities in modern European history. The boys he helped trained remained loyal to the end, in many cases joining in the hopeless often suicidal defence of their towns and villages even though the War was lost. Baldur von Schirach was born in Berlin on 9 March 1907, the son of an aristocratic German father and an American mother, whose ancestors included 2 signatories of the Declaration of Independence. On his father's side descended from an officers' family with artistic tendencies and a cosmopolitan background (Carl von Schirach had resigned from the army in 1908 to become a theater director in Weimar) , Baldur grew-up in a pampered, well-to-do environment. One of the earliest members of the NSDAP (he entered the Party in 1924 while attending the University of Munich where he briefly studied Germanic folklore and art history) , von Schirach was soon a member of its inner-most circle, in spite of his youth. A convinced anti-Semite, after reading Henry Ford's « The International Jew » and writings by Houston S. Chamberlain and Adolf Bartels, the aristocratic von Schirach was also a militant opponent of Christianity and of his own caste. Throwing himself body and soul into organizing high-school and university students for the NSDAP, von Schirach proved himself an outstanding organizer and propagandist of National-Socialism. With his infectious enthusiasm and power to inspire youth with the ideals of comradeship, sacrifice, courage and honour, von Schirach was highly-regarded by Hitler who also appreciated his blind devotion as expressed in hero-worshipping verses and such sycophantic sayings as « loyalty in everything and everything is the love of Adolf Hitler » . In 1929, von Schirach was put in charge of the National-Socialist German Students' League and, 2 years later, he was appointed « Reich » Youth Leader of the NSDAP, a post which he held until 1940.

Parents

Baldur was actually more American than German. He was the son of an an officer in the Imperial German Army and an American citizen and, in fact, 3/4 American.

On his father's side descended from an officers' family with artistic tendencies and a cosmopolitan background. His parental grand-father had emigrated from Germany, served in the Union Army and been selected as one of President Lincoln's pallbearers. He married into a wealthy Philadelphia family. His father, Carl von Schirach had resigned from the army in 1908 to become the director of the Imperial Theater in Weimar. He lost his post when the « Kaiser » abdicated and Weimar Republic officials replaced him. He became a supporter of Right-wing politics and hated the Weimar Republic. He was an early supporter of Hitler.

His American ancestors included 2 signatories of the Declaration of Independence and a Union Civil War officer. His mother was an American, daughter of a New York lawyer. He was killed during a World War II bombing raid.

Childhood

Baldur von Schirach was born in Berlin on March 9, 1907. He grew-up in a pampered, well-to-do environment. His 1st language was English because of his mother. He traveled to America with his mother and could have stayed with relatives to pursue a career. He chose to return to Germany. As his father had resigned from the Army to direct the Court theater in Weimar, Baldur grew-up in an artistic, even Romantic environment.

The family was traumatized not by World War I, but the disorders in Germany surrounding the fall of the monarchy. Baldur's father was fired from the Court theater and, for a while, unemployed. He was eventually rehired, but not before Baldur's older brother Karl committed suicide.

Baldur was introduced to Hitler as a teenager. His father had invited Hitler to his home. Hitler, at the time, was pursuing contacts with respectable families to offset the Nazi image of SA street thugs. Baldur was deeply impressed and wrote a poem dedicated to Hitler after he left. One source suggests he entered the Party at age 18. Another source suggests he joined even earlier.

We have little information on how Baldur was dressed as a boy. Coming from an affluent family, he presumably was well-dressed. One photograph shows him wearing a well-tailored suit as a younger teenager.

Education

Baldur claims that his anti-Semitism stemmed from his reading Henry Ford's venomous « The International Jew » . The writings of Houston S. Chamberlain and Adolf Bartels also influenced him. About 1927 (another source says 1924) , Hitler suggest that Baldur enter Munich University to organize a Nazi Student « Bund » . He briefly studied Germanic folklore and art history.

Von Schirach and the Nazis did not exist in a vacuum. Germany was, perhaps, the preeminent industrial nation of Europe. Yet, the country's intellectual avant-garde seemed to reject the achievements of the country's industry and science. Many Germans instead devoted themselves passionately to reviving folk-culture and an anachronistic national heritage. Groups like Wandervogel sang « Landsknecht » songs around camp fires. Many ex-spoused ideological concepts to return to what was seen as pure pre-Christian Germany. Books ex-spousing non-sensical cosmologies associated with Atlantis and a racially superior Master race were enormously popular. Liberalism, Christianity, and democracy had little appeal to many Germans.

Von Schirach was one of the earliest members of the NSDAP. His more cultured background, in comparison to the average Nazi, was an asset as was his success in organizing student groups. The seemingly aristocratic von Schirach was also a militant opponent of Christianity and of his own caste. Von Schirach was soon a member of its inner-most circle, in spite of his youth.

He threw himself into the task of organizing high-school and university students for the Nazis and proved himself to be an outstanding organizer and propagandist of National-Socialism.

Noted by Hitler

With his infectious enthusiasm and power to inspire youth with the ideals of comradeship, sacrifice, courage and honour, von Schirach was highly-regarded by Hitler who also appreciated his blind devotion as expressed in hero-worshipping verses and such sycophantic sayings as « loyalty in everything and everything is the love of Adolf Hitler ».

Student League

Adolf Hitler, in 1929, put von Schirach in charge of the National-Socialist German Students' League.

Von Schirach married in 1931. His wife was the daughter of Hitler's personal photographer, Heinrich Hoffmann. I do not know yet if they had any children. We do note one dramatic scene during the War at the Berghof. At an evening gathering, « Frau » von Schirach had seen a train load of Jews at a Vienna train station being transported and Vienna asked Hitler if he knew about or allowed people to be so mistreated. Hitler was furious, he barked back that people should not talk about things which they know nothing about. He stormed-out of the room, ending the evening gathering.

Von Schirach from the beginning viewed the Nazi Party as « the Party of youth ». Hitler, in 1931, appointed von Schirach Nazi Youth Leader Hitler with a SA rank of « Gruppenführer ». He held this post until 1940 and, when Hitler seized power in 1933, used it to organize the most effective State-controlled youth organization in history. Von Schirach, in 1932, organized a gigantic youth gathering in Potsdam. Boys from all over the « Reich » converged on foot to Potsdam marching through German villages and towns. The waves of these boys passing by must have affected many boys and some parents. Schirach delivered about 70,000 saluting boys to greet Hitler and cheer his speech. Hitler was impressed. Already before the Nazi seizure, von Schirach's ceaseless propaganda, his idealism and organizational flair for mobilizing youth, had succeeded in winning-over hundreds of thousands of young Germans to Hitler's cause.

Hitler upon seizing power, in May 1933, he was made Youth Leader of the German « Reich » at the age of only 26 years. Given control of the Hitler Youth movement which, by 1936, already comprised 6 million members. No other group of Germans were so totally under Nazi control than children one they reached 10 years of age. Von Schirach used a powerful mixture of pagan Romanticism, militarism and naive patriotism to build-up recruits for Hitler's War machine. Young Germans were to be drilled into acceptance of Nazi concepts of character, discipline, obedience and leadership as set-out in von Schirach's book, « Die Hitler-Jugend » (1934) . A whole generation was moulded into a new race of « Supermen ». The success of the Hitler Youth in imbuing German youth with Nazi principles and ideology was an important element in preparing Germany for War. Von Schirach taught German youth that their blood was better than that of any nation and devoted his lyricism to hollow worship of the « Führer » 's genius.

Of all the « Reich » youth groups, it was the Hitler Youth that was of greatest importance. Von Schirach was involved

in every aspect of the Hitler Youth. He chosen a military-type organization. He was a very effective organizer. Given his theatrical background, he was very skilled in staging impressive events. He wrote a great deal of material used by the movement such as slogans used at camp. Von Schirach signed an agreement with the military to funnel Hitler Youth boys into the armed forces. There was no secret about this, the poster shown here exalts in the fact that the « Hilter-Jugend » was the training ground for future officers. More ominous was the fact that particularly outstanding boys were funneled into the SS and boys offered the opportunity considered it a great honour. Von Schirach was not liked by many top Nazis. SS Leader Himmler was the major exception, presumably because von Schirach helped create such an effective recruiting system and provided boys ready to accept the terrible tasks assigned the SS.

At the Nuremberg Trials, part of von Schirach's defence was based on the fact that he, unlike other top Nazis, continued to practice his Christian religion and that he pursued correct ties with Christian church groups in Germany and later, in Austria, after he was appointed « Gauleiter » (the German term for a kind of governor) . We know the devotion to Christianity is correct as regards his wife, who actually raised the treatment of the Jews personally with Hitler. We are less sure about von Schirach himself. And, in fact, the Hitler Youth adopted policies designed to discourage church attendance. We are unsure, at this time, how to evaluate these claims. Many of the claims sound like efforts to save his skin by re-writing history, but we are just beginning to acquire information on this.

Image

Interestingly, von Schirach himself was a far cry from the image of the youths that he sought to create for Hitler. The « Führer » said that the German youth he was creating were to be « Slim and straight, fast as a greyhound, and tough as Krupp steel » . Von Schirach could not have been more different. He had been pampered as a boy. He came from an artistic family where culture had been more important than athleticism. He was fond of quoting Gøethe. He was pudgy and no fan of camping-out and roughing it. He much preferred luxury hotels. He probably would not done well at all as a boy in the Hitler Youth himself. One former Hitler Youth boy looking back reports, « Von Schirach was not an athletic leader. He was good with words. He kept his distance when visiting our camps. »

Von Schirach, who fancied himself as a writer and poet, published 2 books which were best-sellers in 1932, « Hitler, wie ihn Keiner Kennt » (with photographs by his father-in-law) and « Triumph des Willens » . The following year, his collection of poems, « Die Fahne der Verfolgten » , and the short biographies of Nazi leaders, « Die Pionere des Dritten Reiches » , were published.

Von Schirach was, from the beginning, considered to be an outsider by most leading Nazis. Towards the outbreak of World War II, von Schirach's position, was being undermined by the intrigues of Martin Bormann and other enemies. Jokes about his effeminate behaviour and his allegedly white bedroom furnished in a girlish manner, were legion, and he was never quite able to live-up to his own ideal type of the hard, tough, quick Hitler youth. Von Schirach, in fact, felt much more at home in a luxury hotel than a Hitler Youth tent.

With the outbreak of World War II, many « Hilter-Jugend » officials volunteered for military service. After doing so much to prepare boys for battle, von Schirach could hardly avoid military service himself - especially given the jokes

an innuendo about him. At the beginning of 1940, von Schirach enlisted as a volunteer in the German army, serving in France for a few months as an infantry officer and receiving the Iron Cross (2nd Class) . It was hardly front-line duty, he reported with a substantial staff - hardly routine for a low-ranking officer.

« Gauleiter » and Governor of Vienna

Hitler decided to recall von Schirach from France. He had been relieved of his post as Leader of the Hitler Youth, but Hitler appointed him Nazi « Gauleiter » (Governor) of Vienna, in August 1940. A particularly brutal Nazi « Gauleiter » there had caused some dissatisfaction in Vienna. Von Schirach tried to be a cultural gloss on Nazism. He reportedly said, « Vienna cannot be conquered with bayonets, only with music. » At the same time, the transports of Jews steadily rolled to the death camps in Poland. As Vienna « Gauleiter » , supported cultural event as much as practical during the War. While he was in Vienna, he was noted for noxious statements like, « Every boy who dies at the front, dies for Mozart. » . Of course, while making these statements, he was safe in Vienna. When the Russians approached Vienna, he took-off his uniform and quietly left. Von Schirach's unorthodox cultural policies in Austria soon aroused Hitler's distrust. This was encouraged by Bormann who especially disliked von Schirach.

Reports vary as to von Schirach's knowledge or role in the Holocaust. One report indicated that after a visit to the Berghof, in 1943, where he pleaded for a moderate treatment of the Eastern European peoples and criticized the conditions in which Jews were being deported. We do know that he did nothing to limit the deportations from Vienna and bragged about presenting a Jew-free Vienna to Hitler. Von Schirach claims that he never knew of the death camps. Nevertheless, he was on record as saying that the « removal » of Jews to the East would « contribute to European culture » . (Speech of 15 September 1942.) Von Schirach (and Albert Speer) were probably saved at the Nuremberg Trials because the prosecution did not present evidence that they attended the 1943 Posen meeting where Himmler explicitly explained the « Final Solution » to « Reich » leaders. Most of whom were well-aware of what was being done. Anyone attending that meeting, however, could not claim that they did not know. As this was not known by the judges, many were impressed with his impassioned plea, « Before God, before the German nation, before my German people, I alone bear the guilt of having trained our young people for a man whom I for many long years had considered unimpeachable, for a man who murdered by the millions. » The prosecution pointed-out that he was on the distribution for « Einsatzgruppen » reports. Von Schirach claimed that a subordinate had never passed them on to him.

While in Portugal, Henriette von Schirach came across a copy of « Life » magazine with of German reports of atrocities on the Eastern Front. On the way home, she stopped in Amsterdam and witnessed a brutal round-up Jewish women and children. The Netherlands was, in fact, one of the most deadly places in Europe for the Jews during the Holocaust. Afterwards, an SS officer showed her some of the booty seized from Dutch Jews and offered diamonds at a cheap price. The von Schirach's were, on many occasions, invited to Hitler's intimate social gatherings at Berchtesgaden. At one of these occasions, « Frau » von Schirach attempt to report these observations to Hitler. (We are not sure if she confronted with her husband in advance.) Hitler was enraged. She and her husband were never invited back to the Berghof.

For whatever reason, he did lose any real influence with Hitler - a factor here was his wife. Even so, he remained in office as Vienna « Gauleiter ». After the War, he criticized Hitler for using children to defend Berlin. « I don't see how the young can be sent to War. », he said. He himself, however, did the same albeit on a smaller scale in Vienna.

Unlike many top Nazis, he had no intention of fighting to the end or in killing himself and family. He tried to hide as mystery writer after the War. Finally, fearing Austrian anti-Nazis and French occupation troops, he quietly entered the American occupation zone and surrendered.

Von Schirach's attorney, in his closing speech at the Nuremberg War Crime Trials, claimed that his client did not have blood on hands. Von Schirach, at Nuremberg, did not deny the military role of the « Hitler-Jugend », but he claimed, « The idea of attacking other nations never entered my mind. » The deportation of 185,000 Jews from Vienna to Poland during his tenure as Governor was a major item in the indictment against von Schirach at the Nuremberg Trials. The War crimes tribunal conceded that he did not originate the policy, but had « participated in this deportation, though he knew that the best they [the Jews] could hope for was a miserable existence in the ghettos of the East ». Von Schirach admitted that he had approved the « resettlement » but denied all knowledge of genocide, denouncing Hitler from the dock as « a million fold murderer » and calling Auschwitz « the most devilish mass-murder in history ». He claimed at Nuremberg that « My primary activities in Vienna were social work and cultural work. » .

While « Gauleiter », he said :

« If anyone reproaches me with having driven from this city, which was once the European metropolis of Jewry, tens of thousands upon tens of thousands into the ghettos of the East, I feel compelled to reply : I see in this an action contributing to European culture. »

The Court sentenced von Schirach, on 1 October 1946, to 20 years imprisonment for crimes against humanity which he served out at Spandau prison, in Berlin, in the company of Rudolf Heß and Albert Speer. Von Schirach continued his purported change of heart, admitting that he had misled German youth and contributed to poisoning a whole generation which had idolized him. In his memoirs, « Ich Glaubte an Hitler » (1967) , published 1 year after his release from Spandau. Von Schirach tried to explain the fatal fascination which Hitler had exerted on him and on the younger generation. He now considered it his duty to destroy any belief in the rebirth of Nazism and blamed himself before history for not having done more to prevent the concentration camps.

Von Schirach et la culture

Sur la vie culturelle en Autriche même, et tout particulièrement à Vienne, l'ancienne capitale ravalée au rang de « Gaustadt », nous disposons de plusieurs documentations et chroniques dont nous citerons les passages qui nous semblent caractéristiques à la fois des efforts du régime et de son incapacité à assimiler, en profondeur, les traditions culturelles spécifiquement viennoises qui restaient, malgré tout, fort vivaces parmi les supports de la vie intellectuelle et artistique de Vienne.

Baldur von Schirach, le dernier « Gauleiter » de Vienne qui se donnait des airs de protecteur des arts et des artistes, dut faire l'expérience de l'imperméabilité des Viennois à ses tentatives de séduction qui, tout compte fait, furent désapprouvées par Adolf Hitler comme par Josef Gœbbels, le grand Maître de la propagande nazie.

(Baldur von Schirach remplaça Josef Bürckel comme « Gauleiter » et « Reichstatthalter » le 7 juillet 1940, et s'enfuit de Vienne le 6 avril 1945, au moment où les armées soviétiques investirent la ville, alors que le général SS Sepp Dietrich prenait le commandement, ses SS fusillant, pendant et détruisant jusqu'au dernier moment.)

Dans la « Chronique » de F.M. Rebhann (sorte de chronique culturelle et mondaine de l'époque de l'occupation nazie à Vienne, dont le titre équivoque reflète bien les propos non moins équivoques de l'auteur qui entremêle assez adroitement dans son récit, les épisodes des « fastes » avec des remarques sur la répression et le déclin irrémédiable du régime au cours de la Guerre), on trouve un mélange singulier de noms célèbres et inconnus ; il cite, avec une certaine malignité, l'écrivain Bruno Brehm qui, dans le périodique « Wehrmacht », fustigea l'incompréhension et le manque de perspicacité de « l'étranger » qui croyait « que le “ Land Österreich ” posait toujours problème », alors qu'un journaliste aujourd'hui oublié, un certain Leo Schödl, tonna dans le « Völkischer Beobachter » contre une tournée du « Wiener Stadttheater » qui tenta de gagner la faveur du public allemand d'une manière traditionnelle et typiquement autrichienne, alors que selon ce même Schödl celle-ci n'avait jamais existé.

En général, Rebhann poursuit sa chronique à la manière d'un récit plutôt mondain, bien que certaines remarques décrivent assez véridiquement la situation de Guerre, par exemple lorsqu'il note que pendant l'hiver 1939-1940 de nombreux manteaux de cuir polonais apparurent dans les rues de Vienne que suivirent, quelques mois plus tard, des renards norvégiens, alors qu'aucun magasin ne présentait de cuir polonais ou de fourrure norvégienne.

De la chronique mentionnée, il ressort que les Nazis menèrent une politique culturelle essentiellement « völkisch » dont faisaient partie aussi bien les « danseuses nues » que les orchestres à cuivres, et même les bordels. Toutes les écoles de musique furent rapidement mises au pas, les associations d'artistes rassemblées sous la houlette d'un artiste connu, le professeur Eisenmenger, auquel cette dignité ne porta pas préjudice après la débâcle nazie. Opéra et « Opéra populaire » devaient donner une place aux productions médiocres mais « idéologiquement pures » de compositeurs et d'auteurs de livrets sans talent ; même à l'école, l'enseignement du solfège fut désormais soumis aux normes « völkisch ». On se mit à la recherche de « jeunes compositeurs inconnus » mais aryens, car Vienne devait devenir « le cœur sonore du “ Reich ” ». Des célébrités vinrent bien de temps en temps à Vienne (Wilhelm Furtwängler, Hans Knappertsbusch et même Richard Strauß) mais, de plus en plus, la vie culturelle fut empreinte d'un esprit provincial auquel il était tout au plus permis de rayonner vers le Sud-Est balkanique, en souvenir des anciens missionnaires du « Deutschtum » que la monarchie déjà avait délégués dans ces mêmes pays.

...

The longtime head of the « Hitler-Jugend » and, as of 1940, the « Gauleiter » and « Reichsstatthalter » in Vienna also had aristocratic pretensions and a penchant for high-living. Yet, Baldur von Schirach is particularly interesting

because he represents a common type within the Nazi government : the quasi-autonomous chieftain of a particular territory. Replacing the dual leadership of Arthur Seyß-Inquart and Josef Bürckel in Vienna, Schirach treated the Austrian capital and its outlying areas as his own, from 1940 to 1945. This provides another element to the feudal metaphor. Not only were there reciprocal ties binding the sub-leaders to Adolf Hitler (and, to a lesser extent, each other) , but certain sub-leaders, such as Schirach, were charged with ruling specific geographic areas. That the 35 « Gauleiters » usually abused their relative autonomy is no revelation. Schirach, however, offers a striking case of a sub-leader obtaining authority from Hitler and, then, exploiting this position for personal gain.

Schirach was, in many ways, comparable to his brutal associates, such as « Gauleiter-Reichskommissar » Erich Koch of East-Prussia and the Ukraine, « Gauleiter-Reichskommissar » Josef Bürckel of the « Westmark » (the territory encompassing the Saar, Palatinate, and Lorraine) , and « Gauleiter » Albert Forster of Danzig, in that he viewed himself as the prince of his territory (he was, however, less brutal and less anti-Semitic) . Upon moving to Vienna, he inhabited a lavish villa in the « Hohe Warte » neighbourhood, a residence previously used by Bürckel. He immediately enhanced its furnishings by « borrowing » rugs and tapestries from the Schwarzenberg palace, a sequestered property located in the center of the city. Schirach had become accustomed to living in style. Upon his appointment as « Reichsjugendführer » in 1933, he had moved into a luxurious lake-side abode on the « Kleine Wannsee » in Berlin, and, the following year, he and his wife acquired a retreat in the Bavarian mountains. Schirach's residential arrangements in Vienna are telling. They convey a sense of his own self-importance and a willingness to break laws for personal benefit. His concern for style and interior design also reflects the emphasis on culture that marked his rule in Vienna. He was transferred to Vienna with explicit orders to organize and rehabilitate the city's flagging cultural life, although not to the point where it would rival that in Berlin. Hitler created a special arrangement whereby Schirach, not Josef Gœbbels, would be responsible for the arts in that region (the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » , however, continued to provide funding) . Schirach not only controlled the budget of the city's cultural institutions but was given funds (including sizable « Dotationen ») with which to patronize and entertain. Artists were frequently guests at his dinner table and at diplomatic functions.

Schirach projected himself as an artist from the outset of his career with the Nazis.

Howard Becker, in describing Schirach's early years, wrote :

« In Munich, he was studying art-history and Germanic lore in 1924. By 1925, Hitler was referring to him as a “ true follower ” and a “ dependable lad ”, and a close friendship seems to have been formed, partly on the basis of their common interest in art. His poems met with Hitler's approval, and, before long, Schirach was the poet laureate, so to speak, of the Nazi movement. »

Furthermore, Schirach came from a privileged and cultured background. His father had been the head of the Weimar « Hoftheater » (Royal Theater) and held the titles « Rittmeister » , « Gardekürassier » , « Kammerherr » , and « Generalintendant » . Young Baldur had not only grown-up in the Royal « Schloß » but, interestingly enough, had been exposed to a fairly progressive brand of theater. Productions staged by his father included Henrik Ibsen's « The Wild Duck » . Hitler, therefore, chose Schirach for the Vienna post in ...

...

Schirach had not only appointed the organizer of the show, Wilhelm Rüdiger, and helped publicize it but had also purchased 6 paintings totaling 26,500 « Reichsmarks ». Toward the end of the 3rd « Reich », Schirach clearly suffered from Hitler's lack of support (and the increasing enmity of Martin Bormann and Josef Goebbels) . Both contemporary observers and historians have linked the « Junge Kunst » « débâcle » with Schirach's post-1943 decline :

« He remained in Vienna until 1945, although after a stormy meeting at the “ Berghof ”, on Easter 1943, he had forfeited Hitler's trust and friendship on account of his “ un-German ” cultural policies and “ Liberal ” attitudes toward Jews. »

Baldur von Schirach's personal collecting of modernistic artworks caused him fewer problems. Other leaders treated the acquisition of such artworks as a private matter - at least as his prerogative as the ruler of Vienna. Thus, whether it concerned the landscape painting by Auguste Renoir that he bought from the Wels Gallery in Salzburg, the 2 Auguste Rodin sculptures that he kept in his bedroom, or the Vincent van Gogh picture, « Poppies in the Field », that he purchased in Holland with the help of the « Dienststelle Mühlmann » and the director of the Kröner-Müller Museum, Doctor van Deventer, Schirach incurred little discernible criticism. The problem-free act of privately acquiring the Van Gogh can be compared with a public gesture : a speech delivered on the 250th anniversary of the « Wiener Akademie der bildenden Künste », in the autumn of 1942, where Schirach dared to mention Van Gogh in the same breath with Rembrandt and Beethoven. He categorized the products of all 3 men as among the « greatest achievements in art » and, in doing so, precipitated wide-spread criticism (Robert Scholz in the DBFU, again, was particularly upset) . Similarly, Scholz complained when Schirach arranged for the « Wiener Galerie », a public institution, to buy a piece by Vienna's own Gustav Klimt as well as a portrait by Lovis Corinth. Scholz noted that the Corinth picture had been removed from the Berlin « Kronprinzenpalais » during the « entartete Kunst » « cleansing » and that, furthermore, both works had been purchased from the « halb-jüdischer » Berlin art-dealer, Hildebrand Gurlitt. Schirach's penchant for moderately abstract works (he had no interest in Wassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, or the radically modern artists) caused problems for him only when his activities entered the public realm. Indeed, in private conversations with Adolf Hitler prior to the falling-out in 1943, Schirach felt sufficiently secure in his views to defend the work of Franz Marc.

While Schirach espoused more enlightened views toward art, he was nonetheless an agent of Nazi oppression and corruption. In the realm of art-collecting, this manifested in his sponsorship of the « Gestapo's » « Vugesta » agency in Vienna, which liquidated artworks confiscated from Jews. While the « Vugesta » dates back to the immediate post- « Anschluß » period, and, hence, prior to Schirach's presence in Vienna, he not only allowed the agency to continue to operate but turned to it to purchase a number of works for his own collection. After the War, OSS agents approached Schirach with incriminating documents, showing, for example, that he bought a picture by Lucas Cranach, « Madonna with Child » (once possessed by the Gomperz family) , from the « Vugesta » . Another document reveals that Schirach spent 42,092 « Reichsmarks » for other unidentified works from the « Vugesta » , between December 1942 and June 1943. Schirach also acquired Pieter Breughel's « Wolf Overtaking Deer » , which had been confiscated from the

Austrian Jew, Ernst Pollock, after he received approval from Hitler and Hans Poße. Schirach's ingenuous response after the War to the accusations was to claim, « I possess a great collection of paintings and I am convinced that none are from Jewish property. » The transparency of Schirach's lies becomes increasingly clear upon scrutiny of the surviving documents.

A June 1943 letter from the « Gestapo » chief in Vienna, Doctor Karl Ebner to Doctor Siebert, a government official from Bohemia, noted :

« Schirach has been informed of the confiscation of the picture collection and has personally inspected it ; he has ordered that personnel from the “ Kunsthistorisches Museum ” in Vienna take photographs. »

Ebner went on to report of Schirach's consultation with Hitler about the allocation of the artworks. The agents from Linz took their pick, and the remaining artworks were set for distribution among Austrian Museums.

Schirach engaged in a number of other unsavoury activities in his efforts to amass an art-collection. He bought regularly from the « Dienststelle Mühlmann » in the Netherlands, having earlier befriended Kajetan Mühlmann.

Henrietta von Schirach tells in her memoirs of an improbable occurrence in 1943 :

« As the Schirachs were leaving The Hague, a man identified as “ M ” (presumably either Mühlmann or the art-dealer Alois Miedl, with whom they were also acquainted) handed the couple 2 wrapped packages. After boarding the train and opening the parcels, they found that they had been given an early Italian Renaissance painting featuring “ Tobias with an Angel ”, which they placed in their Vienna residence. »

Schirach's father-in-law, Heinrich Hoffmann, also procured pictures for the couple (as well as Hitler and other leaders) , frequently obtaining the works while in the Netherlands. He had good business connections there and could benefit more generally from the Germans' occupation of the country. Hoffmann helped Schirach obtain works from the « Goudstikker » collection, which was acquired by Miedl at a highly-favourable price and, then, sold at great profit. In the final days of the War, Schirach allegedly ordered valuable works removed from the mines at « Alt Aussee » , arranging for the removal of a Rembrandt self-portrait and an unidentified Peter Paul Rubens. Schirach hoped to make use of these valuables during his escape. He was captured in the South Tyrol, in June 1945, and his suitcase containing paintings as well as rare 1st edition books was found in a nearby farm house. This incident also reveals that the « Reichsstatthalter » of Vienna had some authority over the nearby storage facilities.

Although Schirach ruled in a relatively independent and cavalier manner in Vienna, his power stemmed from Hitler and his place at the « Führer's » court. To this end, he made sure to keep the political constellation in his favour - at least, until 1943. For starters, Schirach helped Hitler procure art. His efforts included assisting in the negotiations with the Czernin family for Johannes Vermeer's « Artist in His Studio » , obtaining for Linz a Rubens picture entitled « Ganymede » by way of a forced exchange for the Bloch-Bauer porcelain collection, and working with Hoffmann to acquire works for the « Führermuseum » in Linz, from the Netherlands and Italy, including a valuable Rubens, « Venus

and Cupid » . Schirach's exertions on behalf of Hitler earned him goodwill and helped consolidate his position in Vienna. The added benefits, such as the right to the Gomperz, Cranach mentioned above after the Linz agents had selected works by Breughel, Carl Spitzweg, and others, were nice extras. In other instances of Schirach cultivating useful alliances by helping peers acquire art, he gave a painting by Rudolf Eisenmenger to Party treasurer Franz Xaver Schwarz, in 1943, and arranged for Hermann Göring to acquire the missing pieces of a multi-paneled Gothic altarpiece. Most of the panels were housed in Carinhall, but two remained in the « Wiener Akademie der bildenden Künste » . Schirach helped the « Reichsmarschall » by engineering a trade. As the exchange also constituted the city's birthday present to the « Reichsmarschall » , who was celebrating his 50th birthday, in January 1943, the generosity of the deal cannot be in doubt.

Baldur von Schirach exercised tremendous power in his post atop the Nazi administration of Vienna. To take the case noted above as an example, it is instructive that Göring had long tried to purchase the 2 panels from the « Wiener Akademie der bildenden Künste » , but without success. Only the intervention of Schirach, the local authority, enabled the transfer. Schirach was both energetic and territorial in his management of the city's cultural life.

He boasted to American interrogators after the War :

« From the time I took-over, there was no art property being lent out from Vienna. »

Schirach's cultural « attaché » , Walter Thomas, commented about Vienna's museums in his memoirs :

« After the long years of stagnation and inactive conservation and protection, there occurred a not altogether healthy, but nonetheless hectic and hasty flurry of purchases, whereby next to some valuable works, also some of the 2nd rank came into the public State collections for a great deal of money. »

...

Egon Schiele had, by far, the hardest climb to international renown. Though it is generally known that he was Austrian, he has never been mistaken for the easy-going stereotype of his country. Though largely misunderstood, he is often seen as an essentially tragic, flawed product of Austrian society. His genius is linked to a perception of Vienna that fostered eroticism, even pornography. Even in his own country, his work had a much harder time securing acceptance and support. In 1922, 4 years after his death, Schiele's mother was unable to persuade the Austrian State Gallery to buy one of his paintings. The only way to have his work put on display was for her to donate a painting. But one of his fervent admirers, Otto Nirenstein, the art-dealer who later changed his name to Otto Kallir, who was so convinced of Schiele's lasting significance that he chose an exhibition of Schiele's works for the opening of his New Gallery in Vienna, in 1923. A handful of Austrian collectors and museum directors recognized their importance, and bought drawings as well as paintings. Yet, in 1937, Schiele was still so utterly unknown that the Nazis forgot to class him among the group of banned « degenerate » artists.

After the « Anschluß » , Schiele's work was not treated as harshly as that of other Expressionism. A dozen of his

drawings from Vienna's Albertina collection were included in a 1943 exhibition under the patronage of Baldur von Schirach, Adolf Hitler's « Gauleiter » in Vienna during the War. That same year, commemorative articles were authorized in the « Ostmark » media to mark the 25th anniversary of Schiele's death.

Between 1945 and 1955, Schiele's work was included in several exhibitions in Austria. The most important among them was an exhibition in Linz, in 1949, which included over 200 Schiele works, and which was later seen in Salzburg and in 3 German cities. Rudolf Leopold, a young Austrian ophthalmologist who eventually amassed the largest collection of Schieles, was beginning to scour all available sources of his drawings and paintings.

...

The last exhibition to do Gustav Klimt « justice » was held in Vienna, in 1943, under the auspices of Baldur von Schirach, the Hitler-appointed « Gauleiter » (overseer) of the city. Though nominally a celebration of what would have been the artist's 80th year, the event was more accurately a display of looted art. Although not specifically deemed « degenerate » , Klimt was certainly an artist whom the leaders in Berlin considered decadent. Nonetheless, von Schirach, with the confidence of a Nazi favourite (he had headed the Hitler Youth movement, and his wife was the daughter of Hitler's official photographer) was not averse to stepping-out of line when it came to culture.

And so, on February 7, 1943, he unveiled an exhibition featuring 66 Klimt paintings and 34 Klimt drawings at the Exhibition Hall on « Friedrichstraße » . During the month that the show was open, 24,000 Viennese flocked to see it. Included in the exhibition were the trailblazing works expropriated from a leading Jewish family.

Serena and August Lederer had been far more than devoted patrons of the artist. Their holdings included the intellectual capstone of Klimt's career, the monumental images of the faculties of « Philosophy » , « Medicine » and « Jurisprudence » intended for the auditorium of the University of Vienna. Far from being embraced as Masterpieces, the paintings, when unveiled in 1905, were deemed « pornographic » . To help the artist weather the storm, August financed the placement of the paintings in his collection and in others. A decade later, Klimt's 1902 « Beethoven Frieze » , the nearly 35 meter long homage to the power of the composer's art, also came into Lederer's hands, along with the preparatory drawings. And, in 1928, 10 years after the artist's death, the Lederers acquired the much acclaimed early paintings « Music » and « Schubert at the Piano » . A critic had deemed the latter « the finest painting ever made by an Austrian » .

When the Nazis took-over Austria, in 1938, August had been dead for 2 years. 1 year later, Serena, after trying in vain to save the collection, fled to Budapest, where she died in 1943. The Klimts were taken-over by the State with the usual rationale that they constituted partial payments for debts owed by the Lederer industries. Several Vienna museums competed for the magnificent quarry but, up to the time of the 1943 exhibition, no decision had been reached as to the collection's destination.

Von Schirach's Klimt retrospective ended-up being the last hurrah of his ambitious Austrian cultural program. The War's turning point had come just a few days before the exhibition opened with the surrender of the Germans at Stalingrad.

By March 1943, the entire 3rd « Reich » had been mobilized for « Total War », and, as the threat posed by air-raids became increasingly real, it was determined that the Klimts would be better off in storage. Soon after the exhibition closed, more than 10 paintings from the Lederer collection, including the 3 faculty pictures (along with a number of other Klimt canvases) were hidden in a castle in Immendorf, a hamlet in Lower-Austria not far from the Czech border. (The « Beethoven Frieze » was stored elsewhere.) In May 1945, as the Russians came-over that border, the German unit that had been garrisoned in the castle retreated, but not before laying explosives. Between May 8 and May 11, the building and its contents burned to the ground.

Among the paintings on view in the 1943 retrospective were 3 Lederer family portraits : Klimt had painted not only Serena herself, but also her mother and her daughter. Since these were pictures of Jewish women (and, hence, not given names in the exhibition catalogue) , they were not considered important enough to be hidden. The portrait of Serena's mother never surfaced after the War, but the other 2 re-emerged at auctions and were returned to the Lederers' son, Eric, who died in Geneva in 1985. The 2 remaining portraits are now in New York : the image of Serena is at the Metropolitan Museum of Art ; the painting of her daughter, though not in the current exhibition, belongs to Ronald Lauder.

...

Gustav Klimt's « Beethoven Frieze » in the Secession, Morowitz wrote, is an example of why Nazi cultural officials tolerated, even acclaimed his work.

She explained :

« Klimt's " Frieze " hails the triumph of idealism over materialism, an idea often found in Nazi æsthetics. The rescuing knight around whom the " Frieze " revolves can easily be read as a proto-« Führer » figure, leading his people to a higher-realm. »

Yet, Klimt's extremely sensual subject matter made his work at least suspect to many, even in pre-Nazi Vienna.

Cultural journalist Monica Strauß wrote of the 1943 Klimt retrospective in an article for « The Forward » :

« Although not specifically deemed " degenerate ", Klimt was certainly an artist whom the leaders in Berlin considered decadent. Nevertheless, von Schirach, with the confidence of a Nazi favourite (he had headed the Hitler Youth movement, and his wife was the daughter of Hitler's official photographer) was not averse to stepping-out of line when it came to culture. »

Von Schirach took a risk, promoting the Klimt retrospective as an example of the glories of Germanic art, Morowitz said - and populating it with numerous works that had been confiscated from the families of Klimt's Jewish patrons while also being careful to conceal their connection to the Jewish community. For example, Klimt's 2 portraits of Adele Bloch-Bauer, a Jew, were re-titled « A Lady with a Gold Background » and « Lady Standing » .

Von Schirach opened the Klimt retrospective on 7 February 1943, just 5 days after the German defeat in the Battle of Stalingrad, widely considered to be one of the decisive turning points in World War II. 2 years later, von Schirach surrendered to the Allies and was tried for deporting 65,000 Austrian Jews to the Nazi death camps. He was one of only 2 high German officials who renounced their allegiance to Hitler during the Nuremberg War crimes trials. He served 20 years in Spandau prison, Berlin.

...

During the War, in a nationally broadcast speech announcing a « Day of Music in the German Home », Baldur von Schirach remarked before a performance of Franz Schubert's « Trout » Quintet :

« Not only do we play music at home during the War, but we play music at home because there is a War ; the man who holds the sword of the “ Wehrmacht ” in his strong hands, leads in the name of our poetry and song ! »

...

A sophisticated spy network like the « Gestapo » was hardly necessary to monitor Wilhelm Furtwängler's open challenges to the regime. Heinrich Himmler, who headed the « Gestapo », had long been nursing a grudge against Furtwängler. Now, he saw his chance for revenge approaching.

In the meantime, Richard Strauß asked Furtwängler to intervene with the Nazis on 2 matters. Ist, his villa in Garmisch-Partenkirchen had been billeted to house refugees who had lost their homes in the bombings. He complained that he could not get to his piano. The « Gauleiter » of the area reported him for disloyalty. Adolf Hitler, still remembering Strauß' indiscreet letter to Stefan Zweig in which he demeaned top-ranking Nazis, personally ordered that the composer's 80th birthday, on 11 June 1944, should not be officially celebrated.

Strauß, of course, had asked his close friends Clemens Krauß and Baldur von Schirach to help, for they were on good terms with Berlin, but they declined. Furtwängler did not hesitate. He was already the « friend of criminals », so what was there to lose in helping an infamous composer-felon ?

He wrote to Josef Gæbbels :

« We, Germans, will make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the rest of the world if we neglect to honour the birthday of our greatest living composer. »

To the end of his dealings with the Nazis, Furtwängler appealed to the sense of national image in foreign relations, no matter how absurd the approach may have become at this point in the War :

« We, Germans, will make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the rest of the world if we neglect to honour the

birthday of our greatest living composer. »

Göebbels and Hitler agreed with Furtwängler and permission was soon issued for the premiere of the Opera « Die Liebe der Danaë ». The acceleration in saturation bombing, however, was reaching its zenith in the summer of 1944, and Göebbels ordered all theaters closed before the work could be presented.

...

From the mid-1930's onward, foreign students of free-dance began leaving Austria. The National-Socialists put a stop to classes at Hellerau-Laxenburg, in 1939. They had always regarded free-dance as fundamentally suspect, either too abstract to be subject to their ideological control or too intellectual and outspoken where it represented recognizable dramatic plots. The National-Socialist « Reichstheaterkammer » (« Reich » Theater Chamber) issued decrees stipulating how dance and the other arts were to be performed. Almost all the private dance studios were forced to close-down following the « Anschluß » since most were run by Jewish artists. Some of the traditions of free-dance in Vienna were continued at the Conservatoire of the City of Vienna and at the dance-class at the Vienna Academy for Music and the Performing Arts.

Although the National-Socialists closed-down the more radical modern dance establishments in Vienna following their annexation of Austria in 1938, the city's reputation as a center for dance culture nevertheless prompted the regime to make a little-known decision in 1941. Baldur von Schirach, the « Gauleiter » of Vienna, entrusted Kreutzberg with founding a dance academy in Vienna :

« Durch diese Berufung machen wir die Tanzakademie in Wien zur zentralen Ausbildungsstätte des Tanzes für ganz Deutschland und darüber hinaus für ganz Europa. »

(This appointment makes the dance academy in Vienna the main dance training center in the whole of Germany and, moreover, in the whole of Europe.)

The plan was never carried-out, although teaching rooms had been found in the « Reisnerstraße » in the 3rd District, and pupils had already registered for courses, as the uncatalogued application forms in the archives of the Vienna Academy for Music and the Performing Arts show. Schirach was, no doubt, hoping to fill to the gap left by the failure of a National-Socialist dance institution in Berlin. The « Deutsche Tanzbühne » (German Dance Theater) , which included Rosalia Chladek and Harald Kreutzberg among its members, was closed in 1941.

...

The history of the New Year's Day concert is rather recent. It was a Nazi invention.

The 1st ever performance took place on New Year's Eve of 1939, raising money for the « Winterhilfswerk » , an annual fund raising drive masterminded by the National-Socialist Party to buy fuel for the needy in the coldest

months of the year.

When the Straußes were alive, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra was a little sniffy about their music. Why would such an advanced and adventurous Orchestra want to play popular tunes ?

They started taking it more seriously in the late-1920's - but the idea of a seasonal Strauß gala really gained traction when the Nazi Party's cultural commissars hit upon the idea of a unifying event that could be broadcast live across the 3rd « Reich » . The concert moved to New Year's Day in 1941.

As it became obvious the War was not going to be over quickly, « The Blue Danube » Waltz and « Die Fledermaus » Overture were seen as a helpful way of shoring-up flagging morale.

When it emerged that Strauß had some Jewish ancestry, the Nazi propaganda minister Josef Goebbels himself ensured the news was hushed-up.

When the War ended, not a beat was missed - the concerts simply continued, their awkward history quietly forgotten.

As recently as the 1960's, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra saluted a War-time supporter - Baldur von Schirach, the Nazi « Gauleiter » (Governor) of Vienna who deported tens of thousands of Jews.

...

There had been a tradition of concerts on New Years day in Vienna, since 1838, but not with music of the Strauß family. From 1928 to 1933, there were 5 New Years' concerts in the « Musikverein » , conducted by Johann Strauß II. These concerts were broadcast by the Austrian radio broadcaster RAVAG. According to Norman Lebrecht, writing for the « United Kingdom Spectator Journal » , the concert had ominous origins. It was created by conductor Clemens Krauß, with the blessing of Vienna « Gauleiter » , Baldur von Schirach to improve the moral at the front lines. After World War II, the concert survived, as the Nazi origins have been largely forgotten.

The concert was 1st performed in 1939, and conducted by Clemens Krauß. For the 1st and only time, the concert was not given on New Year's Day, but instead on December 31st of that year. It was called then a special, or extraordinary concert (« Außerordentliches Konzert ») . Johann Strauß II was the only composer performed. The program of that 1st concert follows :

« Morgenblätter » , Opus 279, Waltz.

« Annen-Polka » , Opus 117, dedicated to Maria Anna of Savoy.

« Csárdás » from the Opera « Ritter Pázmán » .

« Kaiser-Walzer » , Opus 437.

« Leichtes Blut » , fast Polka, Opus 319.

« Ägyptischer Marsch » , Opus 335.

« G'schichten aus dem Wienerwald » , Waltz, Opus 325.

« Pizzicato-Polka » .

« Perpetuum mobile » , a musical Scherzo, Opus 257.

Overture to the Operetta « Die Fledermaus » .

There were no encores in 1939, and sources indicate they did not begin until 1945. Clemens Krauß almost always included the « Perpetuum mobile » either on the concert or as an encore. Surprisingly, « The Blue Danube » Waltz was not performed until 1945, and then as an encore. The « Radetzky March » was first performed in 1946, as an encore. Until 1958, these last 2 pieces were often but not always given as encores. Since that year, their position as twin encores has been inviolable tradition, with 2 exceptions : in 1967, Willi Boskovsky made « The Blue Danube » part of his concert program ; and, in 2005, Lorin Maazel concluded the program with « The Blue Danube » , omitting the « Radetzky March » as a mark of respect to the victims of the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami.

...

As the War came to an end, parties at the Croatian embassy became still more bitter and decadent ; the imminence of defeat produced an even more serious breakdown of codes of conduct.

Hans-Georg von Studnitz felt immense relief when he left the stony atmosphere in Berlin for Vienna, in the summer of 1943 :

« Living in the protectorate is like being in heaven. »

The bombardments were ignored in conversations in Vienna, which had thus far been spared. Von Studnitz envied people like the « Gauleiter » Baldur von Schirach, who enjoyed this idyllic city where culture still reigned. However, for artists, Vienna was far from being a paradise.

« Aryanization » had been carried-out, but Josef Gœbbels continued to try to reform the Viennese art-scene to make it conform to National-Socialist imperatives. In particular, he reproached the director of the Opera for continuing to allow performances of a decadent musical style : atonality. He set traps and had clandestine recordings made in order to confound the impudent director, who still dared to produce a work by Rudolf Wagner-Régeny, « Johanna Balk » , with

accents worthy of Kuet Weill's « Threepenny Opera » . The composer's work was forbidden in Germany but could still be produced in Vienna. There more than elsewhere, high-society had rallied to the support of those who were carrying-out the unification of Germany. Young musicians like Werner Egk, the author of « Joan von Zarissa » , annoyed Richard Strauß, who left during the interval at its premiere, taking Gerhart Hauptmann with him to discuss the editing of his trilogy on « Iphigeneia » . Some Austrian writers were well-regarded by Germanic cultural institutions, such as Heinrich Ritter von Srbik, who won a seat in the new Nazi « Reichstag » (the old « Kroll-Oper ») in 1938, and obtained prestigious literary prizes through his political activity. A little cultural court emerged around Baldur von Schirach, who organized numerous receptions and used Vienna's traditional institutions to curry favour with Adolf Hitler. His position was made easier by his family relations and his marriage with Henriette Hoffmann. The latter's father, Heinrich Hoffmann, the NSDAP's official photographer, took advantage of this windfall to open a branch in Austria. Schirach organized evenings at the Opera, supported the 2 Philharmonic Orchestras, and tried to limit the influence of the Czechs, of whom there were many in the region. He also toyed with a certain kind of Liberalism, allowing 2 exhibits of works by Käthe Kollwitz and Egon Schiele, very decadent artists. One of Schirach's fiercest critics was the former superintendent of the Vienna Opera, who published his memoirs under a pseudonym after the War. In these memoirs, he describes the meticulous princely entourage of servants that surrounded Schirach, who was extremely demanding concerning the details of his everyday life, which seems to have been empty and indolent. The author concludes that it was basically a harmful way of life, marked by a kind of dangerous deceitfulness. No doubt this view was influenced by the author's friendship with Richard Strauß, whose disgrace and prudent return at the beginning of the War he had witnessed. Although he was not a native of Vienna, he was also aware of the « Aryanization » of Viennese society. There, as elsewhere, the police monitored the activities of enemies of the State.

The city was caught-up in the War. Soon, it was hit by aerial bombardments. The diary of Marie Wassiltschikow, a former propaganda ministry employee who had followed her physician husband to Vienna, where she worked as a nurse in a « Luftwaffe » hospital, from January to March 1945, throws light on this new period. Her description shows that Viennese high-society suffered during this last phase of the War. The Jockey Club building was destroyed. The Opera was hit by bombs and burned for several days. Many theatres were no more than crumbling facades. The great establishments, such as the Bristol Hotel, were also hit : not a single window remained unbroken. Socialites met for elegant dinners in the private saloons of the Sacher Hotel, but entertainments were now lacking. Only the Vienna Philharmonic pursued its programme ; in mid-February, it was still offering a concert every day despite the bombing, which also came every day. Moreover, it was following the example of the great German Orchestras, which also continued to work right to the end, and whose concerts were broadcast over the radio and recorded. German technology gave them a magnificent stereophonic sound whose quality explains why some of these performances are still regarded as Classics. The conductor who stood-out at this time was Herbert von Karajan, whose energy was inexhaustible. The affection and admiration, in which he later basked, probably had their origin in his work at a time when music was the only remaining distraction that allowed people to forget their troubles and communicate without having to take into account some people's errors and other people's foolishness. Although Karajan was an Austrian, he reflected the Germany that had embraced Nazism out of an inclination to conform. As a young orchestra conductor, he joined the NSDAP in April 1933, and was involved in the intrigues that sought to supplant Wilhelm Furtwängler in Berlin.

In Germany, people still went to shows and concerts, despite the mourning and the bombardments. The SD's reports for Berlin express surprise at attendance figures that did not flag all through the conflict, though free shows experienced occasional off-days and people's eagerness to return to the theatre immediately after an attack waned as the War advanced. The police interpreted this passion for distractions as a way of keeping-up morale and not focusing on death.

...

Day by day, Berlin was pounded by Allied bombs and pummeled into rubble, ash and smoke. Wilhelm Furtwängler knew, as most Germans knew by now, that the War was lost. He was happy that it was all coming to an end, but the sight of Berlin, its history, its culture disappearing before his eyes enraged him, and he became increasingly outspoken and open in his criticism of the Nazis, despite the warnings of his new wife and close friends. He openly taunted Baldur von Schirach, the « Gauleiter » of Vienna who was in charge of the Vienna Philharmonic.

What happens to the Jews who are transported ?

What is going on in the concentration camps ?

What really happened at the Battle of Stalingrad ?

Baldur von Schirach was a Nazi, but he was also cultivated and educated. Furtwängler liked him because of the latter qualities, but he also expected him to know these answers. Furtwängler reasoned that if you, Schirach, had sided with the Nazis despite the qualifications that would have enabled him to know better, he must know what the government was doing to justify his choice. The truth, of course, was that Schirach mostly likely knew exactly what was happening in the East and what was becoming of the Jews. But like most Germans, he also didn't care to contemplate their fate. He had enough problems worrying about his own survival, especially with an albatross like Furtwängler around his neck. According to Elisabeth Furtwängler, they were as aware as most Germans that thousands were being sent to camps in the East, « but we did not, and I swear this to you, we did not know about the gas chambers ! »

A sophisticated spy network like the « Gestapo » was hardly necessary to monitor Furtwängler's open challenges to the regime. Heinrich Himmler, who headed the « Gestapo » , had long been nursing a grudge against Furtwängler. Now, he saw his chance for revenge approaching.

In the meantime, Richard Strauß asked Furtwängler to intervene with the Nazis on 2 matters. First, his villa in Garmisch-Partenkirchen had been billeted to house refugees who had lost their homes in the bombings. He complained that he could not get to his piano. The « Gauleiter » of the area reported him for disloyalty. Adolf Hitler, still remembering Strauß's indiscreet letter to Stefan Zweig in which he demeaned top-ranking Nazis, personally ordered that the composer's 80th birthday, on 11 June 1944, should not be officially celebrated.

Strauß, of course, had asked his close friends Clemens Krauß and Baldur von Schirach to help, for they were on good

terms with Berlin, but they declined. Furtwängler did not hesitate. He was already the « friend of criminals » , so what was there to lose in helping an infamous composer-felon ?

He wrote to Josef Gœbbels :

« We, Germans, will make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the rest of the world if we neglect to honour the birthday of our greatest living composer. »

To the end of his dealings with the Nazis, Furtwängler appealed to the sense of national image in foreign relations, no matter how absurd the approach may have become at this point in the War :

« We, Germans, will make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the rest of the world if we neglect to honour the birthday of our greatest living composer. »

Gœbbels and Hitler agreed with Furtwängler, and permission was soon issued for the premiere of the Opera « Die Liebe der Danæ » . The acceleration in saturation bombing, however, was reaching its zenith in the summer of 1944, and Gœbbels ordered all theaters closed before the work could be presented.

Les Jeunesses hitlériennes

La « Hitlerjugend » (HJ) , la Jeunesse hitlérienne ou les Jeunesses hitlériennes, était une organisation para-militaire du Parti nazi qui fut active entre 1926 et 1945.

La Ire organisation des jeunes du Parti nazi est fondée le 13 mai 1922 à Munich sous le nom de « Jungsturm Adolf Hitler » (Compagnie de jeunes « Adolf Hitler ») . Elle est alors rattachée aux SA. Dirigée par Gustav-Adolf Lenk, la compagnie est interdite dès 1923 en même temps que le Parti nazi. La « Hitlerjugend » est fondée le 4 juillet 1926 lors du 2e Congrès du Parti nazi.

La raison d'être des Jeunesses hitlériennes est la formation de futurs surhommes « aryens » et de soldats prêts à servir loyalement le 3e « Reich » . Il s'agit de contourner les clauses très contraignantes du Traité de Versailles qui interdisent à l'Allemagne vaincue de posséder une armée digne de ce nom et de préparer une génération physiquement et mentalement apte à être, au plus tôt, lancée dans une guerre totale et foudroyante contre toutes les puissances naguère ennemies du « Reich » et du peuple allemands. Dans les Jeunesses hitlériennes, l'entraînement physique et militaire passait bien avant l'instruction scolaire et scientifique. L'apprentissage prodigué aux jeunes comprenait le maniement des armes, le développement de la force physique, la stratégie militaire et un endoctrinement antisémite. Après avoir dissous les organisations de scouts dans tous les « Länder » d'Allemagne, les Jeunesses hitlériennes s'approprièrent beaucoup de leurs activités, bien que les objectifs et le contenu ne soient pas les mêmes. Une certaine cruauté (limitée) des plus grands sur les plus jeunes était tolérée, et même encouragée, puisqu'on pensait que cela éliminerait les plus faibles et endurcirait les autres.

Les membres des Jeunesses hitlériennes portaient des uniformes para-militaires comparables à ceux du Parti nazi et utilisaient un système de grades nazis similaires aux grades et insignes des « Sturmabteilung ». Beaucoup des activités proposées aux garçons ressemblaient à un entraînement militaire : ramper sous des fils barbelés, apprendre à plonger en mer depuis des sautoirs et apprendre comment lancer des grenades factices. Ils avaient un poignard fabriqué par la firme Zwilling J.A. Henckels, sur le plat de la lame, figure l'inscription « Blut und Ehre ! » (Sang et Honneur) . Le manche était orné d'un insigne nazi.

Fixé par les directives de Von Schirach lui-même, les programmes à inculquer à la jeunesse sont précis, se veulent l'armature idéologique de la génération suivante, et comportent un certain nombre de thèmes centrés autour du NSDAP, de Hitler, de l'Allemagne et du peuple allemand, des directives pour les chants à entonner en quelle circonstance.

L'encadrement des Jeunesses hitlériennes était assuré par des adultes, souvent militants du Parti nazi au sein d'un corps d'armée. De plus, ces chefs d'escouades, à la pédagogie de sergent-instructeur exigeant, au « Führerprinzip » une obéissance totale. Le gros des membres comprenait des garçons âgés de 6 ans à 18 ans. Dès 1936, les Jeunesses hitlériennes devinrent officiellement une filière obligatoire pour tous les jeunes allemands. Le groupe servait aussi de base de recrutement pour des groupes para-militaires du Parti nazi : le groupe de la « Schutzstaffel » (SS) s'y intéressait particulièrement. Les membres des HJ étaient particulièrement fiers de se voir accorder le « Sieg Rune » (symbole de la victoire) , par les SS. Les SS utilisaient 2 « Sieg Runes » comme emblème, et cette récompense liait symboliquement les 2 groupes.

Elles étaient organisées dans les villes et villages en cellules locales. Ces groupes se réunissaient chaque semaine : un dirigeant adulte y enseignait la doctrine nazie. Au niveau régional, les responsables organisaient des rassemblements et des manœuvres auxquels plusieurs cellules participaient. Le groupe national se réunissait en général une fois par an à Nuremberg, pour le rassemblement traditionnel du Parti nazi.

Les Jeunesses hitlériennes avaient également créé des « académies » d'entraînement comparables aux lycées. De telles académies étaient considérées comme les bases de la relève du Parti : seuls les élèves les plus dévoués et les plus radicaux pouvaient prétendre devenir de futurs dirigeants nazis.

Quelques sections visaient à entraîner ceux de ses membres qui désiraient devenir officier de la « Wehrmacht » . De tels groupes s'appliquaient à former le jeune disciple dans la spécialité qu'il espérait exercer en tant qu'officier. Ainsi, les Jeunesses hitlériennes de la Marine était la section la plus nombreuse et servait d'auxiliaire à la « Kriegsmarine » pour le secours en mer.

Dès juillet 1933, Schirach organisa les Jeunesses hitlériennes au moyen d'un système de classes d'âges :

Les « Küken » , uniquement des fillettes de 6 à 10 ans, adhésion facultative.

Les « Deutsche Jungvolk » appelés aussi « Pimpfe » (nom familier signifiant cadets) , ou DJ (Jeunes allemands) ,

regroupaient les garçons de 10 à 14 ans.

Le « Jungmädelbund », ou JM (Association des jeunes filles), avait en charge l'encadrement des filles de 10 à 14 ans.

Le « véritable » « Hitlerjugend » s'occupait des jeunes gens de 14 à 18 ans.

Le « Bund Deutscher Mädel » (BDM) encadrait les jeunes filles de 14 à 18 ans ; plus tard, l'âge maximal des membres du BDM fut ramené à 17 ans.

Dès 1938, le BDM subit une modification de sa structure, et le « BDM-Werk » « Glaube und Schönheit » rassembla les jeunes filles de 17 à 21 ans.

Les 4 principales branches des HJ (« Deutsches Jungvolk », « Hitlerjugend », « Jungmädel », « Bund Deutscher Mädel »), quoique comportant quelques variations minimales, étaient structurées de manière similaire. La direction de la Jeunesse du « Reich » (« Reichsjugendführung ») avait organisé sur le territoire du « Reich » des directions régionales, représentant entre 20 et 42 « Gebiete » (pour les DJ ou les HJ), et autant d'« Obergau » pour les JM et le BDM. Ces structures étaient elles-mêmes re-découpées de manière plus fine, jusqu'à des groupes d'une dizaine de membres, par lieu de résidence, désignés sous les termes de « Jungenschaft » (DJ), « Kameradschaft » (HJ véritable), « Jungmädelschaft » (JM) ou « Mädelschaft+ » (BDM).

Pour les niveaux « Jungstamm / Stamm / ... » et inférieurs, chaque unité coordonnait les membres de 4 unités du niveau hiérarchique inférieur. Au niveau « Bann / Untergau », l'organisation se faisait de manière géographique, chacune de ces unités présidant à 4 ou 6 unités du niveau inférieur, tandis que chaque « Gebiet » ou « Obergau » regroupait environ 20 « Bannen » ou « Untergauen ». Une unité du niveau « Jungstamm / Stamm / ... » regroupait en moyenne environ 600 membres, un « Bann » ou un « Untergau » entre 2,400 et 3,600 membres.

En 1934, le « Reich » était ainsi organisé en 5 « Obergebiete » et 19 « Gebiete » ou « Obergau ». L'« Anschluß » de 1938 provoqua la création d'un 6^e « Obergebiet ». En 1942, le nombre de « Gebiete » et d'« Obergau » culmina à 42, dont 4 « Befehlsstellen » pour les pays occupés (Protectorat de Bohême-Moravie, Gouvernement général, Pays-Bas, ainsi que « Osten » pour l'Europe de l'Est et du Sud). Pour le territoire du « Reich », les limites entre « Gebiete » suivaient grosso modo celles des « Gauleitungen » du Parti nazi.

L'unité de base des Jeunesses hitlériennes était la « Bann », l'équivalent d'un régiment militaire. On comptait plus de 300 de ces « Banne », dispersées dans toute l'Allemagne, chacune d'entre elles comptant environ 6,000 jeunes. Chaque unité avait un drapeau avec un dessin pratiquement identique, mais chaque « Bann » était identifiée par son nom, inscrit en noir sur un ruban jaune, au-dessus de la tête de l'aigle. Ces drapeaux mesuraient 200 centimètres de long et 145 centimètres de haut. L'aigle au centre faisait référence à l'Empire allemand (aigle prussien). Il maintenait dans ses serres une épée blanche et un marteau noir. Ces symboles furent utilisés sur le 1^{er} drapeau officiel présenté aux Jeunesses hitlériennes, au Congrès national du NSDAP, en août 1929, à Nuremberg. L'épée était censée représenter

le nationalisme alors que le marteau était le symbole du socialisme. Les mâts utilisés avec ces drapeaux étaient en bambou, surmontés d'une boule en fer blanc et d'une pointe.

Les drapeaux portés par les « Gefolgschaft » des HJ, l'équivalent d'une compagnie de 150 jeunes, montrait l'emblème utilisé par les groupes armés des HJ : 3 bandes horizontales (rouge-blanc-rouge) au centre desquelles un carré blanc tenant sur un sommet et contenant une croix gammée noire en son sein. Le drapeau des « Gefolgschaften » mesurait 180 centimètres de long par 120 centimètres de hauteur avec chaque bande de 40 centimètres. Pour distinguer chaque « Gefolgschaft » et la branche des Jeunesses hitlériennes à laquelle elle appartenait, chaque drapeau comportait un petit bandeau coloré, en haut à gauche. Le bandeau était d'une couleur précise, propre à chaque unité. Par exemple, un bandeau bleu clair avec un numéro d'unité en blanc et une couture blanche était réservé pour les Unités volantes de la HJ (« Flieger-HJ ») .

En 1923, l'organisation comptait un millier de membres. En 1925, le nombre de membres s'élevait à 5,000. 5 ans plus tard, les Jeunesses hitlériennes dépassait les 25,000 sympathisants, et à l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir en 1933, elles comptaient un effectif de 2,250,000 membres. Cette augmentation étant due en grande partie aux membres des autres organisations de jeunesse avec lesquelles les Jeunesses hitlériennes avaient fusionné (avec plus ou moins de consentement) , incluant l'importante « evangelische Jugend » (600,000 membres à l'époque) , l'organisation de jeunesse de l'Église évangélique.

En décembre 1936, l'effectif dépassa les 5 millions de membres. Le même mois, l'organisation devint la seule organisation de jeunesse autorisée dans laquelle toutes les autres devaient se fondre (« Gesetz über die Hitlerjugend ») . Elle devint officiellement obligatoire en 1939 avec le « Jugenddienstpflicht » . L'appartenance pouvait même être proclamée contre l'avis des parents. À partir de là, la plupart des adolescents allemands furent incorporés dans les Jeunesses hitlériennes : dès 1940, l'organisation avait atteint un effectif de 8 millions de membres. Plus tard, les statistiques de guerre sont difficiles à lire, dès le moment où l'on considère que la conscription obligatoire et l'appel à la lutte (chez des enfants à partir de 10 ans) signifie que pratiquement tous les jeunes allemands étaient, dans une certaine mesure, reliés aux Jeunesses hitlériennes.

Le gros de la « génération des Hitlerjugend » était né entre les années 1920 et 1930. Ils formèrent la génération adulte de l'après-guerre et des années 1970 et 1980. Il n'était donc pas rare pour les anciens dirigeants de la République démocratique allemande et de l'Allemagne de l'Ouest d'avoir eu un passé chez les Jeunesses hitlériennes. Du fait que l'organisation était devenue obligatoire dès 1936, il n'y eut pas de volonté de bannir les politiques qui avaient servi dans les Jeunesses hitlériennes, à partir du moment où l'on considérait qu'ils n'avaient pas eu le choix. L'exemple le plus patent fut celui de Manfred Rommel, fils d'Erwin Rommel, qui devint maire de Stuttgart en dépit du fait qu'il a fait partie des Jeunesses hitlériennes. Mais aussi, le ministre allemand des Affaires étrangères Hans-Dietrich Genscher, le philosophe Jürgen Habermas, et le Prince consort des Pays-Bas Claus von Amsberg. En outre, le 19 avril 2008, les médias annoncèrent que le pape de l'Église catholique romaine Benoît XVI (de son nom civil à la naissance Joseph Ratzinger) avait servi contre son gré dans les Jeunesses hitlériennes à l'âge de 14 ans. Cette information suscita une polémique selon laquelle une personne qui avait été liée d'une manière ou d'une autre au Nazisme ne devrait pas devenir pape. Cependant, les faits révélèrent que Joseph Ratzinger ne partageait pas l'idéologie des Nazis et qu'il s'en

était dissocié rapidement.

Cependant, rapidement, le caractère subversif des Jeunesses hitlériennes disparaît, et cette organisation devient impopulaire au sein même des groupes qu'elle est censée encadrer. En effet, comme pour le KdF (« Kraft durch Freude » : la force par la joie) , les membres des Jeunesses hitlériennes utilisent les infrastructures pour la satisfaction de leurs besoins et désirs ; les activités d'embrigadement, les veillées, le camping, pratiqué de manière militaire, et la collecte de dons sont particulièrement impopulaires.

L'endoctrinement de la jeunesse, s'il se voulait totalitaire, rencontre des réserves au sein de la société allemande. Tout d'abord auprès du public que cette organisation est censée encadrer, puis au sein de la société dans son ensemble. Obligatoire à partir du décret « Gesetz über die Hitlerjugend » du 1er décembre 1936, l'organisation se transforme en structure bureaucratique, ce qui détourne beaucoup de jeunes de ses rangs. De plus, le caractère militaire de l'encadrement et des activités proposées jouent un rôle non négligeable dans la désaffection des jeunes à l'égard de l'organisation : dans le meilleur des cas, ils s'ennuient dans les veillées, ne participent pas aux défilés militaires. En outre, l'application du « Führerprinzip » finit par éloigner de l'organisation un nombre de plus en plus croissant de jeunes : obéissance inconditionnelle aux ordres, même lorsqu'ils semblent absurdes, et châtiments sans appel semblent la règle et incitent de nombreux jeunes à se tenir à l'écart.

Auprès de la population, les Jeunesses hitlériennes jettent le trouble au sein des familles : séparés de leur famille, les enfants sont souvent utilisés comme informateurs par le NSDAP. Au sein de la société, lorsqu'ils sont en groupes, les membres sont souvent grossiers et sans gêne à l'encontre des gens qu'ils peuvent croiser. De plus, indisciplinés et jouissant d'une quasi-impunité de fait, les jeunes militants de la « Hitlerjugend » mènent à l'école une sourde résistance contre l'institution scolaire, ce qui suscite de fortes réserves dans le corps enseignant.

En 1940, Artur Axmann prend la tête des Jeunesses hitlériennes pour transformer l'organisation en une force auxiliaire utile dans un contexte de guerre. Les Jeunesses hitlériennes assistent les pompiers et l'effort de reconstruction des villes lors des bombardements alliés. Elles accomplissent des missions dans le service postal, les chemins de fer, le service de radiodiffusion et servent dans les équipes de défense anti-aérienne.

Vers 1943, les chefs nazis transforment les Jeunesses hitlériennes en une réserve militaire où ils puisent des troupes suite aux pertes importantes et croissantes dues à la guerre. Ainsi la 12e « Panzerdivision SS Hitlerjugend » sous le commandement de Fritz Witt est entièrement composée de jeunes garçons entre 16 et 18 ans. Cette division est déployée pendant la bataille de Normandie contre les forces canadiennes et britanniques au nord de Caen. Pendant les mois qui suivent, la division obtient une réputation de férocité et de fanatisme. Quand Fritz Witt est tué par l'artillerie alliée, le « SS-Brigadeführer » Kurt Meyer en prend le commandement et devient le plus jeune commandant de division à l'âge de 33 ans.

Lors de l'invasion de l'Allemagne par les Alliés, la « Wehrmacht » recrute des membres des Jeunesses hitlériennes de plus en plus jeunes. En 1945, la « Volkssturm » engage dans des combats meurtriers et sans espoir des membres des Jeunesses hitlériennes à partir de 12 ans.

Pendant la bataille de Berlin, les Jeunesses hitlériennes constituent une part importante des forces allemandes et se battent avec fanatisme. Le commandant de la ville, le général Helmut Weidling ordonne à Artur Axmann de dissoudre les unités combattantes des Jeunesses hitlériennes, cet ordre n'est jamais appliqué à cause de la confusion de la bataille de Berlin.

À l'issue de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les Alliés ont dissous les Jeunesses hitlériennes comme partie intégrante du Parti nazi. Des membres des Jeunesses hitlériennes furent accusés de crime de guerre mais, dans la mesure où l'organisation était constituée de mineurs, les efforts pour faire aboutir les poursuites furent insignifiants.

Bien que les Jeunesses hitlériennes n'eussent jamais été déclarées « organisation criminelle », on considéra que l'encadrement adulte avait commis des crimes contre la paix en corrompant les jeunes esprits allemands. De nombreux cadres de haut-niveau furent jugés par les Alliés, à l'instar de Baldur von Schirach condamné à 20 ans de prison.

...

The Hitler Youth (« Hitlerjugend » , often abbreviated as HJ in German) was the youth organization of the Nazi Party in Germany. Its origins dated back to 1922. From 1933 until 1945, it was the sole official youth organization in Germany and was partially a para-military organization ; it was constituted of the « Hitlerjugend » proper for male youth aged 14 to 18, the « Deutsches Jungvolk » (German Youth) for younger boys, and the League of German Girls.

With the surrender of Nazi Germany in 1945, the organization de facto ceased to exist. On 10 October 1945, it was outlawed by the Allied Control Council along with other Nazi Party organisations. Under Section 86 of the German Criminal Code, the Hitler Youth is an « unconstitutional organization » and the distribution or public use of its symbols, except for educational or research purposes, are not permitted.

In 1922, the Munich-based Nazi Party established its official youth organization called « Jugendbund der NSDAP » . It was announced on 8 March 1922 in the « Völkischer Beobachter » , and its inaugural meeting took place on 13 May the same year. Another youth group was established in 1922 as the « Jungsturm Adolf Hitler » . Based in Munich, Bavaria, it served to train and recruit future members of the « Sturmabteilung » (Storm Regiment) , the adult para-military wing of the Nazi Party.

Following the abortive « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » (in November 1923) , the Nazi youth groups ostensibly disbanded, but many elements simply went underground, operating clandestinely in small units under assumed names. In April 1924, the « Jugendbund der NSDAP » was renamed « Großdeutsche Jugendbewegung » (Greater German Youth Movement) . On 4 July 1926, the « Großdeutsche Jugendbewegung » was officially renamed « Hitler Jugend Bund der deutschen Arbeiterjugend » (Hitler Youth League of German Worker Youth) . This event took place 1 year after the Nazi Party itself had been re-organized. The architect of the re-organization was Kurt Gruber, a law student from Plauen in Saxony.

After a short power-struggle with a rival organization (Gerhard Roßbach's « Schilljugend ») , Gruber prevailed and his « Greater German Youth Movement » became the Nazi Party's official youth organization. In July 1926, it was renamed « Hitler-Jugend, Bund deutscher Arbeiterjugend » (Hitler Youth, League of German Worker Youth) and, for the 1st time, officially became an integral part of the « Sturmabteilung » . The name « Hitler-Jugend » was taken-up on the suggestion of Hans Severus Ziegler.

By 1930, the « Hitler-Jugend » had enlisted over 25,000 boys aged 14 and upwards. It also set-up a junior branch, the « Deutsches Jungvolk » , for boys aged 10 to 14. Girls from 10 to 18 were given their own parallel organization, the « Bund Deutscher Mädel » (BDM) , League of German Girls.

In April 1932, Chancellor Heinrich Brüning banned the Hitler Youth movement in an attempt to stop wide-spread political violence. But, in June, Brüning's successor as Chancellor, Franz von Papen, lifted the ban as a way of appeasing Hitler, the rapidly ascending political star. A further significant expansion drive started in 1933, when Baldur von Schirach became the 1st « Reichsjugendführer » (« Reich » Youth Leader) , pouring much time and large amounts of money into the project.

The members of the Hitler Youth were viewed as future « Aryan supermen » and were indoctrinated into racism. One aim was to instill the motivation that would enable its members as soldiers, to fight faithfully for Nazi Germany. There was more emphasis on physical and military training than on academic study. The « Nationalsozialistischer Reichsbund für Leibesübungen » (NSRBL) , the umbrella organization promoting and coordinating sport activities in Germany during the Nazi era, had the responsibility of overseeing the physical fitness development programs provided to the German youth.

The Hitler Youth were used to break-up Church youth movements, and in anti-Church indoctrination, used to spy on religious classes and Bible studies, and interfere with church attendance.

After the boy scout movement was banned through German-controlled countries, the Hitler Youth appropriated many of its activities, though changed in content and intention. For example, many activities closely resembled military training, with weapons training, assault course circuits and basic tactics. Some cruelty by the older boys toward the younger ones was tolerated and even encouraged, since it was believed this would weed out the unfit and harden the rest.

Members wore uniforms very much like that of the SA, with similar ranks and insignia.

The Hitler Youth was organized into corps under adult leaders, and the general membership comprised boys aged 14 to 18. The organization was also seen as an important stepping stone to future membership of the elite « Schutzstaffel » (SS) . Members of the Hitler Youth were particularly proud to be bestowed with the single « Sig Rune » (Victory symbol) by the SS. The SS utilized 2 « Sig Runes » as their mark, and this gesture served to symbolically link the 2 groups.

The Hitler Youth was organized into local cells on a community level. Such cells had weekly meetings at which various

Nazi doctrines were taught by adult leaders. Regional leaders typically organized rallies and field exercises in which several dozen Hitler Youth cells would participate. The largest gathering usually took place annually, at Nuremberg, where members from all over Germany would converge for the annual Nazi Party rally.

The Hitler Youth maintained training academies comparable to preparatory schools, which were designed to nurture future Nazi Party leaders, and only the most devoted members could expect to attend.

The Hitler Youth also maintained several corps designed to develop future officers for the « Wehrmacht » (Armed forces) . The corps offered specialist pre-training for each of the specific arms for which the member was ultimately destined. The Marine Hitler Youth (« Marine-HJ ») , for example, was the largest such corps and served as a water rescue auxiliary to the « Kriegsmarine » .

Another branch of the Hitler Youth was the « Deutsche Arbeiter Jugend » (German Worker Youth) . This organization within the Hitler Youth was a training ground for future labour leaders and technicians. Its symbol was a rising sun with a swastika.

The Hitler Youth regularly issued the « Wille und Macht » (Will and Power) monthly magazine. This publication was also its official organ and its editor was Baldur von Schirach. Other publications included « Die Kameradschaft » (Comradeship) , which had a girl's version for the BDM called « Mädelschaft » , and a year-book called « Jungen eure Welt » (Youth your World) .

Another program entitled « Landjahr Lager » (Country Service Camp) was designed to teach specifically chosen girls of the BDM high-moral character standards within a rural educational setting.

The basic unit of the Hitler Youth was the « Bann » (unit of the whole district, consisting of 2,400 to 3,600 members, with 4 « Stamm/Stämmen » each of 600 members or more) , the equivalent of a military regiment. Of these « Banne » , there were more than 300 spread throughout Germany, each of a strength of about 6,000 youths. Each unit carried a flag of almost identical design, but the individual « Bann » was identified by its number, displayed in black on a yellow scroll above the eagle's head. The flags measured 200 by 145 centimetres (79 inches x 57 inches) . The displayed eagle in the center was adopted from the former Imperial State of Prussia. In its talons, it grasped a white coloured sword and a black hammer. These symbols were used on the 1st official flags presented to the delegation of the Hitler Youth at a national rally of the NSDAP, in August 1929 in Nürnberg. The sword was said to represent nationalism, whereas the hammer was a symbol of socialism. The poles used with these flags were of bamboo topped by a white metal ball and spear point finial.

The flags carried by the Hitler Youth « Gefolgschaft » (Escort) , the equivalent of a company with a strength of 150 youths, displayed the emblem used on the Hitler Youth arm-band : a tribar of red over white over red, in the centre of which was a square of white standing on its point containing a black swastika. The « Gefolgschafts » flag measured 180 by 120 centimetres (71 inches x 47 inches) with the 3 horizontal bars each 40 centimetres (16 inches) deep. In order to distinguish both the individual « Gefolgschaft » and the branch of Hitler Youth service to which the unit

belonged, each flag displayed a small coloured identification panel in the upper-left corner. The patch was in a specific colour according to the branch. For example, there was a light-blue patch, a white Unit number, and a white piping reserved for the « Flieger-HJ » , or Flying Hitler Youth. The flag-poles were of polished black wood and had a white metal bayonet finial.

The « Deutsches Jungvolk » was the junior branch of the Hitler Youth, for boys aged 10 to 14. Its flag (« Jungbann ») generally followed the same style as those of the Hitler Youth. The differences were its flag had an all-black field with a white eagle ; the scroll above the eagle's head was in white with the unit number in black ; and the sword, hammer, beak, talons, and left leg of the eagle were in silver-grey colour. The flags eventually measured 165 by 120 centimetres (65 inches x 47 inches) high. The flag-poles were of black polished wood topped with a white-metal spearhead-shaped finial. It displayed on both sides an eagle bearing on its breast the Hitler Youth diamond.

In contrast, the « DJ Fähnlein » flag, that of the name of the unit, equivalent to a troop or company, was of a very simple design. It displayed a single runic « S » in white on an all-black field. The « Fähnlein » number appeared on a white patch sewn to the cloth in the top left-hand corner. It was piped in silver and had black unit numbers. The size was 160 by 120 centimetres (63 inches x 47 inches) . The flag-poles were of polished black wood with a white metal unsheathed bayonet blade. A « Fähnlein » however, was not so much the flag, but the name of the DJ unit itself, a term which had been taken-over from ancient « Landsknecht » denominations.

In 1923, the youth organization of the Nazi Party had a little over 1,000 members and was limited to Munich. In 1925, when the Nazi Party had been re-founded, the membership grew to over 5,000. 5 years later, national membership stood at 25,000. By the end of 1932, it was at 107,956. When the Nazis came to power next year, 1933, and the membership of Hitler Youth organizations increased dramatically to 2,300,000 members by the end of that year. Much of these increases came from forcible take-overs of other youth organizations. (The sizable « Evangelische Jugend » , a Lutheran youth organization of 600,000 members, was integrated on 18 February 1934) . In 1934, a law declared the Hitler Youth to be the only legally permitted youth organization in Germany, and stated that « all of the German youth in the “ Reich ” is organized within the Hitler Youth » .

However, how active many members were remains open to speculation. For example, in the class of Hans J. Massaquoi, 100 % of the Aryan pupils in his class became « Pimpf » . However, many of his classmates joined because of their parents or teachers or to be like everybody else. After several months, many of the children became inactive and almost all left after 1 or 2 years.

By December 1936, Hitler Youth membership had reached over 5 million. That same month, membership became mandatory for Aryans, under the « Gesetz über die Hitlerjugend » law. By 1938, the Hitler Youth had over 7.7 million members. This legal obligation was re-affirmed in March 1939 with the « Jugenddienstpflicht » , which conscripted all German youths into the Hitler Youth - even if the parents objected. Those parents who refused to allow their children to join were told that the State would take their children away. Massaquoi claims, though, that the War did not allow the law to go very far. From then on, most of Germany's teenagers belonged to the Hitler Youth. By 1940, it had 8 million members. Later, War figures are difficult to calculate, since massive conscription efforts and a general call-up of

boys as young as 10 years old meant that virtually every young male in Germany was, in some way, connected to the Hitler Youth. Only about 10 to 20 % avoided joining.

Long before 1939, though, German youths were under growing pressure to join the Hitler Youth. Students who did not join were frequently assigned essays with titles such as « Why am I not in the Hitler Youth ? ». They were also the subject of frequent taunts from teachers and fellow students, and could even be refused their school-leaving certificate - which made it impossible to be admitted to university. A number of employers refused to offer apprenticeships to anyone who wasn't a member of the Hitler Youth. By 1936, the Hitler Youth had a monopoly on all youth sports facilities in Germany, effectively locking-out non-members. As time went on, a number of boys chafed under the regimented nature of the organization ; some even dropped-out and only rejoined when they learned they couldn't get a job or enter university without being a member.

There were a few members of the Hitler Youth who privately disagreed with Nazi ideologies. For instance, Hans Scholl, the brother of Sophie Scholl and one of the leading figures of the anti-Nazi resistance movement « White Rose » (« Weiße Rose ») , was also a member of the Hitler Youth. This fact is emphasized in the film « The White Rose » which depicts how Scholl was able to resist Nazi Germany's ideology while being a member of the Nazi Party's youth movement. The 1993 Thomas Carter film « Swing Kids » also focuses on this topic.

In 1940, Artur Axmann replaced Schirach as « Reichsjugendführer » and took-over leadership of the Hitler Youth. Axmann began to reform the group into an auxiliary force which could perform War duties. The Hitler Youth became active in German fire brigades and assisted with recovery efforts to German cities affected from Allied bombing. The Hitler Youth also assisted in such organizations as the « Reich » Postal Service, the « Deutsche Reichsbahn » , the fire services, the « Reich » radio service, and served among anti-aircraft defense crews.

By 1943, Nazi leaders began turning the Hitler Youth into a military reserve to replace man-power which had been depleted due to tremendous military losses. In 1943, the 12th « SS-Panzer-Division Hitlerjugend » , under the command of « SS-Brigadeführer » Fritz Witt, was formed. The Division was a fully-equipped « Waffen-SS » Panzer division, with the majority of the enlisted cadre being drawn from Hitler Youth boys between the ages of 16 and 18. The division was deployed during the Battle of Normandy against the British and Canadian forces to the north of Caen. During the following months, the division earned itself a reputation for ferocity and fanaticism. When Witt was killed by allied naval gunfire, « SS-Brigadeführer » Kurt Meyer took-over command and became the youngest divisional commander at age 33.

As German casualties escalated with the combination of Operation Bagration and the Lvov-Sandomierz Operation in the east, and Operation Cobra in the west, members of the « Hitlerjugend » were recruited at ever younger ages. By 1945, the « Volkssturm » was commonly drafting 12 year old Hitler Youth members into its ranks. During the Battle of Berlin, Axmann's Hitler Youth formed a major part of the last line of German defence, and were reportedly among the fiercest fighters. Although the city commander, General Helmuth Weidling, ordered Axmann to disband the Hitler Youth combat formations, in the confusion this order was never carried-out. The remnants of the youth brigade took heavy casualties from the advancing Russian forces ; only 2 survived.

The Hitler Youth was disbanded by Allied authorities as part of the denazification process. Some Hitler Youth members were suspected of War crimes but, because they were children, no serious efforts were made to prosecute these claims. While the Hitler Youth was never declared a criminal organization, its adult leadership was considered tainted for corrupting the minds of young Germans. Many adult leaders of the Hitler Youth were put on trial by Allied authorities, and Baldur von Schirach was sentenced to 20 years in prison. However, he was convicted of crimes against humanity for his actions as « Gauleiter » of Vienna, not for his leadership of the Hitler Youth, because Artur Axmann had been serving as the functioning leader of the Hitler Youth from 1940 onward - Axmann only received a 39 month prison sentence in May 1949, but was not found guilty of War crimes.

German children born in the 1920's and 1930's became adults during the « Cold War » years. Since membership was compulsory after 1936, it was neither surprising nor uncommon that many senior leaders of both West and East Germany had been members of the Hitler Youth. Little effort was made to black-list political figures who had been members, since many had little choice in the matter.

Despite this, several notable figures have been « exposed » by the media as former members. These include Stuttgart mayor Manfred Rommel (son of the famous general Erwin Rommel) ; former foreign minister of Germany Hans-Dietrich Genscher ; Pope Benedict XVI ; philosopher Jürgen Habermas ; and the late Prince Consort of the Netherlands Claus von Amsberg.

Le jeune Hitlérien « Quex » (1933)

« HitlerJugend Quex » est un film de propagande très bien construit. Son côté esthétique est soigné et l'acteur qui incarne le héros n'a pas l'allure d'une brute. C'est un bel adolescent dans lequel tout jeune Allemand peut se reconnaître, animé d'une foi ardente et d'un idéal altruiste. Les affiches présentent cette production comme un film sur l'esprit de sacrifice de la jeunesse allemande. Le prospectus de propagande contient ces lignes enflammées :

« Les Jeunesses hitlériennes sont en marche. Des milliers de drapeaux lumineux flottent sur l'Allemagne, drapeaux rouges de sang. Des jeunes gens, par centaines de mille, marchent en colonnes infinies, leur visage a retrouvé son énergie, ils suivent ce drapeau qu'ils connaissent bien, et c'est cette idée qui les mène : se liguer au " Führer " qui les a enrôlés. Plus d'un demi-million de Jeunes Hitlériens vont de l'avant, fiers et conscients de façonner l'Allemagne d'aujourd'hui. Pour y parvenir, ils ont dû souffrir, avoir faim, se sacrifier. Ils sont conscients d'être, demain, l'Allemagne. »

Le film, destiné en 1er lieu aux moins de 20 ans, était patronné par le chef des « Hitler-Jugend » Baldur von Schirach et soutenu par tout l'appareil du Parti et du gouvernement. Adolf Hitler, Hermann Göring et Rudolf Heß, en personne, vinrent assister à la « première » dans une loge de l'« Ufa-Phœbus-Palast » de Munich, le 11 septembre 1933. La 4e Symphonie en mi bémol majeur d'Anton Bruckner (dite « Romantique ») fut jouée en préambule de la projection par l'Orchestre symphonique du « Reich » (qui comprenait pour l'occasion 80 musiciens) .

Puis, Schirach prit la parole pour magnifier le sacrifice d'un jeune Hitlérien, Norbert Norkus, « tombé sous les coups des assassins marxistes » l'année précédente. Une banlieue grise de Berlin avec ses quartiers populaires tristes, ses cafés et ses fêtes foraines est bien décrite par l'image. Hans Steinhof a réalisé « une sorte de chef-d'œuvre du cinéma nazi », ne manquant pas d'affirmer les critiques de cinéma contemporains Francis Courtade et Pierre Cadarsä.

Et ils ajoutent :

« Le choix d'Heinrich George pour interpréter le rôle du vieux Communiste était parfaitement machiavélique. »

D'autant plus habile qu'un rapprochement est fait, par ailleurs, avec un jeune chrétien des catacombes. Tarcisus, portant sous son manteau le Saint-Sacrement, se serait fait tuer en martyr par de méchants païens sous l'Empire romain. Tarcisus s'est transformé en « Quex » (Vif-Argent) et symbolise cette nouvelle mystique, copiant l'image de Saint-Sébastien percé de flèches devenue l'« icône » équivoque associant, dans la peinture, la beauté, le sang et la mort en exerçant une véritable fascination morbide. L'affiche du film montre un très beau garçon qui pourrait figurer dans un magazine homo-érotique américain, des années '60 ou '70, par le style du dessin et l'impression du visage ou aux illustrations de Pierre Joubert pour la collection célèbre « Signe de Piste » exaltant la jeunesse scoute sous l'égide du prince Eric dès 1937. Y aurait-il une inspiration commune ? Dans les 2 cas, il s'agit de valoriser la jeunesse héroïque et prête au sacrifice, refusant de se souiller dans l'immoralité.

« Comment le jeune Heini, si pur, si blond, si germanique, pourrait-il se complaire dans cette vulgaire débauche, tout juste bonne à réjouir des apatrides vicieux ? Dans la nuit, fuyant ses camarades, il découvre avec fascination l'ordre et la santé : les Nazis se réunissent autour d'un feu de camp, se lèvent au petit matin pour aller se baigner dans les claires rivières, et communient dans un même sentiment patriotique, à l'instant du lever des couleurs. Là est la vérité. »

Après le dramatique suicide de sa mère, Heini, poursuivi comme une bête, est mortellement blessé en chantant les premiers mots de l'hymne des « Hitlerjugend » : « Unsere Fahne flattert uns voran » ; sur son lit d'hôpital, a été déposé l'uniforme de la « Hitler Jugend » : suprême cadeau.

Mediating the New Order

« Action does not mean “deciding in favour of”... for that presupposes that one knows in favour of what one is deciding ; rather, action means “setting-off in a direction”, “taking sides”, by virtue of a mandate of destiny, by virtue of “one's own right”. It is really secondary to decide in favour of something that I have come to know. »

(Alfred Bäumler)

« There in the bleak, grey twilight, yellowed, tortured eyes stare into the emptiness. His tender head has been trampled into a bloody pulp. Long, deep wounds extend down the slender body, and a deadly laceration tears through his lungs and heart. Yet, it is as if life stirs anew out of pale death. Look now, the slender, elegant body begins to

move. Slowly, slowly, he rises as if conjured-up by magic, until he stands tall in all his youthful glory right before my trembling eyes. And without moving his lips, a frail child's voice is heard as if speaking from all eternity. "What is mortal in me will perish. But my spirit, which is immortal, will remain with you. And it will show you the way." »

(Josef Goebbels)

« Hitlerjunge Quex » (Hitler Youth Quex) , like « The Blue Light » , is a legend for modern times, a film with a fatal attraction. It sanctifies an adolescent's heroic deed, re-shaping a young boy's dead body into an icon. It demonstrates a cinema of clear lines and straightforward answers, a medium charged with a mission : it aims to « show » the way. The film illustrates a political process and intimates a master narrative wherein human subjects become State objects and living beings give way to abstract patterns. « Hitler Youth Quex » both heralds a new order and prefigures its subsequent self-destruction.

The 1st feature film substantially supported by the new government and produced under the protectorate of the youth leader of the German « Reich » , Baldur von Schirach, « Hitler Youth Quex » offers a stirring example of how the National-Socialists employed a modern medium for State purposes, occupying a vast technology to craft gripping narratives and promote popular legends. Goebbels well-recognized film's potential value as a political instrument when he became minister of popular enlightenment and propaganda in March 1933. Nonetheless, a comprehensive policy did not immediately manifest itself in the declarations of the self-avowed « passionate lover of filmic art » . Being in power did not mean controlling culture ; swift legislation could not ensure overnight legitimation ; any campaign of coordination (« Gleichschaltung ») would demand different strategies on different fronts.

The National-Socialists had become the Masters of public life. Whether they would also become the Masters of popular imagination remained to be seen. The minister entered the scene with a mixture of swagger and circumspection, proclaiming a desire to combat a spiritual crisis and « reform German film from the ground up » . In his early programmatic declarations, Goebbels blended natural and martial metaphors, speaking of film as a body and a territorial surface, declaring himself the physician whose surgery would purge an afflicted organism of harmful alien elements. He scorned wishy-washy entertainments without national character, clear contours, and a sense of the historical moment. A new cinema for a new Germany must rediscover the innate laws of the medium and realize its mission as a mover of masses.

He proclaimed :

« It takes imagination to grant life to the inner-most purpose and inner-most constitution of a new world. »

Repeatedly, Goebbels stressed that film should exercise a discernible effect, that it must act on hearts and minds. Its calling should be that of a popular art (« Volkskunst ») , an art that simultaneously served State purposes and fulfilled personal needs. The new film must free itself from « l'art pour l'art ! » dalliance, intellectual Liberalism, and wanton commercialism. However, makeshift and ambiguous his 1st proclamations might have seemed (they apparently made for some confusion) , Goebbels pointed the way to a popular, contemporary, and distinctly national cinema. Film,

he proclaimed, should emanate from political life and find its way to the deepest recesses of German soul and soil. Such a reform would take time and would demand energy and sensitivity. It made no sense to enforce an authoritarian dogmatism, to « proselytize from morning till night ». Political ideas must assume æsthetic forms. That did not mean re-enacting parades and spectacles, photographing marching storm-troopers, and fetishizing flags and emblems. « Arousing the masses, that's something we know a thing or two about », Gœbbels boasted, and, in so doing, set aside a special place for film apart from mass rallies and overt agitation. Mere loyalty to the Party would not guarantee success. Authentic film-art must transcend the everyday and « intensify life » .

« Hitler Youth Quex » did precisely that, intensifying life to the point of devivification. It focused on a human subject and transformed him into a political property. The film remade and ultimately overcame a boy's mind and body, rendering the material spiritual, transmuting being into form. This process involved the occupation of a real-life destiny and its orchestrated functionalization by the mass-media. Herbert Norkus, a Hitler Youth in the Berlin working-class District of Beuselkietz, had died at the hands of Communist assailants while distributing leaflets during the election of January 1932. Quickly enlisted as a Nazi martyr, Norkus became the subject of impassioned editorials and inspirational public addresses. Memorial services for the boy occasioned elaborate marches and demonstrations throughout Germany. His death received annual consecration on 24 January, a date of ritual observance during the 3rd « Reich » for all fallen Hitler Youths.

These recognitions accompanied a wide-range of popular renderings : novels, plays, poems, and songs. Karl Aloys Schenzinger immortalized Norkus in « Der Hitlerjunge Quex », a novel written between May and September 1932 and pre-published in installments in the Nazi Party organ, the « Völkischer Beobachter », before the book's release in December. The volume would become obligatory reading for Germany's youth, undergoing innumerable editions, registering sales of more than half a million copies by 1945. Soon after Schenzinger's novel appeared, « Ufa » announced plans for a film version directed by Hans Steinhoff and produced by Karl Ritter, a project actively supported by the NSDAP leadership. The premiere took place in the Munich « Ufa-Phœbus-Palast » on 11 September 1933, a festive event attended by Party dignitaries (including Adolf Hitler, Hermann Göring, and Rudolf Heß) and accompanied by a gala-performance of Anton Bruckner's 4th Symphony by the 80 members of the « Reich » Symphony Orchestra. The film received the rating « artistically especially worthwhile », prompting words of praise from Gœbbels, who wrote the prominent « Ufa » executive Ernst Hugo Correll :

« If “ Hitler Youth Quex ” represents the 1st large-scale attempt to depict the ideas and world of National-Socialism with the art of cinema, then, one must say that this attempt, given the possibilities of modern technology, is a full-fledged success. »

Germany's greatest film company, proclaimed the « Lichtbild-Bühne » on 12 September, had mobilized « its extraordinary technical, material, and artistic means » to create « a lasting document of human and social circumstances, of the spiritual and emotional impulses that brought about the turn in Germany's history ». The film, likewise, met with a degree of commercial success, even if it did not match that of the more popular contemporaneous « Ufa » productions directed by Gustav Ucicky, « Morgenrot » (Dawn) and « Flüchtlinge » (Fugitives) . Having cost a modest 320,000 « Reichsmarks » (an amount slightly above average for the time) , it ran for 15 days in the massive

« Ufa-Palast am Zoo » , and, by the end of January 1934, had attracted over 1 million viewers.

Like the 2 other feature films screened in 1933 which portrayed Party martyrs, « SA-Mann Brand » and « Hans Westmar » , « Hitler Youth Quex » unfolds as a family drama against the political and economic crisis of the late-Weimar years. Heini Völker, a printer's apprentice, joins a Communist youth group at the prompting of his father, an unemployed worker and War veteran, a choleric drinker who torments his mournful wife. Heini quickly becomes disenchanted with the unruly comrades during a week-end outing and flees their alcoholic and sexual revelry. Retreating into the woods, he spies a group of Hitler Youths and looks on their nighttime ceremony with fascination, an interest undiminished even after the Nazis discover him and send him away. He returns to Berlin effusing about their discipline and order, singing their anthem to his mother and causing his father to scold and beat him. Despite this outburst and the encouragement of the Communist leader, Stoppel, Heini seeks-out the young Nazis Fritz and Ulla. He refuses to participate in a Communist raid on the new Hitler Youth dormitory, but cannot fully-convince the Nazis of his good faith until he warns them that Stoppel and his group plan to bomb the new hostel. Mother Völker, confronted by an enraged Stoppel after the Communist plot back-fires, fears for her son but does not know how to protect him. In desperation, she turns on the gas to put an end to both herself and the sleeping boy.

...

Given that the SA were playing an important role at this time, it was to be expected that they would require some representation within the cinema. The films produced helped to justify the current SA actions and to publicly develop an institutional mythology around them. Out of the 3 films which fall into this category, « Hans Westmar » is based upon a real character : Horst Wessel. He was, then, mythologized into the Nazi canon with the « Horst Wessel Lied » becoming a symbolic message through being turned into an anthem. « Hitler Youth Quex » is also based upon a true story ...

« Hitler Youth Quex » (« Hitlerjugend Quex ») is a 1932 Nazi propaganda novel based on the life of Herbert « Quex » Norkus. The 1933 film « Hitlerjunge Quex : Ein Film vom Opfergeist der deutschen Jugend » was based on it and was described by Josef Gœbbels as the « 1st large-scale » transmission of Nazi ideology using the medium of cinema. Both the book and the film, like « SA-Mann Brand » and « Hans Westmar » , both released the same year, fictionalized and glorified death in the service of the Nazi Party and Adolf Hitler.

Both the novel and film are based on the real story of Herbert Norkus' life. Norkus, a Hitler Youth member, had died from injuries suffered while being chased and confronted by Communist youths in the night of 23-24 January 1932 in the Beusselkietz neighbourhood of Moabit, Berlin. Already on the next morning, Josef Gœbbels began to use Norkus' death for propaganda purposes during a rally in Berlin's « Sportpalast » . The funeral on 29 January at Plötzensee, Berlin, was turned into a major ceremony of several Nazi Party organizations, under the ægis of Gœbbels. While the murder was condemned also by non-Nazi press, the Communists started a counter-propaganda offensive, describing the incident as an accidental result of Communist self-defence during a Nazi attack. In the subsequent trial, several people were sentenced by the « Landgericht I. » Court in Moabit, yet, the most prominent accomplices Willi Simon, Bernhard Klingbeil and Harry Tack had been able to escape to the Soviet Union.

After the Nazis assumed power, the grave of Norkus was turned into a Nazi shrine, visited annually on New Year's Day by Nazi youth leader Baldur von Schirach for a speech that was broadcast nation-wide. To the site of Norkus' death at No. 4 « Zwinglistraße » , a plaque was attached reading, « He Gave His Life For Germany's Freedom » , the 1st of several such memorial plaques subsequently placed throughout Germany. 24 January was made remembrance day for all killed Hitler Youths, and the flag of Norkus' unit became the Hitler Youth's « blood flag » . 2 weeks after the Enabling Act of 1933, a provocative Hitler Youth march to Norkus' grave took the route through Berlin's communist districts of Wedding and Moabit. Throughout Germany, the Nazis organized demonstrations and speeches commemorating their newly-created martyr. Novels, plays, poems and songs were written about him.

The novel « Der Hitlerjunge Quex » was written by Karl Aloys Schenzinger, between May and September 1932. It was 1st published in Nazi Party newspaper « Völkischer Beobachter » , and as a book in December 1932. A required reading for Hitler Youth members, more than 190,000 copies were sold within the 1st 2 years, and more than 500,000 copies until 1945.

In Schenzinger's novel, Herbert Norkus is named Heini Völker. With a « völkisch » undertone, the opening chapters describe the hardships of Norkus' youth in a working-class district of Berlin, characterized by the Great Depression, the unemployment of his father and the suicide of his mother. The contemporary communist youth (« Rote Jungfront » : Red Young Front) is portrayed as a disorderly gang devoted primarily to alcohol, tobacco and sex. In contrast, the Nazi youth (« Hitlerjugend » : Hitler Youth) is portrayed as an orderly organization, superior in morals Schenzinger lets Heini Völker's father force his son to attend a camping week-end organized by a communist youth group, North Star Moabit. Heini is disgusted and flees the camp, only to encounter a Hitler Youth group in the woods. Deeply impressed, and in an atmosphere of nationalistic pathos, Heini learns of the Nazi movement, « Führerprinzip » (leader principle) , comradeship and « Volksgemeinschaft » (the people's community) . On « the happiest day of his life » , Heini joins the Hitler Youth, and Schenzinger has the « Bannführer » (group leader) symbolize Nazi ideology when he handed-over Heini's uniform to him :

« The uniform is the clothing of the community, of comradeship, of our ideology, of our unified organization ! It makes us all equal, and gives the same to all and demands the same from all. He who wears such a uniform does not have desires of his own anymore, he has only to obey. »

The following chapters deal with Heini's life as a Hitler Youth. Obedience and equality as understood by the Nazis are portrayed in a very positive light. They turn-out to be beneficial not only for Heini, but also for his comrades, for example, his best friend Fritz Dörries, the son of a wealthy merchant. Emphasis is put on the vision of self-sacrifice, the abolition of social barriers, and racial purity, and Heini learns from Fritz that « with us, Hitler Youth, there are no classes. There are only those who get the job done and parasites, and those we'll throw-out. » The haven Heini found in the Hitler Youth is symbolized by his group's hang-out, « Castle Beusselkietz » - Norkus' group was Schar 2, « Hitlerjugend Beusselkietz-Hansa » . His comrades nicknamed him « Quex » because « he carried-out orders faster than quicksilver » (« Quecksilber ») .

The last part of the novel is devoted to the circumstances of Norkus' (or Heini Völker's) death. According to Jay W. Baird (1992), Schenzinger's version is a « thinly veiled parallel to Resurrection » :

When his comrades were gathered around his death bed and wonder whether he is still alive, there « suddenly is a scream. Heini is sitting-up in bed, his eyes wide open. He is singing. They don't recognize the words, but they know the melody. It's the song they sing every day, every evening together, on every march. Everyone knows what it means - death is singing here. »

The novel provided the basis for a subsequent film version, produced in the « Universum Film AG » (Ufa) studios. The plot was written by Bobby E. Lüthge and Karl Aloys Schenzinger, the author of the novel. Produced by Karl Ritter, the film was supported by the Nazi leadership and produced for 320,000 « Reichsmarks » (which was slightly above average for the time) under the ægis of Baldur von Schirach. The latter also wrote the lyrics for the Hitler Youth song « Unsere Fahne flattert uns voran », based on an existing melody by Hans-Otto Borgmann, who was also responsible for the music. The director was Hans Steinhoff. For the film, the novel's title was amended with the sub-title « Ein Film vom Opfergeist der deutschen Jugend » (A film about the sacrificial spirit of German youth) .

« Ufa » were keen to make the film if only to outdo their competition in Munich. The film has a length of 95 minutes (2,605 metres) and was world-premiered on 11 September 1933 at the Ufa-Phœbus Palace, in Munich, in front of Adolf Hitler, Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß and many Nazi dignitaries. It was reviewed favourably having a successful run in Berlin (opening on 19 September) at the « Ufa-Palast am Zoo » . By the end of January 1934, it had gained over 1 million viewers.

« Hitlerjugend Quex » was one of 3 films about Nazi martyrs in 1933, the other 2 being « SA-Mann Brand » and « Hans Westmar » , and by January 1934 had been viewed by a million people.

The film's message is characterized by its final words :

« The flag means more than death. »

...

(Figure 1) Summer camp was an important part of the Hitler Youth experience. Heini comes across this orderly Hitler Youth encampment after running away from raucous Communist youth group his father insisted he join.

« Hitlerjunge Quex » (Hitler Youth Quex) was the 1st Nazi film of consequence. It was about the sacrificial spirit of the German youth. A German youth faces a conflict of ideals between his Communist father and his growing allegiance to the Hitler Youth movement which eventually leads to his own death. Directed by Karl Aloys Schenzinger. The Hitler Youth movement played an important role in generating the enthusiasm for Hitler and the Nazis that allowed them to seize power. They also played a role in the street disorders of the late-1920's and early-1930's. This film idealized a Hitler Youth boy that was killed in those disorders. The film provides a lot of interesting information about the Hitler

Youth uniform in the early years of 3rd « Reich » and how it was worn.

The Nazis, from an early point, turned their fallen comrades into martyrs. This was raised to an art after the Nazis seized power and the Party could use the Government through the Ministry of Propaganda to seize or control the media. It was based on the life of Herbert Norkus, a Hitler Youth in the Berlin working-class district of Beusselkietz. Norkus was killed by Communist assailants while distributing leaflets during the election of January 1932. The Nazis quickly installed the boy as a Nazi martyr. He became the subject of impassioned editorials and inspirational public addresses. Memorial services for the boy occasioned elaborate marches and demonstrations throughout Germany. His death received annual consecration on January 24th, a date which then became a ritual observance during the 3rd « Reich » for all fallen Hitler Youths. (Jay W. Baird. *To Die for Germany : Heroes in the Nazi Pantheon*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1990 ; page 119.) These recognitions accompanied a wide-range of popular renderings : novels, plays, poems, and songs. (« *Film-Kurier* » published and distributed the lyrics to the theme-song of « Hitler Youth Quex » , « Unsere Fahne flattert uns voran » , based on a text by Baldur von Schirach and a music by Hans-Otto Bergmann. The lyrics were available for 1.50 « Reichsmarks » .) Karl Aloys Schenzinger immortalized Norkus in « *Der Hitlerjunge Quex* » , a novel written between May and September 1932 and pre-published to considerable acclaim in installments in the Nazi Party organ, the « *Völkischer Beobachter* » , prior to the book's release in December. The volume would become obligatory reading for Germany's youth, undergoing innumerable editions and registering sales of more than 500,000 copies by 1945. (Gerd Albrecht, editor. « *Hitlerjunge Quex : Ein Film vom Opfergeist der deutschen Jugend* » , Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1983 ; page 16.) Soon after Schenzinger's novel appeared, « Ufa » , the most important German film studio, announced plans for a film version directed by Hans Steinhoff and produced by Karl Ritter, a project actively supported by the Nazi leadership.

« *Hitler Youth Quex* » was, thus, the 1st feature-film significantly supported by the new government and produced under the protectorate of the Youth Leader of the German « Reich » , Baldur von Schirach. The film offers a striking example of how the Nazis planned to employ modern medium for State purposes. Once they seized power, they controlled one of Europe's most modern and sophisticated movie industries. They immediately mobilized this potent medium to craft gripping narratives and promote popular legends. Josef Gœbbels well-recognized the film's potential value as a political instrument when he was appointed Minister of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda, in March 1933. It was directed by Karl Aloys Schenzinger.

The premiere took place in the Munich « Ufa-Phœbus-Palast » on 11 September 1933, a festive event attended by Party dignitaries (Adolf Hitler, Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß, Robert Ley, Ernst Röhm, Franz von Papen, as well as Werner von Blomberg and other high-ranking generals) and accompanied by a gala-performance of Anton Bruckner's 4th Symphony by the 80 members of the « Reich » Symphony Orchestra. The film received the rating « artistically especially worthwhile » , prompting words of praise from Gœbbels, who wrote the prominent « Ufa » executive, Ernst Hugo Correll :

« If “ *Hitler Youth Quex* ” represents the 1st large-scale attempt to depict the ideas and world of National-Socialism with the art of cinema, then, one must say that this attempt, given the possibilities of modern technology, is a full-fledged success. »

(Figure 2) Notice that Heini wears his new Hitler Youth cap in the hospital, recovering from his mother's efforts to commit suicide. Notice the uniform worn by the boys visiting him. One wears the shoulder strap, the other does not. The child at the left in the beret is probably a girl.

« Hitler Youth Quex » was about the sacrificial spirit of the German youth. A German youth faces a conflict of ideals between his Communist father and his growing allegiance to the Hitler Youth movement which eventually leads to his own death. Like the 2 other German feature-films screened in 1933 which portrayed Party martyrs, « SA-Mann Brand » and « Hans Westmar », « Hitler Youth Quex » unfolds as a family drama, set against the chaotic political and economic crisis of the late Weimar years. Heini Völker, a printer's apprentice, joins a Communist youth group at the prompting of his father, an unemployed worker and War veteran, a choleric drinker who torments his mournful wife. During a weekend outing, Heini quickly grows disenchanted with his unruly Communist comrades and flees their alcoholic and sexual revelry. Retreating into the woods, he spies an idealized group of Hitler Youths and looks upon their night time ceremony with fascination, an interest undiminished even after the Nazis discover him and send him away. Heini returns to Berlin effusing about the order and discipline of the Hitler Youth, singing their anthem to his mother, and causing his father to scold and beat him. Despite this outburst and the promptings of the Communist leader, Stoppel, Heini seeks-out the young Nazis Fritz and Ulla. He refuses to participate in a Communist raid on the new Hitler Youth dormitory, but cannot fully convince the Nazis of his good faith until he warns them that Stoppel and his group plan to bomb the new hostel. Mother Völker, confronted by an enraged Stoppel after the Communist plot back-fires, fears for her son, but does not know how to protect him. In desperation, she turns on the gas to put an end to both herself and the sleeping boy. After awakening in a hospital, Heini finds himself surrounded by a group of Hitler Youths who express their gratitude and present him with a uniform and a mirror. As a result of his mother's death and his father's submission to the special plea of Hitler Youth Brigade Leader Cass, Heini moves into a Nazi dormitory. Active and energetic (so much so that his alacrity gains him the nickname « Quex », meaning quicksilver) , Heini works all night to print leaflets for the upcoming election and insists on distributing them in his old neighbourhood, Beuselkitz. Members of Stoppel's group, headed by the vicious Wilde, learn of Heini's presence and chase him through the streets, cornering him in a fairground where Wilde bludgeons him with the knife once coveted by Heini. When his Nazi cohorts reach him, it is too late. With his last breath, Heini gestures upward and utters the words, « Our flag flutters before us, it leads. » , as the image segues into a close-up of a Party banner over which marching figures parade in geometric configurations.

« Hitler Youth Quex » is a legend of modern film-making. The film sanctified an boy's heroic deed. The film was used to re-shape the idealistic young boy's dead body into an icon for German youth. It demonstrates how movies can effectively present issues as good or bad, leaving the viewer with clear lines and straightforward answers. The Nazis demonstrated with this film how they would charge a medium with a mission. The film showed the way for German Youth. The film illustrates the Nazi ideology that German youth was a State possession. It heralds the Nazi New Order. Many still do not understand how close Hitler and his cohorts came to achieving their goal. The film narrative makes an effort to present the facts of Heini's experiences dispassionately, a clever propaganda trick. Yet, the characters are drawn so starkly - the idealistic Hitler Youth and the depraved Communist youth that there is no way to avoid reaching the conclusion the Nazis wanted. In our media dominated modern world, we have become accustomed to

questioning what is told us. « Hitler Youth Quex » will look simplistic and pretentious to us. But this is not how it was received by young Germans at the time.

(Figure 3) « Hitler Youth Quex » glorified the death of a Hitler Youth boy. It set the standard that Hitler Youth members should aim for. Many boys took it very seriously.

The « Reichminister » for Propaganda, Doctor Josef Gœbbels, took a special interest in film-making. « Hitler Youth Quex » was the 1st major film made under his supervision.

This is what he thought of the film :

« There in the bleak, gray twilight, yellowed, tortured eyes stare into the emptiness. His tender head has been trampled into a bloody pulp. Long, deep wounds extend down the slender body, and a deadly laceration tears through his lungs and heart. Yet, it is as if life stirs anew out of pale death. Look now, the slender, elegant body begins to move. Slowly, slowly, he rises as if conjured-up by magic, until he stands tall in all his youthful glory right before my trembling eyes. And without moving his lips, a frail child's voice is heard as if speaking from all eternity :

“ What is mortal in me will perish. But my spirit, which is immortal, will remain with you. And it will show you the way. ” »

(Josef Gœbbels, quoted in : Jay W. Baird. To Die For Germany : Heroes in the Nazi Pantheon, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1990 ; page 116.)

The Hitler Youth movement played an important role in generating the enthusiasm for Hitler and the Nazis that allowed them to seize power. They also played a role in the street disorders of the late-1920's and early-1930's. This film idealized a Hitler Youth boy that was killed in those disorders. After seizing power, the Nazis quickly brought order to the streets. All competing youth movements were either abolished or incorporated into the Hitler Youth.

The film transpires in the Völker's apartment, the Dörries' apartment, the forest, a Hitler Youth home, an amusement park, a hospital, the streets, and a bar.

The main characters are : Heine Völker, Father Völker, and Mother Völker. The Communists include : Stoppel, Gerda, and Wilde. The Hitler Youth include : Youth Leader Cass, Fritz Dörries, and Ula Dörries.

Important props include : knife, cigarettes, alcohol, flags, the Hitler Youth uniform, and leaflets. The Hitler Youth knife was an important part of the uniform. Receiving a knife was an important part of a boy's life in the 3rd « Reich » . The Hitler Youth were extensively used to pass-out leaflets on the street before the Nazis seized power. After they seized power, they were used to collect money for Party charities.

The 2 principal songs in the movie are : « Our Flag flutters before us » and the « Internationale » .

The film raises a variety of interesting issues : Order and Chaos, Social Classes, Work and Unemployment, Family Structure, Femininity versus Masculinity, Sacrifice, and the Hero's Death.

(Figure 4) The Nazis took film-making very seriously. « Hitler Youth Quex » was one of the 1st movies made after the Nazis seized power. Here, Heini is over-joyed to put-on his Hitler Youth uniform. Note the caps the boys wear. They were replaced by the more familiar campaign caps.

The film provides a lot of interesting information about both German boys' clothing and the the Hitler Youth uniform in the early years of 3rd « Reich » , and how it was worn. The Hitler Youth was originally organized as the youth auxiliary of the Storm Troopers (SA) . The SA were the Nazi Party thugs that terrorized the streets before the Party seized power and Nazi opponents in the 1st few years of Nazi rule. Most of the stills show the Hitler Youth uniforms, however, the film also showcases what German boys were wearing in the early-1930's. We see German boys in their regular clothes being recruited into the Hitler Youth. The Hitler Youth uniform was based on the SA uniform. Many of the SA thugs objected to this as they didn't like children being allowed to wear a uniform that they saw as a military uniform that they wore to remake Germany and terrorize their opponents with. Likewise, many German parents, at 1st, didn't want their children to wear a uniform that made them look like little SA men.

Actually, clothing plays a major role in this film. 1st, Communist dissolution and lack of discipline stand in direct opposition to Nazi containment and resolve. One way that this is expressed is through clothing. Bernhard K. , was 10 years old when he 1st saw « Hitler Youth Quex » in 1933, could vividly recall the film many decades later :

« Communist youths were shown. All of them dressed like ruffians. Unsavoury figures. Then, they set-up camp and even girls were with them. Everything was really disgusting. The Hitler Youth, on the other hand : all dressed the same, clean, nice, with leaders who had everything under control. I still remember today that, after the film, we all agreed : the Nazis made an altogether great impression, there was discipline, one wanted to join in. The Communists, on the other hand, no ; our parents would never have let us be part of a bunch like that. 2nd, quite a bit of attention is devoted to the Hitler Youth. Even in the hospital, he admires his new Hitler Youth cap with a mirror. Another scene is devoted to Heini finally being admitted to the Hitler Youth and receiving his uniform. He is delighted as he puts it on and appears before the others in it. »

(Quoted in : Karl Heinz-Huber. « Jugend unterm Hakenkreuz » , Ullstein, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1936 ; page 19.)

In the film « Quex » , I don't remember whether the Communist youth group (of which Heini was a member early in the film, before his rescue by the Nazis) wore uniforms or not. Maybe not. The neighbourhood Heini lived in (Beusselkietz) was as bleak as any Charles Dickens could have imagined. The boys probably could not have bought uniforms, and the Communists probably couldn't provide them freely. A lack of uniform might also symbolize solidarity of the proletarians and the « class struggle » . Besides, the film-makers were Nazis, and they could hardly let the Communists upstage them by wearing nicer clothes. In fact, the opposite is true. The Nazis were showing they could produce order out of the chaos which followed the end of the First World War (Berlin and Munich were 2 cities that

witnessed open warfare between the Communists and « others ») . The Nazis were neater and cleaner than the Communists in this film, and they were much better behaved. Who wouldn't be impressed ! Why did Heini respond so significantly to his new uniform ? Early in the film, he visits Ulla and her family (who are Nazis) at their nice, comfortable home. What a contrast it is to his own. And Ulla and her family are attractive and kind to Heini. Probably, he's never been so well treated by anyone else, except by his mother. When Heini puts on the Hitler Youth uniform brought to him by Ulla and her brother, he is really shedding his identification with his old world and is joining the best thing he's ever had going for him.

...

I saw « Quex » about 12 years ago. It's a treasure of a film. The young main character really does seem physically and spiritually renewed by his « Hitler-Junge » uniform. He really is proud to belong to the « Hitler-Junge » , and the « Hitler-Junge » is everything he's never had and always wanted - a real sense of belongingness. The « Hitler-Junge » was a surrogate family to him. Also, Heini responds to music, especially the « Hitler-Junge » Lied (Song) . The words and music are stirring, especially the closing line - « Ja, die fahne ist mehr als der todt ! » (Yes, the flag will triumph over death !) . The closing scene as Heini dies from his wounds and the fade in to that « Hitler-Junge » procession in the heavens is nothing short of inspirational.

La première de « Quex » à Munich

The premiere of the film « Hitler Youth Quex » , on 11 September 1933, at the Ufa-Phœbus Palace, in Munich, took on all of the aspects of a Nazi Festival. Long columns of Hitler Youth formed a ceremonial guard outside the theater, blowing trumpet fanfares to the delight of the crowd gathered to catch a glimpse of the « Führer » . The guests in attendance included many of the elite of the 3rd « Reich » : Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß, Robert Ley, Ernst Röhm, and Franz von Papen, as well as Werner von Blomberg and other high-ranking generals. Search-lights outside the theater added a dramatic touch, and the hall was aflame with the black, white, and red flags of Party and nation. Flowers were banked in the national colours before the stage, featuring a raised floral Swastika. A gala-performance of Anton Bruckner's 4th Symphony (« Romantic ») was given as a preamble by conductor Franz Adam and the 80 members of the « Reich » Symphony Orchestra. No touch had been overlooked for the celebration of the living dead.

Turning to Hitler and the guests of honour, Baldur von Schirach offered a brief testimonial :

« I want briefly to direct your thoughts to that young comrade who can't be with us anymore, because he has lain buried for a year and a half. It was in the time of the worst terror, when I stood before 2,000 Berlin Hitler Youth and spoke to them of sacrifice, of the “ Führer ”, and of heroism. An oppressive atmosphere lay over our meeting, and it was as if we expected something horrible to happen. I spoke of the bravery that everyone must show, and that there might be one of us out there whom I would never see again. And I said to him : Thank you that you take this fate on your shoulders, that you have the honour among the millions to bear the name of Hitler Youth, to become a leader in the community which you embody. On the next morning, the Hitler Youth Herbert Norkus was butchered by Marxist murder bandits. As I stood at his casket, Communists threw stones against the wall of the mortuary. Today, a

youth movement of a million and a half fighters stands where that little Hitler Youth fell. Every single one of them is wedded to this spirit of sacrifice, this comradeship. We want to fight on in his unyielding spirit. “ Heil Hitler ! ” »

After the playing of the Hitler Youth March, the director of the Bavarian State Theater, Hans Schlenk, read the prologue from Kurt Klawitter's « Ours the Victory - Ours the Power » . The film itself was greeted with grand approval and boisterous shouts of « Heil ! » At its conclusion, Jürgen Ohlsen, who had played « Quex » , appeared on the stage in the company of Steinhoff and Ritter. Looking like the wandering Parzifal, he saluted Hitler who was standing with his entourage. Deeply moved, Hitler smiled approvingly, and, lost in memories of the « Kampfzeit » , he slowly returned the salute.

The reporter for « Kinematograph » , Germany's oldest film magazine, described the conclusion of the ceremonies :

« The shouts and “ Heils ” were heard throughout the neighbourhood, and they carried-out into the dark blue fall evening. Blood, tears, and victory (the story of our times) were relived that night in the presence of those who gained the final victory. “ Hitlerjunge Quex ”: is a fanfare of German youth and of the German future. »

There is no question that « Hitler Youth Quex » fulfilled the mission assigned to it. It was, at once, a propaganda and an æsthetic success, an ornament to Gœbbels' dream of using the best of modern technique in the service of the mythical National-Socialist ideal. « Hitler Youth Quex » lent currency to Gœbbels' affirmation that « film is one of the most modern and far-reaching means of influencing the masses » . It appealed to the propaganda Minister because it was produced in the heroic key of National-Socialism, because it was a felicitous union of political realism and art, and, most important, because it channeled idealism into action in support of the State. In a letter to Ernst H. Correll, director of production at « Ufa » , Gœbbels praised the film, noting that « “ Ufa ” as well as all those involved have contributed significantly not only to the development of the film-art but also to the æsthetic configuration of National-Socialist ideology » .

The film had a remarkable appeal for young people in Germany. It was shown on both Party and « Ufa » commercial channels, and its audience numbered well over 20 million. Curt Belling, a senior official in the Gœbbels film apparatus, referred to « Hitler Youth Quex » as « the film of National-Socialist youth » . As late as 1942, it was being shown in the Youth Film Hours of the Hitler Youth, an important propaganda activity of the organization.

There were many reasons for its success. Above all, « Hitler Youth Quex » was a film of youth, by youth, and for youth. As such, it both fascinated and inspired the young and met the requirements of the Party elite. It set a standard for the other major propaganda films that followed : « Ich für dich - Du für mich » (Carl Frœlich, 1934) ; « Kopf hoch, Johannes ! » (Viktor de Kowa, 1941) ; « Jakko » (Fritz Peter Buch, 1941) ; « Himmelhunde » (Roger von Norman, 1942) ; « Hiz'nde hock ! » (Alfred Weidenmann, 1942) ; and « Junge Adler » (Alfred Weidenmann, 1944) . From the point of view of the Party, « Hitler Youth Quex » had the great merit of laying the foundation for the central motif of Hitler Youth martyrology. Further, it schooled a generation to prepare for a sacrificial death for Germany.

Music Amongst the Hitler Youth

By 1945, the « Hitlerjugend » (Hitler Youth) included almost every German boy in the Reich ; hundreds of thousands of girls were incorporated into its sister organization, the « Bund Deutscher Mädel » (BDM, or League of German Girls) . The physical and mental training of German youth was one of the Nazi Party's greatest priorities, and much importance was placed on childhood activities and education. The primary organiser and leader of the « Hitlerjugend » , Baldur von Schirach, was considered to be one of the most important Nazi officials in the « Reich » . Within the system of military exercises, educational programmes, marches, camping and community service that made-up the « Hitlerjugend » 's activities, there was a prominent emphasis on music, in particular group singing. According to an internal « Hitlerjugend » memo, it was :

« ... precisely during celebrations and singing events that we have an excellent opportunity to have a political effect wide beyond the typical formation. Songs possess the strongest community-building power. Thus, we use them deliberately at those moments when we want to waken the consciousness of being part of a community, in order to deepen the power of such an experience. »

The « Hitlerjugend » was 1st created in the early 1920's, when the Nazi Party was still a fringe movement. With the Nazi rise to power in 1933, von Schirach took control of the « Hitlerjugend » and oversaw a large expansion of the group in terms of both membership and activities. In December 1936, the Hitler Youth law was declared, and membership in the « Hitlerjugend » became mandatory for all youth in Germany. (This was achieved in part by banning other youth groups and incorporating their membership into the « Hitlerjugend » .) The organization's aim was to instill discipline and a love for Germany, and to educate youth along Nazi lines :

Beyond the influence of parents and school, the entirety of German youth is to be exclusively educated, in body, mind and manners, in the spirit of National-Socialism, for the service of the people and the people's community.

Together with his music-chief Wolfgang Stumme, Baldur von Schirach emphasized the power of music and song in the context of the « Hitlerjugend » 's educational endeavour, and himself wrote several « Hitlerjugend » songs. Music featured prominently in the « Hitlerjugend » curriculum, and children were given regular classes in formal music training (vocal and instrumental) . Hundreds of « Hitlerjugend » music groups were established, which performed at birthday parties for high-ranking Nazi officials and at Nazi Festivals ; some even performed internationally. Group singing was considered particularly important as a means of building group cohesion and obedience, and numerous song-books were published for this purpose. Ironically, these activities integrated many musical practices common to banned communist and leftist youth groups - the emphasis on group music-making rather than solo performances ; the importance of folk-songs ; the use of music to build group solidarity - and often also used the very same songs, simply changing the lyrics to promote a Nazi world-view. The « Hitlerjugend » also incorporated a great deal of instrumental music, particularly brass bands.

One former « Hitlerjugend » member remembered :

« In the songs that we sang, in the poems that we recited, everything was bright, shiny and clear, the sun and earth were ours, and tomorrow so, too, would be the whole world. »

« Philharmoniker » - « Symphony and Love » (1944)

Un mauvais film que les mélomanes doivent à tout prix regarder

Film du réalisateur et acteur allemand Paul Verhoeven (né le 22 juin 1901 à Unna, Rhénanie-du-Nord-Westphalie ; décédé le 22 mars 1975 à Munich, en Bavière.

Synopsis : Hans Schonarth est violoniste à la Philharmonie de Berlin. Son frère Alexandre, violoniste également, a préféré faire carrière dans la musique légère, jusqu'au jour où il tombe amoureux de la fiancée de Hans et décide d'entrer lui aussi dans le légendaire Orchestre allemand pour se rapprocher de la belle Maria.

...

Tourné en 1944 sur un scénario avant tout destiné à faire oublier au public allemand les bombardements et l'approche inéluctable de la défaite totale, « Philharmoniker » (le Philharmonique, sous-entendu de Berlin) est une romance résolument indigente entre un bon aryen, violoniste de son état, et une jolie aryenne, dont l'histoire ne précise pas si elle est bonne.

Seulement voilà, comme il est question de musique et que l'Orchestre phare du 3e « Reich » a été sollicité pour les nombreuses scènes de concerts, le spectateur va avoir droit en prime à quelques extraits du grand répertoire symphonique allemand avec les plus grands chefs de l'époque. Et c'est là que « Philharmoniker » fait fort : des Symphonies de Beethoven et de Anton Bruckner, « Les Préludes » de Franz Liszt dirigés par des géants tels que Hans Knappertsbusch, Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm, sans oublier Richard Strauß lui-même qui dirige une de ses propres œuvres (le « Festliches Präludium », Opus 61) . On peut y admirer pendant quelques secondes sa fameuse battue minimaliste.

Manque à l'appel Wilhelm Furtwängler qui aurait absolument refusé d'apparaître dans ce film de propagande. Ce n'est pas dramatique dans la mesure où il existe quantité de témoignages filmés de son art et qu'il en existe justement très peu des chefs précédemment mentionnés.

Autre élément intéressant : de nombreuses scènes se déroulent dans l'ancienne salle de la « Philharmonie » (« Alte Philharmonie ») qui fut entièrement détruite lors d'un bombardement au phosphore des Britanniques, en 1944, peu après la fin du tournage !

(Le réalisateur allemand Paul Verhoeven, né en 1935, n'a aucun lien de parenté avec le réalisateur hollandais du même nom, né en 1935.

« Philharmoniker » : a love-story in the Philharmonic « milieu »

The Nazis scored a major « coup » in bringing Wilhelm Furtwängler within a goose-step of an official Party event, and Josef Goebbels and Hermann Göring immediately sought ways to present him more often at close proximity to such gatherings. But Furtwängler managed successfully to side-step them most of the time. After the War started, he performed 3 times in occupied countries. 2 of those occasions took place in Copenhagen, 1st on 5 February 1942 with the Berlin Philharmonic, and 2nd in May 1943 when he took the Vienna Philharmonic on tour through Scandinavia. Otto Straßer, the General Manager of the Philharmonic, informed him that the tour would ruin the Orchestra financially if it passed-up the receipts they expected in Copenhagen. The 3rd and 4th occasions both took place in Prague ; 1st in 1942, a small concert he presented before an invited audience in Prague while he was staying in the Czech capital on his way to Budapest ; and 2nd, a concert with the Berlin Philharmonic on 16 March 1944.

Perhaps, the blessing that truly cursed Furtwängler during the 3rd « Reich » was the relentless admiration Adolf Hitler heaped on him throughout the regime. In 1941, the « Führer » came-up with a grand scheme in which an entire ship would be given to Furtwängler so that he could sail around the world with or without his Orchestras to conduct concerts in the handful of countries with which Germany still had cordial relations. Goebbels also created on Hitler's orders a massive public relations campaign around Furtwängler, photographing him in every conceivable location, usually with the image of Hitler or a Swastika somewhere within the frame.

These blandishments, of course, concealed other dark motives. Even at this stage of the War, in 1941, Goebbels was preparing to mobilize every part of German life, especially cultural activities, for quasi-military purposes. Music was to play an integral part in Germany's eventual campaign of « Total War » , and Goebbels intended that Furtwängler take his place at the head of this massive military offensive. But if Winifred Wagner once despaired because Furtwängler seemed like a sponge that leaked water from all sides the moment he was seized, a conjunction of ill-luck and Furtwängler's maddening unreliability prevented Goebbels from being any more successful in containing him.

Furtwängler was an avid skier and highly-skilled for a man of his age. When the Ministry of Propaganda learned that he was in Sankt Anton, the « Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung » sent a photographer to take shots of Furtwängler on the slopes. The paper got their pictures and a message from the photographer :

« This might be Furtwängler's last adventure on skies.

Furtwängler had skidded down a dangerous slope, lost his balance and tumbled down the grade. He sustained a broken arm, a concussion, and 16 other injuries - mostly bruises, and was in critical condition for several days. The doctors also found nerve damage in his right arm and predicted that he would not be able to conduct if he survived.

All this did not stop him from leaving the hospital to hear a radio transmission of a recording he recently had made of Anton Bruckner's 7th Symphony. He had to go on foot to a tavern in a nearby village, which had the only radio powerful enough to receive the transmission. Usually, the radio played dance-music, but Furtwängler told the proprietor who he was and asked him to tune to his broadcast. Despite complaints from customers, the tavern resounded with Bruckner. While he listened, Furtwängler realized that he might never have another chance to perform this great work, and he wept. He reconciled himself to the only option he felt he had left : composing.

8 painful months later, he was back on the podium.

He told Curt Riess :

« I hoped to cancel a few concerts to be free for a few months, even a year. »

But that was impossible. If one is involved in the musical world, one is eaten-up by it. A drastic decision would be required to leave it.

Franz Liszt, for example, declared from one day to the next :

« From now on, I will not play the piano. »

Furtwängler already had made one binding decision : to stay in Germany to make German music in his own way. When he returned to his 1st rehearsal after the accident, his arms caused him so much pain that he had to stop after a few minutes. His doctors advised him to cancel the concert. He refused. They predicted he would have to stop in the middle of the concert, but he completed it. He was exhausted from the pain, but he knew now that he could still conduct. Within a year, the arm was back to normal. Nonetheless, his malady enabled him to evade engagements he did not want to accept and provided him, with a handy means of excusing himself from appearing at politically-oriented events.

But Goebbels was just as persistent in pursuing Furtwängler for propaganda purposes as Furtwängler was wily in avoiding him. Now that he was able again to make music, Goebbels was anxious to see to it that Furtwängler made more music in the service of the 3rd « Reich » . His new project for promoting the cultural glory of the Nazis was « Symphony and Love » (« Philharmoniker ») , a film directed by Paul Verhoeven, recounting the achievements of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. He made numerous offers to Furtwängler to appear in the film and have a say in its production. Furtwängler hated the blatant Nazified bias in the script. It made no mention of any of the Jews who had been connected with the Orchestra (Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, etc) , barely acknowledged Arthur Nikisch's contribution to it, and interpolated a ridiculous love-story. Furtwängler firmly refused to have anything to do with it. Goebbels could easily have gone to dozens of other conductors who had worked with the Orchestra and could not have been more cooperative in this period. For example, Clemens Krauß, Karl Böhm, Hermann Abendroth, Robert Heger, Hans Knappertsbusch, and others took the Berlin Philharmonic on tours to occupied countries, appeared as guest-conductors in those States, and took part in domestic propaganda projects. But only the apostate Furtwängler could give the film the stamp of legitimacy it needed.

The film was a masterful example of Nazi public relations in its clever distortion of facts and wholesale untruths. According to the script, the Nazis alone had made the Berlin Philharmonic the great Orchestra it had become over the years. The concert agency of Wolff and Sachs, which was largely responsible for marketing the Orchestra everywhere, was left unmentioned. Louise Wolff and Bruno Walter never existed.

After, it looked as though Furtwängler's refusal to have anything to do with the film was final, Goebbels fingered his only remaining trump card. Richard Strauß was all too happy to make a brief appearance. He was seen conducting a few bars from his « Festival » Overture (« Festliches Präludium », Opus 61) before the cameras. A stand-in conducted the rest of the segment.

Goebbels had no idea how difficult « Symphony and Love » would be to make, and when it looked as though its completion was far into the future, he ordered a treatment for a film about Beethoven, to star the well-known German actor Gustav Fröhlich. He wanted Furtwängler to supervise the sound-track. Furtwängler was anxious to humour the Propaganda Minister at this point, in 1941, because he needed his help to get more money for the Philharmonic and enlist him in his battle against some virulent enemies who were threatening him at the Berlin Philharmonic, so, he did not decline immediately. Eventually, they talked seriously about the film, but Goebbels' arrogant manner collided with Furtwängler's propensity for long-windedness. An argument erupted.

Furtwängler stood-up and told the Minister :

« You are mistaken, “ Herr ” Minister, if you think you can exploit Beethoven in a film. » , and stormed-out.

Goebbels shelved his plans for immortalizing Beethoven on celluloid.

« Symphony and Love » , however, kept stewing on Propaganda Minister's back burner. When it was finally completed and released in 1944, it nauseated the critic Werner Fiedler, and he said as much in a review. Its director Paul Verhoeven was so angry that he demanded that Fiedler, who was already on Goebbels' black-list, be apprehended. Furtwängler, on the other hand, was so delighted with the review that he met with Fiedler in one of his rare encounters with critics for an amiable discussion on the nature of criticism. Goebbels had his hands so full with the Allies closing-in on Germany that he never got around to ordering Fiedler's arrest.

At the « Staatsoper » , Hermann Göring was also determined to put Furtwängler on a leash and make him conduct more frequently at his musical palace, but he too found himself frustrated. He tried persuasion rather than subterfuge. As far back as 1937, he had arranged for Furtwängler to conduct a spectacular production of « Tannhäuser » in Berlin, and he once again asked him to resume his position as Music Director at the « Staatsoper » . The position of Music Director at the « Staatsoper » was one of the appointments Furtwängler resigned in 1934, in the wake of the « Paul Hindemith Affair » .

(The premiere of « Tannhäuser » was given on 10 November 1937. Max Lorenz took the title-part in a production designed by Emil Preetorius and directed by Heinz Tietjen. Tiana Lemnitz and Heinrich Schlusnus sang Elisabeth and Wolfram, respectively. The fascinating switch in casting was Frida Leider, singing Venus for the 1st time. It was a turning-point in her career. She had been the reigning Elisabeth up until that time and still had several seasons of impassioned Isoldes and Brünnhildes left. But she clearly was moving toward the twilight of her singing career.)

But, at that time, Furtwängler was still smarting from Göring's most recent intrigues that had forced him into declining the invitation from the New York Philharmonic. He not only refused to take-up his post again at the « Staatsoper » but asked Göring to release him from his guest-conducting arrangement there. Predictably, Göring was furious and insisted that Furtwängler fulfill his guest-commitments at the « Staatsoper » to the absolute letter. But such threats had no teeth ; if Furtwängler did not wish to conduct, he was under no obligation because he was a free-lance and had no contract.

Furtwängler was Germany's finest conductor, but it galled both Gœbbels and Göring to know that Furtwängler could get away with his insubordinance simply because he had no real rivals anywhere in the « Reich » . They also realized that the racial policies of their own regime had backed them into a desolate corner : the pool of 1st class German talent was rapidly thinning-out. While Göring once boasted that he, alone, would decide who was Aryan and who was not at the « Staatsoper » , Jews were unable to perform there by 1938. It would be only a matter of months before the veteran Leo Blech would have to be dismissed. Blech was probably the only full-Jewish conductor still employed at a « Reich » institution. The other prominent conductors (Otto Klemperer, Fritz Busch, Erich Kleiber, Hermann Scherchen, Jascha Horenstein, Fritz Zweig, Fritz Stiedry, William Steinberg, Joseph Rosenstock) , all were gone now.

(Hermann Göring got special dispensation for Leo Blech, one of the finest Opera conductors Germany produced in the 20th Century, who remained unmolested and kept his title of « Generalmusikdirector » until the end of 1937. He emigrated to Sweden and led a successful career during the War, at the Royal Opera Stockholm, and was influential in developing the early careers of several singers who gained lasting fame in the post-War era. Most notable among them was Birgit Nilsson.)

...

A fictitious story in a real Orchestra : in this film, premiered in 1944, Paul Verhœven tells the love and life story of a violinist in the Berlin Philharmonic « milieu » . At the same time, without openly showing propaganda or symbols of the National-Socialist regime, the NS ideology becomes clear. Notwithstanding, the concert scenes showing the « Berliner Philharmoniker » conducted by Richard Strauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Eugen Jochum and Karl Böhm make the movie a musical document of its times.

The « Berliner Philharmoniker » were the driving force behind this film, which premiered in December 1944 and was filmed by Paul Verhœven. At the same time, without openly showing propaganda or symbols of the National-Socialist regime, the NS ideology becomes clear : sacrifices must be made during a crisis ; you may not be disloyal ; you stick with the collective unconditionally. The screen-play by Erich Ebermayer and Paul Verhœven, based on an idea by music-writer Friedrich Herzfeld, was personally approved by Josef Gœbbels, propaganda minister at the time.

Besides actors playing musicians, you can experience the « Berliner Philharmoniker » themselves in the film. Conducted by Richard Strauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm and others, they play music by Anton Bruckner, Franz Liszt, Richard Strauß and Johannes Brahms. Wilhelm Furtwängler, « de facto » the principal conductor, is missing, however ; he was already at logger-heads with the regime and refused to participate in the film.

The story is exciting and also touching : Alexander Schonath, 1st violinist, leaves the Philharmonic in an economic crisis. His younger, ailing brother Hans pursues a career in the Orchestra and gets engaged to Maria, the daughter of a member of the Orchestra board. Alexander returns and begins an intense love-affair with Maria, and tries to win back his place in the Orchestra from his brother. When he learns, however, how ill Hans is, Alexander leaves the Philharmonic again. Here again, « nationalistic » fate has different plans with the protagonist.

...

The film « Philharmoniker » (The Philharmonic) , directed by Paul Verhoeven, uses footage of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra on tour in Spain and Portugal, during the year 1944. In 2010, Misha Aster has called the film « an artwork of artwork - a propaganda film made of propaganda » , which captures « the unique and terrifying semiotics of the moment » (page 214) . It is essentially a love-story and contains original music by Alois Melichar. The Berlin Philharmonic, under the direction of Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm and Hans Knappertsbusch, plays excerpts from Ludwig van Beethoven and Anton Bruckner Symphonies ; Franz Liszt's Symphonic-poem « Les Préludes » ; the « Festliches Präludium » by Richard Strauß ; and « The Blue Danube » waltz by Johann Strauß. The film takes a light-weight rather than serious approach to the difference between Symphonic music and Jazz - the former presented as « great art » and the latter « primitive music » .

In 1990, Paul Verhoeven's son, Michæl, won acclaim for his film « The Nasty Girl » , a story about a young girl in the Germany of the 1970's who explores the behaviour of the people in her hometown during the 3rd « Reich » . In a lengthy interview in « The New York Times » (8 October 1990) , the younger Verhoeven apparently gave no inkling of his own father's behaviour as it palpably was documented in the film « Symphony and Love » . The « Times » article also states that Paul Verhoeven spent the War as a film- and stage-director of « apolitical light-comedies » . So « apolitical » was « Symphony and Love » that Verhoeven demanded the arrest of Werner Fiedler, a critic who panned the film. Fiedler's arrest almost certainly would have led to his liquidation.

Comment :

« Philharmoniker » is a typical German Nazi propaganda movie about World War II. A story with love and music which will let the audience forget for a while the bombs over their cities. So far, I would not have screened the work until the end. What captivated me were these sequences where one see the great German conductors of that period leading the Berlin Philharmonic « Reich » Orchestra, as it was called during the War. One would regret not to see Wilhelm Furtwängler. Fortunately, plenty of visual documents exist where one can see and hear the « Devil's Master » . It was the 1st time I saw a younger Hans Knappertsbusch conducting Beethoven in a « Werke-konzert » . The same for Eugen Jochum who was already a great specialist of Anton Bruckner. At the end, Richard Strauß conducts one of his own works (the « Festival » Overture ; « Festliches Präludium » , Opus 61) with a minimalist gesture. Another interesting point is that one can see the « Old Philharmonie » concert-hall where the « Philharmoniker » played before it was hit by British phosphorus bombs on January 29th, 1944, and completely burned to the ground within a few hours. It happened shortly after the movie was released on the evening of December 4th, 1944, at the «

Berliner Taubentzen-Palast » .

...

Playing the (fictitious) role of « Generalmusikdirektor » of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra : Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm, Hans Knappertsbusch and Richard Strauß.

Pieces performed :

Movements I and II of Ludwig van Beethoven's 5th Symphony ; Movement I of Anton Bruckner's 7th Symphony ; Franz Liszt's « Les Préludes » ; Johann Strauß's (II) « On the Beautiful Blue Danube » waltz ; and Richard Strauß conducts one of his own works : the « Festival » Overture (« Festliches Präludium ») , Opus 61.

Story : Erich Ebermayer, based on an idea by Friedrich Herzfeld.

Director : Paul Verhoeven (1901-1975) .

Executive Producer : Herbert Engelsing.

Music : Heinz-Friedel Heddenhausen.

Cinematography : Friedl Behn-Grund.

Film Editing : Hans Heinrich.

Production Design : Otto Erdmann, Franz F. Fürst, Artur Nortmann.

Costume Design : Max von Formacher.

Production Managers : Erich Fahrur, Heinz Landsmann, Heinz Sander.

Assistant director (2nd unit) : : Alfons Von Plessen.

Sound Department : Hans Ruetten.

Still photographer : Karl Ewald.

Assistant cameraman : Rudolf Müller.

Duration : 1h, 19min.

Date of the Premiere : Evening of 4 December 1944 at the « Berliner Taubentzen-Palast » . It had received excellent reviews.

Synopsis : In late-1920's, Berlin the financial situation of Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra is precarious. One of the violinists leaves the Orchestra to play in a light-music ensemble, but returns after Nazi « Machtergreifung » .

The Cast

Eugen Klöpfer as Schonarth, the father.

Will Quadflieg as Alexander Schonath.

Malte Jäger as Hans Schonath, Alexander's brother.

Theodor Loos as Herbert Hartwig.

Irene von Meyendorff as Maria Hartwig.

Erich Ponto as Strähle, the Orchestra servant.

Kirsten Heiberg as Heddy Lindt, the singer.

Elisabeth Flickenschildt as Fuchs, the female concert-agent.

O.E. Hasse as Urdol, the male concert-agent.

Franz Schafheitlin as the « Ministerialrat » .

Eduard von Winterstein as Arzt.

Erika von Thellmann as « Frau » Brettschneider.

Erich Fiedler as Schneemann.

Paul Verhoeven as Grode.

Curt Ackermann as the director of the Rio-Bar.

Jeanette Bethge as Bertha, the maid.

Oscar Sabo as Schulz.

Karl Etlinger as Weidner.

Herbert Gernot as Ullmann.

Paul Rehkopf as Mack.

Bill Bocket as Bill Bocketts.

Charles François as Carl François.

Also starring ...

Walter Klam.

Ruth Buchardt.

Alfred Stein.

Horst Winter.

Angelo Ferrari.

Werner Kurz.

André Saint-Germain.

Karl Rathgeb.

...

Philharmoniker ist ein Musikfilm von Paul Verhoeven aus dem Jahr 1944.

Deutschland vor 1933 : Die finanzielle Lage der Berliner Philharmoniker hat sich verschlechtert, und obwohl die Musiker dem Orchester die Treue halten, ist es der gerade erst ins Orchester aufgenommene erste Geiger Alexander Schonath, der den Philharmonikern den Rücken kehrt. Er geht als Geiger zu einer Gruppe, die Unterhaltungsmusik spielt, und gilt von nun an unter den Philharmonikern als Verräter. Vor allem Alexanders Vater als eines der ältesten Mitglieder des Orchesters kann seinem Sohn nicht verzeihen.

In Wirklichkeit handelte Alexander jedoch aus guten Motiven. Ursprünglich war er als Sologeiger mit einer Tanzkapelle umhergezogen, was zu einem ersten Bruch mit dem Vater geführt hatte. Alexanders immer etwas kränklicher Bruder Hans, der ebenfalls Musiker ist, brachte es derweil zum Konzertmeister bei den Philharmonikern. Hans verlobte sich mit der Tochter des Orchestervorstands, Maria. Zu dem Zeitpunkt erschien unerwartet Alexander in Berlin und begann eine Affäre mit Maria. Ihr gelang es in der Folge, Alexander mit seinem Vater auszusöhnen. Zudem konnte sie ihren Vater, den Orchestervorstand, überzeugen, Alexander bei den Philharmonikern einzustellen. Die plötzliche Konkurrenz durch den Bruder sowohl im Privat- als auch im Berufsleben war zu viel für Hans, der während eines Konzerts ohnmächtig zusammenbrach. Als die Ärzte Alexander erklärten, daß jede Aufregung für Hans tödlich sein könnte, verließ Alexander die Philharmoniker, obwohl er nun als Verräter galt.

Im Jahr 1933 verbessert sich die finanzielle Lage der Philharmoniker deutlich. Hans stirbt während einer Auslandstournee und Maria trifft kurze Zeit später zufällig mit Alexander zusammen. Sie begegnet ihm zunächst ablehnend, erfährt jedoch von der Sängerin Heddy die wahren Hintergründe über Alexanders damaliges Verschwinden. Maria liebt Alexander immer noch und versöhnt ihn erneut mit seinem Vater. Der talentierte Geiger wird nun endgültig ein Mitglied der Philharmoniker und er und Maria werden ein Liebespaar.

Die Dreharbeiten für Philharmoniker fanden vom 26. November 1942 bis zum März 1943 unter anderem in der 1944 zerstörten alten Berliner Philharmonie und in Wien statt. Die Filmbauten übernahmen Otto Erdmann, Arthur Nortmann und Franz F. Fürst.

Die Filmprüfstelle stufte Philharmoniker im November 1944 als « Jugendfrei ab 14 Jahre » ein und verlieh diesem Film das Prädikat Künstlerisch besonders wertvoll.

Die Uraufführung des Films war am 4. Dezember 1944 im Berliner Tauentzien-Palast.

Im Film sind neben den Darstellern die Berliner Philharmoniker selbst zu hören und zu sehen. Unter den Dirigenten Richard Strauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Eugen Jochum und Karl Böhm, die im Film auftreten, erklingen Werke von Anton Bruckner, Franz Liszt, Richard Strauß, und Johannes Brahms. Zu Beginn des Films erklingt Ludwig van Beethovens 5. Sinfonie. Die zeitgenössische Kritik hob im Hinblick auf die Dirigenten hervor, daß die « Meister ihres Fachs, die Namen von Welt, die hier Laienspieler vor der Kamera sind, die Meister der Maske [übertreffen] ! »

Die zeitgenössische Kritik lobte Philharmoniker als « musikalischen Ohrenschmaus und mimische Augenweide » . Er schaffe es, « Musik aus ihrer absoluten Selbstherrlichkeit zu lösen und mit den privaten Episoden menschlicher Schicksale zu verknüpfen » . Gleichzeitig gelänge es ihm, « die Majestät der Musik sichtbar zu machen » . Andere Kritiker betonten, daß im Film weniger die Handlung wichtig ist, als vielmehr « das Erlebnis der Musik, die wiederum die Entwicklung eines Orchesters vorwärtstreibt » . Paul Verhoeven hätte in Philharmoniker « atmosphärische Momente » und « Konzerte von eindringlicher Wirkung » eingefangen. Hervorgehoben wurden auch die Leistungen der Schauspieler, die « unbewußt auf dem Podium die höchste Natürlichkeit der Kunst erzielten » , so wäre « der Geiger des deutschen Films » Will Quadflieg hier « der Virtuose seines Lebens und seiner Kunst schlechthin » und Irene von

Meyendorff zeige « mehr sprechende Wärme im Blick und Gefühl, als sie es sonst in ihrem wie zur Medaille geprägten Gesicht geben kann und darf » .

Das Lexikon des Internationalen Films bewertete Philharmoniker 1990 als « Musikfilm mit guter Kameraarbeit und ausgezeichneten schauspielerischen Leistungen » . Er biete « vollendetes Musizieren der Berliner Philharmoniker unter der Stabsführung von Richard Strauß, Eugen Jochum und Hans Knappertsbusch » .

...

Das Regime aber suchte die Lage zu « überspielen » . Da sämtliche Theater, Varietés, Kabarett und Schauspielschulen von Josef Gæbbels zum 1. September geschlossen wurden, kam dem Kino eine noch größere Unterhaltungsbedeutung zu, als es diese seit den 30er Jahren ohnehin schon in Deutschland hatte. Durchaus beachtenswerte Filme erhielten jetzt ihre Uraufführung : die « Feuerzangenbowle » (nach Heinrich Spörl und mit Heinz Rühmann, Erich Ponté, Paul Henckels und andere) am 28. Januar, die « Träumerei » über Robert und Clara Schumann (mit Hilde Krahl und Mathias Wieman) am 3. Mai, die « Zaubergeige » am 9. Mai oder der künstlerisch sehr wertvolle Musikfilm « Philharmoniker » am 4. Dezember. Die gesamte deutsche Schauspielerelite war hier beteiligt, von Will Quadflieg über Erich Ponté, O.E. Hasse bis zu Erika von Thellmann, Elisabeth Flickenschildt und andere. Die Generalmusikdirektor Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm und Hans Knappertsbusch dirigierten, auch der Komponist Richard Strauß, nicht aber Wilhelm Furtwängler und Herbert von Karajan. Gespielt wurden von den Berliner Philharmonikern die ersten beiden Sätze der 5. Sinfonie Beethovens, der 1. Satz der 7. Sinfonie Bruckners, die durch die früheren nationalsozialistischen Siegesmeldungen etwas in Misskredit geratenen, musikalisch aber hervorragenden « Les Préludes » von Franz Liszt sowie der Walzer « An der schönen blauen Donau » . Vorausblicken dürfte man auch auf den Widerstandsfilm « Kolberg » , der zwar erst am 30. Januar 1945 uraufgeführt wurde, aber mit großem Aufwand 1943 und 1944 gedreht werden war. Hier spielten Heinrich George und Kristina Söderbaum ihre letzten großen Rollen. Das alles war eine Welt, die Helmuth von Moltke vielleicht - nur über den VB in seine Zelle holen konnte.

Inhalt

Alexander Schonath ist ein überaus begabter Musiker, der in einem Philharmonischen Orchester die erste Geige spielt. Doch als das Orchester in finanzielle Schwierigkeiten gerät, ist Peter auch der erste, der die Truppe verläßt - die anderen Musiker, allen voran Peters Vater, sehen in ihm einen « Déserteur » ; vom Vater hat er ohnehin nie viel Anerkennung erfahren. Er spielt nun in einer Unterhaltungskapelle. In Alexanders Abwesenheit macht sein jüngerer, stets kränklicher Bruder Hans Karriere bei den Philharmonikern und verlobt sich mit Maria, der Tochter des Orchestervorstandes Herbert Hartwig. Da kehrt Peter plötzlich zurück und beginnt eine leidenschaftliche Affäre mit Maria. Hans ist am Boden zerstört, zumal Peter, der sich mit Marias Hilfe mit seinem Vater versöhnt hat, ihm seinen Platz im Orchester streitig zu machen droht. Zwischen den Brüdern entwickelt sich ein heftiger Konflikt, der bei Hans einen Herzanfall auslöst. Als Peter vom Arzt erfährt, daß man jede Aufregung von Hans fernhalten muß, um sein Leben nicht zu gefährden, beschließt Peter, abermals fortzugehen. So macht er sich auf den Weg, nennt niemandem seine Beweggründe und zieht sich erneut den Haß seiner Kollegen zu, die meinen, er lasse sie wieder im Stich. Und es wird lange dauern, bis tragische Umstände die Wahrheit ans Licht und Peter endgültig mit Maria zusammenbringen werden.

...

Regie : Paul Verhøeven.

Drehbuch : Erich Ebermayer, Paul Verhøeven.

Kamera : Friedl Behn-Grund.

Schnitt : Hans Heinrich.

Musik : Heinz-Friedel Heddenhausen, Ludwig van Beethoven, Anton Bruckner, Franz Liszt, Johann Strauß junior, Richard Strauß, Alois Melichar.

Darsteller

Eugen Klöpfer : Vater Schonath.

Walter Klam.

Will Quadflieg : Sohn Alexander Schonath.

Malte Jäger : Sohn Hans Schonath.

Theodor Loos : Orchestervorstand Herbert Hartwig.

Irene Meyendorff : Tochter Maria Hartwig.

Erich Ponto : Orchesterdiener Stræhle.

Kirsten Heiberg : Sângerin Heddy Lindt.

Elisabeth Flickenschildt : Konzertagentin Fuchs.

O. E. Hasse : Konzertagent Urdol.

Produktionsfirma : Tobis-Filmkunst GmbH (Berlin) (Herstellungsgruppe Herbert Engelsing) .

Paul Verhøeven (1901-1975)

(Geboren 23. Juni 1901, Unna, Nordrhein-Westfalen ; gestorben 22. März 1975, München, Bavaria.)

Durch privaten Schauspielunterricht kommt Paul Verhoeven 1921 zum Theater in München, später auch Dresden, Frankfurt und Berlin. Neben kleineren und größeren Rollen versucht er sich als Regisseur und Schreiber. Sein erster Spielfilm ist 1937 die Operettenverfilmung « Die Fledermaus ». Im Folgenden dreht er Lustspiele, Komödien und Melodramen, wobei seine nächste Operettenverfilmung « Die Nacht in Venedig » (1942) von Josef Göbbels als « mustergültige Unterhaltung » gepriesen wird. 1943 wird er Intendant an zwei Berliner Theatern und dreht weiterhin Filme, wie den pompösen « Philharmoniker », welcher in seiner Schlußsequenz das Jahr 1933 als Überwindung der Krise glorifiziert. Der Prestigefilm wird mit den Prädikaten « künstlerisch besonders wertvoll », « staatspolitisch wertvoll » und « kulturell wertvoll » ausgezeichnet. 1944 wird Verhoeven zum Kriegsdienst einberufen, entzieht sich diesem aber. Von 1945 bis 1948 ist er Intendant am Staatsschauspiel München. Er erhält außerdem von der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht die Lizenz zur Filmherstellung und gründet die Firma V-Film. Das erste Projekt « Du bist nicht allein » fällt 1949 mit seinem Nachkriegsstoff beim Publikum durch, was Verhoeven in finanzielle Schwierigkeiten bringt und bestimmte Filme unter Zwang drehen läßt. « Das kalte Herz » ist sein einziger DEFA-Film, auch wenn das Werk später zum großen Erfolg wird. In der BRD dreht er vorwiegend Liebesfilme, Komödien und Volksstücke. Ab 1955 ist Verhoeven als Schauspieler und Regisseur für das Fernsehen tätig, insbesondere für Bühnenstücke und Dokumentarspiele. Daneben bleibt er dem Theater treu, wird zum Beispiel 1963 zum Schauspieldirektor der Münchner Kammerspiele und gründet ein eigenes Tournée-Theaterunternehmen. Politisch macht Paul Verhoeven 1969 für die SPD und Willy Brandt Werbung.

...

Deutscher Film- und Fernsehregisseur, Schauspieler und Theaterdirektor (1901-1975) . Der Begründer der Schauspielerdynastie Verhoeven war als Regisseur von 60 Kino- und Fernsehfilmen, als Theaterdirektor und als Schauspieler, Produzent und Drehbuchautor einer der produktivsten deutschen Filmkünstler. Er inszenierte mit dem Defa-Märchenfilm « Das kalte Herz » (1950, nach Wilhelm Hauff) , der zum Klassiker wurde, seinen schönsten Film (und einen der ersten Farbfilme) . In den NS-Jahren war er Regisseur von Unterhaltungsfilmern (« Der große Schatten ») , die einen Bogen um Politik machten, in den 50er-Jahren inszenierte er Komödien und Dramen mit moralischem Anspruch (« Der Jugendrichter ») . Der Fernsehregisseur Verhoeven ist der Vater von Doku-Dramen, damals Dokumentarspiele genannt (« Der Hitler-Ludendorff Prozeß » , 1971) . Verhoeven starb in München während seiner Rede bei der Trauerfeier für Schauspielerin Therese Giehse.

Paul Verhoeven wurde im westfälischen Unna geboren, wuchs mit dreizehn Geschwistern in einfachen Verhältnissen auf. Er debütierte in den 20er-Jahren am Münchner Schauspielhaus und kam über Wien, Frankfurt-am-Main und Dresden nach Berlin, wo er 1933-1944 Intendant des Theater am Schiffbauerdamm wurde. 1937 inszenierte er die Operette « Die Fledermaus » fürs Kino und wurde Regisseur von Musikfilmen (« Das kleine Hofkonzert » , « Philharmoniker ») , an Screwball Comedies angelehnte Lustspiele (« Der Tag nach der Scheidung » , « Herr Sanders lebt gefährlich ») , Western (« Gold in New Frisco ») und historische Bilderbögen (« Salonwagen E 417 ») . Für das im Theatermilieu angesiedelte Drama « Der große Schatten » (mit Heinrich George) , erhielt er 1942 den Biennale-Preis von Venedig.

Nach dem Krieg wurde Verhøeven 1946-1949 Intendant des Staatsschauspiels München und von 1963 bis zu seinem Tod Schauspieldirektor der Münchner Kammerspiele. Nach dem in der DDR entstandenen « Das kalte Herz », kreisten die Filme der Adenauer-Zeit mit Stars wie Luise Ullrich (« Ich weiß, wofür ich lebe », « Eine Frau von heute »), Heinz Rühmann (« Das kann jedem passieren »), Ruth Leuwerik (« Die goldene Brücke »), Curd Jürgens (« Tingeltangel ») um Schuld, Sühne, Ärzte, Richter und Kriegerwitwen (« Du bist nicht allein »). In seinem letzten Kinofilm, « Ihr schönster Tag » (1961), spielte Inge Meysel die Hauptrolle.

Ende der 50er-Jahre nutzte Verhøeven die Möglichkeiten des Fernsehens und inszenierte für BR und SWF anspruchsvolle Adaptionen moderner Literatur (« Die große Wut des Philip Hotz », Max Frisch), Klassiker wie « Nachtsyl » (Maxim Gorki) und Jaroslav Haseks Schelmenroman « Die Abenteuer des braven Soldaten Schwejk » (1958). In den 60er- und 70er-Jahren folgten Doku-Dramen (« Der Fall Jeanne d'Arc », « Der Panamaskandal », « L.D. Trotzki - Tod im Exil »). In diesen Jahren war Verhøeven Schauspieler in Kinofilmen von Sohn Michæl (« Paarungen »), spielte einen Kardinal in « Oh Jonathan ! » (mit Rühmann) und in Fernsehkrimis (zwei « Tatort »-Folgen um Zollfahnder Kressin; Durbridge-Krimi « Ein Mann namens Harry Brent », Krimi-Dreiteiler « Babeck », mit Jürgens und Senta Berger).

Aus Verhoevens Ehe mit Schauspielerin Doris Kiesow stammen die Töchter Lisa, Monika und Sohn Michæl, Regisseur (und andere « Mutters Courage »), aus der Liaison mit Schauspielerin Edith Schulze-Westrum Sohn Thomas S-W, Tierfilmer. Er ist Schwiegervater von Senta Berger, die 1966 Michæl heiratete, und Mario Adorf, und Großvater der Schauspieler Stella Maria Adorf, Luca und Simon Verhøeven (Regisseur von « Männerherzen »). Er ist auf dem Waldfriedhof München begraben.

...

Paul (Paulus Josef) Verhøeven wurde am 23. Juni 1901 als Sohn eines Fuhrunternehmers im nordrhein-westfälischen Unna geboren, wuchs mit seinen dreizehn Geschwistern in ärmlichen Verhältnissen auf; die Vorfahren stammten aus den Niederlanden und waren Bauern gewesen. Den ursprünglichen Berufswunsch, Architekt zu werden, gab Verhøeven nach kurzer Zeit auf, da er sich schon früh für alles interessiert hatte, was mit dem Theater zusammenhing. Er schlug die künstlerische Laufbahn ein, nahm Schauspielunterricht bei Karl Wüstenhagen (1893-1950) in Dortmund und profilierte sich schon bald als Charakterdarsteller, vornehmlich aber als Regisseur. Diesen Weg konnte er vor allem in Berlin fortsetzen, wo er innerhalb weniger Jahre zu den bedeutendsten Schauspielern und Regisseuren zählte.

Sein Leinwanddebüt hatte Verhøeven 1936 mit der kleinen Rolle des Barmixers Billy in Luis Trenkers frühem Western « Der Kaiser von Kalifornien » gegeben, ein Jahr später trat Verhøeven als Regisseur mit der Operetten-Adaption « Die Fledermaus » in Erscheinung. In der Folgezeit übernahm er Rollen in Filmen anderer Regisseure wie beispielsweise als « Juwelen-Max » in Arthur Maria Rabenalts Abenteuer « Die Drei Codonas » (1940) oder in Robert A. Stemmlers Krimikomödie « Herr Sanders lebt gefährlich » (1944), wo er die Titelrolle des Kriminalromanautors Paul Sanders mimte. In vielen Filmen, für die er hinter der Kamera stand, glänzte er auch als Schauspieler, wie etwa in « Salonwagen E 417 » (1939), « Der Große Schatten » (1942), « Die Nacht in Venedig » (1942) oder « Philharmoniker » (1944); zu etlichen Filmen schrieb er selbst das Drehbuch.

Nach Ende des 2. Weltkrieges arbeitete Paul Verhøeven in München für das Theater, anfangs als Intendant des « Bayerischen Schauspielhauses », später als Gastregisseur und Gastschauspieler an den « Kammerspielen ». Wegen der völligen Zerstörung des « Residenztheaters » 1944 richtete Paul Verhøeven im ebenfalls weitgehend zerstörten Ballsaal der Münchner Residenz eine vielgerühmte Spielstätte ein, das « Theater am Brunnenhof ». Während der Bauzeit des Brunnenhoftheaters inszenierte Paul Verhøeven als erste Aufführung seiner Intendanz im Prinzregenttheater Shakespeares « Sommernachtstraum » mit der bis Kriegsende verbotenen Musik des jüdischen Komponisten Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (und andere mit Rudolf Vogel, Käthe Braun, Elfie Beyer). Verhøeven eröffnete das « Theater am Brunnenhof » mit Lessings « Nathan der Weise », einem Stück, das im Dritten Reich verpönt war und nun den Neubeginn geistiger freier Auseinandersetzung markierte. Unter der Regie von Arnulf Schröder spielten und andere Eva Vaitl, Curd Jürgens und Hellmuth Renar.

Beispielhafte Inszenierungen waren das höchst aktuelle Nachkriegsstück « Wir sind noch einmal davongekommen » von Thornton Wilder, das eine aufregende Begegnung mit amerikanischer Bühnendramaturgie bedeutete, « Ein Traumspiel » von August Strindberg und als Arbeit des Regiegastes Jürgen Fehling « Maria Magdalena » von Friedrich Hebbel (mit Joana Maria Gorvin und Otto Wernicke). Nach schwerer Krankheit und Querelen mit dem Kultusminister Alois Hundhammer legte Paul Verhøeven 1948 die Intendanz nieder. Als das « Residenztheater » wieder hergestellt war, inszenierte Paul Verhøeven unter der Intendanz seines Nachfolgers Alois Johannes Lippl 1952 Shakespeares « Wintermärchen ». Noch ein letztes Mal war er an diesem Haus tätig - als Darsteller. Und wieder mit einem Stück von William Shakespeare. Unter der Regie von Fritz Kortner spielte Verhøeven 1955 den « Julius Cæsar ».

Auch für den Film blieb der « Theatermann » Verhøeven unverzichtbar und so trat er auch hier weiterhin mit prägnanten Figuren auf der Leinwand in Erscheinung und setzte erfolgreich seine Arbeit als Regisseur fort. Meist war er mit Rollen in « seinen » Filmen präsent, wie 1951 in « Heidelberger Romanze » als Detektiv Schulze neben Liselotte Pulver und O.W. Fischer, oder in « Roman einer Siebzehnjährigen » (1955). Mit Luise Ullrich drehte er « Vergiss die Liebe nicht » (1953), mit Karlheinz Böhm und Gert Fröbe « Hochzeit auf Reisen » (1953), mit Gerhard Riedmann und Waltraut Haas « Jede Nacht in einem anderen Bett » (1957) oder mit Heinz Rühmann « Der Jugendrichter » (1960), mit dem er auch seinen letzten Theatertriumph in der Neil-Simon-Komödie « Sonny Boys » feierte. Ein schöner Erfolg wurde auch der Film « Ihr schönster Tag » (1962), inszeniert mit Inge Meysel und Rudolf Platte nach Curth Flatows Bühnenstück « Das Fenster zum Flur », für seine Regiearbeiten « Die Schuld des Doktor Homma » (1951) und « Vergiss die Liebe nicht » (1953) wurden mit dem « Bundesfilmpreis in Gold » ausgezeichnet.

Ab den 1960ern arbeitete Verhøeven auch vermehrt für das Fernsehen, unter seiner Regie entstanden erfolgreiche Fernsehspiele wie « Der Fehltritt » (1960), « Bedaure, falsch verbunden » (1962), « Mamselle Nitouche » (1963), « Der Fall Jeanne D'Arc » (1966), « Der Fall Mata Hari » (1966) (hier spielte er den Oberst Goubet), « Gottes zweite Garnitur » (1967) oder « Der Panamaskandal » (1967); zu einer seiner letzten Regiearbeiten zählt 1971 das Fernsehspiel « Der Hitler-Ludendorff Prozeß ».

Als herausragender Schauspieler bleibt Verhøeven auf dem Bildschirm in nachhaltiger Erinnerung, meist verkörperte der Mann mit den markanten Gesichtszügen hintergründige Charaktere. So sah man ihn mit der Rolle des Porphyri in Franz Peter Wirths « Raskolnikoff » (1959), in John Oldens « An der schönen blauen Donau » (1965) spielte er im gleichen

Jahr den Legationsrat von Guben, für die Interpretation der Titelrolle in Peter Beauvais' « Bernhard Lichtenberg » (1965) erhielt Verhoeven die « Goldene Kamera ». Erneut unter der Regie von Peter Beauvais agierte er 1968 als Samuel Fielding in dem Francis-Durbridge-Mehrteiler « Ein Mann namens Harry Brent » und als Körner in dem von Wolfgang Becker inszenierten dreiteiligen Krimi « Babeck » oder stand ein Jahr später als Theaterdirektor Hassenreuter in Beauvais' Hauptmann-Adaption « Die Ratten » zusammen mit Inge Meysel (Frau John) vor der Fernsehkamera. 1971-1972 zeigte er sich zudem in zwei « Tatort » -Produktionen, spielte in « Kressin und der tote Mann im Fleet » (1971) den Professor Petersen, in « Kressin und der Mann mit dem gelben Koffer » (1972) den Waffenhändler Nobiling. Im Kino konnte man Verhoeven zuletzt in Franz Peter Wirths Verwechslungsschwank « Oh Jonathan - oh Jonathan ! » (1973) als Monsignore Berghammer neben Protagonist Heinz Rühmann bewundern.

Verhoeven war seit Ende der 1950er Jahre lange Zeit Präsident der « Deutschen Film-Union », dem Dachverband der deutschen Filmschaffenden. In den 1960er Jahren zählte er zu den Dozenten der ersten Stunde am « Deutschen Institut für Film und Fernsehen » (DIFF), dem Vorläufer der « Münchner Filmhochschule ».

Der Künstler war seit 1930 mit der Theaterschauspielerin Doris Kiesow (1902-1973) verheiratet, die ihre eigene Karriere für die Kinder zurückgestellt hatte; aus der Verbindung stammen die Kinder Lis, Monika und Michæl; die 1931 geborene Lis Verhoeven ist ebenfalls eine renommierte Schauspielerin geworden, Sohn Doktor Michæl Verhoeven (geboren 1938), der seit 1966 mit der Schauspielerin Senta Berger verheiratet ist, gehört zu den bedeutenden deutschen Regisseuren beziehungsweise Filmproduzenten und stand in seinen frühen Jahren in verschiedenen Filmen ebenfalls als erfolgreicher Schauspieler vor der Kamera. Aus der Beziehung mit der Schauspielerin Edith Schultze-Westrum stammt der Sohn Thomas Schultze-Westrum, der Zoologe und Tierfilmer ist. Auch Paul Verhoevens Enkel Luca Verhoeven (geboren 1979) und Simon Verhoeven (geboren 1972) haben sich inzwischen einen Namen als Schauspieler beziehungsweise Regisseur gemacht und führen somit erfolgreich die Tradition der Verhoeven-Dynastie fort. Paul Verhoeven war überdies der Schwiegervater von Mario Adorf, der 1963 Tochter Lis Verhoeven geheiratet hatte, inzwischen jedoch von ihr geschieden ist. Die gemeinsame Tochter Stella Adorf ist ebenfalls Schauspielerin, unter anderem war sie in Michæl Verhoevens Film « Das schreckliche Mädchen » (1990) zu sehen.

Aus der Beziehung Paul Verhoevens der Schauspielerin Edith Schultze-Westrum (1904-1981) stammt der Sohn Thomas Schultze-Westrum, der Zoologe und Tierfilmer ist.

Ende Oktober 2003 strahlte der Bayerische Rundfunk die Dokumentation « Die Verhoevens » aus, in dem der Regisseur und Autor Felix Möller drei Generationen Theater, Film und Fernsehen beziehungsweise eine außergewöhnliche Familie porträtierte. « In sehr persönlichen Gesprächen, raren Archivaufnahmen und Ausschnitten aus 70 Jahren deutscher Filmgeschichte entsteht ein liebevolles Panorama », so « Der Spiegel »; der Film ist inzwischen auch auf DVD erhältlich.

Im Oktober 2005 erschien dann von Michæl Verhoeven unter dem Titel « Paul, ich und wir » ein ebenso persönliches wie unterhaltsames Buch, in dem der Autor ein schillerndes Bild seiner berühmten Familie bis hin zu seiner Frau Senta Berger und seinen Söhnen nachzeichnet. Fast ein ganzes Jahrhundert wird in der Familiengeschichte gespiegelt und macht mit den Menschen das lebendig und nacherlebbar, was geschah.

Le cinéma sous le 3e « Reich »

La période du cinéma sous le 3e « Reich » est l'histoire du cinéma allemand entre 1933 et 1945. Ce cinéma est marqué d'abord par une « aryanisation » radicale, c'est-à-dire l'éloignement des artistes juifs, ainsi que par l'étatisation progressive des structures artistiques et par des orientations politiques marquées. Il fait suite à la période plus diversifiée artistiquement parlant du cinéma sous la République de Weimar, que d'aucuns ont qualifiée d' « âge d'or du cinéma allemand ». Néanmoins, contrairement à une idée répandue, les films de propagande ne représentent qu'une infime partie des métrages réalisés sous le régime nazi. Josef Goebbels, ministre de la Propagande et de l'Éducation du peuple, qui a sous sa tutelle l'industrie cinématographique allemande, la mène certes d'une main de fer, notamment en imposant ses choix dans divers scénarios ou pour un acteur ou une actrice en particulier. Mais il a compris, dès 1933, que le public se désintéresse des films marqués idéologiquement. Ainsi, les films réalisés sous le 3e « Reich » ne seront pas des odes au régime, mais la plupart du temps des divertissements ou des films historiques, parfois et discrètement marqués d'anglophobie et d'antisémitisme. Par ailleurs, la mise au pas du cinéma allemand a affaibli son potentiel de modernité « internationale ». Si l'histoire du cinéma n'a pas vraiment retenu les noms des réalisateurs des films tournés sous Goebbels en dehors de Leni Riefenstahl, ceux de Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau, Fritz Lang ou Georg Wilhelm Pabst restent aujourd'hui encore auréolés de prestige.

Les thèmes traités dans les films changent au gré de la situation géopolitique de l'Allemagne. Ainsi, « Le Juif Süß », réalisé par Veit Harlan en 1940 obtient un grand succès et est considéré comme emblématique de l'incursion nazie et antisémite dans le cinéma allemand. Réalisé en 1944, « Kolberg », en s'inspirant d'un événement historique des guerres napoléoniennes, vise à redonner espoir et combativité au peuple alors que la Seconde Guerre mondiale est quasiment perdue pour l'Allemagne. Entre 1933 et 1945, le cinéma allemand est le 2e cinéma du monde quant au nombre de films produits, qui sont diffusés progressivement dans toute l'Europe occupée. Il bénéficie de nombreuses avancées technologiques et artistiques, notamment par le travail de cadrage et d'ambiance de Leni Riefenstahl (usage du « travelling », de caméras sur rails et de caméras sous-marines) ou l'invention du cinéma en couleur avec Agfacolor, dont le film « Les femmes sont les meilleurs diplomates » est le 1er à utiliser la technique.

En 1933, dès l'arrivée au pouvoir des Nazis, le style de la production change rapidement. Plus d'un millier de personnes travaillant dans les métiers du cinéma choisissent l'émigration ou y sont contraintes. Le cinéma allemand, qui a tenu tête à l'industrie hollywoodienne jusqu'à l'avènement du cinéma parlant, se voit privé de grandes personnalités parties à l'étranger, dont les réalisateurs Fritz Lang, Robert Wiene, Henrik Galeen ou, plus tard, Detlef Sierck (le futur Douglas Sirk), le chef opérateur Eugen Schüfftan et les acteurs Fritz Kortner, Peter Lorre, Conrad Veidt ou, plus tard, les actrices Brigitte Helm et Elisabeth Bergner. En raison de la politique d' « aryanisation » du cinéma menée par le régime nazi, les Juifs ne peuvent plus exercer leur métier en Allemagne. La loi du 6 juin 1933 interdit aux Allemands qui ne sont pas de « pure souche », de travailler dans le cinéma et des valeurs montantes du cinéma allemand, comme Kurt Bernhardt, Robert Siodmak ou Max Ophüls, sont ainsi contraintes à l'exil. Certains artistes n'ayant pu fuir seront, comme Kurt Gerron, tués dans les camps de concentration.

Passionné de cinéma, Adolf Hitler regardait régulièrement des films (parfois, 3 dans la même soirée), imposait à ses

invités après un dîner officiel le visionnage d'un film et pouvait même annuler des réunions pour cela. Il a vu au moins une vingtaine de fois le « Siegfried » de Fritz Lang, qu'il avait même envisagé de nommer à la direction de l'industrie cinématographique allemande, malgré ses origines partiellement juives. Bien que ces films étaient boycottés officiellement par l'Allemagne nazie à partir de 1935, il se plaisait à regarder des dessins animés américains comme « Blanche-Neige et les 7 Nains » ou des « Mickey Mouse » .

Josef Goebbels s'intéresse très tôt au potentiel du cinéma comme instrument de propagande. Adolf Hitler et lui-même sont par ailleurs des cinéphiles. Il propose à Fritz Lang, dont il admire certains films (« Les Nibelungen » , « Metropolis ») un poste dans la « Internationale Filmkammer » , ou IFK (Camera internazionale del film - Bureau international du cinéma) . Fritz Lang (dont la mère était d'origine juive) refuse et s'exile en France avant de rejoindre les États-Unis. Goebbels peut néanmoins compter sur la collaboration de quelques pionniers du cinéma allemand comme Carl Fröhlich, Carl Hoffmann, Peter Ostermayr, Paul Wegener ou Walter Ruttmann, mais aussi de techniciens importants de la période expressionniste comme Fritz Arno Wagner, Günther Rittau, Otto Hunte, Walter Röhrig ou Hermann Warm. De grands acteurs de l'époque du cinéma muet et des débuts du parlant, par conviction ou par opportunisme, travaillent aussi pour une industrie cinématographique allemande désormais contrôlée par le pouvoir nazi : Alfred Abel, Lil Dagover, Gustav Fröhlich, Gustaf Gründgens, Emil Jannings, Rudolf Klein-Rogge ou Werner Krauß. Certaines personnalités du cinéma allemand qui professaient des idées de gauche sous la République de Weimar se rallient au régime nazi comme les réalisateurs Werner Hochbaum et Phil Jutzi ou s'en accommodent à l'image de l'acteur Heinrich George ou du réalisateur Georg Wilhelm Pabst, après son retour en Allemagne en 1939.

La loi nationale-socialiste sur le cinéma est votée le 16 février 1934. Tous les scénarios sont contrôlés par un « Reichsfilm dramaturg » (censeur cinématographique du « Reich ») afin de vérifier leur conformité avec la doctrine nazie. Une fois le film terminé, il est soumis à un comité de censure issu du ministère de la Propagande. Cette procédure de contrôle s'applique également aux films étrangers et, à partir de l'ordonnance du 3 juillet 1935, pour les films réalisés avant 1933 (ceux-ci doivent être examinés jusqu'au 30 décembre 1935, courant le risque de perdre leur visa d'exploitation) . Les films censurés ne rentrent officiellement pas dans le cadre des 3 mentions (« Prädikat ») décernées par le ministère :

Groupe I : film d'intérêt national.

Groupe II : film reconnu.

Groupe III : film recommandé aux jeunes.

Aussi, les films contraires à la volonté du gouvernement, adaptés d'ouvrages d'auteurs placés sur une liste noire (« Z-Liste ») , ou bien réalisés et interprétés par des Juifs ou des acteurs ayant quitté l'Allemagne (à l'instar de Marlene Dietrich) sont interdits. Néanmoins, cette politique s'ancre dans une tradition plus ancienne : en 1929, une forme de censure existait déjà si les films ne rentraient pas dans les « Prädikat » suivants : « artistique » , « propre à la formation du peuple » ou « instructif » .

La Chambre de la culture du « Reich », ainsi que sa sub-division de la Chambre du film du « Reich » (« Reichsfilmkammer », la Ire chambre créée, dès 1933) est chargée de promouvoir l'art allemand selon les idéaux prônés par le NSDAP. En 1937, le président de cette Chambre est Oswald Lehnien.

Pendant la Guerre, la production cinématographique se partage entre des films de propagande comme « Le Juif Süß » (« Jud Süß ») de Veit Harlan (1940), des films de divertissement comme « Ce diable de garçon » (« Die Feuerzangenbowle ») de Helmut Weiß (1944) et des films à caractère historique se situant entre le divertissement et la propagande comme ceux consacrés à Frédéric le Grand (avec régulièrement Otto Gebühr dans le rôle principal). C'est au plus fort de la Guerre que les plus grosses productions allemandes sont tournées à l'exemple de « La Ville dorée » (1942) ou de « Kolberg » (1944) de Veit Harlan, ou encore le film en couleur « Les Aventures fantastiques du baron Münchhausen » de Josef von Báky. Les grandes fresques historiques ou les films de pure propagande comme « Le Juif éternel » (« Der ewige Jude », 1940) ou « Retour au foyer » (« Heimkehr », 1941) laissent parfois la place à des histoires d'amour, réalisées pour la Ire fois en couleur grâce à la technique allemande de l'Agfacolor (« Frauen sind doch bessere Diplomaten » de Georg Jacoby, 1941), ce qui permet au public d'échapper à la tristesse du quotidien et d'oublier l'horreur des bombardements.

Gœbbels déclare ainsi :

« La bonne humeur a son importance dans la bonne marche de la Guerre. »

Entre 1943 et 1944, au plus fort des bombardements alliés, le nombre de spectateurs dépasse pour la Ire fois le milliard, ce qui fait du cinéma allemand le 2e au monde, après le cinéma américain. Les plus grands succès du cinéma allemand pendant la Guerre appartiennent au genre de la romance :

« Die große Liebe de Rolf Hansen » (1942) : 8 millions de « Reichsmark » .

« Wunschkonzert » de Eduard von Borsody (1940) : 7,6 millions de « Reichsmark » .

« Frauen sind doch bessere Diplomaten » de Georg Jacoby (1941) : 7 millions de « Reichsmark » .

« Wiener Blut » de Willi Forst (1942) : 7 millions de « Reichsmark » .

Nathalie de Voghelær déclare en ce sens :

« Jusque dans les dernières années de la Guerre, la “ Ufa ” continue de produire des films respirant la joie de vivre et l'ambiance de villégiature promptes à faire oublier les tristes réalités de la vie et à susciter le réveil du moral des Allemands. Cette orientation répond pleinement aux exigences de Gœbbels de participer à la “ Guerre totale ” et de croire à la victoire coûte que coûte. Cependant, les productions s'épuisent et, entre 1944 et 1945, de nombreux films restent inachevés avant l'effondrement du National-Socialisme. »

Pendant la Guerre, les acteurs, réalisateurs et le personnel technique sont exemptés du service militaire : ils sont classés « UK » . Néanmoins, leurs conditions vont de mal en pis : Fritz Schuch, qui réalise « Une journée fabuleuse » (« Ein toller Tag ») aux studios de Neubabelsberg déclare à propos de cette période :

« Presque chaque jour, il y avait des attaques aériennes. Le plus souvent, nous ne pouvions donc travailler qu'une ou 2 heures, le matin, avant que la sirène ne se mit à hurler. »

Un rapport de la « Ufa » établi en septembre 1944 que 87 des 249 salles de cinéma du « Deutsche Film Theater GmbH » sont détruites ou inutilisables et qu'une grande partie des autres doivent changer d'emplacement. Malgré l'antagonisme l'opposant à Hermann Göring, grand mécène de théâtre, Josef Goebbels met en place le difficile plan de reconversion de 270 théâtres et salles de spectacle en cinémas. Le public n'est néanmoins pas au rendez-vous, ne serait-ce que du fait de la place prise par la Guerre dans la vie quotidienne.

Le régime nazi développe, à l'instar du régime soviétique, un cinéma de propagande en y consacrant de grands moyens. Ce cinéma est vite dominé par la figure de Leni Riefenstahl. Dès 1934, elle filme le congrès de Nuremberg dans « Le Triomphe de la volonté » (« Triumph des Willens ») . Par la suite, elle magnifie les Jeux olympiques de 1936 à Berlin dans « Les Dieux du stade » (« Olympia ») , inventant par là même de nouvelles techniques de cadrage et de montage qui influenceront de nombreux réalisateurs par la suite. D'autres cinéastes allemands de l'époque s'exercent avec un certain talent au cinéma de propagande comme Hans Steinhoff, le réalisateur du célèbre « Jeune Hitlérien Quex » (« Hitlerjunge Quex » , 1933) , Veit Harlan, Karl Ritter ou Hans Bertram.

En dehors de quelques films phares, la production des films de propagande ne rencontre guère de succès auprès des spectateurs. Cherchant à distiller le message nazi dans des films grand public, le régime favorise la réalisation de films à caractère historique tels que « La Jeune fille Jeanne » (« Das Mädchen Johanna ») de Gustav Ucicky (1935) , qui donne à voir sous les traits d'une Jeanne d'Arc guidant un peuple désespéré une allégorie d'Hitler. De grandes figures de la culture ou de la science allemande sont célébrées à des fins de propagande comme dans « La Lutte héroïque » (« Robert Koch, der Bekämpfer des Todes ») de Hans Steinhoff (1939) . Le cinéma de propagande, notamment par le biais de documentaires, va jusqu'à instiller des contre-vérités historiques : par exemple, dans « Vestiges du passé allemand » (« Zeugen deutscher Vorzeit » , 1941) , on présente de réelles fouilles archéologiques comme la découverte de vestiges et de dessins proche de la svastika, « preuves tangibles du caractère ancestral de la civilisation germanique » . Des documentaires contribuent aussi à cette propagande, comme « L'élite SS Adolf Hitler en action » (« Leibstandarte SS Adolf Hitler im Einsatz » , 1941) qui présente l'avancée d'une troupe d'élite de Berlin à Athènes, ou « Sterilisation beim Manne durch Vasorektion » (1936) , qui présente « les opérations chirurgicales de stérilisation chez l'homme par vasectomie. Filmées dans un hôpital ultra-moderne, ces scènes visent à démontrer la rapidité de cette intervention, réalisée sous anesthésie locale, en seulement 5 à 10 minutes » .

En 1933, parmi les 3 premiers films « commandés » par le nouveau régime, on relève « SA-Mann Brand » , « Hans Westmar » et « Le Jeune Hitlérien Quex » . Si ce dernier film obtient un vrai succès populaire, et une empathie du public à propos de la mort du héros, l'adhésion du public à de tels métrages politiques est un échec. Par exemple, le film « SA-Mann Brandt » , s'il bénéficie d'un avis officiel élogieux (un communiqué officiel fait part d'un film «

particulièrement recommandé pour sa valeur artistique »), des officiels reconnaissent officiellement qu'il s'agit d'un « navet de circonstance ». Goebbels, fasciné par le cinéma soviétique qu'il trouve néanmoins trop « moral », va s'en inspirer pour éviter dès lors les films de propagande explicites, mais plutôt la production de « films à grand budgets à l'esthétique recherchée et soignée ». On s'oriente dès lors vers des divertissements : comédies musicales, films « téléphones blancs », « Heimatfilm » ou films sur le passé prussien. Ainsi, sur les 1,350 longs-métrages produits entre 1933 et 1945, on compte 1,200 divertissements.

Concernant les documentaires produits par le régime, Christian Delage écrit en substance que « l'uniformisation est de mise. Ceci nécessite une organisation et une planification du management, afin d'engendrer des standards de production, tout en trouvant des nouveautés, en suscitant la surprise pour présenter un documentaire qui serait à la fois déjà connu tout en n'ayant jamais existé. »

Nathalie de Voghelær note :

« L'idée est donc qu'un film nazi doit être avant tout une œuvre d'art, mais pas de n'importe quel art, uniquement de l'art national-socialiste. Ainsi, afin d'endiguer tout bourrage de crâne trop intensif, la plupart des films allemands n'ont pas, trop ouvertement, des buts propagandistes. Dès lors, un bon film de propagande est un film où on ne voit pas la propagande. »

En 1937, Josef Goebbels prononce un discours au 1er congrès annuel de la Chambre nationale du film : il édicte plusieurs directives, notamment sur les scénarios qui doivent toucher le public, opter pour une langue compréhensible de tous et, lorsqu'on adapte un livre, être dans un style « purement cinématographique ».

Comme le montre Siegfried Kracauer dans « De Caligari à Hitler », la rupture entre le cinéma sous la République de Weimar et le 3e « Reich » n'est pas totale ; même, certaines thématiques trouvent des résonances dans les 2 périodes. Parmi les films précédant le 3e « Reich », on remarque la présence de certains thèmes dont le futur régime se portera garant : le nationalisme (« Die letzte Kompanie » - « La dernière compagnie », 1930), la jeunesse (« Ein Burschenlied aus Heidelberg » - « Un champ de compagnon pour le salut », 1930) l'antisémitisme (« Liebling des Götter » - « Favori de Dieu », 1930), la mise en exergue d'un héros de l'histoire allemande (« Das Flötenkonzert von Sans-Souci » - « Le Concert de flûte de Sans-Souci », 1930), le Heimat-Film (« Der Rebell » - « L'Héroïque embuscade », 1932), et enfin, la notion de sacrifice (« Morgenrot » - « L'Aube », 1933).

Nathalie de Voghelær note 3 idées importantes dans le processus :

Le « renforcement de la cohésion nationale », le « respect de la tradition » et l'« extermination des sous-hommes », en précisant néanmoins que ces lignes évoluent au gré de la situation géopolitique internationale.

Également, elle relève 3 thématiques récurrentes dans l'art populaire prôné par le régime :

La « mythologie et la Grèce antique », le « néo-Classicisme » (notamment l'histoire de la Bavière et de l'Allemagne)

ainsi que l' « idéologie nazie » (fusionnant la politique et l'art) .

Et des discours politiques en cohérence avec la politique du régime :

L'antibolchévisme et l'antisémitisme.

3 autres thèmes sont également récurrents dans les films documentaires :

« La cosmogonie qui inscrit le racisme et l'antisémitisme dans une exaltation de la nature originelle et du foyer germanique. »

« La recherche de la légitimité et d'une cohésion nationale dans l'instauration du 3e " Reich " » .

« La représentation des catégories sociales et des modèles culturels annonçant l'avènement d'un État racial millénaire. »

Nathalie de Voghelær note, également, selon les théories nazies exposées dans la presse de l'époque, que le cinéma « est défini comme un instrument destiné à populariser, chez les spectateurs de cinéma, les grands thèmes du nouveau régime en mettant en avant la spécificité allemande, le nationalisme, l'armée. Certains producteurs se conforment à cette idéologie nazie et la suivent dans les œuvres qu'ils promotionnent. Ce positionnement peut se comprendre car il est en relation directe avec le contexte de l'époque : la défaite subie lors de la Première Guerre mondiale et l'humiliation du Traité de Versailles. De plus, les pouvoirs économiques et culturels connaissent une très forte hausse. Les protagonistes qui adhèrent à ces nouvelles idées ont, dès lors, l'impression de participer à une certaine reconstruction de l'Allemagne, tout en favorisant l'avènement d'une société nouvelle. »

Les Iers films du régime sont en fait des documentaires (« Kulturfilm ») , réalisés dès 1932 par le NSDAP à sa propre gloire. Ces métrages sont néanmoins d'une qualité relative, le Parti n'ayant ni le temps, ni l'argent nécessaires pour créer « ex nihilo » une force cinématographique. Sa stratégie va donc être de mettre sous tutelle l'industrie du cinéma, florissante sous la République de Weimar, afin de profiter de son expérience et de son aura, puis de la concentrer en monopole. Le régime relance dès lors l'industrie cinématographique, moins productrice depuis la fin des années 1920. En 1935-1936, les studios sont alors utilisés à 95 % , le nombre de courts-métrages double et on compte 20 % de plus de longs-métrages ; les spectateurs suivent, puisque leur nombre est multiplié par 422. En outre, l'Allemagne est alors le plus gros producteur de films au niveau européen (80 films par an) et le 2e au niveau mondial derrière les États-Unis. Ces succès sont liés notamment à des innovations, comme les nouvelles pellicules ou la mise au point de nouveaux cadrages. Certes, pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, certains artistes doivent s'engager, mais, en 1943, pas moins de 83 longs-métrages sont produits.

Pour ce qui préfigurer le « Programme Aktion T4 » (la loi du 14 août 1934 autorise déjà leur stérilisation) , des films insistent sur la nécessité de l'euthanasie des handicapés : « L'Héritage » (« Das Erbe » , 1935) use de métaphores animales (chien contre hérisson ; chat contre perdrix) pour « illustrer la lutte permanente opposant les

différents animaux entre eux et la sélection naturelle qui s'opère selon la loi du plus fort » . En 1934-1935, 2 films muets sont réalisés : « Toute la vie est lutte » (« Alles Leben ist Kampf ») et « Maladie héréditaire » (« Erbkrank ») ; le 1er use encore de la métaphore animale en montrant qu'une espèce différente intégrée dans un nouveau milieu est inutile, et expose de façon détournée des raisons « politique, financière et sociale » pour faire passer le lourd message de la nécessité de l'euthanasie ; le second énumère des reproches faits à ces handicapés (viol, alcoolisme, pyromanie) , leur coût supposé (1,2 milliards de « Reichsmark » , contre 713 millions à l'administration du « Reich ») et place « bien en évidence, dans le même cadre filmique, des êtres dont certains sont condamnés à rester dans un état quasi-végétatif et des infirmières dont la jeunesse et l'entrain semblent gâchés par une telle proximité » . La loi sur l'euthanasie sera autorisée en 1939.

Des films antisémites sont également réalisés. Néanmoins, comme le note Nathalie de Voghelær, « à l'instar des idées prônées par le Parti, il est importants, dans les documentaires, que la haine des Juifs n'apparaisse pas comme résultant d'une volonté pré-établie par les autorités nazies mais comme émanant de la réalité même des mœurs et du comportement de ceux qui constituent l'anti-race » . Le documentaire « Le Juif éternel » , réalisé par Fritz Hippler, se propose par exemple d'exposer de façon didactiques les « tares » des Juifs : physiques (« spécifiques aux hommes et aux femmes juives ») , sociétal (« on dénonce leur mode de vie dans les ghettos comme étant une réalité tout en insistant sur la barbarie de leurs coutumes religieuses ») et sociales (« on compare les Juifs à des parasites et plus précisément à des rats ») .

Un commentaire présent dans le film dit ainsi :

« Partout où ils surgissent, les rats causent la ruine du pays, détruisant les biens et la nourriture des hommes. C'est ainsi qu'ils propagent des maladies telles que la peste, la lèpre, le typhus ou le choléra. Ils sont sournois, peureux et cruels et apparaissent la plupart du temps en bande. Ils représentant parmi les animaux l'élément de destruction perfide et souterrain. Exactement comme les Juifs parmi les hommes. Le peuple parasite des Juifs regroupe une grande partie des criminels internationaux. »

Néanmoins, le film va parfois à contre-courant puisque certaines scènes, comme « cette image d'une petite fille qui sourit timidement et qui est pleine d'émotion et de beauté » , émeuvent le public. Dans le documentaire « Theresienstadt » (« Der Führer schenkt den Juden eine Stadt » - « Le Führer offre une ville aux Juifs » , 1944-1945) , le régime va jusqu'à présenter le camp de concentration de Theresienstadt en Autriche comme un « camp modèle » , montrant les détenus faisant des activités ludiques et intellectuelles. Le réalisateur juif Kurt Gerron, alors emprisonné dans le camp où il tient un cabaret pour distraire les autres détenus, est forcé de le réaliser. Après la réalisation de ce film, Gerron est déporté dans le dernier convoi pour Auschwitz, où il est ensuite gazé dès son arrivée, avec son équipe technique.

Il convient de noter que la Chambre du film du « Reich » ne favorise que rarement les films politiques, et donc antisémites, ce qui explique leur petit nombre. Le 1er film de fiction antisémite est « Les Rothschilds » (1940) , d'Erich Waschneck, qui retrace l'ascension de la famille Rothschild après son enrichissement lors des guerres napoléoniennes et veut, par là, prouver que les Juifs sont les seuls responsables de la Guerre. « Le Juif Süß » , réalisé

la même année, constitue l'une des rares incursions du cinéma nazi dans un vrai discours de propagande raciale ; le caractère antisémite et la volonté délibérée du réalisateur ont été longuement débattus, Veit Harlan se défendant en avançant que « tout refus d'obéir l'aurait entraîné devant un peloton d'exécution » .

Des films anglophobes sont également réalisés, comme « Le Président Krüger » de Hans Steinhoff : ce dernier long-métrage présente des massacres commis par les Britanniques durant la Guerre des Boers, l'établissement de camps de concentration et les discours « gâteux et hypocrites » de la reine Victoria. La critique n'est évidemment pas gratuite, et le parallèle historique est aisément devinable à la fin du film, lorsque le président boer Paul Kruger déclare :

« Voilà comment l'Angleterre a soumis notre petit peuple par les moyens les plus cruels. Pourtant, le jour de la revanche finira par arriver. Je ne sais pas quand, mais tant de sang ne peut avoir coulé en vain, tant de larmes ne seront pas versées pour rien. Nous n'étions qu'un petit peuple faible. Des peuples grands et puissants se lèveront contre la tyrannie britannique. Ils écraseront l'Angleterre. Dieu sera avec eux. Alors la route sera ouverte vers un monde meilleur. »

Parmi les autres films anti-britanniques, on peut citer « Carl Peters » , qui prend comme cadre le monde colonial d'avant la Première Guerre mondiale, ou bien « Ma vie pour l'Irlande » et « Le Renard de Glenarvon » , lesquels se basent sur la guerre d'indépendance irlandaise et ses prémices, afin de dépeindre les Britanniques comme des oppresseurs. Dans « Titanic » , le scénario prend des distances avec la réalité historique en affirmant que c'est l'avarice des Britanniques qui a causé le naufrage du célèbre paquebot.

Devant l'enlisement du conflit mondial, Josef Gæbbels infléchit dès 1941 sa politique cinématographique :

« Son objectif est à présent de dissiper dans l'esprit du peuple allemand l'idée d'une victoire proche et facile pour, au contraire, réveiller le civisme allemand en vue d'une " Guerre totale " . »

C'est par exemple pour cela que s'amoncellent les « Fredericus-Filme » , films biographiques des Rois de Prusse Frédéric-Guillaume Ier, Frédéric-Guillaume II, Frédéric-Guillaume III et Frédéric II, ce dernier étant le plus représenté, notamment par l'acteur Otto Gebühr, alors très populaire en Allemagne. Le choix de cette période est clivant, puisqu'elle est assez lointaine pour prendre des libertés sur les scénarios tout en conservant le prestige de ces monarques dans l'imaginaire collectif allemand ; d'autre part, ils sont vus comme des référents par Adolf Hitler, proposent une gamme de caractères adaptables à plusieurs postures idéologiques et enfin rejoignent l'ambition d'agrandir l'Allemagne (à l'époque la Prusse) .

Ces films concentrent plusieurs thèmes récurrents : le monarque qui agit tel un guide, une « figure bienveillante mais inflexible » , des Autrichiens insouciantes et efféminés, des Français courtisans et intrigants et une Prusse frugale, contrastant avec l'opulence insolente de ses ennemis. Parmi ces films, on peut citer « Les 2 Rois » (1935) de Hans Steinhoff sur un scénario de Thea von Harbou (ce film insistant sur le message de l'obéissance paternelle) ou « Le Grand Roi » (1942) de Veit Harlan. Dans ce second film, on peut relever des répliques laissant penser à une attitude à avoir par rapport à l'actualité de la Guerre : « douter de la victoire, c'est de la haute trahison » ou « il fuit devant

le combat, il fuit devant la vie » ; pourtant, les directives des autorités compétentes vont contre cela ; elle déclarent :

« Ce film, excellent tant du point de vue artistique que du point de vue de la vulgarisation, mérite une attention particulière de la part des journaux. Néanmoins, dans les commentaires, toute comparaison entre Frédéric II le Grand et le “ Führer ” est à éviter par tous les moyens, de même que toute analogie avec l'époque actuelle, en particulier la note pessimiste qui se dégage à plusieurs reprises des dialogues au début du film, ne doit en aucun cas être identifiée à l'attitude du peuple dans la Guerre présente. »

De grands moyens sont mis à disposition pour le film, comme « l'aide de soldats et de la police de Berlin » et la réquisition de 5,000 chevaux. Néanmoins, c'est le film « Kolberg » qui fait prendre conscience du gigantisme des super-productions de l'époque : 8 millions et demi de « Reichsmark » sont dépensées et 180,000 soldats sont réquisitionnés pour certaines scènes.

Veit Harlan, le réalisateur, note même :

« Du sel fut amené en wagons entiers pour figurer de la neige dont devait être recouverte la jetée du pont. Des quartiers de la cité de Kolberg furent reconstruits en décors, près de Berlin, pour être bombardés par les canons de Napoléon puis incendiés. 6 caméras (dont une sur un bateau et une autre dans la nacelle d'un ballon captif) filmèrent simultanément la chute de la ville. Je provoquais une inondation autour de Kolberg en faisant dévier la rivière Persante par plusieurs canaux spécialement construits dans ce but. »

Le film, apologie du sacrifice, s'achève sur cette phrase : « Le meilleur naît toujours de la douleur. » Il sera parachuté aux soldats défendant la forteresse de La Rochelle « pour inciter ce bastion allemand à résister en attendant l'arrivée des renforts » .

Le cinéma de la période véhicule peu de figures féminines de 1er plan. Dans le film « Le Juif Süß » , la mort de Dorothée l'érige en martyre. On relève un certain nombre de documentaires instructifs réalisés pour les BDM. En effet, les jeunes (les filles mais surtout les garçons) , représentant l'espoir du régime, et une masse influençable par l'éducation et l'embrigadement, n'est pas négligée. On veut, en effet, les détacher du corps familial, pour lui substituer l'autorité des Jeunesses hitlériennes et, de fait, du « Führer » . On oppose ces 2 conceptions, en vantant par là même un univers champêtre mythifié : le film « Le Chemin vers nous » (« Der Weg zu uns » , 1939) qui met en face une ville industrielle fournie d'usines avec un camp de jeunesse organisé dans la nature ; aussi, le film « Rivage hostile » (« Feindliche Ufer » , 1938) raconte la confrontation entre des salariés d'usine et des salariés agricoles. On évite aussi de montrer des rôles d'universitaires à l'écran (susceptibles de développer un esprit critique chez les étudiants) et on propose, sous la forme de jeux, la préparation au combat par exemple dans les films « Soldats de demain » (« Soldaten von Morgen » , 1941) , « Les cadets apprennent à voler » (« Pimpfe lernen fliegen » , 1941) .

Cette opposition se poursuit dans les films destinés aux adultes, le monde agricole étant mis en avant, en dépit de la réalité industrielle de l'Allemagne. Des films traitent bien de la vie des ouvriers, mais c'est davantage pour insister sur l'idée de cohésion et d'uniformité (comme dans les chantiers de « Ils sont quatre cents à construire un pont » - «

Vierhundert bauen eine Brücke » , 1937) : par exemple, « L'Allemagne au travail » rend compte de la dilution de l'individualité de ceux qui travaillent en usine, mais idéalise en même temps les soirées de l'ouvrier, le montrant en train de s'occuper du jardin et du potager de sa maison ; le documentaire « Vie quotidienne entre les tours des mines de charbon » (« Alltag zwischen Zechentürmen » , 1938) reprend le même principe, mais pour un mineur. Aussi, « Ouvriers allemands en vacances » (1936) , permet d'entrevoir pour cette classe sociale des perspectives inimaginables sous la République de Weimar, le documentaire présentant les congés d'une famille au Portugal et à Madère (choix de destination qui permettent aussi d'insister, en comparaison, sur le développement économique allemand) .

Les affaires courantes liées au cinéma allemand sous le 3e « Reich » dépendent du ministère du « Reich » à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande, dirigé par Josef Goebbels. Le réalisateur Veit Harlan, dans son livre « Le cinéma allemand selon Goebbels » (1974) décrit de façon détaillée ses différents entretiens avec Goebbels, et la manière dont se préparait la réalisation d'un film (« du synopsis à l'exploitation ») : le réalisateur envoie ses projets de scénario au ministre, qui donne son aval sur le thème, la distribution et les scènes tournées, étant ainsi parfois à l'origine de profonds remaniements et révisions. Une fois le film tourné, il est projeté au ministre dans la salle de projection du ministère : souvent, Josef Goebbels procède à de nouveaux remaniements (retrait d'une scène, demande de changement de fin, etc.) .

Veit Harlan note ainsi :

« Je devais apporter sans cesse des modifications et celles-ci furent à leur tour modifiées. Par endroits, on pouvait voir, dans le scénario, le redoutable “ crayon vert ministériel ” dont se servait Goebbels. Il fallait insérer des passages entiers écrits par Goebbels lui-même. Le “ crayon vert ” avait force de loi. »

Le président de la Chambre du film, Oswald Lehnien, déclare en 1937 que le cinéma est « une synthèse d'éléments artistiques, politiques et économiques » et doit être un « facteur de civilisation obéissant à l'idéologie du régime » .

En 1941, Fritz Hippler, qui dirige le département cinématographique au ministère de la Propagande, déclare :

« Comparé aux autres arts, le cinéma par sa faculté d'agir directement sur le sens poétique et l'affectivité (et donc, sur tout ce qui n'est pas intellectuel) a, dans le domaine de la psychologie des masses et de la propagande, un effet pénétrant et durable. »

Néanmoins, Veit Harlan considère que l'intérêt du ministre pour le cinéma, sans doute esthétiquement véritable, n'enlève en rien au « mépris sans limite » qu'il nourrissait pour la corporation :

« En bon ministre de la Propagande, il exploitait la popularité des acteurs et des cinéastes et s'en servait cyniquement pour ses propres fins. »

Goebbels le disait lui-même :

« On ne se place pas soi-même, on y est placé. »

Il lui déclare par exemple :

« Vous, les acteurs, vous nous devez tout. C'est nous, les Nationaux-Socialistes qui avons fait de votre métier une profession respectable. Nous vous faisons gagner davantage que nos plus grands hommes de science. »

La critique cinématographique est censurée sous le 3e « Reich » . Il convient pourtant de reconnaître qu'elle était très peu développée sous la République de Weimar. En 1933, on les remplace par des « compte-rendus » et, par la loi du 22 septembre 1933 (qui s'applique pour tous les journalistes) , les critiques sont placés par la Chambre de la Culture du « Reich » (« Reichskulturkammer ») sous le contrôle du ministère de la Propagande (à partir du 4 octobre, cette loi vaut aussi pour les rédacteurs-en-chef) . Néanmoins, des journaux comme le « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » ou le « Deutsche Zukunft » faisant preuve de trop de libertés voient, par une ordonnance du 26 novembre 1936, les critiques d'arts remplacés par des « chroniqueurs artistiques » , les plaçant donc sous une tutelle totale du ministère. Dès lors, les critiques s'apparentent davantage à des panégyriques des films étudiés ou bien à de simples synopsis.

Il a toujours existé dans le cinéma allemand ce que les Américains appellent des « stars » , mais jamais de « star-system » comparable à ce qui se passait à Hollywood. De nombreux dirigeants nazis ont ainsi dénoncé ce mode de fonctionnement, qu'ils assimilaient à une invention juive. Néanmoins, afin d'affirmer la puissance du cinéma allemand, Josef Goebbels a œuvré en faveur d'un tel système, notamment après le départ vers les États-Unis de personnalités comme Marlene Dietrich.

Le meilleur exemple de ce nouveau système est le recrutement, en 1937, de l'actrice suédoise Zarah Leander par la « Ufa » , qui devient en quelques années une des vedettes les plus importantes et les mieux payées du cinéma allemand. Les campagnes de presse en sa faveur sont alors lancées par le bureau de presse de la « Ufa » , cachant volontairement son passé d'actrice déjà célèbre en Suède pour se concentrer sur sa carrière de chanteuse. Ce bureau de presse va même jusqu'à donner des instructions détaillées aux journaux, sur la façon de la présenter et à Zarah Leander elle-même lors de ses apparitions publiques. Cette « starisation » est alors inédite en Allemagne. De hauts-dignitaires du régime, comme Adolf Hitler, Josef Goebbels ou Hermann Göring, apparaissent parfois en publics accompagnés d'acteurs ou d'actrices alors très populaires, notamment afin de donner une coloration « glamour » aux manifestations du NSDAP, la plupart du temps dominées par des hommes. Hitler apprécie ainsi particulièrement les dîners mondains avec les actrices Olga Tchekhova et Lil Dagover. En 1935, Göring épouse même une actrice, Emmy Sonnemann. Les relations de Goebbels avec plusieurs « stars » féminines de cinéma sont également connues ; une scène du film « Le Voyage à Tilsit » faisant référence de manière trop explicite de la relation de son mari avec l'actrice Lida Baarova, conduit Magda Goebbels à demander à Hitler qu'elle soit renvoyée dans son pays natal, la Tchécoslovaquie.

Le proximité personnelle des dirigeants politiques est devenue pour les acteurs un facteur déterminant pour la réussite professionnelle des acteurs de cinéma (les circonstances floues de la mort de l'actrice Renate Müller, peut-être assassinée par la « Gestapo » pour son refus de tourner dans des films nazis en est un contre-exemple) . Un système informel de listes a décidé à quelle fréquence un acteur pourrait tourner : des « stars » comme Zarah Leander, Lil

Dagover ou Heinz Rühmann en bénéficient par exemple. Ces vedettes, qui bénéficient de la renommée offerte par le régime se voient aussi offrir, dès 1938, des avantages fiscaux décidés par Hitler en personne : ils peuvent déduire 40 % de leurs revenus comme frais professionnels. Parmi les personnalités marquantes de cette période, on relève les réalisateurs Leni Riefenstahl, Eduard von Borsody, Willi Forst, Carl Frölich, Rolf Hansen, Veit Harlan et Georg Jacoby. Les artistes les plus en vues sont Zarah Leander, Kristina Söderbaum, Lida Baarová, Lil Dagover, Margot Hielscher, Marianne Hoppe, Brigitte Horney, Maria Landrock, Frida Richard et Annie Rosar. Quant aux acteurs, Horst Caspar, Otto Gebühr, Heinrich George, Joachim Gottschalk, Gustav Knuth, Ferdinand Marian, Hans Albers et Jakob Tiedtke partagent souvent les têtes d'affiches. D'autres personnalités marquent également la période, comme les producteurs Paul Grætz et Kurt Ulrich, ou le cadreur Walter Frentz. Les films sont tournés dans plusieurs studios, dont les studios de Babelsberg.

En 1944, Josef Goebbels dresse une liste des « artistes irremplaçables » a appelé la « Gottbegnadeten-Liste », comprenant des personnalités comme Arno Breker, Richard Strauß et Johannes Heesters, des acteurs de cinéma et de théâtre (Hans Albers, Heinz Rühmann, Elisabeth Flickenschildt, Friedrich Kayßler) . Pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les « stars » du cinéma allemand soutiennent l'effort de guerre, en se produisant devant les troupes ou en recueillant des fonds pour l'Organisation de secours de l'hiver allemand (« Winterhilfswerk ») . Bien que la plupart des « stars » masculines aient été exemptées du service militaire, certains ont mimé un engagement militaire pour les films d'actualités : ainsi, en 1941, le très populaire Heinz Rühmann, qui avait un brevet de pilote, en tant que courrier de la « Luftwaffe » .

Le cinéma allemand est l'un des participants de la Mostra de Venise, qui tend cependant à devenir une vitrine de l'Italie fasciste. En 1938, la Mostra subit ainsi les pesantes pressions politiques du gouvernement fasciste. Les vainqueurs sont imposés au jury international et les films primés sont le long métrage allemand « Les Dieux du stade » de Leni Riefenstahl et « Luciano Serra », pilote de Goffredo Alessandrini, 2 films ouvertement de propagande, même si le 1er est encore aujourd'hui reconnu comme l'un des chefs-d'œuvre du cinéma des années 1930. Depuis 1938 donc, les pressions politiques faussent les résultats et ruinent le Festival, avec l'avènement du conflit la situation dégénère à tel point que les éditions de 1940, 1941 et 1942, par la suite considérées comme « non avenues », se déroulent bien loin du Lido de Venise avec peu de pays participants et l'absolu monopole des œuvres et des réalisateurs appartenant à l'axe Rome-Berlin, dans un climat plus propagandistique qu'artistique, représentés également fortement par les « stars » italiennes comme Alida Valli, Assia Noris et Fosco Giachetti. La « Coupe Mussolini », après avoir récompensé Leni Riefenstahl en 1938, couronne « Le Maître de poste » de Gustav Ucicky en 1940 ; « Oncle Krüger » de Hans Steinhoff en 1941 ; et « Le Grand Roi » de Veit Harlan en 1942, comme « meilleur film étranger » .

Le cinéma allemand est marqué, durant cette période, par de nombreuses innovations, tant technologiques (pellicule « Agfacolor ») que techniques (cadrages et montages de Leni Riefenstahl) .

En 2011, le réalisateur franco-australien Philippe Mora exhume 2 films de propagandes réalisés (par un studio indépendant) en cinéma 3-D, en 1936, et qui feraient du cinéma allemand, sous le 3e « Reich », le précurseur du cinéma en relief.

...

Nazism created an elaborate system of propaganda, which made use of the new technologies of the 20th Century, including cinema. Nazism courted the masses by the means of slogans that were aimed directly at the instincts and emotions of the people. The Nazis valued film as a propaganda instrument of enormous power. The interest that Adolf Hitler and his propaganda minister Josef Gœbbels took in film was not only the result of a personal fascination. The use of film for propaganda had been planned by the National-Socialist German Workers Party as early as 1930, when the Party 1st established a film department.

The Nazis were early aware of the propagandistic effect of movies and already in 1920 the issues of the « Racial Observer » included film criticism. In 1923, Philipp Nickel produced a documentary of the « German Day in Nuremberg ». Hitler had written about the psychological effect of images in « Mein Kampf » :

« One must also remember that of itself the multitude is mentally inert, that it remains attached to its old habits and that it is not naturally prone to read something which does not conform with its own pre-established beliefs when such writing does not contain what the multitude hopes to find there.

The picture, in all its forms, including the film, has better prospects. In a much shorter time, at one stroke, I might say, people will understand a pictorial presentation of something which it would take them a long and laborious effort of reading to understand. »

Further short Nazi films about Party rallies were made in 1927 and 1929. The 1st NSDAP film office was established in 1931 and started producing « documentaries » in a larger-scale. Like, in 1932 :

« Hitlers Kampf um Deutschland » (Hitler's fight for Germany) ; « Blutendes Deutschland » (Germany is bleeding) ; « Das junge Deutschland marschiert » (The German Youth is on the March) .

The Nazi propagandist Hans Traub, who had earned his Ph.D. in 1925 with a dissertation on the press and the German revolutions of 1848-1849, wrote in 1932 in the essay, « The film as a political instrument » :

« Without any doubt, the film is a formidable means of propaganda. Achieving propagandistic influence has always demanded a “ language ” which forms a memorable and passionate plot with a simple narrative. In the vast area of such “ language ” that the recipients are directly confronted by in the course of technical and economical processes, the most effective is the moving picture. It demands permanent alertness ; it's full of surprises concerning the change of time, space, and action ; it has an unimaginable richness of rhythm for intensifying or dispelling emotions. »

Josef Gœbbels, who appointed himself « Patron of the German film » , assumed, accurately, that a national cinema which was entertaining and put glamour on the government would be a more effective propaganda instrument than a national cinema in which the NSDAP and their policy would have been ubiquitous. Gœbbels emphasized the will to end the « shamelessness and tastelessness » that he thought could be found in the former movie industry. The main-goal

of the Nazi film policy was to promote escapism, which was designed to distract the population and to keep everybody in good spirits ; Gœbbels, indeed, blamed defeat in World War I on the failure to sustain the morale of the people. The open propaganda was reserved for films like « Der Sieg des Glaubens and Triumph des Willens » , records of the Nuremberg rallies, and newsreels. There are some examples of German feature films from the 3rd « Reich » that deal with the NSDAP or with Party organizations such as the « Sturmabteilung » , Hitler Youth or the National Labour Service, one notable example being « Hitlerjunge Quex » about the Hitler Youth. Another example is the anti-Semitic feature film « Jew Suss » . The propaganda films that refer directly to Nazi politics amounted to less than 1/6 of the whole national film production, which mainly consisted of light entertainment films, although it is those propaganda films that are much more well-known today, such as « Triumph of the Will » .

For conceiving a Nazi film theory, Gœbbels suggested as formative material the « Hamburg Dramaturgy and Laokoon » , or the « Limitations of Poetry » by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, and also demanded « realistic characters » pointing to William Shakespeare. Gœbbels emphasized Lessing's idea that « not only imagining per se but purposeful imagining would prove the creative mind » .

Emil Jannings wrote in 1942, in the « National-Socialist Monthly » , about the goal of showing men and women who can master their own fate as models for identification. The authorities and NSDAP departments in charge of film policy were the film department of the Ministry of Propaganda, the Chamber of Culture (« Reichskulturkammer ») , the Chamber of Film (« Reichsfilmkammer ») , and the film department of the Party Propaganda Department (« Reichspropagandaleitung ») .

A system of « award » was used to encourage self-censorship ; awarded for such things as « cultural value » or « value to the people » , they remitted part of the heavy taxes on films. Up to 1/3 of the films in the 3rd « Reich » received such awards.

To subdue film to the goals of propaganda (« Gleichschaltung ») , the Nazi Party subordinated the entire film industry and administration under Josef Gœbbels' Ministry of Propaganda, and gradually nationalized film production and distribution. A State-run professional school for politically reliable film-makers (« Deutsche Filmakademie Babelsberg ») was founded, and membership of an official professional organization (« Reichsfilmkammer ») was made mandatory for all actors, film-makers, distributors, etc. The censorship that had already been established during World War I and the Weimar Republic was increased, with a National Film Dramaturgist (« Reichsfilmdramaturg ») pre-censoring all manuscripts and screen-plays at the very 1st stages of production. Film-criticism was prohibited and a national film award established.

A film bank (« Filmkreditbank GmbH ») was established to provide low-interest loans for the production of politically welcome films, and such films also received tax-benefits.

In the mid-1930's, the German film industry suffered the most severe crisis it had ever faced. There were multiple reasons for this crisis. Firstly, many of the most capable actors and film-makers had left the country after the rise to power of the Nazi government ; others had been banned by the new « Reichsfilmkammer » . These people left a gap

that the film industry could not easily fill. Secondly, the remaining actors and film-makers seized the opportunity to demand higher-salaries, which considerably increased production budgets. Consequently, it became more and more difficult to recover production costs. Thirdly, the export of German films dramatically dropped due to international boycotts. In 1933, exports had covered 44 % of film production costs ; by 1937, this figure had dropped to a mere 7 % .

More and more production companies went bankrupt. The number of companies dropped from 114 (1933-1935) to 79 (1936-1938) to 38 (1939-1941) . This did not necessarily lead to a decrease in the number of new films, as surviving production companies became more prolific, producing many more films.

Nazi companies went on to produce co-productions with companies of other countries : 8 co-productions with the Kingdom of Italy ; 6 co-productions with the French 3rd « République » ; 5 co-productions with the Kingdom of Hungary ; 5 co-productions with Czechoslovakia ; 3 co-productions with Switzerland ; 2 co-productions with the 2nd Polish Republic and the Empire of Japan (e.g. : « The Daughter of the Samurai ») ; and 1 each with Franco's Spain, the United States, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and Sweden.

The consolidation of the film industry was undoubtedly beneficial for the Nazi government. On the one hand, an ailing and unprofitable film industry would not have been of much use for the propaganda requirements. And, on the other hand, a small number of big film production companies were easier to control than a multitude of small ones. Goebbels went even further and directed a holding company (« Cautio Treuhand GmbH ») to buy-up the stock majorities of the remaining film production companies. In 1937, the « Cautio » acquired the largest German production company, « Ufa » , and, in 1942, merged this company with the remaining companies (« Terra Film » , « Tobis » , « Bavaria Film » , « Wien-Film » and « Berlin-Film ») into the so-called « Ufi-Group » . With one stroke, the entire German film industry had been practically nationalized, but unlike the situation in the USSR, German film-making preserved its character as a private industry. Although Goebbels founded the « Filmkreditbank GmbH » in order to fund the industry, the funds came from private investors. Thus, there were no government subsidies to the film industry in Nazi Germany. Because of this, the industry was forced to remain profitable - and to produce films that met the expectations of the audience.

A concentration also took place in the distribution field. In 1942, the « Ufa »-owned « Deutsche Filmvertriebs GmbH » (DFV) took the place of all companies so far remaining. For the export of films to foreign countries, special companies had been established such as the « Cinéma Film AG » .

Since the days of the Weimar Republic, there had also existed an extensive system of educational film hire services which was extended under the Nazi administration. In 1943, there were 37 regional services and 12,042 city services. In parallel, the Party Propaganda Department (« Reichspropagandaleitung ») ran its own network of educational film hire services which included 32 « Gaue » , 171 Districts, and 22,357 local services. All film-hire services had extensive film collections as well as rental 16 millimeter film projectors available that made it possible to show films in any class or lecture room and at any group meeting of the Hitler Youth.

Apart from the « Ufa »-owned cinema chain, the cinemas were not nationalized. The majority of the 5,506 cinemas that existed in 1939 within the so-called « Altreich » (« Old Reich » : i.e. , Germany without Austria and the Sudetenland) were small companies run by private owners. However, a large number of rules and regulations issued by the « Reichsfilmkammer » limited the entrepreneurial freedom of the cinemas considerably. For instance, it was mandatory to include a documentary and a news-reel in every film programme. By a law of 1933 (the « Gesetz über die Vorführung ausländischer Bildstreifen vom 23. Juni 1933 ») , the government was also entitled to prohibit the presentation of foreign films. An import quota for foreign films had been set during the Weimar Republic, and during World War II, the import of films from certain foreign countries was completely prohibited. For example, from 1941 onwards, the presentation of American films became illegal.

A quantitative comparison of the percentage of German movies screened versus foreign movies screened shows the following numbers : in the last year of the Weimar Republic the percentage of German movies was 62,2 % and, in 1939 in the 3rd « Reich » , it was 77,1 % , while the number of cinema visits increased by the factor 2.5 from 1933 to 1939 ; on the contrary, the percentage of for example American movies screened was reduced from 25,8 % in 1932 to 13,9 % in 1939 ; 1 U.S. movies were considered « artistically valuable » by the Nazi authorities.

In order to boost the propaganda effect, the Nazis supported film-shows in large cinemas with large audiences where the feeling of being part of the crowd was so overwhelming for the individual spectator that critical film perception had little chance. Film-shows also took place in military barracks and factories. The Hitler Youth arranged special film programmes (« Jugendfilmstunden ») where news-reels and propaganda films were shown. In order to supply even rural and remote areas with film shows, the Party Propaganda Department (« Reichspropagandaleitung ») operated 300 film-trucks and 2 film-trains that carried all the necessary equipment for showing films in, for example, village inns. The dislike that Goebbels and other film politicians had for individual, more private film viewing was probably one of the reasons why they did not make any effort to develop television (at that time, a technique that was ready to be applied) as a new mass-media.

Film propaganda had the highest-priority in Germany even under the severe conditions of the last years of World War II. While schools and playhouses stopped working in 1944, cinemas continued to operate until the very end of the War. In Berlin, for instance, anti-aircraft units were posted specially to protect the local cinemas in 1944.

Books

The Nazis and sympathizers published many books. Most of the beliefs that would become associated with the Nazis, such as German nationalism, eugenics and anti-Semitism had been in circulation since the 19th Century, and the Nazis seized on this body of existing work in their own publications.

The most notable is Adolf Hitler's « Mein Kampf » detailing his beliefs. The book outlines major ideas that would later culminate in World War II. It is heavily influenced by Gustave Le Bon's 1895 « The Crowd : A Study of the Popular Mind » , which theorized propaganda as a way to control the seemingly irrational behaviour of crowds. Particularly prominent is the violent anti-Semitism of Hitler and his associates, drawing, among other sources, on the fabricated «

Protocols of the Elders of Zion » (1897) , which implied that Jews secretly conspired to rule the world. This book was a key source of propaganda for the Nazis and helped fuel their common hatred against the Jews during World War II. For example, Hitler claimed that the international language Esperanto was part of a Jewish plot and makes arguments toward the old German nationalist ideas of « Drang nach Osten » and the necessity to gain « Lebensraum » (living space) east-wards (especially in Russia) . Other books such as « Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes » (Ethnology of German People) by Hans Friedrich Karl Günther and « Rasse und Seele » (Race and Soul) by Doctor Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss attempt to identify and classify the differences between the German, Nordic, or Aryan type and other supposedly inferior peoples. These books were used as texts in German schools during the Nazi era.

The pre-existing and popular genre of « Schollen-roman » (novel of the soil) also known as blood and soil novels, was given a boost by the acceptability of its themes to the Nazis and developed a mysticism of unity.

The immensely popular « Red Indian » stories by Karl May were permitted despite the heroic treatment of the hero Winnetou and « colored » races ; instead, the argument was made that the stories demonstrated the fall of the Red Indians was caused by a lack of racial consciousness, to encourage it in the Germans. Other fictional works were also adapted ; Heidi was stripped of its Christian elements, and Robinson Crusoe's relationship to Friday was made a master-slave one.

Children's books also made their appearance. In 1938, Julius Streicher published « Der Giftpilz » (The Poisonous Mushroom) , a storybook that equated the Jewish people to poisonous mushrooms and aimed to educate children about the Jews. The book was an example of anti-Semitic propaganda and stated that :

« The following tales tell the truth about the Jewish poison mushroom. They show the many shapes the Jew assumes. They show the depravity and baseness of the Jewish race. They show the Jew for what he really is : " The Devil in human form. " »

Text-books

« Geo-political atlases » emphasized Nazi schemes, demonstrating the « encirclement » of Germany, depicting how the prolific Slav nations would cause the German people to be overrun, and (in contrast) showing the relative population density of Germany was much higher than that of the Eastern regions (where they would seek « Lebensraum ») . Geography text books stated how crowded Germany had become. Other charts would show the cost of disabled children as opposed to healthy ones, or show how 2 child families threatened the birthrate. Math books discussed military applications and used military word problems, physics and chemistry concentrated on military applications, and grammar classes were devoted to propaganda sentences. Other textbooks dealt with the history of the Nazi Party. Elementary school reading text included large amounts of propaganda. Children were taught through textbooks that they were the Aryan Master race (« Herrenvolk ») while the Jews were untrustworthy, parasitic and « Untermenschen » (inferior sub-humans) .

Maps showing the racial composition of Europe were banned from the classroom after many efforts that did not define

the territory widely enough for Party officials.

Even fairy tales were put to use, with Cinderella being presented as a tale of how the prince's racial instincts lead him to reject the stepmother's alien blood (present in her daughters) for the racially pure maiden. Nordic sagas were likewise presented as the illustration of « Führerprinzip », which was developed with such heroes as Frederick the Great and Otto von Bismarck.

Literature was to be chosen within the « German spirit » rather than a fixed list of forbidden and required, which made the teachers all the more cautious although Jewish authors were impossible for classrooms. While only William Shakespeare's « MacBeth » and « The Merchant of Venice » were actually recommended, none of the plays were actually forbidden, even « Hamlet », denounced for « flabbiness of soul » .

Biology texts, however, were put to the most use in presenting eugenic principles and racial theories ; this included explanations of the Nuremberg Laws, which were claimed to allow the German and Jewish peoples to co-exist without the danger of mixing. Science was to be presented as the most natural area for introducing the « Jewish Question », once teachers took care to point-out that in nature, animals associated with those of their own species.

Teachers' guidelines on racial instruction presented both the handicapped and Jews as dangers. Despite their many photographs glamorizing the « Nordic » type, the texts also claimed that visual inspection was insufficient, and genealogical analysis was required to determine their types, and report any hereditary problems. However, the National-Socialist Teachers League (NSLB) stressed that at primary schools in particular they had to work on only the Nordic racial core of the German « Volk », again and again, and have to contrast this with the racial composition of foreign populations and the Jews.

Books for occupied countries

In occupied France, the German Institute encouraged translation of German works, although chiefly German nationalists, not ardent Nazis, and produced a massive increase in the sale of translated works. The only books from English to be sold were English Classics, and books with Jewish authors or Jewish subject matter (such as biographies) were banned, except for some scientific works. Control of the paper supply allowed Germans the easy ability to pressure publishers about books.

Comics

The Nazi-controlled government in German-occupied France produced the « Vica » comic book series during World War II as a propaganda tool against the Allied forces. The « Vica » series, authored by Vincent Krassousky, represented Nazi influence and perspective in French society, and included such titles as « Vica contre le service secret anglais », and « Vica défie l'Oncle Sam » .

Films

The Nazis produced many films to promote their views. The Department of Film was important for organizing film propaganda. It has been estimated that 45 million people attended film screenings put on by the NSDAP. « Reichsamtsleiter » Neumann declared that the goal of the Department of Film was not directly political in nature, but was rather to influence the culture, education, and entertainment of the general population.

A main medium was « Die Deutsche Wochenschau », a newsreel series produced for cinemas, from 1940. Newsreels were explicitly intended to portray German interests as successful. Themes often included the virtues of the Nordic or Aryan type, German military and industrial strength, and the evils of the Nazi enemies.

On 22 September 1933, a Department of Film was incorporated into the Chamber of Culture. The department controlled the licensing of every film prior to its production. Sometimes, the government would select the actors for a film, financing the production partially or totally, and would grant tax breaks to the producers. Awards for « valuable » films would decrease taxes, thus encouraging self-censorship among movie makers. Under Josef Gœbbels and Adolf Hitler, the German film industry became entirely nationalised. The National-Socialist Propaganda Directorate, which Gœbbels oversaw, had at its disposal nearly all film agencies in Germany by 1936. Occasionally, certain directors such as Wolfgang Liebeneiner were able to bypass Gœbbels by providing him with a different version of the film than would be released. Such films include those directed by Helmut Käutner : « Romanze in Moll » (Romance in a Minor Key, 1943) , « Große Freiheit Nr. 7 » (The Great Freedom, No. 7, 1944) , and « Unter den Brücken » (Under the Bridges, 1945) . Schools were also provided with motion pictures projectors because film was regarded as particularly appropriate for propagandizing children. Films specifically created for schools were termed « military education » .

« Triumph des Willens » (Triumph of the Will, 1935) by film-maker Leni Riefenstahl chronicles the Nazi Party Congress of 1934, in Nuremberg. It followed an earlier film of the 1933 Nuremberg Rally produced by Riefenstahl, « Der Sieg des Glaubens » . Triumph of the Will features footage of uniformed Party members (though relatively few German soldiers) , who are marching and drilling to militaristic tunes. The film contains excerpts from speeches given by various Nazi leaders at the Congress, including speeches by Adolf Hitler. Frank Capra used scenes from the film, which he described partially as « the ominous prelude of Hitler's holocaust of hate » in many parts of the U.S. Government's « Why We Fight anti-Axis » 7 film series, to demonstrate what the personnel of the American military would be facing in World War II, and why the Axis had to be defeated.

« Der ewige Jude » (The Eternal Jew, 1940) was directed by Fritz Hippler at the insistence of Josef Gœbbels, though the writing is credited to Eberhard Taubert. The movie is done in the style of a documentary, the central thesis being the immutable racial personality traits that characterize the Jew as a wandering cultural parasite. Throughout the film, these traits are contrasted to the Nazi state ideal : while Aryan men find satisfaction in physical labour and the creation of value, Jews only find pleasure in money and a hedonist lifestyle.

...

Nazism created an elaborate system of propaganda, which made use of the new technologies of the 20th Century,

including cinema. Nazism courted the masses by the means of slogans that were aimed directly at the instincts and emotions of the people. The Nazis valued film as a propaganda instrument of enormous power. The interest that Adolf Hitler and his Propaganda minister Josef Goebbels took in film was not only the result of a personal fascination. The use of film for propaganda had been planned by the National-Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP), as early as 1930, when the Party first established a film department.

Goebbels, who appointed himself « Patron of the German film », assumed, accurately, that a national cinema which was entertaining and put glamour on the government would be a more effective propaganda instrument than a national cinema in which the NSDAP and their policy would have been ubiquitous. The main goal of the Nazi film policy was to promote escapism, which was designed to distract the population and to keep everybody in good spirits; Goebbels indeed blamed defeat in World War I on the failure to sustain the morale of the people. The open propaganda was reserved for films like « Der Sieg des Glaubens » and « Triumph des Willens », records of the Nuremberg rallies, and newsreels. There are some examples of German feature films from the 3rd « Reich » that deal with the NSDAP or with Party organizations such as the « Sturmabteilung », « Hitler Youth » or the « National Labour Service », one notable example being « Hitlerjunge Quex » about the « Hitler Youth ». Another example is the anti-Semitic feature film « Jew Suss ». The propaganda films that refer directly to Nazi politics amounted to less than 1/6 of the whole national film production, which mainly consisted of light entertainment films, although it is those propaganda films that are much more well-known today, such as « Triumph of the Will ».

The authorities and NSDAP departments, in charge of film policy, were the film department of the Ministry of Propaganda, the Chamber of Culture (« Reichskulturkammer »); the Chamber of Film (« Reichsfilmkammer »); and the film department of the Party Propaganda Department (« Reichspropagandaleitung »).

A system of « award » was used to encourage self-censorship; awarded for such things as « cultural value » or « value to the people », they remitted part of the heavy taxes on films. Up to 1/3 of the films in the 3rd « Reich » received such awards.

To subdue film to the goals of propaganda (« Gleichschaltung »), the Nazi Party subordinated the entire film industry and administration under Josef Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda and, gradually, nationalized film production and distribution. A State-run professional school for politically reliable film-makers (« Deutsche Filmakademie Babelsberg ») was founded, and membership of an official professional organization (« Reichsfilmkammer ») was made mandatory for all actors, film-makers, distributors. The censorship that had already been established during World War I and the Weimar Republic was increased, with a National Film Dramaturgist (« Reichsfilmdramaturg ») pre-censoring all manuscripts and screenplays at the very first stages of production. Film criticism was prohibited and a national film award established.

A film bank (« Filmkreditbank GmbH ») was established to provide low-interest loans for the production of politically welcome films, and such films also received tax benefits.

In the mid-1930's, the German film industry suffered the most severe crisis it had ever faced. There were multiple

reasons for this crisis. Firstly, many of the most capable actors and film-makers had left the country after the rise to power of the Nazi government; others had been banned by the new « Reichsfilmkammer ». These people left a gap that the film industry could not easily fill. Secondly, the remaining actors and film-makers seized the opportunity to demand higher salaries, which considerably increased production budgets. Consequently, it became more and more difficult to recover production costs. Thirdly, the export of German films dramatically dropped due to international boycotts. In 1933, exports had covered 44 % of film production costs ; by 1937, this figure had dropped to a mere 7 % .

More and more production companies went bankrupt. The number of companies dropped from 114 (1933-1935) to 79 (1936-1938) to 38 (1939-1941) . This did not necessarily lead to a decrease in the number of new films, as surviving production companies became more prolific, producing many more films.

The consolidation of the film industry was undoubtedly beneficial for the Nazi government. On the one hand, an ailing and unprofitable film industry would not have been of much use for the propaganda requirements. And, on the other hand, a small number of big film production companies were easier to control than a multitude of small ones. Goebbels went even further and directed a holding company (« Cautio Treuhand GmbH ») to buy-up the stock majorities of the remaining film production companies. In 1937, the « Cautio » acquired the largest German production company, « Ufa » , and, in 1942, merged this company with the remaining companies (« Terra Film » , « Tobis » , « Bavaria Film » , « Wien-Film » and « Berlin-Film ») into the so-called « Ufi-Group » . With 1 stroke, the entire German film industry had been practically nationalized, but unlike the situation in the USSR, German film-making preserved its character as a private industry. Although Goebbels founded the « Filmkreditbank GmbH » , in order to fund the industry, the funds came from private investors. Thus, there were no government subsidies to the film industry in Nazi Germany. Because of this, the industry was forced to remain profitable - and to produce films that met the expectations of the audience.

A concentration also took place in the distribution field. In 1942, the « Ufa » -owned « Deutsche Filmvertriebs GmbH » (DFV) took the place of all companies so far remaining. For the export of films to foreign countries, special companies had been established such as the « Cinéma Film AG » .

Since the days of the Weimar Republic, there had also existed an extensive system of educational film hire services which was extended under the Nazi administration. In 1943, there were 37 regional services and 12,042 city services. In parallel, the Party Propaganda Department (« Reichspropagandaleitung ») ran its own network of educational film hire services which included 32 « Gaue » , 171 Districts , and 22,357 local services. All film hire services had extensive film collections, as well as rental 16 mm film projectors available, that made it possible to show films in any class or lecture room and at any group meeting of the « Hitler Youth » .

Apart from the « Ufa » -owned theatre chain, the cinemas were not nationalized. The majority of the 5,506 theatres that existed in 1939, within the so-called « Altreich » (the « Old “ Reich ” » , i.e. , Germany without Austria and the Sudetenland) were small companies run by private owners. However, a large number of rules and regulations issued by the « Reichsfilmkammer » limited the entrepreneurial freedom of the cinemas considerably. For instance, it was

mandatory to include a documentary and a newsreel in every film programme. By a law of 1933 (the « Gesetz über die Vorführung ausländischer Bildstreifen vom 23. Juni 1933 »), the government was also entitled to prohibit the presentation of foreign films. An import quota for foreign films had been set during the Weimar Republic and, during World War II, the import of films from certain foreign countries was completely prohibited. For example, from 1941 onwards, the presentation of American films became illegal.

In order to boost the propaganda effect, the Nazis supported film shows in large cinemas with large audiences where the feeling of being part of the crowd was so overwhelming for the individual spectator that critical film perception had little chance. Film shows also took place in military barracks and factories. The « Hitler Youth » arranged special film programmes (« Jugendfilmstunden ») where newsreels and propaganda films were shown. In order to supply even rural and remote areas with film shows, the Party Propaganda Department (« Reichspropagandaleitung ») operated 300 film trucks and 2 film trains that carried all the necessary equipment for showing films in, for example, village inns. The dislike that Goebbels and other film politicians had for individual, more private film viewing was probably one of the reasons why they did not make any effort to develop television (at that time, a technique that was ready to be applied) as a new mass-media.

Film propaganda had the highest priority in Germany even under the severe conditions of the last years of World War II. While schools and playhouses stopped working, in 1944, cinemas continued to operate until the very end of the War. In Berlin, for instance, anti-aircraft units were posted specially to protect the local cinemas, in 1944.

There always had been film stars in Germany, but a star-system comparable to the star-system in Hollywood did not yet exist. Various Nazi leaders denounced the star-system as a Jewish invention. However, in order to improve the image of Nazi Germany, Goebbels made great efforts to form a star-system. After Marlene Dietrich and Greta Garbo had gone to Hollywood, and could not be persuaded to serve the National-Socialist film industry as figure-heads, new film stars were promoted.

The best-known example is the Swedish actress Zarah Leander who was hired, in 1937, by the « Ufa » and became the most prominent and highest-paid German film star in only a few years. The publicity campaign for Leander was run by the press office of the « Ufa », which concealed her past as a film actress, already well-known in Sweden, and put their money right away on her charisma, as a singer with an exceptionally deep voice. The « Ufa » press-office provided the newspapers with detailed instructions on how the new star would have to be presented, and even the actress herself had to follow detailed instructions whenever she appeared in public. This kind of star publicity had not existed in Germany before.

High-politicians such as Hitler, Goebbels, and Hermann Göring appeared in public, flanked by popular German film actors. The female stars, in particular, were supposed to lend some glamour to the dry and male-dominated NSDAP events. Hitler's preferred dinner partners were the actresses Olga Tschechowa and Lil Dagover and, from 1935, Hermann Göring was married to the popular actress Emmy Sonnemann. The relationships of Goebbels to several female film stars are also notorious. Magda Goebbels left a screening of the film « Die Reise nach Tilsit », because it seemed to her too close a telling of her husband's relationship with Lida Baarova, which had resulted in the actress being sent back

to her native Czechoslovakia.

Personal proximity to the political leaders became a determining factor for the career success of film actors (The early death of Renate Müller apparently resulted from her lack of co-operation with the requirements of the regime) . An informal system of listings decided how frequently an actor would be cast. The 5 categories extended from « to cast at all costs even without a vacancy » (for instance, Zarah Leander, Lil Dagover, Heinz Rühmann) to « casting under no circumstances welcome » .

How crucial the film stars were for the image of the National-Socialist government is also evident from the tax benefits that Hitler decreed, in 1938, for prominent film actors and directors. From that time on, they could deduct 40 % of their income as professional expenses.

In 1944, Josef Goebbels made a now infamous list with « irreplaceable artists » called the « Gottbegnadeten » list with people such as Arno Breker, Richard Strauß and Johannes Heesters.

During World War II, German film stars supported the War effort by performing for the troops or by collecting money for the German Winter Relief Organization (« Winterhilfswerk ») . Although most of the male stars were exempted from military service, some (such as the popular Heinz Rühmann) participated in the War as soldiers, often accompanied by newsreel film crews.

Fine-Art

By Nazi standards, fine-art was not propaganda. Its purpose was to create ideals, for eternity. This produced a call for heroic and Romantic art, which reflected the ideal rather than the realistic. Explicitly political paintings were very rare. Still more rare were anti-Semitic paintings, because the art was supposed to be on a higher plane. Nevertheless, selected themes, common in propaganda, were the most common topics of art.

Sculpture was used as an expression of Nazi racial theories. The most common image was of the nude male, expressing the ideal of the Aryan race. Nudes were required to be physically perfect. At the Paris Exposition of 1937, Josef Thorak's « Comradeship » stood outside the German pavilion, depicting 2 enormous nude males, clasping hands and standing defiantly side by side, in a pose of defense and racial camaraderie.

Landscape painting featured mostly heavily in the Greater German Art exhibition, in accordance with themes of blood and soil. Peasants were also popular images, reflecting a simple life in harmony with nature, frequently with large families. With the advent of war, war art came to be a significant though still not predominating proportion.

The continuing of the German Art Exhibition throughout the war was put forth as a manifestation of German's culture.

Magazines

In and after 1939, the « Zeitschriften-Dienst » was sent to magazines to provide guidelines on what to write for appropriate topics.

Nazi publications also carried various forms of propaganda.

« Neues Volk » , was a monthly publication of the Office of Racial Policy, which answered questions about acceptable race relations. While it mainly was aimed at regarding race relations, it also included articles about the strength and character of the Aryan race compared to Jews and other « defectives » .

The « NS-Frauen-Warte » , aimed at women, included such topics as the role of women in the Nazi State. Despite its propaganda elements, it was predominately a woman's magazine. It defended anti-intellectualism, urged women to have children, even in War-time, put forth what the Nazis had done for women, discusses bridal schools, urged women to greater efforts in « Total War » .

« Der Pimpf » was aimed at boys and contained both adventure and propaganda.

« Das deutsche Mädel » , in contrast, recommended for girls hiking, tending the wounded, and preparing for care for children. It lay far more emphasis than « NS-Frauen-Warte » on the strong and active German woman.

« Signal »

« Signal » was a propaganda magazine published by the « Wehrmacht » during World War II. It was distributed throughout occupied Europe and neutral countries. « Signal » was published from April 1940 to March 1945, and had the highest sales of any magazine published in Europe during the period 1940 to 1945 - circulation peaked at 2.5 million, in 1943. At various times, it was published in at least 20 languages. There was an English edition distributed in the British Channel Islands of Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney, and Sark : these islands were occupied by the « Wehrmacht » during World War II.

The promoter of the magazine was the chief of the « Wehrmacht » propaganda office, Colonel Hasso von Wedel. Its annual budget was 10 million « Reichsmarks » , roughly \$ 2.5 million at the pre-War exchange rate.

The image that « Signal » transmitted was that of Nazi Germany and its « New Order » as the great benefactor of European peoples and of Western civilization in general. The danger of a Soviet invasion of Europe was strongly pointed-out. The quality of the magazine itself was quite high, featuring complete reviews from the front lines rich in information and photos, even displaying a double center page full colour picture. In fact, many of the most famous Second World War photos that are to be seen today come from « Signal » . The magazine contained little of none anti-Semitic propaganda, as the contents were mainly military.

Newspapers

The « Völkischer Beobachter » (People's Observer) was the official daily newspaper of the NSDAP since December 1920. It disseminated Nazi ideology in the form of brief hyperboles directed against the weakness of parliamentarism, the evils of Jewry and Bolshevism, the national humiliation of the Versailles Treaty and other such topics. It was joined in 1926 by « Der Angriff » (The Attack) , a weekly and later daily paper founded by Josef Gœbbels. It was mainly dedicated to attacks against political opponents and Jews (one of its most striking features were vehemently anti-Semitic cartoons by Hans Schweitzer) but also engaged in the glorification of Nazi heroes such as Horst Wessel. The « Illustrierter Beobachter » was their weekly illustrated paper.

Other Nazi publications included « Das Reich » , a more moderate and highbrow publication aimed at intellectuals and foreigners ; « Der Stürmer » , the most virulently anti-Semitic of all ; and « Das Schwarze Korps » , an SS publication, aiming at a more intellectual tone.

After Adolf Hitler's rise to power, in 1933, all of the regular press came under complete Nazi editorial control through the policy of « Gleichschaltung » , and short-lived propaganda newspapers were also established in the conquered territories during World War II. Alfred Rosenberg was a key member of the Nazi Party who gained control of their newspaper which was openly praised by Hitler. However, Hitler was dissatisfied by Rosenberg's work and slandered Rosenberg behind his back, discrediting his work.

...

The Coda music to the 3rd « Reich » : Anton Bruckner's Symphony No. 4 (« Romantic ») , the Classical piece which signaled the end of Adolf Hitler.

(From Albert Speer's « Inside the 3rd “ Reich ” » .)

When Adolf Hitler took power in 1933, the Nazis controlled less than 3 % of Germany's 4,700 papers.

The elimination of the German multi-Party political system not only brought about the demise of hundreds of newspapers produced by outlawed political Parties ; it also allowed the State to seize the printing plants and equipment of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties, which were often turned-over directly to the Nazi Party. In the following months, the Nazis established control or exerted influence over independent press organs.

During the 1st weeks of 1933, the Nazi regime deployed the radio, press, and newsreels to stoke fears of a pending « Communist uprising » , then, channeled popular anxieties into political measures that eradicated civil liberties and democracy. SA (Storm Troopers) and members of the Nazi elite para-military formation, the SS, took to the streets to brutalize or arrest political opponents and incarcerate them in hastily established detention centers and concentration camps. Nazi thugs broke into opposing political Party offices, destroying printing presses and newspapers.

Sometimes using holding companies to disguise new ownership, executives of the Nazi Party-owned publishing-house,

Franz Eher, established a huge empire that drove-out competition and purchased newspapers at below-market prices. Some independent newspapers, particularly conservative newspapers and non-political illustrated weeklies, accommodated to the regime through self-censorship or initiative in dealing with approved topics.

Through measures to « Aryanize » businesses, the regime also assumed control of Jewish-owned publishing companies, notably, Ullstein and Mosse.

Ullstein, which published the well-known Berlin daily the « Vossische Zeitung » , was the largest publishing-house company in Europe by 1933, employing 10,000 people. In 1933, German officials forced the Ullstein family to resign from the board of the company and, 1 year later, to sell the company assets.

Owners of a world-wide advertising agency, the Mosse family owned and published a number of major Liberal papers much hated by the Nazis, including the « Berlin Tageblatt » ; the Mosse family fled Germany the day after Hitler took power. Fearing imprisonment or death, reputable journalists also began to flee the country in large numbers. German non-Jewish newspaper owners replaced them, in part, with ill-trained and inexperienced amateurs loyal to the Nazi Party, as well as with skilled and veteran journalists prepared to collaborate with the regime in order to maintain and even enhance their careers.

The Propaganda Ministry, through its « Reich » Press Chamber, assumed control over the « Reich » Association of the German Press, the guild which regulated entry into the profession. Under the new Editors Law of October 4, 1933, the association kept registries of « racially pure » editors and journalists, and excluded Jews and those married to Jews from the profession. Propaganda Ministry officials expected editors and journalists, who had to register with the « Reich » Press Chamber to work in the field, to follow the mandates and instructions handed-down by the ministry. In paragraph 14 of the law, the regime required editors to omit anything « calculated to weaken the strength of the “ Reich ” abroad or at home » .

The Propaganda Ministry aimed further to control the content of news and editorial pages through directives distributed in daily conferences in Berlin and transmitted via the Party propaganda offices to regional or local papers. Detailed guide-lines stated what stories could or could not be reported and how to report the news. Journalists or editors who failed to follow these instructions could be fired or, if believed to be acting with intent to harm Germany, sent to a concentration camp. Rather than suppressing news, the Nazi propaganda apparatus instead sought to tightly control its flow and interpretation and to deny access to alternative sources of news.

By 1944, a shortage of newspaper and ink forced the Nazi government to limit all newspapers 1st to 8, then 4, and finally, 2 pages. Of the 4,700 newspapers published in Germany when the Nazis took power in 1933, no more that 1,100 remained. Approximately half were still in the hands of private or institutional owners, but these newspapers operated in strict compliance with government press laws and published material only in accordance with directives issued by the Ministry of Propaganda. While the circulation of these newspapers was approximately 4.4 million, the circulation of the 325 newspapers and their multiple regional editions owned by the Nazi Party was 21 million. Many of these newspapers continued to publish until the end of the War.

Upon occupying Germany, Allied authorities shut-down and confiscated presses owned by Nazi Party organs. The last surviving German radio station, located in Flensburg, near the Danish border, made its final broadcast in the name of the National-Socialist State on May 9th, 1945. After reporting the news of the un-conditional capitulation of German forces to the Allies, it went off the air.

In the post-War U.S. occupation zone of Germany, the military administration believed that the re-establishment of a free-press was vital to the denazification and re-education of Germans, and essential to the creation of democracy in Germany. Therefore, the 1st German newspaper approved for publication by the U.S. military high-command appeared on January 24th, 1945, in Aachen, 3 months after the U.S. forces captured the city.

Among those tried by the Allies as major war criminals at the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg were Hans Fritzsche, head of the Radio Division of the Propaganda Ministry, and Julius Streicher, editor of « Der Stürmer » .

Newspapers in occupied countries

In Ukraine, after Nazis cracked down on the papers, most papers printed only articles from German agencies, producing the odd effect of more anti-American and anti-British articles than anti-Communist ones. They also printed articles about antecedents of German rule over Ukraine, such as Catherine the Great and the Goths.

Photography

The Nazis also implemented a number of photographers to document events and promote ideology. Photographers include Heinrich Hoffmann and Hugo Jaeger.

Posters

Poster art was a mainstay of the Nazi propaganda effort, aimed both at Germany itself and occupied territories. It had several advantages. The visual effect, being striking, would reach the viewer easily. Posters were also, unlike other forms of propaganda, difficult to avoid.

Imagery frequently drew on heroic realism. Nazi youth and the SS were depicted monumentally, with lighting posed to produce « grandeur » .

Hans Schweitzer, under the pen name « Mjölnir » produced many Nazi posters.

Posters were also used in schools, depicting, for instance, an institution for the feeble-minded, on one hand, and houses, on the other, to inform the students that the annual cost of this institution would build 17 homes for healthy families.

Radio

Before Adolf Hitler came to power, he rarely used the radio as a form of connection with the public, and when he did so non-Party newspapers were allowed to publish his speeches. This changed soon after he came to power, in 1933. Hitler's speeches became famous all over Germany and were often major events for the Germans. Hitler's speeches were broadcast on the national radio, every newspaper (members of the Nazi Party or not) published his speeches, they were shown in the weekly newsreels, and reprinted in large editions in books and pamphlets all across Germany. The speeches made by Hitler became so significant to the Nazis that even restaurants and pubs were expected have their radios on whenever Hitler was delivering one of his speeches and in some cities public speakers were used so passersby could hear him deliver one of his speeches. The extent that Nazi propaganda emphasized and portrayed his speeches was done so that the main points of his speeches appeared in the weekly posters and were all over Germany by the hundreds of thousands.

The radio was an important tool in Nazi propaganda and was also used to promote genocide.

Internal broadcasts

Certainly, the Nazis recognized the importance of radio in disseminating their message and to that end Josef Goebbels approved a scheme whereby millions of cheap radio sets (the « Volksempfänger ») were subsidised by the government. Goebbels claimed the radio was the « 8th great power », and he, along with the Nazi Party, recognized the power of the radio in the propaganda machine of Nazi Germany. In the « Radio as the 8th Great Power » speech, Goebbels proclaimed :

« It would not have been possible for us to take power or to use it in the ways we have without the radio. It is no exaggeration to say that the German revolution, at least in the form it took, would have been impossible without the airplane and the radio. Radio reached the entire nation, regardless of class, standing, or religion. That was primarily the result of the tight centralization, the strong reporting, and the up-to-date nature of the German radio. Above all, it is necessary to clearly centralize all radio activities, to place spiritual tasks ahead of technical ones, to provide a clear worldview.

By the start of the Second World War, over 70 % of German households had one of these radios, which were deliberately limited in range in order to prevent loyal citizens from considering other viewpoints in foreign broadcasts. Radio broadcasts were also played over loudspeakers in public places and workplaces.

In private homes, however, people could easily turn-off the radio when bored and did so once the novelty of hearing the voice from a box wore-off ; this caused the Nazis to introduce many non-propaganda elements, such as music, advice and tips, serials and other entertainment. This was accelerated during the War to prevent people from tuning in enemy propaganda broadcasts ; though Goebbels claimed in his « Das Reich » article that it was to make the radio a good companion to the people, he admitted the truth in his diary.

External broadcasts

As well as domestic broadcasts, the Nazi regime also used radio to deliver its message to both occupied territories and enemy States. One of the main targets was the United Kingdom to which William Joyce broadcast regularly, gaining the nickname « Lord Haw-Haw » in the process. Joyce first appeared on German radio on 6 September 1939, reading the news in English but soon became noted for his often mischievous propaganda broadcasts. Joyce was executed in 1946 for treason. Although the most notorious, and most regularly heard, of the United Kingdom propagandists, Joyce was not the only broadcaster, with others such as Norman Baillie-Stewart, Jersey-born teacher Pearl Vardon, British Union of Fascists members Leonard Banning and Susan Hilton, Barry Payne Jones of the « Link » and Alexander Fraser Grant, whose show was aimed specifically at Scotland, also broadcasting through the « New British Broadcasting Service ».

Broadcasts were also made to the United States, notably through Robert Henry Best and « Axis Sally » Mildred Gillars. Best, a freelance journalist based in Vienna, was initially arrested following the German declaration of war on the United States but before long he became a feature on propaganda radio, attacking the influence of the Jews in America and the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who succeeded Winston Churchill in Nazi propaganda as « World-Enemy Number 1 ». Best would later be sentenced to life imprisonment for treason. Gillars, a teacher in Germany, mostly broadcast on similar themes as well as peppering her speech with allegations of infidelity against the wives of servicemen. Her most notorious broadcast was the « Vision of Invasion » radio play, broadcast immediately prior to D-Day, from the perspective of an American mother who dreamed that her soldier son died violently in Normandy.

France also received broadcasts from Radio-Stuttgart, where Paul Ferdonnet, an anti-Semitic journalist, was the main voice during the « Phoney War ». Following the occupation, « Radio Paris » and « Radio Vichy » became the main organs of propaganda, with leading far right figures such as Jacques Doriot, Philippe Henriot and Jean Hérold-Paquis regularly speaking in support of the Nazis. Others who broadcast included Gerald Hewitt, a British citizen who lived most of his life in Paris and had been associated with the « Action Française ». The use of domestic broadcasters intended to galvanise support for occupation was also used in Belgium, where Ward Hermans regularly spoke in support of the Nazis from his base in Bremen, and the Italian Social Republic, to where Giovanni Preziosi broadcast a vehemently anti-Semitic show from his base in Munich. Pro-Nazi radio broadcasts in the Arabic language aired in North Africa, crafted with the help of Mohammad Amin al-Husayni and other Arab exiles in Berlin to highlight Arab nationalism. They recast Nazi racist ideology to target Jews alone, not all Semites. Downplaying Benito Mussolini's operations in Africa, they touted the anti-colonialism of the « Axis » powers.

Speakers

The Nazi Party relied heavily on speakers to make its propaganda presentations, most heavily before they came to power, but also afterwards. Adolf Hitler, in « Mein Kampf », recounted that he had realized that it was not written matter but the spoken word that brought about changes, as people would not read things that disagreed, but would linger to hear a speaker. Furthermore, speakers, having their audiences before them, could see their reactions and adjust accordingly, to persuade. His own oratory was a major factor in his rise, and he despised those who came to

read pre-written speeches.

Such speakers were particularly important when it was not wanted that the information put across not reach foreigners, who could access the mass-media. Schools were instituted to substitute for the political conflict that had formed the old speakers. In 1939, Walter Tiessler, speaking of his own experience as an early speaker, urged that they continue.

« Sturmabteilung » speakers were used, though their reliance on instinct sometimes offended well-educated audiences, but their blunt and folksy manner often had their own appeal.

The ministry would provide such speakers with information, such as how to spin the problems on the eastern front, or how to discuss the cuts in food rations. The Party propaganda headquarters, sent the « Redner-Schnellinformation » (Speakers' Express Information) out with guidelines for immediate campaigns, such as anti-Semitic campaigns and what information to present.

Specific groups were targeted with such speakers. Speakers, for instance, were created specifically for « Hitler Youth » . These would, among other things, lecture « Hitler Youth » and the « BDM » on the need to produce more children.

Themes

Nazi propaganda promoted Nazi ideology by demonizing the enemies of the Nazi Party, especially Jews and communists, but also capitalists and intellectuals. It promoted the values asserted by the Nazis, including heroic death, « Führerprinzip » (leader principle) , « Volksgemeinschaft » (people's community) , « Blut und Boden » (blood and soil) and the youth were taught early to take pride in the Germanic « Herrenvolk » (Master race) . Propaganda was also used to maintain the cult of personality around Nazi leader Adolf Hitler, and to promote campaigns for eugenics and the annexation of German-speaking areas. After the outbreak of World War II, Nazi propaganda vilified Germany's enemies, notably the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States, and exhorted the population to partake in « Total War » .

Historiography

Nazi propaganda is a relatively recent topic of close study. Historians of all persuasions, including Eastern Bloc writers, agree about its remarkable effectiveness. Their assessment of its significance, however (whether it shaped or merely directed and exploited public opinion) is influenced by their approach to wider questions raised by the study of Nazi Germany, such as the question whether the Nazi State was a fully totalitarian dictatorship, as argued by Hannah Arendt, or whether it also depended on a certain societal consensus.

In addition to media archives, an important primary source for the study of the Nazi propaganda effort are the reports on civilian morale and public opinion that the « Sicherheitsdienst » and, later, the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » compiled from 1939 on. Another are the « Deutschland-Berichte » , reports

gathered by underground agents of the « Sopade » that particularly dealt with German popular opinion.

AB 108 : Le 3e « Reich » et l'art

« Entartete Kunst »

Art dégénéré (« Entartete Kunst ») était la plate-forme officielle adoptée par le régime nazi pour interdire l'art moderne en faveur d'un art officiel appelé l'« art héroïque ». La théorie était la suivante : l'art héroïque a symbolisé l'art racial pour, la libération de la déformation et de la corruption, alors que les modèles modernes déviaient de la norme prescrite de la beauté Classique. Les artistes de races pures ont produit l'art racial pur, et les artistes modernes d'une contrainte raciale inférieure ont produit les travaux qui étaient dégénérés. Ironiquement, la théorie a commencé avec Max Nordau, un intellectuel juif. Dans l'adaptation nazie, elle a été employée pour défendre les vues d'une théorie culturelle de déclin et de racisme.

D'abord appliqué aux arts plastiques, le terme d'art dégénéré est ensuite étendu à la musique (Schœnberg, Bartók, par exemple, mais aussi la musique « swing »), à la littérature ou encore au cinéma (Max Ophüls, Fritz Lang, Billy Wilder). Cette expression a été reprise, en 2007, par le cardinal Joachim Meisner à propos de l'art se coupant de la religion. Cette affirmation a fait objet d'une polémique en Allemagne.

De juin à novembre 1937, les Nazis organisent à Munich une unique grande exposition d'art dégénéré, qu'ils présentent comme étant produit par les bolchéviques et les juifs. Cette exposition présente 730 œuvres d'une centaine d'artistes, choisies parmi 20,000 œuvres saisies dans les musées allemands. Presque tous les grands artistes modernes allemands (tels que Nolde) et étrangers (tels que Picasso et Chagall) y figurent. Les visiteurs étaient invités à confronter les productions de malades mentaux (envers lesquels le régime nazi se montra, comme on le sait, sans pitié) et celles de représentants de l'avant-garde. Une confrontation destinée à mettre en évidence la parenté entre les 2 productions et stigmatiser la perversité des artistes.

Le succès public est immense, avec plus de 2 millions de visiteurs, bien que le local soit mal adapté et mal situé. La file des visiteurs s'étend jusque sur le trottoir et « la foule devint telle que le Docteur Gœbbels, courroucé et gêné, ne tarda pas à la faire fermer ». Aujourd'hui, l'exposition nous apparaît comme une impitoyable mise au pilori de créateurs livrés en pâture à l'opinion publique. Tout autre était le but poursuivi à l'époque :

« Il s'agit d'abord de présenter le peuple allemand, référent structurel et l'her du Nazisme, comme la victime d'une gigantesque manipulation destinée à l'escroquer. »

L'enjeu de l'opération consistait à faire passer des artistes persécutés et bâillonnés pour des terroristes. Ainsi, dans la 5e salle de l'exposition, l'« insondable saleté » de Karl Hofer, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Max Beckmann ou Oskar Kokoschka est-elle assimilée « aux plus bas instincts du gangstérisme ». Il s'agissait de faire croire que la condamnation de ces inventeurs rendait, in fine, justice aux Allemands.

Parmi les œuvres considérées comme dégénérées, 5,000 sont saisies par les Nazis pour être ensuite détruites, 125 sont vendues aux enchères à Lucerne en Suisse, d'autres sont récupérées par des collectionneurs nazis comme Josef Goebbels. Si des artistes tels que Kandinsky, Klee et Schwitters quittent l'Allemagne dès l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir, Max Beckmann s'enfuit le lendemain de l'ouverture de l'exposition. De nombreux artistes fuient aux États-Unis où ils contribuent à la diffusion de l'art moderne en Amérique. Ceux qui restent sont contraints à une sorte d'exil intérieur. Si Otto Dix et Erich Heckel assagissent leur production afin de ne pas être soupçonnés, d'autres continuent de peindre en secret, par exemple la nuit, tout en produisant des commandes officielles la journée.

Parmi les centaines d'artistes ayant été stigmatisés comme producteurs d'un art dégénéré, on retrouve :

Hans Baluschek, Ernst Barlach, Willi Baumeister, Max Beckmann, Hans Bellmer, Marc Chagall, Otto Dix, Max Ernst, Conrad Felixmüller, Otto Freundlich, Johnny Friedländer (exilé en Tchécoslovaquie puis en France) , Otto Griebel, George Grosz, Hans Grundig, Richard Haizmann, Erich Heckel, Katharina Heise, Eugen Hoffmann, Wassily Kandinsky, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Paul Klee, Paul Kleinschmidt, Oskar Kokoschka, Rolf Kurth, Julo Levin (qui mourut à Auschwitz) , Max Liebermann, Franz Marc, Ludwig Meidner, Albert Mentzel (exilé en France) , Hans Mettel, Jean Metzinger, Paula Modersohn-Becker, Marg Moll, Oskar Moll, Johannes Molzahn, Wilhelm Morgner, Otto Mueller, Gabriele Münter, Edvard Munch, Hanna Nagel, Emil Nolde, Felix Nussbaum, Max Pechstein, Franz Radziwill, Emy Roeder, Oskar Schlemmer, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, Kurt Schwitters, Friedrich Skade, Christoph Voll, Lovis Corinth, Gerhard Marcks, Ernst Křenek.

...

L'expression « art dégénéré » doit sa fortune à l'exposition « Entartete Kunst » que les Nazis organisèrent en 1937, à Munich. La dégénérescence n'est pas la décadence. Cette dernière notion implique dans une visée Spenglerienne un affaiblissement des cultures, analogue au vieillissement auquel sont voués les corps, mais non une dénaturation. La dégénérescence, l'« Entartung », terme emprunté à la biologie, suppose qu'un objet a perdu certains de ses traits distinctifs au point qu'il cesse d'appartenir à son genre, à son espèce d'origine. Ainsi, selon l'idéologie nazie, du Juif qui n'appartient plus à l'espèce humaine. Ainsi de l'œuvre qui, faute de satisfaire à des critères de savoir-faire, de favoriser la cohésion de la communauté allemande et de répondre à une conception dogmatique de la mimésis, échappe à la sphère de l'art. On connaît le sort que le régime hitlérien réserva aux livres et aux hommes « impurs ». Le sort des œuvres d'art est plus mal connu ; on n'a pu établir avec certitude qu'un bûcher ait été allumé, en 1939, pour détruire des œuvres d'art. Mais il est notoire que, sans croire à la valeur intrinsèque de ces œuvres, les Nazis surent mettre à profit leur valeur marchande. Pour eux, parler d'art à propos de l'art moderne relevait d'une filiation usurpée, et d'ailleurs le mot « Kunst », grossièrement crayonné sur l'affiche de l'exposition, était placé entre guillemets.

Les fondements idéologiques de cette conception sont à chercher dans les théories raciales de Houston Stewart Chamberlain, de Joseph Arthur de Gobineau et d'Alfred Rosenberg qui affirmaient la supériorité de la race germanique. Dans des livres aux titres éloquentes, « Rembrandt als Erzieher » (Rembrandt comme éducateur) et « Dürer als Führer » (Dürer comme guide) , publiés en 1908 et 1928, Julius Langbehn donnait une inflexion raciale au « point de vue historique et national » introduit en histoire de l'art par Heinrich Wölfflin.

...

C'est sous l'appellation « Entartete Musik » que les Nazis, entre 1933 et 1945, désignaient toute production musicale qui ne rentrait pas dans les normes artistiques étroites édictées par le 3e « Reich » .

En 1938, le régime nazi, alors au pouvoir en Allemagne, présentait à Düsseldorf l'exposition « Reichsmusiktage » , soit un Festival de musique du « Reich » . Cette manifestation importante, organisée du 22 au 29 mai, était destinée à présenter des concerts et des conférences idéologiquement corrects et ethniquement purs pour l'édification des masses dans le cadre des actions de propagande dont le « Reich » était coutumier.

En marge du « Reichsmusiktage » , une autre exposition intitulée « Entartete Musik » , organisée par Adolf Ziegler, directeur du Théâtre National de Weimar, et inaugurée le 24 mai, avait pour but de stigmatiser pour la musique ce qu'une autre exposition de 1937, à Munich, avait fait pour certaines autres formes d'art en les qualifiant d' « Entartete Kunst » (d'Art dégénéré) . Dans son discours d'inauguration, Ziegler expliqua que la décadence de la musique était due à l'influence du judaïsme et du capitalisme, boucs émissaires des difficultés de l'Allemagne à cette époque.

Cette étiquette « Entartete » , appliquée à différentes formes d'art depuis le début des années 1930, s'inscrivait dans la théorie pseudo-scientifique dont les Nazis se faisaient les champions : celle d'une dégénérescence d'une partie de la race humaine, coupable d'une déviance de la norme officielle et justifiant les monstrueuses exterminations de triste mémoire.

Qu'il s'agisse d'arts graphiques et plastiques ou de la musique, le but était le même : discréditer, isoler, décourager, voire même interdire ces créations. En ce qui concerne la musique, aussi bien la composition que l'exécution, la critique, la musicologie et la publicité étaient visées par cette discrimination. Pour le gouvernement nazi, plusieurs types de musiques entraient dans cette catégorie pour des raisons bien différentes.

Comme on peut s'en douter, les œuvres de musiciens ou d'interprètes juifs ou d'origine partiellement juive étaient concernées. C'est ainsi que Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Arnold Schœnberg, Franz Schreker, Walter Braunfels, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Kurt Weill, Gustav Mahler, David Nowakowsky et Berthold Goldschmidt parmi d'autres furent mis à l'index. Mais cela ne s'arrêtait pas là car il suffisait que les œuvres mettent en scène ou utilisent des thèmes ou des personnages juifs ou africains, comme ceux d'Ernst Křenek, ou même aient pour auteurs des artistes d'inspiration marxiste, comme Hanns Eisler, ou tout simplement que les artistes aient montré de la sympathie pour des opposants au régime nazi. Tel fut le cas pour Anton von Webern, coupable d'avoir maintenu des liens avec Arnold Schœnberg qui s'était exilé.

Mais la musique moderne (nous dirions aujourd'hui contemporaine, comme pour qualifier les œuvres de Paul Hindemith, Alban Berg, Arnold Schœnberg ou Anton von Webern) tombait également sous ce qualificatif de dégénérée.

En fait, un coup d'arrêt à l'évolution de la musique avait été décidé afin de témoigner de la loyauté du régime envers

les grands compositeurs allemands des XVIIIe et XIXe siècles qui portaient témoignage de la grandeur de l'esprit allemand. De plus, la modification de la forme et de la structure musicales vers lesquelles évoluait la musique en ce début du siècle, apparaissait comme une menace à la culture de la Loi, de l'Ordre et du contrôle de la société sur laquelle reposait le régime nazi.

Bien entendu, dans ce cadre, le jazz était tout autant, sinon plus, considéré comme dégénéré en raison de ses origines, de l'ethnie de la plupart de ses interprètes et, d'une manière générale, en raison de son association avec une culture afro-américaine honnie.

Cette politique de muselage de tout un riche et multiple courant de création mise en œuvre dès le début du régime nazi, principalement par le Ministère de la propagande du sinistre Josef Gœbbels, rendit pour ces artistes de plus en plus difficile, puis totalement impossible, de pouvoir s'exprimer, de faire jouer leurs œuvres ou même de se produire en public pour les interpréter. Nombreux furent ceux qui choisirent l'exil, quand ils le purent, tels Arnold Schönberg, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith, Berthold Goldschmidt, ou se cachèrent comme Karl Amadeus Hartmann ou Boris Blacher quand ils ne furent pas exterminés dans des camps tels Viktor Ullmann ou Erwin Schulhoff.

Ironiquement, quelques œuvres, après avoir été qualifiées de « Entartete Musik » furent ensuite adoptées avec enthousiasme par le régime nazi pour les besoins de sa propagande.

Liste des artistes mentionnés dans le catalogue d'exposition « Entartete Kunst »

Adler, Jankel
Barlach, Ernst
Bauer, Rudolf
Bauknecht, Philipp
Baum, Otto
Baumeister, Willi
Bayer, Herbert
Beckmann, Max
Belling, Rudolf
Bindel, Paul
Brün, Theo
Burchartz, Max
Burger-Mühlfeld, Fritz
Camenisch, Paul
Caspar, Karl
Caspar-Filser, Maria
Cassel, Pol
Chagall, Marc
Corinth, Lovis

Davringhausen, Heinrich
Dexel, Walter
Diesner, Johannes
Dix, Otto
Drexel, Hans Christoph
Dreisch, Johannes
Eberhard, Heinrich
Ernst, Max
Feibusch, Hans
Feininger, Lyonel
Felixmüller, Conrad
Freundlich, Otto
Fuhr, Xaver
Gies, Ludwig
Gilles, Walter
Gleichmann, Otto
Großmann, Rudolph
Grosz, George
Grunding, Hans
Haizmann, Richard
Hausmann, Raoul
Hebert, Guido
Heckel, Erich
Heckrott, Wilhelm
Heemskerck, Jacoba van
Heister, Hans Seibert von
Herzog, Oswald
Heuser, Werner
Hoerle, Heinrich
Hofer, Karl
Hoffman, Eugen
Itten, Johannes
Jawlensky, Alexej von
Johansen, Eric
Kallmann, Hans Jürgen
Kandinsky, Wassily
Katz, Hans
Kirchner, Ernst Ludwig
Klee, Paul
Klein, Cesar

Kleinschmidt, Paul
Kokoschka, Oskar
Lange, Otto
Lehmbruck, Wilhelm
Lissitzky, El
Lüthy, Oskar
Marc, Franz
Marcks, Gerhard
Matare, Ewald
Meidner, Ludwig
Metzinger, Jean
Mitschke-Collande, Constantin von
Moholy-Nagy, László
Moll, Margarethe
Moll, Oskar
Molzahn, Johannes
Mondrian, Piet
Muche, George
Meuller, Otto
Nagel, Erich
Nauen, Heinrich
Nay, Ernst Wilhelm
Neistrath, Karel
Nolde, Emil
Pankok, Otto
Pechstein, Max
Purrmann, Hans
Rauh, Max
Richter, Hans
Röder, Emy
Rohlf's, Christian
Scharff, Edwin
Schlemmer, Oskar
Schlichter, Rudolph
Schmidt-Rottluff, Karl
Scholz, Werner
Schreyer, Lothar
Schubert, Otto
Schwitters, Kurt
Segal, Lasar

Skade, Friedrich
Stukenberg, Friedrich (Fritz)
Thalheimer, Paul
Tietz, Johannes
Topp, Arnold
Völker, Karl
Voll, Christoph
Watenphul, Max Peiffer
Wauer, William
Wollheim, Gert

...

« Degenerate Art » (« Entartete Kunst ») was a term adopted by the Nazi regime in Germany to describe virtually all modern art. Such art was banned on the grounds that it was un-German, Jewish, or Communist in nature, and those identified as degenerate artists were subjected to sanctions. These included being dismissed from teaching positions, being forbidden to exhibit or to sell their art, and in some cases being forbidden to produce art.

« Degenerate Art » also was the title of an exhibition, held by the Nazis in Munich, in 1937, consisting of modernist artworks chaotically hung and accompanied by text labels deriding the art. Designed to inflame public opinion against modernism, the exhibition subsequently traveled to several other cities in Germany and Austria.

While modern styles of art were prohibited, the Nazis promoted paintings and sculptures that were traditional in manner and that exalted the « blood and soil » values of racial purity, militarism, and obedience. Similar restrictions were placed upon music, which was expected to be tonal and free of any jazz influences ; disapproved music was termed « Degenerate Music » , likewise, films and plays also were censored.

The early 20th Century was a period of wrenching changes in the arts. In the visual arts, such innovations as Cubism, Dada and Surrealism (following Symbolism, Post-Impressionism and Fauvism) were not universally appreciated. The majority of people in Germany, as elsewhere, did not care for the new art which many resented as elitist, morally suspect, and too often incomprehensible.

Under the Weimar government of the 1920's, Germany emerged as a leading center of the « avant-garde » - the birthplace of Expressionism in painting and sculpture, of the atonal musical compositions of Arnold Schœnberg, and the jazz-influenced work of Paul Hindemith and Kurt Weill. Films such as Robert Wiene's « The Cabinet of Doctor Caligari » (1920) and Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau's « Nosferatu » (1922) brought Expressionism to cinema.

The Nazis viewed the culture of the Weimar period with disgust. Their response stemmed partly from a conservative æsthetic taste, and partly from their determination to use culture as a propaganda tool. On both counts, a painting such as Otto Dix's « War Cripples » (1920) was anathema to them. It unsparingly depicts 4 badly disfigured veterans

of the First World War, then, a familiar sight on Berlin's streets, rendered in caricatured style. Featured in the « Degenerate Art » exhibition, it would hang next to a label accusing Dix (himself, a volunteer in World War I) of « an insult to the German heroes of the Great War » .

As dictator, Adolf Hitler gave his personal taste in art the force of law to a degree never before seen. Only in Joseph Stalin's Soviet Union, where Socialist Realism was the mandatory style, had a modern State shown such concern with regulation of the arts. In the case of Germany, the model was to be Classical Greek and Roman art, seen by Hitler as an art whose exterior form embodied an inner racial ideal.

The reason for this, as Henry Grosshans points-out, is that :

« Hitler saw Greek and Roman art as uncontaminated by Jewish influences. Modern art was seen as an act of æsthetic violence by the Jews against the German spirit. Such was true to Hitler even though only Max Liebermann, Ludwig Meidner, Otto Freundlich, and Marc Chagall, among those who made significant contributions to the German modernist movement, were Jewish. But Hitler took upon himself the responsibility of deciding who, in matters of culture, thought and acted like a Jew. »

The supposedly « Jewish » nature of all art that was indecipherable, distorted, or that represented « depraved » subject matter was explained through the concept of degeneracy, which held that distorted and corrupted art was a symptom of an inferior race. By propagating the theory of degeneracy, the Nazis combined their anti-Semitism with their drive to control the culture, thus consolidating public support for both campaigns.

The term « Entartung » (or « degeneracy ») had gained currency in Germany by the late- 19th Century when the critic and author Max Nordau devised the theory presented in his 1892 book, « Entartung » . Nordau drew upon the writings of the criminologist Cesare Lombroso, whose « The Criminal Man » , published in 1876, attempted to prove that there were « born criminals » whose atavistic personality traits could be detected by scientifically measuring abnormal physical characteristics. Nordau developed from this premise a critique of modern art, explained as the work of those so corrupted and enfeebled by modern life that they have lost the self-control needed to produce coherent works. He attacked Æstheticism in English literature and described the mysticism of the Symbolist movement in French literature as a product of mental pathology. Explaining the painterliness of Impressionism as the sign of a diseased visual cortex, he decried modern degeneracy while praising traditional German culture. Despite the fact that Nordau was Jewish and a key-figure in the Zionist movement (Lombroso was also Jewish) , his theory of artistic degeneracy would be seized upon by German National-Socialists during the Weimar Republic as a rallying point for their anti-Semitic and racist demand for « Aryan » purity in art.

Belief in a Germanic spirit (defined as mystical, rural, moral, bearing ancient wisdom, and noble in the face of a tragic destiny) existed long before the rise of the Nazis ; the composer Richard Wagner celebrated such ideas in his work. Beginning before World War I, the well-known German architect and painter Paul Schultze-Naumburg's influential writings, which invoked racial theories in condemning modern art and architecture, supplied much of the basis for Adolf Hitler's belief that Classical Greece and the Middle-Ages were the true sources of « Aryan » art. Schultze-

Naumburg subsequently wrote such books as « Die Kunst der Deutschen. Ihr Wesen und ihre Werke » (The art of the Germans. Its nature and its works) and « Kunst und Rasse » (Art and Race) , the latter published in 1928, in which he argued that only racially pure artists could produce a healthy art which upheld timeless ideals of Classical beauty, while racially mixed modern artists produced disordered artworks and monstrous depictions of the human form. By reproducing examples of modern art next to photographs of people with deformities and diseases, he graphically reinforced the idea of modernism as a sickness. Alfred Rosenberg developed this theory in « Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts » (Myth of the 20th Century) , published in 1933, which became a best-seller in Germany and made Rosenberg the Party's leading ideological spokesman.

Adolf Hitler's rise to power, on January 31, 1933, was quickly followed by actions intended to cleanse the culture of degeneracy : book burnings were organized, artists and musicians were dismissed from teaching positions, and curators who had shown a partiality to modern art were replaced by Party members. In September 1933, the « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Culture Chamber) was established, with Josef Gœbbels, Hitler's « Reichminister für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » (« Reich » Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda) in charge. Sub-chambers within the Culture Chamber, representing the individual arts (music, film, literature, architecture, and the visual arts) were created ; these were membership groups consisting of « racially pure » artists supportive of the Party, or willing to be compliant. Gœbbels made it clear :

« In future, only those who are members of a Chamber are allowed to be productive in our cultural life. Membership is open only to those who fulfil the entrance condition. In this way, all unwanted and damaging elements have been excluded. »

By 1935, the « Reich » Culture Chamber had 100,000 members.

Nonetheless there was, during the period 1933-1934, some confusion within the Party on the question of Expressionism. Gœbbels and some others believed that the forceful works of such artists as Emil Nolde, Ernst Barlach and Erich Heckel exemplified the Nordic spirit ; as Gœbbels explained :

« We, National-Socialists, are not un-modern ; we are the carrier of a new modernity, not only in politics and in social matters, but also in art and intellectual matters. »

However, a faction led by Alfred Rosenberg despised the Expressionists, and the result was a bitter ideological dispute which was settled only in September 1934, when Adolf Hitler declared that there would be no place for modernist experimentation in the « Reich » . This edict left many artists initially uncertain as to their status. The work of the Expressionist painter Emil Nolde, a committed member of the Nazi Party, continued to be debated even after he was ordered to cease artistic activity, in 1936. For many modernist artists, such as Max Beckmann, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, and Oskar Schlemmer, it was not until June 1937 that they surrendered any hope that their work would be tolerated by the authorities.

Although books by Franz Kafka could no longer be bought by 1939, works by ideologically suspect authors such as

Hermann Heße and Hans Fallada were widely read. Mass-culture was less stringently regulated than high-culture, possibly because the authorities feared the consequences of too heavy-handed interference in popular entertainment. Thus, until the outbreak of the War, most Hollywood films could be screened, including « It Happened One Night », « San Francisco », and « Gone with the Wind ». While performance of atonal music was banned, the prohibition of jazz was less strictly enforced. Benny Goodman and Django Reinhardt were popular, and leading British and American jazz bands continued to perform in major cities until the War ; thereafter, dance bands officially played « swing » rather than the banned jazz.

By 1937, the concept of degeneracy was firmly entrenched in Nazi policy. On June 30 of that year, Josef Goebbels put Adolf Ziegler, the head of the « Reichskammer der Bildenden Künste » (« Reich » Chamber of Visual Art) , in charge of a 6 man commission authorized to confiscate from museums and art collections throughout the « Reich » , any remaining art deemed modern, degenerate, or subversive. These works were, then, to be presented to the public in an exhibit intended to incite further revulsion against the « perverse Jewish spirit » penetrating German culture.

Over 5,000 works were seized, including 1,052 by Emil Nolde, 759 by Erich Heckel, 639 by Ernst Ludwig Kirchner and 508 by Max Beckmann, as well as smaller numbers of works by such artists as Alexander Archipenko, Marc Chagall, James Ensor, Albert Gleizes, Henri Matisse, Jean Metzinger, Pablo Picasso, and Vincent van Gogh. The « Entartete Kunst » exhibit, featuring over 650 paintings, sculptures, prints, and books from the collections of 32 German museums, premiered in Munich on July 19, 1937, and remained on view until November 30 before traveling to 11 other cities in Germany and Austria.

The exhibit was held on the 2nd floor of a building formerly occupied by the Institute of Archæology. Viewers had to reach the exhibit by means of a narrow staircase. The 1st sculpture was an oversized, theatrical portrait of Jesus, which purposely intimidated viewers as they literally bumped into it in order to enter. The rooms were made of temporary partitions and deliberately chaotic and overfilled. Pictures were crowded together, sometimes unframed, usually hung by cord.

The 1st 3 rooms were grouped thematically. The 1st room contained works considered demeaning of religion ; the 2nd featured works by Jewish artists in particular ; the 3rd contained works deemed insulting to the women, soldiers and farmers of Germany. The rest of the exhibit had no particular theme.

There were slogans painted on the walls. For example :

« Insolent mockery of the Divine under Centrist rule »

« Revelation of the Jewish racial soul »

« An insult to German womanhood »

« The ideal - cretin and whore »

« Deliberate sabotage of national defense »

« German farmers - a Yiddish view »

« The Jewish longing for the wilderness reveals itself - in Germany, the Negro becomes the racial ideal of a degenerate art »

« Madness becomes method »

« Nature as seen by sick minds »

Even museum big-wigs called this the « art of the German people » .

Speeches of Nazi Party leaders contrasted with artist manifestos from various art movements, such as Dada and Surrealism. Next to many paintings were labels indicating how much money a museum spent to acquire the artwork. In the case of paintings acquired during the post-War Weimar hyper-inflation of the early 1920's, when the cost of a kilo loaf of bread reached 233 billion RM (« Reichsmark ») , the prices of the paintings were, of course, greatly exaggerated. The exhibit was designed to promote the idea that modernism was a conspiracy by people who hated German decency, frequently identified as Jewish-Bolshevist, although only 6 of the 112 artists included in the exhibition were, in fact, Jewish.

The exhibition program contained photographs of modern artworks accompanied by defamatory text. The cover featured the exhibition title (with the word « Kunst » , meaning art, in scare quotes) superimposed on an image of Otto Freundlich's sculpture « Der Neue Mensch » .

A few weeks after the opening of the exhibition, Josef Gœbbels ordered a 2nd and more thorough scouring of German art collections ; inventory lists indicate that the artworks seized in this 2nd round, combined with those gathered prior to the exhibition, amounted to some 16,558 works.

Coinciding with the « Entartete Kunst » exhibition, the « Große deutsche Kunstausstellung » (Great German art exhibition) made its premiere amid much pageantry. This exhibition, held at the palatial « Haus der deutschen Kunst » (House of German Art) , displayed the work of officially approved artists such as Arno Breker and Adolf Wißel. At the end of 4 months, « Entartete Kunst » had attracted over 2 million visitors, nearly 3 and a half times the number that visited the nearby « Große deutsche Kunstausstellung » .

« Avant-garde » German artists were now branded both enemies of the State and a threat to German culture. Many went into exile. Max Beckmann fled to Amsterdam on the opening-day of the « Entartete Kunst » exhibit. Max Ernst emigrated to America with the assistance of Peggy Guggenheim. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner committed suicide in Switzerland, in 1938. Paul Klee spent his years in exile in Switzerland, yet, was unable to obtain Swiss citizenship

because of his status as a « degenerate » artist. A leading German dealer, Alfred Flechtheim, died penniless in exile in London, in 1937.

Other artists remained in internal exile. Otto Dix retreated to the country-side to paint un-peopled landscapes in a meticulous style that would not provoke the authorities. The « Reichskulturkammer » forbade artists such as Edgar Ende and Emil Nolde from purchasing painting materials. Those who remained in Germany were forbidden to work at Universities and were subject to surprise raids by the « Gestapo » , in order to ensure that they were not violating the ban on producing artwork ; Nolde secretly carried-on painting, but using only watercolours (so as not to be betrayed by the telltale odour of oil paint) . Although officially no artists were put to death because of their work, those of Jewish descent who did not escape from Germany in time were sent to concentration camps. Others were murdered in the « Action T4 » .

After the exhibit, paintings were sorted-out for sale and sold in Switzerland at auction ; some pieces were acquired by museums, others by private collectors. Nazi officials took many for their private use : for example, Hermann Göring took 14 valuable pieces, including a Van Gogh and a Cézanne. In March 1939, the Berlin Fire Brigade burned about 4,000 paintings, drawings and prints which had apparently little value on the international market. This was an act of unprecedented vandalism, although the Nazis were well used to book burnings on a large scale.

A large amount of « degenerate art » by Pablo Picasso, Salvador Dalí, Max Ernst, Paul Klee, Marcel Léger and Joan Miró was destroyed in a bonfire on the night of July 27, 1942, in the gardens of the « Galerie nationale du Jeu de Paume » , in Paris. Whereas it was forbidden to export « degenerate art » to Germany, it was still possible to buy and sell artworks of « degenerate artists » in occupied France. The Nazis considered, indeed, that they should not be concerned by Frenchmen's mental health. As a consequence, many works made by these artists were sold at the main French auction house during the occupation.

After the collapse of Nazi Germany and the invasion of Berlin by the Red Army, some artwork from the exhibit was found buried underground. It is unclear how many of these, then, re-appeared in the Hermitage Museum in Saint-Petersburg where they still remain.

In 2010, as work began to extend an underground line from « Alexanderplatz » through the historic city centre to the Brandenburg Gate, a number of sculptures from the « degenerate art » exhibition were unearthed in the cellar of a private house close to the « Rote Rathaus » . These included, for example, the bronze cubist style statue of a female dancer by the artist Marg Moll, and are now on display at the « Neues Museum » .

...

The years 1927-1937 were critical for artists in Germany. In 1927, the National-Socialist Society for German Culture was formed. The aim of this organization was to halt the corruption of art and inform the people about the relationship between race and art. By 1933, the terms Jewish, Degenerate, and Bolshevik were in common use to describe almost all Modern art.

In 1937, Nazi officials purged German museums of works the Party considered to be « Degenerate ». From the thousands of works removed, 650 were chosen for a special exhibit of « Entartete Kunst ». The exhibit opened in Munich and then traveled to 11 other cities in Germany and Austria. In each installation, the works were poorly hung and surrounded by graffiti and hand-written labels mocking the artists and their creations. Over 3 million visitors attended making it the 1st blockbuster exhibition.

Many of the artists included in the « Entartete Kunst » exhibition are now considered Masters of the 20th Century. The Nazi Regime had a direct influence on the private and public life of many of those artist.

L'expressionnisme

L'expressionnisme est la projection d'une subjectivité qui tend à déformer la réalité pour inspirer au spectateur une réaction émotionnelle. Les représentations sont souvent fondées sur des visions angoissantes, déformant et stylisant la réalité pour atteindre la plus grande intensité expressive. Celles-ci sont le reflet de la vision pessimiste que les expressionnistes ont de leur époque, hantée par la menace de la Première Guerre mondiale. Les œuvres expressionnistes mettent souvent en scène des symboles, influencées par la psychanalyse naissante et les recherches du symbolisme.

Au début du XXe siècle, ce mouvement profondément ancré dans l'Europe du Nord (en particulier, l'Allemagne) est une réaction à l'impressionnisme français. Alors que l'impressionnisme est encore à décrire la réalité physique, l'expressionnisme allemand lui ne s'attache plus à cette réalité et la soumet aux états d'âme de l'artiste.

L'expressionnisme rompt aussi avec l'impressionnisme à travers une forme très agressive : des couleurs violentes, des lignes acérées. Il s'inscrit alors dans la continuité du fauvisme qui commence à s'épuiser et dont les principaux représentants s'éloignent plus ou moins brutalement : Matisse, Marquet, Van Dongen, Braque, Derain, Friesz et Vlaminck. Pour autant, l'expressionnisme n'est pas vraiment un mouvement ou une école mais davantage une réaction contre l'académisme et la société. Les artistes expressionnistes resteront souvent isolés. « Le Cri » du peintre Edvard Munch, ou « La Guerre » d'Otto Dix sont des tableaux représentatifs du genre expressionniste en peinture. En musique, les Symphonies de Dmitri Chostakovitch sont d'esprit expressionniste, à partir de la fin des années 1920.

On peut rattacher les peintres des XVe et XVIe siècles, Matthias Grünewald et Le Greco à la tendance expressionniste, mais, en pratique, le terme s'applique essentiellement aux œuvres du XXe siècle.

Les 1ers éléments annonciateurs de l'expressionnisme apparaissent à la fin du XIXe siècle, en particulier dans la toile d'Edvard Munch, « Le Cri », ainsi que dans l'évolution des travaux de Van Gogh. Le critique d'art Wilhelm Worringer, en 1908, est le 1er à parler d'expressionnisme.

L'expressionnisme éclot par ailleurs alors que la technique photographique se perfectionne et que le rapport de l'art à la réalité s'en trouve profondément modifié. L'art pictural perd sa fonction de moyen privilégié de reproduction de la

réalité objective ce qui renforce sa composante subjective et lui permet progressivement de s'affranchir des normes.

Plusieurs groupes peuvent être rattachés à l'expressionnisme, tels que l'Association des Artistes munichoïses (NKVM) et la Nouvelle Sécession de Berlin dont sont issus par rupture, respectivement « Der Blaue Reiter » (Le Cavalier bleu) et « Die Brücke » (Le Pont) . En 1918, le Groupe de Novembre en cristallise la portée politique. Après 1933, le mouvement, dans sa dimension formelle, a influencé nombre d'autres artistes, comme les expressionnistes abstraits aux États-Unis.

« Die Brücke » est fondé en 1905 par Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Fritz Bleyl, Erich Heckel et Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, à Dresde. Max Pechstein et Emil Nolde, en 1906 ; Otto Müller, en 1910 ; et Cuno Amiet les rejoignent. Le fauviste Van Dongen se joignit aussi à eux et fut l'intermédiaire avec ses compagnons français. L'intention du groupe était d'attirer tout élément révolutionnaire qui voudrait s'unir à eux, c'est ainsi qu'ils l'exprimèrent dans une lettre adressée à Nolde. Leur plus grand intérêt était de détruire les vieilles conventions, à l'identique de ce qui se passait en France.

Selon Kirchner, ils ne pouvaient s'imposer de règles et l'inspiration devait couler libre et donner expression immédiate aux pressions émotionnelles de l'artiste ; ils se préoccupent moins des aspects formels, position qui les séparait du fauvisme de Matisse et Braque avec des scènes très brutales et sanglantes.

Pour les Allemands, le contenu est plus important que la forme. La charge de critique sociale qu'ils imprimèrent à l'œuvre leur valut la critique des conservateurs qui les accusaient d'être un danger pour la jeunesse allemande.

Kirchner fut considéré comme le plus authentique représentant de « Die Brücke » . Il fut un artiste hyper-sensible qui peignait les rues et la vie urbaine de Berlin de manière nouvelle et originale. Ses formes décharnées et pointues, aux couleurs acides, sont caractéristiques, dans des œuvres comme « L'École de danse » de 1914.

Emil Nolde, même s'il quitta le groupe à la fin de l'année 1907, a aussi été considéré comme un des plus importants représentants du groupe. Influencé par le belge Ensor et par Van Gogh, il se sentit fortement attiré par le primitivisme noir et par le mythe du sauvage. Sa recherche du paradis se centra plus sur la concrétion du primordial que sur les attitudes escapistes, façonnant son sentiment tragique de la nature et son inspiration de caractère psychologique et instinctif, éléments qui ont fait de lui le peintre expressionniste par excellence. Vers 1909, et après une grave maladie, il commença à peindre des tableaux à thème religieux, dans lesquels il exprima son inspiration mystique.

Edvard Munch, bien qu'il ne soit pas lié avec « Die Brücke » , est considéré comme le père de l'expressionnisme. Il était norvégien et, jusqu'en 1885, s'intéressa à l'impressionnisme et au symbolisme. À partir de 1892, son style est pleinement formé, courbes sinueuses, coloris arbitraires, obsession pour l'infirmité et la mort, êtres inquiétants qui fuient d'une masse de couleur, comme on l'observe dans son tableau le plus célèbre, « Le Cri » . Son séjour en Allemagne, jusqu'en 1908, explique son influence au sein de « Die Brücke » . En 1913, se produisit la dissolution du groupe, conséquence des différences évidentes entre les composants du groupe et l'établissement d'un marché qui pour eux compliquait les exigences d'un front commun.

En 1912, un autre groupe d'artistes dont Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, August Macke, Alexei Jawlensky, Gabriele

Münter et Marianne von Werefkin se rassemblent à Murnau, à côté de Munich sous la dénomination de « Der Blaue Reiter » (Le Cavalier bleu) . À la différence de « Die Brücke » , les artistes de « Der Blaue Reiter » ressentent le besoin de créer un langage plus contrôlé pour promouvoir leurs messages. Ils publièrent des livres et organisèrent des expositions. Ils développèrent un art spirituel dans lequel ils réduisirent le naturalisme au point d'arriver à l'abstraction. Ils partagèrent certaines idées avec les expressionnistes de « Die Brücke » mais ils possédaient une purification plus importante des instincts et ils voulaient également capter l'essence spirituelle de la réalité. Sur ce point, leurs idées étaient plus recherchées et spéculatives. Les plus grands représentants étaient Kandinsky et Franz Marc, accompagnés de Macke, Jawlensky et Klee.

Kandinsky, originaire de Moscou, arriva à Munich en 1896. En 1909, il est nommé président de la Nouvelle Association d'artistes de Munich et organisa les expositions de 1909 et 1910 pour présenter le travail des fauvistes et des Iers cubistes. Dans le catalogue réalisé lors de la seconde exposition, il commença à introduire sa théorie de l'art qui s'acheva, 2 ans plus tard, lors de la publication de son livre, « Du Spirituel dans l'Art » . En 1912, après avoir donné sa démission de l'association, il fonda avec Franz Marc, « Der Blaue Reiter » . Ce nom dérive de l'amour de Kandinsky pour les cavaliers et de celui de Franz Marc pour les chevaux. Le groupe se dispersa avec la guerre à laquelle Macke et Marc moururent. Les 2 Ires expositions de « Der Blaue Reiter » montraient des œuvres graphiques et des dessins. « La Fugue » de Kandinsky (1914) peut être considérée comme de tendance expressionniste abstraite.

En 1913, ils seront invités à participer à une exposition internationale à Berlin nommée « Le Salon d'automne berlinois » . Sa poétique se définissait comme un expressionnisme lyrique dans lequel l'échappatoire tendait non pas vers le monde sauvage mais vers la spiritualité de la nature et du monde intérieur. Pour Kandinsky, la peinture devait s'étendre de la pesante réalité matérielle jusqu'à l'abstraction de la vision pure, avec la couleur comme moyen, d'où le développement d'une théorie complexe de la couleur. Dans « La Peinture comme art pur » , livre de 1913, il soutient que la peinture est déjà une réalité séparée, un monde en soi, une nouvelle forme d'être, qui agit sur le spectateur à travers la vue et qui provoque en lui de profondes expériences spirituelles. Auparavant, en 1910, Kandinsky avait réalisé les Ires aquarelles abstraites.

Pour Klee, l'artiste devait se mêler aux forces de la nature et agir comme milieu afin que ses créations soient acceptées de la même manière que l'on accepte les phénomènes naturels. À la différence de Kandinsky, Klee était convaincu que l'art pouvait capter le sens créatif de la nature et c'est pour cela qu'il rejetait l'abstraction absolue. Concrètement, Klee se laissa influencer au début, comme Macke, par le simultanésisme des Delaunay. En même temps, il fut le 1er artiste à pénétrer dans les domaines de l'inconscient alors que Sigmund Freud et Carl Jung commençaient à les étudier.

Après la dissolution du groupe, en 1919, Walter Gropius fonde le « Bauhaus » , à Weimar ; école de dessin et d'architecture, dont les professeurs étaient les plus grands Maîtres de l'expressionnisme constructif, et qui réunit des hommes comme Feininger, Klee ou Kandinsky.

En Allemagne, après la Première Guerre mondiale, le réalisme expressionniste apparut, mouvement dans lequel les artistes se séparèrent de l'abstraction, réfléchissant sur l'art figuratif et rejetant toute activité qui ne s'occupait pas

des problèmes de l'urgente réalité de l'après-guerre. Ce mouvement regroupa Otto Dix, George Grosz, Max Beckmann et le sculpteur Barlach.

Quelques musiciens se sont ralliés au mouvement expressionniste, notamment les compositeurs de l'École de Vienne : Arnold Schönberg (« Erwartung », « Die glückliche Hand ») ; Alban Berg (« Wozzeck », « Lulu ») ; Anton von Webern (Passacaille pour orchestre) . Les éléments musicaux qui se rattachent à cette esthétique se caractérisent par un emploi intense du chromatisme et d'agrégats d'une richesse parfois excessive, aboutissant à une exaspération des sentiments, une tension, une frénésie teintées de pessimisme, voire de morbidité.

« Der Blaue Reiter » publia, dans son 1er n°, l'œuvre de 3 compositeurs : Arnold Schönberg (qui s'exerça aussi à la peinture expressionniste) , Alban Berg et Anton von Webern, trio que formait la dénommée Seconde école de Vienne. Dans la trajectoire de ces musiciens, nous trouvons la présence pleinement expressionniste dans les Opéras « Lulu » et « Wozzeck » de Berg et dans les drames « Die Erwartung » et « Die glückliche Hand » de Schönberg.

...

La Première Guerre mondiale se termine par la défaite de l'Allemagne, en 1918. Le pays est alors en ruine, et connaît une crise économique très grave. Les rues sont pleines de mendiants, de soldats infirmes, et de miséreux qui tentent de survivre par tous les moyens. Les artistes sont alors très marqués par cette déprime générale. Certains ont connus les horreurs de la guerre, et veulent en témoigner à travers leurs œuvres. D'autres veulent exprimer le malaise de cette société. Pour la 1re fois dans l'histoire de l'art, des artistes vont choisir de représenter le monde dans ce qu'il a de laid, on appellera ce mouvement : expressionnisme. L'expressionnisme se caractérise par une représentation des hommes à la limite de la caricature. Ils sont souvent montrés comme des pantins désarticulés aux expressions exagérées, souvent tristes ou mélancoliques et parfois ridicules.

Les expressionnistes, grâce à leur regard critique sur la société allemande de l'entre-2-guerres, seront également les 1ers à comprendre la menace représentée par Adolf Hitler, et la montée du Nazisme. Les couleurs de leurs tableaux sont souvent violentes et contrastées, et le noir est très présent.

Dès son arrivée au pouvoir, en 1933, Hitler s'attaque aux artistes modernes, et plus particulièrement aux expressionnistes qui seront les 1ers à être inquiétés par le régime nazi. Leurs images inquiètent, horrifient les allemands, et déplaisent à Hitler parce qu'elles montrent la société telle qu'elle est (misère, intolérance, décadence) , et non telle qu'il voudrait qu'elle soit. En 1937, à Munich, Hitler inaugure l'exposition d'art dégénéré. Celle-ci regroupe plus de 600 œuvres d'artistes modernes (cubistes, expressionnistes, futuristes) , tous considérés comme dégénérés mentaux, et indignes de vivre. Le but est bien de les faire taire. En 1939, 5,000 œuvres sont brûlées par les Nazis. Durant la guerre, beaucoup d'artistes allemands fuiront leur pays afin d'échapper aux persécutions, et se réfugieront notamment aux États-Unis.

L'Allemagne se remet difficilement de la Première Guerre mondiale, et l'industrie cinématographique, pour des raisons économiques, a du mal à rivaliser avec les luxueuses productions américaines. Les réalisateurs des studios allemands

compensent alors le manque de moyens en utilisant le symbolisme, et une mise-en-scène proche du théâtre. Ils sont également influencés par le regard des peintres expressionnistes sur la société. Les récits, dramatiques ou fantastiques, traitent souvent de sujets comme la folie ou d'autres troubles mentaux, la trahison ou le crime. Pour accentuer le sentiment d'angoisse et d'irréalisme, les décors aux formes simplifiées, privilégient les contrastes d'ombres et de lumières (souvent peintes directement sur les murs), les lignes obliques ainsi que les angles aigus. Les acteurs ont un jeu peu naturel, et leurs expressions sont très exagérées. De plus, un maquillage vient souvent accentuer les traits de leur visage et renforcer rides et ombres. Avec l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir et la Seconde Guerre mondiale, nombre de techniciens et cinéastes allemands fuirent vers les États-Unis et furent accueillis à bras ouverts par les studios. Beaucoup d'entre eux eurent une carrière florissante, et leur production influença le cinéma américain. 2 genres furent particulièrement concernés : le film policier et le film d'horreur durant les années '30 et '40. Même Walt Disney utilisera des ambiances expressionnistes dans ses dessins animés. Aujourd'hui encore, l'influence de l'expressionnisme est présente dans le cinéma.

...

Le terme « expressionnisme » se rattache à l'atmosphère de malaise et de révolte qui a précédé et suivi la Première Guerre mondiale et que les créateurs d'alors ont traduite par une esthétique violente et tourmentée.

Si, dans le domaine de la création plastique, on peut employer le mot « expressionnisme » pour désigner toute tendance à l'exagération expressive pouvant exister à toutes les époques et dans toutes les civilisations, au sens strict on l'emploie à propos d'un courant artistique qui s'est épanoui dans un champ chronologique plus restreint, et qui représente l'une des composantes majeures de l'art du XXe siècle.

Le mot « expressionniste » apparaît en 1911, lors de la XXIIe Exposition de la « Berliner Sezession », groupement d'artistes allemands d'avant-garde, pour qualifier un groupe de peintres français, composé d'anciens fauves et de Picasso. Il est ensuite repris pour désigner tout courant artistique novateur et moderne. En 1914 enfin, plusieurs peintres et sculpteurs allemands seront regroupés sous ce vocable : Erich Heckel, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Max Pechstein et Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, tous anciens membres du groupe « Die Brücke » (Le Pont) ; Vassili Kandinsky et Franz Marc, membres du « Blaue Reiter » (Le Cavalier bleu) ; et l'Autrichien Oskar Kokoschka.

Tous ces artistes pratiquent un art dans lequel se remarquent de nombreux traits communs : des empâtements marqués et des couleurs violentes, une vision de la réalité souvent déformée et exagérée, des sujets permettant la création d'une atmosphère pathétique et traduisant des sensations et des sentiments exacerbés.

De manière générale, l'expressionnisme, tel que le mot est employé dans l'entre-2-guerres, se définit plus par une attitude de l'artiste que par un style précis. Il s'agit pour celui-ci de chercher à communiquer au spectateur, par l'intermédiaire des couleurs et des lignes du tableau, la violence et la singularité d'une émotion. L'artiste expressionniste a le souci d'exprimer une conception du monde tourmentée et révoltée, et de partager avec le spectateur des sensations extrêmes et brutales.

La situation de la peinture en Allemagne, au début du XXe siècle, et une affinité particulière du génie germanique devaient faire de ce pays la terre d'élection de l'expressionnisme au tournant du siècle.

Max Liebermann (1847-1935) , Max Slevogt (1868-1932) , Lovis Corinth (1858-1925) empruntent encore alors à l'impressionnisme des effets, assez appuyés, de facture ; sous l'influence du courant d'idées symbolistes, la jeune génération rejette cet art souvent lourd et superficiel, et, malgré la caducité de ses formules, est davantage touchée par l'idéalisme postromantique de Hans von Marées (1837-1887) et d'Arnold Böcklin.

Le renouvellement de l'intérêt pour les traditions nationales, né avec le Romantisme, remet en faveur les peintres des XVe et XVIe siècle (Grünewald et, surtout, Dürer) comme les techniques anciennes de la gravure, en particulier sur bois, à laquelle Munch s'initie à Berlin, où il fait en 1892 une exposition retentissante.

Après celle de Munch, l'œuvre des novateurs français, Gauguin, Cézanne, Lautrec, et celle de Van Gogh, présentée à Berlin (1903) , à Munich (1904) , à Dresde (1905) , accélèrent l'évolution, au moment où le rêve édénique de Gauguin est l'aboutissement du vaste courant européen de retour à la nature (auquel le Romantisme allemand avait été fort sensible) et qu'illustrent notamment les artistes réunis à Worpswede (dans le nord de l'Allemagne, près de Brême) , à la fin du XIXe siècle.

C'est à Dresde que le groupe « Die Brücke » (1905-1913) , qui joint à la nostalgie de l'innocence primitive le goût de l'activité communautaire, fait la synthèse de ces éléments divers, où l'emportent nettement la tradition graphique médiévale ainsi que l'influence de la plastique africaine et océanienne, étudiée au musée ethnographique de Dresde.

Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Erich Heckel, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, Max Pechstein, Otto Mueller pratiquent, les 3 lers surtout, un art d'où toute nuance est bannie au profit de stylisations abruptes, anguleuses, où les couleurs, disposées en aplats, s'accordent moins qu'elles ne se heurtent (Kirchner, « Femme au divan bleu » , 1910 ; Schmidt-Rottluff, « la Lecture » , 1911) .

Membre de « Die Brücke » , en 1906-1907, Emil Nolde apporte à l'expressionnisme, à partir de 1909, une dimension métaphysique (fort étrangère au paganisme érotique de « Die Brücke ») , où le sarcasme douloureux voisine avec la frénésie extatique, à l'aide d'un métier dru, d'une exécution tumultueuse (« Légende de Marie l'Égyptienne » , 1912) .

Transférée à Berlin en 1911, « Die Brücke » y rencontra un climat plus favorable qu'à Dresde et exposa dans la galerie ouverte par Herwarth Walden, directeur de la revue « Der Sturm » (fondée en 1910) . La notion d'expressionnisme s'élabore à ce moment, et « Der Sturm » en généralise l'emploi : le terme est appliqué à la présence du fauvisme français à la Sécession de Berlin et au « Sonderbund » de Düsseldorf dans un compte rendu de la revue « Die Kunst » .

En 1912 sont ainsi qualifiées d'expressionnistes 3 sélections, présentées par « Der Sturm » , d'œuvres très différentes : allemandes (« Der Blaue Reiter ») ; françaises (Braque, Derain, Friesz, Vlaminck) ; et belges (Ensor, Wouters) .

L'expressionnisme recouvre donc en Allemagne, à cette époque, les tendances nouvelles internationales.

L'équipe du « Blaue Reiter » (Kandinsky, Jawlensky, Marc, Macke, Campendonk) arrivant à notoriété à Berlin en même temps que « Die Brücke », et le goût personnel de Walden l'inclinant davantage vers l'intellectualisme poétique de Kandinsky et de ses amis, « Der Blaue Reiter » fut, pendant quelque temps, à la pointe du mouvement expressionniste. Mais il était sollicité par de tout autres formes que celles qui avaient donné à « Die Brücke » son impulsion : le cubisme français, le futurisme italien (exposé à « Der Sturm », en 1912), tandis que Kandinsky jetait, dès 1910-1911, les bases d'un art d'effusion pure, d'où la référence au visible était écartée.

C'est sur cette dernière voie que Marc, surtout, devait s'engager : son besoin de communion avec le monde le rapproche de « Die Brücke », mais il s'exprime désormais par l'intermédiaire de l'animal, non plus de l'être humain (« Chevreuils dans la forêt, II », 1913-1914).

Le visage humain est, au contraire, pour Jawlensky l'objet de multiples variations ; en quête d'une spiritualité toujours plus grande, il s'inspire de l'icône dans les tableaux antérieurs à 1914 (« Femme au chapeau bleu », 1912-1913).

À Vienne, le courant expressionniste part du symbolisme décoratif et graphique de Gustav Klimt, dont procèdent à leurs débuts Richard Gerstl (1883-1908), disparu trop tôt pour avoir pu donner sa mesure, Egon Schiele et Oskar Kokoschka.

Le Suisse Ferdinand Hodler, dont la Sécession viennoise montra un ensemble important en 1904, est également une des sources de l'expressionnisme autrichien, notamment de celui de Schiele, que caractérisent une exaspération graphique et une tension égocentrique et érotique rarement atteintes (« Figure féminine en noir », 1911). Collaborateur de « Der Sturm » dès 1910, Kokoschka fait preuve, en revanche, d'une réceptivité directe à autrui dans ses portraits psychologiques (1907-1914), où s'équilibrent les qualités du coloriste et du dessinateur (« Portrait d'Herwarth Walden », 1910).

La diffusion de l'expressionnisme sous les auspices de « Der Blaue Reiter », du cubisme et du futurisme, et favorisée par de grandes expositions (« Sonderbund » à Cologne, en 1912 ; le Salon d'automne allemand à Berlin, « Der Sturm », 1913), toucha des artistes d'une génération antérieure, comme Christian Rohlf (1849-1938), Corinth, ainsi que Wilhelm Morgner (1891-1917), Ludwig Meidner (1884-1966), fondateur à Berlin du groupe « Die Pathetiker », et Heinrich Nauen (1880-1940).

« Die Brücke » dut, en effet, autant à la conjoncture historique qu'à l'outrance de ses procédés de faire peu école, et ce sont plutôt ses artistes qui furent influencés par leurs contemporains. À cet égard, le fauvisme connut une situation analogue. Mais si l'emploi de la couleur pure, la simplification des formes, la référence fréquente à Van Gogh et le renouveau de la gravure sur bois en France comme en Allemagne justifient le rapprochement entre expressionnisme et fauvisme, ce dernier illustre le plus souvent un esprit beaucoup moins tourmenté, où le bonheur de peindre hérité de l'impressionnisme est encore fort sensible, quand les réussites de « Die Brücke », foncièrement hostile à l'impressionnisme, sont d'ordre graphique plus que pictural. Les fauves atteignent pourtant, par moments, à

l'expressionnisme, en particulier Vlaminck (de très bonne heure : « Sur le zinc », 1900) et Van Dongen (« Danseuse borgne », 1905) ; de telles rencontres sont plus fortuites chez Matisse et Derain. Au début du XXe siècle, en marge du fauvisme, Rouault donne une version française originale de l'expressionnisme (un peu à la manière de Nolde, en Allemagne) avec des aquarelles d'une magistrale aisance, sur des thèmes religieux ou inspirées par le spectacle de la comédie et de la déchéance humaines (« Fille au miroir », 1906) .

La Première Guerre mondiale entraîna le déclin, puis la disparition de l'expressionnisme allemand tel qu'il s'était manifesté peu avant. Les réactions au conflit, désormais individuelles, engendrèrent de nouvelles cristallisations expressionnistes, chez Kirchner (« Autoportrait en soldat », 1915) ; chez Kokoschka (« Autoportrait », 1917) et ce recours à l'autoportrait trahit une prise de conscience douloureuse.

Mais d'autres artistes, qui devaient constituer après la guerre le courant de la « Neue Sachlichkeit » (Nouvelle Réalité ou Nouvelle Objectivité) , réalisent alors quelques œuvres où l'accent de revendication sociale et de révolte contre la guerre l'emporte nettement : « Hommage à Oscar Panizza » (1917-1918) de George Grosz, dans une esthétique très proche de celle du futurisme, mais où la ville et les masses qu'elle emprisonne se heurtent dans une atmosphère d'émeute et de rage impuissante ; « la Nuit » (1918-1919, Düsseldorf) où Max Beckmann, tout en empruntant aux retables des primitifs leur dessin dur, leur composition serrée et leur gesticulation véhémement, crée une œuvre d'un irréalisme fantastique sans précédent. C'est au contraire sur l'excès même de la description naturaliste que reposait l'effet de « la Tranchée » (1920-1923) , tableau disparu d'Otto Dix, atroce vision du carnage né du déferlement d'une haine aveugle et stupide. Après de telles prémisses, la « Neue Sachlichkeit » pouvait difficilement ne point se départir de l'objectivité qui était son ambition, et Beckmann, Grosz et Dix portèrent violemment témoignage contre la mentalité de l'après-guerre. En Allemagne, le post-expressionnisme restait fidèle à ses origines ; seul l'éclairage psychologique s'était modifié : à la réaction inquiète, spontanée de l'individu contre son destin se substituaient la satire des milieux, la protestation délibérée contre la coercition qu'ils exerçaient.

À partir de 1950 environ, l'inspiration issue des foyers traditionnels, désormais exsangue, va permettre à l'Amérique de prendre le relais par le biais de l'expressionnisme abstrait.

Celui-ci, selon Barbara Rose, est la conséquence de 2 catastrophes : la dépression économique des années 1930 et la Seconde Guerre mondiale. La Ire, qui toucha durement les artistes américains, vit, pour atténuer immédiatement ses effets, la création du « Federal Art Project » (1935-1943) , destiné à fournir du travail aux peintres en leur faisant décorer maints lieux publics (gares, écoles, aéroports) sous l'influence, au début du moins, des Mexicains (Rivera, Orozco) , qui avaient également travaillé aux États-Unis. Cette expérience donna aux Américains le goût des très grands formats, et cette notion d'échelle américaine (« American scale ») devint une référence essentielle de leur peinture. La Seconde Guerre mondiale contribua, d'autre part, à faire mieux connaître aux États-Unis, et particulièrement à New York, les tendances européennes contemporaines. Nombre d'artistes avaient cherché refuge à New York : Chagall, Léger, Grosz, Beckmann, Lyonel Feininger et le groupe surréaliste presque au complet (Breton, Dali, Ernst, Masson, Matta) .

La génération expressionniste américaine, menée par Jackson Pollock et Willem De Kooning, arrivés respectivement à New York en 1929 et en 1926, médita 2 leçons apparemment contraires : celle de Picasso, dont la verve lui paraissait

mieux convenir à l'expression du sentiment moderne que l'abstraction géométrique de Mondrian, lui aussi réfugié à New York ; celle du surréalisme (auquel Picasso avait d'ailleurs apporté une éloquente contribution) pour son aspect expérimental et technique, sous le signe de la spontanéité « automatique » qui caractérisait les activités du groupe. Max Ernst, sans doute, révéla à New York le procédé du « dripping », dans lequel la couleur s'égoutte de boîtes de conserve perforées sur la toile. Enfin, l'espace ouvert des tableaux surréalistes (Miró, Matta, Tanguy) pouvait accueillir plus librement des expériences techniques nouvelles et réaliser la synthèse, toujours difficile, entre l'imagination et l'expression. Les derniers tableaux d'Arshile Gorky peuvent ainsi se situer à la charnière du surréalisme et de l'expressionnisme abstrait (« Le foie est la crête du coq », 1944) .

Soutenu par Peggy Guggenheim, Jackson Pollock allait incarner au plus haut degré l'expressionnisme américain. Il s'essaya dès 1941-1942 au « dripping », mit au point le procédé du « all-over » (toute la surface de la toile recouverte de peinture pour suggérer la continuité de la création) et travailla debout, ses immenses formats posés sur le sol. Une telle disposition exigeait une mobilité constante à laquelle tout le corps (et plus seulement le bras et la main comme naguère) participe : d'où le terme d'action painting, que l'on doit au critique d'art Harold Rosenberg. Les foisonnants lacs de couleur de Pollock restituent au niveau de la toile une émotion brute ; çà et là émergent parfois des repères figuratifs (têtes, membres) , auxquels l'artiste allait revenir de façon plus explicite dès 1951 (« Number 27 ») .

...

À l'exception de l'utilisation du terme par Herwarth Walden dans son magazine polémique « Der Sturm », en 1912, le terme expressionnisme est généralement lié à des peintures et des œuvres graphiques en Allemagne, au tournant du siècle, qui conteste les traditions académiques, notamment par les groupes « Die Brücke » et « Der Blaue Reiter » . Le philosophe Friedrich Nietzsche a joué un rôle important dans l'expressionnisme moderne originairement en clarifiant et en servant de conduit pour les courants jusqu'alors négligés dans l'art antique.

Dans « la Naissance de la tragédie », Nietzsche a présenté sa théorie du dualisme ancien entre 2 types d'expérience esthétique, à savoir l'apollinien et le dionysiaque ; un dualisme entre le plastique l'art de la sculpture, du rêve inspiration lyrique, de l'identité, ordre, de régularité, et le repos calme, et, d'autre part, la non-plastique art de la musique, de l'ivresse, l'oubli, le chaos et la dissolution extatique de l'identité dans le collectif. L'analogie avec le monde des dieux grecs caractérise la relation entre ces 2 extrêmes : 2 filleuls, incompatibles et pourtant inséparables. Selon Nietzsche, 2 éléments sont présents dans toute œuvre d'art.

Habituellement, le terme se réfère à l'art qui exprime une émotion intense. On peut dire que tous les artistes sont expressifs, mais il y a une longue ligne de production artistique dans laquelle l'accent est mis sur la communication par l'émotion. Un type d'art se produit souvent pendant le temps de bouleversements sociaux, et par la tradition de l'art graphique il y a un dossier fort et remuant du chaos en Europe du 15e siècle sur la Réforme protestante, de la Guerre des paysans allemands, de la Guerre de 8 ans, l'occupation espagnole aux Pays-Bas, le viol, le pillage et les catastrophes associées à des périodes innombrables du chaos et de l'oppression sont présentés dans les documents de

l'imprimeur. Souvent, le travail est peu impressionnant esthétiquement, mais presque sans exception a la capacité de transporter le spectateur vers des émotions fortes en utilisant le drame et souvent l'horreur des scènes représentées.

Le terme a également été utilisé par l'historien d'art tchèque Antonín Matejcek, en 1910, comme le contraire de l'impressionnisme :

« Une volonté expressionniste, surtout, de s'exprimer ... (un rejet expressionniste) la perception immédiate et s'appuie sur des structures psychiques plus complexes ... Impressions et images mentales qui traversent l'âme mentale des peuples à travers un filtre qui les débarrasse de toute accumulation substantielle et sont assimilés et se condensent en des formes plus générales, dans les types, qu'il transcrit par de simples formules à la main et des symboles. »

Le groupe « Der Blaue Reiter » a été fondé par un certain nombre d'émigrés russes, y compris Wassily Kandinsky, Marianne von Werefkin, Alexej von Jawlensky, et d'autres artistes natifs allemands, comme Franz Marc, August Macke et Gabriele Münter. « Der Blaue Reiter » a été un mouvement artistique durable, de 1911 à 1914, fondamentale à l'expressionnisme, avec « Die Brücke » qui a été fondé la décennie précédente, en 1905.

Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, Alexej von Jawlensky, Marianne von Werefkin, August Macke, Gabriele Münter, Lyonel Feininger, Albert Bloch et d'autres ont fondé le groupe en réponse au rejet de la peinture « Jugement Dernier » de Kandinsky à l'exposition. « Der Blaue Reiter » a manqué un manifeste artistique central, mais a été centré autour de Kandinsky et Marc. Paul Klee était également impliqué.

Le nom du mouvement est le titre d'un tableau que Kandinsky a créé, en 1903, mais on ne sait pas si il est à l'origine du nom du mouvement en tant que tel puisque le professeur Klaus Lankheit a découvert que le titre de la peinture avait été changé. Kandinsky a écrit, 20 années plus tard, que le nom est dérivé de l'attachement de Marc pour les chevaux et l'amour de Kandinsky pour les coureurs, combinés à leur amour commun de la couleur bleue. Pour Kandinsky, le bleu est la couleur de la spiritualité : le plus sombre est le bleu, le plus cela éveille le désir de l'homme pour l'éternité.

Ils croyaient à la promotion de l'art moderne, la connexion entre l'art visuel et la musique ; le spirituel et les associations symboliques de la couleur et une approche intuitive et spontanée de la peinture. Les membres sont intéressés par l'art européen médiéval et le primitivisme, ainsi que par la scène de l'art non figuratif et contemporain en France. À la suite de leurs rencontres avec les cubistes, fauves et des idées « Rayonist », les artistes du « Der Blaue Reiter » ont muté vers l'abstraction.

« Der Blaue Reiter » a organisé des expositions, en 1911 et 1912, partout en Allemagne. Les membres de « Der Blaue Reiter » ont également publié un almanach proposant de l'art contemporain, primitif et folk, dont des peintures d'enfants. En 1913, « Der Blaue Reiter » a exposé dans le 1er « Herbstsalon » allemand.

Le groupe « Der Blaue Reiter » a été perturbé par le déclenchement de la Première Guerre mondiale, en 1914. Franz Marc et August Macke ont été tués au combat. Wassily Kandinsky, Marianne von Werefkin et Alexej von Jawlensky ont

été contraints de revenir vers la Russie, en raison de leur nationalité russe. Il y avait aussi des divergences d'opinion au sein du groupe. Conséquemment, « Der Blaue Reiter » a été de courte durée, d'une durée de 3 ans seulement, de 1911 à 1914.

Les membres fondateurs de « Die Brücke » étaient Fritz Bleyl, Erich Heckel, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner et Karl Schmidt-Rottluff. Plus tard, les membres ont été Emil Nolde, Max Pechstein et Otto Mueller. Le groupe d'artistes a eu un impact majeur sur l'évolution de l'art moderne au XXe siècle et sur la création de l'expressionnisme.

« Die Brücke » est parfois comparé aux fauves. Les 2 mouvements partagent des intérêts communs dans l'art primitiviste. Les 2 ont un intérêt commun dans l'expression des émotions extrêmes à travers la couleur vive qui était très souvent non naturelle. « Die Brücke » et les fauves ont employé une technique de dessin qui était rudimentaire, et les 2 groupes partagent une antipathie pour compléter l'abstrait.

Les membres fondateurs du « Die Brücke », en 1905, étaient 4 étudiants en architecture du « Jugendstil » : Fritz Bleyl, Erich Heckel, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner et Karl Schmidt-Rottluff. Ils se sont rencontrés grâce à la « Hochschule Königliche Technische » de Dresde, où Kirchner et Bleyl ont commencé à étudier en 1901 et sont devenus des amis proches dès leur 1er mandat. Kirchner a poursuivi des études à Munich, en 1903-1904, et sera de retour à Dresde, en 1905, pour compléter ses études. L'institution a fourni un large éventail d'études en plus de l'architecture, tels que des dessins à main levée, des dessins en perspective et l'étude historique de l'art.

Ils ont répondu à la fois aux artistes du passé comme Albrecht Dürer, Matthias Grünewald et Lucas Cranach l'Ancien, ainsi qu'aux mouvements d'avant-garde contemporains internationaux.

Dans le cadre de l'affirmation de leur patrimoine national, ils ont redonné vie à des médias plus anciens, notamment les gravures sur bois. Le groupe « Die Brücke » a développé un style commun basé sur des couleurs vives, la tension émotionnelle, des images violentes et une influence du primitivisme. Après s'être d'abord concentré exclusivement sur la matière urbaine, le groupe s'aventure dans le sud de l'Allemagne en expéditions organisées par Mueller et produit plus des nus et des images arcadienne. Ils ont inventé la technique de gravure appelée linogravure, même si, dans un premier temps, « Die Brücke » a décrit ces gravures sur bois comme étant traditionnelles, ce qu'ils faisaient également.

Les membres du groupe se sont d'abord isolés dans un quartier ouvrier de Dresde, visant ainsi à rejeter leurs propres milieux bourgeois. Erich Heckel a pu obtenir une boucherie vide sur la « Berlinerstraße », à Friedrichstadt, pour que le groupe « Die Brücke » l'utilise comme studio. Bleyl décrit le studio comme étant : celui d'un bohème, pleine de peintures situées un peu partout, des dessins, des livres et du matériel d'artiste, beaucoup plus comme un logement romantique d'un artiste qu'une maison d'un étudiant bien organisé en architecture.

Kirchner est devenu un lieu qui a renversé les conventions sociales pour permettre des rencontres sans lendemain et de la nudité fréquente. Des sessions de dessins de groupes utilisant des modèles du cercle social, plutôt que des professionnels eurent lieu. Les peintres du « Die Brücke » choisissaient des poses d'un quart d'heure pour encourager

la spontanéité. Bleyl décrit un modèle du genre, « Isabella », une fille de 15 ans du quartier, comme une personne très vive, au corps admirable, joyeuse, sans aucune déformation provoquée par la mode ridicule du corset et tout à fait adapté à nos exigences artistiques, en particulier dans son épanouissement des seins de jeune fille.

Le groupe « Die Brücke » a composé un manifeste (portant surtout sur le travail de Kirchner) , qui a été sculpté sur bois et présentait une nouvelle génération, qui veulent la liberté dans notre travail et dans nos vies, l'indépendance des anciennes forces en place.

Emil Nolde et Max Pechstein ont rejoint le groupe « Die Brücke » , en 1906. Bleyl, marié en 1907, avait comme souci de soutenir sa famille et a quitté le groupe « Die Brücke » . Otto Mueller a rejoint « Die Brücke » , en 1910.

En 1911, Kirchner a déménagé à Berlin, où il fonda une école d'art privée, « MIUM Institut » , en collaboration avec Max Pechstein dans le but de promulguer l'enseignement moderne de la peinture. Ce ne fut pas un succès et l'école a fermé l'année suivante.

En 1913, Kirchner a écrit « Chronik der Brücke » (chronique « Brücke ») , ce qui a conduit à la fin du groupe.

...

Expression est le contraire d'impression. L'expressionnisme est un mouvement inverse, de l'intérieur vers l'extérieur : c'est le sujet qu'imprime sa marque sur l'objet. L'expressionnisme, mouvement culturel et artistique de la fin du XIXe siècle à 1925, fortement individualiste, où les artistes expriment leur émotion et leur subjectivité. Cette tendance artistique n'est cependant pas nouvelle dans l'histoire de l'art. Elle fait référence à des artistes comme Grünewald du Gothique tardif allemand, le Greco, Goya et des précurseurs comme Van Gogh, Gauguin, Ensor, Munch. Précisément, l'œuvre « Le Cri » d'Edvard Munch, de 1895, dans ses différentes versions picturales et graphiques, on pourrait la considérer le symbole de tout expressionnisme. Ce mouvement a eu une intensité particulière en Allemagne (« Die Brücke ») et en France (Fauvisme) , dans lequel ils se sont adhérents différents artistes avec des orientations radicalement diverses et des personnalités isolées, qui n'ont pas, contrairement aux autres avant-gardes historiques, rédigé des manifestes ni des lignes de développement communes.

La violence de la guerre et l'ouverture de nouveaux chemins artistiques ont marqué le déclin de l'expressionnisme aux alentours de la Ire décennie du XXe siècle. La Première guerre mondiale a soulevé la nécessité impérieuse de conjuguer l'expérimentation dans l'art comme un engagement politique très marqué : l'expressionnisme prend les traits d'une violente dénonciation politique et décide de représenter les vices de la société contemporaine, dénonçant son échec. L'expressionnisme a été victime du Nazisme, avec l'exposition « Art dégénéré » (1937) dans un but dénigrant et de censure. Toutefois, les principes expressionnistes ont profondément influencé non seulement les arts visuels, mais aussi la danse, la musique (Schœnberg) , le théâtre (Brecht) , le cinéma (Lang) , l'architecture (Taut) , la sculpture (Barlach) et la littérature (Scheler) .

En 1905, Heckel, Schmidt-Rottluff et Kirchner fondent à Dresde le groupe « Die Brücke » (Le Pont) , rejoints ensuite

par Nolde, Pechstein, Müller. Ils diffusèrent leur art dans la revue « Der Sturm », créée en 1910, en réaction contre la société urbaine dont ils dénoncèrent la corruption et la dureté dans leurs toiles ou leurs gravures (Kirchner, « Rue à Dresde »), ils peignirent également la nature, qui devient une mythologie, l'illustration d'un nouveau monde qui serait à créer (Schmidt-Rottluff, « Le soleil dans les pins », 1913). Leur touche est large, leur gamme chromatique se compose de couleurs outrées, les compositions sont simplifiées, l'angoisse s'exprime dans leurs gravures. Les tendances expressionnistes seront reprises par « Der Blaue Reiter », créé en 1911 à Munich, par Kandinsky et Marc.

Ernst Ludwig Kirchner (1880-1938) comme les autres fondateurs du « Die Brücke », était étudiant en architecture à Dresde. Il se passionne pour les arts figuratifs à travers son intérêt pour la peinture et la gravure du début du XVI^e siècle allemand (Lucas Cranach, Albrecht Dürer), les estampes japonaises, la sculpture africaine, et les peintres modernes comme Munch, Gauguin et Van Gogh ; il est frappé par l'immédiateté de leur expression, fondée sur la linéarité et l'accentuation anti naturaliste des couleurs, à teneur symbolique et psychologique. Kirchner est peut-être le représentant le plus explicite et cohérent de mouvement expressionniste allemand.

Malgré son intégration au groupe, Kirchner était principalement un solitaire. Il vécut sous une constante tension mentale, provoquée par la déception de ses espérances dans la Première Guerre mondiale, les années d'après-guerre et la terreur nazie, sombrant dans des profondes crises nerveuses. Pour finir, la maladie et la désespérance ont porté Kirchner au suicide, en 1938.

Oskar Kokoschka (1886-1980) est introduit dans les cercles culturels radicaux par son ami, l'architecte Adolf Loos. Son admiration pour Munch, pour les fauves et pour les peintres du « Die Brücke » situent son travail dans le cadre de l'expressionnisme. Bien que n'adhérant pas officiellement au programme du groupe « Die Brücke », les œuvres de Kokoschka expriment une force et une pénétration psychologique ; une violence chromatique réellement expressionniste. « La Fiancée du vent » (« Die Windsbraut »), terme allemand qui signifie tourbillon ou ouragan est un hommage à Alma Mahler, épouse du compositeur Gustav Mahler, dont leurs brèves et tourmentés amours lui ont inspiré cette œuvre : un homme et une femme dont le portrait est celui de la belle et intelligente Alma, gisent emportés par un tourbillon, témoignage aussi des catastrophes menaçantes de cette époque. Comme dans l'art Romantique, l'amour et la mort apparaissent ici comme des frères, mais le message caché n'est pas mort et transfiguration, sinon horreur et condamnation.

Dans les années 1920, la peinture de Kokoschka s'éloigne progressivement de l'expressionnisme pour privilégier le traitement pictural de grands espaces (paysages et vues de villes). Il se consacre parallèlement à la réalisation de décors et de costumes de théâtre.

Egon Schiele (1890-1918) peintre autrichien, il suscite l'admiration de Gustave Klimt, qui lui procure des nombreuses commandes. Attentif à la leçon des expressionnistes (Kubin, Gerstl, Kokoschka), Schiele se tourne très rapidement vers une peinture qui représente la réalité crue de l'homme saisi dans son conflit exacerbé entre la vie et la mort. Des tableaux tels « l'Autoportrait » aux doigts écartés tout en représentant la frontalité des peintures de Klimt réduisent l'espace à une sorte de vide tragique. Plus qu'à la couleur, Schiele confie l'expression de son angoisse à une ligne coupante, d'une netteté toute gothique, particulièrement efficace dans ses très nombreuses aquarelles et dans ses

dessins d'une tension hallucinée. Il s'installe à la campagne et épouse, en 1915, Edith Harms : le mariage lui procure une sérénité inattendue, qui modifie son inspiration. Une force de composition émerge des peintures de cette nouvelle phase, notamment dans « Edith la femme de l'artiste ». En 1918, à la Sécession de Vienne, une grande rétrospective lui assure, à la veille de sa mort, un succès tardif.

Les dessins de Schiele expriment avec une grande intensité la désespérance, la passion, la solitude et l'érotisme ; la souffrance qu'implique la sexualité, les aspects obscurs des relations homme et femme, comme Sigmund Freud les décrit dans son œuvre. La nue sexualité de ses figures féminines l'a converti en un artiste controversé et nombre de ses dessins ont été confisqués ou brûlés ; en 1912, Schiele fut emprisonné pendant une longue période.

Les Nazis face à l'expressionnisme

Actors : David McCullough, Sander Gilman, Peter Guenther, Robert Hughes, Josephine Knapp, Olda Kokoschka, Peter Selz.

Producer, director and writer : David Grubin.

Executive Producers : Stephanie Barron, David Grubin.

Associate Executive Producer : Karl Katz.

Field Producer : Alice Markowitz.

Associate Producer : Laura Jean Ozment.

Original Music : Michaël Bacon.

Cinematography : Allan Palmer.

Film Editing : Bob Eisenhardt.

Studio : The Los Angeles County Museum of Art / David Grubin Productions, Inc.

Distributor : MUSE Film and Television, Inc.

© 1993 David Grubin Productions, Inc. / The Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Broadcast on KCET on 15 April 1993, in English and German (with sub-titles) .

Videocassette available to schools and libraries (1-800-343-4727) .

Homevision : VHS (NTSC) , Color, 57 min 30 sec.

ASIN : B000077VSU.

Release Dates : 11 April 1993 ; 17 December 17, 2002.

<http://movieberry.com/movies>

http://simple-movie.com/movie/degenerate_art/

http://www.filmous.com/degenerate_art/

http://www.amazon.com/gp/offer-listing/B00000FEHZ/ref=dp_olp_used?ie=UTF8&condition=used

0:00 : Credits.

1:00 : Beginning of program ; scenes from Berlin ; narrator describes the Nazi Party's ascent to power and the art exhibition they held in Munich, in 1937.

1:45 : Interviews with Robert Hughes, art critic, and Peter Guenther, art historian.

3:00 : Degenerate Art exhibit held in Berlin (1992) .

3:45 : Footage of Hitler rally (from Leni Riefenstahl film) . Photos and footage from 1937 Munich exhibition.

4:50 : Interview with Josephine Knapp, an American who attended the 1937 exhibition.

5:45 : Peter Günther describes the setting : paintings badly lit and badly displayed.

6:20 : Interview with Sander Gilman, cultural historian.

6:50 : Interview with Kurt Assize, who saw the exhibit as a 16 year old.

7:30 : Gilman describes the power of modern art that the Nazi's so feared.

7:50 : Wagner (music from « Tannhäuser ») accompanies an example of acceptable painting. Narrator describes Hitler's artistic aspirations.

8:30 : Gilman describes Hitler's artistic style and opposes it to the contemporary avant-garde style.

9:30 : Interview with Bernard Schulze, painter, who was a student at the time of the Munich exhibit.

11:00 : Narrator introduces Expressionism and describes the contributions of Ernst Ludwig Kirchner.

11:20 : Interview with Peter Selz, art historian.

11:35 : Narrator describes the work of another Expressionist painter, Oskar Kokoschka.

12:10 : Interview with Olda Kokoschka, Kokoschka's widow.

12:35 : Selz describes Kokoschka's violent reception in Vienna.

13:15 : Hitler cut-off the careers of the most promising Expressionists.

14:10 : Hughes describes the effect of WWI trench warfare on modern artists (Kokoschka, Kirchner, Dix) .

16:00 : Hitler also fought in WWI, an event that contributed to his decision to enter politics. Footage of post-War Germany.

17:30 : Emil Nolde was one of few Expressionist painters to join the Nazi Party.

19:00 : Hitler was released from prison, in 1924, and began immediately to attack those who had lost the War : Jews, Communists, Bolsheviks, Degenerates.

19:30 : Gilman explains the history of the term degenerate.

21:00 : Footage from 1920's Germany, paintings from that era. Narrator describes the successful career of Max Beckmann, before WWI, and the change in his style following that experience.

24:00 : Footage of food lines and Nazi parades and rallies. Gilman explains the way Hitler not only manipulated the population into blaming Jews and degenerates for their economic woes but also into regarding works of modern art as symbolic of that very degeneracy.

26:00 : Footage of rallies during 1933, when Hitler became Chancellor of Germany ; Gœbbels addresses the crowd during a book burning.

27:30 : Titus Felixmüller, son of artist Conrad Felixmüller (whose works were displayed at the Munich exhibition) , describes the terrorism the Nazi's carried-out against his father. Felixmüller had already burned much incriminating evidence : letters, paintings, sketches.

29:10 : More Nazi footage. Narrator describes the actions against modern art taken by the Nazis : closing museum wings devoted to modern art, firing museum directors, closing the « Bauhaus » . Despite these extreme measures, Emil Nolde remained a loyal Party member. Hughes points-out that there's no contradiction between being a fascist and being an artist.

30:20 : Goebbels addresses a gathering praising the « Führer » 's artistic taste.

31:00 : Interview with Karla Eckert, former reporter for Nazi Party newspaper. She describes the difficult task of covering the Munich exhibit, paintings she loved, for the Party paper.

32:30 : Films and music also were affected. Works by László Moholy-Nagy, Alban Berg, Paul Hindemith, and Arnold Schönberg were ridiculed (background music : Schönberg's « Variations for Orchestra » , Opus 31) . Jazz was also attacked.

34:00 : One of the 1st Nazi buildings was the House of German Art, completed in Munich, in 1937. Hughes describes the Classicist Nazi art aesthetic. Peter Guenther describes the frightening impact of the « Haus der Deutschen Kunst » .

39:00 : Across the park from the « Haus der Deutschen Kunst » , the Degenerate Art exhibit was mounted, including works by Kandinsky, Mondrian and Klee. Hughes, Knapp, and Selz describe various aspects of the exhibit. The narrator points-out that although 112 artists had been singled-out as degenerate, only 6 were Jewish.

42:00 : The Nazi leadership turned on their loyal Party member, Emil Nolde (27 of his paintings were hung in the Degenerate Art show) . Many artists began to flee Germany.

43:50 : Olda Kokoschka comments on Oskar Kokoschka's experience.

45:00 : Ursus Dix, Otto Dix's son, describes why Dix felt he could not leave Germany.

45:45 : The Degenerate Art exhibit toured Germany and Austria for more than 4 years and was seen by more than 3 million people. Kirchner committed suicide in June 1938. The Nazi's put a constant watch on Nolde.

48:10 : In 1938, the Nazi's put much of their plundered art up for auction. Gert Werneberg cataloged much of that art.

48:30 : Interview with Werneberg, who describes the occasion when Nolde came to her asking for help.

49:15 : The auction was held in Switzerland, in June 1939. Works sold included those by Van Gogh, Picasso, Gauguin, Matisse, along with those by German artists.

50:30 : New exhibitions were mounted yearly at the « Haus der Deutschen Kunst » , and Hitler was always the largest

buyer.

52:00 : Footage of bulldozer rolling bodies into mass graves. Hughes points-out the eerie similarity between the elongated, emaciated corpses and the very figures in Expressionist art that the Nazi's had hoped to eradicate.

53:30 : Selz, Gilman, and Hughes remark on the continuing impact that art once designated as degenerate exercises upon contemporary viewers.

54:40 : Film concludes with a voice recording of Thomas Mann speaking at the Library of Congress.

55:00 : Credits.

57:00 : Information on how to order VHS cassette and transcripts.

57:30 : End.

Writers Guild of America Award.

« Extraordinary TV. The documentary itself is a work of art. » (Daily Variety)

« An evocative documentary that brings back the poisonous spirit of the times. » (New York Times)

« A film of indisputable power. » (Wall Street Journal)

« Thorough, moving ... a potent, timely reminder. » (Los Angeles Times)

« A rich and engrossing art-history lesson and a modern morality tale. » (Philadelphia Times)

An award winning film about the most widely seen art exhibition ever assembled, « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) , commissioned by Adolf Hitler as an attack on modern art and artists. The documentary is based on the Los Angeles County Museum of Art exhibition (1990-1991) where the Nazi show was recreated. The film, incorporates footage of the original exhibition, reminiscences by visitors to « Entartete Kunst » , and commentary by critics and historians.

The film explores how the Nazis defamed and vilified avant-garde artists in Germany, during the 1930's, culminating in the infamous art show called « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) .

This is a documentary from 1993 written, produced, and directed by David Grubin about the art exhibit under the Nazi regime of what they considered to be the most corrupting and corrosive examples of what they called « Entartete Kunst » or Degenerate Art. The exhibit, which opened in July of 1937, was meant to be laughed at and

despised. I ran across it, in a class on Modernism and Post-Modernism.

Degenerate Art opens with a view of the historic « Altes Museum » in Berlin that's as visually arresting as it is supremely ironic.

Between the columns of the grand neo-Classical facade, banners bearing the portraits of the most talented German artists of this Century hang majestically. These are the artists Adolf Hitler tried to destroy by renouncing as Degenerate.

Last summer, the persecuted artists were back in Berlin, in symbolic triumph, represented by some of the paintings and sculptures that Hitler banned, more than 55 years ago. The exhibition of their work finally closed the book on Hitler's determined campaign to destroy modern art and to remake German culture in his own image.

Before he became the charismatic « Führer », Hitler fancied himself an artist. He tried to enroll at the Academy of Visual Arts in Vienna, but his application was rejected.

The rejection must have wounded him deeply, because 35 years later, when he was the absolute ruler of Germany, Hitler got even. He ordered thousands of avant-garde artworks removed from German museums and closed the modern art wing of the national gallery in Berlin.

And then, he did something even more remarkable. He ordered that an exhibition of confiscated work, which he called Degenerate Art, be organized so that Germans could see for themselves how the people that Hitler hated (and wanted them to hate) had corrupted their glorious Nordic culture.

Degenerate Art turned-out to be the most popular art exhibition of all time. More than 3 million people saw it during a tour of 13 German and Austrian cities. Most of them agreed with Hitler that the art produced by Jews, Bolsheviks and anyone else who offended his pedestrian bourgeois taste was rubbish.

Well, history has proved that 3 million Teutons and one failed painter could be dead wrong. The art that Hitler trashed has survived, and the reputations of the vilified artists have flourished.

The story of Hitler's vigorous campaign to suppress modern art, music, literature and theatre was first told in 1991 through an exhibition organized by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art that traveled to Berlin. Now, Degenerate Art has become an hour long television program, produced by David Grubin Productions Inc. in cooperation with the museum and narrated by David McCullough.

Television handles this intriguing, multi faceted story very well, perhaps because it's less about aesthetic issues than about cultural history and the dynamics of authoritarianism. You don't need to know much art history to appreciate what the Nazis were trying to accomplish, or the irony of their ultimate failure.

Their goal was fundamental, to crush dissent of all kinds. They were trying to homogenize Germany by promulgating rosy cheeked Teutonic romanticism as a cultural ideal. Expressionist painters, who represented the darker, more violent side of human nature, were not welcome.

Today, we might wonder why the Nazis attacked modern art with such determination. The artists didn't wield any political authority, and it's evident from the public response to the original Degenerate Art show that the masses didn't understand what the artists were trying to say.

So, why did the Nazis not only reject modern art but try to defile it ? We can only assume that Hitler, whose abilities as a painter didn't rise above the picturesque, considered all forms of modern art a personal insult.

Degenerate Art recreates the war on culture through period movie footage intercut with comments by several Germans and one American who saw the original exhibition in Munich, in 1937, by cultural and art historians, and by relatives of several artists whose works were confiscated.

Art critic Robert Hughes periodically tosses a pungent observation into the pot. For instance, he observes at one point that the 1937 show of proscribed art was really a kind of show trial, at which the artists were not only to be found guilty of crimes against German culture but also humiliated and hounded into silence.

The tactic succeeded in several notable cases. Max Beckmann, perhaps the pre-eminent German artist of this Century, fled to exile in Holland, and eventually came to the United States. After his paintings were banned, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner committed suicide.

And then, there was poor Emil Nolde, who joined the Nazi Party years before Hitler came to power in the misguided belief that he would be spared from persecution. He wasn't. Eventually, the Nazis prohibited him from painting. But Nolde was so committed to art that he switched to working in watercolors so that the smell of oil paints and turpentine wouldn't betray him to the police.

Besides featuring the art that Hitler despised and snippets of the 1937 exhibition, Degenerate Art shows us the Nazi response : a new museum called the House of German Art, where the government mounted exhibitions of the Art Deco kitsch, as Hughes describes it, that typified Hitler's taste.

And, in a segment that might be called the art critic's nightmare, Karla Eckert, who was a reporter for a Nazi newspaper, describes the dilemma she faced in covering the 1937 exhibition.

« I loved the show » , she recalls, « but what could I do ? » She and a colleague agonized « for hours » , then decided that the only safe and honourable course would be to describe exactly what they had seen, without comment.

Wisely, Degenerate Art doesn't spend any time moralizing about Hitler's folly ; the lessons to be drawn from it are by now abundantly obvious. Nor does it seek to draw parallels with recent events involving the American government,

individual artists and grants to arts organizations. To have done so would confuse both issues.

The program closes as it opened, with a slow pan across the portrait banners on the « Altes Museum » facade, where Beckmann's glowering visage stands as the perfect symbol of modern art's determined resistance to Hitler's aggressive philistinism.

Degenerate Art is about the most widely seen art exhibit ever assembled : « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) , was commissioned by Hitler as an attack on modern artists. The original exhibition was a sensation ; drawing more than 3 million visitors, between 1937 and 1941, and resulting in the banning and destruction of work by many important German artists. 650 paintings, sculptures, prints and drawings were confiscated from museum collections and brought together for ridicule and defamation. The film, shot on location in Berlin, Los Angeles and Washington, includes interviews with the sons of Otto Dix and the widow of Oskar Kokoschka, as well as critics and historians. The film features archival footage, some of it never seen before, of the original exhibition and of artists in their studios.

Los Angeles County Museum of Art curator Stephanie Barron served as executive producer of the special, together with 5 time Emmy winner David Grubin, who also wrote and directed. The program is based on Barron's widely acclaimed recreation and analysis of Hitler's notorious exhibition « Degenerate Art : The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany » , which was the highlight of LACMA's 1991 season.

The museum show, which had been in the works since the mid 1980's, galvanized attention. Its opening had coincided with furious debates over government censorship in the United States, as politically motivated battles raged about the National Endowment for the Arts.

Given the show's critical and popular success, 2 more venues were hastily added to its tour. After a planned stop in Chicago, it went on to sites in Washington and Berlin.

Among the program's most interesting features is a series of interviews with visitors to the original 1937 exhibition, who returned to the « Altes Museum » for the LACMA show. Their eyewitness accounts are often riveting, as much for the poignant shadow of the nearly incomprehensible magnitude of the crushing events through which they lived as for the specific anecdotes they have to tell.

Josephine Knapp, an American art historian, was on a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship in Europe, in 1937, and almost accidentally found herself in Munich. Titus Felixmuller is the son of artist Conrad Felixmuller, whose work was mocked and condemned along with paintings, sculptures and prints by Marc Chagall, Emil Nolde, Oskar Kokoschka, Max Beckmann, Ernst Kirchner and dozens more.

Karla Eckert had the odious task of promoting the exhibition in the official Nazi newspaper. German student Kurt Assis was sent to see the show when it traveled to Berlin.

Peter Günther, a German expatriate and professor emeritus of art history at the University of Houston, saw it in

Munich, where he also walked across the park to see Hitler's concurrent exhibition of governmentally sanctioned German art. The stark disparity between the shows, one of reviled Modernists and the other of Hitler's fondness for an art of treacle and bombast, would form the polarities of American critic Clement Greenberg's enormously influential 1939 essay, « Avant-Garde and Kitsch » .

The 2nd highlight of the program is its reckoning with Hitler himself, with his taste and canny understanding of cultural manipulation. The Austrian born dictator had been a painter in his youth, which partially explains his subsequent vehemence with regard to the political uses of art and his appointment of Josef Goebbels as cultural propagandist. His own failure to be successful as an artist heightened his resentment against German Modernists, whose work had been heartily accepted into State-funded museum collections.

In the numerous examples of his work that are shown, Hitler's æsthetic sense turns-out to be revealing. His paintings are bright, cheerful, starkly idealized images of the people and the land of a cheerful peasant mother and her baby in a veiled masquerade as the « Madonna and Child » ; or, a triumphant landscape, meant as a pæan to the glories of the fatherland.

In 1991, curator Stephanie Barron organized L.A. County Museum of Art's Degenerate Art exhibit, which was a partial remounting of a 1937 Munich exhibition (blessed by Hitler) as an example what's wrong with modern art. Producer and director David Grubin has brought an extraordinary TV documentary out of the exhibit and from archival films of the original showing. The documentary itself is a work of TV art.

In the skillfully assembled filmed segments, viewers see both the newness and the ugliness of the original anti- avant-garde exhibit. It was haphazardly mounted as a sign of the scorn Nazis held for the controversial works.

That 1st exhibit toured Germany for several years to enthusiastic response ; modern art had been effectively blotted-out in Nazi Germany.

The documentary has witnesses who were there in 1937, art historians, art critic Robert Hughes, and relatives of banned artists, to help fill in the remarkable story.

The government, having pulled some 1,600 suspect works of art from German and Austrian museums, selected 650 of them to be shown as representatives of what the Nazis decided was dangerous art.

Grubin explains that non-representational art threatened the 3rd « Reich » politically, morally, socially and artistically.

The earlier book burnings signaled the closing down of literary freedom ; the exhibition (which opened in Munich the day after the new, coldly impressive House of German Art opened) was Hitler's way of notifying the art world that Berlin, a 1920's art leader, was now following orders.

Samples of Hitler's own paintings have a sentimental, postcard dullness to them and are reflected in the works of

approved artists represented in the German art hall.

Fascinating clips from the opening day at the hall, with Hitler attending, display startlingly bland, stiff heroic works with most of the figures nude and expressionless. The artists' names, if known, aren't mentioned.

Not all of the pieces from the degenerate artists exhibit were in the 1991 show (Barron and her team managed to gather together about a quarter of the earlier show) and not all are Masterworks by a long shot.

But Kirchner, Kokoschka, Beckmann and Nolde (a Nazi himself) are represented by particularly powerful, evocative works, and several unidentified pieces remain fresh and intriguing.

Inevitably, the exhibits in 1937 and 1991 of expressionistic art warn about censorship, of State decisions about what's good for the people and what influences people for good or bad.

Thomas Mann is quoted at the end of the documentary about there being no good Germans, no bad Germans, only Germans.

The documentary is a strong statement.

...

« The history of Hitler's war against modern art is sandwiched between black and white footage of the original Degenerate Art exhibition, in 1937, and color footage of the 1991 reconstructed display in this concisely edited documentary. Clocking in at only 55 minutes, the film establishes the future dictator's failed attempt at a career in traditional painting and his contempt for the success of modern art. It tracks World War I's effect on both Germany's art community and its economy, paralleling « Der Führer » 's rise to power. Eyewitnesses and scholars describe the 1937 graffiti strewn side-show of a presentation meant to humiliate and thus destroy the artists. After the riveting stories of careers ruined, work destroyed in order to avoid concentration camps, and Hitler's seemingly contradictory fascination with nudes, viewers are left to mull on their own any connection with today's continued efforts to restrict art in the name of societal preservation. » (Kimberly Heinrichs)

« This is a riveting PBS documentary by David Grubin, acclaimed director of many “ American Experience ” films. This one is about the National-Socialist effort to stomp out modern art in Germany 1933-1945. Liberal use of archival film combined with close-up views of the paintings themselves as well as knowledgeable interviews add-up to a spellbinding primer on how modernism is a threat to totalitarianism. You think you may not like some of this art either, but the fascinating explanations and historical context will change your mind. As the critic Robert Hughes points-out in the film, the attempt by the Nazis to censor grotesque art (and regiment culture) could have resulted in the grotesque horrors displayed in the concentration camps at the end of the War. If you are at all interested in culture wars or the relationship between art and politics you must see this. »

« This is a superb presentation of one of the lesser-known aspects of the 3rd “ Reich ”. The blockbuster degenerate art show in Germany, in 1936, is detailed with actual footage from the original show along with excellent footage from the recent hanging of all the surviving work from that show back in Berlin. The documentary very effectively details the history of the German Expressionists and Hitler's collision course with their work and it puts the work into the perspective of Hitler's House of German Art, the invasion of Poland, and most importantly the liberation of the camps and the burial of the typhoid dead. Its presentation of book burning in Nazi Germany and the connection to the burning of people is profound. »

Berlin's Free University has an Internet database (in German only) documenting the fate of more than 21,000 artworks condemned as degenerate by the Nazis and seized from German museums, in 1937. The website, the result of 8 years of research by art historians at the university, includes works by Franz Marc, Emil Nolde, Otto Dix, Marc Chagall, Max Beckmann, Wassily Kandinsky and Ernst Ludwig Kirchner. It gives details of the museums they were seized from and their current location, in cases where it is known and where the work wasn't destroyed.

Hitler et le pouvoir de l'esthétique

Hitler and the Power of Æsthetics

Frederick Spotts. « Hitler and the Power of Æsthetics » , Overlook Press, Hutchison (2003) ; 456 pages.

Article by Morton P. Levitt . « Journal of Modern Literature » , Volume 26, Number 3/4, Temple University (Summer 2003) ; pages 175-178.

Frederick Spotts' surprising thesis is encapsulated in his title : « Hitler and the Power of Æsthetics » , not, as we might expect of his subject, the Æsthetics of Power. True, he does discuss early on (in a chapter entitled « The Artful Leader ») the stagecraft with which the Nazis attracted Depression-era Germans to their mass marches and assemblies. But his central concerns involve æsthetics for their own sake, both as a demonstration of the dictator's unlimited power and as its justification. Hitler, as Spotts presents him, had goals and employed means which even the most caustic observer can recognize as æsthetic. He may have been delusional, about art as about so much else, but about art, at least, he was neither hypocritical nor obviously insane (even if the results of his policies may in themselves appear mad) . The documentary record, as Spotts presents it, including many primary sources of letters and journals and a large body of often telling illustrations, is very clear on Hitler's seriousness, even dedication, to art as he understood it. Spotts's consistent theme that Hitler saw himself, at least that he claimed repeatedly over the years of his dictatorship that he saw himself principally as an artist, should convince the most skeptical of readers. Hitler and the Power of Æsthetics is filled with such surprises and ironies.

This is not to say that Hitler's taste was good ; it was conventional, old fashioned, utterly unoriginal. It was also consistent in painting, in music, especially in architecture, in all of which fields he regarded himself as an expert and to all of which he devoted inordinate resources of time, energy, and money, even when affairs of State would seem to indicate that he should neglect æsthetics for the moment and concentrate on power. Instead, as his Empire crumbled

around him, Hitler turned increasingly to his art projects, not only for solace, it seems, but as if they were the true purpose of his Empire. To be sure, he similarly regarded himself as a military expert, but the occasional mad genius which may have characterized his career as a military strategist was absent entirely from his aesthetic obsessions. As pedestrian as these may have been in quality, however, in sheer volume (in the amount of money spent, objects purchased, and artists supported) they may well have made Hitler the greatest art patron in history. He had once maintained he could imagine nothing finer than to be a cultural philanthropist (page 257) .

There are other, equally stunning surprises here as well. This Hitler is often opposed to using art for propagandistic purposes : our obvious expectations aside, he was not directly involved in the infamous « Degenerate Art » exhibition merely a passive figure in its origin and development and not the evil genius behind it (page 163) ; and it was Richard Wagner's music that he loved and not the myth-making. As Spotts puts it :

« It has sometimes been assumed that Hitler was attracted to Wagner's works because of the plots, with their Classic conflict between the outsider and a rigid social order, their lonely heroes and dark villains, their Nordic myths and Germanic legends. However, there is no record of any comment on how he interpreted the works or whether he saw in them any ideological message much less whether he envisaged himself as Lohengrin, Siegmund, Siegfried, Wotan or any other Wagnerian character. It was the music that moved him. » (page 236.)

His financial and moral support for the Bayreuth Wagner Festival was so complete, often against the wishes of Nazi Party officials, as to make it « the only cultural institution in the 3rd “ Reich ” independent of Nazi control » (page 258) . A mediocre painter himself, as several photographs of his work make clear, Hitler saw himself as an artist above all, regarding and employing art much as Plato does in « The Republic » . His career proves the dangers of mixing art and politics : more accurately, the dangers of ...

...

In his 1938 essay, « Brüder Hitler » , Thomas Mann felt obliged to recognize that Hitler was, in some real sense, an artist and, in a well-known aphorism, Walter Benjamin said that Fascism aestheticizes politics. These 2 insights form a starting-point for Frederic Spotts's remarkable new book. You may qualify « artist » with « would-be » or « talentless » , or you may say, as Spotts does, that « Hitler's problem (in a way, his tragedy) was that he confused aesthetic drive with aesthetic talent » . But there's no escaping the central role that art played in his life, and in the political drama of National-Socialism.

It would scarcely be exaggerating to call the 3rd « Reich » one vast performance, epitomized by the awe-inspiring if spine-chilling Nuremberg rallies, those epic « son et lumière » shows with their immense choreography - what Josef Goebbels called : « a “ via triumphalis ” of living bodies » . They were more than the usual circuses that tyrannies provide for the masses. As Spotts says, their ultimate purpose « was to fill a void at the centre of National-Socialism ... unlike Marxism, it offered little that was concrete enough to get hold of. What Hitler provided was ritual in place of belief, or ritual as belief » . The form was the content ; the medium was the message.

Behind this ritual stood a failed artist who had been rejected twice by the Academy in Vienna, a rejection easily explained by the pictures Spotts reproduces (asked once how good Mao's poems were, the great Sinologist Arthur Waley replied : « Let's say they're better than Hitler's paintings but not as good as Winston Churchill's ») . But this only inflamed the overwhelming sense of grievance that ran through his life.

Failure and resentment informed his æsthetic outlook and his loathing of Modernism related also to his hatred of the Jews and of Communism, although the pet phrase « culture-Bolshevism » to damn experimental art was ironical in view of the startlingly brutal and retrograde cultural regime which Joseph Stalin was imposing in Russia.

Not that there was anything new in an enthusiasm for « healthy » and « positive » art, or the belief that :

« Art which merely portrays misery is a sin against the German people. » (Kaiser Wilhelm II's words, not Hitler's.)

But the Nazis took it much further. Spotts also dissects the internal politics of the ruling gang to find that the « degenerate » campaign was in part a manœuvre against the « closet Modernist » Gœbbels by his rivals.

Much of the « Reich » 's official art was mere « kitsch » , and its architecture was vulgarly and oppressively grandiose, endless monuments to the fallen and, in Hitler's morbid doodlings, still huger monuments to those who would one day die for the fatherland. The only admirable and even beautiful products of the regime shown in the fascinating and copious illustrations were purely functional, like « autobahn » bridges. And yet, National-Socialism was alarmingly art-conscious.

Hitler apart, many of his entourage had nurtured creative aspirations : Josef Gœbbels the published novelist ; Alfred Rosenberg the architecture student and would-be philosopher ; Baldur von Schirach who wrote poetry and patronized music ; Hans Frank an aspiring poet.

Creative aspirations did not, of course, mean creativity. Hitler banned art-criticism on the grounds (with which some artists might sympathize) that « the stupid must not criticize the clever » ; his reign was, in some ways, the revenge of the mediocre on the original.

He adored Richard Wagner, made Bayreuth into a shrine of the « New Order » , and spent his happiest times there with the Wagner family. Party officials compelled to sit through interminable evenings in the « Festspielhaus » may have deserved everything they got, but one may feel a flicker of pity for the factory workers rewarded, and the War-wounded rehabilitated, by being sent to « Tannhäuser » .

If the artistic yearnings of all those Nazi poets and painters « manqués » cast a bleak light on the redemptive power of art, or any idea that the sublime and the beautiful will make us better people, there is another bleak side to the story in the behaviour of the German « arts community » , especially musicians. Some went into exile, either involuntarily or because they would not serve the regime, but far more did not. There were musicians who divorced

Jewish spouses to keep their jobs, while great names like Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner and Wilhelm Furtwängler chose to endorse the regime.

It may be thought that the Germans had never properly understood what the « Ring » actually teaches about hubristic power-worship and the annihilation of love. As it was, « the final and most curious aspect of Hitler's Wagnermania » was that, after Stalingrad, he couldn't bear to listen to that music any more, and turned to Franz Lehár for consolation.

Meantime concerts of high-standard continued, until what Spotts calls the most grotesque episode in musical history. On April 13, 1945, the Berlin Philharmonic played Bruckner's 4th, as a recognized sign that the 3rd « Reich » was reaching its own last bars. At the exits, members of the « Hitler Youth » handed-out free cyanide capsules. Unimaginable wickedness and horror ended to the sound of sublime music.

...

Hitler's taste underwent several significant changes. During most of his life, Bruckner held little appeal. Heinrich Hoffmann did not so much as mention the composer's name when once identifying Hitler's favourites. Even after becoming Chancellor, Albert Speer noted, his interest « newer seemed very marked » .

The composer had, however, symbolic importance to him, both as a « home-town boy » and as a rival to Johannes Brahms, so beloved in Vienna. It was a fixed part of the Nuremberg rallies for the cultural session to open with a movement of one of his Symphonies. In June 1937, he was famously photographed paying his respects to the composer, standing in mute homage before a monument at « Walhalla hall of fame » , near Regensburg, as Siegmund von Hausegger and the Munich Philharmonic played the magnificent Adagio of the 7th Symphony.

Why Hitler staged that event is not known. Speculation has ranged from the theory that it was intended as a cultural precursor of the annexation of Austria (« Anschluß ») the following year, to the notion that it was out of nostalgia for his « beautiful time as a choir-boy » and Lambach Abbey - with its Bruckner associations. Undoubtedly, Hitler felt a personal kinship. Both had come from small Austrian towns, grew-up in modest circumstance, had fathers who died at an early age, were autodidacts, and made their way in life despite great obstacle. On a number of occasions, he contrasted the Austrian Catholic Bruckner, whom the Vienna shunned, to the north German Protestant Brahms, whom they idolized. Then, suddenly, in 1940, he developed a passion for Bruckner's Symphonies. He even began mentioning him in the same breath with Richard Wagner. « He told me » , Gœbbels noted in his diary, « that it was only now during the War, that he had learned to like him at all. The enthusiasm steadily grew. By 1942, he placed Bruckner on a level with Beethoven, and categorized the farmer's 7th Symphony as « one of the most splendid manifestations of German musical creativity, the equivalent of Beethoven's 9th » . His feelings about Bruckner, the man and the composer, are best conveyed by a remark he made after listening to a recording of the 1st movement of the 7th at his military headquarters, in January 1942 :

« Those are pure popular melodies from Upper-Austria, nothing taken-over literally but “ Ländler ” and so on that

know from my youth. What the man made-out of this primitive material ! In this case, it was a priest who deserves well for having supported a great Master. The Bishop of Linz sat for hours, alone in the cathedral, when Bruckner, the greatest organist of his time, played the organ. One can imagine how difficult it was for a small peasant lad when he went to Vienna, that urbanized, debauched society. A remark by him about Brahms, which a newspaper recently carried, brought him closer to me : Brahms' music is quite lovely, but he preferred his own. That is the healthy self-confidence of a peasant who is modest but, when it came down to it, knew how to promote a cause when it was his own. That critic Hanslick made his life in Vienna hell. But when he could no longer be ignored, he was given honours and awards. But what could he do with those ? It was his creative activity that should have been made easier.

Brahms was praised in the heavens by Jewry, a creature of salons, a theatrical figure with his flowing beard and hair and his hands raised above the keyboard. Bruckner, on the other hand, a shrunken little man, would perhaps have been too shy even to play in such society. »

From then on, Hitler did everything possible to promote Bruckner and to enlist him in his vendetta against Vienna. Saint-Florian, where the composer's career had begun, was to be turned into a pilgrimage site in the manner of Bayreuth. « He wants to establish a new cultural centre here » , Gœbbels noted. « Simply as a counter-weight to Vienna, which must gradually be shoved aside. He intends to renovate Saint-Florian at his own expense. » Accordingly, Hitler financed a centre of Bruckner studies there, had the famous organ repaired and augmented the composer's library.

He even designed a monument in his honour to stand in Linz, and endowed a « Bruckner Orchestra » which he was determined to make one of the world's best. The publication of the Robert Haas edition of the composer's original score was subsidized from his own funds. And he dreamed of constructing a bell-tower in Linz with a carillon that would play a theme from the 4th Symphony.

(Frederick Spotts. « Hitler and the Power of Æsthetics »)

...

Adolf Hitler, qui a échoué à devenir un artiste, ne s'est pas pour autant détourné du monde de l'art. Grand amateur de peintures et essentiellement passionné d'architecture, il a encouragé un art dit nazi, au style néo-Classique et teinté de mégalomanie.

L'arrivée d'Adolf Hitler au pouvoir marque brutalement la fin de la diversité culturelle qu'avait apportée la République de Weimar pour l'Allemagne.

Hitler qui se prenait pour un artiste, avait fixé les principes qui devaient régir l'art national-socialiste.

Dans « Mein Kampf » , il écrit :

« Un artiste qui peint l'herbe en bleu est un menteur. »

Avec des visions de cet ordre, l'art ne risquait pas d'évoluer. Les canons de l'art étaient fixés une fois pour toutes, et ne devaient en aucun cas être changés.

De nombreux auto-dafés ont lieu. Les livres de Marx, Freud, Einstein, Brecht, Gide et autres auteurs célèbres qu'ils soient juifs, communistes ou différents de la pensée dominante, finissent brûlés en place publique. La culture est prise en main : la presse écrite est mise sous contrôle par le Parti nazi, qui choisit même les films qui passent au cinéma. La propagande passe par des moyens de communication qui ont pour seul but de mettre en avant l'idéologie hitlérienne. Les Jeux olympiques d'été de 1936 seront instrumentalisés pour conforter l'image de marque du régime hitlérien sur la scène internationale.

Les ouvrages scolaires vont être « assainis ». Pour ne pas céder à la disparition d'une certaine culture, on attribue aux écrits de bon nombre de romanciers ou poètes la mention « auteur inconnu de langue allemande » .

En 1933, Josef Goebbels crée la « Reichskulturkammer » (Chambre de la culture du « Reich ») , véritable cellule de censure médiatique, est une organisation corporatiste des métiers de la culture, pour promouvoir l'art « aryen » selon les idéaux du Parti national-socialiste. Pour publier une œuvre, quelle qu'elle soit, il fallait appartenir à la Chambre compétente. Le début de la non-liberté artistique est en marche.

L'art dégénéré (« Entartete kunst ») , était le genre qui permettait au régime nazi d'interdire l'art moderne pour mieux conserver l'art Classique. L'art Classique symbolisait la pureté de la race tandis que les peintres modernes contournaient la norme définie par le 3e « Reich » . Les artistes qui soutenaient les idées d'Hitler et du Nazisme produisaient de l'art racial pur, alors que les artistes modernes qui, pour eux, étaient une race inférieure, créaient des tableaux considérés comme dégénérés.

Fut qualifiée d'art dégénéré toute œuvre ne correspondant pas aux critères esthétiques, et idéologiques, des Nazis. En principe, tout art moderne était condamné par le « Reich » . De nombreuses rafles s'effectuèrent dans les différents musées allemands. On estime à près de 5,000 le nombre d'œuvres, peintures, sculpture ou dessin détruit sur ordre de Goebbels, à la veille de la guerre.

En 1935, le gouvernement organisa une exposition d'art dégénéré à Nuremberg. Cette même année, furent promulguées les Ires lois anti-juives. Coïncidence consternante pour un art aussi appelé « judéo-bolchévique » .

En 1937, fut organisée, à la Maison de l'art allemand de Munich, une nouvelle exposition d'art dégénéré.

Les Nazis firent exposer des œuvres d'handicapés mentaux ainsi que des dessins d'enfants au milieu d'œuvres d'artistes connus tels Otto Dix, Max Ernst ou encore Marc Chagall, dans le but de démontrer l'aspect malsain et impur de cet art moderne. À côté de chaque œuvre, des commentaires méprisants suscitaient l'opprobre du public : il s'agissait ou bien de citations d'artiste tronquées et isolées de leur contexte afin de les rendre choquantes ; ou bien de diatribes

du « Führer » ou d'autres membres éminents du Parti. Ils conspuaient alors le « snobisme » des intellectuels de Weimar qui avaient mordu à l'appât de ce que les Nazis appelaient la « juiverie internationale et bolchévique » et qui avaient élevé au rang d'œuvres d'art les productions bâtarde de véritables « malades mentaux » - d'où l'appellation « arts dégénérés » .

Cette exposition eut un gros succès, il fallait que cette exposition ridiculise les peintres et sculpteurs d'avant-garde, et par la même occasion, permette au public de trouver des arguments contre l'Art Moderne. Cubisme, Dadaïsme, Expressionnisme, Futurisme, Impressionnisme, Abstrait, ... les nazis fermèrent les portes à tous ces courants, mais pas seulement pour des raisons esthétiques.

Néanmoins, il a existé un art interdit, un art rebel. L'existence de cet art prouve qu'il y eut une faille dans le système de contrôle artistique du régime.

Face à l'exposition des « Arts dégénérés » , le citoyen allemand était convié à apprécier, dans un autre pavillon, l'exposition des « Arts allemands » .

Le régime hitlérien a saturé d'idéologie les images les plus familières. Il a récupéré tous les styles consacrés antérieurement au modernisme pour les ré-actualiser pompeusement sur le mode du gigantisme, ce qui flattait les prétentions Impériales du régime.

La culture officielle se sclérosa sur des formes traditionnelles vidées de leur sens :

Sculptures néo-Grecques et néo-Romaines (où la femme est réduite aux attributs de la maternité avec une insistance particulière sur la largeur des hanches et la générosité des seins ; l'homme étant invariablement représenté en athlète de gymnase) .

Style néo-Baroque, en architecture avec une débauche « Kitsch » de moulures et dorures.

Style néo-Moyen-âgeux en lithographie où les gravures les plus célèbres d'Albrecht Dürer et Lucas Cranach servirent de faire-valoir au « Führer » .

Réactionnaire par essence, « la culture Nazie » se positionna en s'opposant à toute innovation. Cette épuration des arts provoqua l'exil des plus grands créateurs et ne rencontra pas de résistance dans la population.

L'art officiel, s'inspire du Classicisme, et reste à l'opposé de l'art dégénéré. Il rejette toute forme de modernité, et s'appuie sur l'Académisme passé.

Les sculpteurs officiels du « Reich » , produisent des œuvres de nus, souvent des sculptures à sujets mythologiques. Des guerriers et des athlètes, pour les hommes : fiers, droits, corps musclés brandissant des armes ; des déesses à corps parfait, des nymphes pour les femmes, aux chevilles étroites et allongées et aux seins ronds et bien mesurés. Ces

sculpteurs n'innoveront pas, et imiteront les grands Maîtres du Classicisme, ils diront que la seule beauté artistique se trouve dans l'art passé.

Les peintres officiels, se bornent au réalisme et au néo-Classicisme, sans jamais rien d'un tant soit peu moderne dans leurs œuvres.

Cet art largement encouragé par le régime nazi, est désigné comme étant le modèle de l'art pur, de l'art aryen. Cet art officiel n'a pas que des raisons d'esthétiques ou de goûts artistiques : il est un art de propagande qui manifeste les différents aspects de l'idéologie nazie, de la pureté de la race aryenne, de la virilité des hommes ainsi que son soutien au régime.

« La famille de paysans de Kahlenberg », la toile d'Adolf Wissel, en est un exemple flagrant : on peut y trouver la future doctrine qu'adoptera le régime de Vichy de Pétain, « Travail, Famille, Patrie ». En effet, cette toile représente une famille allemande presque au complet avec la mère s'occupant de la plus petite fille, le petit garçon blond aux yeux jouant sagement avec un jouet de bois, la plus grande des filles, travaillant consciencieusement sur ses devoirs, la grand-mère brodant un vêtement pour l'un des enfants, et le père, digne et propre sur lui, supervisant le tout. L'absence du grand-père, sûrement mort lors de la Grande Guerre, pourrait servir, au besoin, à rappeler un épisode douloureux et à raviver la haine et l'esprit de vengeance des Allemands.

On voit ici clairement apparaître un intérêt tout autre que celui du souci de l'esthétisme.

La « Reichskulturkammer » dirigée par Josef Gœbbels encourage vivement les artistes à exalter les valeurs de la race allemande. Toute œuvre d'art dénonçant le bolchévisme, les Juifs, ou n'importe quelle opposition au régime, est la bienvenue pour Hitler et ses partisans.

Toutes les peintures et sculptures ont un message normatif, qui peut être résumé en : l'aryen pur doit être beau, grand, fort et surtout, patriotique.

On peut dire, que l'art officiel nazi, bien plus qu'un art de propagande et qu'un art esthétique, servait de modèle pour les partisans d'une Allemagne nazie. Il montrait la voie à suivre voulue par le régime, ainsi que les écarts à ne pas commettre. C'était, une espèce de manuel pour bien apprendre à rester dans les rangs du « Reich », et qui laisse entrevoir combien il dangereux d'en sortir.

Dans de telles conditions, de nombreux artistes quittèrent l'Allemagne nazie, non seulement parce qu'ils avaient des craintes pour leur vie, mais aussi en signe d'opposition au régime nazi.

Selon l'idéologie nazie, le peuple allemand était le « 1er peuple musicien de la terre », Richard Wagner son héros, et Anton Bruckner son prophète. Pour implanter leur théorie, les Nazis ont détourné la pensée musicale des compositeurs du passé, et ré-écrit l'histoire.

Les théoriciens de l'antisémitisme ont revisité le passé allemand, tentant d'en séparer le bon grain aryen de l'ivraie juive, et ce, dès Georg Friedrich Händel dont ils changent les paroles des Oratorios, parlant du peuple juif. Il faut ré-écrire l'histoire de la musique allemande et autrichienne, pour « laver les souillures » .

La 9e Symphonie de Beethoven devient la référence de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et de son directeur musical Wilhem Furtwängler, architecte empressé de ce nouvel ordre musical nazi.

Franz Liszt, devient allemand et non plus hongrois.

Richard Wagner avec l'aide de sa famille (notamment sa fille, devenue proche d'Hitler) est sur-exploité.

Felix Mendelssohn, de par son origine juive, fut une des victimes préférées des théoriciens de l'antisémitisme musical malgré sa conversion au christianisme. Sa statue à Leipzig fut détruite, la rue qui portait son nom fut re-baptisée du nom d'Anton Bruckner et, enfin, un grand concours fut organisé pour recomposer son « Songe d'une nuit d'été » dans une version aryenne.

Dès 1933, les programmes de musique classique à la radio sont contrôlés. Mendelssohn est pratiquement interdit de diffusion. Dans les défilés, les manifestations et célébrations officielles ou à la radio, c'est Wagner que l'on entend le plus.

La musique dégénérée (« Entartete musik ») était ainsi qualifiée par les Nazis, entre 1933 et 1945, pour toute musique qui ne correspondait pas aux normes de l'art officiel. « Une musique qui a perdu les qualités habituelles de son genre, de sa race » , loin de l'idéal aryen, de la race supérieure.

Ils appelaient « musique dégénérée » , la musique des années '30, qui allait de la musique atonale au jazz conçu comme une musique afro-américaine, toute la musique de musiciens aux origines juives, ou encore toute la musique prolétarienne qui emprunte au jazz nombre de ses procédés.

L'idée de décadence, de dégénérescence, d'empoisonnement de la pureté des origines prédomine l'esprit nazi. La musique dégénérée est présentée comme une catégorie haïe où le régime nazi range toute la musique qui lui semble éloignée de sa propre vision de la musique, ou de sa vision du monde.

La conception du monde national-socialiste se fonde sur l'idée du sang, de la race, du peuple, et sur l'idée d'un État totalitaire. Et comme l'avait écrit Hitler dans « Mein Kampf » :

« Les Juifs étaient incapables de manier la musique et le verbe. »

En 1938, se tient à Düsseldorf l' « Exposition Musique Dégénérée » .

C'est le pendant musical de l'Exposition de Munich : les musiciens de jazz, de musique atonale (donc de musique

moderne) dont beaucoup sont juifs ou communistes vont être, à leur tour, assimilés à des « dégénérés » et leur musique sera interdite.

Le projet « Linz », est celui d'Hitler de construire un gigantesque musée d'art dans la ville de sa jeunesse.

On sait qu'Hitler était amateur d'art, qu'il voulait faire une carrière artistique, mais qu'il fut refusé à l'entrée de l'École des Beaux-arts de Vienne. On sait aussi qu'il doubla son intérêt pour la peinture par une passion pour l'architecture.

L'histoire du Musée de Linz commence vraiment avec l'« Anschluß ». La persécution des Juifs qui accompagna l'entrée des troupes allemandes et la main-mise nazie sur le pays conduisit au vol de nombreuses œuvres d'art appartenant à des collectionneurs juifs. Il fallait décider du devenir de ces œuvres, qui rejoignirent celles déjà confisquées en Allemagne après la « Nuit de Cristal » et entreposées dans le « Führerbau » de Munich. L'un des autres facteurs qui donna l'idée à Hitler de construire le musée fut sa visite du Musée des Offices de Florence, en mai 1938. Il fut étonné devant la richesse des collections de cette ville de province et demanda si l'équivalent existait en Allemagne. On le dirigea alors vers la « Gemäldegalerie » de Dresde (Musée d'art des Collections nationales), qu'il visita 1 mois plus tard. Jusqu'à sa fin, Hitler restera très attentif à l'évolution de son projet et s'investira personnellement à de nombreuses reprises. À Dresde, c'est Hans Posse, le directeur de la galerie des peintures depuis 1910, qui le conseillera et le guidera dans ce projet.

En fait, Hans Posse avait été le constructeur du Musée, celui qui avait fait de la galerie une institution d'envergure internationale. Or, à cette période précise, Posse, en désaccord avec la direction des musées de la ville, fut renvoyé de son poste. Hitler non seulement exigea sa ré-intégration immédiate, mais le nomma directeur du futur Musée de Linz. À partir de ce moment-là, Posse se consacra avec attention à la constitution des collections. Il le fit de façon cohérente en sélectionnant des œuvres d'importance dans le butin, de plus en plus conséquent, des pillages nazis à travers toute l'Europe. Il était, pour cela, en concurrence avec d'autres services nazis, ceux d'Alfred Rosenberg et ceux de Hermann Göring (mais aussi avec les dirigeants nazis viennois, inquiets de voir l'émergence d'un pôle culturel concurrent dans leur pays) et il lui fallut souvent se battre pour obtenir les œuvres qu'il voulait, malgré le droit de préemption que s'était accordé Hitler. Pendant ce temps, les juristes allemands trouvaient des habillages légaux à ce qui n'était qu'un pillage systématique des collections juives. Posse disposait aussi de fortes sommes d'argent, de diverses origines, pour acheter des œuvres qui passaient dans les galeries et salles des ventes allemandes ou étrangères (aux Pays-Bas, en particulier) mais ces œuvres se retrouvaient aussi souvent sur le marché parce que leurs propriétaires juifs s'étaient vus contraints de les vendre pour obtenir un peu d'argent face à la persécution économique.

Alfred Rosenberg était l'un des intellectuels les plus influents du Parti nazi. La guerre a grandement facilité ses activités, car elle a permis le pillage organisé des bibliothèques juives, collections d'art, et autres actifs dans les pays envahis par la « Wehrmacht ». Fondé en octobre 1940, son « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (Groupe de travail de la « Reichsleiter Rosenberg ») devient l'organisation nazie qui rencontre le plus de succès dans le pillage de l'art.

À la fin de la guerre, le Groupe de travail de la « Reichsleiter Rosenberg » avait expédié près de 1,5 million d'œuvres d'art et d'objets de toute l'Europe vers le « Reich » .

Entre 1939 et 1941, l'architecte Roderick Fick, sous la houlette d'Albert Speer, dessina les plans de l'immense Musée, dont l'achèvement était prévu pour 1950. Dès juin 1941, le « Führerbau » de Munich se révéla trop petit pour accueillir les tableaux sélectionnés. Hans Posse tomba malade et mourut le 8 décembre 1942. Goebbels fit son éloge lors de son enterrement à Dresde, auquel Hitler en personne assista. Il y avait, à ce moment-là déjà, 2,470 œuvres prêtes à être exposées.

Le successeur de Posse fut Hermann Voß, le directeur du Musée d'art de Wiesbaden. Voß n'était pas un Nazi mais il fut tout de même nommé, probablement parce que Göring pensait pouvoir le contrôler plus facilement. Il put s'entourer d'un plus grand nombre de collaborateurs, qui travaillaient à constituer les autres collections du musée, de monnaies et d'armes en particulier. À partir de l'été 1943, devant la menace des raids aériens alliés, les collections du futur Musée furent peu à peu envoyées en lieu sûr, dans des musées de province, des châteaux, puis des mines de sel, où elles rejoignirent celles des grands musées allemands. Les Soviétiques pillèrent systématiquement tous les dépôts qu'ils trouvaient dans leur avancée vers l'Ouest. Pour les Américains, ce fut moins clair : des consultations entre alliés occidentaux avaient conduit à des déclarations de principe de restitution des œuvres d'art. Il y eut cependant des pillages, par des soldats et des officiers américains et français, mais aussi par des Allemands. Ce fut notamment le cas dans le « Führerbau » .

La collection a rassemblé jusqu'à 4,712 œuvres.

Les modalités de constitution de la collection du Musée de Linz ont déterminé celles des restitutions. Comme l'origine nationale des œuvres était connue, celles qui ont été retrouvées ont été restituées aux États, et avant tout, 37 % à la République fédérale d'Allemagne. Par contre, les vendeurs, souvent des marchands, ne se sont pas toujours précipités pour réclamer les œuvres rapatriées, pour des raisons compréhensibles. En France, par exemple, les musées nationaux ont hérité de 294 œuvres provenant de la collection de Linz, dont les propriétaires ne se sont pas manifestés ou n'ont pas été identifiés. C'est 50 % de l'ensemble des œuvres restituées au titre de la collection de Linz, qui se trouvent d'ailleurs aujourd'hui toujours dans les musées français, sous l'appellation « MNR » (Musées nationaux de récupération)

AB 109 : Le 3e « Reich » et la musique

Introduction

À Munich, en 1937, et à Düsseldorf l'année suivante, des manifestations officielles (journées musicales du « Reich » , concert de l'Orchestre symphonique du « Reich » à l'usine « Schiess-de-Fries » , le 23 mai 1938, discours de politique musicale de Josef Goebbels à l' « Alten Tonhalle » , le 28 mai 1938 (Exposition « Entartete Musik ») , illustrent la conception manichéenne de l'art. Ces Expositions exaltent la fusion de l'être allemand dans la communauté nationale et populaire tout en fustigeant la modernité artistique du 1er tiers du XXe siècle. Les condamnations prononcées

contre les formes d'art dites « dégénérées » donnent lieu à une édifiante théâtralisation. Ces « cabinets des horreurs » sont affublés de slogans diffamatoires désignant les « déraillements » des Modernes. Toute l'esthétique nazie est dès le départ, dans son « programme » même, « mise-au-pas ». Elle a pour objectif de mettre sous tutelle par l'image, la parole et le son toute forme d'expression qui doit uniquement servir les desseins du régime et appartenir au « corps ethnique » (« Volkskörper »), sans échappatoire possible et sans restriction aucune, à l'exclusion de toute forme non admise : « Dein Volk ist alles, du bist nichts. » (Ton ethnie est tout, toi tu n'es rien.) .

La scène champêtre des « Jeunes filles revenant des champs » est caractéristique du courant « Blut und Boden » (sang et sol) . La joie irradiant les visages exalte l'optimisme de rigueur dans un « Reich » ayant retrouvé sa pureté originelle.

L'affiche « l'Allemagne, pays de la musique » illustre le credo hitlérien associant la musique à l'Allemagne dans une communauté de destin. L'aigle symbolisant l'État allemand place l'orgue (l'instrument roi) sous son aile protectrice. Propos esthétique et projet politique ne font qu'un, l'art et la nation sont désormais indissociables. « Le 1er peuple musicien de la Terre » (Josef Gœbbels) est celui d'un « Reich » désormais millénaire.

La lithographie corrosive de George Grosz, « La bénédiction visible de Dieu est avec moi », épingle la bourgeoisie et les profiteurs de guerre. Cette scène de Noël souligne le contraste entre la prétendue harmonie familiale où l'on chante le traditionnel « Douce nuit, sainte nuit », et le quotidien douloureux de ces 1res années de la République de Weimar.

Le musicien représenté sur la couverture de la brochure signée Hans Severus Ziegler est inspiré de l'Opéra-jazz à succès « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Jonny mène la danse !) d'Ernst Křenek. Il illustre la « dégénérescence raciale » définie par les Nazis et l'idée selon laquelle « le Juif a du sang de nègre ». Quant au saxophone, il symbolise le jazz : musique « dégénérée » par excellence.

« Alte Tonhalle »

Im Jahre 1818 erfolgte das erste Niederrheinische Musikfest im Geisler'schen Lokal, das ab 1830 zum Zentrum der Musikliebhaber wurde. Es war eine Gaststätte mit großem Saal, die bereits vorher als Beckers Gartenlokal bekannt war. Im Geislerschen Saal lagen die Zuschauerzahlen im Jahre 1850 bei nahezu 1.000 Besuchern. Bekannte Komponisten wie Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Norbert Burgmüller und Robert Schumann musizierten dort. Im Jahre 1863 erwarb die Stadt das Lokal, das schon damals Tonhalle genannt wurde.

Die erste städtische Tonhalle wurde in zweijähriger Bauzeit erschaffen und im Jahre 1865 eröffnet. Sie befand sich am Flinger Steinweg, der heutigen Schadowstraße. Das Gebäude verfügte über einen großen Konzertsaal, den Kaisersaal, der 42,48 meter lang und 24,20 meter breit war. Mit zwei Galerien faßte dieser Raum 2.820 Personen. Der Saal, den eine gute Akustik auszeichnete, wurde nach Kaiser Wilhelm I. benannt, zu dessen Ehren von den Rheinischen Provinzialständen anlässlich seiner Visite am 18. September 1884 in der Tonhalle ein Festeßen gegeben wurde.

Im Jahre 1886 wurde ein Wettbewerb für einen Neubau ausgeschrieben, bei dem die Entwürfe der Architekten Hermann vom Endt und Bruno Schmitz im Stil der Neo-Renaissance ausgezeichnet wurden. Die Stadtbaumeister Eberhard Westhofen und Peiffhoven planten später auf der Grundlage dieser Neubaupläne eine Erweiterung, die von 1889 bis 1892 umgesetzt wurde. Der zentrale Eingangsbereich des Gebäudes wurde durch eine klassizistische Portikusanlage betont. Aus diesem Bausegment stammt eine Säule, die Helmut Hentrich als Erinnerung an den traditionsreichen Ort Düsseldorfer Musik und Festkultur im Malkastenpark aufstellen ließ. Der Kaisersaal und der Rittersaal blieben hierbei erhalten. 1901 wurden der Kaisersaal von dem Stadtbaurat Peiffhoven und dem Beigeordneten Johannes Radke mit neuer Stuckatur versehen. Den Rittersaal stattete in diesem Zuge die Firma Hemming & Witte mit Deckengemälden aus. Der Mittelteil der Hauptfassade zeigte vier Säulen, gekrönt von einem Dreiecksgiebel.

Der Gebäudekomplex war beim Ausbau bis an die Schadowstraße 91 vorgezogen worden. Der Bau umfaßte nun neben den übernommenen Konzertsälen auch neue Gesellschaftsräume, Ladenlokale und Restaurants. In dem Bau hielten die Düsseldorfer Karnevalsvereine ihre Sitzungen ab, der Künstlerverein Malkasten feierte hier seinen Maskenball. Neben den wöchentlichen Symphoniekonzerten, erfolgten dort auch Tagungen von Wirtschaftsverbänden, Vorträge, Wohltätigkeitsbasare und Karnevalsbälle. Auf einem « Kohlentag », den die Montanindustrie 1871 in der Tonhalle abhielt, rief William Thomas Mulvany den « Verein zur Wahrung der gemeinsamen wirtschaftlichen Interessen in Rheinland und Westfalen » ins Leben, womit ein Grundstein für die Entwicklung der wirtschaftlichen Interessenvertretung in Westdeutschland und für die Entwicklung Düsseldorfs zum « Schreibtisch des Ruhrgebiets » gelegt wurde.

Das Gebäude wurde 1942 durch Bomben beschädigt und später abgebrochen. An derselben Stelle befindet sich heute eine Niederlaßung der Warenhauskette Karstadt.

...

Mit dem Entstehen der bürgerlichen Musikkultur zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts fanden sich in Düsseldorf musikbegeisterte Bürger zum Städtischen Musikverein zusammen und pflegten insbesondere die oratorische Musik. 1818 wurde die erste Tonhalle mit hervorragender Akustik an der Flinger Straße (heute Karstadt an der Ecke Schadowstraße / Tonhallenstraße) errichtet. 1863 entschloß sich die Stadt Düsseldorf die « Tonhalle » zu kaufen, um ihren Bürgern einen attraktiven und repräsentativen Konzertsaal zu geben. Ein Jahr später stellte die Stadt die bis dahin lose verpflichteten Musiker in ihren Dienst und gründete die Düsseldorfer Symphoniker. Damit war Düsseldorf nach Aachen die zweite deutsche Stadt, die ein festes Orchester hatte. Namen wie Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Robert Schumann, Johannes Brahms, Gustav Mahler, Richard Wagner und Richard Strauß sind mit der Tonhalle und ihrem Orchester verbunden. Von 1880 bis 1892 wurde die Tonhalle unter dem gleichen Namen und am gleichen Ort neu errichtet ; der Kaisersaal bot 3.000 Sitzplätze und lieferte 1912 den Rahmen für die zweite Aufführung der 8. Sinfonie von Gustav Mahler.

Der Zweite Weltkrieg schien dieser Tradition ein Ende zu machen. 1942 wurde die alte Tonhalle durch Bomben zerstört. 1944 wurde das Orchester aufgelöst, die Musiker in kriegswichtige Betriebe geschickt. Nach dem Krieg wurde im Juli 1945 mit 45 Musikern der Konzertbetrieb wieder aufgenommen. Die Reihe der Generalmusikdirektoren, die seit 1945

den Symphonikern vorstanden, umfasst namhafte Dirigenten wie Eugen Szenkar, Jean Martinon, Rafael Frühbeck de Burgos und mit der Spielzeit 2000-2001 Generalmusikdirektor John Fiore.

...

Die erste Tonhalle von 1818 bis zur Zerstörung zum Ende des zweiten Weltkrieges :

Jedem Düsseldorfer, der einen kulturellen und stadtgeschichtlichen Hintergrund hat, kommt bei Nennung des Gebäudenamens « Tonhalle Düsseldorf » Glanz in den Blick, Wehmut ins Herz und auch ein bisschen Stolz in die Brust.

Tonhalle Düsseldorf war für die Düsseldorfer über mehr als 150 Jahre Synonym für hochrangige Feste und große kulturelle Erlebnisse. Zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts verließ man zu Fuß oder mit dem Pferdewagen durch das Flinger Tor die Stadt und kam nach Überwindung einiger Befestigungsanlagen über den Flinger Steinweg (die heutige Schadowstraße) in einen herrlichen Wald, in dem « Jansens Garten » lag, der für die Düsseldorfer eine hochbeliebte Vergnügungsstätte war.

Hier wurden die « Niederrheinischen Musikfeste » begründet, hier war die Wiege des Städtischen Musikvereins im Jahre 1818, hier wirkten Ferdinand Hiller, Julius Rietz, Ferdinand Ries, Robert Schumann und Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy hatten hier ihre künstlerische Heimstatt, Mendelssohns « Paulus » und Schumanns « Der Rose Pilgerfahrt », « Adventlied » und « Requiem für Mignon » wurden hier und andere uraufgeführt, Josef Joachim und Jenny Lind wirkten hier umjubelt an Konzerten mit. Franz Liszt, Johannes Brahms und viele große Künstler des 19. Jahrhunderts feierten hier große Erfolge.

1850 übernahm die Hofkonditorei Geisler die Säle und übergab sie 1863 in den Besitz der Stadt Düsseldorf. Von diesem Zeitpunkt an wurden die Säle vielfältig umgestaltet und dann nach langen Diskussionen im Stadtrat in den Jahren 1880 bis 1892 komplett neu errichtet. Die neuen Gebäude erhielten die alten Namen, es blieb bei « Tonhalle » Düsseldorf und bei den Namen für die Säle : Der Kaisersaal mit 3.000 Plätzen in Stuhlreihen und 1.000 Plätzen an Tischen, dem Rittersaal mit circa 1.000 Plätzen, dem Verbindungssaal und einer großen Vielzahl von repräsentativen Nebenräumen. Hier fand 1912 mit 1.000 Mitwirkenden kurz nach der Münchner Uraufführung in Deutschland die zweite Aufführung der 8. Symphonie von Gustav Mahler statt.

Orchestre symphonique de Düsseldorf

L'Orchestre symphonique de Düsseldorf a été fondé en 1818 à partir du « Städtischer Musikverein » . 2 grands compositeurs y ont occupé le poste de chef d'orchestre général : Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy et Robert Schumann. L'Orchestre symphonique joue au nouveau « Tonhalle » en tant qu'Orchestre de concert, et au « Deutsche Oper am Rhein » en tant qu'Orchestre de Théâtre. Mais il s'est également produit en Chine et au Japon.

...

The « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » is the Düsseldorf « Tonhalle » 's resident Orchestra. This means they form the core, driving force and artistic heart of one of Germany's leading concert halls. Their work in the « Tonhalle » and in the « Oper am Rhein » gives the « Symphoniker » an unusual profile which is all their own. On their regular concert tours (to Holland, Austria, the Czech Republic, Switzerland, Spain, China, and Japan) , the Orchestra carries Düsseldorf's reputation as a city of culture out into the world.

The « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » have a long tradition : right back in the 18th Century, internationally celebrated artists, among them Georg Friedrich Händel and Arcangelo Corelli, worked with the local Court Orchestra. When the Court ceased to exist, many of the musicians went to Mannheim, the seat of one of the leading Orchestras of the age. In fact, the « Mannheim School » formed the foundation of modern orchestral culture.

The year 1818 saw the formation in Düsseldorf of an association that still exists and was to become the cradle of the « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » : the « Städtische Musikverein zu Düsseldorf » is one of the world's oldest mixed concert choruses. With its unbroken tradition, it can look back on an impressive list of musical directors, of whom Mendelssohn and Schumann are today the best-known. It was in Düsseldorf that Robert Schumann had the only employment contract in his life. In 1864, the « Symphoniker » achieved autonomous status, becoming Germany's 2nd oldest Municipal Orchestra.

In the early 20th Century too, many great names in international music, including soloists Edwin Fischer, Elly Ney and Vladimir Horowitz, as well as conductors Richard Strauß and Jascha Horenstein, worked with the « Symphoniker » . During the Nazi period, they became one of the « “ Reich ” Orchestras » alongside the Berlin Philharmonic and the Linz « Bruckner » Orchestra. At the « Reich » Music Festivals, the « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » was responsible for premieres of compositions that followed the Party line - at a time when attempts were made to demonstrate not only the existence of « degenerate art » (« Entartete Kunst ») but also of « degenerate music » (« Entartete Musik ») . In 2014, to mark the Orchestra's sesquicentennial, the « Tonhalle » and the « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » will be approaching this topic, with the « music of totalitarianism » at the focus of concert planning.

Reconstruction post-1945 was in the hands of conductor Heinrich Hollreiser. He was succeeded as General Music Director by Eugen Szenkar, Jean Martinon, Rafael Frühbeck de Burgos, Henryk Czyz, Willem van Otterloo, Bernhard Klee, David Shallon, Salvador Mas Conde and John Fiore. Carlos Kleiber, Hans Wallat, Christian Thielemann and Fabio Luisi have conducted the Orchestra at Operatic performances. Since 2009, Andrey Boreyko, one of the leading conductors of his generation, has been « Generalmusikdirektor » of the « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » . The title « Schumann Guest of the “ Düsseldorf Symphoniker ” » is currently borne by the Swiss conductor Mario Venzago. To mark the Schumann bicentennial, in 2010, the composer's entire « œuvre » was performed in Düsseldorf by such artists as Christoph Eschenbach, Thomas Zehetmair, Daniel Barenboim, Paavo Järvi, Riccardo Chailly, Thomas Hampson, Rudolf Buchbinder, Midori, Helene Grimaud and Frank Peter Zimmermann. But the « Düsseldorf Symphoniker » were at the focus. For 2011, the Orchestra is taking on the vocal Symphonic works of Gustav Mahler. Performances with international big names such as Christiane Œlze, Thomas Quasthoff and Robert Dean Smith are covering the spectrum from the « Song of Lament » (« Das klagende Lied ») to the « Song of the Earth » (« Das Lied von der Erde ») .

...

Die Tonhalle Düsseldorf ist die musikalische Heimat des Städtischen Musikvereins und der Düsseldorfer Symphoniker. Dort finden die Symphoniekonzerte der Stadt Düsseldorf statt. Darüber hinaus bietet die Intendanz der Tonhalle ein umfangreiches Konzertprogramm mit einer Vielzahl von Konzertreihen und Veranstaltungen aller Art. In ganz besonderer Weise hat sich die Tonhalle Düsseldorf mit ihrem Intendanten Michael Becker der musikalischen Jugendförderung verschrieben. Die Tonhalle Düsseldorf gilt als das « jüngste Konzerthaus in Deutschland » und als das einzige Konzerthaus mit einem eigenen Jugendsinfonieorchester. Bestellen Sie sich das Jahrbuch « O-Ton » für die jeweilige Konzertsaison und Sie werden schnell die Vielseitigkeit und die interessanten Programmfolgen erkennen. Klicken Sie auf den Menü-Punkt « Tonhalle Veranstaltungen » und Sie befinden sich auf der Internet-Präsenz des Hauses.

Die alte Tonhalle Ecke Tonhallen-/Schadowstraße Jeder Düsseldorfer, der einen kulturellen und stadtgeschichtlichen Hintergrund hat, bekommt bei Nennung des Gebäudenamens « Tonhalle Düsseldorf » Glanz in den Blick, Wehmut ins Herz aber auch ein wenig Stolz in der Brust.

Tonhalle Düsseldorf war für die Düsseldorfer über mehr als 150 Jahre Synonym für hochrangige Feste und große kulturelle Erlebnisse. Zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts verließ man zu Fuß oder mit dem Pferdewagen durch das Flinger-Tor die Stadt und kam nach Überwindung einiger Befestigungsanlagen über den Flinger Steinweg (die heutige Schadowstraße) in einen herrlichen Wald. Dort befand sich « Jansens Garten », später « Beckers-Gartensaal » genannt, der für die Düsseldorfer eine äußerst beliebte Vergnügsstätte war.

Hier wurden die « Niederrheinischen Musikfeste » begründet, hier war die Wiege des Städtischen Musikvereins im Jahre 1818, hier wirkten als Musikdirektoren Johann August Burgmüller, Ferdinand Ries, Louis Spohr, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Ferdinand Hiller, Julius Rietz, Robert Schumann, Julius Tausch, Julius Butts, Karl Panzner, Georg Lennart Schneevoigt, Hans Weisbach und Hugo Balzer. Mendelssohns « Paulus » und Schumanns « Der Rose Pilgerfahrt », « Adventlied » und « Requiem für Mignon » wurden hier und andere uraufgeführt. Josef Joachim, Johannes Brahms, Hans Richter, Otto Goldschmidt, Jenny Lind, Clara Novello, Franz Liszt, Anton Rubinstein, Richard Strauß, Georg Szell, Fritz Steinbach, Ferruccio Busoni, Eugen d'Albert, Walter Gieseking, Bronisław Hubermann, Edward Elgar, Pablo de Sarasate, Wladimir Horowitz, Elly Ney, Edwin Fischer, Hans Knappertsbusch und viele andere mehr, wirkten hier an umjubelten Konzerten mit.

Der Kaisersaal bei einer Tischveranstaltung 1850 übernahm die Hofkonditorei Geisler die Lokalität und übergab sie 1863 in das Eigentum der Stadt Düsseldorf. Von diesem Zeitpunkt an wurden die Säle vielfältig umgestaltet und dann (nach langen Diskussionen im Stadtrat) in den Jahren 1880 bis 1892 komplett neu errichtet. Die neuen Gebäude erhielten die alten Namen, es blieb also bei « Tonhalle » Düsseldorf und bei den Namen für die Säle : Der Kaisersaal mit 3.000 Plätzen in Stuhlreihen und 1.000 Plätzen an Tischen, dem Rittersaal mit circa 1.000 Plätzen, dem Verbindungssaal und einer Vielzahl von repräsentativen Nebenräumen sowie einem großen Kellergewölbe. Im Jahr 1912 hörte man im Kaisersaal mit 1.000 Mitwirkenden (kurz nach der Münchner Uraufführung) die zweite Aufführung der 8. Symphonie (« Symphonie der Tausend ») von Gustav Mahler.

In den Jahren 1938 und 1939 fanden hier die « Reichsmusiktage » statt. Ziel der damaligen Machthaber war es, Düsseldorf zur Reichsmusikhauptstadt zu küren. Aus diesem Anlass mußten die Tonhalle Düsseldorf und die Stadt auch die entwürdigende Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » ertragen.

Rückwärtige Seite der zerstörten Tonhalle Düsseldorf im zweiten Weltkrieg hatte die Pracht in einer Bombennacht des Jahres 1943 leider ein Ende, die Tonhalle wurde zerstört. In den Nachkriegsjahren stand die Kultur zunächst und auch verständlicherweise im Hintergrund. Der Kommerz erhielt die Oberhand bei den Stadtverordneten, was dazu führte, daß das Gelände der Tonhalle an einen Kaufhauskonzern verkauft wurde, der heute noch dort sein Filiale hat.

Figures du patrimoine

Le 1er volet de l'Exposition examine la question du patrimoine musical, de son assimilation par les représentants de l'avant-garde de Weimar, et le processus de récupération des grandes figures de l'histoire musicale dans le but de conforter la démarche idéologique du régime National-Socialiste.

Aux yeux de Josef Goebbels, Ministre de la Propagande, les grands Maîtres du passé incarnent la majesté du peuple allemand. La question de la place conférée à des compositeurs comme Bach, Beethoven, Wagner et Bruckner revêt, de ce point de vue, une importance cruciale.

Cette partie évoque l'ambiguïté d'un amour commun pour une même musique à laquelle Modernes et « officiels » attribuent une valeur différente. Ainsi, un monde sépare les sombres lithographies d'Oskar Kokoschka, hommage visuel à la cantate « O Ewigkeit, Du Donnerwort » de Bach, de l'hommage du peintre Edmund Steppes, « À Jean-Sébastien Bach », artiste reconnu et admiré par Adolf Hitler.

La photographie d'Hitler devant le buste de Bruckner au « Walhalla », réalisée le dimanche 6 juin 1937 montre le « Führer » saluant respectueusement le buste d'Anton Bruckner (réalisé par Adolf Rothenberger), icône du régime nazi. Le compositeur autrichien représente une figure récurrente dans les discours d'Hitler. Ce dernier se complaisait, en effet, dans une identification fondée sur une communauté du sol (« Boden ») d'autant plus fondamentale à ses yeux qu'il se sentait investi de la mission d'abolir la Monarchie Austro-Hongroise au profit d'un grand « Reich » unissant l'Allemagne et l'Autriche. Hitler célébrait également en lui l'humilité du petit paysan en proie à l'ingratitude de la société viennoise « corrompue ».

À partir de 1937, Arno Breker, nommé professeur à Berlin et fort de ses réalisations pour les jeux Olympiques de 1936, s'investit dans une mission de glorification de l'art allemand. Il termine son buste de Richard Wagner en 1939, après avoir conçu ses sculptures pour le « Zeppelinfeld » de Nuremberg et pour la cour de la Nouvelle Chancellerie à Berlin. Breker prête un profil titanesque et promothéen au compositeur, qui sera immortalisé par plusieurs sculptures, dont un marbre gigantesque installé dans le « Rosengarten » de Bayreuth. Hitler possédait lui-même un exemplaire du buste en bronze.

L'affiche-programme de la représentation de gala des « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg », le 17 novembre 1935 à

l'Opéra allemand de Berlin, célèbre la ré-ouverture solennelle du « Deutsches Opernhaus ». Cette nouvelle production est dominée par l'intendant Wilhelm Rode, à la fois interprète de Hans Sachs et metteur-en-scène. Benno von Arent, artiste choyé du régime, en signe les décors et les costumes.

La création contemporaine

À partir de l'étude d'un certain nombre de courants allemands ou étrangers antérieurs à l'avènement du Nazisme et rejetés par ce dernier (jazz, expressionnisme, musique atonale, musique légère) , il s'agit dans un second temps d'explicitier à travers l'idée de création moderne les présupposés théoriques et idéologiques ayant étayé leur condamnation en éclairant d'autres domaines artistiques, en particulier celui des arts plastiques. Les grandes figures fondatrices de la modernité (Arnold Schœnberg, Ferruccio Busoni, Hans Pfitzner, Franz Schreker, Ernst Křenek, Emil Nolde, Kurt Weill) sont évoquées, notamment en liaison avec l'évolution des différentes formes lyriques (monodrame, sketch, Opéra d'actualité, Opéra-jazz, Opéra-revue) .

La série d'auto-portraits d'Arnold Schœnberg est réalisée en 1910, seconde grande phase picturale après 1907 et contemporaine de la rédaction du Traité d'Harmonie. Ces œuvres de dimension réduite reflètent le monde intérieur d'un compositeur qui envisageait la peinture comme le prolongement de la composition, une possibilité d'exprimer ses émotions et ses idées, un autre moyen de « faire de la musique avec des couleurs et des formes » .

Bertolt Brecht et Kurt Weill, les 2 principaux artisans de l'avant-garde dramatique se rencontrent en 1927 et inaugurent leur collaboration par « Mahagonny-Songspiel » , un projet scénique destiné au Festival de Baden-Baden le 18 juillet 1927.

Ce projet des 2 artistes marque la volonté de rompre avec la tradition lyrique. Le propos expérimental (projections de Caspar Neher, caractère artisanal de la mise-en-scène, fusion des dimensions de la répétition et de la création) s'accompagne d'une déclaration anarchiste qui provoque un scandale parmi le public mondain du Festival.

« Les danseuses aux bougies » d'Emil Nolde se situe dans le prolongement de la période créatrice de l'artiste inaugurée en 1906 lorsqu'il rejoint le mouvement expressionniste « Die Brücke » (Le Pont) . Nolde décline le thème de la danse aussi bien en danse festive à travers des peintures de cabaret, qu'en danse sauvage, « seul résidu authentique de la nature originelle de l'homme » . Ici, les figures féminines semblent ployer et se tordre sous la douleur. L'usage de la gravure sur bois témoigne d'une inspiration puisée dans les arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie. Nolde, fasciné par l'art primitif, accompagne en 1913-1914 une mission ethnographique en Nouvelle-Guinée. Ce voyage renforce sa conception d'un art visant à retrouver ce qui caractérise la création de ces peuples : « l'expression intensive de la force et de la vie dans les formes les plus élémentaires » .

À ces propositions avant-gardistes condamnées par le régime nazi s'opposent les productions restauratrices de Richard Strauß, Werner Egek et Carl Orff, marquées par le primat de la mélodie, la dimension du populaire germanique et le rituel médiéval.

Ainsi, le projet de décor pour « le Violon enchanté » de Werner Egk cultive un réalisme populaire prisé dans les milieux nationalistes, et que les décors imaginés par Fritz Mahnke mettent particulièrement en valeur.

Musique et résistance

Cette 3e partie s'attache à retracer, au-delà d'un propos manichéen, l'ambiguïté de réactions individuelles ou collectives face au Nazisme : s'exiler et survivre, résister et mourir.

En 1933, de nombreux artistes fuient l'Allemagne nazie, d'autres créateurs restés sur le sol allemand sont frappés d'interdit. Ils s'opposent alors au régime en se réfugiant dans un exil intérieur. Ainsi, bien que membre de l'Académie prussienne des Arts, Emil Nolde est stigmatisé dans l'Exposition « Entartete Kunst » (art dégénéré) de 1937. Ses œuvres sont retirées des musées. C'est dans la clandestinité qu'il continue à peindre ces œuvres de petit format appartenant à une série d'aquarelles intitulées « Images non peintes », terme signifiant qu'elles servaient d'ébauche à de grandes peintures à l'huile censées être réalisées une fois libre. Le chant qui émane de l'aquarelle « Drei Sanger » (3 chanteurs) s'apparente à un cri d'angoisse, et renvoie au peintre du poète norvégien Edvard Munch. La bouche et les yeux des personnages ne sont plus que des cavités béantes et sombres composant des visages cadavériques. À mi-chemin entre la révolte et l'agonie, ce chant tragique s'érige en témoignage de la condition humaine sous la dictature.

À l'écart de la vie musicale officielle, le pouvoir s'attache à régler la question juive, focalisation d'Adolf Hitler dans « Mein Kampf ». De 1933 à 1941, le régime décide d'isoler les membres de la communauté juive au sein d'une Alliance culturelle qui développe une importante vie musicale censurée par l'État. Privés de toute légitimité professionnelle par les nouvelles lois raciales, ses membres doivent s'organiser de manière militante pour survivre. La politique du « ghetto » s'amplifie en 1941, quand la ville-forteresse de « Terezin » (« Theresienstadt ») est utilisée comme camp de concentration des juifs d'Europe centrale. Anti-chambre des camps d'extermination de l'Est, elle accueille des compositeurs et musiciens comme Viktor Ullmann, Gideon Klein et Pavel Haas qui périssent à « Auschwitz » .

Écrit par Wolfgang Langhoff et Rudi Goguel au camp de « Borgermoor » en 1933-1934, « le Chant des marais » (adaptation de « Die Moorsoldaten ») est l'une des Ires œuvres nées dans l'univers concentrationnaire. Le texte de Johann Esser et de Wolfgang Langhoff met en accusation le sort misérable du détenu, endiguant sa mélancolie pour lui insuffler du courage, lui apporter l'espoir et lui donner des forces.

Résister signifie ici s'affirmer pour contrer les tentatives de briser l'homme prisonnier, garder espoir et courage en dépit de la situation déprimante, vouloir vivre face à la mort omniprésente.

La mélodie de Rudi Goguel connaît une popularité plus grande après que Hanns Eisler a réalisé une adaptation pour le chanteur antifasciste Ernst Busch, en 1935. La version française, « le Chant des marais », fut notamment introduite au camp de « Dachau » .

À « Terezin », que les Nazis présentent comme un camp modèle à l'opinion internationale, la musique est pratiquée

dans un cadre officiel mais aussi de manière spontanée. On y compte des représentations d'Opéras, de musique de chambre, un ensemble de jazz, des spectacles de cabaret et de revue ou encore un studio de musique nouvelle. À « Auschwitz », la musique fait aussi partie de la vie quotidienne. Plusieurs formations musicales y exercent. C'est en musique que les victimes sont accueillies avant d'être exterminées.

Le prisonnier Hans Bonarewitz mené à son exécution en est l'exemple. Hans Bonarewitz est interné à « Mauthausen » en juin 1942. Il tente de s'enfuir du camp en se dissimulant dans une caisse en bois transportée par un camion. Capturé 18 jours plus tard, il est exposé 7 jours durant sur la place d'appel dans sa caisse en bois avant d'être pendu, le 30 juillet 1942. L'orchestre, contraint de jouer lors de son exécution, donne un caractère autant sinistre que pervers à cette cérémonie macabre.

Mécanismes et outils de propagande

Du Festival de Bayreuth au camp de « Terezin », le régime nazi maîtrise parfaitement les outils aptes à emporter l'adhésion du peuple allemand et à ménager la communauté internationale.

L'Opéra « Totentanz » (danse macabre) de Josef Reiter fut présenté en avril 1938 au « Deutsches Opernhaus » de Berlin qui incombait aux services de Josef Goebbels. Le programme pour l'Opéra « Totentanz » montre à quel point l'effigie du « Führer » envahit le moindre objet, de l'assiette aux figurines en plâtre en passant par toutes sortes de brochures présentant des manifestations culturelles, désormais indissociables de l'action politique.

L'image véhiculée par les actualités et les films de propagande donne l'idée d'une communauté nationale unie et indissoluble. Le régime s'appuie sur une vie musicale très riche, dominée par la qualité des productions symphoniques et lyriques. L'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin rayonne à l'étranger malgré des campagnes de « boycott ».

La vie musicale est réglée par le poids des associations (Jeunesses hitlériennes ; La Force par la Joie - KdF). La pédagogie et les mouvements de masse font l'objet d'un accompagnement idéologique très présent. La direction de la Jeunesse du « Reich » (« Reichsjugendführung » - RJF) organise la musique au sein des Jeunesses Hitlériennes. Celle-ci prend en charge l'enseignement musical en dehors de l'école à travers la « Hitlerjugend » (HJ) pour les garçons et le « Bundeutscher Mädel » (BDM) pour les filles, seuls groupements de jeunesse autorisés à partir de 1936. À côté du professeur de musique du secteur privé ou du Conservatoire, un nouveau personnage apparaît, celui de « dirigeant musical pour la jeunesse ». Le principe fondamental régissant l'organisation de ce mouvement est la croyance en l'essence communautaire de la musique qui vise au retour d'une organisation sociale de type féodal.

L'éducation musicale a pour objectif de remplacer la « Gesellschaft », organisation individualiste, par la « Gemeinschaft », organisation sociale holistique. En découle une pédagogie entièrement orientée vers des pratiques collectives censées dessiner une nouvelle unité du peuple, fondée sur la participation active au groupe.

Les clichés pris par Liselotte Orgel-Köhne, « Camp musical » (1938), « Organisation de loisirs de jeunes filles » (1939-1942), tendent à véhiculer une image conviviale de ces camps dont l'ambition était d'« élever la jeunesse en

êtres conscients de leur germanité » .

Média choyé par la propagande, la radio s'attache à intégrer le grand répertoire dans le projet politique. Sa production industrielle (25 % de foyers détenteurs, en 1933 ; 65 % , en 1941) permet une couverture efficace des messages politiques et programmes de divertissement soigneusement sélectionnés par la censure. Bridés sur les ondes moyennes, ces appareils ne permettaient guère de capter les radios étrangères.

L'huile sur toile « le “ Führer ” parle » de Paul Matthias Padua dépeint une famille de paysans, toutes générations confondues, du berceau au vieillard, rassemblés autour du « récepteur du peuple » et plongés dans un recueillement quasi-religieux. Une photographie accrochée au mur telle une image pieuse, et un journal ouvert à la page où figure son nom nous laissent supposer qu'ils sont en train d'écouter un discours de Hitler. Ainsi la figure du « Führer » est présentée comme objet d'un culte de la personnalité poussé à son paroxysme. L'œuvre est exposée à Munich dans le cadre de la Grande exposition d'art allemand.

La période de guerre est quant à elle propice à une campagne tendant à attiser l'enthousiasme des troupes. La musique militaire et la musique légère sont perçues comme un baume indispensable alors que s'annoncent les signes de la débâcle.

...

« L'Allemagne, pays de la musique » proclame une affiche touristique éditée en 1938 par la Société des chemins de fer du « Reich » à l'intention des pays européens : on y voit l'aigle figurant l'État allemand prendre sous son aile l'orgue (instrument par excellence symbolisant l'œuvre de Jean-Sébastien Bach) . Sous le 3e « Reich » , politique et musique sont indissociables : c'est le thème de l'exposition qui fut organisée par la Cité de la musique de Paris du 8 octobre 2004 au 9 janvier 2005 et du catalogue publié pour l'occasion : « Le 3e “ Reich ” et la musique » . Comment la dictature Nationale-Socialiste récupère-t-elle la musique et en fait-elle un instrument de propagande ? Comment la musique participe-t-elle à la fascination qu'a exercée le Nazisme sur les masses ? Quelles sont enfin les modalités de la création musicale dans l'exil, la « résistance intérieure » ou le système concentrationnaire ?

L'Exposition est structurée selon 2 pôles sans s'y réduire toutefois. Le 1er est consacré à l'instrumentalisation par le Nazisme des grandes figures du patrimoine musical allemand : Bach, Beethoven, Bruckner, et évidemment Wagner sont célébrés comme la quintessence du génie germanique et servent à définir une musique conforme à l'idéal nazi. La 9e Symphonie de Beethoven devient ainsi l'œuvre de référence de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et de son directeur musical, le très charismatique Wilhelm Furtwängler. Le répertoire Romantique fait l'objet d'une récupération systématique. C'est ainsi que le buste d'Anton Bruckner est installé solennellement par Adolf Hitler, le dimanche 6 juin 1937, au « Walhalla » (ce temple néo-Grec édifié près de Ratisbonne, au début du 19e siècle, et dédié aux grandes figures de l'histoire allemande) , le « Führer » saluant dans ce compositeur le petit paysan autrichien, victime comme lui d'une société viennoise corrompue. Mais l'icône musicale du régime reste bien sûr Richard Wagner, dont l'exposition présente un buste réalisé en 1939 par Arno Breker (un autre de ces bustes fit partie de la collection personnelle d'Hitler) .

L'Exposition s'attarde sur le Festival de Bayreuth, devenu à partir de 1924 le symbole de la réaction culturelle contre les expérimentations musicales de la République de Weimar. L'affiche réalisée en 1937 par Jupp Wiertz, l'un des créateurs d'affiches les plus fameux de l'entre-2-guerres, est emblématique : l'utilisation de faisceaux lumineux mettant en valeur le buste wagnérien donne un caractère quasi religieux à la manifestation. Le Festival de 1937 est dominé par l'Opéra « Parsifal ». Mais c'est l'Opéra « les Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » qui, en exaltant l'idéal d'une société médiévale et corporatiste, s'impose comme l'Opéra culte du 3e « Reich » (une des pièces les plus précieuses de l'Exposition est d'ailleurs la partition autographe de l'Opéra, conservée par le Musée national germanique de Nuremberg depuis 1902). Cet Opéra, joué en ouverture des congrès du NSDAP, est aussi choisi pour l'inauguration triomphale du « Deutsches Opernhaus » de Berlin, en novembre 1935.

Le second pôle de l'Exposition est consacré à la condamnation par les Nazis des œuvres musicales « décadentes » ou « dégénérées » : ces vocables désignent la musique juive, « nègre » et communiste. L'exclusion du compositeur d'origine juive Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy du patrimoine musical allemand est ainsi emblématique. Dans la nuit du 9 au 10 novembre 1936, sa statue est détruite devant le « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig. Plusieurs compositeurs sont sollicités pour élaborer une version « aryenne » du « Songe d'une nuit d'été ». Alors que Richard Strauß jugeant le projet absurde décline l'offre, Carl Orff (plus opportuniste) s'attelle à la tâche, en 1939, en profitant du succès des « Carmina Burana ». La justification musicologique vient de l'étude de Karl Blessinger « Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Mahler. 3 chapitres du judaïsme dans la musique comme clé pour l'histoire de la musique du 19e siècle » (1939), dans laquelle l'auteur dénonce l'influence nocive du judaïsme dans la musique. Par ailleurs, l'Opéra jazz à succès « Jonny spielt auf ! » (« Jonny mène la danse ! ») d'Ernst Křenek, créé à Leipzig en 1927 et mettant en scène les amours d'un homme noir et d'une femme blanche, est symptomatique pour les Nazis d'une dégénérescence raciale. L'affiche de l'Opéra qui représente un saxophoniste noir est reprise pour la brochure de l'Exposition de 1938 sur l'« Entartete Musik » (musique dégénérée). Organisée à Düsseldorf en marge des journées musicales du « Reich », c'est l'équivalent musical de l'Exposition de Munich de 1937 sur la « dégénérescence » dans les arts plastiques. Les courants avant-gardistes (musique atonale d'Arnold Schönberg ou engagée de Kurt Weill) sont opposés aux productions restauratrices de Richard Strauß, Werner Egk et Carl Orff. Parmi les boucs émissaires de l'Exposition figure le chef d'orchestre juif Otto Klemperer, directeur musical du « Kroll Oper » de Berlin, de 1927 à 1931, accusé d'y avoir mené une guerre contre Richard Wagner. La production du « Vaisseau Fantôme », en 1929, est effectivement l'une des manifestations musicales les plus controversées des années '20, tant pour la direction musicale de Klemperer que pour les décors d'inspiration « Bauhaus » d'Ewald (Felix) Dülberg (marqués par l'abstraction formelle). Du reste, les wagnériens obtiennent, en 1931, la fermeture du « Kroll Oper ». L'Exposition de 1938 n'a pas le succès escompté. Elle se heurte à la popularité de la musique de cabaret que les Nazis ne parviennent pas à discréditer, en particulier « l'Opéra de quat' sous » créé par Bertolt Brecht et Kurt Weill, en août 1928, à Berlin (« Theater am Schiffbauerdamm »). La politique antisémite conduit à la dissolution de certains groupes de jazz, comme, en 1935, le sextuor humoristique « The Comedian Harmonists » fondé à Berlin, en 1927. Pour pallier ces interdictions, le ministère de la Propagande encourage des formations « aryennes » de musique légère, tel l'ensemble « Die Goldenen Sieben » (1934) qui peut être considéré comme un « ersatz » des « Weintraubs Syncopators » à la mode dans les années '20.

Mais le schéma manichéen qui oppose une « bonne » et une « mauvaise » musique est loin d'épuiser les ambiguïtés

de la création musicale sous le 3^e « Reich ». Chefs d'orchestre et musiciens entretiennent des rapports plus complexes avec le régime. Il en va ainsi de la concurrence entre Wilhelm Fürtwängler, extrêmement favorisé par les Nazis en dépit de son absence de soutien au régime (il cumule les fonctions de chef d'orchestre à la « Staatsoper », directeur musical de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, vice-président de la chambre de musique du « Reich » et membre du Sénat) et Hans Knappertsbusch, moins apprécié par Adolf Hitler malgré son antisémitisme. Si on met à part le cas des compositeurs ayant choisi l'exil, tel Arnold Schönberg qui dénonce le Nazisme depuis les États-Unis avec « l'Ode à Napoléon Bonaparte » (1942), ceux qui restent en Allemagne sont conduits à se compromettre, comme le montrent les trajectoires de Richard Strauß ou d'Anton von Webern. Ce dernier, bien que resté fidèle à son Maître Schönberg, approuve la politique pan-germaniste d'Hitler et pense convaincre le régime de la valeur de la musique dodécaphonique. Mais ses œuvres ne sont pas jouées dans le « Reich ».

La partie la plus originale de l'Exposition porte sur la création musicale dans les camps de concentration. En particulier, la musique du compositeur Viktor Ullmann (1898-1909) est redécouverte à l'occasion d'un cycle de concerts organisé à la Cité de la musique parallèlement à l'Exposition. Ce pianiste juif a été l'assistant de Alexander von Zemlinsky à Prague après la Première Guerre mondiale et a collaboré au « Schauspielhaus » de Zürich. Le 8 septembre 1942, il est déporté dans le camp de « Theresienstadt », avant d'être transféré et tué à « Auschwitz », le 16 octobre 1944. Le camp de « Terezin » (dans le protectorat de Bohême-Moravie) est le seul camp spécifiquement juif de l'univers concentrationnaire nazi. Camp modèle ou camp vitrine (en 1944, le Comité international de Croix-Rouge le visite et le film de propagande « Le " Führer " » fait don d'une ville aux juifs y est tourné), il se caractérise par une vie culturelle intense dans les domaines de la musique, du théâtre et des arts plastiques. Celle-ci masque en réalité l'entreprise d'extermination : tous les musiciens du camp seront gazés à « Auschwitz ». C'est dans ce cadre qu'Ullmann compose en 1943 l'Opéra « Der Kaiser von Atlantis oder der Todverweigerung » (l'Empereur d'Atlantide ou le refus de la mort), sur un livret de Peter Kien. Cette œuvre, interdite dans le camp (elle sera créée pour la 1^{re} fois en 1975) est emblématique de la composition musicale au cœur de l'anéantissement concentrationnaire. Dans le royaume d'Atlantide, le roi Overall (dont le nom renvoie au germanisme « Überall » évoquant l'hymne allemand « Deutschland über alles ») déclare la « Guerre Totale » et ordonne à la mort de conduire ses armées. Mais celle-ci, révoltée de voir son œuvre transformée en entreprise de massification, décide de ne plus laisser les hommes mourir. Le chaos s'ensuit, si bien qu'à la fin de l'Opéra, la mort accepte d'accomplir à nouveau sa mission à condition que le roi soit sa 1^{re} victime. La mort apparaît ainsi libératrice : « Elle est celle qui délivre de la peste et non la peste » (allusion évidente à la peste brune). Cet argument allégorique est empreint d'une ironie glaciale quand on pense aux conditions de sa réalisation. Mais toute la force de rébellion de l'artiste se dégage : l'Opéra est un acte de vie avant une mort certaine.

La dernière section de l'Exposition, consacrée aux outils et mécanismes de propagande, présente une série de documents audio-visuels matérialisant la politique nazie de manipulation des masses. On y voit la retransmission aux actualités cinématographiques de la cérémonie d'ouverture des jeux Olympiques de Berlin, en août 1936, pour laquelle Richard Strauß compose son hymne olympique. On mesure toute la force du chant dans les associations de masse nazies telles les SA (enregistrement du « Horst-Wessel-Lied » par un chœur de SA, le 10 avril 1933), les Jeunesses hitlériennes ou « la Force par la joie », KdF, (extrait d'un concert donné, en 1944, par l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin pour les ouvriers des usines AEG de Berlin). La production industrielle de postes de radio baptisés

« Volksempfänger » (récepteurs du peuple) , dont 25 % de foyers sont équipés en 1933 et 65 % en 1941, permet une couverture efficace des messages politiques jusqu'à la fin du régime : la radio diffuse ainsi la fanfare « Die Wacht am Rhein » lors de la capitulation française et « les Préludes » de Franz Liszt lors de l'entrée de la « Wehrmacht » en URSS, jusqu'au 2 mai 1945, quand la mort du « Führer » est annoncée avec la Symphonie n° 8 inachevée de Franz Schubert.

...

In addition to other ceremonies and rallies, « Reich » services for the dead included favoured music selections. Commemorative wreaths were placed on the monument to those who died in the November 9th, 1923, abortive « Putsch » , to bands playing such solemn, heroic works as « Raise the Banner » . This was also used in the funeral procession Josef Goebbels planned for Fritz Todt. He also selected the « Funeral March » from Richard Wagner's « Götterdämmerung » , the « Song of the Good Comrade » , and the national anthem, « Deutschland über Alles » .

In 1934, Goebbels, realizing the need for respite from military music, issued a decree which called for lighter music on the radio for several weeks, following intensely emotional experiences such as Party rallies. In order for the propagandistic value of radio broadcasts to be realized, Goebbels also accepted that the « Reich » had to provide programs which would encourage citizens to keep their radios turned-on. Between 1932 and 1937, therefore, the amount of air-time dedicated to music increased to 69 %, 7/8 of which was lighter music. These programs included Operas by the 19th Century Masters Carl Maria von Weber, Albert Lortzing, Peter Cornelius and Otto Nicolai ; Operettas by Johan Strauß, Franz Lehár, Paul Lincke ; and lesser composers like Eduard Künneke and Emil von Reznicek were heard repeatedly. Goebbels was aware that not everyone had a comprehension of music sufficient for appreciation of such works as Wagner's Operas. He found it necessary that simple forms of music should exist and that creators of those forms should be made to realize that they render a service to the « Reich » . Then too, Hitler doubtlessly approved of the inclusion of lighter music, for, he was especially fond of Operettas.

Many Symphonic programs by the Berlin and Vienna Philharmonic Orchestras were broadcast during the 3rd « Reich » . They were usually held to an hour's length, but special exceptions were made for such works as Anton Bruckner's lengthy 7th Symphony. Certain instrumental works became monograms for special events and announcements over the radio. The « Meistersinger » Overture was played for Goebbels' annual radio celebration of Hitler's birthday, and Beethoven's « Eroica » was played to introduce Hitler's speeches on Heroes' Remembrance Day. Robert Herzstein claimed that, in a special effort to keep Germans out of the churches, special attention was given to Sunday broadcasts of the finest Classical and church music and poetry readings.

Goebbels also banned the playing of Mozart's « Requiem » over the radio during the War, because it was « world-renouncing and depressing » . Beethoven's 5th Symphony was also rejected because it had become an allied victory signal. The War also brought confusion about playing, singing, and listening to music of the enemy. This resulted in a ban on the music of Maurice Ravel, Claude Debussy, Frederic Chopin, Georges Bizet, and Piotr Ilitch Tchaikovsky. Nevertheless, Alexander Borodin's « Prince Igor » was performed at Hamburg during the German campaign in Russia.

Musical compositions were often changed to suit the restrictions of the 3rd « Reich ». In Beethoven's « Fidelio », for example, Leonora's loyalty to Florestan was given emphasis in order to take attention away from the prison scenes, which were too relevant to concentration camps, while pianist Wilhelm Backhaus was praised for playing the Schumann Concerto with a new German image, which avoided the typical effeminate manner of playing Schumann.

A portion of the Nazi government, surely not comprised of musicologists, saw a serious problem in the respective value of major and minor-keys in music. Some argued greater gifts were required to compose in a major-key because the composer had to « take upon himself the contradiction and paradox of life ». More « inner-strength » was needed than in the case of a minor-key. Minor-keys, on the other hand, were associated with non-Aryan music. The realization that a great number of songs of the movement were not in a major-key but had « a marked affinity with an alien system of sound » was quite disturbing to some, such as Alfred Rosenberg. However, there was never a resolution of the dispute.

The Nazi leadership, however, did reach some agreement on the music areas each was to dominate. During the 3rd « Reich », for example, Josef Goebbels laid-down the guide-lines for radio and films while Hermann Göring and Baldur von Schirach provided direction to the Operas, at Berlin and Vienna. Hitler patronized the music communities in Munich, Weimar, Bayreuth and Linz. Hitler endowed Linz with a large-orchestra called the « Bruckner » Orchestra. In Munich, as has been seen, he was most concerned with the visual arts. He endowed Weimar with an annual allowance of 60,000 « Deutsche Mark », gave advice on staging and casting, and enjoyed contact with the artists. Hitler also contributed substantial sums to the support of Wagner's music in Bayreuth and granted the operation a complete tax exemption.

Bayreuth became Hitler's « Court Theater » and thrived under his patronage. As will be recalled, before Hitler's attempted Munich « coup », in 1923, which earned him a term in Landsberg Prison, he had visited Wagner's grave and declared to Winifred Wagner :

« Out of “ Parsifal ”, I will make a religion. »

The full-meaning of this remark was clarified by Hitler some 13 years later. In the spring of 1936, Hitler ordered German troops into the Rhineland, which had been de-militarized since 1918. Not long afterward, Hitler went on a triumphal train tour of the region. Although his trip was punctuated with dramatic speeches and church bells saluting his victory, Hitler realized the retaking of the Rhineland showed more bravura than military strength and was thankful for the pacificity of the Western powers.

He said :

« Am I glad ! Good Lord, am I glad it's gone so smoothly. Sure enough, the world belongs to the brave man. He's the one God helps. »

As his train continued the nocturnal journey through the Ruhr District, it passed glowing blast furnaces, slag heaps,

and derricks, and Hitler asked that a record of Wagner's music be played. When the Prelude of « Parsifal » began to sound, he reiterated his intention to develop a religion out of it as, « One can serve God only in the garb of the hero » without any « pretense of humility ». Surprisingly, « Parsifal » was dropped from the 3rd « Reich » repertoire when the War started, « presumably because its Christian over-tones antagonized the neo-paganists surrounding Rosenberg ». The habit of dreary resentments did not permit Hitler to enjoy the success of his tour, for as the record continued with the Funeral March from « Götterdämmerung » .

Hitler recalled :

« I first heard it in Vienna. At the Opera. And I still remember as if it were today how madly excited I became on the way home over a few yammering “ Yids ” I had to pass. I cannot think of a more incompatible contrast. This glorious mystery of the dying hero and this Jewish crap. »

Joachim Fest believed that the Finale of « Götterdämmerung » was the extreme expression of Opera to Hitler. During his years of attending Opera at the Bayreuth Theater, when the stronghold of the gods collapsed in musical climax, he would usually take the hand of « Frau » Winifred Wagner and emotionally kiss her hand.

Hitler also carried his interest in stage-designs for Wagner's works into the years of his Chancellorship. Albert Speer witnessed Hitler's « amazing knowledge of stage-craft, his interest in the diameter of revolving stages, lift mechanisms, and, especially, different lighting techniques ». Speer heard Hitler discuss lighting and scenery for Wagner's music-dramas with Benno von Arent, whom Hitler had made « Reich » State-Designer and Supervisor of Opera and Operetta decor. He also provided Arent with « neatly executed stage-designs, coloured with crayons, for all Acts of « Tristan und Isolde » and sketches for all scenes of « Der Ring des Niebelungen », which he had poured-over, night after night, for 3 weeks. Later, when von Arent was commissioned to stage « Meistersinger » at the opening performance for the Party Rally, Hitler closely studied lighting for the moonlight scenes and « went into ecstasies over the brilliant colours he wanted for the final scene on the Mastersinger's meadow, and over the Romantic look of the little gabled houses opposite Hans Sach's cobbler's shop » .

Hitler's attitude toward Richard Wagner's works was decidedly conservative. Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt reported in « Modern Music », in 1933, that Heinz Tietzen and Emil Pretorius, « 2 representatives of modern ideas in the Theatre », gave the « Ring » and « Meistersinger » « novel scenic dress » in contrast to the Bayreuth tradition, and the « Keepers of the Grail » protested against the « cultural-bolshevistic » interpretation of Wagner, but the government was satisfied. Hitler's own conservatism resulted in his request that Arent replace Emil Pretorius, who had long done the sets for the Bayreuth Festival. Winifred Wagner avoided this change by pretending she did not know what Hitler was driving at in their conversations about the conductors. It is generally recognized, however, that during the 3rd « Reich », the performances came closer to approximating Wagner's original Bayreuth concept than they had immediately before the « Reich ». Indeed, it became increasingly a German event, for fewer and fewer foreigners were seen there.

It was not uncommon for Hitler to intervene in the appointment of musicians to important theatrical posts. Often, he did this to « preserve tradition and keep overbold innovators out of the positions of power ». For such reasons, Karl

Elmendorff was given directorship of the Dresden City Opera, in 1942. He often showed very strong feelings about conductors in particular. He said Hans Knappertsbusch, for example, was « no better than a military-band leader », and he mistrusted Herbert von Karajan because he conducted without a score, and so, could not catch blunders on the part of the singers, « which was inconsiderate of the public as well as the singers ». Baldur von Schirach believed Hitler would have « interfered if Karajan had not been a “ protégé ” of Göring’s, just as Knappertsbusch enjoyed the protection of Eva Braun », who liked the conductor’s « manly good looks » .

Officiels et diffamés

Le temps agit non seulement sur l’interprétation que nous donnons d’un événement, mais également sur le sens que nous associons aux mots qui l’ont accompagné. L’histoire (celle de la musique notamment) est en cela une réflexion sur le langage. Ainsi l’expression « musique dégénérée », choisie sciemment pour ses connotations diffamantes par le commissaire de l’Exposition de mai 1938 à Düsseldorf, est-elle devenue 50 ans plus tard le titre d’une collection discographique, signe de ralliement autour d’un répertoire qu’il était jugé urgent de redécouvrir. Si la supposée dégénérescence de l’art des Ernst Křenek, Kurt Weill et Arnold Schœnberg était déjà considérée à l’époque par une partie des intéressés (Schœnberg en tête) comme un « hommage en négatif » venant de la part d’idéologues fascistes, cette opinion ne constituait pas pour autant une acception culturelle « commune », encore moins une catégorie revendicable. Il y a fort à parier que si un éditeur discographique britannique s’était aventuré dans les années 1930 à proposer un recueil d’œuvres de ces compositeurs sous le terme de « musique dégénérée », il se serait heurté à l’incompréhension, pour ne pas dire à la stupeur des intéressés.

Cette réflexion est moins anecdotique qu’il n’y paraît car elle tend à démontrer la puissance paradoxale de l’art musical sur un pouvoir qui vise à le réduire au silence. Les rapports entre la musique et le totalitarisme, sans l’étude desquels aucune histoire de la musique du XXe siècle ne peut être écrite, tendent à montrer que le temps sert d’agent « inverseur » : plus le régime politique aura essayé d’asseoir son autorité sur la création, plus celle qu’il tente d’annihiler et qui lui résiste tend à devenir « précieuse » aux yeux des générations suivantes et à être valorisée dans les paradigmes modernes de l’histoire. Ce qui ne devait en aucun cas devenir patrimoine, au risque de « salir la culture nationale », devient le symbole d’un lieu et d’une époque : gageons que 1943, sera dans la culture « commune » transmise par les histoires de la musique germanique, l’année de l’incroyable composition du « Kaiser von Atlantis » de Viktor Ullmann dans un camp de prisonniers et non celle de la création du « Schloß Dürande » d’Ottmar Schœck à l’Opéra d’État de Berlin.

L’entreprise de « nettoyage » du « bolchévisme culturel », loin de laisser le champ ouvert à ceux qui ont montré patte blanche, retient au contraire dans son envol l’« ange de l’histoire », attiré par ce qui a pu provoquer pareil « règlement de compte » (l’Exposition de 1938 était sous-titrée : « Abrechnung ») : c’est ainsi que l’époque du Nazisme au pouvoir se révèle a posteriori comme particulièrement foisonnante et diversifiée. À l’exaspération de la tendance nationaliste historiciste du XIXe siècle fait pendant une activité non moins importante de création.

On peut distinguer à ce sujet sinon celle des compositeurs « officiels », dont l’histoire ne retient aucun nouveau nom, du moins la poursuite de l’activité créatrice de ceux déjà établis (à commencer par Richard Strauß, qui continuera à

composer essentiellement des Opéras) ; à son opposé, celle des compositeurs exilés, proches pour la plupart d'Arnold Schœnberg (comme Hanns Eisler, Ernst Křenek et Stefan Wolpe, un élève d'Anton von Webern) , lui-même résidant à partir

de 1934 en Californie via Paris, ou de Franz Schreker, qui était décédé peu après l'accession au pouvoir des Nazis ; enfin, celle des « sans dénomination » , ni officiels, ni diffamés, considérés comme inutiles par le pouvoir (qu'ils indiffèrent) et menacés de l'être par l'histoire (qui, sans la modernité de son formalisme, n'aurait pas retenu le nom d'Anton von Webern, et ne s'est souvenu que récemment de l'existence d'Hans Erich Apostel) . Parmi eux, certains méritent d'être qualifiés d' « exilés de l'intérieur » , comme Karl Amadeus Hartmann, qui s'est « auto-interdit » , ce qui n'a pas empêché ses biographes d'accorder à juste titre à cette « non-musique » une importance au moins aussi grande qu'aux musiques réellement écrites. Le silence fait décidément beaucoup de bruit : peut-être cette leçon de l'histoire a-t-elle été intuitivement ressentie par les créateurs de l'après-guerre, signataires de nombreuses œuvres « trouées de silence » .

Mozart et les Nazis

Instrumentaliser Mozart à des fins politiques : Le cas de la « Mozart-Woche des Deutschen Reiches » (Vienne, 1941)

Du 28 novembre au 5 décembre 1941 s'est tenue à Vienne la Mozart-Woche des Deutschen Reiches, une semaine Mozart célébrant le 150e anniversaire du décès du compositeur. Ce festival d'une très grande envergure (plus d'une soixantaine de manifestations musicales réunissant les musiciens allemands les plus réputés) n'était pas simplement un événement culturel : ses principaux organisateurs, le Reichsstatthalter Baldur von Schirach et le Ministre de la propagande Josef Gœbbels, y voyaient d'abord et avant tout un vecteur de propagande politique. L'objectif de la Mozart-Woche était triple : rassurer le peuple allemand, fédérer le peuple autrichien (annexé par l'Allemagne en 1938) et séduire le reste de l'Europe pour mieux l'asservir.

Mais pour atteindre ce triple objectif, il fallait développer une rhétorique bien particulière visant à présenter Mozart comme l'archétype même du musicien allemand, aryen, nationaliste et assez proche du peuple pour susciter l'enthousiasme des foules. Dans cette communication, nous verrons comment les instigateurs de la Mozart-Woche ont instrumentalisé aussi bien l'œuvre que la personne de Mozart, sans hésiter à déformer les faits pour mieux les faire correspondre à leurs intentions politiques. Nous nous pencherons aussi bien sur le programme musical de la Mozart-Woche que sur le discours qui l'a entouré (articles de journaux, livres parus au moment du festival, publications officielles et discours prononcés par Baldur von Schirach, Josef Gœbbels et Heinz Drewes, chef de la section musique du Ministère de la propagande). Cette étude sera complétée par celle de la perception (ou non) de cette instrumentalisation de Mozart par les membres de la délégation française, la plus importante délégation étrangère invitée à Vienne pour la Mozart-Woche.

...

Among Arthur Honegger's War-time choices, his decision to accept the invitation to attend the 1941 German « Reich » Mozart Week, in Vienna, was the most controversial both during and after the War. The French contingent (the largest

and most prominent of the foreign delegations) was provided with an all-expense-paid trip to attend an event that consisted of political rallies as well as brilliant musical performances. Among those the delegates heard perform were Wilhelm Furtwängler conducting the « Requiem » ; Clemens Krauß, the Mass in C minor ; Hans Knappertsbuch, « Don Giovanni » and « Die Zauberflöte » ; and Karl Böhm, « Le nozze di Figaro » and « Die Entführung aus dem Serail » . They met with Alfred Schlee, the head of Universal-Edition, and attended a reception at the villa of Richard Strauß. But they also heard Josef Gœbbels preside over a Nazi rally at the « Staatsoper » . Gœbbels's co-host, Baldur von Schirach, the « Reich » governor of Vienna, opened the Festival by invoking Mozart's relevance to the goals and visions of the German « Reich » :

« It is for the values that Mozart represents that we are fighting today, and Mozart fights alongside us with the influence of his genius. » (Baldur von Schirach)

German propaganda took full-advantage of the validation provided by the foreigners, and in particular the French, who traveled to Vienna to participate in the Festival. Several articles about the so-called « European » Music Festival appeared in various editions of the German daily newspaper, the « Völkische Beobachter » . The 1st to appear, on 29 November, drew attention to the fact that the « 800 out-of-town guests, among them several from foreign countries » , included « a delegation of French musicians » who were taking part « at the invitation of the “ Reich ” government » . The last, on 7 December, concluded that « the visitors would now return to their homes with the indelible impression of the German “ Reich ” superiority, in both cultural and military matters » . « This, it seems to us, was the greatest value of the German “ Reich ” Mozart Week » , asserted the official newspaper of the Nazi Party. « Victory in the current fight can only belong to the one who feels so secure and serene in military battle that he does not forget the care of the Muses amid the noise of weapons » . Although the articles did not name any of the individual « guests » , it was the collective willingness of a critical mass of them to join the venture that made their presence useful for German propaganda purposes at home and abroad.

Crimes against Culture or Business as Usual ?

Mozart and the Nazis is a well-researched, detailed account of perceptions about Mozart, his music, and his legacy in the 3rd « Reich » and beyond. Indeed, the title does not do full justice to the chronological scope of the work, which opens with the celebrations of Mozart's 175th birthday in 1931 and concludes with the post-War continuation of various projects and interpretations passed down from the Nazi era. The geographic scope also pushes beyond the borders of the 3rd « Reich » , following the fate of German exiles and assessing Mozart's reception among Germany's allies and in territories invaded and occupied by German troops. The author, Erik Levi, wrote one of the 1st English-language studies on music in Nazi Germany and applies his expertise to mine archival sources, contemporary publications, and secondary literature to offer a richly informed survey.

Levi's introduction briefly summarizes the book's goal of examining the Nazi campaign to co-opt Mozart despite the challenge of conforming the composer's character and outlook to their « weltanschauung » . Thereafter, the 1st chapter (« Prologue : 1931, a Mozart Year ») looks at the celebrations as well as the status of various editions of Mozart's music underway in Depression-era Germany. The following 2 chapters (« Der deutsche Mozart » and « Mozart

and the Freemasons : A Nazi Problem ») examine the numerous attempts both before and during the 3rd « Reich » to emphasize Mozart's Germanness and to distance the composer from his known associations with Freemasonry, especially once the movement had become a target of Nazi suppression. The chapter titled « Aryanising [sic] Mozart » analyzes Mozart's direct and indirect associations with Jews, most notably his collaboration with librettist Lorenzo Da Ponte and the popular 19th Century German translations of Da Ponte's texts by another Jew, Hermann Levi.

In the next 2 chapters (« The Mozart Diaspora » and « “ True Humanitarian Music ” : Exiled Writers on Mozart ») , we learn about Mozart's significance for oppressed Jews living within the « Reich » and those driven out of Adolf Hitler's Germany. « Mozart Performance and Propaganda : From the Anschluß to the End of World War II » details the high-profile political exploitation of the Salzburg Mozart festival on the eve of the « Anschluß » , and chapter 8 (« Mozart Serves German Imperialism ») looks at Mozart reception under German occupation. The final chapter (« Epilogue : Nazi Legacies ») traces vestiges of the « nazified » Mozart beyond the 3rd « Reich » , including the completion of an edition of Mozart's works initiated under Hitler, the English dubbing and distribution of a Mozart bio-pic of 1942, and the resurrection of theories about Mozart's opposition to Freemasonry and his deep-seated nationalism, the rhetoric of which could be effortlessly superimposed on the more recent image of an « Austrian Mozart » .

Levi's comprehensive treatment is a valuable addition not only to the study of Mozart reception history but also to investigations of the ways artists and their works can be subjected to a wide variety of interpretations under differing historical conditions. At the same time, Levi's ample evidence of the continuity and ubiquity of Mozart's meaning for audiences in and beyond the 3rd « Reich » tends to undermine the work's main contention that « although many regimes have appropriated great historical and artistic figures of the past for their own political purposes, none has done so with such thoroughness as the Nazis » (page 1) . Levi, like so many others seeking to highlight the singularity of Nazi atrocities against not only European Jewry but also Western civilization, strives to reconstruct a campaign of cultural mayhem as ruthless and thorough as the Holocaust itself, only to struggle with evidence that complicates this agenda.

This becomes clear almost from the start, as Levi demonstrates an adherence to portraying Mozart as a German icon in the years leading up to the 3rd « Reich » , in which severe economic hardships offered Mozart's 175th birthday as « one small opportunity for Germans to be reminded of their great musical heritage » (page 5) , and showing how a leading scholar was already « echoing the Nazi line of attack » in a 1931 essay on « the German » Mozart (page 29) . Indeed, Levi traces this tendency from the time of Richard Wagner (page 16) to its climax reached in the years leading-up to the First World War in « a flurry of publications which sowed the seeds for the omnipresent and unchallenged interpretation of the composer that followed the advent of the 3rd “ Reich ” » (page 20) . Clearly such « abuse » of Mozart was not a Nazi innovation, nor could the Nazis be cited for being the most abusive. Levi even observes a weakening of the insistence on a purely « German Mozart » at the height of World War II, in the interest of currying favour with the Axis and drawing attention to Mozart's debt to Italy (pages 31-32) .

This is not the only instance in which earlier extremism is softened, even silenced, during the 3rd « Reich » . In the fascinating discussion of the troubling relationship between Mozart and Freemasonry, Levi diligently traces efforts to

distance Mozart from the Masons all the way back to the 1790's, culminating in conspiracy theories in the late- 19th Century suggesting that Jews and Masons poisoned Mozart. Yet, a 1928 polemical « exposé » that was reprinted in the 3rd « Reich » prompted a denunciation by propaganda minister Josef Goebbels and a formal ban on further publication (pages 39-40) . Even more fascinating are the controversies over how to represent Masonic themes in contemporary productions of « The Magic Flute » , resulting in a formal pronouncement by Hitler against any attempts to pervert Mozart's original intentions and a position statement by the head of theater operations recommending that producers back away from overly zealous attempts to « cleanse » the work of its Masonic and Egyptian elements (pages 42-51) . With regard to Mozart's Jewish associations, we see a similar degree of ambivalence, with positive endorsements of Da Ponte's contributions appearing as late as 1938 (page 55) and, in the ensuing competition to furnish new German translations to replace those of Hermann Levi, instances of preference for Levi's version over more recent « Aryan » substitutes (page 72) . In fact, the criticisms of Hermann Levi's translation hardly ever cite his Jewishness, but rather contend that the newer, more modern versions should supersede the stilted and overly Romantic texts in use since the late-19th Century. In the end, we learn that the 3rd « Reich » was not the 1st official German entity to abuse Mozart as a cultural icon, and, perhaps, out of a keen interest in gauging public opinion even urged more moderation, not out of any sense of taste or decency but out of a pragmatic need to win over support rather than risk alienating countless Mozart devotees.

Mozart's significance particularly for Jewish performers and scholars provides, perhaps, the most compelling material for readers of this list, as the discussions yield some very poignant insights into this group's stubborn adherence to German cultural identity. As is well-known, the systematic exclusion of Jews from participation in German cultural life led 1st to a stop-gap measure concocted by the government and the Jewish community, known as the Jewish Culture League (« Kulturbund deutscher Juden ») , to provide cultural and educational programs exclusively for Jews by Jews. When it came to excluding German content from the league's programs, the deep connection German Jews held to German culture became all too evident. The ban on Mozart imposed upon the league in 1937 was a bitter pill to swallow, and Herbert Peyser, reporting for « The New York Times » , perceptively noted the German Jews' undying claim to « that same artistic, scientific, and philosophic fare to which, through the Centuries, they have felt a proprietary right to equal that of other Germans » (quoted on page 92) . Once beyond the reach of Nazi authority, German Jews and other exiles could continue to cultivate their connection to Mozart, and Levi provides details of their involvement in the Glyndebourne Festival, Salzburg, and other venues in the United States and Britain. Indeed, Jewish musicologists chose high-profile platforms such as « The New York Times » and Thomas Mann's journal « Mass und Wert » to emphasize Mozart's humanity and, in essence, to draw sharp lines of distinction between the long and venerable legacy of German culture and the Nazis' recent perversion of it.

The rich detail provided in Mozart and the Nazis gives readers a wealth of material for gaining a deeper understanding of how such an important musical figure can be mythologized and exploited to serve both universalist and exclusionary political philosophies. Yet, rather than read this « exposé » as a demonstration of the Nazis' singularity in « abusing » this particular cultural icon, one should be open to observing how, under National-Socialism, the Austro-German Mozart « industry » was allowed to prosper and mature, both within the 3rd « Reich » and beyond. Levi's extensive and very useful bibliography includes a recent article by Ulrich Konrad (under the sub-category « Further Reading ») that forcefully argues for no noticeable changes in Mozart reception before, during, or after the

years of Nazi terror. Looking past the indisputable political exploitation of the Salzburg festival, one cannot help pondering that scholars, performers, and policy-makers of all stripes shared in a common mission to perpetuate the myths surrounding Mozart and his music and to exploit them toward fulfilling their own political and ideological agendas, and that this process continued long past 1945 in and beyond Germany's borders.

Notes

(1) « Music in the 3rd " Reich " » , Saint-Martin's Press, New York (1994) .

(2) The author is not referring to the more widely accepted definition of « aryansation » as the seizure of Jewish-owned property.

(3) Ulrich Konrad. « Die Mozart-Pflege im " Dritten Reich " » , Acta Mozartiana No. 56 (2009) : pages 48-68.

Mozart and the Nazis - How the 3rd « Reich » Abused a Cultural Icon

(Erik Levi, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2010)

The Nazis came to power in 1933. During the subsequent 3 months, German musical life saw tumultuous changes. Within weeks, many prominent German musicians who were considered by the regime to be politically or racially unacceptable had been forced-out of employment, or felt duty-bound to emigrate.

The Salzburg Festival was particularly troublesome. Bruno Walter, who had appeared at the Festival between 1933 and 1937, refused to have anything to do with those musicians who had sought favour with the Nazis. Despite the apparent incompatibility between Mozart's humanitarian and cosmopolitan outlook and the Nazi ideology, the 3rd « Reich » doggedly promoted the composer's music to further the goals of the regime.

For instance, in 1941, to mark the 150th anniversary year of Mozart's death, 4 special postage stamps were issued in honour of the composer. The set was issued by Bohemia and Moravia during the Nazi occupation of the northern part of Czechoslovakia. Issued on 26th October 1941, the stamps depict Prague's Theatre of the Estates, affiliated with the National Theatre. On the 4th of December, the anniversary address was given at the Vienna State Opera by Doctor Josef Gœbbels, Adolf Hitler's Propaganda Minister. Later, after 1948, the Prague Theatre was named the Tyl Theatre (after dramatist Josef Kajetán Tyl) , being the venue where « Don Giovanni » was 1st performed. Hence, the stamps depicted notation from the Opera.

Propaganda placed German politics before German art. In the climate that followed the Nazi take-over, to place examples of German patriotism at centre stage for any figure of cultural and historical significance was crucial. In Paris, a Mozart Week, « received very enthusiastically by Parisian audiences » , was organized in July 1941. Thus, Mozart was promoted as an honorary Nazi. Effects were long-lasting. Certain Mozart projects promoted during the Nazi era re-emerged after the War.

...

Erik Levi's « Mozart and the Nazis » represents a valuable addition to the literature on music during the 3rd « Reich » , in large part because of its focus on the reception of a single composer. For a long time, the music of this period suffered almost total neglect. Indeed, only 2 major studies were published before 1990 : « Musik im dritten Reich » by Joseph Wulf and « Musik im NS-Staat » by Fred K. Prieberg. (1) In the past 20 years, however, a number of valuable publications have appeared, including Erik Levi's « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Michael H. Kater's « The Twisted Muse » , Pamela Potter's « The Most German of the Arts » , and the essay collection « Music and Nazism » , edited by Kater and Albrecht Riethmüller. (2) All of them are highly-informative in exploring how political figures and institutions of the Nazi regime influenced Germany's musical life in the 1930's and 1940's. Yet, they remain general in scope, thereby, leaving both room and need for more focused discussions such as Levi's in this latest book. (3)

One could agree with Leon Botstein's claim, as indeed Levi does, that there was something « about the music of Mozart that rendered the Nazi attempt at appropriation truly ineffective » . (4) It is precisely the resistance of Mozart's music and biography to National-Socialist appropriation that makes his case a particularly interesting one. As Levi states, his study « sheds interesting light on the manner in which the Nazis dealt with the nation's musical heritage, but also illustrates the absurd and sometimes contradictory lengths to which those supportive of the regime were prepared to go in order to ensure Mozart's hallowed status as one of the most important representatives of Aryan cultural supremacy » . (2) Levi examines Nazi attempts at appropriating Mozart in 2 sections of the book : Chapters 2 to 4 focus on the years 1933 to 1938, while Chapters 7 and 8 cover the period from 1938 until the end of the War. In the 2 chapters in between, Levi's focus shifts from the Nazis to the Jews, surveying Mozart's reception in the 1930's among Jewish musicians and writers both in Germany and abroad. Levi frames his study with a Prologue and an Epilogue that offer the reader some historical context of Mozart's reception before and after the 3rd « Reich »

Levi's narrative begins in 1931, a Mozart year of some importance in that it marked the 175th anniversary of Mozart's birth and the 150th anniversary of the premiere of « Idomeneo » . He, then, addresses aspects of Mozart's Operas and biography that the Nazis co-opted for their ideology : Mozart's patriotism was promoted, while the connections to freemasonry were brushed under the rug. (5) Yet, had the adored canonic Operas based on librettos by Jewish-born Lorenzo da Ponte (namely, « Le nozze di Figaro » , « Don Giovanni » , and « Così fan tutte ») been removed from the repertory, it would have made the anti-Semitic laws seem ridiculous. Instead, the Nazis attempted to downgrade Da Ponte's contribution to the Operas, thus, making them more consistent with the ideology. A common strategy, discussed by Levi, was to omit Da Ponte's name from programmes and scores and to present the work in new German translations, thus, emphasizing the Operas' Germanness. This approach was complicated, however, by the fact that the most popular translations had been done by Hermann Levi, the Jewish-German conductor. Consequently, several new translations appeared in the 1930's, with Georg Schünemann's winning the government's endorsement in 1941.

As might be expected, the Nazis used Mozart's hometown of Salzburg to further their propaganda after the annexation of Austria : this was exemplified by changes in the Salzburg Festival's political policies. Prior to the « Anschluß » , the

Festival had banned demonstrations of Nazi support and made great efforts to hire exiled German musicians. After 1938, however, it was turned into a vehicle for Nazi propaganda. The 1939 Festival is the focus of Levi's 7th chapter ; it was, he writes, « one of the last important musical events before the invasion of Poland » (page 151) . The reasons he cites are twofold. 1st, it « acted as a further signal to the outside world of the strengthening alliance between the Germans and the Italians » , through the inclusion of Verdi and Rossini on the programme and the performance of Mozart's Operas in the original Italian. 2nd, it attempted to create « an atmosphere of unbounded cheerfulness that served to deflect attention away from the increasingly fraught political situation in Europe » (pages 151-152) . Once the fighting escalated, the Festival became even more propagandistic : the Operas were performed in German and between 10,000 and 20,000 German soldiers were invited, as the Festival was designated as a « Kriegsfestspiel » (War Festival) .

The festivities for the 1941 Mozart year, the 150th anniversary of Mozart's death, are of particular interest to Levi. He focuses on the 2 key-note speeches made at the Viennese Festival by high-ranking Nazi attendees : the « Welcome Address at the Mozart Week of the German " Reich " in Vienna at the Inaugural Concert » , given by « Reichsleiter » Baldur von Schirach, on 28 November 1941, and « Address for the 150th Anniversary of the Death of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart at the Vienna State Opera » by Reich Minister Josef Goebbels, on 4 December 1941. These 2 speeches link Mozart's music with the current political situation and received much attention from the press, positive in Germany and negative in the United States - « 1st hand evidence of the exploitation of Mozart for propaganda purposes at a crucial moment during the War » . (3)

Among the institutions and figures included in Levi's discussion of the Jewish and exiled communities' engagement with Mozart are the Berlin « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Culture League) , which was banned from performing Mozart in 1935 ; the English Glyndebourne Festival, founded in 1934 by exiled German conductor Fritz Busch and producer Carl Ebert, among others ; and the scholars Otto Erich Deutsch and Paul Nettl. The central figure in this discussion, however, is Alfred Einstein. Levi tells of the struggles Einstein faced while finishing the 3rd, expanded edition of the Köchel Catalog in the 1930's after moving to America. As he was banned from accessing German archives, he completed the project, which nearly doubled the size of the older edition, with materials and support from archives in Sweden, Italy, Russia, England, and the United States. Despite his Jewish ethnicity, the German firm Breitkopf & Härtel published his edition in 1937. German reviewers, who praised the edition, avoided the issue of Einstein's Jewishness by omitting mention of his name. Levi paints Einstein as the voice of reason, a scholar who, though he acknowledged Mozart's occasional patriotism, also emphasized his international travels and foreign-language Operas, while working to refute the claims in contemporary German scholarship about the composer's nationalism.

Levi also discusses popular books and films as examples of appropriation, both by the Nazis and by their opponents. This is particularly valuable, as the popular reception of Mozart and other great composers is often over-looked. Among his examples, Levi includes pacifist Annette Kolb's pseudo-biographical novel « Mozart » (1937) ; the biographical film about Mozart in Prague, « Eine kleine Nachtmusik » (1939) ; and « Wen die Götter lieben » (Whom the Gods Love) , a feature film commissioned by Goebbels (1942) . Surprisingly, the latter would circulate in the United States after the War, dubbed in English and with no mention of its Nazi origins. Perhaps, the most interesting case discussed by Levi is Hans Watzlik's 1935 novel « Die Krönungsoper » , a fictional retelling of Mozart's last visit to Prague. The book was

promoted heavily in the late-1930's, as it strongly espoused the idea that the Czech lands were fundamentally German, creating a sort of artistic justification for the German invasion of Prague in 1939 (pages 196-197) .

One of the principal contributions that Levi's discussion makes to Mozart scholarship is regarding what he calls Germany's musical Imperialism. Whereas scholarship of music and totalitarianism usually focuses on a single country, Levi explores the relationship that other countries had with Mozart's music and how their ties to Germany influenced that relationship, including a total of 10 European countries in his concise account : the Republic of Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Croatia, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Spain, and Italy. For example, even in a non-belligerent country such as Spain, it can be argued that musicology was influenced by the interpretations of Mozart furthered by Nazi propaganda, with the crucial difference that there Catholicism remained central to Mozart's music, as distinct from Germany, where Nazi musicology sought to remove the traces of religion from his works. According to Levi, however, Spain also recognized « Mozart, the German » , insofar as its musicologists were « prepared to celebrate the nationalist (German) trends undoubtedly shaped by the intensification of political alliances between Nazi Germany and Spain » . (page 230)

In France, there was some resistance to the Germans' use of Mozart and other music as Nazi propaganda, as exemplified by French writer Jean Bruller in his 1942 novel « Le silence de la mer » . In an attempt to warn his countrymen « not to succumb too easily to the efforts of the occupying forces to win them over » , Bruller's protagonist realizes « that the true intention of the German army is to exploit and ruin the country, rather than build bridges » (page 222) . The musical community in Paris seemed less wary. Levi describes the Parisian festivities in the 1941 Mozart year as a clear demonstration of camaraderie between France and Germany - surprising, even if organized for most part by Germans.

As Levi explains it :

« A generously funded propaganda machine swung into action, using Mozart both as a means of healing wounds and creating a sense of rapprochement through stressing shared values and common goals. » (page 191)

Although this international overview helps to contextualize the case of Germany, it represents something of an oversimplification, as the author acknowledges, at least with respect to the situation in France. To be sure, scholars of any of the individual countries may find the relevant section lacking in nuance. For example, when discussing Italy, Levi rightly focuses on the anti-Fascist critic Massimo Mila, who resisted Germany's attempts at appropriating Mozart. He reports that Mila based his opposition on the conviction that propaganda « annihilated (music's) aesthetic significance » . (page 235) While this is correct, it would have been just as important to acknowledge Mila's indebtedness to Crocean idealism, prevalent at the time, which emphasized art's spiritual and autonomous nature.

With this section, even in its brevity, Levi does an excellent job of telling a 2 sided story : how Mozart was called upon « to serve both the interest of the ruling German authorities and that of the oppressed population » . (page 190) On the one hand, he cites plenty of evidence to show how Mozart was used for propaganda purposes in Germany and in occupied lands. Patriotic appropriation was quite blatant in the 1941 concert in Hamburg in which

soprano Erika Rokyta substituted the words of the German national anthem (« Deutschland, Deutschland über alles ! ») for the last line of « Alleluja » in Mozart's sacred Motet « Exsultate, jubilate » (KV 165) . Performances of Mozart in occupied lands, especially in the former Czechoslovak Republic, promoted German cultural hegemony, with the hope that « with the passage of time, (the Czech people) could be “ Germanised ” » . (page 190) Some countries even used their own performances of Mozart to show their allegiance to Germany. Croatia's « enthusiasm for honouring the composer » , Levi writes, « was emblematic of the desire among several Eastern European countries to re-inforce their cultural collaborative ties with Germany » . (page 228)

On the other hand, Levi emphasizes that occupied lands also used Mozart's music to counter German Imperialism. Even in the face of War and German propaganda, the people of Bohemia, like those of Moravia and Hungary, wanted to solidify their own relationship with Mozart by placing his achievement within their own national narrative. Especially in the case of Hungary, « although the musical establishment remained resolutely anti-German in outlook, Mozart could not be tarred with the same Teutonic brush as Wagner or Richard Strauß » . (page 229) As the War continued, however, there were fewer and fewer attempts by occupied lands to reject Nazi propaganda and appropriate Mozart to their own national identity. In Hungary, for example, there began an effort to reconcile local and German nationalistic claims. Speeches made by Hungarian politicians at the 1941 festivities were made to appeal to both their German and their Hungarian audiences.

Levi is quick to point-out, as some of these examples show, that attitudes towards Mozart and Germany were not static throughout the 12 years that the Nazis remained in power. This acknowledgement is one of the strengths of Levi's book. England, for example, initially a haven for German exiles, was no longer welcoming them in the 1940's. As bombings escalated, Germans, Jewish and otherwise, were interned in English camps because they were now classified as enemy aliens. Against this military strife, Levi explains the significance of Austrian musicologist Hans Ferdinand Redlich's performance of Mozart's unfinished Opera « L'oca del Cairo » , in 1940 :

« Given that many of the musicians' colleagues had already been interned, the final chorus of the Opera, acclaiming the fall of tyranny and affirming the capacity of true love to rise above adversity, must have sounded unbearably poignant. » (page 119)

The changes in attitude were most evident in occupied lands. Despite local nationalist identification in the 1930's, using Mozart to « Germanize » the population was effective, at least in the concert-halls. While the 150th anniversary of « Don Giovanni » had been celebrated in Prague with a performance in Czech, in 1937, by 1941, the performance was in German and the guests were high-ranking Nazi officials, sitting in « Swastika-bedecked boxes » . (page 203)

In addition, Levi draws attention to continuities between the pre- and post-War periods, the implications of which are not always flattering. While discussing Mozart's connection to freemasonry, Levi addresses the work of Mathilde Ludendorff in the 1930's, which revived the rumour that Mozart was poisoned by the masons (thought to be an agent of conspiracy for the Jews) . This theory did not die with the Nazis but continued to be researched in the post-War period, until it was finally refuted in William Stafford's « The Mozart Myths » , in 1991. (6)

Levi offers a provocative comment on the longevity of this myth :

« The sheer determination with which (these scholars) pursued their ideas appears unsettling, and raises the disturbing question of the extent to which a neo-Nazi strain still impinges upon post-War German Mozart scholarship. » (page 239)

This speculation may seem far-fetched, but it echoes other scholars' claims that there is an « occasional brown residue » in post-War German musicology. (7) Levi points also to the work of Gert Kerschbaumer and Oliver Rathkolb, who have shown that the Austrians' post-War appropriation of Mozart has disturbing parallels in terms of ideas and rhetoric with that of the Nazis. (page 244) Problematic as it is, connecting the Nazi period with the post-War period is one of the overall goals of Levi's scholarship, as he states outright in his 1st book :

« One of the central preoccupations is to establish a sense of continuity in 20th Century German music. » (8)

This continuity is important to expose, both for the historical story that it tells and for the implications it has for current views of German music and scholarship.

The prominent trend in Mozart scholarship of the post-War period was the attempt to restore Mozart as a universal cosmopolitan composer. Unlike other Germanic composers such as Richard Wagner, whose ideological baggage was far weightier, Mozart's new image was quickly accepted. Paradoxically, because of this swift rehabilitation the « brown residue » was allowed to remain :

« Many of the performers and musicologists most closely associated with Mozart, including those who had willingly served in politically compromised events such as the Nazified Salzburg Festivals emerged unscathed to reclaim their prominent positions in Austro-German musical life after 1945. » (pages 236-237)

For example, Levi points to the way in which the aforementioned retranslations of Da Ponte's librettos by Georg Schünemann were promoted again in the 1950's, with reprints by Peters in Leipzig and, again, in the 1970's and 1980's by the New-York-based publisher Dover, the only change being the deletion of the preface indicating the Nazi patronage.

Mozart and the Nazis represents a valuable addition to the scholarly literature on music under National-Socialism, not only because of its focus on a single composer but also because of the significant light it sheds on the contradictions and tensions of Nazi cultural policies. The book's value can be said to reside above all in the way that it explores the consequences of Nazi appropriation in the later 20th Century. It should appeal to a broad constituency of scholars and may well serve as a model for reception studies of other composers during the Nazi period.

Notes

(1) Joseph Wulf. Musik im Dritten Reich : eine Dokumentation, Mohn, Gütersloh (1963) ; Fred K. Prieberg. Musik im

NSStaat, Fischer Taschenbuch, Frankfurt-am-Main (1982) .

(2) Erik Levi. Music in the 3rd « Reich » , Saint-Martin's Press, New York (1994) ; Michæl H. Kater. The Twisted Muse : Musicians and Their Music in the 3rd « Reich » , Oxford University Press, New York (1997) ; Pamela Potter. The Most German of the Arts : Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's « Reich » , Yale University Press, New Haven (1998) ; and Kater and Albrecht Riethmüller (editors) , Music and Nazism : Art Under Tyranny, 1933-1945, Laaber (2003) .

(3) Other, more focused studies include work on German exiles and the Jewish musical community, as well as Beethoven's and Wagner's reception in 20th Century Germany. See Reinhold Brinkmann and Christoph Wolff (editors) . Driven into Paradise : the Musical Migration from Nazi Germany to the United States, University of California Press, Berkeley (1999) ; Lily Hirsch. A Jewish Orchestra in Nazi Germany : Musical Politics and the Berlin Jewish Culture League, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor (2010) ; and David B. Dennis. Beethoven in German Politics, 1870-1989, Oxford University Press (1997) .

(4) Leon Botstein. « After 50 Years : Thoughts on Music and the End of World War II » , The Musical Quarterly 79/2 (1995) ; pages 225-230 - more precisely page 228.

(5) Chapter 3's discussion of the freemasonry problems leads Erik Levi to a fascinating discussion of the Nazi-era stagings of « Die Zauberflöte » .

(6) William Stafford. The Mozart Myths : a Critical Re-assessment, Stanford University Press, California (1991) .

(7) Max Nyffeler. Kulturchronik 19/4 (2001) , page 28, quoted in Michæl H. Kater, « Introduction » in Music and Nazism : Art under Tyranny, 1933-1945, edited by Kater and Riethmüller ; page 11. The original German used by Nyffeler was « gelegentlichen braunen Resten » .

(8) Erik Levi. Music in the 3rd « Reich » ; xiii.

The 1941 Salzburg Festival (2-24 August)

Although hostilities continued to mount and the German army invaded the Soviet Union, the Festival returned to its regular programme. The 150th anniversary of Mozart's death was honoured with productions of 3 of his Operas. Admittedly, little remained of the Festival's former glory and international stature : the audiences consisted mainly of soldiers, whether on leave or recovering from wounds, and workers from German and Italian munitions factories. The Festival functioned as a sort of psychological weapon of domestic warfare and manipulation : as catastrophe loomed ever larger on the horizon, the people's morale had to be shored-up and their worries dispelled. One important administrative appointment was made on 13 September as Clemens Krauß was named the Festival's artistic director.

2 New Mozart productions at the « Festspielhaus »

« Die Zauberflöte »

Conductor : Karl Böhm.

Stage-Director : Heinz Arnold.

Stage-Design : Ludwig Sievert.

...

« Le nozze di Figaro »

Conductor : Karl Böhm.

Stage-Director : Rudolf Zindler.

Stage-Design : Alfred Roller.

Revivals

« Much Ado About Nothing » , « Don Giovanni » , « Der Rosenkavalier » .

Also : 3 ballet performances ; 5 orchestral concerts ; 9 serenades ; 1 concert of sacred music.

Le « Requiem » de Mozart

À l'époque hitlérienne (1941) , l'enregistrement sur disque par Bruno Kittel, à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, du « Requiem » de Mozart, pour célébrer le 150e anniversaire de la mort du compositeur, est un exemple extrême de l'accaparement étatique de l'œuvre, tel que l'avait critiqué Kraus. Ici, tous les éléments révélant trop clairement les origines juives de la chrétienté ont été retirés du texte, par le régime. On trouve donc « Te decet hymnus, Deus in cœlis » au lieu de « Deus in Sion » (c'est-à-dire « Dieu dans les cieux » au lieu de « Dieu de Sion ») ; et « hic in terra » (« ici sur terre ») au lieu de « in Jerusalem » (« à Jérusalem ») ; « Quam olim Abrahæ promisisti » (« Que tu as promise jadis à Abraham ») devient « Quam olim homini promisisti » (« Que tu as promise jadis à l'homme ») .

...

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart : « Requiem » in D minor (KV 626) .

Date of Recording : 1941.

Length : 52 minutes, 16 seconds.

Conductor : Bruno Kittel.

Soloists : Tilla Briem, Soprano ; Gertrud Freimuth, alto ; Walther Ludwig, tenor ; Fred Drissen, bass.

The Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and the Bruno Kittel Choir.

This 1941 recording of the Mozart « Requiem » is the most interesting, in part because of the work's stature and length, but also owing to the perverse policies that existed in Nazi Germany at the time. The conductor, Bruno Kittel, was a Hitler favourite, and he readily acceded to bowdlerizations that excised Sion and Jerusalem from the sung text. One might argue, perhaps, that the performance should have been allowed to rot, but its resurrection provides a symbol (foul as it may be) of the noxious impact of Nazism in general and the potentially insidious image resulting from any political manipulation of the arts.

It was « Polydor » (originally, the German division of « The Gramophone Company » named « Deutsche Grammophon ») that had made a recording of Mozart's « Requiem » Mass (KV 626) , in 1941, with singers Tilla Briem, soprano ; Gertrude Freimuth, contralto ; Walter Ludwig, tenor ; and Fred Drissen, bass. Used was an alternate Nazi-text (according to « The Gramophone Shop Encyclopædia of Recorded Music ») .

« The New York Times » later wrote :

« All references to the Jewish roots of Christianity are purged. “ Quam olim Abrahæ promisisti ” (As was promised to Abraham) becomes “ Quam olim homini promisisti ” (As was promised to man) . “ Deus in Sion ” (God in Zion) becomes “ Deus in cælis ” (God in Heaven) . »

Josef Gœbbels banned the playing of Mozart's « Requiem » over the radio during the War, because it was « world-renouncing and depressing » .

...

Reviewing a new vocal score of Mozart's « Requiem » , in October 1940, Herbert Gerigk urged that future editions of the work should be divested of their original liturgical connections, with the Latin-text replaced by a German translation. Coincidentally, a few months later, Hermann Stephani, Professor of Music at the University of Marburg, had gone some way towards meeting Gerigk's suggestions by proposing to « cleanse » Mozart's « Requiem » of its Hebraic words. In a short article, whose publication in both « Zeitschrift für Musik » and « Die Musik » gave this idea a greater weight of authority, Stephani suggested that :

« Mozart's “ Requiem ”, the deepest and most moving of all those Masses dedicated to the memory of the beloved dead should not be suppressed because of a handful of passages in the text that are inappropriate to our age. The following revision is therefore suggested :

“ Te decet hymnus Deus in cœlis ” (instead of “ in Sion ”) , “ et tibi reddetur votum hic in terra ” (instead of “ in Jerusalem ”) , “ quam tu credentibus ” (instead of “ quam olim Abrahæ ”) , “ promisisti in sempiternum ” (instead of “ et semini eius ”) , “ Dominus Deus omnipotens ” (instead of “ Sabaoth ”) . »

It should be emphasised that Stephani's textual amendments were, by no means, universally adopted in all performances of the « Requiem » that took place from 1941 onwards. Wilhelm Furtwängler certainly had no truck with them, judging by the evidence of the program-book for his performance of the work which presents the words as set by Mozart at the final concerts of the 1941 « Mozartwoche des deutschen Reiches » , in Vienna. But, in Berlin, they were enthusiastically espoused by the choral conductor Bruno Kittel, who regularly directed such repertory with Furtwängler's Berlin Philharmonic. In the autumn of 1941, Kittel was contracted to make a recording of Mozart's « Requiem » for « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft » with the Bruno Kittel Choir and the Berlin Philharmonic. The recording confirms that the text of the « Requiem » follows, word for word, the suggestions Ist outlined by Stephani.

The adaptation of Mozart's « Requiem » was almost certainly the last substantial work by the composer to have been subjected to ideological adaptation during the 3rd « Reich » . During the final years of the War, the emphasis shifted towards guarding Germany's cultural heritage as the nation engaged in a bitter struggle for its very survival. Herbert Gerigk, editor of the journal « Musik im Kriege » and co-author with Theo Stengel of the « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » , became the self-appointed custodian of this legacy. He invested a considerable amount of time and effort in master-minding the confiscation and enforced return to Germany of valuable manuscripts. These included many by Mozart that were formerly in the hands of Jews or had resided in libraries in the occupied territories. He also maintained a watchful eye over any further signs of unwarranted Jewish contamination of German music. In the spring of 1944, Gerigk alighted on a long-running musicological dispute concerning the authorship of Mozart's « Wiegenlied » « Schlafe mein Prinzchen, schlaf ein » . At the end of the 19th Century, Max Friedländer had published an article which cited evidence to suggest that Bernhard Flies, a Berlin-based doctor and music dilettante, rather than Mozart was the composer of the song. Friedländer's verdict was, in fact, upheld in 1937 by the Mozart scholar Alfred Einstein in the 3rd Edition of the complete Köchel catalogue (KV) . Yet, after consulting the 1873 « Musikalisches Konversations Lexikon » , Gerigk discovered that Flies was of Jewish descent. Suspecting a conspiracy on the part of the Jews to try and pass-off a popular work by Mozart as one of their own, Gerigk provided his own explanation as to how its authorship could have been wrested from Mozart :

« We must assume that a copy of the song fell into Jewish hands and that, an amateur musician eager for admiration (Flies) , simply had a few copies of the song printed in his name. Until now, repeated complaints from leading Aryans about Friedländer's view were strikingly ineffective because Jewish “ scholars ” tried with suspicious and unfounded zeal to ridicule the arguments submitted in Mozart's defence. For example, the Jew Alfred Einstein, the editor of the famous Köchel index of Mozart's music, definitively classified the lullaby as a misappropriation in 1937. Once again, the time has come to reverse the efforts of Judea and to give Mozart due credit. As this song has rightfully become one of the musician's most popular melodies, the people clearly have demonstrated their support for Mozart. »

Herbert Gerigk

The German musicologist Herbert Gerigk was born on 2 March 1905 in Mannheim and died on 20 June 1996 in Dortmund. He was notable for his co-authoring of the Nazi « Lexicon of Jews in Music » .

After graduation in 1928, Herbert Gerigk published in 1932 a thesis on Giuseppe Verdi. It was the 1st important musicological overall presentation of Verdi in Germany and appeared in the series « The Great Masters of Music » .

Gerigk joined the Nazi Party in 1932 and joined the SA (« Sturmabteilung ») , in 1933. From 1935, he worked in the National-Socialist German « Reich » as « head the music-section for the monitoring of the intellectual and ideological training and education of the Nazi Party In 1935, he joined the SS (« Schutzstaffel ») .

Gerigk took-over the planning of the music policy of Alfred Rosenberg and was responsible for its implementation in the Rosenberg's office. This policy was to suppress Jewish representation in musical life by removing Jews from their positions and stopping the spread of new music.

Gerigk's most famous work was the antisemitic concoction « Lexicon of Jews in Music » , which he edited in collaboration with Theophil Stengel , Speaker of the « Reich » Music Chamber. The aim of the work was to prevent « accidental » performances of works by Jewish and part-Jewish composers, to identify all Jewish music practitioners, but particularly to devalue composers fixed in the German musical tradition such as Felix Mendelssohn, Giacomo Meyerbeer and Gustav Mahler, through lies and deliberate falsification.

During the Second World War, Gerigk took a leading role in the persecution of Jews. He headed the Office of Music in « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (ERR) , and was a driving force in all activities of the « Music Special Staff » in occupied countries. The activity included the plunder of cultural property in the occupied countries and its transport to Germany. In occupied France alone, Gerigk's investigators carried-out robberies over 2 years from 34,500 Jewish houses or apartments, including those of Emmerich Kálmán, Darius Milhaud, Fernand Halphen, Arno Poldes, Gregor Piatigorski and Wanda Landowska.

Of the machinery of destruction of the Holocaust, Gerigk wrote in 1942 :

« The question must be raised as to whether it is appropriate, given the liquidation of European Jewry, to permit Jewish half-breeds as cultural workers in any form. »

In 1943, he became chief-editor of the music magazine promoted by Rosenberg, « Music in War » ; in 1944, he was promoted to « SS-Hauptsturmführer » .

After the Second World War, Gerigk was never brought to justice for his complicity in the Holocaust. Although his Nazi past prevented an academic career, he worked as a music-critic was at the Dortmund « Ruhr-Nachrichten » . In 1954, he wrote a Dictionary of Music, which was issued by the same firm (« Bernhard Hahnefeld Verlag ») that had published him during the Nazi era.

...

One of the most notorious publications in the world of Nazi musicology, Herbert Gerigk's « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » (Lexicon of Jews in Music) was so popular that, by 1943, thousands of copies were circulating throughout the German « Reich ». The book, ostensibly offering a complete list of Jewish and part-Jewish musicians, also took the opportunity to defame famous musical Jews, such as Felix Mendelssohn, Giacomo Meyerbeer and Gustav Mahler. Gerigk was one of the most influential musicologists of his day, graced with the title : « Leiter der Hauptstelle Musik beim Beauftragten des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP » (Leader of the Music Branch by order of the « Führer » for the Supervision of the Entire Intellectual and Ideological Enlightenment of the Nazi Party) . His varied career under Hitler illustrates some of the many ways in which music was implicated in Nazi ideology. His comfortable life after the War is also typical of the treatment of musicologists during post-War denazification actions.

Gerigk was born on 2 March 1905 in the German town of Mannheim. Although opposed to jazz and atonal music, he did not make explicitly racist accusations, frequently writing about Jewish composers favourably and without bias. However, the early 1930's saw a steady change in his political opinions. The musicologist became increasingly concerned about the « oriental » trends in German music, and subscribed to the theory that Jews, as a race, were responsible for the national disillusionment of Germany following the defeat of World War I. Suddenly, anti-Semitism entered his writings, serving as the explanation for his previous lack of professional success. Hoping to eliminate the competition he felt was depriving « Aryans » like himself of promotion, he wrote and spoke publicly about the suffering that Jews were inflicting upon Germans in the musical world.

Gerigk established a name for himself as an important Nazi musicologist. Indeed, even within the framework of Nazi ideology Gerigk was known as being particularly conservative and critical. He was one of the few Nazis to condemn Werner Egk's otherwise popular Opera, « Die Zauberflöte » (The Magic Violin) , and, in 1936, it was his harsh review of Carl Orff's « Carmina Burana » at its premiere that was partially responsible for the delay before the work achieved success. Gerigk was a meticulous and enthusiastic worker, and his « Reichsmusikkammer » (Nazi Chamber of Music) was one of the most active divisions of Alfred Rosenberg's « Reichskulturkammer » (Nazi Chamber of Culture) . His workers attended every major concert in Berlin, read important music publications, and submitted thorough reviews to Gerigk. Gerigk's passion for collecting information about people led him to contact students at universities and music academies, in order to gather information on the politics of the professors. Over the years, his power and reputation grew steadily. He supervised the publication of serious musicology studies independent of the Rosenberg office, which itself controlled several publishing ventures. When Rosenberg took-over the long-time anti-Semitic journal, « Die Musik » , Gerigk finally had a regular outlet for his voice. In 1937, he was made editor of the magazine, to which he had already contributed many anti-Semitic articles.

By the late 1930's, the Party sensed the need for a comprehensive race-based guide to German music. Having previously experienced countless scandals due to inaccurate information or incomplete lexicons (« Aryan » artists had been accused of being Jewish, just as openly Jewish musicians had been allowed to continue working) , Party officials

wanted a single reference work to which to turn. An extensive undertaking, Gerigk's « Lexikon » was published in the NSDAP series on « Research on the Jewish Question ». Although rife with inaccuracies and misrepresentations, it was substantially more detailed than any previously written work of this nature. The book opened with the proud assertion that :

« The purification of our culture and, thus also, our musical culture of all Jewish elements has been successful. Clear legal restrictions have ensured that in Germany the Jew is not publicly active in the cultural sphere, not as musician or composer, not as writer or publisher or businessman. »

Gerigk nonetheless went on to request further assistance from readers in tracking-down relevant names ; indeed, the « Lexikon » proved to be an ongoing work. In a later edition, Gerigk decided to extend the book's coverage from just « full » and « half-Jews » to black-listing all those who had « Jewish blood ». Unsurprisingly, his « Lexikon » sparked numerous battles over racial identity. Family members of deceased musicians, and occasionally still-living men, regularly filed complaints against the inclusion of their names in Gerigk's book.

In 1943, Gerigk reflected on the positive impact his « Lexikon » had wrought on the German cultural landscape. Remembering the pre-Nazi era, he warned his readership not to forget the times when ...

« The German was almost at the point of becoming homeless in his own Fatherland. Key-positions were occupied mostly by Jews. Besides that, free-masons and exponents of other political entities outside the State were also influential in music. It is very instructive to reflect upon the conditions of that time. »

He was convinced that his « Lexikon » was a key-part of solving this problem.

Gerigk's career received another boost when he was appointed to another « cultural position », this time as part of the « Reich » 's military program of expansion and conquest. In his new position, Gerigk was responsible for stealing or otherwise « re-claiming » objects of musical interest from lands annexed or invaded by Germany. He was primarily busy in occupied Paris, where he collected valuable musical booty, including autographs by Christoph Willibald Gluck and Richard Wagner. He also participated in journeys to Eastern Europe, repossessing objects belonging to Jewish musicians and collectors. Among his many acquisitions were folk-music archives from Minsk, Warsaw and Kraków.

Despite his well-documented support of the Nazi regime, and the role he played in ruining the careers of countless musicians, Gerigk managed to thrive in the post-War years as well. Admittedly, his Nazi past, well-documented by his numerous enemies, prohibited him from acquiring a full-time post as an academic at a German university. However, Gerigk managed to earn a comfortable living as a music-critic in Dortmund. He remained an active author for decades after the War, publishing a musical encyclopædia, as well as numerous other articles and books, well into the 1970's. Herbert Gerigk died on 20 June 1996 in Dortmund, at the age of 90.

...

Herbert Gerigk (geboren 2. März 1905 in Mannheim ; gestorben 20. Juni 1996 in Dortmund) war ein deutscher Musikwissenschaftler, der als einer der einflussreichsten Antisemiten in der Musikwissenschaft des 20. Jahrhunderts gilt. Dafür spricht sein gemeinsam mit Theophil Stengel herausgegebenes Lexikon der Juden in der Musik und seine Tätigkeit als hoher Offizier im Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg bei Raub und Plünderung von Musikalien vor allem aus dem Besitz von verfolgten Juden in den von Deutschland besetzten Ländern im Zweiten Weltkrieg.

Nach vorausgegangener Promotion 1928 habilitierte sich Herbert Gerigk 1932 mit einer Arbeit über Giuseppe Verdi. Es war die erste bedeutende musikwissenschaftliche Gesamtdarstellung Verdis in Deutschland und erschien in der Reihe « Die großen Meister der Musik » .

Gerigk trat 1932 in die NSDAP und 1933 in die SA ein. Anschließend war er Kreiskulturwart in Danzig. Seit 1935 arbeitete er im nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Reich als « Leiter der Hauptstelle Musik beim Beauftragten des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP » . 1935 trat er der SS bei.

Gerigk übernahm die Planung der Musikpolitik Alfred Rosenbergs und war auch für deren Durchführung im Amt Rosenberg zuständig. Diese hatte als Ziel, die jüdischen Vertreter des Musiklebens aus ihren Stellungen zu entfernen und die Ausbreitung der Neuen Musik zu unterdrücken. Seit 1937 war er Herausgeber der Zeitschrift Die Musik.

Gerigks bekanntestes Werk war das antisemitische Machwerk Lexikon der Juden in der Musik, das er in Zusammenarbeit mit Theophil Stengel, Referent der Reichsmusikkammer, herausgab. Das Nachschlagewerk sollte Veranstalter von der « versehentlichen » Aufführung von Werken « jüdischer » und « halb-jüdischer » Komponisten abhalten, alle jüdischen Musikausübenden erfassen, hauptsächlich aber fest in der deutschen Musiktradition stehende Komponisten wie etwa Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, Giacomo Meyerbeer und Gustav Mahler durch Lügen und bewusst falsche Quellenauslegung diffamieren und abwerten.

Auch während des Zweiten Weltkrieges nahm Gerigk eine führende Rolle in der Verfolgung der Juden ein. Er leitete das Amt Musik im Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) und wurde zur treibenden Kraft bei allen Aktivitäten des Sonderstabes Musik in den besetzten Ländern. Die Tätigkeit war die Plünderung von Kulturgut in den besetzten Ländern und der Transport nach Deutschland. Allein im besetzten Frankreich raubten Gerigks Fahnder in zwei Jahren 34.500 jüdische Häuser oder Wohnungen aus, darunter die von Emmerich Kálmán, Darius Milhaud, Fernand Halphen, Arno Poldes, Gregor Piatigorski, Wanda Landowska. Angesichts der Vernichtungsmaschinerie des Holocaust schrieb er 1942 :

« Die Frage muß aufgeworfen werden, ob es im Zeichen der Liquidierung des Judentums in Europa angebracht ist, jüdische Mischlinge als Kulturschaffende in irgendeiner Form zuzulassen. »

1943 wurde er Hauptschriftleiter der von Rosenberg geleiteten Zeitschrift Musik im Kriege, 1944 wurde er zum SS-Hauptsturmführer im Sicherheitsdienst befördert.

Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg mußte sich Gerigk nie für seine Mittäterschaft beim Holocaust vor Gericht verantworten.

Zwar stand seine nationalsozialistische Vergangenheit einer akademischen Laufbahn entgegen ; er war jedoch bei den Dortmunder Ruhr-Nachrichten als Musikkritiker tätig. 1953 versuchte er, mithilfe der CDU und FDP Kulturdezernent in Bochum zu werden, scheiterte aber. 1954 veröffentlichte er das Fachwörterbuch der Musik im Verlag von Bernhard Hahnefeld, der schon das « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » herausgegeben hatte.

Gerigk wurde auf dem Dortmunder Ostfriedhof beigesetzt.

Le Nazisme et l'histoire de la musique : Wagner, Bruckner, Schumann

Les totalitarismes du XXe siècle n'ont pas eu comme unique prétention de dominer le présent, mais également de déterminer la relation à l'histoire ; il n'y a donc rien d'étonnant à ce que les Nazis aient cherché à marquer de leur empreinte la manière dont devait être abordé le patrimoine musical. Dès 1920, des critiques et musicologues proches des milieux politiques conservateurs multiplient les interprétations « polarisantes » de la tradition. Dans une revue comme la « Zeitschrift für Musik » (créée en 1834 par un certain Robert Schumann) , le critique Alfred Heuß n'aura de cesse d'opposer une tradition germanique « pure » à une « fausse » tradition, sous influence « étrangère » , considérée comme particulièrement néfaste lorsqu'elle est le fait de musiciens d'origine juive. Ce mouvement culminera avec la publication, en 1932, du livre raciste « Musik und Rasse » (Musique et race) de Richard Eichenauer : toute trace de critique ou de musicologie y disparaît sous un fatras de considérations dignes du pire Wagner lorsque ce dernier se faisait théoricien.

Avec la nomination, en janvier 1933, de Adolf Hitler à la Chancellerie, il n'est plus question que de propagande. La coercition sur la création s'appuie sur un panthéon de figures et d'œuvres tutélaires, au 1er rang desquelles se trouvent Richard Wagner et Anton Bruckner. On connaît les liens quasi familiaux qui liaient Bayreuth au sommet du pouvoir nazi ; c'est par exemple sur les deniers propres de la Chancellerie que le Festival retrouve alors une stabilité financière. La radio nationale allemande utilise à partir de 1934 la figure du compositeur pour mettre en avant une personnalité exemplaire par ses qualités « germaniques » , sa pensée politique et idéologique, dans un curieux mélange de retransmissions de grande tenue (en direct de Bayreuth) et de propagande. Bruckner sera, quant à lui un compositeur choyé par les Orchestres allemands. Le dimanche 6 juin 1937, Adolf Hitler inaugure son buste au « Walhalla » de Regensburg aux sons du mouvement lent de sa 8e Symphonie.

À cette Ire reconnaissance devait faire suite la transformation de Saint-Florian, la ville où Bruckner avait été organiste, en un second Bayreuth, et Linz, son lieu de résidence, en un centre culturel de la germanité. Il n'est pas jusqu'à Schumann, dont les derniers moments auraient pu ternir le souvenir auprès des hérauts de la « grande race allemande » , qui n'ait été instrumentalisé par les Nazis. Dans sa biographie de 1941, Wolfgang Boetticher défend la thèse d'un Schumann antisémite et prend pour cela à témoin certaines dissensions avec Mendelssohn et une franche hostilité envers Meyerbeer. Mais au-delà de leur rayonnement personnel, ce sont certaines œuvres de ces 3 compositeurs qui ont vu l'histoire de leur réception particulièrement influencée par le contexte particulier de cette époque. Ainsi les « Maîtres-chanteurs » de Nuremberg de Richard Wagner, devenu parangon de l'œuvre nationaliste et, à ce titre, représenté à haute dose sur les scènes allemandes entre 1933 et 1944. Il ne pouvait en être autrement s'agissant d'un Opéra qui se voulait une représentation du génie du « Volk » allemand, sans cesse capable de se renouveler face

aux mesquineries du conservatisme.

Le prélude de l'Opéra plante le décor de cet antagonisme par un contraste thématique audible dans l'exposition de ce qui s'apparente, selon le musicologue Carl Dahlhaus, à une « forme lisztienne » (c'est-à-dire l'association en un mouvement unitaire de la forme sonate Classique et du déroulement d'une Symphonie) .

...

Throughout history toppling of public statues has almost always been indicative of a coming change in public life. Statues are set-up to commemorate certain personages, to endorse certain beliefs, and when there is no longer any place or tolerance for either, these have to be summarily removed. Usually, with a great ceremonial ruckus - and, in modern times, with the omnipresent press in attendance. The wreckers pose and strut before the thing they have destroyed with an obvious sense of achievement, egged on by a cheering, fickle crowd - this same crowd that was around to applaud when the statue went-up. Other by-standers, unwilling to join in and helpless to prevent, watch and wonder about the train of events that will soon follow the symbolic gesture.

Before a watching crowd, in Leipzig, the statue of music composer Felix Mendelssohn was pulled-off its pedestal and destroyed. Perhaps, one of the finest and best-loved to emerge from the long musical tradition of Germany - which was why he was accorded the honour of a statue in front of the « Gewandhaus », Leipzig's famous concert-hall.

However, his greatness paled in comparison to the new reality of being a Jew along with it. It was 14 November 1936 and « Herr » Hitler had been in power long enough to make his position on Jews blindingly clear. There was no place for them outside concert halls or, for that matter, inside concert halls.

The toppling of the Mendelssohn statue, which received only a small mention in « The New York Times », the following day, was a major turning point in the persecution of Jewish Musicians, Composers, Conductors, Singers, Actors, and other theatre personalities, not to mention Jewish professionals from every other walk of life, that had commenced since the moment the Nazis took center-stage, 3 years earlier. So far, they had been obliged to submit to the Racial Laws of 1933 and register their race and religion in the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) , which automatically meant a cessation in possible employment, regardless of talent, for millions of young, upcoming musicians. The well-known, established ones had found themselves receiving cryptic notices and warnings « advising against » performing in public, having performances canceled altogether, or being targeted for uncouth threats from the local Nazi thugs who turned-up to disrupt the performances that did go on. They had watched, appalled, while Jewish shops and businesses were boycotted, defaced, and forced to close down. They had witnessed the outrageous book-burning of 10 May 1933 when, with wild crowd approval, books by writers like Thomas Mann, Karl Marx, Heinrich Heine, Sigmund Freud, Ernest Hemingway, Helen Keller, and others had been tossed into bonfires on the streets of Germany.

Many German intellectuals, Jewish and non-Jewish (Heinrich Mann, Thomas Mann, Bertolt Brecht, Marlene Dietrich, Albert Einstein, Bruno Bettelheim, Walter Gropius, Rudolf Serkin, Erich Leinsdorf, Lotte Lehmann, Berthold Goldschmidt, Otto Klemperer, Franz Werfel, and Bruno Walter, amongst them) grasped which way the wind was blowing and left the

country while they still could. Others, since, often times, it is difficult for civilized beings to comprehend that the rest of the world isn't always of the same decent mold and can be eminently capable of unimaginable horrors, chose to remain and regard the growing excesses as « isolated incidences » that would soon pass - it was a new regime, still setting about its business after all the turmoil of earlier years, and in unsettled times, as one very modern American put it, things happen.

After 14 November, however, things happened on a far more urgent scale. The government issued a decree banning completely all Jewish performers and those tainted with even a drop of Jewish blood from any further association or participation in the cultural life of Nazi Germany. « Jewish » music, along with « Negro » music, and anything else that wasn't composed by racially superior beings, now became taboo - the Nazis wanted to liberate German culture from the « morbid excrescencies of insane and degenerate men » .

Accordingly, some of the most famous and innovative musical works of the past Centuries and many of current years (aside from Mendelssohn's compositions, works by people like Max Bruch, Jacques Offenbach, Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schoenberg, Ernst Křenek, Salomon Sulzer, Berthold Goldschmidt, Erik Wolfgang Korngold, Anton von Webern, to mention a few) were displayed as prime examples of the unwanted degeneracy at the « Entarte Musik » exhibit of 1938. They were also, of course, « dropped » from the repertoires of the Orchestras that continued to flourish in these years. The Music that could, henceforth, be heard in the 3rd « Reich » was mainly that detected as « Good German Music » by the discerning ears of Adolf Hitler and his Minister of Propaganda, Josef Gœbbels. Since this included the works of Ludwig van Beethoven, Richard Wagner, and Anton Bruckner, the German Public didn't grumble too much. Some of the other, more current Nazi musical favourites were Hans Hotter, Herbert von Karajan, Clemens Krauß, Elly Ney, Hans Pfitzner, Li Stadelmann, Richard Strauß, and Wilhelm Furtwängler. A few of these were rabidly anti-Semitic National-Socialists, a few helpless puppets, and a few, like Richard Strauß, outright opportunists who cared to only and not really unreasonably safeguard their musical and personal interests - the latter was briefly appointed the President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , until the Nazis decided he was too opportunistic for even them and relieved him of the post.

Arnold Schoenberg, who had already left for the United States, in 1933, wrote :

« I have at last learned the lesson that has been forced upon me and I shall not ever forget it. It is that I am not a German, not a European, indeed perhaps scarcely a human being (at least, the Europeans prefer the worst of their race to me) but I am a Jew. »

In another letter, he wrote :

« To be sure, after that anything is a kingdom of heaven — however, little it looks like that. »

It is, after all, not an easy matter leaving behind the entire life you had built-up and beginning again from scratch in a completely new environment, a place where people, though for most part well-meaning, have no idea about you and your previous circumstances. Where, on being introduced, you don't find yourself being feted for your name like you

once were, but instead being asked for its spelling. It took a long time for Schönberg and the other emigres to adjust to the change (or rather fall) in their social circumstances, but eventually many of them managed to find their feet and prosper once more and culturally enrich their new homeland.

For a few, like the poet Stefan Zweig, who had written librettos for the Operas of Richard Strauß, however, it was too difficult to attempt the transition ; the loss of homeland together with the treachery of former, respected colleagues, who had also once been close friends proved too much. He committed suicide on 22 February 1942, in Brazil, leaving behind an explanatory note :

« After one's 60th year, unusual powers would be needed in order to make another wholly new beginning. Those that I possess have been exhausted by long years of homeless wandering. I salute all my friends ! May it be granted them, yet, to see the dawn after the long night ! I, all too impatient, go on ahead. »

The Jewish musicians that had remained behind in « the long night » now faced not just a loss of livelihood, but an extinguishing of life itself. And death too was not to be easy. Incarcerated into concentration camps, undergoing unspeakable and unimaginable atrocities, many found themselves in the untenable positions of having to provide music (music that had once had a beautiful and liberating context) in the systematic murder of their own brethren. A great many committed suicide rather than continue. Fania Fenelon, who survived Auschwitz as a member of one of the 6 Orchestras that that camp boasted, has given an heartrending account of the experience in her book, « Playing for Time » . In the « Theresienstadt » concentration camp, where the Germans wanted to create an illusion of well-being for the Nazi propaganda film, « The " Führer " gives the Jews a City » and for hoodwinking the International Red Cross, the Jewish inmates were prodded into putting-up musical programs. 2 of the most famous of these that survived the War, though their creators didn't, are : « Brundibar, the Organ Grinder » , composed by Hans Krása ; and « The Emperor of Atlantis » , by Viktor Ullmann.

Viktor Ullmann, who was a student of Arnold Schönberg, was murdered in Auschwitz. Other promising lives that were cut short at this camp - the Czech avant-garde composer, Pavel Haas ; the conductor Martin Rosenberg ; the young violinist and niece of Gustav Mahler, Alma Maria Rosé ; the contralto Magda Spiegel ; the baritone and cantor Erhard E. Wechseltmann.

A great many others perished in the other Nazi camps. As many of the deaths went unrecorded, it will perhaps never be known how many exactly disappeared forever into the dark night of the Holocaust.

Anton von Webern et les Nazis

Après plusieurs tentatives infructueuses, Anton von Webern tiendra finalement 2 séries de conférences consacrées à la musique de 12 sons, en 1932-1933 (publiées après sa mort en 1960) , d'après les notes de son élève Willy Reich sous le titre de « Chemin vers la nouvelle musique » . Mis à part quelques articles surtout consacrés à la musique d'Arnold Schönberg, ces conférences constituent l'essentiel des écrits de Webern. L'activité de chef de chœur de Webern, à partir de 1921, puis de chef d'orchestre en 1927 (« Arbeiter-Symphonie Konzert ») lui apportent une certaine renommée, en

particulier, dans le répertoire des Symphonies de Gustav Mahler dont il est l'un des grands interprètes. Il mène, en tant que chef-invité, une carrière qui le conduira notamment à Londres jusqu'en 1936. Après le départ de Schönberg, en 1933, et la mort d'Alban Berg, en 1935, Webern est de plus en plus isolé et vit dans des conditions précaires. Cette période voit néanmoins son engagement en faveur du National-Socialisme, alors que son nom figure sur la sinistre liste de « l'art dégénéré ». La guerre accentue sa solitude qu'il compense par sa relation avec la poétesse Hildegard Jone à qui il empruntera plusieurs textes pour ses lieder et ses cantates. Son fils Peter, mobilisé, est tué en 1945, et la mort brutale du compositeur, quelques mois après, met fin à une œuvre restée confidentielle pendant plus de 10 ans. Les différentes versions données de sa mort (le compositeur a été abattu accidentellement par un soldat américain) ont voulu faire croire à une « erreur tragique » et à de sombres histoires d'implication de ses gendres dans le marché noir. En réalité, ceux-ci, Nazis engagés et actifs, sont plus vraisemblablement à l'origine de cet événement, Webern ayant plus probablement protégé leur fuite en tentant de faire diversion.

...

Après avoir fini ses études (1908), Anton von Webern occupe de nombreux postes de chef d'orchestre à Bad Ischl, à Teplice (Teplitz), à Dantzig (Gdansk) ou à Szczecin ainsi qu'à Prague, après quoi il retourne à Vienne où il dirige le « Wiener Arbeiter-Sinfoniekonzerte » (l'Orchestre symphonique des travailleurs de Vienne), de 1922 à 1934. Mais la montée en puissance du régime nazi d'Adolf Hitler (et notamment l'« Anschluss », en 1938, qui verra l'Allemagne s'accaparer l'Autriche) déstabilise Webern puisque sa musique est qualifiée par les autorités de « dégénérée », de « bolchévisme culturel ». Il doit donc, pour gagner sa vie, travailler chez ses éditeurs, Universal-Edition.

Alors que, la Deuxième Guerre mondiale achevée, Webern se sentait plus en sécurité à Mittersill (près de Salzbourg) avec des parents. Cependant, c'est là qu'il fut tué accidentellement par un soldat américain, le 15 septembre 1945 : alors qu'une opération menée par l'armée américaine dans la maison familiale se préparait (un membre de la famille était soupçonné de marché noir), Webern sortit fumer un cigare après le couvre-feu et se heurta à un soldat qui fit feu.

Anton von Webern (qui, au passage, fut probablement influencé par Richard Wagner à ses débuts) laisse derrière lui 31 Opus et une vingtaine de pièces non numérotées, aussi bien pour voix seule que pour voix accompagnée, pour orchestre ou pour piano seul. Il appartient au 1er cercle de la « Seconde École de Vienne », explorant l'atonalité, le dodécaphonisme et la musique sérielle, et fut reconnu par la plupart des jeunes compositeurs des années 1950 comme le membre le plus marquant de ce cercle.

...

En février 1934, une série d'émeutes et d'affrontements entre des miliciens fascistes nazis et des militants communistes embrasent Vienne et Linz. Le chancelier Engelbert Dollfuß décrète le couvre-feu et instaure l'état d'urgence : tous les élus Socio-Démocrates voient leur mandat annulé, les syndicats et associations ouvrières dissous. Anton von Webern perd alors son poste de chef d'orchestre à la RAVAG (radio autrichienne), ce qui le privera d'une partie de ses modestes revenus. En 1935, Alban Berg meurt d'une septicémie. En 1936, Webern est pressenti pour diriger la création du « Concerto à la mémoire d'un ange » de Berg, à Barcelone, mais après quelques répétitions, Webern se sent incapable

de continuer. De fait, cette œuvre sera créée par Hermann Scherchen. Cet événement mettra une fin définitive à la carrière de chef de Webern.

En 1938, les Nazis annexent l'Autriche. Webern voit une grande partie de ses amis, de ses élèves juifs s'exiler. Ne prenant pas lui-même le chemin de l'exil, il reste en Autriche et sera alors mis au banc de la scène culturelle par les Nazis. Il fait partie des musiciens considérés comme « dégénérés » par les Nazis. Il se réfugie dans un exil intérieur, poursuivant inlassablement son œuvre, malgré les bombardements (à partir de l'automne 1943), un enrôlement forcé (mais bref) dans la défense anti-aérienne. Il pourra néanmoins, à 2 reprises, quitter l'Autriche pour la Suisse : en 1940, pour assister à une reprise de sa « Passacaille » pour orchestre, Opus 1 ; puis, en 1943, pour la création de ses « Variations pour orchestre », Opus 30, à Winterthur. Très démuné financièrement, il est contraint de solliciter, à plusieurs reprises, la « Künstlerdank », une bourse de survie accordée aux musiciens nécessiteux par le ministère nazi de la Culture. En février 1945, son fils Peter, en service dans l'armée du « Reich », meurt dans un bombardement, près de Zagreb. C'est pour Webern un choc dont il ne se remettra jamais. Le 31 mars 1945, pour fuir l'armée soviétique, Webern et sa famille quittent leur maison de Maria Enzersdorf (près de Mödling, à 20 kilomètres au sud de Vienne) pour Mittersill, dans le Tyrol. C'est là que Webern passera les derniers mois de sa vie. Juste après la capitulation, il est pressenti pour occuper un poste d'enseignement au Conservatoire de Vienne, mais il n'en aura jamais écho.

...

Few composers suffered under the rule of the Nazis as severely as did Anton von Webern. Following the annexation of Austria into the 3rd « Reich », in 1938, Webern's music was declared « decadent » and effectively banned from performance throughout most of the German world. During World War II, at the age of 60, he was forced to enlist in a civilian brigade that did grueling and dangerous manual labor. His son, Peter, was a soldier in the German army and was killed near the end of the War. Webern and his wife experienced utter deprivation during the chaos at War's end. Finally, he was himself shot and killed by an American occupation soldier.

Anton von Webern had no sympathy for the Nazis' anti-Semitic ideology or for their brutish politics. But, in the early days of World War II, he expressed a naively idealistic enthusiasm for the 3rd « Reich » and even for its leader, Adolf Hitler. This was very common at the time among German people from all walks of life, for the epic tragedy to be inflicted by Hitler upon the world was still unsuspected. Motivated by a strong sense of patriotism, Webern believed that the German nation could lead the world in a positive direction.

...

Although an outstanding teacher, Anton von Webern never received an appointment at the University of Vienna or the Music Academy. He held a minor position at the Israelitic Institute for the Blind (1925-1931) and, from 1932 on, gave private lecture courses. Public recognition at home remained limited to the Vienna Music Prize, awarded to him twice (1924, 1932) under the Socialist regime.

Politically never active, Anton von Webern, yet, fell victim to the rising tide of Right-wing nationalism. Schönberg left Europe soon after Adolf Hitler came to power, in 1933. The Nazis branded the music of the « New Vienna School » as « cultural Bolshevism » and « degenerate art » and banned performance of this type of music. Webern's artistic isolation grew complete with Alban Berg's death, in 1935, and his economic plight became desperate after the Nazi annexation of Austria, in 1938.

The political upheaval brought to a halt the publication of his works. With almost no private pupils left, Webern had to resort to accepting such tasks as piano arrangements of works by lesser composers. Always of a retiring disposition, he fell into total obscurity with the outbreak of World War II.

Webern's disillusionment with the Hitler regime was deepened by increasing bombing raids. In February 1945, his only son, Peter, was killed in a strafing attack on a military train on the eastern front. When the Russian Army neared Vienna, the composer and his wife fled to Mittersill, near Salzburg, where their 3 daughters and grandchildren had sought refuge.

...

As the 1st Austrian Republic's political instability led towards the embrace of Adolf Hitler and Nazism, Anton von Webern's inner musical vision remained undimmed, producing a sequence of Masterworks that includes the Opus 23 and Opus 25 Lieder (1933-1934) ; the choral Cantata, « Das Augenlicht » (premiered by the BBC Symphony Orchestra, in 1938) ; and the beautiful Cantata No. 1, Opus 29 (1938-1940) . Outwardly, his over-literal patriotism and love of his Germanic « Heimat » led him perversely to approve the 3rd « Reich » 's 1938 « Anschluß » of Austria. Stupefyingly, his support for Nazi rule persisted even when his own music was pronounced « degenerate » , and performances of it were banned. Meanwhile, he persisted in visiting Jewish friends who had gone into hiding, on the grounds that the political situation made no difference to their continuing association. Much sanctimonious ink has been spilled as to whether Webern's music is somehow posthumously contaminated by this near-transcendent capacity for political self-delusion. But it takes a seriously prejudiced ear to hear the precepts of the 3rd « Reich » as being articulated in any way in Webern's later works.

As the War began to be lost, Webern reverted to a belated wish for deliverance from the conflict. With the Red Army closing-in on Vienna, Webern and Wilhelmine made their way west to Mittersill, in the Salzburg Alps, ending-up in U.S. occupied territory.

...

After Adolf Hitler took-over the reign, in 1933, Anton von Webern's music was banned as a manifestation of cultural Bolshevism and degeneration of art. His position in Austria became all the more difficult as after the « Anschluß » (the occupation and annexation of Austria, in 1938) , his works could not be published. Though Webern has sharply criticized the Nazi cultural policies through private lectures given in 1933, their intended publication did not occur at that time which proved fortunate to some extent. If it had been published, there would have been even more serious

consequences. Despite all this, Webern's works with the « Vienna Workers Chorus » ended and, 4 years later, his contract with the Austrian Radio was also terminated. He tried to survive in the country by taking private tuitions to certain pupils and making piano arrangements of musical scores.

He composed 3 important choral works during the period of 1938 to 1944. In 1940, he produced his orchestral composition called : « Variations » , Opus 30. It was because of the Swiss philanthropist Werner Reinhart that Webern was able to attend the festive premiere of the « Variations for Orchestra » , in Winterthur, Switzerland, in 1943. Reinhart used all his monetary and diplomatic means to facilitate the travelling of Webern to Switzerland. In return for the support rendered, he dedicated the songs to Reinhart.

In February 1945, Webern and his wife Wilhelmine had to flee from Vienna to Mittersil, near Salzburg, as their son Peter was killed in an air bombardment of a troop train on the eastern front. They stayed with their daughter where they thought it would be safe. However, his life ended in a tragic note when on the evening of September 15, 1945, he was shot and killed by an American soldier by mistake, when he stepped-out of his son-in-law's house. Austria was under the occupation of Allies and his son-in-law was arrested for black-market activities. Despite the curfew that was imposed, he stepped-out of his house to enjoy a cigar, when he was shot. The soldier who was responsible for the action, Raymond Norwood Bell, was overcome by regret and died of alcoholism in 1955.

...

The case of Anton von Webern is both bizarre and tragic because of his established place in the music-world. As late as

1990, one historian of music could still write that this outstanding pupil of Arnold Schönberg and proponent of serial music had been indifferent toward National-Socialism. Given Webern's background one would like to think so, yet, it is far from the truth. The Austrian Webern, who originally had Left-wing ties, was shocked at first by the Nazis, who had forced the departure of his beloved teacher Schönberg from the « Preußische Akademie der Künste » and from Berlin. But then, he slowly came to sympathize with what he saw as an interesting experiment engendered by National-Socialism. According to his chief-biographers, the composer « maintained for years that Hitler, after satisfying his followers with an initial display of raw power, would moderate his policies » . Webern associated Hitler with everything that was positive in Germany, for, as the American violinist Louis Krasner has observed :

« He was passionate about his belief in the superiority of German culture and its destined, historic role. »

Arnold Schönberg, in exile, remained in touch with Webern by mail, telling him from Paris, in August 1933, about his resolve to reconvert to Judaism.

Then, on New Year's Day 1934, Schönberg wrote him from America that he was worried about him and his friend Alban Berg, neither of whom had written lately.

He wrote :

« Since, after all, we, Jews, have experienced it a hundred times, in these days, that the unbelievable has happened, that people had suddenly become Nazis who, yesterday, were still friends, I could not at all explain to myself your silence other than that you, too, had fallen in line. »

Webern quickly allayed his teacher's worries and, for a while, Schönberg felt at ease.

Thereafter, Webern fell on hard economic times as, musically, he found less and less acceptance. And, as Schönberg had feared, his empathy with National-Socialism intensified, so much so that, one day, he exclaimed that someone should attempt « to convince the Hitler regime of the rightness of the 12 tone system ». Whether there was a connection between the 2 factors at the time (penury, on the one hand ; and pro-Nazi sentiment, on the other) must be doubted, for Webern was living in the Vienna suburb of Mödling and had no chance of finding employment or any kind of reward in the German « Reich ». So, his feelings must have been genuine rather than opportunistic. This is borne-out by a story his Jewish acquaintance Louis Krasner told. In April 1936, Webern, accompanied by Krasner on his way to the ISCM (International Society for Contemporary Music) Festival, in Barcelona, instead of traveling directly from Vienna through Switzerland, intentionally made a detour through Munich. There, he took Krasner to the railway station pub for a beer. Back in the train compartment, he asked him :

« Did anyone do anything to you ? Did any harm come to you ? »

He continued :

« This proves that what we've been hearing about all these excesses in Germany is not true. It's all propaganda ! »

Later, in June 1937, Schönberg, again, demanded to know whether there was substance to new rumors that Webern had become « a follower of or adherent to the Nazi Party », to which Webern quickly protested :

« No, no, no !! »

March 1938 brought the « Anschluß » of Austria, and Webern became a citizen of the « Reich ». Within a few weeks, Webern's daughter was in the « Hitler Youth » and quickly married to an Austrian Storm-Trooper (SS) . Webern was a legal witness to the ceremony, at which the groom wore his Party uniform. The composer's own son, Peter, and another son-in-law also were actively drawn to the Nazi movement. Soon, the Nazi fight against « degenerate » music was extended to the newly-annexed Austria, and Webern's music was so branded. When the Nazis organized their exhibition of « degenerate music », later that year in Düsseldorf, they included a picture of Webern, identifying him as a 12 tone composer even more extreme than Schönberg. Webern, himself, maintained personal relationships with Jewish friends, a dangerous thing to do, yet, they nevertheless suspected him of sympathy for the Nazis' cause.

Even though the Nazis had caused Webern to sink deeper into poverty by making performances of his work impossible and taking Jewish students away from him, he developed an almost psychotic sense of German patriotism that grew

odder still after the outbreak of World War II. In 1940, he found reading Hitler's « Mein Kampf » exhilarating and observed every German victory on the western front with great enthusiasm.

Webern wrote to a friend, in May :

« Are things not going forward with giant steps ? This is Germany, today ! But the National-Socialist one, to be sure ! This is exactly the new State, for which the seed was already laid 20 years ago. Yes, a new State it is, one that has never existed before !! It is something new ! Created by this unique man !!! »

This, in the same year that a Nazi music-critic equated Webern's music with « the violation of all natural feeling » .

Webern's financial situation deteriorated further, leading to bouts of depression, and he may finally have made the tactical decision to cash-in on his documented affection for the Nazi regime. On 9 November 1940, a day of commemoration for Hitler's « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » and a Nazi holiday in the « Reich » , he wrote to a functionary of the « Reich » Music Chamber, of which he was a member in good standing, complaining that he found himself « in complete isolation » . He pointed to his success, as a composer and teacher of music, and noted how he had suffered under the Austro-Fascist regime of Engelbert Dollfuß and Kurt Schuschnigg, hoping for an improvement after the « Anschluß » . This, however, did not happen « despite all the willingness to cooperate » . Although he did not say so outright, he was obviously asking the Nazi rulers for a hand-out. He was immediately sent an application form for « Künstlerdank » , Josef Goebbels's Nazi charity for needy artists. In addition to indicating that he was « Aryan » and not a member of the Nazi Party, Webern also wrote that he was currently earning no more than 225 « Reichsmarks » a month, and that on only an irregular basis. The Nazi music administrators registered without emotion that his mode of composition was generically related to Schönberg's and was, therefore, the cause of his present problems. Since he, himself, was politically beyond suspicion, however, and his son was a (formerly illegal) Austrian Nazi Party member, a gift of money would be possible. Hence, it was proposed to allot Webern the sum of 250 « Reichsmarks » as a one-time contribution. As it turned-out, this would help Webern allay starvation for a little more than 4 weeks. Nonetheless, Schönberg's worst fears appear to have been realized.

...

Anton von Webern's music, along with that of Alban Berg, Ernst Křenek, Arnold Schönberg, and others, was denounced as « cultural Bolshevism » and « degenerate art » by the Nazi Party in Germany, and both publication and performances of it were banned soon after the « Anschluß » , in 1938, although neither did it fare well under the preceding years of Austrofascism. As early as 1933, an Austrian « Gauleiter » on the « Bayerischer Rundfunk » mistakenly and very likely maliciously characterized both Berg and Webern as Jewish composers. As a result of official disapproval throughout the 1930's, both found it harder to earn a living ; Webern lost a promising conducting career which might have, otherwise, been more noted and recorded and had to take on work as an editor and proof-reader for his music-publishers, Universal-Edition. His family's financial situation deteriorated until, by August 1940, his personal records reflected no monthly income. It was thanks to the Swiss philanthropist Werner Reinhart that Webern was able to attend the festive premiere of his « Variations for Orchestra » , Opus 30, in Winterthur, Switzerland, in

1943. Reinhart invested all the financial and diplomatic means at his disposal to enable Webern to travel to Switzerland. In return for this support, Webern dedicated the work to him.

There are different descriptions of Webern's attitude towards Nazism ; this is, perhaps, attributable either to its complexity, his internal ambivalence, his prosperity in the preceding years (1918-1934) of post-War « Red Vienna » , in the 1st Republic of Austria, the subsequently divided political factions of his homeland as represented in his friends and family (from Zionist Schœnberg to his Nazi son, Peter) , or the different contexts in which or audiences to whom his views were expressed. Further insight into Webern's attitudes comes with the realization that Nazism, itself, was deeply multi-faceted, marked « not by a coherent doctrine or body of systemically interrelated ideas, but rather by a vaguer world-view made-up of a number of prejudices with varied appeals to different audiences which could scarcely be dignified with the term :“ ideology ”. »

In broad terms, Webern's attitude seems to have first warmed to a degree of characteristic fervor and, perhaps, only much later, in conjunction with wide-spread German disillusionment, cooled to Adolf Hitler and the Nazis ; but he was no anti-Semite. On the one hand, Willi Reich notes that Webern attacked Nazi cultural policies in private lectures given in 1933, whose hypothetical publication « would have exposed Webern to serious consequences » later. On the other, some private correspondence attests to his Nazi sympathies, though he denied these to Schœnberg when asked (only once) , who heard rumours, never confirmed to him by Rudolf Kolisch and Eduard Steuermann, denied to him by Louis Krasner and, then, very strenuously denied to him by Webern. As such, Schœnberg's Violin Concerto of 1934(5)-1936 continued to bear a dedication to Webern. Webern's patriotism led him to endorse the Nazi regime, for example, in a series of letters to Joseph Hueber, who was serving in the army and himself held such views. Webern described Hitler on May 2, 1940, as « this unique man » who created « the new State » of Germany ; thus, Alex Ross characterizes him as « an unashamed Hitler enthusiast » .

Musicologist Richard Taruskin describes Webern accurately, if vaguely, as a pan-German nationalist but, then, goes much further in claiming specifically that Webern joyfully welcomed the Nazis with the 1938 « Anschluß » , at best extrapolating from the account of his cited source Krasner and, at worst, exaggerating or distorting it, as well as describing it sardonically as « heart-breaking » . Taruskin's authority on this delicate issue must be credited, if at all, then, only with the significant limitations that he has been polemical, in general, and hostile, in particular, to the « Second Viennese School » , of whom Webern is often considered the most extreme and difficult (i.e. , the least accessible) .

In contrast to Taruskin's methods and pronouncements, musicologist Pamela M. Potter advises that :

« It is important to consider all the scholarship on musical life in the 3rd “ Reich ” that, taken together, reveals the complexity of the day-to-day existence of musicians and composers, as it seems inevitable that debates about the political culpability of individuals will persist, especially if the stakes remain so high for composers, for whom an up or down vote can determine inclusion in the canon. »

In this vein, it might be noted in relation to Taruskin's claim that Webern wrote to friends (husband and wife Josef Humplik and Hildegard Jone) on the day of the « Anschluß » not to invite celebration or to observe developments but

to be left alone :

« I am totally immersed in my work (composing) and cannot, cannot be disturbed. »

Louis Krasner's presence could have been a disturbance to Webern for this reason, and musicologist Kathryn Bailey speculates that this may indeed be why he was rushed-off by Webern.

There is, moreover, significant political complexity to be treated, more than enough to complicate any consideration of individual culpability : it is imperative to note that some Social-Democrats viewed the National-Socialists as an alternative to the Christian-Social Party and, later, to the « Vaterländische Front » in the context of reunification with Germany ; for example, Karl Renner, a Chancellor who served in both the 1st (1919-1933) and 2nd (post-1945) Austrian Republics, favoured a German « Anschluß » as an alternative to the, then, Austrofascist regime, under which Berg, Webern, and the Social-Democrats suffered. And Webern's professional circle in Vienna included, besides many Jews, many Social-Democrats ; for example, for David Josef Bach, a close friend of Schœnberg's as well, Webern conducted many workers' and amateur ensembles. Under the Nazis, some Social-Democrats expected, there might be more work and protections for workers and laborers, as well as other social reforms and political stability, if not democracy ; Webern may well have hoped to, again, be able to conduct and to be better able to secure a future for his family.

Krasner, himself, painted not a sentimental portrait but one imbued with a wealth of factual and personal detail for its publication in 1987, describing Webern as clearly naive and idealistic but not entirely without his wits, shame, or conscience ; Krasner carefully contextualizes Webern as a member of Austrian society at the time, one departed by Schœnberg and one in which the already pro-Nazi Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra had even refused to play the late-Berg's Violin Concerto. As Krasner vividly recalled, he and Webern were visiting at the latter's home in Maria Enzersdorf, Mödling, when the Nazis invaded Austria ; Webern, uncannily seeming to anticipate the timing-down to 4 o'clock in the afternoon, turned-on the radio to hear this news and immediately warned Krasner, urging him to flee immediately, whereupon he did (to Vienna) . Whether this was for Krasner's safety or to save Webern the embarrassment of Krasner's presence during a time of possible celebration in the pro-Nazi Webern family or, indeed, in most of pro-Nazi Mödling, by Krasner's description (as well as one even more vivid of Arnold Greißle-Schœnberg) , Krasner was ambivalent and uncertain, withholding judgment. Only later did Krasner realize how self-admittedly « foolhardy » he had been and in what danger he had placed himself, revealing an ignorance perhaps shared by Webern. Krasner had even revisited frequently, hoping to convince friends (e.g. , Schœnberg's daughter, Gertrude ; and her husband, Felix Greißle) to emigrate before time ran-out.

Moreover, Krasner retold from a story related to him in long discussion with Schœnberg's son, Görgi, a Jew who remained in Vienna during the War, that the Weberns, much to their risk and credit, had provided Görgi and his family with food and shelter toward the end of the War at the Weberns' home, in a Mödling apartment, belonging to their son-in-law. Görgi and his family were left behind for their safety when Webern fled on foot with his family to Mittersill, about 75 kilometres away, for safety of their own in light of the coming Russian invasion ; Amalie, one of Webern's daughters, wrote of « 17 persons pressed together in the smallest possible space » upon their arrival. Ironically, the Russians pronounced Görgi a « Nazi spy » when he was discovered due to the Nazi munitions and

propaganda in the Weberns' basement store-room. Görgi is said to have saved himself from execution by protesting and drawing attention to his clothes, sewn as specified by the Nazis with the yellow « Star of David ». He continued to live in this apartment with this family until 1969.

Webern is also known to have aided Josef Polnauer, a Jewish friend who, as an albino, managed to largely escape the Nazis' attention and, later, edit a publication of Webern's correspondence from this time with Hildegard Jone, Webern's then lyricist and collaborator, and her husband, sculptor Josef Humplik.

Anton von Webern's 1944-1945 correspondence is strewn with references to bombings, deaths, destruction, privation, and the disintegration of local order ; but also noted are the births of several grandchildren. At the age of 60 (i.e. , in December 1943) , Webern writes that he is living in a barrack away from home and working from 6 am to 5 pm, compelled by the State, in a time of War, to serve as an air-raid protection police officer. On March 3, 1945, news was relayed to Webern that his only son, Peter, died on February 14th of wounds suffered in a strafing attack on a military train, 2 days earlier.

...

The bombs began falling with greater intensity in March 1945, as the War neared its end and the Soviet and Western Allied armies advanced upon Vienna. Though the Austrian composer Anton von Webern lived 15 miles away from the city center, on a « cul-de-sac » at the base of a forested hill, the exploding bombs, blaring sirens, and almost constant fire of anti-aircraft guns were ever-present there, as well. For a composer who thrived on silence, it was too much to bear. It wasn't just the noise, however, that prevented him from working, or even that he was destitute, unable to perform in public, his music banned by the Nazis on grounds of « degeneracy ». He was, above all, numbed with grief following the death of his son, Peter, a soldier in the German army. Webern, a nervous man during the best of times, was beaten-down, on the verge of collapse, a devout Christian now questioning the existence of God.

At the end of March, German officials began evacuating civilians from Vienna. Webern's wife, Wilhelmine, could have boarded one of the refugee buses designated for women and children, but she would not countenance being separated from her husband. Instead, the Weberns decided to take refuge in the Alpine village of Mittersill, 230 miles away. 2 of their 3 grown daughters, Christine and Maria, were already there with their own children, living in the home of Maria's in-laws. On Good Friday, March 30th, with Vienna in a state of chaos, Webern and his wife packed all they could into 2 rucksacks. In the darkness of the next morning, they began walking, hoping to hitch a ride somewhere along the way. They walked for 8 grueling hours (18 miles in total, burdened with the weight on their backs) to the town of Neulengbach, where they managed to get on a train continuing westward.

On Easter Monday, April 2nd, they disembarked at the picturesque town of Zell am See. There, while waiting on the station platform, they ran into their eldest daughter, Amalie. She and her 2 young sons had also fled Vienna, on a bus bound for Innsbruck and, then, southern Germany, but had decided, mid-journey, to head to Mittersill instead. Heartened by this fortuitous coincidence, 3 generations of Weberns now boarded the train to Mittersill. It was, no doubt, a joyous reunion once they arrived at the village and, later, the family's ranks would grow, yet, larger with the

return of Christine's and Amalie's husbands from the front - 17 people crammed into one Tyrolean country-house. There, on a meadow overlooking the Salzach River, amid the serenity of evergreen forests and Alpine peaks, the extended family waited-out the War's end. On April 30th, Adolf Hitler committed suicide. Soon after, the Germans surrendered, and American soldiers occupied Mittersill, overseeing the transition to peace-time.

Webern suffered from malnutrition and a violent case of dysentery, but he soon recovered, even without the aid of medication. He began finding moments of solace in his new environment, taking long, meditative walks into the surrounding forests, delighting in the lichens, the mosses, the Alpine flowers. He read the poems of Rainer Maria Rilke, copying, line after line, into his diary. He began to feel re-generated. Sitting with his wife on a bench near the Mittersill church, one radiant summer day, while gazing-up at the mountains capped with early snow, Webern said :

« I would like to be buried here, someday. »

He was only 61, too young for premonitions, but a few months later, he was dead.

The death of Anton Friedrich Wilhelm von Webern (one of the most inventive artists of the 20th Century, whose experiments in sound greatly influenced the course of contemporary music) was, for many years, a matter of rumor and conjecture. Only a few facts were known. On the evening of September 15th, 1945, the Weberns dined at the home of Christine and their son-in-law Benno Mattel, who had set-up residence of their own in the village. After dinner, 2 American soldiers came to the house to see Mattel. At some point, Webern went outside to smoke a cigar, and as he lit-up, a confrontation with one of the Americans took place. 3 shots were fired. Webern stumbled inside and died. The 3 bullet holes can still be seen on the façade of the house at « Am Markt Nr. 101 » (Anton-Webern-Gasse Nr. 2) , just to the right of the front-door.

...

Anton von Webern spent the last months of his life in Mittersill. The Webern couple lived there with the daughter Christine Maria Halbich in the house marked « Burk Nr. 31 » .

In the evening of September 15th, 1945, the couple was staying with the other son-in-law, Benno Mattel, in the house « Markt Nr. 101 » . The American occupying power suspected Mattel of being a black-market operator and set a trap for him that evening. Sentries were posted around the house. When Webern left the house to smoke a cigarette, an American soldier shot him by mistake.

20 years after his death, a bronze commemorative plaque was fixed on the entrance door.

...

Was Webern murdered, or was his death accidental ? Who was the soldier who pulled the trigger, and had he acted in self-defense, after some provocation from Webern ? Shortly after visiting Mittersill, in 1959, a German-born American

musicologist named Hans Moldenhauer became determined to answer these questions, and did so in a 1961 book, *The Death of Anton von Webern: A Drama in Documents*. Based largely on this book, a new one-act opera called « *The Death of Webern* », a moving and taut work by the composer Michaël Dellaira, with a libretto by the poet J. D. (« Sandy ») McClatchy, premiered with 3 performances in New York City by the « Pocket Opera Players » .

Writing an Opera about a composer (especially, one as pioneering and idiosyncratic as Anton von Webern) can be tricky. To what degree should the work's musical idiom reflect, mimic, or comment on the music of its subject ? Webern will forever be associated with Arnold Schönberg and Alban Berg, the 3 making-up the so-called « Second Viennese School » . Though Webern's earliest works emerged from the plush world of post-Romanticism, he soon began experimenting with tonality and form, reducing harmony, melody, and rhythm to their constituent elements - sound distilled, with beauty revealed in the inherent severity and compression of a work. Some of his pieces last barely 1 minute, with each note containing a world of expression - and each silence, too.

A wonderful Webern-like economy characterizes Dellaira's score, not just in the orchestration for chamber ensemble but also in its intensity. The music is concentrated and spare, with a wide-range of feeling communicated by the attenuated phrases that flit about the longer vocal lines. But Dellaira is not beholden to Webern ; he can (and does) make use of a variety of musical styles precisely because this work, though ostensibly about Webern, is really the story of Hans Moldenhauer.

At the outset of the Opera, Moldenhauer sits at his desk, wondering why the burden of investigating Webern's death has fallen to him. Against a brooding clarinet line and a roll of the snare drum suggesting gunfire, he laments that a « man who devoted his life to sound » has so easily been « swallowed by silence » . When Moldenhauer later recalls how much the composer's music has meant to him, Dellaira quotes from Webern's early « *Passacaglia* » - a lovely moment of homage. But because the « *Passacaglia* » marked a point of departure for Webern (very soon after, he would move beyond the tonal world of Gustav Mahler, Richard Strauß, and Richard Wagner) , the passage also invokes a deeper sense of nostalgia and loss.

Among the many felicities of McClatchy's libretto is how he treats the letters, statements, and affidavits that Moldenhauer assembled in his search, making poetry out of mundane official correspondence. Returning home from Austria, Moldenhauer sent letters of inquiry to the U.S. secretaries of State and Defense, in the hope that some record of Webern's death might be found - a most improbable gambit. Not surprisingly, the letters were shuffled-down bureaucratic channels to assorted government archivists and military officers. As the Opera shows, Moldenhauer encountered false starts and dead-ends, indifference and obstruction.

An archivist with the War Records Division sings :

« In a time of War, papers are misfiled. Facts, like lives, alas, are lost. »

After failing to make headway with both a State Department clerk and a military officer, Moldenhauer expresses a cynical frustration :

« If you keep looking away, maybe it will disappear. » , as the flute and clarinet spin-out an urgent, restive line against a driving, repeated figure played by the cello and piano.

Moldenhauer's breakthrough comes when he learns that units of the 42nd Infantry, the famed Rainbow Division, were present during the American occupation of Mittersill and that an American soldier named Martin Heiman went to the house where Webern had been shot on that very night. Not only had there been a subsequent investigation, but Heiman, a German-born American, had acted as translator. In a remarkable fulcrum-like scene in the Opera, Heiman reveals the name of the man who killed Webern - an army cook named Raymond Bell. There follows a beautiful canon (a musical form in which a phrase or melody uttered by one voice is repeated, after a short interval of time, by another voice or voices) in which Heiman names the other American soldier present at the Mattel house that night - a 1st sergeant named Andrew W. Murray. Dellaira's use of the canon is not coincidental, I think ; it was one of Webern's favourite forms.

In his 1979 biography, « Anton von Webern : A Chronicle of His Life and Work » , Moldenhauer, writing in collaboration with his wife, Rosaleen, describes how, upon arriving at Mittersill after the War, Webern's son-in-law Mattel tried to purchase black-market goods from the American soldiers stationed in the village. One day, he approached Raymond Bell, looking to buy sugar, coffee, and American dollars. Bell alerted Sergeant Murray, but when the 2 reported Mattel to higher-ups at the Counter-Intelligence Corps, headquartered in nearby Zell am See, they were told to entrap and arrest Mattel themselves.

A sting operation occurred at Mattel's house, on September 15th - coincidentally, the night Anton von Webern and his wife dined there. The Weberns arrived around 8 o'clock and subsequently enjoyed a meal with their daughter and son-in-law, as Wilhelmine Webern would later recount. Afterward, Mattel announced the imminent arrival of some Americans, so Webern, Wilhelmine, Christine, and the Mattels' 3 sleepy children retired to a room across the hall, where the children were put to bed. When Bell and Murray arrived soon after 9, Mattel served them drinks in the kitchen, and the 3 agreed upon a price for certain illicit goods. The Americans drew their pistols and arrested Mattel.

At precisely this time, Webern decided to indulge in a pleasure he had been anticipating all evening : a cigar that Mattel had procured for him. His wife did not want the smoke to disturb the 3 sleeping grandchildren, so Webern stepped outside into the darkness.

Bell, seemingly unaware that others were in the house, heard footsteps in the hallway. Curious, he, too, made his way outside, though what happened next can never be verified. Bell would later say that Webern (5 feet 3 inches tall, 110 pounds, and in frail health) had provoked him into firing the 3 shots. Whatever the motive, Bell ran-off for help, heading to a nearby inn, where a dance was being held for the Americans. Webern, meanwhile, struggled to get back inside the house.

He said :

« Ich wurde erschossen. » (I have been shot.)

Wilhelmine and Christine placed him on a mattress. He was bleeding severely from his stomach.

Webern said :

« Es ist aus. » (It is over.)

With those final words, as laconic and profound as the music he created, he began to slip-out of consciousness. Medical help finally arrived, but Anton von Webern was dead.

As the composer's body was taken away, Wilhelmine fell into a state of shock. It was left to Amalie Waller, awakened at 4 in the morning with the news of her father's death, to find-out just where he had been taken. On that Sunday morning, her search led her to the « Annakirche » , Mittersill's small Baroque chapel.

She would later tell Moldenhauer :

« And it was he. On a blanket, on the floor of the chapel, lay my father - dead. His eyes were open, dreadful terror stood in them. »

During the military investigation, Bell continued to assert that he had acted in self-defense. Heiman maintained, however, that :

« To the best of my knowledge, not the slightest proof existed that Webern attacked the cook apart from the testimony of the cook, who was about 2 heads taller than Mister Anton von Webern. I did not speak to a single officer familiar with the case who believed Mister von Webern was guilty of anything in this connection. Certainly, in my opinion, he was a completely innocent bystander. »

Bell, confined to quarters for a period of time after the shooting, returned to his home-town of Mount Olive, North Carolina, after the War and became a restaurant cook. He died an alcoholic, on September 3rd, 1955, a decade after the incident with Webern. When Moldenhauer wrote to Bell's widow, a school teacher named Helen, he received a poignant response :

« I know very little about the accident. When he came home from the War, he told me he killed a man in the line of duty. I know he worried greatly over it. Every time he became intoxicated, he would say, " I wish I hadn't killed that man." I truly think it helped to bring on his sickness. He was a very kind man who loved everyone. These are the results of War. So many suffer. »

The most expansive scenes in the Opera, full of pathos and heightened expressiveness, are the dialogues between Moldenhauer and Helen Bell and Moldenhauer and Amalie Waller. The scene with Amalie is, for me, the highlight of the

entire work ; she recounts the desperation of the flight to Mittersill (the piccolo and violin playing in haunting unison, floating above the singers) and the traumatic experience of finding her father's body in the chapel.

Amalie sings plangently :

« You are the 1st man who has cared, Doctor. »

Moldenhauer replies :

« I only wanted to discover the truth. » , an understated response burning with the intensity of his endeavor.

Webern's adoption of his teacher Arnold Schönberg's 12 note system gave structure to the music he wrote after 1921, though his experiments with form and tonality were leading in that direction anyway. In 12 note music, the melodies and harmonies of a piece are determined by a specific arrangement of the 12 notes of the chromatic scale, the so-called tone row. The row occurs throughout the piece and can be manipulated in various ways : inverted, reversed, inverted and reversed. It might seem arbitrary but, in the hands of imaginative and inspired artists such as Schönberg, Webern, and Berg, the system gave rise to an enormous range of expressive music. There is nothing cold or mathematical, for example, about Berg's valedictory Violin Concerto, or Webern's moving and gorgeous late-Cantatas.

In one of the Opera's 2 flash-back scenes, we see Webern giving a private lecture at his house, discussing the music of the « Second Viennese School » . He bemoans the fact that most people cannot come to terms with the new music, incapable as they are of appreciating anything that does not render a specific image or mood, or adhere to traditional tonality. But Webern argues that 12 note music is derived from nothing less than natural law, that he and Schönberg and Berg have only developed and furthered a tradition inherited from Bach.

Webern sings :

« The Classical forms have remained. It was our task to extend and clarify them, to dislodge the key-note, and make way for the luminous harmony of the new laws. How 12 notes listen to each other, and in doing so show us the new worlds spinning inside the eternal universe. »

The scene is powerful, with passages marked by a Webern-like severity contrasting with a chorale that recalls the polyphony of Johann Sebastian Bach and Heinrich Schütz - new and old co-existing seamlessly.

Webern goes on to ask what will happen to serious artists in the new Germany, branded by the Nazis as degenerate :

« I cannot even think what and whom they will destroy. It is our duty to save what can be saved, for soon we may all be in prison for calling ourselves “ serious ”. »

Without question, Webern suffered greatly under the 3rd « Reich » . More problematic than his seemingly complex

music was his close friendship with Schönberg, who was Jewish. In the Opera's 1st scene, Moldenhauer holds Webern up as :

« A man who defended his homeland and its history, a man who spoke-out against Hitler and the forces of evil. »

What an injustice that « that man is killed by those he looked on as his saviours. »

But this portrait of Webern is only partially true, and it omits a troubling side of the composer's character.

Perhaps, as a result of his belief in the superiority of pan-Germanic culture, Webern embraced the rise of the 3rd « Reich » , often vigorously. He admired Adolf Hitler and the National-Socialists, praised the Japanese entry into the War, and imagined a time when the entire world might be pacified by the new Germanic order. No evidence exists to suggest that Webern was an anti-Semite (though 3 of his children became Nazis as adults, Mattel was a Nazi Storm-Trooper, and a few of Webern's close friends were also Nazis) . He helped many Jewish friends during the difficult time preceding the annexation of Austria, in 1938, and he later offered Jews refuge in his house, risking arrest and a possible death sentence. Yet, how could a man whose closest friends and colleagues included so many Jews have failed to acknowledge the brutality of the Nazis ?

To suggest that this cultured and intelligent man was startlingly simple-minded when it came to politics is not to apologize for his delusions. There is an almost unbelievable story of a trip he took in 1936 to Barcelona, where he was supposed to conduct the premiere of the Berg Violin Concerto. The soloist on the occasion, Louis Krasner, accompanied Webern on the train journey from Vienna to Spain - yet, rather than go through Switzerland, as almost everyone else attending the Festival was doing, Webern insisted on traveling through Germany, for no other reason than to show his Jewish traveling companion that it was possible for him to survive in Germany unscathed. This « naïveté » revealed itself on another occasion when Webern decided to conduct a program of Felix Mendelssohn's music for the Austrian radio broadcaster « RAVAG » , at a time when the music of Mendelssohn, a Jew, was banned. This transgression (along with Webern's strong ties to cultural institutions supported by Austria's Social-Democrat Party) led to his immediate dismissal from « RAVAG » , for whom he had been conducting regular concerts.

In 1934, Arnold Schönberg, having emigrated to the United States, wanted to dedicate a composition to Webern, on the occasion of his former pupil's 50th birthday. But 1st, he needed Webern to answer a question : « Was he a Nazi ? » Webern wrote back, emphatically stating that he was not, and expressing « a sense of the most vehement aversion » toward anti-Semites. Schönberg was only temporarily put at ease. A few years later, he confronted Webern about the matter, again, as reported in Kathryn Bailey's « The Life of Webern » :

« I have heard repeatedly in the last few months a rumour which I have not believed and which has been described by various sources as untrue. Nevertheless, under the circumstances, it is necessary that I know the whole truth, and this I can get only through a direct answer to a direct question. Is it true that you have become a supporter, or even a member, of the Nazi Party ? There are few things that could give me greater joy than your answering no to the questions. »

How Webern responded, or if he did so at all, is not known : no response to Schönberg's letter has been found.

In times of War, of course, the choices a person makes in order to get by (and who is to say that Webern's choices were not entirely practical) are often fraught with ethical complication. That Webern was not morally guiltless during the most horrific period of the 20th Century does not diminish him as a seminal artist, the creator of hugely influential pieces that are challenging and thorny, but luminous and beautiful, too. Wherever his sympathies lay, « The Death of Webern » makes clear that some of the questions that Hans Moldenhauer set-out to answer will forever remain unknowable. At the end of Dellaira's affecting Opera, with so many of the puzzle pieces put together, Moldenhauer still registers a note of deep pessimism :

« Lies. Half-truths. No one knows. No one remembers. No one wants to remember. »

That a musical work about Anton von Webern, who helped explode the world of tonality, should end quietly in C major (that most traditional of key-signatures, the key of some of the greatest works of Haydn, Mozart, and Schubert, a key that conveys solidity, familiarity, and happiness) might be the most tantalizing irony of all.

...

Anton von Webern was killed on September 15th, 1945, in Mittersill, Austria. For a long time, no one knew the exact circumstances of the great composer's death and the musical-world more or less accepted the mystery. Then, musicologist Hans Moldenhauer carried-out an investigation that took in the U.S. Army's own account of events.

Webern was going outside to smoke a cigar while a sting operation was being carried-out to arrest his son-in-law Benno Mattel, a former SS-member and black-market operative. Raymond Norwood Bell, company cook from North Carolina, was one of the soldiers participating in the action. Hearing some noises outside the room they were holding Mattel in, Bell went to investigate and apparently bumped into the composer and fired 3 shots. Bell later stated that he had been attacked. 10 years after the incident, Bell died of acute alcoholism attributed to the guilt he felt over what had happened.

...

The wife of Raymond Norwood Bell stated that, whenever her late-husband got drunk, he regretted Webern's death. Considering he died of alcoholism this must have been often, and if he drank in company must have made him hard to take at times.

A former drinking buddy of Bell's might conceivably have said :

« Ray was a good sort and we all knew what he had gone through, but it got to the point where all he wanted to talk about was Webern. It was too much, as if the Second Viennese School consisted of him alone and there had never

been a Schönberg or a Berg, not to mention composers like Stravinsky or Bartók, the poor guy » ,

...

Anton von Webern, hoping not to disturb his sleeping grandchildren, stepped outside his house in Mittersill, Austria in the evening of 15 September 1945. He barely managed to enjoy a couple of draws on his cigar before he was shot and killed by an American Army soldier. Details of this fatal encounter had been sketchy until the musicologist Hans Moldenhauer, taking the U.S. Army's internal report into consideration, published the results of his investigation.

By September 1945, World War II had ended and Austrian territory was placed under Allied occupation. Serious food shortages among the civilian population led to severe malnutrition, and a lack of cleaning and sanitation supplies led to massive outbreaks of acute communicable diseases. It is hardly surprising that a thriving black-market quickly developed. Benno Mattel, Anton von Webern's son-in-law, was not only a former member of the « Waffen-SS » (an armed wing of the Nazi Party) , he was also smuggling goods. On the evening of the shooting, a major sting operation was underway at the Webern house, and Benno was arrested. Raymond Norwood Bell, a company cook from North Carolina participated in that operation, and when he felt threatened by the frail 62 year old composer smoking his cigar, fired 3 shots.

Moldenhauer's account of the shooting has not been unanimously accepted. In fact, it has been severely criticized for portraying a sense of American callousness, with a Wild-West mentality invading peaceful Austria and « depriving the victimized country of one of its cultural treasures » . In defense of Bell, one might mention that although major hostilities had ceased, Austria was clearly not a happy nor safe place. Armed bandits roamed the country-side, and not everybody had accepted the loss of the War. In addition, Austria was not a victim of Germany's aggression, but had welcomed Adolf Hitler with open arms. Add to this that Raymond Bell was described as an overly nervous person and you have the perfect recipe for disaster.

But it would be equally absurd to suggest that American military personnel (as an extension of U.S. foreign policy) were and are primarily concerned with the well-being of humanity. Just ask the civilian population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ! After all, the trigger-happy and intoxicated American yokel (self-righteously clinging to delusional notions of moral fortitude) has a definite place in the establishment of the American consciousness ; and it clearly still resonates in American life today. And let's not forget that Raymond Bell died of acute alcoholism, in 1955. For all we know, he might already have been blitzed beyond Nirvana on that day, in September 1945.

Upon hearing of Webern's death, Igor Stravinsky said the musical-world should mourn his passing and summed-up both the nature and extent of his accomplishments as well as the insurmountable obstacles he faced :

« Doomed to a total failure in a deaf world of ignorance and indifference, he inexorably kept on cutting-out his diamonds, his dazzling diamonds, the mines of which he had such a perfect knowledge. »

And Arnold Schönberg famously referred to Webern's Masterpiece of concision : the 6 Bagatelles for String Quartet,

Opus 9, as « a whole novel in a single sigh » .

...

Romanian-Jewish musicologist and composer Filipp Herschkowitz had been a student of Anton von Webern's in Vienna and sought refuge from the Nazis in the East. He ended-up bringing Webern's music to a state of even greater incomprehension and indifference in his exile in The Soviet Union, a trying obscurity that would last until his death, in 1989. Composer Dmitri Smirnov studied with Herschkowitz and recounts the fate of a lone modernist looking to uphold the tradition of his teacher in a land of social realism :

« As time passed, the “ Second Viennese School ” went-out of fashion, without ever having come into fashion in the 1st place, and Herschkowitz was deserted by everyone : an eccentric that no one needed, who spoke in amusing paradoxes or dull truths. »

What Herschkowitz appears to emphasize is Webern's (and Schönberg's and Beethoven's) relationship with tradition :

« The great Masters make-up a strictly organic chain. They are always “ innovators ” and never “ avant-garde ”. Innovation is the only possibility of remaining on the rails of tradition. »

This is the inverse of Herschkowitz's contention that Webern's many post-War imitators such as Karlheinz Stockhausen and Pierre Boulez became entirely focused on appearing new and novel so as to distinguish themselves from their fellow composers and advance their careers.

...

The documentary evidence surrounding Anton von Webern's death reveals an uncomfortable, non-tragic side of what happened, though this seems clearly unintentional. In a letter to his daughter that Moldenhauer reproduces the composer asks her :

« And how do you get through these horrors ? »

It is 1945 and you would think he might be referring to genocide or something similarly evil, but no. He has just lamented the loss of some belongings from a hideaway under their garden-house in their abandoned Vienna home.

He writes :

« Just think !! All our “ silver ” !!! »

...

I wonder if in the decade between Anton von Webern's and Raymond Bell's death the latter ever thought of attending a concert of the Austrian composer's music. He was reportedly wracked by guilt and may very well have wanted some point of contact with the soul of the man he killed. Some people would have turned to spiritualism and « séances », but a composer actually provides an opportunity for anyone, his killer included, to commune with his spirit for an extended period of time (though, in Webern's case, this period of time could turn-out to be quite short) .

...

Anton von Webern was born December 3rd, 1883. Franz Kafka was born July 3rd, 1883. Here are 2 classmates from the Central European school of stripped-down expression, of creating art works on a diametrically opposite scale of a Richard Wagner or Victor Hugo, and of being highly-unsuited to the everyday world.

Arnold Schönberg famously referred to one of Webern's Masterpieces of concision, the 6 Bagatelles for string quartet, Opus 9, as « a whole novel in a single sigh » .

...

Aside from what I imagine to be the scarcity of Anton von Webern performances in the North Carolina area, I imagine the likelihood of Bell going to one to be very low. He was described as an overly nervous person to start with, so it's hard to imagine him at a concert of Webern's music at all. For one thing, the music is not what you would call soothing. Yes, you can reach a kind of meditative calm as you listen to it, no question, though even then it retains an edge. But some people just are not predisposed to put their nerves at the disposal of this particular Master of modern art, and Bell seemed to fit this category of people.

...

Not everyone accepts Moldenhauer's account of Webern's shooting as fact. One thing that grates has been the sense of American callousness, as if a shoot em' up mentality invaded peaceful Austria and deprived the victimized country of one of its cultural treasures. Webern's own Nazi sympathies, which co-existed with his continued admiration and friendship with his exiled teacher Arnold Schönberg and many other Jews, is a possible key to an alternative explanation of what happened that night.

While it has always been assumed that Bell was lying or exaggerating when he said that the frail 62 year old composer attacked him it has been suggested that he did so to provoke precisely what came about : his death. That following the collapse of the regime he supported, the death of his son in combat and, perhaps, most daunting of all, the idea that he would be confronted by returning colleagues and friends as the true extent of Nazi brutality began to become clear, the possibility exists that he found himself no longer able to face the idea of going on living.

...

Raymond Bell holds a singular and terrible place in the history of 20th Century art. We know all about the destruction Joseph Stalin and his secret-police henchmen wrought on Russian and Eastern European culture but we don't know who actually put the bullet into Isaak Babel's head and whether he later drank himself to death out of guilt or just drank himself to death in the normal course of things. The same goes for the Nazi who turned-on the gas that killed Czech composer Viktor Ullmann or the Spanish Fascists that were the probable murderers of Federico García Lorca. They escaped identification, and very possibly could have escaped guilt as well.

...

Long an opponent of the « Second Vienna School », Igor Stravinsky, upon hearing of Anton von Webern's death, said the musical-world should mourn his passing and summed-up both the nature and extent of his accomplishments as well as the insurmountable obstacles he faced :

« Doomed to a total failure in a deaf world of ignorance and indifference, he inexorably kept on cutting-out his diamonds, his dazzling diamonds, the mines of which he had such a perfect knowledge. »

Composer Anton von Webern was Double-Agent for the Nazis

(By Heinrich Kincaid, from the « Associated Press » .)

BERLIN, GERMANY (AP) - Recent admissions by an ex-Nazi official living in Argentina have confirmed what some musicologists have suspected for years : that early- 20th Century German composer Anton von Webern and his colleagues devised the so-called « serial » technique of music to encrypt messages to Nazi spies, living in the United States and Britain.

In what can surely be considered the most brazen instance of « Art Imitating Espionage » to date, « avant-garde » composers of the Hitler years working in conjunction with designers of the Nazi « Enigma » code were bamboozling unsuspecting audiences with their atonal thunderings while, at the same time, passing critical scientific data back and forth between nations.

« This calls into question the entire “ Second Viennese School ” of music » , announced minimalist composer John Adams, from his home in the Adirondack Mountains.

« Ever since I first encountered compositions by Arnold Schönberg, I wondered what the hell anyone ever heard in it. Now, I know. »

Gunned-down by an American soldier in Berlin (?), 62 year old Anton von Webern's death was until now considered a tragic loss to the musical-world. At the time the U.S. Army reported that the killing was « a mistake » and that, in stepping onto the street at night to smoke a cigarette, Webern was violating a strict curfew rule.

It is now known that Webern was using music to shuttle Werner Heisenberg's discoveries in atomic energy to German spy Klaus Fuchs working on the Manhattan atom bomb project in New Mexico. Due to the secret nature of the project, which was still underway after the invasion of Berlin, Army officials at the time were unable to describe the true reason for Webern's murder.

Hans Scherbius, a Nazi Party official who worked with Minister of Propaganda Josef Goebbels, admitted at age 87 that the Nazis secretly were behind the 12 tone technique of composition, which was officially reviled to give it the outlaw status it needed to remain outside of the larger public purview.

« These pieces were nothing more than cipher for encoding messages. » , he chuckled during an interview on his balcony in Buenos Aires.

« It was only because it was “ naughty ” and difficult that elite audiences accepted it, even championed it. »

Physicist Edward Teller, who kept a 9 foot « Steinway » piano in his apartment at the Los Alamos laboratory, was the unwitting deliverer of Heisenberg's data to Fuchs, who eagerly attended parties thrown by Teller, an enthusiastic booster of Webern's music.

Arnold Schoenberg, the older musician who 1st devised the serial technique at the request of the Weimar government of Germany, composed in America to deliver bomb data stolen by Fuchs back to the Nazis, who worked feverishly to design their own atomic weapons.

As an example, Scherbius showed « Associated Press » reporters the score of Webern's Opus 30 « Variations for Orchestra » overlaid with a cardboard template. The notes formed a mathematical grid that deciphered into German a comparison between the neutron release cross-sections of uranium isotopes 235 and 238.

Schoenberg responded with a collection of songs for soprano and woodwinds that encrypted the chemical make-up of the polonium-beryllium initiator at the core of the Trinity explosion.

And, in Japan, Toru Takemitsu took time-out from his own neo-Romanticism to transmit data via music of his nation's progress with the atom.

Composer Philip Glass in New York City says :

« The most curious thing about it is that musicians continued to write 12 tone music after the War, even though they had no idea why it was really invented. Indeed, there are guys who are churning-out serialism to this day. »

Unlike the diatonic music, which is based on scales that have been agreed upon by listeners throughout the world for all of history, 12 tone music treats each note of the chromatic scale with equal importance, and contains a built-in mathematical refusal to form chords that are pleasing by traditional standards. Known also as serialism, the style has

never been accepted outside of an elite cadre of musicians, who believe it is the only fresh and valid direction for post-Wagnerian Classical music to go.

« Even if this is really true » , states conductor Pierre Boulez, a composer who continues to utilize serial techniques, « the music has been vindicated by music-critics for decades now. I see no reason to suddenly invalidate an art form just because of some funny business at its inception. »

It may look like a news story and even read vaguely like one, but it in reality appears to be a smartly outline hoax. The style is too casual and opinionated, the facts are mostly wrong, and the scenario described is implausible.

What we have, rather, is a clever bit of satire which harps on an all-too-familiar point about modern art - that it's too cerebral and inaccessible, and perhaps isn't even art at all.

« Avant-garde » composers like Webern and Schœnberg are easy targets for such criticism. Their more challenging works have long been considered unlistenable by some, and the question : « Is it really music ? » has frequently been posed. It's but a small comedic leap to the suggestion that their methods were invented for some nefarious, non-musical purpose - say, transmitting scientific data to Nazi spies.

In part because it was never really intended to fool anyone (it's not that kind of hoax) , it's not hard to prove the story a fake. What follows is a short list of factual errors and logical inconsistencies. It's not exhaustive, but more than sufficient to debunk the central claims. Additions to the list are welcome ...

Although Anton von Webern was killed in the tragic manner described, the incident happened in Mittersill, Austria, not Berlin.

Klaus Fuchs spied for Russia, not Germany.

The Webern work alluded to, « Variations for Orchestra, Opus 30 » , was composed in 1940 - 2 years before the « Manhattan Project » began.

Japanese composer Toru Takemitsu could not have been privy to his country's nuclear secrets during World War II. He was all of 14 years old when Japan surrendered.

We are told that Anton von Webern and his comrades encoded data in their scores with help from the designers of « the Nazi Enigma code » . More accurately, « Enigma » was a machine, the most sophisticated cryptological tool of its time. In any case, we are asked to believe that the brilliant designers of this machine helped Webern encrypt messages that required nothing more than a cardboard template to decode.

According to the story, Klaus Fuchs was spying for the Nazis. If so, what was the strategic point of Webern passing secrets from Heisenberg, in Germany, to Fuchs, at the « Manhattan Project » ? Isn't that backwards ?

Why would Arnold Schönberg, a Jew who fled Nazi oppression in Germany, in 1933, spy for the 3rd « Reich » ? It's nonsensical. Furthermore, it's true that Schönberg was in America during the War, but he was teaching at UCLA throughout. How was he supposedly gaining access to top-secret information from Los Alamos ?

Composer Chris Hertzog has provided its own comments on the story :

« Hello, I'm a composer, and like most of my colleagues, immediately recognized the Webern forwarded “ news article ” as a humorous fraud. As someone who gets pissed-off at all the misinformation on the Web, I appreciate your dissection of the story. A few more tip-offs that something was wrong :

1) John Adams is quoted in the story as not understanding Schönberg's music, and implies that he hates it, an obvious falsehood to anyone familiar with Adams' work. Adams has described his own “ Chamber Symphony ” as a cross between Schönberg and cartoon music (and if you listen carefully, you can hear him quoting Schönberg tongue in cheek !) . In the most recent issue of “ Perspectives of New Music ” (the granddaddy of American new music magazines) , John Adams describes how his own Violin Concerto was influenced by Schönberg's Violin Concerto, a famous 12 tone composition. Also, as far as I know, Adams lives in San Francisco, not New England.

2) Schönberg's famous article on “ The method of composing with 12 tones ” was published in in the mid- 1920's (1925, I believe, although I have no proof of it in front of me) , years before the 3rd “ Reich ” came to power. His 1st works using this technique were written between 1920-1923. Recent scholarship has uncovered that “ avant-garde ” Russian composers such as Nikolai Roslavets developed 12 tone technique independently a decade before Schönberg, and the American composer Charles Ives experimented with 12 tone rows even earlier than that. 12 tone composition was one of those historical ideas that was in the air, at the time.

3) By showcasing “ avant-garde ” art and music in their famous “ Degenerate Art ” exhibit in the 1930's, the Nazis brought far more public attention to 12 tone music than had they simply ignored it. (Kinda like most Americans had never even heard of Robert Mapplethorpe or Andre Serrano or Karen Finley until the big NEA hoopla a few years back suddenly made them, or their artwork, household names) .

Ironically, the one 20th Century Viennese composer who is notorious for putting secret-codes into his music was not mentioned in this “ news story ” : Alban Berg. However, Berg's secret-codes were not military, but rather an obsessive-compulsive reworking into music of his unrequited (and adulterous) love for Hannah Fuchs-Robettin. The best-known example of this is in Berg's “ Lyric Suite ”, where different motives represent Berg and Fuchs. (As a composition professor once pointed-out to me, “ When Berg makes this movement 69 measures long - he really means 69 !! ”) See noted Berg scholar George Perle's “ The Secret Programme of the Lyric Suite ” in volume cxviii of “ The Musical Times ” (1977) . In the early- 1980's, Berg expert Douglas Jarman also discovered a multitude of Hannah Fuchs references in Berg's Violin Concerto, a work which was dedicated to Alma Mahler-Gropius's recently deceased daughter, and subtitled “ In memory of an angel ”. Turns-out, according to Jarman, that the Violin Concerto has a hidden program chock full of musical sublimation of Berg's blue balls for Hannah Fuchs. Jarman's argument is extremely convincing.

And, finally, in the truth is stranger than fiction department, an American composer, George Antheil, actually did patent a device for encoding guidance instructions for torpedoes in World War II. Even stranger, Hedy Lamarr was the co-author of this patent. It used piano-roll-like devices to rapidly switch frequencies so they could not be intercepted by enemies. Although the military never used Antheil's and Lamarr's patent during WWII, it is now considered to be the spiritual fore-runner of the multiple-frequency transmission and reception used in current cellular phone technology. »

...

The accidental killing of Anton von Webern was a pivotal moment in modern culture. Abstruse, obscure and painfully incapable of emotional expression, Webern had stepped outside to light an after-dinner cigar procured by his ex-SS son-in-law, on September 15th, 1945, when an American soldier fired 3 times into the dark in the occupied Austrian village of Mittersill. « I have been shot. » , said the composer, stumbling back indoors. « It is over. »

News of the tragedy was slow to travel and newsprint hard to come by. Months lapsed before any eulogy of Webern appeared in the musical press and when his 1st Cantata was posthumously premiered at an international Festival in London the following summer it was received with, at best, respectful bafflement for nothing in the music was benign or ingratiating.

Webern wrote in tight little aphorisms, applying Arnold Schœnberg's 12 note method of composition with fanatical rigour to such random variables as rhythm, intervals and dynamic levels of loud and soft. Inspiration was anathema to Webern. All had to be strictly counted and numerically correct. If pleasure entered the process, it was the solitary satisfaction of making a line read the same forwards, backwards and upside-down. Inverted by nature, Webern wrote music that turned-in upon itself, rejecting every human value except absolute order.

To composers coming of age in post-War Europe, he was the perfect hero and patron saint : a composer who liquidated the cultural past with a clinical solution, his death an act of martyrdom. Pierre Boulez, in France, revered him above Schœnberg. Karlheinz Stockhausen, in Germany, claimed the discovery of Webern as his « greatest musical experience » . In the 2nd half of the 20th Century, Webern defined and dominated modernity in music as Pablo Picasso had done in painting and Joyce in English literature.

No composer has ever achieved so much influence with so little music. Every note he wrote, played end to end, lasts little more than 5 hours and BBC Radio 3 will tax the forbearance of many of its 2 million listeners when, on the anniversary of his death, it devotes a whole day to Webern and his music.

None of it is easy on the ear. It took Webern 4 years of study with Schœnberg in Vienna before he scratched-out his 1st Opus in 1908, a 12 minute « Passacaglia for Orchestra » . In a tediously discursive era, brevity was his distinguishing feature. His only Symphony is 10 minutes long, his String Quartet, 8. Concise as they are, his music requires unblinking concentration from the listener through a trail of disjointed plinks and energy spikes. The reward is neither instant nor necessarily sensual - which explains why Webern is the least loved of all great composers and

the one held most to blame for alienating audiences from contemporary music.

His impact is unmistakable. When the Hollywood director William Friedkin went searching for the scariest music on earth for his 1973 movie « The Exorcist », it was Webern that chilled his marrow, choosing the « 5 Pieces for Orchestra » to stalk the realm between known and unknown after a tranquilising burst of Mike Oldfield's « Tubular Bells »).

Webern seemed to know no fear. The music he wrote was logical in the extreme, irrefutably superior to Romantic improvisation, as much science as it was art.

He was, by all accounts, an odd man, a scion of Austrian nobility who married his 1st cousin and shrank from close relationships. Prone to wild rages and long silences, he may have been clinically depressed for much of his life and suffered a public breakdown when, at a 1936 Festival in Barcelona, he refused to come-out of his dressing-room for the world-premiere of Alban Berg's Violin Concerto. Berg's widow had to go down on her knees and beg him to relinquish the score to another musician.

Although a capable conductor, he never settled in a proper job and, apart from a few BBC dates in London, gave most of his concerts with a « Workers Orchestra », in Vienna. When the Nazis took-over Austria, in 1938, Webern found himself on the list of the banned, demonised for « decadence » and prohibited from publication and performance. Despite official opprobrium, he embraced Nazism with naive enthusiasm, cheering Adolf Hitler's victories and justifying his racial purities while, in the same breath and at risk of arrest, decrying the enforced exile of his teacher, Schönberg, and the extirpation of modern art.

This bizarre dichotomy has led some interpreters to depict Webern as the mad-scientist of music, a boffin who, in the grim finality of the 3rd « Reich », found compositional uplift in the ethereal vocal canons of the medieval Court composer Heinrich Isaac. Weakened by conscripted labour and mourning his only son, who was killed at the front, Webern fled Vienna to his in-laws' mountain village, where he fell sick with dysentery. He weighed just 50 kilos when he was shot, aged 61, by a U.S. army cook who was so consumed with remorse that he died exactly a decade later, irredeemably alcoholic.

In the modernist trinity with Schönberg and Berg, Webern was the fundamentalist, the doctrinaire apostle who would never bend a rule or borrow a tune for the sake of beauty but who, in rigorous application of the law, achieved the clarity of morning air and mountain streams. To Igor Stravinsky, who switched from neo-Classicism to Webern's serialism in the early 1950's, his works were « dazzling diamonds » an organic resource perfected by human hands. To Pierre Boulez and Karlheinz Stockhausen, they amounted to an epiphanic revelation that structure in music arises from the order in which notes and intervals are used.

What strikes the innocent ear in Webern, after initial dismay and confusion, is the frozen moment of perfect sound. Listen on, and you enter a world like no other : obsessive, self-contained, episodically celestial.

Scan the entire canon, from the « Passacaglia » to the posthumously published piano pieces, and you will not find one weak work of Webern's, or one that fails immediately to proclaim its authorship. In the history of western music, that statement is true only of Beethoven and Wagner. It is time to recognize Webern by the same measure, as a maker of the modern world and a sanctuary from its pressures.

Controverses entourant Wagner

The German composer Richard Wagner was a controversial figure during his lifetime, and has continued to be so after his death. Even today, he is associated in the minds of many with Nazism and his Operas are often thought to extol the virtues of German nationalism. The writer and Wagner scholar Bryan Magee has written :

« I sometimes think there are 2 Wagners in our culture, almost unrecognizably different from one another : the Wagner possessed by those who know his work, and the Wagner imagined by those who know him only by name and reputation. »

Most of these perceptions arise from Wagner's published opinions on a number of topics. Wagner was a voluminous writer and published essays and pamphlets on a wide-range of subjects throughout his life. Wagner's writing style is verbose, unclear and turgid, which has greatly added to the confusion about his opinions. Several of his writings have achieved some notoriety, in particular his essay, « Das Judentum in der Musik » (Jewishness in Music) , a critical view on the influence of Jews in German culture and society at that time. The essays he wrote, in his final years, were also controversial, with many readers perceiving them to employ an endorsement of racist beliefs. Some commentators also believe that some of Richard Wagner's Operas contain adverse caricatures of Jews.

Wagner was promoted during the Nazi era as one of Adolf Hitler's favourite composers. Historical perception of Wagner has been tainted with this association ever since, and there is debate over how Wagner's writings and Operas might have influenced the creation of Nazi Germany.

Finally, there is controversy over Wagner's paternity. It is suggested that he was the son of Ludwig Geyer, rather than his legal father Carl Friedrich Wagner, and some of his biographers have proposed that Wagner himself believed that Geyer was Jewish.

Paternité

(Image) Caricature, entitled « Darwinian Evolution » , by T. Zajacskowski in the Viennese satirical magazine, « Der Floh » , circa 1875. The suggestion is that Richard Wagner descends from the orthodox Jew (left) who is holding a shofar, while Wagner wields a baton.

Richard Wagner was born on May 22, 1813, the 9th child of Carl Friedrich Wagner, a clerk in the Leipzig police service, and Johanna Rosine Wagner. Wagner's father died of typhus 6 months after Richard's birth, by which time Wagner's mother was living with the actor and playwright Ludwig Geyer, in the Brühl, at that time the Jewish quarter

of Leipzig. Johanna and Geyer married in August 1814, and for the first 14 years of his life, Wagner was known as Wilhelm Richard Geyer. Wagner, in his later years, discovered letters from Geyer to his mother which led him to suspect that Geyer was, in fact, his biological father and, furthermore, speculated that Geyer was Jewish. According to Cosima's diaries (26 December 1868) Wagner "did not believe" that Ludwig Geyer was his real father. At the same time, Cosima noted a resemblance between Wagner's son Siegfried and Geyer. The philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche was one of Wagner's closest acolytes, and proof read Wagner's autobiography « Mein Leben ». It may have been this closeness that led Nietzsche to claim, in his 1888 book, « Der Fall Wagner » (The Case of Wagner), that Wagner's father was Geyer, and to make the pun that, « Ein Geyer ist beinahe schon ein Adler. » (A vulture is almost an eagle.) , Geyer also being the German word for a vulture and Adler being a very common Jewish surname. Despite these conjectures on the part of Wagner and Nietzsche, there is no evidence that Geyer was Jewish, and the question of Wagner's paternity is unlikely to be settled without DNA evidence.

Antisémitisme

Prior to 1850, there is no record of Wagner expressing any particular anti-Semitic sentiment. However, as he struggled to develop his career, he began to resent the success of Jewish composers such as Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and Giacomo Meyerbeer and blamed them for his lack of success, particularly, after his stay in Paris, in 1840-1841, when he was impoverished and reduced to music copy editing. Ironically, at the same time, Wagner did have considerable contact with Meyerbeer, who loaned him money and used his influence to arrange for the premiere of the Opera « Rienzi », Wagner's first successful Opera in Dresden, in 1842 ; Meyerbeer later expressed hurt and bewilderment over Wagner's written abuse of him, his works, and his faith. Wagner's first and most controversial essay on the subject was « Das Judentum in der Musik » (Jewishness in Music), originally published under the pen name K. Freigedank (K. Freethought), in 1850, in the « Neue Zeitschrift für Musik ». In a previous issue, Theodor Uhlig had attacked the success in Paris of Meyerbeer's Opera « Le prophète », and Wagner's essay expanded this to an attack on supposed « Jewishness » in all German art. The essay purported to explain popular dislike of Jewish composers, in particular Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer, who is not mentioned by name but is clearly a target. Wagner wrote that the German people were repelled by Jews due to their « alien » appearance and behaviour :

« With all our speaking and writing in favour of the Jews emancipation, we always felt instinctively repelled by any actual, operative contact with them. »

He argued that Jewish musicians were only capable of producing music that was shallow and artificial, because they had no connection to the genuine spirit of the German people.

In the conclusion to the essay, he wrote of the Jews that, « only one thing can redeem you from the burden of your curse : the redemption of Ahasuerus going under ! ». Although, this has been taken by some commentators to mean actual physical annihilation, in the context of the essay it seems to refer only to the eradication of Jewish separateness and traditions. Wagner advises Jews to follow the example of Ludwig Börne by abandoning Judaism. In this way, Jews will take part in « this regenerative work of deliverance through self annulment ; then, are we one and undis severed ! ». Wagner was, therefore, calling for the assimilation of Jews into mainstream German culture and society ; although,

there can be little doubt, from the words he uses in the essay, that this call was prompted at least as much by anti-semitism as by a desire for social amelioration. (In the very 1st publication, the word here translated as « self annulment » was represented by the phrase : « self annihilating, bloody struggle » .

The initial publication of the article attracted little attention, but Wagner wrote a self justifying letter about it to Franz Liszt, in 1851, claiming that his « long suppressed resentment against this Jewish business » was « as necessary to me as gall is to the blood » . Wagner republished the pamphlet under his own name, in 1869, with an extended introduction, leading to several public protests at the 1st performances of « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » . Wagner repeated similar views in later articles, such as « What is German ? » (1878, but based on a draft written in the 1860's) , and Cosima Wagner's diaries often recorded his comments about « Jews » . Although, many have argued that his aim was to promote the integration of Jews into society by suppressing their Jewishness, others have interpreted the final words of the 1850 pamphlet (suggesting the solution of an « Untergang » for the Jews, an ambiguous word, literally « decline » or « downfall » but which can also mean « sinking » or « going to a doom ») as meaning that Wagner wished the Jewish people to be destroyed.

Some biographers, such as Theodor W. Adorno and Robert Gutman, have advanced the claim that Wagner's opposition to Jews was not limited to his articles, and that the Operas contained such messages. In particular, the characters of Mime in the « Ring » , Klingsor in « Parsifal » and Sixtus Beckmesser in « Die Meistersinger » are supposedly Jewish stereotypes, although none of them are identified as Jews in the libretto. Such claims are disputed. Wagner, over the course of his life, produced a huge amount of written material analyzing every aspect of himself, including his Operas and his views on Jews (as well as many other topics) ; these purportedly « Jewish » characterizations messages are never mentioned, nor are there any such references in Cosima Wagner's copious diaries.

Despite his published views on Jewishness, Wagner maintained Jewish friends and colleagues throughout his life. One of the most notable of these was conductor Hermann Levi, a practising Jew and son of a Rabbi, whose talent was freely acknowledged by Wagner. Levi's position as « Kapellmeister » in Munich meant that he was to conduct the premiere of « Parsifal » , Wagner's last Opera. Wagner initially objected to this and was quoted as saying that Levi should be baptized before conducting « Parsifal » . Levi, however, held Wagner in adulation, and was asked to be a pallbearer at the composer's funeral.

Racisme

Some biographers have asserted that Wagner, in his final years, came to believe in the Aryanist philosophy of Arthur de Gobineau. However, the influence of Gobineau on Wagner's thought is debated. Wagner was 1st introduced to Gobineau in person, in Rome, on November 1876. The 2 did not cross paths again until 1880, well after Wagner had completed the libretto for « Parsifal » , the Opera most often accused of containing racist ideology. Although, Gobineau's « An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races » was written 25 years earlier, it seems that Wagner did not read it until October 1880. There is evidence to suggest that Wagner was very interested in Gobineau's idea that Western society was doomed because of miscegenation between « superior » and « inferior » races. However, he does not seem to have subscribed to any belief in the superiority of the supposed Germanic or « Nordic race » .

Richard Wagner's conversations with Gobineau during the philosopher's 5 week stay at Wahnfried, in 1881, were punctuated with frequent arguments. Cosima Wagner's diary entry for June 3 recounts one exchange in which Wagner « positively exploded in favour of Christianity as compared to racial theory ». Gobineau also believed that, in order to have musical ability, one must have black ancestry.

Wagner subsequently wrote 3 essays in response to Gobineau's ideas : « Introduction to a Work » of Count Gobineau, « Know Thyself », and « Heroism and Christianity » (all in 1881) . The « Introduction » is a short piece written for the « Bayreuther Blätter » in which Wagner praises the Count's book :

« We asked Count Gobineau, returned from weary, knowledge laden wanderings among far distant lands and peoples, what he thought of the present aspect of the world ; today, we give his answer to our readers. He, too, had peered into an Inner : he proved the blood in modern manhood's veins, and found it tainted past all healing. »

In « Know Thyself », Wagner deals with the German people, whom Gobineau believes are the « superior » Aryan race. Wagner, in fact, rejects the notion that the Germans are a race at all, and further proposes that we should look past the notion of race to focus on the human qualities (« das Reinmenschliche ») common to all of us. In « Heroism and Christianity », Wagner proposes that Christianity could function to provide a moral harmonization of all races, preferable to the physical unification of races by miscegenation :

« Incomparably fewer in individual numbers than the lower races, the ruin of the white races may be referred to their having been obliged to mix with them ; whereby, as remarked already, they suffered more from the loss of their purity than the others could gain by the ennobling of their blood. To us, Equality is only thinkable as based upon a universal moral concord, such as we can but deem true Christianity elect to bring about. »

Wagner's concerns over miscegenation occupied him until the very end of his life ; he was in the process of writing another essay, « On the Womanly in the Human Race » (1883) , at the time of his death, in which he discusses the role of marriage in the creation of races :

« It is certain that the noblest white race is monogamic at its 1st appearance in saga and history, but marches toward its downfall through polygamy with the races which it conquers. »

Wagner's son-in-law, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, expanded on Wagner and Gobineau's ideas in his 1899 book, « The Foundations of the 19th Century », a racist work extolling the Aryan ideal that later strongly influenced Adolf Hitler's ideas on race.

Appropriation nazie

About the time of Wagner's death, European nationalist movements were losing the Romantic, idealistic egalitarianism of 1848, and acquiring tints of militarism and aggression, due in no small part to Bismarck's take-over and unification

of Germany, in 1871. After Wagner's death, in 1883, Bayreuth increasingly became a focus for German nationalists attracted by the mythos of the Operas, who have been referred to by latter commentators as « The Bayreuth Circle » . This group was endorsed by Cosima Wagner, whose anti-semitism was considerably less complex and more virulent than Richard's. One of the Circle was Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the author of a number of « philosophic » tracts which later became required Nazi reading. Chamberlain married Wagner's daughter, Eva. After the deaths of Cosima and Siegfried Wagner, in 1930, the operation of the Festival fell to Siegfried's widow, English born Winifred, who was a personal friend of Adolf Hitler. Hitler was a fanatical admirer of Wagner's music, and sought to incorporate it into his heroic mythology of the German nation. Hitler held many of Wagner's original scores in his Berlin bunker, at the end of World War II, despite the pleadings of Wieland Wagner to have these important documents put in his care ; the scores perished with Hitler, in the final days of the War.

Many scholars have argued that Wagner's views, particularly his anti-semitism and purported Aryan-Germanic racism, influenced the Nazis. These claims are disputed. Recent studies suggest that there is no evidence that Hitler even read any of Wagner's writings and further argue that Wagner's works do not inherently support Nazi notions of heroism. During the Nazi regime, « Parsifal » was denounced as being « ideologically unacceptable » and the Opera was not performed at Bayreuth, during the War years. It has been suggested that a « de facto » ban had been placed on « Parsifal » , by the Nazis. However, there were 23 performances at the « Deutsche Oper Berlin » , between 1939 and 1942, which suggests that no formal ban was in place.

The Nazi fascination with Wagner was largely inspired by Hitler, sometimes to the dismay of other high ranking Nazi officials, including Josef Goebbels. In 1933, for instance, Hitler ordered that each Nuremberg Rally open with a performance of the « Die Meistersinger » Overture, and he even issued 1,000 free tickets to Nazi functionaries. When Hitler entered the theater, however, he discovered that it was almost empty. The following year, those functionaries were ordered to attend, but they could be seen dozing off during the performance so that, in 1935, Hitler conceded and released the tickets to the public.

In general, while Wagner's music was often performed during the 3rd « Reich » , his popularity actually declined in Germany in favor of Italian composers such as Giuseppe Verdi and Giacomo Puccini. By the 1938-1939 season, Wagner had only 1 Opera in the list of 15 most popular Operas of the season, with the list headed by Italian composer Ruggero Leoncavallo's « Pagliacci » . Ironically, according to Albert Speer, the Berlin Philharmonic's last performance before their evacuation from Berlin at the end of World War II was of Brünnhilde's immolation scene at the end of « Götterdämmerung » .

As part of the regime's propaganda intentions of « Nazifying » German culture, specific attempts were made to appropriate Wagner's music as « Nazi » and pseudo academic articles appeared such as Paul Bulow's « Adolf Hitler and the Bayreuth Ideological Circle » (« Zeitschrift für Musik » , July 1933) . Such articles were Nazi attempts to rewrite history to demonstrate that Hitler was integral to German culture.

There is evidence that music of Wagner was used at the Dachau concentration camp, in 1933-1934, to « re-educate » political prisoners by exposure to « national music » . However, there seems to be no documentation to support

claims sometimes made that his music was played at Nazi death camps.

La musique de Wagner en Israël

Wagner's Operas have never been staged in the modern State of Israel, and the few public instrumental performances that have occurred have provoked much controversy.

Despite Wagner's known writings against Jews, there was no opposition to his music in the early Zionist movement and its founders ; Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, was an avid admirer of Wagner's music. The Palestine Orchestra, founded in 1936 by Bronisław Huberman in what is now the State of Israel (and which became the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra) , « during its 1st 2 years programmed several works by Richard Wagner who was recognized as one of the great Western composers despite the well-known fact that he had been a fanatical anti-Semite » . However, the Orchestra banished his works from its repertoire after « Kristallnacht » , in 1938 (to be followed, shortly after, by the exclusion of works of Richard Strauß) .

Because of Wagner's anti-Semitic ideas and the association of his works with Nazism, Wagner's music was not performed publicly in the modern State of Israel, until 2000. Although, his works are broadcast on Israeli government owned radio and television stations, attempts to stage public performances in Israel have raised protests in the past, including protests from Holocaust survivors. In 1981, conductor Zubin Mehta, as an encore at an orchestral concert on Tel-Aviv, proposed to play extracts from « Tristan und Isolde » , offering those who wished (including 2 members of the Orchestra who had asked to be excused) the opportunity to leave. Despite a few vocal protests, most of the audience stayed to the end of the piece. In 1992, conductor Daniel Barenboim programmed works by Wagner at a concert of the Israel Philharmonic, but this was cancelled after protests, although a rehearsal was opened to the public. The 1st documented public Israeli Wagner concerts were in 2000, when the Holocaust survivor Mendi Rodan conducted the « Siegfried Idyll » in Rishon LeZion, and, in August 2001, when a concert conducted by Daniel Barenboim in Tel Aviv included as an encore an extract from « Tristan und Isolde » , which divided the audience between applause and protest. A concert with works by Wagner was announced for 18 June 2012, in Tel Aviv ; however, these plans were abandoned after protests.

Wagner était-il juif ?

The music of Richard Wagner is constantly being heard, on recordings, on radio, and live in the theatre. International groupies travel the world in pursuit of live performances of his Opera cycle, « The Ring of the Nibelung » . This constant exposure is due to the intrinsic appeal of the music, the craft employed in its orchestration, the effectiveness of his Operas as music theatre, and its consequently usefulness to music organisations who can always rely on performances of Wagner's music to bring financial reward. Another consequence of this exposure, is that Wagner also remains a controversial figure, not because of his music, but because of its political associations with the Nazis before and during World War II, and also because of Wagner's own anti-Semitic writings in pamphlets published during his lifetime.

If your initial approach to Wagner is through his music, it then comes as a great shock to read his anti-Semitic rantings, mainly in his infamous tract « Judaism in Music », written in 1850, to which he wrote an appendix, in 1869. Although couched in the form of musical critique, there are passages in the text which overstep the bounds of artistic comment, and which can only be described as personal abuse. What is even more disturbing is that, in their emotive and irrational aspects, Wagner's prose reads like a prototype of later Nazi propaganda.

The ban on public performances of his music in Israel gives rise, from time to time, to articles and letters on the topic in mainstream papers here in Australia, no doubt as elsewhere, reviving the « Wagner controversy ». One correspondent, here in Sydney, Australia, pointed-out that the ban is informal, rather than mandatory, and is maintained out of respect to the survivors of the Holocaust who were subjected to Wagner's music heard constantly on radio, at public rallies, and also, most offensively, in concentration camps. This same correspondent also pointed-out that the ban does not extend to recordings of Wagner's music, which are available in record stores, as they are in all democratic countries.

As a composer, I find all of this troubling, since the music of Wagner as is inescapable as the music of other musical geniuses of the 19th Century, and to ignore it totally is to ignore not only the music itself, but the seminal changes which Wagner wrought in the nature of music, its composition and its performance.

To compound the irony, Wagner's influence is to be found in the work of many fine Jewish composers of the early 20th Century, including those who suffered persecution under the Nazis, and whose work is currently being re-discovered, performed and recorded, notably in the Decca Records « Entartete Musik » series. Wagner's influence is also to be heard in the work of the many accomplished Jewish composers who escaped from Europe, many of whom went to America to work in Hollywood, in the film industry. Wagner effectively « invented » many of the devices which found pertinent application in the creation of the great Symphonic film scores of the 1930's, and the decades following. The controversy is not going to die quietly, and, as part of my own process of coming to terms with Wagner, I wish to explore further aspects of the various issues which arise in considering the place of Wagner's music in world culture.

One aspect of Wagner's life keeps being mentioned, in passing, by writers and commentators, but it is always in passing, often literally in a footnote by biographers, and I have come to think that it deserves much more serious attention. The question arises : « Was Wagner Jewish ? ». Or, to be more accurate in terms of the facts, « Did Wagner think he might be Jewish ? ». Or, to be even more specific, « Did Wagner think he might be of Jewish descent ? ». From which arises the even more germane question, « Was Wagner afraid that he might be thought to be Jewish ? ». While the probable answer to the latter question is « Yes », a definite answer to questions relating to his parentage could only be provided by conducting a DNA testing, were this possible, on both Wagner himself, and his step-father, the successful actor and painter Ludwig Geyer (or on their descendants ?) .

Here again, the psychological issue is still not whether Wagner was of Jewish descent, but whether or not Wagner thought he might be, since writers differ on the question of whether or not Geyer himself was Jewish. British writer James Beswick Whitehead, with whom I have discussed the matter, writes :

« Wagner's possible Jewish ancestry would be a delicious irony. It certainly appears more than likely that Geyer was his father but was Geyer Jewish ? »

John Chancellor, in his 1978 biography of the composer, states bluntly that he was not :

« He could claim the same sturdy descent as the Wagners. His pedigree also went back to the middle of the 17th Century and his forefathers were also, for the most part, organists in small Thuringian towns and villages. »

Chancellor blames Friedrich Nietzsche for raising the question of Geyer's Judaism as an extra-seasoning to his charge of illegitimacy, when he had fallen-out with Wagner. But, in his book, « Wagner and Nietzsche » , Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau appears to accept that Geyer was Jewish. The famous singer draws on Robert Gutman to suggest that Richard and Cosima egged each other on in their anti-Semitism, because both had Jewish roots to deny. Cosima was the daughter of Liszt and the Comtesse d'Agoult whose maternal grandfather was a Jewish banker from Frankfurt.

(Cosima's 1st husband was the conductor Hans von Bülow, whom she married in 1857 and with whom she had 2 daughters, Daniela and Blandine. She left him for Richard Wagner in 1864, and bore Wagner 3 children, Isolde, Eva and Siegfried, before marrying him in 1870.)

There does seem to be agreement, however, that Wagner himself had doubts about his own parentage, and from this doubt 2 factors emerge which would have had a profound influence on Wagner's development. The 1st factor is the effect of his doubts about paternity. The 2nd factor is the nature of that paternity.

The 1st factor, doubt about paternity, has been explored in some depth in the case of George Bernard Shaw, whose situation was very similar to Wagner's. The man who became his step-father, and who was probably his biological father, Vandeleur Lee, was also, like Geyer, a man of the theatre, who married Shaw's mother very soon after the death of Shaw's putative and legally registered father, George Carr Shaw, an alcoholic who was unable to provide adequate material support for his family. For some years, Lee undertook this task himself. Shaw never resolved the issue in his own mind, because it was an issue which involved a moral question pertaining to his own mother, and it is thought that this unspoken mystery deeply influenced the pattern of Shaw's relationships with women throughout his life. The matter is fully explored in Michaël Holroyd's 1988 biography on George Bernard Shaw. But no biography has provided an equivalent exploration of the almost identical family drama which dominated in Wagner's early life, which must have been equally influential in forming his character.

Coincidentally, Shaw himself was an ardent supporter of Wagner, and wrote a pamphlet titled, « The Perfect Wagnerite » , in which he interpreted « The Ring of the Nibelung » as a critique of capitalism. He also analysed Wagner's debt to the philosopher Schopenhauer, who was, by profession, a merchant, described by some as a banker : which would explain his pessimistic view of life as summed-up by the aphorism :

« All life is a debt. We spend our lives paying interest. The capital is repaid on death. »

Those familiar with a persistent theme in Wagner's libretti, will recognise a Romanticised version of this philosophy in his metaphysical poetry exalting death as the ultimate fulfilment of love, a concept which reached its apogee in the libretto of « Tristan und Isolde » .

But Shaw also recognized the inconsistencies in Wagner's character and wrote :

« Wagner was not a Schopenhaurite every day of the week, nor even a Wagnerite. His mind changes as often as his mood. Wagner can be quoted against himself almost without limit, much as Beethoven's Adagios could be quoted against his Scherzos if a dispute arose between 2 fools as to whether he was a melancholy man or a merry one. »

Dating from 1908, this quip is a typical Shaw sally, making light of a serious issue to draw attention to it. To what extent does Wagner's unpredictable nature and its bewildering inconsistencies of behaviour apply to his anti-Semitism ? And how much of this can be attributed to the 2nd factor arising from his doubts about his own paternity, in relation to his having spent his childhood bearing the name Geyer ?

Let us look at both sides of the coin. It is true that Wagner's anti-Semitic rhetoric in his article « Judaism in Music » , written in 1850, is pernicious ; but it is also true that that its generalities were a mask to disguise its true specific purpose which was to attack Istly the Jewish composer Giacomo Meyerbeer, and later, in an appendix added in 1869, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. This was an ignoble way to return Meyerbeer's earlier attempts to assist Wagner's career in Paris, which correspondence of the time suggests were sincere ; but Wagner later felt that these attempts were only token gestures, since they did not bear fruit : and his failure to advance his career in Paris was a deeply felt humiliation. (Meyerbeer did, however, assist in arranging the premiere of Wagner's Opera « Rienzi » in Dresden, on 20 October 1842.)

In the 2nd diatribe, Wagner also delivered a slightly muted attack on Mendelssohn, calling him technically clever, and good at evoking « nature » , but lacking « depth » . I can recall this charge still being levelled against Mendelssohn until as late as the 1960's. Anyone who is sensitive to Mendelssohn's music knows that this is nonsense, and I only recently realized that the slur originated with Wagner, which is why we can discount it. Wagner's attack was tactical. He was trying to create a « place » for himself by attacking others - alas, a « normal » if odious tactic in the arts, still practised widely in Australia today, and which would be thought trivial in Wagner's case, were it not for the political context in which the attack was made.

The attacks were a preparation on Wagner's part, to carve-out a politically correct role for himself as a German nationalist, writing music to this agenda, as distinct from (what he described as being) the synthetic, non-nationalist kind of music favoured by Jewish composers. As pointed-out in the recent Thames & Hudson publication, « The Wagner Compendium » (2001, Edition Barry Millington) , there is some basis for Wagner's thesis, but the characteristic he condemned is not necessarily a bad one, and there is no question that Wagner was being mischievous by deriding what we describe today as an element of cultural « fusion » in music. Indeed, the ability to treat all ethnic musics with impartial interest, and to absorb their elements into original works of art music, and to create a new synthesis

from disparate elements, as Mendelssohn did, is basic to the craft of composition ; and, because of their exceptional ability in this regard, Jewish composers have been at the forefront of most advances in music in the 20th Century. This is clearly so from the avant-garde of the New Viennese School which pioneered the use of atonality, to the adaptation of jazz to popular music, and its use in film music.

Ironically, Wagner's music, in its time, offered a paradigm for this kind of evolution in his chosen area of work, music theatre, and among Jewish composers of the 1930's successfully applying his techniques in Opera were Franz Schreker, Irwin Schulhoff and, before he settled in America, Erich Wolfgang Korngold. The Nazis condemned atonality and jazz as degenerate, but they could do nothing to prevent the flowering of Jewish musical talent in the area of music for film by a generation of Jewish composers, referred to above, who fled persecution in Europe to settle and find work in Hollywood. I personally consider their contribution to 20th Century music to have been as significant as any other development in the evolution of music and it is again ironic that many of the techniques they used for this new form of music theatre called cinema, were based on Wagnerian theory and practise.

Let us now look at the other side of the coin, for it is also true that Wagner's anti-Semitic rhetoric was not matched by his behaviour. The Nazis denied Jewish musicians employment, imprisoned and killed them, but Wagner employed them in high-positions of trust at Bayreuth. It is true that he made a nuisance of himself trying to convert them to Christianity, but it is also true that he inspired, in his colleagues, a degree of professional dedication unusual in the performing arts in any period. Conductor Hermann Levi, in letters to his father, a chief rabbi in the town of Giessen, writes of his time preparing for the 1st Bayreuth Festival :

« Wagner is the best and noblest of men. I thank God daily for the privilege to be close to such a man. It is the most beautiful experience of my life. » . (April 1882.)

« The Wagners are so good to me that I am quite touched. I arrived here on June 12th and, from that day until July 1st, I have lunched and dined every day at Wahnfried. Frequently, I called at 12 noon and left only at midnight. » (July 1882.)

« I refuse even to consider whether I deserve an order or any other kind of recognition for “ Parsifal ” . As for my “ prestige ” , I have plenty of that and I feel that I am far too well off as it is. Moreover, I have no idea what they could give me. The Order of merit is the appropriate award of the Bavarian Crown, but that might be rather awkward, considering my name is Levi. » (November 1882.)

As is widely acknowledged, anti-Semitism was ubiquitous in Europe at that, or any time, but it was not an attitude encouraged by the current wearer of the Bavarian Crown. Ludwig II wrote to Wagner :

« It is good, beloved friend, that you are not going to discriminate between Gentiles and Jews when it comes to performing your exalted, sacred work (“ Parsifal ”) . Nothing is more odious, more disagreeable than such antagonism. Whatever our religions may be, fundamentally, we are all human beings and as such we are brothers, are we not ? » (October 1881.)

It is true that some of Wagner's descendants consorted with the Nazis, and that one of the architects of racial theory, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, married into the Wagner family. But not all Wagners collaborated with racists, then or now. Wagner's son, Siegfried, also a composer, who died in 1930, refused a request to bar Jewish patrons and artists from Bayreuth. Writing in 1921, he reasoned thus :

« We have a great number of loyal, honest and unselfish Jewish friends. They have frequently given us proof of their devotion. You demand that we should turn all these people from our doors for no other reason than that they are Jews ? Is that human ? Is that Christian ? Is that German ? Oh, no ! If we were really to consider such action, we Germans would first of all have to turn into quite different people. It is a matter of complete indifference to us whether a human being is a Chinese, a Negro, an American, a Red Indian or a Jew. But we could well take lessons from the Jews in solidarity and in helping one another. If the Jews are willing to support us, they deserve our particular appreciation, for my father attacked and offended them in his writings. They are entitled to hate Bayreuth, and, yet, many of them revere my father's works with genuine enthusiasm, in spite of his attacks on them. »

As I mentioned earlier, the Wagner problem only arises for the period following the horrors of World War II, because his music has consistently made money for musicians and music institutions world-wide. If his work had sunk into obscurity because of disinterest, there would be no controversy. But because it is such a money spinner for the entire music industry, he had to be re-instated, and this was achieved, initially, by attempts to whitewash his character, and downplay his politics. These attempts are still being made, and they are regrettable because truth is always more edifying than evasion, and repression of fact obscures other issues which merit attention : issues besides the uncomfortable fact of Richard Wagner's persistent indulgence in anti-Semitic rhetoric during his lifetime.

In passing, it must be said that Wagner, generally, found stress relief in vociferous complaint, and few targets escaped attack, including Germany itself. In a letter to Franz Liszt, of September 1860, he wrote :

« It is with horror that I contemplate Germany and my plans for the future there. May God forgive me, but all I can see in Germany is small-mindedness, boorish behaviour, pretence and arrogance. Believe me, Franz, we have no Fatherland ! If I am a German, it is because Germany lives within me. »

And so we return to the question : « Was Wagner Jewish ? » . The most interesting and least explored aspect of Richard Wagner's character lies in his relationship to his stepfather, the painter and actor Ludwig Geyer, from whom he acquired his love of theatre. Various commentators have affirmed that Wagner himself had doubts about his own paternity, but, as I have pointed-out, none have explicitly explored the obvious inference, that he may have suspected that he was partly of Jewish descent, through Geyer, whose affair with Wagner's mother pre-dated the death of Wagner's presumed father, Friedrich Wagner, a Police Registrar, who was ill at the time young Richard was conceived, and who died 6 months after his birth. Soon after this, Wagner's mother, Johanna, married Ludwig Geyer. Richard Wagner himself, I have read, was known as Richard Geyer until, at the age of 14, he had his name legally changed to Wagner. He had apparently taken some abuse at school because of his name and it has always seemed to me that his later anti-Semitism may have been motivated, at least in part, by sensitivity to this abuse, and by a kind pre-emptive

denial to prevent difficulties and suffering arising from prejudice.

Christian hostility to Jews throughout the Centuries was only modified when Jews consented to convert to Christianity, and the history of music abounds in cases where musicians have had to convert in order to be able to earn a living. Closer to our own time, Gustav Mahler had to convert in order to secure employment as a conductor at the Vienna Opera. The entire Mendelssohn family also converted and, before them, the entire family of Mozart's great librettist, Lorenzo da Ponte. Da Ponte was a picaresque individual, a notorious philanderer and adventurer, from Venice originally, where his Jewish father had converted to Christianity and been baptised together with his 3 sons. In a wonderful instance of pragmatism, they all took the surname of the Bishop who performed the ceremony.

In allowing performances of Mozart Operas, the Nazis conveniently overlooked the fact that most of Mozart's libretti were written by a Jew, though the facts of Da Ponte's heritage cannot have been unknown to them. In contrast, they were less lenient in their treatment of a living Jewish writer, Stefan Zweig, whom Richard Strauß initially chose as his 2nd Opera librettist following the death of the Austrian poet Hugo von Hoffmanstahl, with whom he had had a long and fruitful collaboration. Josef Gœbbels allowed only one performance the Opera Strauß wrote to Zweig's libretto « Die Schweigsame Frau » , and then blocked further partnership, forbidding Strauß to give employment to a Jew. A letter from Strauß to Zweig criticising Gœbbels' « interference » was intercepted by the authorities. Zweig escaped to Switzerland, and Strauß was obliged to work thereafter with the dull and unimaginative, but impeccably Aryan cultural historian Joseph Gregor. None of the Operas Strauß wrote during World War II have stayed in the repertoire except « Capriccio » , for which he ended-up writing the libretto himself, with conductor Clemens Krauß, because Gregor's work on the idea was too plodding ! The whole tangled story is well told in a biography of Strauß by Matthew Boyden (Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1999) .

The Nazis overlooked Strauß's politically incorrect indiscretions because his international fame made him a useful cultural ambassador for the 3rd « Reich » . In passing, it must be said that their selective application of prejudice does give some support to the thesis that the Holocaust was, in essence, organized theft, to which racial hatred gave a rationale. When convenient, the rationale was forgotten, or at least, set aside. A bizarre offer made to the Jewish composer Emmerich Kalman provides a case in point. Adolf Hitler himself admired the Operettas of Kalman, and, in 1936, shortly after the « Anchluss » of Austria, conveyed an offer to the composer to make him an honorary Aryan. The offer was delivered by a general of the 3rd « Reich » who, in reply to Kalman's understandable concern about its genuineness replied : « I will guarantee it with my life. » . To which Kalman replied : « But who will guarantee your life ? » . Immediately following this incident, Kalman and his family hastily left Vienna for their native Hungary, where they were issued with Hungarian passports and travel visas. This enabled a trans-European exit, via Paris, to the United States. Shortly thereafter, the production of Kalman's works in the Greater « Reich » were forbidden, as had been the performance generally of works by Jewish composers since the advent to power of the Nazi Government, in 1933.

It does no credit to Wagner's character to suppose that he may have adopted anti-Semitism as a mask to conceal any hint of Jewish heritage in his background. But the possibility is worth exploring, in the context of his life, his talent, and his creative aims. He was not born into a Jewish heritage, nor was he Jewish by religion, so the hypothesis we are exploring is not a normal case of denial, such as, for example, a youthful rebellion against parental authority.

It is a case of pre-emptive denial of a possibility. We are not dealing with a certainty in Wagner's life, but with a question to which he could never be given a clear answer. In this context, he may have felt that being Jewish, or being thought to be Jewish, was not a burden that he wished to bear. The artistic aims he set for himself from an early age were enormously ambitious ; indeed, they were grandiose and, on the face of it, impossible to achieve. In the end, they were only achieved by a miracle, the timely support of an adolescent admirer, who ascended to the throne of Bavaria, and who became his patron, Ludwig II.

What were Wagner's aims ? As they finally evolved, they were to achieve a revolution in the art of Opera, or, as he defined it, music-drama. With Ludwig's help, he was largely successful in a number of respects which it is worth summarising. He pioneered the dissolution of the Classical system of harmony, and paved the way for many developments in music of the 20th Century, including new techniques for giving music a narrative role in drama. He embraced the use of new systems for instruments and new instruments, especially in the brass sections of the orchestra allowing him to write innovative chromatic harmonies, of which other composers, such as Johannes Brahms and Robert Schumann, strongly disapproved. Brahms refused to write for the new brass instruments.

Wagner also pioneered innovations in theatre design, which included hiding the Orchestra in a pit below the stage, and blacking-out the lights in the auditorium. He overcame enormous hostility and inertia to achieve these changes. It is possible to imagine that, in some private moments of reflection early in his life, he must have decided that such aims were difficult enough, without adding to them the burden of racial and cultural prejudice which came with being, or being thought to be, Jewish. Such fears could well have originated when he was an impressionable adolescent, if he had had early experience of prejudice, through being teased at school for being Jewish.

Such speculation is only interesting if there is to be found, in his creative work, any resonance of such an issue, any traces of cultural ambiguity. Music historians have been quick to point-out anti-Semitic elements in Wagner's libretti : the gold-loving Nibelung lord Alberich as a symbol of Jewish materialism ; the jealous rival songsmith Beckmesser, in the « Meistersingers of Nuremberg » , incapable of original work, who steals the work of others, a symbol of the kind of Jewish creativity Wagner attacked in his polemic writing. But is there reverse side to this coin ? Are there any symbols in his libretti, sympathetic to a Jewish heritage in European culture ? Surprisingly, there are, but they are of an esoteric nature, and they are not reflective of orthodox Judaism any more than were Wagner's Christian references reflective of Christian orthodoxy.

To find our sources, we must turn to what is often described as the « hidden stream » of Western culture, which is rich in the very lore on which Wagner drew for his libretti : lore which encompasses the fate of Jerusalem, the role of the Knights Templar, their connection to King Arthur and the Knights of the Holy Grail, and the related mythology of the Ring Lords of antiquity. These themes are being re-explored in a explosion of new writings which have emerged on the back of the discoveries by archeologists of ancient manuscripts pre-dating the establishment of Christian orthodoxy in the 4th to the 7th Centuries. But these ideas were very much in vogue in the latter decades of the 19th Century, where they infused much art of the time, from pre-Raphaelite painting to the work of Richard Wagner.

We start with an early Opera, « The Flying Dutchman » . This figure is synonymous with that of the « Wandering

Jew » , in fact, the 2 are linked in meaning : later interpretations of the « Dutchman » legend attributed his curse to demonic punishment ; but behind the same curse of endless journeying is also a symbol of the Jewish Diaspora. Interestingly, when the Dutchman does come to shore in Wagner's libretti, it is the Gentile father of Senta, the beloved, who displays greed for material wealth, whereas the Dutchman's needs are spiritual.

Spanning the « Ring » cycle are Wagner's 2 Grail Operas, « Lohengrin » and « Parsifal » . The Grail Knights are, according to neo-Gnostic interpretations, custodians of the family tree of Jesus (Joshua) and Mary (Magdalene) , whose heirs were the Merovingian monarchs of Southern France, until deposed in the 7th Century by machinations and assassinations arranged by the Roman church. The politics of that period are quite fascinating, and are too complex to elaborate on here. Suffice to say that if the Merovingian blood line was Jewish, and of Royal descent, the heretical details were a threat to the newly established Carolingian dynasty of the Holy Roman Empire. The facts had to be suppressed, belief in them declared a heresy, and, to ensure suppression, such heresy had to be punishable by death.

The facts of a usurped Royal, Jewish line went underground, and re-surfaced in esoteric form, in the Grail legends, and in fairy stories of Princes and Princesses deprived of their inheritance, such as Cinderella and the Sleeping Beauty. Whether or not Wagner knew of these references, it is to these legends he turned for the content of his Operas.

In terms of his Opera « Lohengrin » , the Knight Lohengrin magically appears to restore Elsa to her rightful place on the throne, of which she has been deprived by trickery. The condition of his help is that she should never ask his name or from whence he came. To those who understood the riddle, there is here, the unspoken inference that Lohengrin himself is of the Jewish blood line, information which he cannot disclose, either in fact or in name, or else he will have to « return from whence he came » . Could there possibly be, in this and in the Dutchman story, an subjective echo of Wagner's own feared identity as a Jew ? If so, this would co-exist as a buried sub-text buried within the wider meanings.

Since Wagner read widely, and studied deeply in such matters, it is probable that he was acquainted with Gnostic interpretations of the Grail mythology, particularly as he is known to have visited the mysterious village of Rennes-le-Château, in the South of France, before writing « Parsifal » . This otherwise normal country town purports to be where the treasure of the Knights Templar was hidden by the Cathars after the 13th Century Albigensian Crusade against them instigated by the Catholic Church, and could be construed to be in the area of the actual location of the events of « Parsifal » , that is, the location of the castle of the Grail, Montsalvat, which the libretto describes as being « in the country in the character of the northern mountains of Gothic Spain » . The treasure was 2-fold, encompassing both the material treasure rescued from the Temple of Jerusalem, in 70 AD, but was also supposed to include the Grail itself, which is no doubt what drew Wagner to visit Rennes-le-Château.

Whatever else Wagner may have known about the Grail legend, he already had his own conception of what it meant to him before making this visit. « Parsifal » , his last Opera, was written in 1878, but in an essay written in 1849 (titled « Die Wibelungen ») , he saw it as a relic originating in India, the birthplace of the original Aryan civilisation, and one which embodied a transcendent and transforming power, pre-dating Christianity itself. There is no historical justification for such a supposition, except in the sense that the Grail has always embodied an idea in the form of a

vessel, and many of the cultural values underlying Western thought do have their origins in the East (as brilliantly shown by English writer Stephen Oppenheimer in his exhaustive 500 page study « Eden In The East » , published by Phoenix, 1999) .

The symbolism in « Parsifal » is sufficiently elastic to allow a number of interpretations, including racist ones. What sin or condition, exactly, is being redeemed and healed in « Parsifal » ? Is it a moral one ? A cultural one ? A racial one ? It must be said that Wagner deliberately leaves that question open to interpretation, and there are no shortage of interpretations. However, the traditional version has the Grail Knights as proto-Teutonic Knights defending a pure Christian-Aryan heritage, and defending it against incursions by the alien, pagan threat of the magician Klingsor, who seeks to divert them from their quest through the wiles of his captive Flower Maidens, embodiments of sensual gratification. The ailing leader, Amfortas, has been compromised by temptation, and some commentators find, in the leader's « wound which will not heal » , a sexual malady. « Parsifal » is the « wise fool » who can retain his innocence, resist temptation and thus bring redemption to the community of the Grail.

The Nazis, of course, characterized Klingsor as a Jew, but a re-casting of the same story could produce an inversion of racial roles, and it is precisely such a re-casting which has been embraced by a direct descendant of Richard Wagner, the composer Adrian Wagner, who lives in the United Kingdom ; at least, that is the inference one must draw from his association with writer Laurence Gardner, author of « Bloodline of the Holy Grail » , « Genesis of the Grail Kings » and « Realm of the Ring Lords » , all published since 1996. Adrian Wagner has written companion musical suites to 2 of these volumes.

Laurence Gardner's thesis enlarges on themes brought to public notice in the 1982 best-seller by Bainton, Leigh & Lincoln, « The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail » , a work which draws on many sources including the apocryphal scriptures and Gnostic writings which have emerged from archeological discovers over the past 2 Centuries.

A summary below explains how this agenda discovers a « Jewish bloodline » context in the Grail legend, supplanting the orthodox Christian one, and, by inference, allows a similar context in the Wagnerian Grail Operas supplanting the traditional « Teutonic Knights » context with its overtones of German nationalism, and Aryan racial purity.

An entry in Cosima Wagner's diary of December 2, 1887, confirms the composer's ambivalence about the Opera's meaning for him, at the time of its composition, when he says to her :

« I shall still write “ Parsifal ” for my wife, but I wouldn't say it's a sign of faith in the German spirit any longer. »

It is quite likely that this remark reflects Wagner's disenchantment with the German public, which, by then, he had come to feel had given him insufficient support and backing in the creation of the Bayreuth Festival. The 1st « Festpielhaus » lost money, and 6 years elapsed before it could reopen, in 1882, by which time Wagner was exhausted and disenchanted by the response to his embrace of German nationalism. His anti-Semitism had been a calculated part of that posture, and, despite it, support from Jewish musicians in the Festival, and, from Berlin, Jews of the Festival were significant factors in its survival. Wagner lived to see « Parsifal » produced in the 1882 Festival, but died

the next year.

The word « Grail » has other meanings beside the one Wagner attributed to it. Was he aware of them ? In the Gnostic tradition, the word has a double meaning : on the one hand, it is said to be a contraction of « San(g-Real) » - which means, in French, Royal Blood, and, in code, means, in turn, that the Grail is a document which provides proof of the line of descent of « Royal Blood » : the blood being that of David and Solomon, through Joshua, or Jesus, and his wife, Mariam, or Mary Magdalene, Joshua having been an heir to the throne of Jerusalem by direct descent, as was his brother, James. (To clarify, « Jesus » is the Greek version of the Hebrew name « Joshua » or « Yeshua » and came into circulation when the New Testament Gospels were translated into Greek from the original Aramaic) . In addition, the concept of the Grail as a vessel has the esoteric meaning of « the womb which carries the Holy Blood » , and is a reverential symbol of Mary Magdalene, who, to this day, is still the subject of cult worship in areas in the South of France, that is, in the former lands of the Merovingian monarchs.

The traditional meaning of the Grail as the cup which carried the blood of Jesus shed when on the Cross is a compatible, or at least an analogous meaning, and it is, of course, the meaning Wagner illustrated in « Parsifal » , composing music of extraordinary power to portray the wondrous, healing properties of the Grail. The belief that blood itself has magical properties is one of great antiquity. Wagner drew on it for the rites portrayed in the final scenes of « Parsifal » ; scenes which have as much affinity with the earlier religion of Mithras as they do with orthodox Christian worship ; and the rituals observed in « Parsifal » are also related to rites of Freemasonry, as might be expected considering the links between the Knights Templar and Masonry.

Whatever Wagner's acquaintance with such diverse aspects of Grail lore, he only took what he needed for « Parsifal » , a selective process he also used in deriving material from legend his other Operas. It's worth mentioning, at this point, that « Parsifal » also revisits a theme which Wagner dealt with in an earlier Opera, that of the conflict between flesh and spirit. That other Opera is « Tannhäuser » , another work in which Wagner, while paying lip service to orthodoxy, displays dissent. The dissent occurs during the scene where Tannhäuser. has returned from his futile trip to Rome to beg forgiveness for his sexual sins, committed during his sojourn in Venusberg. The Pope withholds forgiveness, and Tannhäuser bitterly refers to his rejection in a German phrase of ambivalent meaning, sometimes translated as, « I saw him who is God's messenger » , and sometimes as, « I saw him who claims to represent God » . Lost in the garment of piety with which Wagner otherwise clothed his libretto, this Gnostic barb was overlooked, and Wagner was accused of having written a pro-Catholic Opera by those to whom it mattered, whose sectarian interests he was thought to have betrayed.

Is it possible to sum-up the foregoing ? All one can say is that ironies abound. Despite Wagner's anti-Semitic rhetoric, there is consistent evidence of his interaction with Jewish artists throughout his life, both on a personal basis, and professionally, after the establishment of Bayreuth : and there was a persistent groundswell of support for his innovations from Jewish people in Berlin, in the early years of the Festival, which continued despite the hurtful re-publication of his earlier tracts. Much of the information used in this survey comes from a recent book by a Jewish writer Paul Lawrence Rose, « Wagner : Race and Revolution » published by Faber & Faber, in 1992, and other information and quotations from correspondence come from « A Documentary Study » by Herbert Barth, Dietrich Mack

and Egon Voß, published by Thames & Hudson, in 1975, and « The Real Wagner » by Rudolph Sabor, published by Andre Deutsch, in 1987, and further quotations from books are included courtesy of James Whitehead.

Wagner's music is here to stay. But can he himself be forgiven ? I discussed these matters in recent e-mails with a long-time Jewish friend in London, a connection maintained since our days together at Cambridge University in England, in the 1950's. I suggested that the difference between Adolf Hitler and Richard Wagner was this : Hitler, who wished to be a painter, gave-up art for politics, and, in his impotent and vengeful frustration, refused Jews employment and then murdered millions ; Wagner never gave-up on art, and though he voiced complaints about Jewry, never refused a Jew employment, and never committed homicide. My friend was kind enough to say that, as an anti-Semite, Wagner was an amateur. The painter was a professional. That is probably about the best one can say for Richard Wagner, the man. The music speaks for itself.

But as for the question : was Wagner of Jewish heritage ? If that DNA testing I mentioned earlier could be done, and if it turned-out that this was true, then the question would arise - Could Richard Wagner be acclaimed in history as one of the great Jewish composers of the 19th Century ? Such a verdict would please as many people as it would annoy. But it would be a final, fitting irony, in the career of a man in whose life ironies abound.

In the aftermath of World War II, the main problem facing those in the music industry who wished to « reinstate » the music of Richard Wagner was its posthumous use for political purposes by the Nazis. A thesis needs to be written about music as polemic. Most of the hijacks have been completely inappropriate. The Labor Party in Australia have « adopted » the Jupiter theme from Gustav Holst' « The Planets » Suite for their theme song to assume nobility of purpose for themselves. This embrace is by a political Party formed largely by Irish revolutionary socialists who still despise the British ! The « British » national anthem is a German tune, which was still doing the round of German States at the time of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria. The « Jubel-Overture » by Swiss composer Joachim Raff (who taught Franz Liszt how to orchestrate) sounds as if it uses « God Save The King » as its main theme, but, in fact, the piece was written shortly after the aforementioned jubilee to celebrate the 25th year of the reign of Adolf, Duke of Nassau ! My essay « Variations on a racist theme » documents the embrace of the tune by the United States, to new words, and titled « America » . In that form, for a 100 years, it rivalled the « Star Spangled Banner » as America's official national anthem, despite its association with England, with whom the colonist had fought a War.

The German national anthem in use during the Nazi era is based on the theme from the slow movement of Haydn's « Emperor » String Quartet, but the ignominy to which the tune was subjected has not resulted in prohibition of performance of that work, nor has it deterred Protestants the world over from singing the hymn set to its melody « Glorious Things of Thee Are Spoken » .

It is the peculiar quality of music that it provides a simulacrum in sound for « events » creating by the human central nervous system, « events » called « emotions » and these « events » can be directed for political purposes. Thus, « pride » feels the same, whoever feels it, but the object of pride can change according to the social context which inspires it.

I have read one commentary on the Nazi use of Richard Wagner's music which points-out how stupid it was of the Nazi hierarchy to take on board the Nordic gods as their heroes, since the demise of the gods was specifically prophesied by Wagner in the « Ring » cycle. I realise this kind of commentary does not assuage the distress of people who were there in Germany, during the 1930's, hearing the « Rienzi » Overture played at the start of Nazis rallies, following by public speeches threatening and denouncing them because of their race and cultural heritage.

Perhaps, it is best to allow Wagner to speak for himself on these matters, quoting directly from his own writings. Prophetically, he wrote :

« Is the German already tottering to his fall ? Woe to us and to the world if the nation itself were saved and the German folk remained but the German spirit had taken flight for the sake of power. »

Did he anticipate Adolf Hitler ? :

« The German folk does not want demagogues. Do we ever see a conqueror, a forcible usurper, whether folk or individual, that does not seek to found his wilful annexation on religious, mythical or other trumped-up covenants ? »

The author of the cautionary tale about misuse of the « Ring » of world power also wrote :

« To conquer without ever considering how they are to be won over ! Never to ask oneself how Holland, Switzerland, and so forth are to be converted into friends ! Only for the army. It is not the Jews we have to complain about, for each organism tried to further its own interests. »

The development of scientific weapons of War alarmed him :

« It can but arouse our apprehension to see the progress of the art of War departing from the springs of moral force and turning more and more to the mechanical : here, the rawest forces of the lower nature powers are brought into artificial play. Already a grim and ghastly sight is offered by the armored Monitors, against which the stately sailing ship avails no more : dumb serving men, no longer with the looks of men, attend these monsters. Art invents torpedoes for the sea, and dynamite cartouches, or the like, for everywhere else. »

And again :

« It is thinkable that all this, with art and science, valour, point of honour, life and chattels should one day fly into the air through some incalculable accident. Then, it might really look " as if God had made the world that the devil might take it ". »

L'antisémitisme de Wagner et l'appropriation de sa musique par les Nazis

Cet aspect de la personnalité de Wagner a donné lieu à une abondante littérature polémique, largement alimentée tant

par la récupération de sa musique par le régime National-Socialiste que par l'amitié de l'épouse de son fils Siegfried, Winnifred Chamberlain, avec Adolf Hitler.

Le compositeur et chef d'orchestre allemand Siegfried Wagner est né à Tribschen, en Suisse, le 6 juin 1869 et est mort à Bayreuth, le 4 août 1930. Il est le fils de Richard Wagner et petit-fils de Franz Liszt.

3e enfant de Richard Wagner et Cosima von Bülow, il doit son nom à l'opéra Siegfried, auquel travaille son père au moment de sa naissance. Cette période de bonheur pour le couple Wagner inspire à Richard la pièce pour petit orchestre Siegfried-Idyll (1870), basée sur des motifs issus de l'opéra et dédiée à Cosima. Le titre originel, Tribschener Idyll mit Fidi-Vogelgesang und Orange-Sonnenaufgang (Idylle de Tribschen avec chant d'oiseau de Fidi et lever de soleil orange), fait référence au surnom de Siegfried, Fidi.

Lui-même compositeur d'Opéras, Siegfried Wagner vit longtemps dans l'ombre de son père. Après la mort de celui-ci en 1883 (il a alors 14 ans), il songe à devenir architecte, mais se tourne vers la musique et étudie la composition avec un disciple de son père, Engelbert Humperdinck.

Il était secrètement homosexuel et ne semble pas avoir tenu à se marier. En 1914, à 45 ans, une rencontre est arrangée avec Winnifred Williams Klindworth, jeune Anglaise âgée de 17 ans. Leur mariage a lieu le 22 septembre 1915. Le couple aura 4 enfants :

Siegfried eut également avec la fille d'un pasteur un enfant adultérin, Walter Aign, qui fut employé comme répétiteur au « Festspielhaus » (Palais des Festivals) du vivant de Siegfried, mais que Winnifred fit renvoyer après sa mort.

En 1908, sa mère Cosima lui délègue (en titre seulement) la direction du Festival de Bayreuth. Après la Première Guerre mondiale, la très mauvaise situation financière du Festival le pousse à entamer des tournées de concert pour récolter des fonds.

À partir de 1924, il s'attache à la modernisation des représentations du Festival, que Cosima tend à figer dans un conservatisme buté, et engage le décorateur Kurt Söhnlein.

Il ne prend véritablement la direction du Festival qu'à la mort de sa mère en 1930. L'un de ses projets les plus importants est la nouvelle production de Tannhäuser, pour laquelle il engage le chef Arturo Toscanini. Les difficultés du Maître à communiquer avec l'orchestre dans son allemand à couper au couteau, son intransigeance artistique, ainsi que la chaleur de cet été caniculaire, épuisent Siegfried qui fait un infarctus pendant une répétition, et meurt le 4 août 1930, sans avoir pu moderniser le Festival en profondeur comme il l'avait projeté. La direction passe à sa femme Winnifred.

L'antisémitisme de Richard Wagner n'a rien d'exceptionnel : ces discours, comme les préjugés raciaux en général, sont courants. Mais ces thèses sont déjà combattues : Nietzsche, par exemple, se brouille avec Wagner, en partie pour ses opinions antisémites. L'antisémitisme est un débat central à l'époque, y compris aux yeux mêmes de nombreux

intellectuels juifs. Entre pogrom et assimilation, les discussions entre penseurs juifs font rage.

Tout au long de sa vie, dans ses conversations, dans ses écrits, Richard Wagner n'a cessé d'émettre des opinions « anti-judaïque » car elles ne se fondent pas sur des préjugés raciaux mais sur le reproche adressés aux Juifs de demeurer juifs et donc de n'être pas allemands. Cet anti-judaïsme est donc fort différent de l'antisémitisme qui repose sur des distinctions raciales. Wagner préconise l'assimilation des Juifs à la culture germanique. L'assimilation est aussi sujet de débat entre les intellectuels juifs.

Le 1er essai de Wagner, « Das Judenthum in der Musik », est publié en 1850 dans la revue Neue Zeitschrift für Musik sous le pseudonyme de « K. Freigedank » (« libre pensée »). Wagner s'est donné pour but d'expliquer la prétendue « aversion populaire » envers la musique des compositeurs juifs tels que Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy ou Giacomo Meyerbeer. Il écrit notamment que le peuple allemand est « repoussé » par les Juifs en raison « de leur aspect et de leur comportement d'étrangers » ; les Juifs « sont des anomalies de la nature » jasant « de leurs voix grinçantes, couinantes et bourdonnantes ». Wagner allègue que les musiciens juifs, n'étant pas en relation avec l'esprit authentique du peuple allemand, ne peuvent qu'écrire une musique artificielle, sans aucune profondeur, et rabâcher la vraie musique à la manière des perroquets.

L'article attire peu l'attention. Cependant, après que Wagner l'ait publié de nouveau en 1869 sous la forme d'un pamphlet signé de son véritable nom, de vives protestations s'élevèrent dans le public lors d'une représentation des Maîtres-chanteurs.

Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy

Après sa mort, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy fut l'objet de la propagande anti-juive. Cela commença avec « Das Judenthum in der Musik » un pamphlet de Richard Wagner qui avait pourtant été fortement influencé par les compositions de Mendelssohn. L'ouvrage parut sous un pseudonyme, en 1850, 3 ans après la mort de Mendelssohn mais, en 1869, parut une édition augmentée sous le vrai nom de l'auteur. À la date de la 2e publication, Wagner était déjà un compositeur influent si bien que son point de vue contribua à faire mépriser l'œuvre de Mendelssohn dans la seconde moitié du 19e Siècle. En 1933, après la prise du pouvoir par le régime nazi, Josef Goebbels interdit (en sa qualité de président de la « Chambre de la culture du “ Reich ” ») les représentations des œuvres de Mendelssohn. Il y en eut néanmoins quelques-unes, par exemple « le Songe d'une nuit d'été » dirigé par Wilhelm Fürtwängler en février 1934 (à l'occasion du 125e anniversaire de Mendelssohn). Des compositeurs allemands, parmi lesquels on compte le prestigieux Carl Orff furent invités à écrire des alternatives musicales à la musique de Mendelssohn pour « le Songe d'une nuit d'été ». Bustes et plaques commémoratives de Mendelssohn furent retirés (par exemple, en novembre 1936, le monument de Mendelssohn devant le Gewandhaus de Leipzig ; ce qui entraîna la protestation publique de Fürtwängler). Le maire Carl Gørdeler démissionna de son poste en raison de la suppression en son absence du monument de Mendelssohn et il fut, par la suite, un des personnages importants de la Résistance allemande.

Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and « The Jewish Question »

His dual name reflects a multi-faceted religious identity, but Adolf Hitler's 3rd « Reich » homed in on his Jewishness and banned Felix Mendelssohn's music.

On the paternal side, Mendelssohn was the grandson of the 18th Century Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786) , but was not raised in the Jewish faith.

On March 21, 1816 (as it happened, the birthday of Johann Sebastian Bach) , he was baptized, along with his 3 siblings, as a Lutheran. His parents, Abraham and Lea Mendelssohn, were baptized a few years later.

To acknowledge their new spiritual identity, the family adopted a 2nd surname, so that Felix Mendelssohn became Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. Abraham intended that, eventually, his family would omit the Mendelssohn name altogether. His son never did so, however, and continued to sign his letters and publish his music under his dual name.

The issues of religious identity and intra-faith tolerance are critical to our understanding of the composer's life and work. Of Moses Mendelssohn's 6 children who survived into adulthood, 2 preserved their Jewish faith, while 2 converted to Lutheranism, and 2 to Catholicism.

Given this family history, it is telling that Mendelssohn set sacred texts for a variety of faiths, not just Lutheran, but Anglican and Catholic texts (« Tu es Petrus, Lauda Sion ») .

He wrote a short hymn setting for the Huguenot church and, towards the end of his life, was in correspondence with the « Neues Tempel » of Hamburg, which commissioned him to compose several Cantata-like Psalm settings, ultimately unfulfilled.

Though Christian by virtue of his baptism and practising faith, Mendelssohn remained, in the eyes of many, a Jew. His family's wealth partially insulated him from anti-Semitic sentiments of the time ; but, after his death, Richard Wagner attacked the composer's memory in a racist essay published anonymously in 1850.

Wagner maintained that, as a Jew, Mendelssohn could only imitate the profundities of Bach and Beethoven ; his music was derivative and ultimately superficial.

The rise of the 3rd « Reich » at the beginning of the 20th Century did further, seemingly irreparable damage to Mendelssohn's reputation. The Nazis tore down his statue that had stood before the Leipzig « Gewandhaus » . The Nazis banned Mendelssohn's music but left his grave unscathed in the Trinity Cemetery of Berlin, liquidated the family banking house and banned his music.

But they were unable to expunge Mendelssohn completely from German culture. When Richard Strauß was asked to write new music for « A Midsummer Night's Dream » , he replied that he could not improve on Mendelssohn's music.

...

A rival's envy and the Nazis combined to turn Felix Mendelssohn from a hot 19th Century composer to a pariah and left hundreds of his scores unpublished. Real rescue operations began only a dozen years ago.

Thanks largely to the « Mendelssohn Project », which has been working since 1996 to redress decades of neglect, the composer's works are being recovered and performed. For the bicentenary of his birth, the Museum of Jewish Heritage, in New York, will present 13 world-premieres, on January 28, in a program entitled :

« Mendelssohn : Lost Treasures and the Wagner Suppression. »

Dubbed « the Mozart of the 19th Century » by Robert Schumann, Mendelssohn (1809-1847) composed lyrical Masterpieces such as the Violin Concerto and the Overture to « A Midsummer Night's Dream ». He was widely performed in German-speaking countries and England. Yet, 3 years after his death at 38, Richard Wagner launched a campaign to denigrate the Jewish-born, Protestant-raised composer in a scabrous tract titled : « Judaism in Music » .

Mendelssohn's popularity quickly plummeted, and any chance for a serious revival was scotched when his music was banned in Adolf Hitler's Germany. Sympathizers smuggled hundreds of his music manuscripts, letters and artworks (he was a brilliant watercolorist) out of the Berlin State Library to Warsaw and Kraków, in the winter of 1936-1937.

« A couple of years later, when those cities were no longer safe, the materials were smuggled-out again » and scattered all over the globe », said Stephen Somary, conductor and founder of the « Mendelssohn Project » .

Through the project, which is based in New York and Stuttgart, Germany, Somary has been gathering these lost works since 1996. He discovered a trove of musical works through allusions in the composer's 9,000 letters. He says 270 of a total of 770 scores remain unpublished. They've had no life in concert halls and aren't even mentioned in biographies.

Somary said :

« There were references to Symphonies and 2 Operas I hadn't seen listed anywhere else. There's a children's Symphony, Lieder, Concerti, a few Piano Trios, and a C minor Trio for piano, violin and viola. »

Even the works we think we know aren't the only versions that exist or the ones Mendelssohn preferred.

Somary continued :

« The " Italian " Symphony was not published by Mendelssohn, who didn't care for it, so he re-wrote the 2nd, 3rd and 4th movements. He thought the 1st movement was such a disaster it would have to be scrapped completely. In fact, all of the known 5 Symphonies have substantial alternate versions. »

Mendelssohn : Lost Treasures and the Wagner Suppression

(Historical background by Stephen Somary.)

« Judaism is the evil conscience of our modern civilization. »

With these words, Richard Wagner (1813-1883) , the celebrated composer of German nationalistic Opera, concluded Part One of his 1850 treatise : « Judaism in Music » . He had just completed an argumentative circle petitioning for the cognitive dismissal of all Jewish influence in the Germanic arts.

Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847) , who died a mere 3 years earlier, had seemingly secured a place among the greatest composers who ever lived. From a period which began in 1835, with Mendelssohn's appointment as the General Music Director of the « Gewandhaus » in Leipzig, until the public distribution of Wagner's treatise, the world had never witnessed a figure in the arts so equally beloved, influential, and revered. Then came the « assassination » (albeit posthumously, and in prose) that was followed by decades of work by Wagner, and his many fellow German nationalists, to re-teach the world who Felix Mendelssohn was and what the value, or lack thereof, of his artistic output had truly been. Normally, generations follow a natural course in determining the popularity of an artist. Mendelssohn never received this chance, because decades of work by Wagner and his supporters were dedicated to extreme revisionist history.

As a result, publication and natural dissemination of Mendelssohn's full « œuvre » was suppressed as anti-Semitic sentiments increased exponentially over the ensuing decades. There remained, however, people dedicated to the cause of keeping Mendelssohn's name alive, but they were greatly out-numbered. The fact that Mendelssohn was not completely forgotten prompted Adolf Hitler's Nazi regime to add the Jewish-born composer's name (an assimilation-conversion to Christianity was undertaken by Mendelssohn's family when he was a child) in the mid-1930's to a series of lists of forbidden artists. At this point, a majority of Mendelssohn's manuscripts (both published and unpublished) were housed in the basement of the Berlin State Library. They were smuggled-out by Mendelssohn supporters to Warsaw and Kraków, during the winter of 1936-1937. By 1939, when these cities fell under Nazi control, they were smuggled-out again - but, this time, by any means possible and to any locations away from Hitler's influence. This secured the safety of these documents, but created a massive practical problem of tracking them down.

The suppression by Richard Wagner, the plague of anti-Semitism, and the subsequent banning of his name, comprised the principle reason that hundreds of manuscripts and artworks by Felix Mendelssohn, and thousands of personal letters, either to or from the composer, fell into obscurity. There were other factors as well which led to Wagner's work to be so successful. Felix Mendelssohn, born into a wealthy family, could afford' himself the luxury of deciding that he did not like to publish. In fact, only the first 72 of Mendelssohn's Opus numbers were actually published in the composer's lifetime. A great majority of the remainder of published works were done so in the few intervening years between his passing and Wagner's influential rise in popularity. Mendelssohn also did not plan for what to do with the hundreds of unpublished manuscripts in the couple of months when it seemed more and more likely that the he (at the age of only 38) was mortally ill.

Felix Mendelssohn also set a particularly difficult standard for himself when it came to deciding what was fit for publication and what was not. For example, his « Italian » Symphony, one of the most beloved works in the entire Orchestra literature, did not meet his standards. So much so, that he re-wrote the last 3 movements before putting it away. This was a fact unknown to the composer's widow, Cécile Jeanrenaud Mendelssohn, when a publishing-house came calling, shortly after Mendelssohn's death, asking to publish this work : she gave them the wrong version !

The fact that Felix Mendelssohn did not like to publish, combined with his early death, and the subsequent suppression by Wagner and, then, later by the Nazis, led to apathy and disinformation as the world started defining what this 19th Century giant of a composer and man was really about, and how many works he actually wrote. In recent decades, there has been much painstaking research undertaken in the quest to bring the understanding of Mendelssohn's output to light, but many mysteries still abound. The « Mendelssohn Project » believes itself to be in the forefront of the work to uncover the full Mendelssohn story, and found a natural partner in the « Museum of Jewish Heritage » . The Museum was willing to delve into this topic, and work to assist in sharing the true Mendelssohn story with the world.

The concert is a particularly historic event in that it is presenting 13 Masterpieces by Felix Mendelssohn in the context of what led them to be unpublished in the 1st place. As has been evidenced over the recent years, not many institutions have had the courage to « take on » the seemingly untouchable Wagner. By confronting Wagner's suppression of Mendelssohn's lost treasures, neither the « Museum of Jewish Heritage » , nor « The Mendelssohn Project » , is leveling criticism of the true greatness of Wagner's musical gifts. But the fact remains that he was one of the most prominent anti-Semites in history, and the evil he wrought should not go unnoticed.

It is hoped that this concert will serve as one more small step in the large task of presenting to the world, for the 1st time ever, the scope of the life and music of Felix Mendelssohn, as well as to nudge our society ever so slightly forward to understanding the damage done to him by a suppression caused by overt anti-Semitism. The true picture of Felix Mendelssohn, gifted and passionate, but also at times tragic and tortured, has been swept under the table and ignored for more than one and a half Centuries. There is more to the story about this fascinating and complex man which will still take years to unravel.

...

Richard Wagner a également attaqué les Juifs dans d'autres essais. Dans « Qu'est-ce qui est allemand ? » (1879) , il écrit par exemple :

« Les Juifs tiennent le travail intellectuel allemand entre leurs mains. Nous pouvons ainsi constater un odieux travestissement de l'esprit allemand, présenté aujourd'hui à ce peuple comme étant sa prétendue ressemblance. Il est à craindre qu'avant longtemps la nation prenne ce simulacre pour le reflet de son image. Alors, quelques-unes des plus belles dispositions de la race humaine s'éteindraient, peut-être à tout jamais. »

En dépit de ses écrits antisémites, Wagner a plusieurs amis juifs. Le plus représentatif d'entre eux est sans doute le

chef d'orchestre Hermann Levi, un Juif « pratiquant » que Wagner désigne pour diriger la 1^{re} représentation de « Parsifal ». Le compositeur souhaite d'abord que Levi se fasse baptiser (sans doute en raison du contenu religieux de cet Opéra), mais renonce finalement à cette exigence. Cependant, lorsqu'il analyse le détail des péripéties de cette valse-hésitation telles que les rapporte Carl Glasenapp, Theodor W. Adorno, dans son « Essai sur Wagner », résume en ces termes ce que cet épisode relève, selon lui, du côté « démoniaque » de Wagner :

« Une envie sadique d'humilier Levi, une humeur conciliante et sentimentale et surtout la volonté de s'attacher affectivement le maltraité se réunissent dans la casuistique du comportement de Wagner. »

Levi maintint toutefois des relations amicales avec Wagner et fut sollicité, à ses funérailles, pour porter son cercueil. Un autre de ces amis fut Joseph Rubinstein.

Notons enfin que l'antisémitisme de Wagner n'est quasiment pas évoqué, dans ses abondants écrits, par son plus fervent admirateur, le viennois Arnold Schönberg (1874-1951), fils de commerçants juifs convertis. Schönberg réembrassa la foi juïdaique dans les années 1930.

Après la mort de Wagner à Venise, en 1883, Bayreuth devient le lieu de rassemblement d'un groupe anti-Sémite soutenu par sa femme Cosima et formé d'admirateurs zélés du compositeur, notamment du théoricien racialisiste Houston Stewart Chamberlain. À la mort de Cosima et de son fils Siegfried en 1930, la responsabilité du Festival échoit à la veuve de ce dernier, Winnifred, amie personnelle d'Adolf Hitler. Hitler est lui-même un zélé de Wagner, donnant une lecture National-Socialiste à un anti-Sémitisme retiré de son contexte, et aux thèmes germaniques qui jalonnent l'œuvre, censée inscrire le Maître de Bayreuth dans l'idéologie nazie. Les Nazis font un usage courant de sa musique et la jouent lors de leurs grands rassemblements. Il n'est pas le seul compositeur apprécié des nazis : Beethoven et Bruckner sont aussi récupérés par le régime.

Eu égard à cette ambiguïté, les œuvres de Wagner ne sont pas représentées en public en Israël (largement fondée à l'origine par des Juifs d'Europe centrale imprégnés de civilisation germanique), où, par ailleurs, la musique de Wagner est couramment diffusée par des stations de radio ou des chaînes de télévision d'État, sans susciter plus de scandale qu'à New York, Paris ou Berlin. Jusqu'à présent, toutes les tentatives de représentation publique (notamment par le pianiste et chef d'orchestre Daniel Barenboim qui a dirigé le prélude de Tristan und Isolde à Tel Aviv, en 2001) ont déclenché les plus vives protestations, certains auditeurs ayant même quitté la salle au cours du XX^e siècle. Ce n'est qu'au cours des dernières années que de nombreux Israéliens ont soutenu qu'il est possible d'apprécier son talent musical, sans que cela n'implique l'acceptation de ces idées politiques ou sociales. En 2010, un avocat israélien mélomane, Jonathan Livny, fonde une « Société wagnérienne israélienne » afin de mettre fin au boycottage des œuvres du compositeur dans son pays.

Gottfried Wagner, le frère d'Eva et le demi-frère de Katharina, est le vilain petit canard des Wagner : dès 6 ans, il avait barbouillé de rouge le buste de la statue de son arrière grand-père signée Arno Breker, le sculpteur préféré de Adolf Hitler. Il a été puni en étant envoyé en pension. Le buste est toujours en face du théâtre, à Bayreuth.

Musicologue, Gottfried a écrit sa thèse sur la musique dite « dégénérée » et interdite par les Nazis, soit que les compositeurs eussent été juifs, soit qu'ils se soient opposés au régime.

Pour lui, la musique de Wagner ne peut être étrangère aux théories raciales de son auteur exposées dans « Le Judaïsme dans la musique », publié d'abord sous un pseudonyme en 1850 puis révisé et publié sous son nom en 1869. Dans son entretien à l'AFP, il affirmait :

« Wagner a développé ses propres théories raciales. Un racisme obscène. Avec ce qu'on sait aujourd'hui, on ne peut pas l'ignorer et dire seulement " c'est de la belle musique ". »

Quelque temps après cet entretien, le chef d'orchestre Daniel Barenboim, de nationalité israélienne, a livré au New York Review of Books un long article intitulé « Wagner et les juifs », dans lequel il s'oppose, sans le citer, au point de vue de Gottfried Wagner :

« Wagner a été pour Hitler une sorte de précurseur et sans doute le modèle personnel et idéologique le plus important qu'il ait eu. Néanmoins, aussi révoltant qu'ait pu être l'antisémitisme de Wagner, personne ne peut le tenir pour responsable de l'usage et de l'abus qu'Hitler a fait de sa musique et de sa vision du monde.

Le compositeur juif Ernest Bloch, par exemple, refusait d'accepter la prise de possession de Wagner par les Nazis.

Ce genre d'argument importe peu à Gottfried. Il demande que soit rendue publique la correspondance qui va de 1923 à 1945 entre Hitler et certains membres de sa famille, dont Winnifred, la belle-fille de Wagner, qui dirigea le Festival de 1930 à la fin de la guerre.

27 rouleaux de pellicule existent aussi, montrant, en privé, le Chancelier du 3e « Reich » chez les Wagner. Hitler était un habitué du Festival, et un ami de la famille que les enfants appelaient « oncle Wolf » .

L'éditeur exclusif de Wagner est la maison Schott à Mayence.

Friedrich Nietzsche, décriant tout ce qu'il pressent de nauséabond non tant chez Wagner en soi que chez les admirateurs de Wagner, écrit cependant : « J'aime Wagner. » (Ecce homo, « Pourquoi j'écris de si bons livres, Le Cas Wagner, I ») .

Le terme Wagner est entré dans la langue courante, comme adjectif depuis 1861 (wagnérien) , comme substantif depuis 1873 sous la plume d'Alphonse Daudet dans son recueil « Contes du lundi » .

« La musique commence là où s'arrête le pouvoir des mots. » (Richard Wagner)

« Vous, mes frères souffrants de toutes les classes de la société humaine qui sentez une sourde colère couver en vous, quand vous aspirez à vous délivrer de l'esclavage de l'argent pour devenir des hommes libres, comprenez bien notre

tâche, et aidez-nous à élever l'Art à sa dignité, afin que nous puissions vous montrer comment vous élèverez le métier à la hauteur de l'Art, le serf de l'industrie au rang de l'homme beau, conscient de lui-même, qui, avec le sourire de l'initié, peut dire à la nature, au soleil et aux étoiles, à la mort et à l'éternité : vous aussi vous êtes miens ; et je suis votre Maître. » (Richard Wagner, l'Art et la Révolution.)

« Si l'œuvre d'art grecque contenait l'esprit d'une belle nation, l'œuvre d'art de l'avenir doit contenir l'esprit de l'humanité libre en dehors de toutes les limites de nationalités : le caractère national ne peut être en elle qu'un ornement, un attrait fourni par les diversités individuelles, non pas un obstacle. » (Richard Wagner, l'Art et la Révolution.)

...

Compositeur et dramaturge allemand (Leipzig, 1813 - Venise, 1883) .

Musicien mais aussi dramaturge, philosophe et metteur-en-scène, Richard Wagner fut sans rival dans l'Allemagne de son temps. Sous sa plume et sous sa direction, l'opéra devint une « œuvre d'art totale » censée élever son auteur au rang des dieux. Bayreuth fut (et demeure) le lieu de son apothéose.

Dernier de 7 enfants, Richard Wagner naît dans une famille ayant le goût des activités artistiques : son père, Friedrich Wagner (1770-1813) , au demeurant greffier de police, et sa mère, Johanna (1778-1848) , font du théâtre, tout comme ses sœurs Rosalie (1803-1837) et Louise (1805-1871) , tandis que son frère aîné, Albert (1799-1874) , est chanteur et sa sœur Clara (1807-1875) , la femme d'un chanteur. Un autre frère, Julius (1804-1862) , est orfèvre et la 4e fille, Ottilie (1811-1883) , épouse le philologue Hermann Brockhaus (1806-1877) , dont Friedrich Nietzsche sera le disciple.

Orphelin de père à l'âge de 6 mois, le jeune garçon est élevé par sa mère, aux côtés d'un beau-père (son vrai père ?) , Ludwig Geyer (1778-1821) , acteur mais aussi peintre et poète, et de son oncle Adolf Wagner (1774-1835) , homme lettré qui exerce une forte influence sur sa formation intellectuelle. Ses études, cependant, sont décevantes. Passionné de poésie (Homère, Shakespeare) , il se sent bientôt la vocation de musicien. En 1831, il trouve en Theodor Weinlig (1780-1842) , Maître de chapelle à Leipzig, le mentor selon ses vœux. Avec lui, il travaille l'harmonie et le contrepoint. Dès 1832, il compose sa Symphonie en ut majeur et, en 1833, son 1er opéra, « les Fées » .

Chef d'orchestre à Magdebourg (1834-1836) , Richard Wagner y épouse une jeune cantatrice, Minna Planer (1809-1866) , avec laquelle il partage ses rêves de célébrité mais aussi ses difficultés financières, dues à l'échec de son 2e opéra, « la Défense d'aimer » (1836, d'après « Mesure pour mesure » de Shakespeare) . Le couple déménage pour Königsberg (1836) , puis pour Riga (1836-1839) , avant d'échouer à Paris, où est terminé « Rienzi » (1840) et composé « le Vaisseau fantôme » (1841) .

En 1842, Wagner rentre à Dresde, où l'on monte « Rienzi » . Le succès qu'il obtient lui permet d'occuper le poste de Maître de chapelle de la Cour royale de Saxe (1843) . Mais l'accueil mitigé fait au « Vaisseau fantôme » (1843) et

l'insuccès de « Tannhäuser » (1845) , nullement compensés par l'enthousiasme qu'il soulève en dirigeant l'exécution des Symphonies de Beethoven, le plongent dans la frustration.

C'est alors que Wagner affiche ses sympathies pour les révolutionnaires qui provoquent le soulèvement de Dresde en 1849. Contraint de fuir la répression, il trouve refuge en Suisse grâce à l'amitié indéfectible de Franz Liszt. C'est ce dernier également qui dirigera, à Weimar, la création de « Lohengrin » (1850) .

Établi à Zürich, Wagner se consacre à la fois à des essais théoriques (dont « l'Art et la Révolution » , 1849 ; « l'Œuvre d'art de l'avenir » , id. ; « Opéra et drame » , 1851) et à la mise au point du projet qui donnera naissance à la Tétralogie (« Der Ring des Nibelungen » - l'Anneau du Nibelung) ; il passe l'année 1852 à en écrire les poèmes. Il entreprend mais interrompt la partition musicale de l'œuvre pour s'occuper de « Tristan und Isolde » (achevé en 1859) , transposition de la passion nouvelle que lui inspire Mathilde Wesendonck (1828-1902) , poétesse et épouse du riche industriel qui est aussi son mécène.

En lisant Schopenhauer, Wagner a trouvé à sa propre pensée des racines et des prolongements qu'il ne soupçonnait pas. Il envisage désormais la possibilité de bâtir un système. C'est à Paris qu'il revient, en 1859, pour tenter d'imposer son œuvre. Il réussit à faire jouer « Tannhäuser » à l'Opéra, en mars 1861, mais les représentations, trop houleuses, sont arrêtées au bout de 3 jours. Ulcéré par la cabale du Paris de Napoléon III, et criblé de dettes, Wagner parcourt l'Europe et va jusqu'en Russie, multipliant les concerts pour faire connaître son répertoire, qui s'est enrichi des « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » (1861) . Il se trouve à Stuttgart le 3 mai 1864, lorsqu'un envoyé du jeune roi Louis II de Bavière (monté sur le trône le 10 mars) l'invite à Munich pour y être comblé de faveurs.

À peine installé, Wagner fait venir Cosima (1837-1930) , l'épouse du chef d'orchestre Hans von Bülow (1830-1894) qui est la fille de Liszt, dont il s'est épris. De leur liaison naît une fille prénommée Isolde (1865-1919) . Tandis que « Tristan und Isolde » triomphe sur scène (1865) , la Cour de Bavière se déchaîne contre le compositeur, qu'elle rend responsable des égarements du roi. Reprenant le chemin de l'exil en Suisse, Wagner s'établit à Tribschen, près de Lucerne. Veuf depuis 1866, il y est rejoint par Cosima, qui demande le divorce afin de se remarier avec lui (1870) , après lui avoir donné 2 autres enfants, Eva (1867-1942) et Siegfried (1869-1930) . Pièce orchestrale, « l'Idylle de Siegfried » (1870) portera témoignage de leur félicité.

Entre-temps sont créés à Munich « les Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » (1868) , puis, sur ordre du roi mais contre la volonté de l'auteur, « l'Or du Rhin » (1869) et « la Walkyrie » (1870) .

En 1871, Wagner choisit la petite ville de Bayreuth pour faire construire le théâtre dont il rêve et fonder un Festival. Il pose la Ire pierre du « Festspielhaus » (Théâtre du Festival) le 22 mai 1872, jour de son 59e anniversaire, et l'inaugure le 13 août 1876 en présence de l'Empereur Guillaume Ier, mais non de Louis II de Bavière, qui n'a assisté qu'aux répétitions de la Tétralogie. Il y crée en 1876 le cycle complet de la Tétralogie (achevé depuis 1874) , puis en 1882 « Parsifal » .

Dans ce théâtre, la scène a été conçue pour être l'endroit magique où se produirait l'alchimie de tous les arts (poésie,

musique, théâtre, danse) , ainsi que des décors, costumes et jeux de lumières. Le spectacle doit éveiller des énergies psychiques qui sommeillent en chacun et susciter la communication effective de tous. Tel est l'idéal de l' « œuvre d'art totale » à laquelle Wagner aspire dans ses écrits théoriques.

Homme usé, Wagner meurt lors d'un séjour à Venise. Ramenées à Bayreuth, ses cendres reposent dans le jardin de sa villa (Wahnfried, « Paix des illusions ») , où celles de Cosima seront aussi déposées en 1930.

Obsédé toute sa vie par la fondation d'une école, Wagner s'élève au-dessus des conventions qui faisaient de l'opéra un simple divertissement. Il considère le théâtre lyrique comme le lieu d'une initiation sacrée, et la tragédie, comme un « jeu scénique solennel » par lequel l'artiste s'érige en guide spirituel de son peuple. C'est ce rôle qu'il s'attribue en composant des drames musicaux où le texte devient musique, la musique action et l'action théâtre. C'est pourquoi il est, de tous les auteurs d'Opéras, le 1er qui écrive lui-même ses livrets, et le 1er qui caractérise ses personnages par l'emploi de certaines sonorités verbales.

Wagner fait de l'harmonie l'élément central autour duquel se construit le drame, et du leitmotiv (« motif conducteur ») , le thème qui en épouse les fluctuations, variant en fonction de son évolution. À l'orchestre, où les cuivres sont renforcés, il donne une ampleur sans précédent : pour la Tétralogie, 134 instruments, qui, dans la fosse de Bayreuth, sont superposés et non juxtaposés. Son influence s'étendra de Anton Bruckner et Gustav Mahler à Claude Debussy et Arnold Schœnberg.

Retrait du monument dédié à Felix Mendelssohn

Après sa mort, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy fut l'objet de la propagande anti-juive. Cela commença avec « Das Judentum in der Musik » , un pamphlet de Richard Wagner qui avait pourtant été fortement influencé par les compositions de Mendelssohn. L'ouvrage parut sous un pseudonyme, en 1850, 3 ans après la mort de Mendelssohn mais, en 1869, parut une édition augmentée sous le vrai nom de l'auteur. À la date de la 2e publication, Wagner était déjà un compositeur influent si bien que son point de vue contribua à faire mépriser l'œuvre de Mendelssohn dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle.

En 1933, après la prise du pouvoir par le régime nazi, Josef Goebbels interdit (en sa qualité de président de la « Chambre de la culture du " Reich " ») les représentations des œuvres de Mendelssohn. Il y en eut néanmoins quelques-unes, par exemple, « le Songe d'une nuit d'été » dirigé par Wilhelm Furtwängler, en février 1934 (à l'occasion du 125e anniversaire de Mendelssohn) . Des compositeurs allemands, parmi lesquels on compte les compositeurs Richard Strauß et Carl Orff, furent invités à écrire des alternatives musicales à la musique de Mendelssohn pour « le Songe d'une nuit d'été » .

...

Mendelssohn was the much-loved music-director in Düsseldorf from 1833 to 1835, his 1st paid position. He launched his tenure there, and also the revival of the music of Händel, with a performance of the Oratorio « Israel in Egypt » .

(Händel had been almost entirely forgotten in Germany at the time, except by scholars.)

Mendelssohn left Düsseldorf when he took-over the music directorship of Leipzig - a post he held until his early death in 1847, at age 38. Leipzig's musical culture was so completely transformed by Mendelssohn that the city still bears his imprint, even after all of these years and in spite of Nazi efforts to efface his memory. It was largely due to Mendelssohn that the works of his then-forgotten Leipzig predecessor, Johann Sebastian Bach, were revived and his remaining manuscripts preserved.

Criticism of Mendelssohn for his very ability (which could be characterized negatively as facility) was taken to further lengths by Richard Wagner. Mendelssohn's success, his popularity and his Jewish origins irked Wagner sufficiently to damn Mendelssohn with faint praise, 3 years after his death, in an anti-Jewish pamphlet, « Das Judentum in der Musik » :

« Mendelssohn has shown us that a Jew may have the amplest store of specific talents, may own the finest and most varied culture, the highest and tenderest sense of honour - yet, without all these pre-eminences helping him, were it but one single time, to call forth in us that deep, that heart-searching effect which we await from art. The washiness and the whimsicality of our present musical style has been pushed to its utmost pitch by Mendelssohn's endeavour to speak-out a vague, an almost nugatory Content as interestingly and spiritedly as possible. »

This was the start of a movement to downgrade Mendelssohn's status as a composer which lasted almost a Century, the echoes of which still survive today in critiques of Mendelssohn's supposed mediocrity.

The philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche expressed consistent admiration for Mendelssohn's music, in contrast to his general scorn for « Teutonic » Romanticism :

At any rate, the whole music of Romanticism (e.g. , Schumann and Wagner) was 2nd rate music from the very start, and real musicians took little notice of it. Things were different with Felix Mendelssohn, that halcyon Master who, thanks to his easier, purer, happier soul, was quickly honoured and just as quickly forgotten, as a lovely incident in German music.

Some readers, however, have interpreted Nietzsche's characterization of Mendelssohn as a « lovely incident » as condescending.

In the 20th Century, the Nazi regime and its « Reichsmusikkammer » cited Mendelssohn's Jewish origin in banning performance and publication of his works, even asking Nazi-approved composers to re-write incidental music for « A Midsummer Night's Dream » . Carl Orff obliged. Under the Nazis, « Mendelssohn was presented as a dangerous “ accident ” of music history, who played a decisive role in rendering German music in the 19th Century “ degenerate ” . »

The German Mendelssohn Scholarship for students at the Leipzig Conservatory was discontinued in 1934 - and not

revived until 1963.

...

Mendelssohn Bartholdy wurde nach seinem Tod Objekt antijüdischer Propaganda. Den Beginn machte Richard Wagner, der von den Kompositionen Mendelssohns stark beeinflusst wurde, mit seinem Pamphlet *Das Judentum in der Musik*, das 1850, drei Jahre nach dem Tode Mendelssohn Bartholdys, unter einem Pseudonym und dann erweitert 1869 unter seinem Namen erschien. Wagner war zum Zeitpunkt der zweiten Veröffentlichung bereits ein einflussreicher Komponist, und er « schädigte Mendelssohns Ruf nachhaltig » : Seine Auffassung trug zur Geringachtung des Werkes von Mendelssohn Bartholdy in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts bei.

1933, nach der Machtübernahme des NS-Regimes, verbot Josef Gœbbels (in seiner Eigenschaft als Präsident der « Reichskulturkammer ») Aufführungen der Werke Mendelssohn Bartholdys. Gleichwohl gab es einige Aufführungen zum Beispiel des *Sommernachtstraums* ; so führte zum Beispiel Wilhelm Furtwängler im Februar 1934 anlässlich Mendelssohns 125. Geburtstag den *Sommernachtstraum* auf.

Deutsche Komponisten, darunter so berühmte wie Carl Orff, wurden aufgefordert, musikalische Alternativen zu Mendelssohn Bartholdys Musik zu *Ein Sommernachtstraum* zu schreiben. Büsten und Gedenktafeln von Mendelssohn Bartholdy wurden entfernt (zum Beispiel im November 1936 das Mendelssohn-Denkmal vor dem Leipziger Gewandhaus - wogegen Furtwängler öffentlich protestierte) . Der Oberbürgermeister Carl Gærdeler trat wegen der Entfernung des Mendelssohn-Denkmal in seiner Abwesenheit von seinem Amt zurück und wurde in Folge eine der zentralen Figuren des deutschen Widerstands.

...

1936 : Les Nazis interdisent l'exécution des œuvres de Felix Mendelssohn qu'ils qualifient de « grave accident dans l'histoire de la musique » . Même sa célèbre « Marche Nuptiale » , utilisée jusqu'alors par des milliers de couples allemands à l'église, est dorénavant bannie. Bustes et plaques commémoratives du compositeur sont aussi retirés. Sa tombe située au cimetière berlinois de la Trinité est cependant épargnée.

Mendelssohn, Wagner and the Nazis come together in an amusing story from the roof-top of the Prague concert-hall. The German high-command had ordered that a statue of Mendelssohn be removed. The SS officer in charge, one Julius Schlesinger, didn't know which of the many statues Mendelssohn's was. After unsuccessfully seeking advice from Doctor Rabinovich, a learned Jew, Schlesinger resorted to selecting the statue with the biggest nose ! Surely, he thought, this must be the one. Just as the statue started to topple-over, he realized to his horror that instead of Mendelssohn, his team had unwittingly selected the musical hero of the Nazis ! It was none other than the statue of Richard Wagner !

8 octobre 1936 : (Leipzig) Local Nazi newspapers joined in demanding removal of the Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue from the Municipal Hall. It was suggested the statue of the famous composer be presented to the Jewish Culture League of Leipzig.

For the excited report about the possibility of receiving the Mendelssohn statue, see the article « Um ein Mendelssohn-Bartholdy-Denkmal », « Jüdische Rundschau », 7 October 1936.

The name on the statue is the full name by which Mendelssohn was baptised. It ends with his mother's surname « Bartholdy ». This surname had been adopted by his mother's Jewish family, from a property they owned, in an effort to break away from their Jewish roots.

Then, in 1847, at the age of just 38, in his adopted home city of Leipzig, Felix Mendelssohn died. Some years later, in 1892, a large bronze statue of the composer was erected in the city. But this is not it. The story of Mendelssohn's statue reveals some of the absurdities and complexities around Nazi policies on race, in the years just before those same policies led to the programmes of mass murder. Although Mendelssohn had been baptised into the Lutheran Church, and had lived as a practising Christian, he was born a Jew. Under Nazi policies, baptism could not change his race.

Ironically, for all the anti-Semitic persecution that Mendelssohn's music and his descendants had received, Mendelssohn had in his own lifetime made a clear statement about his conversion from Judaism to the Lutheran faith by championing the previously forgotten Christian music of Johann Sebastian Bach. He wrote :

« To think that a Jew should give back to the people the greatest Christian music in the world ! »

The Nazi Deputy Mayor, Hans Rudolf Haake, pressed Karl Gærdeler to remove the statue, especially so in the spring of 1936.

Gærdeler said no.

Juillet 1936 : After more pressure, Gærdeler agreed that moving the statue to another distinguished public location might be discussed, but he postponed the discussion to some undetermined time after the summer.

L'affrontement politique se poursuit entre l' « Oberbürgermeister » (maire) de Leipzig, le docteur Karl Gærdeler, et le « Gauleiter » (député-maire : le responsable administratif régional) , Hans Rudolf Haake, au sujet du sort à réserver à la statue du compositeur Felix Mendelssohn. Finalement, après d'intenses négociations, Gærdeler accepte le principe que la statue puisse quitter son emplacement original devant l'édifice de la salle de concert du « Gewandhaus » pour aller vers un site moins attrayant, soit le côté-est de l'édifice. Mais les discussions demeurent en suspens.

Automne 1936 : Le 1er magistrat doit s'absenter du 8 au 13 novembre pour un voyage d'affaires en Finlande, sur l'invitation de la Chambre de commerce allemande. Il participera, entre autres, à une importante conférence sur l'économie, les prix et la monnaie qui se tiendra à Helsinki, le 10 novembre.

Mais avant son départ, il rencontre Adolf Hitler et le ministre de la Propagande, Josef Gœbbels. Ces derniers lui

promettent que rien n'arrivera à la statue durant son absence. Il était important pour le régime de donner une image de tolérance face au monde entier qui se déplacera dans le cadre des Jeux Olympiques de Berlin.

Gørdeler informe le député-maire Haake de cette rencontre, avant son départ.

Le gigantesque monument de bronze, une œuvre du sculpteur Clemens Buscher (1855-1916) réalisé d'après des esquisses de Werner Stein, fut inauguré le 26 mai 1892 devant le (second) « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig. Le compositeur avait été nommé directeur musical de cet Orchestre (le « Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchester ») pendant plusieurs années.

Hans Rudolf Haake est le 1er « Gauleiter » national-socialiste de Westphalie. Il est également gouverneur de la province du Rhin ; un membre de la mouvance « völkisch » du « Landtag » .

8 novembre 1936 : Les Nazis ont vent que le chef anglais Thomas Beecham accompagné par une délégation de musiciens de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Londres (actuellement en tournée au pays) veulent déposer une gerbe au pied du monument de Mendelssohn (« compositeur au sang totalement juif ») , situé devant l'édifice du « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig.

Nuit du 9 au 10 novembre 1936 : Sur ordre du député-maire national-socialiste Hans Haake (avec l'appui des conseillers municipaux, également des Nazis) , le monument dédié à Mendelssohn est retiré de son espace, en plein milieu de la nuit (pour ne pas attirer l'attention du public) .

Karl Gørdeler avait déjà osé défier le régime en permettant l'exécution de la musique chorale de Mendelssohn (geste toujours impunis en septembre 1936) ; en s'opposant au démantèlement de sa statue ; en plus de refuser de hisser le drapeau à croix gammée devant son Hôtel-de-ville.

La statue, de même que sa base, sont amenées à la hâte, dans un soubassement à proximité. Le bloc de granite sera réduit en mille morceaux alors que le métal, lui, sera recyclé.

De plus, il est décidé que la rue « Mendelssohn-Bartholdy-Straße » porterait dorénavant le nom du compositeur Anton Bruckner : « Anton-Bruckner-Straße » .

Le maire apprend la choquante nouvelle sur le chemin du retour, après avoir quitté Stockholm ; il accuse Hans Haake de trahison. Pour sa part, le chef d'orchestre Wilhelm Furtwängler protestera publiquement.

Gørdeler demande à Haake des explications.

Haake mentionne que l'histoire de la statue n'était « qu'anecdotique comparé au fond du problème » . Il déclare à ce sujet :

« La position du docteur Gørdeler face à la “ question juive ” s'est révélée particulièrement évidente à travers

l'histoire de la statue de Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. »

Et, de poursuivre le « Gauleiter » :

« Mendelssohn ne peut faire l'objet de promotion dans aucune ville musicale allemande. »

Gærdeler va tenir une séance du Conseil municipal pour examiner le projet de reconstruction sous l'angle juridique. Le trésorier de la ville, Kohler, propose plutôt de remplacer le monument par le portrait d'un autre grand compositeur allemand. Mis en échec, le maire menace de prendre sa retraite dès le 25 novembre (1936) . On le « force » alors à prendre congé. Le député-maire Hans Rudolf Haake prend sa place par intérim. Les élections municipales approchent à grand pas. Le 22 mars 1937, le maire « élu » de Leipzig demeure fermement sur ses positions. Puisqu'il était impossible pour Gærdeler de congédier Haake, il va remettre officiellement sa démission, le 31 mars 1937.

The removal of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue was the incident Gærdeler chose for his resignation, and the Nazi Deputy Mayor accepted it as a gesture on precisely this point.

Some dispute this and argue that Gærdeler had objected only to Haake's insubordination, and that Haake's accusations against Gærdeler were a cover for Haake's own disobedience. But Gærdeler's further actions, on behalf of the Jews, make that a highly-implausible explanation, and, contrary to the critics' intent, they conclusively prove his commitment to helping the Jews. In 1938, Gærdeler sought the aid of a foreign power for the purpose of saving the Jews from persecution and, thereby, committed treason (« Landesverrat ») under existing German statute law.

One of the Councillors, Otto Wolf, wrote on 7 December 1936 to Party authorities that Gærdeler had, in 1934, severely criticised Hitler's actions « in the Röhm affair » and said that the Courts of law should have been employed, and that it was impossible for him to wear the Party badge if he received one ; that Gærdeler had resisted every renaming of a street named after a Jew ; that Mrs Gærdeler had, herself, driven in the mayor's official automobile to Jewish stores to do her shopping ; that, in May 1936, faced with the « Führer » 's and the government's confidence in Gærdeler, the Council renewed Gærdeler's appointment as mayor but, since then, he had ever more displayed his economic pessimism, particularly in connection with the new 4 Year Plan ; and that we are scandalised now, in the matter of the Mendelssohn monument, that, we, the councillors asked Mayor Haake to remove it in Doctor Gærdeler's absence, that Doctor Gærdeler, a non-National-Socialist, now invokes discipline toward him from National-Socialists in a fundamentally National-Socialist matter, while he has not enough discipline to support the measures of the « Reich » government.

When the Party's regional leader (« Gauleiter ») Martin Mutschmann installed Gærdeler's successor, the Leipzig National-Socialist county leader (« Kreisleiter ») Walter Donicke, he said that Leipzig as a world-rank city had to have a National-Socialist mayor. Gærdeler wrote to Mutschmann from New York, on 23 November 1937, to explain the reasons for his resignation, listing 1st the removal of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue and the refusal of the Saxon Ministry of the Interior to take the action against Haake that Gærdeler had to demand to preserve his authority. In consequence, Gærdeler concluded, he was forced to resign his office. He had not the power to simply have the statue brought back, and so, he had lost both, a point of principle and his authority. The issue of his authority forced him to

resign, although, of course, it was not the primary cause of the conflict. When Haake proposed that the City Council approve Gærdeler's request to be relieved of his office with pension, not one of the 30 Councillors who were present rose to say a word of thanks, or in Gærdeler's defence. After his resignation as mayor of Leipzig, in the autumn of 1936, effective in April 1937, Gærdeler worked in Berlin as a consultant and agent for the Robert Bosch Company of Stuttgart.

Plus Gærdeler, il écrivit de sa cellule de la prison de Plötzensee, à Berlin :

« À cette époque, j'avais refusé d'endosser la position culturelle de la ville. »

Karl Gærdeler avait été élu maire de Leipzig, en 1930. Il s'est publiquement opposé au ré-armement du pays, aux lois de Nuremberg et à l'antisémitisme des Nazis. Il devint un des personnages importants de la Résistance allemande. Il sera pendu, le 2 février 1945, après avoir subi son procès à Berlin devant le « Tribunal du peuple », accusé de complot contre le « Führer » .

Le « Tribunal du peuple »

Le « Volksgerichtshof » (Tribunal du peuple) était une Cour spéciale, plus précisément un tribunal politique visant la condamnation pour haute-trahison et atteinte à la sûreté de l'État contre le régime nazi ; il a été mis en place par Adolf Hitler après l'incendie du « Reichstag », en 1933.

Au 1er janvier 1943, le « Tribunal du peuple » comprenait 47 juges professionnels et 95 juges « bénévoles », dont 30 officiers, 4 officiers de police et 48 « SA », « SS », « NSKK » et chefs des « Jeunesses hitlériennes ». En 1944, le nombre des assesseurs était monté à 173 et le nombre de procureurs du « Reich » à 179. De 1934 à 1945, le tribunal prononça plus de 10,980 condamnations à une peine de prison et 5,179 condamnations à mort pour haute-trahison.

Le tribunal siégeait alors dans les locaux du « Neues Kammergericht » (nouvelle Cour d'appel), construit de 1909 à 1913, dans le quartier de Schöneberg, à Berlin. Après la guerre, celui-ci abrita le Conseil de contrôle allié et, plus particulièrement à partir du blocus de 1948, l'organisme chargé du contrôle des couloirs aériens menant à Berlin. Depuis 1990, le Neues Kammergericht a repris sa destination initiale, puisqu'il accueille désormais la Cour constitutionnelle de Berlin.

...

The « People's Court » (« Volksgerichtshof ») was a « Sondergericht », a special court, established in 1934 by German Chancellor Adolf Hitler, who had been dissatisfied with the outcome of the « Reichstag » fire Trial (all but one of the accused were acquitted). The « People's Court » was set-up outside the operations of the constitutional frame of law. The court had jurisdiction over a rather broad array of « political offenses », which included crimes like black marketeering, work slow-downs, defeatism and treason against the 3rd « Reich ». These crimes were viewed by the

court as « Wehrkraftzersetzung » (disintegration of defensive capability) and were, accordingly, punished severely. The death penalty was meted-out in numerous cases in this court.

The Court handed down an enormous number of death sentences under Judge-President Roland Freisler, including those that followed the 20th « July Plot » to kill Hitler. Many of those found guilty by the Court died in the Plötzensee prison. The proceedings of the court were often even less than show trials in that some cases, such as that of Sophie Scholl and her brother Hans Scholl and fellow « White Rose » activists concluded in less than an hour, without evidence being presented or arguments made by either side. The president of the court often acted as prosecutor, denouncing defendants, then pronouncing his verdict and sentence without objection from defense counsel, who usually remained silent throughout. Unsurprisingly, it did not follow the laws and procedures of regular German trials, being easily characterized as a « kangaroo court » . It almost always sided with the prosecution, to the point that being hauled before it was tantamount to a death sentence.

With almost no exceptions, cases in the People's Court had pre-determined guilty verdicts. There was no presumption of innocence nor could the defendants adequately represent themselves or consult an attorney. A proceeding at the « People's Court » would follow an initial indictment in which a State or city prosecutor would forward the names of the accused to the « Volksgerichtshof » for charges of a political nature. Defendants were hardly ever allowed to speak to their attorneys beforehand and, when they did, the defense lawyer would usually simply answer questions about how the trial would proceed and refrain from any legal advice. In at least one documented case (the trial of the « White Rose » conspirators) , the defense lawyer assigned to Sophie Scholl chastised her the day before the trial, stating that she would pay for her crimes.

The « People's Court » proceedings began when the accused were led to a prisoner's dock under armed police escort. The presiding judge would read the charges and then call the accused forward for « examination » . Although the court had a prosecutor, it was usually the judge who asked the questions. Defendants were often berated during the examination and never allowed to respond with any sort of lengthy reply. After a barrage of insults and condemnation, the accused would be ordered back to the dock with the order « examination concluded » .

After examination, the defense attorney would be asked if they had any statements or questions. Defense lawyers were present simply as a formality and hardly any ever rose to speak. The judge would then ask the defendants for a statement during which time more insults and berating comments would be shouted at the accused. The verdict, always « guilty » , would then be announced and the sentence handed down at the same time. In all, an appearance before the « People's Court » could take as little as 15 minutes.

The best-known trials in the « People's Court » began on 7 August 1944, in the aftermath of the 20th « July Plot » that year. The 1st 8 men accused were Erwin von Witzleben, Erich Hoepner, Paul von Hase, Peter Yorck von Wartenburg, Helmuth Stieff, Robert Bernardis, Friedrich Klausning, and Albrecht von Hagen. The trials were held in the imposing Great Hall of the Berlin Chamber Court, on « Elßholzstraße » , which was bedecked with swastikas for the occasion and there were around 300 spectators including Ernst Kaltenbrunner and selected civil servants, Party functionaries, military officers and journalists. A film camera ran behind the red-robed Roland Freisler so that Hitler could view the

proceedings, and to provide footage for newsreels and a documentary entitled « Traitors before the People's Court » . The last documentary of « Die Deutsche Wochenschau » , it was not shown at the time.

The accused were forced to wear shabby clothes, denied neck ties and belts or suspenders for their pants, and were marched into the court-room hand-cuffed to policemen. The proceedings began with Freisler announcing he would rule on « the most horrific charges ever brought in the history of the German people » . Freisler was an admirer of Andrey Vyshinsky, the chief prosecutor of the Soviet purge trials, and copied Vyshinsky's practice of heaping loud and violent abuse on defendants.

The 62 year old Field Marshal von Witzleben was the 1st to stand before Freisler and he was immediately bawled at for giving a brief Nazi salute. He faced further humiliating insults while holding onto his trouser waist-band. Next, former Colonel-General Erich Hoepner, dressed in a cardigan, faced Freisler, who addressed him as « Schweinehund » . When he said that he was not a « Schweinehund » , Freisler asked him what zoological category he thought he fitted into.

The accused were unable to consult their lawyers, who were not seated near them. None of them were allowed to address the court at length, and Freisler interrupted any attempts to do so. However, Major General Helmuth Stieff attempted to raise the issue of his motives before being shouted down, and Witzleben managed to call-out :

« You can hand us over to the hangman. In 3 months, the enraged and tormented people will drag you alive through the muck of the streets. »

All were condemned to death by hanging, and the sentences were carried-out shortly afterwards, in Plötzensee prison. His prediction proved slightly incorrect, as Freisler died in a bombing raid, in February 1945, approximately half a year later.

Another trial of plotters was held on 10 August. On that occasion the accused were Erich Fellgiebel, Alfred Kranzfelder, Fritz-Dietlof von der Schulenburg, Georg Hansen and Berthold Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg.

On 15 August, Wolf-Heinrich Graf von Helldorf, Egbert Hayessen, Hans Bernd von Haeften, and Adam von Trott zu Solz were condemned to death by Freisler.

On 21 August, the accused were Fritz Thiele, Friedrich Gustav Jaeger and Ulrich Wilhelm Graf Schwerin von Schwanefeld who was able to mention the « many murders committed at home and abroad » , as a motivation for his actions.

On 30 August, Colonel-General Carl-Heinrich von Stülpnagel, who had blinded himself in a suicide attempt, was led into the court and condemned to death along with Cæsar von Hofacker, Hans Otfried von Linstow, and Eberhard Finckh.

Notable people sentenced to death by the « Volksgerichtshof » :

1942 : Helmuth Hübener - At the age of 17, he was the youngest opponent of the 3rd « Reich » executed as a result of a trial by the « Volksgerichtshof » .

1942 : Maria Restituta Kafka - A Catholic nun and surgical nurse who was found guilty of distributing regime-critical pamphlets.

1943 : Otto and Elise Hampel - The couple carried-out civil disobedience in Berlin, were caught, tried, sentenced to death by Freisler, and executed. Their story formed the basis for the 1947 Hans Fallada novel, « Every Man Dies Alone » .

1943 : Members of the « White Rose » Resistance movement - Sophie Scholl, Hans Scholl, Alex Schmorell, Willi Graf, Christoph Probst, and Kurt Huber.

1943 : Julius Fučík - A Czechoslovakian journalist, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia leader, and a leader in the forefront of the anti-Nazi Resistance. On 25 August 1943, in Berlin, he was accused of high-treason in connection with his political activities. He was found guilty and beheaded 2 weeks later, on 8 September 1943.

1943 : Karlrobert Kreiten - A German pianist. Nazi Ellen Ott-Monecke notified the « Gestapo » of Kreiten's negative remarks about Adolf Hitler and the War effort. Kreiten was indicted at the « Volksgerichtshof » , with Freisler presiding, and condemned to death. Friends and family frantically tried to save his life to no avail. The family was never notified officially about the judgment. They only accidentally learned that Kreiten had been executed with 185 other inmates in Plötzensee Prison.

1943 : Max Sievers - A Communist and former chairman of the German Freethinkers League. He fled to Belgium after the Nazis came to power, but they caught-up with him after invading that country. He was convicted of « conspiracy to commit high-treason along with favouring the enemy » , sentenced to death, and beheaded by guillotine, on 17 February 1944.

1944 : Max Josef Metzger - A German Catholic priest. Metzger was the founder, in 1938, of the « Una Sancta Brotherhood » , an ecumenical movement for bringing Catholics and Protestants to unity. During the trial, Freisler said that people like Metzger (meaning clergy) should be « eradicated » .

1944 : Erwin von Witzleben - A German Field-Marshal (« Generalfeldmarschall ») . Witzleben was a German Army (« Wehrmacht ») conspirator in the 20 July Bomb Plot to kill Hitler. Witzleben, who would have been Commander-in-Chief of the « Wehrmacht » in the planned post- « coup » government, arrived at Army Headquarters (OKH-HQ) in Berlin, on 20 July, to assume command of the « coup » forces. He was arrested the next day and tried by the « People's Court » , on 8 August. Witzleben was sentenced to death and hanged, the same day, in Plötzensee Prison.

1944 : Johanna (« Hanna ») Kirchner - A member of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany (« Sozialdemokratische

Partei Deutschlands » , or SPD) .

1944 : Lieutenant-Colonel Cæsar von Hofacker - A member of a resistance group in Nazi Germany. Hofacker's goal was to overthrow Hitler.

1944 : Carl Friedrich Gerdeler - Conservative German politician, economist, civil servant and opponent of the Nazi regime, who would have served as the Chancellor of the new government had the 20th « July Plot » of 1944 succeeded.

1944 : Otto Kiep - Chief of the « Reich » Press Office (« Reichspresseamts ») , which became involved in the Resistance.

1944 : Elisabeth von Thadden, as well as other members of anti-Nazi « Solf Circle » .

1944 : Julius Leber - German politician of the « SPD » and a member of the German Resistance against the Nazi regime.

1944 : Johannes Popitz - Prussian finance minister and a member of the German Resistance against Nazi Germany.

1945 : Helmuth James Graf von Moltke - German jurist, a member of the opposition against Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany, and a founding member of the « Kreisau Circle » dissident group.

1945 : Klaus Bonhoeffer and Rüdiger Schleicher - German Resistance fighters.

1945 : Erwin Planck - Politician, businessman, Resistance fighter and son of physicist Max Planck. Planck was an alleged conspirator in the 20th « July Plot » .

1945 : Artur Nebe - An SS-General (« Gruppenführer ») . Nebe was a conspirator in the 20 July Bomb Plot to kill Hitler. He was the head of the « Kriminalpolizei » (or « Kripo ») , and the commander of « Einsatzgruppe B » . Nebe oversaw massacres on the Russian Front and at other locations, as he was commanded to do by his superiors in the SS. After the failure to assassinate Hitler, Nebe hid on an island in the Wannsee until he was betrayed by one of his mistresses. On 21 March 1945, Nebe was hanged, allegedly with piano wire (Hitler wanted members of the plot « hanged like cattle ») , at Plötzensee Prison.

Judge-Presidents of the « People's Court » :

Fritz Rehn (13 July - 18 September 1934) .

Otto Georg Thierack (1936 - August 1942) .

Roland Freisler (20 August 1942 - 3 February 1945) .

Harry Haffner (12 March - 24 April 1945) .

...

L'opération nocturne de démantèlement de la statue de Mendelssohn illustre bien la haine vouée au compositeur juif par les autorités nazies. En s'en prenant à l'une des figures emblématiques du Romantisme allemand, 2 ans presque jour pour jour avant les pogroms de la « Nuit de Cristal » , le pouvoir veut alors faire passer un double message : d'une part, la poursuite de la politique de mise-au-pas et de purification de la vie musicale allemande entreprise dès la prise de pouvoir ; d'autre part, l'annonce que cette politique n'épargnera aucun des compositeurs juifs, fussent-ils de confession protestante, et aussi assimilés à la tradition musicale allemande que Mendelssohn.

Voir Alexander Demandt. « Vandalismus » , page 172 ; et Gerhard Ritter. « The German Resistance : Karl Gørdeler's Struggle against Tyranny » , Freeport, New York (1970) .

...

On 26 May 1892, 24 years after the Committee in charge of the monument in honour of the composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy had been founded and 45 years after his early death, the monument could be inaugurated. The bronze monument was situated on the east-side of the old « Gewandhaus » music hall, in Leipzig, and had been created after drafts by Werner Stein.

At the end of the 19th Century, the skillful monument was living proof of a high historico-cultural value and an appreciation of the musical genius of Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and of his merits to the world of music.

During the Nazi period, the Mendelssohn monument was torn down on 9 November 1936, as Mendelssohn was considered a Jew and, therefore (according to Mayor Hans Rudolf Haake) , a National-Socialist, could « not be displayed as an exponent for a German city of music » . It is not known what happened to the monument.

...

It was the dead of night. A large marble statue of the Jewish composer Felix Mendelssohn was quietly dismantled to avoid attention. It was hurriedly moved into a nearby cellar and completely smashed to pieces !

Who was responsible for such an act ? And why such extreme hatred ?

It all started just 3 years after Mendelssohn's death. In 1850, an article entitled « Judaism in Music » appeared in a music paper. The author's identity was concealed but he later re-published his article, in 1869, this time boldly revealing his identity. It was Richard Wagner ! In the article, Wagner fiercely attacked Mendelssohn's music and the

music of other Jewish German composers whom he had previously praised :

« The life and works of Mendelssohn clearly demonstrates that no Jew, however gifted and cultural and honourable, was capable of creating art that moved the heart and soul. »

In 1881, Wagner truly revealed the extent of his anti-Semitic feelings in article in the « Bayreuther Blätter » entitled : « Know Thyself ! » . In it he praises the massacres of Jews in Russia as « an example worthy of imitation » . He concludes with these impassioned words about the Jews :

« Drive them out, German people - but not like the Egyptians, those Hamitic fools, who even gave them golden vessels for the journey. For they must go away empty-handed. Whither I know not, but I wish them all the same fate. May they find no shelter, no homeland ; unhappier than Cain, may they seek and not find ; may they descend into the Red Sea, but may they never, never emerge from it. German people, know thyself ! »

Why did Wagner, himself rumored to have been of Jewish extract, launch such a tirade of abuse on his fellow German ? After his death, Mendelssohn was viewed as the most important figure in German musical culture. His music was extremely popular across Europe. He raised the profile of the conductor to an art-form in his lifetime and he also considered a most accomplished pianist. For Wagner, a composer trying to forge his own musical career, Mendelssohn was a hard act to follow. Instead of relying completely on his own music to do all the « talking » , Wagner couldn't resist the urge to publicly slander Mendelssohn and his musical legacy. Sadly, many listened.

50 years later, Adolf Hitler a keen admirer of Wagner and his music, frequently used his music during Nazi rallies to whip-up the emotions of his audience to court his anti-Semitic policies. The policy of « Gleichschaltung » (Coordination) required music to satisfy the National-Socialist's model for a new German culture. There was no toleration of any Jewish art, music, film or architecture. Even jazz music was banned because it was considered « degenerate » because of its association with Black Americans. In 1936, the Nazis banned Mendelssohn's music calling it a « dangerous accident of music history » . Even his famous « Wedding » March which had been used by thousands of German couples to accompany them down the aisle was outlawed.

Returning to the opening story, 45 years after Mendelssohn's death, a statue in Leipzig was established in 1892, in front of the « Gewandhaus » , home of the « Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchester » that he had directed for many years. The monument paid tribute to Mendelssohn's contribution to German musical culture.

...

In 2003, the then mayor of Leipzig, Wolfgang Tiefensee, and the honorary conductor of the « Gewandhaus Orchester » , Professor Kurt Masur, agreed to rebuild the Mendelssohn monument. With the help of a generous donation by Doctor Wolfgang Jentzsch, the reconstruction of the monument started.

The reconstructed Mendelssohn monument is located in the heart of the city, on « Dittrichring » , just across from

Saint-Thomas Church. The Monument was inaugurated on 18 October 2008.

On a plinth which is 4 metre high and made of granite, there is a bronze statue of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, about 3 metre of height. On the steps of the monument sits the muse of music, with 2 cherubs making music and singing on each side. On the plinth, you can read the inscription « Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy » , on the front, and « Edles nur künde die Sprache der Töne » (May the language of music only tell of noble things) , on the back. On the sides, 2 medallions symbolise church music and secular music.

...

Conductor Kurt Masur worked tirelessly to rehabilitate Mendelssohn to his rightful place of honour in Leipzig, and also to replace Leipzig's bronze and stone monument.

On 27 September 2008, the city of Leipzig replaced the bronze statue of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy that the Nazis tore down on 9 November 1936 and later used for scrap metal. The recreated statue is installed, at the entrance to the garden courtyard, on the left of the Opera House. The re-installation ceremony, on 18 October 2008, was celebrated with speeches and an all-Mendelssohn concert, including his « Lord, Hear My Prayer » for soprano, chorus and orchestra, as well as his Violin Concerto and « Italian » Symphony No. 4.

In 2009, a stamp was issued in Germany to celebrate the 200th anniversary of Mendelssohn's birth. Despite extreme persecution, his legacy has enjoyed a renaissance and his wonderful gift of melody is being enjoyed by a new generation of music-lovers.

10 novembre 1936 : Sir Thomas Beecham, the famous English conductor is touring Germany with the London Philharmonic Orchestra. On morning, he plans to lay a wreath at the base of the Mendelssohn memorial with a delegation of musicians. Arrived at the location, expecting to see the statue, they are surprised by its absence - it seems it has vanished into thin air ! They search around a bit but to no avail.

14 novembre 1936 : The destruction of the Mendelssohn memorial statue, in Leipzig, is reported by the « Morning Post » . Wiener Library Archives, Leo Baeck Institute, New York. See also : Larry Todd. « Mendelssohn : A Life in Music » , xx-xxi.

Hiver 1936-1937 : Loyal Mendelssohn supporters managed to smuggle hundreds of his documents including music scores, letters and drawings out of the Prussian State Library in Berlin, to Poland. When the Nazis invaded Poland, they hurriedly moved his materials out of the country and they became scattered across the world. About 270 of these scores remain unpublished and, subsequently, unheard by the public to this day ! Thanks to the efforts of the Mendelssohn project, established in 1996, large numbers of these documents have been traced and brought back together again.

Karl Gærdeler

Karl Gørdeler, ancien maire de Leipzig, sera la figure principale de l'opposition au Nazisme dans les années 1940-1941, alors que les officiers ont l'attention détournée par les succès militaires.

Son groupe comptait :

Le diplomate Ulrich von Hassell.

Le ministre des Finances de Prusse, Johannes Popitz.

Le chef du « Cercle de Kreisau » , Helmuth James Graf von Moltke.

Gørdeler était également en contact avec le « SPD » clandestin de Julius Leber avec les oppositions catholiques et protestantes.

La Ligue d'urgence des pasteurs (« Pfarrernotbund ») du pasteur Martin Niemöller, créée en 1933, est l'organisation de résistance protestante la plus importante. Localement, il s'agira de « conseils de frères » (« Bruderräte ») , rassemblées en un Conseil de frères du « Reich » (« Reichsbruderrat ») , qui s'unit aux synodes libres.

Lors du 2e synode libre national (1934) , les opposants créent une Église confessante (« Bekennende Kirche ») . Ses personnalités sont Friedrich Weißler (juriste, mort déporté en 1937) , le pasteur Paul Schneider (mort déporté en 1939) . Theophil Wurm (évêque du Wurtemberg) prend la succession de Niemöller, à la tête de l'Église confessante. Il entre en contact avec Friedrich Bonhoeffer, avec le groupe de Karl Gørdeler et avec le « Cercle de Kreisau » .

Avec la remontée du risque de guerre mi-1939, Oster, toujours en contact avec Halder, Witzleben (qui n'est plus à Berlin, ce qui complique les choses) , Gørdeler, tente de relancer le projet de « Putsch » . Mais il apparaît que les officiers sont beaucoup moins prêts à suivre. En particulier, les officiers prussiens sont séduits par le projet d'Hitler de reprendre Dantzig et la Haute-Silésie à la Pologne.

Le « Cercle de Kreisau » est l'un des mouvements de la résistance allemande les plus connus. Il n'était pas composé que de membres conservateurs, mais ses membres venaient essentiellement de cette mouvance (officiers et hauts-fonctionnaires de l'aristocratie) . De 1938 à l'attentat du 20 juillet 1944, il comptait 20 membres actifs et environ 20 sympathisants. Le domaine de Kreisau (en Silésie) , appartenant à la famille von Moltke, a abrité, de 1940 à 1943, des rencontres de fonctionnaires et d'officiers, d'ecclésiastiques catholiques et protestants, d'hommes politiques conservateurs mais aussi Sociaux-Démocrates. Leurs réflexions devaient préparer une Allemagne post-nazie, démocratique, humaniste, sociale et européenne. Le Cercle a été créé par un avocat, le comte Helmuth James von Moltke. D'éducation partiellement britannique (par sa mère) , il aurait été surnommé le « Comte rouge » en raison de ses prises de position sociales découlant de l'éthique chrétienne. Von Moltke fut arrêté début 1944 par les Nazis et tué le 23 janvier 1945. En 1940, le « Cercle de Kreisau » est rejoint par le haut-fonctionnaire, le comte Peter Yorck von Wartenburg qui avait fondé un autre groupe de résistance en 1938. Arrêté le 21 juillet 1944, il fut exécuté le 8 août 1944. Le «

Cercle de Kreisau » était en liaison avec d'autres groupes de résistance, tels :

Le groupe de Franz Sperr, au sud de l'Allemagne (en contact avec de hauts-officiers) .

Un groupe de dirigeants travaillistes catholiques de Cologne.

Le « Cercle de Fribourg » .

Des communistes modérés non stalinien.

À partir de 1943, certains membres du « Cercle de Kreisau » décidèrent de passer à l'action contre le régime et prirent contact avec Ludwig Beck, Karl Friedrich Gerdeler, Ulrich von Hassel et Claus Schenk von Stauffenberg. La plupart des membres du « Cercle de Kreisau » furent inculpés de haute-trahison après le « Putsch » du 20 juillet 1944 et furent condamnés à mort.

Les principaux membres du « Cercle de Kreisau » sont :

Le comte Helmuth James von Moltke (avocat) .

Le comte Peter Yorck von Wartenburg (haut-fonctionnaire) .

Adam von Trott zu Solz (juriste ouvert sur l'international, fonctionnaire au ministère des Affaires étrangères) . Exécuté le 26 août 1944.

Hans-Bernd von Haefen (juriste, très haut-fonctionnaire au ministère des Affaires étrangères) . Exécuté le 15 août 1944.

Julius Leber (ancien député Social-Démocrate) . Exécuté le 5 janvier 1945.

Theodor Haubach (philosophe socialiste ?) . Exécuté le 23 janvier 1945.

Carlo Mierendorff (ancien député Social-Démocrate du SPD) . Mort en décembre 1943, lors d'un bombardement allié à Leipzig.

Adolf Reichwein (professeur d'histoire Social-Démocrate) . Exécuté le 20 octobre 1944.

Otto Heinrich von der Gablentz. Proche du socialisme religieux. En contact avec la résistance norvégienne. La « Gestapo » ignore sa participation au « Putsch » du 20 juillet 1944. Il a survécu à la guerre.

Carl Dietrich von Trotha (haut-fonctionnaire au ministère de l'Économie) . Il a échappé à la « Gestapo » et survécu

au régime nazi.

Horst von Einsiedel (membre du SPD) . Destin terrible : s'il échappa à la « Gestapo » , il sera arrêté en 1945 par les Soviétiques et mourra en 1948 dans l'ex-camp de concentration nazi de Sachsenhausen, alors utilisé par les Soviétiques.

Theodor Steltzer (haut-fonctionnaire de la république de Weimar) . En 1940, ayant un haut-poste militaire dans la Norvège occupée, où entra en contact avec la résistance norvégienne. Il survécut à la guerre.

Harald Poelchau (aumônier de prison influencé par le socialisme religieux) . Il ne fut pas démasqué par la « Gestapo » après le 20 juillet 1944.

Hans Peters (professeur de droit et politique à Berlin) . Son appartenance au « Cercle de Kreisau » ne fut pas découverte par la « Gestapo » et il survécut.

Alfred Delp (jésuite, prêtre à Munich, fut rédacteur de la revue catholique « Stimmen der Zeit » jusqu'à son interdiction en 1941) . Arrêté en juillet 1944 et exécuté le 2 février 1945.

Lothar König (jésuite) . Après le 20 juillet 1944, se cacha dans la cave-à-charbon du Collège de jésuites Berchman jusqu'à la fin de la guerre.

Augustin Rösch (provincial des jésuites responsable du sud de l'Allemagne) . Arrêté par les Nazis le 11 janvier 1945, mais pas tué.

Paulus van Husen (juriste et important homme politique du Parti centriste en Silésie) . Arrêté en août 1944, mais libéré par les troupes soviétiques.

Hans Lukaschek (important politicien centriste de Silésie, était le membre le plus âgé du « Cercle de Kreisau ») . Arrêté le 20 juillet 1944, il est libéré peu avant la fin de la guerre.

Eugen Gerstenmaier (membre du bureau des relations ecclésiastiques internationales) . Arrêté par les Nazis en 1944 mais libéré par les troupes américaines.

Le comte Gottfried von Bismarck-Schönhausen, pourtant membre du Parti nazi au « Reichstag » et officier SS.

Dans sa biographie de Gørdeler, Gerhard Ritter établit une distinction entre ceux des Allemands qui travaillaient pour une défaite de l'Allemagne et ceux qui travaillaient à renverser le régime nazi, tout en restant loyaux envers l'Allemagne. Donc, pour Ritter, Gørdeler était un patriote tandis que ceux qui étaient impliqués dans l'Orchestre Rouge étaient des traîtres qui méritaient le peloton d'exécution. Les historiens ouest-allemands des années 1950 en vinrent à réduire la résistance aux seuls Nationaux-Conservateurs impliqués dans le complot contre Hitler du 20 juillet 1944. Il se produisit une héroïsation et une sacralisation de la résistance, et ceux qui en étaient furent crédités des plus hauts

mobiles éthiques et moraux. Dans les années 1950, la résistance étaient décrite comme issue des classes moyennes et du Christianisme avec une insistance sur l'héroïsme des individus se rebellant seuls contre la tyrannie.

L'historien canadien Peter Hoffmann écrivit un essai en 2004, « la Résistance allemande et l'Holocauste » (The German Resistance and the Holocaust) . Il y soutenait que la majorité des conjurés du 20 juillet 1944 était surtout motivée par le rejet de l'Holocauste. En particulier, Peter Hoffmann utilisait les exemples de l'indignation de Claus von Stauffenberg devant le massacre des juifs russes, en 1942, du conseil donné par Karl Friedrich Gørdeler en 1938-1939 à son contact des services de renseignement britanniques, l'industriel A. P. Young, suggérant que le gouvernement britannique prenne une position dure contre la politique antisémite du gouvernement allemand.

L'historien israélien Danny Orbach, dans un livre paru en 2010, prit également la défense des résistants allemands, notant en particulier le fait que Gørdeler était particulièrement favorable au sionisme, l'importance du rejet de l'Holocauste dans la motivation de la résistance nationaliste-conservatrice et les nombreuses tentatives des résistants pour protéger des juifs persécutés. Dans un article récent, Orbach fit également état du fait que les accusations de Christof Dipper étaient basées sur une mauvaise interprétation, voire une distorsion des sources primaires, tout particulièrement les mémorandums de Gørdeler sur la question juive.

...

Karl Friedrich Gørdeler, the son of a Prussian district judge, was born on 31 July 1884 in Schneidemühl, in the Prussian Province of Posen (now, Piła, Wielkopolskie, in Poland) . He was a monarchist conservative German politician, executive, economist, civil servant, and opponent of the Nazi regime. Had the 20th « July Plot » of 1944 succeeded, Gørdeler would have served as the Chancellor of the new government. He was hang, on 2 February 1945, in Plötzensee Prison, Berlin.

After studying law, Gørdeler became a local civil servant. After World War I, he joined the conservative German National People's Party (DNVP) .

In 1930, Gørdeler became mayor of Leipzig. He also became price commissioner in the government of Heinrich Brüning and remained in office when Adolf Hitler came to power, in 1933.

Gørdeler opposed the racial ideology of the National-Socialist. When DNVP began to cooperate with the NSDAP Party, in 1931, he left the Party. He was one of very few politicians in opposition to the ruling NSDAP after 1933. He resigned, in 1934.

Gørdeler publically opposed German re-armament and the Nuremberg Laws. As mayor of Leipzig, he refused to pull down the statue of the Jewish composer Felix Mendelssohn or to fly the Swastika flag over the city hall.

Gørdeler resigned as mayor of Leipzig, in 1937, and spent the next 2 years travelling around Europe as overseas representative of the Bosche company. In 1938, he met Winston Churchill and other important political figures, in

Britain and France. Gørdeler provided information about Nazi Germany and encouraged governments not to make too many concessions to Hitler. He was appalled by the Munich Agreement which he saw as « out-and-out capitulation » and claimed that it would lead to a War in Europe.

During the Second World War, Gørdeler advocated a negotiated peace with the Allies. However, he was deeply disappointed when his political contacts in Britain told him that the War would only come to an end if Germany unconditionally surrendered.

By 1940, Gørdeler had become convinced that only the German armed forces could overthrow Hitler. He made contact with Ludwig Beck but they were unable to find enough senior military leaders to take part in a « coup » .

In 1944, Gørdeler became involved in the « July Plot » and he agreed to become Chancellor after Hitler's assassination. On 18th July, 1944, Gørdeler was warned that the « Gestapo » had discovered that he was involved in a conspiracy to kill Adolf Hitler. He went into hiding but was arrested the following month, on 12th August. Karl Gørdeler was interrogated and tortured for 5 months before being executed on 2nd February, 1945.

...

Karl Friedrich Gørdeler was born to a family of Prussian civil servants. His parents were supporters of the Free Conservative Party, and Gørdeler's father served in the Prussian « Landtag » as a member of that Party after 1899. Gørdeler's upbringing was described by his biographer and friend Gerhard Ritter as a part of a large, loving middle-class family that was cultured, devoutly Lutheran, nationalist, and conservative. As a young man, the deeply religious Gørdeler chose as his motto to live by, « omnia restaurare in Christo » (restoring everything in Christ) . Gørdeler studied economics and law at the University of Tübingen, between 1902 and 1905. Starting in 1911, Gørdeler worked as a civil servant for the municipal government of Solingen. That same year, Gørdeler married Anneliese Ulrich, by whom he had 5 children. Gørdeler was described as :

Gørdeler's own career had been both impressive and idiosyncratic. He came of conservative Prussian stock with a strong sense of duty and service to the State ; his father had been a district judge. His upbringing had been happy, but sternly intellectual and moral ; his legal training had pointed to a career in local administration and economics. He was a born organiser, an able, voluble speaker and writer, tough and highly-individual ; in politics, he became a Right-wing Liberal. Although, at heart a very humane man, Gørdeler's frigid, spartan belief in hard work and his austere, puritanical morality - he would not tolerate a divorced man or woman in his house-lacked warmth and comradeship. He was, in fact, an autocrat by nature and his commanding personality, combined with his utter belief in the rightness of his point of view, enabled him to persuade weak or uncertain men over-easily to accept his own particular point of view while he was with them.

During World War I, Gørdeler served as a junior officer on the Eastern Front, rising to the rank of Captain. From February 1918, Captain Gørdeler worked as part of the German military government in Minsk. After the end of War, in November 1918, Gørdeler served on the headquarters of the XVII Army Corps based in Danzig (now, Gdańsk, in

Poland) . In June 1919, Gørdeler submitted a memorandum to his superior, General Otto von Below, calling for the destruction of Poland as the only way of preventing territorial losses on Germany's eastern borders. After his discharge from the German Army, Gørdeler joined the ultra-conservative German National People's Party (DNVP) . Like most of the political class of Germany, at that time, Gørdeler strongly rejected the Versailles Treaty, which stipulated that Germany cede territories to the restored Polish State. In 1919, before the exact boundaries of the Polish-German border were determined, he suggested restoring West Prussia to Germany. Despite his strongly held hostile feelings towards Poland, Gørdeler played a key role in breaking a strike by the Danzig dockers, who wished to shut-down the Polish economy by closing Poland's principal port during the Polish - Soviet War of 1920, on the grounds that however undesirable Poland was as a neighbour, Soviet Russia would be even worse.

In 1922, Gørdeler was elected as the mayor (« Bürgermeister ») of Königsberg (now, Kaliningrad, Russia) , in East Prussia, before being elected mayor of Leipzig on May 22, 1930. During the Weimar Republic, Gørdeler was widely considered to be a hard-working and outstanding municipal politician. On December 8, 1931, Chancellor Heinrich Brüning, a personal friend of Gørdeler, appointed him as « Reich » Price Commissioner, and entrusted him with the task of overseeing his deflationary policies. The sternness with which Gørdeler administered his task as Price Commissioner made him a well-known figure in Germany. Accepting the post of Price Commissioner forced Gørdeler to resign from the DNVP because Alfred Hugenberg was a committed foe of the Brüning government. In the early 1930's, Gørdeler was a leading advocate of the viewpoint that the Weimar Republic had failed as proven by the Great Depression, and what was needed was a Right-wing revolution to replace democracy.

After the downfall of the Brüning government, in 1932, Gørdeler was considered to be a potential Chancellor and was sounded-out by General Kurt von Schleicher, who ultimately chose Franz von Papen instead. Following the fall of his government, on May 30, 1932, Brüning himself recommended to President Paul von Hindenburg that Gørdeler succeed him. Hindenburg vetoed Gørdeler because of his former membership in the German National People's Party (DNVP) . Starting in 1928, under the leadership of Alfred Hugenberg, the DNVP had waged a vituperative campaign against Hindenburg, claiming that he was one of the « November Criminals » who were alleged to have « stabbed Germany in the back » , in 1918, which led Hindenburg to loathe and hate the DNVP. As a result, by 1932, no member of the DNVP or even a former member was acceptable to Hindenburg as Chancellor. The fall of Brüning led to Gørdeler resigning as Price Commissioner. Later, in 1932, Gørdeler was offered a position in Papen's cabinet, which he refused.

As late as 1935, Gørdeler considered Adolf Hitler an « enlightened dictator » , who, provided he received the proper advice, would be a force for good. Gørdeler was later to call the period in which he supported the Nazis the only chapter of his life that he found embarrassing. On 1 April 1933, the day of the national boycott declared against all Jewish businesses in the « Reich » , Gørdeler appeared in full uniform of the « Oberbürgermeister » of Leipzig to order the SA to cease and desist in their efforts to enforce the boycott, and ordered the Leipzig police to free several Jews taken hostage by the SA. Several times, he attempted to help Leipzig Jewish businessmen threatened with the « Aryanization » economic policies of the Nazi regime. A few days after the boycott, Gørdeler found himself as mayor of Leipzig enforcing the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, which unlike the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 did not give him cause for complaint.

As part of his efforts to influence the Nazi regime, Gørdeler had sent Hitler long memoranda containing his advice on economic policy and, in the 2nd half of 1935, wrote-up a new draft law on the powers and responsibilities of municipal governments. Despite his early sympathy for the regime and considerable pressure from the National-Socialists, Gørdeler always refused to join the NSDAP. By the mid-1930's, Gørdeler grew increasingly disillusioned with the Nazis as it became more and more apparent that Hitler had no interest in reading any of Gørdeler's memoranda, but instead was carrying-out economic and financial policies that Gørdeler regarded as highly-irresponsible. In addition, the fact that the Nazis in the Leipzig municipal government massively increased the debts owed the city was a major source of worry for Gørdeler. By 1934, he clashed with Hitler over his foreign policy, as Nazi Germany signed a non-aggression treaty with Poland, to which Gørdeler was opposed, demanding annexation of Polish territories. He wrote to Hitler that continued Polish possession of territories in Gdansk Pomerania and Greater Poland was « thorn in country's economic flesh and honour » , and that « the German people must fight for security of their existence » .

In 1933, a « Reich » law forbade doctors who were members of the KPD or who were « non-Aryans » from participating in public health insurance, exempting only those who were World War I veterans, or children or parents of veterans. A 2nd decree of 1934 banned all physicians from participating in public health insurance who had one or more Jewish grandparents regardless of their religion, or if they were married to a « non-Aryan » . However, these laws did not affect those physicians who received their approbation under the Weimar Republic. On April 9, 1935, the Deputy Mayor of Leipzig, the National-Socialist Hans Rudolf Haake, in defiance of the existing laws, banned all Jewish doctors from participating in public health insurance, and advised all municipal employees not to consult Jewish doctors. In response, the « Landesverband Mitteldeutschland des Centralvereins deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens eingetragener Verein » (Middle German Regional Association of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith) complained to Gørdeler about Haake's actions, and asked him to enforce the existing anti-Semitic laws which, at least, allowed some Jewish doctors to practice. On 11 April 1935, Gørdeler ordered the end of Haake's boycott, and provided a list of « non-Aryan » physicians permitted to operate under the existing laws, and those who were excluded. Critics of Gørdeler such as the American political scientist Daniel Goldhagen have asserted that, because Gørdeler published a list of « non-Aryan » physicians to be excluded from practicing under public insurance, Gørdeler was an anti-Semite ; by contrast, Gørdeler's defenders like the Canadian historian Peter Hoffmann have argued that Gørdeler's insistence on enforcing the laws served to protect those Jewish physicians entitled to practice.

In November 1934, Gørdeler was again appointed « Reich » Price Commissioner, and ordered to combat inflation caused by re-armament. « Gestapo » reports, from 1934 record, that the German public greeted the news of Gørdeler's re-appointment as Price Commissioner as a positive development. The appointment of Gørdeler was Hitler's response to the increasing problem of inflation. Despite the great fanfare which greeted Gørdeler's appointment, he was given little real power. In 1934, Gørdeler was strongly opposed to the idea of devaluing the « Reichsmark » , and had supported Hitler and Doctor Schacht against the advocates of devaluation. During his 2nd term as Price Commissioner, in 1934-1935, Gørdeler often came into conflict with the Economics Minister and « Reichsbank » president Doctor Hjalmar Schacht over his inflationary policies. In Gørdeler's opinion, these posed a grave danger to the German economy, and finally prompted his resignation in 1935 as Price Commissioner. As Price Commissioner, Gørdeler became increasingly troubled by Nazi economic policies, as well as being disgusted by rampant corruption within the Nazi Party. In September 1935, as Mayor of Leipzig, Gørdeler found himself enforcing the Nuremberg Laws,

laws that he found deeply distasteful.

In October 1935, Gørdeler sent Hitler a memorandum in which he urged that the priorities for the use of German foreign exchange should be shifted from buying raw materials that Germany lacked for re-armament and, instead, be used to buy food that Germany was short of like fats. In his report, Gørdeler wrote that the foremost goal of German economic policy should be : « the satisfactory provisioning of the population with fats, even in relation to armaments, as having political priority » . In the same report, Gørdeler argued that the root of German economic problems was re-armament, and advocated as the solution reducing military spending, increasing German exports, and returning to a free-market economy. Gørdeler warned that, to continue the present course of increasing statism in the economy and the current levels of high military spending, would result in the total collapse of the economy with an extremely drastic drop in living standards. After Hitler ignored Gørdeler's report, Gørdeler asked Hitler to dissolve the « Reich » Commissariat for Price Surveillance since there was nothing for that office to do. In the spring of 1936, Gørdeler came into increasing conflict with Haake over the question of demolition of a monument to the German-Jewish composer Felix Mendelssohn.

In the summer of 1936, Gørdeler was heavily involved in trying to influence the decision-making regarding the great economic crisis which gripped Germany that year. Despite his earlier differences with Doctor Schacht, Gørdeler together with Schacht headed the « free-market » faction in the German government who during the economic crisis of 1936 urged Hitler to reduce military spending, turn away from autarkic and protectionist policies, and reduce statism in the economy. Supporting the « free-market » faction were some of Germany's leading business executives, most notably Hermann Duecher of AEG, Robert Bosch of Robert Bosch GmbH and Albert Voegeler of « Vereinigte Stahlwerke AG » . Gørdeler and Schacht were opposed by another faction centred around Hermann Göring calling for the opposite. Despite his disagreements with Göring over the best economic course to follow, on 6 August 1936, Göring commissioned a report from Gørdeler as a leading economic expert about whether Germany should devalue the « Reichsmark » or not. Gørdeler began his report by rejecting the policies of Doctor Schacht's New Plan of 1934 as untenable. Making a U-turn from his stance of 1934, Gørdeler now embraced devaluation of the « Reichsmark » as the best solution to the economic crisis. Gørdeler argued that the tolerance of other Western nations, especially the United States for German State's subsidizing the dumping of exports was wearing thin, and would soon result in harsh new tariffs being applied against German goods. Gørdeler argued that the only way out of the economic crisis which gripped the German economy, in 1936, was the devaluation of the « Reichsmark » , and abandoning all of the restrictions governing foreign exchange in Germany. Gørdeler argued that for devaluation of the « Reichsmark » to be successful would require co-ordination with other nations, especially the United States, the United Kingdom and France, who otherwise might be tempted to engage in competitive devaluations of the Dollar (\$) , the Pound (£) and the Franc (Fr) , respectively. To secure their co-operation, Gørdeler argued for rapprochement with the Western powers. In his memorandum for Göring, Gørdeler wrote of the « grandiose possibility » that a German re-engagement with the world economy, and the end of protectionism and autarchism would lead to a new age of economic co-operation among the world's largest economies. To this end, Gørdeler argued in exchange for Anglo-French-American economic co-operation and support, Germany should at a minimum cease its unilateral economic policies, and sharply cut military spending. In addition, Gørdeler felt that the price of Western economic support would be a moderation of the Nazi regime's policies, in regards to the « Jewish question, freemasonry question, question of the rule of law, Church

question » . Gørdeler wrote that :

« I can well imagine that we will have to bring certain issues into a greater degree of alignment with the imponderable attitudes of other peoples, not in substance, but in the manner of dealing with them. »

The British historian Adam Tooze has argued that Gørdeler was following his own agenda in seeking to moderate the regime's domestic policies in his memorandum, and that it is highly-unlikely that outside powers would have required the concessions on anti-Semitic and other domestic policies that Gørdeler advocated as the price of Western economic support (through Tooze does feel that Gørdeler was correct in arguing that the West would have made cutbacks in military spending a precondition of economic support) . Gørdeler argued his policies of economic liberalisation and devaluation would in the short run cause 2 to 2.5 million unemployed in Germany, but argued that in the long-run, the increase in exports would make the German economy stronger. In public, Göring called Gørdeler's memorandum « completely unusable » . Göring's copy of Gørdeler's memorandum is covered with hand-written personal comments by Göring on the side such as « What cheek ! » , « Nonsense ! » , and « Oho ! » . When Göring forwarded a copy of Gørdeler's memorandum to Hitler, his covering letter stated :

« This may be quite important, my “ Führer ”, for your memorandum, since it reveals the complete confusion and incomprehension of our bourgeois businessmen, limitation of armaments, defeatism, incomprehension of the foreign policy situation alternate. His (Gørdeler's) recommendations are adequate for a mayor, but not for the State leadership. »

Gørdeler's advice was rejected by Hitler in his « 4 Year Plan Memorandum » of August 1936 and, instead, in the autumn of 1936, the Nazi regime launched the « 4 Year Plan » as the way-out of the 1936 economic crisis. Hitler himself found Gørdeler's report objectionable, and Hitler's « 4 Year Plan Memorandum » may have been written, in part, as a reply to Gørdeler's memorandum (Gerhard Ritter favoured this theory whereas Gerhard Weinberg rejects it) . On 4 September 1936, speaking before the German Cabinet, Göring cited Gørdeler's memorandum as an example of flawed economic thinking, and announced that Germany would pursue heavy military spending, protectionism and autarky regardless of the economic consequences.

In the fall of 1936, Gørdeler's on-going dispute with Haake, over the Mendelssohn's statue, came to a head. After much argument, Gørdeler agreed to have the statue moved from its location in front of the « Gewandhaus » concert-hall to a less high-profile position. In the autumn of 1936, Gørdeler left for a trip to Finland promoted by the German Chamber of Commerce. Before leaving, Gørdeler met with Adolf Hitler and the Propaganda Minister Josef Gøebbels, and received their promise that nothing would happen to the statue during his trip. During his trip, the statue was demolished on Haake's orders. Upon his return, Haake stated that the matter of the statue was « only the outward occasion of the conflict » and declared that :

« Doctor Gørdeler's attitude in the “ Jewish Question ” had been revealed particularly clearly in the matter of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue. »

Gørdeler tried to have the statue rebuilt. After failing that, he declined to accept his re-election as mayor of Leipzig and resigned from office on March 31, 1937.

After his resignation as « Oberbürgermeister » of Leipzig, Gørdeler was offered the position of heading the finance department at the firm of « Krupp AG », which was, at the time, Germany's largest corporation. However, Hitler forbade Gørdeler to take-up this appointment, and ordered Krupp to withdraw the offer. Gørdeler, instead, became the director of the overseas sales department at the firm of « Robert Bosch GmbH ». Shortly after his resignation, Gørdeler became involved in anti-Nazi plots. Bosch, who was a friend of Gørdeler's, agreed to turn a blind eye to his anti-Nazi work. As a conservative and self-proclaimed follower of the Bismarckian tradition, Gørdeler was opposed to what he considered the extreme radicalism of the Nazis, and was fearful of what the results of Hitler's foreign policy might be. Starting in 1936, Gørdeler worked to build an opposition faction out of his circle, comprising mostly civil servants and businessmen. Despite his anti-Nazi plotting, Gørdeler continued to submit memoranda to Hitler and the other Nazi leaders out of the hope that he might somehow convince them to change course. The case of Gørdeler has been used by the historian Hans Mommsen to support his view of « resistance as a process », with Gørdeler going from an ally of the regime to increasing disillusionment by Nazi economic policies in the mid-1930s, and finally becoming committed to the regime's overthrow by 1937. By early 1938, Gørdeler was convinced that « something must be done » about the Nazi regime. Describing Gørdeler during this period, the American journalist William L. Shirer wrote that Gørdeler was :

« A conservative and a monarchist at heart, a devout Protestant, able, energetic and intelligent, but also indiscreet and headstrong “ who ” went to work with heart and soul, in opposition to Hitler. »

Using the « cover » of his job as chief of overseas sales at Bosch, between 1937 and 1938, Gørdeler often travelled abroad, mostly to France, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Balkans, the Middle-East and Canada, to warn anyone who would listen about what he considered to be the aggressive and dangerous foreign policy of Nazi Germany. Though opposed to what he considered to be a reckless foreign policy, Gørdeler often demanded, in his meetings with his foreign friends, that the « Great Powers » back the cession of the Sudetenland, the Polish Corridor, the Memelland (modern Klaipėda, in Lithuania) , and the Free City of Danzig, together with the return of the former German colonies in Africa, to Germany. At the same time, Gørdeler became a member of General Ludwig Beck's private intelligence network. Gørdeler's reports were received not only by General Beck, but by General Werner von Fritsch. The German historian Klaus-Jürgen Müller observed that Gørdeler, in his contacts abroad, tended to falsely portray himself as representing a more organized movement than was in fact the case, and presented himself to his foreign contacts as the secret spokesman of a well-organized « German Opposition ». Besides trying to influence foreign governments, Gørdeler attempted to use his reports to the Army leadership to try to influence the Army into considering an anti-Nazi « Putsch ». During one of his visits to London, in June 1937, Gørdeler told Sir Robert Vansittart that he would like to see the Nazi regime replaced by a Right-wing military dictatorship that would seek British friendship, in exchange for which Gørdeler wanted British support for annexing parts of Poland and Czechoslovakia. In October 1937, during a visit to the United States, Gørdeler stayed with the British historian Sir John Wheeler-Bennett at the latter's Estate in Virginia, and informed him of his desire to restore the monarchy in Germany. During the same trip, Gørdeler drafted his « Political Testament » attacking Nazi economic policies, and criticized the

regime for its anti-Christian policies, widespread corruption, and lawlessness. In this period, Gørdeler met several times with Winston Churchill and Vansittart.

During the Blomberg-Fritsch Affair and the attendant crisis caused by the court-martial of General Werner von Fritsch, Gørdeler became closely associated with several loose groupings of German Rightists in the Civil Service and the military who, for various reasons, were unhappy with aspects of the 3rd « Reich ». Gørdeler attempted to use the Fritsch crisis to try to turn the Army leadership against the Nazi regime, but his efforts were in vain. In April 1938, Gørdeler visited London, where he advised the British government both to resist the Nazi claim to the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia while, at the same time, declaring that he wanted to see the area transferred to Germany as soon as possible. As Gerhard Weinberg observed, Gørdeler's contradictory statements left the British somewhat confused. In the spring of 1938, Gørdeler, in association with Hans von Dohnanyi, Colonel Hans Oster, and Johannes Popitz, became involved in planning a « Putsch » against the Nazi regime should the regime launch « Fall Grün », the code-name for the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In June 1938, General Beck often consulted with Gørdeler over the question of whether or not he should resign as Chief of the General Staff as a way of stopping « Fall Grün ».

Vansittart introduced Gørdeler to one of his spies, the British industrialist A.P. Young, who was a close business partner to several German corporations, and as such often visited Germany. Because Young did frequent business with Bosch and because of Gørdeler's position there, the 2 could meet often without raising suspicion. Starting in August 1938, Gørdeler started to leak information to London, informing the British that Hitler intended to launch « Fall Grün » in September 1938. In August 1938, Gørdeler met with Young in the village of Rauschen Dune, in East-Prussia. During his meeting with Young, Gørdeler asked that Young convey a message to the British government, to the effect that London should apply diplomatic and economic pressure on Germany to cease the persecution of the Jews. In order to have more frequent meetings with his British contacts, Gørdeler stayed in Switzerland, in August-October 1938. Though those British politicians and civil servants who met with Gørdeler were impressed with his candor and earnestness, it was judged too risky by the Chamberlain government, in 1938, to stake all upon the Gørdeler's projected « Putsch », especially given that the chances for success were uncertain at best, and the discovery of British backing for an unsuccessful « Putsch » was likely to cause the war the Chamberlain government was seeking to avert, in 1938. Moreover, as one British civil servant wrote on August 22, 1938 :

« We have had similar visits from other emissaries of the Reichsheer, such as Doctor Gørdeler, but those for whom these emissaries claim to speak have never given us any reasons to suppose that they would be able or willing to take action such as would lead to the overthrow of the regime. The events of June 1934 (the “ Night of the Long Knives ”) and February 1938 (the “ Blomberg-Fritsch Affair ”) do not lead one to attach much hope to energetic action by the Army against the regime. »

Ulrich von Hassell wrote in his diary that Gørdeler was « imprudent » but, at least, « he wants to act rather than grumble », which was a marked difference to the generals who indicated that perhaps they would or perhaps they would not act against the Nazi regime should Czechoslovakia be attacked. In the tense atmosphere of September 1938, with the crisis in Central Europe looking likely to explode into War at any moment, Gørdeler was waiting anxiously for the « Putsch » to overthrow the Nazi regime, and his taking over the reins of the German State as the new

Chancellor. During his planning for the « coup », Gørdeler was in contact with Chinese intelligence, using General Alexander von Falkenhausen as intermediary. Like most German conservatives, Gørdeler favoured Germany's traditional informal alliance with China, and was strongly opposed to the volte-face in Germany's Far-Eastern policies, effected in early 1938, by the Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, who abandoned the alliance with China for an alignment with Japan. In a September 1938 meeting with Young, the latter reported that « X » (as Gørdeler was code-named by the British) had stated about the domestic situation in Germany :

« The working classes are nervous, distrustful of the Leader. Their allegiance is doubtful. »

In another meeting, on September 11, 1938, in Zürich, Young recorded Gørdeler as saying :

« The feeling among the people against the War is welling-up at an alarming rate. His (Gørdeler's) recent talks with leading industrialists had satisfied him that the workers' feelings have been bitterly roused to the point where, if they were in possession of arms, they would physically revolt against the regime. »

On September 29, 1938, Gørdeler informed the British, through one of Vansittart's contacts, Colonel Graham Christie, that the mobilization of the Royal Navy was turning German public opinion against the regime. The British historian Sir John Wheeler-Bennett, who knew Gørdeler well, noted that Gørdeler failed to realize that Hitler was not bluffing with « Fall Grün » and had every intention of attacking Czechoslovakia on October 1, 1938, and that he regarded Munich as a personal set-back. In 1938, Gørdeler was deeply disappointed with the « Munich Agreement » which, in his view, though it turned-over the Sudetenland to Germany, was undesirable in that it removed what Gørdeler considered to be best chance of a « Putsch » against the Nazi regime. After the « Munich Agreement », Gørdeler wrote to one of his American friends :

« The German people did not want War ; the Army would have done anything to avoid it ; the world had been warned and informed in good time. If the warning had been heeded and acted upon Germany would, by now, be free of its dictator and turning against Mussolini. Within a few weeks, we could have begun to build lasting world peace on the basis of justice, reason and decency. A purified Germany with a government of decent people would have been ready to solve the Spanish problem without delay, in company with Britain and France, to remove Mussolini and, with the United States, to create peace in the Far-East. The way would have been open for sound co-operation in economic and social fields, for the creation of peaceful relations between Capital, Labour and the State, for the raising of ethical concepts and for a fresh attempt to raise the general standard of living. »

In the same letter, Gørdeler wrote :

« You can hardly conceive the despair that both people and the Army feel about the brutal, insane and terroristic dictator and his henchmen. »

Wheeler-Bennett commented that Gørdeler was vastly exaggerating the extent of anti-Nazi feelings, both in the German Army and among the German public. After Munich, Gørdeler told Young that :

« It is vitally important to realise that Hitler is deeply and definitely convinced that, after his unexpected victory at Munich, anything is possible to him. He says that he (Hitler) is now convinced that England is degenerate, weak, timid and never will have the guts to resist any of his plans. No War will ever be needed against either England or France. »

In November 1938, when Sir Neville Henderson, the British Ambassador to Germany went on sick leave, the acting heads of the Embassy in Berlin sent a series of reports to the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax intended to effect a change in British policy towards Germany. Gørdeler emerged as one of the Embassy's leading informants.

In November 1938, Gørdeler met with Young, in Switzerland, and asked if were possible for the British government to intercede on the behalf of 10,000 Polish Jews the Germans had expelled from Germany, and whom the Poles refused to accept. Gørdeler declared that the treatment of the Polish Jews, stranded on the German-Polish border, was « barbaric ». In December 1938 - January 1939, Gørdeler had a further series of meetings with Young, in Switzerland, where he informed Young that the « Kristallnacht » pogrom of November 1938 had been ordered by Hitler personally, and was not a « spontaneous » demonstration as the Nazis had claimed. Gørdeler recommended that Young inform London that as soon as « the new persecution of the Jews is started, it is absolutely essential to break diplomatic relations ». Gørdeler also informed Young of his belief that Hitler was seeking world conquest, and that the « Führer » had « decided to destroy the Jews-Christianity-Capitalism ». Speaking to Young about the economic situation in Germany, Gørdeler stated :

« Economic and financial situation gravely critical. Inner situation desperate. Economic conditions getting worse. »

In another meeting with Young, Gørdeler claimed :

« The working classes are nervous, distrustful of the leader. Their allegiance is doubtful. »

Gørdeler maintained to Young that :

« The feeling among the people against War is welling-up at an alarming rate. His (Gørdeler's) recent talks with leading industrialists had satisfied X that the workers' feeling have been bitterly roused to the point where, if they were in possession of arms, they would physically revolt against the present regime. »

Gørdeler's reports to Young were later published by the latter in 1974, as « The " X " Documents » .

In December 1938, Gørdeler again visited Britain, where he alienated those British civil servants he met by his extreme German nationalist language, together with demands that the British support the return of Danzig, the Polish Corridor, and the former German colonies in Africa, plus making a huge loan to a post-Nazi government. Gørdeler asked Frank Ashton-Gwatkin of the Foreign Office to ensure that Britain gave a post-Nazi government an interest-free loan of £ 500 million in exchange for which Gørdeler would end protectionism, end the efforts to place the Balkans

into the German sphere of influence, and support Britain in the Mediterranean against Italy, and in the Far-East against Japan. In addition, the fact that Gørdeler was exaggerating the extent of anti-Nazi feeling in Germany, and his inability to organize a « Putsch », were becoming increasingly clear to the British. Sir Alexander Cadogan wrote about Gørdeler's offer :

« We are to deliver the goods and Germany gives I.O.U.s. »

Chamberlain was more hostile, writing : « These people must do their own job. »

In the same month, Gørdeler wrote his « World Peace Programme » calling an international conference of all the world's leading powers to consider disarmament, a « moral code » for relations between the States, and the stabilization of the various currencies. The end of Gørdeler's « World Peace Programme » read :

« Whoever abstains from co-operating wants War and is a breaker of the Peace. »

Despite what Gørdeler perceived as a major set-back after Munich, he continued with his efforts to bring about the downfall of the Nazi regime. Gørdeler was an unyielding optimist ; he believed that if only he could convince enough people, he could overthrow the Nazi regime. Gørdeler believed that through sheer force of will and the goodness of his cause that he could bring down the Nazi regime. Gørdeler spent much of the winter of 1938-1939 holding discussions with General Beck, the diplomat Ulrich von Hassell, and Erwin Planck about how best to overthrow the Nazi regime. At the same time, Hitler grew increasingly annoyed with Gørdeler's memoranda urging him to exercise caution. Gørdeler, together with Doctor Schacht, General Beck, Hassell, and the economist Rudolf Brinkmann, were described by Hitler as « the overbred intellectual circles » who were trying to block him from fulfilling his mission by their appeals to caution, and but for the fact that he needed their skills « otherwise, perhaps, we could someday exterminate them or do something of this kind to them » . During the winter of 1938-1939, Gørdeler sent reports to the British stating that Hitler was pressuring Italy into attacking France, was planning to launch a surprise air offensive against Britain, intended to achieve a « knock-out blow » by razing British cities to the ground sometime in the 2nd half of February 1939, and was considering an invasion of Switzerland and the Low-Countries as a prelude to attacking France and Britain. Unknown to Gørdeler, he was transmitting false information provided by the « Abwehr » chief Admiral Wilhelm Canaris and General Hans Oster who was hoping that these reports might lead to a change in British foreign policy. In this, Canaris and Oster achieved their purpose as Gørdeler's misinformation resulted in the « Dutch War Scare » which gripped the British government in late- January 1939 which, in turn, led to the public declarations by the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, in February, that any German attack upon France, Switzerland, and the Low-Countries would be automatically considered the « casus belli » for an Anglo-German War, leading to the British « continental commitment » to defend France with a large ground force.

On March 16, 1939, Gørdeler suggested to Young that Britain call an international conference to discuss « legitimate » German demands for changes in the international order. Gørdeler claimed that Hitler would refuse to attend the conference and this would so discredit him as to bring about his downfall » . Young passed on Gørdeler's conference idea to Cordell Hull, who was so impressed with it that he offered to bring about the proposed conference to be

chaired by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. This was the origin of Roosevelt's famous appeal to Hitler and Mussolini, on April 15, 1939, that the 2 leaders publicly promise never to disturb the peace for the next 10 years, in exchange for which Roosevelt promised a new economic international order.

In the 2nd half of March 1939, Gørdeler together with Doctor Schacht and Hans Bernd Gisevius visited Ouchy, Switzerland to meet with a senior French intelligence agent representing the Premier Édouard Daladier. Gørdeler told the « 2e Bureau » agent that the strain of massive military spending had left the German economy on the verge of collapse, that Hitler was determined to use the Danzig issue as an excuse to invade Poland which, in itself, was only a prelude for a German seizure of all of Eastern Europe, that a forceful Anglo-French diplomatic stand could deter Hitler, and that, if Hitler were deterred long enough, then, the economic collapse of Germany would cause the downfall of his regime. In April 1939, during a secret meeting with the British diplomat Sir Gladwyn Jebb, Gørdeler stated that, if the British continued with their « containment » policy, adopted in March 1939, then, they might see the « Hitler adventure liquidated before the end of June (1939) ». There is considerable debate as to the accuracy of this information, with some historians such as Richard Overy arguing that Gørdeler and other German conservatives had exaggerated German economic problems to the British and the French. Overy charged that what Gørdeler wanted was a very firm Anglo-French stand in favour of Poland, hoping that, if confronted with such a situation, the German Army would overthrow Hitler rather than risk a World War and, as such, Gørdeler exaggerated the economic problems of the « Reich » to encourage such a stand. The « X documents », and how to interpret them, played a key role in the debate in the late- 1980's between Overy and the Marxist Timothy Mason about whether the German attack on Poland was a « flight into War » forced on Hitler by an economic crisis. Other historians have contended that Gørdeler's information about German economic problems was correct, and have pointed to the fact that only massive Soviet economic support, combined with plundering occupied lands, saved the German economy from collapse, in the winter of 1939-1940. Even with Soviet economic support (especially, oil) and the exploitation of Poland and the « Reich » Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia, under the impact of the British blockade, there occurred a 75 % decline in value and tonnage of German imports during the « Phoney War » .

On 6 May 1939, Gørdeler leaked information to the British Foreign Office stating that the German and Soviet governments were secretly beginning a rapprochement with the aim of dividing Eastern Europe between them. In May 1939, Gørdeler visited London to repeat the same message to the British government. During his London trip, Gørdeler told the British that the state of the German economy was so deplorable that, even if War occurred, then, it could only have the effect of accelerating the German economic collapse, and that Germany simply lacked the economic staying power for an extended War. During the same visit to London, in May 1939, Gørdeler claimed that the German Army leadership was willing to overthrow the regime, that he himself favored launching a « Putsch » immediately, but that « the leaders of the whole movement still considered it too early ». The German historian Klaus-Jürgen Müller commented that Gørdeler, in making these claims, was either lying to the British, or else, was seriously self-deluded. Gørdeler's assessment of the German diplomatic-military-economic situation had considerable influence on decision-makers in the British and French governments, in 1939, who, based on Gørdeler's reports, believed that a firm Anglo-French diplomatic stand for Poland might bring about the fall of Hitler without a War, or failing that, at least, ensure that the Allies faced War on relatively auspicious economic terms.

Besides trying to influence opinion abroad, Gørdeler urged the German military to overthrow Hitler, and frequently found himself frustrated by the unwillingness of the generals to consider a « Putsch ». In a memo written at the end of July 1939, during a visit to Turkey, Gørdeler took the view that Hitler was bluffing in his demands against Poland, and, if he could be forced to stand down by a firm Anglo-French stand, that would be such a blow as to topple the Nazi regime. Later, as the summer of 1939 went on, Gørdeler changed his views about Hitler's intentions towards Poland. In August 1939, Gørdeler contacted General Walter von Brauchitsch, and advised him if Germany attacked Poland, the result would not be the limited War that Hitler expected, but rather a World War pitting Germany against Britain and France. Gørdeler advised Brauchitsch that the only way to save Germany from such a War would be a « Putsch » to depose Hitler. Brauchitsch was not interested in Gørdeler's opinions, and told him that he shared Hitler's belief that Germany could destroy Poland without causing a World War, in 1939. On August 25, 1939, on discovering that the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact had not led as intended to an Anglo-French abandonment of Poland, Hitler ordered the temporary postponement of « Fall Weiß », which had been due to begin the next day. Gørdeler was convinced that the postponement was a fatal blow to Hitler's prestige. On August 26, he went on a trip to Sweden that he had been considering canceling because of the international situation. On August 27, 1939, Gørdeler told the British diplomat Gladwyn Jebb to continue to make a firm diplomatic stand for Poland, as the best way of bringing down the Nazi regime. At the same time, Gørdeler's insistence on restoring Germany to 1914 borders and his intense German nationalism left many British diplomats to distrust Gørdeler as they regarded him as not much different from Hitler. At the beginning of September 1939, Gørdeler returned to Germany a dejected man. Gørdeler was most disappointed and unpleasantly surprised when Germany attacked Poland on September 1, which was followed-up by Anglo-French declarations of War on September 3, which was followed-up by the German Army doing nothing to overthrow Hitler. This marked the beginning of a recurring pattern where Gørdeler would invest great hopes in his beloved German Army rising-up against Hitler, only to discover, time after time, that Army officers much preferred to fight for the « Führer » as opposed to fighting against him.

In 1939-1940, Gørdeler assembled conservative politicians, diplomats and generals, most notably Ulrich von Hassell, General Ludwig Beck, and Johannes Popitz, in opposition to Adolf Hitler. On 11 October 1939, speaking to Hassell of German War crimes in Poland, Gørdeler commented that both General Halder and Admiral Canaris were afflicted with nervous complaints as a result of « our brutal conduct of the War », in Poland. In October 1939, Gørdeler drafted peace terms that a post-Nazi government would seek with Great Britain and France. Under Gørdeler's terms, Germany would retain all the areas of Poland that had been part of Germany, prior to 1918, Austria, and the Sudetenland with independence being restored to Poland and Czechoslovakia with general disarmament, the restoration of global free trade and the ending of protectionism as the other major goals for the new regime. On 3 November 1939, Gørdeler paid another visit to Sweden, where he met with Marcus Wallenberg, Gustav Cassell, and Doctor Sven Hedin. Hedin wrote in his diary that :

« He (Gørdeler) believed in Göring and thought that a speedy peace was the only thing to save Germany, but that peace was unthinkable so long as Hitler remained at the head of affairs. »

At the same time, Gørdeler was deeply involved in the planning of an abortive « Putsch » intended to be launched, on 5 November 1939, and, as such, was in very high spirits prior to that day. Hassell wrote in his diary that with

worry that :

« He (Gœrdeler) often reminds me of Kapp. »

(Wolfgang Kapp, the nominal leader of the « Kapp “ Putsch ” » was notorious for his irresponsibility.)

The proposed « Putsch » became still-born when Field Marshal Walter von Brauchitsch and General Franz Halder, the leaders of the planned « Putsch » got cold feet, and dropped their support. Brauchitsch and Halder had decided to overthrow Hitler after the latter had fixed « X-day » for the invasion of France, for November 12, 1939 ; an invasion that both officers believed to be doomed to fail. During a meeting with Hitler, on November 5, Brauchitsch had attempted to talk Hitler into putting-off « X-day » by saying that morale in the German Army was worse than what it was in 1918, a statement that enraged Hitler who harshly berated Brauchitsch for incompetence. After that meeting, both Halder and Brauchitsch told Gœrdeler that overthrowing Hitler was simply something that they could not do, and he should find other officers if he that was what he really wanted to do. Equally important, on November 7, 1939, following heavy snowstorms, Hitler put-off « X-Day » until further notice, which removed the reason that had most motivated Brauchitsch and Halder to consider overthrowing Hitler. On November 23, 1939, Gœrdeler met with Halder to ask him to re-consider his attitude. Halder gave Gœrdeler the following reasons why he wanted nothing to do with any plot to overthrow Hitler :

That General Erich Ludendorff had launched the « Kaiserschlacht » , in March 1918, which led directly to Germany's defeat in November 1918, yet, most people in Germany still considered Ludendorff one of Germany's greatest heroes. By contrast, the men who staged the « November Revolution » and signed the armistice that took Germany out of a losing War were hated all over the « Reich » as the « November Criminals » . Even if Hitler were to launch an invasion of France that signally failed, most people would still support Hitler, just as the failure of the « Kaiserschlacht » had failed to hurt Ludendorff's reputation as it should have, so the Army could do nothing to overthrow Hitler until the unlikely event that his prestige was badly damaged. Until Hitler was discredited, anyone who acted against him to end the war would be a « new November Criminal » .

That Hitler was a great leader, and there was nobody to replace him.

Most of the younger officers in the Army were extreme National-Socialists who would not join a « Putsch » .

Hitler deserved « a last chance to deliver the German people from the slavery of English capitalism » .

Finally, « one does not rebel when face to face with the enemy » .

Despite all of Gœrdeler's best efforts, Halder would not change his mind.

In January-February 1940, Gœrdeler together with Popitz, Beck and Hassell spent of their time working on the sort of constitutional, economic, social and educational system that a post-Nazi government would carry-out. The basis of all

their planning was the restoration of the monarchy. Gerdeler believed that the main reason why the Army would not overthrow Hitler was the lack of a positive goal to inspire them with the hope of a better tomorrow and, if he and his colleagues could work out plans for a better future, then, the Army leaders would change their minds. During their discussions for a post-Hitler future, it was agreed that various Nazi leaders like Hermann Göring and Heinrich Himmler, provided that they were willing to break with Hitler could have a leading role in a post-Nazi government. The only Nazi leader besides Hitler whom Gerdeler and his circle were adamant could play no role in a post-Nazi government was the Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop who Gerdeler personally hated as an obnoxious bully, and whose foreign policy Gerdeler viewed as criminally inept. In early April 1940, Gerdeler met secretly with General Franz Halder, the Chief of the General Staff, and asked him to consider a « Putsch » while the « Phoney War » was still on, while the British and French were still open to a negotiated peace. Halder refused Gerdeler's request. Gerdeler told Halder that too many people had already died in the War, and this refusal to remove Hitler, at this point, would ensure that the blood of millions would be on his hands. Halder told Gerdeler that his oath to Hitler and his belief in Germany's inevitable victory in the War precluded his acting against the Nazi regime. Halder told Gerdeler that :

« The military situation of Germany, particularly on account of the pact of non-aggression with Russia, is such that a breach of my oath to the “ Führer ” could not possibly be justified. » (Halder was referring to the Hitler oath.)

Only if Germany was faced with total defeat would he consider breaking his oath, and that Gerdeler was a fool to believe that World War II could be ended with a compromise peace. Halder ended his meeting with Gerdeler on April 6, 1940, with the remark :

« England and France had declared War on us, and one had to see it through. A peace of compromise was senseless. Only in the greatest emergency could one take the action desired by Gerdeler. »

In June 1940, much to Gerdeler's intense disappointment, following the German victory over France, the German Army lost all interest in anti-Nazi plots. Not until December 1941, following the 1st German defeats in the Soviet Union, were Army officers again to show interest in becoming involved in Gerdeler's anti-Nazi plots. In June 1941, Gerdeler experienced a brief surge of hope that he learned that Hitler had issued a set of orders to the Army for the upcoming « Operation Barbarossa » that violated international law and made it clear that he wanted the War against the Soviet Union to be waged in the most inhumane, brutal way possible. Gerdeler argued that the Army would now overthrow Hitler because no self-respecting German officer would wage War in such an inhumane fashion and become a war criminal. The sequel was recorded in Hassell's diary, on 16 June 1941 :

« Brauchitsch and Halder have already agreed to Hitler's tactics (in Russia) . Thus, the Army must assume the onus of the murders and burnings which, up to now, have been confided to the SS. »

A series of conferences with Popitz, Gerdeler, Beck and Oster to consider whether certain orders which Army commanders have received (but which they have not yet issued) might suffice to open the eyes of the military leaders to the nature of the regime for which they are fighting. These orders concern brutal measures the troops are to take against the Bolsheviks when Russia is invaded :

« We came to the conclusion that nothing was to be hoped for now. They (the generals) delude themselves. Hopeless sergeant majors ! »

During the winter of 1940-1941, Gerdeler spent much of his time discussing with Popitz, Beck and Hassell which of the « Hohenzollerns » would occupy the throne of Germany after the overthrow of the Nazis. Gerdeler supported the claim of Prince Oskar of Prussia. The idea of restoring the former Emperor Wilhelm II to his throne was rejected by Gerdeler under the grounds that the personality of the former « Kaiser » and the way he had behaved during his 30 year reign made him a completely unsuitable candidate. The Crown Prince Wilhelm was rejected by Gerdeler partly because his well-deserved reputation as a womaniser, a heavy drinker and an irresponsible playboy made him offensive to the austere, God-fearing Lutheran Gerdeler and partly because of his outspoken support for the Nazi regime. Popitz, by contrast, while agreeing with Gerdeler that the unstable former « Kaiser » was unsuitable, insisted on dynastic grounds that the Crown Prince Wilhelm be the next Emperor, and was to spend much time arguing with Gerdeler over which of the sons of the former Emperor was to sit on the throne. They developed a future constitution for Germany and even a list of potential ministers. Popitz favored a return to the pre-1918 authoritarian political system. But Gerdeler argued, with his fellow conspirators, in favor of a British-style constitutional monarchy with an Emperor who was « not meant to govern, but to watch over the Constitution and to represent the State » .

Gerdeler's proposed constitution called for a strong executive, a high-degree of decentralisation, a « Reichstag » elected partially by the people on a British-style « first-past-the-post » basis (instead of by Party lists) and partially by members of local councils, and a « Reichsrat » composed of representatives nominated by Christian churches, trade-unions, Universities, and business groups. To assist with the drafting of the future constitution, Gerdeler enlisted the help, through his friend Dietrich Bonhoeffer, of the so-called « Freiburger Kreis » (« Freiburg Circle ») , an anti-Nazi discussion group of professors at Freiburg University, founded in 1938, and which included Adolf Lampe, Erich Wolf, Walter Eucken, Constantin von Dietze, and Gerhard Ritter. Had the « July 20 Plot » succeeded, Gerdeler would have served as Chancellor in the new government that would have been formed after Hitler's assassination and the overthrow of the Nazi regime. In August 1941, Gerdeler was most disappointed with the Atlantic Charter. He felt that the demands contained in Clause 8, calling for the disarmament of Germany, would make both the task of recruiting the German Army to overthrowing the regime more difficult, and were unacceptable since Gerdeler believed in maintaining a strong military. Starting in 1941, Gerdeler expanded his network of anti-Nazi contacts to include Social-Democrats like Wilhelm Leuschner and Hermann Maas.

In late 1941, under the impact of the news of the deportations of German Jews to be shot in Eastern Europe, Gerdeler submitted a memo to the German government calling for all Jews who had been German citizens or were descended from Jews who had been German citizens, before 1871, to be classified as Germans, and those Jews who were descended from Jews who had not lived within the borders of Germany, prior to 1871, to be considered citizens of Jewish State whose creation would occur later. In the memo entitled « Das Ziel » (The Goal) , Gerdeler wrote that a Jewish State should be created somewhere in South America or Canada, to which almost the entire Jewish population of Europe would be deported ; only German-Jewish veterans of World War I or those German Jews descended from Jews who were German citizens, in 1871, would be allowed to stay. Meanwhile, pending the deportation of the Jews to

the Americas, Gørdeler called in « The Goal » for the Nuremberg Laws to stay in force while demanding the repeal of the post- « Kristallnacht » anti-Semitic laws. Some controversy has been attracted by this memo. Gørdeler's critics are offended by his suggestion that German Jews whose ancestors had not lived within the borders of the German Empire before July 1, 1871, should not be considered German citizens, whereas Gørdeler's defenders, such as the Canadian historian Peter Hoffmann, have argued that Gørdeler was trying to present the Nazi regime with an alternative to genocide. The German historian Hans Mommsen wrote that Gørdeler's anti-Semitism was typical of the German Right, where Jews were widely considered to be part of an alien body living in Germany. Mommsen went on to comment that, given Gørdeler's background in the fiercely anti-Semitic German National People's Party, what is surprising was not his anti-Jewish prejudices, but rather that he was able to make any sort of moral objection to Nazi anti-Semitism. In January 1942, Gørdeler submitted another memo to the German government protesting at the deportation of Leipzig Jews. In April 1942, during another visit to Sweden, Gørdeler contracted the Wallenberg family, asking them to contact Winston Churchill about the peace terms that the British would conclude with Germany once the Nazi regime was overthrown. In May 1942, Gørdeler was much saddened when his son Christian was killed in action while serving on the Eastern Front.

In November 1942, Gørdeler made a secret and illegal visit to Smolensk, using forged papers provided by Colonel Hans Oster, to meet Field Marshal Günther von Kluge and Henning von Tresckow to gain their support for overthrowing Hitler. Both Kluge and Tresckow promised to arrest Hitler when he visited the Eastern Front. Tresckow, in particular, was very favourably impressed with Gørdeler, whom he saw as a kindred spirit. Gørdeler returned to Berlin feeling assured about the future, and was most disappointed when he received a message from Kluge via General Beck stating he changed his mind about acting against the Nazi regime, and to include him out of any « Putsch » . Kluge's change of mind about attempting to overthrow Hitler was related to the « gifts » he had received from Hitler, in the fall of 1942. On October 30, 1942, Kluge was the beneficiary of an enormous bribe from Hitler who mailed a letter of good wishes together with a huge cheque totaling 250,000 « Reichsmarks » made-out to him from the German treasury and a promise that whatever improving his Estate might cost could be billed-out to the German treasury. Hitler was unaware of Gørdeler's plotting, but had heard rumours that Kluge was unhappy with his leadership. After receiving another « gift » of 250,000 « Reichsmarks » from Hitler, later in November, that was intended to buy his loyalty, it had the desired effect with Kluge's message to Gørdeler not to involve him in anti-Nazi plots.

The corruption of the German officer corps by the Nazi regime, via generous bribes, was a source of considerable disgust and exasperation to Gørdeler. One of Gørdeler's contacts with the Army, a Captain Hermann Kaiser, informed Gørdeler that all of the senior officers were taking huge bribes from Hitler, in exchange for their loyalty. By May 1943, Gørdeler was well-aware that Field Marshal Günther von Kluge, General Heinz Guderian and Field Marshal Gerd von Rundstedt had accepted 250,000 « Reichsmarks » cheques as birthday presents from Hitler that were intended to bribe them into loyalty and that, in addition, Guderian had received an Estate in Poland. Since these were all men that Gørdeler had hopes of recruiting, their refusal to join the conspiracy because of their greed for more bribes enraged Gørdeler. Gørdeler wrote with disgust, in May 1943, that the senior officers « think only of helping themselves » .

In December 1942, the « Freiburg Circle » who were continuing their work helping Gørdeler develop a constitution

submitted the « Great Memorandum » to Gørdeler for the proposed post-Nazi German government, which also included « Proposals for a Solution of the “ Jewish Question ” in Germany ». The « Proposals » rejected Nazi racial theories, but stated that, after the overthrow of the Nazis, German Jews would not have their German citizenship restored, would be restricted to living in ghettos, and would be allowed only minimal contact with « German Christians », and called for continuing the Nazi ban on marriage and sex between Jews and « German Christians ». The Israeli historian Saul Friedländer used the « Proposals » to argue that Gørdeler was anti-Semitic, and that his differences with the Nazis on the « Jewish Question » were ones of degree, not kind.

After the Battle of Stalingrad, the pace of Gørdeler's conspiratorial activities gathered speed. Between November 1942 and November 1943, Gørdeler was in regular contact with his friends, the Wallenberg family of Sweden whom he used as middle-men in his efforts to make contact with the British and American governments. On January 22, 1943, at the home of Peter Yorck von Wartenburg, Gørdeler met with the « Kreisau Circle », during which he argued and debated forcefully about the social and economic policies to be pursued by a post-Nazi government. Only with some difficulty were Ulrich von Hassell and Fritz-Dietlof von der Schulenburg able to patch-up a measure of agreement between the « Kreisau Circle » and Gørdeler. Those present at the meeting of January 22 were : Gørdeler, Hassell, General Beck, Johannes Popitz and Jens Jessens for the conservative faction ; and : von der Schulenburg, Yorck von Wartenburg, Eugen Gerstenmaier, Adam von Trott zu Solz and Helmuth James Graf von Moltke, for the Left-leaning « Kreisau Circle ». In March 1943, Gørdeler wrote a letter addressed to several German Army officers appealing to them to overthrow the Nazis and demanding that just one line divide Germans « hat between decent and non-decent ». Gørdeler went on to write :

« How is it possible that so basically decent a people as the Germans can put-up for so long with such an intolerable system ? Only because all offences against law and decency are carried-out under the protection of secrecy and under the pressures of terror. »

Gørdeler argued that if only a situation were created « in which, if only for 24 hours, it (were) possible for the truth to be spoken again », then, the Nazi regime would collapse like a house of cards. In May 1943, Gørdeler submitted a memo to the Wallenbergs, which he asked them to pass on to the Anglo-Americans outlining his thoughts on the German-Polish border. In the same memo, Gørdeler called for a « European community » comprising a German-dominated confederation which, in turn, was to be sub-divided into an Eastern European confederation consisting of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, a confederation of the Scandinavian States, a South European confederation, and a Balkan confederation. The « European confederation » was to be 1 economic unit with 1 military ruled over by a Council consisting of 2 representatives from every State, who would elect a European President for a 4 year term. Helping the Council and the President was to be a Federal Assembly to which each of the various confederations would send 5 to 10 members based on their populations. Finally, the European confederation was to serve as the nucleus of a « World Confederation of Nations » that would banish war everywhere, and promote peace and prosperity.

During the spring of 1943, Gørdeler grew increasingly impatient with the military end of the conspiracy, complaining that those officers involved in the plot were better at finding excuses for inaction than reasons for action. In a letter

to General Friedrich Olbricht of May 17, 1943, Gørdeler wrote :

« MY DEAR GENERAL .

I have, again and again, considered the view that we must wait for the psychologically right moment.

If, by this, we mean the moment at which events cause us to take action, then it will coincide with the beginnings of the collapse ; action would then be too late to be exploited politically. In the meantime, irreplaceable cultural monuments and the most important industrial centers would be heaps of ruins and the responsibility for precious lives would fall on the military leaders. Therefore, we must not wait for the “ psychologically right ” moment to come, we must bring it about (emphasis in the original) . For we are certainly agreed that leadership without far-sighted correct action is impossible.

For the sake of the future of our fatherland, I would not like to see the intelligentsia which has grown-up throughout the Centuries excluded from this leadership ; for the same reason, the experienced leaders among our soldiers should not be excluded either.

Stalingrad and Tunis are defeats unparalleled in German history since Jena and Auerstädt. In both cases, the German people were told that, for decisive reasons, armies had to be sacrificed. We know how false this is ; for soldiers and politicians can only describe such sacrifices as necessary when they are justified by successes in other fields which outweigh the sacrifice. The truth is that our leadership is incapable and unscrupulous ; if it had been true leadership, both tragic sacrifices would have been avoided and a favourable military and political situation would have been established.

The number of civilians, men, women and children of all nations and of Russian prisoners of War ordered to be put to death, before and during this War, exceeds 1 million. The manner of their deaths is monstrous and is far removed from chivalry, humanity, and even from the most primitive ideas of decency among savage tribes. But the German people are falsely led to believe that it is Russian Bolsheviks who are constantly committing monstrous crimes against innocent victims.

The list of such things can be extended at will. I chose these 2 examples, because they are obvious examples of the poisoning of people's minds, and taken in conjunction with a corruption never before known in German history and the suppression of law, they offer every opportunity of creating (emphasis in the original) the 'psychologically right' moment. The vast majority of the German people, almost the whole working-class, knows to-day that this War cannot be brought to a successful conclusion.

In face of this, the patience of the people is inexplicable. But this perversity is based only on the fact that terror fosters secrecy, lies, and crime. It will disappear as soon as the people realize that terror is being attacked, corruption removed and that sincerity and truth are taking the place of secrecy and falsehood. At that time, every German will pull himself together again, both the decent and corrupt, each will reject and condemn the action which he tolerated

yesterday or to which he took no exception, because it was secret, because the decent German will again see decency and the others will be faced with responsibility.

If we can find no other way, I am ready to do everything to talk personally to Hitler. I would tell him what he must be told, namely that, in the vital interests of the people, his resignation is essential. If such a personal talk can be brought about, there is no reason why it should end badly. Surprises are possible, not probable, but the risk must be taken. Only it is not unreasonable, on my part, to demand that action must be taken immediately.

The political conditions for this exist.

I urgently entreat you, my dear General, to consider again whether the difficulties standing in the way of the technical measures cannot also be overcome. I also ask you to think over the method I have suggested and to give an opportunity on my return to discuss the situation and the possibilities calmly.

With my best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

GÆRDELER »

Gærdeler had great faith in his idea that, if only he could meet with Hitler and explain to him that his leadership was grossly inadequate on military and economic grounds, then, Hitler could be persuaded to resign in his favor, thereby, ending Nazi Germany through non-violent means. It took considerable effort on the part of Gærdeler's friends to talk him out of this plan. After a visit to western Germany, where Gærdeler was horrified by the damage caused by Anglo-American bombing, in July 1943, Gærdeler wrote a letter to Field Marshal Günther von Kluge that read as :

« The idea fostered by the High-Military authorities that the devastation in the West was not so bad and that, after a few days, during which they “ gathered-up their chattels from among the ruins ”, the workers return to work, induced me to look at the devastation for myself. You would be as shocked as I was. The work of 1,000 years is nothing, but rubble. There is no point in describing my feelings when I looked down from the “ Trolleturm ” on the ruins of the town of Barmen and on Elberfeld, half of which is destroyed. In Essen, it is almost impossible to find one's way through the streets because all of the familiar landmarks are lost in the rubble. 60 % of Krupps is destroyed and it is only working to 30 % of capacity. It is untrue to say that the contrary is the case. The damaged sections have not even been rebuilt in other parts of Germany ; the process of shifting the industry is only in its initial stages. Whoever has the courage to think must realize even without special technical knowledge that buildings must be found, then adapted, then machinery must be procured, most of it new, and then coal and labour must be obtained. In Elberfeld, even undamaged factories in the “ Vohwinkel ” area are only working to 30 % capacity, because the workers have left. In Essen and Wupertal, about 2/3's of the population have disappeared and, in Colognen about 4/5's. That is how it is with the people who, in 3 days, gather-up their chattels from the rubble. The coal output of the Ruhr has now dropped from 420,000 to 300,000 tons a day and is decreasing daily. In June, the output of the South German

armaments industry declined sharply for the 1st time, because the drop in supplies from the Ruhr is making itself felt. Furthermore, nothing can be done with these ruins. They are heaps of debris, concrete, and iron. Reconstruction will take generations. The debris cannot be disposed of on German soil, it would ruin too much land. It must, therefore, be dumped into the sea. The removal of debris from Essen alone will take 3 years, using 100 wagons a day.

100 milliard " Marks " would not be too high a estimate for the damage sustained so far. At present, our national debt is 250 milliards ; in 3 months, our debts will be as high as our total assets.

You, Field-Marshal, know that all theories which maintain that this means nothing and that a pernicious economy based on debt can go on unpunished are sheer nonsense. No, the German people is faced with the decision either to declare itself bankrupt ; then, we have all lost everything and industry has no capital. As this is an impossible situation because it would mean revolution on the largest scale, those whose money is invested in real estate must part with some of this, in order to finance the firms which must be kept going in order to maintain economy and avert revolution. Thus everyone will be poor. Or, the German people can again disguise the truth and start on the road to inflation by incurring further debts and by letting things go on as they are doing now. In the end, this would come to the same as the other. For the chances of 1923 will not occur a 2nd time.

Even now, the difficulties of maintaining life of the German people for War and Peace are tremendous. For the whole of Europe has been thoroughly ruined by Hitler's madness. In 1918, Norway, Denmark and Holland, at least, were intact. To-day, every European country is to a great extent laid waste, robbed of its supplies and its gold and currency ruined. One can be seized with holy rage when one hears how frivolously even well-educated people talk of reconstruction after the War. It fills one with horror that cultured people are simply living from day to day at the expense of a universe which is collapsing and content themselves with the thought that we have not yet collapsed, fondly imagining that this can go on.

The transition to peace-time conditions when millions of soldiers have lost the habit of work and are looking for homes and jobs and finding only ruins can only come about if we have as the basis of our action a moral, idealist conception which will seize men's minds and lift them above the material difficulties and if we can win the people over to this.

To-day, the bonds of morality have been torn away ; what is left is merely convention. Anyone who travels, as I do, almost constantly see what is going on, for example, in the big hotels. He can see officers who have nothing in common with our good officer class ; he can see young louts with a Party badge who talk victory but never think of doing their duty as soldiers. Even in the " Wehrmacht ", the bases of morality must be shattered, because the religious background has been forsaken and comrade can denounce comrade behind his back without himself being treated as a scoundrel. The introduction of the special Court into the military tribunal, the penetration of the Army with secret agents, speak volumes. A week ago, I heard a report by a SS soldier, aged 18½ , who had previously been a decent lad, but who now said calmly that " it wouldn't be exactly a very pleasant thing to machine gun trenches filled with thousands of Jews and, then, to throw earth over their quivering bodies ". What has become of the proud army of the Wars of Liberation and of the Emperor Wilhelm the 1st ? But the people know and feel this with a certainty which is

admirable and instinctive, and which, thank God, still exists. For God's sake, Field-Marshal, do not be deceived when you are told the people believe the lies which are forced down their throats. The people despise these lies and hate those who spread them abroad. That is the truth. It will break forth with all the greater force the longer people try to surpass it. But it will go hard with all those with responsibility.

Hitler has made his 5th military blunder in the South. He is pouring German soldiers and valuable arms into Sicily, whereas reason must tell him that Italy can no longer be saved. The squandering of German strength, the useless sacrifice of German soldiers is a crime ; for even the time gained by defending Sicily means nothing. The secret hints of powerful new weapons are, according to my enquiries, mere irresponsible chatter, for even if these new weapons are really ready one day, they will not alter the decision which has been reached already in men's minds-quite apart from the fact that the enemy has just as effective weapons. Thus, from the military angle, the same mistake is being made as in 1918 - only more senselessly ; one has not the courage to face the inevitable facts in time. But, in 1943, that is a great deal more fateful than 1918, for then our leaders were mentally and morally sound, whereas to-day they are insane and morally corrupt.

If there is still anyone who wants proof of this insanity, he will no longer require it when he hears that Hitler has told his entourage that his aim is the partition of Italy ! In the end, Mussolini would be forced to ask him for help, he says, then, he would perhaps appoint him Governor of Northern Italy, and make the Apennines the German frontier ! Hitler is also prepared to accord Russia (provided she makes peace) frontiers which a decent German government would not have to grant even today ; he is dreaming of another victory nearer home. In view of this national disaster which is now becoming obvious and into which we have been led by an insane and godless leadership, which disregards human rights, I take the liberty of making a last appeal to you, Field-Marshal. You may be sure that it will be the last. The hour has now come at which we must take the final decision on our personal fate. On the one hand, there is the way clearly indicated by conscience ; on the other, a different easier way. The former may have its dangers, but it is the honourable way ; the latter will lead to a disastrous end and to terrible remorse. In face of the terrible and increasing destruction of German cities, do you my dear Field-Marshal, know of yet another way to achieve victory which will (1) make it possible to hold Russia off from Europe for good, (2) force the U.S.A. and the British Empire to give-up these attacks and finally make peace ? That, from the political and military point of view, is the question with which we faced. If such a victory exists, then, the chances of it must be made clear to the German people not with lies, but with the truth, which by then must be a reality. But if there is no such victory, then, it is a sheer crime to continue the War, because there is never a heroic ending for the people, but simply the necessity to go on living.

I have again ascertained, and I accept the responsibility for this, that there is still the possibility to conclude a favourable peace, if we Germans again make ourselves capable of taking action. It is self-evident that no statesmen in the world can negotiate with criminals and fools because he cannot lightly place the fate of his people in the hands of fools. Our own conscience too tells us that. Naturally, the possibilities are less easy to realize a year ago. They can only be exploited if the politician still has a certain time for freedom of action, that is, if he is not, as in 1918, faced overnight by the military " Diktat : we can do no more ! ". If this 2nd condition, which depends on the military authorities, is fulfilled that we can calmly and by reasonable action slow down the tempo of the War, at once, in the

case of the War in the air and, gradually, in the land fighting. Anyone who to-day can tell the German people that the War in the air is over have the people behind him, and no one will dare a word or lift a finger against him. That and none other is the state of affairs.

I am at your service, no matter what the risk, for any such action which simply calls things by their proper name and deals with criminals. For this purpose, I could become an officer again if only I knew that it would ensure quick organized action. I can tell you, to-day, that I can win over to you, Field-Marshal, and to any other General resolved to take the necessary action the overwhelming majority of the German working-class, the German civil service and the German business world. I also, if you so desire, make “ Herr ” Gœbbels or “ Herr ” Himmler your ally ; for even these 2 men have long realized that, with Hitler, they are doomed.

(Gœrdeler was over-selling the extent of opposition to Hitler to Kluge here ; there is no evidence that Himmler or Gœbbels were a part of Gœrdeler's anti-Nazi circles.)

Therefore, all this is required is really a decision, bold thinking and right action. What is most dangerous and, in the end, unbearable is to shut one's ears, day after day, to the voice of conscience. In this, I am sure that you, my dear Field-Marshal, will agree with me.

You must, however, know my opportunities for action are limited in time. For many years, I have been looked upon as a militarist, an admirer of the military, as a promoter of militarism and as the friend of many Generals. I have had many an unpleasant moment in my life because of that, both after the 1st War and in recent years ; for many in Germany expected nothing of the Generals for the start. But I always took their part, saying that one could rely on their character, and their sense of responsibility. Now, it has come to this that I myself feel ridiculed and in South Germany, where I have many excellent friends, I am told that Prussian militarism is to blame for everything. They are not fools, the men who say this ; they are men who love Germany, and the German soldier, but who despair because with our eyes open, our minds working and our hearts feeling we are letting the Fatherland be led into the abyss by criminals and fools and are letting German youth and German manhood be driven unresisting to death and mutilation.

We must put an end to this state of affairs in which we allow fools to force their delusions and lies on the German people. We must make the War of conquest, started from a spirit of domination, into a War of necessary defence. We have absolutely no cause to fear Bolshevism or the Anglo-Saxons.

(Gœrdeler was playing down his anti-Communism, in order to entice Kluge into joining the conspiracy by trying to counter Nazi claims that Hitler was the world's only “ bulwark ” against the Soviet Union.)

People in those countries are the same as we are and we have much to throw into the balance. But German interests must, once again, be represented with force and reason by decent Germans.

I will not trespass any further on your time, my dear Field-Marshal ; I only ask one more answer from you, and I

know what it means if you do not give me this answer. One thing I ask you ; not to refuse to answer because you are afraid. I have learned to be silent and I shall not forget the lesson. I know what I owe to the men whom I trust. Unless at least 3 or 4 men in Germany have more confidence in each other, then we go out of business.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Gørdeler. »

Kluge refused to answer Gørdeler's letter, despite the fact that Gørdeler was all but calling the Field-Marshal a coward for his refusal to join the conspiracy.

In August 1943, Gørdeler and his friend, the « Oberbürgermeister » of Stuttgart, the disillusioned « SA-Brigadeführer » Karl Strölin sent a joint memo to the « Reich » Interior Minister, the « Reichsführer SS » Heinrich Himmler complaining about the anti-Semitic and anti-Christian policies of the Nazi regime, asking for the end of the « emergency » laws that had suspended civil rights in Germany, since 1933, and called for the end of the NSDAP influence on the judiciary. Predictably enough, the memo drew the attention of the « Gestapo » , who visited both men at their homes to deliver a « final warning » telling them if they continued with « trouble-making » , they would be sent to a concentration camp. In September 1943, Gørdeler appealed to his friend Jacob Wallenberg to ask that the British suspend bombing attacks against Berlin, Stuttgart and Leipzig until the middle of October because « the oppositional movement has its centres there and the interruption of communications would make the « Putsch » more difficult » . In a memo, Gørdeler sent to the British and American governments, in the autumn of 1943, he called for a negotiated peace between the Allies and Germany, once the Nazis were overthrown. In the same memo, Gørdeler called for the « 1914 frontier » to serve as the basis of Germany's borders both in Western and Eastern Europe, called for Austria and the Sudetenland remaining part of the « Reich » , and for the annexation of the south Tyrol region of Italy. In the discussions within the German Opposition between the « Easterners » who favoured reaching an understanding with the Soviet Union after the overthrow of Hitler, and the « Westerners » who favoured reaching an understanding with Britain and the United States, Gørdeler belonged to the « Westerners » , considering Communism to be no different from National-Socialism, and regarding the « Easterners » as being dangerously naive about the Soviets.

In the summer of 1943, Gørdeler confidently told Jacob Wallenberg that the « Putsch » to depose Hitler would happen for certain « in September » , even through Gørdeler had, yet, to win-over any active-duty senior officers. After 5 years of trying, the only senior officers Gørdeler had recruited were Field Marshal Erwin von Witzleben, whom Hitler had forced into retirement in early 1942, and General Ludwig Beck, who had resigned in 1938. In September 1943, Gørdeler attended a meeting at the home of Olbricht where, together with his host Olbricht, General Beck and von Tresckow, he finally won-over the vacillating Field Marshal Kluge into joining the conspiracy. However, no sooner than Kluge was finally persuaded to join the plot than he was badly injured in a car accident that removed him from active command. As Gørdeler gloomily noted, Kluge's successor, Field Marshal Ernst Busch, was a convinced National-

Socialist who was clearly not « verschwörungsfähig » (plot-worthy) .

In the autumn of 1943, Gørdeler met Colonel Count Claus von Stauffenberg. The 2 men took an immediate dislike to each other. Gørdeler wrote that Stauffenberg « revealed himself as a cranky, obstinate fellow who wanted to play politics. I had many a row with him, but greatly esteemed him. He wanted to steer a dubious political course with the Left-leaning Socialists and Communists, and gave me a bad time with his overwhelming egoism. » Gørdeler, who had been the unofficial leader of the German opposition since 1937, resented the efforts of Stauffenberg, who he regarded as a dangerous « Romantic socialist » , to take-over the conspiracy. Stauffenberg, for his part, saw Gørdeler as the leader of « the revolution of the greybeards » . Stauffenberg saw Gørdeler as an out-of-touch reactionary, a man living in the past, whose plans to restore the monarchy were simply not relevant to the modern world. Moreover, Stauffenberg was an « Easterner » who favoured making contacts with the underground KPD, and wished for a post-Nazi Germany to ally herself with the Soviet Union ; Gørdeler, by contrast, was a « Westerner » and, thus, a resolute anti-Communist and wanted a post-Nazi Germany to align herself with the Western powers. Despite his differences with Stauffenberg, Gørdeler did appreciate Stauffenberg for solving a problem that had bedevilled him since 1938. Gørdeler had always assumed that, to stage a « Putsch » , required recruiting a senior military figure who could order large bodies of troops into action against the Nazi regime, and it had been the unwillingness of senior military officers to be recruited, like Kluge, who could never quite make-up his mind, or Halder who had severed relations with Gørdeler, in 1940, once he became convinced that Hitler would win the War that had prevented him from staging a « Putsch » . Stauffenberg solved that problem by devising « Operation Walkyrie » , a plan that ostensibly was meant to crush a slave labour uprising but, in reality, was the cover for a « Putsch » that could be activated by officers of less than senior rank. Gørdeler was pleased that, at long last, the means for a « Putsch » without the senior officers who were plainly not willing to break with the regime had been devised by Stauffenberg, but his uneasy relations with Stauffenberg were described by the German historian Hans Mommsen as one of mutual « misunderstandings » .

Unlike the « Kreisau Circle » , Gørdeler was a strong champion of « laissez-faire » capitalism, and was very much opposed to what he saw as the socialism of the « Kreisau Circle » . In Gørdeler's vision, this economic system was to serve as the basis of the « democracy of the 10 Commandments » . However, Gørdeler was heavily criticised by other members of the German resistance (for example, by some members the « Kreisau Circle ») for objecting to killing Hitler (whom Gørdeler wanted to see tried ; Gørdeler had no objection to Hitler being executed after his conviction) , for his sympathy for re-introducing monarchy, and for his extremely anti-communist ideology. In late February 1944, Gørdeler sent Strölin to meet Field Marshal Erwin Rommel to see if he would like to join the anti-Nazi conspiracy, and was delighted when Strölin gave him a positive report about Rommel's attitude towards the conspiracy. Gørdeler decided that Rommel would be the ideal person to play a leading role in a post-Hitler government and asked Strölin to find-out if Rommel would be willing to play that role. As Rommel was fully engaged in preparations to resist the expected Allied landing in France all through the spring of 1944, it proved difficult for Strölin to make contact again. After meeting Gørdeler, in March 1944, Strölin described him in a high-strung state, constantly afraid that he could be arrested at any moment, and anxious to recruit Rommel while attempting to juggle Rommel's demand that he be « Wehrmacht » Commander-in-Chief with his prior promise that position would go to Erwin von Witzleben if Hitler were overthrown. Not until May could a meeting be arranged to sort-out where Rommel stood, in regards to the conspiracy.

On May 27, 1944, Gørdeler attended a secret meeting with Strölin, the former Foreign Minister Baron Konstantin von Neurath and General Hans Speidel (who was representing Rommel) at Speidel's flat, in Freudenstadt. At the meeting, Speidel speaking on behalf of Rommel made clear that his chief wanted nothing to do with any attempt to assassinate Hitler, but was prepared to serve in a government headed by Gørdeler. Later, in 1944, Gørdeler told Kunrath von Hammerstein that : « In those days, your father stood at the helm of world history. » , by which Gørdeler meant that, if General Kurt von Hammerstein-Equord had carried-out a « Putsch » in 1933, then the present state of world troubles, in 1944, might have been avoided.

A latter-day controversy about Gørdeler concerns his attitude towards anti-Semitism. Some historians, such as Christof Dipper and Martin Broszat, have argued that Gørdeler agreed with the anti-Semitic policy of the regime until 1938, though, afterwards, he did resist the Holocaust and other forms of mass murder. The German historian Christof Dipper in his 1983 essay, « Der Deutsche Widerstand und die Juden » (translated into English as, « The German Resistance and the Jews ») argued that the majority of the anti-Nazi national-conservatives such as Gørdeler were anti-Semitic. Dipper wrote that, for Gørdeler and his social circle, « the bureaucratic, pseudo-legal deprivation of the Jews, practised until 1938, was still considered acceptable » . Through Dipper noted, no-one in the « Widerstand » movement supported the Holocaust, he also claimed that the national-conservatives like Gørdeler did not intend to restore civil rights to the Jews after the overthrow of Hitler. By contrast, the Canadian historian Peter Hoffmann, in his 2004 essay, « The German Resistance and the Holocaust » , has contended that Gørdeler was opposed to anti-Semitism in all forms, and that this opposition played a major role in motivating his efforts to overthrow the Nazi regime. Most recently in his 2011 book, « Carl Gørdeler and the “ Jewish Question ”, 1933-1942 » and in his 2013 book, « Karl Gørdeler gegen die Verfolgung der Juden Hoffmann » , has defended Gørdeler against the charge that he was an anti-Semite. Hoffmann quotes memoranda for Hitler, from the years 1934-1939, in which Gørdeler urged the government to change its « Jewish policy » as a matter of justice and national interests ; Gørdeler argued that Germany could enjoy good relations with Britain, France and the United States only if the policies concerning « the “ Jewish Question ”, the “ Free-Masons' Question ”, legal security, the “ Church Question ” » were changed. He beleaguered the British government, before the War, to pressure Hitler to alleviate his « Jewish policy » . In 1941, he proposed that the League of Nations found a Jewish State that would extend Jewish citizenship to all Jews in the world. Since Germans, according to the German citizenship law of 1913, lost their German citizenship by acquiring another citizenship, Gørdeler declared that, for German Jews, there must be 4 categories of « exceptions » to this rule. Analysis of population, emigration, immigration and naturalization statistics shows that Gørdeler's proposal guaranteed German citizenship to at least 94 % of German Jews, while sustaining the legal fiction of « exceptions » . Gørdeler, thus, intended to protect, if possible, all German Jews against the loss of their German citizenship ; the few who did not fall into one of Gørdeler's categories of « exceptions » could have applied, under the 1913 German citizenship law, for re-instatement. As a leading civilian anti-Hitler conspiracy leader, Gørdeler worked tirelessly to bring about the pre-condition for his proposals' implementation : the overthrow of the Nazi government. The Israeli historian Danny Orbach in his 2010 book, « Walkyrie : Hahitnagdut Hagermanit Lehitler » (Walkyrie : Germans Against Hitler) defended Gørdeler against the charge that he was an anti-Semite by noting Gørdeler's strong support for Zionism and his work with Chaim Weizmann, in encouraging German Jews to move to the British Mandate for Palestine. In a recent article, Orbach also argued that Dipper's accusations of anti-Semitism are based on a misreading, if not distortion, of Gørdeler's memoranda, thus ignoring Gørdeler's plan to restore emancipation to the German Jews and securing a

national homeland for their Polish brethren. The Israeli historian Tom Segev has dismissed Orbach's claims that Gørdeler was a philo-Semitic, stating that Gørdeler was an anti-Semitic who supported Zionism only because he disliked the idea of German Jews living in Germany, and much preferred if they all move to Palestine. The Israeli historian David Bankier wrote, in 2002, that Gørdeler was appalled by the Holocaust and was sincerely against the Nazis, but for him, Jews were not and never could be Germans and, instead, were an alien, foreign element who would just had be relocated from Germany whatever they liked it or not. Bankier wrote that Gørdeler felt that the « Final Solution to the Jewish Question » was going too far and would have to be stopped, but « for Gørdeler, the solution of the Jewish question after the War was the establishment of a Jewish State, in parts of Canada or South America, and granting German citizenship only to a small, elitist minority of Jews willing to assimilate completely » .

In May 1944, Gørdeler revived his idea of 1943 of talking Hitler into resigning as a way of achieving a peaceful end to Nazi Germany. Again, Gørdeler proposed to meet with Hitler, explain to him why his leadership was defective, and hope that Hitler would resign and appoint Gørdeler his successor. Again, it took considerable effort on the part of Gørdeler's friends to talk him out of this plan, which they considered to be as bizarre as it was impractical. The British historian Ian Kershaw commented Gørdeler's plans to talk Hitler into resigning reflected a certain lack of realism on his part. In June 1944, Gørdeler finished his final Cabinet list. Had the « Putsch » of 20 July 1944 succeeded, the Cabinet that would have taken power included the following :

President of Germany (« Regent-Reichsverweser ») : Colonel General Ludwig Beck.

State Secretary to the Regent : Ulrich Wilhelm Graf Schwerin von Schwanenfeld.

Chancellor : Karl Gørdeler (DNVP) .

State Secretary to the Chancellor : Count Peter Yorck von Wartenburg.

Vice-Chancellor : Wilhelm Leuschner (SPD) .

Deputy Vice-Chancellor : Jakob Kaiser (Christian Trade Union leader) .

Minister of War : General Friedrich Olbricht.

State Secretary to the Minister of War : Colonel Count Claus von Stauffenberg.

Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces : Field Marshal Erwin von Witzleben.

Commander in Chief of the Army : Colonel General Erich Hoepner.

Minister of the Interior : Julius Leber (SPD) .

Minister of Economics : Doctor Paul Lejeune-Jung (lawyer and economist) .

Minister of Finance : Ewald Loeser (DNVP) .

Minister of Justice : Joseph Wirmer (« Zentrum ») .

Minister of Education : Eugen Bolz (« Zentrum ») .

Minister of Agriculture : Andreas Hermes (« Zentrum ») .

Minister of Reconstruction : Bernhard Letterhaus (Christian Trade Union leader) .

Minister of Information : Theodor Haubach (SPD) .

The position of Minister of Foreign Affairs would have gone to either Ulrich von Hassell (former ambassador to Italy) or Count Friedrich Werner von der Schulenburg (former ambassador to the Soviet Union) depending upon whether the Western powers or the Soviet Union signed an armistice with the new German government. In the radio address, Gørdeler planned to deliver, once the « Putsch » had triumphed, was included the statement :

« The persecution of the Jews, which has been carried-out in the most inhuman, deeply shaming and quite irreparable ways, is to cease. »

On 16 July 1944, Gørdeler saw his wife and children for the last time, in Leipzig, and then departed for Berlin to prepare for the « Putsch » planned for later that month. In the days preceding the « Putsch » attempt of 20 July 1944, Gørdeler stayed at the home of General Beck, in the Berlin suburb of « Lichterfelde » . Unlike Beck, Gørdeler was very confident of the success of the planned « Putsch » , and in a most optimistic mood. On 17 July 1944, a warrant for Gørdeler's arrest was issued, causing him to go into hiding. Gørdeler spent the day of the « Putsch » hiding-out at the Estate of his friend, Baron Palombrini, in an anxious and agitated state, listening obsessively to the radio for news of success. Following the failure of the 20 July « Putsch » , the « Gestapo » searched the room in which Gørdeler had been hiding-out in the « Anhalter Bahnhof » hotel, in which they discovered a vast collection of documents relating to the « Putsch » such as the text of Gørdeler's planned radio address to the German people as Chancellor. Much to Gørdeler's deep disappointment, it was Army troops led by Major Otto Ernst Remer rather than the SS who crushed the « Putsch » of 20 July, marking the final time Gørdeler's hopes in the Army were to be dashed.

Gørdeler managed to escape from Berlin, but he was apprehended on 12 August 1944 after being denounced by an inn-keeper named Lisbeth Schwaerzel, in Marienwerder (modern Kwidzyn, Poland) , while visiting the grave of his parent. After his arrest, 8 members of Gørdeler's family were sent to the concentration camps under the « Sippenhaft » law. His brother Fritz was also sentenced to death and executed on 1 March 1945. Under « Gestapo » interrogation, Gørdeler claimed that the Holocaust was the major reason for his seeking to overthrow the Nazi regime. On 9

September 1944, after a trial at the People's Court, he was sentenced to death. Gørdeler was not physically tortured by the « Gestapo », and freely co-operated with the « Gestapo » in naming names, which made him the object of a considerable hatred from the other prisoners, who saw him as a « spineless rat ». Gørdeler's friend, the historian Gerhard Ritter who shared the same prison with him, reported that Gørdeler was never tortured, but was instead subjected to « the overheating of cells, painfully tight shackling especially at night, bright light shining on one's face while one tried to sleep, completely insufficient food ». One prisoner recalled that Gørdeler was often « groaning aloud from hunger ». Gørdeler's hope in confessing all was to overload the « Gestapo » with information and, thereby, buy time to save his life and the others imprisoned ; in the process, he caused hundreds involved in the plot to be arrested. During his time in prison, Gørdeler was asked by the SS to assist with writing the constitution of a future SS-ruled Germany. Gørdeler agreed, and often met with Otto Ohlendorf and Doctor Mäding of the SD to provide his advice. Whether Gørdeler was sincere in wishing to help the SS or just trying to buy time to save his life remains unclear. When confronted with the loneliness of his imprisonment and the utter defeat of his cause, Gørdeler, who had always been a highly-devout Lutheran, became increasingly preoccupied with spiritual matters. Gørdeler was overwhelmed with despair over what he considered to be the triumph of evil and the destruction of all that he loved. Gørdeler's friend, the historian Gerhard Ritter, saw Gørdeler in prison, in January 1945, and reported :

« I was astonished at his undiminished intellectual power but, at the same time, I was shocked by his outward appearance. It was a man grown old who stood before me, shackled hand and foot, in the same light summer clothes as had on when captured, shabby and collarless, face thin and drawn, strangely different. But it was his eyes that shocked me the most. They were once bright grey eyes and had flashed beneath the heavy eyebrows ; that had always been the most impressive thing about him. Now, there was no light in them ; they were like the eyes of a blind man, yet, like nothing I had seen before. His intellectual power was as it had always been ; his spiritual strength was not. His natural cheerfulness had gone ; his look seemed turned inward. What I beheld was a man with the weariness of death in his soul. »

While Gørdeler was on death row, he wrote a letter which called the Holocaust the very worst of Nazi crimes. But, at the same time, Gørdeler remained anti-Semitic. In his « Thoughts of a Man condemned to Death », written towards the end of 1944 in prison, Gørdeler wrote :

« We should not attempt to minimize what has been happening, but we should also emphasize the great guilt of the Jews, who had invaded our public life in ways that lacked customary restraint. »

He was finally executed by hanging, on 2 February 1945, at Plötzensee Prison, in Berlin. While awaiting his death sentence, Gørdeler wrote a farewell letter, which ended with :

« I ask the world to accept our martyrdom as penance for the German people. »

...

The 2nd principal Resistance leader, Karl Gørdeler, was the Mayor of Leipzig, from 1930 to 1936, a candidate for «

Reich » Chancellor, in 1932, and « Reich » Prices Commissioner, during the years 1931 to 1932 and 1934 to 1935. He opposed the National-Socialists from the beginning. By 1939, he was the acknowledged civilian leader of the Resistance. He was hanged on 2 February 1945. Some say that Gørdeler had little or no objection to Hitler's anti-Jewish policies. An examination of the documents reveals that the opposite is true. While Gørdeler was waiting for his execution in prison, in 1944, he wrote in retrospective notes that he had initially worked loyally with the National-Socialist government. He believed even then that, given the opportunity, he could persuade Hitler to see reason and to end the War. He based this belief upon an interview he had had with Hitler, in 1935, during which he had won Hitler over to his own view on some point of economic policy.

But, in matters concerning Jews, Gørdeler had never worked loyally with the National-Socialist government. In fact, he had intervened, in April 1933, against the national boycott. In full formal dress, he had confronted the Storm-Troopers (SA) when they harassed and attacked Jews and businesses belonging to Jews. He had used the Leipzig police to liberate Jews who had been detained and beaten by the SA. Gørdeler's critics do not mention these actions. They say, instead, that Gørdeler had signed a list of names of physicians who were excluded from practice because they were Jews, and, that this demonstrated his anti-Jewish attitude. The facts are a little complicated, but they are quite different.

A government decree of 1933 excluded from practice under public health-insurance plans Communist physicians, and « non-Aryan » physicians, unless they were World War veterans or sons or fathers of World War veterans. A decree of 1934 excluded physicians from approbation if they were descended from one or more Jewish grandparents, or if they were married to « non-Aryans » . But physicians who had been previously admitted to practice under medical insurance plans did not lose their approbation. On 9 April 1935, in contravention of these regulations, Gørdeler's Deputy Mayor, Rudolf Haake, a National-Socialist, warned civil servants in the municipal administration against consulting any Jewish physicians. Now, the « Landesverbandes Mitteldeutschland des Centralvereins Deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens eingetragener Verein » (Saxon Association of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith) complained against the Nazi Deputy Mayor and asked Gørdeler to stop the unlawful boycott. On 11 April, Gørdeler signed an internal memorandum which listed « non-Aryan » physicians who were permitted by law to treat patients under the public health-insurance regime, and those who were legally not permitted to practice. The facts are then : the Association invoked the legal position, and Gørdeler confirmed the legal position. The National-Socialists attempted to exclude all Jews from practice. Gørdeler protected those who were not excluded by law.

Then, there was the matter of the Mendelssohn statue. It had been placed in front of the Leipzig « Gewandhaus » concert-hall, in 1892, in honour of its former director, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy was a Christian, but considered a Jew by the National-Socialists because of his descent. The Nazi Deputy Mayor Haake pressed Gørdeler to remove the statue, especially so in the spring of 1936. Gørdeler said no. After more pressure, he agreed, in July 1936, that moving the statue to another distinguished public location might be discussed, but he postponed the discussion to some undetermined time after the summer. In the autumn of 1936, Gørdeler followed an invitation of the German Chamber of Commerce to travel to Finland. Before he left, he secured high-level support from Propaganda Minister Josef Gøebbels and from Hitler for his decision to leave the monument in place, and he instructed Deputy Mayor Haake accordingly. But while Gørdeler was out of town, Haake had the statue removed. When Gørdeler had

returned and demanded an explanation, Haake accused him of not sharing the National-Socialist Party's view on the Jews. Haake declared that the matter of the statue was « only the outward occasion of the conflict » , and that « Doctor Gørdeler's attitude in the Jewish Question had been revealed particularly clearly in the matter of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue » . Since Gørdeler could not dismiss Haake, he could only himself resign in protest. The removal of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue was the incident Gørdeler chose for his resignation, and the Nazi Deputy Mayor accepted it as a gesture on precisely this point.

Some dispute this and argue that Gørdeler had objected only to Haake's insubordination, and that Haake's accusations against Gørdeler were a cover for Haake's own disobedience. But Gørdeler's further actions, on behalf of the Jews, make that a highly-implausible explanation, and, contrary to the critics' intent, they conclusively prove his commitment to helping the Jews. In 1938, Gørdeler sought the aid of a foreign power for the purpose of saving the Jews from persecution and, thereby, committed treason (« Landesverrat ») under existing German statute law.

At the request of the British government's Chief Diplomatic Advisor, Sir Robert Vansittart, the British industrialist A. P. Young, who had business and personal links with the Robert Bosch electrical-technology company in Stuttgart, met with Gørdeler, in August 1938, in Rauschen Dune, a village on the Baltic Sea, north of Königsberg. Speaking with Young, Gørdeler urged the British government to refuse to discuss the vital issues that Germany was interested in resolving if the practices against the Jews continued. In early November 1938, German authorities drove 10,000 Polish Jews across the German frontier with Poland, Poland refused to admit them, and they were marooned in no-man's-land for days. On 6 and 7 November, 2 days before the Pogrom in Germany, Gørdeler met with Young for the 2nd time, in Switzerland. He declared his concern at the lack of any strong reaction in the democracies against the barbaric persecution of 10,000 Polish Jews in Germany. In December 1938 and in January 1939, Gørdeler again met with Young, again in Switzerland. Gørdeler said the Pogrom of November 1938 had been ordered by Hitler. He urged the British government that as soon as « the new persecution of the Jews is started, it is absolutely essential to break diplomatic relations » with Germany. He warned that Hitler was determined to conquer the world, and that Hitler had « decided to destroy the Jews-Christianity-Capitalism » .

Later, in 1941, the deportation of Jews from Germany and mass killings in camps began. Gørdeler now drafted proposals to treat Jews who had been German citizens, or whose ancestors had been German citizens before 1871, as Germans, and to consider Jews who themselves or whose ancestors had not lived within the borders of the German Empire before 1 July 1871, as nationals of a yet to-be-founded Jewish State. It seems outrageous to suggest depriving Jews who were naturalized Germans of their citizenship. But Gørdeler obviously tried to offer an alternative to deportation and murder. His proposal would have restored German citizenship to German Jews with German descent of long standing, and it would have removed lately naturalized German Jews from German jurisdiction and thus protected them. Gørdeler tried desperately to persuade the murderers to accept a relatively less harmful alternative to murder. In view of Gørdeler's actions, on behalf of both German and Polish Jews, it is impossible to suggest that he ever intended any injury to Jewish rights. In January 1942, Gørdeler wrote a memorandum to brand the cruelties of the deportation of the Jews of Leipzig.

...

Karl Gørdeler found himself in a « dynamic situation » . In April 1933, when SA thugs were maltreating Jews in Leipzig, Gørdeler, as mayor of Leipzig, went in formal dress to a Jewish quarter of his city to protect Jews and their businesses, and he used the city police to free Jews who had been detained and beaten by SA stormtroopers.

In the same month, the government issued anti-Jewish laws and a cluster of anti-Jewish decrees, such as the civil-service law that barred Jews from government and administrative positions, at every level and of every kind, from teaching positions in all educational and scientific establishments, from primary schools to Universities and academies, and barred converted former Jews from the Catholic and Lutheran clergy. A decree excluded « non-Aryan » physicians who (or whose fathers and sons) were not World War veterans and Communist physicians from practice under the public health system. In May 1934, the government excluded from approbation physicians who had one or more Jewish grandparents, and also non-Jewish physicians who were married to a « non-Aryan » ; physicians previously admitted to practice under public health-insurance plans did not lose their approbation. In July 1934, when a national law required the establishment of a « race authority » within the municipal health commissions, Gørdeler resisted official and unofficial pressures for several months, but was finally forced, in January 1935, to accept this since it was the law. On 9 April 1935, Gørdeler received a complaint from the Central-German Association of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith (« Landesverband Mitteldeutschland des Centralvereins deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens eingetragener Verein ») against the Leipzig deputy mayor, Hans Rudolf Haake, a National-Socialist, who had advised all municipal administrators and employees against consulting Jewish physicians.

Here, Gørdeler immediately acted against this unlawful boycott attempt. On 11 April 1935, he signed a list of « non-Aryan » physicians who were not excluded by law from practice under public health-insurance plans and of those who were legally excluded, and he circulated the list in the Leipzig municipal administration. Gørdeler could not break the law, regardless of whether he considered it just, but he could and did confirm the legal position and the protection it provided for those whom the law had not excluded from practice or approbation.

In 1936, the matter of access for Jews to municipal public baths became an issue. There had been restrictions on access to public baths imposed on Jews as early as 1933 in Tübingen, Plauen, Nuremberg, Erlangen, and Munich. The central government in Berlin and the NSDAP leadership, at the time, opposed the general expansion of measures separating Jews from non-Jews out of internal and foreign-political considerations. The NSDAP leadership ordered the repeal of these restrictions, to little effect, but they tolerated local initiatives restricting access to public baths, sports facilities, libraries, and hospitals. The « Deutsche Gemeindetag » ignored the lack of a positive government directive and told inquiring municipalities that they could make any rules they wished. When the « Völkischer Beobachter » of 19 July 1936 reported that the mayor (« Oberbürgermeister ») of Breslau, Doctor Hans Fridrich, had forbidden German Jews the use of municipal baths, numerous municipalities followed the example. The files in the Leipzig City Archives reveal that Haake sought to give force to that unofficial practice in Leipzig. The ultimate responsibility, here, rested with Gørdeler. From a post-Auschwitz point of view, one may wish that Gørdeler had taken a more principled position in this matter, but we do not know his considerations, only that the restriction had been issued without his approval. He may have decided not to resign yet, or not over this issue rather than one of potentially greater public appeal ; he certainly still hoped to influence government policy, at a higher-level and in larger issues. The records reveal no

further personal involvement by Gørdeler other than his answer on 19 September 1936 to an inquiry from the Saxon section of the National Conference of Municipalities. He wrote, using the passive voice in the 3rd person that, from the end of July 1935, Jews had been prohibited from using the Leipzig municipal summer baths, indoor pools, and other communal baths. The date of Gørdeler's reply may help to explain its mild form ; it was 4 days after he had received the complaint, and 2 days after he had submitted his long memorandum on the economy to Hermann Gøring. Gørdeler was a prominent figure on the national political stage. From 1934 to 1935, he held « high national office » in the economic-policy field. He ultimately renounced the possibility of regaining his office as « Reich » Prices Commissioner when Hitler did not meet his demands for expanded authority.

In the summer of 1934, he wrote a memorandum on internal policy in which he demanded the consolidation of German racial policies. He addressed it to the « Reich » chancellor, as Gørdeler's biographer Gerhard Popitz, who lost his life for his part in the 20 July 1944 plot, was a jurist, from 1919, in the « Reich » Ministry of Finance ; from 1925 to 1929, as State secretary ; in 1932-1933, as « Reich » minister without portfolio ; and, from April 1933 to 20 July 1944, Prussian minister of finance. He is not on record as having questioned the government's right to define its citizens, but chaotic and unlawful arbitrariness was abhorrent to him. In 1933, 1934, and 1935, Popitz was concerned with the rule of law and orderly procedures, and with ending the extra-legal and unpredictable hooliganism of SA troopers and individual Party functionaries. An uncompromising protest against these persecutions could have led only to retirement and inactivity ; the chance of achieving anything lay in attempting to work within the existing system.

In March 1933, Popitz sent a draft for the « Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service » to vice-Chancellor Franz von Papen (a different version became law, on 7 April 1933) . Apparently, Popitz agreed that the government should have the ability, if it wished to do so, to remove Communists and Jews from the civil service. A meeting of ministers, on 5 May 1933, including Popitz and chaired by the Prussian minister president Hermann Gøring discussed details of the law's implementation, and the protocol declared unanimous agreement with the proposals, in particular with Popitz' suggestion that civil servants could be retired with full pension rights but without being given reasons, so that neither political nor « racial » reasons would be given, thereby, avoiding any defamation.

In discussions preceding and during the preparations for the Nuremberg Race Laws, on 20 August 1935, Popitz said he wished « that the government set a clear limit (it did not matter where) for the treatment of the Jews but, then, firmly see to it that the limit be respected » . In stark contrast with this seemingly conformist position, Popitz wrote his deep convictions into constitutional drafts and laws prepared about 1940, for the time after Hitler's fall, toward which he conspired with others ; here, Popitz stipulated the complete removal of the measures discriminating against Jews.

After his arrest for having participated in the conspiracy to overthrow the regime, the « Gestapo » quoted Popitz as having agreed that the Jews should be removed from positions in the State and in the economy, but that he had recommended a more gradual method, especially because of foreign-policy considerations. Whether Popitz had personally agreed with and approved restrictions upon Jews does not, on close scrutiny, emerge from this summary interrogation report. It contains Popitz' acknowledgment of the position he had taken, in 1935. The vulgar language of the German « Gestapo » report shows, however, that it contains the formulations of the interrogator ; only under

torture could Popitz have signed or agreed to them. His alleged expression of his « approval of the National-Socialist State in every way » is blatantly incorrect ; Popitz himself contradicted it in his testimony at his trial in the « People's Court » , on 3 October 1944, saying that « the manner and speed of the solution of the “ Jewish Question ” » had caused his « inner detachment from National-Socialism » . He disagreed with the manner of the « solution of the Jewish Question » , namely, discrimination, humiliation, robbery, forced emigration, mistreatment, and mass murder. He disagreed with the method and, therefore, with the « solution » . Popitz was hanged, on 2 February 1945, on the same day as Karl Gørdeler.

Gørdeler demanded, in his 1934 memorandum on German internal policy, adherence to Bismarck's maxim that all internal policy actions must be examined for their foreign-policy consequences. He demanded a « consolidation » of German racial policies and insisted that decisions about internal actions and their desirability from the foreign-policy point of view must be the domain of the Foreign Ministry, not, for example, of the Propaganda Ministry, and he concluded :

« What the law has put in place will be understood as self-protection and barely questioned abroad if, in this framework, everything now transacts itself with iron discipline and avoiding excesses and pedantism. »

In view of international law and the positions taken by the Western Powers in this matter, Gørdeler's assumption that, « What the law has put in place will be understood as self-protection and barely questioned abroad » was no doubt realistic. At the same time, he made clear his general rejection of racial policies by laughing at them :

« If, in the field of art, for example, we dislike Mendelssohn's composition “ The Creation ”, we should not perform it, but we should not announce that, for reasons of racial policy, it must be replaced by another. We might badly embarrass ourselves here, for it is rather possible that no living German composer could produce a better composition. »

On the whole, however, in the interest of gaining acceptance for his moderate and rational ideas, Gørdeler attempted to strike a sympathetic note in his memorandum, as when he welcomed Hitler's expressed wish to avoid conflict with the Catholic Church. Confident of his access to the highest levels of power, that is, to Hitler, particularly during his 2nd term as « Reich » Prices Commissioner, from 5 November 1934 to 1 July 1935, Gørdeler nevertheless expressed his criticisms clearly.

On 7 August 1936, General Hermann Göring, minister-president of Prussia, asked Gørdeler for his views on the foreign-currency and raw-materials situation. Gørdeler submitted a preliminary memorandum, on 31 August, and a longer, more elaborate version, on 17 September. In both, he advised austerity, slowing re-armament, and fiscal responsibility. Now, he fell-out of favour.

In his memoranda of 31 August - 17 September 1936, Gørdeler also said that he saw a « grand opportunity » to end the international currency turmoil and to win a great moral victory by reaching agreement with the « Western Powers » , particularly, England and France. He declared himself convinced that England and France would make available to

Germany, at low interest rates, the necessary gold to stabilise the German currency, but that they would not come to an agreement with Germany, unless certain other issues were also resolved. He made this point in the preliminary version of his memorandum, explicitly citing, in the following order, the « Jewish Question », the « Free-Masons Question », legal security, the « Church Question » (« die Judenfrage », die « Logenfrage », die « Rechtssicherheit », die « Kirchenfrage ») and, even more explicitly and strongly in the long version :

« One must reckon with “ very decided wishes ”, on the part of England and France.

I do not doubt that England and France have certain wishes in another area. I could imagine that we must bring into a certain greater agreement with imponderable views of other nations some questions such as the “ Jewish Question ”, the “ Free-Masons’ Question ”, legal security, the “ Church Question ”. But I assert that these sacrifices are nothing “ vis-a-vis ” the course of events that begins if we do not now come to the only decision for which an alternative decision of any kind does not at all exist. »

German fiscal soundness and an orderly budgetary and debt management were indispensable. It will be necessary temporarily to reduce the tempo of re-armament.

But, he declared in the longer version, the wishes of England and France will go farther.

« It is a fact that there are, in place, governments with other views there, and there are issues in which great discord has emerged. Well-known are the concerns about the treatment of the “ Jewish Question ”, the “ Free-Masons’ Question ”, the “ Church Question ”. But since, in the experience of world history, it has commonly always been less a question of fundamentals than of method and since the honour, liberty and existence of the German people are priorities since, moreover apparently, there now exists the possibility to bring-up for negotiation with good prospects of success our colonial demands and since, in any case, we need time for quiet re-armament, so certain sacrifices in forms seem to me nothing considering the course of events which will occur with certainty if we do not now reach the decision which is now required. Having reviewed my preliminary report, I cannot see that there could be any alternative decision which was apt to lead us out of our situation. It is the same in economic and political life as in the military. Certain situations demand one decision and none other. If the one is not taken, success will not be achieved. More, however, is at issue here ; it is not the question of achieving or not achieving a success, but the issue is that every wrong decision must bring us into ever more untenable positions. Almost daily now, I am receiving emergency messages from businesses of the free economy and from my administration which point to the consequences of the increasing scarcity of raw materials. »

Gørdeler knew that Göring was in charge of the 4 Year Plan, and that this plan included some form of autarky policy. He knew also that the plan aimed at achieving the utmost speed in War preparations. He agreed that military intervention against Poland would be necessary to regain formerly German territory, and he conceded that armaments were necessary. He tried to show, however, that they could not be accomplished without changing the treatment of the Jews and other groups who had incurred the hatred of the Nazis. He put the Jews 1st, in his list. The boycott against German business and industry had an effect, of course, but Gørdeler did not cite this, as he very well could have

done. He chose to cite « very decided wishes », on the part of England and France, that went beyond any insistence on German fiscal soundness and an orderly budgetary and debt management.

« It is a fact that there are, in place, governments with other views (in England and France) , and question Gørdeler out of his inner-self would never understand him and his fellow Party members. »

In the matter of the Mendelssohn monument :

« It was not material but ideologic principles that were decisive. »

He asserted that the Leipzig Party officials and City Council were unanimous on his, Haake's, side and that they and the public were incensed about Gørdeler's resistance and considered his resistance « weakness » . Haake stressed that « the real cause lay in Doctor Gørdeler's world-view which was the opposite of National-Socialism » , that Gørdeler had criticised and opposed most National-Socialist policies, since 1933 - and that the issue of the Statue was « only the outward occasion of the conflict » .

It might be argued that Haake used these accusations to justify his own insubordination, and that Haake only construed a link between Gørdeler's attitude in the « Jewish Question » and the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue. Gørdeler, however, had used the example of Mendelssohn earlier, in 1934, in the context of his rejection of racial policies. Even more important is the fact that Gørdeler had taken his position on the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue before it had become an issue of his authority over that of his deputy through Haake's insubordination. And, in the same time frame, in September 1936, Gørdeler had demanded a change of policy in the « Jewish Question » at the highest-level of government. This fact, that the larger context of Gørdeler's actions aimed at protecting Jews, makes the argument that it was a matter of injured authority untenable.

Haake, for his part, wrote from conviction. On 4 December 1936, he wrote to the Saxon governor (« Reichsstatthalter ») and the Party's regional leader (« Gauleiter ») Martin Mutschmann that, from the beginning of his association with Mayor Gørdeler, he noted :

« Again and again, that the latter made an effort to work within the thought system of National-Socialism, but that he never quite succeeded. »

And that Gørdeler lacked « the great faith » that National-Socialists own in all decisive questions ; just as Gørdeler, in 1933, doubted that the National-Socialist government would last long, so he also doubted the appropriateness of the various measures - whether it was re-armament, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, or economic decisions, Doctor Gørdeler was invariably pessimistic. From the middle of the year, Doctor Gørdeler had been increasingly pessimistic. He had criticised the national financial policies most severely, predicting a catastrophe, and considered the foreign-currency and raw-materials situation as particularly dire. Haake, he continued, had read Gørdeler's memorandum for Göring, and it reflected the same pessimistic mentality. For any measure to be taken, Gørdeler wanted, at least, a 51 % chance of success. National-Socialists cannot work with such a man in view of the great tasks that must be

accomplished in future. Gørdeler showed no understanding for the National-Socialist position in the « Churches' Question » .

« Doctor Gørdeler's attitude in the " Jewish Question " had been revealed extraordinarily clearly in the matter of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue. As I wrote, he has made extraordinary difficulties not only in the matter of the Mendelssohn monument, but in all cases of re-naming streets named after a Jew. If he now took the occasion of the matter of the Mendelssohn monument to ask to be pensioned, I am firmly convinced that the causes lie much deeper. »

Haake also surmised that Gørdeler's frustrated ambition to again be named « Reich » Prices Commissioner was involved, and that Gørdeler may have felt, in the face of the successes of National-Socialism, that his own very different views were no longer sustainable.

When Mutschmann installed Gørdeler's successor, the Leipzig National-Socialist county leader (« Kreisleiter ») Walter Donicke, he said that Leipzig as a world-rank city had to have a National-Socialist mayor. Gørdeler wrote to Mutschmann from New York, on 23 November 1937, to explain the reasons for his resignation, listing 1st the removal of the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy statue and the refusal of the Saxon Ministry of the Interior to take the action against Haake that Gørdeler had to demand to preserve his authority. In consequence, Gørdeler concluded, he was forced to resign his office. He had not the power to simply have the statue brought back, and so, he had lost both, a point of principle and his authority. The issue of his authority forced him to resign, although, of course, it was not the primary cause of the conflict. When Haake proposed that the City Council approve Gørdeler's request to be relieved of his office with pension, not one of the 30 Councillors who were present rose to say a word of thanks, or in Gørdeler's defence. After his resignation as mayor of Leipzig, in the autumn of 1936, effective in April 1937, Gørdeler worked in Berlin as a consultant and agent for the Robert Bosch Company of Stuttgart.

Robert Bosch and his company executives, particularly Hans Walz and Albrecht Fischer, gave support and assistance to Jews in the 1930's, in many forms through community organisations and the like. In December 1936, Karl Adler, the Jewish head of the Conservatory for Music in Stuttgart, wrote in an appeal to Hans Walz that Robert Bosch's help in critical times was « today support and assistance for thousands of the despairing German Jews » . In the case of a Frankfurt jewellery store whose Jewish co-owners wished to sell their shares and emigrate, Bosch paid a generous price and facilitated the transfer of the proceeds of the sale via Switzerland to the United States. When Karl Adler was arrested, in connection with the 9 November 1938 pogrom, Robert Bosch caused Hans Walz to intervene, and Adler was released on condition that he increase the speed of Jewish emigration as manager of the Stuttgart bureau of the Agency for Adult Education (« Mittelstelle für Erwachsenenbildung ») that Martin Buber had founded in 1934. Adler's task was enormously complicated, particularly by the fact that most assets of Jews had been confiscated, and also because the « Gestapo » had set-up an office of their own, in the agency. Robert Bosch supported Adler's work with « substantial sums » , from 1938 to 1940. This had to be done in secret, in sealed envelopes containing between 500 and 3,000 « Reichsmarks » . Many Jews had to be smuggled across the border, at a cost of about 1,000 « Reichsmarks » per person. In one spectacular case, the police and SS extorted an exorbitant sum for allowing a group of Jews to cross the Rhine into France.

In August 1937, Gørdeler travelled to Canada and the United States. Gørdeler wrote for Hitler 2 reports about his visit to Canada, and 1 lengthy one about his travels in America. He called his 1st report on Canada, dated 27 September 1937, a « Special Report ». In it, he stressed Canadian views on German policies toward the Jews and the churches, devoting one and a half pages of the not quite 4 pages of the report to Canadians' conspicuously large interest in Germany's treatment of the « Jewish Question » :

« Strikingly, the treatment of the “ Jewish Question ” meets with greater interest in Canada than in Western Europe. This astonished me all the more, since I did see negroes in Canada but no Jews. If, nevertheless, a conspicuously high-interest is focused in Canada upon the treatment of the Jews in Germany, it is because this young country displays an uncommonly high-respect for the values of humanity. »

Gørdeler, thus, characterized German policy toward the Jews as inhuman. He concluded that, if German policy-makers hoped to influence the Canadian government, they must know these facts and must accommodate the critical views of Canadians in the « Jewish Question », the « Church Question », and the « Rule-of-Law Question » .

In a report on America, dated 2 January 1938 (for Robert Bosch, Gustav Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach, Hermann Göring, Hitler's adjutant Fritz Wiedemann, and Generals Werner Freiherr von Fritsch, Ludwig Beck, Franz Halder, and Georg Thomas) Gørdeler wrote that the Americans were generally understanding and friendly toward Germany. The boycott movement (initiated by the American Jewish Congress) was less noticeable the farther removed one was from its centre in New York.

...

While Klaus-Jürgen Müller and Ulrich von Hassell had been pursuing their various negotiations, others closely associated with Hassell were using their influence to the same ends, through other channels. These were 2 of the most famous and distinguished men of the resistance, General Ludwig Beck, a former Chief of the General Staff, and Karl Gørdeler, the former Mayor of Leipzig and a minister in Adolf Hitler's so-called Cabinet, until differences with Hermann Göring had led to his retirement, in 1937.

General Beck had openly turned against Hitler's aggressive policy, as early as 1938, at the time of Munich, and had Britain and France showed fight he might, at that moment, have led a « coup d'État » with the help of other senior officers who had begun to share his views. Messages to that effect had been given with extreme frankness to Lord Halifax, in London, but Neville Chamberlain's decision to fly to Germany and negotiate with Hitler frustrated their plans. Meanwhile, Beck had retired, though he kept in close touch with military circles. He was a man of exceptional intelligence and determination, a Liberal in outlook and an outstanding thinker and writer on military affairs. But he was a widower in poor health, suffering from insomnia and pain in his teeth which his doctors found incurable. He had linked himself with Gørdeler, the man whom nobody could quite fathom but whose personality was so strong that, when a shadow Cabinet was to be discussed by the conspirators during the following years, he inevitably emerged as the future Chancellor of Germany. Beck has been described by a man who knew him well as like « a sage or a

philosopher ; a great gentleman, one who combined graciousness with an innate authority. Every word, every gesture, revealed the even poise of his mind and temperament. His whole personality radiated a noble candour. » He was regarded as « the heart of the movement » along with Gørdeler, and its « recognized head » ; in this capacity, he was the natural mediator when disputes arose, as they were so frequently to do.

Hassell's association with Gørdeler had begun before the War, but even as early as 1939, Hassell noted down that Gørdeler was considered « imprudent » . What appealed to Hassell, then, about this austere and difficult man was that he « wants to act rather than grumble » , a marked contrast to the generals and militarists - apart, that was, from Beck, who was a fellow-member with Hassell of a closed group of intellectuals called the « Wednesday Society » , a 19th Century intellectual club limited to 16 persons who met regularly to discuss cultural and scientific matters round the dinner-table. Hassell, Gørdeler and Beck frequently met to exchange opinions and information ; differing on certain points in the successive plans they had to « massage » the generals into active resistance against Hitler but, at least, in fundamental agreement, that it was necessary, somehow or other, to get Hitler removed from power. To Hassell, Gørdeler always appeared fearless, alert, active and optimistic too optimistic, in fact, in his anticipation of the collapse of the Nazis during the early stages of the War and in his belief that, in the end, the reluctant generals would take action against Hitler.

Gørdeler's own career had been both impressive and idiosyncratic. He came of conservative Prussian stock with a strong sense of duty and service to the State ; his father had been a District judge. His upbringing had been happy, but sternly intellectual and moral ; his legal training had pointed to a career in local administration and economics. He had held the important office of Mayor of Leipzig, a professional position in Germany of much greater power than that of mayor in a comparable British or American industrial city. He was a born organiser, an able, voluble speaker and writer, tough and highly-individual ; in politics, he became a Right-wing Liberal. Although, at heart, a very humane man, Gørdeler's frigid, spartan belief in hard work and his austere, puritanical morality (he would not tolerate a divorced man or woman in his house) lacked warmth and comradeship. He was, in fact, an autocrat by nature, and his commanding personality, combined with his utter belief in the rightness of his point of view, enabled him to persuade weak or uncertain men over-easily to accept his own particular point of view while he was with them.

In addition to holding office as Mayor of Leipzig, he had accepted a government economic post as Price Commissioner for a brief period before Hitler came to power, and then again, between 1934-1935, under Hitler himself, whom he tried to persuade to introduce certain major reforms in local administration. But his association with the Nazis did not last long, though it always remained a period he had to live down when he became active in the Resistance. He had resigned as Mayor of Leipzig, in 1937, when, against his firmly expressed wish, the statue of Mendelssohn opposite the « Gewandhaus » concert-hall was removed by the National-Socialist councillors, in November 1936, while he was abroad, on the ground that the composer was a pure Jew.

Gørdeler had written endless memoranda to Göring, to the Pope, to the German generals, to his contacts at home and abroad, all of them designed to prevent the drift into War. In May 1939, he had been able personally to report to Winston Churchill, in Britain, on the opposition movement. Once War had been declared, he too tried to promote peace negotiations before the hostilities in the West developed on a scale which might make the discussion of an armistice

on favourable terms impossible. He knew that Field-Marshal Walter von Brauchitsch, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, and General Franz Halder, Beck's successor, were, at all events, approachable on the subject of a military « coup d'État » which, at this stage, was for many members of the Resistance, as far as they were prepared to go in support of action against Hitler. That Hitler should be arrested and brought to trial was considered preferable to assassination, which might have made the « Führer » seem a martyr instead of a criminal whose evil deeds should be made public in a Court of law. So, plan and counter-plan were worked-out and abandoned during the period of stalemate preceding the War in the West ; debate and counter-debate turned on the relative merits and demerits, moral and political, of the « coup d'État » and the assassination, on the reliability or, otherwise, of the new Army with its large number of Hitler enthusiasts among the younger men should Hitler be known to remain alive in custody. Many commanders, in key positions, were hostile to any act of sudden violence, or « coup de main » , involving Hitler ; among these, in addition to Brauchitsch, was General Friedrich Fromm, Commander of the Reserve (or Home) Army. Beck and Gerdeler, however, certainly won the goodwill of many senior officers during this and subsequent periods of the War.

But the « coup d'État » was constantly postponed. During the early months of 1940, Gerdeler continued his efforts to encourage peace-feelers, in Sweden and Switzerland. It became increasingly clear that London would not stir either way until the « coup d'État » about which all these agents were hinting had taken place. The British were expecting immediate action from the Resistance, in Germany ; they had been given several indications, from as near official sources as were possible in an underground movement, that this would be the case. The only thing that did not happen was the « coup d'État » itself.

Meanwhile, it was also clear that Hitler was preparing to invade in the West. Not only were numerous warnings given, but the celebrated incident, in January 1940 (when a staff officer carrying plans for the invasion of the West made a forced landing in Belgium) , gave absolute proof of Hitler's intentions. But still no action was taken in Germany. Oster, driven desperate by the situation, had, since the previous November, been issuing secret warnings to the countries faced with invasion, giving them dates when hostilities might be anticipated ; from the German point of view, such action still seems the highest form of treason and has to be defended, even in terms of the resistance itself, as the work of a man moved by « deeply-felt hate of Hitler » and « genuine moral indignation at the bare-faced crime of aggression against friendly neighbours » . Nevertheless, the absence of any sign of the « coup d'État » was leading to a suspicion in Britain that some trick was being played by the agents of Hitler and that there was, in fact, no effective resistance in Germany, after all.

On 15 April, the tenuous relationship between Britain and the agents of the Resistance was dissolved by Hitler's invasion of Denmark and Norway. Chamberlain's Government, in any case, was on the verge of collapse. A month later, on 10 May, Hitler entered Holland and Belgium, and Winston Churchill became Prime Minister. A new, tough policy of « unconditional surrender » became, from that day, the answer the agents of the conspirators had to face. The good faith of the German Resistance movement had to be proved before the world by removing Hitler from the new heights of power and popularity that he had achieved through the success of his ruthless strategy of « blitzkrieg » .

Winston Churchill was not without knowledge of the Resistance movement. He had heard of it from Ewald von Kleist,

an opponent of Hitler, in August 1938, and from Gørdeler himself, in May 1939 ; on both occasions, he had shown keen interest. He also received Fabian von Schlabrendorff, one of the men who was later actually to share in an attempt on Hitler's life and a man whom he knew personally ; they had met at Chartwell, in July 1939. Schlabrendorff began by saying :

« I am not a Nazi, but a good patriot. »

Churchill had grinned and replied :

« So am I. »

He had even sent a letter of encouragement to the members of the Resistance through Kleist, which Oster, Beck and Halder, among others, had all read ; a copy of this letter found by the « Gestapo » among Kleist's papers was one of the direct causes of his execution, in 1945. But, for Churchill and for the rest of the Allies, the vague appeals of the Resistance for direct signs of encouragement proved fruitless once Hitler's naked aggression had been unleashed. Only their unaided removal of the tyrant could, in the view of Britain's new Premier, prove that they were as good as their word.

Even as early as 1940, Gørdeler had begun to despair of moving the generals in the direction of any absolute plan for a « coup d'État » . As Hassell himself put it :

« These generals seem to want the Hitler Government itself to order them to overthrow it. »

Hassell, Gørdeler and Beck lived in a world in which they had constantly to distinguish between hard news and rumour, between the genuine leakage from secret discussions revealing Nazi policy and mere wishful thinking.

The rapid conquests of 1940-1941 had made all discussions with the generals abortive, for they never knew whether they were to be rewarded by Hitler with large sums of money and made field-marshal or dismissed as too incompetent to fulfil the blindly instinctive, though sometimes astute, strategies of their Master. Hassell, more sensitive by now to the tide of opinion than Gørdeler, had begun to find his friend handicapped by quite outmoded conceptions and by « his facile prophecies of an early breakdown of the regime » . In November 1941, he claimed to have made favourable contacts with Churchill ; Hassell believed this was entirely fantasy. Gørdeler, he felt by now, was all « will-power and no tact » . The months now passed in time-consuming debate about who should be leader in Gørdeler's shadow Cabinet. Hitler lived on, unthreatened by discussions as to whether the monarchy should or should not be brought back to Germany. Action, when it came eventually, originated with the younger generation.

Gørdeler occupied the next 3 years, 1941-1943, which were years of stalemate and frustration for the Resistance, in writing endless memoranda, planning a constitution and setting-up a shadow Cabinet for the new Germany, once Hitler had been spirited away. He made approaches to other leaders of disaffection, more particularly, those who had formerly been organisers of the labour unions, men such as the Socialists, Wilhelm Leuschner, Julius Leber, Theodor

Haubach, Carlo Mierendorff and Adolf Reichwein. They too wanted to see a successful « coup d'État » but, as in the case of the other sections of the Resistance movement, they lacked effective co-ordination. During the years of the Nazi regime, thousands of brave men and women, in their ranks, were gaoled, tortured and, in many cases, killed.

Gørdeler's militant Liberalism, in its way as autocratic as the man himself, now moved partially to the left in order to accommodate his new colleagues ; nevertheless, he also considered it right to debate the restoration of the monarchy. Gørdeler's growing circle in the Resistance passed their time in constant discussions and dissensions about the shape of the new Germany they were fashioning under the feet of Hitler. According to Hans Bernd Gisevius, their ceaseless activity was, in itself, a sign of their helplessness. Meetings were held everywhere in private houses at the home of Claus Bonhøffer, for instance ; the circle of debate included Hassell, Beck, Leuschner and even Prince Louis Ferdinand, 2nd son of the Crown Prince. But, beneath all these discussions, lurked the fear that the Allies' demand for unconditional surrender from any German Government, with or without Hitler, would make any such plans purely academic. Gørdeler was not alone in his endless attempts to obtain from the Allies some form of positive re-assurance of the kind, he and all the resistance leaders, wanted - that they, at least, would no longer be regarded with suspicion once a « coup d'État » was successfully achieved and that honourable negotiations would then be possible in place of defeat.

It was in this spirit that Bonhøffer had gone to Stockholm, but the results were negative. Gørdeler had hoped that the British art of compromise would assert itself, but he was mistaken. In July 1941, Britain and Russia had agreed they would not sign a separate peace with Germany and, in January 1943, America, too, joined in the general stipulation that the surrender of Germany must be unconditional. As for the members of the Resistance, the situation was to remain, as Eden put it, to Bishop George Bell, in August 1943 :

« If any section of the German people really wished to see a return to a German State based on respect for law and the rights of the individual, they must understand that no one would believe them until they had taken active steps to rid themselves of their present regime. »

...

Extrait de « OPUS » , un « thriller » policier (publié en 2001) par Edward Alexander :

(« OPUS » is a political thriller about the joint search by American and Soviet Cultural Officers for a Beethoven Cello Concerto in Hungary, leading to the involvement of 3 Intelligence agencies, World War II intrigue, and culminating at KGB Headquarters.)

Wilhelm Canaris' antipathy to Adolf Hitler had grown immeasurably. Meanwhile, the resistance cell of the « Abwehr » had become what might be termed « the fulcrum of the opposition » . Philipp Scheidemann recited a dizzying list of names, beginning with Colonel Hans Oster, and continuing with Ernst von Dohnanyi and many others of whom Phil had never heard. He smiled gently at Scheidemann's display of the famous German « thoroughness » in his recounting of the anti-Hitler resistance movement.

Scheidemann stopped for a moment to explain, with visible amusement, that the official view of the German Democratic Republic towards the Resistance was that it was nothing less than an attempt « to save the foundations of the capitalistic hegemony of the monopolies » , he said, underlining the quote with a change of emphasis.

« Let me now return to Karl Gørdeler. He was, I suppose, what you would call a conservative German. In the beginning, he didn't entertain any ideas of resistance. But he did things which irritated the Nazis. As early as 1933, for instance, he refused to raise the Swastika flag over the Leipzig Town Hall. »

« But his antipathy towards them deepened when they began waging their anti-Semitic campaigns. For him, the last straw occurred in 1936, when the Nazis ordered the removal of Felix Mendelssohn's statue from the front of the Leipzig " Gewandhaus " building. »

« I assume you know what I am talking about. »

« Absolutely. Mendelssohn was a Jew and the " Gewandhaus ", where he had conducted its great Orchestra, was the most famous concert-hall in all of Germany. »

« Excellent ! I see you are well-informed » , the old man exclaimed, rubbing his bony hands together.

« Now, we come to the nucleus of our story. During his tenure as Lord Mayor, Gørdeler was very friendly with my old chief, " Herr " Doktor von Hase, whom he visited often. I remember so well when the Mendelssohn statue was removed because von Hase, who was the President of the " Gewandhaus ", was up in arms. My God, none of us could believe it. Mendelssohn, one of our greatest men of music. »

« Beyond all that, however, Gørdeler had a far more personal reason to hate the Nazis. He had lost 2 sons on the Russian front and was a deeply embittered man. His hatred of Hitler became an obsession, but even so, and this is curious, he never favored assassination, only overthrow. »

...

« He was saying something about the safety of our firm and employees, and that he could not get involved. »

« Gørdeler replied that he would not get him involved, but that my chief could help in a very indirect way. Now comes the most important part of what I heard that day. Gørdeler said that he had just learned something which was absolutely astonishing, and that his source was unimpeachable. He then lowered his voice, and I remember his words so distinctly : " My source is one of us - Canaris. ". Do you remember when, a few moments ago, I told you of the 4 major groups in the Resistance ? Canaris was the head of one of them, the " Abwehr ". »

« Gørdeler had lowered his voice and I had to listen hard but I heard most of it. Canaris, he said, had sent him a

private message to the effect that an officer on his, Canaris' staff, someone whom he trusted and who bore a name which evoked our deepest military traditions, might be an agent working for the Nazis. This could only mean, Gørdeler maintained, that the " Gestapo " had penetrated the ranks of the Resistance and was using this officer to build dossiers on everyone. »

...

Carl Friedrich Gørdeler (geboren 31. Juli 1884 in Schneidemühl, Provinz Posen ; gestorben 2. Februar 1945 in Berlin-Plötzensee) war ein deutscher Jurist, Politiker (DNVP) und Widerstandskämpfer gegen den Nationalsozialismus. Er gehörte zu den führenden zivilen Köpfen der Widerstandsbewegung und sollte nach dem Attentat vom 20. Juli 1944, an dessen Planung er maßgeblich beteiligt war, das Amt des Reichskanzlers übernehmen.

Gørdeler entstammte einer preußischen Beamtenfamilie. Er war seit 1911 als Kommunalpolitiker tätig und von 1930 bis 1937 Oberbürgermeister von Leipzig. Geistig orientierte Gørdeler sich an der preußischen Tradition und einem wirtschaftsliberalen Wertkonservatismus. Der Verwaltungsfachmann war in den 1920er Jahren mehrfach als Reichskanzler im Gespräch, bevor er 1931-1932 und 1934-1935 das Amt des Reichskommissars für Preisüberwachung innehatte.

Die Machtübertragung an die NSDAP bewertete Gørdeler zunächst positiv. Aus seiner konservativen Weltanschauung heraus weigerte er sich jedoch von Anfang an, Mitglied der Partei zu werden, und entwickelte sich bis 1936 zu einem entschiedenen Gegner des Regimes. Als in Leipzig im November 1936 das Denkmal des jüdischen Komponisten Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy abgerissen wurde, trat Gørdeler demonstrativ vom Amt des Oberbürgermeisters zurück. In den folgenden Jahren reiste er durch die Staaten der Westmächte, um vor dem Nationalsozialismus zu warnen und die alliierten Regierungen zu beraten.

Mit Beginn des Zweiten Weltkrieges bildete sich um Gørdeler ein konservativer Kreis des zivilen Widerstands heraus, der das Ende der NS-Herrschaft herbeiführen wollte. Dieser sogenannte « Gørdeler-Kreis » war ein geistiges Zentrum der Opposition gegen Hitler und verfügte über zahlreiche Kontakte zu anderen Widerstandsgruppen, insbesondere zum militärischen Widerstand um Ludwig Beck. Nach dem Scheitern des Attentats vom 20. Juli wurde Gørdeler im August 1944 denunziert, vom « Volksgerichtshof » zum Tode verurteilt und am 2. Februar 1945 in Berlin-Plötzensee hingerichtet.

Carl Friedrich Gørdeler wurde als dritter Sohn von Julius Gørdeler und seiner Frau Adelheid, geborener Roloff, in Schneidemühl, Kreis Kolmar in Posen, geboren. Seine Familie gehörte väterlicher- und mütterlicherseits zur preußischen Beamtenelite. Bereits sein ursprünglich aus Lüchow stammender Urgroßvater Christian Gørdeler war als Oberrevisionsrat zur Zeit Friedrich Wilhelms III. in Berlin tätig gewesen. Sein Großvater, Dietrich Wilhelm Gørdeler, arbeitete am Oberlandesgericht Hamm in der Provinz Westfalen. Seit seiner Versetzung 1852 an das Appellationsgericht Marienwerder in der Provinz Westpreußen war die Familie eng mit dem ländlichen Ostelbien verbunden. Der noch in Hamm geborene Vater Julius Gørdeler wuchs in Marienwerder auf und heiratete die Tochter des dortigen Appellationsgerichtsrats Carl Roloff, nachdem er als Offizier der Reserve aus dem Deutsch-Französischen Krieg 1870-1871 zurückgekehrt war. Aus dieser Ehe gingen vier Söhne (Gustav, Franz, Carl und Fritz) sowie eine Tochter (Else) hervor. Über die Jugendzeit

Gørdelers liegen aufgrund seiner erhaltenen Jugenderinnerungen, die er kurz vor seiner Verhaftung 1944 verfasste, detaillierte Quellen vor.

Nach der Geburt des dritten Sohnes Carl Friedrich gab Julius Gørdeler seine Tätigkeit als Rechtsanwalt in Schneidemühl auf und ergriff die Chance, als Amtsrichter und gleichzeitig als Geschäftsführer der Landwirtschaftsbank « Neue Westpreußische Landschaft » zu arbeiten. Bis zu seinem sechsten Lebensjahr wuchs Carl Friedrich Gørdeler in der kleinen Landstadt Schneidemühl auf, bevor sein Vater 1890 ins nahe Marienwerder versetzt wurde und die Familie dorthin umzog. Am Umfeld der Familie änderte sich jedoch wenig : Ihre Lebensführung war bürgerlich und von provinzieller Einfachheit und Naturverbundenheit geprägt. Sein Vater führte die Familie patriarchalisch-autoritär, kompensiert durch die « liebevolle Würde » und Lebhaftigkeit der Mutter. Der große Familienzusammenhalt und insbesondere auch die geschlechterspezifische Rollenverteilung bestimmten Gørdelers spätere Auffassungen über die Familie als wichtigste Stütze der Gesellschaft (er selbst nannte dies das « Grunderlebnis » seiner Kinder) und Jugendzeit. Hinzu kam der « Geist altpreußisch-konservativen Beamtentums » : Gørdeler erfuhr eine Erziehung zu preußischen Tugenden und königstreue-konservativer Grundeinstellung. Auch politische Diskussionen fanden im Hause der Familie häufig statt, besonders, seitdem der Vater 1899 für die Freikonservative Partei in den preußischen Landtag eingezogen war.

Seit 1891 besuchte Gørdeler das humanistische Gymnasium Marienwerder, wo schon sein Vater das Abitur gemacht hatte. Auch wenn er nicht zu den besten Schülern gehörte, so beurteilte er im Rückblick seine Schulzeit doch als « vorzüglich » . Am humanistischen Gymnasium erwarb er eine bürgerlich ästhetisch-geschichtlich ausgerichtete Bildung. Besonders die Kultur des antiken Griechenlands und die friederizianisch-protestantische Tradition standen im Vordergrund. Am 22. März 1902 legte Carl Friedrich Gørdeler dort die Reifeprüfung erfolgreich ab. Anschließend meldete er sich, der Mode der Jahrhundertwende folgend, zur Offiziersausbildung bei der kaiserlichen Marine. Er verbrachte aber nur wenige Monate als Schüler der Marineakademie in Kiel, da ihn « furchtbares Heimweh » packte. Nach dem kurzen Zwischenspiel als Marinesoldat entschloss sich Gørdeler schließlich, die Familientradition fortzusetzen und Jurist zu werden.

Neue Aula der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, in der eine Gedenktafel an die ehemaligen Tübinger Studenten erinnert, die am 20. Juli beteiligt waren.

Am 13. November 1902 nahm Gørdeler an der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen das Jura-Studium auf. Dort hatten bereits seine beiden älteren Brüder studiert, und wie sie wechselte auch Carl Friedrich nach drei Semestern die Universität : 1905 ging er an die Albertina nach Königsberg. Die juristischen Fakultäten dieser beiden Hochschulen galten als besonders konservativ und elitär. Neben Vorlesungen der Rechtswissenschaft besuchte Gørdeler auch historische, da er sich sehr für die Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts, insbesondere für die Preußischen Reformen, interessierte. Dieses historische Interesse prägte später auch seine politischen Ansichten.

In Tübingen trat er der « Akademischen Turnerschaft Eberhardina » (heute : Alte Turnerschaft Eberhardina-Markomania) bei. Im Kaiserreich bildeten die Verbindungen die zentralen Institutionen des studentischen Lebens. Die « Eberhardina » , der auch Gørdelers Brüder angehörten, war eine 1884 gegründete, freie, farbentragende und

pflichtschlagende Turnerverbindung. Zu seinen Kommilitonen gehörte Eugen Bolz, der als Zentrums Politiker 1928 bis 1933 württembergischer Staatspräsident war und später im Widerstandskreis des 20. Juli mitwirkte. Nach Gørdelers Wechsel nach Königsberg legte er am 31. Oktober 1905 sein erstes Staatsexamen mit dem Prädikat « befriedigend » ab, was damals im zweiten juristischen Staatsexamen eine anerkanntswerte Note war. Wenige Tage später erfolgte seine Ernennung zum Referendar. In Königsberg lernte er die Arztochter Anneliese Ulrich kennen, mit der er sich 1903 verlobte. Er war Mitglied der Verbindung Rossitten, aus der 1926 die Fliegerei Preußen hervorging.

Vom 1. November 1905 bis zum 30. September 1906 stand Carl Friedrich Gørdeler als Einjährig-Freiwilliger beim 1. Ostpreußischen Feldartillerie-Regiment Nummer 16. Nach Beendigung der militärischen Dienstpflicht begann er mit einer praktischen Ausbildung als Referendar. Er absolvierte seinen Vorbereitungsdienst an verschiedenen Stationen, so in Fischhausen, Braunsberg, Königsberg und Marienwerder. Neben seinem Referendariat hat Gørdeler die Zeit gefunden, zum Thema Das Bewusstsein der Pflichtwidrigkeit im Schuldinhalte und Behandlung in der Literatur und den wichtigsten deutschen Gesetzbüchern des 19. Jahrhunderts zu promovieren. 1907 reichte er die Dissertation bei Professor Robert von Hippel an der Universität Göttingen ein. Insgesamt erhielt er hierfür aber nur die Note « rite » .

Drei Jahre später beendete er seine Referendariatszeit und legte am 31. März 1911 in Berlin das zweite Staatsexamen ab. Wenig später wurde er zum Gerichtsassessor ernannt. Dies bedeutete jedoch nur, daß er nunmehr die formalen Voraussetzungen für das Amt des « Gerichtsrats » (zum Beispiel Amtsrichter oder ähnlich) besaß ; keineswegs aber bedeutete es die Übernahme in den dauerhaften Beamtenstatus ; vielmehr verdiente die Mehrheit der Juristen in der Kaiserzeit erst ab Mitte vierzig ihr erstes Gehalt. So war Gørdeler (wie andere auch) veranlasst, anderswo einen Arbeitsplatz zu finden. Aufgrund seines politischen Interesses entschied er sich, wie später auch sein Bruder Fritz, für eine kommunalpolitische Laufbahn. Um hierauf besonders gut vorbereitet zu sein, entschloss sich Carl Friedrich Gørdeler auf Anraten des mit seinen Eltern befreundeten Königsberger Oberbürgermeisters Siegfried Körte dafür, zunächst Praktika im Bankwesen zu absolvieren. Zu diesem Zweck ließ er sich am 21. April 1911 für ein Jahr aus dem Justizdienst beurlauben.

Vom 24. April bis zum 14. September arbeitete Gørdeler bei der Bank der « Ostpreußischen Landschaft » und anschließend bis zum 10. Oktober in der Königlichen Seehandlung, der preußischen Staatsbank, am Gendarmenmarkt in Berlin. Das Praktikum im Bankwesen verschaffte ihm Einblicke in ökonomische Zusammenhänge, die ihm später in der Kommunalverwaltung von Nutzen waren. Nach Abschluß der Praktika und des Referendariats strebte Gørdeler, nunmehr Jurist, einer ersten festen Anstellung entgegen. Zudem hatte er während seiner Praktikumszeit seine Verlobte Anneliese Ulrich (1888-1961) geheiratet, die er in Königsberg kennengelernt hatte. Aus der Ehe gingen fünf Kinder hervor, die Söhne Ulrich (1913-2000) , Christian (1914-1942) und Reinhard (1922-1996) sowie Marianne (1919-2011) , die Mutter von Frieder Meyer-Krahmer, und Benigna.

Am 15. Oktober 1911 trat Gørdeler als Gerichtsassessor in den Dienst der Stadtverwaltung von Solingen ein, der Oberbürgermeister August Dicke vorstand. Er fand zunächst neben der reinen Verwaltungstätigkeit durch die Teilnahme an den Stadtverordnetenversammlungen einen Einblick in die kommunalpolitische Praxis, bevor er seit dem 17. Oktober auch das Recht hatte, den Kommissionssitzungen beizuwohnen. Am 10. Juni 1912 erfolgte seine dauerhafte Anstellung als besoldeter juristischer Hilfsarbeiter. Die Position eines juristischen Hilfsarbeiters war für die Vorbereitung auf höhere

Beamtenposten geschaffen worden, weshalb Oberbürgermeister Dicke Gørdeler auch von Anfang an mit der Leitung kleinerer Dezernate betraute. Die Stadt Solingen stellte in vielerlei Hinsicht einen Gegensatz zu den Orten seiner Jugend dar : Sie war eine moderne Industriestadt, politisch eine Hochburg der Sozialdemokratie. So entwickelte der konservative Preuße eine stärkere Offenheit gegenüber anderen politischen Strömungen, ohne in irgendeiner Weise von seinen nationalkonservativen Überzeugungen abzurücken.

Am 17. Dezember 1912 wählte ihn die Stadtverordnetenversammlung für zwölf Jahre in das Amt des Beigeordneten. Gørdeler hatte zuvor erwogen, als Stadtrat nach Halberstadt zu wechseln. Wegen seiner besonderen fachlichen Befähigung war die Stadtverordnetenversammlung schließlich bereit, ihn ungewöhnlich schnell zu befördern, um ihn auf diese Weise in Solingen zu halten. Für die Familie war sein beruflicher Aufstieg « ein schöner Erfolg », wie seine Frau Anneliese später schrieb, insbesondere deshalb, weil wenige Tage nach Gørdelers Amtseinführung das erste Kind, Sohn Ulrich, zur Welt kam. Zu den Aufgaben als Beigeordneter gehörte die Leitung des Schul-, Sozial-, Finanz-, Steuer- und Versicherungswesens sowie die Vertretung des Bürgermeisters, womit er auch tatsächlich während einer Abwesenheit Dickes betraut wurde. Bereits in Solingen bildete sich heraus, was Gørdeler in späteren Schriften häufig betonte : Im Vergleich der beiden Kommunalverfassungen, der Bürgermeister- und der Magistratsverfassung, bevorzugte er eindeutig die Bürgermeisterverfassung, weil diese die seines Erachtens effektivste Verwaltungsstruktur habe. Aus der geregelten Tätigkeit als Beigeordneter wurde Gørdeler schließlich durch den Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs herausgerissen.

Carl Friedrich Gørdeler war derjenige, der am 31. Juli 1914 in Solingen von der Rathauptreppe die allgemeine Mobilmachung verkündete. Als Reserveoffizier mußte er sich sofort nach der Mobilmachung beim Feldartillerie-Regiment Nummer 71 melden. Seit dem 4. August 1914 stand er bei diesem Regiment in Ostpreußen. Gørdeler fand Verwendung als Adjutant des Kommandeurs der Ersatzabteilung, mit der er an der für die Deutschen siegreichen Schlacht bei Tannenberg teilnahm. Es folgten die Schlacht von Wilna und der Stellungskampf um Smorgon. Im Oktober 1915 erfolgte die Auflösung des Regiments ; die Truppen wurden dem Feldartillerie-Regiment Nummer 93 überstellt. Dort stieg Gørdeler, mittlerweile im Rang eines Oberleutnants, zum Führer der 6. Batterie, wobei es sich um leichte Feldhaubitzen handelte, auf. Danach war er als Ordonnanzoffizier bei verschiedenen Stäben an der Ostfront tätig, zuletzt als Hauptmann der Reserve beim Oberkommando der 10. Armee, die General Erich von Falkenhayn unterstellt war. Dort gehörte die Finanzverwaltung der besetzten Gebiete Weißrusslands und Litauens zu seinen Aufgaben. Gørdeler nahm bis zum 31. Januar 1919 an der Ostfront am Ersten Weltkrieg teil. Für seine Verdienste wurde er mit dem Eisernen Kreuz I. und II. Klasse ausgezeichnet.

Seit Beginn des Krieges kämpfte er « mit größtem Optimismus bis zum letzten Tag ». Sein patriotischer Enthusiasmus entsprang einer unbedingten Übereinstimmung mit den Kriegszielen des Kaiserreichs. Diese Haltung behielt er bis zum Kriegsende, trotz der grauenhaften Kriegserfahrungen, darunter auch dem Tod seines Bruders Franz 1918 bei Saint-Quentin an der Westfront. Allerdings teilte Gørdeler nicht die Erfahrungen des Grabenkrieges im Westen, die seine Generation prägen sollten.

Zu der schweren Enttäuschung durch die Kriegsniederlage kam bei Gørdeler das Entsetzen über die politischen Umbrüche im Zuge der Novemberrevolution. Nach seiner Rückkehr kämpfte er am 3. und 4. März 1919 in Straßenkämpfen in Berlin als Freikorps-Mitglied gegen den Spartakusbund. Später sah er dies kritisch: Angesichts der

politischen Entwicklung 1918 sei der Versuch einer Revolution rückblickend « eine natürliche Selbstverständlichkeit » gewesen. Die veränderte Situation führte bei Gærdeler 1918-1919 zu seiner Sinnkrise. So bezweifelte er, daß es überhaupt sinnvoll sei, unter diesen Bedingungen wieder in den Verwaltungsdienst einzutreten. Letztendlich nahm er seine Tätigkeit als Beigeordneter in Solingen aber wieder auf. Der jungen Weimarer Republik stand Carl Friedrich Gærdeler vom ersten Moment an ablehnend gegenüber und setzte sich in den folgenden Jahren auch für die Wiedererrichtung der Hohenzollern-Monarchie ein.

Im Februar 1919 trat Gærdeler in die junge Deutschnationale Volkspartei ein. Die DNVP stand rechts im politischen Spektrum der Weimarer Republik und verstand sich als Erbin der konservativen Parteien aus der Kaiserzeit. Zudem meldete sich Gærdeler freiwillig zum vom Alldeutschen Verband ausgerufenen « Volkskampf » gegen Polen. Für Carl Friedrich Gærdeler stellte das « Diktat von Versailles » einen Verlust der Heimat und eine Erniedrigung Deutschlands dar. Nachdem die Nationalversammlung für den Versailler Vertrag gestimmt hatte, waren die Pläne eines militärischen Konflikts mit Polen zur Rückgewinnung der abgetrennten Gebiete endgültig gescheitert. Gærdeler zog aus seiner intensiven Beschäftigung mit dem Thema des polnischen Korridors die Konsequenz, sich in revanchistischen und nationalistischen Organisationen zu betätigen. Hierzu zählt unter anderem seine Mitgliedschaft im « Deutschen Ostbund », der seine Aufgabe in der Herstellung einer « Einheitsfront des ostmärkischen Deutschtums » gegen « slawische Überflutung » sah. So trug Gærdelers verstärktes politisches Engagement seit 1919 lange Zeit nicht nur reaktionär-revanchistische, sondern auch deutlich völkische Züge. Er hatte sich weltanschaulich verstärkt von einem traditionellen Wertkonservatismus altpreußischer Prägung hin zu einem aggressiv-völkischen Nationalismus bewegt ; eine Geisteshaltung, gegen die Gærdeler später kämpfte und deren Opfer er selbst wurde. Gærdeler war zu diesem Zeitpunkt auch von der Dolchstoßlegende überzeugt, die er später als « Gift » bezeichnete.

Da sich die Familie Gærdeler nach dem Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges nicht mehr in Solingen heimisch fühlte und sie in Gedanken bei ihrer ostdeutschen Heimat war, entschloss sich Gærdeler, für das Amt des Zweiten Bürgermeisters von Königsberg zu kandidieren. Am 14. Januar 1920 setzte er sich in der Wahl nur knapp gegen den sozialdemokratischen Gegenkandidaten durch. Am 11. Februar 1920 fand in der Königsberger Stadtverordnetenversammlung seine Amtseinführung statt, während der die SPD- und USPD-Fraktionen unter Protest den Saal verließen : Da der liberale Oberbürgermeister Lohmeyer mit ihren Stimmen gewählt worden war, beanspruchten sie Gærdelers Posten für einen Linken. Obwohl Gærdeler in seiner Amtseinführungsrede seine Verpflichtung für das Allgemeinwohl, nicht für Parteiinteressen, bekräftigte, beherrschte vor allem heftiger Parteienstreit seine Zeit als Zweiter Bürgermeister. So gelang es etwa seit 1927 nicht mehr, den Haushalt in der Stadtverordnetenversammlung durchzubringen.

Gærdeler sah die Selbstverwaltung der Städte, die auf den von ihm bewunderten Freiherrn vom Stein zurückging, als wichtigsten kommunalpolitischen Grundsatz an. Da die Verwaltungsstrukturen nach den Umbrüchen der Revolution noch ungeordnet waren, gelang es Gærdeler, den Verwaltungsapparat durch Neuordnung zu straffen und ihm gleichzeitig mehr Gewicht gegenüber der Stadtverordnetenversammlung zu geben. Auf dem Deutschen Städtetag engagierte er sich für eine einheitliche deutsche Gemeindeordnung, die eine starke Stellung des Bürgermeisters garantieren und gleichzeitig die Parteipolitik « aus dem Rathaus heraushalten » sollte. Nach Gærdelers Konzeption führe dies schließlich zu besseren Ergebnissen für alle Seiten, obwohl das tatsächliche demokratische Mitspracherecht geschwächt werde. Ähnliche Verfassungspläne entwickelte er später auch für die Reichsebene, wo er mehr Macht für einen überparteilichen

Reichspräsidenten (oder Monarchen) forderte. Da Gærdeler über seine Tätigkeit beim Deutschen Städtetag in Politikerkreisen überregionale Bekanntheit erlangt hatte und für seine kommunalpolitischen Vorstellungen und seinen Pragmatismus auch Zuspruch aus der Zentrumspartei und der DVP erhielt, war er in den 1920er Jahren mehrfach als Reichskanzler im Gespräch.

Als er 1930 nach Leipzig wechselte, lobten auch SPD-Vertreter seine Verdienste um die Königsberger Stadtverwaltung; die linken Parteien nahmen geschlossen an seiner feierlichen Verabschiedung teil: Aus pragmatischen Gründen hatte sich Gærdeler in seiner Königsberger Zeit an die Weimarer Republik angenähert und insbesondere positive Erfahrungen in der Zusammenarbeit mit den Sozialdemokraten gemacht.

Am 23. Mai 1930 « geschah das Unerwartete » : Der konservative Ostpreuße Gærdeler wurde mit den Stimmen des « Vereinigten Bürgerblocks » (DNVP, Zentrum und Vertreter von konservativen Kleinparteien) sowie einzelnen Stimmen sowohl aus der SPD- als auch aus der NSDAP-Ratsfraktion zum Oberbürgermeister der sächsischen Metropole Leipzig gewählt. Leipzig hatte nicht nur als Messestadt mit 700.000 Einwohnern und einem pulsierenden Geschäftsleben überregionale Bedeutung, sondern auch als Sitz des Reichsgerichts, der Deutschen Bücherei und hochstehender kultureller Institutionen wie des Gewandhaus-Orchesters. So bedeutete dies für Gærdeler einen enormen Karrieresprung. Die Familie zog aus ihrer mittelgroßen Königsberger Etagenwohnung in eine repräsentative Bürgervilla im Leipziger Stadtteil Leutzsch. Unmittelbar nach seiner Amtseinführung begann Gærdeler mit der Umstrukturierung der Leipziger Stadtverwaltung hin zu einer schlanken, klar hierarchischen Struktur nach Königsberger Vorbild. So begann er, gleichartige Verwaltungsstellen zu großen Dezernaten zusammenzulegen und auch den Einfluss der Parteien über die Verringerung (!) der Ratsmitgliederzahl zu beschränken. Zudem gehörte er seit seiner Wahl zum Oberbürgermeister dem Vorstand des Deutschen Städtetages an, wodurch seine kommunalpolitischen Vorstellungen deutschlandweit an Gewicht gewannen.

Kurz bevor Gærdeler sein Amt übernommen hatte, hatte die Weltwirtschaftskrise eingesetzt. Die daraus folgende schwierige Finanzsituation belastete seine Amtszeit schwer. Zudem hatten sich die Arbeitslosenzahlen erheblich erhöht und mit ihnen die Wahlergebnisse für die extremen Parteien, insbesondere die NSDAP. Gleichzeitig gab es in Leipzig Probleme mit der zunehmenden Verstädterung : Weite Teile der Stadt waren nicht kanalisiert, hinzu kam Wohnraummangel. Es gelang Gærdeler dennoch, diese Probleme weitgehend zu lösen und dabei das Haushaltsdefizit durch eiserne Sparpolitik zu beseitigen. Der Wohnungsnot begegnete er durch eine Intensivierung der Vorstadtbebauung. Gærdeler erarbeitete sich zudem den Ruf eines Experten für öffentliche Finanzen, was ihn in Verbindung zu Reichskanzler Heinrich Brüning brachte, der auf Reichsebene eine ähnliche Politik verfolgte. Brüning leitete ein Präsidialkabinett, das mit Notverordnungen eine rigide Deflationspolitik betrieb. Als die ersten Einsparungen kaum Wirkung zeigten und die politische Radikalisierung zunahm, suchte Brüning nach einem geeigneten Preiskommissar, der staatlich verordnete Preissenkungen von 10 Prozent gegen den Widerstand der Wirtschaft durchsetzen sollte. Für diese Aufgabe wählte er 1931 Gærdeler aus. Dieser zögerte zunächst, da derartige staatliche Eingriffe seinen wirtschaftsliberalen Überzeugungen vom « freien Spiel der Kräfte » entgegenstanden. Schließlich entschloss er sich nach einem Gespräch mit Reichspräsident Paul von Hindenburg, die Aufgabe parallel zum Oberbürgermeisteramt anzunehmen.

Dies war eine bewusste Entscheidung für Brünnings Deflationspolitik und gegen die Deutschnationalen, insbesondere

gegen ihren Vorsitzenden Alfred Hugenberg, der Fundamentalopposition gegen das verhasste « schwarz-rote System » betrieb. Diese grundsätzliche Differenz führte schließlich zum Austritt Gærdelers aus der DNVP 1931.

Für Brüning, dem durch Andeutungen Hindenburgs seit Ende 1931 klar war, daß er quasi als « Reichskanzler auf Abruf » fungierte, war Gærdeler der Wunschnachfolger im Amt. Nach seiner schlussendlichen Demission schlug er diesen Hindenburg in seiner letzten Aussprache am 30. Mai 1932 direkt als möglichen Nachfolger vor. Da Hindenburg jedoch mit der Wirtschaftspolitik im Stile Brünings brechen und einen Rechtsruck der Regierung herbeiführen wollte, kam Gærdeler für ihn als neuer Reichskanzler nicht in Frage. Gærdeler erkannte, daß die drängende Frage der Umgang der Deutschnationalen und des Zentrums mit der NSDAP war. Er schrieb : « Schon nach dem Sturz Brünings mußte sofort die NSDAP vor die Entscheidung gestellt werden, nunmehr die Verantwortung mit zu übernehmen oder nicht mehr zu einer neuen Wahl zu kommen. » Hierbei handelte es sich nicht um eine Unterstützung der nationalsozialistischen Ideologie, sondern Gærdeler sah lediglich zwei Möglichkeiten, den Aufstieg der NSDAP aufzuhalten : Entweder, sie an Regierungsverantwortung zu beteiligen, sie zu « zähmen » oder sie zu verbieten und « Hitler und seine gesamte entourage endgültig hinter Schloß und Riegel » zu bringen. Die Kanzlerschaft Franz von Papens unterstützte er nicht. Als dieser ihm anbot, als Innen- oder Finanzminister in sein Kabinett einzutreten, lehnte Gærdeler ab. In der Folgezeit verlor er rasch an Einfluss und wurde nicht länger als Preiskommissar zu Kabinettsitzungen herangezogen. Später machte er sich wegen dieses Entschlusses schwere Vorwürfe, daß er die Chance verpasst hätte, den weiteren Aufstieg Hitlers zumindest etwas abzubremsen.

Seine Forderung, die NSDAP mit in die Regierungsverantwortung zu nehmen, wird von einzelnen Historikern als Unterstützung für den Nationalsozialismus gewertet. Hierbei werden belegte Äußerungen Gærdelers über ein Verbot der NSDAP aus den Jahren 1932 und 1933 nicht beachtet. Andererseits kann von einer konsequenten Ablehnung des Nationalsozialismus von Beginn an ebenso wenig die Rede sein wie von einer begeisterten Unterstützung. In den politischen Auffassungen Gærdelers gab es durchaus einen Konsensbereich mit der NSDAP, der zu einer gespaltenen Haltung Gærdelers und einer anfänglichen Kooperation zwischen ihm und den neuen Machthabern führte.

Gærdelers Haltung zur Machtübernahme der NSDAP ist ambivalent : Einerseits erschienen seiner bürgerlichen Natur das lärmende Auftreten der Nationalsozialisten, ihre wirtschaftlichen Vorstellungen und ihre Gewalttätigkeit als bedenklich. Neben dieser Distanz gab es allerdings auch Schnittmengen zwischen seinen politischen Vorstellungen und dem Programm der NSDAP : Insbesondere die Beseitigung des « Diktats von Versailles » und die Stärkung der Reichsexekutive führten dazu, daß Gærdeler der Machtergreifung 1933 auch positive Seiten als « nationale Revolution » abgewinnen konnte. Zu einer Stellungnahme gegen die politischen Umwälzungen konnte er sich zu diesem Zeitpunkt nicht durchringen, obgleich er sie kritisch sah. Trotz seiner Hoffnungen auf eine baldige Beseitigung des Versailler Vertrags und einer innenpolitischen Umformung weg vom reinen « Parteienstaat » kann von einer euphorischen Unterstützung der Machtergreifung nicht gesprochen werden. Daß Deutschland sich aber gerade durch den stetigen Machtausbau der NSDAP in den von Gærdeler abgelehnten Parteienstaat verwandelte und seine Ideale von Recht, die auf einem tiefen Vertrauen in die preußische Rechtsstaatlichkeit beruhten, in ihren Grundfesten erschüttert werden sollten, erkannte er nicht. So unterschätzte er insgesamt (trotz gegenteiliger Äußerungen aus der Weimarer Zeit) die aufsteigende Gefahr.

Am Abend des 30. Januar 1933 blieb Gørdeler bis spät in die Nacht im Rathaus, um persönlich die Besetzung der Behörde durch die SA zu verhindern. Anders als in vielen Städten gelang dieses Vorhaben. In Sachsen war Gørdeler der einzige Oberbürgermeister, der auch nach der Machtergreifung im Amt blieb - auf Reichsebene waren es nur vier Oberbürgermeister, die Großstädten weiterhin vorstanden. Sein Bruder, Fritz Gørdeler, der bis 1933 das Amt des Oberbürgermeisters seiner Heimatstadt Marienwerder innehatte, wurde aus dem Amt gedrängt, da er sich weigerte, in die NSDAP einzutreten. Da Carl Friedrich Gørdeler in der Metropole Leipzig nach wie vor über großen Rückhalt in der Bevölkerung verfügte, konnten die Nationalsozialisten ihn nicht einfach aus dem Rathaus zwingen. Durch den Vorfall mit seinem Bruder hatte sich seine Skepsis den neuen Machthabern gegenüber noch verstärkt. Er beschloß, im Amt zu bleiben, um die gemäßigten Kräfte zu stärken und die nationalsozialistische Regierung zu beraten, um dem Allgemeinwohl weiterhin dienlich zu sein. Dies als aktive Unterstützung Hitlers zu interpretieren, erscheint verkürzt.

Besonders deutlich zeigte sich seine Skepsis im sogenannten « Flaggenkonflikt » : Gørdeler war nicht bereit, am Leipziger Rathaus und dem Reichsgericht die Hakenkreuzflagge zu hissen, die zu diesem Zeitpunkt noch nicht die Nationalflagge war. Stattdessen flaggte Gørdeler, wie es zu diesem Zeitpunkt das Gesetz vorschrieb, am Rathaus mit der sächsischen Landesflagge sowie der Stadtflagge Leipzigs und am Reichsgericht mit Schwarz-Weiß-Rot. SA und SS forderten eine unbedingte Verwendung der Hakenkreuz-Flagge und drohten, dies mit Terroraktionen zu untermauern. Die Flaggenkrise wurde schließlich durch einen Erlass Hindenburgs entschärft, wonach Hakenkreuzflagge und schwarz-weiß-rote Fahne gemeinsam zu hissen seien. Als am Tag von Potsdam die Nationalsozialisten ihr vermeintliches Anknüpfen an die Traditionen Preußens inszenierten, war Gørdeler nicht, wie die meisten Konservativen, begeistert von diesem Wiederaufleben des « preußischen Geistes » . Er schrieb : « Der Geist von Potsdam will nicht nur angerufen sein, er muß auch lebendig werden. » Hiermit verknüpfte Gørdeler, der der NS-Propaganda mit mäßig beeindruckter Distanz begegnete, zahlreiche Kritikpunkte an die nationalsozialistische Regierung, welche er im Sommer 1934 in einer Denkschrift an Adolf Hitler formulierte : Er setzte die Wirtschaftspolitik der Nationalsozialisten, die durch Neuverschuldung und Geldschöpfung die Arbeitslosenzahlen senkten, in Gegensatz zur Sparsamkeit des Großen Kurfürsten. Für Gørdeler galt : « Wirtschaftspolitik ist Friedenspolitik. » Die nationalsozialistischen Wirtschaftsvorstellungen, die letztlich zur Autarkie, der Loslösung vom Weltmarkt führen würden, hielt er für gefährlich und lehnte sie aus wirtschaftsliberaler Überzeugung ab, jedoch auch, weil er bereits 1934 militärische Auseinandersetzungen in Form von Wirtschaftskriegen fürchtete.

Ein wichtiger Bezugspunkt der zunehmenden Gegnerschaft Gørdelers zum Nationalsozialismus war die Verfolgung von politischen Gegnern und der jüdischen Minderheit. Der NS-Schutzhaftpraxis fielen allein bis März 1933 über 1.000 Sozialdemokraten, Sozialisten und Kommunisten zum Opfer, die seit Ende April in die Konzentrationslager Colditz, Hainichen und Sachsenburg überstellt wurden. Gørdeler nannte diese Vorgänge ein « gesetzloses Treiben » , dem ein « Ende zu machen » sei. Die nationalsozialistische « Judenpolitik » kritisierte er ebenfalls seit Beginn der NS-Herrschaft. Aus humanistischer und rechtsstaatlicher Überzeugung setzte er sich für betroffene jüdische Bürger ein. Zunächst betraf dies vor allem die Reaktionen Gørdelers auf die Verdrängung von Juden aus dem kulturellen Leben Leipzigs : Er bemühte sich, wenn auch vergeblich, um den Verbleib des Kapellmeisters am Leipziger Gewandhaus, Bruno Walter, und des Direktors des Alten Theatres, Detlef Sierck, der wegen seiner jüdischen Ehefrau aus dem Amt gedrängt wurde. Im Falle des Leipziger Jura-Professors Ludwig Ebermayer war Gørdelers Einsatz sogar vorerst erfolgreich. Daneben äußerte Carl Friedrich Gørdeler seinen Widerspruch gegenüber der antisemitischen Praxis durch demonstratives Grüßen von

renommierten jüdischen Intellektuellen in Anwesenheit einflussreicher Nationalsozialisten.

Als am 1. April 1933 während des sogenannten Judenboykotts in ganz Deutschland jüdische Geschäfte boykottiert wurden, ging Gørdeler auf den Brühl, das damalige Zentrum des Pelzhandels in Leipzig, wo sich viele jüdische Geschäfte befanden. Dort besuchte er trotz der Wachposten der SA, die vor den Warenhäusern stationiert waren, die jüdischen Geschäfte. Dieser ungewöhnliche Vorgang, daß sich ein amtierender Oberbürgermeister in dieser Form gegen die Politik des NS-Regimes stellte, sorgte auch überregional für gewisses Aufsehen ; so berichtete die Frankfurter Zeitung darüber. In der Diskussion, die sich in der Folgezeit zwischen führenden Leipziger Nationalsozialisten und Gørdeler ergab, führte dieser vor allem den außenpolitischen Schaden an, insbesondere in Bezug auf Leipzig als Messestadt, zu dem solche Aktionen führten.

Die Verabschiedung des Gesetzes zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums bedeutete den Übergang von willkürlichen antisemitischen Maßnahmen hin zu einer gesetzlich geregelten expliziten Diskriminierung von Juden. Das Gesetz vom 7. April 1933 bestimmte in seinem sogenannten Arierparagrafen, daß « Beamte nicht-arischer Abstammung in den Ruhestand zu versetzen » seien. Davon ausgenommen waren jüdische Beamte, die bereits vor dem 1. August 1914 Beamte gewesen waren oder am Ersten Weltkrieg auf deutscher Seite teilgenommen hatten beziehungsweise einen gefallenen Vater oder Sohn hatten.

Gørdeler äußerte sich nicht ausdrücklich gegen dieses Gesetz, da ein Protest wegen des offiziellen Charakters des Arierparagrafen nicht ohne einen vollständigen Bruch mit dem NS-Regime möglich gewesen wäre. Diesen wollte er jedoch nach wie vor vermeiden.

Hitler und Gørdeler während der Grundsteinlegung des von Emil Hipp gestalteten Richard-Wagner-Hains, 6. März 1934
Am 30. Januar 1935 wurde die Deutsche Gemeindeordnung (DGO) erlassen, eine grundlegende Reform des Kommunalverfassungsrechts. Die Nationalsozialisten griffen hierbei in Teilen auf Vorschläge Gørdelers zurück, die er im Deutschen Städtetag geäußert hatte. Gleichzeitig bedeutete die DGO das Ende der kommunalen Selbstverwaltung, die für Gørdeler eines der bedeutendsten Elemente der deutschen Bürokratie überhaupt war. Das neue Gesetz beseitigte die unmittelbare oder mittelbare Mitwirkung der Bevölkerung an innergemeindlicher Willensbildung und übertrug weite Teile der städtischen Aufgaben an den Staat oder an die Partei. Die verbliebenen Aufgaben der Gemeinde gingen nach dem « Führerprinzip » auf die Person des Bürgermeisters über. Obwohl Gørdeler einen ähnlichen Machtausbau immer gefordert hatte, lehnte er das Gesetz als Ganzes ab. Auf die Beteiligung der Bevölkerung wollte er nicht verzichten, ebenso beklagte er das Ende der Selbstverwaltung : « Die Zeit wird lehren, ob man auf die Dauer damit auskommt, auf jeden Befragungsakt der urteilsfähigen Bürger einer Gemeinde zu verzichten. » Er selbst suche nach dem Mittelweg zwischen « überspitzten demokratischen Gedankengängen » und den « uns wesensfremden faschistischen ». Die DGO bedeutete für ihn aber die « Tötung der Idee der Selbstverwaltung ». Diese grundsätzliche Argumentation im Spannungsfeld zwischen Bejahung autoritärer Strukturen preußischer Prägung und der Ablehnung nationalsozialistischer Politik weist bereits den Weg, der Gørdeler in den Widerstand führte.

Am 5. November 1934 erfolgte die Berufung Carl Friedrich Gørdelers auf das Amt des Reichskommissars für Preisüberwachung. Für dieses Amt hatten ihn seine praktischen Erfahrungen als Preiskommissar unter Brüning sowie die

Beratung der Regierung durch die Denkschrift vom August 1934 empfohlen. Der Historiker Gerhard Ritter vermutet, daß Hitler ihn in Unkenntnis seiner tatsächlichen Ansichten, die aus einer vermeintlichen Nicht-Beachtung der Denkschrift von 1934 resultierten, lediglich wegen seiner Erfahrung zum Preiskommissar berufen habe. Diese Geste Hitlers bewertete Gærdeler als einen « Lichtblick » ; er hatte die Illusion, die Nationalsozialisten würden in der Wirtschaftspolitik einen anderen Kurs einschlagen, noch nicht aufgegeben. Trotzdem zögerte er, unter diesen politischen Bedingungen das Amt anzunehmen. Für seine Entscheidung spielte der Wunsch, mäßigend auf die Regierung einwirken zu können, eine große Rolle. Seine Befürchtung, als Preiskommissar die Konfrontation mit der NS-Politik nicht vermeiden zu können, bestätigte sich. An Gærdelers zweitem Tag als Preiskommissar erschien Robert Ley, der Leiter der Deutschen Arbeitsfront, forderte Vollmachten für die NSDAP und schlug vor, « einige Wucherer und Hamsterer aufzuhängen » , um den Preiserhöhungen ein Ende zu machen. Gærdeler war entsetzt und stattete stattdessen die Landesbehörden beziehungsweise in Preußen die Regierungspräsidenten mit den Vollmachten zur Preissenkung aus. Dieser Schritt führte zu Differenzen mit Hitler, der damit Kompetenzen aus dem Bereich der NS-Regierung verloren hatte.

Im März 1935 führte das NS-Regime die allgemeine Wehrpflicht ein und proklamierte den Aufbau einer deutschen Luftwaffe. Die Kosten für die Aufrüstung der Wehrmacht machten eine geordnete Haushaltspolitik für die Zukunft unmöglich. Die von Reichsbankpräsident Hjalmar Schacht ins Spiel gebrachte Finanzierung durch die sogenannten Mefo-Wechsel lehnte Gærdeler strikt ab. Im Juni 1935, kurz vor Ablauf von Gærdelers regulärer Amtszeit als Preiskommissar, fand eine Aussprache zwischen Gærdeler, Schacht und Hitler statt, in der der Preiskommissar erweiterte Vollmachten verlangte. Als diese ihm nicht zugestanden wurden, stellte er sein Amt zur Verfügung, obwohl Hitler eine Verlängerung der Amtszeit gern gesehen hätte. Auch nach weiteren Anfragen, ob er für ein anderes hohes Reichsamt, etwa in Zusammenhang mit den von Hermann Göring Anfang 1936 übernommenen Aufgaben im Bereich der Devisen- und Rohstoffwirtschaft, zur Verfügung stünde, beharrte Gærdeler auf seinem Standpunkt.

Eine letzte wirtschaftspolitische Kooperation zwischen ihm und dem NS-Regime stellte eine von Göring im August 1936 angeforderte Denkschrift dar, in der er den nationalsozialistischen Wirtschaftspolitikern seinen Standpunkt unzweideutig darlegte und ihnen ein letztes Mal seine Unterstützung anbot, solange sie umdachten : Er war zu der Erkenntnis gelangt, daß es sich bei der von ihm beklagten Politik nicht um negative Begleiterscheinungen handelte, sondern, daß eine vollständige Neuorientierung notwendig war. Göring bewertete die Denkschrift Hitler gegenüber als « vollständig unbrauchbar » , zumal sie völlig mit Hitlers eigener in dieser Zeit entstandenen programmatischen Denkschrift über den Vierjahresplan kollidierte. Seine Erfahrungen als Preiskommissar und seine Einblicke in wirtschafts- und rüstungspolitische Angelegenheiten des NS-Regimes hatten zu einer direkten Konfrontation mit Führungsgrößen der NSDAP geführt und seine in der Kommunalpolitik angesammelten Zweifel zum Kulminieren gebracht : Seine kritische Begleitung der nationalsozialistischen Politik schlug in Opposition um. Er war nicht nur bei der Führung in Ungnade gefallen, sondern wollte von sich aus « nur noch mit Anstand aus der Sache herauskommen » . Der Rücktritt vom Oberbürgermeisterposten zeichnete sich ab.

Die Richtlinien der DGO verschlechterten die Situation der Kommunalverwaltung immer weiter. Gærdeler kritisierte die « öde Mechanisierung und Gleichmacherei » , die sich als ein « Unglück für unser Vaterland » erweisen werde. Seine Tätigkeit als Oberbürgermeister empfand er nicht länger als interessant und seine Position als einflussreich, sondern sämtliche Prozesse nur noch als abtumpfend. Daher erwog er im Frühjahr 1936, in die Privatwirtschaft zu wechseln.

Am 5. Mai 1936 erklärte er sich bereit, in den Dienst des Krupp-Konzerns einzutreten. Bereits seit Oktober 1935 stand Gørdeler in Kontakt mit Gustav Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach. Seit seinem Besuch auf der Villa Hügel am 4. Dezember 1935 arbeitete Gørdeler auf seinen Eintritt in das Krupp-Direktorium hin. Dennoch wollte er seine anstehende Wiederwahl abwarten, um eine Machtprobe mit dem Reichsinnenminister Wilhelm Frick zu provozieren. Am 22. Mai 1936 erfolgte schließlich die Wiederwahl Gørdelers durch den von den Nationalsozialisten instrumentalisierten Rat der Stadt Leipzig. Ausschlaggebend für die Wiederwahl des parteilosen NS-Kritikers Gørdeler durch die Nationalsozialisten war, daß er « trotz seiner politischen Unzulänglichkeit das Vertrauen unseres Führers besaß ». Die Differenzen zwischen Gørdeler und der NS-Führung vom Sommer 1935 blieben den nationalsozialistischen Ratsherren wohl verborgen. Der wiedergewählte Gørdeler selbst wartete nun lediglich auf einen Anlass für seinen Rücktritt.

Noch vor Gørdelers Wiederwahl wandte sich der Leiter des Amtes für Handwerk und Händel der NSDAP-Kreisleitung Leipzig, Eckert, an den Oberbürgermeister : Er forderte den Abriss des « vor dem Gewandhaus aufgestellten Denkmals des Vollblutjuden » Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy. Zu diesem Zeitpunkt bestand im gesamten Deutschen Reich bereits ein Aufführverbot « nicht-arischer Kompositionen », zu denen die Nationalsozialisten auch die Werke Mendelssohns zählten. Gørdeler hatte sich stets für deren Aufführung eingesetzt, und so konnte beispielsweise der Thomanerchor noch im September 1936 ungeahndet Lieder Mendelssohns singen. Nach der Abrissforderung prüfte der Kulturstadtrat Hauptmann zunächst die Rechtslage im Fall des Denkmals. Der Stadtrat übte unterdessen immensen Druck auf Gørdeler aus, den « Juden in Erz » zu beseitigen. Schließlich machte der Stadtkämmerer Köhler den Vorschlag, das Denkmal durch ein Bildnis eines anderen bedeutenden deutschen Musikers zu ersetzen. Carl Friedrich Gørdeler nannte diese Alternative « prüfbar », unter der Voraussetzung, daß das Denkmal unangetastet bleibe, bis er seine Entscheidung getroffen habe. Dadurch gewann er Zeit, um in Regierungskreisen Unterstützung für seine ablehnende Haltung zu suchen. Ausgerechnet das Reichspropagandaministerium ließ verlauten, daß « solche Bildstürmerei » nicht gewünscht sei. Diese Stellungnahme beruhte allerdings nicht auf tatsächlicher Unterstützung der Position Gørdelers, sondern wurde nur mit Blick auf die Olympischen Spiele in Berlin abgegeben. Josef Gøebbels befürchtete in dieser Frage ein negatives Echo im Ausland.

Als Carl Friedrich Gørdeler vom 8. bis 13. November nach Skandinavien reiste, um und andere am 10. November in Helsinki einen Vortrag über Wirtschaft, Preise und Währung zu halten, ergriffen die Nationalsozialisten die Initiative und entfernten in der Nacht vom 9. auf den 10. November eigenmächtig das Mendelssohn-Denkmal. Die Nachricht vom Abriss erhielt Gørdeler auf seiner Rückreise in Stockholm. Nach seiner Rückkehr warf er seinem NS-Stellvertreter Hans Rudolf Haake Illoyalität vor ; als er bemerkte, daß der Stadtrat und auch die Reichsregierung gegen ihn standen und eine Wiedererrichtung des Denkmals auf keinen Fall unterstützen würden, reichte er am 25. November 1936 sein Pensionierungsgesuch ein. Er wurde sofort beurlaubt. Später, als er im Gefängnis über seinen Rücktritt berichtete, schrieb er : « Damals führte ich den klaren Entschluss aus, nicht die Verantwortung für eine Kulturschandtat zu übernehmen. » Am 22. März 1937 erfolgte Gørdelers Verabschiedung aus dem Dienst der Stadt Leipzig.

« Ein beruhigtes Europa, in organischer Entwicklung zu immer größer werdender wirtschaftlicher Einheit fortschreitend, bedeutet die Sicherung des Friedens und der Wohlfahrt der Welt. »

(Carl Friedrich Gørdeler, 1938.)

Gørdeler organisierte vielerorts in Europa und den USA Treffen mit Politikern und Industriellen, die als Ansprechpartner für ihn in Frage kamen, um sich, entgegen einer praktizierten Appeasement-Politik, für eine härteres Vorgehen gegenüber Hitler einzusetzen. Nach dem offenen Konflikt mit der NSDAP wagte Gustav Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach nicht mehr die Berufung Gørdelers in den Krupp-Vorstand ohne Rücksprache mit Hitler. Noch im März 1937 teilte er Gørdeler mit, daß Hitler einen Mann mit den wirtschaftspolitischen Ansichten Gørdelers nicht in der Schwerindustrie sehen möchte. Stattdessen kam dieser über Theodor Bäuerle in Kontakt mit dem Kreis oppositioneller Demokraten in Stuttgart, der sich um den Industriellen Robert Bosch gebildet hatte. Bosch verfolgte das Ziel, die westeuropäischen Staatsmänner vor der Gefährlichkeit des Nationalsozialismus zu warnen. Aus diesem Grund schloß er 1937 mit Gørdeler einen Beschäftigungsvertrag ab, der nun als Berater der Firma Bosch in Finanzfragen angestellt war. Dieses Vertragsverhältnis gab seiner bevorstehenden ausgedehnten Reisetätigkeit ein legales Aussehen - sogar Hermann Göring, bei dem er wegen einer Visa-Angelegenheit vorsprach, unterstützte das Vorhaben in Unkenntnis des tatsächlichen Zwecks. Gleiches gilt für Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach, der Gørdelers Reisen finanziell unterstützte. Bis zum Beginn des Zweiten Weltkrieges bereiste Gørdeler mehr als zehn europäische Länder, den Nahen Osten und Nordafrika sowie Kanada und die Vereinigten Staaten. Ausführliche Berichte über seine Reiseeindrücke sandte er an Krupp, Bosch, Göring, Schacht, daneben an die Generäle Werner von Fritsch, Georg Thomas, Franz Halder und Ludwig Beck. Diesen kannte er vermutlich bereits seit seiner Zeit als Preiskommissar 1935. Die Auslandsreisen Gørdelers legten den Grundstein für die Zusammenarbeit mit Beck, die später den Kern des konservativen Widerstandes bildete.

Seine erste Reise führte ihn nach Brüssel (4. bis 16. Juni 1937) und England (bis 15. Juli) . In Belgien knüpfte er nicht nur Kontakte zu einflussreichen Wirtschaftsführern, sondern wurde auch von König Leopold III. und Premierminister Paul van Zeeland empfangen. Die Weise, auf die Gørdeler aufgenommen wurde, obwohl er ohne Auftrag irgendeiner Behörde oder Partei reiste, zeigt, daß er im Ausland durchaus als politische Persönlichkeit hohen Ranges und in gewisser Weise auch als Vertreter eines « anderen Deutschlands » angesehen wurde.

Sein Aufenthalt in London bot ihm gleichermaßen Anlass zur Kritik wie zur Bewunderung : Mit Sorge betrachtete er die unsichere Sozialpolitik und das Nachlassen der wirtschaftlichen Kraft. Dagegen machten vor allem der englische Lebensstil und die politischen Traditionen des Vereinigten Königreichs, wie etwa das britische « self-government » , großen Eindruck auf ihn. Überrascht zeigte er sich von der Verhandlungsbereitschaft Großbritanniens (« Appeasement ») , obgleich die Juden- und Kirchenpolitik der Nationalsozialisten das Verhältnis schwer getrübt hatten. Besonders intensive Gespräche ergaben sich mit Außenminister Anthony Eden. Später, als der Widerstand seine außenpolitischen Ansichten formulierte, blieb Gørdeler der Anglophile, während Ludwig Beck vor allem auf eine Verständigung mit der « Grande Nation » Frankreich setzte.

Ende Juli plante Gørdeler eine ausgedehnte Südamerika-Reise, zog es dann aber vor, zunächst nach Paris zu fahren. In seinem Bericht aus Frankreich schilderte er die große Verständigungsbereitschaft, aber auch die Empfindlichkeit wegen der Beteiligung deutscher Truppen im Spanischen Bürgerkrieg. Es gelang ihm, dauerhafte Kontakte zum französischen Politiker Paul Reynaud zu knüpfen. Von Boulogne aus setzte er im September 1937 nach Kanada über. In Ottawa sprach er von großen Möglichkeiten einer deutsch-kanadischen Kooperation, da Deutschland als Industrie- und Forschungsnation für eine Partnerschaft mit dem rohstoffreichen Kanada besonders geeignet sei. Über diese Idee sprach er auch mit Premierminister Mackenzie King.

Ab dem 2. Januar 1938 hielt sich Gørdeler in den Vereinigten Staaten auf, wo der emigrierte Anwalt Gotthilf Bronisch in New York als sein wichtigster Vertrauter agierte. Während seiner Amerikareise hatte Gørdeler sein politisches Testament verfasst, welches er Bronisch mit der Maßgabe übergab, es im Falle seines Todes zu veröffentlichen. Ausführlich kritisierte er die New-Deal-Politik Roosevelts, wobei er gleichzeitig von beachtenswerten Chancen für eine Achse Washington-London-Berlin berichtete. Würde Deutschland die europäischen Probleme durch eine friedliche Verständigung mit seinen Nachbarstaaten und Großbritannien lösen können, erhoffte er sich dadurch auch eine transatlantische Zusammenarbeit. Falls das Deutsche Reich aber den kriegerischen Konflikt heraufbeschwören sollte, so stünde Amerika als einer seiner stärksten Gegner fest. Auch in Amerika kam er mit einflussreichen Männern des öffentlichen Lebens zusammen, und andere mit Außenminister Cordell Hull, dem ehemaligen Präsidenten Herbert C. Hoover, Finanzminister Henry Morgenthau sowie dem Industriellen Owen D. Young.

Nach seiner Rückkehr im Januar 1938 erfuhr er in einem langen Gespräch mit den Generälen Beck und Fritsch von Hitlers Kriegsplänen, die seinen Hoffnungen auf eine politische Verständigung die Grundlage entzogen. Gørdeler versuchte, die Militärs zu einem Putsch zu bewegen, was jedoch auch dadurch scheiterte, daß General Fritsch zwei Wochen darauf im Zuge der Blomberg-Fritsch-Krise abgesetzt wurde. Mitte März, unmittelbar nach dem Anschluß Österreichs, brach Gørdeler zu seiner zweiten Reise nach Frankreich und England auf. In der britischen Hauptstadt hielt er vor der renommierten London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) einen Vortrag zum Thema « Wirtschaft und öffentliche Verwaltung », der äußerer Vorwand der Reise war. Zudem begleiteten ihn seine Frau und seine Tochter, um dem London-Aufenthalt einen « familiären Anstrich » zu verleihen. In seinem Vortrag vor der LSE unterstrich Gørdeler seine wirtschaftsliberalen Ansichten und warnte vor Lohnregulierung und dem bevormundenden Wohlfahrtsstaat. Gleichzeitig polemisierte er gegen den damals überaus populären John Maynard Keynes und dessen Vorstellungen von staatlich beeinflussten Wirtschaftsprozessen. Ein von Heinrich Brüning arrangiertes Zusammentreffen mit Winston Churchill kam auf dieser Reise nicht zustande. Neben dem Anschluß Österreichs, den er sorgenvoll beobachtete, stand die Frage des Sudetenlandes in den Gesprächen mit dem Diplomaten Robert Vansittart, I. Baron Vansittart, auf der Agenda. Gørdeler betonte, daß er vor allem einen klaren Kurs gegenüber NS-Deutschland für notwendig halte, zweitrangig, wie die Entscheidung Großbritanniens in dieser Frage ausfallen würde.

« Es ist eine phantastische Illusion, einen dauerhaften Frieden auf einen Pakt mit dem Teufel zu gründen. »

(Carl Friedrich Gørdeler über das Münchner Abkommen, 1. Oktober 1938.)

1938 reiste Gørdeler fünf weitere Male nach Großbritannien, um den Manager Arthur Primrose Young zu teilweise mehrtägigen Gesprächen zu treffen. Der Kontakt war über Robert Vansittart zustande gekommen. Die Gesprächsprotokolle ergaben die sogenannten « X-Dokumente », die das Foreign and Commonwealth Office sowie über Owen D. Young US-Präsident Franklin D. Roosevelt erreichten. So war das Weiße Haus en détail über Gørdelers Vorstellungen informiert. Im Wesentlichen forderte dieser, der in den Gesprächsprotokollen nur « X » genannt wurde, ein entschiedenes Auftreten zumindest Frankreichs und der USA. Großbritannien betreffend kritisierte er Premierminister Neville Chamberlain, den er als « Hemmschuh » für ein aktives Auftreten gegen den Nationalsozialismus bezeichnete. Die schwache Appeasement-Politik lehnte er als unmoralisch und in höchstem Maße gefährlich ab. Die « X-Dokumente

» wurden nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges von A. P. Young veröffentlicht ; sie zeichnen ein differenziertes Bild von Gørdelers Ansichten im Jahr 1938. Statt einer Kursänderung seitens der britischen Regierung zeichnete sich ein Abkommen mit dem Deutschen Reich über die Sudetenfrage ab. Noch am 11. September richtete Gørdeler eindringliche Briefe nach London, in denen er berichtete, daß Hitler fest zum Krieg entschlossen sei.

Als am 30. September das Münchner Abkommen zwischen England und Frankreich einerseits und dem Deutschen Reich und Italien andererseits geschlossen wurde, sprach Gørdeler vom « Verrat von München » . Tief besorgt sprach er von einem Erstarken der « bösen Kräfte » in Deutschland, das dieses Zugeständnis an Hitler bringen würde. Aus Sorge vor polizeilicher Verfolgung reiste er Mitte Oktober 1938 in die Schweiz.

In den letzten zwölf Monaten vor Kriegsbeginn blieb Gørdeler weiterhin einer Doppelstrategie verpflichtet, die darauf abzielte, die NS-Regierung durch inneren und äußeren Druck von ihrem politischen und wirtschaftlichen « Vabanque » - Kurs abzubringen. Im Frühjahr 1939 unternahm Gørdeler eine weitere Reise nach Frankreich. Im Sommer führte ihn sein Weg noch einmal nach Großbritannien, in die Schweiz und in die Türkei. Von der Türkei aus besuchte Gørdeler auch die britischen, französischen und italienischen Besitzungen im Nahen Osten und in Nordafrika. Über diese Reisen fertigte er wie in den Vorjahren umfangreiche Berichte an, die er Gustav Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach, Robert Bosch, Hermann Göring, Hjalmar Schacht, Ludwig Beck, Werner von Fritsch, Franz Halder, Georg Thomas sowie dem Auswärtigen Amt und der Reichskanzlei zur Verfügung stellte. In diesen Ausarbeitungen plädierte Gørdeler für eine auf « Ausgleich » und « Verständigung » mit den Westmächten gestützte Revision des Versailler Vertrages. Nach der Annexion der Sudetengebiete hielt er eine Reihe von « deutschen Lebensforderungen » für erfolgreich verhandelbar : « Beseitigung des Korridors, Einräumung von Kolonialbesitz, billige Hergabe von Gold, um die deutsche Währung wieder weltfähig zu machen. » Als Gegenleistung solle Deutschland den Westmächten verbindliche Rüstungsbegrenzungen und eine damit einhergehende Wiederannäherung an die Weltwirtschaft zusichern. Gørdeler versuchte mit diesen Vorschlägen, bei verschiedenen Einflussgruppen und bei offiziellen Stellen einen alternativen politischen Ansatz ins Gespräch zu bringen, der « das Risiko eines großen Krieges verringerte, ohne von der seit 1933-1934 von ihm mitverfochtenen Expansionsstrategie die geringsten Abstriche zu machen » . In dem Bericht über die Gespräche, die er während seiner letzten Auslandsreise vor dem Krieg geführt hatte, schrieb Gørdeler Anfang August 1939 : « Die Grenzen von 1914 im Osten, Kolonien, Gold, Zutritt zu Rohstoffen, dürften zu haben sein. » Unabdingbare Voraussetzung dafür sei aber ein Verzicht Deutschlands auf einseitige Schritte gegenüber Polen, da Großbritannien und Frankreich einen weiteren Prestige- und Einflussverlust nicht mehr hinnehmen könnten und unter diesen Umständen den Kampf aufnehmen müssten. Diesen « Großkrieg » aber werde Deutschland verlieren, da es auf eine solche Auseinandersetzung wirtschaftlich nicht vorbereitet und Italien als Bundesgenosse wertlos sei.

Als Gørdeler sich darüber klar wurde, daß diese Vorstöße nicht mehr bis in das Machtzentrum durchdrangen, begann seine endgültige, auch innenpolitische Abkehr vom NS-Regime. Die neuere Forschung hat herausgearbeitet, daß es sich noch bei Gørdelers verfassungspolitischen Reformvorschlägen vom Herbst 1938 « nicht um eine strikte Ablehnung des nationalsozialistischen Regimes handelte, sondern um Vorschläge zu dessen Verbesserung » . Der grundlegende Distanzierungsprozess setzte Ende 1938 ein, als Gørdeler seine Bemühungen um ein Regierungsamt einstellte. Er war im Sommer 1940 abgeschlossen.

« Das deutsche Volk muß und wird sich selbst von einem System befreien, das unter dem Schutz des Terrors ungeheuerliche Verbrechen begeht und Recht, Ehre und Freiheit des deutschen Volkes zerstört hat. »

(Carl Friedrich Gørdeler, Mai 1943.)

Im Zusammenwirken mit dem früheren Generalstabschef des Heeres Ludwig Beck entwickelte Gørdeler (ausgehend von der bereits seit 1863 in Berlin bestehenden Mittwochsgesellschaft, einem Kreis nationaler und konservativer Politiker) in den folgenden Jahren den Kern einer Widerstandsgruppe gegen die NS-Regierung. Zu diesem Kreis stießen zwischen 1941 und 1943 auch Sozialdemokraten wie Wilhelm Leuschner und ehemalige Funktionäre der christlichen Gewerkschaften wie Jakob Kaiser und Bernhard Letterhaus. Leuschner, Kaiser und Letterhaus hatten bereits 1933 im sogenannten Führerkreis der Gewerkschaften zusammengearbeitet. In Leipzig wurden der Bankier Wilhelm Schomburgk und der Unternehmer Walter Cramer zu Gørdelers engsten Vertrauten. Regelmäßige Gesprächspartner Gørdelers in Berlin waren vor allem Ulrich von Hassell, Paul Lejeune-Jung, Erwin Planck, Johannes Popitz, Josef Wirmer, Max Habermann, Albrecht Haushofer, Carl Langbehn und Jens Jessen.

Obwohl dieser Oppositionszirkel « hauptstadtbekannt » war, wurde er bis 1944 von der Gestapo nicht behelligt. Der Historiker Karl Heinz Roth führt diese « großbürgerlich-aristokratische Immunität » unter anderem darauf zurück, daß sich die politische Konzeption der Gørdeler-Gruppe bis 1943 weiterhin im Rahmen des « Bündnisses zwischen den traditionellen Eliten und der NS-Bewegung » bewegte. Noch im Juli-August 1943 autorisierte Gørdeler den Versuch von Johannes Popitz, Heinrich Himmler für die Anliegen der Gruppe zu gewinnen. Mit Claus von Stauffenberg, der die zum Staatsstreich entschlossenen jüngeren Stabsoffiziere repräsentierte, nahm Gørdeler erst im September 1943 Verbindung auf.

Ziel des Widerstands war für den Kreis um Gørdeler der Sturz Adolf Hitlers, um den Krieg zu beenden. Dabei lehnte Gørdeler persönlich die Tötung Hitlers ab und plädierte für dessen Verhaftung und einen anschließenden rechtsstaatlichen Prozess. Die Gruppe sah für die Zeit nach dem Umsturz Gørdeler als Reichskanzler vor. In dieser Eigenschaft erarbeitete er umfangreiche Pläne zu einer Verfassung und Ministerlisten, die vielen Mitverschwörern später zum Verhängnis geworden sind.

Die außen- und innenpolitische Konzeption Gørdelers war nicht frei von Widersprüchen. Obwohl er seit Anfang 1943 davon ausging, daß « die deutschen Kräfte auf allen Gebieten sich dem Zustand des Verbrauchtseins » näherten, der « Kräfteinsatz der Gegner aber noch einer erheblichen Steigerung fähig » sei, lehnte er eine Rückkehr zur politischen Vorkriegsgeographie und die umstandslose Aufgabe der seit 1938 erzielten deutschen Gebietsgewinne ab. Deutschland sollte in den Grenzen von 1914 (also nicht nur unter Einschluss der nach 1918 verlorenen preußischen Ostgebiete, sondern auch Elsass-Lothringens und Nordschleswigs) aus dem Krieg hervorgehen, zudem sollten Österreich und das Sudetenland beim Reich, dem Gørdeler auch für die Zeit nach Hitler eine Hegemonialstellung auf dem Kontinent zusprach, verbleiben. Der polnische Staat sollte allerdings restauriert werden und durch eine « Staatsunion mit Litauen » einen Zugang zur Ostsee erhalten. Zentrales Nahziel Gørdelers war es, zu einer Verständigung mit den USA und insbesondere mit Großbritannien zu gelangen, um so « alle Kriegskräfte des deutschen Volkes auf den Osten zu konzentrieren » ; einen Friedensschluss mit der UdSSR zog er nicht in Erwägung, sondern bot Briten und Amerikanern

wiederholt an, die bewaffnete « Sicherung gegen Russland » zu übernehmen. Im Februar und Mai 1943 beriet er sich mit dem schwedischen Bankier Raoul Wallenberg und ließ durch dessen Brüder ein in diesem Sinne gehaltenes Schreiben an Churchill überbringen. Ähnliche Vorstöße unternahm er im Frühjahr 1944 über Allen Dulles in der Schweiz, George Earle in der Türkei und einmal mehr Wallenberg. Innenpolitisch kreiste Gørdelers Denken um Mittel und Wege, einen befürchteten, mit der Novemberrevolution vergleichbaren Umbruch « von unten », von dem er annahm, daß « er sehr viel schlimmere Formen annehmen (würde) als 1918 », unter allen Umständen zu verhindern. Eine wenigstens informelle Einbeziehung der KPD in die Umsturzvorbereitungen und die Gestaltung der Nachkriegsordnung lehnte er (anders als etwa Stauffenberg unter dem Einfluss Julius Lebers und Adolf Reichweins) strikt ab ; diese « reaktionäre » Haltung untergrub in den letzten Monaten vor dem Umsturzversuch die Position Gørdelers auch bei Stauffenberg, der zuletzt eher den Sozialdemokraten Leuschner als künftigen Reichskanzler favorisierte.

Gørdelers Verfassungspläne, deren Grundlagen er zuerst 1941 in der Programmschrift Das Ziel erarbeitete, können als konservativ, wirtschaftsliberal und antikommunistisch bezeichnet werden. Von den jüngeren Angehörigen des Kreisauer Kreises und dem sozialistischen Widerstand wurden sie deshalb abgelehnt. Für den ultrakonservativen Flügel der Opposition um Johannes Popitz, Ulrich von Hassell und Jens Jessen, der an der Perspektive « eines “ totalen ” Obrigkeitsstaates » festhielt, enthielt Gørdelers Ansatz umgekehrt bereits zu weitgehende Zugeständnisse an den Gedanken einer Repräsentativverfassung.

Eine uneingeschränkt direkte Wahl von Abgeordneten sahen Gørdelers Verfassungspläne allerdings nur für die Ebene der Gemeinden vor. Die repräsentativen Körperschaften auf Kreis-, Gau- und Reichsebene sollten vollständig oder zum Teil indirekt gewählt werden, ihre Beschlüsse waren für die Exekutive (von den Bürgermeistern an aufwärts) in zentralen Fragen nicht bindend. Gørdeler sah ein Zweikammerparlament mit einem Reichstag und einem Reichsständehaus vor. Die Reichstagsabgeordneten sollten zur Hälfte direkt, zur anderen Hälfte indirekt (durch die Abgeordneten der Gaulandtage) gewählt werden. Das Reichsständehaus konzipierte Gørdeler als Plenum des Besitz- und Bildungsbürgertums : Es sollte aus dem « Präsidenten und den Gruppenführern der Reichswirtschaftskammer (bestehen), aus den Präsidenten aller übrigen Reichskammern (Ärzte, Anwälte, Künstler und so weiter), der gleichen Zahl von Rektoren von Hochschulen, den Landeshauptleuten und bis zu 30 Personen, die der Staatsführer auf Grund ihrer Leistungen für das deutsche Volk auf Lebenszeit berufen muß ; diese letzteren müßen 50 Jahre alt sein » . Gesetzentwürfe sollten zwingend beide Kammern passieren ; Entwürfe « mit finanziellen Auswirkungen dürfen von einem oder beiden Häusern jedoch nur eingebracht werden, wenn der Reichskanzler vorher zugestimmt hat » . An die Spitze des Staates wollte Gørdeler einen mit umfangreichen Vollmachten ausgestatteten « Reichsführer » stellen : « In Betracht kommen : Erbkaiser, Wahlkaiser, auf Zeit gewählter Führer. » Persönlich favorisierte er die Erbmonarchie. Auch die kurzfristige Planung Gørdelers für die Zeit nach dem Umsturz wurde von den liberaldemokratisch orientierten Stimmen in seinem weiteren Umfeld nicht uneingeschränkt unterstützt. Gørdeler lehnte es beispielsweise ab, die Konzentrationslager nach einem erfolgreichen Umsturz sofort aufzulösen. Sie sollten der Wehrmacht übergeben und die Insassen richterlich überprüft werden. Der Reichsinnenminister sollte das Recht erhalten, die « weitere Verwahrung » auch nicht straffälliger (also politischer) Häftlinge anzuordnen, « soweit diese während des Krieges zur Sicherheit des Reiches unerlässlich ist » . Die Deutsche Arbeitsfront sollte in eine vergleichbare Organisation, für die weiterhin Zwangsmitgliedschaft galt, umgewandelt werden ; ihr Vorsitzender und dessen Stellvertreter konnten nach Gørdelers Vorstellungen zwar nunmehr von den Mitgliedern gewählt werden, waren aber vom Staat zu bestätigen. Dieser

halbstaatlichen « Deutschen Gewerkschaft » sollte auch die Verantwortung für die Arbeitslosenversicherung und die Arbeitsämter übertragen werden. Die aus dem sogenannten Führerkreis hervorgegangenen Gewerkschafter in Gørdelers Umfeld wie Leuschner und Kaiser unterstützten diesen Plan ausdrücklich. Jene Gesetze und Regelungen, die die NSDAP privilegiert oder mit dem Staatsapparat verschmolzen hatten, sollten nach der Absetzung der Hitler-Regierung annulliert, die Partei aber nicht aufgelöst oder verboten werden. Die Hitlerjugend wollte Gørdeler in eine « Staatsjugend » unter Führung eines « in Erziehungsfragen bewährten Generals » umwandeln.

Nach Saul Friedländer gehörte Gørdeler in die Reihe der « konservativen Feinde des (nationalsozialistischen) Regimes » . Einer ihrer gemeinsamen Pläne war, daß in einem « künftigen Deutschland das Bürgerrecht nur Juden gewährt werden würde, die sich auf eine lange Vorfahrenreihe im Land berufen konnten ; die später Hinzugekommenen würden das Land verlassen müßen » . In diesem Zusammenhang propagierte Gørdeler den so genannten Judenstaat in Kanada als « Dauerlösung » für die europäischen Juden nach einem Friedensschluss mit den Alliierten. Auch wenn Gørdeler die zutage tretende Vernichtungspolitik der Nationalsozialisten in Osteuropa vehement ablehnte, änderte sich « an Gørdelers Antisemitismus bis zu seinem Lebensende nichts » . Andere Forschungen lehnen dagegen eine einseitig antisemitische Auslegung ab und sehen in den Schutzrechten, die auch ein jüdischer Staat über seine Bürger ausbreitet, den eigentlichen Kern von Gørdelers Konzept. Er habe darin « den Schutz der Juden einem jüdischen Staat anvertraut » und somit « in ihre eigenen Hände » legen wollen.

Am 14. Juli 1944, also noch vor dem Attentat vom 20. Juli 1944, wurde gegen Gørdeler Haftbefehl erlassen. Davon durch Freunde in Kenntnis gesetzt, floh er in seine westpreußische Heimat. Dort wurde er in einem Wirtshaus von der Buchhalterin Helene Schwärzel erkannt, verraten und am 12. August 1944 verhaftet. Der « Volksgerichtshof » verurteilte ihn wegen Verrats am Volke am 8. September 1944 zum Tode. In der Hoffnung, von ihm die Namen weiterer Verschwörer erforschen zu können, wurde seine Hinrichtung immer wieder verschoben. Zermürbt durch die Haftbedingungen wurde er zu einer « Ergebniserklärung » gebracht, in der er ausführte :

« So haben wir den 20. Juli als ein endgültiges Gottesurteil zu achten. Der Führer ist vor fast sicherem Tod bewahrt. Gott hat nicht gewollt, daß Deutschlands Bestand, um dessen Willen ich mich beteiligen wollte und beteiligt habe, mit einer Bluttat erkaufte wird; er hat auch dem Führer diese Aufgabe neu anvertraut. »

Offenbar im Bestreben, den Widerstand gegen das Regime zu rechtfertigen, gab er in Verhören und schriftlichen Berichten ausführlich Auskunft über Organisation, Ziele und Beteiligte des Widerstands aus Gewerkschaften, Unternehmen und Kirche.

Am 2. Februar 1945 wurde Gørdeler in Plötzensee durch Erhängen hingerichtet. Seinen Bruder Fritz ereilte das gleiche Schicksal ebenfalls in Plötzensee knapp einen Monat später.

Sein Sohn Reinhard Gørdeler war viele Jahre Vorstandsvorsitzender der Deutschen Treuhand-Gesellschaft und der KPMG. Sein ältester Sohn Ulrich war über vier Wahlperioden Landtagsabgeordneter in Niedersachsen.

Seit dem Jahr 1999 wird der Carl Gørdeler Preis für Kommunalwissenschaft, kurz Carl-Gørdeler-Preis, verliehen. Die

Prämie wird jährlich in Verbindung mit der Carl und Anneliese Gørdeler-Stiftung vergeben.

Im Film Operation Walküre - Das Stauffenberg Attentat wird er von Kevin R. McNally gespielt.

Politisches Testament. Gørdelers politisches Testament, herausgeber von Friedrich Krause, New York (1945) .

Hans Rudolf Haake

Rudolf Haake, son of a Leipzig businessman, was born on October 17, 1903. He completed studies in trade and worked until the end of 1924 as a warehouse clerk. In 1928-1929, he attended courses at Leipzig's « Handelshochschule » (College of Business) . In 1922, Haake became a member of the NSDAP. He played a large part in the development of the Hitler Youth organization in Leipzig. In 1926, Haake moved to Kelbra/Kyffhäuser, where he worked in his father's company. He founded a local branch of the NSDAP in Kelbra and was leader of the Kyffhäuser district office. In 1928, he returned to Leipzig. In 1930, by then a local Party Business Manager for the NSDAP in Leipzig, he moved into City Hall as a City Councilor. He became the regional director for municipal policy. From June 1931 until March 1932, Haake was editor of « Der Freiheitskampf » (The Battle for Freedom) , the publicity organ of the Saxon NSDAP.

He represented the Party with speeches at numerous events in and around Saxony and published several brochures. On January 1, 1933, Haake became director of Leipzig's municipal National-Socialist faction. In mid-March, 1933, Walter Dönicke, the State Commissioner for Special Service for the Leipzig administrative region, assigned Haake to the Leipzig municipal government in order « to protect the interests of the NSDAP » . In May 1933, the now like-minded City Council elected him honorary Mayor. In 1934, he rose to the paid position of full-time mayor and deputy to the Lord Mayor, Doctor Carl Gørdeler. During Gørdeler's administration, Haake was responsible for nearly all of the anti-Jewish measures enacted within the municipal government. After the resignations of Gørdeler in 1936, and his successor, Walter Dönicke, in 1938, Haake took-over the management of City Hall until the appointment of Alfred Freyberg in 1939. At the end of 1941, he began to come into conflict with Lord Mayor Freyberg. In November 1942, Haake was suspended from service. After a forced retirement in April 1943, Haake moved with his wife and 7 children to Kelbra. In 1944, he became Director of the Training and Education Department for the NSDAP eastern division's Lithuanian regional administration. When American soldiers arrived in Kelbra on April 12, 1945, Haake had barricaded himself in the City Hall. After a brief exchange of gunfire, he died of a bullet wound.

...

The institutional « Gleichschaltung » of the « Naturschutz » movement also faltered due to infighting among Nazi leaders. Despite Schultze-Naumburg's prominence in Rosenberg's Fighting League for German Culture, the DBH and the RVDH affiliated initially with Haverbeck's RVH, but they left this organization in 1934 because of the organization's chaotic structure and the perceived threat to regional autonomy. The Rhenish provincial governor Heinz (Heinrich) Haake, who had become president of the DBH in 1933, announced that the DBH would become a stand-alone organization with a loose affiliation to the German Gemeindetag, an agreement that specified that the Provincial Association in each Prussian province would steer regional Heimatschutz organizations. Haake rationalized the DBH's

structure by designating one regional organization in each state, free city, or Prussian province as that area's representative Heimatschutz organization and calling on local Heimat organizations to become corporate members of the DBH's regional affiliates.⁸⁷ While the RNG had envisioned a centralization of landscape preservation tasks at the national level, continuing conflicts over jurisdiction ultimately allowed Haake and other provincial and state officials to chart an independent regionalist course in environmental affairs.

Synchronizing the Provinces : Heinz Haake and the Nazification of Rhenish Landscape Preservation

With Haake at the helm, Rhenish landscape preservation entered a new phase of activity in which older conceptions of provincial landscape preservation coexisted uneasily with the Nazi regime's racializing tendencies. Haake, who held power from April 1933 until the regime's collapse in 1945, was one of the 3rd « Reich »'s most important defenders of regional self-administration. The lack of cultural-political direction from Berlin led Haake to re-emphasize traditional discourses of regional autonomy as the best solution to executing administrative tasks and building national character. A member of the NSDAP since 1921, Haake belonged to the small band of Party leaders known as the « Old Fighters » and had served as one of only 7 NSDAP Deputies in the Prussian Assembly, between 1925 and 1929. His loyalty to Hitler and a strong and unified « Reich » were, therefore, unquestioned. Yet, he insisted on the need for regional autonomy within the organic State. He proclaimed that « every German has a duty to his more familiar "Heimat", where he first really experienced things and where he grew-up, on a par with his membership in the greater German "Volksgemeinschaft" ». The German landscape and the German person are not uniform in their appearance, but rather German life is embodied in a diversity of forms that in their totality represent « Germandom ».

As president of the Prussian Gemeindetag, an organization representing the interests of provincial governors, Haake defended Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl's belief in the diversity of « land and people » as the basis of German national character.

...

Echoing the aesthetic perspective of the region's cultural elites, Haake's promise to build-up regional cultural affairs evoked a rhetorical and institutional continuity with previous « Heimat » traditions, thus facilitating the middle-class organization's incorporation into the regime. Haake's emphasis on the organic region as the basis for state building and cultural promotion led to growing provincial support for « Naturschutz » and « Heimatschutz » activities. Between 1933 and 1937, Haake more than doubled the province's funding for cultural affairs, from 500,000 « Reichsmarks », in 1933, to 1,250,000 « Reichsmarks », in 1937, with a sizable increase for « Naturschutz » affairs. In 1934, for example, « Naturschutz » offices reported receiving approximately 6,800 « Reichsmarks », with 4,000 coming from the provincial administration and 1,800 from the Rhenish « Oberpräsident ». In 1937, in contrast, the provincial administration reported granting approximately 26,500 « Reichsmarks » for « Naturschutz ». This included funds for a new limnology research center in Krefeld, 4,500 « Reichsmarks » for the Rhineland-Westphalia Natural History Association, and 2,000 « Reichsmarks » for a new provincial journal, « Rhenish Friend of Nature », which showcased the province's achievements in nature protection and nature study. Provincial funding not only helped state nature protection offices but also provided continuous support for organizations such as the VVS and the « Eifelverein », and

this bolstered their nature protection engagement. Haake named Hubert Iven, the noted naturalist and former district nature protection officer in Cologne, to become the head of the Rhine Province's nature protection office. Although the Rhineland's nature protection offices remained honorary posts rather than true civil-service positions, the province took steps to enhance the status of nature protection officers. The province published administrative guidelines for district « Naturschutz » officers, outlining their responsibilities and providing directions for executing the RNG's provisions, and created a series of courses that provided professional training in landscape planning. Under the provisions of the new law, Rhenish nature protection officials were to ensure the protected status of several existing nature protection regions, including the Siebengebirge, the Rodderberg, the Wahner Heath, and the Urfelder Heath, as well as new ones, such as Bislicher Island, by registering them in the so-called « “ Reich ” Nature Protection Book » .

To integrate « Heimatschutz » into regional planning, Haake established the Rhenish Society for Regional Planning, the regional affiliate of the « Reich » Office for Spatial Planning (« Reichstelle für Raumordnung ») , in 1936. Under Haake's direction, the Rhenish Society for Regional Planning (« Rheinische Landesplanungsgemeinschaft ») implemented the Nazi drive toward functionally efficient spatial planning by promoting economic growth, improving the province's infrastructure, rationally distributing the Rhineland's natural resources, and expanding the province's stock of public housing. Such measures included many projects that were detrimental to nature protection, including agricultural land reclamation, street building, dam construction, and suburban expansion. Yet, Haake viewed careful regional planning as an extension of the regime's commitment to preserving Germany's landscape. Spatial planning, he remarked, « is concerned with a social demand, that is creatively based and precisely therefore (reflects) the harmony with Nature » . Calling on the RVDH to work closely with the Rhenish Society for Regional Planning, Haake charged the RVDH with helping to create a comprehensive regional plan for the Rhine Province. Whereas earlier provincial planning efforts had centered on « defending against damages left behind by the Liberal period » , noted a 1936 issue of « Die Rheinprovinz » , the Nazi regime demanded a « creative new ordering of the entire space » . The new organic landscape would be both functional and beautiful, attuned to æsthetic needs and the health of the population.

...

Hans Rudolf Haake (geboren 17. Oktober 1903 in Leipzig ; gestorben 12. April 1945 in Kelbra) war ein deutscher Kommunalpolitiker der NSDAP und übte 1937 sowie 1938-1939 das Amt des Oberbürgermeisters der Stadt Leipzig kommissarisch aus.

Der gelernte Handlungsgehilfe war ab 1924 als einer der ersten Nationalsozialisten Leipzigs mit dem Aufbau der Leipziger Hitlerjugend befasst. 1925 trat er in die NSDAP ein und besuchte eine Rednerschule dieser Partei. In der Folgezeit wurde Haake häufig als Redner bei Versammlungen eingesetzt. Bei den Kommunalwahlen von 1929 und 1932 wurde Haake als Stadtverordneter gewählt. Ab 1933 war er Vizevorsteher der Stadtverordneten. Im gleichen Jahr wurde er zum ehrenamtlichen Bürgermeister gewählt. 1935 erfolgte die Wahl zum berufsmäßigen Bürgermeister und damit gleichzeitig zum Stellvertreter des Oberbürgermeisters Carl Friedrich Gørdeler. Haake war Dezernent für das Statistische Amt, das Gewerbeamt, das Amt für Wehrmichtsangelegenheiten, das Schul- und Bildungsamt, das Markthallenamt, das Vermietungs- und Stadtverkehrsamt, das Stadtgesundheitsamt und die Beschäftigungsstelle.

Nach dem Machtantritt der Nationalsozialisten im Deutschen Reich verkörperte Haake wie kein Zweiter die Gleichschaltungspolitik in der Leipziger Stadtverwaltung. Nach der Ernennung des Oberbürgermeisters Carl Friedrich Gærdeler zum Reichskommissar für die Preisbildung im Jahre 1934 nutzte er die häufige Abwesenheit Gærdelers dazu aus, dessen zur NSDAP distanzierenden kommunalpolitischen Kurs zu unterlaufen und zum Teil offen zu sabotieren. Im November 1936 wurde während einer Auslandsreise Gærdelers auf seine Veranlassung hin das Denkmal für den jüdischen Komponisten Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy abgerissen. Da Gærdeler die Wiedererrichtung nicht durchsetzen konnte, nahm er seine Wiederwahl zum Leipziger Oberbürgermeister nicht an. Deshalb führte Haake ab dem 1. Januar 1937 kommissarisch das Amt des Leipziger Oberbürgermeisters bis zum Amtsantritt Walter Dönickes am 12. Oktober 1937. Nach der Absetzung Dönickes am 11. Oktober 1938 wurde Haake erneut kommissarischer Oberbürgermeister. In diesem Amt blieb er bis zum 20. August 1939. Sein Nachfolger wurde Alfred Freyberg.

In die Amtszeiten Haakes fallen die Bildung der Leipziger Stadtwerke (1937) , die 125-Jahr-Feier der Völkerschlacht (1938) , die Abschiebung von 1.598 Leipziger Juden nach Polen sowie die Novemberpogrome 1938, bei der sechs Leipziger Synagogen zerstört wurden, darunter die Große Gemeindesynagoge.

1943 wurden von dem amtierenden Oberbürgermeister Freyberg Korruptionsvorwürfe gegen ihn erhoben, woraufhin er aus der Stadtverwaltung entlassen wurde. Im Anschluß war Haake zeitweise Hauptarbeitsgebietsleiter der NSDAP in Litauen.

Haake schoss am 12. April 1945 aus einem Fenster des Rathauses in Kelbra auf amerikanische Soldaten, von denen er auch zwei verletzte. Danach erschoss er sich selbst. Seine Leiche zeigte nur wenige Blutstropfen am Kopf.

...

Der NSDAP-Politiker Hans Rudolf Haake amtierte als Bürgermeister sowie zweimal kommissarisch als Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Leipzig. An der Öffentlichen Höheren Handelslehranstalt in Leipzig bestand Haake Ostern 1921 die Reifeprüfung und arbeitete bis Ostern 1923 als kaufmännischer Lehrling bei der Lebensmittelgroßhandlung Theodor Bader und dann ein weiteres halbes Jahr als Kontorist. Anschließend war er bis August 1924 bei der Lebensmittelgroßhandlung Günther Stöckert als Lagerist beschäftigt. Danach arbeitete er im Unternehmen seines Vaters, bis 1926 in Leipzig und bis 1928 in Kelbra. 1928-1929 studierte Haake zwei Semester an der Handelshochschule in Leipzig, brach das Studium aber aufgrund seiner politischen Tätigkeiten ab. Bereits 1922 war er der NSDAP und nach Aufhebung des Parteiverbots erneut am 01.04.1925 mit der Mitgliedsnummer 1181 beigetreten. In Kelbra gründete er die Ortsgruppe der NSDAP und leitete den Bezirk Kyffhäuser. Nach dem Besuch einer NS-Rednerschule trat er ab 1927 als Versammlungsredner in Sachsen, Thüringen und Halle-Merseburg auf. Innerhalb der Partei machte Haake schnell Karriere und übernahm zahlreiche Ämter. So amtierte er ab Ende 1928 in Borna als Ortsgruppenleiter und von Oktober 1930 bis 1931 als Bezirksleiter im Kreis Borna. Hinzu kam von Juni 1931 bis Ende März 1932 seine Tätigkeit als Schriftleiter der NS-Tageszeitung « Der Freiheitskampf », 1932 bis 1933 als Kreisschulungsleiter im Kreis Leipzig und 1931 bis 1938 als Kreisamtsleiter für Gemeindepolitik. Im Herbst 1929 erfolgte Haakes Wahl in die Leipziger Stadtverordnetenversammlung, wo er im Januar 1930 in die inneren Ausschüsse Aufnahmeanusschuss und Schulausschuss sowie in den gemischten Ausschuss zur Beratung über die Eingemeindung von Vororten gewählt wurde. Auch übte er ab

dieser Zeit das Amt des Geschäftsführers der NSDAP in Leipzig aus. Bei den Gemeindewahlen 1932 wurde er als Stadtverordneter wiedergewählt. Die Wahl Haakes zum ehrenamtlichen Bürgermeister von Leipzig erfolgte am 11.05.1933 ; ab dem 01.01.1935 war er als Bürgermeister der Stadt tätig und somit fester Vertreter Carl Friedrich Gørdelers. Außerdem fungierte er als Dezernent des Wirtschaftsamts, des Verkehrsamts, des Statistischen Amtes und des Vermietungsamts. Des Weiteren war er im Aufsichtsrat der Leipziger Außenbahn AG, des Gemeindeverbands für das Elektrizitätswerk Leipzig-Land, dem Hypothekenverein und dem Zweckverband für die Stadt- und Girobank und im Beirat der Leipziger Dichterstiftung. In Abwesenheit Gørdelers ließ Haake 1936 das Mendelssohn-Denkmal abreißen, was zu Streitigkeiten mit dem Oberbürgermeister führte. Nach Gørdelers Beurlaubung und anschließendem Ruhestand übernahm Haake am 01.01.1937 kommissarisch dessen Amt und wurde am 11.10.1937 durch Kurt Walter Dönicke abgelöst, der jedoch bereits ein Jahr später ebenfalls von seinem Posten entbunden wurde. So amtierte Haake ab dem 11.10.1938 erneut als kommissarischer Oberbürgermeister. Er übernahm die Geschäftsführung mit den Schwerpunkten Messe, Hafen- und Kanalbau, Gutenberg-Ausstellung und Wohnungsbauprogramm. Am 20.08.1939 erfolgte die Einführung Alfred Freybergs in das Amt des Oberbürgermeisters. Wegen einer Augenerkrankung mußte sich Haake im Februar 1942 einer Operation unterziehen, die jedoch nicht die gewünschten Verbesserungen brachte ; er blieb auf einem Auge blind. 1943 schied er wegen Korruptionsvorwürfen aus der Stadtverwaltung aus und siedelte nach Kelbra über. Später war er noch als Hauptarbeitsgebietsleiter und Redner der NSDAP in Litauen tätig und leitete dort bei der NSDAP-Bezirksleitung Litauen des Arbeitsbereichs Osten ab dem 17.01.1944 den Bereich Schulung und Erziehung. Aus Litauen kehrte er fast erblindet nach Kelbra zurück. Als amerikanische Truppen am 12.04.1945 in die Stadt einrückten, eröffnete er vom Rathaus aus das Feuer und verwundete den Kommandanten eines Panzers. Bei der Erstürmung des Gebäudes fand Haake den Tod.

Alfred Roller

Le peintre, graphiste et scénographe autrichien Alfred Roller est né le 2 octobre 1864 à Brünn, en Moravie, et est mort le 21 juin 1935 à Vienne.

Roller étudie d'abord à l'Académie des Beaux-arts de Vienne auprès de Christian Griepenkerl et de Eduard von Peithner Lichtenfels mais, finalement, il est désabusé par le traditionalisme de l'Académie. En 1897, il co-fonde la Sécession viennoise avec Koloman Moser, Joseph Maria Olbrich, Josef Hoffmann, Gustav Klimt et d'autres artistes qui rejettent le style dominant de l'art académique. En 1899, il devient professeur de dessin à l'Université des Arts appliqués de Vienne (« Kunstgewerbeschule ») puis est nommé président de la Sécession, en 1902. En début de carrière, il est très actif en tant que graphiste et dessinateur. Il conçoit de nombreuses couvertures et des vignettes pour les pages du périodique sécessionniste « Ver Sacrum » ainsi que les affiches pour les 4e, 14e et 16e expositions du mouvement. Il est également l'auteur de la mise-en-scène de ces mêmes expositions. En 1902, Roller est présenté par Carl Moll au compositeur et chef d'orchestre Gustav Mahler. Il exprime un intérêt dans la scénographie et montre à Mahler plusieurs croquis qu'il a exécutés pour l'Opéra « Tristan und Isolde » de Richard Wagner. Impressionné, Mahler l'embauche afin de concevoir les décors d'une nouvelle production de l'œuvre. La première, en février 1903, se veut un grand succès critique. Roller va mettre-en-scène d'autres productions de Mahler. Roller quitte la Sécession de même que son poste de professeur à la « Kunstgewerbeschule » pour devenir chef-décorateur à l'Opéra d'État de Vienne, poste qu'il va conserver jusqu'en 1909.

...

Gustav Mahler, éloigné du monde des arts plastiques, découvre le groupe d'artistes de la Sécession qui compte parmi ses membres Klimt, Moser, Hoffmann, Moll, Orlik et le scénographe Alfred Roller. La rencontre avec ce dernier, en 1902, est décisive. Confronté à la rigide tradition de l'Opéra de Vienne, il saisit cette occasion pour se libérer des mises-en-scène Classiques comme les proposait le pourtant très talentueux Heinrich Leffler, entre 1900 et 1903. Avec Roller, Mahler s'implique totalement dans un travail sans précédent sur tous les paramètres de la mise-en-scène. L'exigence par rapport aux musiciens est source de conflit :

« Je ne me suis pas ménagé et pouvais donc tout exiger des autres. » , dit-il dans son mot d'adieu à l'Opéra de Vienne. Le 15 octobre 1907, sa dernière représentation viennoise, « Fidelio » de Beethoven, est un triomphe.

...

Lorsque Gustav Mahler put enfin accéder, grâce à l'appui sans faille du Comte et Obersthofmeister Lichtenstein, en avril 1897, à la direction de l'Opéra de Vienne, tout d'abord en tant que « Kapellmeister » (le titre de directeur ne lui sera officiellement accordé qu'en septembre, pour le début de la nouvelle saison) , la vénérable scène lyrique des Habsbourg souffrait depuis quelques saisons de tous les symptômes de la routine. Mahler avait plusieurs fois pointé les effets pervers de cette fausse tradition qu'il qualifiait sans aménité et avec son habituelle (et dangereuse, surtout pour lui) absence de diplomatie de « Schlamperei » (littéralement : pagaille, mais à entendre plutôt dans le sens de travail bâclé) . Plus encore que l'indolent train-train propre à l'ère de Wilhelm Jahn, le directeur enfin sortant de l'institution Impériale qu'il menait tranquillement depuis 1881, c'était aux yeux de Mahler l'absence d'un directeur musical d'envergure qui pesait sur le rayonnement du théâtre : Hans Richter, le seul des 3 chefs d'orchestre alors en exercice dans la fosse qui eut une stature internationale, était de plus en plus souvent absent. Il allait d'ailleurs s'exiler définitivement en Angleterre, en 1900, prenant, entre autre la direction de l'Orchestre Hallé de Manchester.

La Ire apparition de Mahler dans la fosse du « Hofoper » prit d'emblée le caractère d'un manifeste. S'octroyant la direction de « Lohengrin » , il marchait clairement sur les terres d'Hans Richter, wagnérien de la Ire heure, et se rangeait sans ambiguïté du côté des partisans de l'auteur de « Tristan und Isolde » . Mahler avait donc choisi clairement le camp de la musique de l'avenir. Pourtant, il contrebalança immédiatement cette Ire apparition wagnérienne en dirigeant 19 jours plus tard une « Zauberflöte » de Mozart dont il avait repris de fond en comble le matériel d'orchestre. Tout au long de son « magister » , il reviendra régulièrement aux Opéras de Mozart, y conduisant une véritable ré-évaluation du style comme des moyens mis-en-œuvre et accompagnant lui-même les récitatifs du piano. Une santé chancelante l'empêcha de mener à bien ses autres projets, et l'été fut entièrement consacré à un repos nécessaire ainsi qu'à l'élaboration d'une nouvelle production intégrale du « Ring » , ouvrage absent depuis un certain temps de la scène viennoise. Avec ce nouveau cycle de l'« Anneau » , Mahler imposait un style dépouillé qui surprit la critique, lui valant des contradicteurs farouches mais aussi des thuriféraires ardents. Parmi eux, Hugo Wolf lui-même, qui transporté par l'art du chef, dut faire violence à sa timidité naturelle pour lui confier son « Corregidor » . L'affaire fera long feu, mais Mahler tiendra parole, créant l'œuvre en 1904, une année après la mort du

compositeur.

Le soin que Mahler apporta à la direction musicale du « Ring » rompait sensiblement avec la tradition viennoise, qui, si elle consentait à produire les Opéras de Wagner, les avait jusque-là défigurés par de nombreuses coupures, pratique à laquelle même le gardien du temple wagnérien qu'était Hans Richter, héros du Festival de Bayreuth, avait dû se plier. C'est grâce à Mahler qu'une tradition philologique de l'interprétation wagnérienne s'enracina à Vienne.

La renommée de Mahler en temps que compositeur se trouva considérablement accrue par la publication de ses 1^{re} et 3^e Symphonies, ainsi que des parties séparées de la 2^e qui avait remporté un triomphe lors de sa création et que nombre d'orchestre souhaitaient mettre à leur répertoire. Toutes ces publications, généreusement supportées par un don de Guido Adler, affermirent encore le prestige du nouveau directeur du « Hofoper » .

En 1898, Hans Richter renonça aux Concerts de la Philharmonie, désignant intrinsèquement Mahler comme successeur. Si Mahler fut très souvent admiré à Vienne en tant que chef lyrique, il ne convainquit jamais complètement la critique dans son emploi de chef symphonique, alors même que le public, fasciné par son engagement, sa gestique nerveuse et ses programmations sortant des sentiers battus, lui vouait un culte que l'on peut vérifier par l'augmentation importante du nombre de spectateurs et d'abonnés. Lors de la tournée de l'Orchestre à Paris, en 1900, les louanges furent unanimes et la critique viennoise dût convenir un peu tard des grandes qualités, sinon du génie, de Mahler chef symphonique. Mais à mesure que les années passaient, Mahler fut de plus en plus perçu par les musiciens de la Philharmonie comme un autocrate absolu, au point que le compositeur décida, après sa maladie de 1901, de démissionner : un désamour partagé entre le chef et l'orchestre était consommé depuis longtemps alors même que le public continuait d'aduler Mahler.

Si l'on veut comprendre comment s'amalgama autour du compositeur un cercle de jeunes gens comprenant Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg, Alexander von Zemlinsky, ou Anton von Webern, il faut prendre la mesure de l'impact des concerts symphoniques dirigés par Mahler. C'est au travers de cette part trop méconnue de son activité viennoise, plus encore que par sa présence à l'Opéra, qu'il devint un des éléments fédérateurs de la future Seconde École de Vienne. Des liens d'amitiés et d'admiration réciproques se tissèrent, qui aboutirent en 1904 à l'engagement actif de Mahler au sein du « Vereinigung schaffender Tonkünstler » en faveur notamment de Zemlinsky et de Schönberg.

Mais la défense de la musique contemporaine fut également une des préoccupations majeures du « magister » de Mahler à la « Hofoper » . Il y présenta pas moins de 30 créations : la « Manon » et le « Werther » (en première mondiale) de Massenet, « la Fiancée vendue » et « Dalibor » de Smetana, « la Bohème » , « Madama Butterfly » , « Louise » , « Samson et Dalila » , « Eugène Onegin » , « Djamilah » , « Feuersnot » , Vienne était bien devenue une des places majeures de la création lyrique.

Pourtant, Mahler considéra son travail comme imparfait tant qu'il ne put réaliser le rêve du spectacle total, qui est au cœur même du principe de l'Opéra, mais que la philosophie wagnérienne revivifia considérablement.

Sa rencontre, en avril 1902, avec Alfred Roller, allait définitivement métamorphoser le paysage de la scène lyrique

viennoise.

Alfred Roller était depuis le début des années 1890 un membre actif des nouveaux courants artistiques qui bousculaient la Vienne Impériale. En 1897, il fonda avec ses amis peintres et poètes la Sécession viennoise, en devint le président en 1902 et fut l'éditeur de la fameuse revue « Ver Sacrum ». Sa véritable passion, et de fait son métier, était la mise-en-scène, lumières et décors compris. Mahler lui proposa de collaborer à une nouvelle production de « Tristan und Isolde ». Lorsque, le 21 février 1903, le rideau se leva sur le spectacle tant attendu, le public se trouva confronté à une esthétique radicale. Loin d'en être choqué, il en fut au contraire comme transporté. Alfred Roller s'exprimait en couleurs crues et en architectures épurées. Il accordait la 1^{re} place à la lumière, la chargeant souvent de significations symboliques. Ses maquettes et les décors qu'il en déduisait frappent aujourd'hui encore, tout comme les projets wagnérien d'Edmond Appia, par leur modernisme dont l'esthétique semble avoir plusieurs décennies d'avance.

Mais l'apparence du spectacle n'était qu'une part de sa magie. Roller, tout comme Mahler, était un admirateur de Sigmund Freud, et la relecture qu'il proposait de l'univers wagnérien ouvrait grand les portes de la psyché. Une direction d'acteur percutante ajoutait encore à cette vaste entreprise de ré-évaluation qui permit aux ouvrages de Wagner d'acquérir une nouvelle dimension. Wagner était devenu définitivement un musicien de l'avenir, et son théâtre était bien l'objet utopique du spectacle total, maintenant que la scène rejoignait enfin la musique.

On peut assurer que les expériences de Roller et de Mahler fondèrent une nouvelle esthétique du théâtre musical dont nos scènes contemporaines sont aujourd'hui encore les héritières. Leur collaboration fit flores et les spectacles devenus légendaires s'enchaînèrent : « Fidelio » (1904), un « Don Giovanni » qui stupéfia public et critique (1905), « l'Enlèvement au Sérail », « les Noces de Figaro » et « la Flûte enchantée » la même saison (1906), une complexe « Iphigénie en Aulide » que Mahler regardera comme son chef-d'œuvre du temps de Vienne, sont restés mythiques.

Après la mort de Mahler, Roller continuera à signer pour Vienne quelques productions majeures, notamment celles de l'« Elektra » et du « Rosenkavalier » straussien, cependant ce fut à Berlin, au théâtre et pour Max Reinhardt, qu'il produisit la part majeure de son œuvre.

Mais Mahler ne se souciait pas que de la scène et de l'orchestre. Il constitua à Vienne une équipe de chanteurs de la force, plutôt un ensemble idéal qu'une troupe : Anna Bahr-Mildenburg, Selma Kurtz, Marie Gutheil-Schoder, Leo Slezak, Erik Schmedes, Richard Mayr figurent encore au panthéon des vrais connaisseurs lyriques.

Parallèlement, il engagea 2 jeunes chefs d'orchestre pour le seconder, Fanz Schalk et Bruno Walter ; ce dernier devint son disciple et l'un des fervents thuriféraires de son œuvre. Mahler vécut à la tête du « Hofoper » des années harassantes, faisant fi des intrigues de cours ou des continuelles cabales, n'avouant qu'une seule frustration, celle de ne pas avoir pu créer la « Salomé » de Strauß, interdite par la censure. Cette activité débordante, si elle freina durant les 1^{res} années son énergie créatrice sembla par la suite la libérer. L'été 1899 verra naître la 4^e Symphonie, l'année 1900 tout un ensemble de lieder (« Rückert », « Kindertotenlieder »), puis chaque été suivant une grande Symphonie orchestrale (5e, 6e, 7e), journal intime d'un homme dont l'œuvre devient le miroir.

En mars 1902, Mahler avait épousé Alma Schindler, ouvrant une étrange boîte de pandore. On sait que leur relation tumultueuse fut essentiellement basée sur l'idéalisation et la frustration et avec le recul du temps, et la publication des écrits intimes d'Alma, on perçoit mieux ce personnage que Frank Wedekind aurait pu inclure dans son théâtre. En forçant Mahler à l'introspection, Alma l'a reconduit à son œuvre. Celle-ci allait à nouveau prendre le 1er pas.

Des campagnes de presse nettement antisémites, croissant à mesure que Mahler privilégiait justement la divulgation de son œuvre, eurent raison et de sa santé et de sa patience. Le décès de sa fille aînée Maria, durant l'été, acheva de le déstabiliser. En décembre 1907, tout était consommé et les parties se séparaient d'un commun accord. Felix Weingartner, lui-même compositeur de talent autant que chef renommé, succédait à Mahler et Mahler, libéré, pouvait accepter l'offre qu'Heinrich Conrad lui avait faite en juin : directeur musical du Metropolitan Opera de New York. Le temps du Nouveau Monde était venu.

...

« Concernant l'embauche des artistes, Adolf Hitler n'exprima qu'une seule fois un " désir " : à l'occasion d'une nouvelle mise-en-scène de " Parsifal ", il proposa comme metteur-en-scène le célèbre artiste Alfred Roller, de l'Opéra National de Vienne. Malheureusement, à cette époque, Roller était déjà très malade et son travail ne nous donna pas entière satisfaction, de sorte que nous dûmes nous passer de sa collaboration, et que nous confiâmes le soin de réaliser de nouvelles esquisses à mon fils Wieland. Hitler se soumit sans protester à notre décision. » (Winnifred Wagner)

« Le Chevalier à la rose », dont Hugo Hofmannsthal écrit le livret en 1909 et 1910 en étroite collaboration avec Richard Strauß (leur correspondance montre que le compositeur avait des vues très précises sur le livret et savait les faire prévaloir), et dont la première eut lieu à Dresde, le 26 janvier 1911, fut un triomphe. Max Reinhardt était l'auteur de la mise-en-scène et Alfred Roller celui des décors et des costumes.

On entend souvent dire que le monde d'aujourd'hui change à une vitesse folle. Il y a moins d'un siècle, Richard Strauß a probablement déjà senti cette accélération et a décidé de vivre avec son temps. Après avoir connu un succès retentissant, tant commercial que critique, l'Opéra « Der Rosenkavalier » (1911) est adapté 15 ans après la première au médium le plus moderne de l'époque : le cinéma muet !

...

The Austrian painter, graphic designer, and set designer Alfred Roller was born on 2 October 1864 in Brünn, Mähren, and died on 21 June 1935 in Vienna.

Alfred Roller, at 1st, studied painting at the Academy of Fine-Arts in Vienna under Christian Griepenkerl and Eduard Peithner von Lichtenfels but, eventually, became disenchanted with the Academy's traditionalism. In 1897, he co-founded the Viennese Secession with Koloman Moser, Joseph Maria Olbrich, Josef Hoffmann, Gustav Klimt, and other artists who

rejected the prevalent academic style of art. In 1899, he became a professor of drawing at the University of Applied Arts in Vienna (« Kunstgewerbeschule ») and president of the Secession, in 1902.

In his early career, Roller was very active as a graphic designer and draughtsman. He designed numerous covers and vignettes for the pages the Secessionist periodical « Ver Sacrum », as well as the posters for the 4th, 14th, and 16th Secession exhibitions. He also designed the layout of the exhibitions themselves.

In 1902, Roller was introduced to the composer Gustav Mahler by Carl Moll. Roller expressed an interest in stage design and showed Mahler several sketches he had made for Richard Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde ». Mahler was impressed and decided to employ Roller to design the sets for a new production of the piece. The production, which premiered in February 1903, was a great critical success. Roller continued to design sets for Mahler's productions. Eventually, Roller left the Secession and his teaching post at the « Kunstgewerbeschule » to be appointed chief stage-designer to the Vienna State Opera, a position he held until 1909.

...

Alfred Roller studied architecture and painting at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. In 1897, he was a co-founder of the Secession in Vienna and, in 1902, he became its president. In 1905, he left the Secession. He was brought to the Opera by Gustav Mahler and he designed sets and costumes, until he became the director of the School of Arts and Crafts in 1909. In 1908, he had met the young Adolf Hitler, who wanted to be an architect at the time.

He worked for several other theatres before he returned to the Opera in 1918. In 1920, he was among the founders of the « Festspiele » in Salzburg. In 1929, he became a teacher at the Max Reinhardt Seminar in Vienna. In 1934, Adolf Hitler, now « Reichskanzler » of Germany, brought him to the Wagner « Festspiele » in Bayreuth to design a new set for « Parsifal ». But the result was something that looked like the original set of 1882 and was a disappointment. At that time, Roller was already seriously ill and he died in 1935.

Adolf Hitler took a liking to his son, but the young man was sent to the front after his name was taken off a list of artists kept by Winnifred Wagner. There, he died soon afterwards.

...

The artist and designer Alfred Roller made his greatest impact as a stage-designer. With Gustav Klimt and others, he was one of the founder's of the Vienna Secession (1897), the multi-disciplinary group of artists that broke away from what they saw as the conservative Vienna Academy and its historicist style, to create new, modern art. Like his artist-colleagues, Roller also taught at Vienna's « Kunstgewerbeschule » (School of Applied Arts).

For the Secession, the « Gesamtkunstwerk » or Total Artwork (a unification of artists and craftsmen of different disciplines : painting, sculpture, architecture, design ; in the creation of an overarching concept) was the new ideal. Roller was the founding editor of the Secession's, « Ver Sacrum », an artistically designed and illustrated publication

that included text, music, and poetry. He participated in the planning and design of the Secession's exhibitions, and his new, modern style of exhibition design was exemplified in the 1901 Secession exhibition, which featured paintings by Giovanni Segantini and sculpture by Auguste Rodin. The Secession's Beethoven exhibition (1902) was, perhaps, the group's greatest expression of the « Gesamtkunstwerk ». For the exhibition, the Secession building was devoted entirely to Beethoven, with his music playing (in an arrangement by Gustav Mahler), the display of art and design created especially for the occasion (notably, Klimt's « Beethovenfries ») and, at the exhibition's center, Max Klinger's monument to Beethoven.

Roller also applied the ideal of the « Gesamtkunstwerk » to his set designs. From 1903 to 1907, he was set designer to Gustav Mahler during the time the composer was music director of the Vienna « Hofoper » (Court Opera), where they did ground-breaking work together. Collaborating closely with Mahler, Roller realized and completed the musician's vision through staging. Roller's innovative stage design placed a new focus on light, color and space, with simplified staging. Roller went on to become head designer at the Vienna Opera and at the « Burgtheater ». He also designed the original productions of Richard Strauß' « Der Rosenkavalier » and « Die Frau ohne Schatten ».

Gustav Mahler, Alfred Roller, and the Wagnerian Gesamtkunstwerk : « Tristan » and Affinities between the Arts at the Vienna Court Opera

Stephen Carlton Thursby, Ph.D., Doctor of Philosophy, Florida State University.

Gustav Mahler's music has been extensively studied and discussed in both scholarly and popular circles, especially since the middle of the past Century. His conducting and directorial activity, however, deserves greater attention. The 1903 Vienna Court Opera production of Richard Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » was a landmark in Opera history because of Mahler's Masterful conducting and Secession artist Alfred Roller's vibrant costumes, sets, and lighting design. Roller helped to move the Court Opera away from overly naturalistic and museum-like stage sets and costumes towards greater stylization and abstraction. The dissertation situates this collaborative project within « fin-de-siècle » debates about the nature of the Wagnerian « Gesamtkunstwerk », which today is generally misinterpreted as a multimedia spectacle in which all production elements are conceived organically.

Previous studies of this production explored the technical achievements of Mahler and Roller and surveyed the critical response in Vienna. More work remains to be done in examining the deeper cultural significance of the Mahler-Roller « Tristan » and differing contemporary views on the proper balance of aural and visual stimuli in the « Gesamtkunstwerk ». This study demonstrates the degree to which Mahler participated in a long tradition of addressing the proper sphere of the arts in the theatrical spectacle through his work with Roller in Vienna. Their partnership also anticipated the spirit of cooperation and mutual encouragement that characterized the work of influential troupes such as the « Ballets Russes » and « Ballets Suédois », both of which represented the « modern » in the 20 years after Mahler's death. The spirit of the Mahler-Roller production of « Tristan und Isolde » can also be detected in Wieland Wagner's bold post-War productions at Bayreuth. Through his work with Roller, Mahler served as a link between naturalistic Romantic stage practice, epitomized by many 19th Century Wagner productions, and the more symbolic style of 20th Century directors such as Wieland Wagner.

Seeing Mahler : Music and the Language of Antisemitism in « Fin-de-Siècle » Vienna

Klára Moricz. From : Notes, Volume 68, Number 2, December 2011 (pages 359-361) .

On 29 March 1935, Arnold Schönberg gave a speech in Los Angeles about his experience of growing-up as an « Austrian-Jewish artist » . Among the challenges faced by Jewish artists, he singled-out the lack of self-confidence, caused by Jews' acceptance of Richard Wagner's philosophy :

« You were not a true Wagnerian if you did not believe in " Deutschtum " , in Teutonism ; and you could not be a true Wagnerian without being a follower of his anti-Semitic essay, " Das Judentum in der Musik ", (" Judaism in Music ") . »

(« Style and Idea : Selected Writings of Arnold Schönberg » , edited by Leonard Stein, University of California Press, Berkeley 1984, page 503.)

In her book, « Seeing Mahler : Music and the Language of Antisemitism in " Fin-de-Siècle " Vienna » , Kay M. Knittel sets-out to show the pervasiveness of anti-Semitism in Viennese music criticism of Mahler's time. She is not the 1st to notice the anti-Semitic « clichés » frequently used by critics to condemn Mahler's work. Her project is not to point-out the most blatantly anti-Semitic attacks on Mahler, but to show that even seemingly objective critics were culturally conditioned to judge Mahler not primarily as a musician but as a Jew. She consciously excludes from her discussion the most virulently anti-Semitic papers, focusing her attention on Vienna's leading critics : Julius Korngold, Robert Hirschfeld, Max Kalbeck, Hans Liebstöckl, Max Graf, and Theodor Helm. She is little concerned with these critics' backgrounds, ideologies, or æsthetic convictions (we learn only, on page 131, that Hirschfeld himself was Jewish) , only with their use of language, more precisely with parallels she finds between their writings and that of Wagner in his infamous « Judaism in Music » . She aims to demonstrate that the same language still permeates scholarship on Mahler today and suggests that we can free ourselves of its anti-Semitic implications only by acknowledging its presence and its origin.

In the 6 chapters of her book, Knittel attempts to systematically deconstruct the language of Mahler's critics, devoting separate chapters to Alfred Roller's and Alma Mahler's descriptions of Mahler's body (« Die Bildnisse von Gustav Mahler ») , to Wagner's poisonous essay and its resonances with old and new anti-Semitic tropes (« Das Judentum in der Musik ») , to Viennese reviews of Mahler's Symphonies (« Die Wiener Kritiker ») and of Richard Strauß' Symphonic poems (« Das Problem Richard Strauß ») , concluding with the evaluation of Mahler scholarship in the present (« Eine musikalische Physiognomik ») . Knittel reads descriptions of Mahler's body against Oskar Panizza's viciously anti-Semitic short story, « Der operirte Jud » (1893) , in which a Jewish character, Itzig Fittel Stern, tries to erase his Jewishness by undergoing surgery. As expected, the counterfeit fails and at the end of the story Stern's real features become visible to the horror of his gentile bride. (One wonders why Knittel, while meticulously avoiding openly anti-Semitic attacks on Mahler, chose such a blatantly anti-Semitic text as a model against which she measures the much more subtle anti-Semitic language of Mahler's critics.) Knittel argues that in the introduction to his picture book « Die

Bildnisse von Gustav Mahler » (edited by E. P. Tal & Co. Verlag, Leipzig, 1922) , Roller, a visual artist with keen eyes, acknowledges Jewish stereotypes by actively going against them as he depicts Mahler's naked body as perfect and beautiful. In Roller's avoidance of describing Mahler's genitals (and hence addressing « the obvious issue of circumcision » , page 32) , Knittel sees inadvertent emphasis on « its association with castration » . One wonders what Roller could have written about the topic to escape suspicion. Much more convincing is Knittel's discussion of Alma Schindler's ambiguous relationship to Mahler's Jewish background. As her diaries attest, Schindler had to overcome her strong anti-Semitism in order to marry Vienna's most celebrated musician. Her attraction to fame and glamour trumped her bias - yet, it seems that she could never quite overcome her repulsion and kept trying to rid Mahler of his Jewish traits.

Instead of the anti-Semitic reviews of Mahler's time, Knittel uses Wagner's 1850 attack on Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn to create an inventory of supposedly Jewish trademarks : « banality, triviality, incomprehensibility, eclecticism, overwhelming » .

...

The young Gustav Mahler made several attempts to write his own Opera, but only succeeded in completing one left unfinished by Carl Maria von Weber, « Die drei Pintos » . The latter had languished as a series of unperformed sketches since Weber's death, in 1826, and only taken-up by the 26 year old Mahler in the midst of an attempt to seduce Weber's grandson's wife. The completed work was panned by venerable contemporary critics such as Hans von Bülow and Eduard Hanslick, and is rarely performed today.

But the fascination persists, projecting an alternative history in which the composer often seen as Richard Wagner's successor writes a stage work to compete with his idol.

In the highly anti-Semitic climate of « fin-de-siècle » Vienna, Mahler was a deeply divisive figure and the object of a rash of newspaper caricatures. He raised eyebrows as much for his supposedly dogmatic and tyrannical style of direction as for his radical approach to the repertoire. In the course of his tenure, some 33 new Operas were introduced to the « Hofoper » 's repertoire (including new works by Camille Saint-Saëns, Alexander Zemlinsky and Richard Strauß) , and 55 more were radically reworked. His partner in crime in these Operatic reforms was the artist and designer he met in 1902 and appointed chief stage-designer 1 year later : Alfred Roller.

Roller was the co-founder of the so-called Vienna Secession, a group of Austrian artists determined to « save culture from its elders » . Against the bourgeois picturesque historicism of Hans Makart and the then dominant « Genossenschaft der bildenden Künstler Österreichs » , Roller and his associates (including Gustav Klimt, Kolomen Moser, Joseph Hoffmann, and Carl Moll) declared war against the established order, heralding an æsthetic of curves, gaps and blurred edges, with affinities to the « Jugendstil » and « Art Nouveau » .

At the « Hofoper » , Roller's changes were sweeping : excessive ornamentation was banished, form was to follow function, and every element of the staging had to serve a specific purpose, with proto-expressionistic lighting playing a

pivotal role. Mahler and Roller's Wagner productions, in particular, represented the 1st significant break with, and advance upon, the standard set by the composer himself at Bayreuth. The impact of these reforms was tremendous, and can be felt in the post-War New Bayreuth of Wieland Wagner, the theatre of Max Reinhardt and the cinema of Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau, Fritz Lang - even Orson Welles.

The dream of a Mahlerian « gesamtkunstwerk » inevitably finds focus in the composer's Symphonies, with more than one person suggesting the 8th, in particular, with its solos, choruses and Faustian narrative, could work as a staged performance.

...

Through Gustav Mahler's tireless and persistent efforts, by the beginning of the 20th Century, the Vienna Court Opera had become the center of Operatic production in Europe. Intendants, stage directors, and designers all flocked to Vienna to study the new staging styles and methods of production. However, the progressive æsthetics of the Court Opera did not achieve its full effectiveness until the final years of Mahler's directorship. 3 productions stood-out as precursors of new scenic styles that would greatly influence future Operatic staging. These were « Tristan und Isolde » (1903) , « Fidelio » (1904) , and, most important, the production of « Don Giovanni » (1905) . Each of these productions was staged by Mahler and his colleague Alfred Roller, a founder of the great art movement, the Secession.

When Mahler took charge of the Vienna Court Opera, in 1897, the state of the scenic arts and stage direction was stagnant and staunchly bound to pictorial realism. Adherence to the past traditions reigned supreme. Franz Gaul, longtime costume designer and director of production (« Chef der Ausstattungswesens ») , attempted to slow Mahler's reforms and was forced into retirement in 1900. Shortly thereafter, Heinrich Lefler, a founding member of « Hagenbund » , another and lesser-known Viennese art movement, was named to the post. Anton Brioschi, the 3rd generation in the dynasty of artists and designers at the Court Opera, remained in his position as scenic designer and painter. Mahler himself would stage some of the new productions. He had great expectations, hoping to push the visual styles of the Court Opera into new, different, and directions. But Mahler continued to be frustrated. Although Lefler initiated some scenic reforms and innovations including a large turntable for the stage, he seemed unable to translate Mahler's unique æsthetic ideas of staging into practice. Indeed, Hugo von Hofmannsthal noted in a letter to Alexander von Zemlinsky, in 1901 :

« I fear that what Mahler is lacking, is the imagination of the eye. He has a poor understanding of the visual genre. »

It was not until 1 year later that Mahler met an artist who understood and shared his views of Operatic production. That artist was Alfred Roller, then President of the Secession and a highly-respected Professor at the School for the Applied Arts (« Kunstgewerbeschule ») , where he taught the techniques of graphic arts.

How did the Secession affect the scenic arts ? Before 1897, the æsthetic values of the Viennese bourgeoisie relating to the visual arts were dominated by the tastes and styles of the Austrian painter Hans Makart and his circle. His paintings espoused historical scenes with the lavish decorative elements, rich and lush colors, muted lighting, and

emphasis placed on the sensual. In this, Makart achieved a superficial form of « Gesamtkunstwerk » . No intellectual stimulus was provided or desired. No literary grounding or any kind of theme was present in Makart's works, « for the viewer need not fathom any further than what actually is present in the image » . The Viennese were content with these values and rigidly opposed change of any kind. These values carried over in the theater, particularly the « Burgtheater » and the Court Opera.

At that time, many younger artists were members of the Society of Austrian Visual Artists (« Genossenschaft der bildenden Künstler Österreichs ») , which owned the only publicly available exhibition space, the « Künstlerhaus » . But many of these artists were restless, for the teaching (chiefly, at the « Akademie der Bildende Künste ») and exhibition authorities were insular, conservative, and locked in the past, and they frowned on change. Nor were they interested in new ideas and movements from other great artistic locales such as Paris, beginning with the Impressionists and continuing with « Art Nouveau » , in Germany with « Jugendstil » , and Scotland with the efforts of Rennie Mackintosh.

At about the same time, Mahler made his debut at the Court Opera, in early 1897, a group of artists including Gustav Klimt, Koloman Moser, Joseph Hoffmann, Carl Moll and Alfred Roller formed an association called the Union of Austrian Visual Artists (« Vereinigung bildender Künstler Österreichs ») . After this group broke away from the « Genossenschaft » , they were known popularly as the Secession. This term was never an official name of the body, but its use was never discouraged, and it served as the name of their exhibition space. As noted in their journal « Ver Sacrum » for which Roller served as editor, the purpose of the Secession was « to assert its break with the fathers. The Secession defined itself as a new Roman " secessio plebis ", in which the plebs, defiantly rejecting the misrule of the patricians (the current authorities) , were withdrawing from the republic (the current visual styles) . »

In that same journal, 4 points of the Secession were elucidated :

To « declare war » on the passive, « same old ruts » , rigid sycophants (i.e. , authority opposing any kind of change) , poor taste, and a break with the past. The break acted as a challenge to the established order, authority, and tradition. The members of the movement were to pledge « themselves to save culture from their elders » .

To appeal for the vigorous support of those who grasp the idea of art as a high mission of culture and as the educational duty of a civilized nation.

To declare that the Secession is not a destructive trend. Neither does it preach for a radical change nor does it dissolve form and color. Works of the old Masters are to be studied and cherished, for art does not preach ; it creates.

To promote not only forms of current Austrian art, but also those from abroad. New forms should be brought to Vienna and made available for examination through regular exhibitions. Through these new works of art, the artistic sensibilities should « awaken the dozing instincts » , that lie within every person, instincts toward beauty and freedom of thoughts and feelings.

Further emphasis was given to the ideal of the unity of art. All forms of art should come together to provide an organic whole, or, broadly put, a « Gesamtkunstwerk » (although this word itself was never used) . One of the primary intentions of the works of the Secession was to create a condition known in German as « Stimmung » , or « atmosphere » , or perhaps even better, « ambience » .

The Secession consequently possessed neither a common artistic aesthetic nor a visual or creative « style » . It was, rather, an agglomeration of ideas and philosophies. Although there were similarities in the expression of the visual form, such as the « curving styles » comparable to « Jugendstil » or « Art Nouveau » , all artists within the Secession had their own concepts, perceptions, and distinct aesthetic identity. They encouraged, nudged, sometimes forced, and often provoked the viewers to think for themselves and « to fill in their own gaps » instead of having everything provided for them.

These ideals were in complete contrast to those governing the scenic arts at the Vienna Court Opera. At that time, the state of the scenic arts was one of stagnation. A series of scenic images provided a locale (sometimes simple, at other times elaborate) for singers who, for the most part, were content to sing from static positions within the settings on the stage. These settings complemented the effect of the « peep show » created by perspective art amid the confines of painted wings, leg drops, borders, and backdrops. In short, a series of « pretty scenes » were presented, none of which required much intellectual thought on the part of the viewer. Instead, only the senses involving the eyes and ears were engaged, and little was left to the imagination. The idea of a true « Gesamtkunstwerk » in performance at the Vienna Court Opera had not yet arrived.

Before Mahler's arrival, the chief scenic designer and painter at the Court Opera was Anton Brioschi who, in 1884, had succeeded his father, Carlo. Although the optical illusion of painted perspective and « trompe-l'œil » was maintained, the productions rarely reflected the dramatic spirit inherent in the action and the music of Opera. Plastic demerits such as steps, palatial stairs, and lamps were occasionally used, as in the grandiose 2nd Act in the 1875 production of Karl Goldmark's « Königin von Saba » . Properties and set decorations were usually painted directly onto the drops and wings. Scenic decoration continued to be just that ; decoration for the stage, a background for the singers.

In this environment, Mahler began to implement his idea of a « Gesamtkunstwerk » into the production of Opera. He firmly believed in the organic unity of the arts in the service of the music. Each aspect of Operatic production (directing, lighting, acting, costuming, singing, or the playing of the orchestra) had its rightful place within the confines of a performance. Mahler sought to focus the attention of the audience on the overall performance of the Opera unfolding on the stage. Merely to view the « pretty settings and costumes » or to hear only the singing of favourite stars was, according to Mahler's intentions, not acceptable.

Early 1902 found Mahler wrestling with proposals for a new production of « Tristan und Isolde » . Sometime before June of that year, Roller drew several sketches and presented them to Mahler at a social encounter. Mahler's reaction was enthusiastic, and he asked Roller to proceed further with more formal designs and stage models. During the summer, Mahler decided to use these designs over those presented by Lefler and Brioschi, which did not break with the more standard practices of the time. The previous settings had been designed and painted by Carlo Brioschi, in

1883. They were modeled after the original production for the 1st performances of the Opera, in 1865, at the Munich Court Theater by Angelo Qualigo. A number of painted sails and hangings created the illusion of a canopy. Another set of decorated curtains upstage served to mask the prow of the ship and to establish a separate space for the great love scene between « Tristan und Isolde ». Roller's designs, depicting 2 scenes in Act I, emphasized an « acting space », as opposed to the past practice in which scenery functioned merely to decorate the stage. While Brioschi's production of « Tristan und Isolde » created the illusion of the scenic space and its contents through the standard practice of painted scenery (drops and flats) , Roller's production never intended a realistic recreation of the deck of a Celtic ship complete with sails, lines, rails. Instead, Roller produced a simple, strong linear that suggested the sailing ship. For the 1st time in the history of staging and scenic practices of the Court Opera, elements of the setting (chiefly colors) were used to create an « atmosphere » (« Stimmung ») that was greatly intensified by stage lighting, which complemented the clearly delineated and plastic settings with massive sails, a sloping deck, and the upstage quarterdeck.

In Act I, for example, intense « daylight » was cast upon the massive red-orange sails. A bright, blue horizon could be seen through the gaps of the curtains. At the stipulated moment in the Act, the sails and curtains were opened, the hidden parts of the ship and the bright sky were revealed. The new production of « Tristan und Isolde » was one of the 1st attempts to incorporate stage lighting as a vital part of the stage picture ; that is, to use lighting to create a dramatic mood, rather than merely to illuminate the settings.

In most of the reviews, the production itself was given great emphasis while the singers and the conducting received only passing mention. A number of reviews centered largely on a discussion of the æsthetic effects generated by Roller's work and the influences of the Secession. In a perceptive, detailed review for the « Hamburger Abendblatt » , Max Graf wrote :

« This new production was designed by Professor Roller, one of the leaders of the Secession. Every brushstroke, every combination of colors calls out the motto of the Secession from the viewer in the " Parkett " to the age its art, to art its freedom. In the history of the modern scenic art, Roller's endeavors deserve a new chapter, for he actually treads a new path. »

Another critic, Max Kalbeck, stated that « each of the Acts appeared to fit the music, was pictorially right, and the decoration carefully shaded, all of which raised the music-drama to a " Gesamtkunstwerk " , such as Wagner must have had in mind. »

Kalbeck further declared that « one could see the music with his eyes » .

In May 1903, Mahler engaged Roller as Director of Production at the Vienna Court Opera, and the process of scenic renewal accelerated. Mahler was greatly pleased with the results and with Roller's speed in implementing changes and reforms in the scenic and directorial arts. Many of the critics, although at first encouraging, were suspicious of change and of the influences of the Secession. In an interview with the Viennese newspaper, « Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt » in September 1903, Mahler, seeking to allay the fears of the critics, discussed his opinions regarding the visual

æsthetics of operatic production :

« I deliberately avoid the use of the words " lighting effects " . We do not need garish effects, but rather lighting, with all its intensities, nuances, and strengths, should be of service to theater. Going only for the crude effect has no artistic value. But lighting alone does not serve its purposes. All modern art must serve the theater, and I say not just the Secession. What matters is the collaborative effort of all arts. It cannot continue with these cliches, for modern art must also extend itself to the costumes, to properties, to everything that can revitalize a work of art. »

In 1904, a new production of « Fidelio » replaced the earlier settings created by Carlo Brioschi, in 1876. In Act I, Brioschi's Prison Courtyard (naturalistic to the extreme) was placed within a castle with a bright city skyline in the background. Roller's production was a complete contrast. He emphasized the use of gray and dark colors, which, together with effective stage lighting, created a dramatic « Stimmung » inherent in the music. The setting was described by Julius Stern in the « Fremdenblatt » :

« Here it is a great surprise, completely different from the previous scene of Rocco's " Stube " and, in any event, far more clever than before. Standing in the background is an immense blue - black wall. At the end of the wall is a low gate and, next to it, an even lower basement window. Above the gate, a mighty stone arch rises-up and below, parallel to the wall, the gateway for the stairs that leads the condemned prisoners of the state to their horrific fate below. »

Writing in the « New Freie Presse » , Julius Korngold referred to Appia's seminal work « Die Musik und die Inszenierung » and noted how important stage lighting had become at the Court Opera :

« For Appia, the artistic power of light stands at the very top of the hierarchy of scenic elements ; therefore, he rightfully preferred the plastic and architectural arrangement of the stage before a painted surface, the decoration. Similar tendencies cannot fail to be recognized in the thoughtful endeavors of Professor Roller. Stage design has been brought forward as an independent artistic participant and appears completely to enter in certain symbolic relationships through the atmospheric elements expressed in the libretto and the music. It was seen in " Tristan " ; those scenes were painted through the music. Now, one wishes to see similarly painted Beethoven music in the new " Fidelio ". »

Roller's next important production was his controversial staging of « Don Giovanni » . This production was the culmination of the Secession's effect upon the scenic arts at the Vienna Court Opera, and represented the 1st true break in the scenic traditions. While « Tristan und Isolde » and « Fidelio » still used aspects of naturalism (albeit stylized) as the basis for Roller's designs, in « Don Giovanni » , they were not used. Instead of being visually specified, they were suggested through spatial arrangements and colors.

The basic configurations of the stage setting for « Don Giovanni » consisted of 4 towers (2 on each side of the stage) and a checkerboard patterned groundcloth which covered the stage floor. Roller dispensed with the traditional principle of wings and borders to create scenic illusion. The towers served as part of a frame, and the borders, with their neutral color, functioned to frame the stage space. The 2 sets of towers were movable only to and from center stage ;

none moved-up, or downstage. Doorways in the towers could be opened or closed. Windows in the upper-part of the towers could serve as balconies. Changes of scenery were rapid. Drops could be flown in or out between the towers. For most scene changes, less than a minute was required behind the drop, so interruptions to the flow of the Opera remained at a minimum. Consequently, the attention of the viewer was uninterrupted and remained completely focused on the unfolding action in the space between the towers. Thus was developed the basic stage setting in the form of a neutral unit set, the 1st ever at the Court Opera and the 1st intended to be used for other Operas as a cost-saving measure.

If we now turn to the graveyard scene in the 2nd Act of « Don Giovanni », Roller's design stands in sharp contrast to the naturalistic scene of a church cemetery as designed by Carlo Brioschi in 1869 for the opening of the newly built Court Opera (and renewed by Anton Brioschi in 1887) . Roller's dramatic design centered on the « Commendatore » on horseback amid the gravestones mounted on the stage floor and on the towers, with great emphasis placed on lighting to provide dramatic intensity ». Bright moonlight streamed into the scene between the towers from the left.

Max Graf described the scene :

« The Commendatore : that is in the cemetery, in which walls and gravestones light-up in the white moonlight, during which the huge cypresses wave to and fro in the background. There stands on a pedestal the mighty statue of a man in armor holding-up a field marshal's baton, and seated on the back of an Andalusian horse. »

« Don Giovanni » became the most famous and best-known of all of Roller's works during his collaboration with Mahler, for the controversy it sparked had ramifications that continue even today.

To describe this production as controversial is an understatement. It was either praised or damned. Maximilian Muntz gave his 1st impressions after the premiere in the morning edition of the « Deutsche Zeitung ». It was a terse notice of a distinctly unhappy timbre, calling the production « preposterous », a « sacrilege », and noting that the performance was a « resounding flop » (« eklatanten Durchfall ») . 2 days later, Muntz expanded his opinions in the feuilleton of the « Deutsche Zeitung ». He called the towers « gray smokestacks », tasteless, and having absolutely nothing to do with Mozart's music. The colors in the lighting were too much :

« One minute violet, another orange-yellow light, gray or half-darkness, but never, ever, in natural daylight. »

He further complained that Mahler had made the musical performance of the Opera subservient to the designer.

The most emotional and biased review against Roller's work was filed by Hans Liebstockl in a sneering tone for the « Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt ». He denounced the settings in all their forms : the towers, colors, drops, and the lighting :

« Scenery ! Scenery ! Bring forth the high towers with holes ! Milkyways ! Glaring red trees ! Mystifying courtyards !

Dark chambers ! Yellow castles ! Lines, comers, contrasts, clashes of colors ! Out with the discordant ingeniousness ! »

Liebstockl railed on that one could never be rid of the towers and that, « Don Juan would, without a doubt, find them in Hell. » . He Further declared that, « These towers have a number of objectives. 1st, they insult the eyes. 2ndly, they are unacoustical, and 3rdly, no one can explain what they mean. » The colors and even the painted groundcloth came under attack :

« Everything is extravagant, all thought out as a surprise. A hateful, clumsy, crude, and horrible thing lies within Roller's glory. »

At the opposite end came the positive review from that great chronicler of the Secession, Ludwig Hevesi. He devoted an entire essay of an astounding one and one-half pages in the « Fremdenblatt » to the production alone. Hevesi wrote that the new production was « of greatest interest for the critical observer of the theatrical art, for conventional realism has been overcome, as every work presses for its own style, its own ambience (« Stimmung ») instead of the purely mediocre waxworks of the past » .

And so, the true break in the scenic traditions was the production of « Don Giovanni » with its use of a unit setting complemented by different backdrops to suggest locales. The audience was compelled to think and view the stage picture from a new and different perspective. The principles of the towers were utilized for productions in the « Burgtheater » of « Hamlet » (1920) and « Macbeth » (1921) .

...

Gustav Mahler plunges into an oblivion of work. Over lunch at his Vienna apartment, on « Auenbruggergasse » , he appoints Alfred Roller head of stage design, starting with « Tristan und Isolde » . Roller sweeps the stage of clutter and presents every scene in a different light, attuning it to time of day and musical « color » . Each Roller setting advances the plot in a way that is at once real and surreal, from an orange-yellow dawn to an empurpled night. Overriding Wagner's directions, he sets Tristan's ship on the diagonal, the better to contrast the captain on deck with Isolde below. The split screen effect accentuates character development.

Up in the lighting turrets, Roller experiments with colored discs and optical aids, graduating the mood shifts. « When King Marke returned to find Isolde in Tristan's arms, it was not the usual idiotic stage dawn that filled the sky but an excruciating greyness that made you shiver » , notes the Graz critic Ernst Décsey. Many of the effects, Mahler tells Décsey, are conceived « over cups of black coffee » . In rehearsal, Anna von Mildenburg resists the innovations. Mahler asks Roller to explain things to her at home ; Mildenburg takes the taciturn professor to bed and proclaims him a genius.

At 7 in the evening on Saturday, February 21st, 1903, with nationalists warning of an anti-Wagner « outrage » , Opera production enters the modern age.

« The mysterious delicacy, the lashing impetuosity of the strings, contrasting storm and calm, are controlled by Mahler as perhaps never before. »

Tristan is sung by tall Erik Schmedes, Isolde by Mildenburg in a Klimt-like costume. Richard Mayr is King Marke ; Hennine Kittel sings Brangane, Isolde's maid.

« Breathless stillness draws the eye to the stage. The curtain divides. The music becomes almost visible, grows plastic in its indescribable perfection, as if transported into another world. »

After the 2nd Act, Mahler collapses with a migraine. « If only someone else could take over » , he moans. His sister Justi, in a misplaced attempt at Jewish humor, tells Alma, « I had him young, you've got him old. » . Mahler returns to a sustained ovation, a roar that does not abate until he breaks his rule and takes a personal bow. The Opera ends just before midnight. In the morning, the Wagnerite Gustav Schönaich from the « Wiener Allgemeine » leads a chorus of praise, endorsing Roller as « a man with a true vocation » . The Brahmsian Max Kalbeck praises the « great graphic harmony » , and Julius Korngold the « painted Tristan music » . Mahler's aim, says Hermann Bahr, is « to remedy the insufficiencies of a single art, which no longer satisfies our increased dramatic demands, with resources from the other arts » . In a Century of motorcars and manned flight, of socialism and psychology, the public will no longer accept static, monolithic stagings. Mahler and Roller have achieved Wagner's alliance of the arts.

Mahler writes after the premiere :

« My dear Herr Roller. How you put me to shame ! For days, I have been wondering how to thank you. And I've come to the conclusion that, instead of trying to put anything into words, I should simply remain silent. I know we are similar in one respect : in our completely unselfish devotion to art, even if we approach it by different roads. And I was also fully aware that you would not think me unappreciative or undiscerning if I did not try to express what you have achieved and what you have come to mean to me. Could you not dine with us on Friday ? »

They go on to reconfigure « Fidelio » , « Falstaff » , « The Flying Dutchman » , « Lohengrin » and the « Ring » , 5 Mozart Operas, and Cluck's « Iphigénie en Aulide » . In 5 years at the Vienna Opera, Mahler establishes a bench-mark of consistency. In the next 5 years, with Roller, he creates an æsthetic that places Vienna in the vanguard of modernism. Where Paris embraces abstract art, Vienna drives fusion and fission across all the arts. Klimt, Moll, and Roller quit the Secession as a thing of the past. Hoffmann and Moser found the « Wiener Werkstätte » . Arnold Schönberg breaks through to atonality. Hugo von Hofmannsthal versifies « Elektra » 's taboo love ; Arthur Schnitzler's text for « Reigm » (« la Ronde ») is banned ; Theodor Herzl's early death triggers a Schnitzler novel, « Der Weg ins Freie » , about a composer facing Viennese anti-Semitism. All these sparks and more fly-out of and around the Mahler-Roller collaboration.

Roller provides some of the clearest glimpses of Mahler, at work and at play. He tells the designer after a rehearsal tantrum :

« Please don't think I was really angry, being fierce is the only weapon I have for keeping order. »

Roller visits Mahler at the lakeside and observes him in the nude, he writes :

« In the course of my profession, I have seen a great many naked bodies of all types and I can testify that, at the age of 40 (44) , Mahler had the perfect male torso, strong, slim, beautifully made. His lips were classically shaped and their immediate area had that multiplicity of detail which is produced by the habit of very carefully articulated speech. They were thin and, when he was wearing his customary sober expression, usually closed. It was only when he was listening intently that they stayed slightly open. But if Mahler was disgruntled, angry or out of sorts, he would pull his mouth out of shape, taking half his lower lip between his teeth, wrinkling his brow and tightening the folds of his nose. Pulled about like this, his face took on such a distorted grimace that he really did become " the nasty Mahler ". »

He defines Mahler as « a combination of robust goodwill and triumph over adversity » , and he detects « Christ-like » qualities in this infinitely modest » Jew. They are as close to each other as 2 partners in art can be, sharing the same ideals and, at different times, the same lover. But art is short and life is long, and when the wind changes, Roller swears fealty to another leader.

On May 8, 1906, a teenager from Linz cadges a ticket and squeezes into the standing section to see Mahler conduct « Tristan und Isolde » . He returns a year later, hoping to study with Roller, but he is too timid to knock at his door with a letter of introduction. In February 1934, Adolf Hitler summons Roller to his Chancellery to regret his callow shyness and reminisce about that revelatory « Tristan und Isolde » , recalling every last detail :

« In the 2nd act, the tower to the left, with the pale light. »

Neither man mentions Mahler, who is being written-out of the record. Roller accepts a commission to stage « Parsifal » at Hitler's Bayreuth.

Casting of the carapace : Mahler and Roller

Although Bayreuth's idea of authenticity was occasionally questioned in the 2 decades following the composer's death, it was not until 1903 that a new philosophy of Wagner performance was given a practical trial in a major theatre. Its instigator was no stern critic of Bayreuth but a composer generally reckoned to have been the supreme Wagner conductor of his generation. That man was Gustav Mahler. His production at the Vienna Court Opera of « Tristan und Isolde » with designs by Alfred Roller marks the moment of liberation from the stranglehold of 19th Century orthodoxy. It opened-up a new era in which it was seen that new solutions to old performance problems could reveal previously unsuspected layers of meaning. Thus was born the idea that there could be such a thing in an Opera House as the valid, creative interpretation of a Masterwork. What lent particular authority to this development was that it was driven not by a professional stage director but by a man who, like Wagner, was a great composer and conductor. The radical departure came not from scenic considerations but from concern that the production should spring from

the score. There was, in truth, nothing in this notion that could not have been sanctioned by Wagner's own ideas and hopes for his works. The seeds had been planted by the composer but their germination had to be tended by his inheritors.

Gustav Mahler had first visited Bayreuth as a 23 year old student, in 1883. In the years that followed, he often returned, becoming well-known to Cosima and his son Siegfried, who were fully aware of his formidable reputation as a Wagner conductor, in Budapest as director of the Royal Hungarian Opera, 1888-1891, and as music director at Hamburg, 1891-1897. In Budapest, he gave the first performances in Hungarian of « Das Rheingold » and « Die Walküre » , while in his first season at Hamburg, there were more Wagner performances (64) than in any other house (Berlin, 50 ; Dresden, 49 ; Leipzig, 38) . But anti-Semitic prejudice deterred the Wagners from ever inviting him to conduct in the « Festspielhaus » . Cosima, supporting Felix Mottl's candidature, also opposed the confirmation of his appointment as director of the Vienna Opera, in October 1897. Not that this prevented her from soliciting the composer to perform her son's Operas there. Siegfried's first Opera, « Der Bärenhäuter » , was duly given in Vienna, in 1899, by Mahler, who, while insisting on cuts to improve the work, appears to have generally thought well of it. But despite Cosima's tireless advocacy, Mahler did not perform any of Siegfried's other Operas.

Bayreuth's rejection of Mahler was, in the end, no loss but its own, nor could Mahler's own fierce integrity and independence ever have been at home in such an authoritarian atmosphere. New thought about the performance of Wagner's works had perforce to come to be realized elsewhere. Yet, the irony is that Mahler was a stage reformer in Wagner's own mould. He subscribed to every tenet of his theatrical reforms and his ideas about the theatre and the performance of Opera - the coordination of words, music and every element in the scenic presentation. But where Wagner had concentrated on the production of his works, leaving their conducting to associates, Mahler's first avocation was to conduct them. His supervision of all aspects of the singers' performances became necessary for him when, like Wagner, he saw that the dramatist's intentions would otherwise be betrayed.

At the Budapest Opera, Mahler's domination of every part of a production was remarked by Count Albert Apponyi :

« He governs with sovereign authority the stage, the action, the movements of the soloists and the chorus ; so that a performance rehearsed and produced by him is in every way artistically complete. His eye extends over the entire production, the scenery, the machinery, the lights. »

Cosima Wagner herself had nothing but praise for Mahler's exceptional ability as a « répétiteur » . While he was still at Hamburg, she asked him to coach the tenor Willy Birrenkoven (a member of the Hamburg company) in the role of « Parsifal » , for which Bayreuth had engaged him, in 1894.

Mahler wrote to his distinguished physicist friend Arnold Berliner :

« Birrenkoven is causing a stir in Bayreuth : Cosima and the others having no need to rehearse him further. By the way, he is singing in the opening performance, not Van Dyck ! »

Cosima was no less pleased with Mahler's coaching of Anna von Mildenburg for the role of Kundry at Bayreuth, in 1897. While Mahler's direction of their expression and movement was valued by most of his leading singers, his concern for every detail of stage business was not always welcome backstage. During Mahler's time at Hamburg, his efforts were resisted all along the line by the chief stage director, Franz Bittong.

Mahler always sought to emulate Wagner's programme for the reform of theatre management and practice - major decisions made by artists rather than State functionaries, adequate rehearsal time, and so on. This was uphill work, especially at a prominent house like the Vienna Court Opera with its political pressures and repertory system (in Mahler's 1st season, he conducted 111 performances of 23 Operas) . Mahler quickly moved to bar latecomers from taking their seats once the music had started and darkened the auditorium. In the pit, he changed the seating so that the conductor was no longer in the middle of the band but at the very front, with the audience behind him and all the players in front of him. He had, for some time, wanted to lower the Orchestra pit for Wagner performances, intending that its level would henceforth be adjustable. Emboldened by the success of « Tristan », in 1903, he proceeded, against considerable opposition, to carry-out his plan.

His intention had been to lower the pit by 1.5 metres, but when that was thwarted by technical difficulties, he settled for 50 centimetres and, at the same time, enlarged its area from 47 to 59 square metres His defence of his actions in an interview, published on 6 September 1903, shows how well he understood the rationale behind the sunken pit at Bayreuth :

« The plans were designed so that the floor of the pit could be lowered or raised hydraulically, according to the needs of the work performed. Thus, I would put the Orchestra at the lowest possible level for certain of Wagner's works, but would keep the small Mozart Orchestra at a normal height, and so on, as suits the work in question and is suggested by constant observation. There are strong arguments for the practice of placing the Wagner Orchestra as low as possible : in some of his works, the Orchestra is meant to sound as from a nebulous distance ; in this way, too, the singers' voices can stand-out effectively. To be sure, some passages of Wagner I can imagine better with a completely open Orchestra - for instance, the Prelude to the 3rd Act of " Lohengrin ". But all in all, the public should gladly welcome the lowering of the pit for the Wagner Orchestra. For, I think, it cannot be very pleasant during an orchestral storm for the people in the stalls to hear the cymbals above anything else, until they feel like stopping up their ears. All this will be changed once the music comes-up from a great depth. »

In a 2nd interview, 3 days later, he declared his belief that the Orchestra was « no longer a unit which functions independently and need pay no attention to what is going on in the rest of the theatre. The Orchestra must serve the theatre in the same way as the other factors, such as the lighting, the full effect of which, on the stage, we still do not know ? » Mahler went on to argue that the light-spill from the musicians' stands in the pit was an undesirable distraction and spoilt the artistic effect of the stage lighting. He did not win his battle in a single round, but the eventual installation of hydraulic machinery, in 1904-1905 (Mahler had wanted this all along) , made it on 7 November 1901 that Mahler 1st met the 22 year old Alma and, within months, they were married (9 March 1902) . The director of the Imperial Opera was plunged into the very centre of the new movement in art. Its leading practitioners, most particularly Carl Moll, Gustav Klimt, Alfred Roller and Kolo Moser, « vied with one another

to be his teacher » . For his part, Mahler had much to offer the Secessionists, not least in that their programme sought to dissolve boundaries between the arts. A central part of the Secessionist aesthetic was that its exhibitions were not just pictures hung on walls but « total works of art » (« Gesamtkunstwerke ») in which the boldly geometric « Kunsttempel » (designed by Josef Olbrich after a sketch by Klimt and completed in 1898) , the exhibits displayed within it, music and on occasion other events all had their part to play. The 14th Secession Exhibition (April - June 1902) was focused on Max Klinger's monumental new Beethoven sculpture, which was set in a shrine-like enclosure by Alfred Roller with an allegorical frieze about the composer by Klimt as a supporting commentary. Mahler was invited to collaborate and at the opening of the exhibition conducted his own arrangement for 6 trombones of a passage from the choral movement of the 9th Symphony.

What the Secession had to offer Mahler was exactly what he had been searching for - a wholly new approach to the scenic dimension of Opera production. While wishing to dispense with the pictorial literalism of the late- 19th Century, Mahler had so far lacked a collaborator who could help him effect on the deeply conservative Operatic stage a comparable revolution to that already under way in the conventional theatre. He had achieved something in this direction from 1900, when he had appointed Heinrich Lefler (a painter trained at the Academy) as head of scenic design at the Opera. Lefler quickly made a name for himself by attempting to eliminate painted flats and non-functional props, earning himself the appellation « Raumschöpfer » , or space creator. But it was not until Mahler met Roller (probably, early in 1902) that he encountered a vision of how to use that space which he could fully share.

By extraordinary coincidence, Roller, who had, for some time, interested himself in scenic design, had only recently discovered « Tristan » in traditional style performances under Mahler's baton at the Opera. He had hated the settings and been fired to make sketches of his own which he quickly showed to Mahler. So impressed was the conductor that, recognizing the « true visual expression' of the Wagnerian drama, and despite Roller's total lack of stage experience, he swiftly commissioned him to design new sets for « Tristan » . For Roller, this proved to be as decisive a turning point as it was for Mahler and, indeed, for the future course of Opera production, generally.

The artists of the Secession had highly-distinctive talents and Roller was no exception. They were united in turning their backs on the old academies in the cause of internationalism, of eliminating barriers between pure and applied art and of proclaiming the freedom of the artist to realize his own vision independently of that of « society » and the wealthy patron. Thus, the Secession invited artists from all over Europe to contribute to its exhibitions. These artists included, from France, Puvis de Chavannes, Degas, Pissarro, Renoir, Rodin, Seurat, Signac and Vallotton ; from Germany, Max Klinger, Hans Thoma and members of the Munich Secession ; from Switzerland, Ferdinand Hodler ; from Norway, Edvard Munch ; from Belgium, Henri van de Velde ; and from Italy, Giovanni Segantini. Also shown were Japanese and Russian artists and the Scottish artists Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Margaret Macdonald and Herbert and Frances MacNair (the « Glasgow 4 ») , to whom a whole « Scottish Room » was devoted at the 8th Exhibition in November - December 1900. The uncluttered, elegant spatial layout of this room influenced Roller's designs for the next exhibition and doubtless his approach to stage design.

Born in Moravia, in 1864, Alfred Roller studied painting at the Vienna Academy with Eduard Lichtenfels and Christian Griepenkerl, drawing much inspiration from visits to Venice and Ravenna. A founder-member of the Secession, he

became a co-editor of its journal, « Ver Sacrum » , in 1898, taught at the « Kunstgewerbschule » (School for Applied Arts) , from 1900, and replaced Carl Moll as president of the Secession, in 1902. Roller's graphic skills were much in evidence in the pages of « Ver Sacrum » and in posters for the Secession. With hindsight, one can see his huge mural painting « Sinkende Nacht » (Nightfall) for the Klinger exhibition, in April - May 1902, as very possibly inspired by the « O sink hernieder, Nacht der Liebe » love duet in the 2nd Act of « Tristan » and, thus, an anticipation of the stage designs he was shortly to prepare for Mahler. This mural was on the wall behind and above the huge enthroned Beethoven. On the opposite wall was a complementary depiction of « Der werdende Tag » (Day-break) by Adolf Böhm.

Roller found his liberation from the dictates of academy painting in the sinuous fantasy of line, colour and tone (the style being more important than the « faithful » depiction of a subject) and, in an interest in spatial arrangement which quickly showed itself in the exhibition settings, he designed for the Secession (that for the 9th Exhibition, in 1901, being particularly striking in its dramatic use of space and light to display paintings by Segantini, sculptures by Rodin and other works) . It was to be but a short step from here to his discovery of a new medium in the 3 dimensional arena of the stage. The persistence of 19th Century pictorial realism on the Operatic stage was indeed an urgent case for the liberation æsthetics of a Secessionist. We have seen how avant-garde theatre had been using artists as agents of scenic reform for more than a decade. Roller was the 1st artist of independent standing to succeed in doing the same for the Operatic stage. Just as Paul von Joukowsky had, with « Parsifal » , pointed Wagner in a new scenic direction, so Roller, working with a conductor who was also a composer of genius, provided a spring-board for escape from the tired visual æsthetic that was still prevalent.

Roller and Mahler's common point of departure was the elimination of anything visual that did not relate to their understanding of the music as the core of the drama. Mahler, Roller later recalled, « had the utmost contempt for mere outward show on the stage, for any purely decorative detail, however brilliant and dazzling, that did not arise inevitably from the total conception » . Himself a Master of « decorative detail » , Roller discovered an almost moral vocation in subjugating his decorative prowess to serve their joint ambition of a wholly unified stage production. This did not mean the rejection of pictorial imagery but rather its re-creation in spatial terms. The stage, said Roller, dealt not with « pictures » but with « space » . In his pursuit of this, he would have found inspiration and support in the work of the architects most closely associated with the Secession, especially Otto Wagner and his pupil Josef Olbrich. Kurt Blaukopf even ventures the view that Roller translated Otto Wagner's « architecture into scenic principles » .

The Romantic realism of the Vienna Opera's scenic style created by Carlo Brioschi up to 1886 and, thereafter, by his son Anton was to be superseded by simpler images. All the scenic essentials specified by Wagner would still be there, but in stylized form. Roller later recalled that Mahler had welcomed « a stage on which everything is only intimated » . The aim would no longer be the creation of a peep-show illusion but of a functional stage space inhabited by the performers.

Many of these ideas had long been advocated by Adolphe Appia (including the notion that the 19th Century « stage of illusion » , or « Illusionsbühne » , had to be replaced by a new « Andeutungsbühne » , meaning a stage on which things should be suggested rather than shown) and were published by him in German, in 1899, as « Die Musik und die Inszenierung » . This would almost certainly have been known to Mahler and to Roller. 3 substantial extracts from

the book were published in the « Wiener Rundschau » (15 December 1900) under the title, « Das Licht und die Inszenierung, von Adolphe Appia, Rom » . Henry-Louis de La Grange argues that Roller's own articles testify that he was acquainted with Appia's writings. He also cites an unpublished letter of Mahler's (10 July 1899) which he believes may have been written to Appia and whose contents suggest that, « Mahler also knew his writings and put some of his ideas into use in his own theatrical work » .

Both Roller and Mahler were set on using the latest technology in order to paint the stage with light rather than pigment. The Opera's lighting installation, dating from 1887, was therefore improved during the « Tristan » rehearsals. Light became a principal agent in the search for a visual stylization and for symbols which, in activating the audience's imagination, would deepen the musicality of its response. The dominant colour of a scene or of an entire Act could determine its character, mood and atmosphere and its significance within the dramatic structure of the whole. The key to everything was Wagner's music, not his visual taste. Mahler's 1st principle was constant : « It's all in the score. » (« Steht alles in der Partitur. ») But however much he was indebted to the libertarian thrust of the Secessionists, Mahler was wary of the least whiff of theatrical theory or of anything doctrinaire. He did not want to hear his productions described as « Secessionist » but simply as serving their composers faithfully. Thus, in September 1903, he is quoted as saying :

« We want to make the light serve the theatre in all its grades, nuances and degrees of strength. But the matter does not end with the lighting ; the whole of modern art has a part to play on the stage. Modern art, I say, not the Secession. What matters is the conjunction of all the arts. There is no future in the old standard clichés ; modern art must extend to costumes, props, everything that can revitalise a work of art. »

This was very much what Siegfried Wagner professed for Bayreuth, in 1907, the difference being that Mahler put it into practice in Vienna, in 1903-1907, whereas Siegfried's lip-service did not begin to be translated tentatively into action at Bayreuth until the « Tristan » of 1927.

The 1st fruit of the Mahler-Roller partnership was the « Tristan und Isolde » which opened on 21 February 1903. Such was its success that Mahler appointed Roller his « Leiter des Ausstattungswesens » (head of stage design) in place of Heinrich Lefler (who went to the « Burgtheater ») . Together, they went on to give new or redesigned productions of « Fidelio » (1904) , « Rheingold » (1905) , « Così fan tutte » (1905) , « Don Giovanni » (1905) , « Die Entführung » (1906) , « Lohengrin » (1906) , « Figaro » (1906) , « Die Zauberflöte » (1906) , « Die Walküre » (1907) and « Iphigénie en Aulide » (1907) . The partnership was curtailed only by Mahler's resignation, in response to intolerable pressures at the Opera, and his departure for America, in December 1907. Roller himself continued to work with Mahler's successor, Felix Weingartner, completing the « Ring » , in 1909, but he felt the loss of the wholehearted support he had had from Mahler and resigned that same year. Not all the Mahler-Roller productions were equally successful but, together, they amounted to a revolution in the staging of Opera - and this in merely 4 years !

« Tristan und Isolde » , Vienna 1903 : « Wie hör' ich das Licht ! »

From the surviving pictures, it is not immediately apparent why Mahler's « Tristan » production struck its

contemporaries as so extraordinary. Roller's settings provided every pictorial image specified by Wagner, creating credible locations on board ship, in the garden of a palace at night and at Tristan's castle, in Kareol. What surprised audiences was that these settings made no attempt to be a simulacrum of the composer's 1865 production, or even of Cosima's later Bayreuth staging of 1886. It was the 1st time that a stage of international renown, rather than copying the authorized version, had gone back to Wagner's score and created its own new images from it. Just as Mahler had made his own interpretation of the score, so Roller made his of the stage directions.

He slewed the deck of the ship round at a slight angle. This became fully apparent only when the great sails curtaining off Isolde's quarters were pulled aside to reveal that these quarters were a kind of rear stowage underneath the upper stern deck on which Tristan was stationed at the helm. The stem itself and starboard side of the vessel were screened from view by a huge hanging sail and by the left side of the proscenium. The sea and horizon were visible only above the gunwhale on the right. And it was at this side that steps led up to the higher deck. This brilliantly simple device was as symbolically apt (the upper, light deck for Tristan, the lower, claustrophobic, dark quarters for Isolde) as it was dramatically effective. Tristan and Kurwenal could without any artifice be visible to the audience while totally out of sight of Isolde and Brangäne. Similarly, the scandal of the lovers' embrace was intensified by its being observed by the sailors, themselves unseen at the rail of the upper-deck.

At the end of the Act, sails and awnings were hoisted-up and away to herald Marke's arrival, the king's red banner flapping against a bright blue sky while a brilliant carpet for his welcome snaked-out as an intrusive gash across the fore-stage at the feet of Tristan and Isolde. In the 2nd and 3rd Acts, the significant innovations were the « built » solidity of the masonry (stone terraces, tower and steps for the castle at Kareol) and a drastic pruning of the customary foliage. The overall effect was, at least from a modern viewpoint, to make the settings more rather than less realistically credible ! There was the merest hint of Secession style in the black-and-white chequered paving of the terrace in Act 2.

But what everyone was talking about was not the scenery but the way it was lit. It was Roller's new-found skill in painting with light that was the major breakthrough. For him, this was a natural development of an interest in the effects of changing light that had already been demonstrated in a series of paintings of a single landscape view in different seasons and at different times of day that he had shown at the Secession exhibition in 1900. There could scarcely have been a better 1st stage subject for Roller than an Opera ruled so pervasively by the symbolism of Day and Night. For at least one member of the audience, « the way the stage looked said literally what the work was about » .

Quite how Roller, totally unschooled in stage technology, learnt how to manipulate the lights we do not yet know, but the results were sensational.

Emil Lucka said :

« Untiringly, he carried-out his tests, moving from the stage to the stalls, from the stalls to the gallery, experimenting with screens, coloured discs, light-intensities, altering, improving, dealing in nuances. »

Roller was among the very 1st practitioners of « Lichtregie », the use of the lighting console as a principal agent in the staging of Opera. Among his many discoveries was the dynamic use of light in every grade of intensity, including crescendos and decrescendos between dark and light. This was the more effective because light could be thrown not onto the usual pictorial painted backdrop, hangings and flats but onto a plain cyclorama, this being among its earliest recorded uses on the stage of the Vienna Opera.

Egon Wellesz wrote :

« The gradual brightening of the stage (at the beginning of Acts in the later " Ring " production) produced the most impressive effect. »

The low levels of intensity to which, when dramatically appropriate, Roller was prepared to reduce the lighting (as in Act 2 of « Tristan ») were much complained about, the general custom being a relatively high and constant level of illumination.

Others, like Wellesz, were enthusiastic :

« Everything that was done had reason and meaning, always serving only to heighten the dramatic effect. »

What was particularly striking was Roller's use of colour symbolism - an almost garish orange-yellow tonality for the hateful realm of Day in Act 1 (thus prefiguring the same idea in Siegfried Wagner's production of 1927) , a deep violet velvety darkness for Act 2 and, for the long reckoning of Act 3, a dull autumnal grey. In the 2nd Act, the sky was alive with a thousand stars.

« Out of the Prelude, the blue night rose mysterious and this night was not the hitherto invariable, obvious, static picture, but breathed and trembled like the orchestra, the garden came alive around the lovers, getting darker or lighter with straying moonbeams and drifting shadows. »

Towards the end of the Act, when Marke breaks in on the lovers, « it was not the usual idiotic stage dawn that filled the sky but an excruciating greyness that made you shiver at the very sight of it » .

...

(Photos) What most surprised the audience about the production of « Tristan » at the Vienna Opera by conductor-director Gustav Mahler, in 1903, was that, quite exceptionally, it made no attempt to copy either Wagner's or Cosima's stagings of the work. Mahler and the artist Alfred Roller re-imagined Act 1 with the brilliantly practical and symbolic layout of a light upper-deck for Tristan and claustrophobic quarters for Isolde immediately beneath it. This photo of the 1944 wartime revival in Vienna shows that it was uncannily faithful to Roller's original design.

Mahler worked as intensively with his singers as Wagner did. Erik Schmedes, the remarkably youthful looking Tristan, in 1903, is at the helm in Act I with the bearded Friedrich Weidemann as Kurwenal. Contemporary paintings of Anna von Mildenburg as Isolde show her in a richly gilded Klimt-like costume. This may have been rejected for the distinctly less flattering dress worn by her in this uncomfortable photograph, also from 1903.

...

For Julius Korngold (father of Erich Wolfgang Korngold and Eduard Hanslick's successor as critic for the « Neue Freie Presse ») , Roller's designs for the 3rd Act were « painted Tristan music » , the colours suggesting « weariness, illness, ruin, and imminent death » . At the end of the Act, Tristan and Isolde's « final metamorphosis and apotheosis were suggested by light effects which transformed even the neutral colours of the costumes » .

Those costumes were also Roller's work. (Roller was, at Mahler's express instruction, the 1st head of stage design to be entrusted with scenery, costumes and lighting, responsibilities formerly divided between 3 people.) While his costumes were for the most part of sober practicality, a Klimt-like passion for kaleidoscopic geometric patterning broke-out in the decoration of Isolde's dress in Act I, injecting a note of fashionable modernity. The Secession's love-affair with abstract patterning and ornamentation was also on display in the design of Isolde's travelling chests, couch and other furniture. Mahler's direction of the action was dictated solely by the music and the psychology of the situation - that is, by the intuition that, as Thomas Mann put it, Wagner was a pioneer practitioner of depth-psychology through music. Tristan did not offer his sword to Isolde for her to kill him but held its point at his chest ready for her to plunge it in.

The interrelationship between the music and the « mise-en-scène » (which had of course always been Mahler and Roller's goal) won high praise, as from Egon Wellesz :

« I am thinking of the warm rusty brown colour of the sail, like those used even nowadays by the fishermen of Chioggia, which stretched over the entire stage ; the sombrely glowing colour of the sail seemed to reflect so perfectly the mood of the music. It is hard to begin to describe how enraptured we were. Then, in the 2nd Act, came the blue, starlit night, changing at the end into a deathly pale morning and, in the 3rd Act, the huge linden tree under which the wounded Tristan lay. A barren, desolate landscape just as in the music. Behind the low rampart, one imagined the sea. Never had a scene made such a profound impression on me. »

The « Tristan » was a huge and immediate success. Dissenting voices were in the minority. Roller was variously reproached for imperfect sightlines, for failing to integrate the singers into the settings, for creating too much visual beauty and for « his orgies of darkness » . The critic Robert Hirschfeld complained that the « subtle pantomime » of Anna von Mildenburg as Isolde went for nothing because of what he considered to be the prevalent gloom. Siegfried Wagner, attending the premiere on 21 February, also moaned about the lighting, later giving Ernst Décsey the predictable Bayreuth line :

« My father mounted the production of " Tristan " himself in Munich, so I'm afraid that's it and that's how it will

have to stay. »

The singers were mostly well received and the praise for Mahler's conducting was universal.

The wider significance of the production as a « total work of art » was recognized by the more perceptive critics. With characteristically broad sweep, Hermann Bahr wrote that :

« Reinhardt's aim, the same that Richard Wagner and later Appia, the young Fortuny, Olbrich and Kolo Moser cherished, has now been fulfilled, for the 1st time, by Mahler and Roller in " Tristan " and " Fidelio ". That aim is to remedy the insufficiencies of a single art, which no longer satisfies our increased dramatic demands, with resources from the other arts. »

Max Graf, doubtless tuning in somewhat overhastily to the impact of the 16th Secessionist Exhibition (17 January to 28 February 1903, and thus concurrent with the « Tristan » premiere) , which had been devoted to introducing the French Impressionists to the Viennese public, also drew attention to modern art's contribution to the « Gesamtkunstwerk » :

« The nervous colour-Romanticism of the modems now prevails in the new Tristan sets by Alfred Roller. Light and air are called upon to make music along with the Wagner Orchestra. For the 1st time, Impressionist arts appear on the Operatic stage. The composer extends his hand to the painter. What would the Master himself have said of the art of light and colour displayed in this Impressionistic " Tristan " ? »

Graf's conclusion was that Wagner might have been astonished that his vision had inspired such an imaginative response from the world of art but also shocked that the artist appeared to be wishing to prevail in his own right. While entirely mistaken as to Roller's ambition, Graf's review does point-up just how iconoclastic Roller's scenic work was generally considered to be. The idea that a stage-designer could make an original contribution to the performance of an Opera was revolutionary, and was immediately recognized as such.

Having discovered his scenic collaborator, Mahler went on to apply the Wagnerian principle of a totally unified production with the music as the ruling element to everything he performed. There was, however, one highly-important variation, in that Mahler sought always to find optimum conditions for each and every Opera on its own terms. In Roller's words :

« Each work of art carries within itself the key to its own production. »

Thus, for Mozart, who, together with Wagner, was the principal focus of Mahler's attention, he was, in Egon Wellesz's recollection :

« The 1st to rediscover the sound of the Mozart Orchestra at a time when the full sonority of the Wagner Orchestra was regarded as the ideal. He performed Mozart's Operas with a small body of strings, accompanying the recitatives on

a harpsichord attached to the conductor's desk. »

Roller described how Mahler agreed to his designs for « Don Giovanni » (21 December 1905) only « after long reflection had convinced him of their relevance to the work's musical shape ». The novelty was the square towers at either side of the stage, towards the front, which remained throughout the Opera and « between which the various changes of scenery took place ». (The idea of using 2 permanent towers just behind the proscenium frame was mooted in Georg Fuchs's writings and was also put into practice at the Munich « Künstlertheater » from 1908.) They framed the action and had adjustable elements, so they could serve as parts of Donna Anna's house, a street scene, Don Giovanni's palace, a cemetery, a banqueting room, and so on. The towers were Roller's solution to the perennial problem in « Don Giovanni » of effecting a large number of scene changes fast enough to avoid undesirable breaks in the music. It was doubtless this above all else which sold the idea to Mahler. Thus, the Operatic debut of a set with permanent (though also changeable) features. It was the bold, functional stylization which made the greatest impression on contemporaries, the presence on the stage of items which were not part of a complete pictorial depiction but were, as on the Shakespearean stage, whatever the particular scene required them to be. This invention of the idea of a unifying, multi-purpose, non-naturalistic scenic artefact capable of symbolizing the drama as a whole was to have a huge influence on Mahler and Roller's successors in 20th Century stage production.

Ist steps to a new « Ring » , Vienna (1905-1907)

When they turned from « Tristan » to the « Ring » , Mahler and Roller encountered a rather different set of problems. Their solutions show how difficult it was to hold the centre ground between stage realism and stylization in pursuit of the psychological development of the drama. Ever since his Prague and Budapest days, Mahler had dreamt of creating his own « Ring » production - in Vienna he had inherited the Opera's original staging which had remained virtually unchanged since its creation, in 1877-1879. Sketches in the Theatre Collection of the Austrian National Library show that Roller went on almost immediately after « Tristan » to plan for a new « Ring » . He imagined the 2nd scene of « Rheingold » as a verdant open space, rocky outcrops at right, under a huge greeny skyscape with soft mauve-pink clouds. Further studies from 1904 show a Rhinedaughter with a mermaid's tail and Nibelheim with waves of bluey light and flames flaring in the background. Roller's 1st sketches for a project were soft-focus, almost Romantic, experimenting with colour, light and atmosphere. As his ideas developed the designs became more severe and architectural.

The working sketches and their realization in the finished productions of « Das Rheingold » (23 January 1905) and « Die Walküre » (4 February 1907) show, on the one hand, Roller the painter wanting to re-create nature in the theatre and, on the other, Roller the stage-designer seeking simplification and visual drama. Like Wagner, Roller was a man of the mountains. On his holiday climbs in the Dolomites, he had discovered the milieu juste for the « Ring » 's untamed landscapes. He put it on stage quite specifically for the 2nd Act of « Walküre » (the model almost certainly being the precipitous Val de Mezdi, in the heart of the Sella massif) . The profile of the Valkyrie rock in the 3rd Act may well have been taken from the same locale and bears a resemblance, if reversed from left to right, to a design by Adolphe Appia which had been published in 1899 in « Die Musik und die Inszenierung » .

For « Rheingold » , Roller's vision was of nature before the Fall. He sought to evoke this by dressing the Rhinedaughters as mermaids, their tails covered with greenish scales, and putting garlands in Erda's floor-length tresses. The mountain-top space, also Dolomite inspired, rose in levels punctuated by banks of Alpine flowers and framed between pines and giant boulders. Nibelheim was a pitch-black cavern, filled with suppurating vapours. Roller was on less certain ground in his response to the scenic transformations so powerfully depicted in the music and to the troublesome magical effects. His attempts at such scenes as those of the swimming Rhinedaughters (awkwardly suspended in basketwork cages) and the riding Valkyries (juvenile doubles on « papier-mâché » horses, the Valkyries themselves entering on foot from the wings, though this was cleverly managed so that they seemed to be materializing from a stormy cloudscape) did not begin to measure-up to Bayreuth's solutions. Despite the installation of a huge double revolve (2 discs, each 11 metres in diameter, placed side-by-side) , the scene changes to and from Nibelheim could only be managed behind curtains.

One of Roller's criteria was to eliminate anything likely to come across as puerile or risible. Hence Alberich's transformations into giant snake and then toad were masked in a gloom of vapour and black velvet drapes, while the previous wooden « rainbow bridge » was abandoned altogether (as the curtain fell, the gods were moving slowly towards the landfall of an optical rainbow projection) . Like Wagner's movement director Richard Fricke, Roller believed that it was always better to appeal to the imagination rather than risk offence to the intellect. Roller's strongest suit, however, was once again as an artist painting with light.

Julius Korngold wrote :

« The lights swathe the gods in brilliance and serenity ; they leave them wallowing in murky mists. The movement on the stage is frozen, as it were, into a series of pictures which are then, however, inverted with a truly inner movement by the magical changes of lighting. The final communion between stage and music is established by Mahler's art. It is he who gives light to the Orchestra. The element of tone painting, which in " Rheingold " predominates over emotional expression, is completely fused with the paintings on the stage. »

Inevitably, there were complaints about the « orgies of darkness » as also about inappropriate « Symphonies of colour » . But it is clear that although very low levels of illumination played their part in obscuring events better left to the mind's eye, Roller's intentions were always naturalistic and dramatic. In Nibelheim, the only palpable illumination was the glow from Mime's forges, in Hunding's hut from the hearth and from a single torch on the left-hand wall. Roller re-sited the door (just as Siegfried Wagner was to do at Bayreuth, in 1928) so that the moonlight streamed in diagonally, and it was only at that moment that there was sufficient light for the facial similarity of the twins to be apparent. In the 2nd Act of « Walküre » , the light falling on Wotan, seemingly pinioned to the rocks like Prometheus, became progressively greyer through the course of the great doomsday monologue. At the end of the Act, the combatants became visible only at their emergence as silhouettes high up at the back of the stage.

Otto Klemperer said :

« It was indescribable, Mahler, who was his own producer, ruled over everything. I had never seen the close of the

2nd Act presented so lucidly on the stage. »

In the 3rd Act, the soaring flames struck by Loge from the rocks around the sleeping Brünnhilde died down into a glow around the horizon, revealing a star-spangled sky of deepest blue above.

Much of the criticism of the low levels of lighting was on the grounds that the singers' expressions and gestures went for nothing, and it was supported not unreasonably by the argument that Wagner himself had always insisted on clarity of communication between performers and audience. This was the only point of disagreement between Roller and Anna von Mildenburg (Brünnhilde) who, otherwise, responded gallantly (if not fearlessly !) to the obstacle course presented by the solidly built sets, especially the rocky ravine of the 2nd Act of « Walküre » , where there was scarcely a level place and where footholds were few and far between. Mildenburg describes herself leaping from rock to rock like a true flying Brünnhilde (the costume had the benefit of being equipped with a pair of white wings) . But there was no question that some of Roller's sets gave unprecedented restriction to the singers' movement, particularly as scenery did not yet generally make athletic demands on them. There were press complaints about « tableaux vivants » with the singers as figurines. Cometh the veritable rocky gorge, cometh the need for the veritable mountain goat ! If most accounts praised Roller's conciliation of realism and stylization, this was tempered with reservation that the human element had to some extent been subordinated to the decorative. For all the efforts, Mahler must have made, and for all the power and artistry of the vocal performances, characterization and acting came across less strongly than the sheerly visual drama. The problem of the actor's integration into the setting remained imperfectly solved.

The debut of the art of the director

The most far-reaching legacy of Roller and Mahler's work together was their demonstration that fidelity to the protean, evanescent spirit of a dramatist's work is more artistically fruitful than fidelity to the letter of his intentions. The right to interrogate a work of genius and come-up with answers undreamt of by its creator was established once and for all. It marks the birth, for the Opera stage, of the shocking idea that production is not just the literal reading of the composer's blueprint but can be creative in its own right. As already suggested, the special authority of Mahler and Roller as iconoclasts who were themselves creators of genius undoubtedly played a major part in winning acceptance (though this has never been universal) for what was a revolutionary idea in Opera production. It is perhaps remarkable that the proving ground should have been the works of Wagner, the only composer whose « after-life » came to be so zealously protected by his heirs. The Vienna productions were the 1st effective challenge to their hegemony.

Of course, Mahler and Roller made their decisive 1st moves without stepping wholly off the carpet - nor could that ever have been possible in a theatre with the political and social constraints of the Vienna Court Opera. And the decorative elements in Roller's æsthetic never sat entirely comfortably with Mahler's more ascetic preference in scenic matters (and vice-versa !) . Mahler himself believed that the disciplined simplicity of their last collaboration, Gluck's « Iphigénie en Aulide » (18 March 1907) , was their greatest achievement, a view shared by Bruno Walter and Lilli Lehmann. Mahler was never an uncritical admirer of the Secessionists ; his visual sense was closer to the philosophy of

the architect Adolf Loos that « lack of ornament is a sign of spiritual strength ! » . And indeed Loos, a scourge of the Secessionists, was openly scornful of what he considered to be the decorative indulgence of Roller's settings :

« There are too many coffers around. Nicely arranged. The carpet is " Rudniker " (Prague) . I've used them too. For the entrance hall. All those cushions look nice. »

Roller's subsequent readiness to deploy his illustrative gifts to satisfy the theatre public's perennial appetite for the pictorial (one thinks of Franco Zeffirelli, in our own day) would have been seen by Adolphe Appia as a betrayal of the moral stance he demanded of the « metteur-en-scène » . There is certainly no question that Mahler brought-out the radical best in Roller, and that, after the brief golden years of their partnership, the artist became to some extent, so far as his theatre work was concerned, a victim of his own versatility.

Roller stayed on to complete the new « Ring » with Mahler's successor, Felix Weingartner, but the magic had fled. An almost unbelievable trust in literal depiction is evident in Roller's complaint to Mahler (by then conducting at the Met) about Weingartner's bold and prescient idea of staging the « Royal Hunt and Storm » in Berlioz's « les Troyens » (1909) « as a dumb-show or masquerade got up by Dido in the forest for the entertainment of her guest » . The down-to-earth Roller considered this imaginative idea of Weingartner's to be quite absurd. Roller, feeling himself undervalued by Weingartner, resigned his Opera post in May 1909 and took over the directorship of the School for Applied Arts. He went on to do important theatre work with, inter alia, the « Burgtheater » in Vienna and Max Reinhardt in Berlin, and returning to the Vienna Opera (1918-1934) designed important productions of Richard Strauß's Operas. In 1920, he was a co-founder with Reinhardt, Strauß and Hofmannsthal of the Salzburg Festival and, in 1934, made a belated Bayreuth debut in designing sets and costumes for Heinz Tietjen's production of « Parsifal » . Roller often reverted to a pictorial, decorative style - as in his famous designs for the premiere of « Der Rosenkavalier » in Dresden in 1911 - but the fastidious, elegant efficiency of his designs, the economy, visual honesty and truth to the musical drama that he had so momentarily developed with Mahler, never deserted him. His radical modernism mellowed in the service of entrepreneurs and impresarios whose theatrical objectives were considerably less idealistic than those of Gustav Mahler.

...

« Der Rosenkavalier » is a 1926 Austrian silent film of the Opera of the same name by Richard Strauß (music) and Hugo von Hofmannsthal (libretto) . Directed by Robert Wiene, it premiered on 10 January 1926 at the Dresden « Semperoper » , which had also hosted the actual Opera's premiere, 15 years earlier. Hofmannsthal considerably changed the storyline for the film version (which included a final scene in the formal gardens behind the Field Marshal's residence) and Strauß ; score included music not only from the Opera but also sections of his François Couperin Suite and a March for the Field Marshal, who appears in this version.

The music during the film's performances was provided by an Orchestra. At the premiere, this was conducted by Richard Strauß himself. The film's projection speed had to be adjusted by the projector in order to fit the speed of the Orchestra. This task fell to the film's cameraman, Hans Androschin, because only he knew the exact length of each

scene and cut. In later performances, a special recording, also conducted by Strauß, provided the music. A planned tour of the United States, in 1927, by Strauß and his orchestra failed to go ahead because of the emergence of sound films.

Strauß conducted the Vienna and London premieres (and recorded excerpts from the film score on the Victrola label at that time) . The American premiere took place at Yale University's Woolsey Hall with the Yale Symphony conducted by John Mauceri (who received special permission from Strauß' son) on March 29, 1974. A copy of the film was found in the Czech National Archive and Mister Mauceri translated the titles with Glenn Most into English. The final sequence was missing from the print and was performed with orchestral music and titles alone. The score and parts were held by the Library of Congress. The audience at Yale included the famed Strauß soprano Maria Jeritza, who was living in New Jersey at the time.

...

Director : Robert Wiene, Music : Original music by Richard Strauß, Musical arrangement : Bernd Thewes, Adaption : Frank Strobel.

Film versions of Operas were already popular in the silent film era ; however, few other Opera films of the time were as spectacular and of such a high musical quality as the « Rosenkavalier » which was created in 1925. The film stars a number of brilliant performers, among them Michaël Bohnen, who was considered to be the incarnation of Ochs von Lerchenau « par excellence » . The film is based on the music of the « Rosenkavalier » Opera by Richard Strauß. It was arranged in an instrumental form to suit the film medium and was played by a « répétiteur » on set. Taking the Opera's story line as its central theme, the result was a film comedy enlivened with attractive locations, including Schönbrunn castle and its extensive grounds. The « people's film Opera » , as Richard Strauß liked to call it, was staged in an opulent scenography produced by Alfred Roller who had furnished the setting for the Opera's premiere. The director was Robert Wiene, who had made a name for himself with THE CABINET OF DR. CALIGARI (1920) . In « Rosenkavalier » , he proved that he not only had impeccable taste when it came to creating the Rococo ambience of the original but was also perceptively tuned into the ironic element which distinguishes « Rosenkavalier » as one of the major 20th Century Operas.

The film and its brilliant music, which was written for a large orchestra, was originally 2 hours long. Since the last (8th) reel is missing, it had not been performed for a long time. However, the complete film music, in the form of the original orchestral parts annotated with numerous synchronic indications, has survived. In conjunction with on-set photos as well as programme texts, these directions made it possible for the Finale to be reconstructed. On the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the film premiere (10 January 1926 in « Semperoper Dresden ») , ZDF/ARTE commissioned a comprehensive restoration from « Filmarchiv Austria » which also included a reconstruction of the Finale. It is now possible, once again, for both film and music to be performed, thereby introducing the audience to Richard Strauß' previously little-known talents as a film music composer.

...

Many people accuse Richard Strauß's music of sounding like a film soundtrack. Not everyone realises that he did actually write one - albeit after a considerable amount of arm-twisting.

Largely based on his Opera « Der Rosenkavalier » , it was created for live performance by Orchestra (no singers) alongside the 1925 silent movie of the same name, which fleshes-out the story line of the Opera but still manages to come in at half the length.

The Opera's librettist Hugo von Hofmannsthal also wrote the film's script. But despite pleading he could whip up little enthusiasm in Strauß. There was much at stake for Strauß. If the film failed, he failed. But if, on the other hand, the film were successful, it might undermine the reputation of the Opera in comparison, a risk to which Strauß was acutely sensitive. The politicking between film-makers, financiers, publishers and the numerous other parties engaged in the making of a movie was another aspect of the process Strauß found distasteful. His doubts were salved by liberal applications of cash, and he took the job, but it wasn't a whole-hearted effort.

Much of the routine rearrangement was turned over to assistants. Where new music was required for new scenes, Strauß preferred to recycle old tunes. The limited amount of truly new material, principally a battle march, lacks inspiration. Once complete, Strauß tried his best to turn his back on it - Hofmannsthal had another battle persuading him to conduct the 1926 Dresden premiere. But eventually the score was delivered, the premiere conducted.

The film's director was Robert Wiene, a hot property after his influential (and financially successful) 1920 film « Das Kabinett des Doktor Caligari » . That cost \$ 20,000 to make. 10 times as much was raised for « Rosenkavalier » , enabling Wiene to stage a massive battle and an extravagant outdoor masked ball Finale. Both are centred around the Marschallin's husband, who is of course unseen in the Opera. In the film, he's cipher-like and I suspect created merely for the purpose of these very scenes. Servants, guests, soldiers, peasants (some interesting « real » faces) crowd the screen. More cash was splashed on opulent costumes and lavish sets from the designer of the Opera's 1911 premiere, Alfred Roller.

In spite of all the money thrown at it, the film has little of Caligari's extraordinary originality. Perhaps, it was all those interfering financiers or perhaps Wiene was simply running-out of ideas. There is just one truly memorable image - the screen fills with what looks like a huge white fleece, which parts like a set of jigsaw pieces, revealing itself as the massed heads of a group of elderly periwigged gossips. But the pace is unflagging, and (within the confines of silent movie high-style) Wiene draws excellent performances from all his actors, right down to the extras.

Sadly and despite initial acclaim, the original film did not survive intact. The version shown at the Châtelet was pieced together from what remains, using a selection of stills and brief clips to make-up 10 minutes missing from the end.

Silent movie specialist Frank Strobel has been conducting this version around Europe, since 2006 - he visited Liverpool last year, but not, as yet, London. He was fortunate to have for this performance the services of the young and energetic Orchestre National d'Île de France, who make something of a specialism of work outside the mainstream

Classical repertoire. They played the technically challenging music tirelessly for nearly 2 hours, filling the lofty tiers of the Châtelet with great attention to detail and dynamics.

The score isn't Strauß's greatest, the movie isn't that special, but with the Orchestra in the pit and the film projected on the Châtelet's enormous screen above them, somehow they compensated for each other's deficiencies. The many comic moments charmed, the Marschallin's sad surrender of Octavian drew a tear or two, the whole drama came alive. A packed and hugely varied audience (several small children included) gave Orchestra and conductor a massive ovation.

Instrumentation : 2+1/pic. 2+1/ca. 2+1/bcl.bthn. 2+1/cbn - 4.3.3.1 - timp. 3perc.hpd.pno/cel.hmn. 2hp - strings : 16.14.12.10.8 (110 minutes) .

The cast :

Michaël Bohnen as Ochs von Lerchenau.

Huguette Duflos as Marschallin.

Paul Hartmann as Marschall.

Jaque Catelain as Octavian.

Elly Felicie Berger as Sophie.

Carmen Cartellieri as Annina.

Karl Forest as Herr von Faninal.

Friedrich Feher as Valzacchi.

Alfred Roller, heard of him ?

The answer to this question, happening somewhere out there in the sunlit realm where no grief was felt, and where people could go on talking about today and tomorrow without howling, the answer was an astonishing « no » . The young Adolf Hitler had not, at that date, heard of Alfred Roller. And this man in Linz who owned a bit of real estate and happened to be their landlord was a friend, or acquaintance, of Alfred Roller, the greatest designer of Opera sets in Vienna.

That 1st, fantastic « Tristan » , which he had seen during his few weeks in Vienna when the bastards at the Academy of Arts had turned him down. Could anything have been more magical than that « Tristan » ? Gustav Mahler was on

the podium, conducting, and when the brooding, everlastingly unsettling opening prelude was completed, the curtain went up and there was Roller's ship, at a right angle to the stage, with wind flickering the sails and Tristan in the prow.

Never to be forgotten Roller ! But, when asked through the fog of grief « Heard of him ? » , Hitler had only shaken his head sadly, unaware of what « Herr » Klaus Peter Treibel was suggesting, namely the impossible : that there might exist a link, in real life and not in fantasy, between the desolate kitchen in a flat in « Urfahr » , where happiness itself died to the light of Christmas candles on a tree, and a man who invented the magical scenery of the Court Opera in Vienna.

Triebel had scribbled-out a note of introduction and recommendation for Hitler :

« Go to Roller. Go and say old Treibel recommended you. He's a good man, Roller, he'll help you - who knows, maybe get you doing set designs for the Operas ? Now, Offenbach, there's one to get your feet tapping. »

So back to Vienna, he had come. He had spent some money on clothes before he arrived, a dark hat, a gentleman's overcoat, none of your rubbish, a walking cane. The letter remained propped on the chimney piece of the small room he shared with August Kubizek. Every day, Kubizek went-out to the Academy of Music and studied - in reality. Every day, he, in turn, would walk the streets pretending to be at the Academy of Arts, and he would come back to the room and stare at the envelope addressed to Professor Roller. Eventually, he developed enough courage to take the envelope down. He had, by now, filled a portfolio with drawings. There were some proposed sets for « Lohengrin » and « Tannhäuser » . There were all the architectural drawings for the complete rebuilding of Linz, of course. He was beginning to wonder whether it might not be advantageous to demolish Vienna and rebuild from scratch ; but that would come later. And he had set-out for the Court Opera House, with the portfolio and the letter of introduction.

But what would he say when he was stopped at the door ? :

« Excuse me, I have come to see Professor Roller. »

« I'm sure you have, " Sunny Jim ", and I'm just off to see the Emperor, good day to you. »

What if he met with mockery ? His grief was still at the raw stage when any set-back, however slight, was capable of provoking either the most abject misery, actual sobs, or a return of his old rages. In a café, the other day, he had ordered a particular type of cake with a pot of coffee. The waiter had brought the wrong cake. When he saw the waiter coming, with a nut-and-walnut concoction instead of the cherry-and-cream one upon which he had set his heart, he felt the universe collapsing. Looking at the callous waiter, who couldn't give a damn whether he brought a cherry « gâteau » or a plate of raw human flesh, he had made one very firm decision : he was not going to burst into tears just to satisfy this young sadist. Quite the opposite. But although the decision had been made to stand firm, he had not quite reckoned on what happened next, since the wave of pure vitriolic rage that shook his whole being at the very moment of the waiter's arrival had in fact taken him completely by surprise. The cake had been hurled,

the plate had been smashed, but much more dangerous had been the coffee pot flying through the air, raining its contents on the shoulders of others in the café. Naturally, he had found himself being escorted from the premises and set-down on the pavement, with pompous comments about his good fortune not to have been handed over to the police.

Fearing a revisitation of such an outburst, he had come to the door of the Opera House. In fact, the commissionaire, in his splendid uniform with frogging and epaulettes, had been friendly, asking « Sunny Jim » whether he could help. When he had shyly, almost inaudibly, mumbled the name of Alfred Roller, he had been told to go to a particular office on the 1st floor. But then, courage had failed him and he had muttered something about not needing the Professor today ; another day. He merely wanted to know where the Professor's office was, should he ever need it.

His cowardice nagged at him, all through a concert that evening which August Kubizek took him to - the everlastingly wonderful 7th Symphony of Bruckner ! This would not do, this fear. The next day, he would go and confront Roller. But the next day, and the next, though he managed to make himself go to the Opera House, he could not bring himself to beard the great man in his den. And, coming away from the Opera House that 3rd time, he had been visited by an outburst of despair that made him dance with anger, and he had taken « Herr Treibel » 's letter and torn it into confetti, hurling it into the air about him in the street.

For weeks, afterwards, he thought of writing to Treibel to get another letter of introduction to Roller, but it was no use. He did not have the nerve. Worse than this, he could not summon-up enough energy to do it. For days on end, he did nothing, simply did not know how the time passed. At other times, he could do some work and he felt the quality of his draughtsmanship, especially of his architectural draughtsmanship, improving. Months, years passed. At some point, he had applied to the Academy again and, once again, the bastards had turned him down, even though he seriously believed that some of the drawings in his portfolio stood comparison with Michelangelo. The money began to run-out. What money there was, he spent on going to the Opera, and he saw all the Mahler-Roller productions, some of them many times over. Legends in the history of Wagner production and he was there ! One letter, one measly letter might have allowed him to cross the bridge and enter the legend, become part of that world.

...

Alfred Roller (geboren 2. Oktober 1864, in Brünn Mähren ; gestorben 21. Juni 1935, in Wien) war ein österreichischer Bühnenbildner, Maler und Grafiker.

Roller war 1897 Mitbegründer und 1902 Präsident der Wiener Secession, von der er sich aber 1905 trennte. 1903 wurde er als Nachfolger von Heinrich Lefler von Gustav Mahler an die Wiener Hofoper geholt und reformierte in kongenialer Zusammenarbeit mit Mahler die szenische Kunst im Sinne der Idee des Gesamtkunstwerks (Zusammenwirken von Raum, Farbe und Licht mit Musik, Wort und Gestik) . Nach 1909 war er auch Bühnenbildner unter anderem für das Burgtheater. Roller machte die Ausstattungen für sämtliche Wiener Richard Strauß-Erstaufführungen. Später kam es zu einer engen Zusammenarbeit mit Max Reinhardt, bei dem er ab 1929 auch Lehrer am Wiener Reinhardt-Seminar war.

Der wohl bekannteste Bewunderer von Rollers Arbeit war Adolf Hitler, der ursprünglich 1908 nach seinem Umzug von Linz nach Wien, bei Roller in die Lehre gehen wollte. Zu diesem Zwecke verfasste eine Linzer Bekannte ein Empfehlungsschreiben an Roller. Werner Maser schrieb in seiner Hitler-Biografie, Roller habe daraufhin Hitler zu einem Gespräch empfangen und an einen Bildhauer namens Panholzer vermittelt. Laut neueren Forschungen von Brigitte Hamann (Hitlers Wien, 1998) ließ Hitler jedoch diese Chance ungenutzt : Nachdem er bereits in der Hofoper vorstellig geworden war, verließ er diese wieder, so daß eine Begegnung mit dem von ihm verehrten Roller nicht zustande kam. Roller lernte er fünfundzwanzig Jahre später kennen, nachdem er bereits Reichskanzler geworden war.

1920 war Roller zusammen mit Richard Strauß und Max Reinhardt Begründer der Salzburger Festspiele und schuf die erste Ausstattung zu Hugo von Hofmannsthals Jedermann. Im Jahr vor seinem Tod schuf Roller 1934 auf Wunsch Hitlers die Bühnenbilder für den Bayreuther « Parsifal » .

Emil Preetorius

Le graphiste, illustrateur, décorateur de scène de niveau international et grand collectionneur d'art extrême-oriental Emil Preetorius est né le 21 juin 1883 à Mainz et est mort le 27 janvier 1973 à Munich. Il fut Président de l'Académie bavaroise des Beaux-arts de Munich. Personnalité riche et complexe, il est l'auteur de plusieurs essais sur l'art, et il fut aussi un ami très proche de Thomas Mann, dont il illustra « Maître et Chien » . À l'arrivée d'Adolf Hitler au pouvoir, en 1933, un brouille survint entre eux, et Thomas Mann fera de Preetorius un portrait acide, dans son grand roman « le Docteur Faustus » , sous les traits du personnage Kridwiss. Néanmoins, les 2 hommes renoueront durant la guerre puis, de nouveau, après la guerre.

La Ire réalisation de Preetorius à Bayreuth sera, en 1933, « l'Anneau du Nibelung » , en collaboration avec Heinz Tietjen et, au pupitre, le chef Karl Elmendorff.

...

The stage-designer Emil Preetorius was born on June 21, 1883, in Mainz. He was one of the most important stage designers of the 1st half of the 20th Century. The young Emil Preetorius successfully studied jurisprudence and art history in Giessen. In 1909, he co-founded a school of illustration and the book trade in Munich together with Paul Renner. In 1928, Preetorius became a professor at the Munich « Hochschule für Bildende Künste » . He became the head of scenery for the Bayreuth « Festspiele » in 1932. During the 1930's, Emil Preetorius's scenes, such as the rock of the « Valkyrie » for the « Ring des Niebelungen » , were among the most important and influential designs for Richard Wagner's works. From 1953 to 1968, Emil Preetorius was the president of the « Bayerische Akademie der Schönen Künste » in Munich. Emil Preetorius died on January 27, 1973, in Munich.

...

The stage-designer Emil Preetorius was born in Mainz and was one of the most important stage designers of the 1st

half of the 20th Century. He studied law and art history in Giessen and, in 1909, he co-founded a school of illustration and the book trade in Munich together with Paul Renner. In 1928, Preetorius became a professor at the Munich « Hochschule für Bildende Künste » .

He became the head of scenery for the Bayreuth « Festspiele » , in 1932. During the 1930's, Emil Preetorius's scenes, such as the rock of the Valkyrie for the « Ring des Niebelungen » , were among the most important and influential designs for Richard Wagner's works. From 1953 to 1968, Emil Preetorius was the president of the « Bayerische Akademie der Schönen Künste » , in Munich.

...

Emil Preetorius studied law, art and physics. He was promoted to Doctor in Law. He also learned himself drawing and painting and, in 1909, together with Paul Renner he started the « Schule für Illustration und Buchgewerbe » , in Munich.

He was among the most important artists that worked for the magazines « Simplicissimus » and « Jugend » . From 1926 onwards, he lectured on the art of illustrating and on stage designing. In 1932, he became responsible for stage designing at the Bayreuth Festival. During the Second World War, the young Wieland Wagner tried to have him removed because he wanted to do the job himself.

In 1951, Preetorius retired. From 1948 to 1968, he was president of the Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts.

Grave location in Munich : « Bogenhausener Friedhof » (right wall, number 32) .

...

Emil Preetorius (geboren 21. Juni 1883 in Mainz ; gestorben 27. Januar 1973 in München) war ein deutscher Illustrator, Graphiker und gilt als einer der bedeutendsten Bühnenbildner der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts.

Preetorius studierte Rechtswissenschaften, Kunstgeschichte und Naturwissenschaften in München, Berlin und Gießen, wo er zum Doktor juris promoviert wurde. Anschließend besuchte er kurze Zeit die Münchner Kunstgewerbeschule, bildete sich aber vorwiegend autodidaktisch als Maler und Zeichner aus.

1909 gründete er gemeinsam mit Paul Renner die Schule für Illustration und Buchgewerbe in München, leitete seit 1910 die Münchner Lehrwerkstätten und wurde 1926 Leiter einer Klasse für Illustration sowie einer Klasse für Bühnenbildkunst an der Hochschule für Bildende Künste in München, an der er seit 1928 als Professor wirkte. 1914 gründet Preetorius zusammen mit Franz Paul Glaß, Friedrich Heubner, Carl Moos, Max Schwarzer, Valentin Zietara die Künstlervereinigung « Die Sechs » , eine der ersten Künstlergruppen für die Vermarktung von Werbeaufträgen, speziell Plakaten.

Preetorius gehörte zum Freundeskreis von Thomas Mann, für den er dessen Werke Herr und Hund sowie die Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull illustrierte. Seit 1923 war Preetorius für die Münchner Kammerspiele tätig. 1932 wurde er szenischer Leiter der Bayreuther Festspiele.

1942 geriet Preetorius nach einer Denunziation als « Judenfreund » kurzfristig in Gestapohaft, wurde aber auf Betreiben Hitlers, der ihn zu den drei wichtigsten Bühnenbildnern zählte, wieder freigelassen. 1943 wurde Preetorius von den NS-Machthabern mit der Goethe-Medaille für Kunst und Wissenschaft ausgezeichnet. 1951 trat er in den Ruhestand. Von 1947 bis 1961 war Preetorius Mitglied des Bayerischen Senats. Von 1948 bis 1968 amtierte er als Präsident der Bayerischen Akademie der Schönen Künste in München.

In seinen Buchillustrationen (unter anderem zu Alphonse Daudets Tartarin de Tarascon, 1913) , Buchgraphiken und Plakaten war Preetorius vom japanischen Holzschnitt beeinflusst, als Bühnenbildner knüpfte er an den romantischen Klassizismus an. Er veröffentlichte unter anderem Vom Bühnenbild bei Richard Wagner (1938) , Weltbild und Weltgestalt (1947) und Geheimnis des Sichtbaren (1963) .

Emil Preetorius ist in München auf dem Bogenhausener Friedhof bestattet.

1953 : Großes Verdienstkreuz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.

Vom Bühnenbild bei Richard Wagner (1938) .

Gedanken zur Kunst (1941) .

Weltbild und Weltgehalt (1947) .

Geheimnis des Sichtbaren (1963) .

Heinz Tietjen

Le chef d'orchestre et metteur-en-scène allemand Heinz Tietjen est né le 24 juin 1881 à Tanger, au Maroc, et est décédé le 30 novembre 1967 à Baden-Baden. De 1904 à 1907, il est en poste au Théâtre de Trèves dont il devient l'intendant, en 1919. Durant toute sa carrière, il cumule les fonctions de directeur de théâtre, de chef d'orchestre et de dramaturge. De 1919 à 1922, il est à l'Opéra de Sarrebruck puis, de 1922 à 1924, à Breslau (aujourd'hui, Wrocław en Pologne) . De 1925 à 1945, il travaille au « Staatsoper » de Berlin. De 1931 à 1944, il succède à Siegfried Wagner comme directeur artistique du Festival de Bayreuth. En 1944, Richard Strauß lui dédie « l'Amour de Danaé » . Après la guerre, il poursuit sa carrière jusqu'en 1959, à Berlin et à Hambourg.

...

The German conductor and music producer Heinz Tietjen was born on June 24, 1881, in Tangier (Morocco) , and died

on November 30, 1967, in Baden-Baden.

At age 23, he held the position of producer at the Opera House in Trier and was appointed its director in 1907, holding the dual roles until 1922. Simultaneously, he was the director at Saarbrücken and Breslau (now Wrocław, in Poland) , from 1919 to 1922.

Hans Tietjen was the director of the « Deutsche Oper Berlin » , between 1925 and 1927, then director of the Prussian State Theatre. From 1931 to 1944, he served as artistic director at the Bayreuth « Festspielhaus » for Winnifred Wagner with whom he had a Romantic liaison.

In 1948, he returned to direct the « Deutsche Oper Berlin » , serving until 1955 when he was appointed manager and artistic director of the new Hamburg State Opera, a job he held until 1959.

Heinz Tietjen was also a Nazi. His family is forbidding access to this archives in Berlin so that his total involvement with Adolf Hitler is kept as much as possible sealed.

Grave location in Baden-Baden : « Baden-Württemberg Stadtfriedhof » .

...

Heinz Tietjen was a pupil of Arthur Nikisch. When he was 23, he became producer at the Opera House in Trier and, in 1907, he became it's director (until 1922) . From 1919 until 1922, he was also director of the Opera's of Saarbrücken and Breslau.

In 1925, he became the director of the Berlin Symphony Orchestra (until 1927) and, subsequently, of the Prussian State Theatre. Although the Nazi's initially didn't trust him, Hermann Göring asked him, as early as 1932, if he would be willing to keep his position in Berlin.

From 1931 to 1944, he was also artistic director at Bayreuth, where he was romantically involved with Winnifred Wagner (Siegfried Wagner had died in 1930) . After the War, he scolded the Wagners but, in later years, he was again in contact with Winnifred. He had to undergo a denazification trial, but it was decided that he was innocent and he was allowed to continue his career.

From 1948 to 1954, he was the director of the « Städtischen Oper Berlin » and, from 1956 until 1959, he directed the « Staatsoper » in Hamburg where his production of Wagner's « Ring » was very succesful. In 1959, he retired.

...

Heinz Tietjen (geboren 24. Juni 1881 in Tanger, Marokko ; gestorben 30. November 1967 in Baden-Baden) war ein deutscher Regisseur, Dirigent und Intendant.

Tietjen absolvierte zunächst eine Kaufmannsausbildung in Bremen und arbeitete im « Anschluß » für die Bremer Westafrika-Gesellschaft im Ausland, ehe er begann, sich der Musik zuzuwenden und unter anderem bei dem ungarischen Dirigenten Arthur Nikisch zu lernen.

Tietjen erhielt 1904 sein erstes Engagement als Kapellmeister und Regisseur am Theater Trier, avancierte dort 1907 zum Direktor und war von 1919 bis 1922 schließlich Intendant des Hauses. Er wurde im « Anschluß » zum Intendanten des Breslauer Theaters berufen, was er mitunter wohl seinen Förderern, dem späteren preußischen Kultusminister Carl Heinrich Becker und den Fachreferenten seines Ministeriums, Ludwig Seelig und Leo Kestenberg, zu verdanken hatte. Eine weitere Stelle als Intendant führte Tietjen an das Saarländische Staatstheater Saarbrücken.

Seit 1925 war Tietjen Leiter der Deutschen Oper Berlin und übernahm ab 1926 zudem die Leitung der staatlichen Opernhäuser Unter den Linden und Krolloper. 1927 wurde er Generalintendant aller Preußischen Staatstheater, die das königliche Schauspielhaus am Gendarmenmarkt, das Schillertheater sowie die Theater Wiesbaden und Kassel umfassten, und behielt diesen Posten bis 1944 bei. Seine spätere Vertraute Winnifred Wagner berief Tietjen 1931 zum künstlerischen Leiter der Bayreuther Festspiele, die er von 1934 bis 1944 in Zusammenarbeit mit ihr leitete. Nach Deutung von Hannes Heer war Tietjen 1931 zum « mächtigsten Theaterleiter in der Endphase der Weimarer Republik » geworden, der seine Karriere « seinem Doppeltalent als wirtschaftlich wie künstlerisch gleich effektiver Theatermanager und als ebenso gerissener wie verschwiegener Kulturpolitiker » verdankte. Tietjen befürwortete die Schließung der Krolloper, die 1931 von der nationalsozialistischen Presse als « rötlich-jüdisches Kulturinstitut » angegriffen wurde.

Heinz Tietjen war der erste Regisseur neben den Mitgliedern der Familie Wagner, der in Bayreuth mehrere Opern inszenierte. Außer den Familienmitgliedern war vor Tietjen überhaupt nur ein Regisseur, August Harlacher (1888 : Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg) , tätig. Heinz Tietjen inszenierte sechs der sieben in Bayreuth aufgeführten Opernwerke (Ausnahme : Tannhäuser) . Diese Breite erreichten außer ihm nur die beiden Wagner-Enkel Wieland und Wolfgang Wagner. Er ist außerdem neben Wieland Wagner der einzige Regisseur, der in einem Festspieljahrgang zwei Opern inszenierte (1933 : Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg, Der Ring des Nibelungen) .

Von 1933 bis 1941 und nochmals 1959 war er auch Dirigent in Bayreuth :

1933-1934 : Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg.

1934, 1936, 1938, 1939, 1941 : Der Ring des Nibelungen.

1936, 1937, 1959 : Lohengrin.

Nach Machtübernahme der Nationalsozialisten wurde Tietjen von Hermann Göring am 11. September 1936 zum Leiter der Berliner Staatsoper und im Dezember desselben Jahres, gemeinsam mit Gustaf Gründgens, zum Preußischen Staatsrat ernannt. Als Generalintendant der preußischen Staatstheater war Heinz Tietjen, Vertrauter von Adolf Hitler und

Göring sowie Freund der Hitler-Verehrerin Winnifred Wagner, eine wichtige Stütze der nationalsozialistischen Kulturpolitik. Am 1. Juni 1933 entließ Tietjen 27 Angestellte von Staatsoper und Schauspielhaus. Im Schauspielhaus kündigte er dem Kommunisten Hans Otto. An der Absprache Tietjens mit Göring war auch Wilhelm Furtwängler, Operndirektor der Staatsoper, beteiligt.

Für Hannes Heer besteht kein Zweifel an Tietjens Rolle als Steigbügelhalter der Nazis. Belege dafür lieferten Personalakten, die er im Preußischen Staatsarchiv Dahlem und von Entnazifizierungsakten, die er im Berliner Landesarchiv fand. Danach drang Tietjen nicht bei Hans Hinkel darauf, zumindest die in Mischehe lebenden Ensemblemitglieder weiter zu beschäftigen.

Nach Kriegsende wurde gegen Tietjen ein Entnazifizierungsverfahren eingeleitet, das im April 1947 mit seiner vollständigen Entlastung geschlossen wurde. Die Kommission bescheinigte ihm zwar eine « opportunistische Haltung » , sah aber aufgrund zweier beigebrachter Zeugenaussagen eine « aktive Beteiligung » am Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus als gegeben an. Hannes Heer hält die Selbstinszenierung Tietjens als Schutzpatron des Ensembles, als Judenretter oder gar als Widerstandskämpfer für geschönt.

Im August 1948 wurde Tietjen vom Berliner Magistrat erneut die Intendanz der Deutschen Oper übertragen, die er diesmal bis 1954 ausführte und wo unter seiner Leitung 1951 erstmals die Berliner Festwochen veranstaltet wurden. 1954 ging Tietjen an die Hamburgische Staatsoper. Von 1957 an war Tietjen dort als Intendant tätig, ehe er sich 1959 zur Ruhe setzte.

Tietjen wurde 1953 mit dem Großen Verdienstkreuz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland ausgezeichnet. Anlässlich seines 50. Bühnenjubiläums erhielt er am 26. September 1954 vom Berliner Senat die Ernst-Reuter-Plakette. 1956 wurde er mit dem Silbernen Blatt der Dramatiker Union und 1958 mit dem Ehrensiegel der Stadt Trier ausgezeichnet.

Im Berliner Bezirk Tempelhof-Schöneberg wurde die Tietjenstraße nach ihm benannt.

In der Trierer Innenstadt (am Theater) wurde der Heinz-Tietjen-Weg nach ihm benannt.

Tietjen wurde 1955 zum Mitglied der Berliner Akademie der Künste gewählt.

...

Heinz Tietjen war ein Schüler des bekannten Dirigenten Arthur Nikisch (1855-1922) und ein Regietalent. Zunächst Opernintendant und Regisseur in Trier, Saarbrücken und Breslau, übernahm er 1925 die Intendanz der Städtischen Oper, später die der Staatsoper in Berlin. Als Generalintendant der preußischen Staatstheater von 1930 bis 1945 beeinflusste er spürbar das kulturelle Leben in Deutschland. Seit 1930 war er auch künstlerischer Leiter der Bayreuther Festspiele und setzte neue Maßstäbe mit seinen Wagner- Inszenierungen. Von 1948 bis 1954 wieder Intendant der Städtischen Oper Berlin, erneuerte er die Zusammensetzung des Ensembles und aktualisierte den Spielplan. Als Intendant der Hamburger Staatsoper von 1956 bis 1959 wurde er besonders für seine « Ring » -

Inszenierung gefeiert.

Hans Schemm

Hans Schemm was born on 6 October 1891 in Bayreuth and died on 5 March 1935 in Bayreuth. He was a « Gauleiter » in Nazi Germany.

Schemm, whose parents ran a shoe-maker's shop, 1st went to a « Volksschule » for 5 years and, then, as of 1905, to a teachers' college. In 1915, he got married ; in 1917, a son was born. He taught school beginning in 1910, 1st in Wülfersreuth, then, as of 1911, in Neufang ; and, from 1920, at the « Altstadtschule » (Old Town School) , which was later named the « Hans-Schemm-Schule » , in Bayreuth. During the First World War, he worked at a military epidemic hospital in Bayreuth where he became infected with tuberculosis.

In 1919, he belonged to the « Freikorps Bayreuth » , which took part in the street-fighting that was common at the time among opposing political groups in Munich.

On the basis of his background in bio-chemistry, Schemm became head of a bacteriological-chemical laboratory in Thale (« Hubertusbad ») . After it closed in 1921, for financial reasons, Schemm returned to the classroom until 1928.

Schemm's interactions with Nazi groups had begun by 1923. On September 30 of that year, he 1st met Adolf Hitler. With Hitler's quick confidence, Schemm became an assessor in the « Bayreuth Völkischer Bund » in 1924 ; and, in the following year, he organized the « Bayreuth Nazi Ortsgruppe » (Local Group) and the Nazi « Gau » of Upper-Franconia (« Oberfranken ») .

Schemm built the organization up with determination. His political positions were clearly anti-democratic, anti-Semitic and anti-Communist, as can be seen in some of his quotations :

« We are revolutionary, we want to overthrow the present State. On our enemies, we shall take revenge, and indeed, bloody revenge. »

« We are not objective - we are German ! »

« ... that a Jew should dangle from every lamppost. »

In 1927, Schemm founded the National-Socialist Teachers' Federation. In 1928, he became a member of the Bavarian parliament.

As Party leader for Bavaria, Schemm was responsible for preparing the Party members and candidates for the election campaigns. In 1929, under Schemm's management, the Munich Nazis won 9 seats, and Schemm became the faction leader. The presence of the Nazi representatives in the parliament was controversial.

Schemm also took on the role of publicist in the late-1920's : for a brief period, he took-over the leadership of several Nazi newspapers (« Streiter », « Weckruf » and « Nationale Zeitung ») . In April 1929, Schemm founded his own newspaper ; and, in August of the same year, appeared in the « Nationalsozialistische Lehrerzeitung » (National-Socialist Teachers' Newspaper) , the National-Socialist Teachers League's (NSLB) journalistic organ. On 1 October 1930, came the 1st edition of the weekly newspaper « Kampf für deutsche Freiheit und Kultur » (Struggle for German Freedom and Culture) , which was published by Schemm, and whose circulation rose from 3,000 in the beginning to 20,000 by 1932.

In 1931, Schemm founded the Bayreuth National-Socialist Cultural Publishing House (« Nationalsozialistischer Kulturverlag Bayreuth ») which, beginning on 1 October 1932, published the daily newspaper « Das Fränkische Volk » (circulation : 10,000) .

In 1930, Schemm became a member of the German national parliament, the « Reichstag » .

In 1933, the « Gau » of Upper-Franconia, led by Schlemm, was united with the « Gau » of Upper-Palatinate and Lower-Bavaria (« Oberpfalz-Niederbayern ») to form the « Gau Bayerische Ostmark » . Schemm kept his job as « Gauleiter » . Furthermore, he became an « SA-Gruppenführer » . On 16 March 1933, the « Reich » Governor (« Reichsstatthalter ») Franz Ritter von Epp appointed Schemm to be the provisional Culture Minister. Hitler, then, appointed him on 13 April 1933, the « Leader of Cultural and Educational Affairs of Bavaria » .

In 1933, Schemm became an honorary citizen of Bayreuth.

In April 1933, when Schemm arrived in Passau to attend the laying of the corner-stone for the Hall of the Nibelungs, he also addressed the masses. Passau honoured Schemm by dedicating a street and a school to him.

In March 1935, Schemm was seriously injured in an aircraft crash. Although Hitler personally ordered Berlin Professor Ferdinand Sauerbruch to fly to Bayreuth, Schemm, however, succumbed to his injuries on March 5 before the professor's arrival. His successor as « Gauleiter » was Fritz Wächtler.

The Nazis posthumously honoured Schemm as a publicist and educator by naming multiple schools, streets, and halls after him.

...

NSDAP-Gauleiter der Bayerischen Ostmark, Reichswalter des Nationalsozialistischen Lehrerbunds (NSLB) und Bayerischer Kultusminister.

Hans Schemm wurde als zweiter von drei Söhnen des Konrad Schemm und der Babette Meyer geboren. Seine Eltern betrieben eine Schusterei. Aufgrund der Beanspruchung der Eltern als Lieferant des örtlichen Militärs wuchs er überwiegend bei seiner Großmutter auf. Sie weckte bei ihm das Interesse für Geschichte und Mythen. Er besuchte zunächst die Volksschule und von 1905 bis 1910 (drei Jahre Präparandenschule und zwei Jahre Seminarkurse) das

Lehrerseminar an der Königlich-Bayerischen Lehrerbildungsanstalt Bayreuth. 1915 heiratete er die vier Jahre ältere (aus vermögendem Hause stammende) Baumeisterstochter Babetta Lorenzia Zeitler. 1917 wurde der Sohn Rudolf geboren. Ab 1910 unterrichtete er als Lehrer zunächst in Wülfersreuth, ab 1911 dann in Neufang und ab 1920 an der Altstadtschule, der späteren Hans-Schemm-Schule in Bayreuth. Während seiner Zeit als Lehrer experimentierte er mit Chemikalien und arbeitete mit seinem Mikroskop. Er wurde 1911 vom Wehrdienst zurückgestellt und der Ersatzreserve zugeteilt. Am sechsten Mobilmachungstag (6. August 1914) wurde er « auf dringende Vorstellungen zuständiger Militärärzte » als Krankenwärter beim Reservelazarett in Bayreuth eingesetzt. Im Winter 1915-1916 infizierte er sich mit Tuberkulose, was wieder zeitweise zur Freistellung vom Wehrdienst führte.

Vom 18. April bis 6. Mai 1919 gehörte er dem Freikorps Bayreuth an. An der gewaltsamen Niederschlagung der Münchner Räterepublik am 2. Mai 1919 nahm er nicht mehr aktiv teil, weil er erst danach in München eintraf.

Schemm wurde im September 1920 Laborant eines bakteriologisch-chemischen Labors der Chemischen Werke Werchow in Thale (ehemals Sanatorium Hubertusbad), das jedoch bereits 1921 aus finanziellen Gründen schloß. Schemm, der sich zuvor wissenschaftlich mit chemisch-biologischen Fragen befaßt hatte, kehrte wieder in den Schuldienst zurück. Nebenberuflich lehrte er zwischen 1921 und 1928 an der Volkshochschule.

Ab 1923 hatte Schemm Kontakt mit nationalsozialistischen Gruppierungen, trat der NSDAP bei und lernte am 30. September 1923 Adolf Hitler kennen. 1924 wurde er Beisitzer im Völkischen Bund Bayreuth. Am 27. Februar 1925 gründete Schemm die NSDAP-Ortsgruppe Bayreuth und im gleichen Jahr den Gau Oberfranken der NSDAP.

Schemm baute die Organisation zielstrebig auf. Seine politischen Positionen waren klar antidemokratisch, antisemitisch und antikommunistisch, was und andere folgende Zitate belegen :

« Wir sind revolutionär, wir wollen den gegenwärtigen Staat stürzen. An unseren Feinden werden wir Rache nehmen und zwar blutige Rache. »

« Wir sind nicht objektiv - wir sind deutsch ! »

« ... daß an jedem Laternenpfahl ein Jude baumeln solle. »

1928 wurde Schemm Mitglied des Bayerischen Landtags und daneben Leiter des Bezirks Franken der nationalsozialistischen Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur. 1932 schied er aus dem Landtag aus.

Systematisch bereitete Schemm die örtliche NSDAP auf die Wahlkämpfe vor, zunächst für die Stadtratswahlen 1929. Die NSDAP erreichte neun Mandate, Schemm wurde Fraktionsvorsitzender. Der Einzug der NSDAP-Fraktion führte zu häufigen Tumulten und einer Prügelei, die durch das aggressive Verhalten der NSDAP-Mitglieder und insbesondere Schemms veranlasst waren.

1930 wurde Schemm Mitglied des Reichstags und blieb es bis zu seinem Tod.

1929 gründete Schemm den Nationalsozialistischen Lehrerbund (NSLB), dem er als Reichswalter vorstand. Auf seine Initiative hin entstand im Rahmen des NSLB eine Arbeitsgemeinschaft von Geistlichen beider Konfessionen. Dies führte zur Bildung einer Arbeitsgemeinschaft nationalsozialistischer evangelischer Geistlicher, die sich ab Mitte 1931 Nationalsozialistischer Evangelischer Pfarrerbund (NSEP) nannte.

1928 und 1929 hatte Schemm die Leitung mehrerer nationalsozialistischer Zeitungen (Streiter, Weckruf und Nationale Zeitung) aufgrund seiner parlamentarischen Immunität übernommen, die er jedoch kurze Zeit später bereits wieder abgab, da es zu viele aufreibende Prozesse gab und sich die Redaktionen nicht immer an seine Anweisungen hielten. Im April 1929 gründete Schemm eine eigene Zeitung, ab August des gleichen Jahres erschien dann die Nationalsozialistische Lehrerzeitung, später benannt Der deutsche Erzieher. Reichszeitung, das Verbandsorgan des NS-Lehrerbundes. Am 1. Oktober 1930 erschien die von Schemm herausgegebene Wochenzeitung Kampf für deutsche Freiheit und Kultur, welche die Auflage von zunächst 3.000 Stück auf 20.000 Stück (1932) steigerte.

1931 gründete Schemm den Nationalsozialistischen Kulturverlag Bayreuth, der ab dem 1. Oktober 1932 die Tageszeitung Das Fränkische Volk (Auflage 10.000 Stück) herausgab.

Schemm konnte 1933 die Gründung eines NS-Gaus Bayerische Ostmark durchsetzen, « Mark » im mittelalterlichen Sinn als Kriegsgebiet und Barriere gegen die « Slawen » verstanden. Gauhauptstadt wurde Bayreuth, das gleichzeitig auch Sitz des NSLB war. Schemm und die Gauleitung waren danach aktiv, um ein « Ostmark-Bewusstsein » zu fördern (zum Beispiel durch Ostmarklied, Ostmarkstraße, Ostmarkverlag). 1942 wurde der Gau, der infolge der NS-Eroberung von Teilen der Tschechoslowakei nunmehr nicht im Grenzgebiet lag, in « Gau Bayreuth » umbenannt. Schemm gründete einen « Gauverlag Bayerische Ostmark » mit Sitz in Bayreuth, durch den etliche regionale Blätter gleichgeschaltet und zentral gesteuert wurden. Bis 1942 trugen die Bezeichnung « Bayerische Ostmark » neben dem « Fränkischen Volk » die Deggendorfer Zeitung, die « Rottaler Zeitung », das « Hofer Tagblatt », die « Frankenwald-Zeitung », die « Kulmbacher Rundschau », die « Dingolfing-Landauer Zeitung », die Donau-Zeitung, der « Regensburger Kurier », die Coburger Nationalzeitung und andere Tageszeitungen. Nur wenige davon konnten noch eine kurze Zeit eine gewisse Eigenständigkeit bewahren, bis sie wegen der Papierrationierung im Weltkrieg ihr Erscheinen ganz einstellten.

Der Gauverlag Bayerische Ostmark, ab 1942 « Gauverlag Bayreuth », produzierte bis kurz vor Kriegsende eine große Anzahl Bücher, insbesondere auch Feldpostausgaben von Kleinschriften. Es erschienen nicht nur offensichtliche Propaganda-Schriften, sondern auch Bildbände über Städte der « Bayerischen Ostmark », sowie welche zu Bulgarien, und den eroberten Städten Prag und Krakau. 1939 zeigte der Verlag eine besondere Nähe zu Alfred Rosenbergs Kulturpolitik; zum Beispiel erschien im März ein Auswahlband, der aus 9 Essays von 1938 in einer Literatur-Zeitschrift Bücherkunde, einem Organ des Rosenbergschen « Amts Schrifttumspflege » bestand, sowie 3 weiteren. Beide Publikationen hatten den gleichen Herausgeber beziehungsweise Hauptschriftleiter, Günther Stöve.

Ab 1928 war Hans Schemm Gauleiter des NSDAP-Gaus Oberfranken, der 1933 mit dem Gau Oberpfalz-Niederbayern zum Gau Bayerische Ostmark vereinigt wurde. Schemm blieb Gauleiter und etablierte in den folgenden Jahren in diesem Gau eine Nebenausgabe des « Fränkischen Volkes », die « Bayerische Ostwacht », welche später in « Bayerische Ostmark » umbenannt wurde. Schemm wurde außerdem SA-Gruppenführer. Am 16. März 1933 ernannte Reichsstatthalter Franz Ritter von Epp Schemm zum kommissarischen Kultusminister Bayerns (Kabinett von Epp). Hitler

berief ihn dann am 13. April 1933 zum « Leiter der kulturellen und erzieherischen Angelegenheiten Bayerns ». Aufgrund dessen hatte auch der NSLB und der Reichstenographenbund seinen Sitz in Bayreuth. Auch unter der Regierung von Ludwig Siebert (Kabinett Siebert) blieb Schemm bis zu seinem Tode bayerischer Kultusminister. 1933 publizierte er das Buch Gott, Rasse und Kultur.

Auf der Tagung Die Erziehung im nationalsozialistischen Staat, die vom 1. bis 5. August 1933 in München stattfand, rechtfertigte er in einem Referat die nationalsozialistische Gleichschaltung :

« Der Nationalsozialismus kam zum Siege durch sein begeistertes Bekenntnis zur Totalität. Und wir werden deswegen nicht nachgeben, bis auch die Letzten gleichgeschaltet und die, welche nicht wollen, aus irgendwelchen Gründen weggestorben sind. »

Schemm wurde 1933 Ehrenbürger von Bayreuth und später in Eggenfelden und Hof.

1934 wirkte Schemm mit Hans Frank bei der Organisation der Schachweltmeisterschaft 1934 mit und ließ Schach in Bayern zu einem Schulfach machen.

Am 5. März 1935 starb Schemm aufgrund von Verletzungen, die er sich bei einem Flugzeugabsturz zugezogen hatte. Das Flugzeug war während des Starts am Flugplatz Bayreuth aufgrund eines Pilotenfehlers abgestürzt. Es gab auch Gerüchte, daß der Absturz alkoholbedingt war oder er selbst das Flugzeug gesteuert hatte. Hitler persönlich beorderte den Berliner Professor Ferdinand Sauerbruch per Flugzeug nach Bayreuth, Schemm erlag jedoch vor dessen Eintreffen seinen Verletzungen. Sein Nachfolger als Gauleiter und Reichswalter des NSLB wurde Fritz Wächtler.

Schemms Leben wurde von den Nationalsozialisten, zum Teil aber auch noch in der nachfolgenden demokratischen Zeit, verklärt. Infolge seines frühen Todes wurde er oft als « guter Nazi » bezeichnet. In der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus wurden Schulen, Straßen und Hallen nach ihm benannt. Unter anderem trugen das Theodolinden-Gymnasium und die Rotbuchenschule in München seinen Namen. Eine dieser Benennungen überdauerte bis April 1986 :

Die « Hans-Schemm-Kaserne » der US-Streitkräfte in Bayreuth, deren Hauptgebäude heute und andere das Sozialgericht Bayreuth beherbergt. Ein Gedächtnisraum wurde im Haus der Deutschen Erziehung eingerichtet.

Fritz Wächtler

L'homme politique allemand Fritz Wächtler est né le 17 janvier 1891 à Triebes et a été exécuté le 19 avril 1945 à Waldmünchen. Il a été « Gauleiter » du « Gau » de Bavière-Ostmark du 5 décembre 1935 au 19 avril 1945, date de son exécution par son successeur, le « Kreisleiter » de Bayreuth Ludwig Ruckdeschel.

Entré au NSDAP en 1926, il gravit rapidement les échelons de la SA. Élu député au Élections législatives allemandes de novembre, il est nommé « Gauleiter » à la suite du décès accidentel de son prédécesseur, en novembre 1935.

À la fin du conflit, alors que lui et son administration battent en retraite devant l'avancée des troupes américaines, il est exécuté sur ordre personnel de Adolf Hitler, sur les conseils de Martin Bormann, par son rival et successeur Ludwig Ruckdeschel.

...

The Nazi German politician Fritz Wächtler was born on 17 January 1891 in Triebes, in the Principality of Reuss-Greiz (present-day Thuringia) . He was the « Gauleiter » of the eastern Bavarian administrative region of « Gau Bayreuth » . Trained as a primary school teacher, he also became head of the National-Socialist Teachers League (NSLB) in 1935. During World War II, he held the honorary rank of « SS-Obergruppenführer » and « Reich » Defense Commissar of Bayreuth. Prone to alcoholic outbursts and unpopular with the local residents, he eventually ran afoul of Martin Bormann in a political intrigue. Wächtler was shot on the orders from the « Führerbunker » near the end of the War in April of 1945.

Wächtler was the son of a watch-maker. Between 1905 and 1911, he attended the « Weimar Lehrerseminar » , a special training academy for primary school teachers. After 2 years of teaching activity and military service, he became in 1914 a « 1 year volunteer » (« Einjährigfreiwilliger ») on the front during World War I. By 1915, he had been promoted to lieutenant. During the War, he received many awards. After the War, Wächtler worked again as a teacher in Thuringia.

Wächtler joined the Nazi Party in April 1926 (Member No. 35,313) and became its founding Local Group Leader (« Ortsgruppenleiter ») as well as « Sturmabteilung » leader in his hometown of Triebes. He also became district manager of the Party for Weimar-North. In 1929, Wächtler was elected as a member of the « Landtag » of Bavaria and appointed Deputy « Gauleiter » for the district of Thuringia. From August 1932, Wächtler served as Education Minister in the cabinet of the Minister President of Thuringia, Fritz Sauckel.

Following the Nazi Seizure of Power in 1933 until December 1935, Wächtler held the post of Interior Minister of Thuringia. He also became a member of the « Reichstag » in Berlin, in November 1933, a post he held until his death. In November 1934, Wächtler joined the « Schutzstaffel » (SS-Nr. 209 058) as an SS-Colonel. By the end of January 1936, he was promoted to the rank of « SS-Brigadeführer » and, in April 1937, to « SS-Gruppenführer » .

On 5 March 1935, the 1st « Gauleiter » of the Bayreuth, Hans Schemm, died in an airplane crash. Wächtler was appointed his successor and also took-over management of the National-Socialist Teachers League (NSLB) . From January 1936, he also acted as a « person responsible for primary school questions » on the staff of Rudolf Heß. He was also awarded the title of the Prussian State Council and, until 1938, served as the acting mayor of the city of Bayreuth.

Unlike Schemm, Wächtler enjoyed no popularity among the residents of his district nor among the « Reich » leadership. He was brutal with subordinates and prone to uncontrolled alcoholic outbursts in public. Even Winifred Wagner, daughter-in-law of Richard Wagner, complained repeatedly about his misconduct to her close friend Hitler.

However, she also frequently tried to intervene with the « Führer » on behalf of Jewish friends for clemency. This is probably why, while little appreciated by Hitler, Wächtler remained untouched until 1945.

Wächtler was involved in organizing the anti-Jewish « Kristallnacht » riots of 9-10 November 1938, in his district. The next day, the « Reich » leadership in Berlin ordered cessation of further property destruction because they feared the riots they had instigated would lead to more radical actions not under their control. Wächtler himself tried to use the opportunity to force public school teachers to sign a personal oath that they would no longer teach any religious subjects. Highly-unpopular, Rudolf Heß had to order the directive rescinded. From 1938, Wächtler's district also became home to the Floßenbürg concentration camp and its many sub-camps.

In February 1939, the « Donau-Zeitung » reported about Wächtler's visit in Hauzenberg, where the « Gauleiter » had dedicated a Party district house. After seeing the condition of the school in Wegscheid, a new building was decided. In March 1939, when Wächtler spoke at the « Passau Nibelungenhalle », the « Donau-Zeitung » reported an audience of 12,000. In April 1939, Wächtler purchased the « Passau Haus », where Adolf Hitler had lived for 2 years. 1 year later, he donated it to the city of Passau.

On 16 November 1942, Wächtler was appointed « Reich » Defense Commissar (« Reichsverteidigungskommissar ») for his district and, by August 1944, given the rank of « SS-Obergruppenführer ». It was in these positions that he came to realize the War would be lost. This attitude also became apparent to his superiors when he prevented the seizure of the historic « Bayreuth Festspielhaus » for use in defense of the city. By 1945, his additional failure to send daily situation reports to « Führer » Headquarters brought him to the attention and suspicion of Martin Bormann, Hitler's private secretary. Bormann had previously ordered the closing of the National-Socialist Teachers League (NSLB), on 17 February 1943, together with all its « Gau » offices across Germany. Wächtler, fearing the loss of influence, complained that the NSLB was essential for the War effort in long rambling memos to Bormann, to no avail.

In 1945, Hitler declared Bayreuth to be a fortress, which led to the destruction of over 1/3 of the city by air-raids. On 1 April 1945, Bormann issued a further order that all « Gauleiters », « Kreisleiters », and other NSDAP political leaders were to fight to the death in their districts. With the city in ruins and only 200 irregular defenders left, Wächtler left Bayreuth with his staff as American tanks approached on 13 April. He set-up offices at a hotel in Waldmünchen in the southern part of the « Gau » near the Czech border. It is unclear whether communications difficulties prevented Wächtler from informing « Führer » Headquarters of his location, however, his deputy and political rival Ludwig Ruckdeschel used the opportunity to contact Bormann and accuse Wächtler of desertion. On orders from « Führer » Headquarters, Ruckdeschel appeared at the hotel with 35 SS troops and summarily executed Wächtler, on 19 April.

...

Fritz Wächtler (geboren 7. Januar 1891 in Triebes ; gestorben 19. April 1945 in Waldmünchen) war ein deutscher Politiker (NSDAP), NSDAP-Gauleiter der Bayerischen Ostmark und SS-Obergruppenführer (1944).

Wächtler, Sohn eines Uhrmachers, wurde zwischen 1905 und 1911 auf dem Weimarer Lehrerseminar zum Volksschullehrer ausgebildet. Nach zweijähriger Lehrtätigkeit und dem Wehrdienst als Einjährigfreiwilliger diente er 1914 an der Front des Ersten Weltkrieges und wurde 1915 zum Leutnant befördert. Durch seine Verdienste erhielt er zahlreiche verschiedene Auszeichnungen.

Nach Kriegsende arbeitete Wächtler zunächst erneut als Lehrer in Thüringen, bis er im April 1926 der NSDAP beitrug (Mitglied-Nummer 35.313). In seiner neuen Funktion war Wächtler Gründer und Leiter der ansässigen Ortsgruppe von Triebes und Führer der SA seines Heimatorts. Gleichzeitig wurde er Bezirksleiter der Partei für Weimar-Nord.

1929 wurde Wächtler zum Mitglied des Landtages gewählt und zum Gauorganisationsleiter und stellvertretenden Gauleiter für den Gau Thüringen ernannt. Ab August 1932 fungierte Wächtler als Volksbildungsminister im Kabinett von Fritz Sauckel und später unter Willy Marschler (bis 1945). Von Mai 1933 bis Dezember 1935 hatte er zusätzlich das Amt des Innenministers inne.

Im November 1933 zog er für die NSDAP als Mitglied des Reichstages nach Berlin.

Im November 1934 trat Wächtler in die Schutzstaffel (SS-Nummer 209.058) als SS-Oberführer ein.

Als Nachfolger des am 5. März 1935 verstorbenen, bei einem Flugzeugabsturz in Bayreuth tödlich verletzten Gauleiters Hans Schemm wurde Wächtler am 5. Dezember 1935 zum Gauleiter der Bayerischen Ostmark ernannt. Gleichzeitig wurde er zum Leiter des « NSDAP-Hauptamtes für Erziehung » und ferner zum kommissarischen Leiter des « NS-Lehrerbundes » ernannt. Ab Januar 1936 agierte er auch als « Sachbearbeiter für Volksschulfragen » im Stab von Rudolf Heß.

Ende Januar 1936 wurde Wächtler zum SS-Brigadeführer und im April 1937 zum SS-Gruppenführer befördert. Er erhielt den Titel eines preußischen Staatsrates. Bis 1938 war er zugleich kommissarischer Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Bayreuth.

Als Alkoholiker neigte Wächtler zu unbeherrschten Ausbrüchen und Bloßstellungen auch gegenüber Untergebenen. Winifred Wagner beklagte sich mehrfach bei Hitler über Wächtler. Wohl auch darum wurde er auch von Hitler wenig geschätzt, blieb jedoch bis 1945 unangetastet. Es wird vermutet, daß Hitler in den letzten Kriegsjahren keine Unruhe wollte.

Am 16. November 1942 erhielt Wächtler das Amt des Reichsverteidigungskommissars in seinem Gau und erhielt im August 1944 den Rang « SS-Obergruppenführer ». Nach dem Vorstoß amerikanischer Truppen auf die Gauhauptstadt Bayreuth wurde Wächtler wegen vorzeitigen Verlassens seiner Befehlsstelle in Bayreuth von einem SS-Kommando in der Gauleitungs-Ausweichstelle bei Waldmünchen erschossen. Angeblich erfolgte die Exekution auf persönlichen Befehl Adolf Hitlers, vermutlich jedoch ging dem Befehl eine Intrige seines Stellvertreters Ludwig Ruckdeschel mit Martin Bormann voraus.

Ruckdeschel, ein fanatischer Nationalsozialist, galt als langjähriger Rivale Fritz Wächtlers. Im April 1945 bezichtigte er ihn der Fahnenflucht und denunzierte ihn offensichtlich beim Führerhauptquartier. Am Morgen des 19. April (1945) fuhren Ruckdeschel und eine Abteilung von 35 SS-Männern vor Wächtlers Hotel, dem Grenzhotel in Herzogau, vor. Wächtler wurde abgeführt, an den nächsten Baum gestellt und erschossen. Ruckdeschel wurde sein Nachfolger und gab bekannt, Wächtler sei aus der NSDAP ausgestoßen und wegen Feigheit im Angesicht des Feindes hingerichtet worden. « Jedem Schuft und Verräter, der sich ebenso verhält, droht das gleiche Schicksal. » 1948 wurde er zu acht Jahren Haft verurteilt, allerdings nicht wegen der Erschießung Wächtlers, sondern unter anderem der Ermordung von Domprediger Johann Maier, der sich an einer Kundgebung zur kampfflosen Übergabe der Stadt Regensburg beteiligt hatte.

...

Fritz Wächtler, Sohn eines Uhrmachers, wurde zwischen 1905 und 1911 auf dem Weimarer Lehrerseminar zum Volksschullehrer ausgebildet. Nach zweijähriger Lehrtätigkeit und dem Wehrdienst als Einjährigfreiwilliger diente er 1914 an der Front des Ersten Weltkrieges und wurde 1915 zum Leutnant befördert. Durch seine Verdienste erhielt er zahlreiche verschiedene Auszeichnungen. Nach Kriegsende arbeitete Wächtler zunächst erneut als Lehrer in Thüringen, bis er im April 1926 der NSDAP beitrug (Mitglied-Nummer 35.313). In seiner neuen Funktion war Wächtler Gründer und Leiter der ansässigen Ortsgruppe von Triebes und Führer der SA seines Heimatorts. Gleichzeitig wurde er Bezirksleiter der Partei für Weimar-Nord. 1929 wurde Wächtler zum Mitglied des Landtages gewählt und zum Gauorganisationsleiter und stellvertretenden Gauleiter für den Gau Thüringen ernannt. Ab August 1932 fungierte Wächtler als Volksbildungsminister im Kabinett von Fritz Sauckel und später unter Willy Marschler (bis 1945). Von Mai 1933 bis Dezember 1935 hatte er zusätzlich das Amt des Innenministers inne.

Im November 1933 zog er für die NSDAP als Mitglied des Reichstages nach Berlin. Im November 1934 trat Wächtler in die Schutzstaffel (SS-Nummer 209.058) als SS-Oberführer ein. Als Nachfolger des am 5. März 1935 verstorbenen, bei einem Flugzeugabsturz in Bayreuth tödlich verletzten Gauleiters Hans Schemm wurde Wächtler am 5. Dezember 1935 zum Gauleiter der Bayerischen Ostmark ernannt. Gleichzeitig wurde er zum Leiter des NSDAP-Hauptamtes für Erziehung und ferner zum kommissarischen Leiter des NS-Lehrerbundes ernannt. Ab Januar 1936 agierte er auch als « Sachbearbeiter für Volksschulfragen » im Stab von Rudolf Heß.

Ende Januar 1936 wurde Wächtler zum SS-Brigadeführer und im April 1937 zum SS-Gruppenführer befördert. Er erhielt den Titel eines preußischen Staatsrates. Bis 1938 war er zugleich kommissarischer Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Bayreuth. Am 16. November 1942 erhielt Wächtler das Amt des Reichsverteidigungskommissars in seinem Gau und erhielt im August 1944 den Rang « SS-Obergruppenführer ». Er war in dieser Position allerdings so realistisch, daß er sich die Niederlage selbst eingestand. Dies zeigte sich, als er die Beschlagnahme des Festspielhauses für NS-Zwecke verhinderte.

Nach dem Vorstoß amerikanischer Truppen auf die Gauhauptstadt Bayreuth wurde Wächtler wegen vorzeitigen Verlassens seiner Befehlsstelle in Bayreuth von einem SS-Kommando in der Gauleitungs-Ausweichstelle bei Waldmünchen erschossen. Angeblich erfolgte die Exekution auf persönlichen Befehl Adolf Hitlers, vermutlich jedoch ging dem Befehl eine Intrige seines Stellvertreters Ludwig Ruckdeschel mit Martin Bormann voraus. Als Alkoholiker neigte Wächtler zu unbeherrschten Ausbrüchen und Bloßstellungen auch gegenüber Untergebenen. Winifred Wagner teilte mehrfach sein Fehlverhalten Hitler

mit. Wohl auch darum wurde er auch von Hitler wenig geschätzt ; dennoch blieb er bis 1945 unangetastet. Es wird vermutet, daß Hitler vor dem « Endsieg » keine Unruhe wollte.

Ludwig Ruckdeschel

Ludwig Ruckdeschel est né le 15 mars 1907 à Bayreuth et est mort le 8 novembre 1968 à Wolfsbourg. Il fut le dernier « Gauleiter » en poste à Bayreuth, du 19 avril 1945 à l'occupation totale de son « Gau » par les armées alliées dans les jours qui ont suivi.

Ayant appartenu à divers groupes « Völkisch » , il adhère à la SA en 1923, puis au NSDAP en 1925. Il connaît une ascension régulière au sein du NSDAP, qui lui permet d'accéder au poste de « Kreisleiter » de Bayreuth.

En 1934, il adhère à la SS. En tant que « Brigadeführer » , il est affecté en novembre 1944 au sein de la division « SS Hitlerjugend » .

Nazi fanatique, il dénonce son supérieur le « Gauleiter » Fritz Wächtler, informant Adolf Hitler de la retraite de ce dernier devant l'avancée des troupes américaines en avril 1945. Aussitôt nommé à la place de Wächtler, il reçoit l'ordre de l'exécuter. Nommé « Gauleiter » , il applique avec sévérité les directives émanant de Martin Bormann dans les derniers mois du conflit.

Jugé en 1948 par un tribunal, condamné à 8 années de prison, il est libéré en 1953 et a travaillé ensuite à l'usine Volkswagen de Wolfsbourg.

...

Ludwig Ruckdeschel was born on 15 March 1907 in Bayreuth, than part of the Kingdom of Bavaria within the German Empire ; and died on 8 November 1986 in Wolfsburg. After finishing his education he became a Merchant.

Ruckdeschel was the Nazi « Gauleiter » of Bayreuth during final month of the « Gau's » existence before the collapse of Nazi Germany, in 1945. Before this, from 1933 to 1941, he served as the deputy of « Gauleiter » Fritz Wächtler, whom he had executed on orders by Martin Bormann. From 1933 to 1945, he was also a member of the German Parliament, the « Reichstag » .

During the Second World War, Ruckdeschel served in the « Waffen-SS » , rising to the rank of a « Sturmbannführer » , a rank equivalent to a major. After the War, he was arrested in 1947 and eventually sentenced to 13 years in prison but released in 1952.

Ruckdeschel joined a nationalist youth organization in 1921, and the SA in 1923. He was a founding member of the local branch of the Nazi Party in Bayreuth, in early 1925, and became closely associated with « Gauleiter » Hans Schemm. From 1928 onward, he became a permanent employee of the « Gau » administration of the Nazi Party. In this role, he was responsible for the publication of Right-wing books and newspapers.

With the Nazis rise to power in 1933, he became deputy « Gauleiter » of the « Gau Bayerische Ostmark » which was renamed « Gau Bayreuth » in June 1942. He also became a member of the « Reichstag » in November 1933, and held this office until 1945.

In September 1934, Ruckdeschel moved from the SA to the SS, joining as a « Sturmhauptführer » but receiving frequent promotions after this. With the death of Schemm, in 1935, Ruckdeschel temporarily acted as « Gauleiter » for 9 month until Fritz Wächtler was appointed to the position in December 1935.

Ruckdeschel was called-up for service in the « SS Division Totenkopf » , in April 1940. He was drafted into the « Wehrmacht » in July 1941, serving in a propaganda unit, but released again in October. From December 1941 onward, he served in a War correspondent role in the « Waffen-SS » . He was transferred to the « SS Division Leibstandarte Adolf Hitler » in May 1942, and became a company commander in the « SS Division Hitlerjugend » in May 1943. He was promoted to « Hauptsturmführer » on 21 June 1944 and, severely wounded 6 days later, losing his right arm. After recovery from his injuries, Ruckdeschel spend time in a SS training unit before serving as an inspector of the « Volkssturm » , from January 1945 onward.

Ruckdeschel, according to the historian Ian Kershaw a fanatical Nazi, commanded the execution of « Gauleiter » Wächtler, on 19 April 1945, on orders from Martin Bormann, after Ruckdeschel had denounced his long-term rival as a coward and deserter. He, then, served as the « Gauleiter » of Bayreuth in the final weeks of the War.

In post-War Germany, Ruckdeschel was arrested in 1947 and sentenced to 8 years in jail, the following year, for attempted manslaughter and negligence for the execution of 2 citizens of Regensburg, one of them the preacher Johann Maier, who had advocated the peaceful surrender of the city. The sentence was expanded to 13 years in 1949. Released in 1952, he worked for Volkswagen until 1968.

...

Ludwig Ruckdeschel (geboren 15. März 1907 in Bayreuth ; gestorben 8. November 1968 in Wolfsburg) war ein deutscher Politiker (NSDAP) und SS-Brigadeführer.

Ruckdeschel besuchte von 1913 bis 1921 die Volksschule in seiner Heimatstadt. Danach absolvierte er eine kaufmännische Lehre und besuchte währenddessen die Handelsschule. Von 1924 bis 1928 verdiente er seinen Lebensunterhalt als kaufmännischer Angestellter und Geschäftsführer.

Nachdem er bereits von 1921 bis 1922 in der völkischen Jugendbewegung aktiv gewesen war, gehörte er seit 1923 der Sturmabteilung (SA) , der Kampfformation der Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP) an. Während des Parteiverbotes war er im Völkischen Bund Bayreuth aktiv und war ab 1925 Führer im örtlichen Frontbann. Ab 1924 war er Vertrauter von Hans Schemm. Nach der Neugründung der NSDAP im Frühjahr 1925 trat Ruckdeschel nicht nur erneut in die SA, sondern auch in die Partei selbst ein (Mitgliedsnummer 29.308) .

Von Januar 1926 bis zum September 1928 amtierte Ruckdeschel als Geschäftsführer der Ortsgruppe und Bezirksleitung in Bayreuth der NSDAP. Im Oktober 1928 wurde Ruckdeschel Gaugeschäftsführer und Gaupropagandaleiter des Gaus Oberfranken. Unmittelbar nach der nationalsozialistischen « Machtergreifung » im Frühjahr 1933 wurde Ruckdeschel am 1. Februar 1933 zum Gaugeschäftsführer und Stellvertreter des Gauleiters im Gau Bayerische Ostmark (Oberfranken-Oberpfalz-Niederbayern) berufen. Im November 1933 wurde er Mitglied des Reichstages, dem er bis 1945 angehörte.

In seiner Heimatstadt begründete er 1930 die Deutsche Buchhandlung und war ab Anfang Januar 1931 Herausgeber der Wochenzeitung Kampf (für deutsche Freiheit und Kultur) , die ab Anfang Mai 1933 als Braune Sonntagszeitung firmierte.

Ruckdeschel war Gesellschafter und anfangs Geschäftsführer der 1934 gegründeten Ostmark-Selbsthilfe GmbH und deren 1935 gegründeten Tochtergesellschaft Allgemeine Förderungsgesellschaft GmbH. Die Unternehmen des Gaus Bayerische Ostmark, deren Vermögen größtenteils aus geraubtem Vermögen der Sozialdemokratie bestand, waren im nationalsozialistischen Sinn gemeinnützig. Die Ostmark-Selbsthilfe errichtete unter anderem die Gartenstadt in Bayreuth.

Vom 19. April 1945 bis zur deutschen Kapitulation amtierte Ruckdeschel als Nachfolger von Fritz Wächtler als letzter Gauleiter des Gaus Bayreuth. In dieser Funktion forderte er in einer Rundfunkansprache vom 22. April angesichts des unaufhaltsamen Vormarsches der amerikanischen Truppen die Verteidigung der Stadt Regensburg bis zum letzten Stein. Kurze Zeit später floh er ; die Stadt blieb dank einer kampflosen Übergabe am 27. April weitgehend unzerstört.

Ruckdeschel trat am 20. Oktober 1934 der SS bei und erhielt die Mitgliedsnummer 234.190 zugewiesen, wo er am 9. November 1941 bis zum SS-Brigadeführer der Allgemeinen SS aufstieg. Während des Zweiten Weltkrieges wurde er Anfang April 1940 zur SS-Totenkopf-Division eingezogen, wo er einer Kriegsberichter-Abteilung zugeteilt war. Im Mai 1942 wurde er zur Panzer-Abteilung der Leibstandarte-SS Adolf Hitler versetzt. Anfang Mai 1943 wurde er zum Führer der 6. Kompanie/SS-Panzer Regiment 12 in der 12. SS-Panzer-Division « Hitlerjugend » ernannt. Im Juni 1944 verlor er durch Kriegsverletzungen seinen rechten Arm. Ende September 1944 wurde er nach einem Lazarettaufenthalt zum SS-Panzer-Ausbildungs- und Ersatz-Regiment versetzt und Ende Januar 1945 zum SS-Sturmbannführer der Rang der Waffen-SS befördert, dem höchsten Rang den er in dieser Organisation erreichte.

Vom Januar bis zum 16. April 1945 wurde er als Inspekteur des Volkssturms im Stab des Oberbefehlshabers West eingesetzt.

Ruckdeschel kann nach Auswertung einer Untersuchung des renommierten Historikers Ian Kershaw ohne weiteres als fanatischer Nationalsozialist bezeichnet werden. Er galt als langjähriger Rivale des Gauleiters der Bayerischen Ostmark Fritz Wächtler und bezichtigte ihn der Fahnenflucht. Ruckdeschel denunzierte ihn offensichtlich beim Führerhauptquartier.

« Früh am Morgen des 19. April (1945) fuhren Ruckdeschel und eine Abteilung von 35 SS-Männern vor Wächtlers Hotel vor Wächtler wurde abgeführt, an den nächsten Baum gestellt und schließlich von einem Erschießungskommando

hingerichtet. Ruckdeschel gab bekannt, Wächtler sei aus der NSDAP ausgestoßen und wegen Feigheit im Angesicht des Feindes hingerichtet worden. »

Kershaw gibt eine Aussage Ruckdeschels wieder :

« Jedem Schuft und Verräter, der sich ebenso verhalte, drohe das gleiche Schicksal. »

Im August 1947 in Untersuchungshaft genommen wurde Ruckdeschel am 2. November 1948 vom Oberlandesgericht Nürnberg zu acht Jahren Haft verurteilt. Gegenstand des Verfahrens war die Hinrichtung zweier Regensburger Bürger, darunter der Domprediger Johann Maier, nach einem Standgerichtsverfahren am 23. April 1945. Die Hingerichteten hatten sich an einer Kundgebung zur kampfblosen Übergabe der Stadt beteiligt. Nach der vorzeitigen Haftentlassung 1952 fand Ruckdeschel eine Beschäftigung als Gästeführer für prominente Gäste bei Volkswagen in Wolfsburg.

Bayreuth sous le 3e « Reich »

Pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, le Festival est mis à la disposition du Parti Nazi et les représentations réservées à partir de 1940 à des soldats blessés au front, « invités du Führer ». « Les Maîtres-chanteurs », facilement détournable dans le sens d'une propagande ultra-nationaliste, est la seule œuvre à l'affiche en 1943 et 1944.

En 1945, il est hautement incertain que le Festival de Bayreuth puisse jamais rouvrir. La participation du Festival à la politique culturelle du National-Socialisme, l'intimité de la famille Wagner avec Hitler, l'utilisation de Wagner par la propagande du régime, les difficultés de l'Allemagne d'après-guerre et notamment la destruction des 2 tiers de la ville de Bayreuth, concourent à l'associer avec le Nazisme sur le rejet duquel se construit la jeune République fédérale. Pendant plusieurs années, le Palais des Festivals est utilisé comme Théâtre par l'armée américaine. Un tribunal condamne Winnifred Wagner pour son soutien aux Nazis, et lui interdit de diriger le Festival, dont elle transfère la direction à ses 2 fils Wieland et Wolfgang.

Afin de rompre avec ce passé encombrant, Wieland, secondé par Wolfgang, décide de donner au Festival de Bayreuth une orientation esthétique radicalement nouvelle, connue sous le nom de « nouveau Bayreuth ». Le 29 juillet 1951, le 1er Festival d'après-guerre est inauguré par une 9e Symphonie de Beethoven dirigée par Wilhelm Fürtwängler, dont l'enregistrement par Walter Legge, publié en 1954 par His Master's Voice, est considéré depuis par toute la critique musicale, d'André Tubeuf à John Ardoin, comme un sommet du genre. Mais si « les Maîtres-chanteurs » de Rudolf Hartmann sont montés dans la veine traditionnelle, « Parsifal » et « l'Anneau du Nibelung » constituent un choc pour les habitués. Les décors naturalistes et réalistes font place à un espace scénique minimaliste et elliptique qui permet de viser le sens profond de l'œuvre dégagée de tout contexte ou de toute récupération politique. Jusqu'à sa mort en 1966, Wieland soumet à ce traitement tous les Opéras de son grand-père, remettant ses productions sur le métier face aux critiques qui l'accusent de sacrifier la tradition.

Wolfgang Wagner signe également quelques mises-en-scène, mais la critique leur reproche leur manque d'inspiration et leur faiblesse par rapport à celles de Wieland. Il se concentre donc sur le travail administratif.

...

On January 13, 1933, the newly-elected National-Socialist Party celebrated the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death by staging a grandiose memorial ceremony in Leipzig, the composer's birthplace. Adolf Hitler invited Siegfried Wagner's widow, the English-born Winifred, and her son Wieland to be guests of honour at this event. This tribute by the Nazis was the beginning of a deep friendship between the « Führer » and the Wagner family, forging a link between the new Germany and the country's revered composer. Within weeks of becoming Chancellor of Germany, Hitler had appropriated Wagner and made him the « Reich » 's great beacon. Each summer, from 1933 to 1939, Hitler attended the Bayreuth Festival, and he made the Wagner Estate, Wahnfried, his 2nd home. Because she had been one of his earliest supporters, Hitler had great affection for Winifred. Hitler repaid the Wagner family gratitude by pledging his undying friendship and his deepest devotion to Richard Wagner and Bayreuth. With the assistance of Doctor Josef Goebbels, Hitler's untiring propaganda minister, Richard Wagner became the legendary and ideological voice of the new Party, and the musical standard by which all Classical composers would, from now on, be judged. This is how Richard Wagner and Bayreuth fell under the weight of the swastika during the years before the beginning of World War II.

« At the age of 12, I saw the 1st Opera of my life, " Lohengrin ". In one instant, I was addicted. My youthful enthusiasm for the Bayreuth Master knew no bounds. »

(Adolf Hitler. « Mein Kampf » , Volume I.)

Around the time that the Nazis came to power, the Bayreuth holy of holies still existed : the original Paul von Joukowsky sets used at the premiere of « Parsifal » . They were still in use at the « Festspielhaus » even though they were falling apart and were dangerous to the singers. Realistically, the time had come to replace the production, and the logical person to design the sets would be Emil Preetorius. A petition began circulating against this decision. After all, this was the scenery « on which the eyes of the Master had reposed » , and the conservative faction at Bayreuth believed that the scenery needed to be kept and revered like a holy icon. Over a 1,000 signatures were collected, including those of conductor Arturo Toscanini and composer Richard Strauß. Winifred Wagner sent the petition to Hitler along with a pamphlet accusing Preetorius of being « un-German » and « under Jewish influence » . Hitler, on the other hand, favored a new Bayreuth production of « Parsifal » , and selected Alfred Roller to design it. The « Führer » was a great admirer of Roller's work in Vienna, and the 2 had met when Hitler was an aspiring artist.

« " Parsifal ", more than the " Ring " was the Gospel of National-Socialism. » (Robert W. Gutman)

(Photo) Nazis marching to a performance at the « Festspielhaus » . The banner reads : « Richard Wagner's city greets the " Führer " 's guests. » During the War years, Nazi presence was everywhere in Bayreuth. SS troops sound the fanfare from the « Festspielhaus » balcony.

(Photo) The « Festspielhaus » decorated and illuminated to celebrate Hitler's birthday (April 20, 1939) .

At the start of World War II, the Nazis prohibited all performances of « Parsifal » throughout Germany. Bayreuth also had to comply with this order that had originated from the Ministry of Propaganda. Following the controversy over replacing the original sets, and the disappointment over the 1937 production, the ban on « Parsifal » proved puzzling. At 1st, this decision was hard to fathom, and no official reason was given for banishing the work from Germany's stages. Before the War, « Parsifal » , like no other of Richard Wagner's work, had fueled Hitler's imagination, and had provided the Nazis with the kind of mythic Germanic Christian ideological background that was easy for the people to understand. However, as the dead and wounded were being shipped back from the front, presenting an Opera where one of the main characters lay suffering from a mortal wound was obviously not very good public relation for the War cause.

Wagner authority Robert R. Gibson has offered further possible reasons why the Nazis banned « Parsifal » . He argues that the Opera's main character learns pacifism throughout his long journeys and, ultimately, becomes a compassionate human being. These traits were considered feminine attributes, and not worthy of the idealized Nazi conception of the Aryan male. The author also mentions that the ban occurred at the time when the Nazis were trying to suppress homosexuality. Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels denounced priestly and monastic celibate life in a speech, in 1937. « Parsifal » , with its representation of a community of quasi-religious brothers who embrace (the SS were forbidden to touch one another) must have been anathema to the 3rd « Reich » .

Following all the controversy. Alfred Roller's production premiered in 1934, and it was a disappointment. There was really very little that the great designer did that was different from the sacrosanct sets that so many did not want to replace. The temple cupola in the 2nd scene of Act I disappeared, and this made many conservatives very disappointed. Winifred, once again, appealed to Hitler that there should be yet another new production of « Parsifal » to replace this fiasco. Hitler agreed and suggested that Wieland Wagner design the new sets. Hitler had always revered Siegfried's son because he was a direct descendant of the Master. Once the War began, Hitler gave orders that Wieland should be permanently exempt from military service. Wieland's 1937 « Parsifal » was such an old fashioned approach to the Opera that it was deemed even less successful than the Roller production. It would not be until 1951 and the re-opening of the Bayreuth Festival that Wieland would achieve artistic success with this work.

L'antisémitisme de Wagner : Prélude au 3rd « Reich »

In his widely-purchased but seldom read tome « Mein Kampf » , Adolf Hitler paid tribute to those individuals in German history who had achieved what he considered to be the pinnacle of success. Though misunderstood during their lifetimes, these great German « warriors » nevertheless persevered in carrying « the fight for their ideas and ideals to their end » . This short list includes but 3 names : Frederick the Great, Martin Luther, and Richard Wagner. Hitler apparently believed that his name would be added to this list, at some future time. The inclusion of Richard Wagner, in such select company, merits examination. What did Hitler see as Wagner's great accomplishment that elevated him above the likes of Bismarck or Beethoven ?

Undoubtedly, Richard Wagner's numerous music-dramas had significant impact on Germany and on Hitler. In 1890, an

astounding 900 performances of Wagner's Operas were staged in 67 German cities and towns. The Wagner Society, founded 7 years previously on the composer's death, had grown to 300 chapters with a membership of 8,000. The Society existed not merely to propagate the music but Wagner's ideology as well. The voluminous essays penned by Wagner over a span of nearly 50 years exerted considerable influence. Although Hitler has never been described as a scholar or even a great reader, evidence exists that he did delve deeply into racist compositions. Between 1919 and 1921, Hitler borrowed numerous works from the « Nationalsozialistisches Institut », a Party lending library near Munich. Among the titles were the prose works of Wagner and his son-in-law, Houston Stewart Chamberlain.

Chamberlain, an expatriate Englishman, quickly became enamored with Wagner, his music, and his ideology. As a member of Wagner's inner circle and his son-in-law, Chamberlain assumed a leading role in propagating the « Völkish » and racial philosophy of the Meister. More than any other person, « it was Chamberlain who constructed an ideological bridge between Wagnerism and the broader tradition of nationalist and racist thought ». Indeed, Hitler acknowledged his agreement with Chamberlain's views. After meeting Hitler, in September 1923, Chamberlain publicly declared his support for the « Führer » .

Having seen the influence of Wagner's ideology, it is appropriate to examine the sources of his ideas which later developed into a philosophy of regenerative anti-Semitism. Central to Wagner's thinking is the concept of « Volk », the abstract, truly human, essential Germanic spirit. According to Wagner :

« The “ Volk ” has always been the essence of all the individuals who constituted a commonality. In the beginning, it was the family and the races ; then, the races united through linguistic equality as a nation. »

« Volk » were further defined by their physiological differences from others, and they shared a commonality of language and purpose. The Jews thus stood apart from the « Volk », purportedly in their physiology and mother tongue (although German Jews studiously avoided Yiddish for this very reason) . The primary cultural metaphor for Jew as Other was the construct of the Wandering Jew, deeply rooted in European history.

Friedrich Goethe inspired the various interpretations in German ideology of the Wandering Jew (Ahasverus) , a manifestation of the Jewish race as a parasitic, ghost race that had outlived its usefulness and could neither die nor be assimilated into the youthful German nation. In his 1838 Plan of a New Ahasverus, Karl Gutzkow (a leader of the Young Germany movement which superseded the Burschenschaften as the main fomenter of revolution in the 1830's) used the character of Ahasverus to illustrate the problem facing Jewish redemption : the Wandering Jew was « nothing but a ghost, a wandering fossilized mummy of a people that had rejected the fruitful dynamic of history, shunning admixture and assimilation with the other peoples of Europe, refusing to abandon their isolated exclusivity ». Gutzkow transformed the sin of despising Christ into a state of lovelessness and egoism that must be transformed by love and « the emancipation of the flesh » .

Ludwig Börne, whose ideas influenced the Young Germany revolutionary outlook, described the Wandering Jew as a « manifestation of the money demon, this raised fury of greed, this beautiful devil of gold ». In the 1830's, Börne identified the bourgeois capitalist money society with Judaism. In the late- 1840's, Wagner identified Börne with the

figure of the redeemed Ahasverus, the Jew redeemed by his own revolutionary faith into humanity.

Wagner's mythological interpretation of the Wandering Jew saw many transformations, developing as the « perfect plastic expression of both his racist and his revolutionary sensibilities ». Characters, such as the Flying Dutchman (his " Ahasverus of the Ocean ") , were able to achieve redemption because they were not Jewish. This stressed the incapacity of the Jewish Ahasverus to be redeemed. Wagner's hero wanderers learn compassion through suffering, earning their redemption. From « Judaism in Music » (1850) , arguably the seminal text of Wagner's anti-Semitism, Wagner defined the only redemption for the Jews was « the redemption of Ahasverus ; Destruction ! » .

Between 1834-1840, Richard Wagner found an affinity for revolutionary ideals through Heinrich Laube who (along with Karl Gutzkow) was leader of Young Germany. Laube, in « Young Europe » , had given birth to the notion of the revolutionary organization. Wagner shared Laube's vision of a new, free Germany, engineered by new art and literature. They believed that bourgeois restrictions, such as marriage, were the « destroyer of all vital feelings » , and that the artist must disdain these restrictions and transcend them in his life. In his early works, notably his 1st successful opera, *Rienzi*, love was the agent of personal emancipation. *Rienzi* also featured ideas that would come to fruition in the 3rd « Reich » : mass political movements, extensive use of propaganda, and the Führer principle. For these reasons, *Rienzi* has been labelled a fascist Opera. Hitler cited a performance of *Rienzi* as the source of his calling to redeemer of the German people. It was played at his rallies. The autographed score was one of his prize possessions.

In the 1870's - 1880's, Wagner's revolutionary anti-Semitism was influenced by 2 contemporary lines of thought. Darwinism brought an optimistic biological insight into his philosophy ; as with animals, humans' sexual matings brought about improvements in German society that would allow the development of the redeemer. Joseph Arthur Gobineau, in « Essay on the Inequality of Human Races » , introduced Wagner to the degenerative tendencies produced by interracial marriage. His work emphasized the inferiority of the black and yellow races with whom the Germans had little experience and thus substituted the Jews. Wagner, however, enthusiastically adopted the term « Aryan » from Gobineau's work.

Wagner's extreme anti-Semitism has often been ascribed to the belief, widespread during his lifetime, that he was not a pure Aryan. Many, including Richard Eichenauer, 3rd « Reich » music historian, believed that Wagner's real father was the actor Ludwig Geyer who was suspected of being of Jewish descent. Such speculation is historically moot, yet may indeed have troubled Wagner. Similar speculations concerning Hitler are equally fruitless but, nevertheless, have received extensive coverage (e.g. Ralph Waite, « The Psychopathic God ») .

Many of Wagner's defenders in the post- World War II era have pointed to a contradiction between theory and practice. While his written anti-Semitism is undeniable, Wagner associated with many Jews in the course of his work. Among them, were many Jewish musicians, the conductor Hermann Levi, singers Heinrich Porges and Lilli Lehman, and the impresario Angelo Neumann. Neumann was responsible for securing the 1st performance of the Ring cycle outside Bayreuth. One Jew, the pianist Josef Rubinstein, was a member of Wagner's inner circle living at Wahnfried. Wagner's defenders conclude that, while he held racist beliefs, in his personal relations he could rise above his racism. Others conclude that his anti-Semitism was more than « an excusable aberration of genius » , and that Wagner had no moral

scruples about using an individual to further his own ends. Berthold Auerbach, who was attacked publicly by Wagner, came to recognize that his former friend was a spiritual source of the new anti-Semitism in 1880's Germany after receiving much professional support from Jews such as himself, Neumann, Karl Tausig, and Bayreuth patron Alfred Pringsheim.

As John Stuart Mill said : « Of all vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences. » . In his brilliantly written essay, « Race : Fact or Fiction ? » , the eminent philosopher and historian Jacques Barzun examines the entire concept of race. Assuming that one were to explain the concept of race to an alien, he demolishes all the typical racist responses. In particular, he satirically destroys the « infallible oracle » of racial distinction espoused so fervently from Wagner's era to the Nazi era : Blood. Modern medicine disavows blood as an indication of race ; but racists use the term metaphorically rather than literally. Another popular conception of race, common descent or lineage, leads to the inevitable conclusion in the Judeo-Christian West that there is but one race, and it is human.

Why Jews Stood-Up for Richard Wagner

Anti-Semitic Composer Inspired Both Hitler and Herzl

« **Austria or Bust** » : The exhibit shows how Jewish Wagnerism existed in Vienna until the 3rd « Reich » .

In Israel, musicians uphold a boycott on performances of Richard Wagner's music despite some recent attempts to break it. While it is well-known that there are many Jewish Wagnerians (including 2 of today's leading Wagner interpreters, James Levine and Daniel Barenboim) , one might not be aware of just how far back the Jewish fascination with Wagner's music and, at times, even his ideology, goes. The role played by Jews in the establishment and furthering of the Wagner cult, in late- 19th and early 20th Century, Vienna is the topic of a « Euphoria and Unease : Jewish Vienna and Richard Wagner » at the Vienna Jewish Museum.

As curated by Andrea Winklbler, the exhibit deals with many of Wagner's well-known Jewish enthusiasts, including Gustav Mahler and Theodor Herzl (both avid Wagnerians) as well as figures less remembered today, like Victor Adler, founder of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party. While Wagner was being harnessed by Right-wing ideologues, Adler read socialist messages into Wagner's Operas, in which he found an outpouring of sympathy for the proletariat.

As one of the most musically important German-speaking cities in Europe, Vienna quickly became one of the foremost centers of Wagner adulation. The Wagner Societies that sprung-up in the city, as early as 1871 (in other words, during the composer's own lifetime) , had numerous Jewish members and patrons.

Figures like composer Karl Goldmark, poet Siegfried Lipiner, and industrialist Friedrich Eckstein would meet at a vegetarian restaurant (in deference to the composer's dietary preferences) to discuss the « Master » . Eckstein even made a pilgrimage « on foot » to Bayreuth for the 1882 premiere of « Parsifal » , Wagner's final and arguably most

ideologically suspect Opera.

« I wanted people to discover how many Jewish Wagnerians there were in Vienna and the types of contradictions this entailed for being a Jewish Wagnerian. Everyone was aware (even back then) of the fact that Wagner was a nasty anti-Semite. And, despite this, I find it astounding when you look at so many composers and artists who built their own work on his foundation. » , Winkelbauer said.

Mahler's appointment as director of the Vienna Court Opera, in 1897, ushered in a new age of Wagner productions. For the 1st time, Wagner's Operas were performed there, uncut. He also brought the Secessionist artist Alfred Roller on-board to furnish startlingly modern designs.

The museum displays the composer-conductor's heavily marked full-score of « Tristan und Isolde » , one of the most impressive objects on display. (In a particularly satisfying irony, Adolf Hitler, an avid Wagnerian who credited the city with making him a confirmed anti-Semite, saw his 1st « Tristan » , in the legendary Roller production, conducted by Mahler.)

Herzl had his eureka moment during a performance of « Tannhäuser » and dashed home afterwards to start writing « Der Judenstaat » . What exactly the link was in Herzl's excitable mind between the medieval minnesinger and the necessity of a Jewish home in Palestine is anyone's guess. For whatever reason, the portrait of a closed community of artist-statesmen in this early, less nationalistic Wagner Opera, fired Herzl's vision.

A more disturbing case was the self-loathing Otto Weininger, whose twisted gender theories as outlined in the tome « Sex and Character » were fashionable throughout « fin de siècle » Europe. Arguing that the Jews were inherently weak and effeminate people, he famously wrote :

« The most manly Jew is more feminine than the least manly Aryan. »

Himself Jewish, he committed suicide in 1903, an act that seems, at least in part, to have been inspired by seeing « Parsifal » at Bayreuth.

By placing Herzl and Weininger side-by-side, the exhibit argues that very different Jews in Vienna drew from Wagner's « Operas, writing and status as a political artist, both inspiration and justification for their actions » , to quote from an exhibition sign.

Wisely, the exhibit does not attempt to divine the origins of Wagner's vociferous anti-Semitism. That said, the composers Giacomo Meyerbeer and Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy do get a well-merited mention as the 2 main targets of Wagner's racist tract, « Judaism in Music » . There is also information about the innovations in synagogue music instigated by cantors Salomon Sulzer, in Vienna, and Louis Lewandowski, in Berlin, well-known figures who Wagner would have had in mind when writing the essay. Additionally, ample space is given to 2 Viennese journalists who inspired Wagner's ire. The 1st, and better-known of these is the music-critic, Eduard Hanslick, who objected to Wagner's «

Gesamtkunstwerk » aspiration, which he considered fundamentally opposed to music's pure form. Wagner returned the favor by using the Jewish critic as his model for the buffoonish character of Sixtus Beckmesser in « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » , his only comedy. The 2nd was Daniel Spitzer, a satirist and feature writer who humiliated the composer by publishing letters to his seamstress that contained absurdly precise instructions about luxurious fabrics, colors and textures. The letters were so popular that Spitzer continued running them even after Wagner was forced to flee Vienna (incidentally, disguised as a woman) because of his mounting debts.

The exhibit shows how Jewish Wagnerism existed in Vienna up until the 3rd « Reich » . We learn about many of the Jewish singers and conductors active in the 1920's and 1930's. The best-known of these are Bruno Walter and bass-baritone Friedrich Schorr, the Wotan of choice at Bayreuth, between 1925 and 1931. Also featured are Wagner enthusiasts like the theatre director Emil Geyer (who was shot, in 1942, at Mauthausen) , modern architect Josef Frank and the musicologist Guido Adler. Stella Junker-Weissenberg's flapper-era sketches for Wagner costumes are the most fascinating artifacts of this era. And there is a telling postcard by avant-garde photographer Dora Horovitz, writing to Vienna, in 1940, to lament how she misses Bayreuth from her exile in San Jose.

In the final section of the exhibit, video monitors play excerpts from Opera productions, movies and TV shows, and documentaries, including Stephen Fry's « Wagner and Me » and Hilan Warshaw's recent « Wagner's Jews » . Adorning the walls are well-chosen quotes from various figures weighing in on the debate. Alongside the famous Woody Allen quip, « I can't listen to that much Wagner. I start getting the urge to conquer Poland » , there is a serious reflection by Max Brod, who refused to read Wagner's racist tracts so as not to « tarnish my pure impression of an exemplary artistic revelation » .

Ultimately, the exhibitionj « Euphoria and Unease » establishes that the discussion of how to deal with Wagner's anti-Semitism (and its consequences) is, by no means, over. Alongside recent critical scholarship and unorthodox methods of staging Wagner's Operas, « Euphoria and Unease » furthers this iconoclastic approach to Wagner, by examining those Jews who put their belief in a great artist and sworn enemy, and by revealing the contractions and, at times, self-denial that this entailed. There is as little to be gained by turning Wagner into a bogeyman as by holding him up as the « be all and end all » of high-culture :

« We didn't want to make a tribute to Wagner. If the exhibit is, at all, a tribute then it's a tribute to all those who used Wagner to help create their own culture. » , said Winklbauer.

Richard Wagner et la politique

L'œuvre et le rayonnement de Richard Wagner ont toujours eu une dimension politique. Lorsque éclate la Première Guerre mondiale, le Festival de Bayreuth est suspendu, et les décors de « Parsifal » sont « gelés végétant comme des fantômes pendant 10 ans sur la scène désertée.

Le « Cercle de Bayreuth » et l'atmosphère politique en Allemagne sont représentatifs du destin de Wagner sous la République de Weimar. Bien qu'il eût existé des tentatives de mises-en-scène modernes et révolutionnaires (« le

Vaisseau fantôme » de Jürgen Fehling et Otto Klemperer au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin, en 1929), Wagner et Bayreuth devinrent, après la ré-ouverture du Festival, en 1924, le ramassis de la réaction Impériale, puis nationale-socialiste. L'essayiste libéral Bernhard Diebold publia, en 1928, un texte qui fut un véritable appel dans le désert : rapportant sa visite à Bayreuth, il put observer que « les hommes de droite » avaient enrôlé le révolutionnaire de 1848 et réussi à « jeter Wagner avec l'eau du bain de Chamberlain ». Diebold se demande où sont passés « les esprits Libéraux pour l'œuvre d'art Libérale », et souligne ce faisant l'échec, lourd de conséquences, de la gauche à revendiquer pour elle-même le Wagner révolutionnaire, laissant au lieu de cela, sans résistance, le champ entièrement libre à la droite nationale.

Il n'y avait plus qu'un pas à franchir, vers 1933, et la prise de pouvoir (à Bayreuth aussi) des Nazis. Ironie de l'histoire, c'est seulement avec Adolf Hitler que le Festival de Bayreuth se trouva, pour la Ire fois, placé sous la protection directe et financière de l'État. Cette protection et, en outre, les liens personnels du « Führer » avec la famille Wagner, compromise, sont responsables du grand malentendu qui trace une ligne directe de Wagner à Hitler, causant à l'image du compositeur des dommages qui n'ont pas été, jusqu'à nos jours, entièrement réparés. Cette fatalité de l'histoire est d'autant plus dramatique qu'entériner aujourd'hui cette continuité fabriquée de toutes pièces revient à reconduire la propagande wagnérienne du Nazisme et, par là, à la renforcer à titre posthume.

L'antisémitisme de Wagner et sa pensée de la régénération étaient aisés à incorporer sélectivement à l'idéologie nazie, mais ce fut au prix du déni ou du détournement radical de son utopisme révolutionnaire et de la parabole que donnait à lire le « Ring », celle d'un monde désagrégé par l'excès de pouvoir. Parmi les dirigeants nazis proches de Hitler, seule une poignée avait quelque affinité avec la musique de Wagner (Josef Goebbels, Albert Speer) ; le reste vécut les pèlerinages obligatoires à Bayreuth (de 1933 à 1940, après quoi Hitler lui-même ne s'est plus rendu) comme une véritable torture. Pendant ce temps (autre ironie de l'histoire), le Festival vivait, sous la direction artistique de Heinz Tietjen, une toute Ire modernisation scénique qui anticipait, sous certains aspects, la révolution esthétique menée par Wieland Wagner, à partir de 1951. Simultanément, Winifred Wagner, directrice du Festival (1930-1944) profitait de sa proximité avec Hitler pour maintenir à Bayreuth la présence de Juifs « indispensables », plus longtemps et en plus grand nombre que dans aucun autre théâtre allemand. Malgré une histoire ambiguë et qui gagne à être nuancée, l'implication personnelle de Hitler dans les affaires de la famille Wagner et son instrumentalisation du compositeur et du Festival ont lourdement hypothéqué l'héritage wagnérien, véritable chape de plomb qui pèse aujourd'hui encore sur lui.

Il paraît évident, avec le recul, que le Festival ait pu rouvrir en 1951, et que, prenant un second envol, l'interprétation des œuvres de Wagner ait atteint, sous Wieland Wagner, dans le Bayreuth des années 1950 et 1960, un niveau légendaire, qui n'avait pas été trouvé jusque-là et ne le sera plus par la suite. En réalité, comme au moment de la renaissance de Bayreuth, en 1924, rien n'allait de soi. Même s'il s'agit d'autres circonstances, l'histoire de Bayreuth aurait pu aussi se terminer en 1914 et serait, aujourd'hui, un objet d'étude spécialisé pour historiens de la musique. Mais ce qui s'est produit à Bayreuth dans les mises-en-scène révolutionnaires de Wieland Wagner, pour rayonner ensuite dans le monde entier, est l'exact reflet de la situation politique de la République fédérale allemande (RFA) à ses débuts : libérer la scène du fatras de décors naturalistes opulents, se concentrer sur le mythe et l'« épurer » du ballast national-socialiste, tout cela correspondait parfaitement à la sobriété du nouveau départ auquel aspirait la

jeune République fédérale. À la même époque, une nouvelle phalange d'écrivains de cour bayreuthiens œuvrait, autour d'Ernst Bloch, Theodor Adorno et Hans Mayer, à une nouvelle interprétation de l'univers du compositeur : on revendiquait enfin un « Wagner de gauche » et on remettait en lumière la base révolutionnaire de son art, par quoi le culte wagnérien pouvait légitimement se poursuivre sous d'autres augures.

Bayreuth demeura le sismographe de la situation allemande. Après les révoltes étudiantes de 1968, le « Wagner de gauche » monta aussi sur la scène du « Festspielhaus » (le « Tannhäuser » de Götz Friedrich, en 1972 ; le « Ring » de Patrice Chéreau, en 1976) , tandis que s'ouvrait l'ère politisée du « Regietheater » , d'un « théâtre de metteur-en-scène » qui domine aujourd'hui encore, même s'il est désormais totalement fossilisé. La République démocratique allemande (RDA) , elle aussi, s'est approprié pour son compte, dans les années 1950, un Wagner social et révolutionnaire : la mise-en-scène du « Ring » par Joachim Herz à Leipzig, en 1973-1976, présentait la Ire Tétralogie dans l'esprit politique du XIXe siècle, préfigurant celle de Chéreau. Les ondes de choc de la période nazie ébranlèrent encore par à-coups la réception wagnérienne (comme elles ébranlèrent l'histoire de la RFA) : on pense au scandale que suscita, en 1975, l'entrevue accordée par Winifred Wagner à Hans-Jürgen Syberberg, dans laquelle elle proclama une loyauté indéfectible à Hitler ; ou aux procès intentés par Gottfried Wagner à son père, Wolfgang, très proche de Hitler dans sa jeunesse ; ou enfin au renvoi fébrile et hâtif du chanteur Evgeny Nikitin du Festival de Bayreuth, en 2012, pour avoir arboré d'ans sa jeunesse une croix gammée tatouée sur la poitrine. Malgré tous ces fardeaux hérités du passé, la discussion autour de l'art de Wagner est parvenue aujourd'hui, en Allemagne, à un état d'équilibre apaisé et relationnel, capable de mettre en juste balance ses compromissions funestes avec l'histoire allemande aussi bien que sa dimension progressiste et cosmopolite et, enfin, susceptible de l'estimer à sa juste valeur.

...

How should we think about Wagner ? Those who are troubled by that question, as I am, presumably think that as an artist he is worth being troubled about : that his works, or some of them, are demanding, inviting, seductive, powerful. Not everyone who cares about music need share that opinion. The relation of Wagner to the history of Western music and to the formation of a taste is not the same as that of, say, Bach or Mozart : he is not in the same way necessary. His works are, indeed, necessary to explaining its more recent history, very obviously so, but they are not in the same way a necessary part of a taste for Western music. Indeed, it is possible for a serious music lover to hate them - but that is not really the main point, since hatred can be a reaction to their power, in particular because of the peculiarities I shall be discussing. So Thomas Mann referred to Nietzsche's « immortal critique of Wagner, which I have always taken to be a panegyric in reverse, another form of eulogy » . (I)

You can have a well-formed, deep relation to Western music while passing Wagner's works by, finding them boring or not to your taste. But it is clear, equally, that a passionate engagement with these works is not a mistake or a misunderstanding. They are amazing, and there is much to engage with. It is no accident not only that Wagner is voluminously discussed but that immense efforts, expenditure, and imagination are still devoted to producing these pieces.

As well as the troubled and the bored and the revealingly hostile, there has notoriously been a further Party, of the

utterly devoted and, perhaps, there still is. Being devoted does not necessarily mean being uncritical, but if the members of this Party are critical, it is on the very local basis that the Master did not always live-up to his own standards. This Party has a question to answer. No one can deny that some of Wagner's own attitudes are ethically and politically disturbing, some of them very deeply so. I mean that they are disturbing to us ; and, by that, I mean that they are rightly found disturbing by people who have seen the crimes and catastrophes of the 20th Century. We do certainly have to understand his attitudes in the context of his time, taking into account the options and ideological contrasts that were available then. We need to understand what his attitudes meant. But, equally, we have to take into account what they have come to mean.

When it is said that « we have » to take such things into account, one thing this means is that we have no alternative if we are not to be misunderstood. In Shakespeare's « Much Ado about Nothing » (V.iv.38) , Claudio says :

« I'll hold my mind (i.e. , stick to my intention to marry her) , were she an Ethiopie. »

In the Norton Shakespeare, the editor, Stephen Greenblatt, gives an explanation :

« In other words, black and, therefore, according to the Elizabethan racist stereotype, ugly. » (2)

A review in the London Sunday Times criticized him for this on grounds of excessive political correctness. But as Greenblatt reasonably said, in an interview, would they have actually preferred it if he had said « black and, therefore, ugly » ? In Wagner's case, « we have no alternative » does mean this, but it means something else as well : that we have no alternative to taking into account his attitudes and what they have come to mean if we are to experience and reflect on these works at the depth they demand - more precisely, if we are to understand them at the level needed for them to become a significant part of our experience. (Indeed, so far as staging is concerned, we have to take these things into account if we are to put these works on at all, and this is a point I shall come back to.)

If we try to understand as a genuine historical question what range of opinions and attitudes were available in Wagner's world (« where he was » on various matters) , we find that in some cases, he was already in a pretty bad place. Above all, and most notoriously, there is his anti-Semitism. His articles « Das Judentum in der Musik » , attacking Giacomo Meyerbeer and Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and, generally, the artistic impotence of Jews, did not make a big stir when they were 1st published under a pseudonym, in 1850. The document had considerably more effect when he re-issued it under his own name, in 1869, with additions in an even sharper tone and with more directly racist implications (« so far from getting rid of his errors » , Franz Liszt said, « he has made it worse ») . The racist emphasis, influenced by Gobineau, was prominent in other publications of his last years. It has reasonably been claimed that Wagner, by his own writings, contributed to the resurgence of anti-Semitism in Germany, in the 1880's, in particular by helping to make it culturally respectable. (3)

Moreover, it was not only during the Nazi time, through the friendship of Wagner's daughter-in-law, Winifred, with Hitler, that the Bayreuth Festival, which Wagner founded in 1876, became associated with the most repellent ideas. The house Journal, the « Bayreuther Blätter » , was founded in 1878, when Wagner was still alive, by an acolyte, Hans von

Wolzogen, who, as a historian of the Festival has put it, used the Journal as an ideological instrument to propagate a racist, anti-Semitic, chauvinistic, xenophobic and anti-democratic ideology. It would be difficult to find anywhere in the Western world in the late- 19th Century, even in the darkest corner of the French Right, a publication so poisonous, so hate-filled, so spiritually demented. (4)

In some other cases, the attitudes that Wagner held were capable of taking more benign forms, but Wagner's versions were not among them. This seems to be true of the particularly chauvinist form that he gave to the idea that there should be a German art. (5) Thomas Mann considered this in his famous essay (from which I have already quoted) « The Sorrows and Grandeur of Richard Wagner » , which, given as a lecture in 1933, led directly to his exile from Germany, and which is, along with some of Nietzsche's thoughts, still the most helpful reflection that I know on these questions. (6) Mann pointed-out, using a distinction made by a Swedish writer, that Wagner's aspiration was for a German art in the sense of nationale « Kunst » rather than « Volkskunst » - that is to say, the nationalism was a matter of the destiny and political significance of German art, not of its materials.

This, in itself, may seem an entirely intelligible, even innocent or laudable 19th Century ambition. But then, we have to recall that the problem of a distinctively German art, and its relation to a self-conscious artist working in a broader European tradition, had been a preoccupation of German thought since, at least, the late- 18th Century. Above all, it had been a recurrent concern to Goethe, with regard to the German language, its traditions of writing, the public for that writing, the self-conscious cultivation or rejection of differences from the rest of Europe, the relation of German art to various possible political regimes in the German-speaking States, and so on. Indeed, in his writings on these subjects Wagner, unsurprisingly, praises Goethe and Schiller.

Now, the German world in the 1860's was certainly a very different place from what it had been in 1800. Yet, it is still relevant to point-out that, in Goethe's case, the question of how to achieve a distinctively German art was a problem for him, a problem to which he responded in ways that honoured its complexity ; whereas for Wagner, it was, of course, a problem to which, at any given stage of his career, he knew the answer, as against the traitors and enemies who took a different view. This absence of the Goethean spirit, not just in a form anachronistic by the 1860's, but in any form at all, is something I shall come back to when we confront the impression, not lightly to be dismissed, that for all their wonders and power there is an all-consuming assertiveness in Wagner's works which can be disgusting. (7)

I have moved directly from talking about Wagner's personal attitudes, as expressed in his writings, to talking about the character of his work. That is not an oversight ; the problem is that the 2 cannot entirely be separated. It is possible that artists with politically disturbing views could produce works that are not politically disturbing. There are, without doubt, several things wrong with Hans Pfitzner's remarkable Opera « Palestrina » (1st produced in 1917) , such as its heavy-handed attempt to present the Council of Trent in the style of « Die Meistersinger » ; but they do not express what was wrong with Pfitzner himself, whose conservative and nationalist views were congenial enough to the Nazis that (to his great resentment) he was required to undergo denazification after World War II. Wagner's relation to his works was not like this. That is obvious now and has been obvious since they were created, but we shall have to ask what it is about the works that makes this so.

What is troubling is that the problems raised by his repellent attitudes, on the one hand, and the disturbing power of his work on the other, cannot be solved by a distinction between « the work » and « the man ». Or rather, we cannot immediately call on that distinction to solve them. The problems that matter, of course, concern the work : it is only the fact that we want to take the work seriously that forces us to confront Wagner at all. But it does indeed force us to confront him, because Wagner's is a case in which, if we are to deal adequately with the work and its power, we have to take into account the attitudes of the man and what they have come to mean. I do not mean that his views, even his views of his own works, necessarily determine our interpretation of them. His works are independent, in varying degrees, from the outlook expressed in what he wrote around and about them, but we have to ask, in every case, how far they are independent of it, and in what ways. We need to understand, in particular, how far what moves us in the work may be connected with what frightens and repels us in his attitudes.

Some contemporary approaches to the work, though they are very vocal about Wagner's attitudes, fail to grasp that this is the question, and fall short of what we need in order to think about it. A lot of writing about Wagner in the last 30 years conceives the problem as that of revealing a hidden scandal ; they try to trace the ways in which the attitudes have marked the works. (8) These writers spend a lot of effort, for instance, in trying to find signs of anti-Semitism in the Operas themselves, claiming that the representations of Mime, Klingsor, Beckmesser, and other characters introduce Jewish stereotypes. I am not concerned with the question, still much disputed, of whether the attempts at decipherment of these characters are correct. Even if a 19th Century audience did not need as much help in recognizing such stereotypes as, seemingly, we do ; even if Wagner consciously intended them (for which there is no direct evidence) , the point is that these supposed signs are too trivial to help with the only question that can reasonably concern us. The only reason for worrying about Wagner's works is that they are powerful and interesting. But, if that is so, what difference would these signatures, these local coded messages, make ?

In effect, these writers reduce the problem of Wagner's anti-Semitism (so far, as the works are concerned) to these supposed traces, to the idea that, in one instance or another, Wagner is knowingly signaling it. This cannot help to deal with any deep anxieties caused by Wagner's works. In fact, it serves to reconcile these writers' admiration for them with their bad conscience about his attitudes, but at a painless and superficial level. They have externalized the problem, moving it from where it truly belongs.

We can take an analogy from a quite different work of Thomas Mann's, « Death in Venice » : these critics treat the threat, the dangerousness, of Wagner, as if it were the outbreak of cholera, which with luck you can signal and confine by whitewashing and disinfecting the walls. But our, and their, real problem with Wagner is not like this at all - rather, it is like Aschenbach's problem with Tadzio. These critics do not accept at the right level the way in which Wagner is related to his works. They are saying, in effect, that there had better be something wrong with the works, and they have come-up with a circumscribed and relatively painless way of identifying what this is.

In a well-known book Robert W. Gutman has written :

Unhappily, a proto-Nazism, expressed mainly through an unextinguishable loathing of the Jews, was one of Wagner's

principal leitmotifs, the venomous tendrils of anti-Semitism twining through his life and work. In his final years, his hatred reached-out further to embrace those with black and yellow skins. This attitude cannot be shrugged-off as an unfortunate whim or a minor flaw in a musical hero.

This underlines the point that the presence of some anti-Semitic signatures is not in itself enough : they are not going to show that anti-Semitism is « one of the principal leitmotifs » of Wagner's work. The works will have to be more thoroughly polluted than that, and in his book Robert W. Gutman gives interpretations to suggest that they are (though he does less to show that these interpretations are inescapable) . But, then, he is thrown back to the question of why these thoroughly polluted works are supposed to be interesting or important to us. To this, his answer appeals simply to the music :

« Yet, Wagner survives and, primarily, because he was a great musician. His ripe late-Romantic style retains much of its allure. A music of almost unparalleled eloquence and intimacy keeps his works on the stage. (9)

This is not an answer at all. Having refused to separate the man and the work, Robert W. Gutman tries to separate the work and its music, an aim which can be seen to be failing already in the use of words such as « eloquence » and « intimacy » , and which is anyway peculiarly hopeless in the case of Wagner, who took unprecedented steps to unify musical and dramatic expression. If we end-up with such an evasion, it is clear that we must start again.

Some modern productions of Wagner's works have another way of trying to « externalize » the problems. It is a significant fact that we have seen in the Opera House, in recent years, the coexistence of 2 kinds of radicalism. In cases to which it is appropriate, there is an increasing « authenticity » of orchestral and vocal performance, based on historical research ; and, at the same time, there are productions and sets which display all degrees of re-thinking and creativity up to the now notorious extremes of directorial whimsy - which, themselves, are more or less what has come to be expected.

These 2 developments might seem to go in opposite directions. It is true, of course, that they can conflict, as when the production makes it impossible for the singers to express what the music requires or invites them to express. (It is important that this should not be described as a conflict between music and drama ; it is a conflict between the dramatic contribution of the music and the dramatic contribution of the staging.) But this is a matter of particular failures, not of what is intrinsic to the 2 kinds of radicalism. Even quite extreme versions of them, if they are put together in the right way, can produce a triumphant success (this was true of Peter Sellars' recent production at Glyndebourne of Händel's « Theodora ») . They can combine to the same end. The musical performance tries to offer a closer approximation to the composer's means of expression ; the production offers a version of what this drama, these emotional relations, can mean in terms that make sense to us now - it tries to find visual and dramatic equivalences, which work for us, to the expressive content both of the words and of the music as that music is now presented to us. No theatrical presentation of the drama that was simply determined by historical research could possibly do that.

In fact, the idea of a theatrical production of an Opera which is « authentic » in the sense in which musical

performances can aim to be « authentic » (and that itself, of course, raises large questions which are not the concern here) seems to be virtually non-sensical. Critics who attack what they see as the extreme innovations of recent directors and call for « traditional » productions of the « Ring » cannot mean that we should be given what Wagner, in 1876 in Bayreuth, actually had - for one thing, we know what Wagner thought of what he got in 1876. (10) But quite apart from that, since the question is one for us, of what we should do, even the most devoted intentionalist will have to ask not what Wagner wanted granted the resources he had, but what he would have wanted if he had had our resources ; and that means, of course, also, resources to present his works to audiences who have seen what we have seen (and not only on the stage) . We are back, unsurprisingly, where we started, with the problems of staging Wagner's works for us now. In pursuit of a truthful production, there is absolutely no alternative to re-creation.

The objection to some recent productions of Wagner is not that they are in a new idiom, but rather that they do not use that idiom to re-create. What some of them offer is mere comment. Unlike the decipherment of the supposed anti-Semitic signatures, which I have just considered, the ideologically critical treatment of the works in these productions is not minor or episodic. Their comments may be continuous, as when Wotan is throughout represented as a tycoon in the current Bayreuth production of the « Ring » . The problem arises if they are no more than comments, external to any response to the content of the works ; in that case, they are like the supposed decipherment of anti-Semitic messages. (11) Just as being given a decoding of Beckmesser's vocal style as Jewish, even if it were correct, would do very little to help one understand or shape one's reactions to « Die Meistersinger » , so a continuous sub-joined ethical health warning added to the « Ring » (the mechanical injection into it of modern hate-figures, for instance) does not help one to face what the « Ring » , both for good and for bad, requires one to face.

We have to address the works and the problems they present on a larger scale. We have to ask : What general features of Wagner's style contribute to the problems ? I should like to suggest 3, all of them characteristics that were mentioned by Thomas Mann.

Wagner shared with other 19th Century artists, notably Ibsen, the aim of uniting the mythic and the psychological. One might even suggest (this is my suggestion, not Mann's) that in a certain sense Wagner is Ibsen inside out. Ibsen succeeded in some of his works in taking realistic bourgeois domestic drama and giving it the weight, the sense of necessity, that one can find in Sophocles ; Wagner took myths and medieval epics and installed in them a psychology which is often that of bourgeois domestic drama. There is a basic problem with this enterprise, implicit in Walter Benjamin's observation that the heroes of ancient tragedy or epic lack an inner life in a modern sense : many, if not all, of those ancient works gravely express a necessity that transcends biographical particularity. To reconcile this fact with a drama for which intensity almost unavoidably means intense subjectivity is a hard undertaking, as many 19th and 20th Centuries artists have found.

In fact, there are 3 levels involved. Besides the mythical or medieval materials, and the explicit motivations and situations of bourgeois drama, Wagner engages in depth psychological explorations which are expressed in words and music that go far beyond naturalistic drama. Wagner is most successful in reconciling the mythical and the psychological, so it seems to me, when it is this last element that prevails : when the subjective intensity is so extreme, solitary, and unrelated to citizenly or domestic life that in its own way it takes on an authority which is,

perhaps, analogous to that of ancient tragedy. This is notably so in « Parsifal » and in Act 3 of « Tristan und Isolde ». Elsewhere, he succeeds because he can sustain an analogy with domestic drama which does not need to apologize for itself : an obvious example is Act I of « Die Walküre » .

Sometimes, the analogies are imperfectly negotiated, and even the « arts of transition » of which Wagner was justly proud cannot hold the levels together. I personally think that this is true, at all 3 levels, of King Mark's recriminations in Act 2 of « Tristan » . There is the problem that the view of the lovers, from an everyday social perspective, is less interesting at this point than what we have just experienced inside the world of night that they have entered ; and, in addition, for all the references to heroes and courtly honour, it is hard to dissociate Mark's complaints from a bourgeois embarrassment, doubtless familiar to Wagner himself. In such cases, there are problems for production but, with skill and luck, they can be dealt with. However, there is one central case, the character of Siegfried, in which there is a real vacuum, a collapse at the heart of the work, and the very questionable conception of heroism which is associated with him has, I am going to suggest, a political significance.

Another, and very manifest, feature of the style is that Wagner really did break down in some ways, the conventional distinction between the musical and the non-musical. As Mann put it, while the old criticism that Wagner's music is not really musical was absurd, nevertheless, it was not entirely unintelligible : Wagner's work does, in a way, fuse the musical and the literary. Mann says about the E-flat chord that starts « Das Rheingold » :

« It was an acoustic thought : the thought of the beginning of all things. Music has been here pressed into service in an imperiously dilettante fashion in order to represent a mythical concept. » (12)

This implies that the « deeds of music made manifest » which, as he was finishing the « Ring » , Wagner said were offered in his work, (13) and the psychological / ethical /political significance of the text (or rather, one should say, the action) , can only be understood in terms of each other. It is no peculiarity of Wagner that what the work means is not given merely or primarily by the action : it is true of all Opera or, at least, of all great Opera. But Wagner's style does make the dramatic relations between music and action, at once, more pervasive and, emotionally, more immediate. We have already seen one consequence of this, that one cannot adequately explain the power of Wagner by simply appealing to the music. There is another consequence, in (so to speak) the opposite direction : that if someone feels that there is something ethically or politically suspect about, in particular, the « Ring » , that feeling, whether it is correct or incorrect, is not going to be met simply by appealing to the action or, more narrowly, to the text.

It is a paradox that some defenders of Wagner, having elsewhere extolled the unity of music and text in his works, think it is enough to meet these ideological criticisms to point-out that, according to the plot, oath-breaking and theft do not pay-off. Whatever the hopes may be for recovering an overall sense of the end of the « Ring » , you are not going to find it in its closing words, and it is a significant point, a point which comes back again to the figure of Siegfried, that one of the most overwhelming and also, I am going to suggest, unnerving episodes of « Götterdämmerung » , the funeral music, has no words.

Wagner is, more than any other, a « totalizing » artist ; in any given work, all the elements relate to one underlying

conception or tone. Mann, once more, puts this very well, in terms which, from a technical point of view, are no doubt exaggerated, but which express something entirely recognizable :

« It is this infinite power of characterization that separates the works from each other, and develops each of them from a basic sound which distinguishes it from all the others ; so, that inside the totality of the œuvre, which itself constitutes a personal world, each individual work again forms a self-contained unity, like a star. »

Nietzsche said that, in any given work of Wagner's, it is as though it were all presented by one impersonator with a very distinctive voice ; and, since the biographical presence is also strong, this impersonator may easily be taken for the composer. (14) All doubt, duality, or under-determination is either internalized into the action (the characters are represented as undecided or in conflict) , or it is externalized, existing outside the work altogether (the work stands against the rest of the world) ; doubt and duality do not exist at the level at which the work offers itself. The work itself voices or implies total unity and certainty. Because the voice of the work is so distinctive in Wagner's case, and, once again, the historical presence of the composer is close (for instance, in suggesting what the whole enterprise stands against) , the sense is not of a world assumed, but of an outlook asserted.

The extreme modernism of Wagner's later style implies that he is not taking for granted the ethical or social assurances which give structure to many other confident dramatic works of the 19th Century, such as those of Giuseppe Verdi. But, at the same time, though he represents ambivalent characters and actions that have ambiguous or perverse consequences, he was not disposed in the least to the typically modernist development by which ambivalence and indeterminacy become part of the fabric of the presentation itself, so that it is essential to the work that it does not finally tell its audience what to make of it. There are few Operas, in fact, that have achieved this effect, but they include 2 of the greatest among 20th Century Operatic works, « Pelléas et Mélisande » and « Lulu » .

I come back to the absence of the Goethean spirit, that I mentioned earlier, in connection with « Die Meistersinger » and the project of founding a German art. Part of the suspect quality of Wagner lies in the fact that, although he portrays conflicts and contradictions, such as Wotan's indecisions, his recognition that he cannot directly achieve what he wants, the tensions between power and love, and so on, Wagner's tone in presenting these things seems to have at each point an indomitable assurance. He is telling us what it all adds-up to. This aspect of Wagner's style can produce fear and resentment ; one can have the sense of being locked inside Wagner's head ; and it can also give a sense of fraudulent manipulation. Moreover, as soon as Wagner's assurance (the feeling that he thinks he has a hold on what is unconditionally significant) encounters the political, particularly in his trying to transcend it, it can become deeply alarming.

These features and the reactions they arouse may mean that some of his devices simply do not work. But, sometimes, Wagner's inventions work when it seems that they should not and, then, our resistance (and, hence, our conflicts) can be especially strong. More than one consideration that has already come-up leads us to particular and very central examples of this, the funeral music in « Götterdämmerung » , the orchestral interlude between the scene of Siegfried's death and the final scene of the whole « Ring » . The funeral music is almost entirely retrospective in its effect, and it is essential to our experience of the « Ring » that this should be so. No one, I think, could describe it as regretful,

or melancholy, or resigned. It is manifestly triumphant. It is offered as the celebration of the life, just ended, of a great hero. Yet, as many critics have noticed, the subject of this shattering musical memorial scarcely exists as a person.

Siegfried is the least self-aware, in every sense of the word the least knowing, of Wagner's heroes. He does not know much about anything, least of all about himself, and a lot of what he does know he forgets for most of « *Götterdämmerung* », under the influence of Hagen's drug. Although, in his dying moments, the memories of his love for Brünnhilde are restored to him, they do not bring with them any greater understanding, but only a return to a blissful past. In this, and in his relation to these magic drinks, he is quite unlike Tristan, who in his great monologue in the 3rd Act comes to see how everything that happened flowed from himself - that, he himself, as he says, brewed the love potion. To Siegfried, on the other hand, the machinery of spells remains external, and represents nothing in his motivations or his wishes. If he had any character at all, it would be only a limitless (one might almost say clinical) guilelessness.

His encounter with Brünnhilde did teach him something, fear. This gave him, we are told, a new experience, but it is notable that we are not given much more than the telling of it. There is a good deal of psychological material in the last scene of « *Siegfried* » after Siegfried awakens Brünnhilde and it is, of course, expressed in the music, but it almost entirely concerns Brünnhilde's transition from warrior to lover. Siegfried as lover gets new music, but very little of a new psychology. What he carries forward from the encounter is nothing but a blissful memory ; and when he reasserts his individuality as a hero and returns to the world of action, there is no project for him except action itself. « *Zu neuen Taten !* » (« *New deeds !* ») is the 1st thing that Brünnhilde says to him in « *Götterdämmerung* », and, if we take it for granted that he is to resume the only life he is able to live, there is nothing else for her to say. What matters is the absence of an inner life, not in itself the absence of intelligence. Parsifal is defined by a holy lack of intelligence but, in the course of the action, he gains an inner life ; the confrontation with memory and sexuality that is enacted in such extraordinary terms, in the 2nd Act, changes him completely, whereas to Siegfried nothing significant happens at all.

It is not impossible for a great hero to lack an inner life : as Walter Benjamin pointed-out, the heroes of epic and ancient tragedy are often presented with a notably reticent indication of their subjectivity. But it is much harder to present as a great hero one who is simply naive and unimaginative, and whose great deeds, the slaying of the dragon and the journey to Brünnhilde, are not so much emblems of courage as the products of an infantile fearlessness. This is no Achilles. He appears, moreover, in a drama in which subjectivity, self-consciousness, reflection, personal ambivalence, and so on are pervasive, expressed in the artistic means themselves, and, above all, central to the existence of another character, Wotan, who has a better claim to be the hero.

Because the celebration represented by the funeral music is of the seemingly uncelebratable, there is a crisis of theatrical production at this point. Recently, we have often been given an empty stage or Siegfried's body lying undisturbed. On the occasions, I have seen them, these came-out as lame or desperate devices ; but it is not surprising that there is desperation. Critics complain of a willful, contemptuous rejection of the heroic. But it is not the directors' fault that there is a failure of the heroic. They are reacting, if inadequately, to a feature of the work which, if it is

allowed to emerge, is bound now to seem empty or potentially alarming.

Since there is this dramatic failure, it is a real question why the funeral music can indeed be effective, in fact overpowering ; and it is not enough to say that it is an astonishing piece of music, since it is a piece of dramatic music in the deepest Wagnerian sense. I think that there is an answer to the question of how it can move us so much, and I shall come back to this. But the problem that comes first, one that is signaled by the directors' difficulties, is that of heading-off a different kind of message (an implicitly political message) which can readily fill the gap left by Siegfried's absence as hero. I said that the funeral music, granted that absence, can be alarming. The reason for this lies in its relation to the political, or rather, unpolitical aspects of the « Ring » .

The serene and reconciling motif that appears in the last moments of « Götterdämmerung » used to be called « Redemption through Love » . None of these labels for the leitmotifs has any authority, but this was worse than most. For what, even in Wagner's overgenerous use of such words, has been redeemed ? Brünnhilde, of course, sacrifices herself by riding into Siegfried's funeral pyre, but if this is to count as redemption, rather than suttee on horseback, it has to have some further result. She says :

« This fire, burning my frame, cleanses the curse from the ring. »

Indeed, the gold is now purified, because it has been returned to the Rhine - the only place, as the Rhinemaidens sang in the last words of « Rheingold » , for what is close and true :

Traulich und treu
ist's nur in der Tiefe. (15)

The gold has been redeemed, if one insists on the word. But there is no suggestion that the gold's return, or the deaths of Siegfried and Brünnhilde, have also redeemed the world, at least if that means that the world has become a better or freer place. The future of the world, at the end of « Götterdämmerung » , is plainly not a concern, while the gods have no future at all. This is an embarrassment to the familiar political interpretations of the « Ring » . They all begin with a great impetus from « Rheingold » , with its manifest images of expropriation, self-improvement, and slavery, but even the most resourceful of them tend to peter-out as the cycle proceeds, finding material at its end only for some vapid aspiration to a politics of innocence.

The problem with this is not that the « Ring » , as it proceeds, avoids politics. It is rather that the hope for a politics of innocence is one thing that it seems to reject. If one wants transportable lessons from the « Ring » , a conclusion to be drawn from the story of Wotan will be that there is no politics of innocence, because nothing worth achieving can be achieved in innocence. Only in the depths, where nothing has been imposed on nature or wrested from it, is the tender and true. But the nobility and « grandeur » of the funeral music stand against this. Not because of what it says (it says nothing) but, all the more, because of what it does, it can carry the suggestion that perhaps there could be a world in which a politics of pure heroic action might succeed, uncluttered by Wotan's ruses or the need to make bargains with giants, where Nibelungs could be dealt with forever : a redemptive, transforming

politics which transcended the political.

Such ideas had in Germany a long, complex, and ultimately catastrophic history. Politics or, at least, « ordinary » politics, the politics of Parties, power, bargaining, and so on, was seen as something divisive, low, materialistic, and superficial, in contrast to something else which was deep, spiritual, and capable of bringing people together into a higher unity : something, moreover, which instead of peddling satisfactions, demanded renunciation and suffering. There were 2 main candidates for this higher thing, art and the nation, or, indeed, the 2 together.

Such ideals informed the influential conception of the « Sonderweg », the idea of a special path that German development might follow, distinct from (in particular) Britain and France ; and one expression of the difference lay in a supposed contrast between « Kultur », which was German and deep, and « Zivilisation », which was shallow and French. (Thomas Mann himself had supported such ideas during the First World War, and still in part sought to justify them in the diffuse work which he published in 1918, significantly called « Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen » : « Reflections of a Non-Political Man ») . (16) All the elements of this tradition were to be exploited in a desultory but ruthlessly opportunistic way by Adolf Hitler. (17) Hitler was far from unpolitical, but he pretended to be, and perhaps himself believed that in him the nation had transcended politics : that the politics which brought him to power and which, together with terror, kept him in it, was indeed a politics of transcendence.

Wagner was certainly deeply committed to the nationalist ideals of the « Sonderweg », but it is rare in his works (as opposed to his writings) that the will to transcend politics points in a distinctively political direction. « Die Meistersinger » certainly has political implications ; as Nietzsche rightly said, it is against « Zivilisation », German against French. Moreover, it invites questions, which it notably fails to answer, about the politics of art. Hans Sachs believes in the judgment of the « Volk » and, in the last scene, the young knight Walter gets their enthusiastic approval, with a composition which, we are told, reconciles inspiration with tradition. Wagner, no doubt, thought that the same could truly be said of his act as a whole. But, in fact, nothing in this bland formula or, in the way it is worked-out in « Die Meistersinger », is going to close the gap between Wagner's intensely radical avant-garde experiments and music that could be straightforwardly popular as, for instance, Verdi's was.

The politics of art (the relations of Wagner, his music, and the German people) remains, at the end of the Opera, an unsolved question. But the relation of all this to politics in a narrower sense, the politics of government, is not even a question in « Die Meistersinger ». Although, in the last moments of the work (in a notably obtrusive passage, which Wagner seems to have put in at Cosima's insistence) , Wagner gets Sachs to declare the ideals of artistic nationalism, he is careful not to commit himself to what its political implications might be. Sachs's last words on the subject are :

Even if the Holy Roman Empire
dissolved in mist,
yet there would remain
holy German art !

And this, in its context, can fairly be taken to say that the ideals of German art can survive, even if politics change

radically or go badly wrong. This might be called the avoidance of politics.

With « Parsifal » , the one work that Wagner wrote after he had completed « The Ring » , the situation is different again. Nietzsche was clearly wrong when he said that Wagner had ended-up by prostrating himself in front of the Christian cross. Wagner did nothing of the sort : roughly speaking, he took some colored snapshots of the Eucharist and used them to illustrate his journey into the psychology of sex, guilt, memory, and pain. (He thought that Nietzsche lacked a sense of humor, because he presented him with a copy of the « Parsifal » poem inscribed from « Richard Wagner, Oberkirchenrat » (as it were, « The Right Reverend Wagner ») and Nietzsche did not find it funny.) But the work does undoubtedly steal some of its resonance from Christian ritual and its associations and, in particular, Wagner's recurrent theme of a redeemer sustains, in this case, much of its familiar religious meaning. Indeed, in the magnificent climax to Act 3, Gurnemanz, crowning Parsifal as king, uses language so dense with references to redemption and salvation that it has even been suggested that he is addressing not Parsifal but the Redeemer Himself.

(18)

Although Parsifal becomes a king, he is not a king over any subjects. Nor does the Opera suggest that mankind is reclaiming its identity from religion, as in the more Feuerbachian moments of the « Ring » . Here, we can speak of a genuine absence of politics. What we have is the exploitation of religious remnants in the interests of a drama that operates almost entirely at the level of depth psychology. This involves a kind of trick because, in places, the work has to pretend that the whole of human life is transcended and justified by something higher (as it is represented in the final scene, indeed, literally higher) , the Holy Spirit. But the psychological material is so powerful, the symbols of the wound and the spear are strong enough, and, above all, the musical invention is so compelling that Wagner's « Allmacht » , his capacities as a magical manipulator, enable him just about to get away with it. The director is left with some nasty problems, but we need not be, and certainly not any that have to do with politics.

It is not an objection to « Parsifal » that, at the time of writing it, Wagner wrote increasingly crazy articles tying its story together with themes of racial purity. It might be, for some people, an objection to going to see « Parsifal » : they might feel that they did not wish to be associated in any way with a work written by a man with such an outlook. That is, as people say, their privilege. But it has nothing at all to do with interpreting or responding to « Parsifal » , because whatever theories Wagner may have had, they do not structure the work, or surface in it, or demand our attention in experiencing it.

When Robert W. Gutman, for instance, says, « Parsifal's sudden insight in the magic garden was the realization that by yielding to Kundry he would dilute his purebred strain » , he is not reporting the plot, the text, or any implication of the music's associations. He is simply saying how it might look to someone who thought about little but Wagner's racist writings. My point here is not to re-instate the distinction between the work and the man, which I have already said is not a helpful device in Wagner's case. The point is just that one cannot decide in advance, either positively or negatively, what facts about the man, his views, and their history may be relevant to responding to a given work. In particular, if we acknowledge its power, it is a question of what it is in us that does so and, in the case of « Parsifal » , we have a good enough idea of what that is to know that it has nothing essentially to do with Wagner's racist ravings.

In « Die Meistersinger » , politics is avoided and, from « Parsifal » , it is merely absent but, with the « Ring » , neither of these is true. The cycle emphatically addresses issues of power and if, at its end, it suggests that the world in which they arise is overcome, it is hard not to be left with the feeling that the questions of power and its uses have not so much been banished as raised to a level at which they demand some « higher » kind of answer.

I said earlier that there is an explanation of why the funeral music can move us so much even when we recognize that the supposed object of its triumph does not exist. I suggest that it makes sense because we hear it as the celebration not of a man but of a process, of all that has gone before in the « Ring » . The « Ring » , as it moves toward its end, elicits a cumulative sense of its own complexity and power, and it is this that the funeral music celebrates. The music itself helps to bring this out, as motifs associated with earlier parts of the story come to the surface. In celebrating its own fulfillment, the work can make us feel that the whole disaster-laden history has been worthwhile.

What this expresses is not (and it is very important that it is not) the idea that life is redeemed by art, the idea that real life, and real suffering, cruelty, and humiliation, are justified because they can issue in great works of art. It is doubtful that Wagner believed this even about his own works. It is not that the splendors of the « Ring » can justify real life. Rather, the « Ring » 's celebration of what it has presented can symbolize for us ways in which life even in its disasters can seem to have been worthwhile. In these terms, the « Ring » emerges as what it should be, an affirmative drama, and not in a way that invokes a hypothetical and deeply suspect politics of heroism and sacrifice.

The problem still remains, however, whether the part that Siegfried plays in the story can, on any adequate reading, bear the weight that it is required to bear. Some of the strains in the work come, without doubt, from the complex changes of mind that Wagner underwent as he wrote it. But the problem is not just that the work is imperfect. What really matters is a product of history, that the strains pull us toward a sense of the work in which the transcendence of politics tends to suggest not the absence of politics, but a higher, transcendental, politics, of a peculiarly threatening kind.

This is signaled by problems of theatrical production, and those problems remain even if we come to hear the funeral music as a tragic affirmation rather than the celebration of an embarrassingly non-existent hero. The questions that emerge concretely as problems for the theatrical director are, in any case, questions for all of us, if we do not allow Wagner's extraordinary ingenuity to deflect us from them. Particularly, with regard to the « Ring » , but not only there, it may be impossible, even in our imagination, to re-create Wagner's works altogether adequately. It may be that the total unity of psychology, myth, and morally redemptive significance to which Wagner aspired is an illusion, not just in the sense that it is unattainable (that is true of Beethoven's ideals of freedom) but because, as Nietzsche said, it is based, in some part, on a pretense that a set of theatrical, often grandiose, gestures can reveal the nature of the world. If that is so, then to that extent no honest treatment of it can make it work as a whole. We can do it justice - but, then, it comes-out guilty of that pretense, and justly associated, for indelible historical reasons, with a politics that has since Wagner wrote moved into the gap left by that pretense. Or it can come out less guilty - but, then,

theatrical re-creation will have negotiated this as an accommodation between historical memory, what Wagner tried to bring about, and what we can now, decently and (as we say) in all honesty, accept.

If, at least for some of Wagner's works, a production which « did them justice » would find them guilty, this will constitute the historical vengeance of the ethical on an artist who uniquely raised the stakes high enough for such a vengeance to be even possible.

Notes

(1) « The Sorrows and Grandeur of Richard Wagner », in : « Pro and Contra Wagner », translated by Allan Blunden, Faber and Faber, London (1985) ; page 100.

(In quotations from Thomas Mann, I have sometimes modified the translation.)

Nietzsche's attacks on Wagner certainly represent an ongoing deep fascination with him, but some of his remarks may also strike a chord with those who are less involved :

« My objections to Wagner's music are physiological objections. What's the point of dressing them up in æsthetic formulae ? »

(2) Norton (1997) .

(3) This is argued by Jens Malte Fischer in a helpful and admirably balanced new introduction to an edition of Wagner's pamphlet, « Richard Wagner und Das Judentum in der Musik : Eine kritische Dokumentation », Insel, Frankfurt am Main / Leipzig (2000) .

For a review of Wagner's anti-Semitism, see the article by Dieter Borchmeyer, in : « A Wagner Handbook », edited by Ulrich Müller and Peter Wapnewski (translated by John Deathridge) , Harvard University Press (1992) .

(4) Frederic Spotts. « Bayreuth : A History of the Wagner Festival », Yale University Press (1994) ; page 84.

According to Cosima's diary, Wagner did once tell Hans von Wolzogen that he wanted the Journal to strike a broad, idealistic note, and keep away from « specialities », such as vegetarianism and agitation against the Jews. See : Cosima Wagner. « Die Tagebücher », Volume 2, Reinhard Piper Verlag, Munich / Zürich (1977) ; page 700. Cited by Fischer, page 118.

(5) His articles « German Art and German Politics » (1st published anonymously in a newspaper, in 1867, then in book form, in 1868) can be « interpreted, at least in part, as a commentary on “ Die Meistersinger ” », according to John Deathridge in « The New Grove Wagner », Norton (1984) ; pages 52-53.

I come back later to the question whether « Meistersinger » is itself expressly political.

(6) There is one significant qualification to be made : that neither in this essay, nor (yet more remarkably) in pieces written during and after the Second World War, did Thomas Mann, so far as I know, mention Wagner's anti-Semitism.

(7) It was a « nameless presumptuousness » in wanting to have something to say about everything that Mann particularly had in mind when he said in a letter to Emil Preetorius of 1949 that, « there is a lot of Hitler in Wagner » .

(8) For instance : Robert W. Gutman, « Richard Wagner : The Man, His Mind, and His Music » , Harcourt Brace (1968) ; Hartmut Zelinsky, in : « Richard Wagner : wie anti-Semitisch darf ein Künstler sein ? » , Edition Text + Kritik, Munich (1978) ; Barry Millington, « Wagner » , Princeton University Press (1984) ; Paul Lawrence Rose, « Wagner : Race and Revolution » , Yale University Press (1992) ; Marc A. Weiner, « Richard Wagner and the Anti-Semitic Imagination » , University of Nebraska Press (1995) . The idea goes back at least to Theodor W. Adorno, « Versuch über Wagner » , written in 1937-1938, 1st published as a whole, in 1952 ; English translation by Rodney Livingstone, « In Search of Wagner » , Verso (1984) .

(9) Robert W. Gutman, « Richard Wagner : The Man, His Mind, and His Music » , pages xiv, xviii.

It is ironical that Gutman drops a condescending sneer toward Wagner's early biographers for their « Victorian delight in bringing ethical standards to bear on artistic affairs » .

(10) Wagner did very much like the « Parsifal » that he got, in 1882, apart from a problem with the moving scenery. See : « Richard Wagner on Music and Drama » , selected by Albert Goldman and Evert Sprinchorn. From translations by H. Ashton Ellis, University of Nebraska Press (1970) ; pages 369-376. It would certainly look very strange now.

(11) It is, perhaps, worth saying that I do not think that this criticism applies to Patrice Chéreau's 1976 Bayreuth production of the « Ring » , which is widely known on video (issued by Philips) . Some of its inventions are gratuitous but, for the most part, it embodies extremely sensitive responses to the drama.

(12) As Adorno pointed-out (« In Search of Wagner » , page 28) , the idea that Wagner was a « dilettante » goes back to Nietzsche's essay, « Richard Wagner in Bayreuth » , written at the time of the 1st Festival, in 1876.

(13) In the essay, « Über die Benennung “ Musikdrama ” » (1872) .

(14) « Nietzsche contra Wagner » , 2nd section : « Where I Offer Objections » , C.G. Naumann Verlag, Leipzig (1889) .

(15) In Andrew Porter's translation : « Goodness and truth dwell but in the waters » . See : « Richard Wagner : The Ring of the Nibelung » , Norton (1977) .

(16) Translated by Walter D. Morris, F. Ungar Publisher Co. (1983) .

(17) The presence of this among other cultural legacies in Nazi discourse, and above all in Hitler's own speeches, is the subject of Joseph Peter (Maria) Stern's fascinating book : « Hitler : The " Führer " and the People » , Fontana / Collins, London (1975) .

(18) See : Lucy Beckett, « Richard Wagner : " Parsifal " » , Cambridge University Press (1981) ; pages 52-53.

Richard Wagner et Adolf Hitler

Without Wagner would there have been a 3rd « Reich » and what would Richard have thought about his greatest « fan » , Adolf Hitler ?

Undoubtedly, much of Hitler's « weltanschauung » (world view or world philosophy) was dictated by the music, librettos and writings of his favourite composer.

Wilhelm Richard Wagner (22 May 1813 - 13 February 1883) was a German composer, theatre director, polemicist, and conductor who is primarily known for his Operas (or, as some of his later works were later known, « music-dramas ») . Unlike most Opera composers, Wagner wrote both the libretto and the music for each of his stage works. Initially establishing his reputation as a composer of works in the Romantic vein of Carl Maria von Weber and Giacomo Meyerbeer, Wagner revolutionised Opera through his concept of the « Gesamtkunstwerk » (Total Work of Art) , by which he sought to synthesise the poetic, visual, musical and dramatic arts, with music subsidiary to drama, and which was announced in a series of essays between 1849 and 1852.

Wagner realized these ideas most fully in the 1st half of the 4 Opera cycle « Der Ring des Nibelungen » (The Ring of the Nibelung) . His compositions, particularly those of his later period, are notable for their complex textures, rich harmonies and orchestration, and the elaborate use of leitmotifs - musical phrases associated with individual characters, places, ideas or plot elements. His advances in musical language, such as extreme chromaticism and quickly shifting tonal centres, greatly influenced the development of Classical music.

In addition, there was a personal element to Hitler's connection with Wagner.

Of course, Wagner died in 1883, and Hitler was born in 1889 (so, there could be no direct, personal connection) however Wagner had a son, Siegfried, and Siegfried, despite his homosexuality, had sons : Wolfgang and Wieland. After the death of Siegfried Wagner, in 1930, Winifred Wagner, Siegfried's wife, took-over the Bayreuth Festival, running it until the end of World War II.

In 1923, Winifred met Adolf Hitler who, as we know, greatly admired Wagner's music.

When Hitler was jailed for his part in the Munich « Beer-Hall " Putsch " » , Winifred sent him food parcels and

stationery on which Hitler's autobiography « Mein Kampf » was written.

In the late- 1930's, she served as Hitler's personal translator during treaty negotiations with England.

Winifred's relationship with Hitler grew so close that, by 1933, there were rumors of impending marriage.

« Haus Wahnfried » , the Wagner home in Bayreuth, became Hitler's favourite retreat, and he had his own separate accommodation in the grounds of Wahnfried, known as the « Führerbau » .

The name of the villa Wahnfried, is interesting.

« Wahn » means endless striving of an artist for the fulfilment of his aspirations and the triumph of his art. So « Wahnfried » (Wahn free) was the name chosen and, even today, we can see Wagner's motto on the front : « Here where my delusions have found peace, let this place be named Wahnfried. » .

Above the door to the villa is a giant mural, depicting Wotan, King of the Gods and the philandering wanderer, being welcomed by Classical women.

We should also note that Wotan was the name of Wagner's beloved Saint-Bernard dog.

The whole house was a place where Wagner could compose, raise his family and entertain guests.

The Grand Hall is the largest room in the villa, and is a 2 storey space with a gallery around the 2nd floor and a skylight in the ceiling. Furnishings include 2 of Wagner's pianos and numerous busts. The specially designed Bechstein piano was the piano Wagner used when he was composing « Die Meistersinger » , part of « Siegfried » and « Parsifal » . It was a present from the endlessly patient, endlessly generous King Ludwig II for Wagner's birthday, in 1864.

In a shady grove beyond the garden, surrounded with ivy, is the tomb of Richard and Cosima Wagner. The stone is unmarked, because as Wagner insisted, as long as it remained, everyone would know who was buried there.

But to begin at (almost) the beginning :

The most momentous non-event of the Century occurred in February of 1908. And it occurred in Vienna to Alfred Roller. Today, Roller is not so much underestimated as unknown, at least outside a small circle of Opera devotees. Yet, in 1908, he was one of the most important figures on the Viennese artistic scene. He was a painter who, along with Gustav Klimt, organized the Vienna Secession.

He was also professor of Fine-Arts and, soon, to be appointed director of the School of Applied-Arts. But above all, he was a stage-designer of great distinction.

In that 1st week of February, Roller received a letter from a friend declaring that a young man of her acquaintance was a great admirer of his.

The lad was an aspiring painter and loved Opera ; he would give anything, she wrote, to meet Roller to discuss his professional prospects, either in painting or in stage design.

Despite his heavy commitments, Roller generously agreed to meet him, take a look at some of his work and advise him on a career.

The young man was overjoyed and, a short time later, with Roller's reply and a portfolio of his works in hand, went to the Opera house.

On reaching the entrance, so he later said, he got cold feet and left.

A short time later, he summoned-up his courage, returned and, this time, made it as far as the grand staircase, when he again took flight.

On a 3rd occasion, he was well on his way to Roller's office when an Opera House attendant asked his business. At that, he turned on his heels and fled for good.

Now, young Adolf (Hitler) was not a naturally timid young man so what was it that prevented him from meeting Roller ? Was there some force, that prevented him from taking the critical that would have decisively changed world history ?

But he never forgot the gesture, and when he finally met Roller, in 1934, he told him the story. The young man was now Chancellor of Germany.

If only, history sighs, Roller and Hitler had met in 1908 and Hitler had been taken on as an assistant at the Opera, or enrolled at the School of Applied-Arts.

As Hitler himself remarked to his personal staff, in 1942 :

« Without a recommendation, it was impossible to get anywhere in Austria. When I came to Vienna, I had a recommendation to Roller. But I never made use of it. If I had gone to him with it, he would have taken me right off. But I do not know whether that would have been better for me. Certainly, everything would have been much easier. And much different. »

In any event, Adolf Hitler never lost his admiration of Alfred Roller.

When Winifred Wagner decided, in 1933, to stage a new production of Richard Wagner's « Parsifal » at Bayreuth, the

Ist since the original of 1882, Hitler, not unnaturally, proposed Roller to do it, although he had other, more obscure reasons for making that request and she agreed.

So how did it all start ? Hitler's love-affair with Wagnerian Opera had begun in Linz in 1901 when, at the age of 12, he attended his Ist Opera.

The performance was of « Lohengrin » and, as he later wrote in « Mein Kampf » :

« I was captivated at once. My youthful enthusiasm for the Master of Bayreuth knew no bounds. Again and again I was drawn to his works. » .

From that moment, the lad found himself addicted, literally so, to Wagner's Operas.

The composer's musical and intellectual influence in Central Europe was then at its zenith, and Hitler embraced the cult as devoutly as anyone.

During the years following the ecstasy of that Ist « Lohengrin » performance, Hitler returned to the Linz Opera House, night after night.

It was there that he eventually met another Opera enthusiast, August Kubizek :

August (« Gustl ») Kubizek (3 August 1888, Linz - 23 October 1956, Eferding) was a close friend of Adolf Hitler when both were in their late teens. He later wrote about their friendship.

The slightly older August, although training to follow in the footsteps of his father as an upholsterer, was a serious amateur musician, able to play several stringed and brass instruments.

In a short time, he became the sole friend of Hitler's youth.

It was not simply the mutual interest in Opera that drew them together but the compliant Kubizek's willingness (an absolute requisite for everyone else later as well) to listen in tacit agreement or, at least, silence as the domineering « Adi » expatiated on whatever caught his fancy.

According to Hitler's comments to Albert Speer, the 2 young men spent hours wandering through the streets of Linz as he rambled on about music, architecture and the importance of the Arts.

...

Berthold Konrad Hermann Albert Speer (March 19, 1905 - September 1, 1981) was a German architect who was, for a part of World War II, Minister of Armaments and War Production for the 3rd « Reich » . Speer was Adolf Hitler's chief

architect before assuming ministerial office. Speer joined the Nazi Party, in 1931, launching him on a political and governmental career which lasted 14 years. His architectural skills made him increasingly prominent within the Party and he became a member of Hitler's inner circle. Hitler instructed him to design and construct a number of structures, including the « Reich » Chancellery and the « Zeppelinfeld » Stadium, in Nuremberg, where Party rallies were held. Speer also made plans to reconstruct Berlin on a grand scale, with huge buildings, wide boulevards, and a reorganized transportation system.

...

On visiting Vienna for the 1st time, in 1906, it was to Kubizek that Hitler wrote :

« Tomorrow, I am going to the Opera, ' Tristan ', and the day after ' Flying Dutchman '. » , he reported soon after arriving.

Later, the same day, he dispatched a 2nd postcard of the Opera House on which he had written grandiloquently :

« The interior of the edifice is not exciting. If the exterior is mighty majesty, lending the building the seriousness of an artistic monument, one feels in the interior admiration rather than dignity. Only when the mighty sound waves flow through the auditorium and when the whisperings of the wind give way to the terrible roaring of the sound waves does one feel the grandeur and forget the surfeit of gold and velvet covering the interior. »

On settling in Vienna, the following year, he persuaded Kubizek, who had been admitted to the Music Conservatory, to join him there.

The 2 lived together until 1908 when Hitler, following the humiliation of his 2nd rejection by the Academy of Fine-Arts, suddenly vanished from his companion's life.

Beyond his « Wagnermania » , little is known for certain about Hitler's youthful activities. He sang in a church choir at Lambach Abbey (« Stift Lambach ») , a Benedictine monastery in Lambach, Austria.

« Stift Lambach » :

A monastery was founded in about 1040 by Count Arnold II of Lambach-Wels. His son, Bishop Adalbero of Würzburg (later canonised) , changed the monastery into a Benedictine abbey, 10 year later. Since 1056, it has been a Benedictine abbey. During the 17th and 18th Centuries, a great deal of work in the Baroque style was carried-out, much of it by the Carlone family. Lambach escaped the dissolution of the monasteries of Emperor Joseph II, in the 1780's. In 1897-1898, Adolf Hitler had lived in the town of Lambach (with his parents) . He went to the secular « Volksschule » at which Benedictine teachers were employed.

Hitler had seen several swastikas each day as a boy in Lambach, when he attended the Benedictine monastery school,

which was decorated with carved stones and woodwork that included the symbol.

On leaving school, the young Adolf joined a music club, and took piano lessons, from October 1906 until the end of the following January, from a man named Josef Prawratsky.

He soon quit because of lack of money as a result of the expense of his mother's cancer treatments, however, his sister Paula recalled him « sitting for hours at the beautiful Heitzmann grand piano my mother had given him » .

...

Klara Hitler, née Pölzl (12 August 1860 - 21 December 1907) was an Austrian woman, and the mother of Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler.

Paula Hitler - Paula Wolf (21 January 1896 in Hafeld, Austria - 1 June 1960 in Berchtesgaden) was the younger sister of Adolf Hitler and the last child of Alois Hitler and his 3rd wife, Klara Pölzl. Paula was the only full sibling of Adolf Hitler to survive into adulthood.

...

In later years, Hitler occasionally played (according to Winifred Wagner, fairly well) but what he played remains a mystery. Kubizek's 1954 book, « Young Hitler » indicates that Hitler had a fairly solid musical background.

Adolf Hitler was devoted to the works of Franz-Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Ludwig van Beethoven as well as Anton Bruckner, Carl Maria von Weber, Franz Schubert, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Robert Schumann and Edvard Grieg. He was especially fond of Mozart and of Beethoven's Violin and Piano Concertos, and, above all, Schumann's Piano Concerto (Hitler did not like the music of Johannes Brahms) .

The assertion that Adolf Hitler read Richard Wagner's prose writings and everything else he could get his hands on, by or about Wagner, is contradicted by Franz Jetzinger, librarian at the Linz archive, that Hitler did no serious reading at all, at the time. However, this story, along with many of Jetzinger's assertions about Hitler, has been strongly disputed.

...

Franz Jetzinger (3 December 1882 in Ranshofen, Upper-Austria - 19 March 1965 in Ottensheim, Upper-Austria) was an Austrian clergyman, academic, politician, civil servant, editor and author. He remains especially famous as author of the book « Hitler's Youth » .

Jetzinger gained fame, in 1958, through the English version of his book, « Hitler's Youth » , in which he could refute many of Hitler's statements about his early years. Moreover, Jetzinger attracted attention by attacking an earlier published book, « The Young Hitler I Knew » by August Kubizek, whom Jetzinger accused of spreading falsehoods. While

earlier Hitler biographers, like Joachim Fest or Werner Maser, adopted Jetzinger's criticism as their own, Jetzinger's crushing judgment of Kubizek's credibility is now challenged by Brigitte Hamann, author of « Hitlers Wien ». Hamann asserts personal motives for Jetzinger's tendency to illustrate nearly every statement in Kubizek's book as an ex-post modification of facts, claiming Jetzinger was economically motivated, because the previous release of Kubizek's book supposedly undermined the sale of his own work. Many of Jetzinger's statements have now been discredited.

The young Hitler was undoubtedly enthralled by Wagner's music and he was « transported into that extraordinary state which Wagner's music produced in him, that trance, that escape into a mystical dream-world ; a changed man, his violence left him, he became quiet, yielding and tractable, intoxicated and bewitched, willing to let himself be carried away into a mystical universe ; from the stale, musty prison of his backroom, transported into the blissful regions of Germanic antiquity » , according to Kubizek.

According to some reliable sources, Adolf Hitler wrote an Opera, based on a prose sketch which Richard Wagner had developed, but abandoned, entitled « Wieland der Schmied » (Wieland, the Blacksmith) .

An entire chapter is devoted to the story and tells how the young Hitler worked-out leitmotifs, a cast of characters, a plot, a dramatic structure and a rough score.

Even after the passage of 45 years, Kubizek was able to recall the specific names, all old-Teutonic, of the characters. Within 3 days of conceiving the idea of the Opera, Hitler had already composed an Overture (in Wagnerian style) which he played for his friend on the piano in their completely darkened room :

« Eventually, there was produced a very serious sketch for a music-drama with Adolf Hitler as its composer. »

In Germanic and Norse mythology, Wayland the Smith (Old English : Weland ; Old Norse : Völundr, Velentr ; Old High German : Wiolant ; Proto-Germanic : geboren Welandaz, from geboren Wéla-nandaz, literally : battle-brave) is a legendary Master blacksmith. In Old Norse sources, « Völundr » appears in « Völundarkviða » , a poem in the Poetic Edda, and in « Þiðrekssaga » , and his legend is also depicted on the Ardre image stone VIII. In Old English sources, he appears in « Deor » , « Waldere » and in « Beowulf » and the legend is depicted on the Franks Casket. He is mentioned in the German poems about Dietrich von Bern as the Father of Witige.

August Kubizek also explains how Hitler dreamed-up the idea of a « Mobile “ Reichs ” Orchestra » or « Reich Symphony Orchestra » which was to tour German provinces and perform without charge.

In 1928, an Orchestra dedicated to promoting National-Socialist ideals was organized and, in 1931, it became, with Hitler's approval, a travelling National-Socialist Symphony Orchestra.

By far, the best-known of Kubizek's reminiscences relates to the Opera « Rienzi » :

« Following a performance at the Linz Opera of Wagner's ' Rienzi ', Hitler ascended to a high place (the Freinberg Hill

overlooking the city) where he experienced an ideological epiphany. »

« Rienzi, der Letzte der Tribunen » (Rienzi, the Last of the Tribunes) is an early Opera by Richard Wagner in 5 acts, with the libretto written by the composer after Bulwer-Lytton's novel of the same name (1835) .Written between July 1838 and November 1840, it was 1st performed at the « Hofoper Dresden » , on 20 October 1842, and was the composer's 1st success.

The Opera is set in Rome and is based on the life of Cola di Rienzi (1313-1354) , a late medieval Italian populist figure who succeeds in outwitting and then defeating the nobles and their followers and in raising the power of the people.

Inspired by the hero of the Opera, a simple man driven by a sense of mission to restore greatness to Rome, Hitler fell into a state of « complete ecstasy and rapture » and declared that he too was destined to lead his people to greatness.

Kubizek went on to say that he mentioned the episode to Hitler when they met in Bayreuth, in 1939, and found that he recalled it : « In that hour, it began. » , the « Führer » commented.

And it is a story that is anchored in fact.

One fact is that the Opera was actually performed at the local Opera House, beginning in January 1905.

Another is that this is another case where the book and the « Reminiscences » are consistent.

When a sceptical Jetzinger read that passage and challenged it (why ?) , Kubizek responded in evident dudgeon : « The experience after ' Rienzi ' really happened. » .

But most telling is Hitler's own testimony to Albert Speer, in 1938, a full year before Kubizek raised the topic at Bayreuth.

Explaining why the Party rallies opened with the Overture to the Opera, he said it was not simply because of the impressiveness of the music but also because it had great personal significance :

« Listening to this blessed music as a young man in the Opera at Linz, I had the vision that I too must some day succeed in uniting the German Empire and making it great once more. »

Upon the annexation of Austria, Adolf Hitler publicly expressed identical sentiments, without the personal reference to « Rienzi » , telling an audience in Vienna :

« I believe it was God's will to send a youth from here into the " Reich " , to let him grow-up, to raise him to be

the leader of the nation so as to enable him to lead his homeland back into the “ Reich ”. »

The « Anschluß » (German for : connection or union) , also known as the « Anschluß Österreichs » , was the reunion of Austria with the 3rd « Reich » , in 1938.

With the « Anschluß » , the German-speaking Republic of Austria ceased to exist as a fully independent State.

In some sense, then, the « Rienzi » experience marked the primal scene of his political career.

Wilhelm Furtwängler : « Hitler’s love of music was intense, fanatical even. But, as in painting, his taste was limited to a specific type. » .

Wilhelm Furtwängler learned this to his shock at a long meeting with the « Führer » , in August 1933.

Wilhelm Furtwängler (January 25, 1886 - November 30, 1954) was a German conductor and composer. He is widely considered to have been one of the greatest Symphonic and Operatic conductors of the 20th Century.

During the 1920's and 1930's, Furtwängler became one of the leading conductors in Europe, as principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic from 1922, as principal conductor of the « Gewandhaus » Orchestra from 1922 to 1926, and as a major guest-conductor of other leading Orchestras such as the Vienna Philharmonic. He was the leading conductor who remained in Germany during the Second World War.

Adolf Hitler left him in no doubt, meant Opera, and Opera meant Wagner and Puccini.

Giacomo Antonio Domenico Michele Secondo Maria Puccini (22 December 1858 - 29 November 1924) , generally known as Giacomo Puccini, was an Italian composer whose Operas are among the most frequently performed in the standard repertoire.

Puccini has been called « the greatest composer of Italian Opera after Verdi » . While his early work was rooted in traditional late- 19th Century Romantic Italian Opera, he successfully developed his work in the « realistic » Verismo style, of which he became one of the leading exponents.

Symphonies, initially, held little interest to Hitler ; and chamber music, none at all.

There is no record of his ever having attended a chamber concert or a lieder recital.

His attendance at Symphony concerts was increasingly rare as time passed and, when he became Chancellor, he seldom appeared, except on ceremonial occasions.

Adolf Hitler wanted music to be readily available. However, and after 1933, he built-up a large collection of

phonograph recordings at the Chancellery in Berlin, at the Berghof, on his train and, later on, at his military headquarters on the Eastern front.

According to all accounts, these were outstanding in quality and quantity, and the playing equipment was excellent. In the evenings, he enjoyed hearing short excerpts and dramatic highlights of favourite pieces.

« He would then sit back » , according to Christa Schröder, and listen with his eyes closed.

Adolf Hitler had a fascination with Anton Bruckner's music and Hitler saw many parallels with Bruckner's artistic struggles. Both were born in Upper-Austria (near Linz) and both had difficulties achieving artistic acceptance in the musical capital of Vienna.

It is not surprising that Hitler would have the music of Bruckner at one of his many military headquarters. The « Bruckner Archive » (John F. Berky ; abruckner.com) holds 2 discs from the « Telefunken » shellac-set of the Adagio of the Symphony No. 7 performed by Wilhelm Furtwängler and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. These are both single-sided discs and have the small « Führer-hauptquartier » stamp affixed to the label.

...

Christa Schröder, born Emilie Christine Schröder (March 19, 1908 - June 18, 1984) was one of Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler's personal secretaries before and during World War II.

It was always the same recordings that were played, and, usually, the guests knew the number of the record by heart. When Hitler said, for example, « Aida, last act : The fatal stone upon me now is closing. » , then one of the guests would shout the catalogue number to a member of the household staff : « Record number 100 whatever. » .

According to Albert Speer :

« Before long, the order of the records became virtually fixed. Ist, he wanted a few bravura selections from Wagnerian Operas, to be followed promptly with Operettas. »

All the while, he would try to guess the names of the singers and, as Speer remarked, « was pleased when he guessed right, as he frequently did » .

« Aïda » is an Opera in 4 acts by Giuseppe Verdi to an Italian libretto by Antonio Ghislanzoni, based on a scenario often attributed to French Egyptologist, Auguste Mariette. « Aïda » was Ist performed at the Khedivial Opera House in Cairo, on 24 December 1871, conducted by Giovanni Bottesini.

Adolf Hitler was not genuinely fond of Beethoven and, as time passed, his attendance at performances of his Symphonies was usually confined to official events. This was awkward.

Traditionally, Germans looked upon Beethoven along with Gøthe, Rembrandt and Shakespeare as the supreme figures of modern Western culture.

Unlike the others, however, Beethoven was never just a cultural figure, but also an ideological symbol, invoked by every political movement.

National-Socialists, and Alfred Rosenberg in particular, claimed the composer as an « Aryan » hero ; and his music as an elixir that would contribute to the Nation's renewal.

Ludwig van Beethoven (baptized 17 December 1770 - 26 March 1827) was a German composer and pianist. A crucial figure in the transition between the Classical and Romantic eras in Western art music, he remains one of the most famous and influential of all composers. His best-known compositions include his 9 Symphonies, his 5 Piano Concertos, his 32 Piano Sonatas, and his 16 String Quartets. He also composed other chamber music, choral works (including the celebrated « Missa solemnis ») , and lieder.

In his speeches, Adolf Hitler consequently felt obliged to give the composer his due, but his praise rarely rose above the perfunctory.

So, if Hitler had his Wagner, the Party had its Beethoven. When Hitler « entertained » on State occasions, Wagner was performed ; when the Party was « entertained » on Party occasions, Beethoven was played. And played he was, more often than any other Symphonic composer.

His works, above all the 9th Symphony, were the pre-eminent musical set pieces for important occasions. When Hitler wanted to impress State visitors, he hauled them off to a gala performance of a Wagnerian Opera.

In 1938, anxious to gain Hungarian support for his impending dismemberment of Czechoslovakia ; he invited the Prince Regent, Admiral Horthy, to make a State visit.

Miklós Horthy de Nagybánya, in German : Nikolaus von Horthy und Nagybánya (18 June 1868 - 9 February 1957) , was Regent of the Kingdom of Hungary during the years between World Wars I and II and throughout most of World War II, serving from 1 March 1920 to 15 October 1944. He was styled « His Serene Highness the Regent of the Kingdom of Hungary » (« Ő Főméltósága a Magyar Királyság Kormányzója ») .

The social high-point of the occasion was a stunning performance of the Opera « Lohengrin » , a rather tactless choice considering the Opera opens with a call to arms to defend Germany from the Hungarian invader.

The following year, Prince Paul, Prince Regent of Yugoslavia, was invited to Berlin for similar reasons, in this case the imminent invasion of Poland. He was treated to the happier « Meistersinger von Nürnberg » .

Prince Paul of Yugoslavia, also known as Paul Karađorđević (27 April 1893 - 14 September 1976) , was Regent of Yugoslavia during the minority of King Peter II. Peter was the eldest son of his 1st cousin Alexander I. His title in Yugoslavia was « Његово Краљевско Височанство, Кнез Намесник » (His Royal Highness, the Prince Regent) . In 1939, Prince Paul, as acting head of State, accepted an official invitation from Adolf Hitler and spent 9 days in Berlin.

Hitler apparently believed that outstanding musical performances (like his magnificent works of architecture) would leave foreign leaders in awe of the greatness of the 3rd « Reich » and incline them to support his policies.

Hitler's admirer Hans Severus Ziegler and conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler traced his antipathy to the old rivalry between the « Brahms and Bruckner Camps » , in Vienna.

Hans Severus Ziegler (13 October 1893 - 1 May 1978) was a German publicist, intendant, teacher and National-Socialist Party official. A leading cultural director under the Nazis, he was closely associated with the censorship and cultural co-ordination of the 3rd « Reich » . Ziegler played a leading role in promoting the Nazi vision of culture, particularly with regards to « degenerate » music (« Entartete Musik ») . He was a strong critic of atonality, dismissing it as decadent « cultural Bolshevism » .

In an attempt to have him overlook history, and concentrate on the music, they persuaded him to attend a concert of the Berlin Philharmonic, which included the Brahms's 4th Symphony. But when he blithely commented afterwards, « Well, Furtwängler is such a good conductor that under such a baton even Brahms is impressive. » , they admitted defeat.

Johannes Brahms (7 May 1833 - 3 April 1897) was a German composer and pianist. Born in Hamburg, into a Lutheran family, Brahms spent much of his professional life in Vienna where he was a leader of the musical scene. In his lifetime, Brahms's popularity and influence were considerable ; following a comment by the 19th Century conductor Hans von Bülow, he is sometimes grouped with Johann Sebastian Bach and Ludwig van Beethoven (the 3 « B » 's) .

Unfortunately, the record is silent on what Adolf Hitler thought of Richard Strauß's Operas, or even which ones he knew.

Richard Georg Strauß (11 June 1864 - 8 September 1949) was a leading German composer of the late-Romantic and early Modern eras. He is known for his Operas, which include « Der Rosenkavalier » and « Salome » ; his lieder, especially his « 4 Last Songs » ; and his tone poems and other orchestral works, such as « Death and Transfiguration » , « Also sprach Zarathustra » , « An Alpine Symphony » , and « Metamorphosen » . Strauß was also a prominent conductor throughout Germany and Austria. Strauß represents the late flowering of German Romanticism after Richard Wagner, in which pioneering subtleties of orchestration are combined with an advanced harmonic style.

The story that Adolf Hitler begged money from relatives to attend the Austrian premiere of « Salome » in Graz, in May 1906, an event that also drew most of the eminent composers of the day, is possibly apocryphal.

« Salome », Opus 54, is an Opera in I Act by Richard Strauß to a German libretto by the composer, based on Hedwig Lachmann's German translation of the French play « Salomé » by Oscar Wilde. Strauß dedicated the Opera to his friend Sir Edgar Speyer.

The Opera is famous (at the time of its premiere, infamous) for its « Dance of the Seven Veils ». It is now better known for the more shocking final scene (often a concert-piece for dramatic sopranos), where Salome declares her love to (and kisses) the severed head of John the Baptist.

Not until after the « Anschluß », in 1938, did Hitler even visited Vienna.

Hitler liked the best-known Operas of Giuseppe Verdi and Giacomo Puccini. In fact, a performance of « Madama Butterfly » at the Berlin « Volksoper », in 1937, left him so delighted that he decided, then and there, to donate 100,000 Marks a year, to the Opera Company.

Even so, when once attending a performance of « La Bohème », what he talked about during the intermissions was Wagner and Bayreuth. Otherwise, there were few if any non-German composers whose works he could abide.

According to Heinrich Hoffmann, he especially disliked Igor Stravinsky and Serguei Prokofiev, and when Hoffmann's daughter, Henriette von Schirach, presented him with a recording of Piotr Ilyitch Tchaïkovsky's 6th Symphony, he brusquely refused to listen to it.

Heinrich Hoffmann (September 12, 1885 - December 11, 1957) was a German photographer best-known for his many published photographs of Adolf Hitler. Hoffmann married Therese « Lelly » Baumann, who was very fond of Hitler, in 1911, their daughter Henriette (« Henny ») was born on February 3, 1913 and followed by a son, Heinrich (« Heini ») on October 24, 1916. Henriette married « Reichsjugendführer » (National Hitler Youth commander) Baldur von Schirach, who provided introductions to many of Hoffmann's picture books, in 1932. Therese Hoffmann died a sudden and unexpected death, in 1928. Hoffmann and his 2nd wife Erna introduced his Munich studio assistant, Eva Braun, to Hitler. Braun later became Hitler's female companion.

Adolf Hitler liked his music to be melodic, euphonious and accessible. Hitler's taste underwent several significant changes, however. During most of his life, the music of Anton Bruckner held little appeal.

Anton Bruckner (4 September 1824 - 11 October 1896) was an Austrian composer known for his Symphonies, Masses, and Motets. The 1st are considered emblematic of the final stage of Austro-German Romanticism because of their rich harmonic language, strongly polyphonic character, and considerable length. Bruckner's compositions helped to define contemporary musical radicalism, owing to their dissonances, unprepared modulations, and roving harmonies. Unlike other musical radicals, such as Richard Wagner or Hugo Wolf who fit the « enfant terrible » mould, Bruckner showed extreme humility before other musicians, Wagner in particular. This apparent dichotomy between Bruckner, the man, and Bruckner, the composer, hampers efforts to describe his life in a way that gives a straightforward context for

his music.

Heinrich Hoffmann did not so much as mention the composer's name when once identifying Hitler's favourites.

Even after becoming chancellor, Albert Speer noted, his interest « never seemed very marked » .

Anton Bruckner had, however, symbolic importance to him, both as a « home-town boy » and as a rival to Johannes Brahms, so beloved in Vienna. It was a fixed part of the Nuremberg rallies for the cultural session to open with a movement of one of his Symphonies.

In June 1937, Adolf Hitler was famously photographed paying his respects to Anton Bruckner ; standing in mute homage before a monument at « Walhalla Hall of Fame » near Regensburg, as Siegmund von Hausegger and the Munich Philharmonic played the magnificent Adagio of the 7th Symphony. Why Hitler staged that event is not known.

On 7 June 1937, Adolf Hitler installed the bust of austrian composer Anton Bruckner in the famous Regensburg « Walhalla » (a « Hall of Fame » for German Heroes built by Ludwig I of Bavaria from 1830 to 1841) . Richard Wagner, of course, had already been honoured in the « Walhalla » .

On the night of 13th - 14th January 1942, after hearing Bruckner's 7th Symphony, Hitler remarked :

« This work is based on popular airs of Upper-Austria. They're not textually reproduced, but, repeatedly, I recognise in passing Tyrolean dances of my youth. It's wonderful what he managed to get out of that folklore. As it happened, it's a priest to whom we must give the credit for having protected this great Master. The Bishop of Linz used to sit in his cathedral for hours at a time, listening to Bruckner play the organ. He was the greatest organist of his day. »

(« Hitler's Table Talk, 1941-1944 » , edited by H.R. Trevor-Roper ; introduction by Gerhard L. Weinberg.)

Speculation has ranged from the theory that the « Walhalla » intronisation ceremony was intended as a cultural precursor of the annexation of Austria, the following year, to the notion that it was out of nostalgia for his « beautiful time as a choirboy » and Lambach Abbey, with its Bruckner associations.

Undoubtedly, Hitler felt a personal kinship. Both had come from small Austrian towns, grew-up in modest circumstances, had fathers who died at an early age, were autodidacts, and made their way in life despite great obstacles. On a number of occasions, he contrasted the Austrian Catholic Bruckner, whom the Viennese shunned, to the north German Protestant Johannes Brahms, whom they idolized. Then, suddenly in 1940, he developed a passion for Bruckner's Symphonies. He even began mentioning him in the same breath with Wagner. Josef Gæbbels noted in his diary :

« He told me that it was only now during the War, that he had learned to like him at all. »

The enthusiasm steadily grew.

Paul Josef Gœbbels (29 October 1897 - 1 May 1945) was a German politician and « Reich » Minister of Propaganda in Nazi Germany, from 1933 to 1945. He one of Adolf Hitler's closest associates and most devout followers.

By 1942, Gœbbels placed Bruckner on a level with Beethoven, and categorized the former's 7th Symphony as « one of the most splendid manifestations of German musical creativity, the equivalent of Beethoven's 9th » .

His feelings about Bruckner, man and composer, are best conveyed by remarks he made after listening to a recording of the 1st movement of the 7th at his military headquarters, in January 1942 :

« Those are pure popular melodies from Upper-Austria, nothing taken over literally but, “ Ländler ” and so on, that I know from my youth. What the man made-out of this primitive material ! In this case, it was a priest who deserves well for having supported a great Master. »

« The Bishop of Linz sat for hours, alone in the cathedral, when Bruckner, the greatest organist of his time, played the organ. »

« One can imagine how difficult it was for a small peasant lad when he went to Vienna, that urbanized, debauched society. »

A remark by Bruckner about Johannes Brahms, which a newspaper recently carried, brought him closer to me :

« Brahms' music is quite lovely, but he preferred his own. »

« That is the healthy self-confidence of a peasant who is modest but when it came down to it knew how to promote a cause when it was his own. »

« That critic Hanslick made his life in Vienna hell. But when he could no longer be ignored, he was given honours and awards. But what could he do with those ? It was his creative activity that should have been made easier. Brahms was praised to the heavens. »

From then on, Hitler did everything possible to promote Bruckner and to enlist him in his vendetta against Vienna. Saint-Florian, where the composer's career had begun, was to be turned into a pilgrimage site in the manner of Bayreuth.

Gœbbels noted :

« He wants to establish a new cultural centre here. Simply as a counter-weight to Vienna, which must gradually be shoved aside. He intends to renovate Saint-Florian at his own expense. »

Accordingly, Hitler financed a centre of Bruckner studies there, had the famous organ repaired and augmented the composer's library.

He even designed a monument in his honour to stand in Linz, and endowed a Bruckner Orchestra which he was determined to make one of the world's best.

The publication of the Robert Haas edition of the composer's original scores was subsidized from his own funds. And he dreamed of constructing a bell tower in Linz with a carillon that would play a theme from the 4th Symphony.

An even more startling transformation in Hitler's musical taste was a growing passion for Operetta, in particular Franz Lehár's « Die lustige Witwe » (The Merry Widow) .

Franz Lehár (30 April 1870 - 24 October 1948) was an Austro-Hungarian composer. He is mainly known for his Operettas of which the most successful and best-known is « The Merry Widow » .

Adolf Hitler enjoyed Lehár's music, and hostility diminished across Germany after Goebbels's intervention on Lehár's part. The National-Socialist regime was aware of the uses of Lehár's music for propaganda purposes : concerts of his music were given in occupied Paris, in 1941. Even so, Lehár's influence was limited.

« Die lustige Witwe » is an Operetta by the Austro-Hungarian composer, Franz Lehár. The librettists, Viktor Léon and Leo Stein, based the story (concerning a rich widow, and her countrymen's attempt to keep her money in the principality by finding her the right husband) on an 1861 comedy play, « L'attaché d'ambassade » (The Embassy Attaché) by Henri Meilhac.

The Operetta has enjoyed extraordinary international success since its 1905 premiere in Vienna and continues to be frequently revived and recorded. Film and other adaptations have also been made. Well-known music from the score includes the « Vilja Song » , « Da geh' ich zu Maxim » (You'll Find Me at Maxim's) , and the « Merry Widow Waltz » .

There was a remarkable irony in this. Although Hitler almost always avoided mentioning the names of contemporary composers and their works, in speeches in 1920 and 1922, he singled-out « Die lustige Witwe » as a pre-eminent example of artistic « kitsch » . There is no way of knowing when he changed his mind. But, some time in the 1930's, that very Opera became one of his favourites. He never missed a new production of either that or Johann Strauß' « Die Fledermaus » , and drew large sums from his private account for lavish new stagings.

Johann Strauß II (October 25, 1825 - June 3, 1899) , also known as Johann Baptist Strauß or Johann Strauß, Junior, the Younger, or the Son (« Sohn ») , was an Austrian composer of light music, particularly dance music and Operettas. He composed over 400 waltzes, polkas, quadrilles, and other types of dance music, as well as several Operettas and a ballet. In his lifetime, he was known as « The Waltz King » , and was largely then responsible for the popularity of the waltz in Vienna during the 19th Century. Among his Operettas, « Die Fledermaus » and « Der Zigeunerbaron » are

the best-known.

Eventually, Hitler came to revere Franz Lehár as one of the greatest of composers. So thrilled was he upon meeting the composer, in 1936, at a session of the « Reichskulturkammer » that he talked about the experience for days afterwards.

The « Reichskulturkammer » or « RKK » (« Reich » Chamber of Culture) was an institution in the 3rd « Reich » . It was established by law, on 22 September 1933, in the course of the « Gleichschaltung » (coordination ; making the same ; bringing into line) process at the instigation of « “ Reich ” Kunst Minister » Josef Gœbbels as a professional organization of all German creative artists. Defying the claims raised by the German Labour Front (« Deutsche Arbeitsfront » , or « DAF ») under rival Robert Ley, it was designed to control the cultural life in Germany, promoting art created by « Aryans » , and seen as consistent with National-Socialist ideals.

Every artist had to apply for membership on presentation of an « Aryan certificate » .

The « Reichskulturkammer » was affiliated with the Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda with its seat in Berlin and was headed by Doctor Paul Josef Gœbbels.

The importance of Franz Lehár's music in the last years of Hitler's life was evident when he celebrated his birthday, in 1943, by treating himself, and his guests, to a recording of « Die lustige Witwe » .

Clearly, Hitler had a keen ear, but how much did he actually know about music ?

He possessed a powerful memory, and, in fields that interested him, he often befuddled specialists with his detailed, even expert, knowledge.

In fact, confounding professionals, and showing-off to his entourage, gave him wicked pleasure, and those around him occasionally suspected that he boned-up on a topic only to bring the conversation round to it so that he could exhibit his « extraordinary knowledge » .

After the Viennese premiere of Richard Strauß' « Friedenstag » , Adolf Hitler gave a reception for the artists at which, according to one account, « He showed an astonishing array of musical knowledge, and was able, for example, to remind Hans Hotter of what he had been singing 10 years previously :

« Isn't Scarpia too high for you ? That G-flat in Act II ? »

While confirming the story, Hotter commented that it was difficult to draw much of a conclusion from it. « Hitler had an exceptionally good memory. »

According to the nature of an event (in this case, music) , he would prepare himself by reading relevant literature and

surprise everybody by his insider's knowledge.

« Friedenstag » (Peace Day) is an Opera in 1 Act by Richard Strauß, his Opus 81, to a German libretto by Josef Gregor. The Opera was premiered in Munich, on 24 July 1938, and dedicated to Viorica Ursuleac and her husband Clemens Krauß, the lead and conductor respectively. Strauß had intended « Friedenstag » as part of a double-bill, to be conducted by Karl Böhm, in Dresden, that would include as the 2nd part his next Opera, « Daphne » .

Most accounts of Hitler's musical expertise relate to his knowledge of Wagnerian Opera.

Typical was a comment of Winifred Wagner who, as her secretary recorded, « could not stop raving about what an attentive listener he is and how well he knows the works, above all musically » .

In the same vein, Heinz Tietjen remarked that he was « amazed » at how well the « Führer » knew Richard Wagner's scores, citing as an example Hitler's comment after a performance that the oboe had not played quite in tune. « And I had to acknowledge he was right. » , the impresario said.

Heinz Tietjen (June 24, 1881 - November 30, 1967) was a German conductor and music producer. He was the director of the « Deutsche Oper » Berlin, between 1925 and 1927, then director of the Prussian State Theatre. From 1931 to 1944, he served as artistic director at the Bayreuth « Festspielhaus » for Winifred Wagner with whom he had a Romantic liaison.

More convincing are the comments of Baldur von Schirach. Writing after he had served 20 years in the prison of Spandau, he cannot be suspected of gilding the lily. He recalled a performance of « Die Walküre » , which Hitler had attended in Weimar, in 1925.

Schirach's father was managing director of the Opera House and, after the performance, Hitler was introduced to him and went on at great length about what he had seen and heard in a way that demonstrated he really knew his Wagner.

He compared the production with those he had attended in Vienna as a young man, naming singers and conductors, and so impressed the elder Schirach that he was invited home to tea. After he left, Schirach « père » (senior) was said to have commented :

« In all my life, I never met a layman who understood so much about music, Wagner's in particular. »

Baldur Benedikt von Schirach (9 May 1907 - 8 August 1974) was a Nazi youth leader later convicted of crimes against humanity. He was the head of the « Hitler-Jugend » or « HJ » (the Hitler Youth) ; and « Gauleiter » ; and « Reichsstatthalter » (« Reich » Governor) of Vienna. Schirach was born in Berlin, the youngest of 4 children of theatre director « Rittmeister » Carl Baily Norris von Schirach (1873-1948) and his American wife Emma Middleton Lynah Tillou (1872-1944) . Through his mother, Schirach descended from 2 signatories of the United States Declaration

of Independence. He had 2 sisters, Viktoria and Rosalind von Schirach, and a brother, Karl Benedict von Schirach, who committed suicide in 1919, at the age of 19.

Schirach joined a « Wehrjugendgruppe » (military cadet group) at the age of 10 and became a member of the « NSDAP », in 1925. He was soon transferred to Munich and, in 1929, became leader of the « Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Studentenbund » or « NSDStB » (National-Socialist German Students' League) . In 1931, he was a « Reichsjugendführer » (youth leader) in the « NSDAP » and, in 1933, he was made head of the Hitler Youth and given an « SA » rank of « Gruppenführer » . He was made a State secretary, in 1936.

To this account, Albert Speer added that, at his 50th birthday celebration in 1939, Hitler had been particularly excited by a gift of some of Wagner's original scores and, as he leafed through that of « Götterdämmerung », « showed sheet after sheet to the assembled guests, making knowledgeable comments » .

Which were Hitler's favourite Operas ?

Despite the poverty of his Vienna years, he managed to attend « Tristan und Isolde » alone 30 or 40 times, and, in the course of his life, heard it, and « Die Meistersinger », probably a 100 times.

« Tristan und Isolde » is an Opera, or music-drama, in 3 Acts by Richard Wagner to a German libretto by the composer, based largely on the romance by Gottfried von Straßburg. It was composed between 1857 and 1859 and premiered in Munich, on 10 June 1865, with Hans von Bülow conducting. Wagner referred to the work not as an Opera, but called it « eine Handlung » (literally : a drama, a plot or an action) .

Wagner's composition of « Tristan und Isolde » was inspired by his affair with Mathilde Wesendonck and the philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer. Widely acknowledged as one of the peaks of the Operatic repertory, « Tristan » was notable for Wagner's advanced use of chromaticism, tonality, orchestral colour and harmonic suspension.

According to his press chief, Otto Dietrich, Adolf Hitler knew « Die Meistersinger » by heart and could hum or whistle all its themes.

« Lohengrin » no doubt held a special place in his heart.

According to Joachim Fest, Hitler considered the final scene of « Götterdämmerung » to be « the summit » of all Opera.

Joachim Clemens Fest (8 December 1926 - 11 September 2006) was a German historian, journalist, critic and editor, best-known for his writings and public commentary on Nazi Germany, including an important biography of Adolf Hitler and books about Albert Speer.

Fest further cites Albert Speer as having told him, « In Bayreuth, whenever the Citadel of the Gods collapsed in flames

amid the musical uproar, in the darkness of the loggia, he would take the hand of Frau Wagner, sitting next to him, and in deep emotion bestow a kiss upon it. » .

Be that as it may, it was « Tristan und Isolde » that meant most to him.

After listening one evening, in 1942, to a recording of the « Prelude und Liebestod » , Hitler commented : « Well, ' Tristan ' was his greatest work. » .

According to Christa Schröder, the « Liebestod » moved him so deeply that he said he wished to hear it at the time of his death.

And in a letter from Landsberg prison, in 1924, Hitler wrote that he often « dreamed of Tristan » .

At a 1938 Bayreuth performance, Winifred Wagner observed : « He is over-joyed at each beautiful passage that he especially loves ; then, his face just shines. »

There is no way of knowing whether it was the eroticism, the sense of longing, the triumph of sensuality over reason that (in contrast to his own repressed sexual instincts) appealed to him. Possibly, it was the cult of the night or the tragic end. Maybe just the music.

« Tannhäuser » engaged him less, and he was long familiar only with the composer's earliest score, the so-called « Dresden Version » .

At some point, in the 1930's, Hitler heard the later « Paris Version » , and was so taken with it that he ordered Goebbels and Göring to permit only that score to be performed.

Despite the fact that Hitler seemed to favour « Tristan » , the most significant of Wagner's works for Hitler, despite his comments about « Tristan » and « Götterdämmerung » , was « Parsifal » ; and that was the reason why he wanted Alfred Roller to re-stage it at Bayreuth.

This elucidates Hans Frank's story that, while riding on his train through the Rhineland, in 1936, Adolf Hitler asked to have played for him a recording of Karl Muck's performance of the « Parsifal Vorspiel » . Afterwards, in a deeply contemplative mood, he remarked, « Out of Parsifal, I shall make for myself a religion, religious service in solemn form without theological disputation. » .

He recalled that the Vienna Opera archive held sketches of Alfred Roller's 1914 production and he commended these as models for producers.

Not waiting for the « final victory » , Josef Goebbels passed on the word to his ministerial officials with instructions to have photographs of the Alfred Roller sketches circulated to every Opera House. Managers were informed that any

future staging of the work was to follow the Roller model and « was no longer to be done in the Byzantine-sacred style that was common up to then » .

For Hitler, the Gnostic themes of the Grail Quest, and the cosmic struggle between « Light and Darkness » were perfectly portrayed in « Parsifal » .

Being an occult initiate, Hitler was aware of the Gnostic message behind « the externals of the story, with its Christian embroidery ; the real message was pure, noble blood, in whose protection and glorification the brotherhood of the initiated have come together » .

Adolf Hitler's interpretation of « Parsifal » : « I have built-up my religion out of “ Parsifal ”. Divine worship in solemn form without pretenses of humility. One can serve God only in the garb of the hero. » .

« What is celebrated in Wagner's “ Parsifal ” is not the Christian religion of compassion, but pure and noble blood ; blood whose purity the brotherhood of initiates has come together to guard. The king (Amfortas) then suffers an incurable sickness, caused by his tainted blood. Then, the unknowing but pure human being (Parsifal) is led into temptation, either to submit to the frenzy and to the delights of a corrupt civilisation in Klingsor's magic garden, or to join the select band of knights who guard the secret of life, which is pure blood itself. All of us suffer the sickness of miscegenated, corrupted blood. Note how the compassion that leads to knowledge applies only to the man who is inwardly corrupt, to the man of contradictions. And Eternal life, as vouchsafed by the Grail, is only granted to those who are truly pure and noble ! »

« Only a new nobility can bring about the new culture. If we discount everything to do with poetry, it is clear that elitism and renewal exist only in the continuing strain of a lasting struggle. A divisive process is taking place in terms of World History. The man who sees the meaning of life in conflict will gradually mount the stairs of a new aristocracy. He who desires the dependent joys of peace and order will sink back down to the unhistorical mass, no matter what his provenance. But the mass is prey to decay and self-disintegration. At this turning point in the World's revolution, the mass is the sum of declining culture and its moribund representatives. They should be left to die, together with all kings like Amfortas. »

« The old beliefs will be brought back to honour again. The whole secret knowledge of nature, of the divine, the demonic. We will wash off the Christian veneer and bring-out a religion peculiar to our race. »

It has sometimes been assumed that Hitler was attracted to Richard Wagner's works because of the plots, with their Classic conflict between the outsider and a rigid social order, their lonely heroes and dark villains, their Nordic myths and Germanic legends.

However (apart from « Parsifal ») , there is no record of any comment on how he interpreted the works, or whether he saw in them any ideological message ; much less whether he envisaged himself as « Lohengrin » , « Siegmund » , « Siegfried » , « Wotan » or any other Wagnerian character. It was the music that moved him.

Hitler said :

« When I hear Wagner, it seems to me like the rhythms of the primeval world. And I could imagine that science will one day find measures of creation in the proportions of the physically perceptible vibrations of the Rheingold music. »

Perhaps, he was trying to say what Thomas Mann wrote in « Doktor Faustus » that the elements of music are the 1st and simplest materials of the world, and make music one with the world, that « the beginning of all things had its music » .

Christa Schröder recalled his saying that, « Wagner's musical language sounded in his ear like a revelation of the divine » .

The vocabulary suggests that the feelings conjured by the Operas may have filled the void left by the conventional Catholic religious belief he lost, or never really had, and it is quite clear that Hitler saw « Parsifal » in religious terms. In one of his earliest speeches, he made the revealing comment that, in their way, Wagner's works were holy, that they offered « exaltation and liberation from all the wretchedness and misery as well as all the decadence that prevails » , and that they lift one « up into the pure air » .

If escape and purification were part of the appeal, the Operas also responded to that proclivity for the overwhelming, the oceanic, the Romantic, the orgasmic that was evident in his public rallies, parades and spectacles. Like Wagner himself, Hitler believed that music fully realized itself only when it fused with other arts in visible form on stage.

And, like Wagner, his interest extended to virtually every aspect of Operatic production, down to the fabric and design of the theatre itself. He was fascinated by backstage operations, including the functioning of stage machinery. During his visit to Weimar, in 1925, Hitler asked to go behind the stage at the National Theatre. Schirach was with him at the time and later remarked, « He was familiar with all sorts of lighting systems and could discourse in detail on the proper illumination for certain scenes. » .

Hans Severus Ziegler recalled taking a walk with Hitler one night at the Berghof, when the moon suddenly appeared from behind, a cloud and lit the surrounding meadow. Hitler stopped in his tracks and launched into a discussion of the colour of light necessary to achieve verisimilitude for moonlight on a stage, as in the concluding scene of the 2nd act of « Die Meistersinger » . He was insistent that it should be white ; but « it is often greenish or blueish and that is wrong » , he complained : « That is just Romantic “ kitsch ”. » .

Already in his youth, Hitler had made sketches of Wagnerian stage sets that he imagined or actually saw. Although a drawing of « Siegfried » holding a raised sword is a « Kujau » forgery, several authentic sketches survived. Among them is one of the 2nd Act of « Lohengrin » ; others include his rendering of the 2nd and 3rd Acts of the famous 1903 « Mahler-Roller » production of « Tristan und Isolde » , which he had attended in Vienna.

This interest in stage design increased after he became Chancellor, and reached such a level that it was common knowledge that the best way to get an appointment with him, which otherwise might take months, was to let him know that you had photos of a new staging of an Operetta or Opera, particularly Wagnerian. An invitation was almost certain to follow, and then Hitler would spend countless hours studying the pictures.

Most of all, he relished working with Benno von Arent, and, together, they designed several productions that he commissioned and paid for with his private funds. Among them, « Lohengrin » , in 1935, at the German Opera, in Berlin ; « Rienzi » , in 1939, at the Dietrich Eckart Open Air Theatre, in Berlin ; « Die Meistersinger » , in 1934 ; and, later years, at the Nuremberg Opera in connection with the Party rally.

Benno von Arent (19 July 1898 in Görlitz, Prussia - 14 October 1956) was a member of the National-Socialist Party and « SS » , responsible for art, theatres, movies. Self-taught, after various apprentice positions, he obtained his 1st theatre job in Berlin, in 1923, and became a stage-designer. He joined the « SS » , in 1931, and the « NSDAP » , in 1932. The same year, he was one of the founders of the « Bund nationalsozialistischer Bühnen- und Filmkünstler » (Union of National-Socialist stage and movie artists) , which was renamed « Kameradschaft deutscher Künstler » (Fellowship of German artists) after Adolf Hitler's rise to power, in 1933. Arent was appointed « Reichsbühnenbildner » (« Reich » stage-designer) , in 1936, and « Reichsbeauftragter für die Mode » (« Reich » agent for fashion) , in 1939. He designed the diplomatic uniform of the Nazi diplomatic service. In 1944, he was given the rank of « SS-Oberführer » .

He is listed under « Künstlerische Mitarbeiter » , in the 1938-1939 catalog issued by Porzellan-Manufaktur Allach, Munich.

Albert Speer recalled : « At the Chancellery, Hitler once sent-up to his bedroom for neatly executed stage designs, coloured with crayons, for all the Acts of “ Tristan und Isolde ” ; these were to be given to Arent to serve as an inspiration. Another time, he gave Arent a series of sketches for all the scenes of “ Der Ring des Nibelungen ”. At lunch, he told us with great satisfaction that, for 3 weeks, he had sat-up over these, night after night. This surprised me the more because, at this particular time, Hitler's daily schedule was unusually heavy with visitors, speeches, sight-seeing and other public activities. Undoubtedly, Arent's work reflected Hitler's taste. His setting for the 2nd Act of “ Tristan ”, for example, was similar to Roller's Vienna staging that Hitler adored. » .

The main trait of the « Hitler-Arent » style was, as Speer phrased it, « smashing effects » , and Arent's productions were smashing. Gigantic choruses and parades, huge casts of extras and glitzy costumes characterized « Lohengrin » and « Rienzi » . But the « Hitler-Arent » « chef-d'œuvre » was their 1934 joint production of « Die Meistersinger » . This culminated in a 3rd Act meadow scene staged in the manner of a Nuremberg Party rally, with massed banners and martial chorus. No detail of the production escaped Hitler's eye. He fretted over the moonlight scene in the 2nd Act and went into ecstasies over the brilliant colours he wanted for the final scene on the « Meistersingers' » meadow, and over the Romantic look of the little gabled houses opposite Hans Sachs's cobbler's shop. So proud of it was he that he sent it on tour : from Nuremberg to the « Deutsche Oper » in Berlin, in 1935 ; then, to Munich, in 1936 ;

Danzig, in 1938 ; Weimar, in 1939 ; and Linz, in 1941.

It even enjoyed a measure of resurrection after the War when the costumes were used, in 1951, at the Bayreuth Festival, then too impoverished to afford to make its own.

Hitler's adulation of Wagner « the composer » probably developed into veneration of Wagner « the man » rather quickly. Except for Frederick the Great and Bismarck, on no other person did he lavish such repeated and fulsome praise.

« I must be frank to say that Richard Wagner's personality meant more to me than Goethe's. » , he remarked on one occasion.

« The " Führer " talks to me of Richard Wagner, he reveres him and knows of no one like him. » , Goebbels once recorded.

Hitler even managed to introduce Wagner's name into his 1923 « Putsch » attempt, telling the Court, at his trial, that he had been partly inspired by the composer's example of preferring deeds to words.

« When I stood at Wagner's grave for the 1st time, my heart just overflowed with pride that, here, rested a man who would not permit the inscription on his tombstone : " Here lies Privy Counsellor, Music Director, His Excellency Baron Richard von Wagner. " I was proud that this man, like many men in German history, was content to leave his name to posterity, not a title. »

In the early 1930's, it was being argued that Wagner did not simply enchant Hitler with his music and inspire his anti-Semitism, stagecraft and political ideas, but also that he helped to create the very ideological atmosphere that put him in power.

« Of all German creative figures, Wagner is the real father of the current German state of mind. » , wrote Emil Ludwig. It was not by chance, he went on, that Hitler was a Wagnerian.

The 2 men were personally alike. Moreover, they worked the same material.

The composer took the German sagas just as they were. « Such were the ideals that Wagner proffered the German people. But it was not just the stories and the « musical sound » that created a mood of « mystical rapture » but, also, his use of the German language. Only Hitler's prose could compete with his. » These were themes developed in later years by Thomas Mann.

The novelist was scarcely less smitten by Wagner than was Hitler himself.

He too, as a youth, had haunted his local Opera House, and « Lohengrin » had also been the 1st of the Master's

Operas he had attended.

Thomas Mann spoke of the composer as his « starkstes, bestimmendes Erlebnis » : his strongest and most formative experience. From the beginning to the end of his life, he was enthralled by the music, and bewitched by the man. Wagner was the subject, or important theme, of nearly a dozen essays, any number of letters and countless diary entries. But while Hitler admired everything he knew about the composer's life, character, ideology and musical creation, Mann was, in some ways, ambivalent about them.

Thomas Mann's most important commentary on Richard Wagner was an address to the Goethe Society of Munich, in February 1933, on the 50th anniversary of the composer's death. Entitled « The Sufferings and Greatness of Richard Wagner » , it was a deeply searching and astute treatment of Wagner's place in European culture. The fruit of years of thought, it placed the composer among the greatest of artistic figures.

In 1937, Mann noted in his diary that, on one hand, he found « elements of a frightening quality » in a poem Wagner had written for his wife Cosima and that, on the other, he had listened to a recording of « Die Walküre » « with admiration » .

According to Joachim C. Fest, « The youthful Hitler succumbed to the music of Richard Wagner. The charged emotionality of this music seemed to have served him as a means for self-hypnosis, while he found in its lush air of luxury the necessary ingredients for escapist fantasy. » . In fact, Hitler himself later declared that with the exception of Richard Wagner, he had « no forerunners » and, by Wagner, he meant not only the composer but Wagner the personality, « the greatest prophetic figure the German people has had » . The points of contact between the 2 temperaments (all the more marked because the young painter consciously modelled himself after his hero) produce a curious sense of family resemblance.

Joachim Clemens Fest (8 December 1926 - 11 September 2006) was a German historian, journalist, critic and editor, best-known for his writings and public commentary on Nazi Germany, including an important biography of Adolf Hitler and books about Albert Speer and the German Resistance. He was a leading figure in the debate among German historians about the Nazi period.

The style of public ceremonies in the 3rd « Reich » is inconceivable without Wagner's Operatic tradition, without the essentially demagogical art of Richard Wagner - for the « Master of Bayreuth » was not only Hitler's great exemplar, he was also the young man's ideological mentor.

Richard Wagner's political writings were some of Hitler's favourite reading, and his style unmistakably influenced Hitler's own grammar and syntax.

Those political writings, together with the Operas, form much of the framework for Hitler's ideology. Here, he found the « granite foundations » for his view of the world.

Nothing could have symbolized the association more provocatively than the opening scene of Hans Jürgen Syberberg's 1977 film, « Hitler » , in which the Dictator rises ectoplasmically out of Wagner's Bayreuth grave.

Hans-Jürgen Syberberg (born 8 December 1935) is a German film director, whose best-known film is his lengthy feature, « Hitler : A Film from Germany » . Born in Nossendorf, Pomerania, the son of an Estate owner, Syberberg lived until 1945, in Rostock and Berlin. In 1952 and 1953, he created his 1st 8 mm takes of rehearsals by the Berliner Ensemble. In 1953, he moved to West-Germany, where, in 1956, he began studies in literature and Art History, completing them the following year.

He earned his doctorate in Munich. For Syberberg, cinema is a form of « Gesamtkunstwerk » . Many commentators, including Syberberg himself, have characterized his work as a cinematic combination of Bertolt Brecht's doctrine of epic theatre and Richard Wagner's Operatic æsthetics. Well-known philosophers and intellectuals have written about his work, including Susan Sontag, Gilles Deleuze and Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe.

In 1975, Syberberg released « Winifried Wagner und die Geschichte des Hauses Wahnfried von 1914-1975 » ; a documentary about Winifred Wagner, wife of Richard Wagner's son, Siegfried. The documentary attracted attention because it exposed Winifred's admiration for Adolf Hitler. The film thus proved an embarrassment to the Wagner family and the Bayreuth Festival (which she had run from 1930 until the end of the Second World War) .

Syberberg is also noted for an acclaimed visual interpretation of the Wagner Opera « Parsifal » , in 1982.

What Hitler admired in the composer was what he admired in his other heroes : courage.

In a speech in 1923, he defined the vital quality of human greatness as « the heroic » and attributed it to 3 men : Martin Luther, Frederick the Great and Richard Wagner. The « reformer » because he possessed the courage to stand alone against the world ; the « king » because he never lost courage when his lot appeared hopeless ; the « composer » , because he had the courage to struggle in solitude. Each had fought alone and « like a titan » .

As a desperately lonely and friendless figure in his early days, Adolf Hitler must have seen his own situation mirrored in such struggles.

Richard Wagner was thus a symbol or, better, a model of someone who believed in his destiny and let nothing deter him from it. It was no doubt in this sense that he considered the composer, in the oft cited phrase, his only forebear.

Apart from his remarks about « Parsifal » , Hitler never ascribed any of his views to Wagner, not in « Mein Kampf » , his speeches, articles or recorded private conversations. However, there are many obvious parallels in outlook : anti-Semitism, Hellenism, the belief that culture was the « summum bonum » of a civilization, the notion that the arts should never be hostage to commerce, and the like.

Certainly, Wagner's pamphlet « Judentum in der Musik » resonates in Hitler's claim that Jews lack artistic creativity.

« Das Judenthum in der Musik » (Jewishness in Music) , is an essay by Richard Wagner which attacks Jews in general, and the composers Giacomo Meyerbeer and Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, in particular. It was published under a pseudonym in the « Neue Zeitschrift für Musik » (« NZM ») of Leipzig, in September 1850, and was re-issued, in a greatly expanded version, under Wagner's name, in 1869. It is regarded by some as an important landmark in the history of German anti-Semitism.

Some critics point-out that Wagner's opposition to Jews was not limited to his articles, and that the Operas contained such messages. In particular, the characters of Mime, in the « Ring » ; Klingsor, in « Parsifal » ; and Sixtus Beckmesser, in « Die Meistersinger » , appear to be Jewish stereotypes, although none of them are identified as Jews in the libretto.

However, at no time, did he ever trace his anti-Semitism to the composer, not even in his 1920 speech, « Warum sind wir Antisemiten ? » (Why are We Anti-Semites ?) , in which he expounded his views for the 1st time in public. This is not surprising, as his « doctrinal » anti-Semitism, was based on Gnostic and occult teachings, originating with Dietrich Eckart.

August Kubizek does say, however, that the youthful Hitler was said to have read every biography, letter, essay, diary and other scrap by and about his hero that he could lay his hands on.

So, we are left with the apprehension that Richard Wagner, and in particular his « Bühnenweihfestspiel » « Parsifal » , was a seminal influence on Adolf Hitler.

On January 13, 1933, the newly-elected National-Socialist Party celebrated the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death by staging a grandiose memorial ceremony in Leipzig, the composer's birthplace. Adolf Hitler invited Siegfried Wagner's widow, the English-born Winifred, and her son Wieland to be guests of honour at this event. This tribute by Hitler was the continuation of a deep friendship that had begun in 1923 between the « Führer » and the Wagner family, forging a link between the new Germany and the country's most revered composer.

Within weeks of becoming Chancellor of Germany, Hitler had appropriated Wagner and made him the « Reich » 's great beacon.

Each summer, from 1933 to 1939, Adolf Hitler attended the Bayreuth Festival, and he made the Wagner Estate, « Wahnfried » , his 2nd home.

Because she had been one of his earliest supporters, Hitler had great affection for Winifred. Hitler repaid the Wagner family gratitude by pledging his undying friendship, and his deepest devotion to Richard Wagner and Bayreuth.

With the assistance of Doctor Josef Gœbbels, Hitler's untiring Propaganda minister, Richard Wagner became the legendary and ideological voice of the new Party, and the musical standard by which all Classical composers would,

from now on, be judged.

Around the time that Hitler came to power, the Bayreuth « Holy of Holies » still existed : the original Paul von Joukowsky (1845-1912) sets used at the premiere of « Parsifal » . They were still in use at the « Festspielhaus » , even though they were falling apart and were dangerous to the singers.

Realistically, the time had come to replace the production, and the logical person to design the sets would be Emil Preetorius.

The stage-designer Emil Preetorius (1883-1973) was born in Mainz and was one of the most important stage designers of the 1st half of the 20th Century. He studied law and art history in Giessen and, in 1909, he co-founded a school of illustration and the book trade in Munich together with Paul Renner. In 1928, Preetorius became a professor at the Munich « Hochschule für Bildende Künste » . He became the head of scenery for the Bayreuth « Festspiele » , in 1932. During the 1930's, Emil Preetorius's scenes, such as the rock of the Walkyrie for the « Ring des Niebelungen » , were among the most important and influential designs for Richard Wagner's works.

A petition began circulating against this decision, after all, this was the scenery « on which the eyes of the Master had reposed » , and the conservative faction at Bayreuth believed that the scenery needed to be kept and revered like a Holy Icon. Over a 1,000 signatures were collected, including those of conductor Arturo Toscanini and composer Richard Strauß. Winifred Wagner sent the petition to Hitler along with a pamphlet accusing Preetorius of being « un-German » and « under Jewish influence » . Hitler, on the other hand, favored a new Bayreuth production of « Parsifal » , and selected Alfred Roller to design it. The « Führer » was a great admirer of Roller's work, in Vienna.

Following all the controversy, Alfred Roller's production premiered in 1934. There were, however, only a few changes to the overall designs that had originated with Paul von Joukowsky. The temple cupola in the 2nd scene of Act I disappeared, and this made many conservatives very disappointed. Winifred, once again, appealed to Hitler that there should be, yet, another new production of « Parsifal » . Hitler agreed, and suggested that Wieland Wagner design the new sets.

Hitler had always revered Siegfried's son because he was a direct descendant of the Master. Once the War began, Hitler gave orders that Wieland should be permanently exempt from military service. Young Wieland, therefore, designed the sets for the 1937 « Parsifal » .

Wieland was the elder of 2 sons of Siegfried and Winifred Wagner, grandson of composer Richard Wagner, and great-grandson of composer Franz Liszt through Wieland's paternal grandmother. In 1941, he married the dancer and choreographer Gertrude Reissinger. They had 4 children : Iris (born in 1942) ; Wolf-Siegfried (born in 1943) ; Nike (born in 1945) and Daphne (born in 1946) .

Winifred Wagner's close friendship with Hitler meant that, as a teenager and young man, Wieland knew the Dictator as « Uncle Wolf » . His family connections allowed him to avoid the draft in the war.

...

Richard Wagner's Operas had an almost religious effect upon Adolf Hitler ; Wagner's skill for drama and dramatic music no doubt underscored the impact of the legends already known to Hitler from youth.

Hitler and many of his associates shared a fascination with the history and mythology of the German « Volk » , and the following discussion will focus on examples of « mythical influences » , and how they helped shape the personal and political activities of these men.

Richard Wagner's (1813-1883) most famous works are undoubtedly his music-dramas. « Der Ring des Nibelungen » , « Tristan und Isolde » and, most importantly, « Parsifal » were the works that are widely acknowledged as being of great musical significance.

The development and use of the leitmotiv, the parts written for the « helden » tenor, the manipulation of chromaticism in the tonal system, and the development of the music-drama itself are all very important aspects of Wagner and his music.

The ancient sagas that Wagner used as a basis for these music-dramas held for him revealed truths and insights into human behavior and emotions. He has not been alone in his interest and opinions. These myths have been used as an argument for, or illustration of, various beliefs and ideologies. ' The Ring ' has been variously interpreted as a look into the human psyche ; a means of promoting socialism ; a prophecy of the fate of the world and human kind ; and a “ parable ” about the industrial society that was coming of age in Wagner's lifetime.

It was also used by the Nazi Party to justify and glorify racism, and to supply a basis of fanatic loyalty in the Schutzstaffel, or SS.

The legends of German mythology are essentially the same as the old Nordic legends ; many of the proper names are the same in both cultures, and most of the remaining names are very similar to the Norse versions, differing only in spelling.

Thus the Norse Odin, the ruler of the gods, becomes Woden (or Wotan) , further south in the Germanic regions. In the same fashion, the Norse heroes known as Sigurd, Brynhild and Gudrun become Siegfried, Brünnhilde, and Günther in the German stories.

The extremely close parallels between the 2 cultures makes it an absolute certainty that both the Germanic stories and the earlier Norse legends were derived from the same ancient tales.

These early legends are known to the modern world from 2 collections : the Elder Edda, which is written in verse, and the Younger Edda (consisting of the sagas) , which is written in prose. The dating for these collections seems to be in

some dispute ; in Bulfinch's Mythology rather specific dates are assigned : 1056 for the Elder Edda and 1640 for the Younger Edda. However, in Edith Hamilton's Mythology, she speaks of the oldest manuscript of the Elder as dating from circa 1300, some 300 years after the arrival of Christianity in Iceland, and almost 300 years after Bulfinch's date.

Hamilton does state, however, that all of these legends are completely pagan in nature (thus predating Christianity) , and that almost all scholars agree the stories must be much older than the oldest manuscript.

The dates for the Younger Edda are likewise apparently uncertain ; Bulfinch's date of 1640 is hard to reconcile with Hamilton's statement that the Younger was " written down by one Snorri Sturluson in the last part of the 12th Century ".

Regardless of date, it is agreed the most important collection is the Elder Edda.

These 2 very long epics furnish the material for almost all of the presently known myths and legends about the ancient gods of the North.

Unfortunately, as Christian missionaries from the Mediterranean area journeyed further north, they systematically destroyed all the pagan artifacts they could find in a remarkably successful attempt to completely obliterate all remnants of the belief system they were replacing.

Only a few fragments of the entire northern European prehistoric collection of myths have been preserved. The legend of Beowulf in England and the Nibelungenlied in Germany are two tales that survived the zeal of the missionaries.

The Eddas are known only from Iceland ; apparently Icelandic missionaries were less influential than their counterparts on the continent of Europe. Iceland was one of the last European countries to be Christianized.

All of these surviving legends are essentially gloomy and pessimistic in nature ; depressingly so to modern readers.

In Nordic and Germanic mythology the Earth (Midgard) and Heaven (Asgard) were destined to be utterly destroyed by the Frost Giants (who lived in Jötunheim) in a final great battle between Good and Evil, called Ragnarok. Ragnarok is paralleled by Götterdämmerung in Wagner's Ring Cycle.

In this final battle, Evil was predestined to win, and the entirety of creation was to be destroyed. The only bright factor in this thoroughly depressing viewpoint was the belief that, in spite of all, if one could die a courageous, heroic death, then all else faded into insignificance.

It is of interest to realize that the Western ideal of heroism and heroic deeds in the face of certain death springs almost entirely from these Nordic myths, and not from the Greek and Roman mythology that most people are more familiar with. The Greek gods were remarkably unheroic in their conduct. Of course, this idea of heroism and fighting to the death against any odds would fit very well with the kind of fanatic loyalty sought by Adolf Hitler and Heinrich

Himmler.

When Richard Wagner embarked upon the composition of 'Der Ring des Nibelungen' (around 1849), he chose as his framework the Teutonic epic of the Nibelungenlied. The Norse version of this legend is called the Volsungasaga.

Wagner finished the 1st 2 segments ('Das Rheingold' and 'Die Walküre') and part of the 3rd ('Siegfried') by 1857. But 17 years would go by before he would finish the great work with the completion of 'Siegfried' and the final music-drama in the cycle: 'Götterdämmerung'.

As mentioned earlier, the Teutonic versions of these myths are very similar to the Nordic versions, differing chiefly in descriptions of climate, and social condition. The Teutonic versions were generally slightly less violent than their Viking equivalents.

In turn, it seems apparent that Wagner again tempered the German tales somewhat; in 'Tristan und Isolde', after the hero Tristan is mortally wounded, he is kept alive by the power of love until he is united with his lover, Isolde. After Tristan's demise in her arms, she is overcome by waves of ecstatic love, and she dies.

As discouraging as this ending may seem, Richard Wagner saw it as the triumph of love in the face of all adversity; not even death could truly defeat it.

Of course, the story steps outside of the bounds of reality somewhere along the way, but this only adds to the transcendent quality of the story and of the music-drama itself.

Adolf Hitler's attraction to Richard Wagner's music began at an early age. In 1905, aged 16, Hitler left school (ostensibly because of illness) and was able to spend his time as he wished; which he later described as the happiest time of his life.

2 of his favourite pastimes were aimlessly roaming the streets of Linz and attending the opera at night.

He had a passion for music; most especially the mystic operas of Wagner, which he would attend night after night.

His meager supply of pocket money was spent mainly on the opera (a standing room ticket cost only the equivalent of 10 cents) and on purchasing books on German history and mythology, which he would read for hours at a time. His fascination with Wagner's operas seems to have had a profound effect upon him.

His only friend from this period of his life was one August Kubizek, (nicknamed "Gustl") who gave an interesting description: "The charged emotionality of this music seemed to have served him as a means for self hypnosis, while he found in its lush air of bourgeois luxury the necessary ingredients for escapist fantasy."

Kubizek goes on to relate the events of a particular evening spent in Hitler's company. They had attended a

performance of Wagner's ' Rienzi ' and, according to " Gustl ", Hitler had a quite powerful reaction to the opera. The youthful Adolf was " overwhelmed by the resplendent, dramatic musicality " of the opera, as well as deeply affected by the story therein ; that of Cola di Rienzi, a medieval rebel who was an outcast from his fellows and was " destroyed by their incomprehension ". After the opera, Adolf Hitler began to orate. Words burst from him like a backed up flood breaking through crumbling dams. In grandiose, compelling images, he sketched for me his future and that of his people. 30 years later, the boyhood friends would meet again in Bayreuth, and Hitler would remark : " It all began at that hour ! " .

More convincing evidence of Wagner's influences can hardly be wished for after a statement such as this one, but there is more. Between 1909 and 1913, a time which Hitler described as " the saddest period of my life ", he resided in Vienna. It was here, by his own statement in « Mein Kampf » , that he became a confirmed anti-semite. The anti-Semitic opinions Richard Wagner had held were no secret, and the concurrence of opinion between these 2 men could only have served to pull Hitler closer to a greater regard for Wagner. Indeed, Hitler claims to have heard ' Tristan und Isolde ' 30 to 40 times during his years in Vienna. During these years in Vienna, at the Hofoper Opera House alone, at least 426 evenings featured performances of works by Richard Wagner.

In 1923, just before the abortive « Beer-Hall " Putsch " » , Hitler presented himself at Wahnfried, the home of the Wagner family. There, he met Siegfried Wagner (Richard Wagner's only son) and Siegfried's English born wife Winifred.

He is said to have sought out the Master's study, and, deeply moved, stood before Wagner's grave in the garden for a long time. Afterwards, he was introduced to Houston Stewart Chamberlain (Richard Wagner's English born son-in-law) , who was of advanced age and could not speak. Chamberlain later wrote a letter to Hitler voicing his support for Hitler's goals and ideas. Hitler valued this letter greatly, almost as if it were " a benediction from the Bayreuth Master himself " .

Hitler continued in his contacts with the family of Wagner, and it is rumoured that he had a relationship with Winifred after Siegfried's death. Hitler also became a favourite ' Uncle ' (uncle Wolf) to the Wagner's 2 sons, Wieland and Wolfgang.

His idea of the supreme expression of opera was the final scene in ' Götterdämmerung ' and, when in Bayreuth, whenever he witnessed this Finale, he would turn around in his darkened box, seek out the hand of Frau Winifred Wagner, and " breathe a deeply moved Handkuss upon it ". By this time, he had seen all of Wagner's operas countless times, and boasted of having listened to ' Tristan und Isolde ' and ' Die Meistersinger ' over a 100 times each.

Other indications of Wagner's influences are furnished by Albert Speer, who began as Hitler's chief architect and ended as « Reich » Armaments Minister. He speaks of the interior furnishings of Hitler's country house, the Berghof at Obersalzberg. The salon was furnished, along with normal items of furniture, with a " sideboard over 10 feet high and 18 feet long " which was used to store phonograph records. Against another wall was " a massive chest containing built-in speakers, and adorned by a large bronze bust of Richard Wagner by sculptor Arno Breker " .

The admiration Hitler had for Wagner was reciprocated by the Wagner family ; when furnishing this dwelling, the Wagners donated linens and China, and sent Hitler a complete set Richard Wagner's works, along with a page from the original score of Lohengrin.

There is yet another facet of Hitler's dwelling at Obersalzberg that shows his sense of unity with Germany's " heroic " past : the view. Obersalzberg, as one might imply from the name, is a mountain ; high enough to give a good view of the surrounding area. The Berghof, which was designed by Hitler himself, featured a large picture window which offered a view of the Untersberg, Berchtesgaden, and Mozart's home-town, Salzburg. Legend has it that the Emperor Charlemagne still sleeps in the Untersberg, but will someday awaken and restore the German Empire to its past glories. Adolf Hitler didn't hesitate to apply this prophecy to himself : " You see the Untersberg over there. It is no accident that I have my residence opposite it. " .

On the eve of World War II, Adolf Hitler's forces reoccupied the Rhineland. Returning from a triumphal trip through this area, and jubilant over the Allies' weakness, he requested that some Wagner be put on the phonograph. Listening to the Vorspiel to « Parsifal » , he remarked : " I have built up my religion out of « Parsifal » . Divine worship in solemn form without pretenses of humility. One can serve God only in the garb of the hero. " .

The record continued to play. The next selection was the funeral march from *Götterdämmerung*, and brought forth the following comments from Hitler : " I first heard it in Vienna (at the Opera) and I still remember as if it were today. " .

The Germanic myths and the dramatic presentation of these myths by Richard Wagner were, very obviously, a central tool of the Nazi Party. The psychological effects of these music-dramas and stories on the principal figures of the 3rd « Reich » are equally obvious, when they are looked for.

In Joachim Fest's biography of Adolf Hitler, there are no fewer than 34 references to Richard Wagner or his music. And of course, one cannot help but wonder what Richard Wagner would have thought about Adolf Hitler, one of his all time biggest fans ! However, it was Richard Wagner who declared in his ' music-dramas ' that the coming Master race was that of the Germans.

Originally, Friedrich Nietzsche had delighted in Wagner's music, but the latter's obsessive anti-semitism and conversion to an Aryanised Christianity caused him to denounce the composer with every twist of biting irony at his command. The great mass of people, however, were to respond more to Wagner's music than to Nietzsche's difficult writings, partly because it was great and inspired music and partly because its maker had resurrected the mythology of the German race. It is said that myths are the truest expression of a race's spirit and culture, and in ' The Ring ' the Teutonic ' Supermen ' bestrode a stage, wherein was war, treachery, courage, blood and fire, climaxed with a stupendous ' *Götterdämmerung* '. The world of Wotan and Thor, heroes and giants, great deeds, great victories, and great destruction had never been expressed with such power.

The beauty of Richard Wagner's music moved men to such an extent that Adolf Hitler would declare that to understand National-Socialist, Germany one must first know Wagner.

For Wagner believed that the virtues of the Teuton tribes had atrophied with the coming of industrial civilisation ; that courage and will had been poisoned or emasculated by Capitalism and race pollution ; that the Jews were responsible for the enervation and enslavement of the German spirit ; and that a new Siegfried must arise to lead the Germans to an awareness of their greatness and their glory.

Schopenhauer destroyed the meaning of values, Nietzsche proclaimed the need for passing beyond them, and Wagner supplied a new set to replace the old. These 3 men, renowned more posthumously than in their own lifetimes, challenged the world of 1889 and became, in time, the favourites of Adolf Hitler. From them, he derived what fundamental values he possessed. It is impossible to tell whether these men expressed what they felt around them, or what they sensed would be the future ; or whether they were determined to stamp their wills upon the world. Were they prophets ? Or were they magicians ?

We know that Nietzsche derived much of his inspiration from mystical trances which possessed him without warning, and that his greatest work « Thus Spake Zarathustra » was inspired by one such experience in the winter of 1882-1883. We know also that Wagner claimed that the sources of his inspiration flowed from similar supra rational experiences, and the effect of this can be seen in that extraordinary mystical opera « Parsifal » . Whatever the truth, it is at least certain that much of what they foretold, later came to pass.

Yet, the world of 1889 ignored these insignificant portents of change. People continued to live as though nothing important had happened or would happen, and no one so much as deigned to notice the birth of Adolf Hitler. Treaties and contracts were made and broken ; money was won and lost ; children were educated as though all was absolutely certain. Books were written and read which taught Christian, bourgeois, industrial Capitalist, Materialist, Humanist European values as if no other could ever be of the slightest relevance. And yet, it was these books which lacked all relevance.

Nietzsche who knew the true spirit of his age and of the age to come, wrote : “ ‘ And what doeth the Saint in the forest ? ’ asked Zarathustra. The Saint answered : ‘ I make hymns and sing them ; and, in making hymns, I laugh and weep and mumble : thus do I praise God. With singing, weeping, laughing, and mumbling do I praise the God who is my God. But what dost thou bring us as a gift ? ’ When Zarathustra had heard these words, he bowed to the Saint and said : ‘ What should I have to give thee ! Let me rather hurry hence lest I take aught away from thee ! ’ And thus, they parted from one another, the old man and Zarathustra, laughing like school boys. When Zarathustra was alone, however, he said to his heart : ‘ Could it be possible ! This old Saint in the forest hath not yet heard of it, that God is dead ! ’ ”

« Der Bayreuther Kreis » (« The Bayreuth Circle ») was a name originally applied by some writers to devotees of Richard Wagner's music who attended and supported the annual Bayreuth Festival, in the later 19th and early 20th Centuries. Many of these devotees espoused nationalistic German politics, and were supporters of Adolf Hitler from the 1920's onwards, and, therefore, this group of people were directly associated with the rise of Nazism.

There was never any organisation named Der Bayreuther Kreis, or any group of people who identified themselves by that name ; but the term has been used by many historians as a convenient label for Adolf Hitler supporters associated with Wagner and Bayreuth. Examples of such association are given in the following citations :

‘ Only with timely support from « The Bayreuth Circle » , especially Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Winifred Wagner, and henchmen like Dietrich Eckhart in the Thule Society, could Hitler assume the public image of a Wotan / Siegfried figure, complete with telling nickname : “ Wolf ”. ‘

‘ Thus Hitler himself admitted : ‘It was Cosima Wagner’s merit to have created the link between Bayreuth and National-Socialism. ’

‘ It was « The Bayreuth Circle » which raised Wagner’s message to the status of gospel, manoeuvring his ideas into a Germanic Christian doctrine of salvation. ’

...

« Wagner's Racist Operas, the Blinding Truth »

Wagner caricature by K. Klic, Humoristische Blätter, Vienna, 1873. All Jews should be burned at a performance of Nathan the Wise.

Only one thing can redeem you (Jews) from the burden of your curse : the redemption of Ahasverus ; total destruction.

" Cursed Jew-scum "

I have cherished a long repressed resentment about this Jew money world, and this hatred is as necessary to my nature as gall is to blood.

By removing Jewish vermin, I don't necessarily mean destroying them. There are many ways, systematic, and comparatively painless, or at any rate bloodless, of causing races to vanish. We may take systematic measures to dam their great natural fertility. By doing this gradually and without bloodshed, we demonstrate our humanity.

The Jew is the parasite in the body of other nations.

The Jew must not be destroyed, because then " we should have to invent him. It is essential to have a tangible enemy, not merely an abstract one "

Which of the above statements were by Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) and which were by Richard Wagner (1813-1883) ? Most would agree that all of these statements share the brand of racism, and they use " Jew " as an expletive. It

would come as no surprise if we discovered that they were all Hitler's. Hindsight is always the best sight, but the fact is that all but the last 3 came from Richard Wagner. If they were Hitler's, no one would be offering excuses. However, since they were Wagner's statements, his apologists react defensively. After all, they say, what actual harm did Wagner really do ?

I hope to show in this essay how devastating Wagner's legacy was, and, in some ways, still is. The evidence comes from the composer himself, from his " music-dramas ", diaries, letters, and essays. The fact is, that although Adolf Hitler was responsible for ordering the destruction of millions of innocent Jews and other " aliens ", it would be difficult to find public statements by him calling for greater destruction than the above by Richard Wagner. In fact, scholars are still trying to find Hitler's order for the Holocaust, and most of his public statements were more moderate than those cited by Wagner.

Wagner apologists have had to acknowledge Wagner's racism, since there is no way to deny something that was so well documented by Wagner himself. Recognizing that they cannot defend him on that ground, they then deny that any racism is expressed in his " music-dramas ". Some, after peeling away the veneer of fairy tales, are horrified at what they discover in the dramas, as was Thomas Mann in 1940. So, they then try to defend the music by divorcing it from the drama, which is completely contrary to the mandate of the composer's « Gesamtkunstwerke » (Total Works of Art), which will be respected here. They naively claim that music alone is amoral, i.e. , that it cannot communicate any moral or political messages. As such, the Operas are stripped down to mere tone relations in order to prevent and insulate them from the identification of possible racist propaganda.

" Genius ", " Masterpieces ", and " Greatness " have also been used as excuses for Wagner and his music, terms that came out of the very Romantic nationalist Kultur that claimed the superiority of German music in the 1st place. This value ridden rhetoric can no longer be presumed justified or meaningful without a convincing argument.

With all that is now known, it is clear that under the spell of compelling, emotionally charged music, Wagner's apologists are deluding themselves and insist on wearing critical blinders. Compare the following 2 citations :

« In all of Wagner's innumerable commentaries on his own works, there is not a single statement which would entitle us to interpret any of the characters in the music-dramas or any of the details of their plots in anti-Semitic terms, or even to interpret them as allusions to the Jews. The attempt to interpret the Nieblungs, and especially the figure of Mime, as mythic projections of the Jews (an interpretation based on Wagner's description of the physical appearance and speech patterns of Jews in his 1850 essay) is no more than an unverifiable hypothesis.

« No less an admirer than the Jewish composer Gustav Mahler freely admitted the Jewish nature of Mime : " No doubt with Mime, Wagner intended to ridicule the Jews with all their characteristic traits (petty intelligence and greed) the jargon is textually and musically so cleverly suggested ; but for God's sake, it must not be exaggerated and overdone as Julius Spielmann does it. I know of only one Mime and that is myself, you wouldn't believe what there is in that part, nor what I could make of it." »

The 1st is a statement from a Wagner apologist in the 1990's. Mahler (1860-1911) , on the other hand, was a contemporary of Wagner and was intimately familiar with both the Operas, which he conducted (Hitler himself saw Mahler's productions) , and the cultural sensibilities of the time in which he lived. Not only does Mahler's statement demonstrate an immediate recognition of Wagner's stereotypical Jew, it also shows his submission to these stereotypes, and a willingness to deprecate himself in a pathetic act of self-hatred. It is known that Jews who witnessed productions at that time immediately seized upon what they believed to be their invidious representation by Wagner, especially after his freshly published essay « Judaism in Music » in 1850. They rose up in protest when they identified Wagner's Beckmesser as a mocking depiction of Jews at the première performances of Meistersinger in Vienna and Mannheim.

The racist agendas of Wagner's Operas is revealed in the detailed and faithfully kept diaries of his wife, Cosima. She frequently referred to Wagners' friend, Arthur de Gobineau, the French racial theorist and author of « The Inequality of the Races » , which gained widespread acceptance in European communities, thanks to Wagner's assiduous promotion. Gobineau's theories corroborated what he himself had already decided about the " noble and ignoble " races. In Cosima's diary entry of October 17, 1882, she reported :

« In the evening, the 3rd act of Siegfried, well played by Herr Rubinstein, pleases both him and us : " That is Gobineau music " Richard says as he comes in, " that is race. Where else will you find 2 such beings looking at each other ! Here is just forest and rocks and water and nothing rotten in it." »

Richard Wagner himself is here pointing out a racial metaphor in his own music ! Thus, on the authority of the composer himself, it is no longer possible to deny that racial ideas have a direct and purposeful connection to his music. This opens up the entire field for such interpretation, which will be pursued here.

This statement also verifies the composer's race distinction based on appearance. According to Gobineau and Wagner, it is by recognizing similarity through appearance that enables Aryans to bond together and separate themselves from the inferior races.

Wagner was too clever to identify Jews in his music-dramas, especially after he had received critical reactions to his essay « Judaism in Music » , which he 1st published under a pseudonym. Of course, the reason for using a pseudonym was due to a justified fear of reaction. At the same time, he was engaged in writing the anti-Semitic Ring Cycle. After that, he backed off somewhat from offending his Jewish patrons, conductors, and performers, because they provided a substantial part of his support. But he was not about to abandon his virulent racism either (he republished Judaism in Music in 1869 under his own name) , which permeates all aspects of his music-dramas through metaphorical suggestion. Wagner is always just a step away from actually calling his evil characters " Jews ", even though it was obvious to his contemporaries.

Nevertheless, his hatred was so profound (and thus bound to appear in his Operas) , that he let it slip in his essay Know Thyself. He wrote : « If the Jew comes tinkling with his bell of paper (money) , our nation throws its savings at his feet, and makes him in one night a millionaire. »

« Clever though be the many thoughts expressed by mouth or pen about the invention of money and its enormous value as a civiliser, against such praises should be set the curse to which it has always been doomed in song and legend. If gold here figures as the demon strangling manhood's innocence, our greatest poet shows at last the goblin's game of paper money. The Nieblung's fateful ring become a pocket book, might well complete the eerie picture of the spectral world controller. By the advocates of our Progressive Civilisation, this rulership is, indeed, regarded as a spiritual, nay, a moral power; for vanished Faith is now replaced by " Credit ", that fiction of our mutual honesty kept upright by the most elaborate safeguards against loss and trickery. What comes to pass beneath the benediction of this Credit we now are witnessing, and seem inclined to lay all blame upon the Jews. They certainly are virtuosi in an art which we but bungle. »

Here, Wagner indicts the Jews and metaphorically links them to the Niebelungs, the curse, demons, goblins, and the lust for gold in the Ring drama. Thus, according to Wagner himself, it is Alberich, the greedy merchant Jew, who becomes the power crazed goblin demon lusting after Aryan maidens, attempting to contaminate their blood, and who sacrifices his lust in order to acquire the gold (his " pocket book ") , which would make him the " spectral world controller " .

Mime fares even worse, depicted as a stinking ghetto Jew. Siegfried, the Ring's hero, who knows no fear and is free of conscience, hates him merely for his appearance and smell : « That shuffling and slinking, those eyelids blinking. How long must I endure this sight ? When shall I be rid of this fool ? I'd like to catch you and end your shrinking and stop your blinking ! So deeply, Mime, do I loathe you. »

After being nearly choked to death, Siegfried brutally murders Mime with the sword, Nothung. This is Mime's reward for having raised Siegfried, like a father, from birth. Since Siegfried represents the conscience free, fearless Teuton, he feels no remorse. Wagner's music would have us justify Siegfried's form of personal vengeance. He is glorified as the warrior hero of the « Ring » , the archtypal proto-Nazi.

Moreover, as with Beckmesser in Meistersinger, Wagner cast the voices of Alberich and Mime in an abnormally high-register and gives them tritones and other awkward intervals to sing, which make their voices creak, shriek, croak, and buzz, just as he described the speech of Jews in Judaism in Music, " in an arbitrary distortion of our national idiom ". These characters are also typecast in the Opera productions as small, humpback, sulphurous, crooked, drab, and warty, as Siegfried describes Mime. (Where and when have Alberich and Mime ever been cast as tall, blond, blue eyed Aryans ?)

Wagner knew very well that to use Jewish names for his evil characters, or to call them Jews, would reduce his high minded « Gesamtkunstwerke » (Total Artworks) and « Artwork of the Future » to artless, obvious, and vulgar political tracts. His intent was far more artful and covert, but nevertheless still political : to reach his audience on an emotional, subliminal level, bypassing their critical faculties.

« I shall, within these 4 evenings, succeed in artistically conveying my purpose to the emotional (not the critical) understanding of the spectators. »

In other passages of « Opera and Drama » , Wagner cautions against arousing any critical reason in audiences. Thus, he clearly reveals his covert and insidious program of bypassing any critical assessment, and appealing directly to the now vulnerable intuitive and emotional being. Just when " spectators " have lowered their guard and are open to powerful emotional suggestions, veiled political metaphors are compellingly enforced by larger than life voices and a huge orchestra heavy with brass and percussion. (One is here reminded of the emotional power of Hitler's speeches.) Wagner musters all his musical powers to convince us that Siegfried's brutal murders are completely justified and even glorious, and he succeeds, for rarely does anyone question Siegfried's violent actions.

There was no need to name names or identify the " Jew ". Much of his contemporary audience, both Germans and Jews, knew very well who he was depicting, and those who didn't would get the message subliminally. (Nowadays, the more powerful subliminal message dominates.) He did not want his audience to take a critical view, but to uncritically accept the more powerful emotional one. The same appeal to uncritical emotions and attempt to evade critical reason is promoted in Adolf Hitler's book « Mein Kampf » , where he describes how crowds are to be persuaded and manipulated.

Richard Wagner's racist ideology is contained in letters, diaries, and essays such as « Modern, What is German ? » , « Know Thyself » and « Judaism in Music » . It reaches Nazi proportions in his last racist essay « Herodism and Christendom » . Here, all the racist historical models from Luther to Fichte, Feuerbach, Gobineau, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Chamberlain, come to full maturity, when he wrote :

« We cannot withhold our acknowledgment that the human family consists of irremediably disparate races, whereof the noble could rule the ignoble, yet never raise them to their level by commixture, but simply sink to theirs. Indeed, this one relation might suffice to explain our fall. Whilst yellow races have viewed themselves as sprung from monkeys, the white traced back their origin to Gods, and deemed themselves marked out for rulership. It has been made quite clear that we should have no History of Man at all, had there been no movements, creations, and achievements of the white man. Incomparably fewer in number than the lower races, the ruin of the white races may be referred to their having been obliged to mix with them ; whereby, as remarked already, they suffered more from the loss of their purity than the others could gain by the ennobling of their blood. Nowhere in history do the root qualities of the Aryan race show forth more plainly than in the contact of the last pure bred Germanic branches with the falling Roman world. It was a weighty feature of the Christian Church that none but sound and healthy persons were admitted to the vow of total world renunciation ; any bodily defect, not to say mutilation, unfitted them. Manifestly, this vow was to be regarded as issuing from the most heroic of all possible resolves, and he who sees in it a " cowardly self-surrender " (as someone recently suggested) may bravely exult in his own self-retention, but had best not meddle any further with things that don't concern him. It certainly may be right to charge this purblind dullness of our public spirit to the vitiation of our blood ; not only by departure from the natural food of man, but, above all, by the tainting of the Hero blood of the noblest races with that of former cannibals now trained to be the business agents of Society. »

These " cannibals now trained to be business agents of Society " were the Jews. Cosima recorded in her Diaries, in 1879 :

« Richard is in favor of expelling them entirely. We laugh to think that it really seems as if his article on the Jews marked the beginning of this struggle. »

Thus, Cosima exposes their glee at the influence of « Judaism in Music » and in expelling Jews entirely. When news of Russian massacre of the Jews in August 1881 reached Wagner, she recorded him saying :

« That is the only way it can be done ; by throwing these people out and thrashing them. »

Richard Wagner's ideology is not only violently anti-Semitic, it is anti-Christian, following the lead of Friedrich Nietzsche. Christianity was vilified because it was contaminated by Judaism. Wagner wrote :

« Judaism is the evil conscience of our modern civilization. »

The significance of this proclamation is easily missed. Here, Wagner complains about a conscience, hence morality, with which the Jews have contaminated Christianity, and then German « Volk » . " Jews ", he said, " are the evil conscience of mankind ". This conscience is an affliction that must be cast off, because it has prevented the « Volk » from pursuing their Noth, i.e. , the need to recognize their own racial superiority (" Know Thyself ") and their destiny to rule the world. This is further clarified by Houston Smith Chamberlain, Wagner's son-in-law and racial theorist. Jews, said Chamberlain, are afflicted with a guilty conscience, a sense of sin, and this Jewish guilt infected Christianity. It was an evil influence on the Teutonic spirit, specifically on its Noth, or need of the " noble races to rule the ignoble ". This idea of racial Noth (which can only be felt by the « Volk ») has its roots in Fichte, Hegel, and Feuerbach. Only Germans (« Volk » , not to be confused with " folk ", is restricted to Germans) are privileged to feel the gemeinschaftliche Noth (the collective need) . Thus, Noth takes the place of conscience and law, represents the righteousness of the German mob, and is similar to the American concept of " lynch law " .

Richard Wagner's statement was later echoed by Adolf Hitler :

« Conscience is a Jewish invention. It is a blemish, like circumcision. »

Once this conscience is swept away, the German soul is purified and becomes privileged to pursue desires and needs free of any guilt, later making possible the Holocaust. This is why Siegfried feels no guilt when he slays Mime. Wagner's personal life reflects this belief in action. He used people for his personal gain and seemed to love only himself. His lack of conscience is reflected in his appropriation of friends' wives and daughters, his many betrayals, his self-righteous flight from creditors, and his callous treatment of those who could not be of use to him. His hatred of people in general is expressed in the following citation :

« My entire political creed consists of nothing but the bloodiest hatred for our whole civilization, contempt for all things deriving from it, and a longing for nature. In all Europe, I prefer dogs to these dog-like men. Only the most horrific and destructive Revolution could make our civilized beasts " human " again. »

Feuerbach's Noth finds expression in the Ring as the sword, called Nothung, or " Need-ung ". Once more, this disproves the apologists' claim that Wagner's politics do not enter his music. The sword Nothung, a weapon exclusive to murder and war, is glorified in the Ring Cycle. Its motive is cast in the brightest key, C major, as a rising, optimistic, blasting arpeggio. Wagner tries to dazzle us with its blazing music. The music tells us how wonderful the instruments of war are, and the composer even closely allies it with the Nature motive, which implies that war and murder are, after all, only natural.

Only Siegmund can draw Nothung from the world ash tree, only Wotan can smash it to pieces, and only Siegfried can reforge it again. These are the German Gods and their progeny, the « Volk » (called Volsungs in the drama) , destined to rule all other inferior races, if only they would recognize their need (Noth) for racial purity. Mime's is a futile attempt of the Niebelung Jew who will never succeed in forging Nothung, because he is incapable of feeling the collective need.

But what Noth does the sword represent ? Siegmund's need seems to be for a weapon to defend himself against Hunding, but it is much more than that. And, what is Siegfried's need in forging Nothung ? Marc Weiner most aptly expressed the answer :

« Little wonder that the sword's name is Nothung or " Need-ung " ; just as his Volsung father as a representative of the " Volk " had been driven to the sword in the hour of his " highest need ", so Siegfried as " Volk " will claim Nothung in the hour in which he liberates himself from his foreign dwarf father, a representative of the " Volk " 's enemy, the Jew, and in so doing metaphorically raises aloft the Artwork of the Future, an instrument for the destruction of non German art and of foreign presence in the realm of the future " Volk " . »

For Wagner, only German art was worthy of being called Kunst (Art) , but even then only if it wasn't made by Jews like Felix Mendelssohn-artholdy and Meyerbeer. This could have been a cue for Hitler's " Degenerate Art " (Entartete Kunst) exhibit of the 1930's, when he vilified " non-Germanic art " .

A denial of the importance of the political and racial metaphors in Richard Wagner's Operas reduces his dramas to mere fairy tales. Wagner himself would have laughed at such naïvety. Symbolism and metaphorical representation have long been documented in these works. To deny that racist tracts, like « Judaism in Music » , have no representation in his Operas is particularly naive. By the same " logic ", his other essays, such as « Opera and Drama » and « Artwork of the Future » would also have no bearing on his music, but no one claims that. In fact, Wagner himself stated the opposite. His prose works compile an ideology meant to bear upon and become manifest in his music.

In summary, the evidence shows that Wagner's racist ideology is not just expressed in his Operas, but is strong enough to support the contention that this ideology is the very reason that Wagner wrote them.

Indeed, his mature, post revolutionary music-dramas, written and composed in conjunction with diverse social æsthetic anti-Semitic tracts, constitute dramatic representations of the ideas found in his writings. Many Wagner scholars have

been at great pains to dissociate his theories from the dramatic works for which he is largely remembered today, and especially to disavow any connection between his racism and his most celebrated « Total Works of Art », but comparison of these works with motifs and arguments in Wagner's prose writings demonstrates that the former are dramatic enactments of Wagner's theories concerning the preservation of the German community threatened by the Jew in the modern world.

Thus, Wagner's Operas can be seen as tools of racist, proto-Nazi hate propaganda, written for the purpose of redeeming the German race from Jewish contamination, and for expelling the Jews from Germany. In 1993, Gottfried Wagner, the great-grandson of the composer, in an act of self-imposed moral obligation and great personal sacrifice, restored to his roots the conscience that Richard Wagner and Adolf Hitler took away. He wrote :

« Wagner himself misused music as a vehicle of propaganda. Where arguments about Wagner are concerned, Germans quickly lose their sense of humor. With Wagner the German soul becomes exalted ! Woe betide anyone who questions Wagner. »

Richard Wagner, through his inflammatory anti-Semitic writings, was co-responsible for the transition from Bayreuth to Auschwitz.

From the composer himself :

« Consider well my new poem ; it contains the beginning and the end of the world (referring to the Ring) . I shall have to set it to music, after all, for the Jews of Frankfort and Leipzig ; it will justly suit them. »

Why did Wagner write this " for the Jews " ? And why does it " justly suit them " ? How can this statement be construed as other than a racist agenda ? After early denials, by 1940, even the ardent Wagnerite, German novelist and essayist Thomas Mann, recognized Nazi propaganda in Wagner's Operas.

« I find an element of Nazism, not only in Wagner's questionable literature. I find it also in his " music ", in his creative work, similarly questionable, though in a loftier sense (albeit I have so loved that work that even today I am deeply stirred whenever a few bars of music from this world impinge upon my ear) . The Ring emerges from the bourgeois humanist epoch in the same manner as Hitlerism. With its mixture of " roots in the soil and " and " eyes toward the future ", its appeal for a classless society, its mythical revolutionism it is the exact spiritual forerunner of the " meta-political " movement today terrorizing the world. »

...

Adolph Hitler once told Hermann Rauschnig (a German Conservative Revolutionary) :

« I recognize in Wagner my only predecessor. I regard him as a supreme prophetic figure. »

The German composer Richard Wagner revolutionized the Operatic genre and is seen as one of the great composers of Classical music, nevertheless, there exists another part to his legacy, his anti-Semitism. In the mid- 20th Century, Hitler discovered this prophetic voice and the Nazi dictator would then go on to realize Wagner's ideals regarding the Jewish people. The continuing influence of Wagner during Hitler's reign due to the Bayreuth Festival, consolidated Wagner's ideals in Nazi politics. The prophetic role of Wagner was then drawn full circle as Wagner was directly incorporated into Nazi life, regime and operations.

Wagner transformed Hitler :

Wagner, through his music, changed Hitler who, as a political leader, demonstrated and showed his people the wisdom and insight of the 19th Century composer and prophet. In 1905, the future dictator watched the performance of « Rienzi », in Linz. This piece transformed young Adolph. It is this Opera, which « inspired him to begin a political career ». When Hitler invited his childhood friend August Kubizek to attend the Bayreuth Festival, in 1939, Kubizek reminded Hitler of his past awe for Wagner's Opera, in 1905.

Hitler said : « At that hour, it all began ! » .

Hitler was « overwhelmed by the resplendent, dramatic musicality », after the performance, he « began to orate. Words burst from him like a backed-up flood breaking through crumbling dams. In grandiose, compelling images, he sketched for me his future and that of his people. » Hitler seems to have had a vision because of this specific performance.

Having been transformed and reformed by Wagner's music, as a political leader, Hitler then introduces Wagner's prophetic vision in his National-Socialistic world. In National-Socialist journals, particularly in the « Bayreuther Blätter » (monthly newsletter) , which Hitler used as propaganda through its musical context, one could read, « Richard Wagner is a guide towards National-Socialism ». For Hitler, it is fate that Wagner, a musical genius, who revolutionized Opera and pushed harmonies to the limit of their tonality, was German ; according to Hitler, as he says in his speech in Nuremberg, in 1933 :

« German art is the greatest defense of the German people. »

Since Wagner was Nazi Germany's most revered artist, he was also thus seen as the defender of the people ; not against exterior forces, but against the Jewish people who were the source of Germany's past failures and weaknesses. It is Wagner, their savior, who exposed these Jewish traitors and, in consequence, takes on the title of defender of the people. German music also shines and expresses the greatness of its people through the superiority of Wagner's art. Wagner has thus drastically influenced Hitler, who tries to exemplify Wagner's role as not only his savior but as that of his people.

Hitler and his Nazi regime fulfilled Wagner's ideals. Hitler's prophet's words were then incorporated in his National-Socialist society. Wagner comments on the negative effects that the Jews had on German music in his pamphlet,

published in 1850, entitled « Judaism in Music » . In accord with Wagner's idea of the deterioration of music, due to Jewish musicians and composers, Hitler rapidly outlawed, in 1933, any Jewish participation in music. In Wagner's last text, « Know Thyself » (1881) , he argues that « Judaism and nationalism are antagonistic to such a point that only the disappearance of one, will lead to the regeneration of the other. » This aspect was realized through Hitler's internal policies as he was determined to eradicate, through concentration and labour camps, the Jewish virus, which was preventing German society from reaching its true and deserved glory, as Wagner also highlights in : « What is German ? » .

Wagner also physically sets apart the Jew from the common German. In « Der Ring des Nibelungen » and « Die Meistersinger » , Mime, Albrecht and Beckmesser are all respectively appropriated with Wagner's opinion of what it means and looks like to be Jewish. Wagner sets the voices of Beckmesser, Mime and Albrecht in a frantically high-register. The composer makes them sing lines full of dissonant tritons, as well as some other unconventional and musically awkward intervals and tones. This musical aspect of these characters' part makes their voices screech in a similar fashion to the description of Jewish speech in « Judaism in Music » , « in an arbitrary distortion of our national idiom » . In all productions of these 2 Operas, these individuals are hunched, disfigured, ugly and possess other such negative characteristics, as Siegfried describes Mime in several scenes. Similarly, the Nazis portrayed the Jews in an identical manner, most notably in « Der Stürmer » , a weekly tabloid. Just like in the Opera, the Jew was immediately identifiable due to his physical features (nose, forehead, overweight and often hunched) . In contrast to these repugnant caricatures, the main heroes from Wagner's Operas, Walther and Siegfried are always cast as tall, healthy, good-looking men, the embodiment of the Aryan man which the Nazis create as the Jew's counterpart, just as Wagner did.

Wagner also made several statements regarding how the Jewish people should be treated ; one of his most prominent viewpoints is shown as Siegfried chokes Mime to death. The hero does not feel any remorse, as he is fearless and conscience-free, Wagner here thus justifies Siegfried's actions. According to Wagner, the Jew must be rid of, as he is a detriment to the pure German society. Interestingly, Siegfried's actions can be assimilated to that of a model Nazi and Wagner's characterization of the Jewish is nearly identical to Hitler's perspective on these people. All the ideas, which Wagner expressed in his written and musical work, fit Hitler's needs of emulating the negative aspect and influence of the Jewish people on the true Aryans. In essence, Wagner's stated opinions fit almost to perfectly with those of Hitler, which lead to Hitler's fascination of use of the composer.

Even after Hitler's discovery of Wagner, the German composer kept on influencing the Nazis from beyond the grave. Spawning from Hitler's fascination for Wagner, Bayreuth played a key role in the association of Nationalist-Socialism and the composer's music. After Wagner's death, it was his wife, Cosima, who transformed the Festival into a symbol of the dominance of German culture. Hitler even said :

« It was Cosima Wagner's to have created the link between Bayreuth and National-Socialism. »

« The Bayreuth Circle » maneuvered Wagner's musical compositions and ideas, studied previously, into a specific doctrine. Chamberlain, Wagner's son-in-law, was Bayreuth's most notable ideologue. Chamberlain altered Bayreuth's

passive racism and nationalism into an overwhelming force.

Chamberlain demanded the redemption of Aryan Christianity, which could only be achieved through the elimination of the Jewish people. For him, and most of the Festival attendees, 2 races stood across from one another and waged a silent war « in the heart of society but this struggle was above all others, for life and death » . According to historian Frederic Spotts, Bayreuth was « the place to learn, again and again, to have confidence in Germanness, in German idealism and in German selflessness » . Bayreuth is drawn-up to be almost a cradle and motor of Nazi ideology, as depicted by its members and founders. It also highly-influenced Hitler, as « only with timely support from « The Bayreuth Circle » , especially Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Winfried Wagner, and henchmen like Dietrich Eckhart in the Thule Society, could the unimpressive Hitler assume the self- then public image of a Wotan / Siegfried figure, complete with telling nickname : « Wolf » . Due to the creation of Bayreuth by Wagner, Wagner continuously influenced Hitler's Nazi regime through his legacy. Even through death, Wagner's prophetic hand and words were present as « the one who wants to understand a National-Socialist Germany must unavoidably know Wagner » .

In addition to Wagner's influence on Nazi Germany and its leader, Wagner was incorporated in almost every aspect of the Party's agenda, thus fulfilling his role of prophet as his ideals and person are introduced into everyday life. Bayreuth, evoked previously, was considered as the dictator's 2nd residence, it is in this domain that he would celebrate his birthdays and would bring along with him SS soldiers to educate them and display the magnificence of Wagner's music. Hitler also used Wagner's music to emblazon his regime. The Overture of « Rienzi » was made the official hymn for the Nazi Party's ceremonies and « Die Meistersinger » was seen and venerated as the pinnacle of the Operatic genre. His music was also played in concentration camps as Pascal Quignard says :

« Music is the only art which collaborated in the extinction of the Jewish people by the Germans, between 1933 and 1945. »

In concentration camps, music was either played over loudspeakers or inmates were forced to sing, most notably in the Dachau camp where Wagner's music was broadcasted and used to re-educate inmates. In contrast, in Buchenwald, the SS would sometimes allow prisoners to listen in over loudspeakers to other broadcasts of German concerts, and in most cases, it was Wagner's music they heard. This is quite shocking as the SS were the most cruel and brutal branch of the Nazi body.

One can thus see the importance which Wagner holds in the Nazis' eyes, as they wish to share the incredible genius and talent which he possessed. Wagner's music was also used militaristically. Hitler even used the terms « Nacht und Nebel » (Night and Fog) , which belonged to Wagner's « Rheingold » to designate the directive, on the 7th of December 1941, which was to commence deportations. In « Rheingold » , Alberich, the dwarf who symbolizes Jewish cupidity, casts a spell cursing the ring and all its future owners, as he wanted it for himself. The Nazis turn this magic against him, as they start what will become a Jewish genocide. Wagner's music was thus fully incorporated into Hitler's politics. The use of Wagner and his music was extensive, in its use for and by the Party, as well as against the Nazis' enemies. Wagner's voice is thus represented throughout National-Socialist society.

Adolf Hitler ou l'éveil par la musique de Richard Wagner

Un destin en parallèle : les années d'apprentissage (1900-1908)

Au moment où Houston Stewart Chamberlain commençait à revêtir le manteau de Richard Wagner à Bayreuth, un jeune homme âgé de 11 ans, et du nom d'Adolf Hitler, entreprenait ses études secondaires le 17 septembre 1900, à la « Realschule » de Linz. (1) D'après la version donnée dans « Mein Kampf », cette voie aurait été préférée par son père, Aloïs, en vue des aptitudes qu'il avait déjà tout jeune pour le dessin. Aloïs songeait davantage à une carrière de fonctionnaire pour son fils. L'entrée au collège fut une épreuve rude pour le jeune Adolf qui, pour rejoindre Linz depuis sa maison de Leonding, devait faire plus de 1 heure de marche à l'aller chaque jour. Alors qu'il était connu comme ayant du caractère à Leonding, les autres ne faisaient guère attention à lui à Linz. La 1^{re} année académique (1900-1901), son travail fut jugé « insatisfaisant » en mathématiques et en histoire naturelle, l'obligeant à redoubler. Selon ses professeurs, son application en cours était « variable ». Jusqu'en 1905, date à laquelle il quitta l'école, ses résultats furent jugés médiocres. En plus de ses difficultés à la « Realschule » de Linz, Hitler avait des problèmes avec son père car il ne voulait, en aucun cas, faire carrière dans l'administration publique comme le souhaitait son père. Ainsi, comme il le relate dans « Mein Kampf » :

« J'avais des nausées à penser que je pourrais être, un jour, prisonnier dans un bureau ; que je ne serais pas le Maître de mon temps. » (2)

Ce que nous venons de citer précédemment relève de « Mein Kampf » mais ce que savent les historiens peut s'avérer différent. Nous allons offrir une piste nouvelle pour répondre à des questions pendantes sur Hitler. Prenons l'exemple de la « religion de Hitler ». Certains historiens, depuis Friedrich Heer, insistent sur le lien entre le catholicisme autrichien et le Nazisme. D'autres, parlent de « néo-paganisme » en se fondant sur les cérémonies du 3^e « Reich ». Nous allons montrer comment Hitler est passé du catholicisme à la religion de Wagner. Comme il le confia au journaliste Frederick Öchsner, en 1936, durant le Festival de Bayreuth :

« Je vais à l'Opéra comme d'autres vont à la Messe. » (3)

Déjà, à cette époque, le rêve d'Adolf Hitler était de devenir artiste ce que son père ne pouvait admettre :

« Artiste, non. Aussi longtemps que je vivrais, jamais ! » (4)

Avec « Mein Kampf », il s'invente une biographie d'artiste comme en atteste la formulation stylistique précédente, rédigée telle une réplique de théâtre.

On peut observer tout au long de « Mein Kampf » un mimétisme cultivé avec le destin de Wagner : le narrateur se présente comme un artiste contrarié : d'abord par son père ; ensuite par « les Juifs » qui l'ont empêché de répondre à sa vocation durant les années viennoises ; puis, du fait de la Guerre et de la défaite, qui l'ont obligé à « entrer en politique ». Plus tard, en 1940-1941, devenu provisoirement Maître d'une grande partie du continent européen, Hitler

aimait se projeter dans la période où il se retirerait de la politique pour s'adonner à son goût de l'architecture et de l'art.

C'est le 3 janvier 1903 qu'Aloïs Hitler mourut, en laissant sa famille dans une situation confortable. Il est fort peu probable, malgré le chagrin de sa mère, qu'Adolf pleura son père. (5) Avec sa mort, nombreuses tensions et pressions parentales disparurent pour le jeune Adolf car sa mère, essayant d'abord de le faire poursuivre les rêves de son père, n'eut pas raison de la volonté de son fils d'accomplir son rêve de devenir artiste. Dans tous les cas, ses médiocres résultats scolaires excluaient une carrière dans la fonction publique. Changeant d'école, en 1904, et passant ainsi de Linz à Steyr, ses résultats ne devinrent guère meilleurs, excepté en sport et en dessin. Il réussit toutefois, au rattrapage, ses examens de fin de 1er cycle. Il abandonna alors l'école définitivement n'ayant aucune idée précise de ce qu'il allait faire. Ces 2 années (1905-1906 ; 1906-1907) commençaient par la fin de ses études et s'achevaient avec la mort de sa mère, Hitler n'y fit pas allusion dans « Mein Kampf ». Hitler est intéressant et banal parce qu'il est un fils de bourgeois de la fin du XIXe siècle qui a la religion de l'art.

Son ami d'alors, August Kubizek, parle de ces 2 années dans ses mémoires rédigés après la Guerre qui doivent cependant être traitées avec prudence sur le plan des détails et dans ses interprétations. En effet, à l'origine, c'est à l'initiative du Parti nazi que Kubizek fut chargé d'élaborer ses mémoires. (6) Selon l'historien Franz Jetzinger, Kubizek aurait eu tendance à inventer certains passages après sa propre lecture de « Mein Kampf » allant parfois jusqu'au plagiat afin de donner plus d'ampleur à des souvenirs personnels limités, voire effacés. (7) Nous pensons toutefois que l'ouvrage de Kubizek est intéressant dans la mesure où il en dit beaucoup sur le wagnérisme d'Hitler. Quelle que soit la part de l'œuvre de commande, Kubizek, avec toute sa naïveté, en dit beaucoup sur ce à quoi croyait Hitler.

Kubizek était de 9 mois plus qu'âgé qu'Adolf Hitler. C'est par hasard qu'ils firent connaissance dans le courant de l'automne 1905 lors d'une représentation à l'Opéra de Linz. Depuis déjà quelques années, Adolf Hitler était un admirateur de Wagner (8) et Kubizek partageait sa passion pour l'Opéra, en particulier ceux du « Maître de Bayreuth ». Kubizek était docile et impressionnable alors qu'Adolf était dominateur et décidé. Selon Kubizek, à l'époque :

« Hitler avait besoin de parler, il lui fallait une oreille attentive. » (9)

Kubizek, contrairement à Hitler, avait des origines sociales relativement pauvres. Dès qu'Hitler parlait que ce fut d'Opéra, de Wagner, des fonctionnaires inutiles ou des enseignants, « Gustl » l'écoutait attentivement.

Le soir, tous 2 se rendaient au Théâtre ou à l'Opéra, après quoi Hitler faisait sa critique de la pièce vue. Bien que Kubizek s'y connût mieux que lui en musique, il restait toujours soumis dans leurs discussions. La passion de Hitler pour Wagner ne connaissait pas de limites et pouvait le plonger dans des fantasmes mystiques, Wagner incarnant pour lui, le génie artistique suprême. (10)

À cette époque, le jeune Hitler se comportait comme un oisif et attendait que sa mère lui donne l'argent nécessaire pour vivre. Il vivait dans un appartement de la rue Humboldt, à Linz. Comme il se rêvait artiste, sa mère lui offrit un piano sur lequel il prit des leçons 4 mois durant, entre octobre 1906 et janvier 1907. (11) À cette époque, Hitler se

préoccupait uniquement de l'art ; la journée, il passait son temps à dessiner, à peindre, à lire ou même à écrire de la « poésie » et le soir, il allait au Théâtre ou à l'Opéra où il rêvait à son avenir d'artiste. Hitler communiait au culte de l'art qui caractérise la bourgeoisie de son époque.

À l'époque où Hitler commence à fréquenter de plus en plus assidûment l'Opéra, c'est à dire vers 1905, Wagner devient son utopie personnelle ; Hitler s'intéresse à tout ce qui touche au musicien de ses Opéras à ses écrits révolutionnaires, puis antisémites. Ce qu'il avait vu de Wagner, jeune garçon à Linz, devait se révéler décisif après qu'il eut entamé sa carrière politique, Wagner jouant le rôle en quelque sorte, de « langage commun » à Hitler et aux autres Allemands. (12)

En plus de la musique de Wagner, Hitler et Kubizek aimaient à parler d'architecture et de grand art. Alors que Kubizek était un excellent musicien, il se laissait impressionner par Adolf qui lui affirmait qu'il allait devenir un véritable artiste. D'ailleurs, alors que Kubizek travaillait dur dans l'atelier de son père, Adolf Hitler passait son temps à dessiner puis allait retrouver son fidèle « Gustl » après le travail de ce dernier. Au printemps de 1906, Adolf Hitler pria sa mère de l'envoyer passer quelques jours à Vienne pour étudier la galerie de tableaux du Musée de la Cour. Durant un peu plus de 2 semaines, il visita les endroits les plus connus de la ville. Les cartes postales qu'il devait réaliser plus tard, ainsi que son témoignage dans « Mein Kampf », montrent comme il admira les monuments et bâtisses de la rue du « Ring ». Il semble qu'il ait passé le plus clair de ses soirées à l'Opéra de la Cour où les mises en scène de « Tristan et Isolde » ou du « Hollandais volant » de Wagner par Gustav Mahler étaient supérieures à celles qu'il avait pu voir à Linz. À son retour d'un 1er séjour dans la capital des Habsbourg, il avait décidé qu'il allait passer par l'Académie des Beaux-arts de Vienne. Dans le courant de l'année 1907, cette idée se faisait de plus en plus concrète. Bien que sa mère eût insisté pour qu'il prenne enfin un emploi, Hitler la persuada de le laisser retourner à Vienne pour passer le concours des Beaux-arts. (13)

D'un point de vue pécunier, le jeune homme de 18 ans n'avait, à l're vue, aucun souci à se faire depuis que sa tante Johanna lui avait proposé un prêt de 924 Couronnes afin que son neveu puisse mener à bien ses études artistiques. Cet argent lui assurait de quoi vivre durant 1 bonne année. (14) À cette époque, sa mère Klara souffrait d'un cancer du sein et elle avait été opérée, début janvier, par le docteur Eduard Bloch. C'est Hitler qui régla la facture de 100 Couronnes ainsi que les frais d'hospitalisation. Quand il apprit que sa mère ne s'en sortirait pas, il pleura mais partit tout de même à Vienne, au début du mois de septembre 1907, juste à temps pour passer l'examen d'entrée à l'Académie des Beaux-arts. Chaque candidat devait présenter ses travaux et, comme il l'écrivit plus tard, il apporta « une épaisse liasse de dessins ». 113 candidats figuraient au départ et 33 furent éliminés lors du 1er test. Au début d'octobre eut lieu le second examen où les candidats devaient plancher sur des thèmes spécifiques. Parmi les 28 reçus, le nom d'Hitler manquait :

« Travaux insuffisants, trop peu de portraits. »

Telle fut la sentence. (15)

Hitler n'avait jamais pensé qu'il aurait pu échouer comme il allait l'écrire plus tard dans « Mein Kampf » :

« J'étais persuadé que ce serait un jeu d'enfant. J'étais si persuadé du succès que l'annonce de mon échec me frappa comme un coup de foudre dans un ciel clair. » (16)

Quand il demanda une explication au recteur, ce dernier lui dit que s'il serait inapte à suivre les cours de l'École de peinture, il avait des qualités pour l'architecture. Hitler en ressortit « doutant pour la 1re fois de sa vie » .

Après avoir réfléchi quelques jours, Hitler en conclut que le recteur avait raison :

« Je me vis architecte. »

Ayant trop souffert de cet échec, il garda ce dernier secret. Hitler accepta cependant la bifurcation vers l'architecture parce que cela reste de l'art, et surtout que Wagner a été architecte à Bayreuth.

Après la mort de sa mère, il poursuivit son rêve de devenir artiste et retourna à Vienne pour faire ses études d'architecte. Son objectif était clair :

« Je voulais devenir architecte et les difficultés rencontrées étaient de celles que l'on brise et non pas de celles devant lesquelles on capitule. »

Après les funérailles de sa mère, Hitler pouvait une fois de plus vivre sans travailler grâce à l'argent que sa mère avait épargné. Il regagna Vienne, en février 1908, avec Kubizek dans ses valises qui allait étudier la musique. Bien qu'il n'avait guère travaillé, Hitler décida de repasser l'examen d'entrée à l'Académie, l'année suivante. (17) Les années qui suivirent jusqu'en 1913 allaient devenir « la plus triste période de mon existence » , car Hitler n'arrivait pas à devenir artiste et à atteindre ainsi l'objectif qu'il s'était fixé.

La jeunesse d'un futur dictateur et la découverte d'une idole

C'est peu après son arrivée à Vienne, en février 1908, qu'Hitler retrouve son ami August Kubizek dont il avait convaincu les parents de laisser leur fils le rejoindre pour entamer des études de musique. Dès le 1er jour, et malgré la fatigue de son ami, Hitler l'entraîne à l'Opéra. C'est à cette époque qu'il se met à composer un drame dans un style wagnérien traitant de l'arrivée du christianisme dans les Alpes bavaroises (18) ; projet qui n'aboutira pas.

Dès cette époque, on peut dire qu'Hitler connaissait très bien les œuvres de Wagner car il alla jusqu'à essayer d'achever une esquisse d'Opéra de Wagner, « Wieland le forgeron » , qui n'a jamais vu le jour. D'après les souvenirs de Kubizek, Hitler se mit jour et nuit à ce travail afin de tenter de poursuivre l'œuvre de son idole, sans succès bien entendu.

De même qu'à Linz, sa passion pour Wagner ne connut plus de limites : Kubizek se souvient d'avoir assisté aux côtés de son ami à l'Opéra « Lohengrin » plus de 10 fois (19) ; et sa soeur Paula assurait quant à elle, en son temps,

avoir vu en compagnie de son frère le « Crépuscule des Dieux » 13 fois à Linz (20) ; tandis qu'Hitler, lui même, assurait avoir vu « Tristan », « 30 ou 40 fois » . (21)

Kubizek rapporta aussi que :

« La personnalité de Wagner aurait pu tout aussi bien faire partie de lui (Hitler) . Hitler classait les gens, en fait, en 2 catégories de personnes : les amis et les ennemis de Richard Wagner. » (22)

Nous nous rallions au point de vue des historiens Bradley Smith (23) , Joachim Köhler et Joachim Fest (24) lorsqu'ils disent qu'on a toutes les raisons de croire Kubizek lorsqu'il rapporte qu'Adolf Hitler, avant même la période viennoise, fut tellement remué par une représentation de l'Opéra « Rienzi » (25) qu'il l'entraîna dans une longue promenade nocturne au sommet de Freinberg, près de Linz, et dans un état quasi extatique, l'entretint de la signification de ce qu'ils venaient de voir. Kubizek (26) vit dans cet épisode tel qu'il le raconte, à la manière des mystiques, une Ire vision prophétique de l'avenir d'Hitler. De toute évidence, l'étrange soirée lui avait fait une impression durable. D'ailleurs, il le rappela à Hitler lorsqu'ils se retrouvèrent en 1939, des années plus tard, à Bayreuth. Hitler s'en saisit sur le champ, pour faire valoir de ses qualités précoces de prophète à son hôtesse, Winifred Wagner, avant de conclure par ses mots :

« C'est à cette heure que tout a commencé. » (27)

Kubizek rappela dans son ouvrage de souvenirs comment Hitler et lui vécurent une véritable expérience théâtrale en assistant pour la Ire fois à une mise en scène de « Rienzi » au Théâtre de Linz. C'est là qu'Hitler aurait pris conscience de son destin politique, de sa mission allemande. Nous citerons donc cette longue anecdote de Kubizek « in-extenso » car elle est particulièrement importante dans le développement personnel du futur « Führer » :

« Il m'avait parlé de cet Opéra. Richard Wagner l'avait commencé à Dresde, en 1838, et y avait travaillé au cours d'un séjour au bord de la Baltique. »

C'était intéressant qu'il ait composé une œuvre sur la Rome médiévale, à l'époque où il travaillait sur le nord. Wagner acheva « Rienzi » à Paris et, quand l'œuvre fut créée à Dresde 2 ans plus tard, elle assit sa réputation comme compositeur d'Opéras même si elle était moins aboutie que ses œuvres suivantes. Après « Rienzi » , il concentra son attention sur le nord et fit des dieux de la mythologie germanique ; son domaine de prédilection. « Rienzi » , bien que l'action se passât en 1347, était inspiré de l'esprit et du rythme des événements révolutionnaires qui déferlèrent sur l'Allemagne, 10 ans plus tard.

« Nous voilà donc au Théâtre, brûlant d'enthousiasme et retenant notre souffle pendant l'ascension de « Rienzi » jusqu'à la position de tribun du peuple de Rome, puis sa chute. Le rideau tomba à minuit passé. Mon ami, les mains enfoncées dans les poches de son manteau, silencieux et renfermé, marchait à grandes enjambées dans les rues de Linz vers les faubourgs. D'habitude, après un spectacle qui l'avait touché, il se mettait à parler, critiquant la représentation de façon tranchée, mais après “ Rienzi ”, il demeura longtemps silencieux. Cela me surprit, et je lui demandai ce qu'il

en pensait. Il me lança un regard étrange, presque hostile.

Il répondit brusquement :

“ La ferme ! ”

Une brume froide montait, oppressante, dans les rues désertes. Nos pas solitaires résonaient sur le pavé. Adolf prit la route qui montait au Freinberg. Il avançait sans un mot. Il apparaissait presque sinistre, et plus pâle que jamais. Son col retourné accentuait cette impression.

Je voulais lui demander “ Où vas-tu ? ”, mais son visage était si dissuasif que je retins la question.

Comme poussé par une force invisible, Adolf atteignit le sommet du Freinberg et, alors seulement, je réalisai que nous n'étions plus seuls dans l'obscurité, car une voûte étoilée nous surplombait.

Adolf me fit face, me prit les 2 mains et les serra fortement. Il n'avait jamais fait un tel geste auparavant. Je sentis par cette prise combien il était ému. Ses yeux étaient fiévreux d'excitation. Les mots ne sortaient pas facilement de sa bouche comme de coutume, mais de façon éruptive, avec un son rauque.

À sa voix, je comprenais encore plus comme cette expérience l'avait secoué.

Petit à petit, son débit s'apaisa et les mots sortirent plus aisément. Jamais auparavant, et jamais ensuite, je n'ai entendu Adolf Hitler parler comme ce soir-là, alors que nous étions debout tout seuls sous les étoiles, comme si nous avions été les seuls êtres au monde.

Je ne peux pas redire tous les mots qu'il a prononcés. J'étais frappé par quelque chose d'étrange, que je n'avais jamais remarqué même quand il me parlait avec une grande excitation. C'était comme si un second être parlait à travers lui, et lui causait la même émotion qu'il me causait. Il ne s'agissait pas du cas où celui qui parle est excité par ses propres mots. Au contraire, j'avais l'impression que lui-même écoutait avec étonnement et émotion ce qui jaillissait de lui avec une force élémentaire. Je ne veux pas essayer d'expliquer ce phénomène, mais c'était un état d'extase complète et de ravissement, sous l'empire duquel, sans même se réclamer du héros comme d'un modèle ou évoquer son pouvoir visionnaire, il transférait le personnage de “ Rienzi ” sur le terrain de ses propres ambitions. Mais c'était plus qu'un simple emprunt ; l'impact de l'Opéra était plutôt une pure impulsion externe, qui le poussait à parler. Comme un torrent brisant ses digues, les mots jaillissaient de lui.

Il parlait d'une mission spéciale qui allait lui échoir un jour et moi, son unique auditeur, je pouvais difficilement comprendre de quoi il s'agissait. Il me fallut beaucoup d'années pour comprendre le sens de cette heure d'enchantement vécue par mon ami. » (28)

Kubizek raconte ensuite comment « nous sortîmes ébranlés de la fin de “ Rienzi ” bien qu'il soit d'ordinaire habitué

après un événement culturel à parler et à critiquer immédiatement la mise en scène, Adolf se tut longtemps après cette représentation là » . (29)

En effet, cette fois-ci, le héros de Wagner n'est pas issu de la mythologie comme le furent « Lohengrin » ou « Parsifal » mais est issu de l'histoire médiévale, d'une période historique ; réelle donc. Quand Hitler se définit dans « Mein Kampf » comme « un révolutionnaire politique et culturel ayant très tôt conscience de tout et sachant tirer les leçons de l'Histoire » (30) , il pense à « Rienzi » . (31)

Dès ses jeunes années, on l'a évoqué précédemment, Hitler fut totalement subjugué par la puissance des drames musicaux et l'évocation d'un passé germanique héroïque et supérieur. Son 1er Opéra, qu'il vit d'ailleurs avec son père à 12 ans, fut « Lohengrin » puis, aussitôt après, « Rienzi » qui se jouait au Théâtre de Linz depuis le 3 janvier 1905. (32) Comme Brigitte Hamann le relate dans son livre « La Vienne d'Hitler » :

« Hagemüller, pensionnaire de Klara Hitler, déclarera plus tard que le jeune Hitler allait fréquemment au “ Landestheater ”, qu'il avait crayonné des plans en vue de la construction du Théâtre, qu'il préférait les Opéras de Wagner et les drames de Schiller, et qu'en allant et venant dans sa chambre, il chantait l'air célèbre : “ Cygne repars.” » (33)

Hitler fit dès cette époque, de Linz, sa capitale secrète et les historiens qui s'étonnent du fait oublient que c'est dans cette ville que Hitler eut, au sortir de l'enfance, la révélation de Wagner.

Joachim Fest explique dans la biographie qu'il consacre à Hitler les affinités entre le « Maître de Bayreuth » et le « Führer » :

« Les contacts de leurs tempéraments, encore intensifiés par les disciples admiratifs du jeune copiste de cartes postales, font apparaître une étrange ressemblance familiale qui aboutit au portrait déplaisant du “ frère Hitler ”, que Thomas Mann (34) a été le premier à identifier. »

Mann écrivait, en 1938, au point culminant des triomphes hitlériens :

« Qu'on le veuille ou non, ne faut-il pas reconnaître dans le cas Hitler une manifestation qui s'apparente à l'activité artistique ? En un style qui nous inspire sans doute de la honte, toutes les caractéristiques de l'artiste sont présentes dans le personnage : la “ difficulté ”, la paresse, la vague à l'âme pitoyable de l'adolescence, le vagabondage, l'irrésolution, l'errance à demi-stupide dans une bohème sociale et spirituelle du plus bas degré, le refus arrogant de toute activité raisonnable et honorable et sous quel prétexte ? Celui de se sentir obscurément voué à un destin tout à fait indéfinissable qui, si on le précisait, en admettant qu'il pût être précisé, provoquerait un éclat de rire général. Ajoutez à tout cela la mauvaise conscience, le sentiment de culpabilité, la colère contre le monde, l'instinct révolutionnaire, l'accumulation subconsciente de désirs explosifs de compensation, la conscience, la conscience têtue d'un besoin d'auto-justification, de plaidoyer ; c'est une parenté hautement pénible. Je ne me la dissimulerais pas. » (35)

« Il y a encore d'autres analogies surprenantes : ici, comme l'obscurité qui entoure l'identité des ascendants, l'échec scolaire, la fuite devant le service militaire, la haine pathologique du Juif, de même le végétarisme qui, chez Wagner, donne naissance à l'idée absurde et ridicule que l'humanité devra être régénérée par une alimentation à base de plantes. Ils ont aussi le caractère extrême de leurs réactions, l'état permanent d'exaltation dans lequel les dépressions et l'euphorie, les triomphes et les catastrophes alternent sans transition. » (36)

Comme l'explique Sebastian Haffner dans son ouvrage, « Deutschland : Jekyll und Hyde (1939) . Deutschland von innen betrachtet » , Hitler avait 3 buts personnels. Le 1er touchait à son propre développement personnel : il fallait qu'Hitler arrive à asseoir son pouvoir et à le développer. (37)

Le second but consistait à se venger des personnes et des institutions qui l'avaient fait souffrir. (38)

Enfin, le dernier but, et celui qui nous intéresse plus particulièrement : « mettre en scène » des Opéras wagnériens dont lui même, Hitler, serait le héros. (39)

Cette remarque de Sebastian Haffner fait, dans une certaine mesure, écho à celle de l'écrivain Gert Kalow (40) qui, dès 1967, proposa dans son ouvrage, « Hitler ein deutsches Trauma » , publié en allemand, un regard très proche de notre pensée actuelle :

« Hitler était un génie, ce qui veut dire comme il a assez dit lui-même : un artiste. Un artiste qui se servit de la nation toute entière comme d'un moyen d'expression personnel. Hitler nous a pris dans son rêve et nous prit pour fonction dans son “ Moi ” imaginaire. Il fut le metteur en scène qui manipula les masses de façon esthétique tel un chœur. Nous étions ainsi les interprètes et les figurants dans cette œuvre d'art totale, dans ce plus grand opéra wagnérien de tous les temps. » (41)

En effet, Hitler avait le don de manipuler la masse : reste à savoir s'il allait être capable de se comporter tel un chef d'orchestre dirigeant son propre « Parsifal » .

Notes

(1) Bradley Smith. Opus citatum ; pages 68-69.

(2) MK ; page 21.

(3) Walter C. Langer. « Das Adolf Hitler Psychogramm » , Vienne (1973) ; page 110.

(4) MK ; page 22.

(5) Selon son ami d'enfance, August Kubizek, Adolf Hitler aurait sangloté aux funérailles de son père mais ceci n'est en rien sûr, car basé sur des ouï-dires.

(6) Brigitte Hamann. Opus citatum ; page 80. À la fin de 1938, August Kubizek avait déjà été démarché par un représentant des « NSDAP-Hauptarchiv » en vue de rédiger ses souvenirs sur le jeune Hitler, envisagés comme l'une des pièces les plus significatives des archives centrales qui mettent en évidence la « grandeur inconcevable du “ Führer ” dans sa jeunesse » : IFZ, MA-731, « Notizen für Kartei » (8 décembre 1938) , et le rapport sur sa visite à Kubizek.

(7) Voir : Franz Jetzinger ; pages 117-122.

(8) MK ; page 28. Témoignage de Paula Hitler, NA, NND-881077 ; pages 3 et 4.

(9) August Kubizek. Opus citatum ; page 22.

(10) Joachim Fest, tome I ; page 45.

(11) Témoignage de Paula Hitler, NA, NND-881077, 3 ; IFZ, MA 731 (HA=bobine 1) , « Notizen für Kartei », 8 décembre 1938.

(12) Joachim Köhler. « Wagners Hitler » , Munich (1997) ; pages 8 et 9.

(13) Josef Greiner. « Das Ende des Hitler-Mythos » , Zürich / Leipzig / Vienne (1947) .

(14) Carl Schorscke. « “ Fin-de-siècle ” Vienna. Politics and culture » , New York (1979) ; « Vienne, fin de siècle, politique et culture » , Éditions du Seuil, Paris (1983) .

(15) Werner Maser ; page 77. Parmi ceux qui échouèrent en même temps qu'Hitler, figurait un futur recteur d'académie.

(16) MK ; page 30.

(17) Cette 2e candidature a été prouvée par François Delpla dans sa biographie de Hitler, Grasset (1999) .

(18) August Kubizek ; page 164.

(19) August Kubizek ; page 165.

(20) NA-NND 881077 ; page 4.

(21) Adolf Hitler. « Monologe » ; page 224 (24 janvier 1942 ; 22 février 1942) .

(22) August Kubizek ; page 101.

(23) Bradley Smith. « Adolf Hitler, his family, Childhood and Youth » , Stanford (1967) ; page 103.

(24) Voir : Joachim Köhler. « Wagners Hitler » , Chapitre II, Munich (1996) - en particulier : pages 34-35. Et Joachim Fest, tome I ; pages 67-69.

(25) À la gloire d'un populiste romain du XIV siècle qui, dans cet Opéra, aurait tenter d'unifier l'Italie avant d'être finalement abattu par le peuple qu'il avait conduit.

(26) August Kubizek ; pages 111-113.

(27) Joachim Fest, tome II ; page 159.

(28) August Kubizek ; pages 135-137.

(29) August Kubizek ; page 138.

(30) MK ; page 14.

(31) Joachim Köhler ; page 212.

(32) Brigitte Hamann. « La Vienne d'Hitler » , Éditions des Syrtes, Paris (2001) ; page 40 :

« L'œuvre de Richard Wagner figurait elle aussi en bonne place dans les programmes, car le directeur musical de Linz, August Göllerich, avait personnellement connu le Maître. Le " Landestheater " avait à son répertoire " Lohengrin " ainsi que, depuis le 3 janvier 1905, un Opéra de jeunesse, " Rienzi ". Ce dernier retint particulièrement l'attention car le club gymnique de Linz se produisait dans la célèbre " danse des épées ". »

(33) Franz Jetzinger ; page 131.

(34) Thomas Mann véritable visionnaire de l'histoire, se rendra compte a posteriori, dès 1940, des méfaits de Richard Wagner sur Adolf Hitler. Thomas Mann. « Zu Wagners Verteidigung, in : « Musik Konzepte » , Band 5 ; page 32 :

« Nationalsozialismus, in all seiner unsäglichen empirischen Gemeinheit, ist die tragische Konsequenz der mythischen Politikfremdheit des deutschen Geistes ich finde das nazistische Element nicht nur in Wagners fragwürdiger " Literatur ", ich finde es auch in seiner " Musik ", in seinem ebenso, wenn er einem erhabenen Sinne, fragwürdigen Werk. Die Begeisterung, die es erzeugt, darf nicht vergeßen machen, daß dieses Werk aus der bürgerlich-humant. Epoche auf dieselbe Art und Weise heraustritt wie der Hitlerismus. »

(35) Thomas Mann. « GW » , Band 12 ; page 775 et suivantes - in : Fest. « Hitler » , tome I ; page 48.

(36) Joachim Fest ; page 48.

(37) Nous retranscrivons ici la citation originale en allemand d'Haffner :

« Seine persönliche Macht zu erhalten und zu erweitern. »

In : Sebastian Haffner. « Deutschland : Jekyll und Hyde (1939) . Deutschland von innen betrachtet » , Drœmer Knaur (2001) ; page 29.

(38) Sebastian Haffner ; page 29 :

« Rache an alle personen und Institutionen zu nehmen, gegenüber denen er Haß empfindet, und das sind viele. »

(39) Sebastian Haffner ; page 29 :

« Szenen aus Wagner-Opern und Bilder im Stile von Makart ins werk zu setzen, wobei Hitler der Hauptfeld ist. »

(40) Gert Kalow (né le 20 août 1921 à Cottbus ; mort le 11 août 1991) fut connu en tant que rédacteur de l' « Abendstudio » et de la radio « Hessische Rundfunk » . Son ouvrage le plus célèbre reste celui dont nous parlons ici : « Hitler, ein deutsches Trauma » .

(41) Gert Kalow. « Hitler ein deutsches Trauma » , Piper-Verlag, Munich (1974) ; page 42.

Did Richard Wagner Inspired Hitler ?

While Wagnerian fanatics undeniably include a contingent of what one critic memorably referred to as « leathery old Nazis » , these are now no longer taken seriously. After a period of intense academic / historical skirmishing in the late- 1980's to mid-1990's, recent advancements in Wagner studies scholarship have settled our understanding of the genealogical sources of his ideas. His anti-Judaism belonged to the Utopian, anti-clerical family of the sort held by Marx and Bauer as well as drawing on the race theorists and social Darwinism circulating at the time. His overriding obsession with purity of German myth and language metastasized easily into a crusade for purity of race. Adorno's once crankish position that Wagner's work was the decisive element linking the 19th Century rebirth of German Romanticism to the development of National-Socialism now approximates something akin to received wisdom. Hitler's love for the work, epitomized by his identification with the character of the sensitive misunderstood (and, eventually, victorious) artist Walther von Stolzing in « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » is a « fait accompli » matter in the Opera's patrimony and will, most likely forever, encrust the works with a grimy layer of infamy.

Given that Wagner's music has clearly stood the test of time, what remains is a host of delicate and unresolved questions about the implications of the composer's anti-Semitism and other toxic affinities : Was Wagner merely acting

as a vessel for commonly accepted ideas ? Are the anti-Semitic tropes interwoven into the formal properties of the music and Operas themselves ? If music, as Wagner's defenders often proclaim, cannot be fascist, what about the contents of the librettos ? If the librettos are indeed not anti-Semitic, does that justify the lifting of Israel's unofficial ban on reciting his works ? Writing in the « New York Review of Books », last summer, the conductor Daniel Barenboim, perhaps the most ardent living champion of Wagner's rehabilitation, began his eloquent vindication of the right to play Wagner in Israel with the observation that « perhaps, no other composer in history sought to combine such obviously incompatible elements in his works » .

A new exhibition « Euphoria and Unease : Jewish Vienna and Richard Wagner » , at the Jewish Museum of Vienna, and a newly-translated biography « Richard Wagner : A Life in Music » , by German musicologist, Martin Geck, both attempt to give new answers to these often asked questions. Both are sketchily ethereal and less stridently judgmental about Wagner's proto-Nazism than has recently been the case, perhaps, auguring a new trend toward post-ideological enjoyment of the composer's work. Yet, there remains no definitive consensus on what drove Wagner to become an anti-Semite, in the 1st place.

The definitive scholarly examination for a general reader of Wagner's anti-Semitism remains Jacob Katz's 1986 monograph « The Darker Side of Genius » , which ably enumerates the conventional narrative of how Wagner developed his ideas about and violent hatred of the Jews. The Classical explanation lies in Wagner's deep resentment at the public success and facile genius of his 2 Jewish contemporaries in the German musical world : Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and Giacomo Meyerbeer. That Mendelssohn was the wealthy and cosseted son of a banker, while Wagner grew-up in the shadow of poverty and illegitimacy did not help matters either. At 18, Wagner sent his only handwritten manuscript of an early Symphony to Mendelssohn. It was promptly lost in the mail - an accident that he probably blamed on the Jews. Despite his mixed feelings, Wagner only retroactively filtered his resentments through the lens of his rivals' Jewishness. He did so in his infamous 1850 essay, « Das Judentum in der Musik » (On Jewishness in Music) , which was written under a pseudonym (tellingly, it did not appear until after Mendelssohn's sudden death, in 1847) and that he had republished under his own name, 2 decades later.

A humiliating and unproductive sojourn Wagner took in Paris, during his mid- 20's, didn't help much, either. Having fled his conductor's appointment at the Court of Riga through the Russian border to avoid the clutches of his creditors (some of whom, yes, were Jewish) , Wagner arrived in Paris with great hopes, but the French reaction to his work was dismissively cool. Wagner's only income in Paris came from the German Jewish music-publisher Maurice Schlesinger, who commissioned him to correct musical proofs. Wagner bristled at the work, which was mostly of transcribing and collating the work of the now somewhat obscure French Jewish composer Fromental Halévy. The cloying sycophancy of the young Wagner's letters, to both Schlesinger and Meyerbeer, make for uncomfortable reading, and the composer's resentment must have congealed into rancor after Meyerbeer rebuffed him.

Decamping from Paris, he returned to Germany to witness the 1st stirring of the Revolutions of 1848 and was promptly banished from Dresden for his part in that city's failed uprising. His enthusiasm for Utopian politics of redemption curdled into a Romantic fantasia of escape from worldly corruption into a resurgent mytho-poetic dreamworld that would regenerate a conservative society into belatedly accepting the poet-composer as its savior.

Katz's own conclusion is that Wagner simply took himself too seriously, that « his consciousness of his brilliant originality in music seems to have given him a sense of confidence in his own judgment, even in areas in which he had very little knowledge at his disposal » .

Wagner's latest biographer, Martin Geck, worked on the « catalogue raisonné » of Wagner's works, as well as the critical edition of « Parsifal » before writing « A Life in Music » . He faces the underlying problem of all of the dozens of Wagner biographers in trying to find the impossible balance between rehashing the events of Wagner's fabulously picaresque life and laying-out the intellectual history / ideological critique and musicology. Geck's book falls squarely on the musicology corner of the intellectual-history / musicology axis. He is extremely perceptive in his explanation of the way Wagner used the echoes of Beethoven's and Bach's themes to synthesize an archaizing mood for his newly created genre of Symphonic Opera. Extremely spirited and fluid, the book, nonetheless, almost reaches a point of incomprehensibility to non-specialists. (For a straight account of Wagner's life, minus the semiotics and references to Heidegger and Julia Kristeva, the general reader should turn to Barry Millington's « Wagner : The Sorcerer of Bayreuth » .)

Geck also mostly avoids the 2nd problem of Wagner biographies, which is whether to rely on Cosima Wagner's voluminous diaries and Wagner's self-serving autobiography by opting for a dizzily erudite interpretive approach, making this, perhaps, the 1st post-modern Wagner biography. He, more or less, successfully defends Wagner's characters from the charge of being simple, anti-Semitic stereotypes of the wheeling, cringing, degenerate Jew by invoking the complexity and ambivalence with which Wagner imbued all of his characters, in Operas that are about the specter of violent redemption through love.

Geck's excellent 2009 essay, « What Was Eating Wagner ? » , makes clearer his allegiance to the « failed revolutionary » as the culprit for Wagner's turn to the « Dark Side » . Geck both concentrates attention on and elides a direct confrontation with the ideological place of anti-Semitism in Wagner's work by adding crisp, aphoristic « a word about » mini-chapters to the end of each of the book's 13 chapters. Each « a word about » discusses Wagner's relationship with or influence on a Jew, such as his self-loathing accompanist Josef Rubinstein.

The exhibition in the Vienna Jewish Museum exhibit showcases the expected Wagner collectibles, of which there are many, as Vienna housed some of the 1st, and most obsessive, Wagner Societies. The show focuses understandably on his Vienna years and connections. Consequently, and perhaps misleadingly, it focuses on minor quarrels and local characters in the Wagner saga. These include his wrangling with his Viennese seamstress Bertha Goldwag, and portraits of all-but-forgotten mid-Century oddballs and racists such as Felix Mottl, Otto Weininger, Guido von List, or the pan-German radical Georg Ritter von Schönerer. Wagner's relations toward Anton Bruckner can only be described as « snotty » .

The show also focuses on Wagner's prickly relations with scornful contemporary music-critics such as the Jewish critic Eduard Hanslick. Wagner blamed Hanslick for (what he wrongly perceived as) his lack of success and, after Hanslick got his hands on a trove of embarrassingly vain letters between Wagner and his seamstress, he published them with vindictive glee. The perennial problem faced by tempestuous personality types who collect enemies is in the risks of ascribing an essentialist group characteristic to one's enemies. Typically, Wagner failed to take note of the fact that not

every music-critic is a Jew and that, conversely, not every Jew is a music-critic.

What the exhibit does extremely well is inculcating the facts of the sheer number of Jewish musicians and conductors that were instrumental in revealing Wagner's dark magic to the wider world as well as the ironic repercussions that dark magic wrought upon Viennese Jewry. (Mahler's 1st production, after leaving Vienna for New York, was conducting « Tristan und Isolde » , at the Metropolitan.) The Viennese musical world (the world of Gustav Mahler, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Arnold Schönberg, Alexander von Zemlinsky) was decimated by the « Anschluß » . Reading the plaques and dates on the wall, one cannot help but be shocked by how many Viennese Jews died in American exile.

As poised and thorough as the exhibit is, in another sense it is compromised by the adoption of an oddly over-solicitous tone - uncommitted to passing judgment on the Master himself, his disciples, or anyone who appropriated his music for their own ideological ends. It also spares from rebuke the apolitical ordinary listeners who choose to revel in the primordial ecstasy of Wagner's Operas while ignoring the unpleasant implications of his cosmology. Indeed, the exhibit is free to refrain from taking a position on Wagner by a calculated recitation of the judgments of others. It concludes, as this essay began, with a meditation of the Wagner ban in Israel, along with the presentation of dozens of epigrams about Wagner inscribed on the walls of the exhibit's final room.

Depending on one's sensibility, this culmination is either a curatorial sleight of hand or a daring, post-ideological invitation for debate. The quotes argue both the case for and the case against the rejection of the inherent putrescence of Wagner's legacy. The opinions range from the flippant and exculpatory to the outraged and damning. Some are mournfully apologetic, such as Gottfried Wagner's admission that the « ideology of Bayreuth contributed to Hitler's rabid madness and everything that ensued from it » . Several prominent Viennese critics and scholars protest both « Right-wing ideological » and « Israeli » appropriation of the music, demanding their right to enjoy it unmolested by the discomfort of complex emotions. We are reminded also of Woody Allen's immortal crack from « Manhattan Murder Mystery » that, « I can't listen to that much Wagner. I start getting the urge to conquer Poland. » . Finally, there is the recently deceased French Opera director Patrice Chéreau's simple declaration that, « Wagner is not sacred. » .

Yet, curiously absent from that wall are any of the epigrams from « Nietzsche contra Wagner » . Looking at that wall, there is one that I could not avoid recalling. Nietzsche knew full well what he was talking about when he predicted that « one has almost calculated the whole of the value of modernity, once one is clear concerning what is good and evil in Wagner » .

L'influence de Wagner sur Hitler et vice-versa

Adolf Hitler claimed that his « Weltanschauung » was derived from Richard Wagner. His youthful reaction to the opera Rienzi led him to exclaim 30 years later : « It began at that hour. » . In « Mein Kampf » , he praised Wagner as a great revolutionary and claimed to have no forerunner except Wagner. Fest suggests that Wagner had an immense effect upon Hitler. « The Master of Bayreuth » was not only Hitler's great exemplar ; he was also the young man's ideological Mentor. Wagner's political writings (together with his operas) form the entire framework for Hitler's ideology.

Here, he found the granite foundations for his view of the world. To Davidowicz, racial imperialism and the fanatic plan to destroy the Jews were the dominant passions behind Hitler's drive for power, « forming the matrix of his ideology and the ineradicable core of Nationalist-Socialist doctrine » . It was Hitler himself who placed responsibility for these ideas upon Wagner : « Whoever wants to understand National-Socialist Germany must know Wagner. » . Clearly, Wagner and his works were adopted as cultural symbols by Hitler and the 3rd « Reich » , but was his output misused by the Nazis, or does it contain elements that made appropriation possible ?

Richard Wagner's Operatic works reflect the complexity of his genius, being « many layered, not without loose ends, puzzles and internal contradictions » (Arblaster) . It is this that gives those who wish to see elements of racial nationalism in his Operas their opportunity. In *Der Ring des Nibelungen*, the hero is Siegfried, Wagner's « man of the future » . In the contrast between Siegfried and Mime, Brearley sees thinly disguised racism. To her, Mime represents the Jewish people his very name indicates his mimetic Jewish barrenness. Siegfried is care-free and fearless, while Mime is a scheming hypocrite. The dwarf Alberich is shown to possess unpleasant stereotypical characteristics of the Jew, hoarding gold, choosing power over love, and controlling those working for him. Blood purity also features in *The Ring*. When Siegfried and Gunther swear their oath of blood brotherhood, Hagen, another representative of Jewry, does not join in, explaining :

« My blood would spoil all you drink my blood's not pure and noble like yours. »

If these analogies were intended by Wagner, Mime's murder may be seen as a symbol of the ousting of all traces of Judaism from German music and society.

To Gutman, Wagner in « *Parsifal* » « set forth a religion of racism under the cover of Christian legend » . It is undeniable that ideas of blood purity play a role or that the opera may be seen as a fable about racial degeneration and regeneration. The Jew is shown in the guise of Kundry and Klingsor to have poisoned Aryan blood, personified by Amfortas, whose sin was to have sexual contact with a racial inferior. His blood is thus corrupted, and he can no longer act as leader of a male community committed to preserving Christ's sacred blood. « *Parsifal* » 's rejection of Kundry's blandishments is an affirmation of racial purity, which then enables him to rescue the beleaguered Grail community from its degeneration. That community becomes a metaphor for the Aryan race, threatened with decline by interbreeding but saved by a reassertion of the principle of racial exclusivity.

Wagner's detractors seek to corroborate interpretations of his operas with analysis of his letters and many essays. In a letter to Franz Liszt, he admitted that his « long suppressed resentment against this Jewish business » was as necessary to his nature « as gall is to the blood » . Most commonly quoted is Wagner's essay « *Judaism in Music* » , where he sought to explain why « actual physical contact » with the Jew remained for the non-Jew « instinctively repugnant » . He inveighed against Jewish artists, who, motivated solely by commercial instincts and lacking a culture of their own, could only imitate the art produced by the host culture. True Germans could only be repelled by the alien physical appearance of the Jews and by the offensive sibilant sound of their voices. The most condemned passage is Wagner's appeal to the Jews : « Join unreservedly in this work of redemption that you may be reborn through the process of self-annihilation and we shall all be united and indistinguishable but remember that only this alone can

redeem you from the curse which weighs upon you : the redemption of Ahasuerus - Destruction (Untergang) » . To Zelinsky, this sentence contains within it the concept of genocide.

Windell considers that while Wagner's essays do contain elements of emotional nationalism and racial overtones, in his operas « it is almost impossible to find any relevant connection, whatever » . Furthermore, in Wagner's many commentaries upon his own works there is not (to Borchmeyer) a single statement entitling interpretation of any of the characters or details of the plots of his operas in anti-Semitic terms. Thus, in *Der Ring des Nibelungen* the attempt to interpret the Nibelungs as mythic projections of Jews is no more than an unverifiable hypothesis. In fact, Wagner's original conception of the prose scenario (*The Nibelung Legend*, 1848) had ended with the liberation of all the Nibelungs. The truth is that this many faceted work is capable of a multitude of interpretations. To Windell, the message of *The Ring* is that love and sacrifice alone can redeem the world from hatred and corruption, while to George Bernard Shaw, it is a drama about contemporary capitalism. As for « *Parsifal* » , the blood purity theory cannot stand, since « the blood which is referred to is the Saviour's, and whatever may happen to it, racial pollution is not among the conceivable risks » (Tanner) . Perhaps, this view is confirmed by the fact that Wagner allowed the 1st performance of his sacred drama to be conducted by Hermann Levi, the son of a rabbi.

Millington considers Wagner's anti-Semitism to be no isolated phenomenon. According to Völkish ideology, Jews were intrinsically un-German, inevitably cast as rootless outsiders : « Even among liberals and other progressives, it was part of the common currency of thought and discourse. » . Wagner's purpose was to explain the failure of the genuine integration of the Jews. He suggested that the very rootlessness of Jewish artists prevented them from articulating the emotions of the German people. Instead of presenting the depths of the soul, Jewish art dealt in surface appearances. Perhaps, Wagner's attitude may best be summed up by his comment : « If ever I were to write again about the Jews, I should say that I have nothing against them ; it is just that they descended on us Germans too soon, and we were not yet strong enough to absorb them. » .

As for « the Redemption of Ahasuerus - Destruction » , Zelinsky quotes this sentence out of context. It is not simply a question of « self-annihilation » , the voluntary nature of which excludes any thought of physical liquidation, but rather an act of a symbolic nature, intended to bring about the mystic transformation of the whole of humanity. Certainly, the Jew Joseph Rubinstein understood this to be the case when he sought admission to Wagner's household, arguing « that the Jews must perish » . Clearly, he did not mean physical death any more than Wagner, who aimed that « we » should be « united with and indistinguishable from » the Jews. In his treatise « *Religion and Art* » , Wagner re-examined the Jewish question, emphasising that the blood of Christ flowed not for any « one privileged race » , but for « the whole of humankind » . The natural inequality of the races had led to « a fundamentally immoral world order » as a result of the « domination and exploitation of the inferior races » . This must be compensated for by a moral equality « such as true Christianity must encourage » . Wagner regarded this essay as his final contribution to the Jewish question, as is clear from his letter to Angelo Neumann : « I have absolutely nothing in common with the modern anti-Semitic movement - an essay of mine will clarify this, to the extent that it should henceforth be impossible for anyone of intelligence to associate me with the movement. » .

Wagner's writings on the nation and the German spirit reveal no blueprint for later German history. In « *On State*

and Religion » (1873) , he maintained that patriotism might serve as no more than a useful illusory means of bringing people together. To the enlightened ruler, the interests of mankind in general should transcend the role of power. In « What is German » (1865) , he warned of the yearning after German glory, in which Germans could dream of nothing but a resurrection of the Romish Kaiser-Reich. To Wagner, there was a universality in man that transcended race, religion and nationality. To encourage this to emerge required a people to act as role model - a unified Germany ruled by enlightened leadership. When other nation states emulated the « German spirit » , nationalism itself would wither away leaving only universal man. In his essay « Beethoven » (1871) , Wagner considered the most impressive aspect of the former's genius to be his ability to transcend ethnicity.

It is clear that Wagner was inconsistent in his views. He was « a supreme egoist in a Century of artistic egoists » , and his attitudes were almost invariably reactions to the situation in which he found himself as an artist. He became a revolutionary in 1848 because he hoped that in a new Germany a German artist would be heard. His often expressed disdain for Prussia melted completely after the Franco-Prussian War, for he felt that, in the new « Reich » , he would have his opportunity to regenerate society. Yet, his enthusiasm waned rapidly when Bismarck refused to subsidise his Bayreuth theatre, and it ended totally in 1876 when the Emperor abandoned the 1st Bayreuth Festival to attend military manœuvres ! Henceforth, Wagner would largely denounce the militarism of the German Empire. In tandem with his anti-Semitism, Wagner had an unusually large number of close Jewish friends, describing his early friendship with Samuel Lehrs as « the most beautiful friendship of my life » . He looked upon Karl Tausig as a son, appointing him to manage the entire plan for his proposed Bayreuth Festival. Joseph Rubinstein became 2nd in command at Bayreuth and claimed that, in 11 years, he had never experienced any hostility relative to his religion. Angelo Neumann was placed in complete charge of the production of all Richard Wagner's musical works outside Germany, and Hermann Levi was to conduct the world-premiere of Wagner's testamentary « Parsifal » . Interestingly, in moments of extreme artistic frustration, Wagner, the supposed staunch German nationalist, often considered moving to the United States : « If I am not successful, I shall go to America and never dream of returning to Germany. » .

Clearly, the link between Richard Wagner and Adolf Hitler is, by no means, as direct as that seen by Gutman and Zelinsky. To Windell, Wagner's anti-Semitism may be regarded as « offensive and unworthy of a great man, without seeing it as closely related to the unspeakable use of Hitler » . Magee too considers the charge against Wagner to be « mere guilt by association, Wagner's works have nothing whatever to do with Aryans, jackboots, or the gassing of Jews, and to suppose that they have is to accept the perversion of them propagated by the Nazis » . Yet, if this relationship is more tenuous than generally supposed, the question must be asked why the presumption of a direct intellectual relationship has continued to recur.

Newman was partly right when he claimed that it was not Wagner himself but his Bayreuth successors who turned Wagnerism into a cult. Wagner had established the Bayreuth Festival to provide a semi-religious environment where his works could be produced with the requisite seriousness. Yet, his 1st choice for his Festival had not been Germany but the antithesis of the nationalistic state : Switzerland. After his death, it was administered by Cosima, who converted Bayreuth into an international symbol of the cultural predominance of Germany. To her, every utterance of the Master was akin to revelation. She set the tone and interpreted the meaning of Wagner to Germany. Thus Hitler himself admitted :

« It was Cosima Wagner's merit to have created the link between Bayreuth and National-Socialism. » .

It was « The Bayreuth Circle » which raised Wagner's message to the status of gospel, manoeuvring his ideas into a Germanic-Christian doctrine of salvation. Nietzsche 1st diagnosed this :

« The Germans have constructed a Wagner for themselves whom they can revere. »

After Wagner's death, « The Bayreuth Circle » became increasingly sectarian. Thus Behr praised Bayreuth as « the place to learn, again and again, to have confidence in Germanness, in German idealism and in German selflessness » . The most significant Bayreuth ideologue was Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Wagner's son-in-law. Chamberlain called for the birth of a German Christian religion : the redemption of Aryan Christianity would be achieved only through the elimination of the Jew. To him, 2 « pure » races stood facing each other - the Jews and the Germans : « Where the struggle is not waged with cannon balls, it goes on silently in the heart of society but this struggle is above all others for life and death. » . Thus, Chamberlain transformed Bayreuth's passive nationalism and racism into an aggressive crusading force. Under his influence, the Bayreuther Blätter and the official Bayreuth Festival Guide became oracles of militantly nationalistic and viciously anti-Semitic views. Perhaps, above all, the real contribution of « The Bayreuth Circle » to future Fascism lay not in nationalist ideology nor in racist ideas, both of which could be found elsewhere : it lay in the resoluteness with which the opposition between Germandom and Jewry was raised to the central theme of world history, and in its exclusiveness, its « Knights of the Holy Grail » mentality, its total and submissive devotion to the Master. Here, were rehearsed socio-psychological mechanisms which became politically exploitable in the 20th Century.

It was not just that « The Bayreuth Circle » provided Adolf Hitler with the intellectual basis for his « Weltanschauung » . The Wagner family itself gave him the psychological support to counter « his insecurity, the painful sense of being an outsider in bourgeois society, which remained with him for a long time » . Winifred Wagner joined the NSDAP in 1926, giving Hitler the Wahnfried's total endorsement : « For years, we have been following with the deepest personal sympathy and approval the constructive work of Adolf Hitler who sacrifices his life for this ideal of a purified, united national Germany. » . This association lent Hitler an aura of high culture and prestige seldom enjoyed by German politicians, in a country proud of its musical heritage. It was by mixing with the cultural elite that Hitler acquired a sufficient veneer of refinement to make him appear a plausible candidate for high political office, despite his humble origins and minimal formal education. Corroboration of the importance of Winifred's role is contained in the judgement of 2nd July 1947 which convicted her for having « supported and promoted the NSDAP significantly through her friendship with Hitler » . It was, however, Houston Stewart Chamberlain who was to give Hitler the political legitimacy he sought, lauding him « not as the precursor for someone greater, but as the saviour himself, the key figure of the German counter-revolution » . As Fest comments : « To the demagogue, those words came as an answer to his doubts, as a benediction from the Bayreuth Master himself. » .

If « The Bayreuth Circle » , rather than Wagner himself, was the predominant influence upon Hitler, to what extent was the ostensible Wagner - Hitler link caused by Hitler's own appropriation of Wagner ? It is clear that the Nazi

regime sought from its 1st days to link Wagner with itself. On Wagner's birthday in 1933, the Mayor of Bayreuth compared Wagner's struggle against « all the world on behalf of German culture and the German spirit » with the battle in which the Nazis were engaged. In that same year, the *Liepziger Neueste Nachrichten* commented : « Bayreuth is the symbol of the 3rd « Reich » . National-Socialism sees in the works of Richard Wagner something related to it in the essence and in the spirit. » . It is hardly surprising that a new revolutionary regime, seeking to capitalise on intense racial feeling, would claim for itself elements in the nation's cultural tradition which had already attained national and international prestige. Moreover, such views evidently represented Hitler's firm conviction too. Rauschnig reported a conversation with the Führer, in 1934, showing Hitler's firm belief that he truly comprehended the real meaning of Wagner's ideas. « Everything written by that great man that he had read was in agreement with his own innermost, sub-conscious, dormant conviction. » Thus, Hitler found in the composer's writings precisely what his inner convictions made him want to find. Kubizek, Hitler's childhood friend, stated that he sought in his reading « merely confirmation for principles and ideas which he already had » . All this is borne out by Hitler's remarks to Rauschnig on « Parsifal » : « It is not the Christian religion of compassion that is acclaimed, but pure, noble blood, in the protection and glorification of whose purity the brotherhood of the initiated have come together. » . Thus Hitler saw in « Parsifal » the religious vision of the SS plan for the new aristocracy of blood and soil. Wagner's Untergang or metaphorical Destruction was to be transformed into Hitler's Endlösung or Final Solution.

Adolf Hitler's appropriation of Richard Wagner continued into his years of political dictatorship. He claimed that his Emergency Decree of 4th February 1933, banning political meetings and newspapers, was necessary because Wagner had received negative press reviews of his music-dramas, and the Führer wished « to preserve the present day press from similar errors » . The very title Führer was appropriated from a passage at the end of « Lohengrin » : « Zum Führer sei er euch ernannt ! » - « Accept him as your leader ! » Surely, Hitler also identified with Siegfried as the avatar of racial purity. Most importantly, Hitler appropriated from Wagner a vision of the role of the artist in society. He always regarded himself as an artist who had condescended to become involved in politics. The real core of Hitler's political drive lay not in politics but in the religiosity he appropriated from Wagner. Hitler assumed from Wagner the absolute right of the artist to intervene on every subject he wished. He did not view politics as collective action to achieve limited objectives but rather believed in the dictatorship of genius, in the artist intervening like a philosopher-king to impose his will upon the people, leading them to a heroic goal.

It is not difficult to see that, with the apotheosis of Wagner and the glorification of Bayreuth, took root a perceived symbiotic relationship : Wagner - Bayreuth - Hitler - National-Socialism - 3rd « Reich » . Yet, the blame must be more accurately laid at the door of « The Bayreuth Circle » , the Wagner family and of Hitler himself. Wagner's output was used by « The Bayreuth Circle » to pursue its own agenda, and Wagnerism became a more consistent and powerful ideology than Wagner himself could ever have foreseen. The blame that may be attached to Wagner is that his works lent themselves too well to appropriation. It was rather Wagnerism that Hitler appropriated, but it was to Wagner that the « Führer » gave the credit. Nothing was more symbolic of this appropriation than the manner of the « Führer » 's defeat. Just as Siegfried and his lover Brunnhilde were consumed in a funeral pyre, Adolf Hitler and Eva Braun were immolated together in the Gotterdammerung that was Berlin. As always, Hitler followed the Wagnerian myth, for Wagner himself had died quietly in his bed in Venice, surrounded by his loving family.

...

The arrest in Vienna of discredited British historian David Irving for lying about the Holocaust got us to thinking : Is good news finally breaking out somewhere ? Austrian authorities are holding him without bail, pending trial, for breaking a 1947 law that criminalizes Holocaust denial. His lawyer now says he's changed his views - that gas chambers were, in fact, used in Auschwitz, contrary to a 1989 speech he gave in Austria 16 years ago, and that the Holocaust did indeed happen.

This also got us to thinking about our recent item on the hidebound circle jerks of the Vienna Philharmonic, whose long-buried historical relationship with the Holocaust still has contemporary echoes. For instance, at Anton Bruckner Private University (formerly, the « Bruckner-Konservatorium ») in Linz (Hitler's home-town) , not far from Vienna, the big concert-hall is named for Wilhelm Jerger, who was director of the Conservatory until 1973.

Jerger, right (a contrabassist in the Vienna Philharmonic, and a Lieutenant in the « Schutzstaffel » - SS) became the chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic in 1938, when a program was set in motion to « Aryanize » Austrian culture after Austria was made part of Germany through the « Anschluß » . Musicologist William Osborne tells us :

During Jerger's leadership, 6 Jewish members of the Vienna Philharmonic died in the concentration camps. 11 were able to save their lives by timely migration. 9 additional members were found to be of « mixed race » or « contaminated by kinship » (« Versippte ») and reduced to secondary status within the orchestra. 26 « non-Aryans » were thus either murdered, exiled or reduced in status while SS Lieutenant Jerger led the Orchestra.

For documentation, see : « Doktor Clemens Hellsberg, Demokratie der Koenige : Die Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker » (Zürich : Schweizer Verlagshaus : Wien : Kremayr & Scheriau ; Mainz : Musikverlag Schott, 1992) page 505. Hellsberg, who has a Ph.D. in musicology, is the current chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic. His book contains numerous discussions of Jerger's activities.

In 1942, Wilhelm Jerger wrote a book celebrating the Vienna Philharmonic's centennial : « Erbe und Sendung » . (Wien : Wiener Verlag Ernst Sopper & Karl Bauer, 1942.) Jerger's book illustrates his devotion to Nazi ideologies. He includes the genealogies of several prominent father-to-son generations that formed a historical continuum within the ranks of the Philharmonic. Jerger places an asterisk by the name of every « non-Aryan » listed in the tables. Jerger explains that the Aryan stock of these Philharmonic families was so « tough » that the purity of their « blood » was never notably damaged by what racists refer to as « dysgenic influences » :

« And here it is demonstrated, that in spite of manifold influences of blood from elsewhere, this Mind [Geist] continues to implant itself with great toughness through the ancestral lineage, and that it is often very sharply imprinted. It is understandable, that such an inheritance must beget outstanding musicians, who in their stylistic education and in their experience of orchestral playing are already extraordinarily schooled. This is Mind from Old Mind, which helps tradition and inheritance, a dominant trait [überkommene Anlage] to a special development and fulfillment. » (Page 87, translated from the German.)

Schooling is acknowledged as important, but only in the context of a special « blood » inheritance that transmits « Mind ». This follows National-Socialism's ideology of « Ahnenerbe », which asserts that cultural traits are genetically inherited. Jerger also presents a racist portrayal of Gustav Mahler, who became the General Music Director of the Vienna Philharmonic in 1898, replacing Hans Richter, who had led the Orchestra for the previous 23 years. (The Vienna Philharmonic refers to the Richter years as its « golden age ».) Mahler's tenure was troubled in part by a continual pattern of anti-Semitic harassment and he left the Orchestra after 3 years. Using his own words and quoting those of Max Kalbeck (a famous critic at the time) Jerger draws a comparison of Richter and Mahler that reveals the anti-Semitic attitudes Mahler confronted :

« A completely different type of personality entered with Mahler, ' as there ' (to speak with Max Kalbeck's vivid words) instead of the tall blond bearded Hun, who placed himself wide and calm before the Orchestra like an unshakable, solidly walled tower, there was a gifted shape [begabte Gestalt] balancing over the podium, thin, nervous, and with extraordinarily gangly limbs. In fact, a greater contrast was really not possible. There the patriarchal Hans Richter in his stolidity and goodness, and his extremely hearty and collegial solidarity with the orchestra, and here Gustav Mahler, oriented to the new objectivity [neue Sachlichkeit] (nervous, hasty, scatty, intellectualish) the music a pure matter of his overbred intellect. » (Page 57, translated from the German.)

Racist views are apparent in the language : " intellectualish ", " overbred ", " new objectivity " - a new æsthetic associated with Jews - , " gangly limbs ", " scatty " vs. " blond ", " stolid ", and so on. They reflect anti-Semitism and National-Socialist æsthetics. The transparent sub-text is one of chauvinistic masculinity and genetic superiority. The book illustrates that Jerger was not an innocent bystander caught-up in historical events. He was an active and avid cultural leader of the Nazi movement.

« Linz is by no means the only Musikhochschule with this problem. » , Osborne adds. « In Munich, Germany, the Musik Hochschule is housed in Hitler's personal office building. It was called the Fuehrerbau, and was designed by Paul Ludwig Troost, the same architect who designed Munich's Haus der Kunst. »

Osborne continues :

« The Fuehrerbau is considered to be one of the most perfect stylizations of Nazi architecture still in existence. A lot of people get the creeps just walking into the place. There are stories still in circulation that people were tortured in the basement where the student cafeteria now is. Across the street is a sister building that looks identical and was a Nazi administration building. Much of Munich was destroyed by Allied bombing, but, ironically, these 2 buildings survived almost unscratched.

...

Even though the Anton Bruckner Private University has only been known under this name for a short time, musical education in Linz has a tradition stretching back more than 200 years. As early as 1799, the city musical director

Franz Xaver Glöggel, a close friend of Michael Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, founded the 1st music school in Linz. Then, in 1823, the newly-founded Linz Musical Society set-up a singing school : the real precursor of the Anton Bruckner Private University.

The attempt to persuade Anton Bruckner to become director of the Music School in 1863 was unsuccessful. But another important name (the Bruckner biographer and former secretary to Franz Liszt, August Göllerich) was in charge of the newly-strengthened Institute from 1896 to 1923. And, in 1923, the name of Bruckner was finally established with the upgrading of the Music School to the Bruckner Conservatory Linz ; now re-named the Anton Bruckner Private University.

The original main function of the forerunner Institute, which was to raise the quality of musical life in Linz by improving the training of amateur musicians, was taken over by the Linz Music School in 1950. From that time on, the Bruckner Conservatory established itself progressively as a training ground for professional musicians. This development was carried through by the directors Carl Steiner (1945-1958) , Wilhelm Jerger (1958-1973) , Gerhard Dallinger (1973-1990) , Hans Maria Kneihls (1990-1995) and Reinhart von Gutzeit (from 1995-2006) , University Professor Anton Voigt (acting Rector from 2006-2007) , and Doctor Marianne Betz (2007-2012) . In autumn 2012, the Rectorship of the University was taken over by Ursula Brandstätter. From the 1990's on, the Bruckner Conservatory developed from a higher music school into one of the most active cultural centres in Linz. The educational spectrum of the former Bruckner Conservatory was likewise continuously expanded and became the educational basis when private university status was attained in 2004. The Anton Bruckner Private University now offers 22 separate branches of study and 3 university courses in the fields of Classical music, jazz, drama and contemporary dance. Students may study for the degrees Bachelor of Arts or Master of Arts, which are on a par with those of other European universities and Arts Academies.

Effects of the Music of Richard Wagner on the Pseudo-Mysticism of Adolf Hitler and the 3rd « Reich »

There are those (obviously misguided) individuals in today's world who claim that music is an irrelevant occupation for anyone capable of doing anything else, and that it doesn't really have any connection with reality. Apart from the fact that most of these individuals are probably tone-deaf and / or had their hearts broken by musicians, it may indeed be rather difficult to quickly think of an historical example where music has played an important or pivotal role in a major occurrence. There is the link between Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, the SS, and the Nazi Party ; and the music of Richard Wagner.

The police state of Nazi Germany has been well-publicized over the years, but the debt that state owed to prehistoric gods and myths has been somewhat overlooked. Wagner's music is intensely Romantic, violent, heroic, and of mythic proportions ; exactly, the qualities projected by the Nazi Party. Wagner's Operas may have had an almost religious effect upon Hitler ; Wagner's skill for drama and dramatic music no doubt underscored the impact of the legends already known to Hitler from youth. Hitler and many of his associates shared a fascination with the history and mythology of the German « Volk » , and the following discussion will focus on examples of « mythical influences » , and how they helped shape the personal and political activities of these men.

Richard Wagner's (1813-1883) most famous works are undoubtedly his music-dramas. « Der Ring des Nibelungen » and « Tristan und Isolde » are 2 works that are widely acknowledged as being of great musical significance. The development and use of the leitmotif, the parts written for the « heldentenor », the manipulation and « warping » of the tonal system, and the development of the music-drama itself are all very important aspects of Wagner and his music, and of these 2 works. (Sadie, page 352.)

The ancient sagas that Wagner used as a basis for these music-dramas held for him revealed truths and insights into human behavior and emotions. He has not been alone in his interest and opinions. These myths have been used as an argument for, or illustration of, various beliefs and ideologies. The « Ring » has been variously interpreted as a look into the human psyche ; a means of promoting socialism ; a prophecy of the fate of the world and human kind ; and a « parable » about the industrial society that was coming of age in Wagner's lifetime. It was also used by the Nazi Party to justify and glorify racism, and to supply a basis of fanatic loyalty in the « Schutzstaffel », or SS. (Sadie, page 353 ; Albert Speer, page 141.)

The legends of German mythology are essentially the same as the old Norse legends ; many of the proper names are the same in both cultures, and most of the remaining names are very similar to the Norse versions, differing only in spelling. Thus, the Norse Odin, the ruler of the gods, becomes Woden (or Wotan) , further south in the Germanic regions. In the same fashion, the Norse heroes known as Sigurd, Brynhild and Gudrun become Siegfried, Brünnhilde and Günther in the German stories. The extremely close parallels between the 2 cultures makes it an absolute certainty that both the Germanic stories and the earlier Norse legends were derived from the same ancient tales. (Hamilton, pages 303-304 ; Sadie, page 352.)

These early legends are known to the modern world from 2 collections : the Elder Edda, which is written in verse, and the Younger Edda (consisting of the sagas) , which is written in prose. The dating for these collections seems to be in some dispute ; in Bulfinch's « Mythology » rather specific dates are assigned : 1056 for the Elder Edda and 1640 for the Younger Edda. However, in Edith Hamilton's « Mythology » , she speaks of the oldest manuscript of the Elder as dating from circa 1300, some 300 years after the arrival of Christianity in Iceland, and almost 300 years after Bulfinch's date. Hamilton does state, however, that all of these legends are completely pagan in nature (thus predating Christianity) , and that almost all scholars agree the stories must be much older than the oldest manuscript. The dates for the Younger Edda are likewise apparently uncertain ; Bulfinch's date of 1640 is hard to reconcile with Hamilton's statement that the Younger was « written down by one Snorri Sturluson in the last part of the 12th Century » . (It should also be pointed-out that Bulfinch was writing in the 19th Century ; Hamilton, in the 20th. It is very likely Hamilton had the advantage of new data to guide her estimates.) Regardless of date, it is agreed the most important collection is the Elder Edda. (Bulfinch, pages 328-329 ; Hamilton, pages 301-303.)

These 2 very long epics furnish the material for almost all of the presently known myths and legends about the ancient gods of the North. Unfortunately, as Christian missionaries from the Mediterranean area journeyed further north, they systematically destroyed all the pagan artifacts they could find in a remarkably successful attempt to completely obliterate all remnants of the belief system they were replacing. Only a few fragments of the entire

northern European prehistoric collection of myths have been preserved. The legend of Beowulf, in England, and the « Nibelungenlied » , in Germany, are 2 tales that survived the zeal of the missionaries. The Eddas are known only from Iceland ; apparently, Icelandic missionaries were less influential than their counterparts on the continent of Europe - Iceland was one of the last European countries to be Christianized. (Hamilton, pages 300-301.)

All of these surviving legends are essentially gloomy and pessimistic in nature ; depressingly so to modern readers. In Nordic and Germanic mythology the Earth (Midgard) , and Heaven (Asgard) , were destined to be utterly destroyed by the Frost Giants (who lived in Jötunheim) , in a final great battle between Good and Evil, called Ragnarok in the Norse legends. (Ragnarok is paralleled by « Götterdämmerung » in Wagner's « Ring » Cycle.) In this final battle, Evil was predestined to win, and the entirety of creation was to be destroyed. The only bright factor in this thoroughly depressing viewpoint was the belief that, in spite of all, if one could die a courageous, heroic death, then all else faded into insignificance. It is of interest to realize that the Western ideal of heroism and heroic deeds in the face of certain death springs almost entirely from these Nordic myths, and not from the Greek and Roman mythology that most people are more familiar with. (The Greek gods were remarkably un-heroic in their conduct.) This idea of heroism and fighting to the death against any odds would fit very well with the kind of fanatic loyalty sought by Adolf Hitler and Heinrich Himmler. (Bulfinch, pages 348-350 ; Hamilton, pages 300-302 ; Grout, page 746.)

(One may speculate that the hopelessness of Nordic religious beliefs made them considerably less attractive than the new, essentially optimistic, view being spread by Christian missionaries. The old beliefs probably hastened their own demise.)

When Richard Wagner embarked upon the composition of « Der Ring des Nibelungen » (around 1849) , he chose as his framework the Teutonic epic of the « Nibelungenlied » . (The Norse version of this legend is called the Volsungasaga.) Wagner finished the 1st 2 segments (« Das Rheingold » and « Die Walküre ») , and part of the 3rd (« Siegfried ») , by 1857, but 17 years would go by before he would finish the great work with the completion of « Siegfried » and the final music-drama in the cycle : « Götterdämmerung » . (Grout, pages 746-747 ; Hamilton, page 303.)

As mentioned earlier, the Teutonic versions of these myths are very similar to the Nordic versions, differing chiefly in descriptions of climate, and social condition. The Teutonic versions were generally slightly less violent than their Viking equivalents. In turn, it seems apparent that Wagner again tempered the German tales somewhat ; in « Tristan und Isolde » , after the hero Tristan is mortally wounded, he is kept alive by the power of love until he is united with his lover, Isolde. After Tristan's demise in her arms, she is overcome by waves of ecstatic love, and she dies. As discouraging as this ending may seem, Wagner saw it as the triumph of love in the face of all adversity ; not even death could truly defeat it. Of course, the story steps outside of the bounds of reality somewhere along the way, but this only adds to the transcendent quality of the story and of the music-drama itself. (Kerman, pages 288-289 ; Bulfinch, pages 351-352.)

It is generally thought that Wagner was anti-Semitic, and, indeed, he is described as such in a number of sources. Curiously, the only anti-Semitic act cited by any of these writers was the article he wrote for the « Neue Zeitschrift

für Musik » , in September of 1850, entitled « Das Judentum in der Musik » (« Judaism in Music ») . This article has apparently been interpreted in various ways ; several sources characterized it as an attack upon Jews in music in general and an attack upon Giacomo Meyerbeer, who had previously come to Richard Wagner's aid. One source said the article was aimed not only at Jews in general but specifically at Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, who had just died. The sole source that seemed to offer some evidence to the contrary was the entry in « The New Grove Dictionary » . In this article, Robert Marshall points-out several people who did not consider Wagner's article anything more than a bitter attack upon Meyerbeer, and spoke against its being interpreted in such a broad manner as to include all Jews. A Jewish writer stated the opinion that Wagner's statements « had come from the purest of motives » . (Marshall, page 111 ; Sadie, page 348 ; Kerman, page 284.)

If there remains some question as to the depth of Richard Wagner's anti-Semitism, there seems to be no mistake about his great pride in his German ancestry. Wagner himself wrote that he had « come into the world a particularly German type » , and that he considered himself « the most German of the Germans » . In a letter written to Crown Prince Albert of Saxony, he writes :

« No musician was ever so closely restricted to his lingual fatherland as I am, since I could create my music only to my texts and since both text and music in an unprecedented sense are based only on the German language and the German spirit. » (Strobel, page 2,397.)

These statements, taken together with the knowledge that Wagner went to some lengths to separate German music from French and Italian influences, can only reinforce the picture of Wagner as a proud member of the « German race » . (Strobel, page 2,401.)

Adolf Hitler's attraction to Richard Wagner's music began at an early age. In 1905, at the age of 16, Hitler quit school and spent the next 3 years being idle, which he later described as the happiest time of his life. 2 of his favourite pastimes were aimlessly roaming the streets of Linz, and attending the Opera at night. He had a passion for music ; most especially the mystic Operas of Wagner, which he would attend night after night. His meager supply of pocket money was spent mainly on the Opera (a standing-room ticket cost only the equivalent of 10 cents) , and on purchasing books on German history and mythology, which he would read for hours at a time. (Shirer, Pages 9-12.)

His fascination with Wagner's Operas seems to have had a profound effect upon him. His only friend from this period of his life was one August Kubizek (nicknamed « Gustl ») , who gave an interesting description :

« The charged emotionality of this music seemed to have served him as a means for self-hypnosis, while he found in its lush air of bourgeois luxury the necessary ingredients for escapist fantasy. » (Fest, page 22.)

Kubizek goes on to relate the events of a particular evening spent in Hitler's company. They had attended a performance of Wagner's « Rienzi » , and according to « Gustl » , Hitler had a quite powerful reaction to the Opera. The youthful Adolf was « overwhelmed by the resplendent, dramatic musicality » of the Opera, as well as deeply affected by the story therein ; that of « Cola di Rienzi » , a medieval rebel who was an outcast from his fellows and

was « destroyed by their incomprehension » .

« After the Opera, Hitler began to orate. Words burst from him like a backed-up flood breaking through crumbling dams. In grandiose, compelling images, he sketched for me his future and that of his people. » (Fest, pages 22-23.)

30 years later, the boyhood friends would meet again in Bayreuth (probably catching an Opera) , and Hitler would remark : « It began at that hour ! » . More convincing evidence of Wagner's influences can hardly be wished for after a statement such as this one, but more there is. (Fest, pages 21-23.)

Between 1909 and 1913, a time which Hitler described as « the saddest period of my life » , he resided in Vienna. It was here, by his own statement in « Mein Kampf » , that he became a confirmed anti-Semite. The anti-Semitic opinions Richard Wagner had held were no secret, and the concurrence of opinion between these 2 men could only have served to pull Hitler closer to a greater regard for Wagner. Indeed, Hitler claims to have heard « Tristan und Isolde » , 30 to 40 times during his years in Vienna. (Shirer, pages 15-20 ; Fest, page 30.)

During these years in Vienna, at the « Hofoper » Opera House alone, at least 426 evenings featured performances of works by Richard Wagner. (Fest, page 769.)

The next example is not really surprising when one remembers Hitler's high-opinion of himself as an artist, but it was rather well, surprising, to discover the fact that Hitler, knowing absolutely nothing about composition, decided to write an Opera based on an idea considered but later dropped by Wagner. This was to have been a story concerning « Wieland the Smith, full of bloody and incestuous nonsense » . Drawing themes from Germanic sagas, he also attempted to write dramatic literary works. Apparently, none of these projects were ever completed. (Fest, page 31.)

Another insight into Hitler's fixation on Wagnerian Opera was the odd fact that even though at this very time Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg, and Anton von Webern were, to quote Kubizek again, causing the « greatest uproar in Vienna's concert halls in the memory of man » , Hitler remained completely ignorant of any aspect of the controversy ; he also completely ignored the work of Gustav Mahler and Richard Strauß, preferring instead a steady diet of Wagner and Bruckner. Later, when Hitler was essentially homeless and had lost contact with Kubizek, he met another vagabond, named Reinholt Hanisch, who would become Hitler's new only friend. Hanisch says by this time « only grandiose themes » interested Hitler ; « gods and heroes » , and « gigantic aspirations » . Hanisch adds : « In music, Richard Wagner brings him to bright flames. » . By the time, he left Vienna, on May 24, 1913, Hitler is described as leaving no friends behind, preferring the « company » of Karl Lueger, Ritter von Schönerer, and Richard Wagner. (Fest, pages 33, 47, 58.)

After entering politics, Hitler used a vaguely coherent mish-mash of ideas to further his own. During his speeches, he would call upon statements or ideas from Lenin, Gobineau, Nietzsche, Le Bon, Ludendorff, Lord Northcliff, Schopenhauer, Lueger, and, of course, Richard Wagner. (He would also use the so-called « Secret Protocols » supposedly written by the « Wise Men of Zion » , which had already been conclusively proven to be fakes.) He was also known to « rhapsodize at length » about Wagner and his music. (Fest, pages 125, 133.)

In 1923, just before the abortive « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » , Hitler presented himself at Wahnfried, the home of the Wagner family. He is said to have sought out the Master's study, and, deeply moved, stood before Wagner's grave in the garden for a long time. Afterwards, he was introduced to Houston Stewart Chamberlain (Wagner's son-in-law) , who was of advanced age and could not speak. He later wrote a letter to Hitler voicing his support for Hitler's goals and ideas. Hitler valued this letter greatly, almost as if it were « a benediction from the Bayreuth Master himself » . (Fest, pages 180-181.)

Hitler continued in his contacts with the family of Wagner. His idea of the supreme expression of Opera was the final scene in « Götterdämmerung » and, when in Bayreuth, whenever he witnessed this Finale, he would turn around in his darkened box, seek-out the hand of « Frau » Winifred Wagner, and « breathe a deeply moved “ Handkuss ” upon it » . By this time, he had seen all of Wagner's Operas countless times, and boasted of having listened to « Tristan und Isolde » and « Die Meistersinger » over a 100 times each. He often commented on problems of staging, and of the dramatic content, but even though he considered himself a music-lover, he never had anything to say about the musical considerations of these works. (Fest, page 520.)

Other indications of Wagner's influences are furnished by Albert Speer, who began as Hitler's chief architect and ended as « Reich » Armaments Minister. He speaks of the interior furnishings of Hitler's country house, the Berghof at Obersalzberg. The salon was furnished, along with normal items of furniture, with a « sideboard over 10 feet high and 18 feet long » which was used to store phonograph records. Against another wall was « a massive chest containing built-in speakers, and adorned by a large bronze bust of Richard Wagner by Arno Breker » . (Speer, pages 128, 135.)

The admiration Hitler had for Wagner was reciprocated by the Wagner family ; when furnishing this dwelling, the Wagners donated linens and china, and sent Hitler a complete set Richard Wagner's works, along with a page from the original score of « Lohengrin » . (Fest, page 251.)

There is, yet, another facet of Hitler's dwelling at Obersalzberg that shows his sense of unity with Germany's « heroic » past : the view. Obersalzberg, as one might imply from the name, is a mountain ; high enough to give a good view of the surrounding area. The Berghof, which was designed by Hitler himself (architect Speer rated Hitler's design as deserving of a « D » if it had been a project submitted by a student) , featured a large picture window which offered a view of the Untersberg, Berchtesgaden, and Mozart's home-town, Salzburg. Legend has it that the Emperor Charlemagne still sleeps in the Untersberg, but will someday awaken and restore the German Empire to its past glories. Hitler didn't hesitate to apply this prophecy to himself :

« You see the Untersberg over there. It is no accident that I have my residence opposite it. » . (Albert Speer, pages 128-131.)

On January 30, 1933, Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. On February 4, he caused a decree to be issued which gave the government the right to ban political meetings and to shut down the newspapers of his political rivals. A few days later, he was to justify this action by citing newspaper criticisms of Wagner. His stated aim was to « preserve the

present-day press from similar errors » . (Fest, page 391.)

On the eve of World War II, Hitler's forces reoccupied the Rhineland. Returning from a triumphal trip through this area, and jubilant over the Allies' weakness in letting him get away with the re-occupation, he requested that some Wagner be put on the phonograph. Listening to the Overture to « Parsifal » , he remarked :

« I have built-up my religion out of “ Parsifal ” . Divine worship in solemn form without pretenses of humility. One can serve God only in the garb of the hero. » (Fest, page 499.)

The record continued to play. The next selection was the funeral march from « Götterdämmerung » , and brought forth the following comments from Hitler :

« I Ist heard it in Vienna, at the Opera. And I still remember as if it were today how madly excited I became on the way home over a few yammering “ Yids ” (very derogatory term for Jews) I had to pass. I cannot think of a more incomparable contrast. This glorious mystery of the dying hero and this Jewish crap ! » (Fest, page 499.)

Hitler's associates were aware of his interest in Wagner. There were several ploys routinely used by his « toadies » (a synonymous modern word might be « lobbyists ») , in an effort to direct the « Führer » 's attention to them. Hitler would always find the time to speak with someone who brought photographs of the latest stage of a building project, the plans for a new building, or photographs of the sets of a newly staged work, preferably a Wagner Opera. The bearer of such gifts was almost certain to achieve a private meeting with Hitler. (Albert Speer, page 181.)

Hitler's original affiliation with the early incarnation of the Nazi Party was not without trial ; the Party had been denounced by Hermann Esser as « an association of visionaries, worshipers of Wotan » , which was perhaps closer to the truth than Esser imagined. Even Gœbbels, who would become Hitler's Propaganda minister, called for Hitler's expulsion from the Party. (Höhne, page 59.)

Later, however (from 1921) , Hitler was in control of the « Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter Partei » (National-Socialist German Workers Party) . He had already made the acquaintance of several men who were to become key figures in the Nazi regime ; among them were Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß, Alfred Rosenberg (another admirer of Wagner) , and Gregor Straßer. Straßer, a druggist who was to become the number 2 man in the Party, had as his secretary a bespectacled former chicken farmer named Heinrich Himmler. (Shirer, pages 29-30.)

Himmler was a small man, balding, and has been described as looking more like a college professor (!) than anything else. Contrary to his appearance, he was to become the most sinister and feared man in Germany. Uncomfortable in the company of men he considered superior to him, he was nonetheless an extremely organized and crafty individual, qualities that were to serve him well in his pursuit of power. Himmler had formally joined the SS (originally formed as a personal bodyguard for Hitler) , in 1925, as member No. 168. He came to regard Hitler as a god, and spent all of his spare time reading Hitler's speeches and works by Rosenberg and Walter Darré. These authors, in turn, led him to study books on Germanic lore (returning to an earlier, childhood, interest) , mysticism, and secret societies, which

served to set the stage for his later beliefs and actions. (Herzstein, pages 82-83 ; Padfield, page 38.)

Himmler would eventually control all police functions for the Nazi Party and the state when, in 1943, he reached the zenith of his power with his appointment to the office of Minister of the Interior on August 25, 1943. Himmler was already in charge of the SS, which in August of 1942 had been granted sweeping judiciary rights by the newly appointed « Reich » Minister of Justice, Doctor Otto Thierack. (Herzstein, page 95.)

Both Hitler and, to use his description, his « ever-loyal » Himmler were affected deeply by the old sagas brought to dramatic life by Wagner. The torch-lit secret initiation ceremonies of the SS which took place every year all over Germany were held at midnight on April 20th, the « Führer » 's birthday. These gatherings were dominated by subtle and « not so subtle » references to the ancient Germanic myths, and incorporated a great deal of Wagnerian type dramatic stagecraft. This was due much more to Himmler's influences than Hitler's ; by this time, the SS was almost a state within a state. It was subordinate only at the very top of the organization - Himmler answered only to Hitler. (Herzstein, pages 82-83.)

There were several attractive reasons for a young man to want to join the SS (assuming, of course, he had the proper political views, and was « genetically pure ») ; economic, social. One of the most appealing reasons, for some, was the elite mystique that Himmler had worked so hard to implement. He used proclamations of the sacred status of the German lands and peoples as a creed. He borrowed from both ancient German and ancient Nordic mythology to supply the SS with its symbols, oaths, and rituals. The rooms where their secret meetings were held were decorated with runes, prehistoric markings which were said to give the power of prophecy to anyone who knew how to read them. The symbol of the « Schutzstaffel » itself (twin twisted lightning bolts resembling SS) is a runic symbol. (Herzstein, pages 84-89.)

On July 2nd, 1936, Himmler showed, once again, an effort to connect himself and the « Reich » to the glorious past of the German people. He attended an observance of the 1,000th year anniversary of the death of the Saxon king, Heinrich I, who was remembered historically as the « Conqueror of the Slavs » and was referred to by Himmler as his favourite hero. Himmler also harbored similar ideas of conquest, and fancied himself as the reincarnation of this earlier Heinrich. He showed his reverence to his previous self by laying a wreath on the tomb, an act which was conveniently captured by photographers and widely circulated throughout Germany. He was also photographed visiting an archeological site in Bavaria where he could inspect the ancient runic inscriptions which had been uncovered there. (Höhne, page 44 ; Herzstein, page 88-89.)

Early on, Himmler wished for German women to adopt the same moral code as displayed by the heroines of the ancient German sagas, regarding any extra-marital relations as offensive to his personal code. (Höhne, page 32.)

Apparently, his personal code underwent some revision, for it wasn't long before Himmler and the « Reich » began to encourage German women to have as many children as possible, whether or not they were married. (He and Hitler had both considered abolishing the criminal institution of the Christian Church known as marriage, but both came to the conclusion that many Germans were not yet ready to accept such a radical idea.) In order to substitute some sort

of ceremony for those children born-out of wedlock, Himmler instituted a « secular christening » ceremony, called an « SS name giving ». The child was wrapped in a woolen blanket which was covered with embroidered swastikas and runes and set before an altar. The parents then laid their hands upon their child and spoke his or her name in a solemn manner. These « Lebensborn » children were remembered on their birthdays by the SS, each receiving a gift consisting of the appropriate number of candles for the child's birthday. The candles were manufactured at no charge to the SS by the prisoners at Dachau. (Herzstein, page 104.)

Himmler's mystical zeal seems to have exasperated even Hitler at times, although the « Führer » never tried to put a stop to it. Hitler himself wrote :

« What nonsense ! Here, we have at last reached an age that has left all mysticism behind it and, now, he wants to start that all over again. We might as well have stayed with the church. At least, it had tradition. To think that I may some day be turned into an SS saint ! Can you imagine it ? I would turn-over in my grave. » (Albert Speer, page 141.)

And also, concerning Himmler's archeological excavations :

« Why do we call the whole world's attention to the fact that we have no past ? It isn't enough that the Romans were erecting great buildings when our forefathers were still living in mud huts ; now, Himmler is starting to dig-up these villages of mud huts. All we prove by that is that we were still throwing stone hatchets and crouching around open fires when Greece and Rome had already reached the highest stage of culture. We really should do our best to keep quiet about this past. Instead, Himmler is making a great fuss about it all. The present day Romans must be having a laugh at these revelations. » (Albert Speer, page 141.)

Hitler's friend, Hermann Göring, also preferred a glorious myth to reality. During the winter of 1942, when some of the heaviest fighting of the War was taking place at Stalingrad, the « Reich » Marshall and his subordinates were celebrating the re-opening of the destroyed Berlin State Opera House by attending « a festive performance of Richard Wagner's " Die Meistersinger " ». This was immediately after Göring had given Hitler his personal assurances that the (foolishly) promised air supply of Stalingrad would be supervised by Göring himself. Stalingrad eventually fell to the Russian offensive, chiefly because of lack of re-inforcements and re-supply, and is regarded as one of the major turning points of the War. (Albert Speer, pages 329-331.)

Wagner's spell was, by no means, confined to the individuals involved in the Nazi drama. The pomp and spectacle of the huge Party rallies have been compared to the ritual of the Catholic Church, but equally valid (if not more so) , would be a comparison to the musical dramas of Richard Wagner. The dramatic, almost Operatic excesses of the rallies is partly due to these influences. These grand Festivals of Nazism displayed a fine understanding of the same dramatic principals used in Opera, and a knowledge of the « psychology of the common man » . (Fest, page 512.)

When the end came for Hitler, he staged his own « Götterdämmerung » , in his Berlin bunker. He refused to surrender, preferring the taking of his own life over an unheroic end. By his absolute refusal to even consider

capitulation, he ensured vast, horrible destruction of lives and property long after these losses could have had any possible affect upon the outcome of the War. Hitler lived-out his fantasy to the end to the fullest ; precipitating the realization of his favourite Operatic scene, the final destruction of the gods and « Walhalla » . (Whiting, pages 184-185.)

The Germanic myths and the dramatic presentation of these myths by Richard Wagner were, very obviously, a central tool of the Nazi Party. The psychological effects of these music-dramas and stories on the principal figures of the 3rd « Reich » are equally obvious, when they are looked for. In Joachim Fest's biography of Hitler, there are no fewer than 34 references to Richard Wagner or his music. (To give this figure some perspective, Rudolf Heß, Hitler's « 2nd in command » until his flight to England, is mentioned only 30 times.) Indeed, a case could be made, following the judicial trend popular in America today, that the only reason Hitler started the Second World War, tried to carry-out genocide against the Jews and other « inferior races » , and devoted his misguided life to setting-up the « 1,000 Year “ Reich ” » , (thereby, causing the death of millions of people in the process) , was because he had viewed the violent, heroic music-dramas of Richard Wagner as a child ! After completing the research for this report, such a seemingly outlandish idea no longer sounds as outlandish - it could have been at least part of the reason for these heinous acts. (Will the wife of our vice-President now try to have warning labels applied to Wagner's Operas ?) The author will now bow to an irresistible urge to make the following comment : What some judges and juries in the United States need to realize is that reaching a determination of the causes of a criminal act does not necessarily excuse that act. Hitler was still guilty, no matter what influences guided him down the road to a destruction of such mythic proportions.

Finally, one cannot help but wonder what Richard Wagner would have thought about Adolf Hitler, one of his all-time biggest fans !

Richard Wagner, un antisémite Maître spirituel de Hitler ?

À propos du livre de Pierre-André Taguieff : « Wagner contre les Juifs » , éditions Berg International (2012) .

Définir aussi précisément que possible l'antisémitisme de Wagner, sans tomber dans l'anachronisme, ni céder à des raccourcis faciles, tel est l'objectif largement atteint de ce nouveau livre de notre éminent collègue Pierre-André Taguieff. Depuis le beau livre du grand historien israélo-hongrois Jacob Katz qui avait travaillé sur cette même question (« Wagner et la question juive » , traduit en 1986) , 2 écoles s'affrontent sur cette question, à la fois épineuse et cruciale : existe-t-il une ligne historique directe ou indirecte entre la détestation des Juifs par Wagner et l'antisémitisme exterminateur des Nazis ? En termes plus crus : Wagner a-t-il été, d'une manière ou d'une autre, une sorte de Maître à penser d'Adolf Hitler, au point de l'influencer dans son génocide largement planifié du peuple juif ? De la réponse à cette question dépend l'honorabilité ou, au contraire, la déchéance morale du grand musicien. Sans même parler du discrédit qui rejallirait alors inmanquablement sur son œuvre. Il y a, comme vient de l'écrire 2 tendances, grosso modo : l'une prétend que l'auteur de toute cette mythologie musicale germanique n'avait rien à voir avec l'hitlérisme et que sa judéophobie, largement partagée par d'innombrables secteurs de la population allemande au cours de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, faisait partie du « Zeitgeist » , tandis que l'autre entend établir un rapport

incontestable de cause à effet entre les écrits théoriques de Wagner et l'antisémitisme racial et génocidaire des Nazis.

Pierre-André Taguieff a subtilement évité cet écueil dès son titre puisqu'il parle d'un Wagner contre les Juifs. Sans plus. Le reste, le lecteur attentif le découvrira s'il a, comme nous l'espérons, la patience de regarder les choses de près. L'antisémitisme wagnérien est incontestable mais encore faut-il en définir la nature. Wagner a incontestablement cherché à montrer, voire à prouver que la Germanité était inconciliable avec la Judéité. Et ce triste débat a connu un prolongement après la mort de Wagner, en 1912 dans la revue pan-germaniste « Kunstwart », entre Moritz Goldstein et Ernst Lissauer, le 1er se voulait partisan de l'affirmation de l'identité juive tandis que l'autre, auteur du tristement célèbre chant de haine contre l'Angleterre (« Haßgesang gegen England »), optait résolument pour une fusion, une disparition des Juifs au sein de l'ethnie allemande. Détail significatif : le rédacteur en chef de cette revue pan-germaniste, Ferdinand Avenarius, a reconnu avoir près d'une centaine de lettres de ses lecteurs. Il y a de nombreuses années, j'avais eu l'occasion de publier la traduction française de ces textes dont l'arrière-plan wagnérien n'était guère douteux.

Walter Scheel, alors Président de la RFA, avait eu l'idée (bonne ou mauvaise, à chacun de juger) de poser, à sa façon, la question des relations entre Richard Wagner et son admirateur, Adolf Hitler : « Was könnte Wagner dagegen ausrichten, daß Hitler ihn mochte ? » (Que pouvait faire Wagner contre le fait qu'Hitler l'aimait ?). Il n'est pas uniquement question ici de la musique du héros de Bayreuth, mais aussi de l'ensemble de son œuvre théorique puisque l'auteur de l'Anneau du Nibelung avait des idées politiques dont l'axe central demeurait tout de même le rejet, voire la haine du Juif.

On connaît la phrase désabusée de Hitler (« Quand je réalise qu'un Meyerbeer était le contemporain de Wagner ! ») dont le Ministre de la propagande Josef Gœbbels avait largement annexée la musique wagnérienne à la politique culturelle du « Reich ». Mais la tentation fut grande, jadis, de voir en Wagner, l'authentique interprète des mouvements les plus intimes de l'âme germanique, menacée selon lui par les Juifs, peuple étrange et étranger à la fois, venu édulcorer, par sa musique et sa littérature, la pureté et l'authenticité de la race germanique.

Beaucoup de gens importants dans la République des arts et des lettres ont succombé, au moins momentanément au charme de la musique de Wagner : le jeune Nietzsche n'y fait pas exception mais il ne tarda pas à rompre avec un milieu qui lui paraissait infesté de courtisans et de thuriféraires. Il va même jusqu'à écrire qu'il ne manque pas de malhonnêtes gens dans l'entourage du Maître, pas même les antisémites ! On ne peut pas y voir une allusion au gendre (posthume) du Maître, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, mais plutôt à sa propre épouse Cosima qui anima les « Bayreuther Blätter » après la disparition de Wagner.

Avec le soin scrupuleux de l'historien averti et du philologue exigeant, Pierre-André Taguieff revient sur un certain nombre de traductions de Wagner qu'il juge fautives : ainsi propose-t-il de traduire « Das Judentum in der Musik » non plus par « le Judaïsme dans la musique », mais par « la Juiverie dans la musique », au motif que, selon lui, ce terme « Judentum » (dans son orthographe ancienne avec un TH) aurait une connotation largement péjorative et renverrait à des idiosyncrasies cristallisant tout le négatif incarné par le Juif. C'est peut-être vrai, mais au plan géographique, pour marquer les sites d'implantation juive, la langue allemande utilise le terme (que je n'aime pas) de

« Judenschaft » .

Pierre-André Taguieff montre à l'envi que le trait le plus caractéristique de l'antisémitisme de Wagner et de sa chère épouse Cosima est et demeure l'ambiguïté, voire l'ambivalence. Celles-ci éclatent dans toute leur négativité lorsque le Maître et son épouse croient déceler en un Juif bien défini moins de défauts réhivitoires que ceux dont ils ont décidé d'affubler tous les autres. Le cas du chef d'orchestre juif Hermann Lévi, de surcroît fils de rabbin, est éloquent, puisqu'il fut choisi pour diriger « Parsifal » . Il y a aussi le cas d'un autre proche de Wagner, Angelo Neumann, son impresario, l'un des principaux architectes de Bayreuth (il se disait même que c'étaient eux, les Juifs, qui avaient construit le mythe de Bayreuth où ils aimaient se montrer) .

L'attitude face aux Juifs, on l'aura compris, ne laisse pas d'être largement contradictoire, le Maître oscillant entre un pseudo-désir d'être juste et de reconnaître les mérites de chacun, et cette tendance paranoïaque qui lui fait apparaître Giacomo Meyerbeer comme son ennemi mortel, complotant dans l'ombre pour lui nuire et entraver sa propre gloire ainsi que la large diffusion de sa musique. Cette rivalité d'ordre professionnel joue, selon nous, un grand rôle dans le rejet presque psychanalytique du Juif, et on pourrait même y ajouter les doutes que Wagner nourrissait quant à sa filiation. Déjà le livre de Jacob Katz avait accordé de longs développements aux relations de la mère de Wagner et d'un ami de ma famille nommé Ludwig Geyer, un acteur d'origine juive que sa mère épousera environ 1 an après le décès de son époux.

Il reste que Wagner a probablement été le compositeur qui avait le plus lu et médité les ouvrages de philosophie et d'histoire publiés de son temps. Un écrivain, diplomate de son état mais aussi auteur de théories « racialistes » exerça sur Wagner une influence relativement mineure, en raison du pessimisme qui s'exhalait de ses écrits et qui se révéla incompatible avec l'idée de régénération de Wagner. Il s'agit de Joseph Arthur de Gobineau dont la popularité en Allemagne dépassait (et de loin) ce qu'elle avait pu être en France. J'ai pu m'y arrêter longuement dans mon livre intitulé « Renan, la Bible et les Juifs » (publié chez Arléa, en 2009) : même le philosophe-historien de Tréguier sembla peu ouvert au pessimisme foncier du Comte et usa de toutes sortes de subterfuges pour ne pas recenser le 1er volume de son « Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines » . Mais ce fut tout de même Wagner qui parla à Ludwig Schemann de Gobineau dont il allait devenir le traducteur et le grand propagandiste en Allemagne.

Pierre-André Taguieff a mentionné une expression comme le « wagnéro-gobinisme » , qui me paraît fondamentale : elle exprime bien le grand retentissement prodigieux du fameux « Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines » en Allemagne. Mais j'avoue ne pas encore avoir compris pour quelles raisons précises, le rôle de corrupteur, de menace (même biologique) contre le peuple allemand, fut dévolu au Juif. On ne se rend pas immédiatement compte du caractère dévastateur de certaines formules de certains penseurs allemands contemporains, comme par exemple le grand historien nationaliste Heinrich von Treitschke ; ce dernier, empêtré dans une violente controverse avec son alter ego juif, Heinrich Grätz, avait écrit dans les « Annales Prussiennes » une phrase dont il ne soupçonnait nullement l'horrible retentissement : « Die Juden sind unser Unglück » (les Juifs sont notre malheur) .

Comme Wagner chez qui l'on trouve sans peine des formules tout aussi condamnables, l'on ne peut pas affirmer que von Treitschke savait quel usage sanguinaire les Nazis feraient de ses formules, moins de 4 décennies plus tard. Bien

que ces 2 hommes, l'historien et le musicien, aient livré le creuset où s'élaborèrent tous ces ressentiments antisémites, on ne peut pas, sauf à tordre la vérité historique, leur imputer la paternité de l'extermination des juifs d'Europe. L'auteur passe au crible une analyse de Theodor Wiesengrund-Adorno qui impute à Wagner un rôle décisif dans l'extermination physique des Juifs ; Pierre-André Taguieff signale aussi, cependant, que vers la fin de sa vie, le grand universitaire de Francfort-sur-le-Main reconnaissait devant ses fidèles étudiants qu'il n'avait pas observé une distance critique suffisante pour juger objectivement de cette affaire. Il y a, c'est incontestable, cette terrible phrase terminale qui conclut « La juiverie dans la musique : sombrer ! ». Mais Wagner ne fut pas le seul à penser ainsi : j'ai souvenir d'une lettre que Rahel Varnhagen (qui finit par se faire baptiser) adressée à son frère où elle lui recommandait de « tuer les juifs en nous ». Je trouve Rahel bien plus violente que Wagner qui, lui au moins, n'est pas né juif, même si des doutes sérieux subsistent quant à sa réelle filiation.

Cette époque eut le triste privilège d'être celle où la « question juive » (comme aimait à le dire) se posait avec une acuité toute particulière et Pierre-André Taguieff expose dans un chapitre spécifique la solution wagnérienne. En France, on préférait parler du « problème juif » tandis qu'en Allemagne on a toujours dit la « question juive » (« Judenfrage »). On ne s'est jamais posé la question de savoir si les Juifs avaient été perçus par eux-mêmes comme une question ou s'ils n'étaient un problème qu'aux yeux des autres. Ces différentes appellations s'en référaient aux difficultés d'intégrer les Juifs d'Europe au sein de sociétés de culture chrétienne.

Comme Wagner a su se frayer un chemin en direction des riches et des puissants qui l'ont adulé et statué à Bayreuth et ailleurs, on omet souvent de rappeler qu'il fut, dans sa jeunesse, un authentique Romantique révolutionnaire et qu'il participa au soulèvement de Dresde ; il dut même fuir cette ville, en 1849, après avoir fait de l'agitation aux côtés d'un révolutionnaire autrement plus célèbre, Mikhaïl Bakounine. Mais de 1849 à 1871, Wagner avait fini par choisir son camp, celui des forces de la restauration et du conservatisme. Il avait dû affronter la misère pendant quelques années et cette épreuve avait suscité en lui une profonde aspiration : ne plus jamais être dans le besoin, pouvoir se procurer tout ce dont il avait besoin. Il suffit de relire les lignes échangées avec le roi Louis II de Bavière pour s'en convaincre. Il aspirait à devenir un musicien, un artiste d'État, être pensionné dès son plus jeune âge ! Et dans cette quête éperdue d'un bonheur matériel stable, Wagner a considéré que la juiverie, comme il aimait la nommer, était un obstacle sur son chemin. Ce qui explique que son pamphlet « la juiverie dans la musique » n'est nullement une improvisation ni une œuvre de circonstance, mais une véritable profession de foi, un témoignage crucial de sa « Weltanschauung ». Mais cette judéophobie, cet antisémitisme imprégnait largement, comme on l'a relevé supra, l'air du temps, le « Zeitgeist ». Même du côté juif, on pouvait lire les déclarations grinçantes d'un Henri Heine qui n'hésitait pas à maudire la vallée du Nil d'où les enfants d'Israël ont pu s'enfuir pour survivre jusqu'à son époque. Ce Heine qui considérait le judaïsme non point comme une religion (bonne ou mauvaise) mais comme une véritable maladie. À ses yeux, les Juifs souffraient d'une triple affliction : la souffrance, la pauvreté et la maladie car leur judéité n'était rien d'autre qu'une pathologie ! Wagner n'a donc pas tout inventé, l'idéologie antisémite avait déjà de solides soutiens dans le monde des idées. Le pamphlet de Wagner, publié pour la 1^{re} fois en 1850, connut une ré-édition en 1869. Et dans sa lettre à Madame Marie Mouchanoff, Wagner justifie son point de vue, n'hésite pas même à l'aggraver : il se complait dans une sorte de victimologie qui est le fruit de son imagination.

Pour parachever sa volonté de délégitimer le peuple juif, réputé le peuple élu, Wagner n'hésite à faire du peuple

allemand le peuple originel, l' « Urvolk » , une idée déjà utilisée par Fichte dans ses « Discours à la nation allemande » . Mais l'aspect le plus inquiétant et qui pouvait augurer de la suite, à l'insu de son auteur probablement, concerne l'affirmation du caractère indélébile des traits juifs (« jüdische Merkmale ») . Certains antisémites allaient jusqu'à assurer que même la conversion n'y changerait rien. Si l'on pousse un tel raisonnement jusqu'au bout de sa logique criminelle, on aboutit à l'extermination pure et simple. Cependant, on ne trouve pas une telle déclaration explicitement énoncée dans l'ensemble de l'œuvre de Richard Wagner. Mais on est conduit à se poser la même question : pourquoi un tel acharnement ? Une telle obsession ? Certes, Wagner a pu avoir des concurrents juifs (Giacomo Meyerbeer, Jacques Offenbach) , mais cela justifiait-il une telle attitude ? À près de 20 ans d'intervalle, cette monomanie n'avait pris une ride, bien au contraire, elle s'affirmait avec toujours plus de force. L'historien des idées Hans Mayer, cité par Pierre-André Taguieff, rappelle que l'Allemagne de cette époque, en gésine d'un sauveur, voulait voir dans tout artiste créatif et inspiré, un sorte de génie, de sauveur ou de prophète, porteur d'un idéal quasi-messianique. Il n'est pas exclu que Wagner se soit senti investi d'une telle mission. Héros et prophète de l'Allemagne et de son génie insurpassable qu'il incarnait pleinement, quiconque se dressait sur son chemin devenait son ennemi et « eo ipso » celui de l'Allemagne dans son ensemble !

Le grand compositeur était animé d'un énorme ressentiment et éprouvait tant de sentiments de frustration : ainsi, après son échec retentissant à Paris, il envisagea, d'après le journal intime de sa femme Cosima, de demander à Bismarck d'écraser Paris sous les obus de son artillerie, voire même de brûler la capitale française qui faisait figure de grande pécheresse à ses yeux : vouloir annihiler toute une métropole au motif exclusif qu'elle n'avait pas honneur à l'un de ses drames musicaux. Wagner n'avait probablement jamais feuilleté le livre de Jonas qui exhale son dépit lorsque le Seigneur refuse d'annihiler Ninive et tous ses habitants.

Richard Wagner a-t-il été influencé dans son antisémitisme par les courants philosophiques irriguant l'Allemagne de son époque ? C'est quasi certain et la phrase de George Lachmann Mosse selon lequel l'antisémitisme allemand fait partie de l'histoire intellectuelle allemande recouvre, hélas, une triste réalité ! Et je me permets d'ajouter que vu mon cursus, c'est un constat qui me coûte. Le fondateur de la germanistique française, le grand Charles Andler (qui a, en autres, bien étudié les œuvres de Friedrich Nietzsche) et qui, natif d'Alsace en 1866, ressentit dans sa chair les oppositions franco-allemandes de son temps, nous a appris que nous devons faire le départ entre l'Allemagne spirituelle (« das geistige Deutschland ») et l'Allemagne politico-militaire, incarnée par le chancelier de fer Otto von Bismarck. Nous devons étudier les œuvres impérissables de la Ire sans nous préoccuper des méfaits de la seconde. Visiblement, Mosse va bien plus loin puisqu'il semble affirmer que la grande majorité des penseurs, philosophes et écrivains de l'aire germanique sont coupables d'antisémitisme.

Que Ludwig Feuerbach avec ses conceptions matérialistes ait cloué au pilori le christianisme, mais surtout sa source originelle, le judaïsme, pour privilégier le polythéisme grec, il n'y a là rien d'étonnant. Mais sa critique de la religion juive glisse inéluctablement vers des idées largement antisémites. Est-ce une nouveauté ? Pas vraiment, puisque même un homme comme Kant, pourtant ami de Juifs comme Markus Herz et Salomon Maimon (tous deux admiratifs de son criticisme) , ne nourrissait pas à l'égard du judaïsme des idées neutres. Il refusa de placer le judaïsme parmi les religions ou les spiritualités, arguant que c'était un conglomérat de statuts et articula même la violente accusation d' « Ethnizismus » (ethnisme) contre lui. Hermann Cohen, son disciple de Marbourg, signala cette tendance dans le

recueil d'Écrits juifs (« Jüdische Schriften ») . Pourtant, les Kantiens juifs furent légion, même en Israël où l'on se montra très favorable à cet impératif catégorique qui évoquait aux yeux des Juifs religieux la notion de loi, et donc de Tora, contrairement à l'antinomisme Paulinien qui finit s'imposer au sein du christianisme primitif.

Mais Fichte ira, selon moi, bien plus loin, en dépit de son introduction dans les salons berlinois grâce à une célèbre femme juive. Ce philosophe nationaliste allemand (il suffit de se reporter à ses « Discours à la nation allemande » pour s'en convaincre) ne respectait véritablement qu'un seul Juif, Salomon Maimon, en raison de sa publication intitulée « Essai de philosophie transcendante » . Il ne tarissait pas d'éloges sur son mentor juif qui avait adressé au criticisme Kantien des remarques qui ont permis à l'idéalisme d'avoir une seconde vie. Fichte ne disait-il pas qu'il rêvait de couper la tête de tous les Juifs afin de la recoudre avec d'autres idées ? Voici un argument quelque peu étonnant sous la plume d'un philosophe ! En fait, Fichte ne supportait pas l'idée de l'élection divine des Juifs ni surtout leur statut de peuple prétendument originel. Il destinait cette place si enviée à son propre peuple, les Allemands. Et cette idée que le salut viendrait un jour du peuple allemand se retrouve, bien plus tard, même dans la bouche d'un social-démocrate allemand, Gustav Stresemann qui fit, en 1918, alors que son pays avait subi une effroyable défaite, la proclamation suivante : « Am deutschen Wesen wird die Welt genesen » (C'est par l'essence allemande que le monde sera régénéré.) . Cette « usurpation » messianique a donc fait florès depuis le milieu du XIXe siècle.

Arthur Schopenhauer ne fait pas exception dans cette galerie de philosophes germaniques, lui qui assignait au Nouveau Testament des origines hindoues ou brahmanes et ne voulait pas entendre parler de judaïsme qu'il stigmatisait copieusement pour sa joyeuse prise de possession du monde et pour son optimisme. Il reprenait les idées de Marcion dont le souci majeur est de couper l'Église de toutes ses racines juives. Mais l'auteur du « Monde comme volonté et représentation » (un livre qui avait nettement séduit son lecteur Wagner lequel lui tressa des couronnes sa vie durant) allait bien plus loin puisqu'il refusait le récit biblique de l'Exode des Hébreux d'Égypte, arguant que ce sont les Égyptiens qui les chassèrent du pays en raison de leurs maladies contagieuses et leur irrépressible kleptomane. Il ajoutait même que les chiffres avancés par la Bible étaient fantaisistes car comment un tel désert aurait-il pu fournir une alimentation suffisante pour une telle population ? Et pour bien montrer de quel côté penchait son cœur, Schopenhauer concluait que le monothéisme (originellement juif) avait pour corollaire l'intolérance. C'est ce philosophe qui insistera le plus sur ce qu'il nommait la « puanteur juive » , une remarque qui marquera profondément son fidèle lecteur Wagner.

Le problème auquel ce brillant ouvrage de Pierre-André Taguieff tente d'apporter une réponse est, on se le rappelle, le suivant : quel fut l'apport spécifique, individuel et originel de Wagner à l'antisémitisme allemand en général et dans quelle mesure a-t-il fourni des arguments (ou des munitions) à la Shoah ? Certains ont voulu voir en Wagner le père spirituel d'Adolf Hitler, mais il s'agit là d'un saisissant raccourci que les historiens les plus réputés et les plus fiables ont (à juste titre) refusé de valider. Taguieff consacre à cette problématique son chapitre le plus long et le plus nourri. On y rencontre un Wagner, certes, fidèle à ses idées mais qui refuse de signer une pétition publique d'une ligue antisémite par trop voyante et bruyante, redoutant peut-être des conséquences qu'il pourrait regretter par la suite. Mais cette retenue n'est pas du tout un retrait, l'homme reste fidèle à ses idées développées dans « la Juiverie dans la musique » tant en 1850 que 19 années plus tard.

Il convient de ne pas oublier les effets pervers de la grande crise économique qui suivit les fameuses « Gründerjahre » de l'ère Bismarckienne ; et là aussi, les Juifs devaient jouer le rôle de bouc-émissaire (« Sündenbock ») puisqu'on voyait en eux soit les instigateurs de la dépression soit ceux qui en tiraient le plus grand profit. Plus tard, lorsque le spectre de la Grande Guerre se profila avec une insistance toujours plus grande sur l'Europe, les Partis et les journaux antisémites désignèrent les Juifs comme les vrais responsables, les organisateurs de ce complot ourdi contre l'Allemagne avec la complicité active des grandes puissances, la France et l'Angleterre. Du coup, lorsque sonna l'heure de la défaite, les Juifs se retrouvèrent une fois encore sur le banc des accusés. Erich Ludendorff, le généralissime allemand, n'hésite pas à écrire dans un ouvrage paru en 1921 que « la juiverie internationale » (« Das Weltjudentum ») est responsable de la défaite de l'Allemagne. Les forces armées allemandes estimaient avoir été trahies par l'arrière alors qu'elles tenaient bon au front. D'où la fameuse légende du coup de poignard dans le dos (« Dolchstoßlegende ») .

On s'appuya, pour ce faire, sur les Protocoles des sages de Sion : même Adolf Hitler s'y réfèrera dans « Mein Kampf » en s'en prenant violemment aux Juifs. Le « Führer » stigmatisait le bolchévisme juif tandis que d'autres clouaient au pilori le rôle des Juifs dans le système capitaliste. Leur action politique dissolvante (certains d'entre eux dirigeaient la social-démocratie allemande, voire des mouvements d'extrême gauche) avait fini par causer la perte de la patrie allemande. Au fond, on finit toujours par retrouver le même raisonnement : le Juif, élément étranger, inassimilable, inéliminable, étranger nulle part et partout chez lui, dissout petit à petit l'identité germanique de l'Allemagne et mutile gravement l'âme de son peuple. Un peu plus tard, on stigmatisera la main mise des Juifs sur la presse, notamment libérale, et cela donnera naissance à la terrible accusation de « reptilisme journalistique » . Toujours, cette vieille assimilation du Juif à un animal venimeux dont le poison tue.

À la suite de spécialistes israéliens, Pierre-André Taguieff nous livre d'intéressants commentaires sur la fluidité terminologique des antisémites allemands de l'époque, et notamment de Wagner lui-même. Comme le discours antisémite est tout sauf cohérent (même lorsqu'il n'est pas dépourvu d'une certaine logique délirante interne) ses partisans font preuve involontairement d'un certain éclectisme, ce qui complique d'autant la définition même de leur haine anti-juive : est-ce un racisme biologique, la conviction que les Juifs sont définitivement un élément étranger inassimilable ? Est-ce que la solution de la question juive ne pouvait être que la « solution finale » (« Endlösung ») ? La question ne se laisse pas trancher facilement. Existe-t-il vraiment un lien direct entre Adolf Hitler, Alfred Rosenberg, Houston Stewart Chamberlain et Richard Wagner qui serait la base de ce monstrueux montage ? Au fond, c'est là toute la question car même Wagner ne répugnait pas, à l'occasion, à emprunter à la terminologie de l'antisémitisme biologique. Ne dit-il pas à maintes reprises, et dès les Ires lignes de « La Juiverie dans la musique » , que la seule présence (physique) d'un Juif dans son entourage suscitait en lui un sentiment de rejet et de malaise ? Ce wagnérisme a-t-il influencé Hitler ? On a du mal à tirer cela au clair car l'adolescent Hitler avait bien assisté à des représentations de Wagner dans sa ville de province et, en 1923, il reconnaîtra qu'il fut immédiatement conquis par un Maître qui savait, mieux que tout autre parler à l'âme allemande. Ayant conquis le pouvoir, le « Führer » instrumentaliserait les drames musicaux avec le redoutable concours d'un grand spécialiste de la propagande comme le docteur Josef Göbbels.

On ne doit pas omettre de souligner l'importance qui revient à l'ouvrage d'Alfred Rosenberg, « le Mythe du XXe siècle », paru en 1930 et où l'auteur tresse des couronnes à Wagner dont il fait l'interprète le plus accompli de la race nordique-germanique où les Juifs n'ont aucune place et d'où ils doivent être chassés. Dans cet ouvrage, Rosenberg se fait le champion du « désenjuivement » (« Entjudung ») puisque, selon lui, l'Allemagne souffre de « l'enjuivement » (« Verjudung »). À la lecture de tels syntagmes dont la seule langue allemande semble avoir le secret, on peine à en croire ses yeux ! Quand on pense à tous ces écrivains judéo-allemands qui érigèrent les plus beaux monuments de la littérature et de la philosophie allemandes et qui firent de cette langue le médium linguistique le plus influent de l'Europe de l'entre 2 guerres, on se demande quelle maladie a bien pu s'abattre sur ces gens. Ignoraient-ils la « Lorelei » de Heinrich Heine ou les « Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten » (Contes villageois de la Forêt-Noire) de Berthold Auerbach, un petit-fils de rabbin, qui avait même songé un temps à marcher sur les traces de son grand-père.

Je m'arrête un instant sur cette phrase incroyable de Paul de Lagarde qui affirmait sans rire : « Nous sommes antisémites mais pas des ennemis des Juifs. ». Voulait-on simplement dire que les Juifs devaient abandonner leur attachement à leur religion et à leur nationalité antique, en somme réaliser une conversion foncière au christianisme, et qu'une fois que cette formalité sera accomplie, le problème juif serait résolu ? Dans ce cas, il ne s'agirait pas ici d'une racialisation du Juif mais d'une simple coercition à caractère religieux, un peu comme le décret d'expulsion d'Isabelle la catholique qui laissait aux Juifs le choix entre la conversion et l'expulsion des possessions de la couronne. Une déclaration de Wagner, « Connais-toi toi-même », une phrase qui se retrouve, sous une forme très proche, dans « Mein Kampf » d'Hitler : Wagner parle de l'exemple le plus étonnant de permanence raciale que l'histoire mondiale ait jamais produit. Hitler, quant à lui, évoque le plus fort et le plus persistant instinct de conservation de ce peuple (« der stärkste Selbsterhaltungstrieb dieses Volkes »). Le « Führer » s'est simplement contenté de paraphraser sa source wagnérienne !

Pierre-André Taguieff montre qu'il y a Wagner et le wagnérisme car il est indéniable que le gendre et le thuriféraire du musicien, Chamberlain, a infléchi sa pensée politique dans le sens souhaité par les Nazis. Il serait donc en majeure partie responsable de la nazification à la fois de l'œuvre et des idées de son idole. Mais il y a plus : le « Cas Wagner » est insaisissable, même s'il a proféré des phrases qui, dûment nazifiées, ont conduit à une apocalypse. J'apprécie les 2 dernières phrases de Pierre-André Taguieff qui parle de la tâche indélébile de l'antisémitisme sur l'œuvre de Wagner tout en ajoutant que cette série de paradoxes nous donne matière à penser. Jacob Katz allait dans le même sens en écrivant à la fin de son ouvrage, « le Cas Wagner » : « Wagner sitzt zu Gericht über Wagner. » (Wagner comparaît devant lui-même, devant sa conscience.), s'il en avait vraiment une.

Un rapide coup d'œil sur les textes de Wagner excellemment traduits et très bien annotés montre que notre homme pensait les Juifs et les Allemands dans des catégories strictement antinomiques. Ceci est particulièrement criant dans la lettre à Madame Marie Mouchanoff et dans le texte intitulé « Modernes », ce dernier me rappelant le texte désespéré de Moritz Goldstein (Kunswart, 1912) où on pouvait lire cette phrase que même Wagner ne renierait pas : « Nous autres Juifs gérons le patrimoine culturel d'un peuple qui nous dénie le droit de le faire. ».

Une chose me touche au plus profond de moi-même : ce Wagner avait dit de lui-même qu'il était le plus allemand de tous les Allemands. Et pour nous qui avons porté au pinacle la langue et la philosophie allemandes dont il se

prétendait le produit le plus abouti, ne sommes nous pas passés à côté de l'essentiel ?

(Maurice-Ruben Hayoun)

Philosophe, exégète et historien des idées, Maurice-Ruben Hayoun, professeur des Universités de Strasbourg, de Bâle, et d'Heidelberg est un spécialiste reconnu de la philosophie juive médiévale et de la pensée judéo-allemande.

The Psychopathology of Richard Wagner (Borderline Personality Disorder)

Richard Wagner is considered one of the most important and influential figures in the history of Western music. His music is among the greatest and most popular ever written, and can be heard around the world in concert halls, Opera Houses and, even, in movies and cartoons. At the same time, Wagner remains « one of the most controversial figures of his or any age » due to his anti-Semitism, fervent dislike of the French and their Operas, contradiction filled prose works on musical and political topics, and his desire to save and restore Germany and German culture through his art works. Over the years, the terms « egotist », « narcissist », « anti-Semite », and others have been used to describe Wagner. However, more effort should be expended on discovering evidence of psychological or psychiatric conditions that may have influenced his behaviors, as he was surely an individual who « strayed beyond the normal parameters of mental health ». As Julius Kapp stated :

« A one sided impression of him, such as he himself created in the Autobiography at the expense of his environment, cannot, in the interests of research, be tolerated ; for research demands that justice shall be done also to those who were in touch with him, and that, in so far as a re-examination of reliable sources is feasible, tendenciousness shall be replaced by an objective picture. »

In 2003, Professor John Louis Di Gaetani published a book entitled « Wagner and Suicide », in which he proposed, based on evidence from Wagner's letters, autobiography, Operas, and biographies about Wagner that the composer suffered from Bipolar Disorder. Likewise, I am proposing, based on evidence from not only his correspondence and biographical literature, but from research on Borderline Personality Disorder from mental health professionals, that Wagner may have suffered from Borderline Personality Disorder, possibly in addition to Bipolar Disorder. I do so by examining Wagner's letters and the biographies about him to find instances where his behavior matched the accepted behaviors of Borderline Personality Disorder as indicated in the latest edition of the « Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Text Revision » and other relevant sources.

Since I am not a psychology, psychiatry, or any other kind of medical or mental health student or professional, I am not qualified to render a definitive diagnosis of anything on to anyone. For this reason, I feel it is imperative that I use relevant source material from mental health professionals to support the ideas in this paper. I believe that my research strategy, because it uses research and evidence from actual mental health experts, convincingly supports my ideas. I am aware that it is not possible to arrive at an indisputable conclusion. I have merely proposed an idea, and have provided relevant data to support it.

The « Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 4th Edition Text Revision » , from 2000, lists 9 criteria for diagnosing an individual with Borderline Personality Disorder (page 710) . Any 5 of the 9 must be present in order to render a legitimate diagnosis. The 7 (instead of the minimum of 5) criteria that I believe Wagner displayed most strongly are :

Frantic efforts to avoid real or imagined abandonment.

A pattern of unstable and intense interpersonal relationships characterized by alternating between extremes of idealization and devaluation.

Identity disturbance : markedly and persistently unstable self-image or sense of self.

Impulsivity in at least 2 areas that are potentially self-damaging (e.g. , spending, sex, substance abuse, reckless driving, binge eating) .

Recurrent suicidal behavior, gestures, or threats, or self-mutilating behavior.

Chronic feelings of emptiness.

Inappropriate, intense anger or difficulty controlling anger (e.g. , frequent displays of temper, constant anger, recurrent physical fights) .

The other 2 main criteria of the disorder are :

Affective instability due to a marked reactivity of mood (e.g. , intense episodic dysphoria, irritability, or anxiety usually lasting a few hours and only rarely more than a few days) .

Transient, stress-related paranoid ideation or severe dissociative symptoms.

I used the evidence of Wagner's behaviors to complete the « Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria » (MIDC) , developed by Doctor Aubrey Immelman of the Psychology Department of the College of Saint-Benedict at Saint John's University, in Minnesota. Doctor Immelman described the MIDC as « more applicable and yielding richer and more nuanced results of evaluating public figures at a distance » than the DSM alone. I initially contacted Doctor Immelman because I discovered that he conducted a posthumous psychological evaluation of one of the 9 / 11 hijackers. Since I have engaged in a similar project (a posthumous psychological evaluation of a person) , I contacted him for his input and opinions on the general idea and research strategies I have used. Doctor Immelman sent me the MIDC and instructed me to fill it out with the relevant data about Wagner's behaviors and to send it to him so he could make a judgment of whether Wagner displayed borderline tendencies. I sent Doctor Immelman the MIDC with the relevant information on January 17, 2010, and on January 19, 2010, I received an e-mail from him that contained the following quote :

« I think you have sufficient data to demonstrate a borderline pattern in Wagner. »

As for the 1st criterion, I have found information regarding his relationship to Minna Planer, his 1st wife. Wagner « thought he could not live without her » and that « it seemed impossible for him to live with her, but he could never really break free ». He also expressed fears of the abandonment that would come with his mother's passing in a letter to her from July 25, 1835 :

« O Mother, what if you should prematurely die, ere I had fully proved to you that it was to a worthy son, of boundless gratitude, you shewed so great a love ! »

Elbert Lenrow proposed that Wagner's autobiography, « Mein Leben » (My Life) , was written solely to « repay everyone he knew for real or fancied wrongs done to him » .

As for the 2nd criterion, I have found evidence that suggests that he experienced this kind of pattern in his relationships with his friends until they refused to lend him money. (On this matter, Alfred Einstein wrote that « Wagner was unable to hold a single friend, without crises, to the end of his life » .) An example of this is his friendship with Baron Robert von Hornstein, in the late- 1850's. Although they had a close relationship, Wagner eventually « devalued » Hornstein for his refusal to lend him money, in addition to another extravagant request. In response to Hornstein's letter, in which he refused to send him money, Wagner wrote that « it will probably not happen again that a man like me will apply to you » citing the « impropriety of your Hornstein's letter and labelling him totally ignorant of my works ». Wagner seems to have displayed idealization and devaluation on a much larger scale when, in 1849, he glorified the common working people in a prose work called « The Revolution », yet, in a letter from December 30, 1851, to his friend Kietz, he referred to his :

« Most bloody hatred of our entire civilization, and contempt for all that it has produced. That I ever set store by the workers as workers is something I must now atone for grievously : with the noises they make, these workers are the wretchedest slaves, whom anyone can control nowadays if he promises them plenty of " work ". In the whole of Europe, however, I prefer dogs to these doglike men. »

As for the 3rd criterion, with the elaboration from the DSM-III-R, from 1987, I believe that Wagner displayed this « markedly and persistently unstable self-image or sense of self ». Interestingly, it has been proposed that this can be caused by changes in « the fabric of traditional and organized societies », such as Wagner may have experienced growing-up in a society that was being changed by « rapid industrialization, immigration, mobility, technology, and mass communication » as well as by changes in his personal world as a result of being born « into a War torn country and a frequently uprooted family ». Garten explained this feeling of uncertainty of identity :

« At an age when most other composers had already achieved some Masterpieces or, at any rate, established their unmistakable identity, Wagner was drifting aimlessly, unsure which way to go. What is more, for quite some time, he vacillated between drama and music. »

Wagner also changed his outlook on musical aesthetics as well as political philosophy throughout his life. In his younger years, he was a « Young German » with left-wing political beliefs but, in his later years, he became disillusioned with the world and with politics and began following the pessimistic philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer. « In any case, he changed some of his key views over the years, in part radically, he rarely acknowledged the fact publicly and probably did not always admit it to himself. » These changes in beliefs have been attributed to the idea that : « Wagner did what most people tend to do in the fullness of time. He changed. » . However, I believe that his mental state may have had an influence on these changes, as they are too far reaching to be due to coincidence. For instance, in the years following his exile from Dresden, in 1849, he expounded his ideas of the « gesamtkunstwerk » or « total work of art » , in which music, dance, singing, and the visual arts of painting, architecture, and sculpture would be combined to achieve the large dramatic result, thus creating a more or less equal partnership between music and the other arts for this purpose. However, he seems to have deviated from this belief not only in that « it is music that in his “ Gesamtkunstwerk ” wins the real and final victories » but that it did so to the highest degree in « Tristan und Isolde » , completed in 1859, several years after he worked-out these theories.

As for the 4th criterion, I have found evidence to suggest that he behaved in self-damaging ways by engaging in reckless spending and substance abuse. « Hurn and Root » stated that :

« Wagner was always short of money. He never had as much as he wanted. This was partly because he wanted so much. His tastes were extremely extravagant. He ran through considerable sums in years when he was living in poverty because he spent as fast as he borrowed ; more often, he spent faster. He had to be smuggled across the frontier, at Riga, because he had left so many debts behind him. »

As for the 5th criterion, I have found information from his letters that would suggest suicidal intentions. In a letter to Franz Liszt, from March 30, 1853, Wagner stated :

« My nights are mostly sleepless ; weary and miserable, I rise from my bed to see a day before me which will bring me not one joy. Intercourse with people who torture me, and from whom I withdraw to torture myself ! I feel disgust at whatever I undertake. This cannot go on ; I cannot bear life much longer. »

In a letter from December 17th, 1853, he wrote :

« My head is burning. There is something wrong with me ; and sometimes, with lightning like rapidity, the thought flashed through me that it would be better, after all, if I died. »

In a letter from January 15, 1854, to Franz Liszt, Wagner wrote :

« Not a year of my life has passed recently without my finding myself at least once on the very brink of a decision to end my life. » .

Wagner also wrote in a letter to Otto Wesendonck :

« My life is a sea of contradictions, from which I can only hope to emerge through death. »

These letters seem to reflect « bouts of suicidal despair » .

As for the 6th criterion, I have found information in his letters. For instance, in a letter to Anton Pusinelli from February 9, 1866, he wrote :

« Oh God, how sad, how sad I am ! There are only wounds and scars in my heart, scarcely one single sound place. Life is boundlessly difficult for me, and the longer I live, the more difficult it becomes ! »

I believe that the letters in which he expresses suicidal intentions are indicative of « chronic feelings of emptiness » , especially if these feelings are so strong as to cause the person to wish for death.

As for the 7th criterion, I have found mention of incidents of domestic violence towards Minna Planer. There were « violent arguments between the 2 of them » in which he would « rant and rave all night, committing acts of domestic violence so serious that Minna “ lay there in convulsions for hours on end ”. Overcome by remorse, he would then throw himself at her feet and, weeping, “ beg for forgiveness like a child ”. » . 6 months after Wagner and Minna got married, « Minna, battered and bewildered by her husband’s lightning switches of mood from towering rage to tearful remorse, ran-off with a merchant » . His letters also express threats of violence should Minna not return to him and commit herself entirely to him. A letter to her from November 7, 1835, states :

« Open your heart Minna, if you don’t I am going to compel you ; by God, I shall come to Berlin and tear you away by force. »

A letter from the next day to Minna states :

« What is there left to say after my previous letters, to the girl whose heart has not been touched by these entreaties, by these presentations, these offers ? This girl would no longer be touched in her heart - only by a sharp knife. »

Most disconcerting is the contrast between these letters and his intention, expressed in a letter to her from a few days before, on November 4, to send « from now on only quite calm letters » .

It is also important to note that « separation from or loss of primary caregivers in childhood is associated with the development of the disorder » . Wagner’s father, Carl Friedrich Wagner, passed away in a typhus epidemic when Wagner was 6 months old and his « adoptive » father, Ludwig Geyer, who married Wagner’s mother Johanna after Carl’s death, passed away when Wagner was 8 years old.

I believe that Wagner displayed one of the emotional responses inherent in borderlines known as « projection » , which is « the displacement of the hate and anger those with borderline personality disorders feel towards themselves and attributing these unacceptable parts of themselves to others. Rather than dislike themselves, borderline patients believe it is others who dislike them and cause their problems » . For instance, he blamed Minna Planer's « mere existence for having “ destroyed ” his position as conductor in Dresden, when it is plain that he himself was largely responsible for the destruction of this as well as of his wife's position and possibly life » .

It seems that Wagner also displayed another one of the common emotional responses in borderlines known as « splitting » , which is the perception of « persons and institutions as all good or ideal, or all bad with no redeeming qualities » . One instance of this is in his views on Bismarck. He referred to him as a « barbarian Junker » when he argued against the rule of Germany by Prussia or Austria, but then held him to be the « new savior of Germany » and lauded Prussia as « the wave of the German future » and the embodiment of « the true German spirit » . He subsequently returned to a negative outlook on Bismarck, referring to him as a « pig caller » when he would not agree to fund Wagner's Bayreuth enterprise after a Prussian military victory.

Wagner also seemed to display « prominent patterns of manipulation of others » that are common in borderlines. « Wagner became a virtuoso at raking in money and, as in his art, he was not afraid of using extreme means, the excuses that he offered ranging from an urgent need for medical supplies to the threat of imprisonment for debt, a threat that on one occasion he even claimed had been realized. » He did this with « the cunning of little boys who often succeed in persuading their parents to buy them what they want » . He also seemed to manipulate his friends with efforts of « guilt tripping » , in order to obtain money from them. For instance, in a letter from November of 1862 to his niece Franziska, he asked her to ask a friend of his for a rather large loan, claiming that worrying about this matter had caused him to experience « a sleepless night » and also stating that « you alone can work it » . I believe that he behaved manipulatively in his political endeavors as well, as he was interested in the overthrow of the government in favor of one « whose chief interest would be Opera » so that he may achieve his own artistic dreams.

Although I have received the agreement of a psychiatrist for the idea that Richard Wagner may have had a borderline personality, it is not possible to absolutely prove that he suffered from one mental illness or another. However, it is still quite interesting to explore the literature on his life to obtain information that would suggest that he did, as it provides a more informed and enriched perspective through which we can view Wagner, and helps us to better understand how a creative genius can be afflicted with mental and emotional obstacles throughout his or her life. It is fascinating how, even though oppressed by personal and mental barriers, Wagner's mind was able to flourish and operate in such a way as to create some of the greatest musical art in existence. As Revelli wrote :

« To this great Master, the Orchestra of today owes a debt of gratitude, as do thousands of conductors, hundreds of thousands of musicians, and millions of music lovers, the world over. »

Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn et Mahler

Giacomo Meyerbeer (1791-1864) , Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (1809-1847) et Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) ont fait

l'objet d'un acharnement idéologique dans la politique musicale nationale-socialiste. La figure de Meyerbeer est évoquée dans le contexte du séjour parisien de Richard Wagner. Ce dernier, malgré les échanges qu'ils aient pu avoir, s'est empressé par la suite de dénigrer le compositeur de « Robert le diable ». Les théoriciens antisémites ne manquèrent pas d'amplifier cette querelle à des fins de propagande. Le régime nazi ne ménagea pas non plus ses efforts pour effacer le souvenir de Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, dont la famille était d'origine juive. Dans la nuit du 9 au 10 novembre 1936, le monument édifié en son honneur, en 1892, devant le « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig fut démantelé. La même année, la rue portant son nom fut rebaptisée rue « Anton Bruckner ». Enfin, une série de commandes officielles devant donner naissance à un « Songe d'une nuit d'été » « arien » fut initiée.

Si le compositeur fait également l'objet d'un rejet de caractère racial, Adolf Hitler a toujours conservé une certaine estime pour Gustav Mahler chef d'orchestre, notamment dans la production de « Tristan und Isolde » mis-en-scène par Alfred Roller, spectacle qu'il avait vu à l'Opéra de Vienne lors de ses années d'apprentissage avant la Première Guerre mondiale. Parue dans la foulée des « Journées musicales du " Reich " » de 1938 et de son congrès sur « Musique et race », l'étude de Karl Blessinger « Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Mahler ». 3 chapitres du Judaïsme dans la musique comme clé pour l'histoire de la musique du XIXe siècle (1939) fut abondamment citée dans les ouvrages postérieurs, notamment dans le « Dictionnaire des Juifs dans la musique » (1940). L'auteur fait remonter au XIXe siècle l'influence nocive du judaïsme dans la musique. Blessinger distingue 3 époques représentées par 3 compositeurs emblématiques : Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, « le Juif assimilé » ; Meyerbeer, le « Juif affairiste sans scrupules » ; et Mahler, le « type fanatique du rabbin d'Europe de l'Est ». Le livre de Blessinger fut ré-édité en 1944 sous le titre plus concis de « Judaïsme et musique ».

...

Felix Mendelssohn, whose Symphonies, Concertos and lieder had remained a basic part of bourgeois music culture, was another matter. The composer, who had converted to Christianity as a child, was eliminated, step by step, from German musical life. In 1936, the Mendelssohn monument in Leipzig, where he had lived and worked for many years, was destroyed under cover of darkness, and the family descendants were bullied and forced into exile. A famously absurd attempt was made to replace Mendelssohn's music for Shakespeare's « A Midsummer Night's Dream ». The music, today the composer's most popular work, had been banned, but it had traditionally been used for performances of the play. Hans Pfitzner refused to provide a replacement in contrast to the ambitious young Carl Orff.

In the years around the « fin-de-siècle », a 3rd « Music Jew » came to the prominence, alongside Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn : Gustav Mahler. He, too, was helped little by his conversion to Catholicism. This permitted him the office of artistic director of the Vienna Court Opera, but did not protect him from the anti-Semitic campaigns which began as soon as he took on a leading position in Viennese cultural life and which followed him, with varying intensity, for the rest of his life. These campaigns, to be sure, were nonetheless directed less against Mahler, the conductor, than against Mahler, the composer. Mahler sought to escape this problem through suppression and concealment, and to a certain extent he succeeded. After his death, however, the discussions of the futility of his artistic efforts and of the absence of « true German depth » in his works continued with unabated intensity. One must consider, as drastic as it is, the truth : Had Gustav Mahler not died in 1911, he would have had to experience, at the age of 78, Hitler

marching into Vienna and his enthusiastic reception there. He would have been bullied and deprived of his rights, as happened to Sigmund Freud, and had he not as Freud did chosen emigration in his old age, he would have been, and this may be said with certainty, deported to an extermination camp, as happened to his niece Alma Rosé.

To recall how the approach taken with these 3 composers of international reputation in the spirit of Richard Wagner, to whom go back all demonizations of Jewish composers set the tone for what happened to living composers and musicians, whether Jewish or, though non-Jewish, undesirable, whether politically or because proponents of avant-garde music (« Neutöner ») , one might have a look at the 1939 work of the National-Socialist musicologist Karl Blessinger, « Mendelssohn - Meyerbeer - Mahler. Drei Kapitel Judentum in der Musik als Schlüssel zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts » (Mendelssohn - Meyerbeer - Mahler. 3 Chapters of Jewry in Music as Key to the Music History of the 19th Century) . The formulation alone explains why works of these 3 composers form the basis of the program for Thomas Hampson's concerts, even though they were not directly affected by exile and persecution.

The « cardiac asthma of exile » (Thomas Mann) found its most compelling poetic formulation in the words of the emigrant Bertolt Brecht. A verse from his poem « An die Nachgeborenen » (To Those Born After) reads thus :

I would also like to be wise.

In the old books it says what wisdom is :

To shun the strife of the world and to live-out your brief time without fear

to get by, too, without violence

to repay evil with good

not to fulfill your desires but to forget them is thought wise.

All this I cannot do :

Truly, I live in dark times !

The composers of our lied project lived, like Brecht and millions of others, in truly dark times. Whatever their personal fates, they survived in their music. To remember this is our obligation. In the words of Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer :

« What is of value is not the conservation of the past, but instead the redemption of past hope. »

The author, born in Salzburg in 1943, studied German literature, history, musicology and voice. From 1982 to 1988, he was professor of literature at the University of Siegen. Since 1989, he is professor of theatre studies at the University of Munich. Author of many books, including : « Große Stimmen : Von Enrico Caruso zu Jessye Norman » (1993) ; « Jahrhundertdämmerung : Ansichten eines anderen “ Fin-de-siècle ” » (2000) ; « Richard Wagner's “ Das Judentum in der Musik ” » (2000) ; « Gustav Mahler : Der fremde Vertraute » (2003) .

Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy : The Jewish Question

Mendelssohn dual name reflects a multi-faceted religious identity, but Hitler's 3rd « Reich » homed in on his

Jewishness and banned Felix Mendelssohn's music.

On the paternal side, Mendelssohn was the grandson of the 18th Century Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786) , but was not raised in the Jewish faith.

On March 21, 1816 (as it happened, the birthday of Johann Sebastian Bach) , he was baptized, along with his 3 siblings, as a Lutheran. His parents, Abraham and Lea Mendelssohn, were baptized a few years later.

To acknowledge their new spiritual identity, the family adopted a 2nd surname, so that Felix Mendelssohn became Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. Abraham intended that, eventually, his family would omit the Mendelssohn name altogether. His son never did so, however, and continued to sign his letters and publish his music under his dual name.

The issues of religious identity and intra-faith tolerance are critical to our understanding of the composer's life and work. Of Moses Mendelssohn's 6 children who survived into adulthood, 2 preserved their Jewish faith, while 2 converted to Lutheranism, and 2 to Catholicism.

Given this family history, it is telling that Mendelssohn set sacred texts for a variety of faiths, not just Lutheran, but Anglican and Catholic texts (« Tu Es Petrus » , « Lauda Sion ») .

He wrote a short hymn setting for the Huguenot church and, towards the end of his life, was in correspondence with the « Neues Tempel » of Hamburg, which commissioned him to compose several Cantata-like Psalm settings, ultimately unfulfilled.

Though Christian by virtue of his baptism and practising faith, Mendelssohn remained in the eyes of many a Jew. His family's wealth partially insulated him from anti-Semitic sentiments of the time ; but after his death, Richard Wagner attacked the composer's memory in a racist essay published anonymously, in 1850.

Wagner maintained that as a Jew, Mendelssohn could only imitate the profundities of Bach and Beethoven ; his music was derivative and ultimately superficial.

The rise of the 3rd « Reich » in the 20th Century did further, seemingly irreparable damage to Mendelssohn's reputation. The Nazis tore down his statue that had stood before the « Leipzig Gewandhaus » . The Nazis banned Mendelssohn's music but left his grave unscathed in the Trinity Cemetery of Berlin, liquidated the family banking house and banned his music.

But they were unable to expunge Mendelssohn completely from German culture. When Richard Strauß was asked by the Nazis to write new music for « A Midsummer Night's Dream » , he replied that he could not improve on Mendelssohn's music.

...

The life and music of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy are currently enjoying a healthy resurgence of interest in the scholarly literature. Throughout his short career, Mendelssohn endeavored to collect systematically his manuscripts and correspondence, much of which he had bound in volumes, almost as if he intended to preserve for future historians a careful record of his life's work. The survival of these precious materials has facilitated a critical reevaluation of Mendelssohn and has opened-up new avenues of inquiry about his music and central role in the European concert life of the 1830's and 1840's.

Probably no major composer of the 19th Century has had as unpredictable and mercurial a posthumous reception as Mendelssohn. Lionized and subjected to a kind of cult worship after his death, in 1847, he soon fell victim to Richard Wagner's mid-Century critique, « Das Judenthum in der Musik ». What is more, Mendelssohn's music, characterized in part by Classicist / historicist tendencies, by an emphasis on symmetry, and, in general, by an avoidance of dramatic modes of composition, was measured against Wagnerian criteria, and inevitably suffered in the comparison. During the 20th Century, of course, Mendelssohn's statue in Leipzig was destroyed and his music banned by the Nazis. The post-War era now has seen continuing attempts to reconstruct Mendelssohn's work. The eventual outcome of this process remains unclear, though the essential significance of Mendelssohn's influence on the development of 19th Century music cannot be denied.

Mahler et le judaïsme

Né le 7 juillet 1860 à Kalischt, petite communauté rurale située aux confins de la Bohême et de la Moravie, Gustav Mahler appartenait à une de ces familles juives émigrées, assignées à résidence au sud-est de la Bohême, mais originaires probablement de Galicie ou de Bukovine comme ce fut le cas pour d'autres noms illustres : Sigmund Freud, Franz Kafka, Karl Kraus ou Stefan Zweig. Le nom Mahler a sans doute été immatriculé à la suite de l'Édit de 1787 de Josef II. La généalogie de sa famille remontait à peine au-delà du XIXe siècle. Certains lui prêtèrent comme arrière grand-père possible un certain Abraham Mahler (1720-1800) , chanteur de synagogue, sans que cette filiation ait été ratifiée par la majorité des biographes. Le grand-père Simon Mahler est, en revanche, identifié avec certitude par des documents datant de 1825. Son épouse Maria Bondy, fille d'un gérant de cabaret-distillerie, donna naissance en 1827 à un fils, Bernhard, qui reprendra cette profession. Marié à Maria Hermann, en 1857, Bernhard Mahler eut 14 enfants : 11 garçons et 3 filles. Gustav, le 2e des garçons, vit mourir 6 de ses frères et 1 de ses sœurs. Ses 2 autres sœurs épouseront 2 frères Rosenblum qui deviendront célèbres sous le nom de Rosé. Justine se maria en 1902 avec Arnold Rosé (1863-1946) , violon solo de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne et fondateur du Quatuor Rosé, qui devint un proche collaborateur de Mahler durant sa direction de l'Opéra de Vienne. Leur fille, Alma Rosé, mourra en 1944 à Auschwitz après y avoir dirigé le célèbre Orchestre de femmes. L'autre frère, Eduard Rosé, violoncelliste du Quatuor, fut déporté à Terezín où il mourut en 1943.

Après la naissance de Gustav, la famille Mahler quitta Kalischt et s'installa à Iglau, en Moravie, 35 kilomètres plus loin. Après 13 années de résidence, Bernhard Mahler y obtint un droit de citoyenneté qui restait parcimonieusement accordé aux Juifs. Devenu notable, il acheta une vaste maison où la bibliothèque garnie d'œuvres Classiques et modernes allemandes faisait sa fierté et témoignait de son degré d'assimilation. Il resta cependant fidèle à la communauté

israélite d'Iglau, forte de quelque 1,500 membres, mais les liens étaient plus sociaux que religieux, à la façon des Juifs moraves qui, selon Stefan Zweig, s'étaient émancipés de toute orthodoxie étroite. Bernhard Mahler ne se convertira pas pour autant car il aimait adopter des attitudes de libre-penseur.

Les 2 communautés religieuses d'Iglau vivaient en bonne entente et le jeune Gustav fit même partie du chœur de l'église catholique. C'est là qu'il entendit sans doute pour la 1^{re} fois des musiques de Haydn, Mozart et Beethoven. S'il a parfois fréquenté la synagogue avec sa mère, il ne semble pas qu'il en ait apprécié la musique. En revanche, les petits groupes de musiciens ambulants, bohémiens, tziganes ou klezmer, laisseront des traces évidentes dans son subconscient musical, tout comme les chants appris d'une servante tchèque de la maison familiale. Iglau appartenant à une bande étroite de langue allemande entourée de villages tchèques, Gustav Mahler pratiqua les 2 langues, toutefois, rien n'indique qu'il ait parlé yiddish. Après de 1^{res} études à Iglau, il s'inscrivit le 10 septembre 1875 au Conservatoire de Vienne. Il a alors à peine 15 ans mais jouit déjà de la protection de Julius Epstein (1832-1926), un ami de Johannes Brahms. C'est là qu'il rencontre ses futurs beaux-frères, les Rosenblum, qui viennent de Roumanie.

Les amis juifs ne manquent pas et Mahler retrouve notamment un camarade du lycée d'Iglau, Josef Steiner, son aîné et confident auquel il adressa en juin 1879, depuis les environs de Tétény, en Hongrie, une longue lettre qui n'est pas sans rappeler le « Testament d'Heiligenstadt » de Beethoven :

« Je suis devenu un autre. La plus intense joie de vivre et le sentiment le plus lancinant de la mort règnent tour à tour dans mon cœur mais je sais une chose : cela ne peut continuer ainsi ! Quelle issue peut-il y avoir sinon l'anéantissement de moi-même ? De toute l'énergie du désespoir, je m'accroche à la douleur qui est mon unique consolation. »

C'est ensuite Dieu lui-même qu'il accuse :

« Je te connais enfin, menteur (" Lügner ") . De la vallée de l'humanité, mes paroles doivent bien résonner à tes oreilles, là-haut sur tes hauteurs solitaires et froides. Comprends-tu enfin cette douleur indicible qui s'est amassée ici-bas pendant des millions de siècles et qui se dresse aujourd'hui comme une montagne. C'est sur le sommet de cette montagne que tu trônes sans doute avec ton rire sardonique ! Comment pourrais-tu donc répondre de cela un jour devant le Vengeur (" Rächter ") , toi qui n'as même pas su calmer la douleur d'une seule âme tourmentée. »

À ces lignes écrites le 17 juin, il ajoute le jour suivant une sorte d'auto-analyse :

« Rien ne parvient jamais à me réjouir vraiment et les larmes coulent même sur mon sourire le plus heureux. »

Il évoque alors la campagne et le paysage au bord du Danube où il aime se réfugier en des termes schubertiens :

« Les branches me bercent doucement comme les filles du Roi des Aulnes (" Erlkönig ") . Tout contre ma joue, je sens la caresse des fleurs et des feuilles de mon tilleul (" Lindenbaum ") bien-aimé. Nous voyons le joueur de vielle (" Leiermann ") , debout, tenant son chapeau dans ses mains décharnées. »

Après avoir évoqué des amis et lieux chers, ainsi que son frère Ernst mort à l'âge de 13 ans, Mahler décrit une vision :

« Les nuages s'éclaircissent et, tout à coup, comme dans une madone de Raphaël, apparaît une tête d'angelot et, au-dessous, Ahasverus avec toutes ses souffrances. Il voudrait monter vers lui et accéder à la félicité et à la rédemption mais l'ange s'envole en riant et disparaît. Ahasverus lui jette un regard d'une immense douleur puis, reprenant son bâton, poursuit sa marche, sans larmes, éternelle, immortelle. »

Le 3e jour, il conclut sa lettre en écrivant :

« Toute l'histoire de ma vie est contenue dans ces pages. Je crains qu'un soir d'orage ma barque ne se brise sur un écueil. Il est 6 heures du matin. Je suis déjà dans la prairie, assis près du berger Parkas pour écouter le son du chalumeau. Quelle tristesse mais aussi quelle extase passionnée chante dans cette mélodie populaire. »

Mahler révèle ainsi, à la veille de son 19e anniversaire (le 7 juillet), non seulement ce qu'il appelle l'histoire de sa vie mais aussi certains aspects psychologiques de sa personnalité. Les allusions à Schubert ne sont pas dues au hasard. Son Maître et protecteur, Julius Epstein, était un fervent schubertien, éditeur des Sonates pour piano, à une époque où on les considérait comme des ébauches maladroites effacées par celles de Beethoven et où l'on préférerait noyer sous les vagues la permanence de la mort qui marque si fortement les destins viennois de Schubert et de Mahler. Le judaïsme et la judéité, voire leur rejet, sous-tendent clairement ce texte avec, en particulier, cette interpellation dramatique du Dieu inaccessible sur son Sinaï glacé, indifférent à l'égard de son peuple symbolisé clairement par Ahasverus, le Juif errant, traînant sa malédiction éternelle, n'ayant droit à la rédemption que dans l'anéantissement, selon la formule de Wagner à la fin de « Das Judentum in der Musik ».

Mahler reprend le même terme (« Selbstvernichtung ») et la même image de naufrage. Très jeune, il s'était fait membre de l'« Akademisches Wagnerverein », créé à Vienne en 1872. Il vit Wagner diriger 3 concerts entre octobre 1875 et mars 1876 mais n'osa pas l'aborder. La lecture de l'essai « Religion und Kunst », en 1880, le transporta au point de lui faire partager l'enthousiasme de Wagner pour le végétarisme et la théorie pour le moins originale de la consommation de viande comme cause du déclin du christianisme. Le 1er novembre, Gustav Mahler mentionnait dans une lettre à un ami qu'il était devenu végétarien complet et qu'il attendait du végétarisme la régénération de l'humanité. Selon le biographe de Mendelssohn, Eric Werner, Mahler aurait aussi affirmé très tôt que Wagner était le plus grand compositeur depuis Beethoven et qu'il serait bientôt reconnu partout comme un Maître alors que Mendelssohn sombrerait complètement dans l'oubli, ce qui paraît évidemment influencé par les thèses défendues dans les essais « Das Judentum in der Musik » (1850-1869) et « Zukunftsmusik » (Musique de l'avenir, 1861). Il n'est donc pas surprenant que Mendelssohn ne figurât pratiquement jamais au répertoire des concerts de Mahler. Celui-ci ne dirigea qu'une seule fois la « Symphonie écossaise » (Vienne, 1901) et la « Symphonie italienne » (New York, 1911), mais 167 fois, Wagner.

Cette conversion opportuniste coïncidait avec un intérêt personnel certain pour la culture germano-chrétienne, en même

temps qu'avec une tiédeur manifeste vis-à-vis du judaïsme. Néanmoins, cela ne pouvait suffire à changer les convictions tenaces de ses adversaires les plus acharnés. En témoigne cette attaque du chef du Mouvement bourgeois antisémite, le chevalier Georg von Schönerer, après l'exécution sous la direction de Mahler de la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven :

« Un Juif de Bohême corrompt les plus grandes œuvres musicales de tous les temps ! Il est temps d'écarter les Juifs d'une position aussi influente. Mahler est une faute capitale dans la vie musicale viennoise qui discrédite toute l'image artistique de l'Autriche dans le monde. »

Mahler éprouvera durant toute sa vie les déchirements qui ont tourmenté tant d'autres Juifs convertis comme Heinrich Heine, Otto Weininger ou Ludwig Wittgenstein, le menant parfois comme ceux-ci à des réactions proches de l'antisémitisme. En revanche, il marquera toujours sa réprobation à l'égard des histoires antisémites qu'il entendait raconter autour de lui. Alma, qui se présente dans ses « Mémoires » comme une catholique devenue libre-penseuse à la lecture de Schopenhauer et de Nietzsche a raconté que dans ses discussions avec son mari sur des sujets religieux, celui-ci défendait toujours le christianisme, si bien qu'elle en vint à le qualifier de « juif chrétien » .

La foi chrétienne plutôt que le judaïsme trouvera place dans la musique de Mahler, grâce à la fraîcheur naïve du « Cor enchanté de l'enfant » (« Des Knaben Wunderhorn ») , célèbre recueil de poésies populaires qu'Achim von Arnim et Clemens Brentano ont collationnées à partir de 1803 dans les campagnes et les villes ou retrouvées dans les vieux almanachs et livres de prières. Curieusement, cette anthologie extrêmement riche a très peu intéressé les compositeurs Romantiques à l'exception de Robert Schumann (4 fois) et de Johannes Brahms (6 fois) . Mahler, le 1er, en exploitera véritablement les magnifiques possibilités musicales (au total, 24 fois) avec un goût marqué pour des poèmes à caractère ou sujet religieux. L'« Urlicht » (Lumière originelle) de la 2e Symphonie tout comme « Es sungen drei Engel einen süßen Gesang » (3 anges chantaient un doux chant) dans la 3e Symphonie comptent parmi les plus chargés de signification. Le Scherzo purement orchestral de la 2e Symphonie reprend la musique d'une mélodie sur Saint-Antoine prêchant aux poissons (Sankt Antonius fischpredigt) . À 3 reprises, Mahler a décrit le programme de cette 2e Symphonie. Même s'il l'a abandonné par la suite, ses commentaires restent révélateurs de ses intentions initiales. Le 1er mouvement reprend quasi textuellement un Poème symphonique antérieur intitulé « Todtenfeier » . Ce cérémonial funèbre est suivi d'un Andante rappelant les moments heureux de la vie avant que le Scherzo n'évoque avec une certaine ironie les interrogations métaphysiques et les sermons qui, comme ceux de Saint-Antoine, sont écoutés bouche-bée par les poissons curieux mais qui, le sermon fini, retournent aussitôt nager sans que rien soit changé. La parabole est claire mais Mahler la dramatise dans une lettre (décembre 1895) au critique Max Marschalk :

« Dénuée de sens paraît la vie, un affreux cauchemar dont on se réveille avec un cri de dégoût ! »

Après l'« Urlicht » qui ramène la sérénité confiante, « la voix touchante de la foi naïve » , l'énorme finale « Die große Appel » apporte la réponse de Mahler car, contrairement à ce que le titre « Auferstehung » (Résurrection) , provenant d'une Ode de Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724-1803) , donne à penser, les 2 tiers du texte sont de Mahler lui-même. C'est en assistant aux funérailles d'Hans von Bülow, le 29 mars 1895, à la « Sankt Michælskirche » de Hambourg que Mahler entendit l'Ode de Klopstock chantée par le chœur avec accompagnement d'orgue sur une mélodie de cantique ou de choral protestant. Sitôt la cérémonie terminée, Mahler entama l'écriture du Finale de sa

Symphonie sur la base du sujet qui s'était ainsi brusquement révélé à lui. Il n'utilisa cependant que les 2 Ires strophes du poème original dont il supprima, en outre, le nom de Jésus-Christ et le refrain « Halleluiah ». Voulut-il ainsi écarter des accents trop explicitement chrétiens. Le problème d'une conversion officielle n'était pas encore posé et sa culture religieuse (sujet qui n'était pas davantage au 1er plan de ses préoccupations) restait surtout liée à l'Ancien Testament comme le montreront, 2 ans plus tard, ses réactions durant les leçons de catéchisme préparatoires à son baptême.

De quelle Résurrection s'agit-il donc ? Sans doute moins de celle définie par le « Credo » chrétien ou par l'iconographie de la pesée des âmes que d'un réveil des morts tel qu'il est évoqué dans l'Ancien Testament (Isaïe, XXVI, 19 ; et Ézéchiel, XXXVII, 12 et 27) dépourvu de véritable « Jugement dernier ». Le Talmud, la Michnah, Maïmonide dans son « Article sur la Résurrection » et beaucoup d'autres ont épilogué jusqu'aujourd'hui sur le sens à donner à la croyance en une résurrection et sur les conditions de sa réalisation. Le psychanalyste freudien Theodor Reik (1888-1969), né lui aussi en Bohême dans une famille juive, a consacré tout un livre à la 2e Symphonie de Mahler et, plus particulièrement, au thème de la résurrection dans son Finale. Le début de la dernière strophe peut être interprété comme l'immortalité que l'artiste conquiert par ses œuvres.

Avec des ailes que je me suis conquises / Je m'envolerai, je mourrai, afin de revivre

Mahler semble donc prendre ses distances à l'égard de la vision chrétienne du jugement des âmes, ce qu'accentueront le panthéisme et la référence nietzschéenne de la 3e Symphonie, puis le pessimisme fondamental des 6e, 9e et 10e Symphonies. Rien n'indique dans le cheminement des Symphonies une influence quelconque de la conversion de Mahler. À Alfred Roller qui lui demandait pourquoi il n'écrivait pas de Messe, il répondit que telle n'était pas son intention et que, de toute façon, il ne lui serait pas possible de mettre le « Credo » en musique. Peu après, lors d'une répétition de la 8e Symphonie, il lui lança :

« Voici ma Messe ! »

La Ire partie de cette Symphonie utilise le texte latin de l'hymne « Veni Creator Spiritus », attribué, sans doute à tort, à Raban Maur (784-856), un moine bénédictin qui devint Évêque de Mayence, tandis que la seconde repose sur la scène finale du « Second " Faust " » de Gœthe. Le 1er projet prévoyait 4 mouvements avec, au centre, un Scherzo et un Adagio intitulé « Caritas ». Le Finale portait le titre « Die Geburt des Eros » ou, plus tard, « Schöpfung durch Eros ». En dernière instance, seule la scène finale du « Second " Faust " » de Gœthe sera choisie pour servir de long second mouvement. Le rapprochement de 2 univers spirituels et poétiques aussi différents et d'autant plus intrigué que Mahler abandonne ici totalement les constantes populaires et tragiques de son inspiration au profit d'une double Cantate festive qui célèbre, en dehors de tout pessimisme, le pouvoir créateur de l'Esprit-Saint et de la vie avec l'« Éternel Féminin ». Unissant un texte liturgique latin à la poésie du plus illustre représentant de la littérature Romantique allemande, Mahler apporte un double tribut au christianisme et aux traditions culturelles germaniques. Il occupait alors depuis 9 ans, à la tête de l'Opéra de Vienne, le poste le plus prestigieux de la vie musicale autrichienne tandis que ses propres compositions étaient accueillies comme des événements, en dépit des controverses qu'elles pouvaient soulever. La plupart de ses adversaires reconnaissaient leurs mérites et ne contestaient pas la sincérité de

l'artiste. Cette médaille dorée avait cependant son revers car rien ne semblait pouvoir effacer, dans certains milieux, le dogme wagnérien de l'impossibilité pour un Juif de représenter d'une façon pleinement valable la musique allemande. Pour eux, sa musique constituait un phénomène épisodique de mode, dû largement à son aspect spectaculaire que la 8e Symphonie, dite « des Mille », portait à son paroxysme. On attribuait son succès au soutien des milieux Libéraux et intellectuels, largement juifs, de Vienne ; mais, à l'aune du grand art éternel, profond, lourd de métaphysique généré par le sang et le sol germaniques, on estimait qu'une telle musique ne pouvait qu'être appelée à disparaître. Ces attaques régulièrement entretenues feront que l'interdiction de la musique de Gustav Mahler, à partir de 1933, ne soulèvera guère de protestations, même pas de ceux qui furent ses proches tel Richard Strauß (qui accepta sans hésiter la présidence de la « Reichsmusikkammer » chargée de l'élimination de la musique et des musiciens juifs) ou Hans Pfitzner.

La bibliographie du mépris

Mahler a vécu à Vienne à une époque où l'antisémitisme populaire, issu d'une tradition chrétienne millénaire, avait pris une dimension économique et sociale en réaction contre ce qui était perçu comme une concurrence juive se développant à tous les niveaux. Le Juif n'était plus ce corps étranger misérable traînant sa malédiction séculaire, il jouait à présent un rôle influent dans les circuits de la finance comme en témoigne la réussite des Rothschild, des Itzig, des Oppenheimer, des Mendelssohn ; il occupait également une fraction importante des postes d'enseignement supérieur, en médecine en particulier. Et voici qu'un petit Juif, venu des frontières de la Bohême et de la Moravie, s'empare à la fois de l'Opéra de Vienne, de la tradition symphonique beethovénienne, dont il revendique la succession, et de l'Orchestre wagnérien pour réaliser, à son tour, une musique de l'avenir et une autre religion de l'art !

Après le Festival germano-français, organisé en mai 1905 à Strasbourg, où Mahler était venu diriger sa 5e Symphonie et Richard Strauß sa « Sinfonia domestica », Romain Rolland, le Français qui comprenait alors le mieux la musique allemande, écrivit :

« C'est Beethoven qu'il veut être, ou Wagner. Il a tort : il lui manque leur équilibre et leur force herculéenne. »

Durant plus d'un demi-siècle, les musicologues allemands, mais parfois aussi français ou anglo-américains, vont dénoncer 100 fois, au nom de la culture européenne, cette appropriation contre-nature et cela bien avant que cette « défense » de la culture ne se transforme en un « Juden verboten ». Déjà légataires universels de l'héritage wagnérien, Cosima et Houston Stewart Chamberlain se feront les gardiens du temple de la culture germanique. Lorsque Mahler mit en scène l'Opéra oublié de Mozart, « Zaïde », sous la direction de Bruno Walter, Chamberlain écrivit à Cosima qu'il avait goûté grâce à la musique :

« Un des plaisirs les plus nobles et les plus délicats de sa vie, bien que, comme vous pouvez l'imaginer, tout cela a été joué avec une incompréhension vulgaire tout à fait monumentale. »

Cosima renchérit dans sa réponse, dénonçant l'influence de Mahler à Vienne qui « fait perdre aux gens toute leur pureté de perception ». Pureté (nationale, aryenne, raciale) et impureté (cosmopolite, sémite) seront les critères de

toute une musicologie ou pseudo-musicologie pour laquelle ne suffit ni le passeport chrétien ni le témoignage d'une grande œuvre religieuse comme la 8e Symphonie de Mahler. Au contraire, la mégalomanie de la « Symphonie des Mille » et son immense succès lors de la création à Munich, en 1910, dans le plus grand des 6 halls construits pour l'Exposition de 1908, intensifieront les exaspérations. En honorant de leur présence cette création, les membres parmi les plus prestigieux de la vie culturelle allemande firent, en effet, de cet événement musical le plus important depuis l'inauguration de Bayreuth avec les représentations du « Ring », en 1876, ou la première de « Parsifal », en 1882. Il fut salué comme tel par Gerhard Hauptmann, Guido Adler, Paul Stefan qui virent en Mahler « un génie représentatif de la grande tradition allemande (Gerhard Hauptmann) ; un artiste « digne de figurer dans les rangs des grands Allemands » (Paul Stefan) . Un tel triomphe ne pouvait être au goût de tout le monde. On attribue à Hans Pfitzner ou Max von Schllings une réflexion ironique qu'ils répandirent avant la première :

« “ Veni Creator Spiritus ” ? Et si l'Esprit-Saint ne venait pas ? »

C'est ce que s'efforceront de prouver les contempteurs à l'aide d'arguments musicaux ou esthétiques souvent imprégnés de préjugés nationalistes ou racistes. Rudolf Louis, un biographe de Bruckner, attribua tout le succès de la Symphonie à la présence de Mahler, chef d'orchestre :

« Quiconque a jamais entendu une œuvre de Mahler avec un autre chef sait à quel point il reste alors peu de chose de cette musique. »

Et il ajoute :

« Mahler parle l'allemand avec l'accent, le rythme et les gestes du Juif par trop oriental. »

2 ans plus tard, dans un livre sur « La Musique allemande d'aujourd'hui » (Munich, 1912) , il dénonce de nouveau « le caractère foncièrement juif de Mahler, son ton de youpin, son inauthenticité repoussante même si son honnêteté subjective ne peut être mise en doute.

Pour Ludwig Schnittler du « Bayerische Kurier », Mahler « ne possède pas la plus infime capacité d'inventer une musique personnelle », rejoignant par ces propos la théorie wagnérienne de l'impuissance créatrice génétique.

Paul Ehlers de la revue berlinoise « Allgemeine Musikzeitung » ira plus loin encore, dénonçant la menace que les « fausses valeurs sémitiques » font peser sur l'art allemand :

« Plus Mahler lutte avec ferveur pour un art germano-catholique, plus s'affirme son caractère juif. »

Tout en prétendant n'avoir rien contre les Juifs et n'être pas raciste, il souligne que ceux-ci n'ont pas été capables de produire un grand compositeur et que, pour l'homme germanique, cette musique de couleur sémitique suscite un sentiment d'éloignement, d'étrangeté. 28 ans plus tard, à l'occasion du 50e anniversaire d'Hitler, le même Paul Ehlers saluera dans le « Zeitschrift für Musik » d'avril 1939 :

« Celui qui a sauvé la musique allemande en la libérant de l'emprise destructive de ses vertus par des violeurs étrangers qui l'ont vidée intérieurement par des exécutions déformées et leur mépris arrogant pour des œuvres qui font partie des trésors les plus précieux de l'art allemand. Combien de fois durant notre combat contre l'influence croissante des Juifs, n'avons-nous pas désiré ardemment un homme aux mains pures dont le fouet aurait la force de jeter les impies hors du temple. Cet homme est venu avec son glaive puissant, Maître du peuple et de l'art allemands, comme un orage au printemps foudroyant le monde décadent, traître et malhonnête des voleurs juifs, libérant ainsi la musique allemande de la captivité spirituelle dans laquelle la décadence juive l'avait tenue. »

Le compositeur Max Reger avait écrit, peu après la mort de Mahler, au duc Georges II de Saxe-Meiningen :

« Tous ceux auxquels Dieu, notre Seigneur, a laissé pousser un nez sémitique sont naturellement des partisans convaincus de Mahler car les Juifs veulent à tout prix avoir un grand compositeur ! Pour être cela, il manque avant tout à Mahler du style et, sans ce style dont il est totalement dénué, aucune grande composition n'est pensable. Il me semble, et à beaucoup d'autres également, que Mahler est le Meyerbeer de notre temps ! Il y a chez tous les 2 une véritable intelligence sémitique, le travail à l'aide de moyens expressifs superficiels et l'absence de tout style. Comme disait Goethe : malheur à l'art dont on chante la louange dans toutes les rues ! »

Malgré la contradiction qu'il y a à décrire les musiciens juifs, à la fois, comme des imitateurs impuissants et, à la fois, comme dominant la culture allemande, ces arguments se retrouvent chez des auteurs comme Hans Joachim Moser (« Geschichte der Deutschen Musik », tome II, 1924) et Richard Eichenauer (« Musik und Rasse », 1932) , préparant ainsi le terrain pour les mesures brutales qui, dès l'arrivée d'Hitler au pouvoir, conduiront au bannissement de Mendelssohn et de Mahler de la vie musicale. Si les tentatives de substituer au 1er, soit le pur german Ludwig Spohr, ne furent guère couronnées de succès, il n'en est pas de même d'Anton Bruckner dont on fit, à l'aide de moyens musicologiques et médiatiques considérables, le substitut politiquement correct de la Symphonie mahlérienne.

Le retour à la liberté et à la dignité a permis à Mahler de conquérir enfin sa vraie place de plus important Symphoniste du début du XXe siècle et de traducteur incomparable de l'âme allemande dans ses mélodies avec Orchestre. Reste-t-il encore une place pour la judéité dans ces chefs-d'œuvre absolus de l'assimilation d'une culture germanique au rayonnement de laquelle Mahler a plus contribué que tout autre compositeur du XXe siècle ?

Felix Mendelssohn et le 3e « Reich »

La destruction de la statue du compositeur Felix Mendelssohn à Leipzig, dans la nuit du 9 au 10 novembre 1936, illustre la haine vouée à ce dernier par les autorités nazies. En s'en prenant à l'une des figures emblématiques du Romantisme allemand, 2 ans presque jour pour jour avant les pogroms de la « Nuit de Cristal » , le pouvoir veut alors faire passer un double message : d'une part, la poursuite de la politique de mise-au-pas et de purification de la vie musicale allemande entreprise dès la prise de pouvoir ; d'autre part, l'annonce que cette politique n'épargnera aucun des compositeurs juifs, fussent-ils de confession protestante, et aussi assimilés à la tradition musicale allemande que Mendelssohn. Dès avril 1933, l'Allemagne nazie se dote ainsi des outils juridiques et institutionnels de cette mise

sous contrôle. La création de la « Reichskulturkammer », en septembre 1933, et de sa section musicale, la « Reichsmusikkammer » 2 mois plus tard, le développement du maillage territorial par la superposition des administrations et des organisations nazies, donnent au nouveau pouvoir les moyens juridiques et matériels de censurer la totalité de la vie musicale, ne se concentrant pas seulement sur les acteurs (compositeurs et interprètes) de cette dernière, mais surveillant également étroitement la conformité des programmes des manifestations publiques aux canons de la nouvelle politique.

Or, cette dernière est avant tout un antisémitisme. Mendelssohn, Mahler et Schönberg y joueront un rôle considérable, car à travers leur éradication, le pouvoir hitlérien mettra en place les prémisses culturelles du génocide qu'il s'emploiera plus tard à appliquer aux juifs européens. Mendelssohn tient dans ce dispositif une place particulière à cause de l'estime que lui portaient la plupart des compositeurs allemands de son temps, de Schumann à Brahms, et de son enracinement dans l'histoire de la musique nationale. De 1933 à 1938, sa disparition programmée de la mémoire culturelle allemande passera par 3 phases concomitantes : la 1^{re}, de caractère idéologique, est menée par les musicologues antisémites pour justifier esthétiquement la mise à l'écart du compositeur ; la seconde porte sur l'organisation par les autorités politiques de son éradication ; la 3^e enfin, examinera les problèmes soulevés par la très populaire musique-de-scène composée par Mendelssohn, en 1826, pour « le Songe d'une nuit d'été » de William Shakespeare.

Felix Mendelssohn et l'idéologie nazie

Lorsqu'il écrit « Mein Kampf », Adolf Hitler a parfaitement conscience de la nécessité de donner à l'antisémitisme une base scientifique solide :

« Le ton (des Ires brochures antisémites que j'ai lu) était tel qu'il faisait naître en moi des doutes, à cause de l'argumentation à la fois plate et extraordinairement anti-scientifique apportée au soutien de ses affirmations. »

À la même époque, il prenait soigneusement ses distances avec l'activisme primitif des Iers compagnons de route de son Parti. L'élargissement de son audience à des strates de la société jusqu'alors rebutées par ses vociférations de batteur d'estrade, leur adhésion à une vision totalitaire du monde, impliquaient le développement d'une argumentation dépassant le simple appel au pogrom. Le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (Ligue de combat pour la culture allemande) sera le cheval de Troie d'Alfred Rosenberg pour investir les milieux académiques et culturels et obtenir leur coopération afin d'élaborer une théorie des races scientifiquement fondée. Cette science des races, véritable « biologie nationale-socialiste », avait pour objectif tactique de conférer une aura de respectabilité à un discours politique cantonné jusqu'alors à l'imprécation. À plus long terme, cette pseudo-science servira, après la prise de pouvoir, à justifier l'extermination des juifs.

Le « Dictionnaire des Juifs dans la Musique » des musicologues nazis Theo Stengel et Herbert Gerick, paru en 1940, constitue un bon exemple de la phraséologie nazie en matière d'antisémitisme musical, et consacre plus de 2 pages à Felix Mendelssohn. Comme il était difficile, même à l'antisémite le plus acharné, de l'accuser de bolchévisme culturel (« Kulturbolschewismus »), concept par lequel les conservateurs allemands dénonçaient, à partir de 1918, les différents

courants de la Nouvelle Musique, censée porter atteinte à l'intégrité culturelle de l'Allemagne défaite, le pouvoir national-socialiste s'acharnera à démontrer que le seul fait qu'il fût juif justifiait la mise à l'écart du compositeur et de son œuvre. L'article qui lui est consacré synthétise ainsi les positions avancées par les différents théoriciens. Rappelons que ce dictionnaire rassemblait environ 10,000 noms de musiciens juifs de toutes qualités, indiquant également leur ville de résidence. Il constituait ainsi un parfait outil de délation, non seulement pour s'assurer qu'aucun d'entre eux ne puisse exercer une quelconque activité professionnelle sur le territoire allemand, mais aussi dans la perspective de la solution finale qui allait être mise en place peu de temps après sa parution.

L'article consacré à Mendelssohn, rappelant sa filiation comme fils de banquier et petit-fils de Moses Mendelssohn, le « rationaliste des Lumières » (entre guillemets dans le texte) , présente sa situation éminente dans l'histoire du Romantisme allemand comme le produit d'une légende inventée par ses co-religionnaires. La redécouverte de Bach qui lui est attribuée ne serait qu'une falsification. Mendelssohn ne serait d'ailleurs pas un Romantique allemand, car en composant ses « Chansons sans paroles » , il aurait renié fanatiquement une des caractéristiques essentielles de ces derniers, celle de s'appuyer sur les textes de chansons populaires tels qu'avaient pu les réunir Herder, Arnim et Brentano. Il serait même un internationaliste (qualité éminemment juive) combattant d'Angleterre le principe de musique nationale propre au Romantisme. Les auteurs du Dictionnaire reprennent ensuite les diverses critiques antisémites de Richard Wagner dont parlera tout à l'heure Philippe Olivier et sur lesquelles nous n'insisterons donc pas, concluant en se référant à l'ouvrage de Karl Blessinger, « Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Mahler » , 3 chapitres du « Judaïsme dans la musique » comme clé de l'histoire musicale du 19e siècle, paru en 1939 :

« Blessinger a prouvé que Mendelssohn (comme type de juif assimilé) appartient à la longue série de représentants de cette race qui ont consciemment détourné de son sens notre patrimoine culturel dans une perspective juive pour en organiser la falsification. »

Blessinger lui-même, dans l'ouvrage cité, tente de démontrer à quel point tout au long du XIXe siècle, les juifs ont organisé un complot contre la musique allemande. Sans revenir sur certains des arguments évoqués plus haut, il prétend par exemple que Mendelssohn ne s'est intéressé à la « Passion Saint-Matthieu » de Bach qu'afin que « le Judaïsme puisse prétendre s'imposer sur l'une des plus grandes créations allemandes » . Il cherche également à prouver que les juifs cherchèrent à maintenir artificiellement les œuvres de l'auteur de la « Symphonie écossaise » , et cite le cas (fantasmagorique) du violoniste Joseph Joachim qui aurait tout fait pour retirer le Concerto pour violon de Schumann afin qu'il ne fasse pas d'ombre à celui de Mendelssohn.

Un autre théoricien des relations entre race et musique, Richard Eichenauer, qui publia en 1932, un ouvrage intitulé « Musik und Rasse » (Musique et Race) , s'acharne sur notre compositeur. Adhérent de la cause nationale-raciste au Front Nordique dès 1923, puis du NSDAP en 1932, ce professeur de langues rejoint la même année le Bureau de la Race et de l'Installation de la SS, chargé de surveiller la pureté raciale de l'organisation, où il occupera le grade de lieutenant. Dans « Musik und Rasse » , Eichenauer fait abondamment référence aux théories raciales de l'anthropologue Hans Friedrich Karl Günther. Ce dernier, après avoir distingué 6 races européennes (nordique, dinarique, occidentale, orientale-alpine, baltico-orientale, phaelienne) , place à leur tête la race nordique, celle des chefs et des grandes civilisations. Selon Eichenauer, qui reprend à cet égard une théorie formulée par un autre musicologue raciste, Hans-

Joachim Moser, la musique européenne a été dominée par un combat entre les races nordiques et orientales. Cette opposition atteint son apogée au 19^e siècle avec l'émancipation des juifs, appartenant à la race orientale, dont certains sont assez habiles pour s'approprier les caractéristiques stylistiques de la musique nordique. Mendelssohn en est le parfait exemple dont le visage montre « un mélange de caractères à la fois moyen-oriental et juif oriental » . Tout comme Moser, il reproche à la musique de Mendelssohn sa superficialité, manquant ainsi du poids propre au « grand homme » dans la tradition nordique, et l'accuse d'être simplement un virtuose creux.

De nombreux autres musicologues ou personnalités du monde musical allemand emboîtent le pas à ces travaux soi-disant scientifiques pour s'attirer les grâces du régime. Ainsi Willy Strecker, propriétaire de la maison d'édition musicale Schott à Mayence (éditeur entre autres compositeurs juifs, de Erich Wolfgang Korngold et Ernst Toch) , déclare-t-il que les juifs n'ont aucun pouvoir créatif. Ils savent en revanche imiter, mais leur brillance et leur supériorité technique les conduisent à la superficialité, au maniérisme et à la trivialité. Et Strecker de déclarer que la musique de Mendelssohn écrit une musique « sucrée » , et que des œuvres comme « le Songe d'une Nuit d'été » étaient suspecte à cause de leur douceur creuse et semblable « à une anguille » .

Mendelssohn est également accusé d'être un plagiaire, et d'avoir imité Franz Schubert. Par ailleurs, sa musique, comme celle de tout compositeur juif, présente une dégénérescence du sentiment allemand en sentimentalité, dont la féminité s'oppose à l'héroïsme du Beethoven de la « Symphonie héroïque » , par exemple. Plus généralement, Mendelssohn est présenté par certains auteurs, tout comme Gustav Mahler, comme étant celui des musiciens juifs qui a le plus acquis un vernis allemand, parce que dans sa jeunesse, il aurait voulu être allemand et non juif, et parce qu'il maîtrisait à un tel point la technique de composition qu'il pouvait s'insérer dans une culture étrangère (l'allemande) sans être démasqué par l'auditeur moyen. Il appartenait donc aux musicologues du « Reich » de fournir aux autorités culturelles et au public les éléments permettant d'éclairer leur jugement afin d'échapper à la dictature de Mendelssohn et de ses co-religionnaires.

L'exécution de la musique de Felix Mendelssohn sous le National-Socialisme

Préparée par les théoriciens d'un antisémitisme scientifique appliqué à la musique comme Eichenhauer, Blessinger ou Moser, le pouvoir nazi ne tarda pas à mettre en place une politique de mise-au-pas de la vie musicale allemande, avec pour but d'en exclure tout élément jugé contraire à l'idéal national-socialiste. Cette politique résulte non d'un pouvoir unique et centralisé, mais de multiples officines aux influences contradictoires, guidées avant tout par la volonté de prendre l'ascendant au sein de la hiérarchie nazie. Étant donné le rôle joué par la musique dans la vie culturelle allemande, et le nombre considérable d'institutions et d'hommes qui en dépendent, il s'agit bien d'une lutte interne de pouvoir. Comme l'a souligné Hannah Arendt, chaque administration publique est par exemple doublée par une organisation du Parti nazi souvent concurrente. Les organisations nationales-socialistes elles-mêmes, qu'elles relèvent des différents échelons géographiques du Parti, ou d'organisations contrôlées par le Ministre de la Propagande Josef Gœbbels, l'idéologue Alfred Rosenberg, ou l'organisateur de la politique de loisirs nazie, Robert Ley, émettent des instructions contradictoires qui brouillent souvent les pistes. Dans le cas Mendelssohn, au nombre de ces organisations doit s'ajouter l'influent « Cercle de Bayreuth » qui continuera à colporter, en les radicalisant, les analyses de Richard Wagner au sujet du compositeur. Il n'est pas étonnant qu'il ait fallu ainsi 5 ans à cette politique pour se coordonner,

la « Nuit de Cristal » des 8 et 9 novembre 1938 marquant, à cet égard, un point de non retour en ce qui concerne le déterminisme antisémite absolu de ses contenus.

Dans ce cadre, Mendelssohn fait l'objet d'une attention toute particulière des autorités nazies. Sa position essentielle dans la vie musicale allemande, la popularité d'œuvres comme son Concerto pour violon, la « Symphonie italienne » ou la musique-de-scène pour « le Songe d'une nuit d'été » de Shakespeare, restaient toujours incontestées en 1933. Peu de temps après sa création, la même année, la Chambre de la musique du « Reich » émet diverses instructions (plus ou moins suivies d'effets) interdisant l'exécution de la musique du compositeur. Certains catalogues d'œuvres (consacrés notamment à la musique chorale) font figurer devant celles de Mendelssohn la mention : « Ne doit pas être chanté pendant les concerts du Parti national-socialiste ». Un zèle tout particulier anime les NSKG (« National-sozialistische Kulturgemeinde » : Communautés culturelles nationales-socialistes) d'Alfred Rosenberg, idéologue radical du Nazisme, dont le responsable du département musical, Friedrich Herzog, déclare en 1937 :

« Une période illustre ne souffre aucun compromis. Si certains chœurs confessionnels ne veulent pas le comprendre, et, comme c'est arrivé récemment dans une ville rhénane, introduisent en fraude du Mendelssohn dans un concert simplement sans le nommer, il faut alors se poser la question de la confiance que l'on peut accorder à de tels chefs d'orchestre qui frapperont avec la dernière énergie à la moindre porte de service pour saboter consciemment nos entreprises de purification musicale. »

Ce zèle ne rencontre pas l'unanimité, même chez les théoriciens antisémites, comme par exemple Hans-Joachim Moser, qui écrit :

« Personne ne l'a plus admiré que Schumann, Brahms, Bülow et Reger - cela devrait donner à penser à tous ces petits Maîtres qui aujourd'hui se croient capables de remplacer Mendelssohn. »

Wilhelm Furtwängler et la Philharmonie de Berlin joueront encore des extraits du « Songe d'une nuit d'été », en 1933 et 1934. Le Concerto pour violon sera lui-même donné par le violoniste Wolfgang Schneiderhan sous la direction de Carl Schuricht, en 1934. Le boycott ne s'applique d'ailleurs pas aux interprètes étrangers qui pourront ainsi, comme l'écossais Frédéric Lamond, consacrer une soirée entière à notre compositeur, en 1935. Ici et là, des chœurs sont chantés, mais de plus en plus furtivement. De fait, l'hostilité du régime vis-à-vis de l'auteur des « Variations sérieuses » est affirmée de façon si appuyée, que très rares sont les artistes qui osent prendre le risque de maintenir ses œuvres dans leur répertoire. En 1938, la cause est entendue, et Mendelssohn disparaît totalement des programmes des concerts. Des concerts peut-être, mais pas encore des magasins de musique ou de disques. L'éditeur berlinois Bote & Bock publie encore, en 1938, des œuvres de compositeurs juifs, dont Mendelssohn à côté de compositeurs estampillés nazi bon-teint, et cela malgré les instructions données à ce sujet par Josef Goebbels, 2 années auparavant. Une incohérence comparable se retrouve dans les catalogues discographiques. L'une des principales compagnies allemandes, « Telefunken », exportait encore, en 1939, un enregistrement du Concerto pour violon.

Dans la réalité cependant (même si l'on peut imaginer que, dans le cadre de la « Hausmusik », Mendelssohn figurât encore parmi les compositeurs joués en famille, malgré les risques de dénonciation), notre compositeur disparaît de la

vie musicale. À 2 exceptions près, l'une importante, puisqu'il s'agit des concerts donnés dans le cadre du « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (l'Union culturelle juive) ; l'autre, beaucoup plus marginale, celle des camps.

Rappelons que le « Jüdischer Kulturbund » fut créé à Berlin, en juillet 1933, à l'issue de négociations entre les associations représentant la communauté juive et le Ministère de la Propagande représenté à cette occasion par Hans Hinkel. La création d'un « Kulturbund » (Union culturelle) répondait à un double objectif : il fallait, d'une part, rassurer les artistes juifs (musiciens, acteurs, artistes de music-hall) qui, après avoir perdu leur emploi, retrouveraient ainsi du travail et la possibilité de créer ; et, d'autre part, stabiliser émotionnellement la communauté juive, au sein d'une organisation défendant une culture juive pour les juifs, à l'écart de la population allemande. Sous l'impulsion des diverses communautés régionales, la création d'associations culturelles juives dans les différentes régions allemandes, à la suite de celle de Berlin, avait entraîné la formation d'Orchestres et de divers ensembles de musique de chambre ou vocale. Il existait ainsi des Orchestres symphoniques à Mannheim, Francfort, Stuttgart et Berlin, qui étaient, ainsi que les autres formations de ces associations culturelles (chœurs, ensembles de musique de chambre, etc.) , les seuls en Allemagne habilités à jouer les œuvres de compositeurs juifs, dont Mendelssohn sera l'un des principaux. De ce dernier seront notamment donnés les grands Oratorios bibliques.

L'un des principaux problèmes auxquels eurent à faire face les différents « Kulturbünde » à travers l'Allemagne nouvelle, outre de récurrents problèmes financiers, fut l'exil progressif des meilleurs musiciens qui constituaient l'ossature de ses divers Orchestres ou formations. Tant et si bien que les diverses associations furent amenées à faire appel à des artistes juifs étrangers pour maintenir le niveau des concerts. La contralto Sabine Kalter, en exil à Londres, vint ainsi chanter des Lieder de Mendelssohn et Mahler, à Berlin, au printemps de 1937. Le « Kulturbund » fut interdit après la « Nuit de Cristal » , ses associations locales dissoutes, et fut ré-organisé en 1939, à partir de Berlin, où restait encore un chœur de chambre au programme duquel figurait des œuvres de Mendelssohn.

La musique de Mendelssohn sera aussi présente dans les camps de concentration. La création d'un grand nombre d'orchestres, créés avec l'assentiment ou sur l'ordre des commandants des camps, qu'il s'agisse des camps d'origine (Auschwitz, Auschwitz-Monowitz, Dachau, Mittelbau-Dora, Großrosen, Mauthausen, Natzweiler, Neuengamme, Janowska) , des détachements extérieurs (Blechhammer, Ebensee, Falkensee, Fürstengrubbe, Gleiwitz I. , Gollerschau, Gusen, Jawischowitz, Trawniki) , ou des camps d'extermination (Auschwitz-Birkenau, Belzec, Majdanek, Sobibor ou Treblinka) , illustre la réalité et l'intensité de cette vie musicale. Bien qu'il existât déjà des Orchestres (« Lagerkappelle ») dans certains d'entre eux, c'est une ordonnance du Bureau central de la sécurité du « Reich » , d'août 1942, qui en institua officiellement la création dans les principaux camps. Celui de Buchenwald avait été créé dès 1938 ; celui de Floßenbürg en 1940 ; le principal Orchestre de Dachau, au début de l'année 1941. L'ordonnance d'août 1942 améliora la situation des ensembles existants, et déclencha la création de nombreuses autres formations, comme celle de Mauthausen. Généralement forts d'une trentaine de musiciens, recrutés exclusivement parmi les prisonniers, ces Orchestres disposaient d'instruments provenant souvent des pillages nazis.

Au camp de Dachau, ouvert dès 1933, un groupe de détenus, musiciens amateurs, avait obtenu l'autorisation de constituer un Orchestre de salon à partir de 1940, qui donnait des concerts de musique légère pour divertir les « kapos » du camp. Au début de 1941, le commandant du camp décida la création d'un véritable Orchestre, dont le

répertoire intégra rapidement quelques Classiques favoris comme la 2e « Rhapsodie hongroise » de Franz Liszt ; les Ouvertures d' « Orphée aux enfers » de Jacques Offenbach, de « la Pie voleuse » de Gioachino Rossini, ou de « Poète et paysan » de Franz von Suppé. Il existait également un Orchestre à cordes, formé par un musicien hollandais de la radio d'Eindhoven, au programme duquel figuraient des œuvres de Tommaso Giordani, Händel, Mozart, Beethoven et Grieg, et qui donna également le Concerto pour violon de Mendelssohn sous un faux nom de compositeur pour éviter la censure des autorités du camp.

Le ghetto de Terezín, créé en 1941 à l'ouest de Prague, est l'unique lieu de concentration des juifs européens où se développa, avec l'assentiment des autorités nazies et dans un but de propagande, une véritable vie culturelle. La population du ghetto, formée de nombreux artistes, médecins et intellectuels, comportait en son sein un grand nombre de musiciens autour desquels se développèrent plusieurs Orchestres, chœurs ou formations de chambre, qui donnaient des concerts réguliers. Mendelssohn figurait largement au programme de ces manifestations, notamment son Oratorio « Elias », donné entre autre à l'été 1944 sous la direction de Karl Fischer avec un chœur de 80 chanteurs accompagné par 2 pianos. Survivant de Terezín et d'Auschwitz, le violoniste Karel Fröhlich, qui émigra aux États-Unis, en 1948, raconte :

« J'ai plus joué à Terezín que dans ma " vie civile ". Je m'éveillais souvent à 3 heures du matin. À 4 heures, je commençais à travailler tout le répertoire pour violon : les Concertos de Brahms, Tchaïkovski, Sibelius, Mendelssohn. »

Le « Songe d'une nuit d'été » : aventures et nouvelles aventures

La très populaire musique de scène du « Songe d'une nuit d'été » est une parfaite illustration du « problème Mendelssohn » tel qu'il se posa au monde culturel nazi. Dès 1934, la pression mise sur les institutions culturelles par le nouveau pouvoir pour, comme on l'a vu, bannir les œuvres de Mendelssohn de la vie musicale allemande, incita certains théâtres à chercher des solutions alternatives au chef-d'œuvre de notre compositeur.

Une Ire remarque s'impose à cet égard. La pièce de Shakespeare avait suscité, bien avant 1933, d'autres musiques d'accompagnement. Pour faire court, on se limitera à évoquer celles de Bernhard Paumgartner à Vienne, en 1924, ou d'Ernst Křenek (archétype du « bolchéviste de la musique » dont la création de l'Opéra « Jonny spielt auf ! », en 1926, suscita en Allemagne et en Autriche des manifestations d'une rare violence, organisées par les Partis nazis de ces pays respectifs) pour le Festival de Heidelberg en 1926. Plus proche de nous peut être aussi évoqué l'Opéra éponyme de Benjamin Britten, composé en 1960. Pour le cinéma, Hans May avait écrit une partition dès 1925, sans oublier la Ire collaboration d'Erich Wolfgang Korngold avec Hollywood pour le film éponyme de Max Reinhardt, pour lequel le compositeur n'arrangea d'ailleurs rien d'autre que la partition de Mendelssohn. Dans tous ces cas, il s'agit d'œuvres suscitées par un besoin créatif, celui d'un compositeur émerveillé par le texte de Shakespeare, ou celui d'un metteur-en-scène cherchant auprès d'un compositeur contemporain une partition plus conforme à sa vision de l'œuvre que celle de Mendelssohn : toutes démarches inspirées par des conceptions et projets esthétiques parfaitement honorables.

Sous le Nazisme, l'apparition de plus d'une quarantaine de nouvelles partitions pour la pièce relève d'une toute autre démarche : il s'agit, pour des raisons raciales, d'éradiquer le chef-d'œuvre du compositeur d' « Elias » de la vie

musicale. Dès 1934, le processus se met en marche, et les productions recourant à la partition traditionnelle se raréfient rapidement : si, le 10 avril 1934, celle-ci est encore utilisée à Ulm, elle n'est plus présente au mois de juin 1934, dans une représentation sur la scène de plein-air du Musée de Brandebourg, à Berlin, que diffusée sur disques, l'auteur et les morceaux restant anonymes. On peut citer encore quelques autres productions l'utilisant encore (ainsi, à Pâques 1935, au théâtre de Meiningen) avant sa disparition en juin 1937, date de sa dernière utilisation au théâtre municipal de Brandenburg / Havel.

Parallèlement, 2 des plus hautes autorités du Reich, le Ministre de la Propagande Josef Gœbbels, et le directeur de l'organisation nationale-socialiste de loisirs Kraft durch Freude (la force par la joie), Robert Ley, cherchent à inciter les compositeurs aryens à écrire une par autorités du « Reich », le Ministre de la Propagande, Josef Gœbbels, et le directeur de l'organisation nationale-socialiste de loisirs « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF : la force par la joie) , Robert Ley, cherchent à inciter les compositeurs aryens à écrire une partition de substitution à celle de Mendelssohn. La pièce de Shakespeare reste, en effet, très jouée sous le Nazisme, ne connaissant pas moins de 11 nouvelles productions en 1933 ; 20 en 1934 ; 11 en 1935 ; 13 en 1936 ; 12 en 1937 ; 17 en 1938 et 1939 ; et 20 en 1940. Le brusque accroissement du nombre de productions, entre 1933 (11) et 1934 (20) , semble traduire un retour à la confiance des directeurs de théâtre grâce à l'apparition de solutions de substitution à la partition traditionnelle.

Ces dernières se rangent en 2 catégories, celles compilant de la musique d'autres compositeurs, d'une part, et les partitions originales, d'autre part. Relèvent par exemple de la compilation, un arrangement de la musique d' « Obéron » de Carl Maria von Weber, réalisé en 1934 par Ernst Balzer. Des œuvres peu connues de Weber fourniront aussi le matériau d'une autre de ces compilations en 1937, à Königsberg. Au rang de ces pots-pourris aurait pu également figurer ce qui allait devenir en réalité la 1re musique originale « aryenne » du chef-d'œuvre de Shakespeare, celle du compositeur Edmund Nick, présentée le 15 septembre 1934, au Grand Théâtre de Berlin, récemment rebaptisé en Théâtre du Peuple. Nick avait d'abord travaillé sur des fragments de « The Fairy Queen » de Henry Purcell avant de se décider à écrire sa propre partition. Il fera par ailleurs carrière comme arrangeur d'œuvres proscrites, les « aryennisant » pour le compte du Bureau du « Reich » des Arrangements musicaux, en les débarrassant de toutes références qui, de prêt ou de loin, pouvaient rappeler les origines juives de leurs auteurs ou compositeurs.

Le moins que l'on puisse dire est que l'opération ne fut pas couronnée de succès. Même chez ceux des critiques dont l'engagement national-socialiste ne pouvait être mis en doute, l'idée de remettre en cause le chef-d'œuvre de Mendelssohn ne pouvait qu'être vouée à l'échec. Le très influent critique Fritz Stege écrivait alors dans la « Revue berlinoise de Musique » :

« Que l'on puisse avancer des doutes justifiés contre Mendelssohn, n'empêche pas que Mendelssohn a capté le mystère de la forêt d'une manière qui reste unique par son atmosphère. Nick aurait pu apprendre de Mendelssohn, comment se conformer à l'essence d'un projet dramatique, sans s'égarer dans un humour musical déplacé ou de la triviale musique de salon. Je passe aussi sur le fait de savoir lequel des 2 mérite le plus le reproche de sentimentalité. Il faut aussi constater que la soi-disant sentimentalité de Mendelssohn n'est pas prouvée dans son essence, mais seulement dans la falsification de son style d'interprétation. Non : il ne convient au « Songe d'une nuit d'été » que la musique de Mendelssohn. Aucun arrangeur ne tirera d'honneur à porter atteinte à ce chef-d'œuvre artistique. »

Quelques semaines après, la contradiction est apportée à Stege par Friedrich Herzog, directeur du département musical des NSKG (Communautés culturelles nationales-socialistes) d'Alfred Rosenberg, qui, bien que n'ayant pas apprécié la musique de Nick, propose de commander des partitions alternatives à 5 compositeurs en vue à l'époque : Werner Egl, Gottfried Müller, Hans Pfitzner (figure importante de l'antisémitisme musical allemand), Rudolf Wagner-Regeny et Julius Weismann. Seuls les 2 derniers accepteront.

Il est important de noter ici que cette surenchère dépasse largement l'œuvre de Mendelssohn. Elle traduit, en effet, la lutte de pouvoir que se livrent, par messagers interposés, les 2 principales tendances de la vie culturelle nazie, représentée l'une par Goebbels, l'autre par Rosenberg, et qui se poursuivra jusqu'en 1938. Si Rosenberg représente la fraction idéologique la plus radicale du National-Socialisme, Goebbels tente, jusqu'à 1935, d'être l'apôtre d'une forme modérée d'ouverture esthétique, quand bien même son activisme antisémite est au moins aussi violent que celui de son adversaire. Dans la « question Mendelssohn », Stege d'un côté, membre de la présidence de la « Reichsmusikkammer » (Chambre de la musique du « Reich »), composante de la « Reichskulturkammer » (Chambre de la Culture du « Reich »), présidée par Goebbels, et Herzog, porte-parole de Rosenberg, s'opposent comme ils s'opposent quelques mois plus tard dans l'affaire Furtwängler / Hindemith. Le célèbre chef d'orchestre avait publiquement pris fait et cause pour le compositeur, mis en cause par les Nazis les plus radicaux pour son « Kulturbolschewismus ». Dans cette dernière affaire, Hitler soutiendra les vues de Rosenberg. Comme le montrent ses carnets, Goebbels n'était pas dupe des dommages causés à la culture allemande par la mise-au-pas systématique prônée par Rosenberg et ses sbires, comme en témoigne son attitude lorsqu'il découvrit que Johann Strauß, compositeur favori du « Führer », avait des ascendances juives :

« Un gros malin a découvert que Johann Strauß avait 1/8 de sang juif. J'interdis de rendre cela public. Tout d'abord, car rien n'est encore prouvé ; deuxièmement, parce que je n'ai pas envie de laisser indéfiniment réprimer l'ensemble du patrimoine culturel allemand. Il ne nous reste finalement plus de notre histoire que Widukind, Henri le Lion et Rosenberg. C'est un peu court. », écrit-il, le 5 juillet 1938.

Quoiqu'il en soit, la partition du « Volksdeutscher » Wagner-Regeny, né en Transylvanie, écrite à partir du dépeçage d'un Concerto pour piano dont il était mécontent, fut créée lors du 3e congrès des NSKG à Düsseldorf, le 6 juin 1935. De forme néo-Baroque, intégrant des éléments proches du jazz (dans les limites du tolérable selon les canons nazis), elle reçut un accueil plutôt mitigé dans la presse, qui écrivait par exemple :

« La réalité de sa caractérisation (des personnages) est très peu différenciée, recourant à des tournures orchestrales inhabituellement simplistes ; le compositeur utilise, par exemple, pour la « Marche des Elfes » presque les mêmes accents de cuivres et roulement de tambour que pour celle des artisans. »

La musique de Weismann ne fut guère plus appréciée.

Plus prudents, les compositeurs reconnus qui avaient approchés par le régime, y compris et surtout ceux écrivant encore dans un style Romantique, même tardif, tels Hans Pfitzner et Richard Strauß, déclinèrent l'offre, déclarant ne

rien pouvoir proposer de supérieur à l'œuvre de Mendelssohn. Cela n'empêcha par une ribambelle de plunitifs moins scrupuleux de s'atteler à la tâche : qu'ils se nomment Alfred Irmeler, chef à l'Opéra de Weimar dirigé alors par le commissaire d'État Hans Severus Ziegler, proche du clan Wagner et futur responsable de l'exposition « Entartete Musik » de Düsseldorf de 1938, qui composa une partition en septembre 1935 ; Werner Creuzburg, en octobre 1935 ; Robert Tants, en juillet 1937, pour n'en citer que quelques uns. Tous échouèrent, renvoyant à l'oubli cet épisode de la vie politico-musicale nazie, qui aurait pu n'être que ridicule s'il n'avait en réalité traduit l'acharnement du National-Socialisme à détruire toute trace de Mendelssohn, et partant, de l'ensemble des artistes d'origine juive, dans la culture allemande.

Certains de ceux qui contribuèrent à cette mascarade firent, après la guerre, amende honorable, tel Albert Imler déjà mentionné, ou une personnalité bien plus célèbre : Carl Orff. Celui-ci reçut, en avril 1938, la commande d'une nouvelle partition de la part de la ville de Francfort, représentée par son maire, Fritz Krebs, Nazi historique, ancien directeur régional de la Ligue de Combat pour la Culture allemande d'Alfred Rosenberg, directeur du Parti National-Socialiste de la région de Francfort, membre du conseil de la Chambre de Musique du « Reich », Hans Meißner, Intendant des scènes municipales de Francfort, et son adjoint Friedrich Bethge, « Obersturmführer » de la SS. Il reçut pour sa composition la somme de 5,000 « Reichsmark ». L'œuvre fut achevée en juin 1939, et reçut à nouveau un accueil mitigé, souffrant peu la comparaison inévitable avec l'œuvre de Mendelssohn. Orff tentera après la guerre de se justifier, déclarant qu'il était mécontent de l'œuvre, et qu'il n'avait fait que réaliser un projet qu'il aurait eu dans ses cartons depuis 1917, sur lequel il aurait travaillé à nouveau avant 1933 : bref, il s'agirait non pas d'une contribution au patrimoine musical du Nazisme, mais sa partition s'identifierait au contraire à celui de la République de Weimar.

Les 2 dernières partitions de substitution datent de 1944. La Ire, pot-pourri Baroque, fut créée au Théâtre de Braunschweig, le 16 juin de cette année ; l'autre, due à la plume de Franz Anton Wolpert, n'atteignit jamais la consécration publique puisque le théâtre d'État du gouvernement général de Cracovie, pour lequel elle était destinée, avait fermé ses portes lorsqu'elle fut achevée. Elle connut cependant une exécution concertante. Tout comme la musicologie nazie n'hésita pas à publier ses ouvrages racistes jusqu'à l'effondrement du 3e « Reich », lorsque ne résonnait plus sur l'Allemagne que le fracas des bombes (on pense ici à l'« Histoire de la Musique Allemande » de Karl Blessinger, publiée également en 1944), les autorités musicales nazies s'acharnèrent jusqu'à la fin pour faire disparaître toute trace de l'œuvre de Mendelssohn. Quelques mois plus tard, le 16 octobre 1944, le Nazisme déportait en bloc la quasi-totalité des musiciens et compositeurs du ghetto de « Theresienstadt » vers Auschwitz, où la plupart furent immédiatement assassinés. Mendelssohn se releva immédiatement de cette folie destructrice. Il en va malheureusement autrement des centaines, voire des milliers d'autres compositeurs juifs ou réprimés pour leur esthétique que le Nazisme persécuta. Pour beaucoup d'entre eux, l'Histoire est encore à écrire.

AB 110 : Le musicien et l'idéologue

Olivier Lussac : « Musica Falsa » n° 8, avril - mai 1999, Ire partie, pages 25-27 et n° 9, juin - juillet - août 1999, 2e partie, pages 50-51.

« Celui qui est resté passif sait qu'il s'est rendu moralement coupable chaque fois qu'il a manqué à l'appel, faute

d'avoir saisi n'importe quelle occasion d'agir pour protéger ceux qui se trouvaient menacés, pour diminuer l'injustice, pour résister. » (Karl Jaspers, « La Culpabilité allemande », 1948.)

L'idéologie Nationale-Socialiste, on le sait, commence par l'antisémitisme qui, en musique, a plusieurs sources. Aucune ne devrait être négligée. Pourtant, l'une des plus fortes et des plus claires fut celle de Richard Wagner qui publia, en septembre 1850, un essai intitulée « Judenthum in der Musik » (Judaïsme dans la musique) , dans lequel il s'attaque non seulement à Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, mais aussi à Giacomo Meyerbeer. À la lecture de cet essai, Franz Liszt, scandalisé, demanda des explications. Wagner y répondit de manière éloquente, le 18 avril 1851 : « Meyerbeer représente quelque chose de particulier pour moi : je ne le hais pas, mais il me dégoûte profondément. » . À la fois, Wagner était attiré par la puissance musicale de son collègue et, en même temps, le haïssait profondément, à cause du succès obtenu à Paris en 1840-1841. De même, sa relation avec Heinrich Heine était conflictuelle et son admiration exagérée tourna bien vite en rejet, jusqu'au moment où il déclara dans son essai que Heine était submergé « par les démons impitoyables de la négation » . Wagner accepta partiellement les théories raciales de Gobineau et, finalement, identifia les juifs aux diables. En 1881, le Théâtre du « Ring » à Vienne brûla et Wagner raconta à sa femme Cosima que tous les juifs devraient alors brûler dans un spectacle de « Nathan » .

Cette attaque si forte contre le juif, à la fin du texte, représentait pour Adolf Hitler une source précieuse pour sa « solution finale » . En tout cas, l'idéologie nazie devait pratiquer une relation entre les formes de l'art et les formes de société.

L'antisémitisme des musiciens allemands n'était pas seulement provoqué par les succès indéniables de Felix Mendelssohn-Baltholdy, Giacomo Meyerbeer ou même Jacques Offenbach, mais encore causé par la « musique répugnante » d'un Arnold Schœnberg, qui fut l'objet d'attaques et de dénonciations directes, précisément parce qu'il possédait une forte individualité.

Après la Première Guerre mondiale, la musique atonale représentait même l'équivalent de la musique bolchévique et de l'internationalisme juif. De tels jugements se trouvaient par exemple dans la revue « Zeitschrift Für Musik » dirigée en 1920 par le compositeur Hans Pfitzner. Comme de nombreux conservateurs, ce dernier se considérait apolitique. Cependant, au milieu de la Première Guerre, il dédia son « Deutsche Gesänge » à l'amiral von Tirpitz et, après la fondation de la République de Weimar, parla de la maladie sociale. Selon lui, tous les arts étaient les reflets de la condition étatique. Aussi, dans un écrit de 1920 intitulé « Die neue Ästhetik der Musikalischen Impotenz. Ein Verwesungssymptom ? » (La Nouvelle esthétique de l'impuissance musicale : un symptôme de la décadence ?) , Pfitzner attaqua le critique musical juif Paul Bekker et dénonça « l'œuvre internationale bolchévique de la subversion » , dans laquelle « le chaos atonal, correspondant à d'autres formes d'art, est le parallèle artistique du Bolchévisme qui menace l'Europe. » Depuis la guerre 14-18, nombreux sont les musiciens qui exigeaient de substituer la musique « non-germanique » par celle considérée comme « véritablement allemande » , tout spécifiquement durant l'année terrible de 1923. Et, à la fin de cette même année, Pfitzner publia dans le « Zeitschrift für Musik un Kampfblatt für deutsche Musik und Musikpflege » (Journal de combat pour la musique allemande et la culture musicale) . Un livre d'Erich Wolff et de Carl Petersen datant de 1923, intitulé « Das Schicksal der Musik von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart » (Le Destin de la musique de l'Antiquité jusqu'à aujourd'hui) , dénonça la musique atonale, « compréhensible seulement de

manière pathologique » . Car la nouvelle musique, selon les 2 auteurs, préparait le terrain des ennemis de l'Allemagne « pour ériger un homme de pure machine, un animal intellectuel, un destructeur du monde, rangeant la culture du Christianisme dans le barbarisme » .

Aussi, Hans Schilling voyait-il, dans ses essais, notamment « Richard Wagner comme le prophète du monde aryen » (« Musik » , novembre 1933) , Wagner comme le prédécesseur de la révolution culturelle de Hitler. « Nous continuons la marche, écrivait Walter Engelsmann, que Wagner a commencé, comme un révolutionnaire et un pionnier de l'art allemand depuis 85 ans. » (« Musik » , octobre 1933) . En effet, lorsque l'Opéra « Parsifal » fut produit en 1934 à Bayreuth, Harlmut Zelinsky lui-même considérait que le « pur enseignement du Christ » était incarné dans « Parsifal » , conçu à l'antipode du monde judaïque, symbolisé par Kundry. « Parsifal » était pur, de noble sang capable de sauver et de préserver la nation. Cette idée de pureté du sang prit une place essentielle dans la politique raciale des Nazis. En prenant Wagner comme seul précurseur, Adolf Hitler se référa au caractère messianique du mythe wagnérien, pour repousser les forces obscures par le feu et le fer. Ainsi, il releva à son apogée l'esprit et la race allemande. Dans un livre de 1933, Hans Schlemm disait que « La musique allemande est à la 1^{re} place. C'est la plus germanique de tous les arts. L'esprit allemand trouve son expression ici comme le plus beau, le plus pur et le plus direct des arts. » (« Wege zur deutschen Musik ») . Encore, dans l'article « Vom Wesen deutscher Musikauffassung » (1939) , il était dit que « La musique imprime plus profondément l'esprit de notre peuple. » , comme moyen de formation du caractère allemand. Il fallait y songer, au-delà même du juif, ce qui pouvait déranger l'esprit allemand, c'était ce quelque chose d'impur qui pénétrait la musique allemande : l'étranger sous toutes ses formes, à partir duquel Herbert Gerigk, directeur de la revue « Musik » , devait écrire un « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » (Lexique des juifs en musique) , dans lequel il montrait que les juifs avaient pris le contrôle de tous les postes. Il fallait donc les éliminer.

Et pour comprendre cette nouvelle musique, il fallait, comme le fit Richard Eichenauer, trouver une correspondance avec les Chorales de Martin Luther, qui ne furent pas seulement considérés comme chrétiens, mais plutôt universellement et éternellement germaniques, fondement des caractéristiques des peuples nordiques. Jean-Sébastien Bach ne servit pas de modèle, mais ce fut plutôt Heinrich Schütz (comme Wagner et Bruckner) , qui fut joué par la jeunesse hitlérienne. Il fallait recouvrer la mélodie, comme le préconisait Eichenauer dans son livre « Musik und Rasse » : dans l'harmonie de Wagner, 2 caractéristiques semblaient dominer, la simplicité et l'illustration colorée ; une harmonie qui n'était pas difficile à comprendre, qui, dans la plupart des cas, manquait totalement d'intelligibilité compliquée. En d'autres termes, la musique ne peut être qu'émotion.

Les recherches sur la race musicale renvoyaient alors aux idées majeures qui servirent à développer l'essence de l'esprit allemand. Comme Hans Severus Ziegler l'écrivait, il fallait se battre « contre la culture négro, pour le caractère national allemand » . Il essaya alors de supprimer les œuvres de Igor Stravinsky, Paul Hindemith et Ernst Křenek de tous les programmes de concert. Pour la commémoration « Wagner » de 1938 à Leipzig, Ziegler opposa l'héroïsme aryen au judaïsme et au bolchévisme, toujours considérés comme des forces du mal. Ce fameux discours mettait en lumière les idées d'une race en musique. Le juif correspondait au monde d'Alberich, de Beckmesser et de Kundry que Wagner utilisa dans sa Tétralogie, comme monde des profondeurs, de l'obscur, de l'enfer ; tandis que « Parsifal » s'apparentait au lumineux, au monde lumineux du peuple germanique, qualifié alors de « rein » (pur) et de « heil » (glorieux) . 2 mots qui, dans la langue allemande, possèdent plusieurs significations. « Rein » , en effet, signifie « pur

», mais aussi « propre », « net ». La notion de purification était donc présente et les Nazis exploitèrent l'impureté comme un moyen pour juger et détruire. Dans son discours inaugural de l'Exposition « Entartete Musik » à Düsseldorf, Ziegler utilisa les 2 sens du mot, pour « une atmosphère propre et air frais et libre, où, dans le futur, la création, aussi bien que les musiciens de l'Allemagne, respirant librement, peuvent vivre et travailler ». La pureté était donc assimilée à la propreté et le reste à la saleté ! En même temps, il jugea l'atonalisme comme un charlatanisme. L'apparente extension de l'harmonie était considérée comme une dévaluation de la tonalité et provoquait donc une dégénérescence. Alors Ziegler s'en prend violemment à Arnold Schönberg, sans savoir que ce dernier se réfère aussi à Beethoven, lorsqu'il souligna : « Parce que l'atonalité a ses fondements dans l' " Harmonielehre " du juif Arnold Schönberg. Je déclare que cela est le produit de l'esprit juif et, finalement, manque la sensation pour la pureté du génie allemand Beethoven. ». Tout comme l'idée de pureté, une ambiguïté semblable se retrouve dans le terme « heil », aussi originaire de « Parsifal ». « Heil » se réfère à « heilig » (saint, sacré) . Comme nom, il exprime la santé et le salut. Le Christ est donc le Sauveur. Avec le mot « Heil / heil » (sainteté, santé et salut) , Ziegler avait dans l'esprit le sens même de la musique, qui était « une des places (salutaires) de notre profonde existence intérieure » . Il explicitait ainsi le sens de salut, comme le prouve le fameux « heil Hitler ! » , qui pouvait être tracé depuis Wagner et pouvait conduire à qualifier la bonne santé de l' « Esprit allemand » .

Opposée à cette idée de pureté du sang et de santé se trouvait l'idée de dégénérescence. Aussi, dans l'esprit de Ziegler, la musique pouvait être interprétée que comme de manière dégénérée. Et, en dépit d'une conférence sur le compositeur Johannes Brahms, en 1933, Arnold Schönberg avait sous-estimé le danger qui pouvait émerger de l'idéologie wagnérienne. Parce qu'il n'était pas certain que Wagner fut un aryen, il pensait, contrairement à d'autres compositeurs, que Wagner était tolérant envers les juifs, que ceux-ci pouvaient devenir de vrais Allemands. Pour Hans Severus Ziegler, cette possibilité était impossible. Pour lui, il s'agissait de préserver la pureté du sang et la supériorité de la race allemande. Les théories raciales devinrent ainsi un moyen efficace de contrôle et de modèle pour le musicien Beethoven, par exemple, en dépit de son apparence non-germanique ; Mozart en dépit de son accointance avec Da Ponte ; le cosmopolite Franz Liszt et Franz Schubert qui fut décrit par Eichenauer comme un « Nordique de l'est » . Pour Adolf Hitler et Josef Gœbbels, Anton Bruckner pouvait être considéré comme un représentant aryen : « Comme fils du sol autrichien, Anton Bruckner est spécifiquement choisi pour représenter à notre époque l'esprit indissoluble et la communauté émotionnelle du destin qui unit la nation dans son ensemble. » (Josef Gœbbels, 6 juin 1937.) Bruckner le provincial, comme Hitler, fut en effet rejeté par la métropole autrichienne et le compositeur fut considéré par les Nazis comme une victime du système juif, parce que le critique Eduard Hanslick s'était opposé à lui. Le dimanche 6 juin 1937, donc, un buste de Bruckner fut édifié dans un lieu symbolique, au « Walhalla » , près de Regensburg, en Bavière. Gœbbels proclama alors que Bruckner était le symbole de l'entière nation allemande.

Comment Ziegler pouvait-il préserver cette pureté de la race ? Lors du « Reichsmusiktage » du 28 mai 1938, le docteur Gœbbels proclama les « 10 principes de la création musicale germanique » :

« Ni le programme, la théorie et l'expérimentation, ni la structure déterminent l'essence de la musique. Son essence est la mélodie. La mélodie exalte le cœur et fortifie l'esprit. Comme avec n'importe quelle autre forme d'art, la musique est générée par des forces mystérieuses et profondes, prenant racines dans les caractères nationaux. La musique germanique et la musique juive sont opposées, à cause de leur nature, contradictoire l'une de l'autre. La bataille

contre le judaïsme dans la musique germanique ne sera jamais abandonnée. La musique est le plus sensuel des arts. Parce qu'elle parle plus au cœur et aux émotions qu'à la raison. Laissez-nous remercier Dieu de nous donner la capacité à écouter la musique, à l'expérimenter et à l'aimer passionnément. La musique est un art qui touche l'esprit plus profondément : il possède le pouvoir d'apaiser la peine et de bénir avec bonheur. Si la mélodie est l'origine de la musique, alors il s'ensuit que la musique pour le peuple ne peut pas s'épuiser elle-même dans les chorales ou les pastorales. Elle doit toujours retourner à la mélodie comme racine de son essence. Élever les trésors (de la musique) et les transmettre au peuple est notre devoir le plus important. Le langage des sons est quelque fois plus irrésistible que le langage des mots. Les grands Maîtres du passé sont par conséquent représentatifs de la majesté véritable de notre peuple. Pour maintenir et pour accroître la gloire et l'honneur de notre nation. »

De nombreux musiciens se rallieront à ce discours. Plus étrange encore, nombreux sont ceux qui officieront la musique après la Guerre : Josef Müller-Blattau devint professeur à Freiburg en 1937 et, après la guerre, eut la même fonction à l'Université de Saarbrücken. Son Maître, Wilibald Gurlitt, se proclama lui-même en faveur du « Chancelier du peuple » Adolf Hitler. Heinrich Bessler devint, en 1948, professeur à Iéna et, en 1956, à Leipzig. Walther Vetter glorifia les Opéras de Mozart aux conférences de Düsseldorf et, après avoir découvert l'origine de Da Ponte, il fut promu comme professeur et comme directeur de l'Institut de Musicologie de l'Université de Posen. Après 1945, il continua sa carrière comme l'un des plus éminents représentants de la musicologie allemande. Ernst Bücken embrassa très vite le darwinisme dans les recherches musicales. Ernst Kirsch proclama qu'« aucun juif ne peut être un camarade national » , lors des conférences de Düsseldorf.

Cependant, parmi les musicologues, certains résistèrent. Ce fut le cas de Hans Joachim Moser qui, en 1935, dans son dictionnaire de la musique, rappela que Robert Schumann et Johannes Brahms admiraient Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. Friedrich Blume insista sur la mixité dans son essai « Musik und Rasse » : « Toute la musique qui est connue et comprise par nous a grandi sur le socle des caractéristiques nationales et s'est finalement mélangée racialement. » . De tels propos ne furent pas sans conséquence. Il n'obtint aucun poste de professeur, mais laissa à la postérité un fameux « Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart » . Il questionna ainsi les rapports entre la race et la musique et en vint à cette conclusion : si on observe l'expérience raciale de la musique, selon les aryens, ceux-ci dissocient radicalement l'approche scientifique de l'approche intuitive. Le scientifique, au contraire, prend en compte les changements historiques de l'écoute et montre alors que l'association populaire du monde germanique avec la tonalité n'a pas de validité éternelle.

D'autres encore parmi les compositeurs refusèrent une telle entreprise. Béla Bartók fut absent de l'Exposition de l'« Entartete Musik » , parce qu'il appartenait à une nation amie. Il refusa ce traitement de faveur et, le 5 mai, avec Zoltán Kodály et d'autres artistes, protesta dans une résolution contre les lois raciales hongroises et demanda un peu plus tard d'être admis dans le cercle des « dégénérés » . Chez les compositeurs, ce fut alors une rébellion silencieuse, comme le souligne Gunter Weisenborn dans son « Rapport sur le mouvement de résistance du peuple allemand : 1933-1945 » . Le musicologue Kurt Huber était membre d'un groupe de résistance à Munich et fut condamné à mort en 1943. Le chef d'orchestre Leo Borchard demanda la fin de la guerre dans un tract. Le pianiste Helmut Roloff aida les juifs à émigrer. Le compositeur Karl Amadeus Hartmann dédicça son poème symphonique, « Miseræ » , aux victimes de Dachau. Il ne publia cette œuvre qu'à partir de 1945. Le critique musical Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt aida

les artistes de l'avant-garde musicale, principalement dans les 1res années du régime nazi. La résistance, comme on le sait, s'organisa également dans les camps de concentration, notamment à « Theresienstadt » et dans les autres pays, avec les Hanns Eisler, Theodor W. Adorno, Paul Dessau et Kurt Weill. Ils furent également aidés par Arturo Toscanini, Ignaz Paderewsky et Pablo Casals, tandis que Ernst Busch passait à la radio russe des chansons anti-fascistes. En 1938, la « BBC » mit encore en place un service pour l'Allemagne et, en 1941, c'est la 5e Symphonie de Beethoven qui annonçait le programme créé par Martin Esslin, Richard Friedenthal, Alfred Kerr, Erika et Thomas Mann, Peter de Mendelssohn, Erich Ollenhauer et Robert Neumann, tandis que l'« Office of War Information », aux États-Unis, programmat un « We fight back », sous la direction de Ernst Joseph Aufricht.

Il est bien évident que, sans ces réactions salutaires, « On se reconnaîtra, en tant qu'individu, moralement coupable d'avoir par crainte laissé échapper de telles chances d'agir. » (Karl Jaspers, « La Culpabilité allemande », 1948.)

Sources

Barron Stephanie : « Entartete Kunst. Das Schicksaal der Avant-garde im Nazi-Deutschland », Los Angeles County Museum of Art et « Deutsches Historisches Museum », Berlin, Hirmer Verlag, Munich (1991-1992) .

Dümling Albrecht : « " Entartete Musik ", The Exhibition of Düsseldorf 1938-1988 in texts and Documents », Londres (1995) .

Steinweis Alan E. : « Art, Ideology and Economics in Nazi Germany », University of North California Press, Chapell Hill, London (1993) .

Willett John : « Art & Politics in the Weimar Period », Da Capo Press, New York (1978) .

AB III : le National-Socialisme, le 3e « Reich » et la scène musicale

Musique, économie et opportunisme politique

In March 1933, clarinetist Valentin Grimm found himself caught in a dilemma. Having learned of Adolf Hitler's victory in late January, he had returned to Germany after spending many years as a professional musician in New York City. Being a card-carrying Nazi Party member, he was now looking for a comfortable job in one of Germany's many well-known Orchestras. No one offered to hire him, however, because there were no jobs. Grimm was facing a welfare existence unless things changed dramatically. They did not. In 1936, he finally landed a shaky part-time position with a Hamburg Pops Opera. The 185 Marks he was paid every month was too little to live on and too much to starve. As late as 1938, Grimm was so poor that he could not even afford the dark suit he needed to play in the Orchestra. Grimm seriously contemplated returning to New York.

In Berlin, the violinist Georg Kirchner did not fare much better. He had fallen victim to the tidal wave of unemployment sweeping across the waning Weimar Republic, and he also failed to make it back into the work force

after Hitler's assumption of power. After several precarious years, on the dole, he gave-up all hope of a musical career and accepted work in a machine factory, in 1938. The cellist Friedrich Walther was only slightly better off. Having served in the Bayreuth Festival Orchestra, from 1927 to 1933, he suddenly was discharged. Although Winifred Wagner, daughter-in-law of Richard Wagner and patron of the Festival, offered to recommend him for a new job elsewhere, Walther was judged to be somewhat less than accomplished during auditions. Still, he managed to secure work as a back-up cellist at the « Deutsche Oper » , in Berlin, earning a mere 360 Marks a month plus expenses and subject to dismissal with only 2 weeks' notice. In 1933, conductor Otto Klein was holed-up in the capital awaiting a suitable job offer. With no such prospect in sight, he begged the government for support money. 5 years later, Klein had still not found employment. To pass the time and sharpen his skills, he composed the Opera « Atlantis » , which was immediately doomed to oblivion. By this time, both Klein and his wife had been struck by illness. They were supported solely by Klein's 2 brothers, who sent him 230 Marks a month. Hanns Rohr, another conductor, had a doctorate in music. Having gotten by as an itinerant guest-conductor, from 1928 to 1934, he now accompanied his wife, a violinist, at the piano. If not for generous handouts from music-loving friends and the odd guest-conductor's job, the couple would have gone under. By 1937, Rohr was suffering from a heart condition ; 1 year later, his distraught wife entered a sanatorium.

During the 1st years of the Nazi regime, the fate of these musicians was hardly atypical ; in fact, their personal difficulties were symptomatic of the widespread economic confusion that characterized the cultural scene in Germany, following the last years of the Weimar Republic. The root cause could be traced back to January 1933. At that time, the new Hitler regime had inherited from the Republic a stagnant economy marked by high unemployment and low wages. This unemployment subsided only gradually ; it was not until 1936 that it fell below that of 1928-1929, and full employment was not achieved until 1938-1939. In 1933, real earnings were a mere 87 % of those in 1925-1929, a relatively stable phase for the Republic and, only in 1938, did they begin to surpass those of the peak years of Republican prosperity.

As difficult as these conditions were for the average German wage earner, they were much more onerous for the country's hundred thousand or so musicians, fewer than half of whom were devoted to the so-called Classics, or « serious music » . Not until about 1938 were they finally on an economic par with the national standard. One reason for this lag was that in tough economic times, matters of culture usually took 2nd place. This made itself felt even in Germany, a country with a tradition of staunch public support for its cultural institutions, including Opera Houses and Symphony Orchestras. Such support, which had been gradually withdrawn as a result of the depression during the later years of the Republic, was only haltingly restored in the 1st years of the 3rd « Reich » , as overall conditions improved. In the summer of 1933, for instance, some members of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, financially one of the best endowed of Germany's « culture Orchestras » (those musical organizations dedicated exclusively to « serious music ») , were still subjected to salary cuts of 40 % . In 1935, unemployed Munich musicians were performing recitals in nursing homes on a volunteer basis just to maintain their skills. Even as circumstances were improving, by late 1936, 4 out of 5 of Germany's gainfully employed musicians were bringing home less than 200 Marks a month - which was less than what most blue-collar workers earned. The jobless rate still hovered above the 20 % mark, more than twice the national average.

Matters improved more quickly between 1936 and 1939 against the backdrop of general economic progress. More specifically, musicians of all kinds were needed after the establishment of Hitler's « Wehrmacht » , in 1935, and the expansion of various government and Nazi Party organizations, notably the SS and the compulsory « Reich » Labor Service, all of which were eager to have their own bands. Moreover, geographic expansion caused by the annexation of Austria and, eventually, the Sudetenland and Memel created additional demands. In March 1938, an impending shortage of qualified musicians prompted the music lover Josef Gœbbels, head of all organized musicians under the Nazi regime, to promulgate a basic wage decree guaranteeing the profession's attractiveness. By this order, « culture Orchestras » were favored over mere dance and light-entertainment bands. Orchestras were divided into 5 competency classes, and musicians' salaries and pension payments were standardized by law.

These developments were reflected in an ascending salary curve for orchestra musicians, soloists, and conductors alike, with variations in each category based on qualifications, experience, and national prominence. Throughout the 3rd « Reich » , those musicians at the lowest end of the professional scale who were contractually employed consistently earned more in wages than any freelance work might net them. But at the upper end of the scale, an eminent artist might make as much from frequent guest appearances as from a guaranteed salary. If a musician was so fortunate as to be securely employed in 1933, his monthly earnings as an Orchestra member could be as high as 450 Marks. In 1936, the same salary could be as low as 350 Marks per month, but it might well have risen, as it did for 1st violinist Hans Ortleb of the « Deutsche Oper » , in Berlin, to over 600 Marks by early 1939. Concert Masters and soloists could expect to make at least double those amounts, depending on their opportunities for independent concertizing. This income placed them very close to the category of physicians, who, topping lawyers and dentists, were the highest-paid of the self-employed professional groups in the Nazi era.

Financially, conductors generally fared much better, with the world-famous Wilhelm Furtwängler the undisputed champion. In 1934, he received 1,000 Marks per concert, contractually performing 22 of them in Berlin alone, in addition to touring, which fetched an equivalent amount per event. By 1937, Furtwängler was already getting 2,000 Marks per appearance and, in 1938-1939, this figure doubled again. For all of 1939, he earned well in excess of 200,000 Marks, more than triple the 60,000 Marks (including 20,000 Marks in expenses) that his Austrian colleague Clemens Krauß was paid after assuming the directorship of the « Bayerische Staatsoper » in Munich, in 1937. Somewhat lesser-known conductors were still comfortably well off. For example, Hans Rosbaud, in 1934-35, was earning about 13,000 Marks per year at « Radio Frankfurt » . Other conductors employed for radio programs or as assistants throughout the « Reich » could be paid as much as a well-placed concert Master, but less qualified ones were dependent on touring, and received as little as 200 Marks per engagement.

It is almost impossible to gauge the earnings of composers, many of whom doubled as conductors, soloists, or Conservatory teachers. At one end of the spectrum was Carl Orff, who always tried to be fiercely independent. He subsisted for years on his publisher's advances, which he did not begin to make good on until the War, when Orff's Operas finally began to bring him wealth. No other composer of serious music earned as much as Richard Strauß who, in 1936 (not one of his banner years) , earned over 80,000 Marks from all sources ; high for a composer but noticeably trailing Furtwängler. Hans Pfitzner, who ranked just after Strauß in national importance, was making about half that much.

Because, in general terms, the economic situation of musicians was so bleak until 1938, Nazi Party and government agencies tried to do what they could to help. Special Symphony and chamber Orchestras were financially supported and filled with jobless Nazi musicians. When the British jazz band leader Jack Hylton applied to tour Germany, in 1934-1935, he was allowed to do so only on condition that he contribute 25 % of his earnings to unemployed German colleagues. The « Reich » made grants of thousands of Marks to aid the unemployed and facilitate the dignified retirement of older musicians. At Carnival time, in February 1935, a musicians' ball was organized in Munich's posh « 4 Seasons » Hotel (the « Hotel Vier Jahreszeiten Kempinski » on « Maximilianstrasse 17 ») for the benefit of impoverished musicians and, in 1936, Josef Goebbels instituted « Kunstlerdank », a social-assistance program backed with millions of Marks, from which the chronically indigent, such as involuntarily retired musicians and other artists, were to profit. From the fall of 1937 to the fall of 1938, « Kunstlerdank » benefited more than 3,000 musicians with up to 300 Marks each.

The program's work did not cease after economic conditions for musicians had improved. Even during World War II, when many musicians were in a position to exploit their unique talents, Goebbels called on musicians to entertain the troops and participate in various cultural schemes, to the extraordinary financial advantage of the musicians. But the very fact that « Kunstlerdank » was a creature of the regime raises the question of a possible inter-relationship between economic performance and pro-Nazi political deportment and, specifically, the question of opportunism. That is, did their financial straits motivate musicians to join the Nazi Party, between 1933 and 1945 ? Given the insufficient evidence to date, the answer can only be equivocal. From a largely north German sample of musicians of all stripes and qualifications, between 1933 and 1938, most of whom joined the Party, in 1934, it may be concluded that about 20 % of the profession was in the « Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei » (NSDAP) (National-Socialist German Workers' Party or Nazi Party) before the War. Moreover, those who were employed showed a stronger tendency to join the NSDAP than those who were idle. Still, this does not rule-out destitution as a possible motive for Nazi Party membership. In 1934, for instance, though about one 3rd of all musicians were jobless, more than half of the employed ones had a monthly income of 100 Marks or less. It may have been only these who show-up as NSDAP members in the statistics. But why, then, was the proportion of Vienna Philharmonic musicians (among the best paid in the « Reich ») who were Nazi Party members also equal to 33 % after the « Anschluß » of Austria, in 1938, and why did this membership rise over the years, even with the economy on the up-swing ? It is clear that, in this case, factors other than purely economic ones were causing many artists to jump on the Nazi band wagon.

To be sure, interference in music professionals' lives by the Nazi regime was considerable, and not only in economic terms. Official dictates called for the nazification of music to the extent that art generally had to be « put to the service of an idea » which, in this case, meant the ideology of racist National-Socialism. At the height of the War, Wolfgang Stumme, chief of music in the « Hitler-Jugend » (Hitler Youth), still described German music as an antidote to « dangerous poison threatening the blood », that is, stimuli from the « Jewish, materialistic, Bolshevist environment ». In theory, then, only narrowly defined « German music » was to be produced and listened to. In 1938, Hans Pfitzner, under the impression that creative freedom was being stifled, remarked sarcastically to Hermann Göring, the boss of the « Preussische Staatsoper », that in present-day Germany « any criticism is forbidden, indeed abolished, so that you cannot write it if a soubrette sings badly, even when it is really so ». Of course, Pfitzner knew well that

such policies represented merely the ideal condition called for by Nazi fanatics, and that they could not be enforced with any degree of consistency. Goebbels knew this also when he pronounced, in February 1934, that however tightly a government might rule, it had to keep loose reins on artistic and intuitive activities. Richard Strauß, as President of Josef Goebbels' « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber, or RMK) , took his cue from Goebbels when, in 1935, he listed the desirable qualities of a music director : he had to have good ears, he had to be able to play the piano well, he had to understand the art of singing, and he had to comprehend the dynamics of modern Opera (especially Strauß's own) . Significantly, in this catalog of virtues, Strauß failed to mention anything about Nazism or the Hitler regime.

These 2 conflicting tenets, censure and toleration, turned-out to be the guidelines for music creation and administration in the 3rd « Reich » . While they expressed opposite intentions, neither one in its pure and unadulterated form dominated the musical life of the nation. Typically representing compromise in combination, they tempered each other, ensuring that some degree of artistic freedom would always obtain. Such a fluctuating system of balances, as we know today, was characteristic of the overall policy structure of Hitler's 3rd « Reich » and served to keep it going.

Germane to the question of artistic opportunism, or the premeditated blending of art and politics in the 1st years of the regime, the principle of compromise found its practical embodiment in a 3 stage process of policy making : 1st, if a musician proved to possess artistic talent and loyalty to the regime in more or less equal measure, then professional success could be virtually guaranteed ; 2nd, if a lack of musical competence was painfully obvious, then no amount of political dedication could warrant artistic survival ; and 3rd, even if a musician's ties to the regime were minimal or non-existent, he could still forge an impressive career for himself if the quality and quantity of his musical output were high by any standards, unless he went-out of his way to insult the regime. The 3rd stage explains the relative success of conductors such as Hans Rosbaud and Wilhelm Furtwängler, of composers such as Richard Strauß, and of performers such as the bass-baritone Hans Hotter.

Officially, then, as with many occupations in the 3rd « Reich » , Nazi affiliation of one kind or another was held to be a prerequisite for career advancement in the « serious music » business, and prospective employers often applied pressure to individual musicians to join the Nazi Party. This prompted many artists of solid, but not outstanding ability, to find jobs or improve their situation on the basis of existing or newly earned Nazi credentials. The conductor Gerhart Stiebler was out of work and judged to be merely competent as a musician, but because he had joined the NSDAP, in 1932, and been very active as a Party speaker, he was hired as musical director of the Górlitz Theater, in June 1933. Regime officials as highly-placed as Prussian Minister of Education Bernhard Rust had seen fit to intervene on his behalf. Although, in 1936, the consensus was that Wilhelmine Holzinger, a freelance pianist always in search of a job, was but a mediocre musician, she had befriended « Gauleiter » Julius Streicher of Nuremberg and other Party leaders and, finally, was deemed worthy of further support in the form of a job at Radio Nuremberg. And, in Berlin, in 1936, there was Walter Lutze, a repertory conductor at the city's « Deutsche Oper » , which was within not Göring's but Goebbels's own jurisdiction. Lutze, too, was able but not brilliant and, like Stiebler, had joined the Party, in 1932. In addition, he was an old friend of Heinrich Hoffmann, Adolf Hitler's personal photographer, and father-in-law of Hitler Youth leader, Baldur von Schirach. When Lutze was served notice on artistic grounds, Goebbels personally intervened

and prevented his dismissal ; although the conductor was slated for removal during the War, when musicians were scarce, the propaganda Minister protected him up to the end of the regime.

The entire Schirach family exemplifies Nazi patronage in the arts. Baldur's father, Karl von Schirach, long retired as « Generalintendant » of the Weimar stage but an old follower of Hitler, since the 1920's, was made intendant of the Wiesbaden Theater, in 1933. Rosalind, Karl's daughter, was a run-of-the-mill soprano at the Berlin « Deutsche Oper » . Together with her lover Gerhard Husch, the well-known baritone, she organized a powerful Nazi cell there that wielded much influence. One trade journal hailed her as the « ideal image of a Nordic-Aryan singer » .

Baldur himself wrote melodramatic poems, many of which venerated the « Führer » and were set to music, giving Cantatas such as those by the unexceptional Hans Ferdinand Schaub timely and very convenient content. In fact, gearing the thematic content of a musical composition to the spirit of the times could bring rich rewards to its creator ; Schaub found himself elevated to the position of « State composer » by the « Gauleiter » of Hamburg and was granted an unconditional sinecure. Friedrich Leiboldt of Naumburg composed his « Horst Wessel » Cycle in part on verses by von Schirach ; it was scheduled to be premiered by a mixed choir, in 1934. Rudolf Bockelmann, another famous baritone, acted as soloist in the song « For the “ Führer ” » , written by the little-known Hans Gansser and marketed by « Electrola » Records, in 1935. Paul Winter, who perhaps deservedly was to rise to the rank of general during World War II, crafted a hymn-fanfare and had it performed at Vienna Radio, in April 1938, after Hitler had marched his troops into Austria ; it was inspired by his profound joy over the « magnificent consummation of the union of Greater Germany » . Frequently, such politically inspired compositions were generated because venal regime leaders (Göring, Goebbels, or Alfred Rosenberg) had commissioned them.

But even though, in the 2 years of Hitler's rule, some 20,000 compositions with political applications were produced, the large majority, written by crass dilettantes of undoubtedly sterling Party reputation, were never recognized. Hitler himself, while admitting to only moderately sophisticated musical tastes, at least was shrewd enough to see through the most blatant cases of opportunism. Hence, he « disliked the newly composed Party rally music » and, by 1935, he had forbidden the inflationary practice of personal dedications to the « Führer » .

Not only career-conscious composers but also instrumentalists and conductors who, for lack of talent, had been failures in the pre-Nazi period now attempted to use the Party badge or other regime paraphernalia to pursue their goal. They still failed because of incompetence. Doris Kaehler, at 38, not the youngest contralto in the business, traveled from Berlin to Berchtesgaden, where she beleaguered Hitler at his « Berghof » , hoping that a chance to sing for him might lead to a spot at State radio. Kaehler was a Nazi « Old Fighter » (one of those who had joined the Party before January 1933) and the daughter of a minor Party functionary, but her artistic credentials were wanting. Paul de Neve, who in the « Marxist-Jewish “ Reich ” » had directed musical events for the Party for free, was hoping for restitution ; yet, he remained merely a candidate for « Kunstlerdank » for, in 1938, he was already 57 and had no particular artistic merits. Party comrade Otto Wartisch, a conductor, failed dismally to land a contractual post at the Munich Philharmonic, in 1936, as did Party comrade Fritz Müller-Rehrmann, hoping for a post as conductor, composer, or music professor anywhere in Germany, in 1937. Typically, artists such as Wartisch and Müller-Rehrmann over-estimated their chances and, on the basis of their Nazi pedigrees, aspired to positions they could never do justice to,

even at the pleasure of benevolently minded dictators, as Goebbels himself correctly observed, in late 1936. The composer Paul Hindemith at the start of the Nazis' regime declared that :

« Bad works can't be pushed indefinitely, and the people they are now digging-out are all complete mediocrities. »

Agences nazies pour l'administration de la musique

One reason why the compromise between suppression and toleration was workable was the relative impotence of, and the lack of cooperation between, the agencies set-up to administer music in the regime. The 1st of these agencies was the « Kampfband für deutsche Kultur » (Combat League for German Culture or « Kfdk ») . The « Kfdk » , founded by the Nazi Party ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, in February 1929, was a political lobby aimed at rescuing German culture from what the National-Socialists considered pornography, Bolshevism, international Jewry, and the « gutter press » (all symbolized by « Bauhaus » art, critical writings in the left-wing « Weltbühne » , and modernist - or « atonal ») music. It was aimed at Germany's educated elite during Adolf Hitler's rise to power, at a time when he was eager to court the upper-strata of society. Until January 1933, conservative, nationalistic, and race-conscious Germans, most of them from academic circles but also performing artists, had joined its various regional cells. In the realm of music, the local « Kampfband » leaders would stage recitals and concerts, frequently with the help of unemployed musicians (such as a « Kampfband » choir) , and Nazi sympathizers with an interest in high culture would attend, as well as contribute money.

For administrative purposes, the « Kampfband » leadership created elaborate sub-divisions, including sections for serious and for light music, for Opera, for instrumental and vocal-music, for composition, and, not least, for music education. After January 1933, the « Kampfband » 's ambition to be the sole regulator of music in the 3rd « Reich » became stronger, fueled by Rosenberg's own sense of mission as the Party's official philosopher and warden of all things cultural. As job-creation schemes became ever more important, local music events featuring unemployed or under-employed instrumentalists, vocalists, even entire Orchestras or choirs took precedence in all the German provinces, such as in Halle, where an evening of Johannes Brahms sonatas and Richard Wagner's « Wesendonk Lieder » was organized in March 1933. The inclusion of Wagner signaled the « Kampfband » 's uppermost purpose, that of sweeping « the last bits of Jewish rot out of our German house, quickly and thoroughly » . This belligerent agency acquired some official currency when it managed to put on a celebration in honour of Hitler's birthday, on 20 April 1933, in Berlin, on which occasion Rosalind von Schirach's paramour Gerhard Husch presented songs by Johann Sebastian Bach and Franz Schubert. Similarly, unadulterated German fare was offered a month later in Leipzig, when « Kampfband » organizers penetrated the famous « Gewandhaus » Orchestra Hall to stage works by Brahms (supposedly, in honour of the Centenary of his birth) . And, in early summer, a special arts Festival in Berlin afforded Gustav Havemann's national « Kampfband » Orchestra the chance to present selections from Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » and « Der fliegende Holländer » . To emphasize the Nazi Party backing, at a « Kampfband » Festival, in Stettin in the fall, the pianist Annemarie Heyne, a niece of Deputy « Führer » Rudolf Heß, participated, and in Plauen so did Heinrich Bienert, a reciter of poetry as well as a « Standartenführer » in the SA.

The « Kampfband » was weak, however, and its domination over German music was tenuous and short-lived for 2

reasons. 1st, it was an unofficial, unauthorized Party organization, founded on impulse by one Nazi leader ambitious for overall cultural control, and without Adolf Hitler's committed backing. Throughout its existence, the « Kfdk » had its organizational and financial base only in the Nazi Party and was never grounded in government. Soon after, the regime had been installed, Rosenberg's reign was challenged by Josef Goebbels, Hermann Göring, and Prussian (later « Reich ») Culture and Education Minister Bernhard Rust, because of his jurisdiction over music education. 2nd, despite Rosenberg's historic role as founder and spiritual figurehead, the « Kampfbund » never enjoyed strong central leadership, either from Berlin or from Munich, the seat of Party headquarters. Instead, it was directed locally and regionally by mid-level Party bosses, not all of whom were musicians, and who were likely to be engaged in internecine feuding. Every provincial hamlet seems to have had a « Kampfbund » dictator « who issued directives capriciously » , as Paul Hindemith's frustrated music-publisher wrote him, in April 1933. And so, as a consequence of the « Kampfbund » 's shaky beginnings and lack of authority, centralization, and coordination, Rosenberg eventually was surpassed by stronger contenders for cultural control, the most persistent of whom turned-out to be Goebbels.

During 1933 and early 1934, the « Kampfbund » sought to fortify its influence with the aid of local delegates who held key positions in municipal music circles. In Rhenish Krefeld, it was conductor Walther Meyer-Giesow who lorded it over the municipal orchestra, a collegium musicum, and a madrigal choir, and who, throughout 1933, planned virtually all the musical activities in town. In Munich, « Kampfbund » dictator Paul Ehlers so usurped the traditional « Bach-Verein » and its choir and orchestra that Carl Orff who, before the 3rd « Reich » , had played a key role in it, withdrew in early 1934. And, in Marburg, the « Kfdk » chief used his power to organize as many musical events as possible, for the greatest number of Party faithful, at preferential ticket prices.

The undoing of Rosenberg's combative organization began as early as spring 1933, for it was taking liberties in music policy and administration for which it had no mandate, thus embarrassing not only civil but Party authorities as well. In April, a Rhenish « Kampfbund » cell, allegedly with Rosenberg's authorization, offered Munich composer and conductor Hans Pfitzner the directorship of the Düsseldorf Opera. But when Pfitzner checked with the lord mayor of Düsseldorf, who was ultimately responsible, he received no commitment. The « Kampfbund » then explained that it had merely tried to act on a suggestion from Rosenberg, but that, naturally, Pfitzner would have to deal with the mayor himself. The « Kampfbund » had lost face, and Pfitzner was chagrined.

In north German Schwerin, meanwhile, concert Master Karl Kramer was summarily dismissed from the Mecklenburg State Theater for displeasing one of his superiors. Kramer had the « Kampfbund » intercede with the « Gauleiter » , but since it was without authority, nothing came of the action. In Hamburg, « Kapellmeister » and « Kampfbund » member Willi Hammer set-down a definition of art meant to serve as a general directive for the « Reich » , but no sooner had it been promulgated than it sank into oblivion. By spreading lies, a Berlin « Kampfbund » functionary, in February 1934, tried to discredit the noted music-critic Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, but was forced to apologize after Stuckenschmidt's vigorous protest.

By this time, Goebbels, who not only was in charge of propaganda for the Party but also, since March 1933, held a ministerial position authorizing him to oversee matters of culture almost everywhere, had put his « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) , or « RMK » , firmly into place, and it was now applying heavy

pressure on Rosenberg's disparaged « Kampfbund » cells. Although Rosenberg was given an « Office for the Supervision of the Total Spiritual and Philosophical Education and Development of the NSDAP » , his remained a marginal Party agency, in contrast to Gœbbels's dual functions in the Party and the State. Within this new office, Rosenberg created yet another music control post, hoping to redouble the efforts of his lackluster « Kampfbund » on the strength of Party legitimacy while coupling the impotent « Kfdk » with the « Kraft durch Freude » (Strength-through-Joy or « KdF ») organization, of Robert Ley. The new control post, known as the Main Office for Music, was handed over to Herbert Gerigk, an ambitious musicologist and music-critic with impressive Nazi credentials. Meanwhile, the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » in its new guise became known as the « NSKG » , or « NS-Kulturgemeinde » (National-Socialist Cultural Community) ; henceforth, it would perform merely as a music (and theatre) lobby, purchasing cheap blocks of tickets for its many, now entirely passive, members throughout the « Reich » . It also organized concerts of its own. The « NS-Kulturgemeinde » was totally absorbed by « Strength-through-Joy » , in 1937 and, thereupon, ceased to exist as one of Rosenberg's cultural platforms. During the War especially, the « KdF » organized mass events for the sake of armaments production and troop entertainment ; in its service, German musicians performed for BMW workers as well as for « Waffen-SS » soldiers and civilians on the home front. Here, music's new calling as an instrument of politics and war had been fully realized.

Significant defections from the « Kampfbund » had occurred in the spring of 1933, when 4 leading functionaries left to organize a Nazi cartel of musicians in Berlin under violinist Gustav Havemann. Their « Reichskartell der Deutschen Musikerschaft » was organized along neo-corporatist lines, using notions borrowed in part from Italian Fascism, ideally thought to serve the collective interests of a professional group and popular long before Adolf Hitler with spokesmen for other occupations, such as lawyers and physicians. In the fall, this « Reichskartell » became the nucleus for the « Reich » Music Chamber.

In March 1933, Josef Gœbbels was still indicating his support for Rosenberg's « Kampfbund » but, by then, it was already clear that he intended to take-over the reins of culture in the « Reich » himself. Gœbbels fully realized this claim when, in late June, he was officially authorized to set-up the machinery for such control, utilizing his new « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » (« Promi » , or « Reich » propaganda Ministry) , and hence endangering any and all of Rosenberg's pre-existing Party institutions. Former Rosenberg sycophants such as Havemann were beginning to drift into Gœbbels's camp, and Hans Hinkel, once a « Kampfbund » secretary, was already in his employ.

The founding of the « Reichsmusikkammer » was formally announced on 1 November 1933, as part of an umbrella organization, the « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Culture Chamber, or « RKK ») presided over by Josef Gœbbels. There were similar sub-chambers for visual arts, theatre, literature, journalism, radio and, later also, for film. Membership in the « Reichsmusikkammer » , as in the other chambers, was compulsory for all professionals in their respective categories. Havemann and other cronies from the « Kampfbund » (such as Heinz Ihler, a Berlin businessman, occasional piano player, and Nazi « Old Fighter » since 1927) commenced to staff the various sections, Havemann himself taking charge of musicians after merging his « Reichskartell » , and Ihler becoming the executive secretary. Hans Hinkel became responsible for the « Reichsmusikkammer » , in 1935, when he was appointed secretary-general of the « Reich » Culture Chamber. This much larger culture chamber was ceremoniously inaugurated

on 15 November 1933, with Richard Strauß conducting his own « Festliches Präludium » . This was no accident, for at Gœbbels's behest Strauß had agreed to serve as president of the subordinate « Reichsmusikkammer » .

Since 1945, and even before, there has been much speculation as to why the world-famous composer consented to take on this (to say the least) questionable job. Richard Strauß certainly did not have to do so for financial reasons, for he was a wealthy man ; he was in no need of additional publicity ; and, in 1933, he was not yet under any sort of political pressure. The answer is not, as one German musicologist has contended, that he was a power-hungry, dyed-in-the-wool National-Socialist, but that he saw in the dictatorship of Adolf Hitler a convenient if somewhat distasteful tool to realize goals he himself had been anticipating for decades. Admittedly, no friend of the democracy of Weimar, Strauß believed that a dictatorial regime could finally implement the changes toward neo-corporatism that would benefit the German musical profession and, in particular, composers on behalf of which he had been toiling since the beginning of the 20th Century. As newly available documents from the Strauß family archive in Garmisch reveal, 3 goals were foremost in his mind. 1st, he wanted to upgrade musical culture in the country by instituting throughout the highest level of training and performance. 2nd, he wished to increase the profit share of serious composers « vis-à-vis » light-music composers, among whom he most detested the creators of Operettas such as Franz Lehár, a constant object of his vilification. 3rd, he aimed to extend the period of copyright for « serious music » compositions, for the sake of composers and their heirs.

His was a specialized agenda, sharply skewed toward the immediate concerns of people like himself. Significantly, Strauß chose to head the « Reichsmusikkammer » section for composers, personally. It is doubtful whether Gœbbels recognized the potential for conflict when he appointed the Mæstro - a conflict that inexorably developed over time. But for now, in the fall of 1933, he merely wished to exploit Strauß's immense prestige nationally and especially internationally, for Hitler's regime craved recognition abroad, just as Strauß intended to exploit the powers of a dictatorship. In any event, because of Strauß's professional self-interest in the « Reichsmusikkammer » and his reluctance to exchange the comfortable life of a composer in Garmisch for a functionary's presence in Berlin, he delegated most « Reichsmusikkammer » affairs to underlings, in particular to his business manager Ihlert, becoming personally involved only in matters dear to his heart. Strauß' letters to the few men in Berlin whom he trusted and regularly corresponded with, notably Ihlert, Hugo Rasch, and Julius Kopsch, demonstrate contempt for their daily routines, which he deemed far beneath him.

One immediate result of this absentee presidency was a lack of direction in the upper-ranks of the Berlin « Reichsmusikkammer » , leading to confusion, corruption, and infighting. At Berlin headquarters, Ihlert and Havemann, especially, were soon feuding with their colleagues ; Ihlert himself was accused of protectionism and inefficiency, others of tardiness and sexual misconduct. A 2nd result was a conspicuous absence of firm « Reichsmusikkammer » controls throughout the « Reich » , normally manifested in the fascist strictures and repression that even then typified Nazi policy in other areas.

It is true that under Richard Strauß's arm's-length presidency the « Reichsmusikkammer » initiated what became its traditional policy of conscripting professional musicians and demanding monthly membership fees. The « Reichsmusikkammer » also instituted musical competency tests in order to weed-out amateurs and frauds and, thereby,

help define a professional code - all in the spirit of neo-corporatism that was a hallmark of the era. Moreover, the « Reichsmusikkammer » granted (and withheld) permission for musicians to travel abroad and spend a predetermined amount of hard currency. And to continue the job-creation programs already begun, on a much smaller scale, by the « Kampfbund » , it limited the number of foreign instrumentalists allowed into Germany who might snatch jobs away from natives.

Meanwhile, Goebbels, in order to assuage musicians' concerns, and in keeping with his stated principle of relative artistic freedom, maintained a fairly low profile as cultural enforcer in the early days of the regime. Hence, Strauß himself was able to hold controls and censorship to an absolute minimum. This, in fact, was one of the few areas of « Reichsmusikkammer » policy that still interested him and over which he tried to reserve decisions for himself, certainly whenever he could make it his business to be informed. This was evident not only in the matter of the proscription of Jewish colleagues, which he soft-pedaled, but also with regard to the nature of the music to be performed. For instance, when, in March 1934, the fanatical Nazi critic and « Reichsmusikkammer » presidium member Fritz Stege wished to censure a concert pianist with a penchant for modern works, the presidium opposed him on the grounds that « in principle, the " Reich " Music Chamber cannot forbid works of an atonal character, for it is up to the audience to judge such compositions » .

The immediate circumstances of Strauß's dismissal from his post by Goebbels, in July 1935, are well-known : in 1932, he had employed the Austrian Jewish novelist Stefan Zweig as librettist for his Opera « Die schweigsame Frau » , and that was looked upon as an affront to the National-Socialist regime. Moreover, when Zweig, finding his situation increasingly distasteful if not downright dangerous, attempted to extricate himself from the ongoing working relationship, Strauß wrote him, on 17 June 1935, stating that he was only playacting as « Reichsmusikkammer » president to prevent the worst from happening. Long suspicious of Strauß, the « Gestapo » intercepted the letter, and a disgusted Goebbels compelled him to resign. Public announcements indicated that Strauß had done so because of « old age » and « severely strained health » .

Although in the post-War literature, this has become the standard explanation of Strauß's break with the « Reichsmusikkammer » , the deeper and more important reasons were structural. During Strauß's denazification hearings, in 1947, it was said that the dismissal symbolized a « change in the system » , of the chain of command between Goebbels as cultural overseer and his chamber leaders, and of the overall policy to be observed within a chamber. The fact was that Strauß, although prestigious, was simply too single-minded and egotistically independent to serve the Nazis well over the long run. His absence from Berlin and his general lack of interest in the day-to-day administration of the « Reichsmusikkammer » had already caused disruptions ; and his skeptical attitude toward the « Jewish Question » made it clear that although he was authoritarian, he was by no means ruthless enough to implement the censorship and other controls Goebbels wanted to see applied throughout the « Reichsmusikkammer » . This had surfaced as a problem during the Paul Hindemith affair of 1934-1935, when Strauß advised his council that the composer should not be ostracized from the « Reichsmusikkammer » . Hindemith's as yet unperformed Opera « Mathis der Maler » hitherto had been the only contemporary « serious music » composition to be declared unwanted, not by any new æsthetic-ideological criteria but for political reasons, not the least of which had to do with Hitler's long-standing dislike of that composer, with his modernist reputation. It had not been Strauß who indicted him but the

highest level regime leaders themselves.

Strauß was replaced by Peter Raabe, the retired « Generalmusikdirektor » of Aachen and a professor emeritus at the Technical University there. He was sufficiently non-descript to serve as Gœbbels's ideal puppet. Born in 1872, he had enjoyed a respectable if not spectacular career as conductor, and had earned a doctorate with a dissertation on Franz Liszt. He had just begun his retirement when the Minister's call reached him. Raabe had a personal motive for accepting this post, for his conducting career was in the process of being eclipsed by the meteoric rise of Herbert von Karajan, who, though active only a few months in Aachen, had outshone him there chiefly as conductor of the Municipal Opera. Although Raabe did not apply for Nazi Party membership until 1937, he was a fanatical follower of Adolf Hitler and, by all accounts, was deeply committed to Nazi cultural policy. Unlike Strauß, however, and probably influenced by his idol Liszt, whose harmonic innovations anticipated the atonality of Arnold Schönberg, Raabe was partial to the more modern composers, a weakness Gœbbels liked to ridicule, and which made Raabe even softer putty in the Minister's hands.

Raabe's far more subordinate position as president of the « Reichsmusikkammer » became obvious in a number of ways. Unlike Strauß, Raabe was made to wait in the antechambers of Gœbbels's Ministry when ordered to report to his lieutenants, and Raabe's protest went unheeded. Deciding to tighten his policy of public controls somewhat while still favoring persuasion and conversion over outright restriction, Gœbbels met with no objections from Raabe when he instituted closer monitoring of concert programming. In September 1935, a limited black-list of works by Jews and foreigners was issued, something Strauß most certainly would never have consented to. In 1936, Raabe, despite his protest, finally had to acquiesce in Gœbbels's decision to absorb into the « Reichsmusikkammer » the « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » (General German Music Society), Liszt's creation of 1859, in which Raabe played a leading role and whose independence he wished to preserve. (It was at the « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein »'s annual functions that Raabe had been observed to favor « modernism ».) The « ADMV » was duly liquidated in 1937. In the matter of Paul Hindemith's proscription, it was Raabe who at Gœbbels's insistence, in October 1936, signed an order placing all of Hindemith's works on a public performance index, something that could never have been entrusted to Strauß.

By this time, however, Raabe was no longer the Minister's sole pleni-potentiary in matters of musical culture in the « Reich » for, in late 1936, Gœbbels had appointed Heinz Drewes, the « General-Musik-Direktor » of Altenburg, to head a department of music in the Propaganda Ministry. The reasons for this move are not entirely clear, but it can be surmised that Gœbbels wished to have some sort of guarantee that Raabe would be held in check to avoid a repetition of the extreme embarrassment that Strauß had caused him. This would have been wholly in keeping with the National-Socialists' practice of establishing a « fragmented administration », with double and triple levels of jurisdiction, duplication of responsibility, and crossed chains of command. Ultimately, the higher leaders benefited from such institutionalized chaos, since only they could act as arbiters in seemingly endless disputes or in cases where government efficacy was seriously at stake. Invariably, this strengthened their position. This, incidentally, was the major reason why Adolf Hitler himself did not intervene in the initial rivalry between Rosenberg and Gœbbels for, in the final analysis, it was he who emerged supreme.

Göebbels made sure that he would always have the last word by artfully entangling the responsibilities of Raabe and Drewes. His scheme was clever enough : Raabe as president of the « Reichskulturkammer » came under Göebbels as president of the « Reich » Culture Chamber, of which the « Reichsmusikkammer » was a part. The « Reichskulturkammer » was of course rooted in Göebbels's « Promi » . Drewes, while an official of the « Promi » , was not given responsibility for Raabe, whose formal superior was Göebbels. On the contrary, just to keep Drewes in his place, he was cross-appointed to the « Reichsmusikkammer » 's presidium, thus making him nominally subordinate to Raabe. Predictably, Drewes and Raabe were constantly at each other's throats regarding « the leadership in music » , which made Göebbels happy, for he could always threaten either man with ammunition derived from the intrigues of the other.

In theory, Drewes's department was to have powers of policy creation and Raabe's agency powers of policy enactment. But, in practice, in those areas that really mattered to him, Göebbels towered over both men, conveying his wishes in person or using as his conduit a State secretary of his Ministry. As long as it lasted, this delineation meant that Raabe continued to exercise responsibility in practical matters such as coopting and regulating « Reichsmusikkammer » membership and devising technical rulings. In terms of ideological and content controls, however, Raabe seems to have been comparatively disadvantaged, or to have taken his cue from Drewes's department, if not (as in the case of Hindemith's banning, in 1936) directly from Göebbels. This is evident from the details of the long battle Raabe waged against jazz, a battle he could not win till the end, not least because Göebbels himself divined that jazz served certain propaganda functions, especially in War-time. In the « serious music » realm, Raabe's subservience became transparent in the summer of 1937, when Carl Orff, whom Rosenberg's « Kampfbund » had been battling since 1932, premiered his scenic Oratorio « Carmina Burana » . Drewes took an immediate dislike to Orff and, while never censuring outright any of the composer's current or future works, successfully intimidated him, keeping him in abeyance until well into the War. Raabe's office merely echoed Drewes's authority. Almost certainly, it was Drewes, too, not exactly a champion of modern music, who had prevailed on Göebbels to dissolve the « ADMV » against Raabe's wishes ; this, in fact, cemented the eternal enmity between the 2 functionaries.

Under the presidency of Peter Raabe, the « Reich » Music Chamber was to experience several personnel changes. The most important of these were the appointment of the composer Paul Græner as head of the composers' section, which Richard Strauß himself had led until the summer of 1935, and then Græner's own replacement 6 years later by Werner Egk, a former student and friend of Carl Orff and disposed, like Orff, toward the composition of more modern music. This change occurred over differences concerning the place of popular music, and because Göebbels, in the hope of establishing a uniquely Nazi musical style, had found it imperative to grant some leeway to the more progressive of Germany's composers. The traditionalist Græner, whom the Minister had derogatorily described as a « Santa Claus » , back in 1936, could give no such assurances. In any event, Egk's appointment at a nominally inferior but, in fact, extremely influential level after July 1941 reduced the power of both Drewes (who intermittently found himself at the war front) and Raabe who performed his duties rather perfunctorily, delivering speeches and conducting concerts throughout the « Reich » . Off and on, Göebbels considered replacing both Drewes and Raabe, for he could not say who was the duller of the 2. Wilhelm Furtwängler was reportedly interested in the « Reichsmusikkammer » post. In the end, both men proved indispensable for carrying-out the practical chores that had become their everyday routines in a period of scarce new talent. At the close of 1943, it was Drewes whom Göebbels credited with having resuscitated

Berlin's musical scene after 1 year of severe British air attacks. But Raabe, too, had to postpone his plans to retire to private life « in order to write a couple more books ». Ironically, one of his final tasks was to decree, during late summer 1944, the dissolution of all major culture Orchestras in the « Reich », save for a fortunate few, such as the Berlin Philharmonic, that were still needed to uphold civilian and troop morale.

...

Berthold Goldschmidt (1903-1996) : Prominent Jewish composer and conductor who had experienced harassment as a Jew even before Adolf Hitler came to power. He escaped to England, in 1935. He stayed in obscurity until the 1980's when his work was again recognized internationally.

Otto Klemperer (1885-1973) : He emerged as one of the leading German conductors of his generation. After conducting « Tannhäuser », in 1933, on the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death, Klemperer fled to the United States to escape Nazi persecution. He became conductor of the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra, in 1937. By 1955, after years of health problems, he was appointed the principal conductor of the London « Philharmonia » Orchestra.

Ernst Křenek (1900-1991) : Considered a respectable German Catholic until he wrote a modern Opera called, « Jonny Spielt Auf ! ». The storyline of the Opera featured a black man as the main character. The Opera was a musical mix of jazz, spiritual, and Classical. He employed special sound effects to depict traffic noise, trains, and sirens within the music.

Erik Wolfgang Korngold (1897-1957) : A Jewish child prodigy. By the age of 10, he composed « Der Schneemann » which was orchestrated and conducted by his teacher, Alexander von Zemlinsky. In 1934, he began writing musical arrangements for Hollywood films. While working in the United States, in 1938, the Nazis seized his Austrian home and property. Korngold never returned to live again in Austria. His lengthy Hollywood career produced 2 Academy Awards for film scores. He was a popular composer for films, generating music for more than 20 movies.

Arnold Schönberg (1874-1951) : Though he emigrated to the United States just after Adolf Hitler came to power, in 1933, he understood what it meant to be persecuted and what lay ahead for the Jews who did not leave Germany. He foresaw the decimation of the Jews, and tried to get the public's attention.

His agenda stated :

« Anti-Semitism must be stopped. - A united Jewish Party must be created. - Unanimity in Jewry must be priority. - An independent Jewish State must be created. »

It is no wonder he drew the hatred of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis. He was telling the world that Hitler was dangerous before Hitler had a stranglehold on the German people.

Bruno Walter (1876-1962) : He was born Bruno Walter Schlesinger. Walter was the conductor of the Leipzig Orchestra

and frequent guest-conductor of the Berlin Orchestra, prior to the 3rd « Reich » . In 1933, the Nazi government canceled his concerts due to the « threat to public order » . They could no longer guarantee his personal safety. Walter fled to Austria and, then, to the United States where he became a well-know conductor and music advisor.

Anton von Webern (1883-1945) : He was a staunch follower of Adolf Hitler, though not a member of the Nazi Party. He agreed with Hitler's writings, and felt that Hitler would moderate his policies concerning the Jews, after the 1st display of power. He was friends with Arnold Schönberg, an exiled German Jew whose music had been classified as degenerate and, thereby, banned. This friendship along with his advocacy of atonality in music got his works listed as degenerate. The Nazis burned his writings and forbade performances of his music after Hitler took-over Austria. He retired to a life in the country toward the end of the War. He was accidentally shot to death by an American soldier, in 1945, while smoking a cigarette at night, outside his daughter's home in Mittersill.

« **Degenerate Music** » : Title Page of the Exhibition Guide (1938) . This grotesque figure became the Nazi symbol for all they considered « degenerate » in the arts. Hitler envisioned the day when German culture would be free of « morbid excrescencies of insane and degenerate men » .

As with the visual arts, the Nazis aimed to demonstrate the difference between good « German » music and « degenerate » music by staging major cultural events. To this end, they organized the « Reichsmusiktage » (« Reich » Music Days) in Düsseldorf, from May 22 to 29, 1938. This week-long event included concerts and lectures that presented ideologically and ethnically « pure » music. It was accompanied by the « Degenerate Music » exhibition, which opened on May 24. The show was similar in concept to the « Degenerate Art » exhibition : its main purpose was to document the work of artists who had been defamed by the Nazi regime since 1933. The « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » (« Reich » Music Inspection Office) , which was part of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry, had drawn-up a list of « degenerate » artists and their works for this purpose. The exhibition covered all areas of music, from composition, performance and criticism to musicology and promotion. Examples of « degeneracy » were found in Classical music in composers such as Alban Berg, Paul Hindemith, or Igor Stravinsky, and in the genres of jazz and swing in general. The exhibit's main organizer was Privy Councilor Doctor Hans Severus Ziegler, who was director of the Weimar National Theatre. Ziegler was also head of the Cultural Office in the Gau of Thuringia, and had carried-out « cleansings against cultural Bolshevism » in Thuringia, even before 1933. The visual component of the exhibition consisted of photographs, portraits, paintings, caricatures, and posters intended to illustrate the « sub-human » character of the featured musicians and the inferiority of their works. One such example appeared on the cover of the Exhibition Guide. The image was based on the cover sheet of Ernst Křenek's Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (« Johnny Strikes-up the Band ! » , 1925-1926) , but replaced the carnation on the African-American saxophonist's lapel with a Star of David. The Opera had been banned in 1933, and Křenek, an Austrian, had emigrated to the United States after the annexation of his country (« Anschluß ») , in 1938.

The exhibition remained on view in Düsseldorf until June and subsequently traveled to other cities along with the « Degenerate Art » exhibit. As of 1938, the « Reich » Music Days were supposed to take place annually, but they were canceled after the beginning of the war in 1939.

...

Although the self-centered conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler might have periodically issued minor gestures of dissent or defiance, his musical activity served the requirements of the regime, at home and abroad. His performances often took place in « highly-propagandistic frameworks », such as when he directed Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » at the 1935 Nuremberg Party rally, which produced the Nuremberg racial laws and when he conducted at a performance honoring Adolf Hitler's birthday, in 1942. The regime paid the piper for his efforts. Hitler and especially Josef Goebbels made certain that Furtwängler's salary and other sources of income remained healthy. Michaël H. Kater concludes that Furtwängler was « an elitist, beholden to authority, and with a strongly conservative bent, a man who decided to ride-out a dangerous political storm, assuaging his ego with occasional humanitarian commitments which for him, the powerful culture broker, entailed very few risks » .

Whereas in Furtwängler's case, Kater seeks to revise existing scholarship. In other instances, Kater offers unprecedented political analysis of important figures. A good case in point is that of Carl Orff. Until Kater, we have known very little about the Nazi-era career of this composer, whose choral work « Carmina Burana » is the only work of « serious music » composed in the 3rd « Reich » that has become part of the standard repertory. (The sections on Carl Orff in « Twisted Muse » are drawn from a lengthier article by Michaël H. Kater in the « Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte », in 1995.)

Epitomized, the apolitical artist who, for the sake of his music, adjusted to political realities. Although he managed successfully to conceal the fact of his partial Jewish ancestry, he understandably perceived himself to be especially vulnerable. Kater argues that these circumstances led to « accommodate himself to a regime that, at heart, he detested » . The nature of Orff's compositions complicated his predicament. « Carmina Burana » , like most of Orff's compositions from the Nazi years, as certainly a far cry from the atonal modern compositions that the Nazis had ridiculed and banned, but as nevertheless « sufficiently idiosyncratic to be suspect » in some Nazi circles. His publishers and his producers shrewdly worked the system, sounding-out officials in the « Reich » Music Chamber and the Propaganda Ministry, in advance of performances. In Kater's estimation, this was the record of neither a « hero » nor a « Nazi villain » . Nor, it should be added, was it the record of a Nazi victim, as he preferred to portray himself, after 1945.

The example of Orff points-up a particular strength of the book, namely its ability to relate the fascinating details of individual careers to the unfolding of official policy and to institutional factors. For a musician, much could ride on an ability to negotiate one's way through the political-bureaucratic labyrinth. Those who succeeded in doing so should not automatically be categorized as Nazis. Yet, Kater's determination to illustrate the complexities and ambiguities of the era does not deter him from rendering harsh judgments where they are appropriate. Kater has little sympathy for German musicians, some of them household names, who collaborated with and prospered under National-Socialism, only to lie about their record after the War. In a particularly compelling section, Kater demolishes the post-War self-exculpatory assertions of soprano Elisabeth Schwarzkopf. Kater also provides the most careful treatment to date of the Nazi-era career of Herbert von Karajan. As for musicians who were purged for artistic or « racial » reasons, never before has the readiness of large numbers of German musicians, both major and minor, to acquiesce or cooperate

actively in the purge of their colleagues, been as thoroughly and persuasively documented.

Michaël H. Kater devotes many pages to German musicians who attempted to buck Nazi trends, and to those who left the country. His chapter on « Persecuted and Exiled Jewish and Anti-Nazi Musicians » offers fascinating portraits of several of the Century's most important musical figures, such as Bruno Walter, Arnold Schönberg, Otto Klemperer, and Kurt Weill. Kater has performed a valuable service by bringing their stories together in one place, integrating them into a study whose main focus is on what took place inside Germany's borders. These exiled German musicians were, after all, representatives of German musical traditions, a fact that should not be obscured by their physical separation from Germany, or by the willingness of the majority of their colleagues to make music under the auspices of National-Socialism.

Carl Orff

Carl Orff remains something of an enigma in the musical history of Nazi Germany. As an artist, the odds seemed stacked against him when the Nazis came to power : it was expected that the composer would become, yet, another victim of the 3rd « Reich » 's oppressive cultural policies. Yet, Orff managed to establish a place for himself and his music within Nazi Germany. Like that of Paul Hindemith and Ernst Křenek, Orff's music was often categorised as « degenerate » (« entartete ») . But the artist's attempts to ingratiate himself with the regime paid dividends. By the early 1940's, his music was celebrated by many Nazi elites, and his « Carmina Burana » was one of the most popular pieces in Nazi Germany. Yet, later on, by means of a misleading representation of his own « resistance activities » during the Nazi years, and by judiciously emphasising negative Nazi opinions of his music, he managed to secure a clean slate to perform and work in post-War Germany, untainted by his accommodationism throughout the Hitler years.

Carl Orff was born in 1895 into an upstanding Munich family of officers and scholars. His mother was an accomplished pianist who taught him when he was a child. While still a teenager, he enlisted, but returned home in 1917 after a near-lethal case of shell shock. After several years of experimentation, sampling various musical career possibilities, Orff became a partner in the Munich « Günther » School, an educational institution that united music and movement. The composer maintained a life-long interest in music education.

By the late- 1920's, Orff had established himself as a significant figure in the small but important modernist musical oasis in otherwise conservative Munich, the League for Contemporary Music. Founded in 1927, it presented works by Bartók, Hindemith, Schönberg and Stravinsky, among others. The young musician also collaborated briefly with Bertolt Brecht, and participated in the innovative new Bach Club in Munich, all of which solidified his reputation for being outside the mainstream, even avant-garde. Nonetheless, his star was slowly rising by the early 1930's, when Hitler came to power and the reality of making music in Germany was to change dramatically.

Like many other artists of the time, Orff was considered a leftist. He had many Jewish friends, including Kurt Weill and the poet Franz Werfel, and collaborated extensively with well-known Marxists like Brecht. There are also reports that Orff was a quarter Jewish, a fact that could only have added to his insecurities. Despite this, or perhaps because of it,

Orff never either overtly or covertly resisted or opposed Nazi policies. Recognising the precariousness of his status in the new Nazi Germany, throughout the 1930's, he tried to establish his loyalty to the regime. Awarded a job composing music for schools, he developed his theories on music pedagogy, trying to integrate his ideas into the music policies of the « Hitler Jugend » (Hitler Youth) , sometimes tailoring them specifically to Nazi demands. Choosing to forget all associations with Jewish, leftist, or modernist artists, Orff emphasised his hatred of jazz music and the atonality of Schœnberg and his disciples, and emphasised his own sincere and deep-seated appreciation of folk music.

For years, Orff had been targeted by the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (Fighting League for German Culture, or « KfdK ») as a cultural bolshevist. This dangerous reputation was initially confirmed at the controversial premiere of what was to become his best-known work, « Carmina Burana » , in 1937. Despite Orff's increasing contacts with Nazi officials, and his well-regarded work in music pedagogy, the premiere was met with a stinging critique by the influential Nazi musicologist Hans Gerigk. According to Gerigk, « Carmina Burana » suffered from a « mistaken return to primitive elements of instrumentalism and a foreign emphasis on rhythmic formulae » . For most, such a damning review would have signalled the end of the piece, if not of the career of the composer. However, his positive contacts with high-ranking figures, and the sheer popularity of the piece with the public, gradually transformed it into a hit. Despite its exotic sounds and sexual themes, the piece came to be perceived as « a celebration of the power of an uninterrupted life instinct » and its elemental melodies and rhythms were said to bear witness to « the indestructible and always re-emerging power of the ways of the common people » .

The success of « Carmina Burana » led the mayor of Frankfurt to ask the composer to write alternative music for Mendelssohn's « A Midsummer Night's Dream » :

« His " Carmina Burana " exhibits exquisite beauty, and if we could get him to do something about his lyrics, his music would certainly be very promising. »

After the War, along with most artists who had continued to be active under the Nazis, Orff was placed on a black-list, as someone in potential need of denazification. However, he managed to clear his name with the help of an American friend. Suddenly afraid of being « too Nazi » , rather than not Nazi enough, Orff fabricated an elaborate account of his involvement in the Munich resistance group, the White Roses, organized by his friend Kurt Huber. (In fact, he had never had any involvement with the group.) In addition, despite « Carmina Burana » 's success under Adolf Hitler, he repeatedly represented the piece as covertly anti-Nazi. Orff died in Munich in 1982 as one of 20th Century Germany's most prominent composers.

...

The name Carl Orff generally means 1 of 2 things. The 1st is that Orff was the composer of the insistently earthy « Carmina Burana » , the ever-popular choral celebration of sex, drinking and youthful excess. The 2nd is that he was the foremost German composer to achieve international eminence during the Nazi years.

To a few people, Orff is also known for a small number of other works (especially those in which he attempted to

repeat the success of « Carmina Burana ») and as the author of one of the 20th Century's most influential programmes of music education for children, a system still widely in use in many parts of the world. But these other achievements have inevitably been over-shadowed by « Carmina Burana » and the career in Adolf Hitler's Germany. The Cantata stands at the centre of Orff's output, while the Nazi connection affects every judgment about him.

It was the 1st performance of « Carmina Burana » in Frankfurt, in 1937, that established the Bavarian, then 41, as a major musical figure. Orff was so clear about the work's pivotal importance in his output that he later disowned almost everything he had written before it. But « Carmina Burana » also made Orff's name in Nazi cultural circles. After some initial official discomfort about the work's frank sexual innuendos, Orff's Cantata was elevated to the status of a signature piece in Nazi circles, where it was treated as an emblem of 3rd « Reich » « youth culture » . The Nazi newspaper, the « Völkischer Beobachter » , once pointed to Orff's Cantata as « the kind of clear, stormy, and yet always disciplined music that our time requires » .

But, as Tony Palmer's new film about Orff, « O Fortuna » , establishes, there is another thing we ought to know about the composer as well. The film, which takes its title from the opening phrase of « Carmina Burana » , makes it clear that Orff had the psychology of a permanent adolescent. He thought 1st and mainly about himself. He could not sustain adult relationships - including with a daughter whom he rejected. « He had his life and that was that » , she tells Palmer. The composer sought to avoid personal and moral responsibility in most things, and then wished to be forgiven for his failure to accept these responsibilities.

Mid- 20th Century Germany was unusually full of adults who wanted to forget their own and their society's failings during the Nazi years. Watching clips of Orff in Palmer's film, it is tempting to see him as a recognisable type of post-War German, a man carrying his part of a shared trauma about which he preferred to remain silent. Orff himself was never a paid-up Nazi. But he prospered under National-Socialist rule and he had a particular ugly secret of his own from the Nazi period, which Palmer's research has brought into the light.

In his home-town of Munich, Orff had long been a close friend of the Swiss-born academic Kurt Huber, who had helped him with his librettos for « Carmina Burana » and other works. Huber, however, was an anti-Nazi oppositionist, unlike Orff. Indeed, Huber was a founder of the « White Rose » resistance movement. This led to his arrest by the « Gestapo » , in February 1943, after which he was tortured, given a show trial and executed.

Orff called at Huber's house the day after the arrest, unaware of what had happened, and was informed about Huber's fate. His 1st reaction was to bewail the danger that he himself would now be ruined. Huber's wife pleaded with Orff to make representation or a statement on Huber's behalf. But Orff said nothing. « He only thought about himself » , recalls Huber's widow, Clara, in the film. She and the composer never met again.

Orff's self-protective reflex can certainly be understood. Which of us can be confident we would have reacted more bravely in such circumstances ? But Orff's moral slipperiness did not end there. Indeed, as Palmer shows, it gave way to a much less understandable hypocrisy. In 1946, the composer was interrogated by the denazification authorities. Eager to put himself on the right side of the Americans, Orff lied to his interrogators, claiming that he himself had

been a co-founder of the « White Rose » group along with Huber.

Orff was given the all-clear ; he returned to public life and eminence in the new West Germany, where he worked and lived until his death, in 1982. Unsurprisingly, however, he was secretly ashamed of his guilty secret. Shortly after receiving his denazification all-clear, Orff wrote-out his feelings of guilt in an apologetic letter to the dead Huber - which was, of course, never made public.

All this tells us a lot about Orff the man. But what, if anything, does it tell us about Orff the musician ? On the face of it, nothing very much at all. And yet, as the 2 facts that most people know about Orff remind us, Orff's music has always been fated to be judged in the light of his severely compromised public life and of the deeply damaged personality Palmer's film so graphically depicts. It is hard to believe that either the enduring critical iciness towards Orff or the lack of establishment interest in performing any of his works other than « Carmina Burana » (and that only with a clothes-peg clamped ostentatiously over the managerial nose) are unrelated to Orff's chequered history.

In some ways, this is extremely unfair to Orff. He was, after all, a product of the Germany of his entire lifetime, not just of the Nazi years. For example, the life-long concern with « music for use » , which he shared with his contemporaries Paul Hindemith and Benjamin Britten, derives more from the egalitarian æsthetic preoccupations of the social democratic era of the Weimar Republic of the 1920's than from any specifically Nazi teaching.

The idea that composers should write music that was accessible to all classes (which Orff embodied in his « Schulwerk » projects for the musical education of children, and in some of his compositions for adult audiences) was widely shared in socialist and non-socialist Europe throughout the inter-War period, as well as in America. It is far from dead today, as the arts policies of the Labour government typify, and certainly far from discredited. As Alex Ross puts it in his lauded survey of 20th Century music, « The Rest Is Noise » (which skates rather quickly over Orff in other respects) :

« Untold millions of children would learn the basics of musical language by tapping-out notes on the mallet percussion instruments that Orff had constructed to his purposes. The man himself may have been politically duplicitous, but his passion for teaching was profound, and it probably touched more lives than any music described in this book. »

More than 60 years after the collapse of the 3rd « Reich » , the continuing popularity of « Carmina Burana » looks like outliving the taint of association that has harmed both the work and the composer for so long. The musical establishment may continue to agonise over the important question of whether a bad man can produce a great piece of work, or whether Orff's sub-Stravinskyan ostinatos are an explicit homage to the ethnic paganism in which the Nazis wallowed. But the musical public decided long ago that it has no such inhibitions.

...

Music, along with all other forms of culture, was subject to Nazification from January 1933 on. The policy of «

Gleichschaltung » (coordination) meant that music had to conform to the Nazi ideal. Hence, some composers were tolerated and even elevated to a status of pure Nazism, while other composers, frequently Jewish, were shunned and effectively censored. Adolf Hitler, along with art, films and architecture, played a major part in what was musically tolerated and what was not.

German composers had played a huge part in defining Classical music during the 18th and 19th Centuries. Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Richard Wagner and Johannes Brahms all left their own individual mark on music and culture in general. In the 20th Century, the Austrian composer Arnold Schœnberg had also become very influential in Berlin, the city he worked in.

The influence of these composers, and others in Germany, was undeniable but their collective genius counted for nothing in Nazi Germany if they failed to impress Hitler. The « Führer » had an almost fanatical devotion to the work of Richard Wagner, which to Hitler represented everything that was good about culture in Nazi Germany. To Hitler, Wagner's music personified Nazism. His attendance at the Bayreuth Festival was very well publicised by the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda. In fact, Hitler ordered that the Bayreuth Festival should become a National-Socialist annual event and performances continued up to 1944. The message Josef Gœbbels wanted to spread was a simple one : if the music of Richard Wagner was good enough for the « Führer » , everyone else in Nazi Germany should follow his lead and listen to good German / Nazi music. Therefore, there was enormous promotion of Wagner's music by German radio stations and major concert venues frequently played his music.

Other composers were not as favourably received and even listening to their music could have been deemed anti-Nazi and subversive with potentially dire consequences. Music by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and Giacomo Meyerbeer was banned because they were Jewish. Arnold Schœnberg's music was banned because it was too radical and in the mind of Hitler simply not classically German. The same was true for the compositions of Paul Hindemith. He was an internationally recognized composer but, in Nazi Germany, his music was seen as being too experimental and decadent. Hitler banned his music from being played in concert halls while Gœbbels stated that Hindemith was an « atonal noise-maker » .

« Gleichschaltung » not only covered composers. Orchestras were purged of Jews as were the casts of Operas. For Hitler, only true Aryans could truly play the music of Wagner. Famous Jewish conductors went into exile to continue their work ; one of the most famous being Otto Klemperer who had international fame for his interpretation of Gustav Mahler. Equally famous for his interpretation of Mahler was Bruno Walter who was also a Jew. He had been criticised by Hitler pre-1933 and had to flee Germany once Hitler gained power. Walter went to Austria which was his primary base. Walter was working in Paris when the 1938 « Anschluß » took place and unable to return to either Germany or Austria, he settled in France which gave him citizenship.

Ironically, by fleeing Nazi Germany pre-1939, they may well have saved their lives. Despite the « Nazification » of music, some did stay in Hitler's Germany. The most famous was the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler. He had fallen-out of favour with the Nazi establishment because of his defence of Paul Hindemith. However, he made his peace with the regime and remained in his posts at the Berlin Philharmonic and the Berlin State Opera. Richard Strauß was put in

charge of the « Reich » Music Chamber, for some time, while the world famous pianist, Walter Gieseking, was sent abroad by Gœbbels to display his talent.

Concerts at halls such as the Berlin Opera House became major Party events. Senior Nazi functionaries were all but required to attend and there was a very good chance that the music on offer was composed by Richard Wagner.

What might be defined as popular music was also heavily controlled by the State. Jazz music was banned as it was considered to be « black music » with origins from the southern States of America. The Nazis associated jazz music with Black Americans and, as a result, it was labelled « degenerate » . Gœbbels also tried to ban « Lili Marlene » but had to backtrack when German soldiers throughout Europe requested that it was played on « Reich » controlled radio stations.

Chambre de la culture du « Reich »

The « Reichsmusikkammer » (« “ Reich ” Music Chamber » , « State Music Institute » , « State Music Bureau ») was a Nazi institution. It promoted « good German music » which was composed by Aryans and seen as consistent with Nazi ideals, while suppressing other, « degenerate » (« entartete ») music, which included atonal music, pop music such as jazz and country, those experimenting with electronics and music by Jewish composers as they were seen to be of non-artistic merit and produced solely for popularity and financial gain. The Institute was founded in 1933 by Josef Gœbbels and the « Reichskulturkammer » (State Bureau of Culture) , and it operated until the fall of the 3rd « Reich » , in 1945.

One of the Institute's primary goals (that of extolling and promoting « good German music » , specifically that of Beethoven, Wagner, Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Brahms and the like) was to legitimize the claimed world supremacy of Germany culturally. These composers and their music were re-interpreted ideologically to extol German virtues and cultural identity.

Music and composers who did not fall into the « Reichsmusikkammer » 's definition of « good German music » were deprecated and then banned. The Institute proscribed various great composers of the past, including the Jewish-by-birth composers Gustav Mahler, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, and Arnold Schönberg, and also Claude Debussy, who had married a Jew. The music of politically dissident composers such as Alban Berg was also banned. And composers whose music had ever been considered sexually suggestive or savage, such as Paul Hindemith, Igor Stravinsky and the like, were denounced as « degenerate » and banned.

Jazz and swing music were seen as degenerate and proscribed. Jazz was labelled « Negermusik » (Negro Music) ; and swing music was associated with various Jewish band leaders and composers such as Artie Shaw and Benny Goodman. Also proscribed were Jewish « Tin Pan Alley » composers like Irving Berlin and George Gershwin.

The « Reichsmusikkammer » also functioned as a musicians' guild, with composers, performers, conductors, teachers, and instrument manufacturers being obliged to join in order to pursue or continue a career in music. Membership

could be denied on grounds of race or politics. Dozens of composers, song writers, lyricists, and musicians were ruined or forced into exile because for one reason or another (often political or racial) they did not adhere to or comply with the « Reichsmusikkammer » 's standards. The career, for instance, of popular Operetta composer Leon Jessel was destroyed by the Institute when it promoted boycotts of his music and finally banned it.

Although Josef Goebbels and other high-level Nazis in the « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Culture Institute) basically controlled the « Reichsmusikkammer » , titular presidents and vice-presidents were appointed ; in the beginning, this was largely for the sake of the Music Institute's public relations and prestige.

President :

Because of his international fame, composer Richard Strauß, although privately a critic of the Nazi « Reich » , was installed as president of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , in November 1933. Strauß's motivations in accepting the post were largely to protect his Jewish daughter-in-law and Jewish grand-children, and to preserve and conduct the music of banned composers like Gustav Mahler, Claude Debussy, and Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. He was dismissed from the post, in June 1935, when a letter to his Jewish librettist Stefan Zweig, critical of Nazi racial profiling, was intercepted by the « Gestapo » .

Peter Raabe was appointed President after Strauß's dismissal. For much of his tenure as president, Raabe was not the sole leader regarding musical culture in the « Reich » . In 1936, Josef Goebbels appointed Heinz Drewes, then general music director of Altenburg, to head a department of music in the Propaganda Ministry, resulting in confused and tangled roles. Raabe tried to resign in 1938, but his resignation was not accepted, and he served until the end of the « Reich » , in 1945.

Vice-president :

Renowned conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler was appointed vice-President of the Institute, in 1933. However, he refused to adhere to the ban on Paul Hindemith's « Mathis der Maler » , and resigned in 1934 condemning anti-Semitism.

Paul Græner was appointed vice-president upon Furtwängler's resignation. He resigned in 1941.

« I have at last learned the lesson that has been forced upon me during this year, and I shall not ever forget it. It is that I am not a German, not a European, indeed perhaps scarcely a human being (at least, the Europeans prefer the worst of their race to me) but I am a Jew. » (Arnold Schönberg)

After the horrors of World War I, most Europeans expressed their sense of freedom by embracing the roaring 1920's. A decadent lifestyle was emerging from the night life of jazz clubs and cabarets. Berlin was at the heart of the bold and innovative music trends of the 1920's and 1930's. Musicians experimented with their art by pushing away from accepted musical forms and finding new ones.

While many Europeans were celebrating new-found freedom in the arts, Germany was already beginning to fall under the shadow of the swastika. For almost 100 years, an atmosphere of anti-Semitism had been growing in Europe. Richard Wagner, the well-known composer, had spoken publicly against the Jewish people in his booklet, « Das Judenthum in die Musik » (Judaism in Music) . The Nazi Party played upon these historic prejudices in their rise to power.

19th Century psychologists introduced the term degenerate (or « entartete ») to describe any deviance or clinical mental illness. Later, a broader definition was applied to include scientific literature (medical, biology and anthropology) . By 1933, Hitler's 3rd « Reich » referred to the mentally ill, communists, Gypsies, homosexuals and Jews as subspecies of the human race. The words « Jewish » , « Degenerate » , and « Bolshevik » were commonly used to describe any art or music not acceptable to the 3rd « Reich » .

After the race laws of 1933, the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) required a registry of all German musicians. As a result, 100's of talented composers had their work deliberately suppressed and careers ended simply because their race or style of music offended the 3rd « Reich » . By 1938, examples of degenerate music were on display at the « Entarte » Musik Exhibit for the public to view. Famous works by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Gustav Mahler, and Arnold Schönberg were used as examples of unacceptable music. A generation of incredibly innovative and promising musicians was virtually excluded from its place in music history.

The « Reichsmusikkammer » registry was completed in 1940 and included all musicians' race and religion. Those Jews who had escaped detection up until 1940 were now in jeopardy. It was easy to find and arrest Jews based on this list. The following composers were considered « degenerate » by the Nazi regime.

On 13 February 1934, the composer Richard Strauß gave a speech celebrating one of the central cultural institutions of the 3rd « Reich » : the « Reichskulturkammer » (« RKK » , or « Reich » Chamber of Culture) and its musical division, the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« RMK » , or « Reich » Chamber of Music) . His speech not only revealed the accommodationist approach taken by many (non-Jewish) musicians in Nazi Germany, but also reflected the ways in which some musicians who were not directly persecuted by these organisations hoped to profit from them. Strauß' speech began :

« The " Reichskulturkammer " (the dream and goal of all German musicians for decades) was created on 15 November 1933, thus constituting an important step in the direction of the reconstruction of our total German musical life. At this point, I feel compelled to thank « Reich » Chancellor Adolf Hitler and « Reich » Minister Doctor Goebbels, in the name of the entire musical profession of Germany, for the creation of the " Reichskulturkammer ", since Adolf Hitler's seizure of power has not only resulted in a transformation of the political situation in Germany, but also of its culture, and since the National-Socialist government has called to life the " Reichskulturkammer ", it is evident that the new Germany is not willing to allow artistic life to remain in isolation, but that new ways and means will be explored for the revival of our musical culture. »

After Strauß's declaration of loyalty and optimism, Gustav Havemann conducted an orchestral performance of those

« most German » of composers, Beethoven and Wagner, and the event concluded with a group rendition of the Nazi hymn, the « Horst Wessel Lied » .

This celebration marked the beginning of a new phase of cultural production in Germany. For the duration of Adolf Hitler's rule, from 1933 to 1945, artists in Germany were mandatorily organized under one of the branches of the « Reichskulturkammer » . Founded only months after the Nazi seizure of power, the « Reichskulturkammer » was intended to consolidate, purify and strengthen Germany's cultural life. The « Reichskulturkammer » was divided into 7 separate branches : film, music, theatre, press, writing, visual art and radio. With its jurisdiction extending to all spheres of German music, the « Reichsmusikkammer » was sub-divided and organized regionally. It included branches for composers, musicians and music teachers, and separate departments for concerts, choral and folk music, music publishing houses and musical businesses. At its founding, Strauß was appointed president, and Wilhelm Furtwängler, his deputy. The organisation was intended to have a dual impact on German music. Its primary goal, especially in the early years, was the « cleansing » of the musical world, which consisted primarily of eliminating Jews, foreigners and political leftists from the musical scene, and ensuring that music composed by such « undesirables » was neither available nor performed. (Almost simultaneous with the creation of the « Reichskulturkammer » was the creation of the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Cultural League) , which was intended to temporarily employ the thousands of Jews fired by the actions of the « Reichskulturkammer ») . The 2nd goal of the organisation was improving the situation of « Aryan » musicians.

Under the leadership of Strauß and Furtwängler, the « Reichsmusikkammer » worked to improve the situation of German musicians, especially composers. As Paul Græner, future vice-President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , pronounced in 1934 :

« The great work of the " Reichskulturkammer " extended itself over all artistic professions thus the instrument was created for the application of the grand design of corporate reconstruction for the benefit of the art and artists. This refers not only to a renewal of organisation, inasmuch as the " Reichskulturkammer ", especially the " Reichsmusikkammer ", will watch over the intellectual and artistic life of the nation. »

In its role as guardian of the « artistic life of the nation » , the « Reichsmusikkammer » was especially interested in reforming music education programmes for youth, as well as in training young musicians. By the mid 1930's, it had successfully lobbied for increases in state spending for musicians, especially for Orchestras ; in 1935, standardised wages and maximum work hours for musicians were set by the State, and during the Chamber's 1st few years, the number of unemployed musicians fell substantially. There was also increased support for lesser-known « Aryan » musicians, and for rediscoveries of forgotten works.

Substantial as these improvements were, they were overshadowed by more high-profile acts of purging, defamation, intimidation and vilification. Indeed, Josef Gœbbels lost his 2 flagship leaders over such « Reichsmusikkammer » initiated actions : vice-President Furtwängler (as well as Gustav Havemann) , in 1934, over the « Hindemith affair » , and President Strauß, a year later, over his collaboration with Stefan Zweig. Their replacements (respectively, Paul Græner and Peter Raabe) were both more active and involved in the activities of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , but

also far more ideologically committed to the Nazi agenda, and more subservient to Goebbels. One of Raabe's 1st actions as President was to establish a list of black-listed Jewish and foreign works, something Strauß had refused to do. The list included over 100 composers whose work could be neither publicly performed nor broadcast, and included Aaron Copland, Otto Klemperer and Artur Schnabel. Musicians were limited in the repertoire they were allowed to play ; all « undesirable » music (that of Jews and foreigners - especially Americans -, and jazz) was officially prohibited.

The bulk of « Reichsmusikkammer » energy was focused on eliminating « degenerate influences » from the musical world. From its inception, it required all members to be registered, which functioned as a racial screening process. 2 of the most successful Jewish musicians in Germany, conductor Bruno Walter and composer Arnold Schönberg, were harassed, forced to cancel performances and resign their positions. Jews began to be systematically purged as a centralised bureaucracy and replaced with more « ideologically reliable » people. Professional Jewish musicians were fired, and the music of Jewish composers was banned. There were also comprehensive bans on Poles (with the exception of Frederic Chopin) , Russians, French (except Georges Bizet) and black musicians. Many musicians eventually emigrated out of fear and financial desperation, including some of Germany's leading composers, conductors and instrumental virtuosi.

One of the highlights of « Reichsmusikkammer » activity was the 1938 Düsseldorf « Reichsmusiktage » (« Reich » Music Days) , intended to present the glory of « purified » German music. There was a focus on military music, but an exhibition was also put together on « Entartete Musik » (Degenerate music) , under the guidance of Hans Severus Ziegler. Due to its great popularity, the show was intended to become an annual event, allowing the general population to experience and celebrate « Aryan » music ; the outbreak of war, however, meant that the 2nd show, in 1939, was the last. War brought worsened conditions within Germany, as funding decreased, institutions shut down, musicians were enlisted, and travel became extremely difficult for Orchestras. Many « Reichsmusikkammer » activities had to be curtailed. There was also an increased conservatism in German music ; many previously tolerated composers, including Igor Stravinsky, were now subject to a ban. But despite the War, the « Reichsmusikkammer » continued to fight for the cause of German musicians, and, even at the peak of fighting, it was able to maintain a relatively high employment rate amongst musicians in Germany. There were also some new opportunities for German musicians, particularly performing for soldiers on the front. The importance that the Nazi Party ascribed to cultural activity is indeed reflected in the remarkable diversity and quantity of music and theatre offered to soldiers during the War.

« Degenerate Music » : Title-Page of the Exhibition Guide (1938)

As with the visual arts, the Nazis aimed to demonstrate the difference between good « German » music and « degenerate » music by staging major cultural events. To this end, they organized the « Reichsmusiktage » (« Reich » Music Days) in Düsseldorf, from May 22nd to 29th, 1938. This week-long event included concerts and lectures that presented ideologically and ethnically « pure » music. It was accompanied by the « Degenerate Music » exhibition, which opened on May 24th. The show was similar in concept to the « Degenerate Art » exhibition - its main purpose was to document the work of artists who had been defamed by the Nazi regime since 1933. The « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » (« Reich » Music Inspection Office) , which was part of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry, had drawn-up a list of « degenerate » artists and their works for this purpose. The exhibition covered all areas of music,

from composition, performance and criticism to musicology and promotion. Examples of « degeneracy » were found in Classical music in composers such as Alban Berg, Paul Hindemith, or Igor Stravinsky, and in the genres of jazz and swing in general. The exhibit's main organizer was Privy Councilor Doctor Hans Severus Ziegler, who was director of the Weimar National Theater. Ziegler was also head of the Cultural Office in the « Gau » of Thuringia, and had carried-out « cleansings against cultural Bolshevism » in Thuringia even before 1933. The visual component of the exhibition consisted of photographs, portraits, paintings, caricatures, and posters intended to illustrate the « sub-human » character of the featured musicians and the inferiority of their works. One such example appeared on the cover of the exhibition guide. The image was based on the cover-sheet of Ernst Křenek's Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Jonny Strikes up the Band ! » , 1925-1926) , but replaced the carnation on the African-American saxophonist's lapel with a Star of David. The Opera had been banned in 1933, and Křenek, an Austrian, had emigrated to the United States after the annexation of his country (« Anschluß ») , in 1938.

The exhibition remained on view in Düsseldorf until June and, subsequently, traveled to other cities along with the « Degenerate Art » exhibit. As of 1938, the « Reich » Music Days were supposed to take place annually, but they were canceled after the beginning of the War, in 1939.

...

On 13 February 1934, the composer Richard Strauß gave a speech celebrating one of the central cultural institutions of the 3rd « Reich » : the « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Culture, or « RKK ») and its musical division, the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Music, or « RMK ») . His speech not only revealed the accommodationist approach taken by many (non-Jewish) musicians in Nazi Germany, but also reflected the ways in which some musicians who were not directly persecuted by these organisations hoped to profit from them. Strauß's speech began :

« The " Reichskulturkammer " (the dream and goal of all German musicians for decades) was created on 15 November 1933, thus constituting an important step in the direction of the reconstruction of our total German musical life. At this point, I feel compelled to thank " Reich " Chancellor Adolf Hitler and " Reich " Minister Doctor Gœbbels, in the name of the entire musical profession of Germany, for the creation of the " Reichskulturkammer " since Adolf Hitler's seizure of power has not only resulted in a transformation of the political situation in Germany, but also of its culture, and since the National-Socialist government has called to life the " Reichsmusikkammer ", it is evident that the new Germany is not willing to allow artistic life to remain in isolation, but that new ways and means will be explored for the revival of our musical culture. »

After Strauß's declaration of loyalty and optimism, Gustav Havemann conducted an orchestral performance of those « most German » of composers, Beethoven and Wagner, and the event concluded with a group rendition of the Nazi hymn, the « Horst Wessel Lied » .

This celebration marked the beginning of a new phase of cultural production in Germany. For the duration of Hitler's rule, from 1933 to 1945, artists in Germany were mandatorily organized under one of the branches of the «

Reichskulturkammer » . Founded only months after the Nazi seizure of power, the « Reichskulturkammer » was intended to consolidate, purify and strengthen Germany's cultural life. The « Reichskulturkammer » was divided into 7 separate branches : film, music, theatre, press, writing, visual art and radio. With its jurisdiction extending to all spheres of German music, the « Reichsmusikkammer » was sub-divided and organized regionally. It included branches for composers, musicians and music teachers, and separate departments for concerts, choral and folk music, music publishing houses and musical businesses. At its founding, Strauß was appointed president, and Wilhelm Furtwängler his deputy. The organisation was intended to have a dual impact on German music. Its primary goal, especially in the early years, was the « cleansing » of the musical world, which consisted primarily of eliminating Jews, foreigners and political leftists from the musical scene, and ensuring that music composed by such « undesirables » was neither available nor performed. (Almost simultaneous with the creation of the « Reichskulturkammer » was the creation of the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Cultural League) , which was intended to temporarily employ the thousands of Jews fired by the actions of the « Reichskulturkammer ») . The 2nd goal of the organisation was improving the situation of « Aryan » musicians.

« Reichsmusiktage »

On 22 May 1938, the 125th anniversary of Richard Wagner's birth, the « Reichsmusiktage » (« Reich » Music Days) officially opened in Düsseldorf. This was a long-planned and carefully orchestrated event, intended to show both Germans and the international community that the musical arts were thriving under the Nazi regime. New works by leading « Aryan » composers were premiered, and the programme was dominated by the works of great German composers from Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart to Richard Wagner and Anton Bruckner. In addition to the wide-range of performances and lectures, the « Reichsmusiktage » also marked the opening of the « Entartete Musik » (degenerate music) exhibit, organized by Hans Severus Ziegler. Modelled after the previous year's successful exhibit of « Entartete Kunst » (degenerate art) , the exhibit was intended to show the cultural degradation and moral threat posed to the nation by Jewish and other « degenerate » musicians. The category of « degenerate » was difficult to define, in music as much as in the visual arts, but the dominant criteria for inclusion in Ziegler's show were race and « modernism » . The advertisement for the exhibit showed a black jazz musician with the features of an ape, playing a saxophone and wearing a Jewish star. Perhaps, ironically, the composer whose Opera was the source of this image was neither Jewish or black ; rather, it was the Catholic Austrian Ernst Křenek, whose enormously popular Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Jonny Strikes Up the Band ! » , 1925-1926) became the inspiration for Ziegler's nightmare of musical and racial degeneration.

...

Die Reichsmusiktage fanden vom 22. bis 29. Mai 1938 in Düsseldorf statt. Sie waren eine Veranstaltung der NS-Propaganda und standen unter der Schirmherrschaft von Josef Gœbbels. Gœbbels hatte ursprünglich eine jährliche Wiederkehr der Reichsmusiktage geplant. Diese wurden zwar im Mai 1939 erneut durchgeführt, entfielen aber nach dem Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs.

In der Ideologie der Nationalsozialisten wurde zwischen deutscher und nationaler Kunst auf der einen Seite und «

kulturbolschewistischer » und « entarteter Kunst » auf der anderen Seite unterschieden. Inhaltliche und stilistische Argumente wurden dabei mehr und mehr durch rassistische Aussagen ersetzt. Die Nationalsozialisten versuchten die Gleichschaltung der Kunst durch Sonderveranstaltungen und Festspiele zu fördern und der Bevölkerung als das « Deutsche » nahezubringen. Hierzu gehörten auch die Reichsmusiktage, die am 22. Mai 1938, dem 125. Geburtstag von Richard Wagner, in Düsseldorf eröffnet wurden. Sie standen unter der Schirmherrschaft von Josef Goebbels, der sie als Veranstaltung für « musikpolitische Grundsatzklärungen und Weichenstellungen » bezeichnete. Die Veranstaltung dauerte vom 22. - 29. Mai und wurde von Heinz Drewes, dem Leiter der Musikabteilung im Propagandaministerium, organisiert.

Im Rahmen der Reichsmusiktage wurde am 24. Mai 1938 eine Ausstellung im Kunstpalast am Ehrenhof in Düsseldorf eröffnet, die unter dem Namen « Entartete Musik », an die im Jahre 1937 zuvor in München stattfindende Ausstellung « Entartete Kunst » anknüpfte. Als Hauptverantwortlicher der Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » galt Hans Severus Ziegler, einer der frühesten Anhänger von Adolf Hitler und seit 1935 Generalintendant des Weimarer Nationaltheaters.

In dieser Ausstellung wurde öffentlich die Musik angeprangert, die nicht in die Weltanschauung der Nationalsozialisten hineinpasste, besonders die Werke von jüdischen Künstlern. Wie schon zuvor in München, wurden auch auf dieser Ausstellung in Düsseldorf abschreckende Beispiele von « entarteter Musik » vorgeführt. In über 50 Vitrinen sah man neben Büchern, Partituren und Bühnenbildern auch Fotos und verunglimpfende Karikaturen. Außerdem konnten per Knopfdruck Ausschnitte aus Schallplatten-Einspielungen der angeprangerten Werke angehört werden.

In der Ausstellung wurden neben Musikern auch Musikwissenschaftler, Musikdirektoren, Musikkritiker, Musikpädagogen sowie Dirigenten angeprangert und deren Werke und Schriften als « entartet » bezeichnet. Sowohl « nicht-arische » Persönlichkeiten wie Alban Berg, Arnold Schönberg oder Kurt Weill als auch « arische » Musiker wie Paul Hindemith, der mit einer Jüdin verheiratet war, sowie Igor Strawinsky aus Russland waren verfeimt.

Die Ausstellung war in Düsseldorf bis zum 14. Juni 1938 zu sehen und wurde danach noch in Weimar, München und Wien gezeigt. Es gab dazu keinen begleitenden Katalog, sondern nur die als Broschüre gedruckte Eröffnungsrede von Hans Severus Ziegler im Düsseldorfer Kunstpalast. Auf der Titelseite dieser Broschüre war ein schwarzer Jazz-Saxophonist als Karikatur zu sehen. Provozierend daran war zum einen das bewußt überzeichnete Gesicht, im Kontrast zur Kleidung, Frack und Zylinder des Musikers, zum anderen aber auch der große Davidstern, der anstelle einer Nelke im Knopfloch prangte. Die Nationalsozialisten wählten diese fiktive Figur als Symbol der Ausstellung und auch der gesamten Reichsmusiktage 1938 als Inbegriff der Entartung. Die Karikatur erinnert an den schwarzen Musiker Jonny, die Titelfigur aus Ernst Kreneks Oper Jonny spielt auf ! , gegen die NSDAP-Mitglieder schon vor 1933 protestiert hatten.

Zum Höhepunkt der Reichsmusiktage zählte neben dieser Ausstellung auch eine « kulturpolitische Kundgebung » . Neben einer Ansprache von Reichspropagandaminister Goebbels und einer Rede von Gauleiter Friedrich Karl Florian dirigierte Richard Strauß selbst sein « Festliches Präludium Opus 61 » , ein Werk für Orchester und Orgel aus dem Jahr 1913, das er extra für diese Gelegenheit neu besetzte. Weiterhin wurden in ganz Düsseldorf auf verschiedenen Plätzen so genannte Platzkonzerte gegeben, musikwissenschaftliche Symposien sowie Fachtagungen von Komponisten und Musikpädagogen veranstaltet, wobei die Verkörperung und Darstellung des « Deutschen » in der Musikkultur diskutiert

wurde. Es wurden außerdem insgesamt drei Opern uraufgeführt.

Eigentlich hatte Goebbels die Reichsmusiktage als feststehende, jährlich stattfindende Einrichtung vorgesehen, doch wurden sie nach einer Wiederholung im Mai 1939 wegen des Zweiten Weltkriegs nicht mehr durchgeführt.

Weder in Deutschland noch in der ausländischen Presse wurden die Reichsmusiktage 1938 als bedeutendes Ereignis wahrgenommen. Im Gegensatz zur vorausgegangenen Kunstausstellung im Jahr 1937 in München waren sowohl die Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » als auch die Reichsmusiktage als Ganzes für viele Mitläufer des nationalsozialistischen Kulturbetriebs ein Misserfolg. Da zumeist Künstler verurteilt wurden, die schon ins Ausland emigriert waren, konnte die gesamte Veranstaltung nicht direkt zu Beschlagnahmungen oder Verboten führen. Ebenso war die propagandistische Auswertung der Ausstellung damals begrenzt, die Reaktionen aus dem In- und Ausland waren eher bescheiden und zurückhaltend. Während manche Zeitungen immerhin ihre Verwunderung darüber aussprachen, warum so bekannte Komponisten wie Paul Hindemith und Igor Strawinsky als « entartet » eingestuft wurden, blieben die Reaktionen aus dem Ausland merkwürdig zurückhaltend. Die in den USA erscheinende Zeitschrift « Musical America » beschränkte sich lediglich auf eine Auflistung der als « entartet » eingestuften Werke und Komponisten. Die Londoner Times schien ganz im Zeichen der damaligen Appeasement-Politik sogar ein wenig Verständnis für diese Aktion aufzubringen. Der regimetreue Dirigent Peter Raabe, damaliger Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer, blieb den Eröffnungsfeierlichkeiten der Reichsmusiktage 1938 demonstrativ fern. Allerdings wurden solche negativen Reaktionen durch die nationalsozialistische Zensur von Presse und Rundfunk der Öffentlichkeit verschwiegen.

« Jüdischer Kulturbund »

En avril 1933, 2 mois après la proclamation du 3e « Reich », les Juifs allemands sont écartés de toute activité professionnelle publique. Avec les lois raciales de Nuremberg, en 1935, ils seront déchus de la nationalité allemande. Dès octobre 1933, les artistes juifs se regroupent en associations, tolérées par le régime, sous le contrôle du « Reichskulturverwalters » Hans Hinkel et jouant pour un public exclusivement juif dans des lieux exclusivement juifs. Le « Kulturbund Deutscher Juden » est dirigé par le Docteur Kurt Singer et se développe dans 60 villes allemandes. Après 1935, parce qu'on ne peut pas être « Juif et Allemand en même temps », la fédération se transforme en « Jüdischer Kulturbund in Deutschland ». En 1938, une exposition appelée « Entartete Musik » à Düsseldorf, essayera de démontrer que la musique des Juifs est une musique dégénérée « nègre, bolchévique et cosmopolite » incompatible avec les standards de la musique allemande définis par Josef Goebbels suivant, en cela, les idées de Richard Wagner, de Theodor Stengel ou de Hans Pfitzner. Ainsi, en 1938, environ 2,300 musiciens juifs auront été chassés des activités musicales du « Reich ». Plus de 180,000 Juifs de toute l'Allemagne deviendront membres actifs de l'association. Pendant sa Ire année d'activité, le « Kulturbund » présentera 69 Opéras et 117 concerts et, de mi-1934 à mi-1935, 57 Opéras et 358 concerts. La fédération culturelle juive durera jusqu'en 1941. À partir de ce moment-là, tous les musiciens juifs auront, soit choisi l'exil, soit été directement assassinés, soit déportés dans des camps de concentration où ils seront assassinés peu après. Seuls quelques-uns survivront.

...

« Jüdischer Kulturbund » , or « Der Jüdische Kulturbund » , was a Cultural Federation of German Jews, established in 1933. It hired over 1,300 men and 700 women artists, musicians, and actors fired from German institutions, and grew to about 70,000 members, according to some authors. Saul Friedländer speaks of at least 180,000.

The organisation was originally named « Kulturbund Deutscher Juden » (Cultural Federation of German Jews) , in 1933, but, in April 1935, the Nazi authorities (forcing the organisation to delete the term German from the name) imposed a change of the name into « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Cultural Federation) . Also known as the « Kubu » , this institution was created by unemployed Jewish performers with the consent of the Nazis « for » the Jewish population. The Nazis permitted this association to hide its oppression of Jews. The « Kulturbund » was one of the most famous examples of Jewish creativity in response to cultural exclusion. It provided a semblance of leisure for its 70,000 members in 49 different locals.

After the exclusion of Jewish Germans and gentile Germans of Jewish descent from participating in almost all organisations and public events, the « Kulturbund Deutscher Juden » tried to provide some compensation, as tried « Israelitisches Familienblatt » .

The « Kulturbund » put on theatrical performances, concerts, exhibitions, Operas and lectures all over Germany, performed by Jewish entertainers, artists, writers, scientists, which were no longer permitted by the Nazi Party regime to appear before audiences. Thus, Jewish performers could earn again their, however scarce, livelihood. The performances took place at authorized segregated venues with « Jewish only » attendance, meaning Jewish Germans and gentile Germans of Jewish descent and their eventually gentile spouses.

Following the « Kristallnacht » pogroms, on November 9 and 10, 1938, the « Kulturbund » was allowed to continue its activities ; however, the discrimination and persecution of Jews had driven many into impoverishment. The number of venues and of ensemble members was reduced.

On December 16, Hans Hinkel, State commissioner for Prussian theatre affairs including the « Kulturbund » , in Josef Goebbels' « Reich » 's Propaganda Ministry, declared in front of Doctor Werner Levie (1903-1945) , a Dutchman and, therefore, one of the few available members (not in hiding or arrested) of « Kulturbund » 's executive board that, until the end of December, all the still existing 76 Jewish German publishing companies were to be shut down or sold to so-called Aryan owners. The few publications, which would still be permitted to appear, were to be directed by a publishing department to be formed within « Kulturbund » . In January 1939, the « Kulturbund » 's publishing department opened in the offices formerly used by the « Zionist Jüdische Rundschau » , which had been shut down right after the Pogrom, with its former editor, Erich Liepmann, being the manager of the publishing department. The « Kulturbund » managed to save a great deal of the book stocks of the to-be-ceased publishing houses from being pulped. Levie reached the concession, that Jewish publishers obliged to liquidate their companies, might export their book stocks on their own until April 1939 if the respective purchasers would pay in foreign exchange to the « Reichsbank » . However, the publishers would be paid in inconvertible « Reichsmarks » only.

The « Kulturbund » 's publishing department bought the remaining book stocks from their old proprietors at a

discount of 80 % to 95% of the original price and would only pay, once proceeds from sales abroad or to German or Austrian Jews and gentiles of Jewish descent would materialise. Also Austria, annexed by Germany in March 1938, was covered by the « Kulturbund » 's publishing department.

The Propaganda Ministry only allowed the « Kulturbund » to continue to exist, if it would change its statutes to that effect that the Minister (Göebbels) may (at any time) interfere in affairs of the executive board, even dissolve the « Kulturbund » and dispose of its assets. The changed statutes came into effect on 4 March 1939.

The « Kulturbund » 's executive secretary Levie emigrated to the Netherlands at the end of August 1939. He was succeeded by Johanna Marcus, who soon also emigrated and then by Willy Pless. The « Kulturbund » 's performing activities, nonetheless, were embraced by the Jewish population who previously were barred from all cultural and entertainment events.

On September 11, 1941, the « Gestapo » ordered the closure of the « Kulturbund » , but excepted its publishing department, which was to be taken over by the « Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland » .

Jewish observers state that, ironically, the « Kubu » produced what amounted to the best theatre, cabaret, concerts, Opera, conferences in Germany during the Nazi era.

The « Kulturbund » 's publishing department sold books from its stock to Jewish Germans and Austrians and thus created a surplus, which partly covered losses in the performing department. A considerable sum was transferred to the Central Office for Jewish Emigration, to pay emigration fees levied from lucky receivers of foreign visas, who, however, were too poor to pay them.

The conductor Joseph Rosenstock led the Opera department. The 1st opera was « The Marriage of Figaro on 14 November 1933.

Mozart in the Ghetto : The « Jüdischer Kulturbund » and « Figaros Hochzeit »

It seems ironic that one of the earliest manifestations of the Mozart Diaspora actually took place inside Nazi Germany. A staged performance of « Figaros Hochzeit » opening in Berlin, in November 1933, almost 10 months after the Nazis seized power, became the 1st Opera to have been performed by the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Cultural League) . Spearheaded by a group of idealists including Doctor Kurt Singer, the recently dismissed assistant director of the « Stadtische Oper » in Berlin, the theatre critic Julius Bab, Berlin's chief rabbi Leo Baeck, the former conductor of the Mannheim Opera, Joseph Rosenstock, producer Kurt Baumann and economist and journalist Werner Levie, the Jewish Cultural League was established by the Nazis to enable Jews to continue working in the cultural sphere despite being deprived of their employment opportunities in Germany's theatres and Opera Houses. It also provided an exclusively Jewish audience with cultural sustenance at a time when German Jews were undergoing the constant trauma of officially engineered boycotts and racial persecution.

Singer was given the job of persuading the Nazi authorities of the viability of the Jewish Cultural League. Despite some initial hesitancy on the part of the regime, the organisation was sanctioned in June 1933 by Hans Hinkel, who was then Commissar for the Prussian Ministry of Science, Education and Art. A memorandum of agreement between Singer and Hinkel, drafted on 7 July 1933, established the conditions under which the « Kulturbund » could operate, namely that all its members had to be Jewish, that performances were to be given to exclusively Jewish audiences who had paid seasonal subscriptions, that all programmes had to be approved by the regime at least 1 month in advance, and that any advertisements or announcements about its activities would only be placed in the Jewish press.

The summer months of 1933 were spent recruiting professional actors and musicians, while the small « Berliner Theater » on « Charlottenstraße » was leased for the Jewish Cultural League's exclusive use. As plans for its opening season were unveiled, the organisation published its 1st monthly letter, in October 1933. The central message, linking the various declarations included in this bulletin, promised that a peaceful co-existence between German and Jewish culture could be achieved, and that members of the Jewish Cultural League should be able to perform the Classic repertory with which all Germans, irrespective of racial origin, had grown-up. Julius Bab underlined this sentiment eloquently :

« This German culture, in its Classical form, as we have welcomed it, has always been an open gate to the entire world, a way to the whole of humanity ; and, in this very sense, we, as Gennan Jews, want to and have to enshrine it, if we want to escape the inwardly dangerous return to the " Ghetto ". For this reason, the Classical creators of Germany and the world, Lessing and Gœthe, Shakespeare and Molière, Mozart and Beethoven will continue to be essential for our theatrical experience.

The theatre that we are creating will be a Jewish one but, at the same time, a German one ; it will flourish from this very double root of existence, which nurtures us as Gennan Jews, and from which we cannot be separated as long as we live. »

An indication of the organisation's aims can be gleaned from the choice of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's play « Nathan der Weise » (Nathan, the Wise) and Mozart's « Figaros Hochzeit » that were to open its 1st season. As a plea for religious tolerance, the Lessing, « written in a true spirit of brotherhood during the Enlightenment and dedicated to the dramatist's Jewish friend, the philosopher Moses Mendelssohn » , was produced in an audacious manner. Although the programme book respectfully asked the audience to refrain from indulging in political discussions, in or near the theatre, the decision to present « Nathan » alone on stage, in the final scene, rather than emphasise a sense of harmonious unity between Christian, Jew and Muslim, provided a telling commentary on the isolation that was currently facing Germany's Jews.

At 1st glance, « Figaros Hochzeit » , produced by Kurt Singer with Heinz Condell, as stage-designer, and Joseph Rosenstock, as conductor, must have seemed more remote from the immediate concerns of its Jewish audience than Lessing's play. Nonetheless, its selection cannot have been completely unintentional. Besides reflecting a triumphantly successful example of the fruitful creative partnership between the composer and his Jewish-born librettist, the Opera, at least in its original incarnation, represented a challenge to the established order, attacking authoritarianism and

making a plea for equality, liberty and fraternity. Hinkel and the Nazi censors responsible for sanctioning the performance may have been unaware of its subversive undercurrents, merely regarding the work as an entertaining and diverting comedy.

The extent to which audiences at « Figaro » picked-up on these resonances remains unclear, judging by the reviews of the Opera that appeared in the Jewish press. Apart from praising the qualities of the performance, most critics naturally chose to emphasize the specifically Jewish elements that contributed to Mozart's work. Writing in the « Gemeinblatt der Jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin », Ludwig Misch made pointed reference to the Jewish provenance of Mozart's librettist, Lorenzo Da Ponte, as well as the modern German translation of the text by Hermann Levi. An anonymous writer in the « Jüdische Rundschau » commended the Jewish Cultural League for « not letting us down » by ensuring that :

« A Jewish Figaro should be a proper Figaro that does honour to our name. As Jews, we look at every great artwork with reverence, we absorb it and take pleasure in it, we attest our gratitude through the artistic seriousness with which we engage with it and with which we tackle its production and performance. »

Although the non-Jewish German press was forbidden from discussing the Jewish Cultural League's « Figaro », a review of the production by Herbert F. Peyser appeared in the New York ...

...

... (« Kulturbund Oper ») and contemplate adding further works to their repertory. In February 1934, the « Kulturbund Oper » took its « Figaro » production to Breslau, in February 1934, where, according to a report filed in the March 1934 issue of the « Kulturbund deutscher Juden Monatsblatt » , the company managed to overcome the problems of transferring their production from a small intimate theatre to one housing nearly 1,700 seats. At the end of the « Kulturbund Oper » 's 1st season, Kurt Singer outlined his plans for the coming years, making it abundantly clear that he had every intention of featuring more Mozart. « Die Zauberflöte » was very much in his sights and, in 1935, he also submitted a proposal to the Propaganda Ministry to stage « Così fan tutte » .

Unfortunately, neither of these projects was to come to fruition since Hinkel became increasingly preoccupied with the need to chip away at Singer's freedom of choice in the repertory that he wished to feature. As the « Manchester Guardian » reported on 27 June 1935, it had become a « thorn in the flesh » for the Nazis that the « Jews had created among themselves such an atmosphere of purely Gennan culture » . Hinkel retaliated by making the demand that the Jewish Cultural League should, in future, confine its activities to performing works by Jews or foreigners, and that « Aryan » composers, such as Mozart, were to be strictly off-limits. The intensification of cultural apartheid gathered pace in Berlin, over the summer of 1935. After concluding an agreement with the State Secret Police that they should be more vigilant in monitoring its activities, Hinkel told a press gathering that those holding responsibility in the Jewish Cultural League « may now show what they can do for their racial comrades. We shall not disturb them if they do not meddle in our German cultural life. Germany and its great cultural possessions belong to Germany. »

After such a public declaration, there was little chance of Hinkel sanctioning the performance of further Mozart Operas by the « Kulturbund Oper ». The final dress rehearsal of « Così fan tutte » had already taken place in November 1935 before the Nazi authorities (much to Singer's dismay) forbade the production altogether. The ban was seized upon by those opposed to the Nazis abroad as a further evidence of the erosion of Jewish civil liberties. For example, on 10 November, the anti-Nazi Czech Social-Democratic weekly « Neuer Vorwärts » carried the banner headline « Jews are no longer allowed to play Mozart », while the « Manchester Guardian », on 16 November, described the removal of the Opera as indicative of the « peculiar malignant meanness of the Nazi mind ».

Although Hinkel had thwarted Singer's plans to put on more Mozart in Berlin, his proscriptive policies were applied with far less rigour outside the German capital. Thus, in April 1936, the Frankfurt section of the Jewish Cultural League featured a staged performance of Mozart's « Die Entführung aus dem Serail » with Hans Wilhelm (William) Steinberg as conductor, following this, in November of the same year, with « Die Zauberflöte » under Richard Karp. Even in Berlin, a concert performance of « Figaro » with piano accompaniment at the « Joseph-Lehmann-Schule », in May 1936, seems to have taken place without Hinkel's intervention. Yet, the capacity of the Cultural League to make decisions as to its future repertory and direction was to be increasingly restricted over the following year. If Hinkel had not made his intentions perfectly clear in earlier directives, a more specific course of censorship was forthcoming. On 14 May 1937, Hinkel issued an order banning the Jewish Cultural League from performing Beethoven, Mozart and plays by Gøethe.

The screw was further tightened after the « Anschluß » with the Austrian-born Haydn and Schubert being added to the list of composers that could not feature in the Jewish Cultural League's programmes. Naturally, such sanctions only applied to public performance, since the Ministry of Propaganda did not have the power to prevent individual Jewish musicians from coming together in their homes to perform works by these composers. Yet, from 1937 onwards, the private performance of a Mozart chamber work by Jews in Germany was effectively an illegal activity which could have carried the risk of severe penalties had it been discovered by the police.

While Jews were being denied the right to perform Mozart in public in Nazi Germany, those who had left the country and chosen to settle in Palestine were appropriating the work of the same composer in order to establish their own sense of identity. In 1935, Hermann Swet reported in the « Pariser Tageblatt » on a remarkable concert given, on 22 April, in the amphitheatre of Mount Scopus by a student choir (the combined forces of the Jerusalem Academic Chorus and Choir of the YMCA) and a dilettante University Orchestra under the direction of Karl Salomon, a pupil of Max Reger, who had left Germany in 1933. The work to which they had devoted their attention was Mozart's 1771 biblical Oratorio « Betulia liberata » with an original text by Metastasio, performed on this occasion under the title of « Judith » in a Hebrew translation that was made by the Amsterdam-based 18th Century poet David Franco Mendes.

It would be tempting to suggest that political motives played a significant role in this performance, just as they did 1 year later in rather different circumstances when musicologist Hans Joachim Moser sought to revive « Betulia liberata » in Nazi Germany with an entirely new aryanised text. Certainly one could draw parallels between the Oratorio's plot, in which Judith frees the Israelites from the Assyrian-occupied town of Betulia, and the struggle during that period to assert an indigenously Jewish cultural stance in British-occupied Palestine. Yet, Swet's article, entitled «

Mozart at the Wailing Wall » and published in an exile newspaper, did not allude to such matters. Rather, it praised Salomon's pioneering efforts for presenting the composition probably for the 1st time in Hebrew, and highlighted the various moments in the score that seem to foreshadow « Die Zauberflöte » and the « Requiem ». The writer also commented, slightly less favourably, on a performance by the short-lived Palestine Chamber Opera of Mozart's « Die Entführung aus dem Serail », also in Hebrew translation. It was given at Jerusalem's Cinema Zion in rather intimidating circumstances, with Sir Arthur Wauchope, the British high commissioner to Palestine, and other colonial officials ostentatiously making their presence felt by sitting in the front row of the auditorium. Nonetheless, Swet noted the morale-boosting impact of hearing this repertory even under such difficult conditions, adding that it was thanks to the efforts and influence of musicians who had emigrated from Germany to Palestine during the past 2 years that « one gradually gets to appreciate and love Mozart all the more » .

Synagogue Organ Music

The Destruction of a Cultural Tradition

In the Jewish cultural realm, the organ can be heard in American Reform temples, in some British synagogues, as well as in the remote Jewish communities of Argentina and Curaçao. However, the organ in the synagogue represents a music culture deeply rooted in the German-Jewish tradition of the 19th and 20th Centuries. That, today, it is rather a neglected part of Jewish tradition, may lie in the fact that the organ was never elevated from its controversial status in Judaism. A rather marginal entity, the synagogue organ remains an oddity for Jews and non-Jews alike. Nonetheless, the German-Jewish tradition deserves to be remembered in light of its brutal elimination during the 3rd « Reich » . Indeed, this musical culture clearly shows the Holocaust's effect on music as a paradigm of « culturecide » .

The Synagogue Organ and Its Repertoire

With the introduction of organs into Reform synagogues, in the early 19th Century, a new branch of Jewish music began. The admission of organs into the synagogue service, which traditional Jews regarded as a « Christianisation » of the service, was the subject of vehement quarrels and debates surrounding the halachic question of whether one may play the organ on Sabbath and Holidays and, if so, whether a Jewish musician may perform. The debate extended to communities and to rabbinical conferences, and was the subject of various polemics.

After the synod in Leipzig, in 1869, most synagogues in German-speaking lands introduced organs, a development that would extend to other countries and continents as well, reaching its peak by the turn of the Century. With the legitimization of the organ, in the 2nd half of the 19th Century, its function also started developing and expanding. By then, the organist commonly played independently between cantorial solos and also in processionals and recessionals. Interludes served to introduce the congregation into the different moods of the service or to fill the silence during silent prayer. Thus, in the following decades, composers began to establish a specific style of organ music for use in the synagogue, mostly consisting of Jewish liturgical themes. At the beginning of the 20th Century, this repertoire evolved into a fusion of Western Classical music, liturgical, paraliturgical, and folk-melodies, eventually flowering into a form which could be performed at concerts as well as in the synagogue.

Organ Music in the « Kulturbund »

Although synagogue music under the Nazis might easily have been destroyed outright, it continued to develop within the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Culture League), an all-Jewish performing arts ensemble maintained by the Nazis, between 1933 and 1941. The policy of cultural apartheid and the isolation of Jewish cultural activity from the rest of the German population led to an enhanced « Jewish » consciousness and awoke the desire for « Jewish experiences ». For music, including organ music, the consequence was a substantial enrichment of the repertoire, especially of that which was connected to Jewish folk and liturgical music, and to contemporary compositions. As a result, the mid-1930's witnessed a transformation of synagogue organ music.

In the « Kulturbund » concerts, the organ's original function in liturgical music shifted to the concert-hall. This development reached its climax with several synagogue concerts, which opened and closed with organ music. Sometimes the instrument also would have a solo-part within Jewish Oratorios. In addition to great organ compositions of a distinctly Jewish flavour, the Classical repertoire (e.g., preludes and toccatas by Johann Sebastian Bach and Dietrich Buxtehude, and pieces by Georg Friedrich Händel and Léon Boëllmann) would also be performed.

Although the « Kulturbund » seemed to act as an intermediary impetus for music, its establishment was an astute move by the National-Socialists. At first, the repertoire could be chosen freely but, later, censors restricted it to all works except those which were considered « German ». Thus, organ music consisting of Jewish musical themes or written by a composer of Jewish origin could be performed only in the synagogue. Only Jewish audiences could become acquainted with these compositions and culturally identify with them, and only organists of Jewish origin were allowed to play them. As a consequence, the repertoire became as isolated as the Jews themselves. Jewish music for organ (which was in origin an off-shoot, a partial imitation of Western musical forms and structures combined with essential ingredients of Jewish musical tradition) was definitively torn from one of its roots: the Western musical environment.

During the time of the « Kulturbund », and coinciding with the first years of their regime, the Nazis also succeeded by and large in proscribing the further publication of music by Jewish composers. In addition, although it took longer, they wrested away complete control of the various music publishing-houses that were owned by Jews. Thus, organ music was rarely or never published after 1933. Music written by composers of Jewish origin or by those who did not conform with the Nazis' ideas of « German music » was not allowed to be printed. Consequently, such music could not be reproduced, and much of the repertoire did not survive the Holocaust.

Synagogue Musicians during the 3rd « Reich »

The « Entjudung » (dejewification) and destruction of Jewish culture in Nazi Germany was a gradual process conducted in 5 successive phases. It began with a series of highly-publicized acts to ostracize prominent Jewish figures and their friends through defamation, boycott, and cultural ghettoization between 1933 and 1935. Next, came legal dismemberment and dissimulation, between 1935 and 1938. Then, came the destruction of the economic basis of existence through « bureaucratic exclusion » of all Jews. The total disfranchisement of the « Kulturbund » followed

between 1939 and 1941. And, at last, from 1941-1945, came the « Final Solution » , the Nazis' plan to annihilate and exterminate the Jewish people.

One of the Nazis' objectives focused on eliminating Jewish musicians, among whom were organists and composers of organ music. When the « Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums » (Law for the Reconstitution of the Civil Service) passed the « Reichstag » , in 1933, Jewish musicians were fired from civic positions. In 1935, the situation became worse when, on 27 August, Hans Hinkel banned Jewish musicians (already expelled from the « Reichsmusikkammer ») from playing organ in church, and Christian musicians from playing in synagogues. A number of Jewish musicians left Nazi Germany at this early stage, but most of those able to escape the « Reich » had financial means, and were able to find willing sponsors and continued support in their adopted lands.

Others changed their careers, becoming synagogue musicians, when they realized that synagogues in their home-towns and prospective countries of emigration could offer employment and that, unlike in the secular music-world, competition would be comparatively minor. Consequently, they prepared themselves before emigrating, and learned how to play the organ, or focused on composing for the synagogue service. Nonetheless, many musicians, even those participating in the « Kulturbund » , lost their roots. Ripped-out from their previous musical environment, they had to fight unemployment, re-organization, defamation, and anxiety, instead of dedicating themselves to their music.

Although many Jewish musicians were able to leave the « Reich » before the deportations began, a significant number could not do so and were interned in camps. Numerous Jewish musicians were deported and killed, among them Arno Nadel (1878-1943) and Siegfried Würzburger (1877-1941) . By the time of the last Jewish deportation, and with the brutal killing of organists and composers in concentration camps, German-Jewish musical culture had been nearly eradicated.

The Extinction of the Synagogue Organ

The paradoxical flourishing and development of organ music between 1933 and 1938 was also viciously ended by the destruction of the instruments on the night of 9 to 10 November 1938, during « Kristallnacht » . The destruction itself was a process that started with cultural anti-Semitic propaganda, the defamation of organs and the music. An example is given in « Der Stürmer » , from 19 October 1938 :

« It is a disgrace ! »

The Jew organ in the church of « Saint-Korbinian » in Munich

It is reported to us by a trustworthy source from Munich that the organ of the former Jewish synagogue in Munich has been acquired through purchase by the Bishop's Office from the Jewish religious community. Shortly before the demolition of the synagogue, the organ was moved by the transport firm A. Frank & Sons, at « Westendstraße Nr. 160 » , in Munich, to the church of Saint-Korbinian, on « Gotzingerplatz » . The organ case is said to have been bought through the Steinmeyer firm in Öttingen, in Bavaria, and installed in the church of Saint-Korbinian by the same

company. Now, when the faithful arrive for worship in the church of Saint-Korbinian, they will have the peculiar pleasure of hearing music from an organ that has stood in a synagogue for years. The very organ that once accompanied the Jews' songs of hatred for non-Jews now adorns a Christian church. It is a disgrace !

Some organs were saved by selling them to churches. Since the price paid was so nominal, such deeds on the part of the churches can hardly be called heroic. More accurately the churches took the opportunity to feather their nests at the expense of others. Although they were physically saved, the « deportation » of organs from synagogues to churches represents a misuse of the instruments.

On the night of 9 to 10 November 1938, deliberate cultural destruction reached its peak. An eyewitness report of « Kristallnacht » in Königsberg's (now, Kaliningrad, in Russia) Jewish community describes how a gang of brawlers systematically demolished benches, pulled-out the Scrolls of the « Law from the Ark » , tore prayer books and piled everything up in a big heap in the middle of the synagogue. The report also details the « Kristallnacht » bombing and setting on fire of the organs. Adding insult to injury, the organ in the Königsberg synagogue was misused by playing the « Horst Wessel » Song, which was adopted as a Nazi national anthem by the SA. Thus, this single event comprised three distinct forms of culturecide : intellectual (through defamation) , musical (by the playing of Nazi music on the organ) , and physical (by burning and bombing) .

Nevertheless, a few organs escaped the wrath of « Kristallnacht » . Police officer Wilhelm Krützfeld prevented the setting of Berlin's « Oranienburger » Street New Synagogue on fire, thereby, also saving its organ from destruction. When Krützfeld realized that disguised SA members had started a fire in the anteroom of the synagogue, he chased them away and, then, called the fire brigade. This was a unique reaction to « Kristallnacht » when, for the most part, « Aryans » simply watched, and fire brigades did not respond. However, a few months later, the Berlin synagogue was requisitioned by the « Wehrmacht » , for use as a quarter-Master's store, « Heeresbekleidungsamt III » .

Both organs, the one in Berlin as well as the in Munich mentioned in « Der Stürmer » survived « Kristallnacht » , but not the bombing raids of 1943 over Berlin and, in 1944, over Munich. What was lost was not just the greatest synagogue organs in Munich and Berlin, but symbolic monuments to a specific cultural era in Germany.

The newly-emergent German-Jewish organ tradition abruptly ended at its peak in 1938, when most of the instruments (and, with them, the possibility of performing organ music) were destroyed on « Kristallnacht » . Although this date marks the beginning of the end, the extinction of this growing cultural tradition was a longer process that continued beyond 1938, with the emigration and murder of Jewish composers and musicians. Only the mass-exodus, beginning in 1933, prevented the cultural « Final Solution » from being completely consummated.

Today, there are again, though few in number, organs in German synagogues in Aachen, Berlin, Dresden, and Frankfurt-am-Main. The organ in the Frankfurt synagogue is not used during prayer services, as the congregation follows the Orthodox tradition, though it is sometimes played during weddings. The same is true of the reed organ in the Aachen synagogue. Despite the few remnants of the German-Jewish organ tradition, the historically significant organs have been annihilated and the tradition of organ music in synagogues no longer exists in Germany.

Directions as a result of Emigration

Although the emigration of artists and the transplantation of this particular form of German-Jewish culture initially did not appear to contribute to its destruction, in the long term its impact was decisive. At first, it managed to survive emigration from Germany and exile in the United States. Indeed, because of employment possibilities in the United States, many musicians became organists or composers of liturgical music. Prominent and highly-talented musicians, (among them : Hugo Chaim Adler, Herbert Fromm, Heinrich Schalit, Herman Berlinski, and Ludwig Altman) are, in a broader sense, responsible for the further development of this aspect of German-Jewish culture. They and others composed pieces especially for use in the synagogue, taught organ playing, and influenced the voicing and dispositions of organs in synagogues.

The developments and turns the German-Jewish organ tradition has taken in the United States illustrate the impact of the German-Jewish emigrants. Initially, the musicians tried to maintain their German-Jewish (musical) identity. However, many emigrants had to change direction and, instead of launching performing careers, had to adapt to new circumstances. In the end, the « émigré » composers were the last generation of German Jews involved in synagogue music. The following generation of synagogue musicians, despite musical freedom and possibilities, were apparently not really concerned with the further development of the organ in Jewish worship. In the end, with the death of the emigrant generation, synagogue organ music died as well. The next generation was no longer familiar with the musical tradition of the German synagogue and, in that way, the music was torn away from its cultural context. Emigration would finally confirm the culturecide, albeit after a delay.

Those musicians who escaped to Palestine or England had an even harder time, since there were no organs in synagogues, and little demand in churches ; and there was consequently no need for their skills. Although there has never been an organ in an Israeli synagogue, notable composers Paul Ben-Haim, Karel Salomon, Yochanan Samuel, and Chaim Alexander created a novel repertoire for the organ. These composers saw the organ's potential not as a liturgical instrument, but as a source of unusual sounds and as a concert instrument. Some of them were inspired by their recollection of the sound of the organ from their early years in Germany. The organ compositions of contemporary Israeli composers are as diverse as the origins of the composers themselves, most of whom are emigrants from Germany, Austria, Poland, Hungary, and the former Soviet Union ; a substantial number are Israeli-born. If there is no unified style or school of organ music in Israel, it is due to the lack of a long tradition of organ music and, because of such diverse (secular and religious, Eastern and Western) musical cultures, coming together.

...

On 7 April 1933, Adolf Hitler's regime began an official assault on Germany's cultural life with the « Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums » (Law for the Reconstitution of the Civil Service, or « GWB ») . By means of the law's Aryan paragraph, « civil servants who are not of Aryan ancestry » were to be dismissed. This measure prevented non-Aryans (defined, at that time, as any person descended from a Jewish parent or grandparent) from holding positions in the public sphere, especially at cultural institutions such as State-run music Conservatories, Opera

Houses, concert halls and theatres. However, after a series of debates, Jews were allowed to continue as artists within their own separate organization : the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Culture League) , originally called the « Kulturbund Deutscher Juden » (Culture League of German Jews) .

Kurt Baumann, a young production assistant, developed the preliminary plan for the « Kulturbund » , to be set in Berlin, in the 1st months of 1933. In his memoirs, he explained :

« My idea to found a Jewish cultural circle was based on very simple numbers ; at the time, 175,000 Jews alone lived in Berlin, many other big cities had, percentage wise, similar concentrations. I figured that a city of 175,000 inhabitants could have their own theatre, Opera, Symphony Orchestra, museum, lectures, and even " Hochschule " (Institute of Higher Education) , and this with the economic proportion of a mid-sized city. »

From the outset, he feared his plan would not be supported by Zionists, who would insist that the organization conduct its cultural activities in Yiddish or Hebrew, or by the majority of German Jews, who would respond to the suggestion of a pure Jewish cultural circle with the cry :

« We're not going voluntarily into the ghetto ! »

Nevertheless, within 14 days, he worked-out a detailed proposal and contacted the former director of Berlin's « Städtischen Oper » (Municipal Opera House) , Kurt Singer, whose assistant he had been from 1930 to 1932.

Singer had envisioned a similar organization and was the perfect choice to champion the « Kulturbund » . He had served as a military doctor in World War I and was known and respected in German national circles. Baumann and Singer revised the initial plan, which was not originally designed as a long-term venture, and recruited other Jewish leaders, such as Berlin's chief rabbi Leo Baeck, conductor Joseph Rosenstock, and journalist Werner Levie. When Baumann approached theatre critic Julius Bab with the project, the latter incredulously asked :

« Are we allowed to do this ? »

Indeed, it was not clear how the organization would win the Nazi government's sponsorship.

Singer struggled to generate interest within various government offices, but was eventually invited to meet with Hans Hinkel. Hinkel had been appointed head of the « Preußischen Theater-Ausschuß » (Prussian Theatre Commission) by the new Prussian minister Hermann Göring immediately after Adolf Hitler's ascension to power. He recognized several reasons to support the « Kulturbund » : the regime could exploit it as propaganda by citing it as supposed proof that Jews were not being mistreated ; it could function as a cultural outlet and source of income for Jews which would help to quell social unrest ; and, finally, the organization could help ensure the end of Jewish involvement in German culture. In April 1933, Hinkel began negotiating the operating terms for the creation of the « Kulturbund » with Singer. There were several stipulations : the « Kulturbund » was to be staffed only by Jewish artists and financed by the all-Jewish audiences through a monthly fee ; only the Jewish press was allowed to report on « Kulturbund »

events, further isolating Jewish activities from the racially accepted German population ; League programmes were to be submitted to Hinkel for approval before performance. This latter requirement allowed the regime to promote a repertoire they saw as appropriate for a Jewish organization by censoring German culture and promoting Jewish culture. For « Kulturbund » leaders and members, this led to a debate about what constituted Jewishness in art that lasted for most of the organization's tenure. In the middle of May 1933, however, satisfied with these conditions, the « Kulturbund » received the Nazi government's support and one of the most paradoxical partnerships in German history began.

The « Kulturbund » had 8 separate departments. Anneliese Landau gave regular speeches on music, which were illustrated by « Kulturbund » performers. She was part of the « Kulturbund » 's lecture department, which included Julius Bab, Arthur Eloesser, Max Osborn, Julius Guttmann, and Ernst Landsberger. Bab also directed the play department, which was associated with the dramaturgy department. Heinz Condell, Hans Sondheimer and Werner Levie supervised the « décor » and costume division, the technical department, and the management division respectively. Levie, who worked as economic editor of the « Vossische Zeitung » (a Berlin newspaper named after one of its early owners Christian Friedrich Voß, 1724-1795) , until 1933, also acted as « Kulturbund » secretary and would later assume a more prominent role, as Singer's replacement, in 1938.

Along with Singer, Joseph Rosenstock led the Opera department, in which Baumann also worked. The concert department, linked with the Opera division, was headed again by Rosenstock and Singer, but also by the concert director Michaël Taube, who had been Bruno Walter's assistant at the Municipal Opera, in Berlin. Taube acted as conductor of the « Kulturbund » 's small Orchestra until he immigrated to Palestine, at the end of 1934. After his departure, Rosenstock as its conductor worked to expand the group. When he too left, for Tokyo, in 1936, Hans Wilhelm Steinberg (later, William Steinberg) replaced him. After only 3 months, Steinberg traveled to Moscow and then Tel Aviv to conduct the newly founded Palestine Symphony Orchestra, established by the violinist Bronisław Huberman and later know as the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra. He was succeeded by Rudolf Schwarz, who had served as the main conductor under chief music director Josef Krips at the « Badisches Landestheater » in Karlsruhe, from 1925 to 1933.

The « Kulturbund » 's management leased as its performance hall the « Berliner Theater » on « Charlottenstraße » , in the northwest corner of Berlin, from the Berlin « Rathaus » (City Hall) . After 2 years as the « Kulturbund » 's home, in 1935, the « Kulturbund » lost the theatre, unable to renew its lease. « Kulturbund » operations then transferred to a slightly smaller space, the « Herrnfeld-Theater » on the « Kommandantenstraße » . « Kulturbund » management also had a hall built next to the theatre for chamber concerts, which opened on 28 November 1937 and began showing films on 24 September 1939.

The « Kulturbund » was not entitled to the government subsidy enjoyed by accepted Aryan musical institutions. Instead, membership dues were to fund these performance spaces as well as the salaries of its staff of artists. « Kulturbund » leaders advertised for these positions throughout Berlin : at synagogues, cafés, and music schools that still allowed Jews. From a total of 2,000 submissions, management hired, for its 1st season, 35 actors and singers ; 35 orchestral musicians ; 22 chorus members ; 10 female dancers ; 25 technical staff ; 26 box and cloakroom attendants ;

10 administrative staff ; and several manual workers. Approximately 200 of applicants (or 10%) found employment that 1st year, in addition to guest-conductors, concert soloists and lecturers.

The average monthly wage for members of the Opera and theatre ensemble was 200 « Reichsmark » , and for members of the Orchestra, 180 « Reichsmark » . With its mounting expenses, the « Kulturbund » struggled economically. By October 1933, the « Kulturbund » had about 12,500 members. This number increased to around 20,000 during the winter, approximately 10 % of the Jewish population. From 1934 to 1937, membership remained at about 18,500 with new members replacing those that emigrated.

After presenting at the door one's ticket and identification badge proving Jewish descent, members could attend 2 cultural events per month - alternately, an Opera and their choice of a lecture in the fields of philosophy, art, religion or music in 1 month and, the next month, a drama and a concert. On 11 September 1941, the « Kulturbund » was officially dissolved. The « Geheime Staatspolizei » (Secret Police) cited Paragraph 1 of the « Reich » president's order of 28 February 1933 as reason for the liquidation of the League - it was necessary for the protection of people and State.

...

The Jüdischer « Kulturbund » (Jewish Culture League) , originally called the « Kulturbund » Deutscher Juden (Culture League of German Jews) , was a performing arts ensemble by and for Jews, created in Berlin in collaboration with the National-Socialist regime. The « Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums » (Law for the Reconstitution of the Civil Service) of April 7, 1933, generally dismissed non-Aryans (defined, at that time, as any person descended from a Jewish parent or grandparent) from holding positions in the public sphere, especially at cultural institutions such as State-run music Conservatories, Opera Houses, concert halls and theatres. (1) From 1933 to 1941, the League was the most significant site in Nazi Germany that still allowed, and, paradoxically, even encouraged Jews to participate in music as well as theatre.

In 1933, Kurt Baumann (1907-1983) , who, as a Jew, had been dismissed from his duties as a director's assistant, developed the preliminary plan for the League, which was to include theatrical plays, Opera, and orchestral concerts. (2)

In his memoirs, he explained :

« I based my idea of founding a Jewish cultural circle on very simple numbers. At the time, 175,000 Jews lived in Berlin alone, many other big cities had similar concentrations, percentage-wise. » (3)

Baumann shared his plan for the League with Kurt Singer (1885-1944) , whose assistant he had been at Berlin's « Städtische Oper » (Municipal Opera) . (4) Singer, a musicologist, neurologist and conductor, known and respected in nationalist circles, had envisioned a similar organization. Together, they worked to recruit other Jewish luminaries, such as Berlin's chief rabbi, Leo Baeck, journalist Werner Levie and conductor Joseph Rosenstock. When Baumann approached

theatre critic Julius Bab with the project, Bab was justifiably skeptical :

« Dürfen wir denn das ? » (« Are we allowed to do it ? ») (5)

Singer attempted to generate support for the organization within various Nazi government offices, and he was eventually invited to meet with Hans Hinkel, who had been appointed head of the Prussian Theatre Commission by the new Prussian minister, Hermann Göring, immediately after Adolf Hitler's ascension to power. (6) In April 1933, Hinkel and Singer began to negotiate terms for the creation of the League - terms that included several stipulations : the League was to be staffed only by Jewish artists and financed by the all-Jewish audiences through a monthly fee ; only the Jewish press was allowed to report on League events ; League programs were to be submitted to Hinkel for approval before performance. This last requirement allowed the regime to exclude works of « Aryan » German origin and promote a repertoire considered appropriate for a Jewish organization - a repertoire that included « Jewish » art, according to Hinkel's definition of Jewish art. (7)

These stipulations explain the regime's otherwise apparently puzzling support of the Jewish organization. For the Nazi officials, the League was meant to function as propaganda : by pointing to their support of the League, the Nazis could claim that Jews were not oppressed but encouraged to find their own forum for cultural expression. (8) At the same time, however, through Hinkel's censorship of the repertoire, the League offered a way for the regime's leaders to attempt to segregate Jews from Germany's cultural life and prevent Jewish appropriation of so-called German art.

By the beginning of September 1933, the League consisted of 8 separate sections. Its lecture department included Anneliese Landau, Julius Bab, Arthur Eloesser, Max Osborn, Julius Guttman and Ernst Landsberger. Bab also directed the drama department, which was associated with the dramaturgy department. Heinz Condell, Hans Sondheimer and Werner Levie supervised the sets and costume division, the technical department, and the management division, respectively. Levie, who had worked until 1933 as economic editor of the « Vossische Zeitung » (a liberal Berlin newspaper) , also acted as League secretary. (9) Along with Singer, Joseph Rosenstock led the Opera department, in which Baumann also worked. (10) The concert department, linked to the Opera division, was also headed by Rosenstock and Singer as well as the concert director Michaël Taube, who had been Bruno Walter's assistant at the Municipal Opera, in Berlin. (11) When Taube left for Tokyo, in 1936, Hans Wilhelm Steinberg (later known as William Steinberg) replaced him. When Steinberg left for Palestine, later that year (to work with the newly conceived Palestine Orchestra) , he was succeeded by Rudolf Schwarz. (12)

Berlin's municipal administration leased the « Berliner Theater » on « Charlottenstraße » , in the northwest corner of Berlin, to the League's management, for use as a performance venue. But, in 1935, after 2 years, the League was not allowed to renew the lease and lost the theatre. League operations were then transferred to the « Herrfeld-Theater » on the « Kommandantenstraße » . By October 1933, the League had about 12,500 members ; this number increased to circa 20,000 (nearly 12 % of Berlin's Jewish population) during the following winter. From 1934 to 1937, membership remained at about 18,500, with new members replacing those that emigrated. (13)

The creation of the Jewish Culture League, in Berlin, was soon followed by the formation of active League chapters in

Cologne and Frankfurt. Whereas the original Berlin League maintained a theatre ensemble, Opera company and Philharmonic Orchestra, the Cologne branch operated only an independent theatre ensemble, and the Frankfurt League, which had no Opera or theatre ensemble, focused on orchestral music and maintained its own Philharmonic Orchestra under the direction of William Steinberg, until he left for Berlin, in 1936. (14) Smaller off-shoots of the Berlin League were formed in Hamburg, Munich, Mannheim, Breslau, Kassel, Stuttgart and other locations. The most active League branches were in Berlin, Frankfurt, Cologne and Hamburg, which maintained a 3rd independent Jewish theatre ensemble. (15) The Berlin chapter, supervised by Singer, was the largest. By 1935, the Jewish Culture League had 46 local chapters in other towns and cities, which the Nazi regime put under the umbrella union, « Reichsverband der jüdischen Kulturbünde » (« Reich » Association of Jewish Culture Leagues) , also based in Berlin.

Singer was primarily in charge of program approval, which was no easy task given Hinkel's requirements for League performances and the censorship of offending offerings. Still, despite pressure from the regime, League organizers did not generally gravitate toward « Jewish » works. To some, such a repertoire was, in fact, at odds with their sense of Germanness and threatened to turn their Jewish organization into a ghetto. On the other hand, from the very start, the « Jüdische Rundschau » , a newspaper serving the Zionist movement, challenged this Teutonic mindset and demanded that the League confront the changing situation of Jews in Germany and the need for a repertoire specifically connected to Jewishness. (16) The existence of this conflict, which the heterogeneity of the Jewish public only compounded, helps to explain why League leaders did not follow the example of other organizations dedicated to the question of « Jewish » art. The League lacked the support for any specific program, as well as the time needed to create one. Indeed, the organization was never envisioned as a long-term venture ; at the time, most people did not expect the regime or its anti-Semitic policies to last long. (17) League organizers also differed as to the very definition of « Jewish » art. To address this controversy officially, Singer convened a Jewish Culture League Conference, designated « Die Kulturtagung des Reichsverbandes der Jüdischen Kulturbünde in Deutschland » , on September 5, 1936. In speeches given the following day, prominent theatre and music scholars advised League representatives how best to satisfy all those involved through the performances of recommended Jewish works. (18)

This conference probably represented the peak of official interest in the question of Jewish art within the League, but it yielded no definitive solutions. In the following years, as conditions worsened in Nazi Germany, other concerns overshadowed this debate. After « Kristallnacht » (on 9 and 10 November 1938) and, in the absence of Singer, who was visiting the United States, Levie was put in charge of the League and, on December 31, the League in Berlin and its various branches were consolidated into the « Jüdischen Kulturbund in Deutschland » (Jewish Culture League in Germany) , which was still based in Berlin. (19)

On September 4, 1939, Fritz Wisten, who had been involved in the League's theatrical productions, replaced Levie, who had left Germany at the end of August. (20) When the League had finally outlived its usefulness, the organization was officially dissolved on September 11, 1941. At this time, Germany was embroiled in War on 2 fronts - both with Britain and the Soviet Union. Adolf Hitler had also become committed to the elimination of European Jewry, and had approved the mass deportation of German Jews eastward. (21) Although the « Final Solution » was not discussed until the « Wannsee » meeting on January 20, 1942, Hitler's approval of deportation was a decisive turn toward murder. (22) The regime no longer needed the League for propaganda purposes and had found a more extreme means of segregation.

Still, as an explanation for the liquidation of the League, the secret police cited Paragraph I of the « Reich » president's order of February 28, 1933 - for the protection of people and State. (23)

Lily E. Hirsch is Assistant Professor of Music at Cleveland State University. She has published articles in « Philomusica » , the « Journal of Popular Music Studies » , « The Musical Quarterly » , and has a book, entitled « A Jewish Orchestra in Nazi Germany : Musical Politics and the Berlin Jewish Culture League » , forthcoming from the University of Michigan Press (2010) .

(1) Alan E. Steinweis : « Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany » , University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1993) , page 106. See also : Saul Friedländer : « Nazi Germany and the Jews » , Volume I : « The Years of Persecution, 1933-1939 » , Harper Collins Publishers, New York (1997) , page 28 ; and Erik Levi : « Music and National-Socialism : The Politicization of Criticism » , in « The Nazification of Art : Art, Design, Music, Architecture & Film in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , edited by Brandon Taylor and Wilfried von der Will, Winchester Press, Hampshire (1990) , page 168.

(2) Julius Bab : « Leben und Tod des deutschen Judentums » , (written in Summer 1939) edited by Klaus Siebenhaar, Argon, Berlin (1988) , page 106. See also : « Germans No More : Accounts of Jewish Everyday Life, 1933-1938 » , edited by Margaret Limberg and Hubert Rübsaat, translated by Alan Nothnagle, Berghahn Books, New York (2006) , page 183.

(3) Ken (Kurt) Baumann : « Memoiren » , Leo Baeck Institute, New York (1977) . All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

(4) Sylvia Rogge : « Gau, Die doppelte Wurzel des Daseins : Julius Bab und der Jüdische Kulturbund Berlin » , Metropol, Berlin (1999) , page 60.

(5) Ken Baumann : « Memoiren » , page 32.

(6) Steinweis : « Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany » , pages 33-35.

(7) See : « Letter from Hans Hinkel to Kurt Singer » , 15 July 1933, Fritz-Wisten-Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin, and « Satzung des Kulturbundes Deutscher Juden » , Fritz-Wisten-Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin. See also Michaël H. Kater : « The Twisted Muse : Musicians and their Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (1997) , page 101.

(8) See : Martin Goldsmith : « The Inextinguishable Symphony : A True Story of Music and Love in Nazi Germany » , John Wiley & Sons, Inc. , New York (2000) , page 298 ; Kater, page 98 ; Erik Levi : « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Saint-Martin's Press, New York (1994) , page 51 ; Michaël Meyer : « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Peter Lang, New York (1991) , page 75 ; Bernd Sponheuer : « Musik auf einer " kulturellen und physischen Insel " : Musik als Überlebensmittel im Jüdischen Kulturbund 1933-1941 » , in : « Musik in der Emigration 1933-1945 » .Verfolgung,

Vertreibung, Rückwirkung, edited by Horst Weber, Metzler, Stuttgart/Weimar (1993) , page 111 ; and Herbert Freeden : « Jüdisches Theater in Nazideutschland » , J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen (1964) , page 51.

(9) Horst J. P. Bergmeier, Ejal Jakob Eisler, and Rainer E. Lotz : « Vorbei Beyond Recall : Dokumentation jüdischen Musiklebens in Berlin 1933-1938. A Record of Jewish musical life in Nazi Berlin 1933-1938 » , Bear Family Records, Hambergen (2001) , page 67.

(10) Bergmeier, Eisler, and Lotz, page 401.

(11) Bergmeier, Eisler, and Lotz, page 53.

(12) Rogge-Gau, page 62. See also : Barbara von der Lühe : « Konzerte der Selbstbehauptung : Die Orchester des Jüdischen Kulturbundes 1933-1941 » , « Das Orchester » Nummer 44 (1996) , pages 7 and 10 ; and Bergmeier, Eisler, and Lotz, pages 365 and 385.

(13) Bergmeier, Eisler, and Lotz, pages 71, 91-93, and 107-109.

(14) Eva Hanau : « Die musikalischen Aktivitäten des Jüdischen Kulturbunds in Frankfurt am Main » , in : « Verfemte Musik : Komponisten in den Diktaturen unseres Jahrhunderts, Dokumentation des Kolloquiums vom 9-12 Januar 1993 in Dresden » , edited by Joachim Braun, Peter Lang, Frankfurt (1993) , pages 79-80.

(15) Hanau, page 80.

(16) See, for example : « Warum " Nathan der Weise " ? » , « Jüdische Rundschau » (25 July 1933) , page 3.

(17) See : Henryk M. Broder and Eike Geisel : « Premiere und Pogrom : der Jüdische Kulturbund 1933-1941 » , Wolf Jobst Siedler Verlag GmbH, Berlin (1992) , pages 228 and 247.

(18) See : conference transcript in : « Geschlossene Vorstellung : Der Jüdische Kulturbund in Deutschland 1933-1941 » , « Akademie der Künste » , Berlin (1992) , pages 266-297.

(19) This reconfiguration was described by Werner Levie in : « Aktennotiz » , Fritz-Wisten-Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin (16 December 1938) .

(20) Fritz Wisten : « Bericht über die Arbeit des Jüdischen Kulturbundes in Deutschland eingetragener Verein in der Zeit von 01.09.1939 - 31.08.1940 » , Fritz-Wisten-Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin, page 4.

(21) Mark Roseman : « The Wannsee Conference and the Final Solution : A Reconsideration » , Metropolitan Books, New York (2002) , page 57.

(22) Roseman : « Letter from secret police » , « Vereinsregister Berlin » , Leo Baeck Institute, New York (11 September 1941) , pages 81-94.

...

« Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Cultural Association) : German Jewish organization founded in Berlin, in May 1933, when the National-Socialist regime dismissed Jewish high-school teachers, artists, and authors from their positions and excluded all Jews from German cultural life. The « Jüdischer Kulturbund » was initiated by Kurt Baumann, a young theatre director, and directed by Kurt Singer, who was a physician and a musician and a director of the Berlin Opera. Singer engaged some good Jewish artists to perform and also organized a series of lectures on scientific subjects. Their existence was accepted by the « Gestapo » only after the words « German Jews » were eliminated from its title and their activities were under Nazi scrutiny. The « Jüdischer Kulturbund » devoted itself to extensively spreading interest in Jewish art and culture, in spite of the Nazi persecution, and worked to secure continued cultural activity by providing funds from the resources of its members and through the communities themselves. Evidently, the work of the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » largely helped to maintain a closely knit Jewish population and awaken a love for the land of Israel by promoting Zionist ideas. This body also published the « Monatsblätter des Kulturbundes deutscher Juden » , from 1933 on, edited by Julius Bab. The paper was forced to change its name to « Monatsblätter des jüdischen Kulturbundes » in 1938, after « Kristallnacht » .

From its foundation until October 1938, it organized 8,457 programs, including lectures, concerts, plays, art exhibits, and Operas. Julius Bab, Joseph Rosenstock (a musical director who died in 1985) , Kurt Singer, Kurt Baumann, and Werner Levie (secretary general) directed the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » 's affairs. In early 1938, there were 76 branches of the « Kulturbund » in 100 towns, with more than 50,000 members and 1,700 artists. Membership and the scale of activities were proportionately larger outside of Berlin. Yet, in Berlin alone, the membership fluctuated between 12,000 and 18,000. The choice of the programs for lectures, plays, and concerts was often very difficult and was constantly controlled by the secret police (« Gestapo ») , the Chamber for Arts and Culture (« Reichskulturkammer ») , and the leadership (« Gauleitung ») of the Nazi Party, in Berlin. The « Kulturbund » was itself divided over whether to present general cultural programs or those of specific Jewish content as advocated by the Zionists. For every organized performance, the material had to be submitted in writing for approval by the State commissioner (« Staatskommissar ») Hinkel. Hinkel told the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » which plays and lectures could be performed and which articles and literary works could be published. After the November 1938 « Kristallnacht pogroms » , local activities were centralized and, therefore, better controlled by the national organization, which was disbanded in September 1941. A few of the leading organizers managed to emigrate, but the great majority of artists eventually perished in death camps. The « Kulturbund » provided spiritual support for Jews in Germany during a time of ever more intense persecution ; and, for individual artists, it provided both employment and an opportunity to remain creative and productive amidst the great struggle for basic survival.

« Ein Tanz auf dem Vulkan » : The Legacy of the Jewish Culture League

(Lily E. Hirsch.)

During the years 1933-1941, there was one significant site in Nazi Germany in which Jews were still allowed and encouraged to participate in music as well as theatre. This was the Jewish Culture League (« Jüdischer Kulturbund ») , originally called the Culture League of German Jews (« Kulturbund Deutscher Juden ») . This short article discusses the paradoxical legacy of this Jewish organization as it reflects post-World War II perceptions of the idea of resistance, the Jew as victim, and responses to the Holocaust in former West and East Germany. Specifically, it focuses on the « Geschlossene Vorstellung » exhibition and discussion of the League with former members, sponsored by the « Akademie der Künste » in Berlin, in 1992.

During the years 1933-1941, there was one significant site in Nazi Germany in which Jews were still allowed and encouraged to participate in music as well as theatre. This was the Jewish Culture League (« Jüdischer Kulturbund ») , originally called the Culture League of German Jews (« Kulturbund Deutscher Juden ») . In some ways, this organization appears a positive haven for Jews and music during the early years of the 3rd « Reich » . Thus, the circumstance may challenge our understanding of the Nazi regime's restrictive policies toward Jews, in Germany, and general brutality during the 3rd « Reich » . However, scholars and former League members have never agreed on the organization's ultimate meaning : was the Jewish Culture League a hard-won victory that enriched the lives of those who touched it, or was it ultimately a deal with the devil ? Radically different attitudes towards Jewish culture in the 2 Germanies after the War has only confounded this question and confused the recouping of this organization's history. In this short article, I will discuss the paradoxical legacy of this Jewish organization as it reflects post-World War II perceptions of the idea of resistance, the Jew as victim, and responses to the Holocaust in former West and East Germany. To do this, I will specifically focus on the « Geschlossene Vorstellung » exhibition and discussion of the League with former members, sponsored by the « Akademie der Künste » in Berlin, in 1992.

Kurt Baumann, a young German-Jewish former production assistant in Berlin, and Kurt Singer, a well-respected German-Jewish physician, musicologist, and music director, developed the initial League plan in the early months of 1933. The Jewish organization was to be set in Berlin, and, by its premiere, was intended in part as a shelter for the Jews dismissed from various musical posts following the Civil Service Laws of April 7, 1933. After struggling to gain official acceptance, Singer, acting as the organization's primary spokesperson, eventually met with the Nazi administrator Hans Hinkel. Hinkel found several reasons to support the organization : the regime could exploit the League as international propaganda by citing it as supposed proof that Jews were not being mistreated ; it could function as a cultural outlet and source of income for Jews which would help to quell social unrest. Finally, the creation of the League could help the Nazis ensure the end of perceived Jewish appropriation of German culture. To this end, Hinkel's office would censor within the League music by composers of German origin and generally encourage the performance of so-called Jewish music. (1)

With these Nazi goals and regime support, the Jewish Culture League gained an immediate following and soon inspired similar organizations throughout Germany. By 1935, the League had 46 local chapters in various towns and cities, which the Nazi regime put under the umbrella union, the « Reichsverband der jüdischen Kulturbünde » (« Reich » Association of Jewish Culture Leagues) . (2)

Despite this success, the League was not without conflict. Hinkel's program requirements inspired a heated debate about the idea of Jewish music and what constituted an appropriate repertoire for a Jewish organization among a diverse community - Zionist, assimilated, Eastern, rural, Orthodox. The heterogeneous League community continued this debate for most of its tenure - culminating in the Jewish Culture League Conference in Berlin, September 1936. (3) As conditions worsened for Jews in Germany, however, music of distraction, rather than a distinct nationality (Jewish or otherwise) became the order of the day. Former member Susanne Wisten-Weyl recalled :

« The people were so thankful whenever they could laugh. » (4)

In the League's latter years, after 1938, this laughter and entertainment, as it would be in the concentration camps, acted for some as a coping mechanism - a form of evasion, self-possession, and even liberation. (5)

By moving beyond its earlier debates and responding to the changing situation of Jews in Germany, the League was able to remain relevant until its very end on September 11, 1941. On this date, the League was dissolved « for the protection of people and State » . (6) Many League members had already emigrated by 1941. Today, some former members credit the League with giving them the financial and emotional support they needed to face leaving their homes. Ernest Lenart, a former actor in the organization, tied this positive function to the League's insignia. This emblem, a torch and the hexagonal Star of David, appeared on the League's monthly publication and many programs. Lenart explains :

« Not coincidentally, the torch was the symbol of the Culture League. » (7)

The organization was « a ray of hope in a cloudy time » . (8)

But the League has also been viewed in a more critical light. To exist, League leaders had to collaborate with the enemy and even lend legitimacy to the regime's plans as a means of propaganda. Most members were not aware of this function. (9) Not only that, the organization, according to some, may have contributed to the tragedy to come. The historian Alan Steinweis wrote :

« By providing Jewish artists and audiences with an outlet for creative expression, the Culture League rendered Jewish existence in National-Socialist Germany somewhat less desperate than it otherwise might have been, thereby, lulling German Jews into a tragically false sense of security about the future. » (10)

It is this idea that has inspired some of the worst criticism of the League. Martin Goldsmith, who wrote a popular memoir regarding his parents experience in the organization, asks directly :

« Had there been no Jewish Culture League, would there have been fewer Jewish deaths ? » (11)

These contrasting points were center stage during a podium discussion held in conjunction with the « Geschlossene Vorstellung » exhibition, in Berlin, which ran from January 26th through April 26th, 1992. The League exhibit was an

official off-shoot of the popular larger exhibition entitled « Jüdische Lebenswelten » (Patterns of Jewish Life) , which showcased Jewish artifacts, paintings, photos, and videos from various Jewish cultures in the Martin Gropius Building, in Berlin. (12)

Just 2 years after the reunification of the 2 Germanys, in 1990, « Patterns of Jewish Life » represented an opportunity for former East Germans to learn more about the Nazi period and Jewish culture in general, which was sidestepped in East German education. (13) The GDR was, by and large, hostile to religion and nationalism, in keeping with Communist ideals, and thus intolerant of Zionism and, with few exceptions, of Jews in general. (14) Not only that, the GDR did not take responsibility for the Holocaust, in part for political reasons, taking shelter in the Communist resistance to Adolf Hitler. (15) And thus, the East did not attract the Jewish returnees that would populate West Germany. (16) With the reunification, a new sense of nationalism aggravated this attitude of denial, with calls of « We are the people. » or « We are one people. » , that, for many Jews, foretold of a heightened anti-Semitism. (17)

It should be mentioned that this anti-Semitism, around 1990, was not the sole province of former East Germans. In the Federal Republic, as Frank Stern explains, following World War II, Jews were treated as victims through outward displays of philo-Semitism - though anti-Semitism remained virulent. The public pro-Jewish attitude, in some ways, substituted for active rejection of anti-Semitic thinking - a reckoning with the fundamental attitudes that, for some, justified the Holocaust. (18) In the late- 1960's and 1970's, this expected display of philo-Semitism was slowly replaced with a verbalized desire to overcome collective guilt. (19) In the 1980's, as the United States « educated » Germany about its history, for example, in the Holocaust miniseries with Meryl Streep, some West Germans even re-evaluated the exceptionality of Germany's Jewish genocide. (20) In this way, West Germany witnessed different strains of anti-Semitic discourse which replaced the idea of Jewish suffering with a belief in the Jews as a source of suffering. (21) The exhibit of Jewish culture, in 1992, thus came at a significant juncture - an opportunity to educate and mold the New Germany at a time of increased intolerance in both former East and West Germany.

Hannah Kroner, once a dancer in the Jewish Culture League, was invited to attend the exhibition, along with 43 other former performing members. They had been contacted by the journalists and organizers Eike Geisel and Henryk Broder, who, together, had recently interviewed past League members. Upon arrival on March 30th, Kroner was greeted by news cameras and much fanfare. (22) On April 1st, she, along with other members, toured the League exhibit. (23) The following night, the « Akademie der Künste » sponsored a podium discussion of the League titled, « Actually, it was a Good Time - Or Was It ? » . The event underscored the ambivalence of the League's legacy. With Broder as moderator, the discussion included 6 former members, among them Kroner, and special guest Herbert Freeden, who had served in the League's theatre department and later written the 1st book on the League, published in 1964. Kroner recalled that, before the discussion, Freeden had threatened to leave the stage if panelists only discussed happy memories. (24) In an earlier interview, Freeden responded to criticism by affirming the League and its function during the 3rd « Reich » :

« Could it be that someone postponed his emigration because he could go to the Opera, theatre, concerts ? No one gave-up or postponed his emigration because the Culture League existed ; fundamentally, it had been moral support for the Jews. » (25)

In contrast, during the panel discussion, « playing devil's advocate » , Kroner recalls :

« Freeden's very definite conclusion was that " we were used " ; " that we were misled by our own leaders into a feeling of false security " ; that it was all an " illusion " ; and possibly contributed to a sense of false optimism, preventing many of us from seeking emigration. » (26)

The other panel members disagreed. Kroner herself defended the League from the stage :

« The organization most certainly did not deceive me into wanting to stay in Germany, but it provided the opportunity to stay in physical shape, so vital for a dancer. It was not a happy time off the stage, but it was constructive and also happy while on stage, for which I am grateful. » (27)

Though former members, on and off, the panel have expressed their own positive opinions of the organization (a luxury perhaps of survival) . Freeden's summation of negative charges that night was significant in several ways. For several Berlin Jewish organizations, the larger exhibit (« Patterns of Jewish Life ») did not « pay enough attention to Jewish suffering » . (28) The League exhibition was a prime candidate for such criticism. Of his work on the League with Broder, Geisel explained :

« Sometimes, we have been accused by critics of showing the entertainment of this theatre and that we pushed all the crimes into the background. » (29)

At showings of their interviews with former members, Geisel continued :

« The German audience didn't know how to react. Many didn't talk or say anything. They knew that, usually, Jews are victims. That's what they learned at school. They cannot bear a picture on TV or conversation when a Jewish actor says, ' I loved this theatre. It was the best part of my life and I didn't care about the Nazis.' » (30)

The League was a challenge to reigning perceptions of Jewish life under Adolf Hitler's rule. In other words, the idea of the League as entertainment, diversion (even a source of laughter or joy) for Jews in Nazi Germany contrasted 2 potent post-Holocaust tropes of the supposed Jewish experience during the 3rd « Reich » : that of resistance and victimization.

The idea of resistance has been fundamental to work on Jewish activity during the period, including discussions of life in the concentration camps and the « Judenräte » (Jewish Councils) . Of the League, Freeden, in fact, explained that the League's performance of music and theatre within a German tradition represented « an element of spiritual resistance » . (31) In contrast and complement, Yehoyakim Cochavi has discussed as resistance the embracing of Jewishness within the League. (32) In part, this idea of resistance, in either formulation, grows from the call of the young poet Abba Kovner, in January 1942, in the Vilna Ghetto in Lithuania :

« Let us not be led like sheep to the slaughter. » (33)

After the Holocaust, survivors were admonished for failing to adequately respond to this plea. (34) Any evidence of resistance (real or imagined) has been significant to survivors and scholars as a challenge to this claim and a way to regain lost honour.

After World War II, however, past and present Jewish culture in Germany for some had a new « rôle » (as living monument) from resistance to reminder. In New York, in December 1945, Leo Baeck, a former influential rabbi in Berlin, envisioned a Germany without Jews. There were moral and psychological reasons to leave, including the constant reminder of guilt and resultant self-contempt related to what has been termed « Survival Guilt Syndrome ». With the founding of Israel, in 1948, Jews were also needed elsewhere. (35) And so, that year's Jewish World Congress declared that, soon, no Jew would enter Germany again. (36) However, in the 1950's, Zwi Harry Levy, a prominent rabbi in Germany offered a religious justification for Jews to remain : Jews could be a monument for the German people. (37) In this way, the image of Jew as victim (a constant reminder of the past) became valuable as the basis for a so-called « negative symbiosis » . (38)

The idea of the League as diversion and amusement (a positive force for Jews in Nazi Germany) does not correspond to either of these influential images of the Jew. And, yet, in the Jewish Culture League, there was entertainment, and this entertainment, for some, saved lives. But that is not the whole story either. In way of conclusion, I offer 2 brief examples :

For some, League membership provided a certain degree of protection (exempting performers from forced labor and ensuring release from arrest) following « Kristallnacht » . This protection for the former League violinist Henry Meyer, later a member of the renowned « LaSalle Quartet » , continued even in the concentration camp. He recounted how, on the night before he was to be gassed, at the age of only 18, a Jewish prisoner doctor mentioned he was from Breslau. Meyer explained that he had played in Breslau with the Jewish Culture League. The doctor remembered Meyer and quickly left the barrack. A moment later, he returned with a dead body. He exchanged Meyer's information with that of the corpse, left the body, and carried Meyer out of the barrack.

Through that act, Meyer recalled :

« I was back alive. » (39)

Of course, many were not so lucky. In 1938, Kurt Singer, the co-founder and initial League leader, was visiting his sister and lecturing at Harvard University. (40) After « Kristallnacht » , though he was offered a university position in the United States, Singer returned to Europe out of loyalty and the import he placed on the League. (41) En route in Rotterdam, friends convinced Singer to suspend his homecoming. He remained in Holland and, for a time, participated in musical activities there, including concerts at Amsterdam's Jewish Theatre, originally the « Hollandsche Schouwburg » , which the Nazis established, in 1941, based on the model of the Berlin Jewish Culture League. (42) With the Nazi occupation of Holland, Singer tried to return to the United States, but was unable to procure a means of departure.

Because of his « outstanding service to Germany's artistic community », Singer was eventually sent to the « model » concentration camp of « Terezín », where he died on February 7, 1944. (43)

Whether or not Singer began this return trip in part because he believed Jews still had a home in Nazi Germany (a fallacy the existence of the League may have fostered) is hard to judge. What is clear from these examples is that the League served different functions for different people in what Freedman called, in 1964, « ein Tanz auf dem Vulkan » (a dance on the volcano) . (44) As Timothy B. Malchow rightly points-out, to reify the Jewish experience as solely that of victim or otherwise threatens to reinforce fixed thinking about the Jew - a practice fundamental to anti-Semitic thought. (45) As Terrence Des Prés writes in his essay « Holocaust Laughter » of 1987 :

« It's not fear and sorrow we need more of, but undaunted vision. » (46)

The Berlin « Jüdischer Kulturbund » and the « After-Life » of Franz Schubert : Musical Appropriation and Identity Politics in Nazi Germany

(Lily E. Hirsch.)

The interaction between the performance of a musical work and its audience varies according to aesthetic and social expectations belonging to a particular historical moment. The study of music reception can, therefore, disclose as much, if not more, about the audience and its environment than it does about the musical work alone. This logic is applied by examining the reception of some of Franz Schubert's music in the context of the Berlin « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Culture League) , a cultural organization established by an alliance of Jews and Nazis, in 1933, and disbanded by the latter, 8 years later. The reception of Schubert by the League is a complicated matter, but it offers the opportunity to spotlight some of the contradictions inherent in the League's creation and operation, which also inform broader debates regarding « Jewish music » and musical politics during the 3rd « Reich » .

To set the stage for this examination, some preliminary comments about the creation of the organization are in order. The initial plan for the Jewish Culture League, originally called the Culture League of German Jews (« Kulturbund Deutscher Juden ») , was developed by Kurt Baumann in the early months of 1933. Between 1928 and 1933, he had served as a production assistant at the Berlin « Staatsoper » , the « Volksbühne » , and the « Städtische Oper » (Municipal Opera) , in Charlottenburg. When he was dismissed from his duties, at age 26, he realized that Berlin could support a separate Jewish cultural life. (1) In his Memoirs, he explained :

« My idea to found a Jewish cultural circle was based on very simple numbers ; at the time, 175,000 Jews lived in Berlin alone, many other big cities had similar concentrations, percentage wise. I figured that a city of 175,000 inhabitants could support its own theatre, Opera, Symphony Orchestra, museum, lectures, and even " Hochschule ", all within the economic conditions of a mid-sized city. » (2)

In 2 weeks, he worked-out a detailed proposal and contacted the former director of Berlin's Municipal Opera, Kurt Singer, whose assistant he had been, from 1930 to 1932. (3) Singer, who was also a physician, musicologist, and the

director of the Doctors' Chorus (« Ärztechor ») , in Berlin, had envisioned a similar organization. After revising the initial plan drafted by Baumann (4) and recruiting other Jewish luminaries, (5) Singer struggled to win Nazi sponsorship. He was eventually invited to meet with Hans Hinkel, who had been appointed head of the Prussian Theatre Commission by the new Prussian Minister, Hermann Göring, immediately after Adolf Hitler's ascension to power. (6) Hinkel recognized several reasons why support of the League was prudent, especially after Hitler's Law for the Reconstitution of the Civil Service was enacted, on 7 April 1933. This measure effectively barred non-Aryans (defined then as any person descended from a Jewish parent or grandparent) from holding positions at State-run music Conservatories, Opera Houses, concert halls, and theatres. (7) The regime would be able to exploit the organization in international propaganda by citing it as evidence that Jews were not being mistreated ; it could function as a cultural outlet and source of income for Jews, which would help to quell possible social unrest ; and, finally, the creation of the League could help the Nazis control and, ultimately, ensure the end of Jewish involvement in German culture. Hinkel agreed to the founding of the League and, in mid- May, summoned Singer to a final meeting with Göring, who warned :

« If you do it properly and do as you're told by " Herr Hinkel ", all will go well. If you misbehave, then there will be trouble, as you well know. » (8)

Thus the League received the Nazi government's « blessing » (9) and one of the most paradoxical partnerships in German history began. (10)

The Jewish Culture League gained an immediate following and, at the beginning of September, the League already consisted of 8 separate sections : the drama department, which was associated with the dramaturgy department (directed by Julius Bab) ; the Opera department (headed by Singer and the general music director Joseph Rosenstock) , which was linked with the concert department (directed by Singer, Rosenstock, and conductor Michaël Taube, who was succeeded by Hans Wilhelm - William - Steinberg and, later, Rudolf Schwarz) (11) ; the set and costume division (Heinz Codell) ; the technical department (Hans Sondheimer) ; the management division (Werner Levie) ; and the lecture department, which was organized by Julius Bab, Arthur Eloesser, Max Osborn, Julius Guttmann, Ernst Landsberger, and Anneliese Landau. (12) The Jewish Culture League in Berlin became an example for the Rhine-Ruhr and the Rhine-Main areas, catalyzing the formation of active Leagues in Cologne and Frankfurt, respectively. Smaller off-shoots formed in Hamburg, Munich, Breslau, Kassel, and other locations. By 1935, the Jewish Culture League had 46 local chapters in other towns and cities, all of which the Nazi regime generalized under the umbrella union, « Reichsverband der jüdischen Kulturbünde » (« Reich » Association of Jewish Culture Leagues) . The Berlin chapter (the 1st and last site of League activity) was the largest with 20,000 members in early 1934. (13)

This growth and early success does not mean that the central Berlin branch was without conflict. Hinkel had insisted on certain operational terms for the League before agreeing to its creation. These terms included the condition that the League be staffed by Jewish artists only and financed by the all-Jewish audiences through a monthly membership fee of 2.50 « Reichsmark » per person. Only the Jewish press was allowed to report on League events, further isolating Jewish activities from the rest of the population. There was also a stipulation that League programs were to be submitted to Hinkel's office for approval. (14) This latter requirement allowed the regime to protect Germany's

cultural legacy while promoting a repertoire they saw as appropriate for a Jewish organization. To this end, the censors in Hinkel's office began to encourage the performance of what they considered Jewish music (a composition by a Jewish composer or with a Jewish / Old Testament theme) and to suppress music by German composers : Richard Wagner and Richard Strauß were off limits from the start ; in 1936, Beethoven was added to the list, soon followed by Robert Schumann, Johann Sebastian Bach, and Johannes Brahms. Works by Franz Schubert and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, both officially Austrian until the « Anschluß » , as well as Georg Friedrich Händel (somewhat « tainted » by his Israelite Oratorios) could be performed until 1938, when they too were banned from the League's programs.

Some assimilated League members and associates feared the consequences of these early bans and insisted that an organization dedicated to Jewish music would, in effect, be no more than a cultural Ghetto. Members with Zionist ties, however, demanded a greater devotion to a repertoire that fostered a Jewish awareness. As the Zionist voice, with Nazi support, gained representation in the League, the League was forced to ask, « What is Jewish music in Nazi Germany ? » . This question culminated in the Jewish Culture League Conference, in September 1936. At this event, leaders in the field of music advanced conflicting ideas of what Jewish music was, including the belief that Jewish music did not yet exist, that all music created by composers of Jewish origin was Jewish music, and platforms between the 2 that privileged certain musical characteristics as markers of authentic Jewish music. The League's performance programs, collected in a 1992 volume entitled « Geschlossene Vorstellung : Der Jüdische Kulturbund in Deutschland 1933-1941 » (15) , reflect these debates, especially during the League's early years (1933-1937) , before the more pressing concerns of escape and survival took center stage.

There are many composers within this repertoire that may prompt us to ask the following questions : Why was Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy so popular ? Why was Arnold Schœnberg, who returned to the Jewish faith in 1933, so unpopular ? What could explain the increase in Gustav Mahler's popularity during the League's tenure ? Why was Kurt Weill completely absent from the repertoire ? To avoid generalizations that would undermine the complexities of the League's context, this article focuses solely on Franz Schubert, who might at 1st appear an unlikely choice. He is not usually considered in discussions of national controversies, and his own political dealings never reached the level of strife associated with composers such as Richard Wagner, Giuseppe Verdi, or Béla Bartók, to name a few. And yet, the prominence of his music in the League (a highly-charged nationalistic organization) makes him a necessary focus. Indeed, Schubert was the 2nd most frequently performed composer ; along with Beethoven, Schubert's music was included in 46 League performances. What could account for Schubert's extreme popularity within this Jewish organization ? What does his standing reveal about the League's debates or, by extension, about the national self-identification of those who participated in them ?

German Music and Identity in the League

One explanation for Schubert's popularity in the League concerns the prevalence of lieder and « German music » , that is, music composed by musicians of German origin. Despite Nazi censorship, Singer and other department directors programmed German music more regularly than so-called Jewish music, and it was more popular with audiences generally. This popularity challenged the foundation of the League as a Jewish organization.

Performance Breakdown

The prominence of German music is indicative of the strong German orientation of the League, especially in its early years, as well as of the German self-identification of its public and leaders. As Singer explained, members of Jewish communities in Berlin generally remained « theatre people of 1900, internally distant from Jewish pieces or pieces considered to be Jewish » . (16) As many have pointed-out, until the Nazis assumed power, many « Jews » had not considered themselves Jewish and continued to identify themselves as German. In « My German Question » , Peter Gay explains this psychology :

« For my parents and for me, cherishing our Jewishness was not an acceptable option. We did not want to be Jews by Nazi edict ; their definition of our “ race ” was just another lie that we repudiated as unhistorical and unscientific. We did not think of ourselves as members of a chosen people, divinely selected for glory or for suffering. Whatever our pious fellow-pariahs might say, we could not make ourselves believe what we did not believe. (17)

For League members, performing works by German composers functioned as a link to German culture and, thus, to the German nation as a whole. (18) Not only that, for some members, it was also a means of resistance against the cultural and intellectual ghettoization forced upon them by the Nazis. Herbert Freeden, a former member and early historian of the League, suggested as much when he wrote that “ in its stubborn refusal to give-up its bond to Europe and to deny its intellectual tradition, the “ Kulturbund ” became a moral reservoir of strength for Jewish Germans, and an element of spiritual resistance ”. » (19)

Lieder, a genre Richard Taruskin offers as the answer to the question « What is German ? » (« Was ist deutsch ? ») , (20) held a special significance within this struggle. Lieder connected League members to Germany through language, which, according to Johann Gottfried von Herder, was the defining feature of a nation and « exemplified the spontaneity of the “ Volksgeist ” » . (21) The Nazis shared this opinion and attempted to deny Jewish Germans access to language as a preliminary method of excluding them from the nation. For example, on 13 April 1933, Nazi students posted and otherwise made public, on university buildings and billboards throughout Germany, a list of 12 crimes allegedly committed by Jews. The 5th item on the list proclaimed : « The Jew who can only think Jewish but writes German lies. » . (22) Thus, the students demanded that works by Jewish authors appear only in Hebrew, or, if they must appear in German, be labeled as translations. (23) Along these lines, the Nazis « suggested » that the Jewish Culture League conduct its affairs in Hebrew rather than German - a difficult request given that most members of the League were not familiar with Hebrew. (24) The Nazis, however, viewed this as an insubordination, as a means of « passive resistance » . (25) Coming closer to the truth, the New York « Times » explained the Jewish Culture League's opposition to this order as reluctance to discard the « manifold Jewish cultural values that find expression through the medium of the German language » . (26)

This adherence to German culture and language as a means of asserting their members' place in German society was part of a much larger tradition. In the past, Jewish Germans had viewed German culture as their entry into German society. To this end, they had embraced the concept of « Bildung » , defined in the spirit of G ethe as both a process and a product imperceptibly « ushering its subjects to states of greater complexity and self-awareness » . (27) In the

19th Century, the medium of this transformation, or self-improvement, had been most often literature, philosophy, and the arts. (28) After the « Hep ! Hep ! » (29) riots of 1819, the jurist Eduard Gans, Jewish scholar Leopold Zunz, and merchant Moses Moser had met to consider ways to reduce the rampant « Judeophobia ». They established the Society for Culture and Science of the Jews with the goal of introducing Jews to German culture and, at the same time, re-inforcing Jewish identity. They hoped that their organization would form a bridge between the Jews and their German home, eliminating the image of the Jew as « outsider ». (30) As Moses Mendelssohn's example had proved long before, however, integration through « Bildung » did not necessitate religious transformation or full assimilation. Rather, German and Jewish culture could exist in parallel without merging. Thus, even in Orthodox homes, including those of rabbis, parents would sing both Hebrew and German songs with their children and, on official occasions, principal Orthodox personalities would cite both Talmudic dicta and quotations from the works of G ethe, Schiller, and even Wagner. (31)

But the appeal of lieder can also be credited to the League members' sentimental attachment to that musical tradition, nurtured by the nostalgia for the past implicit in the genre. (32) The members' familiarity with lieder, as well as the music of Beethoven, Bach, and Brahms, further enhanced this attraction. Indeed, studies in the psychology of music have suggested a strong connection between the brain's response to pleasure in conjunction with the recognition of familiar music, or repeated hearings of a musical piece. (33) Thus, although the League was committed to Jewish music (in a large part due to Nazi pressure) , German music mattered to League members who were painfully aware of the irony of their German cultural identity, attached as they were to the music they had always known, and nostalgic for a past without the threat of Nazi persecution.

Another Explanation : Lieder and « Hausmusik »

Still, the popularity of lieder, and Schubert's work in general, is not solely explained by connecting the League's German self-identification and traditions with the Germanness of their repertoire. Music, like people, rarely adheres to neat national distinctions, and although League administrators were expected to program music based on race and nationality, additional factors compounded the difficulty of their choices. These factors frustrate any hope for a straightforward overview of the repertoire choices, but, nonetheless, expose embedded cultural values and the conflicted processes that League organizers went through to meet their constituents' expectations as well as Nazi requirements.

To illustrate my point, the significance of lieder also relates to the belief that true Jewish music had to be vocal-music, as no instruments were allowed in the liturgy (34) - a point that featured prominently in the Jewish Culture League Conference. As Singer explained in his closing remarks there, « According to the knowledge and experiences of the real specialists, Jewish music only exists in synagogue music and in Jewish folksong. » . (35) He also proclaimed, « Jewish music is not orchestral music ; it is vocal, an ardent prayer, a song of the individual or many, but not instrumental. » . (36) The composition of song was therefore specifically emphasized and promoted during the conference. In fact, to close the meeting, League organizers announced a composition competition to promote Jewish music in the following genres : an Overture for orchestra ; a choral work for 4-voice mixed choir with orchestra ; a choral work for 2 or more voices for school or youth choirs ; a cycle of lieder for voice with piano ; and a cycle of choral songs for small choir a capella or with instruments. (37) The predominance of vocal-music within this list is undeniable and was only

enhanced by lieder's special significance within Jewish communities, historically and during the 3rd « Reich » , as a genre appropriate for « Hauskonzerte » (home concerts) . (38)

During the early 19th Century, « Hauskonzerte » thrived in the Berlin salons hosted by Sara Levy and Amalie Beer, as well as in Vienna under the auspices of various Jewish financier families - the most famous of which was hosted by Felix Mendelssohn's great-aunt, Fanny Arnstein, who « virtually dominated Vienna's salon life between 1780 and 1818 » . (39) The Viennese salons allowed Jews, who were excluded from the social circles of the Austrian aristocracy, to create their own spheres of influence and cultivate their love of literature and music. During the reign of Emperor Franz-Josef I (1792-1835) and his minister Clemens von Metternich, when Vienna was permeated by spies, corruption, and deceit, these salons also provided a safe occasion for social gatherings. (40) Given the similar climate of fear in Nazi Germany, it is understandable that the Jewish Culture League was forced to turn to this tradition, which continued into the 20th Century, in both Vienna and Berlin, despite the rise of public concert life. (41)

Hilda Klestadt Jonas, a former performer in the League's Düsseldorf branch, remembered that « people felt more comfortable » during these concerts at private homes. (42) Since « Hauskonzerte » were less official than the League's standard offerings, a complete reconstruction of their content and frequency is impossible. Still, the programs collected in « Geschlossene Vorstellung » list several « Hauskonzerte » featuring lieder: in March 1934, a concert featured Franz Schubert lieder and Robert Schumann duets ; in December 1934, a full program of Schubert lieder ; in January 1935, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy lieder and duets ; in February 1935, lieder by Jakob Schønberg ; on 13 October 1935, a Schubert and Gustav Mahler lieder evening ; and, in January 1937, a concert featuring « Die schöne Müllerin » , to name a few. (43) These private performances represented a loophole, circumventing Hinkel's mandatory repertoire inspection. Henry Meyer, a member of the Berlin League's Orchestra, recalls :

« We were denied Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven. We then played them in many “ Hauskonzerte ”, where we did not have to work under these limitations. » (44)

This allowed the League to maintain a tradition of performing Bach and Beethoven, Schubert and Schumann - a tradition that, as the musicologist and League lecturer Anneliese Landau insisted, was fundamental to the next generation's education and « self-cultivation » . (45)

These concerts made a virtue out of need as well. The League was chronically plagued by a shortage of wind players ; and, as early as 1933, the emigration, often on short notice, of accomplished performing artists and prominent musicians presented a substantial impediment to rehearsal and performance schedules. (46) In a review of Mozart's « Le nozze di Figaro » , the League's 1st Operatic production in the « Berliner Theater » on « Charlottenstraße » , on 14 November 1933, Ludwig Misch, a composer and music-critic in Berlin, identified these limitations :

« The “ Kulturbund ” had only limited means at its disposal, which came from member contributions. The lack of Jewish wind players, which had to be taken into account in the programming of orchestral concerts became an object of mounting worry with regard to Opera. The obvious necessity to limit the choice of performers to the small circle of Jewish artists made gathering an ensemble an even greater problem than it already was. » (47)

Thus, traditional genres reserved for « Hauskonzerte » , such as lieder, were ideal for the League.

Franz Schubert's status, however, becomes more complicated when compared to Robert Schumann's. Heralded as preeminent lied composers, both Schumann and Schubert were accepted by the less-progressive League public. (48) Nevertheless, Schumann's music was included in only 14 performances, one less than Gustav Mahler's. Schubert's music, on the other hand, was included in over 3 times that number. What distinguished Schubert from Schumann in the eyes of League members ?

Schubert's Jewish Music

Schubert was an extremely prolific composer. He wrote approximately 630 songs, which is over 5 times the number of songs Schumann wrote during the period of productivity that many scholars have called Schumann's « Liederjahr » (1840-1841) . The League's performances of Schubert's music, however, were not just the result of a voluminous oeuvre. Rather, the League responded to contrasting images of the 2 composers. Both Schubert and Schumann set the poetry of Heinrich Heine, (49) forging a link between them and the icon of German-Jewish culture. But the commonalities end there. During the Nazi era, Schumann was heralded as representative of the German musical tradition, and, in Friedrich Welter's « Musikgeschichte im Umriss » , as a forerunner of National-Socialism. (50) As diagnosed by Nazi musicologist Wolfgang Boetticher, Schumann was said to have been strongly anti-Semitic in his reviews of Giacomo Meyerbeer's music, lamenting its « annoying, grumbling and indiscreet rhythm » while deploying the term Jew as an « insult » . (51) This picture of Schumann was hardly attractive to Jewish communities. Schubert, in contrast, was cast as a friend to Jews, owing perhaps to the fact that several of his works, arguably composed in response to his Catholic upbringing, could be considered « Jewish » .

Schubert, who was brought-up in a strict and religious household, participated in the Catholic Church as a choirboy. (52) This orthodox upbringing may account for the many liturgical works Schubert wrote throughout his life. However, as an adult, Schubert did not subscribe to the religion of his youth, a disinclination perhaps foreshadowed by his « bad » (« schlecht ») grade in religion at the « Kaiserlich-Königlich Normalhauptschule » . (53) The change in attitude is evident in a letter to Schubert, dated 12 October 1818, in which his free-thinking brother Ignaz warned :

« If you should wish to write to Papa and me at the same time, do not touch upon religious matters. » (54)

This admonition suggests that Schubert's religious outlook was closer to that of Ignaz, who perhaps feared reprisal from their father. Schubert also left clues about his later religious views in his sacred music. Unwilling to pledge loyalty to the Church, Schubert always omitted « Et in unam sanctam catholicam ecclesiam » from the Credo of his Masses and, occasionally, expunged the phrase « Et expecto resurrectionem » , the only statement of belief in the resurrection of the dead. (55) Furthermore, in a letter of January 1827, Schubert's friend Ferdinand Walcher wrote-out a musical incipit over the words « Credo in unum Deum ! » followed by the exclamation, « Not you, I know well enough. » . (56) Schubert may have been attracted to the humanist movement of the time. As Frank Ruppert concluded :

« Franz Schubert was a Christian humanist, the product of a synthesis of messianic Judaism and the platonic vision of life as an ascent to divine perfection. » (57)

This unorthodoxy, whether the result of humanism or not, is evidenced by his musical contribution to cantor Salomon Sulzer (1804-1890) and the new « Seitenstettengasse » Synagogue, in Vienna, inaugurated in 1826. After an unsuccessful attempt to secure a composition for the synagogue from Beethoven, Sulzer turned to Schubert. The composer, « in a remarkably generous gesture to the small community of Jews in Vienna » , (58) responded in July 1828 with a setting of Psalm 92 (« Tov L'Hodot » , or « It is good to give thanks to the Lord ») for mixed chorus and baritone solo. In 1841, the piece was published in « Schir Zion » , Sulzer's collection of 122 pieces for the liturgy and 37 commissioned compositions. In 1870, Schubert's setting of Psalm 92 was re-issued together with Moses Mendelssohn's translation « Lieblich ist's dem Ew'gen danken » . For the original setting, Schubert had used the Hebrew text, even though the German would have been acceptable to Sulzer. (59) The piece itself does not show characteristics commonly found in music considered Jewish. (60) Rather, it is homophonic and harmonically simple, typical aspects of some of Schubert's part-songs. It also pays homage to traditional sacred emblems : it has an overall plagal tonal scheme of I (C major, measures 1-28) - IV (F major, measures 29-70) - I (C major, measures 71-88) , and, in the opening and closing sections, a solo quartet and the choir alternate antiphonally as in responsorial psalmody. However, Schubert did make concessions to the piece's function : the middle-section, which is more complex harmonically, includes a baritone solo for the cantor. Sulzer, who must have chanted verse 1 and verses 10 through 16, which Schubert did not set. In keeping with the conventions of the synagogue, the piece is also a cappella.

The New Madrigal Society (« Neue Madrigalvereinigung ») , directed by Ludwig Misch « took-up the cause » (« sich eingesetzt hat ») of Schubert's Psalm 92. (61) Misch formed his Madrigal Society (later known as the « Jüdischer Madrigalvereinigung » or Jewish Madrigal Society) under the supervision of the League, which cleared the group's repertoire with Hinkel's office. (62) The Madrigal Society performed the work in Hebrew at League concerts in December 1934, twice in 1936, and recorded it in Berlin on the « Lukraphon » label at the beginning of 1935. (63) Those involved in these performances were in this way made aware of Schubert's unusual gift to the synagogue, if they were not already familiar with the work. The piece, cited as « den für Sulzer komponierten 92. Psalm » (the Psalm 92 composed for Sulzer) , (64) highlighted Schubert's connection to Sulzer, whose own sacred music was included in 2 League events.

This emphasis was consistent with the earliest performances of Psalm 92, as well as with its treatment within scholarship on Jewish music. Premiered at Sulzer's synagogue, in the summer of 1828, the work was 1st heard in a secular setting at an event organized in Vienna by the Society for the Collection and Preservation of Artistic and Historic Jewish Mementoes, on 12 May 1904, in celebration of the Centenary of Sulzer's birth. Schubert's setting of the Psalm opened the concert, a performance devoted solely to Hebrew music. (65) Both Abraham Wolf Binder, musician and scholar of Jewish musical studies in New York, and Aron Marko Rothmüller, a composer at one time associated with the League, have used the Psalm to illustrate Schubert's close friendship with Sulzer, who was, according to Binder, the « 1st recognized interpreter of the songs of Franz Schubert » . (66) The music-critic and author Artur Holde, active in Berlin until he immigrated to the United States, in 1936, also maintained that one of those who

appreciated Sulzer's interpretive gifts was Schubert himself. (67) Could this consistent emphasis on the Psalm setting's connection to Sulzer have enhanced Schubert's overall popularity in the League ? Sulzer was indeed a significant ally. He had served as chief cantor at the « Seitenstettengasse » Synagogue for 45 years. During his tenure, he revitalized music for the Jewish liturgy and his innovative style would influence the development of synagogue music for decades to follow. (68) For these reasons, he was well-known and generally respected in Jewish communities. No doubt Schubert's treatment of Psalm 92 created a sympathetic image of the composer, and cast him as a friend to Sulzer and, by extension, to Jews in general.

Such a view was maintained and expanded during the Nazi era by the conductor Fritz Busch, a prominent and early non-Jewish victim of the Nazi regime. Parochial Party politics forced Busch to leave his job as the director of the State Opera in Dresden, in March 1933, and he eventually emigrated. (69) In March 1942, he appeared as conductor of the 3 Choir Festival of New York, which was sponsored by the Congregation Emanu-El and directed by Lazare Saminsky « in an expression of faith and principle » . Busch explained his appearance thus :

« In joining my work with that of a Jewish fellow-musician, Lazare Saminsky, director of the Festival, and in trying thus to help in the fostering of cultural comradeship and amity among creeds and races, I am not doing anything new : I merely follow in the footsteps of a very great and a very lovable German musician, Franz Schubert. 100 years ago, in another sinister period of history full of strife between creeds and nations, Schubert, German and Christian as could be, carried his high-minded friendliness so far as to compose a choral work to Hebrew words for the synagogal service of his friend, the famous cantor, Salomon Sulzer of Vienna. It is published in Sulzer's collection and is used by the Jewish people the world over as their own. This is what Schubert did. I am happy to follow his example. » (70)

Busch here propagates the posthumous picture of the German, rather than Austrian, Schubert, friend to Sulzer and spokesman for tolerance. He also asserted that the Jewish people claimed Psalm 92 as their possession, explaining that it was « used by the Jewish people the world over as their own » , implying a connection between Jewish music (conceived of as the cultural property of the Jewish people) and Psalm 92. He was not alone. In 1976, the composer and cantor Eduard Birnbaum, (71) whose « Talmudische Rhapsodie » was performed by the League, in 1935, similarly claimed Schubert in his article, « Franz Schubert as a Composer of Synagogue Music » . (72)

Schubert's other Psalm settings shed further light on the allure his music had within Jewish communities. He composed music for Psalms 13 (incomplete) and 23 and arranged Maximilian Stadler's setting of Psalm 8, (73) all to Moses Mendelssohn's translations. Schubert's Psalm 23 (1820) , for SSAA chorus and piano, was performed by the League at Berlin's « Friedenstempel » on « Markgraf-Albrecht-Strasse » , in November 1936. The Psalm, one of the most popular in the Psalter and ascribed to King David, describes a traveler who passes through luscious pastures and beyond still waters until he comes to « The Valley of the Shadow of Death » . (74) Here, the Psalm switches from 3rd person references to God (He) to 2nd person references (Thou) , addressing God directly and emphasizing that the traveler is no longer alone :

« He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil : for Thou art with me. » (75)

The German-Romantic theme of a lone traveler, meeting his fate and finding comfort, would have appealed to Schubert, who continually visited this subject in his compositions. For our purposes, however, Schubert's use of Moses Mendelssohn's translations is the main point of interest.

Mendelssohn had hoped that his translations, which were inspired by a desire to restore the Hebrew lyric, would become popular with musicians. Nevertheless, not even his grandson, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, made consistent use of them. **(76)** What is more, there is evidence that Felix refused a request from the Hamburg Temple, the 1st Reform synagogue in the city, for Psalm settings with Moses's translations, opting for the Lutheran instead. **(77)** In light of this, why and how would Schubert have come to employ Moses's translation in lieu of the others available ? Moreover, could the use of Moses's translation of Psalm 23 be considered another gesture of « cultural comradeship » by the League community ? In his article on the setting, Walther Dürr states :

« One has often wondered why Schubert had recourse to this Psalm in Moses Mendelssohn's German translation, which was certainly intended for the Jewish communities - if not directly for the synagogues. » **(78)**

Dürr immediately counters this hypothesis, which he restates only to cite common conclusions about the Psalm's destination. According to him, use of Moses's German translation does not necessarily imply a connection to the synagogue. A German, rather than Latin, version was appropriate for Psalm 23's secular destination, and Mendelssohn's German translation was desirable as « one of the most modern translations not compromised by the clash between denominations » . **(79)** Indeed, other composers had recognized the strengths of Mendelssohn's translations before Schubert and had set them to music. Among them was Maximilian Stadler, who knew Schubert and was most likely the source of Schubert's familiarity with these translations. Still, the fact that a Jewish connection has been assumed is a significant reality within Schubert reception history.

A final sacred work to consider in this discussion of Schubert's « Jewish music » is « Mirjams Siegesgesang » (Miriam's Song of Triumph) , composed in March 1828, for soprano solo and mixed chorus with piano accompaniment. This Cantata-like work, with a text specifically written for Schubert by Franz Grillparzer, describes the rejoicing of the Israelites after their deliverance from the Egyptians, accompanied by Moses's hymn of triumph and praise (Exodus 15) . **(80)** Given the subject matter, this work was « Jewish » . The work (based on an Old Testament theme) not only fit the Nazi definition of Jewish music but also had musical and thematic ties to Georg Friedrich Händel's Israelite Oratorios, which League organizers consistently designated as Jewish music. **(81)** The League's performance of the work at Bechstein Hall, in February 1936, enhanced this perception : the composition was programmed alongside Schubert's Psalm 92, and the lied « Dem Unendlichen » (To the Infinite One) , to a text with religious themes by Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, along with sacred-themed works by Beethoven and vocal compositions by the Jewish composers Rosy Geiger-Kullmann, Cilly Zukmann-Bizony, and Gerhard Goldschlag. The work was also performed at the synagogue on « Oranienburgerstraße » , again with Psalm 92, among other works. While the February concert positioned Schubert as a composer of sacred music, the latter context suggested that these works could belong to a particular denomination. That is, the synagogue setting provided the proper context in which to appreciate Schubert's Psalm 92 and « Mirjams Siegesgesang » as « Jewish » .

Schubert, of course, could not have predicted the appeal of these sacred pieces to Jewish communities (or their subsequent rebirth as symbols of religious tolerance or reconfiguration as « Jewish » works) . However, reception history is the product of many, sometimes contradictory factors that have little to do with the composer and his life. This is especially true in the case of Schubert reception. **(82)** With few of his own letters to set the record straight, Schubert's biography is less restrictive than those of other composers, and a myriad of interpretations are possible. **(83)** Jewish communities could therefore claim Schubert for their own purposes - performing his work at the synagogue and satisfying the regime's definition of Jewish music with the works of an « Aryan » composer.

Schubert's general reception also played a role in this appropriation. The narrative post-humously ascribed to him includes the idea of « poor Schubert » (« armer Schubert ») and renders him an outsider or stranger. These images index a state of being to which the members of the League, who were experiencing increasing discrimination and forced estrangement, could no doubt relate. The 1st myth, that of « poor Schubert » (« the unrecognized genius, the artist who valiantly struggles for acceptance and, yet, is inexplicably ignored by the world until after his death ») **(84)** appears, again and again, in the writings of Schubert's friends, critics, and biographers, from the time of his death, on 19 November 1828, on. Schubert had referred to himself as such in his earliest surviving letter, written to his brother, in 1812, while away at school ; it was signed : « Your loving, poor, hopeful, once again poor, and not to be forgotten brother Franz. » (« Deines Dich liebenden armen, hoffenden und nochmal armen Bruders Franz zu erkennen. ») . **(85)** This idea was later propagated by Rudolf Hans Bartsch's well-known novel « Schwammerl » (1912) , which had reached a printing of 236,000 copies by 1932 and had been the basis of Heinrich Berté's Operetta « Das Dreimäderlhaus » (1916) . **(86)** Central to Bartsch's novel was both the relationship between Schubert and Beethoven, and the idea of Schubert as a struggling genius. However, as Alexander Stillmark noted, Bartsch gave the tribulations and deprivations of the genius a positive spin by accentuating the rewards to be reaped later. **(87)** The deprivations included the composer's precarious financial situation, which, although often exaggerated, quite literally necessitated the adjective « poor » , and his early death. Memoirs, reviews, and reference works have lamented the ephemeral life of the « all too young deceased composer of genius » , **(88)** and Oscar Bie wrote in his Centennial biography « Schubert, the Man » :

« If he had lived, he would have projected the distinction of his youth into a still riper manhood (into an indescribably fruitful future) and would have become the 1st and foremost of all. » **(89)**

League associates were aware of this myth and fixation on Schubert's early death. In the program leaflet for an October 1934 performance, Anneliese Landau wrote the following of Schubert's composition of the « Great » C major Symphony, his last complete Symphony **(90)** :

« He composed it half a year before his death, when all the still unsung lieder had to be sung before the great inexorable silence. » **(91)**

This dramatic description of Schubert and the Symphony he never heard performed corresponds to the Romantic traits of the Symphony itself, which moved beyond the spirit of the Classical period apparent in Schubert's 1st 6 Symphonies.

(92) The popularity of Schubert's « Unfinished » Symphony, performed once during the League's 1st season and twice in the 3rd season, similarly indexes a certain interest in Schubert's later, more Romantic compositions, as well as the tragedy of his short (« Unfinished ») life. Schubert's economic need (another aspect of the « poor » Schubert myth) may also have been a part of this awareness. In a speech delivered in 1939, shortly after her immigration to the United States, Landau said that :

« Schubert had the hard luck to live in a period of social changes. » (93)

Thus having to rely on his friends :

« These friends (not quite as poor as Schubert, but not blessed with wealth either) gave Schubert shelter and food through many years. » (94)

It is difficult to say whether Landau portrayed Schubert in such a light in her 1st speech to League members, in 1933. However, many of Landau's later speeches were based on, or were direct translations of, the speeches she gave at the League.

The 2nd myth (Schubert as an outsider) is visible in the Schubert iconography, where, as Antonio Baldassare observes :

« It is striking how often Schubert appears on the periphery within a group of people and how explicitly he avoids any visual contact in portraits. » (95)

He is present but never wholly accepted or included. For example, Leopold Kupelwieser, in his « Landpartie der Schubertianer von Atzenbrugg nach Aumühl » (1820) , depicts a group traveling in a cart drawn by 2 horses, from Vienna to Atzenbrugg. 2 smaller figures run ahead of the cart, while 2 others appear at the left margin of the watercolor, absorbed in conversation. These latter figures represent the artist, in a cap, and Schubert, wearing glasses and a top hat. Similarly, in Kupelwieser's « Charade : Gesellschaftsspiel der Schubertianer in Atzenbrugg » (1821) , Schubert again is near the margin, at the piano. In her 1939 speech on Schubert, Landau subscribed fully to the depiction of Schubert as the outsider or « Other » , seeing him as the representation of « the tragic loneliness of the Romantic artist » . (96) By calling him « perhaps the greatest of all Romantic composers » and « the 1st for whom the Lindenbaum with its majestic trunk, with its spreading shade became a symbol of protection against a hurting outside world » (97) , she catalogued Romantic tropes of protection and pain and connected Schubert to a world beyond suffering, represented by the « Lindenbaum » (lime tree) , the ultimate German symbol of « the innocence and security of childhood » . (98) She concluded her speech with « Schubert is beauty that never can be destroyed » . (99) Schubert was the Romantic ideal, threatened by a world to which he did not belong. Landau discussed Schubert in a similar way for League audiences, in 1933, explaining Romanticism as a stylistic period and « Weltanschauung » (world view) that focuses on the conflicted relationship of the individual to those around him. (100)

Schubert's music was instrumental to the creation of this myth : in it, the popular consciousness meshes Schubert's life with his musical subjects. One famous example of an outsider, linked to Schubert and the eternal Jew, (101) is the

narrator of « Winterreise », a cycle of 24 songs composed a year before Schubert's death. This character is portrayed as lonely and forgotten in the 3rd song, « Gefror'ne Thränen », where he bemoans his unnoticed frozen tears, and in the 13th song, « Die Post », where he awaits a letter, any letter, and struggles to maintain his waning hope, which is reflected in the music by the alternation between major and minor. In the final piece, « Der Leiermann », the lonely wanderer confronts his « other » self, a beggar-musician, who embodies all his fears of solitude and estrangement from the world. This cold isolation is captured in the piano accompaniment, with the organ-grinder's empty open 5th in the left-hand functioning as a drone and, according to Jonathan Bellman, evoking the « style hongrois » to signify the Gypsy, another societal outcast. (102) As in Psalm 23, the end of the journey is marked by the narrator's switch from 3rd person to 2nd person in the 5th stanza, when the wanderer addresses the organ-grinder directly :

« But he lets it all go on as go it will ;
Keeps the handle ever turning, never still ;
Strange old organ-grinder, shall I go with you ? » (103)

This cycle was performed by the League, in October 1934 and on 7 April 1935. The popularity of the work is evident in a review of the 1934 performance. Jakob Schœnberg, critic for the « Jüdische Rundschau », wrote :

« Only enthusiastic devotion to the work could make possible the almost 2 hour, uninterrupted rendition of ' Winterreise ' without the slightest letting-up of the interpretive power. » (104)

This devotion can be credited to the appeal of the Romantic outsider, who, in Schubert's lied, « Der Wanderer », which the League programmed in its 1st and 3rd seasons, declares :

« I am a stranger everywhere. » (« Ich bin ein Fremdling überall. ») (105)

In a performance setting, the words and the human voice in Schubert's musical rendering allowed League members to take solace that they were not alone, (106) and established a link between them and Schubert. (107) Schubert and his musical depictions of loneliness and estrangement could also function as a form of catharsis, allowing League members to grieve while listening. This response to music, in Jerrold Levinson's estimation, « allows one to bleed-off in a controlled manner a certain amount of harmful emotion with which one is afflicted » . (108) Sad music is only therapeutic for « listeners currently in the grip of unhealthy emotions, whether on a conscious or unconscious level » . (109) The appeal of Schubert's music, in this vein, is evident in newspaper articles from the period, which highlight the profundity of emotion Schubert's music can conjure. A review of Schubert's « Great » Symphony, for example, emphasizes the work's « Slavic melancholy » (« slawische Melancholie ») and « depths of feeling » (« Tiefe des Empfindens ») . (110)

Nazi Policy

Schubert's music could no longer function in this way, after 1938. At this time, the Nazis banned Schubert from League programs. But why had they not done so earlier ? Beethoven had been banned 2 years prior, in 1936, the year

Germany entered the « danger zone » - a period of mobilization during which Germany prepared for expansion toward Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. (111) Already before 1936, they had censured Jewish enjoyment of Beethoven's music, canceling a League production of « Fidelio » , in 1934. (112) Moreover, in a letter to the director of propaganda of the Berlin Spandau district, dated November 19, 1934, the Charlottenburg propaganda office had condemned as « tactless » (« taktlos ») a recent issue of the League's monthly newsletter which had celebrated and discussed Beethoven and Gœthe. The propaganda officer complained :

« What do Beethoven and Gœthe have in common with the Jews ? » (113)

Perhaps, this opinion explains an order issued by Hinkel's office banning Beethoven's « An die ferne Geliebte » (To the Distant Beloved) , a song cycle set to verses written by a Jewish medical student, Alois Isidor Jeitteles. (114) There is no official explanation of this ban, but, generally, musical settings by German composers of texts by Jewish authors were more likely to be approved. (115) Although these conditions suggest a preference for Beethoven, this trend did not continue in the case of Beethoven's « An die ferne Geliebte » . Meanwhile, the Nazis allowed Schubert's setting of not only German texts by Jewish authors, but also a Hebrew text (Psalm 92) . Beethoven was clearly held in higher esteem than Schubert.

Within the regime's musical politics, Beethoven was privileged as the heroic « Aryan » ideal and placed beside Wagner as representative of German supremacy. In fact, in 1924, Josef Gœbbels had put him ahead of Wagner, musing :

« Why always put Wagner out front as a great man ? Why not Beethoven ? He stood immeasurably higher as a character. » (116)

The Nazis had begun propagating a « völkisch » image of the composer in the Weimar era. The idea of Beethoven as a « world conqueror » was an important element of this image, allowing Nazi music scholars to draw parallels between Beethoven and Hitler. (117) Beethoven was « not just a great composer but also a legendary spiritual leader who could unify the folk with his powerful art » . (118) The image of Beethoven, thus, could serve to legitimize the Nazi Party's political agenda by promoting the composer as « an artist, who, like Adolf Hitler, embodied National-Socialist heroic ideals » . (119) This alignment inspired critic Walter Jacobs, writing for the « Kölnische Zeitung » , to recommend that the National-Socialist politician use Beethoven's 3rd Symphony, the « Eroica » , as the sonic emblem of the 3rd « Reich » . (120) Although the Nazis elected Anton Bruckner instead, Beethoven remained an important symbol. His music was regularly appropriated for Party rallies, Festivals, films - such as « Wunschkonzert » (Request Concert) , in 1940 - which recast Beethoven's « Pathétique » Piano Sonata as a March - and radio programs such as the internationally recognized « Beethoven Cycle » broadcast, in January 1934, on the « Deutschlandsender » , the national broadcasting station. (121) Furthermore, the « Schlusschor » of Beethoven's 9th Symphony was performed at the opening ceremonies of the 1936 Olympics in Berlin. One can assume that the universality of Schiller's lyrics (reflecting the atmosphere of the Olympics as an international event) was valued just as much as Beethoven's music. But organizers saw the work foremost as a « proclamation of the Nazi “ Volksgemeinschaft ” » . (122)

Schubert, on the other hand, represented « one of the most complicated problems of German music » (« eines der

kompliziertesten Probleme der deutschen Musik ») . (123) In « Musik und Rasse » , an important work of the era, Richard Eichenauer identified in Schubert's music a « certain softening of voice leading » (« gewisse Erweichung der Linienführung ») , frequent shifts from major to minor, and harmonic weakness - which he credited to Schubert's supposed mixed ancestry. These characteristics, for Eichenauer, distinguished Schubert's work from the music of Beethoven. (124) Linked with femininity (and homosexuality) , this assessment is echoed in both past and present writings on Schubert. In fact, it was Robert Schumann who first coined the analogy of « Beethoven to Schubert as man to woman » . In his 1838 review of Schubert's « Grand Duo » , Schumann had compared Schubert to Beethoven, explaining that Schubert was « a feminine character (“ Mädchencharakter ”) , much more voluble, softer and broader ; or a guileless child romping among giants » , conducting himself « as a wife to husband, the one giving orders, the other relying on pleas and persuasion » . (125) Despite the subtleties Scott Messing identifies in Schumann's critique (and in his more plastic, androgynous understanding of the feminine in Schubert) , this statement represents the beginning of a school of critical analysis that has permanently fixed Schubert in gendered categories. (126) The endurance of this view is evident in Scott Burnham's summation of contemporary opinion :

« From Theodor W. Adorno to Carl Dahlhaus and Susan McClary, Schubert's music is consistently characterized as non-Beethovenian rather than as Schubertian. We can hardly begin to talk about Schubert in any other terms : Schubert is non-processual rather than processual ; reminiscent rather than goal-oriented ; the sense of self projected by his music is permeable rather than autonomous, or feminine rather than masculine, or “ gay ” rather than “ straight ”. » (127)

During the 3rd « Reich » , this thinking was partly based on the Symphonic / melodic opposition that, according to Sanna Pederson, « barely masks the masculine / feminine opposition that underlies it » . (128) In Nazi thought, the association of Schubert with the feminine would link the composer with Germany's « Other » , the Jew, who Otto Weininger had likened to women in his infamous « Sex and Character » . He wrote :

« It would not be difficult to make a case for the view that the Jew is more saturated with femininity than the Aryan, to such an extent that the most manly Jew is more feminine than the least manly Aryan. » (129)

The « cliché » that Schubert was a « typical Austrian » , or even the epitome of what was considered « Viennese » , further contributed to the gendered reading of Schubert and his music, at this time. On November 25, 1928, the American novelist Thomas Wolfe described the celebration of Schubert's Centenary as follows :

« This has been Schubert week (he died 100 years ago, and the ceremonies in his honour this past week have been endless ; their devotion to him is astounding) his picture is everywhere, books about him are everywhere, he has been sung, played, memorialized in churches, Opera, concert houses and public places all this week) and always to great crowds. I think Schubert has become a great symbol to these people, standing for all that was best and greatest in “ the good old time ”. He is Vienna incarnate and he is rooted in their hearts forever. » (130)

Faced with negotiating the embodiment of Vienna, Schubert reception is affected by an imagined dichotomy between the « weak Austrian » and the « manly German » . (131) This dichotomy is evident in the writing of Max Morold, who describes « softness » (« Weiche ») and « naïveté » as typical of music from Austria. (132) Nazi reception of

Anton Bruckner's music overcame this characterization in spite of the fact that the composer was born in Ansfelden, near Linz ; this, too, may have relieved Bruckner of the burden of « personifying » his country's capital city. Adolf Hitler came to despise Vienna, though he, at one time, admired the city, especially its « Ringstraße » . (133) He had experienced rejection there, several times during his student days. (134) Still harboring a grudge, Hitler endeavored, once in power, to establish Linz as a counterweight to Vienna, which, according to Josef Goebbels, was to be « gradually phased-out of the picture » . (135) Hitler's position on this matter could not have enhanced Schubert's standing in Nazi Germany or encouraged the Nazis to « protect » Schubert, as they had Beethoven, from « appropriation by Jews » .

This is not to say that the Nazis completely ignored Schubert's work. To the contrary, although he did not hold the same place of honour as Beethoven, he was recognized as an Aryan and an important composer of « Hausmusik » , a genre ironically valued by the Nazis for 2 reasons : 1st, it resisted certain aspects of modernity that were equated with American culture (136) - government support of « Hausmusik » functioned to appease « Blood-and-Soil » purists, who objected to false mechanical progress and confirmed the greatness of the genre's German composers ; 2nd, « Hausmusik » allowed the Nazis to infiltrate domestic life, influencing the private as well as the public spheres and nurturing the family, exalted as the « germ cell » of the nation in Nazi thinking. (137) Schubert was useful in this scheme, as the regime's 1940 « Hausmusik » event dedicated to his work demonstrates. (138)

Schubert also had value as the annexation of Austria approached. The « Anschluß » of Austria, in 1938, was a distinct challenge for Germany, with doubts about the union lingering on both sides. Many Germans were suspicious of Austria and its cosmopolitanism and wanted to unite only with Austrians of what they considered complementary belief and style, if such a group even existed. In short, they saw Austria's culture and heritage as too irreconcilable with Germany's to warrant unity, despite the fact that both countries shared the same language. (139) The main task of resolving these doubts fell upon German historians, who endeavored to overcome the « kleindeutsch » historiography, which implied Austria's separateness. German education also changed to accommodate the annexation, emphasizing Austria's great men and its culture as they contributed to Germany. (140) This re-education was at the heart of Anton Bruckner's induction, on the eve of Austria's annexation, in 1937, into Regensburg's « Walhalla » , a replica of the Parthenon completed under the auspices of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, in 1841, to honour Germany's cultural Masters. (141) Schubert's induction, 7 years earlier, on the 100th Anniversary of his death, lacked the same level of political fanfare and exploitation. However, Schubert, like Bruckner, did play a role in political strategies preceding and following the annexation of Austria. Writings about Schubert reflect German scholars' efforts to make Schubert worthy of his membership in the German pantheon.

In 1939, Richard Benz attempted to distance Schubert from the so-called femininity of lyrical genres by positing his lieder as an outgrowth of absolute instrumental music. He wrote :

« The Schubertian lied is not the natural lied of the " Volk ", though it carries all its magnificence - it was born from absolute music, from instrumental music. » (142)

The film « Drei Mädel um Schubert » , produced under Nazi auspices, in 1936, was also meant to « set the record

straight » (143) , amending Schubert's life as presented in « Dreimäderlhaus » , the 1916 Operetta by Heinrich Berté, a Jew. In 1934, Karl Hasse had attacked the Operetta as a « commercial exploitation of falsified or distorted anecdotes » (« geschäftliche Ausbeutung von gefälschten oder verzerrten Anekdoten ») in his article « Franz Schubert » (144) , and Richard Benz had denounced it in his « Die ewigen Meister » as « blasphemy » . (145) According to Benz, the specific offense perpetrated by Berté was the propagation of a popular, but extremely flawed, picture of Schubert as a sentimental Viennese aesthete whose music was inspired by the « Wiener Wald » and the Biedermeier movement. (146)

This re-education was particularly valuable in the case of Schubert. The Nazis, and Germans in general, recognized the power of music as a means of unification. (147) For example, when German troops marched into Yugoslavia, on 8 April 1941, to rejoin those regions which had once belonged to the « Reich » 's province of Styria, Adolf Hitler ordered the Styrian District Commissioner « Ueberreither » to « Make this land German again, for me. » . The commissioner responded by creating music schools, which disseminated German music, anchored young citizens in the German tradition, and ensured future stability and continuity. (148) The Nazis recognized music's ability to aid in the imagining of a nation, to borrow Benedict Anderson's term (149) , creating imagined cohesion by sonically indexing a common past and place. Schubert was useful, in this regard, as a shared sonic symbol, and his music could be appropriated to serve the construction of a Greater Germany.

Conclusions

The initiative taken by the Nazis to define musical identity and influence musical taste was, therefore, complicated in the case of Schubert. But within the League, he rivaled Beethoven in significance. Several explanations, as we have seen, account for his prominence : factors within Schubert's reception history contributed to his appeal, among them, the image of Schubert as outsider or stranger, and the intimate quality of his music, which allowed members to turn inward during a shared musical experience. In this regard, Schubert's popularity derived from League members' need for reflection and emotional release. More instructive, however, is the fact that Schubert achieved this popularity through interconnected factors relating to his multi-faceted association with Jewish, German, and Austrian communities. That is to say, the Nazis allowed Schubert to flourish longer in the League than Beethoven because he was Austrian, and League organizers were attracted to his music, which most considered both German and Jewish.

This latter explanation signals one more challenge, beyond Nazi restrictions, that undermined the League's process of repertoire selection. Though nationality and race were to guide the League organizers' musical programming, this criterion was hardly expedient in practice. The composers themselves (their lives, music, and reception history) confounded the already complex, discursive, and heavily performed debate about Jewish music and repertoire formation in the League. How could the League define « Jewish music » and « German music » and select their repertoire accordingly, when the nationality of composers could, as in the case of Schubert, concurrently represent Austrian, German, and Jewish loyalties ?

This complicated question undermines the very foundation of the League as an organization dedicated to the propagation of a distinct national music. However, it also exposes music's flexibility and fluidity in reception, which

League organizers could exploit in their negotiations with the Nazis and in their search for an appropriate national repertoire. With Schubert's varied national appeal, League administrators could harness the music (both Jewish and German) of a single composer to meet the needs of its diverse constituency. In this way, music reception (in particular, how it is able to subvert and sustain ideas of national music) was, in many ways, both a blessing and a curse to the musical activities of the Berlin Jewish Culture League.

Foot-notes

Lily E. Hirsch is visiting assistant professor of music at Cleveland State University. She received her Ph.D. in musicology from Duke University, in 2006. She has published articles in « Philomusica » and the « Journal of Popular Music Studies » , and has presented papers at the national conferences of both the American Musicological Society and the Society for Ethnomusicology. She is currently working on a book on the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » for the University of Michigan Press.

My sincere thanks to Bryan Gilliam, Susan Youens, Joy Calico, and Christopher Gibbs for their invaluable comments on this article. I am grateful to the Leo Baeck Institute, New York ; Wiener Library, London ; « Akademie der Künste » , Berlin ; and « Centrum Judaicum Archiv » , Berlin. I would also like to acknowledge R. Larry Todd, Ruth HaCohen, Eric Meyers, and Orin Starn for their contributions to my work on the Jewish Culture League.

(1) See : Julius Bab's 1939 « Leben und Tod des deutschen Judentums » , edited by Klaus Siebenhaar, Argon Verlag, Berlin (1988) ; page 106. See also : « Germans No More : Accounts of Jewish Everyday Life, 1933-1938 » , edited by Margaret Limberg and Hubert Rübsaat, translated by Alan Nothnagle, Berghahn Books, New York (2006) , page 183.

(2) « Meine Idee, einen juedischen Kulturkreis zu gruenden, basierte ich auf sehr einfache Zahlen ; zur Zeit lebten 175.000 Juden allein in Berlin, viele andere Grosstaedte hatten prozentuell aehnliche Konzentrationen. Ich rechnete mir aus, daß eine Stadt von 175.000 Einwohnern eigenes Theater, Oper, Sinfonieorchester, Museen, Vortraege, ja sogar eine Hochschule erhalten koenne, und dies mit den oekonomischen Verhaeltnissen einer Mittelstadt. » . Ken (Kurt) Baumann, « Memoiren » , unpublished typescript, Leo Baeck Institute, New York, page 27. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

(3) Sylvia Rogge-Gau. « Die doppelte Wurzel des Daseins : Julius Bab und der Jüdische Kulturbund Berlin » , Metropol Verlag, Berlin (1999) , page 60.

(4) 2 unpublished versions of the plan for the foundation of the League have been preserved : a hand-written version by Kurt Baumann, and a typescript entitled « Plan to Establish a German-Jewish “ Kulturbund ” with Its Own Teachers, Concerts, and Lectures » (« Plan zur Errichtung eines Deutsch-Jüdischen Kulturbundes mit eigenem Theater, eigenen Konzerten und Vorträgen ») , which is signed by Baumann and Singer. Both drafts provide a timeline, cost and salary estimates, and the organizational structure of the different departments (Opera, Theatre, Concert, and Lecture) . The typescript also lists possible repertoire choices. Copies of both versions are available in the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » Collection, Leo Baeck Institute, New York.

(5) The Jewish leaders involved, at this early stage, included Berlin's chief rabbi, Leo Baeck, journalist Werner Levie, theatre critic Julius Bab, and conductor Joseph Rosenstock, who the Nazis had removed from his post as music director of the National Theatre, in Mannheim. See : Fred K. Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » , Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt (1982) , page 79.

(6) Hinkel's position would change rapidly, in the early years of the 3rd « Reich » , in tandem with the « Gleichschaltung » (coordination) of artistic and professional associations. In May 1935, he became the 3rd « Reichskulturwarter » in the central office of the « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Culture) ; and, in July 1935, he assumed responsibility for the supervision of the cultural activity of non-Aryan citizens living in the « Reich » . See : Erik Levi. « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Saint-Martin's Press, New York (1994) , page 51 ; Michaël Kater, « The Twisted Muse : Musicians and Their Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (1997) , page 97 ; and Horst J. P. Bergmeier, Ejal Jakob Eisler, and Rainer E. Lotz, editors, « Vorbei ... Beyond Recall : Dokumentation jüdischen Musiklebens in Berlin 1933-1938 » (A Record of Jewish Musical Life in Nazi Berlin 1933-1938) , Bear Family Records, Hambergen (2001) , page 55.

(7) The 7 April law originated with Wilhelm Frick, who submitted the decree to the cabinet on 24 March 1933. At 1st, upon « Reich » President Paul von Hindenburg's insistence, Jewish combat veterans and employees who had entered the civil service by August 1914 were exempt. These exemptions were nullified with Hindenburg's death, in August 1934. Alan E. Steinweis. « Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany » , University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1993) , page 106. See also : Saul Friedländer. « Nazi Germany and the Jews, Volume I : The Years of Persecution, 1933-1939 » , Harper Collins, New York (1997) , page 28 ; and Erik Levi, « Music and National-Socialism : The Politicization of Criticism » , in : « The Nazification of Art : Art, Design, Music, Architecture, and Film in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , edited by Brandon Taylor and Wilfried von der Will, Winchester Press, Hampshire (1990) , page 168.

(8) « Wenn Ihr alles richtig macht und Herrn Hinkel pariert, dann wird alles gut gehen, wenn Ihr ueber die Straenge haut, dann knallt's, Ihr wisst das ja. » . Baumann, « Memoiren » , page 45.

(9) Baumann, « Memoiren » , page 45.

(10) Shortly, thereafter, the League was registered with the Berlin Jewish community, according to a document of 25 July 1933, which states : « Hiermit melden wir den Verein “ Kulturbund deutscher Juden ” zum Vereinsregister an. » , Vereinsregister Berlin, Leo Baeck Institute, New York.

(11) Steinberg, who later changed his name to William Steinberg, directed the Palestine Orchestra for a few months after leaving Germany, in 1936. In 1938, he immigrated to the United States and conducted in San Francisco, Pittsburg, Boston, and at the Metropolitan Opera in New York. He died in New York, in 1978. Rudolf Schwarz began conducting the League Orchestra after Steinberg's departure. He survived Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen and immigrated to England, where he continued working as a conductor. Barbara von der Lühe. « Konzerte der Selbstbehauptung : Die Orchester des Jüdischen Kulturbundes 1933-1941 » , « Das Orchester » No. 44 (1996) ; pages 7, 10.

(12) Rogge-Gau. « Die doppelte Wurzel des Daseins » , page 62.

(13) Martin Goldsmith. « The Inextinguishable Symphony : A True Story of Music and Love in Nazi Germany » , John Wiley & Sons, New York (2000) , page 78.

(14) See : letter from Hans Hinkel to Kurt Singer, 15 July 1933, Fritz-Wisten-Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin, and « Satzung des Kulturbundes Deutscher Juden » , Fritz-Wisten-Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin. Since every member paid the same dues, seating rotated so everyone had a turn in the front rows. Kurt Treitler, who as a youth was a member of the Berlin League, remembers the system as « very egalitarian » . Kurt Treitler, in a conversation with the author (21 April 2006) .

(15) « Theatermenschen von 1900, dem jüdischen oder als jüdisch geltenden Stück innerlich fern. » , in : « Geschlossene Vorstellung : Der Jüdische Kulturbund in Deutschland 1933-1941 » , Akademie der Künste, Berlin (1992) , pages 376-425.

(16) « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , page 270.

(17) Peter Gay. « My German Question : Growing-up in Nazi Berlin » , Yale University Press, New Haven, CT (1998) , page 110.

(18) The weekly newspaper of the « Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens » (Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith) supported this effort and emphasized the need to preserve a German identity in its editorials. For example, in December 1934, the « CV-Zeitung » praised the Berlin League's decision to dedicate their performance of Beethoven's « Eroica » Symphony to the memory of the recently deceased President Hindenburg. See : Levi. « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , page 56.

(19) Quoted in : Rebecca Rovit. « Collaboration or Survival, 1933-1938 : Re-assessing the Role of the “ Jüdischer Kulturbund ” in Theatre in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , « the Pre-war Years : Essays on Theatre in Nazi Germany » , edited by Glen W. Gadberry, Greenwood Press, London (1995) , page 151.

(20) Richard Taruskin. « The Oxford History of Western Music, Volume 3 : The 19th Century » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (2005) , page 124.

(21) As the « juice of life » , language (as transmitted by German legends, sagas, and ancient poetry) , by Herder's account, engaged the spiritual roots of the « Volk » . This emphasis upon language was common to a whole generation of philologists, by the turn of the 20th Century. One important work, in this vein, was Karl Sessa's « Our Visitors » (« Unser Verkehr » , 1816) , which focused on the Jews' inability to speak German properly. In this way, language was used as a test of assimilation and a means to stigmatize strangers. See : George L. Mosse. « Toward the Final Solution : A History of European Racism » , University of the Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin (1985) , page 38. In a

letter to her mentor, Karl Jaspers, Hannah Arendt, in 1933, articulated her idea of the German language as a vital element of the German nation, writing : « For me, Germany means my mother tongue, philosophy, and literature. » . Quoted in Richard J. Bernstein. « Hannah Arendt and the Jewish Question » , MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1996) , page 15. Elon similarly states : « Their (the Jews') true home, we now know, was not Germany but German culture and language. » . Amos Elon. « The Pity of It All : A History of the Jews in Germany, 1743-1933 » , Metropolitan Books, New York (2002) , page 9.

(22) Sander L. Gilman. « Jewish Self-Hatred : Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews » , John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland (1986) , page 309. See : Friedländer. « Nazi Germany and the Jews » , Volume I, page 57.

(23) Gilman. « Jewish Self-Hatred » , page 309.

(24) In fact, somewhat less than 6 % of Jewish Germans had even a basic knowledge of Hebrew. Gilman. « Jewish Self-Hatred » , page 311.

(25) « 3 Jewish Leaders Arrested in “ Reich ” » , New York « Times » (25 September 1936) , page 15.

(26) « 3 Jewish Leaders Arrested in “ Reich ” »

(27) Thomas Pfau. « From Mediation to Medium : Æsthetic and Anthropological Dimensions of the Image (“ Bild ”) and the Crisis of Bildung in German Modernism » , « Modernist Cultures » Volume 1, No. 2 (Winter, 2005) , page 141.

(28) Elon. « The Pity of It All » , pages 111-112. Carl Schorske labels this assimilation through culture the « 2nd stage in Jewish assimilation » . Schorske. « “ Fin-de-Siècle ” Vienna : Politics and Culture » , Vintage Books, New York (1981) , page 149.

(29) « Hep » is an acronym for the Latin « Hierosolyma est perdita » (Jerusalem is lost) . Elon. « The Pity of It All » , page 101.

(30) Elon. « The Pity of It All » , page 101.

(31) Mordechai Breuer. « Modernity Within Tradition : The Social History of Orthodox Jewry in Imperial Germany » , translated by Elizabeth Petuchowski, Columbia University Press, New York (1992) , pages 81-83.

(32) Roland Barthes called Lieder « the starting point of a wound, of a nostalgia » . Quoted in Lawrence Kramer, « Classical Music and Post-modern Knowledge » , University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles (1995) , page 143.

(33) See : Jerrold Levinson. « Music in the Moment » Cornell University, Ithaca, NY (1997) , pages 60-61 ; James L. Mursell. « The Psychology of Music » , Greenwood Press, Westport, CT (1971) , pages 216-217. David J. Hargreaves. «

The Developmental Psychology of Music » , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1986) , page 111. Hargreaves proposes an inverted « U » representation of the relationship between familiarity and enjoyment. That is to say, with repeated hearings, a listener's enjoyment of a given piece will typically increase steadily until, he or she, becomes over-exposed to the piece. At this point, enjoyment will steadily decrease.

(34) Historically, scholars have given no explanation for the importance of song within the Jewish community, and simply maintained that Jewish people have an innate inclination toward poetry and song. See : Kalman Bland. « The Artless Jew : Medieval and Modern Affirmations and Denials of the Visual » , Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (2000) , page 21.

(35) « Nach der Erkenntnis und den Erfahrungen der wirklichen Fachleute ist die jüdische Musik nur in der synagogalen Musik und im jüdischen Volkslied existent. » , « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , pages 294-295.

(36) « Ist die jüdische Musik keine Orchestermusik ; sie ist vocal, inbrünstiges Beten, Gesang des Einzelnen oder vieler, aber nicht instrumental. » , « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , page 294.

(37) « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , pages 296-297. See also : Herbert Freedman. « Jüdisches Theater in Nazideutschland » , J. C. B. Mohr / Paul Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen (1964) , page 85.

(38) Kravitt explains that, in the 1st half of the 19th Century, Lieder were not performed in public. Yet, they were a favourite in concerts given in private homes. According to Emelie Bittener : « Lieder fitted particularly well into the atmosphere of the intimate social gatherings. » . Quoted in Edward F. Kravitt, « The Lied : Mirror of Late-Romanticism » , Yale University Press, New Haven, CT (1996) , page 20.

(39) Alice M. Hanson. « Musical Life in Biedermeier Vienna » , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1985) , page 114.

(40) Charles Sealsfield, an Austrian exile formerly known as Karl Postl, wrote about Vienna's repression in a notorious tract on the city, published in 1828. Leon Botstein. « Realism Transformed : Franz Schubert and Vienna » , in : « The Cambridge Companion to Schubert » , edited by Christopher H. Gibbs, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1997) , page 22.

(41) See : Leon Botstein, « Music, Femininity, and Jewish Identity : The Tradition and Legacy of the Salon » , in : « Jewish Women and Their Salons : The Power of Conversation » , edited by Emily D. Bilski and Emily Braun, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT (2005) , pages 159-169. See also : Mark H. Gelber, « Melancholy Pride : Nation, Race, and Gender in the German Literature of Cultural Zionism » , Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen (2000) , pages 32-33. Gelber explains that these « turn of the Century » cultural evenings, in Vienna and Berlin, were also an important part of cultural Zionist activity and included poetry readings, music, and song, as well as political or cultural speech.

(42) Hilda Klestadt Jonas (former member and performer in the Jewish Culture League in Düsseldorf) , in a

conversation with the author (8 August 2004) .

(43) See the collected programs in « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , pages 376-425.

(44) « Mozart, Haydn und Beethoven waren uns versagt. Die haben wir dann in den vielen Hauskonzerten gespielt, bei denen wir nicht unter dieser Beschränkung arbeiten mußten. » . Meyer in : Henryk M. Broder and Eike Geisel, « Premiere und Pogrom : Der Jüdische Kulturbund, 1933-1941 » , Wolf Jobst Siedler, Berlin (1992) , page 142. Anneliese Landau also argued that « Hausmusik » was important, in general, to Jewish communities in Germany, historically, and in Nazi Germany, « in a sense recreating musical communities within Jewish society » . Quoted in : Philip V. Bohlman, « The World Centre for Jewish Music in Palestine 1936-1940 : Jewish Musical Life on the Eve of WWII » , Clarendon Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (1992) , page 91.

(45) « Denn Bach und Beethoven, Haydn und Mozart, Schubert und Schumann gehören zu ihrer Menschbildung. » Anneliese Landau. « Bring Musik ins Haus : Notwendigkeit und Wert der Hausmusik » , « CV-Zeitung » (22 May 1936) , page 7.

(46) « Kulturarbeit in allen Teilen des Reiches » , « CV-Zeitung » (26 October 1933) , page 9. See also : Kater, « The Twisted Muse » , pages 100 and 103.

(47) « Hat der Kulturbund nur die beschränkten Mittel zur Verfügung, die aus den Mitgliedsbeiträgen fließen. Der Mangel an jüdischen Bläsern, der schon bei der Aufstellung der Konzertprogramme in Rechnung gestellt werden mußte, wurde in der Opernfrage zum Gegenstand gesteigerter Sorge. Die selbstverständliche Notwendigkeit, sich auch in der Auswahl der Darsteller auf den begrenzten Kreis jüdischer Künstler zu beschränken, machte die Zusammenstellung des Ensembles zu einer noch problematischeren Angelegenheit als es sonst der Fall war. » Quoted in « Volker Dahm » , « Kulturelles und geistiges Leben » , in : « Die Juden in Deutschland 1933-1945 : Leben unter nationalsozialistischer Herrschaft » , edited by Wolfgang Benz, C. H. Beck Verlag, Munich (1988) , page 132.

(48) League audiences consistently demonstrated their conservative musical tastes, which Hans Nathan felt were « further feeding the views of the earlier Furtwängler public » (« die Anschauungen des früheren Furtwängler-Publikums weiter nährte ») . « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , page 288. According to Ronald Taylor, Furtwängler was devoted to the Classical tradition and « viewed music from a firm 19th Century platform of Beethoven, Wagner, Bruckner and Brahms » . Taylor, « Introduction to Furtwängler on Music : Essays and Addresses » , edited and translated Ronald Taylor, Scolar Press, Aldershot, United Kingdom (1991) , xi-xii.

(49) In the League's 2nd and 3rd years, there were concerts devoted specifically to settings of Heine's texts. Generally though, the degree of his popularity is difficult to assess : many programs collected in « Geschlossene Vorstellung » simply list lieder without further details.

(50) Michaël Meyer. « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Peter Lang, New York (1991) , page 274.

(51) Wolfgang Boetticher. « Robert Schumann : Einführung in Persönlichkeit und Werk » , Bernhard Hahnefeld Verlag, Berlin (1941) , page 186. See also : Meyer, « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , page 269. There were difficulties with which Nazi musicologists had to contend in the case of Schumann, such as the composer's mental illness and relationship to Felix Mendelssohn. See my forthcoming article : « Segregating Sound : Robert Schumann in the 3rd “ Reich ” » in : « Rethinking Schumann » , edited by Roe-Min Kok and Laura Tunbridge, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (2010) .

(52) Christopher H. Gibbs surmises that it was « fairly oppressive » . Gibbs, « The Life of Schubert » , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2000) , page 54.

(53) Gibbs. « The Life of Schubert » , page 45.

(54) Quoted in : Brian Newbould, « Schubert : The Music and the Man » , University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles (1997) , page 71.

(55) John Reed. « Schubert » , Schirmer Books, New York (1997) , page 40. See also : John Gingerich, « To how many shameful deeds must you lend your image » : « Schubert's Pattern of Telescoping and Excision in the Texts of His Latin Masses » , « Current Musicology » No. 70 (Fall 2000) , pages 61-69 ; Glenn Stanley, « Schubert's Religious and Choral Music : Toward a Statement of Faith » , in : « The Cambridge Companion to Schubert » , pages 207-223 ; and Walther Dürr, « Schubert's Treatment of the Liturgical Mass Text » , in : « Goethe and Schubert : Across the Divide » , edited by Lorraine Byrne and Dan Farrelly, Carysfort Press, Dublin (2003) , pages 214-233.

(56) Gibbs. « The Life of Schubert » , page 55.

(57) Quoted in : Newbould, « Schubert : The Music and the Man » , page 130.

(58) Elaine Brody. « Schubert and Sulzer Revisited : A Recapitulation of the Events Leading to Schubert's Setting in Hebrew of Psalm XCII, D. 953 » , in : « Schubert Studies : Problems of Style and Chronology » , edited by Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscombe, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1982) , page 60. Except for Latin sacred pieces and Italian songs, Schubert's vocal works are all in German, making this piece extremely unique.

(59) Brody. « Schubert and Sulzer Revisited » , page 47.

(60) Joshua R. Jacobson. « Franz Schubert and the Vienna Synagogue » , « Choral Journal » , Volume 38, No. 1 (August 1997) , page 13. A turn figure appears in measures 9, 10, 14, and 76, which is unusual within Schubert's œuvre and reminiscent of the turning figure in « Der Leiermann » , which Jonathan Bellman uses to connect the piece to the music of the East. Jonathan Bellman. « The “ Style Hongrois ” in the Music of Western Europe » , Northeastern Press, Boston, Massachusetts (1993) , page 156.

(61) Kai. « Konzerte und Vorträge in Berlin und im “ Reich ” » , « CV-Zeitung » (5 March 1936) , page 4.

(62) Ludwig Misch. « Erinnerungen an die Zeit des nationalsozialistischen Terrors » , unpublished typescript, Leo Baeck Institute, New York, page 4.

(63) « Bergmeier, Eisler, and Lotz, Vorbei ... Beyond Recall » , page 362.

(64) Kai. « Konzerte und Vorträge in Berlin und im “ Reich ” » , page 4.

(65) Eric Mandell. « Salomon Sulzer, 1804-1890 » , in : « The Jews of Austria : Essay on their Life, History and Destruction » , edited by Joseph Fraenkel, Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. Ltd. , London (1967) , page 221. The impulse to commemorate the alliance between Sulzer and Schubert endured well into the 1970's with the establishment of the annual Hermann Prey Schubert Festival in Hohenems (Sulzer's birthplace) , Austria. « Psalm 92 » was performed at this Festival, in the summers of 1976 and 1977. See : Reinhard van Hoorickx, « Schubert and the Bible » , « Musical Times » , No. 119 (November 1978) , page 953 ; and Brody, « Schubert and Sulzer Revisited » , page 57. Hanoch Avenary credits the impulse to commemorate the relationship between Schubert, Sulzer, and Hohenems to the initiative of Walter Pass. See : Hanoch Avenary, « Kantor Salomon Sulzer und seine Zeit : Eine Dokumentation » , Jan Thorbecke Verlag, Hohenems (1985) , page 192.

(66) Abraham Wolf Binder. « Studies in Jewish Music : Collected Writings of Abraham Wolf Binder » , edited by Irene Heskes, Bloch Publishing Company, New York (1971) , page 74. Binder also describes Schubert as Sulzer's close friend (page 284) , as does Aron Marko Rothmüller, in his : « The Music of the Jews : An Historical Appreciation » , Beechhurst Press, New York (1954) , page 104. The League performed 2 compositions by Aron Marko Rothmüller, and he is mentioned in a speech at the Jewish Culture League Conference. See : « Geschlossene Vorstellung » , page 290.

(67) Recounting what is most likely a myth, Holde explained that after asking Sulzer to sing his song « Der Wanderer » , 3 times in succession, Schubert allegedly exclaimed : « It's only now that I understand my own music and what I felt when I set the words : “ Ich wandere still, bin wenig froh, und immer fragt der Seufzer, wo ? ” » . Artur Holde, « Jews in Music : From the Age of Enlightenment to the Present » , Philosophical Library, New York (1959) , pages 17-18.

(68) See : Malcolm Miller. « Salomon Sulzer : A Centenary Observed » , « The Musical Times » , Volume 132, No. 1775 (January 1991) , page 730 ; and Rothmüller. « The Music of the Jews » , pages 103-105.

(69) Thomas Eisner. « Fritz Busch : A Friend Remembered » , « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 85, No. 3 (2001) , page 458. See also : Kater. « The Twisted Muse » , pages 120-125.

(70) « Statements of Faith » , New York « Times » (22 March 1942) , section X, page 7. Emphasis added in the 3rd line by this author.

(71) Birnbaum was born in 1855 and became a composer, scholar, and long-time cantor in Koenigsberg.

(72) Eduard Birnbaum. « Franz Schubert as a Composer of Synagogue Music », translated from « *Allgemeinzeitung des Judentums* » (1898) , in : « Contributions to A Historical Study of Jewish Music » , edited by Eric Werner, Ktav Publishing House, Inc. , New York (1976) , pages 91-103. Even today, « Psalm 92 » is performed in this context, most memorably at « The Papal Concert to Commemorate the Holocaust » , held on 7 April 1997, at the Vatican. The concert was conceived and organized by Pope John Paul II and the conductor Gilbert Levine to honour the victims of the Holocaust and to celebrate the Vatican's recognition of the State of Israel. In addition to « Psalm 92 » , the concert included Max Bruch's « Kol Nidre » , Leonard Bernstein's Symphony No. 2, « Chichester Psalms » , and excerpts from his « Kaddish » , and Beethoven's Symphony No. 9, 3rd movement. Gilbert Levin, conductor, « Papal Concert to Commemorate the Holocaust » , Rhino Records Inc. , Los Angeles, CA (1997) .

(73) Stadler (1748-1833) was a Benedictine monk at Melk, Austria. He settled in Vienna, in 1796. Schubert slightly altered Stadler's melody, harmony, and rhythm (Hoorickx : « Schubert and the Bible » , page 954) .

(74) K. H. Strange and R. G. E. Sandbach. « Psalm 23 : An Anthology » , The Saint-Andrew Press, Edinburgh (1969) , page 18.

(75) In the German rendition of the Psalm, which Schubert set, the familiar « Du » is used when the speaker addresses God, further emphasizing the comfort of this final sanctuary : « Er führt mich auf rechtem Steige zu seines Namens Ruhm. Und wall' ich auch im Todesschatten Thale, so wall' ich ohne Furcht, denn Du beschüttest mich. » , text of Franz Schubert's « Der 23. Psalm » , in : « Complete Works : Breitkopf & Härtel Critical Edition of 1884-1897 » , Volume 12, Dover Publications, Inc. , New York (1995) . For translation, see : « The Lord is Our Shepherd » .

(76) Felix used Moses' translations only once in early Psalm exercises of 1821. See : R. Larry Todd. « Mendelssohn : A Life in Music » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003) , page 56.

(77) Todd. « Mendelssohn » , page 469 ; and Lily E. Hirsch. « Felix Mendelssohn's Psalm 100 Reconsidered » , « Philomusica » (2004-2005) .

(78) « Man hat sich oft gefragt, weshalb Schubert wohl für diesen Psalm auf Moses Mendelssohns deutsche Übersetzung zurückgegriffen hat, die doch eigentlich für die jüdischen Gemeinden (wenn auch nicht unmittelbar für die Synagogen) bestimmt war. » Walther Dürr. « Gott ist mein Hirte (D. 706) : Schuberts Vertonung des 23. Psalms in der Übersetzung von Moses Mendelsohn » , « Württembergische Blätter für Kirchenmusik » , Volume 57, No. 5 (1990) , page 172.

(79) « Eine der modernsten und im Streit der Konfessionen unbelastete Übersetzung. » Dürr. « Gott ist mein Hirte » , page 172.

(80) This work may have been intended for Schubert's concert of 26 March 1828, which consisted entirely of his own compositions. Brown concludes that its exclusion from the event suggests that it was not ready in time. Maurice J. E. Brown. « Schubert : A Critical Biography » , Macmillan & Co. Ltd. , London (1958) , pages 283-284.

(81) Kater explains that the Nazi definition of Jewish music was extended to « libretti written by Jewish authors, a strong line from the Old Testament, or the works of any Jewish or baptized Jewish composers » . Kater. « The Twisted Muse » , page 101. For information on the League's appropriation of Händel, see : « Händel, Verdi, and National Pride » , in : Lily E. Hirsch, « Imagining “ Jewish Music ” in Nazi Germany : The Berlin “ Jüdischer Kulturbund ” and Musical Politics, 1933-1941 » , Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University (2006) , pages 158-206.

(82) See : David B. Dennis. « Beethoven in German Politics, 1870-1989 » , Yale University, New Haven, CT (1996) , page 19.

(83) Christopher H. Gibbs. « “ Poor Schubert ” : Images and Legends of the Composer » , in : « The Cambridge Companion to Schubert » , page 37. Gibbs relates this phenomenon to the post-Freudian concept of « transference » and « the unusually intimate nature » of Schubert's music, which deepens a listener's engagement with Schubert and his music. See : Gibbs. « The Life of Schubert » , pages 186-187.

(84) Gibbs. « “ Poor Schubert ” : Images and Legends of the Composer » , page 46.

(85) « Franz Schubert : Briefe und Schriften » , Brüder Hollinek, Vienna (1954) , page 2. Translated in : « Franz Schubert's Letters and Other Writings » , edited by Otto Erich Deutsch, translated by Venetia Savile, Books for Libraries Press, New York (1928) , page 24.

(86) Popular film versions of Heinrich Berté's Operetta also spread the image of Schubert as neglected and meek. See : Gibbs. « The Life of Schubert » , pages 19-20.

(87) Alexander Stillmark. « “ Es war alles gut und erfüllt ” : Rudolf Hans Bartsch's “ Schwammerl ” and the Making of the Schubert Myth » , in : « The Biedermeier and Beyond » , edited by Ian F. Roe, Peter Lang, New York (1999) , page 230.

(88) Gibbs sees this phrase (« zu früh verblichener genialer Tonsetzer ») as the most common phrase in works appearing in the decade following Schubert's death. Gibbs. « “ Poor Schubert ” : Images and Legends of the Composer » , page 43.

(89) Oscar Bie. « Schubert, the Man » , translated by Jean Starr Untermayer, Dodd, Mead & Company, New York (1928) , page 1.

(90) The Symphony was written in 1825-1826, but revised before August 1827, when the orchestral parts were created. See : Paul Badura-Skoda. « Possibilities and Limitations of Stylistic Criticism in the Dating of Schubert's “ Great ” C Major Symphony » , in : « Schubert Studies » , page 187.

(91) « Er schrieb sie ein halbes Jahr vor seinem Tode, als müßten noch alle ungesungen Lieder vor dem großen

unerbittlichen Schweigen ausgesungen werden. » Anneliese Landau. « Beginn der 2. Konzertwinters » , in the October 1934 League's program, « Jüdischer Kulturbund Sammlung » , « Akademie der Künste » , Berlin, page 8.

(92) See : L. Michaël Griffel. « Schubert's Orchestral Music : “ Striving after the Highest in Art ” » , in : « The Cambridge Companion to Schubert » , page 204.

(93) Anneliese Landau, speech, unpublished typescript, « Anneliese Landau Archiv » , « Akademie der Künste » , Berlin, page 2.

(94) Landau, speech, page 3.

(95) Antonio Baldassarre. « The Iconographic Schubert : The Reception of Schubert in the Mirror of his Time » , RIDIM/RCMI (Fall 1997) , page 49.

(96) Joseph Machlis and Kristine Forney. « The Enjoyment of Music » , W. W. Norton & Company, New York (1991) , page 319.

(97) Landau, speech, pages 4-5.

(98) John Reed. « The Schubert Song Companion » , Manchester University Press, Manchester (1985) , page 466.

(99) Landau, speech, page 5.

(100) « Schuberts Lied, Vortrag im Kulturbund » , « CV-Zeitung » (16 November 1933) , page 6.

(101) Wolfgang Stühr credits the inception of « Die Winterreise » to Wilhelm Müller's fascination with the figure of the eternal Jew, and also his knowledge of William Wordsworth's « Song of the Wandering Jew » . See : Wolfgang Stühr. « Ahasverus, Zum Leben Verurteilt : Der Ewige Jude, der fliegende Holländer, der Fahrende Geselle » , in : « Mythen in der Musik : Essays zu den Internationalen Musikfestwochen Luzern » , Sticher, Lucerne (1999) , pages 72, 80.

(102) Bellman. « The “ Style Hongrois ” in the Music of Western Europe » , page 156.

(103) « Und er lässt es gehen alles, wie es will, dreht, und seine Leier steht ihm nimmer still ; Wunderlicher Alter, soll ich mit dir geh'n ? » See text, in : « Franz Schubert Complete Song Cycles : “ Die schöne Müllerin ”, “ Die Winterreise ”, “ Schwanengesang ” » , edited by Eusebius Mandyczewski, translated by Henry S. Drinker, Dover Publications, Inc. , New York (1970) page 209 ; originally published by Breitkopf & Härtel (1895) .

(104) « Nur begeisterte Hingabe an das Werk konnte die fast zweistündige, pausenlose Wiedergabe der “ Winterreise ” ohne das geringste Nachlassen der darstellerischen Kraft ermöglichen. » Jakob Schœnberg. « Hauskonzert » , « Jüdische Rundschau » (30 October 1934) , page 11.

(105) « Der Wanderer » was set to a poem by Georg Philipp Schmidt von Lübeck, who achieved fame for this single poem, published in 1808 under the title « Des Fremdlings Abendlied » (The Stranger's Evening Song) . The poem encapsulates a Romantic yearning particularly fitting of the League member's situation, especially as the « Wanderer » longs for a land of his own, which speaks his own tongue. See the translation of the poem and subsequent description in Reed. « The Schubert Song Companion » , page 137.

(106) I highlight the importance of the human voice in this creation of comfort and solace with Jacques Derrida in mind. He explains that « as soon as vocal signs strike your ear, they announce to you a being like yourself » . According to Derrida, through song alone, you are thus reminded that you are not alone. Derrida. « Of Grammatology » , translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland (1997) , page 196.

(107) Stephen Davies explains : « We can imagine that the emotions expressed in the music are the composer's and, thereby, achieve a feeling of communion with the emotions of another. » . Davies. « Why Listen to Sad Music If It Makes One Feel Sad ? » , in : « Music and Meaning » , edited by Jenefer Robinson, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY (1997) , page 243.

(108) Jerrold Levinson. « Music and Negative Emotion » , in : « Music and Meaning » , page 230.

(109) Levinson. « Music and Negative Emotion » , page 230.

(110) « Das Berliner Kulturbundorchester in Hamburg » , « Hamburger Familienblatt » (29 November 1934) , « Fritz-Wisten-Archiv » , « Akademie der Künste » , Berlin. This emotional response to Schubert and his music may be related to the post-Freudian concept of « transference » and « the unusually intimate nature » of Schubert's music. Anneliese Landau observed the intimate quality of Schubert's music, and credited it to its relationship to the « I » (« Ich ») rather than a group identity. Landau. « Die Dezember-Konzerte » , in the December 1933 program accompanying the League's performance of « Othello » , « Fritz-Wisten-Archiv » , « Akademie der Künste » , Berlin, page 14. Richard Taruskin made a similar observation in his discussion of the solitary « I » at work in Schubert's music, versus the big « We » of Romantic nationalism. Taruskin identified this « I » not only in Schubert's lieder, but also in his Sonatas and Symphonies, which avoid the struggle evident in Beethoven's works, and favor instead predictable tonal and thematic closures that offer « serene satisfaction » rather than « strenuous gratification » . See : Taruskin. « The Oxford History of Western Music » , Volume 3, No. 63, page 86.

(111) Bryan Gilliam. « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner : Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation » , « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 78, No. 3 (Fall 1994) , page 584.

(112) Levi. « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , page 52.

(113) « Was haben denn Beethoven und Gœthe mit den Juden gemein ? » Letter to the « Kreis I. der NSDAP zu Händen der Propagandaleiters Pg. Hickethier » (Berlin-Spandau) from the Berlin Charlottenburg « Propaganda-Amt »

(19 November 1934) , Document No. 575, Wiener Library, London, pages 1-2.

(114) See : Document No. 575, Wiener Library, London. The Nazi musicologist Karl Blessinger attempted to distance Beethoven from Jeitteles by dismissing the verses as a mere « stylistic exercise » (« Stilübung ») , and thus « without influence over the overall character of the music » (« ohne Einfluß auf den Gesamtcharakter des Zyklus ») . Blessinger. « Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Mahler : Drei Kapitel Judentum in der Musik » , Bernhard Haynefeld Verlag, Berlin (1939) , page 47.

(115) Käthe Mende identified this tendency, which she learned from the League's central office, in a letter to the singer Käthe Fischer over an upcoming performance of their « Musikgruppe des jüdischen Frauenverband » . Mende did express some confusion as to whether or not the exception only applied to lieder or could also be applied to Opera : « Es ist mir freilich nicht ganz klar, ob die Zulassung infolge eines jüdischen Textdichters sich nur auf Lieder, oder auch auf ganze Oper bezieht. » . Letter from Käthe Mende to Käthe Fischer (1 August 1937) , « Centrum Judaicum Archiv » , I, 75C FR I, No. 28, 9832, Berlin.

(116) Quoted in Guido Heldt. « Hardly Heroes : Composers as a Subject in National-Socialist Cinema » , in : « Music and Nazism : Art Under Tyranny, 1933-1945 » , edited by Michaël H. Kater and Albrecht Riethmüller, Laaber Verlag, Laaber (2003) , page 118.

(117) This association of Beethoven with Adolf Hitler is also demonstrated by performances of Beethoven's music on Hitler's birthday, in 1937 and 1938. Dennis. « Beethoven in German Politics, 1870-1989 » , page 162.

(118) Mary-Elizabeth O'Brien. « The Celluloid War : Packaging War for Sale in Nazi Home-Front Films » , in : « Art, Culture, and Media Under the 3rd “ Reich ” » , edited by Richard A. Etlin, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois (2002) , page 163.

(119) O'Brian. « The Celluloid War » , page 162.

(120) Dennis. « Beethoven in German Politics, 1870-1989 » , page 151.

(121) O'Brien. « The Celluloid War » , page 163. The Sonata changes into a March as the camera moves from an intimate gathering of « petite bourgeoisie » dressed in « Wehrmacht » uniforms to columns of marching infantrymen. O'Brien states : « The fluidity of these scenes suggests that War is necessary to protect German culture. » .

(122) Dennis. « Beethoven in German Politics, 1870-1989 » , page 162. The 3rd Symphony also had a place in the festivities. This movement is now the official hymn of the EU.

(123) Karl Hasse. « Von Deutschen Meistern : Zur Neugestaltung unseres Musiklebens im neuen Deutschland » , Volume 2, Gustav Bosse, Regensburg (1934) , page 74.

(124) Richard Eichenauer. « Musik und Rasse » , Julius Friedrich Lehmanns Verlag, Munich (1932) , pages 214-216.

(125) David Gramit. « Constructing a Victorian Schubert : Music, Biography, and Cultural Value » , « 19th Century Music » , Volume 92, No. 1 (Summer 1993) , page 72. Gramit explains that Schubert's skull, according to Kreissle's « Franz Schubert » (1865) , supposedly had an « almost feminine organization » (« fast weibliche Organisation ») .

(126) See : Scott Messing. « Schubert in the European Imagination » , Volume I : « The Romantic and Victorian Eras » , University of Rochester Press, New York (2006) , pages 8-15.

(127) Scott Burnham. « Beethoven Hero » , Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (1995) , page 155.

(128) Sanna Pederson. « On the Task of the Music Historian : The Myth of the Symphony after Beethoven » , « Repercussions » , Volume 2, No. 2 (Fall 1993) , page 9. See also : Poundie Burstein. « Lyricism, Structure, and Gender in Schubert's G-Major String Quartet » , « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 81, No. 1 (Spring 1997) , page 51-63.

(129) Otto Weininger. « Sex and Character » , translation from the 6th German edition, William Heinemann, London (1906 ?) , page 306. Marion Wilson Kimber explains that this idea of the feminized Jew appeared not only in Weininger's writing, but also earlier in the writings of Jewish scientists and was, in fact, prominent in the scientific and psychological works of the late- 19th Century. See : Marian Wilson Kimber. « The Composer as Other : Gender and Race in the Biography of Felix Mendelssohn » , in : « The Mendelssohns : Their Music in History » , edited by John Michael Cooper and Julie D. Prandi, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (2002) , page 345.

(130) Suzanne Stutman, editor. « My Other Loneliness : Letters of Thomas Wolfe and Aline Bernstein » , University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1983) , pages 279-280.

(131) Marie-Agnes Dittrich. « Kein grollender Titan : Franz Schubert, der Österreicher » , « Hamburg Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft » , No. 15 (1998) , page 195.

(132) Max Morold. « Die deutsche Tonkunst in Österreich » , in : « Ruhmeshalle deutscher Arbeit in der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie » , edited by Adam Müller-Guttenbrunn, « Deutsche Verlags-Anhalt » , Suttgart (1916) , page 453.

(133) On his 1st visit to Vienna, Adolf Hitler wrote : « From morning until late. I ran from one object of intense interest to another, but it was always the building that held my primary interest. For hours, I could stand in front of the Opera, for hours, I could gaze at the Parliament ; the whole “ Ring ” Boulevard seemed to me like an enchantment out of “ The 1,001 Nights ”. » (Schorske. « “ Fin-de-Siècle ” Vienna » , pages 45-46.

(134) Adolf Hitler attempted and failed to enter the Academy of Fine-Arts, in Vienna, in both 1907 and 1908. He also tried to gain admittance to the Vienna Architectural School. Gilliam. « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner » , page 601.

(135) Josef Goebbels. « The Goebbels Diaries : 1939-1941 » , translated by Fred Taylor, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York (1938) , page 266.

(136) Kater. « The Twisted Muse » , page 132.

(137) Claudia Koonz. « Mothers in the Fatherland : Women, the Family, and Nazi Politics » , Saint-Martin's Press, New York (1981) , page 178. She further points-out that the Nazis contradicted their ideological concern for the family with Party meetings and other social policy that actually emptied the household of its members.

(138) Kater. « The Twisted Muse » , page 131.

(139) Maurice Williams. « German Imperialism and Austria, 1938 » , « Journal of Contemporary History » , No. 14 (1979) , page 139.

(140) Stanley Suval. « The Anschluß Question in the Weimar Era : A Study of Nationalism in Germany and Austria, 1918-1933 » , Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland (1974) , page 63.

(141) See : Gilliam. « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner » , pages 584-609. See also : Albrecht Riethmüller. « Die Walhalla und ihre Musiker » , Laaber Verlag, Laaber (1993) , pages 16-17.

(142) « Denn das Schubertsche Lied ist nicht das natürliche Lied des Volks, obgleich es alle seine Herrlichkeiten in sich trägt - es ist geboren aus der absoluten Musik, aus der Musik des Instruments. » Richard Benz. « Von den drei Welten der Musik » , Christian Wegner Verlag, Hamburg (1939) , pages 88-89.

(143) None of the movies the Nazis made during their reign were about Wagner, Beethoven, or Bruckner ; they presented « hardly heroes » instead, such as Schubert and Tchaïkovsky, perhaps, in an effort to redeem them or sanitize them for political purposes, such as the « Anschluß » , in Schubert's case. See : Heldt. « Hardly Heroes » , pages 114-135.

(144) Hasse. « Von Deutschen Meistern » , page 73.

(145) Richard Benz. « Die ewigen Meister » , Eugen Diederichs Verlag, Jena (1935) , page 63.

(146) Benz. « Die ewigen Meister » , page 63.

(147) Thomas Mann and, according to Hans Rudolf Veget, « the majority of Germans » , believed that music « more than literature and politics » , had the power « to bind and unite » . Veget. « Hitler's Wagner : Musical Discourse as Cultural Space » , in : « Music and Nazism : Art under Tyranny, 1933-1945 » , page 22. For a striking discussion of this use of music, see : Gilliam. « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner » , pages 584-604.

(148) Helmut Brenner. « National-Socialist Strategies for Denationalisation and “ Ethical Change ” Through Music and their Practical Realisation as Attempted in Slovenian Lower-Styria, 1941-1945 » , « Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung » (1990) , pages 97, 106.

(149) Benedict Anderson. « Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism » , Verso, London and New York (1983) , page 6.

...

Under the leadership of Richard Strauß and Wilhelm Furtwängler, the « Reichsmusikkammer » worked to improve the situation of German musicians, especially composers. As Paul Græner, future vice-president of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , pronounced in 1934 :

« The great work of the “ Reichskulturkammer ” extended itself over all artistic professions thus the instrument was created for the application of the grand design of corporate reconstruction for the benefit of the art and artists. This refers not only to a renewal of organisation, in as much as the “ Reichskulturkammer ”, especially the “ Reichsmusikkammer ”, will watch over the intellectual and artistic life of the nation. »

In its role as guardian of the « artistic life of the nation » , the « Reichsmusikkammer » was especially interested in reforming music education programmes for youth, as well as in training young musicians. By the mid- 1930's, it had successfully lobbied for increases in State spending for musicians, especially for Orchestras ; in 1935, standardised wages and maximum work hours for musicians were set by the State, and during the Chamber's 1st few years, the number of unemployed musicians fell substantially. There was also increased support for lesser-known « Aryan » musicians, and for rediscoveries of forgotten works.

Substantial as these improvements were, they were over-shadowed by more high-profile acts of purging, defamation, intimidation and vilification. Indeed, Josef Goebbels lost his 2 flagship leaders over such « Reichsmusikkammer » initiated actions : vice-president Furtwängler (as well as Gustav Havemann) , in 1934, over the Paul Hindemith « affair » , and president Strauß, 1 year later, over his collaboration with Stefan Zweig. Their replacements (respectively, Paul Græner and Peter Raabe) were both more active and involved in the activities of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , but also far more ideologically committed to the Nazi agenda, and more subservient to Goebbels. One of Raabe's 1st actions as president was to establish a list of black-listed Jewish and foreign works, something Strauß had refused to do. The list included over 100 composers whose work could be neither publicly performed nor broadcast, and included Aaron Copland, Otto Klemperer and Artur Schnabel. Musicians were limited in the repertoire they were allowed to play ; all « undesirable » music - that of Jews and foreigners (especially, Americans) , and jazz - was officially prohibited.

The bulk of « Reichsmusikkammer » energy was focused on eliminating « degenerate influences » from the musical world. From its inception, it required all members to be registered, which functioned as a racial screening process. 2 of the most successful Jewish musicians in Germany, conductor Bruno Walter and composer Arnold Schönberg, were harassed, forced to cancel performances and resign their positions. Jews began to be systematically purged as a

centralized bureaucracy and replaced with more « ideologically reliable » people. Professional Jewish musicians were fired, and the music of Jewish composers was banned. There were also comprehensive bans on Poles (with the exception of Frederic Chopin) , Russians, French (except Georges Bizet) and black musicians. Many musicians eventually emigrated out of fear and financial desperation, including some of Germany's leading composers, conductors and instrumental virtuosi.

One of the highlights of « Reichsmusikkammer » activity was the 1938 Düsseldorf « Reichsmusiktage » (« Reich » Music Days) , intended to present the glory of « purified » German music. There was a focus on military music, but an exhibition was also put together on « Entartete Musik » (Degenerate Music) , under the guidance of Hans Severus Ziegler. Due to its great popularity, the show was intended to become an annual event, allowing the general population to experience and celebrate « Aryan » music ; the outbreak of War, however, meant that the 2nd show, in 1939, was the last. War brought worsened conditions within Germany, as funding decreased, institutions shut down, musicians were enlisted, and travel became extremely difficult for Orchestras. Many « Reichsmusikkammer » activities had to be curtailed. There was also an increased conservatism in German music ; many previously tolerated composers, including Igor Stravinsky, were now subject to a ban. But despite the War, the « Reichsmusikkammer » continued to fight for the cause of German musicians and, even at the peak of fighting, it was able to maintain a relatively high employment rate amongst musicians in Germany. There were also some new opportunities for German musicians, particularly performing for soldiers on the front. The importance that the Nazi Party ascribed to cultural activity is indeed reflected in the remarkable diversity and quantity of music and theatre offered to soldiers during the War.

...

The « Reich » Music Examination Office (« Reichsmusikprüfstelle ») was an organisation within the « Reich » Ministry for Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda whose role was to prevent the distribution of « undesirable » music within Nazi Germany. In doing so, it worked in conjunction with the Music Chamber of the « Reich » Chamber of Culture.

The Office was established as a result of an « Order Concerning Undesirable and Dangerous Music » , issued by the Music Chamber, in December 1937. Heinz Drewes became the Office's 1st director. Initially, the Office's remit was to screen all foreign music before publication or distribution but, in March 1939, this role expanded to encompass all music. As this task was too great for one bureau to deal with, publishers were only under compulsion to submit music to the Office if it was requested, although some composers submitted their own compositions anyway.

As part of its work, the « Reich » Music Examination Office published lists of « undesirable » compositions, the 1st of which was produced on 31 August 1938 and published in the Music Chamber's official journal, on 1 September. Several more of these lists were published. In practice, very few compositions were actually banned, as the mere existence of the Office had a self-regulatory effect.

« Degenerate Music » : Title Page of the Exhibition Guide (1938)

As with the visual arts, the Nazis aimed to demonstrate the difference between good « German » music and «

degenerate » music by staging major cultural events. To this end, they organized the « Reichsmusiktage » (« Reich » Music Days) in Düsseldorf from May 22-29, 1938. This week-long event included concerts and lectures that presented ideologically and ethnically « pure » music. It was accompanied by the « Degenerate Music » (« Entartete Musik ») exhibition, which opened on May 24. The show was similar in concept to the « Degenerate Art » exhibition - its main purpose was to document the work of artists who had been defamed by the Nazi regime, since 1933. The « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » (« Reich » Music Inspection Office) , which was part of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry, had drawn-up a list of « degenerate » artists and their works for this purpose. The exhibition covered all areas of music, from composition, performance and criticism to musicology and promotion. Examples of « degeneracy » were found in Classical music in composers such as Alban Berg, Paul Hindemith, or Igor Stravinsky, and in the genres of jazz and swing in general. The exhibit's main organizer was Privy Councilor Doctor Hans Severus Ziegler, who was director of the Weimar National Theatre. Ziegler was also head of the Cultural Office in the Gau of Thuringia, and had carried-out « cleansings against cultural Bolshevism » in Thuringia, even before 1933. The visual component of the exhibition consisted of photographs, portraits, paintings, caricatures, and posters intended to illustrate the « sub-human » character of the featured musicians and the inferiority of their works. One such example appeared on the cover of the exhibition guide. The image was based on the cover sheet of Ernst Křenek's Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (« Johnny Strikes-up the Band ! » , 1925-1926) , but replaced the carnation on the African-American saxophonist's lapel with a « Star of David » . The Opera had been banned, in 1933, and Křenek, an Austrian, had emigrated to the United States after the annexation of his country (« Anschluß ») , in 1938.

The exhibition remained on view in Düsseldorf until June and, subsequently, traveled to other cities along with the « Degenerate Art » exhibit. As of 1938, the « Reich » Music Days were supposed to take place annually, but they were canceled after the beginning of the War, in 1939.

Ernst Křenek

Le compositeur autrichien d'origine tchèque Ernst Křenek est né le 23 août 1900 à Vienne, dans l'Empire austro-hongrois ; et est mort le 22 décembre 1991 à Palm Springs, dans le sud de la Californie.

Fils d'un officier de l'Armée commune, mais d'origine tchèque, Křenek a fait ses études de 1911 à 1919, dans le lycée viennois de « Klostergasse » et a commencé en même temps, à l'âge de 16 ans, à étudier la composition avec Franz Schreker à Vienne. Après son service militaire, et avoir étudié pendant 2 semestres la philosophie, il a suivi son professeur en 1920, à Berlin, où il a fréquenté bientôt le cercle d'éminents musiciens, dont Ferruccio Busoni, Hermann Scherchen et Eduard Erdmann. Ses Ires œuvres sont écrites dans une atonalité libre et très personnelle, ainsi en est-il de son Opéra-comique, « Der Sprung über den Schatten » .

À partir de 1923, Křenek a vécu 2 années en Suisse et s'est ensuite rendu à Paris. En 1924, il épousa Anna Mahler, fille de Gustav Mahler, mais ce mariage a abouti à une séparation au bout de 1 an. Sous l'influence de Igor Stravinsky et du néo-Classicisme français, le style de composition de Křenek a changé pour devenir plus accessible et plus plaisant. Dans le cadre de ses activités de 1925 à 1927, en tant qu'assistant de Paul Bekker, le directeur artistique de l'Opéra de Kassel, Křenek a rencontré son plus grand succès auprès du public, le 10 février 1927, avec la création à

l'Opéra de Leipzig de son « Opéra-jazz » « Jonny spielt auf ! » . Cet Opéra qui raconte l'histoire de l'opposition entre un violoniste classique et un violoniste de jazz, a été l'une des œuvres les plus jouées dans les années 1920 et a obtenu un grand succès public. Hanns Eisler, dans un article en octobre 1927, a qualifié l'Opéra de « pièce ennuyeuse et stupide » , mais a souligné expressément qu'il considérait au contraire Křenek comme un compositeur très talentueux.

Après le divorce avec sa Ire femme, Křenek a épousé la célèbre actrice Berta Hermann et est retourné à Vienne. Encore une fois, son style de composition a été transformé, après une étude approfondie de la musique de Franz Schubert, et a commencé sa phase de néo-Romantisme, qui a culminé avec l'Opéra « Das Leben des Orest » (la vie d'Oreste) et le cycle de lieder « Reisebuch aus den österreichischen Alpen » (les 2 pièces datant de 1929) . Mais, déjà la même année, il a commencé son exploration de la technique dodécaphonique de Arnold Schœnberg, qui a influencé son travail dans les années suivantes.

Depuis l'Opéra « Jonny spielt auf ! » , Křenek était devenu pour les Nazis un « bolchévique culturel » et, après leur arrivée au pouvoir en 1933, ses œuvres ont été interdites dans le « Reich » allemand. Křenek, converti au catholicisme après 1930, avait en même temps de la sympathie pour le Fascisme italien, dont il a fait état publiquement, même s'il n'approuvait pas ses actions politiques concrètes.

Křenek a composé dans la période 1930-1933, l'Opéra dodécaphonique « Karl V » , dont la première à Vienne en 1934, a cependant été empêchée pour des raisons politiques et n'a pu avoir lieu à Prague qu'en 1938. Cependant, dès l' « Anschluß » , il est déclaré « artiste dégénéré » par les Nazis et émigre en 1937 aux États-Unis. Après la Guerre, il n'a jamais pu se décider pour un retour en Europe. Aux États-Unis, il a alors commencé une intense activité d'enseignement, la première à partir de 1939 au « Vassar College » de Poughkeepsie, dans l'État de New York ; en 1942-1947, à la « School of Fine-Arts » de l'Université Hamline à Saint-Paul, au Minnesota. En 1945, il est devenu un citoyen américain. Il a alors changé pour des raisons de simplicité l'orthographe de son nom en « Křenek » . De 1947 à 1966, il a vécu à Los Angeles et a été invité par diverses universités. En 1950, il s'est marié avec sa 3e épouse, la compositrice Gladys Nordenstrom. Parmi les œuvres les plus importantes de ces années, on peut citer sa pièce chorale « Lamentatio Jeremiæ Prophetæ » (1941) et l'Opéra « Pallas Athene weint » (1955).

Křenek a poursuivi sans cesse l'expérimentation dans ses compositions. À partir des années 1940, il travaille sur la musique sérielle, et dans les années 1950, son travail aborde la musique électronique, avec l'Oratorio de Pentecôte « Spiritus intelligentiæ, Sanctus » (1955-1956, en collaboration avec le Studio de musique électronique de la « Westdeutscher Rundfunk » , à Cologne) . En 1966, il s'installe à Palm Springs, mais il est encore actif en Europe comme interprète de ses œuvres. Jusque ses dernières années, il compose sans relâche et son catalogue d'œuvres a atteint le numéro d'Opus 242. Son travail inclut presque tous les styles du XXe siècle et, comme Igor Stravinsky, il est arrivé à une Maîtrise extraordinaire quel que soit le style.

...

Le compositeur Ernst Křenek, l'un des plus originaux de l'école autrichienne contemporaine, se place dans le sillage de

Arnold Schœnberg ; il a néanmoins abordé les tendances d'écriture les plus diverses. Cet éclectisme et l'abondance de son œuvre l'ont rendu difficile à situer, et son importance a été souvent sous-estimée.

Il voit le jour à Vienne, le 23 août 1900, dans une famille d'origine tchèque (il abandonnera l'orthographe originale de son nom, Křenek, pour en simplifier la prononciation) . Il travaille à l'Académie de musique à partir de 1916, notamment avec Franz Schreker. Il étudie également la philosophie à l'université de Vienne en 1919-1920. Puis, il suit Schreker à Berlin, travaille à la « Musikhochschule » (1920-1923) et fréquente les figures marquantes de la vie musicale allemande, notamment Ferruccio Busoni et Hermann Scherchen. Après un séjour à Zürich (pendant lequel il épouse Anna Mahler, la fille du compositeur, dont il divorce en 1925 pour se remarier avec l'actrice Berta Hermann) , il débute dans la vie musicale active comme chef d'orchestre et assistant de Paul Bekker à l'Opéra de Kassel (1925-1927) et à l'Opéra de Wiesbaden (1927) . Il connaît vite le succès avec le scandale provoqué par son second Opéra, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (créé à Leipzig, en 1927) , dont l'argument traite des amours entre Noirs et Blancs. Cet ouvrage sera traduit en 18 langues. De retour à Vienne, en 1928, Křenek s'adonne à la critique musicale comme correspondant de la « Frankfurter Zeitung » (1929-1933) et se lie d'amitié avec Alban Berg et Anton von Webern. Il fait des tournées de conférences et dirige dans le monde entier. En 1938, lors de l' « Anschluß » , il quitte l'Autriche pour les États-Unis : il enseigne au « Vassar College » de Poughkeepsie, dans l'État de New York, de 1939 à 1942, et à Hamline University à Saint-Paul, dans l'État du Minnesota, où il est nommé à la tête du département musical (1942-1947) . Il obtient en 1945 la nationalité américaine. En 1947, il se fixe en Californie mais revient régulièrement en Europe à partir de 1950 pour diriger ses œuvres.

...

The Austrian composer (of Czech origin) Ernst Křenek was born on 23 August 1900 in Vienna, in the Empire of Austria-Hungary ; and died on 22 December 1991 in Palm Springs, South California. He explored atonality and other modern styles and wrote a number of books, including « Music Here and Now » (1939) , a study of Johannes Ockeghem (1953) , and « Horizons Circled : Reflections on my Music » (1974) . Křenek wrote 2 pieces using the pseudonym Thornton Winsloe.

Son of a Czech soldier in the Austro-Hungarian army, he studied there and in Berlin with Franz Schreker before working in a number of German Opera Houses as conductor. During World War I, Křenek was drafted into the Austrian army, but he was stationed in Vienna, allowing him to go on with his musical studies. In 1922, he met Alma Mahler, widow of the late Gustav Mahler, and her daughter, Anna, to whom he dedicated his Symphony No. 2, and whom he married in March 1924. That marriage ended in divorce before its 1st anniversary.

At the time of his marriage to Anna Mahler, Křenek was completing his Violin Concerto No. 1, Opus 29. The Australian violinist Alma Moodie assisted Křenek, not with the scoring of the violin part, but with getting financial assistance from her Swiss patron Werner Reinhart, at a time when there was hyper-inflation in Germany. In gratitude, Křenek dedicated the Concerto to Moodie, and she premiered it on 5 January 1925, in Dessau. Křenek's divorce from Anna Mahler became final a few days after the premiere. Křenek did not attend the premiere, but he did have an affair with Moodie, which has been described as « short-lived and complicated » . He never managed to hear her play the

Concerto, but he did « immortalize some aspects of her personality in the character of Anita in his « Jonny spielt auf ! » . « Jonny » , his « Jazz-Opera » completed in 1926, was an enormous success across Europe and made Křenek a household name for several years ; there was even a brand of cigarettes, still on the market today in Austria, named « Jonny » . Křenek himself became uncomfortable with this success though, as his musical colleagues criticized the commercialisation of his music, and, shortly afterwards, changed his compositional direction radically.

The jazz-influenced score of « Jonny spielt auf ! » and its central character of a black jazz musician (who is also seen womanizing and stealing a priceless violin) brought Křenek the opprobrium of the nascent Nazi Party ; the image of Jonny was distorted to form the centre-piece of the poster advertising the « Entartete Musik » exhibition of so-called « degenerate » music in 1938. Křenek was frequently named as a Jewish composer during the 3rd « Reich » , although he was not, and was intimidated by the regime until his emigration ; on March 6, 1933, 1 day after the election in which the Nazis gained control of the « Reichstag » , Křenek's incidental music to Goethe's « Triumph der Empfindsamkeit » was withdrawn in Mannheim, and eventually pressure was brought to bear on the Vienna State Opera, which cancelled the commissioned premiere of « Karl V » .

In 1938, Křenek moved to the United States, where he taught music at various universities, the 1st being Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, State of New York. He later taught at Hamline University in Saint-Paul, Minnesota, from 1942 to 1947. There, he met and married his 3rd wife, his student and composer Gladys Nordenstrom. He became an American citizen in 1945. He later moved to Toronto, Canada, where he taught at The Royal Conservatory of Music during the 1950's. His students included Milton Barnes, Lorne Betts, Roque Cordero, Samuel Dolin, Robert Erickson, Halim El-Dabh, Richard Maxfield, Will Ogdon, and George Perle. He died in Palm Springs, California, where he had lived since 1966. In 1998, Gladys Nordenstrom founded the Ernst Křenek Institute ; in 2004, the private foundation moved from Vienna to Krems, Austria.

After meeting Křenek in 1922, Alma Mahler asked him to complete her late husband's Symphony No. 10. Křenek assisted in editing the 1st and 3rd movements but went no further. More fruitful was Křenek's response to an approximately contemporary request from his pianist and composer friend Eduard Erdmann, who wished to add Franz Schubert's « Reliquie » Piano Sonata to his repertoire, for completions of that work's fragmentary 3rd and 4th movements. Křenek's completion, dated to 1921 in some sources but to 1922 in his own memory, later found other champions in Webster Aitken in the concert-hall and Ray Lev ; Friedrich Wührer ; and, more recently, Stanislav Khristenko on records.

In his notes to the Lev recording, dated July 1947, Křenek offered insights into the challenges of completing another composer's works in general and the Schubert Sonata in particular :

« Completing the unfinished work of a great Master is a very delicate task. In my opinion, it can honestly be undertaken only if the original fragment contains all of the main ideas of the unfinished work. In such a case, a respectful craftsman may attempt, after an absorbing study of the Master's style, to elaborate on those ideas in a way which to the best of his knowledge might have been the way of the Master himself. The work in question will probably have analogies among other, completed works of the Master, and careful investigation of his methods in

similar situations will indicate possible solutions of the problems posed by the unfinished work. Even then, the artist who goes about the ticklish task will feel slightly uneasy, knowing from his own experience as a composer that the creative mind does not always follow its own precedents. He is more conscious of the fact that unpredictability is one of the most jealously guarded prerogatives of genius. However, scruples of this kind may be set aside once we are certain that the author of the fragment has put forth the essential thematic material that was expected to go into the work. If this is not the case, I feel that no one, not even the greatest genius, should dare to complete the fragments left by another genius. »

As an example, Křenek explains that a careful student of Rembrandt's style might be able to complete a painting lacking 1 or 2 corners but could never supply 2 entirely missing paintings from a 4 painting series ; such an attempt would result only in « more or less successful fakes » . Turning to a musical example, Křenek, evidently unaware of the surviving sketch of a 3rd movement, avers that Schubert's own « Unfinished » Symphony was left by its creator with only 2 of its 4 movements written ; of the other 2, there is no trace. It would be possible to write 2 or more movements to the Symphony in the manner of Schubert, but it would not be Schubert.

Křenek's music encompassed a variety of styles and reflects many of the principal musical influences of the 20th Century. His early work is in a late-Romantic idiom, showing the influence of his teacher Franz Schreker, but, around 1920, he turned to atonality, under the influence of Ernst Kurth's text-book, « Lineare Kontrapunkt » , and the tenets of Ferruccio Busoni, Artur Schnabel, Eduard Erdmann, and Hermann Scherchen, amongst others.

A visit to Paris, during which he became familiar with the work of Igor Stravinsky (« Pulcinella » was especially influential) and « les 6 » , led him to adopt a neo-Classical style around 1924. Shortly afterward, he turned to neo-Romanticism and incorporated jazz influences into his Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Jonny Strikes Up the Band ! , 1926) and 1 Act Opera, « Schwergewicht » (1928) . Other neo-Romantic works of this period were modeled on music of Franz Schubert, a prime example being « Reisebuch aus den österreichischen Alpen » (Travelogue from the Austrian Alps, 1929) .

Křenek abandoned the neo-Romantic style in the late-1920's to embrace Arnold Schönberg's 12 tone technique, the method exclusively employed in Křenek's Opera « Karl V » (1931-1933) and most of his later pieces. His most uncompromising use of the 12 tone technique was in his 6th String Quartet (1936) and his Piano Variations (1937) . In the « Lamentatio Jeremiæ prophetæ » (1941-1942) , Křenek combined 12 tone writing with techniques of modal counterpoint of the Renaissance.

In 1955, he was invited to work in the Electronic Music Studio at the « Westdeutscher Rundfunk » in Cologne, and this experience motivated him to develop a total serial idiom. Beginning around 1960, he added to his serial vocabulary some principles of aleatoric music, in works such as « Horizon Circled » (1967) , « From 3 Make 7 » (1960-1961) , and « Fibonacci-Mobile » (1964) .

In his later years, his compositional style became more relaxed, though he continued to use elements of both 12 tone and total serial techniques.

On Křenek's 85th birthday, the City of Vienna donated the Ernst Křenek Prize.

« Křenek has an insatiable musical curiosity and, with regard to exterior influences, he is perfectly capable of adopting the attitude : I have to try everything once. All of Křenek's mature works are cast in one mold, they are all held together by one single musical temperament. His work tends to be lyrical elegiac, euphoric : qualities that characterize this uniquely generous, self-possessed, peaceable personality. He is truly the opposite of an “ artist as egotist ”. »

(Glenn Gould, « Hommage à Ernst Křenek » , in : « Musik-Konzepte » 39/40.)

Decorations and awards

1951 : Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany.

1955 : City of Vienna Prize for Music.

1959 : Extraordinary membership, « Akademie der Künste, Berlin » .

1960 : Grand Decoration of Honour in Silver (« Großes Silbernes Ehrenzeichen ») .

1960 : Membership, « Akademie für Musik, Wien » .

1960 : Gold Medal of the City of Vienna.

1960 : Great Silver Medallion for Service to the Austrian Republic.

1960 : Membership, National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York.

1960 : Honorary doctorate, University of New Mexico.

1963 : Grand Austrian State Prize for Music.

1964 : Grand Arts Prize of Land Nordrhein-Westfalen.

1965 : Great Cross of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany (« Großes Verdienstkreuz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland ») .

1966 : Hamburg Bach Prize.

1966 : Living Legend Award by the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg.

1969 : Honorary membership of the « Musikakademie, Graz » .

1969 : Music Prize, Brandeis University.

1970 : Honorary Ring of the Vienna.

1970 : Honorary membership, Hamburg State Opera.

1970 : Honorary membership, « Akademie Mozarteum Salzburg » .

1970 : Ludwig-Spohr-Prize, City of Braunschweig.

1975 : Honorary citation for Arts and Science, Republic of Austria.

1977 : Honorary doctorate, Philadelphia Musical Academy.

1978 : Gæthe Medal of the « Land » of Hessen.

1980 : Richard-Strauß-Medallion, GEMA.

1981 : Honorary Citizen of the City of Vienna.

1984 : Honorary Citizen of the City of New Orleans.

1988 : Honorary membership in the « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde Wien » .

1990 : Grand Decoration of the State of Salzburg.

...

Even during his lifetime, Ernst Křenek, who left behind an « œuvre » of more than 240 Opus when he died at the age of 91, held quite an extreme position in music history. Because of his great versatility, critics in Europe often spoke of him as constantly changing his « style of composing » , tacitly implying that a creative life must be stylistically uniform. In the United States, however, he was deemed the « one-man history of 20th Century music » , a unique and nearly unbelievable fact Křenek lived-up to through his creation of work that spans more than 7 decades of the 20th Century, from the end of the 1910's until the end of the 1980's. When taken seriously, this « bon mot » does not refer to the temporal concordance of his works or his participation in the latest developments in music throughout his life ; it rather points to his role as a 20th Century contemporary.

In the early 1920's, when Křenek's chamber music 1st became well-known through his participation in the avant-garde music festivals in Donaueschingen and Salzburg, he was seen as a representative of « new » music - a form of music that responded to the re-shaping of society after 1918 and to the accelerated developments in technology by counteracting the high-expectations of art with humour and timeliness. A typical example of this attitude is the genre of the « Zeitoper » (contemporary Opera) , which Křenek also worked with. Yet, even then Křenek did not follow a specific pattern in working on his compositions : shortly before his contemporary Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Jonny Strikes Up the Band ! , 1926) became a smash-hit, his expressionistic Opera « Orpheus und Eurydike » , based on a play by Kokoschka premiered, and even prior to this (many years before Brecht's attempt) , Křenek had already written an « epic » music-theater piece, « Zwingburg » (1922) .

Because Křenek was not one of Arnold Schœnberg's Viennese students and was almost an entire generation younger than Alban Berg and Anton von Webern, it was not until 1930 that he 1st approached dodecaphony out of compositional necessity, but also, out of an æsthetic understanding. The agreement of his musical ideas with intellectual analysis became one of the trademarks of Křenek's work. (This agreement also had a political component in his 1st work using the 12 tone technique, the « musical drama » « Karl V » , which had already been banned in Austria, in 1934 ; it was the reason its premiere at the Vienna State Opera was prevented, and eventually also, led to Křenek's exile to the United States, in 1938.) In the 1950's, Křenek's contacts to the younger European avant-garde music scene encouraged him to begin composing electronic music, the serial arrangement of musical material and its counterpart, random operations. It was not simply his fascination with certain pieces works of this kind that utilized these techniques that sparked his interest but, again, because he wanted to fundamentally explore these new possibilities, both intellectually and artistically, it was also the new intellectual and artistic possibilities that could be explored through them.

Back in the early 1940's in the United States, he had already begun to experiment with sequence rotation in his 3rd Piano Sonata (which later became one of Glenn Gould's favourite pieces) and the great « a capella » work « Lamentatio Jeremiæ Prophetæ » - in doing so, he did not seek to push the dodecaphony further in the direction of serialism but, instead, to create a bridge to modal music. Significantly, his interest in linking this to history arose in the early years of exile, a time when Křenek feared that his loss of Europe could lead to a loss of history altogether. This played an audible role in his later works as well. During this phase, there are 2 particularly remarkable elements : the juxtaposition of phrasal techniques and historical elements (with quotations or allusions, also to some of his earlier works) and the breaking-up of the work's continuity into fragments. The one insured his compositions a place within (his own) history, while the other enabled him to reflect on them as irrevocably fragmented - giving him the ability to express his refusal to down-play the specific break in history, one of the most incisive experiences that the 20th Century inflicted upon its contemporaries.

...

A study of Viennese-born composer Ernst Křenek's prodigious output is rather like a study of 20th Century music in microcosm. Křenek moved with ease through the various æsthetic and stylistic changes that marked that turbulent Century, taking what he considered the best features of each and fusing them into a new language all his own. Born

in August of 1900, Křenek began musical training at the age of 6, and later studied privately with Franz Schreker in Vienna before enrolling for formal training with the same at the Berlin Conservatory in 1920.

Křenek's music of the early-1920's (including the Symphony No. 1 from 1921, and the 1st 2 String Quartets) is chromatically charged and rather angst-ridden ; however, a 1924 trip to France, during which he was exposed to the more utilitarian, entertaining aspects of Parisian music (and Igor Stravinsky's neo-Classicism in particular) encouraged him to explore a more accessible style. In 1927, the Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Jonny Strikes Up the Band !) which fuses jazz idioms to Křenek's own brand of tonality, made Křenek a household name ; the work was such a popular success that it eventually received performances in over 100 cities in 18 different languages.

From 1925 to 1927, Křenek lived in Kassel and Wiesbaden, serving as assistant manager of those city's Operas. After returning to Vienna in 1928, Křenek began questioning his own musical aesthetic, and, upon meeting Alban Berg and Anton von Webern, made a serious study of the Second Viennese School's 12 tone techniques. By 1931, when he began composing the Opera « Karl V » (in celebration of the unifying virtues of Catholicism, as opposed to the degeneration of Germanic society in the 1930's) , Křenek was convinced of the merits of serial composition ; the Opera stands as his 1st thoroughly dodecaphonic work. Nazi officials were not oblivious to the political sub-text of the Opera, and the planned 1934 Vienna premiere of the work was canceled by the authorities. Křenek visited the United States in 1937, and when Hitler invaded Poland, Křenek was expelled from Austria and moved across the Atlantic permanently.

Křenek divided the remainder of his life between active composition (he remained prolific until his death in 1991) and teaching duties (1st at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, State of New York, and later, at Hamline University in Minneapolis and as guest-professor/lecturer at many other American institutions) . Křenek was an American citizen from 1945 on.

In the 1950's and 1960's, Křenek began to explore electronic composition (like « Spiritus intelligentiæ, Sanctus » for voices and electronic sounds in 1956) , and also aleatoric (chance) music (like the 1957 work « Sestina ») . During the last decades of his life, Křenek scrupulously avoided all compositional « trends » and « systems » , choosing instead to rely on his own musical wits.

In 1992, 1 year after his death, Křenek's remains were transferred to the city of Vienna where, in later years, he had come to be honoured as befits a musician of his stature.

...

Ernst Křenek (1900-1991) was one of the most prolific musical figures of his time. Born with the Century in 1900, he lived until 1991 and was active as a composer for more than 7 decades. During that time, he played a part in many of the Century's significant artistic movements, from atonality to neo-Classicism and from jazz-influenced writing to total serialism, with turns to Schubertian lyricism and avant-garde electronic music at various points. In addition to his astonishing productivity as a composer (his work list includes 242 compositions) , he was also a prolific writer and critic as well as an avid educator. Virtually, the only figure of his time to have had both superstar popular success

(with his Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » - Jonny Strikes Up the Band !) and credibility as a major modernist, the experience of exile was particularly difficult for Křenek, who continued to be productive until the very end of his life without ever recovering his earlier stature.

Křenek was born in Vienna in 1900 and, like his compatriot Erich Wolfgang Korngold, was a prodigy, beginning his composing career at the age of 6 (though his Opus 1 dates from his 17th year) . A decade later, he began his studies with Franz Schreker at the Vienna Music Academy. Though Křenek would eventually break with Schreker as his music became more atonal, the composer played a major role in his early thinking about music. His 1st works are written in a late Romantic style, and already Křenek displays an almost Mozartian reach, writing pieces for keyboard, chamber ensemble, orchestra and Operatic forces (in his career, he wrote 22 Operas) .

In 1920, Křenek moved to Berlin to continue his studies with Franz Schreker, and there, he met such influential musicians as Ferruccio Busoni, Hermann Scherchen and Artur Schnabel. Though he had begun his career writing in a late-Romantic idiom, by the early 1920's, he adopted an un-compromising atonal style. In 1922, he completed his 2nd Symphony, Opus 12, a major work of epic proportions that reveals the young composer at his most original. 2 massive outer-movements, each more than 25 minutes in length and characterized by slow introductions, where ideas and concepts slowly emerge-out of a kind of primordial ooze, surround a motoric Allegro half that length, consisting of a series of contrapuntal expositions. While it has been noted that there is much Mahler in this composition (to make the comparison more tempting, Křenek had married the composer's daughter Anna just before he began composing the Symphony) , the work also stands apart from the spirit of Mahler and moves in what are, arguably, even riskier directions. Around this time, Křenek also completed his 1st dramatic work, the scenic Cantata « Die Zwingburg » based on a work by Fritz Demuth and a libretto by Franz Werfel, a Classic expressionist work of alienation and social commentary.

Between 1923 and 1925, Křenek spent time in Switzerland, where he met such figures as Friedrich Gubler (an editor of the « Frankfurter Zeitung ») and the poet Rainer Maria Rilke. He also met Theodor W. Adorno at this time, and their lively polemics on the subject of new directions in music is one of the most exciting intellectual exchanges of its time. During this period, he also visited Paris, where he became acquainted with Igor Stravinsky's neo-Classical style, particularly « Pulcinella » , and with the music of « les 6 » . Returning from France, he befriended Alban Berg, Anton von Webern and Arnold Schönberg.

Out of this ferment and virtual explosion of styles came the only work that Křenek could count as an unequivocal public success : the Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Plays On) . Combining the eclecticism of the times with a nod at a kind of « European jazz » as cultivated by Igor Stravinsky and Darius Milhaud in « le Boeuf sur le toit » , the piece was an instant hit and gave rise to hoards of imitations. Set in night-clubs, glaciers and trains, and referencing almost all the available styles of the time in some guise or other, the Opera tells the story of the lovers Max and Anita and their travels through the « demi-monde » , and especially their connection with the black violinist Jonny, who steals an Amati violin. The symbolic aspects of the tale, especially the contrast between the self-absorbed Central European intellectual and the « free man » , « Jonny » caught the imagination of audiences throughout Europe. The Opera was performed in dozens of different Opera Houses, and made its way to New York as early as

1929.

Ironically, it was the very success of *Jonny*, in particular its use of « jazziness », that made things difficult for Křenek later on. As the Nazis continued their inexorable rise to power, certain vernacular styles became convenient targets for the Nazis, and it was inevitable that « *Jonny* » would end-up being considered what some started calling « degenerate music » .

Of course, despite the runaway success of the work, it was hardly typical of Křenek. More characteristic, one could argue, was his other major Operatic work of the period, « *Karl V* », commissioned by the Vienna State Opera and completed in 1933. The work deals with the life and ideals of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who ruled Austria in the 16th Century (1500-1558) . As he did research for the project, Křenek became convinced that the Emperor embodied a kind of Christian humanism that could oppose the barbarity of current political movements. For this special project, the composer used a musical approach that was to colour his works for the remainder of his career : the 12 tone system. Though he took a different attitude towards dodecaphonic music than Schönberg, he believed greatly in its rigour, its uncompromising standards and its possibilities for further development. The Opera was due to be performed in 1934, but was cancelled and not performed until almost 50 years later as a major gesture of reconciliation.

Křenek remained productive throughout the 1930's, devoting a great deal of time to writing essays and lecturing. It was in 1937 that he 1st visited the United States. He made a 2nd trip to the U.S. the following year, and was intending to return to Austria when the « *Anschluß* » of 1938 made that impossible. Křenek ended-up staying in the United States and accepting a position in the Department of Music at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, State of New York. Despite the fact that he had been a rising superstar in European musical circles, in the United States, he was just another exile, and despite good connections, he struggled to find a position that would allow him both the freedom to compose and an environment where he could put his pedagogical theories into practice. Some of the conflicts that were to dog his career appeared early on in Vassar, where the assumption was that he would contribute to teaching music as a Liberal art. Křenek felt strongly that, even as such, it was important for students to understand the rigour of composition, particularly 12 tone composition, even if they never became composers, and in his high-minded but probably inflexible style, he alienated the rest of the music faculty and was forced to leave.

Despite these conflicts, he was characteristically prolific. His continued efforts to freshly exploit the 12 tone system and comment, through the lens of Christian humanism, on ongoing events led to the composition of « *Lamentatio Jeremiæ Prophetæ* » in 1942. Based on the biblical writings of the Prophet Jeremiah, the « *Lamentations* » is an astonishing work for « a cappella » voices. It explores intersections of various historical musical tendencies, and invokes a special musical spirit through the linkage of 12 tone and modal tendencies. In this work, contemporary style and basic principles of Netherlandish counterpoint mesh with an expressive power that is sustained for more than an hour.

In 1942, Křenek received an offer to become a professor and head of the Department of Music at Hamline University in Saint-Paul, Minnesota. Despite the small size and budget of the institution, this proved a productive time for the composer. Not only were the teaching conditions at the college congenial, but the conductor of the Minneapolis

Symphony Orchestra, Dimitri Mitropoulos, took a keen interest in Křenek's compositions and performed several of his works with the Orchestra including the 2nd Symphony (which got a frosty reception) and the Piano Concerto No. 3 (which was a hit) . Křenek also helped to found a local chapter of the International Society for Contemporary Music that played a major role in local musical life and offered many significant premieres. Despite these activities, Křenek never really reconciled himself to the region (He once remarked : « I wonder what desperation drove people to settle in this latitude. ») and, rather suddenly, departed for the West Coast in 1947, leaving a good deal of bad feeling behind. Aside from a visiting stint, here and there, Křenek was to spend the rest of his life in California, in Los Angeles and Palm Springs. During this period, he continued to compose conduct, teach and write.

Křenek's California years cannot be characterized by a single style or approach ; indeed, the period contains over 100 compositions, including experimental works such as « From 3 Make 7 » (1961) and « Fibonacci Mobile » (1964) , takes in electronic works inspired by his visit to Cologne in 1955, and includes such autobiographical pieces such as « The Dissembler » (1978) and « Spätlese » (1972) . The latter, in particular, is a fine example of emotionally intense but technically more relaxed later style. Beautifully written for the voice, and profoundly expressive, the 6 poems reflect on the joys and bitterness of life, and on coming to terms with oneself.

Starting in the 1960's, and continuing for the remainder of his life, Křenek was honoured in many ways, most appropriately, as far as the composer was concerned, through a production of « Karl V » in Vienna, in 1983. Many Festivals of his work were mounted, especially in California. His last work, a « Suite for mandolin and guitar » was written in 1989. The composer died in 1991.

...

Born in Vienna in 1900, Ernst Křenek's life encompassed nearly the entire 20th Century : he died at the age of 91, in exile, in the United States. « Exile » could, indeed, be a fitting description of his enforced stay in America - after all, he might just as well have returned to Austria once World War II was over. He did spend some time in his native country every now and again, but only for short periods, perhaps because he no longer felt at home, neither was he prevailed upon by the cultural powers that were to settle once again in Vienna. For all his successes as a composer, the high-regard in which he was held as a teacher, and the fact that he was married to an American lady, Křenek did not really feel at home in the United States either. His was a Central European fate which he shared with many other « émigrés » .

Ernst Křenek lived an extraordinarily rich life, thanks to his multifarious gifts, his insatiable hunger for everything new, his tremendous creative impulse and the historical circumstances which had a bearing on his decisions.

His autobiography, which covers the 1st 37 years of his life, runs to nearly 1,000 pages. No wonder : Křenek was a keen observer of the political and art-scene, he absorbed whatever he deemed of significance for his development, drew his own conclusions and incorporated them in his music. Also, he was a remarkable writer : he was the author of the librettos of his numerous Operas and an esteemed contributor to the journal « Musikblätter des Anbruch » , released by his publisher, Universal-Edition.

Křenek wrote his autobiography in English ; it appeared in German translation under the title « Im Atem der Zeit » . Opposite the title-page is a photograph of the 25 year old composer, with a hat on his head, a cigarette between his fingers, and a smile on his lips and in his eyes. At the age of 25, the young man boasted a considerable body of work : 40 titles, including several Operas, 3 Symphonies and chamber music, sowed his wild oats during what are commonly known as the « Roaring 20's » .

Vienna was an important cultural centre in Křenek's youth. He, no doubt, had an inspiring time, with Arnold Schœnberg and his pupils, Franz Schreker (who was to become his professor of composition) , Sigmund Freud, Oskar Kokoschka (with whom he was to cooperate on the Opera « Orpheus und Eurydike ») , Karl Kraus (whose texts he was to set) , Adolf Loos, Peter Altenberg, Arthur Schnitzler, Franz Werfel and many others to be met in « cafés » and at concerts. Mahler had died in 1911, but Křenek knew his widow, married his daughter Anna, and had as a result access to the leading representatives of Austrian cultural life who frequented Alma Mahler's salon.

Similarly to Kurt Weill (also born in 1900) , who was recommended to Universal-Edition by his teacher, Ferruccio Busoni, Křenek, too, was brought to the publisher's attention by his professor, Franz Schreker : thanks to financial assistance by the Austrian Ministry of Culture, the publisher ran no risk in taking-on works by Schreker's most talented pupils. Křenek had been in touch with Universal-Edition before, in that he did some proof-reading in return for which he was paid in kind, that is, he could help himself to scores he could otherwise not have afforded. He felt honoured as he 1st entered the premises as a composer under contract rather than as a junior assistant.

He was aware, of course, that as a composer signed on by the prestigious Universal-Edition, with an option on his works to be written in the next 10 years, his standing in Austrian musical life had improved overnight. In his « Autobiography » , he devotes an entire chapter to Universal-Edition and its director, Doctor Emil Hertzka.

He has this to say about the Director :

« At any rate, Emil Hertzka was a man of great vision and exceptional business courage. I don't believe that he knew anything about music in a professional sense, but I don't think either that this is necessary for a good publisher. He had a certain flair for values, which in that business is more than scholarly knowledge and firmly established artistic principles, and a highly-enterprising spirit. »

At 25, Křenek started to work on an Opera which was to make him famous throughout Europe : « Jonny spielt auf ! » , referred to at the time as a « Jazz-Opera » , had in fact nothing to do with the music of the American blacks, but it did have a black musician as one of its principal characters. « Jonny » was a typical product of the 1920's, and was in no time programmed by Opera Houses all over the continent. Its unprecedented success proved a provocation for the Right-wing in Austria which organized demonstrations against the production at the Vienna State Opera House. « Jonny » gave the young composer (and not only him) a foretaste of what was lying in wait for Europe in a few years' time.

Křenek was to turn his back on « Jonny » and other works in that vein to embark on a new stylistic period in which he was inspired by Franz Schubert. (In fact, Křenek was comparable to Igor Stravinsky and, indeed, to Pablo Picasso in the way he tried his hand at different idioms and means of expression throughout his life) . The high-point of his Schubertian phase was the song cycle « Reisebuch aus den österreichischen Alpen » (Travelogue from the Austrian Alps) of which he also wrote the text. The 1st version for voice and piano was followed in 1973 by one for voice and orchestra under the title « 8 Songs from Travelogue from the Austrian Alps ») . Both versions are among Křenek's most popular compositions.

In the ensuing years, the composer remained faithful to the stage. « The Dictator » , composed at the age of 26, where he « shamelessly followed in Puccini's footsteps » as he put it, is a testimony to Křenek's keen awareness of the nature of Benito Mussolini's regime in Italy. He also possessed amazing pre-science, prophesying the advent of an even more dangerous dictator in Germany. No wonder this 1 Act piece is described by Křenek as a « tragic Opera » .

In the same year, 1926, he started to work on a 2nd 1 Act work, « The Secret Kingdom » , which is, in stark contrast to « The Dictator » , a fairy-tale Opera, with a king who finds his real happiness in Nature. A « green » Opera ? Křenek himself says in his « Autobiography » that, in this tale, he wished to say « yes » to simple life, to the love of Nature and pleasure in small things ; also, he wished to say « no » to modern civilization which, in his view, led to stress, commercialisation and corruption.

A reduced version was recently prepared with slight changes in the libretto, turning « The Secret Kingdom » into a successful children's Opera.

The tale was completed in 1927 and Křenek immediately set to work on the last piece of the trilogy, the « Burlesque Operetta » « Heavyweight or The Pride of the Nation » . It treated of the same subject as « The Secret Kingdom » , but in a satirical approach, which the composer himself found more satisfying. He was inspired by a statement given by the German ambassador to the United States on the occasion of a visit there by the star boxer Max Schmeling, to the effect that, in modern times, sportsmen were the real representatives of a nation's culture, rather than scientists or artists. Musically, it was Křenek's intention to write a genuine hit, whereas in the fairy-tale Opera he « revelled in a sweet, Romantic, pre-Wagnerian idiom, spiced with some atonality » .

Křenek's next assignment was the Opera « The Life of Orestes » (1928-1929) . He turned to the ancient Greek myth and created, as he called it, « a grand Opera » , which would contrast the Classical story with light-weight, catchy music. As so often with Křenek, the work had a profound philosophical message : the peril inherent in freedom. Orestes is free to do whatever he chooses - and he uses it to commit murder. Orestes faces the judge Aristoboulos (a character of the composer's invention) in the last act and hears him expound on the notions of justification, right, law and mercy, culminating in the question « What is the truth ? » - which had actually been the question posed by Pontius Pilate. With hindsight, Křenek realised that the moral and spiritual « climate » of the last act pre-empted his next Opera, the « chef-d'œuvre » « Charles V » (1930-1933) .

« Charles V » marked another new departure with regard to its idiom : it was the 1st product of Křenek's

preoccupation with the 12 tone technique of composition as developed by Arnold Schœnberg. En route to dodecaphony, he had composed some vocal music, including the song-cycle « Songs Late in the Year » (1931) and 2 Karl Kraus's settings : « Through the Night » (1931) and « The Lark » (1931) .

He addressed himself with tremendous ambition to the work on the Opera, with thorough preliminary studies of the historical figure of the Emperor as well as of the new requirements imposed by dodecaphony.

In his « Autobiography » , Křenek writes :

« The work made very slow progress in the beginning. This was due to the fact that I had decided to employ for the 1st time the 12 tone technique, which I eventually had come to understand in its basic tenets. This sentence makes easy enough reading, but the mental agony that preceded my decision was awful, and the consequences of that decision have been, and are, of the greatest magnitude, as far as my personal life is concerned. The more I penetrated the 12 tone world, the closer I came toward making a decision as to my own active entering this world. The decision involved tremendous responsibility for, in the 1st place, I felt it was not something one might try and possibly drop, if not satisfied. I felt keenly that it had almost the character of a religious decision, that I had to sign-up for good, or never touch it at all. Furthermore, I knew that deciding for the technique meant forgetting, once and for all, about an easy way to success. At that time, the 12 tone technique was regarded as a hare-brained aberration, a sinister cult exercised by a few personally honourable musicians who through some appalling whim of fate had been misled to abominate their remarkable talents in such a perfectly silly manner. But, then, I had obviously reached an impasse from which I had to find a way out, or else, stop composing altogether. »

The elation Křenek felt on receiving an offer from the Vienna State Opera House (in the person of Clemens Krauß) , asking him to compose a music theatre piece, turned into disappointment and despair over the theatre's decision not to premiere the work. Křenek assumed that Krauß could not warm to the music, and was worried about its possible reception in the face of the growing political weight of the far-Right. For Křenek, the cancellation of the world-premiere was one of the bitterest and most humiliating shocks of his life. It was not until later that he realized his « naïveté » with regard to the political connotations of his Opera against the background of Austria shifting increasingly towards losing its independence and becoming a satellite of Nazi Germany.

The world-premiere of « Charles V » only took place in 1938, in Prague. As long as he lived, Křenek could not get over this disappointment.

As a convinced opponent of the Nazis, Křenek saw no other way out than to emigrate and begin a new life in the United States. During his years of exile, contact with Universal-Edition petered-out, and his new works appeared with a number of publishers, a fact which was not exactly helpful to the distribution of his compositions. A number of those pieces which were originally published in the United States have recently been taken-on by Universal-Edition. These include the ballet « 8 Column Line » of 1939 and the chamber Opera « Tarquin » of 1940.

After World War II, contact with Universal-Edition was quickly re-established. The Piano Concerto No. 3, composed just 1

year after the War, in 1946, is already part of the catalogue, as are numerous compositions written in the ensuing decades. Beyond works for orchestra and chamber music, they include the Opera « Pallas Athene weint » published jointly with Schott Music International and premiered in Hamburg, in 1955.

It was typical for Křenek and his insatiable thirst for new developments in music that he visited the electronic music studio of West German Radio in Cologne, as early as the mid-1950's. Years before, he had sketched a Whitsun Oratorio which he could not realize through traditional means - the studio offered the technical possibilities for him to turn the sounds he imagined into practice. The Oratorio, which bears the title « Spiritus Intelligentiæ, Sanctus » , is his Opus 152. It was 1st performed in Cologne on 30 May 1956, at a concert which also featured the world-premiere of Karlheinz Stockhausen's « Gesang der Jünglinge » .

The catalogue of Universal-Edition includes 156 compositions by Ernst Křenek, that is, the bulk of his « œuvre » . The earliest piece is his Piano Sonata, Opus 2, No. 1 (1919) , and the last one is the Organ Concerto, Opus 230, composed exactly 60 years later, in 1979.

In his « Autobiography » , Křenek expressed the fervent hope that his music would survive him and would be played, understood and valued by future generations. The future of Ernst Křenek's music is in safe hands : it is promoted by Universal-Edition, in cooperation with the composer's widow Gladys Křenek, as well as the Ernst Křenek Institute which looks after his estate.

...

Austrian-American composer Ernst Křenek is one of the prominent exponents of the serial technique of musical composition.

Křenek studied in Vienna and Berlin and was musical assistant at the German Opera Houses of Kassel (1925-1927) and Wiesbaden (1927-1928) . In 1938, he immigrated to the United States, where he taught composition at Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York (1939-1942) , and Hamline University, Saint-Paul, Minnesota (1942-1947) , before settling in Palm Springs, California.

Křenek's earliest compositions were influenced by Gustav Mahler (who was briefly Křenek's father-in-law) . In his 1st Operas, however, he turned to a dissonant, Expressionist style, as in « Zwingburg » (Dungeon Castle, 1924) . He gained international success with the Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Strikes Up the Band ! , 1927) , a work written in an idiom that mixed Expressionist dissonance with jazz influences and strove to reflect modern life in the 1920's. After a period in which he espoused the Romanticism of Franz Schubert, he began in the 1930's to use the 12 tone method of Arnold Schœnberg. His 1st significant 12 tone work was the Opera « Karl V » (1933 ; produced in 1938) . His other important 12 tone works were the Piano Concerto No. 2 (1937) and the Symphony No. 4 (1947) .

Křenek experimented widely with styles and techniques of composition. In « Sestina » (1957) , he used total serialization, in which not only pitch but all musical elements are arranged in basic series. In his Piano Concerto No. 3

(1946) , he temporarily abandoned the 12 tone method for traditional tonality ; his Symphony No. 5 (1950) is atonal but avoids serial technique. In his Oratorio « Spiritus Intelligentiæ, Sanctus » (1958) , he utilized electronically produced sound. In « Pentagram » , for wind quintet (1952 ; revised in 1958) , and in « Fibonacci Mobile » (1965) , mathematical ideas influence the musical content. Křenek's other compositions include Sonatas for harp and for organ ; « 12 Short Piano Pieces » (1938) , an introduction to 12 tone technique ; « 11 Transparencies for orchestra » (1954) ; and Operas. He also wrote several books, notably « Über neue Musik » (Music Here and Now, 1937) , « Studies in Counterpoint » (1940) , and « Selbstdarstellung » (Self-Analysis, 1948) , an autobiography.

...

Ernst Křenek was born in Vienna in 1900, and studied music in Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, with Franz Schreker among others. Deeply embedded in the cultural world of Weimar Germany, Křenek was friends with the greatest musicians of his day, and enjoyed a brief marriage to Gustav Mahler's daughter. His jazz-inspired Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » was one of the most popular and widely-performed compositions of the period, touring all over Europe and the United States.

In his early years, Křenek was not a modernist, but later, started using Arnold Schœnberg's 12 tone system. His musical alliance with Schœnberg, his brief marriage to Mahler's daughter and, above all, his Opera, convinced many Nazis that he must, somehow, be Jewish. Having already fled the increasingly reactionary environment of Germany in 1928 for his homeland in the early-1930's, the composer responded to the political crisis by re-asserting his faith in Catholicism as a supra-national religion and his faith in Austria as a supra-national State. His 1st work in the 12 tone system, the Opera « Karl V » , was conceived as anti-Nazi, pro-Austrian and Catholic. Commissioned by the Vienna Opera, « Karl V » was completed in 1933 but, under pressure from Adolf Hitler's supporters, its scheduled premiere was cancelled. In dire economic straits, the composer emigrated to the United States.

Unimpressed with the American lifestyle and cultural scene, Křenek had an initially difficult time. His early concerts were unpopular, and a teaching appointment ended in humiliation when suspicious colleagues got him fired in 1942 for his allegedly « Communist » modernist leanings. Despite the difficulties and restrictions of America, Křenek managed to establish a strong modern music scene in the small Minneapolis college of Hamline, before moving to California in 1950. Happy in the warm weather, and living in the Los Angeles area where both Schœnberg and Stravinsky had settled earlier, he secured a steady income for himself through teaching and composing. His Operas remained far more popular in Germany and Vienna than in the land that inspired his Masterpiece « Jonny spielt auf ! » . Křenek died at the age of 91, in California.

Important Dates

1900 : Born on 23 August in Vienna.

1906 : 1st music lessons ; 1st compositions.

1916 : Begins his studies with Franz Schreker at the Vienna Music Academy.

1918 : Military service.

1919 : Study of philosophy at the University of Vienna (2 semesters) .

1920-1923 : Křenek follows Franz Schreker to the State School for Music in Berlin ; meets Ferruccio Busoni, Hermann Scherchen, Eduard Erdmann, Artur Schnabel and others.

1921 : 1st compositions using free atonality.

1923-1925 : Residence in Switzerland ; encounters Friedrich Gubler (arts section editor of the « Frankfurter Zeitung ») , Rainer Maria Rilke, and Werner Reinhart.

1924 : 1st encounter with Theodor W. Adorno ; trip to France ; acquaintance with the music of Igor Stravinsky and « les 6 » ; compositional approach to neo-Classicism ; marries Anna Mahler.

1925-1927 : Assumes post as Paul Bekker's assistant at the Kassel State Opera ; study of Franz Schubert's music ; « Romantic » compositional phase.

1927 : Follows Paul Bekker as his assistant to Wiesbaden State Opera ; premiere of « Jonny spielt auf ! » in Leipzig ; and international recognition.

1928 : Marries actress Berta Haas (Hermann) ; returns to Vienna ; meets Karl Kraus.

1929 : Trip to North Africa ; intensification of life-long literary activity ; writes for the music journal « Anbruch » and for the « Frankfurter Zeitung » ; exploration of music esthetic questions, study of 12 tone technique.

1932-1933 : Finds music journal « Dreiundzwanzig » together with Alban Berg, Rudolph Ploderer, and Willi Reich ; active in the International Society for New Music ; 1st compositions using 12 tone technique.

1933 : Commissioned by the Vienna State Opera for « Karl V » ; Křenek's name put on the Nazis' black-list in Germany.

1934 : Following a Nazi-tainted campaign, the Minister of education cancels the premiere of « Karl V » ; trip to Spain.

1935-1937 : Intense literary activity ; writes articles for the « Wiener Zeitung » ; concerts and lectures in Vienna and other cities.

1937 : 1st trip to the United States.

1938 : 2nd trip to the United States ; leaves Vienna directly after Austria's « Anschluß » to the German « Reich » ; concerts and lectures in American exile.

1939 -1942 : Professor of Music at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York ; guest-lecturer at the Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin.

1942-1947 : Professor of Music, Head of the Department of Music, and Dean of the School of Fine-Arts at Hamline University, Saint-Paul, Minnesota.

1945 : Receives American citizenship

1947-1949 : Guest lecturer at universities and colleges in New Mexico and Los Angeles and at the Chicago Musical College.

1947-1966 : Permanent residence in Los Angeles.

1948 : 1st publication of his German autobiography, « Selbstdarstellung » .

1950 : Marries composer Gladys Nordenstrom ; resumes concert and lecture tours in Europe ; lecturer at the International Darmstadt Summer Courses.

1954 : Křenek Festival in Madison, Wisconsin.

1956 : Serial compositions ; study of electronic music and medieval counterpoint.

1957 : guest-professor at Princeton University.

1960 : Křenek Festival in Venice.

1963 : Křenek Festival founded by the North Carolina Music Society in Raleigh.

1965 : Křenek Festival in Minneapolis and Saint-Paul (Twin Cities) , Minnesota ; guest-professor at Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts.

1966 : Moves to Palm Springs, California.

1967 : Guest-professor at Peabody Institute in Baltimore, Maryland, and at the University of Hawaii.

1968 : European tour with rigorous conducting and teaching activities.

1969 : 1st Křenek Festival at the « steirischer herbst » arts festival in Graz, Austria.

1974 : Křenek Festival at California State University, Northridge.

1975 : 75th birthday celebration at the College of the Desert in Palm Desert, California ; Twin Cities Music Festival in Honour of Ernst Křenek at Hamline University, in Minnesota ; Křenek Festivals at California State University, Northridge , and University of California, San Diego.

1978 : Ernst Křenek Archive founded at the University of California, San Diego.

1979 : Křenek Festival at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

1980 : Ernst Křenek Archive founded at the Vienna City and State Library ; 10 city tour through the United States and Canada (sponsored by the German Goethe Institut) .

1982 : Our Thanks to Ernst Křenek, exhibition by the Vienna City and State Library ; Křenek begins to spend summers at the Arnold Schœnberg House in Mödling (near Vienna) .

1984 : Premiere of « Karl V » at the Vienna State Opera.

1985 : Křenek Festival, University of California, San Diego.

1986 : 1st award ceremony for the Ernst Křenek Prize of the City of Vienna, donated to celebrate his 85th birthday.

1990 : Křenek Archive (USA) Newsletter 1st published.

1991 : Dies on 22 December, in Palm Springs.

1992 : Transferral of remains and burial in an honorary grave contributed by the City of Vienna.

1994 : Ernst Křenek Society, Palm Springs, founded.

1997 : Ernst Křenek Institute, Vienna, founded.

2004 : Inauguration of the Ernst Křenek Institute Private Foundation (www.krenek.com) , Krems an der Donau, Austria.

2008 : Inauguration of the Ernst Křenek Forum, « Minoritenkloster Stein » , Krems an der Donau ; permanent exhibition dedicated to his life and work.

2012 : Reprint of Křenek's autobiography « Im Atem der Zeit. Erinnerungen an die Moderne » , including a version for audio-book ; publication of an anthology of eclectic texts (« In der Zeiten Zwiespalt ») .

...

1900 : Born in Vienna on August 23.

1906 : Ist music studies (piano lessons) .

1916 : Studied composition with Franz Schreker at the Vienna Academy of Music.

1919 : Studied philosophy at the University of Vienna.

1920-1923 : Studied composition with Franz Schreker at the « Staatliche Musikhochschule, Berlin » .

1924 : Residence in Switzerland ; journey through France and Italy.

1925 : Assistant to Paul Bekker at the « Staatstheater, Kassel » .

1927 : Ditto, Wiesbaden

1928 : Return to Vienna.

1929 : Journey to North Africa.

1930-1933 : Numerous literary activities, especially for the « Frankfurter Zeitung » .

1934 : Journey to Spain.

1935-1937 : Concerts and lectures ; literary activities (editor of the music periodical « 23 » ; contributions to the « Wiener Zeitung ») .

1937 : Ist journey to America.

1938 : Emigration ; lectures and concerts in the United States.

1939-1942 : Professor of music at Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York ; guest-lectures at Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin.

1942-1947 : Professor of music, head of the Department of Music and dean of the School of Fine-Arts, Hamline

University, Saint-Paul, Minnesota.

1945 : U.S. citizenship.

1947-1949 : Guest-lectures at University of New Mexico, Los Angeles City and State Colleges, and Chicago Musical College.

1947-1966 : Established residence in Los Angeles, California.

Since 1950 : Extended concert and lecture tours throughout the United States and Europe.

1963 : Křenek Festival, North Carolina Music Society, Raleigh.

1965 : Křenek Festivals, Minneapolis and Saint-Paul, Minnesota ; visiting-professor, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.

1966 : Move to Palm Springs, California.

1967 : Visiting-professor, Peabody Institute, Baltimore, Maryland, and University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

1968 : Tenure in Europe, intensive conducting and lecturing.

1969 : Křenek Festival, Steirischer Herbst, Graz.

1974 : Křenek Festival, California State University, Northridge.

1975 : 75th birthday celebration, College of the Desert, Palm Desert, California ; Twin Cities Music Festival in honour of Ernst Křenek, Hamline University, Saint-Paul, Minnesota.

1979 : Křenek Festival, University of California, Santa Barbara.

1980 : Tour of 10 cities in the United States and Canada (Goethe-Institute) .

1982 : « Ernst Křenek. Life and Work. » , exhibition by the « Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek » .

1986 : Establishment of the composition competition for the « Ernst-Křenek-Preis der Stadt Wien » .

1991 : Died in Palm Springs, California, on December 22.

...

Ernst Křenek (geboren 23. August 1900 in Wien ; gestorben 22. Dezember 1991 in Palm Springs, Kalifornien ; ursprünglich Křenek) war ein US-amerikanischer Komponist österreichischer Herkunft.

Ernst Křenek, Sohn eines Kaiserlich-und-Königlich-Offiziers böhmischer Herkunft, besuchte von 1911 bis 1919 das Wiener Gymnasium Klostergasse und begann schon während dieser Zeit im Alter von 16 Jahren sein Kompositionsstudium bei Franz Schreker in Wien. Nach seinem Militärdienst und einem zweisemestrigen Philosophiestudium folgte er seinem Lehrer 1920 nach Berlin, wo er bald im Kreise bedeutender Musiker wie Ferruccio Busoni, Hermann Scherchen und Eduard Erdmann verkehrte. Seine frühesten Werke sind in freier, sehr individueller Atonalität geschrieben, so die komische Oper *Der Sprung über den Schatten*.

Ab 1923 hielt sich Křenek zwei Jahre in der Schweiz auf und reiste dann nach Paris. 1924 heiratete er Anna Mahler, die Tochter Gustav Mahlers, doch das Paar trennte sich noch im gleichen Jahr. Unter dem Einfluß Igor Strawinskis und des französischen Neoklassizismus veränderte sich Kreneks Kompositionsstil hin zum Eingängigeren und Unterhaltameren. In Verbindung mit seiner Tätigkeit von 1925 bis 1927 als Assistent von Paul Bekker, dem Intendanten der Oper Kassel, entstand so sein größter Publikumserfolg, die am 10. Februar 1927 im Opernhaus Leipzig uraufgeführte, so genannte « Jazz-Oper » *Jonny spielt auf*. Sie war eine der meistgespielten Opern der zwanziger Jahre und ein großer Publikumserfolg. Hanns Eisler hat sie in einer Rezension im Oktober 1927 als « langweiliges und geistloses Stück » bezeichnet, jedoch ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen, daß er Křenek ansonsten für einen sehr begabten Komponisten halte.

Nach der Scheidung von seiner ersten Frau heiratete Křenek die bekannte Schauspielerin Berta Hermann und kehrte nach Wien zurück. Wieder wandelte sich sein Kompositionsstil ; nach einer intensiven Beschäftigung mit der Musik Schuberts begann seine neoromantische Phase, die ihren Höhepunkt in der Oper *Das Leben des Orest* und dem Liederzyklus *Reisebuch aus den österreichischen Alpen* (beide 1929) fand. Doch schon im gleichen Jahr begann seine Auseinandersetzung mit der Zwölftontechnik Arnold Schöenbergs, die in den folgenden Jahren sein Schaffen bestimmte.

Spätestens seit der Oper *Jonny spielt auf* war Křenek für die Nationalsozialisten ein « Kulturbolschewist » und nach ihrer Machtübernahme 1933 wurden seine Werke im Deutschen Reich als « entartet » verboten. Křenek konvertierte nach 1930 zum Katholizismus und hatte Sympathien für den italienischen Faschismus, die er auch öffentlich bekundete.

Křenek komponierte in der Zeit von 1930 bis 1933 die Zwölfton-Oper *Karl V.*, deren Uraufführung in Wien 1934 allerdings aus politischen Gründen verhindert wurde und erst 1938 in Prag stattfinden konnte.

1937 reiste Křenek zum ersten Mal in die USA, in die er 1938 nach dem « Anschluß » Österreichs an das nationalsozialistische Deutschland emigrierte. Nach dem Krieg konnte er sich nie zu einer endgültigen Rückkehr nach Europa entschließen. In den USA begann er eine intensive Lehrtätigkeit, zuerst ab 1939 am Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York, von 1942 bis 1947 dann an der « School of Fine-Arts » der Hamline University in Saint-Paul, Minnesota. 1945 wurde er amerikanischer Staatsbürger. Die Schreibweise seines Namens hatte er in Amerika der Einfachheit halber von Křenek auf Křenek geändert. Von 1947 bis 1966 lebte er in Los Angeles und hielt

Gastvorlesungen an verschiedenen Universitäten. 1950 heiratete er seine dritte Frau, die Komponistin Gladys Nordenstrom. Zu den wichtigsten Werken dieser Jahre gehören das Chorwerk « Lamentatio Jeremiæ prophetæ » (1941) und die Oper Pallas Athene weint (1955) .

Ungebrochen war weiterhin die Experimentierfreudigkeit Kreneks. Seit den 1940er Jahren beschäftigte er sich mit der seriellen Musik, und in den fünfziger Jahren fand auch die elektronische Musik Einzug in sein Schaffen, so in dem Pfingstatorium « Spiritus intelligentiæ, Sanctus » (1955-1956, entstanden in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Studio für elektronische Musik des Westdeutscher Rundfunk in Köln) . 1966 zog er nach Palm Springs, doch längst war er auch wieder in Europa als Interpret seiner Werke tätig. Bis in seine letzten Lebensjahre komponierte er unermüdlich, sodaß sein « Œuvre » die Opusnummer 242 erreichte. Sein Schaffen umfaßt fast alle Stilrichtungen des 20. Jahrhunderts, und, ähnlich wie Igor Strawinski, erreichte er in jedem Stil eine außerordentliche Meisterschaft.

Privat pflegte Křenek regen Austausch mit den führenden Künstlern und Intellektuellen seiner Zeit wie Rainer Maria Rilke, Theodor W. Adorno, Thomas Mann, Schönberg und Strawinsky.

Křenek ist auf dem Wiener Zentralfriedhof (Gruppe 33 G, Nummer 1) in einem Ehrengrab beigesetzt. Im Jahr 2011 wurde in Wien Liesing (23. Bezirk) die Ernst-Křenek-Gasse nach ihm benannt.

Anläßlich seines 85. Geburtstages stiftete die Stadt Wien zu seinem Gedenken den Ernst-Křenek-Preis.

Auszeichnungen

1951 : Verdienstorden der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.

1955 : Preis der Stadt Wien für Musik.

1960 : Großes Silbernes Ehrenzeichen für Verdienste um die Republik Österreich.

1960 : Goldenes Ehrenzeichen der Stadt Wien.

1963 : Großer Österreichischer Staatspreis für Musik.

1965 : Großes Verdienstkreuz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.

1966 : Bach-Preis der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg.

1970 : Ehrenring der Stadt Wien.

1975 : Österreichisches Ehrenzeichen für Wissenschaft und Kunst.

1978 : Gœthe-Plakette des Landes Hessen.

1981 : Ehrenbürgerschaft der Stadt Wien.

1984 : Ehrenbürgerschaft der Stadt New Orleans.

1990 : Großes Ehrenzeichen des Landes Salzburg.

Censure de la musique par le politique (1933-1945)

Political Music Censorship : Some Remarks on Nazi Music Regulations (1933-1945)

(Ursula Geisler)

How music is treated in a society is a relevant marker of how the space of individual freedom is defined. Texts dealing with what has been seen as the dangerous potential of music for society can be traced back a long time, with prominent examples since as early as Plato's Republic. (1) The imagination of the existence of « good » and « right » music in contrast to « bad » and « false » music has been used to construct a dichotomy between the « Self » and the « Other » in different historical periods. (2) This is particularly evident within the framework of dictatorships like National-Socialism. In order to secure and affirm « the moral, spiritual and cultural superiority of the German nation », music and musicians were extensively exposed to control and censorship measures in the years 1933-1945. (3)

The present article focuses on political music censorship, which, historically, has often been linked to the institutionalisation of ideological, social, religious and æsthetical principles. (4) More specifically, the present article deals with the « Reich » Department for Music Arrangements (« Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen », or RfM), the music censorship institution established by the National-Socialists after the beginning of World War II, in 1940. The aim is to shed light on how political music censorship was discursively constructed and by which means music censorship was envisioned to support the Pan-German vision of the after-War future.

Political music censorship

Political music censorship is intertwined with various aspects of a systematized assertion of governmental or majority interests. The focus and reasons for censorship change over time and space, as does the music it is opposed to. However, as Korpe, Reitov and Cloonan point-out, « censorship is a form of cultural protection and intended mass behavioural control ». (5) Such attempts to control the masses by regulatory music measures have been made throughout history in many countries world-wide. If music is censored by means of institutionalisation within a legal framework, the censorship implementation is suitable for describing the cultural construction of the society's legitimacy. It can, therefore, be relevant to focus on specific historical periods known for totalitarian structures that affected individuals' possibilities of choice in everyday life to an extreme degree. As a politically extremist government that built on mythological and racial discourses of culturally superiority, the Nazi regime, which held power from 1933 to

1945, put specific focus on establishing ways to control artists and the arts in general.

Nazi music censorship

As Friedrich Geiger has shown in his comparative work on the persecution of composers, both the Nazi and the Stalinist regime were rooted in an aesthetic concept of dominion. The different art forms (music, poetry, literature, architecture and film) were referred to by Geiger as « assistant arts » in the construction of a political « Gesamtkunstwerk ». Music, with its potential to organize people into a collective mass, was seen as especially suitable for achieving this target, (6) making this art form an especially important element in the political discourse and preservation of power. To support their attempt to establish an aestheticized political order, the National-Socialists sought to build on historic references and to continue the 19th Century's functionalization of music. The intense debates on the political and societal tasks of music from the 1920's onwards also laid the ground-work for an expanded positioning of music at all levels for the period 1933-1945. (7) On the one hand, music life (of a highly-controlled and specific type) flourished under direct support from the Nazi regime, and expanded into many areas. Examples include the Hitler Youth music ceremonies, Classical and choral music education and the Wagner Festivals in Bayreuth. On the other hand, certain music and musicians were banned and discriminated against on ideological grounds. The construction of racial dichotomies was combined with aesthetic and cultural values, as well as stereotypes regarding artistic potential. The political propaganda constructed Jews and Jewishness as the utmost « Other » to be defeated. The examples presented in the present article of the implementation of political music censorship measures, which were undertaken in the context of « Gleichschaltung » (enforced conformity) illuminate the dual strategies of cultural concessions and prohibitions. Special attention will be given to the elements of institutionalization and language.

Institutionalization

Although much has been written about the overall function of music in the racist ideology and propaganda of the National-Socialists, little has been written about the concrete execution of the music censorship laws and principles that were enforced by specialized institutions under the leadership of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry (« Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda ») . (8)

Nazi music censorship laws and orders were implemented both by the culture division (« Kulturabteilung ») and the music division (« Musikabteilung ») of the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda », as well as by the « Reich » Music Chamber (« Reichsmusikkammer ») . (9) Established in 1933, the « Reichsmusikkammer » was conceptualized as a superior organisational structure for professional music life in Germany. From a structural standpoint, the « Reichsmusikkammer » established specific offices for composers, musicians, concert life, music education, choir and folk-music, music-publishing, instrument-makers, and so on. These offices were placed at the centre of music control, and were connected as partners to working commissions, ministries, music organisations, and other associations within the « Reich » . However, although ambitious, the « Reichsmusikkammer » could not keep-up with this ambition in practice. The overall importance of the « Reichsmusikkammer » as a tool for the control of musical life in Germany after 1933 was thus intended, but not entirely achieved. (10) Membership in the « Reichsmusikkammer » was

compulsory for all music professionals, and the organization was headed by certain famous people who were highly-regarded in the music industry, such as the composer Richard Strauß and the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Along with the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (« Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums ») of 1933 and the Nuremberg Laws (« Nürnberger Gesetze ») of 1935, this « Reichsmusikkammer » membership requirement was used as a tool to discriminate against Jewish participation in musical life.

Music censorship legislation

In December 1937, Peter Raabe, the 2nd director of the « Reichsmusikkammer » after Richard Strauß, gave a new, very specific order on how to treat foreign music in Germany :

« All foreign music that shall be distributed in Germany by music-publishers must be submitted to the Music Inspecting Authority of the “ Reich ” Propaganda Ministry. It is prohibited to distribute sheet music that has been declared as unwanted by the Music Inspecting Authority. » (11)

This was the starting-point for the establishment of the « Reich » Music Inspecting Authority (« Reichsmusikprüfstelle ») as a sub-division of the « Reichsmusikkammer ». The « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » was charged with the task of « not only studying foreign music, but also supervising German production and taking action against unwanted and harmful music ». (12)

The distribution of so-called « unwanted » foreign musical scores was forbidden. The main-task of the « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » was to keep an eye on performances and on the publication of music. For this purpose, the « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » registered and examined all concert programs, and also required the examination of all planned publications - such as documents pertaining to musical education, biography, æsthetics, or theory. Additionally, the « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » was tasked with inspecting the scores that were to be distributed through German music-publishers and dealers. As Alan Steinweis shows, this order was difficult to carry-out, since the number of scores voluntarily submitted exceeded the authority's inspecting capacities. Since it was not possible to review all incoming material, the directive was subsequently modified to state that music-publishers were only required to send in works that had been specifically requested by the Inspecting Authority. (13)

In 1939, a new and more detailed decree was issued ; this ruling gave particular attention to foreign music, which had become more and more popular, and which the authorities had difficulties controlling :

Generally prohibited is any music whose composers, lyricists, arrangers, or publishers are Jews or members of enemy States (England, Poland, Russia, France ; Georges Bizet's « Carmen » and Frédéric Chopin are exceptions) . American refrain-song is forbidden, since it sounds identical to English. Prohibited is hot- and swing-music, both original and adaptations. Also prohibited is alien (« artfremd ») music in so far as it originates from Jews or Negroes, or tries to imitate negro music, as well as music with quotations from Jewish composers. All music that has been declared as unwanted by the Music Inspecting Authority (« Reichsmusikprüfstelle ») is included in the performance ban. (14)

In addition, 1 year before this 1939 decree, Josef Goebbels had made a speech at the cultural-political demonstration in connection with the exhibition of so-called « degenerate music » in 1938.

In this speech, Goebbels had underlined that :

« The German musical life has been definitely cleaned of the last traces of Jewish arrogance and domination. »

« Our Classical Masters, again, appear before the public in a pure and un-adulterated form. »

Bearing these 2 statements in mind, one might ask why it was so important to establish another censorship institution : the « Reich » Department for Music Arrangements (« Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » , or RfM) in 1940. (15)

The « Reich » Department for Music Arrangements

The « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » was established for at least 2 reasons : to control the field of Operetta and Opera by adjusting older texts to current political demands, and to place orders for new dramatic works. As Pamela Potter and others have shown, the staff for implementing and executing the different demands of the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » 's departments and divisions were often recruited from the former musicology departments of German universities. One main-task was to legitimise the execution of music censorship. (16) Music institutions established after 1933 provided different possibilities for making a career in the various music-controlling institutions of the regime. One prominent example is Hans Joachim Moser (1889-1967) who until 1933 served as the director of the Academy for Church and School Music (« Akademie für Kirchen- und Schulmusik ») in Berlin, during the time of the Weimar Republic. After being the target of much hostility from several supporters of the Nazi Party, he retired around 1933, and, then, later tried to regain entry into the regime's music-related organizations. (17) He succeeded in 1940, when he was appointed the « Generalsekretär » (General Secretary) for the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » , which was under the direct control and authority of Josef Goebbels and the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » . When Goebbels established the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » , in April 1940, World War II had already been going on for 7 months and Norway was on the point of being occupied by the German « Wehrmacht » (the armed forces of the 3rd « Reich ») . The « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » was commissioned (like the « Musikprüfstelle ») to ensure that the music repertoire upheld Nazi ideals regarding racial and social purity along with the National-Socialist ideology.

The « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » 's main-tasks were to commission new musical scores and productions and to adjust existing musical scores and text-books to the ideological regulations of the Nazi regime. The revision of music, along with the revision of the lyrics of older Operettas and Operas, were important concrete working areas of the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » , along with supporting the production of new music. Anselm Gerhard explains that Moser's task as General Secretary of the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » was « systematically to “ de-Jewify ” (“ entjuden ”) the texts of several Händel Oratorios, as well as of all of Robert Schumann's “ Heine Lieder ” , and, thereby, to contribute to the destruction of Jewish traditions » . (18) Potter gives another example of

the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » 's modification specifications, referring to studies by Katja Roters and Werner Rackwitz (19) :

« The most radical changes made to the Old Testament Oratorios generally consisted of transforming biblical characters into anonymous heroes or completely transferring the setting of the action to a historical event that demonstrated Germanic heroism. » (20)

Another censorship measure concerned composers from the 19th Century, such as Georges Bizet (1838-1875) . In November 1940, Ernst Hartmann wrote to Josef Göbbels regarding his reported discovery of an unknown Opera by the French composer Georges Bizet. The « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » took-over the correspondence with Hartmann and requested more information about « Ivan, le Terrible » , which had been deposited at the « Conservatoire Nationale » in Paris by a friend of Bizet's. As late as April 1942, a contract was signed with Hartmann, for musical editing, and with « Josef Wenter in Wien » , for editing of the text. Excerpts from this correspondence provide many details about the censorship methods in use by the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » .

In January 1943, Moser wrote to Wenter about how to adjust the Opera libretto to the current political agenda :

« Taking place in Kiev, with the “ Tsar of the Tartars ”, is politically not at all appropriate. For all of these reasons, we propose to move the plot to a very early but already Christian France ; this would fit the kidnapping of woman, the procession, and the local musical colour. This could be, say, the western Franconian Merovingian Empire, or a legendary Aquitania in the 6th to 9th Century. The Zircassians in Caucasia could be replaced by the Basques in the Pyrénées ; instead of Moscow, it could be “ Tours ”, or another “ appropriate ” city ; the Visigoths could be mentioned - the main focus would be on the renaming of the main characters ; Olga could be transformed into the holy Oda, “ Renat ” or “ Turpin ” or something like that instead of Ivan, Marie could be replaced by an old-fashioned name. This operation would have some charm and advantages because of the fresh “ milieu ”, and it would (as I see it) at the moment even be politically desirable to show the, so to speak, “ Germanic-Romanian music culture ” of what would later be Burgundian soil. » (21)

This quotation gives a detailed demonstration of the methods of æsthetic-political music censorship used by the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » . The main-ways that music could be scrutinized and altered were spatially, temporally, nationally, and religiously. The naming and titles of key-actors and objects could also be changed.

War utopias and realities

Due to the increasing pressure by the realities of the War, this project to re-cast the Bizet Opera (which was to include a performance in German) was not completed before 1945. (22) The work of the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » was seen as the last step in shaping the German music repertoire (although mainly its Operas and Oratorios) in line with a National-Socialist in age of the future European musical landscape. Through a detailed editing process, the German musical repertoire was bowdlerized and adjusted to the newly-formulated Pan-Germanic cultural needs. As the National-Socialists foresaw an expansion of German borders through the conquest of new

territories, there was an increasing demand to expand the future musical repertoire, in accordance with National-Socialist ideals. In envisioning these future scenarios there was a more or less concrete definition of what kind of music should be at the core. Moser's (and through him, the Nazi regime's) musical ideals and visions were concretised in the 1st « year-book of German music » which came into being under on-going War conditions, 10 years after the 1933 « Machtergreifung ». The realities of the War, at this time, shine through Moser's report, not only in his indirect mention of on-going air-bombardments by the Allies on German territory (« heute luftbedrohte Bezirke des Altreichs »), but also in his mentions of the new borders of the postponed so-called « Dritte Reich », which was to have taken place after Germany won the War and was in the phase of recovering and restoring territory (« Aufbauzeit »). The work of the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » was posited as being a decisive ingredient in what Moser called « caring peace planning » (« fürsorgliche Friedensplanung »). (23) What was formulated as a pan-Germanic utopian narrative was betrayed by the harsh reality. By 1944, it became obvious that the preparation and material requirements for « Total War » were so vast, and the concrete cultural production so limited, that all raw materials had to be dedicated to armament production. Moser was called to serve as a member on the « Orgelbeirat » (Organ commission), which decided which organs were least worthy and could, therefore, be melted down for War needs. Restrictions were also put in place for other materials and natural resources, such as paper for sheet music production. (24)

Censorship and language

Language has obviously played a crucial role in the legislation and discourse of National-Socialism. The Nazi regime's official language usage has also been characterized as a disturbed communication situation, (25) which gave rise to a National-Socialistic language usage built on historical contexts and sources. In reality, there was no genuinely new Nazi language system, but rather strong linguistic references to former patterns, movements and trends, such as nationalism, « völkisch » socialism, anti-Semitism, cultural pessimism (« Kulturpessimismus ») and racism.

The linguistic effects on music censorship were diverse, and incorporated the concrete establishment and usage of certain dichotomies outlining and defining the limits of accepted and desired versus condemned and forbidden music.

In Josef Goebbels' speech on the « Reich » Music Festival (« Reichsmusiktage ») in Düsseldorf, in 1938, he once again pointed to the regime's musical-political principles, which were later enforced by subordinate authorities like the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen ».

One of the 10 principles sums-up what was at the centre of music censorship :

« Like any other art, music is derived from mysterious and profound forces, which are rooted in ethnic belonging (« Volkstum »). Jewishness and German music are opposites, which by their nature stand in the starkest contradiction to each other. The fight against Jewishness in German music is, therefore, still today our major task, never to be revealed. » (26)

This racially grounded argumentation was imbedded in a framework of æsthetical and national values.

As Bernd Sponheuer points-out :

« National-Socialist ideas are not contained within individual concepts and ideological elements that can almost without exception be traced back to other sources, but within their specific arrangement and receptive embedding. » (27)

In the quote above, Goebbels states that there is a natural division between Jewishness and German music. Here, « Jewishness » and the « German » are set in direct opposition, with the « Other » to be defeated and the « Self » to be protected. This racially grounded dividing principle was the central Nazi argument for the exclusion of Jewish musical life from German contemporary musical development. It had a profound negative effect on the possibilities for so-called « unwanted » persons to maintain their participation in everyday music culture. (28)

As shown above, musicologists like Hans Joachim Moser were important for the formulation of the ideological goals of Nazi music regulation. In Moser's description of the starting-point for the « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen », the main-focus was the desire « to broaden the program of both serious and light German music scenes - in accordance with " Reich " interests in order to encourage the valuable and to protect against commercialized productions and poor taste. » (29) In 1943, Moser summarized the preceding years of work in the field of music, with one of his articles in the « Jahrbuch der deutschen Musik 1943 » (Year-book of German Music 1943) entitled : « Von der Steuerung des deutschen Musiklebens » (About the regulation of German musical life) .

Moser's use of National-Socialist language in describing the necessity of regulating music is evident in such statements as :

« The tasks of the totalitarian State are largely determined : here, what is needed is less impulse, but more protection of the weak and guidance of the strong, so that the lurking subversive seeds will not gain any power. » (30)

Moser's use of the dichotomy of weak and strong to justify the necessity of regulating music exemplifies the use of language as a tool for discrimination ; his combination of protection of the weak with guidance of the strong is completed by an organicist assertion about subversive seeds (« Zersetzungskeime ») who lie in wait at every turn, ready to take advantage of any sustenance given to them. This kind of argumentation and language use had not been invented by the Nazis, but was sharpened and put into practice in the Nazi era. The Nazi use of language as a strong tool of discrimination was exemplified in music censorship, where language was mainly used to include and exclude specific music.

Nazi cultural revolution

When the Nazis came to power in 1933, they envisioned a « cultural revolution » that would implement a national-racist ideal of German art and music on all societal levels. This message was disseminated through public channels such as the school and the broader education system ; the Nazi Party was also adept at manipulating public opinion

through media such as radio and film, mainly through the cinemas and weekly news films. Art-exhibitions were also conceived in order to guide public opinion and to emphasize the necessity and value of cultural-political censorship measures.

In July 1937, the exhibition « Degenerate Art » (« Entartete Kunst ») opened in Munich, showing 650 confiscated artworks from 32 museums (31) and, 1 year later, the exhibition « Degenerate Music » (« Entartete Musik ») followed in connection with the regime's 1st « " Reich " Music Festival » (« Reichsmusiktage ») in Düsseldorf. This exhibition was shown in Weimar, Munich and Vienna that same year, and plans were made to schedule further exhibitions in the coming years. Ultimately, these plans were not carried-out due to the outbreak of World War II. (32)

The exhibition « Degenerate Music » was supplemented by sound examples that attendees could listen to on demand. This multi-media exhibition is one more example of the technical modernisation that accompanied the Nazi regime's striving for total control of the population through aesthetic means.

The auditory and visual conceptualisations of the public sphere were also intended to extend into people's private spaces. Radio, for instance, which could be used as a direct propaganda channel to people's living-rooms, was a platform for the distribution of both permitted and favoured music. Thus, radio music was the audible media counterpart to silenced and censored music.

What is the opposite of music censorship ?

Political music censorship is a question of power relations and a consequence of the construction of music as powerful. Musical objects, subjects and expressions are defined and re-interpreted in the process of the establishment of music censorship in order to make them controllable and separable from accepted fields of music-making and expression. Through the process of censorship, music becomes subordinate to laws and regulations unrelated to aesthetics. Although the tools for political music censorship vary, one common feature is the assumption of an almost fixed and absolute Self from which music is defined and censorship of the Other can be constructed as meaningful. This positioning of « Self » and « Other » often provides music censorship with a legal framework within which to operate, although this framework can vary greatly depending on location and historical period. Music censorship is seldom a sudden implementation of a totally new agenda, but rather, is dependent on a number of known and established criteria, which serve as the conditions on which the regulations and the concrete design of censorship legislation rest. Those criteria are themselves culturally constructed. For instance, general views on music and its function in a given society will affect attitudes towards music taboos, as well as a society's treatment of individual access to music production and reception. Relevant questions relating to this issue are : Who is allowed to be a musician, a composer, a musical actor, etc. ? Which instruments and sound sources are accessible to whom ? Who is commissioned with representing social interests, and are they politically motivated or independent ? What narratives exist about the function of music in that society ?

The Nazi construction of German music, which was drawn mostly from the Classical repertoire, as well as from traditional folk-music (« Volksmusik ») , was considered desirable and given strong support by Nazi officials ; it was

hardly surprising that these 2 genres therefore dominated the radio repertoire. At the same time, programmes that included Nordic music (« Nordische Musik ») also increased. The integration of Nordic music not only broadened the invisible borders of the imagined pan-German cultural nation, but also facilitated a concretisation of the racist and imaginary German affinity to Nordic culture. (33)

The question « What is the opposite of music censorship ? » may, at 1st glance, sound somewhat naive or provocative ; however, focusing on a question like this facilitates an understanding of the complexity of topics concerning censorship. It is not only a question of the music, musicians and other musical expressions that are not censored, but also of musical freedom and of what music is actively promoted and supported. Governmental support can influence the development of musical life in certain directions, and, together with censorship measures, can have a crucial effect on wide-ranging areas of the cultural landscape.

Researching music censorship

In order to study the topic of music censorship in the Nazi era, a broad range of secondary reference literature still needs to be supplemented with in-depth archival and library research. Relevant documents can be found in the German « Bundesarchiv » (National Archive) in Berlin. (34) Some of the most relevant sources have also been collected and compiled by individual researchers ; Fred K. Prieberg's « Handbuch deutscher Musiker 1933-1945 », for example, is one of the most extensive compilations of original sources on music and the 3rd « Reich » . Over more than 9,000 pages Prieberg compiles an enormous number of original text excerpts and pieces of information on relevant persons, institutions, journals, etc. ; this contribution represents an exceptional individual effort to shed light on what is often a consciously obscured period of music and politics. Prieberg's hand-book has been published only in a digital format, making it easily searchable and, therefore, a valuable resource for research on both individual musicians and composers, as well as on larger topics like censorship. (35) Prieberg's private archive, « The Prieberg Archive » , which totals about 50 metres of shelf space, was handed-over to the Institute of Musical Science at the Christian Albrechts University in Kiel, where it can be consulted by researchers. Since 2005, the « Lexikon verfolgter Musiker und Musikerinnen der NS-Zeit » has collected and systematically published the bibliographical information of musicians, musicologists and others involved in the national music life who were discriminated against or forced to emigrate from Germany after 1933 (or from Austria after 1938) . This ambitious reference project contains more than 4,000 names, of which several hundred have already been supplemented with more detailed information regarding their biography, music production and publications. An outstanding bibliography completes this resource, providing a helpful introduction to searchable archives, reference literature and other relevant sources concerning persecuted musicians in Nazi Germany. (36) This kind of publication on music censorship, from the perspective of the personal consequences, is an important research contribution, complementing research that focuses on cultural violations by the perpetrators of censorship.

Summary

Between 1933 and 1945, political music censorship in Germany was based on racial principles ; so-called atonality and Jewishness were, therefore, the main-targets of censorship activities. These censorship principles were built on music

discourses from before 1933, using existing terminology such as Musical bolshevism, German music, and atonal music. Political music censorship carried-out by specific institutions like the « Reich » Department of Music Arrangements (« Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen ») and the « Reich » Music Inspecting Authority (« Reichsmusikprüfstelle ») was, thus, not only limited to the sphere of musical scores or text-books, but to all musical activities from « unwanted » (« unerwünscht ») persons.

For a better understanding of the systematically enforced music censorship in the Nazi era, one must remain aware of the embedding of music into the hierarchical political structures and institutions. Music underwent a crucial change during this time period, towards both an objectification and a symbolic transformation. This was paralleled by strategies of defining music and musicians in terms of « Otherness » as opposed to « Germanness » , in a racially and, thus, politically useful sense. Concrete music censorship activities were part of a racially grounded policy, which resulted in systematically enacted regulations. While Germany's reputation as a « Kulturnation » since the 19th Century had been based on the use of music mainly as a representation of nationalised universalism, the National-Socialist construction of cultural meaning employed music as a metaphor for genetic purity and superiority.

Notes

(1) Plato (428-348 BC) . The Republic, refer to : <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1497/1497-h/1497-h.htm>

(2) Theories of Otherness and Constructiveness provide relevant perspectives when dealing with questions of music and censorship. Refer to Annette Kreuziger-Herr (editor) , « Das Andere. Eine Spurensuche in der Musikgeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts » , Peter Lang, Frankfurt-am-Main et al. (1998) .

(3) Erik Levi, « Music and National-Socialism : The politicisation of criticism, composition and performance » , in : Brandon Taylor, and Wilfried van der Will (editors) , The Nazification of Art, The Winchester Press, Hampshire (1990) ; page 159.

(4) When taking a closer look at which songs, labels or concerts that have been censored, and the reasons for this censorship, since the 1960's, this linkage could even apply to contemporary music censorship, refer to : www.zensur-archiv.de/index.php?title=Musik.

(5) Marie Korpe, Ole Reitov, and Martin Cloonan, « Music Censorship from Plato to the Present » , in : Steven Brown, and Ulrik Volgsten (editors) , Music and Manipulation. On the Social Uses and Social Control of Music, Berghahn Books, New York (2006) ; page 240.

(6) Friedrich Geiger, « Musik in zwei Diktaturen. Verfolgung von Komponisten unter Hitler und Stalin » , Bärenreiter-Verlag, Kassel (2004) ; page 199.

(7) Refer to Erik Levi, « The Censorship of Musical Modernism in Germany, 1918-1945 » , in : Beate Müller (editor) , Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age, Rodopi, Amsterdam (2004) , pages 63-86 ; Ursula Geisler, « Med

sången in i framtiden. Den tyska ungdomsmusikrörelsen och kris på 1920-1930-talen » , in : Mats Arvidson, Ursula Geisler, and Kristofer Hansson (editors) , « Kris och kultur. Kulturvetenskapliga perspektiv på kunskap, estetik och historia » , Sekel, Lund (2013) ; pages 69-86.

(8) To mention just a small number of influential references : Joseph Wulf, « Musik im Dritten Reich : Eine Dokumentation » , Gütersloh (1963) ; Fred K. Prieberg, « Musik im NS-Staat » , Frankfurt-am-Main (1982) ; Hanns-Werner Heister, and Hans-Günther Klein, « Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland » , Fischer, Frankfurt-am-Main (1984) ; Pamela M. Potter, Trends in German musicology 1918-1945 : The effects of methodological, ideological, and institutional change on the writing of music history, Yale University (1991) ; Pamela M. Potter, Most German of the arts : Musicology and society from the Weimar Republic to the end of Hitler's « Reich » , New Haven (1998) ; Brunhilde Sonntag, Hans-Werner Boesch, and Detlef Gojowy (editors) , « Die dunkle Last. Musik und Nationalsozialismus » , in : « Schriften zur Musikwissenschaft und Musiktheorie » , Band 3, Köln (1999) ; Hans Grüss, Kolja Lessing, Marion Demuth, Frank Geissler, and Eckhard John (editors) , « Musik-Macht-Missbrauch » , Altenburg (1999) ; Isolde von Förster, Christoph Hust, and Christoph-Hellmut Mahling (editors) , « Musikforschung-Faschismus-Nationalsozialismus - Referate der Tagung Schloß Engers vom 8. bis 11. März 2000, Mainz (2001) .

(9) There are several scientific publications on National-Socialism and the music of recent decades that focus on the « Reichsmusikkammer » and other organizations that worked to institutionalize music : Günter Berghaus (editor) , Fascism and theatre : Comparative studies on the æsthetics and politics of performance in Europe, 1925-1945, Berghahn, Oxford (1996) . Hinrich Bergmeier, and Günter Katzenberger (editors) , « Kulturaustreibung. Die Einflußnahme des Nationalsozialismus auf Kunst und Kultur in Niedersachsen. Eine Dokumentation zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung » , Dölling und Galitz, Hamburg (1993) ; Hubert Kolland, « Trösterin - in Gleichschritt gebracht. Die Faschisierung des Musiklebens » , in : « Staatliche Kunsthalle Berlin » (editor) , « 1933 - Wege zur Diktatur. Ergänzungsband » , Berlin (1983) , pages 137-167 ; Hanspeter Krellmann (editor) , « Wer war Richard Strauß ? Neunzehn Antworten » , Insel, Frankfurt-am-Main (1999) ; Gert Holtmeyer (editor) , « Musikalische Erwachsenenbildung: Grundzüge-Entwicklungen-Perspektiven » , Gustav Bosse, Regensburg (1989) ; Erik Levi, Music in the 3rd « Reich » Macmillan, Basingstoke (1994) ; Nina Okrassa, « Peter Raabe. Dirigent, Musikschriftsteller und Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer (1872-1945) » , Böhlau, Köln-Weimar-Berlin (2004) ; Horst Weber (editor) , « Musik in der Emigration 1933-1945 : Verfolgung-Vertreibung-Rückwirkung, Metzler, Stuttgart (1994) .

(10) Refer to Martin Thrun, « Die Errichtung der Reichsmusikkammer » , in : Hanns-Werner Heister, and Hans-Günther Klein, « Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland » , Fischer, Frankfurt-am-Main (1984) ; page 81.

(11) Original quote from Fred K. Prieberg, « Handbuch deutsche Musiker 1933-1945 » , auprès des Zombry (2004) , 5626 :

« Alle ausländische Musik, die in Deutschland durch Musikalien-Verleger oder -Händler vertrieben werden soll, ist der Musikprüfstelle des Reichsministeriums für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda vorzulegen. Der Vertrieb von Noten, deren Verbreitung durch die Musikprüfstelle als unerwünscht erklärt wird, ist verboten. »

(12) Original quote from Prieberg, 2219 :

« Die nicht nur ausländische Musik sichten wird, sondern auch die deutsche Produktion beobachtet und gegen unerwünschte und schädliche Musik einschreitet. »

(13) Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany : the « Reich » Chambers of Music, Theater, and the Visual Arts*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1993) ; page 141.

(14) « Verfügung des Herrn Ministers für die Programmgestaltung des deutschen Musiklebens vom 2. September 1939. »
Original quote in : Prieberg (2004) , 2322 :

« Grundsätzlich verboten sind Musiken, deren Komponisten, Textdichter, Bearbeiter und Verleger Juden oder Angehörige der Feindstaaten (England, Polen, Rußland, Frankreich. Ausnahmen : Bizet-Carmen, Chopin) sind. Amerikanischer Refraingesang ist, weil er mit dem Englischen gleichlautet, untersagt. Verboten sind hot- und swing-Musik im Original und in Nachahmungen. Verboten ist artfremde Musik soweit sie von Juden oder Negern stammt oder Negermusik nachzuahmen versucht, desgleichen Musik mit Zitaten jüdischer Komponisten. Alle Musiken, die von der Reichsmusikprüfstelle für unerwünscht erklärt worden sind, fallen ebenfalls unter das Spielverbot. »

(15) <http://www.nrw2000.de/ns/entartetemusik.htm#>, original :

« Das deutsche musikalische Leben ist von den letzten Spuren jüdischer Anmaßung und Vorherrschaft endgültig gesäubert » and « unsere klassischen Meister erscheinen vor der Öffentlichkeit wieder in reiner und unverfälschter Form » .

(16) Pamela M. Potter, « Die deutscheste der Künste. Musikwissenschaft und Gesellschaft von der Weimarer Republik bis zum Ende des Dritten Reichs » , Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart (2000) ; Erik Levi, « Music and National-Socialism. The Politicization of Criticism, Composition and Performance » , in : Brandon Taylor, and Wilfried van der Will (editors) , *The Nazification of Art*, The Winchester Press, Hampshire (1990) , pages 158-182, 167.

(17) Refer to Christine Fischer-Defoy, « Kunst Macht Politik : Die Nazifizierung der Kunst- und Musikhochschulen in Berlin » , Berlin (1987) .

(18) Anselm Gerhard, « Musicology in the 3rd “ Reich ” : A Preliminary Report » , in : *The Journal of Musicology*, Volume 18, No. 4 (2001) ; pages 517-543, 530.

(19) Katja Roters, « Bearbeitungen von Händel-Oratorien im Dritten Reich » , in : « Schriften des Händel-Hauses in Halle » , Volume 16 ; Altenburg, Halle (1999) , pages 33-42 ; Werner Rackwitz, « Geschichte und Gegenwart der Hallischen Händel-Renaissance » , in : « Schriften des Händelhauses in Halle » , Volumes 1-2, Händel-Haus, Halle (1977, 1979) , pages 7-10.

(20) Pamela M. Potter, « The Politicization of Händel and His Oratorios in the Weimar Republic, the 3rd “ Reich ”, and the Early Years of the German Democratic Republic » , in : The Musical Quarterly, Volume 85, No. 2 (2001) ; pages 311-341, 334.

(21) Moser to Wenter 29. Januar 1943, BA R55/20572, Original :

« Eine Verlegung nur nach Kiew als “ Zar der Tartaren ” ist politisch in keiner Weise hinlänglich. Aus all diesen Gründen schlagen wir vor, die Handlung in ein sehr frühes (wegen Frauenraub) , aber schon christliches (wegen der Prozession) Frankreich (wegen des musikalischen Lokalkolorits) , also in das westfränkische Merowingerreich oder ein etwas sagenhaftes Aquitanien des 5.-8. Jahrhunderts zu verlegen. Statt der Zirkassier im Kaukasus könnten die Basken in den Pyrenäen stehen, statt Moskau “ Tours ” oder eine andere “ einschlägige ” Stadt, die Westgoten könnten erwähnt werden-hauptsächlich käme es auf die Umtaufung der Hauptpersonen an ; Olga könnte die heilige Oda werden, statt Iwan “ Renat ”, “ Turpin ” oder dergleichen, für Marie vielleicht auch einen als altertümlich empfundenen Namen. Reiz und Vorteil dieser Operation wäre zugleich die Unabgebrauchtheit dieses Milieus, und es würde meines Erachtens sogar zur Zeit politisch ganz erwünscht sein, die sozusagen “ germanisch-romanische Musikkultur ” des später burgundischen Bodens zu zeigen. »

(22) There is, however, evidence that Georges Bizet’s Opera « Iwan der Schreckliche » was performed at a castle in Tübingen, as early as 1946. Kultur Nachrichten in the Zeit-online archive : <http://www.zeit.de/1946/33/kulturnachrichten> [20131205] . It would be interesting to know which version was performed at the Mühlingen castle and if there was any information on how exactly the work had come to Germany.

(23) Moser (1943) ; page 78.

(24) Peters to Moser (10 July 1944) , BA R55/20572.

(25) Birgitta Almgren, Germanistik und Nationalsozialismus : Affirmation, Konflikt und Protest. Traditionsfelder und zeitgebundene Wertung in Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft am Beispiel der Germanisch-Romanischen Monatsschrift 1929-1943, Almqvist and Wiksell, Uppsala (1997) ; Seiten 34, 44f.

(26) Josef Goebbels, « Zehn Grundsätze deutschen Musikschaffens » , Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer 5 (1938) 11: 3, Original :

« Wie jede andere Kunst, so entspringt die Musik geheimnisvollen und tiefen Kräften, die im Volkstum verwurzelt sind. Judentum und deutsche Musik, das sind Gegensätze, die ihrer Natur nach in schroffstem Widerspruch zueinander stehen. Der Kampf gegen das Judentum in der deutschen Musik ist deshalb heute noch unsere große, niemals preiszugebende Zeitaufgabe. »

(27) Bernd Sponheuer, « The National-Socialist Discussion on the “ German Quality ” in Music » , in : Michael H. Kater, and Albrecht Riethmüller (editors) , Music and Nazism. Art under Tyranny, 1933-1945, Laaber-Verlag (2003) ; page 36.

(28) Erik Levi, « Music and National-Socialism. The Politicisation of Criticism, Composition and Performance » , in : Brandon Taylor, and Wilfried van der Will (editors) , The Nazification of Art, The Winchester Press, Hampshire (1990) ; pages 158-182, 167.

(29) Hans Joachim Moser, « Von der Tätigkeit der Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen » , in : Hellmuth von Hase (editor) , Jahrbuch der deutschen Musik. Im Auftrage der Abteilung Musik des Reichsministeriums für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda, Breitkopf & Härtel and Max Heße Verlag, Leipzig and Berlin (1943) ; Seiten 78-82, 78, Original :

« Den Spielplan der deutschen ernsten wie heiteren Musikbühnen in einer Richtung erweitert und bereichert zu sehen, die treuhänderisch von Reichs wegen Wertvolles fördert und nur Händlerisches, geschmacklich Anfechtbares verhindert. »

(30) Hans Joachim Moser, « Von der Steuerung des deutschen Musiklebens » , in : Hellmuth von Hase (editor) , Jahrbuch der deutschen Musik 1943. Im Auftrag der Abteilung Musik des Reichsministeriums für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda, Breitkopf & Härtel and Max Heße Verlag, Leipzig and Berlin (1943) ; Seite 22, Original :

« Die Aufgaben des totalitären Staates sind weitgehend bestimmt : hier tut weniger Im puls not als Schutz der Schwachen und Lenkung der Starken, damit die hier wie in allem Leben lauenden Zersetzungseime nirgends Macht gewinnen. »

(31) <http://www.dhm.de/lemo/html/nazi/kunst/entartet/>

(32) Albrecht Dümling, and Peter Girth, « Entartete Musik. Dokumentation und Kommentar » , Düsseldorf (1988) .

(33) Ursula Geisler, « “ ... was an Musik des Nordens nur nordisch maskiert ist. ” Konstruktion und Rezeption “ nordischer ” Musik im deutschsprachigen Musikdiskurs » , in : Frank-Michael Kirsch, and Birgitta Almgren (editors) , Sprache und Politik im skandinavischen und deutschen Kontext 1933-1945, Aalborg (2003) , Seiten 223-238 ; Ursula Geisler, « Herders “ Volksgeist ” och Götiska förbundet » , in : Greger Andersson, and Ursula Geisler, Myt och propaganda. Musiken i nazismens tjänst, Forum för levande historia, Stockholm (2007) , Seiten 25-45.

(34) <http://www.bundesarchiv.de/benutzung/zeitbezug/nationalsozialismus/index.html.de>

(35) Fred K. Prieberg, « Handbuch deutsche Musiker 1933-1945 » , Auprès des Zombry (2004) .

(36) www.lexm.uni-hamburg.de

Musique classique et leadership nazi sous le 3e « Reich »

Music was not simply another art form in the 3rd « Reich » . In the Nazi imagination, music had a unique significance and power. As a nation, Germany had a long tradition of musical success (Germans are disproportionately

represented among the great Classical composers, including Mozart, Bach, Beethoven, Haydn, Schubert, and Wagner) leading some to claim that music was « the most German of all the arts ». The internationally acknowledged importance of German composers, conductors, and musicians was an enormous source of pride ; at the same time, the modernist and « cosmopolitan » trends in the arts of the inter-War world were felt, in some quarters, to pose an enormous threat. For the Nazis, the purported degeneration of German music was both a metaphor and a symptom of the degeneration of the nation.

The idea that Germany had a particular affinity for great music, and that this was under threat in the inter-War period, was not confined to the Nazi Party. Many conservative nationalists perceived the musical trends of this period as an omen of global degeneration, and it was Germany's defeat in World War I, the economic devastation that followed, and the humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles, that brought the situation to a head. For many, the increasing popularity of swing, jazz, avant-garde experimentation, and African-American and Jewish musicians were not a coincidence : they were both cause and effect of the general collapse of German society and German values. If German music was associated with heroism, love of nation, the drive toward creation, and rootedness in blood and soil, this « degenerate » music was profit- and thrill-driven, imitative and superficial, and lacking in originality because it was lacking its own healthy nation and culture. Many social critics and musicologists bemoaned these trends. While these concerns did not focus solely on Jews, they were a primary target. Although only a small percentage of German musicians were Jewish, the prominence of people like Arnold Schönberg, Otto Klemperer, Kurt Weill and others gave strength to the idea that Jews were in the vanguard of an organized cabal to pervert and appropriate German values. The threats that Jews seemed to pose to Germany and its musical heritage were summarised in their assumed foreignness and their link with an undesirable and destructive modernity.

Since their earliest years, the Nazis had envisioned themselves as a mass nationalist movement, and as powerful as visual arts, theatre, or literature might be, it was music that was seen as the great crowd-pleaser, the most effective way to seduce and sway the masses. As the Minister of Propaganda Josef Goebbels put it :

« Music affects the heart and emotions more than the intellect. Where then could the heart of a nation beat stronger than in the huge masses, in which the heart of a nation has found its true home ? »

The Nazi quest to purify the German music world from « degeneracy », and return it to its mythic Germanic-ness (a notoriously indefinable category) motivated an enormous amount of activity, planning, and policy-making. Almost immediately after Adolf Hitler was proclaimed Chancellor, in January 1933, Nazi supporters, in a continuation of the early activities of the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (Combat League for German Culture) , began to disrupt musical performances by Jewish artists.

Nazi-sponsored newspapers took particular glee in slandering the names and careers of « degenerate » musicians, often threatening violence in retaliation for « un-German » concerts. This early harassment, however, was only the beginning. In March 1933, Goebbels took control of all German radio stations and the press, summarily firing all of the art and music-critics who did not support his aesthetic agenda. 1 month later, on 7 April 1933, the Law for the Re-establishment of the Civil Service was passed, which led to the widespread dismissal of Jewish conductors, singers, music

teachers, and administrators. In July, the 2 most important composers at the illustrious Prussian Academy of Art, Arnold Schönberg and Franz Schreker, were dismissed.

The rapidity with which these developments took place stunned Jews living in Germany, but there was very little protest from non-Jews, some of whom leapt at the opportunity to fill newly-vacant positions. (Isolated but significant protests mainly came from both Jewish and non-Jewish musicians and composers in the United States.) The only major German figure to offer any sort of public protest was the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, who wrote an open letter to Goebbels. Although he approved of the elimination of « Jewish influence » over German music, he also insisted that there were brilliant individual Jews who should be allowed to continue performing ; he worried about filling the positions of some of the best musicians in his Orchestra. There were also some more established Jews who were deeply woven into the musical life of Germany and not as easy to summarily fire ; several such musicians maintained employment under the Nazis during the initial years of the regime. By the end of 1935, however, the purge was more or less complete. Many German-Jewish musicians had, by this point, fled Germany, the bulk going to the United States, England, or Palestine.

Confronted with a large population of unemployed Jewish artists, Nazi leaders developed a temporary « solution » . In the summer of 1933, the Prussian Ministry of Education met with leaders of the Berlin Jews and agreed to set-up the « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (Jewish Cultural League) , which was officially registered on 23 June 1933 under the organisation of Doctor Kurt Singer. In November 1933, the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber or « RMK ») , the branch of the « Reich » Cultural Chamber responsible for music, was initiated, an organisation that required a membership card, and thus « Aryan » status, for musical employment. The « Reichsmusikkammer » consolidated the multitude of existing unions and professional associations for musicians from Weimar Germany. Initially, German musicians were excited by the prospect of a centralised framework ; many were, thus, attracted to the Nazis not because of ideology but rather because of the potential artistic benefits. It soon became clear, however, that artistic freedom was allotted strictly on a racial basis. Following on, from the dismissals and purges of the early Nazi years, the Nuremberg Laws of September 1935 worsened the situation further, as now even « half-Jews » and those married to Jews were no longer legally able to perform or compose. The music publishing world was also targeted, and hundreds of leading publishers and staff were persecuted, fired, and imprisoned.

The year 1938 saw the mounting of the infamous « Entartete Musik » (Degenerate Music) exhibit, modelled on the successful earlier touring exhibition of « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) . Under the organisation of Hans Severus Ziegler, this ambitious production took place in Düsseldorf, and was intended to identify to the German public what music was « degenerate » , to demonstrate its dangers, and celebrate its purging from German society. Ziegler quickly realized, however, that « Degenerate Music » was remarkably difficult to define. Many of the pieces played at the exhibition as examples of degeneracy were, in fact, popular among listeners, and some feared that the display was attended by fans eager to hear them. In addition, while the firing of Jews had evoked little protest, this exhibit was more disturbing to German musicians, probably because « degeneracy » was not simply linked to blacks and Jews, but also to experimental and « foreign » music of diverse kinds.

The definition of « degenerate » fluctuated throughout the 3rd « Reich » even for the most committed Nazis. In

addition to the practical difficulties of purging « undesirables » from Germany's musical world, there were many conflicts as pragmatism came into conflict with racial theory. One composition that troubled Nazi policy-makers was the 19th Century German-Jewish composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy's « A Midsummer Night's Dream », a widely-admired work that continued to be performed, including by Wilhelm Furtwängler. Other examples that vexed censors and decision-makers were Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's collaboration with a Jewish librettist, Georg Friedrich Händel's setting of Old Testament texts to music, and both Robert Schumann and Franz Schubert's setting of the Jewish Heinrich Heine's poetry to music.

In general, however, Nazi policy succeeded in remaking Germany's musical scene, in a short time. The musicologist Hans Joachim Moser penned a celebratory summary of these policies :

« As is the case everywhere, Jewry has especially penetrated into the sphere of music in the USA and Europe ; publishers, agents and the press have arranged to have their racial comrades placed in almost all decisive positions and, thus, attempted to force their taste upon that of the common people. That individuals among them through assimilation and talent have, particularly as imitators / reproducers, produced some impressive works, we do not need to deny. Yet since, after 1933, they are removed from our cultural circle, so it is due to the righteous emergency defence of the Aryan people against the intellectual and economic tyranny forced on us by Jewry. »

For those left to profit from this « righteous defence » of German music, the situation was dramatically different than it had been before 1933. By 1937, the « Reichsmusikkammer » counted among its members tens of thousands of professional musicians and music workers and, under Josef Gœbbels, a new system of professionalisation of the music world took place. Every musician was assigned to 1 of 5 levels, each of which had a set wage. Gœbbels also developed many programmes to aid poor and unemployed musicians, which boosted many salaries and careers. Commitment to Nazi ideology, however, tended to be weighed more heavily than musical talent, allowing loyal mediocrity to be rewarded over skill. Composers and musicians could be used as propaganda weapons for the « Reich » , producing marches and light music to distract and entertain the population, and music for Party events and rallies. Countless compositions celebrated Adolf Hitler, Germany, and the glorious future of the Nazi Party.

On a broader social level, music was considered an important means of instilling « German values » , nationalism, and a sense of community. Countless musical organizations were established, musicians promoted, prizes awarded, and Festivals staged with the intent that « German » music reach into every home, school, and army barracks in the « Reich » . Music also formed an important part of the Nazi Party's own activities, and featured prominently at Party rallies and other public events. The « Horst Wessellied » (« Horst Wessel » song) , based on the mythic story of a young Nazi murdered by a gang of communists, was popular and widely sung. Many propaganda songs were aimed at the youth, and under the leadership of Baldur von Schirach, the « Hitlerjugend » (Hitler Youth) developed an elaborate music program. Even soldiers on the front were encouraged to attend cultural events, and to sing amongst themselves. Between 1933 and 1945, scores of soldiers' song books were published, the majority during the War years. A 1943 volume in the series « Yearbook of German Music » reminded its readers that, « at times of combat, music is a source of joy » .

Music was also a prominent feature of life under Nazi internment. There was a « music-corps » within the SS and, in some camps, there were separate SS bands. In occupied cities and towns, local musicians were frequently forced to perform for Nazi audiences. SS officers organized musical « cafés » and cabarets for their own entertainment in many of the large ghettos, including Warsaw. Many concentration camps had their own Orchestras, which played to entertain the Nazi guards. Music was also widely used as a means of torture : inmates were forced to play music while being beaten, or to sing while performing exhausting labour ; music accompanied public hangings and executions, and was broadcast over loudspeakers during mass shootings. The Italian Jew, Primo Levi, characterized this music as :

« The voice of the “ Lager ”, the perceptible expression of its geometrical madness, of the resolution of others to annihilate us 1st as men, in order to kill us more slowly, afterwards. »

...

The 3rd « Reich » entered the annals of History as the most extreme aberration of civilized society. Its benchmark was the murder of millions of people in the name of an elaborate ideology that planned to divide the world into superior and inferior race groupings. From 1933 until 1945, the Nazi leadership planned, organized, and executed their ideas, inflicting relentless misery in the European arena. Nearly 70 years after the War, the singularity of the period still generates more attention than most other episodes in History.

This essay, as part of that phenomenon, is the 2nd of 2 to appear in Yad Vashem's e-newsletter on the aspects of a cultured country whose cultural legacy is subverted by the new regime to serve its ideological aims. (The 1st article is online and titled, « The 3rd “ Reich ” and the Theft of a Musical Legacy ») . Ghettos, camps, marking, maiming, and murder are not the object of study here. However, to attain levels of persecution involving all the above and to the extent the Nazis succeeded, presupposes a level of control of every aspect of life in a country, including the cultural realm.

7 December 1933 : Berlin, Germany - (Photo) Adolf Hitler, Rudolf Heß, Heinrich Himmler, Josef Gœbbels and other senior officials at an SS concert, profits of the concert were dedicated to the winter charity project.

The focus of the essay is the sphere of Classical music in Germany, after 1933, and the largely successful attempts of the new regime to control the repertoire and everything connected with music for all the music-loving Germans in Germany and, from the outbreak of War, in the conquered territories as well. The article will cover aspects of the intricate relationship that developed between the regime and 2 of the most conspicuous conductors in Germany during the « Reich » , Wilhelm Furtwängler and Herbert von Karajan. They were to a large extent the public face of German culture that the world saw. Just as the international value of the Berlin Olympics, in 1936, was of major importance to the rulers of the 3rd « Reich » , so was the continued prominence of German music and culture on the world stage high on the « political » agenda of the « Reich » leaders. In fact, according to Eric Levi in his book, « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , 5 prominent Nazis were in the forefront of this internal Nazi battlefield, for such it was. None other than Hermann Göring, Josef Gœbbels, and Alfred Rosenberg, 3 of the 5, were in virtual competition with each other in their efforts to garner additional spheres of influence. In this struggle, the visible faces of the conductors

became the pawns of these powerful men. How each reacted to the inevitable pressures will be examined below.

Herbert von Karajan

When Adolf Hitler came to power, in 1933, Herbert von Karajan, as a rising musical meteor in Germany, was all of 24 years old. 15 years later, at the end of the Nazi era, after investigations by Allied authorities, he became the German musician with the longest « sentence » of enforced unemployment which lasted for 2 1/2 years. He, who would become the dominant figure in German music after the War, constantly faced demonstrations and accusations based on his « War behavior » whenever he conducted in the United States. No persons ever presented pointed evidence against him and the atmosphere of guilt surrounding him appears to have been circumstantial.

However, Herbert von Karajan became one of the few senior musicians in Germany to join the Nazi Party. Many emigrated and most of the others remaining in Germany kept their distance from the Nazi Party. The date of Karajan's enrollment in the Party is in doubt. The fact of his enrollment is not. Copies of his Party card and their registration numbers show that he applied twice : once in Austria ; and the 2nd time in Ulm, Germany. Both applications were as early as April and May, 1933. He claimed a later date of 1935 and connected his enrollment with the formality of becoming the music director of Aachen.

What he did as a Nazi member or sympathizer in these 2 years will probably remain an open question unless more documentation is unveiled. He had connections with other Nazis and SS members, in this period, and at the young age of 28, he landed the plum position of Opera conductor of the Berlin State Opera.

Beyond voluntarily becoming a member of the Nazi Party, his activities on behalf of the Nazi regime were various and visible :

He conducted tributes on the occasion of Adolf Hitler's birthdays during the coming years.

He conducted at the official celebration of the « Reich » after the annexation of Austria, or « Anschluß » .

He dutifully presented programs of inferior musical propaganda material and, after the War, broke out. His clean-cut chiseled face was an integral part of the picture-perfect cultural representative of the 3rd « Reich » on the podiums of captured European capitals.

There is no doubt that the individual musicians enjoyed a surge in their financial situation as a result of Karajan's unparalleled success in the emerging recording markets but this came together with the price tag of enduring an autocratic mien that became the core of Karajan's projected image. He created an aura around him that has been likened to Hitler's « Führer » image and, although this kind of « talk » smacks of the sensational, Karajan grew-up in the Nazi era, became a member of the Party and never once disavowed his Nazi connections after the War. He has been accused of using anti-Semitic slurs about various Jews in his music circles despite their presence in his entourage.

It has been said of the famous German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, that his War-time Nazi affiliation and sympathies are dwarfed in their importance by his refusal to recant in the face of various approaches made to him after the War. The same atmosphere surrounds the silence of Karajan after the War. For many people, the undeniably beautiful recordings that he made after the War are besmirched by his silence. Karajan can be seen as an example of the relative failure of denazification in Germany after the War, bearing in mind that with everything described above, he achieved well-nigh total hegemony in the post-War world of Classical music.

Wilhelm Furtwängler

At 47, Wilhelm Furtwängler was double the age of Karajan when the Nazis rose to power, in 1933. Not a rising meteor but the shining northern star in the German music firmament, Furtwängler, the foremost representative of the German music legacy in Germany and around the world, was suddenly thrust into the maelstrom of Nazi totalitarian politics, and without prior experience in the razor-edged world of political manoeuvring, had to secure his position in a very insecure arena.

His situation was more precarious than Karajan's if only for the simple reason that he never joined the Nazi Party and, for the most, fought for the right to retain his artistic independence. Other internationally recognized « faces » of German music had been world-renowned names like Bruno Walter and Victor Klemperer, who as Jews, were forced to leave Germany after 1933. Furtwängler remained the pre-eminent conductor in Germany, after 1933, and his unenviable choices with the ensuing paths that he trod have brought both opprobrium and high-regard for the stances that he adopted.

The complexity of his situation stems from his initial decision to remain in Germany, after 1933, in order to fight for musical autonomy from within the new reality of a totalitarian politics.

After the War, the Berlin Philharmonic never again enjoyed the same surge that came from a feeling of togetherness and community, as they had under Furtwängler.

The authority struggle that developed between Wilhelm Furtwängler and Josef Goebbels is fascinating because both men needed each other to achieve their own aims. At the simplest level, Furtwängler needed the continued financial backing of Goebbels to keep the Berlin Philharmonic solvent and Goebbels needed Furtwängler's international standing to further the façade of German culture. There was a constant « give and take » in their relationship that mirrored the tension between the domain of art and music and the world of power politics. No totalitarian regime can afford a demonstrative creativity and independence from any agency under its aegis that admits values other than its own. An autonomous world of music would permit deviations according to guidelines external to the regime's dictates. Goebbels had the power to crush any unorthodoxy if he so wished and, yet, a subtle relationship of toleration within limits existed between the 2. Furtwängler collaborated, and Goebbels displayed flexibility.

Any judgment of the famous conductor would have to take the following points into consideration :

His decision to remain in Germany when voluntary exile was a definite option for him was taken with a view to maintaining artistic integrity and minimizing the invasive inroads of the political superstructure.

As mentioned above, Furtwängler, the very visible figure-head of German music, refused to join the Nazi Party. As an outsider, he remained suspect and susceptible.

He refused to conduct musical scores created for Nazi leaders.

By and large, he avoided conducting at Nazi functions in an attempt to minimize the visible aspect of his collaboration with them.

As far as possible, he avoided conducting in countries occupied by the « Wehrmacht » .

He refused the showering of gifts, like a house from Hitler himself and several cars from Göring.

Furtwängler intervened on behalf of Jews and other victims of the « Reich » 's racist policies and brazenly offended Nazi principles by continued association with them. He was unable to save his loyal Jewish personal secretary, Doctor Berta Geißmar, who was forced to leave Germany and settled in England. She had been his organizational lifeline and the concentrated effort of the regime to expel her indicates the extreme reaction of the « Reich » leaders « vis-à-vis » Furtwängler's Jewish associations.

Despite the points listed above, Furtwängler's record, before and during the War, was sullied by the very fact that he had collaborated with the regime. « Émigré » musicians especially were incensed that he had lent his honourable presence to Nazi legitimization in the eyes of the world. Berta Geißmar insisted that contact with Nazi officialdom was necessary if any attempt was to be made from within in the struggle of art against politics. Whatever his actions, one photograph of his bowing after a concert of the Berlin Philharmonic with Hitler, Goebbels, and Göring sitting in the front row looks very much like unbridled collaboration. But the critics weren't in the hall to hear the applause of adulation from the audience for the beloved national figure of Furtwängler. The regime's leaders were, and even to them, it was clear that a nuanced approach with this national treasure was advisable. Of all the prominent names in German music, Furtwängler alone remained to struggle for German artistic autonomy.

The 2 cases of Furtwängler and Karajan portrayed here indicate the importance of the world of culture and art to the Nazi regime. All the evidence shows that before the top echelon leaders would apply themselves to murderous racist policies, they were intimately involved in efforts to control art in the « Reich » on all fronts. « Decadent Art » was curtailed as antithetical to new artistic conventions of the « Reich » and the world of jazz was also targeted.

Clearly, the magnificent achievements of German Classical music could be retained as a beacon of light for the new Germany but, naturally, within the limits of new parameters. The narratives of Furtwängler and Karajan help to illustrate the tensions that began in 1933, and the different paths that 2 prominent musicians chose in confronting

the 3rd « Reich » .

Elly Ney, pianiste des Nazis

Documentaire 52 minutes d'Axel Fuhrmann (Allemagne, 2014) sur « Arte » .

<http://www.zone-telechargement.com/emissions-tv/83630-nom-de-code-.html>

Elly Ney, pianiste des Nazis. Documentaire portrait (Nom de code : sonate au clair de lune, Elly Ney, pianiste sous le régime nazi) . Portrait de la pianiste Elly Ney (1882-1968) et rôle qu'elle joua pour populariser Beethoven lui-même récupéré par la propagande nazie (comme Strauß ou Wagner) . Après des débuts au « Carnegie Hall » et une brillante carrière aux États-Unis, l'interprète se spécialise dans de grandes célébrations théâtralisées en l'honneur de Beethoven, lisant notamment son fameux « Testament de Heiligenstadt » en pré-ambule à ses concerts. Elle fut la seule pianiste allemande de son temps à pouvoir s'affirmer au même niveau que ses collègues hommes (Artur Schnabel, Wilhelm Backhaus, Wilhelm Kempff, ce dernier également complaisant aux Nazis) . Ses enregistrements des œuvres pour piano de Beethoven se sont peu à peu imposées, devenant presque légendaires. Témoins de l'époque et historiens tentent d'expliquer pourquoi antisémite notoire, membre du Parti nazi dès 1937, elle soutint le régime hitlérien et ne dérogea pas de ses convictions jusqu'à sa mort. Ney gagna une quasi réhabilitation en finançant les travaux de réfection de la maison de Beethoven à Bonn, endommagée pendant la Guerre.

Photos, extraits de films et lettres permettent cerner le personnage, tandis qu'une graphologue analyse l'écriture de la soliste et que une pianiste se penche sur son jeu très particulier, très différent de celui de ses collègues Dame Myra Heß, Annie Fischer et Artur Schnabel notamment. À une époque où les femmes ne sont pas légions sur l'arène musicale, Elly Ney se distingue par son jeu à part et ses accointances discutables avec le régime hitlérien. À chacun de juger.

...

Pianiste élevée au rang de mythe, Elly Ney (1882-1968) a voué sa vie au culte de Beethoven. Mais celle qui se considérait avant tout comme une musicienne populaire se laissa aussi séduire par l'idéologie nazie et, en particulier, par l'antisémitisme, à l'instar de Leni Riefenstahl ou de Winifred Wagner. Ce documentaire retrace son parcours et s'interroge sur la personnalité complexe de cette artiste légendaire.

Autour de 1900, les compositions de Beethoven passaient pour injouables par des femmes, émanant d'un titan puissant et viril. Puis la pianiste Elly Ney vint et s'identifia (y compris physiquement, avec un regard habité et une volumineuse tignasse) au compositeur. Après des débuts au « Carnegie Hall » et une brillante carrière aux États-Unis, elle préféra célébrer des grand-messes en l'honneur de son idole, lisant notamment lors de ses concerts le fameux « testament de Heiligenstadt » , écrit en 1802 par un Beethoven très déprimé.

Le Testament de Heiligenstadt (« Heiligenstädter Testament ») est une lettre manuscrite de Ludwig van Beethoven à ses frères Kaspar et Johann, écrite le 6 octobre 1802 du Heiligenstadt, où le compositeur avait alors ses quartiers (au

6 de la « Probusgasse », dans la périphérie de Vienne, aujourd'hui le 19^e arrondissement) . Il s'agit d'un document historique, témoignage inestimable dans la vie de Beethoven puisque le musicien y exprimait son désespoir devant sa surdité débutante et la nécessité qui en découlait de s'isoler peu à peu des hommes. Mais Beethoven sortit victorieux de cette crise, résolu à affronter son destin plutôt que de s'abattre : c'était le début de la période « Héroïque » qui allait durer jusqu'en 1808 et l'apothéose de la 5^e Symphonie.

Écrite dans une période de profonde crise morale de Beethoven, alors que le compositeur achevait sa 2^e Symphonie, cette lettre ne fut jamais envoyée et fut retrouvée par Anton Schindler et Stephan von Breuning dans un tiroir secret de l'armoire de Beethoven, quelques jours après sa mort en mars 1827, aux côtés de la « Lettre à l'immortelle Bien-aimée » .

Le Testament de Heiligenstadt (octobre 1802)

« Pour mes frères Carl et Johann Beethoven,

Ô vous ! hommes qui me tenez pour haineux, obstiné, ou qui me dites misanthrope, comme vous vous méprenez sur moi. Vous ignorez la cause secrète de ce qui vous semble ainsi, mon cœur et mon caractère inclinaient dès l'enfance au tendre sentiment de la bienveillance, même l'accomplissement de grandes actions, j'y ai toujours été disposé, mais considérez seulement que depuis 6 ans un état déplorable m'infeste, aggravé par des médecins insensés, et trompé d'année en année dans son espoir d'amélioration. Finalement condamné à la perspective d'un mal durable (dont la guérison peut durer des années ou même être tout à fait impossible) , alors que j'étais né avec un tempérament fougueux, plein de vie, prédisposé même aux distractions offertes par la société, j'ai dû tôt m'isoler, mener ma vie dans la solitude, et si j'essayais bien parfois de mettre tout cela de côté, oh ! comme alors j'étais ramené durement à la triste expérience renouvelée de mon ouïe défaillante, et certes je ne pouvais me résigner à dire aux hommes : parlez plus fort, criez, car je suis sourd, ah ! comment aurait été-t-il possible que j'avoue alors la faiblesse d'un sens qui, chez moi, devait être poussé jusqu'à un degré de perfection plus grand que chez tous les autres, un sens que je possédais autrefois dans sa plus grande perfection, dans une perfection que certainement peu de mon espèce ont jamais connue - oh ! je ne le peux toujours pas, pardonnez-moi, si vous me voyez battre en retraite là-même où j'aurais bien aimé me joindre à vous. Et mon malheur m'afflige doublement, car je dois rester méconnu, je n'ai pas le droit au repos dans la société humaine, aux conversations délicates, aux épanchements réciproques ; presque absolument seul, ce n'est que lorsque la plus haute nécessité l'exige qu'il m'est permis de me mêler aux autres hommes, je dois vivre comme un exilé, à l'approche de toute société une peur sans pareille m'assaille, parce que je crains d'être mis en danger, de laisser remarquer mon état - c'est ainsi que j'ai vécu les 6 derniers mois, passés à la campagne sur les conseils avisés de mon médecin pour ménager autant que possible mon ouïe ; il a presque prévenu mes dispositions actuelles, quoique, parfois poussé par un instinct social, je me sois laissé séduire. Mais quelle humiliation lorsque quelqu'un près de moi entendait une flûte au loin et que je n'entendais rien, ou lorsque quelqu'un entendait le berger chanter et que je n'entendais rien non plus ; de tels événements m'ont poussé jusqu'au bord du désespoir, il s'en fallut de peu que je ne misse fin à mes jours. C'est l'art et seulement lui, qui m'a retenu, ah ! il me semblait impossible de quitter le monde avant d'avoir fait naître tout ce pour quoi je me sentais disposé, et c'est ainsi que j'ai mené cette vie misérable - vraiment misérable ; un corps si irritable, qu'un changement un peu rapide

peut me faire passer de l'euphorie au désespoir le plus complet - patience, voilà tout, c'est elle seulement que je dois choisir pour guide, je l'ai fait - durablement j'espère, ce doit être ma résolution, persévérer, jusqu'à ce que l'impitoyable Parque décide de rompre le fil, peut-être que cela ira mieux, peut-être non, je suis tranquille - être forcé de devenir philosophe déjà à 28 ans, ce n'est pas facile, et pour l'artiste plus difficile encore que pour quiconque - Dieu, tu vois de là-haut mon cœur ; tu le connais, tu sais que l'amour des hommes et un penchant à faire le bien y habitent, - ô hommes ! lorsqu'un jour vous lirez ceci, songez que vous vous êtes mépris sur moi ; et que le malheureux se console d'avoir trouvé un semblable, qui malgré tous les obstacles de la nature, a pourtant fait tout ce dont il était capable pour être admis au rang des artistes et des hommes de valeur - vous, mes frères Carl et Johann, dès que je serai mort et si le Professeur Schmidt vit encore, priez-le en mon nom de décrire ma maladie, et joignez son récit à cette présente feuille, afin qu'au moins le monde se réconcilie autant que possible avec moi après ma mort - en même temps, je vous déclare ici tous 2 héritiers de ma petite fortune (si l'on peut l'appeler ainsi) , partagez-la loyalement, et supportez-vous et aidez-vous l'un l'autre, tout ce que vous avez fait qui me répugnait, vous le savez, vous a été pardonné depuis longtemps, toi frère Carl, je te remercie encore particulièrement pour l'attachement que tu m'as témoigné ces tout derniers temps, je vous souhaite une vie meilleure et moins soucieuse que la mienne, recommandez à vos enfants la vertu, elle seule peut rendre heureux, pas l'argent, je parle par expérience, c'est elle qui même dans la misère m'a élevé, je la remercie autant que mon art, pour m'avoir fait éviter le suicide - adieu et aimez-vous, - je remercie tous mes amis, en particulier le Prince Lichnowski et le Professeur Schmidt. - Je souhaite, si vous le voulez bien, que les instruments du Prince L.(ichnowsky) soient conservés par l'un de vous, mais qu'il ne s'élève à cause de cela aucune dispute entre vous, dès qu'ils pourront vous être utiles, vendez-les tout simplement, comme je serais heureux de pouvoir encore vous rendre service sous la tombe - s'il en va ainsi, c'est avec joie que je m'empresse vers la mort - mais si elle vient avant que je n'aie eu l'occasion de faire éclore toutes mes facultés artistiques, alors, malgré ma rude destinée, elle vient encore trop tôt, et je la souhaiterais volontiers plus tardive - pourtant, ne serais-je pas alors aussi content, ne me délivrerait-elle pas d'une souffrance infinie ? - viens quand tu veux, je vais courageusement vers toi - adieu et ne m'oubliez pas tout à fait une fois mort, j'ai mérité cela de vous, parce que j'ai souvent, dans ma vie, pensé à vous rendre heureux, soyez-le -

Ludwig van Beethoven, Heiligenstadt, le 6 octobre 1802. »

Beethoven an seine Brüder Kaspar Karl und Nikolaus Johann van Beethoven (« Heiligenstädter Testament »)
Heiligenstadt, 6. und 10. Oktober 1802

« O ihr Menschen die ihr mich für Feindseelig störisch oder Misanthropisch haltet oder erkläret, wie unrecht thut ihr mir, ihr wißt nicht die geheime ursache von dem, was euch so scheint, mein Herz und mein Sinn waren von Kindheit an für das zarte Gefühl des Wohlwollens, selbst große Handlungen zu verrichten dazu war ich immer aufgelegt, aber bedenket nur daß seit 6 Jahren ein heilloser Zustand mich befallen, durch unvernünftige Ärzte verschlimmert, von Jahr zu Jahr in der Hofnung gebeßert zu werden, betrogen, endlich zu dem überblick eines daurenden Übels das (deßen Heilung vielleicht Jahre dauren oder gar unmöglich ist) gezwungen, mit einem feurigen Lebhaften Temperamente gebohren selbst empfänglich für die Zerstreungen der Gesellschaft, muste ich früh mich absondern, einsam mein Leben zubringen, wollte ich auch zuweilen mich einmal über alles das hinaussetzen, o wie hart wurde ich durch die verdoppelte traurige Erfahrung meines schlechten Gehör's dann zurückgestoßen, und doch war's mir noch nicht möglich

den Menschen zu sagen : sprecht lauter, schreyt, denn ich bin Taub, ach wie wär es möglich daß ich da die Schwäche eines Sinnes angeben sollte, der bey mir in einem Vollkommenern Grade als bey andern seyn sollte, einen Sinn denn ich einst in der grösten Vollkommenheit besaß, in einer Vollkommenheit, wie ihn wenige von meinem Fache gewiß haben noch gehabt haben - o ich kann es nicht, drum verzeiht, wenn ihr mich da zurückweichen sehen werdet, wo ich mich gerne unter euch mischte, doppelt Wehe thut mir mein unglück, indem ich dabey verkannt werden muß, für mich darf Erholung in Menschlicher Gesellschaft, feinere unterredungen, Wechselseitige Ergießungen nicht statt haben, ganz allein fast nur so viel als es die höchste Nothwendigkeit fodert, darf ich mich in Gesellschaft einlassen, wie ein Verbannter muß ich leben, nahe ich mich einer Gesellschaft, so überfällt mich eine heiße Ängstlichkeit, indem ich befürchte in Gefahr gesetzt zu werden, meinen Zustand merken zu laßen - so war es denn auch dieses halbe Jahr, was ich auf dem Lande zubrachte, von meinem Vernünftigen Arzte aufgefordert, so viel als möglich mein Gehör zu schonen, kamm er mir fast meiner jezigen natürlichen Dispozition entgegen, obschon, Vom Triebe zur Gesellschaft manchmal hingerißen, ich mich dazu verleiten ließ, aber welche Demüthigung wenn jemand neben mir stund und von weitem eine Flöte hörte und ich nichts hörte, oder jemand den Hirten Singen hörte, und ich auch nichts hörte, solche Ereignisse brachten mich nahe an Verzweiflung, es fehlte wenig, und ich endigte selbst mein Leben - nur sie die Kunst, sie hielt mich zurück, ach es dünkte mir unmöglich, die Welt eher zu verlaßen, bis ich das alles hervorgebracht, wozu ich mich aufgelegt fühlte, und so fristete ich dieses elende Leben - wahrhaft elend, einen so reizbaren Körper, daß eine etwas schnelle Veränderung mich aus dem Besten Zustande in den schlechtesten versezen kann - Geduld - so heist es, Sie muß ich nun zur führerin wählen, ich habe es - daurend hoffe ich, soll mein Entschluß seyn, auszuharren, bis es den unerbittlichen Parzen gefällt, den Faden zu brechen, vielleicht geht's besser, vielleicht nicht, ich bin gefaßt - schon in meinem 28 Jahre gezwungen Philosoph zu werden, es ist nicht leicht, für den Künstler schwerer als für irgend jemand - Gottheit du siehst herab auf mein inneres, du kennst es, du weist, daß menschenliebe und neigung zum Wohlthun drin Hausen, o Menschen, wenn ihr einst dieses leset, so denkt, daß ihr mir unrecht gethan, und der unglückliche, er tröste sich, einen seines gleichen zu finden, der trotz allen Hindernißen der Natur, doch noch alles gethan, was in seinem Vermögen stand, um in die Reihe würdiger Künstler und Menschen aufgenommen zu werden - ihr meine Brüder Carl und Leerraum, sobald ich Tod bin und Professor schmid lebt noch, so bittet ihn in meinem Namen, daß er meine Krankheit beschreibe, und dieses hier geschriebene Blatt füget ihr dieser meiner Krankengeschichte bey, zu damit wenigstens so viel als möglich die Welt nach meinem Tode mit mir versöhnt werde - zugleich erkläre ich euch beyde hier für meine die Erben des kleinen Vermögens, (wenn man es so nennen kann) von mir, theilt es redlich, und vertragt und helft euch einander, was ihr mir zuwider gethan, das wist ihr, war euch schon längst verziehen, dir Bruder Carl danke ich noch in's besondere für deine in dieser leztern spätern Zeit mir bewiesene Anhänglichkeit, Mein Wunsch ist, daß ich euch ein beßers sorgenvolleresloseres Leben, als mir, werde, emphelt euren nach Kindern Tugend, sie nur allein kann glücklich machen, nicht Geld, ich spreche aus Erfahrung, sie war es, die mich selbst im Elende gehoben, ihr Danke ich nebst meiner Kunst, daß ich durch keinen selbstmord mein Leben endigte - lebt wohl und liebt euch ; - allen Freunden danke ich, besonders fürst Lichnovski und Professor schmidt - die Instrumente von fürst L.(ichnowsky) wünsche ich, daß sie doch mögen aufbewahrt werden bey einem von euch, doch entstehe deswegen kein Streit unter euch, sobald sie euch aber zu was nüzlichem dienen können, so verkauft sie nur, wie froh bin ich, wenn ich auch noch unter meinem Grabe euch nützen kann - so wär's geschehen - mit freuden eil ich dem Tode entgegen - kömmt er früher als ich Gelegenheit gehabt habe, noch alle meine Kunst-Fähigkeiten zu entfalten, so wird er mir trotz meinem Harten Schicksaal doch noch zu frühe kommen, und ich würde ihn wohl später wünschen - doch auch dann bin ich zufrieden, befreyt er mich nicht von einem endlosen Leidenden Zustande ? - Komm, wann du willst, ich gehe dir muthig entgegen - lebt

wohl und Vergeßt mich nicht ganz im Tode, ich habe es um euch verdient, indem ich in meinem Leben oft an euch gedacht, euch glücklich zu machen, sey es -

Ludwig van Beethoven

HeiglInstadt am 6ten october 1802. »

...

Heiligenstadt, le 10 octobre 1802 :

« Ainsi je te fais mes adieux - et certes tristement - oui, à toi, espérance aimée - que je portais avec moi jusqu'à présent - l'espérance d'être guéri au moins jusqu'à un certain point - elle doit maintenant me quitter complètement, comme les feuilles d'automne tombent et se flétrissent, elle aussi est morte pour moi, presque comme je suis venu ici - je m'en vais - même le grand courage - qui m'animait souvent durant les beaux jours d'été - il a disparu - ô Providence ! - laisse-moi une fois goûter la joie d'un jour pur - cela fait si longtemps que la résonance intérieure de la vraie joie m'est étrangère - oh ! quand - oh ! quand, ô Dieu ! - pourrai-je dans le temple de la nature et des hommes l'éprouver à nouveau ? - Jamais ? - Non - oh ! cela serait trop difficile. »

...

HeiglInstadt am 10ten oktober 1802 :

« So nehme ich den Abschied von dir - und zwar traurig - ja dir geliebte Hofnung - die ich mit hieher nahm, wenigstens bis zu einem gewißen Punkte geheilet zu seyn - sie muß mich nun gänzlich verlaßen, wie die blätter des Herbstes herabfallen, gewelkt sind, so ist - auch sie für mich dürr geworden, fast wie ich hieher kamm - gehe ich fort - selbst der Hohe Muth - der mich oft in den Schönen Sommertägen beseelte - er ist verschwunden - o Vorsehung - laß einmal einen reinen Tag der Freude mir erscheinen - so lange schon ist der wahren Freude inniger widerhall mir fremd - o wann - o Wann o Gottheit - kann ich im Tempel der Natur und der Menschen ihn wider fühlen - Nie ? - nein - o es wäre zu hart. »

« Heiligenstadt » Testament House on Probusgasse 6, in Vienna's 19th district

Beethoven wrote his « Heiligenstadt Testament » in this house. In fact, it was a letter to his brothers that he never posted. It was written in desperation as, at the age of just 32 and in the middle of writing his Symphony No. 2, Beethoven realized that his deafness was incurable. Despite all the misery and physical and mental anguish he suffered, Beethoven continued for another 25 years writing his great Symphonies and other unique works of music in a world of silence.

À travers photos, extraits de films, lettres et témoignages, ce documentaire retrace son parcours, en s'interrogeant à la fois sur le rôle qu'elle joua pour populariser Beethoven, lui-même récupéré par la propagande nazie, et sur son

engagement pour le régime hitlérien. Seule pianiste allemande de son temps à pouvoir s'affirmer au niveau de ses collègues hommes (Artur Schnabel, Wilhelm Backhaus et Wilhelm Kempff) , elle a laissé des enregistrements légendaires des œuvres pour piano de Beethoven, tant son jeu singulier différait de celui de ses contemporains.

...

La pianiste allemande Elly Ney est née le 27 septembre 1882 à Düsseldorf et est morte le 31 mars 1968 à Tutzing. Après avoir passé ses années d'enfance à Düsseldorf, en compagnie de son père, Jakobus Ney, militaire de carrière, et de sa mère, Anna Ney, professeur de musique.

À l'âge de 10 ans, la jeune pianiste est prise en classes de Maître au Conservatoire de Cologne. C'est 9ans plus tard qu'elle reçoit le Prix Mendelssohn de la ville de Berlin, juste 1 an avant de recevoir le Prix Ibach, décerné par la ville de Cologne.

À partir de 1904, elle devient professeur de la classe de Maître de Cologne pour 1 année. Son 1er enregistrement connu est certainement celui des « 13 pièces pour piano » (« dreizehn Klavierstücke ») aux Éditions Welte-Mignon, datant du 9 février 1906. Elle donne aussi des concerts de la musique de Beethoven et dirige les élèves de Bonn.

Elle se marie en 1911 avec le chef d'orchestre et violoniste néerlandais Willem van Hoogstraten. Le couple vit tout d'abord à Bad Schlangenbad et, plus tard, à Bonn. Au début de la Première Guerre mondiale, Hoogstraaten perd sa nomination en tant que Maître de Chapelle de Bad Honnef. Ils fondent ensemble, avec le violoncelliste Fritz Otto Reitz, « Le Trio Elly Ney » (« Das Elly-Ney-Trio ») et donnent des concerts en Allemagne, en Suisse et aux Pays-Bas.

Le couple a une fille, en 1918, Eleonore van Hoogstraten, qui deviendra plus tard actrice.

Elly Ney est élue membre honoraire de la « Beethoven-Haus » de Bonn, en 1921.

Membre du Parti nazi, qu'elle rejoint en 1937, elle affichait ses vues antisémites. Elle fut bannie un certain temps après la guerre, mais se « réhabilita » , notamment en aidant aux réparations de la maison natale de Beethoven, endommagée pendant le conflit.

Elle réalisa, sur la fin de sa vie, des enregistrements prodigieux et très originaux, surtout de Beethoven, mais aussi les grands Maîtres germaniques, comme Mozart, Schubert et Mendelssohn.

...

The German romantic pianist Elly Ney was born on 27 September 1882 in Düsseldorf and died on 31 March 1968 in Tutzing. She specialized in Beethoven, and was especially popular in Germany.

In Düsseldorf, her mother was a music instructor and her father was a registrar. Her grandmother introduced her to

the works of Beethoven, and supported her piano playing. She studied at Cologne with Isidor Seiß and Karl Bötcher. After winning the Mendelssohn Scholarship, in 1901, she studied in Vienna with Theodor Leschetizky and Emil von Sauer. She taught at the Cologne Conservatory for 3 years, then became a touring virtuoso. In 1927, she was given the honorary freedom of Beethoven's birthplace Bonn. In 1932, she founded the Elly Ney Trio with Wilhelm Stroß (violin) and Ludwig Hoelscher (cello) : in quintets, the group recorded with Florizel von Reuter (violin) and Walter Trampler (viola) . She traveled to many parts of the world, including the United States, playing at Carnegie Hall, in New York.

A pianist with a big-boned approach to the repertory, Elly Ney was as assertive regarding her career as she was in approaching the keyboard. Deciding that teaching was too confining, she determined to have an important career and pursued the means to achieve it. In chamber music performance, Ney was just as striking and individual a force as in her solo appearances. A number of recordings document her vigorous dedication to her art. After studying at the Cologne Conservatory with Karl Böttcher and Isidor Seiß, she traveled to Vienna to learn from Emil Sauer and the legendary Theodor Leschetizky. Leschetizky believed that those with slender hands needed to bring more pressure to their touch, in order to achieve a sensuous tone. Without any doubt, this issue was addressed in his work with the young German pianist and the results became an integral part of Ney's sound. At the age of 16, Ney won the Mendelssohn Prize and she also placed 1st in the Ibach competition. After 3 years of teaching at the Cologne Conservatory, Ney decided she preferred performance to life as an instructor and, thereafter, committed herself to concert work. Launching her career in Holland, Ney completed a successful tour of Europe. She became equally appreciated in the United States, where she presented herself as both an orchestral soloist and in recital. Following one of the pianist's early American performances, critic H. E. Krehbiel commented :

« She presses the truism of reposefulness, beautiful symmetry, and varied loveliness of tone upon nearly everything she plays. »

Among Ney's many honours was the Freedom of the City of Bonn, granted to her in 1927. That same year, she played the world-premiere of Ernst Toch's Piano Concerto in Berlin, repeating the work the following year in America with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. In 1932, Ney formed her own Piano Trio with violinist Max Strub and cellist Ludwig Hölscher. In 1937, Adolf Hitler chose to celebrate her birthday by bestowing upon Ney the title of professor. 2 years later, Ney received an invitation to assume direction of piano classes for the planned « Hochschule » at the Salzburg « Mozarteum » . Married to Dutch conductor Willem van Hoogstraaten, in 1911, Ney divorced in 1927 and, subsequently, married Paul Allais of Chicago. She retired after the end of WWII. Ney expressed particular appreciation for the music of Beethoven with Brahms as another favourite. Even in moments of bold display, however, the lessons learned from Teodor Leschetizky remained with her and the tone kept a rounded quality. The evidence of this may be found in her recordings.

BRAHMS : Piano Concerto No. 2 in B-flat major, Opus 83 (recorded on 1, 2 and 5 June 1939 and 29 April 1940, with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and pianist Elly Ney) .

Matrix Nos. : 14704, 14712, 11393, 14744, 11414, 11424, 11433, 11443, 11453, 11464, 14721 and 14734 GS 9. 1st issued on « Grammophon » , 67566 through 67571.

The Brahms 2nd Piano Concerto conducted by Max Fiedler with Elly Ney is a lovely performance, imperturbable but never bland, the music cradled, deposited on a number of Cloud Nines, with a Finale unrivalled perhaps in my experience for its embracing of the *grazioso* in Brahms' *allegretto* marking.

Early in the 20th Century, Max Fiedler had earned the reputation in Germany as a Brahms specialist, and it was in that capacity that he made his only commercial records for « Grammophon / Polydor », all of which are presented here.

The B-flat Concerto set has an interesting history. Originally recorded over 3 days, in June of 1939, with 4 takes made for nearly every side, Ney was unhappy with some of the results, and wrote to the conductor in the fall of that year about scheduling a remake session. Fiedler was on tour in Stockholm at the time, and replied that it would have to wait until his return. However, his death there, in December of that year, appeared to doom the project.

Ultimately, « Grammophon » scheduled a session for April of the following year with a « ghost » conductor (who remains unknown, although Alois Melichar has been suggested as a likely suspect) . 5 of the 12 sides were done over, with the original Fiedler-conducted takes remaining on Side 3 of the 1st movement (CD 2, Track 3, 8:41 to 13:11) , all of the 2nd and 3rd movements, and the 1st side of the 4th movement (to 3:18 on Track 6) . As far as I am aware, this is the 1st release to acknowledge the extent of Fiedler's participation.

Multiple sources were assembled for each recording, and the best portions of each were used for transfer. The overture and the 4th Symphony came from laminated American Brunswicks ; the 2nd Symphony mostly from black label 1930's « Polydor » pressings ; and the Concerto from 3 different 1940's « Grammophon » and « Polydor » editions. Even so, some inescapable noise and distortion inherent in the original recordings remain.

...

The strongest early musical influence on Elly Ney came from her grandmother, who loved the music of Beethoven. When the child was 5, her father retired from the army and took a position on the town council in Bonn and, at the age of 10, Ney was taken to play for Doctor Franz Wüllner, principal of the Cologne Conservatory. He placed her under the tuition of Isidor Seiß himself a pupil of Friedrich Wieck, father of Clara Schumann. After 9 years of study with Seiß, Ney won the Mendelssohn Prize in Berlin and decided she wanted to study with Teodor Leschetizky in Vienna, her motivation for this move being the fact that Leschetizky had studied with Carl Czerny who, in turn, had studied with Beethoven. Ney's final teacher was Emil von Sauer, one of Liszt's greatest pupils.

Ney began her successful performing career in 1904, making her Viennese debut 1 year later. She also took-over Seiß's class at the Cologne Conservatory but, after 3 years, abandoned it in favour of performance. Arthur Nikisch and the Leipzig « Gewandhaus » Orchestra were frequent concert partners, and she also performed chamber music with her Trio comprising cellist Fritz Reitz and violinist Willem van Hoogstraten whom she married in 1911. In 1921, Ney and her husband travelled to the United States, where, until the outbreak of World War II, Ney enjoyed great success. In 1927, Ney was awarded honorary freedom of the city of Bonn, Beethoven's birthplace, and in the 1930's, she formed a new piano Trio with cellist Ludwig Hoelscher and violinist Wilhelm Stroß, later replaced by Max Strub. During World War

II, Ney taught at the « Mozarteum » in Salzburg, but because she stayed within the 3rd « Reich » and did not renounce Hitler and his ideals, she came to be seen, like Furtwängler, as a Nazi sympathiser.

Ney's mature style was eminently suited to the music of Beethoven. Nobility, grandeur, and her complete immersion in his works resulted in performances of great profundity ; but the young Ney had a virtuoso repertoire and, in the 1920's, she recorded Liszt, Chopin, Schubert, Debussy, Gottschalk and MacDowell for « Brunswick » Records. However, it is her recordings from the 1930's of Brahms's Piano Concerto No. 2, Opus 83 ; Schumann's « Kinderszenen » , Opus 15 ; Schubert's « Wanderer » Fantasy, D. 760 ; Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 15, K. 450 ; and, most of all, the works of Beethoven that are important. Ney's best recording is of Beethoven Piano Sonata, Opus 111, recorded in May 1936. In the « Arietta » , Ney plumbs the depths of Beethoven's musical psyche in a performance of utter concentration that is one of the finest readings of this work on disc. She brings the same attributes to her reading of Brahms's Piano Concerto No. 2, Opus 83, with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and Max Fiedler. Most of these recordings, plus Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 15, K. 450, and Richard Strauß's « Burleske » (conducted by her husband, Willem van Hoogstraten) have been re-issued on compact disc.

Later in her career, Ney recorded for the German label « Colosseum » . Between 1960 and 1968, she recorded a large amount of her repertoire which was recently re-issued on 12 compact discs. 7 of the discs are devoted to Beethoven, including the last 3 Concertos with Willem van Hoogstraten, and some Sonatas and shorter pieces. One disc contains recordings made on Beethoven's own piano, an instrument that became too fragile to be used thereafter, but these recordings are only of historical interest. The sound quality varies, and a recording from 1964 of Schubert's « Wanderer » Fantasy has a piano with an unpleasant tone. Other major works include Schumann's « Études symphoniques » , Opus 13 ; 3 Mozart Sonatas ; and a robust Piano Sonata in F minor, Opus 5, by Brahms ; plus a few previously unreleased items. Good as it is to hear Ney in this varying repertoire, she was already in her late- 70's when she began this series of recordings, and 86 by its end. The 1968 recording of Beethoven's last Piano Sonata, Opus 111, may have a lifetime of experience behind it, but it is in Ney's recordings from the 1930's that she really makes her mark.

...

During the 3rd « Reich » , she voluntarily joined the Nazi Party in 1937, participated in « cultural education » camps, and became an honorary member of the League of German Girls. She held anti-Semite views. Ney was awarded the War Merit Cross, 2nd Class for care for troops. After the War, the city of Bonn imposed a stage ban on her. In 1952, a request for lifting the ban was rejected, stating that Ney was a « pronounced National-Socialist » . Nevertheless, she was named Honorary Citizen of Tutzing, in 1952. She continued touring until her death, increasingly concentrating on Beethoven's piano works.

...

A female pianist in the last Century, a Beethoven specialist, did not sit on the broad fence like most of us, but who stood in the gardens on opposite sides with utter conviction and determination. Elly Ney (1882-1968) wrote adoring

letters to « mein Führer » . According to the pianist Edward Kilenyi, who was a captain in the U.S. Army at the time, she would read extracts of Hitler's writings and soldiers' letters from the concert stage ; and, in Salzburg, where she taught during the War, she used to honour Beethoven's bust with a Nazi salute. During the War, Ney taught at the « Mozarteum » in Salzburg, but because she stayed within the 3rd « Reich » and did not renounce Hitler and his ideals, she came to be seen, like Furtwängler, as a Nazi sympathiser. Her career, which had flourished in the earlier years of the 20th Century, never recovered. The mayor of Tutzing, the small Bavarian town where she died, removed her portrait from the Town Hall.

...

Elly Ney was strongly in favour of National-Socialism and held anti-Semitic views. In 1937, Adolf Hitler gave her the title of professor as a birthday gift. During the War, she was a teacher at the « Mozarteum » in Salzburg and she was a member of several Nazi organizations.

The Nazi era had damaged her reputation and, only in 1952, she was able to resume her career. Until old age, she played with technical brilliance and did tours and recordings. She was most famous for her interpretations of Beethoven and Brahms.

...

In 1937, Adolf Hitler chose to celebrate Elly Ney's birthday by bestowing upon her the title of professor. 2 years later, she received an invitation to assume direction of piano classes for the planned « Hochschule » at the Salzburg « Mozarteum » . Married to Dutch conductor Willem van Hoogstraaten, in 1911, Ney divorced in 1927 and, subsequently, married Paul Allais of Chicago. She retired after the end of WWII. Ney expressed particular appreciation for the music of Beethoven with Brahms as another favourite. Even in moments of bold display, however, the lessons learned from Teodor Leschetizky remained with her and the tone kept a rounded quality. The evidence of this may be found in her recordings.

...

Elly Ney, a charismatic, leonine performer whose Beethoven captivated European audiences, spent the Nazi years yearning for an opportunity to give a private recital for the « Führer » , an honour ultimately granted to Wilhelm Backhaus, whom she deeply envied thereafter. Ney was obliged to find fulfillment in Hitler's handshake, an encounter that she later described as her life's apogee. Her commitment to National-Socialism barely faltered after the War, and it is this, and her sustained anti-Semitism, that makes her case so particularly compelling. Although Ney ultimately renounced Hitler (in 1952 !) , declaring that the « Nazis had betrayed Germany » , her true allegiance remained constant, even as her touring career gradually petered-out. It is more than a little depressing to note that her biography skips over her devotion and sterling service to the 3rd « Reich » - a dedication so enthusiastic that she regularly preceded her concerts with a devotional peroration on the glories of National-Socialism.

...

50 years ago, a white haired woman stood on a stage in Bad Godesberg, a small-town south of Germany's « Cold War » capital, Bonn. She stood for 20 minutes as the crowd stomped and applauded her performance of a series of Beethoven pieces on the piano.

The pianist, Elly Ney, was one of Germany's most talented during the 3rd « Reich » . But her political loyalties and actions caused her to be banned from ever playing again in the birth city of her beloved Beethoven, Bonn. Of her exile she said :

« I will never go back to Bonn. I prefer to play in a prison since the people there are not so demanding. »

As talented as she was, the Bonn city council could not tolerate Elly Ney's Nazi past - and would not allow her to publicly play any piano within city boundaries.

In the 1930's, Elly Ney was noted among German musicians for her enthusiastic anti-Semitism. She considered, for example, the work of Richard Strauss's librettist, Stefan Zweig to be « ugly, Jewish-demonic » . Jazz to Elly Ney, was also dangerous due to its racially « impure » qualities.

In 1933, Ney refused to perform in Hamburg after she was asked to replace a Jewish pianist, Rudolf Serkin. For her, replacing a Jew was unbearable.

A devout member of the Nazi Party, the pianist supported Adolf Hitler's efforts to remove Jews from important posts including the cultural sector and was pleased when Jewish musicians were no longer allowed to perform in Hitler's Germany.

...

The section of Nazi musicians would be incomplete without a discussion of 2 women, Li Stadelmann and Elly Ney. Both were keyboard artists (as were most German female instrumentalists) , and befitting the regime's character as a male-supremacist society, they were without any Party, State, or other institutional office. Yet, they were confirmed National-Socialists nonetheless, and they had an impact on the musical life of the nation.

In both cases, these women's National-Socialist beliefs were driven by genuine anti-Semitism, stemming from what they regarded as bitter experiences in pre-regime days. Li Stadelmann was a Munich-based harpsichordist specializing in Baroque music, especially that of Bach. Even in the 1920's, she was sufficiently accomplished to be invited to concert engagements abroad. In 1929, while on a tour of West Prussia (which then belonged to Poland) , she had played with the violinist Andreas Weisgerber, a Jew. Stadelmann reacted angrily when Weisgerber's sensitive interpretation of the Classical German composers was enthusiastically accepted by their audiences. In 1933, she hailed the coming of Adolf Hitler, rejoicing that « our German Masters will find German interpreters » . She immediately joined the Nazi Party

and, subsequently, at least 3 additional Nazi organizations. After the Munich « Bach-Verein » was usurped by the « Kampfbund » to cleanse it of « Jewish influence », church-music recitals relied heavily on Stadelmann. The harpsichordist continued to make her name as one of the most sought after chamber musicians of the Nazi period.

Elly Ney's case is much more significant because she was both a greater artist and a more fanatical National-Socialist. Born in 1882, in Düsseldorf, the daughter of an active Imperial army sergeant and a music teacher, she was a child prodigy, giving public concerts as a teenager and touring the United States extensively from 1921. By 1930, she had performed as a piano soloist in all the larger cities of the union and in many other countries as well. Most probably her intense nationalism derived from the narrow-mindedness of her « petit bourgeois » military home, which appears to have rendered her entirely xenophobic. When, as a 10 year old, she trained under the Jewish Cologne Conservatory piano teacher Isidor Seiß, she immediately took a dislike to him because of his « racially alien » qualities. As she later recalled, she made-up for this unpleasant experience by spending more time in the choir of conservatory director Franz Wüllner, a Gentile. During her concert tours, she was keen to propagate German values abroad, as in the United States, where she fancied herself fighting for « spiritual ideals and for German music » and, in Switzerland, where she had German poems recited before her concerts. Characteristically, she was skeptical of the newer composers such as Arnold Schönberg and Ernst Toch, but deeply appreciated the German-rooted Hans Pfitzner, with whom she shared a general suspicion of Jews.

Even before 1933, Elly Ney had developed a personal idealism that was not without its eccentricities. Like Hitler, she was a fervent vegetarian ; she valued special herbs and juices and explored the spiritual powers of hydrotherapy !

From a history of the Eden vegetarian colony, founded in 1893, north of Berlin :

« Eden got support from artists like the conductor Karl Klindworth, the pianist Elly Ney and the sculptor Wilhelm Groß. » (It is not clear when Elly Ney was giving this support.)

16th World Vegetarian Congress (1960) in Hannover and Hamburg :

« Later in the evening, The Animal Protection Society gave a concert with the famous professor Elly Ney. Now 82 years of age, giving a wonderful piano recital of Bach, Schubert and Beethoven. Vladimir Ruzdak (baritone) and Gisela Litz (mezzo-soprano) charmed the audience with their singing. »

Quote from Elly Ney (unknown date) :

« Vegetarianism has been a concern of mine for decades, and I think it is the natural way of living for people. It is incomprehensible to me that not every animal friend is at the same time a vegetarian. »

(« Der Vegetarismus ist mir seit Jahrzehnten ein inneres Anliegen, und ich halte ihn für die naturgemäße Lebensweise des Menschen. Es ist mir unbegreiflich, daß nicht jeder Tierfreund zugleich Vegetarier ist. »)

She subscribed to a sort of humanitarian ethics, which her admirers today interpret as having been universal, but upon closer examination turns-out to have applied only to racially pure and patriotic Germans - in a word, to fellow Nazis. Indeed, within the 3rd « Reich » , she was altruistic to the point of self-sacrifice, performing virtually free of charge for young German audiences ; but they tended to be members of the Hitler Youth. On those occasions, when she played for blue-collar audiences, it was for workers in the German Labor Front of Robert Ley ; and when she entertained soldiers, they frequently included the Waffen-SS. Her chosen medium was Beethoven, whose compositions she interpreted impressively, and after whom she styled herself physically, displaying that same heroic facial expression and that well-known untamed mane. Beethoven, of course, was in vogue in the 3rd « Reich » ; he stood for the heroic spirit with which Hitler himself identified. Ney came to enjoy the appellation of high-priestess that music-critics bestowed upon her, for the aura of the quasi-divine was very much to her taste. Nor does she seem to have minded the translation of that concept from an originally Christian setting to a neo-Pagan Germanic one.

With her exuberant talent and thoroughly professional background, Ney would have flourished no matter what political regime she found herself in ; indeed, the distinguished Trio that she headed, along with cellist Ludwig Hølscher and violinist Wilhelm Ströb (later, Max Strub) , had been founded in the final phase of the Weimar Republic. But, given her personal and political predilections, she was fated to do particularly well in the 3rd « Reich » , to the point where many regarded her as the prototypical National-Socialist musician. For her own commercial benefit, she exploited the national Beethoven-mania for all it was worth, performing the Master's works repeatedly in concerts and making many recordings ! And though at least one knowledgeable foreign observer found her approach insensitive, she became something of a Mozart specialist as well, with the help of an adjunct faculty position at Salzburg's famous « Mozarteum » Conservatory.

But Ney's ambition reached beyond the music that was her life. She aimed to become the personal friend of as many Nazi regime leaders as possible, for she regarded them as Germany's true saviours from all the perceived ills besetting it, particularly Judaism. Ney's abiding anti-Semitism is probably unique among the outstanding German musicians of the time. She was obsessed with Jews as firmly as she believed in the curative powers of medicinal herbs. Early on in the regime, she claimed to have realized how insidiously the Jews had oppressed the Gentiles, without using any force at all, and later, once she had read Richard Wagner's treatises on the so-called « Jewish Question » , she became even more convinced. Over time, she came to accept all the vicious prejudices proliferating in Nazi Germany : that a disagreeable interpretation of a Bruckner Symphony could have been the result of Jewish manipulation ; that the writings of Stefan Zweig, Richard Strauss's librettist, were « ugly, Jewish-demonic » ; and so on. She also regarded the art of jazz as racially « degenerate » and « dangerous » , precisely because, technically, it is of such great virtuosity. Not surprisingly, these sentiments influenced her career decisions. As early as spring 1933, when she was asked to perform in Hamburg, in place of the young Jewish pianist Rudolf Serkin (who, then, living in Switzerland, had already been banned) , she regarded this as an insult. In a letter, she claimed that the thought of sitting in for a Jew was distasteful to her and that she could bear it only by concentrating « on the work alone » .

For Ney, Adolf Hitler was the cure to rid Germany of this alleged disease. She welcomed his early attempts to remove Jews from influential positions. « He is proceeding slowly, yet, radically » , she remarked. Of course, she was aware that she, herself, was one of the beneficiaries of such measures. Upon recording Franz Schubert's « Forellenquintett » (Trout

Quintet) for « Electrola » , she commented on the absence of « Jewish recordings » with great satisfaction. She was equally delighted that foreign Jewish soloists of the stature of Carl Flesch, Jascha Heifetz, and Vladimir Horowitz had all « played themselves out » .

Ney's tireless public service for the benefit of any conceivable Party organization, especially the Hitler Youth, found a natural complement in her persistent lobbying for the favour of the leaders. With Josef Gæbbels, the chief of the « Reich » Culture Chamber, she does not seem to have had any notable rapport while, at the same time, he appears to have been indifferent to her artistry. In any event, she was interested, 1st and foremost, in the « Führer » . Enthralled by several of Hitler's early broadcast speeches, she was determined to play for him in private, and she was beside herself with envy after learning that her colleague Wilhelm Backhaus had already managed to do so, by May 1933. In the summer of 1936, the pianist, who in her public addresses never neglected an opportunity to praise Hitler, finally enjoyed his vicarious presence when she was seated close to the « Führer's » box at the Bayreuth Festival. Barely 1 year later, Hitler bestowed upon Ney, who had dutifully held a number of Party organization memberships, the honorary title of professor. Finally, in the summer of 1938, she met him during an official dinner, where he shook her hand warmly. Thus encouraged, she asked outright to be allowed to play for him, but again, this came to naught. By the fall of 1939, when War had broken-out, Ney had to resign herself to the fact that « the “ Führer ” is occupied » . All those other Party eminences she communed with (Hinkel, Frick, Heß, Rust, von Schirach) could never quite make-up for this disappointment.

...

Elly Ney (geboren 27. September 1882 in Düsseldorf ; gestorben 31. März 1968 in Tutzing) war eine deutsche Pianistin, die als Interpretin der Klavier-Werke Ludwig van Beethovens Bedeutung erlangt hat. Die Künstlerin ist wegen ihrer Nähe zum Nationalsozialismus umstritten.

Elly Ney wurde am 27. September 1882 als Tochter des Feldwebels Jakobus Ney und der Musiklehrerin Anna Ney in Düsseldorf geboren. Da ihre Mutter nicht in einer Kaserne leben wollte, wechselte der Vater in eine Beamtenstelle nach Bonn. Ihre Kindheit und Jugend war geprägt von einem militaristischen und musischen Elternhaus ; der Historiker Michæl Kater nennt ihre Erziehung xenophob.

Sie war unter anderem Schülerin von Franz Wüllner und Isidor Seiß sowie von Teodor Leszetycki und Emil von Sauer. Als 10-jährige wurde sie in die Meisterklasse des Kölner Konservatoriums aufgenommen. Als 19-jährige gewann Elly Ney den « Mendelssohn-Preis » der Stadt Berlin, mit 20 Jahren erhielt sie in Köln den « Ibach-Preis » .

Ab 1904 war sie selbst für einige Jahre Lehrerin der Kölner Meisterklasse. Am 9. Februar 1906 nahm sie dreizehn Klavierstücke für das Reproduktionsklavier Welte-Mignon auf, sicherlich die ältesten von ihr überkommenen Aufnahmen. Sie gab Konzerte und Einführungen in die Musik Beethovens für Bonner Schüler.

1911 heiratete sie den niederländischen Dirigenten und Violinisten Willem van Hoogstraten. Das Paar lebte zunächst in Schlangenbad und später in Bonn. Nach dem Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkriegs verlor Hoogstraten seine Stellung als

Kurkapellmeister in Honnef. Zusammen mit dem Cellisten Fritz Otto Reitz gründete das Paar das Elly-Ney-Trio und gab in Deutschland, der Schweiz und in den Niederlanden Konzerte. 1918 bekam das Ehepaar eine Tochter, die spätere Schauspielerin Eleonore van Hoogstraten.

Von 1921 an lebte Elly Ney zeitweise in den USA und entwickelte sich zur Spezialistin für Beethoven und Brahms. Zahlreiche Berichte der « New York Times » aus den 1920er Jahren besprechen ihre Konzerte in Spielorten wie der « Carnegie Hall » in New York. Bei ihrem Debüt-Konzert in den USA am 15. Oktober 1921 spielte sie nur Beethoven, im zweiten Konzert Brahms, Schubert und Chopin. Hoogstraten leitete mehrere Orchester und wurde 1925 Musikdirektor des Oregon Symphonie Orchesters. Mit Orchestern unter Hoogstratens Leitung gastierte Ney als Solistin in fast allen großen Städten der USA. Auch als Solo-Künstlerin wurde sie für Konzerte überall in den USA engagiert ; zum Beispiel trat sie im Rahmen einer Freiluftkonzertreihe Symphonies under the Stars 1929 in Hollywood auf. In den USA entstanden in den 1920er Jahren ihre ersten Plattenaufnahmen. 1928 heiratete sie in zweiter Ehe den Kohlewerkdirektor Paul Allais (1895-1990) aus Chicago, der ihr zuvor einige Jahre bei ihren Konzerten in den USA nachreiste. Diese Ehe hatte nur kurz Bestand. Obwohl nicht mehr verheiratet, lebte Ney mit ihrem ersten Mann Hoogstraten danach weiter in einer Lebensgemeinschaft und feierte 1961 mit ihm Goldene Hochzeit ; beide haben ein gemeinsames Grab in Tutzing.

Auch in Deutschland blieb Elly Ney in den 1920er Jahren weiter aktiv. Für ihren Beitrag zum besonders glanzvollen Gelingen des Beethovenfestes 1927 und für ihre internationale Karriere, die auch ihrer Heimatstadt Bonn zu Ansehen verhalf, wurde ihr im selben Jahr die Ehrenbürgerschaft der Stadt Bonn zugesprochen.

Ab 1930 verlagerte sie ihren künstlerischen Wirkungskreis wieder nach Europa. Mit dem Geiger Wilhelm Stroß und dem Cellisten Ludwig Hoelscher gründete sie 1932 erneut ein Elly-Ney-Trio, welches in verschiedenen Ländern erfolgreiche Auftritte absolvierte.

1933 beantragte Ney, die nach Heirat mit einem Amerikaner und Scheidung staatenlos war, die Wiedereinbürgerung. Angesichts der prominenten Antragstellerin wurde vom zuständigen Beamten die Frage, ob « die Antragstellerin in nationaler Hinsicht als wertvoller Bevölkerungszuwachs anzuerkennen sei » , positiv beantwortet. Sie sei als Künstlerin im deutschen Sinne tätig gewesen, wenngleich ihre Heirat mit einem Amerikaner an sich gegen eine gute deutsche Gesinnung spräche, so der Beurteiler der Stadt Bonn über deren Ehrenbürgerin.

1933 begeisterte sich Elly Ney für Adolf Hitler und wandte sich dem Nationalsozialismus zu. In einem Brief an Willem van Hoogstraten vom März 1933 schrieb sie :

« Eben hörte Hitler 45 Minuten sprechen. Bin tief erschüttert. Eine ungeheure Gewalt. Lies die Rede ! Das ist Wahrheit einer tief empfindenden und entflamten Menschenseele. Hitler sprach mir aus der Seele über die Kunst. Endlich wird es ausgesprochen und wird die Bahn frei. »

Am 20. April 1937 wurde sie von Hitler zur Professorin ernannt, am 1. Mai 1937 wurde sie Mitglied der NSDAP (Nr. 6.088.559) . Für ihre Mitarbeit bei den Olympischen Spielen 1936 verlieh Hitler ihr 1937 eine Erinnerungsmedaille. Ney

war Mitglied weiterer nationalsozialistischer Organisationen, unter anderem Ehrenmitglied im Bund Deutscher Mädel (BDM), und hielt Reden an die Jugend, in denen sie Beethoven und die « nordische Musik » im Geist des Nationalsozialismus deutete. Im Zweiten Weltkrieg, in der Zeit des Generalgouvernements Polen gastierte Elly Ney 1941 auch in Krakau, wo damals die « Philharmonie des Generalgouvernements » eingerichtet war. Ihre missionarische Musikauffassung bewies sie 1942 in Görlitz, wo sie die zweite Aufführung von Carl Orffs Carmina Burana unter Protest verließ, das Werk als « Kulturschande » bezeichnete und ein lokales Aufführungsverbot erreichte. Ney spielte im Verlauf des Kriegs zunehmend Konzerte in Lazaretten und Krankenhäusern. 1943 erhielt sie das Kriegsverdienstkreuz 2. Klasse für Truppenbetreuung. 1944, in der Endphase des Zweiten Weltkriegs wurde sie von Hitler in die Gottbegnadetenliste der unersetzlichen Künstler aufgenommen. In der Anfangsphase der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus gab sie zahlreiche kostenfreie Konzerte für Organisationen der NSDAP und beschwerte sich beim Reichspropagandaministerium über zu wenige staatliche Aufträge als Honorarkünstlerin. Später wurde sie offenkundig häufiger bezahlt, denn für 1943 meldete sie zirka 190.000 Reichsmark Einnahmen.

Elly Ney hatte Talent, eine solide Musikausbildung und erlangte zweifelsfrei bereits vor der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus Anerkennung und Ruhm; ihre Karriere wäre in jedem System erfolgreich weiter verlaufen. Einer Interpretin von ihrem Rang wäre mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit auch unter anderen politischen Verhältnissen ein Lehrauftrag und ein Professorentitel angedient worden. Die Bedeutung der Musik Beethovens für den Nationalsozialismus und die Rassegesetze von 1936, die unter anderem Juden die Aufführung der Werke Beethovens untersagten, förderten ihre Karriere in den 1930er Jahren jedoch nachhaltig.

Elly Ney hatte in den 1920er und 1930er Jahren maßgeblichen Anteil an der Gestaltung und Entwicklung der Beethovenfesttage in Bonn. Sie war mit dem Elly-Ney-Trio und als Solistin die dominante Musikerin dieser Musikereignisse. Wegen ihrer nationalsozialistischen Verstrickung wurde sie von der Stadt Bonn jedoch in der Nachkriegszeit bis 1952 mit einem Auftrittsverbot belegt.

Trotz ihrer nationalsozialistischen Vergangenheit konnte Elly Ney in den 1950er Jahren eine Alterskarriere beginnen, die bis wenige Wochen vor ihrem Tod andauerte. In Gefängnissen und Flüchtlingslagern gab sie Konzerte. Sie veröffentlichte 1952 eine Autobiographie und spendete für den Neubau der Bonner Beethovenhalle. Nachdem jedoch durch die Presse verbreitet worden war, daß sie dem rechtsextremistischen Deutschen Kulturwerk Europäischen Geistes nahestand, stellte sie ihre Zahlungen ein. In ihrem Nachlaß wurde allerdings ein Sparbuch mit dem Zweck « Spenden für den Wiederaufbau der Beethovenhalle » gefunden, auf welches bis 1959 Spenden eingingen. Der Betrag von circa 75.000 DM wurde 1995 für Renovierungsarbeiten an der Beethovenhalle verwendet. Ebenfalls 1952 erhielt sie die Ehrenbürgerschaft der Gemeinde Tutzing in Bayern aufgrund ihrer Verdienste um die Musik und ihrer musikalischen und kulturellen Aktivitäten an ihrem damaligen Wohnort.

Elly Ney spielte noch im hohen Alter schwierige Werke der Klavierliteratur. Sie unternahm ausgedehnte Tourneen und spielte zwischen ihrem 79. und 86. Lebensjahr einen Großteil ihres Repertoires als Solistin oder unter ihrem Lebenspartner Willem van Hoogstraten als Dirigent des Fränkischen Landesorchesters Nürnberg auf Stereoschallplatten ein. Ebenso machte sie Film- und Fernsehaufnahmen. Am 6. Februar 1965 gab sie im Kanzlerbungalow für Ludwig Erhard und ausgewählte Gäste ein Hauskonzert. Auch andere bedeutende Politiker der Nachkriegszeit wie Theodor Heuß

und Kurt Georg Kiesinger besuchten Konzerte von Elly Ney und würdigten ihre Kunst. Im Herbst 1964 nahm sie als Solistin im Alter von 82 Jahren an einer 19-tägigen Tournee des Berliner Symphonischen Orchesters unter Carl August Bunte durch die Bundesrepublik Deutschland teil. Zu ihrem 85. Geburtstag gab die Stadt Bonn einen Empfang, an dem auch der damalige Bundespräsident Heinrich Lübke teilnahm.

Elly Ney war Klavierlehrerin renommierter Musiker wie zum Beispiel von Franz Hummel.

Sie starb 1968 im 86. Lebensjahr in Tutzing und wurde dort neben ihrem 1965 verstorbenen Ex-Ehemann und Lebenspartner Willem van Hoogstraten beerdigt. Der damalige Oberbürgermeister von Bonn, Wilhelm Daniels, hielt eine Trauerrede.

Bezüglich ihres sogenannten romantischen Klavierspiels, das sich auch bei ihren Zeitgenossen Alfred Cortot oder Edwin Fischer findet und sich vom Klavierspiel späterer Generationen deutlich unterscheidet, schrieb der Musikkritiker Joachim Kaiser : Immer wieder versuchte sie, herauszuholen, worüber blendende Pianisten gern hinwegwollen : die Innigkeit.

Siegfried Mauser, Rektor der Hochschule für Musik und Theater München und Professor für Musikwissenschaften, datiert den Leistungshöhepunkt von Elly Ney auf die 1920er Jahre und bewertet ihre späteren Leistungen als die einer durchschnittlichen Pianistin. Mauser bezeichnet Ney als Vertreterin eines kunst-religiösen Beethoven-Interpretationsstils, der von den Nationalsozialisten ähnlich wie die Musik Wagners für ihre Zwecke missbraucht wurde, was Ney andererseits eine Verlängerung ihrer Karriere ermöglichte. Die Qualität von Neys Musikinterpretationen nach 1930 ist laut Mauser geringer als die von Pianisten wie Artur Schnabel oder Edwin Fischer.

Höheres gibt es nichts, als der Gottheit sich mehr nähern als andere und von hier aus die Strahlen der Gottheit unter das Menschengeschlecht zu verbreiten lautet das Schlusswort von Elly Neys Vortrag Wie ich zu Beethoven kam. Das belegt den religiösen und missionarischen Aspekt ihrer Musikinterpretation.

Bei ihrem ersten Konzert in den USA spielte Elly Ney drei Klaviersonaten von Beethoven, Nr. 29 (Hammerklavier) , Nr. 23 (Apassionata) und Nr. 14 (Mondscheinsonate) sowie Sechs Variationen für Klavier und Andante favori. Die « New York Times » schrieb dazu :

« Madame Ney as a neo-Classicist, is no stickler for the letter of the law, Beethovenian or otherwise, but she had ideas about the music, chosen at risk of monotony and anti-climax, and she created a mood unconventional but not inappropriate to the spiritual titan of sculpturesque sounds whose works rank with Angelo and Rodin. »

(« Frau Ney ist als Neo-Klassikerin keine Verfechterin der reinen Lehre, der von Beethoven oder anderen, aber sie hat Ideen zur Musik, bevorzugt das Riskieren von Monotonie und Steigerung, und sie erzeugt eine unkonventionelle Stimmung, die aber nicht unangebracht ist für den geistigen Titan skulpturesker Musik, dessen Werke den Rang derer von Angelo und Rodin haben. »)

« In den Sympathiebekundungen der Ney-Gläubigen wurde diskret darüber hinweggesehen, daß das Spiel der greisen

Pianistin nicht mehr immer sachlicher Kritik standzuhalten vermag, von subjektiver künstlerischer Beurteilung ganz zu schweigen. Diskret ist auch längst Elly Neys pianistischer Großeinsatz im Dritten Reich vergessen. Erfahrene Ney- und Beethoven-Kenner leugnen indes nicht, daß die Altmeisterin mitunter in der Hingabe des Spiels ganze Passagen versehentlich wegläßt. »

(Peter Stähle 1965 in der Zeit.)

« Beim Verklingen der letzten Arietta-Takte herrschte Staunen über die geistige und physische Kapazität der Künstlerin. Als Elly Ney aber dann noch 45 Minuten Zugaben aus dem Ärmel schüttelte, war des Jubels kein Ende. Unter den herausragenden Phänomenen unserer Zeit ist Elly Ney eines der bemerkenswertesten. »

(Der Weser-Kurier, 1967.)

« Das Klavierspiel von Elly Ney war weltweit bekannt durch exzessives Temperament verbunden mit Esprit ; wie einst die berühmte argentinische Pianistin Teresa Careño vermochte sie das von Haus aus spröde Klavier zum Singen zu bringen ; ihre brillante klavieristische Technik vor allem das Legato-Oktavenspiel im Pianissimo wurde in vielen Kritiken bezeugt. »

(Hans D. Hoffert, zitiert in « Pro Classics » .)

« Hier huldigt eine Grande Dame des Klaviers derart beeindruckend ihren Hausgöttern Beethoven, Mozart und Schubert, daß man geneigt ist, die politischen Verfehlungen ihres Lebens rundheraus gering zu achten. Darin liegt für kritisch reflektierende Hörer ein Dilemma, das selbst unter weniger gestrengen historischen und moralischen Maßstäben kaum aufzulösen ist. Und dieser Zwiespalt wird eher mit jedem Takt größer - so einzigartig und tief sinnig wirkt dieses Klavierspiel. Fast schon unerklärlich ist diese ungebrochene Gestaltungskraft bei der Beethoven-Platte, die als Glanzstück das gewaltige Adagio aus der " Hammerklaviersonate " enthält. Dies ist eine große, dabei völlig uneitle Kunst, deren Magie man sich kaum entziehen kann. »

(Christian Wildhagen in der Neuen Zürcher Zeitung zu einer Neuveröffentlichung von späten Aufnahmen Elly Neys im Jahr 2003.)

« Als Kopf des nach ihr benannten Trios nämlich (alternierend mit Florizel von Reuter und Max Strub als Geiger, mit dem Bratschisten Walter Trampler und dem Cellisten Ludwig Hølscher) weiß Ney sehr wohl zu überzeugen - und zwar just bei den Komponisten, die nicht Beethoven heißen : in einer tief sinnig schönen Wiedergabe von Schumanns Es-Dur Klavierquartett von 1938, in einem fast aufgekrazten Haydn-Rondo drei Jahre zuvor. In Beethovens Geistertrio hingegen bündeln sich erneut alle Eigenwilligkeiten ihres Spiels, das priesterliche Sich-Versenken in die Partitur, das Erstarren und Verharren auf vertikalen Klangsockeln, die unerbittlich langsamen Tempi jenseits aller Spannungsgesetze und dramaturgischen Zusammenhänge. »

(Christine Lemke-Matwey in der Zeit zu einer Neuveröffentlichung von Kammermusik-Aufnahmen im Jahr 2004.)

Am 23. Juni 1935 sagte Elly Ney in ihrer Ansprache zum Auftakt des 5. Volkstümlichen Beethovenfestes in Bonn :

« Wir haben ja das wunderbarste Vorbild an unserem Führer, bei dem jedes Wort und jede Handlung eine Wiedergabe ist von heiligster Überzeugung, von unerschütterlichem Glauben. Diesen Glauben wollen wir doch in uns hüten und stärken, er ist unser Stern, dem wir treu bleiben wollen, er ist unser Quell, aus dem die göttliche Musik unseres Meisters entsprang. Was ist denn klarer, wahrer, echter als die Musik unseres Beethoven ? Gerade diese Musik brauchen wir heute, die Musik des Kämpfers und Siegers für die Kämpfenden und Siegenden. Das ist die Quelle, die im Herzen unseres Volkes als Gottesgabe verborgen liegt, die uns erlöst vom Banne des Feindlichen, Fremden, die uns zur Besinnung führt auf unsere Pflichten für unser Volk, unsere Jugend. »

Nachdem sie am 20. April 1937 von Hitler zur Professorin ernannt worden war, schrieb sie in einem Danktelegramm an Reichskulturwart Hans Hinkel vom Propagandaministerium :

« Es wird weiterhin mein heißes Bestreben sein, unserer Jugend die Einheit des gewaltigen Geschehens durch unseren Führer mit den erhabenen Schöpfungen unserer Meister nahezubringen. »

In einem Telegramm an Adolf Hitler vom 17. Dezember 1938 heißt es :

« Mein Führer, nach meinem Berliner Schubert-Abend in der Philharmonie lebte aufs neue mein sehnlichster Wunsch auf, Ihnen, mein Führer, einmal Schubert vorspielen zu dürfen. Seit Jahren war es mein größter Wunsch, meinen innigverehrten Führer an dieser ergreifenden Sprache der Ostmark teilnehmen zu lassen. »

1938 sagte sie in einem Arbeitslager der Reichsjugendführung :

« Die Jugend vertraut ihren Führern bedingungslos, weil diese sich die idealistischen, von Adolf Hitler vorgeschriebenen Ziele zu eigen gemacht haben. »

1940 schrieb sie in einem Brief an das Reichspropagandaministerium über eine Reise in die besetzten Niederlande :

« Es ist mir nicht sehr angenehm, daß ich dort im Hotel Central wohnen muß. Jedoch hoffe ich, daß sich dort keine Juden mehr aufhalten, so wie es früher war. »

Aus privaten Briefen ihres Nachlasses in Bonn ergeben sich zahlreiche weitere Belege ihres Antisemitismus und ihrer Unterstützung der Ideologie des Nationalsozialismus, zum Beispiel teilte sie im Mai 1933 Willem van Hoogstraten in einem Brief mit, daß sie die Bücherverbrennung der Nationalsozialisten befürworte. In einem weiteren Brief zeigte sie sich begeistert von der Entfernung jüdischer Musiker aus staatlich finanzierten Stellen und die Folgen von Boykott-Aufrufen für die Konzerte jüdischer Musiker. Diese seien « ausgespielt », während ihre eigenen Konzerte ausverkauft seien. 1933 empfand es Elly Ney als Zumutung, für Rudolf Serkin in Hamburg einzuspringen, der nach dem Reichstagsbrand am 28. Februar 1933 auf Druck aus Berlin für das Reichs-Brahmsfest in Hamburg eingeladen wurde.

Ihrem Lebenspartner Willem van Hoogstraten teilte sie in einem Brief mit : aber inzwischen erlebe ich doch, wie ohne Gewalttaten aber doch tatsächlich die Christen jahrelang durch die Juden unterdrückt waren. Sympathisch ist es mir nicht, für Serkin in Hamburg zu spielen. Ich leide darunter und kann es nur, wenn ich an das Werk allein denke. Elly Ney spielte auf dem Hamburger Reichs-Brahmsfest an Stelle von Rudolf Serkin. (Rudolf Serkin kannte diese Abneigung vermutlich nicht. Er würdigte Elly Neys Klavierspiel ; die Abendzeitung München, zitierte ihn im Nachruf bei Elly Neys Tod.)

Hinweise auf eine unmittelbare Schädigung anderer Personen durch Elly Ney, etwa durch Denunziation gibt es nicht. Allerdings gibt es auch keine Hinweise, daß sie wie Wilhelm Furtwängler ihre Kooperation mit den Nationalsozialisten nutzte, um für verfolgte Personen einzutreten. Elly Ney hatte persönlichen Umgang mit vielen prominenten Politikern der NSDAP, es ist jedoch nur ein persönliches Zusammentreffen mit Hitler belegt.

Der Historiker Michæl Kater kommt auf Grund der vorliegenden Quellen zu dem Urteil, daß Ney eine fanatische Nationalsozialistin war und ihr unverbrüchlicher Antisemitismus einmalig unter den herausragenden Musikern jener Zeit. Der Historiker Hans Mommsen zählt Elly Ney zu den Personen, die die Nazi-Diktatur aktiv getragen und moralisch gestützt haben.

Nach Interpretation von Beatrix Borchard setzte Ney das System Beethoven ein, um den Zweiten Weltkrieg als kulturellen Abwehrkampf gegen Klänge und Rhythmen, welche sie wie den Jazz als minderwertig und artgefährlich sah, zu rechtfertigen. Ney zitierte häufig bei Kerzenschein das Heiligenstädter Testament, ehe sie ihr Konzert begann. Nach Berichten der « New York Times » und des Hamburger Abendblatts hat Elly Ney ihre Konzerte mit dem Hitlergruß eröffnet.

Kurt Wolff, ein nach New York emigrierter Jugendfreund von Elly Ney, schrieb an ihren Lebenspartner Willem van Hoogstraten in einem Brief aus dem Jahr 1947, daß er es bei ihrer Leidenschaft und ihrem Temperament sehr gut verstehe, daß sie 1933 auf die « braunen Götter » reingefallen sei. Er fragte aber, wie es sein könne, daß sie 1937 in die Partei eintrat und zwischenzeitlich nicht bemerkte, was vorging.

Der 1952 amtierende Oberbürgermeister von Bonn Peter Maria Busen erklärte, Elly Ney habe ihm bei einem Besuch mündlich mitgeteilt, sie sei den Täuschungen des Nationalsozialismus erlegen wie andere und bedaure das tief und ehrlich. Mit Entsetzen habe sie später die Erkenntnis von dem verderblichen Einfluß des Nationalsozialismus und von seinen Verbrechen gewonnen. Bonn nahm nach dieser Einlassung ein Auftrittsverbot zurück. Zuvor hatte sich im Stadtrat von Bonn mehrfach die Fraktion der FDP für eine Aufhebung des Auftrittsverbots eingesetzt ; eine Fürsprache des Ney-Bewunderers Theodor Heuß wird vermutet.

Wilhelm Hausenstein schrieb in seinen Tagebüchern :

« Es wurde mir glaubwürdig erzählt, daß amerikanische Offiziere nazistische Künstler heranziehen, in privater, aber (bei Offizieren) doch immerhin offiziöser Form. So sei Elly Ney im Wagen zu einem General geholt worden, nach Bad Heilbronn, wenn ich es richtig behalten habe. Sie ist das Exemplar eines ebenso dummen wie talentierten

Künstlertums ; ihr Hitlerismus war die aufgelegte Blödheit (vielleicht mit einiger Hysterie vermischt) und ist, wenn überhaupt, so aus der Blödheit zu einem Teil exculpabel. »

In ihrer Autobiografie ging Elly Ney nicht auf ihre nationalsozialistische Vergangenheit ein, eine öffentliche Erklärung und Distanzierung ist nicht bekannt. Das wird kontrovers als Scham oder Starrsinn beurteilt.

Ehrungen

Josef Weinheber, Hans von Wolzogen, Heinrich Lersch, Agnes Miegel und Ina Seidel widmeten ihr Gedichte.

1927 : Ehrenbürgerin von Bonn.

1937 : Ernennung zum Professor honoris causa durch Hitler.

1937 : Silberne Olympia-Erinnerungsmedaille für den Einsatz bei den Olympischen Spielen 1936 durch Hitler.

1937 : Porträtierung durch den Maler Hans Trimborn.

(Elly Ney war mit dem Maler und Musiker Hans Trimborn befreundet. Trimborn stand dem Nationalsozialismus anders als Ney distanziert gegenüber ; sein expressionistisches Bild steht im Widerspruch zur damaligen Kunstdoktrin. Es ist unklar, ob Ney es sich deswegen nicht schenken ließ und es auch nicht erwarb und ob Trimborn damit seine Kritik an Ney ausdrücken wollte.)

In den frühen 1940er Jahren erhielt Elly Ney die Beethoven-Medaille der Stadt Bonn.

1943 : Kriegsverdienstkreuz 2. Klasse für Truppenbetreuung.

1943 : Beethovenmedaille, am 17. Oktober mit Karl F. Chudoba.

1944 : Ehrenmitglied der Universität Rostock.

1952 : Ehrenbürgerin von Tutzing.

1967 : Konzert und Empfang durch die Stadt Bonn zum 85. Geburtstag.

Das Zusatzschild « Ehrenbürgerin » wurde entfernt.

Der Text der neuen Tafel erinnert an die nationalsozialistische Vergangenheit der Pianistin. Der Hinweis auf die Ehrenbürgerschaft fehlt.

Die rote Farbe sind Reste einer Beschädigung durch Unbekannte nach der umstrittenen Entscheidung des Tutzinger Gemeinderats, das Denkmal der in den Nationalsozialismus verstrickten Künstlerin nicht zu entfernen.

2008 begann in der Gemeinde Tutzing eine Debatte über die Ehrung von Elly Ney, die bundesweite Aufmerksamkeit erregte. Elly Ney ist Ehrenbürgerin der Gemeinde, ferner ist dort eine Straße nach ihr benannt und ihr wurde ein Denkmal an einer Promenade am Starnberger See gewidmet. Der bei der Kommunalwahl 2008 erstmals gewählte parteifreie Bürgermeister Stephan Wanner ließ ein Bild von Elly Ney im Rathaus entfernen, was die Debatte auslöste. Unter anderem sprach sich die Vorsitzende des Zentralrats der Juden in Deutschland, Charlotte Knobloch, gegen die fortgesetzte Ehrung wegen der unzweifelhaft feststehenden antisemitischen Haltung von Elly Ney aus. Am 25. Januar 2009 veranstaltete die Evangelische Akademie Tutzing eine Podiumsdiskussion zur Ney-Problematik über Erinnerungskultur, die vom Fernsehen des Bayerischen Rundfunks am 31. Januar 2009 gesendet wurde.

Michæl H. Kater, emeritierter Professor für Geschichte an der York-Universität in Toronto und Autor des Fachbuchs Die mißbrauchte Muse. Musiker und Komponisten im Dritten Reich, empfahl in einem Interview mit der Süddeutschen Zeitung deutliche Distanzierung. Er bewertete Ney als « abstoßende Figur der deutschen Musikgeschichte ». Ihr Antisemitismus sei unentschuldig und teilweise schlicht egoistisch durch ihr lästige Konkurrenz jüdischer Musiker motiviert.

Hans Maier, Bayerischer Staatsminister an der Donau und Professor für Geschichte und Politikwissenschaften, hält zur Beurteilung die Frage, ob sich Ney in der Nachkriegszeit vom Nationalsozialismus distanziert hat, für entscheidend. Wenige dazu vorhandene Dokumente werden jedoch kontrovers beurteilt. Maier vertritt die Auffassung, daß geehrte Künstler nicht unbedingt Vorbild-Qualitäten in ihrem gesamten Wirken haben müßen.

Der Gemeinderat von Tutzing beschloß am 9. Februar 2009 gegen den Antrag des parteifreien Bürgermeisters, das Elly-Ney-Denkmal an seinem Platz zu belassen, aber ein Zusatzschild mit einer Information zu ihrer nationalsozialistischen Verstrickung anzubringen. Über die Ehrenbürgerschaft müße man nicht beraten, da diese mit ihrem Tod erloschen sei. Auf diesen juristisch zutreffenden Sachverhalt haben andere Gemeinden in ähnlichen Fällen mit der symbolischen Aberkennung einer historischen Ehrenbürgerschaft reagiert. Von dieser Möglichkeit der posthumen Aberkennung machte der Gemeinderat von Tutzing auf derselben Sitzung vom 9. Februar 2009 im Fall des früheren Münchner Gauleiters und Gründers des Konzentrationslagers Dachau Adolf Wagner Gebrauch, da in seinem Fall ein unterschiedlicher Unrechtsgehalt vorliege, Elly Ney sei hingegen nur « aktive Mitläuferin » gewesen. Die in Vergessenheit geratene historische Ehrenbürgerschaft von Wagner in Tutzing war im Verlauf der Ney-Diskussion bekannt geworden. Das Ehrenggrab von Elly Ney in Tutzing soll weiter auf Kosten der Gemeinde gepflegt werden, der Begriff Ehrenbürger soll aus der Beschriftung des Elly-Ney-Denkmal und der Elly-Ney-Straße entfernt werden. Der Gemeinderat distanzierte sich von den antisemitischen Aussagen von Elly Ney und ihrer Unterstützung des Nationalsozialismus.

Die Entscheidung wurde kritisch kommentiert, so von der Osnabrücker Zeitung als « beschämende Peinlichkeit ». Gerhard Summer schrieb in der Süddeutschen Zeitung :

« Eine distanzierte Ehrung jedenfalls gibt es nicht - entweder man steht zu jemanden oder nicht. »

Die Elly-Ney-Gedenkstatue wurde am 11. Februar 2009 von unbekanntem Tätern beschädigt ; ein Zusammenhang mit der Entscheidung des Tutzing Gemeinderats über das Denkmal wird vermutet.

Die Entscheidung über eine Neubeschriftung des Elly-Ney-Denkmal vertagte der Gemeinderat von Tutzing auf seiner Sitzung vom 16. Juni auf den 7. Juli 2009, da man sich noch nicht auf eine Formulierung einigen konnte. Unter anderem war von dem in Tutzing lebenden Journalisten Heinz Klaus Mertes das Augustinus-Zitat « Bekämpfe den Irrtum, nicht den, der irrt ! » vorgeschlagen worden. Die Gemeinde Tutzing teilte auf ihrer Internetseite im Juli 2009 mit :

« Die Geschichte in ihrer Gesamtheit nicht in Vergessenheit geraten zu lassen und davor zu warnen, sich als Nutznießer von totalitären Systemen vereinnahmen zu lassen, ist Absicht dieser Tafel. »

Der Satz steht so auf der neuen Tafel, wodurch das ehrende Denkmal tendenziell zu einem Mahnmal umdefiniert wird.

2008 wurde zur Erinnerung an den Pianisten Karlobert Kreiten im Rahmen der Beethovenfesttage in Bonn ein von Hans Christian Schmidt-Banse zusammengestelltes « Concerto Recitativo » mit Titel An diesem unglückseligen 3. Mai des Jahres 1943 aufgeführt. Kreiten hat sich im privaten Kreis kritisch zum Nationalsozialismus geäußert und war nach Denunziation hingerichtet worden. Dem wurde in den verlesenen Texten das Verhalten von Elly Ney gegenübergestellt, die sich, ihre Kunst und die Musik Beethovens in den Dienst des Nationalsozialismus gestellt hat.

Elly Ney wurde auch als Reichsklaviergroßmutter, Witwe Beethoven und später als Hitlers Pianistin bezeichnet. Dieses letztere Epitheton ist jedoch missverständlich, da es Ney trotz einiger Versuche nicht gelang, Hitler persönlich vorzuspielen ; ihre Unterstützung bezog sich auf das nationalsozialistische Regime.

Mauricio Kagel ließ in seinem Film Ludwig van eine Elly Ney darstellende Karikatur in einer satirischen Sequenz die Waldstein-Sonate spielen und Beethoven zitieren.

Der amerikanische, in Wien ansässige, renommierte Begleit-Pianist und Puppenspieler Norman Shetler, ein großer Verehrer von Elly Ney, lässt bei seinen Aufführungen eine Puppe namens « Nelly Ey » auftreten, die zu den Klavierklängen von Beethovens 5. Sinfonie mit ganzem Körpereinsatz auf ein kleines Klavier eindrischt.

La vie musicale à Berlin

Au début du XVIIe siècle, Berlin entra dans l'histoire de la musique avec des musiciens tels Johannes Eccard et Nikolaus Zangius, Maîtres de chapelle à la Cour du prince électeur. La musique protestante fut représentée dans la 1re moitié du XVIIe Siècle par Johann Crüger. Pendant la guerre de 30 Ans, l'activité musicale connut un ralentissement comme dans le reste de l'Allemagne. En 1701, Berlin prit rang de résidence royale. C'est sous le règne de Frédéric II (1740-1786) que la ville devint un foyer musical important, les artistes se partageant entre la capitale de la Prusse et le séjour royal de Potsdam. On y rencontre Johann Joachim Quantz, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, Fanz et Johann Georg

Benda, Carl Heinrich et Johann Gottlieb Graun, Johann Friedrich Reichardt, Christoph Nichelmann, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg et Carl Friedrich Zelter. Les compositeurs de l'École de Berlin se sont illustrés dans les domaines de la Symphonie, de la musique instrumentale, du lied et de l'Opéra. En 1742, fut inauguré l'Opéra royal « Unter den Linden » ou « Hofoper » (Opéra de la Cour) . Berlin était également réputé, à cette époque, comme centre de théorie musicale.

Au XIXe siècle et dans la 1re moitié du XXe siècle régna une activité intense : les Orchestres, les Sociétés chorales, les académies de musique religieuse, les Opéras et les Écoles de musique se multiplièrent, en particulier, de 1800 à 1832, sous l'impulsion de Zelter. La musique orchestrale se développa particulièrement dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. De nombreuses formations furent créées : la « Musikausübende Gesellschaft » , fondée par Johann Philipp Sack, en 1752, l' « Orchestervereinigung Berliner Musikfreunde » , devenue ensuite le « Berliner Orchesterverein » , le « Königliches Hoforchester » , devenu ensuite la « Staatskapelle » , qui compta parmi ses chefs Félix Weingartner et Richard Strauß, et, enfin, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin qui, fondé en 1882, est considéré depuis plusieurs dizaines d'années comme l'un des meilleurs Orchestres du monde ; il a eu notamment pour chefs : Hans von Bülow (1887-1892) ; Arthur Nikisch (1897-1922) ; Wilhelm Furtwängler (1922-1945 et 1947-1954) ; Sergiù Celibidache (1945-1947) ; et Herbert von Karajan (1954-1989) . Au XXe siècle, sont venus s'ajouter les Orchestres de la radio : « Berliner Rundfunk » pour Berlin-Est ; « Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk » et « RIAS » pour Berlin-Ouest. L'Orchestre « RIAS » a connu une période de grande notoriété lorsque Ferenc Fricsay en était le directeur (1948-1954) .

Parmi les Sociétés chorales figurent le Chœur philharmonique, le Chœur de la cathédrale Sainte-Hedwige et la célèbre « Singakademie » , fondée en 1791, par Christian Fasch et dirigée ensuite par Zelter ; c'est avec le concours de cette formation que Félix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy dirigea, en 1828, la « Passion selon Saint-Matthieu de Jean-Sébastien Bach, tombée dans l'oubli depuis près d'un siècle. Les Académies de musique religieuse les plus importantes sont l' « Akademie für Kirchenmusik » , fondée en 1822, la « Gesellschaft zur Förderung der kirchlichen Tonkunst » et le « Cäcilienverein » .

Plusieurs grandes scènes d'Opéra ont valu à Berlin sa renommée dans le domaine lyrique. Inaugurée en 1742, la « Hofoper » a vu la création de l'Opéra « Der Freischütz » de Carl Maria von Weber, en 1821, et l'opposition entre les partisans de cette œuvre de style nouveau et ceux du style de Gaspare Spontini, qui était alors directeur musical du Théâtre. « Les Joyeuses Commères de Windsor » d'Otto Nicolai y furent créées, en 1849. Baptisée, après 1918, « Staatsoper » (Opéra d'État) , cette scène a eu pour intendants ou directeurs de la musique Richard Strauß, Félix Weingartner, Karl Muck, Max von Schillings, Heinz Tietjen. Les créations de « Wozzeck » d'Alban Berg (1925) ; « Christophe Colomb » de Darius Milhaud (1930) ; « Das Herz » de Hans Pfitzner (1931) et « Peer Gynt » de Werner Egk (1938) s'y sont, entre autres, déroulées. Située dans l'ancien secteur Est, la « Staatsoper » a eu pour directeurs musicaux, après la guerre, Franz Konwitschny (1955-1961) et Otmar Suitner (1964-1975) .

Le « Deutsches Opernhaus » , inauguré en 1912, et appelé après 1918 « Städtische Oper » (Opéra municipal) , a compté parmi ses intendants Carl Ebert et parmi ses directeurs musicaux Bruno Walter et Ferenc Fricsay. Détruit en 1944, lors d'un bombardement aérien, il a repris en 1961 le nom de « Deutsche Oper » .

Inaugurée en 1924, le « Kroll Oper » devint rapidement célèbre par son orientation très particulière ; notamment sous la direction d'Otto Klemperer (1927-1931) , ce fut un Théâtre de créations et une scène d'avant-garde en ce qui concerne les décors et la mise-en-scène du répertoire. Une position comparable, dans le domaine de l'interprétation scénique, a été occupée après la dernière guerre par le « Komische Oper » , qui, ouverte en 1947, a appuyé sa célébrité sur les mises-en-scène de son intendant Walter Felsenstein.

Dans le domaine de l'enseignement de la musique, les institutions les plus importantes sont l'Université, où ont professé Philipp Spitta et Arnold Schering, la « Hochschule für Musik » , fondée en 1869, le Conservatoire municipal (autrefois « Stern'sches Konservatorium ») , le Conservatoire Klindworth-Scharwenka, l' « Institut für Musikforschung » et la « Berliner Kirchenmusikschule » .

...

Berlin était, avec Vienne, l'un des Iers centres de création musicale de l'Europe, mais où les nouveaux détenteurs du pouvoir ont mis un frein à tout débordement. Dès 1933, la musique a été pour le 3e « Reich » au cœur d'un dispositif esthétique-politique tentaculaire qui, jouant sur le goût inné du peuple allemand pour la musique, pénétrait toutes les classes de la société. Si la création était bridée, les Orchestres, les Théâtres d'Opéra qui, sous la République de Weimar et frappés par la crise, avaient fini par vivre d'expédients, devinrent, en quelques semaines, l'objet de toutes les attentions du régime.

Berlin comptait 2 maisons d'Opéra fameuses. Tout d'abord, le vieil Opéra « Unter den Linden » , du nom de l'avenue « Sous les tilleuls » où il s'élevait. Héritier de l'ancien Opéra de Cour, il abrita, en 1821, la création du « Freischütz » de Carl Maria von Weber, qui marqua la vraie naissance de l'Opéra allemand. En 1919, la Cour et son souverain abolis, le Théâtre prit le nom d'Opéra d'État. Le « Staatsoper » , sous la direction de Max von Schillings, redevint vite une grande maison. Un chef tel qu'Erich Kleiber domina la scène berlinoise, notamment avec la création, en 1925, de l'une des œuvres emblématiques du XXe siècle, le « Wozzeck » d'Alban Berg d'après la tragédie de Georg Büchner. Mais, en 1935, Max von Schillings s'était effacé devant un formidable personnage, le nouvel intendant Heinz Tietjen.

Le second opéra de Berlin était d'origine plus récente. Le « Deutsches Opernhaus » (ou « Städtische Oper » : Opéra de la Ville) , avait été créée par la municipalité, dans le faubourg de Charlottenburg. Il s'agissait, face au plus traditionnel Opéra « Unter den Linden » , de disposer d'un haut-lieu du théâtre lyrique plus novateur, plus démocratique aussi.

Placé après la Première Guerre mondiale sous l'autorité du chef Bruno Walter et de l'intendant Heinz Tietjen et bénéficiant d'aménagements scéniques exceptionnels, le « Deutsche Oper » connut jusqu'en 1929 un âge d'or qui vit s'y produire les plus grands chanteurs de l'époque. Après le départ d'Heinz Tietjen pour l'Opéra « Unter den Linden » , le « Deutsche Oper » fusionna un temps avec son rival plus ancien.

Outre l'Opéra Comique (« Komische Oper ») , il y avait une 3e maison d'Opéra : le « Kroll Oper » (ou « Oper am Königsplatz ») fut amené à fermer en 1933 parce que trop moderne, trop engagé aussi, avec des metteurs-en-scène avant-gardistes, qui donnaient des œuvres de Kurt Weill, naturellement détesté à Berlin, avec des décorateurs venus

souvent de l'École du « Bauhaus » et d'un modernisme outrancier aux yeux du régime. C'est le grand Otto Klemperer qui avait fait régner là un esprit nouveau, jouant Igor Stravinsky ou Leoš Janáček. Après l'incendie du « Reichstag », le « Kroll Oper », inhabité, devint le siège du « Reichstag » national-socialiste.

...

Dans les années 1920, l'une des périodes culturellement les plus riches de l'histoire berlinoise, la capitale de l'Allemagne se distinguait aux yeux du monde lyrique par la présence de 3 Théâtres d'influence internationale. Il y avait l'Opéra de Charlottenburg, fondé en 1912 à l'aide de capitaux privés, sous le nom de « Deutsches Opernhaus », puis rattaché à la municipalité sous la dénomination de « Städtische Oper ». Sous l'impulsion du chef Bruno Walter et d'Heinz Tietjen, ce Théâtre sut attirer, jusqu'à l'avènement du Nazisme, les plus grands chanteurs de l'époque (Lotte Lehmann, Maria Ivogün, Lauritz Melchior, Alexander Kipnis) . Il y avait le « Staatsoper », situé sur l'avenue « Unter den Linden », et où le chef d'orchestre Erich Kleiber effectua certaines créations capitales dont le « Wozzeck » d'Alban Berg, en 1925. Et enfin, il y avait le mouton noir, l'enfant terrible, le « Kroll Oper », où le jeune avant-gardiste Otto Klemperer se lança dans une politique radicale d'enrichissement du répertoire et de dépoussiérage des conventions. Entouré de metteurs-en-scène comme Gustav Gründgens, de décorateurs comme Ewald Dülberg ou Oskar Schlemmer, il rendit la scène accueillante aux tendances esthétiques les plus nouvelles, comme le « Bauhaus », le Surréalisme ou la « Neue Sachlichkeit ». Les Ires auditions d'œuvres de Paul Hindemith (« Cardillac ») ; d'Arnold Schönberg (« Neues vom Tage ») ; d'Igor Stravinsky (« Mavra » et « Œdipus Rex ») y côtoyaient le décor cubiste du « Fidelio » de Beethoven ou celui, surréaliste, des « Contes d'Hoffmann » de Jacques Offenbach, à l'origine de fameux scandales. Le régime hitlérien, puis la division de la ville, avaient mis un coup d'arrêt de près de 60 ans à cette situation unique.

Réunion des compositeurs allemands à Berlin (1934)

« We Take Care of the Artist » : The German Composers' Meeting in Berlin (1934)

(« Vi tar hand om konstnären » : Det tyska Tonsättarmötet i Berlin, 1934)

Petra Garberding (translated from Swedish by Per F. Broman) Volume III, Issue 2, Summer 2009.

(Photo : Richard Strauß Institute, Garmisch-Partenkirchen) Richard Strauß speaking at the German Composers' Meeting in Berlin, on 18 February 1934.

Introduction

In April 2006, the Swedish Scientific Council (« Vetenskapsrådet ») presented the results of various research projects examining Sweden's relations with Nazism, Nazi Germany, and the Holocaust (« Sveriges förhållande till Nazism, Nazityskland och Förintelsen ») . (I) Several researchers and journalists were surprised at how much Sweden had accommodated Nazi Germany and how much Sweden complied with Nazi Germany's demands. The project report

seemed to adopt the perspective that Nazism was something that came to Sweden from Germany. But earlier research has established that Sweden also took part in developing Nazism, for example through the inspiration of Swedish racial biologists. My study, « Music and Politics in the Shadow of Nazism : Kurt Atterberg and Swedish-German Musical Relations » , (2) shows how both countries stimulated each other in Swedish-German musical relations during the Nazi period in Germany (1933-1945) and how music was used as a political tool. In my study, I also wanted to answer the following questions : Which ideas about « good » and « bad » music were brought to the fore ? What kinds of national tales were created and what did they imply for Swedish-German musical relations at the time in the shadow of Nazism ? I argued that music can only acquire a political meaning when it is placed in a verbal or symbolic context. In my study, I analyzed conversation and debates about music to find-out what meaning becomes attached to music in different verbal contexts.

The book focuses on material from Swedish, German, and Austrian archives by and about the Swedish composer Kurt Atterberg (1887-1974) . I studied correspondence, memoirs, minutes, newspaper articles, and radio programmes, and talked to contemporary Swedish composers. Kurt Atterberg was a central figure in Swedish music during the 1st half of the 20th Century, and his life gives a glimpse of the spirit of the time. Atterberg composed 9 Symphonies, 5 Operas, and several orchestral works, Concertos, and pieces of chamber music. Many of his compositions have a national Romantic character and a popular style. Atterberg also worked as music-critic for the newspaper « Stockholms-Tidningen » (1919-1957) . He stood-up for composers' rights and was one of the founders of the Swedish Composers' Society (« Föreningen Svenska Tonsättare » , or FST) and the Swedish Performing Rights Society (STIM) . He was also a Swedish representative in several international composers' rights organizations. Between 1940 and 1953, he was the secretary of the Royal Academy of Music (« Kungliga Musikaliska Akademien » , or KMA) in Stockholm. During the 1st half of the 20th Century, Atterberg had a strong influence not only on Swedish musical life, but also on international musical relations. Atterberg left a huge amount of material behind. Among other material, he collected about 10,000 letters and wrote about 1,500 pages of memoirs, which have never been published. Atterberg's archives are today kept by the Music Museum in Stockholm.

The theoretical platform for the study is a critical discourse analysis, inspired by the model proposed by the Austrian professor in linguistics, Ruth Wodak, and her research team at the Research Centre for Discourse, Politics, and Identity at the University of Vienna (Wodak et al. , 2003) . Critical discourse analysis implies a political commitment to social change (Winther Jørgensen and Phillips, 2000 ; pages 67-70) . One purpose of this kind of analysis is to uncover unequal power relations and oppression (Fairclough, 1992 ; Wodak, 1996 ; van Dijk, 1997 ; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 2001 ; Wodak and Reisigl, 2001) . I define discourse as a form of social practice which entails the use of language in speech and writing. Discourse as a social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation, institution, and social structure that frame it. The discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. Discourses constitute situations, objects of knowledge and social relations between people. They are constitutive in the sense that they can sustain and reproduce the social status quo and in the sense that they can transform it (Wodak, 1996 ; page 15) . Within this theoretical framework, the subject is seen principally as decentred ; the subject comes into existence through discursive events. The discursive struggle produces objects of knowledge and power. I understand power as something that is practised and functions as a productive force (Foucault, 2003 ; page 195) . Inspired by Wodak's analytical model, my analyses consist of 3 parts :

1) The text's content.

2) Argumentative strategies.

3) Realization of these strategies through language (Wodak et al. , 1998 ; page 71ff) . Wodak insists on the importance of studying each text in its historical and political context.

An English-language summary of the topics covered may be found in my book (pages 267-278) . These include the reception of Atterberg's person and music in Nazi Germany, the struggle in Swedish music life for « good » national music and its consequence for Swedish-German musical relations, and the discussion in Sweden after World War II about Atterberg's involvement with Nazi Germany.

My study shows how Sweden and Germany inspired each other in their musical relationship. Both countries encountered similar problems in the 1st half of the 20th Century, as modernization accelerated in Europe, occasioning dramatic changes in musical life. Different ideas were circulating on how to deal with these problems. Composers' rights organizations were founded and musical life became more bureaucratized. Many composers endeavoured to strengthen national identity ; others looked at music as something supranational and cosmopolitan. I argue that the struggle for the best expressions for national identity and their musical representation was important for the development of relations between Sweden and Nazi Germany. For many European composers and musicians, an engagement with Nazi Germany was interpreted as a contribution to the establishment of a strong national identity and the improvement of their own national musical life. But the struggle for a strong national identity in the different European countries could be used by the Nazi government to spread its political propaganda, especially with the support of « apolitical » artists such as Atterberg, with his central position in Swedish musical life and large international network.

Swedish-German musical relations were also influenced by different views on music and politics in Sweden and Germany. For Nazi politicians, music and politics ran together and music was to give expression to Nazi ideology. In Sweden, music and politics were to be kept apart. Most Swedish composers and musicians defined their engagement with Nazi Germany as purely musical work. The Nazi government, for its part, used Nordic composers and music to confirm Nazi ideas on race biology and to spread Nazi propaganda.

The extract translated below is the 1st part of Chapter 3 of my book. This Chapter deals with the efforts to establish copyright organisations and international music exchange and their implications for music and politics in the shadow of Nazism. The extract is a detailed analysis of Kurt Atterberg's article in the Swedish newspaper « Stockholms-Tidningen » on the 1st meeting of a new music organization in Nazi Germany, the Federation of German Composers (« Berufsstand deutscher Komponisten ») , in Berlin, in February 1934. This meeting was the starting point for a more centralized organization of Nazi German musical life. Here, the Nazi government presented its political programme for music. I compare Atterberg's report of the meeting in the Swedish newspaper « Stockholms-Tidningen » with accounts in 3 different German newspapers, « Völkischer Beobachter » , « Der Berliner Westen » and « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » . These newspapers were chosen because they had a nation-wide coverage and reported in great detail

about the meeting. The aim with the analysis was not to find-out the « true » story of this meeting, but to show the different interpretations of the meeting in the German and the Swedish contexts. This kind of analysis can give an insight into how National-Socialist linguistic usage could be reproduced or transformed in a Swedish context. Newspaper articles also give information about the frame of reference, that is, which kinds of stories were seen as normal and acceptable in a society and which were not.

Kurt Atterberg worked as a music-critic for « Stockholms-Tidningen », one of the largest dailies in Sweden at the beginning of the 20th Century. Its political affiliation was liberal (3) until 1956 and Social-Democrat thereafter. (4) My investigation of the paper's reporting on Nazi Germany during the 1930's and 1940's, as part of which I sampled and read some 100 articles, showed that the writers of « Stockholms-Tidningen » usually avoided criticism of, or reported positively about, the events in Germany. There were, however, also a few critical articles (see also : Blomberg 2003 ; page 25) . National-Socialist language (words or concepts that were frequently used in National-Socialist contexts) was used in all Swedish dailies, including « Dagens Nyheter », « Svenska Dagbladet », and « Göteborgs Handels-och Sjöfartstidning » . This was partly due to the fact that direct references were being made to German-language texts, or that attempts to translate German material as accurately as possible often involved some transfer of the text to Swedish (Brylla, 2005 ; page 117) . Linguist Charlotta Brylla has argued that, in dealing with the use of National-Socialist language in Swedish newspapers, one can detect 3 main strategies :

1) The direct quote (« Det okommenterade citatet ») . National-Socialist speeches were retold as accurately as possible without commentary. Examples of this strategy are found, for example, in « Dagsposten » .

2) The direct quote with journalistic commentary (« Citatet med referatmarkering ») . This was used in many dailies, among them « Dagens Nyheter », « Svenska Dagbladet », « Nya Dagligt Allehanda », and « Stockholms-Tidningen » . Here, the quotes are embedded in reporting, contextualized through a journalist's simple annotation, for example, « Hitler strongly criticized » or « Hitler emphasized » .

3) An editorial / journalistic commentary on an event / speech (« Det kommenterade referatet ») . Here, the original was not quoted but described in an analytical and often critical context. This sort of commentary was most common in papers that were critical of Nazi Germany, as for example : « Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning », « Dagens Nyheter », « Eskilstuna-Kuriren », and « Social-Demokraten » (Brylla 2005a ; page 207, see also : Almgren 2005 ; pages 62-63) .

Clearly, the types of quotes and reports published can provide insight into an author's and the paper's approach to National-Socialist messages.

This essay incorporates this kind of analysis, departing from an examination of Atterberg's published article about the Composers' Meeting that took place on February 18, 1934, in the University Assembly Hall and Philharmonic Hall in Berlin, and then comparing his account with those from 3 German papers. My purpose is not to demonstrate whether or not Atterberg had a naïve or incorrect perception of the Composers' Meeting, or whether or not he saw through the plans of National-Socialism ; rather, my intention is to investigate different narratives of the Composers' Meeting in

Swedish and German contexts.

« Stockholms-Tidningen » published Atterberg's article called « Droit moral och internationellt utbyte av folklig musik. Tyska tonsättares strävan » (« Droit moral » and international exchange of « folklig » music) on March 10 of the same year. Atterberg had been invited to the meeting by Richard Strauß. (5) The trip was financed by the Swedish government's support of Atterberg's attendance of the premiere of his Opera « Flammendes Land » in Braunschweig, on February 17, the day before the Composers' Meeting. (6) That the Swedish government was interested in the events at the meeting in Berlin is clear from a confidential report that Atterberg sent to the State Department, on February 28, 1934. The report is very similar in style to the article I am analyzing here. (7)

In the article, written after his return, Atterberg described in detail who had attended the meeting, what speeches were given, and the content of the music-political program. Atterberg described a rise of music in Germany and the beginning of a new era. According to his report, the Composers' Meeting was characterized by enthusiasm and progress. German composers' and politicians' aim to support « music for the people » and oppose « ultra-modern music » was apparent at the meeting and welcomed by Atterberg :

« För första gången ha Tysklands alla tonsättare samlats i ett enda förbund. För första gången har man gemensamt anordnat en " demonstration " med flygande fanor och klingande spel. Det klingande spelet var en realitet : Philharmonikerkonsert med Furtwängler, Pfitzner, Hausegger, Řezníček, Hindemith, Georg Schumann, Græner som dirigenter och Richard Strauß åhörande sin egen odödliga tondikt " Till Eulenspiegels lustige Streiche " under Furtwänglers trollstav. De flygande fanorna syntes väl ej, men deviserna på standaren vid denna demonstration voro " Internationellt utbyte av folklig musik ", och, i brist på lämplig översättning, den franska juridiska termen " Droit moral ". Den som förde dessa standar var tonsättaren juris doctor Julius Kopsch, sedan många och långa år Richard Strauß' högra hand i kampen för ett enat komponisternas Tyskland.

Jag kom för sent till den inledande Mozartkvartetten, men fick i stället fägna mig åt anblicken av den av en ganska unik publik fyllda aulan.

Framför talarstolen och bänkade i långa led å ömse sidor därom satt nästan allt, vad Tyskland hade att uppvisa i fråga om tonsättare och tonkonstnärer i konstnärligt eller administrativt ledande ställning : Strauß, Pfitzner, Hausegger, Græner, Reznicek, Furtwängler, den nya ledaren för Musikhochschule professor Fritz Stein för att nu nämna några. Av de utländska representanter märktes den österrikiske tonsättaren Kienzl, " Evangeliemannens " skapare, och konservatoriedirektören Marx från Wien, vice ordföranden i den franska tonsättarsammanslutningen Carol-Bérard, en av dirigenterna vid Stora operan i Paris Medlemmar av diplomatiska kåren, riksjustitieminister dr Gürtner och som representant för propagandaminister Gœbbels statssekreterare Funk. » (8)

For the 1st time, all of Germany's composers have gathered in one Society. For the 1st time, one has jointly organized a « manifestation » with flying banners and sounding performance. The sounding performance was a reality : a concert with the Philharmonic conducted by Wilhelm Furtwängler, Hans Pfitzner, Siegmund von Hausegger, Emil von Řezníček, Paul Hindemith, Georg Schumann, Paul Græner, and with Richard Strauß attending the performance of his

own immortal music poem « Till Eulenspiegels lustige Streiche » under Furtwängler's magic baton. The flying banners were invisible, but the slogans on the standards during this manifestation were « International exchange of “ folklig ” music » (« folkish » music, popular music, music based on folk or national music) , and, lacking a proper translation, the French juridical term « Droit moral » . Carrying these standards was composer juris Doctor Julius Kopsch, for many long years Richard Strauß's right-hand in the struggle for a united composers' Germany.

I arrived too late for the opening Mozart Quartet, but could instead take pleasure in (« fägna ») the sight of the hall, filled with a fairly unique audience.

In front of the pulpit and seated in long rows on each side was almost everybody whom Germany could parade in terms of composers and musicians in leading artistic or administrative positions : Strauß, Pfitzner, Hausegger, Græner, Řezníček, Furtwängler, the new head of « Musikhochschule » Professor Fritz Stein, to mention a few. Among the foreign representatives were the Austrian composer Wilhelm Kienzl, the creator of « The Man of the Gospels » (« Der Evangeliemann ») and director Joseph Marx of the Vienna Conservatory, the deputy chair of the French Society of composers, Carol Bérard, one of the conductors at the « Grand Opéra de Paris » , members of the diplomatic corps, national secretary of justice Doctor Franz Gürtner, and Walther Funk, State Secretary at the Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, who appeared as a representative for « Reich » Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda Josef Gœbbels.

The enthusiasm for the supposed up-swing of musical life is clear in these quotes and throughout the entire article. Atterberg's fascination comes into view : he enjoys « the sight of the hall, filled with a fairly unique audience » , and describes the event lightly with the metaphor of « flying banners » . He describes the opening as the beginning of a new epoch in music life, staged by the ones in charge as a « manifestation » . Using such words of concord as « united » , « only one » , and « unity » , and the parallel construction, « For the 1st time ... For the 1st time » , he emphasizes harmony and a new unity through unification, a rhetorical strategy displaying coherence, solidarity, and common interests. It is also an example of discontinuity. A positive change is stressed : music has at last received a prominent role, and earlier divisions have been overcome. Music's new role in society is also shown through the prominent people who were invited, namely « almost everybody who Germany could parade » . Music has, according to Atterberg, gained value through the joint engagement of prominent composers and politicians. The naming of famous people is a strategy of authority, and legitimizes the new musical culture : since « important » figures are present at the Composers' Meeting, musical life is in good hands and finally receiving the prominence that many composers and musicians had long craved. The choice of wording also illustrates an extensive confidence that the authorities will manage their task in a professional way.

Atterberg also explains the concept of « Droit moral » in the article, a concept that would become important during the following years. According to Atterberg, « Droit moral » implied the artist's ideal exclusive conceptual rights. (9) It would prevent the « destruction » of musical works. As an example of the latter, he mentions Bedřich Smetana's Opera « The Bartered Bride » . This Opera, « the Czech nation's pride and jewel » , was to become a film. « With the knowledge of these film makers' psyche » the filming was, according to Atterberg, seen as an attempt at « vandalization » in Czechoslovakia, and the production was banned. The production was then moved to Germany, where

there were no laws assigning the artist's « conceptual rights » . Atterberg received this information from Julius Kopsch, who was also present in Berlin. According to Kopsch (and Atterberg agreed) strong measures were necessary to prevent the « vandalization » of music. As an example, Atterberg mentioned an American publisher that specialized in « the jazzification of Classical Masterworks and distributed its publications across the entire world » . He had « heard and seen how the Pilgrim Chorus had been jazzed to at the Royal » . (10) From this example, it follows that « Droit moral » signified a protection against the making of modern arrangements without the permission of the creator. By using the concept of vandalizing as a topos of catastrophe, a threatening picture is painted, namely that modernism's more powerful, « destructive » impact on musical life must be effectively limited.

Atterberg expressed enthusiasm that German composers were finally unified and collectively wanted to fight this threat. But, according to Atterberg, not only German but also global common laws were necessary in order for the fight to be effective :

« But a conceptual protection for the artist becomes empty if identical rules are not adopted in all countries. The collective and unified generation of German composers is now aiming for the adoption of such rules. » (11) Again, Atterberg emphasizes unity as connected not only to a defined nationality, but to a specific generation. From the earlier mentioned names, it becomes clear that he refers to men born towards the end of the 19th Century, who had achieved important positions in musical life and in politics. These were also the agents during the Composers' Meeting and it was their works that were performed.

The speech described in the greatest depth in both German papers and Atterberg's report was that of secretary Funk, who appeared as a representative of the Nazi government. Atterberg begins his account of Funk's speech as follows :

« Han började sedan med att påpeka, hur all äkta konst är framsprungen ur folket och att det vore den nya regeringens mål att åter göra konsten till folkets sak. Utan att nämna den ultramoderna konsten och musiken gav han ultramodernismen en kraftig snärt genom att påpeka, hur tyska konstnärer och musiker i en tid av “ tygellös ” Liberalism med dess nedrivande tendenser och med sitt “ dissekerande ” själsliga arbete hade blivit främmande för folket och hur de måste förlora folklighetens fasta mark av det enkla skäl, att sådan mark ej hade funnits. Han sammanfattade de nya strävandena ungefär med orden “ Folket skall leva i konsten och konsten i folket. ” »

He then began pointing-out how all real art sprang from the people and that it is the new government's goal to make art once again a matter of the people. Without mentioning ultra-modern art and music, he gave ultra-modernism a powerful hit by describing how, during a time of « uncontrolled » Liberalism with its downward-pulling tendencies and its « desecrating » mental (« själsliga ») work, German artists and musicians had alienated themselves from the people, and how they had lost their firm grip on the ground of popular consciousness for the simple reason that there never was such a ground. He characterized the new tendencies approximately by the words, « the people should live in art and art in the people » .

Atterberg begins his summary of Funk's speech with a direct quote with journalistic commentary :

« He then began pointing-out ... , » which I understand to be aiming at a style of neutral reporting. He then recounts the speech with a few added comments - for example, about the ultra-modern. « The people should live in art and art in the people » is a direct quote. Through the entire article, Atterberg's reporting oscillates between direct quotes and the direct quote with journalistic commentary. Atterberg tries to contextualize Funk's speech for his Swedish readers by explaining what is not explicitly stated. There are no critical comments in the article.

« Real art » is defined as having « sprung from the people » (« art » and « the people » are connected) by contrast with « ultra-modern » art, which has « lost the firm ground of the people » . « Ultra-modern » art is connected to « uncontrolled Liberalism » with « its downward pulling tendencies » and « desecrating mental work » . Liberalism was a word with negative connotations within the National-Socialist movement and was used to describe a lack of order and discipline that, according to the National-Socialists, was due to an increased level of individualism and egoism. Liberalism was often connected with the Weimar period and the failure of democracy. Art not originating from the people is described as rootless and destructive. The negative attributes of « unregulated » , « downward pulling » , and « desecrating » (as opposed to the positive « folklight ») emphasize polarization in order to contrast the situation of art before and after the National-Socialists' assumption of power : while art's situation before 1933 seemed dark, now everything would improve. The new government would save « real art » .

In Atterberg's narrative, non-genuine art is connected to the « ultra-modern » , a link not explicitly stated in the German reports, in which the negative development of the musical life is attributed to the chaos that had existed under the previous government. Moreover, in the German reports, the connection of art to Germanness is significantly more emphasized than in Atterberg's description. Those reports talk about German art and German music, and the musicians are labeled as the most German of artists. Music and Germanness are joined, something that is not done to the same extent in Atterberg's report.

Specifically, it becomes clear that Atterberg has translated the German word « Volkstum » with « folklight » : « folklightens mark » (the soil of « folklight ») is the translation of « der Boden des Volkstums » . (12) In National-Socialist vocabulary during the 3rd « Reich » , the German word « Volkstum » took on a racial element : « race » and the « folk » were connected. The concept of « folk » experienced a semantic shift during this period. « Folk » was a positively-charged concept and implied, among other things, a group of people who shared a culture and a language. To a large extent, there were no biological components until the beginning of the 19th Century. But towards the end of the 19th Century, a notion spread of « folk » as a « race community » (« rasgemenskap ») . National-Socialism was highly-influenced by ideas of « folk » as an expression of « blood » and « race » , a concept that became part of the official language in Nazi Germany.

Atterberg's translation of « Volkstum » as « folklight » conceals the National-Socialistic content from his Swedish readers. It is not apparent how Atterberg himself understood the « folk » concept, whether he considered « folk » primarily as a unity of culture and language or as a unity of race. Here, he remains vague. But because the importance of Germanness in the speech is not made visible, Nazi Germany's aim of retaining the privilege of interpretation on musical matters is also not made visible. But, perhaps, Atterberg wanted to emphasize the international aspect for his Swedish readers.

Atterberg continues his report from the speech :

« Han (Funk) gick vidare in på medlen för realiserandet av detta mål och som första tes av vikt förkunnade han :“ I vår tid finns inga mecenater mer. Staten måste därför vara mecenat för konsten och konstnärerna.” »

« Funk went on to describe the means for realizing this goal and, as his 1st thesis of importance, he declared :“ In our time, there are no longer any benefactors. The government, therefore, has to become the benefactor for art and the artists.” »

This paragraph begins with a direct quote with journalistic commentary : « ... as his 1st thesis of importance, he declared ... » . A certain degree of irony is possibly apparent here : it is not until now that Funk states anything important. Atterberg does not ascribe the same importance to Funk's earlier and more theoretical elaborations on music and art ; he is interested in the practical music-political issues. The direct quote emphasizes the importance of the message : now, « the government » should « become the benefactor for art and the artists » ; it wants to take everybody under its wings.

This section of the speech is recounted, in a different way, in the German articles. Something that is mentioned in several German accounts and not in Atterberg's article is the following section of Fritz Stege's report :

« Es geht nicht um die Richtung der Kunst, sondern um die Art der Kunst. Das Volk soll wieder in der Kunst und der Künstler im Volke leben ! Das ist die erste Aufgabe der nationalsozialistischen Kunstpolitik. » (13)

It is not about the direction of art, but the essence of art. The « folk » shall live again in art and the artist shall live in the « folk » . This is the 1st task for National-Socialist art policy.

Here, the symbiosis between art and « folk » is explicitly connected with National-Socialism. In a different German account, these thoughts are further extended :

« Es ginge nicht um die Richtung der Kunst, sondern um ihre Art. Ihre Aufgabe sei, die deutsche Wesensart zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Nur wenn die Kunst im Volkshaften wurzele, könne auch das Volk in der Kunst und mit ihr leben ; unter diesen Voraussetzungen sei der Staat bereit, das Amt eines Mäzens dem Künstler gegenüber zu übernehmen. (14)

« It was not about the direction of art, but about its essence. The task of art is to express the German spirit (“ Wesensart ”) . Only if art is anchored in the people's steadfast roots (“ im Volkshaften ”) , could the people live in and with the arts ; under these conditions, the State is willing to take-over and perform the duties of a patron to the artist. »

Not only are art and « folk » connected in these statements, but also « folk » and Germanness. The idea of art as having a mandate for expressing the « German spirit » , of being anchored in the people's steadfast roots (« im

Volkshaften wurzele ») implies a notion of a national « soul », common to all Germans, that should be expressed in art. Only « under these conditions », should the German State support the artists. All artists are excluded who could not be considered as expressing « the German spirit ». What « German spirit » referred to is not made explicit.

In Atterberg's report of the speech, the reader gets the impression that the German State will take care of all artists with no exceptions and no demands :

« In our time, there are no benefactors any longer. The government must, therefore, become the benefactor for art and the artists. »

Phrased that way, the demand for art's expression of Germanness becomes invisible. Instead, the statement is coupled with ultra-modernism's threat against the artists. In this context, the message might well be that the German State takes good care of all artists in order to combat the ultra-modern and its consequences. Atterberg continues his report of the speech :

« Han relaterade, hur genom regeringsingripande splittringen bland de tyska tonsättarna bragts ur världen och hur de nu enats under den man, som i årtionden kämpat för detta mål : Richard Strauß. Han slutade sitt tal med utpekande av Richard Strauß som den verkliga ledaren av Tysklands musikliv och som förbindelselänken mellan detta och regeringen. » (15)

He related how, through governmental intervention, the split among the German composers has been made to disappear and how they now have been united behind the man who for decades fought for this goal : Richard Strauß. Funk concluded his speech by declaring Richard Strauß to be the true leader of Germany's musical life and as its link to the government.

According to Atterberg's account, the German government intervened in and repaired the composers' earlier conflicts. However, Atterberg does not refer to any concrete examples of « governmental intervention » (note how the passive sentence constructions « been made to disappear » and « been united » lack agency) which means that a Swedish reader did not receive any concrete information about how the governmental intervention had been put in place.

From the German articles, it becomes clear that the organization referred to was the National Organization for German Composers (« Berufsstand der deutschen Komponisten ») , as part of the « Reichsmusikkammer » and « STAGMA » (« Reichsmusikkammer » and « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Urheberrechte ») . These were National-Socialist organizations with obligatory membership ; in order to practice one's profession, each artist had to be a member. Jewish artists were excluded by an « Aryan clause » . These exclusions disappear in Atterberg's article, along with the idea of compulsory membership. Instead, the split among composers is contrasted with their unification under Richard Strauß, who thus acquires the status of a hero (see : Kargl, 1997 ; page 43) . Strauß is the one who worked for many years for artists' rights and the one who unified the artists. Again, unity is emphasized. I would like to label this mode of speech as a discourse of unity, since the speech of a new unity and unification was central in National-Socialist texts, contrasting these with earlier conflicts (divisions) - among others, in the Weimar

Republic. The politics of unity was also referred to as « Gleichschaltung » (making the same) , which implied that the Nazi regime banned all organizations that did not adapt to the politics of National-Socialism - as, for example, when they refused to implement the « Aryan clause » . On the contrary, conforming organizations, including the National Organization of German Composers, could expect governmental support.

Strauß is described as the link between Germany's musical life and the government. Again, Funk's speech receives a comment, as Atterberg writes :

« It is a fact that Strauß is an unselfish leader of German musical practitioners : from the composers to the unemployed music engravers, from choral Societies to the piano manufacturer, in short, of everything. » (16)

Strauß is also described as an ideal agent for German musical life. The narrative about Strauß as a benefactor for others is a rhetorical strategy emphasizing unselfishness, a description of a man who is always available and who acts without any thought of personal gain. The critique of individualism was central in the national discourses of the 1930's : the individual should by free will subordinate him, or herself, to the needs of the nation and the people. Such notions also existed, during the same period, in the Swedish Social-Democrat concept « folkhemmet » (literally, « the people's home » ; or, the nation for the people) , according to which one should behave in « solidarity with society » and subordinate one's needs to the common good (Frykman and Löfgren, 1985 ; page 137) . Exactly the same idea occurs in Atterberg's comments : Strauß Ist appears as an individual, and is described later as one who subordinates himself to the collective. But other accounts do not support this picture of the artist providing unconditional help to his colleagues. Although Strauß nurtured those who shared his musical taste, he opposed colleagues who had adapted a more modern style than the one he advocated (Splitt, 1987) .

German articles about the Composers' Meeting also portray Strauß as a hero : he is labeled the « Reichführer » (State Leader) of the composers, nominated by the government, which has « fought for decades » against division among composers. (17) The statement can also be interpreted as meaning that Strauß is the personification of the ideal national realization of the musical life. Atterberg's and the German reporting are similar on this point ; however, some of the racist attributions in the German texts disappear when transferred to a Swedish audience.

Several of the foreign guests gave speeches at the Composers' Meeting. Atterberg spoke on behalf of Sweden, Carol Bérard for France, Adriano Lualdi for Italy, and Wilhelm Kienzl for Austria. In Atterberg's article, and in the German articles, the speakers are mentioned by name but the speeches by Funk and Strauß are given most attention. Atterberg describes himself in his article as a representative for the Nordic countries rather than for Sweden. One reason for this was that he had been asked to represent Norway and Denmark as well, since their representatives (Sverre Hagerup Bull and Peter Jørgensen Gram) were unable to attend. The Finnish representative was Yrjö Kilpinen. (18) Atterberg is likewise mentioned by the German writers as a representative for Sweden and for « den skandinavischen Norden » . (19) « Norden » (The Nordic Countries) was a commonly used term for the modern Scandinavian countries during the 1930's , in Germany (Leiska, 2005 ; pages 69-80) , and its use emphasized the relationship between the Nordic countries and Germany.

According to the German reports, the foreign guests spoke as representatives for their respective composers' organizations, and distributed greetings from those who were positive to the idea of cooperation with the new regime. (20) These foreign appearances are represented in the German articles as examples of the German composers' successful international collaborations.

The German accounts of the ordering of the speeches give a view of how conscientiously the organizers had staged the Composers' Meeting. Funk spoke 1st, as the representative of the government, and he concluded his speech with the celebration of Strauß, who then took-over, to large applause. The last speaker was Wilhelm Kienzl from Austria, who was received « enthusiastically ». According to Fritz Stege's and Peter W.'s reports, at the same moment that Kienzl appealed to the « German brotherhood », a String Quartet performed the German national anthem. (21) Here, the National-Socialist message of Austria's forthcoming « Anschluß » to Germany was staged musically, and Kienzl symbolized Austria's apparent longing to come home to the German « Reich ». By using a representative of the Nazi regime to open the Composers' Meeting, and an Austrian to conclude the speeches, climaxes were created at the beginning and the end. Atterberg does not mention the musical staging of Austria's « homesickness » in his article. Likewise, while the German commentators mention « Sieg-Heil » calls and Hitler salutes during the celebration, Atterberg does not. Here, again, the impact of National-Socialism on the event is not evident to Swedish readers.

After the opening ceremony, a conference was held at the Hotel « Kaiserhof » where attempts were made to consolidate the international musical exchange. Atterberg describes it thus :

« Man beslöt därvid att igångsätta ett stort anlagt internationellt utbyte av musik av sådan art, som kunde fattas av den stora publiken. Själv tillät jag mig föreslå att betydelsen av musikaliskt framåtskridande måste erkännas i ett eventuellt programuttalande, men detta vann icke gehör. Synbarligen är man i alla länder grundligt led vid allt, som kan tangera modernism. De närvarande utlänningarna rapporterade, var och en i sin stad, vilka organisationer, som existerade i deras länder och som kunde tänkas vara lämpliga organ för det internationella utbytet. Tyskarna hade sin "Allgemeiner deutscher Tonkünstlerverein", vilken man nu erbjöd som operationsbas. » (22)

« One decided to begin a large-scale international exchange of music such as could be understood by the general audience. I allowed myself to propose that the importance of musical progress must be recognized in a possible program statement, but that idea was rejected. Obviously, there is fatigue in all countries about everything that touches upon modernism. The foreigners present reported, each for their city, which organizations existed in their countries that could be suitable venues for the international exchange. The Germans had their "Allgemeiner deutscher Tonkünstlerverein", which was offered as an operational base. »

Atterberg does not elaborate further on « the general audience », and in the 1st sentence the subject « one » is an example of vagueness and anonymity. The reader does not find-out concretely which music should be exchanged and who should make the choice. Atterberg's suggestion to acknowledge musical progress was not welcomed, which Atterberg interprets as the result of fatigue with modernism.

The musical exchange was to be organized with the aid of the foreign guests present and, according to Atterberg's

description, there was agreement as to how this exchange should be structured. The guests were considered to be national representatives for their home States and were assigned authority to direct the musical selections in their respective countries, so that the « right music » was the target for the exchange.

The German authors do not mention this conference at all, or only very briefly. In the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , Robert Oboussier wrote that the Public German Music Society (« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » , or « ADMV ») should contact the other European countries to promote « foreign folk-connected music » (« die ausländische volksverbundene Musik ») . (23) The « ADMV » obviously assumed a main role in the music exchange. In Atterberg's article, this is portrayed as an offer from the German side :

« The Germans had their “ Allgemeiner deutscher Tonkünstlerverein ”, which was offered as an operational base. »
(24)

Generally, Atterberg provides a more egalitarian description of the collaboration between the countries that would organize the musical exchange, although it is made clear in the German articles that the music exchange should be organized by Germany.

The opening ceremony of the Composers' Meeting concluded with a large concert at the « Alte Philharmonie » , with Josef Göebbels as one of the honorary guests. Wilhelm Furtwängler conducted performances of works by Richard Strauß, Max von Schillings, Georg Schumann, Siegmund von Hausegger, Paul Hindemith, Paul Græner, and Hans Pfitzner. (25) These musicians were to have a great impact during the beginning of the 3rd « Reich » , and several of them became members of the new National Organization for German Composers.

The Composers' Meeting was used extensively in Nazi propaganda. Sections of the opening ceremony were filmed and broadcast on radio. The National-Socialist paper « Völkischer Beobachter » described it as an advancement of National-Socialist cultural policies, and there was a great enthusiasm for the « The New Germany » (« im neuen Deutschland ») . (26) « The New Germany » was a central National-Socialist concept for the positive changes (in the eyes of the National-Socialists) in German society, after 1933 (see : Brylla, 2005 ; page 127) .

Atterberg chose the headline « “ Droit moral ” and international exchange of “ folklig ” music » for his article. In the German articles, this music was described as « völkische Musik, volksverbundene Musik » (music close to the people) , and « Musik des Volkes » (the music of the people) : a music that would « emerge naturally » from the « individuality of a people » . (27) « “ Folklig ” music » was described, in different ways, by the German writers. « Völkische Musik » was a concept with clear race-biological connotations, while « volksverbundene Musik » and « Musik des Volkes » did not necessarily imply race. Here again, appears the semantic shift in the concept of « folk » that was discussed earlier. « Völkisch » was a central National-Socialist concept that defined different peoples by their biological racial characteristics. It also included a clear hierarchy of the different peoples in which the « German » and « Nordic races » were at the top (Geisler, 2006 ; page 64 - Almgren 2005 ; page 39ff) . « Volksverbundene Musik » or « Musik des Volkes » did not imply this component, per se, although the concepts could be charged with a race-biological content in the National-Socialist context.

The different labels for « folk-inspired music » constitute one example of how the National-Socialists used « innocent, harmless words » , on the one hand, and charged words, on the other. Charged concepts such as « völkische Musik » were used, side by side, with more neutral terms, such as « volksverbundene Musik » and « Musik des Volkes » which, in turn through this use, assumed a charged, racial-biological content. The parallel use of concepts that, at the same time, were used in non-National-Socialist and National-Socialist contexts, the semantic shift between non-National-Socialist and National-Socialist concepts, characterized linguistic usage in the Nazi German totalitarian State. Language thus became an effective tool of dissemination, in that the use of « harmless » and, yet, « charged » expressions led people without any National-Socialist connection to spread National-Socialist concepts. For an observer like Atterberg, whose mother tongue was not German, the difference between the various concepts was probably even harder to perceive.

Atterberg translated all 3 terms, « völkische Musik » , « volksverbundene Musik » , and « Musik des Volkes » , as « folklig musik » (Almgren and Brylla, 2005 ; page 108 - Geisler, 2006 ; page 64) . The Swedish word « folklig » is still a word with mainly positive connotations (for example, meaning « natural » , « original » , and « simple ») . At the beginning of the 20th Century, the concept was often used to describe an authentic national culture that was threatened with extinction and had to be saved by collecting « folk culture » , among other things (Frykman, 1993 ; page 140 - Lilja, 1996 ; page 31) . Many people in Sweden, during the 1st half of the 20th Century, considered a concern for « folklig musik » as a remedy against « foreign mass culture » , and an effective protection for « the preservation of Swedishness » (Ling, 1979 ; page 22 - Bohman, 1979 ; pages 56-57) . When Atterberg translated « völkisch » as « folklig » , the National-Socialist content of the term disappeared for his readers and it became a positively charged Swedish word.

This transformation shows that people like Atterberg, who were eager to preserve a national music and wanted to protect it against the impact of modernism, could perceive the exchange of « folklig musik » as a positive act for saving their own national « folk culture » . Germany's wish for an exchange of music of « folkish character » with other countries also meant that other countries' music would be protected against « the modernist threat » . From this perspective, Nazi Germany performed a good deed in saving the domestic national (here, being the Swedish) « cultural heritage » .

It is not clear from Atterberg's texts how much he had adopted the race discourse of the time. He is vague regarding the relationship between race and national identity. He seldom writes about race, though much about Swedishness. He used the term « race » exclusively when describing the Jews. One possible explanation could be that the relationship between race and nation was so obvious in the contemporary conception that the terms were used interchangeably.

Both Atterberg and the German writers portray Germany as a model for opposition to modernist tendencies in musical life, and actively promoting better copyright legislation. According to their descriptions, Germany actively demoted modernist currents by prioritizing a « folk-based » national music, among others. At the same time, Germany appeared as a State eager to improve the life situation of its artists, for example, by modernizing copyright law, by intervening in and preventing conflicts between copyright organizations, while, at the same time, creating new centralized

organizations. From Atterberg's account, it is clear that he considered the centralization of musical life in Nazi Germany as a positive phenomenon since it remedied earlier conflicts and permitted decisions to be made much more quickly. An effective, modern bureaucracy had been established that promoted the « right » music. There is a clear ambivalence towards modernity (Bauman, 1998) : on the one hand, an aspiration to preserve the traditional « folk culture » , and, on the other, an aspiration towards renewal, through new legislation and new institutions.

The Composers' Meeting was described, both by Atterberg and in the German articles, as a heroic departure. A new period in musical life was initiated and set in contrast to a past in which the authentic national had been under threat and the artist was a toy in the hands of the publisher and the entertainment industry. The descriptions of the Composers' Meeting show the expectations that Atterberg and many other composers and conductors had of the Nazi regime's music politics : the anticipation that an effective Germany could deal with rapid changes in musical life, and help other nations along the way. Germany's apparent « success » in dealing with these changes led to a continuous collaboration between German politicians, composers, conductors, and musicians, along with many colleagues in other countries.

Postscript

In my book, I wanted to show the reader why so many composers and musicians were fascinated by Nazi music politics, but I also wanted to show the consequences of these politics and, of course, I am very critical of them. In Chapter 3, I am trying to give some examples of this fascination. Because the translated excerpt is taken-out of its context, the end may sound too positive. To avoid misunderstandings, I would like to add the following paragraphs from the English summary of my thesis :

Many composers and musicians in Sweden and Germany experienced the dramatic changes in musical life during the 1st half of the 20th Century as a threat to established music styles and techniques. In their opinion, a clear national identity could provide security and stability in a changing world. For many of these Swedish composers and musicians, a commitment to Nazi Germany was interpreted as a beneficial contribution to the establishment of a strong national identity, to improvement of their own national musical life and, of course, to the making of a musical career. Their engagement with Germany was totally voluntary and there were no demands from Germany for cooperation. The Nazi government could, for its part, use Nordic composers and music to confirm Nazi ideas on racial biology and to spread Nazi propaganda.

In the 1990's, the effectiveness of Sweden's neutrality during World War II was questioned by Swedish scholars. Several Universities started research projects in different disciplines concerning Sweden's relationship to Nazi Germany. (28) Today, scholars are convinced that Sweden cooperated with Nazi Germany to a much larger extent than was earlier assumed, not only for the purpose of staying-out of the War, but also to serve its own economic and cultural interests. In the sphere of music, many Swedish composers and musicians continued their cooperation with German colleagues during the Nazi period, but there were others who resisted and criticized Nazi politics. (29) Kurt Atterberg is an example of the group that continued its cooperation with German institutions after 1933 and defined its work as purely musical and unpolitical. A composer such as Atterberg, who had a central position in Swedish musical life and a

large network of international contacts, helped to legitimize Nazism and to strengthen Nazi politics by spreading positive impressions about Nazi Germany and cooperating with the Nazi regime in music-political work. This kind of cooperation became a very effective tool in Nazi propaganda.

In my study, I also discuss the assessment of Atterberg that occurred as an expression of the need for new national stories after the War. To secure democracy and create a new, modern, and peaceful Europe, it was necessary to mark a distance from Nazism. Nazism now meant the Holocaust, evil, and a threat to democracy. Strategies for dissociation included the denazifications in Germany and the countries which had been occupied by Germany, and it became necessary to exclude people who had been active in Nazi Germany, to brand them as Nazis or Nazi sympathisers. I argue that Atterberg was a suitable scapegoat for Swedish involvement in Nazism, partly because of his reputation as a powerful and sometimes intolerant person, and partly because his music was not looked on in Sweden as very successful. I compare Atterberg's case with the treatment of Richard Strauß and Wilhelm Furtwängler after the War. Both were accused of having been Nazis because of their involvement in Nazi musical politics but, at the same time, their successful musical careers were emphasized. In such cases, a difference is expressed between the (apolitical and strong) artist and the (political and weak) human being.

Notes

(1) See their report at <http://www.vr.se/download/18.65bf9bc10cd31363a180001073/nazism.pdf>

(2) Petra Garberding. « Musik och politik i skuggan av nazismen : Kurt Atterberg och de svensk-tyska musikrelationerna » (Sekel Bokförlag, Lund, 2007) .

(3) « Liberal » is used here in the European sense, i.e. , non-Socialist and free-market, but also non-conservative.

(4) « Stockholms-Tidningen » was published from 1889 to 1966. « Stockholms-Tidningen, Register. Riksarkivet Stockholm ; Nationalencyklopedin » , 1995 ; page 278.

(5) Kurt Atterberg. « Minnesanteckningar » , Volume 5, Seite 176. Kurt Atterberg's Archive, « Musikmuseet Stockholm » (hereafter, KA, MM) .

(6) « Kurt Atterberg begär ett statsbidrag på 400 kr » , (unknown newspaper) , 2 February 1934. « Tonsättaren Kurt Atterberg fick i fredagskonseljen ett reseunderstöd på 400 kr för att i Braunschweig övervara den tyska urpremiären på hans opera Fanal » , (unknown newspaper) , 17 February 1934.

(7) Kurt Atterberg. « Konfidentiell rapport (till UD) över besök i Berlin den 18 och 19 februari 1934 » (Confidential report - probably written to the foreign office - of visit to Berlin, 18 and 19 February 1934) , KA, MM.

(8) Kurt Atterberg. « Droit moral och internationellt utbyte av folklig musik. Tyska tonsättares strävan » , « Stockholms-Tidningen » , 10 March 1934.

(9) Atterberg uses « ideella rättigheter » , which today has the connotation of « non-profit » in Swedish, rather than what I believe he intended. Betsy Rosenblatt writes, « The term ‘moral rights’ as a translation of the French term “droit moral ”, refers to the ability of authors to control the eventual fate of their works. » .

(10) Kurt Atterberg. « Droit moral och internationellt utbyte av folklig musik. »

(11) « Men ett ideellt skydd för konstnärens och tonsättaren blir en tom bokstav, om ej ensartade bestämmelser antagas i alla länder. Den samlade och enade tyska tonsättargenerationen ämnar nu gå in för sådana bestämmelsers antagande. »

(12) Fritz Stege. « Der Deutsche Komponistentag » , « Der Berliner Westen » , 19 February 1934 ; Robert Oboussier, « Der schaffende Musiker im neuen Deutschland. Erster deutscher Komponistentag » , « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , 19 February 1934 ; Peter W. , « Erster deutscher Komponistentag in Berlin eröffnet » , « Völkischer Beobachter » , 20 February 1934.

(13) Stege. « Der Deutsche Komponistentag. »

(14) Oboussier. « Der schaffende Musiker im neuen Deutschland. Erster deutscher Komponistentag. »

(15) Atterberg. « Droit moral och internationellt utbyte av folklig musik. »

(16) « Faktum är att Strauß på det mest oegennyttiga sättet går i bräschen för det tyska musiklivets intressen från tonsättarna till de arbetslösa notstickarna, från körföreningar till pianofabrikanten, kort sagt för allt. » Ibid.

(17) Stege. « Der Deutsche Komponistentag » ; Oboussier, « Der schaffende Musiker im neuen Deutschland » ; Peter W. , « Erster deutscher Komponistentag in Berlin eröffnet. »

(18) Atterberg. « Konfidentiell rapport. »

(19) Stege. « Der Deutsche Komponistentag » ; Oboussier. « Der schaffende Musiker im neuen Deutschland » ; Peter W. « Erster deutscher Komponistentag in Berlin eröffnet » ; Peter W. « Lebendige Kunst Inhalt und Zweck der Staatsführung » , « Völkischer Beobachter » , 20 February 1934.

(20) Stege. « Der Deutsche Komponistentag » ; Peter W. « Lebendige Kunst Inhalt und Zweck der Staatsführung. »

(21) Stege. « Der Deutsche Komponistentag. »

(22) Atterberg. « Droit moral och internationellt utbyte av folklig musik. »

(23) Oboussier. « Der schaffende Musiker im neuen Deutschland. »

(24) « Tyskarna hade sin "Allgemeiner deutscher Tonkünstlerverein", vilken man nu erbjöd som operationsbas. »
Atterberg. « Droit moral och internationellt utbyte av folklig musik. »

(25) Ibid.

(26) Peter W. « Erster deutscher Komponistentag in Berlin eröffnet » ; Peter W. « Lebendige Kunst Inhalt und Zweck der Staatsführung. »

(27) Ibid.

(28) See, among others, the report from the Swedish Scientific Council (« Vetenskapsrådet ») .

(29) See, among others, Karlsson (2005) ; Andersson and Geisler (2006) .

Richard Strauß : avant, pendant et après le régime nazi

Le cas de Richard Strauß est contigu à celui de Wilhelm Furtwängler. L'auteur du « Chevalier à la Rose », en 1933, a 69 ans. Sa notoriété l'auréole de gloire et il apparaît comme le père tutélaire de la musique allemande. Immense compositeur né à Munich, c'est un homme emblématique d'une culture européenne intense et protéiforme dont l'Allemagne est le berceau. Il connaît le succès dès 1905 avec toute une suite d'Opéras sublimes qui assureront sa gloire : « Salomé » (1905) ; « Elektra » (1909) ; et « le Chevalier à la Rose » (1911) .

Artiste dans l'âme, il ne vit que pour la musique, et tout au long des années alors qu'il connaît la gloire et les honneurs, il œuvre pour protéger la vie sociale et économique de ses autres collègues musiciens certes moins connus. Son jugement politique peu familier du débat des enceintes parlementaires ou des journaux ne s'intéresse qu'à l'art. Il semble un temps attiré par le 3^e « Reich » . Le plus grand compositeur allemand de son temps, il est nommé 1^{er} président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » (RMK) , le 15 novembre 1933. Il pensait alors, tel un Candide, qu'il pourrait utiliser sa fonction pour développer une politique musicale de grande envergure. Mais il prend conscience très rapidement de sa naïveté et s'oppose à Gustav Havemann, un musicien opportuniste qui transitera du gauchisme au Nazisme et l'antisémitisme (phénomène dont seuls les simples d'esprit pourraient s'étonner) , ainsi qu'à Herbert von Karajan « le petit K » aux dents longues.

Richard Strauß voulait développer une politique en faveur de l'éducation musicale et du droit d'auteurs des compositeurs. Il refusera de participer au processus d'aryanisation de la musique allemande qui avait, entre autres buts, de supprimer toutes références aux compositeurs allemands d'origine juive. Il avait de sa personne une idée très narcissique se considérant comme l'héritier de Bach, de Mozart, Beethoven et Wagner et aimait voir ceux qui possédaient l'autorité politique lui donner l'illusion de sa suprématie.

Après la mort, en 1929, de son librettiste Hugo von Hofmannsthal (lui même d'origine juive) , il demanda à l'écrivain juif autrichien Stefan Zweig de travailler pour lui. De cette collaboration naîtra « Die schweigsame Frau » (La Femme silencieuse) . Stefan Zweig conscient de l'antisémitisme virulent au pouvoir en Allemagne demandera à Strauß, pour ne pas compromettre la carrière du compositeur, de retirer son nom de l'affiche. Richard Strauß refusera et maintiendra le nom de Zweig. La première de l'œuvre sera donnée à Dresde, en 1935, avec Karl Böhm à la direction d'orchestre.

Le 17 juin 1935, la « Gestapo » intercepte une lettre de Richard Strauß à Stefan Zweig, où le compositeur décrit sa charge de Président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » comme étant purement un rôle de composition. On le contraint de démissionner et l'Opéra ne sera plus joué. Plus tard, il composera un Hymne olympique pour les Jeux d'été, mais son aura est déjà sur son déclin.

Après la Guerre, dans les enquêtes pour dénazification qui seront conduites, on lui reprochera un manifeste qu'il avait signé en 1933 contre Thomas Mann et d'avoir remplacé, au pied levé, le chef d'orchestre d'origine juive Bruno Walter interdit de concert. Il fut entièrement blanchi de toute collaboration.

Au plan de sa personne et de sa vie privée, sa belle-fille Alice était juive, donc selon les critères nazis ses petits-enfants l'étaient aussi. Durant la « Nuit de Cristal » (« Kristallnacht ») , il réussit à les protéger par ses interventions auprès de personnes amies. Ensemble, ils déménagèrent à Vienne en 1942 où ils bénéficièrent un temps de la protection du « Gauleiter » Baldur von Schirach. Vers la fin de la Guerre, alors que le compositeur s'était absenté, les Nazis arrêterent Alice qui fut incarcérée pendant plusieurs jours. C'est avec de grandes difficultés que Richard Strauß réussit à la faire relâcher. Il put l'emmener ainsi que les enfants à Garmisch où ils demeurèrent en résidence forcée, gardés par les Nazis jusqu'à la fin de la Guerre. Pendant ce temps, la famille proche d'Alice fut déportée au camp de Theresienstadt. Les lettres que Richard Strauß envoya pour demander leur libération demeurèrent sans effet. Il se rendit en voiture en personne au camp mais on refusa de le recevoir à son grand désarroi. Tous moururent ou furent assassinés à Theresienstadt ou dans d'autres camps.

Richard Strauß est mort le 8 septembre 1949.

Si, d'évidence, le Nazisme et ses miasmes contaminèrent des artistes en Allemagne ou en Autriche, la peste brune toucha aussi, hélas, des artistes dans d'autres pays. En France, dans le monde de la musique, le pianiste Alfred Cortot crut jouer une partition de grand talent dans une collaboration crapoteuse avec le régime de Vichy. Le compositeur Florent Schmitt, né en Lorraine, afficha ouvertement ses convictions nazis.

...

The lines between resistance, collaboration and passivity are hard to draw for many artists working within the 3rd « Reich » . While some committed themselves publicly to the project of Nazism, many simply tried to adapt to the new regime as best they could, supporting those in power where possible, and dissenting only when personally threatened. An example of the latter was the composer Richard Strauß, exonerated in his denazification trial as innocent of any ties to the Nazi State, yet, condemned by Thomas Mann after the War as a « Hitlerian composer » . Proud of his lack

of involvement in politics, he asserted that « they can all turn their backs on me. I just sit here in Garmisch and compose ; everything else is irrelevant to me. »

Born on 11 June 1864, Strauß was raised in the culturally rich environment of 19th Century Munich. Encouraged in his desire to play and compose, he dedicated himself early on to music. In 1894, he married Pauline de Ahna, and they had their only child, Franz Alexander, in 1897. Strauß achieved his 1st major success through his pre-World War I Operas, « Salome » (1905) , « Elektra » (1909) and « Der Rosenkavalier » (1911) , which were widely popular. Although he was conservative and sometimes anti-Semitic, Strauß collaborated frequently with the part-Jewish intellectual Hugo von Hofmannsthal, was a great fan of Felix Mendelssohn, and had many Jewish friends.

One of Strauß' primary concerns was strengthening the economic situation of musicians in Germany. Throughout his life, he lobbied for revised copyright policy, better insurance and job protection, and increased government funding for professional musicians. His judgment of politics was often based on the support of culture, particularly music, and this was apparently the source of his early support for the 3rd « Reich » . Strauß was made the 1st president of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , on 15 November 1933. Although he hoped that the position would allow him to achieve his long-term musical goals for Germany, he quickly came into conflict with both Gustav Havemann and Wilhelm Furtwängler, the organization's other leading figures.

In addition to pursuing more innocuous projects like improved music education and copyright protection for composers, Strauß also tried to replace the works of foreign composers with German works, including his own. But he refused to participate in the process of « Aryanizing » the musical world, particularly the black-listing of German-Jewish composers ; he would occasionally even pull strings to minimize artistic censorship, or to limit the impact of restrictive policies. Despite these occasional conflicts, Strauß was generally on good terms with the Nazi Party (probably, the biggest source of conflict with the Nazis was his ego : seeing himself as last in line after the German greats Bach, Mozart, Beethoven and Wagner) .

Strauß once said :

« I am the last mountain of a large mountain range. After me, come the flatlands. »

On his 70th birthday, on 11 June 1934, he received framed autographed portraits of Adolf Hitler and Josef Gæbbels, dedicated to « the venerable great tone Master with respectful gratitude » .

Relations soon grew tense, however. After the 1929 death of his librettist Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Strauß was seeking a new and equally talented collaborator, and settled on the Jewish writer Stefan Zweig, with whom he wrote the Opera « Die Schweigsame Frau » (The Silent Woman) in 1934. The work was premiered in Dresden under Karl Böhm, in June 1935. Zweig, aware of how their partnership would compromise Strauß's position, had been trying to break-off the collaboration, but Strauß refused. On 17 June 1935, the « Gestapo » intercepted a letter from Strauß to Zweig in which the former characterized his job as « Reichsmusikkammer » president as merely play-acting. The letter ultimately resulted in the composer's forced resignation, and led to the cancellation of all further productions of the

Opera ; it was not performed again in Nazi Germany. In an act of damage control, Strauß wrote a personal letter to Hitler assuring him that the letter to Zweig « does not represent my view of the world nor my true conviction » . He never received a reply. Though it represented the beginning of his downfall, this event did not signal the end of Strauß's career in Nazi Germany. He composed an Olympic Hymn that premiered at the Summer Games, just months after his dismissal. His works also continued to be performed widely in Germany. He certainly had many strikes against him when it came to accusations of collaboration : he had signed an anti-Thomas Mann manifesto in early 1933, for example, and when a performance by the Jewish conductor Bruno Walter was cancelled at the last minute, he agreed to substitute. Nonetheless, he also suffered increasingly at the hands of the Nazis.

This suffering was not only professional but also personal. Strauß's daughter-in-law Alice was Jewish, as were (according to Nazi racial law) his grandchildren. He was able to use personal connections to prevent his family from the full-force of harassment during « Kristallnacht » , in November 1938, and, in 1942, he moved with them to Vienna, where they benefited from the protection of Hitler Youth leader and Vienna « Gauleiter » Baldur von Schirach. Towards the end of the War, however, while Strauß was away, Nazis arrested Alice and held her for several days ; Strauß was barely able to secure her release, moving her and the family to Garmisch, where they were kept under house-arrest until the War's end. In addition, many members of Alice's immediate family were deported to Theresienstadt. When Strauß's letters asking for their release were unsuccessful, the composer drove to the camp personally, but to no avail ; all died or were murdered, in Theresienstadt and other camps.

Richard Strauß died on 8 September 1949, absolved of any Nazi affiliations.

...

Richard (Georg) Strauß was born on June 11, 1864 in Munich, Germany. His father was a renowned horn player and he enjoyed a privileged life. To many, Strauß was nothing short of a musical genius. His 1st composition was published at the tender age of 12, and his portfolio was extensive by the time he completed his schooling. Perhaps influenced by his father, Strauß's earliest works were Classical and conservative in nature. Starting his career at such a young age enabled Strauß to enjoy a degree of prominence by his early 20's. Some older, yet, very accomplished composers never reached the level of stature occupied by Strauß. At 22, Strauß's Symphonic fantasy « Aus Italien » (From Italy) revealed the strong Wagnerian influence on the young composer. Strauß's most notable stylistic focuses were his « tone poems » which were derivatives of the older Symphonic poems. The 1st of these, « Don Juan » , was published in 1888 continuing through 1903 with « Sinfonia Domestica » . Following this series of 8 poems, Strauß achieved unrivaled popular success and furthered his position as one of the most advanced composers of the time. During this period, he also held highly-reputable positions as a conductor in Meiningen, Munich, Weimar, Berlin and Vienna. He also served as guest-conductor on numerous occasions and his compositions were frequently performed.

A great portion of Strauß's prolific career developed under the strong sense of nationalism and political unrest throughout Europe. This national pride was furthered by Germany's successes and Germany gained the position of political and industrial power of Europe. Strauß fully embraced the sentiment of national pride and superiority of Germans. Perhaps, his empowering self-confidence was in some way derived from his feeling of belonging to this

superior group. Whatever the foundation of his confidence, it is an identifying characteristic of his compositional style. « Ein Heldenleben » (A Hero's Life, 1898) is the culmination of his confidence. Some critics claim the hero in this piece is identified as Strauß himself, who possesses powers to overcome all obstacles he encounters.

In addition to his tone poems, Strauß was also an accomplished composer in Opera, Symphonic music, songs and choral works :

« Extending Wagner's practice, he carried the leitmotif over into a purely instrumental context. Using an array of very brief, though readily identifiable, melodic figures presented in rapid alternation and shifting combinations, Strauß fashioned complex polyphonic textures only barely contained within a highly-inflected and intensely chromatic harmonic framework. » (Mac Morgan, page 31.)

The result was a compression of an unprecedented amount of material, in a very short amount of time. This intense context made a lasting impression upon his contemporaries. Strauß also demanded the highest levels of instrumental playing for his Orchestras, only to be seconded by Gustav Mahler. Despite his nationalism, Strauß also experimented with foreign musical influences to create different sounds with the musical instruments.

Richard Strauß' Operas possessed similar stylistic qualities with his tone poems, and were essentially works staged to accompany the orchestral music. « Salome » (1905) and « Elektra » (1908) were among his most technically advanced :

« The technical developments encountered in the earlier works are carried to a new and critical stage : the tonal underpinnings are now strained to the breaking point, and the unfolding of the musical argument achieves an almost unbearable level of intensity and complexity. » (Mac Morgan, page 32.)

His next Opera composition, « Der Rosenkavalier » (The Cavalier of the Rose, 1910) , returned to a more traditional composition style with regard to tonality. While his earlier Operas pushed the boundaries of tonality, undermining the foundation of the old tonal system, Strauß preferred to return to the confines of traditional tonality. The plots of the earlier Operas revolved around compulsive obsessions and murderous desires, while « Der Rosenkavalier » was the more traditional love story. This initial path of progression followed by an abrupt return to traditional style marked a turning point in Strauß's career. He never again reached the level of modernity achieved in « Salome » and « Elektra » . His preference to conservatism will later be significant when his position within the 3rd « Reich » is examined.

After Germany's defeat in World War I, Strauß continued in his strong devotion to the arts and met with officials of the Weimar Republic to discuss the administration of culture. At a glance, the musical scene under the Weimar Republic (1919-1933) would seem entirely progressive in nature. Major developments flourished in this environment to include 12 tone composition, experimentation with jazz, a new objectivity, and refreshing conventions of Music Theatre. Some of the more accomplished composers found themselves in an elite community within Berlin. These included Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith, and Kurt Weill, in addition to non-German composers such as Igor Stravinsky and Béla

Bartók. Wilhelm Furtwängler became conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, in 1922, helping it become one of the finest ensembles in Europe. Despite this new found artistic expression and recognition, the foundation of the Weimar Republic itself was in turmoil as Germany struggled to recover from World War I and the severe punishments rendered through the Treaty of Versailles because of Germany's role in the War. Economic, social and political unrest contributed to cultural attitudes both positively and negatively. The increase in popularity of the extremist Nazi Party led to a rise in conservative and traditional cultural ideals promoting a return to Germany's national Romanticism and rejection of all foreign influences. As previously discussed, Richard Strauß belonged to the Romantic genre and appreciated the return to traditional German music. This belief aligned him with the values of the Nazis and led to his appointment in a rather prestigious role following Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany, in 1933. Nevertheless, his role in the music scene under Hitler's regime resulted in much skepticism, criticism along with appreciation.

The rise of Strauß's career under the Nazi regime was a result of his many accomplishments and attitude regarding conservative cultural values :

« Strauß's appointment by (Josef) Gœbbels as President of the " Reich " Music Chamber, in November 1933, was the logical consequence of a lifetime of efforts spent on behalf of the professional interests of German musicians in general and composers in particular. » (Michaël Kater, page 216.)

Among Strauß's many accomplishments, include his lobbying for a union of musicians, a revision of copyright laws that would favor the composer instead of the publisher, and an extension of the royalty rights, from 30 years to 50 years. Despite these achievements, Strauß had a vast array of goals that had, yet, to be realized at the collapse of the Weimar Republic. As noted, Strauß possessed a strong sense of national pride and opposed foreign music unless it was up to the level of his extremely high artistic standards. Many German composers were also deemed unworthy in his standards largely because of their progressive tendencies. Among these, include highly-accomplished composers Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith and Alban Berg.

Coinciding with Strauß's high artistic standards, one of his goals was to have all inadequate composers and music genres censored to prevent contamination of the works of his peers and his own. He also proposed all Orchestras and Operatic stages that were not comprised of quality musicians be shut down regardless of patronage. He believed the Republic should hire only the best musicians and sufficient funds should be set aside to assure Germany would receive the highest quality of music and musical performance. For these and other unrealized goals, Strauß believed in Adolf Hitler as someone who would be more sympathetic to the arts and who had a more authoritarian nature that would bypass the red tape of any parliament entity. With these expectations, Strauß welcomed the coming of the 3rd « Reich » . He seemed to be able to downplay the violent aspects of the 3rd « Reich » , in order to pursue his cultural visions.

Before his presidency over the « Reich » Music Chamber, Strauß had become very integrated within the National-Socialist Party and had proved early on to be a useful tool for Nazi propaganda. Early on, Strauß also learned his aggressive goals would not be so quickly realized within the confines of the 3rd « Reich » . He continually drafted

proposals and submitted these to Josef Gœbbels who utilized as many delay tactics as possible to avoid responding to these proposals. When Strauß realized he might be the renowned figurehead the regime wanted he was able to gain leverage for his causes.

This, then, was the immediate background to an understanding between Strauß and Gœbbels that the composer act as head of a new corporatist professional chamber according to the fascist model now also successfully tried by dictators such as music-loving Benito Mussolini, and that in return, and within the organizational framework, Strauß could service his detailed music-specific interests, those dear to his heart for decades. (Michaël Kater, page 220.)

Richard Strauß's involvement with the inner workings of the Nazi regime was not prompted by anti-Semitic sentiments, but largely an act of personal gratification and a boost to his ego. Additionally, Strauß accepted this appointment because he « believed that a dictatorial regime could finally implement the changes toward neo-corporatism that would benefit the German musical profession, and in particular composers » . (Michaël Kater, 1997, page 18.)

Given the subjectivity involved in several of his administrative platforms, the difficulties he encountered within the organization were largely based upon a personal rather than professional basis.

He began his position as President on a strong footing. On November 15, 1933, Strauß conducted his « Festliches Präludium » for the opening ceremony of the « Reich » Cultural Chamber (« RKK ») , in Berlin. Following this ceremony, Josef Gœbbels extended Strauß's responsibilities to include leader of Professional Composers, which was then included in the music chamber. One of his 1st official actions was the organization of the Composers' Festival in Berlin where he requested the presence of all German composers in an effort to centralize all musicians primarily by banning all lobbies operating without authorization from the « Reichsmusikkammer » . One of his most significant accomplishments, however, was the successful formation of an international composers' cooperation with countries that were either neutral or friendly to Nazi Germany. Naturally, these composers had to meet Strauß's standards, which largely meant they had to be traditionalist oriented. This organization was founded on June 6, 1934, and had an original membership of 13 nations, which quickly expanded to 20. Strauß also served as President of this organization.

Richard Strauß always maintained a high-standard of musicianship and this sentiment did not waiver under the confines of the Nazi Regime. He wholeheartedly believed that Germans should only be exposed to the best musicians and his primary focus rested with Operas. Although not officially enforced, censorship of specific composers and / or compositions was encouraged. For instance, performances of Verdi and Puccini Operas were reduced in favor of German or Austrian works. Operas by Richard Wagner, Max von Schillings, and Alexander Ritter were among the favored selections, in addition to his own compositions of course. Small and understaffed Opera Houses were to be shut down as these could not possibility reach the performance standards of serious works and larger Opera Houses. The Opera Houses, in general, should be consolidated in order to weed-out less competent artists and provide incentives for the recruitment of accomplished and renowned artists. Josef Gœbbels, however, was not supportive of these proposed reforms.

Richard Strauß's constant push for reforms eventually began to wane on Gœbbels's patience. Nonetheless, he continued

his campaign efforts and believed his role as President of the « Reich » Chamber Music would finally prove to be the vehicle toward success. The Nazis, however, believed his role as President was that of a respected and useful ally. Nevertheless, the conflicts between Strauß and the administration became continuous events. Strauß's confidence and egoism led to extreme difficulties in conforming his compositions to meet the standards of the Nazi Regime. Additionally, he teamed-up with writer Stefan Zweig, who by Nazi definition was a full Jew, to complete the Opera « Die schweigsame Frau » . His association with Zweig compromised his position as head of the « RKM » . At this time, the performance of music by Jewish composers was forbidden. Yet, Goebbels, with Adolf Hitler's permission, granted an exception and Strauß was able to premiere his Opera, in 1935. Although Strauß originally welcomed this seemingly act of good will by the Regime, he later chose to delay the premiere given the audiences attitude toward Jewish composers. He did not wish to cause Zweig any further humiliation than he had already encountered. (It was common for the audience to withhold applause or even shout obscenities at performances with Jews at the helm.) Eventually, in efforts to re-establish his alliance with the Nazi leaders, the Opera indeed premiered on June 24, 1935, against Zweig's numerous protests. Zweig officially dissolved his partnership with Strauß noting his solidarity with his fellow Jewish artists who had been persecuted by the Nazis. With this solidarity, maintaining a professional relationship with the head of the « Reichsmusikkammer » was impossible. Strauß genuinely wished to continue his working relationship with Zweig and even convinced him to agree to a secret arrangement. In further defense of himself, he sent a letter to Zweig that his role in the « Reichsmusikkammer » was nothing more than that of a figurehead. This letter was intercepted by the « Gestapo » and delivered to Goebbels. Strauß was subsequently ordered to resign « due to ill health and old age » . (Michaël Kater, pages 242-243.)

Richard Strauß's professional career suffered after his relationship with the Party had dissolved. His works that were previously acceptable under the Nazi standards were now facing censorship. The loss of Zweig as his partner also affected his creative output, coupled with the increased emotional stress Strauß was experiencing. He further mistakenly believed his direct relationship with Hitler was not affected by his termination and requested Hitler meet with him for a private discussion to personally defend his actions. For many months, he utilized every contact he had in order to secure a meeting with Hitler and Goebbels. Strauß was reasonably concerned he would no longer be permitted to conduct in Party sanctioned events. This was somewhat alleviated when he was allowed to conduct the Olympic Hymn he had specifically written for the Summer Olympic Games, held in 1936.

Outside the control of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , Strauß maintained his position as President of the International Composers Association. In this regard, Goebbels still valued the media attention associated with Strauß. Although Strauß still proved to be useful to the Nazis, his status was, by no means, one of mutual respect :

« It required of Strauß to show-off his regime marketable qualities and a continuation of the subservient, sometimes groveling, attitude that had Ist manifested in that self-demeaning letter to Hitler (requesting a meeting) , in July 1935. » (Michaël Kater, page 249.)

Thus, Richard Strauß continued his turbulent relationship with the Regime from the Olympic Games, in 1936, through 1944. It was also during this period that Strauß's Jewish daughter-in-law, Alice Strauß, was harassed as part of the November « Pogrom » , in 1938, also known as « Kristallnacht » . Strauß's relationship with Zweig and his lack of

support for the anti-Semitic policies were perhaps responsible for Alice's harassment. The November « Pogrom » was primarily targeted at males, and Jewish women married to Aryan men were unharmed. Alice was undeniably targeted because of her connection to Richard Strauß. Strauß, still aware of his value to the Regime, demanded Aryan rights be fully extended to his daughter-in-law and grand-children. While Hitler extended certain concessions, the Strauß family remained at risk. Unfortunately, many of Alice Strauß's Jewish relatives were sent to concentration camps where they were murdered. Alice and her husband Franz were also jailed at one point by the « Gestapo ». All these events occurred at the behest of Josef Gœbbels while he was working « professionally » with Strauß.

As the War progressed into 1944, the Nazis no longer cared about propaganda as all efforts needed to be focused on War. Strauß's professional career began to increasingly suffer, and many of his ties with the upper-echelons of the Regime were dissolved. Previous national festivities in honour of his birthday were canceled, leaving the only ceremony for his 80th birthday, held in Vienna. Strauß was deeply wounded by this affront. The Salzburg Festival held, that same year, was also canceled ; he was to premiere one of his last Operas, « Weltschmerz », at this event. The cancellation of the Festival was not directly aimed at Strauß, but fell under the blanket cancellation of cultural events by Gœbbels because of the War. Nonetheless, Strauß suffered severe anguish as a result ; not only at the cancellation of his Opera, but also because of the damage done to the cultural atmosphere in Germany. Following the War, Strauß was the defendant in his own denazification trial, in 1947. Among the charges were Strauß's anti-Semitic activities and his affiliation with the Nazi Party. The trial was ultimately canceled a few months into the proceedings as Strauß did not meet the definitions of any of the Nazi categories. He was formally vindicated in 1948.

In the years following the end of the 3rd « Reich », Strauß composed numerous works and his compositions were performed internationally. Some of these compositions include the « Metamorphosen » for 23 strings (1945) and the « 4 Last Songs » for voice and orchestra (1948) . (Mac Morgan, page 35.)

Yet, there was, and still remains, a stigma associated with Strauß because of his involvement with the Nazi Regime. His overall musical achievements, however, established his historical greatness even prior to his involvement with the Nazis. With the exception of Israel, his works were never banned by the international music community. Strauß died in 1949 and left behind a legacy as « the last German Operatic Master of world-wide importance » . (Jane McClelland, page 347.)

Although his major technical contributions to music were made early on his career (most notably « Elektra ») , his continued devotion to the cultural arts and attempts to improve conditions for his fellow artists are what makes his career and life so much more distinguished. For many years, he led a privileged life and while his motives have been called into question, he continued making strides for musicians even under the direst conditions he experienced under the Nazi Regime. Of course, these conditions were not so dire in comparison to his fellow artisans, but for a man of his esteem to him these were almost intolerable.

Bibliography

Kater, Michaël H. :

« The Twisted Muse » . Oxford University Press, New York (1997) .

« Composers of the Nazi Era » . Oxford University Press, New York (2000) .

Levi, Erik : « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » . Saint-Martin's Press, New York (1994) .

McClelland, Charles and Steven Scher : « Post-War German Culture » . E. P. Dutton & Co. , Inc. , New York (1974) .

Morgan, Robert P. : « 20th Century Music » . W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. , New York (1991) .

Potter, Pamela : « Most German of the Arts » . Yale University Press, New Haven (1998) .

Taylor, Brandon and Wilfried van der Will : « The Nazification of Art » . The Winchester Press (1990) .

Richard Strauß and Hitler's « Reich » : Jupiter in Hell

(Michaël H. Kater.)

Most German composers were in for a hard time when the « Allies » descended on Adolf Hitler's « Reich » , in 1945. Hans Pfitzner, who had strived unsuccessfully to be the « Führer » 's court composer, was lying low in shabby south German quarters. Carl Orff, who had composed an « Aryan » version of incidental music to « A Midsummer Night's Dream » to replace Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy's original, among other follies, lied to American denazification officers about having helped found the anti-Nazi resistance group « White Rose » . He was speedily rehabilitated. His friend Werner Egk, who had been an official in the cultural bureaucracy but who lacked Orff's opportune connections, took much longer to whitewash himself.

Only Richard Strauß seemed unperturbed. As his grandson Richard Strauß, Junior, tells it, American jeeps pulled-up to Strauß's villa in Garmisch, at the end of April. Richard Junior, then 17, ran into the composer's study, shouting : « Grandpa, we are being evacuated within 20 minutes. » .

« Easy, easy. » , the composer said, slowly opening a drawer. He fetched a number of papers, including certificates of honorary citizenship from cities in the United States, and some scores. Then, tall and imposing, he planted himself at the front of his house and announced to the soldiers in halting English :

« My name is Richard Strauß. I am the composer ... » , he held-up pages from his Opera « Der Rosenkavalier » : « Here, you may look at them if you want. »

The Americans stepped back in awe. Nothing happened to Strauß's family. Instead, officers arrived a few days later for dinner. Strauß and his wife were then allowed recuperation in Switzerland. In 1948, after perfunctory German

denazification, Strauß was classified « not incriminated » .

This was the unspectacular end of a career in the Nazi regime by a man whose biographers have usually called him either « fascist » or « apolitical » . Strauß, who loved Mozart's « Jupiter » Symphony above all and himself expected to be called home to the gods after having fulfilled what he saw as Germany's highest cultural mission : this Jupiter said that he never meddled in politics. In fact, neither label applies. As late as 1930, Strauß derided the Nazi Party culture broker Alfred Rosenberg as a political « ingénu » , « who did not have one clue » .

All the same, by January 1933, Strauß, guided by his belief in authority, thought that a Adolf Hitler dictatorship might have the stuff to institute reforms in Operatic production, music instruction and the like. In the fall of that year, he calculatingly accepted the offer of Josef Gœbbels, the « Reich » propaganda Minister, to make him President of the « Reich » Music Chamber. An aes theocrat, Strauß wanted to regulate the affairs of music and musicians in the German « Reich » according to his rarefied canon. For one thing, he wanted an assurance that musicians would earn more money, especially composers, and especially he. Since early in the Century, he had harbored professional and personal goals that had never been realized.

Not that any such short- or long-term frustrations have got in the way of Strauß's ultimate vindication as a bright and permanent light in the musical universe. Whatever else may have been going on, after all, Strauß did continue to write the music that solidified his fame, from « Arabella » , which had its premiere in 1933, through the « Metamorphosen » of 1945 right down to the « 4 Last Songs » of 1948.

Strauß assumed his highly-political job when (in November 1933, as the new head of the music Chamber but, by no means, a Nazi) he thanked Gœbbels and Hitler for allowing him to use the National-Socialist leadership principle in an effort to coordinate the German music establishment tightly. Strauß had enough political savvy to see him through the 1st few months of the Nazi regime's music administration, but he implemented few reforms, for a combination of reasons.

1st, he preferred staying at home in mountainous Garmisch and composing music to directing the Chamber's turgid bureaucracy from Berlin. His deputies, though largely hand-picked, were 3rd rate, and they soon succumbed to internecine quarrels and intrigues against him.

2nd, he could have delegated more authority to his vice-President, the famous conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, but Furtwängler, Strauß's greatest rival as German musician laureate at the time, felt overlooked too often and caused ill will.

3rd, Strauß's sensible-sounding reform proposals offended Gœbbels : not least those for downgrading the Berlin Opera that was under the propaganda Minister's jurisdiction, the « Deutsches Opernhaus » , to a sort of pops company. Strauß wished to leave the serious repertory to Prussian Minister-President Hermann Göring's « Berlin Staatsoper » .

And 4th, Strauß mixed-up his own business with that of his office when he encouraged stagings of his Operas. These

included, in June 1935, his newest one, « Die Schweigsame Frau » , with a libretto by Stefan Zweig, an Austrian Jew. Strauß thus created conflicts of interest, which the leaders of the 3rd « Reich » frowned on, and he violated the regime's official policy of anti-Semitism, an infraction that weighed even more heavily because of his earlier refusal to enact discriminatory policies against Jewish musicians.

Josef Gœbbels ordered Strauß to resign the Chamber presidency, in July 1935, « on account of ill health » , and Strauß complied. He had experienced more than his share of trouble with the music administration in Berlin, and he realized that, even if Hitler and Göring were on his side (a reasonable assumption only in Göring's case) , Gœbbels, his immediate superior, could not stand him.

At any rate, the fact that Strauß was doing his best to retain the services of the Jewish Zweig as his librettist did not escape the leaders of the regime. Gœbbels, especially, was furious. After a couple of repeat performances of « Die Schweigsame Frau » , further presentations were prohibited. Moreover, as the Nuremberg Race Laws were being prepared for promulgation at the Nazi Party rally, in September 1935, it was becoming obvious to the leadership that Strauß was bent on protecting his Jewish daughter-in-law, Alice, as well as his grandsons, Richard, aged 7, and Christian, aged 3.

Richard Strauß, 71 at the time, should have been able to retire to a quiet life as head of his family in Garmisch and as the pre-eminent and still awesomely creative composer of his day. Instead, he entered into a new working relationship with the regime, which has puzzled Strauß biographers ever since. By its unwritten terms, Strauß, for his part, continued to serve the 3rd « Reich » in various representative functions, like President of the Nazi-controlled Permanent Council for the International Cooperation of Composers. He also provided his « Olympische Hymne » for the Olympic Games of 1936, in Berlin, and he conducted his own works as the centerpiece of a « Reich » music Festival in Düsseldorf, in 1938.

But if events of 1935 had constituted a humiliating defeat for him, as he tried to intimate in a pained letter to the « Führer » , in July of that year, why did he cooperate further, and what did he expect in return ? For one thing, this Jupiter, grand-signorial, yet, also disarmingly charming in his arch-Bavarian manner, had never been a recluse ; he loved company. In addition, his music would continue to be performed often and prominently, something very important to his ego : his « sacro egoismo » , as it had always been.

Perhaps, more critical still, behind a facade of what outsiders might have mistaken as immense wealth, Strauß was forced to earn money and spend it moderately, even if, by ordinary standards, he was very well off. He was the sole breadwinner for his extended family, which included that of his son, Franz, whom Strauß employed as his personal secretary.

With « Die Schweigsame Frau » off limits and foreign enemies of Germany now against him, Strauß was acutely dependent on the performance of other compositions, his past and future Operas, in the « Reich » . Apart from personality frictions, he knew that the Nazi leaders, including Josef Gœbbels, not only loved them but also used them as a showcase. Contrary to rumors spread abroad, supposedly by Jewish exiles, German culture, it was claimed, still had

cachet, with Strauß as its symbol.

So, when his new composition, « Friedenstag » , was given its premiere in Vienna to celebrate his 75th birthday, in 1939, with Hitler and Goebbels present, both sides knew that Strauß was caught as the weaker partner in a relationship of mutual dependence with the regime. By then, Strauß had no choice but to continue doing the bidding of the Nazi leadership, for it had placed him under permanent pressure, in effect holding his daughter-in-law and grand-children for ransom as life in the 3rd « Reich » was becoming ever more unbearable for Jews.

In a carefully planned collaboration between Goebbels's Ministry and Heinrich Himmler's « Gestapo » , Alice Strauß and her sons had already been harassed during the Pogrom of November 1938. This action was taken solely to keep the composer in line. Jewish spouses of « Aryan » Germans were then generally not molested. (Nor later, as partners in « privileged » marriages, were they typically evacuated to the Eastern camps.) Moreover, during that infamous « Kristallnacht » , only men, rarely women, were singled-out for punishment. And just to drive the regime's point home, Christian and his brother Richard were man-handled, spat on and kicked by storm troopers in the market square of Garmisch, alongside the small-town's adolescent male Jews.

Richard Strauß used the occasion of the Viennese birthday celebrations, in 1939 (which, both sides understood, were needed window dressing for the outside world) , to demand guarantees from Goebbels that vital confiscated documents would be returned to his daughter-in-law and that his grandsons would not be encumbered in their education and careers. Eventually, the grandsons should also be permitted to marry « Aryan » women. Strauß noted that such concessions would free his creative forces « from a pressing burden » : a strong hint that he was prepared to withhold his side of the bargain. Still, it took the Mephistophelean Goebbels almost 2 years before he asked Hitler to extend to the boys « Aryan » privileges, limited to their formal education.

Then, in 1941, the regime again reminded Strauß who was boss. Alice's Jewish grand-mother, Paula Neumann (« née » Hauowitz) , 3 years older than Strauß himself, was being interned in Prague, as were many other of Alice's Czech-based relatives. Helped by Alice's mother, Marie von Grab, herself safe in Lucerne, Switzerland, Strauß and his son, Franz, tried for several months to move « Frau » Neumann from the Nazi-occupied Czech Protectorate to Vienna, where Gauleiter Baldur von Schirach had recently emerged as the latest of the composer's few benevolent but ultimately impotent allies in the regime. At a time, when other Jews were often protected or set free by the highest Nazi leaders (examples being the wives of Adolf Hitler's favourite light-music composer, Franz Lehár, and of the Viennese film comedian, Hans Moser) , the regime pretended not to notice Strauß's plight.

In 1942, Strauß wrote to « SS-Obersturmbannführer » Doctor Günther of the Prague « Gestapo » , reminding him that « the old woman is without any help » and asking whether he would assist her in traveling to the Swiss border. Strauß had already secured the cooperation of the Swiss « with the greatest of difficulties » , he wrote. But now, « what I was able to accomplish abroad does not seem possible for me in my own fatherland, and that is to facilitate the emigration of a totally innocent and harmless woman to Switzerland, without a single penny of her own » .

No answer came, so Strauß set-out in his « Horch » limousine. Chauffeured right-up to the gates of the

« Theresienstadt » concentration camp, he stepped-out, announcing to the SS guards, as he later would to American G.I.'s : « I am Doctor Strauß, the composer. » . This time, they looked right through him and ordered him to turn around, without Paula Neumann. In the end, she was killed, along with 25 other relatives of Alice Strauß, in the Eastern camps.

In this case, the Nazi regime's reticence was just as calculated as was Josef Goebbels's decision to award carefully selected medals and cash prizes to the Master, from 1942 to 1944. Nor did Strauß's daughter-in-law escape further chicanery ; she and even her husband, Franz, were repeatedly arrested by the « Gestapo » .

Richard Strauß himself was harried in Garmisch, where he was supposed to surrender parts of his house to civil engineers. His social intercourse with Nazi personnel was interdicted (not that he now cared) . Border crossings to his favourite spa in Switzerland were forbidden, and he was denied a full measure of 80th birthday honours, in 1944. (These slights, he minded very much.) His last Opera awaiting performance, « Die Liebe der Danae » , in which the magnificent baritone Hans Hotter was to star (in the role of Jupiter) that summer, was granted only a dress rehearsal in Salzburg.

Clearly, Strauß, the Jupiter of the composer gods, had compromised himself through his working arrangement in Adolf Hitler's hell, by the time the American soldiers looked him up in 1945. He was no hero, as his biographer George Marek has astutely noted, but then Strauß had satirized himself and somehow forewarned his audience, Eulenspiegel-like, in his tone poem « Ein Heldenleben » , half a Century before. Other than for the safety of his family and his personal amenities, he did not do battle with the 3rd « Reich » .

All the same, never having censored a work of art during his short administrative tenure, and having resisted censorship of his own music, he did what he would always claim to have accomplished : he respected art for art's sake even when he disliked it, as with abstract paintings, Paul Hindemith's early atonal experiments and Arnold Schönberg's dodecaphony. As much as he was Jupiter, the last 2 decades of Richard Strauß's life were tainted by misfortune. A child of the 19th Century, he had foolishly tried to use the modern-day phenomenon of totalitarian Fascism for a good cause, or so he thought.

At the cost of personal hardship, he had to be disabused of that notion. Still, he was fortunate not to have come to realize the depths of political corruption and crime that might have lain in wait had he overstayed the Nazis' welcome for him as music Chamber President beyond the summer of 1935.

Herbert von Karajan

Heribert, Ritter von Karajan (chevalier de Karajan) est né dans une famille autrichienne de Salzbourg dont un ancêtre, côté paternel, était originaire de Macédoine. Son arrière-arrière-grand-père, l'Aroumain Geòrgios Johannes Karajànnis, originaire de Kozani, dans l'actuelle Grèce, partit pour Vienne en 1767, puis pour Chemnitz en Saxe. Lui et son fils furent anoblis par l'Électeur de Saxe, Frédéric-Auguste III, le 1er juin 1792, en reconnaissance de leur contribution au développement de l'industrie textile saxonne ; Karajànnis devint Karajan, auquel fut ajoutée la particule « von » . Il

est le second fils d'Ernst, chirurgien et directeur du principal hôpital de Salzbourg, et Martha Cosmac, issue d'une famille de notables de la région de Graz.

Son père qui est clarinettiste au « Mozarteum » de Salzbourg, initie tôt ses enfants à la musique. Son frère-aîné, Wolfgang, se révèle peu doué pour le piano mais Herbert, caché sous l'instrument, profite des leçons laborieuses de Wolfgang, avant même de recevoir des leçons et de devenir un interprète doué. De 1916 à 1926, il étudie au « Mozarteum » de Salzbourg. Le directeur du Conservatoire local, le pédagogue Bernhard Paumgartner, le prend sous son aile et devient son mentor, lui conseillant de se concentrer sur la composition et la direction d'orchestre, cette conversion étant favorisée par une tendinite chronique qui affecte les doigts d'Herbert.

Il poursuit ses études musicales à l'Académie de musique de Vienne auprès du professeur Franz Schalk.

Herbert von Karajan fait ses débuts officiels de chef d'orchestre, en 1929, en dirigeant « Salomé » de Richard Strauß à Salzbourg et devient, jusqu'en 1934, 1er Maître-de-chapelle de l'Opéra d'État d'Ulm. En 1933, il fait ses débuts au Festival de Salzbourg en dirigeant « la Nuit de Walpurgis » de Felix Mendelssohn dans une production du « Faust » de Goethe par le metteur en scène Max Reinhardt. La même année, il présente à Salzbourg une 1re demande d'adhésion au Parti nazi, qui n'aboutit pas à cause des restrictions décidées au sein du Parti nazi après l'arrivée au pouvoir d'Adolf Hitler ; mais il y adhère finalement 2 ans plus tard, en mars 1935, notamment dans le but d'obtenir le poste ardemment convoité de chef de l'Orchestre symphonique du Théâtre d'Aix-la-Chapelle. Cette adhésion fait suite à l'expression répétée de sympathies vis-à-vis de l'extrême-droite dans sa jeunesse, et ne peut être réduite à son carriérisme.

En 1935, il est le plus jeune directeur musical (« Generalmusikdirektor ») allemand et il est invité par Hitler à diriger à Stockholm, Bruxelles et Amsterdam. En 1937, il fait ses débuts à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et de l'Opéra national dans « Fidelio » de Beethoven.

En 1938, il obtient son 1er grand succès à Berlin en dirigeant le « Tristan und Isolde » de Richard Wagner ; le critique berlinois Edwin von der Nüll titre ainsi son article : « Das Wunder Karajan » (le miracle Karajan) . Il devient alors un pion utilisé contre Wilhelm Furtwängler dans la guerre culturelle interne qui oppose Josef Gœbbels à Hermann Göring pour le contrôle du monde musical allemand, Gœbbels soutenant l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et Göring l'Opéra national. Le 26 juillet 1938, il épouse la chanteuse d'Opérette, Elmy Holgerloef. Ils divorcent en 1942, Herbert se remariant le 22 octobre de la même année avec la jeune héritière d'une grande dynastie d'industriels allemands, Anna Maria Gütermann (appelée Anita) .

En 1939, Karajan s'attire l'inimitié d'Hitler lors d'un concert de gala donné en l'honneur des monarques yougoslaves où, en raison de l'erreur du baryton Rudolf Bockelmann, il perd le fil des « Maîtres-Chanteurs de Nuremberg » de Wagner (qu'il dirigeait sans partition, comme à son habitude) , les chanteurs cessent alors de chanter et, dans la plus grande confusion, le rideau tombe.

Furieux, Hitler donne cet ordre à Winifred Wagner :

« Moi vivant, " Herr " von Karajan ne dirigera jamais à Bayreuth. »

Karajan demeure cependant à la tête de l'Orchestre de la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin, à l'Opéra national.

Après la Guerre, en 1947, il est « dénazifié » par les Alliés et pris sous contrat par Walter Legge, pour devenir l'année suivante chef d'orchestre permanent du « Philharmonia Orchestra » de Londres. À la ré-ouverture du Festival de Bayreuth, en 1951, ainsi que l'année suivante, il est invité à diriger l'Orchestre du Festival, notamment dans un « Tristan und Isolde » devenu légendaire. Le chef d'orchestre Wilhelm Furtwängler meurt à la fin de 1954. Karajan est nommé, en 1955, « chef à vie » de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, ce qui lui permet de réaliser son rêve de toujours : devenir le successeur de l'illustre chef allemand.

Sa nomination signe le départ de Sergiù Celibidache, le chef-associé du Philharmonique de Berlin. Karajan vouait une inimitié à Celibidache et raya son nom de la liste des chefs titulaires du Philharmonique. Ce dernier ne redirigera le Philharmonique qu'une seule fois, soit en 1992, après la mort de Karajan. Son nom ne fut rétabli parmi la liste des chefs titulaires que tardivement par Simon Rattle, lors de sa prise de fonction à la tête du Philharmonique de Berlin, en 1999.

Il est alors à la tête de l'Orchestre qui est considéré, à l'époque, et depuis longtemps déjà, comme le plus prestigieux du monde et Karajan peut se considérer comme l'héritier de la plus grande tradition allemande de direction orchestrale (Richard Wagner, Hans von Bülow, Arthur Nikisch et Wilhelm Furtwängler) . La qualité de l'Orchestre est telle que Karajan confia une fois à ses nouveaux musiciens qu' « il avait l'impression de s'appuyer contre un mur épais lorsqu'il les dirigeait » .

En 1955, après un 1er concert au « Carnegie Hall » de New York, il fait avec l'Orchestre une grande tournée aux États-Unis, qu'il renouvelle l'année suivante. C'est dans ces années que se met en place le « système Karajan » très élaboré, qui consiste à faire travailler l'Orchestre en studio avant d'enregistrer les Opéras sur disque, de sorte qu'au moment des représentations sur scène, l'Orchestre est parfaitement rodé.

...

Herbert von Karajan, le prestigieux chef d'orchestre du Philharmonique de Berlin vedette « star » de la « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft » a, après la Guerre, tenté de dissimuler son passé nazi. À l'occasion d'un séminaire qui vient de se tenir à Vienne, l'historien autrichien Oliver Rathkolb éclaire d'un jour nouveau cet épisode de la vie de Karajan en présentant des documents inconnus à ce jour.

Certes, on savait qu'il avait pris sa carte au Parti nazi, qu'il s'était « acoquiné » avec ces derniers comme bien d'autres d'ailleurs, sans qu'on sache réellement à quelle date, qu'il avait dirigé en 1939 « les Maîtres-chanteurs » devant Hitler, à l'occasion d'une soirée de gala donnée à Berlin en l'honneur du Régent Paul de Yougoslavie. (Le concert ne plut d'ailleurs pas au « Führer » . Hitler aurait alors traité Karajan de « freluquet autrichien » , il

considéra cela comme un affront personnel et lui en voulut.)

On connaissait la rivalité farouche qui l'opposait à son aîné, Wilhelm Furtwängler, qui le détestait et qui l'appelait « le petit K ». On avait connaissance du soutien que lui avait apporté Josef Gœbbels, chef de la propagande et, à ce titre, en charge des arts, Hermann Göring lui préférait Furtwängler. Karajan, à la demande d'Hitler, fit le tour des capitales occupées par les Nazis (Amsterdam, Copenhague, Bucarest) . À Paris, en 1941, à l'Opéra Garnier, il dirigea « Tristan und Isolde » avec la soprano française Germaine Lubin dans le rôle d'Isolde.

Jamais durant sa carrière qui le hissa au pinacle de la renommée mondiale (il fut, avant l'heure, une « star » faisant la une des journaux papier glacé, et sa vie mondaine très médiatisée constituait après la musique le second volet de sa personnalité) n'admit-il de reconnaître ses (comment dire ?) fautes ... Bien au contraire, il dépêchait alors immédiatement ses avocats pour faire taire toutes critiques.

Le passé nazi de Karajan lui a valu de nombreuses manifestations hostiles lors de sa tournée initiale aux États Unis, en 1955 (au « Carnegie Hall » de New York, en particulier) . Karajan fut, finalement, admis à diriger en URSS à partir des années 1960. Mais jamais en Israël (le 1er concert du « Berliner Philharmoniker » à Tel-Aviv est récent) .

Arturo Toscanini, Eugène Ormandy et d'autres ont refusé de le rencontrer. Arthur Rubinstein a boycotté l'Allemagne jusqu'à la fin de ses jours, en 1982 !

De sa vie personnelle, il fit état pour se défendre présentant ainsi son 1er mariage avec Anita Gütermann dont le grand père était juif, comme élément en faveur de son innocence. Au lendemain de la Guerre, il utilisa ce même argument pour se défendre contre les Russes qui lui avaient interdit de diriger. Bref, sa renommée était entachée par des zones d'ombre.

Karajan nazi ? Il fallut, en 1945, 2 années pour conduire son procès en dénazification, avant de tourner la page. Légalement. Car Karajan n'a jamais exprimé de regret, n'a jamais rien dit sur la « Shoah », et des musiciens tels qu'Isaac Stern ou Itzhak Perlman ont toujours refusé de le côtoyer. Ce silence sur 10 années noires, qui sont au cœur de sa carrière, pèse plus encore que les années elles-mêmes.

Les documents présentés par le Professeur Oliver Rathkolb, à Vienne, sont rien moins que troublants et découvrent du chef d'orchestre une personnalité plutôt glauque et nauséabonde que celui-ci résolument occulta. L'on pouvait jusqu'à ce jour penser que l'attitude de Karajan envers le Nazisme relevait plus du carriérisme que de la conviction. Les nouveaux documents présentés balaient cette interprétation. Voici ce qu'on y apprend :

Karajan a adhéré au Parti nazi (NSDAP) dès le 8 avril 1933 (Adolf Hitler arrive au pouvoir en janvier 1933) avec la carte numéro 1.607.525 alors que le mouvement hitlérien devait être plus tard interdit en Autriche et le restera jusqu'à l'annexion (« Anschluß ») en 1938.

N'ayant pas payé ses cotisations, une nouvelle carte d'adhérent (numéro 3.430.914) lui a ensuite été délivrée,

rétroactivement au 1er mai 1933. Ce type de carte d'adhérent rétroactive était accordée par le Parti nazi à des personnalités de prestige. Ces éléments figurent, noir sur blanc, dans un fichier de cartes d'adhérents du NSDAP, avec une photo du jeune Herbert von Karajan et une confirmation écrite de son adhésion par le chef d'orchestre, datée du 26 novembre 1936.

Devant une Commission de dénazification des Alliés, en 1945-1946, Herbert von Karajan avait certes admis avoir adhéré au NSDAP, tout en affirmant l'avoir fait non par conviction, mais par souci de sa carrière à une époque où les Nazis contrôlaient totalement la vie culturelle en Allemagne, avec comme maître-d'œuvre le chef de la propagande nazie, Josef Goebbels. La culture était une compétence du ministère de la propagande, détail qui ne pouvait échapper à personne. Et « le petit K » devint une pièce du dispositif.

Ces choix n'étaient pas obligés. L'hydre nazi apparut au grand jour dès 1933, lres arrestations, développement « ad vomitum » de l'antisémitisme, de la haine anti-juive, ouverture des lers camps, autodafés de milliers de livres jugés subversifs, artistes bannis, condamnés, artistes et intellectuels contraints de fuir. A-t-on jamais entendu ce grand chef défendre des démocrates pourchassés ou des artistes juifs menacés ?

Or, durant sa jeunesse, Herbert von Karajan avait déjà manifesté ses sympathies pour l'extrême-droite nationaliste : lycéen, il était adhérent d'une association ultra-nationaliste, la Corporation pan-germaniste « Rugia ». Dans des lettres de l'époque, il ne faisait pas mystère de son antisémitisme, dénonçant par exemple « l'enjuivement du “ Volksoper ” » à Vienne.

Lorsque Hitler arrive au pouvoir, en 1933, Karajan a 25 ans, il a les dents longues et baigne intellectuellement dans ce milieu nationaliste, antisémite, raciste et xénophobe qui porte Hitler au pouvoir. Les mythes de la suprématie allemande et de l'aryen le séduisent, il barbote dedans et c'est au cœur de ce borbier idéologique fétide et nauséeux qu'il cherche à trouver le pouvoir en musique. Son rival c'est Wilhelm Furtwängler, alors âgé de 47 ans.

Les relations entre les 2 hommes sont sans chaleur, le plus jeune envie avec convoitise le rayonnement et l'aura de l'aîné. Wilhelm Furtwängler est alors un chef célébré au sommet de son génie, une quasi institution, et fait figure de proue du génie allemand. Bien sûr, Hitler et les Nazis voudront le circonvenir, et tentèrent de mille manières de l'attirer dans leurs rets. Les Nazis avaient plus besoin de Furtwängler et de son image que le Furtwängler n'avait besoin d'eux. Furtwängler ne cédera pas. Göring l'installera dans des charges honorifiques symboliques du monde de la musique, perverse manœuvre qui avait pour double but de faire oublier à l'opinion publique qu'il avait refusé d'adhérer au Nazisme, et d'utiliser son image pour la propagande du régime. Après la Guerre, on lui reprochera d'avoir donné l'impression de cautionner le pouvoir en place.

Furtwängler voudra maintenir sans souillure la réputation de la musique allemande dont il était le plus prestigieux représentant. Pas davantage ne répondra-t-il à l'antisémitisme alors de mode en Allemagne. Il ne dépassera pas le champ de l'art, et n'intervint pas dans celui plus terrible du champ politique. Certes il n'avait pas en restant en Allemagne la liberté d'expression nécessaire pour cela.

Il croyait à la transcendance de l'art et de la musique et aux valeurs de l'humanisme. Il refusera d'adhérer au Parti nazi.

En 1943, il écrivait :

« Le message que Beethoven a donné à l'humanité me semble plus que jamais nécessaire aujourd'hui. »

Quelques années après la Guerre, il fit la déclaration suivante au « Chicago Tribune » :

« C'eût été plus facile d'émigrer, mais il fallait que subsistât un centre d'intégrité pour tous les allemands bons et honnêtes qui étaient contraints à rester derrière. J'ai alors senti pour moi que faire de la bonne musique s'opposait avec force à l'esprit de Buchenwald et d'Auschwitz et plus fort que les mots ne pourraient le dire. »

Cela sera d'ailleurs corroboré par le lier violon du Philharmonique de Berlin, Richard Wolff (dont la femme de confession juive, fut sauvée grâce à la protection de Furtwängler) . Furtwängler était de façon épidermique et intense attaché à son orchestre.

Si on peut sourire en lisant ces propos, on en mesure la fragilité face à un pouvoir totalitaire, tyrannique et barbare.

Le passé doit toujours éclairer le présent et il serait particulièrement intéressant de le relire à la lumière de certains événements majeurs qui bouleversent aujourd'hui le concert des nations et dépassent les cadres du cartésianisme occidental ! Les proximités historiques ne sont pas si éloignées que cela !

En 1933, Klaus Mann, le fils de Thomas Mann, avait eu le courage de fuir l'Allemagne, son pays, pour combattre par la plume le Nazisme, puis de prendre la nationalité américaine et combattre au sein de la « U.S. Army » contre l'Allemagne. Quand un intellectuel n' a pas peur d'affronter les sarcasmes pitoyables de la société grégaire, se dresse seul face à la violence assassine, l'obscurantisme et aux ténèbres de la pensée, alors chapeau bas !

...

Herbert von Karajan, born Heribert, Ritter von Karajan (5 April 1908 in Salzburg, Austria-Hungary - 16 July 1989) was an Austrian conductor. He was principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra for 35 years. He is generally regarded as one of the greatest conductors of the 20th Century, and he was a dominant figure in European Classical music from the mid-1950's until his death. Part of the reason for this was the large number of recordings he made and their prominence during his lifetime. By one estimate, he was the top-selling Classical music recording artist of all time, having sold an estimated 200 million records.

The Karajans were of Greek or Aromanian ancestry. His great-great-grandfather, Georg Karajan (Georgios Karajánnis) , was born in Kozani, in the Ottoman province of Rumelia (now in Greece) , leaving for Vienna in 1767, and eventually Chemnitz, Electorate of Saxony. He and his brother participated in the establishment of Saxony's cloth industry, and

both were ennobled for their services by Frederick Augustus III, on 1 June 1792, thus, the prefix « von » to the family name. The surname Karajánnis became Karajan. Although traditional biographers ascribed a Serbian or simply a Slavic origin to his mother, Karajan's family from the maternal-side, through his grandfather who was born in the village of Mojstrana, Duchy of Carniola (today, in Slovenia) , was Slovene. By this line, Karajan was related to Austrian composer of Slovene descent, Hugo Wolf. Karajan seems to have known some Slovene.

Karajan was a child prodigy at the piano. From 1916 to 1926, he studied at the « Mozarteum » in Salzburg with Franz Ledwenke, theory with Franz Zauer, and composition with Bernhard Paumgartner. He was encouraged to concentrate on conducting by Paumgartner, who detected his exceptional promise in that regard. In 1926, Karajan graduated from the Conservatory and continued his studies at the Vienna Academy, studying piano with Josef Hofmann (a teacher with the same name as the pianist) and conducting with Alexander Wunderer and Franz Schalk.

In 1929, he conducted the Opera « Salome » at the « Festspielhaus » in Salzburg and, from 1929 to 1934, Karajan served as « Kapellmeister » at the « Stadttheater » in Ulm. His senior colleague in Ulm was Otto Schulmann. After Schulmann was forced to leave Germany, in 1933, Karajan became 1st « Kapellmeister » . In 1933, Karajan made his conducting debut at the Salzburg Festival with the « Walpurgisnacht » Scene (on music by Felix Mendelssohn) in Max Reinhardt's production of « Faust » . It was also in 1933 that von Karajan became a member of the Nazi Party, a fact for which he would later be criticized.

In Salzburg, in 1934, Karajan led the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra for the 1st time and, from 1934 to 1941, he was engaged to conduct Operatic and Symphonic concerts at the « Theater Aachen » .

Karajan's career was given a significant boost in 1935 when he was appointed Germany's youngest « Generalmusikdirektor » and performed as a guest-conductor in Bucharest, Brussels, Stockholm, Amsterdam and Paris. In 1938, Karajan made his debut with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and the Berlin State Opera, conducting Beethoven's « Fidelio » . He, then, enjoyed a major success at the State Opera with Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » . His performance was hailed by Berlin music-critic Edwin von der Nüll as « Das Wunder Karajan » (the Karajan miracle) .

The critic asserted that :

« Karajan's success with Wagner's demanding work, “ Tristan und Isolde ”, sets himself alongside Furtwängler and Victor de Sabata, the greatest Opera conductors in Germany at the present time. »

Receiving a contract with the « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft » , that same year, Karajan made the 1st of numerous recordings, conducting the « Staatskapelle Berlin » in the Overture to « The Magic Flute » . On 26 July 1938, he married Operetta singer Elmy Holgerloef. They divorced in 1942.

On 22 October 1942, at the height of the Second World War, Karajan married Anna Maria (« Anita ») Sauest, born Gütermann. She was the daughter of a well-known manufacturer of yarn for sewing-machines. Having had a Jewish

grandfather, she was considered a « Vierteljüdin » (one-quarter Jewish woman) . By 1944, Karajan was, according to his own account, losing favour with the Nazi leadership, but he still conducted concerts in War-time Berlin, on 18 February 1945. A short time later, in the closing stages of the War, he and Anita fled Germany for Milan, relocating with the assistance of Victor de Sabata. Karajan and Anita divorced in 1958.

Karajan joined the Nazi Party in Salzburg, on 8 April 1933 ; his membership number was 1.607.525. In June 1933, the Nazi Party was outlawed by the Austrian government. However, Karajan's membership was valid until 1939. In that year, the former Austrian members were verified by the general-office of the Nazi Party. Karajan's membership was declared invalid but his accession to the Party was retroactively determined to have been on 1 May 1933, in Ulm, with membership number : 3.430.914.

British musicologist and music-critic Richard Osborne states :

« What are the facts ? Ist, though Karajan was nominated for membership in the as yet unbanned Party in Salzburg, in April 1933, he did not collect his card, sign it, or pay his dues, though the registration itself (No. 1607525) got on to the files and crops-up in many memoranda and enquiries, thereafter. 2ndly, he did not join the Party on 1 May 1933, despite “ prima-facie ” evidence to the contrary. In the 1st place, the membership number 3430914 is too high to belong to that date. The highest-number issued before the freeze on membership, which lasted from May 1933 to March 1937, was 3262698. However, during the freeze, various functionaries, diplomats, and others were issued cards bearing an “ NG ”, or “ Nachgereichte ”, designation. These cards were, by convention, back-dated to the start of the freeze : 1 May 1933. Karajan's Aachen membership was an “ NG ” card, and its number accords with batches issued in 1935, the year Karajan had always identified as the one in which he was asked to join the Party. »

Karajan's prominence increased from 1933 to 1945, which has led to speculation that he joined the Nazi Party solely to advance his music career. Critics such as Jim Svejda have pointed-out that other prominent conductors, such as Arturo Toscanini, Otto Klemperer, Erich Kleiber, and Fritz Busch, fled from fascist Europe at the time. However, Richard Osborne noted that, among the many significant conductors who continued to work in Germany throughout the War years (Wilhelm Furtwängler, Ernest Ansermet, Carl Schuricht, Karl Böhm, Hans Knappertsbusch, Clemens Krauß and Karl Elmendorff) , Karajan was one of the youngest and, thus, one of the least advanced in his career. Karajan was allowed to conduct various Orchestras and was free to travel, even to the Netherlands to conduct the Amsterdam « Concertgebouw » Orchestra and make recordings there, in 1943.

Karajan was discharged by the Austrian denazification examining-board on 18 March 1946, and resumed his conducting career shortly thereafter.

In 1946, Karajan gave his 1st post-War concert in Vienna with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, but he was banned from further conducting activities by the Soviet occupation authorities because of his Nazi Party membership. That summer, he participated anonymously in the Salzburg Festival.

On 28 October 1947, Karajan gave his 1st public concert following the lifting of the conducting ban. With the Vienna

Philharmonic Orchestra and the « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » , he performed Johannes Brahms' « A German Requiem » for a gramophone production in Vienna.

In 1949, Karajan became artistic director of the « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » ,Vienna. He also conducted at La Scala, in Milan. His most prominent activity, at this time, was recording with the newly-formed « Philharmonia » Orchestra in London, helping to build them into one of the world's finest. Starting from this year, Karajan began his lifelong attendance at the Lucerne Festival.

In 1951 and 1952, Karajan conducted at the Bayreuth « Festspielhaus » .

...

In 1938, the same year that Adolf Hitler's Germany annexed Austria, a 30 year old conductor from Salzburg led the Berlin State Opera in a production of Richard Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » . The show was spectacular, and the Austrian conductor Herbert von Karajan was hailed as a wonder. Soon after, he signed a lucrative contract with « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft » . Already a member of the Nazi Party, von Karajan was on the way to becoming one of the leading musicians of the 3rd « Reich » . Like many of his fellow non-Jewish German musicians, however, von Karajan was to emerge from World War II relatively unscathed, going on to become one of the most-recorded musicians in the world. While his egotism and ambition were no secret, his political convictions were vague enough to allow the post-War musical world to look the other way.

Herbert von Karajan was born on 5 April 1908 in Salzburg, the son of a successful physician. As a youth, he studied music and conducting in Salzburg. In 1929, he took-up the position of orchestra conductor in Ulm and, in 1934, was appointed as « Kapellmeister » at Aachen, where he remained until 1941. He joined the Nazi Party in 1933 or 1935, and his break-through came in 1938, when he emerged as a favourite of the Nazi elites. In Berlin, he made a name for himself as a conductor of politically-acceptable contemporary music, particularly the works of Carl Orff and Richard Strauß. After a 1941 performance of the popular « Carmina Burana » , the composer himself said admiringly, « the orchestra under Karajan sounds fantastic » . Constantly striving to further his career, von Karajan was irked by the looming figure of Wilhelm Furtwängler - a man who, despite his politically ambiguous relationship to the « Reich » , was the undisputed pre-eminent German conductor. The competition between the young von Karajan and the older Furtwängler did not go unnoticed, but few thought that von Karajan posed a real challenge. An exiled Russian princess wrote that von Karajan « is very fashionable and some people tend to consider him better than Furtwängler, which is nonsense. He certainly has genius and much fire, but is not without conceit » .

Although von Karajan never involved himself in any explicit political affairs, he profited from the re-organization of the musical world under Hitler. Most famously, Richard Strauß's being fired after his defence of the Jewish librettist Stefan Zweig gave Peter Raabe a job which, in turn, allowed von Karajan to take Raabe's post at the Aachen Opera. Eventually, his name was included in Josef Goebbels' list of musicians « blessed by God » . However, even he was not to remain immune from the « Führer » 's notoriously fickle affections. In 1939, von Karajan led a performance of Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » that was a total failure. Hitler, in the audience, took this as a personal

affront and purportedly never forgave him. Even more scandalously, von Karajan married Anita Gütermann, the heiress to a textile fortune who was burdened with a Jewish grandfather.

However, the very thing that threatened his career in the 3rd « Reich » was to salvage it after the War was over. After the War, the Soviets issued a prohibition on the conductor's public performances - his voluntary entrance into the Nazi Party, several years before the War, began was enough to condemn him. By 1947, though, all bans had been lifted, and he was free to perform and conduct at will. The clearing of his name was largely thanks to his part-Jewish wife, whose Jewishness he exploited in order to plead « resistance » to the « Reich ». Some historians believe that he deliberately lied in order to ensure his denazification. In any case, his career continued on its astronomical trajectory toward fame and fortune. In 1955, von Karajan took-over as music-director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra ; in addition, he led the Vienna State Opera and the Salzburg Festival, as well as working extensively in London and around the world. He remained the artistic director of the Berlin Philharmonic until he retired in 1989, due to poor health. Soon after retiring, von Karajan died in Salzburg, one of the wealthiest and most famous conductors in the world.

...

Æsthetic Realism explains there are 2 kinds of ambition : one ethical and healthy ; the other, ugly and hurtful.

In issue No. 64 of « The Right of Æsthetic Realism to Be Known » , Mr. Eli Siegel wrote :

Every person, every moment of his life, is trying to like the outside world on an honest basis. Along with this aim, which is a large part of man's unconscious, a person would like to despise, put aside, be angry with, have contempt for the outside worlds as a means of making himself important.

Until a man understands these 2 desires, he is not free. The reason for this is, even if we seemingly « succeed » at an ambition which has contempt as its source, we defeat ourselves. To succeed in despising the world is to make ourselves mean and lonely.

Ambition in an Austrian Conductor

Tonight, I will speaking about some aspects of the life and work of Herbert von Karajan, the late-conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. I am using a 1986 biography by Roger Vaughan.

In Eli Siegel's lecture, « Mind and Ambition » , he explained :

4 things are present in ambition : you want power ; you want approval ; you want people to envy you ; and you want to show-off. To be ambitious means you want to do things to people and to have them like you at the same time. But the problem is, if you don't feel you deserve that, even if you win, you'll be in a tangled state.

These 4 things were crucial in the life of Herbert von Karajan.

Karajan was born in 1908 in Salzburg, Austria, to a prestigious family. 100 years earlier, a relative founded the textile industry of Saxony. For this, he was knighted, and the family name changed. From the Greek « Karajannis » , it became the noble « von » Karajan.

As a child, he climbed trees and played with his older brother Wolfgang. He loved the Alps, liked learning languages, was goalie of his school's soccer team. He also showed deep talent for music. By 15, he was touring the Salzburg area as a concert pianist. At 21, he was conductor of the Opera House of Ulm, Bavaria.

His happiest years, I believe, were at Ulm, where he worked closely with the singers, bicycling to their homes to coach them in their parts. He helped with the costumes, and took-up a hammer to build sets. He even worked cooperatively with another conductor, each assisting the other with productions. « We took time » , von Karajan said years later, « to think things out. The small theatres in Germany operated with great care for the material. At Ulm, I could express myself, get to know my faults by what I did. »

And a love for the great conductor Toscanini deepened. Roger Vaughan tells how the young man, « once got on his bicycle and rode 200 miles to hear Toscanini conduct » . This, I believe, represented the best kind of ambition in von Karajan.

However, he also had another kind of ambition. Being very handsome, coming from a family with social rank, and having artistic talent, he felt certain things were coming to him. « I was born to command » , he told Vaughan. And Vaughan quotes von Karajan as saying :

It was difficult for my father to make-up his mind. Always, he would say « ask your mother » , when I came to him with a question. Then, he wouldn't be happy with her decisions. I think this made a big impression on me. Because from childhood, it has always been me who commanded.

As Adolf Hitler came to power, saying he believed in the « basic aristocratic principle in nature » , it met something von Karajan was already disposed to feel. As with millions of other Germans and Austrians, Hitler encouraged and confirmed the worst possible ambitions. In 1933, von Karajan joined the Nazi Party. « We have to show people that we are better than they are » , Mr. Siegel said in « Mind and Ambition » , « because this is the one way we know of being sure of ourselves » .

The tragedy of von Karajan's life (and every man can learn from him) is that, with all his ability at music, he preferred contempt to art.

In 1935, in appreciation of a Festival organized by von Karajan in honour of Adolf Hitler, the Nazi paper, « Der Westdeutsche Beobachter » , wrote :

Herbert von Karajan is the man who can lead the new organization of our cultural life in the spirit and direction which National-Socialism demands.

Karajan was now general music-director of the city of Aachen - a major post, which he helped secure through his loyalty to the Party. He was just 27. Yet, he dreamed of bigger things. He hired, as his agent, a colonel of the SS, Rudolf Vedder, a close friend of Heinrich Himmler. He divorced his 1st wife, and married a wealthy woman who, however, was 1/4 Jewish. This got him into some trouble until his agent managed to get Josef Gœbbels, Minister of Propaganda, to declare her, in effect, an « honorary Aryan » .

His conducting was becoming known for its dynamism and, in keeping with his respect for Toscanini (with whom he worked in the summers at the Salzburg Festival while hiding his Nazi connections) , von Karajan knew his scores and aimed for precision. But while the sound he got from an orchestra was brilliant, hardly any critic, then or later, ever praised it for warmth, or depth of feeling. Said Joseph Wechsberg, in 1962, of von Karajan's conducting for the Vienna State Opera :

His flair for exactness is evident, but also his love of effect. Everything he does is high-voltage, but also missing in depth.

When one's ambition is bad, the desire to impress gets ahead of the desire to feel deeply.

In 1938, the most renowned of German conductors, Wilhelm Furtwängler, got into trouble with the Nazi high-command because he refused to fire Jewish musicians, and after Hitler personally cancelled a production of a new Opera by Paul Hindemith (« Mathis der Maler ») , Furtwängler wrote an open-letter of protest.

To punish Furtwängler, « Reichsmarschall » Hermann Göring called von Karajan to Berlin and gave him Furtwängler's position at the State Opera. Von Karajan always wanted that post, and he eagerly accepted. The horrible state Eli Siegel described in « Mind and Ambition » was his : he had won, but wasn't proud of the basis. He couldn't be sure - had he been called to conduct at the greatest German Opera House because of his talent, his years of carefully studying music, or because he had been a loyal member of the Party ?

Mr. Siegel said in his lecture :

The feeling that we are all right deeply doesn't come that easily. Ambition can be called, in its bad sense, a substitute for the ability to like oneself. In the good sense, it is an extension of the ability to like oneself.

This bad kind of ambition and the politics that accompany it are not confined to Nazi Germany. They go on in every family, in every country, and it is one huge reason Æsthetic Realism is desperately needed by the world.

Von Karajan told his biographer that around this time :

I began having problems with concentration. I couldn't express myself as I wanted. I felt enclosed in a glass case, restricted.

He tried yoga ; later, psychoanalysis. But what he felt in Berlin, as he vied with other musicians for the approval of Hitler while Nazi armies overran France, Greece and the Ukraine, can be explained only by Æsthetic Realism. In the historic issue No. 134 of « The Right Of », the 1st to carry the headline, « Contempt Causes Insanity » , Eli Siegel writes :

The insensibility of steel is what the contemptuous person is trying to attain. To be insensible to what is going on outside of oneself is the ambition of a constant part of self. Every person has been conquered by contempt somewhat.

Von Karajan may have conquered musical Germany, but contempt had conquered him, and he suffered.

As I write about Herbert von Karajan, I understand myself better and see with a fresh sense of gratitude how much pain I was spared because I had the god fortune to meet and study Æsthetic Realism.

In my 1st consultation, I was asked :

Where do you think your individuality comes from - where you are different from other people, or where you are the same ?

I answered, « different » , and my consultants explained this had to do with all my difficulties. I was living a contradiction : I wanted, in music, to show my feelings ; but I wanted in life to act lofty and maintain a picture of myself as deeper than other people - too deep, in fact, for anyone to understand me.

A classmate of von Karajan, from his years at the Conservatory in Vienna, gives this picture of the young conducting student :

He was a serious fellow. He didn't bother with the girls. The rest of us were struggling to conduct, while von Karajan was already doing Brahms from memory. No one could get close to him. There was a buffet downstairs where we all ate. Karajan would arrive, eat his sandwich quickly, and disappear.

Every man wants to distinguish himself - but there is an honest and a dishonest way. In 1975, I had the honour to be studying Æsthetic Realism in classes with Eli Siegel and learning what musicians throughout the Centuries have longed to know - this great principle :

The resolution of conflict in self is like the making one of opposites in art.

At the same time, I was working as an apprentice to a composer who talked about music very differently. He saw music as a unique realm of technical knowledge which only people possessed of special talent could understand.

This was utterly false ; also tremendously flattering. But I was too stupid to see it. My music began to take on a wrong complexity.

Mr. Siegel said to me in a class :

« You planned to make music a hide-away from life, and now you are seeing there is a relation between the technical aspects of music and what people feel. All music has gone for showing that the world can be liked. I hope you like that. »

He was my friend as he showed me the battle raging between opportunism and honesty, between the self truly ambitious for art and the self ambitious to use art as a means of elevating myself. He saved me from narrowness. « Fascism » , Eli Siegel writes in issue No. 111 of « The Right Of » , « begins with the preference by man for his way against truth in any Century. »

It is very hard to trace von Karajan's life in the later years of World War II. For a while, he conducted in occupied countries. In Paris, he is bitterly remembered for having begun an evening at the « Opéra Garnier » with the infamous « Horst Wessel » song of the Nazi Party as a prelude.

...

Herbert von Karajan (geboren 5. April 1908 in Salzburg ; gestorben 16. Juli 1989 in Anif, Salzburg ; geboren als Heribert Ritter von Karajan, in Österreich amtlich Heribert Karajan) war ein österreichischer Dirigent. Als dieser zählt er zu den bekanntesten und bedeutendsten des 20. Jahrhunderts. Karajan arbeitete mit vielen angesehenen Symphonieorchestern, wirkte an bedeutenden Opernhäusern und veröffentlichte zahlreiche Einspielungen klassischer Musik. Er arrangierte auch die Hymne der Europäischen Union.

Herbert von Karajan stammt aus der Familie von Karajan - einer ursprünglich aus der (damals unter dem Namen Rumelien zum Osmanischen Reich gehörenden, heute nordgriechischen) Provinz Makedonien stammenden Familie namens Karagiannis (oder Karaioannes) griechischer Herkunft, die erstmals 1743 in Kozani urkundlich erwähnt ist. Er war der Urenkel des Kaufmanns Georg Karajan, eigentlich Geórgios Ioánnēs Karagiánnis, des Inhabers einer Baumwollhandlung im kursächsischen Chemnitz, und Urenkel von Theodor von Karajan. Georg Karajan wurde mit Ehefrau und seinen Söhnen Demeter und Theodor am 1. Juni 1792 während des Reichsvikariates durch den sächsischen Kurfürsten Friedrich August III. in den erblichen Reichsadelstand erhoben. Die Anerkennung dieses Adelsstandes in Österreich erfolgte für dessen Witwe und die Söhne durch Erlass vom 4. Jänner 1832. Theodor von Karajan wurde am 11. Juli 1869 in Wien mit dem Ritterkreuz des Leopold-Ordens ausgezeichnet und aufgrund der Ordensstatuten als « Ritter von Karajan » in den erblichen österreichischen Ritterstand erhoben. Herbert von Karajans Vater Ernst von Karajan war als Chirurg in Salzburg tätig. Seine Mutter Marta Kosmač entstammte einer slowenischen Familie ; ihr Vater Mihæl Kosmač war in Mojstrana (heute Stadtteil von Kranjska Gora, deutsch : Kronau) geboren. Herbert hatte einen um zwei Jahre älteren Bruder Wolfgang.

Von der Aufhebung des Adels im Jahr 1919 war auch die (österreichische) Familie von Karajan betroffen, deren Familienname zu Karajan ohne vorangestelltes « von » wurde. Der Künstler Karajan hatte seinerseits angedroht, in Österreich nicht aufzutreten, wenn sein früheres « von » auf den Ankündigungsplakaten nicht erscheinen dürfe. Daraufhin wurde ihm Herbert von Karajan als Künstlername zugestanden.

1912 begann Karajan eine pianistische Ausbildung bei Franz Ledwinka. Von 1916 bis 1926 war Karajan Schüler am Konservatorium Mozarteum in Salzburg bei Ledwinka (Klavier), Bernhard Paumgartner (Komposition, Kammermusik) und Franz Sauer, Organist (Harmonielehre). 1925 wurde er Konkneipant der Alldeutschen Gymnasialverbindung Rugia Salzburg im ÖPR. 1926 machte er die Matura am Humanistischen Gymnasium in Salzburg. In seiner schriftlichen Arbeit beschäftigte er sich mit Thermodynamik und Explosionsmotoren. Von 1926 bis 1928 studierte er drei Semester lang Maschinenbau an der Technischen Hochschule in Wien, gleichzeitig Musikwissenschaft an der Universität Wien und bis 1929 an der Wiener Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst Klavier bei Josef Hofmann (1865-1927) sowie Dirigieren bei Franz Schalk und Alexander Wunderer.

Am 22. Jänner 1929 trat Herbert von Karajan zum ersten Mal öffentlich mit dem Mozarteumorchester in Salzburg auf, worauf der Intendant des Ulmer Stadttheaters Karajan zum Probedirigat einlud.

In Ulm wurde Karajan 1930 Erster Kapellmeister am Stadttheater und beim Philharmonischen Orchester.

Der NSDAP trat Karajan in Salzburg am 8. April 1933 bei und bezahlte die Aufnahmegebühr (Mitgliedsnummer 1.607.525). Diese Mitgliedschaft blieb formell bis 1939 gültig, ruhte aber wegen des ab Juni 1933 geltenden Verbots der NSDAP in Österreich. Im Zuge der Überprüfung der österreichischen Beitritte in der Zentrale der NSDAP in München 1939 wurde die Mitgliedschaft amtlich für ungültig erklärt, aber rückwirkend mit Beitrittsdatum in Ulm am 1. Mai 1933 ersetzt; seine nunmehrige Mitgliedsnummer war 3.430.914. Ein zweimaliger Partei-Eintritt lag nach Forschungen der schwedisch-deutschen Historikerin Gisela Tamsen 1939 jedoch nicht vor, Oliver Rathkolb widerspricht jedoch Tamsens Einschätzung, daß Karajan nur aus Karrieregründen der NSDAP beigetreten sei. So polemisierte Karajan 1934 in einem Brief an seine Eltern gegen die Wiener Volksoper, wo er nicht dirigieren wolle, da es sich um ein Vorstadttheater ohne Namen handle, « außerdem wird das gesamte Palästina dort gesammelt sein ».

1934 endete sein Vertrag in Ulm, und so ging er zur Reichsmusikkammer, zum damaligen Leiter der Konzertabteilung Rudolf Vedder. Dieser muß tief beeindruckt gewesen sein, denn er wurde ein wichtiger Förderer. Vedder war eng mit dem Generalmusikdirektor Peter Raabe am Stadttheater Aachen bekannt, und so wurde bereits im April 1934 ein Probedirigat angesetzt. 1935 wurde er am Stadttheater Aachen der jüngste Generalmusikdirektor Deutschlands. Da auch schon der Dirigent Hans von Benda von Vedder protegiert wurde, hatte Benda kein Problem damit, Karajan später nach Berlin zu holen.

Während seiner Aachener Zeit trat Karajan auch bald bei Veranstaltungen der Nationalsozialisten auf. So dirigierte er am 20. April 1935 eine Tannhäuser-Vorstellung anlässlich des « Führergeburtstags », einen KdF-Operabend (Beethovens « Fidelio ») am 30. April. Am 29. Juni 1935 leitete er in einem Konzert zum Kreisparteitag der NSDAP die Aufführung der Propagandawerke Festlicher Hymnus von Otto Siegl, Unsere Seele von Bruno Stürmer sowie Flamme empor und

Feier der neuen Front (nach Texten von Baldur von Schirach) von Richard Trunk.

Am 8. April 1938 leitete Karajan als Gast erstmals das Orchester, das er in seinem Leben später noch mehr als 1.500 Mal dirigieren sollte : die Berliner Philharmoniker. Auf dem Programm standen Wolfgang Amadeus Mozarts Sinfonie Nr. 33 (KV 319) , Maurice Ravel's « Daphnis et Chloé » , Suite Nr. 2 und Johannes Brahms' 4. Symphonie.

Weithin bekannt wurde Karajan, nachdem er am 30. September 1938 in der Berliner Staatsoper mit Beethovens « Fidelio » debütiert und am 21. Oktober Wagners « Tristan und Isolde » dirigiert hatte. Nach der Tristan-Aufführung prägte der Kritiker der Berliner Zeitung am Mittag, Edwin von der Nüll, am 22. Oktober 1938 das Schlagwort vom « Wunder Karajan » . Urheber der Kritik soll aber nicht von der Nüll gewesen sein, sondern Generalintendant Heinz Tietjen, der Karajans Karriere auf Kosten Wilhelm Furtwänglers fördern wollte.

Ein erster Vertrag mit der « Deutschen Grammophon Gesellschaft » wurde geschlossen. In der Folge wurde er Dirigent der Staatskapelle Berlin, am 20. April 1939 verlieh ihm Hitler den Titel « Staatskapellmeister » .

Karajan sank aber in der Gunst von Adolf Hitler, als er in der von ihm auswendig dirigierten Aufführung von « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » in der Berliner Staatsoper am 2. Juni 1939 falsche Einsätze gegeben haben soll und die Vorstellung mit dem Fallen des Vorhanges unterbrochen werden mußte. Karajan selbst sprach in Bezug auf diesen Vorfall vom « dem Alkohol zugeneigten » Sänger Rudolf Bockelmann, der die zweite Strophe ausgelassen hatte, worauf er improvisieren mußte und den Umständen entsprechend noch elegant aus der Situation herausgekommen sei. Jedenfalls entschied Hitler daraufhin, so in den Erinnerungen von Winifred Wagner, daß Karajan niemals bei den Bayreuther Festspielen dirigieren dürfe. Da er jedoch der Favorit von Göring war, leitete er weiterhin die Staatskapelle Berlin, mit der er in der Staatsoper bis 1944 etwa 150 Abende gestaltete.

Karajan dirigierte auch Konzerte in den von der deutschen Wehrmacht besetzten Gebieten, so in Paris vom 16. bis 19. Dezember 1940 mit dem Ensemble des Aachener Theaters und im Mai 1941 im Rahmen eines Gastspiels der Berliner Staatsoper mit Tristan. 1942 wurde Karajans Vertrag an der Staatsoper von Tietjen nicht verlängert. Als Grund gab Tietjen an, daß Karajan maßlose Forderungen gestellt habe. Noch 1943 wurde in einer Kartei der Reichsmusikkammer vermerkt, daß bezüglich Karajans politischer Einstellung laut Reichssicherheitshauptamt keine « nachteiligen Notierungen in politischer Hinsicht » vorliegen würden. Auch seine Heirat mit der « Vierteljüdin » Anita Gütermann veranlaßte das NS-Regime zu keiner Änderung dieser Einschätzung.

Am 19. und 20. April 1944 leitete er aus Anlass von Hitlers Geburtstag das Orchester von Radio Paris im « Théâtre des Champs-Élysées » . In der Endphase des Zweiten Weltkriegs wurde er im August 1944 in die von Hitler genehmigte Gottbegnadeten-Liste der wichtigsten Dirigenten aufgenommen, was ihn vor einem Kriegseinsatz, auch an der Heimatfront, bewahrte. Im selben Jahr begann Karajan eine Anstellung beim « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » in Linz. Noch im Dezember 1944 sollte das Orchester zu « Ehren des Führers » zum besten Orchester des Deutschen Reichs gemacht werden, bevor das Kriegsende dieser Vorstellung ein Ende setzte.

Am 18. Februar 1945 gab Karajan ein letztes Konzert mit der Staatskapelle in Berlin und setzte sich danach mit dem

Flugzeug nach Italien ab. Das Kriegsende verbrachte er zusammen mit seiner damaligen Frau Anita in Mailand und am Comer See, wo er sich (so sagte er) « versteckte, um einem Einberufungsbefehl zu der Kampfpropagandatruppe “ Südstern ” zu entgehen » .

Edward Astley, der als britischer Offizier im « Intelligence Corps » in Mailand und Triest teilweise englischsprachige Radiosender sowie in Triest auch das örtliche Theater leitete, beschäftigte Karajan unmittelbar nach Kriegsende und setzte sich für dessen Engagement bei den Wiener Philharmonikern ein. Karajans Entnazifizierungsverfahren wurde ohne schriftliche Belege abgeschlossen, Karajan habe « genug gelitten » und habe immer nur für die Musik gelebt. Am 12. Januar 1946 gab er in Wien sein erstes Konzert nach Kriegsende, wurde jedoch daraufhin von der sowjetischen Besatzungsmacht wegen seiner NSDAP-Mitgliedschaft mit Berufsverbot belegt ; dieses wurde 1947 wieder aufgehoben.

Musique et musiciens approuvés par les Nazis

Under the Nazi regime, all music produced had to fit within certain standards defined as « good » German music. Suppression of specific artists and their works was common, yet, musicians were permitted limited artistic freedom. The Nazis attempted to create a balance between censorship and creativity in music to appease the German people.

This blend of art and politics led to a 3-prong policy regarding musicians and artists :

Loyal Nazi members who were talented musicians were guaranteed a job.

Loyal Nazi members who were not talented musicians were not guaranteed a job.

Any non-Jewish person who demonstrated a « genius » for music and was a member of the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) was permitted employment. This exception in policy permitted musicians like conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler and composer Richard Strauß to continue working.

According to Adolf Hitler and Josef Goebbels, the 3 Master composers that represented good German music were Ludwig van Beethoven, Richard Wagner, and Anton Bruckner. All 3 composers lived prior to the 20th Century.

Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827) believed that « strength is the morality of the man who stands-out from the rest » . Hitler identified himself with Beethoven as possessing that heroic German spirit. Beethoven was so loved by the German people that his legacy of music was unrivaled by any other composer.

Richard Wagner (1818-1883) : He was Adolf Hitler's favourite composer. During World War I, it is reported, he carried Wagner's music from « Tristan » in his knapsack. Often, Hitler had Wagner's music performed at Party rallies and functions. Wagner's music was uncompromisingly serious, and intensely Teutonic. It was not only Wagner's music that « struck a chord » with Hitler, but also his political views. Wagner wrote a violently anti-Semitic booklet in the 1850's called « Das Judentum in die Musik » (Judaism in Music) insisting the Jews poisoned public taste in the arts. He founded the Bayreuth Festival which, in the 1930's and 1940's, was used by the Nazi Party as a propaganda tool against the Jews.

Anton Bruckner (1824-1896) : He considered himself a disciple of Richard Wagner. Bruckner and Wagner were contemporaries composing much of their music between 1845 and 1880. Bruckner met Wagner, in 1865, at the premiere of « Tristan und Isolde » , in Munich. He dedicated his 3rd Symphony to Wagner. Music historians have referred to Bruckner's Adagio of the 7th Symphony as the Adagio of premonition. It is music written with funerals in mind. Wagner died shortly after Bruckner finished it, in 1883. Like Hitler, Bruckner had humble beginnings. He never forgot his « peasant roots » . Much of Bruckner's early training and education was under the guidance of Augustine monks. He had a genuine love of nature and « the great German Fatherland » . To Hitler, Bruckner exemplified the people. A movement from Bruckner's 7th Symphony was played upon the news of Hitler's death, in April 1945.

Most musicians and composers who lived during the 3rd « Reich » were less fortunate in their ability to please the « Führer » . For many musicians, survival meant compromise. Many tried to strike a balance between allegiance to Germany and commitment to their work. It was a difficult balance to achieve, knowing that to fail meant deportation or, perhaps, death. The following musicians were all involved to some extent with the 3rd « Reich » :

Hans Hotter (1909-2003) : Classical Opera singer Adolf Hitler regarded as « the greatest baritone of the future » . Even though Hotter was not a member of the Nazi Party and had been known to make fun of Hitler at parties, he was given several prestigious positions within the « Reich » .

Herbert von Karajan (1908-1989) : Wealthy gifted musician and conductor, was the youngest director of an Opera company in Germany, in the 1930's. In order to obtain better conducting positions, Karajan joined the Nazi Party where it was rumored he bought some of his appointments. After the War, he was banned from conducting until 1948. He became the permanent director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, in 1958, and was considered one of Europe's most popular conductors.

Clemens Krauß (1893-1984) : The illegitimate child of the Archduke of Hapsburg and a Viennese actress was an accomplished Opera conductor. He was a favourite of Adolf Hitler, though he was not a Party member. Krauß became a captive of Hitler's music Ministry. Though he tried to be transferred to Vienna on numerous occasions, Hitler insisted that he work in Munich.

Elly Ney (1882-1968) : The daughter of a music teacher and an army sergeant was a child prodigy. When she was 10, she had a Jewish piano teacher at the Cologne Conservatory. She disliked her teacher immensely, because of his race. In 1933, she was asked to fill in for a Jewish musician who had been banned from performing, she regarded this as an insult, and said she only managed to do it by concentrating on the music.

Hans Pfitzner (1869-1949) . He called himself a German genius. He was a rabid nationalist who believed that all art should serve the Fatherland. He once tried to persuade Gustav Mahler that the most essential feature of Richard Wagner's music was that it was German, rather than good. Mahler responded that all great artists leave their nationality behind and strive to produce a Masterpiece. Pfitzner left the room in a fit of rage. He was compared to Richard Strauss, yet, is almost unknown today. His most famous Opera was « Palestrina » .

Li Stadelmann : A harpsichord player who specialized in Bach's music. She joined the Nazi Party, in 1933, stating :

« Our German Masters will find German interpreters. »

She was an anti-Semite, who felt that Jews had no place in German culture or society.

Richard Strauß (1864-1949) : He was appointed president of the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) when Adolf Hitler came to power, in 1933. Strauß accepted it as a way to get legislation passed which would benefit « serious » composers in a country he felt had become too commercial in its musical taste. His primary interest was purely musical, whether or not a person was Jewish was irrelevant to him. He regularly refused to fire Jewish musicians and continued to work with Jewish librettist, Stefan Zweig. In written statements to Zweig, he indicated his aversion to political policies. This politically incorrect stance put him at odds with the Nazi government. Josef Goebbels felt Strauß was opportunistic and distrusted him, considering his music borderline German. Only his world-wide fame kept him from being a « persona non grata » . Because Strauß had Jewish relatives (his daughter-in-law) , he was forced to deal cautiously with the authorities. There is a story that he attempted to visit his daughter-in-law's mother who was imprisoned at « Terezín » . The camp guards refused him entrance. Her photograph was returned to Strauß soon after her death. Strauß was forced to resign, in 1935, after which time his music was censored by the « Reichsmusikkammer » .

La discothèque d'Hitler dans le « Bunker »

A NEWLY discovered box of Adolf Hitler's records included music by Jewish composers or played by Jewish musicians

Kept in a box for 62 years, in the attic of a « dacha » near Moscow, the collection of gramophone discs, 78 rpm shellac recordings, which also contains works by Hitler's German favourites, mainly Wagner and Beethoven, had been taken from Hitler's « Wilhelmstraße » Bunker, in Berlin, by a Red Army reconnaissance officer, Captain Lev Besymenski, who died in the summer of 2007, at the age of 86.

After his death, his daughter Alexandra brought the box of some 100 LP's to Germany's « Spiegel » magazine. She said her father had told her that, in May 1945, he and his comrades had been dispatched to take an inventory of objects in Hitler's bunker and the chancellery, which lay in ruins. While others collected silverware engraved with the initials « AH » , he took albums from Hitler's collection, which he found in numbered boxes, packed for delivery to the « Eagle's Nest » headquarters, in Berchtesgaden.

Hitler's collection included works by the Russian composers Borodin, Rachmaninov and Mussorgski. Scratchmark on recordings by Mendelssohn and Offenbach suggest they were among his favourites.

Russian composers were banned under the 3rd « Reich ». But in private, Hitler repeatedly played Rachmaninov and Tchaïkovsky and hundreds more works he publicly labelled « sub-human music » .

In one of Hitler's albums, the famous Polish Jewish violinist Bronisław Huberman played works by Tchaikovsky. This has surprised historians, since Huberman, who fled Vienna in 1937, 1 year before the « Anschluß » , had been declared an enemy of the 3rd « Reich » . Hitler wrote in « Mein Kampf » that Jewish art « never existed » .

A Souvenir from the « Bunker » Hitler's Record Collection surfaces in Moscow

(By Georg Bönisch and Matthias Schepp, in Moscow.)

Part of the music collection stored at the « Führerbunker » , Adolf Hitler's underground shelter during World War II, has been discovered in Moscow, where it lay in the attic of a former Soviet officer for decades. The Nazi leader apparently enjoyed listening to records made by his enemies.

The story sounds like the fairy tale « Open Sesame ! »

It is set on a mid-May day, in 1945, in War-ravaged Berlin. Lev Besymenski, the captain of the military intelligence service of the 1st Belarussian Front, is given a mission : together with 2 other officers, he is to inspect the « Reich » Chancellery (stormed just a few days before) including the underground « bunker » where Hitler stayed during the War and eventually committed suicide.

Besymenski is an expert, and he also speaks German. He served as an interpreter during the arrest of Field Marshal Friedrich Paulus in Stalingrad, in 1943, and had only recently, on 1 May, translated the news for Stalin, from German General Hans Krebs, that Hitler had died. Later, he will reveal to the world what the Soviets long treated as something akin to a State secret - that they found the remains of Hitler's corpse in the garden of the « Reich » Chancellery.

But, on this day, he is standing in the imposing building on Berlin's « Wilhelmstraße » . He has meticulously searched the headquarters of the Nazi regime for several hours. Suddenly, the Soviet commander responsible for the building asks him what souvenir he would like to take with him.

His comrades have already helped themselves to cutlery engraved with the initials « A. H. » . They have selected leather cases containing medals and other trinkets. But Besymenski is thinking of something else. He asks the officer to open several large iron doors for him that have been secured with special locks.

He would write, decades later :

« We were faced with a strange sight. Several rows of sturdy wooden boxes stood in each room, numbered and packed closely together. »

German service staff said the boxes were packed for shipment to the Berghof, Hitler's residence in Bavaria, but the trip never took place, according to Besymenski. The boxes were filled with crockery and various household effects.

Besymenski fills a box with souvenirs for himself and, later, takes it back to Moscow on a special train. 46 years will go by before his daughter Alexandra discovers the booty by chance.

It is August 1991, a pleasant summer day in the « dacha » settlement Nikolina-Gora, close to Moscow, where the Besymenski family owns a house. The family has visitors, and steaming « blinis » are placed on the veranda table at lunchtime. Then it's time to relax. Besymenski sends his daughter into the attic to get badminton rackets.

A Record Collection from the « Führerhauptquartier »

It's dark and cramped-up there, with boxes of books standing around.

Besymenskaya (who is 53 at the time) recounts :

« My shin hit something solid. It was a stack of records. »

They are labelled with rectangular, finely serrated stickers that make her freeze. The print on the stickers reads : « Führerhauptquartier » .

She rushes downstairs excitedly with her discovery :

« Daddy, what's this, and why is it lying on the attic ? »

The 70 year old grumbles :

« Can't you see, they're records. I switched to CDs years ago. »

That is all he wants to say.

One of his guests will later remember :

« I sensed how uncomfortable Lev Besymenski was about the topic. »

The reason for his nervousness was presumably that Besymenski, who became a respected historian and a professor at the military Academy in Moscow, after the War, was trying to prevent people from suspecting him of being a plunderer. Nowhere in his later books about Hitler does he mention what he personally took from Berlin to Moscow, in 1945 : parts of the record collection, at the « Führer » 's headquarters.

While it was customary, at the time, for the victors to take plentiful souvenirs back home, some of them went too far and became embroiled in scandal. Take the example of Marshal Georgy Zhukov. The man who won the battles of

Moscow and Stalingrad and, later, became the Supreme Military Commander of the Soviet Occupation Zone, in Germany, made-off with, among other things (according to Moscow secret police records) :

« 55 works of Classical painting ; 6 boxes containing expensive tableware and tea set ; 9 golden watches ; and 713 pieces of silverware. »

The booty came from the Prussian palaces, in Potsdam, near Berlin.

Music-lover Besymenski, on the other hand, took from the « Reich » Chancellery what corresponded to his personal passion. He had been a frequent guest at the Moscow Conservatory before the War. He died in June 2007, at the age of 86. His daughter Alexandra allowed DER SPIEGEL to view the collection of about 100 shellac records.

Most of them are stored in red, and some of them in blue albums. Each album contains about a dozen records. Some records are scratched and others are broken, but most are well preserved.

Album No. 1 : weather-beaten due to the dampness and the temperature shifts in the attic of the Besymenski « datcha » , contains nothing particularly surprising. It includes the Piano Sonatas No. 24 in F-sharp major and No. 27 in E minor by Ludwig van Beethoven, for example, or the Overture to Richard Wagner's « Der Fliegende Holländer » , performed by the Orchestra of the Bayreuth « Festspielhaus » conducted by Heinz Tietjen (the director of the « Festspielhaus » , between 1931 and 1944) .

Hitler's 2nd passion, after architecture, was music. He went to the Opera House almost daily, during his time in Vienna, to listen to the music of Beethoven, Wagner, Liszt or Brahms. But to him, only German music counted. Yet, Besymenski's collection astonishingly contains works by composers the Nazis considered « sub-humans » , including Russian composers such as : Pyotr Ilyich Tchaïkovsky, Alexander Borodin and Sergei Rachmaninov.

For example, the item with the inventory number « Führerhauptquartier 840 » contains a recording by the « Electrola » company labeled « Bass in Russian with Orchestra and Chorus » - a recording of the aria « The Death of Boris Godunov » by Russian composer Modest Mussorgsky, sung by Russian bass Feodor Chaliapin.

Another album contains nothing but works by Tchaïkovsky, with solo performances by star violinist Bronisław Huberman, a Polish Jew.

« I feel this is a sheer mockery of the millions of Slavs and Jews who had to die because of the racial ideology of the Nazis » , a stirred-up Alexandra Besymenskaya remarks today.

Taking Refuge in the Music of His Enemies

As Hitler, possessed by his manic idea of conquering the world, grew increasingly solitary and seldom faced the public anymore, he apparently tried to relax by listening to records. His radio operator Rochus Misch, who was 90 years old

in 2007, and was the last surviving witness from the « bunker » , told DER SPIEGEL about how Hitler once ordered his servant to play a record following an intense argument with the command of the « Wehrmacht » at the « Werwolf » headquarters, in Vinnytsia, Ukraine :

« Then, he sat there, absorbed in thought. The “ Führer ” probably wanted to distract himself. » , Misch says.

In moments like that, the otherwise bigoted Hitler apparently didn't care who the music was by - notwithstanding the fact that he had always denied that Jewish people were capable of independent cultural achievement. In « Mein Kampf » , he insists there has never been such a thing as Jewish art, and that :

« The Queen of all arts (architecture) owes nothing original to the Jews. »

As late as his last directive to the soldiers on the Eastern Front, from April 15, 1945 (one day before the Soviet Red Army crossed the Oder River and prepared to siege Berlin) , Hitler ranted against the « mortal Jewish-Bolshevik enemy » , from the « Führerbunker » beneath the garden of the Old « Reich » Chancellery.

But the Dictator and his minions were quite capable of appreciating the works of Jewish artists. The record collection, which was presumably stored in the air-raid shelter beneath the New « Reich » Chancellery, includes recordings of musicians such as Austrian Jew pianist Artur Schnabel. Schnabel left Germany immediately after the Nazis came to power, in 1933. His mother, though, stayed behind and was deported to the « Theresienstadt » concentration camp and murdered by the Nazis.

Besymenski, himself Jewish, was surprised by the number of famous Russian names he discovered on the records from the « bunker » :

« They were recordings of Classical music, performed by the best Orchestras in Europe and Germany, with the best solo performers of the time. I was surprised that it also featured Russian music. » , the historian wrote when he was pressured by his daughter, 3 years before, for the sake of posterity, to leave a written testimony of how he obtained the collection.

American troops had already discovered numerous records in a cavern in the Berghof, in 1945 - a different part of the musical collection that was compiled for Hitler and other high-ranking Nazis. Historian Philipp Gassert of the Heidelberg University had access to some of these records when he was doing research in the United States. Like the records now rediscovered in Moscow, those examined by Gassert had small serrated labels.

Lev Besymenski sometimes listened to the Nazi records together with his best friends. Sometimes, he wrote, he also lent them to musicians - including conductor Kiril Kondrashin and famous pianists Emil Gilels and Jakow Sak.

His daughter Alexandra says she will think calmly about what she wants to do with her father's collection, « over a glass of wine » . That's the name of a cheeky soldier's song set to music by the Court chapel Master of Braunschweig,

Franz Abt, in the 19th Century. The number of the record is « Führerhauptquartier 779 » .

« Ein Volk, Ein Reich ... Und Eine Disko »

For more than half a Century, historians have wondered what the Nazis would have done had they won the Second World War. Now, the matter can be settled. A report, unread for 65 years, reveals the Nazis' top priority once they had destroyed the Allies, exterminated the Jews and occupied Europe. They were going to build a big, flash nightclub in Berlin.

« It'll be the most beautiful, the most modern, the most elegant in Europe » , enthused the report's author, Giuseppe Renzetti. « The project is said to have met with the ardent approval of the “ Führer ”. »

Renzetti, Italy's consul in Berlin, told his superiors that already, in mid-1940, the Nazis were preparing their capital for the tourist boom they expected would follow victory. He understood « a manager has already been found for the night-club and that it had been decided to restrict entry to foreigners, the diplomatic corps and the members of Berlin high-society. »

Extracts from the report, dated July 23 1940, were published in « Corriere della Sera » . Italy's former consul was as close as any foreigner to Adolf Hitler ; Josef Gæbbels wrote that Renzetti could almost be seen as a Nazi. To compile his report, the diplomat interviewed top officials including the SS leader, Heinrich Himmler.

But Renzetti found the Germans split over what to do with Britain. Some argued it should be « destroyed » . Some wanted « an understanding » .

The « Führer » , he said, was with the doves.

Hitler has wanted to take into account the wishes of a large mass of the Germans who feel themselves to be related to the British and fear others could profit more than them from the British Empire's destruction.

He said Hitler also felt British and German industry could find a way to coexist.

Renzetti said the Nazis were anticipating a post-War Europe in which they would be « feared and respected » . The economy would be run centrally in collaboration with the Italians, German colonists would be settled in areas such as Alsace and Lorraine, and society would be ruled with a strong hand. Himmler, he said, had indicated a « strong interior policy aimed at avoiding the sort of disturbances that often follow a war » . The head of the SS aimed « to continue with surveillance operations both of the masses and individuals » . But, in passing, Himmler noted that he had been disappointed with the battlefield performance of SS troops. In the new order, Renzetti reported, Germany itself would be homogenised and its strong regional traditions ended.

Renzetti, who had acted as a go-between, carrying messages from Hitler to Mussolini, was consul in Berlin, from 1938

until 1941, when he was posted to Stockholm. He died near Pisa, in 1953.

AB 112 : Pages sombres de l'histoire de la musique en Allemagne

Au lendemain de la défaite de 1918, les milieux nationaux allemands s'opposent avec violence aux défenseurs de la démocratie de Weimar. Il s'agit pour eux de retrouver l'honneur perdu de la nation allemande humiliée par le Traité de Versailles. Cependant, dans cette 1^{re} moitié du XX^e siècle, la musique apparaît comme un élément fondateur des critères du régime nazi, elle est, pour ainsi dire, récupérée à des fins de propagande du régime. Mais dans quels cadres évolue-t-elle ?

Sans exagération, on peut affirmer que, depuis des siècles, la musique en Allemagne apparaît à tous les échelons de la société. On sait, par ailleurs, que la musique s'inscrit dans la vie quotidienne des Allemands comme facteur d'épanouissement de l'individu. Le chant choral a joué un rôle déterminant dans l'établissement du protestantisme et dans l'unification du peuple. Qu'elle soit sous forme communautaire ou religieuse : « Gemeinschaftsmusik » ; utilitaire : « Gebrauchsmusik » ; ou encore pratiquée à la maison : « Hausmusik » , on la retrouve partout. Une véritable dynamique dans la pratique musicale de la jeunesse allemande est mise en œuvre par le pouvoir. Des milliers de chorales parsèment l'Allemagne, mobilisant une large part de la population. Une « dictature du chant » entre les années 1920 et 1940 voit le jour par l'intégration progressive de chants nazis aux répertoires religieux et populaire précédents.

Or, dès 1905, se succèdent des mouvements artistiques dont le contenu et l'expression se dressent contre la pression sociale et le contrôle idéologique véhiculés par le pouvoir politique. À Vienne, Berlin, Dresde, Munich, ces créations artistiques semblent contribuer à saper l'ordre établi, à défaut d'attaquer ouvertement le pouvoir. La modernité artistique incarne un certain mécontentement et le manifeste en s'immisçant dans la lutte sociale. Le mouvement « expressionniste » est un exemple frappant, en ce sens qu'il fait « rayonner la puissance de la vision intérieure en réaction à la vacuité du monde réel » . Il s'agit, bien entendu, d'art abstrait ou en d'autres termes, de créations, dont les significations, loin d'être immédiatement perçues, supposent une interrogation, conduisent donc à penser. Par conséquent, une telle création artistique s'avère extrêmement gênante pour l'édification d'un « Reich » qui se veut millénaire et dont l'enrégimentement des esprits précisément est la préoccupation première.

Au nom d'un art accessible immédiatement et conforme aux schèmes de perception depuis longtemps imposés dans l'imagerie populaire, le Nazisme considère l'art abstrait comme un « art dégénéré » . Mais, plus loin encore dans sa démarche politique, le régime nazi conçoit l'art dit « dégénéré » comme un art « étranger » et réprime tout art qui n'aurait un contenu facilement reconnaissable, rassurant. S'impose alors un art « aryen » dont les thèmes obligent à l'obéissance des valeurs établies et au respect de la force. L'organisation culturelle nazie se révèle dans son slogan de « La force par la joie » : « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF) . Ainsi, tout ce qui est d'origine étrangère est suspect, dégénéré, dangereux. Toute rupture avec la tradition esthétique se devait donc d'être écartée. Le visage totalitaire du Nazisme dans l'art oppose le beau au laid, le national au non-allemand, le sain au dégénéré. Dans cet ordre d'idée, l'esthétique nazie s'associe au beau dans le sens de néo-Classicisme teinté d'inspiration antique et de réalisme populaire célébrant les valeurs du « sang et du sol » : « Blut und Boden » .

L'art, réduit aux canons de l'idéologie officielle, oblige à mettre l'accent sur les théories centrées sur la question « musique et race » et souligne le caractère « laid, non-allemand, dégénéré » de la musique et de ceux qui la composent. Ainsi, de telles démarches conduisent-elles à la mise sous tutelle de la création et du patrimoine. L'artiste devient un sujet fonctionnel dont l'intégrité n'existe pas face au pouvoir. Il est totalement muselé. S'il refuse de se soumettre, il est taxé de réactionnaire, et les « ennemis intérieurs » sont jugés indésirables et poursuivis. Une haine de tout anti-conformisme s'empare de l'Allemagne musicienne.

De violentes attaques antisémites contre la modernité viennoise et contre l'avant-garde de la république de Weimar contraignent le compositeur juif Arnold Schönberg (1874-1951) et le dramaturge et écrivain juif Kurt Weill (1900-1950) à l'exil. Cette haine démesurée pour les juifs vise l'intégrité des êtres. Les slogans raciaux font appels à des notions neurologiques touchant aux concepts de décadence, d'impuissance, de décomposition, de folie, de déraillement. Comment faire face à de telles attaques quand le symbole même de la dégénérescence biologique est cristallisé sur le « juif » qui « aurait du sang nègre dans les veines » et qui tenterait ainsi de contaminer le « corps sain germanique » !

Les musiciens idolâtrés et les musiciens « ennemis »

Le régime nazi rejette donc ce qu'il a appelé « musique dégénérée » et opte pour une musique officielle. En 1933, lorsque Adolf Hitler s'impose comme unificateur d'une nation qui a terrassé ses « ennemis intérieurs », il se présente comme mécène dont les références se concentrent autour de 3 musiciens : Beethoven (1770-1827), Wagner (1813-1883) et Bruckner (1824-1896). Le programme culturel, en effet, est fondé sur la reconquête du Grand « Reich », combat politique s'appuyant sur les icônes qui font la fierté du pays. Beethoven, Wagner et Bruckner sont les figures romantiques les plus instrumentalisées par le régime.

Le tableau de Josef Jurutka (1880-1945) intitulé « Nature morte au masque beethovénien » présenté en 1939 à la Maison de l'art allemand, témoigne de l'admiration du « Führer » pour ce grand musicien. Hitler pensait que la musique de Beethoven illustre le Grand œuvre de son régime. De plus, lors des cérémonies d'ouverture des congrès du Parti nazi, était joué un hymne officiel : l'Ouverture de l'Opéra « Rienzi » de Richard Wagner. En outre, la représentation des « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » à l'Opéra allemand de Berlin, en 1935, devint l'Opéra officiel du 3e « Reich ». Avec ce dernier, Anton Bruckner constitue la grande icône du régime nazi. En juin 1937, le buste du compositeur fut solennellement installé dans les environs de Regensburg, au Panthéon du « Walhalla », temple d'inspiration néo-grecque dorique édifié au début du XIXe siècle et dédié aux grandes figures de l'histoire allemande. Temps fort de la politique musicale et culturelle du régime nazi.

Le dictateur a la certitude d'une conscience musicale innée et supérieure chez l'être germanique. C'est pourquoi il n'hésite pas à présenter l'Allemagne, comme « pays de la musique ». L'affiche sur papier glacé de Lothar Heinemann (1911-1966) intitulée « L'Allemagne, pays de la musique », réalisée en 6 langues, est adressée aux principaux pays européens comme message esthétique-politique : l'aigle figurant l'état allemand place l'orgue - instrument roi - sous son aile protectrice. En 1936, à Nuremberg, un orgue monumental destiné à accompagner les manifestations de Parti nazi

révèle, par le gigantisme de sa facture, la puissance des principes du « Führer ». Ce grand-orgue possède 220 registres, 16,000 tuyaux dont le plus haut est de 12 mètres. Ainsi, l'art et la nation sont-ils désormais indissociables. Le docteur Josef Gœbbels affirme que le peuple allemand est « le 1er peuple musicien de la Terre » .

Les musiciens considérés comme « ennemis » sont effacés des mémoires par le régime nazi. Cette volonté d'anéantir une culture musicale qui avait été florissante dans la période précédente commence, dans la nuit du 9 au 10 novembre 1936. Le monument édifié, en 1892, en l'honneur du musicien d'origine juive Félix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, devant le « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig, fut démantelé. De même, la « rue Mendelssohn » fut rebaptisée « rue Anton Bruckner » . Dans le même ordre d'idée de sape des musiques composées par des juifs, un « Songe d'une nuit d'été » version aryenne fut officiellement commandé par les Nazis pour remplacer l'œuvre « ô combien mythique » de Félix Mendelssohn-Barthold ! Le compositeur Carl Orff, rendu populaire avec son « Carmina Burana » , acceptera de s'y pencher.

Selon Karl Blessinger (1888-1962) , auteur du « Dictionnaire des Juifs dans la Musique » , datant de 1940, l'influence « nocive » du judaïsme remonterait au XIXe siècle. 3 figures emblématiques de la musique allemande y sont calomniées : Mendelssohn (1809-1847) bien sûr, mais aussi Giacomo Meyerbeer (1791-1864) et Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) . Ce livre fut ré-édité en 1944 avec un titre plus précis : « Judaïsme et musique » . Cette volonté marquée d'antisémitisme dans la musique empêche donc de faire connaître les œuvres de ces pourtant illustres compositeurs. Le régime censure tout spectacle ayant un rapport avec la cause juive. On sait que « l'Opéra de quat'sous » de Kurt Weill fut interdit, ou que des ouvrages musicaux pédagogiques tels que « Harmonielehre » d'Arnold Schoenberg ou « Unterweisung im Tonsatz » de Paul Hindemith furent stigmatisés.

Hitler et la destruction de la musique en Allemagne

The Vienna Philharmonic recently issued a report by a group of independent historians in which the Orchestra officially acknowledged for the 1st time the closeness of its relationship to the 3rd « Reich » . Not only had half its players become members of the Nazi Party by 1942, but all 13 of its Jewish players had been fired 4 years earlier, and 5 of them later died in the camps. A few weeks later, « Der Spiegel » published a 6,000 word essay called « Wagner's Dark Shadow : Can We Separate the Man from His Works ? » in which Dirk Kurbjuweit dealt no less honestly with the continuing inability of many German music-lovers to grapple with the fact that Richard Wagner was a virulent anti-Semite whose writings directly influenced Adolf Hitler.

The extent to which Hitler and his cultural commissars sought to control and shape European musical life has been chronicled in detail. But most of these books have dealt primarily, or exclusively, with German-speaking performers and those performing artists from other countries, France in particular, who collaborated with the Nazis. Yet, the unswerving determination of the Nazis to rid Europe of what they called « Entartete Musik » (degenerate music) may well have had an even more far-reaching effect on post-War European musical culture. After all, many well-known Jewish Classical performers (Fritz Kreisler, Artur Schnabel and Bruno Walter among them) managed to emigrate to America and other countries where they continued their careers without significant interruption. Not so the Jewish composers whose music was banned by the Nazis. Some of them were killed in the Holocaust, and none of those who survived succeeded in

fully reconstituting their professional lives after the War.

A turning-point in our understanding of the effects of Nazism on European Classical composition came in the 1990's when « Decca /London » began to release a series of albums called « Entartete Musik » containing some 30-odd works by such celebrated Jewish composers as Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Franz Schreker, Arnold Schönberg, and Kurt Weill, all of whom had their music banned. After the series came to an end, Michæl Haas, its producer, decided to devote himself to further study of the subject. Now, he has written a book called « Forbidden Music : The Jewish Composers Banned by the Nazis » (Yale University ; 352 pages) . It is, amazingly, the 1st full-length history of what happened to the composers who ran afoul of the Nazi regime.

Though Haas is not a historian by training, « Forbidden Music » is still an outstandingly fine piece of work, one that not only tells the story of what happened to these composers but also places it in the historical context without which we cannot fully understand their sufferings. For the history of « Entartete Musik » is, in large part, a tale of Jewish assimilation and its discontents - and of Richard Wagner, whose own mad obsession with Judaism had much to do with the fate of the composers who later felt Hitler's wrath.

Prior to the social emancipation of Jewry that followed the establishment of Austria-Hungary's dual monarchy, in 1867, and the German « Reich » , in 1871, it was all but impossible for German-speaking Jewish Classical composers to achieve success in their native lands. The most important ones either emigrated (like Jacques Offenbach) or spent large parts of their career in other countries (like Felix Mendelssohn) .

Given the extent to which Austro-German musical culture dominated Classical music throughout the 19th Century, it stands to reason that emancipation should have inspired many Jewish composers not merely to assimilate socially but to embrace a new cultural identity for which they had longed so intensely. It was, Haas writes, « the long-awaited entry of the Jews into the most “ élite ”, educated and cultivated “ club ” on earth » . Arnold Schönberg, the least « clubbable » of men, went so far as to proclaim that his invention of the 12 tone method of atonal composition would (in his oft-quoted words) « ensure the supremacy of German music for the next 100 years » .

Not surprisingly, many of these composers sought to expunge all recognizably Jewish elements from their music, hoping thereby to compose in the « true » Germanic tradition. Those who, like Karl Goldmark, failed to purge their styles with sufficient thoroughness were attacked for that very reason by such assimilated Jewish critics as Vienna's Eduard Hanslick, who complained in a review of one of Goldmark's Operas of his « musical transliteration of Jewish Orientalism. It's even used when general human feelings are called for rather than anything specifically Jewish » .

Despite their fondest hopes, these musicians were never able to escape the blight of anti-Semitism. Part of the problem was that their success led to growing envy on the part of less accomplished Gentile musicians. Just as important, though, was the emergence of a specifically racial brand of anti-Semitism of which Richard Wagner was the 1st major proponent. In « Judaism in Music and Other Essays » (1850) and other writings, Wagner proclaimed his « instinctive repugnance against the Jew's prime essence » and decried « the be-Jewing of modern art » , going so far as to claim that Judaism threatened German culture itself, since Jews were « the purest of all races and it matters not with whom

they mix : the Jewish race always dominates » .

Wagner's race-based anti-Semitism became an accepted part of the cultural conversation in « fin-de-siècle » Europe, and it may have had an inhibiting effect on, at least, some of the Jewish composers of the period. The vast majority of German-speaking Jewish composers of the post-emancipation era were so determined to emphasize their « Germanness » that their music became derivative. Some favoured Wagner's hyper-Romanticism, others the conservative traditionalism of Johannes Brahms, but whatever their choice, the result was a body of work that is (with good reason) almost totally forgotten today.

Not until Gustav Mahler, whose 1st Symphony was performed in 1889, did a Jewish composer of profound, even radical, originality appear on the scene. Yet, Mahler's relationship to his Jewish heritage was complex in the extreme. On the one hand, he unhesitatingly incorporated Jewish elements into his music - the slow movement of the 1st Symphony, for instance, contains a section that evokes the pungent sound of what would come to be called klezmer. At the same time, though, Mahler was, as Haas explains, equivocal about his background. Not only did he convert to Roman Catholicism to facilitate his appointment as director of the Vienna « Hofoper » (later to be the Vienna State Opera) , but he « shuddered at the sight of kaftan-wearing, bearded Jews from Eastern Europe and refused to identify with them » .

Whatever his personal feelings about Judaism, Mahler was the key-figure in the development of the next generation of post-emancipation Jewish composers. For those who were convinced that Wagner's all-encompassing Romanticism was a dead end (a « debilitating condition » , as the musicologist Alfred Einstein put it, that threatened to smother Austro-German musical culture) , Mahler's symphonically oriented style, at once more acerbic and more linear, offered budding modernists such as Schönberg a much-needed alternative to the stodgy conservatism of the Jewish composers of the late- 19th Century.

Schönberg soon found himself in the vanguard of musical modernism, though he and his followers, Jewish and otherwise, were outnumbered by other composers who still looked to Wagner or Brahms for guidance. But whatever their musical allegiance, these men all followed the path of assimilation, for they were true believers in Austro-German musical culture who wanted to preserve or (in Schönberg's case) improve it. It never occurred to them that their passport to that culture could be revoked.

How would Austro-German musical culture have evolved had Jewish composers continued to play a part in its development ? The question, while provocative, is unanswerable, for starting in 1933, Adolf Hitler removed them from the scene.

It is in no way surprising that Hitler should have paid close attention to Germany's musical establishment, since he was an æsthete « manqué » with a passion for Classical music. His ideas, moreover, about music and musicians had been shaped by Richard Wagner.

He declared :

« Whoever wants to understand National-Socialist Germany must know Wagner. »

Hitler read Wagner's writings closely and took them seriously, declaring Wagner to be his favourite « political » writer and describing him as one of « the great reformers » in « Mein Kampf » :

« Beside Frederick the Great, we have such men as Martin Luther and Richard Wagner. »

Wagner's pathological anti-Semitism was the insane root of the 3rd « Reich » 's suppression of Jewish composers. But one of the most striking aspects of this policy was the fact that, even though Hitler promulgated a staunchly anti-modernist doctrine, it was not absolute in practice. Except for Hitler himself, Nazi leaders were comparatively indifferent to whether a given composer was a traditionalist or a modernist, so long as he played ball with them. What mattered to them (and to Hitler) was blood. If you were Jewish, it was irrelevant whether you were assimilated or observant, much less whether you were an atonal modernist or a Brahmsian conservative : either way, you threatened the racial purity of German culture.

This attitude completely defeated such fully-assimilated composers as Franz Schreker, who was not raised as a Jew and never thought of himself as one. An influential late-Romantic composer and teacher with modernist tendencies whose Operas, in particular « Der ferne Klang » (1912) and « Der Schatzgräber » (1920) , had had great success, Schreker found himself without employment once the Nazis came to power, and was so shocked that he died of a stroke in 1934.

« Aryan » musicians, by contrast, saw the coming of Hitlerism as an opportunity to get-back at the Jews who, in many cases, had deprived them of the prestige that they saw as their birth right. The great violinist Adolf Busch and his brother Fritz, one of Germany's leading conductors, were the only non-Jewish musicians of international stature who emigrated after 1933 as a matter of principle.

Jewish composers who were in a position to emigrate did so, whenever possible to America. Upon arriving, though, they discovered that they spoke the wrong musical language. America's modern-music culture in the 1930's and 1940's was not Austro-German but Franco-Russian in orientation and, so, had little use for them.

A fortunate few, like Erich Wolfgang Korngold, managed to re-invent themselves as film-music composers, and Kurt Weill found a different kind of success by writing such popular Broadway musicals as « Knickerbocker Holiday » (1938) and « Lady in the Dark » (1941) . The rest were left to struggle. Whether they remained abroad or returned to their native lands after World War II, none of the Austro-German « émigré » composers had a major post-War career, and the lives of many of the younger ones were cut short by the Holocaust. As for Gustav Mahler, his music did not return to the concert-halls of Berlin and Vienna until the 1960's.

And what of the vast quantities of music that were flung into the memory hole of the 3rd « Reich » ?

Most of the conservative Jewish composers of the late- 19th and early- 20th Centuries were too derivative to survive, even such genuinely gifted ones as Hans Gál, a Brahms-influenced neo-Classicist of considerable talent and some real originality. At the same time, the music of modernistically inclined Romantics, like Korngold and Schreker, had already come to be widely seen as « passé » before the Nazis came to power. (In a much-repeated quip, the Jewish conductor Otto Klemperer, referring to the economy of the Weimar Republic, dismissed Schreker's Operas as « typical inflation music » .) Undeniably popular though they were before the War, their music is no longer widely performed. As for the composers who died in the Holocaust, none of their surviving works has found a secure place in the standard repertoire, not even Viktor Ullmann's original and masterly 1944 Chamber Opera, « The Emperor of Atlantis » , which was fortunately recorded as part of « Decca / London » 's « Entartete Musik » series.

Might it have been otherwise had history taken a different turn ? We cannot know. What we do know is that the provincialization of Austro-German music that was already apparent prior to the rise of Adolf Hitler continued after his demise, and it seems safe to say that the near extermination of European Jewry was, at least partly, responsible for this fact. It is surely no coincidence that Paul Hindemith was the only indisputably major German-speaking composer to follow Gustav Mahler and Richard Strauß, and he has had no real successor. (Hindemith also emigrated in 1938, but he had been willing to cooperate with the Nazi regime prior to the banning of his music, wrongly assuming that his accommodation would temper the regime's anti-Semitic excesses.)

In Michæl Haas's bluntly ironic words :

« Germany and Austria, rendered virtually “ Judenfrei ” after 1945, have struggled in the decades following to regain their prominence as leaders of musical development. These 2 German nations found themselves overtaken by the very countries that had given refuge to their “ émigrés ”. »

Indeed, what happened to Austro-German music in the 20th Century can be understood as a spectacular illustration of the law of unintended consequences. By persecuting Jewish Classical performers and suppressing the music of Jewish composers, Hitler sought to ensure for all time the supremacy of Austro-German musical culture. Instead, he destroyed it.

Compositeurs persécutés - Musique persécutée

Essay by Jens Malte Fischer. (English translation by Ben Letzler.)

How It Began

On May 10, 1933 (the new regime wasted no time) , the books of unfavored authors were burned on the « Opernplatz » on « Unter den Linden » , in Berlin, and in other German cities as well. Among those authors were many writers who had played a major role in the Weimar Republic : Alfred Kerr, Kurt Tucholsky, Carl von Ossietzky, Erich Maria Remarque, Heinrich Mann, and Erich Kästner. « Classics » , too, were banned and symbolically destroyed : Sigmund Freud, still living, was discredited in the form of the « Freudian School » , and a much older author of

world-historical significance was consigned to the flames with the slogan, « Against class struggle and materialism, for national community and idealist living » : Karl Marxówhich made clear that the National-Socialist furor for extermination was very much thought historically. The book burnings of these May days came just after the boycott, which went-off according to plan, of Jewish shops and businesses, on April 1, 1933, and they showed with brutal clarity what the new rulers, and the millions of enthusiastic Germans who followed and celebrated them, were capable of, and would be capable of. Anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear could clearly discern the true character of the regime. With these 2 actions, the April boycott and the May book burnings, the spring of 1933 had already seen the start of the inexorable process which led from discrimination to ostracism, then to deportation, and ultimately to the physical extermination of all those who had not placed themselves out of reach of violence, and could no longer escape it. Heinrich Heine's much quoted, truly prophetic phrase proved true to a terrible extent :

« Wherever they burn books, they will, in the end, burn people ! »

The Anti-Semitic Components

The exclusion and persecution of « undesirable elements » soon came to encompass, not only regime opponents from the left of the political spectrum, but also, with radical consistency, Jewish Germans and all European Jews. Anti-Semitism was the glowing core, hardly a secret, of the National-Socialist world view, not for Adolf Hitler alone, though in him to an extreme degree. A swift succession of legal measures forced German Jews out of every field and profession ; they were bullied and, little by little, robbed of their civil rights. This applied to doctors and shop-keepers, lawyers and University instructors and, of course, to writers and musicians as well. There was nonetheless no « notes burning » comparable to the book burnings. In musical matters, the National-Socialists deprived individuals of their rights in a less spectacular fashion than was the case in the field of literature. It is easy to explain why this was so : Liberal or outright Leftist writers, writers who had defended the Weimar Republic or had dared, before 1933, to speak-out against the gathering storm of poisonous National-Socialist ideology, were easy to identify, whether Jewish or not. On the other hand, nothing, with the exception of hard Left struggle anthems, is known of compositions directed against this poisonous ideology before 1933. The art of music, traditionally many-faceted and purportedly unpolitical, always had an easier time staying-out of the battles of the day. There was no way to find a « Jewish » or « Aryan » dominant 7th chord, even if the triad had been successfully identified as « Germanic » , whereas atonal or 12 tone music was ascribed to the « Jewish Ungeist » . Nor were there composers, before 1933, who could clearly be identified as Leftist, Hanns Eisler, and to a lesser extent Kurt Weill, notwithstanding. Here, the criterion of « Jewishness » had to serve as the defining characteristic of choice. For the National-Socialist, subordination (« Gleichschaltung ») of all cultural life, Josef Góebbels created the « Reichskulturkammer » , which, in its sub-groupings, encompassed all « cultural artists » of the German « Reich » . Those who were not members of this organization soon had no chance to work in a profession related to writing, painting, composing or performing. As early as April 1934, the « Reichsmusikkammer » issued guidelines for the acceptance of « non-Aryans » into the trade associations, and made unmistakably clear what was meant :

« Non-Aryans are to be regarded as fundamentally unsuitable as bearers and tenders of the German cultural heritage, and must, therefore, show particular proof of the reliability and suitability required. »

It is almost, needless to say, that proof of particular suitability for non-Aryans, that is, for Jews, could be furnished only in exceptional cases, and these exceptions, too, quite soon grew obsolete.

That German culture needed purification from « un-German elements », termed jointly or separately « cultural Bolshevism » and « Jewish intellectualism », was hardly an idea that had to be invented after January 1933. Here, as in all fields, the National-Socialists were only talented revivers and radicalizers of 2nd hand ideas that had largely arisen at the end of the 19th Century and, then, found new life amidst the confused and uncertain feelings of the Germans and Austrians who, after 1918, had suffered a devastating defeat and had dim prospects for betterment in a Republic that was thoroughly disapproved of and, at best, unloved. In the realm of culture, these ideas, taken together, were captured in the term « degeneracy », and the history of this term culminated in 2 hate exhibitions, the « Entartete Kunst » exhibit in Munich, in 1937, proverbial even today ; and « Entartete Musik » in Düsseldorf, in 1938, which elicited much less attention, but was symptomatic and fateful nonetheless.

Exclusion and Persecution

Both were visible expressions of a swiftly implemented « purification » of German musical life from « elements foreign to the German people and race ». There were, characteristically, no bans on individual works or composers. Rather, it was simply very soon clear to directors of Opera Houses, radio editorial staff, concert agents and Symphony Orchestras which composers and works could no longer be performed, which « non-Aryan » musicians and directors had to be removed from Orchestras and board-rooms. The situation was clear : anyone with too many Jewish grandparents (and the questionnaires expressly inquired after them) 1st had to prove exceptional dependability, as mentioned above, and soon there were no transitional rules any longer. 2 hand-books existed to assist with any possible unclarities : the quite vulgarly anti-Semitic « Musikalisches Juden ABC » (1935) and, following on it, the significantly more serious « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » (1940) , officially sanctioned by the « Reichsmusikkammer ». In the latter book, one could read, for example, of Franz Schreker :

« It was altogether fitting for the age of decay (meaning the Weimar Republic) to place a “ poet-composer ”, who made the most varied sexual aberrations the subject of his musical works for the stage, at the head of the foremost music academy of the “ Reich ”. »

With every indication of contentment, the Schreker article of this lexicon concludes as follows :

« In July 1932, already under the sign of the coming political change in Germany, Schreker had to resign his post as director of the “ Berlin Hochschule für Musik ”. »

This lexicon, along with the Düsseldorf exhibition « Entartete Musik » of 1938, was the ideological lining for countless intrusions into the biographies of individual musicians. The exhibition's initiator, the Weimar Theatre director, Hans Severus Ziegler, set a tone in the accompanying text in which the will to exterminate cannot be ignored :

« What has been collected for the exhibition “ Entartete Musik ” reflects the witches' sabbath and the most frivolous

sort of spiritual-artistic cultural Bolshevism, and reflects the triumph of sub-humanity, of arrogant Jewish impudence and utter spiritual feebleness. »

The exhibition itself put in the stocks, in sound and pictures, such individuals as Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, Kurt Weill, Ernst Křenek, Leo Fall, Otto Klemperer, and Paul Hindemith. Incidentally, neither Hans Severus Ziegler nor the other exhibition organizers were ever held responsible for this act of spiritual terrorism. Ziegler's career in the theatre was over, in 1945, to be sure, but he found a job all the same, as a teacher at a north German boarding school.

There existed, in addition to the Jewish composers and musicians, a smaller group of non-Jewish artists who had already been pursued by the National-Socialist press before the seizure of power and they, too, fell victim to the exclusionary measures. For a brief transitional period, well-wishers still entertained illusions that this process could be deflected (prey to this illusion was, among others, Wilhelm Furtwängler) but, soon, the seriousness of the situation could be ignored no longer.

One must recall how this process of banning and banishments drained musical life in Germany (and, soon, in Austria too) , a process carried-out with all the perfection of a properly functioning civil service and which had the character of torture, of turning the screws tighter and tighter. Only a few representative names can be mentioned here. Among those driven-out, expelled and persecuted were the composers Paul Abraham, Ralph Benatzky, Alban Berg, Paul Dessau, Hanns Eisler, Berthold Goldschmidt, Friedrich Holländer, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Ernst Křenek, Karol Rathaus, Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, Erwin Schulhoff, Robert Stolz, Wladimir Vogel, Franz Waxman(n) , Kurt Weill, Egon Wellesz, Stefan Wolpe, and Alexander von Zemlinsky. Among the conductors driven-out and persecuted were Maurice Abravanel, Leo Blech, Gustav Brecher, Fritz Busch, Oskar Fried, Erich Kleiber, Otto Klemperer, Erich Leinsdorf, Hermann Scherchen, Hans Wilhelm (William) Steinberg, Bruno Walter, and Fritz Zweig. Among the singers driven-out and persecuted were Alexander Kipnis, Lotte Lehmann, Emanuel List, Richard Tauber, and Joseph Schmidt ; among those engaged in music criticism, Theodor W. Adorno, Paul Bekker, and Alfred Einstein ; among instrumentalists, Emanuel Feuermann and Artur Schnabel. Lastly, those who were driven-out, persecuted and murdered in Auschwitz and other camps were those who sought to save themselves by going, so to speak, in the wrong direction. Among the composers might be mentioned : Pavel Haas, Gideon Klein, Hans Krása, Erwin Schulhoff, and Viktor Ullmann. These are only a few names, only the best-known. Of the countless violinists and clarinetists of Jewish extraction to be driven-out of German and, after 1938, Austrian Orchestras, often only names, not even individual fates, are known. In a short period, in 1938, following the « Anschluß » , the Vienna Philharmonic lost 21 members. The case of the violinist Alma Rosé has attained a melancholy fame, in particular because she was the niece of Gustav Mahler. She was a highly-gifted violinist who founded a successful women's Orchestra for entertainment music. Though her family emigrated to London, she herself continued to travel on tour. She was arrested in France, in 1942, and deported to Auschwitz-Birkenau, in 1943, where she conducted the camp Orchestra until she died of an illness in the camp, in 1944.

Another example is Viktor Ullmann. Only these individual biographies allow something approaching an understanding of the terrorist quality of the intrusions into the lives of the individuals who, taken together, made-up the immense mass of millions of the persecuted and ultimately the murdered.

The Case of Viktor Ullmann

Viktor Ullmann was born in Teschen, in 1898, the son of Jewish parents who had converted to Catholicism. (In the age of racial anti-Semitism, conversions to Christianity no longer offered protection from discrimination and persecution) . Ullmann studied composition in Vienna, under Arnold Schönberg, among others. In 1919, he went to Prague, where he worked as choir director and « répétiteur » at the « Deutsches Theater » , the musical director of which was Alexander von Zemlinsky. From Prague, Ullmann went, in the late- 1920's, to Aussig as Opera director, then to Zürich, where he conducted music at the « Schauspielhaus » and achieved success with his 1st compositions. His acquaintanceship with the anthroposophy of Rudolf Steiner changed his life. He became head of a specialist book-shop in Stuttgart, then left National-Socialist Germany quite early, in 1933, and returned to Prague, where with difficulty he started-over and began composing again. Slowly, the new successes came, and Ullmann was on his way to becoming known as a composer of the avant-garde when the Germans marched into Prague, in March of 1939. Ullmann, declared a Jew, was forbidden any public activity as a musician though this did not hinder him from continuing to compose. In September 1942, he was brought to the « Theresienstadt » concentration camp, which the National-Socialists, with unparalleled cynicism, used as a « model camp » . There, a rich cultural life among the prisoners was all but subsidized to create the illusion of normality, and it is no coincidence that 4 of the most important persecuted composers, all of Bohemian-Moravian extraction, lived in « Theresienstadt » , at the same time, and were able to work under the circumstances, as indeed the camp directors encouraged them to : Pavel Haas, Gideon Klein, Hans Krása and Viktor Ullmann. Also worthy of note is the Czech conductor Karel Ančerl, later world-famous, who would be among « Theresienstadt » 's few survivors.

« Theresienstadt » was not an extermination camp, and the living conditions were significantly better than those in other camps, though deceptively so nonetheless. Altogether unjustified was the illusion of many prisoners that they could survive there or that, here, they were somehow protected, for example owing to their intensive artistic involvement in the realm of music. How people could do creative work under the conditions is simply inexplicable. Viktor Ullmann, for example, wrote an entire Opera, « Der Kaiser von Atlantis » , which he finished at the end of 1943, and which has shown its expressive power in numerous performances since its rediscovery some years ago. Shortly after the Opera's completion, the inconceivable radicalization of the extermination measures carried-out in the second-to-last year of the War destroyed all illusions. The so-called « Artist Transport » of October 16, 1944, brought Haas, Klein, Krása and Ullmann to Auschwitz. Haas, Krása and Ullmann were sent to the gas chambers, in a matter of days. Gideon Klein, the youngest and strongest, had to do forced labor for a time, then was murdered during the evacuation of the camp, in January of 1945. 4 of the most important German composers of their generation thus fell victim to the genocide.

Richard Wagner's Fateful Role

Once more, our view must travel back, and our historical perspective must expand, to explain the basis on which musicians, not only (but in particular) Jewish, could be persecuted and deprived of their rights. In this, the insane National-Socialist terror was able, unfortunately, to base its claims on a star witness with a mighty reputation : Richard Wagner. Under a pseudonym, Wagner published the pamphlet « Das Judentum in der Musik » (Jewry in Music) in a

well-known music journal, in 1850. He published the same text again, 19 years later, this time as a brochure and under his own name which, by then, had become known throughout Europe. « Das Judentum in der Musik » is, and one cannot put it more mildly, a central document of 19th Century anti-Semitism, with significance far beyond the musical context. The work's central thesis is that Jews might be exceptionally clever interpreters in the field of music, but are incapable of original creative work, and thus worthless as composers. The Jewish influence on musical life in Europe is portrayed as ominous, and as something to be fought against. Felix Mendelssohn and Giacomo Meyerbeer are made particular examples of these theses. Wagner attacked the former, with whom he had been well acquainted, in relatively moderate fashion. But Meyerbeer, Wagner's competitor in the field of Opera, and from whom he had received personal support (of which he made no mention), Wagner attacked with the worst sort of rancor. The pamphlet and, in particular, the 2nd edition of 1869, created a tremendous sensation. The discussion went as far as England and the United States, and numerous translations were published.

From that moment on, nothing could get rid of the prejudice that Jewish composers were only clever eclecticists, assembling material stolen from various sources, spreading their works with the help of other Jews, and earning a great deal of money in the process. This suspicion was entertained not only by radical anti-Semites, but rather throughout broad circles of the educated European bourgeoisie, a group which grew increasingly receptive to anti-Jewish prejudices often hardly recognized as such by those affected in the closing years of the 19th Century. Giacomo Meyerbeer's Operas, once world-wide triumphs, had already begun to lose favor with the public in that period. By the beginning of the 1930's, the Operas were so seldom to be heard that no further defensive measures were necessary from the National-Socialist administrations.

Un art de la propagande

On comprend ainsi que la musique était devenue une arme formidable du régime nazi. Elle était à la fois outil et mécanisme de la propagande. Contrôlée par le docteur Josef Goebbels, la musique imprègne tous les secteurs de la vie publique à travers la radio, le cinéma, les actualités hebdomadaires. Avec la radio, dont la production industrielle de « récepteurs du peuple » (25% de foyers détenteurs en 1933 ; 65% en 1941), des messages politiques et autres programmes de divertissement, soigneusement choisis par la censure, permettaient une couverture efficace. Ce recours massif à la radio devait contribuer à mettre en pratique l'idée politique de communauté du peuple. Mais, bridés sur les ondes moyennes, ces appareils ne permettaient pas de capter les stations étrangères. Eugen Hadamovsky, directeur de la radio du « Reich », concrétise les objectifs idéologiques édictés, en 1934, par Hitler lui-même :

« Toute propagande doit être populaire et doit adapter son niveau intellectuel aux capacités réceptives des personnes les plus limitées parmi celles à laquelle elle pense s'adresser. Quand il s'agit de tenir bon en temps de guerre, on ne saurait jamais éviter avec assez de prudence des pré-supposés intellectuels élevés. La réceptivité des masses est petite, grande est leur capacité à oublier. »

On assiste donc à une véritable politisation de l'esthétique par une mécanique sordide d'embrigadement. Fin 1942, dans une période où le moral de la population allemande se détériore, le Ministère de la Propagande organise un concours de « Chansons optimistes ». Peu de temps auparavant, la chanteuse et comédienne Zarah Leander interprète

2 grands succès cinématographiques : « La habanera » et « Le grand amour » . Les chansons « Je sais qu'il arrivera un miracle un jour. » et « Ce n'est pas la fin du monde. » , issues de ce dernier film, furent des succès radiophoniques, étant compris comme un appel à tenir bon.

L'art est donc totalement réduit aux « desiderata » de l'idéologie officielle. On récupère, à cette fin même, la musique de jazz et la musique légère. Divertir et soutenir le moral en musique devient le mot d'ordre. Il faut une musique « facile, distrayante, séduisante, qui n'engage à rien et pendant laquelle ce n'est pas un sacrilège si quelqu'un raconte une blague ou si on tape le carton » , affirme Goebbels en 1941. Cette musique de divertissement n'est qu'en apparence apolitique puisqu'elle rend les auditeurs de fait plus réceptifs aux messages Nationaux-Socialistes. Le jazz a confronté le Ministère de l'Éducation du peuple et de la Propagande à un véritable dilemme.

Sur le plan idéologique, le jazz était mal considéré, et, cependant, il incarnait la jeunesse et la modernité. Pour pallier les interdictions frappant le jazz et les artistes juifs, le Ministère de la Propagande encouragea le développement de formations de musique légère allemande, composées de musiciens « aryens » . Fondé en 1934, l'ensemble « Sept en or » (« Die Goldene Sieben ») tend à faire oublier les « Comedian Harmonists » . Créé en 1928, ce formidable sextuor vocal est un fait musical social marquant de la République de Weimar. Malgré leurs interprétations « jazzifiantes » très en vogue, doublées d'un subtil humour littéraire, l'ensemble fut contraint de cesser ses activités en 1935 à la suite de la politique raciale des Nazis, 3 membres du groupe étant juifs. N'oublions pas que tout individu identifié comme juif avait par principe perdu le droit de vivre et devait donc fuir une situation où l'existence était menacée.

Il faut ajouter que, bien qu'officiellement proscrit depuis cette même année 1935 comme « musique nègre » , le jazz continua d'être joué et écouté dans les grandes villes, mais la danse dite « swing » fut proscrite. La répression était tellement forte que même écouter la « BBC » pendant la guerre pouvait mener en camp de concentration.

Les camps de concentration et la musique

Nombreux furent les juifs, et les musiciens de plus est, qui furent contraints de partir pour les camps de concentration, la politique nazie visant à l'extermination totale de ce peuple. Élimination, déportation, expulsion, fuite, accueil en terre d'asile étaient autant de persécutions endurées par les musiciens juifs sous le 3^e « Reich » . Toute profession en rapport avec la musique est fustigée : les pédagogues, les thérapeutes, les musicologues, les critiques musicaux, les rédacteurs de textes sur la musique, les éditeurs de musique et leurs employés, les directeurs de théâtre, les journalistes musicaux, les interprètes.

Étant exposés sans nuances aux projets de la « solution finale » des Nazis, vieillards et enfants, pauvres et riches, célèbres et anonymes, furent déportés dans des camps de concentration, des camps d'extermination. Lorsqu'ils étaient musiciens, ils devaient participer à l'orchestre du camp. À Auschwitz, un « bataillon musical d'Auschwitz » , appelé « Orchestre du camp de Birkenau » , se produisait au milieu de ce camp de la mort.

Le violoniste Henry Meyer, déporté à Auschwitz mais évadé, témoigne :

« N'oubliez pas que nous jouions sur fond de crématoires ! Il nous est même arrivé plusieurs fois de jouer à l'intérieur de l'un de ces fours où se consumait de la chair humaine ! Pourquoi fallait-il que là, en un lieu si terrible, on fasse de la musique ? Un orchestre qui joue des marches en enfer ? »

La claveciniste Zuzana Ruzickova, déportée au camp de concentration de « Terezin » et aux camps d'extermination d'« Auschwitz » et de « Bergen-Belsen », déclare en se remémorant sa libération en 1945 :

« À vrai dire, j'avais le sentiment que, sans la musique, ma vie était dépourvue de sens. »

Elle semble attribuer à la musique par la pratique de son instrument, une sorte de fonction thérapeutique qui lui permet d'oublier son atroce condition existentielle.

Quoi qu'il en soit, des familles entières de musiciens furent décimées par cette politique. L'exemple le plus connu est celui de l'une des familles de musiciens les plus importants du XIXe et du XXe siècle : la famille juive Rosenblum. À la fondation du quatuor, le violoniste Arnold Rosenblum et son frère Eduard, violoncelliste, changèrent leur nom pour « Rosé ». Le quatuor « Rosé », apparenté à Gustav Mahler, était très demandé à Vienne. Johannes Brahms lui confia, en 1890, la création de son 2e Quintette à cordes. Ils ont créé encore les 1ers et 2e Quatuors d'Arnold Schönberg ainsi que les 5 Mouvements, Opus 5, d'Anton von Webern. Malgré leurs compétences, tous les membres de cette famille « Rosé » furent victimes de la terreur nazie.

La musique faisait partie intégrante du système concentrationnaire nazi. Aujourd'hui encore, on a envie d'oublier cette politique d'extermination accompagnée de musique, d'autant que la musique, comme nous l'avons déjà expliqué avant, était considérée par les Nazis comme un art majeur purement allemand permettant l'épanouissement des individus. On a tendance à éluder le fait qu'elle ait pu accompagner la terreur et l'Holocauste. Les témoignages sur la musique dans les camps nous sont parvenus avec parcimonie, car les rescapés ne voulaient pas laisser penser que la présence de la musique pouvait atténuer leurs conditions de vie épouvantables. On constate que la plupart des œuvres musicales qui nous sont parvenues, furent écrites au camp de concentration de « Terezin ». C'est là que la créativité artistique et musicale des déportés a pu s'exprimer, tolérée et même encouragée par les Nazis. Mais qu'est-ce que cette forteresse de « Terezin » ?

L'histoire remonte à 1780, lorsque l'Empereur d'Autriche-Hongrie, Joseph II, sentit la nécessité de protéger son territoire par une place forte, pour prévenir une probable expansion germanique venant du nord. Il fonda une ville de garnison à proximité d'une forteresse et la baptisa « Theresienstadt », la « ville de Thérèse », du nom de sa mère, l'Impératrice Marie-Thérèse. La ville est située au confluent de l'Elbe et de l'Eger, et la chaîne montagneuse de Bohême centrale se profile en arrière-plan. Durant l'occupation nazie, « Terezin » devint l'un des plus terribles camps de concentration pour les détenus politiques, et un rouage important du projet de « solution finale du problème juif ».

En réalité, le camp de « Terezin » était une vitrine culturelle mise sur pied par le régime nazi pour détourner l'attention des pays voisins sur les atrocités qu'il perpétrait. En isolant les compositeurs dans la ville-forteresse, Adolf

Hitler faisait croire à une chance donnée à ce peuple, alors qu'il ne considérait ce camp que comme une anti-chambre des camps d'extermination de l'Est. Certes, les déportés ont pu ainsi créer en marge de leurs tâches officielles, tout en témoignant sous forme dissidente jusqu'au bout de leur force, au péril de nouvelles répressions, avant d'embarquer dans les convois de la mort. Parqués à « Terezin » où le pouvoir donnait l'apparence d'une existence décente, les juifs n'étaient que des marionnettes fantomatiques, prisonniers de la logique d'extermination dont la dernière station était « Auschwitz » .

Le héros de « l'Opéra de quat'sous » , l'acteur Kurt Gerron, arrêté à Amsterdam, fut placé comme « animateur des loisirs » de « Terezin » . On lui demande de réaliser un film de propagande, un documentaire intitulé : « Thierienstadt, ein dokumentarfilm aus dem jüdischen Siedlungsgebiet » , répandu après coup sous le titre : « Le “ Führer ” fait don d'une ville aux juifs » . Le documentaire flatte la grandeur et la générosité de Hitler bien sûr, cependant, avec la même logique implacable, le tournage achevé, le réalisateur est embarqué sans ambages dans un convoi de la mort. Il apparaît donc clairement que ce camp n'est qu'un leurre destiné aux visiteurs ou spectateurs extérieurs, voire aux diplomates.

...

Music has been essential to German culture and national identity for Centuries. For the Nazis, music was seen not only as a source of national pride but also a tool that could be used to reshape German society to reflect the racial and cultural ideology of the 3rd « Reich » . Shortly after taking power in 1933, Nazi officials sought to « coordinate » German music by establishing the « Reich » Chamber of Music to supervise all musical activities in Germany and encourage music that upheld « Aryan » values. Orchestras and conservatories were nationalized and subsidized by the State, while popular performers were recruited to serve as propaganda outlets for the « Reich » . Jewish musicians were stripped of their positions, and those who chose or were forced to remain in Germany formed the Jewish Culture Association (« Jüdischer Kulturbund ») to operate an orchestra, theater, and Opera company composed of Jewish performers. The Nazis also ascribed a racial element to music, denouncing popular music like jazz as well as modern, « avant-garde » orchestral compositions as corrupting influences on traditional German values. A 1938 exhibition in Düsseldorf entitled « Entartete Musik » condemned this so-called « degenerate » music and the artists who performed it.

In the ghettos and concentration camps, music was used as a form of spiritual and cultural resistance against the Nazis. Orchestras, choirs, and other musical groups were formed in many ghettos to give clandestine performances for fellow residents. The ghetto at Terezín (Theresienstadt in German) , which the Nazis used for propaganda purposes as a « model ghetto » , held many of the most prominent Jewish musicians and composers from across Europe, including Gideon Klein, Hans Krása, Pavel Haas, and Viktor Ullmann. Music composed and performed in Theresienstadt and other ghettos reflect the dire living conditions under the Nazis and longing for what was being destroyed. Several concentration camps, including Auschwitz, Sachsenhausen, and Buchenwald, had prisoner orchestras that were forced to give performances for SS officers and visiting dignitaries. For these performers, music became a form of « useful work » that could help guarantee survival.

Love and Loss, Set to Music, During the Holocaust

(« The New York Times » , 4 May 2016.)

Through the crackle of an old phonograph recording, the tenor's voice sounds musky and slightly metallic, but the German words ring out sharp and clear. The soprano's tone is warm, opulent and heady.

I am listening to the love duet from Act II of Richard Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » in a 1943 recording, with Max Lorenz and Paula Buchner as the doomed lovers. For me, it is a recording into my family's history. To a cold April Sunday in 1944 in the Buchenwald concentration camp. My grandfather, Hermann da Fonseca-Wollheim, a doctor and at the time a political prisoner, had recently been transferred there from a « Gestapo » prison in Hamburg, where he was interrogated about what authorities suspected were subversive views. 6 weeks later, he was dead of acute dysentery, one of more than 50,000 who perished there and one of the millions of victims commemorated on Yom Hashoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day.

My grandfather wrote a letter that day to his wife, Käthe, in which he tried to re-assure her that he was in good health, enjoying the fresh air (a reference, most likely to his work in the camp's quarries) and the « splendid » views of the Harz Mountains.

The letter, which is now in the possession of my uncle, is fascinating from a different angle. On the 70th anniversary of the end of the War in Europe last year, my husband, a political commentator for « The Wall Street Journal » , used it as a point of departure to interview my father (who turned 11 on V-E Day) about his War-time memories and to reflect the tensions facing 21st Century Europe.

(Photo) A letter written by Hermann da Fonseca-Wollheim to his wife, Käthe. He later perished in 1944 in the Buchenwald concentration camp, where he had been transferred from a « Gestapo » prison in Hamburg.

But what caught my attention, and set me on the search that brought me to the vintage recording of « Tristan » , was a single line in the letter. « Tonight, at 6, I will listen to the Furtwängler concert on the radio » , my grandfather wrote to my grandmother. « Why don't you, too, turn on the radio on Sundays, so we can think of each other fervently. »

What was the concert that was broadcast that day ? What music might have served as a bridge between a bunk in Block 59 and the bourgeois living-room of his family's Hamburg villa, where my grandmother now did her best to raise 2 young boys on her own amid frequent air-raids ?

I was moved by the notion of music as a kind of telepathic conduit between 2 lovers separated by fate. In some ways, it seemed so modern, similar to the late-night requests to radio stations for songs dedicated to faraway sweethearts. Today, in the age of streaming, on-demand listening, that sense of music as a public space, capable of sheltering secret trysts, seems to be vanishing.

I haven't been able to find-out whether the speaker system at Buchenwald, normally used for barking-out orders, really was given over to Classical music broadcasts every Sunday evening. The Buchenwald survivor and author Jorge Semprún, who wrote a memoir of his time in the camp, mentions the concert broadcasts but suggests that they were subject to the whims of the guards.

As for the program, I received answers from Jörg Wyrchow, an archivist at the German Broadcasting Archive in Frankfurt. What my grandfather referred to as the « Furtwängler Concert » was, in fact, a weekly Classical music hour featuring an array of ensembles and conductors that was broadcast, at Josef Goebbels's behest, beginning in 1944. Each one opened with a « Fanfare » from the 1st movement of Bruckner's 3rd Symphony, signaling, in the words of one radio host at the time, « the fighting spirit of the German people and its attachment to the indelible musical Masterworks of its culture » .

A glance at the program for Spring 1944 shows that these « indelible » Masterworks included Operetta arias as well as Johann Sebastian Bach's « Saint-Matthew's Passion » , waltzes and that 2nd Act from « Tristan » , which aired the day of my grandfather's letter.

Did Käthe receive it in time for the following Sunday's broadcast of Bruckner's 4th, with its wistful opening horn solo ? If so, did it remind both of the pilgrimage they had made to Bruckner's grave in the Saint-Florian Monastery ?

My grandfather, who spent lavishly on books and music, owned a fine gramophone and a large collection of recordings. In the early years of their marriage, he and Käthe hosted listening parties for their friends at which guests seated themselves on a staircase while Hermann nimbly flipped records : One side could hold only about 8 minutes of music. They must have created a deep stock of shared musical memories in my grandparents.

Were Hermann and Käthe able to listen to the following weeks' broadcasts of music by Mozart, Händel and Strauß ? And if so, how did the joyous « Hallelujah » chorus from Händel's « Messiah » resonate with the starving and terrified inmates of Buchenwald ?

On April 17 of this year, my uncle and 2 of my cousins attended a re-dedication ceremony at the Buchenwald memorial, where a new permanent exhibition was unveiled. Among the individual stories singled-out for display is that of my grandfather. Apparently, the reason for his arrest (the word scrawled on his police file) was so unusual that it caught the eye of researchers. « Ausländerfreundlichkeit » was the verdict that would ultimately carry a death sentence : « friendliness to foreigners » .

As a doctor (whose Jewish grandfather made him, in the eyes of the Nazis, a « 2nd degree mongrel ») , he had treated Ukrainian forced labourers employed in a nearby factory, showing them great kindness and teaching himself Russian to better care for them. « One day, we'll all have to learn Russian. » , he was overheard saying - a dangerously defeatist statement and possibly, my grandmother speculated, the cause for his arrest. The « Gestapo » would also find a note one of the Ukrainian women had written for Hermann attesting to his kindness, to show in

event of a Red Army victory.

Among those acts of kindness : sliding open the doors that connected his medical studio to his living-room and playing Classical records for his Ukrainian patients, in the belief that, however temporarily, music could offer some solace.

« Lager » : l'organisation musicale dans les camps

Le chant était une obligation. Pour le détenu, chanter n'était pas un plaisir. Il fallait impérativement chanter dans le travail, dans tous les déplacements. Entonner des chants populaires apparemment anodins lors des interminables appels, lors de longues marches, chanter de grands airs d'Opéra par le détenu pendant que celui-ci même était fouetté voire battu à mort, sont des sévices instrumentalisés par les SS. La haine du détenu intensifiait ses brimades pernicieuses et sadiques. L'auteur Primo Levi écrit à propos de ces « chansons populaires chères aux cœurs allemands » :

« Elles sont gravées dans notre esprit et seront la dernière chose du " Lager " que nous oublierons ; car elles sont la voix du " Lager ", l'expression sensible de sa folie géométrique, de la détermination avec laquelle des hommes entreprirent de nous anéantir, de nous détruire en tant qu'hommes avant de nous faire mourir lentement. »

Pour les SS, la musique était non seulement un moyen de ridiculiser et de tourmenter les détenus, mais s'affirmait comme instrument de torture défiant l'entendement.

Les orchestres aussi durent accompagner, malgré leur souffrance, les rituels quotidiens du camp par des « chansonnettes gaies » ou de « joyeuses marches ». L'orchestre était contraint de jouer aussi lorsqu'un détenu était battu publiquement ou exécuté. On sait encore que des concours d'hymne de camps avaient été organisés par les Nazis. On retrouve ces hymnes officiels à « Lichtenburg », « Esterwegen », « Mauthausen-Gusen », « Buchenwald » .

De plus, peut-être grâce aux orchestres dans les camps, certains musiciens ont pu survivre à la déportation ou parfois échapper à l'Holocauste. Leurs aptitudes musicales les auraient sauvés. L'attrait primordial d'un orchestre de déportés était sans doute pour les SS la possibilité de l'exploiter pour leur propre agrément, à toute heure du jour et de la nuit, dans toute sorte de répertoire. Cette corvée d'esclave était susceptible d'augmenter les chances de survie des détenus. Leur situation au sein du camp leur offrait certes un toit, les exposait à des conditions de travail un peu moins inhumaines, même si la faim les tenaillait, l'hygiène manquait et que les menaces de mort pesaient malgré tout sur chacun.

Les camps d'extermination avaient leur orchestre : à « Treblinka », « Belzec », « Sobibor », « Auschwitz ». Esther Bejanaro, membre par intermittence de l'orchestre féminin d'« Auschwitz-Birkenau » raconte :

« Nous devons jouer quand les trains arrivaient et que les gens étaient immédiatement poussés dans la chambre à gaz. Les déportés nous saluaient joyeusement, pensant que là où il y a de la musique, on ne doit pas être si mal que ça. Cela faisait partie de la tactique des SS. »

L'orchestre féminin d' « Auschwitz-Birkenau » dont Alma Rosé était le chef d'orchestre montre bien que jouer dans l'orchestre ne suffit malheureusement pas pour rester vivant. Alma Rosé n'a d'ailleurs pas survécu à la déportation.

Les déportés ont entrepris de leur propre chef, malgré des conditions d'encadrement extrêmement restrictives, d'organiser des activités musicales. En dépit de la douloureuse réalité concentrationnaire, des ensembles de musique de chambre, des quatuors à cordes, des chorales, des formations de jazz voient le jour. À « Terezin, on a compté 4 orchestres de musique Classique légère ou populaire, un orchestre municipal. On y a représenté des Opéras du répertoire dans leur intégralité, donné d'innombrables concerts de solistes et de musique de chambre, rédigé des critiques musicales, établi un « studio de musiques nouvelles » , composé des œuvres, assisté à des premières, dispensé des cours et des conférences.

La vie artistique et musicale intense qui régna à « Terezin » témoigne de l'incroyable force de résistance de l'esprit humain. Chaque jour, le besoin de nourriture spirituelle se manifestait davantage chez les détenus alors que les Nazis pensaient : « Laissons-les se distraire, demain, ils ne seront plus de ce monde. » . Les musiciens ne manquaient pas une occasion d'apporter un peu de beauté, de distraction, et même de rire, aux détenus pour leur faire oublier un court instant leur terrible réalité.

Comment ces mêmes hommes, qui aspiraient à un art supérieur, symbole d'humanité, ont-ils pu paradoxalement exterminer leurs « alter ego » ? Comment pouvaient-ils être à la fois sensibles à la musique et insensibles aux crimes qu'ils commettaient ? En tout cas, la rencontre de l'art et la barbarie a causé un traumatisme dont nombre d'intellectuels ont refusé de vivre la réalité. Les suicides des écrivains Einstein, Tucholsky, Zweig signifiaient le refus de continuer à exister dans un monde dont les valeurs étaient anéanties à tout jamais. Il fallut pour d'autres subir la terreur jusqu'aux tréfonds de leur chair. Mais l'enfermement des juifs allemands dans une Alliance Culturelle, auto-administrée par les juifs et sous censure nazie n'était-il pas déjà un signe avant-coureur de la "solution finale" ?

Une production musicale de « Terezin »

L'Opéra pour enfants, « Brundibár » , exprime l'esprit de résistance et la foi inébranlable en la justice. Les origines de cet Opéra pour enfants remontent aux années qui précèdent le déclenchement de la guerre. « Brundibár » est un ouvrage du compositeur Hans Krása sur un livret d'Adolf Hoffmeister, écrit pour un concours prévu en 1938 et organisé par le ministère de l'Éducation et de la Culture de Tchécoslovaquie. Le concours n'eut jamais lieu en raison de l'évolution politique du pays. La partition originale ayant été perdue, seule subsistait au moment de l'occupation allemande, sa réduction pour piano. Le directeur de l'orphelinat juif Belgická Ulice : Rudolf Freudenfeld, mélomane passionné et chanteur amateur, encouragea les activités musicales de ses pupilles.

En 1941, l'Opéra de Krása, pas encore représenté, fut travaillé sous la direction de Rafael Schächter à Prague. Une telle activité était interdite par les Nazis et Schächter partit, en novembre 1941, avec le 1er convoi à destination de « Terezin » . Le fils de Rudi Freudenfeld dirigea avec succès la première en 1942-1943, avec des décors de František Zelenka dans la salle à manger de l'orphelinat, dans la plus grande discrétion. Fin juillet 1943, tous étaient déportés à

« Terezin » . C'est alors que des répétitions eurent lieu dans le grenier du bloc L-417. La première de « Brundibár » eut lieu en septembre 1943 dans les bâtiments « Magdebourg » . On donna 55 représentations à « Terezin » , mais avec une distribution parfois changeante du fait des perpétuels convois en partance pour « Auschwitz » . De plus, les mémoires des déportés demeurent parfois contradictoires sur l'accompagnement de cet Opéra : certains se souvenant d'un orchestre, d'autres d'un vieil harmonium. Dans tous les cas, Hans Krása avait écrit une nouvelle version orchestrée, composée sur mesure pour les virtuoses présents au ghetto.

L'orchestration nécessitait 13 instruments : 1 flûte, 1 clarinette, 1 trompette, 1 guitare, 1 accordéon, 1 piano, 1 percussion, 4 violons, 1 violoncelle et 1 contrebasse. Le chœur était constitué de 40 choristes. En réalité, il s'agissait d'une sorte d'Opéra contemporain de dimension réduite. Ce conte moral était l'attraction majeure de « Terezin » et, voir et entendre « Brundibár » , était symbole du statut social des déportés du camp. Dans cette représentation, les enfants jouent le rôle de l'avenir, des lendemains qui finiraient bien par chanter, tandis que l'argument lui-même avait pris peu à peu une tournure politique. Mais quel est l'argument ?

2 jeunes enfants, Pepicek et Aninka, se font du souci pour leur mère malade. Le docteur ayant prescrit à la malade de boire du lait, les enfants se mettent en quête de l'argent nécessaire. Ayant remarqué un vieil homme du nom de « Brundibár » et joueur d'orgue de Barbarie, ils commencent à chanter, au grand dam des passants et de « Brundibár » qui les chasse. 3 animaux, le Chien, le Chat et la Fauvette, leur viennent en aide. Avec le concours des enfants du quartier, ils chantent tous les 5 une charmante berceuse et les gens leur donnent un peu d'argent. Profitant d'un moment d'inattention, le vieux musicien mendiant les vole. Tous les enfants et les animaux le chassent et récupèrent l'argent.

L'Opéra s'achève sur un chant victorieux général, célébrant la déconfiture de l'organiste malfaisant. Bien entendu, le misérable « Brundibár » personnifiait le mal. Lorsque les enfants entamaient le chœur final, « Brundibár est vaincu, nous l'avons eu » , aucun doute ne se manifestait dans l'esprit du public : les enfants parlaient bel et bien d'Adolf Hitler. Quoiqu'il en soit, à la fin du mois de septembre 1944, Hans Krása, qui avait été déporté depuis avril 1942 et pourtant membre de l'Administration des loisirs du ghetto, n'était plus d'aucune utilité à « Terezin » . Aussi fut-il gazé en octobre 1944 au camp d' « Auschwitz » .

Musique dans les ghettos et les camps

Ghetto songs served 3 major purposes : documentation of ghetto life, a diversion from reality, and the upholding of tradition. The ghetto songs reveal the capacity for suffering and the elemental will to survive and the urge to create, to sing and even to laugh. The ghetto had its street singers, its coffee and teahouses. It had its beggars and madmen. One popular tune which was supposedly started by a beggar said :

« Me hot zey in dr'erd, me vet zey iberlebn, me vet noch derlebn. » (To hell with them, we will survive them, we will yet survive.)

Laughter became a necessity and a channel for the hatred of the enemy ; it became the catalyst for expressions of

anger and bitterness when the means of struggle were still not clearly defined. In Alina Kentof's play, « Doctor Yanush Korczak » , the opening scene depicts the children of an orphanage in the Warsaw ghetto, preparing for a concert. One child cries :

« I cannot sing. I'm so hungry. »

Mrs. Stepha, the caretaker, replies :

« We all are ! That is why we must sing. »

Either a single person or small group of people performed ghetto songs, with accompaniment consisting of a single chord-playing instrument, a small band, or an orchestra.

Street Songs

Street songs, a sub-genre of ghetto music, emphasized 4 dominant themes : hunger, corrupt administration, hope for freedom, and a call for revolt. A majority of ghetto street songs were sung to pre-existing melodies, a technique known as « contra fact » . « Contra fact » became necessary because composers couldn't generate new music fast enough for all of the lyrics being written.

Domestic Songs

In traditional Jewish homes, music has always been a part of the family, a religious rite of the Sabbath, and a fundamental element of holiday tradition. Some traditional occasions in which music plays a central part include the Passover and « Yom Kippur » (the Day of Atonement) . Jewish families gather for a Festive meal and sing songs and prayers from the « Hagaddah » , on Passover. For « Yom Kippur » , Jews chant the « Kol Nidre » , a mournful prayer song that asks God's forgiveness.

Domestic songs tended to be more expressive and explicit in their lyrics than street songs. They expressed themes of hopelessness and helplessness, death and revenge.

Resistance Fighter or Partisan Songs

Of all the songs of all the ghettos, the one which spread like wildfire, was the « Song of the Partisans » by Hirsh Glik : « Zog nit keynmol az du geyst dem letstn vet » (Never Say that You Are Trodding the Final Path) . It used a tune by the Soviet brothers Pokras, and it became the official resistance hymn of all the Eastern European partisan brigades. It was translated into Hebrew, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Romanian, Dutch, and English. It was well-known in all the concentration camps.

Songs of the Camps

At each of the 5 extermination camps, the Nazis created Orchestras of prisoner-musicians, forcing them to play while their fellow prisoners marched to the gas chambers. The suicide rate among musicians was higher than that of most other camp workers except the death details. Many musicians had been forced to watch helplessly as their friends and families were destroyed. Auschwitz had 6 Orchestras, 1 of which contained from 100 to 120 musicians.

Fania Fenelon, describes her experience as a member of a women's Orchestra in Auschwitz, from January 1944 to liberation, in her book, « Playing for Time ». Fenelon states that even though she had clean clothes and daily showers, she had to play « gay, light music and marching music for hours on end while our eyes witnessed the marching of thousands of people to the gas chambers and ovens » .

Anita Lasker-Walfisch was able to survive Auschwitz by playing in the women's Orchestra.

« Terezín »

« Terezín » (« Theresienstadt ») was a concentration camp located in Czechoslovakia that was created by Adolf Hitler as a « model camp » to mislead the world about conditions within the camps and ghettos. Many prominent Jewish artists and musicians were sent here. Because of the large number of musicians and performers, the cultural life at « Terezín » was very rich. This richness was used by the Germans to convince outsiders that the Nazis were treating the Jews very well, and that the concentration camps were really resettlement areas. Hitler deemed it best not to exterminate prominent Jewish people until he had conquered all of the « lost » German lands. Conditions were no better than at most of the other camps. For most of the prisoners, « Terezín » was just a transit camp on the way to Auschwitz.

The « Terezín » Chamber Music Foundation is a non-profit organization dedicated to assuring the permanence of the music written by composers who perished in the Holocaust.

« Against All Odds » was composed at « Terezín » , by Alex Ross.

One especially tragic story comes-out of « Terezín » . The Opera of Children Going to the Gas, « Brundibar, the Organ Grinder » , was performed for camp inmates. Seizing an opportunity for a massive propaganda campaign, the Germans also had the Opera moved to a nearby theatre and performed for the International Red Cross. The Red Cross workers were impressed and, shortly thereafter, the camp commander ordered the entire cast and crew to the gas chambers.

The most famous Opera to be written at « Terezín » is probably « The Emperor of Atlantis » , by Viktor Ullman. The Opera is based on the horrors of the concentration camps. The « Emperor » is Hitler, the « Loudspeaker » and « Drummer-girl » cast as Gœbbels and Göring. The soldier and young girl are human pawns in the chaos that is War. In its original version, the « Emperor » had a cast of 7 singers : The « Emperor » , « Death » , the « Harlequin » , the young girl, the « Drummer-girl » , the soldier, and the « Loudspeaker » . It is orchestrated for a small chamber orchestra : 3 woodwinds, 1 String Quartet, 1 trumpet, 1 saxophone, 1 alto, 1 banjo, 1 keyboard player, and some

percussion instruments. The libretto is the symbolic story of « Emperor Overall » who cannot rule chaos on earth any longer because « Death » has decided to go on strike. His strike is caused by his unwillingness to cope anymore with war and famine. « Death » has decided to take the side of the unfortunate humans, and will accept the natural order of things as soon as the « Emperor » agrees to accept his own death. This Opera was never performed until after the War.

Important People

Kasriel Broydo was an author and director of theatre revues and concerts in the Vilno ghetto. He was arrested by the « Gestapo » and deported to a Latvian concentration camp. He was drowned by the Germans in the Baltic Sea, in 1945.

Rudi Freudenfel was the director of the children's Opera « Brundibar, the Organ Grinder » .

Mordecai Gebirtig was born in 1877, in Kraków. He worked all his life as a carpenter in Kraków, and became one of the most popular « folk balladeers » , in Poland. He was deported to the Kraków Ghetto under the German occupation and was killed there, in 1942. His poem, « Our Town Is Burning » , written in 1938, became one of the most popular songs in the ghettos and concentration camps.

Mordecai Gebirtig, Yiddish folk poet, was killed in the Kraków ghetto.

Hirsh Glick was born in 1920, in Vilna. When the ghetto was liquidated, he was sent to a concentration camp, in Estonia. He escaped from the camp and joined the partisans, and died while fighting as a partisan. His partisan song, « Zog Nit Kainmol » (Song of the Partisans) , became the hymn of the underground organization.

Pavel Haas was born in Brno, in 1899. Haas belonged to a group of Czech avant-garde composers. After the German occupation, he spent 3 years in « Theresienstadt » . He died in Auschwitz on October 17, 1944.

Peysakh Kaplan was a writer, composer and music-critic. He wrote the words to a song commemorating the death of 5,000 Jews who were shot to death on the Sabbath of July 12, 1942. The women whose husbands were killed that day were called « shabesdike » , or the Sabbath Ones. He died in the Bialystok ghetto, in 1943.

Hans Krása was a prisoner of the « Terezín » ghetto. He wrote the children's Opera « Brundibar, the Organ Grinder » before the War, in 1938. It was used in the Nazi propaganda film, « The “ Führer ” gives the Jews a City » , filmed in « Terezín » , in 1944. It was performed in Israel, in 1988.

Shmerke Kaczerginski was a poet and ghetto partisan fighter of the Vilna ghetto. He collected and preserved many of the ghetto songs, which have survived today.

Gideon Klein was a composer who was a prisoner of the « Terezín » ghetto.

Aleksander Kulisiewicz was born in Kraków, in 1918. He aspired to become a musician, but ended as a prisoner of the « Sachsenhausen » concentration camp. Even while in the camp, he continued to collect, compose, and perform songs illegally. When an informant told the « Gestapo », they injected him 3 different times with diphtheria. Each time, fellow prisoners managed to smuggle in the antidote. Though his voice was damaged from the repeated dosages of the disease, his collected songs were recorded to preserve the memory of people who were joined together by having been victims of the Nazi camp.

Olivier Messiaen wrote « Quartet for the End of Time », a 49 minute instrumental for the piano, clarinet, violin, and violoncello. These instruments are an unusual combination, chosen because they were the only ones available in the Silesian internment camp where Olivier was a prisoner of War. The French composer wrote :

« Never had I been listened to with such attention and understanding. »

Leyb Rozental wrote a number of plays and several songs in the ghettos. He was drowned by the Germans in the Baltic Sea, near Königsburg, in January 1945.

Martin Rosenberg was a professional conductor before the War. He was arrested, in 1939, and sent to the « Sachsenhausen » concentration camp where he was tortured. While at the camp, he organized a secret chorus of Jewish prisoners. They would perform for other prisoners in some of the less guarded barracks for political prisoners. Rosenberg and the chorus were deported to Auschwitz, in 1942, where they all died in the gas chambers. Before he died, Rosenberg wrote a parody of an old Yiddish folk song called, « Tsen Brider » (10 Brothers) . In the parody, all 10 brothers are murdered in the gas chambers, one by one.

Ervin Schulhoff came from a Prague German-Jewish family. After serving in World War I, Schulhoff spent 4 years in Germany where he was influenced by the « Dada » movement. His jazz music was an attempt to distance himself from « bourgeois » tastes. Schulhoff was arrested and died of tuberculosis after about a 1 year imprisonment in the Wulzburg camp.

Hannah Sennesh was a Hungarian partisan who was captured and executed by the Nazis, in Budapest. She wrote the famous poem, « Eli, Eli », which was later turned into music. Her poem states :

« May these things never cease : the sand and the sea, the sound of the water, the thunder in heaven, the prayer of Man. »

Viktor Ullman was deported to the « Terezín » ghetto on September 8, 1942. While there, he composed 22 works, as well as a libretto for an Opera about Joan of Arc. His most famous piece was the Opera, « Der Kaiser von Atlantis oder Der Tod dankt ab » (The Emperor of Atlantis, or Death Abdicated) . Just before its premiere, most of the musicians of the ghetto were deported to Auschwitz. He was deported to Auschwitz and murdered in October of 1944. Several years after the War, the Opera was finally performed.

Ela Stein Weissberger was a child who sang in performances of « Brundibar » - and lived to tell the story :

« When we sang, we forgot hunger, we forgot where we were. When we were on the stage, we forgot everything. And when we sang the victory song at the end, we imagined that we overcame Hitler. There was such power in this music. »

Musique dans le camp de Dachau

On 20 March 1933, just weeks after Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, Heinrich Himmler announced in the national press :

« On Wednesday 22 March 1933, the 1st concentration camp will be opened in the vicinity of Dachau. It can accommodate 5,000 people. Here, will be gathered together the entire Communist and, as much as necessary, the (Left-wing) “ Reichsbanner ” and Social-Democratic Party functionaries who threaten the security of the State since, in the long term, it is impossible and draining for the State to house them in government prisons. It has become clear that it is not viable to leave these people free, as they continue to make trouble and disturb the peace. We have adopted this measure, undeterred by paltry scruples, in the conviction that our action will help to restore calm to our country and is in the best interests of our people. »

Thus, was announced the formation of one of the most infamous concentration camps on German soil, one that was to hold the dubious distinction of being the longest running camp under Nazi authority, functioning for the duration of the Nazi reign from 1933 to 1945.

Established only 11 miles northwest of the Bavarian city of Munich, the town of Dachau had been famous since the late-19th Century as a cultural centre and an artists' colony. With the outbreak of World War I, in 1914, a gun-powder factory was built on the outskirts of the town ; it was shut-down after the War. The abandoned factory housed the main-camp, though it was expanded and modified frequently throughout the 12 years of its operation. From the outset, Nazi leaders assigned to Dachau the role of primary training centre for SS concentration camp staff. The camp's organisation and routine were intended to serve as the model for all Nazi concentration camps.

Those interned in the camp in the pre-War years for « re-education » in « protective custody » (« Schutzhaft ») were mainly members of anti-Nazi organisations, religious groups and resistance movements, or outspoken individuals. The 1st Jewish prisoners were sent there on account of their political affiliations, not their religion or « race » . However, after « Kristallnacht » and the annexation of Austria, thousands of Jews were sent there. With the influx of different categories of inmates, particularly after the outbreak of War, political prisoners continued to dominate, and they held the key-positions in the internal prisoner hierarchy throughout the camp's 12 existence. The prominence of political prisoners in the hierarchy had important implications for leisure activities in Dachau. Political prisoners were more likely to maintain an active opposition to the regime during their imprisonment, and their relative power in the hierarchy meant that they could organise events amongst themselves and assist other prisoners in arranging their own

clandestine gatherings.

The nature of daily life in Dachau changed markedly over the years, according to the demands of the Central Administration for Camps, the seasons and the whims of camp commanders and personnel. Free time in Dachau was always limited, but there were periods of relaxation. For example, games were permitted during the short rest periods, up to 1938. From 1941, permission was once again granted for cultural activities and amusements : theatrical entertainments, concerts, revues and lectures were arranged, and a substantial library was built-up. As the « Reich » suffered military set-backs in 1943, it relied increasingly on slave labour, and conditions in the camps were subsequently slightly improved with a view to increasing output : supplementary food was provided, parcels could be received by certain categories of prisoners and a few sporting and cultural activities were authorized. Conditions worsened rapidly in the autumn of 1944 with the imminence of German defeat. Apart from these periods of shifting levels of tolerance displayed by the authorities, Dachau inmates also engaged in clandestine music-making throughout the camp's existence.

As the War progressed, Dachau's population became remarkably diverse. Until 1938, it was made-up almost exclusively of Germans, and later of Austrians, but the camp gradually acquired more prisoners as the Nazi net widened across Europe. Communists and Social-Democrats were joined by Jehovah's Witnesses, Roma and Sinti, and homosexuals of various nationalities. Dachau also incarcerated the largest group of clergymen of any camp : almost 3,000, most of whom were Poles. Thousands of Jewish prisoners were interned after « Kristallnacht » , in November 1938, although many were released soon after - at this time, the Nazi authorities encouraged mass Jewish emigration as the solution to Germany's « Jewish Question » . Especially during the later War years, the social composition of Dachau (political, religious, and international) fed the diversity of the camp's musical life.

A wide-range of musical activities took place in Dachau, both forced and voluntary. Testimonies include descriptions of orchestral concerts, cabaret performances, communal singing, choirs, church music and forced singing. There were also, of course, inmates who did not encounter cultural activities at all. One prisoner remembered that :

« Camp music belonged to the tradition of the KZ Dachau. It was a part of every deception put on by the commission, the inspections and the delegations. When some high-level visitor gave the camp the honour of a visit, because he had nothing better to do at the time, and was feeling a little loosened-up by a meal and visit, the band stood upright in front of the canteen block and played cheerful marches, smiled upon with good will. Or, it was a string orchestra, playing Sunday afternoons in the bathroom for the other comrades. »

As was the case in other Nazi camps, forced singing was a regular part of the daily marches and roll-call. Former inmates like Karl Röder recounted having to sing uninterruptedly after returning to the camp from the day's heavy labour :

« I don't know how many hours I sang for in the camp. It must have been thousands. We sang when we went-out to work, and sang when we came-back to the camp. We sang for hours on the roll-call square, in order to drown-out the screams of the ill-treated, but we also sang when the camp commander felt like having us sing. They set great store

on rhythm. We had to sing in a brisk military manner, and above all loudly. After hours of singing, we could often no longer produce a sound. They knew that we saw this singing as punishment, and for that reason they always had us sing at military drills. »

The camp authorities often demanded that the prisoners sing German marches and nostalgic songs. Other inmates described the torture of Dachau's « Moor Express » : while pulling heavy lorries like cattle (attached to the vehicle by ropes and beams) , they were forced to sing in order to « keep the SS amused » . Escaped prisoners who had been caught were forced to march through the camp holding the sign « I'm here again » , while being followed by a small orchestra. Karl Röder remembered :

« Every one of these songs we sang so constantly, it was always the same. I never could manage to simply sing them mechanically. Hate and anger always choked me, and I felt like I was suffocating. I would have preferred physical abuse. »

Private concerts for SS officers were also reasonably common. Prisoners would be asked or forced to provide entertainment at events ranging from birthday parties to quiet dinners. They would generally be remunerated for their work with extra-food or cigarettes, which were valuable bartering items, but many were nonetheless disturbed by such experiences.

Dachau's use of music as a form of torture had another, more unusual aspect as well. Of all the camps under Nazi rule, it was Dachau that made the most extensive use of radio to indoctrinate and explicitly to torture prisoners. The camp commander blasted Nazi radio through loudspeakers, at night and during meals. Inmates were, thus, forced to listen to Adolf Hitler's speeches, news of the « inevitable victory » of the German army, and to songs that mocked prisoners' political, religious, and communal value systems. Radio was often played while prisoners were being beaten, and « the music from the radio speakers set-up in the camp mixed with the groans and screams of the tortured » .

In addition to these coerced musical activities, voluntary music-making was also wide-spread and varied in Dachau. Compared with camps such as Mauthausen and Auschwitz, Dachau afforded inmates a relatively large amount of flexibility in their daily activities. Musical performances not sanctioned by the authorities were ultimately secret and risky, but the situation was helped by the tolerance of influential political prisoners, and the willingness of some SS officers to accept bribes.

The distinction between voluntary and forced music-making was blurred when it came to the camp song, composed in 1938 by Herbert Zipper and Jura Soyfer. This song, as was frequently the case with official camp songs, lived a sort of double life. Loved by the Nazis for its martial quality and marching rhythm, prisoners also loved it for its message of resistance and perseverance. It was, thus, one of the few songs sung both by command of the SS and voluntarily by the inmates.

Informal singing made-up a great deal of the prisoner-organized music life in camp. There were also, however, secret choirs and musical groups, string quartets and orchestras and cabaret shows. Although it is doubtful whether a large

number of inmates was ever able to enjoy these shows, for those lucky enough to attend them they were clearly a powerful experience :

« In an incarceration without foreseeable end, whose sole purpose is the mental and physical destruction of thousands of human beings, the flight into unconsciousness becomes the greatest danger. Seen in this light, the performances were a valuable component of inner-resistance. »

Communal singing was one of the most popular and widely-practised activities amongst Dachau inmates. Political prisoners sang well-known German folk-songs, songs common to the international revolutionary movement, and camp songs common to political prisoners across the Nazi system such as the « Moorsoldatenlied » . In fact, in the early years of the camp, most records of musical activity by prisoners are of singing the songs of youth or radical movements. In the context of a camp like Dachau, national folk-songs proved especially important for creating and expressing prisoner solidarity, and for sharing memories of what had been lost or left behind. Often, it was at night in the barracks, after an exhausting day of forced labour, that the singing would take place, sometimes lasting for several hours. As one survivor recalled :

« Somebody raised himself ; then quietly, then a little louder, a church hymn rang-out. The singer (a cantor from a large church in Poland) had an excellent lyrical tenor voice. Attentively, we listened. After this church song came some Yiddish ones, these being more solemn, even tragic. After a half hour, or an hour, it became quiet. The singer was silent. The block elder spoke again, but this time sounding quieter and more human ; “ Who else wants to sing ? ” The new voice sounded sharper, stronger. It sang “ Valentine’s Prayer ”. “ An Opera singer from Prague ”, someone whispered near me. After a passage from “ Faust ” came other Opera arias. The last song, “ my little city Beltz ” was choked-off in sobs. The singer wept, and also the block elder. They wept for their destroyed homes and their murdered relatives : “ a happy song ” demanded the block elder. The singer from Prague was quiet. An entertainer from the 7 mountains region stood-up. He began to sing a hit song, stopped almost immediately, however. Instead, he sang again the song of home, of the city Beltz, and then he also grew quiet. It became still. »

In addition to such pre-existing repertoire, many prisoner groups composed new songs. As was typical for concentration camps, most songs composed there were topical, telling about the suffering of daily life, or communicating practical information or advice. Many of the songs were based on existing melodies ; the composers of the remaining melodies remain for the most part unknown. Along with informal group singing, there was also a variety of choirs, both officially sanctioned and clandestine.

As previously mentioned, one of the things that set Dachau apart from other camps was its large and well-established population of priests. Their contribution to camp cultural life was primarily in the form of choral music. The Polish choir was particularly active on Christmas entertainments : they sang « Koledy » (Carols) and music from « Szopki » (Nativity plays) . German and Austrian priests organized regular services that quickly developed into a special form of block performance revolving around the chorus.

In May 1938, Herbert Zipper put together a small orchestra that held secret concerts for prisoners, performing at night

or on Sundays for small groups of inmates. Basing his research on the testimonies of former Czech prisoners, historian Milan Kuna documents the existence of 3 instrumental ensembles in the camp during the War years : an officially-sanctioned orchestra, established in 1941 and made-up primarily of Czech musicians ; a separate wind-band, equipped with uniforms, set-up in September 1941 from the ranks of the main orchestra, playing primarily marches for the prisoners leaving and returning to camp for work ; and a 3rd orchestra led by a prisoner called Von Hurk. This orchestra included several professional musicians in its ranks, and played a variety of Classical pieces, including prohibited non-Aryan composers. The composition and functions of Dachau's orchestras were much the same as those of ensembles in other camps. Musicians made use of the combination of instruments available in the camp or those they were allowed to receive from home, and generally wrote their own scores and arrangements. They had the privilege of receiving additional bread rations for their playing and worked almost exclusively inside the camp. Performances were mostly for the SS or important visitors ; repertoire consisted mainly of German marches and popular melodies. Although many prisoners did not have access to the orchestra's concerts, efforts were made to put on clandestine performances exclusively for inmates.

Satirical cabaret performances became a regular feature of Dachau life in 1938 with the arrival of the 1st Viennese victims of the « Anschluss » . Well-known artists including Hermann Leopoldi, Fritz Grünbaum, Paul Morgan, and Fritz Löhner-Beda gave regular Sunday concerts, which were popular and well-attended. This is how former inmate Bruno Heilig described their performances :

« Every Sunday, a cabaret performance was given by the artists in the camp, Fritz Grünbaum, Paul Morgan, Hermann Leopoldi, and the Berlin singer Kurt Fuß. At 1st, the idea of starting a cabaret in a concentration camp seemed to us absurd ; but it proved a success. Crowds of prisoners attended the performances. Grünbaum and Morgan gave their old sketches, which were uproariously applauded by their comrades. Leopoldi made a great hit with Viennese lieder. Kurt Fuß sang sophisticated ballads about women and love.“ From early youth the cunning band has had me on the string ” - this song had not been absolutely the latest thing even when I was still a school boy but, in a concentration camp, it is of no importance to hear only the latest popular favourites. These cabaret matinees gave us the illusion of a scrap of freedom. For 1 hour or 2, one almost had a sense of being at home. »

Most of the cabaret musicians were transported to Buchenwald in late-1938, where they also organized performances.

Dachau was liberated by American troops on 29 April 1945.

L'influence de Wagner sur Hitler et sur l'Holocauste

« Hitler as Lohengrin » (a captured German painting by the U.S. Army) .

« I have an enormous desire to commit artistic terrorism. » (Richard Wagner)

« With the exception of Richard Wagner, I have no forerunner. » (Adolf Hitler)

« Whoever wants to understand National-Socialist Germany must first know Wagner. » (Adolf Hitler)

There is probably no other composer in history who had a greater impact on world events than did Richard Wagner, and his devastating political legacy is 2nd only to Adolf Hitler. The fact that racism was common in Germany, Austria, and other European countries has been used as an excuse for Wagner (and even for Hitler) . But Wagner was not just a musician. He was a national hero and powerful political force to be reckoned with. Writers, philosophers, and politicians testified to his profound influence. His idolatry by King Ludwig II of Bavaria was an example of Wagner's political influence, an influence that was felt throughout Germany. (Among other things, Ludwig helped finance the Bayreuth « Festspielhaus » , which was designed specifically by Wagner for the performance of his Operas.)

The circle closes here that Wagner had already begun to forge, in 1850 : the idea of the Festival was realized as the Bayreuth Festival, which was very soon to have a propaganda effect all over Germany. Added to this, were Wagner Societies springing-up everywhere, that appeared in the German-nationalistic « Bayreuther Blätter » . From the beginning of the Festival, then, anti-Semitism and racism were among the ingredients of the Bayreuth Opera undertaking, whether implicit or explicit. Wagner's anti-Semitism was closely connected to this.

Wagner and Adolf Hitler had so much in common, that it is difficult, at times, to keep them separate. They were both rabid racists. Both were artists and politicians (Wagner, a would be politician ; and Hitler a would be artist) . Both feared they had Jewish paternity, which led to fierce denial and destructive hatred.

The following are other beliefs that Richard Wagner and Adolf Hitler shared :

Race is based on appearance, language, nationality, and « blood » (genetics) .

An « Aryan » white race is the foundation of racial purity, beauty, and goodness.

Germans (the « Volk ») are destined by an urgent need (« Noth ») to rule the world.

All other « races » are inferior.

Friedrich Nietzsche's « Will to Power » and social Darwinism are axiomatic.

A struggle (« Kampf ») for racial survival is inevitable (hence, « Mein Kampf ») .

Conscience (guilt) is an evil Jewish invention and must be purged.

Jews and other foreigners were contaminating German blood.

Jesus was not a Jew.

Jews have no religion.

Jews lust after money and power.

Jews are physically repulsive.

Jews are parasites.

Jews are demons and must be expelled or destroyed.

Wagnerian Art would save the world.

Condemnation of composers Giacomo Meyerbeer and Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and non-German art in general.

Theoretical tracts by philosophers would corroborate their bigotry.

Believed the world owed them a living.

Believed they were infallible.

Extreme egocentrism.

As a young man, Adolf Hitler fancied himself as a composer and artist, modeling himself after his idol, Richard Wagner. He attended Wagner Opera productions obsessively and boasted that he had read everything that the Master wrote. In 1904 or 1905, while attending the Linz Opera Theatre, he met a young Czech musician named August Kubizek, who later published « Adolf Hitler, Mein Jungenfreund » (« The Young Hitler I Knew » , 1953) . It presents one of the few portraits of Hitler's formative years, and much of it has since been documented. This book reveals how Wagner became a model for Hitler's ideas.

The young Hitler was aspiring to be an artist and managed a meager subsistence by painting postcards. Kubizek had attended the Linz School of Music, and so was a training musician. The 2 became inseparable during these early years, and shared their enthusiasm for Wagner's works. They experienced and discussed many musical productions that occurred locally. While Kubizek had broader musical interests, Hitler insisted on the superiority of Wagner's music. Hitler obsessed about attending every possible Wagner production, no matter how poor.

Then one day, the pair went to see a performance of Wagner's Opera « Rienzi » (probably, 1905-1906) . This became a decisive event for the teenaged Hitler, as he was to refer to it after he came to power. It is worth quoting Kubizek's entire account of this extraordinary event :

« It was the most impressive hour I ever lived through with my friend. So unforgettable is it, that even the most

trivial things, the clothes Adolf wore that evening, the weather, are still present in my mind as though the experience were exempt from the passing of time. »

« Adolf stood outside my house in his black overcoat, his dark hat pulled down over his face. It was a cold, unpleasant November evening. He waved to me impatiently. I was just cleaning myself up from the work-shop and getting ready to go to the Theatre. “ Rienzi ” was being given that night. We had never seen this Wagner Opera and looked forward to it with great excitement. In order to secure the pillars in the Promenade, we had to be early. Adolf whistled, to hurry me up. »

« Now, we were in the Theatre, burning with enthusiasm, and living breathlessly through “ Rienzi ” 's rise to be the Tribune of the people of Rome and his subsequent downfall. When, at last, it was over, it was past midnight. My friend, his hands thrust into his coat pockets, silent and withdrawn, strode through the streets and out of the city. Usually, after an artistic experience that had moved him, he would start talking straight away, sharply criticising the performance, but, after “ Rienzi ”, he remained quiet a long while. This surprised me, and I asked him what he thought of it. He threw me a strange, almost hostile glance. “ Shut up ! ”, he said brusquely. »

« The cold, damp mist lay oppressively over the narrow streets. Our solitary steps resounded on the pavement. Adolf took the road that led-up to the Freinberg. Without speaking a word, he strode forward. He looked almost sinister, and paler than ever. His turned-up coat collar increased this impression. »

« I wanted to ask him : “ Where are you going ? ”. But his pallid face looked so forbidding that I suppressed the question. »

« As if propelled by an invisible force, Adolf climbed-up to the top of the Freinberg. And only now, did I realise that we were no longer in solitude and darkness, for the stars shone brilliantly above us. »

« Adolf stood in front of me ; and now, he gripped both my hands and held them tight. He had never made such a gesture before. I felt from the grasp of his hands how deeply moved he was. His eyes were feverish with excitement. The words did not come smoothly from his mouth as they usually did, but rather erupted, hoarse and raucous. From his voice, I could tell even more how much this experience had shaken him. »

« Gradually, his speech loosened, and the words flowed more freely. Never before and never again, have I heard Adolf Hitler speak as he did in that hour, as we stood there alone under the stars, as though we were the only creatures in the world. »

« I cannot repeat every word that my friend uttered. I was struck by something strange, which I had never noticed before, even when he had talked to me in moments of the greatest excitement. It was as if another being spoke-out of his body, and moved him as much as it did me. It wasn't at all a case of a speaker being carried away by his own words. On the contrary, I rather felt as though he himself listened with astonishment and emotion to what burst forth from him with elementary force. I will not attempt to interpret this phenomenon, but it was a state of complete

ecstasy and rapture, in which he transferred the character of “ Rienzi ”, without even mentioning him as a model or example, with visionary power to the plane of his own ambitions. But it was more than a cheap adaptation. Indeed, the impact of the Opera was rather a sheer external impulse which compelled him to speak. Like flood waters breaking their dykes, his words burst forth from him. He conjured-up in grandiose, inspiring pictures his own future and that of his people. »

« Hitherto, I had been convinced that my friend wanted to become an artist, a painter or, perhaps, an architect. Now, this was no longer the case. Now, he aspired to something higher, which I could not yet fully grasp. It rather surprised me, as I thought that the vocation of the artist was for him the highest, most desirable goal. But now, he was talking of a mandate which, one day, he would receive from the people, to lead them out of servitude to the heights of freedom. »

« It was an unknown youth who spoke to me, in that strange hour. He spoke of a special mission which one day would be entrusted to him, and I, his only listener, could hardly understand what he meant. Many years had to pass before I realized the significance of this enraptured hour for my friend. »

« His words were followed by silence. »

« We descended into the town. The clock struck 3. We parted in front of my house. Adolf shook hands with me, and I was astonished to see that he did not go in the direction of his home, but turned again towards the mountains. »

« “ Where are you going now ? ”, I asked him, surprised. He replied briefly : “ I want to be alone.” »

Hitler never forgot this decisive moment. In 1939, after he had become the German Chancellor, he visited Richard Wagner's daughter-in-law, Winifred Wagner, in Bayreuth. Upon recounting the event he exclaimed :

« It was in that hour that it all began. »

Thus, we hear from Hitler himself how influential Wagner and his music was on his later life and political ideals. The prelude to « Rienzi » was often used at Nazi rallies and prefaced Hitler's speeches.

Flanked by Wieland and Wolfgang Wagner, Hitler often visited Wagner's heirs at Villa Wahnfried (Wagner's home) , in Bayreuth, during his War years and rise to power. Bayreuth became a respite and Wagnerian shrine for him and other Nazi leaders. Wagner's family made a cult out of Hitler and considered him to be Germany's Savior. Hitler played with Wagner's grand-children, of whom Wieland and Wolfgang later headed the Bayreuth Festival, and told them stories of his adventures. When he visited on September 30, 1923, Wagner's 86 year old widow Cosima embraced and kissed him. At the same meeting, he was warmly welcomed by Wagner's son, Siegfried, his wife Winifred, and son-in-law, the racial theorist, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who called Hitler : « God's gift to Germany » . Chamberlain forms one of the living links between Richard Wagner and Adolf Hitler. He was friends with and revered them both. His racial theory of the destiny of superior Aryans to rule inferior races, as expressed in his book, « Foundations of the 19th Century »

(1899) , was embraced by both the composer, Cosima, and other Wagner heirs. Hitler found the approval of the Wagner family and Chamberlain to be a rally for his political goals. Chamberlain immediately wrote to Hitler :

« With one blow, you have transformed the state of my soul that Germany, in the hour of her greatest need, brings forth a Hitler that is proof of her vitality. »

Thus, Hitler was the « Messiah » that Wagner's legacy longed for. Wagner's son, Siegfried, and his wife Winifred, who ran Bayreuth during the Nazi era, were also anti-Semites and idolized Adolf Hitler. A special annex was built at Wahnfried for Hitler to welcome his visits. Winifred wrote :

« For years, we have been following with the greatest inner sympathy and approval the uplifting work of Adolf Hitler, this German man who, filled with ardent love for his fatherland, is sacrificing his life for his idea of a purified, united, national greater Germany, who has set himself the task of opening the eyes of the working-class to the enemy within. »

And Siegfried wrote :

« The times of the Spanish Inquisition have returned. Perjury and betrayal are sanctified, and Jew and Jesuit are working hand in glove to exterminate Germanness ! But, perhaps, Satan has miscalculated this time. Should the German cause really succumb, then I'll believe in Jehova, the God of revenge and hatred. My wife is fighting like a lioness for Hitler. Ist rate ! »

The young Hitler was so taken with Wagner and his music that, at one point (around 1907) , he decided to write a « Wagnerian » Opera. Although he had had no musical training, he did not consider this an obstacle. His plan was to have « Gustl » (Hitler's nickname for August Kubizek) write down the notes as he (Hitler) banged-out his conception on the piano. For some reason, Kubizek agreed to this. When he learned through his schooling that Wagner had written a sketch for the Edda legend « Wieland the Smith » as a topic for one of his music-dramas (found in Wagner's posthumous notes) , Hitler siezed on the topic and was determined to complete the project unrealized by his hero :

« Listen “ Gustl ”, I am going to make Wieland into an Opera. »

« Wieland the Smith » is a ghoulish Icelandic legend that was attractive to both Wagner and Hitler. Kubizek described it as follows :

« King Nidur is entirely motived by avarice and greed. Wieland kills his sons out of vengeance, rapes his daughter, and drinks from beakers fashioned-out of the skulls of his sons. »

Hitler did not even flinch at this, but Wagner's version doesn't seem to bear much resemblance to it.

Hitler's conception was grandiose, with Icelandic erupting volcanos, glaciers, old Teutonic instruments, Wagnerian tubas, « Walküre » 's riding through clouds, winged metal helmets ... In spite of unrealistic determination and unrelenting energy, the Opera eventually bogged down and was left unfinished, no doubt due to his lack of musical ability. Even so, it would be fascinating to see the notes and a production of this fragment for its historical significance. If it still exists, it would be a fitting Bayreuth production.

Years later, Hitler associates drew parallels between Hitler's studied methods of public speaking and Wagner's use of leitmotifs. Hitler used endless repetition, thundering crescendi, and rhythmic speech to mesmerize his audiences. He studied theories of mob control, such as Gustave Le Bon's « Crowd » (1895) , and it is clear that he used Le Bon's theory to manipulate and control his audiences. Ernst Hanfstaengel, one of Hitler's political musicians, often played Wagner's music to Hitler on the piano, and he noticed that when he played the « Meistersinger » prelude, one of Hitler's favourites :

« Whole interweavings of leitmotifs, of embellishments of counterpoint, and musical contrast and arguments, were exactly mirrored in the patterns of his Hitler's speeches, which were Symphonic in construction and ended in a great climax, like the blare of Wagner's trombones. »

« My baton will, yet, become the scepter of the future Hanfstaengel also referred to Hitler's arm movements while speaking as similar to those of a conductor swinging a baton. »

Later, while in Landsberg prison, Hitler wrote « Mein Kampf » (My Struggle) to the thunder of Wagner's music, played on gramophone records. The paper for « Mein Kampf » was supplied by Winifred Wagner. She believed that Hitler would « pull the sword out of the German oak » and save Germany from Jewish corruption. Thus, Winifred drew this political metaphor from Wagner's « Die Walküre » , when Siegmund pulls the sword out of the world ash tree. After the War and revelation of Hitler's extermination camps, she maintained that the Holocaust was a lie made-up by American Jews.

The influence of Richard Wagner's music upon Adolf Hitler cannot be over estimated. For him, they were fantasies to be made real. During the rise of National-Socialism, and before Hitler came to power, he predicted the end of the great world conflagration that was to come, and for which he would be responsible.

« Hitler hummed motifs from Wagner's Operas. He seemed to me preoccupied and moody. From having been communicative, he fell suddenly into a dry silence. The political movement was in danger. National-Socialism was approaching one of its crises. The Party was in a well nigh desperate position. But Hitler's every word rang with the firm conviction that he would soon be in power, and be able to lead the German people to a new destiny. We spoke of the result of the War, and the tragical turn of all German victories :

« We shall not capitulate. No, never. » , Hitler exclaimed.

« We may be destroyed, but if we are, we shall drag a world with us : a world in flames. » , he hummed a

characteristic motif from the « Götterdämmerung » .

« “ Parsifal ” , the last of Wagner's music-dramas, is possibly his most racist Opera. » (Adolf Hitler)

« Out of “ Parsifal ”, I have made a religion. » (Adolf Hitler)

What did Hitler mean by this last provocative statement ?

Wagner intended « Parsifal » to be a profound religious parable about how the whole essence of European humanity had been poisoned by alien, inhuman, Jewish values. It is an allegory of the « Judaization of Christianity and of Germany » ; and of purifying redemption. In place of theological purity, the secularized religion of « Parsifal » preached the new doctrine of racial purity, which was reflected in the moral and indeed religious, purity of « Parsifal » himself. In Wagner's mind, this redeeming purity was infringed by Jews, just as devils and witches infringed the purity of traditional Christianity. In this scheme, it is axiomatic that compassion and redemption have no application to the inexorably damned Judaized Klingsor and, hence, the Jews.

(Image) « Siegfried » Hitler, by George Grosz.

Adolf Hitler explained his own interpretation of « Parsifal » to one of his associates, in 1934 :

« Behind the absurd externals of the story, with its Christian embroidery and Good Friday mystification, something altogether different is revealed as the true content of this most profound drama. It is not the Christian religion of compassion that is acclaimed, but pure noble blood. The King is suffering from the incurable ailment of corrupted blood. The uninitiated but pure “ Parsifal ” is tempted to abandon himself in Klingsor's magic garden to the lusts and excesses of corrupt civilization (Kundry) . For myself, I have the most intimate familiarity with Wagner's mental processes. At every stage of my life, I come back to him. If we strip “ Parsifal ” of every poetic element, we learn from it that selection and renewal are possible only amid the continuous tension of a lasting struggle. »

Thus, Hitler clearly understood the racist agenda of « Parsifal » . Only Wagner apologists are left to wear blinders. The sub-text of racist metaphors has not diminished in Wagner's Operas, so they will continue to exert a subliminal influence. To deny this is akin to the same kind of denial that today's violent television, movies, and subliminal advertising have no effect on young people.

The word « struggle » (« Kampf ») is a code word that appears in the writings of Wagner, his heirs, and Hitler (« Mein Kampf ») . It was not an abstract « struggle » against some unknown force, but referred specifically to the struggle against the Jews and other « aliens » . Another code word was « Wolf » , which referred to the God Wotan in the « Ring » Cycle, and to Hitler by Wagner's heirs, and even by Hitler as a reference to himself. Thus, we hear of the « Wolf's Lair » as a reference to Hitler's sanctuary, during the War. « Barbarosa » was another code word shared by Wagner and Hitler. This word specified the « struggle » as War and has its root in the word « barbaric » or « barbarian » , a metaphor for the proud return of the German people to their barbarous roots, free of conscience, and,

therefore, free to wage war and havoc. « Barbarosa » was the ancient Teuton Hero and Warrior, the original ruthless barbarian.

Of course, none of this proves that Wagner « caused » the Holocaust. Yet, there can be no doubt that, he and his music, were partly responsible. He wasn't there, but to speculate that he wouldn't have been a staunch Hitler supporter, as were his heirs of the Nazi years, is simply blind denial.

During the years of the Nazi rise to power in Germany, music history began to be rewritten by German musicologists to conform to Nazi political ideology. Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Giacomo Meyerbeer and Gustav Mahler were vilified and their music lost favor among audiences and performers. At the same time, Wagner was elevated to a God-like status and his music was officially sanctioned. Musicologists began to quote from Wagner's racist essays as support for the Nazi agenda purging all Jewish and non German influences. Since history is written by the victors, if the Nazis had won the War, one can only imagine what music history would be like today. Certainly, it would be a very different tale.

The historic significance of Wagner's racism would be much diminished if it had not been for Hitler and the Nazi Holocaust. Even then, it could not be isolated and seen merely as the unfortunate aberration of a composer obsessed with bigotry. Nevertheless, that is how apologists try to excuse Richard Wagner and his music from their consequences. History is rightfully and unavoidably seen through the lens of the present. Thereby, the horrific consequences of Wagner's racist legacy cannot be denied or diminished.

AB 113 : Musiques interdites par le 3e « Reich »

Nazisme et musique dégénérée

(Un texte de Gil Pressnitzer.)

Ce texte porte sur un aspect important de la machine-à-tuer nazi : le rapport à la musique et son utilisation comme arme de destruction.

La musique comme arme

« La musique est un art mineur car elle disparaît en même temps qu'elle se forme. »

Et pourtant, la musique a souvent été une arme pour les régimes totalitaires (l'URSS et l'art prolétarien) et elle deviendra pour les Nazis une arme essentielle pour la démonstration, à la fois du génie éternel du peuple allemand et de la supériorité aryenne. La musique participe donc à l'établissement du « Reich » de 1,000 ans, son pouvoir est utilisable. Elle sera donc la force de frappe du Nazisme, ainsi jusqu'au tout dernier bombardement les concerts eurent lieu fréquentés par tous les dignitaires.

Écoutons Pascal Quignard :

« La musique est le seul, de tous les arts, qui ait collaboré à l'extermination des Juifs organisée par les Allemands de 1933 à 1945. Il faut souligner, au détriment de cet art, qu'elle est le seul qui ait pu s'arranger de l'organisation des camps, de la faim, du dénuement, du travail, de la douleur, de l'humiliation, et de la mort. Il faut entendre ceci en tremblant : c'est en musique que ces corps nus entraient dans la chambre. La musique viole le corps humain. Elle met debout. Les rythmes musicaux fascinent les rythmes corporels. À la rencontre de la musique, l'oreille ne peut se fermer. La musique étant un pouvoir s'associe de fait à tout pouvoir. Elle est d'essence inégalitaire. Ouïe et obéissance sont liées. Un chef, des exécutants, des obéissants telle est la structure que son exécution aussitôt met en place. Partout où il y a un chef et des exécutants, il y a de la musique ... Cadence et mesure. La marche est cadencée, les coups de matraque sont cadencés, les saluts sont cadencés. »

La Ire fois où Primo Levi entendit la fanfare à l'entrée du camp jouant le « Rosamunde » de Schubert, il eut du mal à réprimer le rire nerveux qui se saisit de lui. Alors il vit apparaître les bataillons rentrant au camp avec une démarche bizarre. Les hommes étaient si dépourvus de force que les muscles des jambes obéissaient malgré eux à la force propre aux rythmes que la musique du camp imposait et que Simon Laks dirigeait.

Primo Levi a nommé « infernale » la musique :

« Leurs âmes sont mortes et c'est la musique qui les pousse en avant comme le vent les feuilles sèches, et leur tient lieu de volonté. »

Ce fut pour augmenter l'obéissance et les souder tous dans la fusion non personnelle, non privée, qu'engendre toute musique.

Ce fut une musique rituelle. La musique, écrit-il, était ressentie comme un « maléfice » . Elle était une « hypnose du rythme continu qui annihile la pensée et endort la douleur » .

Comment entendre la musique, n'importe quelle musique, sans lui obéir ? (Pascal Quignard. « La haine de la musique » .)

« Qu'elle soit spontanée ou imposée, officielle ou acte de résistance, la musique était inscrite dans la vie quotidienne des camps. » , précise Pascal Huynh. Elle était utilisée par les Nazis avec un sadisme défiant l'entendement. « Opérations punitives et exercices journaliers étaient scandés par des marches exécutées par des déportés, notamment lorsque certains d'entre eux tentaient de s'évader. » Et cette perversité des geôliers, qui imposaient aux détenus de jouer de la musique pour accompagner les exécutions capitales !

La musique aura donc un pouvoir de soumission pour les faibles, d'exaltation pour les forts et combien d'exécutions auront lieu au son d'Anton Bruckner ou de Beethoven, et les officiers des camps de la mort écoutaient en pleurant Schubert, entre 2 massacres. Et jamais un pays, dont les nouveaux Maîtres étaient convaincus que leur mission était de

restaurer l'honneur national, ne se soucia autant de l'élévation de son patrimoine. Jamais la vie des concerts ne fut autant favorisée, jusque dans la tourmente des bombardements.

Les origines du concept nazi de musique dégénérée

Le Romantisme allemand

La musique Romantique, donc la musique Romantique allemande, est conçue comme essence de toute la musique.

La musique est conçue comme langue de toutes les émotions - comme langue supérieure à la raison.

La musique est conçue comme effusion ou comme fusion.

Le Romantisme a pris naissance en Allemagne, à la fin du XVIIIe siècle, en réaction au rationalisme. Au primat de la raison, il oppose, afin de la connaître, un primat de l'imagination, des choses invisibles - l'imagination entendue comme le médium où se révèle cette vérité supra-rationnelle. Le Romantisme réclame ici une musique miraculeuse : une musique qui élève l'âme à la vérité ; une musique qui, don de Dieu, élève l'âme à la contemplation de Dieu. Mais le Romantisme réclame aussi une musique nationale : une musique née du peuple ; plus encore : une musique destinée au peuple - non pas destinée aux gens de qualité.

Cela vient de pêle-mêle de :

La montée de l'obscur, la mythologie du Moyen-âge, le développement du moi.

Le Romantisme et les mythes populaires, contes et notion du sang et de la race glanés dans la mythologie du Nord avec la « pureté » du fol, de l'innocent, face aux intrigues de l'intellectuel.

Le surhomme face au reste du monde.

Le pouvoir prométhéen de la musique.

L'impérialisme de l'Orchestre qui écrase les autres formes de musique.

Richard Wagner, autant philosophe que musicien : le wagnérisme « Nacht und Nebel » (Nuit et Brouillard) tiré de « l'Or du Rhin » , qui ensuite est devenu le nom de code d'un ordre célèbre organisant les Ires déportations dès le 7 décembre 1941, Hitler avait publié le décret « Nacht und Nebel » .

Il y a un mélange qui associe, au sein du wagnérisme, la pensée hellénique à la pensée Romantique et qui prépare aussi le terrain au Nazisme : le thème de la dégénérescence, y tient une place si essentielle, l'anéantissement, le héros pur, la ploutocratie de l'or.

La philosophie allemande : la théorie du déclin ; l'appel du gouffre ; le surhomme ; la fascination du bûcher final ; Schopenhauer ; Nietzsche.

La musique cristallise, dès le milieu du XIXe siècle avec Wagner, 2 aspects essentiels de l'idéologie allemande, le nationalisme et l'antisémitisme.

La pensée musicale nazie

La culture musicale de Hitler : elle est celle d'un artiste raté vivant à Vienne. Aussi, il connaît un peu et admire beaucoup le Gustav Mahler de 1906 et les valse viennoises ; mais ses goûts iront vers Anton Bruckner et Richard Wagner.

L'inculture de Hermann Göring et de Josef Goebbels qui, donc, mépriseront toute pensée artistique.

L'ordre moral nazi

Les 3 K : « Kirche » , « Küche » , « Kindern » (église, cuisine, enfants) qui formateront l'asservissement du peuple.

Malgré l'homosexualité latente du Nazisme (les Sections d'Assaut, les SA, mais aussi les SS) , on se raccroche aux valeurs conservatrices et profitant des provocations modernistes (Paul Hindemith, Arnold Schönberg) ou populistes (Kurt Weill, Paul Dessau) ; on rassure le peuple vaincu et déçu par la République de Weimar, par des retours aux vieilles valeurs rassurantes.

La théorisation de l'art dégénéré

La réaction politique contre « 14 ans de République des Juifs » , alliant la haine de la république de Weimar à la recherche de coupables.

La suite logique des lois raciales de Nuremberg (races inférieures, donc musique inférieure noire et juive) : « Les juifs sont incapables de manier la musique et le verbe et empoisonnent le beau. »

Le mauvais goût nazi : on a peur du moderne on veut rejoindre l'ordre grec mais en démesure (défilé, architecture) les arcs-de-triomphe remplacent les lauriers, l'art doit accompagner la cérémonie (la musique et le christianisme) donc être édifiant et monumental.

Le vecteur de Richard Wagner et de Bayreuth : par la main mise sur les théories délirantes de Wagner et sa musique qui les porte en elle, par l'ouverture de Bayreuth à Hitler qui en fera quasiment sa villégiature.

En fait, l'idéologie est celle de la dictature nazie et la musique un prétexte et une arme de propagande, d'une prise

de pouvoir.

La prise de contrôle de l'Art : l'Art conçu comme un aspect essentiel de la vie culturelle.

Cette prise de contrôle représente un aspect lui-même essentiel de la prise de contrôle de toute la vie culturelle.

Prise de contrôle elle-même nécessaire à la domination totalitaire. Hitler a énoncé la nécessité de cette mise sous tutelle de l'Art. Le paragraphe 23 du programme de 1920 propose, en ce sens, la réunion de toutes les bonnes volontés face à la prétendue décadence qui règne, en Allemagne, au niveau de l'Art. Aux yeux de Hitler, la décadence qui règne au niveau de l'Art annonce, pire encore, elle prépare la décadence qui touchera bientôt la nation tout entière ; elle prépare la décadence qui la détruira.

Aussi, tout est boursoufflé et marqué par une forme de confusion mentale : donc, pêle-mêle, on met dans le même sac le sérialisme et Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy.

Le détournement des musiques

Selon l'idéologie nazie, le peuple allemand était le « 1er peuple musicien de la terre » et Richard Wagner, son héros, et Anton Bruckner, le pauvre et doux, son prophète. Pour ancrer leur théorie, les Nazis ont ré-écrits l'histoire et détournés la pensée musicale des compositeurs du passé.

Les théoriciens de l'anti-sémitisme ont revisité le passé allemand, tentant d'en séparer le bon grain aryen de l'ivraie juive, et ce, dès Händel, dont ils changent les paroles des Oratorios, parlant du peuple juif. Il faut ré-écrire l'histoire de la musique allemande et autrichienne, (pauvre Mozart !), pour « laver les souillures ».

Bach est utilisé, ainsi que Bruckner et surtout Beethoven, figure Romantique par excellence, le surhomme prométhéen. Sa 9e Symphonie est l'œuvre de référence de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et de son directeur musical Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Franz Liszt devient allemand et non plus hongrois. Richard Wagner, avec l'aide de sa famille, est amplifié et donc exploité.

Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, de part son origine juive (il était le petit-fils de Moses Mendelssohn, le grand penseur de l'« Aufklärung » juif), fut une des « victimes » préférées des théoriciens de l'anti-sémitisme musical malgré sa conversion au christianisme. Sa statue à Leipzig fut détruite, la rue qui portait son nom fut rebaptisée du nom d'Anton Bruckner, et, enfin, un grand concours fut organisé pour recomposer son « Songe d'une nuit d'été » dans une version aryenne. Ce fut finalement Carl Orff qui eut cet « honneur ».

Dès 1933, les programmes de musique Classique à la radio sont contrôlés. Mendelssohn est pratiquement interdit de diffusion. Les Wagner et consorts sont, eux, matraqués sans cesse en concert et à la radio, dans les défilés, dans les

célébrations.

Musique dégénérée

« Entartete musik » : musique « dégénérée ». C'est ainsi que les Nazis, entre 1933 et 1945, appelaient toute musique qui ne correspondait pas aux normes de l'art officiel. « Musique qui a perdue les qualités habituelles de son genre, de sa race », loin de l'idéal aryen, de la race supérieure.

Ils appelaient donc « Art dégénéré » la musique des années 1930, qui allait de la musique atonale au jazz. Dans l'esprit nazi prédomine cette idée de décadence de dégénérescence, d'empoisonnement de cette pureté des origines, alors que leur mythologie celte ou germanique est basée sur l'inceste et le viol !

Dès leur arrivée au pouvoir, les dirigeants nazis entreprennent une éradication de « l'Art dégénéré » (« Entartete Kunst »), fondée sur une normalité créatrice visant à rejeter toute avant-garde au nom de la pureté de la race aryenne. La catégorie de musique dégénérée se présente comme une catégorie haïe où le régime nazi range toute la musique qui lui semble éloignée de sa propre vision de la musique ou toute la musique qui lui semble éloignée de sa vision du monde.

La conception du monde national-socialiste se fonde sur l'idée du sang, de la race, du peuple, puis sur l'idée d'un état totalitaire. Et comme cela était écrit dans « Mein Kampf » :

« Les juifs étaient incapables de manier la musique et le verbe. »

Quelles sont les musiques dégénérées ?

1) Toute la musique non allemande, au sens très étroit que le régime donne à la notion de « musique allemande ». Ce qui signifie : toute la musique de musiciens aux origines juives ; le jazz conçu comme une musique afro-américaine ; ou encore toute la musique prolétarienne : laquelle emprunte au jazz nombre de ses procédés.

2) Toute la musique qui ne se prête pas à la récupération politique, ou mieux : à la propagande. Toute la musique qui ne pourra être mise à contribution comme moyen de domination. Toute la musique aux capacités critiques. Toute la musique vivante. Ce qui signifie : toute la musique atonale, le jazz, là encore, toute la musique prolétarienne.

Au nom de ses critères, au nom de ses critères politiques. Critères où l'idéologique se mêle à l'esthétique, l'esthétique à l'idéologique, le régime nazi a ré-écrit l'histoire de la musique allemande ; comme il a ré-écrit l'histoire de toutes les Allemagnes.

Les prémices de la répression culturelle

Mais la chasse à l'intelligence avait commencé bien plus tôt, sans que personne ne s'en émeuve, et surtout pas les

juifs allemands. Dès 1924, Adolf Hitler s'en prenait à l'art d'avant-garde.

À l'arrivée au pouvoir des Nazis, les mesures destinées à contrôler la vie culturelle furent immédiates. Josef Goebbels, président de la Chambre de la culture du « Reich », organisa toutes les professions artistiques. À partir de 1933, une loi allemande exigea que tous les musiciens allemands soient officiellement déclarés et enregistrés. Ceux qui, pour des raisons raciales ou artistiques, ne correspondaient pas à l'idéal nazi voyaient leur carrière brisée. Certains musiciens quittèrent alors l'Allemagne, d'autres rejoignirent la Ligue culturelle des juifs allemands. On a alors créé des Orchestres juifs, sous administration juive et destinés à un public juif. Cette ligue fonctionna jusqu'en 1941, date à laquelle la plupart de ses membres furent envoyés à Terezín, atroce anti-chambre d'Auschwitz.

La Société Nationale de la Culture Allemande (« Reichskammer der Bildenden Künste ») était fondée très tôt. Cette organisation voulait mettre fin à la corruption de l'Art et convaincre le public de la relation entre l'origine raciale et l'art. La Ire exposition organisée par le pouvoir a eu lieu en 1933, à Erlangen, où les dessins d'enfants et des malades mentaux se virent accrochés à côté des œuvres sélectionnées de la « Mannheimer Kunsthalle » afin de bien souligner l'aspect pathologique de l'Art moderne. Les interprètes, les compositeurs sont bannis ou interdits et 1938 ne fait que théoriser cela. Il faut savoir que le public réagit de manière très favorable à l'initiative et l'aspect propagandiste en fut agencé avec soin. Cette réaction du public était très prévisible : le XIXe siècle avait déjà vu se manifester la peur, l'aversion du public envers cet inconnu qu'est toujours l'Art moderne. Mais tout cela se nourrissait de la crise économique et d'un anti-sémitisme croissant. 2 facteurs très souvent liés au cours de l'histoire. À la haine des Juifs s'ajoute le rejet du Communisme ; l'un et l'autre ayant partie liée dans le délire nazi. Le concept de Bolchévisme musical est ainsi appliqué à l'encontre de « La Nuit transfigurée » d'Arnold Schönberg. Dans la République de Weimar existait déjà un fort courant anti-sémite et anti-moderniste. Ainsi, Alban Berg, appelé « l'empoisonneur des fontaines de la musique allemande » a envoyé en 1925 son certificat d'aryen pour sauver « Woyzeck » .

Dès 1928, des affiches du Parti nazi appellent à manifester contre « l'Opéra-jazz », traité d' « insolente salissure judéo-nègre » (« Jonny spielt auf ! » d'Ernst Křenek) . En 1938, l'exposition « Entartete Musik » (Musique dégénérée) , à Düsseldorf, dénonce le jazz comme une musique à la fois « juive, bolchévique et nègre » (!) .

À Munich, en 1937, Adolf Hitler inaugure le « Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung 1937 » , (la grande exposition de l'Art 1937) . L'art Allemand accepté montrait des toiles qui soulignaient l'héroïsme, la patrie, le devoir familial, le travail aux champs et autres choses semblables. Avec plus de 3 millions de visiteurs, ce fut la grande exposition de notre temps.

Adolf Hitler dans le discours d'inauguration déclara :

« Avant que le National-Socialisme ne prenne le pouvoir, il n'y avait en Allemagne que le soi-disant “ art moderne ” : chaque année, un autre art moderne. Nous, nous voulons un art Allemand d'une valeur éternelle. L'art n'est pas fondé sur le temps, une époque, un style, une année, mais uniquement sur un peuple. Et tant qu'un peuple existe, l'art est un jalon, le point stable dans les apparences fugitives. C'est l'existence et la durable prestation d'un peuple, et pour

cela l'art est l'expression de l'essentiel de l'existence, un monument éternel, en soi-même l'existence et la performance.

Le Cubisme, le Dadaïsme, l'Impressionnisme, l'Expressionnisme, tout cela est complètement sans valeur pour le peuple Allemand. »

Donc, dès 1933, commence le schéma de la valise ou la mort, les musiciens et les chefs clairement « dégénérés » pour les Nazis, qui n'ont eu d'autres « choix » que l'exil ou les camps de concentration. Vers 1933, les termes « Juif » et « Bolchévique » étaient devenus synonymes pour tout art moderne.

L'exposition de Düsseldorf de 1938

Tout était donc en place pour cette exposition. L'extermination des ennemis passait aussi par l'extermination de la culture. Ses ennemis étaient tous les créateurs car la création est par essence subversive « un régime comme celui de l'Allemagne Nationale-Socialiste ne peut supporter que l'ordre établi risque d'être remis en cause » .

Sus donc à la « juiverie internationale et bolchévique » qui avaient élevé au rang d'œuvres d'art les productions bâtardes de véritables « malades mentaux » (d'où l'appellation : « Arts dégénérés ») .

« Bolchévisme culturel ! Arrogante impudence juive ! » , c'est dans ces termes que Josef Goebbels stigmatise les œuvres d'Arnold Schönberg, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith, Ernst Křenek et tant d'autres, lors de l'inauguration de l'exposition diffamatoire intitulée « Musique dégénérée » , ouverte à Düsseldorf, le 22 mai 1938, date anniversaire des 150 ans de la naissance de Richard Wagner. Elle fait suite à celle dite de l' « Art dégénéré » qui s'est tenue à Munich, 1 an plus tôt. Sur la brochure de l'exposition de Düsseldorf figure un saxophoniste nègre porteur de l'étoile jaune. Sous-titrée : « Un règlement de comptes » , la manifestation qui fut un échec, crache sa haine à tout va. Dans les 2 cas, à Düsseldorf comme à Munich, en musique comme en peinture, on présente toutes ces œuvres comme œuvres folles ou comme œuvres criminelles. On les présente comme l'œuvre de tarés : comme l'œuvre de dégénérés. À cette fin, on en souligne, tantôt, le manque de sens, la prétendue incohérence ; tantôt, encore, on en souligne le manque de fini, la réalisation défailante, les prétendues fautes de composition. Dans les 2 cas, en musique comme en peinture, le rôle de l'exposition consiste, non sans démagogie, à prendre le peuple à témoin de la prétendue décadence où a sombré l'Allemagne ; jusqu'au niveau de la peinture ou même de la musique. Ou encore : à rendre le peuple sensible à la tâche salutaire, à la tâche quasi-sanitaire de purification que mène le régime nazi. Dans les 2 cas, la dénonciation véhémement précède la liquidation ; la liquidation définitive. Bientôt, on brûlera nombre de ces tableaux. Déjà, on a commencé à faire taire tous ces musiciens.

À Düsseldorf, l'exposition est placée sous la tutelle de responsables nazis, On y trouve sous la catégorie de musique dégénérée : la musique atonale de la Nouvelle École de Vienne, le jazz, la musique prolétarienne, bref, l'ensemble de la nouvelle musique apparue ou répandue en Allemagne depuis environ 30 ans : toute la nouvelle musique que rejette le régime nazi. Mais toute cette musique, ou mieux : toutes ces musiques, toutes ces œuvres, cette exposition ne les expose pas : au contraire, elle les exhibe, pêle-mêle. Toutes ces œuvres, elle les accompagne des commentaires les plus corrosifs, des commentaires les plus agressifs, afin de les rendre ridicules, afin de mieux les mettre en accusation, afin

de mieux les mettre au pilori. Une liste noire est établie et tout orchestre se voit interdit de jouer ces œuvres. Ces musiques sont pour les Nazis des musiques d'aliénés, c'est l'art des Juifs et des fous. Il fallait prouver que les artistes de l'avant-garde (les expressionnistes, les Dadaïstes, les membres du « Bauhaus ») étaient des gens dégénérés, séniles, dérangés, fous ou schizophréniques et en plus Juifs ou Communistes !

Était donc considérée comme musique dégénérée celle émanant des races inférieures, qu'elles soient « juives » ou « nègres » et l'on l'oublie trop souvent « tziganes » . Sait-on, d'ailleurs, que l'improvisation caractéristique du jazz était interdite en musique, et que le jazz considérait comme une musique à la fois « juive, bolchévique et nègre » conduit Josef Gœbbels à créer un jazz nazi. « Charlie and his Orchestra » . Les paroles devenaient de la propagande nazie.

C'est une recension de la « musique dégénérée » , où l'anathème était jeté sur la modernité du début du XXe siècle et sur la musique « juive » . La couverture de la brochure de l'Exposition représentait un Noir jouant du saxophone avec « l'Étoile de David » au revers de son veston, détournement abject de l'Opéra-jazz d'Ernst Křenek, « Jonny spielt auf ! » , grand succès des années 1920. À l'occasion de l'exposition étaient présentées les théories sur « musique et race » , qui aboutirent à la publication, en 1940, d'un « Dictionnaire des Juifs dans la musique » .

La notion même de « musique dégénérée » (« Entartete Musik ») , objet de l'exposition de Düsseldorf, ne fait pourtant que démontrer la diversité des styles concernés et le caractère éminemment racial et politique des critères retenus. Placée sous la tutelle de responsables nazis, cette exposition présente, pêle-mêle, sous la catégorie de musique dégénérée : la musique atonale de la Nouvelle École de Vienne, le jazz, la musique prolétarienne, bref, l'ensemble de la nouvelle musique apparue ou répandue en Allemagne depuis environ 30 ans : toute la nouvelle musique que rejette le régime nazi.

C'est ainsi que de très nombreux compositeurs et interprètes, taxés de judaïsme, de dégénérescence ou de bolchévisme, ont perdu, et ce dès 1933, tout moyen d'expression et de subsistance « pure » conforme au National-Socialisme.

Toutes ces musiques, toutes ces œuvres, cette exposition ne les expose pas : au contraire, elle les exhibe, pêle-mêle. Toutes ces œuvres, elle les accompagne des commentaires les plus corrosifs, des commentaires les plus agressifs, afin de les rendre ridicules, afin de mieux les mettre en accusation, afin de mieux les mettre au pilori.

Sur la brochure de l'exposition de Düsseldorf figure un saxophoniste noir porteur de l'étoile jaune. Sous-titrée « Un règlement de comptes » . Arnold Schœnberg, surnommé « le charlatan sans racines » , est inévitablement visé. « Quiconque en mange, en meurt » , fulmine Josef Gœbbels.

Les grandes figures de la musique atonale, ces « faiseurs de bruits » , subissent le même sort. Arnold Schœnberg, Alban Berg et Anton von Webern, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Kurt Weill, Karol Rathaus, Norbert Glanzberg et Alexander von Zemlinsky (beau-frère de Schœnberg) font partie du pilori.

Sont tout particulièrement visés la « musique nègre » , autrement dit le jazz, et les compositeurs juifs, dont certains, comme Schœnberg, sont les représentants d'une avant-garde pour laquelle les Nazis n'ont que haine et mépris. Ainsi, la

musique atonale (dont un critique de l'époque considère qu'elle détruit « cet élément très évidemment allemand qu'est l'accord parfait ») est, pour les Nazis, le produit par excellence de « l'esprit juif ». Les Nazis lui opposent Richard Wagner, non sans quelque absurdité, si l'on garde à l'esprit ce que lui doit la musique moderne, Gustav Mahler et Arnold Schönberg, en particulier. Wagner, auteur d'un pamphlet anti-sémite, « Le Judaïsme en musique », incarne, aux yeux des idéologues du régime, une musique censée régénérer l'âme allemande, sur laquelle les Juifs sont accusés d'avoir exercé leur influence néfaste.

Interdits de concert, chassés des Orchestres et des Conservatoires, privés de toute possibilité de gagner leur vie au pays de Bach et de Beethoven, nombreux sont les compositeurs et interprètes, juifs ou non, qui choisissent de s'exiler, notamment aux États-Unis. C'est le cas, de Kurt Weill, de Paul Hindemith, d'Otto Klemperer ou d'Arnold Schönberg. Mais beaucoup d'autres, malgré la qualité de leur œuvre, et quel qu'ait été leur destin, sont tombés dans l'oubli. Ils commencent à peine d'en sortir.

Les Compositeurs et les Interprètes de la musique dégénérée

La liste est longue. Plus de 200 noms. Aussi citons simplement :

Les Compositeurs

Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, Kurt Weill, Hans Eisler (ami de Bertolt Brecht) , Viktor Ullmann, Joseph Marx, Pavel Haas, Franz Schmidt, Richard Stein, Erwin Schulhoff, Jefim Golyscheff, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Miklos Rozsa, Eric Zeisl, Franz Waxman (Oratorio « la Chanson de Terezín ») , Paul Hindemith, Alexander von Zemlinsky (la « Symphonie lyrique ») , Karol Rathaus, Rudolf Karell, Léon Jessel, Norbert Glansberg, Igor Stravinsky (qui lâchement protesta en hurlant qu'il n'avait jamais été « communiste, matérialiste, athéiste ou bolchéviste » , lettre du 14 avril 1933) , Darius Milhaud, Anton von Webern (mis aussi à l'index tout en étant pro-Nazi voulut convaincre Hitler que le dodécaphonisme assurerait la domination allemande sur la musique pendant 1,000 ans !) , Béla Bartók (considérant comme un honneur le fait d'être traité de « dégénéré » par le régime Nazi aurait lui-même demandé que sa musique soit incluse dans l'Exposition) .

Mais c'est essentiellement sur 3 compositeurs que s'acharnèrent les Nazis : Giacomo Meyerbeer, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy et Gustav Mahler. Ils sont jugés comme la source de la dégénérescence juive au sein de la musique Romantique allemande au XIXe siècle. Ainsi, Blessinger, grand théoricien anti-sémite, voyait dans Mendelssohn le modèle du « Juif assimilé » ; dans Meyerbeer, celui du « Juif affairiste sans scrupules » ; et dans Mahler, « le type fanatique du rabbin d'Europe de l'Est » (Mahler est né en Bohême) . Meyerbeer restait le rival heureux de Wagner, donc, un ennemi.

D'autres furent également maudits. Ernst Křenek, qui n'est pas, lui, d'origine juive, est également flétri parce qu'il utilise le jazz (« cette invasion nègre » , toujours selon Josef Gæbbels !) dans son Opéra « Johnny mène la danse » (1927) . L'auteur, qui met en scène les amours d'un homme noir et d'une femme blanche, est accusé d'être le « pionnier du mélange racial » . Avant-gardiste, il détourne à dessein l'Opéra sérieux, son retour à la mélodie, au

conte, au mythe, au sol et au sang, tels que prônés par Richard Strauß. Ce dernier, malgré ses démêlés avec les autorités, fit l'objet d'un consensus car ses compositions répondaient parfaitement aux attentes du régime : prédominance de la ligne mélodique et nostalgie d'un monde révolu.

Les Interprètes

La vie culturelle à Berlin était soutenue par Otto Klemperer à la tête du « Kroll Oper ». À Vienne (avant l'« Anschluß »), Bruno Walter faisait rayonner la musique, Fritz Busch régnait sur la musique-de-chambre. Tous durent fuir. Par contre, l'ordre nazi délivrera de faux-certificats d'aryanité pour Johann Strauß, Franz Lehár, ces idoles de la vie viennoise qui ne pouvaient valser sur des notes juives. On en vint à détourner les paroles de jazz pour en faire, sur les mêmes airs, de belles chansons allemandes.

La musique officielle national-socialiste

Plusieurs compositeurs s'arrangèrent plutôt bien avec le régime. Cérémonie des Jeux olympiques, des grandes messes nazies, pour cela ces musiciens furent mis à contribution. Mais il n'y eut pas de musiciens véritablement emblématiques de ce nouvel ordre fasciste. Trop de talents avaient fui et les compositeurs favorables aux thèses nazies étaient en fait Werner Egk et Carl Orff, dont les célèbres « Carmina Burana » connurent un grand succès après leur création en 1937, Hans Pfitzner et Richard Strauß, monstre d'égoïsme qui poursuivait son bonhomme de chemin sans révolte ni soumission.

Aussi, on fit appel aux morts qui ne pouvaient pas contredire le « Führer ». Bach, Beethoven, mais surtout et avant tout Richard Wagner et Anton Bruckner. Bayreuth devint la résidence secondaire d'Adolf Hitler. Il y célébrait ses anniversaires et pouvait se vautrer dans les mythes dont il enveloppait sa tuerie. Bayreuth sera donc le temple du Nazisme et Wagner, son Dieu : l'Ouverture de l'Opéra « Rienzi » est l'hymne officiel des cérémonies du Parti ; « les Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg », l'Opéra culte.

La recherche d'une musique pure conforme à la pureté aryenne ?

L'art nazi, figé en stéréotypes, fondé sur la dynamique du groupe agressif, a besoin d'harmonie et de sons rassurants selon les lois de l'habitude. Musique chorale et Classique qui favorisent les élans de foule sont souhaitées. Exaltation des blocs orchestraux. Rythmiques répétitives, d'où ne se détache aucun élément particulier, retour à la mélodie, au conte, au mythe, au sol et au sang.

Des rituels de « Grande Messe » contre la pratique de la réflexion solitaire évitent tout risque de pensée négative. Les Nazis espèrent mettre en place la preuve du beau par le laid, et entretenir l'illusion d'un monde paysan atemporel par le discrédit des œuvres travaillées par les affres de la modernité industrielle. C'est ainsi que, face à l'exposition des « Arts dégénérés », le citoyen allemand était convié à apprécier, dans un autre pavillon, l'exposition des « Arts allemands », un ensemble d'œuvres académiques et rassurantes.

Il fallait flatter le conformisme des classes moyennes, apeurées par le dérèglement du monde traditionnel par l'économie capitaliste industrielle. Donc, la modernité effrayait et le bon peuple se réfugiait dans les mythes éternels et la propagande édifiante du guide. « La culture Nazie » fut réactionnaire par essence, elle se positionna en s'opposant à toute innovation. Cette « épuration » des Arts (qui provoqua l'exil des plus grands créateurs) ne rencontra pas de résistance majeure dans la population, les goûts de Hitler rejoignant ceux de la classe moyenne, en flattant son conformisme et son anti-intellectualisme.

« En vérité, à l'universalisme de la culture progressiste, les Nazis ont opposé une culture de race, une culture populiste. Inspirés par l'ultra-conservatisme, ils ont défendu l'archaïsme et la tradition contre l'évolution, le classicisme contre l'expressionnisme, la figuration contre l'abstraction, l'ordre contre la provocation dadaïste, la musique tonale contre le dodécaphonisme. Voyant l'incarnation du métissage dans le jazz, ils le dénoncèrent comme décadent, lascif, immoral, l'er dans ce qu'ils nommèrent « musique dégénérée » . (Laure Laufer, dans : « Musique tuée, musique tue. »)

Entre 1933 et 1945, les hauts-dignitaires nazis décident de ce que le peuple doit aimer en matière de musique. Pour la musique sérieuse, les Maîtres Baroques, Beethoven, Bruckner et surtout Wagner (dont les œuvres sont ancrées dans la mythologie germanique) , les marches militaires, les chants de propagande et les mélodies évoquant le « terroir » (la fameuse « Heimat ») . Pour la musique légère, il faut avant tout distraire les foules et créer une impression de bonheur et d'insouciance. On voit donc fleurir les comédies musicales, les bluettes et les revues dansées. Le régime nazi engage d'excellents compositeurs et musiciens dont ils exigent des œuvres de qualité, modernes, mais exemptes de toute trace d'influence américaine. Ils doivent travailler selon des formes fixées par la censure. C'est ainsi que naît un genre musical étrange, fortement sentimental, où les improvisations sont en réalité prévues dans la partition. Des années durant, les tubes du 3e « Reich » , enjoués et populaires, prétendent ainsi véhiculer la joie-de-vivre et l'âme Romantique des Allemands. Parallèlement, les Nazis bannissent ce qu'ils décrètent être la musique « dégénérée » : le jazz et toute tendance musicale venue d'outre-Atlantique, les musiques « de nègres » , les œuvres dodécaphoniques, celles de compositeurs d'origine juive ou de compagnons de route de Bertolt Brecht comme Kurt Weill, Paul Dessau ou Hanns Eisler.

Les buts des Nazis

Autant que de propagande, il s'agit de haine profonde, totale. Ce n'est pas qu'une histoire du mauvais goût légendaire des Josef Gœbbels, Hermann Göring, Adolf Hitler (peintre viennois raté dès 1908) , mais cette volonté d'anéantissement de tout un pan de la culture, et cette peur panique de l'Art moderne. La pensée nazie va vers le paganisme des origines et rejette la raison éclairante. Il s'agit aussi d'édifier un nouveau culte, un nouvel ordre esthétique. Cette folie anti-sémite aura conduit à la haine totale. La musique dégénérée aux yeux des Nazis est bien plus qu'une catégorie esthétique, c'est un critère idéologique illustrant la vision du monde nazie. Les 2 se mélangent et se complètent, une musique acceptable pour les Nazis est interdite si elle est celle d'un sous-être ou d'un opposant. Celle de proches idéologiques interdites si elle trop avancée. La hantise de la dégénérescence, de la souillure, le mélange d'idéologie et de goût petit-bourgeois ont donné cette notion d'art dégénéré. La chasse à la dégénérescence en art aura donné dès l'arrivée au pouvoir, en 1933, une implacable répression. Toute une éclosion artistique aura été brisée, et combien de carrières cassées, d'exils, de meurtres en camp de concentration ou de suicides. Des centaines d'interprètes et de

compositeurs ont ainsi été frappés Il y aura eu un Auschwitz culturel aussi. Le nombre des musiciens persécutés par les Nazis se situerait entre 5,000 et 10,000 selon les sources. Comme Bertolt Brecht l'écrivait à Paul Hindemith :

« La musique n'est pas une arche sur laquelle on peut survivre au déluge. »

Le comportement du régime nazi envers la musique ou les arts est un révélateur important de sa folie meurtrière.

Qu'en est-il encore aujourd'hui ?

On a réhabilité toute la littérature interdite et tous les livres brûlés ont été ré-édités, mais la musique dégénérée n'a pas eu encore sa reconnaissance, pire on encense les pires musiciens du Nazisme : Carl Orff, Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner et la vision de la musique allemande par les Nazis n'a pas disparu loin de là : Beethoven génie tellurique que l'on continue à jouer « à la Furtwängler » , Richard Wagner reste le dieu de l'art total.

Il faut remarquer que certaines des œuvres mises au pilori ne s'en sont toujours pas remises :

Le long tunnel de la reconnaissance de Gustav Mahler, jusqu'en 1970 !

Les œuvres maudites qui n'ont jamais été joués et dont on possède les partitions.

Les œuvres dont on se méfie encore (Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Kurt Weill) .

Les bourreaux deviennent comme souvent les victimes : le culte envers les Elizabeth Schwarzkopf, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Karl Böhm, Clemens Krauß, Hans Knappertsbusch (le cas d'Herbert von Karajan est plus compliqué) ; et on fera de ces « collabos » le cœur de la dénazification musicale des années 1950 !

12 ans de totalitarisme absolu doit nous rendre méfiant envers les pouvoirs de la musique et son dévoiement. On est passé de Bach aux « Camps de la Mort » , presque sans problème. Mais il ne faut pas rejeter la musique allemande ni les autres musiques d'ailleurs. La banalité du mal a tout souillé, il ne faut pas qu'elle continue à triompher.

« La musique creuse le ciel » , dit Baudelaire.

Cela reste toujours vrai, même si le ciel a servi de tombeau à des millions de gens.

...

Dans le cadre des Ires journées de la musique du 3e « Reich » , du 22 au 29 mai 1938, une exposition intitulée « Entartete Musik » (musique dégénérée) est inaugurée à Düsseldorf le 24 mai, elle accueille le public jusqu'au 14 juin.

Cette exposition est organisée par le docteur Hans Serverus Ziegler (1893-1978) , « Gauleiter » de Thuringe dès 1933,

Conseiller d'État, et Directeur des théâtres du régime hitlérien. Après la Guerre, il dirige des théâtres, enseigne, et dans sa vieillesse publie des livres orientés à l'extrême-droite, notamment des ouvrages biographiques sur Adolf Hitler.

Josef Goebbels y prononce un discours de politique musicale, le 22 mai, Richard Strauß y assure la partie musicale.

Il s'agit pour les Nazis de préserver la pureté de la musique allemande, de montrer ce qui a été censuré (nettoyé) depuis 5 ans. On y retrouve l'irrationalité de leurs thèmes, les condamnations outrancières, la propagande massive et spectaculaire, les slogans haineux, et en arrière-plan, la propagation d'un mot d'ordre : « l'Allemagne, pays de la musique », qui a encore aujourd'hui de la résonance.

C'est pour que l'Allemagne devienne le pays de la musique Classique, qu'il faut la purifier, la libérer de la « presse d'égoût » et de la « domination juive ». Grâce au National-Socialisme, les artistes se trouvent devant un avenir pur et non falsifié, dit Goebbels dans son discours du 28 mai (en y amalgamant un « expressionnisme atonal »).

C'est une exposition, diffamatoire contre des artistes, qui utilise l'attirail idéologique incohérent et bricolé de la droite populiste, raciste, nationaliste, et anti-démocratique. On y retrouve également des éléments de polémique, autour des musiques atonales, jugées, dès 1920, « bolchéviques », par le compositeur Hans Pfitzner.

Dans la visée, autour de la thématique « musique et race », les musiques atonales, celles de la Seconde École de Vienne (musique sérielle), le jazz « nègre », la musique tzigane, les compositeurs de confession juive, ou issus de familles de confession juive, les compositeurs de gauche, une grande partie des musiques « modernistes » du 1er tiers du XXe siècle.

Une liste d'œuvres interdites aux orchestres est établie. Un dictionnaire des Juifs dans la musique est publié en 1940.

Plus de 200 compositeurs sont mis à l'index. Les musiciens contemporains sont privés de travail sous le régime hitlérien, certains s'exilent, d'autres sont assassinés dans les camps de concentration.

L'affiche, un musicien noir affublé d'une « Étoile de David », et jouant du saxophone, est une référence à l'Opéra « Jonny spielt auf ! » (« Johnny mène la danse ! ») d'Ernst Křenek, qui met en scène des amours entre blancs et noirs. Cet opéra, composé en 1925, a connu un très grand succès international jusqu'en 1930.

Plus de 200 compositeurs sont mis à l'index. Les musiciens contemporains sont privés de travail sous le régime hitlérien, certains s'exilent, d'autres sont assassinés dans les camps de concentration.

Mais c'est essentiellement sur 3 compositeurs que s'acharnèrent les Nazis : Giacomo Meyerbeer, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy et Gustav Mahler. Ils sont jugés comme la source de la dégénérescence juive au sein de la musique Romantique allemande au XIXe siècle. Ainsi, Blessinger, grand théoricien anti-sémite, voyait dans Mendelssohn le modèle du « Juif assimilé » ; dans Meyerbeer, celui du « Juif affairiste sans scrupules » ; et dans Mahler, « le type fanatique du rabbin d'Europe de l'Est » (Mahler est né en Bohême). Meyerbeer restait le rival heureux de Wagner, donc, un

ennemi.

Giacomo Meyerbeer (1791-1864) .

Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (1819-1847) ; le musicologue nazi, Karl Blessinger, décrit Mendelssohn, comme l'archétype du Juif assimilé falsificateur de culture.

Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) .

On trouve également :

Béla Bartók (1881-1945) considérant comme un honneur le fait d'être traité de « dégénéré » par le régime Nazi aurait lui-même demandé que sa musique soit incluse dans l'Exposition.

Alban Berg (1885-1935) .

Boris Blacher (1903-1975) .

Walter Braunfels (1882-1954) .

Paul Dessau (1894-1979) .

Hugo Distler (1908-1942) .

Hans Eisler (ami de Bertolt Brecht) .

Norbert Glanzberg (1910-2001) .

Berthold Goldschmidt (1903-1996) .

Jefim Golysheff (1897-1970) .

Pavel Haas (1899-1944) .

Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963) .

Josef Matthias Hauer (1883-1959) qui cessa complètement de composer lorsque qu'il fut placé sur la « liste » en 1938.

Paul Hindemith (1895-1963) .

Léon Jessel (1871-1942) .

Igor Kahn (1905-1956) .

Rudolf Karell (1880-1945) .

Gideon Klein (1919-1945) .

Erich Wolfgang Korngold (1897-1957) .

Hans Krása (1899-1944) .

Ernst Křenek (1900-1991) qui n'est pas, lui, d'origine juive, est également flétri parce qu'il utilise le jazz - « cette invasion nègre » , toujours selon Josef Gæbbels !

Joseph Marx (1882-1964) .

Darius Milhaud (1892-1974) .

Karol Rathaus (1895-1954) .

Eddie Rosner (1910-1976)

Miklos Rozsa (1907-1995) .

Franz Schmidt (1874-1939) .

Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951) .

Franz Schreker (1878-1934) .

Erwin Schuloff (1894-1942) .

Richard Heinrich Stein (1882-1942) .

Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971) qui lâchement protesta en hurlant qu'il n'avait jamais été « communiste, matérialiste, athéiste ou bolchéviste » (lettre du 14 avril 1933) .

Ernst Toch (1887-1964) .

Viktor Ullmann (1898-1944) .

Franz Waxman (1906-1967) .

Anton Webern (1883-1945) mis aussi à l'index tout en étant pro-Nazi voulut convaincre Hitler que le dodécaphonisme assurerait la domination allemande sur la musique pendant 1,000 ans !

Kurt Weill (1900-1950) .

Stefan Wolpe (1902-1972) .

Eric Zeisl (1905-1959) .

Alexander von Zemlinsky (1871-1942) .

...

Des chef-d'œuvres condamnés au nom du totalitarisme mais dont les verdicts furent hélas reconduits par les hégémonies modernistes de l'après-guerre sont encore en attente de réelle libération : à savoir, trouver enfin un public qui pourra ainsi appréhender sa propre histoire de pair à l'histoire de la musique du XXe siècle. Cependant, entre ces musiques tellement interdites (qu'on ne sait même plus qu'il y eut interdit ou qu'il y eut un jour musique) et l'absolue évidence du génocide, la relation de causalité (voire de générique) est à soumettre à l'évidence. Quoi de commun entre l'index musical des Nazis et la volonté d'exterminer une partie de l'humanité ? Quel lien entre l'annihilation culturelle et la volonté finale ? Comment peut-on institutionnaliser l'une pour fonctionnaliser l'autre ? À moins que tout ne soit contenu anonymement dans la nasse que forge le Pouvoir afin d'assurer son absolue cécité sur un monde rendu sourd par cessation de musique ?

Le 7 avril 1933, la ségrégation antisémite nazie s'édifie avec la Loi de Reconstitution de l'Administration qui exclue implicitement les juifs du cadre public, loi complétée en 1935 par les Lois de Nuremberg qui élargiront l'interdit à tout le champ social. Dès 1933, les compositeurs et musiciens juifs ne peuvent plus exercer leur art en Allemagne. Le cas particulier de l'immense compositeur Frank Shreker (1878-1934) , obligé de démissionner de la direction du Conservatoire de Berlin, dès 1932, nous signifie ce que fut le climat mafieux qui présida au vote de la loi.

C'est en mars 1933 que Shreker, exaspéré par les tensions subies, écrit au Directeur de l'Académie des Arts :

« Lorsque l'année dernière, poussé par Monsieur Havemann qui vint me voir en quelque sorte comme représentant du Parti, j'ai démissionné de mon poste de directeur, Monsieur Havemann s'engagea (il me le garantissait) à ce qu'on me laisse désormais en paix. Et voici que la menace recommence à nouveau *. Mon ascendance : ma mère descend d'une vieille famille aristocratique ; mon grand-père maternel était major de l'armée autrichienne ; mon père était hongrois.

Je ne sais rien d'autre de lui que, selon une lettre, il était protestant. Mais il est vraisemblable qu'il était d'ascendance juive. Il avait reçu de nombreuses décorations autrichiennes et allemandes et la grande médaille d'or pour les arts et les sciences d'Autriche ainsi, je crois, que de Bavière et du Wurtemberg. J'ai moi-même la croix de guerre autrichienne de 2e classe pour le service civil. J'ai été élevé comme catholique, et je me suis assis dès 16 ans au banc d'orgue d'une église viennoise. Que veut-on donc de moi * ? Quant au fait qu'un gouvernement socialiste m'est nommé, je n'y puis rien. »

Lettre morte, Franz Shreker, à l'annonce de son renvoi de l'Académie, sera victime d'une violente crise cardiaque. Un des plus grands compositeurs occidentaux mourra ainsi le 21 mars 1934, sans connaître ce qu'allait devenir « la menace » ni ce que « l'on allait vouloir de lui ». Avant d'essayer de répondre à cette double interrogation, on peut remarquer que cette lettre donne à lire entre les lignes d'une angoisse toute personnelle le syntagme culturel nazi qui ne se manifestera officiellement que 4 ans plus tard :

Musique vivante (malgré sa continuité avec la tradition) - Socialisme (Weimar veut dire bolchévique) - Juif.

Le 24 mai 1938 fut inaugurée à Düsseldorf l'Exposition « Entartete Musik » (musiques dégénérées), écho de l'Exposition « Entartete Kunst » (art dégénéré) qui avait eu lieu à Munich, l'année précédente. « Entartete Musik » regroupait de manière tout à fait arbitraire sous le terme générique de « dégénéré » tout ce qui avait été l'actualité musicale florissante sous la république de Weimar : une thématique était consacrée au jazz et à « l'opérette juive de jadis au rythme du jazz », une autre fustigeait toute l'activité musicale professionnelle (éducation, diffusion, Opéra) sous le terme de « bolchévisme musical », une section étant réservée aux théoriciens de l'atonalité, figuraient au nombre des partitions exposées en tant que « dégénérées » entre autres les chef-d'œuvres :

« La Main heureuse » d'Arnold Schönberg, « Lehrstück » de Paul Hindemith, « Jonny Spielt Auf ! » de Ernst Křenek, « les Stigmatisés » et « le Son lointain » de Franz Shreker, « l'Histoire du Soldat » de Igor Stravinsky, « Kuhle Wampe » de Hanns Eisler, « Lulu » et « Wozzeck » de Alban Berg, « la Princesse au Petit Pois » de Ernst Toch.

Aucun lien formel ne relie ces compositeurs si ce n'est qu'ils contribuaient tous à l'actualité de la vie musicale. Seule une volonté d'éradiquer la musique dans son ensemble paraît tout d'abord être l'objectif de l'Exposition : il n'y a pas eu de catalogue de l'« Entartete Musik » car un tel catalogue était impossible à documenter. Mais il y eut une brochure dont la couverture, sous forme d'affiche, référait à l'Opéra de Ernst Křenek (1900-1992) : « Jonny spielt auf » (Jonny mène la danse !), créé à Berlin en 1925 et dont le héros était un noir.

Voici ce que Křenek écrivit après avoir pu s'exiler aux États-Unis :

« Il est un fait que je me trouvais, en tous les cas, sur la liste noire des Nazis (ou sur une liste du même genre), que l'on m'ait considéré comme juif, comme « aryen », communiste, catholique, tchèque, autrichien ou je ne sais quoi d'autre. Tout simplement, ils n'aimaient ni ma musique ni ma philosophie artistique et avaient recueilli du matériel à ma charge depuis des années. La liste de mes crimes était impressionnante, voire interminable dans mon exaltation du nègre dans « Jonny spielt auf ! » * ; mon cas était donc clair. Bien trop de gens attendaient de voir disparaître de la

scène des individus de mon acabit. Il est évident que le Nazisme devait une grande part de son succès à la jalousie hystérique des démunis. »

Nous verrons qu'un compositeur à l'acuité aussi brillante que Křenek peut lui aussi s'illusionner sur le véritable objectif sous jacent à la liste des condamnés de l'« Entartete Musik ». Si l'on revient à l'affiche de l'exposition de 1938 qui cite iconiquement son Opéra, nous pouvons dégager ses prédicats : un Křenek noir, jouant du saxophone, portant à la boutonnière de son smoking de concert « l'Étoile de David ». C'est-à-dire un ensemble de métissage : un noir (certainement américain, donc un esclave), un saxophone (instrument moderne exclus de la nomenclature Classique), un « smoking » (référant au rituel du concert), l'« Étoile de David » (une anti-décoration, un marquage). Métissage qu'avait déjà souligné, en 1930, l'idéologue Alfred Rosenberg (qui se verra ravir par Josef Gœbbels la main mise sur la culture) à propos de la reprise de « Jonny spielt auf ! » à Munich :

« " Jonny ", le symbole du Maître du monde abâtardi, judéo-nègre, est debout sur une grande mappe-monde et, à ses pieds, l'humanité blanche danse au son du jazz, saute en cercle autour du globe en faisant des courbettes, comme jadis les juifs autour du veau d'or, tout en " chantant " en chœur. Ces mots d'humanité blanche dansant autour du nègre " Jonny " avec des convulsions abominables de lascivité, le remerciant du déchaînement des plus bas instincts, proclament à la face du monde le triomphe victorieux du sang judéo-nègre sur l'ancienne culture aryenne. »

Il est un fait que Křenek est un de ces compositeurs « mis à l'index » par les Nazis qui ne soit pas juif. Mais, en tant que compositeur de l'Opéra « Jonny » et par la suite d'œuvres dodécaphoniques, en tant qu'époux de la fille de Gustav Mahler, Ernst Křenek sera toujours identifié par le régime comme compositeur « dégénéré » donc juif. De même dans l'Exposition « Entartete Musik », la caricature de Igor Stravinsky portait la légende : « qui a inventé l'histoire selon laquelle Stravinsky descendrait de la noblesse russe ? », présupposant une ascendance juive du compositeur complètement fautive. Si nous regardons à nouveau l'affiche « Entartete Musik », nous pouvons envisager le glissement qui va du métissage en tant que cause de la dégénérescence de la musique allemande à la notion de race en tant que fondement d'idéologie nazie : « l'Étoile de David » n'est plus une anti-décoration mais l'unique marquage porteur de tous les dangers de contamination.

C'est un véritable terme vicariant qui va servir à identifier tout et tous ce qui peut(vent) être menace pour la pureté d'une utopique musique allemande - celle-ci impérialisant les traditions autrichiennes (l'invasion de l'Autriche ne date que de 2 mois), tchèques, slovaques, hongroises, roumaines, et jusqu'à française (Darius Milhaud, Paul Dukas) - la Musique ne pouvant être que celle d'un « Reich » unique, d'un Peuple unique et du « Führer » unique telle qu'elle fut embaumée par Hitler lui-même dans le « temple » du « Walhalla », près de Ratisbonne, en 1937, lorsqu'il ajouta au Panthéon (où l'on retrouve déjà Ludwig van Beethoven et Richard Wagner) le petit paysan Bruckner en butte à l'hostilité de la société viennoise corrompue par la « juiverie »*.

Cependant, pour le public de l'Exposition de Düsseldorf, ce qui menaçait la musique allemande dans son utopique unicité n'était qu'une liste improvisée et non exhaustive de compositeurs disparates de par leur origine, leur génération et leur esthétique (ainsi Béla Bartók qui n'était pas à l'origine dans la liste noire exigea d'en faire partie). Nous avons vu l'impossibilité d'un catalogue raisonné qui puisse fonder le concept d'« Entartete Musik ». Mais reportons-

nous à cet extrait du texte accompagnant la brochure rédigée par le pseudo-commissaire Hans Severus Ziegler et qui demeure le seul « prétexte » de l'Exposition :

« Ce qui est réuni dans l'Exposition " Entartete Musik " représente le reflet d'un véritable sabbat de sorcières et du bolchévisme culturel le plus frivole, aux plans spirituel et artistique ; c'est aussi le reflet du triomphe de la sous-humanité, de l'arrogante impudence juive et d'un complet abrutissement intellectuel. La musique juive et la musique allemande demeurent étrangères. Les lois de la musique juive ou les constructions intellectuelles et les doctrines du faux-semblant, la physique et la physiologie juives du son se développent actuellement de façon clairement prédominante dans le monde musical de sang allemand, de telle sorte qu'il existe des imbéciles beni-oui-oui allemands qui ne peuvent se soustraire aux influences d'une race inférieure à cause de leur propre faiblesse et de leur manque de force créatrice et d'inspiration. La dégénérescence de la musique et de la création musicale allemandes naît alors par la force des choses. La musique " dégénérée " est ainsi au fond une musique non allemande, pour laquelle la partie saine du peuple ne trouvera également aucun organe de réception, aucune émotion et aucune réceptivité. »

Le titre du texte de Ziegler figurant sur l'affiche « Entartete Musik » est « Eine Abrechnung » (un règlement de compte) , écho du titre donné par Adolf Hitler au 1er volume de « Mein Kampf » . Mais Hitler, dans son livre, ne reliait la dégénérescence qu'au seul bolchévisme. Dans l'extrait jargonnesque de Ziegler, on voit que le syntagme :

« Musique Vivante - Bolchévisme - Juif » est remplacé par le postulat :

« Musique de sabbat (tous styles confondus : du jazz au post-Romantisme en passant par l'atonalisme et le dodécaphonisme) + Bolchévisme + Non Humanité = Son Juif »

* En janvier 1941, Adolf Hitler, suite à l'écoute de la 7e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner dans son « Repaire du Loup » , qualifia son opposant le compositeur Johannes Brahms de « phénomène de salon porté aux nues par la juiverie » . Le critique musical Eduard Hanslick, qui était « demi-juif » et qui défendait Brahms, avait fait de la vie à Vienne du « petit paysan » Bruckner « un enfer » . Et Hitler d'ajouter que c'était « la chose la plus amère » que « de devoir vivre dans un environnement qui ne comprend pas ce qu'on crée ou ce qu'on pourrait créer » !

...

L'histoire culturelle a longtemps laissé la musique et la vie musicale de côté, accordant la primauté à la littérature et aux arts plastiques. On ne trouve ainsi, avant les années 1980, aucune étude d'ensemble sur la musique sous le Nazisme : seul le recueil de documents réuni et présenté par Joseph Wulf, qui s'inscrit dans la série d'ouvrages que ce dernier a consacrés au 3e « Reich » , est paru en 1966. (1) Il faut ensuite attendre 1982, soit près de 20 ans, pour voir paraître l'ouvrage de Fred Prieberg. (2) Depuis lors, les publications se sont multipliées, en particulier en Allemagne : en témoignent notamment l'ouvrage de Hanns-Werner Heister et Hans-Günther Klein (3) et, en 1988, la reconstitution de l'exposition de Düsseldorf de Albrecht Dümling et Peter Girth marquant le 50e anniversaire de cette exposition, accompagnée d'un ouvrage collectif, présentant documents d'archive et commentaires. (4) Dans les années 1990 ont paru plusieurs études en anglais, dont celles de Michæl Meyer (5) et d'Erik Levi (6) (à laquelle cet article

doit beaucoup) , suivie 3 ans plus tard par celle de Michæl H. Kater. (7) En outre, des équipes de recherche, comme celle de Peter Petersen à Hambourg, s'activent actuellement à mettre au jour les activités précises d'organismes et de personnalités du monde musical pendant le Nazisme, et s'efforcent de réhabiliter les œuvres de compositeurs persécutés. En 1993, à l'instigation de Michæl Haas et Albrecht Dümling, est ainsi née la collection « Entartete Musik » chez « Decca » , consacrée aux œuvres oubliées par l'histoire.

Force est pourtant de constater qu'on ne trouve pas d'écho dans notre pays de ces travaux, aucun des ouvrages cités n'ayant été traduit et aucune étude n'ayant paru en français (8) sur ce sujet, alors même que s'est tenu en Italie, par exemple, un colloque en 1989. (9) Il a d'ailleurs fallu attendre une date récente pour que s'amorcent des recherches sur la vie musicale en France sous l'Occupation, (10) et le chemin qui reste à parcourir est encore long et semé d'embûches, tant sont fortes les résistances auxquelles se heurtent les chercheurs pour consulter les archives de l'époque. Pourtant, l'importance de la musique dans l'identité allemande mérite qu'on s'intéresse à la place que lui accordait le Nazisme. On évoquera donc à grands traits la place de la musique dans l'organigramme du pouvoir nazi, avant de tenter de discerner les critères selon lesquels une musique était taxée de « dégénérée » .

Le contrôle de la vie musicale

Un État totalitaire contrôle, par définition, toutes les sphères de la société, ce qui inclut la vie culturelle. Josef Gœbbels, qui avait été nommé dès mars 1933 ministre de la Propagande et de l'Éducation du peuple (« Volksaufklärung ») , avait vu ses attributions étendues à tout ce qui concernait « l'influence spirituelle de la nation, la propagande en faveur de l'État, de la culture et de l'économie, l'information de l'opinion publique allemande » . Le 22 septembre, une loi du ministère de la Propagande institua la « Reichkulturkammer » (Chambre de la Culture du « Reich ») , illustrant ainsi la volonté de mettre l'art et la culture au service de la promotion de l'État. Conformément à l'organisation interne du régime, le pouvoir sur la culture était partagé entre un ministre du « Reich » (Gœbbels) et un dirigeant du Parti (Alfred Rosenberg) , auxquels s'ajoutait (avec la régionalisation) le président du Conseil de la puissante région de Prusse, Hermann Göring.

La Chambre de la Culture était divisée en 7 départements (théâtre, littérature, presse, radio, arts plastiques, musique et cinéma) , dont les présidents étaient nommés par le ministre. Son inauguration eut lieu le 15 novembre devant le « Krolloper » , lieu chargé de sens puisque c'est devant ce théâtre, si actif pendant la République de Weimar, que s'était déroulé l'autodafé, 6 mois plus tôt. Cette organisation eut pour conséquence immédiate l'exclusion des Juifs de la vie artistique, tout artiste devant obligatoirement y être inscrit pour avoir le droit d'exercer. Le département musical, la « Reichmusikammer » , couvrait l'ensemble des professions de la musique ; il comprenait la section des compositeurs, celle des instrumentistes, l'union des agents et organisateurs de concert, l'union des sociétés chorales et folkloriques, la section des éditeurs de musique, celle des marchands de musique et enfin, celle des facteurs d'instruments. L'éducation musicale et la musicologie dépendaient, quant à elles, du ministère de l'Éducation. À sa tête furent nommées 2 grandes figures du monde musical : le compositeur Richard Strauß, comme président, et le chef de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, Wilhelm Furtwängler, comme vice-président. Mais ces personnalités se heurtèrent rapidement au régime, faisant les frais des conflits de pouvoir entre Gœbbels, qui n'était pas hostile à l'art moderne, et Rosenberg, avant tout idéologue du régime. Le 1er, qui s'était adonné à la littérature dans les années 1920, avait d'abord protégé Paul

Hindemith, qui fut finalement limogé de son poste de professeur de composition au Conservatoire de Berlin, en octobre 1933, à la suite de l'action de Rosenberg contre son Opéra « Mathis der Maler ». À la suite de cette affaire, Furtwängler, qui avait soutenu Hindemith, dut démissionner en décembre 1934. Quant à Richard Strauß, il fut contraint d'abandonner son poste le 13 juillet 1935, (11) en raison d'une lettre qu'il avait adressée à Stefan Zweig, le librettiste (juif) de « Die schweigsame Frau » (12) et Hitler demanda même à la presse de rester discret à l'occasion du 80e anniversaire du compositeur en 1944. Strauß et Furtwängler furent remplacés par des compositeurs de peu de renom mais loyaux serviteurs du régime : Peter Raabe et Paul Graener.

Erik Levi souligne l'ambiguïté de l'action de la « Musikkammer ». En étendant sa main-mise sur les institutions musicales (sauf Bayreuth, directement placé sous le contrôle de Hitler), et en les subventionnant, le gouvernement leur permit aussi de se redresser. En prenant par exemple en charge, en octobre 1933, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin (qui était alors au bord de la banqueroute) pour en faire un véritable orchestre officiel du « Reich », l'État assurait ainsi le plus haut salaire jamais donné à ses musiciens. (13) De même, les instrumentistes, qui avaient conservé leur poste, bénéficièrent de mesures telles que l'instauration d'un salaire minimum, la journée de travail de 6 heures ou l'instauration d'un jour de congé obligatoire. Raabe publia également un décret en 1936 interdisant aux musiciens de l'Orchestre de la radio de jouer à l'extérieur, ce qui offrait aux instrumentistes sans poste fixe davantage d'occasions de se produire et permettait de lutter contre le chômage. Ainsi, l'Allemagne pouvait cultiver son image de protectrice des arts et de « pays de la musique », diffusée à l'extérieur par les tournées de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin.

Pourtant cette politique, issue autant des conceptions politiques que du goût personnel des dirigeants, était souvent incohérente et eut à l'évidence une influence limitée sur le goût du public : l'admiration d'Adolf Hitler pour Richard Wagner eut peu d'influence sur le répertoire des Orchestres, qui programmaient surtout Johannes Brahms, Richard Strauß, Anton Bruckner et Max Reger, et n'enraya pas le déclin de Wagner au profit de Verdi sur la scène. (14)

Richard Wagner, modèle de la musique allemande

La promotion d'un art authentiquement allemand s'appuya sur l'utilisation et la glorification de Richard Wagner : dans « Mein Kampf », Hitler décrit l'admiration qu'il conçut pour le compositeur lors d'une représentation de « Lohengrin » à laquelle il aurait assisté à l'âge de 12 ans. Il est trop rare qu'un musicien occupe une telle place dans les fondements idéologiques d'un État pour qu'on ne s'y arrête pas quelque peu. Certes, la musique faisait partie des attributs de l'identité du pays, comme les nationalistes ne se privèrent pas de le rappeler : « Deutschland das Land der Musik » peut-on lire sur une affiche de l'époque, slogan réaffirmé par un aigle au corps figuré par un rang de tuyaux d'orgue. (15) L'auteur des « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » avait certainement contribué à réactiver cette idée, vraisemblablement née du Romantisme allemand, de « l'Allemagne, pays de la musique » : n'avait-il pas, dans un article de 1841, affirmé que les Allemands étaient « le peuple le mieux doué par Dieu qui fit naître un Mozart et un Beethoven » ? (16) Aussi, Wagner était-il abondamment utilisé au service de l'idéologie nationaliste et, dans son Histoire de la musique allemande, Josef Müller-Blattau ne manqua pas de citer la phrase lapidaire de l'illustre compositeur : « L'Italien est un chanteur, le Français un virtuose, l'Allemand un musicien. » (17) Les idées de Wagner reflètent le préjugé selon lequel les Français auraient des mœurs légères et faciles et une musique conforme à cette

image, alors que les Allemands, réputés sérieux, seraient détenteurs de l'art véritable. Wagner réussit dans sa révolution esthétique, à concilier l'Opéra, en vogue à Paris, avec la musique instrumentale sérieuse des Allemands. Cette révolution se concrétisa par la construction de l'Opéra de Bayreuth, où le théâtre, lieu traditionnel du divertissement, s'était métamorphosé en un sanctuaire de la musique, exigeant le plus grand recueillement, dont il était lui-même le Créateur, « le Dieu irradiant un sacre », selon Stéphane Mallarmé. Bayreuth devint ainsi, dès la fin du 19^e siècle, un centre de pèlerinage où l'on accourait de tous les pays. En France, le fameux guide d'Albert Lavignac, paru en 1897 et maintes fois ré-édité, débute par une véritable profession de foi :

« On va à Bayreuth comme on veut, à pied, à cheval, en voiture, à bicyclette, en chemin de fer, et le vrai pèlerin devrait y aller à genoux. » (18)

Les livrets, conçus par le compositeur lui-même, participent de cette religion. Sans se livrer ici à une exégèse de la symbolique de Wagner, on peut noter que le caractère cosmique et an-historique de ses textes, prenant la forme de mythes universalistes, les rendaient particulièrement aptes à une récupération politique. Les pseudo-mythes nordiques pouvaient ainsi se substituer aux Églises en place, « la mythologie wagnérienne n'étant pas la religion chrétienne, mais un culte spécial sorti du cerveau de Wagner » . (19) Quant à Hitler, il lui était facile de s'identifier à Siegfried, ce héros germanique et rédempteur qui tue Mime, le nain répugnant des Niebelung, dont l'analogie avec le Juif, tel que se le représentait Wagner, apparaît explicitement dans les écrits de son épouse Cosima.

Comme l'écrivait Theodor W. Adorno, en 1938, « l'antisémitisme wagnérien rassemble en lui tous les ingrédients de l'antisémitisme ultérieur » , (20) même si, ce qu'on a appelé « le Cercle de Bayreuth » , dont faisait notamment partie Houston Stewart Chamberlain, a contribué dans une large mesure à le théoriser. (21) Le fait que le pamphlet de Wagner, « Le judaïsme et la musique » , ait été utilisé dans les écoles pour inculquer l'antisémitisme durant le Nazisme (22) est révélateur de l'importance qui lui était accordée. C'est que cet écrit de 1850 (ré-édité en 1869) est d'un antisémitisme des plus virulents, utilisable tel quel par le régime.

On y lit, pour n'en citer qu'un exemple, que la laideur physique du Juif est incompatible avec l'art :

« Nous ne pouvons considérer comme susceptible de se manifester artistiquement, un homme dont nous devons juger l'aspect extérieur comme impropre à une réalisation artistique, à cause de sa race » . (23) Wagner apparaît donc sous bien des aspects comme une figure idéale pour Hitler : la révolution national-socialiste devait triompher, de même que la révolution esthétique opérée par la « musique de l'avenir » avait permis à la musique allemande de s'imposer à toute l'Europe. Aussi, Hitler entretenait-il des liens personnels avec Winifred, la fille de Wagner, qui dirigeait alors le Festival de Bayreuth, et sauva ce dernier de la faillite en le plaçant directement sous son autorité, sans passer par celle des Chambres de la Culture.

Anton Bruckner, héritier de Beethoven et de Wagner

Si Wagner incarnait un des principaux héros de la musique allemande, il était aussi considéré comme l'héritier de l'un de ses plus illustres prédécesseurs, Beethoven. L'affiche de la Semaine artistique allemande à Paris (24) , en septembre

1937, représentait ainsi la musique nationale par le buste de Beethoven, placé devant celui de Wagner, qui regarde dans la même direction que son glorieux prédécesseur. De fait, les Symphonies de Beethoven (en particulier, la 9e) furent abondamment jouées pendant cette période, notamment pour l'anniversaire de Hitler en 1942 et au concert final de l'exposition de Düsseldorf en 1938. (25)

Afin d'étoffer le rang des héros de l'histoire nationale, le régime trouva dans la personne d'Anton Bruckner (1824-1896) un compositeur non seulement digne de figurer aux côtés des 2 héros, mais permettant de les unir. Auteur de musique instrumentale essentiellement, en particulier des Symphonies, il réalisa l'union entre l'art symphonique de Beethoven et le langage wagnérien, et fut l'équivalent, pour la Symphonie, de Wagner, qui « eut le temps de voir réalisé par les Symphonies de Bruckner ce que lui-même rêvait d'accomplir » . (26) Le Festival organisé en juin 1937, les « Bruckner-Tage » (Journées Bruckner) , fut ainsi l'occasion de réaffirmer la suprématie de la musique germanique. Un buste en marbre du compositeur fut inauguré en présence de Hitler au « Walhalla » de Regensburg (Ratisbonne) , temple monumental érigé par Louis Ier de Bavière au sommet d'une colline dominant le Danube. Le cérémonial fut grandiloquent, le chancelier déposant une couronne de laurier au pied du piédestal sous le regard de l'aigle impérial. Le soir, on joua la 3e Symphonie et, à l'automne suivant, c'est également une œuvre de ce compositeur, le Finale de sa 5e symphonie, qui fut choisie pour clore les cérémonies de la Fête du travail (« Parteitag der Arbeit ») . Certes, Bruckner avait été fortement marqué par Wagner, dont il avait découvert en 1863 « Tannhäuser » et « Tristan und Isolde » , comme en témoignent l'ampleur de l'orchestre et le traitement des cuivres de ses longues Symphonies et de ses Messes, animées par la foi et la gloire de Dieu. L'attitude de recueillement que suscitait sa musique, et qui devait servir de modèle à l'attitude à adopter devant le nouveau Messie, explique sans doute aussi la faveur dont il fut l'objet. En outre, il avait été organiste, obtenant même d'être enterré sous l'orgue de l'abbatiale de Saint-Florian, où il avait été enfant de chœur. Or, l'orgue était particulièrement bien vu du régime pour sa puissance religieuse et cérémonielle et, comme on l'a vu, servait d'emblème à la musique. Enfin, comme le souligne Albrecht Dümling, (27) le fait que Bruckner fût autrichien ne gênait nullement les autorités mais leur permettait au contraire d'annexer musicalement ce pays germanophone, avant de le faire par les armes quelques mois plus tard. Les « Journées Bruckner » préparaient, en quelque sorte, l'« Anschluß » .

L'exposition de la musique « dégénérée »

Mais c'est surtout la politique d'exclusion systématique qui caractérise le régime nazi. Les « Journées musicales du “ Reich ” » (« Reichsmusiktage ») qui se déroulèrent en mai 1938, à Düsseldorf, considérée comme la capitale de la musique, furent l'occasion de présenter une exposition de propagande visant à dénoncer la musique « dégénérée » . Calquées sur le modèle des « Journées de l'art allemand » (« Tage der deutschen Kunst ») , qui s'étaient déroulées à Munich, en juillet 1937, et avaient donné lieu à l'exposition « Entartete Kunst » , ce Festival présenta ainsi l'exposition « Entartete Musik » , dont l'inauguration coïncidait avec le 125e anniversaire de la naissance de Richard Wagner (22 mai 1813) . La date relativement tardive de cette manifestation semble indiquer que la musique n'avait pas été la 1re des préoccupations du nouveau régime ; elle était traitée, en tout état de cause, après la peinture et la sculpture. Cette initiative tenait peut-être au fait qu'il restait à convaincre une partie de la population : le public n'avait-il d'ailleurs pas, l'année précédente, boudé l'exposition de l'art « authentiquement allemand » pour se presser à celle de l'art « dégénéré » qui présentait des œuvres de Franz Marc, Paul Klee et Wassily Kandinsky ?

Bien qu'organisée sous l'égide du ministère de la Propagande, dont Heinz Drewes dirigeait le département musical, l'exposition reflétait essentiellement les opinions de son commissaire, Hans Severus Ziegler, directeur du Théâtre national allemand de Weimar, antisémite notoire et pourfendeur de toute innovation artistique. C'est ce qui explique, comme le relève Erik Levi, que Igor Stravinsky fut présenté comme « dégénéré », alors même que son ballet « Perséphone » venait d'être autorisé par la Chambre du théâtre. La brochure que Ziegler fit paraître à cette occasion (28) permet de se faire une idée de l'idéologie ambiante. On y trouve tout d'abord une justification de la politisation de la musique, qui montre que les esprits restaient à convaincre : selon lui, la révolution national-socialiste concerne l'être humain tout entier, et doit s'occuper non seulement des conditions externes (le système politique) mais aussi de la partie intime de son existence, pour laquelle l'artiste doit avoir un rôle éducatif. Il s'agit donc d'appliquer en art la même action qu'en politique : comme la politique doit se libérer des idées démocratiques et « bolchéviques », la création artistique doit se débarrasser des esprits destructeurs de la nation. La politisation de l'art est ici si clairement revendiquée, qu'il paraît désormais difficile à un artiste de prétendre de bonne foi exercer son art dans le cadre du régime sans faire de politique, comme l'avait fait Furtwängler :

« Celui qui croit que la politique et l'art n'ont rien à voir et que les questions d'art pourraient ne pas être examinées sous l'angle du renouveau spirituel du nouveau peuple, ne comprend rien au National-Socialisme. » (29)

Ziegler tente également de définir le concept de « dégénérescence », emprunté à la médecine criminologique du 19^e siècle, qui désignait une dégradation par rapport à ce qui était défini comme une norme. Comme il le résume lui-même, « au fond, la musique dégénérée est la musique anti-allemande » (« entdeutsche Musik ») . (30) Cette conception de la musique, réduite à une simple opposition entre musique dégénérée et musique allemande, prenait modèle sur l'opposition (d'ailleurs, encore en vigueur en Allemagne) , entre Juifs et Allemands. Le terme « dégénéré », tout en englobant théoriquement tout ce que le Nazisme considérait comme s'opposant à son idéologie, comme le modernisme et le « bolchévisme », se réduisait « de facto » essentiellement au « Juif », tous ces termes étant d'ailleurs utilisés de manière confuse et indistincte par Ziegler. Celui-ci souligne pourtant la difficulté qui consiste à reconnaître une musique dégénérée, en dehors de l'Opéra, facilement repérable par son contenu littéraire. De fait, les compositeurs d'Opéras furent particulièrement exposés, comme le rappelle le cas de Richard Strauß, victime de ses relations avec son librettiste juif. Aussi, il ne sembla pas inutile de s'adjoindre la caution scientifique de musicologues. Comme l'a montré Pamela Potter, (31) la crise n'avait pas épargné la musicologie sous la République de Weimar. Aussi, la mise en place de projets sur la musique folklorique allemande ou soutenant l'idéologie et les buts du Parti, et les possibilités de promotion ouvertes par la vacance des postes anciennement occupés par des Juifs, suffirent à attirer les sympathies de nombreux musicologues. L'exposition de Düsseldorf était divisée en 5 groupes de travail (32) intitulés :

« Musique allemande », sous la direction de Joseph Maria Müller-Blattau, professeur à l'Université de Freiburg, que l'on peut considérer comme le musicologue officiel du Nazisme (c'est son ouvrage qui fut traduit en français sous l'Occupation) . (33)

« Maîtres allemands », sous la direction de Theodor Kroyer, qui enseignait à Cologne.

« L'État et la musique » sous l'égide de Heinrich Bessler (1900-1969), de l'Université de Heidelberg, connu encore aujourd'hui des musicologues pour ses éditions de musiques du Moyen-âge et de la Renaissance.

« Musicologie », sous l'autorité de Werner Korte.

« Musique et race », sous la direction de Friedrich Blume, de l'Université de Kiel, connu aujourd'hui comme le coordinateur de la grande encyclopédie de la musique MGG (« Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart »), dont les Iers volumes parurent en 1949.

Les œuvres étaient donc jugées essentiellement selon 2 critères, l'un s'appliquant au langage musical, l'autre à l'identité du créateur. Or, comme on va le constater, il n'était pas rare que ces 2 critères fussent en conflit.

Le rejet du jazz

L'un des principaux genres musicaux interdits était le jazz, représenté sur l'affiche de l'exposition de Düsseldorf par un joueur de saxophone. Cette affiche présente d'ailleurs le cas-type du détournement d'image à des fins politiques. Elle fait référence à l'affiche de l'Opéra qui connut (avec « l'Opéra de quat' sous ») le plus grand succès sous la République de Weimar : « Jonny spielt auf ! », du compositeur autrichien Ernst Křenek (1900-1991). (34) Mais, sur l'affiche, le personnage de Jonny est remplacé par une caricature grossière d'un noir aux lèvres démesurées, avec une étoile juive en guise de boutonnière. L'effet obtenu est saisissant et illustre le concept de « dégénérescence », par un habile mélange de tout ce qui est diabolisé : le Juif, le Noir, l'Amérique et le jazz.

Cette musique (en particulier, le « swing » qui connaissait alors une très grande vogue en Europe) était considéré à la fois comme le produit des Noirs, des Juifs (le clarinettiste Benny Goodman était sur toutes les ondes) et comme l'expression d'une morale dépravée. L'amalgame entre jazz et Juif (le jazzman de l'affiche est caricaturé comme Juif) n'était pas nouveau mais avait été renforcé en Allemagne par le fait que Bernhard Sekles, directeur du Conservatoire de Francfort, avait ouvert la Ire classe de jazz dans les années 1920. Sur le plan musical, on dénonçait l'utilisation débridée des syncopes et de la batterie ainsi que l'utilisation d'instruments primitifs. Pourtant, malgré une interdiction de diffusion à la radio, le jazz connaissait une vogue telle que les autorités durent assouplir leur politique, notamment en germanisant les plus grands succès : c'est ainsi que « Saint-Louis Blues » fut rebaptisé « Chanson de Louis bleu » (« Lied vom blauen Ludwig ») ! Aussi, malgré son succès phénoménal, l'Opéra de Křenek, créé le 10 février 1927 au « Neues Theater » de Leipzig (et qui donna lieu, dès la Ire saison, à 421 représentations dans plus de 40 villes allemandes, sans compter Moscou, Saint-Pétersbourg, Prague et même New York) choqua par le mélange des genres. C'est ce que reflète le ton ironique de ses défenseurs :

« Comment ? ces salles sacro-saintes, consacrées par les mystères de la musique de Mozart et de Wagner devraient résonner de rythmes insolents de jazz venus de la rue ? » (35)

Ernst Křenek, qui avait quitté Vienne pour Berlin en 1920, à la suite de son professeur de composition, et qui avait débuté par de la musique atonale, avait changé radicalement de langage dans cette œuvre, cherchant, comme il s'en

expliquait lui-même, à renouer avec le public :

« Je découvris de nouvelles relations entre l'art et la vie et appris qu'établir une relation directe entre l'artiste et le public n'était pas seulement possible mais souhaitable, et plus difficile à atteindre qu'un radicalisme extrême, qui se révélait incontrôlable et dans le fond très simple. » (36)

Pour le compositeur, il s'agissait d'entrer dans la sphère des intérêts du public plutôt que de l'élargir à une esthétique qu'il jugeait artificielle, par la perte du contact avec la réalité. C'est ce qui explique son retour au langage tonal et les emprunts à la musique à succès de son époque, le jazz.

Compositeurs juifs d'avant-garde

La politique d'exclusion s'explique ainsi en partie par une réaction épidermique à la République de Weimar et au foisonnement culturel qu'elle permit, le Nazisme opérant un amalgame entre l'esthétique musicale et le régime politique de l'époque. Dans la jeune métropole qu'était alors Berlin, on avait assisté, pour reprendre l'expression de Pascal Huynh, à un « bouillonnement musical », (37) dans lequel étaient représentés tous les courants, sans compter le jazz, les revues nègres et le music-hall. Berlin avait vu le début de l'éclatement des langages musicaux, témoignant de la volonté des compositeurs de trouver une voie après Wagner, et nombre d'entre eux (comme on vient de le voir pour Křenek) avaient adopté des courants successifs. Nombre d'entre eux cherchèrent, au sein de la « Neue Musik » (Nouvelle musique), à s'opposer radicalement à l'esthétique du Romantisme post-wagnérien de Max Reger, Hans Pfitzner ou Richard Strauß, qui avait mené à une expressivité exacerbée, un formalisme excessif et un recours à l'instrumental surdimensionné. C'est ainsi que se côtoyaient l'expressionnisme, la « Neue Sachlichkeit » (la Nouvelle objectivité) et le néo-Classicisme, sans compter les expérimentateurs influencés par le dadaïsme, tels que Erwin Schulhoff ou Stefan Wolpe. Ces derniers cherchaient à « choquer le bourgeois », car la présence de la droite nationaliste radicalisait les positions de 2 mondes qui se haïssaient et c'est Vienne, la ville la plus conservatrice, qui avait vu naître l'avant-garde la plus extrême, incarnée par Arnold Schönberg et ses disciples. Aussi, nombre de compositeurs autrichiens avaient-ils trouvé à Berlin un environnement plus favorable que dans leur pays.

Parmi eux figurait Franz Schreker (1878-1934), dont l'Opéra de style expressionniste, « Die Gezeichneten » (Les stigmatisés), créé à Francfort en 1918, avait frappé par les sonorités inouïes d'un orchestre de 120 musiciens, et reçu un accueil triomphal dans toute l'Allemagne. Son Opéra suivant, « Der Schatzgräber » (Le Chercheur de trésor) le consacra comme l'un des plus importants compositeurs d'Opéras de sa génération ; aussi, Schreker se vit-il offrir en 1920 le poste de professeur et directeur de la prestigieuse « Hochschule » (Conservatoire) de Berlin, pour lequel il abandonna celui de professeur de composition à la « Staatsakademie » de Vienne, entraînant à sa suite plusieurs de ses élèves. Son enseignement non dogmatique permit à toute une génération de compositeurs d'Allemagne et des pays limitrophes aussi différents que Karol Rathaus, Berthold Goldschmidt, Ernst Křenek ou Paul Dessau, de développer des styles variés, tout en s'attirant les foudres de la droite réactionnaire. À peine nommé à l'Académie prussienne des arts, en 1932, il fut limogé de toutes ses fonctions dès mars 1933, tant à cause de ses origines partiellement juives que de ses fonctions à la tête d'une institution considérée comme subversive. L'incompréhension de Schreker fut à la mesure des positions qu'il occupait, comme le montrent les démarches pathétiques qu'il entreprit auprès de Schilling, le

nouveau président de l'Académie des arts, et il mourut d'une crise cardiaque l'année suivante.

De même, Arnold Schönberg avait obtenu en 1925 le poste de la classe supérieure de composition de l'Académie prussienne des arts. Après avoir inventé en 1922 le dodécaphonisme en s'appuyant sur les 12 tons du total chromatique pour remplacer la tonalité, il avait appliqué ce système de manière stricte dans le Quintette pour vents, Opus 26, en 1924, et poursuivi cette écriture à Berlin, notamment dans les Variations pour orchestre, Opus 31, et le 3^e Quatuor à cordes, Opus 30. L'année où Schönberg obtenait son poste à Berlin, son disciple Alban Berg voyait son Opéra « Wozzeck » représenté au « Staatsoper » de Berlin sous la baguette d'Erich Kleiber. Même s'il refusa par 3 fois un poste au Conservatoire, Berg était donc aussi en relation étroite avec la capitale allemande et la « Suite lyrique », qui avait connu un grand succès en 1927, à Vienne, y était créée 2 ans plus tard dans sa version orchestrale.

Or, le langage musical des schœnbergiens était considéré comme subversif, et son intellectualité s'opposait radicalement à l'idée que se faisait Hitler de l'art allemand, qui se résumait, comme il l'avait déclaré au congrès de 1934, à : « être allemand, c'est être clair » .

Faut-il pour autant voir là la raison principale du limogeage de Schönberg en 1933 ? Comme le souligne Erik Levi, l'atonalité était considérée comme le produit d'une « conspiration juive » ; le sort réservé aux compositeurs « aryens » était moins prévisible, comme en témoigne le cas de Anton von Webern, le plus radical des disciples de Schönberg. Alors que sa Ire œuvre totalement dodécaphonique, le Trio à cordes, Opus 20, datait de 1928, venant après une période atonale et aphoristique qui remontait à 1909, il fut d'abord protégé, recevant même des subsides de l'État, (38) sans doute à cause de son attitude bienveillante à l'égard du régime. Après l'« Anschluß », son nom figura néanmoins sur la liste des compositeurs « dégénérés », ce qui illustre le fait rare d'un compositeur interdit pour sa seule esthétique, (39) mais qui put, de ce fait, rester en Autriche jusqu'à la fin de la Guerre.

Cette opposition entre Wagner et l'École de Schönberg peut sembler paradoxale de nos jours, où l'on s'accorde à considérer le fameux accord du début du prélude de « Tristan und Isolde », cette sorte « d'anarchie harmonique », selon l'expression du compositeur Henri Barraud, (40) comme le germe du dodécaphonisme. Par l'emploi continu de la modulation et du chromatisme, Wagner a, en tout cas, œuvré de manière significative dans le sens d'une destruction du langage tonal. De même, on peut voir dans sa mélodie continue, caractérisée par cette absence d'air individualisé et mémorisable qui avait de tout temps assuré le succès de l'Opéra, les prémices du « Sprechgesang » (chant parlé), que Schönberg développa à partir du « Pierrot lunaire », en 1912. En fait, ce que le Nazisme retient de Wagner, c'est moins la technique d'écriture musicale, que l'idée selon laquelle la musique doit parler aux sens, à l'âme, et non à l'intellect, comme le font l'art abstrait et la musique atonale, taxés d'intellectualisme et supposés loin des préoccupations du peuple. Selon Ziegler, « La politique culturelle consiste à promouvoir l'âme et la force créatrice du peuple, ainsi que tout ce qui fait la valeur des composantes populaires, que l'on entend par le terme "folklore" ». (41) Il acceptait les dissonances, tant qu'elles ne remettaient pas en cause la tonalité, dans laquelle avaient été composés les plus grands chef-d'œuvres allemands. La musique devait répondre à un idéal de clarté, symbolisé par l'accord parfait, qui permettait son accessibilité au plus grand nombre. C'est ainsi que Carl Orff bénéficia d'un changement d'opinion : ses fameux « Carmina Burana », d'abord critiqués par Herbert Gerigk lors de la création en

1937, furent finalement défendus en 1940 par Alfred Rosenberg, qui louait la simplicité mélodique et harmonique de la pièce, s'inspirant du folklore bavarois, et y voyait « la musique claire, ardente et disciplinée que demande notre époque ». (42) Schreker et Schönberg, à la fois modernes et juifs, étayaient donc facilement la thèse du complot judéo-bolchévique visant à détruire l'Allemagne éternelle. Mais comment d'autres compositeurs d'avant-garde, cette fois non juifs, furent-ils traités ?

Compositeurs aryens modernes : Hindemith, Stravinski et Bartók

Le « cas Hindemith », pour reprendre le titre du fameux article de 1934 de Wilhelm Furtwängler qui marqua la fin du régime de faveur dont bénéficièrent le compositeur et le chef d'orchestre, est révélateur des hésitations du régime et des divergences de ses dirigeants vis-à-vis des compositeurs non-juifs. Goebbels tenta en effet de rallier Hindemith (1895-1963) à sa cause, car c'était alors l'un des compositeurs allemands les plus réputés, qui avait en outre manifesté dans ses dernières œuvres un retour au langage tonal et à la simplicité. Comme la plupart de ses contemporains, celui-ci avait en effet expérimenté plusieurs styles : alors que ses Ires œuvres étaient marquées par l'expressionnisme, il devint l'un des principaux représentants de la « Nouvelle objectivité », prônant au contraire une esthétique d'où était bannie toute sensibilité individuelle. Ce fut notamment l'époque de la Suite de 1922 pour piano, où le caractère percussif de l'instrument prend le pas sur la beauté de la sonorité. Hindemith joua, en outre, un rôle décisif dans l'essor du Festival de Donaueschingen, entre 1921 et 1926, qui fut le 1er Festival consacré entièrement à la musique nouvelle, et en devint le centre européen à Aix-les-Bains jusqu'en 1930, donnant lieu à la création d'œuvres de Dessau, Eisler, Hindemith, Křenek, Milhaud, Webern ou Weill, entre autres.

Or, Hindemith, qui enseignait la composition depuis 1927 au Conservatoire de Berlin, se mit à s'intéresser à la pédagogie. Il écrivit des pièces simples pour les enfants et les amateurs, empruntant parfois au folklore, comme dans les « Konzertmusiken » (1930), qui pouvaient, selon Goebbels, être compatibles avec la nouvelle idéologie. Attaché à une politique de prestige, ce dernier pensait que le régime ne pouvait, sans mettre en péril son image, se permettre d'exclure tous les compositeurs importants, sous prétexte qu'ils étaient modernes, juifs, que leur librettiste était juif, que le traducteur de leur librettiste était juif, ou que l'argument de leur musique avait un rapport quelconque avec les Juifs. (43) Aussi, Hindemith se vit-il offrir une place au sein du conseil de la « Reichsmusikkammer ». Mais, dès 1934, à l'occasion de l'Opéra « Mathis der Maler », dont le livret relate les relations difficiles entre l'art et la politique, Hindemith, qui présentait en outre le défaut majeur d'avoir une épouse juive, fut désavoué publiquement par Goebbels. Celui-ci n'était plus en mesure de le défendre contre les attaques de Rosenberg, dont l'unique préoccupation était l'« aryanisation » de la vie musicale et dont le pouvoir devait s'accroître, surtout après l'entrée en Guerre. (44) Hindemith prit alors congé de son poste de professeur avant de séjourner en Suisse et de s'exiler enfin aux États-Unis.

Quant aux compositeurs étrangers, leur sort dépendait d'avantage de leur pays d'origine que de leur style musical. Stravinsky était considéré comme le représentant de l'internationalisme qui avait marqué la culture de Weimar et avait eu une grande influence sur les compositeurs allemands. D'abord taxé de « bolchévique » (alors qu'il avait quitté la Russie pour la France), il bénéficia ensuite de l'effet du pacte germano-soviétique. Admirateur de Benito Mussolini, il chercha à préserver ses liens avec l'Allemagne et se plaignit en 1939, lors d'une conférence à Harvard, de ce qu'on l'avait fait révolutionnaire malgré lui. Sa musique ne fut officiellement interdite qu'à partir de 1940, après qu'il eût

choisi de rester aux États-Unis.

Béla Bartók, en revanche, ne cacha jamais son hostilité au régime et avait quitté la maison d'édition viennoise Universal, dès son « aryanisation » lors de l'« Anschluß ». Mais, ressortissant d'un pays allié, il ne fut pas interdit et ses œuvres continuèrent d'être jouées dans plusieurs villes allemandes durant le Nazisme, y compris sa *Musique pour cordes, percussions et célesta* (1936), l'une des plus difficiles du point de vue harmonique. L'opposition au régime d'un Hongrois paraissait moins grave que celle d'un Allemand.

Compositeurs bolchéviques et / ou juifs

Les compositeurs allemands marqués politiquement à gauche étaient évidemment des cibles privilégiées ; or, par une « heureuse » coïncidence, les principaux compositeurs engagés étaient juifs, comme Theodor W. Adorno (1903-1969) (seul son père était juif), Paul Dessau (1894-1979), Kurt Weill (1900-1950) et Hanns Eisler (1898-1962). Ils ne légitimaient que trop l'idéologie du complot judéo-marxiste, même si, sur le plan musical, leur langage était paradoxalement conforme aux idées populistes des Nazis. Ainsi Eisler, élève de Arnold Schönberg jusqu'en 1923, était retourné au langage tonal après avoir intégré le Parti communiste allemand en 1926, et avait composé une série de chœurs, d'hymnes et de chants de marches entre 1926 et 1933, qui devinrent des classiques du mouvement socialiste. (45) Ses vues sur la nouvelle musique appelée, selon lui, à transformer la société, l'opposèrent à Schönberg, mais aboutirent à une esthétique proche de celle des Nazis : ceux-ci réutilisèrent certains de ses chants en transformant les paroles, comme « *Der rote Wedding* » (*Wedding la rouge*), qui devint « *Die Hitler-Jugend marschiert* » (*La Jeunesse hitlérienne avance*). Le langage de Kurt Weill, qui avait également été l'élève de Schönberg, suivit un parcours analogue, comme en témoignent les œuvres issues de sa collaboration avec Bertolt Brecht, telles que « *l'Opéra de quat' sous* » (1928).

Schönberg, en revanche, n'avait jamais affiché d'opinions politiques marquées (46) ; c'est son langage musical qui était taxé de « bolchévique ». L'atonalité, comme l'abstraction en peinture, était considérée, on l'a vu, comme révolutionnaire, et le fait que Schönberg fût juif permettait d'introduire un concept racial dans l'analyse musicale : le musicologue Hans Joachim Moser considérait l'atonalité comme le « signe d'une décadence culturelle sous l'influence juive ». (47) Dès lors, toute musique composée par un Juif, quel que fût son style, était automatiquement considérée comme dégénérée, ce qui explique que, parmi les principaux compositeurs post-wagnériens nés dans les années 1860-1870 comme Gustav Mahler, Hugo Wolf, Richard Strauß (le seul resté en vie à l'époque qui nous concerne) et Max Reger, seul le premier ait été interdit.

Seule l'origine du compositeur comptait alors, sans prise en compte de sa musique. 2 compositeurs, Erich Wolfgang Korngold (1897-1957) et Berthold Goldschmidt (1903-1995), remarquables sous la République de Weimar mais qui n'appartenaient pas au courant de la « *Neue Musik* » et n'avaient pas rompu avec l'héritage post-wagnérien, furent ainsi contraints de s'exiler en 1934 et 1935. Pianiste et chef d'orchestre né en Moravie, Korngold avait été l'un des rares enfants prodiges de la composition. Son ballet, « *Der Schneemann* » (*Le Bonhomme de neige*), composé à l'âge de 11 ans dans un style post-Romantique, fit sensation lorsqu'il fut joué à l'Opéra de la Cour de Vienne, et Richard Strauß ne cacha pas son admiration. Il composa avant l'âge de 15 ans plusieurs pièces de musique de chambre avant

d'acquérir une renommée internationale avec « Die tote Stadt » (Hambourg et Cologne, 1920) , Opéra en 3 actes, (48) suivi en 1927 par « Das Wunder der Heliane » , en 1927, qui fut un demi-échec, du fait d'une querelle l'opposant à Ernst Křenek. (49) Après son départ de Vienne en 1934 pour Hollywood, il ne composa pratiquement plus que de la musique de film, genre qu'il porta à son apogée et pour lequel il obtint 2 Oscars. Héritier malgré lui d'un monde disparu, il appliqua brillamment le langage wagnérien au cinéma américain, sans jamais réussir à se refaire un nom dans le monde musical d'après-Guerre, hostile à toute sensibilité Romantique, désormais associée au Fascisme. (50) Quant à Goldschmidt, qui avait étudié auprès de Franz Schreker à Berlin, il rejoignit l'Angleterre en 1935, après que les représentations de son Opéra « Der gewaltige Hahnrei » prévues à Berlin pour la saison 1932-1933 eurent été annulées, et ses activités de chef d'orchestre interdites. Comme Korngold, sa carrière de compositeur pâtit de son exil : successivement critiquée par les conservateurs et interdite par les Nazis, sa musique fut oubliée après la Guerre. Les œuvres qu'il composa en Angleterre, loin de ce qui se déroulait désormais à Darmstadt, restaient marquées par l'esthétique des années 1930, témoignage passé d'un monde disparu. Goldschmidt cessa alors de composer, ce long silence de 25 ans illustrant les conséquences tragiques de l'exil sur son destin. Par une cruelle ironie, l'esthétique de Korngold et de Goldschmitt, héritée de la tradition germanique, comme celle de Gustav Mahler, correspondait peu ou plus à l'esthétique prônée par les Nazis.

Pour le National-Socialisme, la musique se résumait donc à une opposition manichéenne entre musique allemande et musique dégénérée ; sa politique consistait à « aryaniser » la vie musicale, en particulier à la fin des années 1930, lorsque l'influence de Alfred Rosenberg prit le pas sur celle de Josef Gœbbels. La bonne musique, composée par un Allemand pure race, devait répondre à l'idéal de clarté et de sensibilité, qui caractérisait l'esthétique traditionnelle des grands Maîtres allemands. L'Opéra devait mettre en scène les symboles archétypaux de l'idéologie nazie, tels que la puissance, le courage et la supériorité raciale. Toute musique ne correspondant pas à ces critères était taxée de dégénérée, terme dont l'absence de définition précise permettait d'interdire toute œuvre suspecte. Mais les critères pseudo-esthétiques s'effaçaient devant des considérations politiques et raciales : était d'abord suspect l'homme (pour ses opinions politiques et / ou son origine juive) avant sa musique, peu dangereuse lorsqu'elle n'était pas vocale. De fait, seuls les compositeurs ni juifs ni ouvertement marxistes furent l'objet (au moins un temps) d'hésitations ou d'opinions divergentes parmi les dirigeants, et même Anton von Webern, sans doute le compositeur le plus extrémiste de sa génération, fut d'abord protégé.

Néanmoins, l'administration des théâtres et le public restèrent peu convaincus par le répertoire néo-wagnérien conforme à la nouvelle idéologie de Paul Graener, de Georg Vollerthun, de Siegfried Wagner ou de Max von Schillings : l'Opéra « Der Prinz von Homburg » , que Paul Graener fit représenter à Berlin en 1935 grâce à ses hautes-fonctions, ne resta que 3 jours à l'affiche. Les effets de cette politique se firent sans doute moins sentir pendant le Nazisme qu'indirectement après la Guerre. En effet, à l'appauvrissement de la création musicale de l'après-Guerre, amputée de la quasi-totalité des compositeurs d'Europe centrale, anéantis physiquement ou artistiquement, vint s'ajouter le radicalisme de l'avant-garde musicale, forme de revanche inconsciente sur la politique du 3e « Reich » , qui rejeta un peu plus dans l'oubli les derniers survivants de cette époque ?

- (1) Joseph Wulff, « Musik im Dritten Reich. Eine Dokumentation », Rororo Verlag, Hambourg (1966) .
- (2) Fred K. Prieberg, « Musik im NS-Staat », Fischer Verlag, Francfort (1982) .
- (3) Hans-Werner Heister, « Hans-Günther Klein, Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland », Fischer Verlag, Francfort (1984) .
- (4) Albrecht Dümling, Peter Girth (direction) , « Entartete Musik », Düsseldorf (1988) , 2e édition revue et complétée (1993) .
- (5) Michæl Mayer, « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” », Peter Lang, New York (1991) .
- (6) Erik Levi, « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” », MacMillan Press, Londres (1994) .
- (7) Michæl H. Kater, « The Twisted Muse : Musicians and their Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” », Oxford University Press, New York (1997) .
- (8) Pascal Huynh annonçait une suite à son étude approfondie « La musique sous la République de Weimar » chez Fayard (1998) , qui n'a pas encore vu le jour. Quant à l'ouvrage de Lionel Richard, « Le Nazisme et la culture », aux Éditions Complexe (1988) , il ne traite pratiquement pas de la musique.
- (9) Voir les actes du colloque : « La musica nella Germania di Hitler. 1933-1945 : l'emigrazione interna », sous la direction de Roberto Favaro et Luigi Pestalozza, Libreria Musicale Italiana, Lucca (1996) .
- (10) Se référer à : « La vie musicale sous Vichy », Éditions Complexe (2001) d'après le colloque « La vie musicale en France sous la Seconde Guerre mondiale », sous la direction de Myriam Chimènes, Conservatoire de Paris (1999) . Voir notre compte-rendu dans « Vingtième siècle », n° 63 (juillet-septembre 1999) .
- (11) Lettre adressée à Adolf Hitler, reproduite dans : Joseph Wulff, « Musik im Dritten Reich. Eine Dokumentation », Opus citatum ; page 148.
- (12) Voir Alfred Mathis : « Stefan Zweig and Richard Strauß », Music and Letters, XXV/3 et 4, Oxford University Press (1944) ; pages 163-176, 226-245.
- (13) Voir Pamela Potter : article « Nazism », dans : Stanley Sadie, John Tyrrell (direction) , « The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians », Londres (2001) .
- (14) Selon Erik Levi, 4 Opéras différents de Richard Wagner furent donnés lors de la saison 1932-1933 contre un seul (« Lohengrin ») en 1938-1939.

- (15) Affiche reproduite dans : Albrecht Dümling, Peter Girth, « Entartete Musik », Düsseldorf (1988) , Opus citatum.
- (16) Richard Wagner, « Un musicien étranger à Paris », dans Œuvres en prose, traduit de l'allemand par Jacques-Gabriel Prud'homme, Delagrave, Paris (1914) ; volume I, page 297.
- (17) Ibid. ; page 154.
- (18) Albert Lavignac, « Le voyage artistique à Bayreuth », Delagrave, Paris (1897) ; page 1.
- (19) Ibid. ; page 181.
- (20) Theodor W. Adorno, « Essai sur Wagner », traduit de l'allemand par Hans Hildenbrand et Alex Lindenberg, Gallimard (1966) ; page 27.
- (21) Voir Saül Friedländer, « L'Allemagne nazie et les Juifs », traduction de l'anglais par Marie-France de Paloméra, éditions Le Seuil (1997) ; page 98.
- (22) D'après Detlev Peukert, « Inside Nazi Germany », Londres (1987) ; page 148 - cité par Erik Levi, Opus citatum ; page 247.
- (23) Richard Wagner, « Le judaïsme dans la musique, 1850 », dans : Œuvres en prose, Opus citatum, volume 7 ; page 100.
- (24) Reproduite dans : Martine Kahane, Nicole Wild, « Wagner et la France », catalogue de l'exposition organisée par la Bibliothèque nationale et le théâtre national de l'Opéra de Paris, Herscher, Paris (1983) ; page 93.
- (25) Se référer à : Esteban Buch, « La Neuvième de Beethoven. Une histoire politique », Gallimard, Paris (1999) .
- (26) Joseph Müller-Blattau, « Histoire de la musique allemande », traduit par Jean Gaudefroy-Demombyres, éditions Plon, (1943) ; page 287.
- (27) Albrecht Dümling, « Tempelweihe und - säuberung. Die Bruckner-Rezeption Hitlers und Gœbbels », dans : « Entartete Musik », Opus citatum ; page 22.
- (28) Hans Severus Ziegler, « Entartete Musik. Eine Abrechnung », Volk Verlag, Düsseldorf (1939) .
- (29) Ibid. ; page 5.
- (30) Le terme « entdeutsch » comprend l'idée de distorsion, intraduisible en français.

(31) Pamela M. Potter : « Musicology under Hitler : new sources in context » , Journal of the American Musicology Society, No. 49 (1996) ; pages 70-113.

(32) Pour plus de détails, voir Pamela M. Potter : « Wissenschaftler im zwiespalt » , dans Albrecht Dümling, Peter Girth, « Entartete Musik » , Opus citatum ; page 93.

(33) Joseph Müller-Blattau, « Histoire de la musique allemande » , Opus citatum.

(34) Ernst Křenek est cité par Hans Költzsch comme un aryen parent de Juifs par son mariage, dans : « Das Judentum in der Musik » 38e édition, Leipzig (1935) , reproduit dans Albrecht Dümling et al. , Opus citatum.

(35) Artur Hartmann, « Ernst Křenek Jonny spielt auf » , dans : « Die Oper von heute » (revue L'Opéra d'aujourd'hui) , Nachrichtenblätter von Universal-Edition, Wien (September 1927) ; page 31 - traduit par nos soins. Les éditions viennoises Universal-Edition, qui promurent la musique moderne et qui éditaient Ernst Křenek, tentaient ainsi de prendre les critiques à contre-pied.

(36) Ibid. ; page 5.

(37) Pour une étude complète sur le sujet, voir : Pascal Huynh « La musique sous la République de Weimar » , Opus citatum.

(38) Voir Michæl Mayer, « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Opus citatum ; page 45.

(39) Alban Berg, mort en 1932, figurait à tort dans la Ire édition de 1940 du « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik mit ein Titelverzeichnis jüdischer Werke » de Theo Stengel et Herbert Gerigk, révisé en 1943.

(40) Henri Barraud, « Pour comprendre les musiques d'aujourd'hui » , éditions du Seuil (1968) ; page 57.

(41) Hans Severus Ziegler, « Entartete Musik. Eine Abrechnung » , Opus citatum ; page 5.

(42) Cité par Erik Levi, « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Opus citatum ; page 118.

(43) La question s'était posée pour Max Bruch qui, bien que non-juif, avait mis en musique la prière « Kol Nidrei » , ou pour l'Opéra « Jenůfa » de Leoš Janáček, dont le traducteur allemand était juif !

(44) Je remercie Loïc Ori M.L. , qui prépare une thèse sur les pillages musicaux sous le régime de Vichy, d'avoir attiré mon attention sur ce point.

(45) Rappelons qu'il était l'auteur de l'hymne national de la République démocratique allemande.

(46) Alors même que Arnold Schönberg se réclamait de la tradition et ne se sentait nullement révolutionnaire.

(47) Article « Atonal » de l'édition révisée en 1943 du « Musiklexicon » .

(48) Le 1er enregistrement de cet Opéra, interprété par le Chœur et l'Orchestre de la Radio de Munich, ne fut réalisé qu'en 1975 par la firme « RCA » .

(49) Voir à ce sujet l'article de Brendan G. Carroll, président de la Société Korngold, accompagnant l'enregistrement de « Das Wunder der Heliane » , sur étiquette « Decca » (1993) .

(50) C'est ainsi que Paul Dessau, en exil à Paris, composa une œuvre dodécaphonique : « Guernica » ; manière pour lui de marquer son opposition au régime.

« Entartete Musik »

C'est sous l'appellation « Entartete musik » que les Nazis, entre 1933 et 1945, désignaient toute production musicale qui ne rentrait pas dans les normes artistiques étroites édictées par le 3e « Reich » .

En 1938, le régime nazi alors au pouvoir en Allemagne présentait à Düsseldorf l'exposition « Reichsmusiktage » , soit un Festival de musique du « Reich » . Cette manifestation importante, organisée du 22 au 29 mai, était destinée à présenter des concerts et des conférences « idéologiquement corrects » et « ethniquement purs » pour l'édification des masses dans le cadre des actions de propagande dont le « Reich » était coutumier.

En marge du « Reichsmusiktage » , une autre exposition intitulée « Entartete Musik » , organisée par Adolf Ziegler, directeur du Théâtre National de Weimar, et inaugurée le 24 mai, avait pour but de stigmatiser pour la musique ce qu'une autre exposition de 1937 à Munich avait fait pour certaines autres formes d'art en les qualifiant d' « Entartete Kunst » (d'Art dégénéré) . Dans son discours d'inauguration, Ziegler expliqua que la décadence de la musique était due à l'influence du judaïsme et du capitalisme, boucs émissaires des difficultés de l'Allemagne à cette époque.

Cette étiquette « Entartete » appliquée à différentes formes d'art depuis le début des 1930 s'inscrivait dans la théorie pseudo-scientifique dont les Nazis se faisaient les champions : celle d'une « dégénérescence » d'une partie de la race humaine, coupable d'une « déviance » de la norme officielle et « justifiant » les monstrueuses exterminations de triste mémoire.

Qu'il s'agisse d'arts graphiques et plastiques ou de la musique, le but était le même : discréditer, isoler, décourager, voire même interdire ces créations.

En ce qui concerne la musique, aussi bien la composition que l'exécution, la critique, la musicologie et la publicité étaient visées par cette discrimination.

Pour le gouvernement nazi plusieurs types de musiques entraient dans cette catégorie pour des raisons bien différentes.

Comme on peut s'en douter, les œuvres de musiciens ou d'interprètes juifs ou d'origine partiellement juive étaient concernées. C'est ainsi que Felix Mendelssohn, Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, Walter Braunfels, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Kurt Weill, Gustav Mahler, David Nowakowsky et Berthold Goldschmidt parmi d'autres furent mis à l'index. Mais cela ne s'arrêtait pas là car il suffisait que les œuvres mettent en scène ou utilisent des thèmes ou des personnages juifs ou africains, comme ceux d'Ernst Křenek, ou même aient pour auteurs des artistes d'inspiration marxiste, comme Hanns Eisler, ou tout simplement que les artistes aient montré de la sympathie pour des opposants au régime nazi. Tel fut le cas pour Anton von Webern, « coupable » d'avoir maintenu des liens avec Arnold Schönberg qui s'était exilé.

Mais la musique « moderne » (nous dirions aujourd'hui « contemporaine »), comme pour qualifier les œuvres de Paul Hindemith, Alban Berg, Arnold Schönberg ou Anton von Webern, tombait également sous ce qualificatif de « dégénérée ».

En fait, un coup d'arrêt à l'évolution de la musique avait été décidé afin de témoigner de la loyauté du régime envers les grands compositeurs allemands des XVIIIe et XIXe siècles qui portaient témoignage de la grandeur de l'esprit allemand. De plus, la modification de la forme et de la structure musicales vers lesquelles évoluait la musique en ce début de siècle, apparaissait comme une menace à la culture de la Loi, de l'Ordre et du contrôle de la société sur laquelle reposait le régime nazi.

Bien entendu, dans ce cadre, le Jazz était tout autant, sinon plus, considéré comme dégénéré en raison de ses origines, de l'ethnie de la plupart de ses interprètes et, d'une manière générale, en raison de son association avec une culture afro-américaine honnie.

Cette politique de muselage de tout un riche et multiple courant de création mise en œuvre dès le début du régime nazi, principalement par le Ministère de la propagande du sinistre Josef Gœbbels, rendit pour ces artistes de plus en plus difficile, puis totalement impossible, de pouvoir s'exprimer, de faire jouer leurs œuvres ou même de se produire en public pour les interpréter. Nombreux furent ceux qui choisirent l'exil, quand ils le purent, tels Arnold Schönberg, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith, Berthold Goldschmidt, ou se cachèrent comme Karl Amadeus Hartmann ou Boris Blacher quand ils ne furent pas exterminés dans des camps tels Viktor Ullmann ou Erwin Schulhoff.

Ironiquement, quelques œuvres, après avoir été qualifiées de « Entartete Musik » furent ensuite adoptées avec enthousiasme par le régime nazi pour les besoins de sa propagande.

Dans le milieu des années 1990, la firme discographique « Decca » a publié, dans une collection intitulée « “ Entartete Musik ” » - Music suppressed by the 3rd “ Reich ” », une série d'œuvres peu ou connues voire inconnues des compositeurs qui ont été victimes de la censure nazie. Grâce à cette heureuse et courageuse initiative éditoriale, de nombreuses œuvres ont été enregistrées, ce qui a rendu un grand service à la Musique.

Aujourd'hui, cette résurrection se poursuit. Ainsi, parmi d'autres, « le Nain » d'Alexander von Zemlinsky, « la Cruche brisée » de Viktor Ullmann, « les Oiseaux » de Walter Braunfels et « la Passagère » de Mieczyslaw Weinberg sont disponibles commercialement.

Exposition « Musique Dégénérée », Düsseldorf, 24 mai au 14 juin 1938

(Conférence de Michel Pastore dans la cadre de « la Shoah et l'Europe », ARES, tenue les 11 et 12 juillet 2007.)

En tant que conseiller culturel au Consulat Général d'Autriche, je fus contacté par ARES pour intervenir sur le thème « La Shoah et l'Europe ». Mon action depuis 2004 au Consulat consiste à réhabiliter les œuvres musicales interdites par le 3e « Reich ». J'ai eu l'opportunité de créer un Festival Musiques Interdites consacré à la recréation de ce patrimoine essentiel à notre culture. Des chefs-d'œuvre condamnés au nom du totalitarisme mais dont les verdicts furent, hélas, reconduits par les hégémonies modernistes de l'après-guerre sont encore en attente de réelle libération : à savoir trouver enfin un public qui pourra ainsi appréhender sa propre histoire de pair à l'histoire de la musique du XXe siècle. Cependant, entre ces musiques tellement interdites (qu'on ne sait même plus qu'il y eut interdit ou qu'il y eut un jour musique) et l'absolue évidence du génocide, la relation de causalité (voire de générique) est à soumettre à l'évidence. Quoi de commun entre l'index musical des Nazis et la volonté d'exterminer une partie de l'humanité ? Quel lien entre l'annihilation culturelle et la volonté finale ? Comment peut-on institutionnaliser l'une pour fonctionnaliser l'autre ? À moins que tout ne soit contenu anonymement dans la nasse que forge le Pouvoir afin d'assurer son absolue cécité sur un monde rendu sourd par cessation de musique ?

Le 7 avril 1933, la ségrégation antisémite nazie s'édifie avec la Loi de Reconstitution de l'Administration qui exclut implicitement les Juifs du cadre public, loi complétée en 1935 par les Lois de Nuremberg qui élargiront l'interdit à tout le champ social. Dès 1933, les compositeurs et musiciens juifs ne peuvent plus exercer leur art en Allemagne. Le cas particulier de l'immense compositeur Frank Shreker (1878-1934), obligé de démissionner de la direction du Conservatoire de Berlin dès 1932, nous signifie ce que fut le climat maffieux qui présida au vote de la loi. C'est en mars 1933 que Shreker, exaspéré par les tensions subies, écrit au Directeur de l'Académie des Arts :

« Quand, l'année dernière, poussé par Monsieur Havemann, qui vint me voir en quelque sorte comme représentant du Parti, j'ai démissionné de mon poste de directeur, Monsieur Havemann s'engagea (il me le garantissait) à ce qu'on me laisse désormais en paix. Et voici que la menace recommence à nouveau.* Mon ascendance : ma mère descend d'une vieille famille aristocratique, mon grand-père maternel était major de l'armée autrichienne ; mon père était hongrois. Je ne sais rien d'autre de lui que, selon une lettre, il était protestant. Mais il est vraisemblable qu'il était d'ascendance juive. Il avait reçu de nombreuses décorations autrichiennes et allemandes et la grande médaille d'or pour les arts et les sciences d'Autriche ainsi, je crois, que de Bavière et du Wurtemberg. J'ai moi-même la Croix de guerre autrichienne de 2e classe pour le service civil. J'ai été élevé comme catholique, et je me suis assis dès 16 ans au banc d'orgue d'une église viennoise. Que veut-on donc de moi ? * Quant au fait qu'un gouvernement socialiste m'est nommé, je n'y puis rien. »

Lettre morte, Shreker, à l'annonce de son renvoi de l'Académie, sera victime d'une violente crise cardiaque. Un des plus grands compositeurs occidental mourra ainsi le 21 mars 1934 sans connaître ce qu'allait devenir « la menace » ni ce que « l'on allait vouloir de lui ». Avant d'essayer de répondre à cette double interrogation, on peut remarquer que cette lettre donne à lire entre les lignes d'une angoisse toute personnelle le syntagme culturel nazi qui ne se manifestera officiellement que 4 ans plus tard :

Musique vivante (malgré sa continuité avec la tradition) - Socialisme (Weimar = bolchévique) - Juif

Le 24 mai 1938 fut inaugurée à Düsseldorf l'exposition « Entartete Musik » (Musique Dégénérée), écho de l'exposition « Entartete Kunst » (Art Dégénéré) qui avait eu lieu à Munich l'année précédente. « Entartete Musik » regroupait de manière tout à fait arbitraire sous le terme générique de « Dégénéré » tout ce qui avait été l'actualité musicale florissante sous la République de Weimar : une thématique était consacré au jazz et à « l'Opérette juive de jadis au rythme du jazz », une autre fustigeait toute l'activité musicale professionnelle (éducation, diffusion, Opéra) sous le terme de « bolchévisme musical », une section étant réservée aux théoriciens de l'atonalité, figuraient au nombre des partitions exposées en tant que dégénérées entre autres les chef d'œuvres :

« La Main heureuse » de Arnold Schönberg ; « Lehrstück » de Paul Hindemith ; « Jonny spielt auf ! » de Ernst Křenek ; « Les Stigmatisés » et « le Son lointain » de Franz Shreker ; « l'Histoire du soldat » de Igor Stravinsky ; « Kuhle Wampe » de Hanns Eisler ; « Lulu » et « Wozzeck » de Alban Berg ; « la Princesse au Petit Pois » de Ernst Toch.

Aucun lien formel ne relie ces compositeurs si ce n'est qu'ils contribuaient tous à l'actualité de la vie musicale. Seule une volonté d'éradiquer la musique dans son ensemble paraît tout d'abord être l'objectif de l'exposition : il n'y a pas eu de catalogue de l'« Entartete Musik » car un tel catalogue était impossible à documenter. Mais il y eut une brochure dont la couverture, sous forme d'affiche, référait à l'Opéra de Ernst Křenek (1900-1992) « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny mène la danse !), créé à Berlin en 1925, et dont le héros était un noir.

Voici ce que Křenek écrivit après avoir pu s'exiler aux États-Unis :

« Il est un fait que je me trouvais en tous les cas sur la liste noire des Nazis (ou sur une liste du même genre), que l'on m'ait considéré comme juif, comme aryen, communiste, catholique, tchèque, autrichien ou je ne sais quoi d'autre. Tout simplement, ils n'aimaient ni ma musique ni ma philosophie artistique et avaient recueilli du matériel à ma charge depuis des années. La liste de mes crimes était impressionnante, voire interminable, dans mon exaltation du nègre dans « Jonny spielt auf ! » *, mon cas était donc clair. Bien trop de gens attendaient de voir disparaître de la scène des individus de mon acabit. Il est évident que le Nazisme devait une grande part de son succès à la jalousie hystérique des démunis. »

Nous verrons qu'un compositeur à l'acuité aussi brillante que Křenek peut lui aussi s'illusionner sur le véritable objectif sous-jacent à la liste des condamnés de l'« Entartete Musik ». Si l'on revient à l'affiche de l'exposition de 1938 qui cite icôniquement son Opéra, nous pouvons dégager ses prédicats : un noir, jouant du saxophone, portant à la

boutonnière de son smoking de concert « l'Étoile de David » . C'est-à-dire un ensemble de métissage : un noir (certainement américain, donc un esclave) , un saxophone (instrument moderne exclus de la nomenclature Classique) , un smoking (référant au rituel du concert) , « l'Étoile de David » (une anti-décoration, un marquage) . Métissage qu'avait déjà souligné en 1930 Alfred Rosenberg (qui se verra ravir par Goebbels la main-mise sur la culture) à propos de la reprise de « Jonny spielt auf ! » , à Munich :

« “ Jonny ”, le symbole du Maître du monde abâtardi, judéo-nègre, est debout sur une grande mappe-monde et, à ses pieds, l'humanité blanche danse au son du jazz, saute en cercle autour du globe en faisant des courbettes, comme jadis les Juifs autour du Veau d'or, tout en “ chantant ” en chœur. Ces mots d'humanité blanche dansant autour du nègre “ Jonny ” avec des convulsions abominables de lascivité, le remerciant du déchaînement des plus bas instincts, proclament à la face du monde le triomphe victorieux du sang judéo-nègre sur l'ancienne culture aryenne. »

Il est un fait que Křenek est un de ces compositeurs mis à l'index par les Nazis qui ne soit pas juif. Mais, en tant que compositeur de l'Opéra « Jonny » et, par la suite, d'œuvres dodécaphoniques, en tant qu'époux de la fille de Gustav Mahler, Křenek sera toujours identifié par le régime comme compositeur dégénéré, donc juif. De même dans l'exposition « Entartete Musik » , la caricature de Igor Stravinsky portait la légende :

« Qui a inventé l'histoire selon laquelle Stravinsky descendrait de la noblesse russe ? » , présupposant une ascendance juive du compositeur complètement fausse. Si nous regardons à nouveau l'affiche « Entartete Musik » , nous pouvons envisager le glissement qui va du métissage en tant que cause de la dégénérescence de la musique allemande à la notion de race en tant que fondement d'idéologie nazie : « l'Étoile de David » n'est plus une anti-décoration mais l'unique marquage porteur de tous les dangers de contamination. C'est un véritable terme vicariant qui va servir à identifier tout et tous ce qui peut(vent) être menace pour la pureté d'une utopique musique allemande (celle-ci impérialisant les traditions autrichiennes - l'invasion de l'Autriche ne date que de 2 mois - , tchèques, slovaques, hongroises, roumaines, et jusqu'à française ; Darius Milhaud, Paul Dukas) , la Musique ne pouvant être que celle d'un « Reich » unique, d'un Peuple unique et du « Führer » unique telle qu'elle fut embaumée par Hitler lui-même dans le « temple » du « Walhalla » , près de Ratisbonne, en juin 1937, lorsqu'il ajouta au Panthéon Beethoven-Wagner, le petit paysan Anton Bruckner en butte à l'hostilité de la société viennoise corrompue par la « juiverie » .*

Cependant, pour le public de l'exposition de Düsseldorf, ce qui menaçait la musique allemande dans son utopique unicité n'était qu'une liste improvisée et non exhaustive de compositeurs disparates de par leur origine, leur génération et leur esthétique (ainsi Béla Bartók qui n'était pas à l'origine dans la liste noire exigea d'en faire partie) . Nous avons vu l'impossibilité d'un catalogue raisonné qui puisse fonder le concept d' « Entartete Musik » . Mais reportons-nous à cet extrait du texte accompagnant la brochure rédigée par le pseudo-commissaire Hans Severus Ziegler et qui demeure le seul « prétexte » de l'exposition :

« Ce qui est réuni dans l'exposition “ Entartete Musik ” représente le reflet d'un véritable sabbat de sorcières et du bolchévisme culturel le plus frivole, aux plans spirituel et artistique ; c'est aussi le reflet du triomphe de la sous-humanité, de l'arrogante impudence juive et d'un complet abrutissement intellectuel. La musique juive et la musique allemande demeurent étrangères. Les lois de la musique juive ou les constructions intellectuelles et les doctrines du

faux-semblant, la physique et la physiologie juives du son se développent actuellement de façon clairement prédominante dans le monde musical de sang allemand, de telle sorte qu'il existe des imbéciles beni-oui-oui allemands qui ne peuvent se soustraire aux influences d'une race inférieure à cause de leur propre faiblesse et de leur manque de force créatrice et d'inspiration. La dégénérescence de la musique et de la création musicale allemandes naît alors par la force des choses. La musique dégénérée est ainsi au fond une musique non allemande, pour laquelle la partie saine du peuple ne trouvera également aucun organe de réception, aucune émotion et aucune réceptivité. »

Le titre du texte de Ziegler figurant sur l'affiche « Entartete Musik » est « Eine Abrechnung » (Un règlement de compte), écho du titre donné par Adolf Hitler au 1er volume de « Mein Kampf ». Mais Hitler, dans son livre, ne reliait la dégénérescence qu'au seul bolchévisme. Dans l'extrait jargonnesque de Ziegler, on voit que le syntagme :

« Musique Vivante - Bolchévisme - Juif » est remplacé par le postulat :

« Musique de sabbat (tous styles confondus : du jazz au post-Romantisme en passant par l'atonalisme et le dodécaphonisme) + Bolchévisme + Non Humanité = Son Juif »

* En janvier 1941, Adolf Hitler dans le « Repaire du Loup », suite à l'écoute de la 7e Symphonie de Anton Bruckner, qualifia Johannes Brahms de :

« Phénomène de salon porté aux nues par la juiverie. »

Eduard Hanslick, qui était « demi-juif » et défendait Brahms, avait fait de la vie à Vienne du « petit paysan » Bruckner « un enfer », et Hitler d'ajouter que c'était :

« La chose la plus amère que de devoir vivre dans un environnement qui ne comprend pas ce qu'on crée ou ce qu'on pourrait créer ! »

Nous parlons de jargon a posteriori : comme l'a montré Viktor Klemperer, il s'agit en fait d'une langue (« Lingua Tertii Imperii ») où le jargon s'ennoblit en quelque sorte parce qu'il légitime la terreur. Malgré le fatras grotesque de la pseudo-démonstration, à partir du postulat énoncé par Ziegler, tout compositeur dégénéré ne pourra être que juif (voir le cas des non-juifs Křenek, plus haut ; et le cas de Karl Amadeus Hartmann et de Rudolf Karel ou Hugo Distler, plus bas) et devra donc être annihilé en tant qu'artiste (son œuvre ne peut pas avoir été) et en tant qu'être (sa personne ne doit pas avoir existé) .

C'est ainsi que la politique culturelle musicale nazie sert en même temps à cautionner la solution finale : on connaît le souci de l'efficacité nazie à « faire feu de tout bois » et à savoir opérer une véritable synergie totalitariste. C'est ainsi que sont confondus compositeurs, musiciens et Juifs dans cette « menace » que présentait, de par sa puissance créatrice, Shreker mais dont il lui était impossible, de par cette même puissance, d'imaginer l'horreur totalisante. « Que veut-on donc de moi ? » s'interrogeait-il en 1933 quand il pouvait, sinon « être » encore socialement, mais du moins être en se prononçant. Les Nazis voulaient non seulement qu'il n'existe plus mais qu'il n'ait pas été : qu'il s'arroe en

somme de lui-même ce néant identitaire sur lui-compositeur et sur lui - descendant de Juif. Au nom du « sang musical allemand », le sang juif doit disparaître : pour atteindre l'objectif final, la musique allemande doit rendre toute autre musique « exsangue ». Il ne peut s'agir de crime dans le cas de ces musiques « autres » puisque celles-ci, en tant que dégénérées, n'avaient de toutes façons pas de « sens ». Dans le cas des hommes, le crime s'appellera « solution » .

Le 13 mars 1933, l'Autriche est envahie : il aura fallu 5 ans pour épurer la nouvelle Allemagne de ses citoyens juifs. Les mêmes mesures seront réalisées alors en moins de 6 mois. Le 2 avril 1938, le correspondant de « l'Illustration », Roger de Craon-Poussy, écrivait :

« L'« Anschluß », bonheur des uns, est devenu pour les autres, avouons-le, une effroyable catastrophe. D'abord les israélites. Il est impossible de se faire une idée en Occident des conséquences du rattachement pour 300,000 citoyens autrichiens qui représentaient souvent une élite intellectuelle et morale. Médecins, avocats, artistes, acteurs, journalistes, qui ont parfois servi la société avec dévouement depuis des dizaines d'années, les voici sur le pavé, du jour au lendemain, sans la moindre possibilité de gagner leur subsistance ou même d'enseigner ; quoi d'étonnant qu'il y ait parmi eux une véritable épidémie de suicides. Il y a eu, durant les Iers jours, une masse de perquisitions illégales, avec confiscations, pillages et violence physiques. Heinrich Himler a fait sévèrement punir les auteurs d'actions isolées. Évidemment, ce n'était jamais des Nazis, mais toujours des provocateurs communistes. »

En fait, Himler profita des exactions pour réprimer des opposants : la terreur culturelle et raciale fut appliquée immédiatement.

Erich Wolfgang Korngold, alors un des compositeurs les plus connus d'Europe et du « Nouveau Monde », devait créer durant l'automne de 1938, à l'Opéra de Vienne, son 4e (et suite aux circonstances dernier) Opéra « Kathrin » sous la direction de Bruno Walter. Non seulement l'invasion annula « de facto » la première, mais les Nazis saisirent la propriété de Korngold vendant ce qu'ils pouvaient et détruisant le reste dont le manuscrit de « Kathrin ». Heureusement, une copie avait déjà été envoyée aux éditions « Josef Weinberger Musikverlage » (Schott refusant, dès avant l'invasion, d'éditer les compositeurs juifs) et c'est Weinberger qui, malgré les risques énormes, envoya 2 hommes pénétrer dans la maison occupée afin de sauver le reste des manuscrits. « Kathrin » qu'on peut considérer comme un chef-d'œuvre sera créée en territoire neutre en 1939, à Stockholm, et sera accueillie par des critiques antisémites. Repris en 1950, à Vienne, l'Opéra, victime de la dictature moderniste et du culte de l'austérité d'après-guerre (voire aussi de la non réelle dénazification des postes clefs), connaîtra un échec et ne sera plus jamais joué.

Le destin de Korngold représente sous une autre (ou est-ce la même dans un autre registre) forme ce que fut la « menace » et « ce que l'on voulait de lui ». En effet, musicien-star des années '20 à '30, il fut demandé par Hollywood, le 22 janvier 1933, pour composer la musique du film « The Adventures of Robin Hood » mettant en vedette Errol Flynn. « Prends-le comme un présage et pars », lui conseilla le Doctor Alfred Eckmann, directeur de l'Opéra de Vienne, lui assurant le succès de « Kathrin » pour l'automne. Korngold eut donc la chance de survivre grâce à l'exil aux États-Unis. Là, il sera catalogué comme musicien de film et ne pourra réaffirmer sa dimension de compositeur « post-Romantique ». Après guerre, il reviendra en Autriche où l'on préférera l'oublier pour ne pas

réveiller le « vieux monde » . Il faudra attendre 2004 pour que le Festival de Salzbourg réhabilite son Opéra, « La Ville Morte » . L'Opéra de Paris ne l'a toujours pas inscrit à sa programmation et il faudra attendre le débutant Festival Musiques Interdites, en 2006, pour assister en France à la création de son Concerto de piano pour la main gauche. Korngold a pu échapper à la « menace » en sauvant sa vie, mais, malgré la pseudo-protection d'un pays d'accueil, il n'a pu se soustraire à la condamnation nazi de n'être plus rien : son identité de compositeur lui fut de son vivant refusée (lui-même s'arrêtera de composer) et demeure toujours en attente d'une totale réhabilitation.

Car pour certains compositeurs, la « chance » de l'exil fut aussi celle d'une brusque descente vers cette « néantisation » édictée par les Nazis. Comparons, pour ce, l'exil de Kurt Weill et de Norbert Glanzberg. Dans une vidéo diffusée au cours de l'Oratorio « Paroles d'Exil » que nous avons créée en 2006 et repris en 2007, Glanzberg nous interpelle :

« On avait peur en Allemagne d'Hilter ! »

Jetés sur les routes de l'exil par l'arrivée au pouvoir des Nazis, en 1933, Glanzberg et Weill font partie des nombreux artistes et intellectuels qui débarquèrent à Paris dans l'espoir d'y trouver un refuge leur permettant de continuer à créer. Leur statut est à l'époque complètement différent : Weill, de 10 ans plus âgé, est un compositeur reconnu, dont les œuvres, marquées par la volonté idéologique d'écrire pour les masses, reposent sur un langage et une dramaturgie inspirés par le jazz et les différentes formes de musique populaires. Protégé par la Princesse de Polignac, il proposera à Glanzberg de partir pour les États-Unis où il connaîtra le succès que l'on sait en adaptant son art à la forme de « Broadway » . Mais Glanzberg ne le suivra pas : né en 1910, en Galicie, doté d'une formation musicale parfaitement Classique, ayant été assistant d'Alban Berg sur « Wozzeck » , à Aix-la-Chapelle, il connaîtra à Paris la misère et survivra en tant que musicien de cabaret. Durant la guerre, il est caché au château de Montredon par la Comtesse Pastré mais sera arrêté à Nice, en 1943, et miraculeusement sauvé des convois. Après guerre, il écrira pour Edith Piaf quelques-uns de ses plus grands succès. Il écrira aussi pour Yves Montand, Tino Rossi, et composera des musiques de films. Ce n'est qu'à la fin de sa vie qu'il se souviendra qu'il avait été en Allemagne un musicien Classique et qu'il se remettra à composer des œuvres pour grand orchestre comme la « Suite Yiddish » et le Concerto pour 2 pianos. Dans les années 1980, marqué par la lecture du livre de Paul Celan, « La Mort, Maître de l'Allemagne » , il reviendra à la musique de sa jeunesse et composera dans un style Romantique marqué par l'influence de la musique yiddish et par l'efficacité de la chanson populaire les « Holocaust Songs » et les « Holocaust Lieder » . Norbert Glanzberg est mort en 2001.

Si l'exil fut, pour certains, la condamnation à un véritable mutisme musical (au double sens de « muer » et de « muet ») , il fut, pour d'autres, l'injonction au témoignage. Ainsi Erich Istor Kahn (1905-1956) , artiste discret et intransigeant, qui reste encore aujourd'hui un inconnu. Protégé par le chef Hans Rosbaud, collaborateur permanent à Radio de Francfort, ami et disciple de Arnold Schönberg, il crée nombre d'œuvres remarquables dans les années 1930. Le 1er avril 1933, Kahn est démis de ses fonctions. Début novembre, il émigre avec sa femme définitivement à Paris. Malgré les difficultés de vie en France, il compose en 1938 la « Rhapsodie Hassidique » pour chœur d'hommes. Dès la déclaration de la guerre, en 1939, Kahn est interné une Ire fois en tant qu'étranger au camp de Marolles, près de Blois, puis, dans des conditions particulièrement inhumaines, au camp des Milles, près d'Aix-en-Provence. Lors de ses divers internements, Erich Istor Kahn continue à composer : le Psaume XIII « Seigneur, combien de temps vas-tu

m'oublier ? » pour soprano et piano. C'est au cours de son internement dans le Camp des Milles qu'il compose l'hymne « Nenia judæis qui hac ætate perierunt » (Thrène pour les Juifs qui en ces temps périrent) *, véritable prémonition de la solution finale qui se mettait en place en France. Sauvé de la déportation par Varian Fry, Kahn et sa femme partent en 1941 pour New-York. Il continuera à composer et recevra l'appui de René Leibowitz et de Pablo Casals. Kahn mourra subitement en 1956.

Nous retrouvons cette volonté de témoigner « malgré tout » chez les compositeurs qui sont « restés » : à savoir ceux qui ont choisi volontairement un « exil intérieur » et les autres, tous les autres, qui n'ayant pu partir, devront vivre l'atroce condamnation nazi jusqu'à son terme.

Rudolf Karel (1880-1945)

Rudolf Karel fut un des principaux élèves de Antonín Dvořák. Compositeur fécond et reconnu par le public austro-tchèque, il est nommé en 1923 au Conservatoire de Prague et s'impose avec son Opéra, « la Mort Marraïne ». Farouchement anti-Fasciste, il s'engage dans la résistance active et devient chef de réseau. Arrêté en 1943, il est incarcéré à la prison de Pankrác : durant cette période de détention, soumis à la torture, Karel continue de composer dans sa cellule n° 127 notamment l'Opéra-conte, « Les 3 cheveux d'or du grand-père omniscient » qu'il dut écrire sur du papier toilette avec pour crayon des échardes de bois brûlés. Transféré dans la citadelle de Terezín, dans des conditions inhumaines, il continuera à composer un « Nonette » : malade, âgé de 65 ans, Karel fut condamné à mourir de froid, le 5 mars 1945.

Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963)

Karl Amadeus Hartmann incarne, lui, une autre forme de l'exil intérieur : celui peut-on dire d'une « résistance passive » dont témoigne cette lettre qu'il écrivit suite à sa rencontre avec Anton von Webern (1883-1945) qui montrait son approbation du régime :

« Je suis largement à blâmer de ce que la conversation revenait de façon répétée à la politique. C'était une erreur, parce qu'avec mes fortes sympathies pour l'anarchie, j'en vins à savoir des choses que j'aurais préféré éviter d'entendre sa bienveillance à l'égard de ceux qui le pressent contre le mur m'est incompréhensible. »

On sait que Webern sera abattu par un soldat américain lors de la libération de Vienne. Hartmann, malgré sa tendance « anarchiste » (en fait, le courant Social-Démocrate de sa famille artiste), aurait pu devenir l'alibi « musique nouvelle » des Fascistes. Au lieu de collaborer, il choisit volontairement d'interdire toute publication et toute exécution de ses œuvres en Allemagne. Il continue cependant de composer et déploie tous ses efforts pour être joué en dehors de son pays : ainsi, en 1935, à Prague, sera créée son Poème symphonique « Miseræ » dédié « à mes amis qui durent subir 1,000 morts, qui reposent pour l'éternité, nous ne vous oublierons pas (Dachau, 1933-1934) ». Il refusera de s'inscrire à la « Reichsmusikammer » et de répondre au questionnaire sur ses origines raciales. Il montrera son opposition au régime en composant, à partir de 1938, son chef-d'œuvre : l'Opéra « Simplicius Simplicissimus » (créé en 1948, à Munich). Après la guerre, il continuera sa « résistance passive » en refusant de cautionner la dictature musicale

stalinienne instauré en Allemagne de l'Est et en participant, en 1960, avec les compositeurs Paul Dessau (1894-1979) et Hans Werner Henze (1926), à l'œuvre collective « Jüdische Chronik » afin de répondre à la remontée de l'antisémitisme en Allemagne.

L'Hymne « Nenia Judæis qui hac ætate perierunt » fut créé lors du Festival « Musiques Interdites », le 3 juillet 2007, à Marseille. Ce chef-d'œuvre pour violoncelle et piano prouve en quelques 15 minutes combien l'homme reste libre face à l'annihilation et sort vainqueur d'un combat qui semble désespéré. Le 7 juillet 2005, lors du 1er Festival « Musiques Interdites » avait été exécuté l'« Actus Tragicus » pour quintette à vent et quintette à cordes d'Igor Kahn.

Hugo Distler (1908-1942)

Hugo Distler subira l'exil intérieur sans trouver les moyens politiques ou artistiques d'exprimer sa survie. Descendant de l'école musicale protestante, il enrichit très tôt cette tradition de la richesse culturelle de la République de Weimar. Nouveau talent musical de sa génération, Distler n'avait que 25 ans quand Adolf Hitler prend le pouvoir : il venait d'être nommé chef du département de musique de chambre au Conservatoire de Lübeck. Ces convictions spirituelles apportent un renouveau à la musique protestante traditionnelle mais cette nouvelle sonorité représente une intensité religieuse que les Nazis ne pouvaient tolérer. Il doit quitter son poste d'organiste au temple pour rejoindre la « Wehrmacht ». Contraint par un ordre fasciste qui l'avait déclaré « Compositeur Dégénéré » au meurtre de son prochain, Distler préféra poser sa tête dans son propre four à gaz et de mettre fin à sa vie à l'âge de 34 ans.

Mais « l'exil intérieur », s'il fut possible pour les musiciens interdits non-juifs, fut interdit pour les musiciens juifs qui n'avaient pu fuir l'Europe hitlérienne. Ceux-ci se retrouvèrent pris dans la nasse nazi, parqués dans les camps d'internement et, pour la plupart, assassinés dans les camps d'extermination. Leur nombre rend impossible un compte rendu sur chacun d'eux (même pour les compositeurs les plus importants) d'autant que leur liste ne peut être exhaustive par le fait même du génocide nazi.

Viktor Ullmann (1898-1944)

Nous choisissons de mentionner Viktor Ullmann car, non seulement c'est un des plus grands compositeurs du XXe siècle toujours en attente de retrouver sa place, mais parce que son histoire personnelle est emblématique. Fils d'un officier de l'Empire, Viktor Ullmann s'engagea à l'âge de 18 ans en tant que volontaire dans l'armée et vécut les horreurs de la Première Guerre sur le front de l'Isonzo. À son retour, dans un monde bouleversé, il entra dans le séminaire de composition de Arnold Schönberg qui eut sur lui une influence considérable. Mais Ullmann ne fit jamais partie de la stricte « avant-garde » : il fut toujours en quête d'un lien entre la tonalité et l'atonalité. En 1920, il devint directeur de chœur et répétiteur puis, en 1922, chef d'orchestre au Nouveau Théâtre Allemand de Prague dont le directeur était alors Alexander von Zemlinsky. En 1924, les 7 Lieder pour orchestre (aujourd'hui disparus) obtinrent un succès critique et public grâce à leur impact lyrique et déclamatoire. Entre 1927 et 1931, Ullmann fut chef d'Opéra à Aussig et engagé en tant que compositeur pour musique de scène et chef à l'Opéra de Zürich. C'est au cours de cette période qu'il devint membre de la Société d'Anthroposophie. Il épousa Anna Winternitz, s'établit à Stuttgart, abandonna son activité de musicien pour se consacrer à l'anthroposophie dans sa « Librairie Novalis ». En 1933, il dut fuir

l'Allemagne, avec sa femme et son fils, et retourner à Prague où se confirmèrent ses talents de compositeur et de pédagogue : le prix Hertzka lui fut décerné pour sa version orchestrale de ses « Variations Schœnberg » . En 1935, ce prix lui fut décerné une seconde fois pour son Opéra, « la Chute de l'Antéchrist » , d'après le drame d'Albert Steffen. Sur des poèmes du même auteur, Ullmann composa, en 1937, les 6 Lieder pour soprano, déjà caractéristiques du langage tonal indéfini qu'il développera dans les œuvres de « Theresienstadt » . Après l'invasion, les lois raciales qui sévissaient en Allemagne furent appliquées à Prague, interdisant, entre autres, toute activité artistique aux Juifs. Sans espoir d'exécution, Ullmann poursuivit son travail de composition avec, notamment, les très émouvantes « Chansons d'amour de Ricarda Huch » .

Le 8 septembre 1942, Ullmann fut interné dans le camp de « Theresienstadt » (à présent, Terezín) , construit pour accueillir une garnison de 5,000 soldats et où plus de 60,000 Juifs furent parqués en attendant l'achèvement des camps d'extermination. En dépit des conditions de vie épouvantables, une riche activité culturelle due à l'internement de nombreux artistes se développa, progressivement admise par le commandement SS : activités créatrices d'êtres humains confrontés à l'agonie et à la mort. Ullmann fut un des artistes les plus productifs, même si l'on trouve écrit dans son extraordinaire journal intime :

« La plus profonde détresse ne peut pas se transformer en musique, aucune parole ne saura l'exprimer. »

Au cours des 26 mois que dura sa détention, il composa, sur du papier de qualité misérable, plus de 20 œuvres dont les sublimes 3 dernières Sonates pour piano, 2 Symphonies, l'Ouverture « Don Quixote danse le fandango » , l'Opéra « l'Empereur de l'Atlantique ou le Refus de la Mort » , et le mélodrame « Le Chant d'Amour et de Mort du Cornette Christoph Rilke » *. Il était en train de commencer l'orchestration de l'œuvre lorsqu'il fut déporté pour Auschwitz avec sa femme et les compositeurs Pavel Haas, Gideon Klein, Hans Krása. Il mourut gazé, le 18 octobre 1944. Pavel Haas, Gideon Klein, Hans Krása ont été gazés dans le courant d'octobre 1944.

À travers ses quelques exemples, choisis certes arbitrairement (comment référer ne serait-ce qu'à tous les principaux compositeurs de cette période ?) , le fait que la terreur musicale instauré par le 3e « Reich » servit à cautionner le judaïcide paraît fondé. Mais, de même, se fonde en retour le fait que, malgré la solution finale, la musique persista toujours à témoigner de sa force vitale, et ce, malgré les conditions extrêmes auxquelles ses compositeurs furent contraints. Restituer à tous ces grands artistes la place qu'ils méritent, c'est nous ré-approprier une partie essentielle de notre patrimoine culturel. Recréer, un demi-siècle après, ces œuvres magistrales, c'est aussi refaire avec elles le chemin de l'exil, de l'interdit, du génocide. Si la stratégie nazie fut de justifier le crime contre l'humanité en utilisant la culture comme leurre, à l'inverse, la culture comme vérité peut en se reconstituant autour de ces œuvres « dégénérées » dénoncer à jamais le crime. Il s'agit alors de signifier à travers une esthétique, un impératif moral :

« Plus jamais cela car cela a pu avoir lieu. »

Revenons pour finir au texte déjà cité de Hans Severus Ziegler :

« La musique dégénérée est ainsi, au fond, une musique non allemande, pour laquelle la partie saine du peuple ne

trouvera également aucun organe de réception, aucune émotion et aucune réceptivité. »

On sait qu'Hitler n'appréciait pas beaucoup la musique hors mise sa fascination pour Richard Wagner et les Opérettes. Dans le « bunker » final, ce fut le silence absolu qui prévalut : plus un son, si ce n'est le bruit de la radio pour écouter l'avancée des ennemis. Ne plus entendre, ne plus ressentir : cet autisme culturel réclamé au peuple allemand dans le manifeste « Entartete Musik » ne pouvait s'achever après avoir accompli l'acte criminel (envers la Musique et envers l'Humain) que dans le néant.

Néant que niera toujours la musique.

Cet aperçu des Musiques Interdites par le 3e « Reich » ne se prétend pas travail d'historien ni de spécialiste. Ce n'est que mon point de vue personnel en tant que programmateur d'un Festival consacré à cette période noire de l'histoire de la musique. Je tiens enfin à saluer le livre d'Amaury du Closel « Voix Étouffées du 3e “ Reich ”, “ Entartete Musik ” » aux Éditions Actes Sud (véritable somme sur le sujet) qui fut la principale source de cet exposé.

Michel Pastore, Consulat Général Autriche, 27 cours Pierre Puget, 13006 Marseille.

* Dans ce chef-d'œuvre ultime (créé en français au Festival Musiques Interdites 2005 avec Dominique Sanda) , Ullmann relève et réussit le défi qui a hanté toute l'histoire du lyrisme : accomplir une symbiose parfaite et fascinante entre la parole et la musique, le drame et la contemplation. Fidèle à la lumière rilkéenne, la mort est lieu de sérénité dans ce testament de Viktor Ullmann.

...

Dès 1933, une grande majorité du monde musical est d'origine juive, même lointaine : professeurs, directeurs de théâtre, chefs d'orchestre, et évidemment compositeurs. Tous sont victimes d'interdiction de d'exercer, diriger, composer, ou être diffusés ... mis au ban pour l'unique raison suffisante de leur origine sémite. 3 ans plus tard, en 1938, se tient à Düsseldorf l'exposition « Die Entartete Musik » (« musique privée de généalogie, de génération ») qui précise finalement les enjeux culturels de ce bannissement. Sur l'affiche : un noir, jouant du saxophone, portant à la boutonnière de son smoking de concert « l'Étoile de David » . Un noir (un américain, donc un esclave, un sous-homme) , un saxophone (instrument moderne exclus de la nomenclature Classique) , un smoking (tenue emblématique du chef d'orchestre, dans l'exercice de sa fonction dirigeante) , « l'Étoile de David » (marquage de la culture juive dominante) . Musique métissée donc dégénérée, dirigée par la « juiverie » . Hans Severus Ziegler, commissaire de l'exposition explique :

« Ce qui est réuni dans l'exposition “ Entartete Musik ” représente le reflet d'un véritable sabbat de sorcières et du bolchévisme culturel le plus frivole, aux plans spirituel et artistique ; c'est aussi le reflet du triomphe de la sous-humanité, de l'arrogante impudence juive et d'un complet abrutissement intellectuel. La musique juive et la musique allemande demeurent étrangères. Les lois de la musique juive ou les constructions intellectuelles et les doctrines du faux-semblant, la physique et la physiologie juives du son se développent actuellement de façon clairement

prédominante dans le monde musical de sang allemand, de telle sorte qu'il existe des imbéciles beni-oui-oui allemands qui ne peuvent se soustraire aux influences d'une race inférieure à cause de leur propre faiblesse et de leur manque de force créatrice et d'inspiration. La dégénérescence de la musique et de la création musicale allemandes naît alors par la force des choses. La musique dégénérée est ainsi au fond une musique non allemande, pour laquelle la partie saine du peuple ne trouvera également aucun organe de réception, aucune émotion et aucune réceptivité. »

Sans parler des Mahler, Meyerbeer et Mendelssohn frappés rétroactivement d'anathème pour leur seule origine sémite, 3 catégories de musiciens sont considérés comme dégénérés :

Les musiciens « bolchéviques »

Sont dits « bolchéviques », les musiciens engagés dans le socialisme ou le communisme.

Kurt Weill (1900-1950)

Compositeur allemand né à Dessau, le 2 mars 1900 et mort à New York, le 3 avril 1950. Sa musique, considérée par les Nazis comme « dégénérée », lui vaudra de voir ses partitions brûlées. Ses origines juives et ses sympathies pour le communisme font qu'il est contraint de quitter l'Allemagne en 1933.

Paul Dessau (1894-1979)

Avant les années 1930, ce compositeur allemand occupa des postes de chef d'orchestre à Hambourg, Cologne, Mayence et Berlin, tout en composant une musique d'avant-garde notamment pour le cinéma. Engagé plutôt à droite qu'à gauche et d'origine juive, il quitta l'Allemagne dès 1933 pour la France, puis les États-Unis, avant de revenir en Europe après la Guerre et de se fixer à Berlin-Est. Il collabora alors avec Bertolt Brecht pour les musiques de scène de « Mère courage » et du « Cercle de craie caucasien ». D'abord attiré par la musique dodécaphonique, il s'en est éloigné pour s'attacher à une musique réaliste, volontiers engagée et accessible au plus grand nombre.

Les musiciens jazz

Le jazz est considéré par les nazis comme l'« invasion nègre » d'une musique afro-américaine, donc non allemande.

Eddie Rosner (1910-1976)

Trompettiste, compositeur et chef d'orchestre allemand d'origine polonaise. Quasiment inconnu en France, cet enfant prodige du jazz surnommé « l'Amstrong Blanc » par Louis Amstrong lui-même devint, au terme d'une épopée poignante, le « tsar » du jazz en U.R.S.S. Artiste maudit persécuté par les Nazis en tant que dégénéré, consacré « Musicien d'État » par Joseph Staline avant d'être banni et déporté au goulag, Rosner est libéré à la mort du dictateur. Oublié de tous, il parvient à s'installer à Berlin en 1973, avant de mourir dans la pauvreté 3 ans plus tard.

Ernst Křenek (1900-1991)

Dans les années 1928-1938, il est l'un des compositeurs vivants les plus joués grâce à son Opéra, créé en 1927, « Johnny spielt auf » (dont l'affiche de l'exposition est l'illustration directe) et qui raconte l'histoire de l'opposition entre un violoniste Classique et un violoniste de jazz. Cependant, dès l'« Anschluß », il est déclaré « artiste dégénéré » par les Nazis et émigre aux États-Unis où il étudie la musique médiévale et la musique sérielle. Bien qu'il reste très prolifique et compose jusqu'à sa mort dans les genres les plus divers, Ernst Křenek ne réussit pas à renouer avec sa célébrité d'antan. Au cours de sa période américaine, il est surtout reconnu en tant que pédagogue et musicologue, notamment par Glenn Gould.

Les musiciens utilisant les nouvelles harmonies

Issus de l'école d'Arnold Schönberg, ils détournent le Classicisme allemand vers l'atonalité, le sérialisme, le dodécaphonisme.

Hanns Eisler (1898-1962)

Un des principaux élèves d'Arnold Schönberg (avec Anton von Webern et Alban Berg), il compte parmi les grands compositeurs de musique vocale du 20^e siècle. Compagnon de route de Brecht, compositeur de chants de combat ou pionnier de la musique de cinéma, Eisler composa également pour piano et musique de chambre. Ces textes, écrits en Allemagne ou en exil aux États-Unis (certains avec Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno ou Ernst Bloch) montrent que Hanns Eisler fut aussi un penseur de la musique et de ses rapports avec la société. Il a notamment étudié systématiquement les problèmes de la musique de film ; son ouvrage « Composing for the films » est peut-être ce que l'on a écrit de plus intelligent sur le sujet. Ce n'est que depuis la fin du conflit Est-Ouest qu'on peut aborder, délivrée de tabous et de préjugés, la richesse de son œuvre.

Itor Kahn (1905-1956)

D'origine allemande, formé à « Hochschule für Musik » de Francfort, américain d'adoption et par la naturalisation, Erich Itor Kahn compositeur, pianiste soliste et musicien de chambre, associe une discipline de travail typiquement germanique à une conscience professionnelle de responsabilité qu'entraîne le processus de création, toujours préoccupé par la compatibilité de la forme et de son contenu. La technique compositionnelle d'Erich Itor Kahn découle d'une interprétation toute personnelle et originale des principes architecturaux de Schönberg, tandis que sa mentalité créative le rapproche plutôt de Charles Ives. Erich Itor Kahn occupe une place à part dans l'histoire de musique contemporaine.

Les musiciens dégénérés « volontaires »

On dresse une liste d'environ 300 compositeurs dégénérés : certains choisissent volontairement de figurer sur cette liste, bien que les Nazis ne les aient pas comptés, parce qu'ils n'étaient ni juifs, ni « modernistes », ni

communistes.

Béla Bartók (1881-1945)

Grâce à ses recherches, Béla Bartók, d'origine hongroise, pose les bases de l'ethno-musicologie. Il y découvre l'échelle pentatonique et des combinaisons poly-rythmiques qu'il utilise dès ses premières œuvres. Concertiste en Europe et aux États-Unis, il se produit avec le violoniste Joseph Szigeti et le clarinetiste de jazz Benny Goodman. Il fut absent de l'exposition de l'« Entartete Musik », parce qu'il appartenait à une nation amie. Mais Bartók refuse ce traitement de faveur et proteste avec Zoltán Kodály et d'autres artistes, en édictant une résolution contre les lois raciales hongroises. Il demanda un peu plus tard d'être admis dans le cercle des « dégénérés ». Il fuit le régime hongrois pro-nazi et émigre aux États-Unis. En 1943, le succès de son « Concerto pour orchestre » lui vaut de nombreuses commandes, trop tardives car Béla Bartók décède peu de temps après.

Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963)

Né et mort à Munich, n'ayant aucune origine sémitique, c'est dans cette ville qu'il effectue ses études. Dans l'Allemagne hitlérienne, au lieu de collaborer comme Hitler le lui demanda, il choisit volontairement d'interdire toute publication et toute exécution de ses œuvres en Allemagne. Il continue cependant de composer et déploie tous ses efforts pour être joué en dehors de son pays : ainsi en 1935, à Prague, sera créé son poème symphonique « Miseræ » dédié « à mes amis qui durent subir 1,000 morts, qui reposent pour l'éternité, nous ne vous oublierons pas (Dachau, 1933-1934) ». Le public allemand ignorait quasiment tout de ce compositeur caché. Après la Guerre, il cumulera les fonctions officielles à Munich et en Bavière (il y crée notamment le cycle de concerts de musique contemporaine « Musica Viva »).

Terezín

De la naissance du ghetto, jusqu'au 20 avril 1945, près de 140,000 personnes passent à Terezín dont de nombreux artistes (Robert Desnos y est mort). Terezín restera dans l'histoire comme la plus grande mystification du régime nazi.

Victor Ullmann (1898-1944)

Pianiste et compositeur tchèque (autrichien selon d'autres sources), il entame en 1923 une carrière pleine de succès qui durera jusqu'au début des années 1930. Jusqu'à sa déportation, en 1942, son œuvre comporte 41 Opus. Mais la plus grande partie de ces œuvres a disparue : les manuscrits ont été vraisemblablement perdus pendant la période d'occupation allemande. Son œuvre la plus connue est l'Opéra « Der Kaiser von Atlantis » composé et créé en 1944 dans le camp de concentration de « Theresienstadt », et qui est devenu l'ouvrage symbole de la destruction de plusieurs générations d'artistes juifs.

Gideon Klein (1919-1945)

Compositeur et un pianiste tchèque, Gideon Klein a donné son 1er concert à 14 ans. En 1938, il fréquente la « Master-class » de piano de Vilém Kurz. Une carrière de pianiste se dessine alors. Mais l'occupation nazie, en 1940, met fin à ses études. Il est empêché de se rendre à la « Royal Academy of Music », à Londres, pour étudier et ne peut se produire comme pianiste en public. En décembre 1941, il est déporté à Terezín. Avec des musiciens comme les compositeurs Hans Krása, Viktor Ullmann et Pavel Haas, le chanteur Karel Berman, le pianiste et chef d'orchestre Rafael Schächter ou le futur chef d'orchestre de la Philharmonie tchèque Karel Ančerl, il est un acteur important de la vie culturelle du camp. En octobre 1944, 9 jours après avoir achevé son Trio à cordes, il est déporté à Auschwitz puis au camp de concentration de Fürstengrube, une installation extérieure d'Auschwitz. Il y travaille à la mine et meurt peu de temps avant la libération dans des circonstances restées inconnues.

Hans Krása (1899-1944)

Compositeur tchéco-allemand, il est élève d'Albert Roussel, et travaille comme chef de chœur au Nouveau théâtre allemand, à Prague. C'est en 1921 qu'il obtient son 1er succès comme compositeur avec les Lieder avec orchestre, Opus 1, sur des textes de Christian Morgenstern. En 1938, Hans Krása écrit l'Opéra pour enfant, « Brundibár », à l'occasion d'un concours du Ministère de l'enseignement et de l'Éducation Populaire. Mais Adolf Hitler envahit la Pologne et cet Opéra ne peut être joué. Malgré tout, en 1941, la première sera donnée secrètement dans un orphelinat juif. Le 10 août 1942, Hans Krása est déporté au Camp de concentration de Terezín. « Brundibár » y sera donné 55 fois. Dans le camp, il sera marié quelques mois avec Eliška Kleinová pour empêcher sa déportation en tant que femme seule. Dans la nuit du 16 octobre 1944, Hans Krása est transporté en chemin de fer vers Auschwitz. Il meurt dans la chambre à gaz dès son arrivée.

Rudolf Karel (1880-1945)

Fils d'un employé des chemins de fer, Rudolf Karel, d'origine tchèque, a étudié la composition de 1899 à 1904 avec Antonín Dvořák. À Prague, où il est professeur de composition au Conservatoire, il participe à la Résistance contre les Nazis. Il est arrêté le 19 mars 1943, puis interné à la prison de Pankrác. Malgré la torture, Karel commence dans sa cellule n° 127 à écrire une nouvelle œuvre ; son Conte, « Les 3 cheveux d'or du grand-père omniscient ». Sans disposer de papier à musique, il compose sur des petits bouts de papier de toilette, utilisant des éclats de bois qu'il arrache au plancher et qu'il noircit avec du charbon animal - un médicament précieux. Jour après jour, au fil de l'avancement du travail, et sans que l'auteur ait pu se relire, un gardien tchèque fait sortir les feuillets de la prison pour les mettre soigneusement à l'abri (il y en eut 240). En février 1945, il est déporté à Terezín : il compose « Nonette ». Obligé de rester dehors, nu, toute une nuit sous prétexte d'épouillage, il meurt de froid 1 mois plus tard.

Pavel Haas (1899-1944)

Compositeur tchèque, Pavel Haas fut l'un des élèves les plus doués et les plus originaux de Leoš Janáček, mêlant brillamment les influences du jazz, du folklore juif, avec sa Bohême natale. À l'instar de Erich Wolfgang Korngold, il composa de nombreuses musiques de films et de théâtre. Malade et affaibli mais encouragé par Gideon Klein, il compose à Terezín une Étude pour orchestre à cordes (reprise dans le film de propagande nazie, « Der Führer Schenkt

den Juden eine Stadt ») et les « 4 Chants », son chef-d'œuvre. Il est déporté à Auschwitz, le 16 octobre 1944, avec Gideon Klein, Krása et Ullmann, où il meurt dans une chambre à gaz 2 jours après son arrivée. Son épouse et leur jeune fille survécurent à la guerre, grâce à la courageuse initiative de Haas d'orchestrer son divorce.

Bien d'autres compositeurs anonymes ont disparu dans l'anéantissement programmé par le régime nazi, parfois avant même de pouvoir donner la pleine mesure d'un talent qui n'a pas eu le temps d'éclorre.

Conséquences du bannissement

Le régime nazi a finalement réduit au silence la plus grande partie de l'élite musicale qui avait fleuri sous la République de Weimar. Qu'ils aient disparu en déportation ou dans l'anonymat de l'exil, bon nombre des compositeurs dégénérés qui ont survécu à l'extermination n'ont toujours pas retrouvé la place qui devrait être la leur dans la vie musicale de l'après-guerre : soit parce qu'ils ont perdu leur notoriété qu'ils n'ont pas réussi à regagner, soit parce que l'hégémonie de la Seconde École de Vienne et leur théoricien Theodor W. Adorno les ont éclipsés de la scène musicale. Ils restent encore souvent considérés comme des musiciens de second plan.

Norbert Glanzberg (1910-2001)

Doté d'une formation musicale parfaitement Classique, ayant été assistant d'Alban Berg sur l'Opéra « Wozzeck », à Aix-la-Chapelle, il connaîtra à Paris la misère et survivra en tant que musicien de cabaret. Durant la Guerre, il est caché au Château de Montredon par la Comtesse Pastré mais sera arrêté à Nice, en 1943, et miraculeusement sauvé des convois. Après la Guerre, il écrira pour Edith Piaf quelques-uns de ses plus grands succès. Il écrira aussi pour Yves Montand, Tino Rossi, et composera des musiques de films. Ce n'est qu'à la fin de sa vie qu'il se remettra à composer des œuvres pour grand orchestre, comme la Suite « Yiddish » et le Concerto pour 2 pianos.

Erich Wolfgang Korngold (1897-1957)

Fils du critique autrichien Julius Korngold, enfant prodige, il fut recommandé à Gustav Mahler et à Alexander von Zemlinsky. Le triomphe remporté en 1920 à Hambourg, où il était devenu chef d'orchestre, par son Opéra, « Die tote Stadt » (d'après « Bruges, la morte » de Georges Rodenbach), marqua le sommet de sa carrière. Contraint d'émigrer aux États-Unis en 1934, il s'y spécialisa dans la musique de film. Alors qu'il est un des compositeurs les plus connus d'Europe et du Nouveau Monde, les Nazis saisirent sa propriété vendant ce qu'ils pouvaient et détruisant le reste de son œuvre. L'exil et l'Amérique le contraignent à rester musicien de film. Identifié comme tel dans le monde musical d'après-guerre, il reste considéré comme un compositeur de second ordre, notamment en raison de son refus d'adhérer au sérialisme et au dodécaphonisme. Il devait constater, après son retour en Europe, que ses ouvrages, si fêtés un quart de siècle plus tôt, avaient quitté le répertoire. Korngold est mort sans revenir aux grandes formes musicales (Opéras, Lieders) qui avaient été son expression musicale initiale.

Conclusion

Michel Pastore conclu ainsi sa conférence :

« À travers ses quelques exemples choisis certes arbitrairement (comment référer ne serait-ce qu'à tous les principaux compositeurs de cette période ?) , le fait que la terreur musicale instauré par le 3e " Reich " servit à cautionner le judaïsme paraît fondé. Mais de même se fonde en retour le fait que, malgré la " solution finale ", la musique persista toujours à témoigner de sa force vitale et ce malgré les conditions extrêmes auxquelles ses compositeurs furent contraints. Restituer à tous ces grands artistes la place qu'ils méritent, c'est nous ré-approprier une partie essentielle de notre patrimoine culturel. Recréer, un demi-siècle après, ces œuvres magistrales, c'est aussi refaire avec elles le chemin de l'exil, de l'interdit, du génocide. Si la stratégie nazie fut de justifier le crime contre l'humanité en utilisant la culture comme leurre, à l'inverse la culture comme vérité peut en se reconstituant autour de ces œuvres " dégénérées " dénoncer à jamais le crime. Il s'agit alors de signifier à travers une esthétique, un impératif moral :

“ Plus jamais cela car cela a pu avoir lieu.” »

...

Degenerate music (« Entartete Musik ») was a label applied in the 1930's by the Nazi government in Germany to certain forms of music that it considered to be harmful or decadent. The Nazi government's concern for degenerate music was a part of its larger and more well-known campaign against degenerate art (« Entartete Kunst ») . In both cases, the government attempted to isolate, discredit, discourage, or ban the works.

The Nazi government considered several types of music to be degenerate, for several different reasons. Any music that was opposed to the Nazi regime by virtue of its content or the political views of its composers and performers was considered degenerate. This included works by Jewish and Jewish-origin composers (such as Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Arnold Schoenberg, Franz Schreker, Walter Braunfels, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Kurt Weill, Gustav Mahler, David Nowakowsky and Berthold Goldschmidt) ; works that featured Jewish or African characters (such as those by Ernst Křenek) ; or works by composers of Marxist persuasion (like Hanns Eisler) . It also applied to artists that had shown sympathy for opponents of the Nazi Regime (such as Anton von Webern, who had maintained a friendship with Schoenberg during his exile from Germany) . Modernist music, such as works by Paul Hindemith, Alban Berg, Arnold Schoenberg, and Anton von Webern, was also considered degenerate. Modernist music was judged to be inferior to previous Classical music and it, therefore, offended the Nazis' sense of progress and civilization in general - and, in particular, their loyalty to Germany's many great Classical composers. In addition, one might speculate that Modernist music's abandonment of traditional structure and form presented a threat, albeit immaterial, to the culture of order and control that fascist regimes such as the Nazi Party both developed and relied on. Finally, jazz music was considered degenerate because of its roots in and association with the African-American culture.

However, it promoted the works of German composers, especially those of Richard Wagner who was also much admired by Adolf Hitler as well as many others. Especial favourites were « Rienzi » and the « Ring » cycle with all its links to German mythology. Military marches were highly-approved, and widely used as in the films of Leni Riefenstahl such as « Triumph of the Will » .

From the Nazi seizure of power onward, these composers found it increasingly difficult, and often impossible, to get work or have their music performed. Many went into exile (Arnold Schœnberg, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith, Berthold Goldschmidt) ; or retreated into « internal exile » (Karl Amadeus Hartmann, Boris Blacher) ; or ended-up in the concentration camps (Viktor Ullmann, Erwin Schulhoff) .

Some works which were later enthusiastically adopted by the Nazi regime, such as the hugely popular « Carmina Burana » by Carl Orff (1937) , were initially described as degenerate by local music-critics.

Like degenerate art, examples of degenerate music were displayed in public exhibits in Germany, beginning in 1938. One of the 1st of these was organized in Düsseldorf by Hans Severus Ziegler, at the time super-intendent of the Weimar National Theatre, who explained in an opening speech that the decay of music was « due to the influence of Judaism and capitalism » . Ziegler's exhibit was organized into 7 sections, devoted to :

(1) The influence of Judaism.

(2) Arnold Schœnberg.

(3) Kurt Weill and Ernst Křenek.

(4) « Minor Bolsheviks » (Franz Schreker, Alban Berg, Ernst Toch) .

(5) Leo Kestenbergh, director of musical education before 1933.

(6) Paul Hindemith's Operas and Oratorios.

(7) Igor Stravinsky (anon. 1938, 629) .

From the mid- 1990's, the « Decca » Record Company released a series of recordings under the title « Entartete Musik : Music Suppressed by the 3rd “ Reich ” » , covering lesser-known works by several of the above-named composers.

The 1938 Anti-Semitic 3rd « Reich » Exhibition Guide

This extremely rare exhibition guide of the 1938 exhibition entitled « Entartete Musik » by « Staatsrat » Doctor Hans Severus Ziegler was published in 1938 by « Völkischer Verlag » , in Düsseldorf. It is even more rare today than the 3rd « Reich » publication on « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) ! Very few copies are known to exist today.

The cover that Ziegler used for his work originally was a Nazi propaganda poster, a crude exaggeration of the original poster for the Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » . This grotesque figure became the Nazi symbol for all they considered «

degenerate » in the arts.

« Degenerate Music » (« Entartete Musik ») was a label applied in the 1930's by the Nazi government in Germany to certain forms of music that it considered to be harmful or decadent. The Nazi government's concern for « degenerate music » was a part of its larger and more well-known campaign against « degenerate art » (« Entartete Kunst ») . In both cases, the government attempted to isolate, discredit, discourage, or ban the works. The Nazi government considered several types of music to be « degenerate » , for several different reasons. Any music that was opposed to the Nazi regime by virtue of its content or the political views of its composers and performers was considered « degenerate » . This included works by Jewish and Jewish-origin composers (such as Felix Mendelssohn, Arnold Schœnberg, Franz Schreker, Walter Braunfels, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Kurt Weill, Gustav Mahler, and Berthold Goldschmidt) ; works that featured Jewish or African characters (such as those by Ernst Křenek) ; or works by composers of Marxist persuasion, e.g. , Hanns Eisler. It also applied to artists that had shown sympathy for opponents of the Nazi regime (such as Anton von Webern, who had been a moderate supporter of Adolf Hitler but had maintained a friendship with the Jewish composer Schœnberg during his exile from Germany) . Modernist music, such as works by Paul Hindemith, Alban Berg, Arnold Schœnberg, and Anton von Webern, was also considered « degenerate » . Modernist music was judged to be inferior to previous Classical music and it, therefore, offended the Nazis' sense of progress and civilization in general - and, in particular, their loyalty to Germany's many great Classical composers. In addition, one might speculate that Modernist music's abandonment of structure and form presented a threat, albeit immaterial, to the culture of order and control that Fascist regimes such as the Nazi Party both developed and relied on. Finally, Jazz music was considered « degenerate » because of its roots in and association with the African-American culture. From the Nazi seizure of power onward, these composers found it increasingly difficult, and often impossible, to get work or have their music performed. Many went into exile (e.g. , Arnold Schœnberg, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith, Berthold Goldschmidt) ; or retreated into « internal exile » (e.g. , Karl Amadeus Hartmann, Boris Blacher) ; or ended-up in the concentration camps (e.g. , Viktor Ullmann, or Erwin Schulhoff) . Some works which were later enthusiastically adopted by the Nazi regime, such as the hugely popular « Carmina Burana » by Carl Orff (1937) , were initially described as « degenerate » by local music-critics. Like « degenerate art » , examples of « degenerate music » were displayed in public exhibits in Germany, beginning in 1938. One of the 1st of these was organized in Düsseldorf by Adolf Ziegler, at the time super-intendent of the Weimar National Theatre, who explained in an opening speech that the decay of music was « due to the influence of Judaism and Capitalism » . Ziegler's exhibit was organized into 7 sections, devoted to :

(1) The influence of Judaism.

(2) Arnold Schœnberg.

(3) Kurt Weill and Ernst Křenek.

(4) « Minor Bolsheviks » (Franz Schreker, Alban Berg, Ernst Toch, etc.) .

(5) Leo Kestenberg, director of Musical education before 1933.

(6) Paul Hindemith's Operas and Oratorios.

(7) Igor Stravinsky.

« I have at last learned the lesson that has been forced upon me during this year, and I shall not ever forget it. It is that I am not a German, not a European, indeed perhaps scarcely a human being (at least, the Europeans prefer the worst of their race to me) but I am a Jew. » (Arnold Schönberg)

After the horrors of World War I, most Europeans expressed their sense of freedom by embracing the « Roaring 20's ». A decadent lifestyle was emerging from the nightlife of jazz clubs and cabarets. Berlin was at the heart of the bold and innovative music trends of the 1920's and 1930's. Musicians experimented with their art by pushing away from accepted musical forms and finding new ones.

While many Europeans were celebrating new-found freedom in the arts, Germany was already beginning to fall under the shadow of the Swastika. For almost 100 years, an atmosphere of anti-Semitism had been growing in Europe. Richard Wagner, the well-known composer, had spoken publicly against the Jewish people in his booklet, « Das Judentum in die Musik » (Judaism in Music) . The Nazi Party played upon these historic prejudices in their rise to power.

19th Century psychologists introduced the term « degenerate » (or « entartete ») to describe any deviance or clinical mental illness. Later, a broader definition was applied to include scientific literature (medical, biology and anthropology) . By 1933, Adolf Hitler's 3rd « Reich » referred to the mentally ill, communists, Gypsies, homosexuals and Jews as subspecies of the human race. The words « Jewish » , « Degenerate » , and « Bolshevik » were commonly used to describe any art or music not acceptable to the 3rd « Reich » . The Nazi propaganda poster (black man playing the saxophone with the « Star of David » on his jacket) is a crude exaggeration of the original poster for Ernst Křenek Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » . This grotesque figure became the Nazi symbol for all they considered « degenerate » in the arts. Hitler envisioned the day when German culture would be free of « morbid excrescencies of insane and degenerate men » .

After the race laws of 1933, the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) required a registry of all German musicians. As a result, hundreds of talented composers had their work deliberately suppressed and careers ended simply because their race or style of music offended the 3rd « Reich » . By 1938, examples of degenerate music were on display at the « Entarte Musik » Exhibit for the public to view. Famous works by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Gustav Mahler, and Arnold Schönberg were used as examples of unacceptable music. A generation of incredibly innovative and promising musicians was virtually excluded from its place in music history.

The « Reichsmusikkammer » registry was completed in 1940 and included all musicians' race and religion. Those Jews who had escaped detection, up until 1940, were now in jeopardy. It was easy to find and arrest Jews based on this list. The following composers were considered « degenerate » by the Nazi regime.

Berthold Goldschmidt (1903-1996) was a prominent Jewish composer and conductor who had experienced harassment as a Jew even before Adolf Hitler came to power. He escaped to England, in 1935. He stayed in obscurity until the 1980's when his work was again recognized internationally.

Otto Klemperer (1885-1973) emerged as one of the leading German conductors of his generation. After conducting « Tannhäuser » in 1933, on the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death, Klemperer fled to the United States to escape Nazi persecution. He became conductor of the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra, in 1937. By 1955, after years of health problems, he was appointed the principal conductor of the « Philharmonia » Orchestra of London.

Ernst Křenek (1900-1991) was considered a respectable German Catholic until he wrote a modern Opera called « Jonny Spielt Auf ! ». The storyline of the Opera featured a black man as the main character. The Opera was a musical mix of jazz, spiritual, and Classical. He employed special sound effects to depict traffic noise, trains, and sirens within the music.

Erich Wolfgang Korngold (1897-1957) was a Jewish child prodigy. By the age of 10, he composed « Der Schneemann » which was orchestrated and conducted by his teacher, Alexander von Zemlinsky. In 1934, he began writing musical arrangements for Hollywood films. While working in the United States, in 1938, the Nazis seized his Austrian home and property. Korngold never returned to live again in Austria. His lengthy Hollywood career produced 2 Academy Awards for film scores. He was a popular composer for films, generating music for more than 20 movies.

Arnold Schœnberg (1874-1951) . Though Schœnberg emigrated to the United States just after Adolf Hitler came to power, in 1933, he understood what it meant to be persecuted and what lay ahead for the Jews who did not leave Germany. He foresaw the decimation of the Jews, and tried to get the public's attention. His agenda stated :

- 1) Anti-Semitism must be stopped.
- 2) A united Jewish Party must be created.
- 3) Unanimity in Jewry must be priority.
- 4) An independent Jewish State must be created.

It is no wonder he drew the hatred of Hitler and the Nazis. Schœnberg was telling the world that Hitler was dangerous before he had a stranglehold on the German people.

Bruno Walter (1876-1962) was born Bruno Walter Schlesinger. Walter was the conductor of the Leipzig Orchestra and frequent guest-conductor of the Berlin Orchestra prior to the 3rd « Reich ». In 1933, the Nazi government canceled his concerts due to the « threat to public order ». They could no longer guarantee his personal safety. Walter fled to Austria and then to the United States where he became a well-known conductor and music advisor.

Anton von Webern (1883-1945) was a staunch follower of Adolf Hitler, though not a member of the Nazi Party. He agreed with Hitler's writings, and felt that Hitler would moderate his policies concerning the Jews after the 1st display of power. He was a friend of Schönberg, the exiled German Jew whose music had been classified as « degenerate » and thereby banned. This friendship along with his advocacy of atonality in music got his works listed as « degenerate » . The Nazis burned his writings and forbade performances of his music after Hitler's annexation of Austria (or « Anschluß ») . He retired to a life in the country toward the end of the War. He was accidentally shot to death by an American soldier, on the evening of 15 September 1945, while smoking a cigarette outside (in the dark) at his daughter's home, in Mittersill.

...

What are we to make of the composers who decided not to leave Germany and Austria with the arrival of Adolf Hitler ? A very small number, with the means to do so, simply withdrew from public life : Karl Amadeus Hartmann is the most notable example of this so-called « inner-immigration » . This was a situation whereby performances of works were withdrawn by the composer himself in Nazi occupied Europe. Such integrity came at the price of lost income and Hartmann was forced to live-off of the benevolence of his father-in-law.

Others thought National-Socialism an absolutely splendid idea and composed bombastically in approval. A few joined the Party, while a considerable number had their membership application rejected, no matter how undying their devotion to the Aryan cause.

One of the most bizarre instances was Leon Jessel, a Jewish composer whose wife was a member of the NSDAP. Jessel applied for membership to the Nazi « Kampfbund für Kultur » , but was rejected despite having composed « Schwarzwaldmädel » (The Black Forest Girl) , a light Opera that was a favourite of Adolf Hitler. His eventual arrest and assault by the « Gestapo » led to an early death.

Another bizarre case involved the very fine composer Manfred Gurlitt who even joined the NSDAP, only to be chucked-out when he was (falsely) thought to have Jewish blood.

Many composers, however, simply signed whatever was shoved in front of them in order to continue making a living.

Eduard Erdmann and Max Tiessen's works were banned, but they tried to keep things ticking over in whatever manner they could manage, either by teaching or performing. Erdmann joined the Party, in order to continue his career as pianist, a situation that was repeated with Felix Petyrek. Both had moved in « cultural Bolshevik » circles prior to Hitler's arrival and, even afterwards, there is little indication of their conviction to National-Socialism.

Berthold Goldschmidt reminded me that an affidavit obtained for someone who was in no physical danger from the Nazis, was an affidavit less for someone who was. People without connections or funds abroad and families to support

found it easier to do whatever was necessary in order to carry-on as normal - whatever « normal » was. The oppressive conventionalism that became the 3rd « Reich » 's preferred musical ideal was not an overnight phenomenon. Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt and Viktor Zuckerkandl both file reports of interesting musical events taking place after January 30th 1933, such as Paul von Klenau's 12 tone Opera, « Michael Kohlhaas » . In 1934, Alexander von Zemlinsky's « Kreiderkreis » ran for some 20 performances in Berlin, though not without incident. He was Arnold Schönberg's brother-in-law and a Jew. Jewish composers were officially banned from publicly subsidised venues. Atonality and 12 tone music, even today, does not always make for « easy listening » though it was, partially and occasionally, performed under Nazi auspices.

Paul von Klenau's Symphony from 1941, « Der Sturm » . Klenau was originally from a German speaking Danish family and was married to the daughter of Soma Morgenstern. Despite his persuasive arguments in favour of a « non-Jewish 12 tone system » , winning favour among Nazi cultural arbiters, with a Jewish wife, he felt it safer to leave Germany, returning to Denmark in 1940.

Composers who were promoted by the Nazis were either Richard Strauß, whom we know, or Hans Pfitzner and Franz Schmidt, with whom we are at best familiar. Carl Orff is also often mentioned as a « Nazi favourite » , as are Eugène d'Albert and Franz Lehár, both of whom, by the way, were partial to « non-Aryan » librettists - as, indeed, was Richard Strauß. Lehár, like Klenau, had a Jewish wife, which further compromised him. A huge number of other composers, of whom we know little, have simply been relegated to the status of cowardly, unethical and immoral opportunists.

As a recent correspondent has pointed-out to me, our reaction to these particular individuals either results in throwing out the baby with the bathwater, or over-emphasising and wilfully misreading the evidence of their innocence. And, of course, there is the « case » of Paul Hindemith, a composer apparently all too willing to come to an accommodation with the Nazi regime, had Adolf Hitler's strong disapproval and personal intervention not thwarted his intentions and resulted in his reluctant emigration.

« Und wenn du noch so doll den fuß dagegen stemmst, glaub nicht daß du die Zeit in ihrem Laufe hemmst. » :

A pun on the name of (Engelbert) Dollfuß (Crazy Foot) when time states that trying to hold-back the inevitable by stamping on developments with your « foot » is « crazy » .

At the same time, there were composers such as Friedrich Hartmann, who as a supporter of the Austro-Fascist governments of Engelbert Dollfuß and Kurt Schuschnigg, were forced to flee Nazism following the « Anschluß » , in March 1938. Austro-Fascism was not, despite appealing portrayals of the singing von Trapp family, a democratic, pluralistic government. Social-Democrats and Nazis were both persecuted, though more often than not, it was Social-Democrats who were beaten to a pulp in Austro-Fascist prisons or ended on the Dollfuß/Schuschnigg gallows. The infiltration of Austria's police force by the Nazis, between 1933 and 1938, led to Hitler's « saboteurs » and terrorists being covered-up, or if captured, let-off. The 1st convicted Nazi Party member to be hanged was the Dollfuß assassin, Otto Planetta, later hailed as a Nazi martyr.

Otto Planetta (Nazi who murdered Engelbert Dollfuß) was executed by the Austro-Fascist dictatorship on July 31st, 1934.

It should not go unmentioned that the innocent sounding folk-songs performed by the von Trapps were, in fact, instruments of Austro-Fascist propaganda, attempting to shore-up a uniquely Austrian identity, distinct from its German neighbour. Austrian Catholicism was another means by which Austro-Fascists boosted Austrian singularity. Indeed, British journalists at the time, such as George Eric Rowe Gedye, often referred to the governments of Dollfuß and Schuschnigg as a « clerical dictatorship » .

Austrian folk-music, customs and religion were seen as important propaganda tools against a rampant pan-German movement, a movement that in of itself was not necessarily Nazi or even anti-Semitic, but eventually saw Nazism as the most practical means of uniting all German speakers within a single State. Other composers who were close to the « Ständestaat » , as the dictatorship was called, were Ernst Křenek and Jewish born, but Catholic convert, Egon Wellesz. The very concept of « Stände » refers to the individual's corporative position within society : military ; clergy ; workers ; lawyers ; doctors, etc. It saw the individual as a part of the larger « corporative » body of the State, and it was an idea that appealed to those who wished to address the class-warfare of Marxism with a non-democratic alternative.

Yet, contradictions abound and I fear that a very unpleasant reality will soon dawn : with Hitler's 12 years of madness passing from memory into history, progressive composers in the morally « grey-zone » of acquiescence, such as Max Butting, Eduard Erdmann, Felix Petyrek , Heinz Tießen will be ignored, while those who kept to Late-Romanticism such as Julius Bittner, Friedrich Hartmann, Wilhelm Kienzl, Egon Kornauth, Joseph Marx, Franz Schmidt, Florent Schmitt or Emil von Řezníček will enjoy an inevitable revival. Indeed, it does not surprise me that open supporters of the Nazi regime such as Paul Græner are already enjoying a surprisingly welcome reception.

The rehabilitation of Stalinist composers already demonstrates that an accommodation with dreadful political regimes has become less significant in our assessment of their output. Personally, I don't hold to the view that having to be creative while living under a criminal regime should condemn an artist to being written-out of history - regardless of their degree of compliance. The question which is more difficult to address is whether composing in a conservative language allowed talented composers to express themselves and political compliance was merely a by-product.

The ethical dilemma, however, remains : does a composer of audience-friendly Late-Romanticism, who resisted a murderous regime, deserve more support than a progressive, more original voice who « came to an accommodation » with the bandits in power ? And, of course, the question can be reversed and present us with the same ethical dilemma. The argument that an « anti-Nazi æsthetic » is more important than the actual degree of support a composer demonstrated to a repugnant ideology is equally troublesome. Max Butting was a progressive who composed music that could never guarantee friends in high-places within the Nazi Party, yet, he eventually joined the Party himself. So, should Max Butting be performed for the continuing re-education of German and Austrian audiences at the expense of say, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Franz Schreker or Walter Braunfels ?

This is especially awkward in times when new repertoire that appeals to paying audiences and important musicians is not being supplied by today's composers or, indeed, the platforms meant to profile today's composers. What option is there in a market-driven environment but to revive those who were formerly compromised ? The fact is, their devoted participation, or perceived acquiescence with evil political regimes has resulted in their effective exclusion from 20th Century history. Their post-War influence was stymied by being on the losing side of ideological wars. Yet, pre-War composers who had fresh ideas and original approaches were equally stymied once initially silenced by malevolent regimes, then, forced to compromise solely in order to survive. Post-War, these same composers found themselves condemned for being acquiescent to policies that they could not influence in a country, from which they could not flee. Unless our generation tries to unravel our very confused thinking on the subject of guilt and artistic output, future generations will simply judge composers on their ability to connect with the listener. Arguably, this is the only approach that truly matters, otherwise why listen to Richard Wagner ?

One needs to be honest enough to acknowledge that authoritarian governments encouraged music that drew people together in a mutually binding listening experience. Frankly, it wasn't just dictatorships : America was also encouraging music that made the singularity of being American a mutually binding experience : Aaron Copland was an expert at composing the sort of « Americana » that translated populist ideals at the same time as composers in the USSR were churning-out « Soviet Realism » . The use to which such music was put was ultimately the same : it spoke directly to the listener, providing them with a cultural identity and a sense of common destiny.

Berthold Goldschmidt Opera, « Der Gewaltige Hahnrei » (1930) was to have been performed in Berlin, in 1933. So, why are some composers accepted and not others ? Do we spend too much time checking-up which ideologies they supported and too little time assessing their actual music ? Again, Berthold Goldschmidt's opinion needs to be taken into consideration :

« Those of you who did not live through the terror cannot know the fear that was felt by every individual. What people said and did, in order to keep their daily lives quiet, cannot be taken as representing their true character. Fear distorts character. And it was not just the fear for oneself, but the fear for family and friends. »

A composer such as Joseph Marx represents these contradictions. His music is immediately appealing, exceptionally well-composed and gaining ground quickly amongst connoisseurs of rarities. A trawl through his correspondence reveals much that indicates a distaste of the Nazi regime and much that shows him to have profited from it. As music-curator at the Jewish Museum, in Vienna, I exhibited 2 letters written by Marx : one to Franz Schreker, from 1933, informing him that in his opinion :

« The Jews themselves were responsible for today's anti-Semitism, due to their outrageous behaviour. »

He didn't offer Schreker a temporary life-line, which as Chancellor of Vienna's Music Academy, was within his power. He would no doubt have argued that he had practical reasons for not doing so. His reference to « Jews » being responsible for anti-Semitism suggests he felt appointing Schreker may have fanned the flames of Viennese anti-Semitism. It didn't matter that Schreker had in all likelihood never set foot into a synagogue and had played the

organ at his local Catholic church. It didn't matter that Schreker's mother was from Austria's high-aristocracy, nor did it matter that Schreker was not a Jew. His father, Ignaz, who died while Schreker was still a boy, was a convert from Judaism, and that was all it took. The stress of rejection stemming from something outside of his control, led to the stroke that killed him in 1934.

To me, Marx's letter is very damning indeed. Yet, his correspondence with Korngold is friendly and gregarious. I exhibited a letter from Korngold to Marx in which Korngold puns on the words « Atonal » and « Atomic » . There is nothing in their many letters to suggest that Marx was anti-Semitic. Others cite indictments made by Korngold's librettist, Ernst Décsey, who denounced Marx as an anti-Semite of the 1st order. Like Marx, he too was from Graz and was referencing local knowledge rather than official documentation. If personal political views make music unsuitable for consumption, why on earth do we continue to listen to Wagner, Chopin, Berlioz or Liszt, all of whom wrote repellent things about Jews ? Should we ban everyone we don't agree with ? Wouldn't that be just a bit ... Nazi ??

A critical reconstruction of the Düsseldorf exhibition of 1938

(Created by Albrecht Dümling and Peter Girth.)

Doctor Albrecht Dümling, Berlin musicologist and critic focusing especially on 20th Century musical and cultural history.

The Nazi Exhibition

When, in 1933, the Nazis became rulers of Germany, they regarded this as the beginning of a political as well as a cultural revolution. In order to overcome the « chaotic » artistic pluralism of the Weimar Republic, they persecuted as different artists as Arnold Schönberg, Ernst Křenek, Kurt Weill and Hanns Eisler, who as « non-Aryans » did not meet the requirements of the racial laws. They attacked also « Aryan » artists that (like Paul Hindemith and Igor Stravinsky) had close contact with Jews or were married to Jewish partners.

The town of Weimar, in Thuringia, had already, before 1933, been infiltrated by Nazi ideology. In 1930, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, the new director the school of arts, gave orders to remove the paintings of « Bauhaus » artists. Other prominent Nazis in this town were Baldur von Schirach, Heinz Drewes and Hans Severus Ziegler. Drewes, director of the music department of the Ministry of Propaganda, organized the 1st « “ Reich ” Music Days » of the new State, opening in Düsseldorf, on May 22nd, 1938 ; Richard Wagner's 125th birthday. As part of this music Festival, Ziegler, General manager of the German National Theatre in Weimar, opened the propaganda show « Entartete Musik » (Degenerate Music) , which he himself had arranged, following the example of the « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) exhibition of Munich, in 1937.

The reconstruction

Whereas the art exhibition had already been reconstructed several times, the music show was nearly forgotten. The musicologist Albrecht Dümling encountered the historic exhibition, in 1986-1987, when he arranged several concerts

accompanying a « Degenerate Art » Festival, in Düsseldorf. Peter Girth, then, General Manager of the Düsseldorf Symphony Orchestra, had stimulated that project.

Besides the attempt of a reconstruction of the propaganda show the new exhibition demonstrates, how the musical life of the Weimar Republic was destroyed, and offers (like the « “ Reich ” Music Days ») an overview of the German musical life in the 1930's. This included the « racial research » of prominent German musicologists, who lectured during the « “ Reich ” Music Days » .

For the brochure with Ziegler's opening speech, the Nazis used the black musician « Jonny » from Ernst Křenek's popular Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Strikes-up the Band !) (1927) ; the musician's carnation they turned into a « Star of David » .

The poster of 1988 combines this manipulation with Anton Bruckner's silhouette (using the famous portrait by Hermann von Kaulbach) . For those in power, Bruckner represented the genuine German composer ; several of their Party Rallies ended with a movement of a Bruckner Symphony, and a Bruckner fanfare was chosen as the musical symbol of the « Days of German Art 1937 » , in Munich.

50 years after the propaganda show of the Nazis, the new exhibition opened in Düsseldorf. Further venues were already in the 1st year of its existence the Festivals of Vienna and Zürich and the Centenary of the « Concertgebouw » of Amsterdam. In winter 1989-1990, the exhibition travelled to the Germanic National Museum in Nuremberg, where it was combined with an extensive program of concerts and discussions.

As a complement to the exhibition, the film « Verbotene Klänge. Musik unter dem Hakenkreuz » (Forbidden Sounds. Music under the Swastika) was created, showing for example Ernst Křenek remembering the hatred against his Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » .

The Los Angeles Philharmonic Association arranged an English version of the exhibition that opened in March 1991 at the Music Center Los Angeles.

In 2006-2007 also, a Spanish version of the exhibition was created for the University of Seville.

Considering new findings that led to a more differentiated picture of the Nazi's music policies, a new German version of the exhibition seemed necessary. Thus, in 2007, sponsored by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and the « Alten Tonhalle Düsseldorf » , the exhibition « Das verdächtige Saxophon.“ Entartete Musik ” im Dritten Reich » (The ominous saxophone. « Degenerate Music » in the 3rd « Reich ») came into being. There, as already in the exhibition of 1938, jazz and Operetta gained greater prominence.

Press

« It was a chilling reminder that such a thing could happen. I only wish we could have had this exhibit last year. It

could have been a reminder of what happens when a government starts making artistic judgments. »

(The Los Angeles Times)

« The exhibit documents the Nazi's scurrilous, illogical slander of musicians as disparate as Ernst Křenek, Bruno Walter, Richard Tauber and Josephine Baker, and shows with sickening clarity how susceptible music is to political ideology. As an audio-tape plays, you tap your foot to a catchy march until you realize it was composed for some brown-shirt rally. Then, a chill goes up your spine. »

(The Wall Street Journal)

« The exhibition stands as a worthy tribute to a lost epoch of music and a reminder that freedom of the arts cannot be taken lightly. »

(The Jewish Chronicle, London)

Defining « Degenerate Music » in Nazi Germany

During the 12 years of the 3rd « Reich » 's existence, there was no shortage of hyperbole in the representation of art's role and artists' obligations within the new State. Anyone who approaches the subject will be familiar with Leni Riefenstahl's brilliant piece of film propaganda, « Triumph of the Will » , with the sleek and imposing neo-Classicism of the Olympic stadium and « Reich » Chancellery, with their muscle bound statuary and with Paul Ludwig Troost's House of German Art. Digging deeper, one discovers that Hitler laid the corner-stone for this art museum amidst a pompous procession of the history of « German » art that borrowed shamelessly from ancient Greece, and that the museum's grand opening, in 1937, featured not only a hand-selected collection of works considered truly German but, also, an accompanying exhibit of illegally seized modernist art displayed, mockingly, as the « degenerate » work of charlatans, racial inferiors and the mentally deranged.

1 year later, it was music's turn with the creation of the « Reich » Music Days, which assembled music organizations from around the country and which Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels opened with a speech on the « 10 Commandments » for German music. A parallel exhibit on « degenerate music » vilified jazz, modernism and the alleged Bolshevik and Jewish domination of German musical taste under the Weimar Republic.

Yet, tempting though it may be to take the Degenerate Music exhibit at face value and to regard it as a global statement of Nazi Germany's repression of musical freedom, some important questions must be asked in order to arrive at an understanding of the event and its impact. Could an exhibit about music successfully convey a clear delineation between ideals of « good » and « bad » creative work as effectively as an exhibit of visual arts ? Did this exhibit truly represent the state of German musical life at the time or merely the wishful thinking of rabid ideologues ? The images and vitriolic language of this event are abhorrent to our 21st Century sensibilities, but how might such visual and verbal rhetoric have resonated in 1938 ?

Although the events of the « Reich » Music Days - which spanned more than a week and included performances by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and conducting appearances by Richard Strauß as well as concerts at local factories - aimed to highlight the superior features of German music, even the glib Goebbels was strikingly vague in his keynote speech. He circuitously suggested that « the nature of music lies in melody » rather than in theoretical constructs ; « all music is not suited to everyone » ; music is rooted in the folk, requires empathy rather than reason, deeply affects the spirit of man, and is the most glorious art of the German heritage ; and musicians of the past must be respected. (1) Goebbels was not alone in his inability to put his finger on what made music German, for the elusiveness of music in general, and German music in particular, had plagued experts on both musical and political fronts for decades, if not Centuries. (2)

But what about the task of defining « un-German » or « anti-German » music ? The Degenerate Music exhibit, a focal point of the « Reich » Music Days, should have been able to teach Germans how to recognize destructive musical influences and drive them out of the new State. Instead, it offered only a confusing mixture of all music that was construed as alienating, overly intellectual, sarcastic, erotic, socialistic, capitalistic or American. Furthermore, its heavy reliance on the imagery and devices of the art exhibit upon which it was modeled only highlighted the difficulties inherent in pinning labels on music, and the listening booths for sampling the « witches-sabbath » of cacophony may have been the most popular feature for those attendees who actually enjoyed listening to the music that was under fire. (3)

Like Goebbels, Hans Severus Ziegler, the exhibit's curator, was not a musician, and he clearly felt uncomfortable delving into musical issues. In the catalogue, he stated outright that he did not intend to « write prescriptions or outline laws for the new formation of German musical life » , but rather to educate the country's youth. (4) Ziegler indulges in polemics against democracy, Bolshevism and Jews but pays more attention to Jewish literary figures than to musicians. One notable exception was Arnold Schoenberg, who was explicitly attacked as the inventor of atonality and the would-be underminer of the « German » triad. (5)

The fact that the organizers were heavily influenced by the success of the 1937 art exhibit is made even clearer thanks to the abundance of music-related images similar to those used as examples of degenerate art. The art exhibit had heightened its attack on modern artworks by arranging them in a crowded and chaotic fashion on walls strewn with graffiti-like commentary, and the music exhibit was set-up in a similar manner. (6) Furthermore, the music exhibit's catalogue exploited the shock value of some modern art by linking it to music wherever possible. It featured a sketch of a stage-design for a Schoenberg Opera by Oskar Schlemmer, one of the defamed Bauhaus artists ; reproduced caricatures of Jewish musicians that were drawn by Jewish artists ; (7) and showed 2 abstract paintings with musical subjects by the « degenerates » Paul Klee and Carl Hofer, with the inscription, « degenerate art and degenerate music hand in hand » . (8)

When they were not leaning on visual associations, the organizers tapped into popular tropes of racism and anti-Semitism as well as indulging in Janus-faced attacks on Bolshevism and capitalism without ever taking pains to sort out the inherent contradictions. The catalogue's cover, with its depiction of a black saxophonist with a Jewish star on

his lapel, was meant to incite an immediate aversion to racial otherness : since the 1920's, the saxophone had symbolized concerns about the invasion of American culture, and the Jewish star supposedly revealed the manipulative power behind the alleged American conspiracy to debase German culture. An unflattering portrait of Arnold Schœnberg, on page 13 of the catalogue, is accompanied by an observation (by Siegmund Pisling, who was Jewish) that describes him as an explorer who tries to open-up new horizons by turning sounds of anguish and hysteria into music. (9) A « portrait of his Aryan » student, Anton von Webern, is captioned with the comment that the student exceeds the Master « even in the length of his nose » , (10) and another « Aryan » composer, Ernst Křenek, is targeted for « propagating race dishonour » with his hugely successful Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (This work from the 1920's featured, as its central character, a black jazz musician with criminal leanings ; it is defamed elsewhere in the catalogue as « Bolshevist » and was probably also the inspiration for the cover illustration.) (11) The Jewish Opera composer Franz Schreker, whose works had been quite successful throughout the 1920's, and who had died in 1934, was linked with the sex-researcher Magnus Hirschfeld, (12) and Bertolt Brecht and Kurt Weill's satire of Capitalism was twisted to represent their purported encouragement of greed and corruption. (13)

The « Degenerate Music » exhibit neither provided guide-lines for musicians nor reflected current or developing music policy. The repeated attacks against Schœnberg, for one, would hardly have aroused much surprise in Germany in the 1930's, or even in the 1920's. Following the successes of « Pelleas und Melisande » (composed in 1902-1903) , « Pierrot Lunaire » (in 1912) , and the « Gurrelieder » (in 1900-1903, 1910-1911) , Schœnberg abandoned traditional harmony in his atonal and 12 tone works and inspired several other composers to follow suit. By the late- 1920's, however, many younger composers had set their minds on forging stronger relationships with the general public and had shunned Schœnberg's esoteric experiments, for which critical reception had been less than enthusiastic. Following the 1930 premiere of the composer's Opera, « Von heute auf morgen » , musicologist and critic Alfred Einstein reprimanded Schœnberg for his half-hearted attempt to compose a work for the masses by choosing a story with broad appeal but setting it to a 12 tone score with « fanatical seriousness and an overwhelming lack of humour » . This resulted in a work of « pure self-gratification » that was « unsocial and inhumanly difficult » , (14) wrote Einstein - who, like Schœnberg, was later forced to emigrate. Schœnberg had been named director of the prestigious composition Master-class at the Prussian Academy, in 1925, and his public humiliation and resignation, in 1933, attracted much attention as a 1st step toward fulfilling the Nazis' mission to remove all Jews from musical life. The fact that Schœnberg was a Jew whose work had recently declined in popularity provided a convenient coincidence for racist propagandists.

The denigration of Schœnberg did not, however, signal the death of his compositional methods in Germany : several atonal and 12 tone works were created and performed during the 3rd « Reich » , and a few were commissioned by Nazi organizations and premiered in prominent venues. (15) On the occasion of Schœnberg's 60th birthday, in 1934, music-critic Herbert Gerigk, an employee of the Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, went so far as to suggest that, in the right hands (i.e. , in the hands of a composer who was pure of blood and pure in character) , atonal composition could be an effective means of expression. (16)

By 1938, when the Degenerate Music exhibit was mounted, Schœnberg and most of the other individuals attacked in it had either emigrated or died, which made them easy targets. Their absences also became retroactive « evidence » of

the new order's successful eradication of destructive forces. Curiously, Ziegler names « l'Histoire du soldat » as a work that had « insulted German audiences » , but he fails to name its composer, Igor Stravinsky. (17) The Russian Master was enjoying great success in Germany, at the time of the exhibit, (18) and was being cited as a possible mentor and inspiration for young composers in the 3rd « Reich » . (19) His experiments with rhythm and meter unmistakably influenced Carl Orff's hugely successful Nazi era composition, « Carmina Burana » . (20)

The other prominent object of vilification in the exhibit was jazz, but the attacks did little to alter its fate in Nazi Germany. Jazz, like atonality, started-out as an easy target : already, during the 1920's, it had symbolized foreign corruption in the minds of conservative music-critics, leaders of the youth movement and (a little later, during the Depression) practicing musicians who feared competition from the influx of foreign jazz musicians. (21) It is ironic that Germans acquired a much more sophisticated appreciation of jazz during the 1930's, and the genre's popularity would spike during the Second World War, as soldiers demanded it and the German public threatened to tune into foreign broadcasts if German radio refused to offer it on their air-waves. (22) Jazz also managed to thrive in night clubs, some of which were the frequent haunts of SS and SA officers who themselves were jazz enthusiasts. (23)

Finally, in assessing the success or failure of the exhibit, we must try to envision the « Zeitgeist » of 1938, in Germany and abroad - and, here, we encounter even more surprising contradictions. Musicologist Albrecht Dümling, who has long been engaged in reconstructing and understanding the 1938 event and its implications, recently made the stunning discovery that its shrill tone actually repelled some committed National-Socialists, whereas the exhibit may have resonated with the adherents of concurrent strains of xenophobia, in Britain and America. Peter Raabe, who was then President of the all-encompassing national musicians union (« Reichsmusikkammer ») , founded in 1933, tendered his resignation in response to the exhibit ; his predecessor, Richard Strauß, the « godfather » of German music, expressed his dismay more subtly, whereas other prominent musicians simply shunned the event - to such an extent that Josef Gœbbels shut the exhibit down prematurely. At the same time, however, an American reporter completely white-washed the racist content of the exhibit, and a reporter for Britain's « Musical Times » uncritically noted how it « illustrated the sorry plight of German music during the period of “ Jewish influence ” . » (24)

Taken together, all of these contradictions within and surrounding the Degenerate Music exhibit do nothing to mitigate the fact that, at the very least, the event added to the ammunition that was being stock-piled by those who wished to destroy their enemies, Jews and non-Jews alike. Its barrage of anti-Semitic rhetoric was just one more factor that contributed to the German public's acceptance of the assault on the rights, property and physical safety of Jewish citizens, and the exhibit's attacks on so broad a spectrum of musical tastes only increased the possibilities for personal advancement and vindictiveness in an atmosphere rife with denunciation and betrayal.

Pamela M. Potter is Professor of Musicology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She is the author of « Most German of the Arts : Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's “ Reich ” » (1998) and co-editor, with Celia Applegate, of « Music and German National Identity » (2002) . Her current projects include a history of musical life in 20th Century Berlin and a book on Nazi æsthetics in the visual and performing arts.

Notes

- (1) Josef Goebbels. « Zehn Grundsätze deutschen Musikschaffens » , in : « Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer » , Band 5 (1938) , fac-simile in : « Entartete Musik : eine kommentierte Rekonstruktion » , edited by Albrecht Dümling and Peter Girth, Düsseldorf (1988) , page 123 ; portions translated in : Donald Wesley Ellis. « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” : National-Socialist Æsthetic Theory as Governmental Policy » , Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas (1970) , page 127.
- (2) Bernd Sponheuer. « Reconstructing Ideal Types of the “ German ” in Music » , in : « Music and German National Identity » , edited by Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter, University of Chicago Press, Chicago (2002) , pages 36-58 ; Pamela M. Potter. « Most German of the Arts : Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's “ Reich ” » , Yale University Press, New Haven (1998) , pages 200-234.
- (3) Michæl Meyer. « A Musical Facade for the 3rd “ Reich ” » , in : « “ Degenerate Art ” : The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany » , edited by Stephanie Barron, Los Angeles County Museum, Los Angeles (1991) , page 182.
- (4) Hans Severus Ziegler. « Entartete Musik : Eine Abrechnung » , 2nd edition, « Völkischer Verlag » , Düsseldorf (1939) ; page 6.
- (5) Hans Severus Ziegler, pages 13, 22-24.
- (6) Meyer, illustrations on pages 170, 173, and 180 ; description of the exhibit on pages 180-182.
- (7) Hans Severus Ziegler, page 19.
- (8) Hans Severus Ziegler, page 25.
- (9) Hans Severus Ziegler, page 13.
- (10) Hans Severus Ziegler, page 19.
- (11) Hans Severus Ziegler, pages 9, 19.
- (12) Hans Severus Ziegler, page 15.
- (13) Hans Severus Ziegler, pages 17, 21.
- (14) Alfred Einstein. « Arnold Schœnberg : Von heute auf morgen » (world-premiered in Frankfurt) , « Berliner Tageblatt » , Band 3 (February 1930) , translated in : « Alfred Einstein on Music : Selected Music-Criticisms, Contributions to the Study of Music and Dance » , Volume 21, edited by Catherine Dower, Greenwood Press, New York (1991) ; pages 104-105.

- (15) Fred K. Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » , Fischer, Frankfurt-am-Main (1982) ; pages 126, 298-306.
- (16) Herbert Gerigk. « Eine Lanze für Schönberg » , in : « Die Musik » , Band 27 (1934) .
- (17) Hans Severus Ziegler, pages 18-20.
- (18) Joan Evans. « Stravinsky's Music in Hitler's Germany » , in : « Journal of the American Musicological Society » , Volume 56 (2003) ; pages 525-594.
- (19) Michaël H. Kater. « The Twisted Muse : Musicians and Their Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Oxford University Press, New York (1997) ; page 183.
- (20) Michaël H. Kater. « Composer of the Nazi Era : 8 Portraits » , Oxford University Press, New York (2000) ; pages 122-128.
- (21) Michaël H. Kater. « Different Drummers : Jazz in the Culture of Nazi Germany » , Oxford University Press, Oxford (1992) ; pages 26-28.
- (22) Michaël H. Kater. « Different Drummers » ; Chapters 1 and 2.
- (23) Michaël H. Kater. « Different Drummers » ; pages 64, 101.
- (24) Albrecht Dümling. « The Target of Racial Purity : The « Degenerate Music » Exhibition in Düsseldorf, 1938 » , in : « Art, Culture, and Media Under the 3rd “ Reich ” » , edited by Richard Etlin, University of Chicago Press, Chicago (2002) ; pages 62-63.

...

The terms « degenerate art » and « degenerate music » were used to describe works of art and, in this case, music that was created by Jewish or Jewish-origin composers, works that featured either Jewish or African characters (Ernst Křenek's Opera, « Jonny Spielt Auf ! » , is a good example of this) , and works by composers who had different ideological backgrounds (for example, Hanns Eisler was thought to be one of the composers who should be persecuted because he was a communist) . This term has been applied as well to composers who maintained close relationships with banned composers (for instance, Anton von Webern) . In 1938, during the « Reichsmusiktag » (« Reich » 's Musical Day) , in Düsseldorf, Goebbels revealed the « 10 Commandments » for musical creation. These doctrines could be summarized as follows : music needs to have melody and be based on the folk element, and music was and is the greatest art in which Germany had excelled for many years. These basic doctrines were intended to make-up the core of Fascist ideology concerning musical creation. During the Düsseldorf event, a « degenerate music » exhibition was held in order to make the argument stronger.

On the other hand, « avant-garde » music was targeted as degenerate and out of Fascist context. The modernist idioms were thought to be against the ideas of Fascist ideology, mainly because melody was not a key-issue. This attitude resulted in quite a few composers and musicians leaving the country before the outbreak of the War, and many others escaped during the War. However, many of them suffered the consequences of discrimination and were sent to prison camps, where some of them suffered a tragic death.

...

Paul Hindemith secured an appointment in the « Reich » Chamber of Music, in February 1934. The post came as a result of his relationships with Chamber President Richard Strauß and Vice-President Wilhelm Furtwängler. Strauß had approached Hindemith back in November 1933 and inquired whether he would join the executive council of the composers' section in the Chamber. The appointment was subsequently widely reported. It also certainly entailed Goebbels' assent as president of the « Reich » Chamber of Culture. The appointment within the « Reich » Chamber of Music helped in other ways. It facilitated the above-noted discussions about music pedagogy with Robert Ley, Baldur von Schirach, and Bernhard Rust. It was much safer to interact with him now that Hindemith was a high-ranking official in the Chamber. The appointment also enhanced his reputation as a composer. At the 18 February 1934 concert, to celebrate the inauguration of the Chamber, his 1930 piece Concert Music for Strings and Wind Instruments was performed by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, along with works by Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner, and others on the executive council. The event was billed as the « 1st German Composers' Day », and Hindemith himself climbed the podium to conduct his piece. As he noted in one letter :

« One really could not ask for more in the way of an official introduction. »

Many of the ensuing reviews of his piece were also glowing.

But the performance of his work at this high profile « Festkonzert » also elicited « outrage » from certain Nazi « stalwarts », and Hindemith continued to endure a rash of attacks. According to Pamela M. Potter, these arose-out of the political rivalries beyond his control, rather than out of any heroic acts of resistance on his part.

She stated :

« Rosenberg and Goebbels, for their part, displayed relatively little knowledge of music and showed far less interest in engaging in the æsthetic debates surrounding it, and even Goebbels's key-note speech for the opening of the “ Reich ” Music Days, in 1938, where he outlined the “ 10 Commandments ” for German music, was strikingly vague. »

Goebbels, as « Gauleiter » of Berlin, controlled the former City Opera in Charlottenburg, as well as the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, which he transformed into the « Reich » Orchestra, and he exhibited more interest in administrative issues than in æsthetic policy. When he did engage in the latter, he proved inconsistent with regard to modernism - just as with the visual arts. Rosenberg also relied on aides when music policy was involved.

...

Of all of the artistic realms Josef Gœbbels claimed to have Germanized by the end of 1936, music was perhaps the most elusive. By its very nature, music usually conveys no clear messages or meanings, especially when it stands alone without any text, choreography, or other dramatic or visual cues. For this reason, it has been easier to assign arbitrary labels to music than to other forms of cultural output, but also more difficult to justify these labels. Thus, the progressive experiments of Arnold Schœnberg and his School could be designated as « Bolshevik » by the Nazis and « bourgeois » by the Soviets. Such elusiveness posed difficulties for using music as a propaganda tool : its ambiguity made it susceptible to arbitrary labels, but the same ambiguity could keep the labels from sticking. While Nazi ideologues such as Alfred Rosenberg and propaganda minister Josef Gœbbels were quite articulate in their views toward modernism in the visual arts, they had relatively little knowledge of music and showed far less interest in engaging in the æsthetic debates surrounding it. In the 12 years of the Nazi regime, government and Party interests never managed to establish any consistent æsthetic criteria for music, despite the loud out-cries against musical « Judaism » , « Bolshevism » , and « Americanism » . Furthermore, the Nazi system neglected to enforce effective measures to suppress those types of music it may have considered unacceptable.

The most coherent public presentation of any ideologically based musical criteria came in 1938 with the 1st « Reich » Music Days (« Reichsmusiktage ») , in Düsseldorf, and the accompanying exhibit on « Degenerate Music » , though even these events failed to convey consistent guide-lines and came into direct conflict with measures in practice. The stated purpose of the « Reich » Music Days was to foster communication between the creators of music and the public, providing a forum for composers, performers, bureaucrats, educators, and scholars to present their achievements to the « people's community » . The festivities lasted 8 days and were spread all over the city, including concerts at local factories sponsored by the « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF : Strength Through Joy) organization. High-points included Richard Strauß conducting some of his own works, the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra's performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony, and an address by Josef Gœbbels. The event should have been able to illustrate the differences between « good » and « bad » music, but even Gœbbels, a masterful orator in his own right, was strikingly vague in his keynote speech. The « 10 Commandments » he offered for German music in a half-hearted attempt to set the tone for the event provided only hazy notions such as : « the nature of music lies in melody » and not in theoretical constructs ; « not all music is suited to everyone » ; music is rooted in the Volume 9, requires empathy rather than reason, deeply affects the spirit of man, and is the most glorious art of the German heritage ; and musicians of the past must be respected. Gœbbels was not alone in his inability to put his finger on what made music German. For decades, or even Centuries prior to the Nazi era, music-critics, musicians, and scholars had written countless books and articles on the subject, but could conclude only that German music was distinct for its depth, clarity, and « that certain something » that made it recognizably German.

But what about un-German music or anti-German music - the music that was supposed to have been eradicated from Nazi society ? The « Degenerate Music » exhibit, a focal point of the « Reich » Music Days, was intended to teach Germans how to recognize destructive musical influences and root them out from the new State. Instead, the exhibit offered only a confusing array of « ad bominem » attacks, many of them self-contradictory. Furthermore, a look at

how music functioned in the 3rd « Reich » reveals that even the most relentlessly attacked subjects of the exhibit survived the regime unscathed.

The exhibit was modeled on the exhibit of « degenerate art » shown in Munich 1 year earlier, and its purpose was to present a picture of negative Jewish and foreign influences that had threatened German music until the Nazi revolution succeeded in eradicating them. But rather than clearly delineating the difference between good and bad, the exhibit merely threw together a confusing mixture of anything construed as alienating, intellectual, sarcastic, erotic, socialist, capitalist, or American. The cover of the exhibit catalogue is only the 1st illustration of this « mélange » , depicting a black saxophonist, with the « Star of David » on his lapel, against a red background (a possible allusion to Bolshevism) . The image of the black musician immediately incites an aversion to racial otherness, his saxophone invokes the old worries that had peaked in the 1920's about American culture becoming too influential, and the Jewish star apparently is meant to divulge the manipulative power lying behind this destructiveness. Elsewhere in the catalogue, further examples of fear-mongering draw on various conspiracy theories that involve Jews, Bolsheviks, psychoanalysts, capitalists, and Expressionist artists. An unflattering portrait of Arnold Schœnberg accompanies an observation, notably by another Jew, that describes him as an explorer attempting to open-up new horizons by turning sounds of anguish and hysteria into music. A portrait of his student, Anton von Webern, an Aryan, is captioned with the comment that the student exceeds the Master « even in the length of his nose » .

...

« Gestapo » eyes and ears were everywhere. People were disappearing. What could Wilhelm Furtwängler do about the hell into which his country was now sliding ? If the true realm of music is above politics, he reasoned, then, someone must keep that realm open to those for whom every other means of redemption has been denied. He was not about to join a resistance movement, but music making itself now became a symbol of his own kind of opposition to Adolf Hitler and totalitarianism, and Furtwängler saw that this was his destiny.

This form of insurgency dwelt beyond the « Gestapo » 's « terrain » ; there was no concrete means of identifying it and, so, it could not be easily terminated. And here, perhaps, lay the secret to Furtwängler's phenomenal longevity throughout his peculiar kind of defiance against the regime right-up to the end : Furtwängler's realm was in the aural, the suggestive, the intangible, and the very impalpability of music shielded his unique style of sedition. While evidence could easily be produced against writers and visual artists from their own work, it was all but impossible to catch Furtwängler in flagrante « delicto » in his.

Josef Gœbbels was well aware of how Furtwängler was exploiting this chink in Party dogma and set about filling it by making the Nazi Ideal of acceptable music both explicit and tangible under his ongoing program of « Total Conformity » (« Gleichschaltung ») . He long since had succeeded in bringing to heel everything relating to literature, film, the visual arts, and the press. And now, in 1938, he set his target on music by sponsoring a Festival of German Music Days, in Düsseldorf, in conjunction with the city's 650th anniversary celebration.

The week-long « Musikfest » lasted from 22 May until 29 May and included more than 2 dozen events involving the

Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra under Hermann Abendroth, the Düsseldorf Municipal Orchestra, endless parades utilizing army units, the « Hitler Youth », labour groups, music students, and a variety of amateur instrumental and choral clubs. Richard Strauß' Opera, « Arabella », Hans Pfitzner's Cantata, « Of the German Soul », and Beethoven's 9th Symphony were among the large-scale musical offerings trotted-out during that week to affirm German identity at its highest and best. Musicologists from all parts of Germany were brought in for lectures, seminars, and panels to discuss the nature of German music.

Throughout the festivities, a side-show called « Degenerate Music » (« Entartete Musik ») was put on to demonstrate how savagely certain « elements » had ravaged German music. The idea first occurred to Hans Severus Ziegler, State Commissar of the Thuringian Theaters, when he saw the huge success accorded the exposition of « Degenerate Art » (« Entartete Kunst ») held in Munich a year earlier, in 1937. In that infamous exhibit, the works of such reprehensible artists as Pablo Picasso, Oskar Kokoschka, Vassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, Emil Nolde, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Max Beckmann and many others were held-up for ridicule in one building, while the works of artists acceptable to the « Reich », such as Adolf Ziegler, who supervised the exposition, Arno Breker, Richard Scheibe, and Sepp Hilz were displayed for adulation in another. (Adolf Ziegler, incidentally, was no relation to Hans Severus Ziegler.) The latter readily saw how a corresponding exposition of « degenerate music » could serve a number of purposes - especially, his own-and he recruited the help of 3 friends from Weimar : Otto zur Nedden, Chief Dramaturg at the « Deutsches Nationaltheater », Paul Sixt, a young conductor, and Ernst Nobbe, the General Intendant in Weimar.

This lubricious quartet started their project without prompting from any government authority, but their ultimate aim was to gain Berlin's assent in more ways than one. Their overt intention was simply to heap scorn on Jews in music, although such « Aryans » as Paul Hindemith and Alban Berg were not to be spared. No « superior » « Aryan » musicians, however, were produced for contrast. Jazz and blacks were also special targets of the exhibit, and the cover of the exhibition booklet showed a thick-lipped, wide-eyed black-man playing a saxophone with a flat carnation shaped as a « Star of David » stuck to his tuxedo lapel.

The covert and primary intention of the show, however, was to produce a « trading-card » for its organizers that could be used in their tenuous dealings with the government. Ziegler took the lead in bringing the project to fruition because it was his idea and he had the most at stake. He had long been widely suspected of being homosexual, and « certain rumours » about his conduct in Weimar had brought about an official investigation, in January 1935. Such proclivities were a grave and frequently capital offense in the 3rd « Reich », and the grounds for the inquiry were sufficiently serious for him to be suspended from his duties as Commissar. Ziegler appealed to the highest-levels of the « Reich », in Berlin. A few weeks later, the press reported that charges against him had been dropped. Such an abrupt halt in official proceedings of this sort could have been authorized only at the very top. Indeed, Ziegler had many friends in the highest-echelons of the Nazi hierarchy, and he had known Adolf Hitler since 1925. And while the soles of his libido may have traversed the gutter from time to time, both his pedigree and his qualifications were far from down at the cuff. Born in Eisenach, in 1893, his father was a banker, and his maternal grandfather had founded one of the most prestigious and enduring music-publishing houses in the United States, Gustav Schirmer & Sons. Ziegler apparently inherited his musical gifts from his mother's side and developed them through advanced studies in organ, at Cambridge, England, and in cultural history in Weimar and at Greifswald University. He had been active in editing Nazi

publications since 1924 and rapidly moved-up through various capacities in theatrical production and administration until his loyal work for the Brown-shirts was rewarded with the leading position in the Thuringian Theaters, in 1933.

Ziegler received a stern warning for his « peccadillos » and kept his job, but he apparently felt that his personal ties in Berlin could continue to exempt his drives from prosecution. Nonetheless, the pursuit of the love that dared not speak its name, at that time, was fast becoming more dangerous than exciting, and he realized his position was weakening. So, the idea of an anti-Semitic and anti-Black music exhibit flowered into a means of ingratiating himself and his cronies with top-level authorities.

A few months before the Festival was to take place, Ziegler presented the project to Josef Gœbbels and chief Nazi ideologue, Alfred Rosenberg. They both expressed great interest. Since the German Music Days were set to begin 22 May, they had to act quickly. In a rare moment of amicable collaboration, they agreed to include it as part of the festivities. Scores, posters, and other « proofs » of « degenerate music » were displayed in vitrines and along the walls of the exhibition, and visitors could enter private booths equipped with speakers to hear recordings of such worthless composers as Arnold Schœnberg, Gustav Mahler, Felix Mendelssohn, Ernst Křenek, and Paul Hindemith performed by such talentless artists as Fritz Kreisler, Emanuel Feuerrmann, Bruno Walter, and Otto Klemperer. The exhibit went on tour from Düsseldorf to Munich and Vienna, but Gœbbels forbade further press coverage when he foresaw its popularity and began to suspect Ziegler's real motive in producing it.

The German Music Days Festival was an unqualified success as a Party event, and the « Degenerate Music » side-show was well attended. But their long-range impact on Germany's populace was at best dubious. The « Degenerate Music » exhibition, in particular, represented little more than a contemptible joke among the informed and a repository of noisy curiosities to the ignorant. Nonetheless, what was indubitably odious to those who knew of Ziegler and his friends was the shameless spectacle this exhibit produced of one persecuted minority cynically flailing another with utter impunity. Wilhelm Furtwängler was invited to participate, but he and most of the other leading musical figures left in Germany steered clear of having anything to do with it. Absence, however, could not mitigate the pernicious enormity of what Furtwängler alone was now up against. The circus in Düsseldorf may merely have been hoopla, but he could not ignore the fact that the intellectual forces behind it and the exhibit could no longer be dismissed as Brown-shirt rabble-rousers. Intelligent, cultured individuals such as Hans Severus Ziegler and his friends not only were boarding the Nazi band-wagon but were now helping drive it. The very plexus of musical culture in Germany was becoming palpably « degenerate » .

Later that year, Furtwängler expressed how he felt about the « Degenerate Music » project and the base intentions of its creators by boldly presenting the German premiere of the suite from « The Fairy's Kiss » by Igor Stravinsky. He got away with it because music remained a somewhat murky area in Nazi ideology, despite the enormous expense both Josef Gœbbels and Alfred Rosenberg lavished on proving otherwise, and it resisted codification and made strict enforcement of policy rules almost impossible. This circumstance was peculiar to music alone in the 3rd « Reich » , and it further enabled Furtwängler to zigzag through that narrow gray zone with his own line of defense, always a whiff beyond Heinrich Himmler's Dobermans. But Furtwängler's performance of Stravinsky's bitter-sweet ballet music was the last time this « Bolchevist noise-maker » was heard in Germany, until after World War II.

The Nazis' take on « Degenerate Music »

An exhibition opened May 24th, 1938, in Düsseldorf titled « Degenerate Music » that aimed to galvanize public hatred of music deemed « un-German » by the Nazis. A current exhibition now reviews what the original showcased.

The National-Socialists' racial fanaticism left nothing untouched, including the realm of music, which they hoped to see ridded of all « un-German », « un-Aryan » influences. To drive the point home, an exhibition titled « Entartete Musik » (Degenerate Music) opened in Düsseldorf, on May 24th, 1938, as part of a week celebrating « national music ». Everything that was to have no place in the Nazis' musical culture was presented by way of audio snippets, pictures and accompanying texts.

The vilified genres included « Schlager », Operetta and atonal music (but especially music by Jewish composers) as well as jazz, dismissed as « nigger music ».

The exhibition became a starting-point for an unprecedented campaign against musicians and their music. None of the individuals included in the exhibition were allowed to continue their work under the regime. A ban on their work and playing their compositions was the 1st step, leading ultimately to physical pursuit and deportation.

« Effigies of wickedness »

The exhibition was intended as a deterrent, at least according to the intentions of Adolf Hitler admirer, Hans Severus Ziegler. The Nazi official and former director of the State Theater, in Weimar, organized the exhibition.

In a speech that opened the show, he said :

« What has been collected in this exhibition represents an effigy of wickedness - an effigy of arrogant Jewish impudence and complete spiritual insipidness. »

The title-page of the exhibition's accompanying brochure made Ziegler's intentions immediately clear to visitors. A perfidious caricature depicted « Jonny », a black jazz musician known at the time as the title figure in Ernst Křenek's Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Strikes-up the Band !), as well as through Friedrich Holænder's « chanson », « Jonny, wenn du Geburtstag hast » (When It's Your Birthday, Jonny), which Marlene Dietrich made famous in a pointedly erotic interpretation. On the brochure, « Jonny » had been mutated into a monkey, bearing the Star of David rather than a carnation in his button-hole. It would become a prominent figure within Nazi propaganda and the symbol of « degenerate » music.

« Jonny » in the spotlight

As early as 1930, Ziegler had fumed against jazz, saying the genre was helping black culture to « victory ».

Regarding Křenek's jazz Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » , debuted in 1927 in Leipzig to great success, Ziegler wrote in the exhibition brochure :

« A people that nears hysteria in its praise for “ Jonny ”, who has already shown-off much too long for that people, has grown spiritually and mentally ill, and is internally confused and unclean. »

The propaganda exhibition was similarly over-blown. Once celebrated, Jewish Operetta composers like Emmerich Kálmán, Leo Fall, Paul Abraham or Leon Jessel as well as star-singers like Richard Tauber were pictured with obscured faces and demeaned as mentally ill. Sound booths allowed listeners to hear Ist-hand the « corrosive powers » of jazz and swing music.

There were also displays offering polemics against Arnold Schönberg and his followers, whose atonal music was said to have « mocked Classical Masterpieces and flouted hallowed traditions » . Paul Hindemith was also condemned as the « theoretician of atonality » .

The « suspicious saxophone »

The exhibition in Düsseldorf ran through June 14th, 1938, and, then, moved in Weimar, Munich and Vienna. The outbreak of World War II, in 1939, prevented the addition of further stops.

While the Nazi exhibition « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) has been reconstructed and shown numerous times since 1945, « Entartete Musik » was long forgotten. It was not until 50 years later, in 1988, that the musicologist Albrecht Dümling created a commented reconstruction. Since then, the exhibition has traveled to more than 40 cities in countries including Israel, the Netherlands, Switzerland and, under the title : « Banned by the Nazis : “ Entartete Musik ” » , in the United States.

New scholarship on the Nazis' politicization of music, particularly with respect to jazz and Operetta, allowed Dümling to expand the reconstruction in 2007. Under the title : « Das verdächtige Saxophon. “ Entartete Musik ” im NS-Staat » (The Suspicious Saxophone. « Degenerate Music » under the National-Socialists) , there are now around 80 pieces in the exhibition and many original sound-clips. It's a nightmarish documentation that shows not just how the Nazis exploited music and how they defamed musicians, but also makes an appeal to visitors to be vigilant when words like « degenerate » are used to dismiss art.

MUSIC : It Wasn't Music to Their Ears : An exhibition re-creating the Nazis' 1938 denouncement of « degenerate » composers

In 1988, 2 German musicologists doing research at the Düsseldorf library stumbled upon evidence of a little known music exhibition that had been assembled 50 years earlier by Adolf Hitler's propaganda machine.

Newspaper archives revealed how Josef Goebbels, minister of enlightenment and propaganda in charge of film, music,

theater and visual arts, with much fanfare had inaugurated in Düsseldorf a Festival of music (the « Reichsmusiktage » , or the « Reich » 's Music Days) in celebration of German culture.

But along with the chamber music programs, lectures and performances by the « Hitler Youth » singers and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, Goebbels and his cohorts also organized, that summer of 1938, a small exhibition denouncing the composers of so-called « entartete musik » or « degenerate music » . It was part of the larger purge of cultural elements offensive to Nazi ideals, which included the infamous 1937 « entartete kunst » or « degenerate art » exhibition (subject of a current reconstruction at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art) .

Jews Arnold Schœnberg, Kurt Weill, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Franz Schreker, Ernst Toch and Hanns Eisler were ridiculed and maligned in « Entartete Musik » ; so was Alban Berg. Also on display at the Düsseldorf's « Alten Tonhalle » were pictures, posters, manuscripts and memorabilia pertaining to Paul Hindemith, the famed German pedagogue and composer who had married a half-Jew and whose Opera, « Neues vom Tage » , had enraged Adolf Hitler, and Austrian Ernst Křenek, a Catholic deemed politically undesirable because of his progressive musicality and outspoken views against the 3rd « Reich » . A special section of the exhibit denigrated jazz.

Fascinated with these findings, Peter Girth, then general-manager of the Düsseldorf Symphony (he had held a similar post with the Berlin Philharmonic) and Albrecht Dumling, music-critic for « Der Tagesspiegel » in Berlin, worked obsessively to reconstruct the exhibit. Their re-creation, which was included in a German 50 year retrospective on « degenerate art » , has to date traveled to 22 European cities, attracting large crowds in Vienna, Frankfurt, Zürich, Leipzig and Berlin.

Now, « Entartete Musik » comes to America, opening Thursday for a month-long stay at the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion. (The exhibit then goes to Chicago's Ravinia Music Festival.)

« There were many reasons to describe an artist as “ entartete ” and being Jewish was only one » , reflected Girth, who these days serves as general-manager at the State Opera House, in Darmstadt. »

« Stravinsky and Prokofiev were labeled “ Bolshevik ” and unsuitable ; still, others were politically undesirable. And, then, there were those who collaborated with Jewish composers. »

« The Nazis wanted music to be positive and nice-sounding and based on melodies that everyone could sing. » , added Dumling, speaking by phone from Berlin.

« The Nazis could not stand anything critical. They hated jazz because it did not belong to the German race. They hated syncopation and atonal music and anything dissonant. »

« They researched the biographies of each artist, and were delighted, for instance, to find that Anton Bruckner was pure “ Aryan ” from the peasant side. They wanted no mixture and no French or English blood. The life history of a composer became very important to them. »

Banned and persecuted in their homelands, several composers (and writers and musicians, including Otto Klemperer, Bruno Walter and Fritz Busch) fled to America where they met with varying degrees of success.

Kurt Weill, hailed in Europe for his « Die Dreigroschenoper » (The 3 Penny Opera) , went on to earn considerable acclaim as a Broadway composer, while Erich Wolfgang Korngold's film-scores made him the toast of Hollywood. Refugee Arnold Schœnberg, reviled by the Nazis for his atonal compositions (and fired from his teaching post at Berlin's Prussian Academy of Arts) settled in Southern California, as did Hanns Eisler who later was deported for his communist sympathies. Emigre Ernst Křenek, now 90 and living in Palm Springs, remains an important figure in Europe, but has been largely neglected in Southern California.

« Much of the musical life of America is based on these emigrants. » , Dumling reflected. « What was a loss for Germany was a positive effect for America. »

« We worked so hard on this exhibition because it's important, especially with the re-unification of Germany taking place, not to forget the past so it will not happen again. And it is good for Americans to know that Germans are still looking back. »

During a recent phone conversation, Křenek said he 1st became aware of « antagonism » towards his music in 1927, when his most celebrated Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Strikes-up the Band !) was produced in Vienna.

« In “ Jonny ”, the Nazis objected that I brought in an American black-man as the main character. » , Křenek recalled. « They also objected to the music saying it was tainted jazz music, which it was not. At that time, I didn't know jazz very well, but we knew American entertainment music like George Gershwin and Cole Porter. Perhaps, there was some influence from that. »

« Reichsmusiktage »

The facts that Adolf Hitler's coming to power took place in 1933 near the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death (on February 13) and that the opening of the Düsseldorf exhibit « Entartete Musik » occurred only 2 days after the 125th birthday of the Master (on May 22, 1938) was, for Hans Severus Ziegler as for many Nazis, of deep, symbolic significance and a strong argument for the interpretation of Nazi politics as a long-expected cultural revolution. In a memorial speech given in Leipzig to open the Richard Wagner Year, in February 1938, Ziegler, alluding to the « Ring of the Nibelungen » , proclaimed :

« Through one of its best messengers, destiny once held before us, in an over-powering metaphor, the whole tragedy of the Siegfried-Being as an eternal warning. But, at the same time, and not in the least, through the creator of the work himself and his life's struggle, it has shown that the heroic principle (and that is the Aryan principle) will finally attain victory over all forces of darkness. »

With this, Ziegler placed Aryan heroism opposite Bolshevism and Judaism as the forces of darkness. The adjectives with which he characterized Jewishness corresponded mostly with those that Wagner had used for the worlds of Alberich, Beckmesser, and Kundry. In contrast, key-words for the luminous world of the Germanic peoples, as in « Parsifal » , were « rein » (pure) and « heil » (whole) . Both words have more than one meaning in German. « Rein » means not only « pure » but also « clean » . The notion of purification and cleansing (« Säuberung ») recurred again and again in Nazi propaganda. Thus, the book burnings of 1933 were supposed to cleanse the German spirit of the filthy literature of the 1920's. The double meaning of the German word « rein » (pure and clean) is worth noting. The Nazis exploited it by judging all intermixing as « dirtying » , as « impurity » . Their demand for racial purity became all the more plausible to the Germans since they had always understood « purity » as « cleanliness » .

In June 1936, the « Allgemeine Deutsche Musikverein » (General German Music Society) , founded in 1861 by Franz Liszt, celebrated its 75th anniversary in Weimar, with both Ziegler and his colleague, Doctor Ernst Nobbe, director of the « Deutsches Nationaltheater Weimar » (German National Theater) , as members of the honorary committee. When they saw the program, they both immediately protested, claiming that it contained mostly atonal music. This protest, whose sharpness also was motivated by private reasons, led Josef Gœbbels to dissolve the « Musikverein » . With the « Reich's » Music Days in Düsseldorf, he created a substitute for the earlier « Tonkünstlerfeste » (Music Festivals) of this society. Part of the 1st « Reich's » Music Days, in 1938, was the exhibit « Entartete Musik » , initiated by Hans Severus Ziegler as a follow-up to his activities in Weimar, in 1930 and 1936.

In his opening speech at the Düsseldorf exhibit, Ziegler also played on the double meaning of the word « Reinheit » (purity) . As he emphasized right at the beginning, he was concerned with « a clean atmosphere and free and fresh air, where, in the future, the creative as well as the interpretative musicians of Germany, breathing freely, can live and work » . When Ziegler later juxtaposed the « pure » idealism of German artists with Jewish materialism, the charge of Jewish uncleanness almost went without saying. The audience that cheered Ernst Křenek's Opera « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Strikes-up the Band !) was considered by him to be internally so confused and « unclean » that it could no longer understand the « purity » and emotional depth of the 1st measures of Carl Maria von Weber's Romantic Opera « Der Freischütz » . As a counter-example to German purity, Ziegler also mentioned Křenek's Opera « Leben des Orest » (The Life of Orestes) , which he characterized as « rotten through and through » .

From his own Saxon-Thuringian perspective, Ziegler had singled-out Ernst Křenek, who happened to be highly-celebrated in Leipzig, as the main opponent. Arnold Schœnberg, as the father of atonality, also played a significant role in Ziegler's speech as well as in the exhibit. Because Ziegler proceeded on the assumption that music had to be grounded in the natural law of the triad, he (like Richard Strauß) judged atonality as charlatanism. The extension of harmony led to a devaluation of tonality and with that to its « Entartung » (degeneration) . It is, of course, a much disputed point in musicology how far the emancipation of dissonance really was a necessary consequence of the historical development of musical material. There is, nonetheless, no foundation to Ziegler's charge that with the transition to atonality, Schœnberg wanted to disavow the tonal works of music history or shut them off from youth. Likewise, erroneous is Ziegler's conviction that Schœnberg's « Harmonielehre » (Theory of Harmony) was a theory of atonality :

« Because atonality has its basis in the “ Harmonielehre ” of the Jew Arnold Schœnberg, I declare it to be the product

of the Jewish spirit. Whoever eats of it, will die. Whoever learns in the school of Beethoven cannot possibly find his way across the threshold of Schönberg's work-place (" Werkstatt "). Whoever, though, has dwelled longer in the workshop of Schönberg, necessarily loses the feeling for purity of the German genius Beethoven. »

Ziegler apparently did not know how much Schönberg referred to the German tradition and to Beethoven, in particular, as a teacher. Thus, aside from the charge of atonality, the only criterion still remaining in Ziegler's charge referred to Schönberg's so-called racial group, which, indeed much too often, had to conceal the absence of any real stylistic criteria on Ziegler's part. Looking to the world of atonal music, he found still another instance of the Nazi world-view, which saw the Jew as an agent of pollution and degeneration.

Like the idea of « purity », the similarly ambiguous word « heil » also originated from « Parsifal ». It means « whole » and is, like the English word « whole », related to « holy » (« heilig »). As a noun, « Heil » signifies « health » and « salvation ». The « Heiland » (Redeemer) Jesus-Christ is the Saviour. Accordingly, in the German words « Heil/heil » meanings of holism, health, and salvation merge. This web of meaning and linguistic conjuring is what Ziegler had in mind when he called music « one of the holiest areas of our entire inner-being ». Thus, he implicitly named the idea of salvation that (similar to the cry « Heil Hitler ! ») could be traced back to Richard Wagner. What was expected from music was nothing less than the healing of the German soul.

Standing opposite these ideas of purity of blood and healthiness was the charge of « Entartung », which fixed the concept of « degeneracy » to a new norm, namely, the ideal of a music dictated by laws of racial origin. It goes without saying that under these conditions Schönberg's music could only be interpreted as « entartet ». Despite his 1933 lecture, « Brahms, the Progressive », where he deliberately opposed the nationalistic Wagner euphoria, Schönberg seems to have under-estimated the danger emerging from the ideology of the Wagnerians. Because Schönberg was not certain whether Wagner was a pure Aryan (there were rumours about Jewish elements in his family background), he thought, unlike his followers, Wagner had been relatively tolerant to Jews insofar as he allowed them the possibility of becoming « real Germans ». For Hans Severus Ziegler, this possibility of German-Jewish assimilation did not exist. For him, preserving purity of blood was a holy duty. Thus, it was no coincidence that Ziegler moved from Weimar to Bayreuth after World War II, where he saw a good deal of Hitler's patron, Winifred Wagner. Very symbolically, Ziegler chose his last place of residence in Bayreuth, on « Parsifalstraße » (Parsifal Street).

When Ziegler opened the exhibition « Entartete Musik » on May 24, 1938, in Düsseldorf's « Kunstpalast » (Palace of Art), he cited Wagner's essay « Das Judentum in der Musik » (Jewry in Music) in support of the undertaking. Making reference to the earlier exhibition in Munich « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art), held in 1937, Ziegler stressed that this new exhibition « should now bring about a clear decision for music as well : what was and is diseased, unhealthy, and highly-dangerous in our music and that, for this reason, must be eliminated ». Nearly everyone of note in modern music was anathema, among them Paul Hindemith, Alban Berg, Ernst Toch, Hanns Eisler, Ernst Křenek, Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, Kurt Weill, and Igor Stravinsky. Since criteria of « race » were of prime importance, the stylistic spectrum of banned music was very broad, ranging from Léon Jessel's popular Operetta melodies and film hits by Friedrich Holländer to complex 12 note compositions. All sectors of German musical life were affected by the accusation of being « degenerate » : orchestral music and Opera, Operetta and cabaret, film and working-class culture,

publishers and music-critics, concert promotion, musical education, and musicology.

The « Entartete Musik » exhibition was not universally acclaimed. In protest against the exhibition, Peter Raabe announced on May 15 his resignation as president of the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Music) . His resignation, however, was not accepted by Goebbels nor was it ever published. Following this protest, no prominent musicians (with the exception of Paul Græner, Elly Ney, and Ludwig Hœlscher) came to the opening. Since Goebbels recognized that this was a more controversial issue than the Munich art-show, he decided to have this event publicized on a low-key. By June 14, the exhibit was closed prematurely. Subsequently, it traveled to Munich and Vienna as well as to the residence of its creators in Weimar. There, even Richard Strauß, who otherwise always tried to be on good terms with Hitler and Goebbels, dared to utter a few critical words. But because of the official character of the exhibition, open criticism was not allowed.

Geraldine de Courcy, in her report for « Musical America » under the head-line « Düsseldorf Exhibits “ Degenerate Music ”. “ Reichs Week ” Festival Displays Atonalists’ Works and Books of “ Cultural Bolshevism ” » , gave a list of the main-exhibits without even mentioning the racist tendency. The head-line in the « London Times » was much clearer : « “ Degenerate ” Music. Anti-Jewish Exhibition in Germany. » The article itself, however, seems to express some sort of sympathy with the organizers :

« The success which has attended the exhibition of “ degenerate art ” , in Munich and Berlin, has now led the German cultural authorities to assemble an exhibition of “ degenerate music ” , which was formally opened yesterday in Düsseldorf. The object of the exhibition is to illustrate the sorry plight of German music during the period of “ Jewish influence ” , from 1920 to 1933, and to show how this process of disintegration is now being checked. The organizers of the exhibition have made it possible for visitors to obtain both ocular and aural proof of the degeneration of German music during the post-War period. »

Whereas this article echoed British appeasement policy that preceded the Treaty of Munich, Arno Huth in his review of the Zürich premiere of Paul Hindemith's Opera « Mathis der Maler » was more open. After praising the new work as « the artistic credo of a great musician » , he wrote :

« The composition, which is national Opera in the very best sense, and gives powerful expression to a part of German history, German art and German mores, was lifted-out of the baptismal font in the very hour when Hindemith's scores were being pilloried in the Düsseldorf exhibition of “ Degenerate Music ” as un-German ! »

The inclusion of Hindemith in the exhibition, like that of Hermann Reutter, Hermann Erpf, and Igor Stravinsky, had led to critical reactions. For Hindemith, like Strauß, who, up to this date, had not dared to distance himself from Nazi politics, this exhibition made it perfectly clear that his place was no longer in Germany. In March 1939, he ended a letter from Los Angeles after expressing critical thoughts about the U.S. music industry (« This is a nightmare ! ») with these lines :

« The attitude toward artists in Germany is in line with all other actions of the “ Reich ” , which seem to be dictated

only by megalomania, sadism, and shortage of raw material. I see myself as the mouse that frivolously danced before the door of the trap and that even went inside ; just by chance, (the mouse) was outside when the door closed ! »

In his « 10 Principles of German Music Creativity » (1938) , Josef Gœbbels proclaimed :

« Like every other art, music also arises from mysterious and profound powers, which are rooted in the national character. It can, therefore, only be produced and managed by the « children of the national character » according to the needs and the intractable musical urge of the nation. »

Gœbbels added :

« Jewry and German music, those are opposites, which by their nature stand in harshest contradiction to each other. »

The so-called primary emotional element of music was, thus, expanded to include the instinctive, the « intractable musical urge » , the natural, and the racial. Since the Nazis understood art as the expression of the « racial soul » and simultaneously declared the preservation of racial purity as their goal, they excluded Jews from the production and management of German, that is, Aryan music. Neither as interpreter or composer, nor as publisher, teacher, concert manager, or culture policy-maker were any opportunities left for Jews after 1933.

The regime aimed at keeping the musical representatives of the (Leo) Kestenberg period out of the limelight, and the Jews out of everything. This aim was so thoroughly achieved that in 1940 Herbert Cerigk could write with complete assurance in the preface to his « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » (Lexicon of Jews in Music) that « the purge of our cultural life, and hence also of our musical one, of all Jewish elements has been achieved » . From 1940 onward, the « purge » was even extended to the occupied lands of Europe, and such composers, conductors, and musicians as had not been able to flee ended their careers in Theresienstadt and Auschwitz.

Never before in any historical period had participants in the musical professions been so systematically and in such numbers silenced and exiled from a blossoming musical culture. These journeys into exile, mainly in 1933 and 1938, took them to all parts of the world, to Honduras or to Argentina ; to South Africa or to Hong Kong ; to the Soviet Union or to Australia ; to Turkey or the Philippines. Most of them, though, went to the United States, where some of them, such as Bruno Walter, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Franz Waxman, Alfred Einstein, Kurt Weill, and Paul Hindemith were able to get on brilliantly, whereas others, such as Arnold Schœnberg, Ernst Toch, Ernst Křenek, Paul Dessau, and Alexander von Zemlinsky were left to decline. Some were able to carry-on with their careers without any remarkable break, whereas others who had promisingly begun were left stranded.

Even as late as 1944, Karl Blessinger published an enlarged and revised edition of his « Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Mahler : 3 Chapters on Jewry in Music as the Key to the Music History of the 19th Century » (1938) with the ideologically motivated title « Jewry and Music : A Report on Cultural and Racial Politics » . In the last chapter, the author now stressed that :

« The fight for or against “ Entartung ” in music is a very eminent political matter, indeed, part of the enormous world struggle within which we now stand. For that reason, the struggle for the final recovery of German music also reaches much further beyond the artistic-cultural arena. »

Until the bitter end, Nazi propaganda maintained that the War was instigated by the Jews and, therefore, had to be undertaken to defend German culture.

Inter-mixing of races was impermissible for the Nazis because this would (so, they believed) endanger the « purity » , « wholeness » , and « essence » of the German species. Since music was regarded as the expression of the soul, as the essence of the German being, racial laws were administered even more strictly in this domain than otherwise required. As of 1936, « one-quarter Jews » and their spouses were no longer permitted to remain members of the « Reichskulturkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Culture) . As of 1938, attendance at German cultural events was denied to Jews. Non-Aryan and Aryan Germans were strictly separated from one another. In order to undo cultural assimilation, the Nazis, already in 1933, had stimulated the founding of a « Jüdischer Kulturbund » (League for Jewish Culture) . There, often exceptionally high-quality performances of works by, for example, Felix Mendelssohn, Jacques Offenbach, Gustav Mahler, and Kurt Weill, were given before exclusively Jewish audiences. This practice continued in an even more intensive form in the ghetto of Theresienstadt (Terezin) , that fortress near Prague where thousands of Jewish intellectuals and artists were interned from 1942 onward. In spite of the wretched living conditions, the inmates created new works and regularly organized concerts and Opera performances there. This astounding artistic productivity helped the prisoners to maintain their consciousness of the fact that they were still human beings in spite of all the humiliations and misery. It is only in recent years that these treasures have begun to be rescued from obscurity and made accessible. There is still much work to be done on the fatal consequences of Nazi cultural policies for music in exile.

Arnold Schoenberg had claimed in his 1931 essay, « National Music » , that only German and Austrian composers had influenced him. Although he wanted to be seen solely as a German composer before 1933 and solely as a Jewish composer after 1933, it would be difficult to trace his musical genius back to « racial » purity. Vienna was such a fertile and stimulating music city precisely because in the Austro-Hungarian multi-national State so many different influences met. In this sense and in deliberate opposition to the racial principles of the Nazis, Béla Bartók published in 1942, in the magazine « Modern Music » , his essay, « Race Purity in Music » . As a result of his research on folk-music, he compared the diversity of Balkan folklore with the limited musical variety in such parts of the Arabic world, where racial mixing was supposed to be less frequent.

Bartók came to the following conclusion, which certainly is not just valid for the Balkan peninsula alone :

« Contact with foreign material not only results in an exchange of melodies, but (and this is even more important) it gives an impulse to the development of new styles. The situation of folk-music in Eastern Europe may be summed-up thus : as a result of uninterrupted reciprocal influence upon the folk-music of these peoples, there are an immense variety and a wealth of melodies and melodic types. The “ racial impurity ” finally attained is definitely beneficial. »

Since the richness of the German musical culture had certainly also always owed a great deal to foreign influences, Johann Joachim Quantz, the flute teacher of the Prussian King Frederick II, explained the German taste as the « mixed taste ». This, and the very great variety in the later development of German music, stood in sharp contrast to the limited view of the Nazis and their goal of racial purity.

...

In what was generally a laudatory review of « Die Gezeichneten » (Opera in 3 Acts by Franz Schreker) , published in a special issue of « Anbruch » dedicated to Schreker and his music, in 1922, the music-critic Joachim Beck opens with a puzzling remark :

« In looking at a phenomenon like Franz Schreker, it seems to me necessary to keep in mind that there are 2 kinds of creative genius : the genius which starts something ; and that which is in decline. However, the exhaustion of this 2nd type can have something intoxicating to it as well. »

The notion that Schreker is a « genius in/of decline » (« deszendentes Genie ») may strike us as a strange compliment to begin with, but it is made even stranger by the fate that would befall « Die Gezeichneten » 16 years later.

The Nazi government put on the « Reichsmusiktage » in Düsseldorf, on May 22, 1938, Richard Wagner's 125th birthday. The event was organized at the behest of Josef Gœbbels, who sought, as his speech on the occasion put it, to elaborate « the principles of German musical creativity ». 2 days after the Festival kicked-off (with Richard Strauß conducting his « Festliches Präludium » in a new arrangement for orchestra) , the musicologist and director of the Weimar « Nationaltheater » , Hans Severus Ziegler, presented an exhibition entitled « Entartete Musik » , in deliberate reference to the exhibition « Entartete Kunst » , which had toured Germany the year prior to great success. The exhibition was intended to hold-up for ridicule and rejection much of the music of the early-20th Century, music that was either atonal, influenced by non-European traditions, or written or promoted by Jews.

Ziegler wrote in an essay accompanying the show :

« We, descendants of Richard Wagner, should possess the acuity to unmask the charlatans of the most recent past, who lorded over our Opera and concert life for decades. »

Schreker, who had passed away 4 years prior, was one of the most prominent of those supposed « charlatans » . The exhibition catalogue described him as :

« The Magnus Hirschfeld of the Opera world. There was no sexual-pathological aberration that he didn't set to music. »

Both the « Reichsmusiktage » in general and Ziegler's exhibition fell short of the organizers' expectations, perhaps not

surprisingly. After all, « Entartete Kunst » had physically presented modernist visual art of the kind the Nazis deemed « degenerate » and had brought the German public directly face-to-face with the art the organizers wanted them to reject. The « Reichsmusiktage », by contrast, did not present any actual « degenerate » music, and, indeed, could not readily do so. Commandeering a few paintings by Max Pechstein and Otto Dix, slapping them into a lazy display, and counting on the average Fritz's knee-jerk aversion to all things abstract or formalist was one thing. Getting Orchestras to study, rehearse, and perform the music by Franz Schreker, Arnold Schœnberg, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith, or Ernst Křenek, and risking people applauding at the end of the performance was quite another. Ziegler's exhibition, almost by necessity, relied on paraphernalia-posters, photos of composers, and the like. Ziegler's essay on « Entartete Kunst », printed as a kind of exhibition guide, features 17 images : The vast majority are unflattering photographs or cruel caricatures of (preferably Jewish) composers, conductors, and critics, a few others show stage-design or actual performances. There is only 1 picture of a score, from Weill's autograph of the « Dreigroschenoper » - with a note that we are meant to judge his hand-writing, rather than the music. In his May 28 speech at the « Reichsmusiktage », Josef Gœbbels conjured-up « a past we have at last overcome », of which « we can barely imagine any more that it was once reality ». And, of course, it was not going to be the job of the assembled musicians and Nazi-aligned composers and musicologists to bring-back into reality this spectral past. The composers (to say nothing of the performers and conductors) the exhibition insulted were silenced more thoroughly than Pechstein and Dix.

But there was another problem that made « Entartete Musik » a perplexing concept and undertaking. Gœbbels's remarks present a racialized æsthetic, unwittingly highlighting the fact that there were no purely æsthetic properties in « degenerate » music the Nazis objected to, analogous to, say, their allergy to all things abstract or subjectivist in the visual arts. In his speech, Gœbbels charged « Jewish elements » with « trivializing » the « German folk-song » ; he charges « Jewish cliques of publishers and conductors » with « falsifying the German Masters », rails against « kitsch and jazz », and praises a « new » German music that has supposedly replaced « the constructions of a barren, atonal expressionism » with true « artistic intuition ». As the phrase « barren, atonal expressionism » shows, it is unclear throughout Gœbbels's speech what kind of music he has in mind here (only the kind of person who made or championed it) : « expressionism » was, even then, a label only rarely applied to music, and the music it might plausibly be attached to was anything but « atonal », to say nothing of « barren ». Conversely, the atonal musicians attacked in the « Entartete Musik » exhibition were often concerned with the exact opposite of subjective expression.

Ziegler's own screeds, as close as « Entartete Musik » comes to theoretical under-pinnings, are similarly opaque. Kurt Weill, Arnold Schœnberg, Franz Schreker, the Operetta composer Oskar Strauß, Darius Milhaud, Otto Klemperer, and jazz-musicians are all and sundry attacked as « cultural Bolsheviks ». What features of their music mark them as such, Ziegler won't say. He mentions « foreign » tonalities and rhythms, but his essay cites not one musical example. Again and again, he appeals to « our German feeling », « our healthy understanding of art ». This contrasts with the case of the « Degenerate Art » exhibition, which clearly set itself the task of distinguishing a « good » (i.e. , Aryan) modernism and a « bad » modernism.

Another problem confronted by Ziegler and Gœbbels in putting-on their show is perhaps less immediately obvious, but becomes clear in view of Joachim Beck's review of Schreker, and the many like it in the 1910's and 1920's. Beck was not a Nazi, and his review was overall extremely positive. And yet, his invocations of « decline » and « exhaustion »

uncomfortably anticipate the terms of Josef Gœbbels's exorcisms of « degenerate music » : the attributes that Beck admiringly attaches to Schreker's work are generally those that would lead the Nazis to suppress the Opera as « degenerate » music.

By dint of a peculiarity of music history, music castigated as « degenerate » found itself in a very different position than, say, the paintings expurgated from museum collections, or the books burned at Berlin's « Opernplatz » after 1933. There was a long tradition of querying Opera for possible « degeneracy » by the time the Nazis got around to it, so long in fact, that the medium itself had begun to grapple quite self-consciously with the label. What counted as « degeneracy », and what ought to be done about it, was no clearer than in the tirades of Gœbbels and Ziegler, but the term hovered as a threat over the Operas produced in the 40 years after Richard Wagner's death. They were, as the critic Leopold Schmidt said about « Die Gezeichneten », not just « works », but « questions » requiring positioning. This stems at least partially from the fact that much of the music the Nazis labeled as « degenerate » was modernist in only a highly-ambivalent sense, and often enough hewed quite self-consciously to neo-Romantic, 19th Century idioms - this was still very much the music of decadence.

By comparison, the kind of visual art that understood itself as somehow decadent or degenerate was several decades old by the time the Nazis staged their « degenerate art » exhibition in Munich, in 1937.

This peculiarity has also affected the reception history of the Operas silenced by Gœbbels, Ziegler, and their ilk. Not every work the Ziegler branded as « degenerate » had self-consciously grappled with the label. But those that refused to do so, the ones we label today as « avant-garde » (the music of Alban Berg, Arnold Schœnberg, and Paul Hindemith, for instance) entered or re-entered the musical canon with much greater ease after the War (in both Germany and the United States) , while works like « Die Gezeichneten », works understood as « genius in/of decline », had a much harder time doing so, and, in some cases, still remain in the wilderness into which Ziegler and his cohorts cast them. « Die Gezeichneten », for one, had its American premiere in 2010. While it may do (in the case of the visual arts) to simply reject the suggestion of « degeneracy » out of hand, this is not possible when it comes to Opera, whose works had obsessed over their relationship to decline, degeneracy, and decadence for nearly 40 years by the time the Nazi arbiters of musical « health » actually set about to decide which works were to be deemed degenerate, and which weren't.

But if the terms « degeneracy » and « degeneration » were everywhere in discourses about Opera after Wagner, there wasn't a clear narrative one could attach to them. Just who was degenerate, and what « genus » they were degenerating from, was subject to changes and slippages depending on the cultural politics of the day and the political orientation of the writer employing the concept. When the term « Entartung » had 1st attained currency in the wake of Max Nordau's book of the same title, it had attached itself above all to the work of Richard Wagner - that is, someone the Nazis were not very likely to attach it to. The fact that Ziegler and Gœbbels opened their « Reichsmusiktage » on the Master's birthday points to the fact that the « degeneration » they had in mind required a return to Wagner. In the decades since the composer's death, the general discourse around Opera had frequently suggested (even if not in the biologicistic terms of Nordau, Ziegler, and Gœbbels) that Opera had undergone something of a degeneration since Wagner, rather than with Wagner.

As Richard Batka put it in 1899 :

« What if Wagner's work of art was the peak of this development, and perfect in itself, such that every attempt at making him more perfect would be useless, and that every attempt to change it would necessarily lead to a degradation (" Verschlechterung ") of this wondrous artistic organism ? »

The anxiety-provoking possibility that they constituted a « degradation » was inscribed into post-Wagnerian music-dramas in ways entirely different from other musical genres or other arts.

...

Die Reichsmusiktage fanden vom 22. bis 29. Mai 1938 in Düsseldorf statt. Sie waren eine Veranstaltung der NS-Propaganda und standen unter der Schirmherrschaft von Josef Goebbels. Goebbels hatte ursprünglich eine jährliche Wiederkehr der Reichsmusiktage geplant. Diese wurden zwar im Mai 1939 erneut durchgeführt, entfielen aber nach dem Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs.

In der Ideologie der Nationalsozialisten wurde zwischen deutscher und nationaler Kunst auf der einen Seite und « kulturbolschewistischer » und « entarteter Kunst » auf der anderen Seite unterschieden. Inhaltliche und stilistische Argumente wurden dabei mehr und mehr durch rassistische Aussagen ersetzt. Die Nationalsozialisten versuchten die Gleichschaltung der Kunst durch Sonderveranstaltungen und Festspiele zu fördern und der Bevölkerung als das « Deutsche » nahezubringen. Hierzu gehörten auch die Reichsmusiktage, die am 22. Mai 1938, dem 125. Geburtstag von Richard Wagner, in Düsseldorf eröffnet wurden. Sie standen unter der Schirmherrschaft von Josef Goebbels, der sie als Veranstaltung für « musikpolitische Grundsatzklärungen und Weichenstellungen » bezeichnete. Die Veranstaltung dauerte vom 22.-29. Mai und wurde von Heinz Drewes, dem Leiter der Musikabteilung im Propagandaministerium, organisiert.

Im Rahmen der Reichsmusiktage wurde am 24. Mai 1938 eine Ausstellung im Kunstpalast am Ehrenhof in Düsseldorf eröffnet, die unter dem Namen « Entartete Musik », an die im Jahre 1937 zuvor in München stattfindende Ausstellung « Entartete Kunst » anknüpfte. Als Hauptverantwortlicher der Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » galt Hans Severus Ziegler, einer der frühesten Anhänger von Adolf Hitler und seit 1935 Generalintendant des Weimarer Nationaltheaters.

In dieser Ausstellung wurde öffentlich die Musik angeprangert, die nicht in die Weltanschauung der Nationalsozialisten hineinpasste, besonders die Werke von jüdischen Künstlern. Wie schon zuvor in München, wurden auch auf dieser Ausstellung in Düsseldorf abschreckende Beispiele von « entarteter Musik » vorgeführt. In über 50 Vitrinen sah man neben Büchern, Partituren und Bühnenbildern auch Fotos und verunglimpfende Karikaturen. Außerdem konnten per Knopfdruck Ausschnitte aus Schallplatten-Einspielungen der angeprangerten Werke angehört werden.

In der Ausstellung wurden neben Musikern auch Musikwissenschaftler, Musikdirektoren, Musikkritiker, Musikpädagogen sowie Dirigenten angeprangert und deren Werke und Schriften als « entartet » bezeichnet. Sowohl « nicht-arische »

Persönlichkeiten wie Alban Berg, Arnold Schönberg oder Kurt Weill als auch « arische » Musiker wie Paul Hindemith, der mit einer Jüdin verheiratet war, sowie Igor Strawinsky aus Russland waren verfeimt.

Die Ausstellung war in Düsseldorf bis zum 14. Juni 1938 zu sehen und wurde danach noch in Weimar, München und Wien gezeigt. Es gab dazu keinen begleitenden Katalog, sondern nur die als Broschüre gedruckte Eröffnungsrede von Hans Severus Ziegler im Düsseldorfer Kunstpalast. Auf der Titelseite dieser Broschüre war ein schwarzer Jazz-Saxophonist als Karikatur zu sehen. Provozierend daran war zum einen das bewusst überzeichnete Gesicht, im Kontrast zur Kleidung, Frack und Zylinder des Musikers, zum anderen aber auch der große Davidstern, der anstelle einer Nelke im Knopfloch prangte. Die Nationalsozialisten wählten diese fiktive Figur als Symbol der Ausstellung und auch der gesamten Reichsmusiktage 1938 als Inbegriff der Entartung. Die Karikatur erinnert an den schwarzen Musiker Jonny, die Titelfigur aus Ernst Křeneks Oper Jonny spielt auf, gegen die NSDAP-Mitglieder schon vor 1933 protestiert hatten.

Zum Höhepunkt der Reichsmusiktage zählte neben dieser Ausstellung auch eine « kulturpolitische Kundgebung » . Neben einer Ansprache von Reichspropagandaminister Goebbels und einer Rede von Gauleiter Friedrich Karl Florian dirigierte Richard Strauß selbst sein « Festliches Präludium Opus 61 » , ein Werk für Orchester und Orgel aus dem Jahr 1913, das er extra für diese Gelegenheit neu besetzte. Weiterhin wurden in ganz Düsseldorf auf verschiedenen Plätzen so genannte Platzkonzerte gegeben, musikwissenschaftliche Symposien sowie Fachtagungen von Komponisten und Musikpädagogen veranstaltet, wobei die Verkörperung und Darstellung des « Deutschen » in der Musikkultur diskutiert wurde. Es wurden außerdem insgesamt drei Opern uraufgeführt.

Eigentlich hatte Goebbels die Reichsmusiktage als feststehende, jährlich stattfindende Einrichtung vorgesehen, doch wurden sie nach einer Wiederholung im Mai 1939 wegen des Zweiten Weltkriegs nicht mehr durchgeführt.

Weder in Deutschland noch in der ausländischen Presse wurden die Reichsmusiktage 1938 als bedeutendes Ereignis wahrgenommen. Im Gegensatz zur vorausgegangenen Kunstausstellung im Jahr 1937 in München waren sowohl die Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » als auch die Reichsmusiktage als Ganzes für viele Mitläufer des nationalsozialistischen Kulturbetriebs ein Misserfolg. Da zumeist Künstler verurteilt wurden, die schon ins Ausland emigriert waren, konnte die gesamte Veranstaltung nicht direkt zu Beschlagnahmungen oder Verboten führen. Ebenso war die propagandistische Auswertung der Ausstellung damals begrenzt, die Reaktionen aus dem In- und Ausland waren eher bescheiden und zurückhaltend. Während manche Zeitungen immerhin ihre Verwunderung darüber aussprachen, warum so bekannte Komponisten wie Hindemith und Strawinsky als « entartet » eingestuft wurden, blieben die Reaktionen aus dem Ausland merkwürdig zurückhaltend. Die in den USA erscheinende Zeitschrift « Musical America » beschränkte sich lediglich auf eine Auflistung der als « entartet » eingestuften Werke und Komponisten. Die Londoner Times schien ganz im Zeichen der damaligen Appeasement-Politik sogar ein wenig Verständnis für diese Aktion aufzubringen. Der regimetreue Dirigent Peter Raabe, damaliger Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer, blieb den Eröffnungsfeierlichkeiten der Reichsmusiktage 1938 demonstrativ fern. Allerdings wurden solche negativen Reaktionen durch die nationalsozialistische Zensur von Presse und Rundfunk der Öffentlichkeit verschwiegen.

Paul Sixt, Kapellmeister, Dirigent, Komponist : geboren 22. Februar 1908 in Stuttgart ; gestorben 8. Januar 1964 in Detmold. Er war beteiligt an der Konzeption der NS-Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » .

Sixt studierte in Stuttgart und wurde danach Theaterkapellmeister in Weimar. Bereits seit 1930 gehörte er der NSDAP an. Seit 1935 war er Staatskapellmeister und seit 1936 Generalmusikdirektor in Weimar. Ab 1938 war er Leiter der Reichsmusikkammer im « Gau Thüringen » . Zusammen mit Staatsrat Hans Severus Ziegler konzipierte er die Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » , die am 25. Mai 1938 in Düsseldorf eröffnet wurde und in der und andere Igor Strawinski, die Zwölftonmusik und den Jazz als « entartet » denunziert wurden. Später wurde die Ausstellung noch in Weimar, München und Wien gezeigt. 1939 wurde Sixt Rektor der Musikhochschule Weimar.

Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg leitete Sixt zunächst ein Kammerorchester in Stuttgart und wurde 1950 Generalmusikdirektor in Detmold, wo er bis zu seinem Tode (seiner Vergangenheit ungeachtet) die Musiksparte des Lippischen Landestheaters leitete.

...

Nach dem Studium an der Hochschule für Musik in seiner Heimatstadt Stuttgart wirkte Paul Sixt von 1927 bis 1945 in Weimar, zunächst als Solorepetitor, ab 1935 als Staatskapellmeister und seit 1936 als Generalmusikdirektor am Deutschen Nationaltheater. Von 1939 bis 1945 leitete er zudem die Hochschule für Musik. Nach dem Krieg ging er in den Westen, wo er von 1947 bis 1951 Leiter der Volksoper in Stuttgart war, danach bis zu seinem Tod Generalmusikdirektor in Detmold.

Als Komponist schrieb er das 1930 in Altenburg uraufgeführte Märchenspiel « Schlumm » , das Werk « Etüden » , ein Streichquartett sowie Klavierstücke und Lieder.

Über die Leistung von Sixt als Dirigent hieß es 1964 im Nachruf des Deutschen Bühnen-Jahrbuches :

« Für das Dirigentenpult des Detmolder Landestheaters gab es keinen besseren geeigneten Mann als ihn. Die Wertschätzung von Sixt war systemübergreifend - 1941 hatte Josef Gæbbels in sein Tagebuch notiert :

“ Sixt reißt seine Staatskapelle zu einer begeisterten Wiedergabe der Lisztschen ' Preludes ' hin. ” »

Für Gæbbels Wohlwollen hätte Sixt nichts gekonnt, ein Künstler kann Menschen unabhängig von System und Weltanschauungen, unabhängig von ihren Taten und Untaten begeistern. Aber Sixt war nicht nur seit 1930 Mitglied der NSDAP, sondern auch Mitträger des Regimes und seiner Ideologie :

Ab 1938 leitete er die Reichsmusikkammer Gau Thüringen, ebenfalls 1938 hat er sich als Mitverantwortlicher der Ausstellung « Entartete Musik » in Düsseldorf hervorgetan, die im NS-Geist den Jazz, die Zwölftonmusik und auch einzelne Komponisten wie Igor Strawinsky verunglimpfte. Zudem widmete Sixt seine Komposition « Hymnisches Vorspiel » dem später in Nürnberg als Hauptkriegsverbrecher verurteilten Thüringer Gauleiter Fritz Sauckel. Obwohl die ganz

großen Untaten erst durch die kleinen aktiven Rädchen ermöglicht werden, gehörte Paul Sixt zu den vielen, die in Ehren unbehelligt blieben.

Literatur

Hugo Riemann. Musiklexikon, 12. Auflage, herausgegeben von Wilibald Gurlitt, Personenteil L - Z, Mainz (1961) ; Seite 689 f.

Ernst Klee. Kulturlexikon zum Dritten Reich, Frankfurt-am-Main (2007) ; Seite 515.

Wissenschaftsbüro Notz « Paul Sixt » .

Landestheater Detmold

Das Landestheater Detmold ist ein Dreispartentheater mit fünf Spielstätten in Detmold. Mit seinen Gastspielen in mehr als hundert Orten in Deutschland und dem benachbarten Ausland gilt das Theater als die größte Reisebühne Europas.

1820 entschloß sich Fürst Leopold II. , unterstützt von seiner Mutter Fürstin Pauline, in Detmold ein Hoftheater errichten zu lassen, und beauftragte damit den Landesbaumeister von Natorp. Die Grundsteinlegung erfolgte am 18. April 1825.

Nach nur siebenmonatiger Bauzeit hob sich am 8. November 1825 erstmals der Vorhang des Hochfürstlich Lippischen Hoftheaters zur Oper Titus, der Gütige von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. Zum Direktor des neuen Theaters wurde August Pichler ernannt. Die angesehene Pichlersche Truppe war schon im alten Detmolder Komödienhaus zu Gast gewesen. Auf dem Spielplan standen sowohl Musiktheater als auch Schauspiel. Am Theater wirkten so berühmte Künstler wie Christian Dietrich Grabbe als Autor und gefürchteter Kritiker sowie Albert Lortzing als Sänger, Schauspieler und Kapellmeister.

Am 5. Februar 1912 brannte das Theater während der Aufführung des Stückes Der Bettler von Syrakus von Hermann Sudermann wegen eines schadhafte Schornsteins bis auf die Grundmauern nieder. Es wurde aber schon während des Ersten Weltkrieges 1914-1915 nach Plänen des Berliner Architekten Bodo Ebhardt neu errichtet. Die Finanzierung des Neubaus erfolgte mit Spenden der Detmolder Bürger und Geldern des Fürstenhauses. Die laufende Spielzeit konnte im Detmolder Sommertheater provisorisch zu Ende gebracht werden. Vor der Wiedereröffnung ging das Gebäude des Theaters in die Hände des Freistaates Lippe über und wurde am 28. September 1919 mit Lortzings Oper Undine wieder eröffnet.

Wie alle deutschen Bühnen mußte das Theater im Verlauf des Zweiten Weltkriegs, am 1. September 1944, seine Pforten schließen. Nach Kriegsende richtete die englische Besatzungsmacht hier ihr Offizierskasino ein. Der Spielbetrieb wurde daher ins Detmolder Sommertheater verlegt. Am 5. Juli 1952 erfolgte die Freigabe und der Spielbetrieb normalisierte sich wieder. Generalmusikdirektor wurde Paul Sixt, der 1938 mitverantwortlich für die Ausstellung Entartete Musik in Düsseldorf gewesen war.

Die 1843 gegründete Fürstlich-Lippische-Hofkapelle gilt als Vorläufer des Orchesters des Landestheaters. Das Schloß in Detmold war der Sitz des seinerzeit kleinsten deutschen Fürstentums Lippe. Die Regenten gründeten und förderten das Musiktheater derart, daß so namhafte Komponisten wie Albert Lortzing und Johannes Brahms ihren Wohnsitz in Detmold nahmen.

Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg übernahm das Musikensemble die Aufgaben eines Theaterorchesters im Landestheater Detmold mit den Schwerpunkten Oper, Operette, Musical und Ballett. Zum Programm des Musiktheaters gehören so anspruchsvolle Inszenierungen wie Georg Friedrich Händels Alcina oder Purcells King Arthur. Daneben kommen Opern von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Giacomo Puccini, Giuseppe Verdi und Richard Wagner zur Aufführung, sowie zeitgenössische Opern von Giselher Klebe, Hans Werner Henze und Udo Zimmermann. Die leichte Muse ist mit Operetten von Franz Lehár, Johann Strauß und Karl Millöcker und zunehmend mit Musicals vertreten.

Hans Severus Ziegler

The German publicist, intendant, teacher and Nazi Party official Hans Severus Ziegler was born on 13 October 1893 in Eisenach and died on 1 May 1978 in Bayreuth. A leading cultural director under the Nazis, he was closely associated with the censorship and cultural coordination of the 3rd « Reich » .

Ziegler was the son of a banker and, through his mother, the grandson of Gustav Schirmer. His grandmother, the American-born Mary Francis Schirmer, was a close friend of Cosima Wagner and from an early age Ziegler was attracted to the militant nationalism in which the Wagner family were steeped. Ziegler studied German literature at University, completing his education to doctoral standard. He became a journalist, writing mostly for extreme Right organs such as the « Deutsche Wochen-Zeitung » .

On 31 March 1925, Ziegler became a member of the Nazi Party, with his membership number being the comparatively low 1317. From 1925 to 1931, he worked under Wilhelm Frick in Thuringia, serving as deputy « Gauleiter » , from 1930 to 1931. In 1928, he was appointed head of the Militant League for German Culture. It was also Ziegler who, in 1926, came-up with the name « Hitler-Jugend » (Hitler Youth) for the Nazi youth movement. Ziegler was a close friend of the Schirach family and, in 1925, he introduced Baldur von Schirach, who would go on to lead the « Hitler Youth » , to Adolf Hitler.

Ziegler was associated with the hard-line racist wing of the Nazi Party, which looked to Alfred Rosenberg as its champion. In keeping with this Wing, he was particularly staunch in his anti-Semitism.

In 1933, Ziegler was appointed to the Council of State and as a member of the State Government of Thuringia. In addition, he served as President of the « Deutsche Schillerstiftung » and « Reich » culture Senator. In 1936, he was appointed the General Manager of the « Deutsches Nationaltheater » and « Staatskapelle Weimar » and State Commissioner for the State Theatre in Thuringia. In 1935, he was placed on leave whilst he was investigated for alleged breaches of Paragraph 175, the anti-homosexual legislation, although the case was dropped.

Ziegler played a leading role in promoting the Nazi vision of culture, particularly with regards to « degenerate » music. He was a strong critic of atonality, dismissing it as decadent « cultural Bolshevism » . He curated the « Entartete Musik » exhibition in Düsseldorf, with Karol Rathaus and Wilhelm Grosz amongst those receiving the strongest condemnation in the pamphlet he wrote to accompany the exhibition. Whilst working under Frick, in Thuringia, Ziegler had also overseen the removal of modern art pieces from museums and public buildings, and helped to bring about a crack-down on the « glorification of Negroidism » by restricting the performance of jazz music. Promulgated in his 1930 edict, « Against Negro Culture » , the Thuringian foreshadowed the co-ordination of culture that was to happen under the Nazi government. « Entartete Musik » would continue Ziegler's crusade against jazz, whilst also condemning Ernst Křenek's Opera, « Jonny spielt auf ! » as the archetype of Weimar decadence and miscegenation.

In the Soviet occupation zone, several of Ziegler's writings, as well as a book about him, were placed on the « Liste der auszusondernden Literatur » (List of banned Literature) .

After the War, he worked as a representative for « Gaststättenporzellan » and, subsequently, as a private tutor in Essen. He also directed a private theatre, from 1952 to 1954. Politically, he was active in the « Deutsches Kulturwerk Europäischen Geistes » , an extreme-Right study group established in 1950. In this role, he became a regular guest of Winifred Wagner, who regularly hosted such other far-Right luminaries as Adolf von Thadden, Edda Göring and Oswald Mosley.

...

Hans Severus Ziegler (geboren 13. Oktober 1893 in Eisenach ; gestorben 1. Mai 1978 in Bayreuth) war ein deutscher Publizist, Intendant, Lehrer und NS-Funktionär.

Hans Severus Ziegler wurde in Eisenach als Sohn des Kaufmanns und Bankiers Severus Ziegler und einer Amerikanerin geboren. Seine Schwester Eva sollte später den Dramatiker Otto Erlen heiraten.

In Dresden und Zittau besuchte er das Gymnasium. Vor Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges diente Ziegler als Einjährig-Freiwilliger, wurde aber wegen einer Krankheit dienstunfähig geschrieben. Bis Januar 1919 tat er Lazarettendienst. Danach studierte Ziegler Germanistik, Geschichte, Kunstgeschichte und Philosophie in Jena, Greifswald und Cambridge. 1925 wurde er auf Anregung seines geistigen Mentors Adolf Bartels nach der erfolgreichen Verteidigung seiner Dissertation über « Friedrich Hebbel und Weimar » promoviert.

Zwischen 1922 und 1923 arbeitete er in Weimar als Sekretär des völkischen Literaturhistorikers Adolf Bartels und war zugleich Redakteur der Monatszeitschrift Deutsches Schrifttum. 1924 wurde er Gründer und Herausgeber der politischen Wochenzeitung Der Völkische und der daraus entstandenen Tageszeitung Der Nationalsozialist.

Ziegler war seit dem 31. März 1925 Mitglied der NSDAP mit der niedrigen Parteinummer 1317.[1] Zwischen 1925 und

1931 war Ziegler als stellvertretender NSDAP-Gauleiter des Gau Thüringen und von 1930 bis 1931 als Referent im thüringischen Volksbildungsministerium unter Wilhelm Frick tätig. Auf seinen Vorschlag hin erhielt 1926 auf dem NSDAP-Parteitag in Weimar die NS-Jugendorganisation den Namen Hitler-Jugend. Seit 1928 betätigte er sich in Thüringen auch als Gauleiter des nationalsozialistischen Kampfbunds für deutsche Kultur.

1933 erfolgte Zieglers Ernennung zum Staatsrat und Mitglied der Staatsregierung von Thüringen. Ferner fungierte er als Präsident der Deutschen Schillerstiftung und Reichskultursenator. 1936 wurde er zum Generalintendant des Deutschen Nationaltheaters in Weimar und Staatskommissar für die thüringischen Landestheater bestellt. 1935 wurde er kurzfristig beurlaubt, da eine Ermittlung wegen § 175 StGB gegen ihn lief, die aber eingestellt wurde.

Im Rahmen der Reichsmusiktage 1938 in Düsseldorf (zu deren Eröffnung Richard Strauß sein Festliches Präludium von 1913 dirigiert hatte) organisierte Hans Severus Ziegler in Anlehnung an die Münchner Ausstellung « Entartete Kunst » von 1937 (mit deren Organisator Adolf Ziegler er jedoch nicht verwandt war) die Ausstellung « Entartete Musik », in der er gegen Jazz und die Musik von jüdischen Künstlern und Komponisten polemisierte und deren Entfernung aus dem deutschen Musikleben forderte. Anschließend wurde die Ausstellung in Weimar, München und Wien gezeigt. Das Deckblatt der Broschüre trug neben der Karikatur eines schwarzen Jazzmusikers, der einen Davidstern im Knopfloch trägt, die Aufschrift : « Entartete Musik - eine Abrechnung von Staatsrat Doktor Hans Severus Ziegler, Generalintendant des Deutschen Nationaltheaters zu Weimar ». Bereits 1930 (noch als stellvertretender Gauleiter) hatte er mit einem Erlaß für das Land Thüringen unter dem Titel « Wider die Negerkultur, für deutsches Volkstum » seine diesbezügliche Gesinnung offenbart.

In der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone wurden mehrere seiner Schriften sowie ein Buch über ihn auf die Liste der auszusondernden Literatur gesetzt.

Nach Kriegsende arbeitete Ziegler zunächst als Vertreter für Gaststättenporzellan und dann als Privatlehrer in Essen. Von 1952 bis 1954 war er dort Theaterleiter des privaten Kammerschauspiels. Anschließend war er bis 1962 auf der Nordseeinsel Wangerooge als Erzieher und Lehrer im Internat des Arztes und Bürgermeisters Doktor Siemens tätig. Er unterrichtete am damals privaten, später staatlichen Inselgymnasium die Fächer Deutsch und Englisch. Außerdem leitete er die Theatergruppe der Schule, die jährlich im Kinosaal der Insel Aufführungen veranstaltete (zum Beispiel Raub der Sabinerinnen, Die Deutschen Kleinstädter, Prozess um des Esels Schatten, Wilhelm Tell) . Er agierte auch selbst als Schauspieler, meist in Hauptrollen. Daneben war er im rechtsextremistischen Deutschen Kulturwerk Europäischen Geistes tätig.

Nach seiner Pensionierung veröffentlichte Ziegler Beiträge und Bücher im rechtsextremistischen Umfeld und lebte bis zu seinem Tod im 84. Lebensjahr in Bayreuth. 1965 erstattete der Künstler Arie Goral Strafanzeige gegen Ziegler und dessen Verleger, den ehemaligen SS-Führer Waldemar Schütz. Zieglers im Vorjahr erschienenes Buch Adolf Hitler - aus dem Erleben dargestellt « verherrliche den Nationalsozialismus und strotze vor antisemitischem Gedankengut » .

Anlässlich seines Ablebens veröffentlichten die « Ehemaligen Schüler des Inselgymnasiums Wangerooge » in der Tageszeitung Die Welt eine große Todesanzeige. Ziegler war nie verheiratet und starb kinderlos.

Publikationen

Das Theater des deutschen Volkes (1933) .

Praktische Kulturarbeit im Dritten Reich (1934) .

Wende und Weg. Kulturpolitische Reden und Aufsätze (1937) .

Das Recht in der Kunst (1938) .

Entartete Musik (1939) .

Lyrische Gedichte (1940) .

Weltanschauung und Gottglaube (1941) .

Adolf Bartels, ein völkischer Vorkämpfer der deutschen Jugend (1942) .

Große Prüfung. Letzte Briefe und letzte Worte Todgeweihter.

Vom Schaffen deutscher Dichter der neueren Zeit (1957) .

Adolf Hitler - aus dem Erleben dargestellt (1964) .

Wer war Hitler ? (1970) .

Heitere Muse (1974) .

Les musiciens sous le 3e « Reich » (Audrey Roncigli)

Université Nancy 2 (UFR Sciences Historiques, Géographiques et Musicologiques) .

Thèse de Maîtrise I d'Histoire par Audrey Roncigli (juin 2006) .

Sous la direction de monsieur le professeur Didier Francfort.

Introduction

La place et le rôle des Arts dans un régime comme celui du 3e « Reich » ont toujours exercé une grande fascination

parmi les historiens de la culture. Mais, cependant, les différents arts ne prêtent pas tous au même intérêt, il est aisé de le remarquer dans les productions d'histoire culturelle réalisées depuis 1945. On peut ainsi se rendre compte très rapidement que la majorité de ces écrits sont dédiés aux arts visuels et à l'architecture. Erik Levi, dans l'introduction à son ouvrage intitulé « Music in the 3rd " Reich " », le remarque d'emblée. (1) D'autres historiens se sont attelés à ce genre de statistiques : Helen Kehr et Janet Langmaid, dans leur bibliographie intitulée « The Nazi Era » (Londres, 1982) , comptent près de 30 livres parus après 1945 et consacrés à l'histoire de l'art, et 8 ayant pour thème central l'architecture. Le rôle des médias, et principalement celui du cinéma, n'est pas en reste : de nombreux ouvrages, souvent très détaillés, leur sont consacrés. En comparaison, la musique semble avoir beaucoup moins attiré les historiens ; preuve en est, seulement une dizaine de livres en langue allemande traitent exclusivement du sujet, parmi lesquels il faut citer : « Musik im dritten Reich » de Joseph Wulf (1962) ; « Musik im NS-Staat » de Fred K. Prieberg (1982) ; « Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland » de Hanns-Werner Heister et Hans-Günther Klein (1984) ; ainsi que « Entartete Musik » de Albrecht Dümling et Peter Girth (1988) .

Ce constat peut paraître troublant : en effet, l'Allemagne est bel et bien terre musicale, berceau de compositeurs de génie, de musiciens exceptionnels, mais ne dispose pas d'une historiographie développée sur le sujet en ce qui concerne la période nazie. Plusieurs raisons peuvent, en partie, expliquer cette lacune, et elles tiennent à la spécificité propre de la musique, qui est probablement le plus abstrait des arts, et impose plus de difficultés, à un historien, pour montrer des parallèles incontestables entre musique et idéologie politique. Ces parallèles sont quasi-immédiatement visibles, et ce dans tous les sens du terme, dans les arts picturaux ou le cinéma. Il serait cependant faux et dangereux de conclure que des liens entre musique et idéologie politique ne peuvent être mis en valeur, sachant par exemple que le contexte social et politique a, sans conteste, des répercussions plus ou moins importantes sur la composition, et sur la réception des œuvres.

D'autres facteurs expliquent ce relatif désintérêt des historiens culturels pour la musique sous le 3e « Reich » : parmi ces facteurs, le manque de sources brutes. Le fait que le personnel musical de l'après-guerre est majoritairement celui de la guerre, et souvent déjà, celui de la République de Weimar, l'explique en grande partie. Il est ainsi très légitime de penser que la volonté de ces acteurs fut, en 1945, de réduire au maximum les éléments les concernant sur une période trouble, et sur laquelle on aurait été en droit de leur demander des comptes. Tous les historiens s'accordent sur la disparition d'éléments dans l'immédiat après-guerre allemand.

D'autres thèmes d'étude ont été dégagés, comme l'impact de la politique antisémite sur la vie musicale allemande, politique qui a conduit à de nombreuses émigrations, voire à la disparition de personnalités musicales éminentes. Au contraire, peu d'historiens semblent attirés par la biographie de musiciens, pour le moins importants, qui ont choisi de rester, et de collaborer peut-être parce que ces mêmes musiciens ont été les grandes pointures de l'après-guerre musicale, et que des investigations et déclarations historiques auraient pu déranger.

Ceci montre, sous de grands traits, la difficulté à peindre un tableau précis de la vie musicale en Allemagne nazie. Mais de suite, il faut souligner un écueil à éviter : à la fin de la Guerre, après la découverte de l'Holocauste, il fut tentant de lier toutes les activités artistiques en Allemagne, entre 1933 et 1945, aux Nazis. Ainsi, croire que la musique est entrée dans des temps obscurs sous le Nazisme serait une grande erreur : certes, le régime a été cruel et souvent

intolérant, mais la musique s'est enrichie de nouveaux courants, de nouveaux compositeurs, d'œuvres qui ont bouleversé l'histoire de la musique. La musique ne s'est pas tus et n'a pas régressé ; au contraire, elle a continué son développement, et on peut aller jusqu'à affirmer que la poussée réactionnaire qui accompagne l'arrivée au pouvoir de Hitler favorise la création moderniste, débutée durant la République de Weimar. Il n'y a donc pas césure dans l'histoire de la musique en Allemagne au XXe siècle, mais bel et bien une vraie continuité, de même qu'il n'y a pas opposition entre la musique allemande, et celle des autres pays européens, ou même celle de la Russie de Staline. Tout au contraire !

Le but de cette étude est d'observer quelle était la vie d'un musicien en Allemagne nazie : quelles en étaient les difficultés, le contexte, les impératifs, ou les interdits. L'idée est partie d'un constat relativement simple sur 2 chefs allemands majeurs du XXe siècle : Herbert von Karajan et Wilhelm Furtwängler. Bien que de générations et de tempéraments différents, la Guerre les a fait se croiser, se déchirer, et tous 2 se trouvent dans la même situation face à la dénazification, en 1945. À la fin de la Guerre, tous 2 sont ainsi interdits de scène et accusés d'avoir servi le régime, pour être restés en Allemagne, et avoir continué à y jouer. Cependant, leur comportement fut totalement opposé durant ces années, Karajan flirtant gentiment avec le régime qui lance sa carrière ; Furtwängler, plus rebelle, s'opposant souvent à Josef Gœbbels, tout en occupant des postes d'administration dans la Chambre de la musique du « Reich » (« Reichsmusikkammer ») . Alors, comment est-il possible que 2 attitudes aussi éloignées l'une de l'autre, mènent finalement au même résultat ?

Cette étude s'intéresse aussi bien à des aspects politiques, qu'à la personnalité propre des 2 chefs mentionnés ci-dessus ; car cette dernière ne peut s'expliquer sans avoir examiné, au moins en partie, le contexte politique et social qui entoure le monde musical en Allemagne nazie. Il semble tout d'abord nécessaire de s'interroger sur l'idéologie et la politique musicale mises en place, depuis les courants du début des années 1930 (le modernisme face au conservatisme réactionnaire) , jusqu'au bolchévisme culturel ou à l'antisémitisme, liés dans la notion globale d'« Entartung » : la dégénérescence. Afin de faire respecter cette idéologie, le régime a mis en place une structure étatique, liée à des organisations culturelles très précoces, puis représentée par la « Reichsmusikkammer » et le Ministère de la Propagande, sur fond de luttes intestines entre politiciens, notamment entre Gœbbels et Alfred Rosenberg. Dans ce monde bouleversé, le chef d'orchestre s'inscrit dans un processus commencé depuis le début du XIXe siècle et qui l'affirme comme une personnalité majeure du monde musical, détrônant divas et virtuoses, et s'imposant sur le devant de la scène, puis au dehors, jusqu'à devenir une « star » . « Star » qui fait partie intégrante de la vie artistique, et donc, ne peut se cacher et faire fi de la situation politique de son pays ; tout au contraire, et ce principalement en Allemagne. C'est ainsi que Karajan et Furtwängler seront obligés de prendre position et de composer avec (ou contre ...) le régime, leur statut public les impliquant dans la vie artistique du pays, et donc, dans sa vie politique. Ils choisiront tous 2 des chemins différents, en raison de leur personnalité, leur arrivisme ou leur sentiment national, mais aucun des 2 ne sortira indemne de la période du Nazisme.

Idéologie et politique musicale

Attitudes musicales réactionnaires (1919-1928)

Au regard des années 2000, la République de Weimar, née en 1919, apparaît comme l'une des périodes les plus stimulantes de l'histoire de la musique du XXe siècle, une période où l'Allemagne semble abandonner les chaînes du Romantisme national et ouvrir ses portes à un nombre insensé de nouvelles expérimentations artistiques, comme la « Neue Sachlichkeit » (Nouvelle Objectivité) , la composition dodécaphonique, et les liens avec le jazz. La tolérance en matière de musique semble à l'ordre du jour, puisque l'Allemagne accueille alors une multitude de talents, allemands ou non, et ce particulièrement à Berlin, capitale musicale nationale, et rivale de Paris pour le titre de capitale musicale européenne.

Mais, cependant, cette variété artistique présente ne doit pas être idéalisée, car des réactions conservatrices existent parallèlement au progressisme culturel de Weimar. Ainsi, un environnement particulièrement turbulent se dessine, dans lequel 2 attitudes culturelles vont s'opposer. De plus, négliger le poids des forces réactionnaires en action dans la République de Weimar rendrait plus difficile à comprendre l'accession au pouvoir du Nazisme, et l'attrait de la population pour son programme culturel, déjà postulé dans les cercles conservateurs à la fin de la Première Guerre mondiale.

On peut discerner 3 grands types d'opinions culturelles conservatrices durant la République de Weimar. Premièrement, il existe un conservatisme traditionnel émanant des classes aristocratiques, des professions Libérales et des cadres, qui veulent préserver leurs statuts, tout en acquérant une position confortable sous la République. La seconde et la plus radicale des branches du conservatisme, largement alimentée par les intellectuels des classes moyennes, rejette l'ordre social et politique présent et en appelle à une révolution démocratique pour renverser la République. Enfin, à l'extrême-droite, se trouve une pléthore de nationalistes, de Partis politiques fanatiques et d'associations, qui entrent dans le débat culturel lorsque les Nazis émergent comme force politique influente, dans le milieu des années 1920.

La situation instable de l'Allemagne, en 1919, exerce un profond impact moral sur de nombreux musiciens influents. Celle-ci favorise l'ascension de jeunes compositeurs comme Paul Hindemith et Ernst Křenek, alors que les tenants du mouvement néo-wagnérien et Romantique tardif, incluant Max von Schillings, Siegmund von Hausegger et Hermann Waltherhausen, se sentent incapables de continuer à produire dans un tel contexte. Alors que Richard Strauß, regardé comme le compositeur allemand le plus influent, leur est un moment favorable, il semble cependant peu enclin à devenir un porte-parole du conservatisme ; son rival, Hans Pfitzner, prend alors une part active à la défense de ces principes. Aussi bien dans ses œuvres (comme la Cantate « Von deutscher Seele » , de 1921) , que dans ses débats polémistes, Pfitzner reste l'un des piliers de la réaction conservatrice, attachée à l'honneur allemand, a une identité nationale que la Première Guerre Mondiale, véritable catastrophe nationale, a réduit à néant. Ainsi, en 1920, dans le « Süddeutschen Monatshefte » (article intitulé : « Die Neue Ästhetik der musikalischen Impotenz. Ein Verwesungssymptom ? ») , Pfitzner attaque le critique Paul Bekker, qui dresse un parallèle entre les Symphonies de Beethoven et celles de Gustav Mahler. Mais Pfitzner y critique aussi la situation politique et culturelle ambiante, définissant la décadence artistique comme corollaire à la désintégration nationale, et assimilant « le chaos atonal » au bolchévisme » (2) . Il déclare aussi que la culture allemande est totalement au-dessus des menaces des « internationalistes juifs » . Sa position est strictement défensive : il veut protéger et conserver les intérêts allemands. Il est rejoint par Reinhold Zimmermann, dans l'article intitulé « Der Geist des Internationalismus in der Musik » , publié dans le journal antisémite « Deutschlands Erneuerung » . Zimmermann va plus loin que Pfitzner en développant une théorie du

complot juif international mené pour détruire l'identité nationale de la musique allemande, citant Mahler et Arnold Schœnberg. Des échos de ces positions se trouvent dans des essais d'historiens contemporains, comme Karl Storck dans « Die Musik der Gegenwart », où il condamne Schœnberg pour son « chaos tonal » (3) et consacre un chapitre entier au « Problème Mahler », se concentrant sur les origines raciales du compositeur.

Malgré leurs efforts, ces tenants du conservatisme se sentent seuls et isolés dans leur croisade : le modernisme progresse et, en 1920, par exemple, le chef Hermann Scherchen fonde le magazine « Melos » pour promouvoir la musique contemporaine internationale, et l'« International Society for Contemporary Music » (ISCM) voit le jour en 1922. Le milieu des années 1920 et Bayreuth marquent un tournant dans l'histoire du conservatisme : en 1924, le Festival de Bayreuth rouvre, et après l'exécution de l'Opéra « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg », l'assemblée entonne spontanément l'hymne allemand, le « Deutschland über alles ». Durant les années qui suivent, Bayreuth devient le siège du conservatisme musical et une base d'attaque contre la République de Weimar : le « Cercle de Bayreuth », avec ses multiples associations (comme l'« Allgemeiner Richard-Wagner-Verein », ARWV), devient l'un des piliers du conservatisme musical et politique. Les positions du Cercle de Bayreuth peuvent être définies à partir du journal édité par le disciple de Wagner, Hans von Wolzogen, le « Bayreuther Blätter ». En 1921, par exemple, il publie un article élogieux sur l'essai d'Alfred Rosenberg, « Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten » ; il salue le pèlerinage d'Adolf Hitler à Bayreuth, en 1923, occasion pour le chef du National-Socialisme de se lier avec la famille Wagner et le théoricien des races, Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Pour lui rendre hommage, le « Bayreuther Blätter » publie en couverture des extraits de ses discours. Le journal fondé par Robert Schumann, en 1834, le « Zeitschrift für Musik » (ZfM), sauvé de la crise économique par Alfred Heuß, devient lui aussi un écho des positions conservatrices, dissertant sur « l'influence juive dans les compositions allemandes récentes » (4). Plus tard, le « Zeitschrift für Musik » est requalifié pour attirer un lectorat plus important, il devient le « Journal pour le renouveau spirituel de la musique allemande ». Les éditoriaux deviennent chauvins et les articles dédiés à la musique contemporaine sont remplacés par des éloges de compositeurs conservateurs, Heuß condamnant l'influence de compositeurs étrangers sur la vie musicale allemande. Sa cible privilégiée est l'« International Society for Contemporary Music » (ISCM), établie, selon lui, pour que « les Français, les Juifs, et les Bolchéviques puissent torpiller la culture nazie, du dedans ».

À ce titre, le contrat que Schœnberg obtient à Berlin comme professeur de Composition à la « Musikhochschule », en 1925, aurait pu causer la consternation dans les cercles musicaux conservateurs ; mais, en vérité, peu s'intéressent à sa musique. Les conservateurs sont plus engagés contre la popularité croissante du jazz. C'est après que le jazz soit entré dans le monde de l'Opéra, avec l'exemple de « Jonny spielt auf ! » de Ernst Křenek (en février 1927), et le « Die Dreigroschenoper » de Kurt Weill (en août 1928) qu'une propagande active commence à être influente ; dès lors, le « Zeitschrift für Musik » condamne Křenek et Weill en leitmotiv récurrent.

Le modernisme musical et ses courants (1919-1933)

En 1923, Arnold Schœnberg présente sa méthode de composition sérielle qui assurera, selon lui, « l'hégémonie de la musique allemande pendant 100 ans ». Faisant référence à la germanité de sa musique, il se place dans la tradition musicale, qui va de Bach à Wagner, en passant par Mozart, Beethoven et Brahms - comme il l'explique dans un texte de février 1931, « Du nationalisme en musique » (5). Il s'oppose alors totalement à l'idéologie national-conservatrice

ambiante en Allemagne. Ce même Schönberg, à l'origine de la musique atonale, suivi par Anton von Webern et Alban Berg, sera lui-même jugé dépassé par d'autres modernes, dès les années 1920 ; mais l'atonalité reste l'une des formes les plus importantes de la modernité musicale sous la République de Weimar.

Né à Vienne, en 1874, dans une famille juive modeste, Schönberg, violoncelliste autodidacte, est propulsé dans l'univers musical et artistique par le compositeur et chef d'orchestre Alexander von Zemlinsky, qui le prend sous sa protection. En 1904, Schönberg fonde le « Verein schaffender Tonkünstler » (Société des musiciens créateurs), dont la présidence est confiée à Gustav Mahler, lieu d'expérimentation musicale regroupant des créations contemporaines et un petit public d'artistes et de mélomanes, Société qui, malgré sa courte vie (une année), crée de solides liens entre les compositeurs. Cette solidarité est d'autant plus renforcée par le rejet massif par le public de la musique nouvelle, abandonnant la tonalité, rejet se manifestant au cours des concerts par des sifflets, et parfois même, des émeutes :

« En 1905, lors de la première du Poème symphonique “ Pelleas und Melisande ”, le public ne se contenta pas d'interrompre le concert par des sifflets, mais sortit en masse au beau milieu de la séance, en s'appliquant à faire claquer les portes. » (6)

C'est à l'époque de la « double trahison » (1908 : sa femme le trompe avec son ami, qui se suicide) que Schönberg abandonne les derniers vestiges de la tonalité dans son Second Quatuor à cordes, Opus 10, dont le 2e mouvement contient la phrase : « Alles ist hin » (Tout est fini) ; il compose le fameux « Pierrot lunaire » (1912), magnifiant le « Sprechgesang », et les 2 drames musicaux « Erwartung » et « Die glückliche Hand ».

Dans le souci de plus en plus pressant de rationalisation de sa musique qui est dans une impasse intellectuelle depuis quelques années (crise d'inspiration vers 1912, et repli sur la peinture), Schönberg commence, à partir de l'été 1921, à réfléchir de façon approfondie sur l'organisation des 12 sons. Cette entreprise de rationalisation l'amène, en 1923 (Suite pour piano, Opus 25), à ce qui est communément nommé « dodécaphonisme sériel », c'est-à-dire l'utilisation, toujours dans le même ordre, sans répétition ni omission, de chacune des 12 notes de la gamme chromatique, le nombre donné d'intervalles étant lui-même présenté dans un ordre strict (la série). On peut voir dans cette formalisation de l'atonalité à la fois un besoin personnel de cohérence formelle, mais aussi une forme de légitimation du système atonal par la procédure codifiée.

Mais c'est déjà dès 1908 qu'une rupture émerge entre les courants musicaux en Allemagne : le conservatisme de Engelbert Humperdinck, Ferruccio Busoni ou Hans Pfitzner, le mélange expressionnisme / impressionnisme (« Jugendstil ») de Franz Schreker et Alexander von Zemlinsky, et la démarche d'expérimentation de Arnold Schönberg. Ainsi, pour observer la diversité du monde de la composition musicale, il suffit de comparer les résultats musicaux obtenus face à une même source d'inspiration. La poésie de Georg Trakl est ainsi mise en musique par Paul Hindemith (« Die Junge Magd », Opus 23b, de 1922) et par Anton von Webern dans « Ein Winterabend », Opus 13 (1918) et les « Sechs Lieder », Opus 14 (1921). Les musiques sont écrites au même moment, sur l'inspiration d'un même poète, mais sont radicalement différentes (quand bien même étant toutes les 2 de la musique de chambre, ces cycles vocaux opposent « l'esthétique proche de Schönberg pour Webern, au dépouillement de l'écriture tonale de Hindemith » (7). Parallèlement, le « Jugendstil », qui domine en Allemagne depuis le début du siècle, est en déclin progressif, l'échec

d'« Irrelohe » de Franz Schreker le démontre ; Paul Hindemith lui-même, un temps lié à l'« expressionnisme de Francfort » rejette, dès 1921, ses œuvres de jeunesse et le style musical auquel elles se référaient.

Schreker, Busoni et Schœnberg, seront ainsi remis en cause par leurs élèves ; avec eux, les 3 courants de 1908 fondent cependant des bases sûres pour la musique moderne : Ernst Křenek renverse la musique de Schreker, en opposant aux sujets vénéneux et sensuels et à l'orchestre touffu de son Maître, le jazz, la musique anti-Romantique et les sujets d'actualité. Weill s'oppose à Busoni, souhaitant une synthèse entre la tradition de Bach et Mozart et celle de la jeune musique ; dès son 1er Opéra, « Der Protagonist », Weill pose les bases de son esthétique : orchestre réduit, rejet de l'action dramatique traditionnelle, pantomimes. Hanns Eisler enfin, s'oppose à Arnold Schœnberg auquel il reproche son conservatisme et l'élitisme bourgeois de sa musique. La rupture a lieu après « Palmström », Opus 5, œuvre à la fois hommage et satire de la musique de Schœnberg, la musique d'Eisler évoluant alors vers des formes totalement différentes dès cette époque.

Paul Hindemith renonce définitivement à l'expressionnisme avec les « Kammermusiken », créées en 1922 sous la direction de Hermann Scherchen : la musique est plus forme que discours, indépendante de tout message, et devient objective par rapport à la subjectivité Romantique et expressionniste. La « Neue Sachlichkeit » est née. Dans sa forme lyrique, elle devient le « Zeitoper » ; qui se base sur des sujets d'actualité, et intègre des éléments fonctionnels jusqu'alors absents de l'Opéra (sonnette, téléphone, ...). Ce genre est créé par les Opéras de Křenek, et le « Zeitoper » se diffuse avec « Mahagonny » de Weill ; « Hin und Zurück » ou « Neues vom Tage » de Hindemith.

Dès 1926, le saxophoniste noir de « Jonny spielt auf ! » de Křenek, puis l'Opéra « Der Sprung über den Schatten », consacrent l'entrée du jazz dans la musique savante. Les rythmes du jazz attirent de nombreux compositeurs d'avant-garde : Darius Milhaud souligne, dans la revue « Anbruch », les possibilités nouvelles apportées par le jazz à l'orchestration (8). Parmi les pionniers de l'intégration du jazz, figurent Erwin Schulhoff et Paul Hindemith, avec le « Ragtime » pour orchestre ou la « Kammermusik » n° 7 (1921). Schulhoff compose, en 1919, 5 « Pittoresques » pour piano, avec « ragtime », « fox-trot » et « one-step », puis les 5 « Études de Jazz », en 1927, avec tango. Des élèves de Schreker sont également tentés : Wilhelm Grosz (« Jazzyband », pour violon et piano, de 1924) et Alois Haba (« Danses modernes » avec « Blues », « Boston » et tango). Schreker, lui-même, utilise le jazz dans son « Zeitoper », intitulé « Christophorus ». Mais c'est pour montrer la déchéance due à la drogue plus que pour l'utilisation même de la forme. Le jazz constitue aussi une partie de la carrière compositionnelle de Karl Amadeus Hartmann, avec la 2e Suite pour violon seul (1927) ou la « Jazz Toccata et Fugue » (1928).

Bolchévisme musical et « Kulturbolschewismus »

Le concept de « Kulturbolschewismus » (bolchévisme musical) naît dans les décombres de la Première Guerre mondiale, et fait rage tout au long de la République de Weimar. Au cours du temps, il devient partie intégrante de la critique culturelle conservatrice ; il est même utilisé par l'idéologie nationaliste, au même titre que l'antisémitisme, pour constituer l'« Entartung », la dégénérescence. Le bolchévisme musical dénonce, dès 1918 et en réaction à la Révolution d'Octobre en Russie et aux mouvements spartakistes en Allemagne, les compositeurs et propagateurs de la musique nouvelle, au rang desquels Arnold Schœnberg et Hermann Scherchen. Scherchen est un grand diffuseur de cette

musique, fondant en 1919, avec Wolfgang Gurlitt, le frère de Manfred, la Société pour la musique nouvelle (« International Society for Contemporary Music ») ; celle-ci organise des concerts dans la galerie d'art berlinoise de Gurlitt. En 1922, la Société disparaît, mais Scherchen continue son combat, créant de nombreuses œuvres contemporaines comme la Ire Symphonie de Ernst Křenek (1922), la « Kammermusik » n° 1 de Paul Hindemith (1921), les « Drei Bruchstücke aus Wozzeck » (1924) et le Concerto à la mémoire d'un Ange (1936) de Berg. À cause de son engagement pour la musique nouvelle et de ses sympathies communistes, Scherchen devient alors « le bolchévique » par excellence, alors même que le NSDAP récupère en 1932 des chants russes qu'il a arrangés, en y ajoutant des strophes nationalistes ! Il est même qualifié de « politicien de la musique d'orientation communiste » (1932, « Zeitschrift für Musik »). Ce même Scherchen désigne dès 1919 Schönberg comme l'une des figures majeures de la musique du futur. Schönberg, qui, selon la revue « Signale », incarne « le bolchévisme dans la musique », est lui victime de son engagement atonal. En effet, l'assimilation entre destruction de l'ordre tonal et la gauche politique se poursuit en Allemagne. On parle ainsi, des années 1910 jusqu'aux années 1920, d'« anarchisme musical » pour décrire des œuvres comme « Pelleas und Melisande » ou son Quatuor à cordes, Opus 7.

Cependant, force est de constater que le bolchévisme musical n'a pas de définition claire, et tient « souvent plus de l'invective que de la critique raisonnée » (9). Selon le musicologue allemand Eckhard John (10), il relève d'un amalgame d'idées aussi diverses que : Schönberg, futurisme, expressionnisme, musique atonale, dissonance, anarchie, socialisation, maladie, impuissance, révolution, danger, menace ... Termes auxquels s'ajoutent 2 grandes idées du conservatisme politique : l'anticommunisme et l'anti-intellectualisme. La notion de bolchévisme est rapidement assimilée, dès 1919, au concept de révolution et de destruction de l'ordre : ainsi, le bolchévisme musical se trouve en rapport avec la destruction de la monarchie en Allemagne et en Autriche, car lui-même lié à la destruction de l'ordre tonal. Le terme de bolchévisme musical est donc très vaste, et il inclut des réalités musicales très différentes les unes des autres. Pour exemple, le « Zeitschrift für Musik » l'applique « au flot puant du futurisme musical de Schreker, Schönberg, Stravinski et consorts » (11), alors même que les compositeurs sont très éloignés musicalement dès 1922 : Franz Schreker dans le post-Romantique ; Arnold Schönberg dans le dodécaphonisme ; et Igor Stravinski dans le néo-Classicisme. La confusion est égale en politique : la critique musicale assimile toute idée de modernisme musical à celle d'une idée de gauche, révolutionnaire. Or, Schönberg était un fervent admirateur de la maison des Habsbourg, et s'oppose à son élève Eisler, très engagé dans la lutte politique de gauche.

Au milieu des années 1920, la notion plus générale et tout aussi péjorative de « Kulturbolschewismus » remplace celle de bolchévisme musical. Le bolchévisme culturel est l'apanage de tous les Partis bourgeois dès 1930, et il est transcendé par le Nazisme dans sa dénonciation de la dégénérescence. Le terme prend le sens d'« étranger et destructeur du peuple », en termes politiques et moraux. Il est associé à « la démoralisation (« Entsittlichung ») du peuple, à l'émancipation des femmes, au déchaînement de la sexualité, à la corruption morale de la jeunesse, à l'antimilitarisme, bref, à l'ensemble des phénomènes centrifuges qui parcourent la société allemande » (12). « Véritable psychose du satanisme », on lui impute même la « déchristianisation des masses » (se référer à Karl Fœrtsch, pasteur berlinois) (13). Kurt Hutten, dans « Kulturbolschewismus. Eine deutsche Schicksalsfrage. », paru en 1932, explique : « le bolchévisme culturel porte en lui cette conception de la liberté conduisant à un art de mauvaise qualité selon lui, il a pour corollaire la « sexuelle Entfesselung » (le déchaînement sexuel), et la déchéance morale et spirituelle. « Kulturbolschewismus » et « Entartung » vont donc de pair. Carl von Ossietzky résume ainsi :

« Le bolchévisme culturel est le dogme démocratique des frères Mann, un morceau de Hindemith ou de Weill. Tous sont des acolytes payés ou volontaires de Moscou. » (14)

Devenu mot d'ordre politique à part entière lors des élections du 5e « Reichstag », en 1930, le bolchévisme culturel envahit le vocabulaire politique. Il participe à la défense des valeurs chrétiennes soutenues par les organisations catholiques, et il est l'objet de débats radiophoniques ou au « Reichstag ». Les attaques contre le « Kulturbolschewismus » se renforcent après 1930, liées à la progression de la musique atonale de Schönberg, puis, à la popularité croissante du jazz, auxquelles s'ajoute dès lors une politisation des sujets musicaux chez certains compositeurs.

Déjà, en 1923, la polémique est lancée par le « Harmonielehre » de Schönberg, qui définit l'ordre dodécaphonique, même si celui-ci s'en était distancié en écrivant :

« Je suis un musicien, je n'ai rien à voir avec l'atonalité. »

L'idée est reprise par Berg, en 1930, mais l'argument ne suffit pas et les critiques continuent à voir dans l'atonalité, l'expression de la dégénérescence, poussant même jusqu'à rallier des musiciens de la nouvelle musique contre l'atonalité. La campagne contre le « Kulturbolschewismus » s'étend dès 1927 au domaine de la musique légère et du jazz. La violence contre le jazz est inouïe ; les haines et les pulsions se déchaînent. Les relations entre « la musique de nègre », la liberté sexuelle et le communisme sont données comme arguments contre le jazz. Le saxophone représente ainsi « le chant d'un nègre castré » et le jazz devient une menace pour la virilité de l'homme allemand. Le sentiment de haine contre le jazz atteint son paroxysme avec les « arrangements jazz » ou « Verjazzung » et, par exemple, la transcription de « Tannhäuser » en formation « charleston ». La forme même de ce style, sans chef, est décrite comme relevant du bolchévisme : on parle de « Kappellen-Kommunismus » .

Antisémitisme

Les Nazis, à travers leur programme antisémite, ont un but final : l'effacement total de toute influence juive sur la musique allemande. Le thème du « complot juif international » domine toute la période de la République de Weimar et celle du 3e « Reich » : cependant, si des statistiques de juin 1933 montrent que seulement 2 % de la profession musicale allemande est d'origine juive (15), la présence sur la scène musicale de personnalités controversées comme Schönberg, Weill, ou Klemperer aident les Nazis à renforcer l'idée que le complot juif domine dans le monde de la musique, et que seule l'extermination de toute influence juive et de toute réminiscence de la République de Weimar sauvera la culture allemande.

Quand ils accèdent au pouvoir en 1933, les Nazis ne perdent pas de temps et appliquent leurs propositions : des lois sont promulguées pour bannir l'emploi de Juifs dans les salles de concerts et les maisons d'Opéras. La musique de compositeurs juifs est progressivement supprimée des programmes de concerts et des diffusions radiophoniques. L'antisémitisme touche à peu près tous les éléments de la vie musicale en Allemagne durant la période, mais 2 grands

aspects peuvent être particulièrement soulignés : l'élimination des musiciens et compositeurs juifs et la redéfinition du répertoire en une aryanisation de la musique.

Arrivé au pouvoir le 30 janvier 1933, Adolf Hitler commence sa politique d'élimination systématique des Juifs à partir d'une série de mesures législatives. Concernant le monde musical, l'acte le plus important est le « Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums », approuvée par le « Reichstag », le 7 avril 1933 : cette loi devient l'arme légale du gouvernement pour éliminer les Juifs de l'administration publique. Seules les personnes qui peuvent prouver leurs origines aryennes sont désormais autorisées à servir l'État. Dans la sphère musicale, cette loi barre l'accès aux Juifs aux maisons d'Opéras et aux salles de concerts.

Mais déjà avant cet acte, le régime nazi avait commencé sa lutte face aux musiciens juifs ou opposés au régime : le 7 mars 1933, Fritz Busch, opposé aux Nazis, est arrêté en pleine répétition de « Rigoletto » au « Dresden Oper » ; le 16 mars, Bruno Walter, d'origine juive et chef principal du « Leipzig Gewandhaus », trouve les portes de sa salle de concert closes par les Nazis ; 4 jours plus tard, alors qu'il doit donner un concert à Berlin avec le « Berliner Philharmoniker », il demande la protection du Ministère de la Propagande, et reçoit en retour un avis stipulant que le concert ne pourrait se tenir qu'avec un chef aryen : c'est finalement Richard Strauß qui dirigera le concert, se trouvant à Berlin au « Staatsoper » pour « Elektra ». Quelques jours plus tard, le journal nazi « Völkischer Beobachter » rapporte que Strauß a sauvé le concert comme « un salut pour la nouvelle Allemagne » (16). Walter quitte alors l'Allemagne pour l'Autriche, départ salué par la presse nazie (17). Une autre cible du régime est Otto Klemperer, chef influent durant la République de Weimar, directeur du « Kroll Oper », de 1927 à 1930. Klemperer prend parti pour la cause des « modernistes », et dirige régulièrement en U.R.S.S. L'opposition au chef devient très prononcée en 1933, lorsqu'il dirige une production controversée de « Tannhäuser » au « Staatsoper », pour le 50^e anniversaire de la mort de Richard Wagner. Fritz Stege, dans le « Zeitschrift für Musik », parle d'un affront à la mémoire de l'un des plus grands compositeurs allemands. La production est interdite par les Nazis après 2 représentations, et Heinz Tietjen, intendant du « Staatsoper », décide d'annuler les concerts de Klemperer à la « Staatskapelle ». Finalement, Klemperer quitte l'Allemagne le 5 avril 1933. 2 jours après, la loi sur le service public amène des départs en masse de chefs d'origine juive, comme Fritz Stiedry et Fritz Zweig à Berlin ; Jasha Horenstein à Düsseldorf ; Wilhelm (William) Steinberg à Francfort ; Gustav Brecher à Leipzig. De nombreux directeurs de Conservatoires sont licenciés : Bernhard Sekles à Francfort ; Walter Braunfels à Cologne. Pendant ce temps, de nombreux autres de leurs collègues ont déjà quitté l'Allemagne, comme Hanns Eisler, Ernst Toch ou Kurt Weill. La purge se développe partout en Allemagne (Schreker et Schönberg sont interdits à l'Académie de Musique prussienne), et dans les médias, la radio étant contrôlée par Josef Goebbels, Ministre de la Propagande. Le personnel de la radio, mais aussi de la presse, est épuré : les critiques Alfred Einstein, et Hugo Leichtentritt, par exemple, sont remplacés par des membres du Parti nazi. Quelques musiciens expriment leur désaccord face à l'épuration : Wilhelm Furtwängler, par exemple, qui écrit à Goebbels pour défendre Walter et Klemperer. Paul Schwers, dans le « Allgemeine Musikzeitung », soutient la lutte antisémite, mais craint les conséquences d'une épuration systématique sur la vie musicale.

Il faut également souligner que des exceptions sont faites lorsqu'il s'agit d'assurer une qualité artistique aux maisons musicales allemandes : Hermann Göring, qui dirige le « Staatsoper », garde les solistes juifs Igor Kipnis et Emanuel List. Goebbels, qui respecte Furtwängler comme musicien, accepte sa demande de garder des musiciens juifs au «

Berliner Philharmoniker » , du moins jusqu'en 1935, date à laquelle il revoit sa position. Mais, parallèlement, des listes de musiciens bannis par le « Reich » sont publiées dans « Die Musik » , les agents musicaux juifs sont interdits sur le sol allemand, les chanteurs juifs du « Sängerbund » sont licenciés. En novembre 1933, Goebbels dévoile la « Reichsmusikkammer » (RMK) , à laquelle l'adhésion est obligatoire pour exercer une activité musicale. Les lois de Nuremberg, promulguées en 1935, ont de sérieuses implications sur les carrières de nombreux musiciens allemands mais, sans être appliquées équitablement, Hindemith est condamné pour avoir épousé une non-aryenne, alors que Rudolf Wagner-Régeny reste applaudi du régime, bien que marié à une Juive.

Une propagande musicale antisémite se développe également, aussi bien dans les journaux, comme « Die Musik » , le « Zeitschrift für Musik » , que dans des ouvrages : « Der Kampf um deutsche Musik » de Karl Grunsky (1933) ; « Das Judentum in der Musik » de Erich Müller (dans : « Handbuch der Judenfrage » de Theodor Fritsch, 1932) . Le Parti nazi soutient un ouvrage rédigé par Herbert Gerigk, le « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » (1937) , très virulent, où l'auteur, éditeur de « Die Musik » et habilité à accéder aux archives de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , fustige nombre de compositeurs et musiciens : Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, entre autres. Karl Blessinger est un autre propagateur de l'idéologie musicale antisémite, à travers des essais tels « Die Überwindung der musikalischen Impotenz » (1920) où il attaque Mahler ; et « Judentum und Musik : Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- und Rassenpolitik » (1944) , qui résume l'ensemble de sa pensée.

Très vite après l'établissement de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , en novembre 1933, des directives officielles sont données pour interdire toute représentation d'œuvres composées par des Juifs. Des groupes au sein du Parti nazi, souvent loyaux à Alfred Rosenberg, rival de Josef Goebbels, souhaitent cependant des mesures plus poussées et donc, l'expurgation de toute influence ou souvenir judaïques » sur scène.

Ainsi, pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, un programme d'aryanisation du répertoire est mis en place, avec le soutien du Ministère de la Propagande. Cette décision a des répercussions principalement sur 3 compositeurs : Felix Mendelssohn, d'origine juive ; Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, qui a écrit ses Opéras avec un Juif, Lorenzo da Ponte ; et Georg Friedrich Händel, qui a utilisé les textes de l'Ancien Testament. Le régime encourage la création de nouvelles partitions pour remplacer la musique de Mendelssohn pour « Ein Sommernachtstraum » (Le Songe d'une nuit d'été) (18) . Les textes des libretti de « Don Giovanni » , « Così fan tutte » , ou « Le Nozze de Figaro » , sont retraduits en allemand par le musicologue Siegfried Anheisser, soutenu par Göring dès 1931, et publiés par le « Deutscher Musikverlag in der NSKG » , en remplacement de la traduction du chef juif Hermann Levi (19) . Hermann Stephani révisé le « Requiem » de Mozart, et efface les mots d'origine hébraïque, comme « Sabath » (20) . La situation est la même pour Händel.

Alfred Rosenberg déclare ainsi :

« Les œuvres religieuses de Bach, Händel, Mozart et Beethoven doivent être nettoyées de toutes leurs chansons de Jéhovah » (21)

Il décide donc l'aryanisation de la majorité des Oratorios de Händel, comme « Le Messie » dès 1935, ou « Judas

Maccabeus » (nouveau poème par Hermann Burte en 1936 et Hermann Stephani en 1939, le rebaptisant « Der Feldherr »). Goebbels crée, en mai 1940, la « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitung », Chambre d'arrangement musical, qui transforme « Judas Maccabeus » en « Wilhelm von Nassauen » grâce à Harke et Johannes Klöcking. Ils arrangent également « Israël en Égypte » en « Mongelensturm » (1942), puis finalement, en 1944, en « Opfersieg von Walstatt » (l'Oratorio raconte implicitement la victoire du Prince Blücher sur la France, en 1813). Cette campagne d'aryanisation du répertoire a beaucoup de succès dans le « Reich », jusqu'en 1944, mais il est difficile d'examiner jusqu'où les musiciens suivent la « Reichsstelle » et utilisent les versions arianisées.

Se produit également une germanisation du répertoire qui passe par la représentation de compositeurs protégés par le « Reich » : Richard Wagner figure parmi les compositeurs lyriques les plus populaires, entre 1932 et 1940 ; la musique de Richard Strauß préempte pendant la République de Weimar et le 3e « Reich », comme celle de Johannes Brahms et d'Anton Bruckner ; Gustav Mahler est remplacé par Hans Pfitzner, compositeur du « Reich » ; Paul Græner et Max Trapp, membres du Parti, sont également promus, dès 1933, au rang des compositeurs les plus joués (22).

La purge du répertoire moderniste en 1933 et « l'affaire Hindemith »

Les maisons d'Opéra allemandes se trouvent souvent en difficulté économique durant la saison 1932-1933, et ainsi, les directeurs refusent de prendre des risques en programmant de la musique moderne. Non pas que cette musique soit subitement bannie : au contraire, juste après l'arrivée au pouvoir de Hitler, le « Staatsoper » programme le « Wozzeck » d'Alban Berg ; l'Opéra de Kassel donne l'« Œdipe Rex » d'Igor Stravinski. Le chef Hermann Scherchen dirige des pièces de Anton von Webern et Ernst Křenek à Munich ; la « Suite lyrique » de Berg est jouée à Cologne. Béla Bartók, lui-même, vient à Francfort pour donner son Second Concerto pour piano, en février 1933.

Mais fin février, le climat change : Kurt Weill est banni et, 6 jours après l'incendie du « Reichstag », les Nazis invoquent la nécessité d'obtenir les pouvoirs absolus. C'est alors qu'ils vont se livrer à une purge sans égal dans le monde musical allemand : le 1er objectif est d'éliminer les Juifs, les sympathisants politiques ennemis, et les musiciens et compositeurs appelés « dégénérés » (« entartete »). En juin 1933, les Nazis ont mis à l'index une liste de « musiciens dégénérés », au rang desquels on trouve Arnold Schœnberg, surnommé « le charlatan sans racines ... quiconque en mange, en meurt » (Josef Goebbels) ; ou encore Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler, Ernst Toch, Otto Klemperer, Hermann Scherchen.

Avec l'intervention du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (KfdK) d'Alfred Rosenberg, la République de Weimar, jugée « bolchévique, internationaliste et décadente », est fustigée et les compositeurs du « Reich » sont promus. Paul Græner, compositeur du « Reich », écrit ainsi :

« Comme l'Allemagne se redécouvre, s'estime à nouveau, il lui appartient d'avoir un art sain, un art qui peut l'aider, un art de nouveau Romantique. » (23)

« Romantique » est le mot utilisé, car tous ces compositeurs dont les sympathies se rapprochent du « Reich » veulent faire revivre cet esprit Romantique, au contraire des modernistes. La propagande de Græner fonctionne, et ainsi, des

compositeurs Romantiques tardifs comme Georg Vollerthun (« Der Freikorporal ») sont programmés à Berlin. Le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » continue à combattre le modernisme, et organise des Festivals où est exaltée la musique de compositeurs membres du Parti. C'est en novembre 1933 que Goebbels, avec la « Reichskulturkammer », retire à Rosenberg son rôle purgatoire. Il apparaît d'abord suivre Græner dans la nécessité d'une renaissance d'un art national Romantique, mais dans un discours de juin 1934, il devient plus pragmatique par rapport au modernisme :

« Nous, Nationaux-Socialistes, nous sommes loin d'être démodés. Au contraire, nous pensons être les meilleurs porte-parole du modernisme le plus avancé, tant politiquement et socialement, que spirituellement et artistiquement. » (24)

Mais il oscille entre Libéralisme temporaire face à certains modernistes et attitudes réactionnaires quand le régime est en danger. C'est enfin en 1936, au Festival de l'« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » (ADMV), qu'il prend la décision radicale de bannir toute musique moderniste.

Le cas du compositeur Paul Hindemith est, à cet égard, significatif : Hindemith s'est acquis une réputation d'enfant terrible qu'illustre le coup d'éclat que fut le « Lehrstück » (sur un texte de Bertolt Brecht, 1929). Cette œuvre fit scandale lors de sa création, avec son thème de l'absence de solidarité entre les hommes, sa musique de cirque, et le lien qu'elle crée avec le public. Professeur de composition à Berlin, en 1927, Hindemith touche à tous les genres du modernisme, après avoir tourné le dos à l'expressionnisme : la musique de film (« Vormittagsspuk », 1927) ; le jazz (« Ragtime Wohltemperiert », 1921) ; l'Opéra constructiviste (« Hin und zurück », 1927) ; le « Zeitoper » (« Neues vom Tage », 1929). Déjà, avant 1933, les audaces de Hindemith lui valent l'hostilité de certains Nazis. Sa collaboration avec Brecht le classe dans le bolchévisme culturel ; en 1930, déjà, Wilhelm Frick, ministre de l'Éducation de Thuringe, gouvernement en majorité nazi, fait interdire ses œuvres dans la région. Hitler lui-même avait été dégoûté par la sexualité explicite de « Neues vom Tage » (25). Mais 2 facteurs l'aident à garder sa place en marge du régime : sa propre évolution, et le soutien qu'il reçoit de membres influents du NSDAP.

Hindemith se détourne ainsi du musicien à scandale, pour une écriture plus instrumentale (« Konzertmusik », Opus 48 à 50). Il se lie au poète sympathisant nazi Gottfried Benn, avec qui il écrit la Cantate « Das Unauffhörliche », Hindemith met un terme à ses expériences modernistes et revient à des formes musicales plus traditionnelles. Ce changement est salué par Gustav Havemann, membre du NSDAP et du « Kraft durch Freude », qui demande sa réintégration et lui propose un programme pour l'enseignement de la théorie musicale. Il coopère avec le pouvoir, reste à Berlin, et ne manifeste aucune réaction devant le sort de bon nombre de ses collègues, ni devant l'internement en camp du beau-frère de sa femme. Richard Strauß lui propose une place à la « Reichsmusikkammer » qu'il accepte en 1934. Avec sa « Konzertmusik für Streicher und Bläser », donnée pour l'inauguration de l'institution, puis avec la création de la Symphonie « Mathis der Maler », dirigée par Wilhelm Furtwängler, en mars 1934, il rompt avec son style antérieur. Mais Alfred Rosenberg dénonce la femme de Hindemith, Gertrud Rottenberg, d'origine juive, et ses liens avec les musiciens juifs Emanuel Feuermann ou Bronisław Huberman. Paul Zschorlich, dans le « Deutsche Zeitung » puis le journal « Die Musik » s'attaquent à lui : pour avoir joué pour l'« International Society for Contemporary Music », dominée par les Juifs, et chantre du bolchévisme musical » et pour avoir « déformé atonalement la glorieuse « Bayrischer Avanciermarsch » ».

Josef Gœbbels intervient personnellement pour la défense du compositeur, le 25 juin 1934 :

« Hindemith doit être reconnu, sans ambages, comme l'un des plus importants talents de la jeune génération de compositeurs. »

Mais la nouvelle organisation d'Alfred Rosenberg, les « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde » (NSKG) , amplifie les attaques contre lui (avec Friedrich Herzog, conseiller musical des « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde ») . Hindemith menace de s'exiler en novembre 1934, et un bref répit permet à sa Symphonie « Mathis der Maler » d'être jouée à Essen. Furtwängler publie alors dans le « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » un article intitulé « Der Fall Hindemith » , où il défend le compositeur face à Rosenberg, espérant obtenir de Hitler l'autorisation de créer l'Opéra « Mathis der Maler » qu'il devait diriger. Furtwängler déclare que l'opposition n'est pas faite en raison de ses liens avec des Juifs, mais sur ses œuvres de jeunesse « douloureuses » .

Il conclut en demandant :

« Hindemith ne s'est jamais engagé en politique : où irons-nous si les méthodes de dénonciation politique étaient appliquées à l'art ? »

Destinée avant tout à faire reculer Rosenberg, l'initiative de Furtwängler reste vaine, et Gœbbels se range avec Rosenberg. Quelques jours après, Gœbbels, à travers le journal « Der Angriff » met en cause Hindemith, et Furtwängler est contraint de démissionner. Au Palais des Sports de Berlin, lors d'une réunion de politique culturelle du NSDAP, Gœbbels se lance dans une violente diatribe contre Furtwängler et Hindemith, louant la loyauté des artistes allemands au régime nazi (26) . Le soutien de Havemann, du critique Fritz Stein, voire de Richard Strauß lui-même n'y fait rien. En décembre 1934, Hindemith se met en disponibilité de son poste à la « Musikhochschule » et part en mission pour le gouvernement turc. Il déclare alors servir la culture allemande à l'étranger, salue en mars 1935 les « efforts intellectuels décadents de Schönberg » et prête serment à Hitler, le 17 janvier 1936. Il joue de plus en plus à l'étranger, mais le Ministère de la Propagande du « Reich » interdit l'exécution de ses œuvres, en réponse à la volonté d'Hitler d'une purification renforcée des arts. Hindemith démissionne de son poste berlinois et s'installe en Suisse, en septembre 1938, puis aux États-Unis, en 1940.

Il y écrira :

« En Allemagne, l'artiste se mesure également à l'aune de toutes les autres entreprises du “ Reich ”, qui semblent dictées exclusivement par la folie des grandeurs, le sadisme et le manque de matière première. Il me semble avoir été la souris qui danse stupidement devant la souris et finit par y entrer. Une fois ressortie, la porte s'est refermée. »

L'exposition « Entartete Musik » de Düsseldorf en 1938

(28)

Une atmosphère de grande répression musicale s'installe en Allemagne, en 1938, après des périodes ambivalentes face au modernisme musical. C'est la division musicale du Ministère de la Propagande qui applique des mesures strictes envers le répertoire contemporain, succédant au « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde », absorbé en 1937 par l'organisation « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF). Le 1er acte de cette politique est la réunion initiale de la « Reichsmusikprüfstelle », en décembre 1937, qui publie des listes de musiques considérées comme dangereuses pour la nation allemande (29), le jazz par exemple.

Un autre indice du changement de politique face au modernisme est l'organisation de l'exposition « Entartete Musik », qui s'ouvre en mai 1938, à Düsseldorf, en addition aux journées musicales du « Reich », les « Reichsmusiktage » de 1938 (30). L'idée est probablement liée à l'exposition « Entartete Kunst », qui s'est tenue à Munich, l'année précédente. Bien que la manifestation de Düsseldorf fait l'objet de moins de publicité au niveau national et international, elle demeure l'un des exemples les plus criants de la répression musicale durant la période nazie.

Le Ministère de la Propagande n'y joue qu'un rôle mineur, bien que l'exposition soit organisée pendant les « Reichsmusiktage » ; c'est Hans Severus Ziegler, dont la croisade contre le modernisme commence dès 1930, alors qu'il travaillait au Ministère de l'Éducation de Wilhelm Frick, en Thuringe, qui en est le principal instigateur. Ziegler siège, dès 1937, au « Reichskultursenat » de Goebbels, mais cela ne lui suffit pas : il décide de programmer sa propre propagande anti-moderniste, à l'écart des institutions officielles. Cela explique pourquoi aucun catalogue officiel publié n'accompagne l'exposition, « sorte d'affaire improvisée » (31). Pour le choix du matériel d'exposition, Ziegler s'est offert les services de Paul Sixt, chef d'orchestre, ainsi que ceux du critique Herbert Gerigk.

Les photographies et les portraits de compositeurs contemporains jugés dégénérés constituent l'élément principal de l'exposition. La sélection comprend des figures centrales comme Arnold Schönberg, Igor Stravinski, Paul Hindemith, Anton von Webern et Ernst Křenek, des « faiseurs de bruit » selon Goebbels, mais aussi des compositeurs d'Opérettes d'origine juive comme Oscar Straus et Leo Fall. Un slogan violent accompagne les œuvres, attaquant l'origine raciale et le caractère moderne de chaque compositeur. Par exemple, la légende au portrait de Stravinski par Jacques-Émile Blanche souligne le fait que les origines du compositeur sont suspicieuses :

« Wer hat das Märchen erfunden, daß Strawinsky aus russischen Adelgeschlecht stammt ? »

(Qui a propagé l'idée folle que Stravinski descendait de la noblesse russe ?)

D'autres exemples de « dégénérescence musicale » sont données à travers les œuvres théoriques comme « Harmonielehre » de Schönberg, « Unterweisung im Tonsatz » de Hindemith, ou « Studien zur Harmonie und Klangtechnik der neueren Musik » de Hermann Erpf ; ou, encore, des magazines comme « Melos » et « Anbruch », qui, selon Ziegler, promeuvent la cause de la « musique bolchévique avancée ». Au milieu de la salle, une grande affiche dénonce l'influence pernicieuse du jazz.

La curiosité du public est cependant attirée par les extraits de musique « dégénérée » proposés sur des disques gramophone. 6 cabines spéciales sont construites tout particulièrement pour l'exposition, et le public choisit, en

appuyant sur un bouton, d'écouter de la musique de Alban Berg, Paul Hindemith, Kurt Weill, Ernst Křrenek et d'autres.

Ziegler inaugure l'exposition avec un discours qu'il intitule « Abrechnung » (une vengeance, un règlement de comptes) . Le contenu de son discours a été publié dans un petit livret illustré de photographies provocantes ; la couverture représente un nègre jouant du saxophone avec une étoile de David sur sa manche. Ziegler utilise une citation du « Mein Kampf » d'Adolf Hitler pour justifier ce qu'il appelle : une croisade. Il offre une vision particulièrement colorée de la musique « dégénérée » , comme en témoigne cette définition devenue célèbre :

« L'exposition “ Entartete Musik ” présente l'image d'un véritable sabbat de sorcières et du bolchévisme culturel le plus frivole. C'est aussi le reflet du triomphe de la sous-humanité, de l'arrogante impudence juive et d'un complet abrutissement intellectuel. La musique “ dégénérée ” est ainsi, au fond, une musique non-allemande, pour laquelle la partie saine du peuple ne trouvera aucun organe de réception, aucune émotion et aucune réceptivité. » (32)

Alors qu'il concentre ses efforts principalement sur les produits musicaux de la République de Weimar, Ziegler souligne que ces forces « dégénérées » sont toujours en mouvement et représentent un véritable danger pour la vie musicale nationale, « même si elles sont en train de disparaître lentement » (33) . Il pense que l'exposition peut aider à clarifier les choses pour les générations futures, afin que « les musiciens créatifs d'Allemagne soient une nouvelle fois capables de respirer, de vivre et de travailler librement dans une atmosphère clarifiée » (34) .

Il essaie d'adjoindre à ses arguments raciaux des arguments plus musicaux : il croit en la beauté de l'harmonie diatonique et au bienfait de la mélodie simple, argument proche de celui que les Staliniens utiliseront pour condamner, quasi au même moment, la musique de Dimitri Chostakovitch. Mais bien que l'exposition attire beaucoup de public et que le livret de Ziegler soit publié, l'impact sur la vie musicale allemande est moindre. Une explication à cela peut être trouvée dans le rapport qu'entretient Ziegler lui-même avec les autorités musicales. En s'étant mis à dos Peter Raabe, en raison de son opposition au Festival de l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » en 1936, Ziegler ne peut pas compter sur l'appui de la « Reichsmusikkammer » . Raabe, alors président de l'institution, à la suite de Richard Strauß, se dissocie même totalement de l'exposition, et refuse de la visiter. De plus, comme l'exposition n'est pas organisée par le Ministère de la Propagande, la presse ne rend compte que peu du projet, se limitant à des rapports allusifs dans des journaux locaux. Mais la raison la plus importante est sans doute la date de sa tenue : en mai 1938, les intérêts nationaux portent moins sur la culture que sur la politique étrangère, suite à l' « Anschluß » et aux ambitions nazies sur la Tchécoslovaquie et la Pologne.

En tous cas, l'exposition « Entartete Musik » demeure une attaque explicite et organisée contre la musique moderniste, avec plus ou moins de résultats, mais elle exacerbe la répression contre les compositeurs contemporains, sur fond d'arguments raciaux plus que musicaux.

Musique et contrôle étatique

Les Ires organisations culturelles nazies

La mise en place du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (KfdK) a lieu le 23 février 1929, à Munich ; il s'agit d'une simple association, indépendante du NSDAP, comme l'a voulu son fondateur Alfred Rosenberg. Parmi les membres, on peut retenir l'architecte Paul Schultze-Naumburg, l'historien Adolf Bartels, Eva Chamberlain, Winifred Wagner, Alfred Heuß. S'inspirant du programme et des théories racistes de la « National-sozialistische Gesellschaft für deutsche Kultur » (NGDK), le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » lutte contre l'anéantissement du domaine culturel. Le rôle du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » est double : jusqu'à l'arrivée au pouvoir de Hitler, il est « l'instrument de lutte du Nazisme contre la République de Weimar dans le domaine culturel » (35) ; après 1933, et jusqu'en 1934, date de sa disparition, il participe à la « mise au pas » de la vie culturelle et encourage « à un art allemand conforme à la race » (36). L'extension du mouvement est rapide : de 25 à 240 groupes locaux, entre avril 1929 et janvier 1933 ; soit de 300 à 6000 membres ! Il dispose d'une presse, le « Mitteilungen des Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur », publié de 1929 à 1931, puis, le « Deutsche Kultur-Wacht » fondé par Hans Hinkel ; organe officiel de l'association, dès décembre 1932.

3 types d'intervention sont mises en place par le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » : des manifestations culturelles ; des conférences ; des interventions d'agit-prop contre la politique culturelle de la politique de Weimar. Dans une conférence en 1929, à l'Université de Munich, Alfred Heuß s'en prend ainsi à Ernst Křenek et Kurt Weill. Avec Heuß, rédacteur en chef du « Zeitschrift für Musik » (ZfM), le journal bascule sous l'égide du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » et propage ses idées : il participe ainsi à la campagne permanente contre le jazz. À partir de 1931 et la participation des Nazis au gouvernement de Thuringe, les interventions du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur », tant dans la presse que radiophoniques, deviennent très agressives. Les faiblesses de l'organisation se révèlent dans son indépendance face au NSDAP, bien que Goebbels l'ait reconnue, en 1932, comme organisation culturelle allemande et national-socialiste. Face à l'organisation implacable du Parti Nazi, elle se révèle faible et également en proie à des difficultés économiques et à des luttes intestines : elle doit se résoudre à accepter la primauté du Parti.

À la suite du jeu des alliances entre les Partis extrémistes et la Droite bourgeoise, Wilhelm Frick, membre du NSDAP, prend le contrôle de la Thuringe, comme Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Éducation populaire (1930-1931). Il appelle à son service 3 personnalités qui vont, dès lors, faire main basse sur la culture dans le « Land » : Hans Severus Ziegler, le chef du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » de Thuringe, nommé conseiller pour les théâtres, musées et établissements d'enseignement artistique ; Paul Schultze-Naumburg pour l'École d'Architecture ; et Hans F. K. Günther, pour l'anthropologie sociale à Iéna. Dès lors, le gouvernement prend des mesures radicales, parmi lesquelles l'« ordonnance contre la culture nègre », en avril 1930 (tout concert de jazz est interdit en Thuringe, les œuvres de Stravinski et Hindemith sont bannies). Entre 1929 et 1940, la part des pièces de théâtre et Opéras contemporains en Thuringe passe de 57 % à 14 %.

Bien que la présence des Nazis en Thuringe soit limitée dans le temps, les efforts de Frick sont largement remerciés dans la presse du Parti (37) ainsi que dans le « Zeitschrift für Musik », après que le journal soit passé sous le contrôle de l'éditeur Gustav Bosse et de Heuß. Accompagné de Fritz Stege, membre actif des « Deutschvölkische Freiheitsbewegung », organisation associée au NSDAP, le « Zeitschrift für Musik » devient rapidement au service du Parti, publiant des articles musicaux, mais aussi d'autres essais touchant à des thèmes politiques. En 1932, le « Zeitschrift für Musik » publie un article du « Deutschlands Erneuerung » où les Nazis sont décriés comme les seuls

capables d'atteindre « de si grandes aspirations politiques » (38) . Les Nazis soutiennent ouvertement le journal : dans la section musicale du « Praktische Kulturarbeit im Dritten Reich » , Ziegler cite le journal pour avoir toujours défendu la musique allemande et nationale (39) .

Une autre organisation très rapidement contrôlée par les Nazis est l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » (ADMV) , fondée par Franz Liszt, en 1861, et destinée à protéger et favoriser la cause de la musique allemande. Durant les années 1920 et 1930, l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » propose, à travers ses Festivals, tout l'éventail de la diversité musicale de la République de Weimar, mais en évitant déjà certains répertoires « problématiques » . Après l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir, l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » purge son conseil intérieur des juifs et des sympathisants de gauche. Sous la direction de Peter Raabe et Siegmund von Hausegger, 2 membres actifs du Parti nazi, l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » montre une loyauté presque sans faille au régime, et expose sa volonté de parfaire les objectifs de la nouvelle politique culturelle (40) . Le programme du Festival de Dortmund, en juin 1933, est ainsi très vite modifié : les compositions de Walter Braunfels et Anton von Webern sont supprimées et remplacées par celles de Max Trapp et Hermann Unger, 2 membres influents du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » . Dès cette période, l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » montre sa volonté de s'affilier à la politique culturelle du « Reich » . Le Festival de l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » de 1934, qui se tient à Wiesbaden, explicite bien cet attachement : on célèbre les compositeurs du passé, et un hommage spécial est rendu à 3 compositeurs allemands : Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner, et Max von Schillings. Le jeu de musique contemporaine programmée est presque totalement diffamée, comme en témoigne l'article de Friedrich Herzog dans « Die Musik » contre la cantate « Zeit zu Zeit » de Hermann Erdlen, l'accusant d'usage de « Sprechstimme » , « technique utilisée par le compositeur juif Max Brand dans son Opéra « Maschinist Hopkins » (41) . À cette époque, « Die Musik » devient le porte parole du « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde » de Rosenberg, destiné à succéder au « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » et à défier l'organisation de Goebbels. L'indépendance de l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » dans l'Allemagne nazie, alors que les autres organisations culturelles sont toutes coordonnées, suscite la méfiance des autres organisations.

La Ire offensive du « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde » contre l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » commence dans la seconde moitié de l'année 1935 : « Die Musik » critique vivement l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » pour son élitisme (42) . Gerigk va jusqu'à accuser l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » d'être infiltrée et contrôlée par les Juifs, citant la promotion par l'organisation du compositeur juif Ernt Toch, avant la période nazie. « Die Musik » attaque aussi l'influence moderniste qui se fait sentir, selon elle, dans l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » . Or, depuis 1935, l'organisation de Rosenberg montre avec succès des exemples de déviance par rapport à l'idéologie du Parti de la part de quelques artistes. Richard Strauß, par exemple, a été démis de ses fonctions à la « Reichsmusikkammer » (RMK) , pour avoir collaboré avec un Juif (Stefan Zweig) pour l'écriture de « Die sebwigsæue Frau » (la Femme silencieuse) ; Paul Hindemith a déjà quitté ses fonctions à Berlin. Le « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde » échoue donc dans sa volonté de voir disparaître l' « Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » , dont Peter Raabe reste le président. Ce dernier réussit à apaiser les tensions avec le « Nationalsozialistische Kulturgemeinde » et à appliquer la politique du Parti dans l'organisation. Mais s'annonce alors une phase de relative quiétude pour le répertoire moderniste : en avril 1936, Hindemith et Stravinski présentent leurs nouvelles œuvres à Baden-Baden, une « Arbeitskreis für Neue Musik » voit le jour à Francfort, faisant la promotion des compositions de Béla Bartók, Igor Stravinski, Serge Prokofiev, Albert Roussel et Bohuslav Martinů, qui avaient tous reçu

des critiques de la part du gouvernement nazi. Plusieurs explications peuvent être avancées : tout d'abord, les Jeux olympiques de 1936 à Berlin amènent une relâche de la censure pour éviter des critiques de l'étranger ; de plus, les Nazis ne voient plus d'un mauvais œil l'internationalisme, et Richard Strauß lui-même, en 1934, essaie d'organiser un Conseil permanent de coopération internationale entre les compositeurs. Cette organisation représente une alternative à l'« International Society for Contemporary Music », que l'Allemagne avait quittée en 1933. Ainsi, la scène allemande est plus ouverte aux compositeurs étrangers, et Alfred Rosenberg le prend comme une attaque. La controverse s'envenime au Festival de Weimar, en 1936, pour les 75 ans de l'« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » ; Raabe veut monter le « Doktor Johannes Faust » de Georg Reutter ; l'intendant du Théâtre, Ziegler, s'y oppose en raison du bolchévisme culturel du compositeur et de sa musique atonale. Cependant, l'Opéra est maintenu, et Ziegler remonte jusqu'à Gœbbels, lequel répond en demandant la suppression dans la programmation de tous les compositeurs bannis. Raabe campe sur ses positions, et renie les accusations de Ziegler. Les implications de ces tensions sont considérables : Gœbbels n'assiste pas au Festival, et décide de casser l'indépendance de l'« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein », situation clarifiée le 22 décembre 1936 lorsque Raabe déclare que l'« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » est placée sous le contrôle de la « Reichsmusikkammer ». L'« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein » survit jusqu'en juin 1937, avec les Festivals de Francfort et de Darmstadt, ensuite remplacés par les « Reichsmusiktage », Festivals musicaux nationaux dirigés par le Ministère de la Propagande. Ziegler sort renforcé des luttes, organisant en 1938 l'exposition « Entartete Musik » ; Raabe en sort extrêmement diminué.

La « Gleichschaltung » de la vie musicale et la lutte entre Rosenberg et Gœbbels

Lorsque les Nazis arrivent au pouvoir, en 1933, la question n'est pas tant de savoir quand et comment former un corps pour la politique musicale, mais plus de désigner quel politicien va avoir le droit d'exercer le contrôle sur cette politique. Les protagonistes majeurs dans cette lutte sont : Alfred Rosenberg, l'idéologue en chef du Parti, et Josef Gœbbels, fondateur du Service de Propagande du « Reich », en 1930. En janvier 1933, Rosenberg se sent le plus à même de prendre en main la politique culturelle, ayant fondé le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » et gagné le contrôle du journal « Die Musik ». Mais Hitler hésite à donner à Rosenberg un pouvoir d'État, Gœbbels ayant été promu au Ministère de l'Information du peuple et de la Propagande, assurant « la reconstruction nationale du pays de nos ancêtres » (43). Mais les ambitions de Gœbbels vont plus loin que la propagande, il souhaite diriger les affaires culturelles du pays, de la radio au théâtre, en passant par la presse culturelle.

Il est contré dans son projet par Rosenberg, mais aussi par d'autres membres du cabinet d'Hitler, le « Führer » n'ayant pas délimité les sphères de pouvoir précises de chacun de ses ministres. Hermann Göring, par exemple, veut diriger tous les théâtres du pays, fondant la « Preussischer Theaterausschuß ». Comme Ministre de Prusse, il demande à exercer son plein droit sur les maisons du « Preussisches Staatstheater », qui inclut le « Berliner Staatsoper », empiétant ainsi sur les fonctions de Gœbbels, tout juste nommé « Gauleiter » de Berlin.

Gœbbels doit également faire face à Bernhard Rust, Ministre de l'Éducation de Prusse, qui se dit spécialiste en musique et organise, en juin 1933, une commission de censure des œuvres jouées à Berlin, avec Max von Schillings, Georg Kulenkampff et Wilhelm Furtwängler. Robert Ley, le leader du « Deutsche Arbeitfront » (DAF) joue un rôle encore plus dangereux : le « Deutsche Arbeitfront » a réduit la puissance des syndicats et gagné le ralliement des travailleurs,

parmi lesquels nombre de musiciens. Naturellement, ces rivalités internes au Parti rendent plus difficile encore la mise en place d'une politique culturelle cohérente. De nombreux musiciens veulent apporter leur soutien au « Reich » et ainsi, achever la « Gleichschaltung » - la coordination de la vie musicale : Paul Græner, Max von Schillings ... Ce dernier est félicité par Hitler et autorisé à participer à la réorganisation de la vie musicale dans le pays (44) . Il obtient le poste de Président de l'Académie des Arts de Prusse, et doit purger l'assemblée des membres indésirables, licenciant au passage Arnold Schönberg et Franz Schreker. Il prend également le poste d'Intendant du « Städtische Oper » de Berlin, en succession à Carl Ebert, victime des purges. Il meurt en juillet 1933, Goebbels est débarrassé d'un rival.

D'autres veulent aussi participer activement à la « Gleichschaltung » : le critique Fritz Stege qui crée le « Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Musikkritiker » ; ou encore, le violoniste et chef d'orchestre Gustav Havemann, membre de la section berlinoise du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » . Pendant l'été 1932, il rédige un plan d'organisation d'une Chambre de la Musique, avec Friedrich Mahling, Max Trapp et Paul Græner. Mais ses plans échouent, malgré des débuts de négociations. Le 10 mai 1933, il fonde le « Reichskartell der deutschen Musikerschaft » . Le 4 juillet, l'organisation propose la mise en place de cartes nécessaires pour l'accès à des fonctions musicales, et obtenues après contrôle racial et politique. Ce projet reçoit l'approbation du Parti, mais Havemann doit faire face au « Deutsche Arbeitfront » de Robert Ley, qui inclut la plus grande union professionnelle de musiciens allemands, la « Deutsche Musikerverband » , avec ses 20,000 membres.

Goebbels prépare aussi ses plans : il se rapproche du pouvoir lorsque Hitler décrète que le Ministre de la Propagande a le pouvoir de s'occuper de « toutes les sphères qui influencent l'esprit, incluant un pouvoir absolu sur les affaires culturelles » (45) . Goebbels demande à Hitler d'accepter son projet de « Reichskulturkammer » (RKK) , qui serait apte à superviser toutes les activités intellectuelles et culturelles du pays. Parallèlement, la lutte entre Rosenberg et Goebbels s'intensifie : les 2 hommes s'opposent sur le pouvoir, mais aussi au niveau de la politique culturelle. Rosenberg est très réactionnaire, totalement opposé au modernisme ; Goebbels, au contraire, paraît moins attaché à des principes idéologiques et privilégie l'action.

À cette date, Hitler a peu confiance en Rosenberg pour diriger la politique artistique du pays.

Goebbels écrit ainsi dans son journal, le 19 juillet 1933 :

« Hitler parle aigrement contre Rosenberg, parce qu'il réussit tout et n'importe quoi (" alles und nichts ") » (46)

Rosenberg, dans le même temps, reprend à son compte l'organisation de la « Reichskulturkammer » en l'appliquant à son « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » , assignant à chaque personnalité la responsabilité d'un secteur, comme l'Opéra, la musique dans les écoles, la musique religieuse, etc. Goebbels recherche le soutien d'autres hommes influents dans sa lutte contre Rosenberg, alors que Hitler, dans son discours sur la culture au Congrès de Nuremberg, le 1er septembre 1933, prône le compromis et le consensus. C'est finalement le 22 septembre qu'il se prononce pour Goebbels, et la « Reichskulturkammer » , incluant la « Reichsmusikkammer » , est créée et inaugurée le 15 novembre à Berlin.

Entre temps, Goebbels s'est réconcilié avec Hermann Göring, qui a dissout la « Preussischer Theaterausschuß » mais garde le contrôle sur le « Berliner Staatsoper ». Goebbels s'allie avec le « Deutsche Arbeitfront » de Ley, attachant ses membres à la « Reichsmusikkammer ». La mise en place de la « Reichsmusikkammer » annonce la fin du « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » et de l'« Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein », à plus ou moins long terme.

Goebbels, la « Reichsmusikkammer » et le Ministère de la Propagande (1934-1939)

La vie musicale allemande semble stabilisée en 1934 : ayant éliminé Rosenberg, et allié avec Göring et Ley, Goebbels peut installer son autorité sur le monde musical. La « Reichsmusikkammer », quelquefois en conflit avec le Ministère de la Propagande pour des attributions de fonctions, n'en reste pas moins sous la responsabilité de Goebbels. Ce n'est qu'en 1935 que le Ministère de la Propagande prend le dessus sur la « Reichsmusikkammer ». Mais pour comprendre ce résultat, il est nécessaire d'étudier la structure et les fonctions de la « Reichsmusikkammer », ainsi que les attitudes de ses membres.

Comme l'indique la loi du 1er novembre 1933, la « Reichsmusikkammer » est l'une des 7 Chambres de la « Reichskulturkammer », organisation centrale du « Reich » qui embrasse toutes les activités artistiques et créatrices du « Reich », avec Goebbels pour président. Dans sa conception originale, comme la « Reichskulturkammer », la « Reichsmusikkammer » est aussi divisée en 4 niveaux (47) :

Un Comité exécutif, avec Président, Vice-Président, Directeur Économique et Conseil intérieur.

Une organisation administrative interne, avec des départements en charge de la publicité, de la propagande culturelle, du contrôle financier et législatif.

7 départements comprenant les différentes professions musicales des organisations locales dans les 31 districts, sous le contrôle du « Landeskulturwalter » .

La structure paraît très ordonnée, et cela correspond au souhait de restaurer l'ordre dont parle Goebbels à la cérémonie d'ouverture de la « Reichskulturkammer », en novembre 1933. Il essaie de définir les fonctions des différentes Chambres : en soulignant le fait que le régime nazi n'a pas l'intention de « restreindre le développement culturel », il est cependant « nécessaire de conjuguer tous les champs de création sous l'auspice du “ Reich ” et d'obéir à sa volonté. Lorsque cela sera achevé, seulement, les artistes allemands se sentiront protégés et auront le sentiment heureux d'être aussi indispensables à la nation que ceux qui fournissent au peuple les moyens de subsistance » (48) . Selon Heinz Ihert, la « Reichsmusikkammer » pourrait « améliorer la qualité de la musique allemande », en « luttant contre le chômage et en assurant que 50,000 musiciens d'orchestre, professeurs, et musiciens d'église perçoivent un salaire décent » (49) .

Peter Raabe, futur président de la « Reichsmusikkammer », souligne ces propos dans un discours en 1934 :

« La “ Reichsmusikkammer ” a été formée pour protéger la musique ; ainsi, la “ Reichsmusikkammer ” sera une sorte d’agence par laquelle tous les désirs du musicien peuvent être exaucés, grâce à une autorité officielle qui créera des choses merveilleuses jamais encore réalisées. » (50)

Mais, cependant, en examinant la loi du 1er novembre 1933, on s’aperçoit que les fonctions de la Chambre sont aussi restrictives et prohibitives. L’appartenance à la Chambre est limitée à des musiciens racialement et politiquement « sûrs » . Par là-même, tout musicien dont l’adhésion se voit refusée ne peut travailler en Allemagne (51) .

La « Reichsmusikkammer » commence son travail le 28 décembre 1933, publiant en 5 ans 43 articles, dans le « Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer » , articles concernant le plus souvent l’adhésion d’organisations musicales à la Chambre. D’autres ordonnances visent à limiter la liberté des musiciens, soumettant à examen le droit de voyager à l’étranger (7 mai 1934) , demandant à ce que les programmes de concerts soient présentés à l’avance pour approbation (16 juillet 1934) , interdisant l’usage de pseudonymes aux consonances étrangères (29 septembre 1934) , ou obligeant à utiliser un piano allemand en concert (2 juillet 1934) .

En 1934, la « Reichsmusikkammer » paraît toute puissante dans le domaine musical : la publicité, les ordonnances abondent, et les personnalités comme Richard Strauß et Wilhelm Furtwängler, respectivement nommés Président et Vice-président, ont une influence énorme. Strauß pense que son poste peut lui permettre d’influencer la vie musicale dans un sens positif. Lors de l’adresse inaugurale de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , le 15 novembre 1933, il adresse à Hitler et Goebbels « les remerciements les plus vifs de l’ensemble de la profession musicale allemande » pour renouer le lien entre le peuple et la musique (52) . Il réaffirme sa loyauté au régime en « ouvrant la voie à la créativité saine » et en s’assurant que « la maladie et le mal disparaîtront » (53) . Mais Strauß n’est pas entièrement libre de son pouvoir : il est lui-même interdit de concert à Salzbourg, selon l’ordonnance de mai 1934 de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , et sa collaboration avec Stefan Zweig pour le libretto de « Die schweigsæue Frau » (la Femme silencieuse) est condamnée ; une lettre qu’il envoie à son ami est interceptée par la « Gestapo » , donnée à Hitler et Strauß, est contraint à la démission d’autres membres du conseil exécutif sont aussi éliminés : Furtwängler et Havemann, qui soutiennent Hindemith, sont poussés à la démission, comme Friedrich Mahling. Peter Raabe remplace Strauß, et Paul Græner remplace Furtwängler. Raabe se montre plus présent et actif dans la « Reichsmusikkammer » . En 1936, il étend l’organisation, créant de nouveaux départements pour la propagande extérieure et les archives. Parallèlement, la « Reichsmusikkammer » est renforcée au niveau local avec des représentants musicaux dans les villes, les « Musikbeauftragter » . Raabe prend des mesures efficaces contre le chômage des musiciens, fait évoluer les conditions de travail des musiciens d’orchestre (6 heures par jour en plus d’un jour de congé) , des musiciens de radio, et dispense les musiciens sans emploi du travail forcé.

Mais Goebbels devient méfiant, et renforce alors le pouvoir du Ministère de la Propagande sur la vie musicale ; ainsi, le « Reichskulturwalter » Hans Hinkel doit rendre compte des activités de la « Reichskulturkammer » à Goebbels, et c’est lui, et non Raabe, qui élabore, le 11 septembre 1935, la première liste de compositeurs bannis par le « Reich » . Goebbels crée une division musicale dans le Ministère de la Propagande, à la tête de laquelle il place Heinz Drewes, un jeune chef d’orchestre. Le conflit entre le Ministère de la Propagande et la « Reichsmusikkammer » est ouvert : désormais, le Ministère fixe la politique, et la « Reichsmusikkammer » applique les directives. Parmi les actions de

Drewes au Ministère de la Propagande, il faut citer l'instauration de la « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » (54) destinée à censurer toutes les publications nouvelles et les enregistrements contraires à l'esprit allemand. Dans le même temps, Goebbels demande à Raabe de renforcer la politique de purification des musiciens.

Ceci n'est pas sans poser de problèmes : les non-aryens sont exclus, mais la question est délicate pour les musiciens ayant une moitié ou un quart de sang juif. La décision revient alors au président de la « Reichsmusikkammer », ou alors, le musicien peut s'en retourner au Parti nazi. Le processus est long, bureaucratique, et engendre les rivalités. D'autres problèmes existent : il est ainsi obligatoire pour les employés du monde de l'Opéra d'être membre à la fois de la « Reichstheaterkammer » et de la « Reichsmusikkammer » ; les critiques doivent appartenir à la « Reichspressekammer » et à la « Reichsmusikkammer ». Mais les communications sont rares et laborieuses entre les Chambres, et beaucoup de problèmes émergent, comme par exemple le cas de Richard Mohaupt, banni de la « Reichsmusikkammer » pour son instabilité politique, mais membre de la « Reichstheaterkammer » comme chef de ballet. L'erreur est rectifiée en 1938 et le compositeur est banni.

Bien que Goebbels ait assuré la primauté du Ministère de la Propagande sur la « Reichsmusikkammer », en 1937, il n'a pas réussi à réduire les conflits entre Raabe et Drewes. Le problème est l'ambition de Drewes d'interférer dans l'application de la politique musicale, rôle que Goebbels a assigné en entier à Raabe et la « Reichsmusikkammer ». En 1938, une réforme administrative est appliquée à la « Reichsmusikkammer » : les compositeurs et solistes sont regroupés en une Chambre, et la Chambre chargée de la musique religieuse disparaît.

Pendant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale : aryanisation renforcée, extension aux territoires annexés et enjeux politiques

L'entrée en Guerre ne produit pas de changements immédiats dans l'organisation bicamérale du contrôle étatique sur la musique. En 1939, les pouvoirs du Ministère de la Propagande sont enracinés, et le conflit entre Peter Raabe et Heinz Drewes n'est plus à l'ordre du jour. En effet, l'activité du Ministère est constituée en majorité par la politique de censure. Avant la Guerre, la « Reichsmusikprüfstelle » de Drewes n'a établi qu'une seule liste de musique déclarée inacceptable dans le « Reich ». Il en fait publier 3 en plus : le 15 avril 1940, le 15 mai 1941 et le 15 juillet 1942.

La loi sur la « Reichskulturkammer » est ensuite étendue à l'Autriche le 1er juillet 1938, aux Sudètes, le 1er novembre de la même année, puis, à l'ensemble du protectorat de Bohême en Moravie, le 15 février 1941, et, enfin, à l'Alsace-Moselle, les 15 février et 15 mai 1943. L'extension de la « Reichskulturkammer » en Autriche amène la dissolution de la « Österreichischer Komponisten » dirigée par des personnalités comme Max Brand, Hans Gál, Egon Wellesz et fervente défenseuse de la musique de Schönberg. Elle est remplacée par le « Bund der deutschen Komponisten in Österreich », dirigé par Friedrich Bayer, critique du « Völkischer Beobachter ».

Le Ministère prend aussi des mesures prohibitives en relation avec le conflit présent : des décrets sont instaurés interdisant la publication et l'exécution de musique de compositeurs juifs et de celle composée par des musiciens de pays ennemis. Mais la perception de la « musique de l'ennemi » est très variable selon les alliances politiques. Ainsi, le pacte germano-soviétique de 1939 permet à la musique de compositeurs soviétiques d'être jouée en Allemagne, alors qu'elle avait été interdite en 1933. Mais, en 1941, lorsque l'Allemagne envahit l'URSS, l'ordonnance est révoquée. La

musique française, quant à elle, subit un sort inverse d'abord bannie à l'exception notable de « Carmen » de Georges Bizet, elle est rétablie en 1943, pour mettre en avant le rôle de la France alliée au côté de l'Allemagne contre l'Angleterre et les États-Unis.

La période de Guerre amène aussi la création de la « Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitung », le 1er mai 1940, sous la direction de Drewes, et du musicologue Hans Joachim Moser. Cet organe est destiné, comme on l'a déjà vu, à l'aryanisation du répertoire, ainsi qu'au ré-arrangement d'Opéras oubliés ou rejetés du XVIIIe et du XIXe siècle, en les accordant aux volontés du régime : Drewes et Moser réhabilitent « Jessonda » de Louis Spohr, « Euryanthe » de Carl Maria von Weber. Mais seuls « Iphigénie en Tauride » de Christoph Willibald Gluck, arrangés en allemand par Joseph Müller-Blattau, et 2 œuvres inconnues d'Otto Nicolai sont présentées en 1942. Parallèlement, l'aryanisation du répertoire se poursuit, avec des œuvres plus ou moins connues, des libretti de Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart à ceux de Oskar Nebdal, dont le « Polenblut » est transféré de Varsovie aux Sudètes, pour coller à l'annexion.

Mais le Ministère de la Propagande doit aussi faire face au problème du contrôle de la musique dans les territoires occupés. Josef Goebbels en a une vision très précise. Il dit ainsi à Drewes, concernant la vie musicale à Prague, que les « Allemands doivent être supérieurs aux Tchèques en tous points de vue, et ne doivent en aucun cas travailler avec des adversaires qui n'en auront jamais la carrure. Ainsi, nous devons instaurer à Prague un grand Orchestre allemand » (55) . Drewes installe ainsi un Orchestre symphonique allemand, mais ailleurs, dans les régions occupées, la situation n'est pas toujours aussi simple.

Dans le territoire allemand du « Reich », l'effort de Goebbels consacré sur la Guerre l'éloigne des activités dans les provinces. Ainsi, des rivalités se développent entre le Ministère et les régions. La nomination de Baldur von Schirach, directeur de la « Hitlerjugend » au poste de « Gauleiter » de Vienne, en 1939, en est un exemple. Schirach pense pouvoir passer outre la direction nazie sur les éléments concernant la musique, lui qui est le compositeur du « Horst Wessel Lied » . Par exemple, alors que Goebbels perd patience face au manque de coopération de Richard Strauss avec le régime, Schirach lui accorde sa protection personnelle. Le Ministère s'oppose aussi à lui quand il veut organiser un Festival de musique contemporaine à Vienne, pendant l'été 1941, programmant des compositeurs bannis par Berlin.

En lisant les journaux de Goebbels, entre 1939 et 1941, on s'aperçoit que des tensions se créent entre le Ministère de la Propagande et Drewes, lequel apparaît, selon le Ministre de la Propagande, réticent à « comprendre la musique comme instrument pour les masses » (56) et à dépenser plus pour la musique populaire (Goebbels considère la musique populaire comme d'une importance capitale dans l'effort de guerre) . Drewes se plie finalement aux exigences de Goebbels et conserve son poste.

Pendant la Guerre, l'influence de Peter Raabe sur la vie musicale commence à diminuer. La « Reichsmusikkammer » publie toujours tous les décrets du Ministère de la Propagande, mais n'y joue plus aucun rôle de décision et n'a plus aucun avis à donner. En avril 1940, Goebbels pense même remplacer Raabe par Furtwängler (57) , mais l'idée n'aboutit jamais. Un an plus tard, Raabe accepte, comme Drewes, de participer à l'effort de musique populaire, en échange de fonds pour financer le Musée Liszt de Weimar. Durant la Guerre, Goebbels ne manque pas de souligner le chaos qui règne dans l'organisation de la « Reichskulturkammer » , et propose une ré-organisation totale, avec

indépendance absolue par rapport au Ministère. Hans Hinkel est encore une fois l'instigateur de ces réformes.

L'examen de l'État et des organisations culturelles nazies, en 1943, montre que ni Goebbels, ni le Parti n'ont réussi à créer un contrôle absolu sur la vie musicale allemande. Le département en charge de la musique au sein du Ministère de la Propagande s'est considérablement développé, avec 7 départements reliés à la musique et au théâtre, à la fois pour le « Reich » et les territoires occupés. Les réformes de Hinkel pour la « Reichsmusikkammer » n'apportent aucun changement majeur dans le fonctionnement de l'institution, qui reste archaïque et bureaucratique. Au niveau du NSDAP, Rosenberg continue de jouer un rôle majeur. À la fin de la Guerre, son département musical est en phase de détrôner celui de Goebbels, tant il est en avance dans l'aryanisation du répertoire et dans la lutte contre le jazz. Cette multitude d'organisations et d'acteurs démontre, en quelque sorte, « les inconstances et les contradictions politiques qui caractérisent la vie musicale sous le 3e " Reich " » (58) .

Hitler et Wagner : Hitler et son idéologie de l'art

(59)

Beaucoup a été dit et écrit sur les liens entre Adolf Hitler et la musique, notamment celle de Anton Bruckner ou plus encore, celle de Richard Wagner. L'instrumentalisation de la musique de Wagner par les Nazis tient pour beaucoup sur le culte que Hitler vouait au compositeur, et sur le rapprochement entre Bayreuth et le futur Chancelier, dès les années 1920. « En recevant Hitler à la villa Wahnfried, le 1er octobre 1923, le clan Wagner pense avoir trouvé en ce dernier le rédempteur de l'Allemagne » (60) . À Bayreuth, on s'intéresse dès 1919 à l'agitateur nationaliste par l'intermédiaire de 2 membres de son entourage, Josef Stolzing-Czerny et Michæl Georg Conrad. Le chef spirituel du clan Wagner, à cette époque, est l'écrivain raciste Houston Stewart Chamberlain, époux d'Eva Wagner, fille de Cosima et Richard Wagner : il prône la séparation absolue entre Aryens et Juifs, et ses théories sur la pureté du sang et la sélection des plus forts sont explicitées dans « Die Grundlagen des 19. Jahrhunderts », publié en 1899. Ce livre influence beaucoup Hitler, qui le découvre lors de son séjour à Vienne.

Hitler suscite l'enthousiasme dans la famille Wagner, jusqu'à en devenir un intime (61) . Quelques semaines après son accueil à Wahnfried, il est interné pour le « " Putsch " de la Brasserie » manqué de Munich. Winifred fait alors diffuser une pétition de Chamberlain pour Hitler, signée par plus de 1,000 sympathisants, au rang desquels le couple Chamberlain, Siegfried et Winifred Wagner, et Hans von Wolzogen.

Siegfried Wagner écrit ainsi lui-même :

« Dieu soit loué qu'il y ait encore des Allemands. Hitler est un homme superbe. Il doit aller jusqu'au bout ! » (62)

La pétition de 1924 reçoit plus de 10,000 signatures, dont celle d'un habitué de la villa Wahnfried, Ziegler, futur « Gauleiter » adjoint de Thuringe, fondateur de l'hebdomadaire nazi « Der Völkische » et organisateur de l'exposition « Entartete Musik » de 1938. L'engagement en faveur d'Hitler des « Bayreuther Blätter », le journal du cercle de Bayreuth, est manifeste dès 1924.

Dans un numéro s'ouvre par une citation de Hitler :

« Notre combat concerne la substance sacrée. » ...

Chamberlain met en parallèle Hitler et Wagner, tous 2 « révolutionnaires », et il entraîne avec lui tout le cercle de Bayreuth, conservateur, à croire dans ce « rédempteur de l'Allemagne ». Dès lors, les « Bayreuther Blätter » s'emploient à rapprocher les pensées des 2 hommes.

Hans von Wolzogen approuve le « Führer » en 1930 et compare son rôle à celui de Wagner dans le domaine de l'art :

« L'authentique expérience de Bayreuth, c'est la masse humaine qui incarne l'idéalisme en prêtant serment sur la " pensée " du Maître Wagner. Voilà ce que le Maître a fait de la masse. La masse a de nouveau trouvé son Maître. Comment une masse a-t-elle pu devenir aussi émouvante et émue, si ce n'est avec le " Führer ". » (63)

Karl Grunsky ajoute, en 1933 :

« Que Hitler ait une relation intérieure et certaine avec l'art se manifeste par l'importance que Wagner a pour lui. La vie des 2 grands hommes trahit de nombreux points communs. » (64)

Le Festival de Bayreuth de 1933, marquant le Cinquantième de la mort de Wagner, s'ouvre sur l'entrée triomphale de Hitler dans le « Festspielhaus », symbole du rapprochement entre le « Führer » et celui qu'il considérait comme son seul précurseur, Wagner. Josef Goebbels et Alfred Rosenberg deviennent peu à peu, eux aussi, des familiers de Bayreuth, et la musique de Wagner, rattachée pour longtemps dans les esprits à la culture nazie, souffrira d'un discrédit certain après-guerre.

Dès « Mein Kampf », Hitler a une vision claire du rôle de l'État nazi dans le domaine de la culture, en affirmant que son rôle est d'« empêcher le peuple d'être poussé dans les bras de la folie spirituelle » ; il prône ainsi l'épuration de la culture allemande et la soumission de la création artistique aux normes édictées par le nouveau pouvoir et déterminées par les principes de « l'hygiène raciale ». L'art est, en effet, pour Hitler la forme supérieure d'expression d'une race. Selon lui, la race aryenne est « créatrice de culture », et l'art ne peut donc être créé que par elle. Pour prouver la supériorité de la race aryenne, il tente une définition de la beauté, résultante de l'efficacité (« Zweckmäßigkeit ») de l'œuvre d'art. À cette conception de l'idéal de la beauté, il oppose le « faux-sentiment de beauté » de l'art moderne, de celui de la République de Weimar. Il ajoute la dimension du génie, qui pressent le principe de finalité dans la nature et de beauté dans l'art, avec la pré-éminence d'une personnalité géniale, équivalent artistique du « Führerprinzip » politique. Par ailleurs, c'est la pureté raciale qui détermine chez l'artiste ou chez un peuple la capacité à produire un art harmonieux. Le métissage racial est synonyme de dégénérescence artistique ; les Juifs sont toujours le bouc-émissaire. « Ce furent et ce sont toujours les Juifs qui ont amené les nègres sur le Rhin, dans le but de détruire par un inévitable abâtardissement la race blanche et d'abattre sa grandeur culturelle et

politique pour la dominer. » (65)

Rosenberg le théorique, Gœbbels le pragmatique.

En mars 1933, Josef Gœbbels est nommé Ministre de l'Information du peuple et de la Propagande ; en janvier 1934, Alfred Rosenberg est Chargé d'affaires du « Führer » pour la supervision de l'ensemble de la formation intellectuelle et idéologique du NSDAP (« Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP ») . Ils incarnent à eux 2, au-delà de leurs luttes intestines, l'ensemble de la politique culturelle nazie. Rivalité d'hommes, nourrie par des volontés d'ambition personnelle, mais aussi rivalité d'action, l'un choisissant le cadre du Parti avec le « Promi », le Ministère de la Propagande ; l'autre, l'indépendance avec des organisations comme le « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » . Mais les 2 hommes sont aussi très idéologiquement opposés, en matière de culture, et leurs doctrines se sont fondées dès les années 1920 ; alors, sans visée politique.

Rosenberg développe très tôt une esthétique raciale fondatrice d'un idéal de beauté. Il pense que les valeurs héroïques germaniques sont exprimées dans l'idéal de beauté aryen. Selon lui, après l'architecture Gothique, après Rembrandt ou après Bach et Wagner, la culture allemande a régressé. Les tentations modernes sont des agressions contre l'idéal de beauté aryen et autant de dangers qui risquent de provoquer « l'anéantissement de tous les idéaux artistiques de la nation allemande » (66) .

Dans « le Mythe du XXe siècle » , il exprime pleinement son idéologie raciste :

« Une puanteur de cadavre s'échappe de Paris, Vienne, Moscou, et Berlin. Le fécondateur juif s'accouple avec les déchets de tous les peuples. Les bâtards sont les héros de l'époque, les revues de putes et de danse nue mises en scène par des nègres, la forme d'art de la démocratie de novembre. C'est la fin, la peste de l'âme est là. » (67)

Ainsi, en remède, il exige une « hygiène raciale » permettant l'amélioration de la race et exige la discrimination raciale contre les Juifs. La pensée culturelle de Rosenberg s'organise donc essentiellement sur la théorie du déclin racial et il développe une attitude très critique face aux créateurs de son époque ; il est aussi un des principaux acteurs de la lutte contre le modernisme.

La théorie de l'art pour le peuple de Josef Gœbbels s'est développée bien avant sa prise de fonctions comme chef de la propagande au sein du NSDAP. C'est après ses études de lettres qu'il débute une carrière d'auteur de théâtre et de romans ; son seul ouvrage, « Michæl » , développe déjà quelques unes de ses conceptions sur l'art, et l'œuvre est empreinte d'expressionnisme. C'est lui qui ordonne la « Nuit de Cristal » (1938) et la « Solution finale » (1942) , mais son antisémitisme est différent de celui de Hitler et de Rosenberg, comme le remarque Amaury du Closel (68) . Dans sa jeunesse, il lit Heinrich Heine, écoute Gustav Mahler, et n'a aucun sentiment antisémite, et lorsqu'il rejoint le NSDAP, c'est plus par conception héroïque et socialiste que par attachement national-socialiste. Il est cependant fasciné par la personne du « Führer » , celui qu'il appelle dans son « Journal Politique » , le 1er janvier 1925 :

« Adolf Hitler, guide et héros, tambour de la renaissance, de la foi et de la ferveur allemandes. »

Son antisémitisme est lié à sa volonté de faire carrière, et donc, de plaire à Hitler. La publication de « Michæl » avec des citations antisémites, en 1929, relève d'un ajout postérieur à l'adhésion de Gœbbels au NSDAP :

« Le Juif est un abcès sur le corps de nos malades. Il n'est pas du tout rusé. Il n'est que raffiné, roublard, retors, futé, et sans scrupules. »

Mais Gœbbels ne présente ni l'antisémitisme aux arguments raciaux et génétiques de Rosenberg, ni la haine zélée du Juif des membres du Parti : il se contente de suivre le mouvement, en quelque sorte. Et sa situation particulière est remarquée dans un de ses articles intitulé « Die Radikalisierung des Sozialismus » , publié dans le « Nationalsozialistische Briefe » du 15 décembre 1925 :

« L'antisémitisme est le point de départ de notre prise de conscience, mais il n'est pas tout. »

Mais Gœbbels saura utiliser la politique antisémite et ordonner l'exécution de solutions d'extermination du peuple juif, dans les années 1940, à priori, dans un but pragmatique d'efficacité au sein du régime.

Gœbbels est également très ouvert, notamment au début des années 1920, au modernisme, ne serait-ce que par tactique : il cherche à s'entourer des meilleurs artistes du moment, et peu importe à quel courant ils sont rattachés. Il tente ainsi de provoquer le retour de Hermann Scherchen, grâce à Wilhelm Furtwängler. Ce n'est pas lui qui expulse les Juifs des Opéras de Berlin, mais Hermann Göring ; c'est Bernhard Rust qui renvoie Arnold Schönberg et Franz Schreker. Lui, montre une certaine tolérance face au modernisme. Jusqu'en 1936, il tolère même à Berlin des expositions d'art moderne, soutenant le maintien d'œuvres d'Edvard Munch, Lyonel Feininger, Emil Nolde et Franz Marc, décriées par les Nazis, au Palais du « Konzprin » . Mais, face à la volonté d'Hitler de contrer tout modernisme, Gœbbels renonce et suit la ligne droite du Parti.

Gœbbels tient à l'idée d'un art au service de la propagande, en marche vers l'unité nationale et, afin de voguer vers cette unité, il s'engage dans la pensée culturelle admise et l'utilise à la fois comme nourriture et enjeu de sa propagande.

Être chef d'orchestre en Allemagne nazie : l'exemple de Herbert von Karajan et Wilhelm Furtwängler

Rivalités orchestrales

Herbert von Karajan et Wilhelm Furtwängler, peut-être les 2 personnalités musicales les plus représentatives du XXe siècle en Allemagne, ont toujours été mis en opposition, en concurrence, voire en combat. Et ce n'est pas un hasard si l'ouvrage d'un ancien timbalier du « Berliner Philharmoniker » , Werner Thärichen, rappelle le nom des 2 directeurs successifs de l'Orchestre : « Furtwängler ou Karajan » .

Dans sa préface à l'essai, Rémy Louis conclut :

« Furtwängler ou Karajan ? Mieux vaut dire ... Furtwängler “ et ” Karajan. Chacun a laissé derrière lui une œuvre, mieux encore : un monde. À ce degré de réalisation, et quels que soient les critères esthétiques ou politiques que l'on se fixe, il est sans doute désormais inutile de choisir. » (69)

Mais il n'en a pas toujours été ainsi. Dans l'affrontement entre Karajan et Furtwängler, qui constitue l'un des épisodes les plus singuliers de l'histoire de l'interprétation musicale européenne du XXe siècle, la situation politique de l'Allemagne joue un rôle plus qu'important.

Herbert von Karajan est né le dimanche 5 avril 1908, à Salzbourg, dans une dynastie aristocratique de médecins et d'universitaires autrichiens d'ascendance grecque (les « Karajanides ») . Il commence très tôt le piano, avec son frère Wolfgang, et, à 4 ans, au « Landestheater » de Salzbourg, assiste à une représentation des « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » de Richard Wagner ; de retour à la maison, le tout jeune garçon, qui s'appelle encore Heribert, construit des répliques en carton des personnages et il est capable de mimer toute la mise en scène.

Il entre très vite au « Mozarteum » , obtient son baccalauréat en 1926, et s'inscrit à la fois à l'École Technique Supérieure de Vienne et au Conservatoire National, où il a pour professeur Franz Schalk en direction d'orchestre. Il dirige son 1er orchestre en 1928, puis loue l'Orchestre du « Mozarteum » pour sa 1re direction en public, avec la 5e Symphonie de Tchaïkovski, le Concerto pour piano n° 23 en la majeur (KV 488) de Mozart, et le « Don Juan » de Richard Strauß.

Il est remarqué par le Directeur du Théâtre d'Ulm, et en devient son « Kappelmeister » ; à cette occasion, il donnera son premier Opéra, « le Nozze di Figaro » . En 1934, il est engagé comme chef d'orchestre permanent à Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) , poste qu'il conservera jusqu'en 1942, et il dirige la même année le Philharmonique de Vienne. En 1935, il est nommé « Generalmusikdirektor » à Aachen, le plus jeune en fonction à ce poste : il n'a que 27 ans !

Il fait des débuts triomphants à Berlin, en 1938, à tel point que Robert Oboussier, fervent admirateur de Furtwängler, écrit :

« Ce musicien qui n'a pas encore 30 ans est destiné aux plus grandes choses. » (70)

Herbert von Karajan est nouveau dans la capitale allemande, et Furtwängler ne voit pas d'un très bon œil son arrivée dans la sphère berlinoise : il le considère comme « une nouvelle version autrichienne de Toscanini » (71) ; et quand on sait que Furtwängler s'était montré très irrité par le succès de Toscanini en Allemagne, en 1929-1930, se profile déjà à l'horizon une jalousie monstre envers celui qu'il appellera toute sa vie « Herr von K. » , refusant de prononcer son nom. En 1938, Karajan représente la synthèse entre germanité et italianité, le modèle du chef d'orchestre de l'avenir, alors que Furtwängler symbolise plus le sentiment de défense de la germanité inconditionnelle.

Mais alors que naît le « Wunder Karajan » (expression d'Edwin van der Nüll) , Furtwängler se trouve en situation délicate face aux autorités du « Reich » : sa lettre ouverte de 1934 et sa prise de position pour Paul Hindemith le

poussent à la démission de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , en décembre. Mais il veut rester en Allemagne, à tout prix, car il pense être « une conscience musicale dont la présence est nécessaire aux Allemands » (72) . Herbert von Karajan adhère au Parti nazi dès 1933, par 2 fois, et accepte de jouer pour le régime, lors des fêtes du NSDAP par exemple.

L'opposition entre les 2 chefs est croissante, et le poste de « Gastdirigent » confié à Karajan pour le « Deutsche Oper » de Berlin, avec « Tristan und Isolde » , rend Furtwängler furieux. Ils deviennent en quelque sorte les pions d'un jeu de pouvoir entre Goebbels, le « Reichsmarschall » Hermann Göring, et Heinz Tietjen (directeur de l'Opéra « Unter den Linden » , Directeur artistique du Festival de Bayreuth, et Indentant des Théâtres de Prusse) : Karajan, protégé de Göring et Tietjen, va favoriser le déclin de Furtwängler, soutenu occasionnellement par Goebbels, puis, il deviendra le grand Mæstro de la guerre en Allemagne, évinçant son rival des scènes pour une décennie.

Le Docteur Oliver Rathkolb, de l'Institut d'Histoire contemporaine de l'Université de Vienne, résume assez bien la situation :

« On n'a toujours pas bien établi à quel point Karajan a servi à éliminer ou, tout au moins, à neutraliser l'assise artistique de Furtwängler, devenu encombrant politiquement. Karajan servit de contrepoids. » (73)

Karajan lui-même explique à Roger Vaughan (74) que c'est Tietjen qui organise, en grande partie, la rivalité entre lui et Furtwängler. Tietjen appelle Karajan à son service dès septembre 1938, à Berlin, pour se venger de Furtwängler qui l'a quitté, quelques temps plus tôt, en raison de « l'affaire Hindemith » .

Il mentionne que :

« Goebbels se foutait de ce que Furtwängler pensait des Nazis. Il l'aimait beaucoup. » (75)

Mais Tietjen se rétracte fin-1943, peut-être sous l'ordre de Goebbels ; et Furtwängler revient diriger à Berlin. Karajan perd son auréole de gloire, mais gagne quelques postes, en représentation à l'étranger, ou enregistrer Anton Bruckner, en 1942, jusqu'à son départ d'Allemagne fin-1944 (76) .

Karajan dirige les Concerts symphoniques de l'Opéra de Berlin, d'octobre 1940 à février 1943, ne laissant aucune place à son aîné. Il se déplace en pays occupé : à Paris, en 1940, dans la Messe en Si de Bach, en mai 1941 à l'Opéra Garnier, dans « Tristan und Isolde » avec Germaine Lublin ; il se rend aussi à Rome, en mars 1941. Furtwängler se plaint de la popularité de Karajan à Goebbels, et de sa mise à l'écart.

Goebbels note à ce propos dans son « Journal » , en décembre 1940 :

« Furtwängler se plaint de Karajan, j'y ai mis le holà. Furtwängler se conduit très bien, il est notre plus grand chef. »

Karajan cesse alors ses activités à Aachen, et il est remercié de son poste berlinois, en 1943.

Karajan connaît alors les ennuis avec les autorités : il épouse, en secondes noces, une jeune fille avec un quart de sang juif, Anita Güttermann. Goebbels intervient pour étouffer le problème, car il sent que Karajan peut lui être utile : Furtwängler est, en effet, de plus en plus mal vu, et désespéré. Mais la fin de la guerre approche, et tous 2 connaissent alors les mêmes déboires. Ils doivent s'éloigner d'Allemagne : Furtwängler en Suisse ; Karajan en Italie, alors que leurs parcours avaient été plus que différents pendant la période nazie.

Après-guerre, nouveaux enjeux

La période de la dénazification est sombre pour les 2 hommes. Ils sont autorisés à diriger tous 2, dès 1947, et la concurrence entre eux repart de plus belle : à Vienne, puis, à Salzbourg.

À la fin de la Guerre, Furtwängler se trouve en Suisse ; Karajan à Salzbourg chez ses parents. Il y est invité pour diriger le « Wiener Philharmoniker », en janvier 1946 :

« Vienne avait trouvé, une fois encore, son idole. » (77)

Au lendemain du concert, Karajan est interdit de scène, mais participe aux Ires ébauches du Festival de Salzbourg. Beaucoup d'institutions demandent son retour, comme celui de Clemens Krauß, Hans Knappertsbuch, ou Karl Böhm. Parmi les acteurs de cette demande : Alexander von Hryntschak, président de la « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde », Rudolf Gamsjäger, son secrétaire-général ; le Baron Heinrich von Puthon, président du Festival de Salzbourg ; Bernhard Paumgartner, chef de l'Orchestre du « Mozarteum » ; et Walter Legge, qui développera la carrière de Karajan par le disque, avec le « Philharmonia Orchestra » de Londres, dès 1946.

Furtwängler revient à Berlin en mai 1947, puis, à Vienne, pour le 100e anniversaire de la mort de Felix Mendelssohn. En novembre 1947, il est invité pour le « Deutsches Requiem », à Vienne, et il en profite pour se plaindre du fait que « Herr von K. » dirige « son répertoire » : la 9e de Beethoven avec le « Wiener Philharmoniker ». Son ennemi s'impose devant ses yeux à Vienne, à Berlin et à l'étranger : à Vienne, il devient « “ Dirigent ” à vie » (1947), « Ehrenmitglieder » (1947), puis « “ Konzerdirektor ” à vie » (1950) du « Singverein der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde ». De 1948-1949 à 1963-1964, les « Karajan-Zyklus » fleurissent avec les « Wiener Philharmoniker » et « Berliner Philharmoniker ». Il devient chef principal et directeur musical du « Philharmonia » de Walter Legge, dirige au Festival de Salzbourg en 1948, et à Bayreuth en 1951-1952.

Les rivalités entre les 2 hommes ne cessent jamais, et apparaissent à chaque détour de leurs carrières : si Furtwängler ouvre, en 1949, le Festival de Salzbourg avec le « Zauberflöte », c'est Karajan qui l'enregistre en 1er avec Legge (même si l'enregistrement devait être d'abord réalisé avec Furtwängler, le producteur choisit finalement Karajan). En 1950, Furtwängler obtient de Hilbert que Karajan soit absent de Salzbourg jusqu'à ce que lui-même y revienne.

Furtwängler aurait déclaré :

« Si ce “ Monsieur von K. ” vient ici, je dirigerai un programme qu'ils vont haïr. »

Karajan devra attendre l'année 1955 et la mort de Furtwängler pour y diriger à nouveau. Mais Furtwängler n'est pas invité pour les festivités du 200^e anniversaire de la mort de Bach à Vienne, en 1950 (« Internationale Bach-Fest 1950 der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde »), qui s'ouvrent et se ferment avec Karajan.

Certes, Furtwängler reprend sa pré-éminence à Vienne, où Karajan cesse de diriger entre 1950 et 1957, à Berlin ensuite, où Karajan disparaît jusque 1953. Mais « tout est en quelque sorte déjà joué » (78) : Furtwängler meurt en novembre 1954, épuisé et déprimé par une dénazification qui s'était avérée longue et problématique, dépassé par un rival plus jeune que lui. En mars 1955, Karajan accepte de renoncer à tous ses engagements pour accepter l'offre du « Berliner Philharmoniker », à condition d'y être nommé « chef à vie ». Il s'octroie un cumul de fonctions jusqu'alors inconnu. Il dirige donc : le « Berliner Philharmoniker » ; le Festival de Salzbourg, et ce, dès 1956 ; l'Opéra de Vienne, la même année ; et s'impose dans le monde du disque. 30 ans de domination mondiale s'offrent alors pour celui qui avait déclaré, à Salzbourg, en 1955 :

« Je serai dictateur. » (79)

Le « Cas Karajan »

Karajan n'a jamais accepté de parler ouvertement de la période de guerre et de la dénazification. Certains y ont vu l'aveu d'une culpabilité évidente ; d'autres ont laissé au « plus grand Mæstro du siècle » (80) (selon Carlos Kleiber) l'avantage du doute sur son passé politique pour ne retenir de lui que son testament musical, qui comprend des milliers de concerts et Opéras, presque autant d'enregistrements, et un mythe qu'il s'est lui-même forgé.

Lorsque le 20 janvier 1946, Walter Legge, le producteur anglais, le rejoint à Vienne, où il est invité à diriger, il commet un délit, puisqu'il est un « Allié » qui traite avec un « ennemi allemand ». Vienne connaît une renaissance musicale rapide après la Guerre : 3 semaines après la reddition, on y donne « le Nozze di Figaro », avec « toutes les “ stars ” du 3^e “ Reich ” » (81) : Maria Cebotari, égérie berlinoise de Hitler ; le ténor Julius Patzak ; le baryton-basse Hans Hotter. La ville attire, dès lors, l'attention du monde musical entier. Legge pense à Furtwängler pour être chef du « Philharmonia », l'Orchestre qu'il fonde à Londres spécialement pour l'enregistrement. Mais il désire quelqu'un de plus jeune, et son choix se porte sur Karajan, rentré de son exil italien. Malheureusement, il est recherché par les autorités comme figure de proue de la culture nazie encensée par Josef Gœbbels contre Furtwängler, au moment où celui-ci est disgracié. Karajan est interdit de scène, mais Legge convainc les autorités anglaises de le laisser enregistrer, même sous interdiction de scène : plus que n'importe quel autre chef, « Karajan sera alors fabriqué par le disque » (Walter Legge). Legge se défend contre ses anciens collègues qui l'accusent de collaborer avec d'anciens Nazis, en rétorquant : « traiter un artiste de nazi est un sabotage ! Ces artistes n'avaient pas le choix du camp dans lequel ils se sont retrouvés ». Mais un tel argument est-il recevable ?

Le 3^e « Reich », on l'a vu, prend le pouvoir sur la musique en 2 temps : la loi du 7 avril 1933 qui évince les Juifs des institutions de l'État, et l'appartenance nécessaire à la « Reichskulturkammer », en date du 15 novembre 1933.

Hinkel, général SS, directeur de la « Reichskulturkammer » et Commissaire d'État pour la Musique auprès de Goebbels, institue les fiches sur les artistes, où sont mentionnés les origines raciales et les soutiens des autres musiciens. Si la carte est nécessaire, l'appartenance au Parti nazi n'est mentionnée nulle part dans la législation comme corollaire obligé à l'exercice d'un emploi. Certains musiciens ont émigré, d'autres ont refusé l'enrôlement total, comme Furtwängler, Krauß ou Knappertsbusch.

Citons, à son propos, une anecdote. Au cours d'une conversation avec l'ambassadeur d'Allemagne en Hollande, il lui demande :

« Êtes-vous un Nazi obligé ou un Nazi convaincu ? »

Interloqué, l'ambassadeur lui demande la différence.

Knappertsbusch répond :

« L'un est un salaud (" Schweinehund ") ; l'autre, une saloperie (" Schanerei ") . » (82)

Kempe rejoint l'armée plutôt que de licencier l'altiste de son orchestre, qui est Juif. Eugen Jochum, comme Hans Swarowsky, et Hans Schmidt-Isserstedt, ne rejoignent jamais le Parti.

Norman Lebrecht explique l'engagement dans le NSDAP des artistes par 2 points : soit une ferveur raciste, sous laquelle il range Paul Græner, Max Trapp ; soit des motifs opportunistes, afin d'accéder plus vite à un poste. C'est cette explication qu'il donne à l'adhésion de Karajan au NSDAP. Karajan adhère par 2 fois au Parti : à Salzbourg, le 8 avril 1933 (carte n° 1607525) ; à Ulm, le 1er mai 1933 (carte n° 3430914) (83) . Karajan les déclare « faux » lorsqu'on les lui présente en fac-similé, en 1982, et explique qu'il a adhéré au Parti en 1935, pour avoir le poste de « Kappelmeister » à Aachen.

Il déclare ainsi :

« Devant moi, il y avait ce morceau de papier qui me séparait de l'exercice d'un pouvoir sans limite. Aussi, me suis-je dit, au diable ! Et j'ai signé. » (84)

Selon Lebrecht, Karajan se présente comme un « Muß Nazi » (85)

Roger Vaughan, dans sa biographie sur Karajan (86) , envisage les choses d'un autre point de vue. Il rappelle que Paul Moor, le 1er a divulgué après-guerre les éléments relatifs à l'adhésion au NSDAP de Karajan, prouve la double adhésion de Karajan, en 1933, au NSDAP par maints documents trouvés à la mission américaine à Berlin. Quand le musicologue allemand Fred K. Prieberg, 25 ans plus tard, sort son livre « Musik im NS-Staat » , Karajan déclare à Vaughan que les documents qu'il utilise sont « pure fabrication » et que « Prieberg veut juste faire de l'argent » (87) . Enfin, quand le biographe présente les documents personnellement à Karajan, celui-ci lui montre qu'ils ne sont

pas signés par lui et que ce sont des faux antidatés à une date antérieure à son adhésion réelle (1933 pour Prieberg ; 1935 pour Karajan) . Mais la signature n'était pas toujours imposée lors de l'adhésion, et cette date de 1933 est encore aujourd'hui soumise à nombre d'interrogations, en témoignent les échanges de lettres entre les différents bureaux du NSDAP concernant la question.

Ainsi :

Une lettre du 5 janvier 1939 des bureaux du NSDAP de Munich, à la Trésorerie du NSDAP d'Autriche, souligne que Karajan a adhéré 2 fois au Parti, en avril et mai 1933, et demande si « l'adhésion professionnelle d'avril 1933 » est effective.

La réponse du représentant du Parti en Autriche au Trésorier munichois affirme que c'est aux bureaux de Salzbourg de stipuler sur l'adhésion d'avril.

Une lettre du 4 février 1939 du NSDAP de Vienne au Trésorier du NSDAP de Salzbourg demande une enquête sur la question Karajan.

Le 15 mai 1939, le groupe « Neustadt » de Salzbourg répond au Trésorier de Salzbourg que Herbert Klein, qui a fait signer Karajan au Parti, a donné un reçu au chef et a personnellement établi son adhésion.

Une lettre du 7 juillet 1939 des bureaux munichois du Parti au Trésorier du NSDAP à « Köln-Aachen » , déclare que l'adhésion d'avril est invalide car Karajan n'a pas payé les droits ; celle de mai est déclarée pleinement valable.

Le 12 décembre 1942, l'« Oberreichsleiter » Schneider annonce à la Chancellerie de Berlin que la date officielle pour l'adhésion de Karajan au NSDAP est celle du 1er mai 1933, sous le n° 3430914, et que sa carte a été disponible le 13 juillet 1939.

Karajan persiste cependant à dater son adhésion de 1935. Vaughan s'interroge sur la raison :

« Est-ce pour donner une explication rationnelle à l'action ? Car, avoir adhéré en avril ou mai, 1 ou 2 mois après l'accession de Hitler au pouvoir, sonnerait comme un soutien enthousiaste à Hitler, à sa politique, et à ses projets. Et cela serait moins compréhensible. » (88)

Karajan s'exprime lui-même sur ce point :

« C'est la chose la plus difficile à comprendre pour ceux qui n'ont pas vécu en Allemagne ou en Autriche en ce temps là. »

De plus, cela explique que les idées économiques du « Führer » étaient globalement bonnes, et que c'est ce point qui donne du pouvoir à Hitler. Sebastian Haffner, dans « The Meaning of Hitler » (1979) développe le même argument.

Vaughan conclut sur le sujet en affirmant que Karajan n'a pas été un fervent Nazi, ni même un supporter du mouvement et laisse la discussion ouverte sur la date d'adhésion au régime.

D'autres éléments sont portés à charge contre Karajan, après la Guerre : en 1935, pour les fêtes du NSDAP, il dirige 750 chanteurs et 100 musiciens dans des partitions dédiées au nouveau régime, comme le « Feier der Neuen Front » de Richard Trunk, un hommage à Hitler sur un texte de Baldur von Schirach. En 1943, il assiste à la 5e Symphonie de Bruckner donnée par l'Orchestre de la « Waffen SS » sous la direction de l'« Oberstuführer SS » Rudolf Vedder. On lui reproche des remarques antisémites. À son décorateur Günther Schneider-Siemssen : « Vous avez les yeux bruns, ceux d'un traître » ; ou encore, cette remarque de 1934 face au « Volksoper » de Vienne où « toute la Palestine s'est donnée rendez-vous » . Enfin, on condamne sa collaboration avec son agent de la période, l'« Oberstuführer SS » Vedder.

Mais, pour sa défense, il rétorque avoir épousé une femme au quart de sang juif, Anita Güttermann, et cite ses assistants et amis juifs : Emil Jücker, Rita Köhler, Ernst Haußermann son biographe, son directeur artistique Michel Glotz, son « Konzertmeister » Michel Schwalbé, et son protégé, le chef James Levine. Au niveau de la musique contemporaine, il explique avoir dirigé et enregistré de son plein-gré, en avril 1944, le Concerto pour orchestre de Gottfried von Einem, compositeur banni par le « Reich » : sa musique intègre du jazz, et le compositeur et sa mère sont même internés par la « Gestapo » .

1941 est une année difficile pour Karajan : les bombardements détruisent Berlin, Furtwängler le devance sur une production au « Deutsche Oper » , et ainsi, il compte s'engager dans l'aviation, mais Josef Goebbels le lui interdit. Van der Nüll, le père de l'expression « das Wunder Karajan », est envoyé au front et y meurt : Karajan y voit une attaque personnelle du régime (89) . De plus, le poste d'Aachen est donné au Hollandais Paul van Kempen, et il échoue à succéder à Karl Böhm à Dresde. C'est ainsi qu'il décide de quitter l'Allemagne, après une série de concerts à Berlin, en décembre 1944 : il se rend à Milan, puis à Côme. Découvert, il part pour Salzbourg dans un wagon à bestiaux. Commence alors le processus de dénazification.

Le « crime de l'opportunisme » et ses conséquences

C'est à Vienne, où il est rentré pour un concert, que débute son procès en dénazification. Karajan subit un interrogatoire intensif, les charges retenues contre lui sont très lourdes. On l'accuse d'être le musicien par excellence du « Reich » , et même d'avoir été un espion, d'avoir dénoncé ses collègues juifs et clandestins. Il nie toutes les accusations en bloc, dont la plupart ont été inventées ou déformées, mais admet son appartenance au NSDAP, en 1935.

Dans son autobiographie, Karajan revient sur cet événement :

« Ces gens qui se préparaient à agir contre moi n'en avaient pas le droit. J'en savais trop sur eux pour les reconnaître comme autorités compétentes. » (90)

Le Colonel soviétique Epstein, qui fait interdire ses concerts à Vienne en 1945, déclare :

« Karajan est un fervent Nazi. Il a eu de nombreux honneurs à Berlin. C'est un Nazi de la 1re heure » (91)

Otto de Pasetti, enquêteur pour la Commission de dénazification autrichienne, demande une grâce immédiate :

« Karajan est un personnage arrogant et ambitieux, très imbu de lui-même, pas vraiment sympathique, mais il est impossible qu'il soit un fervent Nazi, ou même un sympathisant. Son adhésion au NSDAP est uniquement professionnelle. » (92)

Par ailleurs, Ernst Lothar veut un long bannissement, pour punir les conséquences et la signification de son engagement au Parti nazi. Cependant, en 1946, Karajan participe à l'organisation du Festival de Salzbourg, mais il est expulsé du « Festspielhaus » par des officiers américains, et remplacé par Hans Swarowsky. Avant la levée de son interdiction de scène, on sait peu de choses sur le déroulement du procès en dénazification ; si ce n'est que, pendant les négociations et les décisions, il est quand même nommé à des postes de 1re importance, à Lucerne ou à Vienne.

Ce « crime de l'opportunisme » , comme le qualifie Eberhardt Manfred, musicologue berlinois, lui est reproché longtemps après la Guerre. Il passe 30 mois au chômage, des manifestations contre lui ont lieu lorsqu'il doit diriger à New York, en 1946. Il est également soumis à une enquête aux États-Unis, cette même année, mais aucun témoin ne réussit à être entendu. S'il explique avoir pris son adhésion au NSDAP, comme « on aurait pris une inscription dans un club de ski alpin » , il semble surtout avoir été prêt à tout pour diriger, et obtenir les postes qu'il convoitait.

« Nous étions tous Nazis : Furtwängler, Böhm, moi. » , déclare-t-il à la presse, en 1948.

Mais il est le seul chef d'orchestre à se voir fermer les portes du « Metropolitan Opera » de New York par Rudolf Bing parce que, selon ce dernier :

« Karajan avait fait plus que ce qui était nécessaire sous la botte nazie. » (93)

Dans l'immédiat après-guerre, Karajan est disqualifié ; il est jugé comme un fervent nazi, d'allure aryenne, et fait en quelque sorte figure d'anti-héros face à un Furtwängler divinisé, grand vainqueur moral, mais non musical, de cette rivalité. Certains musicologues, comme John Culshaw (94) , vont jusqu'à affirmer qu'il donne l'impression d'être un substitut au « Führer » disparu :

« Il remplit le vide laissé par la mort de Hitler dans cette partie de la mentalité collective allemande qui réclame à corps et à cris un chef. Il émanait de lui une aura, qui, si elle avait fait l'objet d'un calcul, aurait été répugnante. »

Norman Lebrecht explicite les points communs entre Hitler et Karajan : une puissance de concentration, une quête inlassable du but à atteindre, une sexualité étrange, qui attire autant les hommes que les femmes, un grand besoin d'amour (comme en témoigne ses 3 mariages successifs, ou encore ses lettres d'amour à la journaliste américaine Mary Roblee, en 1955) . Il souligne aussi un profond narcissisme, de part l'orchestration de ses rappels, des

applaudissements, aussi bien que dans les photographies officielles contrôlées par le Mæstro lui-même. Toujours selon Lebrecht, il maintient entre lui et les autres une certaine distance, un espace. Un haut-responsable de l'industrie discographique va jusqu'à dire que « dans son esprit, il était Hitler ». Son biographe américain pense qu'il admire sincèrement Hitler. Pour finir son accusation, le critique du « Sunday Times » affirme que, comme Hitler, Karajan apprend à manipuler l'image, mentionnant les films consacrés aux Symphonies de Beethoven, où il est éclairé par un rayon de lumière, « comme celui de Albert Speer pour l'arrivée du “ Führer ” à Nuremberg » (95) . Il divise pour conquérir, comme Hitler, qui dresse Josef Gœbbels contre Hermann Göring, et les 2 contre Heinrich Himmler. En effet, Karajan travaille toujours en même temps pour 2 Compagnies et 2 Orchestres, au minimum ! Comme le « Führer » enfin, il exerce un contrôle sur son entourage. « Son but était d'édifier son propre “ Reich ” », note l'un de ses biographes, et son « Reich » s'appelait : Berlin, Vienne, la Scala, Salzbourg, Londres, Paris. Berlin et Salzbourg restent à jamais les places fortes de son empire : Berlin et son contrat à vie avec le « Berliner Philharmoniker », Salzbourg où il impose ses volontés, la ville étant même qualifiée peu à peu par les anglo-saxons de « Sleazbourg », la ville de la corruption et de l'avidité. Lebrecht achève Karajan en jetant le doute sur l'origine de sa fortune, estimée à 500 millions de « Deutsche Mark » : il ne peut imaginer qu'elle relève de cachets de concerts, mais la rattache à la récompense d'un pouvoir occulte.

Lebrecht conclut ainsi :

« Le pouvoir absolu fut l'ultime leçon qu'il reçut du 3e “ Reich ”, et devint l'obsession de sa carrière après-guerre. » (96)

Peut-être faut-il relativiser les propos de Lebrecht et s'en tenir aux faits plus qu'aux parallèles hasardeux entre Hitler et Karajan. Et appliquer à Karajan les propos d'Hermann Heße sur Richard Strauß :

« Nous n'avons pas le droit de lui faire de grands reproches, mais nous avons, je crois, celui de garder nos distances. » (97)

Car l'attitude d'Herbert von Karajan tient finalement plus d'une ambition dévorante que d'idées politiques précises, et il est donc moralement condamnable.

À sa mort, en 1989, il est à la tête d'un empire musical créé de toutes pièces, et il a incarné pendant près de 40 ans, le mythe du chef d'orchestre omniscient et omniprésent. Il fit usage d'un pouvoir souvent absolu, sans scrupules, voulant à tout prix réaliser ses objectifs.

Zubin Mehta, son élève, a résumé la situation dans une phrase, certes cruelle, mais opinée :

« Le problème avec Karajan, c'est que la musique ne lui a jamais suffi. » (98)

Ce qu'il voulait par-dessus tout, c'était la gloire, la réussite, la perfection. À n'importe quel prix. Quitte à faire un pas dans l'immoralité.

De 1933 à 1945 : face au régime nazi

L'attitude de Wilhelm Furtwängler sous le régime nazi est globalement celle d'une cohabitation intéressée, une conciliation dans le but de défendre les valeurs allemandes, mais aussi les artistes juifs et les compositeurs contemporains. Né à Berlin, le 25 janvier 1886, Furtwängler connaît jusqu'en 1933 une carrière sans obstacle, ses amis et ennemis musicaux reconnaissant unanimement sa valeur artistique. Directeur de l'Opéra de Mannheim pendant la Première Guerre mondiale, il effectue des tournées en Suède, et participe à la renaissance musicale de Berlin après 1918. C'est dans la capitale qu'il propose en concert des compositeurs étrangers, comme Béla Bartók ou Igor Stravinski ; mais son cœur est tout entier à la musique allemande, « manifestation la plus caractéristique, la plus profonde, la plus pure et la plus éclatante de l'esprit allemand » (99) . En 1925, à 39 ans, il dirige 6 concerts au « Carnegie Hall » de New York, et cela le propulse au rang de grand chef international. En 1933, principal chef d'Allemagne avec Richard Strauß, il est en quelque sorte, au sommet. À partir de cette date, cependant, commence une attitude unique de conciliation et de résistance mêlées face au régime.

Pour la célébration de l'avènement du 3e « Reich » , il dirige « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » de Richard Wagner , ce qui conduit Thomas Mann à le qualifier de « laquais du “ Reich ” » . Il est filmé dirigeant la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven devant le drapeau nazi et Hitler, Göring, et Goebbels, sans pour autant faire le salut hitlérien, grâce à un jeu de passe-passe avec sa baguette de direction. Il accepte les titres du régime, comme celui de « Generalmusikdirektor » ou de vice-Président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » . Pendant 2 ans, il cohabite avec les Nazis mais, en même temps, il aide les Juifs en situation délicate, il dirige de la musique bannie ; ainsi, c'est lui qui assure la création de la Suite symphonique tiré de l'Opéra « Mathis der Maler » de Paul Hindemith, non sans mal.

Les ennuis commencent réellement quand il rédige une lettre ouverte (100) pour des amis et musiciens connus mais bannis par le « Reich » , comme Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer ou Max Reinhardt (101) . En novembre 1934, ensuite, il intervient pour Paul Hindemith, dans un article en Ire page du « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » : cet article, intitulé, « Der Fall Hindemith » , fait l'effet d'une bombe et, dès lors, « la guerre contre la politique culturelle nazie est ouverte » (102) .

Furtwängler conclut son article ainsi :

« Il est certain que personne n'a fait plus pour mettre en valeur aux yeux du monde la musique allemande, dans la jeune génération, que Paul Hindemith. »

Le jour de parution de l'article, il dirige « Tristan und Isolde » au « Staatsoper » , en présence de Josef Goebbels et de Hermann Göring ; l'arrivée du Mæstro, saluée par une ovation de près de 20 minutes, inquiète le régime, qui lui inflige, dès lors, une torture mentale. Il est harangué par Göring, fustigé dans un discours par Goebbels, et doit donc céder. Il abandonne ses charges, mais il est sommé de rester en poste au Philharmonique de Berlin.

Lebrecht explique ainsi :

« Châtié d'une main, on le flattait de l'autre. Il fut la victime d'une guerre d'usure psychologique sophistiquée. » (103)

On ordonne à sa secrétaire, Bertha Geißmar, de quitter Berlin, ce qui l'affaiblit.

Le sachant, Göring déclare :

« Si Furtwängler était privé de sa Geißmar, sa personnalité musicale s'effondrerait comme un château de cartes. »

En mars 1935, pour sauver sa secrétaire, il fait publier une lettre d'excuses publiques à Goebbels pour l'affaire Hindemith. Goebbels maintient Furtwängler en poste à Berlin, et souligne dans son « Journal », en 1939 :

« Il nous a rendu un grand service à l'étranger. Il remporte des triomphes partout. Nous pouvons tirer parti de lui. »

Furtwängler refuse les dons du régime (Hitler lui propose une maison ; Göring, des voitures) , mais il cesse de diriger vers 1943 pour composer, et émigre peu avant la fin de la Guerre. Mais pourtant, pendant la Guerre, ses concerts à Berlin sont salués comme des moments d'espérance.

Boleslaw Barlog, Intendant du Théâtre de Berlin après la Guerre, souligne :

« Tous les 8 ou 15 jours, les concerts de Furtwängler étaient notre raison de vivre. »

Selon l'épouse de Wilhelm Furtwängler, Elisabeth :

« Il subissait une guerre sur 2 fronts : dans son propre pays, c'était un opposant surveillé et espionné ; à l'étranger, un Nazi insulté et diffamé. » (104)

Mais face aux persécutions du régime, à la torture morale, il choisit cependant de rester en Allemagne car, selon lui, là est sa place et son devoir de musicien allemand. Il écrira dans ses « Carnets », en 1945 :

« Ceux qui émigrèrent ou ceux qui exigèrent que l'on quitte l'Allemagne ont, avant tout, accredité l'idée que Hitler représentait le peuple allemand. Ils croyaient qu'il s'agissait de quitter une Allemagne nazie. C'est précisément ce qui est faux. L'Allemagne n'a jamais été une Allemagne nazie, mais une Allemagne gouvernée par les Nazis. »

Furtwängler a cependant l'occasion de fuir l'Allemagne, très tôt : il a une demeure à Saint-Moritz, et Arturo Toscanini le désigne comme son successeur à New York, pour « sauver son âme » . Furtwängler consulte Goebbels sur la proposition, et souhaite continuer à diriger en Allemagne, d'où d'immenses protestations contre lui aux États-Unis.

Furtwängler note dans ses « Carnets », à ce propos (105) :

« Les controverses politiques me sont très désagréables. Je ne suis pas un politicien, mais un défenseur de la musique allemande qui est le bien de l'humanité, sans lien avec la politique. »

Dans les derniers mois de la Guerre, les Nazis sont très agressifs avec lui. Concernant la question du poste proposé à New York, Goebbels lui déclare :

« Vous pouvez partir si vous le désirez, mais aussi longtemps que nous serons ici (et vous le savez, nous avons fondé un " Reich " qui durera 3,000 ans) , vous ne serez plus autorisé à fouler le sol allemand. »

En janvier 1945, Albert Speer, lui-même, lui conseille de partir en Suisse afin d'éviter le châtime nazi. Il se rend compte qu'il est surveillé, il est apeuré et, en concert à l'étranger, ne rentre pas à Berlin. Il reste en Suisse, dès février 1945, et vit 2 ans et demi à Clarens, dans le Vaud, presque sans revenus, chez Niehaus. Selon Daniel Gillis (106) , il écrit à la délégation américaine un compte-rendu sur son activité contre les Nazis. L' « Information Control Division » est d'accord pour qu'il reprenne ses activités en Allemagne, en septembre 1945, grâce à l'obtention d'un permis. Mais il ne se lance pas, préfère composer et rester avec sa famille. Fin-1945 commence alors une longue période de 2 ans et demi de dénazification et de réhabilitation.

Les années de silence : la dénazification

En 1945, les 4 puissances d'occupation de l'Allemagne ont des idées très diverses sur la régénération culturelle. La dénazification qu'elles engagent est très importante et fournit des « résultats complexes et controversés » (107) . Elle est d'abord mise en place pour ôter leurs emplois à ceux qui ont appartenu au NSDAP. Mais, très vite, la Commission de dénazification organise un système de permis après enquête sur les activités et relations entre musiciens et pouvoir pendant les années de guerre. Il faut noter que la plupart des chefs d'orchestre en contrats, à la fin de la Guerre, les conservent après ; pour les autres, la dénazification est rapide et réduite.

Ce n'est pas le cas pour Furtwängler. Il est exilé en Suisse depuis 1945, et se retrouve, malgré son appel aux autorités américaines en début d'année, sur la liste des musiciens et personnalités du monde culturel empêchés de travailler pendant la dénazification. La liste, publiée par les 3 Alliés, le condamne car il a été « Staatsrat » et vice-Président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » . Le 12 décembre, il envoie une lettre à André Schulhof, organisateur de concerts à New York, où il explique que son exil est une déconvenue personnelle pour lui et un élément de désastre pour sa civilisation, « l'Allemagne réelle » (108) . Sa condamnation tient, selon lui, de la mauvaise présentation des faits au public. Il explique aussi avoir soumis son cas à Dwight D. Eisenhower, et avoir essuyé de sa part un refus de le réhabiliter.

En février 1946, alors qu'il dirige à Vienne, il subit une nuit de détention à Innsbruck, zone contrôlée par les Français. En Autriche, l'accord de dénazification était nécessaire pour travailler. Il obtient l'accord d'un tribunal viennois pour diriger en Autriche, le 9 mars. C'est à Vienne qu'il rencontre Curt Rieß, juif allemand émigré suite au Nazisme, de nationalité américaine mais travaillant en Suisse. D'abord opposé au retour sur scène de Furtwängler, il change d'avis et prend la défense du chef, qui lui confie l'intégralité de ses documents officiels. Il devient son « conseiller en

dénazification » (109) et va à Berlin donner les dossiers de défense à Robert McLure. Celui-ci veut faire lever l'interdiction contre le Mæstro mais lui demande de se rendre en Suisse, pour éviter que l'opinion publique pense à une pression sur les Alliés. Cependant, le 10 mars 1946, Furtwängler se rend à Berlin, en utilisant un avion que les autorités soviétiques ont mis à sa disposition. Il donne une conférence à Berlin-Est et, compte tenu de la compétition culturelle qui existe entre les zones d'occupation, la venue de Furtwängler est vue comme une grande opportunité par les Soviétiques.

Furtwängler déclare pendant la conférence : « Je suis à Berlin uniquement à titre privé », alors même que la capitale le rappelle dès février : « Votre patrie vous supplie de revenir. » (110) Mais cette escapade berlinoise ne plaît pas à McLure qui confirme l'interdiction de scène, à laquelle les Soviétiques répliquent en proposant à Furtwängler la direction du « Staatsoper », en zone soviétique. Mais le chef sait que cela lui exclut la possibilité de travailler à nouveau avec le « Berliner Philharmoniker ». Il retourne donc en Suisse et accepte le procès en dénazification.

En 1946, Berlin est administrée par une « Commandanture » quadripartite alliée, qui contient un comité d'affaires culturelles. Celui-ci inclue également un sous-comité à la dénazification, avec un bureau situé sur « Schlüterstraße », en zone britannique. Son secrétariat est assuré par le « Intelligence Section of British Information Services » : son rôle est de formuler la liste des 25,000 membres de la « Reichsmusikkammer » et de superviser le tribunal, le « Spruchkammer ». Les membres du NSDAP ou ceux des « Kulturkammer » doivent comparaître devant ce tribunal pour obtenir un permis de scène. Les décisions du « Spruchkammer » sont cependant soumises à la ratification des Alliés. Il comprend 22 membres allemands chargés de superviser « la révocation de leurs positions de responsabilité des Nazis et des personnes hostiles aux résolutions des Alliés ». En mars 1946, le sous-comité de dénazification est supervisé par George Clare, officier britannique, de son vrai nom Georg Klaar, juif viennois exilé d'Allemagne en 1938, à l'âge de 17 ans ; c'est lui qui est en charge du dossier Furtwängler. Le Major Sely, son supérieur, lui donne 4 semaines pour boucler le travail.

Clare écrit à ce sujet :

« Le « Spruchkammer » aurait à donner son verdict, mais sur quoi ? Pouvait-on vivre dans une totale dictature en restant sans tâche ? Passer des compromis avec le mal pour éviter le pire ; cette justification est toujours vaine. Mais savoir cela après les faits est aussi facile qu'il est difficile de reconnaître la malignité dès le début. »

En avril, à la réunion du sous-comité de dénazification, Clare évoque le dossier Furtwängler. Les représentants des 4 puissances veulent la réhabilitation du chef, car ils savent qu'il n'a pas été nazi.

Arsenyi Gouliga, le représentant soviétique, déclare :

« Il est ridicule de faire faire la queue comme n'importe qui au plus grand chef d'orchestre du monde. Toute cette histoire est inutile. »

Les 3 autres puissances sont cependant d'avis de faire un procès rapide à Furtwängler, sur les mêmes bases que

n'importe quel autre musicien, et la procédure de dénazification commune s'engage.

Furtwängler doit alors attendre 6 mois avant de passer devant le « Spruchkammer » ; des commentateurs y ont vu la malveillance des autorités américaines, comme Sam H. Shirakava (III) , qui déclare :

« Le procès de Furtwängler se devait d'être une mise au bûcher. »

Il explique que les autorités américaines ont retardé le procès pour laisser la primauté au procès de Nuremberg (qui se déroule du 20 novembre 1945 au 6 septembre 1946) , et « que rien ne devait détourner l'attention de cet événement. Le monde entier serait ainsi prêt pour le procès de la bande des leaders hitlériens en décembre » . En vérité, cela est très peu probable, car le retard vient après que le sous-comité de dénazification transmette le dossier au « Spruchkammer » , et les Américains n'ont aucune puissance dans le tribunal, très indépendant. L'autonomie du tribunal est défendue par Wolfgang Schmidt, secrétaire et juge principal, et Alex Vogel, son président, tous 2 membres d'un mouvement berlinois anti-nazi pendant la Guerre. Le long délai pour l'audition de Furtwängler provient ainsi très probablement d'une masse de cas à juger et du temps nécessaire pour recueillir l'ensemble des éléments du dossier.

Furtwängler est accusé sur 2 points : le fait d'avoir été « Staatsrat » et vice-Président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , même s'il y a été nommé sans avis ; et sur 2 faits précis : il dirige lors de 2 cérémonies du NSDAP, et a fait une remarque antisémite contre Victor de Sabata.

Vogel ouvre la séance du tribunal en déclarant :

« Furtwängler n'a été membre d'aucune organisation nazie, il a essayé d'aider des gens persécutés, et a évité les formalités telles que le salut à Hitler. »

Des investigations sont menées, et elles sont en faveur de Furtwängler. Schmidt, à la tête du tribunal par son aisance et son autorité (qui, selon Clare, le faisaient souvent ressembler à Gœbbels ...) , peine à reconnaître la victoire de Furtwängler. Hans von Benda, son témoin, ancien membre du NSDAP, change son témoignage en cours de procès et nie l'antisémitisme de Furtwängler.

Schmidt en est réduit à déclarer des absurdités, telles que :

« Il est possible que, sans être antisémite, vous n'en pensiez pas moins que certaines choses ne devraient pas être exécutées par des Juifs. »

Furtwängler répond stoïquement :

« C'est ridicule. »

Roger Smithson note :

« L'ensemble des débats a été marqué par une sorte de confusion et d'absence du sens des réalités. »

Le Major Sely relate aussi cette impression :

« Ce fut le cirque plus que jamais. Le résultat était connu d'avance, même si notre gaillard s'est comporté comme un éléphant dans un magasin de porcelaine. Vogel a essayé de coller à Furtwängler la responsabilité de la mort de Van der Nüll : une absurdité. »

Le « Spruchkammer » proclame l'acquittement de Furtwängler, le 17 décembre 1946 : la ratification est retardée de plusieurs mois, car de nombreux cas sont à traiter avant celui de Furtwängler, et aussi parce qu'il manque du papier pour taper les comptes rendus des affaires. Le 1er engagement de Furtwängler intervient en Italie, en avril 1947, puis avec le « Berliner Philharmoniker », le 27 mai de la même année, pour la 1re fois depuis 2 ans et demi.

Après 2 ans et demi de procès, celui dont Heinrich Himmler avait dit : « Il n'y a pas un Juif pour lequel Furtwängler ne soit intervenu. », gagne une réhabilitation, en même temps qu'il revient à la direction. Cet épisode le marque profondément.

Il note ainsi dans ses « Carnets », en 1946 :

« J'ai essayé, très profondément, de juger mon attitude. Je ne suis pas meilleur que d'autres. Mais 2 choses me dictait mon instinct : l'amour pour ma patrie et mon peuple, qui est physique et spirituel ; et le sentiment d'avoir, ici, la tâche de réparer un tort. »

Pour sa défense au tribunal, interrogé sur la raison pour laquelle il n'a pas émigré avant les menaces finales de Goebbels, il cite Arnold Schönberg, lequel lui demande en 1933 :

« Il faut que vous restiez en Allemagne, pour diriger de la bonne musique. »

Le compositeur écrit pour sa défense :

« Je suis sûr qu'il n'a jamais été Nazi. Il appartient à ces nationaux-allemands démodés. Je suis persuadé qu'il n'a jamais été antisémite. De plus, c'est un vrai talent. Et il aime la musique, lui. »

Après son procès, Furtwängler subit des attaques aux États-Unis (112) où on le qualifie de Nazi. En 1948, on lui propose un poste à l'Orchestre de Chicago, mais un tollé se forme contre sa nomination, mené par James Petrillo, Président du Syndicat des Musiciens Américains. Yehudi Menuhin, qui soutient Furtwängler pendant le procès en dénazification et pour sa réhabilitation, se déclare outré de « l'attitude insolente » déployée « pour exclure un illustre collègue » (113) Après 1948, Furtwängler organise des tournées avec le « Berliner Philharmoniker » en Europe, et même en Égypte, mais il a perdu beaucoup de sa force dans un procès long et pénible, lui qui se croyait hors de

tout soupçon.

Il a aussi perdu foi en son pays et en son devoir, comme lorsqu'il écrit, toujours dans ses « Carnets » (113) :

« Il n'est pas un peuple au monde qui sache estimer aussi peu ses grands hommes que les Allemands. »

C'est en novembre 1954 qu'il s'éteint, paisiblement, épuisé, et évincé par son rival, Herbert von Karajan.

Furtwängler est donc resté en Allemagne, pour diriger et défendre l'esprit allemand :

« Je savais que l'Allemagne vivait une terrible crise, je me sentais responsable de la musique allemande, et mon devoir était de l'aider à traverser cette crise. Thomas Mann croit-il vraiment que, dans l'Allemagne de Himmler, on ne devait pas diriger les œuvres de Beethoven ? Jamais ce peuple n'avait autant eu besoin d'écouter la musique de Beethoven et son message de paix et d'amour. »

Il déclare ainsi à un journaliste anglais, après-guerre :

« La simple exécution d'un chef-d'œuvre allemand représentait un plus cinglant démenti à l'esprit de Buchenwald ou d'Auschwitz que tous les discours. Un artiste ne peut pas être totalement apolitique, il doit avoir des convictions. En tant que citoyen, c'est le devoir d'un artiste d'exprimer ses convictions. Mais, comme musicien, je suis plus que citoyen, je suis allemand au sens éternel. » (114)

Peut-être peut-on conclure par les mots d'Emst Lothar, assistant de Max Reinhardt, et officier chargé des questions culturelles en Autriche :

« Furtwängler était totalement allemand, et il l'est resté, en dépit des attaques. Il n'est pas resté auprès de Hitler et de Himmler, mais auprès de Beethoven et de Brahms. » (115)

Historiographie

Les rapports entre musique et politique n'ont pas toujours été un élément clé des recherches des historiens du culturel, ni des musicologues intéressés à l'histoire. Mais, cependant, la place et le rôle de la musique dans les régimes comme l'Allemagne nazie ou l'URSS stalinienne, semblent exercer une certaine fascination chez les spécialistes d'histoire culturelle. Et même si, par rapport à la peinture ou l'architecture, la musique ne détient pas le nombre le plus élevé de productions, celles-ci se sont développées après 1950, en Europe et aux États-Unis.

Concernant la période nazie, il existe tout d'abord des ouvrages contemporains, écrits le plus souvent par des membres du NSDAP, ou de fervents sympathisants. C'est le cas de productions destinées à examiner le rôle pervers des Juifs dans la musique, comme :

Hans Brückner. « Judentum und Musik - mit dem ABC jüdischer und nichtarischer Musikbessener. » , 2e édition (1935) ; 3e édition (1938) .

Richard Eichenauer. « Musik und Rasse » , 2e édition (1937) .

Friedrich Herzog. « Was ist deutsche Musik ? » , tiré de : « Die Musik » , Band XXVI (11 août 1934) .

Alfred Rosenberg. « Blut und Ehre - Ein Kampf für deutsche Wiedergeburt. Reden und Aufsätze von 1919-1933 . » (1936) .

Herbert Gerigk et Theoth Stengel. « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik. Mit einem Titel Jüdischer Werke. » (1940) .

Des ouvrages de propagande sont aussi écrits par les autorités officielles pour promouvoir la théorie musicale du régime : cela commence avec le gouvernement de Thuringe, dès 1930, avec le « Amtsblatt des Thüringischen Ministeriums für Volksbildung » (1930) , puis, le « Kampf um Deutschland Ein Lesebuch für die deutsche Jugend » de Philipp Bouhler (Munich, « Zentralverlag der NSDAP » , 1932) . Les propos du « Führer » concernant la musique sont même publiés : « Führerworte an den deutschen Musiker. Aus der großen Kulturrede auf dem Reichsparteitag 1938 » , ou dans le « Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer » (septembre 1938) . L'exposition « Entartete Musik » , antisémite et anti-modernisme, voit son catalogue publié très tôt ; très rapidement, des ouvrages se développent sur le sujet. Un mois à peine après l'exposition, on compte ainsi « Die Reichsmusiktage in Düsseldorf Ausstellung " Entartete Musik " - Eine Ahrechnung » , de Friedrich Herzog. Peter Raabe, grand rival de Josef Goebbels dans la lutte pour le contrôle de la vie musicale, publie lui aussi un essai, « Die Musik im Dritten Reich, Kulturpolitische Reden und Aufsätze » (1935) . D'autres dignitaires du régime s'expriment sur le rôle de la musique dans l'éducation du Peuple, par exemple, Fritz Reusch dans « Musik und Musikerziehung im Dienste der Volksgemeinschaft » (1938) , ou encore, Wolfgang Stumme dans « Musik im Volk. Grundfragen der Musikerziehung » (1939) .

Les compositeurs de la période 1933-1945 fournissent également nombre d'informations sur la vie musicale en période nazie, par leurs correspondances ou leurs mémoires. Citons pour exemple : « Schriften / Musik und Politik 1924-1948 » de Hanns Eisler ; « Du nationalisme en musique » (II) (1937) de Arnold Schönberg (dans : « Le Style et l'Idée » , 1977) ; les « Correspondances » de Richard Strauss (avec Hugo von Hofmannsthal et Stefan Zweig) ; « Chroniques de ma vie » de Igor Stravinski ; ou encore, « Ausgewählte Schriften » de Kurt Weill.

Après quelques années de réflexion et de débats, les historiens allemands commencent des recherches plus poussées sur la musique en période nazie. On peut citer pour exemple : « Musik im dritten Reich » de Joseph Wulf (1962) ; Musik im NS-Saat » de Fred K. Prieberg (1982) ; « Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland » de Hanns-Werner Heister et Hans-Günther Klein (1984) ; ainsi que « Entartete Musik » de Albrecht Dümling et Peter Girth (1988) . En 1997, Thomas Mathieu publie un remarquable essai sur la politique artistique du National-Socialisme, « Kunstauffassungen und Kulturpolitik im Nationalsozialismus » , qui complète l'ouvrage de Hildegard Brenner (1980) , « Die Kunstpolitik des Nationalsozialismus » . En 2004, le brillant historien culturel Friedrich Geiger publie « Musik in zwei Diktaturen. Verfolgung von Komponisten unter Hitler und Stalin » , où il étudie les types de répression face aux

compositeurs en Allemagne nazie et en URSS. À la « Freie Universität » et à la « Musikhochschule » de Berlin, une équipe de musicologues et d'historiens de la culture, menée par Eberhardt Manfred et Albrecht Riethmüller, de l'« Institut für Musikwissenschaft », travaillent actuellement sur les rapports entre le régime nazi et la musique.

Dans les pays anglo-saxons, comme c'est le cas en Allemagne, la recherche ne se divise pas entre historiens de la culture et musicologues ; les travaux sont souvent communs, et menés de front sur les 2 niveaux, sans affirmer une dominante musicologique ou historique. Parmi les travaux les plus importants, il faut citer : Erik Levi et son « Music in the 3rd " Reich " » ; Jonathan Petropoulos et ses 2 essais, « Arts and Politics in the 3rd " Reich " » et « The Faustian Bargain : The Art World in Nazi Germany » ; Alan E. Steinweis se concentre sur le contrôle de la vie musicale en publiant « Art, Ideology & Economics in Nazi Germany : The " Reich " Chamber of Music, Theater and the Visual Arts » ; en 2004, Michal Meyer réalise un ouvrage complet sur la politique musicale du « Reich », intitulée : « The Politics of Music in the 3rd " Reich " ». L'un des principaux historiens culturels s'étant penché sur le thème de la musique sous le régime nazi est Michael H. Kater qui, par ses 2 ouvrages, « Composers of the Nazi Era » et « The Twisted Muse : Musicians and Their Music in the 3rd " Reich " », réalise un tableau d'ensemble de la musique entre 1933 et 1945.

En France, la recherche sur les relations entre histoire et musique est assez peu développée et divisée entre musicologues et historiens. Du côté des historiens de la culture, Michel Vovelle a été l'un des précurseurs et l'ont suivi dans cette voie. Esteban Buch, qui enseigne à l'École des Hautes-Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), auteur de « La 9e de Beethoven : une histoire politique ; Beethoven et le 3e " Reich " : profil d'un Titan conservateur » dans : « Le 3e " Reich " et la musique » de Pascal Huynh ; ou encore, « Le chef d'orchestre. Pratiques de l'autorité et métaphores politiques », Annales HSS, 57e année, n° 4 (juillet-août 2002). Pascal Huynh, justement, a préparé l'exposition et le catalogue de « La Musique et le 3e " Reich " », à la Cité de la Musique, Paris (2004). À l'E.H.E.S.S., un groupe de recherche sur le thème « Musique et politique » s'est constitué autour de Jean-Marie Donegani, Esteban Buch, Gil Delannoi, Laure Schnapper, Frédéric Ramel, ..., et a publié un dossier intitulé : « Musique et politique » (mai 2004), incluant des études sur la musique sous le 3e « Reich ». À l'Institut de Sciences Politiques de Paris, Myriam Chimenes et Manuela Schwartz travaillent sur la musique en Allemagne Nazie et dans la France occupée : Myriam Chimenes a ainsi dirigé le recueil « La Musique sous Vichy ».

Du côté des musicologues, on peut citer les essais de François Caodou, de l'Institut Français de Musicologie, comme « Une philosophie de la Musique dégénérée ; La vie musicale sous Vichy » ; ou encore, « Wagner et Hitler ». Amaury du Closel, musicologue et chef d'orchestre, réalise en 2004 un essai sur la vie musicale sous le régime nazi et, plus précisément, sur les compositeurs et musiciens interdits d'expression, ou pire, éliminés par le régime (« Entartete Musik : les voix étouffées du 3e " Reich " »).

Concernant la recherche sur la vie musicale sous le régime nazi, les perspectives d'étude restent donc largement ouvertes, tant sur les organisations officielles du régime, que sur le rôle des politiciens du « Reich », et les destins de musiciens et compositeurs.

Conclusion

« La musique n'est pas une arche sur laquelle on peut survivre au déluge », écrivait Bertolt Brecht à Paul Hindemith. Cette remarque semble à elle seule exprimer la complexité, l'enjeu et le dilemme soulevés par l'exercice d'un art sous une dictature. Et nombre de musiciens, durant la période nazie, en auront fait l'expérience, qu'ils soient condamnés pour « bolchévisme », « modernisme », ou « juiverie » : leur art ne les a pas sauvés de l'implacable tyrannie.

À l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir, en 1933, les mesures destinées à contrôler la vie culturelle sont immédiates : comme le souligne Pascal Huynh, organisateur de l'exposition « Le 3e " Reich " et la Musique » (116) :

« Jamais un pays, dont les nouveaux Maîtres étaient convaincus que leur mission était de restaurer l'honneur national, ne se soucia autant de l'élévation de son patrimoine. Jamais la vie des concerts ne fut aussi favorisée. »

Ainsi, un art de propagande, avec des compositeurs officiels du « Reich » tels Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner, Paul Græner ou Max Trapp, se développe, alors que les courants du modernisme musical, sont, dans l'ensemble et à l'exception de certaines périodes précises, liquidés : Arnold Schœnberg, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Kurt Weill, Ernst Křenek, et même Paul Hindemith, un temps idolâtré du régime, sont bannis. Des compositeurs de l'héritage germanique, comme Anton Bruckner et Richard Wagner, sont, à l'inverse, érigés en gloires nationales. Le répertoire est aryanisé pour répondre aux exigences idéologiques du régime, détournant les livrets de Lorenzo da Ponte ou de Georg Friedrich Händel.

À cet égard, la lutte contre les musiciens classés « dégénérés » par le régime, soit parce qu'ils sont Juifs, affiliés au modernisme musical ou au jazz, bolchéviques, ... , bref, porteurs pour le régime de toutes les marques de l'« Entartung », cette lutte est symbolisée par un événement exemplaire : l'exposition « Entartete Musik » de 1938, organisée par Hans Severus Ziegler, et qui fustige tous les compositeurs et musiciens bannis par le « Reich » .

Josef Gœbbels et d'autres politiques du Parti nazi, comme Alfred Rosenberg, Hermann Gœring ou encore Peter Raabe, se battent afin d'obtenir le contrôle de la vie musicale. C'est finalement le Ministre de la Propagande qui l'emporte et peut exercer son pouvoir sur les arts, en mettant en place une véritable « Gleichschaltung » de la vie musicale. C'est par différents organismes qu'il va assujettir la musique au service du régime nazi : les chambres artistiques, comme la « Reichsmusikkammer », en sont le meilleur exemple. Il crée aussi une « Reichsmusikprüfstelle », organisme de censure, ainsi qu'une division musicale au sein même du « Promi », qu'il confie à Heinz Drewes. Mais, en 1943, la multiplicité des organes de contrôle, leur manque de cohésion et de concertation, et leur difficile fonctionnement, montre que ni Gœbbels, ni le Parti nazi n'ont vraiment réussi à mettre au point un contrôle absolu sur la vie musicale allemande, même si de nombreux et éminents musiciens en ont été victimes.

Dans ce 20e siècle troublé, une personnalité part à l'assaut du monde musical : le chef d'orchestre. Avec Hans von Bülow, Gustav Mahler, Richard Strauß, et Arthur Nikisch, le chef devient une personnalité respectée et reconnue. Elle est sacrée avec Arturo Toscanini, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer ou encore Leopold Stokowski, qui deviennent des « stars » au sens propre du terme, des étoiles qui brillent sur les scènes du monde entier. La

génération suivante les transformera en demi-Dieux : Georg Solti, Leonard Bernstein, et plus encore, Herbert von Karajan monopolisant la vie musicale par leurs interprétations et leurs personnalités.

Parmi ces derniers, 2 chefs ont vécu le régime nazi : Furtwängler et Karajan. Les 2 n'ont pas choisi le même chemin, la même attitude face au régime, mais tous 2 ont connu le même sort après la Guerre : la dénazification, et un certain discrédit qui influera sur leurs carrières respectives. Furtwängler a choisi de servir son art en demeurant en Allemagne, coûte que coûte, en intégrant certaines organisations, telles la « Reichsmusikkammer », et a justifié cette attitude en déclarant n'avoir fait que « sauver, du mieux (qu'il a pu), la culture et la musique (allemandes) », conformément à ce que lui aurait demandé Schönberg lors d'une rencontre en France. Furtwängler fait preuve d'un certain courage en prenant position ouvertement pour la défense de musiciens juifs comme Klemperer, et pour Hindemith le moderniste. Mais, en 1945, ses concerts pour le régime et sa participation à la vie musicale nazie le font suspecter et il doit subir la dénazification, dont il sort blanchi, mais blessé dans son honneur. Karajan, quant à lui, est propulsé et érigé en rival jeune et puissant par le régime contre un Furtwängler quelquefois dérangeant. Son attitude face au Parti nazi est moins ambiguë : il y adhère par 2 fois et, dès 1933, accepte d'aller écouter la musique SS dans des camps, travaille avec un « Obersturmführer ». Lui aussi est soumis à la dénazification, et subit 30 mois de chômage, avant de connaître la gloire à Londres, Rome, Vienne, puis Berlin. Face à un Furtwängler sur le déclin, il devient le « Generalmusikdirektor » de l'Europe jusqu'à sa mort, en 1989.

Ce mémoire s'est voulu une 1re approche dans l'étude du monde musical sous le 3e « Reich » : elle ne se veut ni exhaustive, ni achevée. Toute une partie de la vie musicale de 1933 à 1945 a été volontairement éludée dans ce mémoire, à savoir celle organisée par les Juifs eux-mêmes. Certains d'entre-eux choisissent l'exil, en France, comme Erich Kahn, Hanns Eisler ou Joseph Kosma, en Grande-Bretagne, ou aux États-Unis, comme Miklós Rosza, Ernst Křenek, ou Paul Hindemith. D'autres rejoignent la Ligue culturelle des Juifs, le « Jüdischer Kulturbund », qui développe des Orchestres juifs, sous administration juive et destinés à un public juif. Selon l'historien Herbert Freedman (118), ces activités n'étaient pas vaines, dans la mesure où « soir après soir, se trouvait réfuté l'argument de ceux qui pensaient que les Juifs étaient incapables de manier la musique et le verbe ». Cette Ligue fonctionne jusqu'en 1941, date à laquelle la plupart de ses membres sont envoyés à Terezín, antichambre d'Auschwitz. C'est dans ce camp de concentration que des compositeurs comme Pavel Haas, Hans Krása, et Viktor Ullmann seront amenés à composer des œuvres magistrales, mais trop longtemps oubliées. Ullmann compose ainsi l'Opéra « Der Kaiser von Atlantis » comme un testament, avant d'être mené à la mort.

Que peut-on conclure de cette étude ? Que le Nazisme a soumis la musique, comme les autres formes d'art, à son régime ? Que musique et politique ne font pas bon ménage, en témoignent les exemples de Furtwängler ou Karajan ? Certes, ces remarques paraissent simplistes, trop certainement. Cette musique, cependant, a été muselée, humiliée, voire détruite, mais n'a jamais cessé et s'est au contraire enrichie et développée, comme dans un élan d'espoir, comme pour exprimer une volonté de vie à travers l'Art. Peut-être aussi parce que, « sans la musique, la vie serait une tragédie », comme le dit Friedrich Nietzsche, et que, sans la musique, la barbarie nazie aurait sans doute encore été plus barbare.

Résumé

Ce mémoire a été réalisé afin d'observer quels ont été les rapports entre musique et politique durant la période nazie, en Allemagne. Le fait que le « Reich » ait imposé une doctrine politique, sociale mais aussi artistique, a profondément bouleversé la vie des personnels artistiques, des musiciens, et des compositeurs. Il est aussi intéressant de voir à quel point la musique, et les arts en général, sont devenus un enjeu politique certain : si dans certaines périodes troublées de l'Histoire de l'humanité, la musique n'a pas joué un rôle de 1er plan, il semble qu'en Allemagne nazie, la musique, et particulièrement les musiciens, aient été un élément important de la politique artistique, et plus encore, de la politique globale du régime.

Ainsi, le but de cette étude est double :

Observer comment le 3e « Reich » a établi une doctrine artistique, et par quels moyens l'État a réussi à la faire appliquer.

Étudier comment 2 chefs d'orchestre allemands (Karajan et Furtwängler) , parmi les plus marquants de leur génération, ont subi et / ou collaboré avec le régime, et quels en ont été les conséquences après-guerre sur leurs carrières.

Afin de répondre à ces interrogations, des aspects théoriques ont été utilisés : les lois du « Reich » et les décrets-lois de Josef Gœbbels relatives aux Arts, l'organisation de la « Reichskulturkammer » ou de la « Reichsmusikkammer » , des statistiques de performances par compositeur, par chef. La politique musicale de l'État nazi nous a aussi conduit à nous intéresser à des notions plus abstraites comme l'« Entartung » , symbolisée musicalement par le jazz ou le modernisme ; l'aryanisation du répertoire ; ou encore les courants de la musique contemporaine de l'époque, à travers leurs spécificités et leur diversité. Enfin, des débats historiographiques ont été soulevés, portant sur les attitudes de politiciens importants du régime, et sur celles des 2 chefs mentionnés ci-dessus.

La 1re partie s'intéresse à l'idéologie et à la politique musicale mise en œuvre lors de l'accession au pouvoir des Nazis, en 1933, en théorisant les notions de modernisme (« Kulturbolschewismus ») , « antisémitisme » ou encore « Entartung » . Dans le second temps, les organisations destinées au contrôle de la politique artistique sont détaillées, ainsi que les luttes politiques pour leur contrôle : la « Gleichschaltung » , la « Reichsmusikkammer » , le rôle de Gœbbels ou de Rosenberg. La dernière partie de l'étude concerne les carrières et les attitudes de Karajan et Furtwängler durant la période nazie, ainsi que les conséquences à long terme de leurs actions, de leurs prises de positions, ou de leurs silences.

Il ressort de ces éléments que musique et politique ont été intimement liées durant ces années « noires » , et que bien des carrières de musiciens ont été bouleversées par une machine étatique appliquant une doctrine plus ou moins précise, mais toujours implacable ...

Notes

(I) Erik Levi. « Music in the 3rd Reich » ; page xi

- (2) Alfred Morgenroth. « Hört auf Hans Pfitzner » ; page 32.
 - (3) Karl Storck. « Die Musik der Gegenwart » ; page 205.
 - (4) Alfred Heuß. « An die Leser der Zeitschrift für Musik » , dans : « Zeitschrift für Musik » (octobre 1921) ; page 486.
 - (5) Arnold Schönberg. « Le Style et l'Idée » ; page 139a.
 - (6) Jane Kallir. « Arnold Schönberg et Richard Gerstl » , dans : « Vienne 1880-1939. L'Apocalypse joyeuse » ; page 444.
 - (7) Amaury du Closel. « Les voix étouffées du 3e “ Reich ” » ; page 40.
 - (8) Darius Milhaud. « Die Entwicklung der Jazz-Band und die nordamerikanische Negermusik » , dans : « Anbruch Heft » , n° 4 (avril 1925) ; pages 200-205.
 - (9) Amaury du Closel. Opus citatum ; pages 60-61.
 - (10) Eckhard John. « Musikbolschewismus, die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland 1818-1938 » ; page 47.
 - (11) ZdM , n° 89 (1922) ; page 147.
 - (12) Amaury du Closel. Opus citatum ; page 69.
 - (13) Karl Fœrtsch. « Der Kulturbolschewismus und die deutsche Jugend » ; page 3.
 - (14) Cité dans : Eckard John. Opus citatum ; page 180.
 - (15) Fred K. Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » ; page 47.
 - (16) « Völkischer Beobachter » , Berlin (20 mars 1933) .
 - (17) Se référer à : « Bruno Walter verläßt Deutschland » , dans : « Zeitschrift für Musik » (avril 1933) .
 - (18) Fred K. Prieberg. « Ein Sommernachtstraum - arisch » , dans : « Musik im NS-Staat » ; pages 144-164.
 - (19) « Wie lange noch Mozart à la Levi ? » , dans : « Die Musik » (janvier 1936) ; page 279.
- Siegfried Anheisser. « Hermann Levi und die anderen jüdische Übersetzer / Die Stellung des Judentums zu Mozart und

Wagner » , dans : « Für den deutschen Mozart » ; pages 203-209.

(20) Hermann Stephani. « Mozarts Requiem. Vorschlag zur Text Retusche » , dans : « Zeitschrift für Musik » (octobre 1940) ; page 628.

(21) Alfred Rosenberg. « Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts » ; page 617.

(22) Se référer aux Annexes 1, 2 et 3.

(23) Paul Græner. « Aufklang » , dans : « DKW » , volume 2, n° 12 (1933) .

(24) Cité dans : Viktor Reimann. « Josef Gœbbels » ; page 167.

(25) Michæl H. Kater. « The Twisted Muse » ; page 180

(26) Joseph Wulf. « Musik im dritten Reich » ; page 340.

(27) Paul Hindemith. « Briefe » ; page 226.

(28) Se référer aux Annexes 4 et 5.

(29) Listes publiées dans le « Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikammer » .

(30) Se référer à l'Annexe 7.

(31) Erik Levi. Opus citatum ; page 95.

(32) Hans Severus Ziegler. « Entartete Musik. Eine Abrechnung » ; page 16.

(33) Ibid. ; page 19.

(34) Ibid. ; page 20.

(35) Amaury du Closel. Opus citatum ; page 151.

(36) Ibid. ; page 151.

(37) « Ein gutes Beispiel » , dans : « Kritik der Zeit, NS Monatshefte » (1930) ; page 43.

(38) « Zeitschriften-Schau » , dans : « Zeitschrift für Musik » (octobre 1932) ; page 850.

- (39) Hans-Severus Ziegler. « Praktische Kulturarbeit im Dritten Reich » ; pages 39-40.
- (40) Hugo Rasch. « Das Tonkünstlerfest der Allgemeinen Deutschen Musikvereins in Dortmund 19-23 Juni 1933 » , dans : « DKW » , volume 2, n° 13 ; pages 9-10.
- (41) Friedrich Herzog. « Zeit zu Zeit » , dans : « Die Musik » (juin 1934) ; pages 314-316.
- (42) Hermann Killer. « Der Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein am Scheidewege » , dans « Die Musik » (septembre 1935) ; pages 894-897.
- (43) Loi du 13 mars 1933 du 3e « Reich » allemand.
- (44) Max Butting. « Musikgeschichte die ich miterlebte » ; page 99.
- (45) Loi du 13 juin 1933 du 3e « Reich » allemand.
- (46) Josef Goebbels. « Die Tagebücher » ; page 456.
- (47) Se référer aux Annexes 7, 9 et 10.
- (48) Eliot B. Wheaton. « Prelude to calamity : the Nazi Revolution, 1933-1935 » ; pages 415-416.
- (49) Heinz Ihler. « Die Reichsmusikkammer, Ziele, Leistungen und Organisation » ; pages 16-17.
- (50) Cité dans : Hans Hinkel. « Handbuch der Reichsmusikkammer » ; page 92.
- (51) Se référer à l'Annexe 8.
- (52) Hildegard Brenner. « Die Kunstpolitik des Nationalsozialismus » ; page 59.
- (53) « Zeitschrift für Musik » (mars 1934) ; page 289
- (54) Se référer à l'Annexe 6.
- (55) Josef Goebbels. « Die Tagebücher » , volume 4 ; page 78.
- (56) Ibid. ; page 181.
- (57) Ibid. ; page 114.

(58) Erik Levi. Opus citatum ; page 38.

(59) Se référer à l'Annexe 11.

(60) Amaury du Closel. Opus citatum ; page 98.

(61) Se référer à : Brigitte Hamann. « Winifred Wagner oder Hitlers Bayreuth » .

(62) Lettre à Alexander Spring, dans : Annette Hein. « “ Es ist viel Hitler in Wagner ” : Rassismus und antisemitische Deutschumsideologie in den “ Bayreuther Blättern ” » ; page 176.

(63) Hans von Wolzogen. « Masse und Meister » , dans « Bayreuther Blätter » (1930) ; page 50.

(64) Karl Grunsky. « Geistiges Ringen » , dans « Bayreuther Blätter » (1933) ; page 198.

(65) Adolf Hitler. « Mein Kampf » ; page 357.

(66) Se référer à : Alfred Rosenberg. « Kampf für das Schicksal des deutschen Heimat » .

(67) Alfred Rosenberg. « Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts » ; page 447.

(68) Amaury du Closel. Opus citatum ; page 134.

(69) ...

(70) Se référer à : Robert Oboussier. « Berliner Musikchronik 1930-1938 » .

(71) Se référer à : Gisela Tamsen. « The Berlin Philharmonic and its conductors through the changing time » .

(72) Wilhelm Furtwängler. « Carnets » .

(73) Olivier Rathkolb. Cité dans : Roger Vaughan. « Karajan » ; page 122.

(74) Roger Vaughan. « Karajan » ; page 125.

(75) Roger Vaughan. Opus citatum ; page 126.

(76) Se référer à l'Annexe 13.

- (77) Se référer à : Otto Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » .
- (78) Werner Thärichen. « Karajan on Furtwängler » ; page 19.
- (79) Cité dans : Norman Lebrecht. « Mæstro : mythes et réalités des grands chefs d'orchestre » ; page 123.
- (80) Cité dans : « Le Monde de la Musique, spécial Herbert von Karajan » (hors-série, 1999) ; page 45.
- (81) Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 124.
- (82) Cité dans : Robert Pariente. « La symphonie des Chefs » ; page 83.
- (83) Cité dans : Fred K. Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » ; Paul Moor. « The Operator » , dans : « High-Fidelity Magazine » (1957) .
- (84) Herbert von Karajan. « My Autobiography, as told to Franz Endler » ; page 149.
- (85) Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 132.
- (86) Roger Vaughan. Opus citatum ; page 108.
- (87) Roger Vaughan. Opus citatum ; page 109.
- (88) Roger Vaughan. Opus citatum ; page 111.
- (89) Roger Vaughan. Opus citatum ; page 123.
- (90) Cité dans : Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 135.
- (91) Ibid. ; page 135.
- (92) Ibid. ; page 135.
- (93) Cité dans : Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 140.
- (94) Se référer à : John Culshaw. « Putting the record straight » , et « Ring Resounding » .
- (95) Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 145.
- (96) Normann Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 152.

(97) Se référer à : Hermann Heße. « Musique » .

(98) Cité dans : « Le Monde de la Musique, spécial Herbert von Karajan » (hors-série, 1999) ; page 38.

(99) Wilhelm Furtwängler. « Carnets » ; page 35.

(100) Se référer à l'Annexe 12.

(101) « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » (12 avril 1933) .

(102) Elisabeth Furtwängler. « Über Wilhelm Furtwängler » ; introduction.

(103) Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 111.

(104) Elisabeth Furtwängler. « Über Wilhelm Furtwängler » ; introduction.

(105) Se référer à l'Annexe 14.

(106) Daniel Gillis. « Furtwängler and America » ; page 59.

(107) Roger Smithson. « Furtwängler : les années de silence (1945-1947) » ; page 3.

(108) Wilhelm Furtwängler. « Carnets » ; page 45.

(109) Roger Smithson. Opus citatum ; page 4.

(110) « Berlin will Wilhelm Furtwängler » , dans : « Berliner Zeitung » (16 février 1946) .

(111) Se référer à : Sam H. Shirakawa. « The Devil's Music Master » .

(112) Se référer à l'article de Erika Mann, dans : « The Herald Tribune New York » (31 mai 1947) .

(113) Cité dans : Elisabeth Furtwängler. Opus citatum.

(114) Cité dans : Norman Lebrecht. Opus citatum ; page 114.

(115) Cité dans : Elisabeth Furtwängler. Opus citatum ; page 78.

(116) Cité de la Musique, Paris (du 9 octobre au 28 novembre 2004) . Catalogue de l'Exposition édité chez Fayard.

(117) Cité dans : Bertrand Dermoncourt. « La Musique sous la botte nazie » , dans « L'Express » (11 Octobre 2004) .

(118) Cité dans : Bertrand Dermoncourt. « La Musique sous la botte nazie » , dans « L'Express » (11 Octobre 2004) .

Le jazz sous le 3e « Reich »

During the Weimar Republic, jazz conquered Germany and in the process became a symbol of the « Roaring 20's » . Yet, bitter protest was already stirring from nationalist conservatives and right-wing circles. After Adolf Hitler took power, in 1933, the conflict over jazz intensified. The so-called « Fremdländisch » (alien) music had to be eradicated. After some early prohibitions, in this regard, and the creation of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , which would mean exclusion for Jewish musicians and impede artistic exchange with foreign musicians, there followed a liberal phase owing to the 1936 Olympic games being held in Berlin. With the success of the new jazz-style swing and the strengthening of the so-called « Swingjugend » (Swing Youth) , however, further repression came in 1937 and 1938. District Nazi Party leaders, police directors and local business people began to issue numerous decrees prohibiting swing, jazz, and swing dancing for their respective region, city or local establishment. Despite these restrictions, jazz's presence continued, because of the ease with which ignorant inspectors were out-smarted, and the sympathies for the agreeable swing style harboured even by some Nazi functionaries.

After the beginning of World War II, the boycott of cultural products from so-called enemy nations, and bans on dancing, also came to affect jazz. Nevertheless, jazz experienced an upturn in the years of the German « Blitzkrieg » , so much so that after the initial War successes, the prohibition on swing dancing, for example, was once again lifted. On the other hand, jazz bands were brought from countries occupied by or allied with Germany as a substitute for the German musicians called into the armed services. These bands satisfied the demand for syncopated popular music by the civilian population as well as by soldiers on leave from the front. For economic reasons, the Nazi regime, for a long time, even tolerated the production and distribution of German as well as foreign records and films with jazz content. On various occasions, moreover, swing music was actually used in foreign propaganda. This occurred, for example, in recordings and radio broadcasts of the propaganda big band « Charlie and his Orchestra » , which was assembled by order of Josef Gœbbels' « Propagandaministerium » (Ministry of Propaganda) . Only on 17 January 1942, were public and private dance events finally prohibited. The defeat at Stalingrad (31 January - 2 February 1943) and Gœbbels' proclamation of « Total War » (18 February 1943) signalled the end for most of the venues used by swing bands, which in the end led to the downfall of jazz as well.

Despite all the campaigns of defamation and prohibition, as well as the incarceration of some jazz musicians and jazz fans, it cannot be said that there was no German jazz scene in the 3rd « Reich » . Sustained by professional and amateur musicians, jazz bands, and also by enthusiastic swing fans and record collectors, it is more accurate to say that the development of jazz was severely encumbered by political conditions. This made the jazz scene increasingly dependent for its survival upon the loopholes of Nazi cultural policy. Such loopholes existed because the cultural politics of the 3rd « Reich » « vis-a-vis » jazz and jazz-related music was characterized by the coexistence of contradictory and ambivalent measures, for which no unified strategy existed. Depending on the inner dynamic of Nazi

ideology and foreign policy developments, Nazism's response to jazz oscillated between prohibition for ideological reasons, and toleration and appropriation for economic and market-driven considerations. This explains why the Nazis did not decree an all-encompassing, nationwide ban on jazz, nor issue any corresponding law.

Jazz in the Camps

Though ostracized by the Nazi regime as « degenerate », reports by historical witnesses and survivors substantiate the claim that jazz, as well as jazz-related music, could be heard within numerous Nazi camps. That such reports do not constitute the exception is made clear by similar activities of prisoners of War, in camps for foreign civilians and forced labour camps, in police detainment camps, in the internment camps of Vichy (France) , in the Dutch transport camp « Westerbork » , and in the Polish ghettos of Łódź, Warsaw and Vilna, not to mention the equally secret jazz sessions of the members of the « Swingjugend » in youth detention and concentration camps. A few examples should serve to make the spectrum of these jazz activities clear.

In the French prisoner camp in Perpignan, in 1942, for example, the Viennese Erich Pechmann, imprisoned because of his Jewish faith, sang blues pieces and, in addition, imitated instruments with his voice. Using only these simple methods, as Fred Wander relates, Pechmann was able to boost the morale of his fellow prisoners :

« When he played, everything became quiet. He magically produced the sound of an entire band. Everywhere where Pechmann went, he reassured these frightened people. »

Pechmann himself would not survive his detention, and died on 4 August 1944 of typhus.

In November 1939, a group of students from Czechoslovakia founded a vocal octet called the « Sing Sing Boys » in Sachsenhausen. One part of their programme consisted of well-known musical dance numbers of film melodies in a swing arrangement. Beyond that, they used compositions in the jazz idiom from their musical leader Karel Štancl as well as satirical songs from the Liberated Theatre in Prague, which had been closed in 1938 due to its anti-Fascist leanings. These songs contained the heavily jazz-influenced melodies of Jaroslav Ježek, and their performance was prohibited by the German occupiers. Josef Šárka described the concerts of the « Sing Sing Boys » in a letter :

« These appearances were regularly planned. Saturday, Sunday, but also spontaneously, when the oldest camp prisoners came to visit for example. Or during recreational time, when there was no trouble brewing in the camp and it was unlikely that the SS would enter the camp. »

Sometimes even SS members were in the audience, looking for a distraction. Even those prisoners who did not have the energy or opportunity to be present at such concerts were, after a note from Štancl, thankful for the encouragement and variety :

« I cannot think of a single appearance in front of the comrades which was not well-received, with satisfaction and even a certain amount of thankfulness. »

All members of the « Sing Sing Boys » were released under the auspices of a prisoner amnesty program by spring 1943.

In the concentration camp at Buchenwald there were already plans, in 1939, to found a jazz ensemble, but this could only be realized 4 years later, with the support of the illegal International Camp Committee of inmates. This organization had been able to place politically active prisoners in key positions in the camp bureaucracy. Herbert Weidlich, active in the office detail, could now assign all of the musicians of the jazz orchestra « Rhythm » to the specially created work detail for « Transport Protection » . This provided enough time for rehearsals, which were held secretly during time officially allotted for work. A further advantage was that the musicians were not threatened by dangerous or physically demanding work. Not least, the « manipulation » of transports from Buchenwald to other camps guaranteed a constant supply of personnel. Gradually, « Rhythm » developed into a big band with an international personnel that ranged from the amateur to the professional. Older prisoners, who had at 1st rejected « bourgeois » jazz music, recognized that these performances served not only to boost the morale of the prisoners, but also as camouflage for illegal meetings of the camp committee. The concerts themselves took place in specific blocks and, with the knowledge of the SS, also at entertainment evenings held in the movie barracks, so that here, too, jazz music could be heard. Through newly arrived musicians allocated to the band, band members were even made familiar with the latest stylistic developments in jazz. According to Jiri Zák, a U.S. pilot who had been shot down told the band about « Bebop » and « Gillespie's and Parker's " Workshop " on 52nd Street » .

Due to its special position as a « show camp » , « Theresienstadt » had at its disposal an extraordinary amount of cultural freedom and a high-standing (both quantitatively and qualitatively) musical life. Alongside numerous performances of Classical music, there were regular jazz concerts. The jazz combo of the clarinetist and saxophonist Bedrich « Fritz » Weiß was one of the 1st music groups to be formed there. Besides this, the incarcerated jazz and dance musicians accompanied cabaret shows and grouped together to form various bands. The most famous of these was the « Ghetto-Swingers » , which matured from a Czech amateur band under the leadership of the pianist Martin Roman to become an big band. Their music was often rejected by older camp inmates, while younger ones like Klaus Scheurenberg considered the musicians, a sensation :

« “ Nigger jazz ” was offered here, in outstanding form, without objection from the SS. For us, young people, Viennese “ Café ” music was boring, but the new style of the “ Ghetto-Swingers ” buoyed us through their weekly performances in front of the café. »

This popularity and even a performance in a propaganda film about the camp could not, however, protect the « Ghetto-Swingers » from deportation to Auschwitz-Birkenau. Those who had survived the selection formed the core for the newly-founded camp band. Guitarist Coco Schumann talked about this in an interview :

« So the camp “ Kapo ” (leader of work commandos) and “ Lagerälteste ” (camp leader) had a party for the “ Blockältesten ” (block leaders) . And we played. They came in woman's clothing and shoes. Then, they were drunk. One of them took his shoe off and I had to drink champagne from it. But as hard criminals often are, when they hear

music, they start crying like babies. »

If the musicians in « Theresienstadt » could fashion a pure, artistically ambitious jazz repertoire, then they became mere musical slaves in Auschwitz, where their lives depended upon the momentary disposition of the SS and functionaries. Because the musicians were useful for them, the camp band did offer the possibility of escaping the gas chamber. Later, the remaining musicians were transferred via Berlin and Sachsenhausen into a satellite camp of Dachau. But only a few members of the « Ghetto-Swingers » survived the Shoah.

Depending on the particular camp and the specific situation of the camp, the function of jazz and jazz-influenced music in the Nazi camp system was extremely variable. On the one hand, it was an essential component of illegal and / or tolerated camp culture ; on the other, it was a means of propaganda and distraction for the henchmen of the Nazi regime. In their own field of responsibility, individual SS members hardly bothered themselves about the music guidelines of the regime. And so, it came to pass that even the « SS-Rottenführer » (an SS leader) Percy Broad jammed together with Dutch jazz musicians in the men's section of Auschwitz-Birkenau. Only through such varying motivations could the scorned jazz « survive » in, of all places, the Nazi camps. Likewise, the saxophonist Miroslav Hejtmár summarized of his performances with the Buchenwald jazz orchestra « Rhythm » :

« Music that was strictly prohibited as “ racially impure ” by the 3rd “ Reich ” was played before a public so international in composition that, under any other circumstances, it would not have come together. And all of these listeners understood what it was about. The SS, though, did not get it. »

Swing as an Attitude Towards Life

Arising in the mid-1930's and originating in the United States, the newest style of jazz, swing, brought forth a renewed interest in jazz across the world, even in Nazi Germany. As the world began to recover from economic depression, swing and swing-influenced music came to represent the latest trend in popular music. Despite discrimination against jazz music and jazz culture in the 3rd « Reich » , swing found an enthusiastic and dance-hungry audience. For a group of mostly young fans, however, swing music and dancing represented more than a passing fad. For them, it became an overall attitude towards life. These enthusiastic swing fans created their own discrete youth culture. They were to be found primarily in large cities across almost the entire European continent, e.g. , in England, France (« Les Zazous ») , Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Austria (« Schlurfs ») , Switzerland and in the former Czechoslovakia. In comparison with developments in other countries, however, German swing fans were decisively affected not only by the stigmatization of jazz by the Nazi regime, but also by preparations for War and / or experiences of War. This meant that it was only in Germany, with allowance for the annexed Austria, that the « Swingjugend » became a political matter.

Swingjugend

The 1st German « Swing Cliques » , as they were snidely termed in Nazi jargon, originated in 1935-1936 in Hamburg, Berlin, and Frankfurt-am-Main. Incidentally, though the term « Swingjugend » (Swing Youth) also derives from Nazi

parlance and is similarly discriminatory in intent, it became the standard term. By contrast, the term « Swing Kids » is not historically founded and appeared for the 1st time in the film of the same name (United States, 1993, directed by Thomas Carter) . In the 1st years of the War, the « Swingjugend » movement registered a comparably large influx of members and developed into a protest movement that the Nazi regime had to take seriously. The « Swingjugend » rejected the Nazi State, above all because of its ideology and uniformity, its militarism, the « Führer principle » and the leveling « Volksgemeinschaft » (People's Community) . They experienced a massive restriction of their personal freedom. They rebelled against all this with jazz and swing, which stood for a love of life, self-determination, non-conformism, freedom, independence, Liberalism, and internationalism.

In addition to the polite external appearance of the « Swingjugend » which accompanied a cool and laid-back demeanor based on Anglo-American clothing and lifestyle, the Nazis were affronted above all else by their Liberal attitude towards life. Because the « Swingjugend » hardly bothered about curfews, bans on dancing, or the ban on listening on so-called « enemy radio stations » once the War began, they got into further conflicts with the Nazi State. Added to this, the « Swingjugend » began to express their oppositional stance more and more explicitly. This ranged from their mockery of the Nazi movement through provocative actions and violent confrontations, to their refusal of compulsory membership of the « Hitlerjugend » and of the « Bund Deutscher Mädel » (League of German Girls) or of military service in the army. However, commitment to jazz led to their discrimination, isolation, and, finally, criminalization, only when it occurred in connection with non-musical reasons for oppression (alleged moral waywardness, rejection of service in the « Hitlerjugend » or « Bund Deutscher Mädel » , being of the Jewish faith, etc.) . Such acts resulted in swing enthusiasts having to suffer all kinds of sanctions and acts of reprisals. But the fight against the « Swingjugend » was hampered by the fact that the Nazi State had no nation-wide agreed-upon means of dealing with them. Also, in the « Swingjugend » , the Nazis were not confronting a unified organization, but loosely organized, informal peer-groups of friends.

Hamburg's Swing Fans in Nazi Camps

Because Hamburg was considered the center of the « Swingjugend » , the « Gestapo » , police, and other governmental organizations proceeded with special cruelty against the swing movement there. Many « swing boys » and « swing girls » had to endure discriminating interrogations, torture, and detention by the « Gestapo » . This led many a swing fan to commit suicide. Even the national leader of the SS, Heinrich Himmler himself, demanded in a letter from 26 January 1942, that their « ring-leaders » be locked away in concentration camps for 2 to 3 years. Between 40 and 70 of Hamburg's Swing Boys and Swing Girls were deported to various Nazi camps. Youths under the age of 18 were, generally speaking, consigned to the so-called « Jugendschutzlager » (Youth Detention Camps : a type of concentration camp for young people) . The boys were sent to the male-camp Moringen, while the girls were sent to the female camp Uckermark, which was situated near Ravensbrück. After March 1942, adults and Jewish swing members, on the other hand, were deported to Theresienstadt or to concentration camps in Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald, Harzungen, Dora-Mittelbau, Neuengamme, Ravensbrück, Sachsenhausen or Auschwitz.

The Swing Girls were housed separately at the Uckermark youth detention camp in 1942, and were subjected to constant acts of intimidation by the SS. Since the Swing Boys had been categorized as politically oppositional prisoners

at Moringen youth detention camp, they were all held together in the same block. This meant that they could mutually support each other. Together, they secretly sang popular swing titles like « Jeepers, Creepers » ; « Caravan » ; « Some Of These Days » ; « The Flat Foot Floogie » ; « Sweet Sue, Just You » ; or « Goody Goody » . Like their fellow prisoners, they had to work days as forced labourers at a munitions factory. But since the factory did not fall under the oversight of the SS, they could collectively indulge in their passion for jazz in the pauses. Günter Discher remembers how they would imitate the performance of a big-band :

« The salt mine where we worked had really nice acoustics. One of us played on the cartridges - these were like wooden boxes, and he would play drums with some sticks. We improvised all sorts of things. Sometimes, it sounded horrible. Either way, we had successfully gotten through our so-called breakfast break. It was a survival strategy.

Far more dangerous was the unauthorized eaves-dropping on radio programmes in the SS cantina. By means of such actions, the Swing Boys not only used jazz to retain their group identity in Moringen, but were also able to bring-out their oppositional stance and to distinguish themselves from the rest of the prisoners. Their fellow prisoners, according to Discher, didn't know what to do with swing music. We swings became quickly arrogant and had little contact with the others. »

In contrast, the Hamburg Swing Girls in the concentration camp Ravensbrück expressly sang for their fellow prisoners. They were housed together with other female political prisoners in the same block. To this group belonged the sisters Jutta and Inga Madlung, who performed different swing tunes after work or after lights out. In an interview, Jutta Madlung recalled :

« They liked it and were happy about the variety it brought whenever we sang “ In the Mood ” or “ Bei mir bist du schön ” or “ A Tisket, a Tasket ”, or whatever.

But precautions had to be taken so that the performance of hated jazz melodies was not accidentally discovered by an overseer :

“ Sometimes at night, after lights out, we were quite precocious and would cover the windows with our bed sheets and then we would sing. ” »

Herbert Schemmel, interned at the concentration camp Neuengamme, tells of an audacious part of swing history. After his confiscated private record collection was handed-over to his parents, this jazz fan had the records sent to him in the camp. It was possible for him to do this because the SS had had to make concessions to the prisoners after the middle of 1942, in order to make-up for their increased use of prisoners for forced labour. Thus, prisoners were allowed to form camp-bands or to receive food packets. Schemmel took the risk of having the records sent, because as « Lagerschreiber » (Camp Scribe) , he occupied a high-position within the so-called « Häftlingsselbstverwaltung » (Prisoner Self-government) , appointed by the camp's commanders.

« Thereupon, I had my portable record player, along with about 100 records sent to me : English and American swing

records. They got here, but I never received them. Schitli (Wilhelm Schitli, head of the detention camp) called for me and said that there was already something in my files about connections to English industrial circles. The records, therefore, had to be confiscated and would be stored along with my effects. »

This was then done. But the SS man checked-out these records, allegedly dangerous to the State, and the record player and used them at a party at his own home. In the confusion of the last months of the War, Herbert Schemmel was finally able, in January 1945, to illegally smuggle his property out of the effects room and to play the jazz records again.

That Herbert Schemmel did finally recover his records tells us much about the persecution of the members of the swing movement. In the final analysis, the Nazi regime was not able to exercise complete control over the « Swingjugend » and many swing fans remained true to their music, even in the camps of the 3rd « Reich ». Precisely in this extreme situation, music provided a strong footing and constituted a form of intellectual resistance, strengthened all the more by the memory of the many years of persecution for their ties to jazz. Yet, despite such bold activities, it must not be forgotten that many of the Swing Boys and Swing Girls died because of the inhumane conditions of their imprisonment.

« Negermusik »

« Negermusik » (Negro Music) was a pejorative term used by the Nazis during the 3rd « Reich » to signify musical styles and performances by African-Americans that were of the Jazz and Swing music genres. They viewed these musical styles in a racist fashion as inferior works belonging to an « inferior race » and, therefore, prohibitive. The term, at that same time, was also applied to indigenous music styles of black Africans.

At the time of the Weimar Republic during 1927, Ernst Křenek's Opera of « Jonny spielt auf ! » (Johnny Strikes-up the Band !) contained jazz musical performances that caused protests among some Right-wing ethnic-nationalist groups in Germany at the time. In 1930, the American musician Henry Cowell wrote in the « Melos » journal that jazz interpreted a mixture of African-American and Jewish elements, stating that :

« The fundamentals of jazz are the syncopation and rhythmic accents of the Negro. Their modernization is the work of New York Jews. So, Jazz is Negro music seen through the eyes of the Jews. »

Such views were readily picked-up by the Nazis. Their criticisms have included « gratuitous use of syncopation » and « orgies of drums ». More statements from the Nazis included such things as « artistic licentiousness » and « corruption seed in the musical expression » with « indecent dance forms ». They went on to scrutinize all modern music of the 1930's as a « political weapon of the Jews ». On 4 May 1930, Wilhelm Frick, the « Reich » 's newly appointed Minister of the Interior and Education for Thuringia made a decree called : « Against the Negro Culture - For Our German Heritage » .

In 1932, the national government under Franz von Papen pandered to the Nazis by banning all public performances

by black musicians. After Adolf Hitler gained « seizure of power » , in 1933, the « Reich » 's Music Chamber was also created in that same year. This was, then, followed by a full legal ban on this music, on October 12, 1935, across all German national radio. This ban was spear-headed by the German « Reich » 's radio conductor, Eugen Hadamovsky, who purportedly stated :

« Mit dem heutigen Tag spreche ich ein endgültiges Verbot des Negerjazz für den gesamten Deutschen Rundfunk aus. »

(As of today, I am speaking on a definitive ban on the negro jazz for the entire German Radio.)

In 1938, the Nazis organized the « Entartete Musik » public exhibition in Germany, mainly held in Düsseldorf. This exhibition included a poster displaying a cartoon caricature of an African-American male playing on a saxophone with the Star of David on his tuxedo lapel. The overall theme of the exhibition was that of a defamation of contemporary American music as « Negro music » and as another Jewish « plot » upon German culture.

The « Swing Kids » (« Swingjugend ») were a group of jazz and swing-lovers in Germany in the 1930's, mainly in Hamburg (« Sankt Pauli ») and Berlin. They were mainly composed of 14 to 18 year old boys and girls. They defied National-Socialism (Nazism) by listening and dancing to this same banned music in private quarters, clubs, rented halls and vacant « cafés » . Jazz music was offensive to Nazi ideology, because it was often performed by blacks and a number of Jewish musicians. The « Swing Kids » gave the impression of being apolitical, similar to their zoot suiter counter-parts in North America.

On 18 August 1941, in a brutal police operation, over 300 « Swing Kids » were arrested. The measures against them ranged from cutting their hair and sending them back to school under close monitoring, to the deportation of their leaders to Nazi concentration camps.

Prior to the D-Day landings, during the German occupation of the Netherlands, Josef Goebbels's propaganda ministry published pamphlets written in Dutch, named : « Greetings from England - The Coming Invasion » . These pamphlets contained in-between statements, such as « old jazz-records » and a further full statement declaring « at the celebration of liberation your daughters and wives will be dancing in the arms of real Negroes » . This further equated Jazz music with « blackness » during this time to stir up racism and anti-Allied propaganda within occupied Europe.

Ironically, Goebbels managed to create a Nazi-sponsored German swing-band named « Charlie » and his Orchestra whose propagandistic purpose was to win over Nazi support and sympathy from British and American listeners through short-wave radio.

Additionally counter-propaganda was used by Allied forces which played upon the fears of the Nazi's banned music. One such example is Glenn Miller, who was a White American Jazz musician, that initially provided Jazz music, through radio, to Allied combat soldiers for the purposes of entertainment and morale. His same music was used as counter-propaganda by AFN radio broadcasting to denounce fascist oppression in Europe with even Miller once stating himself :

« America means freedom, and there's no expression of freedom quite so sincere as music. » (Glenn Miller)

...

Jazz was much more than just a creative pastime ; in fact, people saw jazz as the « essence of the era's modernism » , a strong surge toward greater equality and emancipation, posing as a perfect advocate for a democracy in Germany. With its debonair, carefree interdependence on chorus-line culture of the cabarets of Berlin, some dubbed jazz as the « incarnation of American vitalism » . Yet, despite the Liberal attitudes of the Weimar democracy, the public and private sentiment toward blacks, including African Americans, was ambivalent ; there was a lack of black jazz musicians in Germany. Regardless of their social situation, the deeply engrained and institutionalized racism of German society was not tolerant of blacks. For instance, many nationalistic student fraternities rejected student members who were coloured or married to coloured females. Furthermore, in 1932, all the conservative musicians and critics were denigrating jazz as a product of « Negro » culture, which provided the government the fodder to forbid the hiring of black musicians. Thus, for many African-American artists, popularity was a mere facade of a grim reality of being seen as a « racial alien » . One critic even went as far as to call jazz a mere « negro noise » , having only one purpose : « To introduce obscenities into society. »

Paul Schewers, a music-critic, brought forth crude images of lewdly dancing black boys and girls in the service of procreation, implying that the lower-forces were always surging through blacks, overtaking the rational light of morality and reason the way the white man grasped it. Undoubtedly, sensuality has an affinity with dance, and it was pervasive in jazz and in the lyrics, but this became a means of judging it as void of morality, and even æsthetics, reduced to being inferior to « high-German culture » .

In neighbouring European countries, the trend continued in the 1930's. Fan magazines were created for jazz and so-called « hot clubs » . The Nazi regime pursued and banned the broadcasting of jazz on German radio, partly because of its African roots and because many of the active jazz musicians were of Jewish origin ; and partly due to the music's certain themes of individuality and freedom. For the Nazis, jazz was an especially threatening form of expression. An anti-jazz radio broadcast « From the Cake Walk to Hot » sought a deterrent effect with « particularly insisting musical examples » .

Perhaps, the source of the critique against jazz was the modernity it implied ; in fact, many of the Jazz-critics were those who were against any form of modernity. Those World War I veterans with Fascist pretensions and of the anti-Semitic « Freikorps » banded with other members in the National-Socialist movement in denouncing Jews and blacks. This burgeoning hatred of jazz and its sub-culture infected the entire Nazi Party structure that Adolf Hitler and his followers were trying so desperately to erect.

Hitler was not fond of modernism in the arts, which included music ; in the Nazi Party's program of February 1920, he threatened to enforce future governmental laws against such inclinations in art and literature. Even though he never publicly spoke-out against jazz, specifically in the Weimar Republic, one can infer that Hitler's sentiments toward

jazz must have had strong ties to his perception of racial hierarchy, with jazz, not surprisingly, being at the very bottom.

In the 1930's, jazz began to see its downturn and started to suffer. Jazz's potential for being linked with the downtrodden minorities and pariahs of German society (the blacks and Jews) rendered it suspect. The future policies emerging against Jazz were encouraged by German musicologists and radio spokesmen. In 1935, attempting to widen the perceived gap between « Nigger-Jew Jazz » and « German Jazz » , Hans Otto Fricke used his prominent status as the director of « Radio Frankfurt » , giving a 2 part lecture series on the subject. To a great extent, Jazz shared a similar fate with other post-War modernist art such as atonal music. It wasn't until 1931 that many crucial British and American jazz players began to leave the country as they faced increasing xenophobic harassment from colleagues and authorities. Many thought that the death of Jazz was upon them, but little did they anticipate that it would be reborn into vitality and health under a dictatorship.

Up until 1935, Josef Gœbbels, the « Reich » Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, had hoped to convince and persuade the public via anti-Jazz propaganda, rather than prohibit jazz. However, jazz was banned in 1935 (WFMU Staff) . In 1935, the Nazi government did not allow German musicians of Jewish origin to perform any longer. The Weintraub Syncopators (most of whom were Jewish) were forced into exile. They worked abroad during much of the 1930's, touring throughout Europe, Asia, and the Middle-East before settling in Australia, in 1937. Even people with a single Jewish grandparent like swing trumpeter Hans Berry were forced to play undercover or to work abroad (in Belgium, the Netherlands or in Switzerland) .

Other dance bands and musicians were not even that fortunate. For example, Mitja Nikisch, son of the celebrated Classical conductor Arthur Nikisch and himself a respected Classical pianist, had created a fine popular dance ensemble in the 1920's, the « Mitja Nikisch Tanz Orchester » , which played in prominent venues. The Nazi regime brought about its demise, leading Nikisch to commit suicide in 1936.

From 1937 onward, American musicians in Europe couldn't cross German borders. Admittedly, in spite of such persecution it was still possible, at least in major cities, to buy jazz records until the beginning of the War ; however, the further development of, and the contact with, the American Jazz World were largely interrupted. The « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Music Chamber) supported dance music that bore some traits of Swing, but listening to foreign stations, which regularly played jazz, was penalised from 1939 on. Even after certain songs and performers were banned in Germany, several radio stations played jazz music by printing a new, German-centric label. For example, the song « Tiger Rag » became « Schwarzer Panther » , or the « black panther » . « Josef ! Josef ! » became « Sie will nicht Blumen und nicht Schokolade » , which translates as « She wants neither flowers nor chocolate. » (WFMU Staff) .

Some musicians did not want to follow this command. Thus, for example, when Jazz was finally prohibited by the Nazis at the beginning of the War, the clarinetist Ernst Höllerhagen left Germany for exile in Switzerland.

At that time, only a relatively small number of people in Germany knew how jazz music sounded in America (at that

time, swing) and that it was Jazz. With the pressing War-time effort, from 1941 to 1943, the Nazis accidentally fostered the jazz craze by forcing bands from Nazi-occupied nations in Western Europe to perform, bringing hot swing. Eventually, the Nazi Party realized that jazz could not be removed entirely from Germany (WFMU Staff) . The Nazis even re-developed and newly produced some pieces, giving them new lyrics, in special studios. One example is the song « Black Bottom » , which was presented as « Schwarzer Boden » . For some Germans, the banned foreign stations with jazz programs were very popular.

The Nazis, on the one hand, would jam transmissions from the Allies' stations but, on the other hand, would also copy them. The band « Charlie and His Orchestra » is considered as a negative example, also called « Herr Gœbbels Jazz Band » . Several of Germany's most talented swing musicians, such as saxophonist Lutz Templin and vocalist Karl « Charlie » Schwedler, were active in a Jazz band. Here, the Nazis replaced the original texts with their own provocative propaganda texts that were pro-Nazi and anti-American/British. For example, the lyrics for « Little Sir Echo » has anti-American/British appeal with lyrics such as :

« German U-boats are making you sore, You're always licked, not a victory came through. You're nice, little fellow but, by now, you should know that you can never win this War ! »

Gœbbels' propaganda was broadcast over pirated short-wave frequencies into America, Britain, and Canada, in order to spread fear and weaken the morale of Germany's enemies (WFMU Staff) .

The situation intensified in 1942 with the entry of the United States in the War. For diplomats of foreign embassies and « Wehrmacht » members, a couple of jazz clubs continued to remain open in Berlin. In addition, individual, illegitimate venues and private parties still played jazz. In 1943, jazz record production was stopped.

The « Swing-Jugend » (Swing Kids) was a movement among mainly youth from 14 to 20 years old who dressed, danced, and listened to jazz in defiance of the Nazi regime. The Nazi Party acted against this movement by detaining several of the young leaders of the « Swing Youth » and sending them to concentration camps. However, the « Swing Youth » continued to resist the Nazi Party by participating in prohibited swing and jazz activities (Neuhaus) . « Charlie and His Orchestra » was moved in the still bombproof province. Jazz was also incorporated into musical works such as Operas and chamber music through « art-jazz » , which utilized jazz-inspired and ragtime-inspired syncopated rhythms and modes. Famous Operas such as Ernst Křenek's « Jonny spielt auf ! » and Boris Blacher's Concertante Music for Orchestra are examples of art-jazz (Dexter) .

The Nazi regime passed notorious edicts banning jazz records and muted trumpets calling them degenerate art (« entartete Kunst ») . « Degenerate Music » was an exhibit sponsored by the Nazi regime that singled-out « degeneracy » or the use of atonal music, jazz, discordant-sounding organization of tones and the individual composers and conductors, both of Aryan and non-Aryan descent. The « Degenerative Music » exhibit actually had the opposite effect of what the Nazis had hoped because soldiers became interested in genuine jazz (Potter) . The documentary film « Swing Under the Swastika » looks at Jazz music under the Nazi regime in Germany, and at the cases of the Madlung sisters who were sent to Ravensbruck concentration camp merely for owning jazz records. There are also interviews

with jazz drummer and guitarist Coco Schumann and pianist Martin Roman, who were saved in the camps so they could and had to play for SS officers and during executions in Auschwitz as part of the « Ghetto Swingers » .

...

While Black people in Nazi Germany were never subject to mass-extinction as in the cases of Poles, Jews, and Romani, they were still considered by the Nazis to be an inferior race and, along with Romani people, were subject to the Nuremberg Laws under a supplementary decree.

Even before World War I, Germany struggled with the idea of black Germans. While inter-racial marriage was legal under German law at the time, beginning in 1890, some colonial officials started refusing to register them, using eugenics arguments about the inferiority of mixed-race children to support their decision. By 1912, this had become official policy in many German colonies, and a debate in the « Reichstag » over the legality of the inter-racial marriage bans ensued. A major concern brought-up in debate was that mixed-race children born in such marriages would have German citizenship, and could, therefore, return to Germany with the same rights to vote, serve in the military, and hold public office as white Germans.

After World War I, French occupation forces in the Rhineland included African colonial troops, some of whom fathered children with German women. Newspaper campaigns against the use of these troops focused on these children, dubbed « Rhineland bastards » , often with lurid stories of un-civilized African soldiers raping innocent German women. In the Rhineland itself, local opinion of the troops was very different, and the soldiers were described as « courteous and often popular » , possibly because French colonial soldiers harbored less ill-will towards Germans than War-weary French occupiers. While subsequent discussions of Afro-German children revolved these « Rhineland Bastards » , in fact, only 400 to 600 children were born to such unions, compared to a total black population of 20,000 to 25,000 in Germany, at the time.

In « Mein Kampf » , Adolf Hitler described children resulting from marriages to African occupation soldiers as a contamination of the white race « by Negro blood on the Rhine in the heart of Europe » .

He thought that :

« Jews were responsible for bringing Negroes into the Rhineland, with the ultimate idea of bastardizing the white race which they hate and, thus, lowering its cultural and political level so that the Jew might dominate. »

He also implied that this was a plot on the part of the French, since the population of France was being increasingly « negrified » .

Under eugenics laws during the 3rd « Reich » , race alone was not sufficient criteria for forced sterilization, but anyone could request sterilization for themselves or a minor under their care. The cohort of mixed-race children born during occupation were approaching adulthood when, in 1937, with Hitler's approval, a special « Gestapo » commission

was created and charged with « the discrete sterilization of the Rhineland bastards » . It is unclear how much these minors were told about the procedures, or how many parents only consented under pressure from the « Gestapo » . An estimated 500 children were sterilized under this program, including girls as young as 12.

Black people in Germany were socially isolated and forbidden to have sexual relations and marriages with Aryans by the racial laws. Black people were placed at the bottom of the racial scale of non-Aryans along with Jews and Romani/Roma people. The Nazis originally sought to rid the German State of Jews and Romani by means of extermination, while black people were to be segregated and eventually exterminated through compulsory sterilization.

Beyond the compulsory sterilization program in the Rhineland, there was no coherent Nazi policy towards African Germans. In one instance, when local officials petitioned for guidance on how to handle an Afro-German who could not find employment and had become a repeat criminal offender, they were told the population was too small to warrant the formulation of any official policy and to settle the case as they saw fit. Due to the rhetoric at the time, Black Germans experienced discrimination in employment, welfare, and housing, and were also barred from pursuing a higher-education.

A number of blacks served in the « Wehrmacht » . The number of German blacks was low, but there were some instances where blacks were enlisted within Nazi organizations such as the Hitler Youth and later the « Wehrmacht » . In addition, there was an influx of foreign volunteers during the African campaign, which led to the existence of a number of blacks in the « Wehrmacht » and SS in such units as the Free Arabian Legion.

While no orders were issued in regards to black prisoners of War, some German commanders undertook to separate blacks from captured French units for summary execution. There are also documented cases of captured African American soldiers suffering the same fate. In the absence of any official policy, the treatment of black prisoners of War varied widely, and most captured black soldiers were taken prisoner rather than executed. However, violence against black prisoners of War, while against the Geneva Conventions, was also never prosecuted by Nazi authorities.

In prisoner of War camps, black soldiers were kept segregated from white, and generally experienced worse conditions than their white comrades, conditions that deteriorated further in the last days of the War. Roughly, half of the French colonial prisoners of War did not survive captivity. Groups such as North Africans were sometimes treated as blacks, sometimes as whites.

Weimar

Dans toutes les sociétés, le maintien de l'ordre public et l'application de la loi comptent parmi les tâches les plus importantes de la police. Or, leur mise en œuvre peut s'avérer particulièrement problématique lors d'un changement majeur de l'organisation politique de la société.

Les Nazis accédèrent au pouvoir en Allemagne, le 30 janvier 1933, et établirent une dictature mettant fin à l'expérience démocratique allemande, celle de la République de Weimar, qui n'avait duré que 12 ans. La police, qui

avait été chargée de défendre la République de Weimar, s'adapta relativement facilement au régime nazi. Il n'y eut ni purge ni démission massives de policiers.

En 1933, la plupart des policiers n'étaient pas nazis, même s'ils étaient dans leur grande majorité conservateurs. Ils se considéraient comme des professionnels neutres et des serviteurs impartiaux de la loi. Ils étaient censés remplir leur tâche indépendamment de leurs opinions politiques personnelles. Néanmoins, les policiers se révélèrent prêts à soutenir le gouvernement nazi qui détruisait la démocratie. La police en particulier, et les conservateurs en général, apportèrent leur appui aux Nazis en 1933. Les conservateurs en vinrent à considérer la dictature nazie comme une solution non seulement à la faiblesse de la République de Weimar mais à toute une série de difficultés professionnelles spécifiques à la police.

Les plus grandes faiblesses de la République de Weimar tenaient à ses origines. La défaite de la Première Guerre mondiale avait sérieusement affaibli la monarchie et conduit à la proclamation de la République de Weimar en 1918. En dépit de la responsabilité de la monarchie dans le déclenchement de la Première Guerre mondiale, de nombreux Allemands tinrent les Partis démocratiques pour responsables de la défaite et de l'humiliant traité de paix qui suivit. Les policiers se montrèrent particulièrement sceptiques envers les Partis démocratiques (Sociaux-Démocrates, Centristes, Libéraux) car ils avaient été formés sous la monarchie à les considérer comme des ennemis de l'État. Dans la république de Weimar, ces Partis dominaient. Les policiers continuèrent à servir l'État notamment parce qu'ils se considéraient comme des professionnels tenus d'appliquer la loi, indépendamment de leurs sentiments personnels, même si la plupart d'entre eux n'étaient pas des démocrates convaincus.

Les bouleversements économiques liés à la Première Guerre mondiale ainsi que la déstabilisation de l'économie provoquée par les réparations firent que les gouvernements de la République de Weimar étaient toujours à court d'argent. Des coupes sombres touchèrent la police avec des conséquences sur le recrutement, la formation, l'avancement et les augmentations de salaire. Il n'y avait pas d'argent non plus pour la modernisation, l'achat de nouveau matériel de laboratoire ou d'armes à feu. D'autre part, il fallait intégrer des policiers venus des territoires perdus par l'Allemagne à la suite de la défaite. Il fallait leur trouver un emploi alors même que les dépenses de fonctionnement étaient réduites au maximum. L'absence d'avancement professionnel qui en résultait démoralisa les élèves policiers et les jeunes recrues.

Parallèlement aux coupes budgétaires touchant les forces de police, la crise économique contribua à un accroissement rapide des actes criminels. Le crime organisé, actif dans la prostitution, la drogue, le jeu, la pornographie, le vol et les cambriolages, se développait. Bien organisés, les gangs fonctionnaient souvent à cheval sur plusieurs régions, compliquant les enquêtes policières. Sous la République de Weimar, il n'existait pas de police nationale. Chaque État de la Fédération allemande possédait sa propre police et suivait une politique distincte de maintien de l'ordre. Le manque de coordination des forces freinait les enquêtes criminelles qui s'étendaient sur plusieurs États. La police de la République de Weimar n'était pas de taille face à ces gangs.

De même que les crimes de droit commun se multipliaient, les crimes politiques atteignirent des sommets encore inégalés en cette période de constante instabilité politique. Des milliers de vétérans armés et d'unités para-militaires

émanant de Partis politiques de droite comme de gauche, s'affrontaient dans des batailles rangées et attaquaient l'État. Certaines de ces forces para-militaires possédaient des armes lourdes et, soutenues par de nombreux partisans, l'emportaient parfois sur la police. Le crime rampant et les troubles politiques amenèrent les forces de police à un point de rupture.

Malgré leur professionnalisme, les policiers avaient des difficultés à s'adapter au nouvel ordre démocratique de Weimar. Ils étaient frustrés par les restrictions pesant sur leur autorité. Certaines affaires criminelles n'aboutirent pas car la police n'avait pas réussi à garantir les droits des accusés ou parce que des éléments de preuve avaient été refusés en raison d'erreurs dans les procédures policières. L'émergence d'une presse libre, très critique des activités de police, exacerba ces frustrations. Les policiers développèrent alors une mentalité d'assiégés. Ils étaient irrités du fait que le public les blâmait alors que les limites constitutionnelles et le manque de crédits les empêchaient d'agir.

...

The city of Weimar (Latin : « Vimaria ») is well-known because of its large cultural heritage and its importance in German history.

It was a focal point of the German Enlightenment and home of the leading characters of the literary genre of Weimar Classicism, the writers Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Friedrich Schiller. In the 19th Century, famous composers like Franz Liszt made a music centre of Weimar and, later, artists and architects like Henry van de Velde, Wassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, Lyonel Feininger and Walter Gropius came to the city and founded the « Bauhaus » movement, the most important German design school of the inter-War period. However, the political history of 20th Century Weimar was inconsistent : it was the place where Germany's 1st democratic constitution was signed after the First World War, giving its name to the Weimar Republic period in German politics (1918-1933) , as well as one of the cities mythologized by the National-Socialist propaganda.

Until 1948, Weimar was the capital of Thuringia. Today, many places in the city centre have been designated as UNESCO World Heritage sites (either as part of the Weimar Classicism complex or as part of the « Bauhaus » complex) and tourism is one of the leading economic sectors of Weimar. Relevant institutions in Weimar are the « Bauhaus » University, the Liszt School of Music, the Duchess Anna Amalia Library and 2 leading Courts of Thuringia (Supreme Administrative Court and Constitutional Court) . In 1999, Weimar was the European Capital of Culture.

Archæological finds dating back to the Thuringii epoch (3rd to 6th Centuries) show that the Weimar part of the Ilm valley was settled early, with a tight network of settlements where the city is today.

The oldest records regarding Weimar date to 899. Its name changed over the Centuries from Wimares through Wimari to Wimar and, finally, Weimar ; it is derived from Old High German wīh- (holy) and -mari (standing water, swamp) . Another theory derives the 1st element from OHG win (meadow, pasture) . The place was the seat of the County of Weimar, 1st mentioned in year 949, which was one of the mightiest actors in early-Middle Ages Thuringia. In 1062, it was united with the County of Orlamünde to the new County of Weimar-Orlamünde, which existed until the Thuringian

Counts' War, in 1346, and fell to the Wettins afterwards.

The Weimar settlement emerged around the count's wooden castle and 2 small churches dedicated to Saint-Peter (which became later the main church) , and to Saint-James. In 1240, the count founded the dynasty's monastery in Oberweimar, which ran under Cistercian nuns. Soon after, the counts of Weimar founded the town, which was an independent parish since 1249, and called civitas in 1254. From 1262, the citizens used their own seal. Nevertheless, the regional influence of the Weimar counts was declining as the influence of the Wettins in Thuringia increased. Hence, the new small town was relatively marginal in a regional context, also due to the fact that it was situated far away from relevant trade routes like the « Via Regia » . The settlement around Saint-James Church developed into a suburb during the 13th Century.

After becoming part of the Wettin's territory, in 1346, urban development improved. The Wettins fostered Weimar by abolishing socage and granting privileges to the citizens. Now, Weimar became equal to other Wettinian cities like Weißensee and grew during the 15th Century, with the establishment of a town-hall and the current main church. Weimar acquired woad trade privileges in 1438. The castle and the walls were finished in the 16th Century, making Weimar into a full city.

After the Treaty of Leipzig in 1485, Weimar became part of the electorate of the Ernestine branch of Wettins with Wittenberg as capital. The Protestant Reformation was introduced in Weimar in 1525 ; Martin Luther stayed several times in the city. As the Ernestines lost the Schmalkaldic War, in 1547, their capital Wittenberg went also to the Albertines, so that they needed a new residence. As the ruler returned from captivity, Weimar became his residence in 1552 and remained as such until the end of the monarchy in 1918. The 1st Ernestine territorial partition in 1572 was followed by various ones, nevertheless Weimar stayed the capital of different Saxe-Weimar States. The court and its staff brought some wealth to the city, so that it saw a 1st construction boom in the 16th Century. The 17th Century brought decline to Weimar, because of changing trade conditions (as in nearby Erfurt) . Besides, the territorial partitions led to the loss of political importance of the dukes of Saxe-Weimar and their finances shrunk. The city's polity weakened more and more and lost its privileges, leading to the absolutist reign of the dukes in the early-18th Century. On the other hand, this time brought another construction boom to Weimar, and the city got its present appearance, marked by various ducal representation buildings. The city walls were demolished in 1757 and, during the following decades, Weimar expanded in all directions. The biggest building constructed in this period was the « Schloß » as the residence of the dukes (North and East wing, 1789-1803 ; West wing, 1832-1835 ; South wing, 1913-1914) . Between 1708 and 1717, Johann Sebastian Bach worked as the Court's organist in Weimar.

The period from the start of the regencies of Anna Amalia (1758-1775) and her son Carl August (1775-1828) through to Goethe's death, in 1832, is denoted as the « golden » or the « Classical » age because of the high-level of cultural activity in Weimar. The city became an important cultural centre of Europe, having been home to such luminaries as Goethe, Friedrich von Schiller, Johann Gottfried von Herder, Christoph Martin Wieland and Friedrich Justin Bertuch ; and, in music, the piano virtuoso Johann Nepomuk Hummel. It has been a site of pilgrimage for the German intelligentsia since Goethe first moved to Weimar, in 1775. Goethe was also active in civic duties while living there. He served as Privy Councilor to the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach for an extended period. The tombs of Goethe and Schiller,

as well as their archives, may be found in the city. Goethe's « Elective Affinities » (1809) is set around the city of Weimar. In comparison to many major German States, the dukes' policy was Liberal and tolerant in this period. The Liberal Saxe-Weimar constitution was brought into effect in 1816.

The time after Goethe's death is denoted as the « silver » age because Weimar remained an influential cultural centre. The 1st emphasis was fostering music. In 1842, Franz Liszt moved to Weimar to become the Grand Ducal court conductor. Liszt organized the premiere of Richard Wagner's « Lohengrin » (1850) in the city. The Weimar School of Music was founded in 1872 as Germany's 1st Orchestra school. Richard Strauß worked in Weimar between 1889 and 1894 as 2nd conductor in the acclaimed « Staatskapelle Weimar » (the Court Orchestra founded in 1491) . Several of his encores for works such as « Don Juan » and « Macbeth » were performed by the « Staatskapelle Weimar » . In 1897, Friedrich Nietzsche moved to Weimar and died here, in 1900.

In 1860, the Weimar Saxon-Grand Ducal Art School, the precursor of today's « Bauhaus » University, was founded. This was the beginning of academic arts education in Weimar. The institution created its own painting style, the « Weimar School » of painting with representatives such as Max Liebermann and Arnold Böcklin. The « Kunstgewerbeschule Weimar » was found by Henry van de Velde with the support of Grand Duke William Ernest in 1902, and represents the other root of the « Bauhaus » , known as « Das Neue Weimar » (The New Weimar) around Harry Graf Kessler. It was a foundation against Prussia's restrictive arts policy favouring Historicism instead of international Arts and Crafts and « Art Nouveau » (« Jugendstil ») .

As early as the 19th Century, the curation of Weimar and its heritage started. Many archives, Societies and museums were founded to present and conserve the cultural sights and goods. In 1846, Weimar was connected by the Thuringian Railway. In the following decades, the city saw a construction and population boom (like most late-19th Century cities in Germany) . Nevertheless, Weimar did not become industrialised, and remained a city of clerks, artists and rentiers. During the German Revolution of 1918-1919, the last reigning grand duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, William Ernest, had to abdicate and went in exile to Heinrichau in Silesia.

The period in German history from 1919 to 1933 is commonly referred to as the Weimar Republic, as the Republic's constitution was drafted here. Berlin as the capital was considered too dangerous for the National Assembly to use as a meeting place, because of its street rioting after the 1918 German Revolution. The calm and centrally located Weimar had a suitable place of assembly (the theatre) , hotels and infrastructure, so it was chosen as the capital.

In 1920, the Federal State of Thuringia was founded by an association of 8 former micro-States (Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach ; Saxe-Gotha ; Saxe-Altenburg ; Saxe-Meiningen ; Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt ; Schwarzburg-Sondershausen ; Reuß-Gera ; and Reuß-Greiz) and Weimar became its capital. Due to that fact, the city experienced another period of growth.

In 1919, Walter Gropius founded the « Bauhaus » School by a merger of the Weimar Saxon-Grand Ducal Art School with the « Kunstgewerbeschule Weimar » . The « Bauhaus » in Weimar lasted from 1919 to 1925, when it moved to Dessau, after the newly-elected Right-wing Thuringian council put pressure on the School by withdrawing funding and forcing its teachers to quit. Many buildings in Weimar today have influences from the « Bauhaus » period. However,

only one original « Bauhaus » building was constructed during 1919-1925, the « Haus am Horn », now used for exhibitions and events on « Bauhaus » culture.

The Weimar Republic era was marked by a constant conflict between progressive forces and reactionary Right-wing forces, the former represented by Harry Graf Kessler and the latter Adolf Bartels in Weimar. After 1929, the Right-wing forces prevailed and Weimar became an early centre of Nazism.

Weimar was important to the Nazis for 2 reasons : 1st, it was where the hated Weimar Republic was founded ; and 2nd, it was a centre of German high-culture during recent Centuries. In 1926, the NSDAP held its Party convention in Weimar. Adolf Hitler visited Weimar more than 40 times prior to 1933. In 1930, Wilhelm Frick became minister for internal affairs and education in Thuringia, the 1st NSDAP minister in Germany. In 1932, the NSDAP came to power in Thuringia under Fritz Sauckel. In 1933, the 1st Concentration Camps were established around Weimar - in Nohra (the 1st one in Germany) and Bad Sulza. Most prisoners at this time were Communists and Social-Democrats. After « Kristallnacht », in 1938, harassment of Jews became more intense, so that many of them emigrated or were arrested.

During the 1930's, the barracks in Weimar was greatly extended. One famous person serving as a soldier in Weimar was Wolfgang Borchert, later a well-known poet and playwright. As it was the capital of Thuringia, the Nazis built a new Roman-Fascist-style administrative centre between the city centre and the main-station. This « Gauforum », designed by Hermann Giesler, was the only Nazi governmental building completed outside Berlin (though there were plans for all German State capitals) . Today, it hosts the Thuringian State Administration. Other Giesler buildings are the « Villa Sauckel », the Governor's palace and the « Hotel Elephant » in the city centre.

In 1937, the Nazis established Buchenwald concentration camp only 8 kilometres from Weimar city centre. The slogan « Jedem das Seine » (To each his own) was placed over the camp's main-entrance gate. Between July 1938 and April 1945, some 240,000 people were incarcerated in the camp by the Nazi regime, including 168 Western Allied POWs. The number of deaths in Buchenwald is estimated at 56,545. The Buchenwald concentration camp provided slave labour for local industry (arms manufacturer Wilhelm-Gustloff-Werk) .

The city centre was partially damaged by U.S. Air Force bombing in 1945, with some 1,800 people killed and many historic buildings destroyed. Nevertheless, most of the destroyed buildings were restored soon after the War because of their importance in German cultural history. The Allied ground advance into Germany reached Weimar in April 1945, and the city surrendered to the U.S. 80th Infantry Division on April 12, 1945. The residents of Weimar were ordered to walk through Buchenwald, to see what had been happening so close to the city, as documented in Billy Wilder's film « Death Mills ». The city ended-up in the Soviet zone of occupation, so U.S. troops were soon replaced by Soviet forces.

From 1945 to 1950, the Soviet Union used the occupied Buchenwald concentration camp as a NKVD special camp to imprison defeated Nazis and other Germans. The camp slogan remained « Jedem das Seine ». On 6 January 1950, the Soviets handed-over Buchenwald to the East-German Ministry of Internal Affairs.

In 1948, the East-German government declared Erfurt as Thuringia's new capital and Weimar lost its influence on

German contemporary culture and politics. The State of Thuringia itself was dissolved in 1952 and replaced by 3 Districts (« Bezirke ») in a local government reform. The city was the headquarters of the Soviet Union's 8th Guards Army as part of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany. Due to its fame and importance for tourism, Weimar received more financial subsidies from the GDR government and remained in better condition than most East-German cities.

...

The Weimar Republic was the 1st attempt to establish constitutional Liberal democratic government in Germany. The republic's name symbolically evoked memories of the German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who had spent a number of years at the Court of Weimar, and of the nation's humanistic cultural traditions. Goethe's Weimar was contrasted with the Prussian Germany of authoritarianism, military swagger, and Imperialism. Many Germans, however, remained attached to the old order and lacked a genuine commitment to Republican ideals. Both the Social-Democrats and those who harkened back to the Prussian past were opposed by the radical opposition, whose program included revolutionary tactics. German culture under the Republic reflected the ideological diversity of a politically fragmented society.

The Warburg Library, the Psychoanalytic Institute, the German Academy for Politics, and the Marxist Institute for Social Research, founded soon after World War I, were dedicated to the critical analysis of political and social values. These institutions reflected the desire of Weimar intellectuals to reconsider the German past. Eckart Kehr's « Schlachtflottenbau und Parteipolitik » (Battleship Construction and Party Politics) , published in 1930, pursued the same critical objective, revealing the domestic socio-economic basis for Imperial Germany's naval policy.

The cult of the hero survived in the poet Stefan George's literary society, known as the George Circle, which, in addition to publishing « elevated » poetry and translating the Classics, displayed its aristocratic mentality in biographies about great historical figures. Ernst Kantorowicz's Emperor Frederick II, a biography of the 13th Century Hohenstaufen ruler, received wide-spread public acclaim. Kantorowicz, a former Prussian army officer, describes the Weimar Republic as the triumph of mediocrity, and, in his preface, he speaks of Germany's secret longing for its Emperors and heroes. In his biography, he mythically portrays Frederick II as a superman who defies all authority and is voraciously eager to taste all of life.

Many German artists during this period were part of the expressionist movement. Both literary and visual expressionism were primarily concerned with representing the immediate present. In contrast to the strict form in the writings of the George Circle, literary expressionism consciously simplified, abbreviated, and distorted sentence structures to give expression to passionate inner-feeling. A reaction to inhuman social conditions and the horrors of World War I, expressionist writing called for a new man and a new world that would be united in brotherly love. The outsider, as a victim of society, became the hero. Writers whose works represent this kind of reaction include Georg Heym and Fritz von Unruh. Although some writers, for example, Kurt Hiller and Heinrich Mann, became politically active extremists, expressionists were, for the most part, solely literary revolutionaries. Inner-experience is also emphasized in the bold and symbolic colours and distorted forms found in the drawings and paintings of expressionist artists such as Franz Marc and Emil Nolde. In his grotesque figures and suggestive juxtapositions, the post-War artist George Grosz satirized

the materialistic pseudoculture of the bourgeoisie.

The dilemma of the Weimar intellectual, who had to choose between the Conservative past and the Liberal present, can be approached through the novelist Thomas Mann. A monarchist before World War I, a common-sense Republican after the War, Mann finally made a genuine commitment to the Republic in the mid-1920's. In 1924, he published « Der Zauberberg » (The Magic Mountain) , a novel that describes Hans Castorp's education through life. While visiting a tubercular cousin in a Swiss sanatorium, the protagonist contracts the disease himself and stays for 7 years. The sanatorium is a cross-section of European civilization in which Castorp is exposed to a variety of political ideologies, including enlightened Liberalism. Significantly, Castorp (and the conservative Mann) cannot choose Liberalism. Love, not reason, the novel concludes, will provide the basis for social reconciliation.

After 1929, National-Socialism offered a different social and political solution. The Nazi Party took full-advantage of political instability and economic depression, launched a large-scale propaganda campaign, and won a mass following. Nazi ideology, authoritarian but promising social revolution, appealed particularly to German youth, who longed for the restoration of order.

...

Weimar, which is perhaps best-known today as the location of the Nazi concentration camp Buchenwald, had a long history in the 3rd « Reich » . The 1st Nazi Party Rally Day, following the 1925 refounding of the Party, was held in Weimar on 4 July 1926, and the Party met there again, in 1936. Weimar was also the scene of large Nazi rallies during the election campaign of 1932.

When Adolf Hitler was in Weimar, he stayed in the « Haus Elephant » hotel on the « Marktplatz » , and he often greeted crowds and reviewed marching columns from the front of the hotel.

Images :

In the view at top, Hitler salutes from his car in front of the hotel, with Rudolf Heß seen in the background ; on the right, Hermann Göring strikes a martial pose, with Hitler at the left and « Gauleiter » Fritz Sauckel in front. These photos were probably taken during the 1932 campaign (the view just above was later, probably 1933 or 1934) . The façade of the hotel was changed during a remodeling in 1936-1937.

Architect Hermann Giesler remodeled the « Haus Elephant » in 1936-1937, adding a « Führer » Balcony over the main-entrance and another in the back court-yard, which has changed hardly at all today. Werner Lindner and Erich Böckler, « Die Stadt : Ihre Pflege und Gestaltung » , Munich (1939) .

The most ambitious 3rd « Reich » building project in Weimar was the « Gauforum » , north of the city center. During the 3rd « Reich » , this was known as the « Adolf-Hitler-Platz » ; under the East-Germans as « Karl-Marx-Platz » ; and now as « Platz-des-Friedens » . Similar complexes were planned in many German cities, but few were started and

fewer still were completed to the level of the Weimar « Gauforum » (which was, indeed, never completed to plan) .

On the left above, Hitler examines a model of the « Gauforum » , along with Fritz Sauckel, Albert Speer, Julius Schaub (chief-of-staff) , and Wilhelm Brückner (personal adjutant) . On the right is an artist's conception of the completed « Gauforum » . The large community-hall at the left was never built. Left : Heinrich Hoffmann, « Hitler abseits vom Alltag » ; Right : Albert Speer, « Neue Deutsche Baukunst » , Berlin (1943) .

The « Reichsstatthaltereie » at the « Gauforum » served as the headquarters for « Gauleiter » Fritz Sauckel. The bell-tower was originally planned to be considerably higher, but it was never finished.

Across from the « Reichsstatthaltereie » was the « Haus der Gliederungen » , an office building for SS, SA, HJ, BDM, RAD, NSKK, NSV, and other Nazi organizations. The view on the right shows the wings at the rear of this building, seen at the left center of the architectural model. Gerdy Troost, « Das Bauen im neuen Reich » , Volume I, Bayreuth (1938) .

AB 114 : Idéologie et appropriation - Bruckner dans le 3e « Reich »

The 1st of the Bruckner controversies, on Bruckner's standing as a composer, had acquired a political dimension as early as 1885, when Josef Schalk had suggested, in an article for « Deutsche Worte » , that Bruckner was not appreciated because he was « too German » . If Josef remained a cultural rather than a political « Neudeutscher » , only a few years later Robert Hirschfeld was regretting (in « Die Presse » , 24 December 1890) that Bruckner « had fallen into the hands of political partisans » because of the constant « scorn and ridicule of conservative critics » . This is, presumably, a reference to « Neue Richard Wagner-Verein » set-up in 1890 (motto : « German visitors always welcome. ») , whose members included August Göllerich. In the post-War period, Bruckner's more nationalistic pupils found natural allies on the far right, and, in January 1929, Friedrich Klose signed the manifesto of Alfred Rosenberg's « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » , set-up « to inform the German people about the inter-connection between art, race, knowledge and moral values » ; another signatory was Winifred Wagner.

IBG (« Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft ») links with the Nazi regime predated the « Anschluß » , when Adolf Hitler had assisted the « Bruckner-Gesellschaft » in a project of great symbolic if no practical importance. In 1931, the IBG had petitioned the Bavarian Ministry of Culture to have a bust of Bruckner installed in Ludwig the 1st's « Walhalla » , in Regensburg, a Parthenon replica and cultural display cabinet for Germanic heroes. The petition was unsuccessful, but, by the time the final instalment of Max Auer's completion of August Göllerich's Bruckner large biography appeared in 1937, he was able to bring the work to what was evidently intended to be a satisfying conclusion with the following :

« The “ Führer ” and Reichs-Chancellor of the German “ Reich ” , Adolf Hitler, has at last agreed to the request of the International Bruckner Society that a bust of Bruckner be installed in the Pan-Germanic Hall of Honour, the “ Walhalla ” , in Regensburg. »

Hitler received the IBG's 1st Medal of honour as a reward, thereby gaining a considerable amount of cultural credibility at absolutely no cost to himself. The installation took place, in June 1937, during the 8th Bruckner Festival in Regensburg. Siegmund von Hausegger conducted excerpts from the 8th Symphony at a special ceremony, following which Hitler was photographed, hat in hand, admiring Adolf Rothenburger's bust of the composer, its plinth draped for the occasion with Nazi regalia.

Adolf Hitler had taken a special interest in Bruckner ever since, as a young man, he had attended August Göllerich's « Bruckner-Festkonzerte » , in Linz. Hitler and Bruckner had both spent their early years in the Linz region, they both idolized Richard Wagner, and the composer of patriotic male-voice choruses and stately Symphonies could be pressed into service to support some of the more simplistic ideas propounded by Nazi ideologues as to what German music should be : steady, serious and spiritual, but not overly chromatic or excitable. A movement from a Bruckner Symphony was played before each of Hitler's « cultural speeches » at the Nuremberg rallies ; for instance, the fugue from the 5th Symphony, a personal favourite of Hitler's, preceded the Party Congress in 1937. Bruckner was also connected, via Linz, with Hitler's frustrated dreams of becoming an architect. The 18 year old Hitler had drawn a design for a new concert-hall in Linz, and, as « Führer » , he had elaborate scale models made for the new Linz that was to be built following the War, the centrepiece of which was to be a monument on the banks of the Danube glorifying Bruckner, Hitler's parents and Hörbiger's « Universal Ice Doctrine » (« Welt Eis Lehre ») . Bruckner's commemoration was therefore to be lumped together with a lunatic fringe pseudoscience and a dictator's personality cult. Hitler's promotion of Linz was part of a private campaign against cosmopolitan Vienna, where he had spent unhappy years as a student, and he planned to make Linz, rather than Vienna, the cultural capital of both the « Ostmark » and the German « Reich » , even proposing to be buried there.

In the wake of the « Anschluß » , the Nazi Party assumed control of all cultural bodies in Austria, including the IBG, which now became the « Deutsche Bruckner Gesellschaft » , Wilhelm Fürtwängler regrettably allowing himself to be installed as President in the place of Max Auer. The new authorities had no difficulty in finding allies in its ranks. Alfred Orel proved assiduous in eradicating « Jewish influences » from the « Musikhochschule » , « while Robert Haas seems to have been far from alone in being a Nazi supporter long before the “ Anschluß ” » . Siegmund von Hausegger has likewise been described as « a prominent supporter of the Nazi regime » who, in 1934, conducted the Munich Philharmonic in a special concert « intended as the SS's art manifesto » . Erik Levi depicts a musical culture in which increasing emphasis, after 1933, was placed on what was perceived as the solid German tradition Bruckner was believed to represent, as opposed to the « decadence » of the Weimar Republic era. Broadcasting also helped to give his work a higher profile.

For some, a lingering unease attends the fact that Bruckner was singled out for promotion by the new regime. But the Nazi misappropriation of Bruckner is due more to a series of historical accidents than because any aspect of his life or work connects him to the regime and its ideology. Bruckner had originated from the same « Gau » (Nazi-era administrative region) as Adolf Hitler, and he was also associated with a venue, Saint-Florian, which was both historic and photogenic (inviting for a regime always seeking to legitimize itself by co-opting Germanic tradition) and had even contrived to monumentalize his own remains, unwittingly initiating a funerary sub-culture. His music seemed to embody a mythic dimension absent from the work of the sober North German Johannes Brahms, and while Brahms's appeal

was universal, the then limited reception of Bruckner's music outside the German-speaking world made it easier to represent Bruckner as a composer who addressed himself specifically to ethnic Germans. He was also closely associated with Hitler's favourite composer, Richard Wagner, an accusation that could not be levelled against Brahms.

While the idea of a « Bruckner-Festspielhaus » in Saint-Florian was by no means new, Hitler's ideas went further, as Josef Gœbbels remarked :

« Drive to Saint-Florian. To the monastery where Bruckner used to compose. What a beautiful Baroque building. We intend to turn the priests out of here and found a Music College and a home for the Bruckner Society. A marvellous plan Hitler intends to establish a centre of culture here. As a counterweight to Vienna, which will have to be gradually phased-out of the picture. He intends to make alterations to Saint-Florian, at his own expense. »

The monastery was to become a « House of Culture » and the great « Bruckner Organ » was to be used « in the service of the People », meaning that it was to assist in the ritualization of Nazi Party activities. In the words of Heinrich Kronsteiner, « the Bruckner Organ in Saint-Florian was the prototype of all the organs in the Upper-Danube District, and indeed in all Austria, and one saw it alreadding becoming a secular rather than a religious instrument ». The « Reich » 's best-known organists were called upon to display their prowess on this iconic instrument, and, in the 1937 « Bruckner-Blätter », Friedrich Högner duly described « the 1st Upper-Danube Organ Competition in the form of displays of improvisation on given themes on the Bruckner Organ in Saint-Florian near Linz, under the auspices of the " Gaulieters " and " Reichsstathalters " and in association with the National-Socialist " Strenght Through Joy " association (KdF) ». .

Despite War-time demands on resources, a new orchestra was founded, the « Bruckner-Orchester Sankt Florian des Grossdeutschen Rundfunks ». No effort or expense was spared. Georg-Ludwig Jochum (the brother of Eugen Jochum) was engaged as principal conductor, and guest-conductors included Carl Schuricht, Joseph Keilberth and the young Herbert von Karajan. The repertoire ranged from Antonio Vivaldi to Zoltán Kodály, but inevitably centred on a high-profile Bruckner cycle.

Much of the ritual attending the Bruckner cult practised in Saint-Florian, at the time, bears the stamp of the senior official of the scene, « Reichsintendant » Heinrich Glasmeier, a fanatical Hitlerite and a devout Catholic who, in a previous posting, had attended High Mass at Cologne Cathedral in the uniform of an SS « Oberturmführer ». Glasmeier's style is evident in the dedication ceremony held to inaugurate the year-long training programme that began on 1 April 1943. 2 days later, the players, escorted by torch-bearing uniformed SS men, assembled in the crypt of Saint-Florian's church for a special wreath-laying ceremony, at which Glasmeier addressed Bruckner sarcophagus, swearing allegiance to Adolf Hitler. On the following day, 4 April 1943, Hitler himself paid a surprise visit, and, he too, descended into the crypt to commune with Bruckner's remains.

A similar ceremony inaugurated the « Bruckner-Chor Sankt Florian », on 9 May 1944, as double-bass player Fritz Westermann described in a letter to his wife. While the Bruckner Organ played overhead, choir members descended to the crypt, where Glasmeier gave the « German greeting » over Bruckner's coffin, members of the SS, carrying lighted

torches, standing on either side. The flickering torchlight played over the thousands of skulls, all too reminiscent of Heinrich Himmler's rites in the « Wewelsburg » Castle (Westermann's description of the scene as « very interesting » is somehow inadequate.) . The Bruckner Orchestra, now renamed the « Linz Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » , was one of the few orchestras allowed to remain active following Josef Goebbels' declaration of (« Total War - Shortest War » (« Totaler Krieg - Kürzester Krieg ») , in August 1944.

The need to ritualize Bruckner's work coincided with a fashion for performances in cathedral acoustics, Saint-Florian presenting itself as the ideal Bruckner space. It is all too easy to see how the supposed sacral character of Bruckner's music could lend itself to employment at the secular rituals through which the Party sought to invest itself with the status of tradition :

After the 1937 Regensburg Festival, Max Auer commented, concerning a concert given in a deconsecrated Minorite Church that « everyone who experienced it came to the conclusion that only a mystic ecclesiastical venue is adequate for Symphonies Nos. 5 and 9 » . « The Concert Hall of the future Bruckner House must employ sacral architecture. »

The choice of words is unfortunate. Performances of Bruckner's Symphonies in ecclesiastical venues can indeed be effective if the acoustics are not too reverberant (in which case they sound dreadful, no matter how slowly the music is taken) but to state that the 5th and the 9th can only make their effect in « mystic ecclesiastical venues » is an example of the tendency to exempt Bruckner from ordinary considerations (those regarding textual fidelity, for instance)

In an article in the Festival Programme for the Regensburg « Brucknerfest » , pianist and conductor Hans Weisbach identified a flexible interpretative approach with the pattern of unauthorized intervention then being detected in the 1st published editions, and argued for a broad « sacral » approach that he equated with fidelity to both the text and the composer's intentions :

« In the soul of this man, who did not take the experiences of earthly life as the inspiration for his art but sent his creative spirit to endless distances, for whom the divine miracles of the universe were transformed into sounds and into which he poured the hot blood of a human heart ; in the soul of this man, music has to transform into a solemnly flowing deep river of noble grandeur. He who has not yet understood that this music has no tendency towards dramatic affect or effect can learn it from every page of the original versions ; he will also learn, to his surprise, how little variation of the basic tempo Bruckner wishes. His tempo indications do not mean to tie the interpreter down, as one so often felt, and only reluctantly followed, in those 1st editions, but to set the interpreter free, because they are in complete harmony with the nature of the music. Intimately related to the tempo (again, clearly evident from the original versions) is the treatment of phrasing indications in the strings. Especially during cantabile moments of the greatest expression, we encounter Bruckner's characteristic of omitting slurs and instead specifying individual bowings for each single note. By adding the comment " lang gezogen " (drawn out) , he gives the conductor as well as the players the opportunity to realize the solemn tempo with the greatest sound and deepest expression, rather than restrict both sound and expression by thrifty usage of the bow. »

The connection between architecture, ambience, and interpretative approach was made explicit by Heinrich Hofer in the « Völkische Beobachter » , reviewing Herbert von Karajan's July 1944 performance of the 8th given in Saint-Florian by the Bruckner Orchestra :

« Here, in the solemn, devotional space of the church, between the starkly laid-out altar and the towering rows of organ pipes, the meaning of Bruckner's musical architecture became particularly evident. The boldly arching and clearly delineated structural elements of the space call for monumental music. Karajan filled the space by grandly letting the music breathe, making it exert great serenity of spiritual introversion. »

This culmination of the cycle, and of the Bruckner Orchestra's activity, was a performance of the 9th Symphony under Wilhelm Fürtwängler (11 October 1944, the anniversary of Anton Bruckner's death) . Fürtwängler later recalled this performance, « given in the last and worst phase of this unholy war » , as exceptional.

We need not, however, assume that it was exceptionally slow, certainly not if Fürtwängler's live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, recorded only 4 days previously, is anything to go by. Even Karajan's 8th was praised for « not over-stretching the tempi » , and acetates of Weisbach conducting the « Grosses Orchester des Reichssenders Leipzig » in the sketches for the Finale of the 9th Symphony, edited by Fritz Öser and recorded for the German Radio in October 1940, reveal an approach that is dignified and stately rather than ponderous. Contemporary recordings vary hugely in terms of interpretative approach, with surprisingly rapid tempi from Wilhelm Fürtwängler and Oswald Kabasta warning against assumptions concerning an approved « Nazizeit » interpretative approach to Bruckner. Nor does anyone seem to have been concerned when Hans Knappertsbusch, who remained loyal all his life to the 1st published editions, conducted the « Bruckner-Orchester » in the 4th Symphony. But there may be more substance to the argument that Robert Haas's later editions, in their elevation of instinct over scholarship, show the influence of Nazi thinking.

Erik Levi has shown how Richard Wagner's writings had given credibility to a specifically Nazi ideology that expressed itself in simplistic polarities : German-Jewish, rural-urban, honest-sophisticated, intellectual-intuitive. One can see how the rustic, unsophisticated, inspired, non-intellectual Bruckner could have been slotted into these stereotypes, and one can also see how Haas's editions of Symphonies Nos. 2, 7 and 8, in which scholarship yields to a mystical-spiritual identification with the composer's imaginative world, were very much products of their time.

6 weeks after the « Anschluß » of March 1938 (which coincided with the completion of Robert Haas's version of the 2nd Symphony) Haas presented a « Report on the Collected Edition of Anton Bruckner's Works » , which he « dedicated to the German people and to our " Führer " Adolf Hitler » . He added that « there were always battles to be fought in public since every performance was accompanied by the same abuse, lies, and defamation by the Jewish press that in his own time Bruckner, the Master, also had to endure » .

Readers familiar with the post-War 1948 preface to Robert Haas' edition of the 8th Symphony will be brought-up short by the conducting passage of this original 1939 preface :

« As for the significance of the content of the 8th, let the " German Michaël " mythos be briefly thought of here, in which Bruckner became wondrously absorbed after 1885. Its transfiguration is the Finale with the mystico-technical contrapuntal device of combining the 4 themes of the Symphony at the end. The meaning of this mythos, as an attitude of mind, seems to me to be realized in the concept of the Greater Germany. It is a sign from Providence that the restored score could ring-out precisely in this year as a greeting from the " Ostmark ". »

As the official term for Austria in the 3rd « Reich » , « Ostmark » has become associated with that era, but the name was long-established, and appears in the text of Bruckner's 1882 « Volkslied » (**WAB 94/2**) . Robert Haas' attempt to represent the transfiguration of the « German Michaël » motif, at the end of the Symphony, as an assertion of transcendent pan-Germanic identity now seems both bizarre and slightly pathetic, but it is consistent with the nebulous exaltation of any aspect of Bruckner's work that could be made to bear nationalist overtones then prevalent. A similar tendency was adumbrated, in equally nebulous terms, by Amalie Klose, to whom Bruckner had played the Scherzo of the 8th on his elderly « Bösendorfer » piano around 1889, asking her : « Hören's den Michel, hören's sein Hörndl ? » (Can you hear Michel, can you hear his little horn ?) . In answer to my question, he said that this « Michaël » represented « der Urtypus des Deutschen » (the essential German character) . I saw and heard the Master in the full joy of creation ; at the same time, I also saw with enriched (« gereifterem ») understanding, that, in this so familiar « Michaël » , lay the quintessence of the spirit of the People, directly experienced and brought to realization by the essentially German (« kerndeutsche ») Upper-Austrian composer, Anton Bruckner.

But neither this statement, or Bruckner's comment to his friend Theodor Helm that « the Austrian-German (character) is intended » (« Der michl ist der österreich. Deutsche gemeit. ») , amounts to being « wondrously absorbed » in a « Teutonic mythos » . The « Upper-Austrian Anton Bruckner » had no problems with identifying himself as « essentially German » in strictly ethnic terms, but this sense of identity was a product of his own, very different, era.

The rise of Nationalism in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which culminated in the 1870 « Ausgleich » , had led to a new awareness of German ethnicity among German-Austrians. This pride in Germanic culture was part of the male-voice Choral Society ethos ; the 1883 « Sängerbund » (**WAB 82**) by Bruckner was praised, for example, because « its powerful chords sealed the vow of everlasting faithfulness to German song in every phrase of the destiny of the German people » , and it is, therefore, not surprising to find assertions of Germanic identity in several of the texts set by Bruckner. But there is no evidence that Bruckner felt that these assertions need, in any way be incompatible with fidelity to the Austrian crown, he served in the « Hofkapelle » . In the words of the chorus « Laßt Jubeltöne laut erklingen » (**WAB 76**) from around 1854 : « God protect Austria's double eagle, and hear our pious prayer : protect our noble ruling couple, Franz Josef and Elisabeth. » . The text is a complacent expression of safe, traditional values (with music to match) .

Anton Bruckner was also known for his tolerance and friendship with Jews. « According to doctor Max von Oberleithner » , Bruckner appears to have found the word « Jew » uncomfortably direct, preferring the more respectful term « the Israelite gentlemen » (« Die Herren Israeliten ») ; he explicitly denied an accusation of anti-Semitism made by a contemporary newspaper, and made a point of telling « Königstein » that « I have nothing against the Israelite gentlemen » . There is of course the following notorious passage in the August Göllicher - Max

Auer impressive biography :

« His aversion to Jews differed from the indiscriminate hatred of the anti-Semites, in that on account of his true and deep piety he changed this feeling into profound compassion. »

But the comment reveals more about August Göllerich, a man who was barred from giving a speech at Bruckner's doctoral award ceremony because of his anti-Semitic views, than about Bruckner. There is no evidence for any « aversion to Jews » on Bruckner's part. There are no anti-Semitic references in his letters, and no anti-Semitic remarks are attributed to him. One can hardly equate his sorrowful approach to a Jewish student : « Tell me, do you really think that the Messiah has not come ? » ; or his unguarded 1st reaction to Karl Almeroth's suggestion that he sit for one of the apostles in Fritz von Uhde's painting of the « Last Supper » : « But I'm not Jewish ! » ; with the outpourings of Richard Wagner, recorded by Cosima in her diary on an almost daily basis (entries began in January 1869, just as Wagner was revising « Das Judentum in der Musik ») . It would be a grave injustice to blame Bruckner for the Nazi appropriation of his work ; but the appropriation would nevertheless continue to the very end, when the Adagio of the 7th Symphony was played on the German radio following the announcement of Adolf Hitler's death.

...

From the relatively unremarkable life of composer Anton Bruckner, the Nazi ideologues were to construct an elaborate and almost entirely fictionalised narrative of Germanic glory and Jewish oppression. Bruckner's biography was recreated as the story of an Austrian peasant who found success, a lad whose connection to the German soil and German blood made him a worthy symbol of « Aryan » supremacy. Certain aspects of his life were emphasized - as a teacher descended from a long line of teachers, Bruckner fitted into the Nazi obsession with education, and the raising of future generations of « authentic Germans » . Other aspects of his biography were modified : the devout Catholic became instead « a believer in God » , a man who had rejected formal religion in favour of the sort of nationalist spirituality preferred by Adolf Hitler.

Despite the fact that he composed many pieces explicitly for the Church, his music was said to represent the deep spirituality that was liberated from the clerical world. According to myth, his 1st exposure to Richard Wagner inspired him to leave his job as a church organist to become a Symphonist. Finally, much of his biography was simply invented by the Nazi press - this was particularly true when it came to the fact that Bruckner's music received a relatively poor reception for most of his life.

In the eyes of the Nazi musicologists, Bruckner was the ultimate victim of the loathed Jewish « bourgeoisie » . His lukewarm reception by the Viennese music-critics was, accordingly, attributed to simple racial discrimination : a brilliant composer and biologically « pure » member of the Germanic race had, yet again, been oppressed, attacked, or simply ignored by the Jewish conspiracy that held the city of Vienna in its grip. As a native Austrian and an under-appreciated artist, Bruckner provided an ideal figure of identification for that other under-appreciated artist, Adolf Hitler. As Josef Gœbbels noted in his diary, in Hitler's eyes the composer was « a farm boy who conquered the world with his music » - a figure analogous to the « Führer » himself. There was also a functional aspect to the centrality

of Bruckner to Nazi music history : as an Austrian, Bruckner served to embody the pan-German fantasies of the Party. It is said that, after listening to Bruckner's 7th Symphony, Hitler cried :

« How can anyone say that Austria is not German ! Is there anything more German than our old pure Austrianness ? »

The important role that Bruckner played in the musical life of the 3rd « Reich » is undeniable. His works were perceived as unproblematically and unapologetically German. The playing of his music preceded speeches at the Nuremberg rallies, and he was one of the most performed composers during the years of Nazi rule. The Nazi Party donated substantial amounts of money to the « Bruckner Gesellschaft » (Music Society) , and developed many Bruckner prizes and Bruckner concert days. Ultimately, they planned a major music Festival, intended to compete with Bayreuth's Wagner Festival in size and glory. For the leader of the « Reich » , Bruckner's music was instilled with the power to cleanse and rebuild the weakened Germanic race. After the loss of World War I and the degeneration of the Weimar Republic, there was but one remedy : a return to the pure sources ! What is purer than that born of the deep religiosity of Johann Sebastian Bach, Ludwig van Beethoven and ... Anton Bruckner ! Now, especially Bruckner's God-consecrated art found a fertile soil, at last it was rightly understood. For many thousands, it was the guide to a beautiful, spiritual world.

AB 115 : Le spectre du Nazisme sur Anton Bruckner

Bruckner, Mahler et l'antisémitisme

« I gratefully acknowledge assistance received in putting this essay together from :

Doctor Dermot Gault ; Doctor Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; Doctor Margaret Notley ; Tanya Buchdahl Tintner ; Doctor Crawford Howie. » (Ken Ward)

Most of the following events post-date the days in the 2nd half of the 1870's when Gustav Mahler was a student in Vienna and Anton Bruckner became his « adopted father-in-learning » but none of the reports, certainly none from Mahler himself, nor even any from avowedly anti-Semitic sources, justifies Norman Lebrecht's distasteful invention that Mahler had to put-up with repeated disparagements of his Jewishness from his friend Anton Bruckner.

...

In his recently published book, « Why Mahler ? » , Norman Lebrecht writes, on page 40 :

« Mahler calls Bruckner his “ father-in-learning ”, overlooking his repeated disparagements of Mahler's Jewishness. It is the price he has to pay for having a mentor. » (1)

Lebrecht gives no reference as to the source that leads him to make this unprecedented assertion about Bruckner's

behaviour towards Mahler, but the sentence does have one footnote, referring to Paul Stefan's early Mahler biography, where you will read that it was Guido Adler's (2) expression, not Mahler's :

« Adoptiv-Lehrvater » - (adoptive / adopted father-in-learning) - and « Adoptiv » could suggest the action of adopting was Bruckner's as much as Mahler's. (3) But in Stefan's book, you will find only descriptions of Bruckner's respect, exaggerated respect even, towards Mahler :

Stefan reports Theodor Rättig telling him Bruckner always spoke of Mahler with extreme respect or deference (« äußerst Achtung ») . Indeed, you will find the same memoir recycled in Lebrecht's own book, « Mahler Remembered » , page 27, footnote :

« Bruckner's publisher, Theodor Rättig, told Paul Stefan that :“ Bruckner always spoke of Mahler with the greatest respect whenever Mahler visited, he always insisted on accompanying the young man down the 4 flights of stairs, hat in hand. ” » (4)

Searching the biographical literature of both composers and a variety of memoirs, I can find no evidence whatever that Bruckner ever once said anything to Mahler disparaging his Jewishness, let alone repeatedly. The only suggestion that Bruckner might have had any reservations on that account comes in a letter written by Rudolf Krzyzanowski's sister-in-law, Marie Lorenz. Krzyzanowski was Mahler's friend, and they were both amongst the small band of enthusiasts who applauded Bruckner at the end of the disastrous performance of the 3rd Symphony, on 16 December 1877, and they shared the task of making the 4 hand piano transcription of the Symphony, this transcription being Mahler's 1st published work. Lorenz had some spiteful comments to make about Mahler, whose confidence, ambition, success and friendship with Bruckner she obviously resented. One suspects she would have loved to have quoted disparaging comments by Bruckner of Mahler's Jewishness, but this even she was unable to do. She writes of Mahler and of his relationship with Bruckner :

« I knew Mahler from his modest times (when he was a student at the Conservatory) and, even at that time, he could not bear being put in the shade in any way. Step-by-step seeking the heights, limb by limb, good fortune easing his path. Tyrannical to the verge of heartlessness, stepping on all obstacles in his way, accessible only if one happened to find him in good humour and, at a propitious moment, he could still act obsequiously at times. Did he have time to devote to Bruckner ? If the question of playing a work was involved ! Yes, but for how long ? And what was left for Bruckner's personal, marvellous, divinely-gifted nature ? And, even so, Bruckner, who had the pure naivety of a child, would be overjoyed to receive a letter from his one-time pupil ! » (5)

As Henry-Louis de La Grange points-out, Mahler did not conduct any Bruckner until many years later, so Lorenz's comment that Mahler had time to devote to Bruckner only if there was a work of his to be performed is obviously untrue. This appears in the 9 part biography of Bruckner by August Göllerich and Max Auer, published between 1922 and 1937 : « Anton Bruckner - Ein lebens- und Schaffens-Bild » . Göllerich quotes Lorenz again, this time where she makes explicit mention of Bruckner's alleged dislike of Mahler's Jewishness and of Bruckner's anti-Semitism, but one wonders how much this might be an expression of her own, not to mention Göllerich's, anti-Mahler, anti-Semitic,

views rather than a true reflection of Bruckner's feelings for Mahler :

« He (Bruckner) took Krzyzanowski to his heart, as opposed to Mahler the Jew, who he valued as an extraordinary musician, but by whom, reports Krzyzanowski's sister-in-law " Frau " Marie Lorenz, he was disturbed. " The Jews ", she further reports, " were to him altogether unlikeable and he was horrified by the word ' Jew ' as though he had committed a great insult against them should the word accidentally slip-out, and he corrected himself with a more delicate description, where he would say, ' the Israelite gentlemen ' ". » (6)

Göllerich continues :

« His dislike of the Jews differentiates itself nevertheless from the indiscriminate hate of anti-Semites, so that for reasons of his sincere and deep religiousness this feeling was transformed into deep compassion. »

This uneasy distinction is then illustrated by the story from Johann Kerschagl's reminiscences of attending Bruckner's lectures at the Vienna Conservatory, the occasion when Bruckner entered the classroom and noticed a small Jewish boy sitting in the front row, gazed a while at him, then put a hand upon his head and said to him, « almost compassionately » :

« Dear child, do you really believe that the " Messiah " has not yet come to earth ? » (7)

According to Kerschagl's memoir, as retold by Göllerich, the whole place burst into laughter, but Bruckner was altogether serious.

August Göllerich was a virulent anti-Semite, so much so that, even though he was Bruckner's « official » biographer, the University of Vienna asked him to withdraw from the celebration of Bruckner's receipt of an honorary doctorate, on 11 December 1891, at which he had been due to speak. (8) That such a man was Bruckner's biographer, and an enormous proportion of the biographical information we have about Bruckner's life comes from his work, renders it necessary to treat his anecdotes and reports with some circumspection, and it is perhaps surprising, and even reassuring, that he found nothing more blatantly anti-Semitic in Bruckner's attitude and behaviour to report in that lengthy biography than the extracts I quote in this essay.

There is a further reference to Bruckner's view of Mahler and Mahler's Jewishness in Göllerich-Auer.

Wilhelm Zinne (1858-1934) , a friend and supporter of Gustav Mahler in Hamburg, who shared Mahler's love of Bruckner and cycling, visited Bruckner in 1892, at the time of the Vienna Theatre and Music Exhibition. Göllerich-Auer quotes Zinne's own report of his meeting with Bruckner. In the rather bare, modest room, with manuscript paper and scores lying on the piano and harmonium, he sat down with Bruckner who « soon asks after " his beloved Mahler ", who he appeared to regard very highly. Let him prepare his Symphony - the 7th above all, which to Bruckner himself was the dearest. » (9)

They drank a bottle of red wine, the conversation became more convivial.

« He expressed great joy over the enthusiasm of the Viennese for his works. He was pleased too by the Berliners and the performance of the “ Te Deum ” under Siegfried Ochs, who was probably a Jew, but that doesn't matter ; Mahler is also a Jew but he rails terribly against the Jews. All this in jest, as he was on this day uncommonly cheerful and in the mood for joking. » (10)

It is hard to read into this reminiscence an anti-Semitism so unforgiving and mean-minded as would have expressed itself in repeated disparagement of « his beloved Mahler » 's Jewishness.

Alma Mahler and Max von Oberleithner both write of Bruckner's preference for the expression « the honourable Israelites » . (11) Our consideration of what to make of this preference must include the likelihood that Bruckner was actually at pains not to be anti-Semitic. As Dermot Gault points-out :

« Bruckner was known for his tolerance and friendship with Jews. » (12)

His long-term friendship with his student Friedrich Eckstein, (13) not to mention his consideration of a proposal of marriage to his pupil Marie Pohoryles, a Polish Jewish young woman who seems to have taken lessons from Bruckner for almost 10 years, (14) are both witness to affections that were free of any of that restraint as would have arisen had Bruckner been anti-Semitic. And, beyond that, he was prepared to rebuke those, like Norman Lebrecht, who would label him in print as anti-Semitic :

Generally, he was, as Doctor Franz Marschner (15) reports, not really in sympathy with the anti-Semitism of some of his most outstanding students, since he currently saw himself strongly promoted by several noble representatives of that race. One thinks only of what Eckstein and Levi had done for him !

That « Circle » , which should have recognized and supported the prophets in their ranks, at that time, did absolutely nothing positive for the Master - but he was, however, good enough to become set-up by the newspapers as an anti-Semite, which could only damage him. One day, at « The Red Hedgehog » Restaurant-Hotel (« Gasthof Zum Rothen Igel ») , just when he had again been denounced in the newspaper as an anti-Semite, he met Doctor Königstein, the critic of the « Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt » .

Bruckner addressed him :

« So, “ Herr ” Doctor, what it says in the newspapers is absolutely not true - I have absolutely nothing against the Israelite gentlemen ! » (16)

Bruckner also fought against anti-Semitism on behalf of the requirements of his students. Bruckner arranged for the purchase of a fine « Organ-harmonium » from the firm of Bernhard Kohn, in Vienna, for the students of the organ-playing course (the Conservatory had no instrument for the students of the course to play on !) but, after its

installation, the Conservatory administration said they could not use it because the Conservatory would not take an organ from a Jewish firm. The students were outraged, and Bruckner took it upon himself to report this outrage to the administration : the following week the « organ-harmonium » was back in service - and that instrument stayed with Bruckner until his final year. (17) That the Conservatory should have sought to forbid the use of a fine instrument because it was obtained from a Jewish firm gives an idea of the extraordinary prevalence of anti-Semitism at that time.

Tanya Tintner, who describes the anti-Semitism in Vienna in her book, « Out of Time : The Vexed Life of Georg Tintner » , (18) gives the background which helps to place Bruckner's reported relations with Mahler and Jews in context. In an e-mail exchange, she wrote :

In Bruckner's time, anti-Semitism was endemic in Austria, and was even to be found in « mild-mannered » and intelligent and, otherwise, perfectly reasonable Austrians ; it was so much part of the fabric of Austrian life that, if you weren't on the receiving end of it, you simply didn't notice it. Low-level anti-Semitism was not only regarded as perfectly acceptable, it wasn't even seen as any sort of negative prejudice at all. It was just the way you dealt with Jews, the way you saw them. Non-Jews had dealings with Jews in Vienna all the time, but that didn't mean that the former had anything other than contempt for the latter, entirely because of their Jewishness. Alma Mahler is a good example of this : she married 2 Jews but it didn't stop her writing and saying the most vile things about Jews in general - see : Oliver Hilmes' book, « Witwe im Wahn » , Siedler Verlag, München (2004) . In Austria, at the time, there was nothing contradictory about this. Nowadays, Alma's behaviour would be utterly unacceptable ; at the time, it was just pretty normal. So, it would be perfectly possible for Bruckner to admire Mahler, be grateful to Mahler, and despise Jews all at the same time.

The question is whether Bruckner was just your regular Austrian (an anti-Semite by current standards, not an anti-Semite by late- 19th Century standards, background anti-Semitism as it were) or something rather worse. Most likely, Bruckner was one of the more tolerant Austrians (and being non-Viennese makes it, yet, more like it was in Vienna, home to a quarter of a million Jews, where the hatred was so extensive) , and anti-Semitism, if any, that might be attributed to him would be of the endemic, « common-or-garden » , background variety.

It is, perhaps, difficult to see Bruckner as at all anti-Semitic, but even if his attitude to Jews fell within the pale of this « background » variety of anti-Semitism, the same cannot be said of some of those with whom he was associated. The primary agency by which Bruckner's works were promoted in Vienna, in the 1880's and 1890's, was the Vienna Academic Wagner Society (« Wiener akademischer Wagner-Verein ») . Josef Schalk was active in this Society on Bruckner's behalf and many of Bruckner's works received piano transcription performances under the auspices of this Society. (19)

Margaret Notley writes :

« Indeed, the Wiener akademischer Wagner-Verein included many Jews. This organization, which Theodor Helm likened, in 1891, to “ a miniature Bayreuth for Bruckner ”, declined to support the anti-Semitic politics that began to pose a

serious threat to Viennese Liberalism, in the 1880's. » (20)

But, in 1890, the extreme Pan-German nationalist and anti-Semite, Georg von Schönerer, together with a splinter group of sympathisers, left the « Wiener akademischer Wagner-Verein » to form the New Richard Wagner Society (« Neuer Richard-Wagner-Verein ») .

The Society declared :

« As national artist, Richard Wagner was an anti-Semite, so must every Wagner Society be un-contaminated German, so that it does not become a caricature of an artistic association that bears the name of “ Wagner ”. » (21)

(The event was reported in the anti-Semitic newspaper, « Deutsches Volksblatt » , on 27 March 1890.)

The 1st motion now put by the board, that « Meister » Anton Bruckner, the heir to Beethoven's genius long silenced to death by the press, be appointed honorary member, and the spiritual creator of the New Richard Wagner Society, Herr August Göllerich be appointed honorary Chairman, was unanimously adopted and called forth a storm of true German enthusiasm. (22)

Both Wagner Societies promoted talks about and performances of Bruckner's works, which didn't happen elsewhere in the conservative music establishment, which leads Doctor Robert Hirschfeld to comment in « Die Presse » , on 24 December 1890 :

« The conservative critics have always treated Anton Bruckner with ridicule and scorn. So, he fell into the hands of political partisans who took pains to take in the “ abandoned man ” in all spheres, in order in the end to discredit him altogether. » (23)

Although this group of anti-Semitic supporters was keen to claim Bruckner as a great German « Meister » , and described such a being as free from Jewish influence, nowhere is there a word or action of Bruckner's that records him as ever being active in their cause. We have no evidence of any response from him to his appointment as honorary member, not even in August Göllerich's biography, nor any evidence of him taking an active role in the « Neuer Richard-Wagner-Verein » at all. Although their programme was anti-Semitic, and they chose Bruckner as their artistic mascot, they seem to have found him totally unusable to follow in Wagner's foot-steps in the vanguard of anti-Semitism. Bruckner continued his association with Jews, including Gustav Mahler, Friedrich Eckstein, Ferdinand Löwe and Herman Levi, and with the somewhat more liberal « Wiener akademischer Wagner-Verein » of which he had also been appointed honorary member, in 1885.

Bruckner's letters to Göllerich are fulsome in their statements of sympathy and friendship, but in the ones that have come down to us, and indeed in all the other letters in the collected letters, there are no anti-Semitic sentiments expressed. Not even when he complains about his fate and that of his music, does he choose to blame « the Jews » , or even « the honourable Israelites » . They don't get a mention. Just as he skirted around the word

« Jude » , referring « politely » , as Alma Mahler describes it, to « the honourable Israelites » , he seems to have deliberately avoided any involvement in the prevalent and increasing anti-Semitism of his times, possibly seeing it as repugnant and probably an irrelevance or even a hindrance to his own concerns, which were primarily to advance his success as a composer. There is, indeed, to my knowledge no record of him having been involved in the promotion of or opposition to any social or political cause, beyond personal representations with regard to his own career and reputation or his music's reception. There is no record of him being remotely involved in the battle within the « Wagner Verein » that led to the defection of August Göllerich et al. , both Societies presumably retaining him as an honorary member, but nor do we know how he responded to the example provided by Rudolf Weinwurm, his very close friend since 1856, who resigned from the « Akademischer Gesangverein » , in 1887, because of its increasing anti-Semitism. (24) Surely, it cannot be, as Thomas Leibnitz speculates, that « Bruckner was unaware of the polemical and aggressive aspects of nationalistic German rhetoric » , (25) but he does seem to have acted, on the whole, as if none of it was anything to do with him nor anything that he had to be explicitly involved with - and I think we can take him at his word : he had absolutely nothing against the Israelite gentlemen.

Notes

(1) Norman Lebrecht. « Why Mahler ? How one man and 10 Symphonies changed the world. » , Faber & Faber (2010) ; page 40.

(2) Guido Adler (1855-1941) : musicologist, friend and promoter of Gustav Mahler, attended Bruckner's University seminars in Vienna.

(3) Paul Stefan. « Gustav Mahler - Eine Studie über Persönlichkeit und Werk München » (1912) ; page 27.

« Bruckner kam meist mit Mahler in den Hörsaal und verließ ihn von Mahler begleitet ; wie denn der ehrwürdige Meister, nach Guido Adlers gutem Wort, Mahlers “ Adoptiv-Lehrvater ” genannt werden kann. »

« Bruckner usually arrived at the lecture hall and left it accompanied by Mahler, so that indeed the venerable Master, in the apt words of Guido Adler, can be called Mahler's “ Adopted Father-in-learning ”. » (Translation : Ken Ward.)

(4) Norman Lebrecht. « Mahler Remembered » , Faber & Faber, London (1987) .

(5) Henry-Louis de La Grange. « Mahler » , Gollanz, London (1974) ; page 41.

De La Grange's translation from Göllerich-Auer, « Anton Bruckner - Ein lebens- und Schaffens-Bild » , Band IV/1 ; page 450. (Translation expanded and completed to include fuller quotation.)

« Ich kenne Mahler noch aus seiner bescheidenen Zeit (noch als Konservatoriums-Schüler) und schon damals hat er nichts vertragen, was nur irgend gewagt hätte, ihn in den Schatten zu stellen ! Von da ab Stufe zu Stufe in die Höhe jagend, Glied um Glied, Glück am Weg. Tyrannisch bis zur Herzlosigkeit und niedertretend, was ihm im Wege stand. Nur

zugänglich in Augenblicken, wenn jemand die richtige Zeit und Stimmung ihn zu rühren das Glück hatte, dann war er auch imstande am Boden zu liegen. Hatte er Zeit für Bruckner ? In Momentum, wo es zu Aufführungen kam ja, aber wie lange ? Und was fiel ab für sein (Bruckners) persönliches fabelhaft gottbegnadetes Wesen ? Und doch hat Bruckner, der das naive Reine eines Kindes an sich hatte, ein Brief seines einstigen Schülers so sehr gefreut ! »

(6) Göllerich-Auer. « Anton Bruckner - Ein lebens- und Schaffens-Bild » , Band IV/1 ; page 532.

(7) Göllerich-Auer, opus citatum.

(8) Margaret Notley. « Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism » , in : « Bruckner Studies » , edited by Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, Cambridge University Presse (1997) ; page 67.

(9) Ibid. Band IV/3 ; page 247.

« Bald fragte er nach seinem „ lieben Mahler “, den er sehr zu schätzen schien. Er möge doch mal seine Symphonie - die „ Siebente “ vor allem, die ihm selbst die liebste sei. »

(10) Ibid. , page 250.

« Er äußerte große Freude über den Enthusiasmus der Wiener an seinen Werken. Er freute sich auch über die Berliner und die Aufnahme des Te Deums unter der Leitung von Siegfried Ochs, der sei wohl ein Jude, aber das macht nichts ; auch Mahler ist ein Jude, aber er schimpft schrecklich auf die Juden. Das alles scherzend, wie er gerade an dem Tage ungemein heiter und zu Scherzen aufgelegt war. »

(11) Stephen Johnson. « Bruckner Remembered » , Faber & Faber, London (1998) ; page 128.

(12) Dermot Gault. « The New Bruckner » , Ashgate (2011) ; page 235.

(13) Frederick Eckstein (1861-1939) : Industrialist, philosopher, musician, a student of Bruckner's at the Vienna Conservatory, in 1880, and later, privately, from 1884. Provided Bruckner financial support, including for the publication of the « Te Deum » .

(14) Göllerich-Auer, opus citatum : Band IV/2 ; page 228.

Entries in : Franz Scheder. « Anton Bruckner Chronologie Datenbank » for Pohoryles (1880-1890) .

(15) Doctor Franz Marschner (1855-1932) : Pianist, organist and music theorist. Bruckner's pupil at the Vienna Conservatory (1883-1885) .

(16) Göllerich-Auer, opus citatum : Band IV/2 ; page 228.

« Überhaupt war er, wie Marschner berichtet, mit dem Antisemitismus einiger seiner hervorragendsten Schüler nicht recht einverstanden, da er gerade von einigen edlen Vertretern dieser Rasse sich stark gefördert sah. Man denke nur, was Eckstein und Levi für ihn getan ! Jene Kreise, die den Propheten in ihren Reihen hätten erkennen und unterstützen sollen, taten damals für den Meister gar nichts Positives, wohl aber war er gut genug, in den Zeitungen als Antisemit hingestellt zu werden, was ihm nur schaden konnte. Beim " Roten Igel " traf Bruckner eines Tages, als er eben in der Zeitung wieder als Antisemit verschrien worden war, Doktor Königstein, den Kritiker des " Extrablatt " :

" Sö, Herr Doktor ", redete er ihn an, " was in dö Zeitungen g'redit wird, is' gar nix wahr - i' hab' ja gar nix gegen dö Herrn Israeliten ! " »

(17) Ibid. , Band IV/1 ; pages 33-38.

(18) Tanya Buchdahl Tintner. « Out of Time : The Vexed Life of Georg Tintner » , University of Western Australia Press (2011) .

(19) Andrea Harrandt. « Preparation for the Public : Piano Transcriptions of Bruckner's Music » , in : « The Bruckner Journal » , Volume 14, No. 1 (March 2010) .

(20) Margaret Notley. « Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism » , in : « Bruckner Studies » , edited by Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, Cambridge University Press (1997) ; page 65.

(21) Eduard Pichl (zeitweiliges literarisches Pseudonym : Herwig) . « Georg Schönerer und die Entwicklung des Alldeutschtumes in der Ostmark » , Vienna (1923) ; page 587.

Der Verein erklärte :

« Wie Richard Wagner als nationaler Künstler selbst Antisemit war, so muß auch jeder Wagner-verein unverfälscht deutsch sein, so er nicht zur Karikatur einer künstlerischen Vereinigung werden, die den Namen " Wagner " trägt. »

(22) Franz Scheder. « Anton Bruckner Chronologie Datenbank » , « Deutsches Volksblatt » (27 March 1890) :

« Der nun zunächst vom Vorstande gestellte Antrag, Meister Anton Bruckner, den von der Presse so lange todtgeschwiegenen Erben des Beethoven'schen Genius, zum Ehren-Mitgliede und den geistigen Schöpfer des neuen Richard-Wagner-Vereines, Herrn August Göllerich, zum Ehren-Obmanne zu ernennen, fand einhellige Annahme und rief einen wahren Sturm echt deutscher Begeisterung hervor.»

(23) Göllerich-Auer, opus citatum : Band IV/3 ; page 98.

« Der konservativen Kritik hat Anton Bruckner stets zum Horn und Spott gedient. So geriet er in die Hände politische

Parteigänger, welche auf allen Gebieten sich des “ verlassenen Mannes ” anzunehmen pflegten, um ihn schließlich gänzlich zu diskreditieren. »

(24) Crawford Howie. « Anton Bruckner - A Documentary Biography » , Volume II, Edwin Mellen (2002) ; page 583. « Wiener Sonn- und Montags-Zeitung » : Monday 7th November 1887 ; page 4.

Robert Weiwurm resigned over the refusal of the Committee to accept an exceptional young tenor into the Choir because he was a Galician Jew.

(25) Thomas Leibniz. « Anton Bruckner and “ German Music ” : Josef Schalk and the Establishment of Bruckner as National Composer » , in : « Perspectives on Anton Bruckner » , edited by Paul Hawkshaw, Crawford Howie and Timothy L. Jackson, Ashgate (2001) ; page 333.

...

Juin 1935 : Peter Raabe succédera au compositeur Richard Strauß (après que ce dernier eut envoyé une lettre à son librettiste juif Stefan Zweig, un farouche opposant à l'antisémitisme, qui sera intercepté par la « Gestapo ») comme président du « Reichsmusikkammer ». La Chambre de la musique du « Reich », une corporation de droit public, sera chargée du contrôle de la vie musicale allemande. C'était l'un des 7 organismes de la Chambre de la culture du « Reich » (« Reichskulturkammer ») , créée le 22 septembre 1933 et placée sous la tutelle du ministère du « Reich » à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande.

L'adhésion à la Chambre était obligatoire pour exercer une activité professionnelle ou se produire publiquement, ce qui permettait au régime nazi d'écarter les artistes qu'il considérait comme « dégénérés » ou « non allemands » , notamment les Juifs.

Durant une grande partie de son règne en tant que président, Raabe ne sera pas le seul en selle en matière de culture musicale. En 1936, Josef Goebbels nommera Heinz Drewes, alors directeur musical général de l'Altenburg, à la tête d'un département de musique au ministère de la Propagande. Ce qui ajoutera à la confusion des responsabilités. Raabe tentera de démissionner en 1938, mais sa démission sera refusée. Il devra servir jusqu'à la fin de 1945.

Anton Bruckner et le 3e « Reich »

One of the greatest German composers of the 19th Century, Anton Bruckner, exerted an enormous influence on the development of music in the modern age. Artists as diverse as Arnold Schönberg, Gustav Mahler, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Paul Hindemith and Herbert von Karajan found inspiration in his grand and innovative Symphonies. Yet, his public integration into the Nazi world and Adolf Hitler's frequently avowed identification with the long dead musician strongly affected Bruckner's post-War reception. Unlike that of Richard Wagner, the name Bruckner does not bear the taint of anti-Semitism, nor has the mythologisation of his life attained the same heights. Nonetheless, Bruckner's music was intimately tied to the workings of the 3rd « Reich » , and, for many years after the War, he was rarely heard outside

the German speaking world. Not explicitly rejected for his association with the horrors of Hitler's War, Bruckner was instead quietly downplayed. It is only in the past few decades that musicians and musicologists in the United States and Western Europe have begun to turn again to Bruckner, exploring both his music and his significance to the Nazi Party.

From the relatively unremarkable life of Bruckner, the Nazi ideologues were to construct an elaborate and almost entirely fictionalised narrative of Germanic glory and Jewish oppression. Bruckner's biography was recreated as the story of an Austrian peasant who found success, a lad whose connection to the German soil and German blood made him a worthy symbol of « Aryan » supremacy. Certain aspects of his life were emphasized : as a teacher descended from a long line of teachers, Bruckner fitted into the Nazi obsession with education, and the raising of future generations of « authentic Germans » . Other aspects of his biography were modified : the devout Catholic became instead « a believer in God » , a man who had rejected formal religion in favour of the sort of nationalist spirituality preferred by Adolf Hitler.

Despite the fact that he composed many pieces explicitly for the Church, his music was said to represent the deep spirituality that was liberated from the clerical world. According to myth, his 1st exposure to Richard Wagner inspired him to leave his job as a church organist to become a Symphonist. Finally, much of his biography was simply invented by the Nazi press. This was particularly true when it came to the fact that Bruckner's music received a relatively poor reception for most of his life.

In the eyes of the Nazi musicologists, Bruckner was the ultimate victim of the loathed Jewish « bourgeoisie » . His lukewarm reception by the Viennese music-critics was, accordingly, attributed to simple racial discrimination : a brilliant composer and biologically « pure » member of the Germanic race had, yet again, been oppressed, attacked, or simply ignored by the Jewish conspiracy that held the city of Vienna in its grip. As a native Austrian and an under-appreciated artist, Bruckner provided an ideal figure of identification for that other under-appreciated artist, Adolf Hitler. As Josef Gœbbels noted in his diary : in Hitler's eyes, the composer was « a farm boy who conquered the world with his music » , a figure analogous to the « Führer » himself. There was also a functional aspect to the centrality of Bruckner to Nazi music history : as an Austrian, Bruckner served to embody the pan-German fantasies of the Party. It is said that after listening to Bruckner's 7th Symphony, Adolf Hitler cried :

« How can anyone say that Austria is not German ! Is there anything more German than our old pure Austrianness ? »

The important role that Bruckner played in the musical life of the 3rd « Reich » is undeniable. His works were perceived as unproblematically and unapologetically German. The playing of his music preceded speeches at the Nuremberg rallies, and he was one of the most performed composers during the years of Nazi rule. The Nazi Party donated substantial amounts of money to the Bruckner Society, and developed many Bruckner prizes and Bruckner concert days. Ultimately, they planned a major music Festival, intended to compete with Bayreuth's Wagner Festival, in size and glory. For the leader of the « Reich » , Anton Bruckner's music was instilled with the power to cleanse and rebuild the weakened Germanic race. After the loss of World War I and the degeneration of the Weimar Republic, there

was but one remedy : a return to the pure sources ! What is purer than that born of the deep religiosity of Bach, Beethoven and Bruckner ! Now especially, Bruckner's God consecrated art found a fertile soil, at last it was rightly understood. For many thousands it was the guide to a beautiful, spiritual world.

Bryan Gilliam . « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner : Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation. » , « The Musical Quarterly » , No. 78 (3) (1994) ; pages 584-604.

Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt. « Anton Bruckner in the 3rd “ Reich ” and after : An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception » , « The Musical Quarterly » , No. 80 (1) (1996) ; pages 132-160.

Michaël Meyer. « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Peter Lang, New York (1993) .

Pamela M. Potter. « Most German of the Arts : Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the end of Hitler's “ Reich ” » , Yale University Press, New Haven (1998) .

Fred K. Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » , Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verlag, Frankfurt am Main (1982) .

...

As the Nazi regime stabilized, the virtues of Beethoven's heroism and defiance gave way to Bruckner's reverence - the title of a popular biography from the 3rd « Reich » . Even Bonn, the city of Beethoven's birth, founded a branch of the Bruckner Society, in the winter of 1943-1944, amid blistering air raids. The political significance of the ceremony was unmistakable, with the presence of Richard Ohling, the propaganda leader for the Cologne / Aachen branch of the Nazi Party (« Gaupropagandaleiter ») and Karl Franz (Johann) Chudoba, who was University rector, as well as the academic liaison to the Party and regime (« Gaudozentrenführer ») .

Bruckner's Symphonies performed a range of political functions in the 3rd « Reich » , beyond their regular programming in the concert-hall. If Beethoven's Symphonies seem to compress the passage of time (again, to cite Theodor W. Adorno) , Bruckner's Symphonies, lasting an hour or more, project a vast structure by means of orchestration that pits the registral extremes against one another. The spatial expanse of the music, along with its monumental passage of time, may be one reason why Bruckner, and not Beethoven, was programmed as part of Hitler's cultural campaign to win the allegiance of Saarland residents, who faced a vote, in 1935, on whether to rejoin Germany or remain part of France ; one is ostensibly absorbed into a Bruckner Symphony, yet, swept away by Beethoven.

Chronology of Symphony Broadcasts (Beethoven and Bruckner)

1933 : 2 ; 0

1934 : 9 ; 0

1935 : 3 ; 0

1936 : 7 ; 5

1937 : 6 ; 2

1938 : 7 ; 7

1939 : 6 ; 5

1940 : 5 ; 4

1941 : 8 ; 0

1942 : 8 ; 2

1943 : 10 ; 4

1944 : 9 ; 5

1945 : 1 ; 2

Repertoire of Broadcasts in the 3rd « Reich »

Beethoven :

Symphony No. 1 : 8 times.

Symphony No. 2 : 7 times.

Symphony No. 3 : 7 times.

Symphony No. 4 : 8 times.

Symphony No. 5 : 12 times.

Symphony No. 6 : 7 times.

Symphony No. 7 : 9 times.

Symphony No. 8 : 8 times.

Symphony No. 9 : 6 times.

Total : 72 times.

Bruckner :

Symphony in F minor : 1 time.

Symphony No. 1 : 2 times.

Symphony No. 2 : 2 times.

Symphony No. 3 : 6 times.

Symphony No. 4 : 6 times.

Symphony No. 5 : 2 times.

Symphony No. 6 : 0 times.

Symphony No. 7 : 8 times.

Symphony No. 8 : 2 times.

Symphony No. 9 : 8 times.

Total : 37

The counts are taken from contemporary broadcast listings, « Schallaufnahmen der Reichs-Rundfunk GmbH » (volumes for late 1929 to early 1936, and early 1936 to early 1939) , and supplemented by data at the « Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv » from 1999.

The Western tour of the National-Socialist « Reich » Symphony Orchestra (« NS-Reichssymphonieorchester ») to Heße and Rhineland-Palatinate proved so successful that the Saarland Nazi Party chapter met with the Orchestra's spokesman and the « Saar-Sängerbund » (Choral Society) to organize an extension that would include 5 of its 6 districts. At the final concert, in the State capital Saarbrücken, the audience numbered over 2,000. The Prelude to « Die Meistersinger » - Wagner's paeon to ...

...

... of aesthetic experience popularized by Josef Goebbels's ban on arts criticism in favor of the « contemplation » of art. This motivic expansiveness and the alleged transcendence of worldly concerns were the qualities stressed by the editors of the « original » versions published in the 1930's under the aegis of the « Bruckner Gesellschaft ». The endeavor began in 1930 but, only in the mid-1930's, did the method and reception of the editions become politicized. The sweeping claims made for the new editions seemed wholly unjustified to a reviewer at the « Musical Times » who compared the 2 scores of the 4th Symphony while attending a 1936 performance of the Leipzig Radio Symphony under Hans Weisbach, at London Queen's Hall. (« The case had been overstated in regard to both the quality of the Masterpiece and the effect of the “ restoration ”. ») At the same time, whatever politics contributed to the reception of the « original » editions, little changed after the fall of the « Reich ». In his 1947 reflections on « Bruckner today », Fred Hamel spoke-out against the omission of a lengthy development (122 bars) in the Finale of the 5th Symphony. Through this powerful effect of the Chorale, the thematic opposition escalates from the dramatic into the ritualistic, and the idealistic power of the Symphony evolves into the religious.

The search for a « pure » Bruckner score, free from intrusion of his colleagues, went hand in hand with a performance practice developed by Hans Weisbach. As director of the Vienna Philharmonic (renamed after the « Anschluß ») , he conducted a number of « Festliche Dunkelkonzerten » (Festival Concerts, in the dark) beginning on November 17, 1939. Each featured a Bruckner Symphony performed in complete darkness, and other works (including Mozart, for example, in concerts on November 15 and December 6, 1940) in semi-darkness. Inspiration for the practice was probably not artistic - although precedents for adjusting the lighting to dramatic ends existed in Opera, along with some earlier reforms in Lieder performances. More likely is that the air raid practices were elevated into an artistic context. Perhaps, too, the 2nd tier director wished to emulate Herbert von Karajan, who conducted everything from memory, with his eyes firmly shut, and had recently gained so much attention from the press.

With its capacity for transcendence and gravity, Bruckner's music served as commemoration (real or imagined) at the end of the 3rd « Reich ». Sequestered in his bunker, in February 1945, Hitler drew comfort from envisioning buildings, including a bell tower in Linz whose carillon would, on special occasions, chime a « motif » from Bruckner's 4th Symphony. In recounting these conversations, his architect Hermann Giesler sought to portray the dictator's humanity :

« “ This melody, which moves me so deeply, is suitable for a glockenspiel. ” He stood-up, grasped my arm, and said : “ You understand me, Giesler. ” »

Adolf Hitler's chief architect, Albert Speer, warned his friends and the musicians of the Berlin Philharmonic that, when Bruckner's 4th was performed (a work « especially dear » to him « for its architectonic final movement ») , they should escape from the Soviet army by fleeing to Bayreuth, which would be taken-over by American soldiers. On the afternoon of April 12, 1945, Speer changed the program to include the most celebrated Finale in the Operatic literature, the immolation scene of Richard Wagner's « Götterdämmerung » , Beethoven's Violin Concerto (a work of immense pleasure and intimacy) and, as a sublime ending, the Bruckner. Afterward, uniformed « Hitler Youth » allegedly

stood at the exit doors holding baskets of free cyanide capsules to distribute to those who feared the ravages of the Soviet army. And, finally, the Adagio of the 7th Symphony, that iconic commemoration of Wagner's death, was broadcast on Hamburg Radio (the only surviving remnant of the « Reich » Radio) , along with excerpts from various Wagner Operas, to prepare for the announcement of Hitler's death, to be made by the commander in chief for the North, Karl Dönitz, whom Hitler's will designated as his successor as « Führer » . The recording was made by the Berlin Philharmonic under Wilhelm Furtwängler, in 1942.

What made Bruckner so quintessentially German, at least in the 3rd « Reich » ? The composer seemed to embody a Parsifalian « naïveté » : the « ingénu » from the « Großdeutsch » rural landscape whose genius was nevertheless undeniable. When Reinhold Zimmerman set-out to write a book on « racial identity in German music » , his focus was Bruckner, not Beethoven or Bach. Admittedly, Beethoven's racial pedigree had long been called into question, as a man of darker complexion (in some paintings) . It is not difficult to find reasons why, coincidentally, Bruckner's music suited National-Socialist ideology. Yet, the fact remains that many accounts of actual performances avoided the subject of the music itself. The instrumentalization of the 7th Symphony is a case in point.

Bruckner's 7th, and not a Beethoven Symphony, was programmed at the inaugural concert of the SS « artistic appreciation » series (« Bekenntnis der SS. zur Kunst ») , in November 1934, featuring the Munich Philharmonic. Oscar von Pander, student of the anti-Semite Rudolf Louis, saw « unimaginable significance » in the event, by its placing culture at the service of National-Socialism. But his report, despite its length and the venue (a music journal) , included nothing about the composition or performance except that this was Bruckner's « Eroica » (on account of its heroic character, as well as the allusions of its slow movement to the funeral march of Beethoven's 3rd Symphony) . He did, however, recount that, afterward, the audience (« Völker » , a politically resonant term) broke into song, and several impromptu songs concluded the concert.

Peter Raabe programmed the 7th Symphony (along with Georg Friedrich Händel and Max Reger) when, as president of the « Reich » Music Chamber, he returned to Aachen to conduct the « Städtisches Orchester » , where he had been music director. On the program, each composer was listed by family name except one, hailed as « the Master Bruckner » . In his report on the concert, Zimmermann, who was based in Aachen, wrote nothing of Raabe's interpretation or, again, the music. Yet, he lingered over the reaction to this highest ranking musician in the regime. The enthusiasm and stormy applause « surpassed all expectations and overwhelmed even the most staid occupants of the concert-hall » . Wary, perhaps, that the response to Raabe verged on « Führer » adoration and could challenge a regime and culture in which Hitler alone commanded such attention, Zimmermann assured that Germans rarely pay homage to an individual ; they do so only in cases of the most obvious merit.

In August, 1944, Josef Goebbels closed down all theatres and concert halls, exempting only the Berlin Philharmonic. Despite the thinning of its ranks and changes in performance venue, the Orchestra persevered, including a recording of Bruckner's 9th under Wilhelm Furtwängler, from October 7, which is unsurpassed in its intensity and intelligence, profundity and power. The choice of the 9th was eminently suitable - a Symphony ostensibly left incomplete, thus without a victorious Finale, the Adagio serves as a more profound conclusion. The circumstances that, if anything, encouraged an escape from the imploding regime, on that Saturday afternoon, as the musicians and conductor

gathered in the hall, with a few Nazi echelons sitting quietly in the front row during those 59 minutes. The United States Army had launched its 1st attack on German territory on the Western-Front on Monday, successfully breaking through Hitler's much-cherished « Siegfried Line » , on Tuesday. The German counter-attack, on Wednesday, had failed. On Thursday, the conscription age was lowered to 16 and hospitals were placed under military control. Friday saw heavy air raids on Berlin, during day and night. Furtwängler had neither the will nor the courage to extricate himself until, 3 months later, Speer had warned him that defeat was near and advised emigrating to Switzerland. Furtwängler was able to cross the border on February 7, 1945, under the pretense that he would return. Despite complications in Switzerland, Furtwängler succeeded, although denazification would last until December 1946, and its ratification came only in April 1947.

From the Symphony to the « Symphonic »

For all the ideological hue and cry, few Symphonies were composed during the 3rd « Reich » ; of those that were, still fewer were by overt Nazi sympathizers or Party members. This avoidance reflected less an « anxiety of influence » , as befell the generation after Beethoven, than an uncertainty about the creative statement to be made through the genre. The problem was not unique to Germany but, elsewhere, the political stakes of the genre were not high. Nor was there encouragement from above. When Peter Raabe organized a conference on the role of German composers (« Reichstagungen des Berufsstandes der deutschen Komponisten ») , in the summer of 1936, the Symphony had no place in the agenda set by Hans Hinkel as to « what we expect from German composers » : music for Nazi celebrations, entertainment music, Opera, music for amateurs » . In the very era when the Symphony had become so politically freighted, the genre seemed in jeopardy in Germany - and especially in Austria.

Josef Reiter, an Austrian born 2 years after Gustav Mahler, pursued nationalistic topics as early as his 1899 « Deutscher Siegesmarsch » (German Victory March) for orchestra. An avid supporter of National-Socialism in the 1920's, Reiter dedicated his only undertaking in the genre, the « Gœthe-Symphonie » (1931) , to Hitler. Johann Nepomuk David, an Austrian who accepted a position at the Leipzig Conservatory, in 1934, and curried favor with the political establishment, wrote only 3 Symphonies during the Nazi regime, despite his total output of 8 symphonies and 3 Sinfonias (as well as 2 epigonic Symphonies that he later destroyed) . A subvention from the « Reich » Music Chamber for an orchestral composition led him to compose a set of « Symphonic » variations on a theme by Heinrich Schütz (1942) . Its Baroque theme notwithstanding, David pursued the military character and narrative that were historically allied with the genre of the Symphony, including the movement titles : (1) « Battle procession » ; (2) « Fear and worship » ; (3) « Portent for the enemy » ; and (4) « Battle, victory, and thanksgiving » .

...

... composed 4 Symphonies and, after the War, he would compose 2 more. But the only Symphony dating from the period of the 3rd « Reich » was his 5th, performed at the 1936 International Music Festival, in Baden-Baden. When Hermann Grabner, a member of the Nazi Party teacher's Union (« Nationalsozialistische Lehrerbund ») and the SA, revised his popular music textbook, in 1940, striking any references to composers and theorists who were Jewish or supposedly modernist, the Mahler examples were replaced by works of Hermann Emil Alfred Max Trapp and the neo-

Romantic Austrian, Egon Kornauth.

Hans Pfitzner's late interest in Symphonic composition was unusual for a composer working in Nazi Germany. Unlike Richard Strauß in his late-period, Pfitzner turned away from the genres most familiar to him in an effort to contribute to the Symphony, the genre cherished by conservatives and National-Socialists, just as he had already composed 5 Operas - the other genre esteemed by the regime. In the period following the Nazi seizure of power, Pfitzner produced only 3 choral works (in 1941), including 2 for the historically political genre of male chorus. The Symphonic recomposition of his Quartet, from 1932, was only one of his attempts to contribute to the Symphonic genre. In 1939, at age 70 (after avoiding the genre for his entire creative life), Pfitzner composed his « Small Symphony » (« Kleine Sinfonie ») despite the unwieldiness of the genre for his compositional voice and, the following year, he wrote a 1 movement Symphony in C major.

The tendency to compose Symphonic works in lieu of Symphonies was a phenomenon strongest with amateur composers who had an Orchestra at their disposal. Wilhelm Furtwängler composed an unnumbered Symphony, at age 17, but only returned to the genre 3 decades later, in the 3rd « Reich ». His role as a collaborator, if dismissed by a few scholars, became amply clear when he sought to prove his ideological loyalty, particularly once the young Herbert von Karajan's success threatened to overshadow his own. In the period 1936-1945, Furtwängler completed his « Sinfonisches Konzert » (Symphonic Concerto), his 1st and 2nd Symphonies, and no other works except 2 Sonatas for violin and piano.

The challenge facing composers was considerable : to write music that would be both clear and folk-inspired and that, at the same time, would make use of the modern, large-scale orchestra. A contemporary idiom that would reflect the Nazi embrace of modern technology and culture, was difficult in the medium of the Orchestra.

Anton Bruckner and National-Socialism

« In the early 1920's, the National-Socialists had rarely concerned themselves with cultural propaganda. Cultural issues were only raised in so far as they related to such broad issues as the treaty of Versailles and the influence of the Jews. »

(Erik Levi ; page 8.)

I shall investigate how this changed, and how the Symphonies of Anton Bruckner became the target of political appropriation. In the 1st part of this essay, I will describe how and why Bruckner's Symphonies were used by the Nazi Party.

After covering this aspect in some detail, I shall turn my attention to post-War reception, and some of the issues faced by Bruckner scholarship today. This will inevitably involve consideration of the various editions of his works and how these relate to performance practice and reception.

Josef Goebbels' Regensburg Address and the Appropriation of Bruckner

Josef Goebbels's Regensburg address may be seen as the pivotal point in the Nazi appropriation of Anton Bruckner. As the Minister for propaganda, Goebbels gave his ceremonial speech « in order to honour one of the greatest Masters of the German musical art » (translation : John Michael Cooper ; page 605) . This event may be seen as paving the way for the subsequent German annexation of Austria. Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt shows how Adolf Hitler's reading of a Bruckner Symphony takes on ideological significance,

« After listening to a recording of the 7th Symphony given to him by Goebbels, Hitler is reported to have said :

« How can anyone say that Austria is not German ! Is there anything more German than our old pure Austrianness ?!
»

(Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 137.)

Hitler's own interest in the composer was also an important factor. Bryan Gilliam (1994) says that :

« The Nazi propaganda campaign glorifying Bruckner would never have taken place were it not for Hitler's personal interest in and identification with Bruckner as a man, a composer, and a fellow Upper-Austrian. »

(Bryan Gilliam ; page 587.)

Goebbels began his Regensburg address by comparing Bruckner to Beethoven. Bruckner's music is celebrated as the continuation of a Germanic Symphonic tradition. In Goebbels words, he like Beethoven, « left to us an artistic legacy of 9 mighty Symphonies » (translation : John Michael Cooper ; page 605) . It is not long before Goebbels draws attention to Bruckner's peasant roots. His mystical nature and simple character are also highlighted, as well as « the child-like purity of his delight in life which he rested upon a faith in God » (translation : John Michael Cooper ; page 606) . This focus on Bruckner's roots and mystical nature may be seen as Goebbels attempt to ally Bruckner with the « völkische » tradition, which plays such an important role in the Nazi ideology. The « child-like purity » alluded to may also be seen as forming an opposition to bourgeois intellectualism and modernistic decadence, key-elements that the Nazi Party wished to purge from German society. Goebbels also emphasizes the hostile reception afforded to Bruckner by certain critics. This could be seen as bolstering support for the recent ban on art criticism, and opposing Viennese Liberalism in general.

« If the public practice of art commentary (" Kuntsbetrachtung ") has been restricted by law to official channels in the new Germany, then, we believe we have also resolved a debt of gratitude to the Master who struggled in solitude, tortured-up to his moment of death by his tormenters. »

(Translation : John Michael Cooper ; page 607.)

Consideration of the points discussed above, may show why Bruckner became an important part of the cultural propaganda campaign. Bruckner's life and works (particularly, the Symphonies) may have been regarded as the ideal vehicle for this cause. Through emphasizing or concealing certain factors of Bruckner's biography, Goebbels could appropriate the composer to promote National-Socialist ideals. There was one area of Bruckner's life though, that did not quite fit with the Nazi line of thought. Bruckner was a church musician (« Kantor ») , and devout Roman catholic. These religious beliefs had to be re-interpreted to fit the Nazi conception of « Gottlaubigkeit » (God believing) . In order to free Bruckner from his catholic roots, Goebbels places emphasis on the influence of Richard Wagner. Bruckner would, no doubt, have been aware of Wagner as a composer, and may well have been influenced by his style. Goebbels account though, sees Bruckner's 1st experience of Wagner's music as having « an almost revolutionary effect on the sonority of his musical language » and states that « from that moment onwards, the church musician, at once, retreats almost entirely and, out of him, emerges the distinct Symphonist » (translation : John Michael Cooper ; page 607) . Bryan Gilliam (in 1994) , points out that this interpretation completely ignores Bruckner's sacred works such as the « Te Deum » and the « 150th Psalm » (Bryan Gilliam ; page 593) . This refusal to acknowledge Bruckner's Catholicism may be seen as an attempt to ally the composer with the Nazi conception of « Gottlaubigkeit » . Gilliam supports this view by saying that :

« The 1937 Regensburg Ceremony placed Bruckner as a God in the Holy-Temple of Walhalla. His music would be the sacred language and Nazism the mystical religion. »

(Bryan Gilliam ; page 595.)

The Viennese « Dunkelkonzerte » may also be seen as an important factor in this portrayal of Bruckner. The « Dunkelkonzerte » was a candle-light concert which lent a religious tone to the music.

According to Gilliam :

« The “ Weiner Konzerthaus ” was transformed into a sacred space where listening to Bruckner became tantamount to attending church. »

(Bryan Gilliam ; page 596.)

Bruckner may not have been the only composer featured, but it was always a Bruckner Symphony that formed the main focus of these events.

It can be seen from the above accounts that Goebbels Regensburg address focused on 4 important points :

Providing a link between Germany and Austria which would help in securing the subsequent annexation or « Anschluß » .

Promoting the blood and soil ethic exemplified by the « Völkische » ideal.

Gaining support for the recent ban on art criticism.

Promoting « Gottlaubigkeit » as the new religion.

I have tried to show above how Bruckner's Symphonies have played a key-role in supporting each of these goals. The Regensburg address drew attention to Bruckner's life and works by unveiling a commemorative marble bust of the composer. The commemorative function of this event though, may be considered as of secondary importance. The main goal can be seen as promoting Nazi ideology through the appropriation and aryanisation of a cultural icon.

Post-War Reception

After the War, Bruckner's symphonies could not easily be freed from the Nazi appropriation. This was mainly because their performance was still tied to the scores published under the Nazi government. This is an area of Bruckner scholarship which remains contentious, up to the present day. Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt (in 1996) says that :

« Establishing “ authentic ” editions of the composers works is still largely governed by arguments and interpretations that originated in connection with the 1st critical edition of Bruckner's works. »

(Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 141.)

These editions, edited by Robert Haas, were published between 1930 and 1944. Korstvedt shows that these « gesamtausgabe » editions overcame initial criticism to become « established as the authoritative source of Bruckner's works » (Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 143) . The « gesamtausgabe » project also received support and funding from the Nazi government. This may be seen as good reason to reject them outright. It may be hard to imagine why the Nazi Party would fund such a venture, if it was not in their interest to do so. The Robert Haas editions though, did seek to present a credible version of Bruckner's works. In Haas' view, the earlier publications had been corrupted. The new critical edition aimed to rectify this situation by referring only to the original autograph manuscripts. Korstvedt addresses some of the problems faced by this view and the rejection of the 1st editions :

« Bruckner never attempted to suppress the editions published in his lifetime nor did he ever publicly renounce or even criticize their authenticity ; moreover, substantial textual evidence exists that testifies to the authority of these editions. »

(Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 142.)

These issues are obviously extremely important and may be felt to have a profound effect on the reception of Bruckner's Symphonies today. The various editions may highlight or hide certain aspects of the score, and it may be difficult to verify the validity of these changes. Korstvedt notes that :

« Haas's scores are considerably sparser in their notation of nuances of tempo and dynamics than are the texts Bruckner published. »

(Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 142.)

Haas also supplemented his editions with material he had composed himself. Although only small sections were added, some may question Haas' approach in this matter. The « gesamtausgabe » editions have also been criticized because of the ideological motivations behind them. It may be considered more than a coincidence that the 1st edition, which was rejected as corrupt, employed editors of a Jewish origin. It is also stated by Korstvedt that « part of the covert mission of the “ gesamtausgabe ” seems to have been to remove Bruckner's scores from the purview of the Viennese publishing-house, Universal-Edition. »

(Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 145.)

This may have been a reaction against Universal-Edition's identification with « such deleterious forces as modernism, atonality, Bolshevism, and Judaism » . (Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 145.)

A later edition of Bruckner's Symphonies was published by Leopold Nowak.

According to Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt :

« He revised all of Haas's editions and rectified Haas's most questionable leaps of faith, notably those found in Haas's editions of the 2nd and 8th Symphonies. »

(Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt ; page 149.)

Even so, Leopold Nowak still used the original autograph manuscripts as his source. It seems that the rejection of the 1st editions is still a prominent factor today. This may be unjustifiable if we consider Bruckner's willingness to have them published at the time. It may be seen from these accounts that the problems surrounding Bruckner scholarship are not easily overcome. The reception of Bruckner's Symphonies has inherited a dark cloud of ideology which is not easy to ignore. It may also be considered unwise to ignore such a problem. Bryan Gilliam (in 1994) suggests that, maybe :

« Important post-War Bruckner interpretations (exemplified by slower tempi and luscious sonorities) have unwittingly carried over this phenomenon of Bruckner as Nazi religious icon to the contemporary Symphony-hall or recording studio ? »

(Bryan Gilliam ; page 600.)

In an attempt to separate ideology and methodology, Julian Horton (in 2004) , investigates 2 musical analyses. The 1st,

by Hans Grunsky, is of the 9th Symphonies 1st movement. This analysis « clearly pre-empt's Nazi cultural politics » and also defends Bruckner against his critics. The 2nd is Robert Haas' analysis of the 8th Symphony's Finale. This is also shown to be imbued with political ideology.

« In Haas's philological, hermeneutic and analytical inclinations the imprints of Nazi cultural politics are plain : an emphasis on the spiritual over the intellectual, and a concomitant notion of textual " purity " ; a sense that this project was embattled by the forces of Jewish Liberalism ; a nationalist context seeing in Bruckner's music the embodiment of an unadorned " German essence ". »

(Julian Horton ; page 84.)

Julian Horton concludes that it is possible to separate the ideology from the methodology. Grunsky's account is seen to rely heavily on metaphors. These are used to establish links between the politics and the music. Once these links are removed, it is posited that the details pertinent to the composition may still be judged on their own merits. A similar situation is found in Haas' analysis, where « a fundamental shift of politics and philological strategy has little more than a peripheral impact on the structure and analytical interpretation of the music » (Julian Horton ; page 87) .

Analysis may be considered one of the most important areas regarding the reception of Bruckner's Symphonies. This is especially so, if the autograph manuscripts are the chosen source. The lack of essential markings in these scores may leave room for various interpretations of the music. All that may be left to decide is how an analysis of these scores should proceed. The performance of any given Symphony may bring-out certain features of the piece. It could emphasize Bruckner as the church organist or mystical genius. It may focus on the harmonic implications of the music and the influence of Richard Wagner's music-dramas. Another choice may be to opt for the 1st edition where more detail is provided in the score. Leon Botstein (in 1996) favours the 1st « Schalk » edition of the 5th Symphony saying that :

« I believe the 1986 edition to be valid biographically (in terms of Bruckner's relationship to it ; it may bear his explicit approval) , historically (this was the version that helped establish Bruckner's fame and reputation and was in use for nearly half a Century) and musically (I have performed it several times and plan to record it next season because of its persuasive structural balance and economy and its effective orchestration) . »

(Leon Botstein ; page 2.)

It may be the case that any performance of a Bruckner Symphony contains a certain amount of subjectivity. Botstein compares this scenario with that of Gustav Mahler's Symphonies, and suggests that modern performance practice does not entirely reflect the composer's intention.

« One suspects that the surface of sensuality, scale, sentiment, and mere pathos in Mahler has been highlighted by smug devotees who in their nearly hysterical attachment to a particular image of the music and the man satisfy a need to demonstrate to others their own presumably profound artistic sensibilities. »

(Leon Botstein ; page 4.)

It may be inferred from this statement that the « artistic sensibilities » described differ somewhat from Botstein's own. This only underlines the subjectivity that is involved in any musical performance. The most brilliant and passionate of musical performances may well be the product of Botstein's « smug devotees » .

Conclusion

The Symphonies of Anton Bruckner have had a more colourful reception history than most. The Nazi appropriation can still be felt to affect certain aspects of Bruckner scholarship today. Among the most important of these is the choice of performing editions. The underlying problem being how to distinguish which editions are authentic, and which are a product of National-Socialist ideology. The use of Bruckner's Symphonies as cultural propaganda is not something that can be swept under the carpet. In searching for a truly authentic performance of a Bruckner Symphony, its reception history must be taken into account. This situation seems to be complicated further by the modern conception of the musical work, whereby, an authentic performance is tied to a definitive version of the score. The music on the page may be one half of the story, the Symphony only really coming to life once it is performed. If there is no general consensus as to which score should be used, then, there is no reason why this should stand in the way of a good performance. The autograph manuscripts contain enough detail to enable a performance. A certain freedom of interpretation should be encouraged. It may be that a new performance alters people's perception of that piece. There will always be good and bad performances and it is hopefully the good ones that will be remembered and influence further performances. In the same way that the history of Bruckner's Symphonies should not be forgotten, the present-day will obviously make its own impression. As much as some would like to realize an authentic 19th Century performance, this may be as impossible as Bruckner composing a 21st Century film-score. The thoughts and ideas that inspired Bruckner to compose these pieces may forever be a mystery. Even if we did know exactly what this motif, and that crescendo meant to Bruckner, a 21st Century musician would still only provide an interpretation of these thoughts. Regarding the Nazi appropriation, these are aspects of the music which are almost impossible to translate into a modern-day performance. In this day and age where sympathy for the Nazi Party is almost non-existent, it may be felt that the only possible translation of the music in this way would be as a bitter reminder of one of the greatest tragedies in human history.

Bibliography

Julian Horton. « Bruckner's Symphonies : Analysis, Reception and Cultural Politics » , Cambridge University Press (2004)

Erik Levi. « Music in the 3rd " Reich " » , Macmillan Press (1994) .

Leon Botstein. « Music and ideology : Thoughts on Bruckner » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 80, No. 1 (1996) ; pages 1-11.

John Michæl Cooper. « Appendix : Josef Gœbbels's Bruckner address in Regensburg (6 June, 1937) » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 78, No. 3 (1994) ; pages 605-609.

Bryan Gilliam. « The annexation of Anton Bruckner : Nazi revisionism and the politics of appropriation » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 78, No. 3 (1994) ; pages 584-604.

Bryan Gilliam. « Bruckner's annexation revisited : A response to Manfred Wagner » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 80, No. 1 (1996) ; pages 124-131.

Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt. « Anton Bruckner in the 3rd " Reich " and after : An essay on ideology and Bruckner reception » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 80, No. 1 (1996) ; pages 132-160.

György Ligeti. « On music and politics » , in : « Perspectives of new music » , Volume 16, No. 2 (1978) ; pages 19-24.

Margaret Notley. « Bruckner problems in perpetuity » , in : « 19th Century Music » , Volume 30, No. 1 (2006) ; pages 81-93.

Martina Viljoen. « Questions of musical meaning : An ideology-critical approach » , in : « International review of the aesthetics and sociology of music » , Volume 35, No. 1 (2004) ; pages 3-28.

Manfred Wagner. « Response to Bryan Gilliam regarding Bruckner and National-Socialism » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 80, No. 1 (1996) ; pages 118-123.

« Dunkelkonzerte »

In the 1930's, in Germany and Austria, the popularity of the so-called « Dunkelkonzerte » reached its height. Concerts for which the hall was entirely darkened and the Orchestra invisibly sunk in its pit, so that the sense of sight should not operate to remind one (while Johannes Brahms, Richard Wagner or Anton Bruckner was being played) of one's difference from the others ; from the crowd that was, thus, an extension of oneself, breathless and unutterably moved, as if possessed by God.

...

The 1937 Regensburg ceremony placed Anton Bruckner as a God in the Holy Temple of « Walhalla » . His music would be the sacred language, and Nazism the mystical religion. His Symphonies, especially in those spiritual slow movements, were deemed a religious experience, and only those who shared the same blood and soil could fully-comprehend the message.

Nowhere is this phenomenon better exemplified than in the Viennese « Dunkelkonzerte » of the early 1940's, in which

the darkened « Wiener Konzerthaus » was transformed into a sacred space where listening to Bruckner became tantamount to attending church. Concert of November 15th, 1940, celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Vienna Symphony Orchestra : before intermission (in a partially darkened hall) , the « Symphoniker » played Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's « Regina cœli » ; after intermission (in a fully-darkened hall) , Anton Bruckner's 9th Symphony.

Bryan Gilliam. « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner : Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation » , in : « The Musical Quarterly » , Volume 78, No. 3 (Autumn 1994) ; page 595.

...

The War-time « Dunkelkonzerte » took place in the « Wiener Konzerthaus » . The tendency to view dimming of lights as a sacralization of space was a notion the « Dunkelkonzerte » fed-off, with Anton Bruckner Symphonies performed as if holding Holy-Mass.

The 1st « Dunkelkonzert » which took place on November 7th, 1939, offered the Prelude to the Opera « Parsifal » by Richard Wagner ; an organ work by Max Reger ; and the 7th Symphony by Anton Bruckner.

...

History of acousmatic sound includes a hidden-choir of nuns singing from behind a grill, concert-hall architecture designed to obscure the Orchestra culminating in Richard Wagner's Bayreuth Opera House, and the quasi-religious Nazi recuperation of Anton Bruckner via the pitch-black « Dunkelkonzerte » .

...

Between November 1939 and March 1944, the « Wiener Symphoniker » performed a series of darkened concerts, or « Dunkelkonzerte » . The musicologist Bryan Gilliam describes how « the darkened “ Wiener Konzerthaus ” was transformed into a sacred space » , in particular, a space in which to hear the transcendent spiritual meaning of Anton Bruckner's Symphonies. At the time, Bruckner had undergone a revival (and revision) under the Nazis, becoming a figure of reverence for the leadership. An « infamous » photograph from Regensburg 1937 captures Adolf Hitler, dressed in full-military garb, respectfully gazing-up at a bust of Bruckner atop a pedestal emblazoned with an iron eagle and swastika. According to Gilliam, in order to « annex » Bruckner, Josef Goebbels and others involved in Nazi cultural propaganda downplayed Bruckner's Catholicism in favour of themes more agreeable to the Party. In Goebbels's Regensburg address, he emphasized Bruckner's rustic peasant roots and his victimization at the hands of music-critics (like the Jewish critic Eduard Hanslick) . In a true act of revisionism, Goebbels described Bruckner's conversion to a new Symphonic style after encountering Richard Wagner, claiming that :

« From that moment onwards, the church musician at once retreats almost entirely, and out of him emerges the distinctive Symphonist »

Bruckner the Aryan, the composer of « Blut und Baden » , is substituted for Bruckner the devout Catholic since, « in order to comprehend him, one must look to the roots of his existence, the elemental forces of blood and race that propelled his humanity » . The comprehension of Bruckner's music, Gœbbels argued, could only occur when situated in the correct (i.e. , Nazi) context, for his style is subject to a « complete misunderstanding » when lumped « under the rubric of religious art » or characterized as Masses without texts. After his conversion to Wagner, Bruckner's religious faith had broken free of all Catholic confines and become purely German :

« It has its roots in the same heroic feeling for the world from which all truly Great and eternal creations of German art blossom. »

All the better that Bruckner, like Hitler, was a « son of Austrian soil » but was called to the « intractable intellectual and spiritual common fate that envelops our entire German people » .

The Viennese « Dunkelkonzerte » always featured a Symphony by Bruckner, along with other works with strongly spiritual themes. Gilliam reproduces a concert program from November 15th, 1940 (celebrating the 40th anniversary of the « Wiener Symphoniker ») , that opened with Mozart's « Regina cœli » , performed in a « half-darkened hall » (« Im halbberdunkelten Saal ») and, after the intermission, closed with Bruckner's 9th Symphony in a « completely darkened hall » (« Im gänzlich berdunkelten Saal ») . The effect, according to reviewers, was « excellent » , the « Dunkelkonzerte » being especially effective for works with a « mysterious Romantic character » . But it was not quite Romanticism the organizers of the concerts were after. Rather, the conservatism of the concert-hall reformers, from the turn of the 19th Century (like Paul Marsop) , who sought to æsthetically shape the listening public into a new social body, was outdone by the organizers of the « Dunkelkonzerte » and their « national æstheticism » - to borrow a phrase from Lacoue-Labarthe. A new social body was to be formed through the communing of listeners in the darkened auditorium, hearing in Bruckner's Symphonies the spiritual mission to which they were called. The « Dunkelkonzerte » employed all the conditions of acousmatic phantasmagoria in its production of transcendence. The eye and ear were separated by the obscure darkness ; the music was separated not only from the source of the Orchestra but from the context of Bruckner's religious faith ; the sound of the Orchestra became a vehicle for sounding-out the Holy Art of the German people, a transcendental sonic message of spiritual destiny and fate. But what about the receivers of this message ? Even if, according to the review, the effect was excellent, who knew exactly what message was being received ?

In Gilliam's words :

« Whether or not contemporary German audiences believed the Nazi propaganda, whether or not they sensed their common soil upon hearing a rustic Scherzo, communed with God during an Adagio, or even perceived Teutonic heroism in a fugal Finale is a large, complex issue yet to be sorted-out. »

Complex indeed, but not without its conditions and history.

...

The appropriation of Anton Bruckner's music was significant on an æsthetic level ; that is, it was an enterprise carefully calculated to engage in the awe-inspiring theatrical spectacle of monumental architecture, extravagant ornament and meticulously planned ritual. This is clear from the session's organization : always beginning at precisely 8 PM , on the evening of the 1st day of the rally, it was held in the town's newly-refurbished Opera House, clad externally in the symbols of the Party. Inside, the familiar red of the Party (the colour that communicated « the social idea of the movement » for Adolf Hitler) was set-off against the stage-curtain, which displayed in its midst the symbol of the rally against a sky-blue background (a colour with « wonderful esthetic effect ») . Garlands, flowers, and laurel leaves strewn about the stage and seating areas added a particularly extravagant touch, and the splendour of the back-drop was set-off against the uniforms of the audience : the dominating brown of the political leaders and the SA, the black and silver of the SS, and the field-grey of the armed forces, next to which shone the « medieval splendour » of the velvet robes of the Rectors and Deans from the highest German schools, lending « a special character to the radiant picture » .

After a preliminary speech by Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg and the awarding of the Party « Prizes for Art and Science » (from 1937, the German National Prizes as an alternative to the Nobel Prizes) , Hitler would take the podium to deliver the crowning address of the event, his annual « Kulrurrede » . An oration of some length, its dominant themes were always similar : the forcing of « degenerate » modern art upon the « Volk » as a result of Jewish and Bolshevist-led decadence, the glory of German culture throughout history, and the National-Socialist remit as its bearers and protectors. Via the media of newspapers, souvenir handbooks and radio, dissemination of the « Kulrurredren » to the farthest corners of the « Reich » could be guaranteed ; Josef Gœbbels, indeed, had identified the latter medium as « the most modern and most important instrument for influencing the masses » and had complemented domestic receivers with speaker systems set-up at street-corners and in work-places. Total audience figures for 1937 show that over 9 million people could be reached by means of the radio ; we should, therefore, not be surprised to find one commentator projecting that Hitler's « lucid words » that year would be « enthusiastically attended by millions » .

In his final « Kulrurrede » of 1938, prefaced by a performance of Anton Bruckner's 7th Symphony given by Hans Weisbach and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, Hitler would outline some telling æsthetics that give us a further sense of the significance of Bruckner's Symphonies in this venue. Music, while undoubtedly « the greatest creator of feelings and moods » , is to be hierarchized beneath speech on the grounds that music appears « least suitable to satisfy the intellect » . It is speech alone that can truly claim to stimulate the intellect, and this accounts for the effect of the works of « the great Master of Bayreuth » : in fusing music and speech together in the form of the music-drama, Wagner, for Hitler, had won for art its greatest triumph, grasping the spectator's mental faculties while deepening their emotional response through the musical medium. Conversely, « the great “ Symphoniker ” » (an ambiguous term that could refer to conductors, Symphonists or even the players in the Orchestra but, following shortly after a performance of the 7th, the specific connection to Bruckner must surely be made) « strive to give an account of more general moods » , an objective for which « they are also in need of an introduction for the listeners, however, by means of certain general clues laid-down in language » . I am led to conclude, then, that Bruckner's Symphonic music was selected here in part because its trajectory could provide an intensifying emotional medium for

the message of Hitler's « Kulturredens » ; that is, it acted as a substrate over which this so-called « material for the intellect » could be laid.

Indeed, if we chart the course of the 1937 culture session performance (the Finale of the 5th Symphony played by the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra under Siegmund von Hausegger) , we gain a strong sense of the motives underlying its selection. Following initial reminiscences of themes from the preceding movements (not the least of which is the 1st movement's solemn pizzicato processional) exposed melodic fragments in the clarinets readily coagulate into nothing less Germanic than a « fortissimo » fugal exposition for the strings. A lyrical 2nd theme, purveyor of Bruckner's dogged adherence to the Sonata principle in the midst of the fugue, is eventually succeeded by a forceful chorale, 1st intoned by the 11 strong brass section and, ultimately, the subject of its own fugal exposition ; at this juncture, Bruckner skilfully binds the chorale and fugue themes into an extended contrapuntal development. However, even this display of compositional finesse pales before the concluding « Steigerung » , in which the motto theme of the Symphony is brought into grand coalition with the Finale's principal themes ; the sonorous mass of over 70 instruments playing « sempre fff » , thus, bring the movement to a close with a sheer expanse of sound in the tonic of B-flat major. The Finale's narrative implications (a trajectory of glorious victory through bitter struggle, of the reunion of fragments into a consummate whole) cannot be dismissed, and nor can they be distanced from the analogous message of Hitler's thoughts on German culture.

At the grand « tutti » of the movement, von Hausegger, thus, manipulated his multitude in a tremendous unity of sound and image, just as only minutes before, Hitler (a personality no less flamboyant in dramatic and rhetorical gesture than the average conductor and Symphony) had addressed his faithful masses. An atmosphere surcharged with emotion had been built-up, and just as Hitler's final words (« beschirmten Gemeinschaft als Träger und Wächter einer höheren Kultur » , surely calculated for their abrasive rhythm and syllabic effect) had initiated an electrical discharge of devotional oaths to leader and nation, so the striking of the final orchestral hammer blow provoked a mass catharsis throughout the Opera House.

This catharsis, however, was not effected through applause, shouts of « encore » , or other customary means. Rather, much as the performance of « Die Meistersinger » , at the re-opening of the Bayreuth Festival, in 1924, had sparked « a hearty rendition of the German national anthem » , the discharge of emotion was voiced in an apparently spontaneous communal chorus ; as one report of the evening relates :

« The exceptional tenor of triumph of Bruckner's Finale turned into the song of the national hymn. »

Bruckner's concluding Chorale statement had been stripped of its religious vestige and clothed instead in the pervasive dogma of nationalism ; the Finale, here, became « gleichgeschaltet » as a mouth-piece of Nazi ideology, engaging with the elaborate theatre of Hitler's « Kulturtagung » in order to play a crucial role in the fascination of the masses, the inculcation of ritual and the propitious communication of political message. At Nuremberg, « absolute » music was pressed into the service of « absolute » power.

It seems unlikely that Bruckner and his Symphonies will ever escape their pernicious association with extreme political

movements. This connection, initiated during Bruckner's lifetime as a result of his presence in Wagnerian circles, was capitalized upon immediately after his death : in 1897, Bruckner's « official » biographer, the virulently anti-Semitic and German Nationalist August Göllerich, successfully petitioned the Parish Council of Linz (« Gemeinderat ») to subsidize a series of concerts in memory of the composer. These concerts, scheduled biennially over the course of the following 25 years, aimed to present all of Bruckner's significant works as well.

As Göllerich was a central figure in the musical life of Linz, at the time (inhabiting posts such as director of the City's « Musikverein » and of several of its « Sängerbünde »), it seems plausible that Hitler, who spent much of his childhood in the city, attended some of these Bruckner performances.

1 June 1906 : Article in the London « Musical Times » ...

(LINZ) Some years ago, the Town Council of this little city on the beautiful blue Danube, at the suggestion of « Herr » August Göllerich, voted a sum of money ; the interest from which, for 25 years, was to be devoted to a bi-annual Anton Bruckner Festival Concert, at popular prices. Up to the present, the 1st 6 Symphonies of the composer have been given at these concerts. Bruckner was organist at Linz Cathedral, from 1855 to 1867, when he succeeded Simon Sechter, organist of the « Hofkapelle », becoming at the same time a professor at the Vienna « Conservatorium ». Bruckner was born, on September 4th, 1824, in Ansfelden, in the Archduchy of Upper-Austria, of which Linz is the capital. There is, consequently, some method in the Linz Town Council's madness : a laudable desire to do honour to the memory of an artist who, after suffering cruel neglect in his lifetime, is now becoming more and more appreciated in Austria and Germany, and even spoken of as the greatest Symphonist since Beethoven. The 5th of the concerts was given on April 7th, 1906, by the Linz « Musikverein » Orchestra, the program consisting of the 7th Symphony, the « Te Deum », and a setting, for 5 part chorus and 3 trombones, of « Psalm 114 ». The last-named was performed for the 1st time, though its composition dates from the period in the 1850's when Bruckner was still organist at the « Stift » (Abbey) of Saint-Florian where, as a boy, he was a chorister. The performances of the 3 works were exceedingly fine, that of the gigantic Symphony especially creating the greatest enthusiasm. The concert attracted many visitors from Vienna and other Austrian towns, and its striking success reflects the greatest credit on the Linz « Musikverein » no less than on the little cathedral town itself, with its 60,000 inhabitants.

...

It is all too easy to see how the supposed sacral character of Anton Bruckner's music could lend itself to employment at the secular rituals through which the Party sought to invest itself with the status of tradition :

After the 1937 Regensburg Festival, Max Auer commented, concerning a concert given in a deconsecrated Minorite church that :

« Everyone who experienced it, came to the conclusion that only a mystic ecclesiastical venue is adequate for Symphonies 5 and 9. The Concert-Hall of the future Bruckner House must employ sacral architecture. »

(« Bruckner-Blätter » , 1937.)

The choice of words is unfortunate. Performances of Bruckner's Symphonies in ecclesiastical venues can indeed be effective if the acoustics are not too reverberant (in which case, they sound dreadful, no matter how slowly the music is taken) but to state that the 5th and the 9th can only make their effect in « mystic ecclesiastical venues » is an example of the tendency to except Bruckner from ordinary considerations (those regarding textual fidelity, for instance)

In an article in the Festival Programme for the Regensburg « Brucknerfest » , Hans Weisbach identified a flexible interpretative approach with the pattern of unauthorized intervention then being detected in the 1st published editions, and argued for a broad « sacral » approach that he equated with fidelity to both the text and the composer's intentions :

« In the soul of this man, who did not take the experiences of earthly life as the inspiration for his art but sent his creative spirit to endless distances, for whom the divine miracles of the universe were transformed into sounds and into which he poured the hot blood of a human heart - in the soul of this man, music has to transform into a solemnly flowing deep river of noble " grandeur ". He who has not yet understood that this music has no tendency towards dramatic affect or effect can learn it from every page of the original versions ; he will also learn (to his surprise) how little variation of the basic tempo Bruckner wishes. His tempo indications do not mean to tie the interpreter down, as one so often felt, and only reluctantly followed, in those 1st editions, but to set the interpreter free, because they are in complete harmony with the nature of the music. Intimately related to the tempo (again, clearly evident from the original versions) is the treatment of phrasing indications in the strings. Especially during cantabile moments of the greatest expression, we encounter Bruckner's characteristic of omitting slurs and, instead, specifying individual bowings for each single note. By adding the comment " lang gezogen " (drawn-out) , he gives the conductor, as well as the players, the opportunity to realize the solemn tempo with the greatest ... »

...

Conductor Hans Weisbach explicitly allied the publication of the Symphonies in their « ursprüngliche Gestalt » with Bruckner's « prophetically foreseen " later times " . »à

The Problem of Time

Concepts of « musical space » could be applied no better than to Anton Bruckner. As Bruckner scholar Mathias Hansen has pointed-out :

« No other musician, not even Richard Wagner or Richard Strauß, indeed, no other great artist of the past was occupied so unconditionally and completely by Fascist ideology as Bruckner. What is more, Bruckner's music was habitually attributed to the mentality of earlier-periods. Thus, in 1934, the Bruckner specialist Robert Haas declared him effectively the heir of an earlier musical sense :

“ The medieval feeling for spaciousness (' Weimtumigkeit ') , which was retained throughout the Baroque way of life and the Enlightenment could fully-vibrate in ecstatic hymns praising the glory of God and the world. ” »

Others, similarly, considered him the product of a « subterranean transmission of the South-German Austrian Baroque » , a « continuer, indeed, the consummator of an age-old world of expression, that flourished in the 17th and 18th Centuries but was later swamped by other artistic currents, filled with powerful sensuality, love of brilliance, and a mighty richness of form drawn from “ pre-Classical ”, appealingly “ objective ” sense of form » . The attempt to classify Bruckner as a Romantic composer (that is to say : a figure of his age) was resoundingly rejected, as his gigantic forms were felt to bear no relation to the formal miniatures of his Romantic contemporaries.

A favourite for triumphal occasions in this respect was Bruckner's 5th symphony, whose fugal Finale (with the famous final chorale apotheosis) constituted a compendium of monumental effects. What is more, the practice of performing this Finale with an additional brass ensemble, positioned at the back of the concert-hall, to re-inforce the final chorale would seem to be the epitome of a palpable musical space. It is no surprise that in the process of replacing these versions with the « Originalfassungen » or « Urfassungen » , during the 1930's, this performance tradition was only given-up with considerable reluctance. In Bruckner's Symphonies, after all, the « sounding cathedral » of absolute music and the « space of cultish celebrations » of earlier musical practices finally came together.

Thus, it was only a matter of time before Bruckner was going to be associated with the « Mütter » . Richard Strauß's successor at the « Reichsmusikkammer » , Peter Raabe, made this clear in his speech for the Regensburg Bruckner Festival of June 1937 :

« For those to whom the works reveal themselves, listening to Bruckner is not merely an artistic enjoyment : it is a descent to the mothers, to the sources of feeling, to which leads no thinking, no knowledge or searching, but only the will to be small before the infinitude of creation, and to be great in striving for the good. »

It is difficult in this context not to think of the popular « Dunkelkonzerte » , in which Bruckner's music was played in fully-darkened concert-halls, enveloping the audiences in a cathedral of sound, as a musical return into the womb. Raabe's reading of the key-scene describing « Faust » 's encounter with the « Mütter » , with his strange emphasis on humility and goodness, may be a little eccentric among interpretations of « Faust » , but it shows the basic principle of individual insignificance in the presence of such overwhelming sounding bodies all the more clearly.

He continued :

« What he saw in those blissful hours of creation could not be conveyed by words. For, it is precisely the tremendous part of absolute music, which places it above all the other arts (including dramatic music, including Song, Mass, Oratorio) that it is their task to pronounce that which can be said neither in words nor in gestures. And if we were to try to pin-down this mysterious power of Symphonic art, it could only be in the words of Gæthe's “ chorus mysticus ” from the end of “ Faust ” II : “ the indescribable, here, it is done. ” »

Bruckner's own lack of written commentary on his work was a rarity among composers in the later- 19th Century. Here, the absence of words is turned into the unsayability topos of absolute music. Like « Faust », who could age, and, indeed, only for a circle of friends and connoisseurs. For the « Urfassungen » movement, this admission was crucial : this later age, the « Golden Age » for Bruckner, had finally begun.

Some authors, like Otto Schumann, brought a racial explanation for « Urfassungen » into play :

The « Nordic » race (located in areas of Germany that conveniently coincided with the Protestant regions) , austere and beholden to the whole, would consider the work with the view to preserving its integrity as a whole. By contrast, the South-German and Austrian « Dinaric » race (who also were predominantly Catholic) was particularly in thrall to the splendor of the individual moment. The sensuous experience, from moment to moment, mattered most to them, just like Catholic Mass - there could not be enough of those magical moments, their basic penchant was instinctually for long versions. Not coincidentally, Schumann's explanation of the sense-driven « Dinaric » outlook matches closely Arnold Schering's concept of monumentality.

As philological exactitude was enlisted to bring about the authentic « Erlebnis » , other commentators were more emphatic in their demand for un-adulterated (and uncut) versions of Bruckner's works :

More drastic still than retouchings are cuts, for they tear-up the formal unity and often render the developmental processes incomprehensible. It is obvious how such interventions could disfigure the construction of whole movements, could render it unrecognizable. We have been deprived of the originals ; not only do we have the right, we have a veritable duty to demand them.

Indeed, the very lengths of Bruckner's music seemed to be a feature that was particularly associated with its essentially German nature. Ernst Bücken, for one, argued that the miniature « temporality of Romanticism » could not be applied to Bruckner. Instead, he saw a direct correlation between the magnitude Bruckner's monumental forms and the ascent of the German nation to greatness. And Karl Grunsky would go even further in a nationalistic diatribe :

« For foreign audiences, the length of Bruckner's Symphonies is hard to bear. »

Only to continue in an almost charming aside which should, strictly speaking, cause his entire racist framework to collapse :

« One can hardly claim, however, that every German could follow them without problems. »

This was precisely the crux with Bruckner. For all the emphatic nationalist rhetoric with which Bruckner and his spacious and expansive forms are appraised, and for all its propensity for « musical space » , the music really did not enjoy as much popular support as his proponents would have wished. In this, the lengths (and, especially, the greater lengths of the restored « Urfassungen ») proved the biggest stumbling block. Critics could well argue that the

magnitude of Bruckner's Symphonies corresponded to the ascent of the German nation, but this did not mean much if the people who were to identify with them were bored or put-off by the sheer lengths of the Symphonies. What had to happen was to find a way to make the nation experience the greatness of Bruckner. In this, philology could only go so far.

Bruckner's Popularity

It is here, at last, that the wordlessness of the « Mütter » has doubled-up on the National-Socialist appropriation of Bruckner and led into an impasse. On the one hand, the ideology of origins valued primordial truths - or, to use the pseudo-scientific parlance of the time, it recognized Bruckner's « chthonic-telluric » elements (which can best be translated as « earthy-earthly ») . On this basis, the « Urfassungen » were considered to provide a more authentic, and, therefore, more immediate access to his musical creation. This, in turn, added to the valorization of the lengths of the Symphonies, which were already considerable. More broadly, the imperative to honour his artistic integrity meant that only the totality of his Symphonic creations (without cuts or alterations) could provide access to the spiritual depths his music conveyed wordlessly. In other words, the very dimensions of Bruckner's Symphonies became an expression of their quintessential Germanness. On the other hand, however, the very same ideology of the « Mütter » also built on the immediacy of a « lived experience » that preceded (or defied) rational reflection and verbal description. The more « völkisch » interpretation of this ideology, therefore, demanded a uniform and un-mediated, felt understanding of Bruckner's music, irrespective of prior education. And that was evidently not forthcoming.

When put in these more general terms, in fact, the problem of Bruckner falls squarely into wider debates about popularity and high-culture that occupied National-Socialist policy-makers at all levels. More than for other political movements, the task of bringing the values of high-art in line with the appeal of popular art was imperative to the cultural politics of the National-Socialist regime.

Bruckner and the National-Socialists in Germany : Ephemera from a Dark Time

(John F. Berky.)

The life and music of composer Anton Bruckner would be interesting if it simply encompassed the years of his life, but unlike most composers, Bruckner's music and even his life took on an added dimension of interpretation during the reign of the National-Socialist Party, in Germany, from 1933 to 1945. The appropriation of Bruckner's music by the Nazi Party is a fascinating study and one that has been well-covered in several scholarly essays. The purpose of this essay is not so much to discuss that complex time, but to look at that era through the examination of several artifacts from that time. In most cases, the objects are small and ephemeral in nature but it is often these overlooked and easily discarded objects that can tell an interesting sidelight and lead us to a better realization of the tenor of the times.

Program Booklets :

One of the most ephemeral, but often most informative musical objects of this time are concert program booklets. Often simply discarded after the concert, an occasional notice or program book can give a glimpse into the musical activity of the time. My interest has always centered around the year 1937, because in that year, the appropriation of Bruckner's music became official with the establishment of the « Day of German Art » celebrations and the placing of Bruckner's bust in the Temple of « Walhalla », the shrine overlooking the Danube in Regensburg, near Munich (Germany) . It was at this ceremony, on June 6th, 1937, that Hermann Goebbels, the Propaganda Minister of the National-Socialist Party, in the presence of Adolf Hitler, presented his skillfully crafted speech which linked Bruckner to the German people and to the mission of the National-Socialists. Below is a program announcement for the Donau Week which took place in Saint-Florian, Linz and Steyr in July of 1937.

A Bruckner 6th by Hans Weissbach and a Symphony No. 3 conducted by Oswald Kabasta would certainly be interesting to hear but, unfortunately, no recordings survive. It is also interesting to see that Eugene Ormandy, who recorded the Bruckner 7th, in 1936, and received a Bruckner Society of America medal of honour, is in Austria several months prior to the « Anschluß » conducting the Symphony No. 5.

Program notes more closely associated with the ceremony at « Walhalla », in Regensburg, exist as shown in the example below :

There are also pictures associated with the installation of Bruckner's bust at « Walhalla » :

There is a more tangible souvenir associated with the Regensburg event. For the occasion, sculptor Karl Goetz (1875-1950) was commissioned to strike the following commemorative coin :

A few weeks after the Regensburg event, the Nazis celebrated the opening of a museum in Munich devoted to the glorification of « German Art ». At the same time, an exhibit was opened to show what the National-Socialists' arbiters of taste considered to be « degenerate art ». The opening event was a national celebration entitled, « Der Tag der Deutsche Kunst » (The Day of German Art) . Programs books and posters were produced as well as postcards of the logos for the 1937 and 1938 events. In 1938, a postage stamp was issued.

For this special day, there was also a radio component with approved German music being presented over the stations of the « Reichs Radio Gesellschaft » (RRG) . In between the radio reports, a special music « stinger » was commissioned which incorporated the opening theme motto of Bruckner's Symphony No. 3. The recording, pressed by « Polydor » still survives. The National-Socialists were actively recording Bruckner's music for broadcast. Transcription discs (like the one shown below featuring Fritz Lehmann) were distributed via transcription discs to the regional radio stations.

With commercial releases, the National-Socialists made it a point to promote acceptable artists while removing recordings by « unacceptable » performers. The most notable example was the deletion of the Jascha Horenstein / Berlin Philharmonic recording of the Bruckner Symphony No. 7 with the same Symphony and Orchestra conducted by Carl Schuricht.

Perhaps, the most unusual bit of ephemera that has come our way is the set of 2 « 78 rpm » discs of a partial performance of the Bruckner Symphony No. 7 with the Berlin Philharmonic conducted by Wilhelm Furtwängler. The recording was made on April 1st, 1942, and only the Adagio exists. What makes this particular set of records so special is that they come from one of the « Führer » bunkers occupied by Adolf Hitler. Based on information gleaned from German periodicals (most notably, « Der Spiegel »), the discs probably come from the bunker under the « Reich » Chancellery, in Berlin. The discs can be identified by the inventory labels attached to them.

La musique en Haute-Autriche sous le National-Socialisme

(Regina Thumser)

« Neuaufbau » des Linzer Musiklebens

Während das Musikleben der Stadt Linz schon vor dem « Anschluß » aufgrund der raschen Expansion der Stadt kaum mit dem wachsenden Bedarf nach musikalischen Veranstaltungen mithalten hatte können, so gab es zwei Gründe, warum es nach dem « Anschluß » bis etwa 1940 dauerte, bis die Nationalsozialisten dieses « neu aufgebaut » hatten. Zum einen war man bestrebt, die am 11. Juni 1938 ergangene Verordnung über die Einführung der Reichskulturkammergesetzgebung im Lande Österreich umzusetzen und die musikpolitische « Gleichschaltung » durchzuführen, zum anderen waren die politischen Größen des Gaus und der Stadt anfangs mit « anderen » Vorhaben beschäftigt. Zudem hatten die zunächst eingesetzten Verantwortlichen wenig bis keine Affinitäten zur Musik, geschweige denn Kenntnisse über ein funktionierendes Musikmanagement. Ämterkumulierung, Missgunst, Neid und Vernachlässigung waren an der Tagesordnung, etwa auch zwischen den sich befehdenden Musikfunktionären Oberösterreichs Franz Kinzl und Othmar Heide sowie Josef Straub - und dies, obwohl die Reichsmusikkammer bereits im Dezember 1934 Richtlinien für die Bestellung eines Musikbeauftragten festgelegt hatte : Dieser müsse nicht « musikalisch ausübend » sein, allerdings solle er « musikverständlich und musikliebend » sein. Die Bestellung erfolge « von der Stadtverwaltung im Einvernehmen mit der örtlichen Parteistelle und der Ortsmusikerschaft » und müsse von der Reichsmusikkammer bestätigt werden.

Weisungen der Berliner Reichsmusikkammer (RMK) wurden vor allem zur Amtszeit Othmar Heides allerdings mehr oder weniger ignoriert. Man hielt sie für eine politisch unzuverlässige Einrichtung, « weil Richard Strauß [Strauß war Präsident der RMK], den [Othmar] Heide für einen “ Judenknecht ” hielt, sein Amt niedergelegt hatte und Herr Raabe den Parteigrößen [in Oberdonau] überhaupt nicht imponierte » .

Richard Strauß und die RMK

Richard Strauß war von 1933 bis 1935 Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer. Er wurde für seine « Musikpolitik » immer mehr angefeindet. 1935 legte er das Amt zurück, nachdem von der Gesta Die schweigsame Frau, abgefangen worden war. Strauß hatte und andere darauf beharrt, daß Zweigs Name genannt werden mußte. (Genauerer dazu Oliver Rathkolb : « Führertreu und gottbegnadet ») .

Lediglich in der Durchsetzung persönlicher Anliegen der Beteiligten wurde auch die Reichsmusikkammer angerufen, oder man berief sich auf die Umsetzung ihrer Richtlinien. Neben den internen Querelen gab es auch diverse Bestrebungen, die Fäden in der Linzer Musikpolitik von oberster Stelle zu ziehen : Adolf Hitler plante neben dem wirtschaftlichen Ausbau von Linz auch, die Stadt Wien gegenüber kulturell aufzuwerten.

« Gleichschaltung »

Die verordnete musikpolitische « Gleichschaltung » forderte nicht nur die Auflösung einzelner Vereine, wie etwa der Magistratskapelle Linz, die erst wieder im Juni 1945 unter Kapellmeister Josef Froschauer revitalisiert wurde, sondern auch die aktive Umsetzung der NS-Richtlinien, welche aufgrund der skizzierten Umstände häufig nicht nachhaltig waren.

Im Bereich der « klassischen » Musik setzte man nach dem « Anschluß » zunächst darauf, diese zu popularisieren :

« Musik verlangt begeisterungsfähige Menschen als Hörer, am wenigsten Sätze und Gleichgültige. Sinfonische Werke setzen eine gewisse heroische Seelenstimmung beim Empfänger voraus. Nun hat aber die verfllossene Kampfzeit gezeigt, daß seelischer Heroismus und Begeisterungsfähigkeit in der bisherigen Oberschicht unseres Volkes nicht allzu häufig zu finden sind. Die mittleren und unteren sozialen Schichten müßen also gewonnen werden. Dies geschieht durch zwei Mittel : Erziehung und Propaganda. »

(Linzer Tages-Post, 26. Juli 1938.)

In der praktischen Umsetzung der Hinführung der « Massen » zur Hochkultur setzte man - wie in der Linzer Tages-Post vermerkt, auf eine « Senkung der Eintrittspreise » und « eine gewisse Lockerung des Toilettezwanges bei Konzerten » . Darüber hinaus sollten das Volksbildungswerk der Organisation « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF) und die « neuzuschaffenden “ Musikschulen für Jugend und Volk ” » Erziehungsarbeit leisten.

Bald wurde aber auch den Linzer NS-Propagandisten klar, daß Populärmusik und -unterhaltung größeren Propagandawert hatten ; vor allem nach Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs und mit Kriegsverlauf wurde die Operette « kriegswichtiger als die Oper ! » .

(Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, Karton Landestheater.)

Georg Ludwig Jochum und das « Reichsbrucknerorchester »

1940 kam « endlich » musikalische Kompetenz von außen nach Linz : der Dirigent Georg Ludwig Jochum. Dieser Bestellung stehen allerdings diverse Mythen um Hitlers Engagement für das Linzer Musik- und Kulturleben gegenüber. So soll sich Adolf Hitler beispielsweise selbst um den Sängernachwuchs für das Linzer Opernensemble gekümmert und den Münchner Generalmusikdirektor Clemens Krauß mit dessen Heranbildung beauftragt haben :

« Er [Hitler] sei diesen Weg gegangen, weil er es für besser halte, gute Stimmen durch eine vorsichtige, mehrjährige

Ausbildung zu Höchstleistungen zu befähigen, als sie zufälligen Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten zu überlassen. Es sei ihm um der Sache willen gleich, ob er auf diese Weise einer ganzen Reihe von Sängern Ausbildungszuschüsse für mehrere Jahre zukommen lassen müsse, wenn ihm nur gewährleistet werde, daß sie nur in den Rollen herausgestellt würden, denen sie gewachsen seien. »

(Henry Picker : Hitlers Tischgespräche im Früherhauptquartier 1941-1942 ; Seite 302.)

Der Dirigent Clemens Krauß soll von Hitler auch mit der Heranbildung eines « wirklich guten Dirigenten » für Linz betraut gewesen sein.

Die genannten Vorhaben Hitlers waren fiktiver Natur, und auch wenn die Bestellung Georg Ludwig Jochums, eines Bruders des Dirigenten Eugen Jochum, nicht erste Wahl war, so gab es in seiner Person eine anzuerkennende Autorität. Georg Ludwig Jochum hatte es dennoch nicht leicht, all den Kulturfunktionären des Gaus und der Stadt zu entsprechen : Er saß als Leiter des Städtischen Symphonieorchesters und des Opern- beziehungsweise Theaterorchesters gewissermaßen zwischen den Stühlen.

Später kam auch noch die Funktion als Leiter des « Reichsbrucknerorchesters » mit Sitz im Stift Sankt Florian hinzu.

Zur Entlastung Jochums im Landestheater trug vor allem Kapellmeister Willy Wickenhäuser bei, der auch die Hauptlast der Probenarbeit zu tragen hatte. Das « Duo » war darüber hinaus für Anrechtskonzerte, « Konzerte außer Anrecht », darunter Aufführungen für die Wehrmacht, Kammerkonzerte, Schallplattenaufnahmen in Sankt Florian und Konzerte für diverse Feierstunden, etwa für den « Heldengedenktag » am 9. November 1941, zuständig.

Stadt und Gau beziehungsweise deren Vertreter bis hin zum Oberbürgermeister und zum Gauleiter trugen Streitigkeiten um die Zuständigkeit der Orchester aus. Im Februar 1944 schließlich sah sich Gauleiter August Eigruber veranlasst, in einem Brief an den Oberbürgermeister von Linz, die Dinge klarzustellen :

« Das Bruckner-Orchester des Großdeutschen Rundfunks ist ein Reichsorchester, welches seinen Sitz in Sankt Florian beziehungsweise derzeit in Linz hat und keinesfalls als städtisches oder Gauorchester anzusprechen ist. »

Es werde « nur fallweise der Stadt Linz als Synphonieorchester [sic] zur Verfügung stehen ». Daher sei die Sicherung des « Bestand[es] des Sinfonieorchesters der Stadt Linz » erforderlich ; es sei « zu vergrößern und in der instrumentaln Leistung zu verbessern ». Das Städtische Orchester habe « den musikalischen Bedürfnissen der Stadt Linz voll und ganz Rechnung zu tragen », werde aber, obwohl es der Stadt unterstehe, auch « zu Gastspielreisen im Gau, insbesondere in den Sommermonaten an den Fremdenverkehrsorten, herangezogen » .

(Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, Karton Landestheater.)

Darüber hinaus werde es kein eigenes Theaterorchester (das Theater unterstand verwaltungstechnisch dem Gau) geben, und das Städtische Sinfonieorchester müsse sich gewissermaßen dem Spielplan des Intendanten unterordnen.

Musikerziehung

Der musikalischen « Nachwuchsförderung » sollte ein am 7. September 1941 durchgeführte Orgelwettbewerb dienen. Aber nicht nur, der Wettbewerb sollte nicht zuletzt die Orgel als Instrument « säkularisieren » , sie dem kirchlichen Bereich entziehen und für den Einsatz in der nationalsozialistischen « Feierstunde » adaptieren. Neben dem « Wert der Improvisation » wurde im Ausschreibungstext « Der Kampf als Auslese » hervorgehoben :

« Der Kampf ist höchste Produktivität. Er ist nicht bloß Erprobung bereits erkannter, er ist auch Weckung aller bisher unbeachtet schlummernden Kräfte. Darum ist der Wettstreit das einzige und tatsächlich erfolgreiche Mittel jeder Begabtenförderung. [Hervorhebungen im Original] Es ist bestimmt kein Zufall, wenn uns diese Erkenntnis gerade jetzt neu aufdämmert, während unser Volk im größten und siegreichsten Kampf seiner Geschichte steht und wenn die letzten Jahrzehnte, jene Zeit pazifistisch-demokratischer Lethargie auch auf dem Gebiet der Kunst durch eine gewisse Freiheit vor wirklichem Bekennen und vor kämpferischem Eintreten gekennzeichnet waren. »

(Archiv der Stadt Linz, Kulturarchiv.)

Am Wettbewerb nahmen insgesamt 54 Organisten, darunter 36 Musiker aus « Gruppe I (Unbekannte Begabungen) » teil. Zum öffentlichen Spiel wurden aus diesem Pool schließlich Josef und Hermann Kronsteiner sowie Martin Ritschel zugelassen. Aus der zweiten Gruppe, die sich aus Komponisten zusammensetzte, kamen Franz Kinzl, Rudolf Keldorfer und Friedrich Ziegler in die Endrunde, und aus der dritten Gruppe, jener der Konzertorganisten und Orgellehrer, Georg Pirkmayr, Ludwig Daxperger und Adolf Trittinger. Die Jury setzte sich aus Professor Johann Nepomuk David, Professor Joseph Meßner aus Salzburg und Hofrat Professor Max Springer aus Wien zusammen ;Vorsitzender des Gremiums war der Komponist Professor Josef Haas.

« Beim ausgezeichnet besuchten öffentlichen Wett-Turnier war die Stiftskirche [Sankt Florian] festlich geschmückt, ebenso die Tische der Preisrichter vor dem Hochaltar. Auf dem Chor waren die Vorgänge hinter großen Blumengirlanden gut getarnt, sodaß der Spieler auch bei Zu- und Abgang nicht gesehen werden konnte. In den Chorstühlen rechts und links vom Hochaltar hatte der Gauleiter und Reichsstatthalter August Eigruber mit den Spitzen von Partei, Behörden und Wehrmacht, sowie einer großen Anzahl auswärtiger Ehrengäste und Vertretern des Musiklebens aus dem ganzen Reich Platz genommen. Auch Berichterstatter und Lichtbildner zahlreicher Blätter waren vertreten. »

(Archiv der Stadt Linz, Kulturarchiv)

Die Improvisationen der Wettbewerbsteilnehmer wurden sowohl vom Reichssender Wien auf Wachsplatten als auch von der Hauptstelle Rundfunk des Gaupropagandaamtes auf « Tonstreifen » aufgenommen. Es war geplant, die Platten « im Musikarchiv des Gaus für die Zukunft » aufzubewahren.

Nachdem das « Urteil der Kenner » und das « Urteil der Liebhaber » (auch Laien waren als Wertungsrichter zum Wettbewerb zugelassen) zusammengeführt worden waren, stand die Reihung fest. Problematisch für den Gau war die

Wertung insofern, als der 26-jährige Autodidakt und « Dorfforganist Hermann Kronsteiner (Windischgarsten) den Gausieger stellte », der ebenso wie sein Bruder Joseph (erhielt einen zweiten Preis) Priester war, was dem Ansinnen der « Entkonfessionalisierung » des Instruments zuwiderlief.

Es gibt Hinweise darauf, daß 1942 ein zweiter derartiger Wettbewerb abgehalten wurde oder abgehalten werden sollte. Georg Ludwig Jochum gab auf Anfrage von Anton Fellner, dem Kulturbeauftragten des Gauleiters und Reichsstatthalters, 1942 seinen Favoriten preis. Er hielt Ludwig Daxspurger von den ihm « bekannten Organisten des Gaus » für « den besten » - im Vergleich mit Adolf Trittinger, Wolfgang Auler und Hellmuth Müllner ; Letztere hatten am ersten Wettbewerb nicht teilgenommen. Weiters gibt es eine Skizze von Josef Kronsteiner, die mit « “ Unser ” Thema » titulierte und mit « Pfingstsonntag, 24. Mai 1942 » (Rudolf von Zinnhobler : Das Bistum Linz im Dritten Reich, XIII) datiert ist.

« Musikbolschewismus »

Einerseits galt es 1938 in Österreich den zwar nicht eindeutig definierten und klar handhabbaren Begriff « Musikbolschewismus » als Selektions- und Eliminierungsmechanismus einzuführen (hierfür erfolgten die « Vorarbeiten » bereits ab 1933 in NS-Deutschland) , andererseits war man bestrebt, den selbst initiierten Verlust auszugleichen, da viele Komponisten und ihre Werke nach diesem Prinzip nicht mehr zugelassen waren.

In Linz war 1938 die Ausschaltung ausübender jüdischer Künstlerinnen und Künstler aufgrund der vorhergegangenen antisemitischen Kulturpolitik nicht mehr vonnöten. Einzig der in den Jahren 1937 bis 1939 in Linz als Opernbariton und 1938 auch als Spielleiter der Oper engagierte Rolf Telasko durfte als jüdischer « Mischling » in der ersten Spielzeit noch in Linz verblieben sein. Er wurde auch 1939-1940 wieder engagiert, nützte aber die Theaterferien, um über Südfrankreich und Argentinien in die USA zu emigrieren. Eine weitere Ausnahme stellte der am 12. Februar 1892 in Linz geborene jüdische Pianist Alfred Spitz dar, der, unter dem persönlichen Schutz Gauleiter August Eigrubers stehend, bis März 1942 auftreten durfte. Eigruber soll ihm im « Anschluß » persönlich außer Landes verholfen haben. Die Komponistin und Dichterin Hedda Wagner, die als Sozialdemokratin bereits 1934 in die innere Emigration gegangen war, wurde im Juli 1938 vom deutschen Reichsverband der deutschen Presse abgelehnt und nützte « ihre unfreiwillige Muße » « zu eigenem Schaffen » .

1941 verfasste Franz Kinzl, der sich bereits im September 1938 als Musikbeauftragter der Stadt Linz durch einen antisemitischen Artikel mit dem Titel Jüdische Tarnung in der Musik hervorgetan hatte, in seiner Funktion als « Leiter des Musikreferates im Gaupropaganda-Amt » unter dem Titel Judentum und Musik eine Liste der jüdischen Komponisten als Unterlage für Säuberungsaktionen auf dem Gebiet der Musik, die er mit einem Vorwort beziehungsweise einer Anordnung versah, wie in Hinkunft mit Werken dieser Komponisten zu verfahren sei. Handlungsbedarf sah man, da die Musikkapelle von Sankt Wolfgang bei einem Ständchen für Reichspropagandaminister Josef Goebbels den Fackeltanz von Giacomo Meyerbeer gespielt hatte, der jüdischer Abstammung war. Als Vorlage für diese Broschüre diente das von Theo Stengel, einem Referenten der Reichsmusikkammer, und Herbert Gerigk, dem « Leiter der Hauptstelle Musik beim Beauftragten des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP » 1940 erstmals herausgegebene Lexikon der Juden in der Musik. Mit der Herausgabe des Heftes sollten alle

« Unklarheiten in Bezug auf erlaubte / nicht erlaubte Komponisten beseitigt werden. Allerdings galt es nun, die durch die « Ausmerzungen » hinterlassene Lücke aufzufüllen. Erreichen wollte man dies, indem man sich der « Klassik » bediente. Unter all jenen Künstlern beziehungsweise Komponisten, die eine Vereinnahmung durch die Nationalsozialisten erfuhren, sticht für Oberösterreich besonders Anton Bruckner hervor.

Vereinnahmung von Komponisten

Die Verherrlichung Bruckners war bereits im so genannten Altreich « vorgelebt » worden, so etwa mit der Aufstellung einer Bruckner-Büste im Marmortempel Walhalla bei Regensburg am 6. Juni 1937. Darüber hinaus versuchten die Musikverantwortlichen der NS sowie die « Musikbetrachter » (darunter Doktor Cornelius Preihs) in Ermangelung (im Sinne der nationalsozialistischen Gleichschaltung), Kunstbetrachtungs- und Musikpolitik akzeptabler - « guter » zeitgenössischer oberösterreichischer Kompositionen, krampfhaft einen Bezug zu all jenen Komponisten herzustellen, die Oberösterreich beziehungsweise Linz zumindest auf der Durchreise gestreift hatten. Die Liste reicht von Christoph Willibald Gluck über Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (vor allem die Linzer Symphonie KV 425, die Mozart 1783 auf der Durchreise von Salzburg nach Wien komponierte), Franz Schubert, Josef Lanner, Carl Michael Ziehrer bis hin zu Johannes Brahms und nicht zuletzt Richard Wagner und Hugo Wolf.

Ein Komponist, bei dem unklar war, ob man ihn als Oberösterreicher, « instrumentalisieren » sollte / durfte, war der 1857 in Waizenkirchen geborene Komponist, Opernkapellmeister, Librettist und Schriftsteller Wilhelm Kienzl. Kienzl stand (wahrscheinlich als Komponist der Melodie zur Bundeshymne der Ersten Republik und ob seiner Freundschaft zu Karl Renner) zunächst aus politischen Gründen bereits 1937-1938 auf der « schwarzen Liste » des Reichssenders Berlin. Fridolin Dallinger erwähnt in einer Kurzbiografie Kienzls, ohne näheres Datum, dessen Tagebucheintrag :

« Auffallende Vernachlässigung meiner Opern in der Ostmark (dem einstigen lieben Österreich) . »

In der zweiten Auflage des Lexikons der Juden in der Musik aus dem Jahr 1943 verwiesen die Autoren auf « unklare Fälle » :

« Unter den lebenden Vierteljuden, die versehentlich des öfteren auch bei Veranstaltungen von Parteigliederungen aufgeführt wurden, sind Boris Blacher und Heinrich Kaminski die wichtigsten. Wilhelm Kienzl, der vor einiger Zeit verstorbene Komponist der Oper “ Der Evangelimann ”, ist gleichfalls Vierteljude. »

(Joseph Wulf : Musik im Dritten Reich ; Seite 428.)

Wilhelm Kienzl, der im Oktober 1941 in Wien verstarb, versuchte man in Oberösterreich erst nach Kriegsende wieder zu Ehren zu verhelfen.

« Arische Moderne »

Besondere Schwierigkeiten gab es im Gegenzug, die « arische » Moderne in das öffentliche Musikleben zu integrieren.

Georg Ludwig Jochum erkannte wahrscheinlich die mangelnde (?) Qualität der einzelnen Werke und opponierte, wenn auch nicht offen, gegen die Aufführung zeitgenössischer Komponistinnen und Komponisten des Gaus. Als Gruppe traten diese Komponierenden « ernster Richtung des Gaus Oberdonau » erstmals im Oktober 1940 auf. Unter ihnen war der Arzt Franz Schnopfhagen (für kurze Zeit Landesleiter der Reichsmusikkammer in der Reichskulturkammer Oberdonau und Organist der Linzer Stadtpfarre) , Franz Neuhofer, Franz Kinzl, der Leiter des Domchores Ludwig Daxspurger, Robert Keldorfer und Franz Xaver Müller aus Linz, der Rieder Gymnasialprofessor Karl Rausch und der Krummauer Komponist Isidor Stögbauer. Als einzige Frau schloß sich die 1891 in Wien geborene, aber zur damaligen Zeit als « die Linzer Komponistin » geltende Frida Kern an.

Alle angeführten Komponistinnen und Komponisten unterzeichneten jenen, vermutlich von Franz Kinzl verfassten Brief, der im Oktober 1940 an den Linzer Oberbürgermeister mit einer Reihe von Vorschlägen ging. Ausschlaggebend war die Gründung des « Beirats für Musikpflege und Konzertwesen » , dem unter anderem Theodor Kerschner (der Vorstand des Gaumuseums) , der Großkaufmann Fritz Wied, Oberstudienrat Walter Gabl, der akademische Musiklehrer Robert Tremel, Franz Schnopfhagen als Leiter der Fachschaft für Komponisten in der Reichsmusikkammer, der Facharzt Karl Kleinschmid, Helmut Müllner in seiner Funktion als Kulturberichterstatter der NS-Tageszeitung Volksstimme sowie die Großindustriellengattin Dora Franck angehörten. Die Komponistinnen und Komponisten waren « der Ansicht, daß die politischen Ereignisse große Hemmungen für das gegenwärtige Schaffen mit sich bringen » und fürchteten um eine « Vertagung jeder Kunstförderung auf unbestimmte Zeit » , bei der besonders die Musik im Vergleich mit Architektur und Literatur ihrer Meinung nach ins Hintertreffen zu geraten schien. Unter der Verwendung von « Volk- und-Rasse » -Termini versuchten sie, die sich als Komponistinnen und Komponisten des Gaus verkannt und unterschätzt fühlten, zu begründen, wie und warum die neue Musik gefördert werden müße :

« Allerdings kann eine Erneuerung niemals von der übermäßigen Pflege des Alten, Ererbten, ihren Ausgang nehmen und ist es nur durch innigsten Kontakt der politischen Führer mit den lebenden Schaffenden selbst möglich, da nur Letztere imstande sind, die nötigen Anregungen für wirksame Maßnahmen zu geben. »

(Archiv der Stadt Linz, Kulturarchiv.)

Etwa einen Monat nach Beginn des Russlandfeldzuges, am 22. Juni 1941, wurde « auf Anordnung des Reichsministeriums für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda » auch die Aufführung von Werken russischer Autoren und Komponisten « bis auf weiteres » verboten : Franz Kinzl sah darin erneut eine Chance, Georg Ludwig Jochum dazu zu bringen, oberösterreichische Komponisten aufzuführen :

« Da Sie in Ihren Anrechtskonzerten am 23. September 1941 und 10. Februar 1942 jedesmal Tschaikowsky zu bringen beabsichtigen, empfehle ich Ihnen, die durch die Anordnung des Ministeriums freigewordenen Plätze durch Kompositionen von Autoren aus Oberdonau auszufüllen. »

(Archiv der Stadt Linz, Kulturarchiv.)

Im darauf folgenden Jahr wandten sich die Komponistinnen und Komponisten an Anton Fellner, den Kulturbeauftragten

des Gues, der erneut bei Georg Ludwig Jochum Fürsprache einlegte :

« Wir müßen es als Ehrenpflicht betrachten, auch die zeitgenössischen Komponisten unseres Gues in einem stärkeren Ausmaß als bisher aufzuführen. Da wir gerade in Oberdonau eine Reihe sehr beachtlicher Komponisten haben wird es sich hiebei vielleicht als praktisch beste Lösung erweisen, in womöglich jedem Anrechtskonzert ein solches Werk aufzuführen, wobei unabhängig, aber nicht am Ende sondern am besten in der Mitte der Saison ein Konzert gaeigener Komponisten gemacht werden könnte. Die heuer geplante Lösung hat sich als nicht sehr zweckdienlich herausgestellt, da auch nach Ansicht der Musikschaffenden das Publikum der Anrechtskonzerte zweifellos für solche Aufführungen oder Uraufführungen, die immer einen gewissen Anspruch stellen, besser geeignet ist als das weniger geschulte KdF-Publikum, so verdienstvoll auch das Eintreten der KdF für die gaeigenen Komponisten anzuerkennen ist. »

(Archiv der Stadt Linz, Kulturarchiv.)

Georg Ludwig Jochum sollte in die Anrechtskonzerte « je eine gaeigene, zeitgenössische Komposition » einbauen. Dies sei der beste Weg « sich mit den zeitgenössischen Musikschaffenden auseinanderzusetzen » .

(Archiv der Stadt Linz, Kulturarchiv.)

Anton Fellner war also sehr bewusst, daß das Konzept des auch von Gauleiter August Eigruber propagierten Konzepts « Kultur ins Volk » zu tragen, nicht aufgegangen war.

Die Quellenlage zur Musikgeschichte der NS-Zeit in Linz und Oberösterreich

Eine wichtige Quelle für die historische Forschung zur Linzer Musikgeschichte stellt der umfangreiche Aktenbestand « Kulturarchiv » im Linzer Stadtarchiv dar, wobei hier auch Akten aus der Zeit nach 1945 einen starken Bezug zur NS-Zeit aufweisen.

Darüber hinaus sind zahlreiche Streuakten zu verzeichnen, die in den nicht als musikbezogenen Sammlungen zu finden sind. Auch das Oberösterreichische Landesarchiv verwahrt dementsprechende Archivalien.

Fragwürdige Kontinuitäten und « späte Ehren »

Einerseits wurde die Entnazifizierung beziehungsweise die Erteilung der Auftrittsgenehmigungen für Musikerinnen und Musiker sowie Künstlerinnen und Künstler durch den « Information Services Branch » (ISB) der « Headquarters der United States Forces in Austria » in Linz ernsthaft durchgeführt, andererseits gab und gibt es hinsichtlich der direkten Kontinuitäten in Linz sehr prägende Gestalten, die als solche häufig nicht mehr im Bewusstsein der Öffentlichkeit stehen. Die NS-Protagonistinnen und NS-Protagonisten aus der Musikwelt wurden nicht nur rasch wieder integriert, erhielten Preise, Ehrentitel und Ehrenpensionen von Stadt und Land, sondern werden und wurden vielfach ohne Hinterfragung ihrer Biografien immer wieder positiv erinnert.

Darüber hinaus dürfte sich Linz nach 1945 relativ rasch den Ruf erworben haben, daß man hier als « Ehemaliger » unkompliziert wieder zu Ehren kommen konnte. Dies läßt sich nicht nur anhand der Musikdirektoren der Stadt Linz (von Friedrich Reidinger über Robert Schollum bis hin zu Kurt Wöb) festmachen, sondern beispielsweise auch am Oberspielleiter und Intendanten des Linzer Landestheaters Oskar Walleck (SS-Standartenführer, Träger des Totenkopfringes der SS und des Ehrendegens des RFSS [« Kommandostab Reichsführer-SS »]) und am Leiter des Brucknerkonservatoriums Wilhelm Jerger. Die Biografie des Landestheaterintendanten Ignaz Brantner wurde dagegen trotz eingehender Recherchen nicht vollkommen transparent.

Nachrufe auf Protagonisten der NS-Zeit

Kurzbiografien und Nachrufe auf Akteurinnen und Akteure der NS-Zeit erweisen sich als sehr problematisch, da diese häufig von ehemaligen Kollegen und Gesinnungsgenossen verfasst wurden.

Anton Bruckner pendant le 3e « Reich » et après

« I owe thanks to William Carragan and Bryan Gilliam for their helpful comments on this essay. » (Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt)

« I do not believe that we as yet know how to think what Nazism is. » (Jacques Derrida, « The Ear of the Other » .)

Idéologie et réception du compositeur

It is no secret that Anton Bruckner figured importantly in the cultural pantheon of National-Socialism. (1) Like many other German speaking artists of the past, Bruckner was exploited by the Nazi cultural program. Both the image of Bruckner and his music were imagined to exemplify the essence of Aryan art and were thus enlisted in the campaign to legitimate Nazism. The outlines of this dark chapter in the history of Bruckner reception are well documented. (2) Bruckner's music was featured at overtly political events ; each of Hitler's cultural speeches at the Nuremberg rallies, for example, was preceded by the performance of a movement from a Bruckner Symphony. (3) Radio broadcasts were announced with the trumpet theme that opens Bruckner's 3rd Symphony. (3) The Nazi government sponsored numerous Bruckner Festivals. (5) Adolf Hitler even hoped to hold an annual Bruckner Festival in Saint-Florian that would rival the prestigious Bayreuth Festival. Although these plans were never fulfilled, in 1943 the « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » of Linz was formed for this purpose. (6) Such crass political exploitation of « German » culture was characteristic of National-Socialism ; yet, the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner was extreme even by the standards of its time and place. As Mathias Hansen put it, Bruckner, even more than Richard Wagner or Richard Strauß, was « occupied by fascist ideology » . (7)

A number of coincidental circumstances fueled the National-Socialist appropriation of Bruckner. Bruckner's music fit Nazi aesthetic desiderata : with its monumental sweep, its outwardly clear and balanced formal outlines, its chorale-like passages, and its prominent use of brass instruments, it was easily heard as profoundly « German » music untainted by decadent cosmopolitanism. Adolf Hitler publicly declared his fondness for Bruckner's music, and seems to have

identified personally with the composer : not only were both, he and Bruckner, born in Upper-Austria, but Hitler imagined that his own unsuccessful attempts to establish himself as an artist in Vienna paralleled Bruckner's ambivalent reception by the Viennese music community. With characteristic paranoia, Hitler ascribed both his and Bruckner's difficulties in Vienna largely to the hostility of the Jewish Viennese establishment. (8) In addition, the tenor of Bruckner criticism in the 1920's and 1930's facilitated the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner. Bruckner had been an icon for conservative and reactionary elements in Austrian society since the 1890's. (9) By the early part of the 20th Century, the image of Bruckner and his music had become identified with militaristic, feudalistic, and nationalistic tendencies. (10) This pattern of reception only intensified after the 1st World War ; the Bruckner literature of the 1920's is shot through with anti-modern mythologizing and partisan rhetoric. (11) The consistent rightward slant of much, if not most, Bruckner reception in the early decades of the 20th Century effectively prepared the ground for developments in the 3rd « Reich » .

These conditions (consideration of musical style, Hitler's personal predilections, and trends in Bruckner criticism) certainly did facilitate the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner. Taken by themselves, however, they are insufficient to explain the trajectory of Bruckner reception in the 3rd « Reich » ; something else was at work. We can only make sense of these developments if we account for the dark political ideology that informed them. Consider the enshrinement of Bruckner in « Walhalla » , an « ersatz » 19th Century Parthenon built by Ludwig I of Bavaria, during the Regensburg Bruckner Festival of June 1937. (12) At the culmination of the ceremony, Hitler personally consecrated the new bust of Bruckner by laying a laurel wreath at the foot of its pedestal. (13) One observer characterized Hitler's gesture as « an elevated symbol of the unlimited solidarity of the “ Führer ” and the German people » . (14) In reciprocation for the honour granted to Bruckner, Max Auer, the president of the « Internationale-Bruckner-Gesellschaft » , presented Hitler with the Society's 1st « Ehrenmedaille » , describing it as « a small token of our deep gratitude for the admission of the bust of Bruckner to “ Walhalla ” » . (15)

The symbolism of these events was glossed in no uncertain terms by the other speakers at the Festival. In his address at the unveiling ceremony, Josef Gœbbels claimed Bruckner as a mystical symbol of German destiny. (15) :

« As a son of the Austrian soil, Anton Bruckner is a particularly apt symbol of the spiritual and emotional community of destiny, insoluble even to this day, that unites the entire German people. His installation in « Walhalla » was a symbolic event of more than simply artistic significance for us. » (17)

The comments of Peter Raabe, the head of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , painted a less overtly political, yet, still tendentious, picture of Bruckner's personality and his historical position. (18) He depicted Bruckner as an artist « out of step » with the negative tendencies of his epoch : a simple man in an era of pretentious and cultured artists, a mystically religious man in an age of secularism - in short, a healthy man in a decadent world. As a result of its lack of artifice and its ideal genuineness, Bruckner's music was able to express something essentially German :

« Therefore, for those who are receptive to them, listening to these works is something more than simply enjoying art : it is a return to the “ mother lodes ”, to the sources of feeling, to which no thinking can lead, nor knowledge and research, rather only the Will, small before the infiniteness of creation but great in its striving after good. » (19)

The speeches by Goebbels and Raabe, like the agenda of the Regensburg Festival as a whole, are so transparently political that the temptation is strong to dismiss the entire event as nothing more than politically expedient propaganda. While it is true that Nazism exploited Bruckner (among others) for political purposes, it is not sufficient to leave the analysis at that. The enshrinement of Bruckner in « Walhalla » « was » politically expedient, and it was a perverse misappropriation of the composer. But it was more than that : far from being an eccentric or isolated event, the « Walhalla » ceremony was a public performance of the ideology that subtended German Bruckner reception between 1933 and 1945. (20) It is in the nature of performances to focus ideological energy and to represent it in a desired form. As Richard Poirier wrote, a performance is an « exercise of power » that produces « a form that presumes to compete with reality itself for control of the mind exposed to it. » (21) The goal of this essay is to uncover something of this ideological underpinning in the hope of understanding an important phase of the genealogy of modern Bruckner reception. Since current views of Bruckner are still shadowed by traditions of reception that crystallized under National-Socialism, this history has immediate pertinence. Ultimately, this project means to clear the way for more critical and sensitive approaches to the composer. We may not, « pace » Derrida, « know how to think what Nazism is » ; but by patiently unraveling how National-Socialism appropriated Bruckner and his music, we might grasp the conceptual dynamics that governed Bruckner reception in the 3rd « Reich » .

National-Socialism and the Ideology of Bruckner Criticism

Although the Nazi State was governed with previously unimagined brutality, its political authority was founded on the exploitation of the cultural power of aesthetic values as well as authoritarian terrorism. Since, even this most brutal of totalitarian regimes was unable to exert actual physical control over all phases of life, the stability of the Nazi government depended not only on State terror and mass murder but also on the compliance of the populace. As Wolfgang Benz has argued, a populace willing to comply with National-Socialism was engendered by what he termed the « ecstasy of the ruled » . This « ecstasy » was fostered largely by aesthetic means : the self-representation of the regime, in flattering terms, State rituals that substituted for religion, and the stylization of the people as a « cultic fraternity » . (22) As Peter Adam wrote, these « rituals and public activities with quasi-religious overtones had one purpose in common, to enfold Party members and, by extension, all Germans in a seamless web of propaganda. » (23) The aestheticization of politics and power was a necessary constituent of the National-Socialist project ; it allowed totalitarian terror and appeals to the greyness of German art not only to coexist but to reinforce each other.

It was necessary for this aestheticization of politics to remain largely beneath the threshold of conscious public awareness ; had it been consciously recognized, it would have lost much of its efficacy. As Josef Goebbels put it :

« This is the secret of propaganda : whomever propaganda seeks to capture is thoroughly imbued with the idea of the propaganda without realizing at all that he is thus imbued. » (24)

Yet, at the same time, the National-Socialist government loudly and frequently proclaimed that art was a fundamental part of the totalizing « geistige Kampf » it was waging. Not only did the ideology of National-Socialism systematically exploit the propagandistic value of culture and artistic representation as sources of both power and legitimization, but

it saw art as a way of formulating and promulgating ideologically desired consciousness. The ultimate goal of Nazi aesthetics was to affirm ruling ideological paradigms ; above all, art was called upon to promote and valorize the myths of race, « Volk » , and German essence, and to offer idealized metaphors of the fascist order. These tropes are evident in Gœbbels's screed on the role of the art in the new State :

« The mission of art and artists is not only to unite, their mission is, far more, to form, to give shape, to get rid of the sick, to clear the way for the healthy. As a German politician, I am therefore not able simply to recognize the distinction between good and bad art. Art should not only be good, but it must also appear to be conditioned by the Volk, better said, only an art arising out of the total " Volkstum " itself can, in the end, be good. » (25)

This conceptual desire to regulate art (to separate the « good and bad ») was supported by extensive, and brutal, practical means. All artistic, literary, and musical activities were subjected to a highly-regimented campaign to take control of the apparatus of artistic production. As part of this « Gleichschaltung » of German culture, the Nazi government organized the « Reichskulturkammer » , headed by Josef Gœbbels, in the fall of 1933. (26) The official charge of the « Reichskulturkammer » was to « promote German culture on behalf of the German " Volk " and " Reich " » and to « regulate the economic and social affairs of the cultural professions » . (27)

Equally important were the ways in which Nazism drew upon well a entrenched traditions of cultural reaction, and by selectively exploiting them generating, in Allan Steinweis' words, « key areas of consensus between official policy and prevailing sentiment in the art world » . (28) We can see this dynamic at work in the large body of Bruckner criticism that appeared in the 1930's and 1940's. (29) Reading Bruckner criticism, from these years, is an often jarring experience ; much of this literature often seems absurdly beholden to reactionary political agendas. Bruckner and his music are often glossed in terms of the « völkische » narrative of cultural decline and imminent rebirth. The 2 paradigmatic manifestations of this tendency were the prevalent representations of Bruckner as an Aryan hero and the identification of Bruckner's music with a mythical lost spirituality. Here is a remarkable example, written in 1936 by Max Auer :

« For 4 years (1914-1918) , destruction was visited upon Europe. Out of deepest need, the people called-out for guidance. False leaders brought nations and peoples to the edge of the precipice in the following decades. Without spiritual renewal, recuperation was not possible. A yearning for elevation out of the misery, caused by the crass materialism of the preceding Century (19th) , grew ever greater. Artistic bolshevism was carried to extremes. Against all this, there was but one remedy : a return to the pure sources ! What art was purer than that born of the deep religiosity of Bach, Beethoven and Bruckner ! Especially, Bruckner's God-consecrated art now found a fertile soil, at last it was rightly understood. For many thousands, it was the guide to a beautiful, spiritual world and, thereby, the foundations were laid for a healthy and strong Bruckner movement, which is only now, after the World War, succeeding with elemental power. » (30)

The bizarrely apocalyptic rhetoric of this example may be unusual, but its themes are not. Besides evoking a number of leitmotifs that echo the authoritarian « Führer » cult, its diagnosis of the ills of modern society was in keeping with the Party line, as was its call for « a return to the pure sources » and a concomitant spiritual renewal and

salvation from decadence and modernism.

An even more sharply political view can be seen in Fritz Skorzeny's article « Anton Bruckner in Light of the German Resurrection » which allied the increased popularity of Bruckner's music with the imagined « resurrection » of the German spirit effected by National-Socialism. (31) Skorzeny claimed that these 2 moments were 2 sides of 1 coin : the source of the new « understanding » and « love » of Bruckner's music was nothing other than the rebirth of the German « Volksgeist » .

Skorzeny wrote :

« It was reserved for our age, to experience for the 1st time, with the deepest emotion, the break of dawn light, the great “ Awake, the day draws night ”. In this light, the miracle of Anton Bruckner is fulfilled. » (32)

Although these passages by Auer and Skorzeny are extreme, their tendentiousness is symptomatic. Both exploited the political resonance of portraying Bruckner as an innocent soul persecuted by nefarious (often ostensibly « Jewish ») modern critics, representing Bruckner's music as spiritual, pure, free from the contamination of modernity, and sacralizing it as an embodiment of the German « Volksgeist » . (33)

One recurrent sub-text of real topical import was the belief that Bruckner symbolized the rightful status of Germany and Austria as 1 nation. After listening to a recording of the 7th Symphony given to him by Josef Gœbbels, Adolf Hitler is reported to have said :

« How can anyone say that Austria is not German ! Is there anything more German than our old pure Austrianness ?! » (34)

Skorzeny's article, which appeared only weeks before the « Anschluß » , related Bruckner reception to German expansionism in no uncertain terms :

« The earth of this land (Austria) is, perhaps, the most precious and sacred in all Germany. In the remote past, profoundly stirred-up by the plow of Barbarian invasions, having drunk the blood of all the German races over the course of Centuries such soil became profound, powerful and fateful, like the people that sprang from it. Thus long ago, it transpired that Austria was selected as the spiritual seedbed for the plant garden of the entire German people. Her gardeners were certainly not always the best, however, and often permitted weeds and poisonous plants to long hinder the noblest seeds. When these were transplanted in the wide German mother-earth, they became mighty trees and bore ripe fruit. Herein lies the crux of Austrian destiny. » (35)

Skorzeny further claimed that « just as Bruckner's personality embodied the essential image of the Austrians, the destiny of his works is, in its deepest essence, characteristically Austrian » . (36) His works, like Austria itself, could come to full fruition only when they were replanted in Germany. The metaphorical unity between Austria and Germany, publicly endorsed at the Regensburg Bruckner Festival by the enshrinement of Bruckner in « Walhalla » and in Josef

Göbbels' speech, was made concretely manifest less than 1 year later with the « Anschluß » , in March 1938. (37) Racism was never far from the surface of « völkisch » Bruckner criticism. Certainly, Bruckner's status as an Aryan was essential to his canonization, and discussions of the essentially German profundity of Bruckner's music pre-supposed that he was an Aryan. (In fact, Ernst Schwanzara actually « demonstrated » the « purity » of Bruckner's blood-lines by tracing his lineage back to the 14th Century. (33) While issues of race remained relatively discrete, anti-Semitism was often explicit. Thus, the slow public acceptance of Bruckner music in Vienna, in the 1880's and 1890's, was often interpreted in racial terms ; in Skorzeny's brazenly anti-Semitic view :

« As Bruckner set-out on his artistic life journey, world Jewry, in the guise of European Liberalism, had already taken-up the battles against the German “ Geist ” which had begun to stir in art. » (39)

Or consider Karl Grunsky's complaint that Herman Kretzschmar's « “ Führer ” durch den Konzertsaal » devoted excessive space (11 pages) to Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy's 5 Symphonies, in contrast to the short shrift (« barely more than 1 page ») given to Bruckner's Symphonies. It was, he wrote, a « gross instance of imbalance between Jewish and Aryan in a German book ! » . (40) The critical remodeling of Bruckner also flowed along ideological channels that are perhaps less immediately apparent. On the one hand, National-Socialism set-out quite deliberately to appropriate the tradition of « German music » . The canon of Ausro-German Classical music was identified with the Aryan race and was seen to symbolize its greatness ; in 1939, for example, Peter Raabe went so far as to identify Germany as « das Volk Bachs, Beethovens und Bruckners » and to ally the fate of the 3rd « Reich » with the fate of German music. (41) Indeed, the legacy of great German composers not only was seen as a sign of German intellectual and spiritual power but was actually imagined to have prefigured the « awakening of the German people » and the rise of Nazism. (42) On the other hand, this nationalistic agenda also had other, less obvious dimensions. Perhaps, the most important function of the exploitation of this repertory was its symbolism of power. (43) As Bernd Sponheuer wrote :

« High art as such appeared (like the “ Führer ”, the “ Volk ”, and the State) as the representation of “ eternal laws ”, which demanded subordination and unquestioning obedience. » (44)

The desired stagings of power through music depended on a complex interpretative edifice that included not only ritualized performance contexts but also verbal and critical explanations of the meaning and significance of the music. Due to the non-representational (and, thus, radically polysemous) character of music, this ideological appropriation had to circumscribe the potential meaning of German music. (45) Thus, the project of musical propaganda in the 3rd « Reich » needs to be seen, in large measure, as a systematic remodeling of musical hermeneutics in terms of the hegemonic narrative of Nazism.

This re-interpretative process had several facets. The most basic included purposeful exploitation of music in the context of Nazi rituals and the coupling of exemplary Classical music with popular or explicitly Nazi music in broadcasts. (46) The use of music in such definitely politicized contexts attempted to impose a rigidly disciplined musical hermeneutics : by seeking to ensure that music served the unified, totalizing telos of National-Socialist mythology and, thereby, narrowing the possible meanings of the musical compositions it employed, it pressed them into

the service of contemporary ideological needs. All refractory tendencies that might have been latent in either an artwork or its « Wirkungsgeschichte » were erased or masked beneath a ritualized, prefigured interpretation.

The henneneutical remodeling of Bruckner also encompassed biographical revision. It embraced the « völkische » tradition of portraying Bruckner as parochial and oddly anachronistic. This biographical tradition emphasized Bruckner's piety, « naïveté », simplicity, provinciality (as opposed to urbanity), mystical profundity (as opposed to intellectual calculation), and essential Germanness; at its most extreme, it saw Bruckner as a « prophet of the “ völkische ” and racial rebirth of greater Germany and the victory of “ earthy ”, stable life-will over decadent civilization ». (47) Bruckner, like the « völkische » movement itself, was believed to be ahead of his time. As critical attacks against Bruckner in the liberal press, in the 1880's and 1890's, supposedly demonstrated during his life, the German culture was not yet ready to recognize the genius of Bruckner's works; such hostility was taken as a sign that « his time was yet to come. » (48)

These biographical constructions were then read back into Bruckner's music. Since Bruckner supposedly stood outside of the cultural and historical currents of his time and place, his works were imagined to be free from the influence of practical contingencies and the corruptions of the marketplace. (49) Indeed, Bruckner's music was often considered to represent a primordial mystical experience, an « Urmusik » that expressed archetypal Germanic truths. (50) These musical qualities were often openly linked with « völkisch » appeals to Bruckner's « peasant » origins, his rural nature, and his « rootedness ». Consider, for example, Werner Danckert's comments from 1938 :

« After decades of unusually stubborn misunderstanding, an audience, prepared by experience, has presently developed for the “ Master of Saint-Florian ”. There is no lack of smart and informative explanation for this. However, it seems to me, an essential prevailing tendency in Bruckner's work and life has eluded virtually every comprehensive interpretation: Bruckner's unique position in his historical environment. » (51)

According to Danckert, Bruckner's music contained a « “ subterranean ” transmission of the South German-Austrian Baroque ». (52) The composer was, in the strict sense, « unzeitgemäss » : he was the « continuer, indeed the consummator, of an age-old world of expression, that flourished in the 17th and 18th Centuries but was later swamped by other artistic currents. It is filled with powerful sensuality, love of brilliance, and a mighty richness of form drawn from a “ pre-Classical ”, appealingly “ objective ” sense of form. » (53)

This strange historiography played with the covertly political mythology of art as timeless verity; such mythic interpretations of Bruckner tied into the continual appeals to « eternal values » by the German Right during the upheavals following the 1st World War and the Weimar Republic. (54) Adolf Hitler, for example, claimed that « true art is and remains eternal. It does not follow the laws of fashion : its effect is that of a revelation arising from the depths of the essential character of a people. » (55) This jargon of timelessness was deeply complicit with Nazism. As Berthold Hinz wrote :

« The notion of “ eternal German art ” was often invoked as a proof to support the idea of a 1,000 year “ Reich ”, which was itself a metaphor for permanence and immutability. At the same time, the National-Socialist concept of

history, based as it was on the æsthetic category of “ greatness ”, precluded any possibility of progress or change. »
(56)

The Musicological Appropriation of Bruckner

Most of the critical writing about Bruckner that emanated from Germany in 1930's and 1940's is so clearly a function of the corrupt cultural climate of Nazi Germany that it demands a highly-suspicious reading. Today, very little of this output retains any degree of legitimacy ; instead, the enduring contributions to Bruckner studies date (with few exceptions) from either the 1920's or from after the War. Nevertheless, one product of this musicological appropriation of Bruckner has remained largely unchallenged : the central issue in modern Bruckner scholarship (establishing « authentic » editions of the composer's works) is still largely governed by arguments and interpretations that originated in connection with the « 1st Critical Edition » (« Erste Kritische Gesamtausgabe ») of Bruckner's works, the « Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke : Kritische Gesamtausgabe », edited by Robert Haas, which was prepared and published between 1930 and 1944.

Haas began the « Gesamtausgabe », unexceptionably, by publishing works that Bruckner had left unpublished, including 2 early Masses, the 1st version of the 1st Symphony (Linz), and the 9th and 6th Symphonies. But, in the mid-1930's, when Haas turned to works that Bruckner had published (a group that included 7 of the 9 numbered Symphonies), he took a revolutionary position, namely that the published texts of these works had been corrupted by intrusive, unauthorized editing and thus needed to be supplanted by modern editions based exclusively on the « pure » texts of Bruckner's autograph manuscripts. Following this approach, Haas produced new editions of all of Bruckner's numbered Symphonies, except the 3rd.

Haas's edition refigured the canon of Bruckner's works. It made available a substantial number of important texts, including previously unpublished versions of the 1st, 4th, 5th, and 9th Symphonies. The text-critical program of the « Gesamtausgabe » did, however, have a more radical dimension ; Haas's dogmatic insistence that works not preserved in extant autograph manuscripts could not be accepted as authentic, entailed abandoning the versions of a number of compositions (notably, the 2nd, 4th, 5th and 8th Symphonies) published during Bruckner's lifetime and supplanting (not supplementing) them with modern editions based solely on the earlier versions preserved in Bruckner's holographs. Indeed, at times, Haas's zeal to produce new, « authentic » editions prompted him to employ highly-questionable editorial methods : for example, his editions of the 2nd and 8th Symphonies do not correspond to any known versions Bruckner himself wrote ; rather, Haas conflated discrete texts to produce what he imagined Bruckner would or should have written in the best of all possible circumstances.

Whatever their philological status, Haas's editions differ musically from those published in the 1880's and 1890's. While they are basically similar in their fundamental thematic, harmonic, and rhythmic substance, the versions of the Symphonies Haas favored often contain passages (typically, short ones) not found in the original published scores. In addition, the orchestration of the « Gesamtausgabe » scores tends to be more rugged and, especially in the brass, more imposing, if occasionally less transparent and finely judged. Moreover, as a rule, Haas's scores are considerably sparser in their notation of nuances of tempo and dynamics than are the texts Bruckner published and, thereby, convey

a more massive and, thus, less dynamic image of the music, a factor that bears crucially on performance practice.

The historical justification of the categorical judgment against the authority of the editions printed during Bruckner's lifetime is, as I have argued in detail elsewhere, beset by a number of unresolved historiographic and evidential problems that render it highly-doubtful. (57) For example, Bruckner never attempted to suppress the editions published in his lifetime nor did he ever publicly renounce or even criticize their authenticity ; moreover, substantial textual evidence exists that testifies to the authority of these editions. These concerns were countered (and still often are) by assertions that Bruckner may, whether as a result of expedience, « naïveté » , or coercion, have allowed his scores to be altered, and even partially re-written, prior to publication, and that he always believed his unpublished manuscripts contained the « real » , essential versions of his works. Thus, by publishing these texts, the « Gesamtausgabe » claimed to carry-out Bruckner's ultimate will. Many critics saw the « Gesamtausgabe » as the disclosure, after decades of obscurity, of the « true Bruckner » . As Franz Moißl wrote, the « Gesamtausgabe » was « a liberation of the true Symphonic will of the Master » . (58)

Although many of the arguments and rationales that were used to justify the outright dismissal of the 1st printed editions of Bruckner's Symphonies and, by extension, to promote the exclusive preserve of the « Gesamtausgabe » may seem tenuous to a skeptical observer, their claim to truth came to seem all but self-evident in the 3rd « Reich » (and indeed beyond) . This acceptance was, in part, an overtly political affair. The new edition was not only consistently heralded and praised in State-sanctioned journals, but it received financial and moral endorsement from the Nazi government. In his speech at the 1937 Regensburg Bruckner Festival, Josef Gæbbels declared that since Bruckner's Symphonies were a precious national legacy, the « Bruckner Gesellschaft » would, henceforth, receive an annual contribution to fund the editing of the « original versions » . Gæbbels not only offered financial support to the « Gesamtausgabe » , he also granted it Adolf Hitler's imprimatur :

« The “ Führer ” and his government consider it their honourable duty to do all that is within their power to permit the whole German people to receive this (Bruckner's) fortunate legacy and, by means of a large-scale promotion of Bruckner cultivation, assist its effects to penetrate not only deeply, but broadly. On these grounds, they have decided to make a substantial annual contribution to the “ Internationale-Bruckner-Gesellschaft ” for the editing of the original versions of his Symphonies until the complete works of the Master are produced in the form he envisioned. » (59)

The politicization of the new Bruckner edition directly affected the course of its reception and legitimation. When the initial volumes of the « Gesamtausgabe » began to appear in the early 1930's, their merits were debated vigorously in the German musical press. This debate, the so-called « Bruckner-Streit » occupied pages of the leading journals and was joined by both staunch opponents of Robert Haas's methodology as well as those in favor of Haas' text-critical position. Yet, by 1937, the « Bruckner-Streit » had fallen silent and the « Gesamtausgabe » was clearly established as the authoritative source of Bruckner's works. « Gesamtausgabe » editions largely replaced others in performance, and, more importantly, the arguments in their favor were generally accepted by the German-speaking scholarly community.

The tenor of the whole discussion about the textual problems of Bruckner's works clearly changed in the wake of the Regensburg Festival as historical and philological questions gave way to ideologically over-determined aesthetic and

stylistic issues as the main concern of Bruckner scholars. The support given to the « Gesamtausgabe » by Josef Goebbels and, by proxy, Adolf Hitler at the Regensburg Festival had a pivotal effect. In the ideological climate of the 3rd « Reich », where scholarship and historical truth were both theorized as political functions, Goebbels's public opinion weighed heavily in favor of the « Gesamtausgabe » and, soon, it became de facto official policy to uphold, if not simply assume as a proven fact, the absolute authority of the « Gesamtausgabe » .

In addition to the effect of Goebbels's sanction, there were other ways (perhaps, more important ones) in which the cultural climate shaped the discourse that legitimated the « Gesamtausgabe » . This discourse depended, in large part, on then current text-critical beliefs, including the view that artworks transcend the material facts of their production, a notion of authorship as the free play of genius, and a belief that the goal of editing should be to produce a hypothetical « urtext » . But this discourse also drew heavily on a complex set of ideological and aesthetic presumptions that gained credence and weight from their resonance with the culture of the 3rd « Reich » . In a culture increasingly committed to « völkisch » theories of « Wissenschaft » , the mission of uncovering the « real » Bruckner carried a real emotional and ideological charge. Advocates of the « neue Bruckner-Bewegung » exploited « völkisch » sentiments by adopting exaggerated tones of fatefulness. As early as 1936, Max Auer referred to the « spiritual battle for the possession of the “ real ” Bruckner » . (60) In the next year, Hans Weisbach wrote that the issues facing Bruckner scholars were « weighty because our generation, which was presented with this decision by fate, bears the responsibility for the form in which Bruckner's Symphonies will live in the spiritual life of humanity » (61) Horst Büttner assumed a similarly portentous tone when he claimed that opinion had decided in favor of the new edition of the 9th Symphony and that « due to the heightened sense of responsibility at present for great national cultural treasures, the time cannot be distant when the “ Originalfassungen ” of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Symphonies will also have won out. » (62)

This « völkische » attitude also placed great import in « public opinion » as a determinant not only of value but also of truth. The German art historian Hans Weigert argued, in 1935, that the « consensus omnium » was a decisive determinant of aesthetic quality since it reflected the « given and native » (« gegeben und eingeboren ») evaluative standards of the « people » . (63) Although, as Bettina Preiss noted, this position is « theoretically virtually meaningless » , (64) such thinking played an important role in the legitimation of the « Gesamtausgabe » . Many who advocated the « Gesamtausgabe » asserted that the new edition allowed the German people to experience, for the 1st time, the greatness of Bruckner's music in its pure form. Consider Max Auer's statement that :

« In view of the victory march of the “ Originalfassungen ” through the concert halls, in view of the not-to-be-explained-away “ authenticity ” of the scores written down by the Master's own fingers, the old compromise versions have lost their right to exist. » (65)

The importance of the « Gesamtausgabe » to the « public » was reflected in Oskar Lang's comment, in 1936, that, unlike most collected editions, which are generally purely academic enterprises, the Bruckner « Gesamtausgabe » was different :

« It is attempting a great feat (and this must be emphatically pointed-out to the public) which concerns the whole

music world, for it removed the spell that until now lay over Bruckner's works. » (66)

As the public became aware of these new editions, they did seem to be persuaded that they contained the « truth » of Bruckner's music. Or, at least, so the critics claimed : in 1938, after the tide had clearly turned, Fritz Öser declared that performances of the new critical editions of Bruckner's Symphonies « aroused unconditional approval among completely unbiased listeners, who set aside their prejudice against the original versions out of respect for the inviolable work of genius. » (67)

Another set of ideological premises also weighed heavily in the debates about the « Gesamtausgabe » : the pursuit of imagined textual purity resonated with the National-Socialist obsession with race. Viewed critically, it is hard to avoid the suspicion that the editors of the « Gesamtausgabe » aimed in part to free Bruckner's works from the specter of an imagined history of Jewish influence, especially since some of those who were accused of corrupting Bruckner's scores were of Jewish descent, notably the conductor Ferdinand Löwe and the publisher Albert J. Gutmann. Max Auer, for instance, said that older editions of Bruckner's music transmitted texts that reflected the deleterious influence of « overly refined city folk » (« überkultivierte Städter ») , a coded term for Jews. (68) An undercurrent of racism swirled in the suggestion that the psychological difficulties Bruckner supposedly suffered late in life (which were believed, by some, to have affected the authorship of the 1st edition of a number of his works) were largely induced by the trauma of conductor Hermann Levi's rejection of the 1st version of the 8th Symphony in 1887. (69) Similarly, part of the covert mission of the « Gesamtausgabe » seems to have been to remove Bruckner's scores from the purview of the Viennese publishing house Universal-Edition. (70) Universal-Edition, which had established its reputation by publishing such composers as Gustav Mahler, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Arnold Schönberg, and Alban Berg, had long been a target for reactionary critics, who identified it with such supposedly deleterious forces as modernism, atonality, bolshevism, and Judaism ; it is not surprising that the Nazis would have been eager to dissociate Bruckner from the firm. (71)

In a less overt way, too, the desire to remove all « foreign » traces from the texts of Bruckner's compositions and to present pure, « authentic » versions resonated with the mythos of racial purity. In a discussion of the textual differences between 19th Century editions of Bruckner's works and those published in the « Gesamtausgabe » , Rolf Pergler transposed the metaphor of purity from a sociological to a textual plane. He claimed that Bruckner's works were governed by the truth of the « Brucknerian formal principle » (« Brucknersche Gestaltungsprinzip ») ; accordingly, textual contaminations, or, as he called them, « foreign bodies » (« Fremdkörper ») found in the older scores could be easily identified by their lack of harmony with the overall form and eliminated. (72) Pergler's stated wish to « eliminate » such « foreign bodies » made manifest a desire that had been latent since the start of the project. In April 1932, Alexander Berrsché compared the « New Critical Edition » (« Neue Kritische Gesamtausgabe ») of the 9th Symphony with the earlier edition, edited in 1903, by Ferdinand Löwe. Berrsché wrote :

« It is hardly to be believed what Löwe alone made-out of the Scherzo in Bruckner's version, it inhabits an entirely different sphere of sound and expression. Löwe cleverly and ingeniously gussied-up the piece ; his work alone induced the view that the Scherzo of the 9th has an elfin, “ Midsummer Night's Dream ” atmosphere and, on the whole, seems a synthesis of Mendelssohn, Berlioz, and Bruckner. Now, it is gone forever, and we may confidently pack away the old

comparisons. The actual Bruckner Scherzo may be without any sparkling bubblieness, but it stands on firm, sturdy legs, on the native soil of the Upper-Austria land. » (73)

The nationalistic, anti-Semitic, and gendered subtext of this review is clear : the polemical implications of the references to Mendelssohn and the use of the terms « elfin » and « sparkling bubblieness » are obvious. So too is its appeal to the politically loaded metaphor of purification ; the « original version » was imagined to have rescued Bruckner's music by cleansing it of alien elements.

During the period 1936 to 1938, the claim that the 1st editions were inauthentic and that the « Gesamtausgabe » alone contained the « real » texts of Bruckner's works gradually metamorphosed from a text-critical hypothesis into dogma. Direct public criticism of the « Gesamtausgabe » was increasingly suppressed. For example, the official journal of the « Bruckner-Gesellschaft », the « Bruckner-Blätter, became increasingly unwilling to publish views that were unsympathetic to the « Gesamtausgabe » . During the mid- 1930's, as the official Bruckner establishment closed ranks, its intolerance grew so strong that it prompted at least 2 writers who were ambivalent about the « Gesamtausgabe » (Friedrich Klose and Friedrich Herzfeld) to use the terminology of religious apostasy in describing their positions. In 1936, Herzfeld wondered aloud if it was considered « blasphemy » (« Gotteslästerung ») even to raise reasonable arguments against the text-critical claims of the « Gesamtausgabe » . (74) Klose wrote that even « at the danger of excommunication » (« auf die Gefahr hin exkommuniziert zu werden ») , he preferred the 1st printed edition of the 9th Symphony to the « New Critical Edition » (« Neue Kritische Gesamtausgabe ») . (75) Thus, by the time of Josef Gæbbels' speech at Regensburg, in June 1937, the debate was ready to be peremptorily ended.

And After

It remains to evaluate how present-day understanding of Bruckner betrays an indebtedness to Nazi-era reception, to determine if and how our engagements with Bruckner and his music are still shadowed by ghosts from this past. In the immediate post-War period, Bruckner scholars generally shied away from explicitly wrestling with the legacy of the 1930's and 1940's, yet, the field did strive to reform itself. Although these efforts at renovation were something less than thoroughgoing, it would be a mistake wholly to discount them. In the late- 1940's, several East German scholars and musicians did attempt forthrightly to confront the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner, most importantly Emil Armbruster. (76) Also, in 1946, in Leipzig, the conductor Heinz Bongartz performed the old edition of the 5th Symphony, which had been damned by Robert Haas. (77) Bongartz's gesture was intended, in part, as a repudiation of Haas' Bruckner project, but it was not understood as such by critics. In the same year, the progressive West German critic Heinrich Strobel addressed the politics of Bruckner reception, if only in passing. His lead essay in the inaugural post-War issue of « Melos » , which was resuscitated in 1946, following its dissolution by the Nazis in 1934, was built around the contention that :

« One certainly cannot simply blot-out the last 12 years and pick-up again where one left off, in 1933. » (78)

Significantly, Strobel singled-out Bruckner reception for comment ; he saw the celebration of « Bruckner as the incarnation of the German urge for endless depths or heights » as particularly hard to disentangle from residue of

the Nazi era. (79)

Western Bruckner scholars generally, however, took a more indirect approach to this painful issue ; typically, they have tried to move Bruckner reception onto new ground and to distance it from its immediate past, without explicitly mentioning National-Socialism or the 3rd « Reich » . For example, in 1947, Leopold Nowak published an oddly allusive monograph on Bruckner's « Te Deum » in which he aggressively reclaimed Bruckner for Catholicism (and hence away from the « Gottgläubigkeit » imposed on him by Josef Gœbbels) and modeled Bruckner as a beacon that could help to guide Austria out of the spiritual confusion sown by the War. (80) A similar tendency to move away from the attitudes of the Nazi era is evident in some of the articles published in the issue of the « Österreichische Musikzeitschrift » , in 1946, devoted to Bruckner on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his death. (81) A new critical direction can be sensed in Wilhelm Waldstein's essay « Anton Bruckner : Versuch einer kritischen Skizze » , which compares Bruckner with Gœthe, an artist who was not popular with the National-Socialists. (82) Franz Gräßlinger's contribution, « Anton Bruckner und Hermann Levi, sein “ Edelster Gönner ” und “ Höchstberühmster Vater ” » , also evinces the changed political climate. Its topic, Bruckner's close association with Hermann Levi, was pointedly ignored by the Nazis. Although it stems, from Bruckner himself, the notion of the Jewish Levi as Bruckner's « noblest patron » and « most famous father » would have been anathema in the 3rd « Reich » . Analytic studies of Bruckner's music have also broken with the past. Since the 1960's, progressive German musicologists have focused their attention on exactly those aspects of Bruckner's music (its constructivist tendencies, its motivic intensity, its dissonance) that were minimized if not ignored by « völkische » interpretations of Bruckner. (83)

All of these scholars, intent on not re-opening old wounds unnecessarily, addressed the problem of Nazi reception gingerly. This approach, which has typified much post-War German culture, has been sufficient to expunge the most politically complicit tendencies emanating from Nazi-era Bruckner reception ; no one now sees Bruckner either as a victim of Jewish critics or as the muse of a new Aryan world order. Yet, as a result of the failure to tackle the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner head-on, some of the subtler and more conceptually slippery dimensions of the traditions of reception fostered by National-Socialism still haunt our engagements with Bruckner and his music. As a result, present-day understanding of Bruckner betrays a subtle (even subterranean) indebtedness to Nazi-era reception in 2 areas : the image of the composer as a naive genius and the editorial status of Bruckner's music.

The prevailing image of Bruckner is that of an exceptionally naive character, a notion derived in large measure from the « völkisch Brucknerbild » that was canonized in the 1930's. As Bruckner scholars have become more sophisticated about the nature and value of anecdotal evidence (thanks largely to the work of Manfred Wagner and Erich Wolfgang Partsch) , the scholarly credibility of old stereotypes about Bruckner's psyche has faded. (84) Yet, while most Bruckner scholars recognize the composer's sophistication and his ambition as well as his simplicity, the popular image of Bruckner has not been similarly corrected. One can still read descriptions of Bruckner that paint the composer as a virtual cipher. As recently as 1992, Robert Simpson wrote that it « almost defeats the imagination » to reconcile Bruckner's « legendary personal naïvety, his provincial background, his total lack of general culture, and his willingness to alter his scores at the behest of self-appointed mentors » with his undeniable compositional achievements. (85) Simpson's work is not simplistic, but is, rather, generally thoughtful and often perceptive. Yet, his credulous acceptance of the image of Bruckner as a « Parsifal » -like « reiner Tor » demonstrates the extent to which such notions

continue to infuse modern consciousness of Bruckner : Simpson's misprision is symptomatic of the widespread failure to appraise critically the ideological commitments of the received wisdom about Bruckner. No scholar subscribes any longer to the « völkisch » ideology of Bruckner reception but, through inattention, there is a real and present danger of re-inscribing piecemeal fragments of this very tradition.

Similarly, despite the critical suspicion now rightly accorded to most German Bruckner reception of the 1930's and 1940's, very little such skepticism exists about the Bruckner « Gesamtausgabe » of 1930-1944. The textual criticism of the 1st Bruckner « Gesamtausgabe » has, of course, been subject to major revision, most importantly by Leopold Nowak, Haas's post-War successor as the general editor of the « Gesamtausgabe » . Nowak did not merely pick-up where Haas had left-off. Indeed, although Nowak did share Haas's exclusive preference for manuscript sources, he revised all of Haas's editions and rectified Haas's most questionable text-critical leaps of faith, notably those found in Haas's editions of the 2nd and 8th Symphonies. (86) Haas's editions themselves may no longer universally be accepted, but Bruckner scholars do continue to accept the flawed central premise of the « Gesamtausgabe » as a proven historical fact : autograph manuscripts are still considered the only representations of the « real Bruckner » , and the early printed editions are dismissed as corruptions of Bruckner intentions. As Deryck Cooke wrote in his article on Bruckner in « The New Grove Dictionary » :

« The 1st editions have been utterly discredited. » (87)

As the rejection of the 1st editions has become an inherited article of faith, it has assumed an undeserved mantle of truth, and its connection to the ideological environment of National-Socialism has largely escaped our consciousness.

The confluence of these 2 vestiges of the dark past of Bruckner reception (namely, the image of the composer as an unwitting genius and a dogmatic belief in the tightness of modern editorial conclusions about Bruckner) substantially governs our approach to his music. We can see this dynamic at work in contemporary Bruckner performance practice. The dominant modern approach to Bruckner interpretation emphasizes monumental sonorities, sets steady, generally slow tempi, and presents Bruckner's forms with architectural severity rather than with dynamic sweep. This style, made famous by Herbert von Karajan, Günter Wand, and Carlo Maria Giulini, among others, is a post-War phenomenon. Performances of Bruckner's Symphonies by musicians of an earlier generation exemplify a quite different approach to the music, one much more concerned with shaping Bruckner's music gesturally and dynamically, and with conveying not the massive coherence of Bruckner's music but its mercurial drama. (88)

The evolution of modern Bruckner performance is, of course, part of a broader post-War trend toward « objective » performance styles ; but it also derives (crucially) from the peculiar course of Bruckner reception in the 20th Century. On one hand, with their emphasis on grandeur, weight, and depth of tone, modern interpretive approaches to Bruckner appear as musical analogues of the biographical construction of Bruckner as a mystical genius, singing great hymns of piety and reverence. On the other, modern performances of Bruckner's Symphonies concretize the biases of modern Bruckner editing. Performances of the old school reflect the texts of the editions printed in the 1880's and 1890's ; these older scores contain abundant indications for subtleties of tempo and dynamics that are absent from Bruckner's earlier unpublished manuscript texts. Haas' and Nowak's scores more or less faithfully reproduce these manuscript

sources ; as a result, they are spartan in their tempo, expression, and dynamic markings. Modern conductors, innocent of the genealogy of modern Bruckner editing and abjuring the old, supposedly corrupt scores, take the texts of modern critical editions as gospel and « then read these texts all too literally » . (89) In so doing, they perpetuate an interpretative style that is alien to earlier traditions.

We would be mistaken to posit any direct influence of politics on the changes in Bruckner performance practice. Indeed, many conductors active in the 3rd « Reich » (like most Bruckner conductors who cut their teeth before Haas' editions were published) retained elements of the 1st printed editions, even when they used Haas' scores. (90) Rather, the current state of affairs reflects the odd mixture of continuity and rupture that has characterized modernist Bruckner reception. The post-War ideology of scholarly objectivity has succeeded in overthrowing the conscious tendentiousness promulgated in the 3rd « Reich » . At the same time, this creed has sown its own confusion : while modernist paradigms of scholarship, which do not actively account for ideology, have relegated the most egregious historical and critical misapprehension borne in the 1930's and 1940's to obscurity, with their stubborn empiricism they have, paradoxically, shielded us from seeing how Bruckner reception continues to be shaded by this ideology. For example, since the pursuit of « authentic » « urtexts » is central to the practice of modern musicology, the essentials of the text-critical project inaugurated by Haas were easily taken-over largely intact in the post-War era. Indeed, the belief that the editions published in the 19th century are « inauthentic » has deepened its hold in the past 50 years ; certainly the replacement of these editions by new critical editions is now complete. Yet, as a result of the narrow focus of this editorial program, we have lost sight of the compromising origins of the dismissal of these older editions. And, at least partially as a result of understandable hesitance to grapple with old demons, we have failed to weigh the historical and evidential merits of this received text-critical position. The longer we persist in failing to account for the after-effects of the purgatory through which Bruckner reception passed in the 1930's and 1940's, the more pernicious this legacy. The past will not go away, even if we stare at it long and hard. All we can do is to address it squarely and try bravely to grasp how it shapes the present.

Notes

(1) This issue has not received the attention it merits. The earliest discussions are short and relatively insubstantial : Peter Gülke. « Der schwierige Jubilar : Zu Anton Bruckners 150. Geburtstag. » , « Musik und Gesellschaft » , Nr. 24 (1974) , pages 547-550 ; Mathias Hansen. « Die faschistische Bruckner-Rezeption und ihre Quellen. » , « Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft » , Nr. 28 (1986) , page 53-61 ; and Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , Reclam, Leipzig (1987) , especially, the Chapter entitled : « Wirkungsgeschichte I (1896-1945) » , pages 19-41. (Note that both Gülke and Hansen wrote their studies in the old DDR.) In the past few years, scholars have begun to explore in a more substantial way the historical and political dimensions of Bruckner reception in the 3rd « Reich » ; see : Christa Brüstle. « Bruckner's " Original " 5th Symphony : Aspects of its Reception and Use (1933-1945) » , paper read at « Perspectives on Anton Bruckner » , Connecticut College (23 February 1994) ; and Bryan Gilliam. « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner : Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation » , « The Musical Quarterly » , No. 78 (1994) , pages 584-604. I address this topic at length in : « The 1st Edition of Anton Bruckner's 4th Symphony : Authorship, Production and Reception » , Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania (1995) ; and « " Return to the Pure Sources " : The Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the 1st Bruckner " Gesamtausgabe " » , in : « Bruckner Studies » , edited

by Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy L. Jackson, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

(2) They are laid-out lucidly, for instance, in Gilliam.

(3) Albert Speer. « Inside the 3rd “ Reich ” », translated by Clara and Robert Winston, Macmillan, New York (1970) , page 156. The Finale of Bruckner's 5th Symphony was a particular favourite for such events. It was performed, for example, « at the personal wish of the “ Führer ” » at the « Parteitag der Arbeit » , in October 1937 (see : Erwin Bauer. « Musik auf dem Parteitag der Arbeit » , « Die Musik-Woche » , 9 October 1937, page 6, excerpted in Joseph Wulf. « Musik im Dritten Reich : Eine Dokumentation » , Mohn, Gütersloh, 1963, pages 248-249) ; at the presentation of the « deutsche Nationalpreise » at the « Reichsparteitage » , in Nuremberg, on 7 September 1937 (see : Fred Prieberg. « Kraftprobe : Wilhelm Furtwängler im Dritten Reich » , Brockhaus, Wiesbaden, 1986, page 279) ; and at the « Programm für die weltanschauliche Feierstunde “ Stirb und Werde ” » , in Weimar on 4 November 1942 (see : Klaus Vondung. « Magie und Manipulation : Ideologischer Kult und politischer Religion des Nationalsozialismus » , Vandenhöck & Ruprecht Verlag, Göttingen, 1971, page 91) . See also : Brüstle.

(4) Dieter Schnebel reported, for example, that « during the 1st years of the Second World War » , the broadcast entitled « Unsterbliche Musik der Deutschen Meister » used this theme as a motto ; see : Schnebel. « Der Dreinige Klang oder die Konzeption einer Leila-Seele-Geist-Musik (Zu Bruckners Dritter) » , in : « Musik Konzepte 23/24 : Anton Bruckner » , edited by Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn, « Edition Text und Kritik » , Munich (1982) , page 15. I am grateful to Maribeth Clark for her bibliographic assistance with this item.

(5) In 1936, alone, 3 Bruckner Festivals were held in Germany : « Brucknerfest in Leipzig » , « Bruckner-Feier der Stadt Leipzig » , and « Deutsches Bruckner-Fest in Berlin » . See : Fred Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » , Fischer, Frankfurt (1982) , pages 282-283.

(6) Hanns Kreczi. « Das Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian and Das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (1942-1945) » , « Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 5 » , « Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt » , Graz (1986) , details the history of this short-lived organization. The plans to make Saint-Florian « das “ Bayreuth Bruckners ” » are discussed on pages 29-36.

(7) « Kein anderer Musiker, nicht einmal Wagner oder Richard Strauß, ja kein anderer grosser Künstler der Vergangenheit überhaupt ist so vorbehaltlos und vollständig von der faschistischen Ideologie olttupiert worden wie Bruckner » ; « Die faschistische Bruckner-Rezeption und ihre Quellen » , page 53. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

(8) Gilliam discusses Adolf Hitler's attitude toward Bruckner in : « The Annexation of Anton Bruckner » , pages 587-588 ; also see : Albrecht Dümling. « Missbrauch als eigentliche Entarrung. Des Beispiel : Bruckner » , in : « Entartete Musik : Zm Düsseldorfer Ausstellung von 1938 : Eine kommemierte Rekonstruktion » , edited by Albrecht Dümling and Peter Girth, « Landeshauptstadt Düsseldorf » , Düsseldorf (1988) , xxviii. The pathological nature of this identification is suggested by Hitler's plan to build a bell tower in Linz to serve as the tomb for his parents and himself. The bell

tower was to feature a carillon that played passages from Bruckner's 4th Symphony. See : Evan Burr Bukey. « Hitler's Hometown : Linz, Austria (1908-1945) » , Indiana University Press, Bloomington (1986) , pages 199-200.

(9) Manfred Wagner. « Von den Wurzeln unseres Bruckner Bildes : Die Nekrologe von 1896 » , in : « Anton Bruckner : Monographie » , Schott, Mainz (1983) , pages 307-343.

(10) Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , page 10.

(11) See : Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , pages 19-41.

(12) This event was discussed most recently by Gilliam. For first-hand reportage, see : Paul Ehlers. « Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 104 (1937) , pages 745-748, and the unsigned article « Anton Bruckner zog in die Wallhalla » , « Hakenkreuzbanner » (6 June 1937) , no page given ; excerpted in Wulf, pages 156-157. For additional modern critical analysis of the event, see : Dümling and Girth, pages 9-18, xxviii, and Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , pages 37-38.

(13) The ceremonies on 6 June 1937 also included a performance of Bruckner's 3rd Symphony and his Overture in G minor and a pontifical Mass featuring Bruckner's Mass in E minor. See : Ehlers, pages 746-747.

(14) « Eine erhebendes Symbol der durch keine Schranken eingegengten Verbundenheit des Führers mit dem deutschen Volke » ; Ehlers, page 747.

(15) « Ein kleines Zeichen unserer tiefen Dankbarkeit für die Aufnahme der Bruckner-büste in die Wallhalla » ; quoted in : « Anton Bruckner zog in die Wallhalla » , page 157.

(16) An English translation of this address by John Michaël Cooper can be found in « The Musical Quarterly » , No. 78 (1994) , pages 605-609.

(17) « Anton Bruckner als der Sohn der österreichischen Erde ist ganz besonders dazu berufen, auch in unserer Gegenwart die unlösliche geistige und seelische Schicksalsgemeinschaft zu versinnbildlichen, die das gesamte deutsche Volk verbindet. Es ist daher für uns ein symbolisches Ereignis von mehr als nur künstlerischer Bedeutung, wenn Sie, mein " Führer " , sich entschlossen haben, in diesem deutschen Nationalheiligtum als erstes Denkmal unseres Reich eine Büste Anton Bruckners aufstellen zu lassen. » ; quoted in Ehlers, pages 747-748.

(18) This speech was printed as « Anton Bruckner : Rede, gehalten am 7. Juni 1937 auf dem VIII. Bruckner-Fest zu Regensburg, anlässlich des feierlichen Einzuges Anton Bruckners in die Wallhalla. » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 104 (1937) , pages 741-744.

(19) « Darum ist das Anhören dieser Werke für den, dem sie sich erschliessen, etwas anderes als nur ein Kunstgenuss es ist ein Gang zu den " Müttern " , zu den Quellen der Empfindung, zu denen kein Denken führt, kein Wissen und

Forschen, sondern nur der Wille, klein zu sein vor der Unendlichkeit der Schöpfung, aber gross in dem Streben nach dem Guten. » ; « Anton Bruckner : Rede » , page 744.

(20) For a meditation on the relationship of ideology to music, and on the resistance of Anglo-American musicology to recognizing it, see : Rose Rosengard Subotnick. « The Role of Ideology in the Study of Western Music » , in : « Developing Variations : Style and Ideology in Western Music » , University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis (1991) , pages 3-14.

(21) « The Performing Self : Compositions and Decompositions in the Languages of Contemporary Life » , Oxford University Press, New York (1971) ; quoted in : Edward Said. « Musical Elaboration » , Columbia University Press, New York (1991) , page 1.

(22) On the aesthetics and ideology of mass rallies, see : Peter Adam. « Art of the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Abrams, New York (1992) , pages 82-90 ; Wolfgang Benz. « The Ritual and Stage Management of National-Socialism : Techniques of Domination and the Public Sphere » , in : « The Attractions of Fascism : Social Psychology and Aesthetics of the “ Triumph of the Right ” » , edited by John Milfull, Berg, New York (1990) , pages 273-288 ; and « Vondung » .

(23) Adam, page 77.

(24) « Das ist das Geheimnis der Propaganda : Den, den die Propaganda erfassen will, ganz mit den Ideen der Propaganda zu durchtränken, ohne daß er überhaupt merkt, daß er durchtränkt ist. » ; speech of 25 March 1933, quoted in : Bernd Sponheuer. « Musik, Faschismus, Ideologie : Heuristische Überlegungen » , « Musikforschung » , No. 46 (1993) , pages 250-37n.

(25) « Es ist nicht nur die Aufgabe der Kunst und des Künstlers, zu verbinden ; es ist auch weit darüber hinaus ihre Aufgabe, zu formen, Gestalt zu geben, Krankes zu beseitigen und Gesundem freie Bahn zu schaffen. Ich vermag deshalb als deutscher Politiker nicht lediglich den einen Trennungsstrich anzuerkennen, den zwischen guter und schlechter Kunst. Die Kunst soll nicht nur gut sein, sie muß auch volkmässig bedingt erscheinen oder, besser gesagt, lediglich eine Kunst, die aus dem vollen Volkstum selbst schöpft, kann am Ende gut sein. » Open letter to Wilhelm Furtwängler, « Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger » (11 April 1933) ; reprinted in : Wulf, page 88.

(26) See : Berthold Hinz. « Art in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , translated by Robert and Rita Kimber, Pantheon Books, New York (1979) , pages 31-35 ; Michaël Meyer. « The Politics of Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Lang, New York (1991) , especially, Chapter 2 : « Music Organization (1933-1945) » , pages 89-252 ; and, above all, Alan E. Steinweis. « Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany : The Reich's Chambers of Music, Theatre and the Visual Arts » , University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1993) .

(27) Steinweis, page 1.

(28) Steinweis, page 2.

(29) The increased importance of Bruckner to musical scholarship in the 3rd « Reich » is evident in the remarkable inflation in the number of articles on Bruckner and related topics that were published in the « Zeitschrift für Musik ». In the decade of the 1920's, the « Zeitschrift für Musik » published fewer than a dozen articles on Bruckner but, after 1932, the volume rose sharply, peaking, in 1936, with 21 contributions on Bruckner, in that year alone.

(30) « Vier Jahre der Vernichtung waren über Europa hingezogen. Aus tiefer geistiger und seelischer Not rief das Volk nach einer Führung. Falsche “ Führer ” brachten in den weiteren Jahrzehnten Völker und Nationen an den Abgrund. Ohne geistige Erneuerung kann es eine Gesundung nicht geben. Immer mehr wuchs die Sehnsucht nach innerer Erhebung aus dem Elend, das der krasse Materialismus des vergangenen Jahrhunderts hervorgerufen hatte. Der Bolschewismus in der Kunst wurde auf die Spitze genieben. Gegen all dies gab es nur ein Mittel : Rückkehr zu den reinen Quellen ! Welche Kunst aber wäre reiner als die aus tiefer Religiosität geborene eines Bach, Beethoven und Bruckner ! Besonders Bruckners gottgeweihte Kunst fand nun einen günstigen Nährboden, nun erst das richtige Verständnis, er wurde vielen Tausenden zum “ Führer ” in eine schöne geistige Welt, und damit war die Grundlage für eine gesunde und starke Bruckner-Bewegung gegeben, die nun, nach dem Weltkrieg mit elementarer Gewalt sich durchsetzte » ; August Göllerich and Max Auer, « Anton Bruckner : Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild » , Bosse, Regensburg (1936) , Volume IV, Chapter 4, pages 61-62. « Anton Bruckner : Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild » has a complex history. Bruckner himself selected Göllerich to write his biography, but Göllerich died, in 1923, without having come close to finishing the work. Auer subsequently took-over Göllerich's notes and sketches and finished the biography. The quotation above is from the final volume (published in 1936) and is undoubtedly the work of Auer.

(31) « Anton Bruckner im Lichte deutscher Auferstehung » , « Die Musik » , No. 30 (1938) , pages 310-313.

(32) « Denn erst unserer Zeit war es vorbehalten, in tiefster Erschütterung den Anbruch der Morgenröte, das große “ Wach auf, es nahet der Tag ” zu erleben. In diesem Lichte vollzieht sich das Wunder um Anton Bruckner » ; Skorzeny, page 311.

(33) For example, consider Oskar Lang's monograph « Anton Bruckner : Wesen und Bedeutung » , « Becksche Verlagshandlung » , Munich (1924) , whose introduction argues that not only was Bruckner free from the flaws and banalities of the 19th Century, but that (in 1924) his music offered « das Vorbild echter unwandelbarer, menschlicher Größe und Höheit » (an example of authentic, constant human greatness and sovereignty) to a world threatened by chaos and both human and musical anarchy, page 10. Also, see : Fritz Grüninger. « Der deutsche Geist in den Werken Anton Bruckners » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 101 (1934) , pages 427-429.

(34) « Ja, da soll einer sagen, Österreich wäre nicht deutsch ! Gibt es etwas Deutscheres als unser altes reines Österreichtum ?! » Quoted in : Friedrich Heer. « Der Kampf um die österreichische Identität » , Böhlau, Vienna (1981) , page 420.

(35) « Die Erde dieses Landes is vielleicht die kostbarste und die heiligste in ganz Deutschland. In grauer Vorzeit schon vom Pflug der Völkerwanderung zutiefst aufgewühlt, im Laufe der Jahrhunderte mit dem Blute aller deutschen Stämme

gertänkt - ein solcher Boden wird tiefgründig und schwer und schicksalhaft wie die Menschen, die ihm entwachsen. So ist es gekommen, daß Österreich seit alters her zum geistigen Saatbeet, zum Pflanzengarten des ganzen deutschen Volkes auserkoren war. Seine Gärtner waren freilich nicht immer die besten, und oft durften Unkraut und Giftpflanzen die edelsten Keime lang, lang eindämmen, bis diese, in die weite deutsche Murtererde verpflanzt, zu mächtigen Bäumen wurden und reiche Frucht trugen. Darin liegt der Kernpunkt des österreichischen Schicksals » ; Skorzeny, page 311.

(36) « Es muß gesagt werden, daß, so wie die Persönlichkeit des Meisters das Urbild des Österreicherers verkörperte, auch das Schicksal seines Werkes seinem tiefsten Wesen nach ein kennzeichnend österreichisches ist. » ; Skorzeny, page 311.

(37) Pamela Potter has commented on this tendency to « coordinate musicological writings with foreign policy » ; see : « The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft (1918-1938) » , « Journal of Musicological Research » , No. 11 (1991) , page 168. Studies of the « Germanness » of Austrian music were common in the year leading-up to the « Anschluß » ; see, for example, Wilhelm Zentner. « Was danken wir der österreichischen Musik » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 104 (1937) , pages 9-13. Also consider the publication of various articles about « German » music in recently annexed or conquered regions, such as Gustav Beding. « Die Lage der sudetendeutschen Musik » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 105 (1938) , pages 574-576 ; Edwin Janetschek. « Die Stellung der Sudetendeutschen im deutschen Sängereleben » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 105 (1938) , page 594 ; and Fritz Feldman. « Deutsche Musikkultur in ostoberschlesischen Industriegebiet » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 106 (1939) , pages 1085-1088.

(38) See : Ernst Schwanzara. « Anton Bruckners Stamm und Urheimat » , in : Göllerich and Auer, Volume 4, pages 135-222.

(39) « Als Bruckner seine künstlerische Laufbahn antrat, hatte das Weltjudentum in Gestalt des europäischen Liberalismus bereits den Kampf aufgenommen gegen den deutschen Geist, der sich in der Kunst zu regen begann. » ; Skorzeny, page 311.

(40) « Ein krasser Fall des Missverhältnisses zwischen Jüdischem und Arischem in einem deutschen Buch ! » , « Gedanken über Mendelssohn » , « Westdeutscher Beobachter » , 10 March 1935 ; reprinted in Wulf, pages 447-448.

(41) « Über den Musikbetrieb während dem Krieges » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 107 (1939) , pages 1029-1030.

(42) Hanns-Werner Heister and Jochem Wolff. « Macht und Schicksal : Klassik, Fanfaren, höhere Durchhaltemusik » , in : « Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland » , edited by Hanns-Werner Heister and Hans-Gunter Klein, Fischer, Frankfurt (1984) , especially, pages 116-117.

(43) In this connection, see : Fred Prieberg's discussion of the role played by music in the Nazi « Aussenpolitik » in occupied countries, « Musik im NS-Staat » , pages 376-409. As one musician wrote : « Music paves the way for the political understanding of the Germanic peoples. » (« Die Musik ist ein Wegebereiter der politischen Verständigung der germanischen Völker. ») , « Thorwald Lammers Tagebuch » , quoted in : Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » , page 380.

(44) « Die hohe Kunst als solche (wie “ Führer ”, Volk und Staat) als Repräsentation “ ewiger Gesetze ”, die Unterordnung und fraglosen Gehorsam verlangen. » ; Sponheuer, page 251.

(45) Erik Levi made a similar point : « Nazi cultural aesthetes found great difficulty in determining the meaning and value of a particular piece of music unless it was allied to an unequivocal political slogan. » ; « Music and National-Socialism : The Politicisation of Criticism, Composition and Performance » , in : « The Nazification of Art : Art, Design, Music, Architecture and Film in the 3rd “ Reich ” » , edited by Brandon Taylor and Wilfried van der Will, Winchester School of Art, Winchester (1990) , page 159.

(46) Heister and Wolff, page 116.

(47) « Als Prophet völkisch-rassischer Wiedergeburt Groß-Deutschlands, des Sieges “ schollenhaft ”-bestandigen Lebenswillen über dekadente Zivilisation. » ; Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , page 21.

(48) It is tempting to relate this to Nietzsche’s « Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen » (1873-1876) and, particularly, to Nietzsche’s notion that German culture had reached such a state that it considered truth itself as « unzeitgemäss » . On the influence of this aspect of Nietzsche’s thought on German culture, see : Stephen Aschheim. « The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany (1890-1900) » , University of California Press, Berkeley (1992) , pages 22-25 and 69.

(49) Jeffery Herf wrote that « reactionary modernist » ideology embraced the « legend of the free creative spirit at war with the “ Bourgeoisie ” who refuses to accept any limits » ; « Reactionary Modernism : Technology, Culture and Politics in Weimar and the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1984) , page 12.

(50) Norbert Nagler comments on the many terms in Bruckner research that begin with the prefix « Ur- » ; « Bruckners gründerzeitliche Monumentalsymphonie : Reflexionen zur Heteronomie kompositorischer Praxis » , in : Metzger and Riehn, page 89.

(51) « Nach Jahrzehnten ungewöhnlichen hartnäckigen Missverstehens hat sich in der Gegenwart das Werk des Meisters von Sankt Florian einer zusehends erlebnisbereiten Hörergemeinde erschlossen. Auch an kenntnis- und verständnisreichen Auslegungen fehlt es nicht. Dennoch (so will es mir scheinen) entzog sich ein vorwaltender Wesenzug im Werk und Leben Bruckners noch jeder zusammenschauenden Deutung : Bruckners Sonderstellung in seiner geschichtlichen Umwelt. » ; Danckert. « Bruckner und das Natursymbol » , « Die Musik » , No. 30 (1938) , page 306.

(52) « “ Unterirdisch ” fortwirkende Überlieferung des süddeutschen-österreichischen Barock. » ; Danckert, page 306. The notion that Bruckner’s music fused Baroque and Romantic elements was not original to Skorzeny. Gotthold Frotscher had made a similar claim in : « Anton Bruckners dynamische Prinzip » , « Die Musik » , No. 16 (1924) , pages 886-887.

(53) « Fortsetzer, ja Vollender einer älteren, im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert lebendigen, späterhin aber von anderen

künstlerischen Strömungen überfluteten Ausdruckswelt, erfüllt von kräftiger Sinnlichkeit, Freude an Glanz und wuchernder Gestaltenfülle, getragen von einem “vorklassisch” anmutenden “objektiven” Formensinn. » ; Danckert, page 306.

(54) Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , pages 11-12 and 24.

(55) Speech of 18 July 1937, quoted in the « Völkische Beobachter » (19 July 1937) ; quoted and translated in Adam, page 24.

(56) Hinz, page 2.

(57) See : Korstvedt. « The 1st Printed Edition of Anton Bruckner's 4th Symphony » , especially, pages 332-368 ; and Korstvedt. « Return to the Pure Sources » , passim, for a more substantial discussion of the issues raised in this paragraph.

(58) « Eine Befreiung des wahren symphonischen Willens des Meisters » ; quoted in : Alfred Orel. « Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner » , « Deutsche Musikkultur I » (1936-1937) , page 223.

(59) « Der “ Führer ” und seine Regierung betrachten es als ihre kulturelle Ehrenpflicht, alles in ihren Kräften Stehende zu tun, um das ganz deutsche Volk dieses beglückenden Erbes teilhaftig werden zu lassen und durch eine grosszügige Förderung der Bruckner-Pflege daran mitzuhelfen, daß diese in ihren Auswirkung nicht nur in die Tiefe, sondern auch in die Breite dringt. Aus diesen Gründen hat sie sich entschlossen, der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft so lange jährlich zur Herausgabe der Originalfassung seiner Symphonien einen namhaften Beitrag zur Verfügung zu stellen, bis das Gesamtwerk des Meisters in der von ihm geschauten Form vorliegt. » ; quoted in : Ehlers, page 747. See also : Cooper's translation of this speech, page 608.

(60) « Dem geistige Kampf um den Besitz des “ echten ” Bruckner » ; Max Auer. « Der Streit um den “ echten ” Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 103 (1936) , page 1195.

(61) « Schwerwiegend auch deshalb, weil unsere Generation, die vom Schicksal vor diese Entscheidung gestellt wurde, die Verantwortung dafür trägt, in welcher Form die Symphonien Bruckners im Geistesleben der Menschheit lebendig sein werden. » ; Weisbach. « Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse » , in : « Anton Bruckner : Wissenschaftliche and Künstlerliche Betrachtungen » , edited by the « Internationale-Bruckner-Gesellschaft » , « Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag » , Vienna (1937) , pages 31-32.

(62) « Bei geschärften Verantwortungsbewusstsein der Gegenwart grossen nationalen Kulturgütern gegenüber dürfte die Zeit nicht fern sein, da sich auch die 4. , 5. und 6. Sinfonie(n) in der Originalfassung durchgesetzt haben werden. » ; Horst Büttner. « Der Linzer Fassung von Bruckners Erster Sinfonie » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 103 (1936) , page 471.

(63) See : Bettina Preiss. « Eine Wissenschaft wird zur Dienstleistung : Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus » , in : «

Kunst auf Befehl, Dreiunddreissig bis Fünfundvierzig » , edited by Bazon Brock and Achim Preiss, « Klinkhardt & Biermann, Munich (1990) , page 49.

(64) Preiss, page 50.

(65) « Angesichts des Siegeszug der Originalfassungen durch die Konzertsäle, angesichts der nicht hinwegzuleugnigen “ Echtheit ” dieser von den eigenen Fingern des Meisters niedergeschriebenen Partituren, haben die bisherigen Kompromissfassungen ihre Daseinsberechtigung verloren. » ; Auer. « Der Streit um den “ echten ” Bruckner » , page 1195.

(66) « Hier aber handelt es sich (und darauf muß die Öffentlichkeit mit allem Nachdruck hingewiesen werden) um eine Grosstat, die die ganze Musikwelt angeht ; denn sie löst den Bann, der bislang noch auf Bruckners Werk gelegen war. » ; Lang. « Der Ur-Bruckner : Betrachtungen zur kritischen Gesamtausgabe » , « Die Musik » , No. 28 (1936) , page 257.

(67) « Wächst gerade bei den völlig unvoreingenommenen Hörern und bei solchen, die aus Respekt vor der unantastbaren Arbeit des Genius ihre Vorurteile gegen die originalen Fassungen ablegten, die uneingeschränkte Zustimmung. » ; Fritz Öser. « Zur Frage der Originalfassungen bei Bruckner » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 105 (1938) , page 773.

(68) Auer. « Die biographischen Tatsachen » , in : « Anton Bruckner : Wissenschaftliche und Künstlerische Betrachtungen » , page 10.

(69) This story was widely repeated. For an influential formulation of it, see : Robert Haas. « Vorlagenbericht » , in : « Anton Bruckner. Sämtliche Werke, Band 4, Teil I : IV. Symphonie in Es-Dur (Fassung von 1878 mit dem Finale von 1878) , Partituren und Entwürfe mit Bericht » , edited by Haas, « Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag » , Vienna (1936) , ii.

(70) In the 1st decade of the 20th Century, Universal-Edition acquired the copyrights to all of Bruckner's Symphonies and most of his concerted choral works. See : Herbert Vogg. « 1876-1976 : 100 Jahre Musikverlag Döblinger » , Ludwig Döblinger, Vienna (1976) , page 25 ; and Alexander Weinmann. « Anton Bruckner und seine Verleger » , in : « Bruckner-Studien : Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag » , edited by Franz Grasberger, « Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag » , Vienna (1964) , page 126.

(71) On the right-wing animosity to Universal-Edition, see : Douglas Jarman. « Vienna after the Empire » , in : « Modern Times : From World War I to the Present » , edited by Robert Morgan, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs (1994) , pages 70-71 and 77 ; and Joel Sachs. « Some Aspects of Musical Politics in Pre-Nazi Germany » , « Perspectives on New Music » , No. 9 (1970) , pages 78-79. Brüstle also discussed this issue.

(72) Roll Pergler. « Der Durchbruch des stilbildenden Prinzips in den Originalfassungen der Symphonien von Anton Bruckners » , in : « Anton Bruckner : Wissenschaftliche und künstlerische Betrachtungen » , pages 18-30.

(73) « Es ist kaum zu glauben, was Löwe allein aus dem Scherzo gemacht hat, das in der Brucknerschen Fassung einer ganz anderen Sphäre des Klanges und des Ausdrucks angehört. Löwe hat das Stück in einer sehr aparten und geistreichen Art aufs Gefällige hingerichtet und seine Arbeit allein hat den Anstoss zu jener Betrachtungsweise gegeben, die aus dem Scherzo der Neunten Elfen- und Sommernachtstraumstimmungen und überhaupt so was wie eine Synthese von Mendelssohn, Berlioz und Bruckner heraushört. Damit ist es nun für immer vorbei, und wir können die alten Vergleiche getrost einpacken. Das wirkliche Scherzo Bruckner : hat nichts von moussierender Spritzigkeit, es steht mit festen, markigen Knochen auf dem heimatlichen Boden des oberösterreichischen Landes. » ; review in : « Münchener Zeitung » (4 April 1932) ; quoted in : Auer. « Anton Bruckners IX. Sinfonie in der Originalfassung » , « Zeitschrift für Musik » , No. 99 (1932) , page 863.

(74) Friedrich Herzfeld, reply to Oskar Lang. « Noch einmal “ Der Ur-Bruckner ” » , « Allgemeine Musikzeitung » , No. 63 (1936) , page 481.

(75) Friedrich Klose, response to Alfred Orel, « Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner » , « Deutsche Musikkultur I (1936-1937) » , page 223. Klose's preference for the 1st edition of the 9th Symphony must have been based on personal taste alone. This edition was edited by Ferdinand Löwe from Bruckner's unfinished manuscript and published in 1903, 7 years after Bruckner's death. Thus, this edition cannot be claimed to represent Bruckner's own text in all details.

(76) Emil Armbruster. « Erstdruckfassung oder “ Originalfassung ” ? : Ein Beitrag zur Brucknerfrage am fünfzigsten Todestag des Meister » , Jost, Leipzig (1946) .

(77) See : Armbruster, page 2.

(78) « Man kann doch nicht einfach die letzten zwölf Jahre auslöschen and wieder da anfangen, wo man 1933 aufgehört hat. » ; Strobel. « Melos 1946 » , « Melos » , No. 14 (1946) , page 1.

(79) « Bruckner als die Inkarnation des Deutschen Dranges in unendliche Tiefen oder Höhen » , Strobel, page 2.

(80) « Te Deum Laudamus : Gedanken zur Musik Anton Bruckners » , Herder, Vienna (1947) .

(81) This was the September 1946 issue of the « Österreichische Musikzeitschrift » .

(82) Franz Gräßlinger. « Anton Bruckner und Hermann Levi, sein “ Edelster Gönner ” und “ Höchstbenühmster Vater ”. » , « Österreichische Musikzeitschrift I » (1946) , pages 292-295.

(83) For examples of this tendency, see : Hansen. « Anton Bruckner » , passim ; Michaël Kopfermarm. « Über den Anfang des Ersten Saues von Bruckners VIII. Symphonie » , Metzger and Riehn, pages 23-70 ; and Manfred Wagner. « Musik von gestern - Provokation für heute : Zum Einfluss Anton Bruckners auf die musikalische Gegenwart » , in

Metzger and Riehn, pages 71-84.

(84) Erich Wolfgang Partsch. « Kritische Gedanken über Bruckner-Rezeption » and « Der Musikant Gottes' - Zur Analyse eines Stereotyps », in : Renate Grasberger and Erich Wolfgang Partsch. « Bruckner skizziert : ein Porträt in ausgewählten Erinnerungen und Anekdoten », « Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien », Volume 8, « Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag », Vienna (1991) , pages 201-234 and 235-257, respectively ; Partsch. « Über Wert und Unwert von Bruckner-Anekdoten », « Musica », No. 46 (1992) , page 166-170 ; Manfred Wagner. « Gefahr der Anekdote », in : « Bruckner Symposion 1977 », edited by Franz Grasberger, « Linzer Veranstaltungsgesellschaft », Linz (1978) , pages 27-33 ; and Wagner. « Anton Bruckner », especially : « Von den Wurzeln unseres Bruckner Bildes : Die Nekrologe von 1896, Dokumente zur Rezeption », pages 307-334.

(85) Robert Simpson. « The Essence of Bruckner : An Essay Towards the Understanding of his Music », revised edition, Victor Gollancz, London (1992) , page 13.

(86) See : Leopold Nowak. « Die Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe : Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale », in : « Bruckner Jahrbuch 1983-1984 », edited by Othmar Wessely, « Linzer Veranstaltungsgesellschaft », Linz (1985) , page 40.

(87) Deryck Cooke. « Anton Bruckner », in : « The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians », edited by Stanley Sadie, Grove's Dictionaries of Music, London (1980) , Volume 3, page 360 ; reprinted in « The New Grove Late-Romantic Masters », edited by Stanley Sadie, Norton, New York (1985) , page 32. See also : Cooke. « The Bruckner Problem Simplified », in : Cooke. « Vindication : Essays about Romantic Music », Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1982) , pages 43-71.

(88) Numerous examples of this performance tradition are preserved in recordings from the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's by Eugen Jochum, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Hans Knappertsbusch, Carl Schuricht, and Jascha Horenstein.

(89) Nikolas Hamoncourt's comments in the notes to his recent recording of Bruckner's 3rd Symphony offer a recent example of these phenomena (« Teldec », CD : 4509-98405-2) :

« I think Bruckner knew perfectly well how he imagined his works would sound and that he set this down quite clearly. He said : " My work is in the score. " . The versions that various friends and conductors forced-out of him were concessions to these friends and to audiences, prompted by the wish to be performed at all. » (7)

Hamoncourt also decried the unwritten decelerandos often taken in the slow movement of the 3rd Symphony :

« There isn't the slightest indication in the score that this is how these passages should be taken. And yet, Orchestras are used to playing them like this. But when a composer like Bruckner writes even the tiniest change of tempo into the score and when he prescribes even the least expressive nuance by means of footnotes and explanations, I'm tempted to agree with him and I am inclined to clear away all this ballast. » (8)

I am grateful to William Carragan for bringing Hamoncourt's remarks to my attention.

(90) Tempo schemes derived from these older texts can be heard quite clearly in. For example, Karl Böhm's 1936 recording of the 4th Symphony with the « Sächsische Staatskapelle » (re-issued on « Da Capo » , LP : IC 053.28 924M) and Eugen Jochum's 1939 recording of the 4th Symphony with the Hamburg Philharmonic (re-issued on « Lys » , CD : 007/8) . Similarly, Siegmund von Hausegger, who was one of Robert Haas' consultants and premiered the « Gesamtausgabe » edition of the 9th Symphony in 1932, adopted some of the tempo and dynamic indications found only in Ferdinand Löwe's 1903 edition when he recorded the « New Critical Edition » (« Neue Kritische Gesamtausgabe ») of the Symphony, in 1938, with the Munich Philharmonic (re-issued on « Preiser » , CD : 90148) . On the continued prevalence of many of the performance indications of Löwe's edition of this Symphony, see : Mark Kluge. « Furtwängler and the Art of Bruckner Interpretation : Conclusion » , « The Newsletter of the Wilhelm Furtwängler Society of America » , Volume 4, No. 4 (1993) , pages 6-13. Furthermore, when performing Haas's edition of the 5th Symphony, several conductors adhered to a practice derived from the text of the 1st edition : adding supplementary brass players (the famous « 11 Apostles » , consisting of 4 horns, 3 trumpets, 3 trombones and 1 bass tuba) in the peroration of the Finale (measures 583-635 in Haas's edition ; compare the passage beginning at rehearsal U, in the 1896 edition) . Hausegger probably did this in the 1st performance in Munich, in October 1935 ; Oswald Kabasta definitely did so in the Viennese premiere, in March 1936, as did Eugen Jochum at a concert in Berlin, in 1938 ; see : Brüstle.

Anton Bruckner et Adolf Hitler

Adolf Hitler aimait la musique mélodique, euphonique et accessible. Mais ses goûts subirent plusieurs changements importants. Pendant la majeure partie de sa vie, la musique d'Anton Bruckner ne lui dira rien.

Selon le photographe personnel d'Hitler, Heinrich Hoffmann, Hitler mentionnera que très peu souvent le nom de Bruckner parmi ses compositeurs préférés.

L'architecte du « Reich » , Albert Speer, a souligné que l'intérêt de Hitler pour le compositeur « n'a jamais semblé très marqué » , même après être devenu Chancelier.

Anton Bruckner avait cependant pour le « Führer » une importance symbolique ; celle du « petit garçon du patelin » qui deviendra le rival de Johannes Brahms, si cher à Vienne. Lors des grands rassemblements du Parti à Nuremberg, un mouvement de l'une des Symphonies de Bruckner était toujours utilisé.

...

La Ire publication des Symphonies d'Anton Bruckner se fera avec l'approbation du Parti Nazi. Bruckner était l'un des compositeurs préférés d'Adolf Hitler. Selon la propagande, ces 2 fils de la patrie, en provenance de Haute-Autriche, avaient réussi à triompher de la bourgeoisie viennoise. L'adulation (bien documentée) de Bruckner pour Richard Wagner de même que l'association de ce dernier (le « Cercle Wagner ») avec les prédécesseurs ultra-nationalistes du

Parti Nazi a certainement contribué à sa reconnaissance comme grand compositeur dans l'univers culturel du 3e « Reich ». Avec la progression des années '30, la musique de Bruckner devint de plus en plus associée avec les théories racistes du National-Socialisme qui affirmait que les versions retouchées avaient été victimes de « contamination » de la part d'influents « étrangers » (voire d'origine juive) . Les Symphonies de Bruckner devaient être « purifiées » pour enfin révéler son véritable génie germanique. Malgré le discours politique auquel il a été associé, il faut saluer l'apport du musicologue Robert Haas dans le processus de publication.

Les chœurs patriotiques pour voix d'hommes et les majestueuses Symphonies de Bruckner seront utilisés pour soutenir les idées infantilisantes des idéologues nazis sur la redéfinition de la musique allemande : simple, sérieuse, spirituelle, sans être délurée et sans trop chromatisme.

...

1936 : Au-delà du 40e anniversaire de la mort d'Anton Bruckner (1896-1936) , Josef Gœbbels commentera l'année en ces termes :

« Nous nous sommes finalement libérés des chaînes de Versailles. » En effet, l'Allemagne était redevenue une formidable « machine de guerre » .

1940 : Tout à coup, Adolf Hitler va développer une véritable passion pour les Symphonies de Bruckner. Il va même commencer à l'introduire dans les discours qu'il tient sur son idole, Richard Wagner. Josef Gœbbels notera dans son journal : « Il m'a dit que ce n'est que pendant la guerre qu'il apprit à l'apprécier. » . Son engouement ne cessera de croître.

Nuit du 13 au 14 janvier 1942 : Après avoir écouté un enregistrement du 1er mouvement de la 7e Symphonie de Bruckner directement de son quartier général militaire (le « Repaire du Loup ») , Adolf Hitler fera ce commentaire : « Cette œuvre est basée sur des airs populaires provenant de la Haute-Autriche. Ils ne sont pas reproduits textuellement, mais, à plusieurs endroits, je reconnais les danses tyroliennes (Ländler) de ma tendre jeunesse. C'est extraordinaire ce qu'il a réussi à faire à partir de ce folklore. Il faut donner, en l'occurrence, le crédit à un prêtre pour avoir parrainer ce grand Maître. L'évêque de Linz avait l'habitude de s'asseoir pendant des heures dans sa cathédrale à écouter religieusement Bruckner jouer de l'orgue. Il était le plus grand organiste de son époque. » (« Hitler's Table Talk » : 1941-1944. Édité par H. R. Trevor-Roper avec un avant-propos de Gerhard L. Weinberg.)

Il est indéniable qu'Hitler se sentait personnellement très proche de ce compositeur. Les 2 provenaient d'une petite localité autrichienne de la même région ; ils grandirent dans un milieu modeste ; leurs pères moururent de manière précoce ; ils étaient autodidactes ; et malgré les nombreux obstacles, ils réussirent à s'affirmer. Souvent, Hitler mettra en opposition Bruckner, ce catholique autrichien contesté des Viennois, et Brahms, ce protestant venu du nord de l'Allemagne qu'ils idolâtraient.

...

« This work is based on popular airs of Upper-Austria. They're not textually reproduced, but repeatedly I recognized in passing Tyrolean dances of my youth. It's wonderful what he managed to get-out of that folklore. As it happened, it's a priest to whom we must give the credit for having protected this great Master. The Bishop of Linz used to sit in his cathedral for hours at a time, listening to Bruckner play the organ. He was the greatest organist of his day. »

1942 : Josef Gœbbels placera Bruckner au même niveau que Beethoven. Il dira de la 7e Symphonie qu'elle est « l'une des plus belles manifestations de la créativité musicale allemande, l'équivalent de la 9e de Beethoven » .

« Pendant des heures, l'évêque de Linz demeurait assis, seul dans la cathédrale, pour écouter Bruckner, le plus grand organiste de son temps, jouer de l'orgue. » (Josef Gœbbels)

« On peut imaginer combien il fut difficile pour ce petit garçon paysan de se rendre à Vienne, une société urbaine débauchée. » (Josef Gœbbels)

« Une remarque récemment parue dans un journal, faite par Bruckner à l'endroit de Johannes Brahms, le rapproche de moi : " La musique de Brahms est tout à fait charmante, mais je préfère la mienne. " » . (Josef Gœbbels)

« Bruckner avait la saine confiance en soi du modeste paysan. Il sut, en temps et lieu, promouvoir les causes qu'il lui tenait à cœur. » (Josef Gœbbels)

« Ce critique Hanslick a fait vivre l'enfer à Bruckner à Vienne. Lorsqu'il était devenu impossible d'ignorer ce grand compositeur, les honneurs et les distinctions ont suivi. Mais que pouvait-il en faire ? On aurait dû plutôt faciliter son activité créatrice. Au même moment, Brahms était porté aux Cieux. » (Josef Gœbbels)

À partir de là, Adolf Hitler fera tout son possible pour promouvoir la musique de Bruckner en l'engageant dans sa « vendetta » contre Vienne.

Pour Adolf Hitler et Josef Gœbbels, Anton Bruckner pouvait être considéré comme un représentant aryen :

« Comme fils du sol autrichien, Anton Bruckner est spécifiquement choisi pour représenter à notre époque l'esprit indissoluble et la communauté émotionnelle du destin qui unit la nation dans son ensemble. » (Josef Gœbbels, 6 juin 1937.)

Bruckner le provincial, comme Hitler, fut en effet rejeté par la métropole autrichienne (Vienne) et le compositeur fut considéré par les Nazis comme une victime du système juif, parce que le critique Eduard Hanslick s'était opposé à lui. Le dimanche 6 juin 1937, donc, un buste de Bruckner fut édifié dans un lieu symbolique, au « Walhalla » , près de Regensburg, en Bavière. Gœbbels proclama alors que Bruckner était le symbole de l'entière nation allemande.

...

Adolf Hitler had taken a special interest in Anton Bruckner ever since, as a young man, he had attended August Göllerich's « Bruckner-Festkonzerte » in Linz. Hitler and Bruckner had both spent their early years in the Linz region, they both idolized Richard Wagner, and the composer of patriotic male-voice choruses and stately Symphonies could be pressed into service to support some of the more simplistic ideas propounded by Nazi ideologues as to what German music should be : steady, serious and spiritual, but not overly chromatic or excitable. A movement from a Bruckner Symphony was played before each of Hitler's « cultural speeches » at the Nuremberg rallies ; for instance, the fugue from the 5th Symphony, a personal favourite of Hitler's, preceded the Party Congress in 1937. Bruckner was also connected, via Linz, with Hitler's frustrated dreams of becoming an architect. The 18 year old Hitler had drawn a design for a new concert-hall in Linz, and as « Führer » , he had elaborate scale-models made for the new Linz that was to be built following the War, the centre-piece of which was to be a monument on the banks of the Danube glorifying Bruckner, Hitler's parents and Horbiger's « Universal Ice Doctrine » (« Welt Eis Lehre ») : Bruckner's commemoration was, therefore, to be lumped together with a lunatic fringe pseudo-science and a dictator's personality cult. Hitler's promotion of Linz was part of a private campaign against cosmopolitan Vienna, where he had spent unhappy years as a student, and he planned to make Linz, rather than Vienna, the cultural capital of both the « Ostmark » (Austria) and the German « Reich » , even proposing to be buried there.

In the wake of the « Anschluß » , the Nazi Party assumed control of all cultural bodies in Austria, including the « Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft » (IBG) , which now became the « Deutsche Bruckner-Gesellschaft » (DBG) , conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler regrettably allowing himself to be installed as President to replace Max Auer (a Jew) . The new authorities had no difficulty in finding allies in its ranks. Alfred Orel proved assiduous in eradicating « Jewish influences » from the « Musikhochschule » , while Robert Haas seems to have been far from alone in being a Nazi.

It is all too easy to see how the supposed sacral character of Bruckner's music could lend itself to employment at the secular rituals through which the Nazi Party sought to invest itself with the status of tradition :

After the 1937 Regensburg Festival, Max Auer commented, concerning a concert given in a de-consecrated « Minorite » Church that :

« Everyone who experienced it came to the conclusion that only a mystic ecclesiastical venue is adequate for Symphonies 5 and 9. The Concert-Hall of the future “ Bruckner-Haus ” must employ sacral architecture. »

The choice of words is unfortunate. Performances of Bruckner's Symphonies, in ecclesiastical venues, can indeed be effective if the acoustics are not too reverberant (in which case, they sound dreadful, no matter how slowly the music is taken) but to state that the 5th and the 9th can only make their effect in « mystic ecclesiastical venues » is an example of the tendency to except Bruckner from ordinary considerations (those regarding textual fidelity, for instance)

In an article in the Festival Program for the Regensburg « Brucknerfest » , conductor Hans Weisbach identified a flexible interpretative approach with the pattern of un-authorized intervention, then, being detected in the 1st

published editions, and argued for a broad « sacral » approach that be equated with fidelity to both the text and the composer's intentions :

« In the soul of this man, who did not take the experiences of earthly life as the inspiration for his art but sent his creative spirit to endless distances, for whom the divine miracles of the universe were transformed into sounds and into which he poured the hot blood of a human heart - in the soul of this man, music has to transform into a solemnly flowing deep river of noble “ grandeur ”. He who has not yet understood that this music has no tendency towards dramatic affect or effect can learn it from every page of the original versions ; he will also learn (to his surprise) how little variation of the basic tempo Bruckner wishes. His tempo indications do not mean to tie the interpreter down, as one so often felt, and only reluctantly followed, in those 1st editions, but to set the interpreter free, because they are in complete harmony with the nature of the music. Intimately related to the tempo (again, clearly evident from the original versions) is the treatment of phrasing indications in the strings. Especially during “ cantabile ” moments of the greatest expression, we encounter Bruckner's characteristic of omitting slurs and, instead, specifying individual bowings for each single note. By adding the comment “ lang gezogen ” (drawn-out) , he gives the conductor, as well as the players, the opportunity to realize the solemn tempo with the greatest ... »

Implication de Hans Wildermann durant le 3e « Reich »

Déjà dans les années 1920, l'artiste Hans Wildermann était devenu un ardent nationaliste et, depuis 1933, s'était lié d'amitié avec la maison d'édition musicale National-Socialiste « Gustav Bosse, Regensburg » . Il sera un acteur important dans la rédaction de l'almanach de la bibliothèque de la musique allemande (1920-1927) et aura le privilège d'avoir son propre éditorial. Auparavant (en 1923) , Wildermann avait été responsable de la quasi-totalité du graphisme pour cette maison d'édition.

En 1942, Hans Wildermann va illustrer la poésie de Dante dans le bouquin écrit par le « Duce » , Benito Mussolini : « Eine Anthologie » (Gauverlag-NS-Schlesien) . La même année, il sera honoré pour le livre de Siegmund Skraup : « Die Oper als lebendiges Theater durch die Abbildung von 35 Bühnenbildern gewürdigt. » (L'Opéra théâtral. Cartographie de 35 décors.) . En 1942, il va illustrer le « Die Schildbürger » , une publication distribuée en 63,000 exemplaires dans tous les postes militaires nazis. En 1944, pour souligner son 60e anniversaire, un hommage sera rendu à Hans Wildermann (pour ses réalisations comme scénographe - peintre de décors - , intellectuel et idéologue) par Carl Niessen dans une revue militaire sur la musique (volume I ; pages 7 à 9.) . Niessen avait été mandaté par le bureau-chef du « NSDAP » pour superviser la formation et l'éducation.

...

Hans Wilhelm Wildermann (geboren 21. Februar 1884 in Kalk ; gestorben 1. November 1954 in Köln) war ein deutscher Bühnenbildner, Maler und Bildhauer.

Hans Wildermann wurde als Sohn des Prokuristen Heinrich W. Wildermann und seiner Ehefrau Maria Wildermann, geborene Röhr geboren. Er besuchte zunächst Schulen in Recklinghausen und Köln und studierte dann in Düsseldorf,

Berlin und München.

Ab 1907 lebte Wildermann wieder in seiner Heimatstadt, wo er unter Max Martersteig und dessen Dirigenten Otto Lohse an der Ausstattung der Kölner Bühnen sowie als Bildhauer arbeitete. Martersteig hatte Wildermanns Radierung Tor der Phantasie gesehen. Der Kontakt entstand dann über Lohses Ehefrau, in deren Salon sich die Theaterwelt aus Deutschland und anderen Ländern traf. Wildermann wirkte dann 1911 an den Opernfestspielen mit und nahm im Jahr darauf an der Kölner Sonderbund-Ausstellung teil, wo er für den Vorplatz der Ausstellungshalle am Aachener Tor die Figurengruppe « Jüngling mit Pony » sowie « Mädchen mit Reh » schuf, die später bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg in den Grünanlagen des Deutschen Rings standen. 1912 entstand der Mülheimer Schifffahrtsbrunnen.

1912 holte ihn Johannes Maurach als Gastbühnenbildner ans Stadttheater Essen. Ein Jahr später, 1913, ging er nach München, wo er auf Paul Klee traf. Danach kam es zu Zusammenarbeiten mit dem Opernhaus Berlin, dem Nationaltheater München und dem Opernhaus Leipzig. Im August 1919 folgte Wildermann wieder Maurach, der nun Intendant an den Städtischen Bühnen Dortmund war. 1920 heiratete er dann in Berlin Erna Maria Concordia Hoheisel. Als Maurach 1922-1923 nach Nürnberg ging, folgte auch Wildermann ihm zunächst. Jedoch gelang es dem neuen Dortmunder Intendanten Karl Schäffer Wildermann nach Dortmund zurückzuholen. 1926 wechselte Hans Wildermann nach Breslau, wo er eine Professor für Theatermalerei an der Staatlichen Akademie für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe erhielt. Ab 1936 war er Leiter des Ausstattungswesens am Breslauer Opernhaus. Die Nationalsozialisten beschlagnahmten 1937 sein Triptychon « Transfiguration » und erklärten es zur entarteten Kunst.

Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg kehrte Hans Wildermann in seine Heimatstadt Köln zurück, wo er zuletzt in Riehl unweit des Zoologischen Gartens wohnte. Am 1. November 1954 starb er in der Universitätsklinik im Stadtteil Lindenthal. Aus seiner Ehe ging eine Tochter, Angelika, hervor.

Schon in den 1920er Jahren verband Wildermann eine tiefe Freundschaft zu dem nationalistischen und seit 1933 nationalsozialistischen Regensburger Musikbuchverleger Gustav Bosse. Dieser ließ ihn den Almanach der Deutschen Musikbücherei (1920-1927) umfänglich bebildern und widmete ihm eine eigene Verlagslinie, Hans-Wildermann-Werke, in der schon 1923 fast das gesamte graphische Werk erschienen war. Wildermann schnitt 1936 die Anton-Bruckner-Medaille der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft anlässlich der Enthüllung der Büste Anton Bruckners in der « Walhalla » am 6. Juni 1937 ; ein Auftrag, der einmal mehr von Bosse ausging. Noch 1942 illustrierte er das Buch Italienische Dichtung von Dante bis Benito Mussolini - Eine Anthologie (Gauverlag-NS-Schlesien) , wurde im gleichen Jahr mit dem Buch von Siegmund Skrap Die Oper als lebendiges Theater durch die Abbildung von 35 Bühnenbildern gewürdigt. Seine Illustrationen zu « Die Schildbürger » erschienen in der Feldpostausgabe 1942 zum 63tausendsten Mal. Zu seinem 60. Geburtstag 1944 erschien in der Zeitschrift Musik im Kriege - Organ des Amtes Musik beim Beauftragten des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP die Hommage von Carl Niessen Hans Wildermann als Bühnenbildner (Heft 1, Seiten 7-9) .

Hans Wildermann begann seine Karriere während der wirtschaftlich schwierigen Zeit der Weimarer Republik. Er nutzte die finanziellen Engpässe aber als Chance und setzte neue Entwicklungen aus der Malerei in der Bühnenbilderei um. Statt aufwendiger, dekorativer Kulissen verwendete er einfache Formen und erzielte gewünschte Effekte mit Farben und

Beleuchtung.

Neben seiner Arbeit als Bühnenbildner arbeitete Wildermann auch stets als Bildhauer, Maler und Grafiker. Das Dortmunder Kunst- und Gewerbemuseum widmete ihm einen Platz in seiner Dauerausstellung.

Die 1933 von Doktor Ernst Scheyer, Kustos und stellvertretender Direktor des schlesischen Museums für Kunstgewerbe und Altertümer zu Breslau herausgegebene « Werkfolge » der Werke Hans Wildermanns umfasst 589 Titel. Darunter 72 Gemälde und 60 Plastiken.

Homer, 1911, Wandgemälde im Deutschen Theater : 10, Köln, Bismarckstraße 7 (kriegszerstört) .

Faust am Meer, 1911, Wandgemälde im Deutschen Theater : 10, Köln, Bismarckstraße 7 (kriegszerstört) .

Griechischer Frühling, 1913, Wandgemälde in der Villa Kruska : 11, Köln-Lindenthal, Pfarriusstraße 4 (Architekt Joseph Maria Olbrich, 1907-1908) .

Transfiguration, Elias, Johannes der Täufer, 1924, Triptychon, Öl auf Holz : 12.

Doktor Max Martersteig, 1908, Bronze (1933 : Besitzer Theatermuseum Köln) : 16.

Mädchen mit Reh, 1911, Bronze-Skulptur : 16, Köln-Riehl (Flora) .

Jüngling mit Pony (auch : Jüngling mit Pferd) 1911, Bronze-Skulptur : 16, Köln-Müngersdorf, Stadionschwimmbad
Schiffahrtsbrunnen, 1912, Bronze : 16, für die Düsseldorfer Städteausstellung erstellt, 1913 in Köln-Mülheim aufgestellt
Industrie- und Handelsbrunnen, 1912, Bronze : 16, für die Düsseldorfer Städteausstellung erstellt, 1913 in Köln-Mülheim aufgestellt.

Knabe mit Kaninchen, 1913, Bronze auf Steinsockel, Köln-Kalk (Stadtgarten) : 16.

Christian Morgenstern, 1918, Bronzeplastik (1933 im Städtischen Museum, Darmstadt) : 17.

Johannes der Täufer, 1924, Holzstatue : 17.

Otto-Lohse-Urne (mit 3 Figuren) , 1925, Bronzetempechen zu Ehren von Otto Lohse : 18.

Liegende-Madonna, 1928, Holzplastik : 18.

Faust-Wirklichkeiten, 1909 bis 1919, Sammlung mit 49 Drucken : 20, entstanden aus Anlass der Faust-Inszenierungen von Max Martersteig.

Vier Elemente, 1922, Grafik : 30.

...

1936 : Au-delà du 40e anniversaire de la mort d'Anton Bruckner (1896-1936) , Josef Gœbbels commentera l'année en ces termes :

« Nous nous sommes finalement libérés des chaînes de Versailles. » En effet, l'Allemagne était redevenue une formidable « machine de guerre » .

The strong role music played in Nazi politics may strike some as unusual ; contemporary political and cultural wars have more to do with sex and violence than with atonality and dissonance. But, in the Germany of the 1930's, music was seen as the most Sacred manifestation of what Hans Sachs, in Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » , calls « holy German art » , and the stakes were high.

Il ne faut pas oublier la filiation nostalgique de Hitler et de Bruckner à travers leur expérience comme enfant de chœur (le 1er à l'abbaye de Lambach et le second à celui de Saint-Florian) . Le futur Chancelier développa un intérêt particulier pour Bruckner lorsque, jeune homme, il assista à un « Bruckner-Festkonzerte » organisé à Linz par le proche du compositeur, August Göllerich.

Hitler's Day of German Art, Munich (1937)

« Tag Der Deutschen Kunst, München (1937) »

« Hitler's Day of German Art (1937) » provides a unique insight into the very little-known celebrations, which took place at each opening of the annual Great German Art Exhibition, from 1937 to 1944, usually during the month of July. The celebrations of the « Day of German Art » lasted 3 days and always began on a Friday. The Sunday marked the climax with the official opening of the exhibition as a large procession entitled, « 2,000 Years of German Culture » , moved through the streets of Munich. The procession illustrated German history, legends and myths and how they were linked to the 3rd « Reich » . The re-print of this rare book will be welcomed by scholars of the period as an indispensable primary source offering a valuable perspective on the formation and development of Nazi ideology.

Edited by Joachim Von Halasz, Foxley Books (5 January 2009) .

Paperback : 14 x 0.3 x 21.6 cm ; 52 pages ; 499 g.

ISBN-10 : 1905742207

ISBN-13 : 978-1905742202

...

Les liens de l'IBG (l' « Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft ») avec le régime nazi ont précédé l' « Anschluß » de 1938. Adolf Hitler avait alors aidé la « Bruckner-Gesellschaft » dans un projet fort symbolique et politique, mais sans aucune importance pratique. En 1931, l'IBG avait demandé au Ministère bavarois de la Culture de voir un buste du compositeur Anton Bruckner être installé à l'intérieur du Panthéon du « Walhalla », une vitrine culturelle pour la promotion des héros germaniques. (Le compositeur Richard Wagner avait été intronisé au même Panthéon pan-Germanique en 1913.) Ce temple néo-dorique en marbre surplombant le Danube, inspiré du Parthénon de l'Acropole et érigé entre 1830 et 1841 par Louis Ier de Bavière, se trouve à Donaustauf, à 10 kilomètres en aval de Ratisbonne (« Regensburg »). La pétition a échoué, mais, au moment de l'achèvement de la dernière tranche de l'exhaustif ouvrage sur Bruckner amorcé par son biographe personnel August Göllerich et complété, suite à son décès, par le musicologue Max Auer, ce dernier sera en mesure d'apporter le « dernier coup de pouce nécessaire » au projet d'intronisation, lors de sa publication intégrale des volumes en 1937 :

« Le “ Führer ” et Chancelier du “ Reich ” allemand, Adolf Hitler, a enfin accédé à la demande de la Société internationale Bruckner que le buste du compositeur soit installé dans la Salle d'honneur pan-germanique du “ Walhalla ” de Ratisbonne. »

Letzter Anmeldungstermin 22. Mai. 1937

Der originale Bruckner* Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse von Hans Weisbach, Leipzig

(* Vergleiche hierzu den Artikel von Hans Weisbach in der von der I. B. G. herausgegebenen Broschüre « Anton Bruckner - wissenschaftliche und künstlerische Betrachtungen zu den Originalfassungen » .)

In der folgenden Abhandlung soll nicht ein Eingreifen in den schwebenden Streit um die Fassungen, sondern nur eine Mitteilung persönlicher Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse erfolgen.

Die Tatsache, daß wir jetzt von einigen Symphonien Bruckners außer den als Erstdrucke bekannten Fassungen, deren Herkunft beziehungsweise deren Herausgeber zum großen Teil nicht feststehen, die den Brucknerschen Handschriften genau entsprechenden sogenannten Originalfassungen besitzen, zwingt jeden, der sich ernsthaft mit der Darstellung der Symphonien Bruckners befaßt, seinem künstlerischen Gewissen die Frage vorzulegen, welche von den Fassungen nach seiner Meinung den schöpferischen Willen Bruckners zum Ausdruck bringt.

Es handelt sich bei der Beantwortung dieser Frage nicht um eine Sache des musikalischen Geschmacks wie etwa bei der Auswahl einer von den vielen Bearbeitungen der Beethovenschen Klaviersonaten, sondern um eine ernste und schwerwiegende Entscheidung, die zugleich ein Bekenntnis bedeutet.

Schwerwiegend deshalb, weil der Unterschied der Fassungen eben nicht in belanglosen Retuschen besteht, sondern weil er grundsätzlicher Natur ist, und zwar in so bedeutendem Maße, daß wir uns zwei in wesentlichen Zügen stark voneinander abweichenden Gestaltungen desselben Kunstwerks gegenübersehen. Schwerwiegend auch deshalb, weil ich glaube, daß unsere Generation, die vom Schicksal vor diese Entscheidung gestellt wurde, gewissermaßen die

Verantwortung dafür trägt, in welcher Form in Zukunft die Symphonien Bruckners im Geistesleben der Menschheit lebendig sein werden.

Da sich nun der Unterschied oftmals in einer tiefgehenden Verschiedenheit der musikalischen Struktur zeigt, scheidet für mich die Möglichkeit, beide Fassungen könnten die Autorschaft Bruckners in gleicher Weise für sich in Anspruch nehmen, vollkommen aus. Bruckner steht mir zu hoch, als daß ich ihm eine so indifferente künstlerische Haltung anzudichten imstande wäre, daß er heute einen in hymnischer Verzückung zur stärksten Glut des Ausdrucks sich steigernden Gesang niederschreibt, um ihn morgen so abzuändern, daß er in einem schwächlichen *pp* verendet (Adagio der 9. Symphonie).

Es steht für mich fest, daß nur eine von den Fassungen die richtige, den Urgestaltungswillen Bruckners darstellende sein kann.

Den einzigen Weg, um zu einer innerlich begründeten Entscheidung zu gelangen, erblicke ich darin, daß wir (unabhängig von dem Streit der Wissenschaftler) den rein künstlerisch-nachschöpferischen Standpunkt zum entscheidenden machen, daß wir gleichsam Bruckner selbst befragen, indem wir uns nach den Originalfassungen von neuem ein Bild seines Wesens, seiner Geisteskraft, seines Musikgefühls und der daraus entstandenen Klangwelt in ihren unerhörten Ausmaßen herstellen.

Es muß aber doch wohl jedem, der sich die Originalfassungen gründlich zu eigen gemacht hat, klar geworden sein, daß unsere bisherige Vorstellung von der geistigen und besonders von der klanglichen Gewalt dieser Tonsprache nicht ausgereicht hat. Dafür müßten allein schon die uns bisher vorenthaltenen Stücke der 4. und 5. Symphonie genügen. Oder soll uns zugemutet werden, auf ein noch großartigeres, kräftigeres Bild Bruckners, wie es uns die Originalfassungen offenbaren, zu verzichten zugunsten eines matteren und schwächeren ?

Wenn ich erkläre, daß ich in Zukunft die Symphonien Bruckners nie mehr anders als in den Originalfassungen aufführen werde, so geschieht das, weil ich die Überzeugung gewonnen habe, daß diese allein den ursprünglichen künstlerischen Willen Bruckners darstellen und daß sie allein vollkommen dem geistigen Gehalt und der Form- und Klangwelt seiner Werke entsprechen.

Zu dieser Überzeugung bin ich nicht dadurch gelangt, daß ich mich nach Kenntnisnahme der verschiedenen Argumente, die die Wissenschaftler für und gegen die Originalfassungen vorgebracht haben, einfach einer der streitenden Parteien angeschlossen habe, sondern es haben mich rein künstlerische Erwägungen dazu geführt, die mit dem Erscheinen der Originalfassung der 9. Symphonie begannen (also ehe von einem Streit die Rede war) und dann ihre selbstverständliche Bestätigung und Fortsetzung mit der Veröffentlichung der weiteren Originalfassungen fanden.

Der Kenntnis der Originalfassungen aber ging voraus eine fast anderthalb Jahrzehnte lange Arbeit oder (besser gesagt) ein Ringen um eine end- und vollgültige Gestaltung der Brucknerschen Symphonien. Zu den Erfahrungen, die ich mit der Aufführung dieser Werke nicht nur in vielen deutschen Städten, sondern auch vor ausländischem Publikum (Budapest, Stockholm, Kopenhagen) gemacht habe, gesellten sich die von zwei vollständigen Zyklen sämtlicher Symphonien, der letzte mit allen bisher erschienenen Originalfassungen.

(Ich erwähne das nur deshalb, weil nach meiner Ansicht eine derartig intensive Arbeit an der Darstellung Bruckners die Voraussetzung für die Berechtigung ist, seine persönliche Meinung in die Waagschale zu werfen.)

Und nun möchte ich einmal alle Dirigenten, denen die Darstellung der Brucknerschen Symphonien zur Herzenssache, wenn nicht zur Lebensaufgabe geworden ist, fragen, ob nicht auch ihnen das Erscheinen der Originalfassungen eine endgültige Befreiung von allerlei Zweifeln bedeutet hat, die sich bei jeder Aufführung immer wieder erneut einstellen und einen nie zu einer vollen Befriedigung über die eigene nachschöpferische Gestaltung kommen ließen.

Ich glaube, sie werden zugeben, daß dort, wo früher Probleme auftauchten, jetzt plötzlich absolute Klarheit, Selbstverständlichkeit und zwingende Logik des Aufbaus und Ablaufs herrscht. Denn im Gegensatz zu den durchaus nicht immer einheitlich und konsequent durchgeführten Bearbeitungen der Erst-drucke bringen die Originalfassungen den künstlerischen Willen Bruckners mit einer solchen eindeutigen Bestimmtheit zum Ausdruck, daß die Möglichkeit, diese Musik verschieden zu « deuten » oder « aufzufassen », von vornherein ausgeschaltet wird.

Und wenn wirklich nachzuweisen wäre, daß manches an den anderen Fassungen von Bruckner selbst genehmigt wurde, so kann doch niemand an der Tatsache rütteln, daß die mit den Handschriften übereinstimmenden Originalfassungen das ursprüngliche Ergebnis des eigentlichen Schaffensprozesses, das heißt die erste in die Materie des Klanges umgewandelte Form der Eingebungen, die erste, durch Skizzen allmählich gewonnene Gesamtgestaltung des geistig erschauten Kunstwerks darstellen.

Sie müssen also als Fundament für jede Interpretation gelten, um so mehr, als wir wissen, daß die vollständige Niederschrift bei Bruckner niemals in Eile geschah, sondern stets die Frucht eines lang en Reifens war.

Welche Erkenntnisse sind aus den Originalfassungen abzuleiten ?

Die Bedeutung der Originalfassungen erhöht sich für mich durch die Feststellung, daß sie unter sich die gleichen Wesenszüge tragen. Was wir in der 9. Symphonie finden, begegnet uns auch schon in der 4. oder 5. Aus der Fülle von Beispielen greife ich die Abstufung vom fff bis zum ppp heraus. Da bei Bruckner nicht nur die seelische, sondern auch die formale Gestaltung enger als bei anderen mit dem Klang verknüpft ist, ergibt eine strenge Innehaltung seiner Vorschriften -das heißt ein wahrnehmbarer Unterschied zwischen pp und ppp und zwischen ff und fff - ganz von selbst einen so natürlichen und einfachen Aufbau der Klangräume, daß alle Zutaten der Dirigenten (wie sie in den alten Erstdrucken in Form von *erescendi*, *diminuendi*, *ritardandi* und *accelerandi* in großen Mengen hinzugesetzt wurden) nicht nur überflüssig werden, sondern sogar im Gegenteil die Stileigentümlichkeit vernichten, die in einer großlinigen, gesunden und kraftvollen Entwicklung jedes musikalischen Gedankens ihren Ausdruck finden. (Allerdings ist die Voraussetzung immer das richtige Tempo.)

Auffallend ist, daß Bruckner in der 9. Symphonie noch genau wie in der 4. das fff gleichmäßig durch die ganze Partitur schreibt und kein Instrument davon ausnimmt. Wenn er diese Forderung eines ungeheuer starken, elementaren Klangerlebnisses in seinem letzten Werk genau so ausdrückt wie in seinen früheren und uns außerdem noch bei der

Bearbeitung der I. Symphonie den besonders auffallenden Beweis dieser Willensrichtung gibt, indem er die in der Linzer Fassung noch anzutreffende Gepflogenheit, die Trompeten und Pauken um einen Stärkegrad schwächer zu notieren, an einigen Stellen aufgibt, um in der Wiener Fassung dafür das durchgehende ff zu verlangen (I. Satz, Buchstabe A) oder das ff durch ,ein durchgehendes fff zu ersetzen (I. Satz, 4 Takte nach Z) , so müssen wir diese Tatsache nicht nur nicht als « Unbeholfenheit » oder « Unerfahrenheit » , sondern im Gegenteil als einen ganz kategorischen Hinweis darauf werten, daß derartige Klangperioden unbedingt für den Aufbau des Ganzen erforderlich sind.

Die Erfüllung dieser Forderung aber birgt zugleich eine innere Rechtfertigung der Riesendimensionen der Symphonien in sich. Denn wir müssen sie so verstehen, daß er von dem wunderbaren Wesen, von dem unendlichen Reichtum und der Weite seines erhabenen Weltgefühls nicht anders Kunde geben konnte als durch die ruhevoll sich entwickelnde Gestaltung der vielen feinen Abstufungen vom leisesten Ahnen einer ewigen Stille bis zu überwältigenden Klangentladungen. Das klangliche Gleichgewicht der Sätze aber ist mit solchem Feingefühl abgewogen, daß jede Abschwächung des fff und jede Verstärkung des ppp eine formzerstörende Nivellierung der großartig geschauten Konturen bedeutet.

Bruckners Klangwelt

Die Originalfassungen geben uns eine ganz klare Erkenntnis von der Klangwelt Bruckners. Darunter verstehe ich das ganz besondere Klanggebilde, das er sich schaffen mußte, um seine musikalischen Ideen für andere sinnlich wahrnehmbar zu machen. Aber ebenso wie diese Ideen einmalige Geisteserzeugnisse des Genies sind, kann ihnen nur eine einzige, und zwar aus demselben Geist geborene Klangerscheinung entsprechen.

Es gibt keinen größeren Irrtum, als wenn man die Brucknersche Klangwelt in irgend eine Beziehung oder gar in ein Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zu der Richard Wagners bringt. Im Gegenteil : die schöpferische Kraft Bruckners erweist sich gerade dadurch so stark, daß er trotz der unsagbaren Verehrung, mit dem er den « Meister der Meister » geradezu anbetete, trotz des eifrigsten Bestrebens, aus den Partituren Wagners zu lernen, sich seine ureigene Klangwelt schuf, die von der Wagners ebenso weit entfernt ist wie dessen Geisteswelt von der seinigen.

Das Wesen der Klangwelt Bruckners ist das einer reinen Naturkraft, deren Aeußerungen in jeder Phase ihres Wirkens die Ruhe ihres göttlichen Ursprungs ausstrahlt, ob sie nun die atemlose Stille ewiger Fernen oder die Weihe hymnischer Gesänge oder die majestätische Gewalt eines elementaren Naturereignisses kündigt.

Die Originalfassungen aber fordern gebieterisch, dieser Klangwelt an sich größere Bedeutung zuzumessen, als das bisher geschah. Wir stehen ja überhaupt vor der merkwürdigen Tatsache, daß (wie die vielen ausgezeichneten Bücher über Bruckner beweisen) das Wesen der Brucknerschen Musik zwar geistig und theoretisch in seiner ganzen Größe und Eigenart erkannt worden ist, daß aber die Praxis damit nicht gleichen Schritt gehalten hat und nicht halten konnte, weil die Dirigenten in den vielen Bezeichnungen für Tempo und Dynamik, die sich in den Erstdrucken finden, unbedingt zu respektierenden Anweisungen Bruckners erblicken zu müssen glaubten. Nun aber lehren es die Originalfassungen anders.

Wie weit die Bearbeiter der Erstdruckfassungen sich und die ihnen ausgelieferten Dirigenten vom « wahren » Bruckner entfernt haben, erweist ein Blick auf das Scherzo der 9. Symphonie. An Stelle der huschenden, erregenden Pizzikati, durch die Bruckner offensichtlich die unheimliche Spannung bis zu dem dämonischen Einschlag des ff erzeugen will, bekommen wir fröhliche Flöten- und Fagottstakkati zu hören. Als Erklärung für eine solche Instrumentationsänderung kann man nur ein mißverständenes Tempo annehmen, und die Bearbeiter bestätigen die Richtigkeit dieser Annahme sogleich durch die Aenderung des gewaltigen Streicher-Unisono am Ende des ersten und zweiten Teiles des Scherzo. Bruckner verlangt dort von den Bässen dieselben sich aufbäumenden Achtelläufe wie von den Geigen. Die Bearbeiter müßen eine sehr geringe Meinung von der Intelligenz des Meisters gehabt haben, wenn sie ihn, nachdem er neun Symphonien geschrieben, darüber belehren zu müßen glaubten, daß man auf dem Kontrabaß solche Stellen in einem schnellen Tempo nicht spielen kann und einfach die an einem Pult spielenden Musiker sich in die Noten teilen ließen. Die praktische Auswirkung dieser Maßnahme aber ist, daß in Wirklichkeit die ganze Stelle nur von der Hälfte aller Streicher gespielt und die von Bruckner zweifellos beabsichtigte Vehemenz auf die Hälfte abgedrosselt wird. Besser hätte man getan, sich die Tempobezeichnung Bruckners genau anzusehen, die mit den sehr klaren Worten « bewegt, lebhaft » jeden Hinweis auf ein « schnelles » Tempo vermeidet.

In welchem Gegensatz dazu steht die Klangwelt, wie sie nach dem Bild, das uns die Originalfassungen vermitteln, in der Phantasie Bruckners gelebt haben muß ! Ganz einheitlich belehren uns diese darüber, daß er von den Streichinstrumenten eine Klangvorstellung hatte, deren Verwirklichung eine große Besetzung voraussetzt.

Die charakteristische Bemerkung Weingartners in einem Brief an Bruckner, ihm müße wohl die große Streicherbesetzung der Wiener Philharmoniker bei der Instrumentation der 8. Symphonie vorgeschwebt haben, könnte sich ebenso auf alle anderen Symphonien beziehen. Denn was er Geigen, Bratschen, Celli und Bässen an reinsten naturgesegneter Sinnenschönheit anvertraut, das muß in üppigster, klanggesättigter Fülle aufblühen ; und was er ihnen an feuriger Bewegtheit und flammender Kraft anvertraut, das muß mit der elementaren Wucht eines gebändigten Naturereignisses zu Klang werden.

Wir dienen also dem Kunstwerk Bruckners, wenn wir die in den Originalfassungen deutlich ausgesprochene Forderung, dem Bläserchor einen an Klangentfaltung ebenbürtigen Streichkörper entgegenzustellen, erfüllen, denn ebenso wie ein noch klingendes fff läßt sich auch ein schon klingendes ppp Tremolo nur mit einem starken Streichkörper erzielen ; besonders, wenn sich dieses aus leisestem, mystischem Schauer stetig anwachsend bis zum flimmernden Glanze hellsten Lichtes entwickeln soll, wie am Schluß der 4. Symphonie. Bemerkenswert ist hier, daß die Bearbeiter des Erstdrucks diese Stelle in den Geigen mit einer schwerfalligen Achtelbewegung beginnen lassen. Der Grund hiefür ist jedenfalls die Befürchtung, daß die Streicher bei der sehr langen Stelle ermüden. Eine starke Besetzung aber wirkt dieser natürlichen Ermüdung gegenüber ausgleichend und läßt sie weniger in Erscheinung treten.

Was nützen aber alle diese Erkenntnisse von Bruckners Klangwelt, wenn sie nicht von der richtigen Empfindung für seine Tempi begleitet sind !

Tempo und Phrasierung

Hier haben glücklicherweise die Originalfassungen wie ein reinigendes Gewitter Klarheit geschaffen.

In der Seele dieses Mannes, der nicht in Erlebnissen des irdischen Daseins Anlaß zum künstlerischen Schaffen fand, sondern seinen schöpferischen Geist in unendliche Fernen sandte, dem sich die göttlichen Wunder des Weltalls zu Klängen formten, in die er das heiße Blut seines Menschenherzens hineinströmen ließ, in der Seele dieses Mannes mußte die Musik zu einem ruhig und machtvoll hinfließenden, tiefen Strom eines erhabenen Weltgefühls werden. Wer bisher nicht erkannt hat, daß dem Wesen dieser Musik jede Tendenz zum dramatischen Affekt und Effekt fremd ist, dem sagen es die Originalfassungen auf jeder Seite und lassen ihn staunend erkennen, wie wenig Veränderungen des Grundtempos Bruckner wünscht. Seine Tempo-angaben bedeuten nicht Zwang wie bei so vielen Bezeichnungen in den Erstdrucken, denen man sich nur widerwillig fügte, sondern sie erzeugen das befreiende Gefühl eines freiwilligen und freudigen Sichunterordnens, weil sie mit dem Wesen der Musik eine vollkommene Einheit bilden. In unmittelbarem Zusammenhang mit dem Tempo steht die (wiederum in allen Originalfassungen einheitlich erkennbare) Behandlung der Phrasierungsbögen in den Streichinstrumenten. Gerade bei gesangvollen Stellen höchster Ausdruckskraft begegnen wir immer wieder der Brucknerschen Eigenart, die Bindebögen wegzulassen und jeder einzelnen Note den Nachdruck eines besonderen Bogenstrichs zu verleihen. In Verbindung mit der charakteristischen Bezeichnung « lang gezogen » erreicht er dadurch, daß nicht durch sparsame Bogeneinteilung die vollströmende Ton- und Ausdrucksgebung gehemmt wird oder (positiv ausgedrückt) , daß sowohl dem Dirigenten wie auch den Spielern die Möglichkeit gegeben wird, das ruhige Tempo mit höchstem Klang und tiefstem Ausdruck zu erfüllen.

Zugleich verrät Bruckner damit eine außerordentlich feine Kenntnis des Orchesterklanges : er weiß genau, daß trotz Fehlens der Bindebögen solche Kantilenen bei einem stark besetzten Streichkörper wie gebunden klingen. Außerdem aber ergibt sich noch eine andere - für sein Wesen sehr charakteristische Auswirkung : Alle solche Stellen bekommen einen edleren, reineren (ich möchte fast sagen) keuscheren Ausdruck.

Kürzungen

Auf die wohl am meisten umstrittene Frage der Kürzungen gibt uns Bruckner selbst eine so bündige, klare Antwort, daß diese Streitfrage damit eigentlich ein für allemal erledigt sein müßte. Es heißt Bruckner fälschen, wenn man die an Weingartner gerichteten Worte : « Bitte sehr, das Finale so wie es angezeigt ist, fest zu kürzen » , wiedergibt, ohne den nachfolgenden Satz hinzuzufügen : « denn es wäre viel zu lange und giltnurspäteren Zeiten » . Oder wenn man die Worte : « Die Tempi bitte ich ganz ad libitum abändern zu wollen » wiedergibt, ohne den Satz aus einem anderen Brief hinzuzufügen : « Bitte nur zu verfügen, wie es Ihr Orchester erfordert ; aber die Partitur bitte ich nicht zu ändern ; auch bei Drucklegung die Orchesterstimmen unverändert zu lassen, ist eine meiner innigsten Bitten. »

Noch deutlicher konnte es Bruckner nicht ausdrücken, daß er alle Freiheiten, die er dem Dirigenten einräumte (hier dürfen wir auch die auf Rat seiner Freunde von ihm gemachten oder genehmigten Änderungen einbeziehen) , nur als vorläufige gelten lassen wollte, solange es sich darum handelte, alles aus dem Wege zu räumen, was sich damals einer Aufführung seiner Werke entgegenstellen könnte. Denn die Sorge, daß seine Werke, wenn sie nicht noch zu seinen Lebzeiten aufgeführt würden, ganz der Vergessenheit anheimfallen könnten, schien angesichts der feindseligen Haltung der Presse berechtigt.

Nun ist es an uns, auf die Frage Antwort zu geben, ob wir den Anspruch erheben dürfen, die von Bruckner prophetisch geahnten « späteren Zeiten » zu sein.

Ein holländisches Buch über Bruckner Wouter

Wouter Paap : « Anton Bruckner, sein Land, sein Leben und seine Kunst. » (Die Gemeinschaft, Bilkoven 1936.)

Wouter Paap hat ein in vieler Beziehung vortreffliches Buch über Bruckner geschrieben, welches warme Empfehlung verdient. Der Verfasser war von der Absicht geleitet, eine Einleitung zu Bruckners Werk zu schreiben und als Ausgangspunkt wählte, er die Verbundenheit zwischen dem Menschen und dem Künstler Anton Bruckner. Dieser Gedanke scheint mir wichtig genug. Lange Zeit war es üblich, in dem Phänomen « Bruckner » den Menschen vom Künstler zu trennen ; von einem psychologischen Rätsel zu sprechen, wie eine derartige Musik gerade in solch einer Persönlichkeit entstehen konnte, wobei man dann Bruckners Menschlichkeit als beschränkt und lächerlich-naiv ansehen wollte. Paap betrachtet die Musik als eine Aeußerung des Menschen Bruckner und zeigt die Verbindung zwischen dieser Menschlichkeit und dem Boden, dem sie entsprossen ist : dem oberösterreichischen Land und als dessen Kern dem Barockkloster Sankt Florian. Als eine Aeußerung selbständigen Denkens ist das dritte Kapitel dieses Buches, betitelt « Der Künstler des Barock » , wohl das wertvollste, obwohl der Verfasser hier zu Ansichten gelangt, die vielleicht anfechtbar sind. Denn so wahr es auch ist, daß die Barockkunst, die Bruckners Jugend umgab, seinen Lebensstil mehr oder weniger stark beeinflussen mußte, scheint es mir doch unrichtig, sein ganzes Wesen um anderthalb Jahrhunderte zurückzusetzen. Bruckner ist doch irgendwie auch eine Erscheinung des 19. Jahrhunderts, zum Beispiel in seinen Scherzi mit ihren « romantischen » Trios ; andererseits ist das Barock als Lebensstil wesentlich raffinierter und sinnlicher als je eine musikalische Aeußerung Bruckners.

Was Paap in dieser Beziehung über die Parallelität zwischen Musik und bildenden Künsten bemerkt, fordert zu einigem Widerspruch heraus. Wenn er zum Beispiel in der Musik von Froberger bis Bach die Charakteristiken des Barockstils der bildenden Künste vermißt (Seite 55) , dann kommt dies daher, daß er sich ausschließlich auf den Klavierkomponisten beschränkt und vergißt, daß in jener Periode Meister wie Lully, Purcell, Corelli, Buxtehude gewirkt haben, deren Musik sicher in Verbindung mit jenen Aeußerungen bildender Kunst zu bringen wären, welche man in dem Sammelnamen « Barock » zusammenzufassen pflegt, einem Stil, der jedoch so verschiedenartig ist, daß man die wesentlichen Eigenschaften eher in den besonderen Charakteristiken als in der allgemeinen Kunstrichtung suchen muß.

Doch auch aus diesem Kapitel ergibt sich, daß Wouter Paap seine Monographie gründlich vorbereitet und die in Betracht kommende Hauptliteratur gründlich durchgearbeitet hat. Daher ist es zu begrüßen, daß er es verstanden hat, seine Schreibweise trotz des vielen biographischen, ästhetischen und anekdotischen Materials so packend und angenehm lesbar zu halten. Dieses Büchlein von etwa 160 Seiten enthält ungefähr alle Daten, die für eine einigermaßen gründliche Kenntnis von Bruckners Persönlichkeit nötig sind. Schade ist nur, daß dadurch die Musik selbst einigermaßen in den Hintergrund geraten ist. Wohl gibt Paap hie und da typische Beispiele von Bruckners Chorstil und seiner melodischen Schreibart. Mit Recht sieht er als Ausgangspunkt von Bruckners Kunst « Musik in ihrer elementarsten Erscheinungsform : die Melodie, das Thema » (Seite 13) . Aber man würde auf diesem Gebiete doch wohl

etwas mehr Ausführlichkeit und besonders eine tiefere Charakterisierung wünschen. Doch scheint sich der Verfasser dies nicht als Aufgabe gestellt zu haben.

Auch die Daten über das Verhältnis der Außenwelt mit Beziehung zu Bruckners Musik sind mit Sorgfalt und Gefühl für das Wichtige zusammengestellt ; besonders jene Seiten, auf welchen über die Bruckner-Aufführungen in den Niederlanden gesprochen wird (Seite 137 ff.) , sind sicher von Bedeutung.

Das Eduard van Beinum gewidmete Büchlein ist mit Geschmack zusammengestellt, wenn auch die köstlichen Schattenbilder (nicht « Karikaturen » !) von Otto Böhler nicht besonders glücklich wiedergegeben sind. Eine zugehörige Literaturliste verstärkt den « einleitenden Charakter » dieser Monographie, welche in diesem Rahmen mit Ehren genannt werden darf.

(Eduard Reeser, Rotterdam.)

ANTON BRUCKNER : KRITISCHE GESAMTAUSGABE, HERAUSGEGEBEN IM AUFTRAGE DER NATIONALBIBLIOTHEK WIEN UND DER INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNER-GESELLSCHAFT

I. SYMPHONIE IN C-MOLL

(WIENER UND LINZER FASSUNG) VORBLEGT VON ROBERT HAAS

A) Wissenschaftliche Ausgabe mit Bericht des Herausgebers : Reich Mark 60. , S. 120.

Für Subskribenten der Gesamtausgabe : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

(LINZER FASSUNG)

B) Ausgabe zu Aufführungszwecken : Partitur-Sonderausgabe : Reich Mark 30. , S. 60.

Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 3.50, S. 7.

Orchesterstimmen auf Anfrage

IV. SYMPHONIE IN ES-DUR VORGELEGT VON ROBERT HAAS

A) Wissenschaftliche Ausgabe mit Bericht des Herausgebers, Finale von 1878 : Reich Mark 60. , S. 120.

Für Subskribenten : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

B) Ausgabe zu Aufführungszwecken : Partitur-Sonderausgabe : Reich Mark 40. , S. 80.

Finale von 1878 (« Volksfest ») : Reich Mark 15. , S. 30.

Orchesterstimmen auf Anfrage

C) Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 4. , S. 8.

V. SYMPHONIE IN B-DUR VORGELEGT VON ROBERT HAAS

A) Wissenschaftliche Ausgabe mit Bericht des Herausgebers . Reich Mark 60. , S. 120.

Für Subskribenten der Gesamtausgabe : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

B) Ausgabe zu Aufführungszwecken : Partitur-Sonderausgabe : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 4. , S. 8.

Orchesterstimmen auf Anfrage

VI. SYMPHONIE IN A-DUR VORGELEGT VON ROBERT HAAS

A) Wissenschaftliche Ausgabe mit Bericht des Herausgebers . Reich Mark 60. , S. 120.

Für Subskribenten der Gesamtausgabe : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

B) Ausgabe zu Aufführungszwecken : Partitur-Sonderausgabe. Reich Mark 40. , S. 80.

Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 3.50, S. 7.

Orchesterstimmen auf Anfrage

IX. SYMPHONIE D-MOLL VORGELEGT VON ALFRED OREL

A) Wissenschaftliche Ausgabe mit Bericht des Herausgebers : Reich Mark 60. , S. 120.

Subskribenten der Gesamtausgabe : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

B) Ausgabe zu Aufführungszwecken : Partitur-Sonderausgabe : Reich Mark 50. , S. 100.

Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 4. , S. 8.

Orchesterstimmen auf Anfrage

C) Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie mit Erläuterung : Reich Mark 20. , S. 40.

In Vorbereitung : VIII. SYMPHONIE IN C-MOLL

MISSA SOLEMNIS IN B-MOLL FOR SOLI, CHOR, ORCHESTER UND ORGEL VORGELEGT VON ROBERT HAAS

Partitur-Sonderausgabe (zu Aufführungszwecken) : Reich Mark 20. , S. 40.

Klavierauszug (von Ferdinand Habel) : Reich Mark 5. , S. 10.

Chorstimmen : je Reich Mark 0.80, S. 1.60.

Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 3. , S. 6.

Orchestermaterial auf Anfrage

REQUIEM IN D-MOLL FOR SOLI, CHOR, ORCHESTER UND ORGEL VORGELEGT VON ROBERT HAAS

Partitur-Sonderausgabe (zu Aufführungszwecken) : Reich Mark 15. , S. 30.

Klavierauszug (von Ludwig Berberich) : Reich Mark 5. , S. 10.

Chorstimmen : je Reich Mark 0.80, S. 1.60.

Studienpartitur : Reich Mark 3. , S. 6.

Orchestermaterial auf Anfrage

CHRISTUS FACTUS EST

Motette für gemischten Chor a cappella.

Partitur : Reich Mark 1.20, S. 2.40.

Chorstimmen : je Reich Mark 20. , S. 0.40.

4 ORCHESTERSTÜCKE VORGELEGT VON ALFRED OREL

Marsch : Moderato - Allegro non troppo - Andante eon moto.

Partitur (27 : 37 cm) : Reich Mark 7.50, S. 15.

Orchesterstimmen auf Anfrage Ausgabe

Ausgabe für Blasmusik (Direktions- und Bläserstimmen) : Reich Mark 4.80, S. 9.60.

MARSCH IN ES-DUR

Ausgabe für Blasmusik (Direktions- und Bläserstimmen) : Reich Mark 3. , S. 6.

MAX AUER : ANTON BRUCKNER - SEIN LEBEN UND WERK

480 Seiten Text, 300 Notenbeispiele, 31 Abbildungen. Ganzleinen : Reich Mark 8. , S. 16.

FRANZ SCHALK BRIEFE UND BETRACHTUNGEN

Veröffentlicht von LILI SCHALK. Preis : Reich Mark 2. , S. 4.

MUSIKWISSENSCHAFTLICHER VERLAG, REGIERUNG GENERAL MIT BESCHRÄNKTER HAFTUNG DER INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNER-GESELLSCHAFT WIEN, IV. , KARLSGASSE 15/3 — LEIPZIG, C I DRESDNERSTRABE 11/13.

Als Mitglied der INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNER-GESELLSCHAFT

(Landes, Ortsgruppe)

bitte ich um Einladungskarten fur mich - mein Frau - zu den Veranstaltungen des Regensburger Bruckner-Festes.

Deutliche Unterschrift :

Name :

Genau Adress :

..... , den Mai 1937.

Nicht Gewünschtes zu streicheln

An die ORTSGRUPPE MÜNCHEN DER INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNER-GESELLSCHAFT zu Händen Herrn WOLFGANG von BARTELS, MÜNCHEN, Agnesstraße 20.

8e Festival Bruckner de Ratisbonne (II)

Walhalla

« Die Walhalla und was zu ihr gehört, vermache ich Deutschland, meinem großen Vaterlande ... »

« Mochten in dieser sturmbewegten Zeit fest, wie dieses Baues Steine vereinigt sein werden, alle Deutschen zusammenhalten ! » (Konig Ludwig I.)

Un temps fort de la politique musicale et culturelle du régime nazi : le Festival Bruckner de Ratisbonne qui se tient du 5 au 7 juin 1937. L'événement est commandité par l'éditeur de la Ire édition critique des Symphonies, Gustav Bosse Verlag, et par la Société Internationale Bruckner dont le siège social se trouve à Vienne au 4, « Karlsgasse » 15/3 (téléphone : U 40.9.63 1/2.) .

Bruckner-Fest, Regensburg vom 5. bis 7. Juni 1937.

Fest- Und Programmbuch

(Foto) BRUCKNER-BÜSTE IN DER WALHALLA ZU REGENSBURG - Skulptur : Professor Rothenburger, München.

(Foto) DIE BRUCKNER-EHRENMEDAILLE DER INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNER-GESELLSCHAFT, GESTIFTET VON GUSTAV BOSSE, REGENSBURG - Skulptur : Professor Wildermann, Breslau.

Bruckner-Blätter

Mitteilungen der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft und des Musikwissenschaftlichen Verlages, Regierung General mit beschränkter Haftung.

1937, Sitz : Wien, IV. , Karlsgasse 15/3, Telefon U 40.9.63 1/2.

VIII. BRUCKNERFEST DER INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNER-GESELLSCHAFT AUS ANLASS DER ENTHÜLLUNG DER BRUCKNER-BÜSTE IN DER WALHALLA ZU REGENSBURG, DURCHGEFÖHRT VON DER STADT REGENSBURG, 5. BIS 7. JUNI 1937.

Festgruß

Von Professor Max Auer, Präsident der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft.

Festlich geschmückt lädt Regensburg in Gemeinschaft mit der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft zu einem Hochfest deutschen Geistes ein. Die Walhalla, von König Ludwig I. von Bayern den Schöpfern deutscher Geisteskultur geweiht, öffnet ihre Pforten einem Manne aus österreichischem Bauernblut, dem Großmeister der Tonkunst Anton Bruckner, dessen Büste nunmehr durch den Führer und Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler auf Ansuchen der Bruckner-Gesellschaft in großzügiger Weise in diesen Tempel des gesamten Deutschtums aufgenommen wird.

Eine neue, durch Not und Tod geschrittene, nach Höherem sich sehnde Menschheit hatte erwachen müssen, um Bruckners erlösender Kunst ganz teilhaftig zu werden ; erst in unseren Tagen enthüllt sich uns seine wahre, starke und herbe Größe, die seine Zeit weder erfassen noch ertrasen konnte.

Wie Bruckners Kunst dank ihrer tiefen Verwurzelung im Boden der Heimat nicht nur deutschen Raum durchstrahlt ; sondern mit ihrer universellen Kraft auch andere Völker Zu beglücken berufen ist, so sollen uns diese Tage auch ein Fest der Gesamtkultur und Völkerver-söhnung bedeuten.

Herzlichen Bruckner-Gruß allen, die zur Ehre des Meisters nach Regensburg gekommen sind !

Samedi, le 5 juin à 20 heures - 1er Concert Gala donné à la « Neuhaussaal »

Anton Bruckner : Ouverture en sol mineur.

Direction : Docteur Rudolf Kloiber, de Ratisbonne.

Ensemble : Orchestre philharmonique de Munich.

Anton Bruckner : 3 Motets ...

« Os justi » .

« Christus factus est » .

« Ave Maria » .

Direction : Professeur docteur Theodor Schrems, de Ratisbonne.

Ensemble : Chœur de la cathédrale de Ratisbonne.

Anton Bruckner : 3e Symphonie en ré mineur.

Direction : Professeur docteur Theodor Schrems, de Ratisbonne.

Ensemble : Orchestre philharmonique de Munich.

Samstag, 5. Juni : 20 Uhr - I. FESTKONZERT (im Neuhaussaal) .

Anton Bruckner : Ouverture in G-Moll.

Leitung : Doktor Rudolf Kloiber, Regensburg.

Orchester : Münchner Philharmoniker.

Anton Bruckner : 3 Motetten :

« Os justi » .

« Christus factus est » .

« Ave Maria » .

Leitung : Professor Doktor Theodor Schrems, Regensburg.

Ensemble : Regensburger Domchor.

Anton Bruckner : III. Symphonie in D-Moll.

Leitung : Professor Doktor Theodor Schrems, Regensburg.

Orchester : Münchner Philharmoniker.

Dimanche, le 6 juin à 8 heures - Messe pontificale à la cathédrale de Ratisbonne

Anton Bruckner : Messe en mi mineur pour 8 parties, chœur et cuivres.

Motets : « Ave Maria » et « Virga Jesse » .

Direction : Professeur docteur Theodor Schrems, de Ratisbonne.

Ensemble : Chœur de la cathédrale de Ratisbonne.

Sonntag, 6. Juni : 8 Uhr - PONTIFIKALAMT IM DOM

Anton Bruckner : Messe in E-moll für achttimmigen Chor und Bläser.

Einlagen : « Ave Maria » und « Virga Jesse » .

Leitung : Professor Doktor Theodor Schrems, Regensburg.

Ensemble : Regensburger Domchor.

Le concert pontificale est donné en présence d'Adolf Hitler et du docteur Josef Gæbbels.

Intronisation de Bruckner au « Walhalla »

Dimanche, le 6 juin à 11 heures - 2e Concert Gala donné au « Staatsakt » du Temple du Walhalla

Lors de la cérémonie spéciale (fort médiatisée : filmée et photographiée) dite « de Ratisbonne » (« Regensburg ») , en Bavière, qui s'est déroulée au Temple du « Walhalla » (le « Temple de la Renommée des Grands Allemands » d'inspiration néo-grecque dorique, édifié au début du XIXe siècle) dans le contexte du 8e Festival Bruckner, le Chancelier Adolf Hitler a solennellement intronisé (parmi les autres demi-Dieux de ce Panthéon) un buste de son compositeur de prédilection, Anton Bruckner, aux sons du mouvement lent de sa 8e Symphonie.

Il lui rendra solennellement hommage, debout en silence chapeau à la main au son de l'Adagio de la 7e Symphonie, après avoir placé le buste du compositeur (une œuvre du sculpteur Adolf Rothenburger) sur son socle, drapé pour l'occasion avec des insignes nazis. Ce qui sera suivi du dépôt, devant le monument, d'une immense couronne de laurier (« laurea insignis » ; aussi appelée couronne triomphale ou « corona triumphalis ») entourée d'une banderole.

(Curieusement, le buste de Bruckner sera le seul à être ajouté au Panthéon du « Walhalla » durant la période du National-Socialisme.)

Étaient aussi présents :

Josef Gæbbels.

« Reichsführer SS » Heinrich Himmler.

« Reich Minister » Franz Gürtner.

« Reich » Minister Walther Darré.

Franz Ritter von Epp.

The ambassador of the German « Reich » in Vienna Franz von Papen.

The Austrian ambassador in Germany Stephan Tauschitz.

Bavarian Premier Ludwig Siebert.

Photo de groupe montrant Adolf Hitler entouré de hauts-dignitaires ...

Ire rangée, de gauche à droite : le ministre du « Reich » Franz Gürtner (en marge à gauche) , le ministre du « Reich » Walther Darré, le « Reichsführer SS » Heinrich Himmler, un inconnu, l'ambassadeur du « Reich » allemand à Vienne Franz von Papen, le 1er ministre de Bavière Ludwig Siebert (en conversation) , le docteur Josef Gœbbels, Franz Ritter von Epp, Adolf Hitler, l'ambassadeur d'Autriche en Allemagne Stephan Tauschitz (en redingote) .

(Photo) Buste de BRUCKNER au WALHALLA de Ratisbonne - Une sculpture du professeur Adolf Rothenburger, de Munich.

(Photo) MÉDAILLE D'HONNEUR DE LA SOCIÉTÉ INTERNATIONALE BRUCKNER, offerte par Gustav Bosse, de Ratisbonne - Une sculpture du professeur Hans Wildermann, de Wrocław.

La raison exacte de la tenue d'un tel événement n'est pas connu. Mais il est possible que le « Führer » voulait faire du « Maître de Saint-Florian » un précurseur culturel de l'annexion (« Anschluß ») de l'Autriche au « Reich » , qui aura lieu l'année suivante.

Pour Adolf Hitler et Josef Gœbbels, Anton Bruckner pouvait être considéré comme un représentant aryen :

« Comme fils du sol autrichien, Anton Bruckner est spécifiquement choisi pour représenter à notre époque l'esprit indissoluble et la communauté émotionnelle du destin qui unit la nation dans son ensemble. » (Josef Gœbbels, 6 juin 1937.)

At the culmination of the ceremony, Adolf Hitler personally consecrated the new bust of Bruckner by laying a laurel wreath at the foot of its pedestal. One observer characterized Hitler's gesture as « an elevated symbol of the unlimited solidarity of the “ Führer ” and the German people » . In reciprocation for the honour granted to Bruckner, Max Auer, the President of the « Internationale-Bruckner-Gesellschaft » , presented Hitler with the Society's 1st « Ehrenmedaille » , describing it as « a small token of our deep gratitude for the admission of the bust of Bruckner to “ Walhalla ” » .

One observer characterized Hitler's gesture as « an elevated symbol of the unlimited solidarity of the “ Führer ” and the German people » .

Le Prélude festif pour orgue à la mémoire d'Anton Bruckner (« Festpräludium für Orgel in memoriam Anton Bruckner ») du compositeur, musicien d'église et maire de la ville de Klosterneuburg, Vinzenz Goller (1873-1943) , est interprété pour l'occasion. La pièce dure environ 4 minutes.

On assistera à des discours, des concerts et la tenue du Congrès de la « Bruckner Gesellschaft » avec, à sa tête, le musicologue Max Auer comme Président. La presse parlera alors du « grand Symphoniste allemand » .

The President of the Bruckner Society, Professor Max Auer, presented Adolf Hitler (during an act of State, on the occasion of the revelation of an Anton Bruckner bust) the Bruckner medal.

Max Auer, the Society's President, who had decried the cultural corruption of the Weimar Republic, described Bruckner's music as a « return to the pure sources » , and the search for purity formed the ideological basis for the 1st Bruckner Edition, edited by Robert Haas. That purist legacy, which rejected early printed editions of Bruckner's works as inauthentic and deemed manuscript sources the only authentic texts for the composer's music, lingers even today.

Max Auer is known to have disagreed passionately : for him, the gulf that separated the Theatre centred Wagner and the church trained Bruckner was more important than superficial resemblances. Auer must have « swallowed hard » when he heard what Gœbbels had to say at Regensburg, but, on this occasion at least, he kept his counsel.

...

Le chef Siegmund von Hausegger à la tête du Philharmonique de Munich interprétera, pour la circonstance, le magnifique Adagio de la 7e Symphonie, des extraits de l'imposante 8e, la 3e Symphonie dédiée à Richard Wagner, au complet, de même que l'Ouverture en sol mineur de 1862-1863, éditée de manière posthume en 1921.

L'artiste-sculpteur Hans Wildermann (choisi par ses patrons nazis, en 1936) dévoilera, lors de cette cérémonie, la « Ire Médaille de la Société internationale Bruckner » (« Internationale-Bruckner-Gesellschaft Ehrenmedaille ») . Elle sera remise par Max Auer (le Président en titre de la Société) à Adolf Hitler comme un « humble témoignage de notre profonde gratitude pour l'intronisation du buste d'Anton Bruckner au “ Walhalla ” » .

(According to Frederic Spotts' « Hitler and the Power of Aesthetics » , Adolf Hitler compared the 7th Symphony of Anton Bruckner favorably with Beethoven's 9th Symphony. A recording of the Adagio was played before the official radio announcement of the German defeat at Stalingrad, on 31 January 1943, and before Admiral Karl Dönitz announced Hitler's death on Radio Berlin, on 1 May 1945 ; a recording by Wilhelm Furtwängler was used.)

Josef Gœbbels stresses the « Wagnerian » element in Bruckner. Bruckner's discovery of Wagner's music-dramas, he asserts, caused a total personal and artistic revolution :

« From that moment onwards, the church musician, at once, retreats almost entirely, and out of him emerges the distinctive Symphonist. »

In his speech, Gœbbels declared that since Bruckner's Symphonies were a precious national legacy, the « Bruckner Gesellschaft » would, henceforth, receive an annual contribution to fund the editing of the « original versions » .

Gœbbels not only offered financial support to the « Gesamtausgabe » , he also granted it Adolf Hitler's imprimatur :

« The “ Führer ” and his government consider it their honourable duty to do all that is within their power to permit the whole German people to receive this (Bruckner's) fortunate legacy and, by means of a large-scale promotion of Bruckner cultivation, assist its effects to penetrate not only deeply, but broadly. On these grounds, they have decided to make a substantial annual contribution to the “ Internationale-Bruckner-Gesellschaft ” for the editing of the original versions of his Symphonies until the complete works of the Master are produced in the form he envisioned. »

A remarkable line from Josef Gœbbels's speech promised a « considerable annual contribution to the International Bruckner Society for editions of the original versions of his Symphonies, until the Master's complete works are available in the form he envisioned » . Gœbbels, the politician, sounds strangely like a musicologist. But if Bruckner was to assume an oracle-like status for the new Nazi religion, the scores to his Symphonies were the Sacred texts, and the clear implication was that these texts had been corrupted by outside Jewish influences.

...

In a speech at the ceremonial unveiling, Josef Gœbbels declared his Party's financial support to the « Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft » (IBG) for their publication of the « original versions » of Bruckner's Symphonies. Gœbbels' intervention seemed to have put an end to concerns about the reception of Bruckner's music, including the copyright dispute. With the « Anschluß » the following year, the « Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft » was increasingly politicized in favor of the Nazi government, which, at the same time, facilitated the « Gesamtausgabe » . In 1938, the « Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag » (MWV) was transferred to Leipzig.

1 November 2015 - « Walhalla » Ceremony (Top View Image) :

Good day Mr. Berky,

You can see from this new angle that a small male choir (boys and men) was positioned not far from the « Führer » . (Gilles)

Thanks Gilles,

I have wanted to know exactly where within the temple the ceremony took place. Due to the temple's symmetry, it was hard to determine. But this photo makes it clear.

Thanks again !!!

(John)

Possibly, members of the « Regensburger Domchor » directed by Professor Theodor Schrems. (Gilles)

Yes, that is very possible. (John)

(« Dom » Choir) And thanks to this information (see sheet attached) , we know that they were there to sign « Locus iste » !!

And they recorded that on 78 rpm !! (John)

Do you know where one can purchase an unmarked copy of the image ? (John)

This picture is available at ...

<http://www.alamy.com/stock-photo-nazism-national-socialism-event-act-of-state-for-the-composer-anton-58562490.html>

Interesting. They do charge a lot !! (John)

You will also find this other rare photo ...

This image from the Nazi Propaganda shows Adolf Hitler on his way to the gallery for honorary guests on the occasion of the unveiling of the bust for the « German naturalized » Austrian composer Anton Bruckner in the « Walhalla » Temple, in Regensburg, Germany (Sunday, 6 June 1937) . To Hitler's right behind him : Josef Gœbbels ; to Gœbbel's right, Bavarian Premier Ludwig Siebert. To Hitler's left behind him, Franz Ritter von Epp.

<http://www.alamy.com/stock-photo-the-image-from-the-nazi-propaganda!-shows-hitler-on-his-way-to-the-60881960.html>

It seems that Sunday, June 6th, 1937, was a very sunny day. (Gilles)

Other Bruckner pictures available at Alamy Stock-Photo ...

<http://www.alamy.com/stock-photo/anton-bruckner.html>

Cool ... Thanks ! (John)

(More Bruckner Halloween Treats ...)

To prolong the pleasure, here are other related pictures on the same topic. Some you may already have, some are new.

Also, the « Walhalla » ceremony celebrating Richard Wagner's Centennial of his birth (1913) .

If you need any informations on the sources, don't hesitate. (Gilles)

The Nazis sure knew how to use culture to push their National-Socialist agenda. (John)

Marketing, fantasy, dreams and power always go together. (Gilles)

Zur Enthüllung der Büste Anton Bruckners in der Walhalla am 6. Juni 1937

Ich und mein Magnum

Niemals zuvor aber und niemals danach wurde die Aufnahme einer neuen Walhalla Büste so sehr zum politischen Instrument vergewaltigt wie im Fall Bruckners 1937. Mit ihr wurde symbolisch schon der « Anschluß » Österreichs vorweggenommen, der ja de facto erst ein Dreivierteljahr später stattfinden sollte. Am Samstag, dem 5. Juni, dem Tag vor der Zeremonie, porträtierte der Völkische Beobachter den österreichischen Komponisten :

« Der Türmer ungeheurer Klangmassen wird selbst Turmwart und Turm der deutschen Ostmark. Sein Weckruf wie sein Glaube heißt Deutschland. » .

Seine Eindeutschung folgte auf dem Fuße :

« Das Blut Anton Bruckners aber ist, wie seine Gestalt, die mit ihrem gewaltigen Langschädel und der für die nordische Rasse charakteristischen Einbuchtung am Hinterkopf als germanisch bezeichnet werden muß, urdeutsch. »

Hitler hatte seinen Auftritt in der Walhalla bestens inszenieren lassen. Vor dem Bau, jetzt « Ehrentempel des Dritten Reiches » , waren durch Albert Speer zwei 23 m hohe Fahnenmasten mit dem Reichsadler errichtet worden. Anwesend war auch ein Gesandter der österreichischen Regierung, als der Einzug nach Walhall mit Bruckners « Germanenzug » , dargeboten von « vereinigten deutschen und österreichischen Chören » , begann. Artig sprachen zunächst Gauleiter Wächtler und der bayerische Ministerpräsident Siebert vom deutschen Vermächtnis, das sich jetzt dank der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung erfülle. Es folgte Josef Goebbels mit einer längeren Rede, worin er den Bogen zu Richard Wagner spannte, unter dessen Eindruck der Österreicher Bruckner ja erst erwacht sei und sich zu eigener Meisterschaft entwickelt habe. Hitler, dem bei dieser Gelegenheit gleich die Bruckner Medaille überreicht wurde, ließ das Kopfbildnis durch Reichskammermusikpräsident Professor Raabe enthüllen. Als einzige, so der Völkische Beobachter, « ist die Statue Anton Bruckners mit der Hakenkreuzfahne umkleidet, zum Zeichen, daß diese Büste die erste ist, die im Dritten Reich auf Beschluss des Führers in dieser Ehrenhalle der großen Deutschen Aufstellung gefunden hat » .

Daß in der Bruckner Büste sich die Züge Hitlers verstecken, nehmen die heutigen Besucher natürlich nicht wahr, wengleich die Person des größten Feldherrn aller Zeiten die Gemüter auf dem Grunde immer noch heftig bewegt. Josefa Beutl, seit 1978 im Kartenverkauf der Walhalla beschäftigt, erzählt, daß seit der Vereinigung der beiden deutschen Staaten und einem stetig anschwellenden Strom von Besuchern aus den neuen Bundesländern immer wieder nach der Büste des Führers gefragt werde, der abschlägige Bescheid auf den Gesichtern dann Spuren großer Enttäuschung

hinterlasse. Dafür dürfte sich ein anderer Büsten-Traum der Walhalla Pilger leichter realisieren lassen, sobald nur die nötige Mindestablagerungszeit von 20 Jahren verstrichen ist. Diese Bedingung muß Franz-Josef Strauß noch erfüllen, denn da die Walhalla 1962 endgültig in das Eigentum des Freistaates Bayern übergang und als Bundes Nationaldenkmal seit dem 9. November 1989 endgültig obsolet geworden ist, dürfte sich für Lokalmatador Strauß eine entsprechende Büsten Lobby wohl beschaffen lassen.

...

Wenige Monate vor dem so genannt « Anschluß » Österreichs konnte die Bevölkerung der Stadt Regensburg am 6. Juni 1937 im Rahmen eines Staatsaktes an der Walhalla eine der aus heutiger Sicht wohl merkwürdigsten Selbstinzenierungen des Nazi-Regimes miterleben. Doch war es nicht, wie sich vielleicht vermuten ließe, die Büste eines bedeutenden deutschen Staatsmannes, die mit großem Aufwand im « Ruhmestempel der Deutschen » enthüllt wurde, sondern die eines in Österreich geborenen Komponisten. Nach Johann Sebastian Bach, Georg Friedrich Händel, Christoph Willibald Gluck, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven, Richard Wagner (1913 anlässlich des 100. Geburtstages) und Franz Schubert (1928 anlässlich des 100. Todestages) war Anton Bruckner der achte in der Walhalla aufgenommene Komponist.

Mag man das Ereignis nun wie Albrecht Riethmüller als « öffentliche Probe » (1993, Seite 16.) oder wie Albrecht Dümling als « symbolische Vorwegnahme » (1999, Seite 204.) in Bezug auf den 1938 erfolgenden « Anschluß » Österreichs und der damit verbundenen Konsolidierung eines geeinten « Großdeutschland » interpretieren - Thesen, die durch den Charakter der Massenveranstaltung in Verbindung mit dem am Nachmittag des 6. Juni sich anschließenden Gauparteitag der Bayerischen Ostmark in Regensburg, bei dem 200.000 Menschen ihre Treue zum nationalsozialistischen Staat und seinem Führer schworen, durchaus gestützt werden - Tatsache ist, daß es Staatsakte in der Walhalla bisher nur zweimal im Zusammenhang mit der Aufstellung der Büsten Ludwigs I. und Kaiser Wilhelms I. in den 1890er Jahren gegeben hatte.

Warum nun wurde gerade ein Komponist, noch dazu ein gebürtiger Österreicher, eines solchen Aufwandes für würdig befunden ? Diese Frage erscheint auch heute noch nicht vollständig geklärt. Wie in der Sekundärliteratur immer wieder betont wird, spielte zwischen 1933 und 1945 Anton Bruckner beziehungsweise seine Musik vor allem deswegen eine so große Rolle, weil sich Hitler offenbar in mehrfacher Hinsicht mit der Person Bruckners identifizieren konnte : Beide waren Österreicher, hatten sich aus einfachen Verhältnissen emporgearbeitet, lebten zeitweise in Linz und wurden in Wien als Künstler zunächst abgelehnt. Nicht nur der einem Großteil der Kompositionen Bruckners, insbesondere den Sinfonien, anhaftende monumentale Charakter, sondern auch die in Werken wie Germanenzug oder Helgoland offen zu Tage tretende Deutschtümelei waren dazu geeignet, ein Massenpublikum, wie es die Nazis bevorzugten, unmittelbar anzusprechen. Die großdimensionierte formale Anlage der Sinfonien, die Prägung durch den Orgelklang, die Bevorzugung klarer Rhythmik und dreiklangsgebundener Harmonik, aber auch das Einbeziehen volksmusikalischer Elemente galten in (4/5) der Zeit als Merkmale einer « echten reinen deutschen » Musik, die anlässlich der jährlich stattfindenden Reichsparteitage oder anderer Feierlichkeiten den im nazistischen Sinne adäquaten musikalischen Rahmen für Propaganda-Reden und Machtdemonstrationen darstellte. Besonders beliebt waren in diesem Zusammenhang im übrigen die Sinfonien Nummer 3, Nummer 5 und Nummer 7. Daß Hitler die Musik Bruckners mindestens ebenso schätzte wie

die Richard Wagners, bezeugt sein zu Beginn der 1940er Jahre angedachter Plan zum Aufbau einer « Weihestätte für das unsterbliche Werk Bruckners » im Stiftsgebäude von Sankt Florian in Linz, wo dann jährlich « Bruckner-Festspiele nach Art von Bayreuth » veranstaltet werden sollten. Wenn es nun unbedingt die Büste eines Komponisten sein mußte, die in die Walhalla aufgenommen werden sollte, lag es nahe, die Anton Bruckners auszuwählen, zumal bereits eine entsprechende Eingabe der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft (im folgenden : IBG) vorlag. Der Walhalla-Staatsakt des Jahres 1937 stellte nur den vorläufigen Höhepunkt nazistisch geprägter Bruckner-Verehrung dar. Er wurde letztlich ermöglicht durch eine Institution, die sich bereitwillig für politische Propagandaveranstaltungen instrumentalisieren ließ. Die Nazis « honorierten » diese Form des Opportunismus, indem sie die IBG nach dem « Anschluß » 1938 gleichschalteten und ihren Präsidenten Max Auer seines Amtes enthoben.

Erste Pläne zur Aufstellung einer Büste Anton Bruckners in der Walhalla existierten bereits zu Beginn der 1930er Jahre, doch wurde einer diesbezüglichen Eingabe seitens der IBG von der bayerischen Landesregierung zum damaligen Zeitpunkt nicht stattgegeben (Christa Brüstle, 1998, Seite 102.) . Auch der Künstler, dessen Werk letztendlich in der Walhalla enthüllt wurde, Adolf Rothenburger, hatte schon 1933 die Ausarbeitung einer Marmorbüste Bruckners in Erwägung gezogen, wie aus einem Schreiben des Komponisten Wolfgang von Bartels an Max Auer vom 10. Juni 1933 hervorgeht :

« Der Bildhauer Rothenburger hat den Plan, die Büste Bruckners in Marmor auszuarbeiten und eventuell zu beantragen, daß diese Büste vom bayr. Staat erworben und in der Walhalla aufgestellt wird. Stünde die IBG Wien einem solchen Plan günstig gegenüber ? Wenn ja, dann könnten wir hier in München beim bayr. Staat vorfühlen, ob solches möglich ! » (Zitiert nach Christa Brüstle, 1998, Seite 102.)

Auer stimmte dem Plan zu und Siegmund Hausegger, der damalige inoffizielle Präsident des deutschen Zweiges der Gesellschaft und Dirigent der Münchner Philharmoniker, nahm die Verhandlungen mit dem bayerischen Ministerpräsidenten Ludwig Siebert auf.

Es sollte allerdings noch 3 Jahre dauern, bis Hausegger im Februar 1936 den Erfolg seiner Mission vermelden konnte (Christa Brüstle, 1998, Seite 103.) . Etwa zur gleichen Zeit beauftragte der Regensburger Musikverleger Gustav Bosse in seiner Eigenschaft als Vorstandsmitglied der IBG den in Breslau lebenden Künstler Hans Wildermann mit der Anfertigung einer Bruckner-Ehrenmedaille, die offenbar im Zusammenhang mit der Enthüllung der Büste an verdiente Förderer der Musik Anton Bruckners überreicht werden sollte.

Zwei Monate später übergab die bayerische Landesregierung im Mai 1936 die Walhalla unter Berufung auf einen Zusatz zur ursprünglichen Verfügung (5/6) Ludwigs I. vom 14. Mai 1862, demzufolge die Verfügungsgewalt über die Walhalla bei einer Auflösung des Deutschen Bundes an Bayern übergehen, bei einer Neugründung des Bundes aber an Deutschland zurückfallen würde, an Adolf Hitler als dem Führer und Kanzler des deutschen Volkes und bat ihn ferner um die Aufstellung weiterer Büsten. Über die Begründung des Ministerpräsidenten Siebert und die Aufnahme der Bruckner-Büste informiert ein Artikel des Völkischen Beobachters vom 22. Mai 1936 unter der Überschrift Ministerpräsident Siebert vollstreckt das deutsche Vermächtnis Ludwig I. , der hier auszugsweise wiedergegeben wird :

« Die nationalsozialistische Landesregierung steht auf dem Standpunkt, daß die Entwicklung der politischen Verhältnisse die Walhalla zu einem reinen deutschen Ruhmestempel gemacht hat, so wie es ihr Schöpfer zweifellos auch wollte. Die Bestimmung der Aufnahme von Büsten um die Nation besonders verdienter Deutscher kommt daher nicht mehr der Bayerischen Landesregierung zu. Sie kann nur noch dem Führer der Nation zustehen. Ich habe darum namens der bayerischen Landesregierung den Führer und Reichskanzler gebeten, daß er die Walhalla in seine Obhut nehmen und insbesondere in Zukunft bestimmen möge, welche Büsten hervorragender Deutscher in Zukunft dort aufgestellt werden. Der Führer hat diesem Antrag stattgegeben und zugleich einen weiteren Antrag genehmigt, daß, einer Bitte der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft entsprechend, zur Ehrung Anton Bruckners, dessen 40. Todestag in das laufende Jahr fällt, die Büste dieses neben Beethoven größten deutschen Symphonikers in der Walhalla zur Aufstellung kommt. Anton Bruckner, der einer oberösterreichischen Bauernfamilie entstammt, verbindet in seiner Musik echte Volkstümlichkeit der Melodik mit den Offenbarungen eines kraftvoll männlichen, tief religiösen Ethos und ist dadurch zu einem der größten Verkünder des deutschen Wesens geworden. Seine Ehrung gilt also gleich dem deutschen Geiste. Der Führer hat in Aussicht gestellt, bei der im Oktober stattfindenden Aufstellung der Büste im Ruhmestempel der Deutschen anwesend zu sein. So hat der Führer dem deutschen Ehrentempel seine Weihe für die Zukunft gegeben. Daß die erste Büste, die nach seiner Entscheidung zur Aufstellung kommt, den Künster edelster deutscher Musik verkörpert, zeigt die Stellung des nationalsozialistischen Deutschland zur deutschen Kultur. » (Süddeutsche Ausgabe, 49. Jahrgang, 143. Ausgabe, Seite 1.)

Die Bedeutung des gesamten Vorgangs unterstrich der Völkische Beobachter mit der förmlich ins Auge springenden rot unterstrichenen Schlagzeile « Die Walhalla als Ehrentempel des deutschen Volkes unter der Obhut des Führers » .

Die feierliche Enthüllung der Büste war für den Herbst des Jahres vorgesehen und sollte im Rahmen des 8. Brucknerfestes der IBG in Regensburg stattfinden. (Zeitschrift für Musik, 103. Jahrgang, Heft 6, Juni 1936, Anton Bruckner in der Walhalla, Seite 724.) Für die Organisation dieser Veranstaltung zeichneten in erster Linie der in München ansässige Komponist und Dirigent Siegmund von Hausegger, der Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer Peter Raabe und Gustav Bosse verantwortlich. Im September des Jahres schienen die Vorbereitungen relativ weit vorangeschritten zu sein, denn die von Bosse herausgegebene Zeitschrift für Musik informierte ihre Leser bereits über die zur Auf- (6/7) führung vorgesehenen Kompositionen Bruckners und die teilnehmenden Dirigenten. (Heft 9, Seite 1154.) Als Aufführungsort war und andere die Minoritenkirche vorgesehen, die aus diesem Anlaß auf Kosten der Nazi-Regierung von Grund auf restauriert und zum Konzertraum umfunktioniert werden mußte. Darüber hinaus wurde beim Öttinger Orgelbauunternehmen Georg Friedrich Steinmeyer (1819-1901) ein Instrument in Auftrag gegeben, das den Anforderungen der Musik Bruckners zu genügen hatte. Gustav Bosse äußerte sich diesbezüglich gegenüber Max Auer in einem Brief vom 1. September 1936 :

« Um auch in den Konzerten etwas Außerordentliches zu erreichen, wurde nach vielen Schwierigkeiten durchgesetzt, daß die unserem Museum angegliederte, früher sehr verwahrloste aber wundervolle gotische Minoritenkirche zu einem Konzertsaal umgestaltet wird. Die Kirche bleibt als solche auch weiterhin Museumsraum, wird aber durch Einbau einer Orgel, einer Beleuchtung und eines auswechselbaren Gestühls für besondere Gelegenheiten feierlicher Konzerte der Musik dienstbar gemacht. Alles wird erstmals anlässlich des Bruckner-Festes in Erscheinung treten. Der Führer selbst hat die Mittel für die Orgel und den Ausbau der Kirche bewilligt. » (Christa Brüstle, 1998, Seite 105.)

Nur zwei Wochen später entschloß sich Hitler jedoch überraschend zu einer Verlegung der Regensburger Brucknerfeier auf Mai 1937. Gustav Bosse, den der Regensburger Oberbürgermeister Otto Schottenheim am 14. September 1936 hierüber in Kenntnis gesetzt hatte, vermutete, daß das Fest wohl « ganz groß, weit über den bisher geplanten Rahmen hinaus gestaltet werden » solle und « daß für diese besondere Ausgestaltung des Festes durch das Reich, die von uns ja so sehr gewünschte äußere Dokumentierung der Verbrüderung Deutschland - Österreich maßgebend » sei, eine Äußerung, die angesichts des angespannten politischen Verhältnisses zwischen Deutschland und Österreich wohl besser nicht an die Öffentlichkeit gelangen durfte. (Brief an Max Auer, 15. September 1936, ebenda, Seite 104.) In der Zeitschrift für Musik wurden ganz andere (weitaus weniger politisch brisante) Gründe für die Terminverschiebung geltend gemacht : « Maßgebend war, daß die Feier alsdann in eine günstigere Jahreszeit fällt und vor allem, daß sie Ende Oktober mit anderen großen Veranstaltungen zusammengefallen wäre, die zahlreiche hervorragende Persönlichkeiten verhindert hätten, an den vorgesehenen Veranstaltungen zu Ehren Anton Bruckners in Regensburg teilzunehmen. » . (103. Jahrgang, Heft 10, Oktober 1936, Seite 1258.) Das 8. Brucknerfest der IBG fand tatsächlich erst nach Ablauf des Gedenkjahres statt, und zwar vom 5. bis 7. Juni 1937. Der Großteil der anfallenden Kosten, die sich auf über 50.000 Reich Mark beliefen, wurde als « Führerspende » deklariert und vom Ministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda getragen.

Die Feierlichkeiten begannen am Abend des 5. Juni mit dem I. Festkonzert im Neuhaussaal. (Programm siehe, Seite 6.) Außerhalb des eigentlichen Festprogramms fand während des sonntäglichen Pontifikalamtes eine Aufführung der E-Moll Messe im Regensburger Dom statt. Die Enthüllung der Büste in der Walhalla im Rahmen eines Staatsaktes in Anwesenheit Hitlers und weiterer hochstehender Persönlichkeiten aus Politik und Kultur war für den Vormittag des 6. Juni (Sonntag) vorgesehen und als Propagandaveranstaltung « par excellence » angelegt, über die in Rundfunk, Wochenschau und Tagespresse berichtet wurde. Der Völkische Beobachter brachte beispielsweise in der Ausgabe vom 7. Juni 1937 die Schlagzeilen « Ein Großer der Musik im Ruhmestempel der Deutschen. Der Führer ehrte Anton Bruckner. » sowie unmittelbar daneben « Adolf Hitler vor 200.000 in Regensburg. Ein starkes Bekenntnis zum Frieden auf dem Gautag der Bayerischen Ostmark » und widmete dem Ereignis immerhin zwei Druckseiten. (Münchner Ausgabe.)

Die Nazi-Regierung war vertreten durch Propagandaminister Josef Gœbbels, Justizminister Franz Gürtner und Ernährungs- und Landwirtschaftsminister Richard Walther Darré ; Österreich schickte seinen Berliner Gesandten Stephan Tauschitz. Weiterhin versammelten sich vor der Walhalla der deutsche Botschafter in Wien Franz von Papen, Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler, Reichsstatthalter General Franz Ritter von Epp, der bayerische Ministerpräsident Ludwig Siebert, der Gauleiter der bayerischen Ostmark, Fritz Wächtler, der Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Regensburg, Otto Schottenheim, zahlreiche hohe Offiziere der Wehrmacht, Mitglieder der IBG, der Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer Peter Raabe und (nicht zu vergessen) als willkommene Staffage Banner- und Standartenträger der Parteigliederungen der Bayerischen Ostmark, die politischen Leiter der Jugendverbände und Mitglieder des Arbeitsdien- (7/8) stes. Beim Eintreffen der Ehrengäste erklangen Wagner-Fanfaren. Zur Eröffnung der Feier trug ein aus 800 deutschen und österreichischen Sängern bestehender Chor Bruckners Germanenzug vor. Es folgte eine kurze Begrüßungsrede Ludwig Sieberts, in der dieser (so der Redakteur der Allgemeinen Musikzeitung Walter Abendroth) « vor allem auf die Bedeutung der Walhalla als Symbol einer geistigen Einheit aller Deutschen hinwies » (64. Jahrgang, Nummer 25, 18. Juni 1937, Seite 393.) und

die Walhalla offiziell der Obhut Hitlers unterstellte. Die Einheit des Deutschen Reiches beschwörend, unterstellte Ludwig Siebert, es sei « die Sehnsucht aller wahrhaft Deutschen der Vergangenheit, ihre Sehnsucht nach dem großen, stolzen, einigen deutschen Vaterlande » gewesen, die sich « in unsrer Zeit durch unsern Führer erfüllt » . habe (Paul Ehlers, 1937, Seite 747.) Die Verbalisierung großdeutscher Zukunftspläne fand ihren Höhepunkt in der etwa viertelstündigen Ansprache Josef Goebbels', in der er und andere « Anton Bruckner als Sohn der österreichischen Erde » als « ganz besonders dazu berufen » erklärte, « die unauslöschliche geistige und seelische Schicksalsgemeinschaft zu versinnbildlichen, die das gesamte deutsche Volk verbindet. Es ist daher für uns ein symbolisches Ereignis von mehr als nur künstlerischer Bedeutung, wenn Sie, mein Führer, sich entschlossen haben, in diesem deutschen Nationalheiligtum als erstes Denkmal unseres Reiches eine Büste Anton Bruckners aufstellen zu lassen » . Die « tiefe Gottgläubigkeit » Bruckners wurzele « in dem gleichen heldischen Weltgefühl des germanischen Menschentums, dem alle wahrhaft großen und ewigen Schöpfungen der deutschen Kunst entspringen » . (Goebbels-Reden, Seite 285.) Darüber hinaus stellte Goebbels in seiner Rede die Weichen für die zukünftige Bruckner-Forschung, indem er sämtliche seit 1935 in der Öffentlichkeit ausgetragenen Streitigkeiten um die « originale » Gestalt Brucknerscher Werke beendete und in seiner Eigenschaft als Präsident der Reichskulturkammer die staatliche Sanktionierung und vor allem auch Subventionierung der von der IBG herausgegebenen Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe verkündete. (Ebenda)

Nachdem Max Auer die neu angefertigte Bruckner-Medaille an Hitler übergeben hatte, begaben sich die Ehrengäste in die Walhalla, wo Peter Raabe die Büste zu den Klängen des vom Regensburger Domchor gesungenen Locus iste feierlich enthüllte. Die Enthüllung sowie die folgenden Kranzniederlegungen durch Adolf Hitler, Ludwig Siebert, Stephan Tauschitz und Max Auer wurden begleitet von Ausschnitten aus Bruckners 8. Sinfonie, die die Münchner Philharmoniker unter der Leitung Hauseggers spielten. Die Aufgabe des österreichischen Botschafters Stefan Tauschitz war es dann, sich im Namen der Österreichischen Regierung für die Bruckner-Ehrung zu bedanken. Hitler verließ die Walhalla unter den Klängen des Deutschland-Liedes, des Horst-Wessel-Liedes und der Österreichischen Nationalhymne. Erst nach dem Abzug aller Ehrengäste durften die übrigen Festteilnehmer die Walhalla betreten.

In seinem Tagebuch kommentierte Josef Goebbels am 7. Juni die Ereignisse in der Domstadt aus der Rückschau :

« Regensburg : Siebert stänkert etwas gegen mich herum. Aber ich sage ihm Bescheid. Der Führer lacht sich aus. Die Feier ist sehr gut und würdevoll. Siebert spricht und ich. Die Walhalla macht auch heute noch einen imposanten Eindruck. Ergreifend, all die großen deutschen Namen zu lesen. Dieser Ludwig war doch ein Kerl. Einmal wird auch der Führer hier aufgestellt. Wohl Bismarck gegenüber. Die Domspatzen singen wundervoll. Bruckner war einer unserer ganz Großen. Wir wollen ihn nun mehr pflegen. Rückfahrt durch Regensburg. Durch ein jubelndes Menschengespinn. In dieser schwarzen Stadt. Sie werden den kürzeren ziehen, diese Klerikalen. » (Die Tagebücher von Josef Goebbels. Sämtliche Fragmente, herausgeber von Elke Fröhlich, Teil I : Aufzeichnungen 1924-1941, Band 3 : 01.01.1937 - 31.12.1939, München und andere 1987, Seite 168.) (8/9)

Ein weiterer Höhepunkt des Regensburger Brucknerfestes war das vom Reichssender Berlin übertragene Konzert am Abend des 6. Juni in der restaurierten Minoritenkirche, bei dem in Anwesenheit Hitlers, Sieberts und weiterer hochrangiger Politiker auch die neue Konzertorgel erstmals erklang. In seinem Artikel über das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis lieferte Paul Ehlers 1937 eine detaillierte Beschreibung des Innenraumes der Minoritenkirche, die er als idealen

Aufführungsort und als « architektonisches Gegenstück » zur Musik Bruckners bezeichnete :

« Vor der Orgelwand baut sich ein riesiges Podium auf; die das Gerüst nach dem Schiff zu abschließende Holzwand, in schwärzlicher, die Maserung des Holzes abhebender Beize leicht getönt, wird von einem mächtigen schwarzen Adler vor dem Stande des Dirigenten gekrönt, als wolle dieses Sinnbild der deutschen Kraft und Hoheit die heilige deutsche Kunst Anton-Bruckner-Medaille der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft, geschnitten von Hans Wildermann 1936 - 9 schützen. (Zeitschrift für Musik, 103. Jahrgang, Heft 5, Mai 1936, nach Seite 544.) Hinter dem Orchesterplatze steigt, die ganze Breite des Hauptschiffes und der Seitenschiffe einnehmend, die Sängerestrade empor. Die hochanstrebenden Fenster sind mit langherabwallendem Tuche verhängt, das Mittelfenster mit kupferrotem, die Seitenfenster mit grauem. » (Seite 745.)

An der Aufführung des Te Deum unter der Leitung von Theobald Schrems waren 475 Sänger aus sämtlichen kirchlichen und weltlichen Institutionen der Stadt Regensburg beteiligt. Die 5. Sinfonie mit den Münchner Philharmonikern unter der Leitung Hauseggers erklang (selbstverständlich) in der « Originalfassung ». Im Rahmen der Festsitzung der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft im Reichssaal des Alten Rathauses am Mittag des 7. Juni wurden schließlich weitere Ehrenmedaillen an ausgewählte Förderer der Musik Bruckners (unter ihnen Ludwig Siebert, Peter Raabe, Max Auer, Siegmund von Hausegger und Gustav Bosse) überreicht. Josef Gøebbels, der an diesem Tag schon nicht mehr in Regensburg weilte, erhielt seine Ehrenmedaille erst am 18. Juni aus den Händen Peter Raabes, des Präsidenten der Reichsmusikkammer, der auch die Festrede bei der Sitzung im Reichssaal hielt. Das Bruckner-Fest kam am Abend des 7. Juni 1937 zu einem krönenden Abschluß mit Aufführungen der Sinfonien Nummer 1 unter der Leitung von Peter Raabe und Nummer 9 unter Oswald Kabasta in der Minoritenkirche. Über den Künstler der Bruckner-Büste in der Walhalla, Adolf Rothenburger, ist bis heute wenig bekannt. Geboren am 24. Januar 1883 in Frankfurt am Main, lebte und arbeitete er wohl ab den 1920er Jahren als Bildhauer in München, wo er und andere einige Bildreliefs für das Deutsche Museum anfertigte. Der Bio-bibliographische Index des Allgemeinen Künstlerlexikons (München / Leipzig, 2000, Seite 545.) gibt eine letzte Erwähnung Rothenburgers « vor 1935 » an. Tatsächlich dürfte Rothenburger aber mindestens noch 1936-1937 an der Bruckner-Büste gearbeitet haben. Dies legt jedenfalls eine auf den Zeitraum zwischen September / Oktober 1936 und Mai 1937 zu datierende Geschichte und Beschreibung der Walhalla und des Marktes Donaustauf (Walhalla-Beschreibung. Amtlicher Führer, Herausgeber von der Walhalla-Kommission in Regensburg, ohne Jahr) nahe, in der sich der Hinweis findet, daß die Büste Bruckners « von Bildhauer Rothenburger in München ausgeführt » und « im Mai 1937 » enthüllt würde (Seite 22.) . Abbildungen der Bruckner-Büste erschienen und andere in einem « im Bruckner Jahr 1937 gelegentlich der Übernahme der Walhalla durch den Führer vom Verschönerungs- und Fremdenverkehrsverein Donaustauf » herausgegebenen Führer durch die Walhalla und durch Donaustauf und in der Allgemeinen Musikzeitung am 2. Juli 1937. (64. Jahrgang, Nummer 27, Titelblatt.) Die Ehrung des österreichischen Komponisten Anton Bruckner blieb (überraschenderweise) die einzige, die in der Zeit des Dritten Reiches im « Ruhmestempel der Deutschen » stattfand. Die Büste steht heute zwischen derjenigen Johann Josef von Görres' (Aufstellung 1931) und Max Regers (Aufstellung 1948) an der Ostseite.

Literatur

Christa Brüstle : Anton Bruckner und die Nachwelt. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des Komponisten in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts, Stuttgart 1998, vor allem Seite 102ff. Konzert in der Minoritenkirche am 6. Juni 1937.

Albrecht Dümling : Der deutsche Michel erwacht. Zur Bruckner-Rezeption im NS-Staat, in : Bruckner-Probleme. Internationales Kolloquium 7. - 9. Oktober 1996 in Berlin, herausgeber von Albrecht Riethmüller, Stuttgart, 1999 (Beihefte zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 45) , Seiten 202-214.

Paul Ehlers : Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis, in : Zeitschrift für Musik 104, Heft 7, Juli 1937, Seiten 745-748.

Gæbbels-Reden, Band I : 1932-1939, herausgeber von Helmut Heiber, Düsseldorf, 1971, Seiten 281-286.

Stefan Maier : Die Aufstellung der Anton-Bruckner-Büste in der Walhalla 1937, in : Feste in Regensburg. Von der Reformation bis in die Gegenwart, herausgeber von Karl Möseneder, Regensburg 1986, Seiten 603-608.

Peter Raabe : Anton Bruckner. Rede, gehalten am 7. Juni 1937 auf dem VIII. Bruckner-Fest zu Regensburg, anlässlich des feierlichen Einzuges Anton Bruckners in die Walhalla, in : Zeitschrift für Musik 104, Heft 7, Juli 1937, Seiten 741-744.

Albrecht Riethmüller : Die Walhalla und ihre Musiker, Laaber, 1993.

Dimanche, le 6 juin à 18 à heures - 2e Concert Gala donné à l'église des Frères mineurs

Anton Bruckner : « Te Deum » pour solistes (SATB) , chœur (SATB) , orchestre et orgue ad libitum.

Direction : Professeur docteur Theodor Schrems, de Ratisbonne.

Ensemble : Chœur de la cathédrale de Ratisbonne.

Anton Bruckner : 5e Symphonie en si bémol majeur (version originale) .

Direction : Docteur honoraire Siegmund Hausegger, de Munich.

Ensemble : Orchestre philharmonique de Munich.

La « Minoritenkirche » (église des Frères mineurs ou des Minorites) est située au 5 de Regensburg, dans le diocèse de Ratisbonne.

L'ancien monastère franciscain consacré (« ordo fratrum minorum ») de « Sankt Salvator » fut fondée en 1221 par l'évêque de Ratisbonne, Conrad IV de Frontenhausen, avec la participation du Comte palatin Otto VIII de Bavière et du roi Henri VII. Cette basilique de style Gothique, avec ces 3 spectaculaires nefs, représente la plus grande église de l'Ordre des Franciscains, en Allemagne du Sud. Lors de la sécularisation de 1799, l'église sera profanée et le monastère dissout. L'église et de grandes parties du monastère, dont le cloître et sa fontaine du Gothique tardif, seront heureusement bien conservées. À travers les époques, l'église va être utilisé comme poste de douane et de péage,

comme salle d'exercices, comme entrepôt et hôtel. Les bâtiments conventuels seront également utilisés comme résidence et comme caserne par l'armée bavaroise.

Sonntag, 6. Juni : 18 Uhr - II. FESTKONZERT (in der Minoritenkirche)

Anton Bruckner : « Te Deum » für Soli (SATB) , Chor (SATB) , Orchester und Orgel ad lib.

Leitung : Professor Doktor Theodor Schrems, Regensburg.

Ensemble : Regensburger Domchor.

Anton Bruckner : V. Symphonie in B-Dur (Originalfassung) .

Leitung : Doktor honoris causa Siegmund von Hausegger, München.

Orchester : Münchner Philharmoniker.

Dimanche, le 6 juin à 21 heures - Concert choral donné à la « Neuhaussaal »

Ensembles : Société chorale universitaire « Ghibellinen » de Vienne ; Liedertafel (orphéon) « Frohsinn » de Linz ; Société chorale de Ratisbonne.

Suite au dévoilement officiel du buste de Bruckner, les Sociétés chorales (et non des individus) sont autorisées à aller déposer des couronnes. Veuillez contacter monsieur Wolfgang von Bartels du 20 de la « Agnesstraße », à Munich.

Sonntag, 6. Juni : 21 Uhr - CHORKONZERT (im Neuhaussaal)

Ausführende : Universitäts-Sängerschaft « Ghibellinen » , Wien ; Sängerbund « Frohsinn » , Linz ; Regensburger Sängerbund.

Nach der offiziellen Enthüllung der Büste können Kränze von Körperschaften (nicht aber von Einzelpersonen) dortselbst niedergelegt werden. Anmeldung bei Herrn Wolfgang von Bartels, München, Agnesstraße 20.

Lundi, 7 le juin à midi - Réunion de la Société Internationale Bruckner dans la salle du « Reichstag » de l'ancien Hôtel-de-ville

Anton Bruckner : Adagio du Quintette à cordes.

Ensemble : le Quatuor Strub.

Discours donné par le docteur Otto Schottenheim, maire de la ville de Ratisbonne et par le professeur Max Auer, président de la Société Internationale Bruckner.

Adresse du docteur Heinrich Gleißner, gouverneur de Haute-Autriche.

Discours du professeur et docteur honoraire Peter Raabe, président de la Chambre de la Musique du « Reich » .

Anton Bruckner : « Träumen und Wachen » (Rêves et réveils) pour chœur d'hommes.

Ensemble : Société chorale universitaire « Ghibellinen » , de Vienne.

Montag, 7. Juni : 12 Uhr - FESTSITZUNG DER INTERNATIONALEN BRUCKNERGESELLSCHAFT (im Reichstagssaale des Alten Rathauses)

Anton Bruckner : Adagio aus dem Streichquintett.

Ausführende : Strub-Quartett.

Ansprachen : Doktor Otto Schottenheim, Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Regensburg.

Professor Max Auer, Präsident der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft.

Festrede : Professor Doktor ehrenhalber Peter Raabe, Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer.

Ansprache : Doktor Heinrich Gleißner, Landeshauptmann von Oberösterreich.

Anton Bruckner : « Träumen und Wachen » für Männerchor.

Ausführende : Universitäts-Sängerschaft « Ghibellinen » , Wien.

Lundi, le 7 juin à 17 heures - 3e Concert Gala donné à l'église des Frères mineurs

Anton Bruckner : Ire Symphonie en ut mineur (version de Linz) .

Direction : Professeur et docteur honoraire Peter Raabe, président de la Chambre de Musique du « Reich » .

Anton Bruckner : 9e Symphonie en ré mineur (version originale de Alfred Orel) .

Direction : Professeur Oswald Kabasta, de Vienne.

Ensemble : Orchestre philharmonique de Munich.

Montag, 7. Juni : 17 Uhr - III. FESTKONZERT (in der Minoritenkirche)

Bruckner : I. Symphonie in C-Moll (Linzer Fassung) .

Leitung : Professor Doktor ehrenhalber Peter Raabe, Präsident der Reichsmusikkammer.

Bruckner : IX. Symphonie in D-Moll (Originalfassung, Alfred Orel Verlag) .

Leitung : Professor Oswald Kabasta, Wien.

Orchester : Münchner Philharmoniker.

Weisungen an die Festteilnehmer

Die Festkonzerte, sowie die Teilnahme am Staatsakt sind für die Mitglieder der I. B. G. unentgeltlich zugänglich.

Bedingung : Lösung einer Teilnehmerkarte gegen Nachweis der Mitgliedschaft für 1937 (Mitgliedskarte beheben) . Zur Anmeldung ist nur die dem Heft beige-schlossene Postkarte zu verwenden.

7 juin 1937 : Adolf Hitler décerne au « Duce » italien, le Premier ministre Benito Mussolini, la Grande-Croix de l'Ordre du Mérite de l'Aigle allemand (nouvellement créé) pour mousser « l'entente de cordialité entre l'Italie et le " Reich " allemand » .

Il y aura aussi une réunion du Parti nazi de Bavière. Le « Führer » s'adressera à un auditoire de 200,000 personnes sur le « Parteitag » du « Bayerische Ostmark » .

1937 : Adolf Hitler choisit de conclure le rassemblement annuel des Nazis à Nuremberg avec une exécution du gigantesque Finale de la 5e Symphonie de Bruckner.

8 juin 1937 : Adolf Hitler édicte qu'on ne peut plus nommer que des hommes, si ce n'est dans le domaine « social » .

29 juin 1937 : Only 23 days after the « Walhalla » ceremony, Bruno Walter recorded for « HMV » Anton Bruckner's « Te Deum » with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra and the Chorus of the Vienna « Staatsoper » during a live performance at « le Théâtre des Champs-Élysées » in Paris (« EMI » - Japan : TOCE 9099 ; BDC 24) .

Soloists : Elisabeth Schumann (soprano) , Kerstin Thorborg (mezzo) , Anton Dermota (tenor) , Alexander Kipnis (bass) .

During that same period, Bruno Walter also recorded for « EMI » Mozart's « Requiem » and Palestrina's « Stabat Mater » .

Discours de Josef Gœbbels au « Walhalla »

Quant à lui, le Ministre de la Propagande, Josef Gœbbels, fera un discours fort habile (et machiavélique) qui lie la vie et l'œuvre de Bruckner à l'agenda National-Socialiste dans le but de créer « l'Art allemand » . En voici une traduction anglaise :

« My " Führer ". Today, we have gathered together with you, my " Führer ", on a consecrated site to honour one of the greatest Masters of the German music. With us, the German people feels itself called upon in this hour to contemplate with gratitude this genius, who, like Beethoven before him, left us and the world an artistic legacy of 9 mighty Symphonies, and who belongs to the proudest treasures of our National musical culture. But it is not only in his musical works that this Master of the Symphonic art speaks to us ; along with them appears strong and unmistakably in Anton Bruckner the lineage of our best musical tradition, which experienced its most visible manifestation in his personality in the last Century.

Here, before us, stands the German church musician who, as a teacher and performer, faithfully prepared and nourishes the sacred music tradition without drawing undue attention to his own work, with which he contributed to that tradition in his during this time of humble employment ; but he also carefully paid attention to the indigenous music of his people, which is played such an important part of daily life outside of the church. It is very fortunate for the history of our music that in his time which in art as in all other areas of intellectual activity was characterized by an increasing use of specialization that certain aspects of German musical creativity could be combined by Bruckner in such decisive way. A Symphonic composer and a church music composer were combined in the genius of Anton Bruckner.

It was not easy for Bruckner's contemporaries to understand the complexities of this man and his personality. His physical appearance, and his music seemed peculiar and almost hard to comprehend. It would take time for Bruckner's musical language, with its originality and inner logic, to be generally understood in broader circles. It is completely misguided to hope to discover in Bruckner's music nothing more than a Symphonic distortion of Wagner's music, as is still often done in certain circles. Like any genius, Bruckner is unique and peculiar unto himself. In order to understand him, one must look to the roots of his existence, the elemental forces of blood and race that propelled his humanity.

Bruckner comes from a long line of peasants which we can trace back as far as the year 1400. Throughout his life, even after his professional advancement and his move to higher social circles, he never disavowed his peasant roots. His almost mystical connection with nature ; his long standing and genuine love for his native soil and for the great German fatherland ; his uncomplex and straightforward character, which was matched with true humility and bore a proud self-understanding of his own accomplishments ; his child-like purity of his love of life, which was anchored upon his faith in God uncomplicated by any intellectual uncertainty, demonstrates how strong and secure his peasant

roots remained in him.

One must know of the hardships of his early life in order to understand that there could be no choice of profession for him to choose. He was the eldest of 11 children. He grew-up with the understanding that he was to become a school Master. None of our other great Masters has so willingly and unhesitatingly placed himself in the service of the schools as he did ; and even after, there was little more for him to study in his art, he continually enrolled in examinations to demonstrate in writing to the Masters of his day his extraordinary technical ability. One of these examiners was honest enough to admit that, " He should be testing us ! " .

Perhaps, this is now the time and the place to object to a misguided statement often directed against the life and works of Anton Bruckner. Saccharine catchwords such as " God's street-musician " or " Our Dear Lady's singer " must be evoked even today as excuses for promoting a religious martyrdom of Bruckner's difficult artistic struggle. The people who promote such clichés are particularly fond of pointing out that his Franciscan humility was his most pronounced characteristic. All such suggestions do not do justice to the image of this great musical genius. As with his personality, there have been and still are numerous misinterpretations of his life's work. A hostile, journalistic branch of criticism, with its incessant torments, embittered him to his rich life of work. During a conversation with Bruckner, Eduard Hanslick once even let slip these words which unmask this guild of " critical mosquitoes " : " I destroy whoever I wish to destroy ! " .

It is with reluctance and disdain that we turn our attention today to these intellectual carpet-baggers, who in Bruckner's day misused their high position as judges in order to set down sentences such as this about his music, whose creativity they simply could not understand : " We truly shudder before the scent of mold that assaults our noses from the discords of this putrefactive counterpoint. " or : " In the event a page here and there from one of his scores accords with our understanding of musical logic, then we can hardly hold him responsible for it ; Bruckner composes like a drunkard. " or : " It is not impossible that the future belongs to this dream-distorted, hung-over style ; a future which, for that reason, we do not envy. " .

Given samples of such utterly deplorable public criticism, one can understand the shocking document written by Bruckner's that is held today in the archives of the Vienna Philharmonic. In 1884, the Philharmonic was considering the premiere of his 7th Symphony. Bruckner wrote to them : " If my request be approved, the most honoured committee will wish to find a way around the undertaking that gives me so much honour and happiness, for reasons that have to do only with the sad situation arising from the prevailing criticisms. " . How much bitterness, how much emotional anguish must have consumed this genius to drive him to such a decision ! If the public practice of music criticism has been restricted by law to official channels in the new Germany, then we believe we have also resolved a debt of gratitude to the Master who struggled in solitude, and was tortured-up to his moment of death by his tormenters.

With regard to this hostile resistance, however, we also cannot fail to mention those misinterpretations of Bruckner's music, those of his true followers and disciples. Here, too, lurks the catchword of succession, a successor to Wagner. And this is by no means always meant disparagingly, but rather, often enough, positively. To the extent that this is meant

to say that Bruckner's artistic development would be unthinkable without Wagner, no one can object. For Bruckner's Mastery 1st developed fully and as a person he was 1st able truly to break free from external barriers, only when he was approached the age of 40. This was when he got his 1st direct impression of the art of the great music-dramatist Richard Wagner. This experience had an almost revolutionary effect on the sonority of his musical language which only then assumed the character that we recognize today as the true Brucknerian style. From that moment onwards, the church musician quickly retreats almost entirely, and, then, emerges the distinctive Symphonist.

This transformation, incomprehensible as it is for such a faithful servant of the church, to an absolute Symphonic art, which, by nature, knows no liturgical obligations, was the fateful point in Bruckner's subsequent artistic development. Here his creative genius frees itself of all ties to the church, and now awakens in him the spring-like force of the great creative act. He is filled with the victorious intoxication of form-giving, and a boundless feeling of freedom roars through his soul. In the works of this mature period, the warrior-like will to act, without which we can imagine absolutely no true Symphony, sweeps us along with it.

A complete misunderstanding of Bruckner's style is revealed when attempts are made to lump his Symphonies together under the rubric of religious art, to characterize them as a kind of church music, to dub them simply " Masses without texts ". It is time to take a stand against these misguided attempts at interpretation. For Anton Bruckner, like every great genius, cannot be forced into the constraints of a artistic stencil. And those of us who, although not making a scholarly examination of his music, let his works affect us so simply and immediately as artistic revelations ; we all sense and know that his deep religious faith has long since been freed of all confessional confines, and that it has its roots in the same heroic feeling for the world from which all truly great and eternal creations of German art blossom. In this sense, Anton Bruckner's works represent a National legacy.

The " Führer " and his government regard it as a cultural debt of honour to do everything in their power to enable the entire German people to share in this sacred heritage, and, with a significant encouragement of interest in Bruckner, to see to it that this interest and its effects penetrate not only deeply but also widely. For these reasons, they have decided to make a considerable annual contribution to the " International Bruckner Society " for editions of the original versions of his Symphonies, until the Master's complete works are available in the form he envisioned.

Permit me, my " Führer ", also to state in this solemn hour that Anton Bruckner, as a son of Austrian soil, is especially called upon to make sense of the unrelenting intellectual and spiritual common fate that envelops the German people even today. It is, therefore, a symbolic event of more than just artistic significance for us that you, my " Führer ", have decided to have a bust of Anton Bruckner included in this sacred National place, once erected by a great Bavarian king, as the 1st monument of our Empire. As admirers of the art of this great Master, we all have been deeply moved by his overpowering genius, wish to offer you, my " Führer ", our deepest gratitude.

With veneration, we consider the immortality of Bruckner's music and recognize one fact with that acknowledgment submitted by a great learned Austrian as he presented at the awarding of an honorary Doctorate to the great Master, declared to him : " Where science must stop, where its insurmountable barriers are set, only there does the realm of

art begin. But you have been able to express that which has remained closed to all knowledge. So it is that I, the rector of the University of Vienna, bow before the school Master from Windhaag. " . And thus, does a thankful Nation bow, in this solemn hour, in the meaning and spirit of this speech before the immortal genius of one of its greatest sons. »

Vinzenz Goller

Parmi les œuvres sans n° d'Opus du compositeur, musicien d'église et maire de la ville de Klosterneuburg, Vinzenz Goller (1873-1943) , citons la Messe en mi mineur de Bruckner (la 2e) avec un accompagnement à l'orgue en remplacement de l'ensemble original d'instruments à vent (2 hautbois, 2 clarinettes, 2 bassons, 4 cors, 2 trompettes et 3 trombones) . L'adaptation éditée chez Universal-Edition (UE 2915) sera donnée en première en 1917. Il la révisé en 1931.

Sa vénération ne s'arrête pas là :

Adaptation pour orgue de l'Adagio de la 7e Symphonie.

2 Fanfares festives pour 11 instruments à vent sur des thèmes de Bruckner.

Vinzenz Goller sera également l'éditeur du beau Motet en fa mineur intitulé « Libera me, Domine » pour chœur mixte à 5 voix (SSATB) , 1 violoncelle, 1 contrebasse, 3 trombones et orgue (ou basse continue) d'Anton Bruckner (**WAB 22**) qui date du 24 mars 1854. Bien que n'ayant pas encore longuement étudié avec Simon Sechter, Bruckner n'était pas un débutant : âgé de 30 ans, il avait accumulé quantité d'expériences de musique d'église. Ce « Libera me » , simple et évident, ne contient pas de contrepoint élaboré, mais sa conduite des voix est excellente, à l'instar du calcul des sonorités. Il recèle la dignité solennelle requise pour une pièce funèbre, et sa section centrale exprime la crainte du jugement avec une puissance et une économie considérables.

Les compositions de Vinzenz Goller sont, pour la plupart, influencées le style et le langage harmonique d'Anton Bruckner et de Gustav Mahler (« Loreto-Messe » , « Ave Maria » , « Ecce sacerdos magnus » , « Lauda sion salvatorem » , « Sorsum Corda » , « Präludium und Fuge über das österliche Halleluja ») .

En 1922, il fonde la « Cäcilia, Österreichische Orgelbau-AG » : une institution pour la construction d'orgues artistiques.

...

Bereits 1921 trug sich Vinzenz Goller (Klosterneuburg) mit dem Gedanken, ein « Institut für künstlerischen Orgelbau » zu gründen. Im Jahre 1922 wurde diese Idee realisiert : Aus den Salzburger Firmen der Orgelbauer Matthäus Mauracher, Franz Mauracher sowie Mertel & Dreher entstand die Firma « Cäcilia » , Österreichische Orgelbau-AG, mit Filialen in Salzburg-Parsch (Geschäftsstelle) , Salzburg-Gnigl und Klosterneuburg. Künstlerische Leiter waren Goller sowie der Salzburger Domkapellmeister Franz Xaver Gruber ; als technischer Direktor fungierte zunächst Franz Mauracher (bis 1926) , dann Max Dreher. Bis 1928 war auch Orgelbaumeister Hans Mertel in der Firma tätig. Binnen kurzem wuchs

die Mitarbeiterzahl auf 100 Mann (1924) ; es wurden auch Klaviere und Harmoniums gefertigt. Orgeln wurden bis nach Holland und Frankreich geliefert ; in Ljubljana und Warschau sowie in Altötting entstanden Filialen. Dem raschen Aufstieg folgte ein schneller Niedergang ; im Oktober 1928 pachteten Max Dreher und Leopold Flamm die Firma, die am 12. Januar 1929 in Dreher & Flamm umbenannt wurde.

...

Komponist, Kirchenmusiker und Bürgermeister der Stadt Klosterneuburg Vinzenz Goller wurde am 9. März 1873 als Sohn des Josef Goller und seiner Frau Rosina, geborene Plaikner, in Sankt Andrä bei Brixen in Südtirol geboren.

Sein Vater war in Sankt Andrä Volksschullehrer, Mesner und Organist. Goller entstammt also (wie viele andere Musiker) einer Familie, die einen guten natürlichen Nährboden für einen Beruf als Kirchenmusiker und Pädagogen bildete. Dazu kam eine überdurchschnittliche musikalische und pädagogische Begabung. Daß in seiner Familie katholischer Glaube und Liebe zur angestammten Heimat lebten, versteht sich beinahe von selbst.

Durch frühzeitige Aktivitäten im Kirchenchor von Sankt Andrä als Sänger und bald auch als Ersatzorganist sowie durch Notenschreiben und Transponieren wurde ihm die Musik natürlicher künstlerischer Lebensraum, seine zweite Natur, mit der er verbunden war wie mit seiner ihn umgebenden herrlichen Heimat der Täler und Berge des Brixner Beckens.

Von Neustift bei Brixen kam Goller 1888 an die Lehrerbildungsanstalt nach Innsbruck. Er wollte ja Lehrer werden. Die Welt der Musik öffnete sich ihm nun weiter durch die Musikschule des dortigen « Musikvereins » , die Professor Josef Pembaur (1848-1923) leitete, sowie durch aktive Mitarbeit in den Kirchenchören von Innsbruck.

1885, also als Bub mit 12 Jahren, kam er als Sängerknabe und Student in das im Tal gelegene Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Neustift. Dort entfaltete sich sein junges Talent organisch weiter und wurde vielseitig gebildet durch Chor- und Choralsingen, durch tägliches Üben im Violin- und Waldhornspiel, durch seine Bekanntschaft mit dem gleichaltrigen Josef Gasser (1873-1957) , sowie durch die erste Begegnung mit einem « großen » Musiker, nämlich Ignaz Mitterer (1850-1924) , dem damals soeben in Brixen angestellten Domkapellmeister.

Von Innsbruck zog er wieder heim als Lehrer. Er wurde Volksschullehrer in Niederolang (1892-1893) , Sexten (1893-1899) und in Sankt Lorenzen im Pustertal (1899-1903) .

An diesen Orten mußte er als Musiker andere bilden und führen, lernte dabei selbst musikalische Pädagogik « von Grund » auf und zwar als Singlehrer, Chorleiter, Organist und Komponist. Als solcher war er fast « gezwungen » zu komponieren, denn die Notenarchive der Pfarre waren ziemlich dürftig.

« So entstanden nach und nach in Anpassung an die Fortschritte meiner jungen Kirchenchöre die später im Druck erschienenen Werke bis Opus 25 ; in der ersten Wochenhälfte wurde komponiert und kopiert', in der zweiten Hälfte einstudiert. »

Sein Talent trieb ihn naturgemäß mehr und mehr ganz zur Musik. Eine Zeit lang nahm er Privatunterricht bei dem

berühmten Josef Rheinberger und erwarb sich « durch Verkauf von Gamsbärten » einen selbstbezahlten Studienurlaub an der Kirchenmusikschule in Regensburg. Goller besuchte in Regensburg den « 24. Kurs » im Jahre 1898, wie die Festschrift « Gloria Deo-Pax hominibus » zum 100jährigen Bestehen der Kirchenmusikschule Regensburg mitteilt. Diese erste systematische kirchenmusikalische Schulbildung in Regensburg auf hoher Ebene formte Goller entscheidend : durch Franz Xaver Haberl, Michaël Haller und Josef Renner jun. kam er mit dem « Cäcilianismus » in Verbindung und Regensburg legte den Urgrund seiner liturgischen Lebensgesinnung durch Doktor Georg Jakob, der dort Liturgik, Ästhetik und Geschichte der Kirchenmusik lehrte.

Im Jahre 1899 verehelichte sich Goller mit Maria Josefa Pfeifhofer aus Sexten. (Der Ehe entsprossen sieben Kinder. Von 1903 an ist Gollers Beruf einzig und allein der Kirchenmusik gewidmet : als Komponist, Pädagoge, Dirigent, Organist und Organisator, beginnend in dem bayrischen Städtchen Deggendorf (an der Hauptkirche « Maria Himmelfahrt ») . Sein Ruf als Komponist (besonders durch seine « Loreto-Messe » , Opus 25) war inzwischen fast weltweit geworden, sodaß er mit dem Aufbau einer « Abteilung für Kirchenmusik » an der Wiener Musikakademie betraut wird. Damit erreicht Goller den « dienstmäßigen » Höhepunkt seines Lebens, er ist Leiter einer der ersten Hochschulen für Kirchenmusik. Er bleibt aber dabei bewußt verbunden mit der « Basis » , mit den kleinen Kirchenchören und dem Volk und komponiert auch weiterhin gemäß seiner Devise : « Aus der Praxis für die Praxis » .

Die « Abteilung für Kirchenmusik » hatte ihren ersten Sitz im Augustiner-Chorherren-Stift Klosterneuburg. Dies ist für Goller im doppelten Sinn bedeutungsvoll : Er kommt in lebendige Verbindung mit einem Zentrum abendländischer Musikkultur und auch mit Pius Parsch, dem Gründer der « Volksliturgischen Bewegung » . Außerdem fällt in diese Zeit die beginnende Erneuerung des christlichen Lebens aus dem Geist der Eucharistie und Liturgie durch Pius X. So wird Goller einer der ersten « volksliturgischen Kirchenmusiker » und ein Kirchenmusiker, der Papst Pius X. von Anfang an überzeugt Gefolgschaft leistet.

Seinen Dienst als Kirchenmusiker unterbricht er von sich aus im ersten Weltkrieg. Mit Italiens Übertritt zu den Alliierten im Mai 1915 meldete Goller sich als « Freiwilliger » der Tiroler Standschützen. Bis zum Kriegsende avancierte er vom einfachen Standschützen zum Bataillonskommandant der Truppen im Pustertal. Nach seiner Gefangennahme im September 1918 durch die Italiener flüchtete er bald aus dem Lager in der Nähe von Mantua über wenig begangene Bergpfade in die Schweiz und von dort nach Österreich. Im Februar 1919 war er glücklich in Klosterneuburg bei der Familie und übernahm wieder die Leitung der Abteilung « Kirchenmusik » , die er bis 1921 inne hatte. Als seine Eltern im August 1920 ihre Goldene Hochzeit feierten, konnte Goller nicht auf legalem Weg nach Brixen gelangen, da er als geflohener Kriegsgefangener noch immer auf den italienischen Fahndungslisten stand. In umgekehrter Richtung ging es diesmal von Österreich über die Schweiz nach Südtirol, auf ebenso geheimen Wegen. Er langte rechtzeitig zur Feier ein. Sie fand in der Nacht statt in der Wohnung seines Bruders Pius Goller, Domherr und Domkapellmeister in Brixen.

Nach seiner Rückkehr nimmt er seinen Beruf als Kirchenmusiker wieder auf, zugleich aber kämpft er mutig als Politiker. Er wird Gemeinderat (ab 1933) und dann Bürgermeister von Klosterneuburg (1936-1938) .

Im März 1938 wurde er durch die Nationalsozialisten seines Amtes enthoben. Zwei seiner Kinder gehörten einer der ersten Widerstandsgruppen an, der « Gruppe Scholz », die aus einigen Dutzend Leuten bestand. Einer aus den eigenen Reihen wurde zum Verräter und die Gruppe wurde am 22. Juli 1940 ausgehoben, inhaftiert und angeklagt. Gollers Tochter wurde infolge der Mißhandlungen während ihrer Haft fast blind, der jüngste Sohn Hubert wurde wegen « Volksverrat » zum Tod verurteilt. Ein enger Parteifreund Hitlers, dem Goller im I. Weltkrieg einmal das Leben gerettet hatte, bewahrte eingedenk dieser Tat den Sohn vor dem Fallbeil. Er wurde « nur » zum Dienst in einer Strafkompagnie verurteilt. Gollers Frau brach unter diesem Schlag zusammen und sollte sich nie mehr ganz erholen. Als 1941 Stift Klosterneuburg aufgehoben wurde, übersiedelte er mit der restlichen Familie nach Sankt Michael im Lungau, wo eine seiner Töchter mit einem Arzt verheiratet war. Nach dem Tod seiner Frau 1946 verbrachte er einige Zeit bei seinen Geschwistern in Südtirol, bis er 1950 wieder nach Klosterneuburg zurückkehrte.

1953 wurde Vinzenz Goller zum Ehrenmitglied der Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst ernannt, er starb jedoch noch, bevor der Festakt statt fand. Nach einem Jagdausflug erkrankte er an einer Lungenentzündung und starb am 11. September 1953 in Sankt Michael im Lungau. Er wurde am dortigen Friedhof an der Seite seiner Frau bestattet. Sein Grab liegt gewissermaßen im geographischen Mittelpunkt seines « Lebenskreises » : Sankt Andrä-Innsbruck-Regensburg-Deggendorf-Klosterneuburg. In das Grab wurden Erde und ein Stein aus Südtirol eingefügt.

Vinzenz Goller schuf überwiegend kirchenmusikalische Werke, für alle kirchlichen Feste im Jahreskreis gibt es Kompositionen von ihm. Die bis 1903 gedruckten Werke erschienen unter dem Pseudonym Hans von Berchthal. Es sind dies Opus 1 bis 3. Unter seinem wirklichen Namen erschienen zahlreiche Messen, Requiem und Offertorien. In seiner « Selbstbiographie » (erschienen unter dem Titel « Zeit lassen ! » im « Alpenländischen Kirchenchor », 1953, Nummer 3 und 4) meint er, er habe für alle Gelegenheiten des Kirchenjahres Texte vertont. Liest man das Werkverzeichnis, so ist klar zu erkennen, daß er tatsächlich für das jeweilige Können des Chores komponierte, den er während seiner « Wanderjahre » als Lehrer vorfand. Die 114 gezählten Werke sind überwiegend für den kirchlichen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die bekanntesten seiner Orgelmessen sind die « Loreto-Messe » und die « Clemens Hofbauer-Messe » .

Um das Jahr 1921 erfolgte die Begegnung mit dem Begründer der « volksliturgischen Bewegung », dem Klosterneuburger Chorherren Pius Parsch. Für die erste « Gemeinschaftsmesse » am Christi-Himmelfahrtstag 1922 in der kleinen Kirche Sankt Gertrud schrieb Vinzenz Goller einfache choralmäßige Melodien. Seine « Klosterneuburger Betsingmesse », die heute als « Leopolds-Messe » tituiert wird, zählt zu seinen bekanntesten und weitest verbreiteten Kirchenkompositionen.

Unter den gedruckten Werken ohne Opuszahl befindet sich unter anderen eine Ausgabe der « Messe in E-Moll » von Anton Bruckner mit Orgelauszug statt des originalen Blesorchesters. Erstmals erschien diese Messe 1917, in einer revidierten Fassung wurde sie 1931 nochmals herausgebracht. Unter den nichtveröffentlichten und nur für Einzelne geschriebenen Werken seien zwei genannt, die Gollers Verehrung für Bruckner deutlich machen :

« Festpräludium für Orgel in memoriam Anton Bruckner », 6. Juni 1937 ; komponiert zur Aufstellung der Brucknerbüste in der « Walhalla » zu Regensburg ; 2 Festfanfaren für 11 Bläser über Themen von Anton Bruckner.

« Non confundar in æternum »

Dans le mi-temps des années 1930, l'Europe persévère dans sa génuflexion devant le Nazisme, après le conférence de Stresa qui doit consolider la paix mais ne révélera qu'un profond désaccord entre les 3 puissances, Adolf Hitler s'emploie à réarmer la Rhénanie.

La vieille France n'écoute déjà plus l'Espoir de Malraux, oublie la Passante du Sans-souci de Kessel ! Dans les années 1880, Anton Bruckner, cet autrichien né près de Saint-Florian compose l'Adagio, « sehr feierlich und sehr langsam » de sa 7e Symphonie autour du dernier vers du « Te Deum » latin : « Non confundar in æternum » .

Lente, pesante, écrasante, solennelle d'orgueil possessif monstrueux est cette journée du dimanche 6 juin 1937. Ce jour-là, Anton Bruckner, homme de haute spiritualité, bon enfant, si peu certain de son talent, admiratif exalté de la musique de Wagner, va être confondu, assimilé, associé, amalgamé, identifié, fusionné, à l'immonde.

Ce lien noir, sacrilège, est tissé par Hitler, lui aussi autrichien, qui exècre l'État multi-ethnique Austro-hongrois, qu'il a fuit jeune pour Munich lesté de son antisémitisme viscéral appris à Vienne. Ce mélomane fou, l'être le plus effroyable que l'humanité nous ait donné, fait pénétrer le buste du compositeur dans le « Walhalla » auprès d'autres gloires à Donaustauf, à 10 kilomètres de Ratisbonne, le Panthéon Germanique.

Tout autre que la bête lui eut rendu cet hommage mérité, ne l'aurait jamais entaché ainsi par ce lien effroyable, d'une salissure profonde. Lui, le « conférencier et proche » de Gustav Mahler, devenait ce jour-là, sous le joug nazi l'un des vecteurs destructeurs de la culture germanique, à seule fin de servir un empire à la suprématie désirée millénaire !

Le « Führer » , dont on peut dire avec certitude, selon les mots de Ian Kershaw, que sans lui l'histoire de monde aurait connu un cours radicalement différent, voyait en Bruckner l'injustice que lui-même « artiste génial » pensait avoir subie ; narcissisme d'identification par le malheur, proche symptôme du paranoïaque.

Anton Bruckner venu tardivement au professorat et à la composition musicale commença sa carrière à un âge où Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart et Franz Schubert avaient depuis longtemps achevé la leur où, Ludwig van Beethoven, Franz-Joseph Haydn et les autres possédaient déjà une œuvre monumentale. Bruckner pense que l'on peut faire de la musique pure en se prévalant de la nouvelle fonction dramatique wagnérienne.

Il introduira dans la 7e Symphonie 4 tubas wagnériens et bâtira ses pans sonores tels des orgues, organiste de la cathédrale de Linz qu'il fut longtemps. Le dur combat que se livraient entre eux Brahmsiens tenant de la musique pure et Wagnériens partisans du drame musical le fait rejeté de Vienne, humilié dans sa propre patrie.

Le combat des amis de l'Un et de l'Autre lui valurent sans doute cette étiquette officielle de wagnérien, pour autant, la musique de Bruckner n'est-elle pas de la musique pure ?

Il lui fallut attendre cette 7e et l'âge de 60 ans pour qu'enfin viennent la reconnaissance et l'estime, la consécration

internationale, malgré le succès de sa 4e Symphonie dite « Romantique » .

Ce combat mortel qui laissera longtemps des traces dans l'histoire de la musique, et n'apportera que désastres culturels, qui en son temps courrouçait Goethe s'insurgeant contre cette manie de l'opposer à Schiller alors que tous auraient dû se réjouir d'avoir deux aussi vigoureux gaillards de cet ordre, selon ses propres mots, servira le mélomane fou pour une répétition grandeur nature au « Walhalla » de ce que sera dans quelques mois l' « Anschluß » .

Il annexe d'abord, la culture, la musique par le biais de Bruckner pour mieux annexer demain le pays, l'Autriche. Sans doute est-ce là, la 1re conséquence du pan-germanisme que Stresa laissait entrevoir.

Ce dimanche 6 juin 1937, le mélomane fou viendra, dans ses pompes et fanfares nazies, déposer une gerbe au pied du buste d'Anton Bruckner sous le regard d'une vingtaine d'officiels un peu coincés par l'étroitesse du monument. La foi religieuse profonde de Bruckner ne sera en rien un frein à la célébration païenne du Symphoniste par cet état, tyrannique et athée.

Son « Te Deum » sera joué le soir même sous la présidence du mélomane fou et de son séide, Josef Gœbbels !

Le « Führer » se tait, il ne fera pas de discours, c'est en silence qu'il rendra hommage à cet homme dont il pense être à l'identique de sa souffrance artistique.

Sans doute dans ce silence prépare-t-il la « Bayerische Ostermark » , délicat euphémisme (la Marche de l'Est Bavaroise) dont il fera usage juste après le « Walhalla » , le jour même, dans un de ses discours fleuve, à Ratisbonne, au congrès provincial du « NSDAP » devant ses chemises brunes et noires et quelques 200,000 participants.

Pourtant, on rata le 40e anniversaire de la mort du compositeur autrichien, sans doute était-ce trop tôt trop en avance pour la réalisation des visées d'annexion du mélomane fou ! Il fallait de plus un événement montrant avec force que ces visées-là étaient attendues, désirées par le peuple allemand. Déjà, la communication de propagande devait être efficace !

Oui, derrière cette assimilation, cette association ténébreuse, se perpétue le simulacre d'une annexion prochaine de tout un peuple ; d'un pays, d'une nation ! Ce jour du dimanche 6 juin 1937, ce fut la culture qui fut pour longtemps kidnappée, otage d'un monde pervers de cruauté.

« Pour l'homme normal, le temps c'est ce qui vient après le début ; le temps de Bruckner, c'est ce qui vient après la fin. Je suis heureux de pouvoir encore aujourd'hui lire les lignes qu'il nous a laissées. » (Sergiu Celibidache)

On ne peut mieux exprimer la musique, l'œuvre Brucknérienne ! Beaucoup se sont complus à chercher des erreurs dans cette œuvre Symphonique monumentale, qu'un juste retour aux sources primitives des originaux rend à ces compositions toute leur force.

Il semble comme le disait Wilhelm Fürtwängler que pour beaucoup ces erreurs sont à l'origine de la puissance des liens organiques de toute l'œuvre Brucknérienne. Jusqu'à ce coup de cymbales avec triangle au sommet de l'Adagio de la 7e, qu'une annotation de la main d'Anton sur une bandelette de papier collée sur la page correspondante avec la mention « non valable » .

Il souhaitait qu'on la supprima, peu de chefs le firent, tant l'effet produit est logique et saisissant. Toute dédiée qu'elle est cette 7e Symphonie à Louis II de Bavière, elle est avant toute autre considération un vibrant hommage au très vénéré Richard Wagner :

« Je rentrais chez moi un jour, très triste ; je me disais il est impossible que le Maître vive longtemps encore. À ce moment précis, l'Adagio en ut dièse mineur me fut inspiré. »

Cet Adagio sublime forme à n'en pas douter un poignant « in Memoriam » . C'est le deuil qui inspire Bruckner, le deuil de son Maître, de Wagner dont le « Parsifal » mit Anton dans l'émotion la plus grande. Cordes graves et tubas wagnériens (2 ténors, 2 basses et, 1 tuba contrebasse) énoncent un 1er thème désolé, déployé par les violons dans l'intensité.

Un second motif en contraste sur la fluctuation des altos et violoncelles. Vient l'insertion de son « Te Deum » ; les violons semblent dire la consolation, puis en un dialogue des thèmes suit en long développement de forme contrapuntique.

Le crescendo mène à la Coda où tonne une dernière fois le thème principal au travers des 4 « tuben » et le tuba contrebasse.

L'affiche créée par Lothar Heinemann : le symbole de l'État allemand se confondant avec l'instrument roi. Cette affiche réalisée à des fins touristiques, revêt une prétention impérialiste. La domination artistique doublant le sentiment de supériorité raciale et politique. Pour Josef Gœbbels, le peuple allemand est « le 1er peuple musicien de la Terre » . (Le 3e « Reich » et la Musique, Cité de la Musique, Fayard.)

Le Temple du « Walhalla » de Ratisbonne

Le « Walhalla » est un temple néo-Grec en marbre, de style Dorique, situé à Donaustauf au bord du Danube, à 10 kilomètres en aval de Ratisbonne, en Bavière.

Ce monument imposant fut édifié, entre 1830 et 1842, dans la vallée du Danube sur un site en hauteur imposant, par l'architecte Leo von Klenze pour le compte du roi Louis 1er de Bavière. Ce dernier voulait en faire le mémorial (le « Walhalla » constitue le séjour des héros dans la mythologie nordique) des grands hommes qui illustrèrent la civilisation allemande depuis 2,000 ans : artistes, militaires, rois, Empereurs, scientifiques, philosophes, penseurs, grandes personnalités.

Le mémorial se visite et on peut y voir aujourd'hui, à l'intérieur, 129 bustes de personnalités allemandes ou d'autres nationalités de langue germanique. Du péristyle, on a une belle vue sur la courbe du Danube, les ruines du château de Donaustauf et les flèches de la Cathédrale Saint-Pierre de Ratisbonne.

Le « Walhalla » honore peu de femmes, essentiellement des Princesses. Les femmes occupaient, sous la République de Weimar, 1 % des chaires universitaires supérieures, ce qui limitait d'avance les protestations quand les Nazis, qui avaient laissé en place les rares titulaires à condition qu'elles ne fussent ni juives, ni proches de la retraite, ni émigrées, entreprendraient d'empêcher de nouvelles nominations féminines.

...

The « Walhalla » is considered the most important of all works commissioned by King Ludwig I of Bavaria (1825-1848) . Architect Leo von Klenze constructed the « Walhalla » , between October 18th 1830 (when the foundation stone was laid) and October 18th 1842 (official opening ceremony) . Proximity to the former Free Imperial City of Regensburg with its magnificent Gothic cathedral is deliberate.

...

« Walhalla » , or German Temple of Fame and Honour is a neo-Classical hall of fame located on the Danube River 10 kilometers east of Regensburg, in Bavaria. The exterior is a close imitation of the Parthenon (a temple of the Greek goddess Athena) , and is constructed of gray marble. It was the idea of 20 year old Crown Prince Ludwig I of Bavaria in 1807, at a time when the German states were defeated and occupied by Napoleon. It was meant as a place for the commemoration of great figures and events in ethnic German history, at the time covering 1,800 years, beginning with the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (in 9 AD) . Whereas the « Walhalla » of Norse mythology was home to those gloriously slain in battle, Ludwig's « Walhalla » was intended not only for warriors but also for scientists, writers, clerics and specifically also for women.

...

The « Walhalla » temple is a hall of fame that honours laudable and distinguished Germans, famous personalities in German history - politicians, sovereigns, scientists and artists of the German tongue. The hall is housed in a neo-Classical building above the Danube River, east of Regensburg, in Bavaria.

...

The « Walhalla » temple is named for « Walhalla » of Norse mythology. It was conceived in 1807 by Crown Prince Ludwig, who built it upon ascending the throne of Bavaria as King Ludwig I. Construction took place between 1830 and 1842, under the supervision of architect Leo von Klenze.

The temple displays some 65 plaques and 130 busts of persons, covering 2,000 years of history. The earliest person honoured is Arminius, victor at the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (in 9 AD) .

...

The « Walhalla » temple is one of the most popular attractions in the area. The monumental building is located in Donaustauf, just 12 kilometres from Regensburg away.

Following the model of the Parthenon, on the Acropolis, the « Walhalla » of Germany was opened in 1842 as Hall of Fame, in honour of the German people which is located on a hill overlooking the Danube. The name goes back to the Teutonic mythology, where the bravest killed warriors found their last resting place in « Walhalla » .

The interior attracts its visitors with 128 marble busts and 65 plaques, reminiscent of prominent figures of the German-Teutonic language family. Among them are King Ludwig I. (the founder of « Walhalla ») , Barbarossa, Goethe, Schiller, Haydn, Luther, Gutenberg, Gauss and Empress Katarina the Great, just to name a few. The temple was conceived as an open monument, so that the series can be continued at any time. As the latest bust, Heinrich Heine was added in 2010.

Once you have climbed the plateau you have a wonderful view over the Danube to Regensburg and to the Bavarian Forest.

...

In der Gedenkstätte « Walhalla » (nach Walhall, Halle der Gefallenen) bei Donaustauf (Landkreis Regensburg, Bayern) werden auf Veranlassung des bayerischen Königs Ludwig I. seit 1842 bedeutende Persönlichkeiten « teutscher Zunge » mit Marmorbüsten und Gedenktafeln geehrt.

Zur Eröffnung im Jahre 1842 wurden 160 Personen mit 96 Büsten und, in den Fällen fehlender authentischer Abbildungen oder bei Handlungen wie dem Rüttschwur, 64 Gedenktafeln geehrt. Heute wird mit 130 Büsten und 65 Gedenktafeln an 195 Personen, Taten und Gruppen erinnert. Zwölf der Geehrten sind Frauen. Jedermann kann eine zu ehrende Persönlichkeit aus der germanischen Sprachfamilie frühestens 20 Jahre nach deren Tod vorschlagen und trägt dann gegebenenfalls die Kosten für die Anfertigung und Aufstellung der Büste. Über die Neuaufnahmen entscheidet der Bayerische Ministerrat.

Die Idee zur Errichtung der « Walhalla » ist vor dem Hintergrund der deutschen politischen Situation zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts zu sehen. Nach Niederlagen gegen Napoleon zerbrach das Heilige Römische Reich deutscher Nation. Viele deutsche Fürsten arbeiteten, notgedrungen oder auf eigenen Vorteil bedacht, im Rheinbund mit den Franzosen zusammen. So kam es, daß das Kurfürstentum Bayern vergrößert und von Napoleon zum Königreich erhoben wurde, und daß im Vierten Koalitionskrieg auch Kronprinz Ludwig I. an der Seite der Franzosen gegen Preußen kämpfend in Berlin einmarschierte.

Durch die politische Zersplitterung und Schwächung Deutschlands und die darauffolgende französische Besetzung zogen die besiegten Deutschen gegen die noch unbesiegten Deutschen und nahmen später an Napoleons verheerendem Russlandfeldzug teil. Diese Lage wurde von vielen als tiefe Erniedrigung Deutschlands aufgefasst (siehe Johann Philipp Palm) . Man begann zunehmend, eine gemeinsame nationale Identität in der Vergangenheit zu suchen, bis zurück zur Germanenzeit. Die Jahrzehnte später erfolgte Errichtung nationaler Denkmäler, wie etwa des Hermannsdenkmals im Teutoburger Wald, die zwar meist klassizistischen Stiles waren, jedoch germanische Themen aufgriffen, ist ein Resultat dieser Identitätssuche.

Angesichts von « Teutschlands tiefster Schmach » im Jahr 1806, als das Heilige Römische Reich aufgelöst wurde, ein Großteil Deutschlands als Rheinbund unter dem direkten Einfluss Napoleons stand und die linke Rheinseite zu Frankreich gehörte, ließ der damalige Kronprinz Ludwig bereits 1807 eine Serie von Büsten « rühmlich ausgezeichnete Teutscher » erschaffen. « Kein Stand nicht, auch das weibliche Geschlecht nicht, ist ausgeschlossen. Gleichheit besteht in der “ Walhalla ” ; hebt doch der Tod jeden irdischen Unterschied auf. » Nur « teutscher Zunge zu seyn, wird erfordert, um “ Walhallas ” Genosse werden zu können » , so Ludwig, denn die Sprache « ist das große Band, das verbindet, wäre jedes andere gleich zernichtet ; in der Sprache währt geistiger Zusammenhang » . Zu den Teutschen zählte Ludwig auch historische Germanen wie zum Beispiel Goten und Wandalen.

Ludwig hatte, wie in der ersten der drei Bodeninschriften vermerkt, schon im Januar 1807 den Beschluss gefasst, so bald wie möglich für 50 große Deutsche einen Ehrentempel zu errichten. Zusammen mit dem Schweizer Geschichtsschreiber Johannes von Müller, der auch den Namen « Walhalla » vorschlug, wählte er Persönlichkeiten aus, von Kaisern längst vergangener Zeiten über jüngst Verstorbene, wie Friedrich Schiller, bis zu Zeitgenossen wie Goethe und Joseph Haydn, und gab auf eigene Kosten deren Büsten in Auftrag, bei Bildhauern wie und andere Johann Gottfried Schadow, dessen Sohn Rudolf Schadow, Joseph Maria Christen oder Christian Friedrich Tieck.

Während die ersten Büsten noch 1807 vollendet wurden, verzögerte sich die Planung und Fertigstellung eines angemessenen Gebäudes um Jahrzehnte. Erst nach der Niederlage Napoleons konnte 1814 ein Ideenwettbewerb ausgeschrieben werden. Die Ausschreibung trug die Überschrift : « Ein Gebäude, dem Andenken großer Deutschen bestimmt. » Ludwig dachte als Standort für den klassizistischen Prachtbau zunächst an den Englischen Garten in München, erst später verlegte er sich auf die Ausführung auf einem Berg und außerhalb der Residenzstadt. Der Entwurf im Stile des Parthenon geht auf Zeichnungen des Architekten und frühen Archäologen Carl Haller von Hallerstein zurück, der mit einem Stipendium des bayerischen königlichen Hofes 1810 Griechenland bereiste und Baustudien am Original durchführte. Eine enge Korrespondenz mit Kronprinz Ludwig ist seit 1811 bezeugt. Sein Entwurf bestand aus 26 Zeichnungen (heute Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München) , die er im November 1815 einreichte. Nach seinem frühen Tode im Jahre 1817 erwarb der Architekt Leo von Klenze im Jahre 1819 ein umfangreiches Konvolut von 175 Blättern Hallers mit Studien zur « Walhalla » und zur ebenfalls von ihm gebauten Glyptothek. Seine 1831-1842 ausgeführte Anlage der « Walhalla » bei Donaustauf enthält einige wesentliche Ideen Hallers.

Bei Ludwigs Regierungsantritt 1825 waren bereits 60 Büsten vollendet, aber noch kein Bauplatz gefunden. Zusammen mit Klenze wurde der Bräuberg oberhalb des Donautals bei Donaustauf ausgewählt. Die Grundsteinlegung für den « Ruhmestempel » erfolgte am 18. Oktober 1830, dem 17. Jahrestag der Völkerschlacht bei Leipzig.

Am 29. Jahrestag der Völkerschlacht, dem 18. Oktober 1842, eröffnete Ludwig I. den Bau mit Worten, die auf einem Stein vor der « Walhalla » zu lesen sind :

« Möchte “ Walhalla ” förderlich sein der Erstarkung und der Vermehrung deutschen Sinnes ! Möchten alle Deutschen, welchen Stammes sie auch seien, immer fühlen, daß sie ein gemeinsames Vaterland haben, ein Vaterland auf das sie stolz sein können, und jeder trage bei, soviel er vermag, zu dessen Verherrlichung. »

Ludwig veröffentlichte selbst eine Beschreibung von « Walhallas » Genossen, die von Heinrich Heine als « Walhall-Wisch » verspottet wurde, als er das Fehlen von Luther kritisierte, der bei der Einweihung noch nicht aufgenommen war. Erst 1847 wurde auch die schon 1831 fertiggestellte Büste des Reformators eingestellt, der mit seiner Bibelübersetzung die deutsche Schriftsprache geprägt hatte. Schließlich wurde 2010 auch die Büste von Spötter Heine selbst in die « marmorne Schädelstätte » aufgenommen.

Auch bedingt durch seine Affäre mit Lola Montez dankte Ludwig im Revolutionsjahr 1848 zugunsten seines Sohnes Maximilian II. ab. Wie auch die Eröffnungsfeier eher sparsam gehalten war, so erfolgten die weiteren Neuaufnahmen in Anwesenheit von Ludwig in einer schlichten Weise, wie auch zuletzt 1866 die von Beethoven. In diesem Jahr, inzwischen war sein Enkel Ludwig II. auf dem Thron, mußte der 80-jährige Ludwig noch miterleben, wie der Deutsche Bruderkrieg dem Deutschen Bund nach einem halben Jahrhundert ein Ende bereitete. Schon zuvor hatte er 1862 testamentarisch die « Walhalla » « Deutschland, seinem großen Vaterlande » vermacht, jedoch hinzugefügt, daß bei Auflösung des Deutschen Bundes Bayern den Besitz übernimmt, mit der Einschränkung : « Würde später wieder ein Bund Deutschland vereinigen, würde Walhalla aufs neue Eigentum Deutschlands. » Dies wurde nicht umgesetzt, « Walhalla » blieb Eigentum des Königreiches und späteren Freistaates Bayern.

Ludwig starb 1868, also zwischen der Gründung des Norddeutschen Bundes und seiner Erweiterung zum Deutschen Reich infolge des Deutsch-Französischen Krieges. Die bayerische Monarchie befand sich zu dieser Zeit in einer Krise. König Ludwig II. führte einen exzentrischen Lebensstil, zog sich immer mehr aus der Öffentlichkeit zurück und vernachlässigte zunehmend die Regierungsgeschäfte. Außerdem gab er Unsummen für den Bau seiner Schlösser aus. Nach dessen Tod 1886 konnte sein Bruder Otto I. nicht als König auftreten, da er als « geisteskrank » galt. Sein Onkel Luitpold vertrat ihn als Prinzregent.

Die erste Neuaufnahme von Skulpturen nach dem Tod des Gründers erfolgte erst 22 Jahre später und galt Ludwig I. selbst. « Das dankbare Volk » ehrte « Ludwig, König von Bayern » mit einem großen Standbild.

Der Architekt Leo von Klenze errichtete den als « Ruhmestempel » gedachten Bau aus Kelheimer Kalkstein im Auftrag König Ludwigs von 1830 bis 1842 hoch über der Donau bei Regensburg. Die « Walhalla » entstand im klassizistischen Stil und erhielt die Gestalt eines marmornen griechischen Tempels im Stil eines dorischen Peripteros nach dem Vorbild des Parthenon in Athen. Die Länge des Tempelbaus beträgt 66,7 meters, die Breite 31,6 meters, die Höhe 20 meters. Die Gesamtanlage mit Unterbau ist 125 meters lang und 55 meters hoch. Innen ist die « Walhalla » 48,5 meters lang, 14 meters breit und 15,5 meters hoch.

Benannt ist die Anlage nach Walhall, der Wohnstatt der tapfersten gefallenen Krieger in der germanischen Mythologie. Die « Walhalla » ist das älteste Beispiel einer Gruppe monumentaler Gedenkbauwerke Deutschlands, zusammen mit dem Niederwalddenkmal bei Rüdesheim am Rhein, dem Völkerschlachtdenkmal bei Leipzig, dem Kyffhäuserdenkmal, dem Deutschen Eck in Koblenz, dem Hermannsdenkmal bei Detmold und der Berliner Siegessäule. Die « Walhalla » war mit Baukosten von vier Millionen Gulden Ludwigs teuerstes Projekt. Das vollplastische Giebelfeld der Nordseite zeigt links die Germanen unter Arminius in der Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald gegen die von Westen (rechts) anstürmenden Römer. Das südliche Giebelfeld stellt Teutschlands Befreyung im Jahr 1814 dar : In der Mitte Germania, links / rechts nähern sich huldigend die deutschen Teilstaaten und Bundesfestungen, im Zwickel sind die Grenzflüsse Rhein und Mosel symbolisiert. Der umlaufende Innenfries von Martin von Wagner stellt die Frühgeschichte der Germanen, ihren Aufbruch vom Kaukasus und ihre Einwanderung in Mitteleuropa dar. Die letzte Etappe bildet die Bekehrung zum christlichen Glauben durch den heilig Bonifatius.

Das Dach wird von einer für die damalige Zeit modernen Eisenkonstruktion getragen.

Personnalités représentées au « Walhalla »

Konrad Adenauer : 1er chancelier fédéral de la République fédérale d'Allemagne (1999) .

Amélie Élisabeth de Hanau-Münzenberg : Épouse de Guillaume V de Heße-Cassel (1847) .

Auguste II le Fort : Prince électeur de Saxe et Roi de Pologne (?) .

Johann Turmair : Érudit humaniste et chroniqueur de Bavière (1847) .

Jean-Sébastien Bach : Compositeur allemand (1916) .

Michel Barclay de Tolly : Général russe et ministre de la Guerre (1847) .

Ludwig van Beethoven : Compositeur Classique allemand (1866) .

Bernard de Saxe-Weimar : Général pendant la guerre de Trente Ans (1847) .

Otto von Bismarck : 1er chancelier de l'Empire allemand (?) .

Gebhard Leberecht von Blücher : Général prussien (1847) .

Herman Boerhaave : Médecin néerlandais (1847) .

Johannes Brahms : Compositeur Romantique allemand (2000) .

Anton Bruckner : Organiste et compositeur autrichien (1837) .

Gottfried August Bürger : Poète allemand (1747) .

Christophe de Wurtemberg : Duc de Wurtemberg (1847) .

Conrad II : Empereur Romain germanique (1024) .

Nicolas Copernic : Chanoine polonais, médecin et astronome (1473) .

Johann von Dalberg : Évêque de Worms (1747) .

Ivan Dibich-Zabalkansky : Général russe (1781) .

Albrecht Dürer : Peintre, graveur et mathématicien allemand (1471) .

Antoine van Dyck : Peintre Baroque flamand (1632) .

Eberhard Ier de Wurtemberg : Comte de Wurtemberg et d'Urach (1080) .

Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn : Prince-évêque de Wurtzbourg (1729) .

Joseph von Eichendorff : Poète et Romancier allemand (1788) .

Albert Einstein : Physicien allemand (1879) .

Érasme : Humaniste et théologien néerlandais (1469) .

Ernest Ier de Saxe-Gotha : Duc de Saxe (1741) .

Jan van Eyck : Peintre flamand (1390) .

Charles-Guillaume-Ferdinand de Brunswick : Général et prince allemand (1733) .

Frédéric Ier du Palatinat : Comte palatin du Rhin (1680) .

Frédéric Ier de Hohenstaufen dit « Barberousse » : Empereur Romain germanique (1122) .

Frédéric le Grand : Ier roi de Prusse (1712) .

Frédéric II de Hohenstaufen dit « stupor mundi » : Empereur Romain germanique (1847) .

Frédéric-Guillaume Ier de Brandebourg : Électeur de Brandebourg (1847) .

Georg von Frundsberg : Soldat et capitaine de lansquenets (1847) .

Jacob Fugger : Banquier allemand d'Augsbourg (?) .

Johann Carl Friedrich Gauss : Mathématicien, astronome et physicien allemand (2007) .

Karolina Gerhardinger : Religieuse allemande (1998) .

Ernst Gideon Freiherr von Laudon : Maréchal autrichien (1847) .

Christoph Willibald Gluck : Compositeur allemand (1847) .

Gœthe : Poète, Romancier et dramaturge allemand (1847) .

Joseph Görres : Écrivain allemand (?) .

Hugo Grotius : Juriste, philosophe, apologiste chrétien, dramaturge et poète (1847) .

Otto von Guericke : Scientifique, inventeur et homme politique allemand (1847) .

Johannes Gutenberg : Imprimeur allemand (1847) .

Guillaume Ier d'Allemagne : Ier Empereur allemand (?) .

Guillaume Ier d'Orange-Nassau : Chef de la révolte des Pays-Bas espagnols (1847) .

Guillaume III d'Angleterre : Roi d'Angleterre et d'Écosse, seigneur d'Irlande (1847) .

Albrecht von Haller : Médecin, poète et naturaliste suisse (1847) .

Hans von Hallwyl : Héros suisse (1847) .

Georg Friedrich Händel : Compositeur d'origine allemande (1847) .

Franz-Joseph Haydn : Compositeur Classique autrichien (?) .

Henri XII Le Lion : Duc de Saxe et de Bavière (1847) .

Henri Ier L'Oiseleur : Duc de Saxe et roi de Francie orientale (1847) .

Wilhelm Heinse : Écrivain, savant et bibliothécaire allemand (1847) .

Berthold von Henneberg : Archevêque de Mayence et prince-électeur du Saint-Empire (1847) .

Johann Gottfried von Herder : Poète, théologien et philosophe allemand (1847) .

Friedrich Wilhelm Herschel : Compositeur et astronome d'origine allemande (1847) .

Hans Holbein le Jeune : Peintre et graveur allemand (1847) .

Ulrich von Hutten : Chevalier d'Empire et humaniste (1847) .

Friedrich Ludwig Jahn : Éducateur allemand (?) .

Immanuel Kant : Philosophe allemand (1847) .

Charles II d'Autriche-Styrie : Général en chef (?) .

Charles V : Empereur du Saint-Empire Romain germanique (1847) .

Charles V : Duc de Lorraine et de Bar (1847) .

Charles X Gustave : Roi de Suède (1847) .

Catherine II La Grande : Tsarine russe (1847) .

Johannes Kepler : Astronome et mathématicien allemand (1847) .

Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock : Poète allemand (1847) .

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz : Philosophe, scientifique, mathématicien, diplomate, bibliothécaire, juriste allemand (1847) .

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing : Écrivain, critique et dramaturge allemand (1847) .

Justus von Liebig : Chimiste allemand (?) .

Paris von Lodron : Archevêque de Salzbourg (1847) .

Louis-Guillaume de Bade : Général impérial (1847) .

Louis Ier : Roi de Bavière (?) .

Martin Luther : Moine augustin allemand, théologien père du Protestantisme (1848) .

Marie-Thérèse : Impératrice du Saint-Empire Romain germanique (1847) .

Maximilien Ier du Saint-Empire : Empereur Romain germanique (1847) .

Maximilien Ier de Bavière : Prince-électeur de Bavière (1847) .

Hans Memling : Peintre allemand (1847) .

Gregor Mendel : Moine et botaniste autrichien né à Brno (?) .

Raphael Mengs : Peintre et écrivain d'art allemand (1847) .

Helmuth Karl Bernhard von Moltke : Militaire prussien (?) .

Maurice de Nassau : Stathouder des provinces de Hollande et de Zélande (1847) .

Maurice, prince-électeur de Saxe : Général allemand (1847) .

Justus Möser : Juriste, historien et théoricien social allemand (1847) .

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart : Compositeur Classique autrichien (1847) .

Johannes von Müller : Historien suisse (1847) .

Burckhardt Christoph von Münnich : Maréchal et Ier ministre russe d'origine allemande (1847) .

August Neidhardt von Gneisenau : Général prussien (1847) .

Nicolas de Flue : Ermite suisse (1847) .

Otton Ier : Fondateur du Saint-Empire romain germanique (1847) .

Theophrast von Hohenheim (Paracelse) : Alchimiste, astrologue et médecin suisse (1847) .

Jean Paul : Écrivain allemand (?) .

Max Joseph von Pettenkofer : Chimiste allemand (?) .

Walter de Plettenberg : Grand-maître de l'ordre des Chevaliers porte-glaives (1847) .

Joseph Radetzky : Maréchal autrichien (?) .

Max Reger : Compositeur post-Romantique allemand (1948) .

Johannes Müller (Regiomontanus) : Astronome, mathématicien et astrologue allemand (1847) .

Johannes Reuchlin : Philosophe et théologien allemand (1847) .

Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen : Physicien allemand (?) .

Peter Paul Rubens : Peintre Baroque flamand (1847) .

Rodolphe 1er du Saint-Empire : Roi des Romains (1847) .

Michiel de Ruyter : Amiral néerlandais (1847) .

Gerhard von Scharnhorst : Général prussien (1847) .

Friedrich Wilhelm von Schelling : Philosophe allemand (?) .

Friedrich von Schiller : Poète et écrivain allemand (1847) .

Sophie Scholl : Résistante allemande de la Seconde Guerre mondiale (2003) .

Johann Philipp von Schönborn : Archevêque de Mayence et évêque de Worms (1847) .

Franz Schubert : Compositeur Romantique autrichien (1928) .

Karl Philipp de Schwarzenberg : Feld-maréchal autrichien (1847) .

Franz von Sickingen : Chevalier allemand (1847) .

Frans Snyders : Peintre néerlandais (1847) .

Heinrich Friedrich Karl vom Stein : Homme d'État et réformateur prussien (1847) .

Erwin von Steinbach : Architecte et sculpteur alsacien (1847) .

Edith Stein : Philosophe et religieuse allemande (2008) .

Adalbert Stifter : Écrivain, peintre et professeur autrichien (?) .

Richard Strauß : Compositeur post-Romantique allemand (1973) .

Maximilian von und zu Trauttmansdorff : Comte autrichien (1847) .

Maarten Tromp : Amiral de la marine néerlandaise (1847) .

Aegidius Tschudi : Homme politique, diplomate, géographe et historien suisse (1847) .

Peter Vischer l'Ancien : Sculpteur allemand (1847) .

Richard Wagner : Compositeur Romantique allemand (1913) .

Albrecht von Wallenstein : Généralissime des armées Impériales, duc de Friedland et de Mecklembourg (1847) .

Carl Maria von Weber : Compositeur Classique allemand (1978) .

Christoph Martin Wieland : Poète traducteur et éditeur allemand (1847) .

Frédéric-Guillaume de Schaumbourg-Lippe : Commandant pendant la guerre de Sept Ans (1847) .

Johann Joachim Winckelmann : Archéologue, antiquaire, historien de l'art allemand (1847) .

Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf : Réformateur religieux allemand (1847) .

Festival Bruckner du Danube (1937)

Le thème : « Art et Culture au pays de Bruckner » .

« Kunst und Kultur im Brucknerland Donaufestwochen 1937 (Bruckner-Fest) » in Linz, Sankt Florian, Steyr 16. bis 21. Juli.

Vendredi, le 16 juillet à 21 heures - Soirée de la Sérénade au « Landhaushof » de Linz sur le Danube

Joseph Haydn : Nocturne en ut majeur.

Franz Schubert : 5 Menuets et 6 Trios.

Anton Bruckner : Intermezzo du Quintette à cordes en ré mineur.

Hugo Wolf : Sérénade italienne.

W. A. Mozart : Sérénade n° 4 (K. V. 203) .

Directeur musical : Professeur Robert Keldorfer.

Ensemble : Orchestre symphonique de Vienne.

Freitag, 16. Juli : 21 Uhr - Serenade im Landhaushof, Linz an der Donau

Joseph Haydn : Notturmo in C-dur.

Franz Schubert : 5 Menuette mit 6 Trios.

Anton Bruckner : Intermezzo für Streichquintett in D-Moll.

Hugo Wolf : Italienische Serenade.

W. A. Mozart : Serenade Nr. 4 (K. V. Nr. 203) .

Leitung : Musikdirektor Professor Robert Keldorfer.

Orchester : Wiener Symphoniker.

Samedi, le 17 juillet à 20 heures - Concert au « Festhalle » de Linz sur le Danube

Ludwig van Beethoven : 8e Symphonie en fa majeur.

Anton Bruckner : 5e Symphonie en si bémol majeur (version originale) .

Directeur musical : Eugene Ormandy.

Ensemble : Orchestre symphonique de Vienne.

Samstag, 17. Juli : 20 Uhr - Festhalle, Linz an der Donau

Ludwig van Beethoven : VIII. Symphonie in F-Dur.

Anton Bruckner : V. Symphonie in B-Dur (Originalfassung) .

Leitung : Generalmusikdirektor Eugene Ormandy.

Orchester : Wiener Symphoniker.

Dimanche, le 18 juillet à 10 heures - à l'église abbatiale de Saint-Florian

Anton Bruckner : « Missa solennis » en si mineur.

Directeur musical : Adolf Trittinger.

Ensemble : Orchestre symphonique de Vienne et chœur du monastère de Saint-Florian.

Sonntag, 18. Juli : 10 Uhr - Stiftskirche, Sankt Florian.

Anton Bruckner : Missa solennis in B-Moll.

Leitung : Musikdirektor Adolf Trittinger.

Ensemble : Wiener Symphoniker und Sankt Florianer Stiftschor.

Suivi d'un Concert d'orgue

W. A. Mozart : Fantaisie en fa mineur.

Franz Schmidt : 2 Chorals Préludes.

« Nun danket alle Gott » (« Maintenant, nous devons tous remercier Dieu ») .

« O wie selig seid ihr doch » (« O combien béni vous êtes encore ») .

Prélude et Fugue en ré majeur.

Max Reger : « Moment Musical » en ré majeur tiré de l'Opus 59.

« Pastorale » en fa majeur tirée de l'Opus 50.

« Ave Maria » en ré majeur tiré de l'Opus 80.

Jean Sébastien Bach : Passacaille et Double Fugue en ut mineur.

Organiste : Professeur Franz Schütz.

Anschließend Orgelkonzert

W. A. Mozart : Phantasia in F-Moll.

Franz Schmidt : 2 Choralvorspiele.

« Nun danket alle Gott » .

« O wie selig seid ihr doch » .

Präludium und Fuge in D-Dur.

Max Reger : « Moment musical » in D-Dur aus Opus 59.

Pastorale in F-Dur aus Opus 50.

« Ave Maria » in Des-Dur aus Opus 80.

J. S. Bach : Passacaglia und Doppelfuge in C-Moll.

Orgel : Professor Franz Schütz.

Dimanche, le 18 juillet à 15 heures - Concert donné à la Salle de marbre de Saint-Florian

Ire partie : Musique à Saint-Florian avec les petits-chanteurs Bruckner

Franz Schubert : Ouverture dans le style italien.

Michäel Haydn : 3 Motets a cappella.

« Plange quasi virgo » .

« Caligaverunt » .

« Tenebrae factae sunt » .

W. A. Mozart : « Splendente te Deus » , hymne pour solistes et orchestre.

Directeur musical : Adolph Trittinger.

Ensemble : Orchestre symphonique de Vienne et chœur du monastère de Saint-Florian.

Sonntag, 18. Juli : 15 Uhr - Musikalischer Fest Akt (Marmorsaal, Sankt Florian) .

I. Teil : Musik in Sankt Florian zu Bruckners Sängerknaben-Zeit

Franz Schubert : Overture im italienischen Stil.

Michäel Haydn : 3 Motetten a-cappella.

« Plange quasi virgo » .

« Caligaverunt » .

« Tenebrae factae sunt » .

W. A. Mozart : « Splendente te Deus » , Hymnus für Soli und Orchester.

Leitung : Musikdirektor Adolph Trittinger.

Ensemble : Wiener Symphoniker und Sankt Florianer Stiftschor.

2e partie

Anton Bruckner : 2e Symphonie en ut mineur.

Directeur musical : Hans Weisbach.

Ensemble : Orchestre symphonique de Vienne.

2. Teil

Anton Bruckner : II. Symphonie in C-Moll.

Leitung : Generalmusikdirektor Hans Weisbach.

Orchester : Wiener Symphoniker.

Lundi, le 19 juillet à 19h30 - au « Festhalle » de Steyr

Franz Schubert : 7e Symphonie en ut majeur.

Anton Bruckner : 6e Symphonie en la majeur (version originale) .

Directeur musical : Hans Weisbach.

Ensemble : Orchestre symphonique de Vienne.

Montag, 19. Juli : 19.30 Uhr - Festhalle, Steyr

Franz Schubert : VII. Symphonie in C-Dur.

Anton Bruckner : VI. Symphonie in A-Dur (Originalfassung) .

Leitung : Generalmusikdirektor Hans Weisbach.

Orchester : Wiener Symphoniker.

Mercredi, le 21 juillet à 20 heures - au « Festhalle » de Linz sur le Danube

Anton Bruckner : 3e Symphonie en ré mineur.

Franz Schmidt : 2e Symphonie en mi bémol majeur.

Direction : Professeur Oswald Kabasta.

Ensemble : Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne.

Mittwoch, 21 Juli : 20 Uhr - Festhalle, Linz and der Donau.

Anton Bruckner : III. Symphonie in D-Moll.

Franz Schmidt : II. Symphonie in Es-Dur.

Leitung : Professor Oswald Kabasta.

Orchester : Wiener Philharmoniker.

Weitere Veranstaltungen

Freitag, 16. Juli : Nachmittag - Linz an der Donau.

STADTRUNDFAHRT einschließl. der Höhen der Umgebung und Besuch des Pöstlingberges.

Samstag, 17. Juli : 9 Uhr - ab Brückenkopf, Linz an der Donau.

FAHRT MIT AUTOBUSSEN IN DAS SALZKAMMERGUT :

Besuch der Kurstadt Gmunden, mit dem Schiff über den Traunsee nach Ebensee. Auffahrt mit der Seilbahn auf den Feuerkogel. Mittagessen im Berg-hotel. Nachmittags zurück nach Gmunden. Besuch des Strandbades. Bei schlechtem Wetter Fahrt mit dem Autobus entlang des Traunsees nach Bad Ischl, Besichtigung der Kurstadt und des Kaiserparks.

Sonntag, 18. Juli : 8.30 Uhr - Brückenkopf, nach Sankt Florian.

ABFAHRT MIT AUTOBUSSEN NACH SANKT FLORIAN.

Montag, 19. Juli : 9 Uhr.

BESUCH DER BRUCKNERGEDENKSTÄTTEN :

Abfahrt mit Autobussen nach Bruckners Geburtsort Ansfelden bei Linz. Besichtigung des Bruckner-zimmers. Weiterfahrt zu dem zweitältesten Stift Oberösterreichs Kremsmünster (gegründet 777) , Stiftsbesichtigung. Mittagessen in Bad Hall. Nachmittags Spaziergang durch den Kurpark. Weiterfahrt nach Steyr und Besichtigung der alten Eisenstadt. Abendessen in Steyr.

Dienstag, 20. Juli : 10 Uhr - Abfahrt.

ÜBERRASCHUNGSFAHRT AUF DER DONAU von Linz donauaufwärts bis Engelhartzell. Konzert an Bord. Mittagessen auf dem Schiff. Auf der Rückfahrt Besuch des Stiftes Wilhering. Festveranstaltung in den schönen Parkanlagen des Stiftes.

Mittwoch, 21. Juli : 9.30 Uhr - Brückenkopf.

BESUCH DES BERÜHMTEN GOTISCHEN KEFERMARKTER ALTARES und des mittelalterlichen Freistadt. Mittagessen in Freistadt. Nachmittags Ankunft in Linz.

Mitteilungen für die Festteilnehmer

Fahrpreisermäßigungen :

Die Teilnehmer genießen auf den österreichischen Bundesbahnen für alle fahrplanmäßigen Züge (ausgenommen die Luxuszüge) eine Fahrpreisermäßigung von 25 Prozent in der 3. Klasse und $33 \frac{1}{3}$ Prozent in der 2. und 1. Klasse gegen Vorweis der Teilnehmerkarte.

Geltungsdauer der Ermäßigungen auf den Bundesbahnen :

a) Die Hinfahrt nach Linz darf frühestens um 0 Uhr des 14. Juli 1937 angetreten werden und muß spätestens um 12 Uhr des 21. Juli 1937 beendet sein ;

b) die Rückfahrt von Linz darf frühestens um 12 Uhr des 16. Juli angetreten werden und muß spätestens um 24 Uhr des 25. Juli 1937 beendet sein.

Ebenso hat die Donau-Dampfschiffahrts-Gesellschaft auf der Post- , Eil- und Lokalschiffstrecke Passau - Wien sowohl für die Hin- als auch die Rückfahrt eine 25prozentige Fahrpreisermäßigung zugestanden.

Geltungsdauer :

Hinfahrt, 10. Juli bis 20. Juli 1937.

Rückfahrt, 17. Juli bis 31. Juli 1937.

Einreise und Aufenthalt von Ausländern in Österreich :

Visumfreiheit für deutsche Staatsbürger wird gewährt. Aufenthaltsgenehmigung ist nicht nötig. Gültiger Reisepaß ist notwendig.

Eintrittspreise :

Von Seite 10. (bis 2.) österreichische Schillinge. Die Karten können entweder direkt oder durch Reisebüros beim Landesverkehrsamt bestellt werden.

Mitglieder der I. B. G. genießen gegen Vorweis der Mitgliedskarte einen Nachlaß von 20 Prozent.

Unterkunft und Verpflegung :

Ferner gibt das Oberösterreichische Landesverkehrsamt ein Gutscheineft für die Dauer der Donau-festwochen heraus, welches enthält :

Die Unterkunft und Verpflegung in Linz von Freitag, den 16. Juli, mittags, bis Donnerstag, den 22. Juli, früh. Ferner die Eintritte zu allen Konzerten in Linz, Sankt Florian und Steyr, die Zu- und Abfahrten zu den Konzerten in Sankt Florian und Steyr, die diversen Autoausflüge, Schiffs- und Seilbahnfahrten, die Besichtigung und die Verpflegung außerhalb Linz. Der Preis enthält außerdem auch die Trinkgeldablöse.

Kartenbestellungen und Auskünfte erteilt das Oberösterreichische Landesverkehrsamt, Reisedienst : Linz and der Donau, Landstraße 36.

29 November 2015 - The « Montreal Gazette » reports on Bruckner Festivals (1937) :

Good day Mister Berky,

I found this small article from Saturday, 24 July 1937, in the Art-section (« NEWS OF STAGE, SCREEN AND MUSIC ») of the « MONTREAL GAZETTE » daily newspaper (which still exists) .

Best Regards,

Gilles Houle, « the chauvinist Montrealer » .

https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1946&dat=19370724&id=_HYtAAAIBAJ&sjid=j5gFAAAAIBAJ&pg=4223,2950298&hl=fr

Festivals of Bruckner Music Are Staged in Middle-Europe

(The Gazette, Montreal, Saturday, July 24, 1937.)

« NEWS OF STAGE, SCREEN AND MUSIC »

In the train of the recent Bruckner Festival in Regensburg, Germany, held under the auspices of the International Bruckner Society, comes another Bruckner Festival which just opened in the Austrian cities of Linz, Saint-Florian and Steyr. These cities lie in the region so intimately bound-up with the composer's career that it has been dubbed « Brucknerland » by the natives.

The inaugural programme of the current Bruckner Festival, held in connection with the Danube Festival Weeks, was given in Linz with a Serenade, under the baton of Robert Keldorfer, who conducted the Vienna Symphony Orchestra in a list containing Bruckner's « Intermezzo » for String Quintet in D minor. Yesterday, Eugene Ormandy directed the same Orchestra in Bruckner's 5th Symphony and Beethoven's 8th Symphony. Today, Bruckner's « Missa solemnis » in B minor will be given, under Adolf Trittinger, in Saint-Florian, and, at a later hour, the Vienna Symphony Orchestra, which performs all the programmes, will play Bruckner's 2nd Symphony, with Hans Weisbach directing.

Tomorrow night, the same conductor will lead the Orchestra in Bruckner's 6th Symphony in the Festival Hall of Steyr, and the Festival will close Wednesday, at Linz, where Oswald Kabasta will conduct the composer's 3rd Symphony. All of the programmes, except that of the Mass, contain works by various other Austrian and German composers.

The 3 day Bruckner Festival held earlier in Regensburg, in connection with the unveiling of the bust of the composer in the « Walhalla » of that city, included concerts by the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra and several choral organizations. The conductors were Rudolf Kleiber, Theodore Schrems, Siegmund von Hausegger, Peter Raabe and Oswald Kabasta.

Among the chief orchestral works performed were 4 Bruckner Symphonies : the 1st, 3rd, 5th and 9th, the latter in the original version. The Choir of the Cathedral of Regensburg, under Doctor Schrems, was heard in the « Te Deum » , « Mass in E minor » , and 3 Motets by the composer. Peter Raabe was the chief-speaker at the Festival meeting of the International Bruckner Society held in the old City Hall.

Siegmund von Hausegger et le 3e « Reich »

Comme chef d'orchestre, Siegmund von Hausegger a été actif à Graz, Munich, Francfort, Berlin et Hambourg. À partir de 1920, il sera à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Munich et le président de l'Académie de Musique où il a également enseigné. Parmi ses élèves citons : Eugen Jochum, Karl Marx et Karl Höller.

Siegmund von Hausegger était reconnu comme un grand interprète des œuvres d'Anton Bruckner et de la « nouvelle École allemande » . Il sera l'un des Iers chefs importants de sa génération à toujours choisir les versions originales (« urfassung ») des Symphonies de Bruckner. Sous cette forme, il donnera en première mondiale, avec sa phalange munichoise, la 5e Symphonie en 1935 et la 9e Symphonie en 1932.

Durant le 3e « Reich » , Siegmund von Hausegger, fervent partisan de la musique de Richard Wagner, de Franz Liszt et d'Anton Bruckner, se conformera aux dictats officiels de la politique culturelle Nationale-Socialiste. Il sera co-signataire avec le chef Hans Knappertsbusch et le compositeur Hans Pfitzner de « protestation de Richard Wagner en provenance de la ville de Munich » , un écrit pamphlétaire qui sera violemment dénoncé par le critique et auteur Thomas Mann. Dans une lettre ouverte à saveur politique adressée à Hausegger, Mann s'en prend à l'homme qui sert l'Allemagne nazie, contribuant ainsi à promouvoir le départ des opposants culturels au régime. Plus tard, Hausegger avouera que ce geste de solidarité s'avérera être la plus grande erreur de sa vie.

Depuis 1934, Hausegger siège sur le Conseil des compositeurs allemands de la Chambre de la musique du « Reich » . En novembre 1934, il va diriger à Munich un concert de propagande devant un auditoire formé de SS avec, au programme, des œuvres de Richard Wagner et d'Anton Bruckner. En 1938, Hausegger, Autrichien d'origine, va appuyer le référendum sur l'annexion de l'Autriche au « Reich » allemand (« Anschluß ») . Il voit dans ce geste « l'action du vrai Siegfried, le héros qui sauve son peuple de l'esclavage » .

À l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire, en 1942, Adolf Hitler lui décerne la « Médaille Goethe pour l'art et la science » . Hausegger se perçoit avant tout comme un grand nationaliste et non un National-Socialiste. Il refusera d'adhérer au Parti nazi (le NSDAP) . Il sera alors victime d'accusations et de menaces permanentes.

Déjà, en 1933, le chef Siegmund von Hausegger quittera le podium après avoir refusé d'interpréter le « Horst-Wessel-Lied » lors d'un concert Symphonique commandité par les SA, à Munich. Il sera averti puis arrêté par la « Gestapo » . Cela entraînera sa démission de la présidence de l'Académie de musique. En 1938, il quittera toutes les institutions auxquelles il était rattaché. Siegmund von Hausegger va mourir à Munich en 1948, soit 3 ans après la fin du 2e conflit mondial.

Le monastère de Saint-Florian sous les Nazis

Le monastère de Saint-Florian, où la carrière du compositeur Anton Bruckner a débuté, deviendra l'hôte d'un projet de transformation en un lieu de pèlerinage, semblable à celui de Bayreuth.

Le directeur de la radiodiffusion du 3e « Reich » (« Reichsintendant des Großdeutschen Rundfunks ») , le docteur Heinrich Meier, avait l'intention de faire du monastère une sorte de « temple sacré » en hommage au compositeur Anton Bruckner ; un peu comme Adolf Hitler l'a fait pour son compositeur fétiche Richard Wagner, le « Festspielhaus » et la ville de Bayreuth. Suite à une levée de boucliers, l'idée d'en faire un instrument entièrement moderne sera abandonnée. Une restauration majeure sera entreprise tout en conservant le caractère d'origine. Il possède 7,343 tuyaux et 103 registres. Il est surnommé, depuis 1930, l'orgue de Bruckner (« Bruckner Orgel ») , son titulaire entre 1848 et 1855.

Gœbbels déclare à ce sujet : « Hitler veut établir un nouveau centre culturel ici pour faire contrepoids à Vienne qui doit être mis de côté progressivement. Il a l'intention de rénover Saint-Florian à ses frais. » .

Par conséquent, Hitler va financer un centre d'études (une chaire) sur Bruckner. Il va subventionner la publication de l'édition des partitions originales de Bruckner entreprise par le musicologue Robert Haas. Le célèbre orgue de l'église abbatiale sera également réparé et la bibliothèque du monastère sera augmentée.

...

On projette d'installer, après la fin de la guerre, une importante station de radio privée dans le monastère de Saint-

Florian afin de diffuser, partout dans le monde, de la musique dite « sérieuse ». L'endroit devait même subir des rénovations (selon les plans d'Hitler) pour devenir, à la fois, un Temple sacré à la mémoire d'Anton Bruckner et un lieu de conservation de nombreux chefs-d'œuvre de l'« Art véritable ». De plus, le monastère sera la résidence officielle du « Bruckner-Orchester » et du « Bruckner-Chor ».

Le directeur de la Radio du « Reich » Heinrich Glasmeier, nommé responsable de la réalisation du projet, va confisquer le monastère en 1940 en faveur du « Reichsgau » du Haut-Danube. Les activités coutumières seront cependant maintenues en raison de l'importance culturelle et historique du lieu (cela sera également le cas pour d'autres monastères) mais, finalement, les chanoines quitteront Saint-Florian en 1941.

La nouvelle vocation du monastère de Saint-Florian était incluse dans le projet mégalomane de faire de la ville de Linz la future capitale culturelle du « Reich ». Saint-Florian serait l'hôte annuel d'un grand « Brucknerfestspiele » basé sur le modèle de celui du Festival de Bayreuth pour la musique de Richard Wagner.

...

Unter all jenen KünstlerInnen, die in Oberösterreich von den Nationalsozialisten vereinnahmt wurden, sticht besonders Anton Bruckner hervor. Mit ihm identifizierte sich Hitler nicht nur biografisch. Für die Nationalsozialisten war Bruckner ein Sinnbild für die « geistige und seelische Schicksalsgemeinschaft, die das gesamte deutsche Volk verbindet ». Kein Wunder also, daß im Marmortempel der Walhalla in Regensburg schon vor dem Anschluß, im Juni 1937, eine Bruckner-Büste des Münchner Bildhauers Adolf Rothenburger in persönlicher Anwesenheit Hitlers enthüllt wurde - im Übrigen die einzige Büste, die man während der NS-Zeit in der Walhalla aufstellte. Nach dem Anschluß sollte insbesondere das Stift Sankt Florian bei Linz den angemessenen Rahmen für die Bruckner-Verehrung bieten. Hierhin sollte der Sitz der Deutschen Bruckner-Gesellschaft unter Wilhelm Furtwängler von Wien verlegt, eine Orchesterschule zur Ausbildung von Dirigenten eingerichtet und eine Musikhochschule und ein musikalisches Gymnasium gegründet werden. Regelmäßige Orgelwettbewerbe und Bruckner-Festspiele waren geplant. Vor allem aber sollte das Stift Sitz der Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft unter Heinrich Glasmeier werden und das Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester des Großdeutschen Rundfunks (auch Bruckner-Orchester genannt) sowie den Reichs-Bruckner-Chor beherbergen. Das alles sollte möglich werden, nachdem das bestehende Stiftsgymnasium, das Sängerknabenkonvikt und die Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Sankt Florian im Juli 1938 aufgelöst worden waren. « Wir wollen die Pfaffen hier vertreiben, eine Hochschule für Musik und die Brucknergesellschaft hinlegen », schrieb Josef Gæbbels in sein Tagebuch, als er im März 1941 das Stift besuchte.

Neben der Bruckner-Verehrung versuchte man, Bezüge zu Komponisten herzustellen, die im Sinne der NS-Kulturpolitik « akzeptabel » waren und Oberösterreich und Linz zumindest auf der Durchreise gestreift hatten : Christoph Willibald Gluck, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Franz Schubert, Josef Lanner, Carl Michael Ziehrer und Hugo Wolf.

Propagandawert der Populärmusik

Vor allem nach dem Beginn des Zweiten Weltkrieges erkannten die kulturpolitisch Verantwortlichen den hohen Propagandawert der Populärmusik. Die Operette wurde damit kriegswichtiger als die Oper. So fand etwa 1942 am

Linzer Landestheater das « Land des Lächelns » von Franz Lehár in einer opulenten Führerausstattung großen Anklang. Nach dem Namen des Librettisten dieser Operette, Fritz Beda-Löhner, suchte man allerdings am Theaterzettel vergebens. Er war bereits im März 1938 ins KZ Dachau gebracht worden und wurde 1942 in Auschwitz ermordet.

Aufführungsverbot für jüdische Werke

Der Musikbolschewismus sollte durch die arische Moderne Oberdonaus ersetzt werden, so lauteten die Schlagworte. Aufführungen von Werken jüdischer Komponisten wurden verboten. Nach Beginn des Russlandfeldzuges im Juni 1941 kam das Verbot für russische Komponisten hinzu. Dies sollte Platz schaffen für zeitgenössische KomponistInnen des Gaues, unter ihnen Franz Schnopfhagen (kurzzeitig Landesleiter der Reichsmusikkammer), Franz Neuhofer, Ludwig Daxperger, Franz Xaver Müller, Karl Rausch, Isidor Stögbauer oder Frida Kern. Diese KomponistInnen versuchten über politische Mittler wie Franz Kinzl und Anton Fellner zu erreichen, daß Georg-Ludwig Jochum, der Leiter des Städtischen Symphonieorchesters und des Bruckner-Orchesters, mehr « gaueigene zeitgenössische Kompositionen » in seiner Programmgestaltung berücksichtigte.

Aufwertung der Musikerziehung

Die Musikerziehung erfuhr durch die Gründung der Städtischen Musikschule, der Musikschulen für Jugend und Volk und der Hitlerjugend-Musikschulen im Mai 1939 eine enorme Aufwertung. Daneben gab es als Ausbildungseinrichtung (von den Plänen für Sankt Florian abgesehen) auch noch das Bruckner-Konservatorium. Dieses war durch eine Umbenennung aus der Linzer Musikvereinschule hervorgegangen. Adolf Trittinger, der bisherige Stiftsorganist von Sankt Florian, wurde 1939 Direktor des Bruckner-Konservatoriums, nachdem sein Vorgänger, Robert Keldorfer, nach der Auflösung des Linzer Musikvereins als politisch untragbar beurlaubt wurde.

Zwischen den einzelnen Einrichtungen der Musikerziehung kam es zu einer Konkurrenzsituation, die neben der kriegsbedingten Raum- und Lehrernot 1942 zur Zusammenlegung der Musikschulen führte.

Neben dem Bruckner-Orchester des Großdeutschen Rundfunks, das als Reichsorchester galt, gab es in Linz auch das Städtische Symphonieorchester unter der Leitung von Georg-Ludwig Jochum.

...

L'ouvrage de référence sur cette période est de l'auteur Hans Kreczi :

Hanns Kreczi

DAS BRUCKNER-STIFT SANKT FLORIAN UND DAS LINZER REICHS-BRUCKNER-ORCHESTER (1942-1945)

Hanns Kreczi, for many years responsible for cultural administration in Linz, gives the 1st account of Adolf Hitler's plan to combine the Augustinian « Stift Sankt Florian », the « Bruckner-Orchester » and the « Bruckner-Chor » to form

the « Musikwerk des Großdeutschen Rundfunks » (music project of Greater German Radio) , which was intended to occupy an important position in the National-Socialist re-ordering of post-War Europe.

From 1942 to 1945, the « Reich » Bruckner Orchestra (the « Führer » 's own Symphony Orchestra) broadcasted live through the « Großdeutschen Rundfunks » (Great German Radio) , directly from the Augustinian Monastery of Saint-Florian (near Linz) . It was especially indebted to the Symphonic work of Anton Bruckner. For the 1st time, we have here a comprehensive and objective analysis of Hitler's project by author Hanns Kreczi.

Title : « Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian und das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (1942-1945) » .

Volume 5 of the Series : « Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien » (Band 5) edited by Othmar Wessely.

368 pages.

46 illustrations.

Bibliography : pages 13-14.

Includes index.

Publisher : Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria (1986) .

ISBN : 978-3-900270-81-0

ISBN-10 : 3201013196

ISBN-13 : 978-3201013192

Dimensions : 24 x 17 cm.

...

Doktor Hanns Kreczi, Archivar und Historiker : geboren 10. Februar 1912 in Wien ; gestorben 25. Juni 2003 in Linz. Kreczi entstammte einer Handwerkerfamilie, besuchte das humanistische Gymnasium im sechsten Wiener Gemeindebezirk und maturierte 1931. Er studierte Theologie, Geschichte und Pädagogik an den Universitäten Wien und Bern, promovierte 1937 und begann ein Studium der Rechte. 1939 trat er in den Dienst des Magistrats der Stadt Linz, wo er das Archiv und die Bibliothek betreute. Nach seinem mehrjährigen Wehrdienst im Zweiten Weltkrieg, entfaltete er ab 1945 als Leiter der Linzer Städtischen Sammlungen eine ausgedehnte wissenschaftliche Tätigkeit. Von 1948 bis 1952 war er Leiter des Kulturamtes der Stadt Linz und rief die Publikations-Reihe « Linzer Regesten » ins Leben, die es sich zum Ziel nahm, möglichst alle stadtgeschichtlichen Quellen zu erfassen. 1952-1977 Kulturverwaltungsdirektor. 1956 gab

er den Auftrag für eine « Historische Personenstandskartei für die Stadt Linz » , die als Vorbereitungsarbeit für eine großangelegte Linzer Stadtgeschichte dienen sollte. Als leitender Beamter war Kreczi am Auf- und Ausbau der Linzer Kulturverwaltung beteiligt, trug und andere wesentlich zur Gründung der Neuen Galerie der Stadt Linz bei und wirkte maßgeblich bei der Wiedererrichtung der Linzer Musikschule mit.

Zu seinen Werken zählen und andere Linzer Häuserchronik (1941) ; Linz, Stadt an der Donau (1951) ; Städtische Kulturarbeit in Linz (1959) ; sowie das Linzer Kulturhandbuch (1965) . Zudem war Kreczi Redakteur der « Linzer Stadtmonographien » .

Das Reich-Bruckner-Orchester war von 1942 bis 1945 ein Reichsorchester des Großdeutschen Rundfunks in Linz. Besonders verpflichtet war es dem sinfonischen Werk von Anton Bruckner ; - Hitlers Plan, aus dem Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Sankt Florian und den Institutionen « Bruckner-Orchester » und « Bruckner-Chor » das « Musikwerk des Großdeutschen Rundfunks » zu bilden, wird hier erstmals umfassend und objektiv dargestellt (Mit 46 Bildtafeln.)

...

At the end of World War II, Allied troops occupied much of Austria including the Town of Saint-Florian. There are stories of the G.I.'s racing their motorcycles down the long corridors of the Augustinian monastery.

There is no way to know if Lieutenant Frank Egner, Junior, of Quakerstown, Pennsylvania, was one of those culprits. My guess is that he probably was not, because he thought enough of Saint-Florian that he sent a letter containing 24 postcards of the Abbey to his wife.

The letter, mailed on June 7 of 1945, weighed alot so while her husband placed 12 cents postage on the letter, she had to pay 36 cents more before she could open it.

(John F. Berky.)

...

1960 schrieb Eugen Kurt Fischer in einem Aufsatz mit dem Thema « Das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian » in der Zeitschrift « Publizistik » :

« Dieser Erlebnisbericht wurde aufgezeichnet, weil bis heute nur an einer einzigen Stelle und in einer Form, die ein falsches Bild gibt, das Projekt Sankt Florian be “ geschrieben wurde ”. » (1)

Eugen Kurt Fischer, der selbst in Sankt Florian gearbeitet hatte, stellte in diesem Artikel (Akten lagen ihm nicht zugrunde) seine Sichtweise über die Person des damaligen Reichsintendanten Heinrich Glasmeier und über den Sinn und Zweck des Bruckner-Stiftes dar. (2) Lange Zeit stand diese Erinnerung, die ein eher positives Licht auf die damaligen Ereignisse warf, weitgehend allein im Raum. Anfang der siebziger Jahre ergab sich in der Erforschung der Geschichte

des Bruckner-Stiftes ein neuer Aspekt. Im wieder sogenannten Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Sankt Florian wurden Unterlagen des Reichsrundfunks aus der Zeit des Zweiten Weltkrieges aufgefunden. (3) Eine erste Auswertung dieses Materials erfolgte durch den Ordinarius für Kirchen-geschichte an der katholische-theologie. Hochschule Linz, Professor Karl Rehberger, gleichzeitig Stiftsarchivar in Sankt Florian. Sein Aufsatz beschäftigte sich allerdings nicht direkt mit der Rundfunkgeschichte, sondern in erster Linie mit dem Thema Stifte Oberösterreichs unter dem Hakenkreuz. (4) Trotz-dem sind in seinem Aufsatz eine Reihe neuer Informationen über die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft und das Projekt Sankt Florian enthalten. In jüngster Zeit widmete auch Ansgar Diller im Band 2 der Reihe « Rundfunk in Deutschland » , Rundfunkpolitik im Dritten Reich, dem Thema einige Aufmerksamkeit, allerdings ohne die Arbeit Rehbergers oder die Bestände des Stiftsarchivs heranzuziehen. (5) Auch die Arbeit Victor Ergerts vertieft das Thema kaum. (6) Im folgenden soll deshalb die Geschichte des Bruckner-Stiftes Sankt Florian insbesondere anhand der Akten des Reichsrundfunks, die im Stiftsarchiv Sankt Florian lagern, nachvollzogen werden. (7)

Die Beziehung zwischen dem Chorherrenstift Sankt Florian, in dem gleichnamigen kleinen Marktflecken in der Nähe von Linz gelegen, und dem Nationalsozialismus begann vor dem « Anschluß » Österreichs an das Reich.

Nationalsozialistisches Gedankengut hatte hier schon vor 1938 Sympathien gefunden. So erklärte zum Beispiel ein Pfarrer aus einem nahegelegenen Dorf, der gleichzeitig kommissarischer Beirat des Stiftsgymnasiums Sankt Florian war, etwa :

« Es ergeht an die Priester die Einladung, an der großen deutschen Bewegung aktiv mitzuarbeiten. Wenn wir die große Stunde nicht erkennen, werden wir einmal ohne Volk sein. » (8)

Die verständigungsbereiten Töne aus Sankt Florian, das nicht zu überhörende Angebot, sich mit den neuen nationalsozialistischen Machthabern nach dem Anschluß zu arrangieren, konnten die Autonomie des Stiftes nicht wahren. Trotz der Würdigung der oben geschilderten Haltung durch den zuständigen Gauleiter wurden in den nächsten Wochen von verschiedenen Seiten Forderungen an das Stift gestellt - zunächst allerdings nur nach Räumlichkeiten. So wollten zum Beispiel die « Reichswerke Hermann Göring » zwei Höfe aus dem Besitz des Stifts für Aussiedlungen, die « Hitlerjugend » wollte Räume, und schließlich mußte für 600 Bessarabier und 400 Deutsche aus der Bukowina Platz geschaffen werden. Hitlerjugend-Veranstaltungen störten darüber hinaus das Leben im Stift. Noch konnte allerdings die kirchliche Hoheit aufrechterhalten, konnte im Gymnasium (wenn auch mit großen Schwierigkeiten) unterrichtet werden. (9)

Hatte sich die Situation seit 1938 nur langsam verändert, so spitzte sie sich 1941 dramatisch zu. Am 21. Januar führten 50 Gestapobeamte eine Durchsuchung des Stifts durch, die Ordensbrüder wurden scharf verhört, das ganze Stift streng bewacht. Am nächsten Tag wurde dem Prälaten die Verfügung über die Beschlagnahme des gesamten Besitzes ausgehändigt, datiert vom 21. Januar 1941. Davon waren nicht nur die Gebäude im Marktflecken Sankt Florian betroffen, sondern auch die Pfarrkirchen, die zum Stift gehörten, die Pfarrhöfe und die Landwirtschaft. Ein kommissarischer Verwalter, eingesetzt vom zuständigen Gauleiter, übernahm nun - im übrigen bis Anfang September 1942 die Verwaltung des gesamten Besitzes. Steuertechnisch bestand das Stift mit der Gauselbstverwaltung als Treuhänderin allerdings weiter fort. Dies änderte sich erst etwa zehn Monate später, im November 1941. Zu diesem

Zeitpunkt ging es in den Besitz des Gaus über. (10)

Die Beschlagnahme war Anlaß für den Reichsintendanten des Rundfunks, sich nun um die Nutzungsrechte für das Stift zu bemühen. Glasmeier, der in der Rundfunkzentrale in Berlin seit Kriegsbeginn, verstärkt seit dem Herbst / Winter 1941-1942 beträchtliche Machteinbußen hinnehmen mußte, sah hier eine Möglichkeit, in den Mittelpunkt nationalsozialistischer Kultur- oder Rundfunkpolitik zurückzukehren. Bereits lange vor seiner Berufung zum Intendanten in Köln, noch in seiner damaligen Eigenschaft als Archivdirektor in Westfalen, hatte er einmal Sankt Florian besucht. Seit damals war in ihm die Idee gereift, hier eine « Kulturstätte von Weltgeltung » zu schaffen. 1941 kam er nun zu einem Zeitpunkt auf den Plan zurück, zu dem der gesamte nationalsozialistische Rundfunk (und in dessen Rahmen wollte Glasmeier das Projekt verwirklichen) mit zunehmender Personalknappheit und Geräteproblemen zu kämpfen hatte. Außerdem wurden jetzt Personalkürzungen diskutiert, und mit den Finanzmitteln sollte so sparsam wie irgend möglich umgegangen werden. (11)

Nach einigen Besuchen im Sommer 1942 beschloß Glasmeier, die Räume in den Stiftsgebäuden zunächst auf ihre Tauglichkeit für dieses Projekt überprüfen zu lassen. (12) Im Herbst des Jahres begannen Techniker des Reichssenders Wien daraufhin erste akustische Messungen in den Räumen des Stifts durchzuführen. Diese Meßarbeiten wurden in den nächsten Wochen fortgesetzt. Währenddessen liefen auch Gespräche zwischen der Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft und der zuständigen Gauleitung an. Nach langen und zähen Verhandlungen einigten sich beide Seiten schließlich. Der RRG wurde die Nutzung der Stiftsgebäude für 99 Jahre (zu einem symbolischen jährlichen Pachtzins von einer Reichsmark) überlassen. Dem Reichsintendanten gelang es darüberhinaus auch, die förmliche Zustimmung des Führers für das Projekt (und damit auch erhebliche finanzielle Mittel) (13) zu erlangen. Hitler berief Glasmeier zum Beauftragten des Führers für die Aufgabe, in den Stiftsgebäuden eine « Kulturstätte ersten Ranges » aufzubauen : das Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian. (14)

Am 1. September 1942, knapp ein Jahr nach der Enteignung, übernahm die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft offiziell das Stift ; die bis Sommer des Jahres dort einquartierten Flüchtlinge mußten es wieder verlassen. Am selben Tag wurde das Stift Doktor Gustav A. Schwaiger, dem Beauftragten und Vertrauten Glasmeiers, vom Verwalter übergeben. Schwaiger, vom Reichssender Wien hierher abgeordnet, übernahm in Sankt Florian die Betriebsführung. (15) In den Septemberwochen und in den nächsten Monaten folgten weitere Mitarbeiter, teils aus Wien vom dortigen Reichssender, teils von der Rundfunkzentrale in Berlin. Am 8. Oktober 1942 fand schließlich der offizielle Einzug des Reichsintendanten statt. (16)

Glasmeier benutzte in den Zeiten seiner Anwesenheit im Stift die Räume der ehemaligen Prälatur. Neben der rein räumlichen.

Nähe zu den ehemaligen Äbten des Chorherrenstiftes demonstrierte er in der folgenden Zeit auch eine recht persönliche Nähe zu ihnen : oft zeigte sich Glasmeier in den Gewändern seiner Amtsvorgänger, (17) ließ die Festtage der großen Äbte prunkvoll feiern. (18) In Berlin im Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda spöttelte man über den neuen « Abt » in Sankt Florian. (19)

Im Stift faßte die neue Verwaltung in den Monaten nach der Übernahme langsam Tritt. (20) Erste organisatorische

Probleme wurden geregelt, die für die Rundfunkarbeit wichtige Leitungsfrage Sankt Florian (München beziehungsweise Berlin in Angriff genommen. (21) Währenddessen begannen im Reich Zuarbeiten. Das Notenmaterial für Sankt Florian zum Beispiel wurde in den Funkhäusern in Köln und Leipzig besorgt. (22) Umfangreiche Vorarbeiten begannen nun auch für das im Rahmen des Bruckner-Stifts neu aufzustellende Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester und für den ebenfalls neu zu bildenden gleichnamigen Reichs-Bruckner-Chor. (23)

Für die Aufstellung des Orchesters fanden zwischen November 1942 und März 1945 fünfzehn Vorspieltage statt. Insgesamt 156 Musiker bewarben sich - ihre jeweiligen Orchester wurden unter Druck gesetzt, sie bei Bedarf freizugeben. (24) Knapp über die Hälfte, nämlich 80 von ihnen, kamen schließlich in die engere Wahl. Dies war auch die Zahl, die bis zum 1. April 1945 erreicht werden sollte. Langfristig hoffte man im übrigen 110 Musiker im Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester zusammenzufassen. (25)

Die für die Anfangsphase angestrebte Orchestergröße wurde zunächst nicht ganz erreicht. Am 5. April 1945 konnten vorläufig nur 72 Musiker nach einem feierlichen Konzert in der Stiftskirche Sankt Florian am Sarge Bruckners von Glasmeier persönlich auf die Person des « großen Genius », so Schwaiger, vereidigt werden. Das Konzert war gleichzeitig das erste öffentliche Auftreten, wenn auch zunächst im regionalen Rahmen. In diesem Bereich arbeitete das Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester auch in den nächsten Monaten weiter. Seine große nationale und internationale Bewährungsprobe sollte es erst am 20. April 1944, dem 55. Geburtstag des « Führers », bestehen. (26)

Sechs Wochen nach dem feierlichen Konzert trafen neun weitere Musiker in Sankt Florian ein. Der größte Teil der jetzt hier Arbeitenden war von den Rundfunkorchestern oder den Sendeanstalten abkommandiert worden. Der Deutschlandsender in Berlin hatte allein 22 Künstler abgeben müssen, vom Reichssender Leipzig kamen elf, die Reichssender in Stuttgart und Berlin verloren je sieben und Hamburg sechs. Von den nun rund 80 Musikern hatten ganze acht vorher kein festes Engagement bei einer Rundfunkanstalt gehabt. (27)

Bei der Aufstellung des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores war die Anwerbung der Sänger und Sängerinnen kein Problem. Mit Wirkung vom 15. September 1942 waren alle Rundfunkchöre aufgelöst worden. Die Bildung eines neuen Chores war somit eine Chance für die Künstler, in ihrem alten Beruf wieder Arbeit zu finden. Für den aufzubauenden Chor, für dessen Zusammenstellung aus den Spitzenkräften der aufgelösten Chöre Doktor Karl A. Wirz zuständig war, erfolgten Proben und Vorsingen zwischen Mitte Dezember 1942 und Mitte Februar 1945 in Leipzig. Die endgültige Auswahl unter den zahlreichen Bewerbern (28) traf der als Chorleiter berufene Thomaskantor Professor Günther Ramín. (29) Diejenigen, die bei dieser Beurteilung überdurchschnittlich gut abschnitten, bekamen schließlich ein Schreiben des Reichsintendanten, datiert vom 22. Februar 1945 :

« Ich berufe Sie mit Wirkung vom 1. März 1945 in den Bruckner-Chor Sankt Florian des Großdeutschen Rundfunks. Der Chor tritt zunächst in Leipzig zusammen, um von Thomaskantor Professor Günther Ramín geschult zu werden. In der Aufbauzeit werden Konzerte in Leipzig, Linz und Sankt Florian dem Chor die notwendige Resonanz verschaffen. »

Wie von Glasmeier angeordnet, trafen alle Anfang März 1945 in Leipzig ein. Am 2. März erfolgte im Haus des Reichssenders Leipzig die erste Einweisung der Chormitglieder in ihre zukünftige Aufgabe. Wirz übernahm die Leitung

der laufenden Geschäfte des neu gebildeten Reichs-Bruckner-Chores. Allerdings erst rund ein Jahr später, im April 1944, waren die Vorbereitungen in Sankt Florian / Linz und in Leipzig dann soweit gediehen, daß der Chor seinen Standort an seinen eigentlichen Bestimmungsort verlegen konnte. (31) Bis zu dieser Verlegung hatte er fast nur in Leipzig gearbeitet.

Nach der Ankunft des über vierzigköpfigen Chores (im Juli 1945 waren es genau 45 Sänger und Sängerinnen) wurden seine Mitglieder wie bereits vor ihnen die Musiker des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters am Sarge Bruckners vereidigt. Wieder ließ es sich der Reichsintendant nicht nehmen, persönlich der Zeremonie zur Einführung des Chores in Sankt Florian beizuwohnen. (32) Einige Tage später, am 5. Mai 1944, folgte in Linz die Begrüßung der Chormitglieder durch den Gauleiter. Zehn Tage später wurde im übrigen der bisherige Chorleiter Ramín durch Professor Michaël Schneider ersetzt. (33)

Neben dem Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester und dem Reichs-Bruckner-Chor spielte und arbeitete in Sankt Florian auch die « Spielge-meinschaft Seiler » unter der Leitung des Bratschensolisten Emil Seiler. Die Künstler, 1944 waren es fünf, traten sowohl bei Veranstaltungen im Stift als auch außerhalb auf. Truppen-betreuungsauftritte wechselten ab mit Kammermusikaufnahmen bei verschiedenen Reichssendern, « Gemeinschaftsstunden » zum Beispiel zur « Ehrung gefallener junger Künstler » mit « Feierstunden im Stift » . (34)

Ein erster Höhepunkt in der Existenz des Bruckner-Stiftes war der 4. April 1945. Hitler besuchte, nach kurzfristiger Ankündigung, die zukünftige « Kulturstätte von Weltrang » . Er begutachtete die Räumlichkeiten und die bisher im Sinne seines Führerbefehls geleistete Arbeit. Der Reichsintendant fühlte sich in seiner Arbeit durch diesen Besuch bestärkt, meinte die Rückendeckung des « Führers » vor Ort erlebt zu haben. (35)

Die Verwaltung des Stiftes (es existierte eine eigene Verwaltungsstelle in Sankt Florian und ein Verbindungsbüro bei der RRG in Berlin sowie beim Reichssender München) hatte mittlerweile konkrete Formen angenommen. (36) Mitte 1945 waren die Verantwortlichkeiten wie folgt verteilt : Schwaiger Betriebs-führer im Sinne des « Gesetzes zum Schutz der nationalen Arbeit » ; gleichzeitig nahm er die Vertretung Glasmeiers wahr. Sein Stellvertreter war Eugen Kurt Fischer, (37) der seinerseits die Kunstsammlung im Stift betreute und für die Bibliothek und die RRG-Bücherei sowie für das Thema Sankt Florian allgemein zuständig war. Castelle beschäftigte sich mit Leben und Werk Anton Bruckners. (38)

Besonderen Wert legte Glasmeier auf die Abschottung Sankt Florians gegenüber den Berliner Reichsministerien, insbesondere dem Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda. Nur so glaubte er hier eine eigenständige und starke Position für sich selbst aufbauen zu können. So ist es nicht verwunderlich, daß der Reichsintendant mit äußerster Sorgfalt rund zehn Monate nach Arbeitsbeginn in Sankt Florian einen Bericht an Goebbels zusammenstellte, an denjenigen, der ihn schließlich in Berlin Zug um Zug entmachtete. (39) Erklärlich wird auch seine Anweisung an seinen Stellvertreter, bei wichtigen Gästen stets selber anwesend zu sein :

« Passen Sie gut auf, daß Sie bei Besuchen fremder Personen von “ Rang und Stand ” (besonders aber solchen aus den Ministerien) selber stets zugegen sind ! » (40)

Gleichzeitig versuchte Glasmeier, durch eine Vielzahl von Einladungen wichtiger Personen des Dritten Reiches sich einen starken Rückhalt zu schaffen. Der persönliche Referent Martin Bormanns gehörte ebenso zu den Gästen des Reichsintendanten in Sankt Florian (41) wie Albert Speer. (42)

Die Verwaltung des Bruckner-Stiftes kümmerte sich aber nicht nur um den Fortgang der Arbeiten im Stift, sondern auch um Angelegenheiten, die das umliegende Land betrafen. Durch eine Übereinkunft zwischen Gauleiter und Reichsintendant wurde die Umgebung des Stifts unter « erweiterten Landschaftsschutz » gestellt, (43) um den Charakter des gesamten Raumes zu erhalten. Ein zukünftiger Bebauungsplan sollte, so die langfristigen Planungen, die Entwicklung des Marktes Sankt Florian festschreiben und den baulichen Bestand regeln. Und andere sollte auch eine Höchstbegrenzung von 5.000 Einwohnern für die Umgebung des Brucknerstifts festgeschrieben werden, « tunlichst nur Personen ... , deren Familien in Sankt Florian bodenständig sind » , wie es in dem Protokoll einer Besprechung über den Bebauungsplan heißt. Die gesamte Planung dieses Raumes sollte sich nach dem Bruckner-Stift richten. (44)

Das Jahr 1944 brachte schließlich den ersten nationalen und internationalen Auftritt des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters, gleichzeitig aber auch fast das Ende der Tätigkeiten im Stift. Am 20. April 1944, nach « langer Probezeit » , wie es in einer Rundfunkzeitschrift hieß, (45) spielte das Orchester am « Führer » -Geburtstag erstmals im Rundfunk. Knapp sechs Monate später, am 4. Oktober 1944, gab es sein letztes öffentliches Konzert. Die Arbeit im gesamten Stift wurde auf ein Minimum reduziert. Die Orchester- und Chormitglieder wurden, wenn dies nicht bereits geschehen war, zu Wehrmachtseinheiten, zur Polizei oder zu Betrieben in der Region abkommandiert. Von den 24 Sängern (im September 1944 hatte der Chor darüber hinaus noch 42 Sängerinnen) waren zehn zur Wehrmacht abgerückt, fünf in verschiedenen Fabriken im nahegelegenen Linz tätig, zwei zur Waffen-SS abkommandiert und einer für wichtige politische Aufgaben der NSDAP, wie es hieß, freigestellt worden. (46) Erst Anfang 1945 wurde dann, wohl auch auf Wunsch Hitlers, die Arbeit im Stift wieder aktiviert. (47)

In den letzten Monaten des Krieges gewann Sankt Florian als Produktionsstätte von Aufnahmen für das Rundfunkprogramm nochmals einige Bedeutung. Geographisch betrachtet, lag das Stift um die Jahreswende 1945 äußerst günstig, relativ weit ab von den vorrückenden Alliierten und der Front im Zentrum des noch von deutschen Truppen gehaltenen Gebietes. (48) In Sankt Florian konnte deshalb noch relativ ungestört gearbeitet werden, wohl der entscheidende Grund, warum die Arbeit im Stift wieder intensiviert wurde. (49) Verwaltungsdirektor Schwaiger konnte denn auch Anfang Februar stolz seinem Vorgesetzten, dem in Berlin endgültig verdrängten Glasmeier, (50) berichten, daß man in Linz « von einer Ausbildung » der verbliebenen Mitglieder des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters in « den normalen Volksturmeeinheiten abgesehen » habe. Die Musiker sollten « lediglich nur eine 5-tägige Ausbildung im Polizeidienst » mitmachen, um « im Ernstfall im Standort Linz selbst zum Einsatz (zu) gelangen » . (51) Das Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (der Chor blieb aufgelöst) arbeitete bis Kriegsende weiter unter der Leitung Georg Ludwig Jochums ; es hatte in den letzten Monaten mit vielen berühmten Dirigenten zusammengearbeitet (52) und war in der Endphase des Krieges wohl eines der produktivsten Orchester für den Rundfunk. So übersandte Jochum am 5. Februar 1945 45 sendefertige Bänder per Kurier nach Berlin, (53) achtzehn Tage später folgten weitere 45, nach wahrscheinlich einer weiteren Lieferung schließlich am 4. März erneut drei. Ein Begleitbrief lautete :

« Heute schon kann ich Ihnen wieder 5 Werke senden. Der Kurier fährt erade nach Berlin und da gebe ich sie ihm

gleich mit. » (54)

Dieses Verfahren war notwendig, da schon lange keine Leitungsverbindung zwischen Sankt Florian und München, geschweige denn Berlin mehr bestand. Die Aufnahmen des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters wurden vor allem im sog. Doppelprogramm, dem gehobeneren Musikprogramm, (55) eingesetzt, wesentlich seltener im Reichsprogramm. Die Lieferungen aus Linz / Sankt Florian bildeten in der Rundfunkzentrale in Berlin eine hochwillkommene Ergänzung zu den in den Schall-archiven der Sendeanstalten lagernden Beständen. (56) Auch verschiedene Einquartierungen konnten in der Folgezeit an der emsigen Tätigkeit in Sankt Florian nichts ändern. (57) Erst das Heranrücken der Alliierten im April / Mai 1945 führte schließlich zur Beendigung der Geschichte des Bruckner-Stifts Sankt Florian. (58)

Das Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian, so läßt sich zusammenfassend sagen, war weitgehend das Werk einer Person, des Reichsintendanten Heinrich Glasmeier. Er nutzte die Situation, die durch die Enteignung des Stiftes entstanden war, ebenso aus wie die Schwäche Hitlers für die Region Linz. Glasmeiers Ziel war es, in Sankt Florian eine Kulturstätte, wie er sich auszudrücken pflegte, zu schaffen, die in der zweiten Hälfte des Krieges bestenfalls als anachronistisch bezeichnet werden konnte. Während überall im Reich (auch beim Rundfunk) derxunseit Jahren dauernde Krieg seine Opfer forderte, wandte der Reichsintendant hier einen Prunk auf, ließ mit einem Aufwand arbeiten, wie er ernsthaft zu dieser Zeit kaum noch denkbar schien.

Ein Schwimmbad für das Wohlbefinden Glasmeiers und seiner Gäste scheiterte nur am energischen Widerspruch Goebbels, die Anschaffung eines silbernen Tafelservices, mit dem Wappen des Reichsintendanten versehen, das von Glasmeier wohl als Krönung des Inventars gedacht war, wurde nur durch das Kriegsende verhindert. In Sankt Florian schuf sich ein Einzelner, motiviert durch persönliche Niederlagen in Berlin, ein Refugium, das nach dem Krieg nach seiner Vorstellung und in Anlehnung an Hitlers Pläne für Linz nichts weniger sein sollte als das kulturelle Zentrum Europas, wenn nicht der ganzen Welt ...

Als musikalisches Zentrum, als Herzstück der Ausbaupläne war das nahegelegene Stift Sankt Florian auserkoren, der Standort von Bruckners Sarkophag sowie seiner Orgel. Im Januar 1941 beschlagnahmte die Gestapo das geistliche Stift mit der Begründung, Ordensangehörige hätten die verbotene österreichische Freiheitsbewegung unterstützt. Nach der bis zum 20. April 1941 (sie !) erfolgten Vertreibung der Chorherren konnte man ungehindert darangehen, hier eine Bruckner-Musikhochschule als « Konservatorium Europas » einzurichten. Neben einem großen Kunstmuseum, einem Opernhaus und einem Bruckner-Festspielhaus entwarf Hitler im November 1942 für das Linzer Stadtzentrum eigenhändig ein Bruckner-Denkmal mit auffallender Ähnlichkeit zur Berliner Siegessäule. (46)

Die Bedeutung des Sankt-Florian-Projekts unterstrich Hitler, indem er Heinrich Glasmeier, den Reichsintendanten des Großdeutschen Rundfunks, zu seinem Bevollmächtigten berief. Dieser erhielt den Auftrag, in dem Stiftsgebäude eine Kulturstätte ersten Ranges aufzubauen. In dieser, « Weihstätte für das unsterbliche Werk Bruckners » sollten jährliche « Bruckner-Festspiele nach Art von Bayreuth » durchgeführt werden. Gestützt auf allerhöchste Protektion sah Glasmeier auch Möglichkeiten, diese Wünsche mit eigenen Rundfunkprojekten zu verbinden. Das von ihm entworfene Hoheitszeichen, eine eigenwillige Verbindung von Kreuz, Hakenkreuz und Familienwappen, entsprach seiner persönlichen Eitelkeit wie auch der dem Sankt-Florian-Projekt eigenen Ungleichzeitigkeit von feudalem Ambiente und modernster

Rundfunk-Technologie. (48)

Als neues deutsches Spitzenorchester rief Glasmeier das « Bruckner-Orchester Sankt Florian des Großdeutschen Rundfunks » ins Leben. Es sollte Kern eines geplanten « Musikwerks Weltrundfunk » sowie nach Hitlers Wunsch auch das künftige « Orchester des Führers » werden. Die zunehmenden Bombardierungen deutscher Städte erleichterten Glasmeier die Anwerbung. Das neue Reichsorchester im bislang als provinziell geltenden Linz erreichte trotz Spitzengehältern für Musiker zwar keineswegs die Attraktivität der Wiener Philharmoniker. Hatte aber immerhin den Vorzug, von alliierten Bombenflugzeugen weitgehend verschont geblieben zu sein. Im Dezember 1942 veröffentlichte Glasmeier einen Aufruf an die besten deutschen Musiker, diesem Orchester beizutreten. Im April 1943 hatten sich immerhin 80 Orchestermusiker in Linz zusammengefunden. die daraufhin am Sarkophag des Komponisten auf Bruckner vereidigt wurden. Die Eidesformel hatte den Wortlaut :

« Anton Bruckner, erhabener Meister der Töne, wir sind hier versammelt. Dir und unserem Führer Adolf Hitler sowie dem Großdeutschen Reich zu geloben und zu schwören, daß wir alle Zeit bereit sind, Deine Werke zu verkünden. » (50)

Nach einjähriger Probenarbeit und mehreren Auftritten sollte es am 20. April 1944, dem Geburtstag des « Führers » , mit einem besonderen Festkonzert vor die Öffentlichkeit treten. Große Vorbereitungen wurden getroffen. Obwohl die Zusage Furtwänglers bereits vorlag und sogar die Speisen- und Getränkefolge zum Eröffnungsmahl genauestens abgesprochen war, mußte das Ereignis wegen der ungünstigen Kriegslage abgesagt werden. Auch Linz, die Stadt der Hermann Göring-Werke. blieb vom Bombenhagel nicht länger verschont. So blieb es in Sankt Florian an jenem « Führergeburtstag » 1944 bei einem schlichten Eintopfessen, serviert von sechs SS-Männern aus Mauthausen. Und an Stelle des vorgesehenen Festkonzerts wurde vom Großdeutschen Rundfunk eine Bandaufnahme der 7. Symphonie von Bruckner mit dem Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester unter Georg-Ludwig Jochum ausgestrahlt. Weisungen der Kulturpressekonferenz zufolge sollte diese Sendung ohne genaue Ortsangabe rezensiert werden - man wollte so offenbar Luftangriffe auf die Klosteranlage vermeiden. Der volkstümliche Spruch « Heiliger Sankt Florian, verschone unser Haus, zünd andere an, hatte zwar dem Bruckner-Stift, nicht aber der Stadt Linz geholfen. Anders als bei einer Bruckner-Symphonie blieb trotz großartiger Steigerungen der Endsieg als das geplante große Finale aus.

Der deutsche Rückzug verurteilte die große Final-Idee und damit auch die triumphalen Planungen zur Bruckner-Stadt Linz zum Scheitern. Bevor die Unter-gangsvisioncn der Götterdämmerng Wirklichkeit wurden und damit Wagnerische Vorstellungen doch wieder gegenüber Bruckner die Oberhand gewannen, gab es Momente des Innehaltens. Es sind die Wochen der Enttäuschung, der Ernüchterung, nachdem sich auch die Planungen für den 20. April 1944 als undurchführbar erwiesen hatten. Wie ratlos sogar die offiziellen Stellen damals in Linz waren, belegt ein Tondokument vom 3. Mai 1944.

Fußnoten

(I) Eugen Kurt Fischer, Das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Rundfunks im Dritten Reich, in : Publizistik, 1960, Heft 5, Seiten 459-464. Bei der von Fischer erwähnten « Stelle » handelt es sich nach seinen Angaben um einen Aufsatz Kurt Wagenführs aus dem Jahr 1948, abgedruckt in : Norddeutscher Rundfunk (Herausgeber)

, Den Schrittmachern des Deutschen Rundfunks zum 29. Oktober 1948, dem 25. Jahrestag der Eröffnung des Programmendienstes in Deutschland, Hamburg ohne Jahr (1948) , Seiten 54-56.

(2) Eugen Kurt Fischer war für die Betreuung der Kunstsammlungen im Stift sowie für die Bibliothek und die RRG-Bücherei zuständig.

(3) Vergleiche eine kurze Notiz von Schw. In : Studienkreis Rundfunk und Geschichte, MITTEILUNGEN 1974, Heft 4, Seite 4.

(4) Karl Rehberger, Die Stifte Oberösterreichs unter dem Hakenkreuz, in Rudolf Zinnhobler (Herausgeber) , Das Bistum Linz im Dritten Reich, Linz 1979 (= Linzer Philosophisch-theologische Reihe, Band 44) , Seiten 244-294.

(5) Ansgar Diller, Rundfunkpolitik im Dritten Reich, München 1980 (= Rundfunk in Deutschland, Band 2) , hier zum Thema insbesondere Seiten 555-557.

(6) Victor Ergert, 50 Jahre Rundfunk in Österreich. Band 4 1924-1945, Salzburg 1974.

(7) Ein auf den Akten des Stiftsarchivs Sankt Florian basierender kurzer Abriß der Geschichte des Bruckner-Stifts Sankt Florian ist Teil der Dissertation des Verfassers zum Thema « Nationalsozialistische Rundfunkpolitik 1942-1945 » . Organisation, Programm und die Hörer, Mannheim 1984. Die Akten der Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft in Sankt Florian, etwa 80 Kartons und Aktenordner, beziehen sich überwiegend auf die Geschichte des Bruckner-Stiftes und die geleisteten Vorarbeiten, also auf den Zeitraum 1944 bis 1945. Das Material ist entweder chronologisch oder nach Sachgesichtspunkten geordnet, so daß ein Zugang relativ einfach ist. Der zuständige Stiftsarchivar, der bereits erwähnte Professor Rehberger, hat darüber hinaus in Eigenarbeit aus den Akten die wichtigsten Unterlagen nach thematischen Gebieten fotokopiert und zusammengefaßt. Neben Unterlagen zu Sankt Florian existieren im Stiftsarchiv, wenn auch nicht sehr umfangreich, Akten und Materialien über Reden und Betriebsappelle des Reichsintendanten zwischen 1937 und 1942, Aufstellungen über den Besitz in Sankt Florian zu Kriegsende sowie und andere Zeichnungen über das « Bauprojekt Adolf-Hitler-Platz » in Berlin, in dessen Rahmen auch die Errichtung eines ZentraleBetriebs- und Verwaltungsgebäudes für sämtliche Berliner Betriebe der RRG (Inland und Ausland) geplant war. Im folgenden Text werden falls möglich - die Kopierbände Professor Rehbergers als Fußnoten angegeben, da sie einen schnelleren Zugriff zum Material erlauben. Materialien, die nicht in diesen Fotokopien erfaßt sind, werden nach der Bezeichnung des jeweiligen Aktenordners oder des Kartons aufgeführt. Über das in Sankt Florian lagernde Material hinaus liegen diesem Aufsatz auch die Akten, die sich im Bundesarchiv Koblenz (BArch) und im Document Center Berlin (DC Berlin) befinden, zugrunde.

(8) Zitiert nach Rehberger, Die Stifte Oberösterreichs unter dem Hakenkreuz, Seite 248.

(9) Vergleiche Rehberger, Seite 256 ff.

(10) Vergleiche ebenda.

(11) Zum Rundfunk im Krieg vergleiche Diller, Rundfunkpolitik im Dritten Reich, Seite 500 ff.

(12) Vergleiche Stiftsarchiv Sankt Florian (im folgenden STA) , Aktenordner Reichsintendanz, Aufstellung über die Reisen des Reichsintendanten Heinrich Glasmeier, Berlin 18.06.1945.

(13) Vergleiche Fischer, Das Brucknerstift, Seite 159 f. Vergleiche auch Glasmeier an Gœbbels, 20.07.1942, BArch R 55/546, fol. 115 ff.

(14) Vergleiche Hannah Spohr, STA Kopienband Glasmeier. Vergleiche auch Führerinformation vom Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda über das Linzer Orchester für das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian, BArch R 55/222, fol. 258 ff ; Haumann, 14.08.1942, BArch R 55/546, fol. 125 f ; Hinkel an Ohlendorf, 51.01.1944, BArch R 56 I 40, ohne fol.

(15) Vergleiche Glasmeier an Gœbbels, 08.09.1942, STA Korrespondenz 9.9. - 51.10.1942 II ; auch : Maria Glasmeier an Ritz, 29.02.1972 (Abschrift vom 16.08.1972) , STA Kopienband Glasmeier. Gustav Adolf Schwaiger. Geboren 29.09.1890 in Ried. Studierte an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Wien. 1942 war Schw. Leiter der Nebenstelle Wien der technischen Zentrale der RRG. NSDAP-Mitglied wurde er im Juli 1942. Vergleiche DC Berlin, Personalunterlagen Schwaiger.

(16) Vergleiche STA Karton ohne Angabe (Inhalt : Angehörige des Bruckner-Stiftes) ; STA Kopienband Musik sowie Rehberger, Die Stifte Oberösterreichs, Seite 295.

(17) Vergleiche Hannah Spohr, STA Kopienband Glasmeier.

(18) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Fischer, 18.02.1945, STA Korrespondenz I.I. "" IV.

(19) Vergleiche Hinkel an Diewerge, 04.06.1945, DC Berlin, Personalunterlagen Diewerge.

(20) Vergleiche F. Schneider, Sankt Florian 16.06.1945, Meine Stellung zur NSDAP, STA Kopienband Schneider.

(21) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Glasmeier, 26.11.1942, STA Korrespondenz 01.11.1942 - 51.12.1942 III.

(22) Vergleiche Wirz an Schönicke, 22.01.1945, STA Ordner Reichsrundfunk, Orchester, Orgel.

(23) Vergleiche Gerd Kärnbach, Entwurf zur Schaffung eines Notenarchivs in Sankt Florian, STA Ordner Korrespondenz 9.9. - 51.10.1942 II. Dazu auch : Wiedemann, Bad Aussee, 21.01.1946, Aufstellung über die als Verwalter der Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft GmbH. Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian geleisteten Dienste bei der Sicherstellung des Eigentums vorstehender Gesellschaft, STA Ordner 1. Oktober 1945 - 51. Dezember 1946.

(24) Vergleiche Fischer, Das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian, Seite 162.

(25) Vergleiche STA Probespiele, Bruckner-Orchester, Bewerber.

(26) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Castelle, 05.04.1945, STA Kopienband Musik und Fritzsche an Gœbbels, 12.05.1945, BArch R 56 I 27, ohne fo.

(27) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Castelle, 05.04.1945, STA Kopienband Musik ; auch Schwaiger, 06.10.1945, STA Kopienband Reichsrundfunk. Außer dem : Mitteilungen in : Rundfunkarchiv, 1944, Heft 4/9, Seite 64.

(28) Genaue Unterlagen über die Beurteilung der einzelnen Künstler befinden sich im STA (STA Probespiele, Bruckner-Orchester, Bewerber) .

(29) Günther Ramín, Jahrgang 1898, war seit 1918 Organist der Thomaskirche in Leipzig. 1959 trat er die Nachfolge des bisherigen Thomaskantors K. Straube an.

(30) Glasmeier, 22.02.1945, STA Karton RRG (Personal) .

(31) Vergleiche Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Chor, STA Karton Fischer.

(32) Vergleiche ebenda.

(33) Vergleiche ebenda. Da Ramín im übrigen während seiner Zuständigkeit nicht immer in Linz / Sankt Florian sein konnte, hatte ihn während der Abwesenheiten Professor Kraft aus Lübeck vertreten. Vergleiche Fischer, Das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian, Seite 162.

(34) Stand 09.06.1945 : Emil Seiler, Walter Gerwig, Lisedore Häge, Linde von Winterfeld, Thea von Sparr und Werner Tietz, STA, Karton ohne Angabe. Vergleiche auch Schwaiger an Castelle, 08.05.1944, und Glasmeier an Cerff, o. D. , beides STA, Korrespondenz, 01.05.1944 - 31.02.1945 XIII.

(35) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Castelle, 05.04.1945, STA Kopienband Musik.

(36) Vergleiche Wirz an Marx, 16.06.1945, STA Ordner Bruckner-Chor.

(37) Eugen Kurt Fischer ist (wie erwähnt) der Autor der oben erwähnten Erinnerungen.

(38) Vergleiche Arbeitsteilung im Bruckner-Stift, 15.07.1945, STA Kopienmappe Fischer.

(39) Vergleiche Bericht der Deutschen Revisions- und Treuhand AG. , Berlin, Prüfung (der RRG) zum 31.05.1942, BArch R 55/548, fol. 69. Vergleiche auch Schwaiger an Tietze, 28.06.1945, STA Korrespondenz-106.

- (40) Glasmeier an Schwaiger, 01.10.1942, STA Korrespondenz 9.9. - 31.10.1942 II.
- (41) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Seiler, 14.05.1944, STA Korrespondenz 1.5. - 31.5.1945 X'V.
- (42) Vergleiche Speer an Glasmeier, 15.07.1944, STA Kopienband Reichs-rundfunk.
- (43) Vergleiche Schwaiger an den Landrat von Linz / Land, 12.05.1944, STA Kopienband Reichsrundfunk.
- (44) Vergleiche Schwaiger, Niederschrift über die Besprechung mit Professor Wiepking über den Bebauungsplan Sankt Florian, STA Kopien-band Fischer.
- (45) Rundfunkarchiv, 1944, Heft 4/9, Seite 64.
- (46) Vergleiche ohne nähere Angaben, September 1944, STA Kopienband Fischer.
- (47) Vergleiche die Unterlagen STA Karton Musiker, Personal.
- (48) Vergleiche Hans Adolf Jacobson, Der Weg zur Teilung der Welt. Politik und Strategie 1939-1945, Koblenz, Bonn 1977, Seite 629.
- (49) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Schulz-Dornburg, 05.04.1945, STA Kopien-band Musik.
- (50) Vergleiche Schwaiger an Glasmeier, 04.02.1945, STA Korrespondenz XIX.
- (51) Ebenda.
- (52) Vergleiche Diller, Rundfunkpolitik im Dritten Reich, Seite 556 ff. ; vergleiche auch STA Ordner Bruckner-Orchester.
- (53) Vergleiche Jochum an Burkhard, 05.02.1945, STA Karten Musiker, Personal.
- (54) Jochum an Burkhard, 15.05.1954, STA Karton Musiker, Personal.
- (55) Zwischen dem 06.04.1944 und dem 27.04.1945, also einschließlich der zweiten Jahreshälfte 1944, in der die Arbeit weitgehend ruhte, wurden vom Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester 87 Aufnahmen gemacht. Bis November 1944 abwechselnd in Wien, Salzburg, Berlin und Linz, dann nur noch in Linz. Vergleiche Aufstellung : Aufnahmen des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters des Großdeutschen Rundfunks (mit Sendetag und wiederholungen) , STA Kopienband Musik ; auch : Aktenordner Reichsrundfunkorchester Orgel.
- (56) Vergleiche ebenda und Schwaiger an Schulz-Dornburg, 05.04.1945. STAKO ienband Musik.

(57) Vergleiche zum Beispiel Schwaiger an Schmidt, o. D. , STA Kopienband Reichs-rundfunk.

(58) Vergleiche Rehberger, Die Stifte Oberösterreichs, Seite 294.

Heinrich Glasmeier

Heinrich Glasmeier est né le 5 mars 1892, à Dorsten, en Rhénanie-du-Nord-Westphalie ; et est mort probablement le 4 mai 1945 à Linz, en Autriche. Il était le fils du commerçant-apothicaire de Dorsten, Bernhard Glasmeier. Heinrich fréquente le lycée « Petrinum » (« Gymnasium Petrinum ») . En 1911, il étudie l'allemand, l'histoire, la philosophie et la science archivistique, à Münster et à Munich. Durant ses études, il fait partie de l'association étudiante catholique de « Cimbria » , à Münster ; et de « Saxonia » , à Munich ; en plus de l'Association des étudiants catholiques d'Allemagne. Sa thèse de doctorat soumise à l'Université de Münster, en 1926, est décrite par la Faculté comme « une polémique théologique catholique fustigeant l'immoralité de la société plutôt qu'une recherche scientifique rigoureuse » . Ce membre influent du milieu étudiant va obtenir le poste d'archiviste du conseil d'administration du CT parce qu'il était le seul membre du NSDAP (en compagnie d'un haut-fonctionnaire du Parti) à faire partie de l'élite culturelle du 3^e « Reich » .

Les fraternités académiques en Allemagne

Probably no period, with the possible exception of the Nazi era, has had as major an impact on German academic fraternities as the late- 1960's. All of the once powerful fraternity organizations lost membership, as well as political and social influence in the closing years of the decade. As a new reformist attitude gained ground, personal networks that had been built-up over decades collapsed. Several factors were decisive in this process. The most important may have been an increasing stress on individualism. The re-organization of the West German Party system must also be mentioned ; one result was that Catholic fraternities lost the support of the Christian Democratic Union. Another important, if less immediate, factor must not be forgotten : all fraternities, including the Catholic ones, bore the burden of having not yet come to terms with the Nazi past.

Any attempt to tell the fraternities' story must be provisional. Although there has been considerable research done on social, political, and cultural developments in the Federal Republic of Germany during the 1960's, fraternity students have not yet received much attention from historians. Aside from Marxist or neo-Marxist studies that deal with the fraternities in an extremely critical fashion and describe them as a monolithic bloc, we only find scattered articles in « Festschriften » and journals. Source material is also a problem. The records of individual fraternities, for example, have generally been dispersed and are also usually confidential. We must therefore rely on the official sources of the fraternity associations, such as their magazines and the minutes of their meetings. Neither the memory of internal conflicts nor the complexity of everyday life in the fraternities is captured in full in such records. The available sources generally address matters of great concern to those active in the fraternities (traditions, rules of conduct, and institutional history) but not the issues of interest to historians.

One further point must be mentioned. Not only were the fraternities much more multi-faceted and fragmented than an outsiders' « prima facie » view would tend to acknowledge, but their membership fluctuated to a degree that is often underestimated. Many members, students or « Alte Herren » (alumni) , were quite mobile, and especially the students tended to change Universities quite freely. This factor led to changing majorities within the fraternities. « Charismatic » students and alumni have been, at least, as important in forming the character of a fraternity as the official policy of the nation-wide associations. Their influence is not even necessarily identical with the social or political majority within a given fraternity. It has had more to do with traditional and personal concepts of « auctoritas » than with the modern notion of democratic rule. However, any historian has to be aware of these restrictions in order to avoid simplistic judgments.

We will concentrate on the Catholic fraternity associations, in particular the « Cartellverband katholischer deutscher Studentenverbindungen » (CV) and the « Kartellverband katholischer deutscher Studentenvereine » (KV) . This choice is not arbitrary. The so-called dueling fraternities (« Burschenschaften » ; « Corps » ; « Landsmannschaften » ; « Turnerschaften » ; and « Sängerschaften ») are certainly of interest to historians. But the Catholic associations offer us some advantages.

1st, up into the 1970's, they were closely connected with the West German Catholic « milieu » (i.e. , with the mainstream of believers and the diverse institutions and organizations at the center of Catholic life) . That connection sheds light on the Catholic « milieu » as a whole.

2ndly, the Catholic fraternities are of special interest because of their ambiguous relationship with National-Socialism.

3rdly, the experience of the fraternities offers fresh insights into the rapid decline of the Catholic « milieu » in West Germany that began in the 1960's.

It seems that the relative decline of the Catholic student fraternities, in the 1960's and 1970's, was caused by their inability to come to terms with their own past. This was compounded by the functional and legitimizing character of German Catholic « Vergangenheitspolitik » after World War II and, even more so, by the difficult circumstances of Catholic existence after the 2nd Vatican Council.

We will sketch the history of the German fraternities and their relations with National-Socialism.

The history of the German fraternity system is a history of constant change and self-reform. Nearly every era before 1933 had its own particular variety of fraternity adapted to the socio-political circumstances of the day. For over 150 years, the dueling fraternities had dominated the social scene. As time went by, they became more and more differentiated. The most important were the « Corps » and the « Burschenschaften » , which were joined in the 1880's by the « Verband der Vereine Deutscher Studenten » (VvdSt) , an explicitly anti-Semitic organization of young reserve officers. All these associations adhered to the principle of « Satirfaktion » , which combined elements of a feudal code of honour with militaristic rituals. There was also a certain homogeneity in the social backgrounds and political attitudes of their members ; by and large, they came from aristocratic and upper-middle-class families,

considered themselves the representatives of the better part of German society, and, after 1871, were loyal supporters of the Prussian dominated German Empire. The fraternity movement was dominated by the « Corps » after 1871. The « Corps » gloried in its tradition of camaraderie and did not try to define itself in intellectual or political terms. This contributed to the fraternities' limited appeal among more intellectual German students. Thus, in the early 1890's, a new element arose within the German fraternity movement : anti-Semitism. The founding of the radically anti-Semitic « Verband der Vereine Deutscher Studenten » was followed by growing unrest. Many fraternities that had previously accepted assimilated Jewish students began, in the 1890's, to exclude Jews as student anti-Semitism spread. Around 1900, the « Burschenschaft » divided into an anti-Semitic, « völkisch » nationalist Right-wing and progressive-reformist Left-wing. Austria and Southern Germany became regional strongholds of student anti-Semitism, but anti-Semitism was strongest among Protestant and national-Liberal students. Smaller, predominantly Protestant Universities, elsewhere in Germany, also joined the anti-Semitic movement ; they would later become centers of National-Socialist activism.

It was thus not the shocking experience of defeat, in 1918, that gave rise to anti-Semitism and ultra-nationalism within the fraternities. Even before 1914, juvenile radicalism and discontent with the alleged vacuousness of bourgeois culture had resulted in immature protests. After 1918, the great majority of dueling fraternities did not accept the Weimar Republic as legitimate, but neither did they adapt entirely to National-Socialist ideas and values after 1933. Nazism's modernizing elements (its notion of the egalitarian « Volksgemeinschaft » , for instance, its euphoric view of technological progress, and its promotion of a Party led mass culture) never found enthusiastic support among traditionalist and reactionary fraternities. The Nazis realized, consequently, that the so-called « Waffenstudenten » were not reliable partners.

The Catholic fraternities were the product of ultra-montanism and the « Kulturkampf » . Because this struggle between Church and State served as the Catholic fraternities' founding myth, they found it difficult to take-up the pan-German nationalism that began to gain ground among German Catholics in the 1890's.

Loyalty to a fatherland dominated by Protestant rulers and aristocrats could never be fully reconciled with loyalty to church and pope. The Catholic fraternities were outcasts in German academic life-long after the « Kulturkampf » of the 1870's. This was intensified by the marked social differences between the Catholic and Protestant fraternities. The members of the Catholic fraternities came mainly from « petit bourgeois » or rural families ; there were few aristocrats and virtually no members of the urban middle-class. Another distinctive attribute of the Catholic fraternities was their proximity to the Center Party, which was widely regarded with suspicion within the allegedly apolitical academic community. Finally, the strict ecclesiastical ban on dueling contributed to a sense of separateness that stood in competition with a desperate desire to become an integral part of the German academic community. This profound tragedy was intensified by the fact that the Catholic fraternities' very otherness allowed them to survive their social heterogeneity. This dilemma between an unwilling but functional distinctiveness and the desire for integration was never overcome. The anomalous position of the Catholic fraternities culminated in the « Akademischer Kulturkampf » of 1906-1907 as the dueling associations attempted, in part through violence, to force the Catholic fraternities to abandon University life. This attack, mounted under the guise of a defense of « academic freedom » , was led by the « progressive » technical universities. Only when Kaiser Wilhelm II refused to order the disbanding of the « CV » and the « KV » did anti-Catholicism cease to be an important force in University life. Grateful Catholic students,

thereafter, tried to compensate for their marginalization with hyper-nationalism, especially during World War I.

Political conflicts within the Catholic fraternities became more virulent in the wake of the War. The « KV » and the « Unitas-Verband wissenschaftlicher katholischer Studentenvereine » (UV) , in effect the leftist Republican-wing of the Catholic fraternity movement, were superficially involved in the social reformism associated with Berlin priest Carl Sonnenschein and social Catholicism. On the other hand, the « CV » firmly embraced a traditionalist position. The « CV »'s Right-wing and the « Ring katholischer deutscher Burschenschaften » (RKDB) sympathized with conservative, anti-Republican extremists, whereas Left-wing « CV » fraternities, the « KV » , and the « UV » accepted the Weimar Republic. Despite warnings from ecclesiastical authorities, anti-Semitism became a real problem. There had certainly been a pre-modern anti-Judaism among German Catholics before the 1920's, but there was a distinct change during the Weimar years. Within the fraternity associations, anti-Semitism generally went hand-in-hand with rejection of the Republic. While officially rejecting the anti-Semitic « Arierparagraph » adopted by the « Burschenschaft » , at the turn of the Century, elements within the « CV » and the « RKDB » turned openly anti-Semitic. The Bavarian « CV » , influenced by the Austrian « CV » and the Christian-Social Party, became a stronghold of Right-wing Catholic thought. Inside the « KV » , only the few aristocratic fraternities also accepted the anti-Semitic and corporatist framework of Othmar Spann and Martin Spahn. After 1925-1926, the « CV » even sometimes abandoned the traditional all-Catholic alliance in University politics and joined nationalist coalitions with dueling fraternities.

The situation was different on the Left. The « KV » and the « UV » never openly questioned the Republic and strictly rejected the idea of forming coalitions with the nationalists. This was not, however, normally a result of democratic impulses. The « KV » was afraid of losing political control in broad coalitions and, therefore, opposed them. Like the « CV » , the « KV » and the « UV » remained within the confines of a Catholic perspective. They were patriotic, anti-communist, and ultra-montane in outlook. They regarded Liberalism, Fascism, and Communism as atheistic, revolutionary, and anti-Catholic. The « KV » and the « UV » maintained coalitions with Jewish fraternities in student parliaments, up to 1933.

Very few Catholics joined the Nazi student organization, the « Nationalsozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund » (NSDStB) before 1933. The majority of Nazi Catholic students came from the ranks of the « RKDB » and some from the « CV » ; hardly any « NSDStB » members were affiliated with the « KV » or the « UV » . Catholic students were comparatively under-represented among the membership of the « NSDStB » and were out-numbered by students affiliated with reformist and patriotic groups such as the « Großdeutsche Finkenschaften » and the « Akademische Gildenschaften » . January 1933 brought a fundamental change. Until the « Reichskonkordat » between the 3rd « Reich » and the Vatican and the self-destruction of the Center Party, the Catholic fraternities maintained a critical position toward National-Socialism. But when it became clear that the Church would not oppose the new regime, the fraternity associations began to vie for advantages. Their central objective was the institutional survival of the fraternities. They were even willing to give-up defining elements of their identity, including the uniformly Catholic background of their membership. Fraternities that held to a strict Catholic position had to leave the umbrella associations. However, at least internally, the fraternities tried to regain authority and to stay Catholic. But, in 1935-1936, most of them gave-up and were disbanded. Only the alumni organizations, the « Altherrenschaften » , survived intact.

Before their dissolution, the Catholic fraternities held disparate and complex attitudes toward the Empire, the Weimar Republic, and the 3rd « Reich ». They were inclined to Right-wing conservatism and were critical of the Weimar Republic. But they never collaborated with the Nazi regime in Germany, and their pre-modern or anti-modern traditionalism helped them maintain some distance from an ideology far too radical for them to accept. Although they had preferred monarchy to democracy, they did not favor National-Socialism over democracy. And while only a tiny minority of Catholic fraternity members was to participate in the anti-Nazi resistance, the activities of former fraternity members after World War II guided the renewal of the fraternity movement.

Katholischen Studentenverbindung (KStV) Cimbria Münster

Entstanden gemeinsam mit der Markomania durch Teilungsbeschluß der Germania vom 09.02.1901, im KV seit 1901, Mutterverbindung des Osning (08.06.1909) und der Westfalia-Mazenod (16.01.1958) , 1972 konnte das heutige Haus bezogen werden.

Der Name Cimbria leitet sich ab vom Namen des germanischen Volksstammes der Kimbern. Hervorgegangen ist er aus dem KStV Germania (gegründet 1864) im KV zu Münster im Jahre 1901. Noch im selben Jahr wurde Cimbria als 34. Kartellverein in den KV aufgenommen.

Cimbria stand zwei Mal dem KV als präsidierender Verein (Vorort) vor : 1907-1909 und 2002-2003. Als Tochtervereine gingen aus dem KStV Cimbria der KStV Tuiskonia zu Münster (gegründet 1902) , der K.St.V. Osning Münster (gegründet 1908) sowie KStV Westfalia-Mazenod zu Münster (gegründet 1959) hervor.

Der KStV Germania im KV zu Münster (gegründet 1864) , eine der fünf Gründungskorporationen des KV, wies zur Jahrhundertwende einen derart starken Mitgliederbestand aus, daß ein geordneter Aktivenbetrieb nicht mehr gewährleistet war. So mußten etwa Kneipen an unterschiedlichen Orten durchgeführt werden; auf Wahlconventen erstarkten die Anhänger unterschiedlicher Chargenkandidaten zu regelrechten Fraktionen. Daher beschloß der hohe Convent Germaniae die Gründung gleich zweier Tochtervereine mit Sitz in Münster, des KStV Markomania und des KStV Cimbria. Bereits im Jahr darauf erstarkte die Akademie in Münster wieder zur Volluniversität, die sie schon von 1780-1806 und von 1817-1818 gewesen war. Hierdurch konnten von da an wieder Juristen und Mediziner in immer größerer Zahl aktiv werden. Anders als andere Korporationen wuchs Cimbria selbst wieder so stark, daß schon 1902 die Gründung des ersten Tochtervereins, des KStV Tuiskonia, notwendig wurde. Trotz dieses Aderlasses stieg die Zahl der aktiven Cimbern bis 1907 weiter auf 167 BbBb. 1906 gründete sich der Philisterverein Cimbriae. Aufgrund des starken Auftretens konnte Cimbria bereits vom WS 1907-1908 bis zum SS 1909 den Vorort des Verbandes übernehmen. Als Vorort fiel Cimbria 1909 die ehrenvolle Aufgabe zu, und andere Papst Pius X. in Rom die Glückwünsche des KV zu seinem goldenen Priesterjubiläum zu überbringen. In diese erste Vorortszeit fiel 1908 die Gründung eines zweiten Tochtervereins, des KStV Osning. 1910 zählte der Philisterverein bereits 138 Mitglieder, die einen Hausbauverein gründeten. Dieser stellte der Aktivitas im Jahre 1913 bereits 2000 Mark zur Verfügung. Von diesem Geld wurde an der Wese in der Nähe der Kaffeewirtschaft « Hof zur Linde » das heute noch bestehende große Bootshaus erbaut. Die Konstante Cimbriae war nach wie vor das Restaurant « Dortmunder » in der Bogenstraße. Der I. Weltkrieges beendete

auch in Münster das Korporationsleben. Ein Großteil der Aktiven zog ins Feld. Ein beachtlicher Teil kehrte nicht Heim. 25 aktive und inaktive Mitglieder fielen, dazu 20 Alte Herren.

Trotz der Schrecken des Krieges sammelten sich danach zahlreiche Cimbern zur Weiterführung des Aktivenbetriebes. 1919 hatte Cimbria wieder 65 Aktive und Fuchse. Das Jahr 1920 markiert einen glanzvollen Höhepunkt in der Geschichte der Verbindung. Der Hausbauverein erwarb das große Haus der Krumpfen Straße im Zentrum der Stadt in unmittelbarer Nähe der Aegidiikirche. Dieses Haus besaß unter anderem einen großen Festsaal mit Bühne und Galerie, Kegelbahnen, Gesellschafts-, Chargen- und Kneipzimmer. Es wurde damit zu einem lebendigen Mittelpunkt des Vereinslebens und darüber hinaus des gesellschaftlichen Lebens Münsters überhaupt, vor allem seines großen Festsaales wegen. Die Programme berichten von zum Teil außerordentlich anspruchsvollen Veranstaltungen theologischen und wissenschaftlichen Inhalts. Eines der gesellschaftlichen und korporativen Höhepunkte war der Besuch des Reichskanzlers Wilhelm Marx, selbst Mitglied im KV, am 4. November 1924 auf dem Haus, wo er vor einer glänzend besuchten Akademikerversammlung sprach. Bis zur Machtergreifung der Nationalsozialisten erstarkte Cimbria weiter zu einem blühenden Verein.

Im Jahre 1935 wurde der KV durch die Nationalsozialisten aufgelöst. Als Todesstoß für das Vereinsleben diente der berühmte Doppelerlaß von Rudolf Heß, der allen Studenten die Mitgliedschaft in einer deutschen Studentenverbindung verbot, verbunden mit der Bestimmung, daß alle deutschen Studenten der Partei oder einer ihrer Gliederungen angehören mußten. So sistierte der Cumulativconvent Cimbriae 1935 unter dem politischen Druck des Regimes den Aktivenbetrieb des Vereins.

Wenn in einem solchen Rahmen die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus nur kurz dargestellt werden kann, so wäre es doch unwahrhaftig zu verschweigen, daß auch Mitglieder der Cimbria in die Verbrechen des Nationalsozialismus verstrickt waren. Zu nennen ist hier Doktor der Philosophie Heinrich Glasmeier, Kavallerieoffizier im ersten Weltkrieg und Direktor des westfälischen Adelsarchivs. Seit 1932 wandte er sich der Partei Hitlers zu, wurde Gaukulturwart und Gaugeschäftsführer der Partei in Münster und später Reichsintendanten des Großdeutschen Rundfunks.

Dem gegenüber steht ein ganz anderes Mitglied : Josef Buchkremer aus Aachen. Als Theologiestudent 1919-1921 bei der Cimbria in Münster aktiv, 1923 in Köln zum Priester geweiht, danach in mehreren Pfarreien in und um Aachen tätig, wurde er als Stadtseelsorger schon 1935 von den Nationalsozialisten mit einem Unterrichtsverbot belegt, weil den neuen Machthabern seine starke Gegnerschaft gegenüber der NS-Ideologie bekanntgeworden war. Aufgrund seiner mutigen Aktivitäten verbrachte Josef Buchkremer die Jahre 1942-1945 im Konzentrationslager, wo er von alliierten Soldaten befreit wurde. Im Oktober 1961 wurde er zum Titularbischof von Agger und Weihbischof von Aachen ernannt. In seinem Wahlspruch « Deo et Hominibus » (Für Gott und für die Menschen) findet auch sein mutiges Eintreten gegen das Unrecht des NS-Staates seinen Ausdruck. Er verstarb 1986 im 87. Lebensjahr.

Das Wiedererstehen des KStV Cimbria ist vor allem das Verdienst von Josef Müntjes. Nach seinen intensiven Recherchen nach dem Verbleib zahlreicher Vereinsmitglieder gelang es ihm, am 20. Februar 1948 einen Wiederbegründungskommers zu schlagen. Es folgte die Herausforderung des Wiederaufbaus. Bereits Ende der 50er Jahre meldete Cimbria dem Kartellverband wieder über 80 Aktive, Inaktive und Fuchse. 1959 erfolgte die Gründung des dritten Tochtervereins, des

KStV Westfalia-Mazenod. Das Bootshaus in Handorf hatte zwar den Krieg überstanden. Doch ging das große Vereinshaus in der Krümmen Straße in den Wirren des Nationalsozialismus und des zweiten Weltkrieges unwiederbringlich verloren. 1957 entstand daher der Hausbauverein « Cimbriener eingetragener Verein », der im Jahre 1963 ein zweites Haus erwarb und 1970 den Aktiven übergab.

Die studentischen Unruhen, denen nach 1968 so viele Verbindungen zum Opfer fielen und die Kontroversen um das Prinzip « religio » und um studentische Traditionen überstand Cimbria glimpflich, wenn auch mit einem Einbruch der Mitgliederzahlen verbunden. Doch erlebt Cimbria seit Beginn der 80er Jahre eine stetige Aufwärtsentwicklung, die sich nicht nur an der Zahl ihrer Mitglieder, sondern auch an den anspruchsvollen Programmen und den glanzvollen Gründungs- und Stiftungsfesten ablesen läßt.

Mit dem Jahr 1997 hielt auch das Informationszeitalter Einzug in die Cimbria. Mehr als 160 Mitglieder weltweit haben seitdem den Weg in einen eigenen E-Mail-Verteiler gefunden, ein digitaler Rundbrief befindet sich in der 90. Auflage. Von Oktober 2002 bis September 2003 hatte Cimbria zum zweiten Mal die Ehre, den Vorort des Kartellverbandes katholischer deutscher Studentenvereine (KV) zu bilden. Höhepunkt dieser Amtszeit waren die Feierlichkeiten zum 150jährigen Bestehen des KV-Studententums im Juni 2003, die der KV in Berlin gemeinsam mit dem 150. Jubiläum des Askania-Burgundia beging. Als Festredner sprach Altbundeskanzler Doktor Helmut Kohl. Inhaltliche Akzente konnte der Vorort Cimbria setzen, indem er und andere maßgeblich an der Stellungnahme der großen katholischen Studentenverbände KV, CV und UV zum Gottesbezug in der europäischen Verfassung mitwirkte. Auch ist Cimbria weiterhin in führenden Positionen auf verbandlicher und überverbandlicher Ebene aktiv. So stellt sie einen der beiden stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden des Europäischen Kartellverbandes (EKV) und den Referenten für Presse- und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit der Arbeitsgemeinschaft katholischer Studentenverbände (AGV) .

...

Officier de cavalerie durant la Première Guerre mondiale, Heinrich Glasmeier est un fervent patriote. Il va être témoin de la défaite de la Ruhr. En 1919, il joue un rôle de 1er plan dans la remise sur pied du chantier naval et dans l'acquisition de navires.

En 1920, Glasmeier travaille comme archiviste à Dülmen pour les Ducs de Croy. De 1922 à 1933, il est l'archiviste des Comtes de Landsberg Velen. En 1923, il travaille comme conférencier-archiviste pour la ville de Münster en plus d'être le directeur des archives privées de la noblesse de la Province de Westphalie (dont la famille du Comte de Merveldt) . En 1927, il devient directeur (à temps partiel) de l'Agence consultative des Archives de la Province de Westphalie.

Durant son passage à l'Université de Münster, l'opportuniste et naïf Glasmeier devient un Nazi aveuglé et convaincu. En 1932, il joint les rangs du Parti. Il est personnellement promu comme SS par Heinrich Himmler. Il accède au poste d'intendant régional du NSDAP en matière de culture pour la Westphalie du Nord.

En 1933, le réalisateur Ernst Hardt qui est à la tête de la Société de la radiodiffusion ouest-allemande à Cologne (aujourd'hui, la WDR ou « Westdeutscher Rundfunk ») est congédié et mis sous arrêt suite à une plainte du «

Katholischer Verband » (l'Association catholique) . Le ministre de la Propagande Josef Gœbbels nomme Heinrich Glasmeier pour lui succéder. Son ascension fulgurante lui permet de décrocher, en 1937, le poste de directeur-général de la Société de la radiodiffusion du « Reich » (« Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft » ou RRG) . Cette dernière fera l'éloge du directeur Glasmeier puisque, comme éminent archiviste, il possédait cette vision nationale-socialiste fondamentale « du Sang et du Sol » (« Blut und Boden ») .

Janvier 1941 : L'abbaye de Saint-Florian est confisquée par les autorités nationales-socialistes via la « Gestapo » . Quelques mois plus tard, les moines augustiniens sont expulsés du site. Dès 1942, le directeur-général Heinrich Glasmeier décide d'en faire la maison-mère de la « Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft » (Société de radiodiffusion du 3e « Reich ») . Les moines qui avaient trouvé asile à Pulgarn ne purent revenir qu'après la fin de la guerre lorsque les Américains reprennent le contrôle du monastère. Aujourd'hui, les lieux abritent le Musée historique des pompiers de Haute-Autriche.

Été 1942 : Grâce au soutien moral et financier d'Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Glasmeier amorce le projet de rénovation de l'ancien monastère augustinien Baroque de Saint-Florian, près de Linz, en mémoire du compositeur Anton Bruckner. Il installe toute l'infrastructure technique nécessaire (dont une immense antenne) pour la diffusion nationale (à travers la « Grande Allemagne ») et pan-européenne de la musique Classique (autorisée par le régime) et surtout, celle d'Anton Bruckner. Toujours en honneur au Maître de Saint-Florian, Glasmeier va fonder le « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » de Linz, de même que son Chœur attitré. Les concerts symphoniques de cette nouvelle phalange seront dirigés par Wilhelm Furtwängler, Herbert von Karajan, Karl Böhm et Eugen Jochum.

30 janvier 1943 : Heinrich Glasmeier reçoit la Médaille d'Or du Parti NSDAP.

Novembre 1943 : Glasmeier est nommé, par le ministre Josef Gœbbels, agent de propagande du « Reich » pour l'ensemble des territoires français occupés.

...

In Salzburg, in 1934, Herbert von Karajan led the Vienna Philharmonic for the 1st time and, from 1934 to 1941, he was engaged to conduct Operatic and Symphony Orchestra concerts at the « Theater Aachen » .

Karajan's career was given a significant boost, in 1935, when he was appointed Germany's youngest « Generalmusikdirektor » and performed as a guest-conductor in Bucharest, Brussels, Stockholm, Amsterdam and Paris. In 1938, Karajan made his debut with the Berlin Philharmonic and the Berlin State Opera, conducting Beethoven's « Fidelio » . He then enjoyed a major success at the State Opera with « Tristan und Isolde » . His performance was hailed by a Berlin critic as « Das Wunder Karajan » (the Karajan miracle) . The critic asserted that Karajan's « success with Wagner's demanding work “ Tristan und Isolde ” sets himself alongside Furtwängler and Victor de Sabata, the greatest Opera conductors in Germany, at the present time » . Receiving a contract with « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft » , that same year, Karajan made the 1st of numerous recordings, conducting the « Staatskapelle Berlin » in the Overture to « The Magic Flute » . On 26 July 1938, he married Operetta singer Elmy Holgerloef. They divorced

in 1942.

On 22 October 1942, at the height of the Second World War, Karajan married Anna Maria (Anita) Sauest, born Gütermann. She was the daughter of a well-known manufacturer of yarn for sewing machines. Having had a Jewish grandfather, she was considered a « Vierteljüdin » (1/4 Jewish woman) . By 1944, Karajan was, according to his own account, losing favour with the Nazi leadership, but he still conducted concerts in War-time Berlin, on 18 February 1945. A short time later, in the closing stages of the War, he and Anita fled Germany for Milan, re-locating with the assistance of Victor de Sabata. Karajan and Anita divorced in 1958.

Karajan was discharged by the Austrian denazification examining board, on 18 March 1946, and resumed his conducting career shortly thereafter.

...

En 1929, le jeune Herbert von Karajan fait ses débuts dans sa ville natale de Salzbourg où il dirige l'Opéra « Salomé » de Richard Strauß. En 1938, il obtient son 1er grand succès à Berlin en dirigeant « Tristan und Isolde » ; un critique berlinois titre ainsi son article : « Das Wunder Karajan » (le miracle Karajan) . Il devient alors un pion utilisé contre le chef Wilhelm Furtwängler dans la guerre culturelle interne qui oppose Josef Gœbbels à Hermann Göring pour le contrôle du monde musical allemand : Gœbbels soutenant l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin ; et Göring, l'Opéra national (« Staatskapelle ») . Le 26 juillet 1938, Karajan épouse la chanteuse d'Opérette, Elmy Holgerloef. Ils divorcent en 1942.

En 1939, Karajan s'attire l'inimitié d'Adolf Hitler lors d'un concert de gala donné en l'honneur des monarques yougoslaves où, en raison de l'erreur d'un chanteur, il perd le fil des « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » du compositeur Richard Wagner (qu'il dirigeait sans partition, comme à son habitude) , les chanteurs cessent alors de chanter et, dans la plus grande confusion, le rideau tombe ; furieux, Adolf Hitler donne cet ordre à Winifred Wagner :

« Moi vivant, " Herr " von Karajan ne dirigera jamais à Bayreuth. »

Karajan poursuivait ses manigances ambiguës. D'ailleurs, personne n'avait véritablement envie d'apporter un concours trop marqué à une personnalité que le « Führer » avait véritablement prise en grippe. Prudence oblige ... Karajan le sentait bien.

Dans ce contexte, le nombre de ses apparitions à Berlin diminua singulièrement. Ainsi, l'Opéra lui fut-il interdit. Il avait brûlé, certes, mais même au « Kroll Oper » qui le remplaçait on ne lui proposait plus rien. Et quand, rebâti à la hâte, l'Opéra « Unter den Linden » ouvrit à nouveau ses portes, début 1943, il y dirigea bien l'Orchestre de la « Staatskapelle » , mais ce fut dans un concert d'orchestre. Il donna même une série de concerts d'orchestre organisés par le colonel SS Rudolf Vedder, pendant la saison 1942-1943 à Berlin, dans la vieille salle de la « Philharmonie » ou dans l'Opéra reconstruit - dont il critiqua d'ailleurs vertement l'acoustique. Heinz Tietjen trouva encore le moyen de réduire le nombre, par lui jugé excessif, des répétitions qu'exigeait chaque fois le jeune chef. Toujours aussi

perfectionniste, celui-ci en voulait toujours plus ; il se vit infliger l'obligation de n'en avoir jamais plus de 5. Il est vrai que la situation du Berlin d'alors devenait de plus en plus critique. Les bombardements alliés se multipliaient et la vie qu'on y menait peut donner le sentiment que, dans une atmosphère de catastrophe de plus en plus prévisible, la société d'alors, les musiciens comme la clique d'Adolf Hitler, qui continuait à multiplier bals et cérémonies, dansait sur un volcan. Les soirées officielles et autres réceptions se succédaient avec un faste clinquant au « Berlin Staatsoper », mais Karajan n'était plus au pupitre quand on y donnait Richard Wagner ou Giuseppe Verdi.

Sur le front de l'Est, les Iers succès remportés par l'armée allemande après l'entrée de ses troupes en Union soviétique étaient bien loin. Après Stalingrad et Léningrad, après la bataille de Moscou, l'avenir paraissait de plus en plus sombre. Avec les mois, une grande partie de la capitale était devenue un champ de ruines. Et pourtant, Madame Göring, Ire dame du pays, continuait à recevoir avec le Chancelier Hitler. Elle donnait des soirées de thé auxquels on se battait pour assister. Pleins d'une infinie délicatesse, membres du Gotha et Maîtres de forges lui baisaient dévotement des mains dont mieux valait ne pas savoir d'où venaient les lourdes bagues dont elles étaient chargées. On portait les mêmes robes longues et les mêmes grands uniformes constellés de décorations. On paradait dans les mêmes salles de banquets.

Cette situation ambiguë perdurera pour Karajan pendant la saison 1943-1944. Ses concerts à la tête de la « Staatskapelle » se poursuivent, tantôt dans la salle de la « Philharmonie », tantôt dans la salle reconstruite de l'Opéra « Unter den Linden ». Toutefois, ses remarques peu amènes sur l'acoustique nouvelle de la salle ont été fort mal prises par le pouvoir, ce qui ne fait qu'accroître la réputation devenue détestable qu'il traîne désormais avec lui dans les allées les plus officielles du 3e « Reich ». Et si Tietjen tentera à nouveau d'entrer avec lui en négociation pour quelques soirées d'Opéras, au cours de la saison 1943-1944, il lui semblera bien évident que l'intendant du « Staatsoper » n'a en aucune manière l'intention de l'engager sur une base régulière. Tout au plus se propose-t-il de lui accorder, çà et là, la direction de quelques œuvres lyriques : Karajan a bien compris que l'ombre qu'il a pu faire à Wilhelm Furtwängler lui porte désormais tort de manière irrémédiable.

Les mêmes problèmes lui viendront lorsqu'il décidera de changer de maison de disques et de travailler aux côtés d'Ernst von Siemens, le nouveau patron de la firme « Siemens », pourtant proche du pouvoir (et c'est un euphémisme !), qui venait d'acquérir la « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft ». Particulièrement lié avec Siemens, Karajan ne trouvera cependant pas d'Orchestre disponible à Berlin pour enregistrer avec lui les Symphonies de Mozart que Siemens lui proposa. Situation tout de même étrange que celle du chef à peu près régulier de la « Staatskapelle », dont les concerts continuent à attirer le Tout-Berlin avec des programmes souvent aventureux, qui poursuit son entreprise d'exploration des œuvres de Jean Sibelius, qui se lance dans l'immense aventure des grandes Symphonies d'Anton Bruckner, qui dirige la première d'un « Concerto pour orchestre » du compositeur contemporain Gottfried von Einem - quitte à recevoir de nouveaux reproches de la part de l'entourage de Josef Göbbels, à qui l'œuvre de von Einem paraît trop révolutionnaire - et qui ne trouve pas à Berlin d'Orchestre pour enregistrer la simple Symphonie « Haffner » de Mozart. C'est finalement à Turin, au début de l'automne 1942, qu'il pourra se lancer dans l'enregistrement, avec l'Orchestre symphonique de la Radio de Turin (pas l'un des meilleurs Orchestres du monde), celui-là des Symphonies « Haffner » et de « Jupiter », ainsi que d'une Overture particulièrement remarquée de la « Sémiramis » de Rossini.

Pendant ce temps, Furtwängler avait retrouvé tous ses droits à l'Opéra « Unter den Linden ». C'est lui qui dirigeait « les Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » donnés pour la ré-ouverture du grand théâtre reconstruit. Continuant son double jeu, Tietjen poursuivait à l'endroit de Karajan sa politique attentiste, évoquant pour lui une nouvelle production de « Don Juan », mis-en-scène par Gustaf Gründgens dont la superbe « Flûte enchantée » était dans toutes les mémoires, voire un « Chevalier à la rose » que Karajan pourrait mettre-en-scène lui-même, sinon un « Tristan und Isolde » avec cette Germaine Lubin qui lui avait permis d'enchanter le Paris de la « collaboration ». Mais rien de tout cela ne se concrétisa. Au cours de ses 2 dernières saisons d'activité à Berlin, Karajan trouva tout de même le temps d'aller diriger l'Orchestre de la Scala à Milan, en novembre 1942 et en mars 1943 ; de donner des concerts en Roumanie, en janvier 1944 ; et de revenir à Paris, en avril et mai 1944, pour des concerts au Théâtre des Champs-Élysées. Le 19 avril, il dirige l'Orchestre de Radio-Paris à l'occasion de son 100e concert. Il y tient lui-même le piano du 12e Concerto de Händel, donne « la Mer » de Debussy et la 5e Symphonie de Beethoven. Jacques Lorcey, dans sa biographie de Karajan, cite le critique Alexis Michaguine, qui dira, parlant de son interprétation de « la Mer », qu'il « dirigea d'une façon vraiment personnelle, en faisant ressortir le leitmotiv : les plaintes, les gémissements de la mer ; à ce moment, il fallait voir les mains du jeune mais déjà illustre Maître : ses mains parlaient, vibraient, chantaient, galvanisaient, hypnotisaient non seulement l'Orchestre mais aussi toute l'assistance ». Le même critique regrettera toutefois, et l'on aurait pu s'en douter, la faiblesse de cet Orchestre de Radio-Paris, la station collaborationniste par excellence, à propos de laquelle on avait inventé à Londres la triste ritournelle :

« Radio-Paris ment, Radio-Paris ment : Radio-Paris est allemand ! »

Au cours du second concert, également très applaudi, et à 1 mois et 2 jours du débarquement allié en Normandie, Karajan dirige la 4e Symphonie de Brahms, le 2e Concerto brandebourgeois de Bach (et, cette fois, il tient la partie de clavecin !), mais aussi le « Don Juan » de Richard Strauß et un fulgurant « Boléro » de Ravel.

Dans ces derniers mois où la fin du « Reich » semble se précipiter, Karajan est installé au grand Hôtel Adlon, au centre névralgique de ce qu'il est resté de Berlin. Toujours dans son journal d'une jeune fille russe, la gentille « Missie » Vassiltchikov note, à la date du 2 août 1944 :

« Ce soir, il y a eu un nouveau raid. Nous nous sentions trop fatigués pour descendre. Mais, soudain, nous avons entendu 2 grosses explosions ; nous avons enfilé pantalons et chandails et couru jusqu'à l'abri. Tous les clients de l'Hôtel semblaient s'être habillés à la hâte ; Karajan, toujours tiré à 4 épingles, était pieds nus, en imperméable, les cheveux en bataille. »

Un Karajan pieds nus, en imperméable et les cheveux en bataille : c'est une étrange image qui s'impose à nous, comme en surimpression des 2 années à venir, où nous verrons le grand chef d'orchestre, adulé par une partie du public en même temps que haï par Hitler, redouter brusquement une issue de la guerre qu'il ne peut que souhaiter mais dont il se met à craindre, d'une manière malade, les conséquences qu'elle pourra avoir sur lui. Installé à l'Adlon, il vit alors très près d'Anita, qui l'a accompagné à Milan ou à Paris. Même dans l'ambiance du Paris des derniers mois, des dernières semaines avant la Libération, l'un et l'autre avaient le sentiment de respirer à nouveau

plus librement, tant la pression qui pesait à Berlin sur le couple était intense.

On a parlé de la déroute allemande sur le front de l'Est. Le 6 juin à l'aube, c'est le 2e front, à l'Ouest, qui est enfin ouvert. Le 20 juillet, l'attentat manqué contre Hitler provoque des réactions d'une violence inouïe. Toute une partie de la haute-société allemande qui était parvenue à survivre pendant les années sombres est décimée ou se terre. On va fermer les Opéras, réduire de manière drastique les concerts. Pourtant, 2 jours après l'attentat manqué, Karajan est officiellement chargé de diriger un immense concert en hommage à Bruckner, dans la grande abbatale de Saint-Florian, en Autriche, où vécut le compositeur. Ainsi, à quelques mois de sa fuite éperdue hors d'Allemagne, c'est un Karajan qu'on peut croire encore au sommet de sa puissance qui, dans l'un des sites historiques de la vie musicale et artistique autrichienne, semble conclure cette 1re partie de sa vie avec un hommage à un Bruckner que Hitler (lui aussi !) se flattait d'aimer.

11 octobre 1944 : Concert du « Linzer Bruckner Orchester » à l'église abbatiale de Saint-Florian. Au programme : la 9e Symphonie de Bruckner dirigée par Wilhelm Furtwängler (la seule et unique fois qu'il aura l'occasion de diriger cet Orchestre) . Son chef principal était Georg-Ludwig Jochum, l'un des 3 frères Jochum. Avec cette phalange et le Chœur « Bruckner » de Linz (dirigé par Günther Ramin) , le Chancelier Adolf Hitler voulait produire les programmes musicaux de la « Radio de la Grande Allemagne » . L'Orchestre Bruckner de Linz fut aussi appelé « l'Orchestre du “ Führer ” »

De nombreux journaux évoquèrent ce magnifique concert. Citons le « Oberdonau-Zeitung » , le « Schlesische Zeitung » , le « Brüner Tageblatt » et le « Königsberger Allgemeine Zeitung » .

Herbert Caspers écrivit dans le « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » :

« À la demande du Docteur Glasmeier, “ Reichsintendant ”, fut jouée par l'Orchestre de la Radio de Linz, dans l'église Baroque de Saint-Florian, où Bruckner dort de son dernier sommeil sous son cher orgue, la dernière œuvre du Maître, sa 9e Symphonie dans sa version originale. Les plus célèbres chefs allemands sont apparus au pupitre de l'Orchestre de la Radio de la “ Grande Allemagne ”. Cette année, c'est Furtwängler qui joua le chant du cygne de Bruckner dans une interprétation faite de beauté extra-terrestre et de plénitude sonore envahissante. »

Dans une lettre à Max Auer, datée du 22 novembre 1952, Furtwängler écrivit :

« Inoubliable m'est restée l'interprétation de cette œuvre incomparable que j'ai pu jouer dans l'église de Saint-Florian, au cours des dernières et pires années de cette maudite guerre. »

After Wilhelm Furtwängler performed the Bruckner 9th in Berlin on October 7, 1944, he then travelled to Saint-Florian and performed the work in the monastery church with the Linz Bruckner Orchestra (Georg-Ludwig Jochum, music-director) . The concert was recorded and deposited in what became the Ross/Weiß/Ross (later, « ORF ») archives, and that the transcription still existed, but in poor condition.

This information was reported by a former member of the « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » . However, Hanns Kreczi's book chronicling the Orchestra's activities, including recordings made by the Orchestra, does « not » list such a recording. The « ORF » archive actually holds relatively few War-time recordings, since most extant « RRG » tapes, in Vienna, were taken away by the Soviets. For instance, the Bruckner 2nd and 6th Symphonies under Georg-Ludwig Jochum were issued by « Urania » from tapes provided by the East-German Radio, where many of the original « RRG » tapes ended-up. Only a handful of tapes from the 93 documented recordings by the « Bruckner-Orchester » still exist. The post-War Vienna radio station was « BTW Rot-Weiß-Rot » .

1944 : On a parlé de la déroute allemande sur le front de l'Est. Le 6 juin à l'aube, c'est le 2e front, à l'Ouest, qui est enfin ouvert. Le 20 juillet, l'attentat manqué contre Hitler provoque des réactions d'une violence inouïe. Toute une partie de la haute-société allemande qui était parvenue à survivre pendant les années sombres est décimée ou se terre. On va fermer les Opéras, réduire de manière drastique les concerts. Pourtant, 2 jours après l'attentat manqué, le chef Herbert von Karajan est officiellement chargé de diriger un immense concert en hommage à Bruckner, dans la grande abbatale de Saint-Florian. Ainsi, à quelques mois de sa fuite éperdue hors d'Allemagne, c'est un Karajan qu'on peut croire encore au sommet de sa puissance qui, dans l'un des sites historiques de la vie musicale et artistique autrichienne, semble conclure cette Ire partie de sa vie avec un hommage à un Bruckner que Adolf Hitler (lui aussi !) se flattait d'aimer.

Les bombes continuaient à pleuvoir sur Berlin, on y exécutait à la hâte les conjurés du 20 juillet et leurs complices, vrais ou faux. Mais il se trouvait encore des courtisans pour organiser, pour le plaisir du « Führer » , une incroyable célébration de Bruckner dans le cadre grandiose du monastère de Saint-Florian. Hitler, raconte Karajan lui-même à Roger Vaughan, l'un de ses biographes, se lança sans hésiter dans l'entreprise. Le couvent avait déjà été largement restauré, le Chancelier du « Reich » procura, assure Karajan, tout l'argent qui était nécessaire. L'artisan de cet ultime festin musical était l'un des dirigeants de la radio d'alors, Heinrich Glasmeier.

« On achètera pour lui des meubles à Paris. On lui obtiendra également un carrosse avec 6 chevaux assortis, à l'intérieur bleu damassé. »

La description que donne Karajan de Glasmeier évoque les personnages ambigus qui hantent les romans de Curzio Malaparte, Kaputt ou la Peau. Glasmeier s'était installé dans une partie du couvent, au nombre incalculable de pièces et où il avait réuni un Orchestre personnel de 25 instrumentistes pour célébrer Bruckner.

« C'est là qu'il vivait, et de quelle manière ! » , s'exclame Karajan dans le livre de Roger Vaughan.

« Il portait un manteau de moine doublé de couleur sable et ne se déplaçait qu'avec une canne d'argent. Chaque soir, il dînait en tête à tête avec le vieil abbé du couvent. »

Sentant venir la fin de la guerre, Glasmeier prenait déjà les devants et s'assurait un avenir en retraçant pour toute l'aristocratie qui voulait bien avoir recours à ses services des arbres généalogiques particulièrement flatteurs.

Si la vie de Karajan, comme celle de Hector Berlioz, est bien un roman, elle abonde en personnages de ce type. On a vu le colonel SS Rudolf Vedder dans la peau du traître d'Opérette tragique. Heinrich Glasmeier, lui, réussit le tour de force, alors que le front de l'Ouest était enfoncé, de convaincre l'Allemagne entière de participer à son projet et d'accroître encore les effectifs du petit Orchestre qu'il avait constitué, jusqu'à former un « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester », un Orchestre symphonique Bruckner du « Reich ». Vainquant toutes les difficultés, il parvint enfin à imposer Karajan pour diriger l'unique soirée du 23 juillet 1944.

Dernier grand moment de ces célébrations Bruckner, Karajan et la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin réaliseront, pendant l'été 1944, un disque historique. Il s'agira de la 8e Symphonie de Bruckner, enregistrée en stéréophonie grâce au preneur de son de la radio du « Reich », un certain Helmut Krüger, qui installa des micros supplémentaires, sans même que Karajan le sût lui-même. Largement diffusée après la guerre, cette version de la 8e de Bruckner constitue l'une des Ires incursions de Karajan, pourtant à l'époque ignorant de ce prodige d'ingéniosité, dans le domaine des technologies modernes où, par la suite, il jouera un rôle de pointe parmi les chefs d'orchestre de son temps.

Mais c'étaient là les derniers feux d'un homme désormais privé de moyens dans un Berlin qui courait tout droit à la catastrophe. Déjà, dans la nuit du 29 au 30 janvier 1944, la vieille salle, historique entre toutes, de la « Philharmonie » de Berlin a été rasée à son tour par les bombes de la « Royal Air Force ». Et dans la seconde partie de 1944, la situation de l'Allemagne est désespérée. Pourtant, ce sont des centaines de milliers d'hommes qui vont se lancer dans la bataille. En Alsace, à Aix-la-Chapelle, à l'est de la Prusse et en Hongrie, la résistance allemande s'avère efficace. Mais, dès le 6 septembre, les troupes soviétiques s'avancent en Bulgarie. Quelques jours après, les fronts ouest et sud font leur jonction en France. Le 18 octobre, l'Allemagne décrète la levée en masse des hommes de 16 à 60 ans. Le 16 décembre, à la surprise totale du commandement allié, une contre-attaque allemande fulgurante a lieu dans les Ardennes. Ce sera un échec, mais lourd de conséquences, puisque c'est à cause d'elle que les troupes américaines ne pourront pas entreprendre la campagne d'Allemagne en même temps que les Soviétiques, qui prendront sur elles une avance considérable, dont l'Ouest paiera le résultat longtemps après la guerre. Le 17 janvier, les troupes du maréchal Joukov entrent ainsi dans Varsovie. Au début du mois de février, la déroute allemande est complète en Pologne. Le 4 février, les troupes soviétiques de Koniev franchissent l'Oder et le 8 février, les Soviétiques prennent Breslau. Au début du mois de février 1945, l'Opéra « Unter den Linden », reconstruit depuis moins de 2 ans, sera à nouveau rasé. Mais Karajan lui-même ne sera plus là pour assister à ce désastre.

C'est un monde qui achève de s'écrouler, et les derniers mois de la guerre verront un Herbert von Karajan littéralement aux abois. Évincé par les autorités nazies de tout véritable pouvoir musical, il ne s'estime pas, pour autant et loin de là, en sécurité devant les progrès de l'armée soviétique. Dès la fin de l'été, il n'a plus qu'une idée en tête : quitter l'Allemagne. Mais, même pour lui (surtout pour lui, peut-être), ce n'est pas chose aisée. Il est désormais nécessaire d'en recevoir l'autorisation expresse pour quitter le territoire allemand. En attendant, il donne encore quelques concerts à l'Opéra « Unter den Linden » - voire, au début du mois de novembre, un concert de musique de chambre dans lequel il tient lui-même la partie de piano. Pour l'essentiel, il passe une partie de l'automne en Autriche qui fait partie du territoire allemand.

Heinrich Glasmeier tombe en disgrâce. Josef Gœbbels le démet de ses fonctions puis l'expédie sur le Front de l'Est.

Introuvable, on le rapporte comme manquant.

Printemps 1945 : Heinrich Glasmeier fuit l'arrivée des troupes américaines. Mais les Nazis sont également cernés par l'Armée Rouge. Terré dans ses luxueux quartiers du monastère de Saint-Florian, le « SS-Oberführer » (major-général SS) Heinrich Glasmeier ressent le fracas de l'artillerie soviétique au-dessus de sa tête. Quelques jours avant la fin de la guerre, soit autour du 4 mai, il se suicide à Linz dans sa voiture, tenant une grenade à la main.

American troops in Salzburg and Upper-Austria under U.S. General Harry Collins, 42nd U.S. division stole various art treasures from Austria, including a Salzburg gold coin collection hidden in Hallein. 7 valuable paintings including a Rubens and a van Dyck, and 7 valuable prints, including 4 Dürers, were stolen from the salt mine of Alt-Aussee while under supervision of U.S. personnel with the full knowledge of the Allied authorities.

Particularly disturbing is the chapter entitled « The Austrian Monasteries » , whose sacred relics did not escape American attention. Stolen from the Saint-Florian Monastery and sent to the villa of Gen.

Members of the 83rd U.S. Infantry Division (named « Thunderbolt ») plundered the treasure depot of the Saint-Florian Monastery in 1945, freely taking paintings, antique furniture and Celtic gold treasure which they carried away on 5 trucks.

On 11 April 1945, the 83rd U.S. Infantry Division encountered Langenstein, a sub-camp of the Buchenwald concentration camp. At the camp, the troops found approximately 1,100 inmates. The inmates were malnourished and in extremely poor physical condition. The 83rd reported the death rate at the camp to be 500 per month. Also, that the prisoners had been forced to work 16 hour days in nearby mines, and were shot if they became too weak to work. After liberation, the death rate continued at approximately 25-50 people per day, due to the severe physical debilitation of the prisoners.

To slow the spread of sickness and death, the 83rd ordered the local German mayor to supply the camp with food and water. Also, medical supplies were requisitioned from the U.S. Army's 20th Field Hospital. In addition, the 83rd recovered documents for use by war crimes investigators.

...

In 1933 radio broadcasting, like the film world, underwent a process of coordination (« Gleichschaltung ») and centralization in both its staffing and its content. Already in that year, the regional broadcasting companies had had to make-over their shares to the « Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft » and, in 1934, they were amalgamated in the « Reichssender » . At the same time, a radio department was formed in the propaganda ministry, and the « Reichsrundfunkkammer » (« Reich » Broadcasting Chamber) was set-up for « Aryan » and politically impeccable broadcasting personnel, and remained in existence until October 1939. It was designed to bring the whole of broadcasting under the control of the State : the radio industry, manufacturers of radio sets, broadcasting periodicals - anyone having anything to do with radio had to join the « Reichsrundfunkkammer » . As early as March 1933, in his

1st speech to the broadcasting managers, Josef Gœbbels had explained that he saw radio broadcasting as « the most modern and all-important instrument for influencing the masses ». With it, he wanted to « imbue people so profoundly with the spiritual content of our times that no one can break free of it ». He warned his subordinates :

« Only never become boring. Never be tedious. Never put ideas and beliefs on show. They have to be there, but that doesn't mean they need bore the listener. Radio should never be let down by the words : people see the intention behind them, and are irritated. »

Transmission using physics and technology was to become a transmission of ideas. The direct, shared experience on the radio would, the Nazi authorities hoped, make possible, as no other medium could, a persuasive closeness between the people and their leaders. As a consequence, « all forms of radio irrespective of their content (were) carriers of the National-Socialist ideology. The political aspect (was) not what the content of a programme happens to be, but the starting point for the whole business of radio broadcasting » .

As had been the case with the « Wochenschau » , the War led to an ever-increasing thirst for information and, with it, to an increase in the importance of radio broadcasting, which was then the only way, via live transmissions, or in only slightly deferred time, to enable the public to share directly in current events. While, in 1938, there had been 9 million radio listeners, early 1943 saw the highest count with 16.2 million. Almost 70 % of all households had a radio set. Compared to the density in other European countries, Germany, in 1938, was, with 134 listeners per 1,000 inhabitants, behind Denmark, Britain, and Sweden but ahead of France. The Nazis showed a great interest in radio, since it went right into the private sphere and opened it up to politicization. In the Second World War, this opportunity, again in contrast to the attempt at psychological warfare in the First that had failed because it bored people, was to be used to the full. Moreover, the development of multi-media techniques, which had already begun under the Weimar Republic, was pursued apace with various forms of « product placement » . Radio periodicals told people about the programmes, catchy tunes taken from films were played which were in turn pressed onto gramophone records to find a further audience, while programmes such as the « Wunschkonzert » request programme were made into films, knowledge of which was to be spread further through the « Buch zum Film » .

By the time of the Austrian « Anschluß » , in March 1938, at the latest the development of German radio broadcasting into an international instrument of propaganda had begun. Only a few weeks after the invasion of Poland, there were 113 transmissions in 15 foreign languages every day and, by 1943, 100 directional transmitters were beaming the programmes to foreign audiences. While, with cinema films, the possibility of their being shown abroad (and the foreign currency that would bring in) had been kept in mind, radio broadcasting, with its potential for stirring-up discontent and spreading disinformation as well as for building trust, was seized on and deployed as a strategic weapon of psychological warfare. The operations and finance plan for the « Interradio » foreign broadcasting company, set-up in May 1941, stated :

« In this War, as in no other before, the battle for public opinion in the countries on every continent plays a decisive role. Experience in the War has shown that broadcasting, as the modern instrument of propaganda that spans the globe, has created a virtually unlimited opportunity for influencing the people of the world. The morale of the enemy

population and their will to do battle can be affected so deeply by this new and dangerous weapon that broadcasting contributes to defeating the foe and is, thereby, supporting the military operations. »

Many of the nations involved in the Second World War evidently thought the same, so that there came to be a real battle of the airwaves with transmitters broadcasting in the languages of the enemy nations. Of approximately 100 radio stations round the world putting-out programmes in German, however, only a handful could be received in Germany. They included the « BBC » German Service ; the « Voice of America » ; Radio Luxembourg ; Radio Moscow ; the « Deutsche Volkssender » ; and that of the National « Free Germany » Committee. But there were also transmitters putting-out black propaganda, i.e. , working under a false identity (« Sender 1212 » as the American-run mouthpiece of a fictitious separatist group in the Rhineland, « Deutscher Kurzwellensender Atlantik») as the British imitation of a station for the German troops) , and jamming transmitters including some targeted at those just mentioned. This was done mostly with whistling and screeching noises to distort the transmissions, but also sometimes by interjecting words ; the best-known of the latter is probably the phrase that during the broadcast of Goebbels's 1943 New Year address loudly intoned on sets tuned to the Breslau transmitter the words « Stalingrad Massengrab » (Stalingrad's Mass Grave) .

In Germany, from 9 July 1940, all the « Reichssender » stations could broadcast only a single programme, with inserted regional slots ; by the autumn of 1942, the sequence and contents of this programme heard all over the « Reich » had been entirely standardized. Of its initially 21 hours a day transmission time, 13 hours were devoted to music, and the remaining 8 to speech radio. Every day of the week had its set pattern : for the evening hours, when a great many Germans were sitting down round the radio set, there was indeed a standardization that made it easy to get used to the programming - every day, the main news came on from 20h00 to 20h20, preceded by 1 hour of mainly military and political information in the form of reports from the front and talks about the situation, interspersed with music. From 20h20 to 22h00, there followed a block with light music. Classical music, as well as non-political speech programmes such as talks, plays, or literary items, were pushed to a marginal place in the programming. « Unser Schatzkästlein - Worte und Weisen aus ewigem deutschen Besitz » (Our Jewel Box, Words and Melodies from the Eternal German Treasure-house) , a popular evening programme before the War, was broadcast in a still relatively prominent place on Sundays from 9h00 to 10h00, a slot previously occupied by the church service. It featured « snippets of chamber music » , interspersed with verses from the Classics, aimed at cultivated middle-class listeners.

Jewish and modern authors or composers were already ruled-out as « decadent » , and Goebbels issued the dictum that « new, difficult works should not be put on the air » . As in other fields, the criteria according to which things were censored became more and more numerous as the War progressed. In September 1940, a list of « undesirable musical works » included :

1. All works by Jewish composers.

2. All works by Polish composers other than those of Frédéric Chopin.

3. All works whose composers came from enemy countries.

March 1942 saw the addition of works from the United States that had been published there. In late 1944, when Italy was no longer among Germany's allies, the propaganda ministry's weekly meeting on the radio programme had to grapple with the following request :

« A railway battalion has donated 10,000 " Reichsmarks " and is asking for the song : " Und abends auf der Heide ". This song is unfortunately banned, as the woman is an Italian and the rights are held by an American firm. The battalion should be written to asking them to choose something else. »

From March 1942, for 1 hour or 2 in the evening, an alternative to the « Reichssender » was offered by the « Deutschlandsender » station, as a concession to giving listeners a choice. They had, at least according to SD reports describing the state of affairs, been showing themselves more and more « indifferent » to the radio programme, which scared Goebbels into introducing sweeping reforms. These were aimed at making the programme as « assorted, varied, and colourful as possible », so as to keep both the troops and the civilians glued to the (German) station. Both the political and the entertainment parts of the radio programme were divided into various topics or kinds of music, and given heads to deal with each. Hans Hinkel had charge of entertainment, in February 1942, while overall responsibility for the « political and propaganda » side was in the hands of the previous head of the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda »'s press department, Hans Fritzsche, who after Hinkel moved to managing film, in mid-1944, took-over responsibility for the whole of radio programming.

Where content was concerned, these restructurings meant most of all a strengthening of « light entertainment ». Of the roughly 190 hours of programming each week, between December 1942 and January 1943 (including the dual programme), around 84 % (i.e., 160 hours) were devoted to the entertainment and artistic side, with around 16 % (a total of 30 broadcasts) going to politics and propaganda items. Some 130 hours of the entertainment part were given-over to light or serious music. Those in charge at the propaganda ministry hoped besides that the « carry-over effect » would come into play, and the enjoyable entertainment on offer would make the medium so interesting that listeners would not switch-off during the less interesting political and propaganda broadcasts. Here, there is a parallel with the « threefold » cinema experience : politics and entertainment became so closely interwoven as to be almost inseparable. The political part, in the strict meaning of the word, which even in the evening accounted for only 30 % on average, consisted of news bulletins, the official « Wehrmacht » report, the week's talks on political and military topics, the « Zeitspiegel » (Mirror of the Times), the eyewitness style reports from the front supplied by the army propaganda companies, together with the central items from the head propagandist himself : the « political and military talks » were broadcast 3 times a week with, each time, high-ranking representatives of the army, « Luftwaffe », and navy commenting on military matters. These commentaries, valued by the public as being accurate and knowledgeable, were given more and more extra airtime. With the « reports from the front », it was rather a matter of a more expressive, emotional presentation of « detail within a few minutes, as a kind of cameo : raids by torpedo-boats on a British convoy, an infantryman tackling Soviet tanks, a " sortie " by a fighter pilot in North Africa ». Particular military successes were presented in « special reports », introduced with a trumpet fanfare. Up-to-date air situation reports from listeners were slotted in. The « Zeitspiegel », especially, as one of the main political and

propaganda broadcast genres, combined information with education, designed to mould opinion in a way interesting to the listener. Transmitted over half an hour, it consisted of 5 or 6 items each about 5 minutes long. These were drawn from the following subject areas : « Ideas about the “ Reich ” History - the “ NSDAP ” » ; « The German Countryside » ; « The German People » ; « Social Life » ; « The Economy, Technology, and Transport » ; « Science and Research » ; « Cultural Life » ; « Sport » ; « Geography from the Military Viewpoint » ; « The Mood at the Front » ; « The Front and Home » ; « Our Allies » ; « Comments on the “ Wehrmacht ” Report » ; and « Other Topics » . The most frequent area covered by reports from the home front was cultural life, with items on cultural weeks, meetings with poets, art exhibitions, Opera and theatre performances, films, and literature.

In view of an ever-increasing preponderance of women on the home front, the « Frauenfunk » (Radio for Women) had a special role to play. Here, the political contribution made by the female « Volksgenossen » , their part in the life and survival of the nation, was more and more identified with their role as shoppers. The « Frauenfunk » had become a main tool in the campaigns to guide consumption in the 1930's, and was even more so during the War. Other speech items, too, were given a War-time make-over ; for instance, the « Deutschlandsender » , on 26 May 1941, broadcast on its own wavelength a 10 minute play by the Denneberg Puppet Theatre with the title : « Kasperle zieht in den Krieg » (Little Casper Goes to War) .

At the start of the War, in the days of quick victories, it was the news bulletins and political broadcasts that were given the lion's share of the airtime. Reports of political successes were celebrated with a skilful use of trumpet fanfares and a feeling for choosing the right moment. As with the shaping of the « Wochenschau » , it was a matter, in the reporting, of condensing apparent eyewitness accounts, in time and space, in such a way that the actual location of the fighting became secondary and the emphasis was placed on the marching of the soldiers symbolizing the German advance. Very soon, however, the proportion of light music was increased, in line with Goebbels's maxims and, as a result of protests from listeners ; already, in 1940, it was back at over 60 % . Literary programmes or talks took a back-seat. There was « Music in the Morning » ; « Musical Pastime » ; the « Harbour Concert » ; « Pleasure in the Afternoon » ; « The German People's Concert » ; « Something for Everyone » ; « Radio Cheer for Young and Old » ; and so on. The framework for the programme was similar to that for the print media : as few long speech items as possible, no difficult allusions, no hunting songs, no U-boat songs, no merry Rhineland songs, unless relevant to current events. « Because of a letter from a listener » , Hinkel instructed the station that :

« No lyrics should be used that are likely to unsettle “ simple ” soldiers, such as : “ Warum soll ich treu sein, wie ein Reh so scheu sein ”. »

« Why should I be faithful, like a roe-deer be so shy. » , a hit song from the 1940 film, « Kora Terry » .

In the winter of 1941-1942, Goebbels had a new Orchestra formed, the « “ Reich ” Light Music Orchestra » , subsequently named the « German Dance and Light Music Orchestra » , which provided the model for the Radio Orchestras of post-War years. From 1 August 1942, it had its regular place in the schedule on Saturday evenings, with the title : « Melody and Rhythm » . The Orchestra's main purpose was to keep members of the armed forces happy, especially those in the « Luftwaffe » , by providing music « with a swing to it » . These troops had in growing

numbers been choosing to listen to British radio stations out of dissatisfaction with what was on offer from the German music programme. The « Dance and Light Music Orchestra » was also to provide the public with an example of « German » jazz music. Making its own output happy and care-free also meant giving the listeners as little cause as possible to tune in to foreign stations. This involved making concessions to preferences and ideological compromises - which were hotly contested within the Party and among listeners. People were listening to « jazz », but it was announced as « lively rhythms ». During the War, the Nazi leadership lightly sacrificed a number of cultural maxims of National-Socialist ideology to public taste. The high-importance attached to radio entertainment, at this time of extreme stress, is clear from a decision taken by Goebbels, in 1944. After his decree of 24 August that year, Radio Orchestras were the only ones still performing. As the War went on, the problems worsened, as they did in the other 2 cultural sectors. Conscription led to staff shortages, many transmitters had to be shut down at night because of the air raids while others ceased operation entirely because they had been destroyed and spare parts were very hard to come by in the occupied territories. A meeting on radio matters, on 29 November 1944, was told that :

« The Munich broadcasting station cannot be kept going. Landshut in Lower-Bavaria is proposed as an alternative. Matters are the same at Saarbrücken. The order for dismantling has been given. The « Reichsender » has also evacuated its female staff. The technical equipment has been moved to « Neustadt an der Haardt » .

...

In connection with the problem of light dance music versus music of greater artistic value, a question which has been widely discussed among radio listeners, the « Reich » Superintendent and general director of the German Broadcasting Company, Heinrich Glasmeier (before 1933, he was an archivist in Westphalia) , declared that the radio broadcasting system has held to a healthy middle course, which it would continue to follow in the future.

« Reich » Superintendent Glasmeier sharply opposed the re-infiltration, by way of the « humorous » sketch, of the destructive Jewish spirit into the radio broadcasting system. We cannot have a situation in which the leaders of the movement extol the sacredness of marriage and the ethos of the German soldier, who must risk his life and blood for the Fatherland while, in the evening, these very values are insulted and ridiculed in « colorful » entertainment sketches with the corroding sarcasm of so-called variety programs. (Loud applause.)

Superintendent Glasmeier addressed an urgent appeal to his musical colleagues not to fall asleep at their desks, filing cabinets, and music cabinets, but to set forth on journeys of discovery in the field of German musical literature, to find unknown precious pearls, which can be transmitted to the German people, works of the past as well as works of contemporary creative artists.

At the conclusion of his discussion, Superintendent Glasmeier distinguished between the tasks of the « Reich » broadcasting stations and the tasks of the « Deutschlandsender » .

...

In the framework of the new cultural programming, Symphony and Opera broadcasts for the edification of listeners increasingly replaced stirring ideological broadcasts. Instead of continuing to emphasize the revolutionary aspects of National-Socialism, the radio now offered, among other things, all 9 of Beethoven's Symphonies, as well as the entire « Ring des Nibelungen » by Richard Wagner. The quality of both the performances and the sound reproduction was so high that such broadcasts were also picked-up by a series of foreign radio stations. But this over-emphasis on high-culture seemed too challenging to many listeners from the lower-classes. Before, these groups had primarily spoken-out against the dominance of partisan political broadcasts ; now, they rebelled against the music programs that were too demanding for their taste. And Josef Gœbbels, always concerned about having a large impact, lent a willing ear to these voices. In response, he had the share of light-music in the radio programming increased first to 60 % and, then, finally to 70 % , allotting only 5 % to broadcasts of so-called serious music.

This did put some noses out of joint - those of middle-class listeners who were fanatically concerned about education and those of « völkisch » minded cultural traditionalists. But it gave the broad masses he was always invoking the desired feeling of living in a very normal society where the stressful work day was always followed by some well-earned entertainment. Gœbbels commented, in 1936 :

The radio program must be configured so that it continues to interest the fastidious taste, yet, appears pleasing and understandable to tastes that are more unassuming. It should offer instruction, stimulation, relaxation, and entertainment in a mixture that is clever and psychologically astute. Special consideration should be given to relaxation and entertainment, because the vast majority of all radio listeners are treated harshly and unsparingly by life, and they have a right to find relaxation, in the few hours of rest and leisure available to them. In comparison, those few who want to be nourished solely by Kant and Hegel carry almost no weight. »

1 year later, Gœbbels even supported the trend toward rejecting all types of intellectual arrogance in programming even more strongly than before :

« What does Furtwängler think he's achieving with his 2,000 listeners in the concert-hall ? , he explained.

« What we need are the millions and, with the radio, we have them. »

Even after the beginning of World War II, this basic approach to radio programming changed very little. True, the program now included Franz Liszt's Symphonic poem « les Préludes » introducing proud reports of victory, but the non-committal tootling of light-music did not decrease for all that. On the contrary, as the state of the War worsened progressively after the fall of Stalingrad, in January 1943, music broadcasts intended to spread a mood of optimism grew substantially on a percentage basis. The musical request programs, often lasting 3 hours, played an important role with their Opera choruses ; melodies from Operettas ; folk songs ; carnival hits ; waltzes ; and military marches. They became more and more popular with soldiers at the front, as well as with approximately 50 % of the listeners on the home front as entertainment on evenings or Sundays. In addition, there were the many hits sung by popular favourites such as Zarah Leander, Hans Albers, and many others. They had catchy 1st lines such as :

« That isn't the end of the world » ; « I know a miracle will happen » , « That can't bother a sailor » , « We'll rock the baby right » , or « At home, at home, we'll see each other again » - all intended to promote a stiff upper-lip ethic that was finally revealed as meaningless at the end of April 1945, as one military defeat followed another.

Almost the same trends can be observed in the development of Nazi film production ; only, at the beginning, were there some obvious differences. The radio was already in government hands before the transfer of power to Adolph Hitler, so the new government could put it in the service of their own ideology without too great an effort, but the entire film industry was still in the private sector, in 1933. There were, therefore, substantial differences in the beginning in terms of how the employees of these 2 industries fared. In radio, Leftists and Jews were a tiny minority of the employees. There were also very few Leftists in the various film companies, but there were a great many Jews, who suddenly saw themselves marginalized. Well aware that they would not have any other professional opportunities under Hitler's thumb, there were approximately 800 directors, cameramen, and actors and actresses who left after the 3rd « Reich » was proclaimed on 30 January 1933, among them : Fritz Kortner, Fritz Lang, Max Ophüls, Otto Preminger, Billy Wilder, and Fred Zinnemann. Most of them, after brief stays in France, England, and the Netherlands, went to the United States and, in most cases, to Hollywood, as Marlene Dietrich did. Later, in their periodical « Der deutsche Film » , the Nazis claimed that, in the years preceding 1933, 70 % of all screen writers, 50 % of all directors, and 20 % of all owners of film production companies had been Jews ; these shocking percentages were cited with the intention of sharply underlining this supposedly deplorable state of affairs. These losses were a serious blow to the German film industry which, a short time before, had been justified in claiming to be the 2nd most important in the world after Hollywood. The half-Jew Fritz Lang, for example, was admired by the German-minded for his « Nibelungen » film (1924) , and Goebbels would have liked very much to keep him in Germany to be utilized as a director of Nazi fascist propaganda films, but Lang refused.

Goebbels established a separate Chamber for film in the process of creating the « Reich » Chambers of Culture, in late fall of 1933. Film had long been considered a low-genre, artistically speaking, and Goebbels liked to portray himself as a friend of the high-arts, so this very fact shows how important he believed film to be. As minister for propaganda, he had to pay particular attention to the lower-art forms that could more easily reach the so-called broad masses. While the educated middle-class preferred to continue attending the Theatre and the Opera, the lower-classes were attracted by the movies ; therefore, Goebbels tried to win-over these groups for the new regime right away through film as well as radio. He was well-aware that the workers who, at the time, made-up almost 50 % of the German population, had largely voted for the Social-Democrats or the Communists, before 1933. So he tried everything he could to appear as a « friend of the worker » despite his own educational background, and to offer them the cultural products with which he could help them to a new consciousness with a maximum of speed and suggestivity. And, for this purpose, the medium of film (along with radio) seemed most suitable to him.

The leadership of the NSDAP also paid considerable attention to the press. Goebbels established a « Reich » Press Chamber, on 15 November 1933, as one of the « Reich » Chambers of Culture and named Max Amann, head of the official Nazi publishing house, as its President. But within the politically influential mass-media, they did not attach the same importance to the press as they did to radio or film. They viewed newspapers, still primarily text-oriented at that time, as similar to books in requiring a more demanding and tedious reception process than the other 2 mass-

media, which functioned primarily visually and acoustically. The newspaper had a monopoly on opinion formation in the public sphere, at the beginning of the Weimar Republic, but its importance had already gradually diminished in the course of the 1920's, due to the impact of radio and film on ever larger segments of the population. Toward the end of the Republic, bankruptcy threatened even some of the newspapers that had previously flourished such as the « Berliner Tageblatt », and that ended their political influence. Even Nazi newspapers such as the « Völkischer Beobachter », the « Freiheitskampf », « Der Stürmer », and « Der Angriff » felt the impact of this problem so that, after 1933, the Party leadership no longer attached the same importance to them as they had at the beginning.

Göebbels considered « Der Angriff », which he had founded in 1927, as his personal newspaper, and he wrote innumerable lead articles for it. But, after his appointment as Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, his interest in the newspaper, which continued to appear, diminished. By May 1933, he agreed to its transformation into the « Tageszeitung der Deutschen Arbeitsfront » and continued to write occasional articles only for the « Völkischer Beobachter » and the weekly « Das Reich ». This lack of interest was not only the result of the increasing dominance of the audio-visual mass-media ; it was also linked to the NSDAP's striving for respectability after its official assumption of power, on 30 January 1933. In the late- 1920's, when the Nazi fascists were still considered revolutionary, their newspapers had been unabashed propaganda organs but, now, many of the leaders were struggling to give the new regime the appearance of having greater prestige. Nevertheless, they were not willing to give-up any media with propaganda potential, so they tried to bring newspaper publishing under their control. They were somewhat more broad-minded here, than in other areas. They even wanted to offer the status of honorary Aryan to the Jew Hans Lachmann Mosse, the owner of the internationally known « Berliner Tageblatt », and to his Jewish chief editor Theodor Wolff, as well if the 2 had been willing to continue managing the paper - of course omitting all comments critical of the regime. But both Lachmann Mosse and Wolff declined the offer, which had originated with Hermann Göring, and did not return to Berlin from exile. Because of the paper's international prestige, the Ministry for Propaganda simply allowed it to continue publishing, albeit under Aryan management, finally shutting it down on 31 January 1939.

Many other newspapers of the Weimar Republic were able to continue appearing after 1933, among them the « Frankfurter Zeitung » (characterized by Alfred Rosenberg as « boursianic ») , the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , the « Kölnische Zeitung » , the « Vossische Zeitung » , and the « BZ am Abend » . Only Leftist papers such as « Vorwärts » , the « Rote Fahne » , and the « Arbeiter-Illustrierte Zeitung aller Länder » were forbidden. Of course, all who worked for the newspapers that continued to appear, as well as their owners, had to become members of the « Reich » Press Chamber and produce an Aryan certificate. They also saw their editors forced to emphasize national ascendancy at all times. And in addition, the Party authorities insisted that they give-up 2 attitudes that had predominated until now in the bourgeois Jewish press : 1st, the sense of personal involvement that had its basis in the « rootlessness of subjective individual interests » and, 2nd, and in contradiction to the 1st, they were to ignore the commandment of « new objectivity » , as the director of the « Reich » Broadcasting Company Eugen Hadamovsky explained in 1933. From now on, every journalist should feel they were 1st and foremost member of a national community and give expression to that feeling in their reports. But beyond that, not too many serious demands were made of this profession during the mid 1930's.

When it became important to spread a mood of optimism during World War II, newspaper editors too were given the task of writing articles that would cheer people up. In the wake of this reversal, the Propaganda Ministry stipulated that words, such as « retreat » or « catastrophe », should be replaced by cleverly obfuscating euphemisms. But, as I said before, a certain limited pluralism was preserved until the end of the 3rd « Reich » in the press, as in the publishing industry and in magazines such as « Das Innere Reich ». Despite relentless attacks on the Semitic evil, published in Julius Streicher's « Der Stürmer », even the weekly newspaper of the Jews of Berlin was able to continue publishing until the middle of 1941. In its final issues, you can still find ads by people seeking a marriage partner, which shows how resigned members of this group had become to the prevailing conditions and how they were trying to get along for better or for worse. But just a short time later, they were forced to recognize, appalled, that they no longer had any options for continuing to live in the 3rd « Reich ». Many of their Aryan fellow citizens, on the other hand, had been relieved of most of the routine dirty work by hundreds of thousands of foreign workers and prisoners of War. As their hope for a victorious end to the hostilities gradually disappeared after 1943, these people declared cynically :

« Enjoy the War ; the peace will be terrible. »

...

Die Reichsrundfunkkammer war eine Institution im Deutschen Reich, die die Aufgabe hatte, mit den Mitteln des Rundfunks die Gleichschaltung der Gesellschaft während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus voranzutreiben. Sie wurde 1933 als eine der sieben Abteilungen der Reichskulturkammer gegründet.

Die Reichsrundfunkkammer hatte den Zweck, « dem Willen des Führers » zu dienen und « das ganze Volk mit dem Rundfunk zu durchdringen, um Staatsführung und Volksgemeinschaft zu einer geschlossenen Einheit zu machen » .

Präsident der Reichsrundfunkkammer war Horst Dreßler-Andreß, als Vizepräsident wurde der Reichssendeleiter Eugen Hadamovsky ernannt.

1939 wurde die Reichsrundfunkkammer aufgelöst und ihre Aufgaben an die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft übertragen.

...

Eine der sieben Kammern der Reichskulturkammer ; gegründet als Körperschaft des öffentlichen Rechts am 1. November 1933 durch die « 1. Verordnung zur Durchführung des Reichskulturkammergesetzes » ; hervorgegangen aus der am 3. Juli 1933 von Reichssendeleiter Hadamovsky gegründeten « Nationalsozialistischen Rundfunkkammer eingetragener Verein » . Josef Goebbels' Ziel einer in der Reichsrundfunkkammer herzustellenden « Rundfunkeinheit » erwies sich allerdings bald als illusorisch : Industrie und Handel der Radiobranche beanspruchte das Wirtschaftsministerium, so daß sie am 19. März 1934 wieder aus der Reichsrundfunkkammer ausschieden ; die Hörerverbände lösten sich auf. Die Kammer war 1937 in fünf Abteilungen gegliedert : Verwaltung, Propaganda, Wirtschaft und Technik, Recht und Kultur. Die am 3. September 1935 errichtete Fachschaft Rundfunk erfasste alle Mitarbeiter vom Intendanten und Sendeleiter bis zum

Tonmeister und Ansager. Eine Berufsausübung ohne Mitgliedschaft war nicht möglich. Präsident war 1933-1937 Horst Dreßler-Andreß, Mai 1937 - 1939 Hans Kriegler, beide zugleich in Personalunion Leiter der Abteilung III (Rundfunk) im Propagandaministerium und des Rundfunks der NSDAP ; Vizepräsident : Eugen Hadamovsky, Geschäftsführer : 1933-1935 Bernhard Knust, 1935-1939 Herbert Packebusch. Die Reichsrundfunkkammer war maßgeblich beteiligt an Entwicklung, Propagierung und Verkauf des Volksempfängers. Sie wurde am 28. Oktober 1939 von Gœbbels aufgelöst, ihre Einzelmitglieder wurden der Musik-, Theater- oder Schrifttumskammer zugeteilt.

...

Hans Kriegler, the President of the « Reichsrundfunkkammer » (the « Reich » Broadcasting Chamber) , from May 1937 to 1939, recommended an improved royalty system for radio-plays, whereby writers would receive fixed residuals for all rebroadcasts of their works. Plans for such a system were seconded, at the time, by « Reichsrundfunkintendant » Doctor Heinrich Glasmeier, who believed that the lack of uniformity in the amounts stations paid for radio-plays was keeping away many potential authors. Such fluctuations show-up in the few broadcasting contracts available for Günter Eich's texts. His honoraria ranged from a low of 150 « Reichsmarks » for a relatively short-piece (« Schritte zu Andreas ») to a high of 900 « Reichsmarks » (for the « Weizenkantate ») , which was quite extraordinary compared to the average radio-play honorarium of only 500 « Reichsmarks » , but very unimpressive when one considers that, at the time, a talented author could earn as much as 80,000 « Reichsmarks » for a successful play, up to 30,000 « Reichsmarks » for a film script, or 10,000 « Reichsmarks » for a novel.

The fact that Glasmeier was reviewing the honorarium problem, at this date, and that Kriegler, a member of the NSDAP elite who, in 1938, held the dual offices of « Reichsrundfunkkammer » President and head of the Propaganda Ministry's Section III for Radio, had taken the initiative to produce « Das Hörspielbuch » strongly suggests that the 1938 campaign to promote the radio-play was sanctioned by the broadcasting system's highest authority, Josef Gœbbels. So much can be gathered from an SD report on a conference in June 1938, in which Gœbbels, his adjunct Karl Hanke, and clumsy « Reichssendeleiter » Eugen Hadamovsky discussed the complete revision of the structure of cultural and political broadcasts. The main directive issuing from this meeting was that « Wortsendungen » (i.e. , radio-plays, narratives, etc.) , which had been « totally neglected » until then should be made more prominent in programming. The report's most interesting feature is the reason given for this directive, since it makes Gœbbels' inherent aversion to the genre clear. The report states that, already before Christmas of 1937, Gœbbels had ordered that the radio-play be eliminated from the program :

« Es sollten in Zukunft Hörspiele möglichst gar nicht oder nur in ganz beschränktem Maße zur Sendung gelangen. Der Hauptwert sei auf musikalische Darbietungen zu legen. »

This directive apparently resulted in a decrease in radio-play broadcasts during the 1st half of 1938. The report goes on to state, however, that Gœbbels was moved by complaints from listener circles to re-instate such programs. Thus, at least until developments following the outbreak of War, changed his attitude, Gœbbels granted the radio-play a reprieve.

The strength of the listener protest against the cut-back in radio-play programming can be gauged by the findings of a survey conducted in the summer of 1939, which indicated just how popular the genre was with the German audience. The radio-journal « Deutsche Radio-Illustrierte » asked listeners to choose their favourite program type(s) from a list of 17 choices. An 18th slot was left open for special wishes. To the surprise of many, the radio-play made a very strong showing in the overall ratings : it was among the top 33 % of favourite programs. And a breakdown of the listeners' programming tastes, according to their occupations, showed that radio-dramas appealed to 1 out of every 2 listeners. Among 14 professional categories ranging from manual laborer to merchant, the rating remained fairly constant. Popularity fluctuated from a high of 61.3 % with housewives to a low of 40.2 % with servicemen and members of the compulsory labor service (« Reichsarbeitsdienst ») . The average preference for the « Hörspiel » in all professions came within hundredths of 1 % of exactly 50 % . Such broad appeal was sure to impress propagandists, for among the 10 most frequently chosen program types, which were almost all musical, the radio-play lent itself particularly well to the manipulation of public opinion. Those categories presenting the Nazis' distorted views of news and current events, the « Aktuelle Kurzberichte » and « Gestaltete Hörberichte » , were chosen less than half as often as the radio-play.

Just prior to this survey, the radio-play had demonstrated its effectiveness in shaping public opinion in the series « Der Krieg im Dunkeln » , broadcast from Berlin during the regime's secret preparations for War.

...

Conductor Siegmund von Hausegger has been described as « a prominent supporter of the Nazi regime » who, in 1934, conducted the Munich Philharmonic in a special concert « intended as the 88's art manifesto » . Erik Levi depicts a musical culture in which increasing emphasis, after 1933, was placed on what was perceived as the solid German tradition Bruckner was believed to represent, as opposed to the « decadence » of the Weimar era. Broadcasting also helped to give his work a higher profile.

For details of the 1st broadcast cycle of 1932-1933, see : August Gollerich and Max Auer : Volume 4 / Chapter 4, page 117. Shortly afterwards, 2 of the conductors - Otto Klemperer, who conducted Bruckner's Symphony No. 5, and Bruno Walter, who conducted Bruckner's Symphony No. 9, in the Orel edition, would be refugees. Fritz Busch who conducted Bruckner's Symphony No. 4 would follow them voluntarily into exile.

Although Richard Strauß conducted Bruckner's 9th Symphony in Salzburg, in 1906, and the 7th in Buenos Aires, in 1923, he did not like the music. Bruckner's mystical religiosity was an anathema to a man of Strauß's non-beliefs (which makes it all the more surprising that he praised Edward Elgar's « The Dream of Gerontius ») . Writing in 1904, to an author who wished to write a book about Bruckner, in a series Strauß edited, Strauß said :

« I admit that every form of piety is so disagreeable to me that I cannot be fair even to its most naive expression. Since I sincerely admire the melodist Bruckner, I am willing to be quiet and retain an unbelieving smile when one crowns his primitive counterpoint stutterings with the title of Mastership. »

In a letter to Emil von Rezníček, written in March 1935, Strauß wrote :

« The boring farmer's music of the good old Anton seems to me to be completely superfluous : “ Te Deum, wenn aus ist, benamst ! ” » (« “ Te Deum ”, praise God when it's over ! »)

See : Günter Brosche. « Richard Strauß und Anton Bruckner » , in : « Richard-Strauß-Blätter » , No. 12, Vienna (December 1978) ; pages 27-29.

For some, a lingering unease attends the fact that Bruckner was singled-out for promotion by the new regime. But the Nazi misappropriation of Bruckner is due more to a series of historical accidents than because any aspect of his life or work connects him to the regime and its ideology. Bruckner had originated from the same « Gau » (Nazi-era administrative region) as Adolf Hitler, and he was also associated with a venue, Saint-Florian, which was both historic and photogenic inviting for a regime always seeking to legitimize itself by co-opting Germanic tradition - and had even contrived to monumentalize his own remains, unwittingly initiating a funerary sub-culture. His music seemed to embody a mythic dimension absent from the work of the sober North German Johannes Brahms, and while Brahms's appeal was universal, the then limited reception of Bruckner's music outside the German-speaking world made it easier to represent Bruckner as a composer who addressed himself specifically to ethnic Germans. He was also closely associated with Hitler's favourite composer, Richard Wagner, an accusation that could not be levelled against Brahms.

While the idea of a « Bruckner-Festspielhaus » in Saint-Florian was by no means new, Hitler's ideas went further, as Josef Gœbbels remarked :

« Drive to Saint-Florian. To the monastery where Bruckner used to compose. What a beautiful Baroque building. We intend to turn the priests out of here and found a Music College and a home for the Bruckner Society. A marvellous plan (Hitler) intends to establish a centre of culture here. As a counter-weight to Vienna, which will have to be gradually phased-out of the picture. He intends to make alterations to Saint-Florian at his own expense. »

The monastery was to become a « House of Culture » and the great « Bruckner Organ » was to be used « in the service of the people » , meaning that it was to assist in the ritualization of Nazi Party activities. In the words of Heinrich Kronsteiner :

« The Bruckner Organ in Saint-Florian was the prototype of all the organs in the Upper-Danube District and, indeed, in all Austria, and one saw it already becoming a secular rather than a religious instrument. »

The « Reich » 's best-known organists were called upon to display their prowess on this iconic instrument and, in the 1937 “ Bruckner-Blätter ”, Friedrich Hogner duly described « the 1st Upper-Danube Organ Competition in the form of displays of improvisation on given themes on the Bruckner Organ in Saint-Florian, near Linz, under the auspices of the “ Gauleiters ” and “ Reichsstathalters ” and in association with the National-Socialist “ Strength Through Joy ” Association » .

Despite War-time demands on resources, a new Orchestra was founded, the « Bruckner-Orchester Sankt Florian des Großdeutschen Rundfunks ». No effort or expense was spared. Georg-Ludwig Jochum (the brother of Eugen Jochum) was engaged as principal conductor, and guest conductors included Carl Schuricht, Joseph Keilberth and the young Herbert von Karajan. The repertoire ranged from Antonio Vivaldi to Zoltán Kodály but inevitably centred on a high-profile Bruckner cycle.

Much of the ritual attending the Bruckner cult practised in Saint-Florian, at this time, bears the stamp of the senior official on the scene, « Reichsintendant » Heinrich Glasmeier, a fanatical Hitlerite and a devout Catholic who, in a previous posting, had attended High-Mass at Cologne Cathedral in the uniform of an « SS Obersturmführer ». Glasmeier's style is evident in the dedication ceremony held to inaugurate the year-long training programme that began on 1 April 1943. 2 days later the players, escorted by torch-bearing uniformed SS men, assembled in the crypt for a special wreath-laying ceremony, at which Glasmeier addressed the sarcophagus, swearing allegiance to Adolf Hitler. On the following day, 4 April 1943, Hitler himself paid a surprise visit and, he too, descended into the crypt to commune with Anton Bruckner's remains.

A similar ceremony inaugurated the « Bruckner-Chor Sankt Florian », on 9 May 1944, as double bass player Fritz Westermann described in a letter to his wife. While the Bruckner Organ played overhead, choir members descended to the crypt, where Glasmeier gave the « German greeting » over Bruckner's coffin, members of the SS, carrying lighted torches, standing on either side. The flickering torchlight played over the thousands of skulls ; all too reminiscent of Heinrich Himmler's rites in the Wewelsburg. (Westermann's description of the scene as « very interesting » is somehow inadequate.) The Bruckner Orchestra, now renamed the « Linz Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester », was one of the few Orchestras allowed to remain active following Josef Gœbbels's declaration of « Total War », in August 1944.

The need to ritualize Bruckner's work coincided with a fashion for performances in cathedral acoustics, Saint-Florian presenting itself as the ideal Bruckner space. The connection between architecture, ambience, and interpretative approach was made explicit by Heinrich Hofer in the « Völkische Beobachter », reviewing Herbert von Karajan's July 1944 performance of the 8th Symphony given in Saint-Florian monastery by the Bruckner Orchestra :

« Here, in the solemn, devotional space of the church, between the starkly laid-out altar and the towering rows of organ pipes, the meaning of Bruckner's musical architecture became particularly evident. The boldly arching and clearly delineated structural elements of the space call for monumental music (directed by Karajan) filled the space by grandly letting the music breathe, making it exert great serenity of spiritual introversion. »

This culmination of the cycle, and of the Bruckner Orchestra's activity, was a performance of the 9th Symphony under Wilhelm Furtwängler (on 11 October 1944, the anniversary of Bruckner's death) . Furtwängler later recalled this performance as exceptional (the 1st violins included the young Reinhold Barchet, later a soloist with the Stuttgart Chamber Orchestra and founder of the prestigious Barchet Quartets) :

« Given in the last and worst phase of this unholy War. »

We need not, however, assume that it was exceptionally slow, certainly not if Furtwängler's live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, recorded only 4 days previously, is anything to go by. Even Karajan's 8th was praised for « not over-stretching the tempi » , and acetates of Hans Weisbach conducting the « Großes Orchester des Reichssenders Leipzig » in the sketches for the Finale of the 9th Symphony, edited by Fritz Öser and recorded for German Radio, in October 1940, reveal an approach that is dignified and stately rather than ponderous. Contemporary recordings vary hugely in terms of interpretative approach, with surprisingly rapid tempi from Wilhelm Furtwängler and Oswald Kabasta warning against assumptions concerning an approved « Nazizeit » interpretative approach to Bruckner. Nor does anyone seem to have been concerned when Hans Knappertsbusch, who remained loyal all his life to the 1st published editions, conducted the Bruckner-Orchester in the 4th Symphony (the edition is not identified in the favourable « Linzer Tagespost » review) . But there may be more substance to the argument that Haas's later editions, in their elevation of instinct over scholarship, show the influence of Nazi thinking.

Erik Levi has shown how Richard Wagner's writings had given credibility to a specifically Nazi ideology that expressed itself in simplistic polarities : German-Jewish, rural-urban, honest-sophisticated, intellectual-intuitive. One can see how the rustic, unsophisticated, inspired, non-intellectual Bruckner could have been slotted into these stereotypes, and one can also see how Robert Haas's editions of Symphonies Nos. 2, 7 and 8, in which scholarship yields to a mystical-spiritual identification with the composer's imaginative world, were very much products of their time. 6 weeks after the « Anschluß » of March 1938 (which coincided with the completion of Haas's version of the 2nd Symphony) , Haas presented a « Report on the Collected Edition of Anton Bruckner's Works » , which he « dedicated to the German people and to our " Führer " Adolf Hitler » . He added :

« There were always battles to be fought in public since every performance was accompanied by the same abuse, lies, and defamation by the Jewish press that, in his own time, Bruckner, the Master, also had to endure. »

Readers familiar with the post-War 1948 preface to Haas' edition of the 8th Symphony will be brought-up short by the concluding passage of his original 1939 preface :

« As for the significance of the content of the 8th, let the 'German Michaël' mythos be briefly thought of here, in which Bruckner became wondrously absorbed after 1885. Its transfiguration is the Finale with the mystico-technical contrapuntal device of combining the 4 themes of the Symphony at the end. The meaning of this mythos, as an attitude of mind, seems to me to be realized in the concept of the Greater Germany. It is a sign from Providence that the restored score could ring-out precisely in this year, as a greeting from the " Ostmark " . »

As the official term for Austria in the 3rd « Reich » , Ostmark has become associated with that era, but the name was long-established, and appears in the text of Bruckner's 1882 « Volkslied » . Haas' attempt to represent the transfiguration of the « German Michaël » motif, at the end of the Symphony, as an assertion of transcendent pan-Germanic identity now seems both bizarre and slightly pathetic, but it is consistent with the nebulous exaltation of any aspect of Bruckner's work that could be made to bear nationalist overtones then prevalent. A similar tendency was adumbrated, in equally nebulous terms, by Amalie Klose, to whom Bruckner had played the Scherzo of the 8th on his elderly « Bösendorfer » piano, around 1889, asking her :

« Can you hear Michel, can you hear his little horn ? (“ Hören's den Michel, hören's sein Hörndl ? ”) In answer to my question, he said that this Michel represented the essential German character (“ der Urtypus des Deutschen ”) . I saw and heard the Master in the full joy of creation ; at the same time, I also saw with enriched (“ gereifterem ”) understanding, that, in this so familiar “ Michel ” , lay the quintessence of the spirit of the People, directly experienced and brought to realization by the essentially German (“ kerndeutsche ”) Upper-Austrian, Anton Bruckner. »

But neither this statement, or Bruckner's comment to Theodor Helm that « the Austrian-German (character) is intended » (« Der Michl ist der österreich. Deutsche gemeint ») , amounts to being « wondrously absorbed » in a « Teutonic mythos » . The « Upper-Austrian Anton Bruckner » had no problems with identifying himself as « essentially German » , in strictly ethnic terms, but his sense of identity was a product of his own, very different, era.

The rise of nationalism in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which culminated in the 1870 « Ausgleich » , had led to a new awareness of German ethnicity among German Austrians. This pride in Germanic culture was part of the male-voice Choral Society ethos ; the 1883 « Sängerbund » was praised, for example, because « its powerful chords sealed the vow of everlasting faithfulness to German song in every phrase of the destiny of the German people » , and it is, therefore, not surprising to find assertions of Germanic identity in several of the texts set by Bruckner. But there is no evidence that Bruckner felt that these assertions need, in any way, be incompatible with fidelity to the Austrian crown he served in the Vienna « Hofkapelle » . In the words of the chorus « Laßt Jubeltb'ne laut erklingen » , from around 1854 :

« God protect Austria's double eagle, and hear our pious prayer : protect our noble ruling couple, Franz-Josef and Elisabeth. »

The text is a complacent expression of safe, traditional values (with music to match) .

Bruckner was also known for his tolerance and friendship with Jews. According to Oberleithner,⁷⁸ Bruckner appears to have found the word « Jew » uncomfortably direct, preferring the more respectful term « the Israelite gentlemen » (« Die Herren Israeliten ») ; he explicitly denied an accusation of anti-Semitism made by a contemporary newspaper, and made a point of telling Königstein that :

« I have nothing against the Israelite gentlemen. »

His aversion to Jews differed from the indiscriminate hatred of the anti-Semites, in that on account of his true and deep piety he changed this feeling into profound compassion.

But the comment reveals more about August Göllerich, a man who was barred from giving a speech at Bruckner's doctoral award ceremony because of his anti-Semitic views, than about Bruckner. There is no evidence for any « aversion to Jews' on Bruckner's part. There are no anti-Semitic references in his letters, and no anti-Semitic remarks are attributed to him. One can hardly equate his sorrowful approach to a Jewish student :

« Tell me, do you really think that the “ Messiah ” has not come ? »

Or his unguarded 1st reaction to his friend and benefactor Carl Almeroth's suggestion that he sit for one of the apostles in Fritz von Uhde's painting of « The Last Supper » (« Das Abendmahl » , 1886) :

« But I'm not Jewish ! » , with the outpourings of Richard Wagner, recorded by Cosima in her diary on an almost daily basis (entries began in January 1869, just as Wagner was revising « Das Judentum in der Musik ») .

It would be a grave injustice to blame Bruckner for the Nazi appropriation of his work ; but the appropriation would nevertheless continue to the very end, when the Adagio of the 7th Symphony was played on German radio following the announcement of Adolf Hitler's death.

...

Doktor der Philosophie Heinrich Glasmeier, Kavallerieoffizier des ersten Weltkrieges, glühender Patriot und begeisterter Cimber, treibende Kraft beim Bau des Bootshauses und beim Kauf des Cimbernhauses 1919, mitreißender Festredner, Direktor des westfälischen Adelsarchivs. Seit 1932 wandte er sich der Partei Hitlers zu, wurde Gaukulturwart und Gaugeschäftsführer der Partei zu Münster und machte, nachdem er 1933 von Himmler persönlich in die SS aufgenommen worden war, eine steile Karriere bis hin zum « Reichsintendanten des großdeutschen Rundfunks » . Seit Frühjahr 1945 ist er als SS-Oberführer (Generalmajor) im Kampf gegen die Rote Armee, in dem er vermutlich den Freitod suchte, in Österreich verschollen.

...

Heinrich Glasmeier (geboren 5. März 1892 in Dorsten ; gestorben vermutlich 4. Mai 1945 bei Linz / Österreich) wirkte als umtriebiger Archivar im Münsterland und hat sich vor allem um die Privatarchive des westfälischen Adels verdient gemacht. Der an der Universität Münster Glasmeier entwickelte sich zu einem überzeugten Nationalsozialisten, war Geschäftsführer des NSDAP-Gaues Westfalen-Nord und Gau-Kulturwart. Im Jahr 1933 wurde er von Reichspropagandaminister Josef Gœbbels zum Rundfunkintendanten des Westdeutschen Rundfunks in Köln (dem heutigen WDR) bestellt und war später der erste (und in der deutschen Mediengeschichte einzige) « Reichsrundfunkintendant » . Anfang der 1940er Jahren baute er nahe Linz im ehemaligen Chorherren-Stift Sankt Florian für die Nazis Produktionsstätten des « großdeutschen und europäischen Rundfunks » auf. Von Hitler mit mit großzügigen Mitteln ausgestattet, pflegte er dort das Andenken des Komponisten Anton Bruckner und gründete das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester. Wenige Tage vor Kriegsende beging Heinrich Glasmeier wahrscheinlich Suizid mit einer Handgranate in seinem Auto.

...

Adolf Hitler wolle das Linzer Kloster Sankt Florian zum Altersruhesitz machen. Dieses Gerücht hörte « die Dolmetscherin

des Großmuftis von Jerusalem » , der in dem Kloster im Dezember 1944 war. Auch wenn die Fama um den Alterssitz in Österreich laut Historiker Norbert Reimann der Substanz mangle Norbert Reimann, Heinrich Glasmeier, in : « Westfälische Lebensbilder, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission des Provinzialinstituts für Westfälische Landes- und Volkskunde » , Münster, Nummer 17 (2005) ; Seiten 180-181.

Hegte Hitler ein Sonderinteresse am Stift und SS-Hausherren Heinrich Glasmeier. Der Reichsrundfunkintendant sollte dort nahe Linz, wo 1855 Anton Bruckner wirkte, die deutschen und europäischen Programme entfalten.

...

Heinrich Glasmeier (geboren 5. März 1892 in Dorsten ; gestorben vermutlich 4. Mai 1945 bei Linz / Österreich) war ein deutscher Rundfunkintendant und Funktionär des NS-Rundfunkwesens.

Heinrich Glasmeier war der Sohn der Kaufmanns Bernhard Glasmeier. Er studierte ab 1911 in Münster und München Germanistik, Geschichte, Philosophie und Archivwissenschaft, trat dabei in die katholischen Studentenvereine Cimbria Münster und Saxonia München im Kartellverband katholischer deutscher Studentenvereine KV ein.

Ab 1913 arbeitete Glasmeier als Archivar in Münster bei der Familie der Grafen von Merveldt. Im Ersten Weltkrieg war er Offizier und war nach Kriegsende an der Niederwerfung des Ruhraufstandes beteiligt. 1920 betreute er in Dülmen das Archiv der Herzöge von Croÿ und von 1922 bis 1933 das Gesamtarchiv der Grafen von Landsberg in Velen. Ab 1923 war er außerdem Archivdirektor der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive und ab 1927 nebenberuflich Leiter der Archivberatungsstelle der Provinz Westfalen. Seine 1926 in Münster eingereichte Promotionsschrift, « die eher einer katholisch-theologischen Streitschrift glich, die die Unmoral der Gesellschaft geißeln wollte, als einer ernsthaften wissenschaftlichen Untersuchung » , wurde von der Fakultät gutgeheißen.

Glasmeier war von Opportunismus und naiver Gläubigkeit gekennzeichnet und glaubte als überzeugter Nationalsozialist blind an Adolf Hitler. 1932 trat er in die NSDAP ein und wurde Geschäftsführer des NSDAP-Gaus Westfalen-Nord sowie « Gaukulturwart » . Glasmeier war Mitglied der SS. Bei der Gleichschaltung der Studentenverbände und somit auch des KV trat Glasmeier den Posten als Beisitzer des Führungsrats des KV an, denn er war das einzige Verbandsmitglied mit einem höheren Parteiamt in der NSDAP. Die Mitgliedschaft in der NSDAP sollte aufgrund eines Beschlusses des KV an sich nicht möglich sein.

Auf Veranlassung des Propagandaministers Josef Goebbels wurde Glasmeier 1933 als Nachfolger des entlassenen und verhafteten Ernst Hardt zum Intendanten des Westdeutschen Rundfunks in Köln ernannt. Die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft RRG lobte die Berufung Glasmeiers zum Intendanten, denn als Archivar habe er seine « nationalsozialistische Grundanschauung von Blut und Boden » gezeigt.

1937 wurde er Reichsintendant des gesamtdeutschen Rundfunks und Generaldirektor der Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft.

Im Sommer 1942 zog er nach Linz in das von den Nazis aufgelöste Stift Sankt Florian der Augustinerchorherren, um

dort eine Produktionsstätte des « großdeutschen und europäischen Rundfunks » aufzubauen. Diese Idee fand die Unterstützung von Hitler. Glasmeier konnte aufgrund großzügiger Geldzuwendungen das Kloster renovieren und im Andenken an Anton Bruckner, der Organist an Sankt Florian gewesen war und dort auch begraben ist, ein Brucknerorchester mit Chor gründen, das mehr als 100 Mitglieder zählte. Die Konzerte dieses Orchesters wurden von Wilhelm Furtwängler, Herbert von Karajan, Karl Böhm und Eugen Jochum dirigiert. Im November 1943 war Glasmeier als Bevollmächtigter des Reichspropagandaministers Goebbels im besetzten Frankreich.

Seit dem 30. Januar 1943 war Glasmeier Inhaber des Goldenen Parteiabzeichens der NSDAP.

Am 4. Mai 1945 flüchtete Glasmeier vor den anrückenden US-Truppen und ist seitdem verschollen. Abweichend von dieser Darstellung gibt Ernst Klee den 31. Januar 1945 als Todesdatum an.

...

Zu einer der schillernden Persönlichkeiten der nationalsozialistischen Zeit entwickelte sich der Dorstener Apothekersohn Doktor der Philosophie Heinrich Glasmeier, ein gelernter Archivar, der sich vor 1933 in der westfälischen Adelsgeschichte und im Heimatbund betätigte. Nach 1933 wurde er Reichsrundfunkintendant und Leiter des Bruckner-Stifts Sankt Florian bei Linz. Dorthin zog er sich vor Kriegsende zurück und suchte beim Herannahen sowjetischer Truppen den Freitod an der Front, als diese schon unmittelbar vor seinem Chorherren-Stift verlief. Der Dorstener Heinrich Glasmeier gilt seither als verschollen. Zwischen seiner Pennälerzeit auf dem Gymnasium Petrinum und seinem ruhmlosen Verschwinden lagen Jahre steten und steilen Aufstiegs im braunen Führerstaat.

Kein Zugang zur demokratischen Gesellschaftsordnung

Heinrich Glasmeier war NSDAP-Wahlkämpfer, Hitler-Fahrer, Stadtverordneter von Münster, Mitglied des Provinziallandtags, Reichsintendant des Deutschen Rundfunks, Generaldirektor des Reichsinstituts des Deutschen Rundfunks (später Reichsrundfunk-Gesellschaft = RRG), « Beauftragter des Führers » und schließlich SS-Hauptsturmführer. Er wurde am 5. März 1892 in Dorsten geboren. Bis etwa 1919 besaßen seine Eltern an der Lippestraße eine Drogerie (später Bonato). 1911 machte er das Abitur, studierte in München und Münster und promovierte 1926. Bereits 1913 wurde er gräflich-merveldt'scher Archivar. Als Kriegsfreiwilliger diente er von 1914 bis 1918 bei den 8. Husaren und beteiligte sich danach in Freiwilligenverbänden an der Niederwerfung der Spartakisten und Roten Armee im Ruhrgebiet. Wieder friedlich geworden, nahm er 1923 eine Stelle im gräflich-landsberg'schen Archiv an, wurde ein Jahr später Archivdirektor der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive und betätigte sich ab 1926 im Nebenamt als Leiter der Archivberatungsstelle der Provinz Westfalen.

Zur demokratischen Gesellschaftsordnung der Weimarer Republik fand Glasmeier keinen Zugang. Den fand er zu seinen Hobbys : Reiten und Rassenkunde. Als Archivar gab er mehrere heimatkundliche Schriften heraus und verfasste Aufsätze in der Fachliteratur.

NSDAP-Parteiredner und Fahrer des Führers

Als Mitglied des Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbundes trat er im Februar 1932 der NSDAP bei (Mitglied Nummer 891.960) und avancierte bald zum Gaukulturwart und Gaugeschäftsführer beim NSDAP-Gau Westfalen-Nord. Zudem half er als SS-Führer mit, die SS-Organisation in Westfalen aufzubauen. Während der für die NSDAP so entscheidenden Lippischen Landtagswahlen hatte Heinrich Glasmeier als Hitlers Fahrer das ihn für die Zukunft prägende « Führererlebnis » . Glasmeier machte sich auch als Partei-Redner für die NSDAP sehr verdient, so daß die Partei ihn nach der Machtübernahme mit der Intendanz des Westdeutschen Senders Köln (heute WDR) belohnte. Seine landesgeschichtlichen Arbeiten, so lobte die Reichsrundfunk-Gesellschaft ihn in einem Artikel am 30. März 1933, entsprächen den « Forderungen der nationalsozialistischen Grundanschauung von Blut und Boden » . Glasmeier liebte paramilitärisches Gepränge und schlug bei seinem ersten Auftreten in Köln einen entsprechenden Ton an. Bewährte Rundfunk-Mitarbeiter, die dem Zentrum nahe standen, setzte er sofort und rigoros an die Luft. Doktor Wilhelm Tigges erinnerte sich. Zu ihm sagte er in soldatischer Kürze :

« Sie sind politisch unzuverlässig. Räumen Sie sofort den Arbeitsplatz, und verlassen Sie das Haus binnen 20 Minuten. »

Angesichts Glasmeiers totaler NS-Ideologie ist nachstehende « Geheime Meldung » der Staatspolizei vom 4. Juli 1935 an die Reichsführung SS ein Kuriosum :

« Betreff : Intendant Doktor Glasmeier - Köln Vorgebirgstraße : siehe auch hies. B. Nummer 98761351K vom 4.7.35
Siehe Nach Mitteilung eines V-Mannes soll seit kurzem eine neue SS-Wache für den Reichssender Köln vom Reichsführer-SS nach Köln gesandt worden sein, die unmittelbar der Reichsführung unterstehen und ebenfalls ihre Wachberichte nach Berlin geben soll. Führer der Wache ist ein SS-Untersführer Nehls von der 6. SS-Standarte. Nach dessen Aussage, die er aufrecht erhalten will, hat Glasmeier zu ihm sinngemäß etwa folgendes gesagt :

« Sie kommen aus Berlin, sind mit den Verhältnissen hier nicht vertraut. Hier ist alles streng katholisch. Wie Sie ja wissen, sind der Führer und Goebbels katholisch und ich auch. Mischen Sie sich nicht in irgendwelche katholischen Dinge ! “ Es wird um Mitteilung gebeten, ob die Angaben über die SS-Wache richtig sind. Soviel bekannt, soll Nehls bereits Meldung sofort nach Berlin gemacht haben. ” »

Nur kurze Zeit mußte er seinen Chefsessel räumen

Wenn Heinrich Glasmeier für kurze Zeit in Ungnade fiel, dann deshalb, weil er im Verdacht stand, größere Geldbeträge des Reichssenders unterschlagen zu haben. Während die Untersuchungen liefen, mußte der Intendant seinen Sessel räumen. Bald fand man in einem früheren Abteilungsleiter, der dem Zentrum angehörte, den « Schuldigen » . Im Mai 1935 konnte Glasmeier auf seinem Intendantensessel wieder Platz nehmen. Die rundfunkinterne Zeitschrift schrieb am 15. Mai 1935 im üblichen Nazi-Jargon :

« Damit ist ein Zustand beseitigt worden, der von böswilligen Gerüchtemachern weidlich ausgenutzt wurde, nicht nur um den Intendanten persönlich, sondern auch den Nationalsozialismus in übler Weise in den Schmutz zu ziehen. »

Am 19. März 1937 überraschte Propagandaminister Goebbels die Öffentlichkeit damit, daß er den Kölner Intendanten Glasmeier zum « Reichsintendanten des Deutschen Rundfunks » und zum « Generaldirektor der Reichsrundfunk-Gesellschaft » machte ; zwei politische und administrative Positionen, die extra für Glasmeier neu geschaffen wurden. Der Dorstener hatte in der obersten Führungsspitze des Reiches wohlgesonnene Gönner. Zu ihnen zählte auch Adolf Hitler, der dem Rundfunkmann bis zum Zusammenbruch durch « Führerauftrag » Narrenfreiheit gewährte.

Zum Leiter des Chorherren-Stifts Sankt Florian in Linz ernannt

Als deutsche Truppen Österreich besetzten, kassierte das Reich Aktien und Aktien des österreichischen Rundfunks, strich am 3. Mai 1938 sämtliche Aktionäre aus dem Handelsregister und setzte Glasmeier als kommissarischen Verwalter ein. Doch seine eigentliche « Spielwiese » fand er in der zweiten Kriegshälfte. Am 21. Januar 1941 beschlagnahmte die Gestapo das bei Linz gelegene Chorherren-Stift Sankt Florian, warf Studenten und Priester samt Abt hinaus, um die altherwürdigen Schlossgebäude des Stifts für die Partei zu nutzen. Glasmeier bekam Wind davon und bemühte sich um die Nutzungsrechte. Er wollte dort eine nationalsozialistische « Kulturstätte von Weltrang » schaffen. Dem Reichsintendanten gelang es im Jahre 1942, Adolf Hitler für das Projekt zu erwärmen. Hitler berief Glasmeier zum « Beauftragten des Führers » für die Aufgabe, in den Stiftsgebäuden eine « Kulturstätte ersten Ranges » aufzubauen : Das Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian. Glasmeier suchte aus dem gesamten Reichsgebiet die besten Musiker zusammen, um das Bruckner-Orchester zu bilden, das zum Lobpreis des Führers spielen sollte.

Heinrich Glasmeier zog im Oktober 1942 (die Kriegswende zeichnete sich bereits ab) mit Pomp in die Räume der ehemaligen Prälatur ein. Neben der rein räumlichen Nähe zu den ehemaligen Äbten des Chorherren-Stiftes demonstrierte er in der folgenden Zeit auch eine recht persönliche Nähe zu ihnen : Oft zeigte sich Glasmeier in den Gewändern seiner « Amtsvorgänger » und ließ die Festtage der großen Äbte prunkvoll feiern. Im Berliner Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda spöttelte man über den neuen « Abt » von Sankt Florian. Am 3. April 1943 konnte Glasmeier nach einem feierlichen Konzert in der Stiftskirche am Sarge Bruckners statt der geplanten 150 nur 72 Musiker persönlich auf die Person des « großen Genius » (Hitler) vereidigen. Seine erste große nationale Bewährungsprobe bestand das Orchester über alle Sender des Reiches am 20. April 1944, dem 55. Geburtstag des Führers. Das war gleichzeitig der letzte Auftritt des so groß geplanten Weltrang-Orchesters. Im Oktober 1944 wurden die Musiker zur Wehrmacht beziehungsweise zur SS eingezogen. Anfang 1945 wurde auf « Führerbefehl » die Arbeit im Stift wieder aufgenommen. Nicht lange allerdings, denn die verbliebenen Musiker mußten bald als Volkssturm-Männer ihr Schloß und die Stadt Linz verteidigen.

Bruckner-Stift war Glasmeiers luxuriöse « Spielwiese »

Das Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian, so lässt sich zusammenfassend sagen, war weitgehend das Werk des Dorsteners Doktor Heinrich Glasmeier. Er nutzte die Situation, die durch die Enteignung des Stifts entstanden war, ebenso aus wie die Schwäche Hitlers für die Region Linz. Glasmeiers Ziel war es, in Sankt Florian eine Kultstätte zu schaffen, die in der zweiten Hälfte des Krieges bestenfalls als anachronistisch bezeichnet werden konnte. Während überall im Reich der Krieg seine Opfer forderte, wandte der Reichsintendant hier einen Prunk auf und ließ mit einem Aufwand arbeiten, wie er zu dieser Zeit nicht mehr angebracht war.

Von Hörergeldern wurden aus Frankreich und anderen Ländern die kostbarsten Möbel und Kunstgegenstände beschafft. Für Glasmeiers Speisesaal mußten die Möbel eigens angefertigt werden (handgeschnittzte Arbeit), Bezüge und Teppiche nach Spezialmustern gewebt. Leider gefielen sie ihm nicht, so daß sie wieder entfernt wurden. Nach einem Teller aus dem Wiener Museum wurde ein ganzes Tafelservice für 50 Personen in Auftrag gegeben, jedes Stück trug das Wappen von Sankt Florian und das Hakenkreuzzeichen des Großdeutschen Rundfunks, dazu auf der Rückseite das Hauswappen der Dorstener Familie Glasmeier. Ein Tafelbesteck aus handgeschmiedetem Silber, massiv vergoldet, durfte nicht fehlen. Über Adolf Hitler erreichte Glasmeier, daß das knappe Edelmetall kurz vor Kriegsende freigegeben wurde.

Er wollte seinen Führer nicht überleben

Eine besondere Stiftskleidung (etwa nach dem Bilde des Erasmus von Rotterdam) war entworfen worden, der « Hausherr » trug bereits ein Probestück davon. Neben einem Schwimmbad sollte ein Gestüt (Glasmeier war Husarenoffizier gewesen) eingerichtet und ein Sportplatz gebaut werden. Vorsichtige Andeutungen, ob das denn angesichts der Kriegsnotlage notwendig sei, begegnete Glasmeier mit dem Hinweis, daß die Akropolis auch in schwerster Notzeit des Griechenvolkes gebaut worden sei. Glasmeier verschwand spurlos, als alles in Trümmer fiel. Er lief in den nahen Geschützdonner. Seine Tochter :

« Er wollte seinen Führer nicht überleben. »

...

Wer sich mit der Geschichte des Archivwesens in Westfalen im 20. Jahrhundert befaßt, wird immer wieder auf einen Namen stoßen : Doktor Heinrich Glasmeier. Als Archivar des westfälischen Adels und als Gründer und Leiter der Archivberatungsstelle Westfalens hat er in vielen kommunalen, kirchlichen und vor allem privaten Archiven Westfalens Spuren hinterlassen und Weichen gestellt, die bis heute sichtbar sind und nachwirken, obgleich seine Tätigkeit in diesen Funktionen nur ein Jahrzehnt (1923 bis 1933) umfaßte. Nach der Machtergreifung der Nationalsozialisten wechselte er seine Bühne : Von Goebbels zunächst zum Intendanten des Westdeutschen Rundfunks nach Köln berufen, stieg er 1937 zum ersten und in der deutschen Mediengeschichte bislang einzigen « Reichsrundfunkintendanten » auf, um schließlich ab 1942 im persönlichen Auftrag Hitlers Herr über das von den Nationalsozialisten aufgehobene Augustinerchorherrenstift Sankt Florian bei Linz zu werden : Alles in allem eine vielschichtige, schillernde Persönlichkeit der Zeitgeschichte, die sich ihrer westfälischen Wurzeln stets bewußt war.

Heinrich Glasmeier wurde am 5. März 1892 in Dorsten als Sohn des Drogeriebesizers Bernhard Glasmeier und seiner Frau Christine Thering geboren. Über sein Elternhaus und seine Jugendzeit äußert er sich in späteren Quellen nie. Er läßt lediglich durchblicken, daß er in einer streng katholischen Umgebung aufgewachsen sei, und betont (beziehungsweise behauptet), daß seine Vorfahren allesamt münsterländische Bauern gewesen seien. Er besuchte das humanistische Gymnasium in Dorsten und machte 1911 das Abitur. Anschließend studierte er in Münster und (nach eigenen Angaben) auch in München. Als Studienfächer gibt er später meist Geschichte, Deutsch, Philosophie und, als Spezialfach, Archivwesen an, wobei bemerkt werden muß, daß « Archivwesen » als Studienfach in dieser Zeit weder in

Münster noch in München angeboten wurde. In einer 1936 abgegebenen Erklärung über seinen Eintritt in die Bewegung Adolf Hitlers macht er einige kurze Bemerkungen über diese Zeit : Sozialist war ich seit 1911. Gründete damals als junger Student die « Sozialstudentische Zentrale » an der Universität Münster, organisierte « Soziale Arbeiterunterrichtskurse » während der Ferien. Stand unter dem Einfluß von Doktor Karl Sonnenschein. Hier wird seine starke Verankerung im katholischen Milieu deutlich, war Carl Sonnenschein (1876-1929) doch einer der führenden Vertreter der katholischen Soziallehre der Zeit. Zudem war er in der katholischen Studentenverbindung KStV Cimbria Münster aktiv. Obgleich er später der Partei gegenüber oft das Gegenteil beteuerte, hat er seine kirchliche Bindung innerlich nie ganz aufgegeben.

1913 nahm er (noch während des Studiums) eine Tätigkeit als Graf von Merveldtscher Archivar in Münster auf, ob mehr aus wirtschaftlicher Notwendigkeit oder Begeisterung an archivalischen Quellen, ist nicht festzustellen. Fest steht jedoch, daß durch diese Arbeit sein Interesse an den Archiven des Adels geweckt wurde. Noch bevor er einen Studienabschluß erreichen konnte, brach der Weltkrieg aus.

Bereits zwei Tage vor der allgemeinen Mobilmachung meldete er sich als Kriegsfreiwilliger beim Husarenregiment Nummer 8 in Paderborn, wurde im April 1916 zum Leutnant der Reserve befördert und war Schwadronsführer und Kommandant des Divisionsstabsquartiers. Als Kriegsauszeichnungen wurden ihm das EK II und das EK I verliehen. Auch während des Krieges befaßte er sich (nach eigenem Bekunden) immer wieder gedanklich mit seinen archivischen Arbeiten. Im letzten Kriegsjahr sei in ihm die Idee einer organisatorischen Zusammenfassung der westfälischen Adelsarchive herangereift. Anschaulich schildert er in einem 1930 erschienenen Aufsatz, wie seine Vorstellungen am 18. September 1918, als er nachts auf der Reduit de Chenay vor Reims Wache stand, konkrete Gestalt angenommen hätten. Er habe bereits im Felde mit Angehörigen des Adels diese Frage erörtert und während eines Urlaubs mit Professor Aloys Meister in Münster, seinem Doktorvater, sowie mit dem Direktor des Staatsarchivs Doktor Schmitz-Kallenberg darüber gesprochen. Ja, er hatte sich bereits Gedanken gemacht, welches Gebäude in Münster für die Aufnahme der Adelsarchive in Betracht kommen könnte.

Doch der unrühmliche Kriegsausgang führte ihn, dessen deutschnationalkonservative Einstellung schon damals ausgeprägt war, zunächst in eine schwere Krise, die sicherlich auch mit seiner ungesicherten beruflichen Zukunft in Zusammenhang stand. Auch hier sind wir im wesentlichen auf die Aussagen seiner Selbstzeugnisse angewiesen: Bis Anfang 1919 blieb er bei der Reichswehr, dann schloß er sich mehreren Freiwilligenverbänden an : Zunächst der »Akademischen Wehr« in Münster, dann dem « Freicorps Lichtschlag » , der « Organisation Escherich » (Orgesch) , und dem « Deutsch-Völkischen Schutz- und Trutzbund » . Gleichzeitig arbeitete er, wie er später behauptete, schwarz für das Wehrkreiskommando der Reichswehr.

Zweifellos verdeutlicht dieses Spektrum seines Engagements in besonderer Weise seine politische Einstellung und ist ein Beleg für seine persönliche Distanz zur Weimarer Republik. Dies galt aber für weite Teile der damaligen Gesellschaft und mußte keineswegs auf eine bedingungslose Hinwendung zum Nationalsozialismus hinauslaufen, wie es bei ihm schließlich der Fall war. Außerdem ist bei der Bewertung dieser Fakten zu berücksichtigen, daß die Informationen hierüber zum großen Teil seinen eigenen Angaben entstammen, und zwar aus der Zeit nach 1933. Sie sollten dazu dienen, seinen geradlinigen Weg zum Nationalsozialismus zu belegen und ihn als jemanden zu legitimieren, der die «

Bewegung » zumindest innerlich schon lange vor der Machtergreifung mitgetragen habe.

Bereits bei seiner ersten Tätigkeit im Merveldtschen Archiv konnte Glasmeier Kontakte zum westfälischen Adel knüpfen. Auch sein Reiterregiment Heinrich Glasmeier war stark vom Adel dominiert, so daß er während der Kriegszeit diese Kontakte weiter ausbauen konnte. Das Thema seiner Dissertation « Das Geschlecht von Merveldt zu Merfeld : Ein Beitrag zur Familien- und Standesgeschichte der Münsterschen Ritterschaft » ging weitgehend auf seine Tätigkeit im Merveldtschen Archiv zurück. Ergänzend mußte er dafür auf das Archiv der Herzöge von Croy in Dülmen zurückgreifen, an die das Haus Merfeld 1836 durch Kauf übergegangen war. Er reichte seine Dissertation Ende Mai 1920 bei der Philosophischen Fakultät in Münster ein. Aloys Meister beurteilte die Arbeit als sehr sorgfältig und mit gutem Urteil durchgeführt. Nur knapp zwei Wochen nach Abgabe der Dissertation fand das Rigorosum in den Fächern Philosophie, Deutsch und Geschichte statt. Die Gesamtnote lautete auf »cum laude«. Der Druck der Arbeit (84 Seiten) erfolgte allerdings erst 1931 in dem von ihm selbst herausgegebenen « Westfälischen Adelsblatt » .

Die Forschungen im Dülmener Archiv hatten für Glasmeier aber noch eine andere, höchst bedeutsame Folge : Nach Fertigstellung seiner Dissertation im Mai 1920 trat er beim Herzog von Croy eine Stelle als Herzoglich Croyscher Hausarchivar in Dülmen an. Somit war seine akademische Ausbildung erfolgreich abgeschlossen und seine berufliche Situation zumindest bis auf weiteres gesichert : Eine « normale » bürgerliche Existenz, angesiedelt im katholisch-konservativen Milieu des Westmünsterlandes, schien vorgezeichnet. Daher war es folgerichtig, auch einen eigenen Hausstand zu begründen : Er heiratete am 23. November Maria Hövener, die Tochter eines preußischen Oberregierungsrates.

Wie sehr er sich seiner münsterländischen Heimat verbunden fühlte, brachte er in der Hochzeitsanzeige zum Ausdruck: Ein handgefertigter Linolschnitt zeigt eine Hochzeitskutsche vor der Silhouette der Stadt Münster, zusammen mit dem plattdeutschen Text Wi trüöden de Fahrt düört Liäben an - un mellt us bi Ju nu äs Frau un Mann. Aus der Ehe gingen drei Töchter hervor (geboren 1922, 1923 und 1925) sowie 1938 noch ein Sohn, der allerdings im Alter von nur fünf Jahren verstarb.

Seine Tätigkeit in Dülmen hat nach außen wenig Spuren hinterlassen. Er bearbeitete dort den Bestand « Haus Merfeld » , den er bereits für seine Dissertation ausgewertet hatte, und stellte Urkunden zusammen, die dem Herzoglichen Haus in einem Prozeß gegen den belgischen Staat im Zusammenhang mit der erfolgten Enteignung der Besitzungen von Nutzen sein konnten. Weshalb das Arbeitsverhältnis bereits 1922 beendet wurde, ist unklar. Möglicherweise war aber von vornherein nur eine zeitlich befristete Tätigkeit vereinbart worden.

Im Mai des Jahres 1922 trat Glasmeier eine neue Stelle bei Max Graf von Landsberg-Velen als Hausarchivar auf Schloß Velen an. Graf Landsberg, der geschichtlich sehr interessiert war, hatte die Absicht, in seinem Hause ein « Landsbergsches Gesamtarchiv » einzurichten, in dem die Archive des gesamten Familienverbandes, also der gräflichen Linie Landsberg-Velen und Genien sowie der freiherrlichen Linien Drensteinfurt, Ahausen und Dankern Heinrich Glasmeier zusammengefaßt werden sollten. Daher führte Glasmeier dort den Titel « Gräflich Landsbergscher Gesamtarchivar » .

Zunächst waren auf Schloß Velen, wo Glasmeier auch seine Wohnung nahm, die räumlichen Verhältnisse für die

sachgerechte Lagerung dieser umfangreichen Archivbestände noch unzureichend. Glasmeier gelang es jedoch, Graf Landsberg dazu zu bringen, Pläne für einen Archivneubau zu entwickeln. Es war dies der erste und bis heute einzige Archivzweckbau, der für ein westfälisches Adelsarchiv (und vermutlich für Deutschland insgesamt) in Angriff genommen wurde. Am 17. Juni 1923 nahm Glasmeier selbst den ersten Spatenstich vor, vier Wochen später, am 15. Juli 1923, fand die feierliche Grundsteinlegung statt, bei der der Rektor der Universität, der Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät, der Vorsitzende der Historischen Kommission für Westfalen, der Direktor des Staatsarchivs Münster sowie acht weitere Professoren der Universität Münster zugegen waren.

Der Bau war großzügig geplant und sollte neben Magazinräumen mit einer Kapazität von 1.000 laufenden Metern Regalfläche über alle für ein großes Archiv notwendigen Einrichtungen verfügen : ein Fest- und Vortragsraum, der auch das eigentliche Familienarchiv aufnehmen sollte, ein Arbeitszimmer für den Archivar, ein Benutzerraum mit Arbeitsplatz für die Archivsekretärin, eine Buchbinderei, eine Buchdruckerei sowie eine Fotowerkstatt. Auch eine Dienstwohnung für den Archivar sowie mehrere Gästezimmer für auswärtige Archivbenutzer waren vorgesehen. Der Bau dieses aufwendigen Gebäudes gestaltete sich jedoch aus finanziellen Gründen schwierig. Erst im Winter 1928-1929 konnte es provisorisch bezogen werden.

Sicherlich hing dieses großzügige Projekt mit seinen weitergehenden Plänen zur organisatorischen Zusammenfassung aller westfälischen Adelsarchive zusammen, die er seit dem Krieg verfolgte. Im August 1919 hatte er erste Überlegungen hierzu in einer Denkschrift niedergelegt, die er einigen ihm persönlich bekannten Adeligen sowie dem Vorsitzenden der Historischen Kommission, seinem Doktorvater Aloys Meister, vorlegte. Diese wurden im Vorstand des Vereins katholischer Edelleute noch im gleichen Monat und noch einmal im darauf folgenden Jahr beraten, stießen auf großes Interesse, erschienen aber so nicht realisierbar.

Dies hatte mehrere Gründe : Zum einen mußte der Plan, der vorsah, alle Adelsarchive an einem zentralen Ort in Münster zusammenzuführen, schon aus finanziellen Gründen scheitern : Hierfür hätte es eines Archivgebäudes sowie eines Personalbestandes bedurft, das dem des Staatsarchivs vergleichbar gewesen wäre, enthielten die Adelsarchive zusammen bereits mehr Urkunden als das Staatsarchiv in seinen Beständen vorweisen konnte. Zum anderen zeigten sich die Archiveigentümer wenig geneigt, die Archive ihren Häusern zu entfremden, um sie an einem neutralen Ort aufzubewahren. Schließlich barg ein solches Konzept einen inneren Widerspruch: Sollten die Archive, wie es Glasmeier vorschwebte, wieder in das Bewußtsein der Familien rücken und identitätsstiftend wirken, durften sie gerade nicht aus den Häusern, deren Geschichte sie dokumentierten, entfernt werden.

Daher entwickelte Glasmeier eine neue Konzeption. Diese sah vor, lediglich einen organisatorischen Zusammenschluß der Archiveigentümer auf Vereinsbasis zu schaffen und auf diese Weise eine fachgerechte Betreuung der Archive an ihrem jeweiligen Ort zu ermöglichen. Zentrale dieser Organisation sollte Schloß Velen beziehungsweise das neue Archivgebäude sein, dessen großzügige Anlage unter diesem Gesichtspunkt durchaus Sinn machte.

Ein solches Vorhaben konnte eher auf eine breite Zustimmung innerhalb des Adels rechnen, da es mehreren Anliegen gleichzeitig gerecht wurde : Das weit verbreitete Mißtrauen gegen die junge Republik, die alle Privilegien des Adels beseitigt hatte und sich vor Sozialisierungsmaßnahmen nicht zu scheuen schien, ließ befürchten, der Staat könne die

privaten Archive unter dem Vorwand, daß deren Sicherheit und Zugänglichkeit nicht gewährleistet sei, beschlagnahmen. Tatsächlich war bereits seit 1921 die Generaldirektion der preußischen Staatsarchive in Berlin dabei, einen Gesetzentwurf auszuarbeiten, der dem Staat ein unmittelbares Zugriffsrecht auf alle privaten Archive einräumen sollte. Dem wollte man durch Eigeninitiative die Grundlage entziehen. Durch die Aufhebung des Fideikommißrechtes mußte zudem in vielen Fällen die Erbfolge neu geregelt werden. Hierfür war unter Umständen der Rückgriff auf ältere Unterlagen erforderlich, was wiederum nur bei einem Mindestmaß an Ordnung und Erschließung möglich war. Schließlich mußte sich der Adel als Stand völlig neu formieren und seine Aufgaben in der geänderten Gesellschaftsordnung neu definieren. Da die Sonderrolle des Adels ausschließlich historisch zu begründen war, erhielten auch unter diesem Aspekt die Archive eine neue Bedeutung.

Der von den Archiveigentümern zu gründende »Archivverein« sollte neben einem Direktor weitere Archivare einstellen. Diese « Wanderarchivare » sollten jeweils einige Monate lang ein Archiv ordnen und in dieser Zeit beim dortigen Eigentümer wohnen. Sobald ein gewisser Abschluß der Arbeiten erreicht war, sollten sie an ein anderes Archiv versetzt werden. Diese Lösung bot gegenüber einer Zentralisierung mancherlei Vorteile : Unter finanziellem Aspekt entfielen vor allem die Kosten für die Bereitstellung und den Unterhalt eines großen Archibgebäudes. Wichtiger noch waren aber die ideellen Faktoren : Die Archive würden an ihren historischen Standorten verbleiben, sie stünden auch in Zukunft unter der Verantwortung ihrer Eigentümer und könnten sich dadurch zu einem Identifikationsfaktor der Familien entwickeln. Auch ihr privater Charakter würde in keiner Weise angetastet.

Es gelang Glasmeier, Graf Max von Landsberg-Velen für diesen Plan zu gewinnen. Dieser übersandte eine neue von Glasmeier verfaßte Denkschrift sowie einen Satzungsentwurf an 106 Standesgenossen und lud gleichzeitig zu einer Gründungsversammlung ein. Diese Denkschrift mit dem Titel « Das Westfälische Adelsarchiv » enthält Glasmeiers grundsätzliche Überlegungen : Adel verpflichtet ! Diese Schatzkammern (das heißt die Adelsarchive) der wissenschaftlichen Forschung zu öffnen, heißt, die sonst toten Schätze zu warmem und nutzbringendem Leben zu erwecken und eine Tat zu tun, die eine vaterländische schlechthin zu nennen ist. Die Plunderkammern mit alten, vermoderten Pergament- und Papiermassen sollten zu liebevoll und sorgsam aufbewahrten Archiven werden, als Stolz des Hauses.

Am 14. Dezember 1923 wurde der Archivverein von 25 adeligen Archiveigentümern unter dem Namen « Vereinigte Westfälische Adelsarchive eingetragener Verein » gegründet. Zum Vorsitzenden wurde Max Graf von Landsberg-Velen, zum Stellvertreter Rudolf Freiherr von Twickel-Havixbeck gewählt. Zum hauptamtlichen Archividirektor und Geschäftsführer des Vereins wurde, wie nicht anders zu erwarten, Doktor Glasmeier bestellt. Graf Landsberg stellte auf Schloß Velen Räume für die Zentrale und Geschäftsstelle des Vereins zur Verfügung.

Bereits im Januar 1924 nahm der Verein seine praktische Arbeit auf. Von Velen aus organisierte Glasmeier seine Aktivitäten und realisierte zahlreiche Ideen, wohlwollend gefördert und unterstützt durch seinen Mäzen und Gönner Graf Landsberg. Die ersten Hilfsarchivare und Bibliothekssekretärinnen (Adelsbibliotheken wandte der Verein gleichfalls vom Beginn an sein Interesse zu) wurden eingestellt. Doch gerade hier zeigten sich schon bald Probleme : Es war schwer, auf Dauer fachlich geeignetes Personal zu bekommen, war doch die kümmerliche Bezahlung, die der Verein seinen « Beamten » bieten konnte, nicht gerade ein Anreiz für qualifizierte Mitarbeiter. Die Folge war eine überaus große

Fluktuation. Selten blieben die Mitarbeiter länger als einige Monate im Dienste des Vereins.

Daß die Arbeit dennoch zunächst einen beachtenswerten Aufschwung nahm, lag zweifellos an dem hohen persönlichen Engagement Glasmeiers, seinem Einfallsreichtum, Improvisationstalent und sicherlich auch an seiner persönlich außerordentlich gewinnenden und charmanten Art, die ältere Vereinsmitglieder, die Glasmeier persönlich gekannt hatten, noch in der Gegenwart dem Verfasser gegenüber immer wieder hervorgehoben haben. Bezeichnend hierfür ist seine Vorgehensweise bei der Realisierung eines seiner Lieblingsprojekte, der Zeitschrift « Westfälisches Adelsblatt ». Da die Mittel des Vereins für eine reguläre Drucklegung nicht ausreichten, ging er einen ganz unkonventionellen Weg: Als er in der Zeitung auf ein Inserat stieß, in der das Inventar einer aufgelösten Akzidenzdruckerei zum Verkauf angeboten wurde, überlegte er nicht lange, kaufte die Maschinen (ohne das Geld dafür zur Verfügung zu haben) und ließ sie nach Velen bringen. Einen Landstreicher, der ihm zufällig über den Weg lief und der angab, Buchdrucker und Buchbinder gelernt zu haben, stellte er kurzerhand als « Archivdrucker » ein. Bereits am nächsten Tag begann er mit dem Druck der ersten Nummer des « Adelsblattes », wobei er selbst und seine Sekretärin als « Druckereihilfen » aktiv waren. Erst später berichtete er Graf Landsberg bei einer günstigen Gelegenheit nach einer Jagd von dieser eigenmächtigen Aktion, und es gelang ihm tatsächlich, von diesem nachträglich die Zustimmung hierfür und das entsprechende Geld zu bekommen.

In den einzelnen Schlössern fand Glasmeier die Archive oft in beklagenswertem Zustand vor. Unter der Rubrik « Archivfahrten kreuz und quer durch Westfalen » berichtete er regelmäßig im « Westfälischen Adelsblatt » über seine Erfahrungen und seine Ordnungsbemühungen, veröffentlichte aber gleichzeitig auch erste Archivübersichten als Ergebnis dieser Maßnahmen. Über etwa 40 Archive liegen derartige anschaulich und lebhaft geschriebene Berichte bis zum Ende der 1920er Jahre vor. Natürlich konnten angesichts der Tatsache, daß Glasmeier stets nur wenige Hilfskräfte, die dazu in der Regel keine archivfachliche Ausbildung oder berufliche Erfahrung aufzuweisen hatten, an tatsächlichen Ordnungs- und Erschließungsmaßnahmen nur bescheidene Ergebnisse erwartet werden. Viel wichtiger aber war ein anderer Erfolg : Es gelang ihm in relativ kurzer Zeit, das Interesse des Adels an seinen Archiven neu zu wecken und das Bewußtsein zu vermitteln, daß die Familientradition, auf die man gerade in dieser Zeit nicht ohne Stolz zurückdachte, sich am nachhaltigsten in den Archiven manifestierte.

Bis Ende 1929 waren dem Verein etwa Zweidrittel aller adeligen Archivbesitzer beigetreten, zweifellos eine beachtliche Leistung. Dabei war die von den Mitgliedern erwartete Beitragsleistung, die 1923 auf 200 Goldmark pro Jahr festgesetzt worden war, nicht unbeträchtlich. Außerdem mußte jeder Archiveigentümer für die Dauer der Tätigkeit der Vereinsarchivare in seinem Haus eine zusätzliche Kostenbeteiligung aufbringen und für kostenfreien Aufenthalt Sorge tragen. Weitere Einzelheiten der Vereinsarbeit können an dieser Stelle leider nicht dargestellt werden.

Glasmeiers Aufmerksamkeit beschränkte sich schon bald nicht mehr auf die Adelsarchive. Ihm blieb nämlich nicht verborgen, daß die Situation vieler Stadt- und Pfarrarchive noch trostloser war als die der Adelsarchive. Hier war Aufklärung bei Bürgermeistern, Gemeinderäten und Pfarrern notwendig, die durch den Archivverein nicht zu bewältigen war. Als Begründer und erster Vorsitzender des Hauptausschusses Geschichte im Westfälischen Heimatbund hatte er schon auf dem Westfalentag in Soest 1923 vorgeschlagen, « Archivpflegekurse » für heimatgeschichtlich interessierte Teilnehmer durchzuführen. Die Gründung des Adelsarchivvereins gab auch diesen Bestrebungen neuen Auftrieb. Ein erster, sich über

zwei Tage erstreckender Kurs dieser Art wurde auf Einladung des Heimatbundes bereits 1924 im Staatsarchiv Münster unter seiner Leitung durchgeführt und stieß auf so lebhaftes Interesse in der ganzen Provinz, daß sich bald ähnliche Veranstaltungen in ganz Westfalen anschlossen. Ziel war es, den Teilnehmern, darunter auch Lehrer, Pfarrer und Bürgermeister, Grundkenntnisse über das Archivwesen zu vermitteln, damit diese künftig als ehrenamtliche « Archivpfleger » ein wachsames Auge auf die Archive in ihrem Bereich richten konnten.

Diese Aktivitäten erregten bald Aufmerksamkeit beim Provinzialverband Westfalen, namentlich bei dem für Kultur zuständigen Landesrat Doktor Karl Zuhorn. Dieser setzte durch, daß der Provinzialausschuß am 20. Mai 1927 3.000 Reichsmark bewilligte, um eine ehrenamtliche « Archivberatungsstelle » für Westfalen, die erste ihrer Art in Deutschland, einzurichten. Personell bestand diese nur aus Glasmeier, der die Aufgabe nebenamtlich übernahm. Im Hauptamt blieb er Direktor der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive.

Solange ihm für die Arbeit der Archivberatungsstelle keinerlei Fachkräfte zur Verfügung standen, sah Glasmeier seine Aufgabe vor allem darin, das Interesse der Öffentlichkeit auf die im Verborgenen schlummernden Archive zu lenken und damit die Voraussetzungen für erste grundlegende Sicherungsmaßnahmen zu schaffen. Diesem Ziel diente in erster Linie eine konsequente Bereisung aller in Betracht kommenden Archive sowie die Ausweitung seiner in der Vergangenheit schon auf so große Resonanz gestoßenen Archivpflegerkurse.

Sie standen daher im Mittelpunkt der Arbeit, und auf diesem Felde hat er zweifellos Beachtliches geleistet. Von 1927 bis 1930 veranstaltete er etwa 22 solcher Kurse in allen Teilen der Provinz Westfalen, an denen insgesamt etwa 700 Personen teilnahmen. Dabei ruhte die Last der Durchführung ganz auf ihm allein. Ein solcher Kurstag begann gewöhnlich damit, daß er in aller Frühe in Velen seinen Wagen mit umfangreichem Anschauungs- und Lehrmaterial belud : Bücher, Prachturkunden, vermoderte Archivalien, Schreiben berühmter Männer, aber auch alle Arten von Aufbewahrungskörpern für Urkunden und Akten, Schalen für Vorführungen von Urkundenwaschen und Schriftreagenzien, Staubtuch, Fönapparat, Talkum, Plastilin, Gips für Siegelabgüsse. Am Zielort angekommen, baute er zunächst eine Ausstellung dieser Anschauungsmaterialien auf, bevor er dann mit seinen Vorträgen begann, die sich (von einer Mittagspause unterbrochen) über rund sechs Stunden erstreckten und erst gegen Abend endeten.

Daß er für diese Vorträge ein vorzügliches Talent besaß und es verstand, seine Zuhörer für die Sache der Archive wirklich zu begeistern, wird aus Rückäußerungen der Teilnehmer bestätigt. So berichtet im Dezember 1928 der Düsseldorfer Staatsarchivdirektor Doktor Redlich an den Landeshauptmann von Westfalen : Herr Doktor Glasmeier versteht es ausgezeichnet, die scheinbar trockene Materie lebensvoll zu behandeln und seine Zuhörer durch seine frische und humorvolle Art sechs Stunden lang zu fesseln. Dabei weiß er die fachlichen Belange mit großem Geschick zu behandeln und wirklich belehrend auf seine Zuhörer zu wirken. Man darf hoffen, daß auf diese Weise allmählich die Mängel beseitigt werden, die bei der Verwaltung der Pfarr- und Gemeindearchive sich zeigten und die Euer Hochwohlgeboren veranlaßt haben, eine Archivberatungsstelle ins Leben zu rufen.

Die große Resonanz seiner Tätigkeit ist sicherlich auch darauf zurückzuführen, daß er eine für die damalige Zeit außerordentlich moderne Archivarbeit propagierte. Diese wurde schon in Äußerlichkeiten deutlich : Bereits seit 1924 benutzte er für seine « Archivfahrten » grundsätzlich einen Pkw, was ihm nicht nur das Erreichen der meist in

ländlichen Regionen gelegenen Ziele erleichterte, sondern für ihn zweifellos auch eine Prestigefrage war. Hatte ihm zunächst Graf Landsberg einen seiner eigenen Wagen zur Verfügung gestellt, gelang es ihm bald darauf, von einem Münsteraner Automobilhändler ein Jahr lang kostenlos einen Wagen der Marke « AGA » leihweise zu erhalten, da sich dieser davon gute Reklame bei den vermögenden Adelshäusern versprach. Bald darauf schaffte er sich einen eigenen Wagen an, für einen Archivar in der damaligen Zeit sicher sehr ungewöhnlich. Nach Ford und Hanomag war es schließlich sogar ein Mercedes-Benz, den er sich mit Hilfe eines vom Provinzialverband gewährten Kredits kaufen konnte.

Zudem war er ein entschiedener Verfechter moderner Archivtechniken : Für die Aufbewahrung der Urkunden, die bis dahin auch in großen Staatsarchiven noch vielfach klein zusammengefaltet in Schubkästen und Schachteln gelagert wurden, führte er das « System Landsberg » ein : große Mappen aus stabilem Karton, in denen die Urkunden, soweit wie möglich ausgefaltet, senkrecht wie Karteikarten in großen Schubladen aufgestellt wurden. Dieses System wird noch heute in vielen westfälischen Adelsarchiven angewandt.

Um Briefen und Akten, die damals auch in den meisten öffentlichen Archiven lediglich mit Bindfaden zu Bündeln geschnürt waren, nach einer Neuordnung nicht wieder in Unordnung geraten zu lassen, ließ er diese, wann immer möglich, zu Faszikeln binden und bibliotheksmäßig aufstellen, ein Verfahren, das unter Archivaren vielfach kritisiert wurde, aber in der konkreten Situation der kleineren Archive ohne ständige Fachaufsicht sicherlich manche Vorteile bot. Für den Erhalt der Ordnung war es ebenfalls wichtig, einfache Signierungssysteme anzuwenden, die lediglich aus einem Buchstaben und einer Zahl bestanden, um eine korrekte Reponierung der Archivalien auch durch Laienkräfte sicherzustellen. In staatlichen Archiven waren demgegenüber damals meist noch komplexe, an der Systematik des Bestandes orientierte vielgliedrige Signatursysteme üblich.

Auch den Archivräumen wandte er große Aufmerksamkeit zu, ließ sie entrümpeln und so ausgestalten, daß bereits der Raum dem ideellen Wert des Archivs gerecht werden konnte. Wenn eine neue Ausstattung nötig und möglich war, ließ er moderne Pohlschröder-Aktenregale aus Stahl anschaffen.

Doch nicht nur die äußeren Formen seiner Archivarbeit waren modern, auch die Zielrichtung: Neben der Bereitstellung der Archivalien für die wissenschaftliche Forschung hatte er stets auch die interessierten oder zu interessierenden Laien als Zielgruppe vor Augen: Eigentümer der Adelsarchive ebenso wie Pfarrer, Bürgermeister und Lehrer und Interessenten der Heimat- und Familiengeschichte. Er riet seinen Hilfskräften, diese bei ihren Archivarbeiten immer wieder mit besonders interessanten Funden zu überraschen, um deren Interesse zu wecken.

Glasmeyer setzte bei seiner Arbeit auch alle damals gegebenen technischen Möglichkeiten der Fotokopie und Reproduktion ein, um wertvolle Archivstücke zu sichern und Anschauungsmaterial für historische Bildungsarbeit zur Verfügung zu haben. Hierzu beschaffte er auf eigene Kosten einen « Kontophot-Apparat » . Am deutlichsten wird dieses Bemühen in der von ihm begründeten und herausgegebenen Reihe « Bildwiedergaben ausgewählter Urkunden und Akten zur Geschichte Westfalens » , die Faksimiles von Archivalien mit Transskriptionen und Erläuterungen zu wichtigen Themen der westfälischen Geschichte (und andere Hanse und Freiherr von Stein) enthielten und wohlfeil verkauft wurden. Dies waren damals völlig neue Wege, um die Arbeit der Archive in das Bewußtsein weiter Kreise der

Bevölkerung zu bringen.

Dennoch war er aus der Sicht der professionellen Archivare ein Außenseiter, da er keine archivarische Fachausbildung genossen und zu keinem Zeitpunkt eine Tätigkeit in einem Staatsarchiv ausgeübt hatte. Seine Erfolge bei der Bewußtseinsbildung für den Wert der Archive und der Sicherung der kleineren Archive waren zwar unbestreitbar und wurden anerkannt, ein latentes Mißtrauen der Fachwelt ihm und seiner Arbeit gegenüber ist aber dennoch stets spürbar. Dies wird schon in einer Stellungnahme aus dem Jahre 1927 deutlich, in der sich das Staatsarchiv in Münster gegenüber dem Provinzialverband nachdrücklich gegen den Plan der Einrichtung einer Archivberatungsstelle aussprach.

Umso mehr bemühte sich Glasmeier von sich aus um archivfachliche Anerkennung. Bereits auf dem 16. Deutschen Archivtag 1924 in Münster stellte er die Arbeit der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive vor und stieß, wie er selbst meinte, auf außerordentlich positive Resonanz. Auch an den folgenden Archivtagen nahm er stets teil. In einem Beitrag in der renommierten, von der Direktion der Bayerischen Staatsarchive herausgegebenen « Archivalischen Zeitschrift » stellte er die Arbeit des Adelsarchivvereins und der Archivberatungsstelle ausführlich dar.

Da er sich der Unzulänglichkeit seiner damaligen Möglichkeiten der Archivpflege bewußt war, war es sein Ziel, die ehrenamtliche Archivberatungsstelle zu einer professionellen Fachdienststelle für das Archivwesen auszubauen, der auch die Heranbildung von Fachkräften übertragen werden sollte. Dies belegt eine 1930 von ihm im Auftrag des Provinzialverbandes herausgegebene Denkschrift, in der er das Modell eines « Landesarchivamtes » entwarf. Neben einem qualifizierten Mitarbeiterstab sollte das Amt auch über eine Restaurierung- und Fotowerkstatt verfügen und mit Hilfe einer eigenen Archivschule die Ausbildung von Kommunal-, Kirchen- und Adelsarchivaren durchführen.

Zweifellos spielten bei diesen Überlegungen auch persönliche Motive eine Rolle. Es wurde gegen Ende der 1920er Jahre immer deutlicher, wie problematisch die finanzielle Basis des privatrechtlich organisierten Adelsarchivvereins gerade in der Zeit der Weltwirtschaftskrise war. Mit Ausnahme einer Sekretärin war das gesamte Personal bereits abgebaut worden. Auch sein großer Mäzen Graf Landsberg-Velen geriet in wirtschaftliche Schwierigkeiten, die 1931 zu einem finanziellen Zusammenbruch seines Hauses führten. Doch damit nicht genug: In den frühen Morgenstunden des 15. April 1931 brach ein Feuer im Nordflügel des Schlosses Velen aus und zerstörte das gesamte dreiflügelige Hauptgebäude. Es gelang Glasmeier, der selbst mit seiner Familie im Südflügel wohnte und das Feuer als erster bemerkte, die Mitbewohner zu wecken und seine persönlichen Dinge sowie Gemälde und Bibliothek zu retten. Das Landsbergische Gesamtarchiv und die Geschäftsunterlagen des Adelsarchivvereins und der Archivberatungsstelle waren zum Glück schon 1928 in das nahezu fertige neue Archivgebäude überführt worden und überstanden das Feuer somit unversehrt. Gleichwohl war es klar, daß eine Weiterarbeit von Velen aus auf längere Sicht nicht möglich sein würde.

Da die Landsbergische Verwaltung nach der Zerstörung des Schlosses in das erhalten gebliebene Archivgebäude übersiedeln sollte, mußte dieses vom Archivgut geräumt werden. Glasmeier erreichte, daß das Archiv im August 1932 in das Staatsarchiv nach Münster überführt werden konnte, eine Entscheidung, die ihm sicherlich sehr schwergefallen sein dürfte. Auch die Archivberatungsstelle selbst und die Geschäftsstelle des Adelsarchivvereins konnten im gleichen Monat in das Staatsarchiv übersiedeln. Insgesamt wurden eineinhalb Eisenbahnwaggons und drei große Möbelwagen von Velen nach Münster transportiert. Dort erhielt er einen Arbeitsplatz in einer Dachmansarde

zugewiesen, die er mit seiner Sekretärin teilen mußte. Für ihn selbst stand nicht einmal ein eigener Schreibtisch zur Verfügung. Die Archivalien wurden auf dem nicht heizbaren und daher im Winter nicht benutzbaren Dachboden verstaut.

Es ist verständlich, daß er diese Situation nicht als befriedigend ansehen konnte. Nur für einen kurzen Augenblick schien sich noch einmal eine Chance auf Fortsetzung einer erfolgreichen Karriere im Archivbereich aufzutun : Im September 1932 stand ein Wechsel in der Leitung des Staatsarchivs Münster an, da Schmitz-Kallenberg in den Ruhestand ging. Offenbar hatte Glasmeier den Vorstand des Adelsarchivvereins darauf aufmerksam gemacht und sein Interesse an dieser Position bekundet. Der Zeitpunkt schien nicht ungünstig, stand mit Franz von Papen doch ein Standesgenosse aus dem westfälischen Adel als Reichskanzler an der Spitze der politischen Verantwortung, dem Glasmeier auch persönlich bekannt war. Zudem hatte Papen wenige Wochen zuvor die preußische Regierung ihres Amtes enthoben und durch einen Reichskommissar ersetzt. Damit hatte er zumindest indirekt Einfluß auf die Besetzung preußischer Beamtenstellen. Fürst Bentheim-Tecklenburg aus Rheda richtete ein Schreiben an Papen, in dem er diesen bat, sich für die Ernennung Glasmeiers zum neuen Direktor des Staatsarchivs zu verwenden. Papen leitete das Gesuch mit einer nachdrücklichen Befürwortung an den amtierenden Reichskommissar für Preußen Doktor Bracht weiter.

Diese Intervention blieb jedoch ohne Erfolg : Im Antwortschreiben des Reichskommissars an Papen heißt es : Die Verdienste des Herrn Doktor Glasmeier um die Organisation des Westfälischen Adelsarchivs und um die Einrichtung der Archivberatungsstelle bei der Provinzialverwaltung werden allseitig anerkannt, dagegen ist seine wissenschaftliche Bedeutung umstritten. Mit der Stelle des Staatsarchivdirektors in Münster ist aber traditionell eine Honorarprofessur für historische Hilfswissenschaften an der Universität verbunden ; eine vorsichtige Fühlungnahme mit maßgebenden Kreisen der Universität hat ergeben, daß Doktor Glasmeier nicht auf deren Zustimmung hätte rechnen können.

Diese Begründung war zwar nicht sachfremd, aber dennoch sicherlich vorgeschoben. Für einen Außenseiter wie Glasmeier war in einer Spitzen-Position des preußischen staatlichen Archivwesens, trotz aller Anerkennung, die man ihm nach außen hin zollte, kein Platz. Allerdings wurde zugesichert, daß sich der Generaldirektor der Staatsarchive Professor Albert Brackmann bei der Provinzialverwaltung für die Ernennung Glasmeiers zum (hauptamtlichen) Leiter der Archivberatungsstelle Westfalen einsetzen wolle : Ich möchte glauben, daß damit allen berechtigten Ansprüchen Rechnung getragen sein würde, schließt Doktor Bracht sein Schreiben.

Ob die Provinz auf eine entsprechende Empfehlung zur Einrichtung einer hauptamtlich geleiteten Archivberatungsstelle eingehen würde, war in der gegebenen Situation jedoch äußerst fraglich, wie sich im übrigen wenig später zeigte. Aber auch dann hätte es nichts daran geändert, daß der berufliche und gesellschaftliche Abstieg unverkennbar war. Geduldeter Untermieter auf dem Dachboden des Staatsarchivs zu sein, war auf Dauer zweifellos keine Situation, mit der sich Glasmeier zufriedengeben konnte. Daher kann es nicht überraschen, daß er sich nach anderen Perspektiven umsah. Seine national-konservative Gesinnung, seine Affinität zum Militär, seine persönlichen Kontakte zu reaktionären Kräften, sein Heimatbewußtsein, all dies trug sicherlich dazu bei, daß die immer stärker werdende nationalsozialistische Bewegung auf ihn eine besondere Anziehungskraft ausübte.

Über seinen Weg zum Nationalsozialismus gab er später (1936) zu Protokoll : Hörte von der Hitlerbewegung kaum.

Wurde auf diese aufmerksam durch meine Archivbesuche beim Freiherrn von Kanne im östlichen Teil Westfalens (jetzt SS-Oberführer RuS-Amt) . Trat aber wegen meiner schlechten Erfahrungen mit « vaterländischen Verbänden » nicht mit fliegenden Fahnen bei, sondern sah mir die Sache aus der Entfernung an. Wählte seit 1930-1931 Hitler. Stellte mich 1931 (Anfang Mai) dem Gauleiter zur Verfügung. Trat aber auf seinen Rat hin nicht offiziell in die Partei ein, um so besser (als Beamter der Provinz Westfalen) für die Bewegung arbeiten und bestimmte kulturelle Aufträge des Gauleiters ausführen zu können. Beim Gauparteitag Januar 1932 in Münster ließ ich mich dann auch offen aufnehmen. Inzwischen hatte ich die Bewegung theoretisch und praktisch gründlich studiert und für sie geopfert. Meine Sehnsucht wurde in ihr erfüllt.

Natürlich ist auch bei diesem Selbstzeugnis zu berücksichtigen, daß es nachträglich zu dem Zweck formulierte wurde, eine vermeintlich tief verwurzelte und weit zurückreichende innere Verbindung mit dem Nationalsozialismus glaubhaft zu machen. Seine Bekanntschaft mit Freiherr von Kanne, dem Besitzer des Rittergutes Breitenhaupt (heute Stadt Steinheim Kreis Höxter) und späteren « Reichskommissar für die Milchwirtschaft » (spöttisch Reichsmilchkanne genannt), reichte im übrigen bis in seine Militärzeit zurück, da von Kanne im Weltkrieg ebenfalls als Rittmeister dem Husarenregiment Nummer 8 angehört hatte. Bernd Freiherr von Kanne war historisch interessiert und hatte sich sehr um sein Archiv bemüht. Weitere Verbindungsleute Glasmeiers zur NSDAP waren Freiherr von Oeynhausen auf der Grevenburg, der wie Glasmeier in den zwanziger Jahren im « Westfalenbund » aktiv war, sowie Freiherr von Lüninck von Haus Ostwig im Sauerland, den Glasmeier ebenfalls sowohl über die Archivarbeit wie auch aus der Arbeit im « Westfalenbund » kannte und der nach der Machtergreifung das Amt des Oberpräsidenten der Provinz Westfalen übernehmen sollte. Auch Graf Wolff-Metternich auf Schloß Vinsebeck stand der NSDAP nahe.

Am 1. Februar 1932 während des Gauparteitags in Münster trat Glasmeier der Partei bei. Drei Monate später übertrug man ihm das Amt eines Gaukulturwarts, und am 1. Oktober wurde er zum Gaugeschäftsführer bestellt. Offensichtlich übte er diese Tätigkeit aber zumindest nach außen hin nebenamtlich aus, da er bis April 1933 noch als Direktor der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive und Leiter der Archivberatungsstelle in Erscheinung tritt und regelmäßige Berichte über seine archivpflegerische Arbeit lieferte.

Seine « große Stunde » im Sinne der Parteikarriere schlug dann im Januar 1933. Die Partei hatte um den Jahreswechsel auf Reichsebene mit Rückschlägen und Ansehensverlust zu kämpfen. Als für den 15. Januar Wahlen in dem kleinen und politisch völlig unbedeutenden Land Lippe angesetzt wurden, beschloß die Parteiführung, hier unter Aufbietung aller verfügbaren Kräfte für einen Prestigeerfolg zu kämpfen, um einen Stimmungsumschwung herbeizuführen. Allein Hitler persönlich sollte in 16 Wahlveranstaltungen auftreten, neben ihm noch alle anderen Parteigrößen wie Gœbbels, Rosenberg und Himmler. Hitler geht auf die Dörfer, spotteten die anderen Parteien. Als Gaugeschäftsführer wurde Glasmeier in diese Planungen unmittelbar einbezogen. Ihm war offensichtlich weitgehend die Organisation und Logistik des Wahlkampfes übertragen.

In diesen Wochen lernte ihn nicht nur Hitler kennen und schätzen, sondern Glasmeier konnte auch enge persönliche Kontakte zu Gœbbels und Himmler knüpfen. Geradezu schwärmerisch erinnert Glasmeier letzteren in einem Weihnachtsgruß 1935 daran, daß er mit ihm am 6. Januar 1933 zum nebelumwallten Hermannsdenkmal gefahren sei und dieser ihn am gleichen Abend in die SS aufgenommen habe. Hitler persönlich hatte zusammen mit Himmler die

Bürgschaft für Glasmeier übernommen.

Die Parteiführung richtete ihr Hauptquartier für den Wahlkampf auf Schloß Vinsebeck bei Graf Wolff-Metternich ein. Goebbels schwärmt in seinem Tagebucheintrag vom 11. Januar : Herrliche Wasserburg. Graf Metternich sehr angenehm. Wunderbare Schlafzimmer und notiert wenige Tage später : Abschied von Vinsebeck fällt schwer. Hitler dagegen fand Unterkunft auf der Grevenburg bei Freiherr von Oeynhausen. Ob dies auf Vermittlung Glasmeiers zurückging, ließ sich bislang nicht definitiv feststellen, ist aber anzunehmen, da Glasmeier mit Freiherr von Oeynhausen gut bekannt war und er die Grevenburg in früheren Jahren im Rahmen der Archivpflege oft besucht hatte.

Der deutlichste Beweis für die Wertschätzung, die Glasmeier in dieser Zeit bei Hitler persönlich gefunden hat, ist zweifellos eine Portrait-Postkarte, die Hitler ihm auf der Grevenburg schenkte. Er versah sein Bild mit der Widmung Doktor Glasmeier, dem besten Kenner der Kultur und Geschichte dieses Landes, herzlich Adolf Hitler. Grevenburg, den 14. Januar 1933. Dieses Bild ist zweifellos ein Schlüsseldokument, das die steile NS-Karriere Glasmeiers zu erklären vermag. Es verdeutlicht, wie sehr es Glasmeier in diesen Wochen gelungen war, sich in Hitlers Bewußtsein zu verankern. Glasmeier hat dieses Bild offenbar als eine Art « Ikone » gehütet und auf allen weiteren Stationen seines Lebens mit sich geführt. Sicherlich hat er es auch benutzt, um gegenüber anderen Parteigenossen, insbesondere den Kritikern in der Partei, sein besonderes Vertrauensverhältnis zum « Führer » herauszustellen. An seiner letzten Wirkungsstätte im Stift Sankt Florian blieb das Bild schließlich bei Kriegsende zurück und gelangte in das dortige Stiftsarchiv.

Die Bedeutung dieses Bildes wird durch das Datum der Widmung noch besonders unterstrichen : Es war der Vorabend jenes Tages, der unter dem Schlagwort « Entscheidungsschlacht in Lippe » als der wichtigste Etappensieg in der Geschichte der « Bewegung » angesehen wurde und im Bewußtsein wie auch der Propaganda der Partei stets eine besondere Rolle spielte. Hitler selbst kehrte zum Jahrestag der Wahl später noch auf die Grevenburg zurück.

Sicherlich hat Glasmeier Hitler bei dieser Gelegenheit auch seine eigentlichen Wirkungsstätten, die Archive dieser Häuser, gezeigt, so daß diesem von da her die besondere Situation privater Adelsarchive bekannt war. Dies sollte 1936 Bedeutung erlangen, als Hitler alle Bestrebungen der Reichsarchivverwaltung und der Partei, im Rahmen einer « Archivschutzgesetzgebung » private Archive einer staatlichen Aufsicht zu unterstellen, persönlich definitiv zurückwies.

Zum Zeitpunkt der « Machtergreifung » war Glasmeier somit bereits fest in das Partegefüge integriert. Daher konnte es nicht überraschen, daß er bei den ersten von den Nationalsozialisten angesetzten Neuwahlen für die Gemeinden und Gemeindeverbände am 12. März für die NSDAP sowohl in die Münsteraner Stadtverordnetenversammlung als auch in den Provinziallandtag von Westfalen einrückte. Von dort wurde er sogleich in das wichtigste Gremium des Provinzialverbandes, den Provinzialausschuß, berufen.

Doch war dies nur der Anfang. Die Nationalsozialisten, insbesondere deren Chefpropagandist Josef Goebbels, hatten längst die Bedeutung des Rundfunks als Propagandamittel erkannt. Goebbels Bestreben ging dahin, die entscheidenden Positionen im Rundfunk baldmöglichst mit ihm ergebenen Parteigenossen zu besetzen. Weshalb dabei seine Wahl ausgerechnet auf Glasmeier fiel, der über keinerlei Qualifikation und Erfahrung im Rundfunkwesen verfügte, ist nicht festzustellen. Allerdings war er einige Wochen zuvor auf Drängen der Nationalsozialisten bereits in den Kulturbeirat des

Westdeutschen Rundfunks berufen worden.

Anfang April 1933 ernannte Goebbels Glasmeier völlig überraschend zum neuen Intendanten des Westdeutschen Rundfunks in Köln, nachdem der Vorgänger, der Dichter und Theaterintendant Ernst Hardt, am 20. März von seinem Amt suspendiert worden war. Glasmeiers absolute persönliche Ergebenheit, seine historisch-kulturelle Bildung, aber auch sein Interesse für alle neuen technischen Errungenschaften mögen bei dieser Berufung eine Rolle gespielt haben, wahrscheinlich hat aber Hitler damals bereits einen entsprechenden Wunsch an Goebbels gerichtet. Am Gründonnerstag, dem 13. April 1933, traf Glasmeier in Köln ein und nahm am folgenden Tag seine Tätigkeit auf. Als Goebbels wenig später seiner Heimatstadt Rheydt einen Besuch abstattete, um dort die Ehrenbürgerwürde entgegenzunehmen, ließ er es sich nicht nehmen, am 24. April Glasmeier persönlich in sein Amt einzuführen. Dieser Festakt im Funkhaus wurde live im Rundfunk übertragen, zweifellos ein Hinweis auf den Stellenwert, den Goebbels diesem Führungswechsel beimaß.

Es kann kaum überraschen, daß man beim Kölner Sender dem Außenseiter Glasmeier mißtrauisch gegenüberstand. Hierzu dürften die eindeutig politische Protektion wie auch sein äußerst selbstbewußtes, oft überheblich erscheinendes Auftreten gleichermaßen beigetragen haben. Bereits bei dem Festakt zur Amtseinführung bemühte sich Glasmeier, in Wortwahl und Gestik den neuen Führungsstil der nationalsozialistischen Machthaber überzeugend zu verkörpern.

Doch nicht nur beim Rundfunk, auch innerhalb der Partei, vor allem aber in der SS, stand man Glasmeier vielfach kritisch oder gar feindlich gegenüber. So bemerkte der zuständige SS-Sturmabführer in Aachen, dem Glasmeier seit seinem Wohnungswechsel nach Köln als SS-Sturmabführer zugeordnet war, in einer Personalbeurteilung vom November 1933, daß Glasmeier in seiner bisherigen Funktion als Reiterreferent im Stab der Standarte wenig Gelegenheit gehabt habe, sich zu betätigen. Daher habe er ihm nun das Fürsorgereferat übertragen, so daß er künftig ein dankbares Aufgabenfeld habe. Es ist schwer vorstellbar, daß Glasmeier die Übertragung dieses Amtes als seiner Person und Stellung angemessen empfunden haben dürfte. Ein halbes Jahr später lehnte die gleiche Stelle seine Beförderung zum Obersturmführer zunächst ab, da sich eine solche aus der bisherigen Tätigkeit nicht rechtfertigen ließe. Als diese kurz darauf doch erfolgte, geschah dies sicherlich auf höhere Weisung.

Das ihm entgegengebrachte Mißtrauen brachte ihn schon bald in ernsthafte Schwierigkeiten. Im Zusammenhang mit einer Unterschlagung, die ein Mitarbeiter des Senders namens Keiper begangen hatte, wurde er im Juli 1934 der Mitwisserschaft beschuldigt. Zudem wurde gegen ihn der Vorwurf erhoben, er habe ein Honorar in Höhe von 1000 Mark, das der freie Mitarbeiter Doktor Castelle für die Bibliothek der SS-Führerschule auf der Wewelsburg gespendet hatte, als seine eigene Spende ausgegeben und dafür den SS-Ehrendolch erhalten. Die Staatsanwaltschaft nahm die Ermittlungen auf, bis zu deren Abschluß Glasmeier sowohl von seiner Funktion als Intendant wie auch von seinem SS-Amt beurlaubt wurde, fast ein dreiviertel Jahr lang. Himmler selbst stellte schließlich eine schriftliche Bescheinigung aus, daß Glasmeier ihm gegenüber besagte Spende ausdrücklich als die eines Dritten bezeichnet habe.

Während der Staatsanwalt im Frühjahr 1935 das Verfahren gegen Keiper eröffnete, stellte er die Ermittlungen gegen Glasmeier ein, weil eine Beteiligung an den Taten Keipers nicht erwiesen sei. Auch andere Beschuldigungen gegen ihn wurden nicht weiter verfolgt. So wurden ihm unan gemessener Aufwand vorgeworfen, Trinkgelage, überhöhte Reisekosten und vieles mehr. Am kuriosesten war zweifellos ein Vorwurf im Zusammenhang mit den vom Rundfunk zu Gunsten der

NSV im gesamten Sendebereich veranstalteten « Bunten Abenden » : Glasmeier bestehende darauf, so wurde behauptet, daß ihn die örtlichen Honoratioren in schwarzem Anzug und mit Zylinder sowie mit Böllerschüssen empfingen, wenn er an den Veranstaltungsort komme.

In heftigen Streit geriet Glasmeier mit dem Führer der im Funkhaus stationierten SS-Funkwache, einem gewissen Nehls. Es wurde ihm und andere verübelt, daß er sich nach kurzer Zeit nicht mehr bei seinen Dienstfahrten von SS-Leuten begleiten ließ, sondern sich eines zivilen Fahrers, der zudem gebürtiger Franzose sei, bediente. Überhaupt hatte die SS-Funkwache das Gefühl, von Glasmeier nicht ernstgenommen zu werden. Bereits im Frühjahr 1935 richtete Nehls eine geheime Meldung an den Chef des Sicherheitshauptamtes in Berlin. Darin wurde auch angedeutet, daß Glasmeier zur Kirche eine positive Haltung einnehme und sich abfällig über Rosenberg geäußert habe. Außerdem habe er sich mehrfach von einem SS-Fahrer in Staffelnuniform zur Kirche fahren lassen. Das Sicherheitshauptamt bat den Führer des Funkschutzes in Berlin, Glasmeier unauffällig beobachten zu lassen und über zweifelhaftes Verhalten des Intendanten General zu berichten. In einem internen Vermerk wird die Haltung der mittleren Parteiebenen zu Glasmeier besonders deutlich. Dort heißt es : Doktor Glasmeier versucht, am Sender eine äußerlich möglichst autoritäre Rolle zu spielen und gibt in kurz aufeinander folgenden Zeiten umstürzendste Anweisungen. Praktisch wird jedoch der gesamte Betrieb von ihm losgelöst, damit er weiter funktionieren kann. Doktor Glasmeier hat « einen nahezu krankhaften Ehrgeiz » , möglichst in der Öffentlichkeit gesehen zu werden und möglichst oft von seinem Schreibtisch aus durchs Mikrofon zu « seinem Volk » zu sprechen. Als Lebensvorbild scheint ihm der des öfteren auch von ihm zitierte tolle Bomberg zu dienen. In einem der bekanntesten Nachtlokale Kölns ist er des öfteren im Zecherkreis zu sehen, steigt (in Uniform !) auf den Tisch, hält Reden und führt Ulk auf. Es scheinen Erwägungen im Gange zu sein, Doktor Glasmeier seines Amtes als Intendant zu entheben. Doktor Glasmeier scheint bei der örtlichen SS wegen seines « nichtkameradschaftlichen und adelsfreundlichen Wesens » in keinem besonderen nationalsozialistischen Ruf zu stehen.

Die Schwierigkeiten, die Glasmeier mit den örtlichen SS-Stellen hatte, blieben auch Heinrich Himmler nicht verborgen, so daß sein Verhältnis zu Glasmeier zunehmend problematischer wurde. Nachdrücklich bemühte sich Glasmeier hingegen, sein Ansehen bei der SS mit seinem historischen Wissen zu heben. So verfaßte er am 24. August 1936 eine Meldung an den SS-Abschnitt V, in der er sich ausführlich mit Hexenverfolgung und Inquisition auseinandersetzte. Er schließt seine Stellungnahme mit der Bemerkung : Bedauerlich ist es auch, daß unsere großen Staatsarchive noch immer von Archivaren aus der alten liberalistischen Zeit verwaltet werden. Es wird höchste Zeit, daß hier Wandel geschaffen wird.

Zudem ließ er keine Gelegenheit aus, dem Reichsführer SS seine persönliche Treue und Ergebenheit zu versichern. So richtete er zum Jahreswechsel 1935-1936 ein unterwürfiges Schreiben an ihn mit der Anrede Sehr verehrter, lieber Reichsführer-SS, in dem er, nachdem er gute Wünsche zu den Weihnächten, dem Julfest und für das neue Jahr vorangestellt hatte, nachfragte, wie es um den Plan stünde, ihn, Glasmeier, als Archivar in seinen Stab zu berufen. Entsprechende Absichten hatte Himmler anscheinend Anfang des Jahres geäußert, und Glasmeier war offenbar bereit, dafür seinen Funkdienst aufzugeben (Ihr Wunsch ist mir Befehl !). Er versäumte es auch nicht, Himmler bei dieser Gelegenheit an den Beginn ihrer Beziehungen zu erinnern, der erwähnten Fahrt zum Hermannsdenkmal am 6. Januar 1933 : Dieser für mich wichtige Gedenktag läßt mich mein damals abgegebenes Treuegelöbnis erneuern.

Die Antwort wenige Tage später dürfte für Glasmeier eine Ernüchterung gewesen sein : Das SS-Hauptamt teilte ihm mit,

daß tatsächlich in Berlin ein Archiv und ein Museum eingerichtet werden sollte, in dem alle Dinge gesammelt werden sollten, die für die Geschichte der SS von Wert seien. Doch statt ihn mit dieser Aufgabe, für die er zweifellos ganz besonders qualifiziert gewesen wäre, zu betrauen, wurde er lediglich aufgefordert, dem SS-Hauptamt geeignete SS-Angehörige für die Stellen der Leitung und der Mitarbeiter zu benennen. Bei seiner Eitelkeit dürfte es ihn besonders getroffen haben, daß diese Aufforderung auf dem normalen Amtsweg, unterzeichnet durch einen SS-Gruppenführer, an ihn erging.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch auf das Verhältnis Glasmeiers zur Kirche einzugehen. Seine Herkunft aus dem traditionell katholisch geprägten Westmünsterland wurde schon erwähnt. Diese wirkte sich auch auf seine archivpflegerische Arbeit aus, nahm sich doch die Archivberatungsstelle unter seiner Leitung in ganz besonderer Weise der kirchlichen Archive an. Noch im Jahr 1930 hatte er sogar einen Lehrauftrag an der Philosophisch-Theologischen Akademie in Paderborn übernommen. Vor diesem Hintergrund sind seine späteren Beteuerungen, daß er sich bereits lange vor dem Parteieintritt innerlich von der Kirche abgewendet habe, wenig glaubhaft, zumal er einräumt, bis 1931 sogar die Sakramente in Anspruch genommen zu haben.

Auch die Anschuldigungen über seine kirchenfreundlichen Äußerungen sowie seinen angeblichen Gottesdienstbesuch in Köln in SS-Uniform entbehren sicherlich nicht jeder Grundlage. Hierzu paßt eine Erinnerung von Karl Holzamer, dem späteren Intendanten des ZDF, der in dieser Zeit als Redakteur beim WDR tätig und als überzeugter Katholik bekannt war. Er berichtet, daß Glasmeier ihm im Sommer 1933 selbst das Kruzifix gezeigt habe, das er in seinem Intendantenzimmer hatte aufhängen lassen, welches später allerdings verschwunden gewesen sei. Weiter bemerkt er: Ich hatte persönlich den Eindruck, daß Glasmeier mich in der eigenen Überzeugung in keiner Weise drücken wollte, sondern bemüht war, eine gewisse schützende Hand darüber zu halten, vorausgesetzt, daß man ihm keinen Ärger machte.

Noch im Sommer 1936 versuchte Glasmeier in einer Meldung an den SS-Abschnitt zu erklären, weshalb er immer noch nicht aus der Kirche ausgetreten sei, nämlich angeblich nach Rücksprache mit Himmler, Rosenberg und verschiedenen Gauleitern wegen meiner politischen Stellung als Intendant des Reichssenders Köln. Wenig später gab er auf einem Fragebogen unter « Konfession » an offiziell noch katholisch, das heißt kirchensteuermäßig. Erst im darauffolgenden Jahr bezeichnete er sich als gottgläubig, so daß in der Zwischenzeit der Kirchenaustritt erfolgt sein dürfte. Schließlich gibt auch die letzte Phase seines Wirkens im Stift Sankt Florian, von der noch zu handeln sein wird, mancherlei Hinweise darauf, daß eine innere Bindung zum kirchlichen Bereich immer noch bestand oder vielleicht auch erneut für ihn Bedeutung erlangt hatte.

Wesentlich konstanter als seine Beziehung zu Himmler hingegen gestaltete sich in der Folgezeit die zu Goebbels, wenngleich Verärgerung und Verdruß auch hier an der Tagesordnung waren. Die wichtigste Quelle hierfür bilden ab 1937 die Tagebücher des Reichspropagandaministers, in denen Glasmeier bis April 1944 fast 150mal erwähnt wird. Allein diese Tatsache belegt, welche Rolle Glasmeier für Goebbels gespielt hat.

Die Aufzeichnungen setzen damit ein, daß Goebbels in Erwägung zog, Glasmeier die Leitung des Reichsrundfunks zu übertragen. Er notierte in seinem Tagebuch am 1. Februar 1937: Vielleicht eignet sich Glasmeier zum

Generalintendanten. Wir werden es prüfen. Wie es zu diesen Überlegungen gekommen ist, ist aus den Quellen nicht ersichtlich. Zwei Wochen später heißt es dagegen : Auch Glasmeier kaum als Generalintendant für den Rundfunk geeignet. Der entscheidende Anstoß kam allem Anschein nach von Hitler selbst. Goebbels notierte unter dem 8. März: Führer auch dafür, daß ich Glasmeier zum GI [das heißt Generalintendanten] mache. Also los! Am 1. April 1937 wurde er dann tatsächlich zum Reichsintendanten und Generaldirektor der Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft ernannt.

Die Bedeutung dieser Ernennung wird auch dadurch unterstrichen, daß es eine solche Position im Reich bislang noch nicht gegeben hatte. Im deutschen Funk wurde noch nie eine Persönlichkeit mit derartigen Generalvollmachten ausgerüstet, kommentierte der « Völkische Beobachter » den Vorgang. Für Glasmeier selbst bedeutete dies zweifellos einen Höhepunkt seiner Karriere, den er sicherlich selbst kaum erwartet haben dürfte. Hatte er sich schon als Intendant in Köln weitgehend von dem gesellschaftlichen Absturz, der für ihn mit dem Zusammenbruch seiner Stellung als Adelsarchivar verbunden war, erholt, so rückte er nun in eine Spitzenstellung des Reiches auf. Seinem übersteigerten Bedürfnis nach Repräsentation und einem Leben « nach Gutsherrenart » kam diese Position in außerordentlicher Weise entgegen. Er hatte auch keine Scheu, einen solchen Stil in Berlin voll auszuleben, was ihm natürlich auch dort mancherlei Mißbilligung aus Partei- und Rundfunkkreisen eintrug. So behauptete man, er sei bisweilen hoch zu Roß (das Reiten war eine seiner größten Leidenschaften) im « Haus des Rundfunks » in der Masurenallee eingeritten. Glasmeier lebt auf zu großem Fuße, notierte Goebbels am 16. November 1939 in seinem Tagebuch.

Es ist also nicht überraschend, daß auch während seiner Berliner Zeit die Denunziationen und Beschwerden über ihn aus Parteikreisen nicht aufhörten. Im Frühjahr 1938 scheint eine solche auch bei Goebbels Aufmerksamkeit gefunden zu haben. In einem sehr persönlichen Brief an den Propagandaminister sah sich Glasmeier genötigt, alle Verdächtigungen hinsichtlich seiner Integrität zurückzuweisen: Irgend jemand hat mal wieder versucht, Ihr Vertrauen zu mir zu erschüttern, beginnt sein Schreiben vom 18. Mai. Er drückt sodann seine tiefe Enttäuschung darüber aus, daß Goebbels offensichtlich an seiner Ergebenheit gezweifelt habe und erklärt, daß er zu denjenigen seiner Mitarbeiter gehöre, die stets zu ihm gestanden hätten und stünden : Ich habe Ihnen einmal die Treue gelobt, und ich gehöre zu den vielleicht etwas unmodernen Menschen, denen Treue kein leerer Wahn ist ! Der Brief schließt mit der Bitte, ihm doch wenigstens einmal im Monat Gelegenheit zu einer ergiebigen Aussprache zu geben.

Es entwickelten sich permanente Querelen innerhalb der Führungsclique des Reichsrundfunks, die Goebbels sehr zu schaffen machten. Mal lag nach seiner Einschätzung die Schuld bei Glasmeier (Gebe Glasmeier auch privat noch eine kleine Lektion. Er muß scharf am Zügel gehalten werden.) , mal bei den anderen (Weber hetzt im Rundfunk unentwegt gegen Glasmeier. Wir müssen Weber wohl beseitigen. Eher gibt es da keine Ruhe.) . Aus Parteikreisen wurde das Mißtrauen gegen Glasmeier immer wieder geschürt. Ende 1939 kam es erneut zu einer Untersuchung gegen ihn, in deren Verlauf die Akten des Prozesses in der Sache Keiper aus der Kölner Zeit hervorgeholt wurden.

Zeitweilig scheint Goebbels entschlossen gewesen zu sein, Glasmeier fallenzulassen. Wahrscheinlich aber hat Hitler persönlich alle Maßnahmen gegen ihn unterbunden. Am 5. Dezember 1939 notierte Goebbels jedenfalls im Tagebuch, daß er dem Führer den Fall Glasmeier klar gelegt habe, ohne daß er allerdings mitteilt, zu welchen Ergebnissen dieses Gespräch geführt hatte.

Die Bedenken gegen Glasmeiers Amtsführung wurden jedoch immer gravierender. Am 16. Januar 1940, während Glasmeier an einem dreimonatigen Einsatz in der Wehrmacht teilnahm, erließ Goebbels ein neues Organisationsstatut für den Reichsrundfunk, durch das Glasmeiers Kompetenzen erheblich eingeschränkt wurden. Ihm verblieb nur die organisatorische Verantwortung, der Einfluß auf die Programmgestaltung wurde ihm dagegen weitgehend entzogen. Daß dies de facto eine Entmachtung war, hat Glasmeier offenbar gemerkt. Bald nach seiner Rückkehr nach Berlin machte er nämlich in einem Brief vom 24. April an Professor Stieren, den Direktor des Museums für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Münster, die sarkastische Bemerkung : Sitze seit Ende Februar wieder in Berlin und bemühe mich, die Musikberieselungsanlage in Gang zu halten.

Auch der Beginn des Krieges führte nicht zu einer Beendigung der internen Machtkämpfe um den Einfluß im Reichsrundfunk. Mit Alfred-Ingemar Berndt, dem Leiter der Presseabteilung im Propagandaministerium, einem altgedienten Parteijournalisten, kam es zu scharfen Auseinandersetzungen, die Goebbels immer wieder schlichten mußte: Berndt hat Krach mit Glasmeier. Aber dabei hat er Recht. Glasmeier ist ein unwirtlicher Geselle, und das Ministerium führt den Rundfunk, nicht umgekehrt, notierte er am 25. Oktober 1939 in seinem Tagebuch, in dem es aber wenig später aber auch heißt : Berndt möchte ihn (das heißt Glasmeier) gern abservieren. Aber das lasse ich nicht zu. Aber auch nachdem ihm der Einfluß auf die Programmgestaltung des Rundfunks Anfang 1940 weitgehend entzogen worden war, blieb Glasmeier Goebbels' wichtigster Vertrauensmann in der Reichsrundfunkanstalt, auf den er besonders in heiklen Angelegenheiten zurückgriff. Dies belegt der Tagebucheintrag vom 22. Juni 1941, dem Tag des Angriffs auf Rußland : Mit Glasmeier und Diewerge (Leiter der Rundfunkabteilung im Propagandaministerium) Rundfunkeinsatz besprochen. Sie müssen nun ins Bild gesetzt werden. Vermutlich steht eine bereits zwei Monate zuvor gemachte Eintragung, nach der er mit Glasmeier besprochen hatte, wie die zu erwartenden großen neuen Nachrichten im Rundfunk dargestellt werden sollten, hiermit in Zusammenhang.

Vielleicht haben diese ständigen Querelen und die weithin verbreitete Kritik aus der Partei dazu beigetragen, daß Glasmeier nach anderen beziehungsweise zusätzlichen Herausforderungen Ausschau hielt. Hier bot sich bald eine Möglichkeit, die seinen Interessen in besonderer Weise entgegenkam : Am 21. Januar 1941 hatte die Gestapo das oberösterreichische Augustinerstift Sankt Florian beschlagnahmt und die Chorherren wenig später aus ihrem Kloster ausgewiesen. Sankt Florian war seit dem 19. Jahrhundert als Wirkungsstätte Anton Bruckners bekannt geworden, der nach seinem Tod 1898 dort seine letzte Ruhestätte gefunden hatte. Seine Musik wurde (neben der Richard Wagners) von der nationalsozialistischen Kulturpolitik besonders gefördert. Zunächst war daran gedacht, die weitläufige Klosteranlage dem Reichsgau Oberdonau zu übertragen, der sie als Stätte der Musikpflege und Repräsentation nutzen wollte.

Glasmeier hatte das Stift im Jahre 1930 kennengelernt, als der 22. Deutsche Archivtag, der gemeinsam mit den österreichischen Archivaren veranstaltet wurde, in Wien und Linz stattfand. Eine der Tagungsexkursionen führte auch nach Sankt Florian. Schon damals hatte die Klosteranlage einen tiefen Eindruck auf ihn gemacht. Hinzu kam seine besondere Verehrung für Anton Bruckner, die ihm bereits 1938 die Ehrenurkunde der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft eingetragen hatte. Die Nachricht von der Aufhebung des Stiftes erregte sofort sein Interesse und ließ in ihm den Plan entstehen, hier ein kulturelles Zentrum für den Reichsrundfunk zu errichten.

Ihm kam zugute, daß Hitler selbst in seinem Bestreben, seinen Heimatgau « Oberdonau » mit der Hauptstadt Linz zu einem kulturellen Zentrum als Konkurrenz zu dem von ihm wenig geliebten Wien zu machen, auf Sankt Florian ein besonderes Augenmerk richtete. Bereits im Juli 1941 war Glasmeier in Linz und führte Verhandlungen. Goebbels notierte hierzu : Glasmeier berichtet mir von seinen Besprechungen in Linz. Er ist dort an der Arbeit, das Stift Sankt Florian, in dem Bruckner lange gewirkt hat, für den Rundfunk zu erwerben und es für die Bruckner-Forschung wie auch für die Bruckner-Musik zur Verfügung zu stellen. Ich halte diesen Plan für ausgezeichnet und unterstütze diese Bestrebungen. Allerdings sind noch eine Reihe von anderen Instanzen am Werk, um dieses schöne Stift in Besitz zu nehmen. Wenige Tage später hatte Goebbels diese Pläne Hitler vorgetragen, der davon begeistert war und sofort dem Gau Oberdonau die nötigen Weisungen erteilte.

Glasmeier begab sich erneut nach Linz und konnte Goebbels bald darauf melden, daß es ihm gelungen sei zu erreichen, den größten Teil der Stiftsanlage für den Reichsrundfunk zu gewinnen. Dort sollte die Bruckner-Gesellschaft ihren Sitz erhalten und ein erstklassiges Orchester entstehen, das in Elite-Aufnahmen (Goebbels) Schallplatten für die Verbreitung im Rundfunk produzieren sollte. Für die notwendigen Investitionen forderte Glasmeier vorerst 10 Millionen Mark, eine für damalige Verhältnisse wahrlich gewaltige Summe. Goebbels stimmte dem Plan trotz der hohen Kosten zu und versprach, sofort die Einwilligung Hitlers einzuholen.

Dennoch zogen sich die Verhandlungen zunächst hin. Erst im Juli 1942 kamen sie zum Abschluß. Am 1. September 1942 trat der Vertrag in Kraft : Das Stift Sankt Florian wurde vom Reichsgau Oberdonau auf 99 Jahre an die Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft für eine symbolische Zahlung von einer Reichsmark jährlich verpachtet. Hiermit begann die letzte Phase in Glasmeiers Wirken, die, obgleich sie nur etwa zweieinhalb Jahre dauerte, sicherlich die in doppeltem Sinne des Wortes merkwürdigste werden sollte. Sie in all' ihren Facetten und Eigentümlichkeiten zu schildern, würde den Rahmen dieses Aufsatzes weit überschreiten.

Als seine wichtigste Aufgabe sah er es an, in Sankt Florian ein großes Reichsrundfunkorchester mit höchstem Qualitätsanspruch unter dem Namen « Bruckner-Orchester » und einen nicht minder großartigen Chor aufzubauen. Hierfür mußten jedoch erst die baulichen Voraussetzungen geschaffen werden. Bereits am 28. Juli 1942 beantragte Glasmeier daher bei Goebbels, aus der Baureserve des Reichsrundfunks fünf Millionen Reichsmark, das war ein Viertel des gesamten Ansatzes, für die Maßnahmen in Sankt Florian entnehmen zu dürfen. Außerdem bat er um Freigabe von Devisen im Wert von 500.000 Reichsmark, um damit Möbel, Gobelins und andere kostbare Ausstattungsstücke im Ausland, vor allem in Frankreich und Italien, zu kaufen. Während die fünf Millionen sofort bewilligt wurden, stieß die Devisenfreigabe auf Schwierigkeiten, die Glasmeier dadurch löste, daß er kurzerhand Fakten schaffte und entsprechende Käufe im Ausland auch ohne Genehmigung tätigte.

Für die Bauleitung holte er einen alten Bekannten aus seiner Zeit als westfälischer Adelsarchivdirektor nach Sankt Florian, und zwar den Düsseldorfer Architekten Franz Schneider, der bereits 1924 für ihn den Neubau des Landsbergschen Gesamtarchivs in Velen geplant und errichtet und in der Weimarer Zeit zudem für zahlreiche westfälische Schloßherren als Architekt gearbeitet hatte. Vielerlei, vornehmlich erhaltende Baumaßnahmen wurden umgehend in Angriff genommen, noch mehr Planungen für umfangreiche Um- und Ergänzungsbauten ausgearbeitet: ein Stiftstheater, eine Prälaten- und eine Stiftshalle, eine Wandelhalle vor dem Sommerrefektorium, eine Kristallgalerie

und ein Vitrinenzimmer. Zu einer Verwirklichung dieser weitreichenden Pläne kam es jedoch nicht, obgleich es Glasmeier oftmals gelang, kriegsbedingte Restriktionen durch Tricks und Täuschung zu umgehen. So ließ er unmittelbar unterhalb der östlichen Stiftsmauer einen Swimmingpool anlegen, den er kurzerhand als Löschteich deklarierte. Die berühmte Orgel der Stiftskirche, als « Bruckner-Orgel » bekannt, wurde mit hohem Kostenaufwand unter der Verantwortung des Wiener Orgelexperten Professor Josef Mertin einer vollständigen Restaurierung unterzogen, die jedoch erst nach Kriegsende abgeschlossen werden konnte. Bis zum Januar 1944 hatte Glasmeier rund 4,5 Millionen Mark für Sankt Florian ausgegeben, davon allein 2,4 Millionen für Einrichtungsgegenstände, durchweg solche von hohem künstlerischen beziehungsweise antiquarischen Wert. Für die Unterhaltung der Gebäude waren bis dahin dagegen lediglich 130.000 Mark verwendet worden.

Im Prälatentrakt des Stiftes richtete er seine persönlichen Arbeits- und Wohnräume ein, die er, nachdem seine Dienstvilla in Berlin-Dahlem im Januar 1943 den Bomben zum Opfer gefallen war, mit seiner Familie bewohnte. Er behielt jedoch bis zum Schluß einen Wohnsitz in Berlin bei, da er ständig zwischen Berlin und Sankt Florian pendelte. Dies funktionierte vor allem deshalb einigermaßen reibungslos, weil er an beiden Standorten über außerordentlich kompetente und loyale enge Mitarbeiter verfügte. In Sankt Florian waren dies vor allem der ehemalige technische Direktor des Reichssenders Wien, Professor Doktor Gustav Schwaiger, sowie Doktor Eugen Kurt Fischer, der schon als Sendeleiter beim WDR für ihn gearbeitet hatte. In Berlin vertrat ihn als sein persönlicher Adjutant Oskar Haaf, ein altbewährter Rundfunkfachmann, der auch in der Rundfunkgeschichte der Nachkriegszeit noch eine Rolle spielte.

Außerordentliche Erfolge waren Glasmeier, der persönlich als unmusikalisch charakterisiert wurde, beim Aufbau des Bruckner-Orchesters und des Bruckner-Chores beschieden, die um so eindrucksvoller sind, wenn man die kurze Zeitspanne ihrer Verwirklichung in Betracht zieht: Es gelang ihm, die besten Kräfte aus allen deutschen Orchestern nach Sankt Florian abzuwerben, nicht zuletzt deshalb, weil er es mit seiner ihm eigenen Beharrlichkeit gegen den Widerstand vieler Parteistellen durchsetzte, diesen Spitzengehälter zahlen zu dürfen und er ihnen im bis dahin von Kriegshandlungen noch weitgehend verschonten Oberösterreich eine optimale Arbeitsatmosphäre bieten konnte.

Auf dem Höhepunkt seiner kurzen Geschichte hatte das Orchester mehr als 100 Mitglieder. Der Chor stand unter der Leitung des Thomaskantors Günther Ramín und umfaßte rund 60 Sänger. Zum Orchestererzieher wurde Georg-Ludwig Jochum, der jüngere Bruder Eugen Jochums, bestellt. Wilhelm Furtwängler, Karl Böhm und Herbert von Karajan wurden als Gastdirigenten verpflichtet. Zum Programmchef des Orchesters und seinem persönlichen Referenten für alle Musikangelegenheiten bestellte Glasmeier Rudolf Schulz-Dornburg, der und andere 1925 Generalmusikdirektor in Münster und 1941 Chefdirigent des Großen Berliner Rundfunkorchesters gewesen war. Das Streicherensemble des Orchesters war 1944 nach Einschätzung Furtwänglers eines der besten in Europa, der gesamte Klangkörper war ohne Zweifel auf dem Wege zur Weltpitzenklasse.

Es kam jedoch nur zu ganz wenigen großen Konzerten. Das erste dieser Art war für den »Führergeburtstag« (20. April) 1943 geplant. Es sollte in der Stiftskirche stattfinden. Da diese aber nicht beheizbar war und das Orchester in dem eiskalten Raum nicht hätte spielen können, plante Glasmeier, bereits eine Woche zuvor mit provisorischen Öfen die Kirche zu temperieren. Angesichts des Mangels an Heizmaterial und der unverhältnismäßig hohen Kosten wurde dieser Plan aber von der Gauleitung gestoppt. Das einzige wirklich große Konzert war die Aufführung der 8. Symphonie

Bruckners in der Stiftskirche unter der Stabführung von Herbert von Karajan am 23. Juli 1944. Hierüber brachte der « Völkische Beobachter » einen ausführlichen Bericht, der von allen großen Zeitungen des Reiches, und andere auch von der « Tremonia » in Dortmund, übernommen wurde. Wenige Tage zuvor war zum ersten Male ein Konzert des « Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters » , wie es offiziell hieß, im Rundfunk gesendet worden, dem die Presse höchstes Lob zollte.

Zur Pflege der Musik alter Meister wurde die Spielgemeinschaft Emil Seiler verpflichtet, die dafür auf eine umfangreiche Sammlung wertvollster alter Instrumente, auf Glasmeiers Veranlassung im gesamten Reich und im Ausland erworben, zurückgreifen konnte und bei zahlreichen Veranstaltungen im kleineren Rahmen auftrat.

Ganz offensichtlich blieb die tausendjährige Geschichte des Stiftes, die Kunst und Kultur, die dem Ort seine Ausstrahlung gaben, nicht ohne Rückwirkung auf Glasmeier selbst. Das naßforsche Auftreten im Stile eines ranghohen SS-Manns, übrigens auch durch erhaltene Originaltonaufzeichnungen einiger Reden im Rundfunk nachvollziehbar, das er sich in den Jahren zuvor besonders in Berlin zu eigen gemacht hatte, wurde mehr und mehr vom Gehabe eines großzügigen Förderers der Künste, insbesondere der Musik, überlagert. Aufschlußreich ist dafür sein abschriftlich überliefertes persönliches Gästebuch : Es enthält die Namen von nicht weniger als 167 Künstlern und Literaten der Zeit, unter ihnen Interpreten wie Elly Ney, Walter Gieseking, Gerhard Husch, Paul Schöffler, Karl Erb und Ludwig Hölscher, Komponisten wie Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner und Wolfgang Fortner oder Literaten wie Hans Carossa, Ernst Wiechert, Werner Bergengruen, Manfred Hausmann, Alia Rachmanowa, Ruth Schaumann und Max Mell.

Aber auch das Stift als geistliche Einrichtung, obgleich das klösterliche Leben erloschen war, übte auf ihn eine große Faszination aus. Er fühlte sich offenbar mehr und mehr in die Tradition des Stiftes eingebunden, wie einige seiner engsten Mitarbeiter übereinstimmend in ihren Erinnerungen berichten. So ließ er in der Abtsgruft an den Todestagen seiner « Vorgänger » Kränze niederlegen. Mit dem letzten Propst Doktor Vinzenz Hartl, der dem Konvent auch in seinem Exil im Kloster Pulgarn vorstand, unterhielt er enge, manche meinen sogar freundschaftliche Kontakte. Als dieser am 6. Oktober 1944 starb, wurde es Glasmeier angeblich von Gœbbels selbst strikt untersagt, wie von ihm beabsichtigt, an der Beisetzung auf dem Priesterfriedhof des Stiftes teilzunehmen. Nach Zeugenaussagen verfolgte er daraufhin die Beerdigung von einem Fenster aus.

Doch dürfte es weniger das klösterliche Leben als solches gewesen sein, das auf ihn so anziehend wirkte, als vielmehr das prunkvolle Barock-Ambiente von Sankt Florian, das ihm nunmehr die Möglichkeit bot, einen Lebensstil zu pflegen, der die Maßstäbe, die er im Umgang mit dem westfälischen Adel kennen und schätzen gelernt hatte, weit in den Schatten stellte. Immerhin war er nun Herr eines barocken Schlosses mit mehr als 400 Zimmern, bedeutenden Kunstsammlungen und großartigsten Repräsentationsräumen. Dazu versetzten ihn die ihm zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel in die Lage, in repräsentativer Weise Gäste zu empfangen, fürstlich zu bewirten und ihnen darüber hinaus noch Kunst- und Kulturgenuß von höchstem Anspruch zu bieten.

In welcher exzessiver Weise er von diesen Möglichkeiten Gebrauch machte, ist nicht nur in vielen Details in seiner Korrespondenz, die sich in großem Umfang im Stiftsarchiv Sankt Florian erhalten hat, zu belegen, sondern wird auch von Augenzeugen aus seiner unmittelbaren Umgebung berichtet. Wichtige Gäste pflegte er am Stiftsportal mit einem Becher Wein willkommen zu heißen, manchmal auch unter Fanfarenklängen vom Turm. Dies war zum Beispiel der Fall,

als Rüstungsminister Albert Speer in Begleitung hoher Militärs und Wirtschaftsvertreter zum Abschluß einer Rüstungstagung in Linz am 25. Juni 1944 Sankt Florian besuchte. Zu Ehren der Gäste gab es zum Empfang Turmmusik, in der Stiftskirche wurde Bruckners Vierte Symphonie aufgeführt und abends eine Serenade auf der Kaiserstiege. Bis spät in die Nacht saß man bei leichter Musik und gutem Essen im Marmorsaal des Stiftes zusammen.

Höhepunkt in Glasmeiers Sankt Florianer Zeit war jedoch der 4. April 1943. Am Tag zuvor hatte Glasmeier das Bruckner-Orchester in der Krypta der Kirche vor dem Sarge Bruckners feierlich auf den großen Genius vereidigt, wie Eugen Kurt Fischer berichtet. Offenbar hatte er einen vertraulichen Hinweis erhalten, daß am folgenden Tag Adolf Hitler, der sich zu einer Besichtigung von Rüstungsanlagen in Linz aufhielt, nach Sankt Florian kommen werde. Um 11 Uhr traf dieser in Begleitung Speers, mehrerer Gauleiter und Generäle ein. In den eineinhalb Stunden seines Aufenthaltes ließ er sich die wichtigsten Kunstwerke zeigen, hörte ein kurzes Orgelspiel in der Kirche, besuchte das Grab Bruckners und bekam im Musikzimmer ein kleines Konzert der Spielgemeinschaft Seiler geboten. Glasmeier hatte dabei Gelegenheit, Hitler, der ihm im übrigen wenige Wochen zuvor anläßlich des 10. Jahrestags der Machtergreifung das goldene Ehrenzeichen der NSDAP sowie das Kriegsverdienstkreuz I. Klasse verliehen hatte, seine weitreichenden Planungen für Sankt Florian anschaulich zu schildern.

Hitler war begeistert. Er erklärte, das Brucknerstift müße das bedeutendste Kulturinstitut und Konservatorium Europas werden und sei aufs Großartigste auszubauen. Kurt Eugen Fischer, auch selbst ganz begeistert von dem Ergebnis des Besuches, bemerkte dazu in einem Brief vom folgenden Tag : Der Reichsintendant hat durch diesen Besuch, der überaus positiv verlief, eine völlig unangreifbare Stellung gewonnen und kann sich mit Recht als Sieger fühlen. Der Begriff « Sieger » bezog sich offenbar auf Glasmeiers innerparteiliche Widersacher, einschließlich des Gauleiters Eigruber, denen sein barockes Gehabe sowie seine ungebremste Ausgabenflut längst ein Dorn im Auge waren. Auch Gøebbels kommentiert den Aufenthalt Hitlers in Sankt Florian in seinem Tagebuch : Er hat Sankt Florian besucht und dort den besten Eindruck empfangen. Auch Glasmeier hat ihm in seiner ruhigen Beständigkeit und seinem nüchternen Fanatismus Freude gemacht. Er wünscht, daß ich das Bruckner-Orchester in Linz zu einem der ersten Klasseorchester des Reiches mache.

In der Tat scheint Glasmeier in der Folgezeit jeden Maßstab verloren zu haben. Er kaufte alles zusammen, was gut und teuer war, beschäftigte die besten Kunsthandwerker, die er gegebenenfalls aus dem Felde holte und, immer mit dem Verweis auf die Wünsche des « Führers » , « u.k. » (« unabhömmlich ») stellen ließ. Nur ein Beispiel sei angeführt, die sog. « Sankt Florianer Tafel » : Um hohe Gäste standesgemäß bewirten zu können, gab Glasmeier 1944 die Ausstattung einer kompletten Festtafel für 60 Personen in Auftrag : ein Tafelservice aus edelstem Porzellan, das die Wiener Porzellanmanufaktur nach dem Vorbild des Hochzeits-Services von Maria Theresia herstellen sollte, ein vergoldetes Silberbesteck, dem Mundbesteck Kaiser Franz' I. nachgebildet, ein komplettes Gläserservice, dazu Leuchter, Terrinen, Vasen, Fruchtteller, feinste Tischwäsche, eben alles, was zu einer barocken höfischen Tafel gehörte. Es wurden großzügige Anzahlungen geleistet, allein für das Porzellan 80.000 Reichsmark. Ein Teil des Porzellans (56 Teile für 12 Personen) wurde tatsächlich fertiggestellt und hat den Krieg überdauert. Es wurde im Jahre 2001 mit einem Schätzwert von 25.000 Euro auf einer Wiener Auktion angeboten.

Daß das Gehabe und der Lebensstil Glasmeiers vor dem Hintergrund der Kriegssituation der Jahre 1943-1944

Befremden hervorrief und Grundlage für allerlei Legenden gab, kann nicht überraschen. Hiervon sind auch alle zeitgenössischen Berichte sowie die nach dem Krieg entstandenen rückblickenden Erinnerungen seiner Mitarbeiter durchdrungen, so daß der Wahrheitsgehalt vieler Glasmeier-Anekdoten nur schwer nachprüfbar ist. Die Frage, die sich dem heutigen Betrachter aufdrängt, nämlich die, wie dies eigentlich möglich war, haben sich auch die Zeitgenossen schon gestellt. Es gibt darauf nur eine Antwort : Glasmeier genoß das volle Vertrauen Hitlers und verstand es, diesem in der Trostlosigkeit der Kriegereignisse eine Illusion für die Zeit nach dem siegreichen Ende des Krieges, an den Glasmeier offensichtlich bis zum Schluß fest glaubte, zu vermitteln. Mit dem Hinweis auf den angeblichen Willen des « Führers » setzte Glasmeier seine Pläne immer wieder gegen alle Widersacher durch. Man scheute sich offenbar, sich ernsthaft dagegen zu stellen, weil man wußte, wie sehr der Ausbau Sankt Florians zu einem kulturellen Zentrum ersten Ranges dem Wunsche Hitlers entsprach. Hierzu paßt ein Gerücht, das der Dolmetscherin des Großmufti von Jerusalem, der Sankt Florian im Dezember 1944 einen Besuch abgestattet hatte, zu Ohren gekommen war : Hitler beabsichtige, so wurde ihr berichtet, Sankt Florian später einmal zu seinem Altersruhesitz zu machen. Auch wenn dieses Gerücht möglicherweise keinerlei realen Hintergrund hatte, gibt es einen Hinweis darauf, wie sich die Umgebung die unglaublichen Vorgänge in Sankt Florian in den letzten Monaten vor dem für jedermann absehbaren Zusammenbruch zu erklären versuchte.

In die Sankt Florianer Zeit fällt noch eine weitere merkwürdige Episode im Wirken Glasmeiers: Am 5. November 1943 sandte ihn Goebbels als Bevollmächtigten des Reichsministers für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda nach Frankreich und übertrug ihm dort die Erledigung aller Angelegenheiten seines Ressorts. Er informierte den Chef des OKW (Oberkommando der Wehrmacht) Generalfeldmarschall Keitel in einem Schreiben über seine Anordnung und forderte ihn auf, die Militärbefehlshaber in Frankreich hiervon in Kenntnis zu setzen. Hintergrund war offenbar ein Machtkampf zwischen Goebbels und der Wehrmacht, die die Propaganda im besetzten Frankreich an das Auswärtige Amt übertragen wollte, um sie de facto selbst in der Hand zu behalten : Dieser Absicht bin ich durch meine Entsendung Glasmeiers zuvorgekommen. Jetzt kommt Keitel auf den typischen Ausweg, die Frage einer Entscheidung des Führers zu unterbreiten. Um diese Entscheidung ist mir nicht bange, notierte Goebbels am 24. November 1943 in seinem Tagebuch, wobei diese Bemerkung ein weiterer Beleg für die Hochschätzung Glasmeiers sowohl durch Goebbels als auch durch Hitler ist. Glasmeier begab sich umgehend nach Paris. Sein dortiges Wirken hat, soweit bisher erkennbar, nur wenig Spuren in den Akten hinterlassen. Im zeitigen Frühjahr scheint er wieder nach Berlin beziehungsweise Sankt Florian zurückgekehrt zu sein, vielleicht auch aus privaten Gründen, da sein jüngstes Kind und einziger Sohn Elmar am 13. März im Alter von nur fünf Jahren plötzlich verstorben war. Hintergründe und nähere Umstände dieser Mission liegen bisher noch weitgehend im dunkeln.

Ganz anders hatte sich Glasmeiers Verhältnis zum Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler entwickelt : Hatte dieser ihm im Frühjahr 1943 noch ein Geburtstagsgeschenk zukommen lassen, so ließ er einen Antrag Goebbels', Glasmeier im Hinblick auf seine neue wichtige Aufgabe in Frankreich vom SS-Oberführer (das entsprach dem Range eines Oberst) zum SS-Brigadeführer (Generalmajor) zu befördern, brüsk zurückweisen: Der Reichsführer SS halte Glasmeier einer Beförderung nicht für würdig, wurde dem Minister von Himmlers Büro kurz und bündig mitgeteilt.

Im Laufe des Jahres 1944 wurde das Wirken Glasmeiers in Sankt Florian auch für seine engsten Mitarbeiter immer unheimlicher, weil es sich inzwischen als völlig wirklichkeitsfremd darstellte. Fischer bemerkt dazu rückblickend :

Schrecklich wurde es, als auch dem letzten die Binde von den Augen fallen mußte und der Mann im Prälatenzimmer des Stifts immer noch Porzellanmanufakturen, Restauratoren, Ebenisten, Teppichweber, Instrumentenbauer, Bildhauer und andere Künstler von Berlin, von Wien und (wenn mich die Erinnerung nicht täuscht) , sogar von Paris zu sich bat, um ein Projekt zu verwirklichen, dessen Zusammenhang mit dem Rundfunk immer fadenscheiniger wurde als « Schloßherr » von Hitlers Gnaden, dessen Träume in ihrer Extravaganz an die des Bayernkönig Ludwig erinnerten, obwohl bei ihm der Wille zur Einsamkeit und der Drang zur Geselligkeit in stetem Widerstreit miteinander standen.

Im Herbst des Jahres wurde auch Sankt Florian mehr und mehr von der schrecklichen Kriegswirklichkeit eingeholt. Am 11. Oktober gab das Bruckner-Orchester sein letztes Konzert, wenige Tage später belegte ein Sanitätspark der Heeresgruppe Südost das Stift. Obgleich Glasmeier immer noch große Pläne verfolgte (und andere hatte er einen prachtvollen Bildband und einen Film über Sankt Florian in Auftrag gegeben) fühlte er sich andererseits verpflichtet, in dieser Zeit einen persönlichen Beitrag zur Rettung des Reiches durch aktiven Kriegseinsatz leisten zu müssen. Oder war dies doch bereits Resignation ? Er beantragte jedenfalls, seine »u.k.-Stellung« als Reichsintendant aufzuheben, um in einer Einheit der Waffen-SS aktiven Kriegsdienst zu leisten. Am 8. November teilte er der Kanzlei des Reichsrundfunks in Berlin durch Fernschreiben mit, daß er auf dem Wege nach Ungarn zum Kriegseinsatz sei : Sieheil dem Führer ! endet das Schreiben.

Doch nun geschah etwas, was nur aus dem Gesamtzusammenhang dieses Geschehens erklärbar ist und dieses andererseits selbst erklärt: Als Hitler von dem Fronteinsatz Glasmeiers erfuhr, beorderte er ihn umgehend zurück mit dem ausdrücklichen Befehl, sich weiterhin ausschließlich um das Stift Sankt Florian zu kümmern. Bereits im Dezember war Glasmeier wieder dort, rechtzeitig genug, um den Großmufti von Jerusalem mit seinem Gefolge gebührend zu empfangen.

Damit war ihm die Gesamtverantwortung für das Stift ausdrücklich durch Hitler persönlich übertragen worden, auch gegenüber der Wehrmacht. Dies war in der Schlußphase des Krieges ganz besonders wichtig: Angeblich war Gauleiter Eigruber entschlossen, das Stift beim Einrücken des Feindes dem Erdboden gleichzumachen. Hierüber soll es zu einer heftigen Auseinandersetzung zwischen ihm und Glasmeier gekommen sein. Dieser begab sich daher Ende Februar 1945 ein letztes Mal nach Berlin, um einen direkten Befehl Hitlers zu erwirken, Sankt Florian vor jeder Zerstörung zu bewahren. Am 8. März teilte er Schwaiger von Berlin aus mit : Es steht alles gut in meinen Verhandlungen und ich hoffe, bald vollen Erfolg melden zu können. Hoffentlich halten Sie das Stift inzwischen in Ordnung ! Tatsächlich gelang es ihm nach hartnäckigen Bemühungen, von Bormann das gewünschte Schreiben auf Befehl des Führers zu erhalten. In diesem wurde seine alleinige Verantwortung für Sankt Florian bestätigt und angeordnet, daß das Stift mit allen Nebengebäuden vor Kriegseinwirkungen zu schützen und notfalls kampfflos und unversehrt dem Gegner zu übergeben sei. Anfang April kehrte Glasmeier nach Sankt Florian zurück. Von seinem Berliner Adjutanten Haaf hatte er sich mit der Bemerkung verabschiedet : Wir werden uns nicht wiedersehen. Einen Zusammenbruch, den von 1918, habe ich überlebt. Einen zweiten werde und will ich nicht überleben, zumal ich als Angehöriger der SS nichts Gutes zu erwarten habe.

Zum « Führergeburtstag » am 20. April 1945 plante er noch ein festliches Konzert, zu dem eine umfangreiche Gästeliste erstellt wurde, obgleich das Orchester durch Einberufungen inzwischen auf eine kleine Schar zusammengeschmolzen war. Am 5. Mai unterzeichnete er die letzte Zahlungsanweisung für seinen Architekten Franz

Schneider, die allerdings nicht mehr zu Ausführung kam, da der Einmarsch der Amerikaner unmittelbar bevorstand. Nach Augenzeugenberichten verließ er noch am gleichen Tag mit einem Wagen und einem Fahrer, angeblich mit Panzerfäusten und Maschinenpistolen bewaffnet, Sankt Florian, um sich an die Ostfront zur Leibstandarte Adolf Hitler zu begeben. In Kremsmünster und Graz soll er noch gesehen worden sein. Danach verliert sich die Spur. Alle in seiner unmittelbaren Umgebung gingen davon aus, daß er an der Front freiwillig den Tod gesucht habe. Seine Familie blieb zunächst in Sankt Florian zurück. Im Winter 1945-1946 wurde er amtlich für tot erklärt.

Bei der Vielfältigkeit seiner Wirkungsfelder und der Gegensätzlichkeit seiner Charakterzüge ist es kaum möglich, eine einheitliche Bewertung seiner Persönlichkeit vorzunehmen. Die letzten Lebensjahre, in denen er zwischen Berlin und Sankt Florian pendelte, sind zweifellos die bemerkenswertesten : Auf der einen Seite ein geradezu naives Vertrauen in den « Führer » und ein noch naiverer Glaube an den Sieg bis unmittelbar vor dem bitteren Ende und auf der anderen Seite der Aufbau eines kulturellen Zentrums, das in kurzer Zeit auf dem Wege war, sich zu einer der ersten Kulturadressen in Europa zu entwickeln, zweifellos eine konzeptionelle und organisatorische Meisterleistung. Ob ohne ihn das Stift Sankt Florian tatsächlich zerstört worden wäre, mag dahingestellt bleiben. An seinem unermüdlichen Einsatz für die Erhaltung dieses Kleinods abendländischer Klosterkultur besteht dagegen kein Zweifel.

Wesentlich zurückhaltender hingegen wird man sein Wirken als Rundfunkintendant bewerten. Hier fehlte ihm offenkundig das nötige Fachwissen, sicherlich auch weitgehend die Führungskompetenz für ein so großes Unternehmen.

Am nachhaltigsten waren aber zweifellos die zehn Jahre seines Wirkens als Adelsarchivar und Leiter der Archivberatungsstelle in Westfalen. Hier hat er durch unermüdlichen Einsatz, Ideenreichtum, Organisationstalent und Verbundenheit mit der Geschichte und Kultur Westfalens Initiativen entfaltet, die dauerhaft Bestand hatten: die Sensibilisierung der Öffentlichkeit für den Wert der privaten, kommunalen und kirchlichen Archive sowie die Entwicklung der Strukturen einer systematischen Archivpflege in privater und kommunaler Trägerschaft. Diese Ideen konnten in den nachfolgenden Jahrzehnten fortentwickelt werden und prägen die westfälische Archivlandschaft noch heute. Auch der von ihm ins Leben gerufene Adelsarchivverein besteht seit mehr als 80 Jahren fort. Ohne Heinrich Glasmeier (das darf wohl unterstellt werden) gäbe es die nichtstaatliche Archivpflege im Bundesland Nordrhein-Westfalen in ihrer heute als vorbildlich angesehenen Weise vermutlich nicht. Die Spuren, die er in zahlreichen westfälischen Archiven hinterlassen hat, sind so deutlich, daß sie noch lange, vielleicht sogar auf Dauer, sichtbar bleiben werden. Aber auch wenn nichts in den Quellen darauf hindeutet, daß er persönlich an Verbrechen des nationalsozialistischen Regimes beteiligt war, ist seine Verstrickung in dieses Regime dennoch so eng, daß sich eine positive Gesamtwürdigung seiner Persönlichkeit und seiner Arbeit verbietet.

Archivalische Quellen

Archiv des Landschaftsverbandes Westfalen-Lippe : Nachlaß Glasmeier.

Bestand 712 (Registratur Westfälisches Archivamt) .

Depositum Vereinigte Westfälische Adelsarchive, Vereinsregistratur.

Bundesarchiv

Bestand R 55 Propagandaministerium.

Bestand R 43 I und 43 II Reichskanzlei.

Bestand R 73 Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft.

BDC (ehemals Berlin Dokument Center, Akte Glasmeier) .

Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, HA I : Rep. 178 II, Nummer 37 (Archivgesetz) .

Stiftsarchiv Sankt Florian : Akten Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft, Nachlaßsplitter Glasmeier.

Gedruckte Quellen

Westfälisches Adelsblatt. Monatsblatt der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive, Jahrgang I (1924) bis 10 (1939) .

Die Tagebücher von Josef Gœbbels. Sämtliche Fragmente, herausgeber von Elke Fröhlich, Teil I : 1924-1941, 4 Bände und Registerband. München (1987) . Teil II, 12 Bände, München (1993-1996) .

Schriften von Heinrich Glasmeier : Das Geschlecht von Merveldt zu Merfeld : Ein Beitrag zur Familien- und Standesgeschichte der Münsterschen Ritterschaft. Dissertation (1920) , gedruckt in : Westfälisches Adelsblatt Jahrgang 8 (1931) ; Seiten 1-84.

Vom Westfälischen Archivwesen, in : Minerva-Zeitschrift Nummer 3 (1927) ; Seiten 126-130.

Vom nichtstaatlichen Archivwesen Westfalens, in : Archivalische Zeitschrift Nummer 39 (1930) ; Seiten 81-113.

Die Archivberatungsstelle der Provinz Westfalen und ihr Ausbau zu einem Landesarchivamt. Denkschrift im Auftrag der Provinz Westfalen (1930) .

Die in den deutschen Archiven verwendeten Methoden zur Aufbewahrung von Urkunden, in : Archivstudien. Festschrift für Woldemar Lippert, Dresden (1931) ; Seiten 103-107.

Freiherr vom Stein. Sein Leben und Wirken, in : Bildwiedergaben ausgewählter Urkunden und Akten, Münster (1931) .

Geschichte des Kürassierregiments von Driesen (Westphalen) Nummer 4, Oldenburg (1932) .

Westfälische Wasserburgen, Dortmund (1932) .

Archivpflege und Rundfunk, in : Richard Kolb und Heinrich Siedemeyer. Rundfunk und Film im Dienst nationaler Kultur, Düsseldorf (1933) ; Seiten 409-413.

Die Reichs-Rundfunk-G.m.b.H. , in : Handbuch des Deutschen Rundfunks (1938) , herausgeber von Hans-Joachim Weinbrenner, Heidelberg-Berlin (1938) ; Seiten 18-20.

Daneben diverse Beiträge im Westfälischen Adelsblatt.

Literatur

Birgit Bernard. Die Amtseinführung des ersten NS-Intendanten des Westdeutschen Rundfunks, Heinrich Glasmeier, durch Josef Goebbels am 24.04.1939, in : Geschichte in Köln, Heft 48 (2001) ; Seiten 105-134.

Derselbe. Von der Wasserburg zum Sendesaal - die kuriose Karriere des Doktor Heinrich Glasmeier, in : Heimatkalender der Herrlichkeit Lembeck und Stadt Dorsten Nummer 61 (2002) ; Seiten 147-151.

Wilhelm Buschkötter. Musik im alten WDR, in : Aus Köln in die Welt. Beiträge zur Rundfunkgeschichte. (Annalen des Westdeutschen Rundfunks, Nummer 2) , herausgeber von Walter Forst, Köln (1974) ; Seiten 47-86.

Norbert Fasse. Vom Adelsarchiv zur NS-Propaganda. Der symptomatische Lebenslauf des Reichsrundfunkintendanten Heinrich Glasmeier (1892-1945) . (Schriftenreihe des Jüdisches Museum Westfalen, Nummer 2) , Bielefeld (2001) .

Eugen Kurt Fischer. Das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Rundfunks im Dritten Reich, in : « Publizistik » Nummer 5 (1960) ; Seiten 159-164.

Oskar Haaf. Meine Leidenschaft war der Rundfunk, (Beim Gongschlag ... , Band 1) , München (1983) .

Dieter Heimann. Die Reichssender-Zeit. Rückblick und Chronik II (1933-1945) , in : Aus Köln in die Welt. Beiträge zur Rundfunkgeschichte, herausgeber von Walter Forst. (Annalen des Westdeutschen Rundfunks, Nummer 2) , Köln (1974) ; Seiten 231-270.

Karl Holzamer. Als Redakteur in den dreißiger Jahren, in : Aus Köln in die Welt. Beiträge zur Rundfunkgeschichte, herausgeber von Walter Forst. (Annalen des Westdeutschen Rundfunks, Nummer 2) , Köln (1974) ; Seiten 87-104.

Franz Herberhold. Archivpflege - wesenhafter Bestand der landschaftlichen Kulturpflege, in : Selbstverwaltung einer Landschaft. Initiativen und Aufgaben am Beispiel Westfalens, Stuttgart (1967) ; Seiten 133-176.

Hanns Kreczi. Das Brucknerstift Sankt Florian und das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (1942-1945) , Graz (1986) .

Karl Rehberger. Die Stifte Oberösterreichs unter dem Hakenkreuz, in : Das Bistum Linz im Dritten Reich, herausgeber von Rudolf Zinnhobler, Linz (1979) ; besonders Seiten 244-294.

Norbert Reimann. Die Sorge um die Archive als Aufgabe der landschaftlichen Kulturpflege in Westfalen. Geschichtlicher Rückblick und gegenwärtiger Stand, in : Der Märker Nummer 45 (1996) ; Seiten 139-153.

Derselbe. Die Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive eingetragener Verein, in : Adelsarchive in Westfalen, bearb. von Wolfgang Bockhorst, Münster (1998) ; Seiten IX-X.

Derselbe. Kulturgutschutz und Hegemonie - Die Bemühungen der staatlichen Archive um ein Archivalienschutzgesetz in Deutschland 1921 bis 1972. (Manuskriptdruck des Westfälischen Archivamtes) , Münster (2003) .

Christa Wiebrand. Privatarchipflege in Westfalen am Beispiel der « Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive eingetragener Verein » . Diplomarbeit am Fachbereich Archiv-Bibliothek-Dokumentation der FH, Potsdam (2001) .

La Radio du Peuple

Le « Volksempfänger » , littéralement : récepteur (« Empfänger ») du peuple (« Volk ») , était un poste de radio, conçu, à l'instigation de Josef Gœbbels, par Otto Griessing au sein de l'entreprise de Georg Seibt. L'appareil, sous le modèle VE301, fut présenté publiquement pour la Ire fois à l'occasion de l'Exposition internationale de radiodiffusion à Berlin qui s'est tenue le 18 août 1933. Le boîtier en « bakelite » du VE301 avait été mis au point par Walter Maria Kersting. Le prix de vente prévu était de 76 « Reichsmarks » pour la version de l'appareil fonctionnant sur le secteur, et de 65 « Reichsmarks » pour celle alimentée par piles.

Le « Volksempfänger » est le seul produit parmi la série de projets de propagande (comme la voiture « KdF » ; le téléviseur « Deutscher Einheits-Fernseh-Empfänger EI » ; le réfrigérateur « Volkskühlschrank » ; ou l'unité de logement « Volkswohnung ») , à avoir atteint la production en série et à avoir été fabriqué en quantité notable.

L'objectif du « Volksempfänger » était de permettre à l'ensemble des familles d'écouter la radio, afin que la propagande national-socialiste pût désormais atteindre chaque foyer.

Les fabricants, au départ, manifestaient quelque réticence, car ils craignaient de voir baisser fortement les chiffres de vente des appareils de marque qu'ils avaient vendus jusque-là, et qui étaient au moins 2 fois plus chers. Ces craintes s'avèrent infondées, et l'on assista au plus à une stagnation de la vente des appareils de marque. Étant donné que l'industrie travaillait, lors de la fabrication du « Volksempfänger » , avec une marge bénéficiaire très faible, tributaire dans une large mesure de l'évolution du prix des tubes utilisés, les conséquences économiques du « Volksempfänger » furent ambivalentes. D'une part, quelques petits fabricants de matériel radio furent incapables de respecter les prix plafonnés imposés par le pouvoir politique, de sorte que plusieurs de ces fabricants firent faillite ou furent absorbées par des concurrents plus grands ; mais, d'autre part, le nombre des auditeurs de radio s'accrut fortement, abstraction

faite d'un léger fléchissement en 1935 et 1936. Cette évolution est sans conteste due à l'introduction du modèle bas de gamme VE 301, peu coûteux, puis, à partir de 1938, du modèle DKE38, le « Deutscher Kleinempfänger » (littéralement : petit récepteur allemand, au surnom populaire de « Gœbbelsschnauze » : museau de Gœbbels) . Pour le DKE38, il avait même été mis au point un tube multiple spécial (2 systèmes électriques réunis dans une enveloppe commune) , le VCL11, grâce auquel le prix put être réduit à 35 « Reichsmarks » .

Les 100,000 lers appareils furent déjà vendus pendant que se tenait encore l'Exposition internationale de radiophonie de Berlin, en 1933. Des différentes variétés du « Volksempfänger » , il fut vendu au total plusieurs millions d'exemplaires. Des augmentations notables du nombre d'auditeurs furent notées d'abord en 1937, consécutivement à une campagne publicitaire intensive menée par le ministère de la propagande, puis à partir de 1939. Ce qui, dans ce dernier cas, apparaît avoir surtout joué un rôle est l'existence au sein de la population allemande, à l'éclatement de la Guerre, d'un puissant besoin d'informations, que l'on voulait assouvir au moyen de la radio.

Cependant, un autre aspect important de la politique radiophonique nazie était que, parallèlement à la diffusion massive de ce moyen de communication que les appareils peu coûteux « Volksempfänger » et « Deutscher Kleinempfänger » rendaient possible, le nombre d'auditeurs soumis à la redevance radio dans le « Reich » s'était accru à proportion ; en 1943, lorsqu'il était à son faîte, ce nombre s'élevait à quelque 16 millions de personnes qui, chaque mois, s'acquittaient d'une redevance de 2 « Reichsmarks » . De ces recettes, une part moindre allait à la « Deutsche Reichspost » , tandis que le reste alimentait les caisses de la Société radiophonique du « Reich » (« Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft » , ou RRG) et, surtout, celles du ministère de la propagande, qui prélevait dans l'argent de la redevance la plus grande part de son budget.

(Photo) Distribution de 500 exemplaires du « Volksempfänger » à l'occasion de l'anniversaire de Josef Gœbbels, en 1938, au centre radiophonique de Berlin, par le « Gaupropagandaleiter » (chef de propagande) Werner Wächter (à droite sur la photo, portant un brassard à croix gammée) .

La désignation VE301 est formée de l'abréviation VE (pour « Volksempfänger ») , avec adjonction du nombre 301, évocation de la date du 30 janvier 1933, jour de la prise de pouvoir par Adolf Hitler.

Le « Volksempfänger » était un appareil de conception et d'exécution techniques fort simples, destiné à capter les ondes moyennes et longues (que l'on désignait initialement encore par ondes resp. , courtes et longues) . Il devait, au minimum, assurer la réception de la radio nationale et d'une station de radio supplémentaire, et ce, dans l'Allemagne entière. La légende selon laquelle le « Volksempfänger » ne permettait pas de capter de stations étrangères mène une vie tenace jusqu'à nos jours ; pourtant, il ressort des descriptions et écrits contemporains de cette époque que les principales stations de radio étrangères pouvaient bien être écoutées avec le « Volksempfänger » .

Aussi, à l'éruption de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, la menace de sanctions draconiennes, pouvant aller jusqu'à la peine de mort, fut-elle brandie par le ministre de la propagande Josef Gœbbels, dans le cadre d'un décret portant mesures d'exception relatives à la radiodiffusion, en cas d'écoute d'émetteurs ennemis - au 1er rang desquels le service de langue allemande de la « BBC » de Londres.

Le « Volksempfänger » se mua bientôt en un des principaux outils de propagande des Nationaux-Socialistes au pouvoir : les discours de Hitler étaient retransmis à la radio, les annonceurs s'évertuaient à ré-interpréter en victoires les pertes et défaites subies par l'Allemagne après le tournant de la Guerre, et on se servait de la radio pour invoquer et attiser la volonté de sacrifice et l'abnégation du peuple allemand. Toutefois, à mesure que la réalité des bombardements et des importantes pertes militaires, dues en particulier à la Guerre à l'Est, ne se recoupaient plus avec le contenu des bulletins d'information, l'effet persuasif de l'instrument radiophonique devait s'amenuiser progressivement.

Le « Volksempfänger » du type VE301W était équipé de 3 tubes électroniques : 1 triode REN904 en détectrice à réaction ; 1 tube RES164 de puissance ; et 1 redresseur RGN354. Par l'effet de réaction du REN904, on obtenait la sensibilité nécessaire. Le haut-parleur était un transducteur de haute impédance, dont le fonctionnement était bon mais qui produisait un son de qualité médiocre.

D'autres appareils sont venus plus tard s'ajouter à la famille des « Volksempfänger » : le « Arbeitsfrontempfänger » DAF1011 (DAF est l'acronyme de « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » : Front allemand du Travail) ; 2 Olympiakoffer (DOK36 et DOK37) ; le « Deutsche Kleinempfänger » DKE38 ; puis également, en 1938, une version actualisée du « Volksempfänger » proprement dit : le VE301 Dyn. La question est discutée de savoir s'il est approprié d'appliquer l'appellation « Volksempfänger » aux appareils autres que les types VE301 ; « Gemeinschaftsempfänger » (traduit grossièrement par : récepteur radio collectif) serait sans doute une désignation plus adéquate.

Déjà, le VE301 Dyn renfermait, outre 1 tube haute fréquence plus sensible, 1 haut-parleur électro-dynamique. Mais un peu auparavant, en 1937, le modèle originel (le VE301) avait été légèrement mis à niveau, puis offert à la vente sous la désignation VE301 Wn (Wn étant le code de « Wechselstrom neu » : courant alternatif nouveau type) . À la différence du modèle d'origine, cet appareil était doté d'un syntonisateur à réglage variable et présentait, grâce à la pentode AF7, un seuil audion amélioré, propre à accroître la sensibilité. L'aspect extérieur de l'appareil avait, en revanche, à peine été modifié ; le seul changement était la localisation des prises d'antenne (3 pour l'antenne ; 1 pour la prise de terre) , lesquelles ne se trouvaient désormais plus sur le côté du boîtier, mais sur le panneau arrière.

...

The Volksempfänger (German for « people's receiver ») was a range of radio receivers developed by engineer Otto Griessing at the request of Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels.

The purpose of the « Volksempfänger » program was to make radio reception technology affordable to the general public. Josef Gœbbels realized the great propaganda potential of this relatively new medium and, thus, considered widespread availability of receivers highly-important.

The original « Volksempfänger » VE301 model was presented on August 18, 1933, at the « 10. Große Deutsche Funkausstellung » , in Berlin. The VE301 was available at a readily affordable price of 76 German « Reichsmarks »

(equivalent of 2 weeks' average salary) , and a cheaper 35 « Reichsmarks » model, the DKE38 (sometimes called by the general public « Gœbbels-Schnauze » - Gœbbels' Snout) fitted with a multi-section tube, was also later produced, along with a series of other models under the « Volksempfänger » ; « Gemeinschaftsempfänger » ; « KdF » (« Kraft durch Freude ») ; « DKE » (« Deutscher Kleinempfänger ») ; and other brands.

The « Volksempfänger » was designed to be produced as cheaply as possible, as a consequence they generally lacked short-wave bands and did not follow the practice, common at the time, of marking the approximate dial positions of major European stations on its tuning scale. Only German and Austrian stations were marked and cheaper models only listed arbitrary numbers. Sensitivity was limited to reduce production costs further, so long as the set could receive « Deutschlandsender » and the local « Reichssender » , it was considered sensitive enough, although foreign stations could be easily received after dark with an external antenna.

Listening to foreign stations became a criminal offence in Nazi Germany when the War began while, in some occupied territories, such as Poland, all radio listening by non-German citizens was outlawed (later, in the War, this prohibition was extended to a few other occupied countries coupled with mass seizures of radio sets) . Penalties ranged from fines and confiscation of radios to, particularly later in the War, sentencing to a concentration camp or capital punishment. Nevertheless, such clandestine listening was widespread in many Nazi-occupied countries and (particularly later, in the War) in Germany itself. The Germans also attempted radio jamming of some enemy stations with limited success.

Much has been said about the efficiency of the « Volksempfänger » as a propaganda tool. Most famously, Hitler's architect and Minister for Armaments and War Production, Albert Speer, said in his final speech at the Nuremberg trials :

« Hitler's dictatorship differed in one fundamental point from all its predecessors in history. His was the 1st dictatorship which made the complete use of all technical means for domination of its own country. Through technical devices like the radio and loudspeaker, 80 million people were deprived of independent thought. It was, thereby, possible to subject them to the will of one man. »

However, despite Speer's claim, both Mussolini's Italy and Stalin's Russia had used radio as a tool to influence the masses long before Hitler's rise to power.

The 1944-1945 British Utility Radio or Civilian Receiver was an equivalent of the « Volksempfänger » . It was produced to a standard government approved design by a consortium of manufacturers using standard components. Sensitivity was extremely limited and no provision for a long-wave band or external antenna was provided.

...

Der Volksempfänger (auch Gemeinschaftsempfänger genannt) war ein Radioapparat für den Empfang von Mittelwellenrundfunk und Langwellenrundfunk, der im Auftrag von Reichspropagandaleiter Josef Gœbbels entwickelt wurde und wenige Monate nach der Machtergreifung Adolf Hitlers 1933 vorgestellt wurde. Er gilt als eines der

wichtigsten Propagandainstrumente der nationalsozialistischen Machthaber.

Das erste Modell VE301 wurde von Otto Griessing bei der Firma Doktor Georg Seibt entwickelt. Vorgestellt wurde es im August 1933 auf der 10. Großen Deutschen Funkausstellung in Berlin. Das Design des Gehäuses aus Bakelit stammte von Walter Maria Kersting. Der vorgeschriebene Preis der Version für den Betrieb am Stromnetz betrug 76 Reichsmark (entspricht nach heutiger Kaufkraft und inflationsbereinigt 316 Euro) ; eine batteriebetriebene Version kostete 65 Reichsmark. Es gab auch den VE301G für den Anschluß an die damals noch verbreiteten Gleichspannungsnetze und die sogenannten Allstromgeräte für Gleich-/Wechselspannung VE301GW, VE301dynGW (dynamischer Lautsprecher) und DKE38 (Deutscher Kleinempfänger) .

Der Volksempfänger war das einzige Produkt aus einer Reihe von Propagandaprojekten wie dem KdF-Wagen, dem Deutschen Einheits-Fernseh-Empfänger E 1, dem Volkskühlschrank oder der Volkswohnung, das in die Serienfertigung gelangte und auch in nennenswerter Stückzahl produziert wurde. Er sollte es jeder Familie ermöglichen, Rundfunk zu hören, um so für die NS-Propaganda erreichbar zu sein. Die Herstellerfirmen waren ursprünglich sehr skeptisch, da sie befürchteten, der Absatz der bisher verkauften und mindestens doppelt so teuren Markenempfangsgeräte würde stark zurückgehen.

Die Absatzzahlen für die teuren Markengeräte stiegen nicht, sie stagnierten. Da die Industrie bei der Herstellung des Volksempfängers mit sehr kleinen Gewinnspannen arbeitete, die in hohem Maße von der Preisentwicklung der verwendeten Röhren abhingen, blieben die ökonomischen Konsequenzen des Volksempfängers ambivalent. Einerseits waren einige kleine Rundfunkfirmen nicht in der Lage, die staatlich auferlegten Preisgrenzen zu halten, so daß mehrere dieser Firmen in Konkurs gingen oder von größeren Konkurrenten übernommen wurden. Andererseits stiegen die Teilnehmerzahlen des Rundfunks mit Ausnahme einer geringen Verlangsamung 1935-1936 steil an. Diese Entwicklung ist auf die Einführung der günstigen Einsteigermodelle VE 301 beziehungsweise ab 1938 des « Deutschen Kleinempfängers » DKE38 (im Volksmund auch « Gœbbelsschnauze » genannt) zurückzuführen. Für den DKE38 wurde sogar die spezielle Verbundröhre (zwei elektrische Systeme in einem gemeinsamen Kolben) VCL11 entwickelt, mit deren Hilfe der Preis auf 35 Reichsmark gesenkt werden konnte. Als Gleichrichterröhre fungierte im DKE38 eine VY2.

Schon auf der Großen Deutschen Funkausstellung 1933 wurde der Volksempfänger am 18. August vorgestellt und während der Ausstellung die ersten 100.000 Geräte verkauft. Insgesamt wurden in den verschiedenen Varianten mehrere Millionen Exemplare der Volksempfänger verkauft. Signifikante Zunahmen der Hörerzahlen waren 1937 als Ergebnis intensiver Hörerwerbung durch das Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda und ab 1939 wegen des Kriegsausbruchs zu verzeichnen.

Ein weiterer wichtiger Aspekt der NS-Rundfunkpolitik war, daß durch die massenhafte Verbreitung des Mediums « Rundfunk » mit Hilfe der kostengünstigen « Volks- » beziehungsweise « Deutschen Kleinempfänger » auch die Zahl der Gebühren zahlenden Rundfunkhörer im Reich sukzessive stieg. Ihre Zahl belief sich zum Höchststand 1943 auf rund 16 Millionen Personen, die pro Monat zwei Reichsmark Gebühren bezahlten. Von diesen Gebühreneinnahmen ging ein kleinerer Teil an die Deutsche Reichspost, der Rest floss an die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft (RRG) und vor allem das Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda, das mittels der Gebühreneinnahmen den Löwenanteil seines

Haushaltes bestritt.

Verteilung von 500 Kleinempfängern (DKE38) im Oktober 1938 anlässlich von Goebbels' 41. Geburtstag im Berliner Funkhaus durch Gaupropagandaleiter Werner Wächter (rechts, mit Hakenkreuz-Armbinde) .

1935 : Geschäfte schließen, damit eine Hitler-Rede gehört werden kann.

Die Bezeichnung VE301 entstand aus der Abkürzung VE für Volksempfänger sowie der 301 als Erinnerung an den 30. Januar 1933, den Tag der Machtergreifung Hitlers.

Der Volksempfänger war ein technisch sehr einfach ausgeführtes Gerät für Mittelwelle und Langwelle, zunächst noch mit Kurz- und Langwelle bezeichnet. Er sollte im ganzen Deutschen Reich mindestens den Empfang des Deutschlandsenders und eines weiteren Programms ermöglichen. Die Legende, daß mit dem Volksempfänger keine ausländischen Stationen empfangen werden konnten, hält sich bis heute hartnäckig. Berichte aus der zeitgenössischen Literatur zeigen, daß mit dem Volksempfänger je nach Standort und Tageszeit auch ausländische Sender mindestens zeitweise empfangen werden konnten. Besonders war dies zu den Nachtstunden möglich, in denen aufgrund der Raumwelle die Reichweite vergrößert ist.

Die Qualität des Empfanges der ausländischen Sender war bei den teureren Konkurrenzprodukten allerdings besser.

Aus diesem Grunde wurden von Reichspropagandaminister Josef Goebbels bei Ausbruch des Zweiten Weltkrieges in einer Verordnung über außerordentliche Rundfunkmaßnahmen drakonische Strafandrohungen bis hin zur Todesstrafe für das Empfangen von « Feindsendern » (in erster Linie das deutsche Programm der BBC London) durchgesetzt.

Der Volksempfänger wurde zu einem der wichtigsten Propagandainstrumente der nationalsozialistischen Machthaber, in dem die Reden Hitlers übertragen und nach der Wende im Zweiten Weltkrieg Verluste und Niederlagen in Siege umgedeutet und der Opferwille des deutschen Volkes beschworen wurde. Je mehr jedoch die Realität von Bombenkrieg und hohen militärischen Verlusten insbesondere an der Ostfront nicht mehr mit den Sendeinhalten konform ging, nahm auch die Beeinflussungswirkung des Mediums Rundfunk fortlaufend ab.

Der Volksempfänger des Modells VE301W war mit drei Röhren bestückt : Triode REN904 als Audion mit Rückkopplung, Endröhre RES164 und dem Netzgleichrichter RGN354. Durch die Rückkopplung in der Audion-Stufe wurde die notwendige Empfindlichkeit erreicht. Der Lautsprecher war ein hochohmiger Freischwinger mit gutem Wirkungsgrad, aber mäßigem Klang. Die Volksempfänger gelten als typische Vertreter der Einkreisempfänger aus der Familie der Geradeusempfänger.

Der VE 301 Dyn enthielt neben einer empfindlicheren HF-Röhre auch schon einen elektrodynamischen Lautsprecher. Schon etwas früher (nämlich 1937) wurde das ursprüngliche Modell (VE301) leicht überarbeitet und dann unter der Bezeichnung VE301 Wn (Wn für « Wechselstrom neu ») angeboten. Im Gegensatz zum Urmodell besaß dieses Gerät keine Käfigspule, sondern eine variabel einstellbare Abstimmspule. Darüber hinaus wurde eine bessere Audionstufe (mit

der Pentode AF7) , die die Empfindlichkeit verbesserte, verbaut. Äußerlich veränderte sich das Gerät kaum. Lediglich die Antennenanschlüsse (3 x Antenne ; 1 x Erde) befanden sich nun nicht mehr seitlich am Gehäuse, sondern auf der Geräterückseite.

Die Volksempfänger lösten die damals noch sehr weitverbreiteten einfachen Detektorempfänger mit dem individuellen Kopfhörerempfang ab. Erst einige Jahre nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg wurden die meisten Volksempfänger zunächst durch die leistungsfähigeren Überlagerungsempfänger und den aufkommenden störungsärmeren UKW-Rundfunk und später durch neue Transistorgeräte abgelöst.

Später kamen zur Familie der Volksempfänger noch weitere Geräte, der deutsche Kleinempfänger DKE38, sowie 1938 auch eine aktualisierte Version des eigentlichen Volksempfängers - der VE301 Dyn hinzu. Ob die Geräte, außer den VE 301, zu Recht die Bezeichnung Volksempfänger tragen, ist umstritten ; Gemeinschaftsempfänger dürfte der korrekte Name sein.

Der Arbeitsfrontempfänger DAF1011 und die zwei Olympiakoffer (DOK36 und DOK37) sind ebenfalls sogenannte Volksempfänger. Diese Geräte sind auch als Geradeausempfänger, jedoch technisch aufwendiger als sogenannte Mehrkreisempfänger ausgeführt worden.

Für die Volksempfänger gab es als Zubehör verschiedene Sperrkreise und weitere Antennenanpassrichtungen und -umschalter. In der Regel wurden einfach nur ein langer Draht als sogenannte Langdrahtantenne oder T-Antennen für die Volksempfänger verwendet.

Mit einem Splitter, wie dem DWt 52 und dem Umschalter DDa 38, war es auch mit den Volksempfängern wie dem VE 301 G möglich, den Drahtfunk zu empfangen.

Nach dem sogenannten Anschluß Österreichs wurden in der Ostmark bei Eumig, Hornyphon, Ingelen, Kapsch, Minerva und Radione Volksempfänger gebaut, die auch im Rest des Reichs vertrieben wurden.

Im Generalgouvernement wurde der DKE, der Deutsche Kleinempfänger von Derufa in Warschau gebaut.

Les institutions musicales Linzoises après l' « Anschluß »

28 mai 1938 : Lors du « Reichsmusiktag » , le docteur Josef Goebbels proclame les « 10 principes de la création musicale germanique » :

« Ni le programme, la théorie et l'expérimentation, ni la structure déterminent l'essence de la musique. Son essence est la mélodie. La mélodie exalte le cœur et fortifie l'esprit. Comme avec n'importe quelle autre forme d'art, la musique est générée par des forces mystérieuses et profondes, prenant racines dans les caractères nationaux. La musique germanique et la musique juive sont opposées, à cause de leur nature, contradictoire l'une de l'autre. La bataille contre le judaïsme dans la musique germanique ne sera jamais abandonnée. La musique est le plus sensuel des arts.

Parce qu'elle parle plus au cœur et aux émotions qu'à la raison. Laissez-nous remercier Dieu de nous donner la capacité à écouter la musique, à l'expérimenter et à l'aimer passionnément. La musique est un art qui touche l'esprit plus profondément : il possède le pouvoir d'apaiser la peine et de bénir avec bonheur. Si la mélodie est l'origine de la musique, alors il s'ensuit que la musique pour le peuple ne peut pas s'épuiser elle-même dans les chorales ou les pastorales. Elle doit toujours retourner à la mélodie comme racine de son essence. Élever les trésors (de la musique) et les transmettre au peuple est notre devoir le plus important. Le langage des sons est quelque fois plus irrésistible que le langage des mots. Les grands Maîtres du passé sont par conséquent représentatifs de la majesté véritable de notre peuple. Pour maintenir et pour accroître la gloire et l'honneur de notre nation. »

11 juin 1938 : L'émission d'un décret du ministère de la Propagande du « Reich » , permet d'amorcer la restructuration de la vie musicale en Autriche.

Octobre 1938 : Les institutions musicales seront placées sous le parapluie de l'organisme du « Reich » , « NSG Kraft durch Freude » (KdF, La force par la joie) et, à partir du novembre 1939, de l'Office culturel municipal.

Les grandes Sociétés chorales traditionnelles, comme le chœur Bruckner (« Brucknerchor ») de Saint-Florian, vont craindre une dissolution forcée et la suspension de leurs concerts pour la saison en cours. Les autorités publiques seront fort inquiètes devant la suite des événements.

À partir de 1940-1941 : Augmentation la diffusion de récitals par des solistes et des ensembles de musique de chambre. Au Conservatoire Bruckner, on compte 3 quatuors à cordes et 1 « Collegium Musicum » .

Dès février 1941, la Chorale municipale, **jusqu'en 1943**, la Chorale académique allemande et, de **1943 à 1945**, le chœur Bruckner (« Brucknerchor ») de Saint-Florian seront aussi employés comme outil de propagande par la grande société de radiodiffusion allemande.

La défaite symphonique

Whatever the ambitions of ideologues and accomplices, the 3rd « Reich » did not usher in a triumphant era in the history of the Symphony commensurate with the achievements of Dmitri Shostakovich and Sergey Prokofiev, in the Soviet Union. With a political history stretching back to 1800, the Symphony might have dominated public musical life in the 3rd « Reich » . Adolf Hitler's fascination with Opera and Richard Wagner is only part of the reason it did not. After the Nazi consolidation of power, around 1935, and especially after the 1936 summer Olympics, composers and critics, and eventually Hitler himself, turned away from the genre of the Symphony or minimized its utility. Ideologues and technocrats no longer had to win the approval of ordinary Germans. A 1937 press memorandum from the Propaganda Ministry announced that « the inner political “ Kampfzeit ” has ended. The “ Führer ” has been successful in bringing an end to the War of all against all. » (« Kampf aller gegen alle ») : a reference to Thomas Hobbes' « Bellum omnium contra omnes » . The combative (« kämpferischer ») journalist of the past, to paraphrase the memorandum, need no longer look for occasions to go on the attack. The dominant concept is that of the good guy (« des ganzen Kerls ») . Thus was banished the ideological fervor that had motivated such writings as Karl Grunsky's

1933 book on « the struggle for German music », which warned of the « danger that music cripple the will ». Historically, he explained, emotional responses to music had often been enervating. By contrast, the greatest Masters of the past Century, he continued, citing Beethoven, Wagner, and Bruckner, « confront and call forth the fount of the will, even though, as a result, they alienate or leave some “ petit-bourgeois ” unmoved » .

L'Orchestre symphonique national-socialiste

August Kubizek explained how his close friend Adolf Hitler dreamed-up the idea of a « Mobile “ Reich ” Orchestra » or « “ Reich ” Symphony Orchestra » which was to tour German provinces and perform without charge.

In 1928, an Orchestra dedicated to promoting National-Socialist ideals was organized and, in 1931, it became, with Hitler's approval, a travelling National-Socialist Symphony Orchestra (« Nationalsozialistisches Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester ») .

...

Was wir jeden Tag erleben : Fest-Schrift zum 5jähr. Bestehen die NS.-Reichs-Symphonie-Orchesters, Herausgeber vom NS.-Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester (Celebration Concert for the 5th Anniversary of the NS « Reich » Symphony Orchestra) , editor Max W. Morstadt, Friedrich Bruckmann Verlag, München (1937) ; 31 pages.

The publication entitled « National-Socialist State Symphony Orchestra and Their Travels Throughout the “ Reich ” » (« NS-Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester erzählt von seinem Reisen durch Reichs ») contains wonderful photos of the Orchestra at work during many performances all over Nazi Germany (in famous music-halls and « Zirkus Krone » , before students and in factories for « KdF » members - « Kraft durch Freude ») , receptions by many famous Nazi dignitaries in fancy uniforms, reviews from many important Nazi newspapers, troubles while traveling from engagement to engagement, telegrams from the « Führer » , etc.

There is a great emphasis on the importance of music and culture for German youth and workers « Generalmusikdirektor » Franz Adam is shown in many photographs with members of the « HJ » (« Hitlerjugend ») and « BdM » (« Bund Deutscher Mäde ») . This rare over-sized Nazi publication ends with a recap of the 1st 5 years of the « NS-Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester » by Rudolf Heß.

Printed by « Friedrich Bruckmann Verlag » of Munich and originally sold for 1 « RM » (« Reichsmark ») , this example of the very rare « NS-Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester erzählt von seinem Reisen durch Reichs » still has the original pink advertising title-slip attached to the front cover. A few of the photos have light spots where, at one time, dampness must have stuck some of the pages lightly together, but in all around nice used condition. No foul odor at all. Anything connected with the Nazi Symphony Orchestra is very difficult to find today.

...

(The premiere of Richard Strauß's « Olympische Hymn » (Olympic Hymn) , a composition for orchestra and mixed chorus, was held on August 1, 1936, at the opening ceremonies of the 1936 Summer Olympics at the Olympic Stadium in Berlin, with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra augmented by the National-Socialist Symphony Orchestra and a chorus of 1,000 members attired in white.)

...

In 1932, the NSDAP founded a Party Orchestra, the National-Socialist Symphony Orchestra. Its 1st concert, as covered in the paper, featured the prelude to Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » . On its opening tour of 5 Bavarian towns under musical director, Franz Adam, it performed a program that included the Overture to « Tannhäuser » . According to the « Völkischer Beobachter » , at these concerts, one could really perceive « how great the effect of noble music is on simple “ Volk ” » comrades who, otherwise, had little opportunity to enjoy art » . The « artistic and (not least) the propagandistic success of 1st concert tour was powerful because anyone could see here that the movement was, in great measure, a cultural movement - indeed, the main cultural movement of the German Volk » . It was, above all, National-Socialism that would « fill the hearts of Volk comrades with love of German art and German character? » Committed to promoting the Party Orchestra, the « Völkischer Beobachter » encouraged readers to attend a subsequent Richard Wagner « Morning Celebration » , which was considered an important part of the Nazi campaign strategy , in 1932. In the middle of the « gigantic electoral battle for Reichs presidency of the German Volk » , it invited readers to this event because the Party « included the Muses on its chariot » - because, for Nazis, German music was not merely a form of entertainment, but daily bread for the soul :

« Come and eat, Germans, that you might be strong in battle ! »

This was the « meaning behind all the performances » of the National-Socialist Symphony Orchestra : the « significance of their concert tours through all of Germany » . In the Nazi movement, Germans were to « find the harmonies of German spirit, the edification of the German Masters, the spiritual unity of Germanness ! » . That was why « German Volk comrades » needed to go to the « Morning Celebration » and listen to heroic themes from « Siegfried » , « Lohengrin » , and « Tristan » .

These works would resonate with what they were all « sensing at this time of the election - the joy of victory and a feeling of spring » . In this spirit, Nazis would « rise and shine at the Morgenfeier » ! After the event, naturally, the paper ran a rave review of the performance :

« Comrade Kapellmeister Franz Adam has achieved what seemed to be completely impossible : selling-out the Zirkus for a musical Morgenfeier in a time of vicious anger and hatred. » His « courage and strength has succeeded in creating a National-Socialist weapon that has achieved a great and noble victory over anti-cultural and anti-German tendencies in music » . In addition to touting such triumphs, the paper devoted significant coverage to events put on by the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » . Its programs, which often included music by Wagner, were described as being « as German as you can possibly imagine » . Such Nazi-Wagnerian events were « important steps on the path to a genuine German culture » , because they showed that Germans had the right to « construct their culture on a 1,000

year old foundation, right in between Bolshevism and reaction » .

...

Der in München wirkende Komponist Franz Adam, dessen Vertonung von « Singet leise, leise, leise » aus dem Jahr 1908 stammt, wurde später Leiter des 1928 gegründeten « Neuen Münchner Tonkünstler orchesters » das 1931 unter dem Namen « Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester » neukonstituiert wurde und seine Konzerttätigkeit den propagandistischen Zwecken der Nationalsozialisten zur Verfügung stellte. Daß sich besonders für München viele solcher « Lebensläufe » aufzeigen lassen, liegt an der Sonderstellung, die München zukam, die « heilige deutsche Kunst weithin zu kündem. München als die « ausersehene Stadt » verfügte über ausreichend finanzielle Mittel, bedeutende und weniger bedeutende Musiker anzuziehen, um durch ihre Arbeit den Propagandaauftrag zu erfüllen.

Auf dem Wittelsbacherplatz intonierte das NS Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester unter Leitung von Franz Adam noch einmal ein Werk des von Hitler besonders verehrten Anton Bruckner, nun die 4. Sinfonie. Die Münchner Philharmoniker spielten ebenfalls in der Residenz auf (Franz Schubert, Overtüre Rosamunde ; Johannes Brahms, I. Sinfonie) . Chöre aus ganz Deutschland sangen auf weiteren zentralen Plätzen der Stadt, darunter der Kölner Männergesangs-verein, die Liederhalle Karlsruhe, der Stuttgarter Liederkranz, der Städtische Chor Augsburg, der Klagenfurter Frauengesangsverein sowie die BürgenSänger-Zunft eingetragener Verein.

Franz Adam

Deutsch Musikalische Berufe Dirigent, Kapellmeister, Musikredakteur, Komponist - Geboren 28. Dezember 1885 München ; Gestorben 21. September 1954 München.

Zeitgenössische Angaben Reichskapellmeister, Generalmusikdirektor, Sachbearbeiter für Musik in der NSDAP.

Leiter des NS-Reichs-Sinfonie-Orchesters, Druckstück betreffend seine Stellungnahme zur Bedeutung des Wortes « volkstümlich » und die Kulterbeflissenheit « des einfachen Mannes aus dem Volk » (1937) .

Wirkungsorte München, Berlin, Brüssel, Köln, Leipzig, Merseburg, Nürnberg, Trier, Weiden.

Beziehungen :

Felix Mottl (1856-1911) , Komponist.

Anton Beer-Walbrunn (1864-1929) , Komponist.

Kollegen :

Walter Theurer (vor 1934 - nach 1944) , Flötist.

Richard Staab (vor 1924-) , Pianist.

Hans Adolf Winter (1892-1981) , Dirigent.

Erich Kloß (1898-1967) , Pianist.

Karl List (1902-1971) , Musikredakteur.

Nachfolger :

Philipp Schiede (vor 1938 - nach 1940) , Violoncellist.

Netzwerk :

Walter Theurer (vor 1934 - nach 1944) , Flötist.

Anton Walch (vor 1899-1959) , Klarinettist.

Fritz Steinbach (1855-1916) , Dirigent.

Oscar Walcker (1869-1948) , Orgelbauer.

Bruno Walter (1876-1962) , Dirigent.

Hermann Wolfgang von Waltershausen (1882-1954) , Komponist.

Heinrich Walcker (vor 1948-) , Orgelbauer.

Ausbildung und Beruf

Franz Josef Johannes Maria Adam wurde am 28. Dezember 1885 als elftes Kind des Kunstmalers Emil Adam und der Schauspielerin Josefa Adam (geborene Wurmb) in der Schwanthalerstraße in München geboren. Nach einer mäßig erfolgreichen Schullaufbahn verließ Adam das Münchner Luitpold-Gymnasium 1903 in der siebten Klasse vorzeitig, um sich ebenda an der Königlichen Akademie der Tonkunst einzuschreiben. Adam studierte dort Klarinette bei Anton Walch (vor 1899-1959) und Klavier bei Anton Beer-Walbrunn (1864-1929) . 1905 beendete er sein Studium zunächst ohne einen Abschluß, nahm als Privatschüler jedoch weiterhin Klavier-, Kompositions- und Dirigierunterricht bei Beer-Walbrunn. 1908 trat er erneut in die Akademie ein und setzte seine Studien bis zum Abschluß 1910 bei Walch (Klarinette) und Beer-Walbrunn (Komposition) sowie bei Richard G'Schrey (Klavier) und Felix Mottl (Dirigieren) fort. Die Schülerschaft Adams bei Mottl wird in zahlreichen biographischen Darstellungen kolportiert. Daß Adam tatsächlich ein

Schüler Mottls war ist zwar nicht unwahrscheinlich, lässt sich aber zumindest anhand der Akademiezeugnisse oder anderer persönlicher Dokumente im Nachlaß nicht nachweisen (Hanke 2004, Seite 14f) . 1914-1915 erhielt Adam überdies privaten Kompositionsunterricht bei Fritz Steinbach (1855-1916) in München. Nach einem Engagement als Klarinettist bei den Wagner-Festspielen in München (1910) sowie als Korrepetitor in Altenburg (1911-1912) verfolgte er in den kommenden Jahren am Stadttheater Gießen (1912-1913) sowie bei den Kurorchestern in Bad Ems (1912) und Ragaz bei Sankt Gallen (1913-1922, mit Unterbrechung durch den Kriegsdienst als Freiwilliger des bayerischen Heeres im Ersten Weltkrieg) nun vornehmlich seine Karriere als Kapellmeister.

Am 9. September 1912 heiratete er die Pianistin Magdalena Nikisch. Aus der Ehe gingen zwei Kinder, Annemarie und Luitpold, hervor. Das Paar ließ sich Anfang der 1930er Jahre wieder scheiden. Wenig später lernte Adam seine zweite Frau Lieselotte Schmidt (Künstlername Berker) kennen, mit der er sich am 5. Dezember 1941 vermählte.

Ab 1924 widmete sich Adam offiziell als erster Kapellmeister der Deutschen Stunde in Bayern (später Bayerischer Rundfunk) dem Aufbau und der Leitung eines Münchner Rundfunkorchesters, vermutlich war er für den Münchner Rundfunk jedoch bereits seit der Gründung 1922 tätig. Gleichzeitig oblag ihm dort als künstlerischer Leiter die Programmgestaltung, bei der er sich während seiner Dienstzeit vor allem Werken deutscher Komponisten zuwandte (Hanke 2004, Seite 27) . Mit großer Breitenwirkung führte er dort überdies (erstmalig in Deutschland) die Übertragung vollständiger Symphoniekonzerte im Rundfunk durch.

Nach seinem unfreiwilligen Ausscheiden aus dem Rundfunk 1928 konnte er bereits im folgenden Jahr die Stellung als Kapellmeister des soeben von (Wilhelm ?) Knödseder (Hanke 2004, Seite 44) neu begründeten Münchner Tonkünstlerorchesters eingetragener Verein antreten, das aus der ebenfalls durch diesen ins Leben gerufenen Interessengemeinschaft süddeutscher Musiker eingetragener Verein hervorging. Auf Adams Bestreben entstand daraus wenige Jahre später das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester (NSRSO) , dem er bis zur Auflösung bei Kriegsende 1945 als Chefdirigent und künstlerischer Leiter vorstand.

Im neubegründeten Kulturrat der Stadt München übernahm Adam 1934-1935 die Abteilung Musik und Film, in deren Zuständigkeitsbereich auch die Münchner Philharmoniker fielen. Offensichtliches Desinteresse an dieser Aufgabe, sein umfassendes Engagement für das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester und seine diversen parteipolitischen Ämter hatten jedoch zur Folge, daß Adam in dieser Funktion weder intern noch in der Öffentlichkeit nachdrücklich in Erscheinung (Hermann 2003, Seite 99) trat.

Im August 1945 wurde Adam von den Alliierten in Garmisch-Partenkirchen aufgegriffen und verbrachte die anschließende, fast drei Jahre andauernde Internierungshaft in verschiedenen Lagern, unter anderem in Altenstadt, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Kaiserslautern und Regensburg. Es sollte ihm nicht gelingen, seine Karriere als Kapellmeister und Dirigent nach 1945 fortzusetzen. Die Internierung und sein äußerst schlechter Gesundheitszustand ließen in den folgenden Jahren alle Bemühungen um einen beruflichen Neustart scheitern, so daß Adam zusehends verarmte. 1949-1953 konnte er zwar noch eine Anstellung als Orchesterleiter und Musiktheorielehrer an einer Musikschule des amerikanischen Militärs in Dachau erlangen, blieb danach jedoch bis zu seinem Tod arbeitslos. Nach einem Schlaganfall starb er am 21. September 1954 in München.

Dirigent des Nationalsozialistischen Reichs-Symphonie-Orchesters

Auf der Suche nach finanzieller Unterstützung wandte sich Adam als Leiter des Münchner Tonkünstlerorchesters bereits 1930 erstmals an die NSDAP (Hanke 2004, Seite 45) . Der Kontakt intensivierte sich zunehmend, so daß das Orchester im Zuge der ideellen und bald auch finanziellen Unterstützung durch die Partei und weitere NS-Organisationen, wie die Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft oder die Deutsche Arbeitsfront, beziehungsweise die NS-Gemeinschaft Kraft durch Freude, von Adam 1931 neu konstituiert wurde. Das Gründungskonzert, das ursprünglich für den 16. Dezember 1931 geplant war, aufgrund eines Verbots durch die Münchner Behörden jedoch nicht durchgeführt werden konnte, fand am 10. Januar 1932 im Zirkus Krone statt. 1934 wurde das Orchester offiziell in Nationalsozialistisches Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester umbenannt, 1937 erfolgte eine weitere Umbenennung in Nationalsozialistisches Symphonieorchester. Geschäftsführer des Vereins war bis 1940 Rudolf Heß (1894-1987) . Im Orchester waren 120 fest engagierte Musiker beschäftigt. Bei Bedarf, so etwa für die Eröffnung des Parteitags in Nürnberg 1935, wurde auf bis zu 150 Musiker aufgestockt. Einer Anregung Hitlers folgend, trat das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester im braunen Smoking auf. Als wirkungsmächtiger Propagandaträger der NSDAP absolvierte das Orchester im Auftrag derselben und unter der Leitung Adams sowie seines späteren Stellvertreters Erich Kloß (1898-1967) über 1500 Konzerte in ganz Europa, dazu gehörten Jugendkonzerte, Werkskonzerte, Auftritte bei Parteitagen und anderen politischen Veranstaltungen, Konzerte im Rahmen der kulturellen Truppenbetreuung sowie Propagandareisen ins Ausland. Das gespielte Repertoire konzentrierte sich vornehmlich auf Werke der deutschen Klassik und Romantik. Neben Kompositionen von Joseph Haydn, Ludwig van Beethoven, Carl Maria von Weber, Franz Schubert, Franz Liszt, Richard Wagner, Max Reger und Anton Bruckner wurde auch Werken zeitgenössischer Tonkünstler, wie etwa Josef Reiter (1862-1939) , Rudolph Stephan (1887-1915) , Max Trapp (1887-1971) , Hermann Blume (1891-1967) , Paul Höffer (1895-1949) , Max Seeboth (1904-1967) , Karl Höller (1907-1987) , Friedrich Jung (1897-1975) oder Paul Scheinpflug (1875-1937) Raum gegeben (Braun 1993, 286 sowie Hanke 2004, Seite 123f) .

Wenngleich Adam und sein Orchester sich von Beginn an für parteipolitische Zwecke (sic !) benutzen ließen (Hanke 2004, Seite 48) blieb das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester Hanke zufolge auf dem Papier. Zeit seines Lebens ein autonomer Verein, der zu keiner Zeit offiziell der Partei angehörte, sondern lediglich (zunächst auf Vereinbarungsebene, später durch Leistungsverträge) mit ihr verbunden war. (Hanke 2004, Seite 49) Braun hingegen berichtet, daß das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester als eigene Ortsgruppe der NSDAP im Kreis München geführt (Braun 1993, Seite 286) wurde. Dessen ungeachtet spielte die politische Gesinnung für Adam bei der Auswahl seiner Musiker wohl nur eine untergeordnete Rolle, eine Parteizugehörigkeit war scheinbar nicht zwingend erforderlich (Vergleiche Braun 1993, Seite 286 ; sowie Hanke 2004, Seiten 56, 67f ; und ebenda Anhang, xlvii) .

Funktionär im NS-Staat

In den Akten lässt sich eine Fülle von Ämtern, Titeln und Positionen nachweisen, die Adam innerhalb der NSDAP und anderer NS-Organisationen inne hatte. So war er seit 01.01.1930 Mitglied der NSDAP (Nummer 348.967) . Er nahm dort die Aufgaben eines Sachbearbeiters für Musik in der Reichsleitung der NSDAP wahr (Reichs-Hauptstellen- und Oberabschnittsleiter Musik) und erhielt die NSDAP-Dienstauszeichnung in Bronze. Er war Mitglied in der Deutschen

Arbeitsfront und im Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur. Bei den Planungen zur Bildung eines Hauptamtes für Ausbildung und Ausrichtung unter Fritz Mehnert wurde er als Leiter eines Amtes Musikwesen vorgesehen (Sieb 2007, Seite 35) . 1933 trat Adam der SA bei, in der er 1939 zum Sturmhauptführer und 1942 (Sieb 2007, Seite 35) zum Sturmbannführer ernannt wurde. Hanke zufolge wurde ihm dieser Titel erst 1943 und rein ehrenhalber (Hanke 2004, Seite 64) verliehen. Als Berater für alle Musikfragen war er ab 1934 Mitglied im Stab des Stellvertreters des Führers und gehörte überdies der Reichsmusikkammer sowie dem Präsidialrat des Reichskultursernats an. Nicht zuletzt wurde Adam 1933 zum Leiter der gesamten nationalsozialistischen Symphonieorchester sowie zum Generalmusikdirektor (1938) ernannt. Wenngleich die zahlreichen Posten Adams in erster Linie ehrenamtlich und vielfach nur repräsentativen Charakters gewesen sein mögen und er in diesen Funktionen keine nennenswerten Dienstpflichten zu erfüllen gehabt haben mag (Hanke 2004, Seite 64f ; sowie ebenda Anhang, xxxviii) - was anhand weiterer Forschungen durchaus noch eingehender zu überprüfen wäre - , ist seine tiefe persönliche Verstrickung in das NS-Regime nicht zu bestreiten. Adams Wirken für das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester erforderte eine intensive und einvernehmliche Zusammenarbeit mit zahlreichen hochrangigen Verantwortlichen des NS-Regimes. Für die Tatsache, daß das Orchester als maßgebliches Propagandainstrument instrumentalisiert wurde und so (wenngleich dies vor allem mit musikalischen Mitteln geschah) offiziell und unmissverständlich für die kruden Ideale und Ziele der Nationalsozialisten warb, hat an erster Stelle sein Leiter Adam in der Verantwortung zu stehen.

In einem Spruchkammerverfahren wurde Adam 1948 zunächst in die Gruppe III als Minderbelasteter eingereiht. Ohne weiteres Nachverfahren erfolgte sodann jedoch eine weitere Einstufung in die Gruppe IV der Mitläufer.

Komponist und Bearbeiter

Seit seiner frühen Studienzeit betätigte sich Adam stets auch als Komponist und Bearbeiter. Die ersten erhaltenen und datierbaren Werke (vor allem Lieder und Chorwerke, so etwa vier Pange Lingua für gemischten Chor) stammen aus dem Jahr 1905. In den Jahren bis zu seinem Abschluß an der Akademie entstanden ferner zahlreiche kammermusikalische Werke für Streicherbesetzung, ein Scherzo für kleines Orchester und einige Gedichtvertonungen. Auch in seiner frühen Zeit als Kurkapellmeister war Adam nicht untätig, so haben sich diverse Kompositionen zu Bühnenwerken, eine Sinfonie in F-Moll sowie diverse Bearbeitungen von Liedern und Klavierwerken Ludwig van Beethovens, Johannes Brahms, Franz Liszts oder Franz Schuberts für Orchesterbesetzung erhalten. Aus Adams Zeit beim Münchner Rundfunk existieren des weiteren zahlreiche Hörspielmusiken, darunter ein Osterspiel und zwei Weihnachtsspiele.

Diverse Werke für Klavier entstanden auch während seiner Internierungszeit 1945-1948. Nach seiner Entlassung schrieb Adam zudem eine Vielzahl Bläser-Kanons, hauptsächlich für Trompeten. Eine zweite Kanon-Serie, wie auch Orchesterwerke und Lieder mit Klavierbegleitung stammen aus seinen letzten Lebensjahren ab 1951. Bis auf seine Vier Lieder, Opus 3, die 1909 beim Musikverlag Lewy in München erscheinen konnten und das Marschlied Die bayerische Landwehr (Postkarte 1915) , blieb sein gesamtes verbleibendes Oeuvre unpubliziert. Zahlreiche Werke kamen jedoch zumindest im Kontext von Adams verschiedenen Kapellmeistertätigkeiten zur Aufführung. Die Manuskripte sind im Nachlaß weitgehend erhalten. Hanke weist jedoch auf Bestandslücken hin, so fehlten unter anderem eine Orchester-Ouvertüre oder Adams erste Sinfonie in G-Dur. Der tatsächliche Gesamtumfang seines kompositorischen Schaffens sei so nicht endgültig

abschätzbar (Hanke 2004, Seite 17) .

Obgleich sich verschiedene Gutachten und Zeugnisse erhalten haben, die Adams Leistung als Komponist wohlwollend positiv beurteilen, muß es weiteren Forschungen vorbehalten bleiben, die schöpferische Qualität seiner Werke einzuschätzen und kritisch zu beurteilen.

Werke

Der musikalische Nachlaß Adams in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek wurde bis dato leider nur oberflächlich erschlossen. Es existiert dort zwar ein maschinenschriftliches Verzeichnis, dieses enthält jedoch nur sehr rudimentäre Angaben. Es wird daher im Folgenden lediglich eine nach Werkgruppen zusammengefasste, tabellarische Auflistung gegeben. So weit Datierungen vorhanden sind, wurde chronologisch geordnet, andernfalls alphabetisch. Eine Ordnung nach Opuszahlen ist nicht möglich, da Adam diese nur vereinzelt vermerkt hat (Vergleiche auch Hanke 2004, Seite 13) . Sämtliche Angaben wurden dem im Nachlaß befindlichen Verzeichnis entnommen. Eine zweifelsohne notwendige Überprüfung, Ergänzung und Korrektur des Verzeichnisses muß zukünftigen Forschungen vorbehalten bleiben.

Musik zu Bühnenwerken und Hörspielen

Um Teich und Wald. Märchenspiel in 5 Akten (vermutlich Titel) , (1911) .

Finale zum « bunten Abend » am 21. März 1914 (im Stadttheater Gießen) .

O. T. (vermutlich Rumpelstilzchen) , (1913) .

O. T. (vermutlich Schneewittchen) , (1913) .

Weihnachtsspiel (Otto Falckenberg) , (1923) .

Leonce und Lena (Georg Büchner) , (1925) .

Heilige Nacht (Ludwig Thoma) , (1926) .

Osterspiel für Chor und Orchester (1926) .

Hamlet (24. Juni 1927) .

Alt-Heidelberg (ohne Daten) .

Ein Spiel von der Auferstehung des Herrn (Helmuth Habersbrunner) , (ohne Daten) (vor 1926, nicht im BSB-Nachlaß enthalten, vergleiche Hanke 2004, Seite 37) .

Faust (Johann Wolfgang von Goethe) , (ohne Daten) .

Jüdin von Toledo, (ohne Daten) .

Wallenstein (Friedrich Schiller) , (ohne Daten) .

Werke für Klavier

Scherzo in F-Dur (1909) .

Skizzen (1910) .

Fragment O. T. , Gießen (10. Oktober 1913) .

O. T. , aus « tägliche Einfälle » (13./14. Oktober 1914) .

O. T. , München, (April 1920) .

Invention, Karlsruhe (28. April 1947) .

Kanon in der Oktave, Regensburg (29. September 1947) .

Kleine Fuge in D-Dur, Regensburg (7. Dezember 1947) .

Tanzweisen-Folge (Werk 12) , (20./27. Dezember 1947) .

Menuet (sic !) , Regensburg (29. Januar 1948) .

Kleine Fantasie (März 1953) .

Doppel-Fuge in G-Dur (1953) .

O. T. (Dezember 1953) .

Doppelfuge in G-Dur (ohne Daten)

Kleine Walzer (ohne Daten) .

Kurzer Kanon im doppelten Kontrapunkt (ohne Daten) .

Werke für Bläser

Kanon im Einklang für 3 Trompeten, in C-Dur (13. Mai 1948) .

Gesellschaftskanon für 3 Trompeten, in F-Dur (5. Juli 1948) .

Gesellschaftskanon I-III für 3 Trompeten (25. Juli 1948) .

Kanon in der Oberquinte für 2 Bläser, (7. August 1948) .

Studie in Kanonform im Einklang für 2 Trompeten (9. August 1948) .

Kanon in der Unteroktave (12. August 1948) .

Gesellschaftskanon für 4 Trompeten (23. August 1948) .

O. T. für 4 Bläser (10. Januar 1952) .

Kanon I-IX (Januar 1953) .

Polonaise für 4 Bläser (ohne Daten) .

Werke für Orgel

2 Kanons in der Oktave für Streich-Trio (12. November 1908 - 21. Dezember 1908) .

Hymne für Orgel (ohne Daten) .

Doppel-Fuge für Orgel (ohne Daten) .

Kammermusik

Doppel-Fuge für Streichquartett, in G-Dur (1. Oktober 1908 - 10. November 1908) .

Doppel-Fuge für Streich-Quartett (1908) .

Doppel-Fuge für Streichquartett, in Es-Dur (22. April 1909) .

Streichquartett (7. September 1909) .

Menuett für Streichtrio (1909) .

Streichquartett in D-Moll (1909) .

Streichquartett in G-Dur (1909) .

Streichquartett in G-Dur (1910) .

Sonatine für Violine und Klavier (1912-1914) .

12 freie Variationen über ein eigenes Thema für Violine, Klarinette und Klavier (1912) .

Streichquartett O. T. (1919) .

Streichquartett in D-Moll (1945) .

Scherzo (ohne Daten) .

Thema con Variazioni für Streichquartett, Opus I, (ohne Daten) (vermutlich Um 1909-1910) .

Werke für Orchester

Scherzo für kleines Orchester (1909) .

Sinfonie Nr. 2, in F-Moll (1914) .

Mazurka für Violine und Orchester (1920) .

Suite für Streichorchester (1945) .

Variationen über ein Marschlied (1951) .

Variationen über ein Wanderlied für großes Orchester (1951) .

O. T. (Orchestersuite) : Einleitung, I. Träumerei ; II. Ländlicher Tanz ; III. Schmerz ; IV. Übermütig (1953) .

3 kleine Skizzen für Klavier und Orchester : I. Schmerz ; 2. Zufriedenheit ; 3. Übermut (ohne Daten) .

Depressionen der Seele (ohne Daten) (vermutlich nach 1945) .

Heimkehr (ohne Daten) (vermutlich nach 1945) .

Kennwort : Der Romantiker, Suite für Streichorchester in 3 Sätzen (ohne Daten) (vermutlich nach 1945) .

Mond-Apotheose (ohne Daten) (vermutlich nach 1945) .

Ouvertüre für großes Orchester (ohne Daten) (vor 1912, nicht im BSB-Nachlaß, vergleiche Hanke 2004, Seite 17) .

Sinfonie Nr. I, in G-Dur (ohne Daten) (vor 1912, nicht im BSB-Nachlaß, vergleiche Hanke 2004, Seite 17) .

Ständchen für Streichorchester (ohne Daten) .

Werke für Gesang solo

Es bleibt zu klären, inwiefern folgende Werke Fragmente sind, ob also ursprünglich Instrumentalstimmen ergänzt werden sollten, die möglicherweise verloren sind oder ob es sich tatsächlich um Werke für nur eine Gesangsstimme handelt.

Ein Musiker wollt fröhlich sein (ohne Daten) .

Frühling (ohne Daten) .

Herbstbild (ohne Daten) .

Lied (ohne Daten) .

Morgengruß, Opus 3 : I. Im Lenz ; II. Abschied (ohne Daten) .

Schließe mir die Augen beide (Theodor Storm) , (ohne Daten) .

Welke Rose (ohne Daten) .

Wiegenlied (Clemens Brentano) , (ohne Daten) .

Werke für Gesang mit Klavier

Die Mutter singt (1905) .

2 Lieder für eine einfache Stimme : Morgen ? ; Junge Liebe (1906) .

Das Veilchen in meinem Garten (1906) .

Das verlassene Mägdlein (Mörrike) , (1906) .

Wenn du dein Haupt (Öhlschläger) , (1906) .

Im Kahn (1907) .

Abschied (Stieler) , (1908) .

Frühling (1908) .

Sommerbild (Hebbel) , (1908) .

Welke Rose (Lenau) , (1908) .

Abendstündchen (1909) .

Dunkel ist die Nacht (1909) .

Frühlingsnacht (1910) .

Verschwiegene Liebe (Eichendorf) , (1910) .

Lied des Engels (1916) .

O Lenz (Bencker) , (1919) .

Wiegenlied (1919) .

Sommernacht (R. Henning) , Opus 16 (1922) .

Sorglos bin ich, wenn in Nächten (1922) .

Nun sei mir heimlich (Storm) , (1924) .

Mei' Sepp du bist (Kobell) , (1926) .

Tod und Leben (G. Schumann) , (1936) .

Nur ein paar Stufen (J. Staab) , (1951) .

Salvatorballade (1951) .

Fry Schwyzerland (ohne Daten) .

Herbstbild (Hebbel) , (ohne Daten) .

I gather poppies, Liebeslied (ohne Daten) .

Im Wald ist so stad (ohne Daten) .

Mein Wunsch ist nun erfüllt (ohne Daten) .

O süßes Glück (ohne Daten) .

Schlafe ! Schlafe Marienkind schlafe nur ein (ohne Daten) .

Vier Blätter fand ich (ohne Daten) .

Wer je gelebt in Liebesarmen (ohne Daten) .

Werke für Gesang mit Harmonium

Schlummerlied (1916) .

Vater unser (1918) .

Werke für Gesang mit Orchester

Fünf Lieder für Sopran mit Orchester : Hör, es klagt die Flöte wieder ; So geht ein Sonntag still zu Ende ; Wie traumverlorenklang ; 4 Blätter fand ich ; O süßes Glück (ohne Daten) .

Abendstündchen (1942) .

So geht ein Sonntag still zu Ende (Storm) , (1942) .

Posten (ohne Daten) .

Schilflieder (Lenau) , (ohne Daten) .

Soldatenlob (ohne Daten) .

Chorwerke

Lied (Grillparzer) , (1905) .

Pange lingua (1. Versuch) , (1905) .

3 Pange lingua für gemischten Chor (1905) .

Marienlied (1906) .

Friedlicher Abend (1907) .

Scherz (1908) .

Stimme des Windes (Lenau) , (1908) .

Abschied (Eichendorff) , (1909) .

Das Kind (Hebbel) , (1909) .

Sommernacht (Reinick) , (1909) .

Ein Musiker wollt fröhlich sein (1910) .

Geistliches Wiegenlied (1910) .

Laudate Dominum (ohne Daten) .

Selig die Toten (ohne Daten) .

Drucke eigener Kompositionen

Vier Lieder für eine Singstimme mit Klavierbegleitung, Opus 3 : 1. Morgengruß ; 2. Im Lenz ; 3. Wiegenlied ; 4. Schließe mir die Augen beide, Lewy, München (1909) .

Die bayerische Landwehr, Marschlied (Postkarte) , (1915) .

Bearbeitungen für Orchester von Werken anderer Komponisten

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart : Sonate für Klavier in F-Dur (1909) .

Edvard Grieg : Klein Haakon (1914) .

Ludwig van Beethoven : Vom Tode (1916) .

Franz Schubert : Wandrers Nachtlied (1916) .

Johannes Brahms : Intermezzo, Opus 117, Nr. 1 (1917) .

Robert Schumann : Davidsbündler-Tänze (1919) .

Franz Liszt : Rhapsodie Hongroise, Nr. 3 (1920) .

Frederick Chopin : IV Prelude in E-Moll, Opus 28, Nr. 4 (1952) .

Carl Maria von Weber : Variations sur un theme de Samori (1952) .

Johann Sebastian Bach : Präludium in G-Moll, BWV 885, ohne Jahr (Bearbeitung für Streichquartett) .

Archivgut

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Handschriftenabteilung, Nachlaß Franz Adam, Ana 559.

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Musikabteilung, Kompositionen aus dem Nachlaß Franz Adam, Mus.N.I.

Sekundärliteratur

Braun, Linde : Das « Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester » , in : München - « Hauptstadt der Bewegung » .

Bayerns Metropole und der Nationalsozialismus, herausgeber von Richard Bauer und andere, München (1993) , Seite 286.

Hanke, Britta : Der Dirigent Franz Adam und das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester - Aufstieg und Fall eines Künstlers im Nationalsozialismus, Magisterarbeit, München (2004) .

Hermann, Michaël : Kommunale Kulturpolitik in München von 1919 bis 1935, München (2003) .

Kater, Michaël H. : Die mißbrauchte Muse. Musiker im Dritten Reich, München (1998) .

Neumann, Sonja : Musikleben in München 1925-1945. Zwischen Arbeitsmarkt, Bürokratie und Ideologie, Au / Hallertau (2009) .

Prieberg, Fred : Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933-1945, CD-Rom, Après des Zombry (2004) (Version 1.2 : 3/2005) .

Sieb, Rainer : Der Zugriff der NSDAP auf die Musik. Zum Aufbau von Organisationsstrukturen für die Musikarbeit in den Gliederungen der Partei, Dissertation, Osnabrück (2007) .

Neun Jahre Kampf um deutsche Musik

Der Aufstieg des « Orchesters der Bewegung »

Franz Adam, der « Vater » des Orchesters - am 20. Jänner in Innsbruck

In : Innsbrucker Nachrichten vom 10. Jänner 1939, Seite 7.

Franz Adam und das nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester kommen am 20. Jänner nach Innsbruck.

Man kann durch einen Beschluß mehrerer gleichgesinnter Menschen einen « Verein » gründen. Der Tag dieser Gründung steht dann im Vereinsregister. Der Verein hat seine Satzungen, nach denen gehandelt wird. Wer glaubt, daß damit der Sinn einer Gründung erschöpft ist, der irrt, denn eine Gemeinschaft wird nicht gegründet. Sie wächst heran, wird in Not gehärtet und von der Leidenschaft des auf ein hohes Ziel gerichteten Kampfes durchglüht, bis aus dem juristischen Bund eine unlösliche Gemeinschaft von Menschen wird, die willens sind, ihr Leben auf Gedeih und Verderben miteinander zu verbinden. So entstand das Nationalsozialistische Reichs-Symphonie-Orchester nicht durch den bloßen Akt der Gründung, in dem alle sagten :

« Wir bilden jetzt ein Orchester und hoffen dabei gut zu leben ! » so war es in der Tat nicht.

Der kulturelle Kampf begann

Das Jahr, in dem der Gedanke, ein nationalsozialistisches Orchester zu gründen, zum ersten Male in Franz Adam, dem heutigen Leiter des Orchesters, erwachte, war eines der sorgenvollsten in der Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus : das Jahr 1930. Etwa 70 Musiker hatten sich unter der Leitung Franz Adams zusammengeschlossen, um in der allgemeinen Beschäftigungslosigkeit des damaligen Musikerstandes ihr Können auf einer Höhe zu halten, die jedem einzelnen die Möglichkeit gab, wieder mit frischer Kraft in seinem Beruf zu wirken, wenn der Glücksfall eines sogenannten « Engagements » auch mal wieder gegeben sein würde. Hunderte von Proben wurden abgehalten, ehe das Orchester zum erstenmal an die Öffentlichkeit trat. Mancher der Musiker hatte kaum das Geld, die Fahrt in die Probe zu bezahlen. Daß ein Durchhalten unter solchen Umständen nicht leicht war, daß der Wille zur Treue auf manche Probe gestellt wurde, das konnten sie Tag für Tag erleben.

Sie sollten sich von Adam trennen

Eine maßgebende Persönlichkeit hatte eines Tages an das Orchester das Ansinnen gestellt, sich von Franz Adam zu trennen. Man bot dem Orchester eine für die damalige Zeit hohe Summe, die man wohl notwendig gebraucht hätte. Pflichtgemäß unterbreitete der Vorstand des Orchesters das Verlangen den Musikern des Orchesters, die mit einem Hohngelächter sondergleichen die Antwort erteilten, die er verdiente: « Wir stehen zu unserem « Vater ! » » Dies war der Erfolg des Angebotes. Noch oft waren strenge, wenn auch selbstverständliche Entscheidungen zu treffen. Das Orchester wurde durch die Not und Verfolgung, die auch seine Mitglieder erdulden mußten, eine Kampfgemeinschaft, die in unverbrüchlicher Treue der Fahne ihres Kampfes folgte. « Die Nazis schaffen den Parteibuchmusiker » , zeternten die roten Parteiblätter in ausbrechender Wut, als sie alle ihre Versuche, das Orchester zu zerschlagen, vereitelt sahen.

Erstes Auftreten

So trat am 10. Jänner 1932, nach einer langen Zeit der inneren und äußeren Vorbereitung, das Orchester der nationalsozialistischen Revolution im « Zirkus Krone » , dem in der Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus geheiligten Raum in München, zum ersten Male an die Öffentlichkeit. Das auf den 16. Dezember 1931 festgesetzte Konzert im « Zirkus Krone » wurde von der damaligen bayrischen Regierung auf Grund des sogenannten « Weihnachtsfriedens » verboten. Diesem ersten erfolgreichen Konzert in München folgte das erste Konzert vor dem « Führer » in Berchtesgaden, der Rudolf Heß beauftragte, das Orchester für die Werbung auf dem flachen Lande einzusetzen. Seit diesem Tage trägt das Orchester voller Stolz den Namen « Orchester des Führers » . Es spielte in Bayern, Schwaben und Franken, von den Parteigenossen stürmisch begrüßt, von den Gegnern mit Bewunderung gehört. Es war eine stille, zähe Arbeit, die auf diesen Reisen des Jahres 1932 geleistet werden mußte.

Als der Tag der Machtübernahme kam, war das kleine Orchester bereits eine Schicksalsgemeinschaft geworden. « Wir werden uns nicht mehr trennen und auch im neuen Reiche unserer Bestimmung, die in den Tagen des Kampfes der Auftrag des Führers war, treu bleiben » , so sagte damals Franz Adam zu seinen Kameraden, die sich gelobten, alle ihre Kraft für das Werk des Führers einzusetzen.

220 Konzerte in elf Monaten

Nach erfolg- und ehrenreichen Fahrten durch Italien und Ungarn erfüllte das Orchester ausschließlich seine immer größer werdenden innerdeutschen Verpflichtungen. Es spielte zunächst im Rundfunk, trat dann in den Dienst der Bestrebungen für die NS.-Gemeinschaft « Kraft durch Freude » , die das Orchester im ganzen Reich einsetzte. In den zahllosen Reisen, deren Umfang das sonst übliche Maß des Orchesterdienstes weit übersteigt, teilte sich Franz Adam mit Erich Kloß. Seit zwei Jahren ist das Orchester verpflichtet, innerhalb von elf Monaten 220 Konzerte für die NS.-Gemeinschaft « Kraft durch Freude » zu geben. Ueber 150 Proben sind notwendig, um für jedes Konzert die vollkommene Leistung zu sichern. Eine Werbung für die deutsche « Musik und ihre großen Meister » kann nur dann erfolgreich sein, wenn dem Publikum künstlerisch vollendete Aufführungen geboten werden. Diesem gleichen Ziele dienen auch die « Konzerte vor der Jugend » und vor allem die « Werkkonzerte » , die Franz Adams als erster deutscher

Musiker zu einer gültigen Form des Musikerlebens erhoben hat. Die Reichsmusiktage in Düsseldorf erkannten dies 1938 in aller Form an, indem sie allein vier Konzerte des NS.-Symphonieorchesters in Betrieben in ihr Programm aufnahmen.

Das Orchester des Führers in der Ostmark

Erstes Konzert in Innsbruck

In : Deutsche Volkszeitung vom 21. Jänner 1939, Seite 6

Von Doktor Thaler

Innsbruck kann es sich als Musikstadt zur besonderen Ehre anrechnen, daß es zum Ausgangspunkt der Konzerte des NS-Reichs-Symphonie-Orchesters in der Ostmark erwählt wurde. So war denn auch das Interesse für dieses Konzert in die weitesten Kreise gedungen, und geraume Zeit vor Beginn der Veranstaltung war der große Stadtsaal lückenlos besetzt von festlich gestimmten Zuhörern aus alle Schichten der Bevölkerung. Der Saal war geschmackvoll geziert, auf der Stirnseite prangte auf rotem Tuch ein mächtiges Hoheitszeichen. Sobald das Orchester, das einheitlich gekleidet in braunem Smoking auftrat, Platz genommen hatte, trat der stellvertretende Intendant Max Alexander Pflugmacher vor und brachte den Gruß und den Dank Innsbrucks an das Orchester des Führers zum Ausdruck. Gleich darauf erklangen die pochenden Schicksalsklänge von Beethovens unsterblicher 5. Symphonie. Mit tiefer Sinngebung hatte Generalmusikdirektor Franz Adam dieses Werk für den ersten Einsatz in der Ostmark gewählt : « Durch Kampf zum Sieg » ist der Gedanke, aus dem die vier Sätze entstanden sind, derselbe Satz, der bereits in Flammenlettern von der Nordkette leuchtete. Die Zuhörerschaft nahm die ausgezeichneten Darbietungen mit stürmischer Begeisterung auf : man konnte unter ihnen besonders Vertreter der Partei und ihrer Gliederungen, der Wehrmacht und des Arbeitsdienstes beobachten, als Vertreter des Gaues war Gauleiterstellvertreter Parteigenosse Christoph an Stelle des dienstlich verhinderten Gauleiters erschienen. Generalmusikdirektor Adam wurde durch einen prächtigen Kranz geehrt. Am Schluß erzwang sich die begeisterte Zuhörerschaft sogar noch eine Zugabe aus dem Gebiet der leichteren Muse. Der Abend war das größte Konzertereignis des laufenden Veranstaltungsjahres.

...

Beethovens « Fünfte » in Vollendung

« Orchester des Führers » stürmisch gefeiert

In : Innsbrucker Nachrichten vom 23. Jänner 1939, Seite 9

Von Doktor Hermann Gerhardinger

Im NS.-Reichssymphonieorchester, das unter der Leitung des Generalmusikdirektors Franz Adam steht, lernte man einen außerordentlich leitungsfähigen Klangkörper kennen, dessen Einzelgruppen vorzüglich besetzt sind. Insbesondere scheint das von den Bläsergruppen und innerhalb dieser im besonderen Maße von der Gruppe der Hörner zu gelten, die über eine selten feine Tongebung verfügt. Die Disziplin des Gesamtklangkörpers steht auf vorbildlicher Höhe ; dies in sämtlichen in Frage kommenden Richtungen, also sowohl im Klanglichen (hier äußert sie sich in prächtiger Ausgeglichenheit) , als auch in rhythmischer Hinsicht und in Bezug auf die Verteilung der Stärkegrade. Alle diese Vorzüge kamen unter der sorgsamsten Leitung des Dirigenten der Wiedergabe der drei aufgeführten Werke wesentlich zustatten,

am meisten wohl jener des den Abend beschließenden Werkes von Reger (Böcklin-Suite) . Sie wären vielleicht in der Symphonie bei durchgängig lebhafterer, weniger schleppender Temponahme noch mehr zur Geltung gelangt.

Einen Sondererfolg holte sich Ilse von Tschurtschenthaler mit der Wiedergabe des pianistisch so dankbaren Klavierpartes im Chopinschen Klavierkonzert. Die Pianistin fasste bei aller Herausarbeitung des reichen technischen Details ihre Aufgabe weniger virtuos-brillant als mehr lyrisch-verhalten auf und brachte damit mehr die zart-versonnene Seite Chopins als die revolutionär-draufgängerische zum Erklingen. Sie, der dirigierende Generalmusikdirektor und das Orchester wurden von der den Saal bis auf den letzten Platz füllenden Zuhörerschaft stürmisch gefeiert.

L'orgue nazi

German church music of the 1930's can be viewed as practically useful church music originating from a re-orientation toward the roots of German culture, in which neo-Classical ideals like « generally comprehensible » and « uniting the congregation » played a role.

It also functioned within National-Socialism. Church music composers in Nazi Germany made themselves opportunistically useful to Nazi culture, and composed also secular works of which some are interwoven with National-Socialism.

Not even German organ culture could escape the control of Nazi culture. Monumental organs could symbolize better than any other instruments the ideals of the time : they symbolized society as a whole, that could be played by a single person (said the « Führer ») .

The static sound of the organ matched the desired objectivity, and the overwhelming sound of the organ referred to the innate power of society. The organ was, therefore, used with great frequency in (political) celebrations.

...

Among the many organists, over the years, who have championed the middle-section of Bach's fantasy, at the expense of the other 2, surely the most notorious was Herbert Haag, one of the leading musicians of the Nazi Confessionalist church as well as the chief ideologue of the « organ-work-shop » component of the Hitler Youth organization. Haag's activities as a Nazi organist need to be understood within the context of that Party's adoption of the organ as its symbolic instrument of choice, something that occurred with the construction of a gigantic 5 manual instrument, complete with loudspeakers, for the 1936 Nazi Rally in Nuremberg. As Haag's colleague Josef Müller-Blattau described this phenomenon, the organ was « the total instrument of the total State » , and Adolf Hitler was the State's « omnipotent organizer » . In other words, the most powerful musical instrument known to the world became linked to the most powerful politician in its history. Haag, for his part, opined that the organ was « the symbolic instrument of the Nazi community » and ideally equipped to « serve a total “ weltanschauung ” and the will expressed in its festivities » .

About these Festivals, which were basically celebrations of Nazi doctrine and which featured organ music exclusively by « Aryan » composers, Haag was both an active participant and an advisor. He wrote in 1939 that :

« Most of Bach's free organ works easily lend themselves to Festival planning. One thinks, say, of the middle-part of the G major Fantasy ; the introduction of the E-flat major Prelude ; the C minor Prelude ; the D major Prelude ; and many of the other large Preludes, Fugues, Toccatas, and Fantasies of the Master. All these pieces have their place as an introduction to a Festival or as an interlude, say, between 2 speakers or between 1 speaker and 1 choir, etc. , and at the end, ... »

Haag was, therefore, advocating those works, or just those sections of works, that are both inherently « powerful » and that would traditionally have been played with a full-registration, to glorify the totalitarianism of the Nazi regime. The relatively genteel-sounding Trio Sonatas would hardly have accomplished this purpose, nor would the flat section of the G major Fantasy or the lightly textured episodes of the E-flat Prelude (for Haag was recommending that only the opening « ritornello » of the latter work be played) .

When he played the organ himself at these gatherings, Haag practiced what he preached - and dressed in his « Storm Trooper » 's uniform, he looked every bit the part. Just consider the program for a Hitler Youth « Abendmusik » event, in 1937, that showcased the choir of Bach's own church (Saint-Thomas, in Leipzig) and Haag as the organ soloist : limiting himself to the music of Bach, Haag performed the G major Fantasy, the E-flat Prelude and Fugue, and the Toccata and Fugue in F major. Perhaps, his rendering of the Fantasy was met with the same adulation as when the piece was heard, in 1936, at another Nazi-sponsored concert, this one taking place at the « Haus der deutschen Erziehung » (House of German Education) , in Bayreuth.

To quote a local music-critic :

« Bach's Fantasy in G major, which Karl August von Kotzebue consummately played on the organ, constituted the end of the concert. In the powerful 2nd part, the organ sounded under his hands like a thundersorm rumbling in the distance. »

Predictably, that evening's entertainment ended with « Deutschland über alles » , played as an organ solo by Kotzebue with all the might the instrument could muster.

The Big Organ of the Nuremberg Congress Hall (« Luitpoldhalle »)

When opened on 26 October 1936, the Nuremberg Congress Hall (Luitpold Hall) Organ was the largest organ in the world outside the United States - it had 16,013 pipes. Had this gigantic instrument survived the Second World War, it would (even today) be 2nd in size in the world, outside the United States, beaten only by Passau Cathedral ; it would be nearly 50 % larger than London's Royal Albert Hall Organ !

...

The gigantic Walcker / Sauer organ built for the « Luitpoldhalle » in Nuremberg, in 1936. This organ, Opus 2550, was by far the biggest instrument Walcker built (5 manuals, 220 ranks and 16013 pipes) , and due to the highly-unrealistic timescale of the Party elite, Sauer were enlisted to help. The organ was destroyed along with the hall during allied bombing raids.

There were a few interesting stipulations included in the organ contract, one of these forbade the organ to impress its listeners with its beauty, rather to bring-out « the spirit of the Reichsparty » . Its main task was to accompany singing at the mass meetings through loudspeakers, despite the size and power of the instrument, they thought it necessary to amplify it ! It was on an epic scale, although there were plans to increase its size still further.

This recording (played presumably by his music director, Eduard Kissel) must be the only one in existence demonstrating the organ, probably recorded soon after its completion :

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W33Nn0jRd7Y>

...

German field marshal Erwin Rommel (popularly known as the « Desert Fox ») has, at the time of writing, received a great deal of publicity and has been regarded by some as almost a hero. There was another Nazi servant, also a War casualty. This was the gigantic organ in the Congress Hall at Nuremberg. While the Atlantic City organ is undoubtedly the largest in the world, this German giant held the honour as the largest instrument, which was not segregated or divided in any way. The 16,013 pipes were all hidden away behind the rather effective pipe-rack.

It is interesting to look back on the building of this organ's predecessor. On August 2 ist, 1935, the notorious Martin Bormann asked the firm, of E. F. Walcker & Co. of Ludwigsburg, to send a representative to discuss the building of an organ for the Luitpold Hall for the Party Congress at Nuremberg, which was to be held later on in the year. The enormous size of the Hall required an organ with, at least, 50 to 60 speaking stops. The difficulty was that the instrument had to be ready for playing by September and, I don't know whether any dire threats in typical Nazi fashion were used, but Walcker undertook this almost impossible task and, by August 28th, were able to tell Bormann that an organ of 50 speaking stops would be ready on the appointed date. The specification included several chorus reeds and a 5 rank cornet and appears to have been designed principally for noise. The 12 following days were spent in transporting, erecting and tuning the organ. Though a little late, it was played for the 1st time by Eduard Kissel at the « Parteitag » (the Day of the National-Socialist Party) .

This organ, however, proved to be too small for the large new hall under construction and so it was decided to build a bigger instrument, which might eventually be re-erected. In the Spring of 1936, several organ builders were requested to tender for an organ of the desired size. The final choice lay between Steinmeyer and Walcker, who were the only 2 German builders in a position to cope with such a large contract. The American Organist, in giving the stoplist in their journal sometime ago, suggested that, as Steinmeyer's wife was an American, the contract went to

Walckers. Perhaps so, but Walckers have been building organs since 1781, and I do not think that this contract necessarily displayed sympathy to the Nazi gang. The firm of Wilhelm Sauer of Frankfurt, who have Doctor Oscar Walcker as a director, collaborated over the tremendous task.

Senator Franz Adam, the conductor of the National-Socialist « Reich » Symphony Orchestra, specified the following points :

The organ must be designed in such a way that the quality does not suffer in any way when transmitted over an amplifier system.

The purpose of the organ will be to support the Orchestra and to accompany the singing of mass meetings. Because of the large size of the Hall, the organ will largely be heard through loudspeakers.

As practical experience over a number of years has shown that amplifying systems multiply the difference of the intervals of the tempered tuning (5th, 3rd, etc.) , mixtures and mutations will have to be modified. Instead, special attention must be paid to diapasons and reeds.

Allowance must be made for the possibility of enlargement, if the organ is to be used as a concert instrument in the new Congress Hall.

The immense range of the organ must not attract the attention of individual listeners because of artistic subtleties, but must bring-out the spirit of the « Reich » Party. Doctor Oscar Walcker and Doctor Eduard Kissel, together, worked out the specifications.

« **Pedalwerk** » : There was only 1 botrowed stop on the organ, the acoustic : 64 feet. The remainder was entirely straight. With so few flue stops of 16 feet pitch, there might have been some duplication of certain manual doubles with good effect. The abundance of upper-work must have put the pedal couplers to little use. The reed chorus of 32 feet to 1 foot pitch was ample for trumpet and tuba tones. Perhaps, Franz Adams's 5th clause forbade the inclusion of quietoo Basses for « cor anglais » and clarinet. Enclosure of certain ranks in the « schwell-werk » and « hornwerk » boxes was a useful provision.

« **Kronwerk** » : This department, of which the pipework crowned the remainder and thus got its name, was not exactly a positif but a miniature of the « hauptwerk » . The tutti was designed to produce a brilliant sparkling chorus and probably did. As with the other manual departments, a 2 feet reed was provided. No indication in the descriptive brochure is given as to how far-up the reed pipes go before the change to flue pipes. The viola served as the only string in this department, while there were 13 flutes not including mutations of this timbre. In Germany, the tremulant is not necessarily confined to enclosed divisions and one served in this department.

« **Hauptwerk** » : This great organ solicits no comments as it was typically German in specification. Though only 3 unison diapasons, there was a profusion of flutes of all pitches. Reeds were all rather small. Power was obtained by

many medium-scaled ranks speaking in a very complete chorus.

« **Oberwerk** » : The normal swell department. 26 ranks had an extra-octave of pipes for use with the octave coupler. The « Bratsche » was a gentle string which had the « vox celestis » as its undulating partner.

« **Schwellwerk** » : According to the brochure, this department was the solo. All ranks were enclosed. Obviously, with so much mixture work, the whole must have been designed to produce some sort of ensemble.

« **Hornwerk** » : With reeds of 20 inch wind pressure lying horizontally and directed into the Hall, this department produced the climax and would be equivalent to our bombarde. Perhaps, it was the « hornwerk » which fulfilled Adams's 5th point !

Tone : Only 15 stops and many of these were of gentle dulciana and salicional quality. There was also no « septième » (7th) , which is an important harmonic in string tone. Unlike the French though, the Germans have never been too keen on string tone and this instrument had an abundance of every type of flute tone. Wind pressures varied from 6 to 20 inches, but, apart from the « feldtrompeten » , most of the pipework spoke on relatively low pressures for so large a building.

Quite a neat appearance was presented by the console, which was reversed and in a shallow pit. The ugly backrest to the bench appears from the photo to spoil this elegance. While in appearance, the stops resemble rocking tablets, they were pivoted like stopkeys. 2 of the tablets are in the « on » position on the right jamb. Both inter-manual and octave couplers were placed in a single row above the top manual. I don't think they followed the standard Willis order ! Above each stop were buttons for adjusting the 4 free combinations which had indicators above the couplers. Strip indicators for the 2 roller crescendi and tell-tales for other blind movements can also be seen under the music desk. The shutters were controlled by 3 normal balanced pedals and some 60 fixed pistons allowed for ample registration. An unusual feature for a German organ was the radiating and concave pedal-boan.

There was no case to this organ, but it had a most pleasing pipe-rack. The single wooden pipes, which formed the 2 towers, belonged to the 32 feet tibia major, while the flat between was composed of bombarde pipes of the same pitch. Such long boots must have caused considerable delay in speech and release. The flanking flats were formed from pipes of the « prinzipal » bass and « großnasat » .

On October 26th, 1936, Eduard Kissel opened this organ in 4 public recitals before an audience of between 4,000 and 5,000 people. The occasion also marked the 2,500th organ built by the Firm of Walcker after their establishment of 150 years. The life of this instrument was but a few years though, as both organ and the building, in which it was housed, were totally destroyed during the heavy raids on Germany. More was the pity, because, being Nazi property, it might well have been confiscated and eventually rebuilt over here in Earls Court or some similar hall where it would have begun life afresh under democratic fingers.

Of the 2 builders, the firm of Wilhelm Sauer are the less-known. They were established in 1857 and have since built

some 1,600 organs. Sauer, who worked for Walcker for a while, studied organ building under Cavaillé-Coll, in Paris. He then tried to transfer his French experience to German organ building and thus his instruments have been more satisfactory for rendering French music. This influence does not appear to have predominated in the organ in question however. « Messieurs » E. F. Walcker & Co. built a tremendous number of organs before the War. The Works in Ludwigsburg escaped damage during the War, but many of their records were destroyed in a store elsewhere. Business was carried on as usual and some 110 new organs were built. One of these arrived safely in Finland, in 1941, while 5 others found their way through the South of France into Spanish churches. Since the War, Walckers have been chiefly engaged in building small unit organs for the many temporary churches which have been erected. There are 5 different models, of which the 4th has a distinct Baroque flavour. Although having only 3 units, one is a small 3 rank mixture which appears on each manual, but on the pedal as a 6 rank mixture !

...

For so many organists, the independence of the pedal, especially for Bach's music, was essential ; however, in his attempt to provide historical and intellectual support for integrating the organ into the ritual worship of Fascism, the the organ historian Gotthold Frotscher makes much in this frightening book (« Aufführungspraxis alter Musik ») of the importance of smaller organs in the meeting places of the Hitler Youth. The pre-Christian, Germanic faces on the cover also resonated with Frotscher's program for liberating the organ from its ecclesiastical legacy and placing it at the center of the Nazi cult. The largest pipe bellowing-out of its pagan mouth provides a disturbingly accurate representation of German organ triumphalism in which the pedal emerges out of myth and memory ; the organ has a glorious German past that will be renewed in the new Nazi present. Quoting the later 19th Century Hegelian aesthetician, Friedrich Vischer, Frotscher writes in his article on « The Organ in Political Celebration » that the instrument can become a vital element of Nazi ceremonies only by remaining at odds with all « fashion and virtuosity, all hypocrisy, sentimentality and mawkishness » . Virile and pure will be the organ and its music in the 1,000 Year « Reich » . In closing, Frotscher argues that the organ must be true to itself, to its power and independence, in order to further « the idea of the society in which we are rooted » . The German organ is planted in German soil ; it grows from the ground up.

Along with its praise of modest organs for the inculcation of young Nazis, « Die Orgel in der Gegenwart » also asserts that the monuments of the past must define and defend the higher purpose of the instrument against degenerate « Wurlitzers » and kindred abominations. If one wants to learn about real organs and organ music, writes the organist and early music pioneer Joachim Altemark in his contribution to the volume, then one needs to be taken to an instrument by Gottfried Silbermann or Arp Schnitger. To be convinced of this, claims Altemark, one had only « to have Bach's E-flat major Prelude and Triple-fugue or the great F major Toccata with Fugue played for him » on these German organs. The essence of what Altemark calls the « German organ art » can be truly heard only on large German instruments with massive, independent pedals capable of projecting the erudition and athleticism of Bach's polyphony, performed with well-trained precision of arms and legs.

The 3rd « Reich » usurped the ancient ethnic organ-related beliefs. When tourism poster artist Lothar Heinemann wanted, in 1935, to express in visual terms « Deutschland, Das Land der Musik » , he did so not by alluding to

Richard Wagner's Operas or Johannes Brahms' Symphonies, but via the mother and father of all pipe-organs, where the pipes themselves metamorphose into the stylized wings of an eagle, although the pedals, the manuals, and the stops are alike unseen.

The German organ arts inspired not only Nazi musicologists, but Nazi designers as well. The notorious tourism poster of 1935 by Lothar Heinemann draws on a long tradition of organ design. Given its cultural status in Germany, the organ is an obvious choice to represent « Deutschland, Das Land der Musik » (Germany, the Land of Music) . Heinemann's glowering, steely blue Nazi Eagle has a cluster of organ pipes as its plumage. On either side, slightly canted from, and somewhat darker than, the bright vertical organ pipes at the center of the image, beams of light extend upward to form the wings. The design seeks the same impact as Nazi architect Albert Speer's infamous light displays, albeit on the minimal space of a poster rather than on the infinity of the night sky. Speer's searchlight beams trace their lineage back to pyrotechnic displays like that of Gabriel Bodenehr, the Elder (1664-1758 or 1673-1765) . Speer's « Cathedral of Light » was staged at the 1937 Party Congress, in Nuremberg, which might well have been partly inspired by the poster, Heinemann's image adopts the Classic framing towers of large northern organs, taken by so many German writers we have encountered as evidence of their preeminence in the development of the instrument and its crucial pedals. Accordingly, the gigantic organ of more than 200 stops built by the Walcker firm at the time of the 1936 Olympic games for Albert Speer's Nazi Congress-Hall (« Luitpoldhalle ») in Nuremberg ...

Original poster « Deutschland das Land der Musik » in the 1937 Paris exhibition. The unique show finds great international attention. It informs also about the cultural cooperation between the Hitler Government and the French Vichy Government.

...

Nuremberg was praised by organist Eduard Kissel, Music Director in Munich, for its thunderous pedal : « the fundamental and enormous rolling basses » (« die grundgewaltige rollende Bässe ») . In Lothar Heinemann's poster, Germany is not only the Master of the organ, but the organ is the musical symbol of the Master race. The bird attains its menace from the sweep of the largest, framing vertical columns ; the eagle threatens flight with the wing feathers that are the visual equivalent of pedal pipes.

What these comparisons of Nazi eagles and Albert Speer's spotlight cathedrals with Silbermann organs and Saxon fireworks suggest is not only that luminous displays and organ imagery share a long visual tradition, but also that the largest metal pipes and columns of light conveyed a sense of transcendent power, frequently described by witnesses in the language of the divine, or its surrogate : the sublime. This capacity for terror is capitalized on by Heinemann, but also, in benign forms, by many composers, not least Johann Sebastian Bach himself, in pieces such as the « Pedal Exercitium » . It was the pedals that could summon thoughts of the « Last Judgment » ; the thunder of the bass could inspire devotion, but could also be criticized for degrading the organ and its higher purpose by disrupting pious thoughts of congregants through the inappropriate over-use of such effects. Bigger meant lower in sound, more imposing and awe-inspiring : the organ as edifice was framed and articulated by pedals, just as it was musically founded on what the feet could do with them.

Reflecting on the organ's exploitation as a Nazi image is not intended to poison the history of the instrument ; supreme manipulators of symbol, the Nazis distilled their own twisted message from historical antecedents with chilling potency. Heinemann's design exploits the privileged position of the organ in German culture across many Centuries ; it was a symbol of German music long before the Nazis. The instrument and its music did significant cultural work, not only in German musical life but also in contributing to a sense of national pride and cohesion. The triumph of the German model of organ-playing, throughout Europe and the world, not only offers a case study in cultural and technological exchange across borders and over time, but also in the uses and abuses of the symbolic power of the instrument that made the unprecedented expansion of that ideal possible. Nowhere is this connection clearer than in Forkel's seminal biography, where Bach's Mastery of the pedal is a vital aspect of his identity as a German hero, both musically and in uniting a people. The organ's power is both visual and sonic. The dual spectacle of dynamic organ performance and static organ architecture exposes the fraught history extending from Gottfried Silbermann and Gabriel Bodenehr to Lothar Heinemann and Albert Speer.

...

Le dictateur a la certitude d'une conscience musicale innée et supérieure chez l'être germanique. C'est pourquoi il n'hésite pas à présenter l'Allemagne, comme « pays de la musique » . L'affiche sur papier glacé de Lothar Heinemann (1911-1966) intitulée « L'Allemagne, pays de la musique » , réalisée en 6 langues, est adressée aux principaux pays européens comme message esthétique-politique : l'aigle figurant l'état allemand place l'orgue - instrument roi - sous son aile protectrice. En 1936, à Nuremberg, un orgue monumental destiné à accompagner les manifestations de Parti nazi révèle, par le gigantisme de sa facture, la puissance des principes du « Führer » . Ce grand-orgue possède 220 registres, 16,000 tuyaux dont le plus haut est de 12 mètres. Ainsi, l'art et la nation sont-ils désormais indissociables. Le docteur Josef Gœbbels affirme que le peuple allemand est « le 1er peuple musicien de la Terre » .

L'affiche créée par Lothar Heinemann : le symbole de l'État allemand se confondant avec l'instrument roi. Cette affiche réalisée à des fins touristiques, revêt une prétention impérialiste. La domination artistique doublant le sentiment de supériorité raciale et politique. Pour Josef Gœbbels, le peuple allemand est « le 1er peuple musicien de la Terre » . (Le 3e « Reich » et la Musique, Cité de la Musique, Fayard.)

...

Weitere Orgelbauten sind die Orgel nach Barcelona Weltausstellung, soweit ich ermessen kann auch heute noch die größte Orgel Europas, die zur Restaurierung ansteht, in Kufstein die Heldenorgel, und im Jahre 1936 wird die Orgel für die Luitpoldhalle in Nürnberg für den Reichsparteitag gebaut mit rund 220 Registern. Die allerdings bereits 5 Jahre später durch Brandbomben restlos zerstört wurde.

« Luitpoldhalle »

Le « Luitpoldhalle » , construit en 1906 sur un plan de 180 mètres sur 50 mètres (590 pieds par 160 pieds) ,

pouvait recevoir jusqu'à 16,000 personnes. Les congrès du Parti Nazi s'y tenaient. La façade fut modifiée dans un style monumental.

...

The Luitpold Hall (« Luitpoldhalle ») , built in 1906, had an outline of 180 metres by 50 metres (590 feet by 160 feet) featured 76 loudspeakers, 42 spotlights, the largest pipe organ in Germany and could seat 16,000 people. Dating back to the Bavarian Exposition, the former machine hall was renovated and 1st used by the Nazis for the Party convention Party congress of 1934. Its monumental neo-Classic facade featured a shell limestone facing with 3 enormous entrance portals. It was in this building during the Party congress of 1935, that the Nuremberg laws were adapted which deprived German Jews and other minorities of their citizenship. The structure was severely damaged by allied bombs, in early 1945, and, a few years later, replaced by a parking lot. The granite staircase leading to the building remains intact today.

...

Dating back to the Bavarian Exposition, the former machine-hall was renovated and 1st used by the Nazis for the Party convention Party Congress of 1934. Its monumental neo-Classic façade featured a shell limestone facing with 3 enormous entrance portals. It was in this building, during the Party congress of 1935, that the Nuremberg Laws were adapted which deprived German Jews and other minorities of their citizenship.

The structure was severely damaged by allied bombs in early 1945 and, a few years later, replaced by a parking lot. The granite staircase leading to the building remains intact today.

...

Ebenfalls auf dem Gelände befand sich die sogenannte Luitpoldhalle, welche ursprünglich als Maschinenhalle diente, dann aber durch Albert Speer der monumentalen NS-Architektur angepasst wurde, um so als vorläufige Kongreßhalle für 16.000 Personen genutzt zu werden. Aus diesem Grund wurde sie auch « Alte Kongreßhalle » genannt, ungeachtet der Tatsache, daß der Bau der neuen, um einiges größeren Kongreßhalle am Dutzendteich noch gar nicht fertiggestellt war. Das Innere der Luitpoldhalle erhielt durch eine Orgel sowie « Bänder, Schnüre und Symbole » nahezu kirchlichen Charakter. Dies sollte auch hier dazu führen, daß der « Führer » wie ein Prediger und Auserwählter seiner Religion, der Ideologie des Nationalsozialismus, erscheinen sollte.

...

Die Luitpoldhalle hatte eine Ausdehnung von 180 x 50 Metern und bot Platz für bis zu 16.000 Menschen. In ihr fand im Rahmen der Reichsparteitage der Parteikongress statt. Da die verspielte Jugendstilfassade der 1906 errichteten Halle nicht zur Optik der Luitpoldarena passte, verblendete man sie 1935 mit einer strengen Kulisse, die dem Eingang einen monumentalen Eindruck verlieh. Auch im Innenraum wurde durch Fahnen und Vorhänge die Aufmerksamkeit der Zuhörer

von der Architektur weg auf die Redner, namentlich Adolf Hitler und weitere Parteigrößen, gelenkt. Während der Jahre 1933 bis 1936 wurde in die Halle die damals größte Orgel Europas eingebaut. Die durch einen Bombentreffer beschädigte Halle wurde 1950 gesprengt und abgetragen. Das Areal wird heute als Parkplatz genutzt.

...

Ein weiteres Bauwerk das längst aus dem Stadtbild verschwunden ist, war die Luitpoldhalle. Sie wurde zur Bayerischen Landes-Gewerbe, Industrie- und Kunstausstellung 1906 errichtet. Anlässlich der 100-jährigen Zugehörigkeit zu Bayern wurde dies Jubiläumsschau in Nürnberg ausgerichtet.

Im Gegensatz zu den anderen Ausstellungsbauten, die als « fliegende Bauten » nur für die Industrieschau von Mai bis Oktober errichtet wurden, wurde das später als Luitpoldhalle benannte Gebäude, für eine längerfristige Nutzung konzipiert.

Gebaut wurde die dreischiffige, verglaste Stahlskeletthalle 1905 von der Firma MAN. Wie auf Fotografien von Ferdinand Schmidt zu erkennen ist, war es eine mächtige Konstruktion, mit einer vom Jugendstil beeinflussten Architektur. Bei einer Länge von 180 Metern und einer Breite von 49 Metern passten später bei Veranstaltungen bis zu 16.000 Menschen in das Bauwerk.

Ursprünglich als Maschinenhalle errichtet wurde das im Luitpoldhain gelegene Bauwerk nach Beendigung der Präsentation vorwiegend als Fest- und Veranstaltungshalle genutzt. Nachdem die Stadt Nürnberg das Gebäude nach Ausstellungsende übernommen hatte, erhielt es auch den Namen Luitpoldhalle - in Anlehnung nach ihrer Lage im Luitpoldhain, der nach dem bayerischen Prinzregent Luitpold benannt wurde.

So fand dort 1910 das 8. Bayerische Arbeiter-Sängerbundesfest statt, gefolgt vom 8. Deutschen Sängerbundesfest mit 40.000 Teilnehmern im Jahr 1912. Auch die Abschlusskundgebung des Wiedervereinigungsparteitags von USPD und SPD fand am 24. September 1922 in der Luitpoldhalle statt. Dieses Gebäude diente anfangs auch dem 1912 eröffneten Tiergarten an der Bayernstraße als Restaurant.

Bevor die Nationalsozialisten das gesamte Areal um den Dutzendteich vereinnahmten, nutzen diese die Halle bei ihren Reichsparteitagen 1927 und 1929 als Unterkunftsmöglichkeit. Da der Grundstein für die geplante Kongreßhalle erst 1935 gelegt wurde, und die Parteitage ab 1933 immer in Nürnberg stattfinden sollten, mußte die Luitpoldhalle in dieser Zeit für die « Nazi-Kongresse » herhalten. Deshalb nannte man sie später auch « Alte Kongreßhalle » .

Wie bereits erwähnt, hatte das Bauwerk eine vom Jugendstil beeinflusste Architektur. Dies wiederum war den Nationalsozialisten zuwider. Die Halle mußte sich eine « Verschönerung » von « Reichsbaumeister » Albert Speer gefallen lassen. Dieser ließ 1935 den Charakter des Gebäudes völlig verschwinden. Die Fassade wurde mit Muschelkalkstein im neoklassizistischen NS-Monumentalstil verkleidet, auch das Glasdach mußte weichen. Im Inneren wurden die Eisenpfeiler rot bespannt und die Decke mit Tüchern und Bändern verkleidet. Bis 1938 hielt das Naziregime ihre Versammlungen, in dem Gebäude ab. Nach dieser Zeit soll die Halle als Lebensmittellager für die Nazi-

Bonzen gedient haben, wie sie einem Augenzeugenbericht von Fritz Nadler entnehmen können (siehe weiter unten) .

Nach schweren Bombentreffern beim ersten Großangriff auf Nürnberg, in der Nacht vom 28./29. August 1942, brannte die Luitpoldhalle aus. Ihre eisernen Reste wurden nach Kriegsende beseitigt. Ende der 1950er Jahre begann die Stadt den Luitpoldhain als Freizeit- und Parkanlage wiederherzustellen.

Fritz Nadler beschreibt in seinem Buch « Ich sah wie Nürnberg unterging » , den traurigen Zustand der ehemaligen Festhalle, nach dem die « Royal Air Force » in 88 Minuten ihre Bombenlast aus 159 Flugzeugen abgeladen hatte :

« ... Total zerschmettert ist die Festhalle im Luitpoldhain, ein Überbleibsel aus der Bayerischen Landes-Industrie-Ausstellung von 1906, das seit 1933 den Namen " Kongreßhalle " führt. Die eisernen Träger sind zerknickt, durcheinandergesprengt, ineinander gesplittert. Vernichtet sind die Massen der dort eingelagerten Möbel, verbrannt Millionen Zigarren und Zigaretten, unheimliche Mengen Schokolade, Liköre, Schnäpse und dergleichen schöne Dinge, die der gewöhnliche Sterbliche nur noch vom Hörensagen kennt. Das für den Katastrophenfall dort eingelagerte Glas ist geschmolzen und zermalmt von den Tommy-Bomben. »

Weiter heißt es in einer Bildunterschrift :

« In dieser Kongreßhalle soll auch die große Wurlitzer Orgel verbrannt sein. Außerdem lagerten hier enorme Lebensmittelmengen. Das geschmolzene Glas der Halle hing, als es nach dem Angriff vom 28. August 1942 erkaltet war, wie ein Wasserfall an den verbogenen und zerschmolzenen Eisengerüsten. »

Herbert Haag

Herbert Haag (geboren 3. Dezember 1908 in Mannheim ; gestorben 13. Juni 1977 in Heidelberg) war ein deutscher Organist und Kirchenmusiker.

Haag studierte Kirchenmusik- und Orgel und andere bei Karl Straube in Leipzig. 1936 erfolgte die Promotion in Musikwissenschaft bei Heinrich Bessler an der Universität Heidelberg über das Orgelwerk des französischen Komponisten César Franck. Seit 1931 bis etwa 1942 war er Dozent für Orgel am Evangelischen Kirchenmusikalischen Institut Heidelberg. Sein Eintritt in die NSDAP erfolgte am 1. Mai 1933. 1943 gründete er die « Orgel-Arbeitsgemeinschaft Baden-Elsaß » und war Fachschaftsleiter der Reichsmusikkammer (Ortsumikerschaft Heidelberg) . Ab 1943 leitete er die Städtische Musikschule Freiburg im Breisgau, wo er mitten im Krieg die Erweiterung der Welte-Orgel des Augustiner museums durchsetzte, die der Musikschule als Übungsinstrument diente. Gegen Ende des Krieges wurde er schwer verwundet. Seine Entnazifizierung gestaltete sich langwierig und dauerte bis 1948. 1953 kehrte er nach Heidelberg zurück und übernahm die Leitung des Kirchenmusikalischen Instituts von 1956 bis 1973. Zugleich war er Landeskirchenmusikdirektor und mehrere Jahre Präsident der Direktorenkonferenz der landeskirchlichen Ausbildungsstätten. Haag setzte sich für einen Neubau des Heidelberger Instituts (1971) ein. Als Organist und Lehrer war er sehr geschätzt.

Haag trat im Dritten Reich nicht nur als Musiker, sondern auch als kirchenmusikalischer « Chef-Ideologe » im Dienst der nationalsozialistischen Staatsmacht hervor. Er instrumentalisierte die Orgel für die « neuen Aufgaben und Forderungen » der NS-Idee, spielte auch Gottesdienste in SA-Uniform und bereiste mit propagandistischen Vorträgen ganz Deutschland : Der Organist müße, so verkündete er, nicht nur als Kirchenmusiker « im besten Sinn Fanatiker der Orgel sein, weil die Orgel in der nationalsozialistischen Feier Künderin ist, nicht nur Instrument » . Im Januar 1943 erschien das von ihm herausgegebene Oberrheinische Orgelbuch. Im Vorwort erläuterte Haag und andere die Wichtigkeit der Orgel bei der Fei ergestaltung. Das Oberrheinische Orgelbuch enthält Werke von Komponisten, die in der Oberrheingegend (links und rechts des Stromes) entweder geboren oder zum Zeitpunkt der Herausgabe hauptsächlich tätig waren und stellt somit einen landschaftlichen und generationsmäßigen Querschnitt durch das Schaffen oberrheinischer Meister der Gegenwart (HH im Vorwort) dar. Nach Kriegsende wurde das Oberrheinische Orgelbuch mit zahlreichen geschwärzten und somit nicht mehr lesbaren Passagen einige Zeit weiter verkauft.

...

Herbert Haag (geboren 1908 in Mannheim ; gestorben 1977 in Heidelberg) war ein deutscher Organist und Kirchenmusiker.

Kirchenmusik- und Orgelstudium und andere bei Karl Straube in Leipzig. Promotion bei Heinrich Bessler in Heidelberg über das Orgelwerk des französischen Komponisten César Franck. Dozent für Orgel am Evangelischen Kirchenmusikalischen Institut Heidelberg 1931 bis etwa 1942. Sein Eintritt in die NSDAP erfolgte am 1. Mai 1933. 1943 gründete er die « Orgel-Arbeitsgemeinschaft Baden-Elsaß » und war Fachschaftsleiter der Reichsmusikkammer (Ortsmusikerschaft Heidelberg) . Gegen Ende des Krieges wurde er schwer verwundet. Seine Entnazifizierung gestaltete sich langwierig und dauerte bis 1948. Ab 1943 leitete er die Städtische Musikschule Freiburg im Breisgau. 1953 kehrte er nach Heidelberg zurück und übernahm die Leitung des Kirchenmusikalischen Instituts von 1956 bis 1973. Zugleich war er Landeskirchenmusikdirektor und mehrere Jahre Präsident der Direktorenkonferenz der landeskirchlichen Ausbildungsstätten. Haag setzte sich für einen Neubau des Heidelberger Instituts (1971) ein. Als Organist und Lehrer war er sehr geschätzt.

Haag trat im Dritten Reich nicht nur als Musiker, sondern auch als kirchenmusikalischer « Chef-Ideologe » im Dienst der nationalsozialistischen Staatsmacht hervor. Er instrumentalisierte die Orgel für die « neuen Aufgaben und Forderungen » der NS-Idee, spielte auch Gottesdienste in SA-Uniform und bereiste mit propagandistischen Vorträgen ganz Deutschland : Der Organist müße, so verkündete er, nicht nur als Kirchenmusiker « im besten Sinn, Fanatiker der Orgel' sein, weil die Orgel in der nationalsozialistischen Feier Künderin ist, nicht nur Instrument » .

Le « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester »

On assistera à l'émergence de guerres intestines entre différentes institutions culturelles déjà en place. 3 orchestres professionnels se partageront la ville de Linz et la région de la Haute-Autriche : le « Städtische Symphonie Orchester » (l'Orchestre symphonique municipal) va offrir, de 1940 à 1945, des concerts en salle et des Opéras au théâtre ; l'Orchestre Bruckner de Saint-Florian sera rebaptisé (sous ordre expresse du « Führer ») le « Reichs-Bruckner-

Orchester » de Linz afin de produire, de **1943 jusqu'à mai 1944**, des captations en studio et en concert réalisées par la Radio du « Reich ». Enfin, un Orchestre de théâtre du Haut-Danube fera la promotion, de **1941 à 1943**, de la musique dite légère et de l'opérette (comme par exemple, « la Veuve joyeuse » de Franz Lehár, une des œuvres favorites d'Hitler) .

...

1940 : On trouve finalement un musicien de calibre à l'extérieur de la ville de Linz : il s'agit du chef d'orchestre Georg-Ludwig Jochum. Ce choix servira à renforcer l'engagement d'Adolf Hitler envers la musique et la vie culturelle Linzoise. Hitler va également se préoccuper des jeunes chanteurs qui sont rattachés à l'Opéra de Linz. Il optera, cette fois, pour le directeur musical de Munich, le chef Clemens Krauß, qui prendra charge de leur formation.

« Hitler en a décidé ainsi parce qu'il croyait à la formation rigoureuse des chanteurs promis à un brillant avenir afin d'assurer des représentations de haut niveau sur une longue période, au lieu qu'ils ne soient utilisés de manière aléatoire. Se sentant responsable de la pérennité de la culture allemande, il se fit un devoir de distribuer, pendant plusieurs années, des bourses d'études afin d'éviter que ceux-ci ne soient mis à la porte après avoir appris des rôles importants durant leur apprentissage. » (Clemens Krauß) (Picker : « Hitlers Tischgespräche im Früherhauptquartier », 1941-1942, page 302.)

Clemens Krauß dit avoir été chargé aussi par Hitler de la formation d'un « très bon chef d'orchestre » pour la ville de Linz.

Les projets visés à Hitler demeureront des demi-victoires. Georg-Ludwig Jochum (le frère cadet d'Eugen Jochum) ne s'est pas avéré être le 1er choix mais, plutôt, le meilleur candidat disponible. Il sera difficile pour lui de répondre aux exigences culturelles du « Gauleiter » (représentant du district du « Reich ») . Jochum se voit assis entre 2 chaises : celle de l'Orchestre symphonique municipal et celle de l'Orchestre du Théâtre.

Par la suite, le « Führer » lui rajoutera le titre de chef du « Reich Bruckner Orchester » , ensemble basé au monastère de Saint-Florian.

Pour réduire les charges de Georg-Ludwig Jochum envers le Théâtre national, on lui assigne un chef assisant, Willy Wickenhäuser, qui dirigera entre autre les répétitions. Le « duo » sera aussi responsable des concerts spéciaux, des concerts en l'honneur de la « Wehrmacht » , des concerts de musique de chambre, des enregistrements en studio et pour la radio et des concerts tenus à Saint-Florian, à l'occasion de diverses cérémonies comme celui du « Jour du Souvenir » qui aura lieu le 9 novembre 1941.

On assistera à des tensions entre le maire de Linz, les élus municipaux et le « Gauleiter » August Eigruber au sujet de l'utilisation de l'Orchestre. En février 1944, ce dernier se sentira obligé de faire parvenir une lettre au magistrat afin de clarifier la situation :

« L'Orchestre Bruckner de la radiodiffusion allemande, c'est l'Orchestre du « Reich » . Il possède son siège permanent à Saint-Florian ou (provisoirement) à Linz. Il ne doit pas être considéré comme un simple Orchestre municipal ou encore de District. Seulement dans certaines circonstances, il pourra remplir cette fonction. Par conséquent, il est essentiel que le Synphonique puisse continuer d'exister et aspirer à devenir un ensemble de 1er plan. Nous sommes fort conscient des besoins de la ville ; nous prévoyons organiser des concerts durant les mois d'été dans les quartiers de Linz et dans les stations touristiques environnantes. » (Archives de l'État de Haute-Autriche. Dossier : Théâtre d'État.)

Ainsi, Linz sera privé de son Orchestre de Théâtre : cette institution dépend, au plan administratif, de la région. Et, quant à lui, l'Orchestre symphonique municipal devra se subordonner, dans une certaine mesure, au Conseil d'administration.

Près d'un mois après le début de la campagne de Russie (le **22 juin 1941**) , grâce à un décret en provenance du Ministère du « Reich » pour l'Instruction publique et la Propagande, les écrivains et les compositeurs nationaux seront interdits d'existence « jusqu'à nouvel ordre » . Franz Kinzl voit dans cette mesure une opportunité pour le chef Georg-Ludwig Jochum de promouvoir les compositeurs de Haute-Autriche dont Anton Bruckner :

« Puisque vous avez l'intention de programmer des œuvres de Tchaïkovsky lors des concerts du **23 septembre 1941** et du **10 février 1942**, je vous recommande de respecter l'ordre du Ministère, en laissant plutôt la place aux œuvres des compositeurs du Haut-Danube. » (Archives municipales de Linz. Dossier : culture.)

L'année suivante, les compositeurs autrichiens se sont cette fois tournés vers Anton Fellner, le Commissaire culturel du District, pour tenter à nouveau de contrecarrer les plans du chef Georg-Ludwig Jochum :

« Nous devons considérer cela comme un devoir de promouvoir les compositeurs actuels de notre District et ce, dans une plus forte proportion. Juste dans la région du Haut-Danube, on retrouve un nombre significatif de musiciens de 1er plan. La meilleure solution est de proposer une de leurs œuvres, surtout lors des concerts de la mi-saison. La présente programmation ne répond pas vraiment à ce critère. Certes, le public local revendique le droit d'entendre ses favoris mais il faut également présenter des soirées de première ou d'avant-première qui respectent notre politique. Le public membre du KdF a aussi droit à son répertoire. » (Archives municipales de Linz. Dossier : culture.)

(Le mouvement appelé « Kraft durch Freude » ou KdF (la Force par la joie) était une vaste organisation de loisirs contrôlée par l'État nazi. Elle faisait partie du « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » ou DAF (Front allemand du travail) qui s'était substitué aux syndicats, dissous le 1er mai 1933.)

Georg-Ludwig Jochum dut donc se plier aux arguments de Fellner. Mais ce dernier était fort conscient que la politique de propagande et d'assimilation proposée par le « Gauleiter » Eigruber qui consiste à « apporter la Culture allemande au peuple » demeurera une utopie.

...

Suite au débat sur l'avenir de l'Orchestre municipal et de l'Orchestre du Théâtre, on assistera, en **1942**, à la fondation à Saint-Florian (sur ordre d'Adolf Hitler) d'un 3e Orchestre Linzois avec le mandat de promouvoir la vie et les œuvres Symphoniques d'Anton Bruckner. Il doit entrer en fonction immédiatement après la fin de la guerre (?). Des musiciens provenant de l'Orchestre symphonique municipal de Linz et de divers autres Orchestres (en fonction depuis 1933) qui travaillent avec la Radio du « Reich » devront donc se sacrifier pour l'effort de guerre. La phalange sera composée de 120 musiciens et devrait, en termes de qualité, se comparer aux Philharmoniques de Berlin et de Vienne. La radiodiffusion se fera directement du monastère de Saint-Florian grâce à l'installation, par le « Reich », d'une nouvelle station de radio.

Dès **1941**, l'Orchestre est placé sous la direction du chef Georg-Ludwig Jochum (soit le frère cadet d'Eugen Jochum) qui assume déjà les destinées de l'Orchestre symphonique de Linz depuis **1940**. Il aura comme assistant le « Kapellmeister » Willy Wickenhäuser.

Après 1 an de préparation et de rodage, le « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » est fin prêt. Le **20 avril 1943**, il offrira un concert exceptionnel à l'occasion du 54e anniversaire d'Adolf Hitler (1 an plus tard, le « Führer » souhaitera le rebaptisé « Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester des Deutschen Rundfunks » ; l'Orchestre Bruckner de Linz de la radiodiffusion allemande du « Reich »). Des concerts publics seront offerts à partir de **mai 1944**. Des captations en direct par la Radio du « Reich » seront effectuées à Saint-Florian, Salzbourg, Linz et Vienne.

Les salles de concert de même que les Théâtres lyriques autrichiens cesseront leurs activités en raison de la déclaration, le **1er septembre 1944**, de la « Guerre totale ». Seul le « Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » poursuivra sa « divine » mission. Les diffusions cesseront le **14 mars 1945**.

...

The 40th anniversary of the « Bruckner Orchester Linz » means that, in 1967, the then Orchestra of the Linz District Theatre (« Landestheater ») donned a new costume with a view to improving its artistic status and marketability on a wider-stage. To include the « genius loci » in its new name seemed perfectly natural. Behind this, however, there lies a long history, always connected to the destiny of the District Theatre.

The performing area built on the « Promenade », in 1803, served all types of theatrical and musical events, for which the Municipal Orchestra of the « Linz Stadtthurnermeister » (music-director), Franz Glöggel, was available. After a quarrel, the Theatre director Franz Graf Föger established a band of his own, in 1806, and this experienced the same ups and downs as the Theatre. For whole decades around the mid-19th Century, some 30 orchestral players were on hand for a season that could last 12 months, but sometimes for only 8 or 9. During the rest of the time, the musicians had to find employment elsewhere. Church music, teaching and playing in spa Orchestras during the summer were essential stand-bys. Some players also worked as music copyists, as the horn player Franz Schimatschek did for Anton Bruckner.

The early 20th Century saw a turn for the worse. From 1914, there was no Opera in Linz for over 5 years. In the period between the 2 World Wars, cultural life was over-shadowed by political and economic problems. The Opera ceased in 1925, Operetta continuing to thrive the longest. Although the Theatre was threatened with closure in 1932 because of serious economic difficulties, this was averted and a core ensemble of orchestral players was retained. Opera with an in-house ensemble was resumed in autumn 1937, beginning with Wilhelm Kienzl's « Der Evangelimann » .

The National-Socialist period was a somewhat confusing time for the Orchestra because of a division of interests between City and District. For a while, there were 3 Orchestras in Linz, including one in the Theatre devoted to « light entertainment » .

After 1945, the professional Orchestra witnessed a steady growth in personnel so as to take on more and more concert engagements under the joint auspices of City and District. It has borne the name « Bruckner Orchester » since 1 January 1967, has been an autonomous institution of the District of Upper-Austria since 1986, and achieved the status of a limited company together with the Linz Theatre, in 2005. The development of its artistic profile has been governed by successive principal conductors :

Professor Kurt WöB (1961-1975) ; Theodor Guschlbauer (1975-1983) ; Doctor Roman Zeilinger (1983-1985) ; Manfred Mayrhofer (1985-1992) ; Martin Sieghart (1992-2000) ; Ingo Ingensand (2000-2002) ; and Dennis Russell Davies (since 2002) .

With its 110 musicians, the Orchestra is now one of Central Europe's leading ensembles, while remaining at the Linz Theatre's disposal in all musical matters. Its artistic home is the « Linz Brucknerhaus » , where major concerts are given. In addition, there are regular concert engagements both at home and abroad, such as tours of Japan and China, and the United States. The Orchestra's CDs include the already legendary « Bruckner Box » with the entire Symphonic « œuvre » , new Bruckner recordings under the present chief-conductor, a series of rarities, and works by the American composer Philip Glass. The latter's 8th Symphony was commissioned by the District of Upper-Austria and premiered by the Orchestra in New York and at its Jubilee Concert in Linz.

To coincide with the 40th anniversary concert in the « Brucknerhaus » , the « Bruckner Orchester Linz » released a Jubilee box-set of CDs containing all the Master's Symphonies. The recordings date from 1981 onwards and feature performances under the direction of 4 principal conductors who have helped to shape the Orchestra. Theodor Guschlbauer conducts No. 0 (« die Nullte ») . Kurt Eichhorn is commemorated in recordings of the 6th, 7th and 9th Symphonies, the last of these with the completed Finale. Martin Sieghart is responsible for the 5th : a recording made in the Abbey Church of Saint-Florian in 1995, and since, deleted from the catalogue. Dennis Russell Davies conducts the 1st (1st version of 1866) , 2nd, 3rd (1889) , 4th (1st version of 1874) and 8th Symphony (1st version of 1884-1887)

...

Im Auftrag Adolf Hitlers aus Musikern des Städtischen Symphonieorchesters Linz und verschiedener Rundfunkorchester

aus dem Deutschen Reich (zum Teil zwangsweise abkommandiert) 1942 in Sankt Florian gegründet, besonders zur Pflege von « A. Bruckners Lebenswerk » . Das rund 120 Mitglieder umfassende Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester sollte, qualitätsmäßig den Berliner und Wiener Philharmonikern vergleichbar, nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg den Grundstock eines eigenen großdeutschen Senders für « ernste Musik » bilden : für das Musikwerk Weltrundfunk mit Sitz in Sankt Florian. Das nach Hitlers Wünschen (und andere auch als Aufbewahrungsort von Kunstschätzen) umzubauende Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Sankt Florian, die neu zu gründenden Institutionen Bruckner-Orchester und Bruckner-Chor sollten das Musikwerk des Großdeutschen Rundfunks bilden. Der Reichsintendant des Großdeutschen Rundfunks, Heinrich Glasmeier, war die Zentralfigur für die Umsetzung der Pläne. Das Stift war bereits 1940 beschlagnahmt und zu Gunsten des Reichsgaus Oberdonau enteignet, jedoch wegen seiner kulturhistorischen Bedeutung nicht wie andere Klöster aufgehoben worden, die Chorherren hatten das Stift allerdings 1941 verlassen müßen. Unter dem Namen Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian wurde es von Hitler in seinen umfangreichen Plan für Linz, die zukünftige Kulturhauptstadt des Großdeutschen Reiches, aufgenommen und sogar als Aufführungsort für jährlich abzuhaltende Brucknerfestspiele (nach Bayreuther Vorbild) vorgesehen.

Zunächst Bruckner-Orchester Sankt Florian des Großdeutschen Rundfunks genannt und unter diesem Namen nach einer Einspiel- und Probezeit erfolgreich ab April 1943 aufgetreten, setzte sich ab Mai 1944 die Bezeichnung Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester durch. Gespielt wurde vor allem in Sankt Florian, Linz und Wien bis zum 14.03.1945. Rundfunkaufnahmen des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters fanden in Wien, Salzburg und Linz statt (zum Teil auf CD wieder veröffentlicht) , Sendungen gab es bis zum 01.04.1945. Künstlerischer Leiter war Georg Ludwig Jochum, als Gastdirigenten waren Wilhelm Furtwängler, der auch als Leiter im Gespräch gewesen war, Herbert von Karajan, Karl Böhm, Hans Knappertsbusch, Oswald Kabasta, Carl Schuricht und Joseph Keilberth verpflichtet. Die nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg geplante Zusammenführung der Musiker in ein neues Bruckner-Orchester in Bad Pyrmont / Deutschland scheiterte (Bruckner Orchester Linz) .

...

Mit einer Verordnung des Reichspropagandaministers vom 11.06.1938 begannen die Maßnahmen zur Gleichschaltung des Musiklebens mit dem Großdeutschen Reich. Die neuen Strukturen krankten allerdings am Kompetenzgerangel mehrerer Kulturbeauftragter von unterschiedlichen Organisationen. Aufgrund unterschiedlicher Interessen von Stadt und Land Oberösterreich / Oberdonau bestanden zeitweise drei Berufsorchester nebeneinander : das Städtische Symphonie Orchester (1940-1945, für Konzerte und Oper im Theater) und das Bruckner-Orchester Sankt Florian des Großdeutschen Rundfunks (seit 1943, ab Mai 1944 : Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester, für Rundfunkaufnahmen und Konzerte) , beide geleitet von Georg-Ludwig Jochum, zu dessen Entlastung 1941 Kapellmeister Willy Wickenhäuser von der StadtLinz. berufen worden war. Schließlich stellte der Gau Oberdonau für die « leichte Muse » ein eigenes Theaterorchester (1941-1943) auf.

Die traditionellen großen Chöre waren von zwangsweiser Auflösung (Brucknerchor) beziehungsweise Beeinträchtigung des Proben- und Konzertbetriebes (Frohsinn) betroffen. Gleichzeitig hatten aber die Behörden Scheu vor der Auflösung der Ensembles, da die Fortsetzung der Choraufführungen großen Stils geplant war. Weiters gab es eine Städtische Chorgemeinschaft (erweitert Februar 1941) , einen Gauchor der deutschen Erzieher (erweitert 1943) und den

professionellen Bruckner-Chor Sankt Florian (1943-1945) als Ensemble des Großdeutschen Rundfunks.

Ab der Saison 1940-1941 ist eine steigende Zahl von Kammermusik- und Solistenkonzerten zu verzeichnen. An Linzer Kammerensembles existierten drei Streichquartette und ein « Collegium Musicum » am Bruckner Konservatorium. Konzertveranstalter waren neben privaten Konzertdirektionen und Vereinen die « NSG Kraft durch Freude » -Organisation (ab Oktober 1938) und das Kulturamt des Linzer Magistrats (ab November 1939) . Als mit der Verfügung des totalen Kriegseinsatzes (01.09.1944) jeder Konzert- und Theaterbetrieb eingestellt wurde, war das Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester ausgenommen.

Der 1945 einsetzende Wiederaufbau konnte auf dem Sektor Musik und Theater zum Teil an alte Strukturen anknüpfen, wenn sich auch viele Erschwernisse entgegenstellten. Das Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester spielte im Auflösungsprozess unter verschiedenen Namen. Das Städtische Symphonieorchester wurde auf Weisung der Amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht aus dem Dienst der Stadt entlassen, der Theaterpächter stellte den verbliebenen Rest an. Orchesterkonzerte kamen wegen unzureichender Kräfte nur zögernd in Schwung. Dabei war der Dirigent Ludwig Daxsperger der « Mann der ersten Stunde » . Infolge der Verfügbarkeit mehrerer kleinerer Räume konnten lokale und auswärtige Solisten und Kammerensembles zahlreiche Konzerte geben ; das Kulturamt des Magistrates wirkte dabei als Veranstalter. Nach Entlassung von Direktor Brantner wurde das Landestheater wieder Pachtbetrieb. Kirchenmusik konnte sich verstärkt entfalten, die Magistratsmusik bereits am 16.07.1945 wieder auftreten.

Le « Reichs-Bruckner-Chor »

Der Rundfunkchor des Mitteldeutschen Rundfunks

1924

Am 14. Dezember 1924 singt mit der Leipziger Oratorienvereinigung der erste Leipziger Rundfunkchor im Sender MIRAG.

Unter der Leitung von Alfred Szendrei, dem musikalischen Direktor des Senders, erklingt gemeinsam mit dem Leipziger Sinfonieorchester Franz-Josef Haydns « Schöpfung » .

Hierzu Szendrei in seinen Erinnerungen :

« Ich habe mir einen ständigen Chor von 32 Sängern zusammengestellt, alle Mitglieder des Gewandhauschores, mit ausgezeichneten Stimmen und alle perfekte Blattleser. Mit nur 1-2 Klavierproben und einer Generalprobe konnte ich mit diesem Chor einwandfreie künstlerische Leistungen erzielen. Ich habe den Chor zu “ funkischem ” Singen trainiert, das heißt den Sängern diejenigen Stärkegrade beigebracht, welche die damalige Mikrophontechnik erlaubt hat. Außerdem sind mehrere Mikrophone so aufgestellt worden, daß die vier verschiedenen Chorgruppen sich klar voneinander abhoben und keinen dicken Brei in der Sendung ergaben. »

1926

Der Rundfunkchor Leipzig 1928-1930 mit Musikchef Alfred Szendrei vor der « Alten Handelsbörse », aus der die Übertragungen stattfanden.

Bis 1931 singt die Leipziger Oratorienvereinigung jährlich in 15 bis 20 Oratorien- und Opernübertragungen unter Szendreis Leitung.

1929

Am 6. Mai wirkt der Chor in der ersten Rundfunk-Übertragung von Arnold Schönbergs « Gurre-Liedern » mit.

Alfred Szendrei schreibt hierüber :

« Ich lud dazu Schönberg ein, und in Erwartung seiner Anwesenheit habe ich ausgezeichnete Solisten herangezogen ... Mein Orchester wurde auf 100 Mann verstärkt, die halsbrecherisch schwierigen Chöre wurden von der Leipziger Singakademie, dem Leipziger Männerchor und der Leipziger Oratorienvereinigung bestritten : es war ein imposanter Chorkörper von mehr als 450 Sängern. Das Podium war zu klein, um solche Massen unterzubringen, und es mußte eine Anzahl Logen im Zuschauerraum dafür herangezogen werden. Die Aufführung war ein großer Erfolg sowohl für Schönberg wie für mich. Wir beide wurden sehr gefeiert, sogar die Presse war einstimmig im Lob, ein Umstand, der sich in Leipzig nur selten ereignete. Obwohl die Funkübertragung einer solchen Massenaufführung ziemlich problematisch und riskant war, haben dennoch der Deutschland-Sender und die meisten anderen Sender die Aufführung übernommen. Wider Erwarten liefen in den nächsten Tagen eine Menge guter Urteile über den akustischen Teil der Übertragung bei uns ein. »

1931

Alfred Szendrei wird von nationalsozialistischen Kräften aus dem Amt des Musikalischen Direktors der MIRAG gedrängt. Die Leipziger Oratorienvereinigung wandelt sich in den deutlich kleineren Leipziger Solistenchor, der im Programm der MIRAG eher das « leichtere » Repertoire bedient.

Am Pult des Leipziger Solistenchores stehen neben Hans Weisbach, Theodor Blumer und Willy Steffen auch Friedbert Sammler und Heinrich Werlé.

1934

Ab Juli nennt sich der Rundfunkchor « Kammerchor des Reichssenders Leipzig » , Ende des Jahres 1934 dann « Chor des Reichssenders Leipzig » .

1935

Der Reichssender Leipzig stellt Curt Kretzschmar als « Kapellmeister, Chorleiter und musikalischer Sachbearbeiter » ein.

Am 1. Oktober erhalten die Leipziger Rundfunk-Chorsänger erstmals feste Verträge.

Der Chor hat etwas 32 Mitglieder.

Hans Weisbach führt Richard Wagners « Ring » auf. Der Chor wirkt in der « Götterdämmerung » mit.

1937

Die Aufnahme der Arie der Marie aus der Oper « Die Regimentstochter » von Gaetano Donizetti mit Irma Beilke und dem Leipziger Sinfonieorchester unter Curt Kretzschmar vom 1. März 1937 stellt die erste erhalten gebliebene Aufnahme mit dem Chor des Reichssenders Leipzig dar.

Am 12. Juni findet erstmals eine A-cappella-Produktion mit deutschen Volksliedern statt.

1938

Zwischen November 1937 und April 1938 werden « Rienzi », « Der fliegende Holländer », « Tannhäuser », « Lohengrin », « Tristan und Isolde » sowie « Parsifal » unter Beteiligung des Chores des Reichssenders Leipzig aufgeführt.

1941

Der Chor des Reichssenders Leipzig wird kriegsbedingt zum Münchner Sender « abgeordnet » .

1942

Am 15. September löst Rundfunk-Reichsintendant Doktor Heinrich Glasmeier alle deutschen Rundfunkchöre auf.

Gleichzeitig wird verfügt, einen Reichs-Bruckner-Chor aufzubauen, der im Stift Sankt Florian bei Linz zusammen mit dem Reich-Bruckner-Orchester tätig sein soll. Etwa die Hälfte der ehemaligen Leipziger Rundfunk-Chorsänger wird in den Bruckner-Chor engagiert.

Thomaskantor Günther Ramin baut diesen Chor in Leipzig auf.

1944

Der Bruckner-Chor wird nach Linz verlegt und arbeitet dort unter Leitung von Johannes Rietz und später unter

Professor Doktor Michael Schneider und dem Chormitglied Walter Kretschmar bis über das Kriegsende hinaus weiter.

Der in Linz verbliebene Teil von 34 Chormitgliedern siedelt im Herbst 1945 nach Korntal bei Stuttgart über und hofft, dort als Chor eines neu zu gründenden Stuttgarter Senders übernommen zu werden.

« Grandiose Pläne » im Kriegsalltag

Der Zweite Weltkrieg nahm seinen Lauf, und so war es nicht verwunderlich, daß im September des Jahres 1942 die deutschen Rundfunkchöre aufgelöst wurden.

Diese oder ähnliche lapidare Feststellungen sind in der Literatur zu diesem Thema des Öfteren zu finden. Wäre es nicht ebenso gut möglich gewesen, die Chöre weiter zusammenzulegen und auf diese Weise wenigstens zwei oder gar nur einen Rundfunkchor zu erhalten ?

Im Folgenden sollen die Gründe für die Auflösung der Rundfunkchöre näher beleuchtet werden. Die Behandlung dieser Thematik ist ohne einige Kenntnisse über die Struktur des Reichs-Rundfunks und über den Reichsintendanten (RI) Doktor Heinrich Glasmeier schwer möglich.

Glasmeier war nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg als Direktor der Vereinigten Westfälischen Adelsarchive tätig gewesen und über das Amt des Intendanten des Kölner Senders auf den Sessel des Reichsintendanten gelangt.

Weil der Rundfunk jedoch immer mehr als Propagandainstrument genutzt und zumindest hinsichtlich der programmatischen Seite dem Propagandaminister Josef Goebbels unterstellt wurde, schwanden die Befugnisse des Reichsintendanten immer mehr, bis er den Rundfunk schließlich nur noch verwalten durfte.

Diese Entmachtung hatte Glasmeier dadurch kompensiert, daß er sich eine Idee Adolf Hitlers zu Nutze machte und diese mit großer Zielstrebigkeit verfolgte : den Ausbau der Stadt Linz zu einem Europäischen Kunst- und Kulturzentrum und speziell den Aufbau einer Bruckner-Weihestätte im Stift Sankt Florian, Bayreuth vergleichbar.

Produktionsstätte des « großdeutschen und europäischen Rundfunks »

(Foto : Archiv des Augustiner Chorherrenstiftes Sankt Florian) Reichsrundfunk-Intendant Doktor Heinrich Glasmeier pflegte prominente Gäste am Stiftsportal mit einem Glasbecher Wein zu begrüßen. Der Vertreter Benito Mussolinis, Dino Alfieri besuchte das Stift am 3. Juli 1943.

Kernstück dieser Pläne war es, in Sankt Florian ein Bruckner-Orchester und einen Bruckner-Chor zu installieren, die zu Adolf Hitlers 55. Geburtstag am 20. April 1944 erstmals öffentlich auftreten sollten.

Da sich Hitler bis zuletzt, trotz oder gerade wegen des aussichtslos gewordenen Krieges immer wieder in dieses Projekt flüchtete, konnte sich Glasmeier der Rückendeckung von allerhöchster Stelle sicher sein.

Obwohl die Pläne, Linz in nationalsozialistischer Manier umzubauen, wegen der angespannten wirtschaftlichen Lage in der ersten Hälfte der vierziger Jahre nicht in Angriff genommen werden konnten, konnte der Aufbau von Bruckner-Orchester und Bruckner-Chor jedoch trotz einiger Abstriche an der Stärke des Chores vollendet werden.

(Foto : Archiv des Augustiner Chorherrenstiftes Sankt Florian) Heinrich Glasmeiers Entwurf zu seinem Wappen als Reichsrundfunk-Intendant.

Heinrich Glasmeier residierte in Sankt Florian wie ein Abt, was an seiner Kleidung und speziellen Ritualen zu erkennen war. So verpflichtete er beispielsweise die Mitglieder von Bruckner-Chor und -Orchester feierlich am Sarge Bruckners.

Im Hoheitszeichen des von den Nazis säkularisierten Bruckner Stiftes offenbart sich die frevelhafte NS-Selbstherrlichkeit, die zum Wappen des Stiftes Sankt Florian ebenbürtig das Hauswappen Glasmeiers stellt, noch dazu in eine Reihe mit dem Hakenkreuz unter dem Schirm des Reichsadlers.

Sich über das Gehabe des Reichsintendanten lustig machend, nannten ihn die Chormitglieder in Verballhornung seines Namens Scherbelheinrich.

Von den Rundfunkchören zum Bruckner-Chor

Eine Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Ereignisse von der Auflösung der Rundfunkchöre bis zum ersten Zusammentreffen des Bruckner-Chores ist sehr interessant und aufschlussreich :

15. September 1942 : Auflösung aller deutschen Rundfunkchöre durch Glasmeier.

9. September 1942 : Brief Glasmeiers an den Linzer Oberbürgermeister :

« Ich habe mit Wirkung vom 15. September alle Chöre des Rundfunks aufgelöst und bilde zur Zeit aus den besten und frischesten Kräften den neuen Bruckner-Chor von etwa 48 Stimmen. Nach Möglichkeit möchte ich diesen Chor zum 1. April 1943 nach Linz verlegen, damit er dort sowohl selbständig als auch als Grundstock eines von Linzer Einwohnern zu bildenden Chores von rund 200 Stimmen wirken kann. »

25. November 1942 : Sendeleiter Wirz berichtet, daß Günther Ramín unter einigen Bedingungen die Leitung des Bruckner-Chores zugesagt hat.

17. und 21. Dezember 1942 : Vorsingen für den Bruckner-Chor in Ramíns Leipziger Privatwohnung.

31. Dezember 1942 : Vertragsende für die Sänger der Rundfunkchöre.

11.-14. Januar 1943 : Weitere Vorsingen bei Ramín in Leipzig.

27. Januar 1943 : Wirz vermeldet, daß die Aufstellung des Bruckner-Chores « soweit vollendet » sei.

22. Februar 1943 : Erste vom Reichsrundfunk genehmigte Personalliste des Bruckner-Chores.

22. Februar 1943 : Einstellungsschreiben an die ausgewählten Chormitglieder.

2. März 1943 : Erste Zusammenkunft des Bruckner-Chores in Leipzig.

Auffallend sind an dieser Aufstellung zum einen die eminent kurze Zeitspanne von zwei Monaten, die zwischen dem juristischen Ende der Rundfunkchöre und dem Arbeitsbeginn des Bruckner-Chores lag und zum anderen deren unmittelbare zeitliche Abfolge.

Glasmeier spricht in seinem oben zitierten Brief in einem Satz von beiden Vorgängen.

Für die Leitung des Bruckner-Chores konnte Thomaskantor Günther Ramín gewonnen werden, der wohl als der kompetenteste Chorfachmann seiner Generation galt.

Ramín wollte selbstverständlich (und dieses war seine Hauptbedingung für die Annahme der Chorleiterposition beim Bruckner-Chor gewesen) Thomaskantor bleiben.

Kanonen oder Singen ? - Aufbauphase in Leipzig

(Foto : Archiv des Augustiner Chorherrenstiftes Sankt Florian) Im Auftrag des Reichsrundfunk-Intendanten Glasmeier vom Notewart des in Auflösung befindlichen Reichssender Leipzig aufgestellte Inventarliste, die später dem Abtransport des gesamten Aufführungsmaterials nach Sankt Florian diente.

In dieser Situation gab es nur die eine Lösung, den Bruckner-Chor in Leipzig aufzubauen und ihn erst später nach Linz zu verlegen.

Die Rundfunkmitarbeiter-Zeitung « Das leere Haus » berichtete ausführlich und wohlwollend über den Probenstart des Chores in Leipzig. Das letzte Häuflein der in Leipzig verbliebenen Rundfunkmitarbeiter war froh darüber, daß wieder Leben im Funkhaus am Markt eingezogen war.

Die Leipziger Öffentlichkeit und die Presse beäugten den neuen Chor dagegen eher argwöhnisch. Was sollte in Zeiten des totalen Krieges eine Chorneugründung, zumal in Leipzig erst kurz zuvor der Riedel-Verein und der Lehrergesangverein eingegangen waren und Leipzig nicht gerade als eine Hochburg der Brucknerpflege bezeichnet werden konnte ! Es gab sogar Anzeigen von Leipziger Bürgern beim Arbeitsamt gegen die Aufstellung des Bruckner-Chores, in deren Folge der Leiter dieser Behörde erst nach Vorlegen schriftlicher Unterlagen von höchster Stelle den Chor weiterarbeiten ließ.

Der Linzer Brucknerforscher Hanns Kreczi zitiert nach Unterlagen des Stiftsarchivs Sankt Florian Arbeitsamtsleiter Handrik mit den Worten :

« Was ist heute wichtig : Kanonen oder Singen ? »

Infolge dieser Vorgänge und auf Grund von Anfragen aus der Bevölkerung wurde die Presse beauftragt, nur noch über die künstlerische Arbeit des Bruckner-Chores zu berichten.

Über das Woher und das Wohin des Ensembles wurde folgender Wortlaut für die Presse freigegeben :

« Der Rundfunk hat seine Chöre an den Reichssendern aufgelöst. Aus diesen Chören ist durch Auswahl ein Spitzenchor zusammengestellt und diesem der Name “ Bruckner-Chor ” gegeben worden.

Es handelt sich hier also um keine Neugründung, sondern nur um eine neue Zielsetzung der Chorarbeit des Rundfunks. Der Reichsintendant hat zur Schulung dieses Chores Professor Ramín berufen. Mit Rücksicht auf das Thomas-Kantorat und die anderen Aufgaben Ramíns ist der Chor in Leipzig zusammengetreten und wird der Öffentlichkeit Proben seiner Arbeit abgeben. »

Mit diesen Sätzen gibt Sendeleiter Wirz, der von Glasmeier mit der praktischen Durchführung der Chorbildung beauftragt worden war, indirekt den Zusammenhang zwischen der Auflösung der Rundfunkchöre und der Schaffung des Bruckner-Chores zu.

Ein Fernschreiben von Glasmeiers Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft an alle Reichssender, aus deren Chören Mitglieder in den Reichs-Bruckner-Chor engagiert worden waren, belegt eindeutig, daß die Sängerinnen und Sänger des auch verwaltungstechnisch als « abgeordnet » galten, daß ihr Arbeitsverhältnis also nicht als beendet angesehen worden war, daß somit der Reichs-Bruckner-Chor als unmittelbarer Nachfolger der Rundfunkchöre angesehen werden muß und daß die Chöre des Rundfunks nur zu dem Zweck aufgelöst worden waren, den Bruckner-Chor möglichst schnell mit möglichst geeigneten Kräften besetzen zu können.

Die Leipziger « Fraktion » im Bruckner-Chor

Von den Mitgliedern des Chores des Reichssenders Leipzig war etwa die Hälfte in den Reichs-Bruckner-Chor engagiert worden :

Sopran	Alt	Tenor	Bass
Eva Anschütz	Waltraute Groch-Männel	Walter Kretschmar	Erhard Neukirch
Käthe Jena	Leonore Eichhorn	Erich Purfürst	
Ursula Thate	Emmy Daehne	Albert Schwarzburger	

Inge Kahle Charlotte Hein
 Marie Kaete Herre
 Dorothea Schröder
 Mary Trautner

Später schieden zwar Mary Trautner und Waltraute Groch-Männel aus dem Bruckner-Chor wieder aus (Albert Schwarzburger war hinzugekommen) , doch sind die Leipziger Rundfunkchormitglieder mit 14 Sängerinnen und Sängern die bei weitem stärkste « Fraktion » darin gewesen, gefolgt von Stuttgart und Frankfurt (je 9) und München (8 Mitglieder) .

Die Ursache für den hohen Anteil von Leipziger Rundfunkchorsängerinnen und -sängern in diesem Ensemble ist nicht schwer zu erkennen. Zum einen war der Leipziger Chor mit seinen etwa 30 Mitgliedern kein kleiner Chor, und zum anderen mag es für die Leipziger natürlich besonders anziehend gewesen sein, zunächst in ihrer Heimatstadt und in ihrem Sender ihren gewohnten Beruf ausüben zu können. Weil es nicht gelungen war, alle Stimmen mit ehemaligen Rundfunkchor-Mitgliedern zu besetzen, hatte Ramín auch freie Sängerinnen, für deren Qualitäten er sich verbürgte, für den Bruckner-Chor empfohlen. Zu diesem Kreis gehörte auch Irmgard Røehling.

Irmgard Genzel-Røehling hatte im Programm von MIRAG und Reichssender Leipzig häufig solistisch gesungen, auch in der Reihe der Bach-Kantaten-Übertragungen aus der Thomaskirche. Daher mußte Ramín sie kennen. Nach der Neugründung des Rundfunkchores gehörte Irmgard Genzel-Røehling zum Aushilfskreis des Rundfunkchores Leipzig.

Konzerte in Leipzig - Ramín Reichs-Bruckner Chor

(Foto : Sammlung Lieberwirth) In der Leipziger Thomaskirche singt der Bruckner-Chor am 23. Februar 1944 sein letztes Konzert. Es ist auch das letzte unter der Leitung von Günter Ramín.

Der Bruckner-Chor bestritt in Leipzig vier Konzerte unter Leitung von Ramín.

Im ersten Konzert am 10. Juni 1943 erklangen unter Mitwirkung des Gewandhausorchesters der « Psalm 150 » (für gemischten Chor, Sopran-Solo und Orchester) und die Große Messe in F-Moll, beide Werke von Anton Bruckner.

Das Programm des zweiten Konzertes am 6. November 1943 verzeichnet vier Graduale und das « Ave Maria » von Anton Bruckner, vier italienische Madrigale von Carlo Gesualdo, fünf Gesänge aus dem Zyklus « Das Jahr » von Ernst Pepping sowie Volkslieder für gemischten Chor.

Das dritte Konzert (2. Dezember 1943) , wieder gemeinsam mit dem Gewandhausorchester, enthielt das « Requiem in bello » von Hermann Simon, den Hymnus « Fons salutaris » von Hans Pfitzner und den « 100. Psalm » von Max Reger.

Das letzte Konzert des Bruckner-Chores in Leipzig fand am 23. Februar 1944 in der Thomaskirche mit dem « Requiem

» von Giuseppe Verdi statt.

Ursprünglich sollte das Konzert im Gewandhaus durchgeführt werden, was jedoch durch die Zerstörung des Hauses im Bombenangriff vom 20. Februar 1944 nicht mehr möglich war.

Das Thomaskirchen-Konzert war gleichzeitig Ramíns Abschiedskonzert vom Chor.

Weil der Thomanerchor aus Sicherheitsgründen Leipzig verlassen hatte und in Grimma weiterarbeitete, wurde dadurch die Leitung des Bruckner-Chores für Ramín immer schwieriger. Diese Situation hätte sich bei der unausweichlichen Übersiedlung des Chores nach Linz um ein Vielfaches verschärft. Deshalb verlängerte Ramín seinen am 31. März 1944 auslaufenden Vertrag nicht.

« ... Daß Sie eine persönliche Schöpfung des Führers sind ! »

(Foto : Privatbesitz Sammlung Hanns Kreczi) Michæl Schneider mit dem Reichs-Rundfunkorchester und dem Reichs-Bruckner-Chor zum Konzert im Marmorsaal des säkularisierten Augustiner Chorherrenstifts Sankt Florian am 27. August 1944.

<http://www.rundfunkschaetze.de/mdr-klassik/mdr-rundfunkchor/mdr-rundfunkchor-1933-1943-koch-chronik/mdr-rundfunkchor-1943-1945-koch-chronik/#PI%C3%A4ne>

Willkommensfeier für den Reichs-Brucknerchor

(Welcome ceremony by the « Reich » Bruckner Choir.)

Audio 1 : Senderkennung für Rundfunkübertragungen des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters und des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores.

(« Sender » broadcasting musical identification used to announce the « Reich » Bruckner Orchestra and the « Reich » Bruckner Choir.)

Audio 2 : Aus der Begrüßungsansprache des Gauleiters Oberdonau, August Eigruber.

(Excerpt of the welcoming speech by August Eigruber, « Gauleiter » of the Upper-Danube.)

Audio 3 : Dank eines namentlich nicht nachgewiesenen Rundfunkvertreters - Aufnahme : 30. April 1944.

(Words of thanks addressed on 30 April 1944 to an unnamed radio broadcasting representative.)

Audio 4 : Gesang der Reichs-Bruckner-Chores - Aufnahme : Reichsrundfunk 30. April 1945.

(Singing by the « Reich » Bruckner Choir during a « Reich » radio broadcast on 30 April 1945.)

Originaltonträger : Mitschnitt der Übertragung auf Schallfolie. (Trotz ihres schlechten Zustandes ist die Aufnahme ein wichtiges Zeitdokument.)

(Original source : Film soundtrack. Despite its poor condition, this recording is an important historical document.)

Weiterarbeit in Linz

Wegen zunehmender Bombenangriffe wurde es auch für den Bruckner-Chor in Leipzig zu gefährlich, und so drängte man auf eine baldige Verlegung des Chores nach Linz, wo er am 30. April 1944 eingeführt wurde.

Zunächst ging die Arbeit unter Leitung von Johannes Rietz, der schon erfolgreich Ramón assistiert hatte, weiter. Im Mai 1944 war es dann gelungen, den Kirchenmusiker Professor Doktor Michael Schneider, einen der besten Organisten Deutschlands, nach Linz zu holen. Dieses geschah auch im Hinblick auf die Bruckner-Orgel in der Stiftskirche Sankt Florian.

Schneider war gerade als Soldat bei der Flak in Berlin eingesetzt. Der Reichsintendant konnte erreichen, daß er nach Linz zur Flak versetzt wurde, wo er dann in seiner Freizeit (sic !) mit dem Bruckner-Chor arbeiten konnte.

Die Monate von Mai 1944 bis zum Ende des Krieges waren für Professor Schneider, die Chormitglieder und für Johannes Rietz, der auch Assistent des neuen Chorleiters blieb, eine sehr schwere Zeit.

Im September 1944 sollte der Chor auf Weisung des Propagandaministeriums « stillgelegt » werden, was so viel bedeutete wie die Einberufung der wehrfähigen Männer und den Einsatz in Rüstungsbetrieben für die anderen Sängerinnen und Sänger. Trotzdem probten sie in ihrer Freizeit unter Schneiders Leitung weiter.

Auch diejenigen Sänger, die in der Umgebung von Linz ihre Wehrmachtsstandorte hatten, nahmen, wenn sie es ermöglichen konnten, an den regelmäßigen Chorproben teil.

Hatte der Chor in den Wochen zwischen Schneiders Amtsantritt und der Stilllegung zahlreiche Konzerte in Linz und Sankt Florian bestritten, sang er im Herbst nur noch in Wehrmachts- und Lazarettkonzerten. Allerdings ist auch noch ein Adventskonzert im Dezember 1944 überliefert.

Mitte Januar fanden in Linz sogar noch Rundfunkaufnahmen mit Volksliedern statt, die im März und April vom Deutschlandsender ausgestrahlt wurden.

Schneider kam mit seiner Flakereinheit beim Einmarsch der Amerikaner für vier Wochen in Kriegsgefangenschaft.

Das Ende des Bruckner-Chores

Nach Professor Schneider übernahm dann der Chortenor Walter Kretschmar, aus dem Chor des Reichssenders Leipzig stammend, die Leitung des Bruckner-Chores.

Manche Chormitglieder hatten nach dem Kriegsende Linz verlassen, doch blieb ein Rest von 34 Sängerinnen und Sängern noch bis zum Herbst in Linz.

Der Bassist Fritz Westermann, der Linz am 5. September 1945 verlassen hatte, schrieb über das Ende des Bruckner-Chores in Linz rückschauend :

« Als die Deutschen aus Österreich heraus mußten, löste sich der Chor vollends auf, der Rest des Chores ging dann nach Kornthal bei Stuttgart. »

Dieser Rest des Bruckner-Chores hatte offenbar die Hoffnung, in Stuttgart als Chor eines neu zu gründenden Stuttgarter Senders als dessen Rundfunkchor übernommen zu werden. Trotz des Scheiterns dieser Pläne sang der Bruckner-Chor noch einige Jahre weiter.

Zu den neu zum Chor stoßenden Chormitgliedern gehörte 1946 auch Clytus Gottwald.

1947 übernahm Hans-Herbert Weigel, ein Sänger aus dem ehemaligen Chor des Reichssenders Leipzig, die Chorleitung. Weigel bewegte Johann Nepomuk David dazu, 1949 Leiter des Bruckner-Chores zu werden.

1952 ging die Leitung des Chores an dessen Sohn Thomas Christian David über. Jedoch spaltete sich der Chor bald auf. Ein Teil wechselte zum Lehrergesangsverein über, ein anderer sang bis zum baldigen Ende des Ensembles unter Hermann Ruck weiter.

Zwar gehört der Bruckner-Chor nicht in die unmittelbare Ahnenreihe des MDR Rundfunkchores Leipzig, doch ist er durch das Aufbaujahr in Leipzig und die vielen Sängerinnen und Sänger, die sowohl ihm als vormals auch dem Chor des Reichssenders Leipzig und später zum Teil wieder dem Rundfunkchor Leipzig angehört hatten, eng mit der Leipziger Rundfunk-Chorgeschichte verbunden.

Michæl Schneider

L'organiste et chef de chœur allemand Michæl Schneider est né le 4 mars 1909 à Weimar et est mort le 26 novembre 1994 à Cologne.

Schneider fait des études musicales à la « Musikhochschule » de Weimar avec Bruno Hinze-Reinhold, Friedrich Martin et Richard Wetz (1927-1930) . Il travaille à Leipzig avec Karl Straube, Kurt Thomas. Il bénéficie également de l'enseignement de Marcel Dupré pendant 3 mois, en 1951.

Il est organiste d'abord à Weimar (1931-1934) , puis à l'église Saint-Matthieu à Munich (1934-1936) . Il enseigne à partir de 1936 à la « Musikhochschule » de Cologne. Il dirige le « Berliner Kantorei » (1942-1944) puis est nommé cantor à l'église Saint-Marc à Munich (1945-1951) . Il dirige le « Musikverein der Stadt Bielefeld » (1951-1959) , puis enseigne à la « Musikhochschule » de Berlin (1958-1965) et ensuite à la « Musikhochschule » de Cologne jusqu'à sa retraite en 1975, où il dirigeait le département de musique religieuse protestante et la classe d'orgue. Après 1975, on lui confia encore des activités pédagogiques.

Il a créé de nombreuses pièces de compositeurs contemporains, parmi lesquels Johann Nepomuk David, Karl Höller, Max Baumann, Hermann Schröder ou Frank Michael Beyer.

Parmi ses élèves, on compte Jürg Baur, Paul Damjakob, Egidius Doll, Hans Eugen Frischknecht, Johannes Geffert, Klaus Germann, Rudolf Innig, Wolfgang Karius, Klaus Dieter Kern, Jon Laukvik, Heinz Lohmann, Stefan Palm, Roland Pløeger, Andreas Rothkopf, Almut Rössler, Hartmut Schmidt et Gerd Zacher.

...

Michæl Schneider, deutscher Organist, Chorleiter, Musikpädagog und Musikwissenschaftler : geboren 4. März 1909 in Weimar ; gestorben 26. November 1994 in Köln.

Schneider studierte von 1927 bis 1930 an der Musikhochschule Weimar bei Bruno Hinze-Reinhold Klavier, bei Friedrich Martin Orgel und bei Richard Wetz Komposition. Anschließend ging er für ein Jahr an das kirchenmusikalische Institut in Leipzig, wo Karl Straube (Orgel) , Kurt Thomas (Chorleitung) und Robert Teichmüller (Klavier) seine Lehrer waren.

Nach Abschluß seines Studiums wurde er zum Organisten an der Stadtkirche St. Peter und Paul (Herderkirche) in seiner Heimatstadt berufen und unterrichtete zugleich an der dortigen Musikhochschule. 1934 wurde er Hauptorganist und Kantor an der Matthäuskirche in München sowie 1935 Lehrer an der Staatlichen Akademie der Tonkunst.

1936 bis 1941 war Schneider Professor für Orgel und Leiter der Abteilung für evangelische Kirchenmusik an der Musikhochschule Köln und übernahm gleichzeitig die künstlerische Leitung des Kölner Bach-Vereins. An der Universität Köln promovierte er 1940 über Die Orgelspieltechnik des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland, dargestellt an den Orgelschulen der Zeit (erschieden Regensburg 1941, 1964, 1973) und schloß damit sein musikwissenschaftliches Studium, das er in Jena (Werner Danckert) und München (Rudolf von Ficker) begonnen hatte, ab. Während des Krieges leitete er von 1942 bis 1944 die Berliner Kantorei (Singgemeinschaft Rudolf Lamy) , 1944-1945 den Bruckner-Chor in Linz. 1945 ging er zurück nach München und wurde Organist und Kantor an der Markuskirche (1949 Kirchenmusikdirektor) ; ab 1948 unterrichtete er wieder an der Münchener Musikhochschule.

1951 war er drei Monate bei Marcel Dupré in Paris und folgte im gleichen Jahr einem Ruf an die Musikhochschule Detmold, wo er wiederum Professor für Orgel und Leiter der Abteilung für evangelische Kirchenmusik wurde und dort 1953-1957 die Position des stellvertretenden Direktors bekleidete. Parallel dirigierte er von 1951 bis 1959 den Bielefelder Musikverein.

Ab 1958 lehrte er an der Berliner Musikhochschule und leitete von 1961 bis 1965 zugleich die Studentenkantorei der Technischen und der Freien Universität. Außerdem war er Organist an der Kirche zum Heilsbrunnen. 1965 wechselte er nochmals an die Musikhochschule Köln und wurde hier erneut Leiter der Abteilung für evangelische Kirchenmusik, Orgelprofessor und zugleich Organist des Gürzenich-Orchesters. Nach seiner Emeritierung 1975 nahm er in Köln weiterhin einen Lehrauftrag wahr. Darüber hinaus setzte er seine umfangreiche Konzert- und freie Lehrtätigkeit im In- und Ausland fort, unter anderem auch als Gastprofessor an mehreren amerikanischen Universitäten.

Durch Karl Straube direkt mit der Reger-Tradition verbunden, versuchte er in seiner Spiel- und Unterrichtspraxis die Prinzipien der Leipziger Schule Straubes mit denen der Pariser Schule Duprés zu vereinigen. Dabei stand er neuen musikwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen und daraus resultierenden Entwicklungen für das Orgelspiel stets offen gegenüber. Er gilt als einer der wichtigsten Vertreter der deutschen neoklassizistischen Orgelschule. Werke von Johann Nepomuk David, Karl Höller, Max Baumann, Hermann Schröder (Orgelkonzert, Opus 25) und Frank Michael Beyer verdanken ihm ihre Uraufführung. Seit den 1950er Jahren machte er auch zahlreiche Rundfunk- und Schallplattenaufnahmen, unter anderem mit Musik von Scheidt, Buxtehude, Pachelbel, Bach und Schröder.

Michael Schneider prägte als Lehrer an fünf bedeutenden Musikhochschulen über Jahrzehnte die Organistenausbildung. Zu seinen Schülern gehörten Jürg Baur, Paul Damjakob, Egidius Doll, Hans Eugen Frischknecht, Johannes Geffert, Klaus Germann, Rudolf Innig, Klaus Dieter Kern, Jon Laukvik, Heinz Lohmann, Stefan Palm, Roland Pløger, Andreas Rothkopf, Almut Rößler, Hartmut Schmidt, Ernst Triebel und Gerd Zacher.

Michael Schneider - Chorleiter des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores und Organist

Der Kirchenmusiker, Dirigent, Hochschullehrer und Musikwissenschaftler Professor Doktor Michael Schneider war 1944-1945 Leiter des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores in Linz. Dadurch ist er indirekt auch mit der Geschichte des Leipziger Rundfunkchores verbunden.

Schneider wurde am 4. März 1909 in Weimar geboren und studierte an der Musikhochschule seiner Heimatstadt die Fächer Klavier, Orgel und Komposition. Am kirchenmusikalischen Institut der Leipziger Musikhochschule vervollkommnete er seine Studien bei Karl Straube (Orgel), Kurt Thomas (Chorleitung) und Robert Teichmüller (Klavier). Danach war er als Organist und Kantor an verschiedenen evangelischen Kirchen in Weimar und München tätig und wirkte an den Hochschulen dieser Städte als Lehrer.

Von 1936 bis 1941 leitete Schneider die Abteilung für evangelische Kirchenmusik an der Kölner Musikhochschule, unterrichtete als Professor das Fach Orgel und leitete den Kölner Bach-Verein. In Köln promovierte er 1940 über « Die Orgelspieltechnik des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland, dargestellt an den Orgelschulen der Zeit ».

Weil Günther Ramín 1944 die Leitung des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores nach dessen Übersiedlung in das österreichische Linz nicht mehr mit dem Thomaskantorat vereinbaren konnte, war der Rundfunk bestrebt, Michael Schneider für diese Aufgabe zu gewinnen.

Schneider galt als einer der besten Organisten seiner Zeit, und so hoffte man, in ihm sowohl einen Leiter des Bruckner-Chores als auch einen Organisten für die Bruckner-Orgel in der Stiftskirche Sankt Florian bei Linz gewinnen zu können. Allerdings war Professor Schneider zu einer Flak-Einheit nach Berlin zum Kriegsdienst eingezogen worden. Rundfunk-Reichsintendant Glasmeier konnte jedoch erwirken, daß man Schneider zu einer entsprechenden Einheit nach Linz versetzte.

So war es Schneider möglich, in seiner Freizeit mit dem Bruckner-Chor arbeiten und an der Bruckner-Orgel wirken zu können.

Im Gegensatz zum 2. Chorleiter Johannes Rietz war der neue Chorchef Schneider also nicht fest, sondern auf Honorarbasis beim Rundfunk angestellt.

Als Leiter des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores wurde Professor Schneider am 13. Mai 1944 offiziell eingeführt.

Obwohl seine Stellung als Leiter des Chores kriegsbedingt nicht lange währte, hat Professor Schneider zahlreiche Konzerte mit dem Chor gegeben. Selbst nach der Stilllegung des Ensembles arbeiteten die in Linz und Umgebung verbliebenen Chormitglieder unter Schneiders Leitung weiter.

Insgesamt verzeichnet die Chronik des Reichs-Bruckner-Chores 13 Konzerte unter der Leitung von Professor Schneider. Verschiedentlich sangen Chormitglieder in Schneiders Orgelkonzerten oder von ihm geleiteten Kammerkonzerten als Solisten mit. Am 13. und 14. Januar 1945 fanden in Linz Aufnahmen von Volksliedern mit dem Bruckner-Chor unter Leitung von Prof. Schneider statt. Die Bänder sind nicht erhalten geblieben.

Nach dem Kriegsende siedelte Michael Schneider nach München über, wo er als Kantor tätig war und 1949 zum Kirchenmusikdirektor ernannt wurde.

Auch seine Lehrtätigkeit nahm er bald wieder auf und wirkte an den Musikhochschulen in München, Detmold, Berlin und wieder in Köln.

Im Rahmen des Rudigierorgeltriduums 1978 spielte Professor Doktor Michael Schneider nochmals in Linz.

Michael Schneider starb am 26. November 1994 in Köln.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum

The German conductor Georg-Ludwig Jochum was born on 10 December 1909 in Babenhausen near Augsburg, Germany, and died on 1 November 1970 Mülheim an der Ruhr, North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany.

He was the son of a Catholic teacher, organist, choir Master and conductor of orchestral and theatre club, and the

younger brother of the composer Otto Jochum and the better-known conductor Eugen Jochum. Like his brother Eugen, he is especially associated with the music of Anton Bruckner. Georg-Ludwig studied at the « Leopold-Mozart-Konservatorium » in Augsburg and in Munich at the « Staatlichen Akademie der Tonkunst » with Joseph Pembaur, Siegmund von Hausegger and Joseph Haas.

After his studies, already in 1932, Georg-Ludwig Jochum was appointed at the age of 23 General Music Director of the City of Münster where he performed at the « Städtischen-Lortzing-Theater » and directed the « Sinfonieorchester Münster ». This made him the youngest orchestral conductor in Germany. In 1934, he became assistant conductor in Frankfurt-am-Main, where he conducted the Opera and the Museum concerts. In 1937, he became Municipal Music Director of Plauen and Music Director of the « Stadttheaters Plauen ». On May 1, 1937, he became at his request a member of the NSDAP (« Mitgliedsnummer » : 5.794.680) , but removed again in January 1941 for failure to post-payments.

From 1940 to 1945, Georg-Ludwig Jochum was General Music Director in Linz and Opera conductor at the « Stadttheater ». He headed the « Städtischen Symphonieorchester », which he reshaped in 1943 on Adolf Hitler's order to « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » of the « Großdeutschen Rundfunks » and with whom he made his debut in April 1944 with a concert on Hitler's birthday. With this Orchestra, he created then the « Bruckner-Feste » in Saint-Florian.

After World War II, in the short term « black lists » of the occupying powers, Georg-Ludwig Jochum was, in 1946, General Music Director for lifetime of the « Duisburger Sinfoniker », with whom he performed and formed a brilliant and high-profile ensemble in the « Mercatorhalle » until his retirement, in 1968. At « Theater Duisburg », he performed with the « Deutsche Oper am Rhein » and was, until 1958, Director of the Duisburg Conservatory.

In 1948-1950, Georg-Ludwig Jochum also conducted the « Bamberger Symphoniker » ; and, in the early 1950's, he conducted the « RIAS-Symphonie-Orchester Berlin » ; guest appearances have taken him throughout Europe, Japan and South America.

...

Georg-Ludwig Jochum (10 December 1909 - 1 November 1970) was a German conductor and younger brother of better-known conductor Eugen Jochum. He was born in Babenhausen, near Augsburg, Germany. After studies in Munich, in 1932, he was appointed General Music Director of the city of Münster. This made him the youngest orchestral chief in Germany. Like his brother, he is especially associated with the music of Anton Bruckner. He died in Mülheim, Germany.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum was the younger brother of conductor Eugen Jochum. In 1932, upon completing his studies in Munich, Georg-Ludwig Jochum was appointed Music Director of the city of Münster, thus, becoming the youngest professional conductor in Germany.

In 1934, he became principal conductor in Frankfurt, leading the Orchestra in Opera performances. In 1937, he became music director of the Municipal Theatre, in Plauen. Also, in 1937, he joined the Nazi Party. It is said that, in 1941, his membership lapsed due to failure to post payments.

However, from 1940 to 1945, he was general music director in Linz, Austria, and Opera conductor at the Linz Municipal Theatre as well as conductor of the Municipal Symphony Orchestra, which was renamed and broadcast over German Radio, debuting in April 1944, on a concert for Hitler's birthday. With this Orchestra, he later created the Bruckner Festival, in Saint-Florian.

Due to his membership in the Nazi Party, he was blacklisted by the occupying Allied powers after the War but this was soon lifted and, by 1946, he became life time music director of the Duisburg Symphony Orchestra.

As with his brother Eugen Jochum, Georg-Ludwig Jochum was a noted interpreter of the Symphonic scores of Anton Bruckner but also conducted and recorded works by Mozart, Chopin, Schubert and others. Unlike his brother, who continued to conduct banned works in the 1930's and was apparently not a Party member, his earlier affiliation with the Nazis likely contributed to his post-War obscurity in recordings.

Conductor Georg-Ludwig Jochum was Eugen Jochum's younger brother who pre-deceased Eugen by several years and early enough to have most of his excellent Bruckner performances recorded in monaural, thus, relegating them to the historical dust bin. Fortunately, there are a few stereo recordings (a Bruckner 7th and the F major discarded Trio to the Bruckner Symphony No. 9) but those Hessian Radio recordings have never been released.

During World War II, Georg-Ludwig was in charge of one of Adolf Hitler's pet projects. As part of his grand scheme to make Linz and Saint-Florian a Brucknerian cultural center, Hitler formed the « Reichs Bruckner Orchester » and Georg-Ludwig Jochum became the « General Musik Direktor » . The Orchestra was a 1st class ensemble and, for a while, Herbert von Karajan attempted to become the « Direktor » . A scheme was planned that would have transferred Georg-Ludwig Jochum to the « Wehrmacht » and the War front, but Furtwängler uncovered the plan and intervened to prevent it.

...

Georg-Ludwig Jochum (geboren 10. Dezember 1909 in Babenhausen ; gestorben 1. November 1970 in Mülheim an der Ruhr ; manchmal auch Georg-Ludwig Jochum geschrieben) war ein deutscher Dirigent und Bruder von Otto und des bekannteren Eugen, mit dem er seine Verbundenheit zur Musik Anton Bruckners teilte.

Der Sohn eines katholischen Lehrers, Organisten, Chorregenten und Leiters des Orchester- und Theatervereins studierte am Augsburger Leopold-Mozart-Konservatorium und in München an der Staatlichen Akademie der Tonkunst bei Joseph Pembaur, Siegmund von Hausegger und Joseph Haas. Schon 1932, mit 23 Jahren, wurde er zum Musikdirektor der Stadt Münster ernannt und trat dort im Städtischen-Lortzing-Theater auf und leitete das Sinfonieorchester Münster. 1934 wechselte er als Erster Kapellmeister nach Frankfurt am Main, wo er in der Oper und die Museumkonzerte

dirigierte. 1937 wurde er Städtischer Musikdirektor von Plauen und musikalischer Oberleiter des Stadttheaters Plauen. Am 1. Mai 1937 wurde er auf seinen Antrag in die NSDAP aufgenommen (Mitgliedsnummer : 5.794.680) , im Januar 1941 aber wegen unterlassener Beitragszahlungen wieder gestrichen.

Von 1940 bis 1945 war er Generalmusikdirektor in Linz und Operndirigent am Stadttheater. Er leitete das Städtischen Symphonieorchester, das er ab 1943 in Hitlers Auftrag zum « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » des Großdeutschen Rundfunks umformte und mit dem er im April 1944 anlässlich eines Konzertes zu Hitlers Geburtstag debütierte. Mit diesem Orchester gestaltete er dann auch die Bruckner-Feste in Sankt Florian.

Nach dem Krieg kurzfristig auf den « Schwarzen Listen » der Besatzungsmächte, wurde er 1946 auf Lebenszeit Generalmusikdirektor der Duisburger Sinfoniker, mit denen er in der Mercatorhalle bis zu seinem Übertritt in den Ruhestand 1968 konzertierte und die er zu einem brillanten und profilstarken Klangkörper formte. Am Theater Duisburg trat er mit der Deutschen Oper am Rhein auf und war bis 1958 Leiter des Duisburger Konservatoriums. 1948-1950 dirigierte er daneben die Bamberger Symphoniker, Anfang der 1950er Jahre leitete er auch das RIAS-Symphonie-Orchester in Berlin ; Gastauftritte führten ihn durch Europa, nach Japan und Südamerika.

Recordings

Sinfonie Nr. 1 in C-Moll (Linz Fassung) RIAS Orchester Berlin, live in Berlin 3. - 4. Februar 1956. CD : Tahra CD 162.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum's recording of the Symphony No. 1 was produced in February of 1956 by the « RIAS » (Radio in the American Sector) Orchestra Berlin and it has been released on several labels. Some identify (and the Deutschland Radio Archiv « Concur ») that the conductor is Georg-Ludwig Jochum. Others have identified the conductor as Harold Byrns. (Either way, it is a great performance.)

So, by chance, who is Harold Byrns ? Harold Byrns (1903-1977) was a German-American conductor and arranger. He split his career between Germany and Los Angeles. Byrns was devoted to the music of Gustav Mahler and was friends with Mahler's widow Alma. It was he who brought Deryck Cooke's completion of the Mahler 10th to Alma and persuaded her to listen to the « BBC » recording that she had permitted to be made. After hearing the recording, she immediately lifted her ban on further performances. For his efforts, Byrns received the Mahler medal from the Bruckner Society of America.

All that being said, we are quite sure that the recording of the 1st Symphony is by G-L Jochum.

Sinfonie Nr. 2 in C-Moll (Haas Fassung) Reichs-Bruckner Orchester Linz, live in Wien 5. - 7. September 1944, LP : Urania 5243-2 ; CD : Tahra CD 163.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum's recording of the Symphony No. 2 (in the Haas Edition) was produced by the Reichs Radio in Vienna on September 5-7, 1944. It was released after the war on a Urania LP (UR-402) . Later, the same recording was released by Urania in a pseudo-stereo pressing (US-5243) .

(Image) Cover picture of the original Urania mono issue. The later issue of the Urania set offered a wonderful woodcut of Bruckner. I have always been impressed by this picture.

(Haas Fassung ?) Rundfunk Sinfonieorchester WDR, live (?) April 1962. 2CD : « Dante » , « LYS » 476/77 (France) .

Sinfonie Nr. 3 in D-Moll (1890 Fassung) Orchester Radio Stuttgart, live 19. November 1964. CD : Tahra CD 164.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum's recording of the Symphony No. 3 was produced by the South German Radio in Stuttgart on November 19, 1964. It employs the 1890 Cyrill Hynais Edition.

Sinfonie Nr. 5 in B-Dur (Haas Fassung) Bruckner Orchester Linz, live in Wien 25. Mai 1944. CD : Tahra CD 166.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum's performance of the Symphony No. 5 was produced by the Reichs Bruckner Orchestra on May 25, 1944, just one month before his recording of the Symphony No. 6.

Sinfonie Nr. 6 in A-Dur (Haas Fassung) Bruckner Orchester Linz, live (?) 26. Juni 1944. LP : Urania LP URLP 7041 ; 2 CD : « Dante » , « LYS » 476/77 (France) .

Georg-Ludwig Jochum's recording of the Symphony No. 6 was produced by the Reichs Radio in Vienna on June 26, 1944. It was released after the war on a Urania LP (URLP-7041) .

Georg-Ludwig Jochum did make some stereo Bruckner recordings for the Hessian Radio but they have never been commercially released. These include a Symphony No. 7 and the discarded Trio in F major to the Symphony No. 9.

Sinfonie Nr. 9 in D-Moll (Nowak Fassung) RIAS Orchester Berlin, live in Berlin 9. Marz 1954. CD : Tahra CD 170.

Georg-Ludwig Jochum's recording of the Symphony No. 9 was produced on March 9, 1954 by the RIAS (Radio in the American Sector) Orchestra Berlin. It has been released commercially many years ago.

I hope that you have come to appreciate the artistry of this man who is forgotten today primarily because he died just prior to the full-fledged use of stereo recordings. (John F. Berky)

...

For someone who can't stop collecting recordings of Bruckner's Symphonies, a website like

<http://www.abruckner.com/downloads/downloadofthemonth/>

is a real treasure trove : mostly obscure, sometimes very rare recordings which are either public domain or failed to

make the transition from LP to CD, available as free downloads/streams in good 320kbps.

The most recent additions are among the most interesting : recordings of Symphonies Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6 by Georg-Ludwig Jochum (the lesser known Jochum brother) , which have a Fürtwängler-like intensity. The 2nd, 5th and 6th are played (in 1944) by the « Reichs-Bruckner Orchester Linz » , Adolf Hitler's elite ensemble, which was a 1st class ensemble, and the recordings (in acceptable monophonic sound) reflect that. His 2nd was the 1st recording ever of that Symphony. The 5th and 6th are absolutely wonderful, among the best I know. The 3rd is a much later recording (1964) in rather bad sound, which makes one regret Jochum post-War career wasn't documented in good stereo sound.

It's said that Georg-Ludwig Jochum made around 90 recordings with the « Reichs » Orchestra. Makes one wonder how much of that material is still collecting dust in some Russian archive - or how much has been used by the Soviets for target practice ?

...

Le « Gauleiter » (représentant du district du « Reich ») August Eigruber écrivit le **22 février 1944**, à propos du mandat de l'Orchestre :

« L'Orchestre Bruckner aura pour tâche de diffuser à la radio de la musique Symphonique partout à travers la Grande Allemagne. L'on pourra alors assister à un plus grand nombre de concerts dédiés à la musique de Bruckner dans le cadre de Festivals et de tournées organisés à l'intérieur du pays comme à l'étranger. La ville de Linz ne pourra entendre son Orchestre à la maison qu'à de très rares occasions. » (August Eigruber)

Parmi les chefs d'orchestre invités, citons : Wilhelm Fürtwängler, Clemens Krauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Karl Böhm, Oswald Kabasta, Carl Schuricht, Joseph Keilberth et ... Herbert von Karajan.

Juillet 1944 : Le jeune Herbert von Karajan interprétera à la tête du « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » de Linz la 8e Symphonie de Bruckner qu'il venait justement d'enregistrer avec la « Stadtkapelle » de Berlin pour la Radio berlinoise. Certes, déjà célèbre mais sans poste officiel, Karajan fera des démarches pour remplacer Georg-Ludwig Jochum. Le musicologue Robert Haas considérait Karajan comme le meilleur interprète du Maître de Saint-Florian mais Josef Gæbbels mettra un frein aux espoirs du « jeune loup » .

...

Le projet de former un autre « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » à Bad Pyrmont, en Allemagne, va échouer.

Dans l'Autriche d'après-guerre, le « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » sera dissout par le haut-commissariat des troupes d'occupation américaines.

L'année 1945 marque le début de la reconstruction des institutions culturelles rattachées à la musique et au théâtre lyrique. Résistance et opposition se manifesteront devant ce projet. Le « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » de Linz changera de nom. L'Orchestre symphonique municipal devra mettre fin à ces activités sur ordre de la puissance occupante américaine. Le bail du Théâtre lyrique sera résilié. Il y aura réduction du nombre de concerts Symphoniques à cause d'un manque d'effectifs. Dans les circonstances, le jeune chef d'orchestre Ludwig Daxspurger (1930-1982) prendra la relève. La disponibilité de salles plus petites va au moins permettre la mise sur pied, avec la participation de l'Office culturel de la ville, de plusieurs concerts mettant en vedette des solistes locaux et étrangers et des ensembles de musique de chambre. Suite au licenciement du directeur Gernot Brandtner, le Théâtre d'État sera mis en location. Dès le 16 juillet 1945, la musique d'église aura la chance de se développer et d'offrir plus de concerts en public.

Otto Jochum

Otto Jochum, deutscher Komponist, Chorleiter und Musikpädagoge : geboren 18. März 1898 in Babenhausen im Unterallgäu ; gestorben 24. Oktober 1969 in Bad Reichenhall. Er war der ältere Bruder von Eugen und Georg Ludwig Jochum.

Der Sohn eines katholischen Lehrers, Organisten, Chorregenten und Leiters des Orchester- und Theatervereins studierte nach einer Lehrerausbildung von 1922 bis 1928 wie seine Brüder am Augsburger Leopold-Mozart-Konservatorium und von 1928 bis 1931 an der Staatlichen Akademie der Tonkunst bei Joseph Haas. Daneben war er von 1921 bis 1932 Organist an der Sankt Georgskirche in Augsburg und Leiter des Singschulkollegium Augsburg (1922-1933) . 1932 wurde er Leiter der Städtischen Singschule in Augsburg, an der er 1935 das Singschullehrerseminar und den Städtischen Chor gründete. Jochum konnte die Schaffung des Augsburger Singschulseminars als der ersten und einzigen deutsche Ausbildungsstätte für Singschullehrer gegen den Widerstand des Reichsunterrichtsministeriums, aber unter Befürwortung durch die Reichsmusikkammer, durchsetzen. 1938 wurde ihm die Direktion des Augsburger Musikonservatoriums übertragen.

Am 1. Mai 1937 wurde Otto Jochum auf seinen Antrag in die NSDAP aufgenommen (Mitgliedsnummer : 5.346.623) . Bereits seit 1934 war er Leiter der Pflugschaft der Singschulen in der Reichsmusikkammer und 1937 Chorgaführer des Reichsverbandes gemischter Chöre für die Gaue München-Oberbayern, Franken, Saarpfalz und Bayerische Ostmark. Seine damals erschienenen Kompositionen sind vom Geist der Zeit geprägt :

Der jüngste Tag, Opus 28.

Vaterländische Hymne, Opus 54c.

Flamme empor, Opus 61.

Ich bin ein deutsches Mädchen, Opus 64.

4, oder Volkwerdung der Nation, Kantate zu einer deutschen Feier, das zum Heldengedenktage 1938 im Festsaal des

Deutschen Museums auf Einladung der NSDAP-Gauleitung München-Oberbayern aufgeführt wurde ; Widmungsträger war der Gauleiter von Schwaben Karl Wahl.

1938 entstand Unser Lied : Deutschland ! , Opus 70, volksdeutsche Hymne nach Worten von Arthur Maximilian Miller.

Nach dem Krieg war er als Chorleiter des 1947 von ihm gegründeten « Jochum-Chores » und als städtischer Musikdirektor in Augsburg tätig und lebte seit 1951 als freischaffender Komponist in Weißbach bei Bad Reichenhall.

Er komponierte vor allem Chorwerke, darunter über 100 Motetten ; 16 Messen ; 4 Oratorien ; 2 Sinfonien (die er Gøthe und Bruckner widmete) ; ein Streichquartett sowie Liederzyklen und Kantaten, außerdem Kammermusikwerke und Symphonien ; er gab zahlreiche Volksliedbearbeitungen heraus.

Auszeichnungen

1932 : Deutscher Staatspreis für Komposition.

1958 : Goldener Ehrenring des Fuggermarktes Babenhausen.

1959 : Bundesverdienstkreuz.

1976 : Erstmalige Verleihung einer « Otto Jochum-Medaille » durch den Schwäbisch-Bayerischen Sångerbund an Persönlichkeiten, die sich um das schwäbische Chorwesen Verdienste erworben haben.

Ludwig Daxspurger

Le compositeur, professeur de musique, organiste et chef de chœur autrichien Ludwig Daxspurger est né le 8 juillet 1900 à Raab, en Haute-Autriche, et est mort le 20 novembre 1996 à Linz. Il fait ses études à l'École normale épiscopale de Linz. Il sera d'abord professeur de niveau primaire. Il va ensuite poursuivre des études à Vienne et enseigner aux Collèges fédéraux de formation des enseignants à Salzbourg et à Linz. De 1930 à 1982, il est l'un des organistes rattachés à la cathédrale de Linz. À partir de 1945, il dirige l'Orchestre symphonique de Linz. Il va offrir des récitals d'orgue dans différentes églises de la ville. De 1945 à 1965, il sera à la tête du Chœur Bruckner de Linz (« Brucknerchor ») . Daxspurger est l'un des membres fondateurs du « Brucknerbundes » de Haute-Autriche en plus d'être membre de la Guilde des artistes du « Innviertler » . Il sera fait chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint-Grégoire.

...

Ludwig Daxspurger (geboren 8. Juli 1900 in Raab, Oberösterreich ; gestorben 20. November 1996 in Linz) war ein österreichischer Komponist, Musikpädagog, Domorganist und Chorleiter.

Daxspurger besuchte das Bischöflichen Lehrerseminars Linz und wurde zunächst Volksschullehrer. Anschließend studierte

er in Wien, unterrichtete an den Bundeslehrerbildungsanstalten in Salzburg und Linz. Ab 1930 bis 1982 war er Domorganist und ab 1945 leitete er das städtische Symphonieorchester beziehungsweise wirkte als Konzertorganist in Linz. Von 1945 bis 1965 leitete er den Brucknerchor Linz und war Gründungsmitglied des Brucknerbundes Oberösterreich. Er war Ritter des Gregoriusordens und Mitglied der Innviertler Künstlergilde.

Daxsperger hat und andere die großen Werke Max Regers uraufgeführt. Er ist Verfasser zahlreicher Chöre und Liedervertonungen, und andere von Gedichten Enrica von Händel-Mazzettis und Franz Stelzhamers. Zu seinen Hauptwerken zählen :

Das Wessobrunner Gebet, für gemischten Chor, Orchester und Orgel, (1928) .

84. Psalm für Soli, gemischten Chor und Orchester (1927) .

Requiem für gemischten Chor und Orgel (1918) .

Franz Kinzl

Franz Kinzl, oberösterreichischer Lehrer, Musiker und Komponist : geboren 2. Juli 1895 in Mettmach, Oberösterreich ; gestorben 23. April oder 23. Oktober 1978 in Lambach, Oberösterreich.

Franz Kinzl besuchte nach der Pflichtschule die bischöfliche Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Linz und begann 1912 an der Schule des Musikvereins Linz, dem Vorgänger der Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität in Linz Oboe zu studieren. Bei Franz Neuhofer studierte er Gesang, sowie bei Josef Gruber Orgel. An der Wiener Musikakademie schloß er sein Studium mit der Heereskapellmeisterprüfung ab.

Im Jahr 1915 rückte er zum Kaiserlich-Königlich Landesschützen-Regiment « Bozen » Nummer II in Bozen ein. Mit diesem war er hauptsächlich an der Südfront in Italien.

Nach dem Krieg unterrichtete Kinzl ab 1919 als Lehrer. 1925 rückte er wieder ein und kam als Militärkapellmeister nach Innsbruck. Bereits 1927 wurde er jedoch wieder als dienstuntauglich entlassen und arbeitete wieder als Lehrer an den Schulen in Atzbach, Hirschbach und Linz, wo er auch die Orgel, den Kirchenchor und die Blasmusik betreute. Zeitweise war er auch als Kapellmeister, als Musikreferent und Musikkritiker bei der Zeitung Neue Zeit.

Da er sehr viel praktisch mit Blasmusikkapellen arbeiteten, begann er auch Werke für Blasorchester zu schreiben.

...

Franz Kinzl war ein österreichischer Komponist, Dirigent, Lehrer, Oboist, Organist und Musikkritiker. Er war ein Sohn des Ehepaares Franz Kinzl senior und Elise Kinzl ; sein Vater war auch ein Lehrer und Direktor der lokalen Band.

Kinzl studierte Pädagogik an der Bischofs Seminar Lehrer in Linz, wo er auch mit Julius Polzer Musik-Box aus dem Jahr 1912 untersucht und studierte an der Schule der Musik-Linz, dem Vorläufer der heutigen Anton Bruckner Privat Universität Linz, Oboe. Er studierte auch privat mit Franz Neuhofer und Schüler von Anton Bruckner mit dem Namen Josef Gruber.

Als Lehrer hat er von 1914 bis Andrichsfurt und später in Eberschwang beschäftigt. Während des Ersten Weltkrieges war er auf 4. Juli 1915 trat in die « Kaiser schutte Regiment Nummer 2" in Bozen und war Leiter verschiedener Militärkapellen, darunter auch einige der Band des Regiments sind in Bozen. Während des Krieges war er nur an der Südfront und kam in italienische Gefangenschaft. In dem Lager der Kriegsgefangenen in Servigliano arbeitete er wieder als Konzert-und Theaterregisseur. Nach dem Krieg absolvierte er an der Musik Akademie Wien, jetzt: Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien, Wien sein Diplom als Kapellmeister.

Er war ein Lehrer in Atzbach, wo er die Bands im Jahre 1921 gegründet, Hirsch im Mühlkreis und Linz. Alle Orte, die er war auch Organist, Dirigent des Chores und den Wind. Dazwischen ließ er sich ab 1925 der Abteilung Schule zu verzichten und wurde Kapellmeister der Militärmusik der Alpen Jager-Regiment Nr. II in Innsbruck. Danach ging er zurück in den Schuldienst.

Kinzl, im Gegensatz zu vielen anderen deutschen und österreichischen Komponisten nie bestritten, daß er. Mitglied der Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei war Er war bereits im April 1933 (und sein Bruder Fritz) ein Mitglied der Partei und hatte die Mitgliedsnummer 1619526 Im Februar 1937 wurde er Mitglied der Nazi-Lehrergewerkschaft wurde. Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg spielte er eine 180-Grad-Wende von seiner politischen Ansichten und war Mitglied der Kommunistischen Partei in Österreich. Nach dem Krieg in Stadl-Paura gründete er ein Orchester von Musiklehrern und wurde ihr Leiter.

Er war auch Professor für Musik an der Oberösterreichischen Akademie Lehrer und Musikberater der Stadt Linz. Er arbeitete auch als Musikberater für das Studio Linz des österreichischen öffentlich-rechtlichen Sender ORF. Er wurde später ein Musikkritiker und Musikkritiker der Zeitung « Neue Zeit » .

Als Dirigent der Brass Bands hatte er das Bedürfnis nach authentischen Konzertwind Musik für Musik-Clubs brach. Mit Ausnahme der Märsche und Tänze, es gab nicht viel Originalmusik für diesen Formationen auf dem Markt. Österreich wurde zu einem der wichtigsten Förderer unter den Komponisten, hielt diese Orchesterform mit authentischen, unabhängig, symphonische Blasmusik. Darüber hinaus schrieb er auch Werke für Orchester-, Kammer-und Vokalmusik. Er erhielt die Anton-Bruckner-Preis der österreichischen Bundesland Ober Österreich und wurde 1965 von der österreichischen Bundespräsident Franz Jonas zum Professor ernannt. Im Jahr 1970 zog er nach Lambach, wo er am 23. Oktober 1978 starb. Rural Österreichische Vereinigung für Brass Bands haben eine Medaille nach ihm benannt, die Professor-Franz-Kinzl-Medaille, die Blasorchester verliehen wird, die während mehr als 10 Jahren hat der nationalen Wettbewerben dieses Verbandes haben herausragende Ergebnisse erzielt.

...

Der am 2. Juli 1895 in Mettmach als Sohn einer Lehrerfamilie geborene Kinzl war Lehrer und Volksschuldirektor, vor allem aber Musiker. Als Komponist gelang ihm das Kunststück moderne Wege zu gehen und trotzdem bereits zu Lebzeiten verstanden zu werden.

Nach dem Besuch der Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Linz begann er 1912 an der Schule des Musikvereins Linz (Vorläufer des Brucknerkonservatoriums Linz) Oboe zu studieren. Studien bei Franz Neuhofer in Gesang und dem Bruckner-Schüler Josef Gruber in Orgel vervollkommneten seine musikalische Ausbildung, die mit der Heereskapellmeisterprüfung an der Wiener Musikakademie abgeschlossen wurde. Nach dem ersten Weltkrieg und der Rückkehr aus der italienischen Gefangenschaft nahm er den Lehrerberuf wieder auf und leitete von 1925 bis 1928 eine Militärmusikkapelle.

Kinzl war Oberlehrer in Atzbach, Hirschbach und Linz, wo er jeweils auch die Orgel, den Kirchenchor und die Blasmusik betreute. Ebenso war er zeitweise als Kapellmeister, Musikreferent der Oberösterreichischen Lehrerbildungsanstalt, Musikbeauftragter der Stadt Linz, Musikalischer Programmberater des Senders Linz und später als Musikschriftsteller tätig.

Kinzl schuf Lieder, Werke für Chöre, Kammermusik und Orchester sowie Symphonien und auch eine Oper, später wandte er sich vorwiegend der Blasmusik zu. Bei Konzertbesuchern und in der Musikwelt, vor allem aber bei den Blasmusikkapellen für die er zahlreiche und originelle Kompositionen schrieb, fand Kinzl große Anerkennung und wurde für seine Verdienste auch zum Professor ernannt.

Der praktische Umgang mit Blasmusikkapellen befähigte ihn, zahlreiche Werke für Blasorchester, für die es bis dahin nur wenige Originalkompositionen gab, zu schreiben. Franz Kinzl wurde so zum Schöpfer und Anreger einer qualitativ hochwertigen und eigenständigen symphonischen Blasmusik.

Bekannt war Kinzl für seinen Humor in allen Lebenslagen, aber auch für sein politisches Engagement. Im Gegensatz zu so manchen « typischen » ÖsterreicherInnen machte er aus seiner Mitgliedschaft in der NSDAP, wegen welcher er nach der Befreiung vom Faschismus bis 1947 inhaftiert war, nie ein Geheimnis und zog Konsequenzen daraus.

Kinzl wurde 1945 Mitglied der KPÖ und gehörte von 1949 bis 1953 der Linksblock-Fraktion des Gemeinderates von Stadl-Paura an. Stets engagiert war Kinzl auch für eine fortschrittliche Kulturpolitik und mit seinen Beiträgen in der kommunistischen « Neuen Zeit ». Er erzielte zahlreiche Preise und Auszeichnungen (Anton-Bruckner-Preis des Landes Oberösterreich und andere) und erhielt 1965 den Ehrentitel « Professor ». Anfang 1970 zog sich Franz Kinzl nach Lambach (Oberösterreich) zurück, wo er am 23. April 1978 verstarb.

Aus Anlaß seines hundertsten Geburtstages wurde die von ihm geschaffene skurrile Ritteroper « Der Keuschheitsgürtel » bei den Kulturwochen im Schloß Wildberg vom 6. Juli bis 25. August 1995 aufgeführt.

...

Franz Kinzl war österreichischer Komponist und wurde am 2. Juli 1895 in Mettmach (Oberösterreich) geboren.

Nach dem Besuch der Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Linz begann er 1912 an der Schule des Musikvereins Linz (Vorläufer des Brucknerkonservatoriums Linz) Oboe zu studieren. Studien bei Franz Neuhofer in Gesang und dem Bruckner-Schüler Josef Gruber in Orgel vervollkommeten seine musikalische Ausbildung, die mit der Heereskapellmeisterprüfung an der Wiener Musikakademie abgeschlossen wurde. Kinzl war Oberlehrer in Atzbach, Hirschbach und Linz, wo er jeweils auch die Orgel, den Kirchenchor und die Blasmusik betreute. Ebenso war er zeitweise als Kapellmeister, Musikreferent der Oberösterreichischen Lehrerbildungsanstalt, Musikbeauftragter der Stadt Linz, Musikalischer Programmberater des Senders Linz und später als Musikschriftsteller und Musikkritiker der Zeitung « Neue Zeit » tätig.

Der praktische Umgang mit Blasmusikkapellen befähigte ihn, zahlreiche Werke für Blasorchester, für die es bis dahin nur wenige Originalkompositionen gab, zu schreiben. Franz Kinzl wurde so zum Schöpfer und Anreger einer qualitätsvollen und eigenständigen symphonischen Blasmusik.

Er erzielte zahlreiche Preise und Auszeichnungen (Anton-Bruckner-Preis des Landes Oberösterreich und andere) und erhielt 1965 den Ehrentitel « Professor » .

Anfang 1970 zog sich Franz Kinzl nach Lambach (Oberösterreich) zurück, wo er am 23. Oktober 1978 verstarb.

Auszeichnungen

Anton-Bruckner-Preis der Oberösterreich Landesregierung.

Berufstitel Professor (1965) .

Würdigung

Von der oberösterreichischen Landesregierung wird über den Blasmusikverband die Professor-Franz-Kinzl-Medaille verliehen.

Werke für Orchester

Overtüren, Symphonische Dichtungen, Symphonische Variationen.

1936 :

Scherzfuge « Wer einen Rausch Niemals gehabt, der ist kein braver Mann » , Sinfonische Variationen.

Konzert für Fagott und Orchester.

« Die Stadt » , Symphonischen Dichtung.

3 Sinfonien.

Symphonische Blasmusik

Ouvertüren (« Der Ackersmann » und andere) , Musik zum Frankfurter Würfelspiel, Große Symphonie für Bläserorchester (Uraufführung 1961 durch die Militärmusik Oberösterreich unter Rudolf Zeman im Landestheater Linz) .

Arbeiten für Konzert

1953 : Vino santo, Overtüre.

1956 : Der Ackermann, Overtüre.

1958-1959 : Sinfonie in C-Moll, für Band ; Premiere : 15. Mai 1960 im « Staatstheater Linz » von den « Militärmusik Oberösterreich » von Rudolf Zeman durchgeführt.

1961 :

Froschmärchen, romantische Overtüre frei, der Brüder Grimm.

Singen EnDes Land, Overtüre zu einem Lied aus Oberösterreich.

1962 :

Konzert für Trompete und Band.

Concertino.

Feierliches Einspiel.

Harmlose Scherze, Overtüre.

Hubertusritt, Overtüre.

Pilgerfahrt, Overtüre.

1969 : Festlicher Gesamtchor, für Band.

1970 :

Ein Krimi, Symphonic Band für Geschichte.

Das Verbrechen.

Recher Chen.

Indizienbeweis.

Feierliches Präludium, für Band.

1972-1973 :

Skizzen zu Einer Geschichte von Stadl-Paura.

Eine lustigö Eicht kleine Paraphrase.

Das Waldruine, Overtüre.

Jubiläums-Overtüre.

Manifestation, festlichen Auftakt.

Frank Burger Musik zum Würfelspiel.

Prologus brevis, Overtüre.

Romantische Skizze.

Kirchenmusik

6 Messen.

Chor « Der Krug » (1930) .

Kantaten

Osterkantate für Soli, gemischten Chor und Orchester.

Werke für Chor

1930 : Der Krug, für gemischten Chor.

Lieder

1972 : War ist Liebe, für Gesang und Klavier ; Text : Doris Demattè.

Kammermusikalische Blasmusik

1935 : Divertimento für Klarinette, Horn und Fagott.

1937 : Bläuserserenade, für 12 Blasinstrumente.

1938 : Trauersuite « Nachruf » für Hornquartett.

1961 :

Konzert Auf der Hausbank, 8 kleine Spielstücke für drei Geräte.

Intrade, für Blechbläserensemble und Pauken.

Suite für Hornquartett.

...

50 Lieder.

Die Jubilarin, Volksoper (1956) .

Seance, Ballett.

Max Springer

Max Springer, deutscher Organist, Komponist, Musikpädagoge : geboren 19. Dezember 1877 in Schwendi, Landkreis Biberach an der Riss ; gestorben 20. Januar 1954 in Wien.

Max Springer wuchs in der Gemeinde Schwendi / Württemberg auf. Er war zunächst Schüler des Klosters Beuron und gelangte als Organist des Sankt Emmausklosters, einer Filiale des Klosters Beurons, nach Prag, wo er an der deutschen Universität und andere bei Antonín Dvořák und Josef Klička studierte. Bereits 1910 wirkte er als Dozent für Komposition an der Wiener Musikakademie, 1923 wurde er zum ordentlichen Professor ernannt und er erhielt den Titel

« Hofrat » . 1926 wurde er Direktor der Wiener Musikakademie. Die Gemeinde Schwendi ernannte ihn 1933 zum Ehrenbürger. Schüler von Max Springer sind Kurt Wöb, Erwin Weiß, Karl Josef Walter, Marko Tajčević, Anton Nowakowski.

...

Max Springer : geboren am 10. Dezember 1877 in Schwendi, Landkreis Biberach an der Riss. Klosterschüler des Benediktinerklosters Beuron (Kreis Sigmaringen) . Weitere Ausbildung in den Benediktinerklöstern Seckau (Steiermark) , Sankt Emmaus, Prag und an der deutschen Universität in Prag und andere bei Josef Klička und Antonín Dvořák.

1900 : Stiftsorganist und Chordirektor an Sankt Emmaus, Prag. Bedeutender Orgel improvisator.

1910 : Professor an der Wiener Musikakademie.

1923 : Ernennung zum « Hofrat » durch die Stadt Wien.

1926 : Direktor der Staatsakademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst, Wien.

1933 : Ernennung zum Ehrenbürger der Gemeinde Schwendi.

1954 : Gestorben am 20. Januar in Wien. Dort begraben.

Komponierte Musik verschiedenster Gattungen. Opern, Symphonien, Messen, Oratorien. Messkompositionen, Lieder, Klavier-, Chor- und Orgelmusik.

Verfasser div. Lehrwerke, und andere über Gregorianik, Singen und Begleitung des gregorianischen Chorals, Orgelspiel, Kontrapunkt.

Schüler von Springer waren und andere Kurt Wöb, Erwin Weiß, Karl Josef Walter, Marko Tajčević, Anton Nowakowski. In Schwendi ist eine Straße nach ihm benannt.

Orgelwerke

Opus 6 : Fünfzig thematische Tonstücke in allen Tonarten stufenweise geordnet für die Orgel, Alfred Coppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1907) ; gewidmet Pater Michæl Horn.

Opus 7 : I. Sonate für Orgel in A-dur, 12 Seiten autograph.

Opus 8 : II. Sonate für Orgel in G-Moll, 10 Seiten autograph.

Opus I : IV. Sonate für Orgel in Fis-Moll, 22 Seiten autograph.

Opus 9a : Konzert-Improvisation in F-Dur (1909) , autograph.

Opus 9b : Weihnachts-Pastorale in G-dur für Orgel, autograph.

Opus 9c : Orgel-Meditation, autograph.

Opus 10 : Choralsong in G-Dur, Alfred Cöpppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1911) ; 27 Seiten.

Opus 14 : 6 Fughetten über den Namen BACH, Alfred Cöpppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1910) .

Opus 20 : 8 Postludien über die gebräuchlichsten « Ite missa est » , Alfred Cöpppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1907) .

Postludium über das « Ite missa est in festis solemnibus » , in D-Dur, aus Opus 20 ; in Orgelwerke über Themen aus dem Gregorianischen Choral (Doppelbauer) Cöpppenrath/Carus Verlag, Regensburg (CV 91.237/00) ; dieses Werk auch in Gauss III.

Opus 21 : 4 Präludien und eine Phantasie über das Oster-Alleluja, Cöpppenrath/Carus Verlag, Regensburg (CV 92.446) .

Opus 23 : Rezitations-Kadenzen und Präludien für die Orgel auch als Zwischenspiele beim Gottesdienste verwendbar, Alfred Cöpppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1908) .

Opus 25 : 3 Pastorale lyrische Tonbilder, Alfred Cöpppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1909) .

Opus 36 : Kleine Präludien für Orgel, Cöpppenrath/Carus Verlag, Regensburg (CV 92.426) .

Opus 37 : Zwölf Vor-, Zwischen- und Nachspiele, Cöpppenrath/Carus Verlag, Regensburg (CV 92.427) .

Opus 40 : Violin-Organ-Konzert, Universal-Edition Nr. 7789, Wien / New York (1925) .

Andante Cantabile in E-Dur aus Opus 6, (siehe oben) Nr. 118 in Gauss III.

Präludium I in C-Dur, Opus 21, Originalbeitrag Nr. 119 in Gauss III.

Präludium II in D-Dur, Opus 21, Originalbeitrag Nr. 120 in Gauss III.

Präludium III in Fis-Moll, Opus 21, Originalbeitrag Nr. 121 in Gauss III.

Präludium IV in F-Dur, Opus 21, Originalbeitrag Nr. 122 in Gauss III.

Phantasie über « O Sanctissima » , Originalbeitrag Nr. 123 in Gauss III.

Postludium über « Ite missa est in festis solemnibus » aus Opus 20, (siehe oben) Nr. 124 in Gauss III.

Phantasie über das Osterhalleluja, Opus 21, Originalbeitrag Nr. 125 in Gauss III.

Improvisation über ein Thema von Andrea Gabrieli, Originalbeitrag Nr. 126 in Gauss III.

Pastorale in F-Dur Nach einem Motiv aus der I. Antiphon der Weihnachtslaudes unter Verwendung des Liedes « Zu Betlehem geboren » in Monar « Weihnachtsalbum, Opus 45 » , Band II, Butz 1182.

Kyriale für den praktischen Gebrauch rhythmisiert und in moderne Notenschrift übertragen, Alfred Coppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1910) .

In Diebold, Orgelstücke, Opus 54c, Friedrich Pustet Verlag, Regensburg (1910) .

Nr. 13b : Präludium über das « Ave Maria » (8. Dezember) .

Nr. 28 : Postludium über das « Salve Regina » .

Josef Schildknecht, Orgelschule, Opus 33. Siebente bedeutend vermehrt und verbesserte Auflage durch Max Springer, Alfred Coppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1910) .

Darin einige Werke von Springer :

Gegenfuge in Fis-Moll.

Postludium « Kyrie fons bonitatis » .

Präludium in B-Dur, in C-Dur, in D-Dur.

Choralvorspiele : Jesus trocknet alle Tränen, Es ist ein Ros entsprungen, Hier liegt vor deiner Majestät, Wir werfen uns darnieder, Conditor alme siderum, Es lag die Welt in hartem Weh.

Werke

6 Fughetten über den Namen BACH, Opus 14 ; Alfred Coppenrath Verlag, Regensburg (1908) .

Fughette in D-Moll, Nr. 3 aus Opus 14.

8 Postludien über die gebräuchlichsten « Ite missa est » , Opus 20.

4 Präludien und eine Fantasie über das Oster-Halleluja, Opus 21.

Missa « Lauda Sion » , Opus 22.

« Te Deum » für gemischten Chor und Orgelbegleitung, Opus 28 ; Bonifatius-Druckerei Verlag, Prag (1914) .

Messe zu Ehren der seligen Crescentia Höß, Opus 31.

Kleine Präludien für Orgel, Opus 35.

Kleine Präludien für Orgel, Opus 36.

Konzert für Violine und Orgel, Opus 40.

Josef Haas

Le compositeur et pédagogue allemand Josef Haas est né le 19 mars 1879 à Maihingen, près de Nördlingen ; et est mort le 30 mars 1960 à Munich. Il a été enterré au « Waldfriedhof » de Munich. Son œuvre traduit un Romantisme tardif.

Josef Haas était le fils du second mariage du professeur Alban Haas. Son demi-frère aîné qui portait le même nom que le père (Alban Haas) était un prêtre catholique et un historien, qui a vécu principalement à Neustadt an der Weinstraße, situé dans le diocèse de Spire. Par l'intermédiaire de ce frère, Josef Haas a ultérieurement eu des relations avec la cathédrale de Spire.

Josef Haas a d'abord été professeur, comme son père, et a travaillé de 1897 à 1904 au Collège à Lauingen sur le Danube.

Pour pouvoir approfondir son goût pour la musique, Josef Haas a fait la connaissance en 1904 de Max Reger et l'a suivi en 1907 pour étudier la musique à Leipzig. Haas a obtenu son diplôme en 1909 et, en 1911, est entré pour enseigner la composition au Conservatoire de Stuttgart, où il a été nommé professeur en 1916. De 1919 à 1921, il était directeur musical de la « Singakademie » à Glogau. Il a ensuite enseigné à l'Académie de Musique de Munich (aujourd'hui, l'Université de Musique et des Arts de Munich) entre 1924 et 1950 en tant que professeur titulaire. En 1921, il a fondé avec Paul Hindemith et Heinrich Burkard les « Donaueschinger internationalen Kammermusikfeste für Neue Musik » .

À l'époque du National-Socialisme, Haas a été exposé à certaines représailles parce qu'il tolérait publiquement la Nouvelle musique dite « dégénérée » et parce qu'il pratiquait aussi sa foi catholique. Après la Seconde Guerre

mondiale, il est devenu président de l'Université de Musique et des Arts de Munich (jusqu'à sa retraite en 1950) et a entamé sa reconstruction. Sa dernière œuvre a été l'hymne pour le Congrès eucharistique international de Munich, en 1960. Il est décédé alors qu'il était en train de la copier.

À Bad Aibling, on trouve depuis 1966, un « Chœur Joseph-Haas » , qui porte le nom du compositeur.

Le sens de sa musique et les intentions de son œuvre ont été formulés par le compositeur comme suit :

« La musique doit réjouir et non blesser ; elle doit émouvoir et non écraser ; elle doit faire progresser et non banaliser. »

(Josef Haas, cité sur le site de la Bibliothèque d'État de Württemberg.)

Pour le 900e anniversaire de la consécration de la cathédrale de Spire, Josef Haas a écrit en 1930 la « Speyerer Domfest-Messe » , qu'il a dédiée à Ludwig Sebastian, l'évêque diocésain de son frère. Jusque dans les années 1950, cette Messe faisait partie du répertoire général des églises du diocèse, puis est tombée temporairement dans l'oubli. Des années plus tard, elle a retrouvé une place dans le nouveau diocèse de Spire. Elle est présente dans le livre de cantiques « Gotteslob » .

L'œuvre de Haas est entièrement basée sur la tonalité. Elle a d'abord été fortement influencée par son maître Max Reger, dont le langage musical, riche en polyphonie harmonique, caractérise aussi les œuvres de Haas. Leur style, cependant, s'attache à la compréhension plus facile de la part le public qui souvent reste étranger aux musiques contemporaines. Par conséquent, ce style possède un ton populaire, humoristique et s'attache à demeurer clair et concis. Les compositions de Haas sont des ouvrages de haute-qualité. L'essentiel de l'œuvre de Haas réside dans la musique vocale, sous forme de lieder, de musique chorale sacrée et profane. En outre, il a aussi laissé de la musique de chambre, de la musique orchestrale, de la musique pour piano et pour orgue. Comme points forts de sa production, on notera les 2 Opéras « Tobias Wunderlich » et « Die Hochzeit des Jobs » .

Durant sa vie, Haas a été un compositeur très apprécié et respecté. Pour son 75e anniversaire en 1954, de nombreuses festivités ont eu lieu dans les 2 anciens États allemands. Depuis la mort de Haas, la présence de ses compositions dans les concerts a été considérablement réduite. Pour perpétuer le souvenir du compositeur et faire vivre sa musique, l'association « Josef-Haas-Gesellschaft » a été créée en 1949 par son ami, le pédagogue Rupert Egenberger.

Haas a eu aussi une importante activité comme professeur de musique. Parmi ses nombreux étudiants, on trouve des compositeurs et des chefs d'orchestre tels que Otto Jochum (1898-1969) ; Karl Gustav Fellerer (1902-1984) ; Eugen Jochum (1902-1987) ; Heinrich Simbriger (1903-1976) ; Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963) ; Karl Höller (1907-1987) ; Philipp Mohler (1908-1982) ; Cesar Bresgen (1913-1988) ; Ernst Kutzer (1918-2008) ; Rudolf Mors (1920-1988) ; Wolfgang Sawallisch (1923-2013) ; Hans Walter Kämpfel (1924) .

Musique de scène

« Die Bergkönigin » , musique de scène en 3 Actes sur des contes de Noël portant le même nom de Franziska Rodenstock, Opus 70 (1927) .

« Tobias Wunderlich » , Opéra en 3 Actes (6 tableaux) basé sur un livret de Ludwig Strecker, junior, Opus 90 (1934-1937) ; création le 24 novembre 1937 par le chef Robert Heger au « Staatstheater » de Cassel.

« Die Hochzeit des Jobs » , Opéra-comique en 4 Actes (8 tableaux) basé sur un livret Ludwig Strecker, junior, Opus 93; (1940-1943) ; création le 2 juillet 1944 par le chef Karl Elmendorff au « Staatsoper » de Dresde.

Oratorios

« Die heilige Elisabeth » , Opus 84 (1931) ; création le 11 novembre 1931 par le chef Bartholomäus Ständer à la tête du « Kasseler Chorvereinigung » .

« Christnacht » , Opus 85 (1932) .

« Das Lebensbuch Gottes » , Opus 87 (1934) ; création le 6 novembre 1934 à Essen par le chef Josef Schüler.

« Das Lied von der Mutter » , Opus 91 (1938-1939) ; création le 19 décembre 1939 à Cologne par le chef Eugen Pabst.

« Das Jahr im Lied » , Opus 103 (1951-1952) ; création le 23 avril 1952 à Cassel par le chef Paul Schmitz.

« Die Seligen » , Opus 106 (1956) ; création le 12 avril 1957 à Cassel par le chef Paul Schmitz.

Cycles de Lieder

6 « Krippenlieder » , Opus 49 (1919) .

« Unterwegs » , basé sur un texte de Hermann Heße, Opus 65 (1925) .

« Gesänge an Gott » , basé sur un texte de Jakob Kneip, Opus 68 (1926) :

« Laßt aus diesem engen Haus ; O Stimme des Weltalls ! ; Das weiß ich und hab' es erlebt ; Mitten in der Nacht ; In dieser Abendstunde ; Wenn einst die Türen der Himmel aufgehen. »

Messes

« Eine Deutsche Singmesse » , Opus 60 (1924) .

« Speyerer Domfestmesse », Opus 80 (1930) ; création le 13 juillet 1930 à Spire.

« Christ-König-Messe », Opus 88 (1935) ; création le 1er août 1935 à Limburg an der Lahn.

« Münchener Liebfrauenmesse », Opus 96 (1946) ; création en 1946 à Munich.

« Te Deum », Opus 100 (1945) ; création le 8 décembre 1946 à la « Musikhochschule » de Munich par le chef Ferdinand Leitner.

« Totenmesse », Opus 101 (1947) ; création le 6 avril 1952 à Fulda par le chef Heinz von Schumann.

« Deutsche Weihnachtsmesse », Opus 105 (1954) .

Deutsche Chormesse , Opus 108.

Musique pour orchestre

« Heitere Serenade », Opus 41 (1913-1914) ; création en 1915 au « Württembergisches Staatstheater » de Stuttgart par le chef Max von Schillings.

Suite Symphonique (1913) .

Variations et Rondo sur un vieux chant populaire allemand, Opus 45 (1916-1917) .

Suite de variations sur un vieux thème Rococo, Opus 64 (1924) ; création le 3 mars 1925 par le chef Hermann Abendroth à la tête du « Gürzenich-Orchester » de Cologne.

Intermezzo lyrique (1937) .

« Overtüre zu einem frohen Spiel », Opus 95 (1943) ; création le 27 septembre 1946 par le chef Hans Rosbaud à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Munich.

« Der Tod auf dem Apfelbaum », Opus 101b (1945) ; création le 27 septembre 1946 par le chef Hans Rosbaud à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Munich.

Musique de chambre

2 Sonatines pour violon et piano (en sol mineur et en ré majeur) , Opus 4 (1905) .

Quatuor à cordes en sol mineur, Opus 8 (1905) .

Sonate pour violon en si mineur, Opus 21 (1908) .

Divertimento en ré majeur pour trio à cordes, Opus 22 (1909) .

« Ein Kränzlein Bagatellen » pour hautbois et piano, Opus 23 (1909) .

2 « Grottesken » pour violoncelle et piano, Opus 28 (1910) .

« Waldhornsonate » en fa majeur pour cor et piano , Opus 29 (1910) .

« Ein Sommermärchen » pour violoncelle et piano, Opus 30 (1910) .

Divertimento en ut majeur pour quatuor à cordes, Opus 32 (1911) .

Trio de chambre en la mineur pour 2 violons et piano, Opus 38 (1912) .

« Grillen » pour violon et piano, Opus 40 (1912) .

Capriccio en sol mineur pour violon et piano (1915) .

Quatuor à cordes en la majeur, Opus 50 (1919) .

Musique pour piano

Ballade (1902) .

5 Études, Opus 2 (1904) .

Bagatelles, Opus 6 (1902-1904) .

« Notenbeilagen zum Musikalischen Hausschatz » (1906) .

« Nächtlicher Spuk » (1910) .

« Mummenschanz » (1911) .

« Kinderlust » , Opus 10 (1908) .

« Lose Blätter » , Opus 16 (1908) .

« Frohe Launen » , Opus 18 (1909) .

« Wichtelmännchen » , Opus 27 (1910) .

« Gespenster » , Opus 34 (1910) .

« Hausmärchen » , Opus 35 (1911) , Opus 43 (1916) , Opus 53 (1920) .

« Jugendfreuden » , Opus 36 (1911) .

« Eulenspiegeleien » , Opus 39 (1912) .

« Alte unnennbare Tage » , Élégies pour piano (Opus 42) .

Sonate en la mineur, Opus 46 (1918) .

« Deutsche Reigen und Romanzen » , Opus 51 (1919) .

« Schwänke und Idyllen » , Opus 55 (1921) .

2 Sonates (en ré majeur et en la mineur) , Opus 61 (1923) .

« Stücke für die Jugend » , Opus 69 (1927) .

« Märchentänze » , Opus 70a (1927) .

4 Sonates (en ut majeur, en ré mineur, en sol majeur, en fa majeur) , Opus 94 (1943) .

« Klangspiele » , 10 petites études pour piano, Opus 99 (1945) .

Musique pour orgue

10 « Choralvorspiele » , Opus 3 (1905) .

3 Préludes et fugues (en ut mineur, en sol mineur, en ré majeur) , Opus 11 (1906) .

Sonate en ut mineur, Opus 12 (1907) .

8 Études de caractère, Opus 15 (1907) .

Suite en ré mineur, Opus 20 (1908) .

Suite en la majeur, Opus 25 (1909) .

Variations sur un thème pour orgue, Opus 31 (1911) .

Introduction et fugue en la majeur (1912) .

8 Préludes (1936) .

...

The German late-Romantic composer and music teacher Josef Haas was born on 19 March 1879 in Maihingen, near Nördlingen ; and died on 30 March 1960 in Munich. He was buried in the Munich « Waldfriedhof » .

Born to teacher Alban Haas from his 2nd marriage, being half-brother to the theologian and historian Alban Haas. At an early age, he came into contact with music. He became a teacher himself and taught from 1897 to 1904 in Lauingen, near the Danube.

In his effort to pursue his musical inclination, he met Max Reger, with whom he took private lessons from 1904 in Munich. He later followed him to Leipzig in 1907 to study music at the Leipzig Conservatory. Among his teachers were Karl Straube and Adolf Ruthardt. In 1909, Haas finished his studies. In 1911, having had his 1st success as a composer and having won an Arthur Nikisch scholarship, he became teacher of composition at the Stuttgart Conservatory, where he was named professor in 1916. From 1921, he taught at the « Akademie für Tonkunst » in Munich (today, « Hochschule für Musik und Theater München ») ; he was professor there from 1924 to 1950.

In 1921, together with Paul Hindemith and Heinrich Burkard, he established the « Donaueschinger Kammermusikaufführungen zur Förderung zeitgenössischer Tonkunst » .

In 1930, he became a member of the Prussian Academy of Arts in Berlin.

During the rule of Nazism, Haas suffered some reprisals, as he openly supported the « entartete » new music and practised his Catholic beliefs. After the Second World War, he became president of the Munich « Hochschule für Musik und Theater » , a position which he held until he became « Emeritus » Professor in 1950 and led the school's reconstruction after 1945.

The work of Josef Haas was entirely based on tonality. At 1st, he was strongly influenced by his mentor Max Reger, whose language of polyphony and harmony also featured in Haas's music.

During his lifetime, Haas was a successful and well-known composer. In 1954, for his 75th birthday, numerous celebratory Festivals took place in both West and East Germany. After his death, the presence of his works in concerts has dramatically decreased.

In 1949, the composer's friend Rupert Egenberger established the « Josef-Haas-Gesellschaft », dedicated to Haas and his work.

Haas was an important music teacher. Among his numerous students are composers and conductors, such as Otto Jochum (1898-1969) ; Karl Gustav Fellerer (1902-1984) ; Eugen Jochum (1902-1987) ; Heinrich Simbriger (1903-1976) ; Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963) ; Karl Höller (1907-1987) ; Philipp Mohler (1908-1982) ; Cesar Bresgen (1913-1988) ; Ernst Kutzer (1918-2008) ; Rudolf Mors (1920-1988) ; Wolfgang Sawallisch (1923-2013) ; Hans Walter Kämpfel (1924) .

...

Josef Haas was born on 19 March 1879 in the Bavarian town of Maihingen, near Nördlingen. The 3d child of the local teacher, he came into contact with domestic and church music at an early age and eventually took-up a career as a primary school teacher himself. His encounter with Max Reger was crucial to his musical career. From 1904, Haas took private lessons with him in Munich and, in 1907, followed him to Leipzig where he also studied with Karl Straube and Adolf Ruthardt at the local Conservatory.

In 1911, his 1st successes as composer and the award of the Arthur Nikisch Scholarship (for the Violin Sonata, Opus 21) earned him an appointment as composition teacher at the Stuttgart Conservatory. In 1921, he took a position at the Munich « Akademie der Tonkunst » where he was appointed professor in 1924, taking-over the composition class and, in 1925, even the direction of the Catholic church music department. In 1924, Haas, with Eduard Erdmann and Heinrich Burkhard, founded the Donaueschingen Festival for New Music, thus, proving his open-mindedness about anything new, despite his always tonal compositions. In 1930, he became a member of the « Preußische Akademie der Künste » in Berlin. After 1945, he strove, as its president, to rebuild the Munich « Hochschule für Musik » .

Haas received numerous awards and honours, including honorary degrees from the University of Munich (1954) and the Papal Institute of Sacred Music in Rome (1953) . He died on 30 March 1960 in Munich. Taking part in many musical organisations, Haas supported not only artistic but also social and legal issues of the musicians. As teacher of a generation of composers and conductors such as Karl Amadeus Hartmann, Cesar Bresgen or Eugen Jochum and Wolfgang Sawallisch, he greatly influenced the recent musical development in Germany.

The comprehensive « œuvre » of Josef Haas comprises compositions from all compositional genres, such as for example the « folk » Operas « Tobias Wunderlich » (1937) and « Die Hochzeit des Jobs » (1944) (both based on texts by Ludwig Andersen) ; the Oratorios « Die heilige Elisabeth » (1931) ; « Das Lebensbuch Gottes » (1934) ; « Das Jahr im Lied » (1952) , which are also accessible to amateur musicians, liturgical works, including Masses in German such as the « Speyerer Domfestmesse » , Opus 80 (1930) , as well as orchestral works, lieder, chamber music, piano and organ

pieces. Haas' close-to-the-people style of composition gained him the reputation of being the « “ Spitzweg ” of modern piano music » .

...

Joseph Haas wurde am 19. März 1879 in Maihingen im schwäbischen Ries als 3. Kind des dortigen Lehrers geboren. Schon früh zeigte sich seine musikalische Begabung. Zunächst wurde er aber Lehrer. Nach erfolgreicher Prüfung versuchte er seine musikalischen Studien zu vervollkommen. Entscheidend war dabei die Begegnung mit Max Reger, dem er bis Leipzig folgte. Schon bald zeigten sich die ersten Erfolge als Komponist, die ihm 1911 die Berufung als Lehrer für Komposition am Konservatorium in Stuttgart und 1921 die Berufung an die Akademie der Tonkunst in München brachten. Konsequenterweise ging er in seinem Schaffen von der Kammermusik über Lieder und Chorwerke zu den großen Orchesterwerken, Oratorien und Opern. Von den bedeutenden Werken seien die beiden Opern « Tobias Wunderlich » und « Die Hochzeit des Jobs » , die Oratorien « Die heilige Elisabeth » , « Das Lebensbuch Gottes » , « Das Jahr im Lied » und « Die Seligen » , von den Liederzyklen « Gesänge an Gott » nach Gedichten von Jakob Kneip und « Unterwegs » nach Gedichten von Hermann Heße, von den Messen die « Speyerer Domfestmesse » und die « Münchner Liebfrauenmesse » sowie von den Kammermusikwerken das Streichquartett in A-Dur Opus 50, die Violinsonate in H-Moll Opus 21, und die Klaviersonate in A-Moll Opus 46 genannt.

Im Jahre 1921 gründete Josef Haas mit Paul Hindemith und Heinrich Burkard die « Donaueschinger internationalen Kammermusikfeste für Neue Musik » und bewies damit seine Aufgeschlossenheit für alles Neue, obwohl er selbst stets tonal komponierte. Schon bald war er einer der gesuchtesten Kompositionslehrer in Deutschland. Aus seiner Meisterklasse gingen so unterschiedliche Künstler hervor wie Karl Amadeus Hartmann, Karl Höller, Philipp Mohler, Cesar Bresgen oder die Dirigenten Eugen Jochum und Wolfgang Sawallisch. Josef Haas war während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus Angriffen als « Fortschrittsapostel » (wegen seines Eintretens für die Neue Musik in Donaueschingen) oder wegen « Romhörigkeit » (wegen seines praktizierten katholischen Glaubens) ausgesetzt. Die Übertragung des Wiederaufbaus der Musikhochschule in München nach dem Kriege als deren Präsident hinderte ihn selbst am Komponieren. Erst nach 1950, als er in den wohlverdienten Ruhestand als Ehrenpräsident versetzt wurde, entstanden noch mehrere teils abendfüllende Werke. Als er am 30. März 1960 über der Reinschrift zur Hymne für den Eucharistischen Weltkongreß in München starb, war er der geachtete Nestor der deutschen Komponisten. Er hatte viele Auszeichnungen erhalten, und andere Ehrendoktor der Münchner Universität und des päpstlichen Instituts für Kirchenmusik in Rom, Ehrensenator der Musikhochschulen in Stuttgart, Dresden und Leipzig, Ehrenmitglied der GEMA und des Deutschen Komponistenverbandes. Seit 1949 gibt es eine Josef-Haas-Gesellschaft, die sich um die Verbreitung seines Werkes bemüht. Dem Werk von Josef Haas wird man nur gerecht, wenn man es an dem mißt, was er selbst zur Sinnggebung in der Musik gesagt hat :

« Die Musik soll erfreuen, nicht beleidigen ; sie soll erschüttern, nicht zerschmettern ; sie soll veredeln, nicht banalisieren. »

Josef Kronsteiner

The composer and cathedral Choir-Master Josef Kronsteiner was born on 15 February 1910 in Losenstein, Upper-Austria ; and died on 15 Mai 1988 in Linz. He teached at the Bruckner Conservatory in Linz. Brother of Hermann Kronsteiner.

Works

Motets, Propers, Masses, Lieder.

...

Josef Kronsteiner, österreichischer Komponist, Domkapellmeister und Professor am Bruckner-Konservatorium in Linz : geboren 15. Februar 1910 in Losenstein ; gestorben 15. Mai 1988 in Linz.

Josef Kronsteiner war der Bruder von Hermann Kronsteiner. Ab 1943 Domkapellmeister in Linz war Kronsteiner auch Dozent am Linzer Priesterseminar und Mitglied der Linzer Diözesankommission für Kirchenmusik. Als Priester wirkte er an der Linzer Minoritenkirche und als Gegner der Liturgiereform feierte er weiterhin die Tridentinische Messe. Josef Kronsteiner war 38 Jahre lang Domkapellmeister in Linz. Die Brüder Kronsteiner waren auch mit Joseph Ratzinger und Georg Ratzinger freundschaftlich verbunden.

...

Josef Kronsteiner, Weltpriester, Domkapellmeister, Musikpädagoge und Komponist : geboren 15. Februar 1910 in Losenstein, Oberösterreich ; gestorben 15. Mai 1988 in Linz. Aus einem musikalischen Elternhaus stammend, besuchte Josef 1921-1929 das Kollegium Petrinum in Linz, wo er musikalischen Unterricht von Heinrich Hagleitner und Georg Wolfgruber erhielt und sich als Sänger sowie Pianist und Organist betätigte. 1931 Musikpräfekt und Obmann der liturgischen Sektion des Linzer Priesterseminars, hier auch Kontakt mit der Liturgischen Bewegung ; 1933 Priesterweihe, 1933-1934 Kaplan in Pabneukirchen, Oberösterreich. 1934-1938 Gesanglehrer und Musikpräfekt am Kollegium Petrinum. Daneben Musikstudien bei Robert Keldorfer am Bruckner-Konservatorium, bei Josefine Prachovny beziehungsweise Maria Hausner (Gesang) und Gisela von Pászthory de Rosza (Klavier, 1934-1937) in Linz, 1937-1938 bei Josef Lechthaler, Louis Dité und Ernst Tittel an der Wiener Musik Akademie ; 1938 Lehrbefähigungsprüfung für Schulmusik. 1938-1941 als Seelsorger in Schwanenstadt / Oberösterreich und Grieskirchen / Oberösterreich tätig, 1941-1943 Domvikar (Nachfolger : Hermann Kronsteiner) am Neuen Linzer Dom (Gründung des Jugendchores) , daneben 1942-1945 Studium bei Johann Nepomuk David, Anton Rhoden und Karl Straube an der Musik Hofschule. Leipzig / Deutschland 1943-1981 Domkapellmeister in Linz, wirkte 1946-1969 auch als Dozent für Choralgesang am Linzer Priesterseminar und war Mitglied der Linzer Diözesankommission für Kirchenmusik. 1957-1974 Landespräses für Österreich und ab 1961 I. Vizepräses des Allgemeinen Cäcilienverbandes. Er war daneben auch Musikschriftsteller und ein von Gregorianik (Choral) und niederländischer Vokalpolyphonie ausgehender, Einflüsse von David verarbeitender Komponist von Kirchen- und Kammermusik sowie ab 1945 Profesor für Kirchenmusik am Linzer Bruckner-Konservatorium.

Preis

2. Preis beim Orgel-Wettbewerb Sankt Florian (1941) .

Geistlicher Rat (1946) .

Plakette von Pius XII. (1952) .

Ehrennadel der Stadt Mönchengladbach / Deutschland (1953) .

Konsistorialrat (1953) .

Ehrenplakette der Stadt Steyr (1957) .

Professor-Titel (1961) .

Monsignore (1966) .

Großer Bruckner-Preis des Landes Oberösterreich (1968) .

Bruckner-Medaille der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft (1970) .

Orlando-di-Lasso-Medaille des Allgemeinen Cäcilienverbandes.

Schrift

Aufsätze über einzelne Werke und andere von Anton Bruckner.

Werke

3 Oratorien (Maria 1958) .

Circa 30 Messen.

Deutsche Ordinariumsvertonungen - Florian-Messe : Gotteslob Nr. 134-136 (ohne Gloria) , Gotteslob (1975) Nr. 429-432.

Christkindelmesse für Soli, Chor und Orgel.

Circa 100 lateinisch und 60 deutsche Propriengesänge.

Chöre.

Kreuzweg für gemischten Chor (1955) .

Orchester-Werke.

Kammermusik.

Lieder.

Hermann Kronsteiner

Hermann Kronsteiner, Weltpriester, Pädagoge, Organist und Komponist : geboren 25. März 1914 in Losenstein, Oberösterreich ; gestorben 13. November 1994 in Linz. Studierte Theologie in Linz, war Musikpräfekt an der dortigen philosophisch-theologischen Diözesanlehranstalt ; 1938 Priesterweihe. Wirkte in der Diözese Linz (Kaplan in Sierning, Windischgarsten, ab 1943 Domvikar in der Nachfolge seines Bruders) , studierte 1946-1948 (Abteilung für Kirchenmusik) und 1951-1953 (Musikerziehung, 1953 Lehramtsprüfung) an der Wiener Musik Akademie bei Franz Kosch, Ernst Tittel, Ferdinand Großmann, Hans Gillesberger und K. Walter. 1948-1949 Hörer an der Päpstlichen Musik Akademie in Rom und 1949-1959 Musiklehrer am Linzer Knabenseminar Kollegium Petrinum. Obmann des Linzer Dommusikvereins, 1974-1984 Landespräsident für Österreich des Allgemeinen Cäcilienverbandes und ab 1955 Vorsitzender der Diözesankommission für Kirchenmusik. 1960-1974 Lehrer an der Wiener Musik Akademie / Musik Hofschule (1963 angegebenen Ort Professor, 1960-1965 Leiter der Abteilung für Kirchenmusik, 1965-1974 Leiter des Institutes für kirchenmusikalische Volksbildung und ab 1961-1980 Kirchenrektor von Sankt Ursula) . Als Komponist war er (wie sein Bruder) auf dem Gebiet der Volksliturgie (Betsingmesse) geschätzt und betonte daher die liturgische Funktion seiner Werke durch eine einfache Satzweise.

Preis

I. Preis beim Orgel-Improvisationswettbewerb Sankt Florian (1939) .

Gausieger beim Orgel-Wettbewerb Sankt Florian (1941) (2. Preis : Josef Kronsteiner) .

Geistlicher Rat (1950) .

Konsistorialrat (1959) .

Monsignore (1969) .

Orlando-di-Lasso-Medaille des Allgemeinen Cäcilienverbandes (1990) .

Werke

Märchenoper Der gestiefelte Kater (1963) .

Kirchenmusik (Oratorium, Messen, deutsche Antiphonar ; lateinisch Proprienwerk 1938-1950) .

Chöre.

Lieder.

Kammermusik.

Orgelwerke.

Schauspielmusiken.

Schriften

Bruckners Kirchenmusik und die Liturgie, in : Franz Grasberger (Herausgeber) , [Festschrift] Leopold Nowak (1964) .

Kirchenmusik heute (1967) .

Vinzenz Goller. Leben und Werk (1976) .

Aufsätze.

Literatur

J. Unfried, in : Chorbl. 4/4 (1949) .

Kürschner (1954) .

MGG 7 (1958) .

Biographisches Lexikon von Oberösterreich 4. Lieferung (1958) und 11.-14. Lieferung (1968) .

Hugo Riemann (1972) .

Rudolf Pacik. Volksgesang im Gottesdienst (1977) .

Bernhard Schörkhuber. Hermann Kronsteiner, Leben und Werk, Diplom Arbeitsagoge Linz (1993) .

MGÖ 3 (1995) .

MaÖ (1997) .

Helmut Zöpfl. Josef Kronsteiner - der Chormeister (2003) .

Ingrid Loimer. Joseph Meßner (2009) ; Seite 79.

Ch. M. Hornbachner. Josef Kronsteiner (2014) .

SK : Band 2 (1954) , Seite 29 ; Band 9 (1961-1962) , Seite 138 ; Band 15 (1967-1968) , Seite 156f ; Band 17 (1969-1970) , Seite 119f ; Band 21 (1973-1974) , Seite 126f ; Band 22 (1974-1975) , Seite 126 ; Band 26 (1978-1979) , Seite 174 ; Band 27 (1979-1980) , Seite 115f ; Band 29 (1981-1982) , Seite 22 ; Band 31 (1984) , Seite 35 ; Band 35 (1988) , Seite 89, 128f ; Band 36 (1989) , Seite 30 ; Band 41 (1994) , Seite 30 und 187 ; Band 61 (2014) , Seite 48 ; weitere Recherchen in der SK ; Mitteilung Archiv Musik Universität Wien.

Schwestern

Deren Schwestern Anna (1902-1982 ; Sr. Cäcilia) ; Agnes (1904-1989, Sr. Theresita) ; und Aloisia (1912-1989, Sr. Elfridis) waren in ihren Orden als Organistinnen und Chorleiterinnen tätig. Der Bruder Ernest (1906-1981) , Uhrmachermeister in Bad Zell / Oberösterreich, betätigte sich fallweise als Kirchenchorleiter.

Nichte

Deren Nichte Hemma, Organistin : geboren 20. April 1946 in Losenstein, Oberösterreich ; gestorben 18. August 2009 in Wien. Studierte 1956-1966 am Bruckner-Konservatorium in Linz (zunächst Klavier, ab 1961 Orgel) und ab 1966 Blockflöte (bis 1970, bei Hans Maria Kneihls) sowie Orgel Konzertfach (bis 1974, bei Hans Haselböck) an der Wiener Musik Akademie / Musik Hochschule ; Diplomprüfung 1974. 1973-1975 Lehrbeauftragte für Orgel am Konservatorium in Eisenstadt (damals Expositur der Musik Hochschule Wien) , 1975-2009 LI-Professor (künstlerisch-pädagogische und administrative Aufgaben) am Institut für kirchenmusikalische Werkpraxis an der Abteilung für Kirchenmusik (ab 2002 Institut für Orgel, Orgelforschung und Kirchenmusik) der Musik Hochschule / Musik Universität Wien.

Preis

Preisträgerin beim Paul-Hofhaimer-Wettbewerb (1973) .

Professor-Titel.

Schrift

(Herausgeber) De arte organistica. Festschrift Hans Haselböck zum 70. Geburtstag (1998) .

Adolf Trittinger

Professor Adolf Trittinger, Komponist, Chorleiter und Organist : geboren 23. März 1899 in Klosterneuburg, Niederösterreich ; gestorben 25. Dezember 1971 in Melk, Niederösterreich. Sängerknabe im Stift Lilienfeld, absolvierte die Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Krems und 1918-1921 die Wiener Musik Akademie (Abteilung für Kirchenmusik) . Er war kurz in Rumänien, dann als Chordirektor im Stift Schlägl tätig. 1934-1938 war Trittinger Organist und Musikdirektor im Stift Sankt Florian. 1937-1943 unterrichtete er am Bruckner-Konservatorium Linz (ab 1939 Direktor) . Sein Einsatz für Paul Hindemith führte zu seiner Entlassung (Nationalsozialismus) . Ab 1946 wirkte er als Musikdirektor im Stift Melk, wo er auch am Stiftsgymnasium Lehrer war und die Chorknaben ausbildete.

...

Seine erste Ausbildung erhielt er als Sängerknabe im Zisterzienserstift in Lilienfeld. Dann absolvierte er die Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Krems. Nach dem Kriegsdienst schloß er 1921 seine Studien an der Kirchenmusikabteilung der Wiener Musikakademie in Klosterneuburg ab. Kurze Zeit war er in Rumänien tätig und wirkte dann ein Jahrzehnt als Chordirektor im Prämonstratenserstift Schlägl. In der Zeit von 1934 bis 1938 übte er die Ämter eines Musikdirektors und Organisten im Augustiner-Chorherrnstift Sankt Florian aus.

Seit 1937 wirkte er am Bruckner-Konservatorium in Linz, dem er 1940-1943 als Direktor vorstand.

Am 18. Juni 1943 veranstaltete er einen Paul Hindemith-Abend, der von Adolf Hitler persönlich beanstandet wurde. Trittinger wurde seines Amtes enthoben und nur die Gunst der Umstände ersparte ihm die Einlieferung in das KZ Mauthausen.

Nach dem 2. Weltkrieg war er Musikdirektor des Benediktinerstiftes Melk, wo er auch am Stiftsgymnasium unterrichtete und die Ausbildung der Sängerknaben leitete.

Er starb am Christtag des Jahres 1971 in der Stiftskirche Melk. Wie gewöhnlich, so verweilte er auch an diesem Festtage noch vor dem Hochamte in der letzten Bankreihe der Stiftskirche in stillem Gebet. Als er an diesem Tage nicht rechtzeitig auf den Chor gekommen ist, wollte ihn ein Student von dort abholen, konnte aber nur mehr den Tod des Herrn Professors feststellen.

...

(Regina Thumser, 2008.)

Adolf Trittinger (1899-1971) wurde seine erste musikalische Erziehung als Schüler und « Singknabe » im Stift Lilienfeld zuteil. Nach dem Kriegsdienst im Ersten Weltkrieg studierte Trittinger ab Herbst 1918 an der « Staatsakademie für

Musik » , Abteilung für Schul- und Kirchenmusik in Wien beziehungsweise Klosterneuburg Musik. Nach Abschluß des Musikstudiums ging er als Chorleiter nach Lugoj (Rumänien) und erhielt vom « Deutsch-schwäbischen Kulturverband » den Auftrag, in Lugoj eine Musikschule zu gründen. Zwei Jahre später übernahm Trittinger « die Leitung des ungarischen Chores und die Stelle eines 2. Kapellmeisters am Stadttheater » in Arad :

« Schon in Lugoj, mehr noch in Arad hatte ich Gelegenheit, angeregt durch die aufrüttelnden Taten des Führers im Mutterlande, in Presse und aktiver Propaganda mitzuarbeiten an den politischen und kulturellen Einigungsbestrebungen des gefährdeten Banater Deutschtums. »

1923 nahm er als Schriftleiter der Arader Zeitung Verbindung mit dem Völkischen Beobachter auf. Er soll damit das Interesse der rumänischen Staatspolizei auf sich gezogen haben und in Folge « wegen “ pangermanischer Propaganda ” als lästiger Ausländer » im Juli 1924 aus Rumänien ausgewiesen worden sein. Nach seiner Funktion als Chordirektor im Stift Schlägl wurde Trittinger 1934 Musikdirektor im Stift Sankt Florian. In dieser Zeit wohnte er mit seiner Ehefrau Emilie Maria Trittinger, geborene Secklar, in Sankt Florian, Schlageterstraße 1.

Adolf Trittinger, der in den Jahren 1934 bis 1936 Mitglied der Vaterländischen Front war, trat der NSDAP am 1. Februar 1938 bei. In einer Vernehmung am 3. Februar 1947 gab er an, er sei « vor dem Jahre 1938 immer ein scharfer Gegner der NSDAP » gewesen und hätte 1938 um seine Stellung gefürchtet :

« Ich hatte schwer zu kämpfen um meine Anstellung zum Leiter des Konservatoriums, welche Stellung ich dann später nur auf Grund meines künstlerischen Könnens doch erhielt. Anlässlich einer Aussprache mit dem Gauleiter Eigruber wurde ich von diesen (sic) mit Schuschniggfreund bezeichnet. Auch wurde mir eine abfällige Bemerkung über Hitler angelastet. Unter diesen Umständen war ich gezwungen Annäherung an die mir immer verhasst gewesene Partei zu suchen. Um meinen politischen Leumund zu verbessern suchte ich um die Aufnahme in die Partei als Anwärter gläublich im April 1938 an. »

Mit 1. September 1940 wurden alle Lehrenden des Brucknerkonservatoriums in Angestelltenverhältnisse des Gaus überführt. Als neuer Direktor wurde Adolf Trittinger « auf unbestimmte Zeit, jedoch mindestens auf die Dauer von 5 Jahren » bestellt. Am 26. November 1940 meldete das Gaupersonalamt, daß gegen Trittinger « ein Parteigerichtsverfahren auf Ausschluß aus der NSDAP anhängig » sei. Dies dürfte zunächst abgewendet worden sein. Ein Parteiausschluß sei auch nicht « anzunehmen, da er später häufig die Uniform eines Hitlerjugend. Führers getragen hatte. Das Tragen dieser Uniform hängt mit seiner Eigenschaft als Direktor des genannten Konservatoriums zusammen und es war für die Hitlerjugend in dieser Anstalt eine eigene Abteilung eingerichtet. Seine Stellung innerhalb der Hitlerjugend konnte nicht einwandfrei festgestellt werden » .

Noch 1941 erhielten Trittinger und sein Stellvertreter Carl Steiner, der 1945 Direktor des Konservatoriums wurde, eine Lohnerhöhung.

Grund für die vor Ablauf des Vertrags erfolgte Kündigung Trittingers soll ein am 18. Juni 1943 im Bruckner Konservatorium veranstalteter Hindemith-Abend gewesen sein, der von Franz Kinzl angeregt worden war. Adolf Hitler

hätte eine Rezension des Abends gelesen und wäre « empört (gewesen) über die freche Nichtachtung seiner Anordnung, entartete Musik eines Hindemith ausgerechnet in seiner Heimatstadt aufzuführen » . Allein die Abwesenheit Gauleiter Eigrubers zu diesem Zeitpunkt hätte verhindert, daß Trittinger in das Konzentrationslager Mauthausen eingeliefert worden sei. Während Prieberg von einer sofortigen Amtsenthebung berichtet (Fred K. Prieberg : Musik im NS-Staat, 1982) wurde Trittingers Dienstverhältnis tatsächlich erst am 19. August 1943 mit Wirkung 1. September 1943 gekündigt. Selbst der Dirigent Wilhelm Furtwängler soll sich für die Erhaltung der « Uk-Stellung » Trittingers eingesetzt haben.

Die Geschichte seiner Amtsenthebung ist in dieser brisanten Form nur von Trittinger selbst überliefert und dürfte von ihm zu einem Teil auch « inszeniert » worden sein. In einem Bericht der Linzer Polizeidirektion vom November 1946 heißt es dazu :

« Nach einem, von dem damaligen Gaukammerer Danzer an den Gauleiter Eigruber gerichteten Schreiben wurde Trittinger wegen mangelnder musikalischer Fähigkeiten abgegriffen und vor allem auch, weil er im Juli 1943 ein Stück von Hindemith zur Aufführung brachte. Er wurde am 19. August 1943 in seiner Eigenschaft gekündigt und entlassen, jedoch vom Gauleiter wieder als Musikbeauftragter nach Vöcklabruck versetzt. »

1947 wurde Trittinger nach § 8 des Verbotsgesetzes (Registrierungsbetrug) angeklagt - er hatte als Parteieintritt den Mai 1938 angegeben (siehe oben) und seine Tätigkeit als « HitlerJugend-Führer beim Brucknerkonservatorium » verschwiegen. Erst in seiner Nachregistrierung gab er an, bei der Linzer Hitlerjugend « Musikreferent im Range eines Hauptgefolgschaftsführers » und nach seiner Versetzung « Musik- und Kulturreferent bei Gemeinde und Kreispropag.-Leiter » in Vöcklabruck gewesen zu sein. Weiters hatte Trittinger vor seinem Amtsantritt, im Oktober 1939, angegeben, er sei « Mitglied der NSV (Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt) seit 1. Juli 1938 » und « Mitglied des RLB (Reichs-Landbund) seit 1. Februar 1939 » gewesen.

Trittingers Karriere verlief trotz des Strafverfahrens ohne Brüche. Ab 1946 war er Musikdirektor des Benediktinerstiftes Melk, wo er auch am Stiftsgymnasium unterrichtete und ihm die Ausbildung der Sängerknaben oblag.

Preis

Professor-Titel (1956) .

Werke

Motetten, geistliche und weltliche Chöre, Kammermusik, Orgelwerke, Lieder.

Literatur

Hugo Riemann (1975) .

Frank-Altmann, Band 2 (1978) .

Hanns Kreczi. Das Bruckner-Stift Sankt Florian und das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (1942-1945) , Graz (1986) .

Peter Erhart. Niederösterreichische Komponisten, Ludwig Döblinger (1998) .

Doktor Friedrich Buchmayr. Stiftsbibliothek Sankt Florian (28. November 2002) .

Manfred Gansberger. Loosdorf, ehemaliger Student im Stiftsgymnasium in Melk.

Fred K. Prieberg. Musik im NS-Staat ; Seite 393f.

Geschichte des Bruckner-Konservatoriums in Linz.

Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, BG/Landesregierung, Linz 3 St (1947) E, Karton 1899, Zahl 801-1500.

Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, Landesregierung, Karton 249, Personalakten 4233-4251 : Trittinger, Adolf (4251) .

Günther Ramón

L'organiste, claveciniste, chef de chœur, « Thomaskantor » , compositeur et pédagogue allemand Günther (Werner Hans) Ramón est né le 15 octobre 1898 à Karlsruhe (Baden-Württemberg) et est mort le 27 février 1956 à Leipzig (Saxe) .

Fils d'un pasteur, il intégra à 12 ans le Chœur de l'église Saint-Thomas (alors sous la direction du Cantor Gustav Schreck) à la « Thomasschule » de Leipzig où ses aptitudes à l'orgue furent repérées par Karl Straube, alors organiste et assistant du Cantor en titre. Ramón lui succéda comme organiste à Saint-Thomas, en 1918, lorsque Straube devint chef de chœur du « Thomanerchor » .

Josef Gøebbels avait assisté, dans les années '20, à des représentations de la « Passion selon Saint-Matthieu » de Bach et s'était prononcé fort enthousiaste.

En 1935, Ramón devient chef de chœur de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin mais quitte son poste, en 1943, à cause de la guerre. Il va diriger le Chœur du « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig, durant 2 périodes : 1933-1938 et 1945-1951.

En 1939, il succède à Karl Straube à la tête du « Thomanerchor » où il s'attache à travailler les œuvres chorales de Jean-Sébastien Bach, permettant au Chœur de revenir sur la scène internationale, à partir de 1945.

Organiste concertiste de renommée internationale, Ramón donne des récitals en Europe, aux États-Unis (en 1933 et 1934) et en Amérique du Sud (en 1954) . Son succès hors frontières suscite, très tôt, l'intérêt des Nationaux-Socialistes

qui tentent d'en tirer politiquement profit.

En février 1935, Hermann Göring propose à « Emmy » de l'épouser. Les fiançailles ont lieu le 15 mars, en présence des ambassadeurs de France, du Japon et de Hongrie en Allemagne.

Puis, le 10 avril 1935, Günther Ramin tient l'orgue au mariage religieux de Hermann Göring avec Emmy Köstlin (née Emmy Sonnemann) à la Cathédrale de Berlin (« Berliner Dom ») . Le couple s'était d'abord uni civilement à la mairie de Berlin (« Rotes Rathaus ») .

Adolf Hitler est le témoin du marié. La réception qui suit a lieu à l'Hôtel « Kaiserhof » . Anna-Maria Sigmund raconte la cérémonie :

« 8 orchestres vinrent jouer devant le palais (de Göring) du ministre-président, à Berlin. Cette journée avait été déclarée jour férié et sans travail. La veille des noces, 1,000 invités avaient assisté en soirée à l'Opéra national à une représentation de gala d' « Hélène d'Égypte » de Richard Strauß et s'étaient ensuite délectés devant 4 fastueux buffets au champagne. Le jour du mariage, les maisons étaient pavoisées et 30,000 soldats formaient, le long des rues, une haie devant laquelle le couple passa jusqu'à la Chancellerie dans une voiture ornée de tulipes et de narcisses, au milieu d'une foule en liesse. Adolf Hitler accueillit la jeune mariée avec des orchidées blanches et lui assura qu'elle pouvait, à tout moment, s'adresser à lui si elle avait quelque souci personnel. Le mariage eut lieu à l'Hôtel-de-ville. On se rendit ensuite à la cathédrale, tandis qu'un escadron de chasse ciliés des aviateurs amis de Göring survolait l'assistance dans un bruit de tonnerre. »

Le journaliste Louis Lochner, correspondant de l' « Associated Press » en Allemagne écrit ainsi :

« On avait l'impression qu'un Empereur se mariait. »

Malgré le fait qu' « Emmy » fut une femme divorcée, l'archevêque évangélique Ludwig Müller ne s'opposa pas à marier religieusement le couple.

Anna-Maria Sigmund poursuit :

« Pour le repas de mariage dans le somptueux « Kaiserhof », face à la Chancellerie, on invita 320 parents et amis, parmi lesquels le prince Philipp von Hessen, Auguste-Guillaume de Prusse, Winifred Wagner, la comédienne Käthe Dorsch, le comte suédois Eric Rosen, beau-frère de la Ire femme de Göring, et des journalistes mondains du monde entier. La mariée portait des bijoux des plus précieux, comme elle l'avait fait pour la représentation à l'Opéra, la veille du mariage. »

Les cadeaux de mariage sont présentés le lendemain à la presse, même s'ils sont parfois issus de fond publics, comme le Sénat de Hambourg, qui envoie un « bateau en argent massif qu'Emma avait déjà admiré, enfant, dans sa ville natale » ; le roi Boris III de Bulgarie lui offre un bracelet de saphirs. L'écrivain juif émigré Klaus Mann réagit

vigoureusement en faisant remarquer à sa « collègue artiste » que les dignitaires nazis présents ce jour-là, son mari même, participent à la mise en place d'un État policier inique qui promeut les camps de concentration ; il lui reproche de fermer les yeux. Sur la demande de Göring, la désormais Madame Göring met un terme à sa carrière, après 23 années d'activité : sa dernière pièce est « Minna von Barnhelm » de Lessing. Cela ne la désole pas, et elle se plaît dans sa nouvelle vie de famille, d'autant plus que Göring est un mari attentionné.

...

The wife of Hermann Göring, formerly Emmy Sonnemann, was a well-known actress of the time. The wedding took place on 10 April 1935, in Berlin. The event was celebrated like the marriage of an Emperor, bringing tens of thousands of German citizens into the streets near the Berlin Cathedral where the ceremony took place. His best-man was, of course, the Chancellor and « Führer » Adolf Hitler. The Pastor who married them was « Reich » 's Bishop Ludwig Müller who was famous, in his own right, as a theologian who helped to found the « German Christian » following « Deutsche Christian » . He supported a revisionist view of « Christ, the Aryan » or a heroic Jesus, as well as a plan of purifying Christianity of what he deemed Jewish corruption and this included purging large parts of the Old Testament.

« Emmy » Göring

Emma Johanna Henny Göring, Ire épouse Emmy Köstlin, née Emmy Sonnemann (et surnommée « Emmy ») le 24 mars 1893 et morte le 8 juin 1973 est une comédienne allemande des années 1920 et 1930.

Mariée en Ires noces, entre 1915 et 1920, elle divorce et poursuit une carrière de comédienne remarquée à Weimar. Elle rencontre Hermann Göring, en 1932, alors président du « Reichstag » . Leur union est d'abord secrète, jusqu'à ce qu'ils se marient lors d'une cérémonie fastueuse, le 10 avril 1935. Elle mène depuis le début des années 1930 une carrière d'actrice de cinéma : elle y met un terme, comme à sa carrière de comédienne, après son mariage. Elle devient alors la seconde épouse du ministre de l'Aviation du 3e « Reich » , veuf depuis 1931. Elle remplit le rôle d'hôtesse à diverses réceptions officielles données par Adolf Hitler, participe à des voyages diplomatiques et organise avec son époux fêtes et cérémonies. Le couple a une fille, Edda, née en 1938.

« Emmy » Göring est incarcérée à la fin de la guerre et mise en accusation en 1947. Son procès donne lieu à des avis divergents, celle-ci mettant en avant l'aide apportée à des collègues juifs, alors que ses détracteurs affirment, au contraire, une adhésion réelle au régime et le profit des ressources financières de son mari. Elle est finalement condamnée à 1 an de camp de travail, en 1948, puis revient vivre à Munich, avec sa fille, où elle finit ses jours en 1973, après avoir publié une autobiographie.

...

Comédienne, « Emmy » Sonnemann réside à Weimar, à partir de 1922. Elle est d'abord choisie pour le rôle de Thekla dans « Piccolomini » de Schiller puis obtient un contrat. Elle joue notamment dans les pièces « Don Carlos » , «

Emilia Galotti » , « Agnes Bernauer » et plusieurs grands rôles du répertoire théâtral Classique. À l'âge de 38 ans, dans une des villes allemandes où le théâtre excelle, elle est alors à l' « apogée de sa carrière » .

Elle aperçoit Hermann Göring, pour la 1re fois, à Weimar, au début de l'année 1932, alors qu'il est déjà l'un des chefs de file du NSDAP et député au « Reichstag » . Elle ne lui parle pas : venu avec Adolf Hitler au « Kaisercafé » , où elle a l'habitude de se rendre, les dirigeants nazis souhaitaient se faire des contacts dans le monde artistique. Elle confessa plus tard avoir confondu Göring avec Josef Gœbbels. Elle le revoit peu de temps après, toujours à Weimar, lors d'une promenade au parc Belvédère. Elle est touchée par le discours qu'il lui tient à propos de sa femme morte d'une crise cardiaque, en 1931 (Carin, dont il était éperdument amoureux) . « Emmy » l'avait alors déjà croisée dans le passé, sans lui adresser la parole. Ayant perdu sa mère récemment, le sort de cet homme veuf la charme, et elle confie bientôt à une amie qu'elle est « heureuse, après tant d'années, d'avoir rencontré en Hermann un homme qui correspond à mes idées » . Il lui offre un portrait de sa femme défunte et bientôt, alors qu'il est en Italie, lui envoie un courrier avouant ses sentiments.

Au départ, il la fait passer pour sa secrétaire ; « grande, blonde et d'aspect imposant » , elle représentait l'image mythifiée de la « femme germanico-nordique » , comme Carin avant son décès. Hermann Göring voue toujours un culte à sa 1re femme, ce qu' « Emmy » accepte sans trop d'opposition. Le couple habite à Berlin, dans un appartement au 34, « Kaiserdamm » ; une pièce-musée est alors consacrée à la mémoire de Carin, avec le mobilier et les affaires qu'elle aimait, notamment son harmonium : seul Göring peut y entrer. La résidence de « Carinhall » honore encore sa mémoire, avec de nombreuses photographies ainsi que 2 yachts utilisés sur le lac voisin, baptisés « Carin I » et « Carin II » . En 1936, Göring baptise un autre pavillon de chasse, plus petit, « Emmyhall » , le pavillon de chasse de Rominten (aujourd'hui, Krasnolesye) : le « Reichsjägerhof » .

À Berlin, lors de la veillée aux flambeaux qui suit la nomination d'Hitler comme chancelier, le 30 janvier 1933, « Emmy » assiste depuis l'Hôtel « Kaiserhof » au spectacle. Après l'incendie du « Reichstag » , fin février, elle défend son mari et prétend le disculper en assurant qu'ils étaient au téléphone pendant le sinistre. Ministre sans portefeuille dans le 1er cabinet Hitler, il est nommé ministre-président de Prusse, le 11 avril de la même année : ces nominations ont des répercussions sur la carrière d' « Emmy » , Göring intervenant en sa faveur pour qu'elle ait le rôle titre dans la pièce « Schlageter » de Hanns Johst, au « Schauspieltheater » . Comédienne douée sans être nécessairement talentueuse, elle bénéficie du prestige de son passage à Weimar, « mais, à l'âge de 40 ans, « Emmy » Sonnemann n'aurait pas pu se hisser de la province à Berlin sans l'aide de son puissant ami » . Elle prend contact avec Hinkel, un des responsables du cinéma allemand au sein de la Chambre de la culture du « Reich » et joue le rôle d'Hedwig dans le film « Guillaume Tell » . En mars, Göring est nommé ministre de l'Aviation.

Contrairement à d'autres épouses de dignitaires, « Emmy » Göring n'est pas spécialement proche du « Führer » . Le couple possède, certes, une Villa sur l'Obersalzberg, non loin de celle d'Hitler mais, par exemple, « Emmy » ne connut jamais Eva Braun, la Maîtresse du « Führer » . Gœbbels écrit ainsi dans son journal, à propos d'une représentation théâtrale officielle (« Egmont » de Gœthe, à Berlin, le 8 novembre 1935) , alors qu'Hitler était assis à côté d' « Emmy » Göring :

« Madame Göring comme une reine. Le “ Führer ” est assis très modestement à côté d'elle. Il raconte après, dans le train (le train pour Munich) , combien il en a souffert. »

Des rumeurs circulent, par la suite, sur ses origines prétendument non aryennes, ainsi que celles de son 1er mari : une circulaire du ministère du « Reich » à la Justice s'en fait écho, un « calomniateur » est même incarcéré 5 mois ; cependant, le « Gotha » de 1936, bottin mondain du comte von Dungern mentionnant également les généalogies des inscrits n'évoque finalement pas le 1er mari d' « Emmy » .

Le couple a une fille, Edda Harda, née le 2 juin 1938 ; « Emmy » était pourtant âgée de 44 ans. L'enfant est ainsi nommée en l'honneur de la comtesse Edda Ciano, fille aînée du Duce Benito Mussolini, bien qu' « Emmy » déclare en privé qu'il s'agit également du prénom d'une amie. Sa naissance est célébrée par le vol de 500 avions au-dessus de Berlin et la réception de 628,000 télégrammes de nombreux pays, la « Luftwaffe » assurant même la protection « ad corpore » de la petite fille ; Adolf Hitler est le parrain. Le 4 novembre, Edda est baptisée chrétiennement, ce qui vaut au couple Göring les reproches de nombreux dignitaires nazis anti-chrétiens. Des cartes postales mettant en scène Göring et sa fille, Klein-Edda (« petite Edda ») , sont distribuées par centaines de milliers. En retour, les Allemands envoient de nombreux cadeaux (par exemple, le maire de Cologne envoie le tableau de « la Madone à l'enfant » de Cranach ; même, des officiers et soldats de la « Luftwaffe » font don d'argent utilisé pour bâtir la « maison d'Edda » , « dans le verger de Carinhall. Un petit château qui disposait d'une salle de théâtre dans laquelle le ballet d'enfants de l'Opéra de Berlin dansait devant le nourrisson » . L'enfant est alors très choyée.

« Emmy » Göring participe régulièrement aux cérémonies officielles ou aux fêtes organisées et données par son mari ; ses finances personnelles, augmentées de diverses cotisations d'entreprises le lui permettent aisément. Elle profite du faste de la vie de son mari qui possède nombre de propriétés en Allemagne, en Autriche et en Pologne. Elle vit alors au gré des excentricités de son époux, par exemple : élever des lionceaux, qu' « Emmy » même considère finalement comme des animaux domestiques. À l'inverse d'autres dirigeants nationaux-socialistes, le couple Göring est vraiment populaire dans la population ; cela « reposait essentiellement sur le fait qu'ils n'apparaissaient jamais en public avec des prétentions politiques » .

Même, la journaliste juive et exilée Bella Fromm :

« Ce n'est pas une intrigante. C'est une femme compatissante, maternelle, du genre “ Walkyrie ”. Grande et forte mais d'un charme calme. Ses beaux cheveux blonds encadrent son front de larges tresses. Ses grands yeux bleus ont un regard doux et serein. “ Emmy ” est une charmante personne. »

Étrangère à la politique, elle fait néanmoins partie des visites d'État, comme le 7 avril 1939 en Cyrénaïque où le couple rencontre le gouverneur Italo Balbo (« Ils furent reçus avec une pompe tout orientale, montèrent sur des chameaux, visitèrent les fouilles romaines et assistèrent à des fêtes somptueuses dans le palais du gouverneur. ») ou plus tard, à Rome, où Mussolini accueille le couple à la gare Termini.

Alors que l'influence politique de Göring diminue après 1938, et surtout en 1941, le couple passe plus de temps

ensemble à Carinhall et Veldenstein, alors que leurs fêtes se font moins fréquentes. À la fin de la guerre, le 31 janvier 1945, « Emmy » part avec sa fille en direction de la Bavière, précisément à l'Obbersalzberg, éloigné des champs de bataille ; au fur et à mesure, des amies la rejoignent. Pendant le mois d'avril, Göring fait évacuer ses œuvres d'art (« 1,000 tableaux, 80 sculptures et 60 gibelins, transportés par train spécial ») et les cache dans une galerie souterraine près des montagnes de Berchtesgaden. Il fait ensuite dynamiter « Carinhall », et est toujours à Berlin pour l'anniversaire du « Führer », le 20 avril, mais le 23 se propose comme successeur d'Hitler, ce à quoi la Chancellerie l'accuse de « haute trahison ».

Il est alors « arrêté avec sa famille par un commando SS et interné dans les abris antiaériens du “ Berghof ” ».

« Emmy » écrit ultérieurement sur ces quelques jours :

« Avant l'effondrement, mon mari, l'enfant et moi avons été arrêtés par Adolf Hitler, le 25 avril 1945, et condamnés à mort. »

Après le suicide d'Hitler, ils sont évacués vers le château de Mauterndorf, qui appartenait à Göring. Le 7 mai, Göring est arrêté par les Américains, alors qu'elle se réfugie au château de Veldenstein, aux alentours de Nuremberg, « avec sa fille, sa femme de chambre et l'infirmière de Göring » alors que la bâtisse est en train d'être dévalisée par des pillards. « Emmy » est arrêtée le 25 octobre de la même année ; sa fille est confiée, un temps, à des paysans, avant qu'elle ne rejoigne sa mère en son lieu d'incarcération, la prison de Straubing.

Lors du procès de Nuremberg, où son époux est jugé (entre novembre 1945 et octobre 1946), « Emmy » Göring et sa fille sont placées dans une maison de campagne de 2 pièces (situées à Sackdillung, non loin de Neuhaus / Oberpfalz, à 30 kilomètres de Nuremberg), sans eau courante ni électricité ; sa nombreuse garde-robe est, en outre, réduite à une peau-de-chagrin. Elle souhaite pouvoir rendre visite à son mari et contacte pour cela le tribunal militaire. Elle écrit alors :

« Je n'ai pas vu (Göring) depuis 15 mois et il me manque si terriblement que je ne sais pas comment m'en sortir ; si je pouvais seulement le voir quelques minutes et lui tenir la main. Mon mari se fait beaucoup de soucis pour mon enfant et moi, qui sommes sans protection et sans assistance. »

Elle n'obtient un droit de visite que le 12 septembre 1946, mais craint pour le verdict. Elle confie alors à Henriette von Schirach :

« Ils ne peuvent quand même pas le pendre. Imaginez, Hermann à une potence ! On nous trompe certainement ! »

Comme les femmes des différents accusés, « Emmy » peut visiter son mari 30 minutes par jour, 8 fois seulement pendant les 15 journées précédant le verdict du tribunal.

Anna-Maria Sigmund note :

« Conformément aux dispositions strictes de sécurité, Göring était enchaîné à son gardien et le couple restait séparé par une paroi vitrée ainsi qu'un grillage à mailles fines. Edda récitait de petits poèmes et ses parents s'entretenaient désespérément de choses sans importance. »

Göring condamné à mort, le couple se voit pour la dernière fois, le 7 octobre 1946 : pendant ce moment, « Emmy » lui déclare :

« Tu peux maintenant mourir avec la conscience tranquille et pure. Tu as fait ici, à Nuremberg, tout ce que tu pouvais pour tes camarades et pour l'Allemagne. Je penserai toujours que tu es mort pour l'Allemagne. » , alors que Göring lui assure qu'il ne sera pas pendu.

Effectivement, il se suicide avec une capsule de cyanure, le 15 octobre ; et s'il apparaîtra que celui qui lui a fourni semble être un jeune gradé américain, « Emmy » compta un temps parmi les suspects, ce qu'elle contestera toujours.

Le 29 mai 1947, elle reçoit un ordre d'arrestation, comme toutes les épouses des « condamnés à Nuremberg » . Toutes sont accusées d'avoir tiré profit de leur position pendant le régime nazi. Comme Henriette von Schirach, épouse du « Gauleiter » de Vienne, Baldur von Schirach, elle est internée à Göttingen, avec un millier de femmes dans 5 baraquements datant de l'époque nazie.

« L'un des 2 avocats d'« Emmy » Göring, le Docteur Strobl, compara l'incarcération de sa cliente aux procès des sorcières au Moyen-âge, tandis que le second, le Docteur Ebermayer, fit appel dès juin 1947. »

Elle écrit une lettre aux autorités compétentes, le 31 octobre, où elle dénonce ses conditions d'incarcération, affirmant souffrir de crises de sciatique depuis 35 ans ainsi que d'une phlébite au bras droit :

« On m'a mise sur un brancard et on m'a fait voyager jusqu'ici pendant 7 heures parce que, prétendument, j'aurais fait une tentative de fuite en zone anglaise. Je suis maintenant alitée ici depuis 5 mois, avec des douleurs immenses. J'ai 54 ans, et j'ai subi infiniment de choses ces dernières années. Monsieur le ministre, vous connaissez peut-être mon dossier, j'étais complètement apolitique, j'ai aidé des personnes persécutées pour des raisons racistes et politiques quand et où je le pouvais, il y a suffisamment de déclarations formelles là-dessus. Ma seule charge est d'être la femme de Hermann Göring. Il est inconcevable de punir une femme parce qu'elle a aimé son mari et a été heureuse avec lui. »

Elle presse ensuite le ministre d'être rapidement convoquée devant la chambre de dénazification et, le cas échéant, de bénéficier d'une mise en liberté temporaire afin de ne pas passer l'hiver dans ces baraquements, mais en vain. Le 20 juillet 1948, elle est mise en accusation par la chambre de dénazification du camp de travail et d'internement de Garmisch-Partenkirchen, par le procureur Julius Herf, qui dépose, en outre, une motion la classant parmi les suspects de Ire catégorie. Selon lui, son attachement à Göring lui faisait automatiquement embrasser l'idéologie nationale-socialiste, chose supplantée également par toutes les largesses et la vie luxueuse que celui-ci mettait à sa disposition.

On met également en avant que sa nomination au théâtre national de Berlin, en 1933, n'était que la conséquence de l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir.

Se justifiant sur son train de vie et ses tenues, « Emmy » Göring déclarait, le 28 juillet de la même année, que cela n'avait été fait que pour plaire à son mari, ce à quoi le procureur lui opposa le 20 octobre :

« À l'occasion d'une représentation, l'intéressée est entrée à l'Opéra national de Vienne vêtue d'un manteau d'hermine blanc, avec des bijoux précieux, et fit scandale dans le public. »

Elle insiste cependant sur le fait qu'elle n'était pas une « personne politique » . En effet, l'acte d'accusation relève :

« L'intéressée fut admise au Parti de la manière suivante : à Noël 1938, Hitler lui communiqua par téléphone que l'affiliation lui avait été octroyée. Elle avait reçu le numéro d'un membre (744606) , décédé en 1932. (Les numéros les plus bas étaient très convoités car il possédaient une haute valeur de prestige et témoignaient d'un attachement ancien au NSDAP.) L'intéressée fut membre de la Ligue des femmes nazies et de la Chambre de Théâtre du " Reich " . »

« Emmy » Göring déclare n'avoir jamais rien su des camps de concentration et d'extermination :

« À mes yeux, ces camps étaient toujours destinés à la ré-éducation politique, tels que Hermann les avait envisagés dès le début. Je ne peux imaginer qu'il ait été au courant de l'ampleur des événements effroyables dans un camp hors de l'Allemagne, à Auschwitz. »

À son crédit, elle comptait avant et après son mariage des amis juifs, comme le professeur Jessner et plusieurs de ceux-ci, pour lesquels elle avait intercédé, ont témoigné en sa faveur lors de son procès. Le tribunal déclare ainsi que « l'intéressée s'est engagée dans une série d'affaires pour d'anciens collègues (juifs) qui, en situation difficile, se tournaient vers elle. Mais il ne peut pourtant pas être question de mobiles anti-Nationaux-Socialistes » .

Parmi les personnalités venues témoigner en sa faveur (une quinzaine) , on note l'acteur Gustaf Gründgens ou le pasteur Jentsch, qui n'hésite pas à la qualifier de « combattante religieuse » . Condamnée en tant que membre du groupe II (« bénéficiaire du régime nazi ») , elle doit restituer 30 % de ses biens matériels et exécuter une peine de 1 an dans un camp de travail, que ses conditions préalables de détention annulent de fait. Elle n'a en outre pas le droit de se produire sur scène durant 5 ans, mais recouvre la liberté. Cette libération suscite des oppositions, comme le montre une manifestation de 300 femmes, à Stuttgart, le 28 juillet 1948. Elles exigent, en vain, qu'elle soit placée dans le groupe I, que tous ses biens, acquis depuis 1933, soient saisis et qu'une nouvelle sanction plus sévère soit prononcée.

Elle s'engage dans d'autres procès en 1949, afin de récupérer certains biens (notamment, artistiques, comme « la Madone » de Cranach ainsi qu'une autre toile du Maître, « Repos pendant la fuite en Égypte » , une « Madone » du XVe siècle de l'Allemagne du Sud, des couverts en or, des tapis japonais et infiniment plus) , au nom de sa fille, bien

qu'on lui objecta que ces présents lui avaient été faits grâce à la position de son époux. Cette affaire judiciaire se poursuit jusque dans les années 1950, avec Edda elle-même, qui jouit un temps des tableaux, dans la mesure où le maire de Cologne avait voulu se faire bien voir du régime nazi et ne subissait pas de pression de Göring. La ville récupère le tableau en 1954, néanmoins l'État de Bavière dut remettre à la jeune fille des bijoux d'une valeur de 150 000 « Deutsche Marks » .

Elle vit ensuite avec sa fille à Sackdillung, puis à Munich dans un « petit appartement commun » , Edda étudiant le droit avant de devenir assistante médicale tout en restant célibataire et dévouée à sa mère.

En 1967, paraissent ses mémoires, « An der Seite meines Mannes » , dans lesquelles elle s'efforce de minimiser le rôle politique qu'elle a joué aux côtés de son mari tout en magnifiant son personnage et occultant les crimes dont il était responsable. Elle y déclare :

« Même si mon mari n'était pas un Saint, je l'aimais et me dis, qu'à travers ce personnage, se cachait quelqu'un de sensible, d'intelligent, de cultivé et simple. »

Elle a bénéficié pour sa rédaction de l'aide des écrivain et juriste Erich Ebermayer et Alfred Muhr, qui ne furent pourtant pas mentionnés dans les remerciements.

Elle décède à Munich, le 10 juin 1973, dans son appartement.

...

En 1936, avant l'inauguration officiel du Congrès du Parti nazi qui se tient à Nuremberg, Günther Ramín rencontre le « Führer » qui lui demande de tester le grand-orgue de la firme E. F. Walcker & Co. de Ludwigsburg, nouvellement installé au « Luitpoldhalle » . Il jouera lors du concert inaugural.

Suite à son second voyage à Florence, le « Führer » Adolf Hitler décide que la ville autrichienne de Linz va devenir LE nouveau carrefour mondial de l'Art : une sorte de Rome Impériale du 3e « Reich » .

Le régime décide alors d'installer au monastère de Saint-Florian un puissant poste de radio qui fera la promotion de la culture national-socialiste dans le monde.

Due to the Nazi occupation of Saint-Florian, the organ needed more renovation and expansion. Following the proposal of the Leipzig cantor of Saint-Thomas, Günther Ramín, who also was intended as organist there, the instrument should be fundamentally restructured. However, the concept enforced by Josef Merklin, who planned a stronger reference to the old Chrismann organ.

À l'automne de 1942, le « Reich » nomme à sa direction l'Intendant Heinrich Glasmeier qui prendra, dès lors, les allures d'un Empereur Romain pompeux et hyper-narcissique. Le directeur-général Rudolf Dornburg von Schulz se voit

charger de la création de l'Orchestre Bruckner du « Reich » à partir des Iers pupitres nationaux mais aussi étrangers dans le but de concurrencer les phalanges de Vienne et de Berlin. Enfin, le « Kapellmeister » et « Cantor » de Leipzig, Günther Ramín, est désigné chef de chœur du « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » de Linz (Saint-Florian) . Ce dernier n'a eu aucune difficulté à choisir les meilleurs voix disponibles puisque, dès 1943, les autorités décident de dissoudre tous les Chœurs de la Radio existants. Les Iers concerts sous sa direction ont lieu à Leipzig.

Selon le fils, Dieter Ramín, le discours de nomination (enregistré sur bande magnétique) fut rédigé par les Nazis sans l'autorisation de son père. D'après son journal intime, Günther Ramín ne se trouvait pas à Linz, ce jour-là. Le ton de ce discours de propagande culturelle (à saveur militariste, apocalyptique et perverse) n'est pas une preuve tacite des intentions du « Cantor de la Thomaskirche » .

Le 4 avril 1943, Adolf Hitler visite la ville de Linz, « future capitale culturelle mondiale » . Tout comme les musiciens du « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » , les membres du Chœur doivent prêter serment devant le sarcophage d'Anton Bruckner qui se trouve dans la crypte de l'église abbatiale de Saint-Florian.

1943-1944, Ramín dirige le Chœur Bruckner du « Reich » (« Reichs-Brucknerchor ») créée par la Radio de Leipzig. Il est composé de membres provenant des autres formations dissoutes de la radiodiffusion. Mais l'association avec ce nouvel ensemble sera de courte durée puisque le « Kapellmeister » n'est pas prêt à quitter son poste à Saint-Thomas (« Thomanerchor ») .

Grâce à sa longue expérience, Günther Ramín continue d'offrir une interprétation formelle, objective et rigoureuse de la musique de Jean-Sébastien Bach qui laisse transparaître son caractère, à la fois humain et divin. Mais dans le contexte socio-politique, cela s'avère être une erreur de jugement aux yeux des Nazis.

À Leipzig, Günther Ramín n'a pas trop souffert de la guerre. Il eu la chance de résider à l'appartement de Karl Straube (qui termina sa vie dans la résignation et l'isolement) qui, heureusement, n'a pas été détruit par les bombardements. Pour leur part, les membres du Chœur qui furent durement touchés ont été évacués vers la ville voisine de Grimma.

En avril 1944, Ramín démissionne de ses fonctions à la tête du Chœur de l'Orchestre Bruckner du « Reich » qui siège au monastère de Saint-Florian, mais demeure quand même l'un des 2 organistes à faire partie de la « Gottbegnadeten-Liste » (la liste des bénis de Dieu) rédigée par Josef Gœbbels (en cette même année) consistant à exempter d'importants artistes du service militaire obligatoire.

Le 3 mai 1944, le « Gauleiter » du Haut-Danube, Heinrich Glasmeier, prononce un grand discours en hommage au « Chœur Bruckner » de Saint-Florian.

Malgré les circonstances difficiles, Ramín est demeuré une personne d'action. Aujourd'hui, on peut lui reprocher, en tant qu'artiste et en tant qu'individu, d'avoir « fermer les yeux » comme tant d'autres ...

Ramín fut témoin de « l'Aryanisation » de l'éditeur Leipzigeois C. F. Peters de même que de l'expropriation de son fondateur, le docteur Henri Hinrichsen, qui va mourir au camp de concentration de « Theresienstadt » , le 17 septembre 1942.

Autre disparition mystérieuse remarquée : celle de Samuel Lampel, le 1er Cantor de la Synagogue de Leipzig, décédé au camp d'extermination d'Auschwitz.

Lors de leurs pauses dans les camps d'extermination, les hauts-gradés SS utilisaient régulièrement la musique de Bach, de Mozart et de Beethoven pour décompresser.

Ernst Kaltenbrunner fut l'un des principaux responsables du système policier nazi, avec le grade d' « Obergruppenführer » . Au procès de Nuremberg, il est condamné à mort pour crimes de guerre et crimes contre l'humanité et exécuté par pendaison. Il a souvent mentionné pouvoir jouer parfaitement Bach au piano.

En 1949, Günther Ramín fut nommé docteur « honoris causa » de l'Université de Leipzig et, l'année suivante, obtint le Prix national de la République démocratique allemande (2e classe) .

Également célèbre comme claveciniste et comme accompagnateur de lieder, il dirigea les Festivals Bach à Leipzig en 1950, 1953 et 1955.

Il fut un des plus grands et un des plus vigoureux interprètes de Bach, et a laissé de mémorables enregistrements de sa musique sacrée.

Günther Ramín conserva son poste avec le « Thomanerchor » jusqu'à sa mort survenue le 27 février 1956 à Leipzig, à la suite d'un accident vasculaire cérébral.

...

Günther (Werner Hans) Ramín was born on 15 October 1898 in Karlsruhe, Baden-Württemberg, Germany ; and died on 27 February 1956 in Leipzig, Saxony, Germany. He was an influential German organist, conductor, composer and pedagogue in the 1st half of the 20th Century.

Son of a pastor, he was accepted, at the age of 12, into the famed « Thomanerchor » of the « Thomaskirche » , in Leipzig, by the then-Cantor, Gustav Schreck. At the time, Karl Straube, the organist, conductor, publisher and advocate of the music of Max Reger, was Schreck's assistant, and he took note of Ramín's abilities as an organist and composer. Later, when Straube took-over the cantorate at the « Thomaskirche » , Ramín became his assistant, filling in for him as choir Master and director.

During World War I, Ramín was drafted into military service ; however, he managed to complete his examinations at the Leipzig « Konservatorium » with distinction in January 1917 and, on 30 May 1918, Straube was able to write to

him on the front that he had been chosen as organist of the « Thomaskirche » . Ramín returned from the War and took-up this position, which he held for 22 years until World War II broke-out.

Ramín built a successful performing career as a concert organist ; however, in the 1930's, he increasingly devoted himself to conducting. He took-over the directorship of the « Lehrgesangsverein » in Leipzig, in 1923, and worked regularly with the Choir of the « Gewandhaus » . In 1935, he became the conductor of the Philharmonic Choir of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, increasing his fame. He was the organist at the 1936 Nuremberg rally, playing on a specially constructed organ, the largest in Germany at the time. On New Year's Day of 1940, Ramín was appointed the Cantor of the « Thomanerchor » at the « Thomaskirche » , succeeding Karl Straube, a post he held until his death. After this appointment, Ramín devoted himself to performing the choral works of Johann Sebastian Bach, earning for himself and the Choir international acclaim through 2 concert tours to Russia (1953) and South America (1955) . The year after this last tour, Ramín suffered a sudden brain hemorrhage and died on 27 February 1956.

Some of Ramín's recordings have been re-released on compact disc. Notable among them is his much admired (although severely abridged) 1941 version of Bach's « Saint-Matthew Passion » , with such stellar soloists as Karl Erb, Tiana Lemnitz, and Gerhard Hüsck. He was also active as an organ teacher. Among his notable students were Christoph Albrecht, Karl Richter, Hanns-Martin Schneidt and Helmut Walcha.

...

Günther Ramín : Conductor, Organ, « Thomaskantor » .

Born : October 15, 1898 in Karlsruhe, Baden-Württemberg, Germany.

Died : February 27, 1956 in Leipzig, Saxony, Germany.

« In Johann Sebastian Bach, I see the ultimate personification of everything which lends meaning, purpose, vigour and gladness to human life. He is for me the supreme symbol of vital and ceaseless energy. » (Günther Ramín)

The remark might stand as a maxim encompassing the life's work of universal musician Günther Ramín, who devoted his entire life to Leipzig and to the « Thomaskirche » , where Bach spent so much of his own life.

The son of a parson, the distinguished German organist, conductor, composer and pedagogue Günther (Werner Hans) Ramín was accepted at 12 years of age as pupil and chorister by the then « Thomaskantor » , Gustav Schreck. While never at ease with the Classical grammar school approach there, he nonetheless composed songs and pieces for the piano and for the organ, which were amazingly well-appreciated by most of his teachers. Karl Straube, then organist at the « Thomaskirche » and Ramín's organ teacher, arranged for him to leave the school at Easter of 1914, at the age of 15 and a half, so that he might apply himself solely to the study of church music.

Very soon, Ramín was permitted to stand for his organ teacher at normal service and for motet performances. In

addition, when Straube was absent for longer periods, he places the training of the choirs of the « Thomaskirche » and the Bach Society in Ramin's hands. Ramin was conscripted by the « militia » in the autumn of 1916. Notwithstanding this hindrance, he completed his final examinations at the Conservatory with distinction, in January 1917. The following autumn found him as a trainee camp in France. There, he soon managed to play the organ at the church in Guise for regimental services, and was even commissioned by the commanding general to organize a church concert there. Later, he took part in theatrical productions at the front.

Straube wrote to the 20 year old Ramin at the front, on 30 May 1918, to inform him that he had been chosen as organist at the « Thomaskirche » quite without his having applied or auditioned for the position. He was to hold for 22 years, until the outbreak of the World War II. During this time, he undertook extensive tours, playing the organ all over Europe, in Russia (1932) and in North America (1933) .

In 1923, Günther Ramin assumed the direction of the « Lehregesangverein » (Teachers' Choral Society) , in Leipzig, which included giving concert performances of works with large Orchestra. The experience soon awakened in him a passion for conducting, and he took great pleasure in conducting 4 Symphony concerts at Leipzig's Albert Hall, in 1929-1930. Because of this liking for working with large choirs and Orchestras, between the years 1933 and 1938, he performed the Bach « Passions » (BWV 244 and BWV 245) ; the B minor Mass (BWV 232) ; the Verdi « Requiem » ; and various modern works with the « Gewandhaus » Choir. In 1935, he assumed the direction of the Philharmonic Choir of Berlin, and Ramin's choral concerts together with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra brought him much acclaim.

Günther Ramin's long years of experience in the training of choirs stood him in good stead when, on 1 January 1940, the Leipzig City Council appointed him « Kantor » at the « Thomaskirche » . Now, Ramin's attention came to focus on Johann Sebastian Bach's Cantatas. Whereas Straube has formerly performed almost the entire cycle of surviving Cantatas, Ramin proceeded differently - at least, in his 1st year of office. About 2 weeks in advance of the church calendar, he would with great enthusiasm play through the appropriate Cantatas from the scores in the Main Bach Edition (which still used the original clefs) , and was always pleased to have his wife and his son there as an audience, and to hear their opinion. He selected the best of the Cantatas and let them help, in the early days, in making the orchestral parts and in removing most of the existing phrase markings.

The Cantatas that were recorded are all radio transcriptions. It was seldom possible for Ramin to rehearse the works together with the Orchestra. Whenever a Cantata was recorded at the « Gewandhaus » , its performance at the « Thomaskirche » , at the beginning of the Sunday service, had to serve as the final rehearsal. This procedure would not meet today's perfectionist standards, but had the great advantage of infectious spontaneity.

Composer Wilhelm Weismann wrote in 1956 of Ramin :

« He innately possessed a quality akin to eternal youth, a quality which was enthralling and radiant and which, time and time again, reached breathtaking proportions through his vehemence and “ élan ”, something quite un-academic, goaded on by his natural penchant for improvisations ! »

It is this quality which makes Ramin's interpretations exemplary even today, whether he is playing the organ or the harpsichord, or conducting the Cantatas or « Passions ». Ramin directed music at the « Thomaskirche » for 16 years, always swimming against the tide of contemporary tastes, fighting the Nazis to uphold Christian mission of the « Thomaskirche » 's musical tradition and fighting the « Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands » (SED : Socialistic post-War governing Party) which, in the end, had to concede that the Choir would only continue to be a source of foreign revenue if it were allowed to pursue the Bach tradition.

« Die Grossen der Welt », a dictionary of great personalities, makes this comment :

« The widespread acclaim accorded to Ramin, the “ Thomaskantor ” and world-famous organist, derives from the fact that, despite having received splendid alternative offers following the collapse of the 1946, Ramin remained loyal to Leipzig and invested tremendous amount of effort in restoring the Choir of the “ Thomaskirche ” to its former glory. »

Despite entry restrictions for West Germany citizens, during the last 10 years of Ramin's life, the Choir of the « Thomaskirche » achieved its greatest heights, especially during the Leipzig Trade Fair and during the « Neue Bachgesellschaft » Festivals, in Leipzig. Peter Schreier recalls the 200th Bach Centenary celebrations :

« The bi-Centenary, in 1950, saw the 1st performance given by the combined Choirs of Kreuzkirche and the “ Thomaskirche ” - the B minor Mass (BWV 232) . The event impressed itself indelibly on my memory ... Just a boy at the time, I was enormously taken with the way Ramin drove us on during the performance, sometimes even stamping his foot. He had such a powerful aura, such a compelling presence, that we had no choice but to comply with his wishes. »

Ramin took 2 concert tours with his choristers : to Russia, in 1953 ; and to South America, in 1955. In February 1956, at the very pinnacle of his career, he suffered a sudden brain haemorrhage and died only a few days later. Doctor Albert Schweitzer (himself an organist) wrote :

« His death means a great loss to Johann Sebastian Bach scholarship. I admired him for the way in which he persisted in promoting the heritage of Bach and the choral tradition of the “ Leipzig Thomaskirche ”, in the face of tremendous odds, and for the success of endeavours and the universal acknowledgement they assured. »

...

Günther Ramin remains both a musical and historical legend in Germany today. His tenure as Cantor of Bach's « old church », Saint-Thomas' Leipzig, in East Germany, from 1940 to 1956, spanned one of the most difficult periods in Germany's recent history, to which Ramin responded with musicianship, enthusiasm, conviction, loyalty and persistence. Founded in 1212, the Saint-Thomas' Choir (the « Thomanerchor ») has maintained an unbroken tradition despite the vagaries and vicissitudes of religious, city and national politics ; it has always been associated in Leipzigers' minds with their deepest cultural and religious traditions.

Probably uniquely in Germany, the boys live-in, studying, relaxing, playing and, of course, singing together. Some 10 to 12 boys, of mixed ages, board together in a « Stube » . A « Thomaner » from the 12th (the oldest) Class acts as « prefect » and is responsible for the good order and welfare of his group. It is a long « Thomaner » tradition, that the oldest are responsible for their younger colleagues. There is a measure of friendly rivalry between the « Stuben » , in their regular football matches ; a major yearly event is the match between Leipzig's « Thomanerchor » and the boys of Dresden's « Kreuzchor » .

With the advent of mass transportation in the early 1920's, Leipzig began to find itself sharing its Choir with an ever-widening circle of European musical centres, providing a new challenge for the then « Cantor » and Ramín's teacher, Karl Straube. Following extensive choral conducting experience, during the 1920's and 1930's, in addition to being Organist at Saint-Thomas', since 1918, Ramín was appointed « Cantor » , on January 1st 1940. The Choir managed to survive the War and, in 1945, began, like the rest of War-torn Europe, to rebuild. There was little food to be had, and Ramín started a fund to support the Choir. He would go on foraging expeditions, returning perhaps with salted herrings, or a supply of codliver oil, a spoonful of which was administered to each boy at breakfast.

In 1948, the Choir made its 1st trip abroad, being invited to an international youth Choir gathering, in Bern, and other engagements throughout Switzerland. At 1st, the concerts were not particularly well-attended. Then, the Choir gave a concert in Geneva, during which several of the boys became ill and were forced, ashen-faced, to leave the stage. Those remaining looked thin in their sailor suits and short trousers, with thick woolen stockings to keep them warm. The local newspaper gave a heart-rending review of these « poor, half-starved little Choir boys » ; thereafter, the good-natured Swiss rallied round and every concert was a sell-out. But, as one of their number recently recalled, they were not sick from hunger, but from a surfeit of rich Swiss cream the like of which they had never tasted in their lives !

A distinguishing feature of Ramín's interpretations is the sharpness and clarity of the boys' voices, and Ramín's practice of rehearsing each part separately ensures that the 4 parts (SATB) are all equally and clearly audible, each section of the Choir infused with an awareness of its own individual contribution and value, giving a depth of dimension to the sound.

Another outstanding feature is the Choir's diction - Ramín always insisted that every single word must be clearly audible and distinguishable.

In stressing the texts themselves and the clarity of enunciation, Ramín was reflecting Bach's own view. Bach was deeply religious. He knew his Bible thoroughly and his family Bible was well-annotated in the margins. One can always tell when Bach feels particularly strongly about a specific text or biblical injunction, for he gives it the special treatment of an outstanding choral introduction or, perhaps, a variation on each verse of the appropriate chorale running throughout the Cantata's movements. Ramín (like his pupil, Karl Richter) , brings a particularly strong spiritual insight to his interpretations, stressing the text and bringing-out significant phrases. Indeed, without such spiritual insight, Bach's music becomes empty and meaningless.

Unfortunately today, spiritual insight is frequently (and quite erroneously) confused with Romanticism and rejected accordingly. This may explain why so many of today's renditions are superficial, aiming not to recreate a musical-spiritual experience but, in the words of John Eliot Gardiner, « to excite modern audiences ». Here, too may lie the explanation for many of today's breakneck tempi, so far removed from the religious devotions of an 18th Century Leipzig congregation.

Ramin is remembered for his loyalty and persistence, his loyalty in remaining with his Leipzig Choir after the division of Germany, in 1946, despite numerous tempting offers from the West, and his persistence in keeping the Choir alive, visible and audible through 2 dictatorships, Nazi and Socialist, fundamentally different ideologically, yet, identically antagonistic towards religion.

In 1945, most of Germany was in total ruins. From the War's end until 1950, both Germanys were struggling to rebuild. Then, as the 1950's progressed, the weight of oppression and economic stagnation settled over East Germany in a cloud of depression ; music was the people's lifeline to sanity and they clung to it desperately. The few visiting foreign Choirs were received with tearful acclaim and, for all musical events, large and small, the line-ups would often form several hours in advance.

It was against this background that East Germans tuned in, at 11h30 on Sunday mornings, to the hear boys and men of Ramin's « Thomanerchor » who dared to sing Lutheran Cantatas and, somehow, managed to get away with it. These broadcasts were authorized and recorded by the « Staatliches Rundfunk Komitee » (SRK : State Broadcasting Committee of the DDR) , between 1947 and 1956. Ramin managed to convince his political « Masters » that the « Thomanerchor » was a major potential foreign currency earner, perhaps, the only way to win some small support from the political regime. But political support was provided only on strictly limited conditions.

The Choir was rehearsed during the week without Orchestra, to be joined by the « Stadt- und Gewandhaus-Orchester » and soloists for the Divine Service on Sundays. This served as the only full « rehearsal » for the recorded performance which followed immediately. The performances were taped at 30 inches per second (giving a significant improvement in quality over the normal professional speed of 15 inches per second) and the tapes were then taken directly to the studio for broadcasting. The « privilege » of re-takes and editing was not permitted by the « Staatliches Rundfunk Komitee » ; each Cantata was, as one old « Thomaner » remembers, « an all-or-nothing » performance and the world would be listening with high-expectations. This sense of pressure and importance may help to explain why many of the performances could only be called electrifying.

Despite the politically imposed limitations, with a few exceptions the general technical standard was excellent, and the broadcasts were regularly picked-up by Western stations. The « Staatliches Rundfunk Komitee » used several high-quality condenser microphones, the only problem being that over-crowding in the Organ Gallery of the « Thomaskirche » where the recordings were made often left little space for microphone stands. The 1st, and indeed the most important element in the recording « chain » is the microphone and, here too, hangs an interesting tale.

In 1927, Georg Neumann pioneered the high-quality condenser microphones used by all professionals, and his company has subsequently been responsible for the development and manufacture of some of the world's finest professional microphones. In 1943, Neumann's Berlin factory was bombed; Mister Neumann took his car and went South to find a place outside the allied bombers' flight-paths. The allied bombers dropped a material somewhat like Christmas tree « tinsel » to confuse the Germans' radar and deflect their anti-aircraft defenses. Mister Neumann was searching for a place without any traces of this « tinsel », and he found it in a little village called Gefell, just 3 miles on the « Eastern » side of the Bavarian border. Here, he set-up shop in a vacant textile mill. He was not to know at the time but, by establishing this sister-factory in what was to become the DDR while retaining a presence in (later West) Berlin, Mister Neumann was to ensure that both East and West would benefit from his pioneering technology.

The high-quality « Neumann / Gefell » studio and broadcast microphones, made in the DDR, were distributed throughout the Eastern Bloc. Most of the microphones went into the broadcast systems and recording enterprises, to be used for example by the DDR recording company « Eterna », and by the Russians for their « MK » and « Melodyia » recordings. Another Neumann / Gefell model went into the public address systems; virtually every town hall and auditorium in the former Soviet Union has one.

It was Günther Ramin's custom to review in advance the full-scores of the several Cantatas appropriate to a particular Sunday and to play them through on the piano, then making his personal selection. Were his choices influenced by the political conditions of the time? If they were, he would surely not have made any such admission. Yet, when one follows the texts with the political conditions and the recording date in mind, one cannot help wondering, for so many of the chosen Cantatas reflect despair or a cry of hope.

For example, BWV 131 « Aus der Tiefe » (From the Depths we call to Thee); and BWV 106 « Gottes Zeit » (God's Time is the Best Time), were both so magnificently and intensely sung, and these performances must surely have been motivated by the prevailing political and social conditions.

From a different point of view, another Cantata performed by the Choir was « Preise Jerusalem », BWV 119. Ostensibly, it is an outgoing, celebratory piece, composed for the 1723 City Council Election. The text is politically innocuous in its praise for the City of Leipzig and its fortunate inhabitants. Yet, at the heart of this work is a key aria in which the unknown librettist warns that « authority comes from God, and he who fails to give it due measure fails to fulfill the Will of God ». This Cantata was broadcast in January 1953, the year of the East German uprising.

Many who lived through and remember life in the DDR look back on Ramin's Sunday broadcasts as a life-saver which helped them to survive spiritually. Never before have words and music, politics, poverty and oppression been so closely inter-linked.

...

Günther Werner Hans Ramin (geboren 15. Oktober 1898 in Karlsruhe; gestorben 27. Februar 1956 in Leipzig) war Organist, Cembalist, Chorleiter und Komponist.

Ramín wurde als Sohn des Superintendenten in Karlsruhe geboren. 1900 zog die Familie Ramín nach Groß-Lichterfelde bei Berlin und 1903 nach Schkeuditz zwischen Halle und Leipzig. Ab 1910 besuchte er zunächst die Latina August Hermann Francke. Noch im selben Jahr wurde er in den Thomanerchor unter Thomaskantor Gustav Schreck aufgenommen und besuchte die Thomasschule zu Leipzig. Danach studierte er auf Anraten des damaligen Thomasorganisten Karl Straube von 1914 bis 1917 am Konservatorium der Musik in Leipzig, wobei er sich zunächst auf das Klavierspiel konzentrierte. Sein Lehrer war Robert Teichmüller. Später kamen Orgelunterricht bei Karl Straube und Kompositionsstudien bei Stephan Krehl dazu. Von 1917 bis 1918 nahm er als Einjährig-Freiwilliger am Ersten Weltkrieg in Frankreich teil.

Am 1. Dezember 1918 wurde Ramín als Nachfolger des zum Thomaskantor ernannten Straube Organist an der Leipziger Thomaskirche. Im Jahr 1920 wurde er auch Gewandhausorganist und unterrichtete als Orgellehrer am Kirchenmusikalischen Institut des Konservatoriums. 1932, kurz nach seiner Ernennung zum Professor, erhielt er einen Ruf an die Berliner Musikhochschule, gab diese Professur aber bald wieder auf. Von 1922 bis 1935 war er auch Chordirigent des Leipziger Lehrergesangsvereins. Von 1929 bis 1935 war er zudem Dirigent des Leipziger Sinfonieorchesters.

Ebenso wie sein Lehrer Straube engagierte er sich in der deutschen Orgelbewegung. Angeregt wurde er durch Hans Henny Jahnn und die Entdeckung der Arp-Schnitger-Orgel in Sankt Jacobi zu Hamburg. So veröffentlichte er 1929 seine Gedanken zur Klärung des Orgelproblems. Ab 1933 war er Mitherausgeber der Zeitschrift Musik und Kirche, die der Orgelbewegung nahesteht und seit 1929 im Bärenreiter-Verlag erscheint.

Ramín reiste als Orgelvirtuose durch Europa und gastierte auch in den USA (1933, 1934) und in Südamerika (1954). Seine internationalen Erfolge weckten Begehrlichkeiten bei den Nationalsozialisten, die ihn für ihre Zwecke zu instrumentalisieren versuchten. So spielte er 1935 auf der Hochzeit von Hermann Göring und weihte 1936 die große Walckerorgel auf dem Reichsparteitag in Nürnberg ein. 1942 wurde zum Leiter des Reichs-Bruckner-Chors in Linz bestellt. Die ersten Konzerte unter Ramíns Leitung fanden in Leipzig statt. Im April 1944 legte Ramín dieses Chorleiteramt nieder. Er stand als einer von zwei Organisten auf der sogenannten Gottbegnadeten-Liste von Goebbels aus dem Jahr 1944, die Künstler vor dem Kriegsdienst schützte.

Von 1933 bis 1938 und erneut von 1945 bis 1951 leitete Ramín auch den Gewandhauschor, 1935 wurde er Leiter des Berliner Philharmonischen Chors, dieses Amt mußte er kriegsbedingt 1943 aufgeben. Von 1943 bis 1944 leitete er den neu gegründeten Reichs-Brucknerchor der Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft Leipzig, der sich aus Mitgliedern der aufgelösten Rundfunkchöre zusammensetzte. Sein Vertrag war befristet, da Ramín nicht bereit war die Leitung des Thomanerchors aufzugeben und mit dem Reichs-Brucknerchor nach Linz ans Sankt Florians Stift überzusiedeln.

Ramín legte großen Wert darauf, einen gemischten Chor zu leiten, da dieser Chorklang seinem Klangideal näher kam als der eines Knabenchores allein. So gestaltete er häufig als Thomaskantor Aufführungen von Thomanerchor und Gewandhauschor zusammen. Die Zusammenarbeit mit dem Gewandhauschor gab er offiziell wegen Überlastung ab. Voraus gingen aber Auseinandersetzungen zwischen dem Gewandhauskapellmeister und ihm um die künstlerischen

Belange des Chores.

Am 18. Oktober 1939 wurde Ramón (wieder als Nachfolger von Straube) zum Thomaskantor in Leipzig berufen, was er von 1940 an bis zu seinem Tode blieb. Mit dem Amtswechsel von Straube auf Ramón wurde die Tätigkeit des Thomanerchors in der Leipziger Nikolaikirche eingestellt. Dieser tritt seitdem hauptsächlich in der Thomaskirche auf. Ziel des Kantoratswechsels war es, den Thomanerchor unter anderem durch die Gründung des Musischen Gymnasiums Leipzig 1941 stärker weltlichen Aufgaben zuzuführen, zu dessen künstlerischem Leiter Ramón ernannt wurde. Da er hier mit Widersprüchen zu kämpfen hatte, gab er dieses Amt Ende 1942 ab. Das Ziel der Nationalsozialisten, das Thomaskantorat mit der künstlerischen Leitung des Musischen Gymnasiums Leipzig zu koppeln, war damit gescheitert.

Nach 1945 gelang es Ramón, dem Thomanerchor schnell wieder zu einem hohen internationalen Ansehen zu verhelfen. Er sah sich als Thomaskantor vor allem dem Werk seines großen Vorgängers Johann Sebastian Bach verpflichtet. Ramón war Präsident des Bach-Ausschusses der DDR, Geschäftsführender Vorstand der Neuen Bachgesellschaft, künstlerischer Leiter des Bachwettbewerbes 1950 sowie Leiter der Deutschen Bachfeste in Leipzig 1950, 1953 und 1955. Außerdem war er Vorstandsmitglied der Internationalen Bachgesellschaft. Im Jahr 1950 wurde Ramón zum Ehrendoktor der Universität Leipzig ernannt. Ein Jahr später erhielt er den Nationalpreis 2. Klasse der DDR wegen seiner Verdienste beim Deutschen Bachfest.

Günther Ramóns Schülerkreis war groß, ein Teil davon wurde später auch bekannt wie etwa Hugo Distler, Paul-Heinz Dittrich, Albrecht Haupt, Diethard Hellmann, Hanns-Martin Schneidt, Karl Richter, Helmut Walcha und Ruth Zechlin.

Am 27. Februar 1956 starb Ramón im Alter von 57 Jahren an den Folgen eines Schlaganfalls in Leipzig. Er wurde auf dem Leipziger Südfriedhof beigesetzt (II. Abteilung). Sein Amtsnachfolger wurde Kurt Thomas.

Briefe von Günther Ramón aus der Zeit von 1926 bis 1949 befinden sich im Bestand des Leipziger Musikverlages C. F. Peters im Staatsarchiv Leipzig.

Die Jehmlich-Orgel des Wurzner Doms wurde 1932 eingebaut - die Auswahl der 46 Register in ihrer besonderen Klangfarbe verantwortete Günther Ramón.

Auszeichnungen :

1950 : Ehrendoktor der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig.

1950 : Nationalpreis der DDR für Kunst und Literatur, II. Klasse.

1952 : Mitglied der Deutschen Akademie der Künste in Berlin (Ost) .

1953 : Ehrensator der Universität Mendoza (Argentinien) .

Vokalwerke :

Der dreizehnte Psalm. Herr, wie lange willst du mein so gar vergessen ? (1928) .

Psalmkomposition für vierstimmigen Männerchor und Orchester.

Aus Zion bricht an der schöne Glanz Gottes. und Herr, höre mein Gebet ! Zwei Motetten für vier- bis sechsstimmigen Chor.

Orgelwerke

Phantasie in E-Moll (1924) .

Präludium, Largo und Fuge (1927) .

Orgelchoralsuite (1928) .

Choralvorspiel (1931) .

Canzona.

Kammermusik

Sonaten in C-Dur für Violine und Klavier, Opus I (1922) .

Schlag ins Kantor

Braune Musik Der Leipziger Thomanerchor wird in diesem Jahr 800 Jahre alt. Über die NS-Karriere des bedeutenden Kantors Günther Ramín wird bei den Feiern kaum ein Wort verloren.

In diesem Jahr begeht der Thomanerchor Leipzig sein 800-jähriges Bestehen. Der Freistaat Sachsen, zentrale Kultureinrichtungen, die Thomasschule, der Chor selbst und die lebenden Thomaskantoren feiern dieses Jubiläum. Zweifellos gehört die Thomanerchor-Tradition zum Schönsten, was die zentraleuropäische Musik anzubieten hat. Aber es gibt auch weiße Flecken, die die Leipziger gern verdrängen. Die gehen zurück bis in die Wilhelminische Ära, die Weimarer Republik, das Nazireich und die DDR. Der Thomaskantor Günther Ramín, einer der bedeutendsten Kantoren in der Geschichte des Chores, steht dabei in Rede - es geht um Splitter seiner Karriere, seiner politischen Herkunft und Gesittung, es geht um Versagen, aber auch um Verdienste eines international berühmten Mannes.

Günther Ramín teilt ausgerechnet mit Bertolt Brecht die Lebensdaten. Er wurde 1898 in Karlsruhe geboren und starb 1956 in Leipzig. Im Alter von elf Jahren kommt er zum Thomanerchor, der Thomasorganist Karl Straube gibt dem

Jungen Orgelunterricht, er erhält eine umfassende Schulung als Sänger einerseits, Dirigier- und Klavierstudien andererseits. In dieser Kombination kündigt sich Ramíns frühe Meisterschaft an. Nur wenige Jahre braucht er, um alle bedeutenden Orgelwerke von Johann Sebastian Bach zu beherrschen. Nach dem Studium wird er erst Organist an der Leipziger Thomaskirche, um dann später, auf Drängen von Straube das Thomaskantorat « als eine der wichtigsten deutschen Stellungen » zu übernehmen.

Antrittsdatum

1. Januar 1940. Bald trugen des Meisters Knaben zu besonderen Festen die Hitlerjugend-Uniform oder die der Pimpfe mit Hakenkreuzbinde und wurden zu Vertretern der deutschen Kultur im Ausland.

Will man Ramíns Wirken während der NS-Zeit gerecht beurteilen, gehört die folgende Geschichte mit ins Bild. Der Kirchenmusiker Jürgen Christian Mahrenholz, Sohn des Kirchenmusikers Christhard Mahrenholz, schrieb 1990 im Rahmen einer Debatte um Kirchenmusik in der NS-Zeit :

« Bei der Beerdigung Günther Ramíns war ich zugegen. Kein Zweifel : Alle waren um die “ deutsche ” Kirchenmusik hochverdiente Persönlichkeiten, dazu ohne Frage in sich integer, die aber nahezu ausnahmslos deutsch-national orientiert oder sogar gesteuert gewesen waren. »

Völkisch aufgeladen

Gedankentum, das bis lange nach 1945, recht besehen, bis heute fortlebt. Fast alle konservativen Bestrebungen (Ramín war darin verwickelt) während der Weimarer Demokratie, die keine war, schienen geeignet zu sein, problemlos in die NS-Periode überführt zu werden. Dazu zählte auch die Bach-Überlieferung und -Aufführungstradition, von wenigen Ausnahmen abgesehen die Kirchenmusik insgesamt. Vor allem jene dumpfen, mythisch, übergöttlich und völkisch aufgeladenen Bach-Bilder, die an dessen letzter Wirkungsstätte vorherrschend waren, wurden der neuen Zeit bereitwillig übergeben. Man dachte deutsch-national und handelte bald darauf NS-deutsch, sodaß die Mythen und gehobenen Religionen, gesponnen um die Bach-Tradition in Forschung und Praxis, nicht nur von Neuem auflebten, sondern obendrein als Innovation verkauft werden konnten.

Der kanadische Historiker Michaël H. Kater schreibt in seinem Buch Die missbrauchte Muse. Musiker im Dritten Reich :

« Die Kombination von polyphonem Reformismus, Hitlerverehrung, dogmatischer und liturgischer Restauration und dem Kreuzzug gegen die Romantik erreichten ihren Höhepunkt in Verbindung mit der “ Orgel-Bewegung ”, die ursprünglich ebenfalls in Beziehung zur “ Zurück zu Bach ” -Kampagne stand. Sie wurde von Meistern dieser Königin der Instrumente wie Karl Straube, Gotthold Frotscher und Günther Ramín geleitet. »

Daß Ramín zu Emmy und Hermann Görings Hochzeit im Jahr 1935, abgehalten im Dom zu Berlin, die Orgel schlug, ist weder Beinbruch noch Fehltritt, auch kein Versehen oder Irrtum, sondern aus gegebenem Anlass die Engführung geistig Verwandter. Ist Günther Ramín deswegen menschlich mies ? Spricht aus dieser Art Instrumentalisierung schon die

Unrechtstat oder die Duldung eines Verbrechertums ?

Linz und Reich

Sein Erlebnis der Musik Johann Sebastian Bachs, deren Rationalität und Formenstrenge, deren Menschlichkeit und Gottverbundenheit, deren Ausgelassenheit und Ernsthaftigkeit mag Günther Ramin indirekt vor größeren Fehler bewahrt haben. Doch hier ist Vorsicht geboten. Einer wie Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Oberkontrolleur deutscher Reinrassigkeit und im Nürnberger Prozess später zu Tode verurteilt, soll seinen Bach auf dem Klavier ja auch vorzüglich gespielt haben. Josef Geßbels hatte schon in den zwanziger Jahren Aufführungen der Matthäus-Passion besucht und sich enthusiastisch geäußert. Führer der SS-Elitetruppe nutzten die Musik von Bach, Mozart und Beethoven als Medium der Entspannung von den Strapazen ihrer Völkermordpraxis.

Daß Ramin im Auftrag Adolf Hitlers vor dem Nürnberger Parteitag 1936 die Probe der neu erbauten Orgel vorgenommen hat (er soll Hitler aus diesem Anlass begegnet sein) gehört mit in dieses Problemfeld.

Das österreichische Linz, « Patenstadt des Führers », sollte, nach Hitlers Italienreise im Jahr 1938, das zweite Florenz werden. Oder auch eine Art deutsches Rom. Das brauchte selbstredend die Einrichtung einer Riesenrundfunkstation, mit deren Hilfe die nationalsozialistische Kulturidee in die Welt getragen werden konnte. Der Reichsintendant Heinrich Glasmeier bezog im Herbst 1942 wie ein römischer Kaiser Position in Sankt Florian. Des Weiteren Generalmusikdirektor Rudolf Schulz-Dornburg, zuständig für den Aufbau des Reichs-Bruckner-Orchesters, bestehend aus ersten Musikern des In- und Auslandes. Schließlich Günther Ramin, dazu ausersehen, den Reichs-Bruckner-Chor für Sankt Florian aufzubauen. Es war kein Problem für ihn, dort Chorleute anzuwerben, da im Jahr 1943 alle Rundfunkchöre aufgelöst worden waren.

Weitere markante Ereignisse : Hitler besuchte am 4. April 1943 die zukünftige « Kulturstätte von Weltrang ». Wie die Orchestermusiker legten die Choristen am Grabe Bruckners ihren Eid ab. Zur Begrüßung des Chores am 3. Mai 1944 sprach der Gauleiter von Oberdonau, hernach noch ein zweiter Herr. Bis heute ist unklar, wer das gewesen ist.

Nachweislich hätte Günther Ramin, so die Auskunft des Sohnes Dieter Ramin, diese Rede (sie liegt auf Tonband vor und wurde seinem Vater fälschlich zu geschrieben) nicht gehalten. Laut Tagebucheintrag wäre er an dem Tag nicht in Linz gewesen. Indes, eine nicht gehaltene Rede ist noch kein Beleg, daß man anders oder gar kritisch geredet hätte. Faktisch gibt der Redetonfall die fatale Gesittung derer wieder, die dieses perverse Großgeschäft kulturell mit geprägt haben.

Der Krieg hat dem unabhkömmlichen Thomaskantor persönlich Schlimmes nicht beschert. Die Wohnung von Karl Straube wurde zerstört, Ramins glücklicherweise nicht. Alle in die benachbarte Stadt Grimma evakuierten Thomaner, die er wahrlich umsorgt hat, konnten überleben. Während das Leben seines Mentors Straube in Resignation und Isolierung endete, blieb Ramin ein Handlungsmensch.

Vorzuhalten ist dem Künstler, daß er wie Millionen andere weggeschaut hat. Dem in Leipzig lebenden Ramin dürfte die « Arisierung » des berühmten C. F. Peters Verlags, einem Musikverlag, verbunden mit der Enteignung von Henri Hinrichsen, der im KZ Theresienstadt starb, nicht entgangen sein. Desgleichen die plötzliche Abwesenheit jenes für die

Ausprägung des Leipziger Synagogalgesangs bedeutenden Oberkantors Samuel Lampel, der in Auschwitz umkam.

Buß und Reu

Schon bald nach dem Kriegsende versammelte Günther Ramín Kräfte frischen Tatendranges. Ob ihn die Schuldfrage innerlich geplagt hat, ob er an sich selbst Fragen gerichtet hat wegen seines allzu beflissenen Selbstvertrauens während der Nazizeit, diese Fragen kann man heute nicht mehr beantworten. Gleichwohl muß er die Verzweiflung des Karfreitag gespürt haben. Wenn einer in entbehrungsreichen Tagen Trost zu geben verstand, dann Dirigent Günther Ramín unter der Kuppel der Thomaskirche. Etwas, das in seine verpasste Bewältigungsgeschichte unbedingt gehört : Buß und Reu, diesen Gemeindechoral aus der Matthäus-Passion, hat er zwar mit seinen Knaben turnusgemäß intoniert, beides aber persönlich nicht mit ihnen eingeübt, jedenfalls nicht öffentlich. Sein Blick war nach vorn gerichtet, wodurch er den neuen Verhältnissen fast automatisch dienstbar wurde.

Daß das Gewandhausorchester dann nach dem Abzug der Amerikaner aus Leipzig zum Empfang der Roten Armee Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, den in der sächsischen Stadt wirkenden Komponisten jüdischer Herkunft, musiziert, ist dann schon eine große Buß- und Reuetat.

Günther Ramín geht nicht in den Westen. Er bleibt in Leipzig, bei Johann Sebastian Bach, bei seinem Knabenchor. Wieder wird der Handlungsmensch gebraucht. Und einzelne Knaben. Der Dichter Bertolt Brecht bittet per Brief den Thomaskantor um kollegiale Hilfe :

« Wäre es Ihnen möglich, daß Sie für unsere Aufführungen von Leben des Galilei drei Ihrer jungen Sänger (bis zu 12 Jahren) - I Sopran, I Mezzo, I Alt, zwölf Stanzas, die Hanns Eisler für die Kalifornische Uraufführung komponiert hat, einstudieren ließen ? »

Ramín lehnt die Bitte Brechts ab, läßt aber drei Knaben die Verse auf ein Band singen, das in den Aufführungen verwendet wird.

Die bruchlos fortgeführten Bach-Aufführungen Ramíns sind weiterhin grandios. Zum Dank heftet ihm Wilhelm Pieck, der Präsident der DDR, 1950 den Nationalpreis an. Der Thomanerchor und mit ihm sein Leiter erhält außerdem den Vaterländischen Verdienstorden in Gold. Und Thomaskantor Ramín darf mit seinem Klangkörper in die Welt, zu Aufführungsterminen in europäischen Städten und in fernerer Ländern - zum eigenen Ruhm und dem der jungen Republik. Es gab nichts im Nachkriegsleben von Günther Ramín, das auf seine NS-Vergangenheit verwies.

Hermann Göring

Hermann Göring was born on 12 January 1893 in Rosenheim, Bavaria. The son of a senior army officer, he was educated at a military school and became a member of the Prussian Cadet Corps.

Göring joined the German Army in June 1912. He served with the infantry during the first few months of the First

World War but was hospitalized with rheumatoid arthritis of the knees. After recovering, he transferred to the German Army Air Service.

At 1st, Göring was an observer for his friend and War ace, Bruno Lærzer, but eventually became a fighter pilot and scored his 1st victory on 16 November 1915. After the death of Manfred von Richthofen, Göring became the leader of his JG I squadron. By the end of the War, Göring had achieved 22 victories and had been awarded the Iron Cross and the « Pour le Mérite » for bravery.

After the War, Göring earned his living as a pilot working for the Fokker company based in Holland. While there, he met and married Baroness Karen von Fock-Kantzow.

Göring returned in 1923 and, after hearing Adolf Hitler speak, joined the National-Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP) .

He later admitted :

« It was political love at 1st sight. »

Hitler also admired Göring and appointed him as head of « Sturm Abteilung » (SA : Storm Section) . The SA (also known as storm-troopers or brown-shirts) were instructed to disrupt the meetings of political opponents and to protect Hitler from revenge attacks. Captain Ernst Röhm of the Bavarian Army played an important role in recruiting these men.

On 8 November 1923, the Bavarian government held a meeting of about 3,000 officials. While Gustav von Kahr, the prime minister of Bavaria was making a speech, Adolf Hitler and 600 armed SA men entered the building.

According to Ernst Hanfstängel :

« Hitler began to plough his way towards the platform and the rest of us surged forward behind him. Tables overturned with their jugs of beer. On the way, we passed a major named Muckel, one of the heads of the intelligence section at Army headquarters, who started to draw his pistol as soon as he saw Hitler approach, but the body-guard had covered him with theirs and there was no shooting. Hitler clambered on a chair and fired a round at the ceiling. »

Hitler then told the audience :

« The national revolution has broken out ! The hall is filled with 600 armed men. No one is allowed to leave. The Bavarian government and the government at Berlin are hereby deposed. A new government will be formed at once. The barracks of the « Reichswehr » and the police barracks are occupied. Both have rallied to the swastika ! »

Leaving Göring and the SA to guard the 3,000 officials, Hitler took Gustav von Kahr, Otto von Lossow, the commander of the Bavarian Army and Hans von Seißer, the commandant of the Bavarian State Police into an adjoining room. Hitler told the men that he was to be the new leader of Germany and offered them posts in his new government. Aware that this would be an act of high-treason, the 3 men were initially reluctant to agree to this offer.

Hitler was furious and threatened to shoot them and then commit suicide :

« I have 3 bullets for you, gentlemen, and one for me ! »

After this, the three men agreed to become ministers of the government. **(36)**

Soon afterwards, Eric Ludendorff arrived. Ludendorff had been leader of the German Army at the end of the First World War. He had, therefore, found Hitler's claim that the War had not been lost by the army but by Jews, Socialists, Communists and the German government, attractive, and was a strong supporter of the Nazi Party. Ludendorff agreed to become head of the the German Army in Hitler's government.

While Hitler had been appointing government ministers, Ernst Röhm, leading a group of storm-troopers, had seized the War Ministry and Rudolf Heß was arranging the arrest of Jews and Left-wing political leaders in Bavaria.

Hitler now planned to march on Berlin and remove the national government. Surprisingly, Hitler had not arranged for the storm-troopers to take control of the radio stations and the telegraph offices. This meant that the national government in Berlin soon heard about Hitler's « Putsch » and gave orders for it to be crushed.

The next day, Göring, Adolf Hitler, Eric Ludendorff, and 3,000 armed supporters of the Nazi Party marched through Munich in an attempt to join-up with Röhm's forces at the War Ministry. On the « Odensplatz » , they found the road blocked by the Munich police. As they refused to stop, the police fired into the ground in front of the marchers. The storm-troopers returned the fire and, during the next few minutes, 21 people were killed and another 100 were wounded, included Göring, who had 2 granite splinters (from a building) in his groin.

To avoid arrest, Göring fled to Sweden. Göring, who lived in Stockholm for the next 4 years, was in a poor physical state because of his morphine addiction. He also suffered from obesity and weighed 280 pounds.

In 1927, President Paul von Hindenburg granted Göring an amnesty and he returned to Berlin. The following year, he was one of the 12 members of the Nazi Party elected to the « Reichstag » and, on 30 August 1932, became its president.

When Adolf Hitler became chancellor, in January 1933, he made Göring a cabinet minister without portfolio. Later, he became minister of the interior and prime minister of Prussia. He immediately replaced 22 of Germany's 32 police chiefs with SA and SS officers. He also appointed Rudolf Diels as chief of the political police, the « Gestapo » .

After the « Reichstag » fire, on 27 February 1933, Göring launched a wave of violence against members of the German Communist Party and other Left-wing opponents of the regime. He also joined with Heinrich Himmler, head of the « Schutz Staffeinel » (SS) , in setting-up Germany's concentration camps.

Göring agreed that the « Sturm Abteilung » (SA) posed a threat to the German Army and, in June 1934, arranged the « Night of the Long Knives » . He also purged Werner von Blomberg and Werner von Fitsch from the high-command of the army.

In February 1938, Göring became head of Germany's armed forces. The following year, he officially became Hitler's deputy and legal heir. He obtained a vast income from his various official posts and converted an old Berlin palace into his official residence. Göring also made money from his own newspaper, Essener National Zeitung and from stock in the aircraft industry.

After the outbreak of the Second World War, Göring was placed in charge of the « Luftwaffe » and took credit for the quick defeat of France, Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg, in the summer of 1940. However, he failed to stop the British evacuation of Dunkirk.

Göring organized the German War effort during the Battle of Britain and made the crucial mistake of changing his tactics and launching the « Blitz » , in September 1940. He was criticized for the failings of the « Luftwaffe » during Operation « Barbarossa » .

When the Red Army made advances into Germany, Göring moved his headquarters to Berchtesgaden. After the suicide of Adolf Hitler, Göring surrendered to the US Army in Austria, on 8 May 1945.

Hermann Göring was found guilty at Nuremberg War Crimes Trial but avoided execution by swallowing potassium cyanide on 15 October 1946.

...

In Nazi eyes, nudism is a vice to be exterminated at all costs. Some 500,000 Germans, male and female, belong to nudist clubs. Suppressing them all by a single, nation-wide order, Nazi Minister-Without-Portfolio Hermann Göring denounced « the so-called cult of nudism » as « one of the greatest dangers to German culture and morals » .

« Herr » Göring said :

« In women, nudism deadens the sense of shame, and in men it destroys respect for womanhood. »

Communism being worse than nudism, the Hitler Government confiscated Karl Liebknecht House (the Communist headquarters in Berlin worth some \$ 120,000) , transformed it into a Nazi bivouack, announced that the life-size bronze statue of Karl Marx in the central hallway will be recast into busts of Adolf Hitler.

(2) Hermann Göring explained about his role in Hitler's government in his book « Germany Reborn » (1934) :

« I became commissioner of the Interior in Prussia and, at the same time, Minister of the “ Reich ”. I had taken on a heavy responsibility and a vast field of work lay before me. It was clear that I should be able to make a little use of the administrative system as it then was. I should have to make great changes. To begin with, it seemed to me of the 1st importance to get the weapon of the criminal and political police firmly into my own hands. Here, it was that I made the 1st sweeping changes of personnel. Out of 32 police chiefs, I removed 22. New men were brought in, and in every case, these men came from the great reservoir of the Storm Troops.

I gave strict orders and demanded that the police should devote all their energies to the ruthless extermination of subversive elements. In one of my 1st big meetings in Dortmund, I declared that, for the future, there would be only one man who would bear the responsibility in Prussia, and that one man was myself. Every bullet fired from the barrel of a police pistol was my bullet. If you call that murder, then I am the murderer.

Finally, I alone created, on my own initiative, the State Secret Police Department. This is the instrument which is so much feared by the enemies of the State, and which is chiefly responsible for the fact that in Germany and Prussia today there is no question of a Marxist or Communist danger. »

(2) Henry (Chips) Channon, diary entry (13 August, 1936) :

« Göring, wreathed in smiles and orders and decorations received us gaily, his wife at his side. There is something un-Christian about Göring, a strong pagan streak, a touch of the arena, though perhaps, like many who are libidinous-minded like myself, he actually does very little. People say that he can be very hard and ruthless, as are all Nazis when occasion demands, but outwardly he seems all vanity and childish love of display. »

(3) Hermann Göring, statement at Nuremberg War Crimes Trial (October 1946) :

« When the civil war broke out in Spain Franco sent a call for help to Germany and asked for support, particularly in the air. Franco with his troops was stationed in Africa and he could not get his troops across, as the fleet was in the hands of the communists. The decisive factor was, first of all, to get his troops to Spain. The Führer thought the matter over. I urged him to give support under all circumstances: firstly, to prevent the further spread of communism; secondly, to test my young Luftwaffe in this or that technical respect. »

(4) Conference on the « Jewish Question » between Hermann Göring, Reinhard Heydrich and Josef Gœbbels (12 November 1938) .

Reinhard Heydrich : In almost all German cities, synagogues are burned. New, various possibilities exist to utilize the space where the synagogues stood. Some cities want to build parks in their place, others want to put-up new buildings.

Hermann Göring : How many synagogues were actually burned ?

Reinhard Heydrich : Altogether, there are 101 synagogues destroyed by fire ; 76 synagogues demolished ; and 7,500 stores ruined in the « Reich » .

Hermann Göring : What do you mean « destroyed by fire » ?

Reinhard Heydrich : Partly, they are razed, and partly gutted.

Josef Goebbels : I am of the opinion that this is our chance to dissolve the synagogues. All those not completely intact shall be razed by the Jews. The Jews shall pay for it. There, in Berlin, the Jews are ready to do that. The synagogues which burned in Berlin are being leveled by the Jews themselves. We shall build parking lots in their places or new buildings. That ought to be the criterion for the whole country, the Jews shall have to remove the damaged or burned synagogues, and shall have to provide us with ready free space. I deem it necessary to issue a decree forbidding the Jews to enter German theaters, movie houses and circuses. I have already issued such a decree under the authority of the law of the Chamber for Culture. Considering the present situation of the theaters, I believe we can afford that. Our theaters are over-crowded, we have hardly any room. I am of the opinion that it is not possible to have Jews sitting next to Germans in varieties, movies and theaters. One might consider, later on, to let the Jews have 1 or 2 movie houses here in Berlin, where they may see Jewish movies. But, in German theaters, they have no business anymore. Furthermore, I advocate that the Jews be eliminated from all positions in public life in which they may prove to be provocative. It is still possible today that a Jew shares a compartment in a sleeping car with a German. Therefore, we need a decree by the « Reich » Ministry for Communications stating that separate compartments for Jews shall be available ; in cases where compartments are filled-up, Jews cannot claim a seat. They shall be given a separate compartment only after all Germans have secured seats. They shall not mix with Germans, and if there is no more room, they shall have to stand in the corridor.

Hermann Göring : In that case, I think it would make more sense to give them separate compartments.

Josef Goebbels : Not if the train is over-crowded !

Hermann Göring : Just a moment. There will be only one Jewish coach. If that is filled-up, the other Jews will have to stay at home.

Josef Goebbels : Furthermore, there ought to be a decree barring Jews from German beaches and resorts, last summer.

Hermann Göring : Particularly here, in the « Admiralspalast » , very disgusting things have happened lately.

Josef Goebbels : Also, at the Wannsee beach. A law which definitely forbids the Jews to visit German resorts.

Hermann Göring : We could give them their own.

Josef Goebbels : It would have to be considered whether we would give them their own or whether we should turn a few German resorts over to them, but not the finest and the best, so we cannot say the Jews go there for recreation. It will also have to be considered if it might not become necessary to forbid the Jews to enter the German forest. In the Grunewald, whole herds of them are running around. It is a constant provocation and we are having incidents all the time. The behaviour of the Jews is so inciting and provocative that brawls are a daily routine.

Hermann Göring : We shall give the Jews a certain part of the forest, and the Alpers shall take care of it that various animals that look damned much like Jews (the elk has such a crooked nose) get there also and become acclimated.

(5) General Franz Halder, provided evidence on the « Reichstag » Fire at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, in 1946.

At a luncheon on the birthday of Adolf Hitler, in 1942, the conversation turned to the topic of the « Reichstag » building and its artistic value. I heard with my own ears when Hermann Göring interrupted the conversation and shouted :

« The only one who really knows about the “ Reichstag ” is I, because I set it on fire ! »

With that, he slapped his thigh with the flat of his hand.

(6) Hermann Göring provided evidence on the « Reichstag » Fire at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, in 1946.

I had nothing to do with it. I deny this absolutely. I can tell you in all honesty, that the « Reichstag » fire proved very inconvenient to us. After the fire, I had to use the « Kroll » Opera House as the new « Reichstag » and the Opera House seemed to me much more important than the « Reichstag » . I must repeat that no pretext was needed for taking measures against the Communists. I already had a number of perfectly good reasons in the forms of murders, etc.

(7) Albert Speer, « Inside the 3rd “ Reich ” » (1970) .

After 1933, there quickly formed various rival factions that held divergent views, spied on each other, and held each other in contempt. A mixture of scorn and dislike became the prevailing mood within the Party. Each new dignitary rapidly gathered a circle of intimates around him. Thus, Heinrich Himmler associated almost exclusively with his SS following, from whom he could count on unqualified respect. Hermann Göring also had his band of uncritical admirers, consisting partly of members of his family, partly of his closest associates and adjutants. Josef Goebbels felt at ease in the company of literary and movie people. Rudolf Heß occupied himself with problems of homeopathic medicine, loved chamber music, and had screwy but interesting acquaintances.

As an intellectual, Goebbels looked down on the crude philistines of the leading group in Munich, who for their part

made fun of the conceited academic's literary ambitions. Göring considered neither the Munich philistines nor Gœbbels sufficiently aristocratic for him and, therefore, avoided all social relations with them ; whereas Himmler, filled with the elitist missionary zeal of the SS, felt far superior to all the others. Adolf Hitler, too, had his retinue, which went everywhere with him. Its membership, consisting of chauffeurs, the photographer, his pilot, and secretaries, remained always the same.

(8) Hermann Göring, order to Reinhard Heydrich (31 July 1941) .

Complementing the task that was assigned to you on January 24, 1939, which dealt with carrying-out by emigration and evacuation a solution of the « Jewish problem » as advantageous as possible, I hereby charge you with making all necessary preparations with regard to organizational and financial matters for bringing about a complete solution of the « Jewish question » in the German sphere of influence in Europe.

Whatever other governmental agencies are involved, they will cooperate with you. I request, furthermore, that you send me before long an overall plan concerning the organizational, factual and material measures necessary for the accomplishment of the desired final solution of the « Jewish question » .

(9) Josef Gœbbels, diary (13 March 1945) :

This evening's Mosquito raid was particularly disastrous for me because our Ministry was hit. The whole lovely building on the « Wilhelmstraße » was totally destroyed by a bomb. The throne-room, the Blue Gallery and my newly-rebuilt theatre hall are nothing but a heap of ruins. I drove straight to the Ministry to see the devastation for myself. One's heart aches to see so unique a product of the architect's art, such as this building was, totally flattened in a second. What trouble we have taken to reconstruct the theatre hall, the throne-room and the Blue Gallery in the old style ! With what care have we chosen every fresco on the walls and every piece of furniture ! And now, it has all been given over to destruction. In addition, fire has now broken-out in the ruins, bringing with it an even greater risk since 500 bazooka missiles are stored underneath the burning wreckage. I do my utmost to get the fire brigade to the scene as quickly and in as great strength as possible, so as at least to prevent the bazooka missiles exploding.

As I do all this, I am overcome with sadness. It is 12 years to the day (13 March) since I entered this Ministry as Minister. It is the worst conceivable omen for the next 12 years.

The « Führer » telephones me immediately after the raid on the Ministry. He too is very sad that it has now hit me. So far, we have been lucky even during the heaviest raids on Berlin. Now, however, we have lost not only a possession but an anxiety. In future, I need no longer tremble for the Ministry.

All those present at the fire voiced only scorn and hatred for Göring. All were asking repeatedly why the « Führer » does not at last do something definite about him and the « Luftwaffe » .

The « Führer » then asks me over for a short visit. During the interview, I have with him he is very impressed by my

account of things. I give him a description of the devastation which is being wrought and tell him particularly of the increasing fury of the Mosquito raids which take place every evening. I cannot prevent myself voicing sharp criticism of Göring and the « Luftwaffe ». But it is always the same story when one talks to the « Führer » on this subject. He explains the reasons for the decay of the « Luftwaffe », but he cannot make-up his mind to draw the consequences there from. He tells me that, after the recent interviews he had with him, Göring was a broken man. But what is the good of that ! I can have no sympathy with him. If he did lose his nerve somewhat after his recent clash with the « Führer », that is but a small punishment for the frightful misery he has brought and is still bringing on the German people.

I beg the « Führer », yet again, to take action at last, since things cannot go on like this. We ought not, after all, to send our people to their doom because we do not possess the strength of decision to root-out the cause of our misfortune. The « Führer » tells me that new fighters and bombers are now under construction, of which he has certain hopes. But we have heard it so often before that we can no longer bring ourselves to place much hope in such statements. In any case, it is now plenty late (not to say too late) to anticipate any decisive effect from such measures.

(10) Albert Speer, « Inside the 3rd “ Reich ” » (1970) .

I witnessed a dramatic scene between Göring and General Galland, who commanded his fighter planes. Galland had reported to Hitler that day that several American fighter planes accompanying the bomber squadrons had been shot down over Aachen. He had added the warning that we were in grave peril if American fighters, thanks to improved fuel capacity, should soon be able to provide escort protection to the fleets of bombers on flights even deeper into Germany. Hitler had just relayed these points to Göring.

Göring was embarking for Rominten Heath on his special train when Galland came along to bid him good-by.

« What's the idea of telling the “ Führer ” that American fighters have penetrated into the territory of the “ Reich ” ? » , Göring snapped at him.

Galland replied with imperturbable calm :

« “ Herr Reichsmarschall ”, they will soon be flying even deeper. »

Göring spoke even more vehemently :

« That's nonsense, Galland, what gives you such fantasies ? That's pure bluff ! »

Galland shook his head :

« Those are the facts. “ Herr Reichsmarschall ” ! »

As he spoke, he deliberately remained in a casual posture, his cap somewhat askew, a long cigar clamped between his teeth.

« American fighters have been shot-down over Aachen. There is no doubt about it ! »

Göring obstinately held his ground :

« That is simply not true, Galland. It's impossible. »

Galland reacted with a touch of mockery :

« You might go and check it yourself, sir ; the downed planes are there at Aachen. »

Göring tried to smooth matters over :

« Come now. Galland, let me tell you something. I'm an experienced fighter pilot myself. I know what is possible. But I know what isn't, too. Admit you made a mistake. »

Galland only shook his head, until Göring finally declared :

« What must have happened is that they were shot-down much farther to the West. I mean, if they were very high when they were shot-down they could have glided quite a distance farther before they crashed. »

Not a muscle moved in Galland's face :

« Glided to the East, sir ? If my plane were shot-up ... »

Göring fulminated, trying to put an end to the debate :

« Now then, “ Herr ” Galland, I officially assert that the American fighter planes did not reach Aachen. »

The General ventured a last statement :

« But, sir, they were there ! »

At this point Göring's self-control gave way :

« I, herewith, give you an official order that they weren't there ! Do you understand ? The American fighters were not there ! Get that ! I intend to report that to the “ Führer ”. »

Göring simply let General Galland stand there. But, as he stalked-off, he turned once more and called-out threateningly :

« You have my official order ! »

With an unforgettable smile, the General replied :

« Orders are orders, sir ! »

(11) Gustave Gilbert, an intelligence officer, interviewed Hermann Göring at Nuremberg on 18 April 1946.

We got around to the subject of War again and I said that, contrary to his attitude, I did not think that the common people are very thankful for leaders who bring them war and destruction.

Göring shrugged :

« Why, of course, the people don't want War. Why would some poor slob on a farm want to risk his life in a War when the best that he can get-out of it is to come-back to his farm in one piece. Naturally, the common people don't want War ; neither in Russia nor in England nor in America, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy or a Fascist dictatorship or a Parliament or a Communist dictatorship. »

I pointed out :

« There is one difference. In a democracy, the people have some say in the matter through their elected representatives, and, in the United States, only Congress can declare wars. »

« Oh, that is all well and good, but, voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country. »

(12) Edward Heath, The Course of My Life (1988) .

I looked towards the dock. In 2 rows, often they sat : Göring reduced to wearing a plain, ill-fitting grey uniform (no medals now) , alert and attentive, vigorously nodding his head in agreement or shaking it in denial ; Heß, with his pale pinched face ; von Ribbentrop, always busy writing notes ; Keitel and Jodi, the soldiers, staring silently and sullenly ahead ; Schacht, the businessman, whose relationship with the Nazis had been more turbulent, and who had distaste etched into his face at having to sit in public with such unpleasant people ; von Papen and von Neurath, politicians both but still the diplomats, polished and immaculate. These all stood-out. But how unimpressive were Seyß-Inquart,

who had betrayed Austria and ruled occupied Holland ; Rosenberg and Fritsche, the propagandists ; and von Schirach, formerly a fanatical and dangerous young zealot, but now, a visibly broken man. For a time, the whole free world had quaked before these men. Ultimately, however, they had brought not glory, but ruin and misery, to their own land and its people. We had lived in their shadow for a decade, but now history was free to deliver a final verdict upon them.

When the Court adjourned for a quarter of an hour, I saw the Nazi leaders arguing heatedly among themselves about the evidence they had heard : evidence which had been gathered from every corner of Europe, from the Chancelleries and concentration camps, from the occupied countries and from Germany itself, of how the Nazis plunged the world into War, led Germany to its undoing and brought themselves, at last, into the dock in that Court House in Nuremberg.

Le « Berlin Staatsoper » d'Hermann Göring

La fin du XIXe et le début du XXe sont une période faste pour l'Opéra de Cour de l'État prussien, (« Hofoper ») . L'Orchestre de la « Staatskapelle » est notamment dirigé par Richard Strauß de 1899 à 1913. La tendance se poursuit après la Guerre de 1914, dans la salle qui prend enfin son nom actuel de « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » dans la décennie 1920, avec la venue de chefs aussi illustres que Wilhelm Furtwängler, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Otto Klemperer ou Erich Kleiber. Ce dernier est à la baguette lorsque la salle accueille la création mondiale de l'Opéra « Wozzeck » d'Alban Berg en 1925.

...

Héritier de la tradition lyrique historique de Berlin, le « Staatsoper » , à 2 pas du Palais impérial, était l'Opéra de Cour de l'État prussien, (« Hofoper ») , avec l'Orchestre d'État, la « Staatskapelle » , il fut dirigé par les plus grands Richard Strauß, Leo Blech, Erich Kleiber, Clemens Krauß, Herbert von Karajan.

Quelques dates

21 mars 1933 : À la demande d'Hermann Göring, responsable du « Staatsoper » de Berlin, en sa qualité de « Preuischer Ministerpräsident » , Wilhelm Furtwängler dirige l'Opéra de Richard Wagner « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » devant Adolf Hitler, le Président Paul von Hindenburg, Hermann Göring, Wilhelm Frick et Alfred Hugenberg.

Juin 1933 : Wilhelm Furtwängler est nommé par Hermann Göring chef-principal du « Staatsoper » de Berlin.

Octobre 1934 : Wilhelm Furtwängler dirige la Tétralogie (« Ring ») de Wagner au « Staatsoper » de Berlin.

2 décembre 1934 : Lors d'une représentation de « Tristan und Isolde » de Wagner à la « Staatsoper » de Berlin, Wilhelm Furtwängler est applaudi pendant 25 minutes lors de son entrée dans la fosse d'orchestre, puis à chaque salut à la fin d'un Acte, en présence de Josef Gæbbels et de Hermann Göring.

4 décembre 1934 : Le chef Wilhelm Furtwängler se démet de toutes ses fonctions officielles (au « Berliner Philharmoniker », à la « Staatsoper » et à la « Reichsmusikkammer ») puis se retire dans les Alpes bavaroises.

21 octobre 1938 : Herbert von Karajan dirige l'Opéra « Tristan und Isolde » de Wagner, sans partition, au « Staatsoper » de Berlin.

22 octobre 1938 : Le critique musical Edwin van der Nüll publie dans le « Berliner Mittagszeitung » l'article « In der Staatsoper, das Wunder Karajan ». Wilhelm Furtwängler le perçoit comme une offense envers lui et s'en plaint à Josef Gebbels.

24 novembre 1938 : Le compositeur Werner Egk dirige la création de son Opéra « Peer Gynt » au « Staatsoper » de Berlin.

18 décembre 1938 : Herbert von Karajan dirige l'Opéra de « La Flûte enchantée » de Mozart au « Staatsoper » de Berlin.

21 octobre 1940 : Herbert von Karajan dirige la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin lors d'un concert symphonique à l'« Alte Philharmonie ».

24 mai 1941 : Tournée parisienne du « Staatsoper » de Berlin avec Herbert von Karajan.

12 décembre 1942 : Wilhelm Furtwängler dirige l'Opéra « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » de Wagner lors de la réouverture du Staatsoper de Berlin.

31 août 1944 : Johannes Schüller dirige « Le Nozze di Figaro » de Mozart au « Staatsoper » de Berlin. Il s'agit du dernier Opéra complet à être monté.

Par contre, l'Orchestre de la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin continuera à programmer des concerts symphoniques et des versions « concert » d'Opéras.

4-5 octobre 1944 : Herbert von Karajan dirige la 8e Symphonie de Anton Bruckner.

3 février 1945 : Le « Staatsoper » de Berlin est complètement détruit par les bombardements alliés.

Avec l'arrivée au pouvoir du 3e « Reich » en 1933, qui voit Hermann Göring prendre la tête de la salle du « Staatsoper » de Berlin, de nombreuses personnalités fuient la persécution nazie, y compris Otto Klemperer, Alexander von Zemlinsky, tous 2 d'origine juive, ainsi qu'Erich Kleiber, qui s'exile après que les Nazis se soulèvent contre la première mondiale de l'Opéra « Lulu » de Alban Berg en 1934, qu'ils qualifient d'« art dégénéré ». En revanche, Herbert von Karajan devient le directeur de l'Orchestre de 1941 à 1945. Pendant la Guerre, les bombardements détruiront la salle à 2 reprises : une 1re fois en 1941 ; une 2e fois en 1944. Les 2 fois, la salle reconstruite est

inaugurée par une représentation des « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » de Richard Wagner. Si la 1re fois, la salle est reconstruite dès l'année suivante, elle met beaucoup plus longtemps à se relever de sa 2e destruction, puisqu'il faut attendre 1955 pour que les travaux s'achèvent.

...

La « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » servait aux représentations officielles du 3e « Reich » . Désigné officiellement en tant que Théâtre national de Prusse (« preußisches Staatstheater ») , l'Opéra était sous l'autorité du Ministre Président de Prusse, en l'occurrence Hermann Göring. Les chanteurs, musiciens et dirigeants juifs furent démis de leur fonction et firent l'objet de persécutions.

La « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » fut touchée à 2 reprises lors de bombardements aériens durant la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Une 1re reconstruction eut même lieu alors que le conflit n'était pas encore achevé. L'architecte Richard Paulick fut chargé de restaurer fidèlement l'Opéra entre 1952 et 1955 et intégra dans la façade des éléments d'origine.

En 1925, le nom de l'Opéra changea en « Städtische Oper » (Opéra municipal) , avant que son nom ne redevienne « Deutsches Opernhaus » sous l'influence du ministre de la Propagande d'Hitler, Josef Gœbbels. L'Opéra fut finalement détruit le 23 novembre 1943.

...

The National-Socialists' « coordination » of culture may have allayed the Opera Houses' immediate financial concerns, but it gave new impetus to their artistic rivalry. In 1933, Prussian Minister President Hermann Göring assumed personal control of the former Court Opera (now, the Prussian « Staatsoper ») on « Unter den Linden » boulevard, while Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels adopted the « Deutsche Oper » and the Berlin Old « Philharmonie » as his pet national ensembles. Power struggles within the National-Socialist cultural bureaucracy breathed new life into old rivalries. Göring and administrators at the « Staatsoper » became ardent supporters of a young conductor named Herbert von Karajan, who first drew national attention in 1938 after being hailed as a musical « miracle » in the Berlin press. Karajan was built-up as a challenger to the mantle of Berlin Philharmonic's senior conductor, Wilhelm Furtwängler, as the city's outstanding musical talent. After 1945, both conductors came under public scrutiny for their close ties to the Nazi regime. If Karajan (who later succeeded Furtwängler on the podium of the Berlin Philharmonic) was long haunted by his Nazi Party membership, Furtwängler was more successful at styling himself as an apolitical, « good » German who had kept the humanist tradition of Mozart and Beethoven alive during the dark days of the 3rd « Reich » .

(Fred K. Prieberg. « Musik im NS-Staat » pages 238-266 ; Michæl H. Kater. « The Twisted Muse » , pages 56-61, 195-203.)

After 1945, Nazi cultural rivalries gave way to Berlin's division between East and West and the emerging tensions of

the Cold War. Berlin's western Allies administered the Opera House in Charlottenburg - Ist revived as the « Staatsoper » (Municipal Opera) , then, renamed the « Deutsche Oper » (German Opera) in 1961 -, while the « Staatsoper » fell under Soviet jurisdiction. In the immediate post-War era, the Soviets attracted Berlin's best musical talent to their sector of occupation through the promise of extra food rations and other perks ; in 1947, they invited the renowned Austrian stage-director, Walter Felsenstein, to establish a 2nd Opera House, the Comic Opera (« Komische Oper Berlin ») , within their city sector as well. After the currency reform of 1948, Berlin's musical balance of power reversed, as the western Opera House, with the assistance of the new West German « Mark » , became the more lucrative site of employment for Berlin artists.

...

After the Nazis took power in early 1933, the Prussian State Theaters and Berlin's leading lyric theater (the « Staatsoper » : State Opera) fell under Hermann Göring's supervision. Furtwängler had signed a contract with the « Staatsoper » in the last days of the Weimar Republic and saw no reason why he should not honour it, since he felt Göring really had nothing to do with him. When Göring tried to void it because he wanted to give the Music Director's post to Fritz Busch, Furtwängler forced him to honour it and prevailed.

The Orchestras, including the Berlin Philharmonic, the « Städtische Oper » (Municipal Opera) , all the non-Prussian Theaters, and the media were taken-up by the Propaganda Minister, Josef Goebbels. For the rest of the 12 dark years that lay ahead, Germany's cultural life (especially Opera) would be a battle-ground on which these 2 men would fight bitterly for power, and the most important squabbling point was the Prussian State Theaters.

There always was a question as to which man really controlled them. Göring staked his claim by forming a Theater Committee within the Ministry of Culture, in March 1933. To head this Committee, he appointed Hans Hinkel who was State Commissar in the Ministry of Culture. This Committee nominally took charge of all the Theaters in the « Reich » except the Prussian State Theaters. This select group of Theaters included those in Berlin, and chief among them was the « Staatsoper » . These Theaters, Göring absorbed into his own domain at the Ministry of Interior where he was chief. All Göring really cared about, however, was the « Staatsoper » . Over at the Propaganda Ministry, Goebbels viewed these developments with dismay. Sharing was never one of Goebbels' virtues, and he was very disturbed at the thought that the most prestigious vessels of the performing arts in Germany belonged to his rival.

To redress this humiliating state of affairs, he formed the « Reichskulturkammer » (RKK) in November, which was intended to become an umbrella over the Ministry of Culture and the various departments within it that controlled the Prussian State Theaters. But Göring did not relinquish his control and shifted them from their former position as a sort of department within the Ministry of Interior into his own office, the Office of Minister President. Goebbels followed suit by serving notice to all other government ministries and their departments, in March 1934, that he, alone, was the highest-authority in the Prussian State Theaters. Göring retorted, NO ! He, alone, was the highest-authority in the Prussian State Theaters. What is more, the « Führer » backed him. Ultimately, Goebbels won, but it would be 1944 before he could claim a Pyrrhic and short-lived victory.

Furtwängler was now beholden to the 2 most powerful men in the 3rd « Reich » , but the idea never intimidated him, as both Goebbels and Göring were soon to learn. Whenever possible, he tried to exploit their enmity and use their common need for him to subvert their attempts to co-opt and destroy German musical culture.

The « Berliner Staatsoper Unter den Linden » has been known by that name or by simply « Lindenoper » or « Staatsoper » since 1918. The « Stadtische Oper » underwent several switches in names. It originally was called the « Deutsche Oper » (German Opera) . In 1925, it became the « Stadtische Oper » (Municipal Opera) . It went back to being called « Deutsche Oper » in 1933, the name it has at present.

...

Situated at the top of the boulevard « Unter den Linden » , the « Staatsoper » , or Prussian State Opera (also known as the « Linden-Oper ») , boasts a tradition dating back to 1742. In the early 1930's, the « Staatsoper » ranked among Berlin's most prestigious cultural showcases. Under the patronage of Prussian Prime Minister Hermann Göring, and fuelled by Göring's rivalry with Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels, the « Staatsoper » served as a prominent back-drop for the Nazis' cultural and political agenda.

1933 marked a double anniversary year for one of Adolf Hitler's favourite composers, Richard Wagner (1813-1883) . Over 12 months, the « Staatsoper » , which enjoyed close artistic and organizational ties with the Wagner Festival in Bayreuth, achieved the near Olympian feat of producing all 13 of the composer's Operas. These performances featured many of the most celebrated Opera stars of the day, singers including Friedrich Schorr, Alexander Kipnis, Emanuel List, Marcel Noë, Charles Kullman, Delia Reinhardt and Tilly de Garmo, alongside conductors Erich Kleiber, Otto Klemperer, Leo Blech, and Fritz Zweig.

By the end of the 1933-1934 season, however, each of these singers, as well as Klemperer, Zweig and 22 other members of the « Staatsoper » community, from orchestra musicians to choristers to scene painters to the theatre's press-officer, had been dismissed. Exasperated by imposed repertoire restrictions, they were followed into exile by Erich Kleiber, and by Leo Blech, who, after over 30 years' service to the Opera House, was forced to flee Germany.

Most, but not all the « Staatsoper's » members escaped the horrors of the Holocaust and the War. Yet, the Nazis' racial persecution and the desecration of culture that took place both within the Opera House and on its very door-step, when students set fire to mountains of « degenerate » books on the « Opernplatz » (today's « Bebelplatz ») , shattered Berlin's once vibrant cultural « eco-system » . During the War, the « Staatsoper » itself was 1st damaged in 1941, then, destroyed by Allied bombing raids in 1945. Long before Hitler's demise, the once proud Opera House, and the culture for which it stood, had been reduced to rubble and ash.

The General Manager during the Nazi period : Heinz Tietjen (1925-1945) .

The General Music Directors during the Nazi period : Clemens Krauß (1935-1936) ; Herbert von Karajan (1941-1945) .

Permanent conductors who worked during the (Nazi) reign of Heinz Tietjen at the « Staatsoper » :

1933-1945 : Robert Heger.

1935-1938 : Werner Egk.

1935-1936 : Hans Swarowsky.

1935-1949 : Johannes Schüller.

1938-1942 : Karl Elmendorff.

1939-1945 : Herbert von Karajan (who realize the 1st stereo recording) .

1940-1942 : Paul van Kempen.

...

In 1930, Erich Kleiber conducted the premiere of Darius Milhaud's Opera « Christophe Colomb » . However, in 1934, when the Symphonic Suite from Alban Berg's Opera « Lulu » was performed by Kleiber, the National-Socialists provoked a scandal and he was forced to go in exile.

During Nazi dictatorship, the building of the « Staatsoper » served for representation of State and National-Socialist Party. As Prussian State Theater, it was under authority of Prussian Ministry President Hermann Göring.

Jewish singers, musicians, directors and other staff were mobbed-out of the House, no more longer engaged and partly even murdered.

After Adolf Hitler's Nazi take-over, members of Jewish origin were dismissed from the Opera House. Many German musicians associated with the « Staatsoper » went into exile, including the conductors Kurt Adler, Otto Klemperer and Fritz Busch. During the 3rd « Reich » , Robert Heger, Herbert von Karajan and Johannes Schüller were chosen « Staatskapellmeisters » .

...

English mezzo-soprano Margery Booth made her professional debut at Queen's Hall, Wigan, on 4 October 1935. She then moved back to London, in 1936, to continue her career making irregular appearances at « Covent Garden » . Her professional career also blossomed with performances at the Bayreuth Festival and with the Berlin « Staatsoper » . She starred as Madalene in 1936 ; as Flosshilde in « Götterdämmerung » ; as the Shepherd boy in a recording of « Tosca » with Hildegard Ranczak, but was most famous for her portrayal as Carmen.

Her marriage to Doctor Egon Strohm, from a brewing family in the « Schwarzwald » (Black Forest) , took her back to Germany.

Her 1st meeting of with Adolf Hitler is thought to have been in 1933, when she was chosen to carry the Holy Grail in the spectacular Finale to the Wagner Opera « Parsifal » at Bayreuth. The « Führer » suddenly burst into her dressing-room and told her how elegant and lovely she was, and sent her the next day a basket of 200 red roses wrapped in a Swastika flag with a card signed : « Adolf » .

At the outbreak of World War II, she was singing at Hermann Göring's « Staatsoper » . The Nazis mistakenly trusted her, by allowing her to perform at the Stalag III-D Open Prison (« Freigegeben ») in Genshagen, near Berlin - a camp for potential recruits to the British Free Corps.

(Photo) 1936 : Adolf Hitler and Nazi leaders at the Berlin Opera House where Margery Booth performed.

Booth mixed with the German top-brass while letting officers hide in her dress top-secret documents for MI9 (the British intelligence branch tasked with unmasking traitors) . She would announce to her audience « I'm Margery Booth from Wigan » . She was initially given personal assurances from Hitler and Josef Gœbbels that they would « deal with the matter personally » if she was insulted because of her British origin.

Ironically, the Opera singer's links to the Nazi regime were so well-known that she was accused of collaborating against Britain, and turning traitor against her country.

When her ties with Britain were discovered by the Nazis in early 1944, Miss Booth was arrested as a suspected spy, and tortured by the « Gestapo » . She kept silent, not revealing any information. She was eventually released, and she later escaped Berlin during an air-raid and making her way West by flying to Bavaria where she was picked-up by the advancing U.S. Army.

After the War, information she provided was used to convict both Lord Haw and John Amery, both of whom were hanged for treason. She, then, returned to London, but was professionally rejected as producers mistakenly concluded that she had been a Nazi, and was offered no work. She divorced her German husband and decided to emigrate in America. On her arrival in New York, she was referred to a doctor who diagnosed a terminal cancer. She died in obscurity in New York, in 1952, from complications due to cancer.

...

24 November 1938 : Werner Egk conducts the creation (opening night) of his Opera « Peer Gynt » .

18 December 1938 : Herbert von Karajan conducts a performance of Mozart's « Die Zauberflöte » .

1939 : Herbert von Karajan conducts a performance of Rudolf Wagner-Régeny's Opera « Die Bürger von Calais » .

21 October 1940 : Herbert von Karajan conducts a Symphonic concert with the « Berlin Staatskapelle » at the Old « Philharmonie » .

1941-1945 : Herbert von Karajan is named « Generalmusikdirektor » (principal musical-director) of the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » .

1942 : Bombing of the « Lindenoper » .

12 décembre 1942 : The Opera House re-opens with Wilhelm Furtwängler conducting a performance of « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » by Richard Wagner.

18 February 1943 : Josef Goebbels pronounces his « Total War » speech at the « Berlin Sportpalast » . The « Staatsoper » is closed.

31 August 1944 : Johannes Schöler conducts « Le Nozze di Figaro » by Mozart. It is the last performance of a complete Opera at the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » . But the « Staatskapelle » continues to program Symphonic and Opera concerts.

4-5 October 1944 : Herbert von Karajan performs Anton Bruckner's 8th Symphony at the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » with the « Staatskapelle » Orchestra.

3 February 1945 : The « Lindenoper » is, once again, destroyed by bombs ; damaging totally the ground-floor walls. The concerts are relocated to the « Admiralspalast » (today's « Metropoltheater ») and the « Schauspielhaus » .

18 February 1945 : Herbert von Karajan conducts at the « Beethoven-Saal » (near the destroyed « Alte Philharmonie ») his last Symphonic concert with the « Staatskapelle » Orchestra.

After the Second World War, the Opera House comes back to its original name : « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » , but the 2nd reconstruction (in freely adapted Baroque forms) will take a long time - only to be completed in 1955. It is inaugurated (again) with Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » .

From 1949, the company served as State Opera of the German Democratic Republic.

...

Towards the end of the 19th Century, the Berlin Court Opera House attained international fame through conductors such as Joseph Sucher, Felix von Weingartner and Karl Muck, and, in later years, Richard Strauß and Leo Blech. After the collapse of the German Empire in 1918, the Opera was renamed the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » and the «

Königliche Kapelle » became the « Staatskapelle Berlin » . The 1920's saw Wilhelm Furtwängler, Erich Kleiber, Otto Klemperer, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Bruno Walter and many others at the conductor's stand.

In April 1928, having undergone a complete renovation with the introduction of a rotating stage, trap-room and wings, the « Linden-Oper » re-opened with a new production of « The Magic Flute » by Mozart. In the same year, Feodor Chaliapin and the Diaghilev Ballet gave guest-performances under conductor Ernest Ansermet.

After Adolf Hitler's seizure of power, all Jews were dismissed from the ensemble. Otto Klemperer, Fritz Busch and many top-soloists went into exile. During the 3rd « Reich » the chief-conductors were Robert Heger, Johannes Schüler and Herbert von Karajan. It was in 1944 under Karajan's « bâton » that the 1st stereo recording was made. The « Linden-Oper » had been increasingly devoted to contemporary composers since the end of the German Empire. In 1925, Alban Berg's Opera « Wozzek » was premiered by Erich Kleiber in the composer's presence. Kleiber also conducted the 1st performances of Darius Milhaud's « Christophe Colomb » , and the « Symphonic Suite » from Alban Berg's Opera « Lulu » , whereupon the Nazis provoked a scandal and Erich Kleiber was also forced into exile. 1938 saw the 1st performance of Werner Egk's Opera « Peer Gynt » , with the composer conducting.

During World War II, the Opera House was twice completely destroyed by allied bombing. Re-building was quick the 1st time, but the 2nd took much longer. Both times, 1942 and 1955, the « Deutsche Staatsoper Berlin » , as it was renamed in 1945, opened with Richard Wagner's Opera « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » .

...

During the 3rd « Reich » , members of Jewish origin were dismissed from the « Berlin Staatsoper » (Prussian State Opera) . Many German musicians associated with the Opera House went into exile, including conductors Otto Klemperer and Fritz Busch. During the 3rd « Reich » , Robert Heger, Herbert von Karajan (1939-1945) and Johannes Schüler were the « Staatskapellmeister » .

Adolf Hitler gave spoke in this building a number of times :

On 3 January 1935, he addressed the German Leadership beginning with a long version of the « Party narrative » , enumerated his own achievements, and then, ostensibly close to tears, confessed that he would not be able to continue the work of reconstructing Germany unless all of the leaders of the Party, the State and the « Wehrmacht » represented a single-unit devoted to no one else but him. As on the earlier occasion of the Otto Straßer crisis, Hitler had apparently publicly threatened to commit suicide. In any case, the speech accomplished its purpose, due in no small part to the fact that Hitler had placed the necessity for an « en bloc » (bold) effort within the context of the approaching Saar plebiscite. His performance was greeted with thunderous applause as Rudolf Heß, who chaired the rally, subsequently gave the floor to Hermann Göring, who (again, just as during the Straßer crisis) expressed the unanimity of all present in moving words. Particular emphasis was put on the fact that he was speaking as a « high-ranking National-Socialist leader and, at the same time, as a “ Reichswehr ” General and a Member of the “ Reich ” Cabinet » (thus, personifying the synthesis of all « German leaders » present) when he read his « Address of

Gratitude and Devotion » :

« Adolf Hitler's birthday that year (1944) , his 55th, had the usual trappings and ceremonials. Josef Gœbbels had Berlin emblazoned with banners and a new slogan of resounding pathos :

“ Our walls broke, but our hearts didn't. ”

The State Opera House on “ Unter den Linden ” was festively decorated for the usual celebration, attended by dignitaries from State, Party, and “ Wehrmacht ”. Gœbbels portrayed Hitler's historic achievements. The Berlin Philharmonic, conducted by Hans Knappertsbusch, played Beethoven's “ Eroica ” Symphony. But the mood among the Nazi faithful at such events was contrived. Gœbbels was well-aware from reports from the regional Propaganda Offices that the popular mood was “ very critical and sceptical ”, and that “ the depression in the broad masses ” had reached “ worrying levels ”. »

(Ian Kershaw, « Hitler 1889-1936 » ; page 799.)

« On the evening of 12 April 1945, the Berlin Philharmonic gave its last performance. Albert Speer, who organized it, had invited Grand Admiral Karl Dönitz and also Adolf Hitler's adjutant, Colonel Nicolaus von Below. The hall was properly lit for the occasion, despite the electricity cuts.

Below wrote :

“ The concert took us back to another world. ”

The programme included Beethoven's Violin Concerto, Anton Bruckner's 8th Symphony (Albert Speer later claimed that this was his warning signal to the Orchestra to escape Berlin immediately after the performance to avoid being drafted into the “ Volkssturm ”) and the Finale to Richard Wagner's “ Götterdämmerung ”. Even if Wagner did not bring the audience back to present reality, the moment of escapism did not last long. It is said that, after the performance, the Nazi Party had organized Hitler Youth members to stand in uniform with baskets of cyanide capsules and offer them to members of the audience as they left. »

(Antony Beevor, « The Fall of Berlin » ; pages 188-189.)

Musik im « Dritten Reich » - Der Dirigent von Hermann Görings Gnaden

Wie wird man ein Stardirigent ? « Dirigent lernen kann man nicht » , war die knappe Antwort, die der berühmte Berliner Kapellmeister Leo Blech einmal gab :

« Dirigent kann man nur werden. »

In diesem Satz steckt viel von der Bescheidenheit, die den Dirigenten von Weltformat auszeichnete - schließlich betonte Blech nicht seinen Fleiß, sondern die äußeren Umstände, die ihn in die höchsten Höhen einer einzigartigen Musikerkarriere getragen hatten.

Wie aber sah das Leben des Mannes aus, der einst zu den größten deutschen Dirigenten zählte, heute aber nahezu vollständig aus unserem kollektiven Gedächtnis verschwunden ist ? Wer waren die Menschen, die ihn förderten und feierten ? Wer die, die ihn schließlich behinderten und gar bedrohten ? Und wie schaffte er es als Jude, die Nazizeit in Deutschland zu überleben ?

Ein Musikgenie als Tuchhändler

Schon in seiner frühen Kindheit deutet einiges daraufhin, daß der 1871 in Aachen geborene Blech einmal ein großer Musiker werden könnte. Bereits als Siebenjähriger gab Blech Klavierkonzerte. Dem Vater, einem bodenständigen Pinsel- und Bürstenfabrikanten, kam das alles zunächst reichlich unheimlich vor. Er bestimmte, daß sein Sohn nach der Schule etwas Anständiges lernen solle - und so wird dem sensiblen Musikgenie eine kaufmännische Lehre als Tuchhändler aufgezwungen.

Noch als Achtzigjähriger erinnerte er sich mit Widerwillen an diese Zeit :

« Jeder Tag dem anderen scheußlich gleichend - das macht alt ! »

Vermutlich wäre seine Karriere an diesem Punkt bereits beendet gewesen, hätte er auf eine glückliche Fügung gewartet. Aber Blech nahm sein Leben in die Hand : Er rebellierte gegen seinen Vater, bis der sein Einverständnis für das Musikstudium an der Berliner Musikakademie gab. Von da an ging es in seinem Leben steil bergauf. Blech schrieb erfolgreich eigene Opern und bekam gut bezahlte Anstellungen : Kapellmeister am Deutschen Landestheater in Prag, dann an der Königlichen Hofoper Unter den Linden in Berlin. Kaiser Wilhelm II. war beeindruckt von dem jungen Aufsteiger, verlieh ihm sogar den Roten Adlerorden. 1913 wurde Blech zum Preußischen Generalmusikdirektor ernannt - vorläufiger Höhepunkt einer Bilderbuchkarriere.

Auch nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg (die Hofoper hieß inzwischen Staatsoper) blieb Blech mit einer kurzen Unterbrechung Unter den Linden. Das Publikum liebte ihn. Bei seinen Musikern war er zuweilen gefürchtet, denn sein Arbeitseifer verlangte jedem einzelnen viel Leistung ab. Wer nicht mitzog, wurde schon mal scharf kritisiert :

Als eine Hauptdarstellerin seiner Lieblingsoper Carmen einmal nicht ganz bei der Sache war, sagte Blech ihr ins Gesicht :

« Eine gute Carmen ist gut, eine schlechte Carmen ist schlecht. Aber gar keine Carmen ? »

Ihm selbst unterlief nur einmal ein Fehler :

In der Pause der Oper « Die Hugenotten » nahm Blech seinen Mantel und ging nach Hause - er hatte geglaubt, die Oper sei schon beendet.

Machtgerangel hinter den Kulissen

Als die Nationalsozialisten 1933 an die Macht gelangten, begann die schwerste Zeit in Blechs Leben. Mit der Verabschiedung des Berufsbeamtengesetzes und der Gründung der « Reichskulturkammer » wurden Juden systematisch aus deutschen Opernhäusern vertrieben. Die Nazis erklärten sie zu politischen Gegnern des Reichs und verfügten Berufsverbote.

Ein Eintrag aus seinem Tagebuch zeigt, wie es zu dieser Zeit in Blech aussah :

« Es ist das Schrecklichste von allem, sich vorwerfen zu müssen, geliebte Kinder erzeugt zu haben. Heute hatte ich zum ersten Mal den Gedanken, daß es für meine Kinder und meine Frau eine Erleichterung wäre, wenn ich, der Jude, nicht mehr lebte. »

Anders als die meisten seiner Kollegen hatte Blech vorerst großes Glück : Hermann Göring, der als preußischer Ministerpräsident auch über das Schicksal der jüdischen Musiker an der Berliner Staatsoper bestimmte, ließ Blech zunächst im Amt. Göring wollte die Oper zu einem Betrieb von internationalem Rang formen und damit seinem Konkurrenten Josef Goebbels, NS-Propagandaminister und Chef der « Reichskulturkammer » , Paroli bieten. Dafür allerdings brauchte Göring überragende Musiker ; seine Judenfeindschaft stellte er dafür hintan. So ist der Fall Blech ein Beleg dafür, daß in der Kulturpolitik der Nazis im Ausnahmefall auch nach Zweckmäßigkeit entschieden wurde.

In den nächsten vier Jahren wurde es um Leo Blech jedoch einsam. Seine Auftritte wurden rar, die Kinder emigrierten in die USA und nach Schweden. 1937 schließlich entließen die Nationalsozialisten den berühmten Dirigenten. Offiziell berichteten deutsche Zeitungen zunächst von einem Krankenurlaub, dann vom Ruhestand des inzwischen 66-jährigen Künstlers. Wer die unzensurierte Presse im Ausland lesen kann, erfuhr dagegen vom Mächtigegeangel hinter den Berliner Kulissen : Im April 1937 war Göring in den Urlaub nach Neapel gefahren. Die Abwesenheit des prominenten Fürsprechers von Blech nutzen Mitarbeiter der « Reichskulturkammer » , um die Vertreibung des unliebsamen Dirigenten durchzusetzen. Der Intendant der Oper und einstige Unterstützer Blechs, Heinz Tietjen, « verständigt » sich auf Druck von oben mit dem Unerwünschten - Blech mußte gehen.

« Kann ich meinen Flügel mitnehmen ? »

Blech floh nach Riga. Auch hier feierte er Publikumserfolge, aber seit der Eroberung Lettlands 1941 waren die Nazis ihm wieder auf der Spur. Als er von den Deportationen in Ghettos erfährt, fragt er :

« Kann ich meinen Flügel mitnehmen ? »

Doch schnell begreift er das Ausmaß der Bedrohung und flieht mit seiner Frau - zurück in das Gebäude der Berliner

Staatsoper. Dort hilft Tietjen den Verzweifelten bei der Flucht nach Stockholm. Leo Blech, seine Frau und seine Kinder überleben die Jahre der Vernichtung.

Le « Deutsche Oper Berlin » de Josef Gœbbels

With the Nazi « Machtergreifung » in 1933, the « Berlin Städtische Oper » (Municipal Opera) was under control of the « Reich » Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda. Minister Josef Gœbbels had the name changed-back to « Deutsches Opernhaus », competing with the Prussian State Opera (« Berlin Staatsoper in Mitte ») controlled by his rival, the Prussian minister-president Hermann Göring. In 1935, the building was re-modeled by Paul Baumgarten and the seating reduced from 2,300 to 2,098 due to the construction of the « Führerloge ». Carl Ebert, the pre-World War II general-manager, chose to emigrate from Germany rather than endorse the Nazi view of music, and went on to co-found the Glyndebourne Opera Festival, in England. He was replaced by Max von Schillings, who acceded to enact works of « unalloyed German character ». Several artists, like the conductor Fritz Stiedry or the singer Alexander Kipnis followed Ebert into emigration. The Opera House was destroyed by a Royal Air Force air-raid on 23 November 1943. Performances continued at the « Admiralspalast in Mitte » until 1945. Ebert returned as general-manager after the War.

General Managers (« Intendanten ») during the Nazi period : Max von Schillings (1933) ; Wilhelm Rode (1934-1943) ; Hans Schmidt-Isserstedt (1943-1944) .

Music Directors (« Generalmusikdirektoren ») during the Nazi period : Artur Rother (1935-1943) ; Karl Dammer (1937-1943) .

...

Concerts at halls such as the Berlin Opera House became major Party events. Senior Nazi functionaries were all but required to attend and there was a very good chance that the music on offer was composed by Richard Wagner.

...

During the period of Nazi Germany, the Opera House was renamed « Deutsches Opernhaus » by Josef Gœbbels, the « Reich » Minister of Propaganda. This period saw the defection of the general-manager of the « Deutsches Opernhaus » and several artists who emigrated rather than endorse the Nazi view of « German only » music. The Opera House was destroyed during a British air-raid on 23 November 1943.

...

It seems that the Munich Opera House was pretty much left alone by the Nazis. Once Jewish staff and artists had been evicted early in 1933, the Theatre suffered less interference than most others. It was never obliged to fly a swastika flag on the roof, or to engage in other acts of propaganda.

But when the young Georg Solti was appointed music-director of the Bavarian Opera House in 1946, he reported that the Orchestra was :

« Full of Nazis, of the worst kind ! »

(Adolf Hitler did plan to replace the historic building of the Munich Opera House with a more grandiose model.)

...

In der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus ging 1934 das in Deutsches Opernhaus rückbenannte Charlottenburger Haus in den Besitz des Reiches über und unterstand damit dem Propagandaministerium von Josef Gœbbels. Als Ministerpräsident des Freistaats Preußen lenkte dagegen Hermann Göring die Staatsoper Unter den Linden, wobei die Häuser manchmal in Stellvertretung ihrer Dienstherrn rivalisierten. Unter der Leitung von Paul Baumgarten wurde 1935 ein Umbau auf 2.098 Sitzplätze durchgeführt und entgegen dem ursprünglichen Entwurf mit einem standesunabhängigen Zuschauerraum eine « Führerloge » geschaffen. Nach der Zerstörung des Hauses am 23. November 1943 fanden die Vorstellungen bis Herbst 1944 im Admiralspalast in Berlin-Mitte statt.

Während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus galt das Deutsche Opernhaus neben dem Bayreuther Festspielhaus als die Repräsentationsbühne des Nazi-Regimes schlechthin.

Schon im Frühjahr 1933 zum Geburtstag des Intendanten Max von Schillings, hieß es in den Opernheften :

« Wir könnten einpacken, wenn es nicht möglich sein sollte, an einer Stätte, wo es gelang, einem empfangsbereiten, beeinflussbaren bürgerlichen Publikum Erzeugnisse des artfremdesten Kunstbolschewismus schmackhaft zu machen, jetzt wieder Werte reinerer, deutscher Wesensart einzubürgern. »

In diesem Geiste waren schon der langjährige Intendant Carl Ebert, die Dirigenten Fritz Stiedry und Paul Breisach, und zum Beispiel der Sänger Alexander Kipnis vom Haus vertrieben worden. Nach dem Tod von Schillings im Juli 1933 wurde Wilhelm Rode, Heldenbariton des Hauses seit 1926, dessen Nachfolger. Man spielte « genehme Werke », also Richard Wagner, Albert Lortzing, Wilhelm Kienzl und so weiter. Zeitgenössische Komponisten wie Kurt Weill oder « artfremde » wie Jacques Offenbach und Giacomo Meyerbeer waren nicht mehr « gefragt » .

Inszenierungen waren schon an sich verdächtig - es gab Dramaturgie und Arrangements. Für die Ausstattung war vielfach Benno von Arent verantwortlich. Dabei ging es um Naturtreue bis ins kleinste Blatt aus Pappe. Hans Sachs sang unter Butzenscheiben und die Festwiese der Meistersinger kam direkt aus einem Film von Leni Riefenstahl. Siegfried ritt zu Pferd heran, auf seinem Schild die (S)S-Rune. Immerhin ging man mit einer Traviata 1935 auch auf dem Weg des Regietheaters zaghaft weiter.

Mitten im Zweiten Weltkrieg wurde der Intendant Rode im Sommer 1943 von dem erfolgreichen Hamburger Dirigenten

Hans Schmidt-Isserstedt abgelöst. Mit Günther Rennert und Leopold Ludwig holte er sich zwei junge Künstler in sein Leitungsteam, die schon auf den künstlerischen Aufbruch des Nachkriegstheaters verweisen. Ihre Arbeit fand in den zunehmenden Wirren und Zerstörungen des Krieges allerdings kaum noch Resonanz. Così fan tutte war im Herbst 1943 die erste Rennert-Regie - sie wurde als « leicht, witzig, phantasievoll » bewertet. Zwei Wochen später, am 23. November 1943, wurde das Haus zerbombt, kurz danach wurden alle Theater vom Regime geschlossen.

...

« Der Minister war ungehalten. Theaterfragen. Wir verlieren zu viel Kräfte an Staatsoper », notierte Josef Goebbels am 9. Juni 1936 in sein Tagebuch :

« Müßen uns mehr heranhalten ! »

Adolf Hitlers Propagandist erschien das Problem so gravierend, daß er sich persönlich einschaltete :

« Fräulein Deinert wieder für Deutsches Opernhaus zurückgewonnen. Rode muß mehr aufpassen. »

Womit Goebbels die seinerzeit gefeierte Tänzerin Ursula Deinert zum Wechsel zurück an das Deutsche Opernhaus in Charlottenburg bewegte, verraten seine fast täglichen Notizen nicht. Wohl aber muß er mit dem Einsatz von Wilhelm Rode, dem Generalintendanten der gemessen an der Zuschauerzahl größten deutschen Opernbühne, unzufrieden gewesen sein.

Ausgerechnet Goebbels mußte sich also bemühen, eine Künstlerin von der Staatsoper Unter den Linden zurück zu gewinnen für das Deutsche Opernhaus, die heutige Deutsche Oper. Dabei war er doch über die seinem Ministerium angegliederte Reichskulturkammer sowie die ihr unterstellten Kammern für Musiker, Schriftsteller, Journalisten und Schauspieler gewissermaßen oberster Vorgesetzter aller deutschen Kulturschaffenden.

Machtkampf um Adolf Hitlers Gunst

Doch so sehr er auch im Film- und Pressewesen weitgehend frei schalten konnte, mit etwas Rücksicht auf den Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler auch bei den bildenden Künsten mit Ausnahme der Architektur : Auf dem Gebiet des Musiktheaters, der Oper also, hatte Goebbels bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg einen zähen Widersacher. Jedenfalls in Berlin. Zur Festsitzung der Reichskulturkammer am 1. Mai 1938 hat Propagandaminister Josef Goebbels den « Führer und Reichskanzler » in das Deutsche Opernhaus eingeladen. Außerdem in der erst 1936 eingebauten Ehrenloge (von links) : Goebbels' Staatssekretär Karl Hanke, Reichswirtschaftsminister Walther Funk und NSDAP-Reichsorganisationsleiter Robert Ley

Denn die Staatsoper Unter den Linden, gegründet und groß geworden als Hofoper der Hohenzollern-Monarchie, unterstand nicht dem Propagandaministerium. Die Verantwortung für das traditionsreichste Berliner Musiktheater lag beim Land Preußen - und damit bei Hermann Göring. Der zweite Mann des Dritten Reiches, der 1933 bis 1945 neben

vielen anderen Funktionen auch als Preußischer Ministerpräsident amtierte, nutzte diese mehr zufällige Zuständigkeit weidlich aus, seinem wichtigsten Konkurrenten um die Gunst Hitlers immer wieder eins auszuwischen.

Göebbels hatte sich noch 1933 über den Durchgriff des Reiches auf kommunale Institutionen die direkte Einflußnahme auf die erst 1912 gegründete, vormals Städtische Oper gesichert. Das war besonders wichtig, denn Hitlers einziges nennenswertes kulturelles Interesse neben der Architektur war die Oper. Zu Richard Wagner Schwiegertochter Winifred soll er sogar einmal gesagt haben, wie sehr ihn eine Aufführung von Wagners Frühwerk « Rienzi » in Linz geprägt habe :

« In jener Stunde begann es. »

Da die Gunst des « Führers » auch für seine engsten Gefolgsleute extrem wichtig war, setzten sowohl Göring wie Göebbels darauf, Hitlers Vorstellung von gelungenem Musiktheater möglichst gut umzusetzen. In den Tagebüchern des Propagandaministers, eher einer Materialsammlung für aktuelle Propagandabotschaften und künftige Memoiren als ehrlich reflektierten Aufzeichnungen, finden sich zahlreiche Spuren dieser Konkurrenz.

Göebbels' Häme über die Staatsoper

Auffallend oft notierte er selbst zu in den gleichgeschalteten Zeitungen gefeierten Aufführungen in Görings Haus Unter den Linden hämische Anmerkungen. Über Abende in « seinem » Opernhaus an der Bismarckstraße dagegen findet man eher ausnahmsweise und meistens nur sanfte Selbstkritik.

Zu einem « Tristan » in der Staatsoper kurz vor Weihnachten 1933 etwa hielt Göebbels fest :

« Furtwängler ist ganz groß und gewaltig in der Ausdeutung dieser so sinnlichen Partitur. Die Sänger : Leider und Melchior schon ziemlich ausgesungen. »

Die Inszenierung habe « zu stumpfe Farben » und sei « noch typisch jüdisch » . Fast hämisch heißt es über Richard Strauß' « Intermezzo » am 21. Mai 1934 :

« Banal, trivial und geschmacklos. Ein schwerer Schlag daneben. Wir sind sehr enttäuscht. »

Immer wieder kritisierte Göebbels angeblich schlechte Bühnenbilder im Haus Unter den Linden und mangelhafte Organisation. Es gehe « drunter und drüber » , die « Eifersüchteleien der Staatsoper » machten « große Schwierigkeiten » . Am 23. Mai 1939 hielt er fest, die Sopranistin Käthe Heidersbach beklage sich, « daß sie so wenig zum Singen kommt » .

Sogar etwas Bedauern schwang offenbar mit, als Göebbels hinzusetzte :

« Das ist das System der Staatsoper. Daran kann ich auch nicht viel ändern. »

Ähnlich negative Bemerkungen zum Deutschen Opernhaus finden sich in den rund 30 Bänden der Goebbels-Tagebücher nur selten. Meistens überschlug sich der Propagandaminister mit seiner Begeisterung. Etwa am 15. September 1934 :

« Abends Deutsches Opernhaus. “ Tannhäuser ”. Guter Start. Glänzende Stimmen, wunderbare Dekorationen, ein gutgeleitetes Orchester. Ganz großes Publikum, fast alle Minister und Diplomaten, der Führer in der Mitte. Er ist ganz angetan von der Aufführung. »

Am 31. Januar 1935 lobte er sich selbst :

« Abends mit Führer Tristan Deutsches Opernhaus. Meine Regieanweisungen sind durchgeführt. Es ist eine wunderbare Aufführung. Szenisch und musikalisch. Führer begeistert. »

Über « La Traviata » heißt es :

« Glänzende Inszenierung. Farbenprächtig ! Und diese wunderbaren Stimmen, diese herrliche Musik. Ich bin davon ganz berauscht. Ich schwelge. »

NS-typische Vetternwirtschaft

Als aber die für das Dritte Reich typische Vetternwirtschaft die Qualität an der Bismarckstraße zu beeinträchtigen begann, schritt Goebbels ein :

« Krach im Deutschen Opernhaus. Die alten Parteigenossen, die nicht singen können, beschwerten sich bei Bouhler, weil sie keine Hauptrollen bekommen » , notierte er am 7. April 1938. Auf den Chef von Hitlers Privatkanzlei Philip Bouhler mußte der Propagandaminister keine Rücksicht nehmen, anders als bei Göring :

« Nun fahre ich aber dazwischen ! »

Immer noch interessierte sich Goebbels besonders für « seine » Oper, nahm wichtige Fragen selbst in die Hand - etwa Ende August 1938 :

« Gegen Rode im Deutschen Opernhaus werden schwere Vorwürfe erhoben. Aber das sind alles die alten Sachen. Ich werde sie nochmals nachprüfen lassen, dann aber Rode auch unter meinen Schutz stellen. Sonst kann er sein Haus nicht mehr leiten. »

Der Heldenbariton Wilhelm Rode, seit 1933 Mitglied der NSDAP, leitete das Haus noch weitere fünf Jahre.

Auch Göring nutzte seine Stellung aus, um persönliche Gunstbeweise zu erteilen, manchmal sogar gegen die Parteilinie. Die Biografen des Nazi-Multifunktionärs sind sich nicht einig darüber, ob es ihm lediglich darum ging, so seine

Machtfülle unter Beweis zu stellen - oder ob ihn manche Auswüchse des nationalsozialistischen Rassenwahns wenigstens zeitweise tatsächlich störten.

Jedenfalls erwirkte er für den Generalmusikdirektor der Staatsoper Leo Blech, nach Nazi- « Rassekriterien » ein « Volljude » und deshalb eigentlich laut dem « Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums » schon 1933 zu entlassen, eine Ausnahmegenehmigung. Erst 1937 wurde der Druck auf Blech zu stark, er emigrierte nach Riga, später nach Schweden. Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg kehrte er zurück nach Berlin, an die Deutsche Oper, die das Haus an der Bismarckstraße fortan hieß.

Der Ärger mit dem Generalintendanten

Ebenfalls unter Görings Schutz stand Heinz Tietjen, der Generalintendant der Staatsoper und aller preußischen Staatstheater. Obwohl Gœbbels offenkundig oft Schwierigkeiten mit dem Leiter auch der Bayreuther Festspiele hatte, konnte der Propagandaminister nichts gegen ihn unternehmen. Der Ärger darüber schlug sich im Tagebuch nieder. « Tietjen ist doch kein Dirigent, sondern nur ein Organisator und höchstens noch ein Schleicher » , notierte er etwa am 23. Oktober 1937, zehn Tage später sogar :

« Tietjen ist ein hinterlistiger Intrigant. »

Doch absetzen konnte Gœbbels ihn nicht - also fand er sich mit Görings Günstling ab.

Die Konkurrenz der beiden Berliner Opern nahm zu Beginn des Zweiten Weltkrieges ab : Sowohl Gœbbels wie Göring hatten nun anderes zu tun als ihre Konkurrenz auf dem Nebenschauplatz Musiktheater auszutragen. Zu Ende ging sie aber erst, als die Staatsoper als erstes kulturell bedeutendes Gebäude bei einem britischen Bombenangriff im April 1941 zerstört wurde. « Ich sehe mir den Schaden in der Staatsoper an. Sie ist verloren. Der ganze Innenraum restlos ausgebrannt. Da ist kaum noch etwas zu retten » , notierte er :

« Ich muntere die Leute von der Staatsoper etwas auf, obschon mir selbst angesichts dieser rauchenden Trümmer sehr schwer ums Herz ist. Wie viele schöne Stunden habe ich nicht schon in diesem Haus erlebt. Und jetzt diese Ruine. »

Vielleicht war das sogar eine ehrliche Empfindung - aber sicher kann man bei Josef Gœbbels nie sein. Als das Deutsche Opernhaus zweieinhalb Jahre später, während der « Luftschlacht um Berlin » Ende November 1943, ebenfalls zerstört wurde, war ihm das kaum mehr einen Satz in seinen nun diktierten Tagebüchern wert.

Les 2 maisons d'Opéra de Berlin (1933-1939)

Whatever the political struggles or administrative squabbles, both Opera Houses (the Berlin « Staatsoper » and the « Deutsche Oper ») continued without interruption to carry-out their primary function : the performance of Opera. To assess the role of the Houses as performing institutions, we must examine (1) political controls by the Reich bureaucracy ; (2) the repertory ; (3) the artists ; (4) propaganda.

The Nazi regime exercised its political controls through the « Theaterabteilung » of the « Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda ». Authority lay, above all, in the hands of Rainer Schlöber, the « Reichsdramaturg ». He had the power to decide whether given works could be performed or not, and he approved the repertoires for all German theatres. He did not have complete power over the State Opera because of Hermann Göring's special position ; nonetheless, Schlöber could forbid performances of certain works, and the State Opera complied with the requirement to submit performance schedules to him. He also participated in the detailed repertory planning of the « Deutsche Oper » under the supervision of Josef Gæbbels.

By contrast with the pseudo-legal nature of Schlöber's authority, arbitrary political interference was a constant factor. One of the conductors engaged by the « Deutsche Oper » in 1935 was Walter Lutze, a man trained in the provinces but without the qualifications for a position in Berlin. Lutze was the brother of Viktor Lutze, Chief of staff of the SA after the purge of 30 June 1934. Wilhelm Rode attempted without success to cancel his contract or have him transferred to another Opera House. It was only in 1944 that Hans Schmidt-Isserstedt, Rode's successor, finally managed to get rid of him. Similarly, Rode was unable to avoid the employment of Benno von Arent as stage-designer. In this case, von Arent's appointment as « Reichsbühnenbildner » came directly from Hitler. Rode compiled evidence of von Arent's late preparation of designs, arbitrariness, and other complaints, without results. The dominant characteristic of the repertoires of the 2 Houses under Nazi control was continuity with what had been played before 1933. What was lost, of course, was the stimulation and excitement of the innovations that had characterized the best work from the 1910's. Operas from those years had not often had the chance of entering the permanent repertory, and they had already begun to disappear with the impact of the depression. Still, they represented political targets for attacks on the decadence of the so-called « Systemzeit ». As a start, « undesirable works » by composers such as Kurt Weill, Arnold Schönberg and Alban Berg quickly disappeared as did, also, those of earlier composers including Giacomo Meyerbeer and Jacques Offenbach. In terms of number of performances, Offenbach was probably the loss most acutely felt by German audiences. Offenbach's gradual disappearance indicates that, in some cases, works by an undesirable composer might continue to be performed for 1 year after the Nazis took-over. Apart from cases such as these, Operatic performance practices represented a statement of continuity in the tradition which carried over from Republic to the Nazi dictatorship.

Above all, Schlöber and musical ideologists fostered the idea of a « Deutscher Spielplan ». In terms of musical ideology and also of the « Führer's » preferences, Richard Wagner provided a definitive statement in his works about what was desirable. Given this fact, it is instructive to trace the number of performances of his works on all German stages starting with 1932-1933, the season which commemorated the 50th anniversary of his death. For comparison, figures are provided for the other most-performed composers.

Years : 1932-1933 ; 1933-1934 ; 1934-1935 ; 1935-1936 ; 1936-1937 ; 1937-1938 ; 1938-1939 ; 1939-1940.

Richard Wagner : 1,837 ; 1,632 ; 1,641 ; 1,607 ; 1,409 ; 1,402 ; 1,327 ; 1,154.

Giuseppe Verdi : 1,265 ; 1,280 ; 1,468 ; 1,497 ; 1,351 ; 1,405 ; 1,309 ; 1,440.

Giacomo Puccini : 762 ; 817 ; 889 ; 1,082 ; 1,186 ; 919 ; 1,013 ; 971.

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart : 719 ; 1,096 ; 1,067 ; 916 ; 960 ; 632 ; 734 ; 643.

Albert Lortzing : 691 ; 531 ; 707 ; 851 ; 995 ; 951 ; 1,027 ; 1,140.

The statistics of both houses reflect and reinforce this national decline of attention to Wagner. Performance figures for the 2 are as follows :

1934-1935 ; 1936-1937 ; 1938-1939 ; 1939-1940.

« Staatsoper » : 64 ; 62 ; 52 ; 38.

« Deutsche Oper » : 50 ; 49 ; 42 ; 35.

Apart from Wagner, the 2 Opera Houses differed from each other in some minor particulars. Both emphasized the main-works from the late 19th Century, Verdi and Puccini above all ; they included Mozart, some works by Richard Strauß, and Georges Bizet's one standard work, « Carmen » . Beyond this, a few differences emerge. Much more than the State Opera, the « Deutsche Oper » emphasized the pre-Wagner, 19th Century German tradition of « Spieloper » , especially works by Heinrich Marschner and Albert Lortzing. The « Deutsche Oper » also produced several Operettas by Johann Strauß II, Franz Lehár, and Paul Lincke. For its part, the State Opera produced more Mozart and Richard Strauß. If one pole of musicological ideology emphasized the great Masterpieces of the past appropriately performed, the other stressed the production of new works reflecting the creative vitality of the repertory. Of the older generation of composers, Richard Strauß was the most widely-known ; he continued to compose new Operas, and they were performed, with the notable exception of « Die Schweigsame Frau » (The Silent Woman) ; whose librettist, Stefan Zweig, was Jewish. The State Opera presented all of his works except this one, which was only allowed a few performances in Dřeň in 1935.

As a result of the « scandal » caused by Strauß indiscretion in his letter to his librettist (letter intercepted by the « Gestapo » and sent to Adolf Hitler) , he was forced to resign from the presidency of the « Reichsmusikkammer » .

« Do you believe I am ever, in any of my actions, guided by the thought that I am “ German ” ? Do you suppose Mozart was consciously “ Aryan ” when he composed ? I recognize only 2 types of people : those who have talent and those who have none. »

(Letter from Richard Strauß to Stefan Zweig, dated 17 June 1935.)

With « Die Schweigsame Frau » , the State Opera might have been taking some slight risk. The « Deutsche Oper » also presented a few Strauß Operas, but they were from an earlier era (« Salome » , « Der Rosenkavalier » , and «

Ariadne auf Naxos ») . This smaller number was mainly due to the fact that the State Opera held exclusive performing rights to most works by Strauß. The other widely-known older composer was Hans Pfitzner. A musical and political conservative, Pfitzner was, nonetheless, not at ease with the Nazis. The State Opera presented his works in very limited numbers, but the « Deutsche Oper » played none of them up to 1939. The basis for this was apparently conductor Wilhelm Rode's personal distaste for Pfitzner.

The « Deutsche Oper » did perform some new works : the Operetta « Wenn die Zarin lächelt » by Clemens Schmalstich, and the Opera « Katarina » by Arthur Kusterer along with the 1st German performances of « Adriana Lecouvreur » by Francesco Cilea. But Rode managed to avoid works by Max von Schillings, his predecessor in office, with but one exception, « Der Moloch » , and that was a failure. Heinz Tietjen was much more adept politically ; he periodically included a few performances of a work by Pfitzner or von Schillings, with appropriate publicity, then, let them disappear again. He commissioned Paul von Klenau, a Danish composer living in Germany, to write a new work, « Rembrandt van Rijn » which was given 7 times during the 1936-1937 season, and once in each of the 2 following seasons before vanishing. More significantly, Tietjen brought the young Bavarian composer Werner Egk to the State Opera as a conductor, and commissioned a new work from him after the success of « Die Zaubergeige » . Egk then composed « Peer Gynt » , which aroused much controversy. Critics found it too reminiscent of the bad old Weimar days, with its syncopation and jazz elements. Hitler, however, found it acceptable, and the State Opera took it to the annual showcase for contemporary works in Düsseldorf.

« Peer Gynt » was, in all likelihood, as much a popular success as any other serious Opera composed during the Nazi period. Certainly, it left much to be desired in the minds of many orthodox musicologists. What is clear from the episode is that, during the years of peace, the regime was willing to tolerate some little leeway, although composers and performers were hard pressed to know just where the outer-limits of this freedom might lie. With the start of the War, the lines of demarcation became narrower. Solo performers, singers who survived the transition to Nazi rule and then continued their careers, found themselves operating under controls different from those they had known before. Time and again, leaders of the regime emphasized the pre-eminence of artistic ability.

« Art comes from ability not from aspiration. » (Josef Goebbels)

« Performance is and always remains decisive. » (Hermann Göring)

Although it must be in agreement with the political tendency of the Werner Egk and Paul von Klenau beliefs. Given the close connection between the « Reich » Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda and the « Deutsche Oper » , Rode had to accept singers under this programme. So far as existing records indicate, the State Opera was able to avoid it. Rode had difficulties with 2 sopranos : Margaret Sattler-Schreiber and Violetta Schadow. When he did not schedule them to sing in major roles, they complained to Goebbels, « Frau » Magda Goebbels, Deputy « Führer » Rudolf Heß, and Adolf Hitler, then, brought a law suit against him. Goebbels decided squarely in favour of musical ability over Party loyalty. The singers were dismissed.

The regime spoke with pride of the ensemble system, as opposed to the undesirable Weimar principle of the « Starkult

» . Retired singers including Erna Berger and Irma Beilke recall the system with pride as a source of dramatic and musical excellence, since it allowed roles and productions to be refined through repeated performances with the same casts. Yet, the greatest rewards (salary and recognition) continued to go to solo singers whom the regime and the public favoured. Max Lorenz at the State Opera received 60,000 « Reichsmarks » annually by the end of the 1930's, despite his « Sondergenehmigung » (Special Permission) - Hitler protected him. Helge Roswaenge, the Danish tenor, also at the « Deutsche Oper » , negotiated a 10 year contract at 100,000 « Reichsmarks » per year, tax-free, in 1938. This escalation of salaries continued during the War, until Goebbels finally managed to implement a policy imposing limits in 1943.

Whatever the material advantages for some performers, clearly there were many restrictions. Theatre managers all over Germany agreed in 1937 to refuse to allow singers to move from one Opera House to another without agreement of both the old and new managers. The purpose was to prevent them from bidding-up their prices. When asked about the musical restrictions under which they worked, one former singer replied that, even if one could not perform the works of some composers, great variety and richness still remained. The ravages of the War placed the entire period in a different perspective for performers, yet, some recall with some honesty that the regime had allowed them to make good careers ; there were positive incentives for singers.

For all its interest in a German-dominated « Spielplan » , the regime also wanted to demonstrate the international calibre of its cultural activity. « Kulturpolitik » grew in importance as foreign relations came to the centre of government activity from about 1935 on. During the period of rapprochement with Poland, the « Staatsoper » offered a major production of « Halka » by Stanisław Moniuszko (Stanisława Moniuszki) , a 19th Century work that epitomizes the traditions of Polish national Opera. The work had been play at Ist in Hamburg, and was certainly planned before the Nazi take-over. The regime even made constructive propaganda out of this production, and the Polish ambassador tended with other foreign guests. On the occasion of an official visit to Berlin by Admiral Miklós Horthy de Nagybánya, head of the Hungarian government, in August 1938, the « Staatsoper » mounted a festival production of Richard Wagner's « Lohengrin » in advance of the regular season. Costs were covered by Hitler's « Reich » Chancellery and the Foreign Ministry. The strongest link between Opera and diplomacy paralleled Germany's growing ties with Italy. During 1937, the entire La Scala company of Milan came to the « Deutsche Oper » « in the interest of the cultural exchange between German and Italy » ; while the Bavarian State Opera from Munich and conductor Clemens Krauß took their « Ring » Cycle production to La Scala. This linkage climaxed in March and April of 1941 when the « Staatsoper » went to Rome, followed by a visit of the « Teatro Reale » of Madrid to Berlin. The War years saw a heavy investment of funds by the « Reich » Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda in sending musicians along behind the « Wehrmacht » to demonstrate the cultural greatness of the 3rd « Reich » to allied and conquered peoples alike. For domestic reasons as well as international ones, Opera served propaganda purposes. These covered a wide-range of events ; a few singers might be on hand for Arias or Lieder ; an Orchestra might perform an Overture (often from « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg ») , or a movement from a Symphony by Beethoven or Anton Bruckner. Here, the function was to establish an appropriate atmosphere for a meeting of the « Reichskulturkammer » , for example, or on « Heldengedenktag » (Heroes' Memorial Day) . For the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin, both Opera Houses presented special performances during their usual summer holiday periods. This list can be readily extended to include a visit to the « Staatsoper » by Adolf Hitler and his immediate entourage on the evening of 21 March 1933,

after the ritual events of Potsdam during the day, or the wedding celebration of « Reich » Marshal Hermann Göring and Emmy Sonnemann at the State Opera, on 10 April 1935.

Given the importance of propaganda to the regime and the excellent uses of it which Josef Goebbels and his staff devised, one is tempted to conclude that Opera, like film or radio, represented no more than another of his tools. But such a conclusion would be an over-simplification, even if one concedes all the uses to which Opera was put. Certainly, it did serve propaganda goals ; that much is clear. It is also true, as Joseph Wulf says in his « Musik im Dritten Reich » , that the basis had earlier been laid, that music was easily adapted to Nazi purposes. The State had all the advantages in this confrontation between art and politics, since it held full-control of political power.

At least during peace time, the regime was willing to tolerate some slight degree of artistic deviation from strict principles of musical purity - the cases of von Klenau and Egk bear this out. It is also possible that the cultural watch-dogs did not always fully-comprehend the subversions which a composer or performer might introduce with great subtlety. A certain degree of « Narrenfreiheit » could be allowed to performers, since their authority and influence stopped at the footlights. And the regime was generous economically with performers, including even a few Jewish ones. Good opportunities for careers were available, if performers were willing to accept some limitations on their free-doing, many were willing. With time, such tactics might have won loyalty to the regime from composers and performers, as well as from audiences. Differences between the situations of the 2 Berlin Opera Houses illustrate the fact that a degree of leeway did exist (« leeway » seems a better choice than « freedom ») . The long-standing rivalry between Goebbels and Göring undoubtedly made this situation possible. The « Staatsoper » had some slight measure of security from the « Reich » Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda controls because of Göring's jealous shepherding of « his » State Theaters. For the « Deutsche Oper » , the benefit from this rivalry was financial in part : higher-salaries and more jobs. Heinz Tietjen had the luxury of financial support from the Prussian bureaucracy, rather than having to answer to « Reich » officials. On balance, it seems that Tietjen may also have taken a few more risks with his « Spielplan » than did Rode ; but he was also more politic in catering to official tastes than Rode. There remains the question of whether political power was adequate to the task of controlling cultural expression to the extent which the regime desired. It was only with the outbreak of the War that the State's assumptions about control of the arts were shown to be only partly accurate. However high the salaries, they had won during peace time, performers demanded even more with War, an indicator that the Nazis had not won their loyalty, even if it had their compliance. Although no useful studies of audience motivations from this time exist, the State itself began to suspect that the public wanted to derive subversive, anti-government messages from, for example, Verdi's « Simon Boccanegra » . Finally, Goebbels himself singled-out « Fidelio » by Beethoven as objectionable on the grounds that it was not a « Volksoper » , thereby, contradicting endless Nazi musicological teaching. Such evidence, admittedly coming from a very dark period for the Nazi leaders, demonstrates that their campaign for control of the internal components of cultural life had had only a limited success, however great the degree of external compliance had been. It does not suggest that performers and audiences had held their ultimate loyalties in reserve during the entire Nazi period. So far as the period 1933-1939 is concerned, Nazism seemed, in fact, to have proved that the arts, and specifically the Opera scene, can be turned to whatever purposes the State desires.

Plus encore que le théâtre ou le cinéma, c'est l'Opéra qui fut considéré par le 3^e « Reich » comme le meilleur vecteur pour exalter les « valeurs allemandes ». Aussi, le National-Socialisme, qui se mit lui-même en scène comme un Opéra, fit de cet art la base de sa politique culturelle. On peut se demander pourquoi tant d'artistes ont collaboré pendant plus de 10 ans avec un régime totalitaire. Si certains ont subi la fascination perverse du Nazisme, la majorité était sans travail suite à la crise de 1929 et Adolf Hitler leur commanda des œuvres. Il faut également prendre en compte l'habileté de Josef Goebbels, ministre de la Propagande et de l'Information, à cacher derrière l'exaltation esthétique de compositeurs comme Richard Wagner les objectifs politiques criminels du Nazisme : il s'agissait d'appeler aux pulsions pour empêcher l'intervention de la raison.

Le documentaire « Opéra et 3^e « Reich » » se propose de retracer l'histoire des rapports entre l'Opéra et le régime nazi, de 1933 à 1944, d'après des images d'archives, des documents de propagande et des films culturels ou de fiction, entrecoupés d'interventions de philosophes contemporains qui analysent ces images et brisent le discours nazi.

...

Le 12 mars 1945, un incendie ravage le bâtiment de l'Opéra de Vienne lors d'un bombardement américain ; la salle et la scène sont détruites, mais la façade, murée par précaution, reste intacte. Les représentations reprurent dès le 1^{er} mai au « Theater an der Wien », alors inoccupé depuis longtemps.

...

It has long been common place for historians and biographers to invoke the notion of « Götterdämmerung » (Twilight of the Gods) when writing about the final days of Adolf Hitler and his monstrous 3rd « Reich ». This trope is used, in both English and German, by leading authors such as Joachim Fest, William L. Shirer, Ian Kershaw, Anthony Read, and David Clay Large. Without exception, however, the idea of « Götterdämmerung » has been used uncritically, rhetorically - almost as jargon, in Theodor W. Adorno's sense. It was even used this way by Adorno himself, who once referred to « Götterdämmerung » as an « inflamed prophecy of the nation's own doom ». In what follows, I propose to measure the implications of this historiographical trope against the reality of the Nazis' appropriation of Wagner and his music.

Perhaps, somewhat surprisingly, the analogy was drawn by the Nazis themselves as the 1,000 Year « Reich » crumbled around them. In February 1945, Martin Bormann received a letter from his wife that stated :

« One day, the “ Reich ” of our dreams will emerge. In some ways, you know, this reminds me of the “ Götterdämmerung ” in the Edda. The monsters are storming the bridge of the Gods ; the citadel of the Gods crumbles, and all seems lost ; and then, suddenly, a new citadel arises, more beautiful than ever before. We are not the 1st to engage in mortal combat with the powers of the underworld, and that we feel impelled, and are also able, to do so should give us a conviction of ultimate victory. »

In a similar vein, an entry in the diary of Fritz Kempfler, the Nazi mayor of Bayreuth, from mid-April 1945 referred to

⋮

« This hour of “ Götterdämmerung ”. »

The trope was also employed by the Allies. A search for the terms Hitler and « Götterdämmerung » in the archives of « The New York Times » finds the 2 linked 11 times between November 1943 and May 1945, including a 1944 story in « The New York Times » Magazine entitled : « “ Götterdämmerung ” by Hitler », which purported to find a « pathological “ Götterdämmerung ” » streak in the Nazis. Following the Allied victory, a front-page article in the « Week in Review » section of « The Sunday Times » began as follows :

« Germany, last week, went down to defeat in the death and flame, the swirling violence, of a Wagnerian Finale. Adolf Hitler had his “ Götterdämmerung ”. »

And the connection continues today, albeit in a somewhat ironic sense, as in the title of Martin Geck's review of Pamela Potter's book on musicology under the Nazis :

« “ Così fan tutte ” or “ Götterdämmerung ” ? The National-Socialist Past of German Musicology »

The word « Götterdämmerung » is a German translation of the same term, « Ragnarok », which appears in the 13th Century Icelandic Prose Edda - one of Richard Wagner's sources for the « Ring ». His « Götterdämmerung » is quite different from the one that appears in the Edda, however. In the myth, once the « Valkyries » have borne enough slain warriors to « Walhalla » and the « Norns » have finished weaving their threads of fate, « Walhalla » is besieged by giants and monsters, led by « Loki ». The fiery fallout of the siege of « Walhalla » ignites the earth (which had been suffering from a monstrous winter) and destroys all living creatures on earth, as « Walhalla » itself, the Gods, and the Giants are consumed by fire. According to the myth, however, a few escape with « Baldur » to the roots of « Yggdrasil », the « World-Ash Tree », and are spared destruction ; they emerge, ultimately, beyond the myth's narrative parameters, to establish a new « world of harmony between man and nature, a world without walls or nations ; a world without Gods » .

Germanic and Norse myths were immensely popular in German-speaking lands in the latter half of the 19th Century, particularly among « völkisch » ideologues like those drawn to the « Bayreuth Circle » around Cosima Wagner and Hans von Wolzogen - not to mention Richard Wagner himself and his choice of subject matter. Articles on the myths themselves, as well as their connection with Wagner's works, appeared frequently in the « Bayreuther Blätter » and the official Festival program, the « Bayreuther Festspielführer » .

...

Towards the end of World War II, on 12 March 1945, the Vienna Opera House was set alight by an American bombardment. The front-section, which had been walled-off as a precaution, remained intact including the foyer, with frescoes by Moritz von Schwind, the main-stairways, the vestibule and the tea-room. The auditorium and stage were,

however, destroyed by flames as well as almost the entire « décor » and props for more than 120 Operas with around 150,000 costumes. The State Opera was temporarily housed at the « Theater an der Wien » and at the Vienna « Volksoper » .

...

The years 1938 to 1945 were a dark chapter in the history of the Vienna Opera House. Under the Nazis, many members of the House were driven-out, pursued, and killed, and many works were not allowed to be played.

On 12 March 1945, the Opera House was devastated during a bombing, but, on 1 May 1945, the « State Opera in the Volksoper » opened with a performance of Mozart's « Le Nozze di Figaro » . On 6 October 1945, the hastily restored « Theaters an der Wien » re-opened with Beethoven's « Fidelio » . For the next 10 years, the Vienna State Opera operated in 2 venues while the true headquarters was being rebuilt at a great expense.

Opera and Fascism

Introduction

Ascribing a specific political significance to such a composite art-form or music-theatre can pose particular problems for the cultural historian. Whilst examination of the composer's choice of subject matter and libretto may reveal a more or less clearly stated political objective, analysis of the musical setting can produce a more ambiguous interpretation of such intentions. This may simply be a question of differing æsthetic positions occupied by drama and music - words and action appearing to present a more concrete reflection of political reality than the seeming abstractions of musical language. Yet, to make a distinction between the political functions of drama and music may also seem artificial. Certainly, when libretto and text are so well-integrated, as in Mozart's « Le Nozze di Figaro » , Beethoven's « Fidelio » , or Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » , the broad political message of each Opera appears to be unequivocal and was perfectly understood by 1st night audiences.

Whether such clear political messages can be discerned in the Operas composed during the era of Fascism in Germany or Italy is more debatable. For ideologues and critics, the stylistic pluralism of music of the 1920's and 1930's proved intractable. At issue was the degree to which composers should repudiate modernism, and whether such a move necessitated a return to an older tradition of Romanticism. Few theorists offered a cogently argued solution to this problem, preferring instead to talk in the broadest terms of what was commonly termed « a reclamation of national musical values » . How this was effected depended, of course, on the specific characteristics of each country's national traditions, and, in this instance, there were contrasting modes of development in Germany and Italy.

If the musical idioms employed by the most significant Operatic composers working in Germany and Italy expressed a variety of æsthetic stand-points, thus, compounding the difficulties of equating political ideology with artistic intent, a more useful line of enquiry may be to determine any general features which were common to the repertoire of this period. Of paramount importance is the extent to which Operas of the Fascist era represented a reaction against the

immediate past, and whether performing traditions, reception and taste altered as a result of political influence.

Operatic Developments in Nazi Germany

Operatic developments in Nazi Germany

Between 1933 and 1944, over a 170 new Operas by German-speaking composers were premiered in the 3rd « Reich » , an impressive statistic which belies the notion that the period was bereft of creative energies in this area. To a certain extent, the composition of new Operas was encouraged. Under the auspices of the « Reichsdramaturg » , Rainer Schlöber, the Nazi regime evolved a co-ordinated plan in which the major Opera Houses were encouraged to commission and perform at least 1 novelty per season. At a local level, numerous State prizes were awarded to composers of Operas. Another important forum for performance of new Opera was the music festival circuit which enjoyed an increasingly hallowed status in German musical life during this period.

Yet, for all this degree of activity, Opera was never deemed the ideal medium for overt political propaganda. No Opera was staged in which characters wearing Nazi uniforms appeared on stage. Neither did Operatic composers attempt to weave well-known political songs into the musical fabric. One possible explanation for the avoidance of such overtly political elements lies in a belief that Opera represented a higher and more pure art-form than drama and the spoken theatre, and, as such, its subject and musical matter should be divorced from contemporary realities. This argument was expounded by the Dresden critic Eugen Schmitz in 1939. Writing in the « Zeitschrift für Musik » , Schmitz claimed that whilst a spoken drama based upon the life of Horst Wessel might have gained public acceptance, an Operatic setting of the same theme, depicting the protagonist as a heroic tenor in conflict against baritone Communist agitators, would easily degenerate into the kind of nationalist « kitsch » that was denounced by the regime.

In surveying the subject matter favoured by Operatic composers during the 3rd « Reich » , the general avoidance of contemporary themes is striking. Without doubt, this represents a conscious reaction against artistic trends that evolved during the Weimar Republic. Amongst the most significant features of that period were the promotion of experimental music-theatre which flourished in State-subsidized theatres, and the growth in popularity of the « Zeitoper » (topical Opera) which reached wide audiences through the enormous success of Ernst Křenek's « Jonny spielt auf ! » . Yet, during the 3rd « Reich » , composers not only avoided experimental music-theatre and the « Zeitoper » , but also largely refrained from setting contemporary dramas or collaborating with the playwrights that were most favoured by the regime. Censorship of chosen texts never became an important issue. Not once did the « Reichsdramaturg » withhold approval of an Opera that had already been accepted for performance by a provincial Opera House. Only changes in political circumstance, particularly during the Second World War, caused Opera Houses to withdraw certain established works after their subjects were deemed inappropriate by the Ministry of Propaganda.

Given the repressive cultural environment, it is hardly surprising that Operatic texts during the 3rd « Reich » manifested the conservative cultural attitudes of the regime. Having rejected experimentation and topicality, composers turned instead to safer themes - myths drawn from either Classical antiquity or Nordic legend, settings of the

established Classics of German literature (Goethe, Heinrich von Kleist, E.T.A. Hoffmann and Friedrich Schiller) , dramas that chronicle glorious episodes of German history, portrayals of simple village life and, perhaps, most frequently of all, the fairy-tale. Within these areas, it was possible to glean messages of ideological relevance the heroism and strength of the Classical warrior, the self-sacrifice for a higher-ideal, intimations of racial superiority, and a strong identification with the upright values of a peasant community. It is significant, however, that the Operas that gained the most public esteem eschewed even such vague political issues, and simply offered escapist entertainment to their audiences.

The emphasis on escapism, or on depicting episodes from the very distant past, is indicative of a broader artistic development that of the resurgence of the « volksoper » , a genre much cultivated during the 19th Century, whose subject matter encompassed both light-hearted comedy and Romantic legend. During the 1st years of the Nazi regime, the « volksoper » revival was strongly demanded by the Nazi musical press as an antidote to what was termed the « negativism » and « cultural bolshevism » of the Operas of Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith and Ernst Křenek. In order to educate younger composers to appreciate the values of the « volksoper » , significant changes to the repertoire were proposed for the 1933-1934 season, including the resurrection of a number of Operas by minor Romantic composers that had fallen into oblivion over the past 20 years. Few of these works, however, survived more than a few performances, and later attempts to salvage minor Operas by Albert Lortzing, Heinrich Marschner and Otto Nicolai proved rather unsuccessful.

During the early years of the regime, the most prominent exponents of the « volksoper » were composers of an older generation, such as Paul Graener (1872-1944) , Max von Schillings (1868-1933) , and Georg Vollerthun (1876-1945) . Largely neglected throughout the Weimar Republic, they joined the ranks of Alfred Rosenberg's « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » and exerted considerable influence in 1933 in persuading Opera Houses to stage their neo-Wagnerian works. Yet, their success was short-lived. Audience reception and critical opinion remained lukewarm, with some even arguing that their creative outlooks were too redolent of a « petit-bourgeois » past.

The real turning-point for this group of composers came in March 1935 after the 1st performance of Graener's « Der Prinz van Hamburg » at the « Berlin Staatsoper » . Although Graener had striven to create a work of « national artistic significance » , the Opera failed to make a strong impression and survived for only 2 seasons. In the same year, however, 2 Operas by younger composers, « Der Günstling » by Rudolf Wagner-Régeny (Dresden) and « Die Zaubergeige » by Werner Egk (Frankfurt) , achieved real success and were hailed in some quarters as the 1st genuinely National-Socialist music-theatre works. Both Wagner-Régeny and Egk had spent their formative years under the cosmopolitan influence of the 1920's. Yet, they had modified their musical idioms sufficiently to make them palatable to the more traditionalist cultural climate after 1933. Besides, such a compromise between modernism and accessibility accorded perfectly with Goebbels' much-quoted demand that National-Socialist art should manifest « a Romanticism of steel » .

In the case of Rudolf Wagner-Régeny, the authorities' enthusiastic acceptance of « Der Günstling » seems paradoxical. The libretto, based on Victor Hugo's play, « Marie Tudor » , was written by Casper Neher, who had a name for himself as Bertolt Brecht's favourite designer and had 3 years earlier collaborated with Kurt Weill on « Die Bürgschaft » . Not surprisingly, such an association aroused considerable suspicion as to the political sympathies of both the composer

and librettist. Yet, despite post-War attempts to view the scenario as presenting some kind of resistance to totalitarianism, in reality, the setting offers little opportunity either for irony or for oblique political criticism. More significantly, Wagner-Régeny's music, whilst rejecting the extravagant gestures of late-Romanticism, is couched in a deliberately simple neo-Baroque language modelled on Gluck and Händel.

Egk's Opera, « Die Zaubergeige » , whose libretto is drawn from Franz Graf von Pocci's 19th Century fairy-drama in which love and honesty triumph over the desire for material wealth, also presents a successful balance between traditionalism and modernism. With its judicious mixture of Romantic and comic elements, it appears to be typically escapist « volksoper » , although anti-Semitic overtones are all too apparent in the unsympathetic portrayal of the shady merchant Guldensack. In keeping with the seemingly un-problematic nature of the story, Egk's music manifests a deliberate naivety. The most pervasive elements are a strong adherence to tonality, symmetrical melodies and a frequent recourse to Bavarian folk-dances. This simplicity is however punctuated by insistent ostinati with a percussive edge and spiced with the occasional harsh dissonance, all of which give the music a veneer of modernity.

The degree to which composers were able to employ surface features of musical modernism, without encountering official disapproval, reflects the regime's uncertainty with regard to musical aesthetics. When the Danish-born composer Paul von Klenau (1883-1946) employed Arnold Schönberg's 12 tone technique in his Opera « Michæl Koblbaas » (Stuttgart, 1933) , critics eagerly condemned the composer for utilizing a culturally degenerate method of composition. Yet, Klenau denied any allegiance to Schönberg, arguing that his utilization of 12 tone procedures was entirely original and claiming that his technique reflected National-Socialist order and discipline. Such a defence of his compositional style, coupled with the evident acceptability of Keist's drama, ensured that Michæl Kohlhaas never fell victim to censorship. Later, the Schönberg pupil Winifried Zillig (1905-1963) managed to camouflage his utilization of the same technique in his 1 Act Opera, « Das Opfer » (Hamburg, 1937) , based on Reinhard Göring's novel about Captain Scott's expedition to the Antarctic. Here again, it was not so much the musical language that proved acceptable as the text which emphasizes the heroic ideals of a man who is prepared to die for a higher-cause.

Ambiguity in Intention and Reception

From examining the pragmatic reception accorded to the works of Klenau and Zillig, one might assume that composers of Opera were allowed greater freedom of expression than playwrights and stage-directors. Yet, this was not always the case. In fact, some of the most significant challenges to Nazi cultural authority occurred in the Opera House. In 1934, the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler failed to secure Hermann Göring's approval for the planned 1st performance of Paul Hindemith's « Mathis der Maler » at the « Berlin Staatsoper » . Furtwängler's overt support for the composer and condemnation of artistic interference in matters of repertoire, expressed in an article published in the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , set him on a collision course with the regime. It was a conflict that Furtwängler was unable to win, and he was subsequently forced to resign his official positions in German musical life. 1 year later, Richard Strauß endured the same fate, relinquishing his post as President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » on account of collaboration with the Jewish writer Stefan Zweig on the Opera « Die schweigsame Frau » (Dresden, 1935) . The work was heard only 4 times before the authorities banned further performances.

Both Strauß and Furtwängler were far too influential as musical figures to be consigned to oblivion. To a certain extent, the regime needed their co-operation in order to maintain cultural credibility. Yet, it is still a matter of conjecture as to how far these artists actually appeased their political Masters. Strauß's next Opera, « Friedenstag » (Munich, 1938) , to a libretto by the Viennese theatre historian Joseph Gregor, is a case in point. The scenario is drawn from an episode that took place towards the end of the Thirty Years War, a departure from Strauß's normal areas of exploration, which, at this time, tended to encompass escapist comedy and Classical mythology. Initially, the Opera met with great success, securing approval from Adolf Hitler who attended a performance in Vienna. Critics of the period drew attention to the ideologically acceptable elements of the plot - the portrayals of the heroic Commandant, who refuses to surrender when his barracks are under siege, and his submissive wife. Yet, the Opera's pacifist conclusion (a choral hymn rejoicing in the laying down of arms) seemed at odds with the regime's belligerent foreign policy, suggesting that the work's ultimate message was somewhat ambiguous.

A similar equivocality may be gleaned from Werner Egk's « Peer Gynt » (Berlin, 1938) . The Opera, a free adaptation of Henrik Ibsen's drama, was commissioned by the « Berlin Staatsoper » , where the young composer had secured a position as « Kapellmeister » . It marked a departure from the light-heartedness of « Die Zauberflöte » , being conceived on a far more ambitious scale. 2 elements of the score disturbed critics at the premiere : 1st, Egk's tendency to lavish attention upon the grotesque elements of the drama at the expense of its Romantic and humanistic aspects ; 2nd, the recourse to a harsher musical style, reminiscent in places of Kurt Weill and other modernists. Egk attempted to justify his use of modernist elements in the scenes depicting the Trolls, on the grounds that the dissonance of such episodes was offset elsewhere by the use of unequivocally tonal passages that were representative of positive forces.

Further examination of the Troll Scene in Act I of « Peer Gynt » suggests however that Egk's claim of a clear division between good (in musical terms, tonal) and evil (atonal) was somewhat misleading. When, in the score, Egk described the Trolls as the « lowest form of humanity » and a « bunch of sadists and gangsters » , he appeared to be making a more oblique reference to Nazi Storm-Troopers (SA) , a point that was emphasized in the original Berlin staging. Moreover, the connection was reinforced through the parodying nature of the musical language, which, at one moment, recalls Weill, then lampoons a ritualistic Nazi hymn, and finally offers a grotesque distortion of the can-can from Jacques Offenbach's « Orphée aux Enfers » , an Operetta banned by the Nazis because of the racial origins of its composer. Egk's free-adaptation of Ibsen's drama abounds in passages of Brechtian irony such as the following lines sung at the outset of the Harbour Scene (Act 2, scene 1) :

So ist's im Leben, dern Schwachen nicht,
Dem Starken Wind's gegeben !
Und wer nicht selber tritt,
Der wird getreten,
Da hilft kein jammern,
Winseln, Bitten, Beten !

...

What we doubt no longer :
the weak will die
the strong be even stronger.
It's dog eat dog
Eat or be eaten !
Unless you beat your foe
You will be beaten.

Again, one can only speculate as to how far contemporary audiences perceived the subversive undercurrent in such passages. In any case, any initial misgivings about Egk's composition were silenced after Hitler attended a performance of the Opera and personally congratulated its author. As a result, « Peer Gynt » was nominated for performance at the 1939 « Reichsmusiktag » held in Düsseldorf, although the Opera was dropped from the repertory of many theatres after the outbreak of War.

The year 1940 marked something of a watershed in terms of German Operatic development. On the one hand, the Ministry of Propaganda appeared to exercise even greater control over the kind of Opera that was to be performed. The banning of works by composers from enemy countries was rigidly enforced, as was the requirement to alter libretti in the light of changing political circumstances. Yet, at the same time, the notion of Opera as entertainment that should divert the public from the realities of War was being actively promoted. This may well explain why relatively few contemporary Operas exploited avowedly patriotic themes. Instead, composers turned with increasing frequency to fairy-tale, romance and comedy. For instance, one of the most popular escapist Operas of the period was Heinrich Sutermeister's « Romeo und India » (Dresden, 1940) , a work which attempted to reclaim a Bel-Canto style reminiscent of 19th Century Italian Opera. Another typical example was Richard Strauß's « Capriccio » , 1st performed in Munich, in October 1942, with financial support from the Ministry of Propaganda. Set in 18th Century Paris, its initial scenario amounts to nothing more than a witty, though masterful, « divertissement » on the nature of Opera.

This vein of « apolitical » comedy had already been exploited with great success by Carl Orff in his Opera « Der Mond » (Munich, 1939) , based on a fairy-tale by the brothers Grimm. Orff's musical style, which reached maturity during the 1930's, offered a striking alternative to the more conventional Romanticism of many of his contemporaries. As some of its roots lay outside German music, like in the work of Claude Debussy and the neo-primitive Igor Stravinsky (in particular, the ballet « Les Noces ») , Nazi critics were initially suspicious of the composer's national credentials. At issue was Orff's fondness for percussive ostinati and his desire to strip his musical material to the barest essentials. Yet, with the gradual acceptance of his most popular work, « Carmina Burana » , 1st staged at the Frankfurt Opera House in 1937, but subsequently better-known in the concert-hall, such objections evaporated. Besides, « Carmina Burana » revealed another more palatable aspect of Orff's style (a strong absorption of Bavarian folk-music) and it was this element that profoundly influenced the idiom of « Der Mond » .

Orff returned to Grimm for his Opera « Die Kluge » (Frankfurt, 1943) . With its judicious mixture of closed forms and spoken dialogue, the work represents a further example of Orff's musical primitivism, although the instrumentation is

much harsher here than in « Der Mond » . A number of post-War commentators have intimated that Orff was making a veiled attack against Fascism in the un-sympathetic portrayal of the despotic King. Yet, such an intention appears to be purely speculative, for despite the fact that « Die Kluge » aroused a more mixed-reception than « Der Mond » , the Opera was staged at 21 theatres until 1944.

Continuity or Change - the Historical Context

Analyzing the nature of contemporary Opera in a totalitarian society provides an obvious starting-point for the definition of a Fascist cultural aesthetic in the musical field. However, other considerations must also be discussed. One area which has already been mentioned is the question of performing traditions, and whether these changed as a result of political pressure. When the Nazis came to power, they were determined to sweep aside what they considered to be the cultural excesses of the Weimar Republic. To this end, they instigated a purge of German Opera Houses which resulted in the dismissal and emigration of numerous composers, conductors, directors, stage-designers, singers and orchestral musicians. However, whilst much attention has been drawn to the effects of this exodus, it must be emphasized that the vast majority of remaining artists stayed in Germany, and that high-standards of performance were maintained and even enhanced in the metropolitan Opera Houses. The most significant changes occurred in the composition of the repertoire which was subject to censorship by the Nazi authorities. It was no longer possible to perform works either by Jewish or « degenerate » composers, and, during the War, the staging of non-German works was subject to political expediency.

Yet, it would be misleading to suggest that the exercise of a tighter control by Rainer Schlöber's office, the « Reichsdramaturgie » , necessarily resulted in a monolithic approach throughout Germany. Despite severe curbs on individual artistic freedom, many theatres retained some of the musical traditions that were characteristic of the 1920's. Thus, whilst the Frankfurt Opera House no longer preserved its earlier reputation of promoting the « avant-garde » , it still proved to be one of the more adventurous of German theatres, both in the number of new Operas that were staged, and in the employment of such controversial figures as Walter Felsenstein and Caspar Neher. In Berlin, there were clear differences of approach and outlook with regard to the 2 major Opera Houses, since political control of the « Berlin Staatsoper » rested with Hermann Göring, whilst that of the « Deutsche Oper » (formerly, the « Städtische Oper ») was under the supervision of Josef Gœbbels. As a consequence, the artistic policy of the « Berlin Staatsoper » remained somewhat insulated from the structures of the Ministry of Propaganda and appeared to be more cosmopolitan.

It is difficult to estimate the degree to which the actual performances and staging of Operas were influenced by the unique political climate. In terms of singing and playing techniques, nothing really changed, since the craft of vocal and instrumental production was dependent upon solid training which had been readily available at Germany's Music Academies for many years. In any case, the major singers of the era, who included such figures as Maria Cebotari, Helge Rosvaenge, Peter Anders and Viorica Ursuleac, commanded reputations that transcended national considerations through commercial recordings and broadcasts. A more open-ended question is the nature of stage-productions and the re-interpretation of the Classical repertoire. Without doubt, producers and designers who were active during the Weimar Republic had to modify their approach. Thus the abstract and experimental interpretations of Richard Wagner, as

manifested in the controversial Jürgen Fehling productions of « Der fliegende Holländer » (« Kroll-Oper » , 1929) and « Tannhäuser » (« Berlin Staatsoper » , 1933) were supplanted by stagings that were more overtly naturalistic and conformed to the conservative production style that had been preserved in Bayreuth. Similar tendencies can be perceived in productions of other standard 19th Century Operas, where conventionally Romantic elements were generally emphasized. Probably the most overtly politicized Operatic production of the era was Benno von Arent's « Die Meistersinger » , presented in Berlin during the late-1930's.

Whilst contemporary propaganda emphasized the historical significance of Richard Wagner for National-Socialism, it is interesting to note that the number of performances of the composer's music-dramas actually declined between 1933 and 1945. How far such a statistic was a genuine reflection of public taste is open to conjecture, since economic factors certainly precluded the regular presentation of Wagner at smaller Opera Houses. Perhaps more significant is the rapid increase in popularity of the works of Albert Lortzing (1801-1851) , whose light-hearted Romantic Operas both managed to fill a void left by the expurgation of the Operettas of Jacques Offenbach, and to satisfy the regime's ideological allegiance to the « volksoper » . However, apart from the Lortzing revival, German Opera audiences maintained a strong preference for the same handful of works, irrespective of the changed political climate.

...

The 3rd « Reich's » omnipresent system of artistic censorship has remained strangely elusive to the historian. Far from the stereotype of the coldly efficient, centralized, totalitarian model of control, it was a fluid and amorphous agglomeration of official proscriptions, un-official pressures, and self-imposed constraints. Improvised amid the early power struggles of the Nazi era rather than erected from a Master plan, its structures were asymmetrical, ambiguous, and often contradictory.

Few areas of artistic activity better illustrate the assertion that cultural policy in the 3rd « Reich » was beset with ambiguities and contradictions than the development of Opera between 1933 and 1945. Of particular concern to cultural ideologues, musicologists and critics was the establishment of an Operatic repertoire that fully-mirrored the political characteristics of the Nazi era. Although this issue occasioned much debate in various music journals, it was never fully-resolved and the notion of a so-called « Opera crisis » persisted throughout the period. In many respects, musicologists of the time had little idea as to what constituted the ideal Nazi Opera, and much of their writing on this subject clutches at vague definitions. All too often, one senses that critics were somewhat helpless, placing their trust upon the rather unpredictable reception of audiences in determining whether an Opera was, or was not, ideologically acceptable. In many cases, attempts to boost the claims of a composer with supposedly impeccable Nazi political credentials misfired, while arguments that justified the success of a particular Opera on purely ideological grounds appeared contrived and unconvincing.

Such evidence would surely lend credibility to the contention that not one palpably Nazi Opera was written during the 3rd « Reich » . At the same time, an analysis of the contemporary repertoire performed at this time evinces certain features which fully accord with the ideological climate of the period : for example, a resurgent nationalism, a conservative-traditional choice of subject matter and a preoccupation with « völkisch » (national ; of the people)

themes. It is more questionable, however, as to whether these ingredients per se counter-act the claim stated above. The problem lies not so much in the relevance or otherwise of certain chosen subject matters as in their musical treatment. In this respect, composers presented a much greater variety of stylistic approaches than one might have expected. While a few effected a retrogressive imitation of 19th Century musical styles, many others embraced aspects of modernism. Indeed, contrary to some of the propaganda of the period, the distinctions between the musical styles of Opera composers during the Weimar Republic and those of the Nazi era were often blurred, many composers rejecting the structures of through-composed post-Wagnerian music-drama and preferring to retain the neo-Classical number Opera or neo-Baroque Oratorio conceptions that had been fashionable at the height of the 1920's « Neue Sachlichkeit » (New Objectivity) .

Although it is important to emphasize elements of continuity within 20th Century German Opera, certain aspects of Nazi Operatic policy still remain unique. In attempting to stamp their own identity on the cultural environment, the Nazis found it necessary to pursue a programme of censorship on an unprecedented scale. Hand in hand with this process, the regime also encouraged a re-appraisal and revival of repertoire of the past, frequently promoting composers of an unequivocal Aryan background, or libretti that could be interpreted in an anti-Semitic light.

Censorship and control of Operatic repertoire

To achieve their desired goal, Nazi censorship of Operatic repertoire took place in 2 phases. Broadly speaking, these moved from organized public demonstrations to the enactment of legal measures. During the early months of 1933, the Nazis relied on the support of the Storm-Troopers (« Sturmabteilung » , or SA) and Party agitators to disrupt performances of works considered to be tarnished by association with the Weimar Republic. Probably the most public demonstration of this process was manifested at performances of « Silverlake » (« Der Silbersee ») , a play by the Expressionist writer Georg Kaiser with music by Kurt Weill, whose 1st performance took place simultaneously in 3 theatres at Leipzig, Erfurt and Magdeburg, on 18 February - nearly 3 weeks after Adolf Hitler seized power. Although the premiere appears to have been an emphatic success, an ever-increasing crescendo of threats in the Nazi press, together with barracking from audiences who were sympathetic to the new regime, generated a campaign to withdraw the work.

...

It should be emphasized that the majority of Opera Houses managed to avoid conflict and controversy simply by pursuing a policy of self-censorship. The inevitable consequence of such action, however, was to produce a repertoire that lacked enterprise and studiously avoided the unfamiliar. Surveying the 1934-1935 season, one commentator remarked upon the fact that only 18 out of 46 theatres had managed to perform repertoire by a living German composer, and that, in 7 of these theatres, the composers represented were established old Masters such as Richard Strauß and Hans Pfitzner. To alleviate this situation, he proposed that each theatre should devote at least 10 % of its attention to premiering German Operas, and that in an annual season of 20 Operas, at least 2 should have been composed by living Germans.

Appraising the repertoire presented in individual Opera Houses, as documented in the 1937 edition of the « Deutsches Bühnen-Jahrbuch », it appears that many theatres heeded such advice. In Essen, for example, 4 out of the 19 Operas featured in their 1935-1936 season were composed by living Germans (Werner Egek, Paul Graener, Erich Sehlbach, Richard Strauß), while in Hamburg the number stood at 3 (Graener, Strauß, Egek) out of 20. Similar statistics apply to the 1937-1938 season in each Opera House although, in the following year, both companies reverted to less adventurous material - a factor which no doubt prompted Rainer Schlöber to issue a directive in 1939 compelling German Opera companies to devote more attention to contemporary German music, and insisting that every Opera company stage at least 1 new production of a German Opera composed after 1900.

Redrawing and expanding repertoire from the past

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Richard Wagner

Although trying to create the necessary conditions for the promotion and performance of contemporary Operas, the Nazis were equally concerned with imposing their influence on the established Classics of the repertoire. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Richard Wagner, 2 of the greatest German-speaking Opera composers, were specifically appropriated for this purpose, though with rather different consequences. In the case of Mozart, the central preoccupation seems to have been the desire to « Aryanize » the libretti of the 3 Operas (« Don Giovanni », « Le nozze di Figaro », « Così fan tutte ») the composer wrote in collaboration with the baptized Jew Lorenzo da Ponte. Although no official directive was issued to this effect, the climate of anti-Semitism that percolated through all aspects of cultural life during this period encouraged numerous opportunists to present their « purified » arrangements of these texts before the public. As a further incentive and justification for their actions, many noted the need to ensure that Opera Houses throughout Germany no longer persisted in rehearsing these Operas in published editions made by the German-Jewish conductor Hermann Levi.

While Mozart remained a fringe concern in the question of Nazi cultural politics, Wagner was elevated to the very centre, as the spiritual godfather to the Party. The association was sealed during the 1920's when Adolf Hitler became a frequent visitor to Bayreuth and received strong political support from members of the Wagner family, most notably the racial historian Houston Stewart Chamberlain. A defining moment in this process was the re-opening of the Bayreuth Festival 10 years after the outbreak of the First World War, and, during the following years, Bayreuth became one of the major rallying points for organized conservative and nationalist opposition to the Weimar Republic. The degree to which Bayreuth had become appropriated by such forces can be exemplified by the increasingly xenophobic material which was published in conjunction with the Festival. 2 issues were predominant : the need to emphasize an irresistible link between Wagner and Hitler as joint redeemers of German society, and the attempt to interpret Wagner's Operas in the light of the current political climate. Commenting on the 1930 « Ring » Cycle at Bayreuth, the critic of the « Völkischer Beobachter », for example, suggested the work to be a parable of the age, with the giant Fafner as a symbol of the indolent upper-classes at the time of Wilhelm II that had failed to foresee the coming revolution ; and Hagen as representative of the politicians that had stabbed the German army in the back in 1918. Inevitably, Siegfried was depicted as the « symbol of young Germany which is now preparing to replace the remnants of a collapsing bourgeois-Marxist State and to erect a new Germany, the 3rd " Reich " » .

Apart from the growing Nazification of Wagner, Bayreuth also came to be regarded as one of the last bastions of Germanic values standing in opposition to such artistic preoccupations as modernism and Expressionism. It is not surprising, therefore, that Nazi sensibilities were especially riled when modernists dared to subject their beloved composer to such reinterpretation during the Weimar Republic. One Wagner production of the 1920's that particularly incensed the Nazis was that of « The Flying Dutchman » (« Der fliegende Holländer ») mounted at the « Kroll-Oper » in Berlin, in 1929, with Otto Klemperer as conductor, Jürgen Fehling as director, and Ewald Dülberg as designer. The production caused offence on a number of counts : the severe rectilinear sets, the Expressionist acting of the singers, the proletarian-style costumes of the major protagonists and the hard-driven musical interpretation of the score. But it was the Kroll's attempt to demythologize Wagner, stripping away many of the composer's most overt manifestations of national Romanticism, that aroused the greatest fury and hastened the demise of the Kroll Opera in 1930.

Although by the early 1930's, few Opera Houses dared to follow the Kroll's example by staging anti-traditional productions of Wagner, 2 further controversies surrounding the composer confronted the Nazis in the early months of the 3rd « Reich » . The 50th anniversary of Wagner's death happened to take place on 13 February 1933, and the regime lost no time in exploiting the event for its own purposes. But while Adolf Hitler, Hermann Göring, Wilhelm Frick and the Wagner family attended a much-publicized commemorative celebration at the « Gewandhaus » in Leipzig, a new and innovative production of the composer's « Tannhäuser » opened at the Berlin « Staatsoper » under Otto Klemperer, with Jürgen Fehling as director and sets by Oskar Strnad. Once again, the provocative nature of the production, which challenged traditional conceptions of the work in both staging and musical interpretation, aroused a chorus of indignation in the Right-wing press, playing admirably into the hands of the Nazis, who now demanded that the new regime exert an even tighter control of cultural policy. Not surprisingly, one of the earliest victims of this charge was Otto Klemperer, who left Germany in April 1933.

Another artist forced into exile partly as a result of his anti-traditional interpretation of Wagner's outlook was the novelist Thomas Mann. Mann's lecture entitled « The Suffering and Greatness of Richard Wagner » , delivered at the University of Munich, on 10 February (and subsequently published in « Die Neue Rundschau » in April 1933) , warned of the inherent dangers of adopting a totally uncritical attitude towards Wagnerian ideology. Inevitably, by expressing such opinions at the very moment when the Nazis were attempting to silence opposition to their policies, Mann entered on a collision course with the new regime. The campaign of denunciation against Mann gathered pace, particularly after a group of Munich intellectuals, including the composers Richard Strauß and Hans Pfitzner, put their names to a published letter of protest against the lecture.

Once the Nazis had managed to silence any independent notions of Wagner's place in cultural history, they set about consolidating and perpetuating the traditional conception of Wagner as epitomized by Bayreuth in the 1920's. Moderately adventurous stagings of his Operas were discarded in favour of a homogenized style that favoured realism and promoted official ideology. Wagner propaganda was further supported by the publication of innumerable books and articles on the composer. For example, the July 1933 issue of the « NS-Monatshefte » was devoted exclusively to Wagner. Entitled « Richard Wagner and the New Germany » , the articles concentrated on subjects such as « Wagner and Hitler » , « Richard Wagner as the leader of the future » , « “ Parsifal ” and National-Socialism » and « Wagner

and Nordic Philosophy » .

In a more overtly public arena, Wagner's work became unmistakably associated with the regime's most significant cultural celebrations. With its rousing final chorale « Germans awake ! Soon will dawn the day » , the Opera « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » was shamelessly exploited by Josef Goebbels as an anthem to the Nazi Party. Thus, on 13 March 1933, the day which formally inaugurated the 3rd « Reich » , festivities began with the convening of the new « Reichstag » and culminated in a gala-performance of the work at the Berlin « Staatsoper » . From then on, the Opera was performed at many important Party and State occasions. In particular, the transmogrification of « Die Meistersinger » into a quintessentially Nazi Opera was realized at the annual Nuremberg Party Rallies, where Benno von Arent's monumental staging of the final Act, with its massed crowds and celebratory flags and banners, consciously mirrored the events taking place outside the Opera House.

A further opportunity to exploit the link between Wagner and the 3rd « Reich » came with the 1933 Bayreuth Festival. Hitler and other Party officials attended the opening performances, and local crowds celebrated their appearance with frenzied enthusiasm. Almost every subsequent year, Hitler made the annual pilgrimage to Bayreuth and, after 1939, he reconstituted the event as a « Kriegsfestspiel » (War Festival) so as to enable regular attendance by German War veterans. The Festival managed to retain a modicum of artistic independence by avoiding subjugation to officials controlling the Chamber of Culture. Thus, although traditional stagings remained the order of the day at Bayreuth, the combined efforts of conductor Heinz Tietjen and director Emil Preterorius steadfastly avoided the blatant pandering to Nazi ideology as manifested by Benno von Arent in Berlin and Nuremberg.

Other composers

Setting aside specific attempts to Nazify Mozart and Wagner, a broader appraisal of traditional Opera repertoire suggests less apparent divergence in taste between the Weimar Republic and the 3rd « Reich » than one might have expected. According to the critic Wilhelm Altmann, the 15 most popular Operas during the 1930-1931 season were Georges Bizet's « Carmen » , Richard Wagner's « Tannhäuser » , Carl Maria von Weber's « Der Freischütz » , Wagner's « Lohengrin » , Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's « Die Zauberflöte » , Pietro Mascagni's « Cavalleria rusticana » , Ruggero Leoncavallo's « I Pagliacci » , Giuseppe Verdi's « Il trovatore » , Giacomo Puccini's « Madama Butterfly » , Jacques Offenbach's « Tales of Hoffmann » , Wagner's « Der fliegende Holländer » , Eugène d'Albert's « Tiefland » (The Lowlands) , Puccini's « La Bohème » , Verdi's « La traviata » and Ludwig van Beethoven's « Fidelio » . The same Operas by Bizet, Leoncavallo, Puccini and Weber remained as popular 8 years later, together with others by Wagner and Verdi. Of course, the Jewish composer Offenbach could no longer be performed, so the only other striking difference between the 2 sets of statistics rests in the considerable rise in popularity of the Operas by the 19th Century composer Albert Lortzing.

Although the Nazis imposed a total ban on the performance of Jewish 19th Century Opera composers such as Offenbach, Jacques-François Halévy and Meyerbeer, policy decisions regarding Operas with libretti by those who were either Jewish or half-Jewish seem to have been far more capricious. The continued popularity of Bizet's « Carmen » should be noted, despite the composer's partly Jewish origins and a collaborative libretto in which one of the partners,

Ludovic Halévy, was wholly Jewish. Yet, there was no active campaign to damage the work's reputation, and it was notably excluded from the wholesale ban on compositions from enemy countries issued during the Second World War. While Richard Strauß's « Die Frau ohne Schatten » (The Silent Woman) was removed after only a few performances because of Stefan Zweig's libretto, no objections were raised with regard to performances of « Der Rosenkavalier », « Elektra » and « Arabella », despite the fact that Hugo von Hofmannsthal was half-Jewish. Even Nazi Party loyalists such as Paul Graener and Georg Vollerthun were excused for having composed Operas with the Jewish playwright Rudolf Lothar, who was in exile during the 3rd « Reich » .

All these exceptions to the Nuremberg Laws of 1935, which effectively forbade any artistic partnership between Aryan and Jew, illustrate the contradictory and ambiguous nature of Nazi censorship. At the same time, there are other examples where the campaign to expunge Jewish influence from German cultural life produced notable changes. The 3 Operas Mozart composed in collaboration with the baptized Jew Lorenzo da Ponte, for example, have already been cited as a high-profile « cause célèbre » . Likewise, Nazi propaganda forced Opera companies to abandon Franz Werfel's highly-successful German translations of some of Verdi's Operas, such as « La forza del destino » (1925) , « Simon Boccanegra » (1929) and « Don Carlos » (1932) , and encourage the creation of alternative adaptations of these works.

Despite the much-publicized proscription of Werfel because of his Jewish origins, the so-called « Verdi renaissance » , which had been largely initiated by the Austrian novelist's efforts, continued apace throughout the Nazi era. Another area of continuity with the Weimar Republic was the « Händel revival » , which had begun in the small town of Göttingen in 1920. Although initially confined to small theatres whose modest orchestral pits were more suitable for the performance of Baroque music, Handel's Operas soon began to attract the attention of much larger companies. Thus, during the Second World War, one finds surprisingly frequent performances of his work ; for example, « Giulio Cesare in Egitto » at the Berlin « Staatsoper » (1939) , « Rodelinda » in both Berlin and Vienna (1940) , « Serse » in Hamburg, Danzig (Gdańsk) and Schwerin (1943) and « Radamisto » at Hagen and Wuppertal (1943) .

...

Nach dem « Anschluß Österreichs » besuchte Adolf Hitler die Staatsoper am 19. Juni und am 27. Oktober 1938. In der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus kam es zum Abgang, zu Verfolgungen und Ermordungen von Künstlern und Angestellten. Für etliche Werke gab es ein Aufführungsverbot. Direktor Erwin Kerber setzte sich bis Ende 1940 vereinzelt für jüdische Künstler ein, kooperierte aber mit den neuen Machthabern.

Am 30. Juni 1944 fand die letzte Vorstellung vor der Sommerpause statt ; es sollte die allerletzte Aufführung im alten Gebäude der Wiener Staatsoper überhaupt werden. Hans Knappertsbusch, der schon die erste Vorstellung nach dem « Anschluß » Österreichs im Jahr 1938 dirigiert hatte, stand auch diesmal am Pult. Auf dem Programm stand Wagners Götterdämmerung.

Die letzte Regieanweisung dieser Oper lautet :

« Helle Flammen scheinen in dem Saal der Götter aufzuschlagen. Als die Götter von den Flammen gänzlich verhüllt sind, fällt der Vorhang. »

Mit 1. September 1944 verfügte Josef Goebbels im Zuge des totalen Kriegseinsatzes der Kulturschaffenden die Schließung aller Theater des Deutschen Reiches. Gegen Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges geriet die Oper am 12. März 1945 nach amerikanischen Bombardements, die eigentlich der Raffinerie in Floridsdorf gegolten haben, in Brand. Die Vorderfront, die schon vorsorglich vermauert worden war, blieb erhalten. Zuschauerränge und Bühne wurden aber ein Raub der Flammen.

Nach Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges führte das Opernensemble, das vorerst in die Wiener Volksoper auswich, die Proben und Aufführungen in dem seit längerer Zeit geschlossenen Theater an der Wien durch, wo bereits am 1. Mai 1945 (als nach der Befreiung von der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft auch die Republik Österreich wieder existierte) die ersten Vorstellungen gegeben wurden. 1947 führte das Ensemble schon eine Auslandstournee nach London durch.

Nach 1945 bildete sich das Wiener Mozart-Ensemble heraus, das weltweit Gastspiele absolvierte und für seine besondere Gesangs- und Spielkultur gerühmt wurde. Sein Gründer und Mentor war der österreichische Dirigent Josef Krips, der aufgrund seiner jüdischen Herkunft die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus nur durch glücklichen Zufall und Hilfe von Kollegen überlebt hatte. Sofort nach 1945 begann Krips die Wiederaufbauarbeit an der Staatsoper und konnte seine ästhetischen Prinzipien durchsetzen. Dazu zählte die Abkehr vom romantischen Mozart-Ideal mit voluminösem Orchesterklang. Stattdessen kamen wieder kammermusikalische Qualitäten zum Tragen sowie ein durchsichtiger, leichter Klang, der später für typisch wienerisch gehalten wurde. Wesentliche Sängerinnen und Sänger waren Anton Dermota, Erich Kunz, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Wilma Lipp und andere.

3rd « Reich » - Dresden exhibition sheds light on Nazi persecution in the Theater

The impact of Nazi « cleansing » policies on Germany's Opera Houses and Theaters has largely been left unstudied - until now. An in-depth look at persecution of artists, musicians and actors is on display in Dresden.

The « Semperoper » dismissed accomplished musicians for their opposition to the Nazis

Fritz Busch, a prominent conductor and musical-director of the Saxon State Opera during his life, once said :

« Decent behaviour is even more important than making good music. »

Busch was not a Jew, but he was opposed to Nazi ideology. This attitude resulted in his dismissal in 1933, 5 weeks after Adolf Hitler's rise to power. His story is one of the most well-known among 50 others that make-up the exhibition « Silenced Voices » , which deals with the expulsion of Jews from the Opera and Theater scene between 1933 and 1945.

Historian Hannes Heer and music scholar Jürgen Kesting have been dedicated to researching the project. Initially, on

the request of the « Hamburger Abendblatt » newspaper and the Hamburg State Opera, they started investigating the stories of Jewish and « politically untouchable » artists that worked in German Theaters during the 3rd « Reich » . One of the sources of information they are using is biographies of prominent composers, conductors, directors and singers, as well as the stories of expulsion from various theaters.

Hannes Heer discovered that prisoners of War worked at the Opera House

One part of the exhibition documents the fate of 44 prominent composers, directors, singers, and actors - the victims of racist Nazi politics. Another section specifically deals with the expulsion of members of the « Semperoper » and the Dresden State Theater. A labyrinth of columns and billboards in the foyers of both houses helps to emphasize the dismal nature of these people's fates. Descriptions and photos present well-known and not-so-well-known artists, Choir and Orchestra members, artisans and stage-hands.

The « threat » of Contemporary Art

In a detailed catalog, Hannes Heer discusses the source of anti-Jewish sentiments in Germany after 1918. The German Empire had gone through a political change following World War I, when it became a Federal Republic. At this time, German culture (described by some as the best and the most beautiful of all) was seen as the only unifying aspect that could be used to forge a new national identity. This automatically excluded all modern artistic movements, which in turn forced theaters to give-up on artistic experiments and contemporary works. The new, compulsory focus was on the canons of culture.

One of the goals of this national stance was to convey the message that it was Jews who were to blame for the revolution, for the defeat in World War I and for economic troubles. A « security scale » was devised with regard to Theaters and Operas, indicating which institutions had the most subversive tendencies. Berlin was at the top of the list, as it was traditionally open to all modern influences, but « avant-garde » theaters such as those in Leipzig and Darmstadt were also being monitored.

Drastic methods

The propaganda was spread in a very direct manner, including methods like stink bombs and chanting to prevent certain performances from taking place. There were also press campaigns against specific individuals, as well as those that called for the resignation of certain directors and those that aimed to influence operatic and theatrical repertoires.

Hannes Heer and Jürgen Kesting have made an important step forward in their research work in Dresden. For the 1st time, documents have been uncovered that prove that prisoners of war had worked at the Opera House.

Heer said :

« We have made quite a sensational discovery in Dresden. It is personal journals that contain names and where people came from. From 1941 onwards, a large number of musicians and stage-hands were foreign workers. »

The « Semperoper » and Dresden State Theater invite visitors to discover the context of the historical events connected with the expulsion of Jews from the city's cultural scene. Lectures, films and cultural presentations complete the program on offer. A CD documentary gives the sound back to those « silenced voices » .

The voice of Fritz Busch was never fully-silenced, however. After his dismissal from the « Semperoper » , he went on to work in South America, Scandinavia, England and New York.

In 1935, he wrote in a letter to the mother of his deceased friend, Max Reger :

« What counts is that, today, I can make the most beautiful music and have remained a free person and can serve my fatherland better in this way than in others. »

« Theater der Totalität » ou le paradoxe des sens : l'abstraction au défi de la représentation

(Julien Ségol)

Le projet d'un « Théâtre Total » , qui fascine une partie des avant-gardes de l'entre-2 guerres, dans le sillage post-Wagnérien, trouve au « Bauhaus » un lieu d'expérimentation privilégié. L'effervescence théorique et artistique encourage toutes les hardiesses : Walter Gropius, Lux Feininger, Oskar Schlemmer ou encore László Moholy-Nagy, tous connaissent la tentation du système qui synthétisera, dans l'ordre représentatif, les composantes de l'humain. L'« homme nouveau » prend ainsi place dans un espace analytique, où chacun des sens doit trouver la représentation qui lui correspond et l'espace du théâtre, pensé comme la forme privilégiée de la représentation, devient l'occasion de ressaisir la figure humaine en l'inscrivant dans une idéologie de la modernité fondée sur l'abstraction. Cet article interroge plus particulièrement la confrontation des visées avant-gardistes de Moholy-Nagy avec l'univers du répertoire traditionnel de l'Opéra dans le cadre de ses réalisations scéniques pour « les Contes d'Hoffmann » et « Madama Butterfly » au « Krolloper » de Berlin, en 1929-1931.

« Théâtre de la totalité » , ou « théâtre total » : titre de l'article de Moholy-Nagy dans le programme d'accompagnement des « Contes d'Hoffmann » à la « Krolloper » de Berlin (12 février 1929) , rapporté par Adolf Weißmann, dans le « Berliner Zeitung am Mittag » (13 février 1929) .

« L'art moderne tend à exploiter presque exclusivement la sensibilité sensorielle. Il s'entend merveilleusement à exciter l'attention et use de tous moyens pour l'exciter : intensités, contrastes, énigmes, surprises. Il saisit parfois, par la subtilité de ses moyens ou l'audace de l'exécution, certaines proies très précieuses : des états complexes ou très éphémères, des valeurs irrationnelles, sensations à l'état naissant, résonances, correspondances, pressentiments d'une instable profondeur. Qu'il s'agisse de politique, d'économie, de manières de vivre, de divertissements, de mouvement, j'observe que l'allure de la modernité est toute celle d'une intoxication. Il nous faut augmenter la dose, ou changer de

poison. Telle est la loi. » (1)

(Paul Valéry)

La vie culturelle de la courte République de Weimar passe pour un âge d'or des bâtisseurs de l'avant-garde, pour le temps de la rupture radicale avec la tradition, de la refonte du présent et de la confiance en un avenir offert par les moyens techniques de la modernité. Sans doute est-il bon de rappeler que l'époque est aussi l'une des heures les plus noires de la jeune Allemagne, tenaillée par la misère économique, divisée dans une société exsangue, menacée par un climat social violent et une vie politique instable. Il est difficile, en outre, de voir en la République de Weimar l'avènement d'une ère nouvelle sans rappeler que la plupart des mouvements auxquels on l'associe se mettent en place bien avant la Première Guerre mondiale, au tournant du XXe siècle. Mais, de façon indéniable, les créateurs de cette période ont eu le sentiment d'un tournant, qui appelait de grandes réformes - de la vie comme des arts. L'effervescence l'emporte sur le manque de moyens, la crise et les incertitudes, emmenée par une foi sans pareille en la modernité et une conviction quant au rôle et à la place de l'artiste dans la société moderne : il n'est désormais plus simple observateur, il en est le « transformateur » . (2) On est surpris, à la lecture des écrits d'artistes, designers, architectes, peintres ou musiciens de voir se répandre un idiome bien particulier dans lequel germe l'idée d'un messianisme moderne : l'artiste devient le pilier d'une société nouvelle qu'il faut préparer à la construction du monde de demain à partir d'une quête de principes fondamentaux.

Nous nous intéresserons plus particulièrement à la mise en œuvre des principes affirmés par le « Bauhaus » dans le cadre de l'expérimentation théâtrale. La scène fait l'objet d'une ambition bien particulière en ce qu'elle devient le lieu de réalisation par excellence des aspirations à l'expérience totalisante. Elle ouvre un nouveau rapport à l'espace, alors réinvesti par le vocabulaire et les matériaux de la modernité avec ce dessin caractéristique d'y redéfinir les contours de l'« homme nouveau », une figure centrale dans l'approche du « Bauhaus ». La pensée de l'espace, irriguée par la tentation de l'abstraction, devient le moyen de repenser le ferment communautaire dans la société moderne en perte de repères traditionnels. Les propositions de Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, appelé par Walter Gropius au « Bauhaus » dès 1923, sont à cet égard révélatrices du « nouveau regard » porté sur l'homme de son temps. Nous interrogerons la confrontation de ses visées avant-gardistes avec l'univers du répertoire traditionnel dans le cadre de ses réalisations scéniques pour « les Contes d'Hoffmann » et « Madama Butterfly », au « Krolloper » de Berlin.

À la recherche d'une communauté originelle : l'être ensemble par les sens

La vision unitaire du monde qui anime particulièrement le microcosme du « Bauhaus », et dont le jeune architecte berlinois Walter Gropius annonce la création dans une déclaration de 1919, (3) se caractérise par la volonté d'éliminer la dualité qui oppose artiste et artisan, par le désir de rapprocher la société et le monde de l'art, et, plus encore, par la nécessité éprouvée de faire fusionner l'art et la vie. L'ambition réformatrice des membres de la nouvelle école poursuit l'idéal d'un retour au primitif, à l'origine de la communauté sociale, qui ne peut qu'advenir par l'expérience sensorielle, gage d'universel et socle de l'originel. Le Romantisme de ce projet n'est évidemment pas sans évoquer l'idée wagnérienne du « Gesamtkunstwerk », médium d'une synthèse de la connaissance, censé abolir les divisions séculaires entre raison et sensation, entre arts et sciences pour en réaliser l'union dans une expérience sensorielle

totale. Le progrès technique et théorique, développé respectivement dans chacun des arts devait ainsi concourir à une grande synthèse dans une forme artistique achevée qui unirait l'art à la vie. Avec le « Bauhaus », l'utopie initiée par Wagner se trouve ré-actualisée d'une tout autre manière, mais l'ambition d'une synthèse entre arts, science et technique demeure. Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, appelé à Weimar par Gropius en 1923, partage de près l'idée d'une nécessité de la « révolution culturelle » pour faire advenir « l'homme nouveau » :

« Le but principal de nos travaux est de hisser le plus tôt possible au niveau actuel de l'humanité celui qui ne l'a pas encore atteint. Comme la compréhension intuitive n'est pas uniforme, certains hommes étant davantage touchés par les choses exprimées par la couleur et d'autres par celles communiquées par les paroles, nous avons le devoir d'ouvrir toutes les sources intuitives pour élargir le plus possible notre champ d'action. Il faut s'approprier à nouveau les éléments les plus simples de l'expression, la couleur, la forme, la matière et l'espace. Tous les créateurs de ces derniers temps ont le pressentiment de ces besoins et se fixent pour but de clarifier les éléments et d'apprendre à les utiliser de façon autonome. » (4)

Le paradigme apparaît, entre ces lignes, d'une époque orientée vers la conquête d'un nouveau ferment communautaire à travers l'affirmation d'un retour aux sens. L'avènement de la modernité passe par la reconquête de la sensorialité et de l'intuition dans la perspective d'une synthèse totalisante.

Il faut pourtant souligner dans cette conception un dualisme surprenant : si les créateurs s'attachent à défendre l'humanité de l'homme et ne cessent d'affirmer le culte « d'une instable profondeur », d'une épaisseur qui résiste et interroge, et que l'art se doit d'éclairer, leurs productions n'en attestent pas moins une fascination pour l'au-delà de l'humain, tant l'exploration des nouveaux moyens techniques offerts par l'âge industriel impose un dictat de l'analyse, une systématique de la déconstruction, pour enfermer finalement la création dans une évaporation de la chair qui laisse place à l'épure (au résidu ?) de la structure, au fantasme d'une construction de la forme pure. Dans une publication commune, Oskar Schlemmer, Lászlo Moholy-Nagy et Fritz Molnar explicitent le concept de « Gestaltung », véritable catégorie élémentaire de leurs théories :

« Au-delà de l'idée de façonner, de donner forme, de concevoir, il faut y voir le goût de souligner la totalité d'un tel processus créateur, qu'il s'agisse d'un artefact ou d'une idée. Il empêche le nébuleux et le diffus. Dans son sens le plus strictement philosophique, il exprime l'« EIDOLON » platonique, le « URBILD », la forme pré-existante. » (5)

L'expérience moderne de la création, à travers ce concept de « Gestaltung », est ainsi à la recherche d'une origine essentielle, d'une unité commune à tous les arts. On peut relever à cet égard, au titre d'anecdote symptomatique, l'intérêt de Moholy-Nagy pour la radiographie :

« Exemples les plus frappants de l'espace-temps au niveau statique, les radiographies donnent une image transparente d'un corps solide et dense, l'image extérieure et intérieure de la structure. Avec un enthousiasme pardonnable, nous pourrions dire que la structure devient transparente, et que la transparence exprime une structure. » (6)

Rien là de morbide, plutôt la confirmation d'un goût de l'époque, de cette « passion de la transparence » qui anime

les créateurs et tend vers cette « élimination de la subjectivité » (7) dans les productions des modernes dont Moholy-Nagy se fait le chantre. Le corps humain, depuis Eadweard Muybridge notamment, se mesure, s'observe et se quantifie. Avec le nouvel appareil d'enregistrement de la réalité (la photographie), la limite entre le regard de la science et l'observation de l'art s'estompe et l'on goûte alors le plaisir de la transparence rêvée autant que l'on jubile de la réduction au simple - annonce de la reproductibilité, de la duplication du même.

Dans le projet d'unité des différents paramètres de la création, l'activité de l'artiste passe par une démarche analytique, par l'affirmation de l'autonomie des composantes (forme, couleur, mouvement, espace). Le caractère aporétique de la tension entre désir de synthèse et approche analytique nous porte à interroger la croyance du « Bauhaus » en la possibilité d'une unité de la culture moderne à partir de la complexité des formes d'apparition du monde. Dans un essai théorique intitulé « Malerei, Fotografie, Film » (1927), Moholy-Nagy pose cette synthèse comme un absolu :

« Ce dont nous avons besoin, ce n'est pas l'œuvre d'art totale (" Gesamtkunstwerk ") , à côté de laquelle la vie s'écoule, séparée, mais une synthèse de tous les moments de la vie, qui SE FORME D'ELLE-MÊME, se rassemble en une " Œuvre totale " (" Gesamtwerk ") (la vie) enveloppant tout, qui abolisse tout isolement, dans laquelle CHAQUE réalisation INDIVIDUELLE résulte d'une nécessité universelle. » (8)

Le projet esthétique revendiqué est celui d'une abstraction supposée aboutir à une nouvelle forme d'unité. Le travail producteur de l'artiste se pense dès lors comme un processus de transformation à partir des éléments simples qu'il isole et met en rapport, à la recherche d'une harmonie expressive des tensions. La notion d'espace est sans doute le point central de la réflexion de Moholy-Nagy, au carrefour des divers arts qu'il explore et interroge, de la peinture au film en passant par la photographie, la sculpture et l'architecture. L'attrait qu'exerce sur lui l'apparition de nouveaux média détermine considérablement sa conception de l'espace. Pour lui, « l'imitation du jeu théâtral » a fait oublier que « la nouvelle expression cinématographique » est avant tout « destinée à faire sentir l'espace à l'aide de la lumière et du mouvement. » (9) Cette évolution de la pensée du mouvement et du rapport à l'espace vers un « jeu formel autonome » (10) devient une constante qui marque chacun des supports dont il fait usage - autant de traces du « nouveau regard » dont il s'efforce de rendre compte :

« Les aspects mécaniques de la photographie ont déjà modifié la technique employée pour décrire un objet, sa structure, sa texture et sa surface, et ont suscité des relations nouvelles avec la lumière et l'espace. » (11)

Pour le photographe constructiviste qu'est Moholy-Nagy, l'élargissement du regard fait partie de la vision de « l'homme nouveau ». Siegfried Kracauer, dans les pages qu'il lui consacre, relève dans son « adhésion chaleureuse » au nouveau médium photographique l'enthousiasme pour « des combinaisons de phénomènes jamais associés auparavant ; ou encore, pour les révélations fabuleuses de l'accélééré, de la mirco et de la macro-photographie et des émulsions infrarouges. » (12) La photographie non seulement a « élargi notre champ de vision » en rendant possible l'expérience du caractère changeant du monde sous une forme combinatoire sans précédent, mais, « ce faisant, elle l'a adapté à la situation de l'homme à l'âge de la technique. » C'est précisément ce qui intéresse Moholy-Nagy dans son travail sur les changements de perspective : lorsqu'il substitue au traditionnel angle de vue horizontal une prise

verticale oblique, offrant un point de vue plongeant ou contre plongeant, il nous donne sur le monde du quotidien un point de vue qui rejoint ceux apportés par l'innovation technique - l'avion, l'ascenseur ...

Moholy-Nagy est ainsi à la recherche d'autres possibilités sensorielles, non figuratives, qui lui accordent la transformation de la réalité, la représentation optique d'une composition dans laquelle s'instille l'abstraction. Les éléments de la rue deviennent, dans l'enregistrement (la transcription) photographique qu'il en propose, des points, des formes, des lignes qui recomposent l'espace et suggèrent une lecture dans laquelle la présence humaine n'est plus narration, anecdote, mais bien figure, forme, matrice. Cette approche prendra dans son œuvre scénique une importance considérable :

« Qui peut croire à l'opacité des corps au moment où notre sensibilité exacerbée et démultipliée a déjà découvert les manifestations obscures de ce milieu ? Pourquoi oublierions-nous dans nos créations le pouvoir dédoublé de notre vision qui est capable de donner des résultats semblables à ceux du rayon X ? Boccioni, dans « Pouvoir de la rue », a démontré cette double capacité dans une représentation expressive : on y voit la fusion des éléments divers de la rue. La passion de la transparence est l'une des caractéristiques les plus évidentes de notre époque. » (13)

Ainsi, cette « passion de la transparence » organise-t-elle le nouveau regard jusqu'à contraindre tout art de la représentation pour le soumettre à une logique de concentration, de fusion des éléments dans un mouvement unique qui détermine (construit, littéralement) les rapports au sein de l'œuvre. Pour Moholy-Nagy, de l'espace plan de l'image photographique, picturale ou cinématographique à l'ouverture de l'espace tridimensionnel, il n'y a pas rupture (approfondissement soudain du champ) mais continuité d'une même pensée à la recherche de formes pures organisant tout.

Vers l'espace total : une approche analogique de la scène et des arts plastiques

La scène devient, dès lors, le lieu de l'expérimentation de l'espace par excellence. On observe, à cet égard, une évolution significative de la place accordée au théâtre dans l'organisation de l'enseignement au « Bauhaus ». Si le programme énoncé par Gropius, en 1919, prétend réunir « architectes, sculpteurs et peintres » sans faire mention de l'art scénique, (14) « le Carnet du Bauhaus n° 4 » (1925) (15) fait du théâtre la figure centrale de son investigation. La scène, en tant que véritable pôle de convergence de toutes les disciplines de la nouvelle école, s'y révèle un enjeu d'importance : lieu de l'expérience totale, elle devient le noyau qui permet de relier organiquement tous les secteurs, comme l'illustre d'ailleurs le plan de conception de la structure du « Bauhaus » par Paul Klee.

La réflexion menée par Schlemmer, Molnar et Moholy-Nagy dans « Die Bühne im Bauhaus » les conduit à interroger le théâtre à partir de sa tridimensionnalité, avec un désir commun : « résorber la dualité entre ce qui est individuel et universel ». (16) L'ouvrage signale avant tout l'idée totalisante du nouveau théâtre. Total, il doit l'être d'abord par la sollicitation de tous les sens de l'homme. Il s'agit d'atteindre par là son essence (sa « structure ») à travers l'expérience synesthésique, puisque « la structure de l'homme, c'est la synthèse de tous ses organes fonctionnels ». (17) Là encore, la tension dualiste fait surface et exprime toute l'ambiguïté de la condition moderne de cet « homme nouveau », pris entre les tenailles de la réduction à l'objet (il devient machine, fonctions) et du sauvetage de

l'humain dans l'affirmation vitaliste d'un universel sensoriel. Ainsi Moholy-Nagy annonce-t-il :

« Dans le nouveau théâtre, les considérations logiques, traditionnelles, émotionnelles ne joueront plus le 1er rôle. Le jeu théâtral est une création artistique et doit s'inspirer de la méthode des arts plastiques. On ne peut pas demander ce que signifie ou représente tel ou tel homme (organe) , de même qu'on ne peut poser cette question au sujet d'un tableau abstrait qui est aussi une entité indépendante, un organisme parfait. » (18)

Le recours à la pensée analogique est particulièrement frappant : l'approche analytique de l'art dans la décomposition de ses matériaux à partir des sens individuels devient un modèle de pensée intégral, une grille de lecture du réel que l'ambition totalisante porte à appliquer jusqu'à l'homme, bientôt déconstruit en une somme de fonctions ou organes. L'homme devient un « élément » dans le tout de la composition théâtrale. On comprend aisément que disparaisse toute logique narrative et illustrative dans la conception théâtrale proposée, dès lors qu'il est réduit à l'autonomie (à l'isolement) dans une combinatoire dynamique.

Si l'expérience est « totale » , c'est aussi parce que le raisonnement analogique est lui-même intégral. À l'intérieur de l'expérience sensorielle, chaque élément est pensé en réseaux de substitution ou d'équivalence. La musique et la couleur sont ainsi mises à plat sur la même partition, comme valeurs équivalentes relevant de mêmes modalités d'utilisation. C'est ce dont témoigne la partition pour une « Sonate de couleurs en 3 parties » (19) de Ludwig Hirschfeld-Mack, publiée par Moholy-Nagy en accompagnement son essai « Malerei, Fotografie, Film » , ou encore le « Dessin-partition pour une Excentricité mécanique » (Synthèse pour forme, Mouvement, Son, Lumière (Couleur) et Odeur) (20) de Moholy-Nagy. Ces partitions pour une expérience totale tiennent lieu de parangon de l'ambition synesthésique, alors décomposée et « mise en scène » simultanément sur 3 plateaux différents.

Lorsqu'il réfléchit à la « nouvelle voie dans la création de phénomènes acoustiques » , Moholy-Nagy pousse la systématique de l'équivalence jusqu'à sa radicalité et en appelle à « un nouvel ordre des tons et des sons atonaux (certains bruits) » (21) ainsi qu'au développement d'une grammaire des « signes graphiques » sonores qui abolirait la distinction entre sons naturels et sons artificiels, élargissant ainsi la palette du son à une unité du vivant et du mécanique :

« Comme la musique englobe aussi, de nos jours, l'enregistrement des bruits divers, la poésie n'a plus le monopole de l'effet mécanique et sensoriel des bruits mis en relation. L'utilisation des relations entre les sons et les bruits appartient au domaine de la musique, de même que, par exemple la peinture est chargée de systématiser l'effet primaire des couleurs. » (22)

Enfin, la dimension totale du théâtre proposée ici tient à l'intégration de l'homme à titre d'« élément » dans la composition d'ensemble, il devient « ersatz » , ou plutôt forme universelle :

« La tâche de l'acteur de l'avenir sera de mettre en action le commun à tous les hommes. » (23)

La fabrique du théâtre de l'homme nouveau ne court-elle pas ici le risque de la réduction ? L'expérience totale ne

pourrait-elle pas devenir réalité totalitaire, là où l'individuel est aboli dans l'universel ? Curieux paradigme qui mène la voie de l'abstraction vers, finalement, une évacuation de l'humain en l'homme. Des 3 contributeurs, Schlemmer est sans doute le plus attentif à ce développement. Il souligne dans son essai l'ambivalence de la destination possible ouverte par la logique moderne de l'abstraction :

« Une des marques de notre temps est l'abstraction qui, d'une part, travaille à disjoindre les composants d'un ensemble existant pour les mener chacun à l'absurde ou les porter à leur plus haut-degré de puissance ; qui, d'autre part, produit tout son effet dans la généralisation et l'assemblage pour élaborer, dans une vaste ébauche, un nouvel ensemble. Marque de notre temps ensuite, la mécanisation, processus inexorable qui s'empare de tous les domaines de la vie et de l'art. » (24)

Que reste-t-il de l'homme dans ce théâtre de la totalité ? Une « figure d'art », comme Schlemmer l'appelle de ses vœux dans ses multiples expériences, du « Ballet Triadique » (1923) aux « Danses du " Bauhaus " » (1925-1927) ? L'homme y prend figure de pantin surdéterminé : il porte masque, son costume se mêle au corps de façon intégrante, ou plutôt il devient costume, absorbé dans les formes et les matériaux de l'âge industriel (cerceaux de fer, cônes de mousse ...).

La réception de ces « figures » de l'homme nouveau par la critique renvoie de façon insistante à l'inquiétude d'une lecture politique. Comment rendre compte, en effet, de ces hybrides qui, n'étant déjà plus hommes, ne sont pas encore tout à fait machines, où l'organique a encore figure humaine mais s'efface devant l'assemblage de matériaux composites et dans le vocabulaire d'une gestuelle articulée ? « Le principe de la rupture formelle, selon les revendications des artistes eux-mêmes, est souvent associé à des politiques de résistance : le montage fragmentaire ostensible y est traité comme un marqueur du " réel " qui interroge la logique de représentation, agissant ainsi comme une force de déstabilisation des cadres politique, culturel et social. » (25) C'est du moins ce à quoi l'on peut songer lorsqu'il s'agit des photo-montages dadaïstes de John Heartfield, des collages de Hannah Höch ou encore des expériences théâtrales défamiliarisantes de Brecht et Piscator. Mais les « poupées humaines » du « Bauhaus » n'ont assurément pas la même portée socio-critique, ce qui soulève la question de leur positionnement idéologique, à tel point qu'on a voulu y voir parfois « le sombre présage de l'obsession nationale-socialiste de la culture physique et d'une subjectivité rationalisée », (26) tant elles paraissent muettes, aveugles et sourdes aux troubles croissants qui menacent la République de Weimar.

Pour former l'homme nouveau, Schlemmer propose un travail de « réhabilitation et de ré-éducation » du corps, ce qui n'est pas sans précédent dans cette époque où tant de nouvelles pratiques du corps émergent, depuis les danses extatiques d'Isadora Duncan jusqu'aux pratiques rythmiques de Jaques-Dalcroze, ou encore la biomécanique de Meyerhold - autant de propositions différentes qui, toutes, tendent à une dé-réalisation du corps. Ainsi, du pantin au clown en passant par l'athlète, le corps de l'homme nouveau oscille entre réhabilitation et détermination. On se souvient alors de Schlemmer : « Tout ce qui peut être mécanisé est mécanisé. Résultat : la prise de conscience de ce qui n'est pas mécanisable. » (27) Faut-il donc voir dans le phantasme moderne de l'homme total l'harmonie d'une dialectique nouvelle ? Le corps parvient à cet équilibre provisoire entre la station de l'humain et le devenir-machine qui lui ouvre pourtant la voie d'une transcendance : la mise en contact du corps avec ce qui le dépasse - la loi du

nombre, de la formule géométrique, dans laquelle il entre en rapport avec un univers abstrait au milieu duquel il se tient.

L'époque est traversée par une ambivalence fondamentale à cet égard : pour Inge Baxmann, « les rêves de technocorps, de fusion du corps humain avec les nouveaux matériaux et les technologies nouvelles, oscillaient entre le fantasme d'un dépassement du corps et l'idée d'une incarnation de la technique dans la chair. » (28) L'expérience de la sensation (jusqu'à son prolongement dans la quête synesthésique) devient le socle d'une culture nouvelle qui révèle la part irréductible de l'humain en même temps qu'elle ouvre la possibilité d'une nouvelle forme de l'être ensemble. L'individu retrouve la communauté des hommes par l'universel de la sensation. Moholy-Nagy, s'interrogeant sur les possibilités du théâtre de son temps, entrevoit l'alternative, mais s'en tient à l'aporie :

« Selon une conception intéressante, le théâtre serait la somme des manifestations de la voix, de la lumière (de la couleur) , de la forme et du mouvement. Dans ce contexte, la participation de l'homme devient superflue. On peut imaginer des instruments perfectionnés qui rempliraient mieux que l'homme lui-même le rôle uniquement mécanique que joue ce dernier. Il y a une autre conception qui ne renonce pas à l'homme, considéré comme le moyen le plus efficace de la création scénique. Mais personne n'a encore réussi à bien utiliser l'homme sur la scène, à en faire un facteur créatif. » (29)

La systématique des sens pose donc d'elle-même la limite du jeu en même temps qu'elle renvoie à ce que l'homme a d'essentiel. Plongé au cœur de l'espace total, il est dissous dans le pur phénomène de la sensation, isolé en ses parties, saturé de chaque composante - à moins qu'il ne s'affranchisse par un travail dynamique, « créatif » , dans lequel il « maîtrise ses dons corporels et intellectuels » pour redevenir le « phénomène le plus actif de la vie » . Mais gare, alors, à ne pas « recommencer l'erreur de l'imitation de la nature. » (30)

« Krolloper » , 1929 : au défi de la représentation scénique

Hans Curjel et Otto Klemperer engagent Moholy-Nagy pour réaliser la scénographie des « Contes d'Hoffmann » , donnés en février 1929, au « Krolloper » de Berlin. Cette maison d'Opéra, dans sa brève existence (1927-1931) , aura profondément marqué la vie lyrique et intellectuelle de cette période. Elle est un véritable laboratoire d'expérimentation autant qu'un ferment d'inspiration pour l'avenir. Elle a su s'allier les collaborateurs les plus audacieux de l'époque pour proposer une révolution des principes de l'Opéra, tant avec des œuvres de répertoire qu'avec des créations contemporaines. On y voit notamment Arthur Maria Rabenalt s'assurer la collaboration d'Oskar Schlemmer dans la mise en scène de « La Main heureuse » et de Teo Otto dans « Erwartung » (Schœnberg) , Jürgen Fehling, celle d'Ewald Düllberg dans « le Vaisseau fantôme » (Wagner) , Otto Klemperer celle du même Düllberg dans « Œdipe Rex » (Stravinsky) , ou encore celle de Niedecken-Gebhard dans « Cardillac » (Hindemith) - autant de grands moments d'Opéra qui ont célébré le dialogue des artistes avec les leurs metteurs en scène du XXe siècle. Dans ce contexte, la collaboration de Moholy-Nagy avec Hans Curjel (par ailleurs, intendant de l'établissement) complète le panel expérimental et permet la mise en œuvre sur scène des théories constructivistes du « Bauhaus » . D'après ce qu'en rapportent les critiques Adolf Weißmann, Theodor W. Adorno, Heinrich Strobel et Oskar Bie dans leurs comptes rendus, mais aussi grâce à divers témoignages et mémoires (Hans Curjel, Sybil Mohly-Nagy) , nous pouvons reconstituer

en partie le fonctionnement de la mise en scène et interpréter avec davantage de justesse les quelques documents iconographiques dont nous disposons aujourd'hui.

Le projet initial peut sembler paradoxal : vouloir confronter un univers par excellence figuratif à une esthétique tout entière orientée vers l'abstraction. Pourtant, dans cette collaboration de Moholy-Nagy (alors assisté du jeune Teo Otto) et de Hans Curjel, c'est la confrontation d'une rhétorique ancienne de la mimésis avec les moyens modernistes de sa mise en forme qui intéresse - et la façon dont le travail scénique entre en résonance avec l'univers mécaniste qui irrigue l'imaginaire créateur de Weimar. L'approche scénique de Moholy-Nagy fait table rase dans une certaine mesure, mais à l'intérieur d'un genre très établi, et compose avec les données d'une œuvre née d'une tout autre idéologie de la représentation. La réalisation de Moholy-Nagy est caractérisée par 3 aspects majeurs : le travail sur la perspective constructiviste, l'idée de la cinétique et l'intérêt pour les nouveaux média (film, photo) .

La perspective est un élément central de l'approche constructiviste. Les principes développés par l'artiste jusqu'alors, mis en œuvre dans le film ou la photo notamment, doivent se retrouver dans l'espace tridimensionnel. Son rapport à la scène porte ainsi la même marque du changement de regard : traitement oblique de la perspective, utilisation de l'espace comme une surface plane séquencée en plusieurs parties qui en rythment la composition, point de vue décalés (vue du ciel, plans de coupe sur intérieur) . Il recourt à l'échafaudage pour matérialiser la structuration de l'espace, là où il recourait à la combinatoire de la ligne oblique et verticale pour structurer l'espace bidimensionnel de l'image photographique.

Pour le prologue, la taverne de Luther à Nuremberg est matérialisée par un échafaudage sous lequel sont accumulées des chaises en acier (dessinées et produites avec son collègue du « Bauhaus » , Marcel Breuer) . La structure est flanquée d'un grand escalier en colimaçon qui dessert la galerie supérieure, permettant la circulation de Lindorf au-dessus des chaises.

L'espace scénique, ainsi découpé en plusieurs niveaux dans sa hauteur, est traité en surface plane, la profondeur n'intervient plus comme un élément de signification, contrairement au dispositif traditionnel dans lequel la lecture du champ de profondeur indique l'importance du rôle des personnages. (31) Hans Curjel, dans un article consacré à l'œuvre scénique de Moholy-Nagy, (32) évoque ces « Flächenbilder » (images planes) comme caractéristique de l'approche constructiviste où la profondeur est dissoute dans la composition géométrique de la surface. Moholy-Nagy accorde également une importance fondamentale à la lumière, qu'il utilise comme un élément à part entière au service de la communication visuelle, autant que pour parfaire chacune de ses compositions scéniques (la recherche de la forme abstraite, « Gestaltung » , est reconduite dans la décomposition des éléments de la scène : lignes, mouvements, couleurs) . Il utilise notamment un rayon lumineux comme ligne mobile, qui donne à la composition l'animation nécessaire. Curjel rapporte que « les effets de lumière et de couleur correspondaient aux séquences dramatiques et musicales de l'œuvre » . (33) L'appareillage lumineux évolue d'ailleurs rapidement vers davantage de complexité dans « Madama Butterfly » qu'il met en scène, toujours à la « Krolloper » (février 1931) , et dans laquelle il collabore à nouveau avec Curjel. Il parvient à réaliser ce qu'il esquissait en 1928 dans un article consacré au film sonore : (34) « projeter la lumière à travers une suite de plusieurs écrans, en partie transparents, tels que filets, grillages, etc. » afin « d'enrichir nos observations spatiales » . Il utilise un écran sur lequel est imprimée une vue

d'avion de Nagasaki, en façon de carte postale en noir et blanc, et devant lequel pend une structure en bâtons de bambou, à la fois mur intérieur de la maison Butterfly et fenêtre sur l'extérieur.

Lorsque la nuit tombe à l'Acte 3 et que la scène se fait plus intime, l'écran, éclairé par derrière, ne laisse plus apparaître que la silhouette de la baie de Nagasaki en ombre chinoise et les bambous, éclairés par un rayon de face, ramènent la lumière (et l'attention) au 1er plan.

Theodor W. Adorno, qui suit de près les innovations de la « Krolloper », est particulièrement sensible à ce traitement de la lumière dans son compte rendu des « Contes d'Hoffmann » :

« L'éclairage de la scène n'est plus celui de l'illusion et du merveilleux à l'ancienne, mais ce n'est pas non plus l'ambiance humide de l'impressionnisme, pas plus que le faisceau symbolique privé d'espace de l'expressionnisme : l'affinité de la lumière elle-même tend bien plutôt à la construction de l'espace, l'espace, au sens le plus littéral, se compose d'un complexe de lumières. » (35)

L'importance du mouvement sur scène est étroitement liée à la compréhension de l'espace. Il est intéressant de relever, à cet égard, la référence de Moholy-Nagy au physicien et philosophe autrichien Ernst Mach, qu'il cite dans un article de sa période américaine consacré à la relation spatiale :

« L'espace consiste en le rapport entre la position de 2 corps. Ceci se comprend de la façon suivante : prenons 2 corps, disons la terre et la lune. L'espace se comprend à partir de la relation entre leurs positions respectives. Changeons à présent la terre et la lune en d'autres corps, par exemple 2 chaises. Cette expérience des rapports visibles entre les positions peut être constatée dans le mouvement (par l'altération de la position) ainsi que par le toucher, il peut être vérifié par les sens. » (36)

Dans sa tentative de réduire la compréhension du monde à des principes fondamentaux de la sensation (précédant de peu l'approche phénoménologique), Mach s'en tient à un relativisme de la sensation, qui devient l'étalon du rapport sujet-objet et joue un rôle constitutif dans la représentation du monde. L'espace ne se laisse saisir que relativement à la position des corps qui l'occupent et au mouvement que sous-tendent leurs rapports. D'où la nécessité, pour Nagy, de matérialiser ces rapports et de les représenter dans le jeu scénique au moyen de structures mobiles. Il s'agit de faire apparaître « le rapport entre l'homme, le matériau, la force et l'espace » (« Zusammenhang zwischen Mensch, Material, Kraft, Raum. ») . Il faut sans doute rapprocher ce projet de l'influence exercée par son collaborateur, El Lissizsky, avec lequel il fonde à Berlin, en 1922, le Groupe G. Lissizsky qui prônait déjà le recours à des structures scéniques d'échafaudages pour la diversité des combinaisons qu'elles offrent et faisait de leur déplacement sur scène un élément du jeu à part entière. L'idée du mouvement, du ballet mécanique de la structure en recomposition sur scène dans le temps du jeu, façonne l'esthétique constructiviste :

« La construction en échafaudage donne à chaque élément en jeu toute la mobilité souhaitable. La forme de chaque échafaudage doit donc rendre possible le mouvement dans toutes sortes de positions, de rotations, d'extensions, etc. Tout est en structure apparente, de façon à laisser à vue le jeu des éléments qui la parcourent. La forme de chaque

élément, à son tour, doit répondre aux exigences et aux intentions. Ils coulissent, roulent, flottent dans l'air, au-dessus et à l'intérieur des échafaudages. » (37)

De la même manière, Nagy conçoit pour « les Contes d'Hoffmann » un plateau mobile qui fait évoluer à vue la composition des structures scéniques, permettant, par exemple, le changement du prologue à l'Acte I (le cabinet de Spalanzani) . De même, dans « Madama Butterfly », la structure de maison pivotante, grâce à la variation de lumières colorées sur l'horizon de la scène, renouvelle constamment la composition de l'espace. Curjel décrit également le bal des modules sur scène, des mouvements et contre-mouvements des plate-formes de la maison et du jardin, et jusqu'à l'annonce de la disparition de Madame Butterfly dans un jeu d'ombres qui opère la métamorphose du personnage en une silhouette virtuelle, flottante, aux contours évanescents. (38) Ces « espaces imaginaires mobiles » se déplacent selon les besoins du jeu, et ouvrent un nouveau rapport à l'espace scénique, qui se développe en des formes nouvelles et connaît des extensions inédites : pendant la scène de la barcarolle, des filles « se balancent, figées en une posture rêveuse, suspendues en hauteur au-dessus des spectateurs. » (39)

L'iconographie le confirme : le jeu d'ombres et de lumières vient dédoubler l'espace réel des structures d'acier, amplifier le volume de la scène par une occupation de toute la hauteur et renvoie l'univers offenbachien à ses caractéristiques :

« Les entrelacs d'une mécanique d'automates et de véritables émotions de l'âme. » (40)

Le résultat n'est d'ailleurs pas sans évoquer le dispositif du « Raum-Licht Modulator » , conçu dès 1922, et réalisé pour l'exposition parisienne de la Société des artistes décorateurs de 1930, au Grand Palais.

Nagy, dans le livret qui accompagnait la représentation des « Contes » , présente son dispositif comme une tentative de « faire advenir l'espace à partir de la lumière et de l'ombre. Les décors se déplacent ici de façon à produire les ombrages. Tout est transparent et toutes les transparences sont soumises à la composition d'un espace tangible. » (41) Les techniques du corps, élément à part entière de la composition scénique, évoluent de même. Le chanteur doit se débarrasser de la grammaire gestuelle héritée d'un style opératique vieilli, chargé « d'une ostentation conventionnelle, de gestes aveugles, routiniers et ridicules. » (42) C'est désormais un corps différent que l'on montre, acquis à la mécanique. Le geste du chanteur devient un élément de la composition de mouvements qui animent la grande machine scénique, au même titre que les jeux de lumières. La logique de dissociation trouve également écho dans l'attrait pour les nouveaux médias : non seulement des jeux de miroirs accentuent certains gestes, défamiliarisent la présence des corps sur scène, mais encore l'usage du film fait son apparition. Une projection vient, l'espace d'une courte minute, dédoubler le temps de l'action et sa matérialisation physique dans l'Acte 3 - « Giulietta » , à Venise. (43) On peut y voir, avec Kracauer, la proposition d'une augmentation poétique de la réalité - ce qu'il thématise sous l'idée de « rédemption » : « isolées du reste du corps et très grossières, ces parties du corps que nous connaissons vont se transformer en des organes inconnus palpitant de leur propre vie. Ces images font exploser notre environnement en un double sens : elles l'agrandissent littéralement et, du même coup, elles font sauter la prison de la réalité convenue et y déploient des espaces que nous n'avons encore explorés, au mieux, qu'en rêve. » (44) La collaboration de Moholy-Nagy la même année avec Erwin Piscator dans la mise en scène de Der Kaufmann von Berlin à la Volksbühne

(septembre 1929) est l'occasion pour lui de développer ce nouvel instrumentarium de la scène moderne, dans laquelle il recourt plus amplement à la projection de films et d'images. L'écho est flagrant au programme énoncé dans « Die Bühne im Bauhaus » , qui posait la question de l'analogie de la scène et des arts plastiques :

« Les arts plastiques ont découvert les moyens purs de leur conception : le rapport des couleurs primaires, des masses, des matériaux, etc. Mais comment des séries de pensées ou de mouvements peuvent-elle se laisser ordonner à forces égales dans leur rapport avec des éléments maîtrisés, « absolus » , de son, de lumière (couleur) , de forme et de mouvement ? Ainsi, la répétition d'une idée avec les mêmes mots, en respectant la même intonation ou en la variant, par le biais de nombreux acteurs, peut agir comme moyen d'une conception théâtrale synthétique. (Des chœurs - mais pas le chœur antique, qui accompagne, passif !) Ou bien, au moyen de dispositifs de miroirs, des visages, des gestes d'acteurs prodigieusement agrandis et leurs voix, corrélativement à cet agrandissement, amplifiées. C'est précisément le même effet que celui engendré par la reproduction simultanée, synoptique, synacoustique (optico- ou acoustico-mécanique) de pensées (cinéma, gramophone, haut-parleur) . » (45)

La technique vient donc opérer sur scène la séparation mise en œuvre dans les compositions picturales antérieures entre les éléments. Dans la matérialité des composantes de l'espace scénique apparaît l'homme nouveau : représentation dans la représentation. La figuration des sens (par amplification, déformation, isolement - autant de manifestations de leur autonomisation) accompagne cette vision de l'Opéra dans un mouvement qui montre et démonte, dans une synthèse qui déconstruit. Si l'humain reste au centre de la composition lyrique, son entrée dans l'abstraction produit une interprétation nouvelle : il s'agit désormais de « l'homme en tant que part de nature au fonctionnement mécanique. » (46)

La scénographie de Nagy avait, on s'en doute, de quoi choquer le public contemporain de l'univers petit bourgeois du décorum romantique, de la toile peinte, des rochers de carton-pâte et du mobilier naturaliste. Sybil Moholy-Nagy souligne ce contraste et rend compte de la réception de cette production qui fit scandale et sensation :

« Le spectateur qui venait pour s'abîmer dans la douceur de la Barcarole et se délecter d'une image du Grand Canal en papier mâché voyait ses plaisirs conservateurs persiflés par cette scène irrévocablement moderne. Au lieu de barges, les couples d'amoureux devaient s'allonger dans des nacelles pliantes en acier inoxydable, qui se détachaient d'un mur nu à l'annonce de la musique. Au lieu d'un ciel éclairé aux néons, constellé de bulbes d'étoiles, un plafond fuselé blanc dessinait la perspective vers le lointain profond, d'où les figures rococo de Hoffmann émergeaient, vêtus de costumes qui faisaient contraster le smoking clownesque du père d'Antonia avec l'allure mobile et futuriste de la robe de sa fille. » (47)

Le critique Adolf Weißmann, dans son compte rendu de la première des « Contes d'Hoffmann » , s'étonne pourtant du scandale suscité par ce « regard nouveau » : pourquoi ne pas rencontrer chez Offenbach, précisément lieu du rendez-vous de l'humain et de la machine, l'univers mécanique d'un constructivisme intégral ? « Pourquoi l'agencement et les mouvements ne seraient-ils pas expérimentaux, dans le cabinet d'expériences de Spalanzani ? Pourquoi ne pourrait-on nous mettre sous les yeux l'avènement de l'homme artificiel ? Et pourquoi le fantomatique ne pourrait-il habiter aussi dans la lumière sous les plafonds de toiles inclinées ? » (48) Les poupées et autres marionnettes mécaniques hantent,

en effet, depuis longtemps l'imaginaire littéraire et théâtral. Déjà le « Coppélia » de Léo Delibes et « les Contes d'Hoffmann » de Jacques Offenbach se sont fait les relais de ces figures ambivalentes que rêvaient Hoffmann et Kleist, à la recherche de la grâce qui n'appartient « qu'à la matière sans conscience ou à la conscience infinie » . (49) Un tel fantasme ne pouvait manquer de trouver un écho retentissant dans une société où l'homme, en pleines noces avec la technique industrielle, est en quête de grâce auprès de dieux nouveaux. Parmi les créatures théâtrales de l' « homme nouveau » , l'humain côtoie ainsi la machine comme un devenir possible autant que comme un substitut vraisemblable, à la fois projet fascinant (révéléur de la « machine désirante » qui s'incarne en lui) et menace terrible (lieu de l'anéantissement, horizon borné, clos, privé de tout devenir) .

En somme, Moholy-Nagy propose d'abord un rapport renouvelé à la mimésis, une rénovation de la façon dont l'humain se parle, se dit, se représente au sein de l'institution qu'est l'Opéra. Si la perspective d'une fusion de l'abstraction et de la représentation relève sans doute du paradoxe (ou de l'utopie) , la réalisation scénique de Moholy-Nagy pose, néanmoins, la question de ses composantes essentielles (des techniques de la mimésis et de ses limites dans le cadre lyrique) et propose une réponse au désir moderne de reconfigurer la vision du monde à partir de l'homme nouveau. Alors s'impose, toujours renouvelé, l'espoir d'atteindre l'origine, l'essence :

« Lorsqu'on donne autant d'espace aux éléments optique, acoustique et cinétique qu'aux éléments littéraires, alors on approche de l'essence du théâtre. » (50)

Est-ce finalement l'homme qui disparaît derrière la machine ? La passion constructiviste pour la forme, son culte de l'abstraction, son désir de totalité par la convocation des sens ne renvoient-ils pas plutôt à l'affirmation ultime de l'humain dans un geste d'anthropomorphisation ? C'est, autrement dit, la rencontre de la marionnette et de l'humain dans le même corps : les marionnettes ont grandi à la taille humaine et les fils se sont résorbés à l'intérieur pour devenir ceux de la conscience.

Notes

(1) Paul Valéry. « Art moderne et grand art » , tiré de : « Degas, Danse Dessin » , Paris (1938) - (1965) ; page 179 (en majuscules dans le texte) .

(2) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Production - Reproduction » , tiré de : « De Stijl » (1922) , n° 7, reproduit dans : Krisztina Passuth. « Moholy-Nagy » , Flammarion, Paris (1984) ; pages 288-289.

(3) Walter Gropius. « Programm des staatlichen Bauhauses in Weimar » , in : « Die neue Architektur und das Bauhaus. Grundzüge und Entwicklung einer Konzeption » , « Neue Bauhausbücher » , Hans Wingler, Berlin (1965) ; page 36 :

« La pensée prédominante du “ Bauhaus ” consiste donc en l'idée d'une unité nouvelle, d'une réunion de la diversité des arts » (« Der beherrschende Gedanke des Bauhauses ist also die Idee der neuen Einheit, die Sammlung der vielen Künste. ») ; voir aussi : Éric Michaud. « Fabriques de l'homme nouveau, de Léger à Mondrian » , Carré, Paris (1997) ; la page 45 cite Walter Gropius :

« Le projet du “ Bauhaus ” est de fonder une corporation d’une nouvelle sorte, une corporation sans cette séparation de classes qui dresse un mur de dédain entre artisan et artiste. Il nous faut vouloir, concevoir, et construire tous ensemble l’architecture nouvelle, l’architecture de l’avenir, où peinture, sculpture, et architecture ne feront qu’un, et qui, des mains de millions d’ouvriers, s’élèvera un jour vers le ciel, symbole de cristal d’une nouvelle foi. »

Gropius écrivait, en 1923 :

« Notre époque est caractérisée par un désir d’élaborer une conception unitaire du monde. »

(4) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Akasztott Ember » (L’homme pendu) , n° 3/4, Vienne (1922) ; page 3 - reproduit dans : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; pages 289-290.

(5) Lux Feininger, cité dans : Oskar Schlemmer, Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, Fritz Molnar. « The Theatre of the Bauhaus » , Middeltown, Connecticut (1961) ; page 50 (majuscules dans le texte) :

« Beyond the significance of shaping, forming, thinking through, it has the flavour of underlining the totality of such fashioning, whether of an artifact or of an idea. It forbids the nebulous and the diffuse. In its fullest philosophical meaning, it expresses the Platonic “ Eidolon ”, the “ Urbild ”, the pre-existing form. »

(6) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « L’espace-temps et le photographe » , tiré de : « American Annual of Photography » , reproduit dans : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; page 346.

(7) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Comment peut-on créer le théâtre total ? » , tiré de : « Dokumentum » , Budapest (mars 1927) ; pages 6-7 - reproduit dans : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; page 301.

(8) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Malerei, Photographie, Film » , München (1926) ; pages 13-14 (majuscule dans le texte) :

« Was wir brauchen, ist nicht das Gesamtkunstwerk, neben dem das Leben getrennt hinfließt, sondern die sich selbst aufbauende Synthese aller Lebensmomente, zu dem alles umfassenden Gesamtwerk (Leben) , das jede Isolierung aufhebt, indem alle individuellen Leistungen aus einer universellen Notwendigkeit entstehen. »

(9) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Nouvelles expériences cinématographiques » (1933) , tiré de : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; pages 321-325.

(10) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Production - Reproduction » (1922) , Idem ; page 290.

(11) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « L’espace temps et le photographe » , tiré de : « American Annual of Photography » , reproduit dans : Krisztina Passuth. Idem ; page 345.

(12) Siegfried Kracauer. « Théorie du film, La rédemption de la réalité » , traduit de l'anglais par Daniel Blanchard et Caude Orsoni, Flammarion, Paris (2010) ; page 36.

(13) Idem ; page 346.

(14) Juliet Koss souligne à ce propos que :

« ... by contrast, Gropius called for instruction in a range of other subjects that he considered necessary for a complete education in the arts. These included anatomy, garden design, contract negotiation, book-keeping, and art history. The Statues of the “ Staatliche Bauhaus ”, in Weimar, published in January 1921, which includes a section on the curriculum, makes likewise no mention of theatre. »

Se référer à : Juliet Koss. « Bauhaus Theatre of Human Dolls » , tiré de : « The Modernity after Wagner » , University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis (2010) ; page 317 - note 2.

(15) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, Oskar Schlemmer, Fritz Molnar. « Die Bühne im Bauhaus » (fac-similé de l'édition originale de 1925) , « Bauhaus Bücher » Band 4, Kupferberg Verlag (1965) .

(16) Formule empruntée par Lászlo Moholy-Nagy à Piet Mondrian : « Une nouvelle création dans la musique » , tiré de : « Der Sturm » , Berlin (juillet 1923) , tiré de : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum, page 292.

(17) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Production - Reproduction » , tiré de : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; page 289.

(18) Idem ; page 289.

(19) Ludwig Hirschfeld-Mack. « Dreiteilige Farbenonatine (Ultramarin grün) » , tiré de : Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Malerei, Fotografie, Film » , « Bauhaus Bücher » , Band 8 ; pages 80-81.

(20) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Partitur-Skizze einer Mechanischen Exzentrik (Synthese von Form, Bewegung, Ton, Licht (Farbe) und Geruch) » , tiré de : « Die Bühne im Bauhaus » , Opus citatum ; page 47.

(21) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Une nouvelle création dans la musique » , tiré de : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; page 292.

(22) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Comment peut-on créer la scène totale ? » , Idem ; page 300.

(23) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Theater, Zirkus, Variété » , tiré de : « Die Bühne im Bauhaus » , Opus citatum ; page 50 (majuscules dans le texte) .

(24) Oskar Schlemmer. « Mensch und Kunstfigur » , tiré de : « Die Bühne im Bauhaus » , Opus citatum ; pages 27-38.

(25) Juliet Koss. « Bauhaus Theatre of Human Dolls » , tiré de : « The Modernity after Wagner » , University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis (2010) ; page 212 :

« Following the arguments of the artists themselves, formal disjuncture is often aligned with the politics of resistance, with the visible montage fragment treated as a marker of the “ real ” that questions the logic of representation and, thus, acts as a destabilizing force in the political, cultural, and social realms. »

(26) Idem ; page 213.

(27) Oskar Schlemmer. « Mensch und Kunstfigur » , Opus citatum ; pages 27-38.

(28) Inge Baxmann. « Mythos : Gemeinschaft, Körper-und Tanzkulturen in der Moderne » , Fink, München (2000) ; page 99 :

« Träume vom Technokörper, von der Fusion des menschlichen Körpers mit den neuen Materialien und Technologien oszillierten zwischen Phantasmen der Überwindung des Körpers und Vorstellungen von einer Verleiblichung der Technik. »

(29) László Moholy-Nagy. « Theater, Zirkus, Variété » , Opus citatum ; page 51.

(30) László Moholy-Nagy. « Theater, Zirkus, Variété » , Opus citatum ; page 51.

(31) Traditionnellement, la pratique circonscrit les airs à l'espace du proscénium (notamment parce qu'il a longtemps été la zone la mieux éclairée) , cependant que les jeux de pantomimes ou les ensembles vocaux ont lieu au niveau des lignes de convergence optiques (visibles de toutes parts dans le théâtre à l'italienne) , soit le second plan, et l'on relègue au niveau des châssis de décors à l'arrière-plan la figuration et les chœurs.

(32) Hans Curjel. « Moholy-Nagy und das Theater » , tiré de : « Die Künstler und das Theater » , n° 24 (novembre 1964) ; page 11.

(33) Idem ; page 12.

(34) László Moholy-Nagy. « Réflexions sur le film sonore » . Article paru d'abord dans : « Korunk » , n° 10, Kolosvar (1930) - puis, en français, dans : « Telehor » , n° 1, Brno (1936) - reproduit dans : Krisztina Passuth. Opus citatum ; page 301.

(35) Theodor W. Adorno. « Berliner Opernmemorial » , tiré de : « Musikblätter des Anbruch » , n° 9 (juin 1929) :

« Das ist nicht mehr das alte illusionäre und zauberische Bühnenlicht, aber auch nicht das impressionistische der

feuchten Stimmung und nicht die raumlosen Symbolkegel des Expressionismus : das Licht wird vielmehr selber zur Raumkonstruktion verwandt, der Raum ist mit Lichtkomplexen strengen Sinnes komponiert. »

(36) Ernst Mach (source non mentionnée) , cité par : Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « The New Bauhaus and Space Relationships » , tiré de : « American architect and architecture » , n° 151 (décembre 1937) ; page 25 :

« Space is the relation between the position of bodies. An explanation for that may be this : 2 bodies exist, say the earth and the moon. The relationship between their position means space. We can now change earth and moon into other bodies, e.g. , 2 chairs. This experience of the visible relationships of positions may be checked by movement (alteration of position) and by touch, and it may be verified by the senses. »

(37) El Lissitzky. « Introduction » à « Kestner-Gesellschaft, Sieg über die Sonne » , Hannover (1923) , cité par : Joseph Harris Caton. « The utopian vision of Moholy-Nagy, Technology, Society, and the Avant-garde » , University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor (1980) , note 120 :

« The scaffolding machinery provides every possibility of movement for objects in play. The individual forms of the scaffolding must, therefore, be capable of movement into various positions, rotations, extensions and so forth. All is of open ribbed construction, in order not to hide from view the play of objects running through it. Each of the objects themselves is formed according to requirements and intentions. They glide, roll, float in the air, above and inside the scaffolding. »

(38) Hans Curjel. « Moholy-Nagy und das Theater » , Opus citatum ; page 12 :

« Haus und Garten auf einer fahrenden Bühnenfläche, auf der sich ineinander- und entgegenspielende Bewegungen ergaben, Gehen und Gleiten zugleich. Im Zwischenspiel vom zweiten und dritten Akt, das die Katastrophe einleitet, verwandelte sich die Titelfigur durch Schattenbewegung in verfremdende, gleichsam schwimmende, virtuelle Gebilde ; Umbau des Menschen in eine Traumgestalt, vor der die Nacht als fahrender Schleier vorbeizog. »

(39) Idem ; page 12.

(40) Hans Curjel. Idem ; page 12 :

« Das Ziel war, die Substanz zu zeigen, die sich im Charakter der Musik ausprägt : das Ineinandergreifen von automatenhafter Mechanik und echter seelischer Emotion. »

(41) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, cité dans : Hans Curjel. Idem ; page 12 :

« Ein Versuch : aus Licht und Schatten Raum entstehen zu lassen. Und andere wandeln sich hier die Kulissen zu Requisiten für Schattenerzeugung um. Alles ist durchsichtig, und alle Durchsichtigkeiten fügen sich zu einer fassbaren Raumgliederung. »

(42) Hans Curjel. Idem ; page 12.

(43) Nous n'avons pas trouvé d'autres traces de ce film que sa mention par Hans Curjel et par le critique Heinrich Strobel (se référer à : « Berlin, Ein konstruktivistischer Offenbach-Konzert » , tiré de : Melos, 1929 ; pages 142-144) . Signalons que Moholy-Nagy s'était intéressé aux problèmes théoriques du film dès ses jeunes années avant de mettre en pratique ses propres idées vers la fin des années 1920. Il réalise dans cette période une dizaine de courts métrages, dont « Impressionnen vom alten marseiller Hafen » (9 minutes, 1929) ; « Ein Lichtspiel : schwarz, weiss, grau » (6 minutes, 1931) ; et « Berliner Stilleben » (9 minutes, 1931) sont des exemples achevés de sa pratique du montage au service d'une recherche, avant tout, formelle - dans l'esprit documentaire du 1er et du 3e, comme dans la fantaisie expérimentale du second.

(44) Siegfried Kracauer. « Théorie du Film » ; page 90.

(45) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Theater, Zirkus, Variété » , Opus citatum ; pages 51-52 :

« Die bildenden Künste haben die reinen Mittel ihrer Gestaltung, die primären Farben- , Massen- , Material- und so weiter Beziehungen gefunden. Aber wie lassen sich menschliche Bewegungs- und Gedankenfolgen in den Zusammenhang von beherrschten, " absoluten " Ton- , Licht- (Farbe) , Form- und Bewegungselementen gleichwertig einordnen ? So kann die Wiederholung eines Gedankens mit denselben Worten, in gleichem oder verschiedenem Tonfall durch viele Darsteller als Mittel synthetischer Theatergestaltung wirken. (Chöre - aber nicht der begleitende, passive, antike Chor !) Oder die durch Spiegelvorrichtungen ungeheuer vergrößerten Gesichter, Gesten der Schauspieler und ihre der Vergrößerung entsprechend verstärkten Stimmen. Ebenso wirkt die simultane, synopitsche, synakustische (optisch- oder phonetisch-mechanische) Wiedergabe von Gedanken (Kino, Gramophon, Lautsprecher) . »

(46) Hans Curjel. Idem ; page 11 : « Der Mensch als mechanisch funktionierendes Stück Natur. »

(47) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. « Sibyl, Experiment in totality » , introduction de Walter Gropius, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, Cambridge (1969) , page 49 :

« The spectator who came to lose himself in the sweetness of the Barcarole, and to revel in a " papier-mâché " image of the " Canale Grande ", found his conservative pleasures persiflated by an unremittingly modern scene. Instead of barges, there were stainless steel folding cots for the romantic couples to recline on, pulled-out of the bare wall at the musical cue of the conductor. Instead of a neon-lit sky studded with bulb stars, a tapered white ceiling led into a deep perspective from which Hoffmann's rococo figures emerged in costumes which contrasted the clownish tuxedo of Antonia's father with the futuristic mobility of his daughter's gown. »

(48) Adolf Weißmann. « Oper : Berlin » , tiré de : « Die Musik » (avril 1929) ; page 536.

(49) Se référer à : Heinrich von Kleist. « Sur le théâtre de marionnettes » , Fayard, Paris (2009) ; page 20 :

« La grâce apparaît sous sa forme la plus pure dans cette anatomie humaine qui soit possède une conscience infinie, soit n'en possède aucune - c'est à dire en Dieu ou dans la marionnette. »

(50) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, cité par : Christopher Innes. « Erwin Piscator's Political Theatre, The Development of modern German Drama » , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1972) ; page 148 :

« When the optical, accoustical and kinetic elements are given as much space as literary ones, we draw nearer to the essence of theatre. »

Le « Kroll Oper »

Le milieu de l'Allemagne - l'Histoire du « Kroll Oper »

Durée : 59 minutes - Date de production : 1990 - Producteur : © Brilliant Music Media MDCCCCLXXX , du cinéaste allemand, Jörg Moser-Metius.

Ce documentaire retrace l'histoire du « Kroll Oper » , un bâtiment célèbre situé sur la Place de la République à Berlin, au beau milieu de l'Allemagne. Il fut bâti en 1844 avant d'être complètement démoli en 1956.

À l'origine construit pour être un centre-de-danse, nommé « Kroll Établissement » , il est changé en maison d'Opéra au début du XIXe siècle. Le ténor italien Enrico Caruso y a chanté, des artistes de l'École du « Bauhaus » y ont travaillé, et lorsqu'Otto Klemperer fut désigné comme son directeur musical, le « Kroll Oper » devint le centre de l'avant-garde musicale européenne.

L'histoire artistique du bâtiment prend tragiquement fin lorsque les Nazis en prennent possession et en font leur siège politique après l'incendie criminel du « Reichstag » , en 1933. Le documentaire revient sur les différents rôles que le « Kroll Oper » a joué dans l'histoire de la ville de Berlin, sur le plan culturel, musical, et politique.

L'Opéra « Kroll » (ou « Kroll-Oper » de Berlin, aujourd'hui disparu) riverain à l'ouest de la Königsplatz (aujourd'hui « Platz der Republik ») faisait face au Palais du « Reichstag » . Il fut construit en 1844 pour le restaurateur Josef Kroll sur un terrain offert par le roi Frédéric-Guillaume IV de Prusse, afin de devenir un lieu de divertissement (un centre-de-danse, nommé « Kroll Établissement ») . Les architectes furent Ludwig Persius, Eduard Knoblauch (le 1er architecte privé de Berlin par son importance) et Carl Ferdinand Langhans. Le bâtiment, victime d'un incendie accidentel mais dévastateur, sera réaménagé en maison lyrique en 1851 et sera utilisé pour des représentations d'Opéras, d'Opérettes et de pièces de théâtre. Il sera à nouveau réaménagé en 1895 et renommé Nouvel Opéra Royal, la résidence des compagnies prussiennes d'Opéra et de ballet de l'État.

En 1924, le bâtiment (d'une capacité de 2,100 sièges) est rebaptisé Opéra d'État de la place de la République (« Staatsoper am Platz der Republik ») , mais est toujours appelé familièrement l'Opéra « Kroll » . La place de la

République ou « Platz der Republik » est située près du « Großer Tiergarten », dans le quartier de Tiergarten - l'arrondissement de « Mitte ». Elle est actuellement bordée, sur son côté Est, par le palais du « Reichstag », en face duquel se trouvait l'Opéra. Elle est aujourd'hui recouverte d'une vaste pelouse de 36,900 mètres carrés.

À cette époque, la capitale allemande était un des plus grands centres internationaux de l'art. Le Berlin d'avant-guerre fut un moment unique. On y retrouvait les artistes Kurt Weill, Bertolt Brecht et Lotte Lenya. Berlin était le centre de la musique d'avant-garde. Durant cette période, Otto Klemperer dirigeait l'Opéra « Kroll ». Bruno Walter et Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirigeaient également à Berlin.

L'artiste Ernst Ludwig Kirchner s'engagera en 1915 dans l'armée mais il est réformé 2 mois plus tard en raison de problèmes de santé (maladie pulmonaire, état dépressif, aggravés par la consommation d'alcool et de stupéfiants) . Il fait alors plusieurs séjours au sanatorium du Docteur Oskar Kohnstamm, à « Königstein im Taunus » dans la Heße, dont il décorera certains murs, aujourd'hui détruits. Intéressé par le portrait, il amorcera sa série de gravures sur bois alors qu'il fait la rencontre d'Otto Klemperer (« Le Pianiste Otto Klemperer » de 1916, gravure sur bois, « Kirchner Museum », Davos) . Kirchner a produit dans un style très personnel des œuvres qui reflètent ses années d'étude auprès d'Arnold Schönberg et ses rencontres avec d'autres musiciens d'exception comme Ernst Toch, Ernest Bloch, Roger Sessions, Igor Stravinsky.

Nommé Directeur musical de l'Opéra « Kroll » de Berlin, de 1927 à 1931, le chef-d'orchestre Otto Klemperer en fit très rapidement une des Ires scènes lyriques d'Allemagne, en dirigeant tous les compositeurs modernes de son époque. La maison devint rapidement célèbre par son orientation très particulière : être un théâtre de créations et une scène d'avant-garde en ce qui concerne les décors et la mise-en-scène du répertoire. Elle accueillera les nouvelles œuvres de Franz Schreker, Ernst Křenek, Kurt Weill, Paul Hindemith (son Opéra « Neues vom Tage » *, en 1929) , Arnold Schönberg (son opéra « Begleitmusik zu einer Lichtspielszene » , en 1930) et Igor Stravinsky (avec la première d' « Œdipus Rex ») dans des mises-en-scène expressionnistes, une politique novatrice fortement encouragée par la République de Weimar, mais qui valut à son auteur l'opprobre des Nationaux-Socialistes (Nazis) , bientôt au pouvoir. Il dirigea également le Chœur philharmonique et, de 1931 à 1933, travailla au « Staatsoper » de Berlin.

* « Nouvelles du jour » est un Opéra-comique en 3 parties de Paul Hindemith sur un livret de Marcellus Schiffer. Composé en 1928, il est créé à l'Opéra « Kroll » de Berlin sous la direction d'Otto Klemperer. Sa création parisienne se tiendra en novembre 1962 au TNP, sous la direction de Charles Bruck. Synopsis : Édouard et Laura sont mari et femme et veulent divorcer, mais le chemin de la séparation conjugale est long et semé d'embûches.

31 août 1928 - « Die Dreigroschenoper » (« L'Opéra de quat'sous ») , sur un livret de Bertolt Brecht est créé à Berlin, au « Theater am Schiffbauerdamm » , sous la direction de Theo Mackeben, avec Roma Bahn dans le rôle de Jenny, Lotte Lenya dans celui de Jenny, et Harald Paulsen en Mackeath. Le livret est inspiré par une traduction d'Elisabeth Hauptmann de « l'Opéra des gueux » (« The Beggar's Opera ») de Johann Christoph Pepusch et John Gay. L'œuvre fait scandale et devient très populaire dans le monde entier, les revenus de cette œuvre, lui permettent de se consacrer à la composition. Le succès, s'explifie après guerre, quand la complainte de Mackie-Messer devient un standard du jazz, après les interprétations de Sidney Bechet et de Louis Armstrong. Le 7 février 1929, la suite «

Kleine Dreigroschenmusik » , réalisée d'après « l'Opéra de quat'sous » , pour instruments à vent, est créée à Berlin sous la direction d'Otto Klemperer.

(Image) Ewald Düllberg - Projet de décor pour le « Der Freischütz » de Carl Maria von Weber, Acte III : stand du concours de tir, Berlin, « Kroll Oper » (1928) , gouache, Cologne, « Universität zu Köln » , « Theaterwissenschaftliche Sammlung » , n° d'inventaire 30883C.

15 janvier 1929 - L'Opéra « Der fliegende Holländer » de Richard Wagner fut présenté au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin sous la baguette d'Otto Klemperer. La mise-en-scène était de Jürgen Fehling. Les costumes, d'Ewald Dülberg. Le projet de décor du 1er Acte sera réalisé par Ewald Dülberg, dans le style de la « Nouvelle Objectivité » .

(Image) Ewald Dülberg - Projet de décor pour « le Vaisseau fantôme » de Richard Wagner, Acte II : chambre dans la maison de Daland ; Berlin, « Kroll Oper » (1929) , gouache, Cologne, « Universität zu Köln » , « Theaterwissenschaftliche Sammlung » , n° d'inventaire 30967A.

(Photo) À gauche, le vaisseau du Hollandais ; à droite, celui de Daland. Aucun charme pittoresque, pas de projections, pas de manoeuvres navales. Le navire du Hollandais, avec ses mâts échelonnés sur 3 niveaux et ses voiles rouges avait une immédiateté laconique et une présence ténébreuse. Le 1er plan ne représente pas la grève rocheuse, mais plutôt la jetée d'un port.

7 février 1929 : Création à Berlin de la suite pour instruments à vent, « Kleine Dreigroschenmusik » de Kurt Weill réalisée d'après « l'Opéra de quat'sous » , sous la direction d'Otto Klemperer.

Après l'accueil houleux, en 1929, de « Neues vom Tage » , l'Opéra satirique de Paul Hindemith, le directeur musical du « Kroll Oper » de Berlin, Otto Klemperer, préféra ne pas renouveler l'expérience avec l'Opéra de Kurt Weill et de Bertolt Brecht. Le 9 mars 1930, le public lyrique de Leipzig connut ainsi, avec graves agitations, la création de « Mahagonny » de Kurt Weill, lre carrière éphémère qui s'acheva 2 ans plus tard par la destruction des partitions sur ordre des Nazis.

En 1929, Kurt Weill acheva la partition de son Opéra « Grandeur et Décadence de la ville de Mahagonny » , dont les révisions datent d'octobre de la même année et dont la première eut lieu au « Neues Theater » de Leipzig, le 9 mars 1930, sous la direction de Gustav Brecher. Des contacts avaient été pris au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin avec le chef Otto Klemperer, qui condamna « la grossièreté des situations et de la langue » .

Lászlo Moholy-Nagy (1895-1946)

Les pressions politiques de la fin des années '20 pousseront Lászlo Moholy-Nagy à démissionner de son poste à l'École du « Bauhaus » . (Hannes Meyer remplacera Walter Gropius au « Bauhaus » de Dessau, en 1928.) Il s'installera à Berlin, de 1928 à 1934. Ne s'associant plus à la peinture, il explorera d'autres avenues de création pour faire vivre sa famille. Il dirigera un atelier de graphisme et de design qui recouvre le domaine de la publicité, de la conception, de

l'installation d'expositions et le domaine scénique. Il collaborera régulièrement avec le « Kroll Oper » de Berlin et avec le Théâtre (politisé) Erwin Piscator. Les militants extrémistes (Communistes et Nazis) attaqueront ses mises-en-scène sur-mécanisées du « Kroll Oper » de Berlin qui réduisaient l'importance des chanteurs au profit du message global.

(Image) Lászlo Moholy-Nagy - Projet de décor pour « Les Contes d'Hoffmann » de Jacques Offenbach, Acte I, Berlin, « Kroll Oper » (1929), Tempéra et encre de Chine, Cologne, « Universität zu Köln », « Theaterwissenschaftliche Sammlung », n° d'inventaire 1267A.

Après un bref séjour à Amsterdam, l'artiste s'établit à Londres en 1935, où il réalise des films documentaires tel « The New Architecture at the London Zoo » (« La Nouvelle Architecture au Zoo de Londres », 1936, où il instaure un dialogue cinématographique avec les expériences architecturales de Berthold Lubetkin).

2 ans plus tard, il accepte de diriger le « New Bauhaus » de Chicago, institution nouvellement fondée par l'« Association of the Arts and Industries », mais l'école ne parvient pas au terme de sa 1re année d'existence, faute d'un commanditaire solide. La grande notoriété de Lászlo Moholy-Nagy aux États-Unis, obtenue grâce à la diffusion de son œuvre mais aussi et surtout par la traduction de ses écrits, lui permet d'ouvrir avec succès sa propre « School of Design » à Chicago, ville où il réside jusqu'à sa mort le 24 novembre 1946. Ses 3 ouvrages théoriques majeurs, « Malerei, Fotografie, Film » (Munich, 1925) ; « Von Material zu Architektur » (Munich, 1929, édité en anglais à New York, dès 1930, sous le titre « The New Vision ») ; et enfin, « Vision in Motion » (Chicago, 1947) ont éclairé la sensibilité visuelle du XXe siècle, autant que l'économie matérielle des nouveaux médias. Ils ont influencé, entre autres, les réflexions de Walter Benjamin sur la reproduction photographique, celles de John Cage et de Marshall McLuhan sur le développement de l'environnement audio-visuel.

Oskar Schlemmer (1888-1943)

Longtemps attiré par le théâtre et la danse, Oskar Schlemmer rejoint le corps professoral de l'École du « Bauhaus » en 1921 et dirige le Théâtre du « Bauhaus », de 1925 à 1929. Trait d'union réalisant l'accord de la musique et de la danse, le corps, au début du XXe siècle, abandonne ses référents originels pour entrer dans la modernité : au corps-pulsion incarné par « Lulu » (« Lulu », Opéra d'Alban Berg) succède un corps-idée, corps reconstruit, dont les mouvements captent et traduisent les énergies contemporaines. Schlemmer a développé au « Bauhaus » un style chorégraphique connu sous le nom de « danses architectoniques ». Il a présenté des pièces dépourvues de trame narrative, qui associaient le mouvement à des formes abstraites, géométriques. Il enfermait ses interprètes dans des costumes qui occultaient et « déshumanisaient » leurs corps, pour leur donner l'apparence de grandes sculptures abstraites. Ses chorégraphies comportaient des mouvements sans difficulté technique majeure, souvent répétitifs, qui imitaient l'action d'objets mécanisés.

Au cœur de cette « Gesamtkunstwerk » réalisant le triple accord entre danse, costume et musique, et symbolisant la « Triade » corps, âme, esprit, l'homme « sur scène devient événement », selon ce créateur polymorphe, peintre, sculpteur, chorégraphe, musicien, danseur, compositeur (entré au « Bauhaus », en 1921, comme « Maître de Forme ») et qui, par la fulgurance de sa pensée transversale, contribua au stimulant décloisonnement des champs artistiques.

L'œuvre la plus représentative de ce style d'Oskar Schlemmer est son « Ballet triadique » (« Triadisches Ballett ») . Une ballet chorégraphique conçue en collaboration avec Hannes Winkler, sur une musique de Paul Hindemith, qui se fonde sur une approche pluri-disciplinaire du mouvement et qui sera présenté en première mondiale au Festival de musique-de-chambre de Donaueschingen, le 30 septembre 1922. Les interprètes étaient Edith Demharter, Ralph Smolik et Hannes Winkler. Œuvre fondamentale du « Bauhaus » pour la danse moderne, ce ballet.

1926 - Festival de Donaueschingen du 5 juillet : Les figures du « Ballet triadique » d'Oskar Schlemmer ouvrent cette parade, sur la musique pour orgue mécanique composée par Paul Hindemith.

1927 - Festival de Donaueschingen : Les figures du « Ballet triadique » d'Oskar Schlemmer ouvrent cette parade sur des extraits de la musique pour percussion composée par Hermann Scherchen.

1930 - Oskar Schlemmer : Création des décors et de costumes de l'Opéra « la Main heureuse » (« Die glückliche Hand ») , drame musical d'Arnold Schönberg, mise-en-scène de Arthur Maria Rabenalt, au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin.

« Deutsche Zeitung » 10. Juni 1930 (Paul Zschorlich)

Schönberg-Heuchelei bei Kroll Oper

Auf Arnold Schönberg bezogen klingen die beiden Titel « Erwartung » und « Die glückliche Hand » wie ein Hohn. Wir « erwarten » gar nichts von ihm, schon seit Jahren nicht, und das er eine höchst unglückliche Hand hat, wissen wir längst.

Wir wissen noch mehr : daß Herr Schönberg seinen Ruf fast ausschließlich den zahlreichen Konzertsandalen zu verdanken hat, die seinen künstlerischen Lebensweg zieren, und das mau auf diese Art unfreiwilliger Berühmtheit seit Jahren ein Geschäft aufzubauen sucht. Er ist Autodidakt und, was wichtiger ist, der Schwager Alexander von Zemlinsky, des Kapellmeisters der Kroll-Oper. Dieser dirigierte auch die « Erwartung » .Vastehste !

Seit Opus 6 hat Schönberg eine Reihe schwerer künstlerischer Fehlgeburten gehabt, die uns vor das seltsame Problem stellten, daß auch sterile Individuen unter Umständen fruchtbar sein können. Das « Schaffen » Schönbergs stellt sich dar als eine Verneinung aller deutschen Musikkultur, als eine Vernichtung des Geschmacks, des Gefühls, der Überlieferung und aller ästhetischen Grundsätze.

Schönberg aufführen heißt so viel wie Kokainstuben fürs Volk eröffnen. Kokain ist Gift. Schönbergs Musik ist Kokain. In berechtigter Selbstwehr hat sich das deutsche Konzertpublikum jahrelang gegen diese Vergiftung gewehrt, zuletzt noch im Dezember 1929 bei Furtwängler. Jetzt aber ist es schlaff geworden, in der Kroll-Oper gab es keinen Skandal, sondern nur Langeweile. « Erwartung » ist ein Monodrama. Richtiger : ein Monotonodrama. Eine Frau begibt sich nachts in einen Wald. Was tut sie dort ? Was sucht sie in der Dunkelheit ? Wir erfahren es nicht. Sie stellt sich vor uns auf und redet und redet. Wir verstehen auch nicht, was sie redet, denn das Orchester deckt das Meiste zu und die

Worte bleiben unverständlich. Aber wenn die Frau auch nichts weiter sucht, so findet, sie doch etwas. Sie stößt plötzlich mit dem Fuß an einen Körper, und das ist nicht einmal ein Fremdkörper, sondern - die Leiche ihres Geliebten ! Dieser Anstoß genügt, um sie länger als eine halbe Stunde wimmern, sich in hysterischen Anfällen und epileptischen Krämpfen ergehen zu lassen. Denn sonst ist niemand auf der Bühne. Die Szene wird von dieser Frau allein bestritten.

Herr Schönberg macht dazu eine Musik, die eine Gipfelleistung erfinderischer Impotenz wie rohester Klangscheußlichkeit ist. (Allein schon das Gequäke der hervorstechenden Oboen muß jedes feinere Ohr beleidigen.) Man wird auf eine Folter gespannt. Nirgends auch nur ein Ausblick auf einen schöpferischen Gedanken. Wenn man unter einem Dilettanten einen Mann versteht, der möchte und nicht kann, so haben wir es hier mit dem Musterbeispiel von Dilettantismus zu tun.

Aber ich meine : wenn es auch traurig ist, das dergleichen mehr als vierzig Jahre nach Wagner geschrieben und dem deutschen Volk angeboten wird, schlimmer noch ist es, das sich ein Operninstitut dazu hergibt, dergleichen aufzuführen. Das Allerschlimmste aber, daß die Hörer es mit Schafsgeduld hinnehmen und so tun, als ob sie etwas davon verstünden. Zwar handelt es sich dabei nur um einen ganz kleinen Kreis, denn obwohl man überreichlich Frei- und Steuerkarten ausgegeben hatte, war das Haus am Pfingstsonnabend nur mäßig besucht. Die Schönberg-Klemperer-Klique war ganz unter sich. Daher denn auch der « Erfolg » , dem nicht die mindeste Bedeutung zukommt und der sozusagen unter Ausschluß der Öffentlichkeit zustande kam. Die Musik Schönbergs ist für mich indiskutabel. Ich weiß, daß sie es auch für andere ist, selbst für solche, die sonst allem « Modernen » leicht zugänglich sind. Ich sprach in der Pause mit einigen Personen, die bekantten, sich entsetzlich gelangweilt zu haben. Aber keiner muckte auf, als der Vorhang fiel. Sie nahmen die Sache hin wie ein unentrinnbares Verhängnis. Man ist müde, in der Musik wie in der Politik. Man läßt die Dinge laufen. Es ist ein Jammer ! Ich habe mich nicht überwinden können, die « Glückliche Hand » noch anzuhören. Ich hatte die Empfindung, damit Schönberg zu viel Ehre anzutun. Daß sein Opus 18 genau so indiskutabel ist wie sein Opus 17, weiß ich im Voraus. Es kann nicht Aufgabe der Musikkritik sein, dem nackten Dilettantismus Vorschub zu leisten. Mögen es die besorgen, die sich Schönberg verwandter fühlen ! Auch über die künstlerischen Leistungen ist nichts zu sagen, denn es gab keine. Das Bühnenbild von Teo Otto - das Erzeugnis eines kaum durchschnittlichen handwerklichen Könnens. Man sah eine Wandeldekoration, deren Technik an eine Provinzschmiere erinnerte. Die Inszenierung eines Herrn so und so - ich möchte wissen, was es da zu « inszenieren » gab. Da sonst niemand auf der Bühne stand, kann der Mann nur die Sängerin Moje Forbach inszeniert haben, die zur Trägerin dieser albernen Szene verdammt war. Vielleicht hat sie die Töne richtig getroffen. Vielleicht nicht. Was liegt schon daran ? Wichtig zu wissen wäre nur, ob Herr Schönberg selber das mit Sicherheit zu beurteilen vermag. Woran ein Zweifel erlaubt ist. Auch diese « Erstaufführung » segelte unter dem Allerweltstitel « Berliner Kunstwochen » . Damit war ein Tiefpunkt erreicht, der ein Skandal an sich ist, gleichviel ob er ausbrach oder nicht.

...

(Image) Projet de décor exécuté en 1930 pour l'Opéra « Die glückliche Hand » (« la Main Heureuse ») d'Arnold Schönberg. Craie sur papier noir, 13¾ pouces x 19¾ pouces (34.7 cm x 50.1 cm) .

Parcours du dessin

1930 : Hans Curjel, Berlin. Acquis auprès de l'artiste.

1975 : Collection particulière, Washington, Seattle. Acquis par descendance.

1994 : Sotheby's, Amsterdam. Vente de décembre. Lot 286.

1995 : Acquis par Yves Saint-Laurent et Pierre Bergé, au cours d'une vente de la Galerie Tarica, en août à Paris.

Littérature

Hans Curjel. « Experiment Kroll Oper » (1927-1931) , « Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Eigel Kruttge » , Munich (1975) ; page 357, n° 11 (illustré) .

Oskar Schlemmer. « Théâtre et Abstraction » , « l'Espace du Bauhaus » , Lausanne (1978) , n° 35 (illustré) .

Karin von Maur. « Oskar Schlemmer, Oeuvrekatalog der Gemälde » , Aquarelle, Pastelle, Munich (1979) ; page 302, n° A 395 (illustré) .

Dirk Scheper. « Oskar Schlemmer - das Triadische Ballet und die Bauhausbühne » , Berlin (1988) ; page 224, n° 250 (illustré) .

...

Le peintre, décorateur de théâtre et scénographe de ballet allemand Oskar Schlemmer est né le 4 septembre 1888 à Stuttgart et est mort le 13 avril 1943 à Baden-Baden.

Après des études auprès de Willi Baumeister à l'Académie des Beaux-Arts de Stuttgart où il rencontre le peintre suisse Otto Meyer-Amden (1885-1933) , en 1907, il intègre le « Bauhaus » de Weimar, de 1920 à 1928, en tant que professeur de peinture puis de décorateur et scénographe, avant d'achever son parcours académique par une année d'enseignement à l'École de Beaux-Arts de Breslau (aujourd'hui, Wrocław) . Ses œuvres, peintes ou sculptées, témoignent de son souci d'allier l'immobilité hiératique de la rigueur géométrique et de la pureté des contours à la vivacité des formes et la mobilité de l'espace. Il en résulte une peinture qui rappelle à la fois le futurisme ou le constructivisme, par son aspect analytique, et le surréalisme, par son aspect onirique. Son œuvre est excellemment représentée à New York, à Francfort et, plus encore, à Stuttgart, où se trouvent les archives Schlemmer, qui contiennent notamment toutes ses esquisses en 2 ou 3 dimensions pour son « Ballet triadique » (« Triadisches Ballett ») de 1922. En 1937, Oskar Schlemmer est déclaré « artiste dégénéré » par les Nazis.

Plus encore que son confrère Rudolf von Laban, Oskar Schlemmer aura lancé le corps humain dans toutes les directions possibles. Et nul alors n'a mieux su le déployer dans l'espace sans écraser celui d'autrui, une chose que le Nazisme allait si effroyablement nier. Ce qui est fondamental dans les tableaux de Schlemmer, c'est l'immobilité de ses

personnages, comme suspendus entre l'attente et l'arrêt ; cette indétermination du temps qui oscille entre le passé proche et le futur immédiat et donne toute sa justesse à la gestuelle. Elle semble ici précéder le verbe et on la retrouve telle que la discernait Oskar Schlemmer quand, dans le Salut Nazi, il devinait toute la terminologie du 3^e « Reich » avant même qu'elle ait été formulée.

...

L'une des plus fortes personnalités du « Bauhaus », où il enseigna de 1920 à 1929, tout d'abord chargé des ateliers de sculpture et de peinture murale, puis de l'atelier de théâtre (1923). Malgré une formation classique de peintre à Stuttgart chez Adolf Hoelzel, au côté de Meyer-Amden, Oskar Schlemmer a su élargir le champ de sa réflexion à partir de considérations purement plastiques dérivant de l'étude du corps humain et de ses rapports avec l'espace. Il préconise la réduction du corps à des éléments simples : cercle, sphère, cylindre, cône, et à des lignes géométriques dont l'emplacement est fixé par des règles de composition (« Homo », « figure T », 1919-1920). Ses peintures, ses dessins, ses aquarelles constituent, à eux seuls, un essai d'intégration de la surface peinte à la totalité de l'architecture que concrétisent mieux encore les peintures murales réalisées au « Bauhaus » ou à Essen : tonalités claires, volumes simples, trouées lumineuses, concertation et rapports de formes vivantes (« L'Entrée du stade », 1930 ; « L'Escalier du Bauhaus », 1932). Dans ces œuvres, l'homme est toujours présent, il est même le foyer de l'espace qui s'organise autour de lui. Ces conceptions, conjuguées à un refus de l'émotion, de l'expressivité, sont plus nettes encore dans les recherches théâtrales que Schlemmer a menées presque exclusivement au « Bauhaus ». Dans une mise-en-scène dépouillée à la manière de Gordon Craig et d'Adolphe Appia qui exclut toute action de type romantique, Schlemmer organise des ballets-mimodrames où seul compte le jeu plastique des corps dans l'espace : « partir des positions du corps, de sa simple présence, de la position debout, de la marche ». Les costumes pour lesquels l'imagination de l'artiste se plie à la géométrie en exploitant la richesse des matériaux (métal, y compris le fil-de-fer qu'il employait pour ses sculptures), les masques, les jeux de lumière et de couleurs (dus surtout à Hirschfeld-Mack) dramatisent le décor schématique (« Danse du métal », 1927) et les attitudes mécaniques issues de l'art de la marionnette (on retrouve ce thème chez Paul Klee, qui était au « Bauhaus » à cette époque). On retiendra, entre autres, le « Ballet triadique » (« Triadisches Ballett »), travaillé dès 1912 et présenté en 1922 (« Trilogie : danse, costume, musique »), « le Cabinet des figures » (1922), « la Danse des bâtons » (1927), où chacun des gestes du danseur est amplifié par les longs bâtons blancs fixés à ses membres, « les Danses d'expression » (1926). « Aborder le monde comme s'il venait tout juste d'être créé », conseillait Schlemmer, en 1929.

Ewald Felix Dülberg

Ewald Felix Dülberg (Emil Franz Konstantin Dülberg) naquit à Schwerin, le 12 décembre 1888, et est mort en 1933. Peintre, il sera reconnu comme le designer et le graveur en titre du mouvement expressionnisme. Dülberg étudia à l'Académie de Munich. En 1910, il entreprit sa carrière d'enseignant. Il travailla à l'école Odenwald Ober-Hambach puis rejoignit l'école « Bauhaus » de Weimar. Là, il développa une expertise en dessin, en théorie de la couleur, en tissage et en équipement scénique. Mais sa forme d'expression préférée restera la gravure sur bois avec laquelle il s'était déjà fait un nom avant l'arrivée de la Première Guerre mondiale. Le 8 juin 1919, il fut parmi les membres fondateurs de l'école d'Art nouveau (Sécession) de Darmstadt et en devint rapidement l'artiste le plus prolifique. Parmi ses élèves les

plus célèbres, on retrouve : le concepteur Teo Otto, le peintre irlandais Cecil Salkeld et le peintre Arnold Bode, concepteur et fondateur de « La Documenta » (une manifestation d'art contemporain qui se tient tous les 5 ans, à Cassel) . En 1918, Hedwig Dülberg-Arnhem enseigna également à l'école Odenwald et suivit son (1er) mari à l'École du « Bauhaus » de Weimar. Ils eurent une fille, prénommée Marie-Esther. L'épouse démarrera avec succès une usine de textile et produira certaines des œuvres d'Ewald, soit des blanchets et des tapis. Après s'être divorcée en 1921, elle poursuivra ses études à l'atelier de tissage de Weimar. Ewald Dülberg sera nommé au poste de concepteur scénique du Théâtre municipal de Hambourg où il fera la connaissance, se liera d'amitié et collaborera avec le jeune et ambitieux chef d'orchestre allemand d'origine juive, Otto Klemperer. Ses décors d'Opéra austères, géométriques et épurés seront d'influence cubiste. Il suivra Klemperer lorsque ce dernier sera nommé directeur musical à l'Opéra « Kroll » de Berlin, en 1927.

(Image) Projet de décor pour l'Acte 2 de l'Opéra « Fidelio » de Ludwig van Beethoven : l'esplanade du Château, « Kroll Oper » de Berlin (1927) ; gouache, Cologne, « Universität zu Köln », « Theaterwissenschaftliche Sammlung », n° d'inventaire 7439B.

Sa célèbre « Crucifixion sur bois », datant de 1923, fera partie de l'exposition d' « Art dégénéré » (« Entartete Kunst ») , plus précisément exposée dans la salle ridiculisant les œuvres regroupées autour du thème de la chrétienté. La carrière d'enseignant d'Ewald Dülberg prendra abruptement fin en 1931, lors de sa révocation de la fonction publique prussienne. Il mourra en 1933. Ce brillant artiste de l'avant-garde restera connu pour son style ornemental et géométrique, sa période abstraite cubiste, de même que pour ses calligraphies. Ses dernières gravures sur bois ne seront publiées qu'à titre posthume.

Hedwig Arnheim-Dülberg

Hedwig était la fille-aînée de la famille Arnheim. Le père était docteur : Félix Arnheim. La mère : Élisabeth, née Samuel. Avec son frère Hans (né en 1895) et ses 2 sœurs, Eva Caroline Friederike (née le 24 mars 1902) et Ruth Anna Frieda (née le 16 avril 1912) , Hedwig fut éduquée dans le protestantisme. Hedwig était fort jolie, dotée d'une imagination fertile et d'un talent polyvalent. Sans oublier son côté ambitieux et sophistiqué. À 18 ans, elle quitta l'école pour vivre quelque temps en Grande-Bretagne. Artistiquement douée, elle était déjà inscrite à l'Académie des Arts d'Hambourg avant l'arrivée de la Première Guerre où elle fut l'élève de Friedrich Adler, un professeur d'art graphique et de design. La passion d'Hedwig se dirigea vers l'art de la broderie. Son professeur de dessin et de modèle vivant était le peintre et graveur sur bois, Ewald Dülberg. Elle en tomba rapidement amoureuse. Ils se marièrent en 1915. Mary Esther naquit de cette union, en 1918. Il divorcèrent 3 ans plus tard. La collaboration du couple Dülberg se transforma en une œuvre hybride commune, faite de la fusion fantastique et brillante de la peinture moderne avec l'art de la broderie et du tapis. Résultant en un équilibre parfait entre l'art pur et l'artisanat.

Hedwig Arnheim (accompagnée de la jeune Mary Esther) prit alors la direction de l'École « Bauhaus » de Weimar, où Hedwig put poursuivre sa spécialisation en textile auprès de Johannes Itten puis de Gunta Stölzl pour finalement compléter sa formation avec l'artiste-bijoutier et designer Naum Slutzky qu'elle épousera en 1923.

Dès le début du « Bauhaus », l'atelier de textile est l'atelier des nombreuses femmes qui suivent l'enseignement du « Bauhaus ». Différentes techniques sont initialement enseignées : tissage, crochet, nouage, macramé, broderie, couture ; mais l'atelier se transforme assez vite en atelier de tissage exclusivement, ce qui lui permet d'expérimenter le programme du « Bauhaus ». Les créations de l'atelier de tissage sont fortement influencées par les cours de Itten, Muche, Klee puis par ceux de Moholy-Nagy et de Kandinsky. Les créations sont dans l'esprit de l'art abstrait (rayures, formes simples, travail sur la couleur) . Après le déménagement à Dessau et sous l'impulsion de Stöltz, la production de l'atelier tend à devenir plus industrielle et de nouvelles matières sont utilisées - soie artificielle, cellophane. C'est aussi l'atelier de tissage qui développe les tissus pour les meubles en tubes d'acier de Breuer.

Le nouveau couple vécut à Berlin et travailla aux ateliers de Franz Singer. Pendant un court laps de temps, ils vécurent aussi à Vienne. Mais ils durent retourner à Hambourg pour des raisons économiques, dès octobre 1924. Le couple résidera sur la rue d'enfance d'Edwig, au n° 5 « Isequai » . (Une plaque commémorative s'y trouve.) Elle réussit à subsister comme designer d'intérieur et, plus tard, comme couturière. Elle divorça de Naum Slutzky, en 1930. Selon l'historien de l'art Hambourgeois, Bruhns Maïke :

« Elle a conçu et brodé des compositions avant-gardistes, des abstractions ton-sur-ton, de même que des nus féminins à la chevelure bleue, perlée de pierres sur un fond de laine jaune. »

Hedwig Arnheim emménagera au domicile de son père du n° 10 « Haynstraße » . Avec l'arrivée du régime nazi, elle émigra à Nice, dans le sud de la France, le 15 février 1936 pour poursuivre sa profession de couturière. Après la dénonciation française anti-sémite du 20 septembre 1943, elle fut interné 3 jours plus tard au camp-de-transition de Drancy. Elle faisait partie d'un groupe de 345 prisonniers juifs. Le 7 octobre, ils montèrent tous dans le convoi de déportation n° 60 qui prit le chemin du camp-de-concentration d'Auschwitz où Hedwig périt dans les chambres-à-gaz.

Hedwig Arnheim fit partie des 10 plus artistes-brodeurs de la 1re moitié du 20e siècle. Aux côtés de son 1er époux, Ewald Dülberg, ils firent la manchette de la presse en tant qu'innovateurs et avant-gardistes. On salua la force stylistique et la technique exceptionnelle d'Hedwig Arnheim. Un article de journal Berlinois datant de 1917 souligne :

« La grande beauté des couleurs de même que l'audace des thèmes. »

Quant à lui, le journaliste Maïke Bruhns dénote l'influence orientalisante de l'ornementation et des lignes courbes.

Parmi les œuvres découlant de commandes, citons : 2 riches compositions aux thèmes festifs en hommage à l'artiste expressionniste Bernhard Hoetger (ce dernier la remercia par l'exécution d'un portrait sculpté) ; une série de gravures sur bois ayant servi à illustrer 2 œuvres littéraires de la journaliste et écrivaine juive, Adolf Götz (1876-1944) .

En 1919, Hedwig Arnheim fut un des membres-fondateurs du mouvement Sécession de la ville de Darmstadt. Elle représenta son nouveau groupe à des expositions organisées en 1919, 1920 et 1921. Une artiste prolifique, ses œuvres figurent dans bon nombre de collections et de rétrospectives de plusieurs musées dont : le « Heydt Museum » de

Wuppertal ; les Archives Berlinoises du « Bauhaus » ; la Fondation « Bauhaus » des villes de Dessau et Weimar ; le Musée des Arts Appliqués de Cologne ; le Musée d'Histoire d'Hambourg ; la Maison Macke ; et le Musée Giersch.

Expositions solo

1916 : Musée des arts décoratifs de Cologne.

1924 : Exposition à sa résidence du 5 de la rue « Isequai » , à Hambourg.

Caspar Neher

Caspar Neher conçoit des décors qui se démarquent du style très réaliste en vogue dans son pays au début des années '20. La carrière de ce décorateur allemand est indissociable de celle de l'auteur et metteur-en-scène Bertolt Brecht, dont il signe les décors des Ires pièces. Il participe à la création historique de « l'Opéra de quat'sous » (1928) , considérée aujourd'hui comme la pièce Maître de l'auteur. Le contexte politique qui sévit en Allemagne, entre 1933 et 1945, force Neher à des réalisations moins suspectes aux yeux des Nazis. Il n'a d'autre choix que de cesser d'incarner, dans ses décors, les revendications dont le théâtre de Brecht est chargé. Pendant la guerre, ses scénographies deviennent moins actuelles, s'inspirant davantage de réalisations artistiques déjà existantes. Après la guerre, il reprend sa collaboration avec Brecht, qui s'était exilé pour fuir le Nazisme. Il sera de la grande aventure du « Berliner Ensemble » , compagnie fondée par Brecht et Helene Weigel, en 1949, dont le travail rayonnera dans toute l'Europe. Après la mort de Brecht, en 1956, il collabore quelque temps avec d'autres metteurs en scène de théâtre, puis reviendra à l'Opéra. Les scénographies de Caspar Neher seront à jamais liées à la révolution théâtrale créée par Brecht.

Teo Otto

Teo Otto fit des études de peinture et de scénographie à l'académie des Beaux-arts de Kassel chez Ewald Dülberg (1923-1926) . Assistant de Dülberg à la Haute-école d'architecture de Weimar, puis au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin (1927) . Décorateur et, dès 1932, chef-décorateur des théâtres d'État de Berlin, où Otto entama sa longue collaboration avec Bertolt Brecht et Leopold Lindtberg. Otto qualifia sa conception du décor de « réalisme fragmentaire » . Il fut, pour le théâtre de langue allemande, le plus important scénographe de sa génération avec Caspar Neher.

Ernst Bloch

Le philosophe allemand Ernst Bloch (1885-1977) s'inscrit dans la lignée des marxistes « non-orthodoxes » tels Georg Lukács, Antonio Gramsci, Karl Korsch ou encore les penseurs de l'École de Francfort.

Son Ier ouvrage, « L'esprit de l'utopie » , paru au début des années '20, fit de lui l'un des principaux théoriciens du concept d'utopie à la lumière de la tradition hégéliano-marxiste. Cette Ire publication eut une influence considérable sur plusieurs de ses contemporains, tels Walter Benjamin et Theodor W. Adorno.

Après la publication de son ouvrage anti-Nazi « Héritage de ce temps » (1935), Ernst Bloch fut contraint de quitter l'Allemagne pour New York. À la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, il refusa une chaire à l'Université Goethe de Francfort pour une chaire à l'Université Karl Marx de Leipzig (1949). C'est alors qu'il commence à faire paraître son ouvrage majeur en 3 volumes « Le principe espérance » (1954-1959) où il s'interroge à nouveau sur le concept d'utopie en adoptant une méthode « archéologique », retraçant dans l'histoire mondiale et dans la culture de masse américaine les ferments de l'utopie, en même temps que les sources de l'appauvrissement de l'« espérance ». Opposé au marxisme stalinien, Ernst Bloch défend la nécessité de l'utopie qui, à ses yeux, n'a rien d'une forme d'aliénation. Pour ce marxiste non-orthodoxe, l'utopie permet de repenser l'histoire. En effet, selon le philosophe, l'expérience utopique est l'occasion d'une prise de conscience renouant (comme plusieurs l'ont remarqué) avec une forme de messianisme moderne.

Isadora Duncan et le « Kroll Oper »

1903 - Dans l'esprit populaire, Isadora Duncan est synonyme de danse moderne pratiquée les pieds nus. Mais elle fit même une apparition complètement nue, sur la scène du « Kroll Oper » de Berlin.

(Un cabaret berlinois lui propose d'exécuter « la Danse des 7 voiles » de Salomé. Elle rejette l'offre.)

1904 - Ouverture le 1er décembre, à Grünewald, près de Berlin, de la Ire « école de danse libre » d'Isadora Duncan aux côtés de sa sœur, Elizabeth. Ce pensionnat gratuit dispense un enseignement général et des cours-de-danse. Un contrat engage les parents à y laisser leurs enfants jusqu'à l'âge de 17 ans et les autorise à se produire aux côtés d'Isadora. 20 élèves sont acceptés.

1905 - Isadora Duncan se produit à Dresde, Hambourg, Saint-Pétersbourg, Moscou, Kiev, Bruxelles, Leipzig, Stockholm ainsi qu'à Amsterdam. Le 20 juillet, Ire représentation de l'« école de danse libre » d'Isadora Duncan, au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin.

Jarmila Novotná

À partir de 1928, la soprano tchèque Jarmila Novotná entame une carrière internationale. En 1928, elle interprète à Vérone Gilda dans « Rigoletto » de Giuseppe Verdi avec Giacomo Lauri-Volpi puis, au « Teatro San Carlo » à Naples, le rôle d'Adina avec Tito Schipa dans « l'Elisir d'amore » de Gaetano Donizetti. Elle rejoint, en 1929, l'Opéra « Kroll » à Berlin, où elle interprète le rôle de Violetta et incarne les héroïnes de Giacomo Puccini, « Manon Lescaut » et « Madama Butterfly ». Elle poursuit sa carrière cinématographique et joue ainsi dans la version filmée de « la Fiancée vendue » par Max Ophüls, en 1932. En 1931, elle épouse le chevalier (baron) Jiří Daubek.

Alexander von Zemlinsky au « Kroll Oper »

Au cours de l'année 1927, le compositeur et chef d'orchestre Alexander von Zemlinsky, isolé, se sentant un peu oublié par Vienne, malgré l'hommage d'Alban Berg, et un peu perdu dans la multitude des courants musicaux des années 1920 (dodécaphonisme, néo-Classicisme, Nouvelle Objectivité, réalisme socialisant) change d'air. Il commet la grande erreur d'aller s'installer à l'Opéra « Kroll », sous la terrible férule d'Otto Klemperer qui était, à cette époque, plus jeune que lui. Lieu des plus intenses innovations que Zemlinsky ne peut comprendre. Il devient alors le 1er « Kappellmeister ». L'accueil que lui réserve Berlin est empreint de respect, sans comparaison toutefois avec la vénération qu'on lui vouait à Prague. Et puis Klemperer n'est pas un exemple de générosité mais plutôt d'ambition dévorante. Sa femme Ida meurt de maladie, en 1929, et, moins d'un an plus tard, il se remarie avec une chanteuse, Louise Sachsels, déjà aimée et rencontrée dès 1915, à Prague. Zemlinsky touche à Berlin un salaire bien plus confortable que dans la capitale tchèque et il a plus de temps libre n'ayant que 3 premières à diriger par saison.

Mais la grave crise économique qui sévit oblige l'Opéra « Kroll » à fermer ses portes, en 1931. Il voit la montée du Nazisme qui lui interdit toute profession. Rabaissé au rang de subalterne, il préfère devenir professeur à l'Académie de musique. Zemlinsky en profite alors pour s'adonner à la composition d'un nouvel Opéra et à quelques apparitions à Leningrad et à Prague. De retour à Berlin, Zemlinsky entame les répétitions de l'Opéra de Kurt Weill, « Grandeur et décadence de la ville de Mahagonny » (« Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny »), assez controversée pour certains politiciens, n'en est pas moins un succès commercial. Mais déjà, le régime nazi se met en place et Zemlinsky doit s'exiler à Vienne, au début de 1933.

Leo Borchard

Né à Moscou le 31 mars 1899, de parents allemands, Leo Borchard passe son enfance à Saint-Pétersbourg où il reçoit une solide formation musicale. En 1920, après la Révolution russe, il émigre définitivement en Allemagne. À Berlin, il devient l'assistant d'Otto Klemperer à l'Opéra « Kroll » et, en janvier 1933, il dirige, une première fois, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. En 1935, il est interdit d'activité par le régime nazi pour « manque de fiabilité politique ». En 1938, il entre dans la clandestinité et participe activement à la Résistance. Malgré les risques considérables, il ne quitte pas Berlin, même aux derniers jours de la guerre. Le 26 mai 1945, 3 semaines seulement après la signature de l'armistice, il dirige le 1er concert de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin de l'après-Nazisme, mais il disparaît tragiquement le 23 août, tué accidentellement à un poste de contrôle dans le secteur américain.

...

Dans le domaine de l'Opéra et, contrairement à des chefs tels Bruno Walter ou Hans Knappertsbusch, on ne trouve aucune trace d'activité de Wilhelm Furtwängler au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin.

En 1930, en conséquence des mesures d'austérité de la ville de Berlin, l'Opéra d'État « Kroll » et le « Schiller Theater » seront fermés suite à une demande reçue par le « Landtag » de Prusse.

Le 12 février 1933, alors qu'Adolf Hitler est arrivé à la Chancellerie, le 30 janvier, Otto Klemperer donne encore un concert auquel se rend le Ministre de la Propagande, Josef Goebbels. Ce dernier notera dans son journal personnel :

« D'origine juive, malgré une conversion au catholicisme. Le soir, une représentation de l'Opéra Tannhäuser. Klemperer le rate complètement. Les Juifs ne comprennent pas Richard Wagner. Ils le haïssent même. Un " Tannhäuser " avec Pilinsky et 7 moutards. L'ensemble de l'exécution est sans aucune piété. Très insatisfaisant. »

(Journal de Josef Gæbbels, 1933-1939.)

Otto Klemperer fuira, dès 1933, le régime nazi et son Allemagne natale pour les États-Unis.

Le film « Ariane » (1931) et le « Kroll Oper »

Certaines scènes d' « Ariane » (en version originale allemande) , un mélodrame de fiction du cinéaste Paul Czinner seront tournées au « Kroll Oper » de Berlin.

Acteurs : Rudolf Forster, Elisabeth Bergner, Hertha Guthmar, Anne-Marie Steinseick, Theodor Loos, Nikolas Wassiljeff, Alfred Gerasch, M. Lieven-Belorussoff, Helen van Vliet.

Réalisation et scénarisation : Paul Czinner.

Co-scénaristes : Claude Anet et Carl Mayer.

D'après l'adaptation d'un roman de Claude Anet.

Dialogues : André Lang.

Musique : Richard Strauß et André Roubaud.

Décors : Zander.

Directeurs de la photographie : Jules Krüger et René Ribault.

Chefs-opérateurs : Jules Kruger, Fritz Arno Wagner, Adolf Schlasy.

Producteurs : Bernard et Émile Natan, Seymour Nebenzahl, Ernst Wolff, Georg Horsetzky.

Studios : Pathé-Natan, Nero Film.

Le film existe en 3 versions : allemande, française et anglaise. (Durée : 1h25.)

...

German version : Directed by Paul Czinner and released on 20 February 1931. Produced by Nero Film and shot in Paris, probably at Pathé-Natan, which co-produced a French version with the same title. Many very long takes in this film. The experiment yields some interesting results. Some moments seem to anticipate the art cinema of the 1960's. Shots continue past the point when actors have exited the frame. We see empty spaces. The image fades to black very slowly. At moments, the camera will frame an evidently irrelevant object while an important conversation is heard from off-screen.

« The Loves of Ariane »

Elisabeth Bergner (Ariane) .

Percy Marmont (Anthony Fraser) .

Oriel Ross (La baronne) .

Warwick Ward (Le docteur) .

Joan Matheson (Olga) .

Elizabeth Vaughan (Waravara, la tante d'Ariane) .

Charles Carson (Le professeur) .

« Ariane, jeune fille russe » (1932)

Parution en salle : 26 février 1932.

Acteurs :

Victor Francen (Constantin) .

Gaby Morlay (Ariane) .

Rachel Devirys (Tante Warwara) .

Maria Fromet (Olga) .

Jean Dax (Professeur) .

Allain Dhurtal (Docteur Kundert) .

Marguerite de Morlaye (?) .

Valentina Frascaroli (?) .

Synopsis : Ariane, jeune étudiante russe à Paris, devient la Maîtresse d'un séducteur quadragénaire pour l'amour duquel elle joue la comédie de la femme libre et volage.

Synopsis : Courtisée par les amis de sa famille, d'abord, par ses camarades étudiants ensuite, Ariane Kustnetzowa est demeurée insensible à l'appel de l'amour. Jusqu'au soir où, pendant une représentation de « Don Juan », elle fait la connaissance de Constantin, qui ressemble au héros de Mozart qui chante sur la scène, cherche la femme et le plaisir, redoute la jeune fille et l'amour.

Synopsis : Ariane est une jeune femme espiègle qui décide d'aller à Paris poursuivre ses études. Elle rencontre un séducteur, lors d'une représentation de « Don Juan ». Ce dernier est fort surpris et plutôt attiré par son originalité et sa vivacité, mais, comme il fuit les jeunes filles, elle cache sa virginité et prétend être légère. Après un séjour idyllique en Italie, il la quitte. Il resurgit après un long moment pendant lequel Ariane s'est douloureusement languie de lui. Elle lui avoue la vérité. Vexé et humilié de s'être fait dupé, il la quitte immédiatement, puis lui pardonne.

Paul Czinner, réalisateur connu par ses œuvres apparentées au « kammerspiel » (naturalisme intimiste) , aborde ici le cinéma parlant avec la lenteur souvent constatée dans les Iers films sonores. Certainement dans un souci de réalisme, le cinéaste prend le parti pris curieux de s'attarder sur les moindres détails (ouvreurs fermant une à une les portes de l'Opéra, etc.) . Mais il en résulte une impression de langueur extrême que la caméra très statique ne fait qu'empirer. Le moins qu'on puisse dire est que le tout est filmé de façon très archaïque qui frôle l'amateurisme avec des « travellings » parfois complètement ratés, comme si le cameraman avait du mal à maîtriser son engin.

Malgré ces réserves certaines, il s'agit d'une fort plaisante étude d'un personnage féminin d'une étonnante modernité. À la fois femme-enfant, espiègle et décidée, Ariane se laisse séduire par un homme beaucoup plus âgé en lui jouant la comédie. Elle ne laisse rien paraître de ses émotions réelles et accepte comme un jeu les principes du séducteur, alors qu'elle est profondément affectée par son manque de tact et son indifférence.

Contrairement à ce que j'ai pu lire ailleurs, Elizabeth Bergner est parfaite dans le rôle d'Ariane. Mutine et spontanée, elle est absolument crédible en étudiante de 17 ans (alors que la comédienne avait plus de 30 ans) et franchement drôle dans certaines scènes (notamment quand elle se drape de bandages parce que son amant l'a légèrement heurtée en se disputant avec elle) . Le film possède en outre une certaine liberté de ton pour aborder des sujets comme la virginité. Paul Czinner tournera la même année une version française avec Gaby Morlay.

L'incendie du « Reichstag » de 1933

Le « Kroll » deviendra le siège du Parlement allemand durant la période nazie, après l'incendie (provoqué) du « Reichstag », situé juste en face, le 27 février 1933. L'Opéra « Kroll » abrite cette assemblée contrôlée par les Nazis. Le choix s'est porté sur la Maison d'Opéra qui était, à la fois, bien placé et suffisamment vaste pour abriter l'institution.

Judi, 23 mars 1933 : Le monde civilisé est sur le point de basculer. Suite à l'incendie du « Reichstag » dans la nuit du 27 au 28 février, incendie présenté par les Nazis comme le résultat d'un complot communiste, Adolf Hitler obtient l'accord des membres du gouvernement pour soumettre un décret d'urgence au président Hindenburg, qui signe le texte dans la journée du 28 février. Basé sur l'article 48, 2e alinéa de la Constitution, le « Reichstagsbrandverordnung » (décret de l'incendie du « Reichstag ») permet de restreindre, en dépassant les normes légales normalement applicables, la liberté individuelle, la liberté d'expression telle que la liberté de la presse, du droit de réunion et d'association.

« La publication du décret de l'incendie du « Reichstag » est accompagnée d'un déferlement de propagande » qui fait la preuve de son efficacité. Dans toute l'Allemagne, les Sections d'Assaut (SA) font déferler « la terreur sanglante des hordes déchaînées » ; les locaux du Parti communiste sont systématiquement saccagés et ses membres sont arrêtés par milliers. De manière plus générale, les Nazis mettent en place « un dispositif associant l'intimidation, la répression et la propagande » .

L'Assemblée se réunit à Berlin, à l'Opéra « Kroll » . Devant les représentants du « Reichstag » , Adolf Hitler dépose sa loi visant au soulagement de la détresse du peuple et de l'État (un « décret d'habilitation ») . Aussi baptisé « loi des pleins pouvoirs » , le document est appuyé par les 430 voix nécessaires afin de donner au Chancelier les pouvoirs d'un dictateur pour une période de 4 ans, renouvelable sans l'accord des députés. Le « Reichstag » donnera ainsi les pleins pouvoirs à Adolf Hitler. L'Assemblée ne sert plus que pour des représentations à la gloire du « Führer » . Dehors, c'est le printemps, mais à l'intérieur de la chambre, les parlementaires viennent de voter pour qu'un hiver sombre, sordide, inhumain et odieux s'abatte sur l'Europe pour les 12 prochaines années.

...

C'est au cours de la nuit du 27 au 28 février 1933 que le « Reichstag » fut incendié. Dans l'immeuble du Parlement allemand, la Police se saisit d'un suspect, un jeune conseiller d'origine Hollandaise, de la mouvance communiste, et en apparence déséquilibré. Il se nomme Marinus van der Lubbe. Il sera considéré comme responsable de l'incendie et sera sommairement exécuté. Mais, dans les faits, le doute demeure. La culpabilité du sympathisant communiste néerlandais ne put jamais être prouvée.

Coïncidence provoquée par des agents nazis ? Certains historiens pensent que le soir du 27 février, un détachement de Sections d'Assaut (SA) nazies aurait emprunté un passage souterrain menant de la demeure d'Hermann Göring (Ministre de l'Intérieur du « Land » de Prusse) au « Reichstag » et y aurait répandu des produits hautement inflammables. La présence de Van der Lubbe sur place, au même moment, allumant de son côté de petits foyers d'incendie, n'aurait été qu'une coïncidence à moins que des agents nazis aient poussé le Hollandais à la faute. Les

Nazis exploitèrent l'événement comme un complot communiste pour justifier l'interdiction des Partis d'opposition. Cet incendie sera considéré comme un modèle de l'utilisation d'opérations terroristes spectaculaires comme instrument favorisant la conquête ou la protection d'un pouvoir. Le drame a lieu 1 mois avant les élections législatives. Adolf Hitler va tirer habilement parti de la présence de ce petit pyromane « communiste » sur les lieux du drame. Dès le lendemain, le 28 février, Hitler fait arrêter 4,000 responsables du « KPD », le Parti communiste allemand. Le même jour, il fait signer par le « Reich » -Président von Hindenburg un « décret pour la protection du peuple et de l'État » qui suspend les libertés fondamentales, donne des pouvoirs de police exceptionnels aux Régions (« Länder ») et met fin à la démocratie ! Un communiste bulgare, Georgi Dimitrov, est présenté comme la tête du complot. Près de Munich, à Dachau, s'ouvre le 1er camp-de-concentration pour recevoir les opposants politiques. Les Nazis peuvent, dès lors, mener une campagne électorale qui mêle terreur et propagande sans qu'aucun opposant ne soit en mesure de se faire entendre.

Malgré cette pression, les élections du 5 mars ne donnent aux Partis nationalistes, regroupés autour des Nazis, qu'une simple majorité au Parlement. Les Nazis eux-mêmes obtiennent 17 millions de voix (soit 44 %) . C'est encore insuffisant à Hitler pour modifier la Constitution en sa faveur. Il lui manque la majorité des 2/3. Le 23 mars, l'Assemblée nouvellement élue se réunit à Berlin, à l'Opéra « Kroll » . Elle se voit soumettre par Adolf Hitler un « décret d'habilitation » qui donne au Chancelier un pouvoir législatif exclusif pendant 4 ans, autrement dit, le droit de gouverner et légiférer à sa guise sans l'accord des députés.

Victor Klemperer

Victor Klemperer (né le 9 octobre 1881 à Gorzów Wielkopolski et mort le 11 février 1960 à Dresde) était cousin avec le chef d'orchestre et compositeur Otto Klemperer (1885-1973) . Pendant le 3e « Reich » , Victor Klemperer se voit interdire le droit d'exercer un métier intellectuel en raison de ses ascendances juives. En avril 1935, il est mis à la retraite anticipée en tant que « non-Aryen » . Il écrit à propos de son éviction de l'Université : « J'ai l'impression de me retrouver comme Ulysse face à Polyphème (qui lança à sa victime désignée) : “ Toi, je te dévorerai en dernier. ” » Son journal personnel, qu'il avait commencé avant 1933, devient alors un moyen intellectuel de survie. Il y note, jour après jour, toutes les manipulations des Nazis sur la langue allemande. Cette langue du 3e « Reich » , Klemperer l'appelle « Lingua Tertii Imperii » , qu'il code pour plus de sûreté par les lettres « LTI » . Il travaille aussi à son « Histoire de la littérature française au XVIIIe siècle » , l'œuvre de sa vie, commencée bien avant la période nazie, et qui n'est publiée qu'en 1954 et 1960.

Pendant la période du National-Socialisme, Klemperer vit à Dresde. Après avoir vendu la maison qu'ils avaient fait construire et qu'ils avaient habitée au début des années 1930 à Dresde-Dölzsch, Victor Klemperer et son épouse, Eva, sont contraints d'habiter dans une « maison de Juifs » (« Judenhaus ») . Le fait que Eva soit « aryenne » permet à son mari d'échapper à la déportation en camp de concentration jusqu'au 13 février 1945. C'est en effet à cette date que les autorités décidèrent de déporter aussi les « couples mixtes » , alors que le camp d'Auschwitz-Birkenau était déjà aux mains des Alliés. Victor et Eva Klemperer ne durent leur survie qu'à l'attaque aérienne survenue le soir même, dans la nuit du 13 au 14 février 1945. Ils décidèrent alors de profiter du chaos pour s'enfuir, dans une Allemagne en proie au chaos de la déroute.

Congrès pénal et pénitentiaire international au « Kroll Oper »

19 au 24 août 1935 : Le Congrès pénal et pénitentiaire international se déroule à l'Opéra « Kroll » de Berlin pour les séances plénières et au « Reichstag » pour les autres sessions. Il réunit environ 750 congressistes dont 443 allemands. Aucun délégué officiel français n'est présent. Lors de ce Congrès, de vifs échanges opposent délégués et rapporteurs allemands, notamment sur le rôle et la place du juge, ou bien encore sur la question de la réadaptation sociale des détenus libérés et du patronage.

D'entrée, le président du Congrès, président de la Cour suprême du « Reich », Erwin Bumke, tout comme le Ministre de la justice Gütner avant lui, avait, dans son discours d'ouverture, vanté les conceptions du nouveau droit pénal national-socialiste axées sur la seule répression, excluant ainsi tout amendement ou reclassement du détenu (à l'exception de certaines catégories d'inculpés amendables comme les adolescents) . Le juge, dans ce contexte, ne se borne pas à appliquer les mesures législatives, mais doit interpréter la volonté générale exprimée par son représentant, le « Führer » . Il préconise également, comme mesure de sûreté dans la législation pénale, la stérilisation pour éviter la pro-création d'enfants ayant des pré-dispositions criminelles.

Accueilli en Allemagne, 2 ans et demi après l'accession d'Adolphe Hitler au pouvoir, ce Congrès de 1935 est donc particulièrement intéressant, car il offre une vision des nouvelles théories du droit pénal allemand et présente les vives réactions qu'elles ont suscitées parmi les délégués étrangers. Plus largement, il fut également une tribune pour saluer le renouveau allemand et l'œuvre constructrice du National-Socialisme en Allemagne, 2 ans et demi après l'accession au pouvoir d'Hitler (1933) ; ce que le discours du Ministre de l'éducation politique et sociale du peuple et de la propagande, Josef Gœbbels, sur « L'Allemagne vue de l'intérieur » ne manque pas d'exprimer ici avec véhémence.

...

Actualités filmées du discours d'Adolf Hitler prononcé le 7 août 1940 à l'Opéra « Kroll » (3 minutes, 24 secondes) :

Le « Führer » se rend à l'Opéra pour y prononcer un important discours devant le « Reichstag » . Le journal « Berliner Nachtansgabe » titre, en grosse manchette - « La réunion du “ Reichstag ” » :

« Berlinois et Berlinoises semblent attendre dans une file d'attente. 3 limousines découvertes sortent d'une propriété avec grille et jardin devant des troupes alignées et des officiers saluant. »

Le Parlement allemand restera à l'Opéra « Kroll » jusqu'à la fin de la Seconde guerre mondiale et il sera le théâtre de certains discours majeurs d'Adolf Hitler, dont le discours « prophétique » du 30 janvier 1939 dans lequel il affirme « si la Juiverie capitaliste internationale d'Europe et hors d'Europe réussit à jeter les nations dans une nouvelle guerre mondiale, le résultat ne sera pas une bolchévisation du monde, ni la victoire des Juifs, mais l'élimination de la race juive du sol européen. »

La dernière séance du « Reichstag » aura lieu à l'Opéra « Kroll » , le 26 avril 1942, pour voter un décret autorisant Adolf Hitler à passer outre la justice et l'administration dans tous les domaines.

22 novembre 1943 : Le bâtiment du « Kroll Oper » est gravement endommagé à la suite d'un bombardement allié de la « Royal Air Force » (RAF) .

La bataille de Berlin et le « Kroll Oper » (1945)

La bataille de la « König Platz » , secteur Ouest : L'artillerie russe ajuste son tir. Les obus de 200 millimètres s'abattent toutefois un peu court, juste devant le « Reichstag » : les bâtiments adjacents s'effondrent les uns après les autres. Le bombardement permet également de nettoyer les champs de mines et les barbelés qui protègent l'accès à l'entrée principale au Parlement. Sur le terrain, les pièces de 152 millimètres et de 203 millimètres joignent leurs coups de départ espacés à ceux des ISUI-52. Objectif : museler les mitrailleuses lourdes allemandes qui battent le terrain depuis les étages du « Reichstag » . Les MG russes crachent rafale sur rafale en direction du Parlement. Un nid de mitrailleuses allemandes se tait dans l'aile nord-ouest, les servants cloués sur le sol poussiéreux du bâtiment.

Aux abords de l'Opéra « Kroll » , totalement fortifié, les mortiers russes font tomber des obus fumigènes sous les fenêtres du bâtiment : l'assaut peut débuter. Les « Frontoviki » s'élancent dans la rue, et se retrouvent cloués au sol par les tirs des mitrailleuses allemandes qui les surplombent ainsi que par les tirs bien ajustés des canons d'infanterie retranchés dans la partie sud du « Reichstag » . Les assaillants refluent en nombre vers le Ministère de l'Intérieur.

Plus à l'Ouest encore, sur la « Inden Zelten Straße » , les troupes d'assaut russes sont repoussées par les soldats du « Volksturm » . Une seconde vague parvient à ramper dans la rue et se faufile dans les ruines (025) .

Dans les ruines du quartier diplomatique, où résiste encore une poignée de « Waffen SS » , le claquement sec d'un calibre 50 se fait entendre. Les mitrailleuses allemandes, ne pouvant rivaliser, sont réduites au silence. Là encore, le combat final approche. Les fusiliers russes encerclent les défenseurs et les harcèlent de toutes leurs armes. Les allemands cèdent les uns après les autres, se réfugiant dans les étages pour se regrouper.

Face au « Reichstag » , les soviétiques sortent des immeubles en ruines du quartier diplomatique et progressent prudemment, sautant de trous d'obus en trous d'obus. L'avance est lente, mais l'assaillant ne subit que peu de pertes, protégé par un écran fumigène. Un T 34/85 est stoppé en pleine course au nord du Parlement par un tir du « Tigre II » , immobilisé à la sortie du pont Marschall. Les canons de la tour de « Flak du Zoo » tentent de ralentir les fantassins russes, sans succès. Par contre, ils cueillent un ISUI-52 à sa sortie du pont Moltke.

Ça ne passe définitivement pas devant l'Opéra ! Une nouvelle vague d'assaut russe se fait repousser. Plus de moyens humains sont rameutés du quartier diplomatique, où les derniers défenseurs se sont rendus, laissant aux mains des russes un butin conséquent en matériel. D'autres chars lourds soviétiques passent sur le pont Moltke sous les tirs décidément imprécis de la tour de « Flak » , et viennent renforcer l'attaque russe. Un T34 - OT se fait détruire par un coup au but du StuG III qui campe devant le « Reichstag » .

Une pièce d'artillerie allemande de 105 millimètres vient de se taire dans une tranchée devant le « Reichstag », certainement à court de munitions. La liaison-radio avec la tour de « Flak » est perturbée : les canons continuent toutefois de chercher quelques cibles en tir tendu.

Au nord du « Reichstag », les « Frontoviki » continuent leur lente progression, sous les tirs constants des défenseurs, à peine gênés par l'artillerie russe (un 9-2 SS tombe toutefois sous les tirs ennemis, succombant à ses multiples blessures) . Les déroutes se multiplient.

Les tirs de couverture russes produisent enfin leurs effets sur les défenseurs de l'Opéra « Kroll » qui se retrouvent cloués derrière leurs mitrailleuses et encaissent quelques pertes. Les soviétiques en profitent pour relancer l'assaut et s'approcher du bâtiment. 2 charges explosives sont placées contre le mur fortifié au coin-nord (N25) . L'une d'elles ouvrent une brèche dans le bâtiment alors que la déflagration de l'autre sème la panique et la désolation parmi les défenseurs du « Volkssturm » . Les survivants s'enfuient. D'autres soldats russes s'infiltrèrent dans les ruines à l'Est de l'Opéra, mettant hors-de-combat une équipe anti-char allemande. Les mitrailleuses allemandes au 2e étage reprennent leurs tirs, tandis qu'un groupe de « Waffen SS » est envoyée en renfort pour soutenir les soldats du « Volkssturm » qui tentent de circonscrire l'attaque russe au coin-nord de l'Opéra.

Un autre T 34/85 explose sous les coups de la « Flak » sur le pont Moltke et prend feu. Les chars déjà passés au sud de la « Spree » engagent plusieurs duels autour de la « König Platz » avec le StuG et un canon 88AA. Le StuG sera finalement détruit, pris pour cible par 3 chars ennemis. Le 88 s'acharne contre un ISII, sans succès.

Au nord du « Reichstag », une trentaine de soldats russes atteignent le pied du bâtiment. Parmi eux, une équipe lance-flammes qui entre vite en action contre les défenseurs retranchés dans les caves. La menace est sérieuse et quelques « Waffen SS » viennent renforcer la position face aux soldats russes. Au-dessus d'eux, un obus de 203 millimètres passe en fusant et s'engouffre dans une meurtrière du 2e étage (AA26) , pulvérisant tous les défenseurs.

Les soviétiques qui ont réussi à pénétrer dans le bâtiment de l'Opéra mitraillent les défenseurs qui cèdent à la panique. Seuls les « Waffen SS » , parvenus dans la partie sud (M26) , tiennent leurs positions. Mais les russes engagent toujours plus de fantassins dans le combat : les ruines à l'Est de l'Opéra grouillent de « Frontoviki » . Un groupe d'assaut surgit du Ministère de l'Intérieur, brave les tirs en provenance du « Reichstag » , parvient à contourner l'Opéra et s'empare d'une position de mortier (O28) . Dans le bâtiment principal de l'Opéra « Kroll » , les russes grimpent dans les étages et neutralisent les servants des mitrailleuses allemandes, presque toutes tombées à court de munitions ou enrayées. Au rez-de-chaussée, la violence de l'attaque russe bouscule également les « Waffen SS » . L'Opéra joue son dernier acte.

Dans le même temps, une section de fusiliers russes descend en courant les quais de la « Spree » vers l'Ouest (« Schlieffen Ufer ») et se répand dans les ruines adjacentes, sous la protection d'un calibre 50 placée en couverture à l'étage du Ministère de l'Intérieur, cette dernière ayant mis en déroute un groupe de mitrailleurs qui prenait le quai sous son feu.

Devant le « Reichstag », un SU-76 puis un ISU1-52 tombent sous les coups des canons allemands devant la « König Platz ». Au nord du bâtiment, un T 34/85 et un IS2 engagent un duel avec le « Tigre II » immobilisé devant le pont Marschall. Le char lourd russe est immobilisé par son adversaire, puis achevé par les tirs provenant de la « Flak du Zoo » .

Pendant ce temps, et malgré l'absence de soutien d'artillerie (radio HS) , les troupes d'assaut russes arrosent les caves du « Reichstag » au lance-flammes (AA26) , grillant leurs occupants. Un début d'incendie survient. Profitant du flottement dans la défense, un groupe du génie ouvre une brèche dans le mur du Parlement, au moyen d'une charge explosive. Les fantassins s'engouffrent dans les caves, créant une Ire pénétration dans le bâtiment fortifié. Les « Waffen SS » contre-attaquent, sans coup férir, faisant dérouter une partie des assaillants dans les étages encore inoccupés. Des flammes se propagent peu à peu au rez-de-chaussée.

Le second étage de l'Opéra « Kroll » est entièrement nettoyé. Au rez-de-chaussée, les soldats du « Volkssturm » s'enfuient ou se rendent. Seuls quelques SS poursuivent le combat au sud-ouest du bâtiment (M27) . Ils doivent toutefois gagner le bâtiment sud, rejoignant une vingtaine de soldats du « Volkssturm » se regroupant pour un dernier baroud d'honneur. Les russes poursuivent, en parallèle, leur poussée vers l'Ouest.

Dans les caves du « Reichstag » , c'est le feu qui sépare les combattants ! Quelques soldats russes tentent de se regrouper au 3e étage, puis sur le toit, poursuivis par une poignée de « Waffen SS » . À l'extérieur, les soviétiques avaient pourtant commencé à se rassembler pour investir le Parlement en force. Ils sont contraints de reporter leur attaque vers l'accès principal à l'Ouest : une tranchée est prise face aux escaliers (X27) , eux-mêmes protégés par un réseau de barbelés.

C'est l'assaut final sur le bâtiment sud de l'Opéra « Kroll » . Une vague de troupes d'assaut bouscule sans effort les derniers défenseurs qui sont annihilés : la puissance de feu des soviétiques est impressionnante.

Dans le « Reichstag » , les allemands procèdent à une chasse aux soldats russes qui ne parviennent pas à se regrouper. Sur le terre-plein que domine le Parlement, les russes hésitent à se lancer à l'assaut, faute d'explosifs pour percer le mur du bâtiment. Les chars et l'artillerie poursuivent leurs tirs, sans plus de succès.

Toute résistance a cessé dans les bâtiments de l'Opéra « Kroll » . Quelques prisonniers sont rassemblés, avant que les vainqueurs ne se tournent vers les quartiers à l'Ouest.

Dans les couloirs du « Reichstag » , le petit groupe de russes aux abois (2 demi-groupes armés d'un lance-flammes et accompagnés d'un leader 8-1) parvient à se rallier : il dévale les escaliers du Parlement (CC29) et prend à revers les défenseurs du rez-de-chaussée, les mettant en déroute. Ils doivent cependant refluer vers le 1er étage : des bruits de bottes se rapprochent de leur position. Il va falloir attendre les renforts et économiser l'essence du lance-flammes. À l'extérieur du « Reichstag » se trouvaient 4 canon de calibre 88 et 2 chars « Tigre II » . La défense du « Reichstag » était assurée par le « SS-Brigadführer » , Wilhelm Mohnke. L'assaut des Soviétiques sur le « Reichstag »

début le 30 avril, au soir. Les combats, à l'extérieur et à l'intérieur, durent toute la nuit avant que le drapeau rouge ne soit hissé sur le toit du « Reichstag », le matin du 1er mai. Staline avait demandé au photographe ukrainien Yevgeny Khaldei d'immortaliser cet événement mais il n'était pas présent le jour de la prise du « Reichstag ». La propagande soviétique recrée la scène, le 2 mai 1945. Le soldat d'origine géorgienne Meliton Kantaria, sur ordre de Staline, hisse le drapeau à la manière des soldats américains à Iwo Jima, le 23 février 1945. La célèbre photographie fut retouchée pour effacer une des 2 montres, celle au poignet droit de l'officier soutenant le soldat portant le drapeau, montre surnuméraire laissant apparaître qu'elle avait été volée, acte pourtant courant au sein des armées d'invasion.

Peu de temps avant qu'Adolf Hitler ne se suicide et que le « Reichstag » ne soit pris, la radio berlinoise avait réussi à diffuser, pour la dernière fois, une œuvre de Richard Wagner, « la Marche funèbre » de « Siegfried », afin de donner du courage aux troupes restantes. Celle-ci annonçait la fin du 3e « Reich ».

Immédiatement après la fin de la guerre, à l'été 1945, le restaurant dans les jardins du « Kroll Établissement » réouvrit ses portes au public, même si la Maison d'Opéra fut complètement démolie, le 27 mars 1951. Le « Kroll-Garten Inn » ferma définitivement ses portes en 1956. L'année plus tard, on rasa ce qui restait du site pour permettre la mise-en-chantier, en 1957, du moderne et audacieux « Berlin Kongreßhalle » (Centre des congrès de Berlin), l'œuvre de l'architecte américain Hugh Stubbins, junior. Aujourd'hui, l'emplacement exact du « Kroll Oper » n'est plus qu'une vaste surface gazonnée, située au sud de la « Bundeskanzleramt » (et tout près de la tour au carillon, un don de la firme automobile Daimler-Benz). Une plaque commémorative rappelant l'histoire du « Kroll Oper » fut installée en 2007.

Mémorial soviétique du « Tiergarten »

Le Mémorial soviétique du « Tiergarten » est un monument qui fut érigé sur le bord septentrional de la « Charlottenburger Chaussee » peu après la chute de la ville de Berlin (le 7 novembre : soit 6 mois après la capitulation allemande), avec des matériaux prélevés sur les ruines de la « Neue Reichskanzlei ». La nouvelle Chancellerie fut, entre 1938 et 1945, la résidence officielle d'Adolf Hitler. Il en avait confié la conception et la réalisation à son architecte personnel, Albert Speer. Les lers clichés du monument, inauguré le 7 novembre 1945, le montrent entouré d'un désert de ruines. En effet, le « Tiergarten » sera sérieusement endommagé par les bombes incendiaires, avant que les arbres restants ne soient tous abattus par la population démunie, pour servir de bois de chauffage. Depuis, le parc a été reboisé. Le monument se situait en secteur britannique, donc à Berlin-Ouest. Mais les troupes de l'Est y eurent accès pendant toute la partition de la Ville. 300,000 soldats russes tombèrent en Allemagne en 1945 et 2,500 d'entre eux sont enterrés sous ce monument. Il a été construit avec le marbre récupéré de la Chancellerie d'Hitler. En 1987, les troupes soviétiques étaient autorisées à y effectuer des relèves de la garde dans ce secteur sous contrôle britannique, appartenant à l'Allemagne de l'Ouest.

La « Rue du 17 juin » est l'avenue principale qui traverse le « Tiergarten ». De nombreuses manifestations et défilés y ont lieu. Au fond, vers l'Est, on reconnaît la porte de Brandebourg et la « Fernsehturm ». Cette large avenue (ayant même servi de piste d'aviation de fortune pendant la guerre) était située en secteur Ouest et bordait le Mémorial

Soviétique. Juste après la répression du 17 juin 1953, quand les chars soviétiques avaient envahi Berlin-Est pour mater les manifestations ouvrières et faisant plus de 100 morts, la municipalité de Berlin-Ouest a décidé de rebaptiser cette avenue. On était alors en pleine Guerre froide.

Station 3, projet de l'artiste Margret Holz intitulé : « Experiment “ Kroll Oper ” », 2005

L'« Expérience “ Kroll Oper ” » (ayant eu lieu du 6 août au 13 novembre 2005) fut un montage joignant les arts plastiques et la musique dans une perspective historique. L'Opéra « Kroll » était situé en face du « Reichstag » (l'actuel « Deutsche Bundestag ») entre la « Paul-Löbe-Allee », la « Scheidemannstraße » et la « Großer Querallee ». Entre 1927 et 1931, l'Opéra « Kroll » était le lieu de l'avant-garde de la musique et de l'Opéra allemands. Des artistes, comme par exemple, le chef-d'orchestre Otto Klemperer, les compositeurs Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith et Igor Stravinsky, la metteuse-en-scène Natalja Sz ou les scénographes Ewald Dülberg et Lászió Moholy-Nagy ont marqué cette période que le metteur-en-scène Hans Curjel avait appelée l'« Experiment “ Kroll Oper ” » (l'Expérience de l'Opéra « Kroll »), en 1928. Cela voulait dire rassembler, sous le même toit, des nouvelles compositions, des compositions Classiques ainsi que des compositions pour tous. Les signes avant-coureurs et les hommes-de-main du Parti national-socialiste ont largement contribué à ce que l'Opéra ferme ses portes en 1931. Pour le pouvoir nazi, les compositions et mises-en-scène des artistes rentraient dans la catégorie de la « Musique Dégénérée » (« Entartete Musik »). La plupart des artistes durent prendre la route de l'exil, dès 1933.

Le projet

Dans le projet, cette courte période de 4 ans, pendant laquelle l'avant-garde était localisée à l'Opéra « Kroll » de Berlin, rencontre le présent de 2005. Avec des montages photographiques, une composition et une vidéo, les artistes posent la question : « Que reste-t-il de l'expérience de l'Opéra “ Kroll ” de 1928 ? » Dans cette recherche s'opère une synthèse des niveaux de temps visuels et acoustiques du « Maintenant, de l'Avant et du Pas Encore », à la fois à l'intérieur et autour de l'Opéra.

Montages photographiques

Il s'agit de superpositions de situations spatiales et de portraits d'artistes de l'Opéra avec des gros-plans des lieux entre 1988 et 2005. Les tirages numériques sont accrochées dans une installation à l'intérieur du musée.

La vidéo

Dans la vidéo 3 x 7 hivers = Winter, un cheval de manège parisien est à la fois acteur et objet pivot entre la situation de 2005 sur l'ancien site de l'Opéra « Kroll » et les événements qui s'y sont déroulés, entre 1927 et 1931. Le cheval passe par 3 x 7 = 21 positions différentes sur le plateau d'un manège et tourne ainsi autour du néant, du vide qui est resté après que les artistes aient été chassés de l'Opéra, emportant avec eux un morceau de culture.

Composition pour violon

Une composition se réfère à Arnold Schœnberg. Dans plusieurs positions du cheval de manège, la composition se lie à la vidéo, le manège s'immobilise pendant un moment, créant une photo sonore.

L'esthétique se trouve, comme dans les différentes épaisseurs de notre perception, dans les superpositions des niveaux de temps des montages-photo et de la composition, et dans le passage entre « le Maintenant, l'Avant et le Pas Encore » de la vidéo. Une scène temporelle ouverte apparaît. C'est une méthode de travail constructive-déconstructive et non une illustration de l'histoire. L'histoire de l'Opéra « Kroll » est présentée dans un ensemble de documents écrits et photographiques.

The Berlin « Kroll » Opera and the politics of cultural reform in the Weimar Republic

By Rachel Emily Nussbaum, Ph.D. , Cornell University (2005) .

This dissertation deals with changes in cultural policy during the Weimar Republic and how they affected the structure of the German Opera public. I pay special attention to the role of theatre-goers' organizations such as the Berlin « Volksbühne » , who formed a major part of the audience for Weimar Germany's best-known experimental Opera, the « Kroll Oper » (1927-1931) . The expansion of the Opera public to include social groups who had previously been excluded was here combined with an attempt to reform Opera aesthetically, to create an « everyday Opera » which would do away with kitsch and make Opera a viable art form capable of speaking to a modern audience. The ideas of the « Volksbühne » centered on community (« Gemeinschaft ») which involved using the theatre as a way of uniting German society. In this way, they lined-up with conductor Otto Klemperer's plans for an Opera representative of the new republican State form. Although the Opera was forced to close in 1931, I argue that it, nevertheless, managed to create its own public far beyond the elites who usually attended Opera. The « Kroll » is an example of the transformation of the idea of the « Bildungsbürgertum » (the educated bourgeoisie) , in the 1920's. It has often been argued that this was an outdated idea in the Weimar era. However, it had considerable power at the time. Avant-garde critics who supported Klemperer's idea of an Opera stripped of spectacle were actually part of the « Bildungsbürgertum » due to their continued belief in the power of culture to unite disparate groups within German society. However, as the Opera audience actually expanded to include the working-class and white-collar workers, conflict surrounding the idea of « Bildung » (self-formation) was inevitable. What would have to change about Operatic culture ? Its form, its content or simply its price structure ? The decline of the old bourgeois culture which had supported Opera, before 1914, meant that its heritage was placed in question. Would « an Opera for every day » still be Opera ? My sources include the files of the Prussian State theatre administration ; the files of the Ministry of State ; the records of « Volksbühne » annual meetings, as well as the organization's published journals ; and contemporary newspapers and music journals.

« Die Kroll Oper - Die Mitte Deutschland - Die Deutsche Mitte »

« Die Deutsche Mitte : Kroll und der Platz der Republik » (The Middle of Germany : The “ Kroll ” Oper) :

1990 · Duration : 59 minutes - Format : SD 4:3 - Film Director : Jörg Moser-Metius - Produced by : Euro-Arts Music, TransTel, SDR, VIDEA L / © Brilliant Music Media MCCCCCLXXX - Programme Number : 0173.

Bought from www.download-films.de (Purchase Code : 3449VVRVSI) :

session=ijZnDuUQsJIS0kLIAMRiCvIQwU3pEd&download=1076

...

« Bei Kroll » - The « Kroll » Opera during Otto Klemperer's tenure (1927-1931) by Film Director, Joerg Moser-Metius. (January 1989, TV short documentary in colour : 28 minutes. Including Lotte Klemperer. Produced by Bernd Helthaler. Grip : Karel Charvat. Production : La Sept.)

The « Platz der Republik » , in Berlin, is the middle of Germany which was once the site of the « Kroll » Opera House. Tenor Enrico Caruso sang and Otto Klemperer conducted there. The film tells the story of the « Kroll Établissement » and the « Platz der Republik » . A social and architectural history of the « Kroll Oper » and its environs, featuring Otto Klemperer and his circle, by Joerg Moser-Metius, film director.

The « Kroll Oper » (formerly located opposite the « Reichstag » building, now the seat of the German « Bundestag » , the lower-house of the German parliament, between « Paul-Löbe-Allee » , « Scheidemannstraße » and « Großer Querallee » , was where the avant-garde of the German music and Opera world came together, between 1927 and 1931. Artists such as the German Jewish conductor Otto Klemperer, the composers Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith and Igor Stravinsky, the director Natalja Sz, the set-designers Ewald Dülberg and László Moholy-Nagy and others left their mark on this cultural phase, which the director Hans Curjel, in 1928, described as the « “ Kroll Oper ” Experiment » .

This experiment failed, Ist financially, then politically : significant factors were the economic crisis, shortages of space due to the Opera's temporary closure, and the lack of acceptance of the performances on the part of the working people who, through the « Volksbühnenverein » (People's Theatre Association) , were the intended audience. In the end, the financial failure offered those opposed to the project the opportunity to politically storm the « Kroll » Opera, which was closed in 1931 as the National-Socialists (Nazis) were ascending to power.

...

Book (Paperback) : « Kroll Opera House » by Hardmond Carlyle Nicolao, Crypt Publishing, USA (September 2011) ; 52 pages / ISBN10 : 6137130304 / ISBN13 : 9786137130308 / EAN : 9786137130308. Format : 22.91 x 15.19 x 0.3 cm - Weight : 0.09 kg.

Book (Paperback) : « Theatres in Berlin : “ Kroll ” Opera House, “ Deutsche Oper Berlin ”, “ Berliner Ensemble ”, “ Komische Oper Berlin ”, “ Deutsches Theater ”, “ Kulturfabrik Moab ” » , Books LLC (7 May 2010) ; 100 pages /

EAN13 : 9781155800264. Format : 229 mm x 154 mm x 17 mm - Weight : 161 g.

The « Kroll » Opera House

The « Potsdamer Platz » was Europe's busiest intersection before World War II reduced it to rubble, the « Times Square of Europe » , the hero of Walter Ruttmann's 1927 montage extravaganza « Berlin : The Symphony of a Great City » . In fact, the words « Potsdamer Platz » mean, as much as they mean anything, the Berlin of the 1920's, the Berlin of crowded restaurants, of businessmen wearing hats and carrying valises, of theatre-goers rushing to a premiere of a new Max Reinhardt production, or chatting about Moholy-Nagy's sets for « The Tales of Hoffman » at the « Kroll » Opera House, of Jewish theatre critics writing for all the important newspapers, of Orchestras in the afternoon filling-up hotel lobbies with hits from « The Threepenny Opera » . In those days, its leading tourist attraction was the cupola-topped complex of restaurants known as Kempinski's « Haus Vaterland » (Aryanized to « Haus Vaterland » after the Nazis came to power) and its culinary incarnations of Germany's various regions.

The « Kroll » Opera House (« Kroll Oper ») was located in the central « Tiergarten » District on the western edge of the « Königsplatz » square (today, the « Platz der Republik » between « Paul-Löbe-Allee » , « Scheidemannstraße » and « Großer Querallee ») , facing the « Reichstag » building (now, the seat of the « Bundestag » , the lower-house of the German parliament) . It was built in 1844 as an entertainment venue for the restaurant owner, Josef Kroll. During its eventful history, it was redeveloped as a lyric theatre, in 1851, after a severe but accidental fire, and was used by various owners and directors for Opera, Operetta and drama.

(Colour picture) - Berlin, « Platz der Republik » where the « Kroll » Opera was located ; photo dating from around 1930. The House was opened in 1924 as the 2nd venue of the Berlin State Opera. The official name was « Oper am Platz der Republik » , but people referred to it only as the « Kroll » Opera because, until the 1st World War, it had been the site of a pleasure establishment called « Krolls Établissement » .

The « Kroll » was later operated by the Prussian State Opera and drama companies. The « Kroll Oper » was where the avant-garde of the German music and Opera world came together, between 1927 and 1931. Artists such as the conductor Otto Klemperer, the composers Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith and Igor Stravinsky, the director Natalja Sz, the set designers Ewald Dülberg and László Moholy-Nagy, and others, left their mark on this cultural phase, which the director Hans Curjel described, in 1928, as the « Kroll Oper Experiment » .

This experiment failed, 1st financially, then politically : significant factors were the economic crisis, shortages of space due to the Opera's temporary closure, and the lack of acceptance of the performances on the part of the working people who, through the « Volksbühnenverein » (People's Theatre Association) , were the intended audience. In the end, the financial failure offered those opposed to the project the opportunity to politically storm the « Kroll » Opera, which was closed in 1931 as the National-Socialists were ascending to power. The « Kroll Oper » building served as the Assembly hall of the Nazi « Reichstag » parliament, from 1933 to 1945. Severely damaged by bombing during the Battle of Berlin, in World War II, it was finally completely demolished in 1956.

Some historical dates

1843-1844 : The « Kroll'scher Wintergarten » , also known as « Kroll Établissement » . Built as the entertainment venue by architects, Ludwig Persius and Carl Ferdinand Langhans, for the restaurant owner Josef Kroll, on a site donated by king Friedrich Wilhelm IV. During the 19th Century, the complex was used by various owners and directors for Opera, Operetta, drama, and variety performances, as well as for concerts.

15 February 1844 : The official opening. The complex included 3 large halls (« Königsaal angegebenen Ort ») , a large veranda, a basement hall, and 14 function rooms. Total capacity : 5,000 guests. Used as a restaurant, for balls, and for concerts by a resident Orchestra.

27 June 1850 : Addition of a garden theatre (« Sommertheater in Kroll's Garten ») by Eduard Titz.

1856 : Demolition of the « Sommertheater in Kroll's Garten » .

September 1850 : The « Königsaal » was also used as a theatre for Opera and drama performances.

1 February 1851 : Main building destroyed by an accidental fire. Subsequently rebuilt by Eduard Titz, to the original exterior plans and (altered) interior plans.

24 February 1852 : Re-opening of the « Kroll Établissement » .

1855 : Renovations and extensions of several green houses.

1856 : The garden theatre is demolished.

1895 : Extensions by Felix Genzmer and Gustav Hochgürtel. Re-opened as « Neues Königliches Operntheater » , operated by the Prussian State Opera and drama companies. The theatre seats 1,600 spectators.

1914-1918 : The « Kroll » is used as a warehouse during World War I.

1922-1923 : Major interior rebuilding by architect Oskar Kaufmann.

1 January 1924 : Re-opened as « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » (also known popularly as the « Kroll Oper ») by the « Volksbühne » Society. Used exclusively for performances of the « Staatsoper » Company. Capacity : 2,100 seats.

1927 : Used by a resident Opera ensemble under the direction of Jewish German conductor, Otto Klemperer. Extensions added to the building.

19 November 1927 : Re-opening of the « Kroll Oper » with Beethoven's « Fidelio » . Under Klemperer's direction, the theatre became famous for an avant-garde approach to Opera direction, stage sets by modern painters, and the staging of many avant-garde Operas by contemporary composers.

31 October 1928 : The « Kroll Oper » , headed by Otto Klemperer, stages George Bizet's « Carmen » , directed by Ernst Legal and designed by Casper Neher.

8 June 1929 : Premiere of Paul Hindemith's new Opera, « Neues vom Tage » (New from the day) .

6 November 1930 : Premiere of Arnold Schœnberg's « Begleitmusik zu einer Lichtspielszene » (Accompaniment to a Film Scene) , Opus 34.

3 July 1931 : Last performance at the « Kroll Oper » with presentation of Mozart's « Le nozze di Figaro » . Officially closed.

1932 : Banquet for Berlin Bibliophiles at the « Kroll » Opera House. The book lovers' and collectors' Societies that began to appear in Germany, at the end of the 19th Century, were based on groups that had been established earlier in England and France. The German Societies attracted book-lovers and collectors from the professions and academia, as well as from publishing houses and the antiquarian book trade. The group known as « Berlin Bibliophile Evening » was founded in 1905 by Fedor von Zopeltitz, one of the original members of the Weimar Bibliophiles group. German bibliophilic Societies had a substantial and active Jewish membership. Of the 300 members of the « Berliner Bibliophilen-Abend » , between 1905 and 1930, 75 were Jewish.

27-28 February 1933 : After the « Reichstag » fire, the « Kroll Oper » is renovated under the supervision of Hermann Göring to welcome the seat of the Nazi German parliament.

23 March 1933 : Site of the infamous « Ermächtigungsgesetz » decision of the « Reichstag » that ceded nearly all legal power to Adolf Hitler. Subsequently used for staged sittings of the « Reichstag » .

After 1938 : Called « Großdeutscher Reichstag » . A parliament without any real political power.

1 September 1939 : Site of Adolf Hitler's speech announcing the beginning of World War II.

22 November 1943 : The « Kroll » building is completely destroyed by allied bombs.

Summer of 1945 : A restaurant re-opened in the gardens of the « Kroll Établissement » . Will keep-up business even after the 1951 demolition of the Opera House.

27 March 1951 : The remains of the main building (Opera House) are demolished.

1956 : The « Kroll Garten Inn » is finally closed.

1957 : Last premises are cleared to make place for the erection of the audacious design of the new « Berlin Kongreßhalle » by the American architect, Hugh Stubbins Junior.

2007 : The exact site of the « Kroll Oper » is nothing but a large lawn on south of the « Bundeskanzleramt » and near the Carillon tower (donated by Daimler-Benz) . It is marked by a memorial plaque.

The early years, 1842-1848

The « Kroll » story began in the Silesian capital, Breslau, where the entrepreneur Josef Kroll (1797-1848) had opened the « Kroll Winter Garden » , in 1837. The Breslau authorities chose this reputable establishment to entertain the new Prussian king, Frederick William IV, when he visited the city, in 1841. The king was impressed by the splendid, flower-decorated rooms and suggested that something similar should be initiated in Berlin to become the social hub for the nobility in the Prussian residence.

After a consultation with his garden director, Peter Joseph Lenné and other members of the government, the king presented an order from the cabinet, dated 19 August 1842, which specified the building site on the west-side of the parade ground in the « Großer Tiergarten » park, and laid-out the conditions : Kroll was able to use the property without charge, but he would have to return the land and demolish any structures he had built if the project failed. The parade ground, which had stood since 1730, was outside of the city just to the north-west of the Brandenburg Gate. It had long degenerated into a sandy field, and the Berliners therefore derisively called it the Sahara. Every step on the sandy ground would kick-up a cloud of dust on the square. When it rained, the soil would turn into a mass of dirty mud. Yet, Kroll took solace in the fact that the greenery of the « Tiergarten » park lay just beyond the property.

The plans for the new building came from the Court architect Friedrich Ludwig Persius, which was a good indicator of the significance that the project had for Frederick William IV, co-working with Carl Ferdinand Langhans and Eduard Knoblauch. After a construction period of only 10 months, Kroll's enterprise opened on 15 February 1844. 40 waiters were to serve-up to 5,000 guests in the 3 halls (the main hall, also referred to as the King's Hall, and 2 smaller halls) , 13 boxes for at least 13 people each, and 14 large rooms (for smaller parties) . 60 musicians provided entertainment. The « Tunnel » was a special attraction and praised as a novelty for Berlin - a hall where one could smoke ! A technical innovation was the newly implemented gas lighting, which consisted of 400 flames.

During the 1st year, Kroll had satisfactory results. The main attractions were the large exhibitions, concerts and balls, which took place around lavishly constructed stage sets, attracting even the Waltz King, Johann Strauß Junior, and his Orchestra, who guested at Kroll's, in 1845. Yet, despite its uniqueness in Germany, as noted by the critics, the enterprise became increasingly difficult to sustain. On 15 April 1848, on his death-bed, Kroll regretted that his king had once had breakfast with him.

Between success and bankruptcy (1848-1894)

Josef Kroll's successor was his eldest daughter, Auguste. The National People's Garden was opened as soon as May 1848, as part of an expansion. Great attractions were offered, 1st in the garden and later in the great hall, such as performances with wild animals by their tamers and an extensive trade fair, in 1849. In 1850, Auguste Kroll established a permanent summer theatre with open-air performances of Operas and other events. Here, among others, Auguste's protégé, Albert Lortzing, directed his Operas « Undine » , « Der Waffenschmied » (The Armourer) and « Zar und Zimmermann » .

The operation of the new Theatre and Opera Company was suddenly disrupted on 1 February 1851, when the curtains were accidentally set on fire while lamps were being lit. But Auguste Kroll didn't let that stop her ; she encashed the fire insurance sum and, on 24 February 1852, the theatre already re-opened in a completely new building. About a year later, Auguste married her « Kapellmeister » , the Hungarian violinist, conductor and businessman Jakob Engel. They successfully expanded the « Kroll » Opera Pool and brought many new Comic Operas to the stage, but also enacted lengthy music-dramas by Richard Wagner. But the couple could not prevent the business from closing its doors on 1 April 1855. Despite all efforts, the earnings were far beneath the costs of operation.

One of the creditors, the entrepreneur Heinrich Bergmann, took-over the insolvent operation and brought in such luminaries as Jacques Offenbach for one of his 1st guest appearances in Berlin. In 1862 however, Kroll was again forced into auction, which enabled Jakob Engel to buy it back. Although the company was still weighed down by debt, Engel was beaming with optimism, and attempted to bring the Berliners back into his establishment in droves with a diverse program - albeit only with moderate success. The situation worsened in 1869, when the implementation of economic freedom in Prussia led to a boom of newly established amusement parks all over Berlin.

Engel's attempts to sell failed because of the Prussian tax authority and the heavy mortgage that weighed down the business. In addition, the former parade ground had been refurbished and named « Königsplatz » (King's Square) , by 18 December 1864, the gardens were redone, and later plans were made for a series of monuments to honour the Prussian victories from 1864-1871. After the Franco-Prussian War, the Victory Column was solemnly unveiled in the middle of the square on 2 September 1873 while, at the same time, a long discussion took place at the German « Reichstag » Diet about whether to tear down the « Kroll Établissement » and build a new parliamentary building in its place. Only in 1876, did these proposals, which were so detrimental to any future investments, get tossed-out, so that Jakob Engel was able to proceed with the modernization and improvement of his establishment. In 1885 (the 1st time in Berlin) , the old gas lighting was, therefore, replaced by the Edison system of electric lighting. 2 years later, Engel was also able to secure a contract extension for another 40 years, but he ran-out of time to implement his plans. He died unexpectedly from a stroke, on 28 June 1888. His son tried to continue his work, but the lack of interest from the Berlin public for the « Kroll » stage's artistic presentation forced him to sell in 1894.

The State Opera (1895-1931)

Following Germany's defeat in World War I, the Royal Theatre was renamed the Berlin State Opera (« Staatsoper Berlin ») , sometimes known as « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » . In 1927, the Prussian State Ministry of Culture founded a

new branch of the « Staatsoper » , popularly called the « Kroll Oper » after the name of its theatre. The building was acquired by the Prussian « Königliche Schauspiele » Royal Theatre company and « Kroll's Establishment » was rebuilt as the « Neues Königliches Operntheater » , a 2nd theatre beside the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » . It played new Operas and old in non-traditional manners. Its brilliant existence under director Carl Ebert included the premiere of Kurt Weill and Bertolt Brecht's « Threepenny Opera » .

Works by young composers like Igor Stravinsky and Gustav Mahler were performed here, but also popular concerts given by the Italian tenor, Enrico Caruso, and Operettas like « Die Fledermaus » . As the decent Opera House, « Unter den Linden » did not match with Emperor Wilhelm's attitudes, plans for a new luxuriant Opera Hall at the site of the « Kroll Oper » were developed and demolition had already started in 1914, when the outbreak of World War I halted the construction works.

After the War, the authorities of the Free State of Prussia were unable to finance the reconstruction, which was finally carried-out by the « Volksbühne » theatre company according to the plans of a « Volksoper » (People's Opera) , designed by Oskar Kaufmann. Nevertheless, it appeared that the « Volksbühne » company also had over extended itself and the completion of the refurbishment had to be secured by public funds. On 1 January 1924, the building was re-opened again as the « Oper am Königsplatz » , the 2nd home of the Berlin State Opera, with conductor Erich Kleiber playing Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » . With the square, the house was renamed « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » , in 1926. To Berliners, it remained known as the « Kroll Oper » .

By 1923, Erich Kleiber was general music director at the « Berlin Staatsoper » - a more prestigious post than either those of Bruno Walter (Charlottenberg) and Otto Klemperer (« Kroll ») . There, he gave such important premieres as « Jenůfa » and « Wozzeck » . Kleiber also conducted regularly the Berlin Philharmonic and, as a native Viennese, the Vienna Philharmonic, up until the time of his death in 1956. Here, it could be argued that Erich Kleiber fulfils all rather arbitrary criteria, a conductor who wielded considerable artistic power, not just a jobbing conductor, more completely than say Wilhelm Furtwängler who was not a particularly natural Opera conductor, in the same sense that Kleiber was. One only has to compare Furtwängler's characterful but unrefined heavy conducting in « The Marriage of Figaro » , with Kleiber's wonderfully agile, elegant conducting of the work in his famous Vienna (1954) recording. Kleiber, although not Jewish, left Germany for South and North America, in 1935, in protest at the Nazi regime, only to return to Europe after Adolf Hitler's defeat. Similarly, conductor Fritz Busch regularly conducted the main German Orchestras and was music director for over 10 years at the Dresden Opera (giving important premieres of Operas by Richard Strauß, Ferruccio Busoni, and Paul Hindemith) before also leaving Germany in disgust, at the crude racial violence of the Nazi regime.

By 1925, complaints about the management of the « Berlin Staatsoper Unter den Linden » , its standards and its deficit, amounting now to nearly 3 million Marks, were being made. Leo Kestenberg was brought-in to deal with the financial situation, while Heinz Tietjen, former Intendant in Breslau, was to be brought in as joint Intendant, helping in the management of the 2 Opera Houses that were now the responsibility of the « Staatsoper » , with the recent refurbishing of the « Kroll Oper » . Matters came to a head when the « Deutsches Opernhaus » was declared bankrupt and taken-over by the city authorities, who re-opened it under Tietjens as the « Städtische Oper » , with

Bruno Walter as musical director. The new establishment was a clear rival to the government « Staatsoper », and when Max von Schillings refused to resign, he was dismissed by the « Kulturministerium ». The matter became a « cause célèbre ». Liberal opinion, which had, after all, been behind the dismissal of Max Schillings by the minister Becker, with his ideals of a socially relevant and widely accessible State Opera, now supported the apparent victim, Schillings. The political Right-wing took the opportunity to castigate the Jewish camarilla that had plotted against the Aryan Schillings and, in particular, the un-German socialist Leo Kestenberg. The affair, « der Fall Schillings », was eventually resolved when the dismissal of Schillings was withdrawn, and he was instead allowed to resign. The « Kroll Oper » was established as an independent house, in 1927, under Otto Klemperer.

Standards remained unsatisfactory, particularly at the « Kroll Oper ». On 22 April 1926, an article in the « Berliner Tageblatt », based on an interview with Franz-Ludwig Hörth and, thus, representative of opinion within the State Opera, argued that the « Linden » and « Kroll » theatres could not be run in tandem with a single company. In July, Hörth followed this up with a memorandum in which he gave reasons for the failure of the « Kroll » as a « Filialbetrieb » and urged that it should be established as a separate Opera House with its own musical staff and company. It was on the basis of Hörth's memorandum that the « Kulturministerium » finally determined to establish the « Kroll » as an artistically autonomous Opera House, and Leo Kestenberg was despatched to offer Otto Klemperer the post of director.

Klemperer was spending his summer vacation in Sils Baselgia, in the Engadine, where as usual a number of musicians were on holiday. News of what was afoot must have reached him, for on 21 August wrote to Hans Curjel :

« You know that I am a burnt child and am firmly determined not to concern myself with unlaied eggs. I have been played with all too often for me to give any sign from my side before an official approach is made. You certainly know, better than almost anyone, what I have in mind. Will it be possible to realise it ? Aspettiamo. How justified my reserve has been is also shown by the fact that no affirmative word has reached you from a responsible mouth. If Kestenberg wants to speak to me, he will certainly let me know and I shall be glad to see him. For the rest, just one request : silentium about all rumours. »

The following day, Klemperer left for Italy, planning to return to Wiesbaden, on 31 August. On 28 August, he was joined in Locarno by Leo Kestenberg, who formally offered him the directorship of an independent « Kroll Oper », while they were swimming in the lake.

Otto Klemperer's engagement was made public on 22 September 1926, 6 days after Heinz Tietjen's appointment as Intendant of the « Staatsoper » had been announced. His contract, which was to run for 10 years, specified that he was to be director of the « Kroll », as well as its music director « in vollem Umfang » (in the full meaning of the word), that the Theatre was to be run independently and that he was to be consulted before Heinz Tietjen took artistic decisions relating to it. His salary was to be 55,000 Marks. Klemperer also stipulated that he should give an annual series of concerts with the « Staatskapelle » (as the State Opera Orchestra was called when it emerged from the orchestral pit). At his behest, Ewald Dülberg was put in charge of stage design. Hans Curjel became « Dramaturg ». Klemperer seemed finally to have achieved his ambition : he was to be sole Master in his own House and free to

put his ideas into practice.

The « Kulturministerium » had, however, omitted to secure the consent of 2 parties whose support was essential to the success of the undertaking. In spite of his close connections with the « Volksbühne », Leo Kestenberg seems to have made no attempt to prepare it for Klemperer's appointment, let alone for his policies. In view of its humdrum, cultural tastes that was to prove a serious omission. Even more grave was the failure of the « Kulturministerium » to secure the agreement of the Ministry of Finance to the establishment of an independent « Kroll » on the grounds that it was merely a matter of internal re-organisation.

It was not long before that bird came home to roost. On 29 November, Tietjen and Klemperer met officials to consider, in more detail, the requirements of an independent « Kroll Oper ». When the additional cost was estimated at 878,000 Marks, the representative of the Ministry of Finance bluntly declared that he could not sanction expenditure on such a scale. Tietjen adroitly averted a head-on collision. But for a while, the entire project was in such peril that, before Klemperer left for New York, a month later, it was agreed that Leo Kestenberg would telegraph if the difficulties had not been overcome. Kestenberg later told Klemperer the situation had grown so threatening that, at one point, the telegram had lain on his desk, ready for despatch. Disaster was eventually averted. But, henceforth, the Ministry of Finance, resentful at the « Kulturministerium »'s failure to consult it, was to be counted among the most formidable of the « Kroll »'s enemies. On July 1927, Klemperer wrote to his wife from Berlin :

« There have been some hot days here (in both meanings of the word) . In spite of all my efforts, the ceiling will not be altered. Fire regulations don't allow it to be covered with material and it can't be painted within 6 weeks. I don't believe it but have no means of enforcing my will. In the process, there was a really very disagreeable discussion with an (all-powerful) “ Ministerialdirektor ” of the Ministry of Finance, who adopted a Prussian tone that I, at least, am not used to. »

Thus, even before an independent « Kroll Oper » had opened his doors, the ineptitude of Becker's ministry had ensured that neither the « Volksbühne » nor the financial authorities felt committed to the project. That was to prove a crucial factor when the « Kroll » came under fire in the « Landtag » for its artistic policies.

Nor did its independence prove to be as unrestricted as had been suggested by the wording of Klemperer's contract. At the meeting in Berlin, on 29 November 1926, the policy was defined as « to establish the “ Kroll Oper ” with its own ensemble on as independent a basis as possible » . The most important limitation was financial. The « Kroll Oper » was to be financed out of the general budget for the State Opera and hence Otto Klemperer's much-prized artistic autonomy was, from the start, circumscribed by the fact that funds were not under his control, but Heinz Tietjen's. The « Kroll » was also obliged to share its Orchestra and chorus with the « Linden » Opera, and this was to prove a potent source of friction during its opening season. Nonetheless, Tietjen was committed to its artistic independence and Klemperer was left full freedom to build his own ensemble. Among his most crucial appointments were those of Alexander von Zemlinsky and Fritz Zweig, as conductors.

Hans Curjel considered Zemlinsky « not quite in the 1st class » as a conductor, but among his admirers were Igor

Stravinsky, who later described a « Nozze di Figaro » he had heard under him in Prague, in the 1920's, as « one of the most satisfying experiences of my life » , and Richard Strauß, who was enchanted by a performance of « Salome » that he subsequently heard him conduct at the « Kroll Oper » . That Zemlinsky, who was music director at the German Theatre, in Prague, was prepared to accept a subordinate position reflects his admiration for Otto Klemperer. Conductor Fritz Sweig was to specialise in the lighter works (but, later, he conducted the entire repertory) , to which he brought a deft hand. This well-balanced and harmonious team of conductors remained unchanged throughout the 4 years during which Klemperer remained at the helm of the « Kroll Oper » .

...

In 1914, during World War I, artist Ernst Ludwig Kirchner was a volunteer in the army, but he could not stand the discipline and constant subordination of military training. He suffered a nervous breakdown. Released from service, he was moved to Doctor Oskar Kohnstamm's sanatorium, in Königstein am Taunus, where he became dependent on Veronal (sleeping pills) , morphine and alcohol. The addictions did not hinder him from creating. He slowly recovered and portrait gained in importance. He worked on a series of woodcuts. He had the chance to meet the famous pianist, conductor and composer Otto Klemperer and produced a wood carving of him, in 1916 : « Otto Klemperer at the piano » , « Kirchner Museum » (Davos) . Catalogue Number : 34. Kirchner also created a series of murals in the sanatorium which are destroyed. The Germans banned his work, and Kirchner became increasingly depressed. On June 15, 1938, he took his own life.

The German neurologist and psychiatrist Doctor Oskar Felix Kohnstamm was born on 13 April 1871 in Pfungstadt and died on 6 November 1917 in Frankfurt am Main. Initially trained in internal medicine, in Giessen and Strassbourg, he received his doctors degree in Berlin, in 1894. Kohnstamm then began as a general practitioner in Königstein im Taunus, a small-town in Heße. There, he became more and more interested in neurology and psychiatry. His wife, Eva, daughter of Johannes Gad - one of Kohnstamm's Berlin professors, agreed to have occasionally depressive patients as guests in the house, who then got chores assigned in house-keeping, gardening or minding the children. Gradually, the idea ripened to build a small sanatorium for treating clinical depressions. The house, build in « Jugendstil » style, opened in 1905 and was expanded in 1912. Kohnstamm was no follower of Sigmund Freud but worked often with hypnosis.

Among his patients were 3 young men who would become world-famous : the painter Ernst Ludwig Kirchner (1880-1938) , the actor Alexander Moissi (1879-1935) and the conductor Otto Klemperer (1885-1973) . Even the playwright Carl Sternheim (1878-1942) has been in medical treatment in Kohnstamm's sanatorium, during the 1st World War. The poets Stefan George, Karl Wolfskehl, the archaeologist Botho Graef and the architect Henry van de Velde have been friends of his.

...

After 1918, Otto Klemperer rapidly emerged as one of the leading German conductors of his generation. In 1923, he declined an appointment as musical director of the « Berlin Staatsoper » , where he felt he would have had

insufficient artistic independence. His sympathy for and authoritative performances of an unusually wide-range of contemporary music, as well as a less overtly emotional interpretation of the Classics than had been common among older conductors, made him appear an expression of the New age. He was, therefore, a natural choice as director when, in 1927, the Prussian Ministry of Culture set-up a branch of the « Berlin Staatsoper », whose special task was to perform new and recent works and repertory works in a non-traditional manner. This, the « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik », played in the « Kroll » Theatre, from which it drew the name by which it is usually known.

Klemperer's period there was of crucial significance in his career and the development of Opera in the 1st half of the 20th century. « Œdipus Rex » and « Mavra » (both produced by Klemperer) ; Schönberg's « Erwartung » and « Die glückliche Hand » ; Hindemith's « Cardillac » and « Neues vom Tage » ; Janáček's « The House of the Dead » and, Weill's « Der Jasager », as well as the impressive list of new and recent orchestral works given at the « Kroll » concerts, is evidence of both bold experiment and lasting musical values. Although the vocal standards of the « Kroll Oper » were inevitably more modest than those of its parent house on the « Unter den Linden Opernhaus », the presence of conductors such as Klemperer (who also produced « Fidelio » and « Don Giovanni »), Alexander von Zemlinsky and Fritz Zweig ensured high musical standards ; and designers such as Ewald Dülberg, Oskar Schlemmer and László Moholy-Nagy had a lasting influence on the development of Operatic production after 1945. In particular, the « Kroll Oper »'s drastically stylized production of « Der fliegende Holländer » (1929) was a decisive forerunner of Wieland Wagner's innovations at Bayreuth, after it re-opened in 1951.

After the closure of the « Kroll Oper », Klemperer remained with the « Staatsoper » where, on 13 February 1933, he conducted « Tannhäuser » on the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death. In April 1933, he emigrated, eventually going to the United States where he had made his début, in 1927.

...

In 1927, the « Kroll Oper » was again detached from the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » as a separate Opera company with German-Jewish Otto Klemperer as its resident conductor, re-opened on 19 November with Beethoven's Opera, « Fidelio ». During Klemperer's term, the House saw world premieres as Paul Hindemith's « Neues vom Tage », in 1929, and Arnold Schönberg's « Begleitmusik zu einer Lichtspielszene », in 1930. He worked with renowned conductors like Alexander von Zemlinsky and directors like Gustaf Gründgens, as well as Caspar Neher, László Moholy-Nagy, Teo Otto, Oskar Schlemmer and Giorgio de Chirico as stage designers. The entire singing cast was placed in the hands of the singing pedagogue, professor Frederick Husler.

There was a great deal of experimenting in Berlin. There were oddities, and occasionally even absurdities, but the common denominator, the characteristic sign of those days, was an unparalleled mental alertness. And the alertness of the giving corresponded to the alertness of the receiving. A passionate general concentration upon cultural life prevailed, eloquently expressed by the large space devoted to art by the daily newspapers, in spite of the political excitement of the times. Musical events naturally aroused public interest to no less an extent. The Philharmonic Concerts led by Wilhelm Furtwängler ; the Bruno Walter Concerts with the Philharmonic Orchestra ; a wealth of choral concerts, chamber-music recitals, and concerts by soloists ; the State Opera, deserving of high-praise because of

premieres such as that of Alban Berg's « Wozzeck » and Leoš Janáček's « Jenůfa » under Erich Kleiber's baton ; the « Kroll Oper » under Otto Klemperer ; and a number of other institutes matched the achievements of the dramatic stage.

During the period of the Weimar Republic, Opera had served as a forum for extraordinary æsthetic and theatrical innovation. Much of the most adventurous work by many of Germany's most innovative directors, artists, and choreographers was to be viewed on the Opera stage. For example, between 1927 and 1931, at one of the most visible centers of Operatic experimentation, Berlin's « Kroll Oper » :

« Stage directors without pre-conceptions were brought in from spoken theatre, and artists like Ewald Dülberg, Oskar Kokoschka, Giorgio de Chirico, Oskar Schlemmer, and László Moholy-Nagy were given shows to design. »

As Ernst Bloch put it, at the « Kroll Oper » :

« Old works were presented as if they were new, and new works were presented as if in recognition that their contemporaneity was not of the sheep and easy sort. »

With the advent of National-Socialism, many of these innovators fled or were arrested. During the course of the Nazi regime, and for years after its demise, a great deal of German Opera production was re-tooled and re-dedicated to serve the national cause.

Otto Klemperer and Ewald Dülberg had planned a production of Mozart's « Die Zauberflöte » , as early as 1924, and the project was revived, 3 years later, when Klemperer had intended to include the Opera in his opening season at the « Kroll Oper » . By 1929, however, when he again returned to the idea, relations with Dülberg had deteriorated badly. Angered by what he considered to be Jürgen Fehling's ineffectiveness as a producer of Wagner's « Der fliegende Holländer » and further annoyed by Hans Curjel's choice of Moholy-Nagy as designer of « The Tales of Hoffmann » , Dülberg had brusquely informed Klemperer that he would, in future, only provide sets if he were also responsible for the production. Klemperer would hardly have accepted such a condition from any other man. But Dülberg was one of his very few close friends, as well as a touchstone in all matters relating to the stage, and the entire staging of « Die Zauberflöte » was accordingly placed in his hands.

Although Otto Klemperer subsequently rated the production as one of Dülberg's most successful achievements, that was not the view of the Berlin critics, several of whom after the premiere, on 10 November, compared his stylised assembly of arches, pillars and steps to a cinema organ. As in his « Don Giovanni » , curtains were again used to ensure rapid changes of scene. But on this occasion, Dülberg's attempt to enliven the stage with brilliantly coloured and elaborate costumes did not find favour, and critics as open-minded as « Bie » condemned his approach as over-theoretical. To an increasing extent, he was seen as falling between 2 stools : his stiff, semi-abstract style offended conservative eyes without convincing those attuned to the advanced art of the period.

« To nail those silly blocks together, to stick romanesque arches on top of them and then to paint the whole thing

like a gigantic bonbon - if " Herr " Dülberg wants to sell us that as modern decor, then, one also must say that - like his " Don Giovanni " - it reveals a timeless lack of talent. But our great Otto Klemperer seemingly cannot have enough of it. » (Hans von Wedderkop in the intellectual monthly, « Der Querschnitt » of December 1929.)

Leichtentritt, among others, praised the clarity, detail and sense of proportion that distinguished Klemperer's account of the score. Friedrich Schorr, who had been seconded from the « Linden » Opera, was an impressive Speaker and the cast, which included singers of the calibre of Jarmila Novotná, Käthe Heidersbach, Hans Fidesser and Fritz Krenn, was on a higher-level than the « Kroll » had fielded in earlier productions. Yet, the evening as a whole evoked little enthusiasm.

It is, however, not certain that Dülberg completed his production. He was taken ill during rehearsals and, on his return, discovered that many alterations had been made during his absence. « Shaking with rage », he told his son to return his production book to Ernst Legal. « That was the end. » Yet, to judge from the warm letter that Otto Klemperer wrote to his friend in Arosa, on 15 December, more than a month after the premiere, their personal relations were good enough for Klemperer to raise the question of a further collaboration. That never came to pass, although later in the season, Ewald Dülberg did produce and design a « Rigoletto » 1st performed on 17 May 1930.

...

Inspired in part by Arnold Schönberg's « Pierrot Lunaire » and his observations and experiences during the 1st World War, Oskar Schlemmer began to conceive of the human body as a new artistic medium. He saw ballet and pantomime as free from the historical baggage of theatre and Opera and, thus, able to present his ideas of choreographed geometry, man as dancer, transformed by costume, moving in space.

Anyone familiar with Otto Klemperer's career, or Peter Heyworth's version of it in his 2 Volume biography, will know that, in Berlin in the 1920's, Klemperer was one of the pioneers of the « Neue Sachlichkeit » (the New Objectivity) , in the performance of the Masterworks of the Baroque and Classical periods. Indeed, Johann Sebastian Bach's Suite No. 3 in D was the work with which he chose to open a pioneering series of subscription concerts at Berlin's « Kroll » Opera, in September 1927. By the end of a texturally severe, yet fervent, account of the Overture, it was clear to those present that a revolution was afoot. The distinguished musicologist, Alfred Einstein, was one of the 1st to declare Klemperer's Bach « un-academic but right » : the fugato firmly propelled, the gavotte fiery, the « bourrées » properly burlesque, the famous Air unemphatic to the point of unemphatic to the point of coolness.

Otto Klemperer's « Kroll Oper » Opens

Early in the morning of 1 September 1927, Hans Curjel, Dramaturg of the re-constituted « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik », burst into Heinz Tietjen's office in the « Oberwallstraße » and shouted excitedly : « Der Betrieb läuft. » (The show's on the road.) The claim was premature. Since May 1926, the « Kroll Oper » had been occupied by the « Linden » Opera, whose theatre had been shut for a reconstruction that was proving far more protracted than had been envisaged. It had originally been intended that it would have returned to its own quarters, by the spring of

1927. Owing to a series of accidents and delays, it was not to do so until April 1928. Thus, Otto Klemperer faced the dual task of forming newly engaged artists into an ensemble and of mounting a series of entirely new productions while sharing his theatre with another full-scale and long established company. As Hans Curjel later recalled, the joint rehearsal schedule was a minefield. Rehearsals, at 1st, took place in an ill-suited administrative building behind « Unter den Linden ». It was not until 10 October that an improvised stage became available in a disused exhibition shed in the grounds of « Schloß Bellevue », some 2 miles to the West. Even the « Kroll » 's small administrative offices were for a while housed in the « Generalintendanz » .

At half past 10, the assembled company was greeted by Otto Klemperer, who then launched into the preparations for Igor Stravinsky's Opera « Œdipus Rex » . At midday, 4 of the 5 men who were to run the « Kroll Oper » , during the 4 years of its existence, as an artistically independent Opera House assembled for lunch at Habel's wine restaurant on « Unter den Linden » . The only abstentee was Alexander von Zemlinsky. Already in his late- 50's, he was, by far, the most seasoned member of the « Kroll Oper » 's leadership. After 16 successful years as musical director of the German Theatre, in Prague, he had practical knowledge unrivaled by that of his colleagues, including Klemperer. Age and experience gave him special authority and made him the musical conscience of the « Kroll » . Otto Klemperer never failed to show him respect, frequently consulted him when problems arose, and later paid tribute to an extraordinarily sympathetic and considerate colleague.

Alexander von Zemlinsky undoubtedly reciprocated these feelings in full measure. Nonetheless, he may have come to feel himself overshadowed as a conductor by the huge stature of Otto Klemperer and grieved at his failure to cut more ice in Berlin.

However baffling his character, Otto Klemperer radiated an effortless sense of authority that commanded the loyalties of his collaborators. As Hans Curjel later put it :

« Otto Klemperer was revered by us all, although there was no kow-towing. His severe and unaffected (« unverwaschenes ») music-making, his freedom from any sort of « self-agrandissement » or other vanity, his eschewal of musical and personal gush were greatly esteemed. The authenticity of his music-making, the self-control with which he conducted, instead of, like others, behaving as though he were officiating at High-Mass, were a great example for us. »

31 October 1928 : The « Kroll Oper » (headed by Otto Klemperer) stages Georges Bizet's « Carmen » , directed by Ernst Legal and designed by Caspar Neher.

1929 : The Berlin Festival's programming : Arturo Toscanini conducts 6 productions with his « La Scala » company. Richard Strauß conducts 6 of his own Operas. Wilhelm Furtwängler conducts « Tristan » and « Figaro » . Leo Blech conducts the « Ring » and Ferruccio Busoni's « Doktor Faust » . Georg Szell conducts Andrea Chénier. Erich Kleiber conducts « La Clemenza di Tito » and « Don Pasquale » . At the « Kroll Oper » , Otto Klemperer presents Paul Hindemith's « Neues vom Tage » , « Don Giovanni » , the legendary Ewald Dülberg production of « The Flying Dutchman » , 3 Ernst Křenek I Acters, and an Igor Stravinsky concert with the composer at the piano. The Diaghilev ballet presents other Stravinsky scores. Bruno Walter conducts « Das Lied von der Erde » . Then, off to Baden-Baden

for the premiere of Bertolt Brecht and Paul Hindemith's « Baden-Baden Learning Play about Acquiescence » , in which a clown is dismembered limb by limb.

7 February 1929 : « Kleine Dreigroschenmusik für Blasorchester » (December 1928 - January 1929) . « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » (« Kroll Oper ») , « Berlin Preußische Staatskapelle » ; Otto Klemperer, conductor.

June 1929 : Paul Hindemith's « Neues vom Tage » is played at the « Kroll Oper » . Throughout the summer and fall, Kurt Weill and Universal-Edition attempt to convince Otto Klemperer and the « Kroll » to produce « Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny » .

Otto Klemperer was to be one of Paul Hindemith's most powerful champions. He also came to like him as a man, even if the relationship never progressed beyond cordiality. It was agreed that Hindemith would himself be the soloist in the 1st performance of a new Viola Concerto during the coming season at the « Kroll Oper » . Thereafter, no living composer figured more prominently in its programmes or came to be regarded as more representative of its spirit. Hindemith was not the only young German composer whom Klemperer looked for new works to be performed at the « Kroll Oper » . As 3 years earlier, when it had seemed as though he was to become director of the « Große Volksoper » , he again turned 1st to the brilliant, versatile figure of Ernst Křenek. As early as September 1926, he expressed interest in 3 1 Act Operas that were still incomplete ; at about the same time, he even seems to have offered him a job at the « Kroll » , which he turned down because it was poorly paid.

September 1929 : Caspar Neher begins a contract with « Volksbühne » . He also designs a triple bill of Operas by Maurice Ravel, Darius Milhaud, and Jacques Ibert for the « Kroll Oper » . Alexander Zemlinsky conducts and Gustav Gründgens directs.

5 December 1929 : « Der Lindberghflug » (September - November 1929, 2nd version with music entirely by Kurt Weill) . « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » (« Kroll Oper ») ; Otto Klemperer, conductor.

24 June 1930 : « Der Jasager » (January - May 1930, Bertolt Brecht) . « Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht, Berlin » ; Kurt Drabek, conductor, with singers taken from the « Staats-Akademie für Kirchen und Schulmusik » and other Berlin schools. After the Festival for New Music rejects Brecht and Eisler's « Die Massnahme » , Weill withdraws « Der Jasager » in protest. It is premiered independently of the Festival as a counter-event. The work is immensely successful and is subsequently performed in schools all over Germany. In November, Kurt Weill discourages a performance at the « Kroll Oper » with Klemperer, at least until the work is firmly established in the school setting.

1930 : The Austrian composer and director Arnold Schönberg invited Oskar Schlemmer to create the set for the play « Die glückliche Hand » . In addition to an almost black stage, Schönberg wished to express through this stage play the ultimate futility of life, and how man is doomed to repeat the same errors over and over again.

(Image) Scenery Project for the opera « Die glückliche Hand » (The Fortunate Hand) of Arnold Schönberg. Chalk on black paper (1930) .

29 May 1931 : Leoš Janáček's Opera « From the House of the Dead » opens at the « Kroll Oper » .

1931 : After the « Kroll Oper » is shut down, Otto Klemperer (1885-1873) , Alexander von Zemlinsky (1871-1942) and Fritz Zweig (1893-1984) conduct at the « Linden Oper » .

An important stimulant to modern Opera was the conductor Otto Klemperer, appointed in 1927 by Leo Kestenberg to lead the « Kroll Oper » , which was conceived to serve a middle-class audience in Berlin and to encourage new forms of artistic expression fostered by the Weimar Republic. Over the 4 year span of Klemperer's reign at the « Kroll » (1927-1931) , these 2 concepts came into profound contradiction « Kroll » 's middle-class audience was ripe to embrace Nazi ideology and to reject all forms of modernism. Nevertheless, Klemperer brought new Operas to the « Kroll » and modernized the staging of established repertoire.

He had been propelled in his meteoric early career by Gustav Mahler's recommendations and, like Mahler, had converted from Judaism to Catholicism. Called by a leading music-critic « perhaps, the best theatre conductor in Germany » , Klemperer took as his model Mahler's practice of involving himself, in all aspects of Operatic production. Klemperer's experiments at the « Kroll » inspired Opera Houses in Dresden, Leipzig, and Frankfurt to adopt modernism.

Opera became an open concept embracing musical theatre. Igor Stravinsky, Paul Hindemith, Leoš Janáček, Arnold Schönberg, Ernst Křenek, Kurt Weill, and Ernst Toch were encouraged by performance opportunities to compose new works for the stage. Stimulated by the new dramatic possibilities in Opera, the Berlin-born actor and stage director Carl Ebert, trained by the renowned Austrian theatre director Max Reinhardt, decided to turn his talents to Opera and musical theatre when he accepted a post as general director of the Darmstadt State Theatre, in 1927. That year, when Klemperer took-over at the « Kroll » and Ebert at Darmstadt, 43 new Operas were premiered in Germany ; 1 year later, there were 60 premieres.

This time in his career, Klemperer rejected expressionist attitudes and adopted the New Objectivity. In 1928, Schönberg commented in his diary on Klemperer's new approach :

« He makes music in a way that is less laden with feeling than is usual here. We are indeed living in an anti-Romantic period. »

Stravinsky's jazz-influenced « Histoire du soldat » exemplified the new attitude. Klemperer's 1928 performance of this work at the « Kroll » , with Ebert cast as the Narrator, met with vehement whistling, hissing, and shouting from the audience which, by this time, was dominated by Nazi rowdies (Josef Gœbbels's street fighters, primed for battles and brawls) who objected to Klemperer's Jewish origin, were hostile to the ideals of the Weimar Republic, and resisted new works.

Yet, Klemperer regularly gave the 1st Berlin performance of each new work composed by Stravinsky, 3 times with the

composer himself as soloist. In his dominant position at the « Kroll » , Klemperer was a powerful advocate for the Weimar theory that art and society were now sweeping to a new synthesis ; art would follow life, as well as inevitable social and economic change. The Austrian Jewish writer Stefan Zweig described this period, when :

« All values were changed, and not only material ones ; the laws of the State were flouted, no tradition, no moral code was respected, Berlin was transformed into the Babylon of the world. In the collapse of all values, a kind of madness gained hold particularly in the bourgeois circles which, until then, had been unshakable in their probity. »

The expression of wide-spread cynicism and licentiousness that characterized Berlin life, in the 1920's, allowed popular and Classical music to be mixed with new ease and energy. The younger generation of composers took-up these ideas ; in the hectic musical ferment of Berlin, they learned to become quick-change artists, readily adapting to new fashions in the arts.

The « Kroll Oper » : A compromised Triumph

By the mid-1920's, after the removal of the obstructionist Schillings, the time seemed right for the realization of Opera reform in its larger political and economic dimensions. Leo Kestenberg's dream of an independent « Kroll Oper » led by conductor Otto Klemperer and pledged to the perhaps irreconcilable goals of artistic innovation and Opera for the masses came into being in 1927 and lasted until 1931. Regardless of the « Kroll Oper » 's achievements, which are debated to this day, its demise remains a powerful symbol of what went wrong in the late- Weimar Republic.

Outside the drama surrounding the « Kroll » , Operatic life in Berlin stayed placidly on course. The period from 1925 to 1929 represented an island of stability in the turbulent waters of Weimar. Although many feared (or hoped) that Hindenburg's election would lead to an immediate resurgence of the Right, the new « Reichpräsident » seemed content to be a figure-head and let the « Reichstag » (German parliament) do its job. This was the golden moment for Opera reform, especially in relatively stable Prussia. The new « Städtische Oper » in Berlin lay outside the control of the Ministry of culture, although Leo Kestenberg had an advisory role. Launched in 1925, in a west Berlin theatre formerly occupied by a private company, it had Bruno Walter as music director and a fine ensemble of singers and conductors. It made no effort to break new ground in its manner of organization, as the « Kroll Oper » would. Nonetheless, it, along with Erich Kleibers's « Staatsoper » , offered Berliners more glamour, as well as traditional musical values and mainstream repertory, than the « Kroll Oper » would ever muster.

At the « Staatsoper » , the firing of Schilling's in 1925 did not have much impact on its programming or the quality of performances. Leo Kestenberg eventually chose the conductor, stage director, and career administrator Heinz Tietjen, whom he had already recommended to run the « Städtische Oper » , to oversee the « Staatsoper » as well. Tietjen would survive key posts in Bayreuth and Berlin through the Nazi era and in Hamburg after the War. Considered calculating but unquestionably intelligent (Leo Kestenberg remembered him warmly in his memoirs) Tietjen was not the man to lead an idealistic reform. Although he assumed his post at the « Staatsoper » , in 1928, he did not give-up the « Städtische Oper » until 1930 and, in 1933, he began conducting at the Bayreuth Festival (under Winifred Wagner's overall direction) . In addition, in 1928, he became an official co-Referent for theatre and Opera within the

ministry.

Then, as now, there were controversies about the viability of having 3 independent Opera Houses in Berlin. Heinz Tietjen tried to coordinate the 3, juggling repertory and sharing facilities. He succeeded only during the 3rd « Reich » , when consent from the affected companies was no longer required. Between 1928 and 1933, there was an occasional important 1st night at the « Staatsoper » , most notably the world-premiere of Darius Milhaud's Opera « Christophe Colomb » , in 1930. Basically, however, it was business as usual on « Unter den Linden » . It was a good business, modestly progressive and well-run, but it was still a business. Success was evaluated in terms of ticket sales, not innovation or « soziale Kunstpflege » . The « Kroll Oper » , by contrast, became the symbol, for both the Left and the Right, of everything entailed in the idea of « Republican Opera » . Leo Kestenberg had contemplated a separate « Kroll » company, since 1924, and he had considered conductors Bruno Walter and Otto Klemperer to run it. Eventually, he recommended Walter, who was less of a firebrand than Klemperer, for the « Städtische Oper » . Otto Klemperer had won a reputation as a conductor with an interest in progressive repertory and a conducting style attuned to modernism ; his blunt directness was considered the aural equivalent of the « Neue Sachlichkeit » (New Objectivity) , a tag-line for Weimar's cool, clean-lined, high-modernist art. Klemperer was the dominant figure at the new « Kroll Oper » ; the rest of the small staff revolved around him. 6 feet 4 inches tall, with a high, reedy voice and wild mood swings of the manic-depressive, he inspired both fanatic loyalty and hostility.

Leo Kestenberg remained a presence at the « Kroll Oper » , at least at 1st ; Heinz Tietjen controlled the purse strings. The company budget was only half that of the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » , and Tietjen denied the use of the « Staatsoper » 's more famous stars. He also had the power to disallow the « Kroll » production of bread-and-butter Operas, reserved for the other 2 Theatres. Nonetheless, it was still Klemperer's company.

The 1st production of the independent « Kroll Oper » , on 19 November 1927, was a core German Masterpiece, Ludwig van Beethoven's « Fidelio » (1805) . The production, which featured a geometric stage design by resident designer Ewald Dülberg, was conducted and directed by Otto Klemperer. Reaction was sharply divided. Even some critics who had previously admired Klemperer found the conception and conducting tight and tyrannical, leaving little room for the collaborative synergy that ideally contributes to an Operatic performance. Reaction to « Kroll Oper » productions was usually divided along political lines, but musically and dramaturgically the company was often slighted even by admirers - particularly, in comparison with the riches evident elsewhere in Berlin under conductors Bruno Walter and Erich Kleiber.

In his published conversations with the music journalist Peter Heyworth and, in Heyworth's subsequent biography, Klemperer downplayed his innovations in repertory and production styles and stressed instead his devotion to sustaining day-to-day quality and doing simple « good theatre » . Even with his occasional forays into stage direction, Klemperer remained primarily a musician (as did Leo Kestenberg) . He seemed to have little sympathy for the « Kroll Oper » 's innovative stage directors, who included Ernst Legal, Jürgen Fehling, and Gustav Gründgens, or his set designers, who besides Ewald Dülberg included Giorgio de Chirico, Caspar Neher, Oskar Schlemmer, Walter Gropius, and, above all, László Moholy-Nagy. They were primarily the passion of the company's resident æsthetic radical, artistic director Hans Curjel.

Otto Klemperer's taste in repertory at the « Kroll Oper » was almost conservative, despite the hysterical attacks from the Right. He perversely rejected works that would surely have enhanced the company's impact on contemporary Opera and its historical lustre - including the world-premieres of Kurt Weill's « Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny » (Rise and Fall of the city of Mahagonny) , in 1927, and Arnold Schœnberg's « Von heute auf Morgen » (From today to tomorrow) , in 1930. Otto Klemperer programmed Igor Stravinsky repeatedly on the « Kroll » stage and on his « Kroll » concerts.

The Russian conductor Serge Koussevitsky bought the world-premiere of the « Symphonies d'instruments à vent » (Symphonies for wind instruments) of Igor Stravinsky, as part of the commission. But a delay of a few days to the Boston performance meant that the actual premiere took place in Brussels, on 13 December, under the baton of Ernest Ansermet. The Boston concert was finally performed on the 19th. Meanwhile, Otto Klemperer who had been keenly bidding for the European premiere, may have lost it in the end because of political difficulties which led, in early November 1930, to the announcement of the closure of the « Kroll Oper » . Igor Stravinsky, who was in Berlin at the time, heard Klemperer's world-premiere of Arnold Schœnberg « Begleitungsmusik » (6 November) . Then, a few days later, ostentatiously attended Klemperer's rendition of « L'Histoire du soldat » and took a bow with him amid tumultuous applause. He told Berlin reporters that he was astonished at the « Kroll » 's closure. He told « Tempo » , on 12 November :

« In no other city have I, and my works, met with such interest and understanding as in Berlin and, for that, I have above all thank Otto Klemperer and the “ Kroll ” Opera. »

But the only entirely new Opera presented at the « Kroll » , throughout Otto Klemperer's 4 year history, was Paul Hindemith's 1 Act « Neues vom Tage » (News of the day) , in 1929. As Klemperer pointed-out during the « Landtag » hearings that closed-out the « Kroll Oper » 's existence, contemporary Operas occupied an only modest number of evenings when compared to the seasons overall. Still, a company that, in 4 short years, offered works by Igor Stravinsky, Arnold Schœnberg, Paul Hindemith, Kurt Weill, Ernst Křenek and Leoš Janáček, plus a Maurice Ravel - Darius Milhaud - Jacques Ibert triple bill, was not resting lazily on tradition.

Naturally, productions of standard-repertory German Operas as the « Kroll Oper » (largely denied the theatre by Heinz Tietjen) aroused the greatest scrutiny from the Right. The flash point was a new production of Richard Wagner's « Der fliegende Holländer » (The Flying Dutchman) , on 15 January 1929. On the positive side, the stripped-down staging, with the characters dressed like timeless working-class seamen, and the score, which was presented in Wagner's original version (unlike the later revision, it does not emphasize redemptive catharsis) , seemed to scrub Wagner clean of accrued mannerisms. Ernst Bloch credited it with « coolness, clarity, freshness, and the salvation of Wagner by means of that freshness » . But the production enraged the Right so much that, as late as 1938, when the Nazis presented an exhibition of « degenerate » music, in Düsseldorf, this premiere was adduced as a low-point of Weimar decadence. « With this production, the undermining of German art under State auspices has reached its climax ! » wrote « Der Tag » . « Throw the vermin out ! » Still, despite the Right's antagonism, the « Kroll Oper » became a positive symbol for the intellectual and artistic elite, and their loyalty grew as the clock began ticking down.

...

A fresh new and creative approach drew in many who had lost interest in Opera, or who were antagonistic to everything it had come to stand for - its moribund theatrical and its comfortable public. The « Kroll Oper » 's supporters included composers like Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler, Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith, Darius Milhaud, Sergueï Prokofiev and Roger Sessions ; actors, dramatists, theatre directors and critics like Paul Wegener, Bertolt Brecht, Erwin Piscator and Alfred Kerr ; literati like Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch and Thomas Mann ; scientists like Albert Einstein ; and many leading politicians and prelates. In the words of composer and critics Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, who was engaged to report on the « Kroll Oper » for the New York journal « Modern Music » :

« People applauded wildly, or protested with whistling and shouting, but no one was silent. Everyone was caught-up. »

And this totally modern European theatre was impregnated with the spirit of Berlin, for only thus could such adventures have been possible or imaginable. It was epoch-making. As unforgettable and un-reproachable as the « Bauhaus » School or, to invoke a Berlin comparison, the theatre or Erwin Piscator.

Otto Klemperer's commitment was to vigorous « Werktreue » performances of the Classics which would « zeitgültig » (relevant for the times) , and to the performance of the best modern works. In the « Kroll Oper » 's 1st 12 months, its repertory included Bedřich Smetana's « The Kiss » ; Giuseppe Verdi's « Luisa Miller » ; Mozart's « Don Giovanni » ; Weber's « Der Freischütz » ; Domenico Cimarosa's « Il matrimonio segreto » ; Georges Bizet's « Carmen » ; Igor Stravinsky's « Œdipus Rex » , « Mavra » , « L'Histoire du soldat » and the ballet « Petrushka » ; Giacomo Puccini's « Trittico » ; Paul Hindemith's « Cardillac » ; and Richard Strauß's « Salome » . Such a cross-section of works old and new was unprecedented.

Otto Klemperer shared the conducting with Alexander von Zemlinsky and Fritz Zweig. As Berlin's 3rd Opera House, the « Kroll Oper » could not hope to compete vocally with the « Staatsoper » and the « Städtische Oper » , but it did not lack for good singers and Klemperer was more concerned with intelligence and musicality than with purely vocal attainments. On the production side, those he work with included Jürgen Fehling (from the « Berlin Schauspielhaus ») , Gustaf Gründgens (from Max Reinhardt's « Deutsches Theater ») and Ernst Legal, the unexciting, safe hand to whom Klemperer ceded administrative control, in July 1928. Legal also produced 5 of the 10 new productions in the « Kroll » 's 1928-1929 season.

The intention was that Ewald Dülberg, as head of design, should work on more productions than he did (these were, in addition of Beethoven's « Fidelio » , a Stravinsky triple bill of « Œdipus Rex » , « Mavra » and « Petrushka » , Weber's « Der Freischütz » , Paul Hindemith's « Cardillac » , Richard Wagner's « Der fliegende Holländer » , Mozart's « Die Zauberflöte » and Giuseppe Verdi's « Rigoletto ») , but he was already suffering from the tuberculosis from which he was to die at the age of 45, in 1933. This opened the way for the « Kroll » 's dramaturg, Hans Curjel, to cultivate a far closer association with artists of the avant-garde than either Dülberg or Klemperer himself (always a musician rather than an « Augenmensch » - visual person) would have wished. Much of the post-Dülberg design work

was undertaken by his young « protégé », Teo Otto, who for Ernst Křenek's « Leben des Orest » (1930) worked from sketches by the surrealist painter Giorgio de Chirico. Otto was to become one of the most intellectual scenic artists of the modern German stage. Other designers from the theatre world included Traugott Müller, a close associate of Erwin Piscator, who worked on Igor Stravinsky's « L'Histoire du soldat » and Paul Hindemith's « Neues vom Tage » , Caspar Neher (Georges Bizet's « Carmen » , Maurice Ravel's « L'Heure espagnole » , Leoš Janáček « From the House of the Dead ») , the Viennese architect Oskar Strnad (an Ernst Křenek triple bill) and Rochus Gliese (Heinrich Marschner's « Hans Heiling ») , these last 2 names both well-known in Berlin through their works for Max Reinhardt.

But Hans Curjel looked to the cutting edge of innovation and was particularly keen to involve Oskar Schlemmer and László Moholy-Nagy from the « Bauhaus » School. Schlemmer's designs for Arnold Schönberg's « Die glückliche Hand » were castigated by the composer for their failure to follow his own minutely detailed instructions (a rapprochement was achieved, but this remains a good example of a clash between a composer who knew what he wanted and an interpretative artist who knew better) . Otto Klemperer's own view, which was not wide of the mark, was that Arnold Schönberg had no idea of theatre, really none at all and that it was right not to follow his instructions exactly.

László Moholy-Nagy was responsible for the « Kroll Oper » 's most visually extreme production, Jacques Offenbach's « Les Contes d'Hoffmann » , conducted by Alexander von Zemlinsky. This opened on 12 February 1929, when the public was still reeling from the hurricane of Klemperer's interpretation of Wagner's « Der fliegende Holländer » . It was as though Doctor Spalanzani had invented not only « Olympia » but the entire production. The mechanistic, constructivist-inspired sets made use of powerful light effects and film-inserts, the scenery constantly on the move. Its props included the 1st functional steel furniture to be seen on an Opera stage. Hans Curjel's idea in commissioning Moholy-Nagy was that :

« A dream world would be evoked with modern materials. Machinery and human emotion would interact so as to reflect the ambivalence that gives the Opera its special flavour. »

The production was denounced by the Right-wing press as cultural bolshevism and Jewish depravity. This was precisely the language of the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » (Action Group for German Culture) , which was founded at about this time, in Munich, by Alfred Rosenberg under Nazi auspices : its patrons included Richard Wagner's daughter Eva, wife of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and Siegfried Wagner's wife Winifred.

Towards the beginning of the « Kroll Oper » 's 2nd season, the spectre of Wagner began to loom, not least because Otto Klemperer was looking for a work which would give the house the kind of palpable success that had so far proved elusive. While Klemperer, the ascetic, was resistant to the rich orchestration of Wagner's later works, particularly as it came across in the lush performances conducted by Wilhelm Furtwängler and Bruno Walter, he took-up Richard Strauß's suggestion that he should resurrect the composer's original version of « Der fliegende Holländer » . In the Prussian State Library, Otto Klemperer and Hans Curjel discovered the score used by Richard Wagner himself for his performances at the « Berlin Schauspielhaus » , in 1844, 1 year after the Dresden premiere. The raw vigour of the Opera in which the young composer had found his own unmistakable voice was, for Klemperer, a good way of settling his differences with Wagner. Otto Klemperer, Ewald Dülberg and their chosen producer Jürgen Fehling (working in

Opera for the 1st time) were wholly antipathetic to Bayreuth's reverential embalming and came-up with a very different view of the work.

The « Allgemeine Musikzeitung » review of the Opera :

« The clean-shaven Dutchman seemed like a bolshevist agitator, Senta a fanatical and eccentric communist woman. Erik, with his wild, tufted hair and in woolen sweater, a pimp. »

The political charge in Wagner's œuvre as a whole surfaced powerfully at the « Kroll Oper » , polarizing attitudes between the nationalist reactionaries at one end of the spectrum and communist revolutionaries at the other.

The « Kroll » 's repertory and productions were, as we have seen, not at all to the taste of its « Volsbühne » constituency, which, as Klemperer later said, only wanted « big singers, big arias, big applause and so on » . The « Kroll Oper » excited the Republic's artists and intellectuals while increasingly incurring the wrath of those who saw in it only the betrayal of the highest values of German culture. Leo Kestenberg's great hope that education would close the gap between modernism and the public had, in no way, been fulfilled. The « Kroll Oper » became a stalking-horse for Rightist attacks on the Republic. Klemperer fought hard to save it but became engulfed by the political tide of nationalism, and the theatre was eventually closed down on July 1931. He joined Leo Blech and Erich Kleiber as one of the 3 principal conductors at the « Berlin Staatsoper » where, in 1933, as part of the celebration of the 50th anniversary of Richard Wagner's death, he conducted a « Tannhäuser » in the « Kroll » pure style, directed by Jürgen Fehling and designed by Oskar Strnad. Shortly thereafter, he was compelled to flee Germany, travelling 1st to Switzerland, then to America. As for the « Kroll Oper » , it suffered the ignominy of becoming the home of the « Reichstag » after the fire of 27 February 1933 and was later razed to the ground by the Allies.

Nazi Reichstag Deputies (July 1933 - May 1945)

Adam, Fritz

Allendorf, Wilhelm

Altenburg, Eduard

Altner, Doktor Georg

von Alvensleben, Ludolf

Amann, Max

Arnold, Alfred

von dem Bach [-Zelewski] , Erich Julius Eberhard

Backe, Herbert Ernst

Ballauf, Werner

Bauer, Josef

Beckerle, Adolf Heinz

Behme, Hermann

Behrends, Doktor juris Hermann
Bennecke, Doktor der Philosophie Heinrich
Berger, Gottlob
Berkelmann, Theodor
von Bismarck-Schoenhausen, Gottfried Graf
Blaschke, Professor Ingenieur Johann « Hanns »
Boeckenhauer, Arthur
Boerger, Professor Wilhelm
Bohle, Ernst Wilhelm
Bolek, Andreas
Bormann, Martin
Born, Otto
Boschmann, Friedrich
Bouhler, Doktor Philipp
Bracht, Fritz
Brandner, Willy
Brass, Otto
Breithaupt, Franz
Brockhausen, Ralf
Buch, Walter
Buerckel, Josef

Christandl, Otto
Cristoph, Edmund
Conti, Doktor der Medizin Leonardo

Dahm, Paul
Daluege, Kurt
Damian, Leopold
Dargel, Paul
Darre, Richard Walther
Dauser, Hans
David, Doktor Herbert
Deiningen or Deminger, Johann
Diehm, Christoph
Dietrich, Hans
Dietrich, Joseph « Sepp »
Dietrich, Doktor Otto
Dinkel, Philipp
Dippel, Hans

Doering, Hans
von Dolega-Kozierowski, Heinrich
Donnevert, Doktor medicinae dentalis Richard
Drauz, Richard
Dreher, Wilhelm

von Eberstein, Friedrich Karl Freiherr
Eggeling, Joachim Albrecht Leo
Eicke, Theodor « Papa »
Eigruber, August
Eisenkolb, Hans
von Eltz-Ruebenach, Kuno Freiherr
Engel, Johannes
Engler-Fuesslin, Fritz
Ernst, Alfred
Ernst, Karl

Fiedler, Richard
Fiehler, Karl
von Fink von Finkenstein, Heinrich Georg Graf
Fischboeck, Doktor Hans
Fitzthum, Josef
Forster, Albert
Frank, Karl-Hermann
Frey, Kurt
Freyberg, Doktor Alfred
Friedrichs, Helmuth
Fritsch, Doktor Karl
Frowein, Otto
Fuchs, Doktor Wilhelm

Gerland, Doktor Karl
Giesler, Paul
Globocnik, Diplom-Ingenieur Odilo Lotario « Globus »
Gæbbels, Doktor der Philosophie Joseph Paul
Gotzmann, Doktor Leo
Græntz, Guenther
Graf, Ulrich
Granzow, Walter
Grieser, Arthur Karl

Grimm, Wilhelm
Grøeneveld, Jacques
Grohé, Josef
von Grolman, Wilhelm
Groß, Martin
Gutenberger, Karl

Habbes, Wilhelm
Hagenmayer, Erich
Hager, Heinrich
Hainzl, Sepp
Hallermann, Doktor August
Hanke, Karl
Hauer, Daniel
Hayler, Doktor rerum politicarum Franz
Hayler, Doktor Franz
Hayn, Hans
Heines, Edmund
Heißmeyer, August
Heitmueller, Walther
Helfer, Wilhelm
von Helldorf, Wolf Heinrich Graf
Henlein, Doktor honoris causa Konrad
Hennicke, Paul
Henze, Max
Herwig, Adalbert
Herzog, Otto
von Heydebreck, Hans Peter
Heydrich, Reinhard Tristan Eugen
Hildebrandt, Karl Friedrich « Fritz »
Hildebrandt, Richard
Hilgenfeld, Erich
Himmler, Heinrich
Hinkel, Hans
Hintze, Kurt
Høvel, Walter
Hoffman, Albert
Hofmann, Erich
Hohenzollern, Doktor rerum politicarum August Wilhelm Heinrich Guenther Viktor Prinz von Preussen « Auwi »
Horn, Karl

von Humann-Hainhofen, Rolf

Jænke, Franz-Werner

Jäschke, Otto

von Jagow, Dietrich

Jahn, Wilhelm

Jeckeln, Friedrich

Jordan, Rudolf

Juettner, Max

Jung, Doktor Karl

Jung, Professor Rudolf

Jury, Doktor der Medizin Hugo

Kaltenbrunner, Doktor Ernst

Kammerhofer, Konstantin

von Kanne, Berndt Freiherr

Kasche, Siegfried

Katz, Doktor Adolf

Kaufmann, Karl

Kaul, Kurt

Keppler, Wilhelm

Kuehtz, Hans

von Killinger, Manfred Freiherr

Klagges, Dietrich

Kob, Adolf Koch, Erich

Koch, Hans K.

Koerner, Hellmut

Køerner, Paul

Koppe, Wilhelm

von Kozirowski, Heinrich

von Krauß, Fritz Ritter

Krebs, Hans

Kreißl, Doktor Anton

Krøeger (Kröger) , Doktor Erhard

Krueger, Friedrich-Wilhelm

Kube, Wilhelm

Kutschera, Franz

Lammel, Richard

Lampe, Heinz

Langoth, Franz
Lauterbacher, Hartmann
Lehmann, Otto
Lenk, Georg
Leyser, Ernst Ludwig
Litzmann, Karl Sigmund
Lohse, Hinrich
Lorenz, Max
Lorenz, Werner
Luckner, Willy
Ludwig, Kurt
Luedtke, Kurt
Luetze, Viktor
Luyken, Max Otto

Malzer, Josef
Marrenbach, Otto
Matthiesen, Martin
Maurice, Emil
Mazuw, Emil
Meinberg, Wilhelm
Metzner, Doktor Franz
Meyer, Doktor rerum politicarum Alfred
Meyer, Christof Christian Fritz
von Meyszner, August Edler
Moder, Paul
Moosbauer, Max
Mueller, Erhard
Muendler, Anton
Murr, Wilhelm

Neumann, Doktor Ernst
Nætzelmann, Erwin

Oberhaidacher, Walther
von Obernitz, Hanns Günther
Ohling, Richard
Oldach, Ludwig
Opdenhoff, Christian
Oppermann, Ewald

Ortlepp, Walter
Overhues, Carl

Paschold, Fritz
Peper, Heinrich
Peterseil, Franz
Peuckert, Rudi
Pflaumer, Karl
Pflomm, Karl
Piekarski, Felix
von Podbielski, Viktor
Popp, Emil
Portschy, Doktor Tobias
Pruetzmann, Hans-Adolf
von Pueckler-Burghauß (Pückler-Burghauß) , Carl Graf

Rabe, Paul Arthur
Rainer, Doktor juris Friedrich « Friedl »
Rauter, Hans-Albin
Redieß, Wilhelm
Reinhard, Wilhelm
Reinhardt, Karl
Reinke, Helmut
Reinhaller, Anton
Reischle, Doktor Hermann
von Renteln, Doktor rerum politicarum Theodor Adrian
Reschny, Hermann
Rethel, Lothar
von Ribbontrop, Joachim
Richter, Franz
Roch, Heinz
Rodenbuecher, Alfred
Røhm, Ernst
Ræsener, Erwin
Rosenberg, Alfred
Roth, Albert
Ruberg, Bernhard
Ruckdeschel, Ludwig
Ruehle, Gerd

von Sammern-Frankenegg, Doktor Ferdinand
Sauckel, Ernst Friedrich Christoph « Fritz »
Saupert, Hans
Schaefer, Johannes
Schaller, Richard
Scharizer, Karl
Schaub, Julius
Scheel, Doktor der Medizin Gustav-Adolf
Schepmann or Scheppmann, Wilhelm
Schicketanz, Doktor Rudolf
Schlessmann, Fritz
Schlumprecht, Doktor Karl
Schmauser, Ernst Heinrich
Schmelcher, Willy
Schmelt, Albrecht
Schmidt, Friedrich
Schmitt, Walter
Schmitz, Hermann
Schneider, Hermann
Schneidhuber, August
Schoene, Heinrich
Schrøder, Doktor Walther
Schrøder, Wilhelm
Schubert, Leo
Schuberth, Fritz
Schuhmann, Walter
Schultz, Karl
Schultze, Professor Doktor Walter
Schulz, Robert
Schwarz, Franz Xaver
Seidler, Walther
Selzner, Klaus
von Semmern-Frankenegg, Doktor Ferdinand
Seyß-Inquart, Doktor Arthur
Siekmeier, Heinrich
Simon, Paul
Sommer, Doktor Hans
Spaeing, Heinz
Spickschen, Erich
Sporrenberg, Jakob

Stellrecht, Doktor Helmut
Strang, Heinrich

Thyssen, Doktor Fritz
Tittmann, Fritz
von Tschammer und Osten, Hans

Uebelhoer, Friedrich
Uhle, Ulrich
Uiberreither, Doktor juris Siegfried
von Ulrich, Curt

Vetter, Karl

[von] Wächtler, Doktor Fritz
Wagner, Doktor Richard
Wahl, Karl
zu Waldeck-Pyrmont, Josias Erbprinz
Weber, Christian
Wege, Kurt
Wegener, Paul
Weinreich, Hans
Wendt, Martin
Werner, Wilhelm
Wetter, August Wilhelm
Weiß, Rudolf
Weitzel, Fritz
Wiesner, Rudolf
Willikens, Otto
Winkelkemper, Doktor Toni
Wintersteiger, Anton
Wolff, Karl
Wolff, Ludwig
Wolkersdoerfer, Hans
von Woysch, Udo
Wurzbacher, Philipp
Wysocki, Lucian

Zapf, Hermann
Zech, Karl

Zenner, Carl

...

Nothing Klemperer was subsequently to do in Opera was to generate the artistic and intellectual excitement of what he had achieved at the « Kroll Oper ». It was not so much a question of back-sliding as of retrogressive cultural circumstance and the catastrophic mental and physical health which all but destroyed him in America. While the « Kroll » was in its death throes, he had already pronounced its finest epitaph :

« Whenever this approach to Opera is revived, it will have to start where we have been obliged to leave-off. They may shut our theatre, but the idea underlying it cannot be killed. »

Heinz Tietjen

At age 23, Heinz Tietjen held the position of producer at the Opera House in Trier and was appointed its director, in 1907, holding the dual roles until 1922. Simultaneously, he was the director at Saarbrücken and Breslau (now, Wrocław, Poland) , from 1919 to 1922.

Tietjen was the director of the « Deutsche Oper Berlin » , between 1925 and 1927, then director of the Prussian State Theatre. From 1931 to 1944, he served as artistic director at the Bayreuth « Festspielhaus » for Winifred Wagner with whom he had a romantic liaison.

In 1948, he returned to direct the « Deutsche Oper Berlin » , serving until 1955, when he was appointed manager and artistic director of the new Hamburg State Opera, a job he held until 1959.

Heinz Tietjen died in 1967, in Baden-Baden. Heinz Tietjen was also a Nazi. His family is forbidding access to his archives in Berlin so that his total involvement with Adolf Hitler is kept as much as possible sealed.

Hans Curjel

Initially, the « Kroll Oper » was the 2nd home of the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » while its own house underwent renovation. Under the directorship of Heinz Tietjen, who, as General-Intendant, oversaw all 3 of Berlin's Opera Houses, it was decided that the « Kroll » should have its own company. Leo Kestenberg of the Berlin's Cultural Ministry oversaw the « Kroll's Établissement » and, consistent with the designs for music reform, intended that the new institution should serve Berlin's working-class and act as a home to experimental Operatic productions. Kestenberg selected conductor Otto Klemperer as the « Kroll » 's music director simply on the basis of reputation and ability, not out of a deeper consideration for any modernist leanings he may have had. Klemperer was not a revolutionary, as was, for example, the theatre's dramaturg, Hans Curjel. Rather, his intention was to cultivate « good theatre ; not avant-garde, but good theatre » . As a conductor, who had recently held posts in Wiesbaden and Cologne, Otto Klemperer was known to command respect from those around him, and while he was hardly prepared for the massive amounts of

bureaucracy that lay ahead, his natural sense of authority resulted in great allegiance from his colleagues. In the words of Hans Curjel :

« His severe and unaffected (“ unverwachsenes ”) music making. »

Ewald Felix Dülberg

Ewald Felix Dülberg (actually, Emil Franz Konstantin Dülberg) was born on December 12, 1888, in Schwerin, and died in Berlin, on July 1933. A painter, he was also the lead designer and engraver of the Expressionist movement. Ewald Dülberg studied at the Art Academy of Munich. In 1910, he began to teach. During the years 1919 and 1920, he worked at the Odenwald School in Ober-Hambach. Then, he went at the « Bauhaus » School of Weimar. However, his love for wood carving and engraving already made him famous before the start of the 1st World War. On June 8, 1919, he became a founding member of the Darmstadt « Art Nouveau » (Secession) School and quickly became one of its most prolific artists. There, he became an expert in the fields of drawing, color theory, weaving and theatrical equipment. Among his most famous students, we can name : the designer Teo Otto, the Irish painter Cecil Salkeld, and the painter Arnold Bolde, founder of « La Documenta » . His wife (with whom he had a daughter named Mary Esther, born in 1918) also taught at the Odenwald School and followed her husband at the « Bauhaus » School of Weimar. She created a textile factory and worked on some of Ewald Dülberg's blankets and rugs. After her divorce, in 1921, Edwig will continue to study in Weimar at the weaving work-shop. Ewald Dülberg will be named as set designer director of the Hamburg municipal Theatre where he will meet, for the 1st time, and will become a close friend and collaborator of the young and ambitious German Jewish conductor, Otto Klemperer. His geometric, austere and simplified Opera sets will be influenced by the Cubism movement. He will follow Klemperer when the conductor will be named musical director of the Berlin « Kroll Oper » , in 1927.

(Image) Set project for Act II of Beethoven's « Fidelio » : The castle's esplanade, Berlin « Kroll Oper » , 1927, gouache, Cologne, « Universität zu Köln » , « Theaterwissenschaftliche Sammlung » , inventory number 7439B.

His woodcut « Crucifixion » , dating from 1923, will be shown at the Nazi exhibition of Degenerate Art (« Entartete Kunst ») , exposed with great mockery in the Christian art gallery. Dülberg's teaching career will abruptly end, in 1931, when he will be dismissed from the Prussian civil service. He will die in 1933. This brilliant avant-garde artist will be remembered for his personal ornamental et geometrical style, his cubist abstract period and for his calligraphies. His last woodcuts will be only published as posthumous works.

Of the « Bauhaus » students and teachers who did not emigrate in America, those who are best remembered (like the textile artist Otti Berger, the painter and book binder Friedl Dicker-Brandeis, the weaver Hedwig Dülberg-Arnheim and the metal worker Lotte Mentzel) perished at Auschwitz.

« Nazis passte dieses Gesicht nicht »

« Die Kunst von Ewald Dülberg war für die Nazis “ entartet ”. Rostock zeigt sie und die anderer Künstler als

Meisterwerke der Moderne. » (Thomas Sternberg)

Reutershagen Ein wenig kantig, zusammengesetzt aus geometrischen Mustern und doch gut zu erkennen, entfremdet zwar, aber durch das Stilmittel des hell-dunkel Kontrastes wiederum ganz lebendig. Einer der großen Dirigenten und Komponisten des 20. Jahrhunderts, Otto Klemperer (1885-1973) , blickt gedankenschwer und aus sehr markanten Augen auf den Betrachter des Holzschnittes von Ewald Dülberg. Und genau diese Portraitkunst gefiel den Nazis nicht - sie fanden sie « entartet » .

Diese Form der Holzschnitttechnik ist typisch für die Arbeiten von Ewald Dülberg. Das Porträt von Otto Klemperer gehört zu den mehr als 60 Arbeiten, die derzeit in der Rostocker Kunsthalle in der Ausstellung « Meisterwerke der Moderne » zu sehen sind. « Und Ewald Dülberg ist unter ihnen ein besonderer, weil besonders vielseitiger Künstler » findet Doktor Heidrun Lorenzen, Leiterin des Kulturhistorischen Museums.

Daß seine und die Arbeiten von 34 anderen Künstlern, deren Werke bei den Nazis als « entartet » eingestuft wurden, zurzeit in der Kunsthalle hängen, ist dem Erfolg der großen Ausstellung zum gleichen Thema im Sommer 2008 zu verdanken. « Wir wurden damals immer wieder gefragt, wann wir wohl die anderen Bilder zeigen » , erzählt Heidrun Lorenzen. Jetzt sind sie zu sehen.

« Nach mehreren beruflichen Stationen wechselte Dülberg zum Bauhaus in Weimar, wo er Zeichnen, Farblehre, Weben und Theatersausstattung unterrichtete » , nennt Heidrun Lorenzen einige Kunstfächer, in denen Dülberg als Experte galt.

Vor Weimar hatte er sich schon längst einen Namen mit seinen expressiven Holzschnitt-Serien gemacht. Sein Holzschnitt « Kreuzigung » von 1923 wurde in der Nazi-Ausstellung « Entartete Kunst » in der Abteilung « Verhöhnung der christlichen Religion » gezeigt. Gleichzeitig entwarf Dülberg kubische Bühnenbilder und ganze Ausstattungsprogramme für das Hamburger Stadttheater. An das Theater in Hamburg hatte ihn Otto Klemperer 1912 geholt. Klemperer, der ein Freund von Gustav Mahler war, war dort zwei Jahre lang Chefdirigent, bevor er nach Wiesbaden zog.

Und Heidrun Lorenzen erinnert daran, daß Ewald Dülberg ein Mecklenburger, ein Schweriner war :

« Dülberg wurde 1888 in Schwerin geboren und heißt eigentlich Emil Franz Konstantin Dülberg. »

Dülberg studierte an der Kunstakademie in München und begann ab 1910 zu unterrichten. Die Lehrtätigkeit hat ihn bis zu seiner Entlassung aus dem preußischen Staatsdienst 1931 immer begleitet.

Neben den Holzschnitten waren Stoffe seine große Leidenschaft. Gemeinsam mit seiner zweiten Frau Hedwig Dülberg-Arnheim, sie war eine Textilkünstlerin, setzte seine Entwürfe in verschiedenen Stickereien und Teppichen um. Hedwig Dülberg-Arnheim kam in Auschwitz ums Leben. Ewald Dülberg starb 1933 in Berlin.

Leo Kestenber

Leo Kestenbergs influence on the shaping of music education policy during the Weimar Republic represents, taken as a whole, a great moment in the often difficult relations between the State, society and art.

As a pianist who became a politician, Kestenbergs was visionary in his ability to formulate music education as a socio-political task and, moreover, to anchor that vision in concrete measures for actual political reform. In so doing, he always maintained a balance (both practical and theoretical) between elite and popular culture, between professional standards of proficiency and quality and a people's education approach whose goal, in the broadest sense, was to make cultural opportunities available to all social classes. With what became known as the « Kestenbergs Reform of the 1920's » , he created structures throughout the entire field of music school education and private music instruction in Germany that have continued to define the field until today.

In keeping with his central desire « to introduce the people as a whole to productive participation in the development of music » , Kestenbergs aimed from the start to establish a unified system of music education from « kindergarten » through Secondary school to the music Academy and University level. In fact, it was Kestenbergs who was the very 1st to found the modern type of music school.

Leo Kestenbergs influence on Berlin's musical life contributed greatly to the image often conjured-up of the « Golden 20's » . His courageous policy of appointments brought personalities such as Franz Schreker, Hans Pfitzner, Ferruccio Busoni, Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith, Erich Kleiber, Otto Klemperer and many others to Berlin. With the famous but also controversial « “ Kroll Oper ” Project » , he attempted to create an accord between Modern æsthetics and the idea of a people's Opera.

Kestenbergs personal fate, his intellectual biography and his pedagogic vision can generate impulses for our time that are especially necessary and highly-relevant today.

Born in 1882, as the son of a Jewish cantor in Rosenberg (Roszahegy, Ruzomberok) , then in Hungary, now Slovakia, Kestenbergs grew-up in Prague and Reichenberg (Bohemia) . In Berlin, he met Ferruccio Busoni, whose pupil he became, and came under Franz Liszt's sphere of influence. The turn of the Century found Kestenbergs earning his living as a pianist, teaching piano at various Conservatories, and working as a music organizer and editor, primarily in Berlin. In 1918, he advanced to the post of music advisor in the Prussian Ministry of Education and the Arts. He used this important office with single-minded determination to promote wide-ranging efforts of reform. Upon his dismissal by the authoritarian Right-wing regime, which succeeded in deposing the last free Prussian government, in 1932, Kestenbergs political engagement on behalf of music in Germany came to an abrupt end. Slandered by the National-Socialists and subjected to attacks, Kestenbergs went to Prague, in 1933, where he devoted himself primarily to organizing an international network for activities in the field of music education. In 1938, Kestenbergs moved to Palestine, where he was the general manager of the Palestine Symphony Orchestra and contributed to building the field of music in Israel. Kestenbergs died in 1962, in Tel Aviv.

Today, more than 60 years after the end of World War II, and soon after the entrance of the nations of Eastern

Europe into the European Union, Kestenberg's contemporary relevance, as one who paved the way for a democratically based universal concept of musical education, is apparent.

Teo Otto

The Swiss stage-designer Teo Otto was born in 1904 in Remscheid and died in 1968 in Frankfurt. He trained in Kassel and Paris. In 1926, he taught at the « Bauhaus » School, in Weimar. He was the youngest of the stage designers who, after World War I, developed the anti-illusionary theatre. In 1927, he was engaged by Otto Klemperer, at the Berlin « Kroll Oper » . From 1927 to 1933, he was the leading stage-designer at the National Theatre (« Berlin Staatstheater ») . In 1928, he became an assistant at the « Berlin Staatsoper » . Following the Nazi's seizure of power in Germany, he returned to Switzerland where he was resident designer at the « Zürich Schauspielhaus » , for 25 years. Teo Otto was the most important and demanded stage-designer of the German-speaking theatre after World War II. He arranged more than 800 productions.

Leo Borchard

Borchard was born in Moscow to German parents, and grew-up in Saint-Petersburg where he received a solid musical education, as well being a regular visitor to the Stanislavsky Theatre. In 1920, after the Russian Revolution, he emigrated to Germany. Otto Klemperer engaged him as his assistant at the « Kroll Oper » , in Berlin (Klemperer, lacking confidence in his own abilities, expected Borchard to critique his conducting technique) . He conducted the Berlin Philharmonic, for the 1st time, in January 1933. In 1935, he was banned by the Nazi regime as politically unreliable. He continued teaching at his apartment and received his friends, including Boris Blacher and Gottfried von Einem. During the War, he remained in Berlin as a Resistance activist under the name Andrik Kraßnow, during which time his duties included contact with Ludwig Lichtwitz, a specialist in false identity papers.

On 26 May 1945, 2 1/2 weeks after Germany's unconditional surrender, he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic at the « Titania Palast » cinema, in a concert featuring the Overture to Mendelssohn's « A Midsummer Night's Dream » ; Mozart's Violin Concerto in A major ; and Tchaïkovsky's Symphony No. 4, to great public acclaim. 1 week later, he was appointed musical director of the Orchestra by the Soviet official Nikolai Berzarin, replacing Wilhelm Furtwängler, who was in exile in Switzerland. His anti-Nazi credentials and command of the Russian language enabled him to enjoy a close relationship with the occupiers. He gave 22 concerts in total, as chief conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra.

Borchard was killed while being driven home after a concert, on 23 August 1945. His British driver misinterpreted an American sentry's hand signal to stop and the sentry shot him dead. The British driver and Borchard's partner, Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, survived. As a result of this incident, it was decided to mark military check-points more prominently so that hand signals were not required.

Fritz Zweig

Doctor Fritz Zweig was the youngest graduate ever from the Conservatory of Vienna. He graduated with Bruno Walter, Wilhelm Furtwängler and Hans Knappertsbuch. He was a student of Engelbert Humperdinck and a close colleague of Richard Strauß and Otto Klemperer.

Fritz Zweig's dedication to music and to the students with whom he shared it, has unwavering artistic integrity, and the personal courage his life has exemplified, have been the very embodiment of a life given to the highest artistic ideals.

Zweig was born in 1893, in Olmütz (Austria-Hungary, today part of Czechoslovakia), of a family rich in musical tradition. A cousin, Otto Zweig, was a « protégé » of Johannes Brahms; a 2nd cousin was Stefan Zweig. After an education that included 2 years of study with Arnold Schönberg in Vienna, he began a career in 1913, at the age of 19, with the Opera in Mannheim as assistant conductor under Artur Bodansky. His young career was interrupted by 4 years as an officer in the Austrian-Hungarian army. After the War, he returned to Mannheim where he was assistant conductor to Wilhelm Furtwängler. In 1921, he succeeded Erich Kleiber as Music Director and 1st Conductor at the Opera, in Barmen-Elberfeld. In 1923, he was invited to Berlin as 1st Conductor at the « Große Volksoper » and, after a very short period, became principal conductor along with Bruno Walter at the « Stadtische Oper », in Berlin (known today as the « Deutsche Oper », in West Berlin). During this period, Fritz Zweig shared the podium with such greats as Otto Klemperer and Alexander von Zemlinsky.

...

The early 1930's saw the formation of the « Kroll Oper », in Berlin, which was built to present newer works and composers, and was under the directorship of Otto Klemperer with Zweig and Zemlinsky as 1st conductors. During this innovative and productive period, Zweig conducted many world-premieres and Berlin premieres of works by such composers as Richard Strauß and Leoš Janáček. The « Kroll Oper » was considered the experimental, vital, innovative Opera of the time, too innovative for Adolf Hitler, who ordered its destruction. Zweig escaped to Prague where he became principal conductor, along with Georg Szell, at the Prague Opera. In Prague, he was assisted by a young man named Jan Popper. In the later 1930's, the advance of the Nazis became a serious problem of survival for Zweig and his family. They escaped to Paris where, for 3 years, he continued to conduct for the Paris Opera, the « Opéra-Comique », Covent Garden, Moscow, Leningrad and many other centers until the 2nd year of World War II. At the last moment, they fled to New York and, a few weeks later, to Los Angeles.

Alexander von Zemlinsky at the Berlin « Kroll Oper » (1927-1933)

« Zemlinsky is absolutely top-class. » (Kurt Weill)

Alexander von Zemlinsky left Prague, in 1927, and took-up an appointment as « Kapellmeister » at the Berlin « Kroll Oper ». He could expect more exciting artistic stimuli than were possible in Prague, after 16 years. This was true of the performance schedule of the « Kroll Oper », which had a strong orientation to modern works and was open to unconventional productions, as well as the encounter with many renowned artists.

No longer responsible for shaping an institution's artistic profile, Alexander von Zemlinsky would now follow the directions of a man 14 years his junior and vie for critical acclaim among impressive names like Bruno Walter, Georg Szell and Otto Klemperer, younger men who already enjoyed celebrated status in prestigious European music capitals. At the peak of his career, a 56 year-old Zemlinsky would attempt to re-invent himself in one of the largest metropolitan cities in the world.

For instance, while Otto Klemperer was artistic and musical director, conductors such as Georg Szell, Erich Kleiber and Leo Blech performed at the « Kroll », as well as Zemlinsky. Great stage directors and designers also worked there, such as László Moholy-Nagy, Gustav Gründgens, Oskar Schlemmer, Ewald Dülberg, Arthur Maria Rabenalt and Ernst Legal. However, the « “ Kroll Oper ” Experiment » was only short-lived. It soon became obvious that the ambitious artistic concept did not always realise its aims, it did not reach the masses and, ultimately, it became increasingly caught-up in political cross-fire. As Zemlinsky was mainly responsible for the House's conventional repertoire, as a conductor, he had only a few artistic highlights, for instance « Les Contes d'Hoffmann » in the sets by László Moholy-Nagy and, in 1931, the performance of Kurt Weill's « Mahagonny », in the « Theater am Kurfürstendamm » with stage-director Caspar Neher. At this time, the « Kroll Oper » had already been closed for half a year, officially because of budget cuts but, in reality, it was because of pressure from Right-wing radical circles (the Communists and the Nazis) who took exception to the House's style.

After the Theatre had been closed, Zemlinsky taught at the Berlin Academy of Music, had many conducting engagements outside Berlin, made some recordings and, above all, had more time to compose. He concentrated on a new Opera that he completed in 1932 : « Der Kreidekreis » (« The Chalk Circle ») based on Klavd (Alfred Henschke) .

On 31 January 1929, after a serious illness, Alexander von Zemlinsky's wife, Ida, died ; only 1 year later, on 4 January 1930, he married the singer Louise Sachsel, whom he had already met in 1915, in Prague. He teaches until 1933, at Berlin's « Musikhochschule » (Music Academy) and is active as a guest-conductor throughout Europe. After Adolf Hitler came to power, it was impossible for Zemlinsky to continue his profession in Berlin and, in summer 1933, he left the city with Louise and returned to live in Vienna.

Alexander Zemlinsky and « Der Kreidekreis » in Berlin

(By Marc D. Moskovitz.)

In 1927, Alexander von Zemlinsky, the 57 year old conductor of Prague's New German Theatre, headed for Berlin, hoping for a fresh musical start. During the previous 17 years, he had given the Czech capital everything he had and had kept the city abreast of contemporary musical currents, but he had been longing all the while to be free of Prague's provincialism. Zemlinsky's preference was always to return to Vienna, the city of his birth, but Vienna seemed indifferent to what he had to offer, and offered him nothing in return. When Otto Klemperer invited the veteran conductor to join his staff at Berlin's newly formed « Kroll Oper », Zemlinsky jumped at the chance. He would spend

the next 5 years in the Prussian capital. Yet, rather than providing true musical fulfillment and the recognition that was Zemlinsky's due, Berlin proved to be his undoing. His work, as a conductor, would be cut short when Otto Klemperer's experimental theatre was closed down after 4 years and, shortly thereafter, Zemlinsky and his 17th Opera, « Der Kreidekreis » , became early victims of Josef Gœbbels' yet-to-be defined (or refined) musical policies.

These misfortunes could not have been predicted. Indeed, upon his arrival in Berlin, early in September 1927, Zemlinsky encountered a revitalized metropolis. The crippling post-War inflation that had left Berliners demoralized, hungry and unemployed, as late as 1923, had been brought under control, and optimism and confidence had returned. The path was paved for Berlin's « goldenen Zwanzigerjahrigen » (the « Golden 20's ») . The city had supplanted Vienna as the musical capital of the German-speaking world and was now home to a number of Zemlinsky's friends and colleagues, among them the composers Arnold Schœnberg, Franz Schreker and Paul Hindemith and such world-class conductors as Bruno Walter, Erich Kleiber and Wilhelm Furtwängler. Berlin was likewise attracting many of Europe's premier architects, scientists, writers and artists and developing the progressive institutions with which they were associated.

By 1931, however, Berlin's promising political and cultural climate had disintegrated. The « Kroll Oper » , for example, under siege from the Right-wing press almost from the start for fostering what it perceived as a « Judeo-Negro » epoch in Prussian art, was finally shut down and, by the summer of 1932, Germany once again found itself knee-deep in recession. With thousands of small businesses failing and 6 million people out of work, new parliamentary elections were held. Victory went to the National-Socialists, now the most powerful Party in Germany, claiming 230 seats in the « Reichstag » . Then, in January of the New Year, Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor.

The closure of the « Kroll » brought to an end the last conducting post of any consequence that Zemlinsky would hold ; this was, in part, a personal choice and, in part, a result of diminishing professional options as the National-Socialists began to tighten the noose around non-Aryans. As a result, Zemlinsky turned increasingly to composition. In 1930, he had begun crafting a libretto based on a play, « Der Kreidekreis » (« The Chalk Circle ») , by Alfred Henschke (better-known as Klabund) .

« Der Kreidekreis » 's Berlin premiere was to have been led by Otto Klemperer, in April of 1933, but in mid-March, 6 weeks after Adolf Hitler's ascent to power, Zemlinsky got word that his Opera was being placed on hold. The « Reich » had yet to establish its « official » policy regulating what could and could not be performed, but already its intent was clear where Jews and their music were concerned. Until January, the attacks had come via the Nazi press and through the disruption of concerts but, in February and March, members of the « Sturm Abteilung » (SA) began invading Opera Houses and threatening conductors. Otto Klemperer and the « Staatsoper » drew attention to themselves, in February, with an unorthodox interpretation of Richard Wagner's « Tannhäuser » , which Josef Gœbbels considered a travesty and which was marred by cries of disgust from Nazis, in attendance. Before another Klemperer concert, a caller threatened to disrupt the performance, which was then cancelled outright « for reasons of public safety » . In view of these events, Heinz Tietjen, « General-Intendant » of Berlin's Opera Houses, refused to allow Klemperer or the « Staatsoper » to take unnecessary risks and wrote to Klemperer, in March, that the decision to postpone « Der Kreidekreis » was « primarily preventive » .

In Dresden, the music director Fritz Busch was man-handled in rehearsal and he subsequently resigned. Although he was not Jewish, Busch was openly and vehemently opposed to Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party. The Jewish conductor Bruno Walter, physically barred from conducting in Leipzig, requested police protection for a concert with the Berlin Philharmonic, but rather than honour his request, the authorities had him replaced.

As in Dresden, the firing had taken place in the theatre and under physical threat by SA mob (« Sturm Abteilung ») . Jews, foreigners, Social-Democrats, and others on the Left were at risk. The « Berlin Staatsoper » was thought to be the next, with Otto Klemperer and Leo Blech among its conductors and Alexander Kipnis, Frida Leider, Emmanuel List, and Lauritz Melchior among its leading singers. Its intendant, Heinz Tietjen, was rumored to have threatened his resignation in the event of the firings of those musicians.

Stettin's chief of police, who had heard about the Opera at 2nd hand, cancelled all further performances and the rest of Germany soon followed suit. « Der Kreidekreis » was branded « Entartete Musik » - degenerate music, unfit for German society.

The ban on « Der Kreidekreis » thrust Zemlinsky into the epicenter of the « Reich » 's ban, for reasons far beyond his Jewish origins. He was simultaneously composer, conductor, teacher, colleague and friend of many who were falling victim to the new decrees, and his association with other known « degenerates » (among them, Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith and Franz Schreker) not to mention his association with the « Kroll » , was enough to have condemned his work. And while his latest Opera may have played behind an Oriental scrim, its themes (prostitution, destitution, decadence and, above all, governmental oppression) were particularly abhorrent to the Nazis. At what was arguably the most heart-breaking moment of Zemlinsky's career, « Der Kreidekreis » was struck from the repertoire just when it appeared destined to triumph. Zemlinsky was never again presented with such an opportunity.

Reminiscences by « EMI » producer, Walter Legge, on Otto Klemperer's « Kroll Oper » years (Berlin, 1927)

In 1927, Otto Klemperer moved to Berlin to take-over a new Opera House, the « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » , the « Kroll Oper » , as it was usually called. At that time, Berlin had an incredibly rich musical life. 3 Opera Houses, the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra with Wilhelm Furtwängler as its chief conductor, concerts by the Orchestras of the Opera Houses and innumerable recitals by the greatest instrumentalists and best concert-singers of the period. The most able singers of the time, who could sing in German, were engaged at one or the other of the Opera Houses and great conductors were in abundance : Wilhelm Furtwängler, Bruno Walter, Erich Kleiber, Leo Blech, Georg Szell, Otto Klemperer (and, occasionally, even Richard Strauß) - all conducting Opera - not for occasional visits but, except for Strauß, living and working in Berlin. It was paradise for young musicians avid to learn but torture for them to decide which Opera or concert to hear each day.

The theatre Klemperer took-over with a 10 year contract (the « Kroll Oper ») was a new venture. It was large, rather uncomfortable and acoustically harsh. The declared policy was to provide Opera for a large public, at low prices. Klemperer chose Operas which, with few exceptions, were not in the repertoires of the other theatres and he put into practice his ideas on modernization of production. I saw the much discussed « Der fliegende Holländer » in modern

dress with Moje Forbach as Senta wearing a coarse woollen blue pull-over and a rough tweed skirt. Fritz Krenn (Ochs at Covent Garden, in 1938) sang Rocco. To my eyes, the revolutionary sets were anachronisms, ugly and contradictory to the music. The « Fidelio » scenery, probably influenced by Adolphe Appia or early « Bauhaus » ideas, was cold and rectilinear. Rosa Pauly, at that time, an untidy but intense singer, sang Leonore. The repertoire was not really suited to the public it was supposed to attract and, apart from the few standard favourites which were mostly produced against the music and subject, little of the novel repertoire Klemperer introduced has stood the test of time. The era of the producers who blight the world's Opera Houses today seems to have been Klemperer's innovation. At his concerts with his Opera House Orchestra, he did much Igor Stravinsky, less Paul Hindemith. After 3 years, the « Kroll Oper » venture closed and Klemperer, unwillingly, was transferred to the « Unter den Linden » Theatre, then Berlin's principal Opera House.

...

In 1927, Otto Klemperer accepted the Directorship of the « Kroll Oper », in Berlin. This was the most controversial period of his career. At that time, Berlin was the musical capital of the world. There were 3 Opera Houses : the « Staatsoper, Unter den Linden » ; the « Stadtische Oper » in Charlottenburg ; and the « Kroll Oper », each playing 7 times a week, 10 months a year. The musical directors were respectively : Erich Kleiber, Bruno Walter and Otto Klemperer. Wilhelm Furtwängler was director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and, when Siegfried Ochs died in 1928, Klemperer was invited to re-organize and direct the Philharmonic Chorus.

The older theatres concentrated mainly on the established repertoire. Klemperer, working on a much smaller subvention, built-up a repertoire of 44 works ranging from Gluck's « Orphée » through Wagner, Verdi and Offenbach to Janáček, Schœnberg, Stravinsky, Hindemith and Weill. Under his direction the « Kroll Oper » became the most vital experimental Opera House in the history of the art. Stimulated by his experience of the Russian theatres and, in particular, Stanislavsky's adventurous achievements Klemperer collected around him the most brilliant avant-gardists of the German theatre. The originality of his productions, his unconventional treatment of the standard repertoire and the high-percentage of contemporary music aroused violent antagonism not only from the critics but from various political parties. The theatre was closed in 1931. He continued to conduct at the « Staatsoper », until February 1933, but, in the following month on the seizure of power by the National-Socialist Party, his contract was summarily cancelled.

The most radical innovations on the Operatic stage were programmatically conceived in opposition to Richard Wagner's legacy : Bertolt Brecht and Kurt Weill's denunciation of the culinary in Opera was also, and more vociferously, a denunciation of the absorptive aspirations and mesmerizing practices of the « Gesamtkunstwerk ». And when the « Kroll Oper » in Berlin (following the lead of provincial theatres, in Darmstadt and Münster, for instance) famously challenge the entrenched Romantic idiom of Operatic stage æsthetics, inviting the likes of László Moholy-Nagy, Leopold Jessner, Giorgio de Chirico, and others, to remake Opera in a modernistic image, Richard Wagner's works formed an especially inviting (and intensely controversial) target. Thus, to cite a brief example : in February of 1929, the German National Party demanded that the Prussian State Parliament launch an investigation into « the transformation of the State Opera at the “ Platz der deutschen Republik ” (the “ Kroll Oper ”) into a laboratory for Bolshevik art experiments ». The crisis erupted in the wake of the « Kroll Oper » production of « Der fliegende Holländer »,

which, according to the Party, brazenly « mocked the spirit of Richard Wagner » .

(Light and transparency, in Opera : liberating the drama from the literal. Not only Adolphe Appia and Alfred Roller but also others. In 1929, Otto Klemperer conducted the Dresden version of « Der fliegende Holländer » at the « Kroll Oper » in Berlin, where a stylized ship appeared against a stark backdrop. The Nazis hated it so much that it became a star exhibit in the « Entartete Kunst » exhibition of 1938.)

« 2 months previously, President von Hindenburg had presented Klemperer with the Gœthe Medal for his services to German culture. In February, he conducted a new production of “ Tannhäuser ”. Adolf Hitler was in the audience : less than a month later Klemperer was a refugee in Switzerland. » (Walter Legge)

In an interview on German radio, the singing pedagogue, Professor Frederick Husler, talks about the special atmosphere which existed at the Opera House, during this period. He mentions some of the singers who were engaged at the time :

« Jarmilla Novotná, who later went to New York to the Metropolitan Opera. Or Kaethe Haidersbach. She became very famous as Evchen in “ Meistersinger ”, in Bayreuth. Or Maria Schult-Stormburg and Moie Vorbach, 2 very distinct personalities. They went to the other House, “ Unter den Linden ”, later. And a very impressive personality : Iso Golland, the Russian. He returned to Russia and has become a highly-respected pedagogue. »

He describes the generosity which existed among the singers :

« Their comradeship was extraordinary. No intrigues would arise. I remember that before rehearsals for a performance of “ Die verkaufte Braut ”, 3 Brides were sitting in my room. Novotná, Haidersbach and Zaezilie Reich. I remember them discussing, absolutely unselfishly, who of them should sing. Haidersbach said Novotná was the original Czech. Novotná said that Haidersbach had the more suitable lyric voice, whereas she herself was a coloratura soprano. And “ Reich ” then put forward an argument (and against herself) the benefit of the whole group. Where could you find such a thing ? »

Late Weimar and the Death of the « Kroll Oper »

Edward Gibbon's analysis of the lateness that preceded the collapse of the Roman Empire cannot, perhaps, be directly applied to Prussian Opera reform. Yet, a connection can be drawn between the lupine legions of the Weimar political Right and the barbarians circling Rome, and between Weimar's shady plotters, whose backroom deals led to the rise of Adolf Hitler, and the corruption of Rome's Emperors. A closer parallel can be found in a common, seemingly willful ignorance of surrounding dangers, a lazy voluptuousness, and at the very end, a feverish energy, like the burst of false hope that victims of tuberculosis were said to evince. At the « Kroll » , lateness was represented by an avoidance of reality, a stubborn insistence on normalcy, and even a secret rush of giddy excitement at a world spinning-out of control : the company enjoyed some of its greatness successes in its last season, after its fate had been sealed. The same blindness was an evidence in Isherwood's view of Berlin, where night pleasures were pursued even as rival gangs

clashed outside the cabarets.

Even before the economic crash of 1929, the conjunction of increasing Right-wing hostility, the « Kroll Oper » 's status as a symbol of cultural bolshevism, the Right's waxing strength in the Republic at large, and perilous finances in Berlin had cast shadows on the company's continued existence. As early as 1927, Heinz Tietjen, contemplating budgetary projections, had hinted that Berlin could not afford 3 Opera Houses, that one would have to go, and that the « Kroll » would be the one to close. A key problem was the growing disenchantment of the « Volksbühne » 's management. By the middle of the decade, the progressive leaders of the early 1920's had been replaced by a more conservative team, and whether they followed or led the taste of their clientele, the signals from « Volksbühne » headquarters were unhappy. The organization had considered the « Kroll Oper » to be a 2nd rate spin-off of the « real » « Staatsoper » even before Otto Klemperer took sole control : if the « Kroll Oper » got half the subsidies of the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » , it must be only half as good (and, in terms of vocal quality, at least, that was probably right) . The modernist productions, even if proportionately few in number, often alienated the organization's increasingly « petit bourgeois » membership. These problems were exacerbated by Leo Kestenberg's lamentable failure to follow-up on his reformist ideals with practical attention to their realization, a failure presented in the feeble guise of allowing the « Kroll Oper » artistic freedom. Kestenberg withdrew from the responsibility of raising his Operatic child just when it was most needed.

In testimony before the « Landtag » , Heinz Tietjen reported that the « Volksbühne » was regularly consulted as to the « Kroll Oper » 's repertory. But, while both the « Kroll Oper » and the « Volksbühne » had offices in the « Kroll Theater » , their administrators rarely talked, at least outside an occasional formal meeting ; instead, they communicated by memos and letters sent to the ministry or to Tietjen. Leo Kestenberg (insofar as he was involved) , Otto Klemperer, and Heinz Tietjen ignored the « Volksbühne » in making their policy decisions. Klemperer's conception of an « Altags Oper » , an Opera company with consistent day-to-day quality, was inherently democratic, but he never bothered to reach-out of the « Volksbühne » or the « Kroll Oper » 's Republican public at any meaningful way, until it was too late.

Although, in retrospect, we can see signs of the Weimar Republic's final decline in late 1928, the period was still one of optimism. The economy seemed healthy, and the elections in May had seemed to favor the defenders of Republican democracy. That winter, however, chronic seasonal unemployment reached a new high, and it failed to recede as much as expected. By the beginning of 1929 (long before the American stock-market crashed in October) , the signs of decline were everywhere apparent, feeding political extremism even within the Center-Right Parties. The elections, in september 1930, signaled an astonishing re-ordering of national electoral strength, with the Nazis jumping from 12 seats in the « Reichstag » (out of 491) to 107 (out of 577) . The new Chancellor, Heinrich Brüning, began issuing presidential decrees that further subverted parliamentary democracy and encouraged the secretive plotting that led to Adolf Hitler's selection as Chancellor, in January 1933.

Prussia lived on in its bubble of protected innocence, as if untouched by the threats from the Right. Sometimes, it seemed as if the whole State government and the citizens of Berlin were as blissfully unaware, as Otto Klemperer and his artistic allies at the « Kroll Oper » . Braun did not have to call State elections to coincide with the national

elections of 1930, and he and his Weimar Center-Left coalition clung to power, isolated and gloomy, like Wotan in « Walhalla ». But extremist rhetoric clouded all political debate, and the Right, holding-up the « Kroll Oper » as the quintessential manifestation of cultural bolshevism, voiced their anger ever more stridently despite their still small numbers in the « Landtag ». This calculated hysteria did not overtly influence behind-the-scenes ministerial decisions, which proceeded with bureaucratic implacability and all the secretiveness that led to Adolf Hitler's installation.

When Otto Klemperer learned of the death of Gustav Stresemann, the Weimar Republic's moderate, cosmopolitan foreign minister, on 3 October 1929, he remarked :

« This is also a fateful day for us. »

And, indeed, the 1st decisive overtures to close the « Kroll » Theatre came at just that time. Heinz Tietjen had already « quite casually » told Otto Klemperer, in spring of 1929, that the « Kroll » would be shut the following year. The theatre was less expensive to run than the other 2 Berlin theatres and, in 1929, the Prussian theatre budget (which included Opera) was less than twice that of Bavaria's, despite the fact that Prussia had a population that was 5 times greater. Nevertheless, the pressure to balance budgets and staunch deficits ran high in every State department. The 3 Opera Houses, in Berlin, provided fewer available seats « per capita » than did a single company in a smaller city, yet, as the depression deepened, all 3 had disturbing numbers of empty seats. The quasi-independent « Oberrechnungskammer », a budgetary oversight Commission, objected to the « Kroll Oper » as unnecessary « competition » for the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » and likewise objected to the « Volksbühne » pact, as an arrangement that was no longer advantageous for the State. By October 1929, the finance ministry had joined the recommendation to close the « Kroll ». To what extent both agencies were havens for embittered monarchists or aggrieved nationalists, and to what extent they were merely acting on dispassionate economic convictions, remains controversial.

In a larger sense, the demise of the « Kroll Oper » was clearly political. The non-political cultural ideals underpinning the « Kroll Oper » were ludicrously unsuited to the times and markedly feeble when compared to the vested interests of the City and State. The « Städtische Oper » had local pride behind it, and the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » had the weight of tradition and symbolism, as the bearer of German Operatic « Kultur ». All the « Kroll Oper » had was the idealistic goodwill of the Weimar intelligentsia, which paled before the implacable persistence of the Right. The climate of extremism intimidated the company's potential defenders.

Leo Kestenberg may have felt that his advocacy was a liability, given the constant attacks on him ; by the late-1920's, word had spread in government circles that he was a « dead man », which presumably referred to his career. Heinz Tietjen remained tactically passive ; no hard evidence has surfaced that he actively plotted against the « Kroll Oper ». And the centrist Becker, who had grudgingly agreed, in 1929, to the recommendation to close the « Kroll » Theatre, had seen his power eroded by the SPD's demand for a larger share of ministerial positions, specifically in the ministry of culture. Braun defended him but, ultimately, gave way and appointed a docile Socialist, Adolf Grimme, to Becker's post. Despite ostensible support for the « Kroll Oper » from Braun and Grimme, the will of the SPD was undermined by the Party's need to cultivate its coalition partner, the « Deutsche Zentrumspartei » (German

Central Party) , which determined that its interests were better served by supporting Operatic culture in the far eastern and western regions of Prussia, where its electoral strength lay.

Throughout 1930, the ministry of culture proceeded largely unimpeded by « Landtag » scrutiny as it dealt primarily with the technical matters of closing the « Kroll » . The « Volksbühne » 's contract needed to be re-negotiated, which hardly proved difficult given the organization's disenchantment with the « Kroll Oper » and its own struggles to maintain its financial commitments, and artists' contracts had to be reconfigured to find them places at the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » . The final decision came on October 1930 : Braun called the ministers of finance and culture to a conference, and the Parties agreed that the « Kroll » Theatre would close at the end of the 1930-1931 season.

Even if the ministerial conferences proceeded with a tone of non-partisan objectivity, the « Landtag » debates on the « Kroll » 's closing were highly-politicized. Karl Koch, a pastor and a member of the « Deutschnationale Volkspartei » (German National People's Party) , predictably attacked the « Kroll Oper » productions of Beethoven's « Fidelio » and Wagner's « Der fliegende Holländer » for their « Neggerkultur » (Negro culture) , but he was not alone in his denouncement. On the Left, the Socialists remained timid defenders of the supposedly socialist Opera company, while the Communists, although voting consistently in favor of the « Kroll Oper » , haughtily disdained bourgeois Opera. (Their own Opera policy often seemed limited to boasting about Moscow and its purported 6 Opera companies.)

Otto Klemperer, galvanized into action in spring 1930 by a growing awareness that his company's situation was dire, undertook a series of private meetings and wrote a number of newspaper articles defending his company. His campaign to save the « Kroll Oper » , coming when it did, seemed too opportunistically concerned with preserving his own ensemble or, eventually, his own position in the State Opera hierarchy. Peter Heyworth seems to think he was making some headway, but his efforts were far too meager - and far too late. He certainly did not affect the decisive ministerial conference of 10 October 1930. During the « Kroll Oper » 's last years, Otto Klemperer carried-on in a charmed limbo, indifferent not only to political and social events but also to dissatisfaction within his own theatre complex. He claimed too late that it would have been easy to coordinate with the « Volksbühne » and engage in educational outreach activities. Leo Kestenberg, supposedly so concerned with musical education, apparently never thought to urge him to do so. It was only after the « Kroll Oper » 's fate was sealed that a press and political campaign began and public attestations of loyalty poured forth.

The sham public battle carried merrily on, with the Leftist press assuming that the « Kroll Oper » was being done in for political reasons. It all came to nothing. On 25 March 1931, with Otto Klemperer and other key « Kroll » figures in the visitor's gallery, the « Landtag » formally voted all subsidy for the theatre out of the budget. In the meantime, a « Landtag » Committee charged with investigating the « Kroll Oper » was summoned to life by the Right-wing Parties. Although some historically interesting testimony emerged, the investigation was essentially an effort to further humiliate Braun and his shaky Center-left coalition. The Committee, which met 9 times between March and June 1931, was obsessed with meaningless detail. The coalition members, who were sure to prevail since their numbers reflected the coalition's majority, sat mutely while the Right peppered the « Kroll Oper » leadership and its allies with insulting questions. The most telling testimony (telling for its brevity) was Leo Kestenberg's. Seelig was allowed to claim credit

(or blame) for the State's initial take-over of the « Kroll » building. Kestenberg denied having anything to do with Opera policy, or with the independent « Kroll » company, or with the propagation of modern Opera and production styles. In short, he lied. Whether his motives were heroic self-abnegation, tactical retreat, appeasement, or cowardice, his testimony brought an ignominious end to Berlin Opera reform during the Weimar Republic.

Otto Klemperer kept fighting (he was even attacked by a Nazi gang in the « Tiergarten ») although he scurried away, on 25 April 1931, for an extended guest engagement in Buenos Aires, thus missing the closing night of his own company. By March 1933, struggling to maintain his position at the « Staatsoper » under the Nazis, he went so far as to try to ingratiate himself with Josef Gœbbels by denying any interest in modernist art.

For all the « Kroll Oper » 's limitations, its productions were good enough on their own to earn it a place in Operatic history, even beyond its symbolic value as a shining light of Weimar culture. Rarely before had there been such a combination of unusual repertory, excellence of ensemble signing and acting, and day-to-day consistency. The contractual obligation to provide performances for all « Volksbühne » members who wanted to attend assured more performances of each production that was normal. Following an Opera's opening performance, all subsequent performances used the same singers, and fresh rehearsals enabled the « Kroll Oper » to maintain the same level of quality (for better or for worse) for the run of the production. The final months of the « Kroll Oper » seemed especially luminous, winning the company its most consistent critical success and popular enthusiasm.

The great appeal of the « Kroll Oper » derived from its aspirations to both artistic and social betterment, as critic and musicologist Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt explained :

« This theatre was, in some magical way, more than a temple of art. One felt that its artistic efforts were part of some large task. It was a “ Volksbühne ” of a higher and more spiritual nature. One believed modern social ideas to be in the air, but also a kind of modern religiosity, an aura of cult and belief, which seemed to stream-out of the very person of Otto Klemperer. After the final curtain of the final performance, Mozart's 1786 “ Le nozze di Figaro ”, on 3 July 1931, the applause went on and on. Hans Curjel thanked the public, and the entire personnel appeared together on stage. Then, the lights went-out. One left the house both moved and embittered. An epoch of European Operatic culture lay behind us. »

From late Weimar to Adolf Hitler

After the summer of 1931, Leo Kestenberg and his allies, in the art department of the ministry of culture, floated in a political limbo, reduced to the execution of routine tasks. Professionally, they were already « dead men » . Otto Klemperer conducted intermittently at the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » , but his staff and ensemble had scattered and their reformist spirit had vanished. The national elections of April 1932 were this time paralleled by Prussian elections, and Braun's tenuous coalition was voted down decisively. In the « Landtag » , the Nazis jumped from 8 to 162 deputies. Braun clung to power, since the Right could not agree on a coalition to replace him. On 30 May, the Brüning national government fell, leading to the plots undertaken by Papen and Schleicher, all under the increasingly senile oversight of Hindenburg. One such manœuver was Papen's « coup » of 20 July 1932, in which the government

of Prussia was taken-over by the national government. Papen then purged all Socialist officials, including Grimme, the minister of culture. The art department at the ministry was abolished, effectively firing Leo Kestenberg and Hans Seelig. Kestenberg was officially retired from the ministry, on 1 December. After Adolf Hitler's accession to power, on 30 January 1933, Kestenberg fled to Prague, where he stayed for 5 years, then to Palestine, where he managed the Palestine Symphony Orchestra (which became the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra) . Leo Kestenberg and Otto Klemperer were estranged for years, but they finally made-up after World War II.

As a sympathetic critic noted, as early as 1925, the ministry of culture's Opera reform efforts were « progressive in ideas but retrogressive in their execution » . The ideas were those of traditional « good German » idealism, but by the time the Weimar Republic came to an end, the Right had cynically reversed the polarity, nationally and locally, in the fight over Opera in Berlin. The Right trumpeted its allegiance to traditional German values. But it had, in fact, drifted far from those precepts. The Left, the true inheritor of Liberal idealism, had been stigmatized by the sharper polemical skills of its oponents. Ministry officials had to recognize their task as inherently political, but this they were incapable of doing. For all its internal contradictions, the failure of Berlin Opera reform was a failure of tactics, not policy - and the same might be said of the Weimar Republic. It was the height of folly to persist with non-political tactics. The wistful desire to play a Liberal, idealistic game was frustrated by the fact that the bourgeois Parties had long since given-up that game themselves.

The only hope for Opera reform would have been to forge a working alliance among the Parties of the core Weimar coalition. Becker recognized this in 1930 but, by then, it was too late. The arts had become virulently politicized by the late- 1920's, making the continued pursuit of a non-political cultural policy a contradiction in terms : the converse of the non-political artist is the non-artistic politician. There were plenty of those in the late Weimar Republic, even in the land of « Dichter und Denker » . But neither is as incongruous as the non-political politician.

...

The Nazis took tight control of the « Staatsoper » after they assumed power, in 1933. Several composers' works were banned, and the repertoire and staging otherwise was shaped to support the Nazi agenda.

Just weeks after Adolf Hitler came to power, on 13 February 1933, one of the leading conductors of Germany, the Jewish Otto Klemperer, gave a performance of Richard Wagner's Opera « Tannhäuser » . The performance was met with outrage, and decried as an insult to the memory of the composer. Years later, one official insisted that it is particularly significant that, as late as 13 February 1933, and after the National-Socialist seizure of power, the Jewish general music director Klemperer had the impudence, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Wagner's death, to mount a production of « Tannhäuser » at the Berlin State Opera that ranked as a deliberate insult to the great German Master and an affront to all people with decent feelings.

The incident and its repercussions served to hasten Klemperer's departure from Germany, on in April 1933. Since the early days of his career, Klemperer had made a name for himself as a champion of the modernist cause of Igor Stravinsky, Arnold Schönberg and Paul Hindemith. Under his direction in the late- 1920's, the « Kroll Oper » , in

Berlin, became a target of hatred for the increasingly reactionary voices of late Weimar, condemned as a centre of cultural bolshevism. Although himself avowedly apolitical, Klemperer had conducted frequently in the Soviet Union, and his early conversion to Catholicism had little meaning for a race-based ideology like that of Nazi anti-Semitism.

Otto Klemperer's performances and their modern « mise-en-scène » were ahead of their time and raised the opposition by conservative circles. In the highly-charged political atmosphere during the late days of the Weimar Republic, public pressure made the general administrator of the Prussian State theatres, Heinz Tietjen, realize that the administration could not afford the funding of 3 Opera Houses, in Berlin. Despite Klemperer's protests, the « Kroll Oper » was finally closed on 3 July 1931 with the last performance of Mozart's « The Marriage of Figaro » .

...

The paradigm shift in production practices reflected by the centennial Wagner « Ring » (1976) recalled innovations that had taken place on the stages of many German Opera Houses prior to the advent of National-Socialism. During the Weimar Republic, Opera had served as a forum for extraordinary æsthetic and theatrical innovation. Much of the most adventurous work by many of Germany's most innovative directors, artists, and choreographers was to be viewed on the Opera stage. For example, between 1927 and 1931, at one of the most visible centers of Operatic experimentation, the Berlin's « Kroll Oper » .

« Stage directors without pre-conceptions were brought in from the spoken theatre, and artists like Giorgio De Chirico, Oskar Schlemmer, and László Moholy-Nagy were given shows to design. »

As Ernst Bloch put it, at the « Kroll Oper » :

« Old works were presented as if they were new, and new works were presented as if their contemporaneity was not of the cheap and easy sort. »

With the advent of National-Socialism, many of these innovators fled or were arrested. During the course of the Nazi regime, and for years after its demise, a great deal of German Opera production, re-tooled and re-dedicated to serve the national cause, reverted to the backwater that had so frustrated Richard Wagner. The elected designers of the Berlin « Kroll Oper » period (including Ewald Dülberg, Oskar Schlemmer and László Moholy-Nagy) finally influenced the development of Opera production after 1945.

László Moholy-Nagy : Mentor to Modernism

By Lloyd C. Engelbrecht. (DVD)

Sound recordings of László Moholy-Nagy speaking in Hungarian and in English. Brief excerpt from the Opera « The Tales of Hoffmann » of Jacques Offenbach. Short film clips : 1) Conductor Otto Klemperer speaking of Moholy's work for the « Kroll Oper » , in Berlin ; 2) Moving images of Moholy's friend, Ellen Frank ; 3) Moving images of Moholy-Nagy

himself.

Clip 1

Jacques Offenbach, « Barcarolle » from « The Tales of Hoffmann » (1881) , sung in German as « Schöne Nacht, du Liebesnacht » . The singers are : baritone Willi Domgraf Fassbänder (1897-1978) as Niklaus, and soprano Felicie Hüni Mihacsek (1891-1976) as Giulietta. The Orchestra of the Berlin State Opera is conducted by Mæstro Julius Prüwer (1874-1943) .

1929 : 78 rpm recording by « Grammophon » (catalogue number : 66862 - matrix number : 1639 BM) .

This is the historical recording with the closest ties to the « Barcarolle » in László Moholy-Nagy's 1929 Berlin production of « The Tales of Hoffmann » at the « Kroll Oper » . Prüwer was associated with the Berlin State Opera, if only in the recording studio, and he conducts here the sister Orchestra to that of the « Kroll Oper » , the « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » . The « Kroll Oper » was officially known as the State Opera on the Plaza of the Republic. Both Domgraf Fassbänder and Hüni Mihacsek sang at the « Kroll » , but not in « The Tales of Hoffmann » . The role of Niklaus is usually sung by a woman in the theatre (but not always in the recording studio) although the character is male or, in other words, Niklaus is an example of what has come to be known as a « trouser role » for a female Opera singer.

The conception of Alexander Scriabin's 1910 Symphonic work, « Prometheus : The Poem of Fire » , Opus 60, for piano, orchestra, optional choir, and « clavier à lumière » (or « Chromola » : a color organ invented by Preston Millar) found an echo in Wassily Kandinsky's published stage-piece « The Yellow Sound » which, like Scriabin's « Prometheus » , began and ended with blue. This piece was influential on the staging of scene 3 of Arnold Schoenberg's « Die glückliche Hand » , which includes a crescendo of lights changing from a dull red to yellow, through dirty-green, violet, blue-grey and bloody red. Schoenberg's piece also had to wait some years for a production. One of the earliest was at the Berlin « Kroll Oper » , with sets by Oskar Schlemmer, who had long been working on ballets with elaborate light-cores under the influence of Scriabin and of Kandinsky's scenario for « The Yellow Sound » .

Isadora Duncan and the « Kroll Oper »

1903 : Isadora Duncan had made modern dance virtually synonymous, in popular consciousness, with barefoot performance. Isadora Duncan used Eastern gestures in her choreography. She even went so far as to appear nude in a performance at the « Kroll Oper » . Although, she refused to play the role of « Salome » in the Berlin music-hall.

1905 : 20 pupils, including Anna Denzler (1894-1980) , from Zürich ; Maria-Theresa Kruger (1895-1987) , from Dresden ; Irma Dorette Ehrich-Grimme (1897-1977) , from Schleswig-Holstein, near Hamburg ; Elizabeth (Lisa) Milker (1898-1976) , from Dresden ; Margot (Gretel) Jehle (1900-1925) , from Berlin ; and Erica Lohman (1901-1984) , from Hamburg, join Isadora Duncan's school. Those pupils are called « Duncaninchen » or « Little Duncans » and have their 1st public performance with Isadora at the Berlin « Kroll Oper » , on July 20.

Wilhelm Reinking and the « Kroll Oper »

Claire Eckstein (1904-1994) met in Munich the gifted scenic designer Wilhelm Reinking, whom she soon married. Reinking recommended her to Heinrich Strohm, director of the Opera theatre in Würzburg. Impressed with her extravagant sense of humor, Strohm hired her to choreograph Paul Hindemith's ballet « Der Dämon » (1926), then Jaap Kool's « Der Leierkasten » (1927) and Rimsky Korsakov's « Scheherazade » (1927), for which Reinking did the scenery. Along with stage director Arthur Maria Rabenalt, Claire Eckstein and Wilhelm Reinking moved to Darmstadt. It is there, from 1927 to 1931, that Eckstein, in addition to her usual duties for the Opera and Operetta, staged several comic ballets with a distinctive modernist ambience : Massarani's « Der arme Guerin » (1928) ; Darius Milhaud's « Le bœuf sur le toit » (1928) ; Erik Satie's « Parade » (1929) ; Florent Schmitt's « Ein höher Beamter » (1930) ; and 2 ballets for which she herself composed the music : « Soirée » (1930) and « Die Gestrandeten » (1930) . During these years, American dancer Edwin Denby (1903-1983) was her partner-collaborator. However, in 1930, the Berlin « Kroll Oper » invited Wilhelm Reinking to design Rossini's « The Barber of Seville », and this opportunity led to others for him in the city. Claire Eckstein brought several of her Darmstadt pieces to Berlin (1931), but these did not open up possibilities for her in a theatre culture suffering from severe austerity measures and political extremism.

Max Terpis and the « Kroll Oper » ballet choreographies

The Hannover choreographies brought choreographer and Opera producer Max Terpis (1889-1958) to the attention of Max von Schillings, director of the Berlin State Opera, who sought to reform the ballet corps, which numbered nearly a 100 dancers, yet, failed to achieve anything resembling the seriousness of purpose that « Kroll » had attempted to provide it, in 1919-1922. Terpis held the State Opera position for 6 years, but his life there was a nightmare of political intrigue and reactionary efforts to undermine his reforms and authority. He produced 19 ballets at the State Opera, nearly all of which used music by living modernist composers, including Kool, Kömme, Igor Stravinsky, Friedrich Wilckens, Manuel de Falla, Franz Schreker, Sergei Prokofiev, Paul von Klenau, Ralph Benatzky, and Darius Milhaud. Max Terpis wrote most of the scenarios himself. Scenic designers such as Emil Pirchan and Panos Aravantinos assisted him in creating expressionist-constructivist settings for ballets that largely inhabited the realm of symbolic fantasy ; « Die fünf Wünsche » (1929) contained a film sequence shot by Gina Fagg. Because of persistent resistance to his expressionist methods from doyens and classically trained dancers, he could not construct group dances as powerfully or radically as he wished, so he increasingly relied on the talents of a few extraordinarily gifted soloists : Rolf Arco, Rudolf Kölling, Daisy Spies, Walter Junk, Dorothea Albu. This strategy only aggravated tensions between himself and the majority of the corps, although Max von Schillings and his successor, Heinz Tietjens, continued to support him. But, in 1929, Terpis faced a full-scale insurrection, from the new music director Otto Klemperer, who accused him of lacking « musicality » and of failing to grasp the nature of theatrical art. Max Terpis, therefore, handed in his resignation, and Rudolf von Laban soon replaced him.

The early Klemperer recordings

Otto Klemperer had a strange recording career. In the 1st phase, from 1924 to 1931, he recorded in Berlin for «

Polydor » , « Parlophone-Odeon » and « Electrola » .When one considers the number of great German conductors who were active, at this time, it is surprising that Klemperer made so many recordings as he did, since his reputation then was not so high as it later became. But then, he left Germany and made no more recordings for a quarter of a Century, until he was used by the « Vox » label, after World War II.

The « Symposium » record label have made a wise choice of the most interesting items from the 1st phase, when Klemperer was at Berlin's « Kroll » Opera, and those who have not heard these recordings before will be very surprised at what they reveal. It is difficult, for example, to reconcile the swift, urgently expressed and exciting 1927 « Coriolan » Overture with the elderly Klemperer's monumental Beethoven style of the late- 1950's and 1960's.

Otto Klemperer and the « Staatsoper Orchester, Berlin » :

Beethoven : « Coriolan » Overture, Opus 62, State Opera Orchestra, Berlin (1926-1927) , « Polydor » : 66599 - 387-388.

Wagner : « Siegfried Idyll » , State Opera Orchestra, Berlin (1926-1927) , « Polydor » : 66604 / 66605 - 394-397.

Ravel : « Alborado del Gracioso » , State Opera Orchestra, Berlin (1926) , « Polydor » : 66463 - 296-297.

Debussy : 2 Nocturnes : « Fêtes » , « Nuages » , State Opera Orchestra, Berlin (1926) , « Polydor » : 66464 / 66465 - 319-320-331-332.

Auber : « Fra Diavolo » Overture, State Opera Orchestra, Berlin (22 May 1929) , « Parlophone » : P-9406 - 2-20862-2 / 2-21431-2.

Offenbach : « La Belle Hélène » Overture, State Opera Orchestra, Berlin , « Parlophone » : P-9469 - 2-21432-1 / 2-21433-1.

Weill : « Dreigroschen Suite » , State Opera Orchestra, Berlin (1930-1931) , « Polydor » : 24172 / 24173 - 2743-2744-2745-2746.

Otto Klemperer on « Naxos » Historical

(Review by Rob Maynard.)

Discussion of the distinctive characteristics of Otto Klemperer's conducting tends to focus on the final phase of his long career, when many of his interpretations appeared to mirror his impassive (if not positively stern) facial expression and his physical immobility.

In fact, his best-known and most widely circulated recordings (made with the London « Philharmonia » and « New

Philharmonia » Orchestras, in the 1950's and 1960's) almost invariably attract such adjectives as « forceful » , « unwavering » , « solid » and « craggy » (the word « granite » appears with almost monotonous regularity) . But that seriously distorts Otto Klemperer's overall achievement in the recording studios. Many of his early 1950's « Vox » label discs, for instance, exhibit a far less monolithic « style » . And the interpretations preserved on « Naxos » Historical issues offer surprising and conclusive proof of the individuality and subtlety of his interpretations of core repertoire at an even earlier stage of his career.

Klemperer's image in the late- 1920's was that of a progressive modernist. Appointed chief conductor of the « Kroll Oper » , in Berlin, in the very year that most of these recordings were set-down and remaining in that post until 1931, Klemperer famously outraged the Nazi Party's cultural pan-jandrums by focusing on works by such culturally (and often racially) suspect composers as Paul Hindemith (« Neues vom Tage » , 1929) ; Arnold Schönberg (« Begleitmusik zu einer Lichtspielszene » , 1930) and Kurt Weill.

And yet, the Brahms and Wagner recordings, expertly restored to fine effect by Mark Obert-Thorn, show him to have been, at the same time, an entirely sympathetic and often quite surprisingly flexible interpreter of such late- 19th Century Romantic repertoire.

From the very opening of the Brahms Symphony, we are in for a surprise, for the timpanist's strokes (far from driving all before them in the usual relentless and dominating fashion) are, while remaining the music's key propulsive driver, far more integrated into the full orchestral mix than we generally expect.

Of course, it might be argued that a single such instance might well be due to the inadequacies of late- 1920's recording technology. (Even though, modern restoration techniques have shown conclusively that many surviving masters have far more detail embedded in them than used to be assumed.) But further listening reveals that the C minor Symphony's opening is of an exact pattern with Klemperer's conception of the whole work, with showy dramatics consistently eschewed in favour of lightness of touch, frequent fleetness of foot (especially, in the Finale) and orchestral transparency that allows the score's finer detail to shine through. And what lovingly-presented detail there is ! Just listen, for instance, to the sweetly seductive solo violin in the slow movement (from about 6 min 56 sec onwards) , « gemütlich » almost in the manner of a Viennese « café » player and making a noticeably more striking contribution than usual.

This is, in fact, an interpretation which might be said to draw-out the similarities to Brahms's 2nd Symphony, rather than following the usual practice of emphasising the contrasts : Klemperer revealed not as granite, but as chalk. The performance of the « Academic Festival Overture » exhibits many of the same qualities. This is a piece that can easily sound somewhat episodic, but Klemperer moulds its various elements together into a coherent and musically convincing whole in which, for once, « Gaudeamus Igitur » does not sound like it has simply been tacked onto the end for dramatic effect.

The « Tristan » Prelude is something of a disappointment - but only compared to the exceptional music-making found on this disc's other tracks. Though just as well-played, here, Klemperer's interpretation lacks individuality. The recording

by the same Orchestra under the much-underrated Max von Schillings, also made in 1927 (and available on « Preiser », Mono 90267) , is, to my ears, a far more involving experience.

That leaves us with an exquisitely shaped, well-balanced and beautifully paced performance of the « Siegfried Idyll » that not only demonstrates, once again, Klemperer's fine musicianship but also showcases the Berlin Orchestra's qualities to perfection.

Today, we tend to remember the Weimar Republic's more avant-garde contributions to the arts. This disc performs an important function of reminding us that, even in an era marked by prolonged economic crisis and political instability, the German musical tradition was still being maintained at the highest levels. Indeed, having listened to this disc, many might argue that such superb and responsive musicianship puts to shame a good number of well-known Orchestras making recordings today.

Banquet for Berlin bibliophiles at the « Kroll Oper » (1932)

The book lovers' and collectors' Societies that began to appear in Germany, at the end of the 19th Century, were based on groups that had been established earlier, in England and France. The German Societies attracted book-lovers and collectors from the professions and academia, as well as from publishing houses and the antiquarian book trade. The group known as « Berlin Bibliophile Evening » was founded, in 1905, by Fedor von Zopeltitz, one of the original members of the Weimar Bibliophiles group. German bibliophilic Societies had a substantial and active Jewish membership. Of the 300 members of the « Berliner Bibliophilen-Abend » , between 1905 and 1930, 75 were Jewish.

Victor Klemperer

Victor Klemperer (1881-1960) , the cousin of Otto Klemperer, was Professor of French Literature at the Dresden University. As a Jew, he was removed from his University post, in 1935, only surviving thanks to his marriage to an Aryan. Ist published in 1957, « The Language of the 3rd " Reich " » arose from Klemperer's conviction that the language of the 3rd « Reich » helped to create its culture. As Klemperer writes :

« It isn't only Nazi actions that have to vanish, but also the Nazi cast of mind, the typical Nazi way of thinking, and its breeding ground : the language of Nazism. »

...

The building of the « Kroll Oper » stood empty for nearly 2 years, until the « Reichstag » fire, on 27 February 1933, severely damaged the « Reichstag » building « vis-à-vis » . After the German federal election, on 5 March 1933, the « Kroll Oper » became the seat of the « Reichstag » parliament, by then a puppet legislature under the control of the Nazi Party. It was chosen both because of its convenient location and for its seating capacity. On 23 March 1933, the majority of the « Reichstag » delegates in the « Kroll » Opera House disempowered themselves passing the « Enabling Act » that gave Adolf Hitler virtually unlimited authority. At this time, the elected MPs of the Communist

Party and several Social-Democrats were already in hiding or arrested. After the election, on 12 November 1933, the Nazis occupied all the seats.

The main hall of the « Kroll Oper » was used for sittings of the « Reichstag » throughout the Nazi regime, nevertheless, the deputies did, in no way, act as a parliament and met intermittently only to serve as the audience of Hitler's set piece speeches. It was here that Hitler made a speech, on 30 January 1939, of his plans for the Holocaust :

« If the international Jewish financiers, in and outside Europe, should succeed in plunging the nations once more into a World War, then the result will not be the Bolshevizing of the earth, and thus the victory of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe. »

The last session of the « Reichstag » was held in the « Kroll » Opera House, on 26 April 1942, passing a decree proclaiming Hitler Supreme Judge of the German People allowing him to override the judiciary and administration in all matters. In these last days, the building, once again, was the site of several performances of the Berlin State Opera, after the Opera House « Unter den Linden » had been damaged by air raids. However, the « Kroll Oper » itself was devastated by a RAF Bomber Command attack, on 22 November 1943. It was further damaged, in the last days of World War II, when forces of the Red Army stormed the « Reichstag » ruin. Bombing destroyed both the « Staatsoper » and the « Deutsches Oper », which both moved into the « Admiralpalast », in the Russian Sector, for the duration. After the War, the « Staatsoper » stayed there while the « Deutsches Oper » moved to the British Sector. Ernest Legal, formerly of the « Kroll Oper », took-over the « Staatsoper ». As a matter of prestige, the East German authorities rebuilt the « Theater Unter den Linden », opening it in 1955.

Already after the War, in the summer of 1945, a restaurant re-opened in the gardens of the « Kroll Établissement », keeping-up business even after the remains of the main building were demolished on March 27th, 1951. The « Kroll Garten Inn » finally closed in 1956 and, 1 year later, the last premises were cleared to make place for the erection of the audacious design of the new « Berlin Kongreßhalle » by the American architect, Hugh Stubbins Junior. The exact site of the « Kroll Oper » is nothing but a large lawn, south of the « Bundeskanzleramt » (and near the Carillon tower, donated by Daimler-Benz) , marked by a memorial plaque since 2007.

The « Berlin Kongreßhalle » (« Haus der Kulturen der Welt »)

The « Haus der Kulturen der Welt » (or House of the Cultures of the World) is Germany's national centre for contemporary non-European art. It presents art exhibitions, theatre and dance performances, concerts, author readings, films and academic conferences on non-European Visual Art and culture. It is one of the few institutions which, due to their national and international standing and the quality of their work, receive funding from the Federal government as so-called Lighthouses of culture. The building is located in the « Tiergarten » park and it is a direct neighbour of the Carillon and the new German Chancellery. It was formerly known as the « Berlin Kongreßhalle » conference hall, a gift from the United States, designed in 1957 by the American architect Hugh Stubbins, Junior, as a part of the « Interbau » exhibition. President John F. Kennedy spoke there during his June 1963 visit to West-Berlin. On May 21,

1980, the roof collapsed killing 1 and injuring numerous people. The hall has been rebuilt in its original style and re-opened in 1987, at the 750 years Jubilee of the City of Berlin. To Berliners, it is also known as the « Schwangere Auster » (the Pregnant Oyster) .

The « Tiergarten » Carillon Tower

The Carillon Tower is located in a free standing tower, next to the House of World Cultures (« Haus der Kulturen der Welt ») , near the « Reichstag » in the north-eastern part of Berlin's central « Tiergarten » park. The concrete structure of the tower of 42 meters high is coated with black granite stone. Its roof is trough shaped. Several architects contributed to the design. Among them, Axel Schultes. It was inaugurated on 27 October 1987, on the 750th anniversary of the City of Berlin, as a memorial to the carillons in the « Parochialkirche » and the « Garnisonkirche » in Potsdam, which were both destroyed in the Second World War. It was funded by Daimler-Benz AG, manufacturer of Mercedes' cars.

The carillon is a large, manually played concert instrument, comprising 68 bells weighing a total of 48 metric tonnes (almost 106,000 lbs.) connected to a keyboard spanning 5½ fully chromatic octaves ; the largest bell weighs 7.8 tons (almost 17,200 lbs.) . The carillon was cast by Royal Dutch foundry, Eijsbouts, according to the specifications of American « carillonneur » , Jeffrey Bossin who has since been giving concerts on the carillon. There are also special concerts with other well-known players. The world's leading composers and virtuosos of bell tower music are annually gathered for the international Festival marking the Pentecost. It is one of the largest instruments of its kind in Europe and, approximately, the 4th largest (by number of bells) in the world. The « carillonneur » sits in a playing cabin, in the middle of the bells, and plays with his fists and feet on a baton-and-pedal keyboard. The purely mechanical action makes it possible to play all dynamic gradations, from very soft to very loud. But the carillon also plays computer-controlled pieces, at 12 noon and 6 pm, daily.

The Dream of a National Theatre : German Civic Culture and The History of the « Kroll » Idea

The Public and the Private : Art and Urban Culture

This article will explore the idea of the national theatre and its roots in pre-1914 Berlin. The complex relationship between private and public deserves more attention, specifically, in the context of the city. Paul Nolte mentions the dearth of regional studies that would clarify the relationship between « elite » culture and « Volkskultur » , and relate both to civic identity. (1) More challenges are needed to counter the idea that, once the « Bürger » had established themselves as a clearly delineated class or socio-economic group, only the private and domestic realm nourished artistic culture. This line of argument reproduces the Habermasian line, in which, as the public sphere evolved, it paradoxically led to a new kind of privacy.

Court and private theatres in Berlin did not measure-up to ideals of the national theatre which gained currency as a result of the Revolution of 1848. At the same time, the proposed national theatre was envisioned as something which would combine the best aspects of both - it would present works of high-artistic quality, and it would be available

and open to all. The « Kroll idea » championed by Otto Klemperer and Hans Curjel, in the 1920's, had roots in the 1840's, as calls for a more Liberal Germany became fused with demands for a different type of theatre. Within this framework, Operas became an increasingly important subject of cultural debate, especially after Richard Wagner's contribution to the national theatre conversation in « The Art Work of the Future » . (2)

Wagner was concerned with establishing Opera, or « music-drama » , as he termed it, within the framework of the national theatre debate. The central importance of music in the construction of a German national identity has recently received much attention from scholars. (3) Theatre has also been recognized as crucial for the development of national consciousness in Germany - and, more specifically, a democratic national consciousness. As Rainer Lepsius has described, the 19th Century concept of the « Bildungstheater » :

« The program of the “ Bildungstheater ” was developed not in a socially narrow sense or aimed affirmatively at a specific class, but for the entire people. » (4)

Even though theatre was usually not understood as political, the popular view that it represented an escape from political reality is mistaken. (5) This article will relate theatre, and especially Opera, to the notion of a civic culture bound-up with and indeed dependent on artistic expression.

This idea took the form of a « national theatre » . Calls for a national theatre accompanied every move toward Liberalism and democracy in Germany, starting with the period immediately following the French Revolution and Germany's attempt to establish its own culture. (6) We will examine the 19th Century roots of the national theatre, focusing on a key-text : Eduard Devrient's « The National Theatre of the New Germany » . We will trace the development of this idea, up to the beginning of the First World War. In the development of the civic culture of Berlin, « Kroll » 's Winter Garden, built in 1844, played a crucial role. Founded as a private theatre and « establishment » , it later became a Court Theatre, in 1896, under Kaiser Wilhelm II. It can, thus, serve as an illustration of both types of theatre and what they meant for Berlin culture at the turn of the 20th Century.

Finally, between 1908 and 1914, conservative politicians developed ambitious plans for the « Kroll » . It was to be the site of a vast new Opera House which would replace the traditional representative house located on « Unter den Linden » . The older building, designed by Georg Wenceslaus von Knobelsdorff, in 1742, was perceived to be no longer compatible with the needs of the regime. However, the outbreak of the First World War left the « Kroll » 's very existence in question. In 1918, the building was a partially demolished ruin. The intervention of Germany's 1st theatre-goers' organization, the Berlin « Volksbühne » , began the « Kroll » 's association with the practice known as « soziale Kunstpflege » , or providing high-culture to lower-income people at reduced prices. The history of the « Kroll » , as an institution of Berlin civic culture, is, however, much older.

Eduard Devrient and the German National Theatre

The most important inspiration for Weimar era attempts to expand civic culture was Eduard Devrient's « The National Theatre of the New Germany » . The author (1801-1877) was the nephew of the noted actor Ludwig Devrient. He was,

himself, an actor, a singer and, eventually, the director of the Court Theatre in Karlsruhe (1844-1846). After a fire, in 1847, the theatre did not re-open until 1853. As a result of censorship imposed after the Revolution of 1848, the theatre was unable to regain its former reputation and could not serve as an example of Devrient's vision, which he first outlined in 1849.

Devrient called for a complete restructuring of the theatre. He was clearly inspired by Friedrich Schiller's « On the Aesthetic Education of Man », which he refers to explicitly, but some of his ideas concerning theatre and morality also show the influence of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's writings on theatre in his « Hamburgische Dramaturgie ». Lessing had been instrumental in promoting Hamburg's National Theatre, founded in 1766, which was « the first serious attempt to provide a German theatrical company with a fixed abode and, at the same time, to introduce a new system of management ». (7) Lessing wrote a series of articles on its performances, which were apparently of very high-quality but could not appeal to the general public. The national theatre in Hamburg was, therefore, short-lived and closed its doors in November 1768.

Lessing's most important feature for Devrient's later argument is his position that theatre and actors are vitally important for national character.

In fact, he argues, theatre ought to be « the school of the moral world ». (8) The ability of actors to arouse empathy had important implications for the structure of society because theatre revealed human traits which were potentially universal :

« In the theatre, we should not learn what this or that person did, but rather what every person of a certain character would do under certain circumstances. » (9)

Even comedy had a moral purpose because it exposed the ridiculous nature of some social conventions. (10)

Lessing took the position that certain emotions, such as fear, were profoundly democratic. Any person might feel such emotions. In this, Lessing relied on Aristotle's theory of catharsis, but re-interpreted it as follows :

« If Aristotle had simply wanted to teach us which passions tragedy can and should excite, he could have spared himself the addition of fear. But he also wanted to teach us which passions could be cleansed in us through those excited by the tragedy ; and, in this context, he had to pay special attention to fear. » (11)

Through the persona of Shakespeare's Richard III, Lessing explores this theory. Why does the protagonist arouse interest, even identification ? Perhaps, because he appeals to the latent emotions of the audience. The audience is, according to Lessing, ambivalent concerning the results of Richard III's actions. This is because they identify with him emotionally, if not morally. Thus, the response to theatre is a mixture of the rational and the emotional. Drama was uniquely suited to unite a national audience because it had the potential to arouse empathy. (12) Thus, the example set by the ancient Greeks and Romans, who had profoundly identified with their theatre, should be emulated in Germany. While many people believed that the French had a true national theatre and that the Germans should

imitate their example, Lessing disagreed. He found French theatre emotionally hollow. (13)

The only advantage France had was that it was already a unified nation. Was it possible to speak of a German theatre culture when there was no one German nation ? The problem did not consist merely in the fact that political unity was an elusive goal. Germans also lacked self-confidence in their culture and a sense of national character :

« One could almost say that this (the national character) consists in not wanting to have one. » (14)

Devrient clearly wanted to change this situation and create a broader basis for German theatre culture. Court theatres, he claimed, had originally set a good example, but « their present appearance does not express their original idea » . (15) After 1815, the monarch could no longer be said to represent the will of the nation. In the realm of theatre, he chose « Intendanten » who were merely Court personalities and did not necessarily have theatrical interests. In a Republic, however, State subsidies would not be counter-productive. They would, in fact, be absolutely necessary :

« Everything which educates and ennobles humanity must be supported by the State, made independent of mere commerce. » (16)

The reform of theatre had to be a national issue and could not be left to individual German States. In Devrient's day, theatre in Prussia, his own State, was under the control of the Ministry of the Interior and was subject to censorship. He demanded that it be placed under the control of the Ministry of Culture. Further, a « Direktion » (directing board) should be established, made-up of the artistic personnel. They would choose the most qualified person to direct the theatre, subject to the approval of the ministry.

In Devrient's view, there was a natural harmony between theatre and Republican institutions :

« The nature of the dramatic art is the most perfect socialization (" Vergesellschaftung ") of all, yet, it still preserves the unique nature of the individual. It demands that the individual find the satisfaction of his own desires in the satisfaction of the general good. The art of acting, therefore, requires Republican virtue in its full strength. » (17)

Further, he contended, theatre should also represent a future Republic :

« Every important date for the nation should be celebrated with an appropriate performance and, thus, gain the sympathy of the present-day. The most important events of the day should also find expression on the national stage. » (18)

In addition to the ideas of Schiller and Lessing, it is not difficult to see the influence of French revolutionary views of theatre and spectacle, particularly the notion of « Republican virtue » . (19) Devrient's vision was, however, primarily a reaction against what he perceived as excessive foreign influence on German culture. In Vienna and Berlin, he claimed, the theatres were already too specialized. This specialization would vanish in the age of the national theatre, which would be composed of 3 branches :

« Clearly, at least until these 3 theatres can consolidate themselves, all other theatres in Berlin must be closed, and Italian Opera and French plays must be forbidden. One must inspire the theatre and the public, both spiritually and ideally, to support a truly national theatre before one can expose them to tempting and distracting rivalry. » (20)

The national theatre, or at least this version of it, was never fully realized. Devrient's ideas, nevertheless, had a significant impact on thinking about theatre after 1848. Their influence remained strong after the First World War, when the German actors' Union republished his work with a preface explaining that this was what theatrical personnel expected from the new Weimar Republic. Devrient influenced primarily those on the political Left. This was due to his suspicion of capitalism and private theatres run for a profit. In Berlin, the latter was certainly dominant at the time he wrote the appeal for a national theatre. It was in the context of private entrepreneurship that « Kroll's Establishment » 1st emerged.

The Origins of the « Kroll » Opera

The history of the « Kroll » Opera has been related before, but seldom in the context of Berlin theatre as a whole. (21) Joseph Kroll, a Breslau « restaurateur », obtained permission from Friedrich Wilhelm IV to build a restaurant with a garden and a space for concerts and other musical performances. The « Establishment », as it was then called, opened on February 15, 1844. It was intended « to offer the educated public of Berlin a place to relax », via concerts, balls and other entertainment suited to « the good taste of the present-day. » (22) A masked ball followed 2 days after the official opening. (23) Lectures and patriotic Festivals were also featured. The building's location, in the « Tiergarten » district, or what was then called the « Exerzierplatz », unfortunately proved a problem. Kroll died and left the establishment to his daughter, Auguste, before a plan could be made concerning the rather remote location. (24)

In 1848-1849, the number of theatres in Berlin was growing and, therefore, the « Kroll » faced increased competition. Shortly after the Revolution of 1848, numerous summer theatres were established, but Auguste Kroll had more in mind for her own theatre than light entertainment. She planned to present Operas instead of the usual summer fare, and received permission from the police president to present Operas in 1850. (25) A fire, in 1851, was not a serious setback and the « Kroll » re-opened the following year.

Auguste Kroll's plan to have high-culture performed at the « Kroll » was unusual, as Opera was an art-form generally reserved for Court theatres. The « Kroll » had, in fact, developed into the archetypal popular theatre (« volkstümliches Theater ») which performed neither Opera nor the German Classics, but rather light entertainment such as vaudeville and Operetta. The relaxation of theatre censorship, after 1850, led to a situation in which « a drama developed which took political and social conditions as its subject ». (26) Not until 1865 did private theatres get permission to perform the Classics. By then, however, the privately owned « Kroll » had long been competing successfully with the Court theatres. Private theatres were originally supposed to ensure the financial survival of their attached restaurants or beer-gardens. In time, this situation reversed itself. The patrons of private theatres had a notably relaxed and participatory attitude towards the theatrical performances they saw. As Ruth Freydank has noted :

« The relationship of theatres to the public was marked, in those years, by direct contact, by enthusiastic activity and by the participation of the audience in the form of calls and interjections, unified singing, its own performances and open demonstrations of approval or disapproval. » (27)

Such activities were not regarded as contrary to decorum. The difference in atmosphere between private theatres and Court theatres may be grasped when one considers the fact that Court theatres did not perceive themselves as open to the wishes of the general public. In fact, only in 1904, was the audience at the « Linden » Opera officially allowed to cheer and boo despite the presence of the Court. (28) A popular theatre was a different matter :

« Here, the little-man had the chance and the right to be himself. » (29)

Such theatres were, however, primarily profit-making operations, which worried those who stuck to Eduard Devrient's vision of the theatre. Especially after the « Gewerbeordnung » of 1869, many new theatres were built. In the early days of a united Germany, after 1870, most politicians did not take theatre seriously as a political institution. Those on the Left, primarily the Social-Democratic Party (SPD) thought differently. They feared the corruption of the public through mass-entertainment. After the Party's legalization, in 1890, it was a major voice in the debate about what theatre should represent and what role it should play. The situation in Berlin was especially complicated. The problem of creating a democratic theatre culture was more acute because Berlin had no City - State tradition, but had always been the capital of the State of Prussia. In the new unified Germany, the city was under pressure to represent the entire nation.

« Kulturtheater » in the Wilhelmine Era and the Origins of the « Freie Volksbühne »

The concept of a cultural theatre (« Kulturtheater ») was wide-spread in the years after 1870. The SPD's understanding of this word was uncomplicated and nonetheless utopian. It meant theatre removed from the demands of the market. However, Wilhelm II also tended to pay lip service to this concept, because he viewed himself as a protector of the arts. He explained his position in the following terms :

« To declare a theatrical production as a commercial item to be sold to the public every evening means giving-up its function as an artistic institution. » (30)

The « Kaiser » 's views led him to interfere constantly in Court theatre, so that it became less and less representative of what the public actually wanted. Thus, both artistic reform and economic reform were pressing issues in the Wilhelmine era, but they were handled in very different ways.

Unification led to a clear change in the position of Berlin. The city's culture was now expected to be the showpiece of the nation, instead of merely the Court or of private citizens. Competing concepts of « Kulturtheater » illustrate the various ways in which Berlin faced the challenge of representing national culture. The expansion of the city, after 1870, and the emergence of a large urban working-class, brought social issues to the foreground. Was access to culture, in

fact, one of these social issues and an additional sign of working-class deprivation ?

The underground cultural activities of the SPD had sustained its political mission. After 1890, this interest in cultural issues continued. The call for a popular theatre, in a new sense of the word, found support among working-class activists and those who sympathized with them. Because the working-class lacked access to most theatres, a popular theatre intended exclusively for them was an idea whose time had come. The « Freie Bühne » , a largely middle-class organization which supported modern drama, was the inspiration for a similar working-class movement. (31) The « Freie Bühne » had been especially successful in promoting the literary movement known as naturalism. Many Left-wing intellectuals, especially the journalist Bruno Wille, called for a working-class equivalent as the best way of making-up workers' deficit in « Bildung » .

Over 2,000 people appeared for the founding meeting, in July 1890. (32) From the beginning, the political goals of the « Freie Volksbühne » , as it was called, were a source of controversy. The organization was never formally subject to the SPD, but always maintained close ties to it. Some members believed that the « Freie Volksbühne » should, in fact, serve as the cultural arm of the Party. Conflict within the SPD over whether to use revolutionary or reformist tactics were mirrored in the development of the « Freie Volksbühne » . This conflict led the organization to split in 1892, as Wille and his followers left to form the « Neue Freie Volksbühne » . Despite their differences, both organizations were regarded as political and, therefore, dangerous to the State. (33)

The expulsion of Wille and his followers on political grounds meant that a vocal opposition favored the idea of explicitly political theatre. (34) Wille, the middle-class son of an insurance inspector, was more concerned with acquainting the workers with traditional « Bildung » . Naturalism was important to him not for its social criticism but because of its artistic quality. The break-up of the original « Freie Volksbühne » did not, however, produce a new age of political theatre. Indeed, it was unclear what sort of drama would be appropriate for this purpose. Naturalism never became the official art of the proletariat, doubtless due to the difficulties of conceiving a well-articulated concept of proletarian culture. (35)

Increasing police harassment led the original « Freie Volksbühne » to re-organize itself along different lines, in 1897. Instead of becoming the literary organization of the working-class, « it encouraged the public taste for dramatic art » . (36) The growth of membership was relatively slow. It reached 6,000 by 1892 ; and 7,600 by 1894. Workers were also joined by many former members of the « Freie Bühne » , which had never had its own theatre. Renting a theatre was a considerable problem for the « Freie Volksbühne » as well. Eventually, they persuaded the « Lessing-Theater » to open its doors for Sunday afternoon performances. These were an absolutely new phenomenon at the time, clearly geared to the needs of workers who, otherwise, had to contend with a 10 hour work-day. (37)

Concerning the behavior of the public in the theatre, it had to learn certain norms. Women frequently did not remove their hats, and men brought beer to the theatre. Once the public was more experienced, however, they showed little desire for theatrical productions that would remind them of their everyday lives. For some later figures on the Left, this represented a far more serious problem. Heinz Selow commented in 1930, that :

« The Social-Democratic worker forgot his political tendencies completely in the theatre - if he was not reminded of them. » (38)

An exclusively political conception of the « Freie Volksbühne » 's role is, however, too narrow. If art as a goal in itself was a major concern of the ordinary people who attended a performance, this did not negatively impact their class-consciousness. Some accounts of the « Volksbühne » 's history have blamed leaders and membership alike for having a « naïve » attitude towards the theatre. (39) Likewise, the fact that workers and the middle-class sat together in the theatre is, according to some commentators, evidence of the latter's undue influence rather than a positive attribute of civic culture. (40) Struggles over the political character of the « Volksbühne » became even more intense during the Weimar era. The fundamental issues at stake, however, remained essentially the same from the 1890's on.

Rather than relying on a dubious concept of proletarian art, which has never been well-articulated, historians ought to take seriously the mission of the « Volksbühne » , as it evolved during the 1890's :

« The “ Volksbühne ” chapters saw themselves as the legitimate heirs and guardians of a theatre culture which had originated with the “ Bürgertum ” and had flourished there ; but it had not been further developed or even preserved by this class, so that it needed a new social and organizational base. » (41)

The æsthetic and political priorities of the « Volksbühne » did, however, have to be re-adjusted when it came to the issue of Opera. The movement for æsthetic reform of Opera initially had nothing to do with the expansion of « Bildung » . Thus, access to Opera performances became a political issue later than was the case with spoken theatre. Naturalism, in the minds of many adherents, had a direct link to the socialist movement. Thus, the demand for a type of theatre which was not often performed elsewhere was tied to the demand for political emancipation. Opera, by contrast, was anything but avant-garde in the 1890's, especially not in Berlin.

Æsthetic Reform of Opera

Members of the « Volksbühne » actually had the opportunity to see Opera performances, as early as 1896. In order to do this, however, they had to rent-out various different venues around the city. This involved considerable effort and expense. The « Linden » Opera remained artistically stagnant well into the 20th Century. The tastes of « Kaiser » Wilhelm II essentially determined what would be performed, there. His « Intendant » , Georg von Hülsen-Hæseler, followed in the tradition of his predecessors and took no chances with anything which might possibly cause controversy. Berlin had shown great resistance to performing the works of Richard Wagner, long after the composer had been accepted elsewhere in Germany. (42) Notable examples of von Hülsen's attitude included his insistence, in 1911, that certain suggestive passages of Richard Strauß's « Der Rosenkavalier » be toned-down. « Kaiserin » Auguste Viktoria apparently took offense at the fact that the Opera opens with a bedroom scene, and Strauß commented that an aristocrat, such as von Hülsen, could not stand to see aristocratic characters behaving the way they often did in real life, engaging in adultery and fathering illegitimate children. (43)

The æsthetic and cultural short-comings of the « Linden » Opera were noticeable to perceptive critics. In the journal

« Die Schaubühne » , Walter Reiß mocked a 1905 production of Wagner's « Die Walküre » for its lack of realistic detail. For example, the character of Siegmund, who is supposed to be seeking shelter from a storm, appeared on stage with perfect hair and clean clothes. The audience only tolerated this, Reiß suggested, because the Orchestra and the singers maintained the highest-standards. (44) Nevertheless, he suggested, there was room for a 2nd opera in Berlin to make-up for the « Linden » Opera's deficits.

Hans Gregor and the « Komische Oper » , 1905-1911

Ironically, for someone who did not produce the works of Wagner, the conductor Hans Gregor considered Opera, « music-drama » . That is, he aimed to make theatrical standards as high as musical ones. Some contemporaries believed he went too far in the theatrical direction. A short « Schaubühne » piece which poked fun at prominent theatrical figures in Berlin featured a Gregor character dismissing the leading lights of the « Linden » Opera with these words :

« Oh, there you go again with your music. » (45)

Gregor arrived from Elberfeld at a time when the Court had Opera in a stranglehold. His concept for a new Opera was revolutionary in that he refused all subsidies. This meant that he could not offer affordable seats. His public was made-up of essentially the same people who would have patronized the « Linden » Opera were it not for the latter's tired and old-fashioned repertory. (46) The « Komische Oper » , which opened in 1905, presented itself as a supplement to the larger house, performing works which had previously been over-looked in Berlin. Some interpreted these works as « those which, perhaps, can best be appreciated by somewhat æsthetically jaded gourmets » . (47)

Gregor wanted to steer his audience away from the accepted German canon. Non-German works were far less popular before 1914 than they would later become. Nonetheless, it is astonishing that the « Linden » Opera passed-over so many Operas which have proven to be of lasting popularity. The works of Giacomo Puccini, now considered the bread and butter of most standard Opera Houses, were missing from its repertory. The « Komische Oper » made-up this deficit by productions of « La Bohème » and « Tosca » . The latter was performed in the 1906-1907 season for the 1st time in Berlin. Apparently, it had been considered too shocking and radical. (48)

French and Italian Opera played a significant role in the « Komische Oper » 's repertory. In addition to Puccini, Gregor premiered Claude Debussy's « Pelléas et Mélisande » in Berlin, as well as several 19th Century French Operas. Gregor was not only unwilling to take on Wagner ; he also lacked the space to do so. From the beginning, he was cursed with an « almost impossible » house. (49) The building on the « Weidendämmer Brücke » was cramped and the acoustics were unsatisfactory. The need for new costumes and singers and for sufficient rehearsal time raised costs enormously. Although critics praised him, Gregor could not fill the House. The gap between his artistic goals and his means led to the closing of the « Komische Oper » , in 1911. (50) The moral of the story appeared to be that, privately financed, Operas could not survive. The citizens of Charlottenburg, at the time a city independent of Berlin, had made their own attempt at privately financed Opera but, in 1912, they also closed. It was clear that they could not sustain the project. The integration of Opera into the project of a national theatre, nevertheless, had a long way to go.

« Kaiser » Wilhelm II did not lack interest in such a project. Notably, however, he expressed himself as follows on the question of theatre :

« I was convinced, and had adopted it as my task, that the Royal Theatre should be a tool of the monarch, just like schools and Universities, which have the task of educating and preparing the next generation to work for the preservation of the spiritual treasures of our splendid German fatherland. The theatre is also one of my weapons. » (51)

Between the ideology of the monarchy, which saw theatre as a means of propaganda for the status quo, and the alternative of a theatre purely for profit, stood the concept of « Kulturtheater » . In 1911, Max Epstein's « Das Theater als Geschäft » had claimed to show that most theatres could survive entirely without subsidies. (52) Proponents of « Kulturtheater » believed that this proposition might be true for theatre which appealed to the lowest -common denominator, but the artistic function of the theatre and that which made it a part of « Bildung » would, thereby, be lost.

The « Volksbühne » , according to future theatre referent Ludwig Seelig, was an example of « Kulturtheater » , but it was a model which ought to be more broadly instituted in German society. (53) It was inextricably bound-up with class struggle, not only because for-profit theatres exploited actors, but also because they offered the public the most undemanding and frivolous art. Seelig expressed himself on this issue as follows :

« The artistically worthless Operetta, farce and tear-jerker of the most sentimental kind command the field. Serious art does not appeal to the public ; at least, not in the way it is presented by commercial theatre. » (54)

Opera, while prestigious, was often under-rehearsed, and the Court theatres which presented it were not suitable models. They wasted money on luxuries and had to make-up for this through imitation of commercial theatres. (55)

Devrient and Wagner were Seelig's inspiration for his idea of theatre which, in his opinion, should be subject directly to cities and States. In 1913, the time of his manifesto, the only theatre directly controlled by a local government was Mannheim's, which had attained communal status as early as 1839. Mannheim also had a theatre constitution, like Vienna's « Burgtheater » and some French State theatres. (56) Importantly, Seelig anticipated many of Otto Klemperer's ideas in his concept for the « Kroll » Opera. He asserted that an ensemble and adequate rehearsal time would benefit both, actors and the public.

One thing Seelig did not anticipate, however, was Klemperer's attitude toward the public. In his view, the theatre should work to promote culture among the downtrodden :

« Today, when the machine threatens to make man himself into a work machine, the treadmill of everyday life which degrades him, the exaltation of the soul to eternal spiritual values is a more urgent problem than ever. » (57)

The « theatre of the people » was the wave of the future. Once theatre ceased to be the sole property of the rich, claimed Seelig, it would lead to social peace and to a reduction in class-conflict. (58)

In retrospect, of course, this seems a dangerous illusion. Class-conflict could certainly not be solved by cultural means alone. However, the attachment of the working-class to high-culture was a real phenomenon which challenged the notion that « Bildung » was only for the privileged few. Thus, the SPD was correct to promote the goal of universal « Bildung » .

The Party was, in fact, the most vocal defender of civic culture. As Liberals abandoned the idea, it became increasingly centered on the arts but artistic culture had always been a main focus in any case. At the turn of the 20th Century, « Bildung » was, indeed, on the defensive because it was so clearly unrepresentative. (59) As an ideal, the Wagnerian project remained powerful, but in the Wilhelmine era, as Wagner became respectable, his works and ideas were increasingly associated with elite culture.

Opportunities for workers were, however, not limited to the « Freie Volksbühne » and the « Neue Freie Volksbühne » . Beginning in the winter of 1907, the « Königliche Bühnen » offered « people's performances » for lower-prices. Both plays and Opera were presented, but the total amounted to 10 productions attended by 1,560 people each. (60) This was insufficient, as demand was much greater than this. The Court theatre system was not suited to the workers' demands, and Wilhelm II's plans for a new representative Operatic culture were intended primarily for his own glorification.

The Plan for a New Opera House, 1908-1914

The competition to build the projected new Opera House went through 3 different stages, that is to say 3 different architectural competitions. (61) Ultimately, nothing was decided. The new House was to have been built on the former site of the « Kroll » Opera, but the latter was rebuilt whereas the plans for a new representative Opera were shelved. The « Linden » Opera, due to historical circumstances, remained the main representative House.

The debates surrounding the plans and financing of a new Opera are, nonetheless, crucial for what they reveal about cultural attitudes in the years directly before the First World War. The issue of the new Opera was first debated in Prussia's House of Deputies, beginning in March 1908. The issues were twofold. The « Linden » Opera was widely acknowledged to be inadequate in terms of fire safety. (62) Several deputies, therefore, proposed addressing the safety situation by converting the House into a site for scholarly meetings and conferences. At the same time, a new House would be built on the former site of the « Kroll » which would comply with contemporary architectural standards. However, it was not only these practical details which occupied the deputies' time. A change in the notion of Opera culture itself was clearly in the air. The new Opera, the deputies insisted, could not be a mere elite institution.

The SPD and the National Theatre

A somewhat surprising source played a prominent role in the debates over the future of Berlin Opera. Social-

Democratic deputy, Karl Liebknecht, said that he supported the idea of a new Opera, although he felt that the city of Berlin should not help to cover the costs. However, he stated that the architectural designs presented, thus far, fell short of what the city and the population of Berlin needed. The task of building what was specifically understood to be a Court opera was impractical, as Liebknecht proclaimed in a 1913 speech in the House of Deputies :

« Through this problem of the Court theatre which is, at the same time, supposed to be a theatre of the people (because the Court cannot fill the theatre, it cannot even maintain the theatre or, at least, does not want to maintain it) , the issue acquires a stark inner-contradiction. » (63)

The theatre designs presented were not satisfactory, because they did not take into account the technical complications involved in building a modern theatre.

Liebknecht also expressed his concern about the high-priority accorded to the Opera as a project. He conceded that the city did have æsthetic and cultural responsibilities to its population :

« But the Royal Opera House will unfortunately not be an institution for the great mass of the people. We will get a theatre exactly like the current Royal Opera House, for the top 10,000 with extremely expensive seats. » (64)

Under such circumstances, the city of Berlin did not even have the right to pay for such a project. (65) Liebknecht, nonetheless, supported the project, at least theoretically :

« By this, I do not mean that all of us have no interest in the building of the Opera House, in spite of its Court theatre character, in spite of its socially exclusive character. But this is not the task of the city of Berlin. » (66)

However, he did not suggest who should fund the new Opera, having already stated that the Court was unwilling to do so. Liebknecht went on to criticize other political Parties for their cavalier attitude to the future of the « Linden » Opera :

« Gentlemen, it would perhaps not offend your æsthetic sensibilities if we suggested that the Berlin police headquarters be moved into the Royal Opera House. » (67)

The SPD was certainly trying to have it both ways. It would support cultural endeavors, but insist that the city of Berlin not be forced to pay for them. After the Revolution of 1918 and the transition to a Republican Germany, the Party's position changed along with political circumstances. Yet, even before the War, Liebknecht foresaw a future for representative German culture which would transcend its connection with the monarchy. The building as such was not something his Party opposed. 4 years later, he stated that even if the submitted designs were all related to the traditional concept of a Court Opera, « We nevertheless feel that the kind of luxury building the Opera House will represent is not solely for this reason a disadvantage or something to be condemned » . (68) The costs did, however, stand-out in view of the fact that Prussia and the « Reich » were less and less willing to spend money for social welfare. (69) Liebknecht demanded change in the area of cultural policy :

« I have repeatedly explained that Social-Democracy can only approve this building under the condition and the expectation that the government and the management of the Opera House fulfill their obligations to the mass of the population and not simply to the Court or to the upper 10,000. » (70)

Ticket prices especially ought to be within the reach of the average Berliner. If this were to become a reality, representative culture could still have a future :

« If an Opera House like this one is built, it will not be built only for a few years, but for generations, and we have the hope and the firm conviction that this House will still be standing at a time when it has lost the character of a Court Opera House, when it will be a people's Opera House, and where the splendid space will serve the general public, the people. » (71)

At this point, the record shows that Liebknecht was cheered by his own Party and called to order by the president of the House of Deputies. Clearly, what the president perceived him to be saying, and what he probably intended to say, was that, sometime, in the foreseeable future, there would be no Court to deal with. Indeed, Liebknecht went on to quip that :

« A gentleman from the Right called to me that he had a better image of the revolution than I do. You seem to be an expert in this area ! » (72)

Conclusion

The last debates on the Opera House project took place in May 1914. As we know, nothing came of these plans, because the First World War intervened. The remains of the « Kroll » Opera served as a hospital during War-time. (73) The impetus for a more democratic high-culture had, however, not been lost. The SPD's call for a more inclusive Opera would attract much support in the years immediately following Germany's defeat.

Notes

(1) See : Paul Nolte. « Gemeindebürgertum und Liberalismus in Baden 1800-1850 » , Göttingen (1994) - on redefinitions of the « Bürgertum » .

(2) Richard Wagner. « The Art-Work of the Future and Other Works » , translated by William Ashton Ellis, Lincoln, Nebraska (1993) . The understanding of Wagner as the promoter of a democratic German art extended well into the Weimar Republic and competed with more exclusively nationalist and racist conceptions. See : « Wagner Reception and Weimar Democracy » , in : Bernhard Diebold. « The Case of Wagner » (unpublished paper) .

(3) For examples, see : Pamela Potter. « Most German of the Arts : Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's " Reich " » , New Haven, Connecticut (1998) ; and : « Music and German National Identity » ,

edited by Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter, Chicago (2002) . The intellectual impact of Opera, in particular, is discussed in : Gloria Flaherty. « Opera in the Development of German Critical Thought » , Princeton (1978) .

(4) In : « Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert » , Band III : « Lebensführung und ständische Vergesellschaftung » , edited by Rainer Lepsius, Stuttgart (1992) ; page 47.

(5) An argument presented most forcefully, in : Richard Sennett. « The Fall of Public Man » (info ?) but which has become something of a « cliché » in discussions of 19th Century Germany.

(6) This was stressed by many theatre reformers in the Weimar Republic. See : Konrad Hænisch. « Neue Bahnen der Kulturpolitik » , Stuttgart (1921) .

(7) Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. « Hamburgische Dramaturgie » , Volume I, Introduction by G. Waterhouse, Cambridge (1926) ; page v.

(8) Ibid. ; page 11.

(9) Ibid. ; page 54.

(10) Ibid. ; page 79.

(11) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 37.

(12) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 55.

(13) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 60.

(14) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 80.

(15) Eduard Devrient. « Das Nationaltheater des neuen Deutschlands » , Berlin (1919) ; page 12.

(16) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 17.

(17) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 25.

(18) Ibid. , Volume II ; page 35.

(19) See : Carol Blum. « Rousseau and the Republic of Virtue : The Language of Politics in the French Revolution » , Ithaca, New York (1986) .

(20) Devrient ; page 44.

(21) The most important source on the « Kroll » 's early history remains Alwill Ræder. « Kroll : ein Beitrag zur Berliner Cultur- und Theatergeschichte » , Berlin (1894) . Ræder published this volume to honour the 50th anniversary of the House's existence. Other important sources include : Hans-Joachim Reichhardt. « bei Kroll 1844 bis 1957 : Etablissement, Ausstellungen, Theater, Konzerte, Oper, Reichstag, Gartenlokal » , Berlin (1988) ; and : Ruth Freydank. « Das Theater als Geschäft : Berlin und seine Privattheater um die Jahrhundertwende » , Berlin (1995) .

(22) Ræder ; page 18.

(23) Ibid. ; pages 20-23.

(24) Ibid. ; page 38.

(25) Ibid. ; pages 83-84.

(26) Freydank. « Theater in Berlin : von den Anfängen bis 1945 » , Berlin (1988) ; page 29.

(27) Ibid. ; page 33.

(28) « Der neue Weg » , Band 48, Nr. 1-2 (January 1919) .

(29) Freydank. « Das Theater als Geschäft » ; page 39.

(30) Ibid. ; pages 16-17.

(31) See : Gernot Schley. « Die Freie Bühne in Berlin : der Vorläufer der Volksbühnenbewegung » , Berlin (1967) .

(32) Freydank. « Theater in Berlin » , page 342.

(33) There is considerable literature on the history of the « Volksbühne » , most recently : Cecil W. Davies. « Theatre for the People : The “ Volksbühne ” Movement, a History » , Amsterdam (2000) . Other sources are discussed below.

(34) Heinz Selo. « Die “ Freie Volksbühne ” in Berlin : Geschichte ihrer Erstehung und ihre Entwicklung bis zur Auflösung im Jahre 1896 » , Berlin (1930) .

(35) See my discussion in Chapter 3.

(36) Selo ; page 78.

(37) Ibid. ; page 31.

(38) Ibid. ; page 169.

(39) Almut Schwerd. « Zwischen Sozialdemokratie und Kommunismus : zur Geschichte der Volksbühne 1918-1933 » , Wiesbaden (1975) ; page 37. In this context, I must also mention Heinrich Braulich. « Die Volksbühne : Theater und Politik in der deutschen Volksbühnenbewegung » , Berlin (1976) .

(40) Schwerd ; page 58.

(41) Dietmar Klenke and Peter Lilje. « Arbeitersänger und Volksbühnen in der Weimarer Republik » , Bonn (1992) ; page 333.

(42) John Sargent Rockwell. « The Prussian Ministry of Culture and the Berlin State Opera » , Unpublished dissertation, Berkeley, California (1972) ; page 4.

(43) Hugo Fetting. « Deutsche Staatsoper Berlin : zur Wiedereröffnung des Hauses unter den Linden am 4. September 1955 » , Berlin (1955) ; page 30.

(44) « Die Schaubühne » , Band I, Nr. 16 (1905) .

(45) Ibid.

(46) The major contemporary source on Gregor is : Fritz Jacobsohn. « Hans Gregors Komische Oper 1905-1911 » , Berlin (1911) . See, also : Freydank. « Das Theater als Geschäft » .

(47) « Die Schaubühne » , Band I, Nr. 11 (1905) .

(48) See : Jacobsohn.

(49) Ibid. ; page 21.

(50) See : Freydank for a discussion of this.

(51) Quoted in : Ibid. ; page 15.

(52) Max Epstein. « Das Theater als Geschäft » , Berlin (1996) . This edition is a fac-simile of the original 1911 edition. In the context of the current controversy surrounding theatre subsidies in Berlin, I find it no accident that Epstein's work is attracting renewed interest.

(53) Ludwig Seelig was a lawyer and SPD member who later became referent for theatre in the Ministry of Culture, in the Weimar Republic.

(54) Ludwig Seelig. « Geschäftstheater oder Kulturtheater ? » , Berlin (1913) ; page 15.

(55) Ibid. ; page 22.

(56) Ibid. ; page 38.

(57) Ibid. ; page 45.

(58) Ibid. ; page 47.

(59) See the 1st section of this Chapter as well as : Ulrich Engelhardt. « Bildungsbürgertum : Begriffs- und Dogmengeschichte eines Etiketts » , Stuttgart (1986) ; and : Georg Bollenbeck. « Bildung und Kultur : Glanz und Elend eines deutschen Deutungsmusters » , Frankfurt (1994) .

(60) Hertha Siemering. « Arbeiterbildungswesen in Berlin und Wien » , Berlin (1911) ; page 129.

(61) Waltraud Strey. « Wettbewerb für den Neubau eines Königlichen Opernhauses in Berlin für Wilhelm II. » , Berlin (1981) .

(62) « Haus der Abgeordneten » , meeting of April 18, 1910. « Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz » , I. HA Rep. 90, Staatsministerium, Band III, Nr. 1, Seite 3 ; Blatt 173.

(63) Meeting of April 29, 1910. Ibid. ; Blatt 183.

(64) Ibid.

(65) Ibid.

(66) Ibid.

(67) Ibid.

(68) Meeting of May 19, 1914. Ibid. ; Blatt 270.

(69) Ibid.

(70) Ibid.

(71) Ibid.

Interestingly, the Conservative deputy Henning had already argued, in 1908, for preservation of the « Linden » Opera because it was so important to preserve Prussian tradition :

« I am not thinking of the present ; I won't say anything about that ; it will probably be handled within very patriotic limits. But no one knows what the future will bring. It could happen that very different flags from the black and white one will be planted there (at the Opera) . »

Meeting of March 12, 1908. Ibid. ; Blatt 166.

(72) Ibid.

(73) See : Reichhardt. « bei Kroll 1844 bis 1957 » .

...

Krolloper befand sich in Tiergarten (Tiergarten-Süd) auf dem Exerzierplatz vor dem Kontext : Brandenburger Tor
Brandenburger Tor, dem späteren Königsplatz und heutigen Platz der Republik.

Joseph Kontext : Kroll, Joseph Anton Jakob Norbert Kroll ließ Carl Ferdinand Langhans (1781-1869) , Ludwig Persius (1803-1845) und Eduard Kontext : Knoblauch, Karl Heinrich Eduard Knoblauch einen großen Gaststättenkomplex errichten. Er konnte am 15.02.1844 nach zehnmonatiger Bauzeit als Krollsches Etablissement eröffnet werden. Der schloßartige Bau bestand aus einem erhöhten zweistöckigen Mittelteil und zwei langgestreckten Flügelbauten, ergänzt durch diverse Außenanlagen. Er verfügte über zwei Wintergärten, 14 Festsäle, drei große Säle und den besonders prunkvollen Königssaal mit Logen und Balkonen für insgesamt 5.000 Gäste. Nach einem Großbrand am 01.02.1851 stellte der Baumeister Eduard Kontext : Titz, Eduard Titz das Haus innerhalb eines Jahres wieder her, wobei er die Ausstattung prunkvoller gestaltete. Zwischen 1895 und 1898 baute Gustav Hochgürtel aus der am 25.06.1850 eröffneten Sommerbühne das Neue Königliche Opernhaus. Wegen Unrentabilität begann nach der letzten Vorstellung vom 30.03.1914 der Abriß, der jedoch durch den Beginn des I. Weltkrieges gestoppt wurde. Der Gebäuderest diente dann als Lazarett und Textillager. 1922-1923 baute Oskar Kontext : Kaufmann, Oskar Kaufmann das Theater wieder auf, das am 01.01.1924 als Neue Oper mit den « Meistersingern » von Richard Wagner (1813-1883) seine erste Vorstellung erlebte. Nach Querelen und Problemen im Spielbetrieb zwischen der Lindenoper und der Kroll kam es zu organisatorischen Veränderungen. Am 19.11.1927 eröffnete die Staatsoper am Platz der Republik unter der Leitung von Otto Kontext : Klemperer, Otto Klemperer mit der Aufführung der Beethoven-Oper « Fidelio » eine neue Ära. Sie wurde abrupt mit dem Beschluß des Preußischen Landtages vom 25.03.1931 über die Schließung des Hauses beendet. Am 03.07.1931 fand mit Mozarts « Die Hochzeit des Figaro » die letzte Vorstellung statt. Nach dem Reichstagsbrand am 27.02.1933 wurde die Kroll als Tagungsstätte des Parlaments umgebaut. Erstmals tagte der Reichstag am 23.03.1933 in der Kroll und verabschiedete dort das Ermächtigungsgesetz. Am 01.09.1939 verkündete Adolf Kontext : Hitler, Adolf Hitler in der

Kroll den Beginn des II. Weltkrieges, und am 26.04.1942 fand dort die letzte Reichstagsitzung statt. Das am 22.11.1943 von Fliegerbomben erheblich beschädigte Gebäude wurde 1951 gesprengt und bis 1957 abgetragen. Heute befinden sich an dieser Stelle eine Parkanlage und Baugelände für das neue Regierungsviertel.

Krolloper

Kroll'scher Wintergarten oder Krolls Etablissement

Architekten : Königlicher Baumeister Ludwig Persius sowie Carl Ferdinand Langhans und Eduard Knoblauch.

Standort : In der Nähe des Brandenburger Tores, am heutigen Platz der Republik, gegenüber dem später erbauten Reichstagsgebäude.

1844 : Erbaut.

15. Februar 1844 : Eröffnung des Kroll'schen Wintergartens.

23 März 1933 : « Ermächtigungsgesetz » : Otto-Wels-Rede im Reichstag (Sitzungsort Krolloper) , SPD-Abgeordnete stimmten als einzige gegen das Gesetz.

November 1943 : Teilerstört durch Luftangriffe.

30 April 1945 : Weitere Schäden bei der Erstürmung des Reichstagsgebäudes.

23. Mai 1945 : Beginn der Aufräumarbeiten, um das Gartenlokal wieder nutzbar zu machen. In den Sommermonaten fanden im Kroll-Garten Konzert- und Tanzveranstaltungen statt.

1. Mai 1950 : Veranstaltung zu Frieden und Freiheit.

1951 : Teile der Hauptgebäude werden gesprengt und abgetragen.

1956 : Nach einer ruinösen Saison gibt der letzte Pächter den Betrieb auf.

4. Mai 1957 : Beantragt das Grundstücksamt Berlin-Tiergarten die Abräumung der Gebäudereste.

Herbst 1957 : Die letzten Spuren der Krolloper sind beseitigt.

August 2007 : Am ehemaligen Standort, auf einer Rasenfläche in der Nähe des neuen Bundeskanzleramtes, erinnert eine ausführlich deutsch / englisch beschriftete Informations- und Gedenktafel an die Krolloper und ihre Geschichte.

...

So etwas Schönes wie die Breslauer wollte Friedrich Wilhelm IV. auch haben : einen Krollschen Wintergarten. Des Königs Wunsch war dem Untertan Befehl, und so zog der Unternehmer Joseph Kroll von Breslau in die Berliner « Sahara » , wie der Exerzierplatz am Brandenburger Tor genannt wurde. In dieser etwas trostlosen Gegend, wo nun das Deutsche Historische Museum entstehen soll, baute Kroll sein Denkmal deutscher Tüchtigkeit : In zehn Monaten stampfte er ein prachtvolles Schloß aus dem sandigen Boden, geschnörkelt und geschmückt, mit Kronleuchtern und Gaslichtern, die jeden Besucher blendeten, und Platz für 5.000 Personen, ein Vergnügungspalast zum Essen, Tanzen und Staunen. Kolossal :

« In diesem Feenpalast wird ein steter Frühling seyn. »

Das ist der Anfang einer krummen deutschen Geschichte vom Familienbetrieb zum Staatstheater - so krumm, so deutsch und so illuster, daß ihr das Berliner Landesarchiv in der Kalckreuthstraße I eine Ausstellung gewidmet hat : « bei Kroll 1844 bis 1957. Etablissement - Ausstellungen - Theater - Konzerte - Oper - Reichstag - Gartenlokal » , womit noch längst nicht alles erwähnt ist. Das ist es auch, was Kroll so spannend macht, diese geradezu unverfrorene Unbefangenheit, mit der das Krollsche Etablissement (schon der Name läßt alle Möglichkeiten - nach oben und unten, rechts und links - offen) genutzt wurde : Goethe und Kasperletheater, Stadtverordnetenessen und Affentheater, Mozart und Kanonendonner und « Große militärische Harmonie » : 6 Flöten, 6 Oboen, 6 Contra-Fagotts, 6 Kontrabässe, 36 Klarinetten, 12 Fagotts, 8 Waldhörner, 16 Trompeten, 12 Posaunen, 4 Sopran-Tuben, 4 Alt-Tuben, 4 Tenor-Tuben, 4 Bariton-Tuben, 12 Schlaginstrumente für türkische Musik und Glasglockenspiel.

Ort des Ermächtigungsgesetzes

Im Ersten Weltkrieg stopfte die Zentralsammelstelle der Reichswollwoche die inzwischen staatlichen Festsäle mit Lumpen und Wolle voll. Davor waren im Neuen Königlichen Operntheater Caruso, das Schlierseer Bauerntheater und Gustav Mahler aufgetreten ; in der nachrevolutionären Staatsoper am Platz der Republik (wie die Kroll-Oper nie genannt wurde) bauten Oskar Schlemmer, Traugott Müller und László Moholy-Nagy ihre strengen Bühnenbilder (von denen die Ausstellung einige sehr schöne Entwürfe enthält) zu Opern von Jean Cocteau und Igor Strawinskij unter der strengen Regie von Otto Klemperer.

Nachdem dessen « Experiment Kroll-Oper » endgültig gescheitert und der Reichstag abgebrannt war, wurde das Theater innerhalb von zehn Tagen (« erstaunlich wie hübsch und zweckentsprechend ») zur politischen Bühne umgebaut ; und « man merkte fast gar nicht » , daß die Plätze der Kommunisten, die als einzige gegen die Schließung der Kroll-Oper gestimmt hatten, in diesem Reichstag leer blieben. Auch jetzt wurden « Einlaßkarten » ausgegeben (« 13 Uhr pünktlich ») ; hier verkündete Hitler das Ermächtigungsgesetz, verteidigte er das gewaltsame Ende des « Röhms-Putsches » und erklärte am 1. September 1939 :

« Von jetzt ab wird Bombe mit Bombe vergolten ! »

Und als Albert Speer längst das gigantische Führer-Palais, Mittelpunkt der « Welthauptstadt Germania » , auf dem Krollschen Gebäude fertiggebaut haben sollte, hüpfen die Berliner hier zwischen Kriegstrümmern herum : Kabarett und Tanz bei Kroll. Endstation Gartenlokal.

So volkstümlich, wie « Kroll » klingt, war es nie. Des Königs Baumeister lieferten den Entwurf für Krolls Vergnügungspalast, der Königliche Theaterfeuerwerker entzündete bei der « Großen Festlichkeit zur Errettung und Genesung Senior Majestät des Königs » , der bei einem Attentat verwundet worden war, ein « imposantes Feuerwerk » , und die Königin kam zu Kroll um sich die Neger aus Afrika zeigen zu lassen. Das « gebildete Publikum Berlins » wollte Kroll, der schon 1848 starb, in seinen prachtvollen Königssaal locken. Die Speisekarte von 1853, in der Ausstellung zu bewundern, wendet sich mit ihren Trüffeln in Burgunder für fünfzehn Silbergroschen offensichtlich an den gehobenen Geschmack und den gefüllten Geldbeutel. Einen « Luxusbetrieb » nennt ein Gutachter Kroll noch nach dem Krieg.

...

Nach der Zerstörung des Plenarsaals durch den Reichstagsbrand am Abend des 27. Februar 1933 wurde die nur einige Hundert Meter vom Reichstagsgebäude entfernte und seit 1931 geschlossene Kroll-Oper von den Nationalsozialisten als neue provisorische Tagungsstätte für das Parlament ausgewählt. Namensgeber für das Gebäude war Joseph Kroll, der mit Förderung von Preußens König Friedrich Wilhelm IV. sein Krollsches Etablissement 1843-1844 als Vergnügungsstätte vor den Toren Berlins in der Nähe des Brandenburger Tores errichtet hatte. Das ursprüngliche Gebäude wurde von Ludwig Persius, Carl Ferdinand Langhans und Eduard Knoblauch im Stil der märkischen Biedermeier-Renaissance geschaffen. Das Gebäudeensemble wurde später auch als Opernhaus benutzt. Zuletzt war das Gebäude von Herbst 1927 bis Juli 1931 unter Leitung von Otto Klemperer Spielstätte für die « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » .

Der Umbau der Kroll-Oper zum provisorischen Parlament

Zu Beginn der zweiten Märzwoche 1933 begannen unter Leitung der Preußischen Bau- und Finanzdirektion die behelfsmäßigen Umbauarbeiten an der Kroll-Oper, deren Großer Theatersaal ursprünglich über rund 1.100 Sitze verfügte und nun zum Sitzungssaal umfunktioniert wurde. Die Decke wurde tiefer gezogen und mit Stoff überspannt, so daß die Deckengemälde verschwanden. Bühne und Orchestergraben erhielten Aufbauten für das Präsidium, die Schriftführer, die Regierungsbänke und die Stenographen. Dabei wurde auch die aus dem zerstörten Plenarsaal des Reichstagsgebäudes stammende, noch intakte Regierungsbank in die neuen Aufbauten der Kroll-Oper integriert. Den Abgeordneten stand als Wandelhalle der Theaterumgang in der Höhe des Parketts zur Verfügung. Die Sitzungssäle der Fraktionen, die Bibliothek wie auch Teile der Parlamentsverwaltungen verblieben im Reichstagsgebäude. Hinter dem Gestühl des Reichstagspräsidiums wurde an der Stirnwand der Oper eine große Hakenkreuzfahne aufgespannt. Rechts und links davon hing, als taktisches Zugeständnis der Nationalsozialisten an ihre Koalitionspartner von der DNVP, anfänglich noch eine schwarz-weiß-rote Fahne des Kaiserreiches. In den beiden Rängen der Kroll-Oper standen jeweils mehrere Hundert Sitzplätze für Presse und Besucher zur Verfügung.

Die erste Sitzung des Reichstages in der Kroll-Oper fand nach den nur noch bedingt als demokratisch zu

charakterisierenden Reichstagswahlen vom 5. März 1933 am späten Nachmittag des 21. März 1933 statt. Einziger Tagesordnungspunkt der konstituierenden Sitzung des ersten nach der Machtübertragung an die Nationalsozialisten gewählten Reichstages war die Wahl des Präsidiums. Entgegen der bisherigen Geschäftsordnung wurde es nicht durch geheime Wahl, sondern durch Zuruf bestimmt. Am Ende der Sitzung sangen die uniformierten Mitglieder der Reichstagfraktion der NSDAP mit erhobenem Arm die erste Strophe des Horst-Wessel-Liedes.

Tag von Potsdam in der Garnisonskirche

Aus Anlaß der Konstituierung des Reichstages hatte Reichspropagandaminister Josef Goebbels am Morgen des 21. März 1933 einen « feierlichen Staatsakt » in der Garnisonskirche von Potsdam inszeniert. An der Veranstaltung nahmen neben Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler Reichspräsident Paul von Hindenburg in seiner Uniform eines kaiserlichen Generalfeldmarschalls, die Abgeordneten des Reichstages ohne Sozialdemokraten und Kommunisten, Vertreter von Reichswehr und SA, Persönlichkeiten aus Wirtschaft und Verwaltung sowie ehemalige Repräsentanten des kaiserlichen Deutschland teil. Mit dem « Tag von Potsdam », dessen öffentliches Erscheinungsbild durch die kaiserlichen schwarzweißroten Farben geprägt war, täuschten die Nationalsozialisten der Öffentlichkeit eine symbolische und politische Verbindung von kaiserlich-monarchischem Deutschland und nationalsozialistischer Bewegung vor.

Das Ende des Parlamentarismus

Schon zwei Tage später, am 23. März 1933, entmachtete sich das neue gewählte Parlament unter massivem Druck in seiner zweiten Sitzung in der Kroll-Oper mit der Verabschiedung des von den Nationalsozialisten und der DNVP initiierten « Gesetz zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich », dem so genannten Ermächtigungsgesetz, selbst. Es übertrug gegen die Stimmen der SPD die parlamentarische Legislativbefugnis auf die Reichsregierung und hob die Gewaltenteilung auf. Alle 81 Abgeordnete der KPD und 26 SPD-Abgeordnete konnten an der Abstimmung nicht teilnehmen : Sie befanden sich in « Schutzhaft » oder waren vor drohender Verfolgung geflohen. Die gesamte Szenerie der Sitzung wurde von den Farben und Symbolen der Nationalsozialisten dominiert. Die Absperrung vor der Kroll-Oper hatte die SS übernommen. Im Innern des provisorischen Parlamentsgebäudes sorgten bewaffnete Angehörige der SA für den « Saalschutz ». Im Zuge der Etablierung und Festigung der nationalsozialistischen Diktatur fand am 17. Mai 1933 die dritte und letzte Sitzung des Reichstages als Mehrparteiparlament statt. Kurze Zeit später wurde der Reichstag aufgelöst.

Nach dem Verbot und der Selbstauflösung der demokratischen Parteien im Frühsommer 1933, dem Gesetz gegen die Neubildung von Parteien, der Reichstagsauflösung vom 14. Oktober 1933 und den Reichstagswahlen im November 1933 war der Reichstag nur noch ein aus Nationalsozialisten bestehendes gleichgeschaltetes Scheinparlament. Formal blieb der Reichstag im nationalsozialistischen Einparteienstaat als Verfassungsorgan und Gesetzgeber bis zum Ende der Diktatur bestehen. Er kam allerdings bis 1942 in unregelmäßigen Abständen nur noch zu insgesamt 18 Sitzungen zusammen, die Hitler insbesondere als Forum für Regierungserklärungen benutzte. Die letzte Zusammenkunft des nationalsozialistischen Reichstages fand am 26. April 1942 statt.

Zerstörung und Abriss der Kroll-Oper

Von Herbst 1941 bis November 1943 wurde die Kroll-Oper auch als Ausweichspielstätte für die bei einem der ersten Luftangriffe alliierter Bomber auf Berlin am 10. April 1941 stark zerstörte Lindenoper benutzt. Allerdings wurde die Kroll-Oper selbst bei einem nächtlichen Luftangriff am 22. November 1943 schwer getroffen, so daß eine Weiterführung des Opernbetriebes auch hier nicht mehr möglich war. Weitere Beschädigungen erfolgten im Rahmen der Kampfhandlungen in der « Schlacht um Berlin » im April 1945.

Nach Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges entschied man sich hauptsächlich aus finanziellen Erwägungen gegen den Wiederaufbau des Gebäudes. Noch bis in die 1950er Jahre hinein wurde aber in den Sommermonaten in den wenigen noch vorhandenen Gebäudeteilen der Kroll-Oper ein Gartenrestaurant betrieben. Große Teile des Hauptgebäudes wurden im März 1951 gesprengt und abgetragen. Im Herbst 1957 waren sämtliche Ruinen- und Trümmerreste der Kroll-Oper endgültig beseitigt. Heute erinnert ein Gedenkstein an das Gebäude, in dem 1933 die parlamentarische Demokratie in Deutschland ihr Ende fand.

...

Die Krolloper (zeitweilig auch Kroll'scher Wintergarten oder Krolls Etablissement) war ein Gebäudekomplex in der Nähe des Brandenburger Tores, am heutigen Berliner Platz der Republik. Im Lauf einer wechselvollen Geschichte diente die Anlage zwischen 1844 und 1951 als Vergnügungsetablisement, Komödienbühne, Textillager, Opernhaus und während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus als Ersatzherberge des Parlaments für das 1933 einem Brand zum Opfer gefallene Reichstagsgebäude.

Der preußische König Friedrich Wilhelm IV. gab den Anstoß dazu, in seiner Residenz einen neuen Ort vornehmer Geselligkeit zu errichten, nachdem er 1841 bei einem Besuch in Breslau den Kroll'schen Wintergarten kennengelernt hatte. Dem Unternehmer Joseph Kroll überließ man in Berlin kostenlos ein Baugrundstück am Rande des Exerzierplatzes, einer staubigen, bei Regen schlammbedeckten Fläche knapp außerhalb der alten Stadtgrenze. Gefordert wurde allerdings ein persönliches Startkapital von 30.000 Talern, das Kroll sich leihen mußte. Auch mußte er sich verpflichten, bei Misserfolg das Grundstück zurückzugeben und seine neu errichteten Gebäude wieder abzureißen.

Am Neubau war maßgeblich der königliche Baumeister Ludwig Persius beteiligt (ein deutlicher Hinweis darauf, daß das Projekt dem König am Herzen lag) , dazu die ebenfalls prominenten Architekten Carl Ferdinand Langhans und Eduard Knoblauch. Nach nur zehn Monaten Bauzeit konnte das Unternehmen am 15. Februar 1844 mit einem prachtvollen Ball eröffnet werden. Die schloßartige Anlage bestand aus einem zweigeschossigen Mittelteil zwischen niedrigen Gebäudeflügeln sowie einigen Nebengebäuden. Sie bot Platz für 5.000 Gäste, die in zwei Wintergärten, 14 größeren Gesellschaftsräumen und drei großen Sälen, darunter der besonders prunkvoll ausgestattete « Königssaal » , bewirtet und von 60 Musikern unterhalten wurden. Eine technische Besonderheit waren die 400 Flammen der gerade neu eingeführten Gasbeleuchtung.

Das erste Geschäftsjahr konnte durchaus erfolgreich gestaltet werden. In den Straßen Berlins warben großflächige Plakate für aufwändig dekorierte Maskenbälle, Italienische oder Chinesische Nächte, Verlosungen oder

Weihnichtsausstellungen. Vorübergehend gastierte auch der Wiener Walzerkönig Johann Strauß bei Kroll - zog sich aber sehr bald wieder zurück, weil, wie er feststellte, seine Musik « dem berlinischen Naturell wenig anhaben konnte ». Trotz aller Anstrengungen stellten sich allmählich wirtschaftliche Schwierigkeiten ein. Joseph Kroll starb 1848 an einem Leberleiden - zuvor bedauerte er, einst dem König begegnet zu sein und sich in Berlin engagiert zu haben.

Lageplan von 1879 ; links außen die Krolloper, rechts die Markierung für den Neubau des Reichstagsgebäudes
Seine älteste Tochter Auguste übernahm den Betrieb, erweiterte ihn und zeigte Attraktionen wie Dompteurnummern mit wilden Tieren und eine große Gewerbeausstellung. Sie beantragte und erhielt eine Konzession für Theateraufführungen, ließ im « Königssaal » ein Podium bauen und dort zunächst Volkstümliches aufführen - Komödien, Lustspiele und Lokalposen. Aber auch einige Opern kamen ins Repertoire, etwa Martha von Friedrich von Flotow und Der Barbier von Sevilla von Rossini - mutige Unternehmungen angesichts der bescheidenen Mittel. Insbesondere protegierte Auguste Kroll einen Komponisten, der trotz mehrfach guter Publikumserfolge ständig am Rande des Existenzminimums lebte : Albert Lortzing. Seine Opern Der Waffenschmied, Undine und Zar und Zimmermann wurden bei Kroll gespielt, die angespannte finanzielle Lage des Unternehmens erlaubte es allerdings nicht, ihm Tantiemen oder Honorare zu zahlen. Im Februar 1851 brannte das Etablissement bis auf die Grundmauern nieder, nachdem Teile der Theaterkulissen beim Anzünden der Beleuchtung Feuer gefangen hatten. Nur der Garten und das Sommertheater blieben verschont. Die Feuerversicherung zahlte 80.000 Taler - und schon ein Jahr später war das Haus wieder aufgebaut, der Baumeister Eduard Titz gestaltete es noch eindrucksvoller als zuvor.

Im Jahr 1853 heiratete Auguste Kroll den ungarischen Musiker Jakob Engel, der bei ihr als Kapellmeister angestellt war. Das musikalische Programm wurde noch anspruchsvoller, neben die leichtgängigen Opern traten Werke wie Rossinis Otello oder Kompositionen von Richard Wagner. An dem seit langem bestehenden Missverhältnis zwischen hohen Betriebskosten und relativ niedrigen Einnahmen änderte sich nichts. Am 1. April 1855 mußte das hoch verschuldete Unternehmen schließen. Mehrere Jahre lang führte einer der Gläubiger den Betrieb, auch er ohne Erfolg. Bei einer Zwangsversteigerung erwarb Jakob Engel 1862 das immer noch verschuldete Unternehmen zurück. Unklar blieb, woher er die erforderlichen 109.000 Taler bekommen hatte. Bei der Programmgestaltung verzichtete er nun auf die kostspieligen Operndarbietungen. Dennoch entstand bald wieder eine kritische Situation. 1869, im Jahr des 25-jährigen Betriebsjubiläums, wurde in Preußen die Gewerbefreiheit eingeführt. Der Konzessionszwang fiel weg, zahlreiche Privatunternehmen entstanden, der Konkurrenzdruck wuchs. Engel wollte verkaufen, aber seine Bemühungen scheiterten an der hohen Hypothekenbelastung. Größere Investitionen verboten sich, weil die Rechtslage des ganzen Areals über viele Jahre hinweg unsicher war. Seit 1864 hieß der Exerzierplatz « Königsplatz » und wurde grundlegend zu einem repräsentativen Stadtplatz umgestaltet. In den 1870er Jahren gab es im Parlament wiederholt langwierige Diskussionen um den Standort des neuen Reichstagsgebäudes, mit der Option, das Kroll'sche Etablissement dafür abzureißen. Eine Entscheidung fiel erst 1876 (der Neubau des Reichstags entstand auf der gegenüberliegenden Seite des Platzes) und Jakob Engel konnte einige seiner Pläne realisieren, zum Beispiel 1885 die alte Gasbeleuchtung durch elektrisches Licht ersetzen - eine Premiere in Berlin. Der Unternehmer starb 1888, sein Sohn versuchte erfolglos, gegen das schwindende Interesse des Berliner Publikums anzugehen. 1894 mußte er aufgeben.

Das Opernhaus (1894-1933)

Julius Bötzw, der Besitzer der Bötzw-Brauerei, betrieb das Haus seit 1894 mit mäßigem Erfolg als reinen Gaststättenbetrieb mit einigen wenigen Konzerten. Ein Jahr später verpachtete er es zunächst, 1896 verkaufte er es an die « Königlichen Schauspiele », eine Institution des Preußischen Staates. Damit endete die Zeit als privat geführtes, multifunktionelles Vergnügungsetablisement und es begann die Geschichte der Krolloper als staatlichem Opernhaus. Das Gebäude bekam den Namen « Neues Königliches Operntheater » und wurde bis 1898 für den neuen Zweck umgebaut. Danach diente es als Ausweichbühne für andere staatliche Theater, wenn dort längere Bauarbeiten nötig wurden. Es gab aber auch bemerkenswerte eigene Produktionen mit großen Sängern wie Enrico Caruso und der Musik « moderner » Komponisten wie Igor Strawinski und Gustav Mahler - und Publikumserfolge wie die Serie von 98 Aufführungen der Operette Die Fledermaus von Johann Strauß.

Kaiser Wilhelm II. wünschte sich allerdings an gleicher Stelle ein noch prunkvolleres und größeres Opernhaus mit mindestens 2.500 Plätzen. Seit 1904 wurde das Projekt « Neues Königliches Opernhaus Berlin » erörtert. Zunächst war beabsichtigt, die historische Staatsoper Unter den Linden dafür abzureißen. 1909 wurden die Pläne konkreter, nun wurde der Standort der Krolloper für den Neubau in Aussicht genommen. Der Berliner Stadtbaurat und Architekt Ludwig Hoffmann legte Ende 1913 Entwürfe vor, das Preußische Abgeordnetenhaus bewilligte die notwendigen Geldmittel. Im Sommer 1914 begannen Abrissarbeiten an der Krolloper, sie wurden aber bei Kriegsbeginn am 1. August 1914 sofort wieder eingestellt. Während des Ersten Weltkriegs wurden die Räume, soweit sie noch brauchbar waren, mit Wolle und Lumpen gefüllt, dem Material der Zentralsammelstelle der Reichswollwoche. Den Sommergarten nutzte man in der warmen Jahreszeit als Nachmittagsheim für verwundete Krieger.

Unmittelbar nach Kriegsende wurde Ludwig Hoffmann vom Kultusministerium aufgefordert, das begonnene Großprojekt weiterzuführen, nun sollte ein « Volksopernhaus » entstehen. Dieser Plan scheiterte - es kam ein neuer Minister und es fehlte an Geld. 1920 pachtete der Verein der Berliner Volksbühne Grundstück und Opernhaus vom Preußischen Staat und verpflichtete sich zum Wiederaufbau des stark renovierungsbedürftigen Gebäudes. Die Fassadengestaltung folgte einem früheren Entwurf Hoffmanns. Der Große Saal für annähernd 2.500 Zuschauer wurde von dem Theaterarchitekten Oskar Kaufmann in einem Stil hergerichtet, den Zeitgenossen als « expressionistisches Rokoko » kritisierten. Gleichzeitig entstanden im Garten neue Terrassen und eine Freilichtbühne, dazu konzipierte Kaufmann auftragsgemäß einen Festsaal für 5.000 Personen. Das Projekt überstieg schließlich die finanziellen Möglichkeiten der Volksbühne. Der Staat mußte die Kosten der Fertigstellung und das Opernhaus selbst übernehmen. Die Volksbühne verpflichtete sich, die Hälfte der Karten für jede Vorstellung abzunehmen. Als zweite Spielstätte der Staatsoper Unter den Linden und unter dem Namen « Oper am Königsplatz » wurde das Haus am 1. Januar 1924 mit den Meistersingern von Richard Wagner wieder eröffnet, Erich Kleiber dirigierte. Nachdem 1926 der Königsplatz umbenannt worden war, hieß das Opernhaus offiziell « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik ». Die Berliner nannten es wie bisher « Krolloper » .

Die Zusammenarbeit der beiden Häuser erwies sich als nicht praktikabel, Sänger und Musiker waren überfordert. Die Zusammenlegung wurde rückgängig gemacht, zum Direktor und musikalischen Leiter der ehemaligen Krolloper berief man den Dirigenten Otto Klemperer. Mit dieser Entscheidung begann der künstlerisch bedeutendste Abschnitt in der Geschichte des Hauses. Eröffnet wurde am 19. November 1927 mit einer modernen Inszenierung der Oper Fidelio von Ludwig van Beethoven. Klemperers erklärtes Ziel war die Erneuerung der Oper als Kunstgattung. In knapp vier Jahren

wurden 44 Werke präsentiert, darunter Uraufführungen mit Arbeiten von Arnold Schönberg (Begleitmusik zu einer Lichtspielszene, 1930) , Ernst Krěenek, Paul Hindemith (Neues vom Tage, 1929) , Igor Strawinsky und Leoš Janáček. Als Dirigenten wirkten am Haus Otto Klemperer, Alexander von Zemlinsky und Fritz Zweig ; als Regisseure Jürgen Fehling, Ernst Legal, Gustaf Gründgens und Hans Curjel (geboren 1896 in Karlsruhe ; gestorben 1974 in Zürich) ; als Bühnenbildner Ewald Dülberg (1888-1933) , Caspar Neher, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Teo Otto, Oskar Schlemmer und Giorgio de Chirico.

Das Opernensemble unter Klemperer lieferte aus heutiger Sicht bahnbrechende Aufführungen. Aus der Einheit von Werk und Inszenierung, von Musik und Theater erwuchs ein modernes Opernmodell, auf das man nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg zurückgreifen konnte - wie es beispielsweise Walter Felsenstein in der Komischen Oper Berlin tat. In der aktuellen Situation der Weimarer Republik um 1930 waren die Reaktionen äußerst uneinheitlich. Der aufgeschlossene Teil des Bildungsbürgertums applaudierte. Das Publikum der Volksbühne, die ja 50 Prozent der Karten zu verteilen hatte, war zumeist befremdet - man erwartete konventionell / kulinarische Aufführungen und sah sich mit modernster Opernästhetik konfrontiert. Rechte Parteien beantragten, den Kulturbolschewismus der Oper zu beenden. Für die Schließung, die auch Heinz Tietjen als Generalintendant aller preußischen Staatstheater befürwortete, führte der Preußische Landtag dann ökonomische Gründe an : In Zeiten wirtschaftlicher Krisen könne sich Berlin drei Opernhäuser nicht leisten. Die letzte Vorstellung in der Krolloper fand am 3. Juli 1931 statt - Die Hochzeit des Figaro von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. Otto Klemperer kommentierte später :

« Ich tat alles nur menschenmöglichste, um die Schließung der Krolloper zu verhindern. Denn ich hing an dieser wie an einem Lebensplan. Ich ließ mich so weit hinreißen, daß ich einen Prozess anstrebte gegen die preußische Regierung. Es kam zu keiner Vereinbarung und ich verlor den Prozess. »

Das Parlament zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus (1933-1942)

Adolf Hitler vor dem Reichstag in der Kroll-Oper zum Abschluß des Feldzugs gegen Polen, 6. Oktober 1939
Nahezu zwei Jahre lang blieb das Opernhaus ungenutzt. Am 30. Januar 1933 wurde Adolf Hitler zum Reichskanzler ernannt. Am 19. Februar 1933 fand hier die Kundgebung « Das Freie Wort » statt, mit der über 900 vernunftdemokratisch beziehungsweise antinationalsozialistisch eingestellte Geistesgrößen gegen die Nazis protestierten. In der Nacht zum 28. Februar 1933 brannte das Reichstagsgebäude - Anlaß für die Nationalsozialisten, die politische Opposition, zuerst vor allem die KPD, rigoros zu unterdrücken. In der Reichstagswahl vom 5. März konnten die NSDAP und die mit ihr koalierende DNVP gemeinsam die absolute Mehrheit der Sitze erringen. Nach Vorschrift der Weimarer Verfassung mußte das Parlament innerhalb von 30 Tagen nach dem Wahltermin zusammentreten. Weil der Plenarsaal des Reichstagsgebäudes nicht benutzbar war (er wurde während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus demonstrativ nicht wieder instand gesetzt) wählte man die Krolloper als Tagungsstätte. Am 7. März 1933 begannen die notwendigen Umbauarbeiten. Die Decke des Zuschauerraumes wurde abgesenkt und mit Stoff verkleidet, um die als unpassend heiter empfundenen Deckengemälde verschwinden zu lassen. Im Parkett installierte man 647 Sitze, weit mehr, als zu diesem Zeitpunkt nötig gewesen wären ; denn elf SPD-Abgeordnete befanden sich in « Schutzhaft » , die 81 Mandate der KPD waren bereits annulliert worden. Reichsinnenminister Wilhelm Frick kommentierte dies so :

« Wenn der neue Reichstag zusammentritt, werden die Kommunisten durch dringendere und nützlichere Arbeiten verhindert sein, an der Sitzung teilzunehmen. Diese Herrschaften müssen wieder an nutzbringende Arbeit gewöhnt werden. Dazu werden wir ihnen in Konzentrationslagern Gelegenheit geben. »

Informationstafel am früheren Standort der Krolloper

In der Folge benutzten die Nationalsozialisten die Reichstagssitzungen in der Krolloper, um in einer Reihe von Beschlüssen den Weg in die Einparteien-Diktatur und in den Krieg formal legitimieren zu lassen. Am 23. März 1933 verabschiedete das Parlament gegen die Stimmen der SPD, aber mit Unterstützung der bürgerlichen Parteien das « Gesetz zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich », das sogenannte « Ermächtigungsgesetz », und beendete damit die Periode der Demokratie im Deutschen Reich. Danach konnte die Regierung Gesetze erlassen, ohne die Zustimmung des Parlaments und die Unterschrift des Reichspräsidenten einzuholen. Die Proteste der SPD beantwortete Hitler mit Hohn :

« Sie reden von Verfolgungen - Sie sind wehleidig, meine Herren und nicht für diese heutige Zeit bestimmt, wenn Sie jetzt schon von Verfolgungen sprechen. »

Schon bei der Sitzung am 12. Dezember 1933 bestand der Reichstag nur noch aus Abgeordneten der NSDAP.

Die wenigen Reichstagssitzungen der folgenden Jahre dienten Hitler als Bühne, um die Ermordung der parteiinternen Opposition nach dem « Röhm-Putsch » zu rechtfertigen, Ansprüche auf die ehemaligen deutschen Kolonien anzumelden, den « Anschluß » Österreichs an das Deutsche Reich zu feiern und den westlichen Demokratien mit Krieg zu drohen. Das Ermächtigungsgesetz ließ er mehrfach verlängern.

Die erste Fernsehübertragung in Deutschland wurde der Öffentlichkeit am 18. April 1934 in der Berliner Krolloper vorgestellt (Fernsehsender Paul Nipkow) .

Am 1. September 1939 verkündete er den Überfall auf Polen, der den Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs bedeutete. Bei der Kriegserklärung Deutschlands an die Vereinigten Staaten am 11. Dezember 1941 erklärte Hitler vor dem Reichstag in der Krolloper den amerikanischen Präsidenten Franklin D. Roosevelt für geisteskrank. Die letzte Sitzung des Reichstags am 26. April 1942 benutzte Hitler, um die militärische Niederlage vor Moskau zum Triumph umzudeuten und sich zum « Obersten Gerichtsherrn aller Deutschen » erklären zu lassen.

Das Ende (1942-1957)

In einem kurzen Intermezzo wurde das Gebäude nochmals als Opernhaus genutzt : Das Ensemble der Staatsoper Unter den Linden spielte hier parallel zu den letzten beiden Reichstagssitzungen, nachdem das eigene Haus bei Luftangriffen der Alliierten schwere Schäden erlitten hatte. Im November 1943 wurde auch die Krolloper bei Angriffen der Royal Air Force stark beschädigt. Die Schlacht um Berlin und die Erstürmung des Reichstagsgebäudes durch die Rote Armee am 30. April 1945 verursachten weitere Zerstörungen. Aber schon am 23. Mai 1945, nur 15 Tage nach Kriegsende, begannen

Aufräumarbeiten, um das Gartenlokal wieder nutzbar zu machen. In den Sommermonaten fanden im Kroll-Garten Konzert- und Tanzveranstaltungen statt. Nach einer wirtschaftlich unbefriedigenden Saison 1956 gab der letzte Pächter den Betrieb auf. Schon 1951 waren Teile der Hauptgebäude gesprengt und abgetragen worden. Am 4. Mai 1957 beantragte das Grundstücksamt Berlin-Tiergarten die « öffentliche Abräumung » der Gebäudereste. Im Herbst 1957 waren die letzten Spuren beseitigt.

Am ehemaligen Standort, auf einer Rasenfläche in der Nähe des neuen Bundeskanzleramtes, erinnert seit August 2007 eine ausführlich deutsch-englisch beschriftete Informations- und Gedenktafel an die Krolloper und ihre Geschichte.

Höhen und Tiefen : Die Kroll-Oper

Die Geschichte der Berliner Opernhäuser (Teil 7) · Von Susanne Geißler

Der Weg vom Vergnügungsetablisement zur avantgardistischen Opernbühne war verschlungen, pleitentüchtig und skandalumwittert. Die Bezeichnungen der Spielstätte wechselten häufig : Krolls Wintergarten, Krolls Etablissement, Krolls Garten, Neues Königliches Operntheater, Neue Oper am Königsplatz, Staatsoper am Platz der Republik, Kroll-Oper, Kroll-Garten. Für die Berliner, die behördlichen Namensgebungen selten Respekt bezeugen, hieß das Unternehmen einfach Kroll.

Im September 1841 weilte Seine Majestät Friedrich Wilhelm IV. in Breslau und dinierte im « Wintergarten » . Dieser behagte ihm derart, daß er dem Eigner Joseph Kroll den Antrag machte, nach Berlin zu kommen und dort ein noch größeres Etablissement zu besten Konditionen zu errichten. Kroll erwies sich als risikofreudiger Geschäftsmann, der die Chance seines Lebens zu nutzen gedachte. Unter dem besonderen Schutz des Hohenzollern (Überlassung eines kostenlosen Baugeländes) pumpte sich Kroll die als Startkapital geforderten 30.000 Thaler zusammen und begab sich nach Berlin. Den zugewiesenen Bauplatz wird er mit gemischten Gefühlen betrachtet haben. Er befand sich an einem riesigen Exerzierplatz vor den Toren der Stadt am Rande des Tiergartens. Nichts war da als Unkraut und Sand, in dem man knöcheltief versank. Jenseits des stadtbegrenzenden « Brandenburger Tores » hatte sich am Ufer der Spree das Restaurations- und Vergnügungsgeschäft ausgebreitet, denn Natur kann der Berliner nur bei Musik und Bier genießen. Aus überdachten Erfrischungsständen, den « Zelten » , entwickelte sich ein Quartier von Ausflugslokalitäten, das, obwohl es bald aus immer größeren massiven Gebäuden bestand, beharrlich weiterhin « in den Zelten » genannt wurde.

Viele Attraktionen

Mit den Vorentwürfen für den gewünschten Vergnügungstempel betraute Friedrich Wilhelm IV. seine Hofbaumeister Friedrich Persius und Carl Ferdinand Langhans. Auf allerhöchste Anordnung machte sich 1845-1846 der große Landschafts- und Gartengestalter Peter Joseph Lenné daran, den Exerzierplatz zu einem Paradeplatz umzugestalten. Später, als sich Preußen zum Kaiserreich gekriegt und gesiegt hatte, erhielt der Platz eine Siegessäule und den Namen Königsplatz. Die konkrete Bauausführung für Krolls Etablissement lag in den Händen des begabten Architekten Eduard Knoblauch, dem Erbauer der Synagoge in der Oranienburger Straße. In der erstaunlich kurzen Bauzeit von zehn Monaten entstand ein monumentaler Bau in Form der märkischen Biedermeier-Renaissance. Mit einem prachtvollen Ball

eröffnete Kroll das Haus am 15. Februar 1844. 5.000 Damen und Herren fanden in drei Sälen ausreichend Platz. Kroll verstand es, mit immer neuen Attraktionen das Interesse des Publikums wach zu halten. In vielen Straßen Berlins warben große Plakate für den Besuch der italienischen oder chinesischen Nächte, der Verlosungen, der phantastisch arrangierten Maskenbälle, Weihnachtsausstellungen oder dergleichen. Er holte sogar den Wiener Walzerkönig Johann Strauß nach Berlin. Strauß befand allerdings, daß die Verführungskünste seiner Tänze « dem berlinischen Naturell wenig anhaben konnten » und zog sich rasch und endgültig mit seiner Kapelle in die Heimatstadt zurück. Als Joseph Kroll kurz nach der März-Revolution 1848 an einem Leberleiden starb, übernahm die älteste seiner vier Töchter die Leitung des Hauses und erwirkte von dem berüchtigten Polizeipräsidenten Hinckeldey die Konzession für Theateraufführungen.

Albert Lortzing

Auguste Kroll ließ im Königssaal ein Podium errichten, spielte sich an einigen Volksstücken warm, um sich dann der Oper zuzuwenden. Zu groß war der Reiz, sich dieser Gattung zu widmen, die sich noch eine Generation zuvor der Hof vorbehalten hatte. Der aus Erfurt zugereiste Theaterdirektor Böttner übernahm das musikalische Regime und schreckte neben den unverzichtbaren Komödien, Lustspielen und Lokalpossen auch nicht vor der großen Oper zurück. In der ersten Saison 1850 wurden zum Beispiel « Martha » von Friedrich von Flotow, « Die Regimentstochter » von Donizetti, « Die weiße Dame » von Boieldieu und der « Barbier von Sevilla » von Rossini aufgeführt. In Anbetracht eines Orchesters von lediglich 36 Mann Stärke darf man das als ein ausgesprochen mutiges Unternehmen bezeichnen. Kurz vor dessen frühem Tod wurde Auguste Kroll zum Schutzengel für einen Komponisten, der zeitlebens als Prophet im eigenen Land nichts oder nur wenig galt : Albert Lortzing. Von Theater zu Theater wandernd, materiell immer am Rand des Existenzminimums, war er bei allen Erfolgen, die seine Opern hatten, ein armer Schlucker geblieben. Auguste verpflichtete ihn, und so studierte er hier vor den Toren der Stadt seinen « Waffenschmied » ein und dirigierte ihn selbst. Auch seine « Undine » erlebte hier ihre Berliner Premiere. Am 12. Oktober 1850 hatte Lortzing die Gelegenheit, die Böttner'sche Einstudierung seines « Zar und Zimmermann » zu sehen. Zu Königs Geburtstag wurde diese Oper angelegentlich eines Festaktes wiederholt.

Die Kroll'sche Unterstützungsaktion war eher ideeller als finanzieller Natur. Außer Ruhm erntete der Komponist von diesen Aufführungen so gut wie nichts. Tantiemen und Honorare wurden nicht gezahlt. Bei der angespannten wirtschaftlichen Lage der Kroll'schen Bühne wäre das auch schwer gefallen. Lortzing starb am 21. Januar 1851 in völliger Armut. Sein Lebensleid fasste der Komponist in einem Brief aus seinen letzten Berliner Jahren zusammen :

« So gestehe ich Dir, was ich noch keinem gestand, daß ich durch die letzten verhängnisvollen Jahre verarmt bin, daß Deutschland darob erröten könnte, wenn es anders Scham im Leibe hätte. Die Herren Intendanten, Direktoren, Oberregisseure und andere, wenn sie nicht gleich Erfolge, wie die des " Freischützen ", auch eines " Zar und Zimmermann " wittern, lassen den deutschen Komponisten im Stich. Wie wurde und wird gleich nach französischen Opern geangelt. Oh, entstünde doch nur einmal eine Revolution beim Theater. »

Brand und Wiederaufbau

Wenige Tage nach Lortzings Tod traf das Kroll'sche Etablissement ein schwerer Schlag : Es brannte bis auf die

Grundmauern ab. Nur der Garten und das Sommertheater überstanden den Brand. Mit 80.000 Thalern Entschädigung aus der Feuerversicherung machte sich die resolute Auguste unverzüglich an den Wiederaufbau. Ein junger ungarischer Violinist und Dirigent auf der Durchreise von Wien nach Petersburg, Jakob Engel, machte in Berlin einen Zwischenaufenthalt und wurde Krolls neuer Kapellmeister. Auguste verliebte sich und nach kurzer Verlobungszeit heirateten die beiden. Der Kroll-Engel, wie er bald genannt wurde, setzte an zum musikalischen Höhenflug. Neben den bewährten Opern von Lortzing, Auber und Donizetti versuchte er mit Rossinis « Othello » die Opera seria bei Kroll einzubürgern und wagte sich auch an die Kompositionen Richard Wagners heran. Bei den Sommerkonzerten brachten Engels Musiker Ouvertüren und Märsche aus « Tannhäuser » und « Lohengrin » zu Gehör.

Doch so sehr sich Engel auch ins Zeug legte, Früchte trugen seine Bemühungen nicht. Die geschäftliche Konstruktion des gesamten Unternehmens war nicht tragfähig genug für einen Opernbetrieb. 1855 wurde das Haus wegen wirtschaftlicher Schwierigkeiten erst geschlossen, dann an den Hauptgläubiger verkauft. Auch der neue Besitzer geriet in den finanziellen Ruin und mußte das Unternehmen 1862 zwangsversteigern lassen. Das auf runde 280.000 Thaler taxierte Objekt ging an den Meistbietenden. Und dieser Meistbietende (keiner wusste genau, wer hinter ihm stand und wie er das Geld zusammengebracht hatte) war zur allgemeinen Überraschung Jakob Engel, der für 109.000 Thaler den Zuschlag erhielt.

Ende der Dynastie

Nach sieben Jahren Interregnum war das Unternehmen wieder in der Hand der Dynastie Kroll / Engel. Von aufwändigen Operninszenierungen ließ Engel (aus Schaden klug geworden) fürderhin die Finger. Berühmt wurde das Haus durch seine Weihnachtsausstellungen, Promenadenkonzerte und Bälle. Dennoch plagten Jakob Engel wirtschaftliche Sorgen. Seit der Einführung der Gewerbefreiheit 1869 fiel der Konzessionszwang weg und die Privatunternehmen schossen wie Pilze aus dem Boden. Kroll verlor seine Exklusivität. So wurde das 25-jährige Jubiläum in einer bedrückenden ökonomischen Lage begangen, die für das Unternehmen seit seiner Gründung nun schon charakteristisch war. Als Engel 1888 starb, übernahm sein Sohn die Leitung, verlor aber bald die Lust. Die 50-Jahr-Feier stand bereits unter dem Stern laufender Verkaufsverhandlungen mit dem Brauereibesitzer Julius Bötzw. Kroll-Junior siedelte mit seiner Mutter nach New York über, wo Auguste Kroll 1907 das Zeitliche segnete. Nach 50 Jahren war die Dynastie Kroll in ihrem Stammhaus erloschen.

Renovierungsbedarf

Was macht man mit einem Haus, das eigentlich zu groß ist, das andererseits niemand missen will ? Brauer Bötzw nutzte es als Restaurationsbetrieb mit gelegentlichen Konzertveranstaltungen. Er hatte sich aber verschätzt, was die Einnahmen aus dieser Art der Bewirtschaftung betraf. 1895 schloß er mit den Königlichen Schauspielen einen Pachtvertrag ab, und so fanden denn ab August bei Kroll wieder Operaufführungen statt. Intendant Graf Bolko von Hochberg veranlasste schließlich, daß Bötzw im April des folgenden Jahres das gesamte Etablissement für zweieinhalb Millionen Mark dem preußischen Fiskus überließ. Hochberg hatte damit endlich eine zweite Spielstätte für die mit ihren 1.500 Plätzen allmählich eng werdende Lindenoper. Er benannte Kroll in « Neues Königliches Opernhaus » um und nutzte es während der dringend erforderlichen Umbauten im Schauspielhaus und an der Lindenoper 1904-1905 als

Interimsbühne. Die auf Verschleiß spekulierende Übernutzung brachte das Kroll-Gebäude selbst in den Zustand dringlicher Renovierungsbedürftigkeit. Denn nicht nur die Theatervorstellungen nagten an der Substanz, sondern vor allem die legendären Bälle bei Kroll.

Mit einer Renovierung wollte man sich jedoch nicht lange aufhalten. Ab 1909 gab es eine Planung für ein neues Kaiserliches Opernhaus. Das Arbeitsministerium trat an den Berliner Stadtbaurat Ludwig Hoffmann heran, der Ende 1913 erste Pläne erstellte. Das Preußische Abgeordnetenhaus bewilligte die erste Rate der benötigten Gelder und unmittelbar darauf begannen die Abrissarbeiten, die der wenige Wochen später ausbrechende Erste Weltkrieg unterbrach. Seit 1915 lagerte die « Zentralsammelstelle der Reichswollwochen » im gesamten Kroll'schen Gebäudekomplex Wolle und Lumpen ein.

Die Volksbühne

Unmittelbar nach dem Krieg nahm der neue preußische Kultusminister Adolph Hoffmann Verbindungen zu Musikern, Theaterleuten und Architekten auf, um die Kroll-Ruine zu einem « Volksopernhaus » mit 3.000 Plätzen auszubauen. Ehe man sich über das Projekt einig werden konnte, gab es einen neuen Kultusminister in Preußen und vor allem kein Geld mehr für den Neubau. Bis zum Juli 1920 geschah nun gar nichts mehr. Etwa zur gleichen Zeit hatte sich die Volksbühne, die mit dem 1914-1915 fertig gestellten « Theater am Bülowplatz » (heute Rosa-Luxemburg-Platz) über ein großes Schauspielhaus verfügte, von dem Gedanken verabschiedet, zusätzlich noch eine Volksoper zu bauen. Stattdessen schloß sie mit dem Preußischen Staat einen Pachtvertrag über 25 Jahre für das Kroll-Grundstück ab. Als Gegenleistung für den sehr geringen Pachtzins verpflichtete sie sich zum beschleunigten Wiederaufbau der Ruine. Mit der Durchführung wurde der Architekt Oskar Kaufmann betraut, der ein erfahrener Theaterarchitekt war. Kaufmann vergrößerte nicht nur den Zuschauerraum und das Bühnenhaus zu Deutschlands größtem Operntheater, er legte auch im südlichen anschließenden Gartenteil zwei Terrassen und eine Freilichtbühne neu an und konzipierte einen ovalen Festsaal, der auftragsgemäß 5.000 Personen fassen sollte. Das Projekt war so groß dimensioniert, daß der Volksbühne bald die finanzielle Puste ausging. Die Inflation tat ihr Übriges. Wieder einmal war Kroll in eine finanzielle Kalamität hineinmanövriert.

Ort der Neuen Musik

Der sozialdemokratische Ministerpräsident Braun sprang seinen Volksbühnengenossen zur Seite. Der Preußische Staat übernahm die Kosten zur Fertigstellung und schließlich das gesamte Opernhaus, während die Volksbühne für 25 Jahre die Hälfte der Karten für jede Vorstellung abzunehmen hatte. Diese konnte sie an ihre Mitglieder zu stark verringerten Preisen weitergeben. Am 1. Januar 1924 wurde die « Oper am Königsplatz » mit den « Meistersingern von Nürnberg » unter Erich Kleiber eröffnet. Doch die Staatsoper wurde nicht glücklich mit ihrer zweiten Spielstätte. Kroll blieb zweite Wahl, solange sie von der Lindenoper aus regiert wurde. Das Solistenpersonal wie auch die Staatskapelle waren durch den doppelten Spielbetrieb überfordert. So trennte man denn, was nicht zusammenwachsen konnte und wollte. Otto Klemperer wurde zum Direktor und musikalischen Leiter der « Staatsoper am Platz der Republik » berufen, die am 19. November 1927 mit Beethovens « Fidelio » eröffnet wurde. Unter Klemperers Leitung wurde das Haus Berlins Vorzeigeobjekt für fortschrittliches, in die Zukunft weisendes Kunst- und Musikverständnis. In ihrer nur vierjährigen

Arbeitsphase erhielt die Stadt endlich ein alle Konventionen aufbrechendes progressives Musiktheater. Zeitgenössische Komponisten wie Igor Strawinsky, Paul Hindemith, Ernst Křenek, Maurice Ravel, Darius Milhaud, Jaques Ibert, Arnold Schönberg, Kurt Weill, Leos Janáček fanden hier ihre Plattform in kompetenter musikalischer Interpretation durch Otto Klemperer, Alexander von Zemlinsky und Fritz Zweig, um nur einige zu nennen. Adäquat waren die Inszenierungen von Jürgen Fehling und Gustav Gründgens und die Bühnenbilder von Teo Otto, Ewald Dülberg, Caspar Neher, den Bauhauskünstlern Oskar Schlemmer und László Moholy-Nagy oder dem italienischen Maler Giorgio de Chirico.

Schmachvolles Ende

Von Anfang an waren die Reaktionen auf diese revolutionären Operaufführungen zwiespältig. Begeisterung auf Seiten des modernen Bildungsbürgertums, eindeutige Ablehnung auf Seiten der Konservativen. Nach einer Spielzeit trat Klemperer als Operndirektor zurück, ihm folgte Ernst Legal (der nach 1945 noch sieben Spielzeiten der Staatsoper Unter den Linden vorstand). Auch ihm war ein Durchbruch zur einhelligen Publikumsgunst nicht beschieden. Die Volksbühnenmitglieder, die ja 50 Prozent der Karten besaßen, konnten die moderne Opernästhetik nicht verkraften. Suchten sie doch gerade den kulinarischen Genuss der konventionellen Operaufführungen. Dieses Bedürfnis wurde von der Leitung der Kroll-Oper schlicht ignoriert, was sich in schwindenden Besucherzahlen manifestierte.

Die Neubesetzung des Kultusministeriums durch den Sozialdemokraten Adolf Grimme, den der Klemperer-Biograph Peter Heyworth einen « anständigen, aber unprofilieren Schulmeister ohne besonderen Sinn für Musik und bildende Künste » nennt, bedeutete das Ende für die Kroll-Oper. Er schlug vor, durch die Schließung des Hauses andere finanziell schwach gestellte preußische Staatstheater zu unterstützen. Das Finanzministerium, von Anfang an voll Reserviertheit gegen das Kroll-Experiment, stimmte erwartungsgemäß zu. Zwar beteiligten sich führende Theaterleute und namhafte Intellektuelle an einer Kampagne « Rettet die Kroll-Oper », jedoch vergeblich. Am 25. März 1931 beschloß eine Regierungsmehrheit aus Zentrum und Rechtsparteien unter Stimmenthaltung der SPD und gegen die Stimmen der Kommunisten die Schließung des Hauses.

Das Ende war schmachvoll. Nach dem Reichstagsbrand vom 27. Februar 1933 wurde am 5. März in Deutschland ein neuer Reichstag gewählt. Noch hielt man sich an die Weimarer Verfassung, die besagte, daß die gewählten Parlamentarier innerhalb von 30 Tagen zur konstituierenden Sitzung zusammen zu treten hatten. Raum suchend verfiel man auf die seit dem Sommer 1931 ungenutzt herumstehende Kroll-Oper als Versammlungsort. Der Zuschauerraum wurde in kürzester Zeit so umgebaut, daß 647 Abgeordnete bequem Platz finden konnten. Eigentlich waren nur knapp 560 Sitze nötig, denn die 81 KPD-Mandate waren schon kassiert, ein Dutzend SPD-Abgeordnete in « Schutzhaft » genommen worden. Der Reichstagspräsident Hermann Göring wurde am 21. März per Zuruf « gewählt ». Nur zwei Tage später peitschte Hitler hier sein « Ermächtigungsgesetz » durch, das die Weimarer Verfassung in wesentlichen Punkten aufhob.

Schutt und Asche

Als die Lindenoper im April 1941 zerstört wurde, erwachte bei Kroll noch einmal das musikalische Leben. Die britische Luftoffensive gegen Berlin machte der erneuten Wiedergeburt am 22. November desselben Jahres ein Ende. Kroll versank

in Schutt und Asche. Nach dem Krieg bewirtschaftete man für einige Jahre noch das Gartenrestaurant. 1957 wurde auch das geschlossen und der letzte Ruinenrest abgeräumt. Im Zusammenhang mit der Internationalen Bauausstellung INTERBAU diente der Platz als Parkgelände für die neu erbaute Kongresshalle.

Die Krolloper, Sitz des Reichstages 1933 bis 1945

1. September 1939 : Adolf Hitler verkündet in der Krolloper den Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs.

Viele Gäste der Stadt Berlin staunen über die großzügigen Grünflächen in der Mitte Berlins. Das viele Grün hat zumindest zwei Gründe. Zum einen liegen (historisch von Alt-Berlin aus betrachtete) die Grünflächen meistens am Stadtrand, zum anderen haben die Stadtverwalter nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg viel Geschichte unter den grünen Rasen gekehrt.

Letzteres trifft auf die Krolloper zu, die als wichtiger geschichtlicher Ort am 31. August 2007 in das Stadtbild zurückkehrte. Peer Steinbrück, Bundesfinanzminister für Finanzen, und Doktor Hans J. Reichardt, Historiker und Autor der Geschichte der Krolloper, enthüllten an diesem Tage eine neue Berliner Gedenktafel. Dietmar Arnold vom Verein Berliner Unterwelten eingetragener Verein beschreibt im Text die wechselvolle Geschichte des Hauses.

Im Tunnel durfte geraucht werden

Das Haus stand einst auf dem Königsplatz, an der dem Reichstag gegenüberliegenden Großen Querallee zwischen Paul-Löbe-Allee und John-Foster-Dulles-Allee am Rande des Tiergartens. Josef Kroll, 1797 in Breslau geboren, errichtete 1843 das größte Berliner Vergnügungslokal - vor dem Brandenburger Tor. Krolls Etablissement bot dem gebildeten Publikum in Sälen, Logen und Zimmern Konzerte, Bälle und Schaustellungen. Im Tunnel durfte geraucht werden (nicht aber etwa auf der Straße) .

Auguste Kroll, Tochter des Gründers, bewarb sich um eine Theaterkonzession, die sie auch erhielt. Feuer vernichtete das von Ludwig Persius, Carl Ferdinand Langhans und Eduard Knoblauch erbaute Gebäude. Das Haus erstand als Theater neu und ging als Krolloper in die Berliner Geschichte ein.

In den turbulenten Jahren zwischen dem Ersten und Zweiten Weltkrieg wirkten hier Otto Klemperer, Erich Kleiber, Gustav Gründgens. Im Zuge radikaler Einsparungen mußte die Krolloper 1931 schließen. Das Haus blieb leer.

Der Reichstagsbrand

Dann brannte der Reichstag. Es war am 27. Februar 1933. Die in einiger Entfernung davon gegenüberliegende Krolloper stieg zum « Reichstagsgebäude » auf - als provisorischer Sitz. Am 23. März 1933 stimmte die Mehrheit der anwesenden Reichstagsabgeordneten dem « Ermächtigungsgesetz » zu, mit die nationalsozialistische Diktatur das Ende der Demokratie im Deutschen Reich herbeiführte. Nur die SPD hatte gegen das Gesetz gestimmt. Die KPD mußte tatenlos zusehen. Ihre Mitglieder waren längst nicht mehr im Reichstag vertreten, sondern auf der Flucht, im Untergrund,

verhaftet.

Die Informationstafel zitiert den Zeitzeugen Josef Felder, der vom 23. März 1933 berichtet. Den Vorschlag, dem Reichspräsidenten Hermann Göring eine scharfe Note zu übermitteln und dann abzureisen, lehnten die SPD-Abgeordneten empört ab.

« Otto Wels wehrte sich ebenso wie der um viele Jahre jüngere Doktor Schumacher energisch gegen ein Fernbleiben von der Sitzung. Die Abgeordnete von Schleswig-Holstein, Luise Schröder (Louise Schröder) , geriet in Erregung. Sie sprang auf und forderte leidenschaftlich :“ Keiner darf fernbleiben ! Ich gehe hinüber und wenn sie mich in Stücke reißen. Man muß vor aller Welt den Nazis widersprechen und mit Nein stimmen. ” »

Im Zweiten Weltkrieg beschädigten Bombentreffer die Krolloper. Die Ruine verschwand bis 1957 unter dem Grün des Tiergartens.

Gedenken an ein merkwürdiges Gebäude

Die SPD Bellevue (Berlin-Mitte) und die Gedenktafelkommission der Bezirksverordnetenversammlung Mitte initiierten die Tafel, unterstützt vom Bundesminister für Finanzen Peer Steinbrück, der die Gedenktafel finanzierte, und dem Verein Berliner Unterwelten eingetragener Verein, der sie gestaltete.

Am 1. September 1939 verkündete Adolf Hitler in der Krolloper den Beginn des Zweiten Weltkriegs. Am Tag vor dem 68. Jahrestag dieses Ereignisses ist ein weiterer verdrängter Ort deutscher Geschichte wieder sichtbar geworden.

L'interdit placé sur « Parsifal » par les Nazis

According to the controversial biography of Wagner by Robert W. Gutman, « “ Parsifal ” , more than the “ Ring ” , was the gospel of National-Socialism » . Gutman interpreted this work in terms of Wagner's later writings, the so-called regeneration essays. He writes :

« Surveying the world from the heights of Monsalvat, the Grail community in “ Parsifal ” was alarmed to observe natural selection working against its distinctive Aryanism. The knights were confronted with an enemy gaining upon them every day. Here was the decisive racial crisis that grew into an uncompromising struggle for power. “ Parsifal ” is an enactment of the Aryan's plight, struggle and hope for redemption. »

Gutman probably found the clue to this analysis in the writings of Theodor W. Adorno, who also saw in « Parsifal » a Master race agenda. As members of « The Bayreuth Circle » had done in the 1880's and 1890's, Adorno saw the work in the context set by Wagner's regeneration essays, as published in the « Bayreuther Blätter » . Gutman might also have been influenced by the claim that Adolf Hitler took a very narrow view of the work in terms of blood, regeneration and selective compassion (see Rauschning's « Conversations with Adolf Hitler » , or « Gespräche mit Hitler » , 1939, while keeping in mind that modern historians, such as Hitler's biographer Ian Kershaw, regard this book as

unreliable) .

The 1st problem with Gutman's interpretation that has been pointed-out in the wake of his book, and in the venomous debate surrounding the subsequent articles by Hartmut Zelinsky and books by his followers such as Marc Weiner, is the lengthy gestation of the work. The story of « Parsifal » was worked-out in detail already in the « Prose Draft » of 1865. This was 13 years before the appearance of the 1st of the so-called « regeneration » articles (« Religion and Art ») . Although we can speculate that some of Wagner's ideas about regeneration and blood had begun to form before 1865, these speculations cannot be proven ; although there is a clear development in Wagner's thought from an emphasis on redemption, as evidenced in his earlier Operas and associated prose writings, to an emphasis on regeneration in the articles that he wrote during his last years, which « The Bayreuth Circle » related (in various ways) to his last Opera. It is hard to find any specific evidence of ideas about regeneration, rather than redemption, in the « Prose Draft » , and it is unlikely that anyone could have predicted the regeneration essays, or indeed anything that Wagner would be writing in the late- 1870's, on the basis of what he wrote in the 1860's. Consistency was not one of Wagner's characteristics and his views on many subjects changed, and some of his attitudes softened, during his last decades.

Unlike « The Bayreuth Circle » of the late- 19th Century, today, we are less likely to see the work in terms of the regeneration essays ; although it was often seen against this background during the 20th Century. With better knowledge of how the work actually developed, from its genesis in the late- 1850's to the completion of the poem (libretto) on 19 April 1877, it seems highly-unlikely that the influences that Wagner absorbed, digested and finally presented in the essays of his last years, were significant in determining the ideal content of the work, which had been almost entirely defined by August 1865. For example, Wagner 1st met Count Gobineau in 1876 (« Cosima's Diary » , entry for 30 November) and, only after meeting Gobineau again in 1880, did Wagner begin to study his writings. Therefore, it is not possible, as Gutman asserted, that Gobineau's racist ideas could have influenced Wagner before he wrote the detailed « Prose Draft » of 1865, or even the 2nd one of 1877. Nor is it likely that Wagner had independently developed ideas similar to those of Count Gobineau, since there is evidence both in « Cosima's Diaries » and in her correspondence with Gobineau, that Wagner had violently disagreed with his racial theories.

Therefore, it seems, to this writer at least, that much debate about « Parsifal » from Theodor W. Adorno (writing in the 1930's) through Gutman (writing in the 1960's) to some of the more hysterical commentators of recent decades has been mistakenly concerned with the ideas about regeneration that preoccupied Wagner while he was finishing an Opera that had been worked-out, in some detail, decades earlier. It can be argued that the theme of regeneration is incidental to « Parsifal » (arguably less central than it is to « Lohengrin » , which also ends with a restoration) and that Wagner's last Opera is actually about redemption and compassion. Most of the criticism and commentary concerning « Parsifal » , in recent decades, has taken for granted that the work was inspired by the ideas of Darwin and Gobineau (both unknown to Wagner when he wrote his original « Prose Draft ») and that (as also has been claimed for « Die Meistersinger ») , the Opera contains a hidden anti-Semitic subtext ; so well hidden, in fact, that it never occurred to the Nazi's that such a subtext might be present.

The 2nd problem is the ban on « Parsifal » that Robert R. Gibson has proposed was enforced during the War years,

in the 3rd « Reich » . If as Gutman asserts, this work was « the gospel of National-Socialism » , why should it have been suppressed or discouraged by the Nazi's ? Was it because the ideologues of the Nazi Party did not share Hitler's enthusiasm for this work ? Or was it, perhaps, that they found messages in the work that they disliked, and this dislike outweighed the regeneration message (which might have been of interest to them) that recently (1937) had been abhorred by their opponent Adorno ?

Incidentally, it was another work entirely that the « Völkischer Beobachter » had hailed as « the gospel of the Nazi movement » : the « Foundations of the 19th Century » (1897-1898) by Houston Stewart Chamberlain, at that time a central figure in « The Bayreuth Circle » during its 2nd (« Wilhelmist ») stage, who married Eva Wagner, in 1907, thus becoming the posthumous son-in-law of Richard. (Houston Stewart Chamberlain never met Richard Wagner ; the nearest he came was to see Wagner across a Bayreuth restaurant) .

So, what are the messages carried by Wagner's Opera that might have led to a ban on performances of « Parsifal » in the period 1939-1945, and its absence in these years from Hitler's Bayreuth ? Which of these messages could have been the real problem and which secondary objections ? It is even possible that the arguments with which the Nazi ideologues persuaded Hitler (if, in fact, they were able to do so) were not the real reasons for them wanting to forbid Wartime performances of the work. In a paper delivered at the Wagner symposium, in Adelaide, Robert R. Gibson suggested the following :

1stly, although it portrays a warrior caste of Grail Knights, there is in « Parsifal » an underlying message of pacifism. At key moments in the work, the protagonist is disarmed. In the 1st Act, « Parsifal » is up-braided for killing a swan, and, as a sign of his growing awareness, breaks his bow and throws away his arrows. In the 3rd Act, he arrives as an armed knight, but allows his armour to be removed, to be replaced by the mantle of the Grail brotherhood, on which appears the emblem of the dove : a symbol of peace. Only then, can he return to the shrine of Monsalvat.

Even in the 2nd Act, which ends in a violent conflict between « Parsifal » and the domain of Klingsor, the only destructive act in that conflict, on the part of the hero, is to grasp the spear and to make the sign of the cross. (In fact, his passivity throughout the Opera does not commend him as an Aryan hero ; in contrast to « Siegfried ») . The spear itself, a holy relic, will not allow itself to be used as a weapon : when Klingsor throws it at « Parsifal » , the spear pauses above his head. « Parsifal » then shows himself more worthy than Amfortas to be guardian of the holy relic by not bearing it as a weapon (« denn nicht ihn selberdurft' ich führen im Streite ») . This pacifist message alone would be sufficient reason, the Nazi ideologues could have argued, to suppress the work at least until the end of the War.

2ndly, the primary message of the Opera is about compassion, scarcely an element of Nazi ideology. It has been regarded as a feminine attribute, not as belonging to the masculine ideal of the Aryan male. One of principal ideologues of the Nazi movement, Alfred Rosenberg, compared Wagner's works as follows :

« The essence of all Nordic Western art has been revealed in Richard Wagner. It shows that the Nordic soul is not contemplative, that it does not lose itself in an individualistic psychology. Rather, it experiences the willed, cosmic,

spiritual laws, and shapes our art spiritually and architectonically. Richard Wagner is one of those artists in whom 3 factors coincide, each of which form a part of our entire artistic life : the Nordic ideal of beauty as it appears outwardly in “ Lohengrin ” and “ Siegfried ” , linked to deepest feeling for nature ; the inner will of man in “ Tristan und Isolde ” ; and the struggle for the highest value of Nordic Western man : heroic honour, linked with inner truthfulness. This inner ideal of beauty is realized in Wotan, in King Mark and in Hans Sachs. Conversely, “ Parsifal ” is a strongly emphasized weakening of the will in favour of an adoptive value. » (« Mythos des XX. Jahrhunderts » , 1930.)

3rdly, the women portrayed in the Opera are no better role models for the women of the 3rd « Reich » , than « Parsifal » is exemplary of the Aryan male ideal. His mother Herzeleide is a War widow who attempts to shield her son from weapons and fighting, and dies of a broken heart when he leaves her in pursuit of a band of Knights. Kundry is, obviously, a foreign element but (despite the subsequent analysis of Weiner, in which she becomes an anti-Semitic stereotype) , Wagner's sympathetic treatment of this degenerate, predatory female might not have appealed to the ideologues.

4thly, the ban occurred at a time when the National-Socialist Party was attempting to suppress homosexuality. The SS were forbidden to touch one another but, in the Opera, we see a community of male warriors who embrace during their ceremonies.

From 1934 to 1937, there was a series of cloister trials, in which the monks of German monasteries were tried for alleged homosexual activities. In a broadcast speech, in May 1937, Josef Goebbels denounced the unnatural life of unmarried priests and monks, and he described monasteries as « breeding places of vile homosexuality » . Given the Nazi campaign against the Church and, in particular, the attempts to discredit monasteries and other religious communities, it is not surprising that an Opera, in which an all male religious community triumphs over adversity through the recovery of a phallic symbol, would be unwanted.

Finally, although « Parsifal » is less complex than the « Ring » , it is still a multi-layered, multi-dimensional, opaque work that allows of many different interpretations. In that respect, it is the antithesis of totalitarian art. The latter is characterized by simple messages, unambiguous images and uncomplicated archetypes. Even if « Parsifal » can be interpreted as a homage to Aryan supremacy, this objective is obscured by other, more obvious messages that would have disturbed Nazi ideologues. We see a youth destroy his weapons, renounce sexual union with a woman and join an enclosed, all male, religious community. In short, doing everything that a good Aryan youth of the 1930's was not supposed to do.

Research into the records of Opera Houses within the 3rd « Reich » , carried-out by Katherine R. Syer, has shown that there were, in fact, both staged and concert performances of « Parsifal » during the War years. There is a recording (issued on CD by « Preiser Records » , 90261) of the 3rd Act of the Opera in a concert performance given in Berlin, on 31st March 1942.

« “ Parsifal ” was not performed in Munich during the War but it was in Von Schirach's Vienna. In Hamburg, “ Parsifal

” was performed annually from the 1929-1930 season until that of 1942-1943, on average 3 times per season ; in 1936, a new production directed by Oscar Fritz Schuh and designed by Emil Preetorius ran for 7 performances. In Frankfurt, which fell within Josef Gœbbels' sphere (as head of the “ Reich ” Chamber of Culture) , “ Parsifal ” had been performed annually in the period between the 2 World Wars, invariably around Easter time. “ Parsifal ” suddenly disappeared from the Frankfurt program, in 1940, only to resurface in 1941, 1942 and 1943. In Dresden, “ Parsifal ” was performed every season, from 1914 to 1944 inclusive, with the number of annual performances fixed at 4 from 1933 to 1944. »

Syer goes on to state that Wolfgang Wagner had a conversation with Adolf Hitler, in 1940, in which, reportedly, the « Führer » stated his wish for a more abstract and indeterminate approach in future stagings of « Parsifal » . However, in the passage that Syer quotes from Spotts' « Hitler and the Power of Æsthetics » , an entry from Josef Gœbbels' diary is inaccurately reported. This error has been corrected by John Deathridge :

« What Gœbbels actually dictated for his diary, on 22 November 1941, was this : " Contrary to what has been reported to me, the “ Führer ” does not want “ Parsifal ” to be performed solely in Bayreuth again ; he only means that one should modernize the set and costumes of “ Parsifal ” somewhat. Either we have to get away from this Christian mystical style, or “ Parsifal ” , in the long run, won't be able to retain its place in the modern repertory. The “ Führer ” gives me several suggestions, which I will immediately put into effect." » (« Wagner Beyond Good and Evil » , John Deathridge, University of California Press, 2008 ; pages 173-174.)

Therefore, we must conclude that, even though some Nazi ideologues had reservations about « Parsifal » and despite Hitler's dislike of the « Christian mystical style » in which it had until then always been presented on stage, both Hitler and Gœbbels were looking forward to new productions of the Opera after the War. Nike Wagner's suggestion (« The Wagners » , page 139) that Hitler wanted Alfred Rosenberg to rewrite the text should not be taken as hard fact, although we can assume that Rosenberg would have done so if asked. She reports her father, Wieland, as saying : « Hitler virtually prohibited “ Parsifal ” . » . Like much else, in Nike Wagner's book, this should be taken with a pinch of salt. Virtually or otherwise, there is no evidence that Hitler prohibited « Parsifal » , at any time. It is possible that certain of his subordinates, on the basis of some hint from Hitler, discouraged performances of « Parsifal » because its pacifistic message was considered unsuitable for the War years. But that would be speculation and in the absence of evidence for a ban, and in the presence of evidence of some performances during the War, we can only conclude that there was no ban on « Parsifal » .

Footnote 1 - « Richard Wagner : The Man, His Mind and His Music » , Robert Gutman (1968) .

Footnote 2 - « Versuch über Wagner » , Theodor W. Adorno (1952) . English translation by Rodney Livingstone, « In Search of Wagner » (1981) .

Footnote 3 - The definitive work on « The Bayreuth Circle » is « Der Bayreuther Kreis von seiner Entstehung bis zum Ausgang der Wilhelminischen Ära. Wagnerkult und Kulturreform im Geiste völkischer Weltanschauung » , Winfried Schüler, Aschendorff, Münster (1971) .

To the extent that « The Bayreuth Circle » had any influence, it was exerted through a publication that Richard Wagner had established in his last years, the « Bayreuther Blätter » . Wagner appointed Hans von Wolzogen as editor, in which post he remained until his death, in 1938, at which the journal ceased to be published. The « Bayreuther Blätter » has been described as the publication forum for « The Bayreuth Circle » ; although it might be more accurate to regard the list of authors, whose articles were selected by von Wolzogen for publication in the « Blätter » , as defining the membership of the otherwise insubstantial group known as « The Bayreuth Circle » . Although the continuity of the editorship maintained a certain continuity also in the content of the journal, Schüler was able to distinguish 3 distinct stages or generations in the « Circle » .

Footnote 4 - Schüler pointed-out that Richard Wagner's ideas about redemption and regeneration culminated in « Parsifal » . It was therefore natural that, after the publication of Wagner's « Religion and Art » and a series of related articles in the « Blätter » , other authors should take-up Wagner's ideas about redemption and regeneration in later issues of the journal. Their articles almost invariably related those ideas to « Parsifal » . The subsequent history of articles relating to « Parsifal » and the theme of mankind's potential regeneration has been documented by Mary A. Cicora in : « “ Parsifal ” Reception in the “ Bayreuther Blätter ” » . In this study, based on Doctor Cicora's doctoral dissertation, the subtly different perspectives of « The Bayreuth Circle » (that is, the authors who published in the « Blätter ») are illustrated by selections from articles in each of the 3 stages of the « Circle » .

Footnote 5 - This subject is discussed in depth by the editor of the Wagner - Gobineau correspondence, Eric Eugène, in « Wagner et Gobineau : Existe-t-il un racisme wagnérien ? » , Le Cherche midi, Paris (1998) .

Footnote 6 - Published in Wagner volume 20, number 2, pages 78-87. The paper was originally given at the « Wagner at the Millenium » symposium held at the University of Adelaide, South Australia, on 25-27 November 1998.

Rainer Schlöber

Rainer Schlöber was a German journalist and writer who held, from 1933 to 1945, the governmental post of « Reichsdramaturg » (« Reich » Drama Adviser) in the Ministry of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda headed by Doctor Josef Gœbbels and also, from 1935 to 1938, President of the « Reichstheaterkammer » (« Reich » Theatre Chamber) , the State governing body for drama. This was an even more important and high-profile position. The equivalent body in the world of music, the « Reichsmusikkammer » , was headed by the world-famous composer Richard Strauß from 1933 to 1935.

According to Doctor Gerwin Strobl, an academic specialist on the 3rd « Reich » and its cultural extensions, in his book « The Swastika and the Stage : German Theatre and Society (1933-1945) » :

« Future leading figures of Nazi theatre, such as “ Reichsdramaturg ” Rainer Schlöber, or Leader of the Hitler Youth and head of the Vienna theatre, Baldur von Schirach, are characteristic of the able, refined and literate group of men attracted by National-Socialist promises of restoring German culture. »

Schlöber began officer cadet training in 1917, during the First World War, after having graduated from secondary education by having taken the « Abitur » (secondary school graduation certificate examination) . Posted to Flanders, he saw combat and was promoted to the rank of full-Lieutenant.

After the end of the First War, Schlöber studied at both Jena and the University of Freiburg, reading History, Philosophy, German Philology and Evangelical (Protestant) Theology. Forced to interrupt his studies during the economic collapse of the early 1920's and making a living as a bank clerk, he returned to study in 1927 at Jena, receiving the degree of Doctor of Literature in 1931.

Schlöber took an active part in « völkisch » (nationalist folk-oriented) politics from 1924. But his NSDAP membership number was only 772,091, indicating that his actual Party membership dated from much later. He was not one of the real « alte Kämpfer » (old Fighters) whose membership, at latest, could not be positioned after number 100,000, though it seems that he joined the Party prior to its election and take-over of government in 1933.

In October 1931 (more than 1 year before the NSDAP and Adolf Hitler achieved State power in Germany) , Schlöber became Culture-Political Editor of the « Völkischer Beobachter » (Folkish Observer) , the Party newspaper of the NSDAP.

The position of Dramaturg in the German « Reich » of the 1930's and 1940's was one which « combined the offices of censor and animator. In neither was Rainer Schlöber altogether successful. Critical plays were of course banned, as were plays by Jewish authors and music by Jewish composers. But the manner of performance was less easy to control and left room for political innuendo and a modicum of independence. »

Schlöber, like Hitler (and Joseph Stalin) , favoured the works of William Shakespeare and mused, in 1933, that Shakespeare was not just « Aryan » but more German than English.

The « Reich » Dramaturgical Bureau produced a « List of Undesirable and Abusive Literature for the Stage » , which included the works of Bertolt Brecht.

Schlöber frequently stressed the usefulness to the « Reich » of the works of George Bernard Shaw. In that, he followed the instruction given to Josef Gëbbels by Hitler himself (who enjoyed « Cæsar and Cleopatra ») , that Shaw's works should be « protected » .

The « Thingspiel » has been described as « multi-disciplinary outdoor theatre » . About 40 outdoor theatres, usually modelled on those of ancient Greece, were developed during the currency of the 3rd « Reich » , all between 1934 and 1937, though a further 360 planned were never built.

The 1st « Thingplatz » was dedicated in Halle, in 1934, though the best-known is the « Dietrich-Eckart-Bühne » in sub-urban Berlin, opened in 1936 for the nearby Berlin 1936 Summer Olympics and named after the dramatist and

writer, Dietrich Eckart, an early comrade of Adolf Hitler. The « Dietrich-Eckart-Bühne », which can seat 22,000 spectators, was renamed the « Waldbühne » (Forest Theatre) after 1948 and is still much-used.

The minister responsible, Josef Goebbels, had in mind a concatenation of national, folk and traditional festivals :

« The festivals, too, which this government celebrates with the people, have a deeper meaning. These are not festivals organized by the government at the expense of the people. Quite the contrary, they are festivals in which the government no longer stand in opposition to each other but that government and people have become one. »

Schlöber was a proponent of the « Thingspiele » and, as « Reichsdramaturg », much involved with the idea and its realization, which he described, in a 1934 speech, as :

« A longing for a drama that intensifies historical events to create a mythical, universal, unambiguous reality beyond reality. »

He added that :

« Only someone who understands this longing will be able to create the cultic popular drama of the future. »

Any subject might be suitable for a « Thingspiel », so long as « placed in the context of the Nordic concept » and « moved into the light of our genuine and just myth of blood and honour » .

Schlöber wrote that the « Thingplätzen » would become :

« The heart of the whole festive national political and artistic life of the individual cities. »

(Rainer Schlöber, « Politik und Drama », published in 1935.)

The effect on an audience of a « Thingspiel » has been analyzed, thus :

« It was mainly the working of light and music, combined with the underlying ritual pattern, that triggered quasi-religious feelings and established an emotional bond among all those present. »

It may be that one inspiration was the « sacred art » noted by Richard Wagner in the formulation of his world-famous music-dramas.

The basis of Schlöber's view of art and of the 3rd « Reich » itself is encapsulated in his words about von Carl Maria von Weber's Opera, « Der Freischütz » (The Free-Shooter) in the 1937 edition of the German Music Year Book :

« The cultural-political goal of the 3rd “ Reich ” is not to focus upon bureaucratic power, but to create fervour in the

service of Holy Art. “ Der Freischütz ” is a mirror of the soul. »

Schlöber's formulation of the « Thingspiel » structure was « an Oratorio or programme of recitative choruses ; a presentation of allegorical “ tableaux vivants ” followed by a presentation of colours and pledges of allegiance : a pageant parade, a ballet, expressionistic dances. »

In September 1939, with the coming of War against Poland, France and Great Britain, Schlöber was also appointed Chief of the Cultural Office of the Hitler Youth, a uniformed position carrying the rank of Regional Leader (« Obergerbietsführer ») . From 1944, Schlöber directed a programme at the Ministry of Propaganda in respect of culture in the context of « Total War » (an expression conceived by Josef Gœbbels) .

In 1945, Schlöber took an active part in the Battle for Berlin, fighting with the remnants of an « SS-Panzer » unit. Taken prisoner by Soviet forces, he was sentenced to death on 30 June 1945 and executed on 9 August 1945.

In 1946, the printed works of Rainer Schlöber were (arguably ironically) placed on a list of prohibited literature in the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany. In 1953, the « Deutsche Demokratische Republik » (East Germany) formalized and continued the ban.

The fact that Schlöber's name is still being cited in books and academic articles would seem to indicate that his work was and is not without importance in the history of drama. The « sound and light » shows of the post-1945 era may not owe their existence entirely to the « Thingspiele » of the 1930's.

...

Rainer Schlöber (geboren 28. Juli 1899 in Jena ; gestorben 9. August 1945 in Berlin) , Schriftsteller und Journalist, war « Reichsdramaturg » im Ministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda und von 1935 bis 1938 Präsident der Reichstheaterkammer. Er war ein einflussreicher Kulturpolitiker des Nationalsozialismus.

Nach dem Abitur 1917 begann Schlöber seine Ausbildung zum Offizier. Kriegsbedingt kam er schon bald zum Fronteinsatz in Flandern. Im September 1917 erhielt er den Rang eines Leutnants. Nach Kriegsende studierte er Geschichte, Philosophie, Deutsche Philologie und evangelische Theologie an den Universitäten Jena und Freiburg. 1920 starb sein Vater Rudolf Schlöber, Universitätsprofessor in Jena und seit 1917 Direktor des Gœthe- und Schiller-Archivs in Weimar. Daraufhin mußte Schlöber sein Studium unterbrechen, arbeitete als Bankkaufmann und brachte es bis zum Prokuristen. Im November 1927 nahm er in Jena das Studium wieder auf und wurde im Mai 1931 bei Albert Leitzmann mit der Dissertation : Johann Friedrich Struensee in der deutschen Literatur zum Doktor der Philosophie Promoviert.

Ab 1924 begann seine publizistische Tätigkeit zunächst für die völkische, später für die nationalsozialistische Bewegung. Seit 1925 war Schlöber Mitarbeiter der durch den antisemitischen Schriftsteller Adolf Bartels herausgegebenen Zeitschrift Deutsches Schrifttum, in der er seine erste Literaturkritik über ein Buch des völkischen Dichter Kurt Geucke

veröffentlichte. Im Oktober 1931 wurde er kulturpolitischer Redakteur beim Völkischen Beobachter. Schlöber war Mitglied der NSDAP (Mitgliedsnummer : 772.091) .

Nach der « Machtübernahme » durch die Nationalsozialisten wirkte er an der Umgestaltung des deutschen Kulturlebens im Sinne des Nationalsozialismus als einflußnehmender Parteifunktionär mit. Dafür durfte er Karriere machen. Im August 1933 erhielt Schlöber durch Josef Gœbbels das neu geschaffene Amt des Reichsdramaturgen im ebenfalls 1933 erstmals eingerichteten Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda. Zudem stieg er zum Ministerialrat auf. In der Folgezeit übernahm er außerdem eine Vielzahl von leitenden Funktionen in Vereinigungen des deutschen Theaterlebens. Bei der Union Nationaler Schriftsteller war er ab Januar 1934 erster Vizepräsident.

Die Durchführung nationalsozialistischer Kulturpolitik hieß zuerst vor allem die Ausmerzung alles Jüdischen in Theater und Oper. Dazu hatte er verschiedene Machtmittel zu Verfügung. So war er als Reichsdramaturg auch für die Zulassung oder Ablehnung von Opern- und Operettenaufführungen zuständig. Er untersagte am 9. März 1934 nach einer Anfrage des preußischen Theaterausschusses Aufführungen von Werken der « jüdischen Komponisten » Giacomo Meyerbeer und Jacques Offenbach. Schlöber war unter anderem auch für die Zensur der Theatervorhaben der Jüdischen Kulturbünde zuständig und achtete dabei unter anderem sehr darauf, daß kein « Jude ausgerechnet Kleist dramatisch ausschachtet » . Weitere Spielverbote wurden auch damit begründet, daß das Dritte Reich das Judentum in seiner eminenten Gefahr erkannt habe. Bei zeitgenössischen Operetten bemängelte er in einem Schreiben an Gœbbels vom 12. September 1934 den hohen Anteil jüdischer Komponisten und Librettisten, woraufhin ihn Gœbbels anwies, eine « Säuberung » vorzunehmen.

Nach dem Tod seines Vorgesetzten Otto Laubinger wurde Schlöber im Herbst 1935 zum Leiter der Theaterabteilung im Propagandaministerium und zum Präsidenten der Reichstheaterkammer ernannt. Im April 1938 folgte ihm in letzterer Funktion der Schauspieler Ludwig Körner nach.

« Die Theaterführung wird von Schlöber in meinem Auftrag vorzüglich verwaltet. »

(Josef Gœbbels : Tagebucheintrag vom 4. August 1942.)

Ebenfalls bis 1938 gehörte Schlöber dem 1935 von Gœbbels berufenen, in der Praxis wenig bedeutenden Reichskultursenat an. Im September 1939 wurde er mit dem Dienstgrad eines Obergebietsführers Leiter des Kulturamtes der Hitler-Jugend. Schlöber, der in seiner Funktion als Reichsdramaturg auch Operaufführungen zu beurteilen hatte, reihte sich ein in die NS-Kritik, die Werke des Komponisten und Kapellmeisters Hans Ebert (1889-1952) als dekadent, dissonant und « Negermusik » klassifizierte. Zwei Tage nach der Berliner Erstaufführung von Eberts Oper Hille Bobbe im Deutschen Opernhaus rügte Schlöber 1942 öffentlich die « nicht arische Versippung » des Komponisten und verlangte, daß der « durch die hier gerügten Lässigkeiten erschütterte Ruf der Reichsdramaturgie hinsichtlich ihrer nationalsozialistischen Zuverlässigkeit wieder hergestellt » werden müsse. Als amtierender Reichsdramaturg war Schlöber weiterhin verantwortlich für die während des Zweiten Weltkrieges von der Reichsstelle für Musikbearbeitungen vorgenommenen Änderungen von Opernlibretti im Sinne des Nationalsozialismus.

Von 1944 an leitete Schlöber, der 1942 zum Ministerialdirigenten aufgestiegen war, die Abteilung Kultur im Propagandaministerium und lenkte Maßnahmen zur Umgestaltung des deutschen Kulturlebens im totalen Krieg. In der Endphase des Zweiten Weltkrieges soll er sich während der Schlacht um Berlin nach Adolf Hitlers Tod den Resten einer SS-Panzer-Einheit angeschlossen haben, die beschossen und zersprengt wurde. Schlöber wurde von sowjetischen Truppen gefangenengenommen, am 30. Juni 1945 zum Tode verurteilt und am 9. August hingerichtet.

In der Nachkriegszeit wurden 1946 in der SBZ sämtliche Werke Schlöbers als Bestandteil der nationalsozialistischen Propaganda in die Liste der auszusondernden Literatur aufgenommen.

Jours de fête officiels promulgués par le 3e « Reich »

The particular idealism surrounding soldierly death was made manifest almost immediately after the seizure of power when, in 1934, « Volkestrauer tag » was swiftly elevated to the status of a legal holiday and equally swiftly remade as « Heldengedenktag » (Heroes Memorial-Day) . In a single gesture, this act signaled the end of the political strife and taint of semi-legitimacy that had attended celebrations of the World War I dead in Weimar. Through the creation of « Heldengedenktag » , the Nazi regime symbolically put to rest a generation of discord over the meaning of the War and War deaths and emphatically proclaimed a new attitude toward them. Rather than being treated as the objects of grief, the World War I dead would be exalted, unambiguously, as heroic martyrs whose sacrifice comprised the founding act of the 3rd « Reich » and whose putative selflessness and spirit of communitarianism were held-up to the nation not merely as collective but also as racial values.

Militarism, long suppressed on past days of national mourning, was now ostentatiously celebrated on « Heldengedenktag » in the « Reich's » capital. Responsibility for the holiday's ceremonies was handed-over to the army. The Minister of War, not preachers, delivered memorial addresses. Swastikas and iron crosses replaced the Christian crosses that had frequently appeared at past World War I memorial celebrations. Flags were no longer flown at half-mast, as would befit a nation in mourning, but triumphally, at full-height. « Heldengedenletag » , proclaimed the « Volksbund » deliriously in 1934, was :

« A symbol of the rebirth of the German people's heroic attitude toward life. On this day, Germans all over the world will forever think of the soldiers who fell in the War and in the freedom movement and take renewed power from their spiritual corps. »

For partisans of the new order, it seems the Nazi regime held within it the power not only to redeem and make resplendent the deaths of the past but also to fill future sacrifices with moral purpose.

War death and its emancipating power were constant themes of regime-approved poetry as well, which became another conduit through which true believers communicated their message about death's meaning to a larger audience :

« The graves of the War / of eternal victory / are the fields and seeds of glory. » , wrote Herbert Böhme, editor of a

weighty, mass-market anthology of verse, « Call to the “ Reich ” », published in 1934. Because soldiers could never die, one should ...

Grieve no more !
for they have left their graves
And returned
In freedom
To the ranks
They march though the streets
and lanes
like life-giving suns !

Scholars have focused our attention very productively on these and other visions of heroic and soldierly death, as well as on attendant notions of sacrifice and martyrdom, which were clearly so central to the Nazi « œuvre », self-presentation, and ways that the Party staged and projected power. One thinks not only of the celebrations of « Heldengedenktag » in Berlin but also of the monumental drama that attended commemorations each November 9th of those who died in the 1923 « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » in Munich. At the same time, we should not allow the fact that the preponderance of Nazi thinking about death focused on heroics and the battle-field to obscure other visions of death that emerged in Nazi Germany, ones that sought to re-interpret mortality and its meaning in broad terms.

Wolfram Brockmeier's poem, « To the Fathers », is one example :

You fathers and mothers of my kin
which you join to this earth,
chase the quiet from your weary lips
and dissolve the sleep that holds you.
Raise yourselves from your dark tombs,
leave your era, come to mine.
My hair tosses in the winds,
and for you, too, are air and light prepared.
And you draw near ! Already I can grasp you :
grapes are red from your blood,
I see you ripen a thousandfold in grain,
and receive you in my wine and bread.

...

Holidays in Nazi Germany were primarily centred on important political events, serving as a form of political education and re-inforcing propaganda themes. Major national holidays were, therefore, controlled by « Reich » Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels and were often accompanied by mass-meetings, parades, speeches and radio broadcasts.

Many of the official national holidays in the 3rd « Reich » were anniversaries of political events, namely the seizure of power on 30 January 1933 ; the announcement of the Party program on 24 February 1920 ; Adolf Hitler's birthday on 20 April ; and the Munich « Beer-Hall “ Putsch ” » of 9 November 1924. Others were traditional German holidays. Heroes' Memorial-Day was celebrated on 16 March ; National Labour-Day on 1 May ; Mothering Sunday in May ; Summer Solstice in June ; Harvest Thanksgiving in Autumn ; and Winter Solstice in December.

From 1937, Jews were banned from the streets during German public holidays.

Sunday, 16 March * (« Heldengedenktag ») : Heroes' Memorial-Day.

* Otherwise, since 1939 : the Sunday before the 16th of March. Before 1939 : the 5th Sunday before Easter (« Reminiscere ») .

Good Friday (« Karfreitag ») .

Easter Sunday.

Easter Monday (« Ostermontag ») .

20 April 1933 to 1944 (« Führergeburtstag ») : Birthday of the « Führer » .

20 April 1939 : National Holiday for Adolf Hitler's 50th birthday.

1 May 1933 (« Feiertag der nationalen Arbeit ») : National Labour-Day Holiday.

1 May 1934 to 1944 (« Nationaler Feiertag des deutschen Volkes ») : National Holiday of the German people.

39 days after Easter Sunday (« Christi Himmelfahrt ») : Ascension-Day.

50 days after Easter Sunday (« Pfingstmontag ») : Whit Monday.

60 days after Easter Sunday (« Fronleichnam) : Feast of Body of Christ or « Corpus Christi » (only in municipalities with predominantly Catholic population) .

29 September (« Erntedanktag ») : 1st Sunday after « Michaelstag ») : Harvest Festival.

31 October (« Reformationstag ») : Reformation-Day (only in municipalities with predominantly Protestant population) .

9 November (« Gedenktag für die Gefallenen der Bewegung ») : Since 1939, Memorial-Day for the Martyrs of the Nazi

movement.

Wednesday before 23 November (« Buß- und Betttag ») : Day of Repentance and Prayer.

25 December (« 1. Weihnachtsfeiertag ») : Christmas-Day.

26 December (« 2. Weihnachtsfeiertag ») : Saint-Stephen's Day (Boxing Day) .

August Eigruber

The Austrian Nazi politician August Eigruber was born on 16 April 1907 in Steyr and was hanged by the Allies on 28 May 1947 in Landsberg am Lech. He became the « Landeshauptmann » (Provincial Governor) of Upper-Austria and the « Gauleiter » (Imperial Governor) of Upper-Danube (Oberdonau) .

After finishing middle-school, Eigruber underwent training in geodesy and fine-mechanics at the Austrian Federal Teaching Institution for Iron- and Steel-working. Thereafter, he was active in his profession. In November 1922, he joined the National-Socialist Worker Youth of Austria, whose leader he became in 1925. In April 1928, he joined the Nazi Party, whose « Steyr-Land » district leadership he took-up in October 1930. For his activities in the NSDAP, which was banned in Austria, Eigruber was sentenced to several months in prison.

From May 1935, Eigruber was the « Gau » Director (« Gaugeschäftsführer ») for the banned Party in the Upper-Austria « Gau » , and he took-over complete leadership of the « Gau » as of 1936. After the « Anschluß » , he was appointed « Landeshauptmann » on 14 March 1938. From 10 April 1938, he furthermore functioned as a ministerial adviser. Shortly before this, in March 1938, Eigruber joined the SA, in which he bore the rank of « Brigadeführer » .

On 22 May 1938, he transferred to the SS as a « Standartenführer » .

In September 1938, « Gauleiter » Eigruber attended the « Reichsparteitag » in Nuremberg. When National-Socialists of Passau met at the « Deutschmeister Inn » , Eigruber joined his allies and reminisced about their venture during the « Kampffahre » .

Rising to the rank of « Brigadeführer » in January 1939, and « Gruppenführer » in 1940.

In July 1940, the « Donau-Zeitung » announced that August Eigruber would travel to Passau by ship. There, he would be ceremonially welcomed at City Hall, and attend the latest play by Hans Baumann.

On 1 April 1940, he was installed as « Reich » Governor (« Reichstatthalter ») of Oberdonau which, in November 1942, led to his appointment as « Reich » Defence Commissar (« Reichsverteidigungskommissar ») . In June 1943, Eigruber was promoted to the rank of « SS-Obergruppenführer » .

...

August Eigruber became one of the most powerful Austrian men in the Nazi Party hierarchy. Eigruber was an associate of several top Nazis including Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Adolf Eichmann and Adolf Hitler, all of whom were born in Austria. He was also a friend of Martin Bormann, Hitler's deputy.

In the 1920's, Eigruber was employed at the Steyr factory and the Reithoffer rubber-plant before turning his interest onto politics. In April 1928, he joined the Nazi Party, whose interests he advanced in the « Steyr-Land » District Council leadership post he took-up in October 1930. He promoted the Nazi Party agenda, even serving time in an Austrian prison for his activities. After the « Anschluß » , he was appointed « Landeshauptmann » , on 14 March 1938. On 22 May 1938, he transferred from the SA to the SS as an « SS-Standartenführer » , a para-military rank considered the equivalent of an « Oberst » (Colonel) . The next day, on 23 May 1938, he was appointed « Landeshauptmann » (Provincial Governor) of Upper-Austria. On 15 March 1940, Eigruber was appointed « Gauleiter » (Imperial Governor) , the top-most Nazi Party representative in that region then known as Upper-Danube (Oberdonau) , formerly and after the War known as Upper-Austria.

In 1938, he helped to establish the Mauthausen complex by conveying the land to the SS and, later, by supporting their other projects, and aiding those efforts of industry including Steyr-Daimler-Puch. On 12 April 1940, he was sworn in as « Reich » Governor (« Reichstatthalter ») of Oberdonau. When Heinrich Himmler visited KL Mauthausen-Gusen with Eigruber in April 1941, their photographs reveal Eigruber had been promoted to SS-Gruppenführer, the equivalent of Major General or a two-star General in the US Army. In November 1942 his successes led to his appointment as Reich Defence Commissar (Reichsverteidigungskommissar). On 21 June 1943, Eigruber was promoted to SS-Obergruppenführer, a rank equivalent to Lieutenant General as was Ernst Kaltenbrunner, and just below that of Himmler's special rank of Reichsführer SS. He also served on the Board of Directors of Steyr-Daimler-Puch AG.

Eigruber was captured on 10 August 1945 by American troops under Lieutenant Snowden near St. Pankraz, along the Austrian and Italian border. He was initially interviewed as a witness for the Nuremberg Trials, but then charged and tried by the American Military Tribunal at Dachau among sixty one other prisoners whose actions were related to Mauthausen camps and war crimes. He was convicted on 13 May 1946. Eigruber was particularly proud to represent the region of Austria where Adolf Hitler (born in Linz) was born, and he remained loyal to Hitler up to the moment of his hanging on 28 May 1947 at the Landsberg am Lech War Criminal Prison Nr. I.

...

Immediately after Germany's unconditional surrender in May 1945, Eigruber was arrested in the Salzkammergut by the United States Army, and he was questioned as a witness at the Nuremberg Trials.

The « big fish » among the accused in the Mauthausen case was August Eigruber, the former « Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria. He was charged with participating in the common design to violate the Laws and Usages of War because, along with other alleged crimes, he had been involved in helping Heinrich Himmler to acquire the property where the

Mauthausen camp was built. Hartheim Castle, near Linz, was also under Eigruber's jurisdiction and he had leased it to the « Reich ». Prisoners from Mauthausen had been taken to the castle to be gassed, according to confessions obtained by the American military interrogators from several of the accused men.

Eigruber was an associate of such top Nazis as Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Adolf Eichmann and Adolf Hitler, all of whom were from Austria. He was also a friend of Martin Bormann, who was Hitler's deputy. When he refused to talk after he was captured, Eigruber was sent to Washington, D.C. , for questioning. Eigruber's importance was such that he was originally slated to be among the men who were tried at the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal.

According to Joshua Greene, who wrote « Justice at Dachau », the chief-prosecutor at Dachau, Lieutenant Colonel William Denson, put in a call to Robert Jackson, the chief-prosecutor at the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal and told him :

« Send me Eigruber. I'll hang him high as Haman. »

Haman was the villain in the biblical story on which the Jewish holiday of Purim is based. Denson made good on his boast : Eigruber was hanged on May 28, 1947.

On February 18, 1946, August Eigruber was brought from Nuremberg to Dachau and turned-over to Lieutenant Paul Guth for interrogation. Lieutenant Guth testified on the witness stand that he had not coerced or threatened Eigruber in any way. Although he had previously refused to talk, Eigruber voluntarily signed a statement for Lieutenant Guth the next day, in which he admitted that he was responsible for leasing Hartheim Castle to the « Reich », in 1939, for the killing of mental patients who were incurably ill or unable to work. He also admitted to inspecting the Mauthausen gas chamber once and to participating in the execution of 10 prisoners of unknown nationality during the night in March or April 1945. Eigruber's statement ended with the following words :

« This statement was made by me on 3 pages on the 19th of February 1946, in Dachau, Germany, of my own free will and without compulsion. To save time, a clerk wrote it down on a typewriter. I have read through it, and I have made corrections that appeared necessary to me. The above declaration contains my statements, and I swear before God that it is the entire truth. Signed, August Eigruber. »

The attorney for the defense, Major Ernst Oeding, objected to the admission of Eigruber's statement into evidence because it had not been witnessed, but his motion was denied by British psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Herbert Alexander Rosenfeld, a Jew who was serving as the « law member » on the panel of 8 judges. Normally, a confession must be witnessed to be admissible in a trial, but according to an Allied directive dated 25 August 1945, a military tribunal was not bound by general rules of evidence.

(Photo) August Eigruber on the far-right in the front-row, wearing a hat. This picture was taken just outside the Mauthausen camp, near the quarry. The man who is strutting on the far left is « Reichsführer-SS » Heinrich Himmler, leader of the SS and head of all the concentration camps. Next to him, in the front-row, is Franz Ziereis, the

Commandant of Mauthausen. Zierys was never brought to justice ; he left the camp on the night of May 2, 1945, but was captured on May 23, 1945 and then « shot while attempting to escape » .

(Photo) August Eigruber on the left, Lieutenant Colonel William Denson on the right. Denson seems to be amused by Eigruber's testimony on the witness stand. Note that Eigruber is wearing an Austrian style gray jacket with green trim, rather than the pin-striped suit that he wore on the 1st day of the trial when he was photographed as he stood-up to answer the charge against him.

(Photo) Lieutenant Colonel William Denson listens as an Army translator asks Eigruber a question in German. The proceedings were painfully slow since the testimony of the accused had to be translated into English for the prosecution team.

Lieutenant Colonel William Denson became famous for his 100 % conviction rate in the 1st 4 proceedings conducted by the American Military Tribunal at Dachau. He died in 1998 at the age of 85 and, in his obituary, he was quoted as saying that August Eigruber was « one of the most arrogant defendants I have ever encountered » . Eigruber was allegedly tortured to force him to confess, and there is even a rumor that he was « mutilated and castrated » after he was captured, but apparently even that didn't humble him.

...

August Eigruber was the « Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria and according to Marie Vassiltchikov, a nurse who wrote a book entitled « Berlin Diaries 1940-1945 » , Eigruber was the « virtual king of this part of Austria » .

She wrote that, in the last days of the War :

« “ Gauleiter ” Eigruber has been thundering over the radio that Oberdonau (the Nazi name for the province of Upper-Austria) must stand to the last man ; there is no escape now ; women and children will not be evacuated, however tough things get, for there is nowhere for them to go. In his rhetoric, he copies Adolf ; but, at least, he is frank and does not try to hide the gravity of the situation. By way of compensation, he promised the population a special distribution of rice and sugar. »

Sadly, the rice and sugar that was promised by Eigruber to the « starving population » was destroyed when several Red Cross trains on a siding at Attnang-Puchheim were bombed by the Allies, killing « all those pretty sun-burnt young nurses » , according to Vassiltchikov's book.

She wrote that :

« Eigruber is a particularly obnoxious individual, who continues to make fiery speeches about “ resistance ”, “ honour ”, etc. »

In the Mauthausen-Gusen camp trials, Eigruber, a dedicated Nazi loyal to the end, was sentenced in March 1946 by the Dachau International Military Tribunal to death by hanging for his responsibility for crimes at Mauthausen concentration camp. The sentence was carried-out in the prison yard at Landsberg Prison, in Landsberg am Lech, on 28 May 1947.

Eigruber died with the words « Heil Hitler » on his lips.

...

August Eigruber, österreichischer Politiker (NSDAP) : geboren 16. April 1907 in Steyr ; gestorben 28. Mai 1947 in Landsberg am Lech. Er war Mitglied des Reichstags und Gauleiter von Oberdonau und Landeshauptmann von Oberösterreich.

August Eigruber war ein unehelich geborener Sohn der Gemischtwarenhändlerin Aloisia Eigruber. Nach dem Besuch der Volks- und Mittelschule absolvierte er eine Ausbildung zum Vermessungstechniker und Feinmechaniker an der österreichischen Bundeslehranstalt für Eisen- und Stahlbearbeitung. Danach war er in seinem Beruf tätig.

Im November 1922 trat er als Mitglied der Nationalsozialistischen Arbeiterjugend Österreichs bei, deren Führer er 1925 wurde. Im April 1928 trat er der NSDAP (Mitgliedsnummer 83.432) bei, deren Bezirksleitung für Steyr-Land er im Oktober 1930 übernahm. Zudem war er örtlicher Kreisleiter.

Wegen seiner Betätigung für die in Österreich verbotene NSDAP wurde Eigruber 1934 zu einigen Monaten Haft verurteilt, die er unter anderem im Anhaltelager in den Wöllersdorfer Werken verbrachte.

Ab Mai 1935 war Eigruber Gaugeschäftsführer der nun illegalen Partei im Gau Oberösterreich und übernahm ab 1936 die komplette Gauleitung. Beim « Anschluß Österreichs » wurde er am 14. März 1938 zum Landeshauptmann ernannt. Seit dem 10. April 1938 fungierte Eigruber zusätzlich als Ministerialrat. Von April 1938 bis zum Ende der NS-Herrschaft im Frühjahr 1945 saß er als Abgeordneter für das Land Österreich im nationalsozialistischen Reichstag.

Kurz zuvor, im März 1938, war Eigruber in die SA eingetreten, in der er den Rang eines Brigadeführers innehatte. Am 22. Mai 1938 wechselte er in die SS (SS-Nummer 292.778) als Standartenführer und wurde im Januar 1939 zum Brigadeführer, 1940 zum Gruppenführer und im Juni 1943 zum Obergruppenführer befördert.

Am 1. April 1940 wurde er als Reichsstatthalter von Oberdonau eingesetzt und im November 1942 zum Reichsverteidigungskommissar. Zudem war Eigruber bei der Steyr-Daimler-Puch AG im Aufsichtsrat.

Eigruber war in seinem Herrschaftsbereich für mehrere Endphaseverbrechen verantwortlich, so und andere für die sogenannte Mühlviertler Hasenjagd. Im April 1945 ordnete Eigruber die Ermordung aller inhaftierten Oberösterreicher im KZ Mauthausen an. Er wollte auch die im Salzbergwerk Altaussee gelagerten Kunstschatze vernichten lassen.

Anfang Mai 1945 ging er nach Kirchdorf an der Krens. Unmittelbar nach der bedingungslosen Gesamtkapitulation der Wehrmacht im Mai 1945 wurde er im Salzkammergut von der US-Armee verhaftet, und als Zeuge bei den Nürnberger Prozessen befragt.

Im Mauthausen-Hauptprozess wurde Eigruber mit 60 weiteren Beschuldigten vor einem US-Militärgericht ab Ende März 1946 im Internierungslager Dachau angeklagt. Eigruber bekleidete keine Funktion in dem KZ Mauthausen. Als zuständiger Gauleiter und Leiter des Ernährungsamtes in Oberösterreich war er jedoch für die katastrophale Ernährungslage der Häftlinge hauptverantwortlich. Zudem nahm er an Exekutionen von Häftlingen teil und stellte das Schloß Hartheim, in dem invalide Häftlinge im Rahmen der Aktion 14f13 vergast wurden, zur Verfügung. Eigruber wurde am 13. Mai 1946 wegen seiner Verantwortung für die Verbrechen im KZ Mauthausen zum Tode durch den Strang verurteilt und am 28. Mai 1947 im Kriegsverbrechergefängnis Landsberg hingerichtet.

...

Im Zuge des « Totalen Krieg(seinsatzes) » ordnete Gauleiter August Eigruber im November 1944 auch die Schließung der Musikschule an. Elli Hierzegger verwendete sich allerdings vehement für deren Weiterführung. Nach Kriegsende versuchte sie die städtischen Politiker von der Weiterführung der Städtischen Musikschule zu überzeugen, konnte dies aber nicht durchsetzen.

Linz

1. Jänner 1942 : NS-Tageszeitung « Volksstimme » begeht 50jähriges Bestehen ; sie wird als älteste nationalsozialistische Zeitung des Großdeutschen Reiches bezeichnet.

Zwölf Waggon Winterbekleidung, dazu 20.000 Paar Skier, in Oberdonau gespendet. Aufruf des Gauleiters an die Sportler, alle Skier abzugeben und andere Sportarten zu betreiben.

15. Jänner 1942 : Arbeitstagung über Ausländereinsatz ; Bestellung von Verbindungsmännern für italienische, slowakische und bulgarische Arbeiter.

17. Jänner 1942 : Weitere Einschränkungen im Personenverkehr auf der Reichsbahn.

Appell des Gauleiters in den Steyr-Werken zur Kraftanstrengung auf zwei Gebieten : Lebensmittelversorgung und Rüstung.

20. Jänner 1942 : Der bisher unbedeutende Forstbesitz des Landes (1.150 Hektar) wird durch Übernahme der Schwarzenbergischen Forste in Südböhmen, der Starhembergischen Forste, schließlich durch den Forstbesitz der beschlagnahmten Stifte auf 40.266 ha ausgeweitet. Vor allem im Böhmerwald entsteht ein geschloßener Forst von 30.000 Hektar.

22. Jänner 1942 : Linz wird dem deutschen Fernschreibnetz angeschlossen.

11. Februar 1942 : Joseph Fließner erhält vom Papst die Rechte eines residierenden Diözesanbischöf.

21. Februar 1942 : Uraufführung « Der Bauernhauptmann » von Hermann Heinz Ortner in Linz.

15. März 1942 : Großkundgebung mit Minister Doktor Josef Gœbbels in Linz anlässlich des 4. Jahrestages des « Anschlusses » .

1. April 1942 : In Linz wird ein Wehrmachtsfürsorgeamt errichtet, das auch für sechs Kreise von Niederdonau zuständig ist.

Elf Verwaltungsgemeinschaften für jeweils mehrere Gemeinden entstehen im Gau.

Oberdonau spendet Bücher für 350 Wehrmachtsbüchereien.

20. April 1942 : Großveranstaltungen zu Adolf Hitlers Geburtstag in Braunau.

Der im Nibelungenwerk in Sankt Valentin produzierte erste Panzer vom Typ « Tiger » wird Hitler im Führerhauptquartier vorgestellt.

29. April 1942 : Charakterkomiker Franz Schmidt-Renner gestorben.

8. Mai 1942 : Abkommen über eine kulturelle Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Gauen Oberdonau und Westfalen-Süd.

10. Mai 1942 : Gautag des Deutschen Alpenvereines in Linz ; Oberdonau hat die stärkste Jugendgruppe.

Das Gaupropagandaamt beginnt mit der Versammlungswelle « Siegen um jeden Preis » .

Erste Todesstrafe für zwei Schwarzschröcker durch das Landesgericht Linz als Sondergericht beantragt.

16. Mai 1942 : Adolf Hitler schenkt Linz die Aphroditen-Plastik von Professor Wilhelm Wandschneider für den Linzer Rundtempel im Hatschek-Park.

25. Mai 1942 : Gauleiter August Eigruber wird auch Gaubevollmächtigter für den Arbeitseinsatz.

1. Juni 1942 : In der Linzer Hofgasse wird erstmals ein Stadtmuseum aufgestellt.

20. Juni 1942 : Adolf Hitler besichtigt die Eisenwerke in Linz.

1. Juli 1942 : Als Einheitstarif für die Linzer Straßenbahn werden 20 Pfennig festgelegt.

Errichtung einer Sonderstation für Schwerbeschädigte als Zweigstelle der Unfallstation des Welser Krankenhauses im Schloß Schmieding bei Wels.

Der frühere Führer der SA-Gruppe Alpenland in Linz, Hermann Giesler, wird Gauleiter von München und bayerischer Staatsminister des Inneren.

11. Juli 1942 : Regierungsrat Paul Ikrath mit dem Aufbau einer Meisterschule für das Handwerk in Linz beauftragt.

15. Juli 1942 : Fertigstellung des Flugzeugmotorenwerkes in Steyr.

1. August 1942 : Ausbau der Berufsschule für Maschinenbau in Steyr zur zweiten Ingenieurschule in Oberdonau. Diese Ingenieurschule für Maschinenbau umfaßt acht Semester, Nebenfachrichtungen sind Kraftfahrwesen und Motorenbau.

8.-9. August 1942 : Die Widerstandsbewegung « GB » wird in Linz gegründet.

19. August 1942 : Die Unterbringung von 12.000 Bombenflüchtlingen in Oberdonau angeordnet.

25. August 1942 : Eröffnung der Gaukulturwoche.

Brand in der Papierfabrik Nettingsdorf.

26. August 1942 : Uraufführung der Operette « Heimkehr nach Mittenwald » von Ludwig Schmidseder in Linz

27. August 1942 : Rüstungsminister Albert Speer und Professor Ferdinand Porsche besichtigen Steyr und Sankt Valentin.

30. August 1942 : Auflösung der Landesbauernschaft Donauland und Errichtung einer selbstständigen Landesbauernschaft Oberdonau.

1. September 1942 : Die Gausammlungen für das Winterhilfswerk stiegen von 4,1 Millionen Reichsmark (1938-1939) auf 10,9 Millionen (1941-1942) .

16. September 1942 : Fertigstellung und Auslaufen des ersten U-Bootes der Schiffswerft Linz.

21. September 1942 : Der Linzer Stadtrat beschließt die Stiftung von Kulturpreisen.

29. September 1942 : Die umgebaute Bühne der Linzer Kammerspiele (Redoutensaal) eröffnet.

Oktober 1942 : Ein Teil des Reparaturprogrammes von « Wasserflug Bremen » nach Wels verlegt.

15. Oktober 1942 : Baubeginn des Ennskraftwerks Großbraming.

16. Oktober 1942 : Leopold Pötsch (Geschichtslehrer Adolf Hitlers) gestorben.

23. Oktober 1942 : Schmelzen der ersten Charge Stahl von 12 Tonnen beim ersten Elektroofen der Eisenwerke Oberdonau.

Uraufführung « Die Fuchsfalle » von Richard Billinger in Linz.

27. Oktober 1942 : August Eigruber und SS-Obergruppenführer Heißmayer eröffnen im beschlagnahmten Stift Kremsmünster die erste « Deutsche Heimschule » des Gaues.

Die Stickstoffwerke nehmen die Produktion auf.

9. November 1942 : Gedenkfeier für die Gefallenen im Landestheater.

12. November 1942 : Eröffnung der Bildtelegraphenstelle Linz.

16. November 1942 : Gauleiter August Eigruber wird Reichsverteidigungskommissar des Gaues Oberdonau.

25. November 1942 : August Eigruber gibt die Pläne für das « Bruckner-Stift » Sankt Florian und das « Bruckner-Orchester » bekannt.

Pianist Helmut Hilpert gestorben.

28. November 1942 : Wegen des warmen Herbstes wird um 10 Prozent weniger Hausbrandkohle zugeteilt.

3. Dezember 1942 : Das 60 Personen fassende Schiff « Hochlecken » am Attersee in Betrieb genommen.

Uraufführung « Ferdinand Waldmüller » von Siegfried Knapitsch in Linz.

Freifrau Edith Krieg von Hochfelden (Pseudonym : Edith Salburg) gestorben.

10. Dezember 1942 : Hans Posse (Kunsthistoriker, Beauftragter Adolf Hitlers für das geplante Führermuseum in Linz) gestorben.

14. Dezember 1942 : Als zweite Stadt von Oberdonau erhält Bad Ischl ein Selbstwählamt.

19. Dezember 1942 : Uraufführung « Lotterie » von Otto Bielen in Linz.

31. Dezember 1942 : 52.000 Arbeiter, vorwiegend Gastarbeiter, leben in 135 Gemeinschaftslagern von 128 Betrieben. Es gibt 137 Werksküchen und 81 Werksärzte.

Mauthausen-Gusen Camp Trials

The Mauthausen-Gusen camp trials were a set of trials of SS concentration camp personnel following World War II, heard by an American military government court at Dachau. Between March 29 and May 13, 1946, and then from August 6 to August 21, 1947, a total of 69 former camp personnel were tried. Among them were some of the former guards at the Mauthausen-Gusen concentration camp system and August Eigruber, a former « Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria.

The 1st trial of personnel from Mauthausen-Gusen took place in the Dachau concentration camp between March 29 and May 13, 1946. Among the accused were 60 former members of the camp's administration and August Eigruber, a former « Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria. Among the defendants were also Viktor Zoller (former commander of the « SS-Totenkopf » guard battalion) , and doctors Friedrich Entress (an SS member and a medic who practiced medical experiments on hundreds of inmates ; killing most of them with injections of phenol) , Eduard Krebsbach and Erich Wasicky handed the Cyclon B to the person who was responsible for running camp's gas chambers who was Doctor Eduard Krebsbach based on the death-bed confession of Commander Ziereis. The Mauthausen-Gusen commander, Franz Ziereis, was shot several weeks after the liberation of the Mauthausen-Gusen camps and died in former Camp Gusen I on May 24, 1945.

The defendants were charged with « violations of the laws and usages of War » , a charge which encompassed among other things murder, torture, beating and starving the inmates. After 6 weeks, all 61 defendants were found guilty. 58 were sentenced to death by hanging (9 were later paroled and their sentences were changed to life imprisonment) , whilst 3 were sentenced to life imprisonment. All the death sentences were carried-out on May 27 and May 28 of 1947, in Landsberg Prison.

Defendants

August Eigruber : Death by hanging.

Viktor Zoller : Death by hanging.

Doctor Friedrich Entress : Death by hanging.

Hans Altfuldisch : Death by hanging.

Josef Riegler : Death by hanging.

Willy Brüning (Gusen) : Death by hanging.

Emil Müller : Death by hanging.

Kurt Keilwitz : Death by hanging.

Franz Kautny : Death by hanging.

Johannes Grimm (DEST-Wienergraben) : Death by hanging.

Adolf Zutter : Death by hanging.

Doctor Eduard Krebsbach : Death by hanging.

Heinrich Häger : Death by hanging.

Hans Spatzenneger : Death by hanging.

Otto Striegel : Death by hanging.

Werner Grahn : Death by hanging.

Doctor Willy Jobst : Death by hanging.

Georg Göbl : Death by hanging.

Hans Diehl : Death by hanging.

Paul Kaiser (Gusen) : Death by hanging.

Doctor Waldemar Wolter : Death by hanging.

Gustav Kreindl : Death by hanging.

Willy Eckert : Death by hanging.

Hermann Pribyll : Death by hanging.

Josef Leeb : Death by hanging

Doctor Wilhelm Henkel : Death by hanging.

« kapo » Willy Frey : Death by hanging.

Leopold Trauner (DEST-Gusen) : Death by hanging.

Wilhelm Müller : Death by hanging.

Heinrich Eisenhöfer : Death by hanging.

Andreas Trumm : Death by hanging.

Erich Meißner : Death by hanging.

Kapo Rudolf Fiegl (Gusen) : Death by hanging.

Josef Niedermayer : Death by hanging.

Julius Ludolf : Death by hanging.

Hans Hegenscheidt : Death by hanging.

Franz Huber : Death by hanging.

Doctor Erich Wasicky : Death by hanging.

Theophil Priebe : Death by hanging.

Kaspar Klimowitsch (Gusen II) : Death by hanging.

Heinrich Fitschok (Gusen II) : Death by hanging.

Anton Kaufmann (DEST-Gusen) : Death by hanging.

Stefan Barczyk : Death by hanging.

Karl Struller : Death by hanging.

August Blei : Death by hanging.

Otto Drabeck : Death by hanging.

Vincenz Nohel : Death by hanging.

Thomas Sigmund (Gusen) : Death by hanging.

Heinrich Giese (Gusen) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Walter Höhler : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Adolf Rutka (Gusen) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Ludwig Dörr (Gusen II) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Viktor Korger (Gusen II) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Karl Billman (Gusen II) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Herbert Grzybowski (Gusen) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Wilhelm Mack (Gusen) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Ferdinand Lappert (Gusen) : Death by hanging (changed to life imprisonment) .

Michæl Cserny : Life imprisonment.

Paul Gützlaff (Gusen) : Life imprisonment.

Josef Mayer : Life imprisonment.

The 2nd Mauthausen Camp Trial started on August 6, 1947. Altogether, 8 former members of the camp's administration were accused of the same set of crimes as in the former trial. On August 21st, the verdict was reached : 4 Nazis were sentenced to death by hanging ; 1 for life imprisonment ; 2 for short-term sentences ; and 1 was acquitted of all the charges. The death sentences were carried-out on August 10, 1948.

Defendants

Franz Kofler : Death by hanging.

Gustav Petrat : Death by hanging.

Michæl Heller : Death by hanging.

« kapo » Quirin Flaucher : Death by hanging.

Emil Thielmann : Life imprisonment.

Hermann Franz Bütgen : 3 years in prison.

Arno Albert Reuter : 2 years in prison.

Stefan Lennart : Acquitted.

Le camp de Mauthausen

Le camp de Mauthausen (ou Mauthausen-Gusen, après l'été 1940) était un camp de concentration (KZ ou KL) instauré par le régime nazi du 3e « Reich » autour des villages de Mauthausen et de Sankt-Georgen an der Gusen, en Haute-Autriche, à environ 22 kilomètres de Linz.

L'emplacement du camp de concentration de Mauthausen a été sélectionné avec celui du 2e camp de concentration de Gusen, en mars 1938. On construisit d'abord le 1er camp de prisonniers à Mauthausen, mais il se développa avec le 2e camp de Gusen I pour devenir l'un des plus grands camps de travail en Europe occupée. En plus des 4 camps situés à Mauthausen et dans les environs de Gusen, plus de 50 camps annexes, situés en Autriche et dans le Sud de l'Allemagne dépendaient du complexe de Mauthausen-Gusen et utilisaient les prisonniers comme main-d'œuvre. Parmi les camps annexes du KZ Mauthausen-Gusen se trouvaient des carrières, des fabriques de munitions, des mines, des usines d'armement et d'assemblage d'avions.

En janvier 1945, l'ensemble des camps dirigés depuis le bureau central de Mauthausen rassemblaient plus de 85,000 prisonniers. Le nombre total des victimes est inconnu mais la plupart des sources parlent de 122,766 à 320,000 morts pour l'ensemble du complexe. Les camps formaient l'un des 1ers grands complexes concentrationnaires nazis et furent parmi les derniers à être libérés par les Alliés. Les 2 camps principaux, Mauthausen et Gusen I, étaient les seuls camps du système concentrationnaire nazi en Europe classés « camps de niveau III », ce qui signifiait qu'ils étaient destinés à être les camps les plus durs à l'intention des « ennemis politiques incorrigibles du “ Reich ” ». Mauthausen-Gusen était plus particulièrement destiné à l'élimination par le travail de l'intelligentsia des pays occupés par l'Allemagne lors de la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Le 7 août 1938, des prisonniers du camp de concentration de Dachau furent envoyés dans la ville de Mauthausen près de Linz, en Autriche, pour commencer la construction d'un nouveau camp. Le site fut choisi du fait de la proximité d'une carrière de granite. Bien que le camp soit, dès le départ, contrôlé par l'État allemand, il fut fondé comme une entreprise économique par une Société privée. Le propriétaire de la carrière Wienergraben située à Mauthausen était

une Société DEST (sigle de « Deutsche Erd- und Steinwerke GmbH ») . La Société, une émanation de Office central SS pour l'économie et l'administration dirigé par Oswald Pohl, loua les terrains destinés à la construction du camp et acheta des terres près de Gusen, dès le 25 mai 1938. Un an plus tard, la Société ordonna la construction du 1er camp à Gusen. Le granite extrait de la carrière avait été utilisé pour paver les rues de Vienne mais les autorités nazies envisageaient la reconstruction des principales villes d'Allemagne en accord avec les idées d'Albert Speer et des autres architectes nazis, et de grandes quantités de granit étaient donc nécessaires. Les fonds pour la construction du camp de Mauthausen furent rassemblés de nombreuses sources dont des prêts de la « Dresdner Bank » , de l' « Escompte Bank » basée à Prague, du soi-disant fonds Reinhardt issu des biens pris aux prisonniers des camps de concentration et de la Croix-Rouge allemande.

Initialement, Mauthausen était uniquement un camp d'internement pour les criminels de droit commun, les prostituées et les autres catégories de « criminels incorrigibles » . Le 8 mai 1939, il fut converti en camp de travail principalement pour les prisonniers politiques.

La principale fonction du camp continua en parallèle de son rôle économique. Jusqu'en 1942, il fut utilisé pour l'emprisonnement et l'exécution des opposants politiques réels ou imaginaires. Le camp servait les besoins de la machine de guerre allemande et pratiquait également l'extermination par le travail. Si les détenus étaient trop malades ou faibles pour travailler, ils étaient transférés dans le revier (« Krankenrevier » : dispensaire) ou dans les autres lieux d'extermination. De 1938 à 1941, le camp ne disposait pas d'une chambre à gaz et, à partir du printemps 1940, les prisonniers malades étaient transférés et gazés au château de Hartheim qui se trouvait à 40 kilomètres du camp où étaient exécutés par injection létale et incinérés dans le crématoire du camp. On construisit en octobre 1941 dans une cave une chambre à gaz dotée d'un système d'aération. Le Zyklon B était livré par la firme Slupetzky à Linz. La dernière opération de gazage eut lieu le 28 avril 1945, et on estime à environ 4,000 le nombre de victimes ainsi exécutées. On utilisa, à partir de 1942, un « Gaswagen » : un camion à gaz dont le pot d'échappement était branché à l'intérieur du véhicule pour asphyxier les occupants, qui faisait la navette entre Mauthausen et Gusen.

Durant les derniers mois de la guerre, le commandant du camp Franz Ziereis se prépara à une possible offensive soviétique. Les prisonniers durent construire des obstacles anti-chars en granite à l'est de Mauthausen. Le camp accueillit également des prisonniers issus d'autres camps dont les sous-camps de Mauthausen, situés en Autriche orientale. Le manque de nourriture déjà flagrant devint dramatique vers la fin de la guerre avec l'arrêt de la distribution des colis alimentaires par la Croix-Rouge. Les prisonniers transférés à l' « hôpital » ne recevaient qu'un pain pour 20 personnes et environ un demi-litre de soupe d'herbe par jour. On ne sait pas pourquoi les prisonniers de Gusen I et II ne furent pas tous exterminés conformément aux ordres de Heinrich Himmler ; le plan de Ziereis prévoyait d'emmener tous les prisonniers dans les tunnels des usines souterraines de Kellerbau et de détruire les entrées.

Le 28 avril 1945, sous le prétexte d'une alerte aérienne, quelque 22,000 prisonniers de Gusen furent emmenés dans les tunnels. Cependant, après quelques heures, tous ressortirent. Selon Stanisław Dobosiewicz, auteur de plusieurs ouvrages sur l'histoire du camp, l'échec du plan allemand aurait pu être causé par la destruction des câbles de détonation par les prisonniers. Même si ce plan fut abandonné, les prisonniers craignaient que les SS veuillent éliminer

les détenus par d'autres moyens. Par conséquent, les prisonniers préparèrent un plan visant à attaquer les baraquements des gardes SS pour s'emparer des armes s'y trouvant.

Le 3 mai 1945, les SS et les autres gardes commencèrent à se préparer pour l'évacuation du camp. Le jour suivant, les gardes de Mauthausen furent remplacés par des soldats du « Volkssturm » sans armes et par des unités improvisées formées d'anciens agents de police évacués de Vienne. L'officier de police responsable de l'unité accepta l'autorité de Martin Gerken, jusqu'alors le plus haut-gradé parmi les « kapos », comme de facto le nouveau commandant du camp. Le travail cessa dans tous les sous-camps de Mauthausen et les prisonniers se préparaient à leur libération ou à la défense des camps contre un possible assaut des unités SS positionnées dans la zone. Il y eut effectivement des attaques, mais elles furent repoussées par les prisonniers. Gusen III fut le seul camp principal à avoir été évacué. Le 1er mai, les prisonniers entamèrent une marche de la mort vers Sankt Georgen mais reçurent l'ordre de retourner au camp, quelques heures plus tard. L'opération fut répétée le lendemain mais elle fut à nouveau annulée. Le 3 mai, les gardes SS abandonnèrent le camp et laissèrent les prisonniers livrés à leur sort.

Le 5 mai 1945, le camp de Mauthausen fut libéré par la 11e division blindée de la 3e armée américaine. À ce moment, la plupart des gardes SS avaient quitté le camp de Mauthausen, mais 30 qui étaient restés furent lynchés par les prisonniers ; un nombre similaire fut tué à Gusen II. Le sous-camp du col de Loibl fut le dernier à être libéré le 6 mai.

Parmi les survivants du camp figurait le lieutenant Jack Taylor, officier de l'Office of Strategic Services⁶⁸ dont le témoignage fut déterminant lors du procès du camp de Mauthausen-Gusen au tribunal militaire de Dachau⁶⁹. Simon Wiesenthal faisait également partie des survivants du camp tout comme Tibor Rubin, un Juif hongrois, qui rejoignit l'armée américaine et s'illustra lors de la guerre de Corée.

Après la capitulation de l'Allemagne, le complexe de Mauthausen-Gusen fut intégré au sein de la zone d'occupation soviétique de l'Autriche. Initialement, les autorités soviétiques utilisèrent certaines infrastructures des camps de Mauthausen et de Gusen I comme casernements pour l'Armée rouge. Les industries souterraines furent démantelées et envoyées en Union Soviétique. Après cela, entre 1946 et 1947, les camps furent abandonnés et de nombreux équipements furent démantelés par l'Armée rouge et par la population locale. Les forces soviétiques détruisirent les tunnels et se retirèrent de la zone à l'été 1947 et le camp fut cédé aux autorités civiles autrichiennes.

Le site ne devint un mémorial national qu'en 1949. Le 3 mai 1975, le chancelier Bruno Kreisky inaugura le musée de Mauthausen. À la différence de Mauthausen, la zone occupée par les camps de Gusen I, II et III a été utilisée pour la construction d'habitations après la Guerre. En 1989, Gerhard Skiba, maire de la ville de Braunau am Inn, commanda un bloc de granite de la carrière de Mauthausen, où tant de détenus moururent d'épuisement en y travaillant ou abattus par les gardes, au comité de Mauthausen. Il le fit installer en face de la maison où Adolf Hitler est né. Sur la pierre figure cette inscription :

« Für Frieden Freiheit und Demokratie nie wieder Faschismus millionen Tote mahnen. »

(Pour la paix, la liberté et la démocratie. Plus jamais le fascisme. À la mémoire de millions de morts.)

...

Dans l'histoire des camps de concentration implantés sur le territoire du 3^e « Reich », Mauthausen se situe au sommet de l'horreur. Plus ou moins 200,000 prisonniers passèrent par ce camp et ses divers satellites. Plus de la moitié d'entre eux y perdirent la vie. Harassés de travail, décimés par l'inanition, brutalisés comme nulle par ailleurs, les concentrationnaires ont été contraints de subir la forme la plus ignoble d'exploitation de l'homme par l'homme. Dès l'annexion de l'Autriche de mars 1938 (« Anschluß »), des recherches sont entreprises pour, à l'image de ceux existant en Allemagne depuis 1933, construire un grand camp de travail. À une vingtaine de kilomètres à l'est de Linz, sur la rive-gauche du proche Danube, entre les communes de Mauthausen, Langenstein et Sankt-Georgen an der Gusen, existent de grandes carrières de granite. C'est sur les hauteurs de la première de ces communes que, sur un terrain surplombant la « Wiener Graben » (fosse viennoise), l'une de ces carrières, que le 8 août 1938 et par un groupe de prisonniers envoyé spécialement de Dachau, sont posées les Ires pierres du KZ Mauthausen.

16 mois plus tard, 4 kilomètres plus à l'ouest, dans les carrières de Kastenholz et Gusen, les SS décident de construire une extension du camp, laquelle est destinée à héberger les prisonniers en nombre sans cesse croissant. Ainsi naît Gusen I, mis en exploitation dès mai 1940. Les détenus travaillent principalement dans les carrières, d'autres sont employés dans les usines Steyr-Daimler-Puch et Messerschmitt, implantées sur place et produisant des armes, respectivement des fuselages de chasseurs Bf 109. 4 ans plus tard, au sud de Sankt-Georgen, des galeries souterraines sont construites (baptisées « Bergkristall »), destinées à la production des Messerschmitt 262, Iers avions à réaction opérationnels de l'histoire. Les prisonniers affectés à ces usines seront logés dans un petit camp, Gusen II, construit au printemps 1944, à quelques centaines de mètres à l'ouest de Gusen I. Et, à la fin de la même année, plus au nord, dans le village de Lungitz, Gusen III est implanté, petit camp de travail destiné à produire le pain de l'ensemble des camps, ainsi qu'à entreposer l'armement et les pièces d'avions produites par les prisonniers de Gusen I et II. Un peu partout en Autriche et durant toute la Guerre, 49 camps annexes et divers commandos de travail, dépendant de Mauthausen, le camp central, seront implantés. Certains pour quelques jours ou semaines seulement, d'autres pour beaucoup plus de temps.

Les prisonniers, au départ, étaient des droit commun et des politiques autrichiens et allemands. Ils seront vite rejoints par des Polonais, Républicains espagnols et, dès l'été 1941, par des prisonniers de guerre soviétiques. En 1945, environ 30 nationalités différentes, hommes et femmes, y sont représentées, parmi lesquelles des Italiens, Français, Hollandais, Hongrois, Yougoslaves, et même quelques Suisses ayant manifestement œuvré contre le Nazisme en dehors de leurs terres. Mauthausen-Gusen fut le camp de l'horreur absolue. Le travail extrêmement pénible dans les carrières, le sadisme sans égal des SS, l'insalubrité et, conséquence directe, les maladies déciment une population carcérale dans des proportions effarantes. Mais le pire fut sans doute le manque de nourriture. Un prisonnier manipulant des blocs de granite 12 heures par jour aurait eu besoin, au minimum, de 3,000 calories pour maintenir son poids. Rares seront ceux qui atteindront les 1,200 calories quotidiennes. Résultat, en quelques semaines ils mourront d'épuisement.

À la libération du camp par les Américains, le 5 mai 1945, environ 200,000 prisonniers seront passés par Mauthausen

et ses satellites. Entre 105,000 et 120,000 d'entre eux (chiffres généralement retenus à ce jour) y auront perdu la vie ! Hors camps d'extermination de Pologne, ce bilan est le plus lourd de tous les camps de concentration du « Reich ». Aujourd'hui, le souvenir demeure, le « Monument public de Mauthausen » ayant été inauguré au printemps de 1949. Si presque tous les baraquements du camp principal ont été détruits, leur emplacement, ainsi que tous les endroits marquants sont préservés et clairement indiqués. Beaucoup de pays ont voulu, dès la fin de la Guerre, marquer leur présence passée dans le camp en y érigeant un monument commémoratif. La France fut la première à le faire (1949) et beaucoup d'autres nations ont suivi. De Gusen, hélas, il ne reste pas grand chose. Juste un petit mémorial et les fours crématoires du camp. Tout autour de ce lieu de mémoire, des villas ont été construites, sur les terres mêlées de sang qui ont vu tant de malheureux périr de la plus atroce des façons (36,000 morts sur 71,000 internés) . Incompréhensible et navrant ! Et plus encore de constater que la « Jourhaus », bâtiment servant de porte d'entrée du camp, de centre administratif et de commandement est, aujourd'hui encore, habitée par une famille de Gusen, comme si de rien n'était. De quoi se demander de quelle matière sont constitués le cœur et la conscience de certains.

...

« La carrière de Mauthausen a été un des lieux les plus horribles de tous les camps nazis, vu que furent employées là des méthodes de travail inimaginables. Et on savait, car des prisonniers de toutes nationalités le racontaient, tous le savaient et disaient que le camp avait été construit par les Espagnols, les républicains espagnols et que chaque pierre portait le sang d'un Espagnol. Même la plus petite pierre de l'escalier de Mauthausen était imprégnée du sang d'un Espagnol. »

Témoignage de Mariano Constante (Capdesaso, Spagna, 1920) , écrivain espagnol dont l'œuvre est centrée sur l'expérience des républicains espagnols dans les camps de concentration nazis.

Mariano Constante est arrivé à Mauthausen en avril 1941. C'était le n° 4584. Il survécut. 4 ans en enfer. Il sortit du camp à la libération en mai 1945.

Militant communiste, après la Guerre, il s'établit en France et ne retourna jamais en Espagne.

Le camp de Mauthausen fut littéralement construit par les prisonniers espagnols, avec leur sueur et leur sang. Quand en Espagne, on dit que chaque pierre de Mauthausen représente la vie d'un Espagnol, ce n'est pas une affirmation exagérée ou rhétorique ; les prisonniers étaient contraint de travailler dans une carrière de granit et à transporter les gros blocs destinés à la construction du camp par un escalier de pierre de presque 200 marches et ce tous les jours et plusieurs dizaines de fois par jour, jusqu'à la mort.

Dans les lers temps, il ne survécut presque personne ; puis, les prisonniers commencèrent à s'organiser et, dans les années suivantes, les Espagnols, les vétérans du camp, furent pour tous les Maîtres incontestés de l'art de survivre dans ces conditions extrêmes et capables d'aider tous les autres internés quelles que fussent leur provenance. Et l'apport fondamental des Espagnols ne se limita pas à la délivrance du camp : Francesc Boix, photographe et militant antifasciste catalan, profitant de son emploi à l'enregistrement des internés, prit tant de photos qu'elles archivèrent les

horreurs du camp et les copies qu'il réussit secrètement à en faire servirent de preuves déterminantes au procès de Nuremberg.

Quand les soldats états-uniens entrèrent à Mauthausen, le comité de bienvenue avait été organisé par les Espagnols et les drapeaux avec la croix gammée avaient tous été remplacés par des drapeaux républicains. Malheureusement, parmi les rares qui survécurent à l'extermination nazie, les infortunés Espagnols ne purent rentrer chez eux où Franco devait encore régner pendant 3 décennies. Ceux d'entre eux, qui malgré tout ce qu'ils avaient vécu et passé, choisirent de rentrer en Espagne le firent clandestinement et pour continuer l'interminable lutte contre la bête fasciste.

La Première République d'Autriche

La Première République d'Autriche (« Erste Republik Österreich ») est le régime républicain qu'a connu l'Autriche pendant l'entre-deux-guerres.

La République est établie le 21 octobre 1919, lors de la ratification du Traité de Saint-Germain par l'Autriche. Elle succède à l'éphémère République d'Autriche allemande créée lors du démembrement de l'Empire austro-hongrois. La Constitution est signée en 1920 et amendée en 1929. Cette période de l'histoire autrichienne est marquée par de violents conflits entre la Gauche et la Droite, comme lors de la Révolte de Juillet (1927) ou lors de la guerre civile autrichienne (après le coup d'État d'Engelbert Dollfuss) de février 1934.

La Première République disparaît le 12 mars 1938 lorsque l'Autriche est annexée par le 3^e « Reich » (« Anschluß »). Cependant, certains considèrent qu'elle se termine dès la mise en place de la dictature austrofasciste en 1933-1934, la Constitution de l'État austrofasciste ne considérant pas l'Autriche comme une république mais comme un État fédéral (« Ständestaat » ou « Bundesstaat Österreich »).

Le 21 octobre 1919, l'Autriche ratifie le Traité de Saint-Germain, qui dissout la République d'Autriche allemande et cède des territoires peuplés majoritairement d'Allemands aux nouveaux États issus de la dissolution de l'Autriche-Hongrie : la région des Sudètes est ainsi cédée à la Tchécoslovaquie, le Tyrol du Sud à l'Italie et une partie du Sud du pays au royaume des Serbes, Croates et Slovènes. La population autrichienne est irritée par cette décision qu'elle considère comme une violation des « 14 points de Wilson » (Woodrow Wilson) et, plus particulièrement, de la possibilité d'auto-détermination de toute nation. Le nouvel État parvient tout de même à conserver certains territoires revendiqués par ces voisins tels que la partie Sud-Est de la Carinthie peuplée de Slovènes et le « Burgenland » qui fut une partie du royaume de Hongrie de 1647 à 1918. Ces territoires votent leur maintien au sein de l'Autriche lors de plébiscites organisés respectivement en 1920 et 1921.

Des élections ont lieu au printemps 1919 afin d'élire une assemblée constituante. Le Parti Social-Démocrate des travailleurs (SDAP) arrive en tête suivi du Parti des Chrétiens-Sociaux (CS) et de l'Association Nationale Allemande (DNV). Le débat fut tendu lors de la rédaction de la Constitution, notamment entre le SDAP et le CS pourtant alliés au sein d'une coalition. Le CS souhaitait une république fédérale avec un chef d'État puissant, le SDAP une république centralisée sans chef d'État (seulement le chancelier). La Constitution qui entre en vigueur en novembre 1920 est un

compromis entre les idées des différents Partis. La République est fédérale mais les régions ont peu d'autonomie et le chef de l'État n'a que des pouvoirs limités.

Le Parti des Chrétiens-Sociaux, proche de l'Église catholique romaine, gouverne l'Autriche à partir de 1920. Le 1er chancelier, Ignaz Seipel, est issu de ce Parti et essaye de forger une alliance politique entre les riches industriels et l'Église catholique. Bien que le gouvernement autrichien soit stable durant ces années, la vie politique est agitée et violente. Des forces para-militaires de Gauche (« Republikanischer Schutzbund », ou SDAP) et de Droite (« Heimwehr », CS et DNV) s'opposent. Les élections d'avril 1927 réduisent l'écart entre CS et SDAP à un siège ce qui radicalise encore plus la vie politique. Des combats de rue ont lieu à Schattendorf, entraînant la mort de 2 personnes, un homme et un enfant. Les militants de Droite, accusés de ce crime, furent acquittés, ce qui eut pour conséquences une immense manifestation de la Gauche et l'incendie du palais de justice. La police tira sur les manifestants, causant la mort de 89 personnes. Cet événement est connu sous le nom de « Révolte de Juillet ». Les violences continuèrent à augmenter en Autriche jusqu'au début des années 1930, lorsque Engelbert Dollfuss devint chancelier.

Le chancelier Engelbert Dollfuss, du Parti des Chrétiens-Sociaux, prend le pouvoir en Autriche en 1932. Il conduit l'Autriche vers la dictature, la centralisation et le Fascisme. Le 4 mars 1933 le Parlement s'auto-dissout et Dollfuss déclare le 7 qu'il gouvernera sans lui. Le 15, quelques députés essayent d'organiser une session du Parlement mais elle est empêchée par le gouvernement.

Outre le SDAP, Dollfuss s'oppose également au Parti nazi autrichien qui souhaite un rattachement de l'Autriche à l'Allemagne. Dollfuss met en avant les racines catholiques de l'Autriche pour refuser l'union avec l'Allemagne, majoritairement protestante. Des violences s'intensifient, conduisant à la guerre civile entre les Nazis, les austrofascistes et les socialistes.

En 1934, Dollfuss impose à l'Autriche un système à Parti unique, dirigé par le Front patriotique (« Vaterländische Front », ou VF) . L'État interdit le SDAP et exécute certains de ses représentants. Il commence également à sévir contre les sympathisants pro-nazis. Ces derniers répondent en organisant un coup d'État et en assassinant le chancelier Dollfuss, le 25 juillet 1934. Cet assassinat irrita fortement l'Italie fasciste de Benito Mussolini, qui avait de bonnes relations avec l'Autriche de Dollfuss. Le « Duce » promet alors de défendre le régime austrofasciste en cas d'invasion allemande. Ce soutien italien évitera d'ailleurs à l'Autriche une annexion dès 1934. Le successeur de Dollfuss, Kurt von Schuschnigg, maintient l'interdiction des activités nazies.

Au début 1938, Adolf Hitler obtient l'accord de Mussolini au sujet d'une l'annexion de l'Autriche par le 3e « Reich » . Kurt von Schuschnigg essaye désespérément d'éviter une guerre avec l'Allemagne nazie. Il annonce le 9 mars son intention d'organiser un plébiscite le 13 du même mois pour décider si l'Autriche souhaite rester indépendante ou rejoindre l'Allemagne. Il lance la devise « rot-weiß-rot bis in dem Tod » (rouge-blanc-rouge jusqu'à la mort) . Hitler répond en exigeant la démission immédiate de von Schuschnigg, que ce dernier est contraint de présenter au Président de la République Wilhelm Miklas, le 11 mars. Von Schuschnigg est remplacé par le dirigeant du Parti nazi autrichien, Arthur Seyß-Inquart, et les troupes allemandes prennent le contrôle de l'Autriche le 12 mars.

Le 13 mars 1938, la Première République d'Autriche a cessé d'exister.

...

The Federal State of Austria (« Bundesstaat Österreich » ; colloquially known as the « Ständestaat » or Corporate State) refers to Austria between 1934 and 1938 while it was a One Party State led by the clerico-fascist Fatherland's Front. The « Ständestaat » concept, derived from the notion of « Stände » (Estates or Corporations) , was propaganda advocated by leading politicians such as Engelbert Dollfuss and Kurt Schuschnigg. The result was an authoritarian government based on a mix of conservative Catholic and Italian Fascist influences.

In the 1890's, the founding members of the conservative-clerical Christian-Social Party (CS) like Karl von Vogelsang and the Vienna mayor Karl Lueger had already developed anti-Liberal views, though primarily from an economic perspective considering the pauperization of the proletariat and the lower middle-class. Strongly referring to the doctrine of Catholic social teaching, the CS agitated against the Austrian labour movement led by the Social-Democrats. The CS also spread anti-Semitic prejudices, albeit never as virulent as the Nazis eventually became.

During the Great Depression in the First Austrian Republic of the early 1930's, the CS on the basis of the « Quadragesimo anno » Encyclical issued by Pope Pius XI, in 1931, pursued the idea of overcoming the ongoing class-struggle by the implementation of a corporative form of government modelled on Italian Fascism. The CS politician Engelbert Dollfuss, appointed Chancellor of Austria in 1932, on 4 March 1933, saw an opportunity in the resignation of Social-Democrat Karl Renner as president of the Austrian « Nationalrat » , after irregularities occurred during a voting process. Dollfuss called the incident a « self-elimination » (« Selbstausschaltung ») of the parliament and had the following meeting on 15 March forcibly prorogued by the forces of the Vienna police department. His Party fellow, President Wilhelm Miklas, with regard to Adolf Hitler's victory in the German elections of 5 March 1933 did not take any action to restore democracy.

Chancellor Dollfuss then governed by emergency decree, including the ban of the Communist Party on 26 May 1933, the Social-Democratic « Republikanischer Schutzbund » para-military organization on 30 May, and the Austrian branch of the Nazi Party on 19 June. Instead, on 20 May 1933, he had established the Fatherland's Front as a unity Party of « an autonomous, Christian, German, corporative Federal State of Austria » . On 12 February 1934, the government's attempts to enforce the ban of the « Schutzbund » at the Hotel Schiff in Linz sparked the Austrian Civil War. The revolt was suppressed with support by the « Bundesheer » and Right-wing Heimwehr troops under Ernst Rüdiger Starhemberg, ending with the ban of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade-unions. The path to dictatorship completed on 1 May 1934, when the Constitution was recast into a severely authoritarian document by a rump National Council.

Dollfuss continued to rule by emergency measures until his assassination during the Nazi July Putsch, on 25 July 1934. Although the « coup » initially had the encouragement of Adolf Hitler, it was quickly suppressed and his education minister, Kurt Schuschnigg, succeeded him. Hitler officially denied any involvement in the « coup d'État » . Nevertheless, he continued to destabilize the Austrian government system by secretly supporting Nazi sympathizers like Arthur Seyß-

Inquart and Edmund Glaise-Horstenau. In turn, Austria under Schuschnigg sought the backing by its southern neighbour, the Fascist Italian dictator Benito Mussolini. Tables turned after the Second Italo-Abyssinian War, in 1935-1936, when Mussolini, internationally isolated, approached Hitler. Though Schuschnigg tried to improve relations with Nazi Germany by amnestying several Austrian Nazis and accepting them in the Fatherland's Front, he had no chance to prevail against the « axis » of Berlin and Rome proclaimed by Mussolini on 1 November 1936.

According to the Hossbach Memorandum, Adolf Hitler, in November 1937, declared his plans for an Austrian campaign in a meeting with « Wehrmacht » commanders. Under the mediation of the German ambassador Franz von Papen, Schuschnigg, on 12 February 1938, traveled to Hitler's « Berghof » residence in Berchtesgaden, only to be confronted with an ultimatum to re-admit the Nazi Party and to appoint Seyß-Inquart and Glaise-Horstenau ministers of the Austrian cabinet. Schuschnigg, impressed by the presence of OKW chief General Wilhelm Keitel, gave-in and, on 16 February, Seyß-Inquart became head of the strategically important Austrian interior ministry.

After the British ambassador to Berlin, Nevile Henderson, on 3 March 1938, had stated that the German claims to Austria were justified, Schuschnigg started a last attempt to retain Austrian autonomy by scheduling a nation-wide referendum on 13 March. As part of his effort to ensure victory, he released the Social-Democratic leaders from prison and gained their support in return for dismantling the One Party State and legalizing the Socialist trade-unions. Hitler reacted with the mobilization of « Wehrmacht » troops at the Austrian border and demanded the appointment of Seyß-Inquart as Austrian chancellor. On 11 March, Austrian Nazis stormed the Federal Chancellery and forced Schuschnigg to resign. Seyß-Inquart was sworn in as his successor by Wilhelm Miklas, and, the next day, « Wehrmacht » troops crossed the border meeting no resistance.

Hitler had originally intended to retain Austria as a puppet State headed by Seyß-Inquart. However, the enthusiastic support for Hitler led him to change his stance and support a full « Anschluß » between Austria and Nazi Germany. On 13 March Seyß-Inquart formally decreed the Anschluß, though President Miklas avoided signing the law by resigning immediately. Seyß-Inquart then took over most of Miklas' duties and signed the Anschluß bill into law. Two days later in his speech at the Vienna Heldenplatz, Hitler proclaimed the "accession of my homeland to the German Reich".

Les « Bürgermeister » de Linz sous la Première République

1918-1919 : Karl Sadleder (DFOP) .

1919-1927 : Josef Dametz (SDAP) .

1927-1929 : Robert Mehr (SDAP) .

1929-1930 : Eduard Euller (SDAP) .

1930-1934 : Josef Gruber (SDAP) .

La guerre civile autrichienne

La guerre civile autrichienne (« Österreichischer Bürgerkrieg »), également connue sous le nom d'« Insurrection de février » (« Februarkämpfe »), désigne les quelques jours d'escarmouches qui opposent en Autriche les forces socialistes et conservatrices-fascistes du 12 au 16 février 1934.

Après la désintégration de l'Empire austro-hongrois à la fin de la Première Guerre mondiale, en 1918, et le traité de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, l'Autriche devient une République parlementaire indépendante. 2 principales factions dominent alors la vie politique de la nouvelle nation : les Socialistes (représentés politiquement par le Parti Social-Démocrate) et les conservateurs (représentés politiquement par le Parti Chrétien-Social, ou « Christlichsoziale Partei », qui deviendra plus tard le Front patriotique, ou « Vaterländische Front »). Les Socialistes trouvent leur bastions dans les quartiers populaires des villes, tandis que les conservateurs peuvent s'appuyer sur le soutien de la population rurale et de la plupart des classes supérieures. Les conservateurs ont aussi maintenu des alliances étroites avec l'Église catholique romaine et peuvent compter parmi leurs rangs des religieux influents.

Comme dans la plupart des démocraties européennes naissantes de l'entre-deux-guerres, la politique de l'Autriche a pris une saveur très idéologique. Les 2 camps ne sont ainsi pas simplement composés de Partis politiques mais comprennent également des structures d'encadrement plus vastes, y compris de propres forces para-militaires. Les conservateurs développent donc l'« Heimwehr », constituée en 1921-1923 ; les para-militaires Sociaux-Démocrates se sont, quant à eux, regroupés dans la ligue de défense républicaine (« Republikanischer Schutzbund »). Les altercations et les affrontements (notamment lors de rassemblements politiques) sont ainsi fréquents. La Révolte de Juillet 1927 est le point culminant de cette confrontation.

À cela s'ajoutent les affres de la Première République d'Autriche qui n'ont fait qu'empirer dans les années suivantes. La Grande Dépression a également montré ses effets en Autriche, entraînant un chômage élevé et une inflation massive. En janvier 1933, l'élection d'Adolf Hitler au poste de chancelier en Allemagne menace l'État autrichien. Le 4 mars 1933, le chancelier Engelbert Dollfuss (appartenant au Parti Chrétien-Social) dissout le Parlement autrichien. Dans un vote serré (concernant les salaires des travailleurs des chemins de fer) au Conseil national, chacun des 3 présidents du parlement ont démissionné de leur poste afin de voter, ne laissant personne pour présider la réunion. Même si les statuts aurait pu résoudre cette situation, Dollfuss saisit cette occasion pour déclarer que le parlement avait cessé de fonctionner, et bloque toutes les tentatives de le convoquer à nouveau. Le Parti Social-Démocrate perd ainsi sa plateforme d'action politique. Les conservateurs, face à la pression et la violence, non seulement de la Gauche mais aussi de Nazis infiltrés venus d'Allemagne, peuvent désormais gouverner par décret, sur la base d'une loi d'urgence de 1917. Les libertés civiles sont alors suspendues et le Parti Social-Démocrate interdit, plusieurs de ses membres étant par ailleurs arrêtés.

Le 12 février 1934, l'« Heimwehr » commandée par Emil Fey, entreprend une marche sur l'hôtel Schiff à Linz, une propriété du Parti Social-Démocrate (dirigé Richard Bernaschek), marche qui dégénère en affrontements. La police, la gendarmerie et l'armée fédérale (« Bundesheer ») viennent épauler cette dernière. Après de brefs combats, le bâtiment est envahi par les conservateurs.

De nombreuses escarmouches ont alors lieu dans toute l'Autriche entre Socialistes et conservateurs. Les Socialistes se barricadent dans les zones urbaines (« Gemeindebauten ») formant les bastions du mouvement socialiste en Autriche, comme Karl Marx Hof. La police et les para-militaires ont pris position en dehors de ces ensembles fortifiés avant d'échanger des tirs avec ces derniers à l'arme légère. Des combats ont également lieu dans les villes industrielles telles que Steyr, Sankt Pölten, Weiz, Eggenberg bei Graz, Kapfenberg, Bruck an der Mur, Graz, Ebensee et Wörgl.

L'intervention de l'armée autrichienne, jusqu'alors neutre, marque le tournant du conflit. Le chancelier Dollfuss ordonne le bombardement du Karl-Marx-Hof, mettant en danger la vie de milliers de civils et détruisant de nombreux appartements avant de forcer les combattants socialistes à se rendre. Les combats dans la capitale prennent fin le 13 février mais perdurent dans les villes de Styrie, en particulier dans Bruck an der Mur et dans Judenburg, jusqu'au 14 ou 15 février.

Après cette date, il ne reste alors que quelques groupes socialistes qui combattent encore contre l'armée, ou qui sont en pleine déroute. La guerre civile autrichienne prend fin le 16 février.

Plusieurs centaines de personnes (y compris les para-militaires, membres des forces de sécurité et des civils) sont morts durant le conflit, auxquelles s'ajoutent plus de 300 blessés.

Les autorités arrêtent et exécutent 9 dirigeants du Parti Social-Démocrate en vertu des dispositions de la loi martiale. On dénombre, en outre, plus de 1,500 arrestations et les principaux socialistes, comme Otto Bauer, sont contraints à l'exil.

Une fois éliminée la principale force d'opposition, le pays connaît l'instauration de l'austrofascisme. Le Front patriotique, résultat de la fusion de l'« Heimwehr » et du Parti Chrétien-Social, devient le seul Parti politique légal (Parti unique) sous le nouveau régime autoritaire, le « Ständestaat » .

En juillet 1934, les Nazis autrichiens tentent un coup d'État qui échoue et fait environ 270 morts. 13 personnes sont exécutées et 4 se suicident avant leur exécution. Le chancelier Dollfuss est assassiné, Kurt von Schuschnigg lui succède et reste à la chancellerie jusqu'en mars 1938 (date de l'« Anschluß ») .

Pendant ce coup d'État, l'Allemagne reste neutre car elle ne sent pas encore assez forte militairement pour intervenir. Benito Mussolini, alors encore hostile et méfiant vis-à-vis du 3e « Reich » , envoie des soldats à la frontière autrichienne pour protéger l'indépendance de l'Autriche si elle venait à être menacée, cette dernière étant liée à l'Italie par une alliance.

La guerre civile autrichienne s'est néanmoins révélée un moment décisif dans l'histoire de la République. Après la Seconde Guerre mondiale, lorsque l'Autriche est réapparue dans le paysage politique en tant que nation souveraine en 1945, la politique retombe sous la domination des Sociaux-Démocrates et des conservateurs (désormais regroupés au sein du Parti populaire autrichien, l'ÖVP) . Toutefois, afin d'éviter un retour des divisions amères de la Première

République, les dirigeants de la Deuxième République ont été déterminés à mettre l'idée d'un large consensus au cœur du nouveau système politique : la « Grande Coalition », regroupant des membres des 2 Partis.

...

The Austrian Civil War (« Österreichischer Bürgerkrieg »), also known as the « February Uprising » (« Februarkämpfe »), is a term sometimes used for a few days of skirmishes between socialist and conservative-fascist forces between 12 February and 16 February 1934, in Austria. The clashes started in Linz and took place principally in the cities of Vienna, Graz, Bruck an der Mur, Judenburg, Wiener Neustadt and Steyr, but also in some other industrial cities of eastern and central Austria.

After the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (following the First World War), the State of Austria (largely comprising the German-speaking parts of the former Empire) became constituted as a parliamentary democracy. 2 major factions dominated politics in the new nation : Socialists (represented politically by the Social-Democratic Workers' Party) and conservatives (politically represented by the Christian-Social Party). The Socialists found their strongholds in the working-class districts of the cities, while the conservatives could build on the support of the rural population and of most of the upper-classes. The conservatives also maintained close alliances with the Roman Catholic Church, and could count among their ranks some leading clerics.

As in most of the nascent European democracies of the time, politics in Austria took on a highly-ideological flavour. Both the socialist and the conservative camp did not merely consist of political Parties, but possessed far-ranging power structures, including their own para-military forces. The conservatives began organizing the « Heimwehr » (Homeguard), in 1921-1923 ; in response, the Social-Democrats organized para-militaries called the « Republikanischer Schutzbund » (Republican Protection Association) after 1923. Altercations and clashes between these forces (at political rallies, etc.) occurred frequently.

A 1st major incident ensued early in 1927, when members of Hermann Hiltl's « Frontkämpfervereinigung » (Front Fighters Union : a para-military association likewise affiliated with the conservative camp) shot and killed an 8 year old boy and a War veteran marching with the « Schutzbund » in a counter-demonstration in Schattendorf (Burgenland). In July, 3 defendants in the case were acquitted, which led to outrage in the Leftist camp even though the acquittal had been issued by one of the 1st Austrian courts to operate under an independent jury system, the introduction of which had been a long-standing socialist demand. On 15 July 1927, a general strike occurred, and demonstrations took place in the capital. After the storming of a police station, security forces started shooting at demonstrators. An angry group of people then set fire to the Palace of Justice (« Justizpalast »), seen as a symbol of a flawed and partial judicial system. Altogether, 89 people (85 of them demonstrators) lost their lives in this « July Revolt », and many hundreds suffered injury. Surprisingly, the violence soon died down and the factions took their battle from the streets back into the political institutions.

However, the travails of the First Republic only got worse in the following years. The Great Depression also showed its effects in Austria, resulting in high-unemployment and massive inflation. In addition, from 1933 (the year Adolf Hitler

became Chancellor of Germany) , National-Socialist sympathizers (who wanted a unification of Austria with Hitler's Germany) threatened the Austrian State from within.

On 4 March 1933, Christian-Social Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss suspended the Austrian Parliament. In a close vote (on railway workers' wages) in the National Council, each of the 3 presidents of parliament resigned their position in order to cast a ballot, leaving nobody to preside over the meeting. Even though the bylaws could have resolved this situation, Dollfuss used this opportunity to declare that parliament had ceased to function, and blocked all attempts to reconvene it. The Social-Democratic Party had, thus, lost its major platform for political action. The conservatives, facing pressure and violence not only from the Left but also from Nazis infiltrating from Germany, could now rule by decree on the basis of a 1917 emergency law, without checks on their power, and began to suspend civil liberties. They banned the « Schutzbund » and imprisoned many of its members.

On 12 February 1934, a force, led by « Heimwehr » commander in Vienna Emil Fey, searched Hotel Schiff in Linz, a property belonging to the Social-Democratic Party. Linz « Schutzbund » commander Richard Bernaschek was the 1st to actively resist, sparking-off armed conflict between a conglomeration of the « Heimwehr » , the police, the « gendarmerie » and the regular Federal Army against the outlawed, but still existent, Socialist « Schutzbund » . Skirmishes between the 2 camps spread to other cities and towns in Austria, with the heat of the action occurring in Vienna. There, members of the « Schutzbund » barricaded themselves in city council housing estates (« Gemeindebauten ») , the symbols and strongholds for the Socialist movement in Austria, such as Karl-Marx-Hof. Police and para-militaries took-up positions outside these fortified complexes and the parties exchanged fire, initially only with small arms. Fighting also occurred in industrial towns such as Steyr, Sankt Pölten, Weiz, Eggenberg (Graz) , Kapfenberg, Bruck an der Mur, Graz, Ebensee and Wörgl.

An apparently decisive moment in the events came with the entry of the Austrian armed forces into the conflict. Though the army remained still a comparatively independent institution, chancellor Dollfuss ordered Karl-Marx-Hof shelled with light-artillery, endangering the lives of thousands of civilians and destroying many flats before forcing the Socialist fighters to surrender. Viennese and Upper-Austrian fighting ended by 13 February, but continued heavily in Styrian cities, especially in Bruck an der Mur and Judenburg, until 14 or 15 February. After that, there were only small groups of Socialists fighting against the armed forces, or fleeing from it. By 16 February 1934, the Austrian Civil War had ended.

Several hundred people (including para-militaries, members of the security forces and civilians) died in the armed conflict ; more than 1,000 suffered wounds. The authorities tried and executed 9 « Schutzbund » leaders under the provisions of martial law. In addition, over 1,500 arrests were made. Leading Socialist politicians, such as Otto Bauer, were forced into exile.

The incidents of February 1934 were taken as a pretext by the government to prohibit the Social-Democratic Party and its affiliated trade-unions altogether. In May, the conservatives replaced the democratic constitution by a corporatist constitution modelled along the lines of Benito Mussolini's Fascist Italy ; therefore, the Socialists coined the term « Austrofascism » although the underlying ideology was essentially that of the most conservative elements in the

Austrian Catholic clergy, a feature inconsistent with both Italian Fascism and Nazism. The Patriotic Front (« Vaterländische Front ») , into which the « Heimwehr » and the Christian-Social Party were merged, became the only legal political Party in the resulting authoritarian regime, the « Ständestaat » .

Though small in scale in an international comparison (and small in scale, indeed, in the light of the events of the Second World War which soon followed) , the Austrian Civil War nevertheless proved a decisive moment in the history of the Republic. After the Second World War, when Austria re-emerged on the political landscape as a sovereign nation, politics again fell under the domination of the Social-Democrats and the conservatives, who now formed a Party called the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP) . However, so as to avoid a repeat of the bitter divisions of the First Republic, the leaders of the Second Republic were determined to put the idea of broad consensus at the heart of the new political system. The concept of the « Grand Coalition » was introduced, in which the 2 major parties (Social-Democrats and People's Party) shared in the government and avoided open confrontation. This system brought with it stability and continuity, but ultimately led to other political repercussions. But the events of the Austrian Civil War had persuaded many in the political establishment (and, indeed, the population at large) that a slow pace of political reform was a small price to pay for social calm.

L'Austrofascisme

L'Austrofascisme est un terme utilisé pour décrire le régime politique instauré en Autriche, entre 1933 et 1938 (« Ständestaat » , littéralement : État fédéral d'Autriche) . La figure la plus marquante de ce régime fut le chancelier Engelbert Dollfuß, qui fut assassiné par les Nazis, en juillet 1934. Ce régime se caractérisa par son autoritarisme, son catholicisme d'État, son opposition au marxisme et au Nazisme, son désir d'autarcie économique, et ses alliances politiques avec le régime fasciste italien de Benito Mussolini (afin de protéger l'Autriche des ambitions annexionnistes du 3e « Reich ») .

Le Front patriotique fut un parti unique (celui du chancelier) , les partis communiste, socialiste et nazi ayant été interdits.

Le 20 mai 1932, le président autrichien Wilhelm Miklas appelle Dollfuß au poste de chancelier. Cette nomination survient à un moment critique pour la jeune république autrichienne, touchée de plein fouet par la crise de 1929. Elle doit aussi faire face aux querelles politiques qui opposent marxistes et chrétiens. Dollfuß est décidé à suivre la politique de son prédécesseur Ignaz Seipel et, bien que son parti ne dispose que d'une voix de majorité au parlement, il refuse toute coalition avec les Sociaux-Démocrates. Décidé à redresser la situation du pays, il se lance, non sans difficulté, dans le rétablissement de l'équilibre financier, à la stabilisation du schilling et à la réorganisation du « Creditanstalt » , une des principales banques autrichiennes.

Le 30 janvier 1933, Adolf Hitler est nommé chancelier d'Allemagne. Cet événement marque le début du combat que vont se mener le Parti nazi autrichien et Dollfuß ; l'un voulant l'« Anschluss » , l'autre le combattant fermement. Conscient de la puissance de son adversaire, Dollfuß essaie de trouver rapidement des alliés : à l'extérieur, Mussolini se révèle être un protecteur. Mais, à l'intérieur, le chancelier tente vainement de créer un gouvernement de coalition avec

les Sociaux-Démocrates. Ces derniers refusent tout compromis et exigent de nouvelles élections, que Dollfuß refuse à son tour.

Le 4 mars 1933, le président et les 2 vice-présidents du Parlement démissionnent afin de pouvoir prendre part au vote particulièrement serré d'une loi. Engelbert Dollfuß déclare le Parlement dissous, puisque incapable de fonctionner. L'Autriche devient un État autoritaire, corporatif et catholique. Il ne gouverne désormais que par décrets ; ce pouvoir dictatorial lui permet de supprimer le droit de grève et de réunion, ainsi que les cours d'assises, et d'interdire la presse marxiste. Commence alors ce que les historiens ont par la suite appelé l'austrofascisme.

Le 30 mai 1933, le Parti communiste d'Autriche est dissous, de même que le Parti nazi, le 20 juin 1933. Ses nombreux membres actifs sont arrêtés et placés dans des camps de concentration. En réaction, la radio allemande le discrédite, utilisant le fait que son père soit inconnu pour l'accuser d'être un « demi-juif ». Il devient la cible à abattre pour les nazis autrichiens.

En juillet 1934, les Nazis autrichiens tentent un coup d'État qui échoue et fait environ 270 morts. 13 personnes sont exécutées et 4 se suicident avant leur exécution. Le chancelier Dollfuß est assassiné, von Schuschnigg lui succède et reste à la chancellerie jusqu'en 1938 (date de l'« Anschluss »). Pendant ce coup d'État, l'Allemagne reste neutre car elle ne sent pas encore assez forte militairement pour intervenir. Mussolini, alors encore hostile et méfiant vis-à-vis du 3e « Reich », envoie des soldats à la frontière autrichienne pour protéger l'indépendance de l'Autriche si elle venait à être menacée.

De 1934 à 1938, Schuschnigg mène une intense mais prudente activité diplomatique afin de faire garantir l'indépendance de son pays par l'Italie, la France et la Grande-Bretagne pendant que le chef d'état-major de l'armée autrichienne, Alfred Jansa, dresse des plans pour s'opposer militairement à une éventuelle agression allemande.

Si l'accord du 11 juillet 1936 réaffirme le maintien de l'indépendance de l'Autriche, celle-ci est désignée comme « le second État allemand » et elle s'engage à « mener une politique extérieure conforme aux intérêts pan-germaniques » et à autoriser l'activité politique du Parti nazi. Au cours de l'été 1937, Hitler fait part à Josef Goebbels de sa volonté de résoudre le problème autrichien par la force, non seulement pour des raisons idéologiques, stratégiques et militaires, mais aussi pour des motifs économiques, l'Autriche disposant d'importantes réserves d'or et de devises, de main-d'œuvre et de matières premières ; elle sera annexée en mars 1938 (« Anschluss »).

Après l'arrivée au pouvoir du gouvernement austrofasciste, l'Autriche s'éloigne de l'économie de marché. Les échanges internationaux sont progressivement interdits en réponse au « Krach » de 1929. Entre 1932 et 1933, le chômage avait augmenté de 22 %. En réponse, les austrofascistes suppriment les allocations chômage. En outre, le gouvernement crée des coopérations de travailleurs afin de satisfaire les mouvements ouvriers.

La politique culturelle officielle du gouvernement austrofasciste, entre 1933 et 1938, était l'affirmation des styles « pré-révolutionnaires » (Baroque et autres), visant à rappeler les images de la « menace de l'Est » (l'invasion de l'Europe par les Turcs ottomans) qui ont ensuite été projetées sur l'URSS. De cette façon, le gouvernement a mis en

garde ses citoyens contre ce qu'il appelle le « bolchévisme culturel », considéré comme une menace majeure pour l'Autriche.

Bien que le terme d'autrofascisme ait été utilisé par les partisans du régime lui-même, il est encore contesté aujourd'hui. Il est principalement utilisé par les historiens de gauche, tandis que la plupart des historiens préfèrent le terme de « Ständestaat » (État fédéral), soulignant ses mérites dans la lutte pour l'indépendance de l'Autriche et contre le Nazisme.

...

Le Front patriotique (en allemand : « Vaterländ Front ») était un parti politique autrichien d'extrême-droite. Il prônait le nationalisme autrichien et l'indépendance autrichienne vis-à-vis de l'Allemagne sur la base de la protection de l'identité religieuse catholique de l'Autriche.

Le Front patriotique a été fondé en 1933 par Engelbert Dollfuß lors d'une fusion du Parti Social-Chrétien, de la « Heimwehr » ainsi que d'autres groupes conservateurs. Il était destiné à recueillir tous les « Autrichiens fidèles » sous la même bannière. Après l'interdiction de tous les autres partis politiques lors de la guerre civile autrichienne, le Front patriotique a tenu une position de monopole dans l'échiquier politique autrichien avec des sympathisants à la fois civils et militaires.

En dépit des efforts de Dollfuß, le Front patriotique n'est jamais devenu un mouvement de masse. À la fin de 1937, il comptait 3 millions de membres (sur une population totale de 6,5 millions d'habitants) et ne pouvait pas ainsi gagner l'appui de ses adversaires politiques (les cercles du Parti Social-Démocrate d'Autriche et du Parti nazi).

Le Parti a été interdit après l'« Anschluss » (annexion de l'Autriche par l'Allemagne), en mars 1938.

...

Austrofascism (German : « Austrofaschismus ») was the authoritarian rule installed in Austria with the May Constitution of 1934, which ceased with the annexation of the newly-founded Federal State of Austria into Nazi Germany, in 1938. It was based on a ruling Party, the Fatherland Front (« Vaterländische Front ») and the « Heimwehr » (Home Guard) para-military militia. Leaders were Engelbert Dollfuß and, after Dollfuß's assassination, Kurt Schuschnigg, who were previously politicians of the Christian-Social Party, which was quickly integrated into the new movement.

The Austrofascist movement's origin lies in the Korneuburg Oath, a declaration released by the Christian-Social para-military organization « Heimwehr », on 18 May 1930. The declaration condemned both « Marxist class struggle » and « Liberal-capitalistic economical structures » and also explicitly rejected « the Western democratic parliamentary system and the multi-Party State ».

The declaration was directed mainly at the Social-Democratic opposition, largely in response to the Linz Program of

1926, and was not only taken by the « Heimwehr » but also by many Christian-Social politicians, setting Austria on a course to an authoritarian system.

Ideologically, Austrofascism was partly based on a fusion of Italian Fascism, as expounded by Giovanni Gentile, and Austria's Political Catholicism.

The election in Vienna, in 1932, made it likely that the coalition of the Christian-Social Party, the « Landbund » , and the « Heimwehr » would lose their majority in the national parliament, depriving the Dollfuß government of its parliamentary basis. To prevent its loss of power, the government sought to replace Austrian democracy with an authoritarian system. These efforts were supported from abroad by Benito Mussolini.

The opportunity for such a transition arrived on 4 March 1933 when the national parliament was paralysed by procedural disputes. Dollfuß held a 1 vote majority in parliament. During a dispute over a voting recount, the speaker and vice-speakers of parliament resigned in order to be able to cast their votes and, in the absence of the 3 speakers, there existed no procedural means to reconvene Parliament. Dollfuß branded this as the « self-elimination of the Parliament » and proceeded to rule on the basis of the War-time Economy Authority Law. This law had been passed in 1917, during World War I, to enable the government to issue decrees ensuring the supply of necessities. The law had never been explicitly revoked and was now used by the Dollfuß government to inaugurate an authoritarian State.

On 7 March 1933, the Council of Ministers issued a ban on assembly and protests. Press regulations were also levied by the War-time Economy Authority Law and touted as economic safe-guards. The law allowed for the government to require approval of a newspaper which had already been printed-up to 2 hours before its distribution under certain circumstances, for instance if « through damage to patriotic, religious or moral sensibility, a danger to public peace, order and security » would arise. This allowed for censorship of the press, but the government was eager to avoid the appearance of open censorship, which was forbidden by the constitution. The opposition made a final attempt to reverse the changes in parliament, which was met by police power, on 15 March 1933. As « Großdeutsche » , who advocated a merger with Germany, and Social-Democrats arrived at the Parliament building, the government sent 200 detectives to the Parliament to prevent the representatives from taking their places in the assembly hall.

On 31 March, the government dissolved the Republican « Schutzbund » . On 10 April 1933, the « Glöckel-Erlass » , authored by former Social-Democratic Education Minister, Otto Glöckel, was abolished ; the new law made participation in Catholic lessons in schools mandatory. On 10 May, all federal, State and local elections were cancelled. The Communist Party of Austria was dissolved, on 26 May ; the National-Socialist Workers' Party (NSDAP) , on 19 June ; and the Free Thinkers Guild, on 20 June.

The Hotel Schiff, an asylum of the Social-Democrats in Linz, was raided by the police, in February 1934. The Social-Democrats resisted, leading to the Austrian Civil War, which was quelled with military and para-military force. Afterward, the Social-Democratic Party was banned in Austria.

On 30 April 1934, the national parliament, in its last session, passed a law that authorised the government with all

the powers previously held by parliament.

On 1 May, Dollfuß' government proclaimed the May Constitution (« Maiverfassung ») , which diminished the term « Republic » and, instead, used as the official name of the State « Federal State of Austria » (« Bundesstaat Österreich ») , though the constitution actually reduced the individual States' autonomy. The Federal Council was retained, though only as a significantly limited check on the Federal government. Rather than establishing the composition of a 59 member National Council through direct suffrage, this was accomplished by 4 « Councils » representing the professionals from Austrian Culture, State affairs, the States of Austria (« Länder ») and Economic affairs (the latter elected by 7 corporations supposedly representing workers and employers) . The National Council lost its power to initiate legislation but was still expected to approve decrees from the government. All essential power lay with the Federal Chancellor (« Bundeskanzler ») , who appointed his government single-handedly, and the Federal President (« Bundespräsident ») , who named the Chancellor.

As with Antonio de Salazar's 1933 constitution (and the « Estado Novo » regime in whole) , the « Maiverfassung » promoted a Catholic corporatism which bore a strong resemblance to the principles outlined in « Quadragesimo anno » , rejecting capitalism and socialism.

Chancellor Dollfuß was killed in July 1934, during an attempt by Austria's National-Socialist Party to topple the regime and proclaim a Nazi government under Ambassador to Rome, Anton Rintelen. The assassination of Dollfuß was accompanied by Nazi uprisings in many regions in Austria, resulting in further deaths. In Carinthia, a large contingent of northern German Nazis tried to grab power but were subdued by the loyalist « Heimwehr » units. The Nazi assassins holding the Federal Chancellery Vienna surrendered after threats to dynamite the building and were executed before the end of July. While « Heimwehr » leader Starhemberg briefly assumed power as vice-Chancellor, Kurt Schuschnigg was appointed Dollfuß' successor by President Miklas, on 29 July, ousting Starhemberg from the government completely in 1936, before surrendering to Nazi pressure in March 1938.

One of the reasons for the failure of the « Putsch » was Italian intervention : Benito Mussolini assembled an army corps of 4 divisions on the Austrian border and threatened Hitler with a War with Italy in the event of a German invasion of Austria as originally planned, should the coup have been more successful. Support for the Nazi movement in Austria was surpassed only by that in Germany, allegedly amounting to 75 % in some areas.

After the parliament was dissolved, the government also dissolved the Constitutional Court (« Verfassungsgerichtshof ») . The 4 Christian-Social members of the Constitutional Court had resigned, and the government banned the nomination of new judges, effectively closing the court.

In September 1933, the government established internment camps for political opposition members. Social-Democrats, Socialists, Communists, and Anarchists were all considered dissidents condemned to internment. After the « July “ Putsch ” » of 1934, National-Socialists were also regularly interned. On 11 November 1933, the government re-instated the death penalty for the crimes of murder, arson, and « public violence through malicious damage to others' property » . In February 1934, rioting (« Aufruhr ») was added to the list of capital offenses. Judges were instructed that, if they

did not pass down a death penalty verdict within 3 days, they would be removed from the case and it would be brought to a jury trial.

John Gunther wrote in 1936 that the State « assaulted the rights of citizens in a fantastic manner », noting that, in 1934, the police raided 106,000 homes in Vienna and made 38,141 arrests of Nazis, Social-Democrats, and Communists. He added, however :

« But (and it was an important “ but ”) the terror never reached anything like the repressive force of the Nazi terror. Most of those arrested promptly got-out of jail again. Even at its most extreme phase, it was difficult to take the Schuschnigg dictatorship completely seriously. This was because of Austrian gentleness, Austrian genius for compromise, Austrian love for cloudy legal abstractions, and Austrian “ Schlamperei ”. »

By 1933, a series of laws had already been passed to bring the educational system in Austria into line with Austrofascism. The Catholic Church was, under the new government, able to exert significant influence on educational policy, which had previously been secularised. In order to pass the « Matura » (the test required for graduation) , a student had to have taken religious education classes. Educational opportunities for women were significantly limited under the new regime.

Post-secondary education was also targeted by the new regime. The number of professors and assistants fell as the government produced legal grounds for deposing those who were critical of the new regime. Disciplinary actions, previously the responsibility of individual Universities, were relegated to the government. Only members of the Fatherland Front were allowed to become University officials.

By 1930, foreign trade to and from Austria moved away from a free-market system and became an extension of the autocratic government. Chief among the changes was the closing of the Austrian market to foreign trade in response to the New York stock exchange crisis, in 1929.

Unemployment grew drastically, by over 25 % between 1932 and 1933. In response, the government removed unemployment benefits from the national budget. Additionally, the government created the so-called « Cooperations » of workers and enterprisers charged with undermining workers' movements. International trade was restricted and eventually banned.

The official cultural policy of the Austrofascist government was the affirmation of the Baroque and other « pre-revolutionary » styles. The government encouraged a cultural mindset reminiscent of the times before the French Revolution. This recalled images of the « Threat from the East » (the invasion of Europe by the Ottoman Turks) which were then projected onto the Soviet Union. In this way, the government warned its people against what it called « cultural Bolshevism » , a force which it claimed posed a great threat to Austria.

The ideology of the « community of the people » (« Volksgemeinschaft ») was different from that of the National-Socialists. They were similar in that both served to attack the idea of a class struggle by accusing leftism of destroying

individuality and, thus, help usher in a totalitarian State. Dolfuß claimed he wanted to « over-Hitler » (« überhitlern ») National-Socialism.

Austrofascism, however, focused on the history of Austria. The Catholic Church played a large role in the Austrofascist definition of Austrian history and identity, which served to alienate German culture. According to this philosophy, Austrians were « better Germans » (by this time, the majority of the German population was Protestant) and that Austria was a 2nd German State but the « better German State ». The monarchy was elevated to the ideal of a powerful and far-reaching State, a status which Austria lost after the Treaty of Saint-Germain.

There was no official policy of Antisemitism between 1933 and 1938. Public violence against Jews was rare. As the Austrofascist State saw itself under the growing pressure by Nazi Germany which penalized its citizens who travelled to Austria with a 1000 Mark fee, and even more so after the failed Nazi coup against the Austrian government in July 1934, many Jews supported the regime. Austrofascist officials supported the Salzburg Festival which employed famous Jewish artists like Herbert Graf, Alexander Moissi, Max Reinhardt, Richard Tauber, Margarete Wallmann, and Bruno Walter. Walter also was a leading-conductor for the Vienna State Opera until 1938, and conducted several concerts given by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. Therefore, the Festival was harshly criticized by German officials and boycotted by German artists like Richard Strauß, Wilhelm Furtwängler, and Clemens Krauß. The Festival also came under attack by Austrian anti-Semites and exponents of Right-wing Parties.

Many Jews fled Germany and found a temporary refuge in Austria. Artists like film-maker Henry Koster and producer Joe Pasternak could not work in Germany any longer and continued to produce films in Austria. Vienna's « Theater in der Josefstadt » provided many Jewish actors, playwrights and directors with the opportunity to continue their work, among them Reinhardt, Albert Bassermann, Egon Friedell, Hans Jaray, Otto Preminger (the theatre's managing director until 1935) , Ernst Lothar (managing director until 1938) , and Franz Werfel. Jewish athletes made the « SC Hakoah Wien » one of the most successful athletic clubs in Austria before 1938. Its athletes excelled on many occasions throughout Europe.

Yet, there was a purge of public offices, and many Jews were fired from their posts on the accusations that they were Communist or Social-Democratic sympathizers. There were occasional outbursts of Antisemitism in Right-wing newspapers. However, Jews continued to be an integral part of Austrian society until March 1938. But some of them lost their hopes for a fruitful future and left Austria before 1938, especially following the « Juliabkommen 1936 » , between Austria and Germany, which provided an amnesty for illegal Nazis. Among the most prominent Jews who left Austria before 1938 were Stefan Zweig and Otto Preminger.

The regime lasted as long as the favour of Fascist Italy under Mussolini protected it against the expansionist aims of Nazi Germany. However, when Mussolini sought to end Italy's own increasing international isolation by forming an alliance with Hitler, in 1938, Austria was left alone to face increasing German pressure.

To protect Austria's independence, Schuschnigg reached an agreement with Hitler under which 17,000 Austrian Nazis received amnesty and were integrated into the fold of the Fatherland Front. Arthur Seyß-Inquart, the leader of the

Austrian Nazis, was appointed Minister of the Interior and Security. As Nazi pressure continued, now supported from within the government, Schuschnigg tried to rally popular support for Austria's independence by a referendum. Hitler reacted by alleging an attempt at a fraudulent vote and demanded that Schuschnigg should hand-over the government to the Austrian Nazis or face invasion. Schuschnigg, unable to find support in France or Great Britain, resigned to avoid bloodshed. After an interlude, in which Nazis had gained control of Vienna, President Miklas, who had at first refused, appointed Seyß-Inquart Chancellor, who then requested military occupation by the German army. The next day, Hitler entered Austria and declared it a part of the German « Reich », which was subsequently formalized on March 15.

Although the term « Austrofascism » was used by the proponents of the regime itself, it is still disputed today. It is predominantly used by Left-wing historians, while most historians prefer the term « Ständestaat ». On a political level, criticism sometimes comes from representatives of the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP ; the post-World War II successors of the Christian-Social Party) , some of whom do not distance themselves from the authoritarian Austrian regime of the Patriotic Front. They usually stress the Austro-fascists' merits in fighting for Austria's independence and against Nazism.

While it is undisputed that the regime was an authoritarian dictatorship in character (it locked away members of the opposition, mostly Nazis, Communists and Social-Democrats, in concentration camps called « Anhaltelager » or imprisonment centers) , some historians argue that it lacked certain characteristics of true Fascism. Although the Fatherland Front used fascist-like symbols (such as the « Kruckenkreuz ») and was meant to be a Party of the masses, it lacked a solid basis in the population, especially among labourers who tended to support the Communists or the Nazis. The Austrian government also did not target minorities or engage in any sort of expansionism.

According to some historians, Austrofascism was a contrived and desperate attempt to « out-Hitler » (« überhitlern ») the Nazis, a term used by Dollfuß himself. They argue that Dollfuß was interested in a renaissance of Catholicism rather than in a totalitarian State, meaning that he wanted to return to the time before the ideas of the French Revolution of 1789 took hold. Ernst Hanisch, for example, speaks of semi-Fascism. Some parallels to Spain, under Francisco Franco, cannot be over-looked, however. Austrofascism is sometimes also called imitation Fascism.

...

The « Vaterländische Front » (VF : « Fatherland Front » , also translated as « Patriotic Front ») was the ruling political organisation of « Austrofascism » . It claimed to be a non-partisan movement, and aimed to unite all the people of Austria, overcoming political and social divisions. Established, on 20 May 1933, by Christian-Social Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuß as a single-Party along the lines of Italian Fascism, it advocated Austrian nationalism and independence from Nazi Germany on the basis of protecting Austria's Catholic religious identity from what they considered a Protestant-dominated German State.

Dollfuß accepted that Austrians were ethnic Germans but rejected the idea of Catholic Austrians submitting themselves to be taken-over by a Protestant-dominated Germany and, instead, claimed that Austria needed to revive itself and recognize the greatness of its history such as its Habsburg dynasty having been the leading part of the German Holy

Roman Empire, and that when Austria restored itself, it would found a federal State of Germany that would recognize Germany as a « Kulturnation » , but would also recognize Austria as having a privileged place within such a federal State.

The Fatherland Front which was strongly linked with Austria's Catholic clergy, absorbed Dollfuß's Christian-Social Party, the agrarian « Landbund » and the Right-wing para-military « Heimwehren » , all of which were opposed to socialism, free-market capitalism and Liberal democracy. It established an authoritarian and corporatist regime, the Federal State of Austria, which is commonly known in German as the « Ständestaat » (Corporate State) . According to the Fatherland Front, this form of government and society implemented the social teaching of Pope Pius XI's 1931 Encyclical « Quadragesimo anno » . The Front banned and persecuted all its political opponents, including Communists, Social-Democrats (who fought against it in a brief Civil War, in February 1934) but also the Austrian Nazis who wanted Austria to join Hitler's Greater German Empire. Chancellor Dollfuß was assassinated by the Nazis, in July 1934. He was succeeded as leader of the « Vaterländische Front » and Chancellor of Austria by Kurt Schuschnigg, who ruled until the invigorated Nazis forced him to resign, on 11 March 1938. Austria was annexed by Nazi Germany, the next day.

The Fatherland Front maintained a cultural and recreational organisation, called « New Life » (« Neues Leben ») , similar to Germany's Strength Through Joy (« KdF ») .

The role of the Fatherland Front has been a contentious point in post-War Austrian historiography. While Left-wing historians consider it to be the exponent of an Austrian and Catholic-clerical variant of Fascism and make it responsible for the failure of democracy in Austria, conservative authors stress its credits in defending the country's independence and opposition to Nazism.

While the Front's aim was to unite all Austrians, superseding all political parties, social and economic interest groups (including trade-unions) , it only enjoyed the support of certain parts of the society. It was mainly backed by the Catholic church, the Austrian bureaucracy and military, most of the rural population (including both land-owners and peasants with its centre of gravity in western Austria) , some loyalists to the Habsburg dynasty, and a significant part of the large Jewish community of Vienna. The « Vaterländische Front » was strongly linked with the Catholic student fraternities of the « Cartell-Verband » that maintained networks similar to old boys in English-speaking countries - in which most « Vaterländische Front » leaders had been members.

In contrast, it was in a 2 fronts conflict with the Social-Democrats, supported by unionized workers and having its stronghold in the capital Vienna and other industrialised towns, and their para-military « Republikanischer Schutzbund » (Republican Protection League) - whose February 1934 uprising (or Austrian Civil War) was crushed in a few days - on the one, and Austrian Nazis on the other hand. The latter, having taken-over Austria's older pan-German nationalist current, were supported by a part of the secular, urban middle- and lower middle-class, including civil servants and public sector workers, professionals, teachers and students. However, they did not have a mass following as in Germany.

After World War I and the dissolution of Austria-Hungary sealed by the 1919 Treaty of Saint-Germain, 3 political camps controlled the fate of the Austrian 1st Republic : the Social-Democrats, the Christian-Social Party, and the German

nationalists, organized in the Greater German People's Party and the « Landbund ». Since 1921, the Christian-Social Party had formed coalition governments along with the German nationalists ; Chancellor Ignaz Seipel, a proponent of Catholic social teaching, advocated the idea of a « corporated » State surmounting the parliamentary system, based on the encyclicals « Rerum novarum » (1891) by Pope Leo XIII and « Quadragesimo anno » (1931) by Pope Pius XI.

On 10 May 1932, the Christian-Social politician Engelbert Dollfuß was designated Chancellor of Austria by President Wilhelm Miklas. Dollfuß formed another Right-wing government together with the « Landbund » and the « Heimatblock », the political organisation of the para-military « Heimwehr » forces. He began to surpass the slim majority of his government in parliament ruling by emergency decrees and, on 15 March 1933, finally prevented the gathering of the National Council. 2 months later, the « Fatherland Front » was founded by Chancellor Dollfuß as a merger of his Christian-Social Party, the « Heimwehr » forces and other Right-wing groups, and was intended to collect all « loyal Austrians » under one banner.

On 30 May 1933, the government banned the « Republikanischer Schutzbund », the para-military troops of the Social-Democratic Party, the Communist Party and the Austrian Nazi Party were prohibited shortly afterwards. From 12 February 1934 onwards, the remaining « Schutzbund » forces revolted against their disbanding, sparking the Austrian Civil War against « Heimwehr » troops and the Austrian Armed Forces. After the suppression, the Social-Democratic Party too was declared illegal and dissolved. Social-Democratic officials like the Vienna mayor Karl Seitz were deposed and replaced by « Vaterländische Front » politicians.

On May 1, the Federal State of Austria was officially declared a single-Party State under the authoritarian leadership of the « Vaterländische Front ». Thereafter, the organisation held a monopolistic position in Austrian politics with both civilian and military divisions. Dollfuß remained its undisputed leader until his assassination during the Nazi « July “ Putsch ” », on 25 July 1934. He was succeeded by Ernst Rüdiger Starhemberg, while his « Vaterländische Front » fellow Justice Minister, Kurt Schuschnigg, became Chancellor.

In 1936, Schuschnigg also took-over the leadership of the « Vaterländische Front ». The Front was officially declared a corporation under public law and the only legal political organisation in Austria. Its symbol was the crutch cross (« Kruckenkreuz »), and its official greeting was « Front heil ! ». The Party flag was adopted as the 2nd State flag of Austria. Though membership was obligatory for officials, the « Vaterländische Front » never became a mass movement. By the end of 1937, it had 3 million members (with 6.5 million inhabitants of Austria) ; it could, however, never win the support of its political opponents, neither from the circles of the Social-Democrats nor from the Austrian Nazis.

Schuschnigg's government had to face the increasing pressure by its powerful neighbour Nazi Germany under Austrian-born, Adolf Hitler. The State's fate was sealed, when the Italian dictator Benito Mussolini approached towards the German Nazis. To ease tensions, Schuschnigg, on 11 July 1936, concluded an agreement, whereafter several conspirators of the 1934 « July “ Putsch ” » were released from prison. Nazi confidants like Edmund Glaise-Horstenau and Guido Schmidt joined Schuschnigg's cabinet, while Arthur Seyß-Inquart attained the office of a State Councillor, though the Austrian Nazi Party remained illegal.

On 12 February 1938, Hitler summoned Schuschnigg to his « Berghof » residence, constraining the re-admission of the Nazi Party and the replacement of the Austrian chief of staff, Alfred Jansa, by Franz Böhme to pave the way for a « Wehrmacht invasion ». Schuschnigg had to appoint Seyß-Inquart Minister of the Interior, encouraging the political activation of the Austrian Nazis. When the Chancellor announced a referendum on Austrian independence, he was finally forced to resign, on March 11, and succeeded by Seyß-Inquart. The Fatherland Front was immediately banned after the « Anschluß » annexation of Austria to Germany, 2 days later.

Les « Bürgermeister » de Linz sous l'Austrofascisme

1934 : Franz Nusko.

1934-1938 : Wilhelm Bock.

L'Autriche sous le national-socialisme

For a long period of the Middle-Ages, much of Upper-Austria belonged to the Duchy of Styria. In the mid- 13th Century, it became known as the Principality above the Enns River, this name being 1st recorded in 1264. (At the time, the term « Upper-Austria » also included Tyrol and various scattered Habsburg possessions in South Germany.)

In 1490, the area was given a measure of independence within the Holy Roman Empire, with the status of a principality. By 1550, there was a Protestant majority. In 1564, Upper-Austria, together with Lower-Austria and the Bohemian territories, fell under Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian II.

At the start of the 17th Century, the Counter-Reformation was instituted under Emperor Rudolf II and his successor Matthias. After a military campaign, the area was under the control of Bavaria for some years in the early 17th Century.

The Innviertel was ceded from the Duchy of Bavaria to Upper-Austria in the Treaty of Teschen, in 1779. During the Napoleonic Wars, Upper-Austria was occupied by the French army on more than one occasion.

In 1918, after the collapse of Austria-Hungary, the name « Oberösterreich » was used to describe the province of the new Austria. After Austria was annexed by Adolf Hitler, the Nazi dictator who had been born in the Upper-Austrian town of Braunau am Inn and raised in Upper-Austria, Upper-Austria became « Reichsgau Oberdonau », although this also included the southern part of the Sudetenland, annexed from Czechoslovakia, and a small part of Styria.

...

« What was actually illicit about a project that was designed to turn the city of his youth into a cultural metropolis. » (Albert Speer)

The region of Upper-Austria, also referred to as the « Reichsgau Oberdonau », anticipated that an era of National-Socialism, and its cultural political policies, would improve and develop the area's status and significance. As the « Führer's home-town », one would believe to have overcome an image of « provinciality » in Linz and Upper-Austria and expect significant development and expansion. Hence, the region began to boast itself as a « homeland », particularly in a culturally political context. The expectations of people living in the region hardly corresponded to the « Führer »'s actual plans and those of the National-Socialistic State.

The cultural political plans for Linz included numerous cultural institutions (such as Museums, an Opera House), however in reality, none of these plans were ever materialized. Moreover, Munich had already been designated as the cultural center of the 3rd « Reich ». Hitler's personal interest in Linz was mostly only in his mind's eye; an idea that revolved more around a sense of a « home-town myth » rather than in achievable terms. Although the National-Socialist art policies (which embodied the racist and ideological criteria of Nazi cultural politics) were implemented by the National-Socialists, they hardly led to fractures in artwork and biography among the resident artists in Linz and Upper-Austria and more importantly, this occurred to a lesser degree than elsewhere. Before 1938, the « modern era », as well as works by few Jewish artists, was rarely discernible in Upper-Austria. Aside from a few documented exceptions, there was no ban on writing, painting or performing arts. This allowed for an exceedingly high-degree of continuity that was practiced before 1938 as well as, in the period after 1945, not only in the area of arts, but also in the policies of cultural politics.

In 1945, Upper-Austria was partitioned between the American zone to the south and the Soviet zone to the north.

Although only a handful of planned National-Socialist projects were built, we continue to see a large legacy of relics from the period throughout Linz and Upper-Austria today - not only as a mind set among city inhabitants but also on a factual level. At select locations, remnants from the period of National-Socialism will be made more visible to the public.

The Linz Economy under National-Socialism

General survey of the economic development in Linz and Upper-Austria during the NS-regime. Far-reaching changes to eliminate mass unemployment; the short period of a peace economy already oriented towards War production (1938-1939), especially the founding of big industrial concerns (the Göring Iron and Steel works and the Nitrogen works); the basic problems created by the ensuing period of a War-time economy with significant peacetime features (1939-1941); and, finally, the period of « Total War » (1942-1945).

In Linz, as elsewhere in Austria, the world-wide economic crisis, coupled with the short-sighted political and economic forces of inertia led to a profound crisis of transformation, culminating in a semi-Fascist « Ständestaat ». An ever-larger growing segment of the Austrian population expected the solution of the crisis from National-Socialism since the unlucky and unloved « Ständestaat » was obviously unable to do the job. After the « Anschluß », Austria was immediately incorporated into the 4 Year Plan.

From the beginning, armament dominated the « Ostmark » economy. By 1940, disillusionment set in among small business owners, since the NS-regime did not give the expected priority to the long-standing protectionist demands of the « old Mittelstand » where they conflicted with the interests of big business. The defeats of the German army at Moscow and Stalingrad led to further measures inimical to small business, such as forced closing or « combing-out » of shops, increased drafting into the armed forces and conscription into War industries, and the flood of foreign workers.

The consequence of the predominance of armament and heavy industry for Linz and Upper-Austria was a structural change in the economy, whose « winners » were the capital-intensive industries at the cost of small and middle-sized businesses not essential for the War effort.

The author also deals with the denazification of the Linz and Upper-Austrian economy. The cleaning of the economy was hindered by the generally-held assumption that an all-too-rigorous denazification would rob the country of the larger part of its economic elites and, thereby, adversely affect economic reconstruction. Thus, the temporary partial reduction in status of National-Socialists was soon followed by a period of re-integration in which the stark pragmatism of the Austrian political Parties, interest groups and the Catholic Church, in a veritable outburst of « mercy lobbying », resulted in the return of the now « ex-National-Socialists » .

The public authorities of the provincial governor of Oberdonau

This contribution investigates the development of the organs of State administration in Upper-Austria during the time of the Nazi tyranny, in other words, the « Reichsgau Oberdonau » , the districts and local authorities.

The « Reichsgaue » (regions) of the Ostmark were instituted in 1940 by the Ostmark Bill. They formed the middle-level of the State administration of the « Reich » , were self-governing bodies, and are to be seen in the context of the reform of the « Reich » of 1933. These regions had no sovereign rights, however, although the responsibility of fulfilling certain sovereign duties was transferred to them. The governor at the head of a « Reichsgau » was the « Gauleiter » of the local Party of the NSDAP.

In December 1939, in an effort to reform the lowest-level of State governance, an order was sent-out regarding the administration of the districts, which was to define the duties and responsibilities of the District Councils and Regional District Leaders. This enjoyed only partial success, however. In the Nazi era, it was only with the Order for German Local Authorities that the local authorities were standardised across the « Reich » . This order regulated all the concerns of the local authorities and, above all, secured the influence of the NSDAP on local life.

A « Reichsgau » (plural « Reichsgaue ») was an administrative sub-division created in a number of the areas annexed to Nazi Germany, between 1938 and 1945.

The term was formed from the words « Reich » and « Gau » , the latter a deliberately medieval-sounding word with a meaning approximately equivalent to « shire » . The « Reichsgaue » were an attempt to resolve the administrative

chaos resulting from the mutually overlapping jurisdictions and different boundaries of the NSDAP Party « Gau » , placed under a Party « Gauleiter » , and the Federal States, under a « Reichsstatthalter » responsible to the Ministry of the Interior (in the Prussian provinces, the equivalent post was that of « Oberpräsident ») . Interior Minister Wilhelm Frick had long desired to streamline the German administration, and the « Reichsgaue » were the result : Party « Gau » and State administrative borders were to be identical, and the Party « Gauleiter » also occupied the post of « Reichsstatthalter » . Rival interests and the influence the « Gauleiters » wielded with Adolf Hitler prevented any reform from being undertaken in the « Old Reich » itself, and the « Reichsgau » scheme was, therefore, implemented only in newly acquired territories.

There were several « Reichsgaue » :

« Ostmark » , formed from the formerly independent Austria.

« Sudetenland » , formed from the substantial part of the German-speaking areas of the former Czechoslovakia, occupied in 1938.

« Danzig-Westpreußen » and « Wartheland » , formed from the Free City of Danzig and areas annexed from Poland.

The « Ostmark » was subsequently sub-divided into 7 smaller « Reichsgaue » , generally coterminous with the former Austrian « Länder » (States) .

...

Austria in the time of National-Socialism describes the period of Austrian history from March 12, 1938 when Austria was annexed by the German 3rd « Reich » (an event commonly known as « Anschluß ») until the end of World War II in spring 1945.

In 1918, at the end of World War I, with the break-up of the multi-ethnic Austro-Hungarian Empire, and with the abolition of the Habsburg monarchy, there were 3 major political groups competing with one another in the young republic of Austria : the Social-Democratic Party of Austria (SDAP) ; Christian-Social Party (CS) ; and the nationalist Great German Union (« Großdeutsche Vereinigung ») , which became the Greater German People's Party (« Großdeutsche Volkspartei » , or GVP) , in 1920. At the time, smaller Parties such as the Communist Party of Austria (« Kommunistische Partei Österreichs » , or KPÖ) and the Austrian National-Socialists (« Deutsche Nationalsozialistische Arbeiterpartei » , or DNSAP) were neither present in the « Reichsrat » (Imperial Council) nor the « Nationalrat » (National Council) .

SDAP, GVP, and DNSAP were clearly, although for different reasons, in favour a union of German Austria with the German State, which was also a Republic by that time (Weimar Republic) . The Christian-Social Party also tended to favour the union, but differed at first on a different subject - they were split on the idea of continuing the monarchy instead of a Republic. Whereas only the Communist Party of Austria decidedly spoke against the annexation in the

course of the 1920's and 1930's, the monarchists originally spoke-up against the annexation and, later, turned to favour it, after the Bavarian Soviet Republic had failed, and Germany had a Conservative government. The Treaty of Saint-Germain, signed on September 10, 1919 by Karl Renner (SDAP), 1st Chancellor of the Republic, clearly forbade any union with Germany, abolished the monarchy, and clearly stated the Republic of Austria as an independent country.

Life and politics in the early years of the 1st Republic were marked by serious economic problems (the loss of industrial areas and natural resources in the now independent Czechoslovakia, hyper-inflation) and a constantly increasing tension between the different political groups. From 1918 to 1920, the government was led by the Social-Democratic Party and, later, by the Christian-Social Party in coalition with the German nationalists.

On May 31, 1922, prelate Ignaz Seipel became Chancellor of the Christian-Social government. He succeeded in improving the economic situation with the financial help of the League of Nations (monetary reform). Ideologically, Seipel was clearly anti-Communist and did everything in his power to reduce, as far as possible, the influence of the Social-Democrats - both sides saw this as a conflict between 2 social classes.

The military of Austria was restricted to 30,000 men by the allies and the police force was poorly equipped. Already by 1918, the 1st homeguards were established like the « Kärntner Abwehrkampf ». In 1920, in Tirol, the 1st « Heimwehr » was put in duty under the command of Richard Steidle with the help of the Bavarian organisation « Escherich ». Soon, other States followed. In 1923, members of the Monarchist « Ostara » shot a worker dead and the Social-Democrats founded their own protective organization. Other para-military groups were formed from former active soldiers and members of the Roman Catholic Church. The « Vaterländische Schutzbund » (Protectors of the Fatherland) were National-Socialists though their swastikas were, at 1st, not taken seriously. Later, they started the Austrian « SA ».

The « German Workers Party » had already been founded in Bohemia, as early as 1903. It was, then, part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It supported German nationalism and anti-clericalism but, at 1st, was not particularly anti-Semitic. This Party stood mainly for making Austria and the Austrian Germans a part of Germany. In 1909, lawyer, Walter Riehl joined the Party and he became leader, in 1918. Soon after that, the name was changed to the German National-Socialist Workers Party. After the fall of the monarchy, the Party split into a Czechoslovakian Party and an Austrian Party under Riehl. From 1920 onwards, this Austrian Party cooperated closely with the German Workers Party or German National-Socialist Workers Party formed in Munich, which Adolf Hitler led after 1921. In 1923, Riehl's Party had about 23,000 members and was a marginal factor in Austrian politics. In 1924, there was another split and Karl Schulz led a splinter group. The 2 opposed each other. In 1926, Richard Suchenwirth founded the Austrian branch of Hitler's German National-Socialist Party, in Vienna. Around that time, Benito Mussolini formed his Fascist dictatorship in Italy and became an important ally of the Far-Right.

The Austrian National-Socialists linked to Hitler (Nazis) got only 779 votes in the 1927 General Election. The strongest grouping besides the Social-Democrats was the Unity Coalition led by the Christian-Social Party but including German Nationalists and the groups of Riehl and Schulz. In the course of these years, there were frequent serious acts of

violence between the various armed factions and people were regularly killed. In the General Election of 1930, the Social-Democrats were the largest single Party. The Christian-Social Party came 2nd but stayed in office in a coalition with smaller Parties. The Austrian National-Socialists linked to Hitler (Nazis) got only 3.6 % of the votes and failed to enter Parliament. In the following years, the Nazis gained votes at the expense of the various German national groups which also wanted unity with Germany. After 1930, Hitler's Party doubled its membership every year because of the economic crisis. One of their slogans was, « 500,000 Unemployed - 400,000 Jews - Simple way out ; vote National-Socialist » .

The Christian-Social Party had ruled from 1932 and Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuß had led them from 1932. The Social-Democrats were no longer their only threat. The previous chancellor and priest, Ignaz Seipel, had worked towards an authoritarian State. Seipel based this on the Papal « Encyclicals » , « Rerum novarum » (1891) and « Quadragesimo anno » (1931) . Abolition of the parliamentary system was necessary for this. A crisis in the Austrian parliament on the May 4, 1933, gave Dollfuß the opportunity he wanted.

Later in May 1933, the Christian-Social Union was converted to the Patriotic Front. The Patriotic Front was a political organisation, supposedly above partisan considerations, Roman Catholic and vehemently anti-Marxist. It purported to represent all Austrians who were true to their native land. Within a week the Austrian Communist Party was banned, and, before the end of the month, the Republican para-military organisation and Freethinkers Organisations were banned along with numerous other groups. Nazis failed to get more than 25 % of the votes in local elections in most areas. In Zwettl and Innsbruck, however, they got more than 40 %, and they tried to lever this into a basis for agitation against the ruling Patriotic Front. Nazi supporters generated a wave of terrorism which crested in early June with 4 deaths and 48 people injured.

In Germany, Adolf Hitler became Chancellor early in 1933. The Social-Democrats deleted any intention to cooperate with Germany from its Party programme. Nazis had fled to Bavaria after their Party was banned in Austria and founded there the Austrian Legion. The Nazis, there, had military style camps and military training. Nazi terrorists in Austria received financial, logistic and material support from Germany. The German Government subjected Austria to systematic agitation. After the expulsion of the Bavarian Minister of Justice, in May 1933, German citizens were required to pay a thousand marks to the German Government before travelling to Austria. The Austrian Nazi Party was banned in June after a hand grenade attack in Krems. Nazi terrorism abated after that though 5 more people were killed and 52 injured by the end of the year.

On February 12, 1934, there was a violent confrontation in Linz with serious consequences. Members of a para-military group acting to assist the police wanted to enter a building belonging to the Social-Democrats or a Party member's home. They wanted to find any weapons belonging to the Social-Democrat para-military which had, by then, been banned. Violence spread to the whole country and developed into civil war. The police and their para-military supporters together with the army won the confrontation by the February 14. There were many arrests. Constitutional Courts were abolished, trade-unions and the Social-Democrat Party were banned, and the death penalty was re-introduced. After political opposition had been suppressed the Austrian Republic was transformed into the Austro-facist « Ständestaat » . The authoritarian « Maiverfassung » (May Constitution) was proclaimed on May 1st. (May 1st was

traditionally an important day for Austrians, especially Viennese, Social-Democrats. Choosing this day must have been seen as a deliberate humiliation.)

From the start of 1934, there was a new wave of Nazi terrorist attacks in Austria. This time, government institutions were targeted far more than individuals. In the 1st half of 1934, 17 people were killed and 171 injured. On July 25, the Nazis attempted a coup under the leadership of the Austrian « SS ». About 150 « SS » personnel forced their way into the Chancellor's office in Vienna. Dollfuß was shot and died a few hours later from his wounds. Another group occupied the building of the Austrian National Radio and forced a statement that the Government of Dollfuß had fallen and Anton Rintelen was the new head of government. Anton Rintelen belonged to the Christian-Social Party but is suspected of Nazi sympathy. This false report was intended to start a Nazi uprising throughout the country but it was only partially successful.

There was considerable fighting in parts of Carinthia, Styria and Upper-Austria and limited resistance in Salzburg. In Carinthia and Styria, the fighting lasted from the 27th to the 30th of July. Some members of the Austrian Legion tried to push-out from Bavaria over the Mühlviertel, a part of Upper-Austria, and towards Linz. They were forced back to the frontier at Kollerschlag. On July 26, a German courier was arrested at the Kollerschlag pass in Upper-Austria. He had with him documented instructions for the revolt. This so-called Kollerschlag Document demonstrated the connection of the July revolt to Bavaria clearly.

The army, the gendarmery and the police put-down revolt with heavy casualties. On the government side, there were 107 deaths and 500 injuries. On the rebel side, there were 140 deaths and 600 injuries. 13 rebels were executed and 4,000 people were imprisoned without trial. Many thousand supporters of the Nazi Party were arrested. Up to 4,000 fled over the border to Germany and Yugoslavia. Kurt Schuschnigg became the new Chancellor.

In Bavaria, many sections of the Austrian legion were officially closed. In reality, they were only pushed further north and renamed, « North-West Assistance ». Fascist Italy was more closely tied to the regime in Vienna and sent troops to the Austrian border, at Brenner, to deter German troops from a possible invasion of Austria. The German government stated that it had nothing to do with the revolt. Germany only admitted that it was trying to subvert the Austrian political system through trusted people. They continued to support the illegal Nazi Party but sympathizers who did not belong to the Party were more significant. This included among others : Taras Borodajkewycz, Edmund Glaise-Horstenau, Franz Langoth, Walther Pembauer and Arthur Seyß-Inquart.

Italy began its conquest of Abyssinia (the 2nd Italo-Abyssinian War) , in October 1935. After that, Mussolini was internationally isolated and strengthened his relations with Hitler. The ruling Austrian Patriotic Front lost an important ally. Despite the murder of Engelbert Dollfuß, his successor Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg had to improve relations with the German government. Like his predecessor, he wanted to maintain the independence of Austria. He saw Austria as the 2nd German State and the better State as it was founded on Roman Catholicism.

In July 1936, Schuschnigg accepted the July Agreement with Germany. Imprisoned, Nazis were released and some Nazi newspapers, which had been banned, were allowed into Austria. The Nazi Party remained banned. Schuschnigg

undertook further to allow 2 people whom the Nazis trusted into the Government. Edmund Glaise-Horstenau became Minister for National Affairs and Guido Schmidt became Secretary of State in the Foreign Ministry. Arthur Seyß-Inquart was taken into the legislative Council of State. Germany rescinded the requirement for a payment of 1,000 Marks for entry into Austria. The transformation of the Austro-fascist State through Nazis was furthered more in 1937 when it became possible for them to join the Patriotic Front. Throughout Austria, political units were set-up and some were led by Nazis. This was a legal disguise for the re-organization.

From 1937, it was clear to the Nazis that it would not be long before Austria was going to be part of the 3rd « Reich ». When the native Austrian-born Hitler wrote « Mein Kampf », he demanded from the 1st page in his book that : « German Austria must return to the great German motherland ». His strategy included the subjugation of Austria and Tschechien, now in the Czech Republic as stated in November 1937.

In February 1938, Franz von Papen, the German ambassador in Vienna arranged a meeting between Hitler and Schuschnigg at Obersalzberg, in Gaden (Bavaria) . Hitler threatened repeatedly to invade Austria and forced Schuschnigg to implement a range of measures favourable to Austrian Nazism. The Agreement of Gaden guaranteed the Austrian Nazi Party political freedom and assisted Arthur Seyß-Inquart in becoming Home Secretary (« Innenminister ») . Schuschnigg endeavoured to maintain Austrian national integrity despite steadily increasing German influence. On March 9, 1938, he announced that he wanted to hold a consultative referendum on the independence of Austria on the following Sunday. Hitler responded by mobilizing the 8th Army for the planned invasion. Edmund Glaise-Horstenau who was, at the time in Berlin, brought Hitler's ultimatum from there and Hermann Göring re-inforced it with a telephone message to Schuschnigg. The German government demanded the postponement or abandonment of the referendum. Schuschnigg conceded on the afternoon of March 11. Then, Hitler demanded his resignation which happened on the same evening.

After Schuschnigg left office, the Federal president Wilhelm Miklas asked Arthur Seyß-Inquart to form a new government as the Germans demanded. From 11 to 13 March, he led the Austrian Government and completed the « Anschluß » . On the morning of March 12, heavily armed German troops and police crossed the Austrian frontier, in total about 65,000. Large sections of the Austrian population were very pleased to see them. In Vienna, Aspern met Heinrich Himmler of the « SS » accompanied by many police and « SS » officials to take-over the Austrian police. Supporters of the Austrian Nazi Party, together with members of the « SS » and « SA » occupied public buildings and offices throughout Austria without a previously planned transition period. The formation of the Greater German « Reich » was announced from the balcony of the Council House, in Linz. On the following day, March 13, 1938, the 2nd session of the Government passed the « Reunification with Germany Law » . Federal President Miklas refused to endorse it and resigned. Seyß-Inquart was now functioning Head of State. He could make his own laws and publish them.

On March 15, Adolf Hitler, who had spent the previous 2 days in his birth-town of Braunau am Inn, made a triumphal entry into Vienna and gave a speech on « Heldenplatz », in front of tens of thousands of cheering people, in which he boasted of his « greatest accomplishment » :

« Als Führer und Kanzler der deutschen Nation und des Reiches melde ich vor der deutschen Geschichte nunmehr den

Eintritt meiner Heimat in das Deutsche Reich. »

(« As leader and chancellor of the German nation and « Reich » , I announce to German history now the entry of my homeland into the German “ Reich ”. »)

Ernst Kaltenbrunner from Upper-Austria, sentenced to death in 1946 at the Nuremberg trials, was promoted « SS-Brigadeführer » and the leader of the « SS » upper-section Austria. Beginning on March 12, and during the subsequent weeks, 72,000 people were arrested, primarily in Vienna, among them politicians of the 1st Republic, intellectuals and above all Jews. Jewish institutions were shuttered.

For April 10, a referendum was set for the already accomplished annexation. In those weeks leading to the referendum, a kind of propaganda took place all over Austria in a way that had been never seen before. Hitler himself, Josef Goebbels, Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß and many other leading figures of the Nazi regime had very squeamishly scheduled appearances in public to hold speeches. The controlled press and radio had no other topic than « YES » to the « Reunion of German and Austria » . Prominent Austrians like Cardinal Theodor Innitzer, who signed a declaration of the Bishops with « Heil Hitler » , and the Social-Democrat Karl Renner promoted the approval. According to official records, 99.73 % voted « YES » in Austria and in Germany ; 99.08 % voted for the annexation.

Excluded from the referendum were about 8 % of the Austrian voters : about 200,000 Jews and roughly 177,000 « Mischlinge » (people with both Jewish and « Aryan » parents) and all those who had already been arrested for « racial » or political reasons.

In many places, assaults took place against Austrian Jews during those weeks. Many were dispossessed of their shops and apartments, into which those who had robbed them moved, assisted by the « SA » and fanatics. Jews were forced to put on their best clothes and, on their hands and knees with brushes, to clean the side-walks of anti- « Anschluß » slogans.

Being 8 % of the population in the German Empire, 14 % of the « SS » members were of Austrian origin. 40 % of the staff in the Extermination camps and 70 % of Adolf Eichmann's staff came from Austria.

Josef Bürckel, previously « Reichskommissar » for the reunion of the « Saar » (protectorate) , was appointed « Reichskommissar » for the re-unification of Austria with the German Empire.

In the process of aryanisation, about 1,700 motor vehicles were seized from their Jewish owners between March 11 and August 10, 1938. Until May 1939, the government seized about 44,000 apartments in Jewish possession.

The largest concentration camp in Austria was the Mauthausen-Gusen complex, with more than 50 sub-camps, among them, the Ebensee concentration camp, « KZ - Nebenlager Bretstein » , Steyr-Münichholz sub-camp and « AFA-Werke » . Euthanasia was practised in Hartheim Castle, near Linz, where the killing program « Action T4 » took place, and in « Am Spiegelgrund » clinic in Vienna, where more than 700 handicapped children were murdered.

Besides Adolf Hitler, the following Austrians were among those playing an active part in the Nazi regime :

Ernst Kaltenbrunner replaced Reinhard Heydrich in 1943, as leader of « Reichssicherheitshauptamt » and « Gestapo » .

Arthur Seyß-Inquart organized or covered several Nazi crimes in the Netherlands.

Odilo Globocnik was « SS » and police leader from 1939 in Poland where he supervised the building of the 4 Nazi extermination camps in Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka and Majdanek. He was one of the main people responsible for murdering about 2 millions of Polish Jews (« Aktion Reinhardt ») .

August Eigruber, « Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria.

Alexander Löhr, commander of « Luftflotte 4 » , carried-out the bombing of Belgrade in April 1941.

Wolfgang Abel, professor of racial biology at the University of Berlin, was involved in compulsory sterilization of so-called « Rhineland Bastards » . During the War, he carried-out racial analyses on 7,000 Soviet prisoners of War on behalf of the high-command of the Army.

Heinrich Groß wrote expertises about « unworthy lives » and carried-out deadly experiments at « Am Spiegelgrund » with handicapped children.

Karl Silberbauer arrested Anne Frank, in 1944.

The Austrian « Gauleiters » Hugo Jury, Franz Hofer and Friedrich Rainer also participated in Nazi crimes.

From March to November 1938, 130,000 people managed to escape legally or illegally from Austria. Among the most famous emigrating artists, there were the composers Arnold Schönberg and Robert Stolz, the film-maker Leon Askin, Fritz Lang, Josef von Sternberg, Billy Wilder, Max Reinhardt, the actors Karl Farkas and Gerhard Bronner and the writers Hermann Broch, Robert Musil, Anton Kuh and Franz Werfel. Friedrich Torberg, who witnessed the German invasion (« Anschluß ») in Prague, did not return to Vienna. Erich Fried flew with his mother to London after his father had been killed by the « Gestapo » , in May 1938, during an interrogation. Stefan Zweig escaped via London, New York, Argentina and Paraguay to Brazil where he committed suicide in February 1942, together with his wife Charlotte Altmann. 1936 Nobel laureate in medicine, Otto Loewi, had to pay his prize money back before emigrating. Additional scientists going into exile were Sigmund Freud, Erwin Schrödinger, Kurt Gödel, Martin Buber, Karl Popper and Lise Meitner. Bruno Kreisky, who had to leave the country for political reasons and because of his Jewish origin, emigrated to Sweden. After his come-back, he served as Austrian Chancellor from 1970 to 1983.

In 1984 in Lackenbach, almost 40 years after the end of War, a memorial for the « Zigeuner-Anhaltelager » Romani

was unveiled. A memorial in Kemetten has not yet been started. Prior to the War, 200 Romani people lived in Kemetten. They were deported in 1941 ; only 5 of them came back in 1945.

In mid-2004, the question of how to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the death of Robert Bernardis, who was shot on August 8, 1944, after being involved in the July 20 plot against Adolf Hitler, led to a political conflict. Politicians of the opposition (SPÖ, Grüne) as well as some celebrities suggested renaming a barracks as « Robert-Bernardis-Kaserne », which was turned-down by the governing ÖVP and FPÖ. The defence minister Günther Platter (ÖVP) finally decided to build a memorial in the yard of the « Towarek-Barrack » in Enns. The Green Politician Terezija Stoisits pointed-out that a barracks was named after Austrian sergeant Anton Schmid in Germany, on 8 May 2004. Schmid was sentenced to death by a « Wehrmacht » Court-martial and was shot on 13 April 1942, after he saved the lives of 100 Jews in the Vilnius Ghetto.

In the 1st years after the War, many memorials were built in several places, commemorating the dead soldiers of World War II who allegedly fought for their country. For the victims of the Nazi regime, memorials have only been built at a much later time.

Since 1992, there is the possibility of doing « Zivildienst » (alternative National Service) in the Austrian Holocaust Memorial Service. Approximately 15 people are deployed in the archive of the concentration camp memorial Mauthausen and, alternatively, in the camp itself. On 1 September 1992, the 1st Austrian Holocaust memorial serviceman started working in the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum. Andreas Maislinger has taken-over the idea from the Action Reconciliation Service for Peace. Annually, approximately 30 civil servants are sent to Holocaust memorials and connected institutions in Europe, Israel, United States, South-America and China by the Holocaust Memorial Service.

The biggest Austrian Memorial for the remembrance of National-Socialist crimes is the Mauthausen-Gusen concentration camp. Part of the Contemporary History Museum Ebensee, it emerged through a private initiative, in 2001, and remembers victims of the Ebensee concentration camp.

L' « Anschluß »

L'annexion

Le 11 mars, à 5h30, le chancelier Schuschnigg est réveillé par un coup de téléphone lui annonçant que la frontière austro-allemande est fermée, le trafic ferroviaire entre les 2 pays interrompu et que des mouvements de troupes ont lieu le long de la frontière. Vers 10 heures, Arthur Seyß-Inquart informe Schuschnigg du contenu d'une lettre envoyée par Adolf Hitler qui exige que le plébiscite soit retardé et les modalités modifiées. Celle-ci précise que si le plébiscite n'est pas levé, le « Reich » considérera que le traité du 12 février 1938 n'a plus de raison d'être. À 13 heures, le chancelier se rend auprès du Président fédéral Wilhelm Miklas, ils s'accordent pour reporter le plébiscite. 2 heures après, les Nationaux-Socialistes autrichiens reçoivent l'ordre de manifester dans les rues et la directive n° 1 d'invasion signée de Hitler est transmise aux responsables militaires. Hermann Göring fait pression sur Seyß-Inquart pour que le gouvernement Schuschnigg démissionne. Ce dernier présente sa démission au Président Miklas qui, dans un 1er temps,

la refuse, puis finit par l'accepter mais exclut de nommer Seyß-Inquart chancelier. Mis sous pression par Göring et Seyß-Inquart toute l'après-midi, le Président Miklas ordonne à Schuschnigg de faire un discours à la radio pour protester contre les demandes allemandes et informer le monde que l'Autriche cède à la force.

...

Dans les semaines qui suivent, après quelques démonstrations comme la pose de la Ire pierre par Hitler de l'autoroute Salzburg-Linz-Vienne, le 15 avril, ou celle de la fondation des « Usines du " Reich " Hermann Göring » à Linz, le 13 mai, une série de mesures fait disparaître l'Autriche de la carte d'Europe. Tout d'abord, la décision du 24 mai qui découpe le pays en 7 « Gauen » (territoires) : Tyrol-Vorarlberg, Salzbourg, Vienne, Styrie, Carinthie qui absorbe le Tyrol oriental, et les 2 régions portant le nom d'Autriche se voient dénommer Haut et Bas-Danube (« Oberdonau » et « Niederdonau »), quant au « Burgenland » qui avait choisi l'Autriche en 1920, il disparaît le 15 octobre, son territoire étant partagé entre le Bas-Danube et la Styrie. Quant à Vienne, en intégrant plusieurs communes environnantes, elle passe d'une superficie de 278 kilomètres carrés à 1,218 kilomètres carrés et devient ainsi la ville la plus étendue du « Reich ».

En 1939, le 15 octobre, une loi entérine les modifications territoriales qui ont suivi les accords de Munich et le démantèlement de la Tchécoslovaquie. Certaines parties de Bohême et de Moravie sont intégrées aux « Alpen- und Donau-Reichsgaue », le terme d'« Ostmark », à trop forte connotation historique, est proscrit. Cette même loi fait coïncider les structures administratives avec celles de l'organisation du Parti. Une fois la Yougoslavie dépecée en 1941, d'autres territoires comme la région de Maribor/Marburg seront directement régis par les lois du « Reich ».

Au printemps 1938, Ernst Kaltenbrunner devient le chef de la police pour l'ancienne Autriche où, dès lors, les lois de Nuremberg s'appliquent. Après avoir acquis quelques mois auparavant un terrain à Mauthausen, à une vingtaine de kilomètres à l'est de Linz, les Nationaux-Socialistes y transportent le 8 août 1938 les Iers déportés. L'histoire de ce camp est liée à celle d'une entreprise spécialisée dans les carrières créée à Berlin (« Deutsche Erd- und Steinwerke ») avec l'appui d'Heinrich Himmler, le chef de la SS. Cette entreprise acquiert des carrières dans l'immédiate proximité de camps de concentration où l'on fait travailler jusqu'à la mort les détenus dans des conditions épouvantables. Au camp de Mauthausen sont rattachées plusieurs dizaines d'annexes, dont celle du camp de Gusen. Environ 200,000 personnes ont été internées, représentant une trentaine de nationalités différentes, 118,000 ont trouvé la mort. Début janvier 1945, il y avait encore 85,000 prisonniers. Le camp a été libéré par les armées américaines le 15 mai. 16,000 Autrichiens « non juifs » sont morts dans les camps de concentration de l'Allemagne nationale-socialiste.

Les Ires mesures

L'histoire du National-Socialisme en Autriche renvoie une nouvelle fois à une histoire qui n'est pas spécifiquement autrichienne, seules les modalités et les spécificités autrichiennes pendant la période du National-Socialisme seront ici retenues. Pendant de longues années, la période nationale-socialiste est demeurée un sujet tabou en Autriche. Jusqu'en 1988, la thèse officielle consiste à dire que l'Autriche est la Ire victime du National-Socialisme, ce qui est vrai si on considère uniquement l'État. Le Ir ouvrage à aborder le National-Socialisme en Autriche a été celui de Karl Stadler, «

Österreich 1938-1945 im Spiegel der NS-Akten » , publié en 1966. Parmi la génération suivante, Gerhard Botz a été l'un des premiers à se consacrer à l'étude du Nazisme en Autriche et a longtemps été perçu comme une menace pour l'historiographie traditionnelle autrichienne. Le cinquantenaire de l' « Anschluß » voit paraître un ouvrage collectif « NS-Herrschaft in Österreich 1938-1945 » (La domination nationale-socialiste en Autriche) , qui est depuis sans cesse ré-édité et enrichi. Paradoxalement, il a fallu l'arrivée au gouvernement de la coalition conservatrice chrétienne et nationale-populiste de Wolfgang Schüssel, au début 2000, et la protestation internationale qu'elle a entraînée pour obliger le chancelier à mettre sur pied une Commission historique qui a mobilisé une centaine de chercheurs et de chercheuses. Ainsi, aujourd'hui disposons-nous de nombreuses et sérieuses études sur la politique d'aryanisation, sur les interdictions professionnelles, sur la politique vis-à-vis de l'Église catholique, sur les Tchèques et leurs organisations, sur les privations de patrimoine des personnes poursuivies politiquement, sur les homosexuels, les travailleurs forcés ou la politique d'expulsion. Un dernier volant des études est consacré à la politique de dédommagement menée en Autriche après 1945 et à ses carences.

La vague d'antisémitisme

Pendant les premiers jours de l' « Anschluß » , se déchaîne à Vienne et en Autriche une folie antisémite. La dictature corporatiste chrétienne avait déjà instrumentalisé l'antisémitisme et avait contribué à marginaliser encore un peu plus les Juifs dans la société autrichienne, néanmoins mis à part quelques écrivains qui avaient préféré quitter l'Autriche pour quelque temps, les journalistes, les médecins, les avocats tenus par leur activité professionnelle ne s'étaient alors guère posé la question. Dès le 12 mars, des scènes d'hystérie collective sont recensées dans tout le pays : humiliations et sévices publics, pillages, lynchages sont le lot des Juifs viennois. Les voisins obligent les Juifs à laver les trottoirs à genoux avec une simple brosse ou viennent chercher le poste de radio tant convoité. Qu'ils soient journalistes, publicistes ou écrivains, médecins, boutiquiers ou simples ouvriers, les Juifs autrichiens savent ce qui les attend. Hermann Göring le leur répète lors d'un meeting le 26 mars 1938 en déclarant que l' « Anschluß » sera suivi du « désenjuivement total » et que Vienne devra être « débarrassée des Juifs » .

Devant cette impasse, peu de choix s'offrent aux intellectuels juifs : se taire, endurer et attendre, s'exiler ou se donner la mort. Beaucoup d'intellectuels connaissent la situation dans l' « Reich » et quand ils ont combattu véhémentement les Nationaux-Socialistes, selon les mots de l'écrivain Friedrich Torberg :

« Ils ne voyaient rien d'autre, pas d'issue, rien. Ils n'avaient plus de forces, ils n'avaient plus d'envie. Ils éprouvaient du dégoût et de l'horreur. Ils réfléchissaient, se demandant si la vie valait encore la peine d'être vécue et concluaient : non, elle ne le valait plus. »

Nombreux choisissent alors d'en finir. Gerhard Botz étudiant les statistiques officielles concernant les suicides a constaté qu'entre le 1er et le 11 mars 1938, il y a 2 à 3 suicides par jour à Vienne ; à partir du 12 mars, ce chiffre augmente rapidement et atteint un maximum les 17 et 18 mars avec 22 suicides par jour, pour ensuite retomber à une moyenne de 5 à 6 par jour. Au total, 213 personnes se seraient suicidées en mars, dont 79 appartenant à la communauté juive ; en avril, on compterait encore 138 suicides, dont 64 juifs. Or, tous les chercheurs s'accordent à dire que ces chiffres sont indubitablement faux, largement sous-évalués. Se référant à des journaux français, l'agence de

presse juive chiffre ces suicides à 1,700 personnes dans la semaine après l' « Anschluß » . Faire paraître l'annonce d'un suicide dans la presse après le 12 mars devient presque un acte de résistance. Ainsi, dans l'édition du 13 mars 1938, la « Neue Freie Presse » publie une brève intitulée « 4 Suicides » qui décline le suicide de 2 fonctionnaires, d'un écrivain, Karl Schlesinger, d'une ménagère avec la mention « on ignore le mobile de leur acte » . Rapidement, les Nationaux-Socialistes veilleront à ce que des termes plus neutres soient utilisés (« décès » , « disparition ») ; il en est ainsi pour Kurt Sonnenfeld, rédacteur à la « Neue Freie Presse » « décédé le 15 mars » . Les avis de faire-part sont eux aussi contrôlés. Selon l'écrivain Alfred Polgar, ces intellectuels qui avalent du cyanure ou qui se jettent par la fenêtre « se mettent en sûreté en échappant par un saut à leurs concitoyens et à cette époque » .

Les Juifs autrichiens devront encore affronter l'hostilité de leurs concitoyens lors de la « Nuit de cristal » , le 9 novembre. En Autriche, 42 synagogues et lieux de cultes sont alors détruits, 27 juifs tués et 88 grièvement blessés. Selon le recensement du 17 mai 1939, d'après les catégories définies par les lois nationales-socialistes de Nuremberg, les territoires ex-autrichiens comptent 94,042 Juifs, dont 92,982 à Vienne et seuls 3,8 % de la population recensée est encore en activité. On estime qu'environ les 2 tiers de la population juive d'avant l' « Anschluß » ont fui. 43,9 % ont trouvé refuge en Europe, principalement en Grande-Bretagne (24,4 %) ; en Italie et en Belgique (3,5 %) ; en Suisse et en Pologne (1,8 %) ; en France et en Yougoslavie (1,3 %) . 22,6 % ont réussi à gagner les États-Unis ; 14,3 % Shanghai ; 1,5 % l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande. Seuls 7,3 % optent pour la Palestine. 16,692 Juifs exilés ont été capturés dans leur nouveau pays d'exil après l'avancée de la « Wehrmacht » dans ces pays et exécutés, 48,767 ont été victimes de la Shoah, soit un total de 65,459 ou 1/3 de la population juive d'Autriche.

L'ordre national-socialiste en Autriche

Quant à l'ordre national-socialiste, il règne aussi dans les entreprises où est appliqué le « Führerprinzip » . Le 10 juillet 1938, un décret stipule que « les hommes de confiance en Autriche seront, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, nommés par le chef régional du NSDAP.

Mais à côté de l'aryanisation des biens juifs, il faut aussi percevoir que de nombreuses entreprises autrichiennes vont passer aux mains des Allemands. En 1938, le capital allemand possède à peu près 9 % de l'économie autrichienne, en 1945, il en détiendra 57 % , la pénétration du secteur bancaire atteindra 83 % et celui de l'industrie chimique 71 % . Ces biens allemands formeront l'immense secteur public autrichien au lendemain de la Guerre. Très rapidement, les résistants et résistantes tout d'abord, mais ensuite une large part de la population autrichienne prend conscience que leur pays est pillé : banques, mines, matières premières sont au service du plan de 4 ans, officiellement dès le 26 mars, et bientôt au service de la Guerre. L' « Anschluß » à peine réalisé, Hermann Göring commence à construire son Empire en Autriche les « Reichswerke Hermann Göring » à Linz, qui deviendront après la Guerre l'entreprise d'État VÖEST.

L' « Anschluß » à peine réalisé, le polycratisme bien connu du National-Socialisme sévit aussi en Autriche et conduit à des aberrations. Ainsi, le dirigeant autrichien des Nationaux-Socialistes, Hubert Klausner, nomme le 13 mars, Sepp Nemeč responsable du Front du Travail allemand et le dote de pouvoirs exorbitants. Il le charge de « liquider la SAG » et attribue les locaux syndicaux de la Confédération syndicale de la « Ebendorferstraße » au Front du Travail allemand.

Or, celui-ci n'est pas encore constitué officiellement en Autriche. Le 18 mai, les Cellules d'entreprise nationales-socialistes (NSBO) s'en inquiètent et revendiquent en conséquence le droit d'intervenir dans les affaires de l'ancienne Confédération syndicale et des Chambres des ouvriers et des employés.

Les militants du NSDAP autrichien prennent rapidement conscience des conséquences de l'« Anschluß » pour eux-mêmes. Ils sont immédiatement confrontés à la concurrence des « Prussiens ». Effectivement, des responsables venant de l'« Altreich » s'installent en Autriche et occupent des postes que les Nationaux-Socialistes autrichiens convoitaient. Cette hostilité envers les Allemands de l'« Altreich » contribuera, si ce n'est à la prise de conscience de la nation autrichienne, du moins à un fort sentiment anti-allemand qui se développera plus ou moins rapidement et plus ou moins intensément suivant les milieux. Le terme « Piefke » caractérisant en Autriche péjorativement les Allemands du nord et datant de la guerre austro-prussienne réapparaît dans la langue de tous les jours.

À côté du secteur bancaire déjà évoqué, on peut citer l'exemple des journalistes. Dès le 12 mars 1938, l'annonce de la démission de Schuschnigg étant connue, des journalistes allemands se mettent en route vers Vienne et l'Autriche. Si les Nationaux-Socialistes autrichiens s'emparent des rédactions des quotidiens, épurent les rédactions, rares sont ceux à détenir quelques semaines après l'« Anschluß » les positions clefs dans ce secteur.

Le rattachement au « Reich » allemand et l'application sur le territoire de l'Autriche du droit allemand a pour certains auteurs contribuer à la modernisation de ses territoires.

...

... histoire, leur trop grande proximité avec les peuples centre-européens, sous-entendu les Slaves.

La participation des femmes et des jeunes filles, toutes très jeunes, à peine plus de 20 ans, à l'activité anti-militariste a été particulièrement forte. Leurs activités consistent, d'une part, à établir les liaisons entre les groupes de résistance dans les entreprises d'armement et, d'autre part, à envoyer aux soldats des tracts et des lettres « sabrant le moral de l'armée ». À cet effet, elles collectent les numéros de poste militaire ainsi que les rapports de la « Wehrmacht ». De plus, lors de rendez-vous avec les soldats dans des cafés ou des parcs, elles discutent avec eux et entreprennent un travail de démoralisation de l'armée de l'intérieur. Des femmes mènent aussi ce combat en France, en se faisant passer pour des Alsaciennes. En 1942, la « Gestapo » réussit à arrêter le noyau du groupe. La plupart des procès prononcent des peines de mort.

Lors des derniers mois de la Guerre, les actions armées se développent dans certaines localités du Tyrol. En décembre 1944, des personnalités conservatrices créent un Comité National Autrichien Provisoire » (POeN) qui entre en contact avec les services Alliés. On voit aussi apparaître le « O5 », toujours mis en avant alors qu'il ne représente presque personne. Le sigle signifie « Autriche », le « O » pour Österreich et le « 5 » pour la 5e lettre de l'alphabet, le « e ». Fritz Molden, fils du rédacteur en chef de la « Neue Freie Presse », qui a des contacts avec Allan W. Dulles, devient agent de liaison entre ce groupe et les Alliés. Le social-démocrate Adolf Schärf rejoint aussi ce groupe qui édite un tract fin-mars 1945 qui exhorte la population autrichienne de participer à des sabotages et qui appelle début-avril

la population viennoise à soutenir l'Armée rouge et à empêcher toute destruction.

Des Autrichiens et des Autrichiennes se sont aussi engagés dans d'autres résistances, tout d'abord avec les Brigades internationales en Espagne, puis au sein de la Résistance française ou belge. Félix Kreibler en est le symbole. Anti-fasciste exilé dès 1936 en France, il rejoint avec sa femme, Denise, la Résistance française, est arrêté et déporté en tant que résistant français, ce qui lui a sauvé la vie, à Buchenwald. D'autres, en Grande-Bretagne, en Suède, aux États-Unis ont contribué à soutenir la résistance de l'intérieur et à structurer les exilés.

En 1945, les résistants, les déportés, les exilés, quel que soit leur sexe, ont eu des difficultés à se faire reconnaître comme victime et à se faire indemniser. Rosa Jochmann, sociale-démocrate déportée à Ravensbrück, déclare « lorsque nous sommes rentrés en 1945, nous ne songions même pas à une loi d'indemnisation, ni à une pension, je voudrais bien connaître celui qui au monde pourrait nous dédommager pour les terribles souffrances que nous avons connues. Mais lorsque nous avons dû constater que même pour les coupables des lois étaient prévues, alors nous nous sommes mis au travail pour en élaborer pour les victimes du Fascisme et leurs familles.

La Déclaration de Moscou

Fin-octobre 1943, les ministres des Affaires extérieures de Grande-Bretagne, des États-Unis et de l'Union soviétique se réunissent à Moscou, l'avenir de l'Autriche figure à l'ordre du jour. Le 30 octobre 1943 est publiée la « Déclaration de Moscou dans laquelle les Alliés considèrent l'occupation de l'Autriche comme nulle et non avenue, disent vouloir rétablir une Autriche démocratique et indépendante mais rappellent l'Autriche à ses responsabilités dans la participation à la Guerre et appellent à ce qu'elle contribue à sa libération. De cette Déclaration de Moscou, les Autrichiens ne retiendront que la phrase sur le rétablissement de l'Autriche démocratique et indépendante. Cette Déclaration de Moscou contribuera à établir d'autant plus facilement le concept de la nation autrichienne et permettra aux Autrichiens et aux Autrichiennes de se dédouaner.

Mais c'est le cours de la Guerre lui-même qui a détaché lentement les populations du National-Socialisme : les bombardements alliés, les pertes de l'armée, l'insécurité grandissante devant l'avancée de l'armée soviétique. On attend encore des travaux d'ampleur sur les destructions des villes, Innsbruck a été détruite à 60 % ; Villach à 85 % ; la ville industrielle de « Wiener Neustadt » à 88 % , près de 50,000 immeubles ont été endommagés à Vienne. 24,000 civils sont morts soit en raison des bombardements, soit en raison d'opérations militaires. De toutes ces destructions, il ne reste dans la mémoire collective que la photo de la cathédrale Saint-Étienne à Vienne éventrée par les bombes.

Après 1945, les adversaires d'hier, Chrétiens-Sociaux et Sociaux-Démocrates, construisent un État sur leurs valeurs et il devient urgent de ne pas remuer le passé récent qui pourrait faire resurgir les désaccords et les rancœurs. Pendant presque 30 ans, les travaux sur l'État autoritaire corporatiste chrétien ou sur le National-Socialisme sont absents des recherches historiques et du discours public. Il a fallu attendre le 9 novembre 1988 pour que le chancelier social-démocrate Franz Vranitzky fasse la distinction, lors de la commémoration du 50e anniversaire de la « Nuit de Cristal » , entre l'Autriche en tant qu'État « victime d'une agression militaire et l'implication coupable de beaucoup d'Autrichiens qui, volontairement ou non, se sont laissés aller à servir d'instruments et de tortionnaires d'un régime

inhumain et criminel » . Les débats autour de l'affaire Waldheim en 1986, puis des commémorations de l' « Anschluß » en 1988, ont contribué à faire évoluer les intellectuels autrichiens qui ont remis en question la théorie de l'Autriche uniquement victime. Néanmoins, jusqu'à aujourd'hui, la Guerre demeure un thème plus souvent abordé dans la sphère privée que dans la sphère publique et la société autrichienne n'a toujours pas assimilé ces débats comme l'a prouvé l'arrivée au pouvoir de la coalition gouvernementale de Wolfgang Schüssel entre conservateurs chrétiens et le FPÖ national-populiste de Jörg Haider, rejouant dans une version moderne l'alliance chrétienne-sociale avec les « Heimwehren » .

Les traces de la Seconde Guerre mondiale se lisent dans les films d'Axel Corti ou de Karin Brandauer, dans l'œuvre littéraire de plusieurs écrivains : dans celle d'Ingeborg Bachmann ou dans l'œuvre autobiographique de Thomas Bernhard, mais aussi chez de nombreux peintres, comme Maria Lassnig ou Amulf Rainer. Mais ce sont les cabarettistes qui ont le mieux mis en scène l'homme ordinaire autrichien qui, quel que soit le régime, quel que soit l'occupant, tire son épingle du jeu. « Herr Karl » , ce bon Monsieur Karl xénophobe et antisémite, déclare à propos de la Libération de Vienne par l'Année soviétique :

« Moi, je m'en suis très bien sorti avec eux. Je savais les prendre. Le portrait d'Hitler, moi je l'ai laissé accroché. Puis, j'ai amené les Russes exprès chez moi. Viens camarade, dawai, tovarich. J'ai attrapé le portrait d'Hitler, je l'ai fait valdinguer, je l'ai piétiné. Ils ont fait “ karacho ” et ils sont partis. »

Puis, il poursuit :

« Quelques mois plus tard qui croyez-vous qui est arrivé ? Les Américains. La délivrance. J'ai tout de suite offert mes services. »

Le cynique « Herr Karl » laisse tomber :

« Moi, je me suis rebâti une existence au moins 20 fois tout au long de mon existence. »

À l'image de « Herr Karl » , la société autrichienne refuse sa part de responsabilités dans les 2 Guerres mondiales et continue à refouler un passé vécu comme pavé d'échecs et de défaites.

...

Le 13 mars 1938, avec l' « Anschluß » , l'Autriche, rebaptisée « Ostmark » , est placée sous l'autorité du « Gauleiter » Josef Bürckel, doté du titre de Commissaire au rattachement de l'Autriche au « Reich » . 190,000 Juifs résident alors en Autriche où les persécutions à leur égard, en particulier à Vienne, deviennent alors plus importantes qu'en Allemagne : humiliations publiques, expropriations mieux organisées, émigration forcée plus rapide. Avant même l'entrée de la « Wehrmacht » sur le territoire et, malgré les efforts des autorités pour la modérer, la violence se déchaîne : les rues sont le théâtre de scènes de violences et de brimades, des appartements et des commerces appartenant à des Juifs sont pillés. Les violences cessent le 29 avril, quand Bürckel menace de sanctionner les coupables.

Quelques jours après l'« Anschluss », Himmler visite les carrières de Mauthausen, à 24 kilomètres de Linz et 145 kilomètres de Vienne. Les 300 Iers détenus, des prisonniers de droit commun autrichiens et allemands de Dachau, arrivent à Mauthausen le 8 août 1938.

L'accélération des persécutions

Après l'« Anschluss » en mars 1938, les mesures anti-juives sont promulguées à une cadence redoublée. Le 1er pas important dans ce processus est la loi du 28 mars abolissant le statut légal des communautés juives accordé au XIXe siècle. Parallèlement, les mesures d'« aryansisation » s'intensifient. La loi du 26 mars 1938 oblige tous les Juifs du « Reich » à déclarer la totalité de leur fortune aux autorités, sous peine de poursuites pénales. Au terme de l'article 7 de ce décret, Hermann Göring, responsable du Plan quadriennal, peut disposer des biens déclarés « conformément aux besoins de l'économie allemande ». D'avril à novembre 1938, les services du « Reich » prélèvent ainsi 2 des 7 milliards de Marks de « biens juifs » déclarés.

Les boutiquiers et les artisans reçoivent l'ordre de cesser toute activité commerciale avant le 1er janvier 1939. Enfin, les exemptions en faveur des avocats et des anciens combattants juifs sont supprimées. En juillet 1938, les médecins juifs doivent demander des autorisations d'exercer et limiter leur pratique à une clientèle exclusivement juive. L'idée du marquage progresse avec l'obligation de porter sur les passeports, les prénoms Sara et Israël (18 août 1938). Début octobre 1938, la lettre « J » est apposée sur les pièces d'identité à l'instigation de la Suisse. Une série de rafles a lieu à Berlin durant l'été alors que les contrôles policiers se font plus fréquents. 1,500 Juifs sont internés dans des camps de concentration. Des destructions de biens, des expulsions de certains villages et la profanation de lieux de cultes ont également lieu. Les synagogues de Munich (9 juin), Nuremberg (10 août) et Dortmund (septembre) sont dynamitées.

Le sort des Juifs autrichiens

Le 20 août 1938, le Bureau central d'émigration juive est mis en place sous la responsabilité de Franz Walter Stahlecker, contrôlé en réalité par Adolf Eichmann lui-même. Il entreprend d'abord de refouler les Juifs par-delà les frontières en particulier en Tchécoslovaquie, en Hongrie et en Suisse. Selon des sources allemandes, environ 5,000 Juifs autrichiens sont chassés entre mars et novembre 1938. En octobre 1938, Heinrich Himmler ordonne de regrouper à Vienne tous les Juifs des provinces autrichiennes. Durant l'été 1938, les Juifs autrichiens tentent de se réfugier illégalement dans les pays voisins et jusqu'au Royaume Uni. La « Gestapo » envoie plusieurs groupes de Juifs en Finlande, en Lituanie et aux Pays-Bas d'où ils sont refoulés. Les protestations des pays étrangers se multiplient et l'entrée illégale ou l'expulsion vers l'Ouest deviennent plus difficiles. Moins de 6 mois après l'« Anschluss », 45,000 Juifs autrichiens ont émigré. En mai 1939, plus de 100,000 Juifs, partent à leur tour, soit près de 50 % des Juifs autrichiens.

...

On 9th March 1938, the Austrian Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg announced a plebiscite on the independence of Austria. Adolf Hitler took this as an opportunity to take action against the Austrian State. Schuschnigg was pressed to resign. The National-Socialist Arthur Seyß-Inquart took-over the chancellorship and formed a new government. The Austrian National-Socialists took power in Austria.

On the morning of 12th March 1938, troops of the German « Wehrmacht » and the SS crossed the German-Austrian border. On 13th March 1938, Hitler announced in Linz the legislation on the « Anschluß » (Annexation) of Austria into the German « Reich » .

During the great celebrations in all of Austria, many potential opponents of the regime were arrested, as well as the Jews who were expropriated and deprived of civil rights. National-Socialist rule was established now in Austria through propaganda, terror and enticements.

The « Plebiscite »

After the « Anschluß » in March 1938, the Austrian army was incorporated into the German « Wehrmacht » . German laws came into force without delay. A Plebiscite was set for 10th April on the annexation of Austria to the German « Reich » , which was only a mockery.

Austrian citizens who were of Jewish descent were excluded from the election. People who were of other political opinions were arrested. Despite this, many Austrian intellectuals and known personalities from all areas publicly supported Adolf Hitler's annexation. The former Chancellor Karl Renner who had founded the 1st Republic and the Austrian Bishops did their best to convince the many who had remained sceptical.

A free democratic election was not possible on 10th April : Election publicity was present in front of and in the election booth, the votes were surveyed and the voting papers were manipulated.

Despite the complete lack of choice that the voters had, the former National-Socialist Mayor of the City of Linz, Franz Langoth, voiced his opinion in 1951 that the election on 10th April 1938 in Austria had been an example of a true, democratic plebiscite and would be recorded as a pure and clean vote in future history.

The « Patenstadt » - Hitler's building plans for Linz

Linz, the City of his youth, was singled-out for the special favour of Adolf Hitler after the « Anschluß » . He intended it to be developed as a Centre of Industry and Culture on the Danube and ultimately to provide room for between 320,000 to 420,000 inhabitants.

The monumental integration of both river banks of the Danube as an administrative forum.

An axial street system in the south as a culture centre by diverting the railway provision, together with the building

of a new railway station for the transport of people.

The building of large industrial factories to the east of the City. (Hermann Göring Factory ; Upper-Danube Steel Works ; Ostmark Nitrogen Factory) .

The port facilities as a large warehouse location for goods.

Linz as an intersection for the German motorway network.

Traffic planning with an inner and outer peripheral ring linked by bridges over the Danube.

Out of these enormous building projects, only the Nibelungen Bridge and the 2 buildings to the left and right of the bridge on the side of Linz Town, the industrial facilities and the port facilities on the bend in the Danube were erected. The commencement of the Second World War, together with the lack of human and material resources, stopped further projects.

However, in the residential sector, within 5 years, 11,000 residences in 2,700 buildings were built. Through an enormous influx of work-force (the level of the population rose from 112,000 in 1938 - to 185,000 in 1943) locally, the unresolved requirement for residences rose from 507 residences in 1937 - to over 15,000 in 1943.

The concentration camp in Mauthausen and the sub-camps in Linz

As early as 8 August 1938, a few months after the « Anschluß » , the 1st prisoners were transferred into the new concentration camp in Mauthausen. The National-Socialist regime established the Mauthausen Concentration Camp to obtain more prison space for political-ideological opponents. It was intended that they should in the Mauthausen Quarry extract the materials for the magnificent building projects in Linz.

The Mauthausen/Gusen Double Camp became the only concentration camp classified as a « Level III Camp » . This meant that for the prisoners, there should be no return.

In total, more than 190,000 people of different nationality became imprisoned in the Mauthausen Concentration Camp, the Gusen Branch Camp and the sub-camps, which numbered over 40. Systematic terror, deliberate killings, exploitation of labour, deficient feeding, inadequate clothing and lack of medical care led to the deaths of about 100,000 prisoners.

Jews in Linz

Of the approximately 600 Jews who had lived in Linz, in March 1938, about 305 fled abroad. 23 died during the course of the years until 1942 (including suicides) . Most of the 205 Jews who fled to Vienna and Bohemia and Moravia were killed in National-Socialist concentration camps.

The Jews who had remained in Linz were nearly all taken to the Theresienstadt Concentration Camp. Hardly any Upper-Austrian Jews died in the Mauthausen Concentration Camp, where many Jews died who had been deported from other parts of Europe.

Only about 26 Jews survived the National-Socialist regime in Linz, Upper-Austria, and, up to 1947, there were only 13 who actually returned to Linz. Although this number was slightly increased later it, nevertheless, shows the end of the old Jewish community in Linz.

...

Linz, capital of Upper-Austria. Jewish money-lenders are recorded in Linz, in 1304 ; a Jewish settlement in the growing market town is probably a Century older. In 1335, a synagogue is mentioned ; 2 Jews were baptized 1 year earlier. Jews were accused of desecrating the « Host » in 1338. Although the community was not harmed during the « Black Death » persecutions of 1348, a local persecution occurred in 1371. In 1396, Duke Albert IV permitted Jews to conduct only fiscal transactions with the burghers ; the decree was renewed in 1412. The Jews were expelled from Linz in 1421, and, in 1426, the synagogue was turned into a church. Jews were permitted to attend the bi-annual markets in the town in 1494, and Jewish horse-dealers and feather and wool merchants, mainly from Moravia, continued to trade at the fairs until their entry was forbidden at the end of the 17th Century. Only in 1783 were the markets officially declared open and, in 1824, the Jews opened their own prayer-room. A cemetery was consecrated in 1863, when the modern community was established. In 1869, there were 391 Jews (1.3 % of the total population) and 533 in 1880. A new synagogue was opened in 1877 by Rabbi Adolf Kurrein (1876-1882) , publicist and author. His son, Rabbi Viktor Kurrein (1923-1938) , wrote the history of the community.

In 1923, there were 1,238 Jews in Linz, 671 in 1934 (0.6 %) , and, in 1938, before the « Anschluß » , 650. On 10 November 1938, the synagogue was burned down by the SS ; the 65 remaining Jews were arrested and ordered to leave within 3 days for Vienna. The Nazis claimed that the Jews must leave the town because it was the capital of the province of Adolf Hitler's birth. Jewish shops were not looted because they had already been « Aryanized » . Shortly after the end of the War, 2,400 Jewish refugees were housed in the nearby Bindermichen camp. A new community was re-organized, which numbered 238 in 1949, and 145 in 1961. In October 1957, an anti-Semitic demonstration was sparked-off by a performance of « The Diary of Anne Frank » . Protests against a ban on shehitah were lodged in 1958. A new synagogue was consecrated in 1968.

The killing of « life not worthy of living »

According to National-Socialist concepts of public health and racial purity, there was no room for human beings who could not be useful to the National-Socialist State in a visible or measurable way. In order to establish which patients were not worthy of living, questionnaires were despatched to all psychiatric institutions. They had to report on all people suffering from schizophrenia, epilepsy and other mental illnesses. Assessors decided on these questionnaires as to whether patients were to be killed. A decisive criterion was if the patient had the ability to work.

One of the few institutions, in which the killing of people took place who were considered as not worthy of living, was « Schloß Hartheim » in Upper-Austria. In 1939, Doctor Rudolf Lonauer was made head of this institute. Lonauer, who also was the director of the Niedernhart Mental Institute in Linz, commenced the systematic killing of people in Hartheim in 1940. About 1,000 people were taken secretly from Niedernhart to Hartheim and were killed there.

The National-Socialist social policy

The National-Socialists considered the German people to be threatened by an over-proportionate reproduction of inferior individuals - mentally or physically handicapped people, the mentally ill or people whose behaviour was deviant. Furthermore, it was thought one could prevent any damage from collective hereditary factors which resulted from the mingling with inferior races, above all, with Jews.

The priority aim for National-Socialist social policy was, therefore, to prevent such a threat at all cost and by all means. This meant in actual fact, expulsion, persecution and finally the murder of those people defined as not worthy of living. For the others, the Aryan comrades, State support was envisaged.

While selecting the inferior, often with the help of communal organisations, such as youth, health and social security offices, the comrades erected an effective propaganda-like social apparatus. National-Socialist Welfare (NSV) and the German Labour Front (DAF) used skilfully arranged mass activities to achieve high-acceptance of National-Socialist policies by the population.

...

Austria 1938-1945 : The National-Socialists seized power on the evening of March 3rd, 1938, and German troops marched into Austria on March 12th ; the Federal President Wilhelm Miklas resigned from office on March 13th, 1938, and the National-Socialist Federal Government passed a constitutional law stating that « Austria is a province of the German “ Reich ” », and a « Reich » Law (« Reichsgesetz ») in the same wording was published in Berlin. The implementation was put into the hands of the « Gauleiter » of the Saarland province, Josef Bürckel, who was temporary leader of the Nazi Party (NSDAP) and became « “ Reich ” Commissioner » (« Reichskommissar ») for the Reunification of Austria with the German “ Reich ” » following the plebiscite over the « Anschluss » on April 4th, 1938. The government was called « Österreichische Landesregierung » (Austrian Provincial Government) and was headed by Arthur Seyß-Inquart as « Reich » Governor (« Reichsstatthalter ») ; it remained in power until 1939, when it was forced to hand-over its powers and liquidate the hitherto existing Austrian State (1st Republic) .

Josef Bürckel was given far-reaching authorities after April 10th, 1938, e.g. : the authority to instruct the « Reich » Governor, but not including « Wehrmacht » (the German Armed Forces) and economy. The name « Österreich » (Austria) was for the time replaced by « Ostmark » .

The replacement of leaders in the public and private sectors led to drastic measures. On April 1st, 1938, the 1st

Austrian officials and patriots were deported to the concentration camp in Dachau, other persons were temporarily arrested. Along with Austrian National-Socialists, many German nationals took-over leading positions, which caused many problems, especially in the economy.

Integration of the Austrian economy into the German system started in March 1938. The Austrian economy was integrated into the 4 year plan and almost all large-scale industry passed into German ownership. On 31 May 1938, the Nazi Party divided the « Ostmark » into « Gau » districts, Upper-Austria and Lower-Austria were re-named « Oberdonau » (Upper-Danube) and « Niederdonau » (Lower-Danube) and the historical borders of the provinces were altered. On 1 October 1938, administrative structures were altered according to the « Gau » structure : The province of Burgenland was split between Lower-Danube and Styria ; the Tyrol and Vorarlberg were merged ; East Tyrol became part of Carinthia ; the Court district of Bad Aussee was integrated into Upper-Danube ; 97 sub-urban municipalities became part of Vienna ; the municipalities of Jungholz and Mittelberg became Bavarian territory. Uniformity, which meant the complete destruction of historic structures, came in the form of the « Ostmark » Act of 1 May 1939. 7 « Reichsgau » districts were created which were identical with the Nazi Party « Gau » districts. They were headed by « Reich » Governors who were at the same time Nazi Party « Gauleiter » and reported to the Minister of the Interior. The powers of the « Reich » Governor of Austria passed over to the « Reich » Commissioner, whose post expired on 31 March 1940, and with this date Austria finally lost its legal personality. From August 1942, even use of the terms « Ostmark » or « “ Ostmark Reichsgau ” districts » was no longer permitted ; the new comprehensive term being « Alps and Danube “ Reichsgau ” districts » .

The administrative districts were placed under the authority of a sub-prefect (« Landrat ») and were equipped with self-governing powers, the German Local Government Act took effect on 1 October 1938, and a number of towns were considerably enlarged through incorporation (Graz, Linz, Salzburg, Innsbruck, Klagenfurt, Krems, Sankt Pölten, etc.) . Major changes came with the creation of registrar's offices and the implementation of new social and tax laws. When assessing administrative and social measures, it has to be taken into consideration that Austria was forced to adopt German administrative practice and accept National-Socialist dictatorship. A strict police regime was introduced in order to consolidate the National-Socialist State, the Austrian armed forces were incorporated into the German « Wehrmacht » , 2 defence district headquarters were established and a 2 year military service was introduced, supplemented by the « Reich » Labour Service (« Reichsarbeitsdienst ») . Critics of the regime were persecuted, deported into concentration camps or sentenced to death. A concentration camp was built at Mauthausen, which later had a number of satellite camps as well.

The persecution and expulsion of Jews reached a 1st peak in the November Pogrom of 9-10 November 1938, followed by almost complete concentration of the remaining Jewish population in Vienna and by their systematic deportation into Concentration Camps and extermination camps. Subject to similar persecution were the Roma and Sinti people, especially in Burgenland. The Roman Catholic Church was subjected to intensive pressure, and this despite the Bishops' attempt in 1938 to remain on good terms with Adolf Hitler. Efforts to gain absolute control of youth education via the « Hitler-Jugend » organisation led to an assault of the Archbishop's palace in Vienna, in October 1938. Following this, numerous monasteries were closed, for example those in Admont, Altenburg, Klosterneuburg, Göttweig, Wilhering, Kremsmünster, Saint-Florian, Lambach and Stams. The abbey of Sankt Lambrecht had already been dissolved in May

1938 and was later turned into a satellite camp of the Mauthausen concentration camp. Church schools were also closed. « Volksschule » primary schools and « Hauptschule » secondary schools were reduced in number, advanced-level specialised schools (« Oberschulen ») underwent far-reaching alterations, a number of additional institutions were created. Federal institutes of education (« Bundeserziehungsanstalten ») were replaced by « Napola » Schools (National Political Institutes of Education) . In teacher training, the Austrian institute for teacher training continued to exist, as did the universities. All forms of social and cultural life were subjected to the requirements of the Nazi Party, whose organisation was closely linked with the organisation of the State.

As for the economy, the hitherto persisting high-levels of unemployment fell sharply due to War preparation by the National-Socialist regime. Road construction (« Autobahn ») took-off, as did the foundation of large-scale enterprises, particularly in Upper-Austria (Linz, Lenzing, Ranshofen) , and restructuring of existing enterprises and the exploitation of raw material resources (iron ore, mineral oil, magnesite and timber) for the armament industry. Numerous military structures (barracks, air-fields, camps) and large troop training fields (Döllersheim, Kaisersteinbruch) were built. Foreign currency reserves (ATS 471,490,000 at the end of 1937, plus clearing assets abroad) of the Austrian National Bank (« Nationalbank » , Österreichische, ÖNB) were claimed by the « Reich » Bank, and, in addition, the Austrian Schilling had to be exchanged at the unfavourable rate of 1.5 Schillings to 1 « Reichsmark » .

Foreign policy was particularly disappointing for Tyroleans, since Hitler did not reunify North and South Tyrol. Instead, German-speaking inhabitants of the Italian province of Alto Adige were given the right to move to Germany, and a large number of them were resettled in what used to be Austria. Hitler continued his aggressive expansion policy, bringing Germany to the brink of War in what came to be known as the « Sudeten crisis » of September 1938, the annexation of Southern Moravia and Southern Bohemia which were consequently incorporated into Upper-Danube and Lower-Danube, respectively. This was followed by the occupation of Czechoslovakia, making Bohemia and Moravia German protectorates, by the foundation of Slovakia and structural changes in the Balkans (Vienna Arbitration Award) . Finally, the attack on Poland led to the outbreak of the Second World War on 1 September 1939.

The immediate consequences were a deterioration of the supply situation and conscription. During the occupation of Norway, for example, Germany used almost only Austrian mountain troops. With the campaign against Yugoslavia, in April 1941, the War was carried to Austria's southern border region (headquarters in the tunnel of Tauchen, near Mönichkirchen) ; Upper-Carniola was annexed to Carinthia ; the eastern part of Slovenia integrated into Styria. The War intensified with the attack on Russia (22 June 1941) and, on 11 December 1941, Germany declared War on the United States of America. 1943 saw the beginnings of anti-aircraft defence organisation for industrial centres in Austria, in which school-children from the upper-grades had to participate as well. To make-up for the shortage of male-workers, women were trained and War prisoners and forced labourers from Poland and the Ukraine were employed in industry and agriculture.

The liquidation of the 6th German Army, including many Austrian soldiers, at Stalingrad in January 1943, marked the decisive turning-point in the War, and the implications of this were soon to be felt in all areas of daily life. « Wiener Neustadt » was the 1st Austrian town to be bombarded, on 13 August 1943, by American bomber fighters based in Tunisia. Later on, industrial sites, oil fields, transport facilities and housing estates were targeted (Bomb Warfare) . All

major Austrian towns suffered heavy destruction. From 28 March 1945, Russian troops coming from Hungary entered Austria and conquered Burgenland, Vienna, the eastern half of Lower-Austria and eastern Styria. Western Austria was liberated by American, British and French troops, the south of Carinthia by the Yugoslav army.

The Nazi Party administration and other structures broke-down completely as the Second World War drew to a close. On 27 April 1945, in Vienna, Austria was proclaimed a Republic again (2nd Republic) .

1938

10.-11. Jänner 1938 : Freistadt ist wieder Garnison. Die 7. Kompanie des Infanterieregiments Nummer 17 zieht in die neuerrichtete Kaserne.

25. Jänner 1938 : Ein Nordlicht ist in Oberösterreich sichtbar.

10. Februar 1938 : Linzer Solofabrik wegen schlechter Auftragslage für zehn Wochen geschlossen.

28. Februar 1938 : Ende Februar werden in Österreich 300.294 Arbeitslose unterstützt, davon in Oberösterreich 32.863.

4. März 1938 : Resolution des oberösterreichischen Landtages an Schuschnigg, in der ihm für « den Friedensschluß zwischen beiden deutschen Staaten » gedankt wird.

5. März 1938 : Minister Doktor Arthur Seyß-Inquart spricht vor einer geschlossenen Vertrauensmännerversammlung der (verbotenen) Nationalsozialisten in Linz.

Der Sonntag in Linz vorgesehene « Deutsche Tag » findet wegen des Versammlungsverbotese nicht statt.

7. März 1938 : Komponist Ludwig Moser gestorben.

9. März 1938 : Bundeskanzler Doktor Kurt Schuschnigg kündigt eine Volksbefragung über das künftige Schicksal Österreichs an ; Verordnung des Landeshauptmannes von Oberösterreich über die Volksbefragung.

10. März 1938 : Nationalsozialistischer Überfall auf ein Heim des Linzer Jungvolkes in Urfahr, Hauptstraße. Acht Verletzte, die durchwegs keine Nationalsozialisten sind.

11. März 1938 : Rede von Landeshauptmann Doktor Heinrich Gleißner im Linzer Sender angekündigt.

Fackelzug der Nationalsozialisten in Linz ; August Eigruber Landeshauptmann von Oberösterreich.

Beschlagnahme der « Tagespost » wegen eines Artikels von Staatsrat Doktor Hugo Jury ; Beschlagnahme des « Linzer Volksblattes » .

Besetzung des Gebäudes des Katholischen Pressvereins (« Linzer Volksblatt ») durch Nationalsozialisten.

12. März 1938 : Der illegale Gauleiter der NSDAP übernimmt die Funktion eines Landeshauptmannes von Oberösterreich, der Linzer Kreisleiter Sepp Wolkersdorfer die Geschäfte eines Bürgermeisters der Landeshauptstadt Linz.

Alle öffentlichen Gebäude werden von SA und SS besetzt. Schwere Auseinandersetzungen beim Jugendheim der Vaterländischen Front in Urfahr.

Aufruf von Gauleiter August Eigruber : Das Zeitalter der Schande und der Schmach, der Not, des Elends und der Verfolgung ist ein für allemal abgeschlossen.

13. März 1938 : Einmarsch von rund 100.000 Mann deutscher Truppen in Oberösterreich.

Adolf Hitler fährt über Braunau nach Linz, wo er zwei Tage bleibt.

Auflösung aller oberösterreichischen Gemeindetage.

Gleißner offiziell als Landeshauptmann abgesetzt.

14. März 1938 : Die Gauleitung der NSDAP zieht ins Landhaus und bezieht die Räume der bisherigen Sicherheitsdirektion.

15. März 1938 : Doktor Ernst Kaltenbrunner wird vom Chef der deutschen Polizei, Heinrich Himmler, unter Beförderung zum SS-Brigadeführer Führer des SS-Oberabschnittes Österreich.

Der Kaiser-Franz-Josefs-Platz wird in Adolf-Hitler-Platz umbenannt.

Die Linzer Garnison wird auf Adolf Hitler vereidigt.

Ermordung des Linzer Polizeidirektors Doktor Viktor Bentz.

Die Linzer Polizeidirektion übernimmt SS-Untersturmführer Doktor Josef Plakolm.

Landeshauptmann Doktor Heinrich Gleißner wird in « Schutzhaft » genommen.

Aufhebung aller jüdischen Vereine.

18. März 1938 : Fachlehrer Rudolf Lengauer aus Schwanenstadt zum Landeshauptmann-Stellvertreter ernannt ; vorher war Diplom-Ingenieur Karl Breithenthaler Landesstatthalter geworden.

Eigruber beruft die bisherigen Mitglieder des Landtages ab.

20. März 1938 : Die Geheime Staatspolizei Linz befiehlt die Abgabe aller in privater Hand befindlichen Waffen bis zum 25. März 1938.

21. März 1938 : Erste Gespräche über die Trassenführung Salzburg - Linz für eine geplante Autobahn.

Vereidigung von 3.500 deutschen und österreichischen Soldaten in der Linzer Südbahnhalle in Anwesenheit des Kommandeurs des 7. Armeekorps, General der Infanterie Ritter von Schober.

30. März 1938 : Letzte Nummer des « Landesgesetzblattes für Oberösterreich » .

1. April 1938 : Verhandlungen der SS wegen Erwerbs von Gründen in Mauthausen zur Errichtung eines Konzentrationslagers.

Die Wehrwirtschaftsstelle Linz (später « Rüstungskommando Linz ») nimmt ihre Arbeit auf.

Aus der 3. und 4. österreichischen Division entsteht die 45. Infanterie-Division mit Generalmajor Materna (!) als Kommandeur.

Errichtung der Donauflotte mit dem Sitz in Linz.

7. April 1938 : Rede Adolf Hitlers in Linz anlässlich der bevorstehenden Volksabstimmung.

8. April 1938 : Erste Nummer des « Verordnungsblattes für den Amtsbereich des Landeshauptmannes für den Gau Oberdonau » (bis 10. Jänner 1940) .

10. April 1938 : Volksabstimmung über den Anschluß. Für Oberösterreich schwanken die Angaben über die Wahlberechtigten zwischen 576.533 und 602.581, die der Jastimmen zwischen 574.141 und 600.488. : in Oberösterreich 99,82 % und in Linz 99,87 % Jastimmen.

Erstmals scheint in einem parteiamtlichen Schreiben der Name « Oberdonau » für Oberösterreich auf.

12. April 1938 : Gauleiter Josef Bürckel ruft zur « Volksspende » für die ärmsten Volksgenossen auf. « Mit der Durchführung der Sammlung ist Parteigenosse Franz Langoth beauftragt. »

Totengedenken der ehemaligen Wehrturner und Schutzbündler gemeinsam mit Formationen der NSDAP in Steyr. Es spricht der frühere sozialdemokratische Bürgermeister Sichelrader.

14. April 1938 : Der Leiter des Gauarchivs Brunnhuber ruft auf, Dokumente aus der Verfolgungszeit zur Verfügung zu stellen.

Selbstaufflösung des oberösterreichischen evangelischen Lehrervereines.

15. April 1938 : Neuordnung der deutschen Kriminalpolizei in Österreich ; für Oberösterreich wird die « Staatliche Kriminalpolizeistelle Linz » geschaffen.

16. April 1938 : Linz wird Hafen der Donauflotte und Sitz des Flottillenkommandos.

Der « Bayerische Hilfszug » verköstigt in Oberösterreich täglich 20.000 Bedürftige.

20. April 1938 : Der 49. Geburtstag Adolf Hitlers wird in Linz mit einer militärischen Parade begangen ; ein Bataillon des Linzer I. Regiment 14 nimmt an der Parade in Berlin teil. Festgottesdienst zu Hitlers Geburtstag der « Romfreien katholischen Kirche » in Ried

NSV verteilt in Oberösterreich 10.000 Lebensmittelpakete im Wert bis zu 5 Reichsmark.

Sozialminister Doktor Hugo Jury besichtigt Elendsviertel in Oberösterreich. Die Stadtgemeinde Linz baut als Sofortprogramm 40 Wohnungen (« größtenteils mit drei Räumen ») in der Gürtelstraße.

24. April 1938 : Adolf Hitler bestimmt die Errichtung von sieben Gauen, und andere des Gaues Oberdonau.

25. April 1938 : Aufruf August Eigrubers « gegen Stellenjägerei » .

28. April 1938 : Die Fahrradsteuer wird aufgehoben, allerdings müssen Fahrräder registriert werden.

Adolf Hitler genehmigt den Bauplatz für die Errichtung der Hütte Linz im Südosten der Stadt.

4. Mai 1938 : Gründung der « Reichswerke AG für Erzbergbau und Eisenhütten Hermann Göring » in Linz.

5. Mai 1938 : Reichsjugendführer Baldur von Schirach erklärt, den ihm verliehenen deutschen Buchpreis 1937-1938 für das « Lied der Getreuen » zur Errichtung einer großen Jugendherberge in Linz verwenden zu wollen, die den Namen « Haus der Getreuen » führen soll.

In Linz werden die « Reichswerke AG für Erzbergbau und Eisenhütten Hermann Göring in Linz » als Tochtergesellschaft der Reichswerke Berlin gegründet.

9. Mai 1938 : Das Elternhaus Hitlers in Leonding wird von der Gauleitung der NSDAP gekauft. « Bei Festsetzung des Preises wurde auch die historische Bedeutung des Hauses berücksichtigt. »

11. Mai 1938 : Ein Nordlicht ist in Oberösterreich sichtbar.

13. Mai 1938 : Ministerpräsident Hermann Göring nimmt in Linz den Spatenstich für die Hütte Linz vor. Er spricht, daß « Eisen wichtiger als Gold » sei und daß wir « jetzt doppelt arbeiten müßten » .

Hitler befiehlt den Bau einer neuen Donaubrücke, der Nibelungenbrücke, in Linz.

16. Mai 1938 : Die dritte Gruppe des Bombergeschwaders 155 (III/KG 155) kommt von Schwäbisch Hall nach Wels. Die Stadt Wels will auch äußerlich als « Fliegerstadt » aufscheinen und benennt den Kaiser-Wilhelm- und Franz-Josef-Ring in Hermann-Göring-Ring um, die Franz-Salvator-Straße in Richthofenstraße und die Rainerstraße in Wilckestraße.

20. Mai 1938 : Linz wird Sitz einer obersten Bauleitung der Reichsautobahn für die Gebiete Oberdonau und Niederdonau, und zwar für die Autobahntrasse Gmunden - Sankt Pölten und Passau - Linz.

22. Mai 1938 : Erster NSV-Opfertag erbringt in Linz 30.000 Reichsmark, in Oberösterreich 105.000 Reichsmark.

Die Landesstelle für Denkmalschutz im Wiener Unterrichtsministerium hat alle Stätten, mit denen Adolf Hitler in Verbindung stand, unter Denkmalschutz gestellt : das Geburtshaus in Braunau Nummer 219 ; das Haus Leonding Nummer 61 ; die Häuser in Linz Huemerstraße Nummer 6 ; Humboldtstraße Nummer 31 ; Blütengasse Nummer 9 ; das Rauschergut in Hafelt ; Gemeinde Fischlham ; die Schmiedmühle ; Lambach Nummer 86 ; und die Häuser Lambach Nummer 213 und Nummer 58 ; die Volksschule in Fischlham ; die Realschule Linz-Steingasse ; und das Realgymnasium Steyr (ehemaliges Jesuiten-Kolleg) .

23. Mai 1938 : Adolf Hitler bestellt als Gauleiter für « Oberdonau » August Eigruber. Stellvertretender Gauleiter wird Hans Eisenkolb.

27. Mai 1938 : Gauleiter Josef Bürckel ernennt die Gauamtsleiter und die kommissarischen Kreisleiter in « Oberdonau » sowie den Linzer Oberbürgermeister Sepp Wolkerstorfer.

31. Mai 1938 : Anordnung Josef Bürckels über die Gaeinteilung : Das steirische Ausseer Land kommt zu Oberösterreich, das nunmehr 12.450 Quadrakilometer und 912.000 Einwohner umfasst. Erstmals scheint der Name « Oberdonau » offiziell auf.

Die deutschen Regimenter (I. Regiment 19 und I. Regiment 7) verlassen den Standort Linz und kehren nach München zurück.

Gründung der Zellwolle Lenzing AG.

3. Juni 1938 : Erste Strafen der Preisüberwachungsstelle wegen « Preistreiberei » (1.000 Reichsmark für die

oberösterreichische Bäckerzunft in Linz) .

Namensänderung der Gemeinde Schönau in Bad Schallerbach.

4. Juni 1938 : Die « Wiedervereinigung » des steirischen mit dem oberösterreichischen Salzkammergut findet im Rahmen eines Übernahmeaktes in Bad Aussee statt.

13. Juni 1938 : Die Filmgesellschaft « Infra » Berlin dreht in Oberösterreich den Film « Die Heimat des Führers » .

22. Juni 1938 : Die Reichswerke Hermann Göring geben für 25 Millionen Reichsmark Inhabervorzugsaktien ohne Stimmrecht aus.

24. Juni 1938 : Die Schiffswerft Linz wird erster Rüstungsbetrieb Oberösterreichs.

1. Juli 1938 : Einführung des Rechtsverkehrs auf den Straßen von Oberdonau und der Steiermark.

Anstelle des « Linzer Volksblattes » erscheint (als Nummer I des II. Jahrganges) die Tageszeitung « Volksstimme » , Parteiamtliches Blatt des Gaues Oberdonau, mit den Beiblättern « Arbeitersturm » , « Ostmark-Woche » und « Heimat-Land » . Hauptschriftleiter ist Harald Schreiner.

2. Juli 1938 : Die seit 1. April in Linz aufgestellte Donauflottille wird unmittelbar dem Kommando der Kriegsmarine unterstellt. In örtlichen Angelegenheiten untersteht sie dem Standortältesten in Linz, in territorialer Hinsicht dem Generalkommando XVII in Wien, ansonsten der Marinestation Ostsee, in Verwaltungsangelegenheiten der Marineintendantur Kiel, in Gerichtsangelegenheiten dem Zweiten Admiral der Ostsee, in Personalangelegenheiten dem Zweiten Admiral der Nordsee, in Ehrenangelegenheiten dem Marinestationskommando der Ostsee.

SA-Gruppenführer Paul Giesler mit der Führung der SA-Gruppe « Alpenland » in Linz betraut.

7. Juli 1938 : Politiker Franz Bachinger gestorben.

8. Juli 1938 : 25.000 SA-Männer zur Sicherung der Ernte in Oberösterreich eingesetzt.

10. Juli 1938 : Durch Eingemeindungen (Sankt Ulrich, Garsten, Sierning, Gleink und Behamberg / Niederösterreich) wird Steyr von neun auf 25 Quadratkilometer und die Einwohnerzahl von 25.000 auf 33.000 ausgeweitet.

13. Juli 1938 : Errichtung des Reichspropagandaamtes Oberdonau.

18. Juli 1938 : In Linz soll eine Reichsmotorflugschule des NS-Fliegerkorps zur Schulung des Führernachwuchses, am Stadtrand von Linz (Holzpoldl) eine ganzjährige Segelfliegerschule für 75 Mann errichtet werden.

24. Juli 1938 : Ein Toter und sechs Verletzte bei einem Zugunglück in Lambach.

25. Juli 1938 : Im Rahmen des Festprogrammes des Reichssenders Wien zum 25. Juli (1934) sind auch die Glocken von Braunau zu hören. Gedenkveranstaltungen in Kollerschlag, Bad Ischl, Mitterndorf und am Pyhrnpass.

1. August 1938 : Aufbau des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen.

Einführung der Zivilehe.

Die noch in Oberdonau lebenden Juden müssen nach Wien übersiedeln.

6. August 1938 : August Eigruber übernimmt das Bauernkriegsdenkmal am Haushamerfeld in die Obhut des Gaues.

9. August 1938 : Mit der Übernahme der Aktienmehrheit der Steyr-Daimler-Puch AG durch die Reichswerke Hermann Göring wird ein neuer Verwaltungsrat mit Doktor Wilhelm Voß als Präsident und Paul Pleiger als Vizepräsident bestellt.

22. August 1938 : August Eigruber eröffnet die erste Gauschulung der DAF im Faustschlößl in Aschach.

Die Stadt Linz beginnt mit dem Bau von 24 Wohnhäusern für mehr als 200 Wohnungen (Zimmer, Kabinett, Küche) .

26. August 1938 : Schwere Hochwasser in ganz Oberösterreich.

28. August 1938 : Eröffnung des Welser Volksfestes, das als « Landesschau Ostmark » des « Reichsnährstandes » durchgeführt wird, durch Reichsbauernführer Walther Daré.

30. August 1938 : Erste Verdunkelungsübung in Linz.

19. September 1938 : Mit Beginn des neuen Schuljahres ist allen privaten mittleren Lehranstalten das Öffentlichkeitsrecht entzogen, auch die Weiterführung als Privatanstalt ohne Öffentlichkeitsrecht wird nicht gestattet.

Außerordentliche Musterung der noch nicht ausgebildeten Jahrgänge 1914 bis 1917 und ärztliche Untersuchung der Jahrgänge 1893 bis 1900.

Einsatz des sudetendeutschen Freikorps im Grenzsicherungsdienst. 300 sudetendeutsche Flüchtlinge im Stift Wilhering und in der Linzer Diesterwegschule einquartiert.

30. September 1938 : Durch das « Münchner Abkommen » werden die sudetendeutschen Randgebiete Böhmens und Mähren-Schlesiens von der Tschechoslowakei losgelöst. Nach einer « Auftragsverwaltung » für den Gauleiter Sudetenland kommt dieses Gebiet nach dem « Gesetz zur Gliederung der sudetendeutschen Gebiete » vom 25. März 1939 (bis Kriegsende) zum Gau « Oberdonau » .

5. Oktober 1938 : August Eigruber verbietet jeglichen Einkauf und sämtliche Kaufverträge in den an Oberösterreich angrenzenden sudetendeutschen Gebieten (« Fort mit den Schlachtfeldhyänen ! ») .

6. Oktober 1938 : Das Divisionskommando kehrt nach Linz zurück.

9. Oktober 1938 : Erstmals Eintopfsonntag in Linz. Sammlung für das Winterhilfswerk (WHW) .

15. Oktober 1938 : Feierliche Übernahme des Gerichtsbezirkes Aussee durch August Eigruber.

16. Oktober 1938 : Übernahme der Verwaltung der sudetendeutschen Bezirke Krummau und Kaplitz durch « Oberdonau » .

18. Oktober 1938 : Die Steyr-Daimler-Puch AG beschließt in einer außerordentlichen Hauptversammlung, den Sitz des Unternehmens von Wien nach Steyr zu verlegen, nachdem die Generaldirektion bereits übersiedelt ist.

19. Oktober 1938 : Adolf Hitler kommt nach Linz und besucht die südböhmischen Gebiete des Gaus.

28. Oktober 1938 : Erste Vorstellung der NS-Gemeinschaft « Kraft durch Freude » am Landestheater.

Schriftsteller Maurice Reinhold von Stern gestorben.

1. November 1938 : Neugliederung Oberösterreichs in 13 Verwaltungsbezirke und zwei Stadtkreise (Linz und Steyr) . Die Bezirke Eferding und Urfahr-Umgebung fallen weg. Sankt Magdalena und Ebelsberg werden Linz eingemeindet ; durch die Eingemeindung von Lichtenegg und Pernaun zählt Wels 25.000 Einwohner.

Der Generalinspekteur des deutschen Straßenwesens, Doktor-Ingenieur Fritz Todt, besichtigt den Linzer Brückenbau und Baustellen der Autobahn, insbesondere die Trassierung am Attersee.

Die ersten 20.000 Männer der Ostmark rücken zum Arbeitsdienst (RAD) ein. Von vier Arbeitsgauleitungen der Ostmark liegt eine in Linz.

9. November 1938 : In einer Gedenkfeier der NSDAP Oberdonau wird der im Land « gefallenen » 43 Nationalsozialisten gedacht.

Beginn der Alteisensammlung.

Reichskristallnacht - Zerstörung der Linzer Synagoge.

10. November 1938 : Weisungsgemäß zünden die Linzer SA und SS den jüdischen Tempel an.

14. November 1938 : Übersiedlung des Marktes auf dem Hauptplatz auf den Hessenplatz.

15. November 1938 : August Eigruber verfügt die Auflassung des Landesfeiertags (Landespatron Sankt Leopold) .

16. November 1938 : Der Gau Oberdonau ist praktisch ohne Arbeitsreserve.

Im Oktober 1937 gab es 22.932 Arbeitslose, im Oktober 1938 3.195.

21. November 1938 : « Oberdonau » zählt 2212 Mitglieder der NSDAP.

25. November 1938 : Nach endgültiger Festlegung der Grenze gegenüber der Tschechoslowakei und der Unterzeichnung des Grenzfestsetzungsprotokolls wird die deutsch-tschechische Grenze durch deutsche Ordnungspolizei besetzt.

30. November 1938 : Historiker Anton Maximilian Pachinger gestorben.

1. Dezember 1938 : Anstelle von Bezirkshauptleuten treten die « Landräte » , die Bezirke werden in Land- und Stadtkreise umbenannt.

3. Dezember 1938 : 800 Ausseer als Gäste bei Gauleiter August Eigruber in Linz.

4. Dezember 1938 : Bei der Abstimmung der Sudetendeutschen stimmten 98,9 % für den « Anschluß » ; in den dem Gau Oberdonau angeschlossenen Gebieten und bei den in Oberösterreich lebenden Sudetendeutschen gibt es : 64.187 Wahlberechtigte, 62.758 abgegebene Stimmen, 62.742 gültige Stimmen, 16 ungültige Stimmen, 23 Nein, 62.719 Ja.

8. Dezember 1938 : Ehrendegen der SS für Gauleiter August Eigruber.

11. Dezember 1938 : Der Reichsführer SS und Chef der deutschen Polizei, Heinrich Himmler, in Linz.

14. Dezember 1938 : Urteilsverkündung im Prozess « Bluttat am Pyhrnpaß im Juli 1934 » ; Urteile zwischen sechs Monate und zehn Jahre schweren Kerkers.

Baubeginn beim Innkraftwerk, Staustufe Ering, zwischen Braunau und Frauenstein durch die Innwerke Töging.

19. Dezember 1938 : Kartograph Gustav Freytag gestorben.

24. Dezember 1938 : Glocken aus Braunau und Linz sind in der Weihnachtssendung des Großdeutschen Rundfunks zu hören.

28. Dezember 1938 : Heimatpfleger Hans Zöttl gestorben.

Linz unter dem Hakenkreuz

Keine andere österreichische Stadt wurde vom Nationalsozialismus stärker geprägt als Linz. Noch heute sind die Spuren der NS-Zeit im Linzer Stadtbild deutlich zu sehen. Schon vor 1938 war Linz das Zentrum der illegalen Nationalsozialisten. Hitler selbst ernannte Linz, die Stadt, in der er einen Teil seiner Kindheit und Jugend verbracht hatte, zur Patenstadt des Führers. Der begeisterte Empfang den Tausenden Linzer den einmarschierenden deutschen Wehrmachtstruppen und Hitler persönlich bereiteten, war die Grundlage für den sofort vollzogenen « Anschluß » und den zweifelhaften Ehrentitel für Linz « Gründungsstaat des Großdeutschen Reiches » .

Wichtige NS-Leute waren in Linz geboren. Die Rüstungsindustrie, die hier unmittelbar nach dem Anschluß gegründet worden waren, machte Linz in den späteren Kriegsjahren zu einem bevorzugten Angriffsziel der alliierten Bomber.

Adolf Hitler und Linz

Adolf Hitler wurde am 20. April 1889 in Braunau geboren. Im Alter von 10 Jahren kam er mit seiner Familie nach Leonding. Dort besuchte er zunächst noch die Volksschule. Im Herbst 1900 begann er an der Realschule in der Steingasse in Linz. Weil er ein ziemlich schlechter Schüler war, mußte er 1904 die Realschule in Linz verlassen. Er wechselte an die Realschule in Steyr, wo er bei Kosteltern wohnte. Auch dort blieben seine Schulerfolge aus, deshalb kehrte er wieder nach Linz zurück. 1905 übersiedelte Frau Hitler - ihr Mann war bereits gestorben- mit ihrem Sohn in die Humboldtstraße, zwei Jahre später nach Urfahr, was damals noch nicht nach Linz eingemeindet war. 1908 verließ Hitler nach dem Tod seiner Mutter Linz, um in Wien an der Akademie der Bildenden Künste zu studieren. Hitlers Schulzeit in Linz war geprägt von deutschnationalem Gedankengut. Die Aufführungen der Wagner Opern im Linzer Landestheater hatten Hitlers Liebe zum Germanenkult geweckt. Gegenüber Wien, das Hitler stets als Wasserkopf, in dem zu viele Juden, Tschechen und Polen lebten, bezeichnete, hatte Linz in Hitlers Herz und Denken stets die Vorzugsstellung. Deshalb bestand der Führer auch darauf, daß die NSDAP während der Zeit der Illegalität ihren Sitz in Linz hatte.

Neben Berlin, München, Hamburg und Nürnberg war Linz die einzige österreichische Stadt, die als « Führerstadt » galt und deshalb eine bevorzugte bauliche Neugestaltung erfahren sollte. Seit dem « Anschluß » am 13. März 1938 galt Linz außerdem als « Gründungsstadt des Großdeutschen Reiches » . Linz sollte nach Hitlers Willen eine Weltstadt werden und als schönste Donaustadt Wien und Budapest in den Schatten stellen. Ab März 1938 sind neun Besuche Hitlers in Linz sicher nachzuweisen. Für Linz und seine Galerie ließ Hitler in ganz Europa Kunstwerke zusammenkaufen oder rauben, denn Linz sollte das europäische Kunstzentrum werden. Noch im April 1945 ließ sich Hitler im Führerbunker das Modell von Linz zeigen.

Der « Anschluß »

In Österreich war bereits im März 1933 das Parlament ausgeschaltet worden und nach dem Bürgerkrieg im Februar 1934 war Österreich endgültig zu einer Diktatur geworden. Nur ein Drittel der Bevölkerung stand hinter dem neuen Staat und die wirtschaftliche Lage war miserabel. Ungefähr ein Drittel der österreichischen Bevölkerung liebäugelte

schon seit der Machtergreifung Hitlers in Deutschland im März 1933 mit einer Vereinigung der beiden Staaten.

Der österreichische Bundeskanzler Schuschnigg hatte auf Drängen Hitlers schon Nationalsozialisten in sein Kabinett nehmen müssen. Für den 13. März 1938 hatte er eine Volksabstimmung über die Unabhängigkeit Österreichs angesetzt. Am 10. März 1938 erhielt die achte Armee der deutschen Wehrmacht den Marschbefehl zum Einmarsch in Österreich. Nach einem deutschen Ultimatum setzte Schuschnigg am folgenden Tag die Volksabstimmung ab. Zur gleichen Zeit wurden auf der Linzer Landstraße die ersten Hakenkreuzfahnen gehisst. Gauleiter Eigruber begab sich ins Landhaus, um dort die Geschäfte des Landeshauptmannes zu übernehmen. Sepp Wolkerstorfer, der Kreisleiter der NSDAP, begann als Linzer Bürgermeister zu amtieren.

Am Abend des 11. März hielt Schuschnigg seine berühmt gewordenen Ansprache an das österreichische Volk, in der erklärte :

« Wir weichen der Gewalt. »

In Linz waren schon im Laufe des Tages alle wichtigen Gebäude von Nationalsozialisten besetzt worden. Am Abend fand auf dem Linzer Hauptplatz eine riesige Freudenkundgebung mit angeblich 50.000 Teilnehmern statt. Am 12. März passierte um acht Uhr Morgens die deutsche Wehrmacht die deutsch-österreichische Grenze. Gegen Mittag erreichte sie Linz, wo sie von einer jubelnden Menge mit Blumen begrüßt wurde.

Als Hitler am gleichen Tag um 19 Uhr in Linz eintraf, war der Jubel der Massen auf der Straße unbeschreiblich. Es waren nicht nur NS-Parteigenossen, die immer wieder « Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer » schrien, sondern halb Linz wollte sich - erfasst von einer Massenhysterie » - kritiklos « dem Führer » anvertrauen. Vom Balkon des Linzer Rathauses hielt Hitler eine kurze Rede, in der er seine Ergriffenheit über den jubelnden Empfang und seine Verbundenheit mit seiner Heimatstadt betonte. Erst hier fasste er den Entschluß, den « Anschluß » sofort und zur Gänze zu vollziehen. Am 13. März teilte er diese Idee bei einem Mittagessen im Hotel Weinzinger an der Donaulände (heute Generali-Gebäude) den zehn « verdienstvollsten und treuesten » österreichischen Nationalsozialisten mit. Zu diesen gehörten Sepp Wolkerstorfer, Franz Langoth und August Eigruber.

Hitler verkündete :

« Österreich ist ein Teil des deutschen Reiches. »

Dieser Gesetzestext wurde prompt nach Wien geliefert, wo er von der Regierung rasch unterzeichnet wurde. Der « Anschluß » war vollzogen. Nach diesen Jubelbildern konnte der Rest der Welt nur schwer gegen eine Besetzung Österreichs durch die Deutschen protestieren.

Die « Volksabstimmung »

Sofort nach dem « Anschluß » wurde das österreichische Bundesheer in die deutsche Wehrmacht eingegliedert und auf

den Oberbefehlshaber Adolf Hitler vereidigt. Für den 10. April hatte Hitler eine Volksabstimmung über die Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands und Österreichs angesetzt. Diese nachträgliche Zustimmung war natürlich eine reine Farce.

Von Anfang an lehnte Hitler eine internationale Überwachung des Abstimmungsvorganges ab.

Die Propaganda setzte sofort und umfassend ein, um den Österreichern noch rechtzeitig vor der Wahl die « positiven und sozialen » Seiten des Nationalsozialismus vor Augen zu führen : Österreichische Kinder durften zur Erholung nach Deutschland fahren, in Deutschland wurde für Not leidende Österreicher Geld und Gewand gesammelt. Linz erhielt 100 Zentner Fleisch- und Wurstkonserven, 61 Zentner Zucker und 264 Zentner andere Lebensmittel.

Leute, die sich kritisch zum neuen System äußerten, wurden sofort verhaftet. Viele Prominente, wie zum Beispiel der Gründungskanzler der Ersten Republik, Doktor Karl Renner, und die österreichischen Bischöfe machten Werbung für den « Anschluß » . Wahlberechtigt waren natürlich nur Menschen « deutschen Blutes » . Juden oder mit Juden verheiratete Personen waren von vornherein ausgeschlossen. Außerdem waren die Wahlzettel teilweise manipuliert und die Stimmabgabe wurde überwacht. Es blieben also nur die Ja-Sager übrig. In Linz waren 81.644 Personen stimmberechtigt. 99,5 % waren zur Abstimmung gegangen, davon hatten 99,92 % mit Ja gestimmt, nur 66 Leute hatten es gewagt, das Nein, welche viel kleiner geschrieben war, anzukreuzen. Bürgermeister Wolkerstorfer freute sich über das beste Ergebnis einer deutschen Großstadt.

Leute, die mit Nein gestimmt hatten, wurden genau untersucht und verfolgt.

Die Patenstadt : Hitlers Baupläne für Linz

Wie schon erwähnt fühlte sich Hitler Linz ganz besonders verbunden und hatte Großes mit dieser Stadt vor. 1938 hatte Linz ungefähr 120.000 Einwohner. In zwei Etappen sollte die Stadt auf 320.000 beziehungsweise 420.000 Einwohner anwachsen. Damit für die vielen Menschen Platz war, wurden deshalb zunächst umliegende Gemeinden eingemeindet. Sankt Magdalena und Ebelsberg wurden Teil von Linz, damit wuchs das Stadtgebiet von 56 auf 96 quadrakilometer an. Die Planungen für den Ausbau von Linz setzten unmittelbar nach dem « Anschluß » mit großer Vehemenz ein. Schon am 13. März 1938 versprach Hitler den Bau einer neuen Donaubrücke. Tatsächlich wurde die Nibelungenbrücke auch 1940 bereits fertiggestellt. Die Pläne für Linz können in folgende Gruppen zusammengefasst werden.

Die Monumentalverbauung der beiden Donauufer als Verwaltungsforum.

Eine Prachtstraße als Verlängerung der Landstraße mit einem Kulturzentrum und einem neuen Bahnhof.

Die Hermann-Göring-Werke.

Neue Hafenanlagen als Großumschlagplatz.

Linz als Knotenpunkt des Reichsautobahnnetzes.

Einen inneren und einen äußeren Ring um die Stadt für den Verkehr.

Zur Monumentalverbauung der Donauufer.

Das Konzentrationslager Mauthausen und seine Außenlager

Gauleiter Eigruber verkündete am 29. März 1938 begeistert, daß Oberösterreich das Konzentrationslager für alle österreichischen Volksverräter bekommen sollte. Tosender Applaus begleitete diese Ankündigung. Bereits am 8. August wurden die ersten Gefangenen aus dem KZ Dachau nach Mauthausen überstellt.

Mauthausen war wegen der Steinbrüche und des reichhaltigen Lehm Bodens, der sich hervorragend zur Ziegelherstellung eignete, als Standort ausgewählt worden.

Die Gefangenen sollten das Baumaterial für die Linzer Prachtbauten beschaffen. Außerdem rechnete die NS-Führung damit, bei Kriegsausbruch noch mehr Haftraum zu brauchen. Die Zahl der Inhaftierten stieg bis 1944 auf 73.000 Personen an.

In der Stadt Linz befanden sich drei Außenlager.

Das Lager I bestand schon seit 1942 auf dem Gebiet der Reichswerke Hermann Göring, hier lebten über 800 Gefangene, die vor allem die anfallende Hochofenschlacke verarbeiten mußten. Bei einem Luftangriff 1944 wurde es weitgehend zerstört und aufgelöst.

Das Lager II befand sich im Märzenkeller unter dem Bauernberg. Die Häftlinge mußten die Stollenanlagen ausbauen. In den Stollen waren sie auch untergebracht. Das Lager III wurde auch auf dem Gebiet der heutigen Vöest errichtet. Hier waren bis zu 5.600 männliche Gefangene untergebracht und beschäftigt. Sie waren bei der Panzerproduktion in den Eisenwerken Oberdonau eingesetzt, weil dieser Betrieb trotz eines 60 % -igen Ausländeranteils an den Beschäftigten unter ständigem Personalmangel litt. Lager III war das größte innerhalb von Linz.

In der Endphase des Krieges wurden Tausende Häftlinge aus Mauthausen und seinen Nebenlagern für Aufräumarbeiten nach Bombenangriffen, insbesondere zur Aufrechterhaltung des Eisenbahnverkehrs herangezogen. Insgesamt waren mehr als 190.000 Menschen aus allen möglichen Ländern und wegen aller möglichen Gründe nach Mauthausen eingewiesen worden. Systematischer Terror, gezielte Tötungsaktionen, Arbeitsausbeutung, mangelnde Ernährung, unzureichende Bekleidung und fehlende medizinische Versorgung führten zum Tod von circa 100.000 Gefangenen.

Juden in Linz

Mit der Industrialisierung in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts waren vermehrt Juden nach Oberösterreich gezogen. Vor allem Urfahr hatte sich zu einem Zentrum der jüdischen Schnapsproduktion entwickelt. Den Katholiken war nämlich die Erzeugung dieses « teuflischen » Getränkes noch immer verboten.

Um 1900 lebten in Linz circa 700 Juden, in ganz Oberösterreich 1.100. Linz war der Sitz einer eigenen Kultusgemeinde, die Synagoge befand sich in der Bethlehemstraße.

Antisemitismus gab es auch schon vor den Nazis, sogar der Linzer Bischof Gföllner wetterte in einem Hirtenbrief 1933 heftig gegen den jüdischen Weltgeist. Die Nationalsozialisten verbreiteten auch schon während ihrer Illegalität ihre rassistische Propaganda. Jüdische Unternehmer wurden wiederholt als Ausbeuter und Blutsauger beschimpft. Die noch illegalen Nazis legten Listen jüdischer Unternehmer und ihres Vermögens an.

Sofort nach der Machtergreifung ging man gegen die Juden vor. Ihre Geschäfte und ihr Vermögen wurden beschlagnahmt. Sie selbst wurden verhaftet und nach Dachau gebracht. Drei Mitglieder der bekannten Unternehmerfamilie Spitz begingen Selbstmord. Gleich nach dem « Anschluß » erschien eine Anzeige in der Zeitung, daß die Firma Kraus und Schober arisiert sei. Jüdische Kinder durften die normalen Schulen nicht mehr besuchen, sie mußten in die Judenschule im Waaghaus in der Altstadt gehen. In der sogenannten « Reichskristallnacht » ging auch die Synagoge in Linz in Flammen auf.

Leopold Mostny, Urfahrner Ehrenbürger, der stets sehr sozial und um das Gemeinwohl besorgt gewesen war, -er hatte unter anderem den Grund für die Erbauung der Jahnschule hergeschenkt, - wurde 100jährig noch in das KZ-Theresienstadt gebracht, wo er bald darauf starb. Ungefähr 300 jüdischen Menschen gelang die Flucht. 145 wanderten nach Israel aus, knapp 100 in die USA, 45 nach Großbritannien. Insgesamt haben in Oberösterreich vor Ort nur 26 jüdische Personen überlebt, die meisten hatten in einer Mischehe gelebt und hatten daher gegenüber anderen doch gewisse Privilegien. Die Zahl der Rückkehrer war spärlich. Fünf wanderten zurück, acht hatten das KZ überlebt und zogen wieder nach Linz.

Nach Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges lebten kurze Zeit Tausende ostjüdische Vertriebene und Flüchtlinge als « Displaced Persons » in den großen Lagern am Bindermühl und in Ebelsberg in Linz. Die meisten wanderten aber nach der Staatsgründung Israels 1948 weiter. Simon Wiesenthal gründete in Linz das Zentrum für Jüdische Historische Dokumentation. Deshalb erlangte Linz für die historische Forschung besondere Bedeutung.

Erst vor sehr kurzer Zeit erinnerte sich die Stadt Linz ihrer ermordeten jüdischen Mitbewohner und benannte Straßen nach ihnen. In der Mostnystraße befinden sich das Altstoffsammelzentrum und das Tierheim. Nach der Familie Spitz und nach dem Präsidenten der jüdischen Kultusgemeinde Karl Schwager sind zwei kleine Wege in der Nähe des Volkshauses Dornach benannt.

Die Tötung « lebensunwerten Lebens »

Die Landes- und Pflegeanstalt Niedernhart hatte den dreißiger Jahren auf beachtliche Erfolge mit der « Arbeitstherapie », die der ärztliche Leiter Doktor Josef Böhm eingeführt hatte, erzielt und sich damit einen rundum sehr guten Ruf erworben. Der « Anschluß » brachte für die Psychiatrie große Veränderungen.

Menschen die keinen sichtbaren oder messbaren Nutzen für den Staat bringen konnten, hatten im NS-System keinen Platz. Schwachsinnige, Epileptiker, Schizophrene, körperlich Missgebildete, erblich Blinde, ... waren in Deutschland sofort nach der Machtergreifung Hitlers per Gesetz zwangssterilisiert worden. Diese Gesetze galten nun auch für Österreich.

Ende 1938 begann man mit der Kindereuthanasie, im Juli 1938 mit der Erwachseneneneuthanasie. Man rechnete aus, was diese Leute dem Staat kosteten, daß man ihre Plätze und Pfleger sinnvoller für Lazarette verwenden könnte und beschloß daher, diese Menschen umzubringen.

Neue Leiter von Niedernhart und Hartheim wurden Doktor Lonauer und Doktor Renno. Schloß Hartheim bei Alkoven, wo sich übrigens 2003 eine Landesausstellung mit dem Thema befassen wird, wurde für Österreich zum Ort des Grauens. Zu Ostern 1940 wurde mit der Tötung der Patienten begonnen.

Niedernhart war manchmal Durchgangsstation, beziehungsweise oft Tarnadresse für den eigentlichen Bestimmungsort.

Meist wurden die Behinderten in Hartheim vergast, die Angehörigen bekamen eine Sterbeurkunde mit falschen Angaben. Weil die Bevölkerung mit diesen Aktionen absolut nicht einverstanden war, sich immer mehr Unmut darüber regte, und auch die Kirchen heftig protestierten, wurde die Tötung Geisteskranker offiziell eingestellt. Heimlich und unter noch größeren Tarnaktionen ging die Ermordung aber weiter und zwar nun auch in Niedernhart selbst.

Die Leiter des Krankenhauses hatten den Ehrgeiz, alle Patienten loszuwerden, damit sie die Betten verwundeten Soldaten zur Verfügung stellen konnten.

Nach Kriegsende beging Doktor Lonauer mit seiner Familie Selbstmord. Doktor Renno tauchte unter und konnte deshalb nie zur Verantwortung seiner Verbrechen vor Gericht gestellt werden.

Der Ausländereinsatz

Bereits ab Mai 1939 spielten tschechische und slowakische Bauarbeiter eine wichtige Rolle beim Bau. 2.000 Männer waren im Lager Schlantendorf bei Sankt Magdalena untergebracht. Jeden Morgen zogen sie zu einer Großbaustelle und arbeiten dort bis zum späten Abend.

Mit Kriegsausbruch verschärfte sich die Situation am Arbeitsmarkt.

Die österreichischen Männer mußten in den Krieg ziehen, also brauchte man jede Menge Arbeiter, meist Zwangsarbeiter aus anderen Ländern.

Im September lebten 20.541 ausländische Arbeitskräfte in Linz. Die Hälfte waren Italiener, die mit Benito Mussolini nicht einverstanden waren und deshalb zur Zwangsarbeit geschickt worden waren. Es waren aber fast 25 Nationen unter den Zwangsarbeitern vertreten. Nur 740 Facharbeiter lebten in Privatquartieren, der Rest war in Baracken- oft unter katastrophalen Bedingungen- untergebracht.

1943 gab es in Linz 84 solcher Lager.

Kriegsgefangene Russen wurden vor allem im Lager Auhof untergebracht. Der Großteil der Zwangsarbeiter war männlich, aber es gab sogar eigene Frauenlager. Eingesetzt wurden diese Menschen in fast allen Bereichen, nach den Bombenangriffen vor allem auch zu Aufräumarbeiten und zur Entschärfung von Blindgehern.

Ab 1944 wurde die Wochenarbeitszeit für alle Beschäftigten auf 72 Stunden ausgedehnt.

In manchen Betrieben betrug der Anteil der ausländischen Arbeitskräfte 60 und sogar 70 % .

All diese Menschen bekamen fast nichts bezahlt und wurden außerdem oft äußerst schlecht behandelt und teilweise sogar verprügelt.

Die Firmen, die solche Menschen beschäftigten, sparten sich so viel Geld. In den fünfziger Jahren wurde zwischen Magistrat Linz und verschiedenen Firmen heftig über Zahlungen gestritten, dann ließ man die Sache einschlafen. Erst in den letzten Jahren wurde wieder über Entschädigungszahlen der noch Überlebenden diskutiert. Momentan befassen sich Historikerkommissionen und ein Auftragswerk des Landestheaters mit diesem Thema.

Das Ende

Lange Zeit waren viele Linzer besonders begeistert vom Nationalsozialismus. Das änderte sich aber je deutlicher Linz die Folgen des Krieges spürte, die Rationierung von allen Lebensmitteln und anderen Gebrauchsgütern des Alltages und die damit verbundenen Preissteigerungen waren schon unangenehm, die Auswirkungen der Fliegerangriffe aber noch viel schlimmer.

Zwischen Juli 1944 und April 1945 gab es auf Linz 22 Fliegerangriffe. Linz war vor allem wegen seiner Schwerindustrie zum bevorzugten Ziel der alliierten Bomber geworden.

Als trauriges Ergebnis von 22 Bombenangriffen blieben :

691 total beschädigte.

1.174 schwer beschädigte.

1.284 mittel und 8.935 leicht beschädigte Häuser zurück.

Das war ein Drittel des Linzer Häuserbestandes.

20.000 Menschen waren obdachlos geworden. Schwerer als die materiellen Schäden wogen die 1679 Toten und die annähernd gleich hohe Zahl an Schwer- und Leichtverletzten. Ein besonders trauriges Ereignis war der Bombenangriff vom 16. Oktober 1944 gewesen. In der Dürnbergerschule waren 40 Berufsschülerinnen ums Leben gekommen. Eine Gedenktafel in der Otto-Glöckl-Schule erinnert daran. Obwohl das Ende schon abzusehen war und in Wien bereits eine provisorische österreichische Regierung zusammengetreten war, wollten die oberösterreichischen Führer noch weiter kämpfen und auch noch die Nibelungenbrücke sprengen lassen. Nur mühsam gelang es besonnenen Personen, August Eigruber von diesem Wahnsinn abzuhalten.

Zwei Vertreter der Stadt - Kreisleiter Franz Danzer und Doktor Rosenauer als Dolmetscher- verhandelten am 4. Mai in Rottenegg mit den Amerikanern.

Am nächsten Tag rückten um 11 Uhr die ersten Panzer der 11. Amerikanischen Division auf dem Linzer Hauptplatz ein. Der Krieg für Linz war zu Ende, aber die Stadt lag weitgehend in Schutt und Asche.

Les Juifs en Autriche

L'histoire des juifs d'Autriche est inséparable de l'Empire d'Autriche jusqu'au XXe siècle puis des persécutions nazies à partir des années 1930.

Les Ires communautés juives se sont installées à la fin du XIIIe siècle. L'Autriche est devenu un centre culturel juif au cours du XIIIe siècle. Les Ires expulsions remontent au XIVe siècles. D'autres ont eu lieu par la suite, comme celle de 1669. En 1867, l'Empereur François-Joseph accorde aux Juifs l'égalité des droits. Dès lors, une bourgeoisie juive assimilée se développe contribuant fortement à la vie culturelle, économique et scientifique autrichienne. En 1900, Vienne, grâce à la présence de ses élites juives, peut apparaître selon les mots de Walter Benjamin comme « la capitale du XXe siècle » .

Pourtant, au même moment, se développent les nouvelles formes de l'antisémitisme nourries par la longue crise qui commence en 1870. 2 mouvements se distinguent : le « Christlichsoziale » influencé par l'anti-judaïsme religieux et l'« Alldeutschen » , un mouvement pan-germaniste. Adolf Hitler qui séjourne à Vienne, de 1907 à 1913, sera fortement influencé par ces 2 mouvements. Après la Première Guerre mondiale et la naissance de la république d'Autriche qui consacre la disparition de l'Empire austro-Hongrois, 201,513 juifs sont concentrés à Vienne.

Après 1918, les Sociaux-Démocrates dominent le vie politique. Malgré l'antisémitisme ambiant, aucune mesure anti-juive n'est prise. Dans les années 1930, on compte quelque 200,000 Juifs vivant en Autriche (recensement 1934 : 191,481) , principalement à Vienne (1934 : 176,034) . En 1934, un régime autoritaire est installé en Autriche. Le nombre de juifs dans les secteurs bancaire, judiciaire et médical diminue.

Suite à l' « Anschluß » avec l'Allemagne nazie, le 12 mars 1938, l'antisémitisme explose. De nombreux commerces juifs sont pillés. Les scènes d'humiliation publique sont fréquentes. Ruth Maier raconte dans son journal :

« Même si les Juifs ne jouissaient pas tout à fait des mêmes droits que le reste de la population, ils occupaient cependant une place décente. Désormais, ils sont ravalés au rang d'animaux, de porcs, de non humains. »

Les lois antisémites en vigueur dans le « Reich » s'appliquent désormais à l'Autriche. Elle raconte encore les violences subies par les Juifs :

« La rue est déserte. Un jeune Juif bien vêtu, arrive au coin. 2 SS surgissent. L'un, puis l'autre, donne une gifle au Juif qui vacille, se tient la tête et poursuit son chemin. »

« L'Autriche devient le laboratoire de la politique antisémite » du « Reich » . Les Nazis y développent la politique des aryansisations forcées mais aussi l'émigration forcée. En août 1938, Adolf Eichmann crée la centrale pour l'émigration juive, la « Zentralstelle für Jüdische Auswanderung in Wien » . Elle prévoit de dépouiller de leurs biens les Juifs avant leur départ, en mai 1939. La moitié des juifs d'Autriche a quitté le pays ; les 2/3, en septembre 1939. En tout, 130,000 personnes sont concernées. Le modèle est copié en Allemagne après la « nuit de cristal » puis en Bohême-Moravie. Avec la guerre, l'émigration devient difficile. Dans un 1er temps, Eichmann envoie 1,584 juifs autrichiens dans les environs de Lublin mais l'opération est interrompue par Heinrich Himmler. En février 1941, les déportations reprennent. Elles concernent 5,031 personnes. Mais les préparatifs de l'invasion de l'URSS interrompent le processus. Après les succès de l'opération « Barbarossa » , les Juifs autrichiens sont de nouveau déportés à Łódź, Riga, Minsk ou encore « Theresienstadt » (plus de 15,000 personnes) . En tout, près de 49,000 Juifs sont déportés. Seul 2,162 survivront.

65,500 des 191,481 Juifs autrichiens et à peu près 25,000 « mischlings » sont assassinés par les Nazis ; on connaît les noms de 62,000 d'entre-eux. Tous les autres (de 130,000 à 155,000) se réfugient à l'étranger où survivent en se cachant. Entre 2,000 et 5,000 survivent à la « Shoah » en Autriche ou dans les camps de concentration.

À la chute du « Rideau de fer » , un nouveau flux de Juifs arrive en provenance de l'ancienne Union soviétique. Au recensement de 2001, la population juive autrichienne était estimée autour de 8,140 personnes, essentiellement à Vienne (7,000) . Les estimations de 2007-2008 évoquent le chiffre de 15,000 à 20,000 juifs en Autriche.

...

C'est à Paris, où il suivait l'affaire Dreyfus pour le quotidien viennois « Neue Freie Presse » , que Theodor Herzl a inventé le sionisme. Si la patrie des droits de l'homme, pensait-il, se laisse gagner à son tour par les fureurs de l'antisémitisme, c'est la preuve que les juifs ne verront pas la fin de leurs tourments tant qu'ils n'auront pas une terre à eux sur laquelle ils ne seront plus minoritaires.

Juif hongrois devenu à Vienne un journaliste réputé, Herzl pouvait, à juste titre, comparer sa situation à celle des juifs

français. Traités avec bienveillance par l'Empereur François-Joseph qui apprécie leur talent et leur loyauté à la couronne, les juifs occupent en Autriche, jusqu'aux années 1880, des positions importantes dans la banque, l'industrie et le monde politique, comme le montre Jacques Le Rider dans une enquête passionnante sur le malaise de la conscience juive dans la Vienne « fin de siècle » .

Tant que l'Autriche a eu un régime électoral censitaire, gauche Libérale et droite conservatrice alternaient au pouvoir. La bourgeoisie juive soutenait le camp Libéral. « Tout petit juif, bon élève, écrit Sigmund Freud, portait alors dans son sac d'écolier un portefeuille ministériel. » Mais le suffrage universel a radicalisé le partage.

La droite est devenue nationaliste et antisémite ; la gauche, socialiste. Les juifs ont été progressivement exclus du jeu politique. Ardents partisans de l'action républicaine des années 1880, les juifs français, aussi, se sont crus pleinement intégrés à la nation jusqu'à l'explosion d'antisémitisme de l'affaire Dreyfus, qui les a ramenés au principe de réalité. La comparaison s'arrête là. L'antisémitisme n'a pas été définitivement vaincu en France par la réhabilitation de Dreyfus. Il s'est réveillé dans les années 1930 et il renaît aujourd'hui chez les Français musulmans. Il a même été au pouvoir sous Vichy, grâce à un solide appui de l'occupant. Mais il est toujours resté un courant politique minoritaire et peu fréquentable.

Dans l'Empire austro-hongrois et les États nationaux qui en sont issus, l'antisémitisme est devenu un code politique dominant. Tous les écrivains et les artistes du milieu viennois, dont Jacques Le Rider dissèque subtilement les rapports à leur judéité, s'identifiaient à la culture allemande qu'ils illustraient avec éclat. Ils ont senti venir ce rejet comme une tragédie inéluctable qu'ils ont, chacun à sa manière, tenté d'exorciser.

Hugo von Hofmannsthal, le flamboyant librettiste de Richard Strauß, a choisi le déni en s'identifiant à la part non juive de ses origines familiales. Karl Kraus, polémiste redoutable, a carrément rallié l'antisémitisme. Mais ce qu'on a attribué à la « haine de soi » n'était peut-être chez lui qu'une manière de dénoncer le conformisme soumis de nombreux juifs viennois. Gustav Mahler s'est abandonné avec masochisme à sa fascination pour le génie wagnérien. La conversion d'Arnold Schönberg au protestantisme est, au contraire, un geste de rupture avec le catholicisme autrichien. Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler ou Stefan Zweig ne se sont pas ré-approprié leur judéité par un souci d'enracinement identitaire mais pour défendre leur honneur face aux insultes et à la haine.

Car pour ces juifs qui jouaient un rôle décisif dans l'extraordinaire floraison culturelle de l'Autriche-Hongrie, à Vienne mais aussi à Budapest, Prague, Zagreb, Trieste et nombre d'autres villes de la double monarchie, la Terre promise ne se situait pas dans une improbable Palestine. Elle se logeait dans la modernité du bel aujourd'hui que leur imagination créatrice ne cessait de redessiner. Ils ne réclamaient pas, comme les autres nations de l'Empire, une portion de l'Autriche-Hongrie. Cette mosaïque de peuples et de religions entraînée dans un grand mouvement de libéralisation, ils l'aimaient et la voulaient tout entière.

Comme les héros de Robert Musil dans « l'Homme sans qualités » , ils étaient tentés de voir dans cette utopie en marche un message d'espoir pour l'Europe et pour l'humanité. Mais ils étaient assez lucides pour pressentir qu'il n'en serait rien.

...

Rares ont été les périodes aussi fécondes politiquement, scientifiquement et culturellement que la Vienne de la fin du XIXe et du début du XXe siècle. Les Juifs, à qui l'Empire Libéral a accordé l'égalité des droits, affluent dans cette capitale de la « Mitteleuropa » et s'imposent rapidement à l'avant-garde dans tous les domaines.

Dans son ouvrage aussi passionnant que complet, Jacques Le Rider nous fait revivre l'effervescence du socialisme et du sionisme naissants dans une société où le raffinement s'accommode très bien d'un antisémitisme de plus en plus virulent et structuré idéologiquement. Il nous initie, à travers une saisissante galerie de portraits, à la naissance de notre modernité : la psychanalyse avec Freud, la littérature avec Schnitzler et Zweig, la musique avec Mahler et Schönberg, la critique du journalisme avec Karl Kraus.

Dans l'Empire austro-hongrois et les États nationaux qui en sont issus, l'antisémitisme est devenu un code politique dominant. Tous les écrivains et les artistes du milieu viennois, dont Jacques Le Rider dissèque subtilement les rapports à leur judéité, s'identifiaient à la culture allemande qu'ils illustraient avec éclat. Ils ont senti venir ce rejet comme une tragédie inéluctable qu'ils ont, chacun à sa manière, tenté d'exorciser.

Car, pour ces juifs qui jouaient un rôle décisif dans l'extraordinaire floraison culturelle de l'Autriche-Hongrie, à Vienne mais aussi à Budapest, Prague, Zagreb, Trieste et nombre d'autres villes de la double monarchie, la Terre promise ne se situait pas dans une improbable Palestine. Elle se logeait dans la modernité du bel aujourd'hui que leur imagination créatrice ne cessait de redessiner. Ils ne réclamaient pas, comme les autres nations de l'Empire, une portion de l'Autriche-Hongrie. Cette mosaïque de peuples et de religions entraînée dans un grand mouvement de libéralisation, ils l'aimaient et la voulaient tout entière.

Dans ce monde-là, celui que l'on retrouve sous la plume de Proust, les élites de la bourgeoisie, mêlées aux derniers représentants de l'ancienne aristocratie, préférèrent, au pouvoir politique, la quête de soi, l'espérance en la science et les valeurs de l'art et du Libéralisme. Moment unique de passion, de beauté et de frustration qui se transformera en cauchemar sanglant avec la montée des nationalismes.

...

Freud, Zweig, Roth et tant d'autres ont cru à cette Vienne, capitale moderne et Libérale d'un Empire austro-hongrois pluraliste, monarchie bicéphale tolérante pour ses minorités qui avait consacré l'émancipation des Juifs. Éducation, pleine égalité des droits (1867), accès à la Fonction publique et à toute profession ; la modernité éclairée avait mené à son terme l'assimilation des Juifs sous la houlette de l'Empereur François-Joseph.

Jacques Le Rider, germaniste et grand spécialiste de la « Mitteleuropa » (l'Europe centrale), scrute l'envers du décor de cette Vienne Impériale de la Belle Époque qui lance et relance cette étrange et inquiétante question de la judéité, cette sempiternelle dialectique du même et de l'autre. Narcissisme de la petite différence ? Les Juifs viennois, en tout

point comparables à leurs compatriotes « de souche », ne seront jamais des Viennois invisibles, comme les autres. D'abord, les Juifs viennois intégrés se retournent contre les Juifs venus de l'Est (« Ostjuden ») qui, de Galicie polonaise et de Bucovine, affluent dans la capitale. Mais que signifie le mot « juif » ? Une confession, une nationalité parmi d'autres, des us et coutumes, l'impulsion décisive donnée à la vie culturelle ? Pour la majorité, ils se sentent « juifs des 3 jours de l'année » (Pâque juive, Nouvel-An juif et Grand Pardon) , viennois jusqu'au bout des doigts.

Mais, depuis les années 1890, l'antisémitisme feutré est devenu « code culturel » et il est de bon ton d'afficher, sans vergogne, cette attitude politiquement correcte dans la bonne société et dans la presse. C'est Karl Lueger (1844-1910) , dirigeant du Parti Chrétien-Social, devenu le maire inamovible de Vienne dont Adolf Hitler se réclamera, qui fédère toute la lie antisémite. Anti-capitalisme et catholicisme radical, anti-Libéralisme et pan-germanisme ; l'assimilation est remise en question jusqu'à la glissade mortelle vers le mot « race » . La sinistre « question juive » fait son entrée, pour n'en plus sortir, dans le débat public. Face à la montée d'un péril de plus en plus brutal, des personnalités montent au créneau, ceux qui savent ce que le mot « juif » veut dire. Le rabbin Joseph Samuel Bloch ferraille dans les journaux, les associations, et même comme député, contre cette haine.

Peine perdue car l'antisémitisme est une passion irréductible, irrationnelle. Nationalisme en miroir, le sionisme offre à Nathan Birnbaum ou à Theodor Herzl la possibilité de penser les Juifs comme peuple avec une langue et un État ou, à tout le moins, une autonomie dans l'Empire. Dans la Vienne littéraire, des écrivains se sentent mal à l'aise. Hugo von Hofmannsthal, élitiste et snob, officier de cavalerie autrichien, déteste de se voir mêler à « tous ces lémures menant une existence parasitaire » . Mais le mot « juif » lui colle à la peau. Même un Karl Kraus, dans la revue « La Torche » , pourfendeur infatigable du journalisme, « ersatz » de littérature et symptôme d'abaissement intellectuel, fustige, parfois dans des termes que ne récuserait pas un antisémite, la marchandisation totale du monde à venir.

...

L'Édit de Tolérance, promulgué par l'Empereur Joseph II, en 1781, ouvrit aux Juifs l'accès aux institutions scolaires et universitaires, ainsi qu'aux métiers dont ils étaient exclus ; en 1787, la carrière militaire leur fut également ouverte. Dans la période qui suivit jusqu'en 1848, les familles juives établies à Vienne s'assimilèrent bien dans la culture bourgeoise allemande, nourrie de l'idéal universaliste de Goethe, Schiller ou Humboldt.

Parallèlement, de nombreux audacieux firent florès dans l'industrie, la banque, le commerce, et furent anoblis par l'Empereur. Comme en Allemagne et dans toutes les sociétés européennes, les Juifs étaient les agents de la modernisation économique et culturelle :

« Ils le sont à Vienne sans doute plus encore que dans d'autres régions de culture allemande, dans la mesure où le type humain façonné par l'éthique protestante, que Max Weber considère comme indissociable de l'esprit du capitalisme, est marginal dans le système culturel autrichien, ce qui attise, à Vienne, le conflit entre le type du juif capitaliste et la tradition anti-capitaliste du catholicisme social. »

Après 1848, l'idéal politique Libéral triompha pendant une trentaine d'années, qui furent l'âge d'or de l'intégration des

Juifs dans la société et la culture viennoises. Mais à partir de 1880, le processus engagé dû faire face à 2 facteurs : le renforcement de l'antisémitisme, suite aux conséquences sociales du « krach » boursier de 1873, et l'afflux dans la ville de juifs pauvres et traditionnalistes des frontières orientales de l'Empire. Entre 1857 et 1910, la population globale de Vienne fut multipliée par 5 mais sa population juive par 28, formant 8,6 % de la population totale, contre 3,7 % à Berlin.

Telle est la toile de fond sur laquelle se déroula la vie des Juifs viennois à la « Belle Époque ». L'éminent germaniste Jacques Le Rider, un des meilleurs connaisseurs français de l'Europe centrale, l'analyse dans un ouvrage passionnant. Comment des Juifs qui n'étaient pratiquement plus juifs, ont-ils affronté un antisémitisme souvent virulent, alimenté tantôt par l'anti-capitalisme marxiste qui travaillait la classe ouvrière, tantôt par l'hostilité « bourgeoise » aux nouvelles formes d'art, ou encore par l'anti-judaïsme d'une certaine tradition catholique ?

Pour répondre à la question, Jacques Le Rider a questionné quelques grandes figures de la modernité viennoise. À commencer par Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), qui resta fidèle au judaïsme mais sous le signe de la rationalité scientifique athée. De son côté, Arthur Schnitzler (1862-1931), l'auteur doux-amer de « La Ronde » et d'un prémonitoire « Vienne au crépuscule », a souvent évoqué dans ses œuvres la difficulté pour un Juif d'oublier qu'il est un juif, « car les autres ne l'oubliaient pas, ni les chrétiens, ni encore moins les juifs ». De fait, un nombre croissant de Juifs, revendiquant leur « judaïté », reprochèrent aux « assimilés » de renier leurs origines : du journaliste Karl Kraus qui adressait aux Juifs toutes sortes de reproches dans des termes que les antisémites n'auraient pas reniés, à Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), qui, retrouvant des attaches ancestrales, lança le mouvement sioniste de retour en Palestine.

Brillante incarnation de la Jeune-Vienne littéraire et futur librettiste de Richard Strauß (« Le Chevalier à la Rose », « Elektra », « Ariane à Naxos »), Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1874-1929), d'une famille anoblie par l'Empereur, constitue un cas troublant :

« Lui qui n'avait dans les veines qu'un quart de sang juif peut cependant être considéré, à maints égards, comme écrivain juif. », disait Martin Buber en 1939.

Le Rider enchaîne :

« Malgré son rejet du judaïsme et son allergie aux discours sociaux concernant la « question juive », malgré son identité culturelle, de toute évidence viennoise, autrichienne et catholique, malgré sa prédilection pour le style aristocratique et l'art Baroque, cet auteur est considéré bien souvent, aujourd'hui encore, comme un « Juif viennois » . »

Autre grand nom de la littérature, Stefan Zweig (1881-1942). Né dans la « bonne bourgeoisie », membre à ses débuts du mouvement « jeune-juif », inspiré par l'idéologie moderniste du « Jugendstil », il refusait que le judaïsme abandonne son universalité pour se figer dans un repli hébraïque ou sioniste. Il privilégia pour lui-même un cosmopolitisme européen de grand lettré, et voyait dans l'assimilation aux cultures nationales la solution la plus

souhaitable pour les Juifs européens. Cet optimisme l'aveugla un temps, si bien qu'il tomba des nues en 1914 lorsqu'il découvrit que son cher Emile Verhaeren tenait des propos anti-allemands et antisémites. En 1934, il se résolut à quitter Vienne.

Pour finir, 2 grandes figures du monde musical. De culture allemande et passionné de Richard Wagner, Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) devint la cible des antisémites dès le moment où il occupa le poste de chef d'orchestre à l'Opéra de Vienne, en 1897. Il le supportait mal. Mais beaucoup voient en lui, comme Max Brod, l'ami de Kafka, un éminent exemple de symbiose judéo-allemande, comparable à Heinrich Heine. De son côté, Arnold Schönberg (1874-1951), converti au protestantisme luthérien, confronté à l'antisémitisme croissant, se convertit au judaïsme en 1934. Il est le compositeur de l'admirable « Moïse et Aaron » et de l'émouvant « Survivant de Varsovie ».

Au moment de l'« Anschluß », en 1938, Vienne comptait environ 182,000 Juifs. Quelque 120,000 purent émigrer avant la fin de 1939. Quelque 49,000 furent déportés, dont 2,142 survécurent. Un monde était anéanti, mais nous vivons encore de ce que des Juifs viennois ont découvert, inventé, créé.

...

L'« aryansisation », c'est-à-dire la dépossession des biens des Juifs s'est d'abord exercée d'une façon sauvage avant d'être ensuite relayée et organisée par l'État nazi. Si cette spoliation ne fut, ces dernières années, évoquée que dans le cadre des vols spectaculaires d'œuvres d'art, les razzias effectuées par la police secrète d'état ne concernaient pourtant pas seulement les œuvres d'art, l'argent et autres objets de valeur. À Vienne comme ailleurs, la « Gestapo » raflait également dans les maisons des Juifs les objets les plus ordinaires et les plus quotidiens. Les couverts rangés dans les tiroirs, le linge serré dans les armoires jusqu'aux souvenirs photographiques ne furent pas épargnés.

C'est ainsi que le mobilier de 8 familles juives viennoises « expropriées » fut entreposé en mars 1938, après l'« Anschluß », dans un garde-meuble de l'État autrichien à Vienne (« Kaiserliches Hofmobiliendepot »). Une grande part de ce mobilier fit l'objet d'un inventaire et devint alors propriété de l'État autrichien. Bien peu de ces objets après guerre fut restitué à leurs anciens propriétaires.

Pendant l'époque nazi et jusqu'en 1998, le mobilier provenant de ce fonds (conformément à la fonction même de ce dépôt) fut prêté avant tout aux services de l'administration. Jusqu'à l'époque la plus récente et sans même que les utilisateurs de ces objets n'en aient su la provenance, ce mobilier se retrouvait dans de simples bureaux ministériels, dans les ambassades autrichiennes à l'étranger, voire dans les théâtres. Depuis 1994, l'administration de ce dépôt mobilier a entrepris une recherche approfondie. Au terme de cette recherche, une partie de ces objets encore existants a pu, dès 1998, en vertu de la loi de restitution, être rendue aux familles des anciens propriétaires.

Ces données historiques constituent le point de départ de l'exposition. Elle a pour objet de thématiser l'« aryansisation » des biens de ces 8 familles juives et de rendre compte de la façon dont les institutions d'État ont, jusqu'à l'époque la plus récente, considéré ces objets. Le cas de ces 8 familles ne reflète qu'une partie infime de la dépossession totale des biens des Juifs. Mais ces illustrations rendent intelligibles, d'une façon exemplaire, les

mécanismes de ce processus brutal. Par exemple : la transformation d'une razzia et d'une expropriation en un simple acte administratif. La « légalisation » et la « normalisation » ayant été rendues possibles par le fait même que les institutions ont été partie prenante de cet acte de barbarie.

...

From 1933 to 1938, transfers of Jewish owned enterprises to German ownership was « voluntary » . At the time of the Nazi take-over, in 1933, there were about 100,000 Jewish owned enterprises in Germany. It is estimated that the value of Jewish help assets, at this time, was in excess of 10 billion « Reichsmarks » . During this « voluntary » period, there was relentless pressure placed on Jews to sell their businesses. By the spring of 1938, 60 % to 70 % of Jewish businesses had been liquidated pursuant to the Decree on the Registration of the Property of Jews of April 26, 1938, all Jews were required to value all their assets (foreign and domestic) and register them if their value was in excess of 5,000 « Reichsmarks » . As a result of this decree, the value of Jewish assets in « greater Germany » (including Austria) was about 8 billion « Reichsmarks » . The compulsory stage of « Aryanization » began with legislation enacted in November, 1938, the goal of which was to « exclude the Jews from the economic life of Germany » . The regulations adopted pursuant to this legislation, prohibited all economic activity of Jews except for certain services that could be rendered to Jews only. In addition, all remaining Jewish businesses were put under government control with the goal of sale to Germans with a substantial portion of the sales price going to the government.

After « Kristallnacht » , the Nazis commenced open confiscation of Jewish property. 2 of the major forms of such confiscation were the imposition of the « Suhneleistung » (atonment payment) , also known as the Jewish Capital Levy (JUVA) and the « Reichsfluchtsteuer » (escape tax) . The former was enacted on November 12, 1938, and imposed a tax of 20 % (later raised to 25 %) of the registered assets of the Jews. 1.25 billion « Reichsmarks » were collected from this tax. The latter tax had to be paid by Jews on leaving Germany, including deportation to concentration camps outside Germany. The amount of the tax was 25 % of registered assets. As a result of these levies and others, those Jews fortunate enough to emigrate were able to save only a small portion of their assets. For Jews remaining in Germany after 1938, whatever assets they had left were kept in blocked accounts in specified financial institutions, from which only a modest amount could be withdrawn for their living expenses.

Since the end of the War, enormous amounts of money have been paid by Germany to the victims of Nazi oppression. The 1st official claim was presented by the Jewish Agency in September, 1945, to the Allied governments. Between 1945 and 1947, the occupying powers enacted various legislation dealing with reparations, particularly regarding real estate. With the founding of the State of Israel, in 1948, the Jewish State, together with the major world Jewish organizations (later organized as the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany) , assumed the major responsibility in representing the Jewish people with respect to their claims. Beginning in 1951, Israel submitted notes to the Allied powers regarding reparations. Although claiming to be sympathetic, the Allied powers made it clear that the issue of reparations would have to be negotiated directly with the West-German government. Over the next 2 years, extensive negotiations took place. Finally, on March 18, 1953, an agreement was approved by all parties. Payments under this agreement ended in 1965. East-Germany did recognize any such claims until 1990. In 2000, a

multi-billion dollar fund was established by the German government, numerous German corporations and other institutions to compensate those individuals who were forced laborers under the Nazi regime.

...

The seizure, confiscation, and theft of Jewish property during the Holocaust took place throughout Europe on a massive scale. Historian Raul Hilberg included in his analysis the expropriation of Jewish property as one of the main stages that comprised the Holocaust. Nazi Germany introduced a wide variety of confiscation measures from 1933, which were implemented by both the financial bureaucracy and the police. The « Aryanisation » of Jewish businesses (their transfer to non-Jewish ownership) during the 1930's saw many companies and private individuals competing to grab the spoils, as the Jews were driven from most branches of the economy. Similar anti-Jewish economic policies were pursued in the territories annexed and occupied by Nazi Germany from the late-1930's. Most States aligned with Nazi Germany (including Vichy France, fascist Italy, and Hungary) also introduced their own extensive legal measures to confiscate Jewish property.

Soon after the Nazi seizure of power, in 1933, Jews were excluded from the civil service and other key-professions, such as the law. A highly-visible boycott of Jewish businesses, in April, aimed to demonstrate public pressure for action against the Jews. The 1st new laws specifically authorizing the confiscation of property were directed mainly against the Nazis' political opponents in July 1933. Some Jews were affected immediately by these laws. By the start of World War II, the law for the denaturalization of emigrants, passed in July 1933, was being applied to expropriate the remaining property of thousands of Jewish emigrants.

The « Aryanisation » of businesses gathered pace during the 1930's as successive measures limited the access of « Jewish-owned companies » to state contracts and government-controlled raw materials. Currency exchange and tax laws were applied in a discriminatory way to seize Jewish property and encourage Jewish emigration. Many Jews were dismissed from employment and forced to resign from company boards, even before specific laws made this compulsory. Business ownership was transferred into « Aryan » hands, sometimes directly through black-mail and coercion. In other cases, Jews sold cheaply, anticipating still harsher measures to come. The guiding Nazi principle was that the Jews must leave, but their property should remain behind. Onerous taxes on emigration and property transfer meant that even Jews who successfully fled Germany could export only a fraction of their former wealth.

The annexation of Austria, in 1938, accelerated the process of expropriation. Here, so-called « wild Aryanisations » took place on a massive scale, as Austrian Nazis simply seized hundreds of Jewish businesses. Both the registration of Jewish property and decrees regulating compulsory Aryanisation reflected efforts by the Nazi authorities to reassert State control over « Aryanisation ». The « Kristallnacht » (Night of Broken Glass) violence, on November 9-10, 1938, which included much looting as well as wanton destruction, was exploited by « Reich » Marshal Hermann Göring, in charge of the 4 Year Plan, to impose a 1 billion « Reichsmark » fine on the Jews. This was collected over the following year through the regular tax-offices. It took the form of a special wealth tax of 25 % . Meanwhile, the Central Office for Jewish Emigration in Vienna, supervised by Adolf Eichmann, also sought to tax wealthier Jews to help cover the emigration costs of those lacking sufficient means.

On the outbreak of War, in September 1939, the blocking of bank accounts was applied to all propertied Jews to secure what little wealth remained. Largely excluded from employment, Jews faced forced labor for little or no pay. Initial expulsions of Jews into the General gouvernement (a part of German-occupied Poland) and also France, in 1939-1940, were accompanied by efforts to seize their remaining property for the State. Mass deportations of Jews from Germany to the ghettos and extermination camps, then, commenced in October 1941. Shortly after this, the infamous 11th Decree to the « Reich » Citizenship Law removed the citizenship of Jews on crossing the « Reich » border, thereby confiscating all remaining property from that instant. The « Gestapo » sealed the apartments and collected detailed inventories from the deportees ; the financial administration used this documentation to clear-out the apartments, sell-off the contents, and wind-up remaining accounts « legally » .

In the occupied East, the Nazis and their collaborators seized Jewish property in each phase of persecution. During ghettoization, sudden relocation forced Jews to leave property behind to be looted. Then Jews in the ghettos had to barter away most of what remained to obtain food to survive. At the mass shooting sites, property was taken directly from Jewish victims, with the most valuable items being sent to Berlin. Considerable efforts were made also to recycle every last item transported by train with the Jews to the extermination centers, such as Auschwitz or Treblinka.

It is important to note that the Axis-aligned and occupied States, including Bulgaria, which did not deport its own Jews to be killed, all implemented extensive confiscation measures, except for occupied Denmark. Bulgaria created a Commissariat for the « Jewish Question » in imitation of the French model and also imposed a stiff property tax on Jewish wealth. Vichy, France, introduced its own confiscation legislation in response to German measures, in part to assert French sovereignty in these matters. In Hungary, full-scale confiscation began in May 1944 concurrent with the deportations to Auschwitz ; the Hungarian government declared that Jewish assets were now viewed as Hungarian national property. In practice, however, confiscation in Hungary became a competition between private looters, various State agencies, and also the Germans to secure what they could under the chaotic conditions of sudden ghettoization. Meanwhile, the Allied nations and governments-in-exile warned that Axis property seizures, including those implemented against Jews, were regarded as illegal, and would be reversed on the conclusion of the War.

Clearly, the mass confiscation of Jewish property was integral to the Holocaust. However, it would be an exaggeration to imply that the Holocaust was motivated primarily by greed. Nazi racial anti-Semitism contained various key-elements, of which economic opportunism was only one strand. Nevertheless, economic discrimination and plunder acted as a catalyst, facilitating the Nazi process of destruction in several ways. The incentive of Jewish property provided an additional motive for some perpetrators and bought more wide-spread complicity from large sections of the general population, while the effect on the victims was demoralizing, debilitating, and stigmatizing. Ever-diminishing means reduced the opportunities for Jews to emigrate or flee, and ultimately it also wore down their physical ability to resist.

Real property, tenancy rights, personal property - expropriation during the Nazi era

Real property was « aryanised » soon after the « Anschluß » . Jews were forced to sell their real property because they were no longer admitted to their professions and the basis for their livelihood was destroyed. At the same time,

they had to generate the funds required to pay discriminatory taxes and finance their flight from the country. Jewish property was transferred to non-Jewish owners and the proceeds were transferred to blocked accounts.

The new tax on registered Jewish assets (« Judenvermögensabgabe ») was imposed after the November Pogrom and proved an additional pressure on Jewish real property owners. With the decree of 3 December 1938 on the use of Jewish assets, Jews were forced to sell their property. « De-Jewification » of real property was now compulsory and decreed from above. The 11th Amendment to the « Reich » Citizenship Act of 25 November 1941 reflects the unscrupulous anti-Semitic practices of the Nazi regime. Deportation and subsequent murder of the former real property owners went hand in hand with these practices. The properties of expelled and deported Jews were now owned by the German « Reich » .

Jewish tenants

Only a few days after the « Anschluß » , Jewish tenants were driven from their apartments. « Wild aryanisation » of apartments started on the spur of the moment. Armed Nazi Party members as well as neighbours forcefully entered and looted apartments owned by Jews. At that point, Jewish tenants were, however, still protected by the law.

A decree of 10 May 1939 allowed landlords to terminate tenancy agreements with Jewish tenants but did not force them to actually do so. Once their homes had been « aryanised » Jews often had to move from one lodging to another. Several families would have to share one apartment and live in very crowded conditions. They were later moved to collecting points from where they were deported to concentration camps.

Personal Jewish property

The looting and confiscation of personal property such as household items, jewellery, books, works of art and cultural objects began right after the « Anschluß » and lasted for several weeks without any orders or instructions to do so. Perpetrators included members of the NSDAP, the SS and SA, but also parts of the local population. On the night of 9 November 1938, known as « Kristallnacht » (Night of Broken Glass) , Jewish shops were looted, Jewish homes vandalized, and Jews were beaten and abused.

Heinrich Himmler's order of 30 July 1938 entitled the State police to auction personal property confiscated in Austria. The « Dorotheum » played a leading role in the expropriation and utilisation of confiscated property. The « Vugesta » , the « Gestapo Office for the Disposal of the Property of Jewish Emigrants » was established in September 1940 and pursued private interests while striving to bring about the « de-Jewification » of society in a manner the « Aryan » population would benefit from as well. Mass deportations began in February 1941 as did sales auctions in Vienna. Everything, even the victims' last belongings, was auctioned. With the 11th Amendment to the « Reich » Citizenship Act of 25 November 1941, Jewish property was automatically transferred to the German « Reich » . The « Dorotheum » and other auction houses as well as private antiques stores, public museums, scientific institutions such as the University of Vienna and the national library benefitted from these activities.

...

The following information on the « Arisierungsakten » (« aryanisation files ») relates, for the most part, to the comprehensive holdings of the former National-Socialist « Vermögensverkehrsstelle » (Property Transaction Office) at the Austrian State Archives. Although, for now only, the « Vermögensanmeldungen » have been able to be incorporated into the Findbuch database from the very diverse files series « aryanisation files », this focus on the holdings of the Austrian State Archives is necessary due to the fact that, in 1938, over 90 % of Austrian Jews lived in Vienna. Due to the vital part played by the Property Transaction Office in implementing the National-Socialist policies of persecution and seizure, its « aryanisation files » take on a central role, in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

Origins of the holdings

« Aryanzation » is the term used to describe the economic (businesses, companies) and asset-related (real estate, apartments, tenancy rights) seizures perpetrated against the Jews under the National-Socialist dictatorship. It is important to differentiate between the 2 forms of « aryanisation » : the so-called « wild aryanisations » and the pseudo-legal expropriations carried-out on the basis of anti-Semitic legal provisions. The former reached their climax in Austria, in March and April 1938, and often took place with brutal force and destruction during the course of the looting and plundering raids. In order to bring these massive legal violations and the subsequent damage to the economy under control, during the course of 1938, a series of legal provisions were enacted by the National-Socialist authorities which were based on the existing anti-Semitic legislation in the German « Reich » . On the basis of the Nuremberg Laws of 15 September 1935 (German « Reich » Law Gazette of 1935, No. 1, page 1146 ; Austrian Law Gazette of 1938 ; page 150) , Jews were ordered by the « Verordnung über die Anmeldung des Vermögens von Juden » (Ordinance on the Registration of Jewish Property) of 26 April 1938 (German « Reich » Law Gazette of 1938, No. 1, page 414 ; Austrian Law Gazette of 1938, page 102) to register their assets. On 18 May 1938, the Property Transaction Office was established in Vienna. It attempted to bring under control and monitor the (sometimes self-appointed) commissars, trustees and « liquidators » of Jewish companies. In bureaucratic procedures, the Property Transaction Office was in charge of deciding on all transfers of ownership involving Jews. That meant approving purchase contracts and prices or ordering liquidations. On the basis of the « Elfte Verordnung zum Reichsbürgergesetz » (11th Decree to the « Reich » Citizenship Law) of 25 November 1941, the « Oberfinanzpräsident » (Chief Finance President) Berlin was charged with seizing all Jewish assets which still remained. The Chief Finance President delegated this task to the competent regional Chief Finance Presidents of the « Reich » Financial Administration.

In a broader sense, the term « aryanisation » not only referred to the measures for the financial plundering of the Jewish population and their physical removal from society but also their exclusion from their jobs (dismissals, redundancies, bans on practicing a profession) , restrictions on vocational training and the appropriation of movables (e.g. , artworks, furnishings, objects made from valuable metals) .

Depending on the date on which the files were opened and their provenance (from May 1938, the Property Transaction Office in Vienna ; upon implementation of the « Ostmarkgesetz » [« Ostmark » Law, German « Reich » Law Gazette, No. 1, 1939, page 777ff. ; Austrian Law Gazette of 1939, page 500] the Property Transaction Office of

the « Reich » regions ; from 1941, the regional Chief Finance Presidents of the « Reich » financial administration) , the significance of the information contained in them varies. Significant information on the « wild aryanisations » only exists in rare cases. The execution of the expropriations and company liquidations can be documented to varied extents. This circumstance is often related to the value or size of the company and the importance attributed to it by the National-Socialist authorities for the German War effort. Experience has shown that files on larger industrial companies and real estate are generally more complex than those on small and medium-sized companies.

In addition to the reconstruction of the individual economic circumstances in relation to the expropriation measures, biographical and professional information on the persecutee and the « aryanizer » can be found.

Alternative sources of information

Alternative sources of information are primarily to be found enclosed in the various « aryanisation files » of the Property Transaction Office at the Austrian State Archives, which are structured according to category or branch : as a result, reports and figures which are enclosed with the original « aryanisation files » may also be found enclosed with the files series « Commissars » , « Trustees » or « Administrators » . The files of the regional Chief Finance Presidents mainly contain self-contained « aryanisation » measures which can also provide supplementary information on the expropriated persons and the status of their assets.

In the case of « aryanised » companies, it is advisable to view the « Firmenbuchakten » (commercial register files) of the competent Commercial Court as these may contain indications of the « aryanisation measure » . For seized real estate, the historical land registers and related collections of documents at the relevant District Court (« Land » Register Court) can provide insight into the transfer of ownership between 1938 and 1945. In both cases, the possibility exists that the file material (« Handelsregisterakten » - trade register files - , historical land registers or collections of documents) have already been transferred to the provincial archives.

Austrian State Archives

In the Austrian State Archives, it is necessary to differentiate between the 2 holdings of « aryanisation files » . Firstly, those of the Property Transaction Office, established in Vienna in 1938 at the Federal Ministry for the Economy and Labour, whose file holdings are, on the one hand, ordered according to economic sector (industry, trade, commerce) or according to category (real estate) and, on the other hand, according to the internal organization which was relevant at the time. It must be noted that during the implementation of the so-called « Ostmark » Law (German « Reich » Law Gazette of 1939, No.1, page 777ff. ; Austrian Law Gazette of 1939, page 500) from 1939, the regional Property Transaction Offices were established in the « Reich » regions, to which the Vienna Property Transaction Office transferred not only its authorities but also the regional « aryanisation files » . After 1945, these files (sometimes supplemented by files pursuant to the « Erstes Rückstellungsgesetz » - 1st Restitution Act - and the « Zweites Rückstellungsgesetz » - 2nd Restitution Act) came into the possession of the local competent provincial archives.

Secondly, « aryanisation files » were opened by the regional Chief Finance Presidents (according to the National-

Socialist authority titles :Vienna - Lower-Danube, Graz, Upper-Danube, Innsbruck) . These were taken on after May 1945 by the re-established « Finanzlandesdirektionen » (Financial Directorates) (for example, files of the Chief Finance President Vienna - Lower-Danube to the Financial Directorate for Vienna, Lower-Austria and « Burgenland ») and used for restitution proceedings pursuant to the 1st Restitution Act and the 2nd Restitution Act. As such, the files of the Chief Finance President Vienna - Lower-Danube form an integral part of the files of the Financial Directorate for Vienna, Lower-Austria and « Burgenland » pursuant to the 1st Restitution Act.

In exceptional cases, the entire « aryanisation files » of the Property Transaction Office Vienna can be found in the files of the Chief Finance President Vienna - Lower-Danube or the Financial Directorate Vienna.

The files on seizures are found in the « Burgenländisches Landesarchiv » under the title « Arisierungsakten » (« Nordburgenland und Südburgenland ») 1938-1945 (« Aryanization files » [North Burgenland and South Burgenland] 1938-1945) in the holdings of the « Forschungsarchiv / Behördliche Archivbestände » (Research Archive / Authorities' archive holdings) . These file holdings also originated at the Property Transaction Office, established by the National-Socialists in 1938.

After the « Anschluß » of Austria to the German « Reich » , the newly-drawn boundaries of the « Gaue » (« Reich » regions) saw « Burgenland » split between the 2 neighbouring « Reich » regions : Lower-Danube and Styria. During this process, as of 15 October 1938 (Austrian Law Gazette of 1938, page 443) , the northern districts Neusiedl-am-See, Eisenstadt, Mattersburg and Oberpullendorf were merged with the « Reich » region Lower-Danube, and the southern districts Oberwart, Güssing and Jennersdorf joined the « Reich » region Styria. For this reason, for the North « Burgenland » and South « Burgenland » districts, there are 2 separate holdings of each the Property Transaction Office and the Chief Finance President of the « Reich » regions Lower-Danube and Styria.

After the end of the War, in May 1945, « Burgenland » was re-established in the Soviet occupied zone. The Eisenstadt authorities took on all archive material from the Lower-Austrian and Styrian Provincial Governments which related to « Burgenland » and had accumulated between 1938 and 1945. The files contain the entire correspondence involved in recording and « aryanizing » Jewish assets (companies, land, insurance policies, stocks and bonds and personal valuables) , for example requests for approval to buy, the appointment of a provisional administrator, valuation reports on assets, purchase contracts, purchase contract approvals, written correspondence and expert opinions on liquidation and « aryanisation » . In several of these « aryanisation files » , property notices can be found which had been enclosed with the respective « aryanisation file » by the Property Transaction Office. In addition, these holdings also contain a box (No. 67) containing 140 un-attributed property notices which are sorted alphabetically.

The file holdings are subdivided into 5 inventories. The inventories consist of 83 boxes with 1,450 individual files and an unknown number of unattributable documents.

Archives of Upper-Austria

The so called « aryanisations » in the « Reich » region Upper-Danube occurred under the supervision of the Office of

the « Reich » governor Upper-Danube, particularly its department IV and sub-department IVc (Economy and Labour) and IVc/W4 (later Ib/J) . Subject area IVc/W4 was in charge of the « de-jewifications » with the exception of agricultural and silvicultural land and it was also known as the « De-jewification Department » , « Aryanization Office » and « Property Transaction Office in Linz » .

The measures documented in the files of the « Reichstatthaltereie » 1940-1945/Arisierung (Office of the « Reich » Governor 1940-1945 / « Aryanizations ») are often confusing and often connected to the corresponding holdings of the Financial Directorate for Upper-Austria (« Finanzlandesdirektion - Beschlagnahmte Vermögen ; Finanzlandesdirektion - Vermögensrückstellungen : Financial Directorate - Confiscated assets ; Financial Directorate - Restitution of assets) , or with the file series « Finanzabteilung des Landes Oberösterreich » (Financial Department of the Province of Upper-Austria) , or FiRK, or the « aryanisation files » and property notices in the holdings « Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Linz » (Jewish Community Linz) . This was a result of the gradual resolution of the competencies between the German « Reich » , the transitional entity « Land Österreich » and the « Reich » region Upper-Danube, established in 1939 (German « Reich » Law Gazette of 1939, No. 1, page 777ff. ; Austrian Law Gazette of 1939, page 500) . The state of the files can be blamed on the conflicting political and economic interests under the National-Socialists and was also caused by semi-legal to illegal interventions and activities.

The Upper-Austrian « aryanisation files » trace the asset related occurrences and liquidation of assets as documents of bureaucratic procedures, the latter up to 1944. In the cases in which no liquidation took place, the contents of the files are occasionally supplemented by documentation of the restitution proceedings from 1946 onward. In this regard, there are cross-overs with the files of the judicial restitution files pursuant to the « Drittes Rückstellungsgesetz » (3rd Restitution Act) . The Upper-Austrian Provincial Archive took on the « aryanisation files » in 1972 in combination with the file holdings « Vermögensentziehungsanmeldungen » (notifications of seized property) as « Vermögensakten » (assets files) of the Office of the « Reich » Governor Upper-Danube. After the transfer of the related « Kanzleiindex » (search index) to the Archives of Upper-Austria, in 1996, both different groups of files were finally separated from one another.

The « Reich » independent regional administration was, as the successor of the « autonomous provincial administration » (1926 to 1938 ; with exceptions until 1940) responsible for both assets of the province and the « Reich » region until both administrative authorities were merged in 1940 and 1941. The file series contains the section of the « Reich » independent regional administration which was continued in the Finance Department of the Office of the Upper-Austrian Provincial Government after 1945. It is important to note that the « aryanisation measures » only form part of the files of the « Reich » independent regional administration, the focus of which is the confiscation of Church establishments (monasteries and abbeys) and the estates of the Schwarzenberg and Starhem families. The administration of properties by the Office of the Provincial Government is documented until the early-1950's in some cases.

This file series also clearly overlaps with other file series of the Archives of Upper-Austria : Financial Directorate - Confiscated assets, Financial Directorate - Restitution of assets, Financial Department of the Province of Upper-Austria (FiRK) or the « aryanisation files » and property notices in the sub-holdings « Jewish Community Linz » .

The sub-holdings of the « Jewish Community Linz » are composed of 2 sub-holdings : firstly, the « aryansisation files » and, secondly, the property notices. Due to their connection of both types of files, the sub-holdings « Jewish Community Linz » are dealt with separately. Further information regarding the « aryansisation » of companies in Upper-Austria can also be gathered from the file holdings of the Property Transaction Office at the Austrian State Archives.

Tyrolean Provincial Archives (1945-1946)

According to information provided by the Tyrolean Provincial Archives, due to the wide-scale destruction of « aryansisation » documents by the National-Socialist authorities at the end of the War, the « Lists regarding assets expropriated by the German “ Reich ” and declared forfeited to the German “ Reich ” with proof of the outcomes of the cash-flows relating to these assets » (this is the full-title) often constitute the sole source of documentary information on property seizures to which Jewish citizens were subjected during the National-Socialist dictatorship. The lists originated partly from the records of the Chief Finance President Innsbruck regarding property seizures under his jurisdiction for the « Reich » regions Tyrol-Vorarlberg and Salzburg. The list was also taken on for administration and edited by the Financial Directorate for Tyrol after the War. Files on property seizure which did not fall under the regional jurisdiction of the National-Socialist Chief Finance President Innsbruck due to the expropriated owner's place of residence were ceded from the Chief Finance President to the « Reich » financial administration (e.g. , Munich, Berlin-Brandenburg or Berlin-Charlottenburg, Upper-Danube and Vienna - Lower-Danube) . In turn, the Financial Directorate for Tyrol ceded the cases of seizure related to a place of residence lying outside the province to the competent Financial Directorates (e.g. , to Salzburg from 1945, and to Vorarlberg from 1946) . As a result of the memos noting the transfer and the fact that files on « aryansisation » and seizure only survived the end of the War in 1945, extremely fragmentarily, it cannot be ruled-out that files or parts of files might be found in Austrian provincial archives or German archives. 2 enclosures are noted on the title-page of the list (probably lists) , which covered, firstly, property and, secondly, bonds and interest coupons. According to information provided by the Tyrolean Provincial Archives, however, the list contains cash and monies deposited on bank accounts which were confiscated by the German « Reich » .

...

Das Judentum in Österreich ist erstmals in der Römerzeit nachweisbar. Zu Beginn des 10. Jahrhunderts gab es mit der Raffelstettener Zollordnung die erste Urkunde, in der Juden als Händler erwähnt werden. Auf dem Gebiet des heutigen Österreichs gibt oder gab es eine jahrhundertelange Geschichte jüdischer Gemeinden in Wien, Burgenland und im östlichen Niederösterreich.

In anderen Landesteilen gab es kaum oder nur in kürzeren Geschichtsabschnitten jüdische Gemeinden sowie ab Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts in einigen Landeshauptstädten. Einige Regionen der bis 1918 bestehenden Habsburgermonarchie wiesen jedoch eine wesentlich stärkere jüdische Besiedelung auf. So gab es in nahezu allen Kronländern Österreich-Ungarns größere jüdische Minderheiten, wobei besonders Galizien und Bukowina, die Teile des heutigen Polen, der Ukraine und Rumäniens ausmachten, große jüdische Bevölkerungsanteile aufwies. Nach der rechtlichen Gleichstellung der

Juden in Österreich-Ungarn sowie bedingt durch die Industrialisierung wanderten viele Juden aus den ländlicheren Gebieten der Monarchie in die Städte Österreich-Ungarns. Viele zehntausende zog es nach Wien, das nach dem Zusammenbruch der Monarchie rund 200.000 Juden zählte, was etwa 90 % aller österreichischen Juden entsprach. Dort entfaltete sich die jüdische Kultur in Theater, Film und Musik, und das assimilierte Judentum brachte herausragende Persönlichkeiten in praktisch allen Gesellschaftsbereichen (Wirtschaft, Wissenschaft, Kunst, Kultur) hervor (siehe Geschichte der Juden in Wien) .

Nach dem sogenannten Anschluß an das nationalsozialistische Deutsche Reich flohen rund zwei Drittel der österreichischen Juden, etwa 65.000 wurden ermordet. Nur wenige überlebten in Österreich, und wenige kehrten zurück. Nach 1945 wurden in den größten Städten kleine jüdische Gemeinden wiedergegründet. Heute leben zwischen 8.000 und 15.000 Juden in Österreich - heute wie damals überwiegend in Wien.

Der älteste Nachweis für jüdisches Leben in Österreich stammt aus der Römerzeit. Es handelt sich um ein Amulett, das 2000 im Gräberfeld in Halbturn (Burgenland) in einem römischen Kindergrab aus dem 3. Jahrhundert gefunden wurde. Die langwierige Auswertung der Grabungsfunde brachte erst 2006 zu Tage, daß sich in dem Amulett ein 22 mm langes Goldblech befindet, auf dem in altgriechischen Buchstaben die wichtigste jüdische Gebetsformel Schma Jisrael eingegritzt ist. Es ist damit das älteste Zeugnis jüdischen Lebens auf heutigem österreichischen Boden.

Erste Hinweise auf die Anwesenheit von Juden im Gebiet des heutigen Österreich nach der Völkerwanderung reichen bis in die Karolingerzeit zurück. Die ersten spärlichen Quellen aus dem Frühmittelalter, in denen Juden erwähnt werden, sprechen nur von durchreisenden Personen und nicht von jüdischen Siedlungen. Konkreter ist ein Brief, vermutlich von Salzburgs Erzbischof Arn (798-821) , in dem dieser einen namentlich nicht genannten Grafen bittet, ihm « jenen jüdischen oder slawischen Arzt » zu schicken, den früher schon ein anderer Bischof in Anspruch genommen hatte.

Der erste unbestrittene Nachweis für die Anwesenheit von jüdischen Kaufleuten ist die Raffelstettener Zollordnung, die zwischen 903 und 906 entstand. Die letzte Bestimmung des in Raffelstätten erlassenen Weistums besagte, daß Kaufleute, nämlich Juden und die übrigen Kaufleute, ob sie nun aus diesem oder anderen Gebieten kamen, den rechtmäßigen Zoll sowohl von Sklaven als auch von anderen Gütern zahlen sollten, so wie es unter früheren Königen üblich war. Jüdische Kaufleute waren demnach im damaligen Fernhandel zwischen dem ostfränkischen Reich und den slawischen Gebieten eine bedeutende Gruppe.

Mit der Raffelstettener Zollordnung lässt sich aber nicht die Ansiedlung von Juden beweisen. Im Herzogtum Bayern sind Juden erstmals 981 in Regensburg nachweisbar, doch kann man nicht ausschließen, daß es auch schon früher ansässige Juden in dem Gebiet gab. Auf dem Gebiet des heutigen Österreich gibt es jedoch etliche Ortsnamen mit dem Namensbestandteil Juden die auf jüdische Handelsstützpunkte oder Siedlungen hinweisen. Diese Judendörfer lagen meist an wichtigen Nord-Süd-Handelswegen. Eine deren wichtigsten war das heutige Judenburg, das als mercatum Judinburch 1074 urkundlich ist. Die Beibehaltung des Namens bis zur Stadterhebung 1224 zeigt die Kontinuität der Niederlassung. (Judenburger Gulden als die erste und lange auch wichtigste Goldmünze Österreichs, Niederlassung bis zur Landesverweisung 1496.)

Der erste namentlich erwähnte Jude in Österreich war ein gewisser Schlom, der 1194 im Formbacher Traditionskodex erwähnt wird. Er wurde vom babenbergischen Herzog Leopold V. zum Münzmeister ernannt und zum Verwalter des herzoglichen Vermögens eingesetzt. Schlom wurde vermutlich speziell für diesen Zweck ins Land gerufen, denn zu dem Zeitpunkt bekam Leopold V. das englische Lösegeld für die Freilassung des Königs Richard Löwenherz. Nachdem ihm einer seiner Bediensteten 24 Mark gestohlen hatte, ließ Schlom ihn ins Gefängnis werfen. Dessen Frau rief einige Kreuzritter zur Hilfe, die Schlom und fünfzehn andere Juden 1196 in einem Pogrom ermordeten. Herzog Friedrich I. verurteilte daraufhin zwei Anführer der Kreuzritter zum Tode. Diese Maßnahme beweist die Bedeutung der Juden für den Herrscher, unter dem sich die Judengemeinde in Wien rasch entwickeln konnte. Davon zeugt auch eine 1204 urkundlich belegte Synagoge in Wien. 1230 entstand eine jüdische Gemeinde in Wiener Neustadt, 1237 in Tulln. Die Zuwanderer stammten vor allem aus den rheinländischen Städten Worms, Mainz und Trier, die sie während der Verfolgungen des Ersten Kreuzzuges 1096 verließen.

Das Städtewesen, das von den Babenbergern gefördert wurde und die städtische Bevölkerung anwachsen ließ, erforderte auch eine erhöhte Präsenz von Juden, die den ständig wachsenden Kapitalbedarf der Neubürger deckten. Auch am Herzogshof in Wien war es schon in den 30er Jahren des 13. Jahrhunderts üblich, daß Juden als Berater tätig waren. Der bekannteste wurde der ungarische Kammergraf Teka (lateinisch « Techanus »), der erstmals 1225 auftrat. Er wird 1232 als Bürge Herzog Leopolds VI. für eine Schuld von 2000 Mark Silber genannt und war damit unmittelbar an der Beilegung eines Streites zwischen Leopold VI. und König Andreas II. von Ungarn beteiligt.

Juden war Ende des 12. und Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts der Aufstieg in hohe Stellungen nicht verwehrt, auch konnten sie christliches Dienstpersonal beschäftigen. In Wien, Krems und Wiener Neustadt konnten sie größere Gemeinden bilden. Verfolgungen gab es während der ersten beiden Kreuzzüge keine, so daß die Ermordung Schloms 1196 eine Ausnahme blieb. Ein Judenrecht bildete sich erst während des Streites zwischen Kaiser Friedrich II. und Herzog Friedrich II. . 1237 verhängte der Kaiser die Reichsacht über seinen Namensvetter und stellte Wien unter seine Herrschaft. Die Wiener Bürger überzeugten ihn, die Juden von allen öffentlichen Ämtern auszuschließen. 1238 war jedoch der Herzog wieder auf dem Vormarsch, und Kaiser Friedrich II. warb nach diesem Wandel um die Gunst der Juden. Im August 1238 erließ er ein Privileg für die Wiener Juden, um die Herrschaftsansprüche zu untermauern. Es beruht auf dem 1236 ausgestellten Privileg für die Juden im Reich. Doch 1240 fiel Wien wieder an den Herzog, und es kam zu einer Aussöhnung mit dem Kaiser. Am 1. Juli erklärte Herzog Friedrich II. das kaiserliche Stadtrecht von 1237 für ungültig und stellte 1244 ein herzogliches Privileg für die Juden in ganz Österreich aus, das Fridericianum. König Ottokar II. übernahm die Privilegien, 1262 kam noch das Verbot der Blutbeschuldigung dazu.

Mit der Zeit, als Folge von Berichten über Blutbeschuldigungen, Hostienfrel, des süddeutschen Rintfleisch-Pogroms und wahrscheinlich einer Wirtschaftskrise, wuchs der Hass auf die Juden. 1338 ging eine Judenverfolgung von Pulkau aus (Beschuldigung einer Hostienschändung) . Die Juden in Wien, der damals bedeutendsten Gemeinde in Österreich, sowie in Krems und Wiener Neustadt entgingen drohenden Pogromen, indem sie den Zinsfuß auf von ihnen vergebene Darlehen senkten.

Im Zuge der Hussitenkriege wurden die Juden aus dem Herzogtum Österreich vertrieben (1420-1421) , da Albrecht V. sie unter anderem verdächtigte, mit den Hussiten zusammenzuarbeiten. Die damalige Vernichtung der jüdischen

Gemeinden ist als « Wiener Gesera » bekannt, woran am « Haus zum großen Jordan » auf dem Judenplatz in Wien ein antisemitisches Relief erinnert. 1496 wurden die Juden auf Drängen der Stände von Maximilian I. aus der Steiermark und aus Kärnten vertrieben, durften sich aber am Ostrand des Reichs (Zistersdorf, Eisenstadt) ansiedeln. Ab 1551 mußten sie beim Aufenthalt in Städten und Märkten den « gelben Fleck » tragen. In Wien stieg die Zahl der Juden am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts wieder an, ein neuer Friedhof (Seegasse, Wien 9) wurde angelegt, und 1624 erhielten die Juden von Kaiser Ferdinand II. ein Privileg und durften sich im heutigen Gebiet der Leopoldstadt ansiedeln. 1669-1670 wurden die Juden neuerlich aus Österreich vertrieben. Doch schon rund zehn Jahre später kamen Samuel Oppenheimer und Samson Wertheimer nach Wien und wirkten als Hofjuden und erhielten Privilegien.

Mit den Toleranzpatenten Josephs II. begann die Emanzipation auch für die traditionell ghettoisierten, damals etwa 1,5 Millionen Juden der Habsburger Monarchie. 1781 war zunächst ein Toleranzpatent für die christlichen Minderheiten erlassen worden, vor allem für die Protestanten und Griechisch-Orthodoxen, die rund ein Drittel der Bevölkerung umfassten. Es folgte 1781 das Hofdekret für die Juden Böhmens, die bis zur ersten Teilung Polens, die 1772 die galizischen Juden unter österreichische Herrschaft brachte, die größte habsburgische Judenschaft dargestellt hatten und schon weitgehend akkulturiert war. Auch für den nach den Schlesischen Kriegen noch bei Österreich verbliebenen Rest Schlesiens wurde 1781 ein Toleranzpatent erlassen.

Mit dem Toleranzpatent für die Juden Wiens und Niederösterreichs 1782 wurden sie zu allen Schulen und Hochschulen zugelassen und erhielten weitgehende Gewerbefreiheit. Ausdrückliches politisches Ziel war, den Juden Zugang zu handwerklichen und landwirtschaftlichen Berufen zu gewähren und somit für den Staat ihre Nützlichkeit zu erhöhen. Einwanderung blieb ihnen aber ebenso verboten wie der Erwerb von Haus- und Grundbesitz und die Einfuhr jüdischer Schriften. 1788 wurde die Militärpflicht auf sie ausgedehnt.

Zahlreiche Sondergesetze schränkten diese Gleichstellungsansätze wieder ein. Einigen Wiener jüdischen Familien gelang jedoch ein aufsehenerregender sozialer Aufstieg (Arnstein, Eskeles, Königswarter, Hönigstein), der zur Zeit der Freiheitskriege gegen Napoleon beschleunigt wurde. Für monarchistische Beamte wie Friedrich von Gentz, den Berater Fürst Metternichs, waren Juden « geborene Repräsentanten des Atheismus, Jakobinismus, der Aufklärerei ». Das hinderte ihn nicht, beim Wiener Kongress im Salon von Fanny von Arnstein (geborene Itzig) zu verkehren. Die Salongesellschaft ermöglichte in Wien wie auch in Berlin im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert regelmäßige und intensive häusliche Kontakte zwischen Menschen unterschiedlicher Stände und unterschiedlicher religiöser Bekenntnisse. Vor allem bot sie Frauen die Möglichkeit, am gesellschaftlichen Leben teilzunehmen. Frau von Arnstein, die es zeitlebens ablehnte, sich taufen zu lassen, versammelte regelmäßig am Dienstagabend eine illustre Gesellschaft von Diplomaten und Aristokraten, darunter Wilhelm von Humboldt, den päpstlichen Nuntius in Wien, Kardinal Severoli, den Duke of Wellington oder Fürst Karl August von Hardenberg. Sie versuchte, auf die während des Kongresses behandelten Probleme ihrer Glaubensgenossen Einfluß zu nehmen.

Die politischen Versuche, die Juden stärker für die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung nutzbar zu machen, hatten jedoch zunächst nur wenig Erfolg. Die weiterhin in christlichen Gilden und Zünften organisierten Berufe wehrten die aufkommende jüdische Konkurrenz nach Kräften ab. Juden blieben weiterhin weitgehend auf den Handel angewiesen und gelangten nur langsam in andere Wirtschaftszweige. In den Städten gelang es den Juden besser als auf dem Land,

Zugang zu handwerklichen Berufen zu finden. Der Fernhandel der Juden, die relativ krisensichere Belieferung der Armee mit Uniformen, auch die Pachtung der Tabakregie erwiesen sich als Ausgangspunkte für den Aufbau jüdischer Manufakturen. Mit der Hilfe von Handelskapital konnten Juden eigene Fabriken aufbauen. Nachdem die Einfuhr von Rohbaumwolle freigegeben worden war, gelang es den Juden in Böhmen zum Leidwesen der Leinen- und Wollgewerke, die seit Jahrhunderten die Stoffbranche dominiert hatten, die schnell anwachsende Baumwollindustrie zu ihrer Domäne zu machen. Die Schneiderzünfte in Mähren konnten trotz heftiger Proteste nicht verhindern, daß kapitalkräftige jüdische Großhändler aus dem traditionell von Juden betriebenen Ausbessern und Umarbeiten von Kleidern und Uniformen eine regelrechte Konfektionsindustrie entwickelten, die nun ihrerseits einer Vielzahl von jüdischen Subunternehmern, die den Vertrieb in Städten und Dörfern übernahmen, Brot gab. Auch jüdischen Bankhäusern gelang die Expansion in Wirtschaftsbereiche, die in dieser frühindustriellen Zeit expandierten. Die von Salomon Rothschild in Wien finanzierte Eisenbahn von Wien nach Galizien war 400 Kilometer lang und beschäftigte mit ihrem Bau 14.000 Arbeiter.

Da sich die Angleichung der jüdischen Rechte an die der anderen Bürger schneller in der Stadt auswirkte, zogen viele Juden in die Städte. Prag wies schon um 1800 mit 8500 Juden, was einem Bevölkerungsanteil von 10,6 % entsprach, den höchsten Anteil an jüdischer Bevölkerung unter allen Großstädten im deutschsprachigen Raum auf. 1848 waren es 11.700. Das waren etwa 40 % der Juden Böhmens, die übrigen hatten sich verstreut in ländlichen Gemeinden niedergelassen. In Mähren dagegen durften Juden sich bis 1848 nicht in Dörfern ansiedeln. Sie lebten hier vorwiegend in Städten, und Brünn entwickelte sich für sie zum Anziehungspunkt. Um 1800 gab es unter den Juden in Böhmen und Mähren zwar auch eine große Zahl von Armen, ihre wirtschaftliche Lage war jedoch besser als in vielen anderen Regionen. Das war Grund genug, um mit den jeweiligen Obrigkeiten zusammen zu versuchen, das « Einschleichen » von Juden aus dem unvorstellbar armen Galizien, die häufig Bettler, Diebe und Gauner waren, zu verhindern. Wien dagegen zählte um 1800 erst 500-600 Juden bei einer Gesamtbevölkerung von etwa 200.000. Nur einzelne privilegierte Familien wurden hier geduldet. 1848 war in Wien die jüdische Bevölkerung auf 4000 angestiegen, was einem Anteil von 0,8 % entsprach, und die erste jüdische Gemeinde in Wien konstituierte sich.

Vor den Freiheitskriegen gegen Napoleon traten katholische Romantiker wie Schlegel, Franz von Baader und Klemens Maria Hofbauer für die passiven Bürgerrechte der Juden ein, setzten aber auch antijudaistische Vorurteile fort. Die 1815 begründete Heilige Allianz der Herrscher Preußens, Russlands und Österreichs betrachtete die christliche Religion als erklärte Grundlage ihrer Politik, vertrat das Gottesgnadentum der Fürsten und stand am Anfang einer restaurativen Phase. Es entstand eine Fortschrittsfeindlichkeit und hinsichtlich der Juden eine Unwilligkeit, ihre Emanzipation fortzusetzen. Der Gesellschaftstheoretiker Adam Heinrich Müller, ein führender Vertreter der deutschen Romantik und Mitglied der Christlich-deutschen Tischgesellschaft, verlangte 1823 in einem Gutachten das Heiratsverbot zwischen Juden und Christen und die Rücknahme erreichter Gleichstellung. In reaktionärer, der vorindustriellen Welt zugewandter Grundhaltung wandte er sich gegen die Modernisierungen, die von der Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Juden herrührten, und setzte Judentum und Kapitalismus gleich.

Währenddessen begann bei den städtischen jüdischen Gemeinden die Assimilation in Form einer Reformbewegung. Ausgehend von Wien glich sich der vorher traditionelle aschkenasische Gottesdienst, der in weiten Teilen auch eine Gemeindeversammlung mit profanen Elementen wie der turbulenten Versteigerung der Sitzplätze in der Synagoge war, dem christlichen Gottesdienst an. Laienprediger verdrängten mit deutscher Sprache die jiddische Sprache und stellten

damit auch den Primat der Rabbiner in Frage. Unter Isaak Noah Mannheimer und Salomon Sulzer entstand der « Wiener Ritus », den neben einer deutschen Predigt strenge Anstandsregeln und ein hohes musikalisches Niveau des Kantors kennzeichnete. Von Wien aus verbreitete sich der Wiener Ritus über Böhmen und Galizien in die ganze Welt und wird auch heute noch verwendet.

Manche Juden entschloßen sich, zum Christentum zu konvertieren. Erst mit zunehmender Akzeptanz der Juden um die Jahrhundertmitte ging die Häufigkeit der Konversionen zurück. Einer der prominentesten Konvertiten war Johann Emanuel Veith, der 1831 am Wiener Stephansdom Hofprediger wurde. Er blieb seiner jüdischen Gemeinde verbunden. Als die Blutbeschuldigungen gegen die Juden von Damaskus aufkamen, schwor er von der Kanzel herab auf den Gekreuzigten, daß diese Anschuldigungen offensichtlich falsch seien. Mit judenchristlichen Freunden rief Veith im Mai 1848 den Wiener Katholikenverein ins Leben, der nicht nur Freiheit für die Kirche gegenüber dem Staat, sondern auch größere Freiheit in der Kirche anstrebte. Auch Paulus Stephanus Cassel wurde evangelischer Prediger und schrieb wichtige Werke zur jüdischen Geschichte. Er nahm die Juden vor den Anschuldigungen Heinrich Treitschkes und Adolf Stöckers in Schutz.

In der Märzrevolution 1848 engagierten sich Akademiker, darunter viele gebildete Juden, meist für den Liberalismus. Adolf Fischhofs Rede über Pressefreiheit im Hof des Niederösterreichischen Landhauses in Wien gilt als Auftakt der Revolution, Ludwig August Frankls Gedicht Die Universität, am Beginn der Revolution von 1848 entstanden, wurde das wohl bekannteste Revolutionslied. Viele Juden kämpften mit den Christen auf den Barrikaden. Im Revolutionsjahr war es noch möglich, daß der jüdische Prediger Isaak Noah Mannheimer und der Kantor Salomon Sulzer zusammen mit katholischen und protestantischen Geistlichen an einem Gemeinschaftsgrab auf dem Schmelzer Friedhof standen, um die Gefallenen der Märztage zu ehren. Es war aber nur eine kurze Zeit, bald nahmen die Spannungen zu. In Wiens Armenvierteln wurde der Ruf laut : « Schlagt die Juden tot ! » , begleitet von einzelnen Gewalttaten. Trotzdem brachte die Pillersdorfsche Verfassung den Juden endlich die ersehnte volle Gleichstellung bei den Bürgerrechten und Religionsfreiheit in Österreich. Dies nahm die Restauration zum Teil wieder zurück : 1851 mußten jüdische Beamte ihre Staatstreue beidein, 1853 wurde Juden Grunderwerb erneut verboten, 1855 auch das Notariat und Lehrerberufe.

Eigene Zeitungen blieben ihnen erlaubt, so daß sie im Verlagswesen häufiger führende Positionen errangen. Daraufhin entstand eine antisemitische katholische Gegenpresse, die nun dauerhaft gegen das « demokratische Judengesindel » hetzte und es mit Liberalismus, Kapitalismus und Kommunismus gleichsetzte. Führend darin war der Artillerieoffizier Quirin Endlich, der « Judenfresser von Wien » . Auch Eduard von Müller-Telling, Journalist für die Neue Rheinische Zeitung von Karl Marx, griff Juden in seiner Schrift « Freiheit und Juden » als « Wucherer » (Vertreter des Kapitals) und « Freigeister » (Vertreter der Demokratie) an, griff aber auch auf die alte Ritualmordlegende zurück. 1848 gründete Sebastian Brunner die Wiener Kirchenzeitung und machte sie zu seinem Sprachrohr eines scharfen kirchlich-katholischen Antisemitismus.

1867 wurde im Österreichisch-Ungarischen Ausgleich die Emanzipation der Juden im Habsburgerreich vollendet. Durch die Dezemberverfassung wurde den Juden erstmals in ihrer Geschichte in ganz Österreich der ungehinderte Aufenthalt und die Religionsausübung gestattet. 40.000 Juden bildeten bereits 6,6 % der Einwohnerzahl Wiens und hatten damit die alten jüdischen Bevölkerungszentren der Habsburger wie Prag, Krakau und Lemberg überflügelt. 1854-1858 wurde

der Leopoldstädter Tempel gebaut, der zu den imposantesten Synagogen in Europa gehörte. Die meisten Einwanderer Wiens waren aus der ungarischen Reichshälfte gekommen, gefolgt von Böhmen und Mähren. Auch galizische Juden waren gekommen, getrieben von Überbevölkerung, Hungersnöten und Choleraepidemien (siehe Geschichte Galiziens). Als die polnische Nationalisierungskampagne sie in den 1870er Jahren zunehmend aus dem Wirtschaftsleben verdrängte, emigrierten sie in Massen. Die Urbanisierung konzentrierte die vordem kleinstädtische und dörfliche Judenheit in den Großstädten. Auch in Städten wie Graz, Linz, Innsbruck und anderen entstanden eigene jüdische Gemeinden. Einigen wenigen Familien gelang es, durch ihre Geschäftstätigkeit im Bankwesen, beim Eisenbahnbau und in industriellen Bereichen sowie im Handel, hier insbesondere im Textilhandel, großen Wohlstand zu erreichen. Der überwiegende Teil der jüdischen Bevölkerung war aber dem Kleinbürgertum zuzurechnen.

Mit dem noch heute geltenden Israelitengesetz von 1890 (Gesetz vom 21. März 1890 betreffend die Regelung der äußeren Rechtsverhältnisse der israelitischen Religionsgesellschaft, zuletzt geändert mit BGBl. Nummer 505 (1994) wurde ein Gesetz geschaffen, welches das Verhältnis der verschiedenen Kultusgemeinden zum Staat auf eine einheitliche Rechtsgrundlage stellte.

Da die meisten erfolgreichen Juden eher deutsch-liberal gesinnt waren, verband sich die Liberalismuskritik mit einem starken Antisemitismus, der zuerst durch religiöse Argumente und später durch die wirtschaftlich-sozialen (zum Beispiel Karl Lueger, 1844-1910 ; 1897 bis 1910 Wiener Bürgermeister) bis hin zu den rassistischen (zum Beispiel Georg von Schönerer, 1844-1921) zunehmend an Bedeutung gewann. 1885 wurde (auch um dem entgegenzuwirken) die Union Österreichischer Juden gegründet. Um eine Assimilation zu verhindern, bildete sich auch eine jüdisch-nationale Partei und 1882 die jüdische nationale Studentenverbindung Kadima. Die Antiassimilations- und nationale Bestrebungen wirkten mit der Begründung des theoretischen Zionismus durch Theodor Herzl zusammen. Unter der geistigen Führung von Zwi Perez Chajes, der ab 1917 Oberrabbiner in Wien war, setzten sich auch die Zionisten in der Leitung der Kultusgemeinde durch.

Viele bedeutende Künstler und Wissenschaftler jüdischer Herkunft bereicherten das österreichische Geistesleben : Alfred Adler, Peter Altenberg, Leo Ascher, Róbert Bárány, Martin Buber, Edmund Eysler, Leo Fall, Sigmund Freud, Alfred Fried, Karl Goldmark, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Emmerich Kálmán, Karl Kraus, Karl Landsteiner, Robert von Lieben, Gustav Mahler, Adam Politzer, Arthur Schnitzler, Arnold Schönberg, Eduard Suess unter anderem mehr Zur Förderung des kulturellen, geistigen und auch sozialen Lebens spielte das Mäzenatentum der Juden eine bedeutende Rolle.

1902 entstand aus einer Stiftung von Charlotte Lea Merores geborene Itzeles ein Mädchenwaisenhaus in der Bauernfeldgasse. 1909 wurde mit dem SC Hakoah Wien auch ein Sportverein als Zeichen der Identität gegründet.

Zu Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs, als die österreichisch-ungarische Armee zuerst weit zurückgedrängt wurde und auch Lemberg verlor, flüchteten rund 50.000 (laut damaligen Polizeiangaben) bis 70.000 (laut der Arbeiterzeitung) Juden aus Galizien vor Massakern der russischen Armee nach Wien. Etwa 25.000 davon blieben. Die jüdische Gemeinde in Österreich zählte damals etwas über 200.000 Mitglieder.

Die Geschichte des Staates in dieser Zeit wurde entscheidend von Juden bestimmt, einerseits von Finanziers wie Louis

Nathaniel von Rothschild (Hauptaktionär der Creditanstalt) , Wilhelm Berliner (Eigentümer der zweitgrößten Europäischen Lebensversicherung) und andererseits von jüdischen Sozialdemokraten und Austromarxisten wie Otto Bauer und Julius Deutsch.

Da mit dem Vertrag von Saint-Germain die volle (auch öffentliche) Religionsfreiheit in Österreich gesichert wurde, konnte 1919 eine jüdische höhere Schule, das Jüdische Privatrealgymnasium in der Drahtgasse (später Chajesrealgymnasium Castellezgasse) , eröffnet werden. Diese Schule war das erste nichtchristliche Gymnasium Österreichs.

Im kulturellen Leben spielten Juden ebenfalls eine wichtige Rolle, sei es in der Kleinkunst, in Film und Theater oder auch der Literatur. Eine der bedeutendsten Kleinkunsth Bühnen der Zwischenkriegszeit, das Budapester Orpheum in Leopoldstadt, das Zentrum des jüdischen Lebens in Wien, brachte einige große Kabarettisten und Coupletmusiker hervor, so etwa Heinrich Eisenbach, Fritz Grünbaum, Karl Farkas, Georg Kreisler oder auch Armin Berg. In der Literatur zählten die Juden Friedrich Torberg, Felix Salten und Joseph Roth zu den großen Namen. Ein weiterer bekannter österreichischer Schriftsteller dieser Jahre, Hugo Bettauer, wurde Opfer des ausgeprägten Antisemitismus dieser Zeit. Er wurde 1925 nach antisemitischer Hetze von einem Anhänger der NSDAP ermordet.

Bedeutende Film- und Theaterschaffende in Österreich waren unter anderem Jakob Fleck, Alfred Deutsch-German, Max Neufeld oder auch der Filmarchitekt Artur Berger. In führenden Funktionen des österreichischen Films fanden sich ebenfalls Juden, so etwa der letzte Direktor der Sascha-Film, Oskar Pilzer, der von 1933 bis 1938 die Geschicke dieser größten österreichischen Filmgesellschaft leitete, bis er einige Monate vor dem « Anschluß » zum Verkauf genötigt und wenig später zur Flucht gedrängt wurde. An der Sascha-Film war auch der Filmproduzent Arnold Pressburger, ebenfalls österreichischer Jude, viele Jahre beteiligt. In den 1920er Jahren verlagerte er seine Hauptaktivität jedoch nach Deutschland, wo er in den 1930er Jahren schließlich enteignet wurde und flüchtete.

Sowohl die klassische Musik als auch die leichte Muse, wie Operetten- und Schlager- sowie Filmmusik war ein weites Betätigungsfeld für viele schöpferische und ausübenden Künstler, wie etwa Alfred Grünwald, Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Fritz Kreisler, Fritz Löhner-Beda, Rudolf Kolisch, Hermann Leopoldi, Arnold Rosé, Franz Schreker, Oscar Straus, Richard Tauber, Gisela Werbezirk oder Erich Zeisl.

Zwischen 1933 und 1938 wurde Österreich Zufluchtsort für viele jüdische Kulturschaffende aus Deutschland. 1934 zählte Österreich bei der Volkszählung 191.481 Juden. Davon lebten 176.034 in Wien ; 7.716 in Niederösterreich ; 3.632 im Burgenland ; 2.195 in der Steiermark ; 966 in Oberösterreich ; 239 in Salzburg ; 269 in Kärnten ; 365 in Tirol ; und 42 in Vorarlberg. Nicht berücksichtigt sind hierbei allerdings jene Personen jüdischer Abstammung, die von den Nationalsozialisten als « Viertel- » und « Achteljeden » ebenfalls verfolgt wurden. Diese Anzahl betrug 1938 etwa 25.000 Personen.

Bei den Sozialdemokraten war eine Reihe von Juden in führender Position tätig (Otto Bauer, Julius Deutsch, Hugo Breitner, Julius Tandler und viele andere) .

Antisemitische Hetze hatte es auch in Österreich bereits lange vor dem « Anschluß » gegeben. Hitler selbst, der 1909

als 20-jähriger nach Wien gezogen war und dort die Schriften des Rassenideologen und Antisemiten Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels und die antisemitische Polemik von Politikern wie Georg Ritter von Schönerer (Alldeutsche Bewegung) und dem Wiener Bürgermeister Karl Lueger kennen gelernt hatte, war von diesem Milieu mitgeprägt. In der Zwischenkriegszeit waren sowohl Vertreter politischer Parteien wie auch der katholischen Kirche gegen Juden und das Judentum aufgetreten. 1925 warnte etwa Bischof Sigismund Waitz vor der « Weltgefahr des habgierigen, wucherischen, ungläubigen Judentums, dessen Macht unheimlich gestiegen » sei, und auch die Christlichsoziale Partei bediente sich im Wahlkampf teils offen antisemitischer Klischees. Der Austrofaschismus ab 1934 drängte Juden in der Organisation des katholischen « Ständestaates » an den Rand der Gesellschaft (vergleiche Klerikalfaschismus) . « Kauft nicht bei Juden » war schon vor der Eingliederung des Landes in das nationalsozialistische Deutsche Reich eine bekannte Parole.

Mit dem « Anschluß » Österreichs 1938 ans Deutsche Reich begann die Ausgrenzung der Juden. 1938 lebten in Österreich, nachdem viele schon zuvor emigriert waren, zwischen 201.000 und 214.000 Menschen, die gemäß den Nürnberger Gesetzen als « Voll- , Halb- , Viertel- , Achteljuden » galten (davon rund 180.000 in Wien) , darunter 181.882 « Volljuden » in ganz Österreich beziehungsweise 167.249 in Wien. Die jüdische Bevölkerung setzte sich sehr heterogen zusammen. Es gab sowohl eine etablierte großbürgerliche und mittelständische Schicht als auch eine große Unterschicht. 1935 waren nur 47.782 Mitglieder der IKG wohlhabend genug, Kultussteuern zu bezahlen.

In den Monaten nach dem « Anschluß » mußten die im Land verbliebenen Juden nach Wien übersiedeln. Es kam zu Enteignungen und pogromartigen Übergriffen, die viele in den Selbstmord trieben. Auch Egon Friedell, der noch am 11. März 1938 an Ödön von Horvath geschrieben hatte : « Jedenfalls bin ich immer in jedem Sinne reisefertig » , nahm sich durch einen Sprung aus dem Fenster das Leben, als Gestapo-Beamte ihn abholen kamen.

Während der Novemberpogrome (« Reichskristallnacht ») wurden in Wien, Klagenfurt, Linz, Graz, Salzburg, Innsbruck und mehreren niederösterreichischen Städten Juden und jüdische Einrichtungen wie Synagogen zu Opfern gewalttätiger Übergriffe. Insgesamt wurden dabei 27 Menschen getötet, darunter auch Richard Berger, der Vorstand der Kultusgemeinde von Innsbruck. Etwa 6.500 Juden wurden verhaftet, von denen die Hälfte in Konzentrationslager, vor allem nach Dachau, deportiert wurden.

Ein Jahr nach dem « Anschluß » lebten in Wien noch circa 91.000 so genannte « Volljuden » und 22.000 « Mischlinge » . Ab 1940 wurden die in der « Ostmark » verbliebenen Juden in großer Zahl in das KZ Theresienstadt oder eines der Ghettos im besetzten Polen deportiert. Baldur von Schirach, als Gauleiter von Wien dafür verantwortlich, bezeichnete dies als seinen « Beitrag zur europäischen Kultur » . Am 1. November 1942 wurde die Wiener Kultusgemeinde aufgelöst. Über 59.000 Mietwohnungen wurden bis Kriegsende in Wien « arisiert » . Die Shoa kostete etwa 65.500 jüdische Österreicher das Leben (62.000 davon konnten namentlich erfasst werden) , über 120.000 konnten noch emigrieren.

Einzelne Österreicher hatten während des Nationalsozialismus versucht, ihren jüdischen Mitbürgern unter Einsatz ihres Lebens zu helfen. Die Gedenkstätte Yad Vashem zeichnete dafür bis heute 90 Österreicher / innen mit dem Titel Gerechte unter den Völkern aus.

Nach Kriegsende lebten in Österreich noch zwischen 2000 und 5000 Juden - etwa 1000 bis 2000 davon überlebten den Krieg in Wien als Mitglieder des Ältestenrates der Israelitischen Kultusgemeinde Wien, in « geschützten Ehen » oder als « U-Boote ». Die übrigen konnten in Konzentrationslagern überleben.

Besonders vom streng orthodoxen Judentum war fast nichts mehr übrig. Die IKG, die im April 1945 aus dem von den Nazis installierten Ältestenrat neu entstanden war, hatte vor allem das Ziel, Alte und Kranke zu betreuen und den wenigen Rückkehrern aus Exil und Lagern bei der Eingliederung zu helfen. Überzeugt davon, daß in Wien keine jüdische Gemeinde mehr entstehen würde, hatten alle Handlungen provisorischen Charakter : gebetet wurde in einem kleinen Raum oberhalb des geschlossenen Stadttempels, Grundstücke wurden an die Gemeinde Wien verkauft, das Archiv der IKG 1952 nach Jerusalem gebracht.

Gleichzeitig kamen Überlebende aus den befreiten KZs und Flüchtlinge aus den neuen kommunistischen Diktaturen in Polen, Ungarn und Rumänien nach Wien, die ihre Heimat durch den Nationalsozialismus verloren und wegen des Kommunismus nicht in ihre Herkunftsländer zurückkehren konnten, sogenannte Displaced Persons. Viele von ihnen betrachteten Wien als Tor zum Westen, als Zwischenstopp auf dem Weg nach Palästina oder die USA. Bis 1955 lebten zwischen 250.000 und 300.000 jüdische Displaced Persons in DP-Lagern in Österreich, die vor allem vom American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee versorgt wurden. Das größte DP-Lager in Österreich war im ehemaligen Rothschild-Spital am Gürtel untergebracht. Etwa 3.000 dieser Neuzuwanderer blieben in Wien und bauten sich eine neue Existenz auf, die meisten von ihnen als Textilhändler in den leerstehenden Lokalen der Vertriebenen. Neben Wien bildeten sich israelitische Kultusgemeinden auch in Graz, Linz, Salzburg und Innsbruck.

Auch die meisten dieser Flüchtlinge hatten während der Verfolgung den Kontakt zur Religion verloren. Bis in die 1980er-Jahre gab es in Wien nur wenige Juden (meist Zuwanderer aus Belgien und USA) , die mit Schläfenlocken und Kaftan als Orthodoxe auf der Straße deutlich erkennbar waren.

Nach dem ungarischen Volksaufstand 1956 flüchteten 17.000 Juden aus Ungarn nach Österreich. 1972 erhielt Österreich mit dem Österreichischen Jüdischen Museum in Eisenstadt das erste jüdische Museum nach 1945. 1975 begann sich in Wien die Bucharische Gemeinde zu konstituieren (Sefardisches Zentrum Wien) . Seit den 1980er Jahren blüht wieder ein vielfältiges, eigenständiges jüdisches Leben, das durch Schulgründungen, Gemeindezentren, Unterstützungsorganisationen, Sportvereine, zahlreiche kulturelle Aktivitäten gekennzeichnet ist. Eine der Hauptaufgaben des 1980 gegründeten Jewish Welcome Service ist die Aussöhnung zwischen den während der NS-Herrschaft in Österreich vertriebenen Juden und österreichischen Nichtjuden sowie die Herbeiführung eines besseren Verständnisses zwischen Juden und Nichtjuden.

1972 wurde das Maimonides-Zentrum, Wiens jüdisches Altersheim, am Standort des 1942 enteigneten Mädchenpensionats, ausgebaut. 1980 konnte eine Volksschule wiederbegründet werden, anfangs in der Seitenstettengasse, die 1988 wieder in die Castellezgasse zog und auch eine AHS-Oberstufe erhielt. Im Herbst 2008 übersiedelte diese Zwi Perez Chajes-Schule von der Castellezgasse in die Simon-Wiesenthal-Gasse neben dem Messezentrum am Prater. Diese Schule gehört dort einem Komplex aus jüdischem Kindergarten, Volksschule und Gymnasium für rund 600 Kinder an und befindet sich nahe dem im März 2008 wiedereröffneten Hakoah-Sportzentrum im Prater, einem Bildungszentrum und einem

Pensionistenheim (ZPC-Campus) . Seit 1990 existiert die liberale Gemeinde Or Chadash. Die ab 1991 beginnende Zuwanderung jüdischstämmiger aus dem Gebiet der ehemaligen Sowjetunion hat die zahlenmäßig schwache jüdische Gemeinde gestärkt. 1989 wurde das Jüdische Institut für Erwachsenenbildung an der Volkshochschule eingerichtet. 1992 eröffnete das Sefardische Zentrum Tempelgasse offiziell, und 1993, auf Initiative von Helmut Zilk, das Jüdische Museum Wien. 1994 wurden das von Alexander Friedmann geleitete Psychosoziale Zentrum Esra (Deutsche « Hilfe ») eröffnet. Die orthodoxe Lauder Chabad eröffnete 1997 die Jüdische Pädagogische Akademie für Lehrerbildung (PÄDAK) , 1999 ein Schulzentrum beim Augarten (Lauder Chabad Campus) , und 2003 (akkreditierung 2007) die Lauder Business School, die erste jüdische Hochschule der österreichischen Geschichte, in Döbling. 1998 wurde das Institut für Jüdische Geschichte Österreichs (INJOEST) in Sankt Pölten in Kooperation mit der Uni Wien und das Jüdische Berufliche Bildungszentrum (JBBZ) , eine europaweit einzigartige umfassende Berufsvorbereitungsakademie für Immigranten, eingerichtet, 2000 folgte das Museum Judenplatz. Heute gibt es auch die orthodoxe Lehrerbildungsanstalt Wiener Akademie für Höhere Rabbinische Studien, und eine ultra-orthodoxe Talmudschule Machsike Hadass (auch für Mädchen) .

Auch öffentliche Zeichen wurden gesetzt : 2000 wurden das Holocaust-Mahnmal von Rachel Whiteread auf dem Judenplatz enthüllt.

Bei der Volkszählung 2001 (der letzten, in der die Religionszugehörigkeit amtlich erfasst wurde) wurden 8.140 Juden in Österreich gezählt, 6.988 davon mit Wohnsitz in Wien. Die IKG Wien geht jedoch von rund 15.000 Juden in Österreich aus, manche Angaben sprechen auch von bis zu 20.000.

2008 gab es in Wien vier koschere Lebensmittelläden, zwei Bäckereien, vier Fleischhauer, vier Restaurants, zwei Imbissstuben, zwei Catering-Firmen und eine jüdische Buchhandlung, Zeichen eines kleinen aber funktionierenden jüdischen Alltagslebens.

Le Festival de Salzburg

Créé en 1917 sous la forme d'une association pour célébrer Mozart, le Festival de Salzburg tient sa 1re édition en 1920. La jeune Autriche républicaine souffre alors d'une grave crise économique et du traumatisme lié à la perte de l'Empire et l'effondrement des Habsbourg. Max Reinhardt et Hugo von Hofmannsthal, chargés de la programmation, veulent faire de ce Festival une manifestation pluri-disciplinaire et internationale. Malgré l'hostilité de la population et le désintérêt du « Bund » , les 2 hommes parviennent à attirer des visiteurs étrangers à Salzburg qui devient un événement culturel mondial majeur à partir de 1925. Le Festival connaît cependant des déficits financiers à répétition couverts par le « Land » , la ville et le « Bund » qui finissent par entrer dans le conseil d'administration. La manifestation a beau être critiquée pour sa programmation conservatrice, elle devient synonyme d'excellence musicale et contribue à renforcer l'image d'une Autriche mélomane. Harcelée par le « Reich » , en 1933 et 1934, le Festival fait figure de bastion anti-azi jusqu'à l'« Anschluss » en 1938. Salzburg est alors instrumentalisé au service de la propagande de Josef Goebbels qui l'utilise notamment pour soutenir le moral des troupes. En 1945, l'armée américaine victorieuse réussit l'exploit de restaurer le Festival 3 mois seulement après son entrée dans Salzburg. C'est l'un des premiers signes de la construction d'une Autriche libre, démocratique et indépendante de l'Allemagne.

L'histoire même du Festival fait l'objet d'un mythe rarement remis en question par les Autrichiens. La quasi-totalité des étudiants qui y consacrent un mémoire reprennent l'idée que le Festival se serait imposé naturellement et de lui-même à Salzbourg, du fait de la grande tradition musicale de la région depuis le Moyen-âge.

La création du Festival de Salzbourg en 1917 et la tenue de sa 1^{re} édition en 1920 sont précédées d'un long mouvement de mémoire autour de la figure de Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. Au début du XIX^e siècle, la ville de Salzbourg n'est appréciée que des peintres et des poètes romantiques à la recherche d'une symbiose entre beauté et nature. D'autres souhaitent simplement se recueillir sur les traces de l'organiste Johann Michael Haydn (1737-1806) qui vécut à Salzbourg, ou du médecin et alchimiste Philippus Aureolus Paracelsus (1493-1541) qui y mourut. Mais nul ne pense alors à célébrer Mozart.

Il faut rappeler que Salzbourg appartient depuis peu à l'Empire d'Autriche. État gouverné par des princes archevêques du XIV^e siècle à 1802, il passe au début du XIX^e siècle des mains des Autrichiens, à celles des Français, puis des Bavarois. À la suite du Congrès de Vienne, il est définitivement rattaché à l'Empire d'Autriche en 1816. Désormais intégré au sein d'un vaste ensemble, Salzbourg perd de son lustre et s'assoupit. C'est la raison pour laquelle, au cours du XIX^e siècle, la bourgeoisie et l'Église catholique locales voient en la figure de Mozart un moyen de faire de Salzbourg un centre musical aussi rayonnant que sous les princes archevêques.

Sur une idée de la société « Lesegesellschaft », le Salzbourgeois Sigmund von Koflern et l'écrivain Julius Schilling lancent un appel à contribution afin d'ériger un monument en l'honneur de Mozart en 1835. Grâce au soutien financier du roi de Bavière Louis 1^{er}, le sculpteur Ludwig von Schwanthaler et le fondeur Johann Stiglmair créent une statue en bronze de 7 mètres de hauteur avec un socle en marbre. Elle est inaugurée le 5 septembre 1842 en présence des 2 fils du musicien. Le retentissement de l'événement dépasse les frontières de l'Empire d'Autriche et les Salzbourgeois ne cessent plus, dès lors, de célébrer Mozart. Peu de temps avant, en 1841, a été créé le « Dommusikverein und Mozarteum ». C'est une association dépendant de la cathédrale et enseignant la musique religieuse. Elle organise régulièrement des concerts. En 1856, elle célèbre le centenaire de la naissance de Mozart par une série de festivités.

Par la suite, des notables de la ville créent en 1870 l'« Internationale Mozart-Stiftung », une fondation privée dont le but est de créer une académie de musique, une salle de concert, ainsi qu'un fonds d'archives consacrés au compositeur. Mais en 1880, le « Mozarteum » se sépare du « Dommusikverein » et fusionne avec l'« Internationale Mozart-Stiftung » dans l'« Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum ». Cette nouvelle structure organise 8 fêtes autour de Mozart, de 1877 à 1910. D'une durée de quelques jours, elles consistent en une série de concerts auxquels participent des musiciens prestigieux comme Gustav Mahler ou Richard Strauß. Enfin, la maison natale de Mozart est transformée en musée, le 15 juin 1880, sous l'impulsion de l'« Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum ».

Parallèlement à ce mouvement de mémoire, Mozart devient également un argument touristique local sujet à une intense exploitation commerciale. En témoigne l'invention dès 1890 des pralinés chocolatés « Mozartkugel », enrobés d'un papier à l'effigie de Mozart-enfant, et auxquels plus personne ne peut échapper encore aujourd'hui lorsqu'il se rend en Autriche.

C'est dans ce contexte que se forge peu à peu l'idée d'un Festival dédié au compositeur. Différents projets sont élaborés simultanément sans qu'aucun d'eux n'aboutisse. Parmi les personnalités qui y prennent part au début du XXe siècle, se trouve l'homme de lettres Hermann Bahr, associé au metteur en scène Max Reinhardt et à l'écrivain Hugo von Hofmannsthal.

Enfin, c'est un simple notable du nom de Friedrich Gehmacher qui concrétise cette idée. Il est juriste, directeur de l'« Arbeiter-Unfall-Versicherungsanstalt », une société d'assurance des accidents du travail, membre du « Mozarteum » et du comité des fêtes autour de Mozart. Son projet naît à l'été 1906, lors de la fête célébrant le 150e anniversaire de la naissance du compositeur. Il se lie notamment avec le critique musical Heinrich Damisch qui souhaite comme lui, créer un Festival autour de Mozart. Né en 1872, à Vienne, Heinrich Damisch est le fils d'un général de l'armée impériale. D'abord officier, il se reconvertit dans le journalisme en 1904 à la suite d'une maladie qui le laisse borgne. En 1913, Damisch crée la « Wiener Akademische Mozartgemeinde » à Vienne, une association pour développer la musique auprès des jeunes. Mais elle est surtout destinée à servir la cause de Salzbourg et à trouver des soutiens. Gehmacher et Damisch veulent suivre l'exemple de Richard Wagner à Bayreuth et faire d'abord construire un théâtre avant de créer un Festival. En outre, la salle du « Mozarteum » est trop petite pour les Opéras. Rivalité, hostilité à Vienne, lâcheté ou peur que ce Festival ne dénature leur idéal et leur échappe, les membres du « Mozarteum » se montrent réticents. La cantatrice Lilli Lehmann craint par-dessus tout une utilisation mercantile de Mozart et s'oppose formellement au projet de Damisch et Gehmacher en 1916. Elle y voit probablement une concurrence pour les fêtes musicales organisées depuis 1877 et dont l'édition de 1914 a été annulée à cause de la Guerre.

Les 2 hommes sont donc contraints d'agir sans le « Mozarteum » et hors de Salzbourg. Ils créent l'association « Festspielhaus-Gemeinde », le 14 juin 1917 à Vienne. Les statuts sont élaborés par l'avocat Arthur Schey. La 1re assemblée générale a lieu le 1er août de la même année à Vienne dans le bâtiment du « Musikverein », dans la salle Richard-Wagner. La résistance salzbourgeoise est ainsi vaincue et Gehmacher crée une 2e branche de l'association à Salzbourg, en décembre.

Il ne faut pas oublier de mentionner que la création de Salzbourg s'inscrit dans un phénomène commun à l'ensemble de l'Europe où se multiplient les Festivals de musique au début du XXe siècle. Si la 1re utilisation du mot « Festival » serait apparue en Angleterre en 1724, c'est en Allemagne à la fin du XVIIIe siècle que naît véritablement la forme artistique du Festival. Au départ, il s'agit principalement de grandes fêtes musicales données pendant plusieurs jours par des Sociétés chorales en l'honneur de compositeurs ou de souverains.

Tout change avec la création du Festival de Bayreuth. Wagner organise, en effet, une série de représentations du cycle complet de la tétralogie « l'Anneau du Niebelungen », du 13 au 30 août 1876 à Bayreuth, dans un théâtre bâti spécialement pour l'occasion. Des personnalités aussi prestigieuses que Anton Bruckner, Franz Liszt, Edvard Grieg, Augusta Holmès, Franz Servais, Vincent d'Indy, Camille Saint-Saëns, Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovski, Charles-Marie Widor, Friedrich Nietzsche, Léon Tolstoï, l'Empereur d'Allemagne Guillaume 1er, l'Empereur du Brésil Pedro II, le roi Karl de Wurtemberg et Louis II de Bavière s'y pressent. La cohérence et la qualité artistiques des représentations, ainsi que le caractère

exceptionnel de la manifestation frappent les esprits. Même si les avis des spécialistes divergent sur la définition du mot Festival, tous s'accordent à dire que Bayreuth a donné à ce dernier son sens contemporain : une manifestation culturelle à caractère exceptionnel avec unité de lieu, de temps et périodicité renouvelée, généralement annuelle. Pour l'économiste Luc Bénito, auteur d'un livre sur le sujet, le Festival est en outre « une forme de fête unique, célébration publique d'un genre artistique dans un espace-temps réduit ». Certaines encyclopédies germaniques y ajoutent les notions de qualité artistique et de tradition. Werner Kohlschmidt va plus loin en avançant que le Festival reflèterait l'idéal de la société à qui il est adressé.

Signalons ici que la langue française n'emploie que le seul mot « Festival », contrairement à la langue allemande qui dispose à la fois de « Festival » et « Festspiele ». Nous sommes donc contraints de traduire « Salzburger Festspiele » par « Festival de Salzbourg » au singulier. Le mot « Festival », employé en allemand, est un anglicisme récent et équivaut aujourd'hui pour les germanophones à celui de « Festspiele ». Pourtant, selon Franz Willnauer, le Festival ne signifierait pas la même chose que les « Festspiele ». Les « Festspiele » procéderaient d'une vision idéaliste du XIXe siècle, tandis que le Festival serait une invention de la seconde moitié du XXe siècle correspondant à un produit culturel de masse. Pour notre part, nous ne pensons pas que cette distinction soit utile : il est évident qu'un Festival du XIXe siècle n'est pas semblable à un Festival du XXe siècle. Par ailleurs, cela idéalise les « Festspiele » alors que les préoccupations économiques et touristiques sont également présentes dès leur création, comme nous avons pu le voir pour Salzbourg.

Le Festival de Bayreuth inspire au début du XXe siècle la fondation de plusieurs Festivals de musique en Europe. À Munich, les « Opernfestspiele » (1875) se muent en Festival moderne consacré à Wagner, à partir de 1901. En Finlande, alors sous souveraineté russe, naît en 1912 le Festival d'opéra de Savonlinna sous l'impulsion de la soprano Aino Ackté. Il est étroitement associé à l'émergence de l'identité finlandaise. En Italie, le ténor Giovanni Zenatello et l'impresario de théâtre Ottone Rovato donnent naissance, en 1913, au Festival de Vérone qui célèbre le centenaire de la naissance de Giuseppe Verdi avec la représentation d'« Aïda » dans les arènes. Cette « vogue » de Festivals est cependant contrecarrée par la Première Guerre mondiale. Seul Salzbourg émerge durant le conflit, encore qu'il ne s'agisse en 1917 que du dépôt des statuts de l'association « Festspielhaus-Gemeinde ». La Ire édition du Festival de Salzbourg ne se tient qu'en 1920, grâce à Max Reinhardt et Hugo von Hofmannsthal qui réussissent à prendre le pouvoir artistique au détriment de Friedrich Gehmacher et Heinrich Damisch.

Entre la création du « Festspielhaus-Gemeinde », en 1917, et la première édition en 1920, des bouleversements majeurs ont eu lieu en Europe. La fin de la Première Guerre mondiale se solde par l'effondrement de l'Empire d'Autriche-Hongrie. C'est la raison pour laquelle Reinhardt et Hofmannsthal modifient profondément les objectifs de la manifestation et lui assignent une double mission. La première serait de faire œuvre de paix après la guerre fratricide de 1914-1918 en créant un Festival international de musique, de théâtre et de danse. La seconde serait de conforter la nouvelle Autriche en servant son image à l'étranger et en stimulant le développement économique de Salzbourg.

À ce moment crucial où la petite république alpine éclot face à l'Allemagne, il nous a semblé que le Festival de Salzbourg pouvait constituer un prisme à travers lequel étudier la construction de l'identité autrichienne. C'est pourquoi nous avons choisi d'intituler notre thèse : « Le Festival de Salzbourg et l'identité autrichienne : 1917-1950 ».

Comme l'a montré Gérard Noiriel, l'idée d'« identité nationale » est extrêmement délicate à utiliser car il n'existe pas de définition objective admise par tous les historiens. Pour notre part, nous entendons par « identité autrichienne », le sentiment commun d'appartenance à la nation autrichienne. Il ne s'agit donc pas ici de définir ce qu'est l'identité autrichienne mais de se concentrer sur l'émergence d'une conscience collective nationale.

À cet égard, la situation des Autrichiens est complexe. La cohésion de l'Empire d'Autriche-Hongrie reposait essentiellement sur son identification à la dynastie des Habsbourg. Or, au lendemain de la Première Guerre mondiale, l'Autriche est démembrée et la restauration des Habsbourg proscrite. Les Autrichiens émettent alors le souhait de vivre dans un espace élargi, comprenant l'Allemagne ou l'Empire perdu des Habsbourg. Le 21 octobre 1918, les députés allemands d'Autriche se constituent en assemblée nationale allemande provisoire dans le palais de la diète de Basse-Autriche à Vienne. Ils proclament le droit à l'auto-détermination d'un État allemand indépendant d'Autriche. Le 12 novembre, l'Assemblée nationale provisoire déclare la création de la République allemande d'Autriche. Mais le traité de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, signé en septembre 1919, interdit toute union avec l'Allemagne, les anciens pays de la monarchie ou les populations allemandes de Bohême et du Haut-Adige. Ces conditions imposées par les Alliés sont vécues comme une injustice et une violation du droit à l'auto-détermination. Dans plusieurs « Länder », des référendums sont organisés jusqu'en 1920 pour faire scission. La petite Autriche républicaine ne réussit alors pas à inspirer de sentiment national en compensation à la majorité de la population, tandis que subsiste une identité culturelle trans-frontalière germanophone et centre-européenne. Une identité centre-européenne étudiée notamment en France par l'historien Victor-Lucien Tapié, puis Bernard Michel.

Comment le Festival de Salzbourg est-il devenu un symbole de l'Autriche à l'étranger et dans quelle mesure a-t-il pu nourrir le sentiment d'identité nationale autrichien qui se développe à partir de la Première Guerre mondiale ?

Abondantes pour la période allant de 1917 à 1938, les sources se raréfient concernant les années nazies et, dans une moindre mesure, sous occupation américaine. Nous avons été dans l'impossibilité de consulter de nombreux documents pour la période allant de 1938 à 1945 aux « Staatsarchiv » de Vienne et aux « Bundesarchiv » de Berlin. Les pièces étaient souvent déclarées introuvables ou inutilisables pour cause de détérioration. C'est ce qui explique que cette partie de notre thèse soit plus courte que les autres, au-delà du fait qu'elle porte sur une durée plus brève.

La quasi-totalité des archives consultées se trouve en Autriche. Nous nous sommes rendue à Salzbourg où nous avons étudié, dans un 1er temps, les archives du Festival (« Archiv der Salzburger Festspiele »). Nous avons été assez déçue par leur contenu : il reste finalement assez peu de documents antérieurs à 1938. Le plus intéressant reste les comptes-rendus des assemblées générales du Festival mais, là encore, ils ont totalement disparu concernant la période nazie. Un très gros travail a été entrepris par les directeurs successifs pour tenter de reconstituer des fonds, notamment avec des revues et des photos de presse classées par année qui nous fait gagner un temps précieux.

Nous avons ensuite vu, avec beaucoup de difficultés, quelques documents de l'archevêché (« Konsistorialarchiv ») mais nous n'avons pas été autorisée à accéder à l'inventaire des archives.

Les archives de la ville (« Stadtarchiv ») présentaient quelques doublons avec celles du Festival et du « Land » (« Landesarchiv ») mais recelaient encore une bonne partie des comptes-rendus d'assemblées municipales. Nous avons enfin dépouillé les archives du « Land » (Province) de Salzbourg qui contiennent notamment la correspondance du « Landeshauptmann » Franz Rehrl au sujet du Festival durant l'entre-deux-guerres.

À Vienne, nous avons pris connaissance de quelques pièces des collections théâtrales et musicales de la bibliothèque nationale (« Musiksammlung » et « Theatersammlung, Nationalbibliothek »), avant de nous concentrer sur la bibliographie. Nous nous sommes également rendue aux « Staatsarchiv » afin de dépouiller des cartons des ministères de l'Intérieur, des Affaires étrangères et de la Culture. Enfin, nous avons glané quelques documents aux archives du « Musikverein » et du « Wiener Philharmoniker », des ensembles musicaux ayant participé activement aux différentes éditions de la manifestation.

Nous avons pu, grâce à l'amabilité des certains interlocuteurs, nous procurer un grand nombre de photocopies par courrier. Il s'agit du contenu de 2 cartons de la U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. À ce sujet, il nous manque la totalité des rapports des officiers dirigeant la Theatre and Music section. Heureusement, une thèse autrichienne sur les médias et les arts sous occupation américaine de 1945 à 1950 comble en partie cette lacune. Nous avons également reçu d'Allemagne de précieux documents du « Freies Deutsches Hochstift » de Francfort et du « Bundesarchiv » de Coblenz. Nous nous sommes rendus sur place à Berlin mais la moisson s'est avérée décevante pour les archives du 3^e « Reich », les quelques dossiers concernant le Festival restant introuvables. Par ailleurs, nous ne nous sommes pas intéressée aux archives personnelles de Max Reinhardt qui sont entreposées à l'Université de Binghamton aux États-Unis car elles contiennent essentiellement des documents de travail sur ses spectacles.

En France, nous avons eu accès à un fonds très riche de revue de presse internationale concernant le Festival de Salzbourg au département de la musique Louvois de la Bibliothèque nationale de France. Nous avons également étudié quelques documents au ministère des Affaires étrangères à Paris, Nantes et Colmar sur la participation d'artistes français à des concerts.

Au niveau bibliographique, nous avons consulté plus de 400 ouvrages, principalement en allemand et en anglais. Il s'agit en partie de publications universitaires avec un grand nombre de périodiques, d'actes de colloque, d'analyses historiques, littéraires ou sociologiques.

D'autre part, nous avons eu la chance de pouvoir disposer d'un grand nombre de livres publiés par des contemporains du Festival. Beaucoup ont laissé des témoignages par le biais de romans, de correspondances, de mémoires ou d'essais. Même subjectif et rétrospectif, ce matériau s'est avéré très riche et a pallié certaines lacunes de nos sources, tout en fournissant un contrepoint intéressant à la teneur des archives officielles. C'est le cas, par exemple, des correspondances privées d'Hugo von Hofmannsthal ou de Richard Strauß dont la liberté de ton contraste avec la retenue de leurs courriers administratifs.

Par ailleurs, il existe une bibliographie abondante sur la construction de l'identité autrichienne. Les historiens et germanistes spécialistes de l'Autriche sont presque unanimes pour dire que les Autrichiens se sentent majoritairement

allemands jusqu'à la veille de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Rappelons que le 1er sondage sur la question n'est effectué qu'en 1956. A cette date, 49 % des Autrichiens interrogés déclarent que l'Autriche est une nation ; 46 % qu'elle n'en est pas une ; et 5 % ne se déclarent pas. Seule la moitié des Autrichiens exprime donc à cette époque un sentiment d'appartenance à la nation autrichienne.

Certains universitaires considèrent toutefois qu'il ne faut pas circonscrire l'identité autrichienne au sentiment d'appartenance nationale et se prononcent pour la thèse d'une identité culturelle autrichienne spécifique, pré-existante à l'identité nationale. C'est le cas par exemple de Friedrich Heer et de Felix Kreißler qui a développé le concept controversé de prise de conscience de la nation autrichienne. D'autres évoquent le passage progressif d'une identité allemande à une identité autrichienne, à l'image d'Ernst Brückmüller, ou de Paul Paster. Une position qui ne remet toutefois pas en cause l'ambivalence des Autrichiens vis-à-vis de l'Allemagne et leur sentiment de rejet développé depuis le milieu du XIXe siècle.

Nous n'avons pas l'intention de trancher dans le débat mais d'explorer la façon dont le Festival de Salzbourg a participé à la construction du sentiment d'appartenance à la nation autrichienne. Les fondateurs ont-ils essayé de définir et de véhiculer une identité autrichienne via le Festival ? Y a-t-il eu des tentatives de contrôle idéologique de la part des autorités locales et du « Bund » (État fédéral) ? Quels sont les stéréotypes renforcés ou créés par le Festival de Salzbourg sur l'Autriche et les Autrichiens ? La manifestation porte en effet en germe tout un éventail de lieux communs que l'on retrouve au cœur de la construction de l'identité nationale autrichienne dans la seconde moitié du XXe siècle comme la figure de Mozart enfant ou encore la beauté des paysages.

Notre thèse relève donc à la fois de l'histoire de l'Europe centrale et de l'histoire culturelle. Dans cette optique, 2 ouvrages nous ont été particulièrement utiles. Celui d'Anne-Marie Thiesse sur les identités nationales démontre comment le sentiment national ne devient spontané que lorsqu'il a été parfaitement intériorisé grâce à l'invention d'un héritage commun et à l'« adhésion collective à une fiction ». Celui de Benedict Anderson sur l'imaginaire national définit la nation comme une « communauté politique imaginaire, et imaginée comme intrinsèquement limitée et souveraine ». En étudiant l'histoire du Festival de Salzbourg, nous allons voir comment cette manifestation a contribué à fournir des éléments symboliques permettant de distinguer l'Allemagne de l'Autriche et de définir la spécificité de cette dernière aux yeux des étrangers comme des Autrichiens.

Concernant la méthodologie, nous avons veillé à ne jamais oublier d'observer des méthodes comparatives, contrairement à la majorité des auteurs ayant écrit sur le sujet. Même les universitaires anglais et américains restent prisonniers d'un point de vue strictement autrichien, voire salzbourgeois. Cette absence de méthode comparative aboutit de façon quasi systématique à une surévaluation de la singularité du Festival de Salzbourg. Ainsi, le fait que Hofmannsthal revendique un double héritage théâtral antique et médiéval n'est absolument pas original. C'est même une constante chez la plupart des intellectuels et artistes européens du XXe siècle. Il s'agissait, à l'inverse, de distinguer ce qui fonde la spécificité du Festival de Salzbourg, et ce en quoi il s'inscrit dans la norme. Quels sont les autres Festivals existant à cette époque ? Quelle est l'influence de Bayreuth sur Salzbourg ? Le Festival de Salzbourg a-t-il contribué durant la période étudiée à forger l'image des Festivals telle que nous la concevons aujourd'hui ? Suivant le credo de Pascal Ory pour qui « un objet culturel n'existe pas en lui-même mais en relation », nous avons toujours considéré les

différentes éditions du Festival en relation avec leurs conditions de production, leur médiation et leur réception. On ne peut, par exemple, circonscrire l'audience du Festival aux seuls festivaliers : les spectacles faisaient aussi l'objet de nombreuses retransmissions radiophoniques dans le monde entier et d'enregistrements par l'industrie du disque. Une démarche qui se heurte toutefois aux limites de nos sources : difficile de déterminer précisément l'ampleur du succès du Festival de Salzbourg, à partir des seuls articles de presse et des maigres chiffres qui subsistent aujourd'hui sur la fréquentation.

Un petit mot sur les articles de presse étudiés en nombre pour cette thèse. Ils ont été sélectionnés à partir de différentes sources. Certaines revues de presse utilisées ont été reconstituées a posteriori par les Archives du Festival. D'autres, comme celles de la Bibliothèque nationale de France, ont été rassemblées à l'époque des faits. En dehors de cela, nous avons procédé à des sondages concernant certains journaux (« Neue Freie Presse », « The New York Times », « Comoedia », « Morning Post », etc.) , en privilégiant des dates charnières internes et externes au Festival (1920, 1925, 1933, 1938, 1945, etc.) .

Enfin, il fallait se garder de trop idéaliser les motivations des fondateurs du Festival de Salzbourg. Animés par de nobles intentions et par un idéal de paix après 1914-1918, ils poursuivent malgré tout également des intérêts personnels. Beaucoup de chercheurs s'extasient sur le fait que Hofmannsthal ait abandonné ses cachets lors des Ires éditions du Festival. Certes, mais il avait tout de même la satisfaction de réaliser ses ambitions artistiques, tout en flattant son ego et en prenant soin d'écarter d'autres dramaturges contemporains de la programmation. Les querelles et rivalités personnelles d'artistes sont d'ailleurs l'une des principales constantes de ce Festival. De même, l'importance des textes théoriques de Hofmannsthal et de Reinhardt sur le Festival est largement surévaluée. Non seulement l'idéologie du Festival est souvent réduite à ces seules publications, mais une analyse de leur audience réelle n'a jamais été entreprise.

Nous précisons également que notre thèse ne relève ni de la musicologie ni de l'histoire du théâtre. C'est la raison pour laquelle nous nous étendons peu sur le contenu artistique et esthétique des représentations lorsque celui-ci ne représente pas d'intérêt majeur à l'avancement de notre réflexion.

Au départ, nous avons envisagé un plan purement chronologique mais celui-ci ne nous permettait pas de dégager les grandes constantes du Festival. Nous avons donc opté pour un plan chronologico-thématique en 5 parties.

Nous avons choisi de commencer l'analyse de notre sujet en 1917, date de création de l'association « Festspielhaus-Gemeinde » , et non en 1920, date de la Ire édition du Festival. La période allant de 1917 à 1920 est particulièrement intéressante à prendre en compte car c'est durant ce laps de temps qu'Hofmannsthal va définir sa conception du Festival à travers un corpus de textes.

Nous mettons un terme à notre étude en 1950. Au départ, nous comptions mener cette thèse jusqu'en 1955, en référence au traité d'État du 15 mai 1955 qui permet à l'Autriche de redevenir une République souveraine et démocratique. Mais la date ne coïncidait pas avec une rupture de l'histoire du Festival. Finalement, nous avons choisi de ne pas dépasser l'année 1950, durant laquelle fut votée la loi nationale de financement du Festival. Cette date

correspond également à la fin de la dénazification pour les artistes, à une prise de distance des américains vis-à-vis du Festival et aux Ires répercussions de la Guerre froide sur la manifestation.

Durant la période que nous étudions, nous avons distingué 4 grandes césures chronologiques. En 1925, le Festival devient un événement culturel international incontournable et médiatisé. 1933 marque l'arrivée au pouvoir de Adolf Hitler avec des mesures compromettant le Festival. En 1938, l'« Anschluss » fait passer le Festival sous la coupe des Nazis. 1945 clôt la période nazie et ouvre l'occupation militaire des Américains à Salzburg.

...

Après l'arrivée au pouvoir des Nazis en Allemagne et le début du 3e « Reich », l'Autriche devient le refuge d'artistes qui ne peuvent ou ne veulent plus apparaître en Allemagne, et qui trouvent à Salzburg l'occasion de se réunir dans le cadre d'un événement culturel de haut-niveau, à peu de distance des frontières allemandes. Ainsi Bruno Walter, juif, s'installe en Autriche, et l'Italien Arturo Toscanini, fermement antifasciste, annule toutes ses participations au Festival de Bayreuth et se replie sur Salzburg, dont il devient un habitué entre 1934 et 1937.

Le nombre de visiteurs allemands tombe de plus de 15,000 à moins de 900 en raison de la taxe de 1,000 « Reichsmarks » sur les visas pour l'Autriche. Des artistes allemands s'y produisent cependant ; Herbert von Karajan y débute en 1933 et Wilhelm Furtwängler en 1937.

En 1938, l'Autriche est annexée à l'Allemagne. Toscanini et d'autres artistes quittent le Festival et émigrent, notamment aux États-Unis. « Faust » de Max Reinhardt et « Jedermann » de Hugo von Hofmannsthal sont retirés du programme, et le Palais des Festivals est transformé dans le sens de l'esthétique du régime.

En 1943, le programme est réduit et le Festival est renommé « Salzburger Theater- und Musiksommer » (Été musical et théâtral de Salzburg) . Max Reinhardt meurt à New York, le 31 octobre. En 1944 ne seront donnés que 2 concerts symphoniques en remplacement du Festival, en raison de la proclamation de la « guerre totale » et de l'interdiction de tous les Festivals après l'attentat du 20 juillet contre Adolf Hitler.

Le public du Festival de Salzburg (1920-1950)

(Amélie Charnay, Université de Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne.)

1917 : En pleine Guerre, 2 inconnus déposent les statuts de l'association « Festspielhaus-Gemeinde » (Communauté du Palais des Festivals) à Vienne. Il s'agit du notable salzbourgeois Friedrich Gehmacher et du critique musical Heinrich Damisch. Ils rêvent de faire ériger un Palais des Festivals en l'honneur de Mozart à Salzburg, la ville natale du compositeur. Une idée inspirée par le Bayreuth de Wagner. Des noms prestigieux s'associent au projet comme le metteur en scène Max Reinhardt, l'écrivain Hugo von Hofmannsthal, ou encore les chefs d'orchestre Richard Strauß et Franz Schalk. Ces hommes prennent rapidement le contrôle artistique de l'association. Plus question de se restreindre à Mozart, le Festival doit être pluri-disciplinaire (musique, théâtre et danse) avec des auteurs Classiques de langue

allemande et étrangère. La 1^{re} édition du Festival de Salzbourg se tient du 22 au 26 août 1920. Faut de moyens, seule la pièce « Jedermann » de Hofmannsthal est représentée en plein-air. (1) Mais, dès 1925, spectateurs et journalistes étrangers affluent. Un succès qui ne s'est pas démenti jusqu'à aujourd'hui.

Max Reinhardt et surtout Hugo von Hofmannsthal pensent l'idée du Festival de Salzbourg bien avant de passer aux travaux pratiques. Il est capital pour eux de redonner un sens au mot « festival » en faisant de Salzbourg une vraie fête réunissant toutes les classes sociales et non un Festival réservé aux élites fortunées. (2) La question est de savoir si cela n'est resté qu'un vœu pieux. Nous commençons notre étude en 1917, date de création de l'association « Festspielhausgemeinde », et nous y mettons un terme en 1950, année qui marque la reprise en main totale du Festival par les Autrichiens et le retour des touristes en masse après la Guerre.

Quel public le Festival de Salzbourg a-t-il attiré de 1917 à 1950 ?

De 1917 à 1925, le Festival s'impose progressivement comme un événement culturel majeur en Europe. À partir de 1933, Salzbourg est menacé par les Nazis au pouvoir en Allemagne. En 1938, la manifestation est réduite à un rôle de simple rouage de la propagande hitlérienne après l'« Anschluss ». Le Festival retrouve son prestige sous l'action de l'armée américaine qui libère le « Land » (province) en 1945.

À Salzbourg, les étrangers ne sont pas les bienvenus (1920-1925)

Initiative d'origine privée, le Festival de Salzbourg trouve peu de soutiens à ses débuts. Les élus locaux se montrent réticents, tandis que le « Land » (région) et le « Bund » (gouvernement fédéral) hésitent à accorder des subventions. Le Festival de Salzbourg est donc condamné à devenir international dès sa création, l'association trouvant sa principale source de financement dans les cotisations des adhérents et dans les recettes des spectacles. Malgré le niveau inégal des représentations et le manque de moyens, la manifestation bénéficie immédiatement de la bienveillance de quelques journalistes étrangers et de la curiosité de touristes européens et nord-américains. Ils sont attirés par la notoriété de Hofmannsthal, et Schalk, mais aussi par les mises en scène de Reinhardt et un festival de musique contemporaine parallèle lancé par Richard Strauß. Il faut souligner également que le Festival de Salzbourg est alors le 1^{er} en Europe à proposer une programmation aussi diverse et ambitieuse. Parmi les personnalités notables qui s'y rendent ces années-là, citons Romain Rolland (3), Paul Géraldy, ou encore Aldous Huxley qui vient en tant que critique musical (4).

La création du Festival a pour conséquence de développer le tourisme à Salzbourg. « Salzbourg est rempli d'étrangers » (5), peut-on lire dans la presse dès 1921. 3 ans plus tard, les journaux font état de 130,000 touristes passés à Salzbourg durant la saison estivale de 1922. (6) Un chiffre élevé au regard des 38,000 habitants de la ville. (7) Une réussite pour Hofmannsthal qui voulait faire de Salzbourg un Festival international. Mais sa volonté de réduire le fossé entre les élites et le peuple se heurte vite à des difficultés.

La population se montre, en effet, résolument hostile à ces visiteurs étrangers. Il faut dire que la situation économique de l'Autriche, à la fin de la Guerre, est désastreuse. (8) Le manque de matières premières et de produits alimentaires,

ainsi que l'augmentation du chômage provoque une crise sociale et politique. (9) Salzburg n'échappe pas à ce climat d'agitation. Les habitants ne perçoivent donc pas d'un bon œil l'organisation de la Ire édition du Festival, en 1920. C'est ce que raconte Gottfried Reinhardt, le fils du metteur en scène, dans ses mémoires :

« Il y eut des manifestations. On avait peur que les étrangers viennent manger le pain de la population, et les journaux fulminaient contre la stimulation attendue du tourisme - un mot alors employé curieusement comme une insulte. » (10)

Par la suite, les étrangers deviennent les boucs émissaires idéaux de l'inflation. Le sentiment de xénophobie est tel qu'il remet un temps en cause la tenue du festival en 1921. (11)

Il est vrai que les billets sont chers et excluent d'emblée la population des festivités. Leur prix se situe entre 50 et 300 couronnes en 1920, sachant qu'un kilo de pommes de terre coûtait alors 6 couronnes. (12)

Dans ce contexte, le Festival de Salzburg devient la cible privilégiée des antisémites. Max Reinhardt qui est juif, est l'objet d'un véritable harcèlement de la part de plusieurs journaux liés au Parti national-socialiste et à l'Union antisémite. (13) Si les journaux antisémites se radicalisent encore les années suivantes, la fin de l'inflation et l'amélioration de la situation économique, dès 1923, apaisent les tensions au sein de la population. Les manifestations de xénophobie et d'antisémitisme vis-à-vis du Festival se font plus rares.

« Le centre de l'Europe » (1925-1933) (14)

De 1925 à 1933, le Festival de Salzburg connaît des difficultés financières telles que son existence est menacée. Il doit son salut au « Landeshauptmann » (président de la province) Franz Rehr. Ce dernier assainit les finances de l'association et pilote sa ré-organisation. En contre-partie, des représentants de la ville, du « Land », et du « Bund » entrent dans la direction. Rehr impose également la création du « Fremdenverkehrsförderungsfond » (fonds pour la promotion du tourisme dans le « Land » de Salzburg) . Une forme de taxe sur les entreprises qui profitent du tourisme dont le produit est reversé à des associations comme le « Festspielhaus-Gemeinde » . Enfin, la manifestation est officiellement reconnue par le « Bund » dont la participation financière reste cependant limitée.

Dans le même temps, le Festival connaît une profonde mutation artistique. Hofmannsthal meurt en 1929, et Reinhardt prend ses distances avec la direction. L'art dramatique n'occupe plus qu'une place restreinte de la programmation. La danse est réduite à portion congrue. Désormais, des chefs d'orchestre prestigieux (Bruno Walter, Clemens Krauß) se battent pour prendre le pouvoir. La notoriété des interprètes lyriques n'est pas en reste (Richard Mayr, Lotte Schöne, Elisabeth Schumann, Franz Völker) . La marque de fabrique du Festival devient donc un répertoire musical Classique, associé à la pièce-phare, « Jedermann », toujours jouée en plein-air. La manifestation a beau être critiquée pour sa programmation conservatrice, elle fait figure de modèle prestigieux pour les voisins européens de l'Autriche. Sa réussite repose sur la participation d'artistes renommés à un Festival centré sur la musique et rendant hommage à Mozart. Une sorte de lieu de pèlerinage dans une ville rassemblant de nombreux atouts : son architecture, ses paysages et la proximité immédiate des montagnes et de la campagne.

De 1925 à 1933, le nombre de festivaliers oscille chaque année entre 60,000 et 70,000. (15) La répartition par nationalité réserve quelques surprises d'après les quelques indices statistiques qui subsistent. (16) En 1926 et 1927, les Autrichiens représentent entre 35 et 40 % des visiteurs. Du côté des visiteurs étrangers, les Allemands sont les plus nombreux : entre 46 et 47 % des festivaliers. Le reste vient d'Europe, des États-Unis, de l'Union soviétique, d'Afrique et d'Asie. (17) Tous les continents sont ainsi représentés. À partir de 1928, le nombre d'Autrichiens est réduit à portion congrue : 80 % des visiteurs viennent de l'étranger. (18)

Mais c'est la douche froide en 1931. Les effets de la dépression commencent à se faire sentir, conjugués à la crise dite du « hundert Marksperr » . Le gouvernement allemand impose, en effet, à ses ressortissants de s'acquitter d'une taxe de 100 Marks pour se rendre en Autriche. Au final, la fréquentation baisse et les touristes allemands se raréfient. (19)

L'importance des touristes étrangers sur la fréquentation du Festival n'est pas sans conséquence sur la programmation. Les spectacles pouvant plaire potentiellement à ces visiteurs sont donc choisis prioritairement. (20)

Désormais, Salzbourg fait figure de capitale européenne culturelle, le temps d'un été. La ville devient, comme l'écrit Stefan Zweig dans ses mémoires, le « centre de l'Europe » . (21) Le retentissement de cet événement est international : on dénombre des centaines de journalistes accrédités et des dizaines de radios qui retransmettent les concerts en Occident. Salzbourg devient un lieu de villégiature pour la haute-société internationale. Un mélange de magnats américains (Edward Filene, William Averell Harriman) ; d'aristocrates européens (l'ex-« Kron-Prinz » , le prince de Bassiano Roffredo Caetani) ; d'hommes politiques (Gaston Doumergue, Winston Churchill) ; d'intellectuels et d'artistes renommés (Richard Beer-Hofmann, Tristan Bernard, Franz Molnar) . Photographes et badauds se pressent devant l'entrée du Palais des Festivals, les soirs de première, pour apercevoir le ballet des voitures luxueuses qui déposent les personnalités sur le tapis rouge. Salzbourg alimente ainsi les chroniques mondaines des journaux du monde entier.

Mais les prix des places restent élevés. Une situation qui provoque un débat récurrent dans la presse. Les courriers des lecteurs contiennent souvent des plaintes. (22) Devant ces protestations, la direction accorde presque chaque année des places à tarif réduit pour la population. (23) Malgré cela, l'animosité des habitants vis-à-vis du Festival reste un sujet de préoccupation pour le conseil d'administration. (24)

Salzbourg contre Bayreuth (1933-1938)

L'Autriche entre ouvertement en conflit avec l'Allemagne à partir du mois de juin 1933. Le Festival est aussitôt pris pour cible par les Nazis. (25) Une taxe est imposée aux Allemands qui souhaitent se rendre en Autriche (26) et des célébrités comme Richard Strauß ou Wilhelm Furtwängler reçoivent l'interdiction de se produire à Salzbourg, en 1934. Un point critique est atteint à l'été de la même année, lorsque les attentats à la bombe se multiplient dans la ville après l'assassinat du chancelier Engelbert Dollfuss. Privée de ses touristes allemands et de ses artistes les plus prestigieux, la manifestation s'ouvre encore davantage aux autres nationalités. Son attractivité est, par ailleurs, renforcée par sa nouvelle image de Festival anti-Bayreuth.

Une véritable communauté d'artistes réfugiés d'Allemagne se forme dans les environs de Salzbourg. Dans la ville même, résident toujours Max Reinhardt et Stefan Zweig. (27) Ils sont rejoints dans la région par Bruno Frank et Carl Zuckmayer. Chez eux, ils accueillent durant le Festival Theodore Dreiser, Jakob Waßermann, Thomas Mann (28) , Franz Werfel (29) et son épouse Alma Mahler, ou encore le comédien Max Pallenberg (30) et la famille de Thomas Mann (31) .

Dans les rangs des festivaliers, on compte également des intellectuels engagés. Salzbourg devient un lieu de rassemblement anti-nazi prisé par Marlene Dietrich, Erich Maria Remarque, Herbert George Wells, James Joyce, Ödön von Horvath, André Gide, l'écrivain américain Theodore Dreiser, Marguerite Yourcenar ou encore François Mauriac. (32)

Certains journaux affirment que des festivaliers habitués à se rendre à Bayreuth, auraient délaissé le Festival pour soutenir politiquement Salzbourg. Il y aurait là tout le gotha de Paris, Rome et Londres :

« Les élites européennes ne sont pas fâchées, en effet, de se réunir dans un centre de culture où l'on ne brûle pas les bibliothèques et où l'on n'oblige pas les partitions à faire de la politique. » (33)

Tout ce petit monde semble fasciné par le chef d'orchestre haut en couleurs Arturo Toscanini, qui s'impose comme l'homme fort du Festival, de 1934 à 1938. Ce farouche opposant à Benito Mussolini et à Adolf Hitler, fait le choix de Salzbourg contre Bayreuth où on le priait de se produire. Ultime pied de nez aux Nazis, il s'obstine à diriger du Wagner à 2 pas de la frontière et de la résidence du « Führer » à Berchtesgaden. Il contribue ainsi à faire de Salzbourg « le refuge de la culture allemande » (34) comme l'écrit François Mauriac dans un article.

L'Europe entière se presse aux représentations du Festival de Salzbourg. Cadre prestigieux et valorisant, il permet à l'Autriche de soigner et d'entretenir ses relations diplomatiques avec ses pays voisins. Horthy, Humbert de Piémont ou encore Edouard VIII se rendent sur les rives de la Salzach. Mais cela ne doit pas masquer les ambiguïtés de la direction et du « Bund » . D'ailleurs, la ville finit par accueillir de nouveau chaleureusement des personnalités du « Reich » après la conclusion du « Gentlemen's agreement » entre le chancelier Schuschnigg et Hitler, le 11 juillet 1936. Grâce au retour des touristes allemands et à l'aura de Toscanini, le nombre d'étrangers venant à Salzbourg augmente à partir de 1936. Un record est même atteint en 1937, avec 52 000 visiteurs ayant passé au moins 1 nuit dans la ville de Salzbourg au mois d'août. (35)

Au service des Nazis (1938-1945)

Suivant les volontés du ministre de la Propagande Josef Goebbels et avec la bénédiction de Hitler, Salzbourg devient le 2e Festival du « Reich » après Bayreuth. La manifestation doit servir à la fois à amadouer l'opinion internationale et illustrer le prestige du régime. (36)

Contrairement à ce que l'on pouvait attendre, Goebbels n'opère aucune révolution artistique. Il n'hésite d'ailleurs pas à choisir des artistes pour leur talent plutôt que leurs opinions politiques. Il sollicite, par exemple, des metteurs en scène restés fidèles à Max Reinhardt comme Heinz Hilpert. (37) La programmation reste ainsi presque inchangée, exception

faite des Opéras de Richard Wagner qui sont écartés pour ne plus concurrencer Bayreuth. Les Nazis inscrivent ainsi Salzbourg dans la continuité de ses débuts, même s'ils rejettent officiellement l'héritage des fondateurs.

Le Festival se déroule comme prévu, du 23 juillet au 31 août 1938. La fréquentation est en forte baisse pour les festivaliers étrangers. (38) En outre, le public comprend pour la 1^{re} fois des travailleurs qui bénéficient de billets à tarif réduit grâce au « Kraft-durch-Freude » (KdF : La force par la joie) , l'organisation de loisirs du « Deutsche Arbeitsfront » (Le Front allemand du travail) . (39)

En 1939, le grand événement est la présence de Hitler qui fait l'honneur de sa visite à 2 reprises. Salzbourg fait alors figure de lieu culturel prestigieux du « Reich » . (40) C'est la raison pour laquelle de hauts-dignitaires s'y rendent encore cette année-là comme le commissaire à la réunification de l'Autriche, Josef Bürckel ; le « Gauleiter » de Vienne, Baldur von Schirach ; le « Gauleiter » de l'« Oberdonau » , August Eigruber ; ou le « Gauleiter » du Tyrol-Vorarlberg, Franz Hofer.

Tout change à la fin de l'année 1940. Goebbels veut se servir du Festival comme moyen de ressouder la population face à la Guerre et de remonter le moral des troupes. En récompense aux sacrifices et à l'effort de guerre, les spectacles sont ainsi ouverts principalement aux soldats en convalescence et en permission, ainsi qu'à la classe ouvrière qui travaille dans l'armement. Salzbourg a également pour mission d'exalter avec émotion les combats et d'exprimer la gratitude de la patrie pour le sang versé. (41)

En 1941, sur les 37 représentations étalées sur 23 jours, 20,000 places sont occupées par des gens portant l'uniforme. Goebbels se réjouit lorsqu'il contemple le public :

« La salle est cette fois occupé principalement par des soldats, des blessés et des travailleurs. Quelle autre image par rapport au dernier Festival de l'été 1939, peu de temps avant l'éclatement de la crise européenne ! » (42)

L'absence de touristes étrangers est compensée en partie par l'afflux de festivaliers japonais et italiens. (43) Parmi eux, des invités de marque et notamment des diplomates comme l'ambassadeur italien Dino Alfieri (44) ; l'ambassadeur du Japon, Oshima Hiroshi ; ou encore l'ambassadeur danois, Otto Carl Mohr. Le maire de Salzbourg reçoit les invités prestigieux à Hellbrunn. (45)

Malgré cela, le Festival traverse la Seconde Guerre mondiale en étant relativement épargné par les événements. Il faut attendre 1944 et la « guerre totale » pour que des représentations soient annulées.

1945, une seconde naissance (1945-1950)

Les Américains pénètrent dans Salzbourg, le 4 mai 1945. Dès le mois d'août suivant, la U.S. Army parvient à rétablir le Festival. Une opération qui relèverait presque du miracle avec tous les problèmes logistiques que pose une ville partiellement détruite par les bombardements et où affluent des milliers de réfugiés. (46)

C'est la raison pour laquelle les habitants redoutent le rétablissement du Festival. À la pénurie de logements, s'ajoutent les difficultés d'approvisionnement en nourriture. (47) Il est, par ailleurs, impossible de voyager entre les différentes zones d'occupation (48) ce qui empêche, de facto, toute reprise du tourisme. Le Festival se déroule du 12 août au 1er septembre. La programmation est réduite à seulement 5 représentations de l'Opéra « L'Enlèvement au sérail » de Mozart ; 3 de la pièce « Le Fou et la Mort » de Hugo von Hofmannsthal ; et 3 soirées de concert.

Le public est composé aux 2/3 du Second Corps de l'armée américaine cantonné à Salzbourg et de quelques officiers des autres puissances alliées. Le tiers restant est réservé à la population autrichienne. (49) Les billets coûtent de 2 à 25 « Reichsmarks ». Des prix raisonnables : à la même époque, une cigarette coûte 1 « Reichsmark ». Mais la population se soucie plus de son quotidien que du Festival. (50)

Les difficultés d'organisation sont sensiblement les mêmes en 1946. Le public des représentations reste majoritairement de couleur kaki.

La situation commence à s'améliorer à partir de 1947. Les visiteurs sont autorisés à séjourner dans les établissements de Bad Gastein et Bad Hofgastein dans le « Land ». (51) Les Américains refusent cependant d'assumer la charge des artistes et des touristes du Festival. (52) Enfin, les festivaliers doivent payer leurs dépenses en dollars américains ou en devises étrangères. Ils ne peuvent organiser seuls leur séjour et sont obligés de passer par l'intermédiaire d'agences de voyage spécifiquement habilitées comme l'« American Express Company » ou « Thomas Cook ». Les transports demeurent également très limités pour les civils. Le train ou la route sont les 2 seuls moyens pour parvenir jusqu'à Salzbourg. Encore faut-il surmonter toutes les difficultés administratives pour obtenir des visas. Il s'agit également de vérifier le passé de chaque visiteur. C'est ce que raconte avec agacement un critique musical français qui parvient à se rendre à Salzbourg en 1947 :

« Me voici à Salzbourg. Non sans peine. Pour y être admis, il a fallu un bon mois de démarches et d'enquêtes, non pas du tout sur ma compétence musicale, mais sur mon passé et mes opinions. Lecteurs candides, qui vous obstinez à demander “ comment il faut s'y prendre pour aller à Salzbourg ”, résignez-vous, cette année encore, à croire sur parole les récits des privilégiés. » (53)

Salzbourg est donc toujours dominé par la présence américaine, que ce soit dans les rues, dans les hôtels ou dans les salles de spectacle. Pas du tout préparées à entendre des concerts Classiques et à assister à des Opéras, les troupes font preuve d'un certain laisser-aller qui choque les rares observateurs autrichiens ou étrangers. (54)

Dimanche, 11 août 1946 (11:00 am) : Petite salle du « Festspielhaus ». 2e Concert symphonique. Carl Schuricht dirige l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne.

Anton Bruckner : Symphonie n° 5 en si bémol majeur, version originale de 1878 éditée par Robert Haas en 1935 (WAB 105) .

Le professeur de musique Adalbert Lorenz raconte de façon ironique une scène dont il est témoin en 1946 :

« J'ai vu des officiers lors d'un concert au Palais des Festivals qui étaient assis au 1er rang et qui mâchaient de la gomme, les pieds appuyés sur la rampe dorée. C'est de cette façon qu'ils appréciaient Bruckner. » (55)

Il faut rappeler que le Festival n'est pas gratuit pour les soldats américains qui utilisent leur solde pour s'acheter des billets. Il semblerait même, selon le témoignage d'Ernst Lothar, qu'ils aient été obligés d'assister aux représentations dans les 1ers temps. (56)

Le Festival change d'aspect à partir de l'été 1948, avec le retour des touristes. 11,978 touristes sont ainsi enregistrés à Salzbourg durant le mois d'août, et l'édition de 1948 compterait même 72,000 festivaliers. Ce chiffre est à relativiser puisqu'il comprend encore de nombreux soldats américains stationnant à Salzbourg et assistant aux représentations. Toutefois, l'augmentation du nombre de civils est bien réelle et s'expliquerait par la possibilité d'acheter des places de l'étranger et l'assouplissement de l'obtention des visas. (57)

Malgré le manque d'hôtels, le retour de la haute-société internationale est notable :

« Cet éclatant succès, le nombre et la qualité des visiteurs le confirment. Visiteurs venus des plus lointains horizons : Américains du Nord et du Sud, Anglais, Scandinaves, Suisses, Hollandais, Orientaux de toutes origines, Éthiopiens, Grecs, Chinois, se coudoient ici dans une même pensée pieuse. » (58)

L'activité touristique connaît encore une nouvelle impulsion en 1949. La direction de la police de Salzbourg comptabilise 100,000 spectateurs, soit 40 % d'augmentation par rapport à l'année précédente. 18,219 touristes auraient passé au moins 1 nuit dans la ville de Salzbourg durant le mois d'août. Le Festival aurait, par ailleurs, attiré 372 journalistes représentant 700 journaux autrichiens et étrangers. Les nationalités qui dominent seraient les Américains, les Italiens, les Suisses, les Britanniques et les Français. (59) Parmi les personnalités qui sont citées dans les chroniques mondaines, la comédienne britannique Jean Simmons (60) ; le Prince égyptien Mohamed Abdel Moneim ; et la comtesse Wenkheim (61) .

Le tourisme franchit encore un palier en 1950 avec 83,720 festivaliers (62) et 29,240 visiteurs étrangers dans la ville de Salzbourg au mois d'août (63) . La plupart viennent d'Autriche. On compte néanmoins 3,750 Italiens ; 3,020 Suisses ; 2,089 Américains ; 1,782 Anglais ; 1,608 Français. Il n'y a quasiment pas de ressortissants des pays d'Europe centrale (18 Tchécoslovaques ; 22 Hongrois ; et 4 Roumains) alors qu'ils étaient très présents avant 1938. Un seul Soviétique est à l'appel. (64) Le tourisme de masse commence même à pointer le bout de son nez avec des cars venant de toute l'Europe déversant ses clients dans les auberges de jeunesse. (65) Cette année-là, plusieurs centaines de radios retransmettent les concerts du Festival dans 13 états européens. Un potentiel de 60 millions d'auditeurs. (66) Du jamais vu pour le Festival qui a enfin retrouvé tout son lustre d'avant-guerre.

La critique la plus souvent développée à l'encontre du Festival de Salzbourg est de s'être coupé très vite de la population locale en privilégiant de riches spectateurs étrangers. (67) L'opposé de ce qu'auraient voulu Hugo von Hofmannsthal et Max Reinhardt.

Il faudrait pourtant se garder d'interpréter les textes de Hofmannsthal à la lumière d'un Théâtre National Populaire, façon Jean Vilar. L'écrivain a-t-il pensé que les paysans de Salzbourg assisteraient réellement aux représentations ? Il n'a en tous cas jamais confondu son public avec le peuple. Il espérait, certes, avoir une certaine influence sur l'ensemble des Autrichiens comme sur l'ensemble des Européens, mais en touchant d'abord les élites qui transmettraient ensuite ses idées au reste de la société. (68)

Or, le Festival de Salzbourg a véritablement conquis les élites européennes et américaines, provoquant ainsi l'intérêt des médias internationaux. Grâce à cette audience, il a contribué à véhiculer une image positive de l'Autriche, et il est devenu l'un des symboles de son indépendance face à l'Allemagne. Un regard étranger qui a pesé également dans le développement du sentiment d'identité nationale autrichien.

Notes

(1) Hans Jaklitsch. Die Salzburger Festspiele. Verzeichnis der Werke und der Künstler 1920-1990 Band III, Residenz Verlag, Salzburg und Wien (1991) .

(2) Max Reinhardt. « Denkschrift zur Errichtung eines Festspielhauses in Hellbrunn » , in : Hugo Fetting, Max Reinhardt. Schriften. Aufzeichnungen. Briefe. Henschelverlag Kunst und Gesellschaft, Reden, Berlin (1974) ; pages 176-182.

(3) Bernard Duchâtelet. Romain Rolland tel qu'en lui-même, Albin Michel, Paris (2002) .

(4) Aldous Huxley. « The Salzburg Festival. A Visiting Englishman's Impressions of an International Fair of Contemporary Music » , Vanity Fair (December 1922) .

(5) « Der Salzburger Festspielmonat » , « Neue freie Presse » (10. August 1921) .

(6) Ernst Hanisch. « Wirtschaftswachstum ohne Industrialisierung. Fremdenverkehr und sozialer Wandel in Salzburg 1918-1938 » , in : Hans Haas, editor. Weltbühne und Naturkulisse. Zwei Jahrhunderte Salzburg-Tourismus, Universitätsverlag Anton Pustet, Salzburg (1994) ; pages 104-112.

(7) Heinz Dopsch. Geschichte Salzburgs Stadt und Land, Band II/2, Universitätsverlag Anton Pustet, Salzburg (1988) ; Tabelle 2, page 1343. Les frontières de la ville de Salzbourg ont été étendues en 1935 aux communes de Berheim, Hallwang, Koppl et Siezenheim. Salzbourg aurait compté 60,000 habitants en 1923 avec ces communes.

(8) Olivier Milza. Histoire de l'Autriche, Hatier, Paris (1995) ; pages 200-201.

(9) Ibidem. ; page 201.

(10) Gottfried Reinhardt. Der Liebhaber : Erinnerungen seines Sohnes, Drömer Knauer, München-Zürich (1973) ; page 361.

- (11) ÖStA/AdR, Wiener Staatsoper, Karton 1921-1927, 628/1921, lettre de Heinrich Damisch à Franz Schalk du 4 mai 1921.
- (12) Irina-Eleonora Kubadinow. Dauerbrenner Jedermann. Rezeptionsgeschichte und soziokulturelles Umfeld, Grund und Integrativwissenschaftlichen Fakultät, Diplomarbeit, Wien (1992) .
- (13) « Volksruf » (26. August 1922) .
- (14) Titre tiré d'une phrase écrite par Stefan Zweig : « C'est ainsi que dans ma propre ville (Salzbourg) , je vivais tout à coup au centre de l'Europe. » dans : Le Monde d'hier. Souvenirs d'un Européen, Livre de Poche, Paris (1998) ; page 405.
- (15) « Salzburger Fremdenverkehrs-Tagung » , Salzburger Volksblatt (9. September 1931) ; ÖStA/AvA, BMU 15, Karton 3275, « Salzburger Festspiele/Musikwesen 1/1927-1934 » , Zahl 27 715/1932 ; SA, Gemeinderats-Sitzung (17. Oktober 1932) .
- (16) Chiffres recueillis dans les articles des journaux locaux et quelques documents des Archives du Festival.
- (17) ASF/Zur Gründung der Salzburger Festspiele, Karton 2, Statistik der Festspielbesucher in den Jahren 1926 und 1927.
- (18) Raoul Auernheimer. « Theater der Republik » , in : Wilhelm Exner, 10 Jahre Wiederaufbau. Die staatliche kulturelle und wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Republik Österreich 1918-1928, WienWirtschaftszeitungs-Verlags-Ges. (1928) ; page 189.
- (19) « Vorschau auf die Salzburger Festspiele » , « Neue freie Presse » (24. Juli 1931) .
- (20) LA, RSTH GK 222/1927, Sitzung des Aufsichtsrates am 24. Januar 1927.
- (21) Titre tiré d'une phrase écrite par Stefan Zweig : « C'est ainsi que dans ma propre ville (Salzbourg) , je vivais tout à coup au centre de l'Europe » dans : Le Monde d'hier. Souvenirs d'un Européen, Paris, Livre de Poche (1998) ; page 405.
- (22) « Die Salzburger und die Festspiele » , Salzburger Volksblatt (25. August 1925) .
- (23) « Festspiel-Bilanz » , Salzburger Chronik (31. August 1929) .
- (24) LA/RSTH GK 223/1928, Sitzung des Aufsichtsrates am 2. November 1926.

- (25) Gerhard L. Weinberg. « Die deutsche Außenpolitik und Österreich 1937-1938 » , in : Gerald Stourzh. Österreich, Deutschland und die Mächte. Internationale und Österreichische Aspekte des « Anschlusses » vom März 1938, Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1990) , page 62 ; Alexander N. Laßner. « Austria between Mussolini and Hitler : War by Other Means » , in : (herausgeber) Günter Bischof. Contemporary Austrian Study 14, New Brunswick and London (2006) , page 93 ; Walter Goldinger, Dieter A. Binder. Geschichte der Republik Österreich 1918-1938, Verlag für Geschichte und Politik Oldenbourg, Wien (1992) , page 205.
- (26) Gilbert Badia. « Un échec de Hitler : le “ Putsch ” de 1934 » , Austriaca n° 26, Rouen (janvier 1988) ; page 84.
- (27) Stefan Zweig quitte toutefois Salzburg dès le 29 août 1934 pour s'installer à Londres.
- (28) Bruno Walter. Thema und Variationen. Erinnerungen und Gedanken, Samuel Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt (1963) ; page 405.
- (29) Franz Werfel aurait eu un projet théâtral avec Max Reinhardt et serait venu principalement pour cela à Salzburg selon Gottfried Reinhardt. Gottfried Reinhardt. Der Liebhaber : Erinnerungen seines Sohnes, Drömer Knauer, München-Zürich (1973) ; page 219.
- (30) Le comédien meurt dans accident d'avion, en 1934.
- (31) Carl Zuckmayer. Als wär's ein Stück von mir. Horen der Freundschaft, Samuel Fischer Verlag, Wien (1966) ; pages 40-41 et 54-55.
- (32) ASF/Revue de presse et photos de presse ; BnF/département de la musique Louvois, cartons Festival de Salzburg.
- (33) Émile Vuillermoz. « Lettre de Salzburg » , Candide (24 août 1933) .
- (34) François Mauriac. « La Harpe de David » , Le Temps (28 août 1934) .
- (35) « Ein Rückblick auf die Festspielsaison 1937 » , Salzburger Chronik (1. September 1937) .
- (36) « Festliche Stadt-Festspielbeginn ! » , Salzburger Volksblatt (1. August 1939) .
- (37) Elke Fröhlich (Herausgeber) . Die Tagebücher von Josef Goebbels, K.G. Saur, München, Teil I : Aufzeichnungen 1923-1941, Band 5. Dezember 1937 - Juli 1938, Seite 2000 (20 März 1938) .
- (38) « Der Fremdenverkehr im Festspielmonat » , Salzburger Volksblatt (1. September 1938) .
- (39) « Music : Nazi Salzburg » , Time (1 August 1938) .

- (40) « Salzburg, ein Mittelpunkt des Reiches » , Salzburger Volksblatt (16. August 1939) .
- (41) Elke Fröhlich (Herausgeber) . Die Tagebücher von Josef Gœbbels, K.G. Saur, München, Teil I : Aufzeichnungen 1923-1941, Band 8, April-November 1940, 1997 (5. Oktober 1940) ; Staatsarchiv, Seiten 694-1941.
- (42) Elke Fröhlich (Herausgeber) . Die Tagebücher von Josef Gœbbels, K.G. Saur, München, Teil II : Diktate 1941-1945, Band 1, Juli-September 1941, 1996 (3. August 1941) .
- (43) « Zahlreiche hohe Festspielgäste » , Salzburger Landeszeitung (22. August 1942) .
- (44) « Staatssekretär Gutterer spricht zur Eröffnung der Festspiele » , Salzburger Landeszeitung (30. Juli 1942) .
- (45) SA/Geimeinderats-Sitzung, discours du maire en janvier 1942.
- (46) Donald R. Whitnah and Florentine E. Whitnah. Salzburg under Siege U.S. Occupation 1945-1955, New York, Contributions in Military Studies, No. 120, Greenwood Press, Westport.
- (47) Roland Floimair (Hrsg) . Vom Wiederaufbau zum Wirtschaftswunder. Eine Lesebuch zur Geschichte Salzburgs, Universitätsverlag Anton Pustet, Salzburg (1994) ; page 4.
- (48) Otto Straßer. Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt. Mein Leben mit den Wiener Philharmoniker, Paul Neff Verlag, Wien-Berlin (1974) ; page 227.
- (49) « Alliierte Besucher der Festspiele » , Salzburger Nachrichten (21. August 1945) .
- (50) Olivier Rathkolb. Politische Propaganda der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht in Österreich 1945 bis 1950. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kalten Krieges in der Presse- , Kultur- und Rundfunkpolitik, Wien, Dissertation zur Erlangung eines Doktorates an der Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien (1981) ; page 281.
- (51) Claudia Elisabeth Schöndorfer. Festspiele für Jedermann ? Das Salzburger Festspielpublikum nach 1945, Diplomarbeit zur Erlangung des Magistergrades an der Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Salzburg, Salzburg (2001) ; page 28.
- (52) ÖStA/AdR, BMHW, 230.184/47.
- (53) Bernard Gavoty. « Dans Salzburg occupé » , Le Monde (25 octobre 1947) .
- (54) Jules Klanfer. « Wilhelm Furtwängler au Festival de Salzburg redevenue autrichienne » , Combat (22 août 1948) .
- (55) Adalbert Lorenz. Hinter den Kulissen. Die Salzburger Festspiele, Eigenverlag, Salzburg (1982) ; page 55.

(56) Ernst Lothar. Das Wunder des Überlebens. Erinnerungen und Ergebnisse, Paul Zsolnay Verlag, Wien-Hamburg (1961) ; page 286.

(57) Idem.

(58) M.J. « Mozart, prince de Salzburg » , L'Époque (10 septembre 1948) .

(59) Österreichische Nationalbibliothek : Report of the United States High-Commissioner, August 1949, page 76 ; Udo Wolter. « Sous le ciel de Salzburg » , Gentiane (23 août 1949) .

(60) Idem.

(61) Idem.

(62) « Fast 90 000 sahen die Festspiele » , Wiener Kurier (23. August 1950) .

(63) « Salzburger Festspiele in Zahlen » , Demokratisches Volksblatt Salzburg (7. September 1950) .

(64) Idem.

(65) « Salzburg-Publikum-total verändert » , Die Presse (26. August 1950) .

(66) « 60 Millionen hörten die Salzburger Festspiele » , Salzburger Nachrichten (1. September 1950) ; « Salzburg-Schaubühne Europas » , Hessische Nachrichten (8. August 1950) .

(67) Voir, par exemple, l'ouvrage de Michael P. Steinberg, The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival. Austria as Theater and Ideology 1890-1938, Cornell University Press, New-York (1990) .

(68) Michèle Pauget. L'Interrogation sur l'art dans l'œuvre essayistique de Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt (1984) ; page 474.

...

The Salzburg Festival was inaugurated on August 22, 1920, when Hugo von Hofmannsthal's morality play « Jedermann » was premiered on the « Domplatz » , directed by Max Reinhardt. Since that time, the Salzburg Festival has established itself as the most important Festival for Opera, drama and concerts.

The birth hour of the Salzburg Festival is generally stated as 22 August 1920 when Hugo von Hofmannsthal's morality play « Jedermann » was first performed on the « Domplatz » (Cathedral Square) in the staging by Max Reinhardt.

The origins, however, go back much further. The 1st Opera ever to be performed north of the Alps probably took place in Salzburg. Prestigious presentations of music and theatre were given with great extravagance at the princely and archiepiscopal Court in Salzburg ; the people were captivated by the many sacred and secular plays. Until Mozart's time, dramas and « singspiels » were performed at the venerable Salzburg University and enjoyed great public interest ; and Salzburg Cathedral had always been the scene of presentations of magnificent church music as well as church festivities which were celebrated with processions.

The dramatic spectrum in Salzburg extends from the mystery and Passion plays of the Middle-Ages, courtly Baroque festivities to the time when middle-class theatre traditions became established. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was born on 27 January 1756 into this dense artistic atmosphere. From 1842, when in the presence of the sons of the composer, the Mozart Monument was ceremoniously unveiled, thus, also laying the foundation stone for revering the genius loci, the idea was repeatedly mooted of organising regular Mozart music festivals in Salzburg. In 1877, the « Wiener Philharmoniker » accepted an invitation from the International Mozart Foundation to come to Salzburg for a music festival and performed here, for the first time, outside Vienna. In 1887, the conductor Hans Richter spoke in the same context in favour of an annual Mozart festival based on the model of Bayreuth.

In 1917, following on from the idea formulated at the end of the 19th Century to hold a regular Mozart festival in Salzburg, the association calling itself « Salzburg Festspielhaus-Gemeinde » was founded thanks to the initiative of Friedrich Gehmacher and Heinrich Damisch, in Vienna, in order to raise funds for building a festival house. The idea of founding a festival in Salzburg had in the meantime already been taken-up by other circles. The poet Hermann Bahr was committed to the idea. Max Reinhardt, who had begun his career at the « Salzburg Stadttheater » (nowadays, the « Landestheater ») and, in 1918, acquired « Schloß Leopoldskron », submitted a relevant Memorandum for the Building of a Festival House in Hellbrunn, in 1917, in Vienna. In 1919, Hugo von Hofmannsthal published a draft programme for the Salzburg Festival. Thus, the festival idea, which had originated on the initiative of the Salzburg middle-class (probably, Salzburg's most successful and sustainable civic initiative) received its intellectual super-structure from its influential protagonists in Vienna.

After the performances of Hofmannsthal's « Jedermann », the Salzburg Festival quickly became established also internationally through the participation of the stage-designer Alfred Roller, the composer Richard Strauß and the conductor Franz Schalk, despite the insecure economic situation and initially without support from public subsidies. In particular from 1933, when the Thousand Mark Ban was imposed by Adolf Hitler, which meant that German guests stayed away, a counterpart to Bayreuth was proclaimed in Salzburg. The festival managed to attract wealthy Western Europeans and Americans to Salzburg, « with the anti-Fascist Arturo Toscanini as the world famous attraction » (Ernst Hanisch quoting from Heinz Dopsch. « Geschichte der Stadt Salzburg », 1996) . Nevertheless, this was only for a short time.

The chequered history of the festival can be described vividly showing the ambivalent features, the breaks and the continuities. Ambivalence is most obvious between the poles of tradition and modern because the Salzburg Festival positioned itself as « an anti-modern product of modernity » (Georg Kreis. « Das Festspiel », 1991) , in an antagonism of bourgeoisie and progressiveness, conservative Catholicism or rather national new definition and a newly-

aroused cosmopolitanism, as well as a new orientation with regard to the future (see : Michael Steinberg. « Ursprung und Ideologie der Salzburger Festspiele 1890-1938 » , 2000) . The attempt to bridge this ambivalence between tradition and modern has repeatedly sparked-off efforts for the festival idea and also criticism of it.

Initially, the festival idea was based on the desire to establish outstanding artistic events of the highest-standard in a close relationship with the cultural tradition of Austria, to the genius loci and to the special scenery of a Baroque city. After the turmoil of the First World War and in the general lack of orientation, the founding of the festival was intended to support the creation of a new Austrian identity, whereby, by referring back to tradition, a cultural restoration took place. The statements made by the founders of the festival move between these poles :

« Organizing a musical and theatrical festival in Salzburg means reviving ancient living traditions in a new way ; it means : doing things in a new way in ancient, meaningful and exquisite places, what was always done there. »

(Hugo von Hofmannsthal. « Festspiele in Salzburg » , 1921.)

« The festive, holiday-like, unique features that all art has and that even theatre in the time of the Ancient Greeks had and also at the time when it was still in the cradle of the Catholic church, that has to be given back to theatre. »

(Max Reinhardt to Ferdinand Künzelmann, 21 July 1918.)

By reflecting on the magnificent cultural heritage a platitude of Austrian cultural history and cultural policy is referred to, which does, however, represent an extremely complex phenomenon. Both the inter-War years as well as the post-War years are characterized by this phenomenon. Even after the horrors of Nazi atrocities, art and culture served as a catalyst so as to compensate for a reduced national sense of self-esteem.

At the same time, the Salzburg Festival was intended as a project against « the crisis, the crisis of meaning, the loss of values, the crisis of identity of the individual human being as well as of entire nations » (Helga Rabl-Stadler) . In the middle of the First World War, the resolve matured to reconcile the nations who were warring against each other by means of a festival that would give them a unifying aim. That is why peace and the belief in Europe are at the centre of the 1st « Appeal for a Plan for a Salzburg Festival » (1919) , incomparably formulated by Hugo von Hofmannsthal : « Europeanism that fulfilled and enlightened the period from 1750 to 1850. » Which other festival can or must fulfil such a founding mission that is valid for all time ?

It is also not by chance that Reinhardt's and Hofmannsthal's festival idea was sparked-off by Salzburg. Far away from the big cities, away from the worries of day-to-day life, the intention was to establish the festival as a place of pilgrimage, theatre as a place of refuge :

« The restlessness of our time, the difficulties caused by daily events take on such dimensions in the big city, oppress us and burden us to such an extent that in the evenings we cannot free ourselves of the worries of the day as we

would wish. The play as such can neither be presented nor received. In the big city we cannot celebrate true festivities with the heart. »

(Max Reinhardt. « Festliche Spiele » , 1935.)

« Besides being anti-modern, a feeling of anti-metropolis also characterized this special festival, which was also intended to bring people together as an overall European project. The big wide-world was to be brought into the small city, whereby, tangible economic and touristic considerations also played a role, resulting in Salzburg becoming stylised as “ the heart of the heart of Europe ”. »

(Max Reinhardt. « Memorandum » , 1917.)

The antithetical reality prompted Max Reinhardt to make the memorable statement that the festival should not only be a “ luxury good for the rich and saturated but also food for the needy ”. »

In the same way, that great history, world history is reflected in the small history of the festival, « grandeur » is manifested on a small scale, for instance, in Hans Pœlzig's design for a festival house in Hellbrunn :

« To a certain extent, the planned festival house in Salzburg is to be understood as the reflection of the solution and conception in Berlin (Pœlzig planned Reinhardt's “ Großes Schauspielhaus ” there) : here, the theatre of the big city in the metropolis of Berlin - there the festival house of “ consecration ” and of “ light ”, away from urban everyday goings on in the province. »

(Constanze Schuler. « Der Altar als Bühne » , 2007.)

The visionary project that aimed to combine landscape and architecture, had, however, to remain *ou-tópos* because of the absence of the hoped-for international financial help, and the massive depreciation of currency doomed the ambitious project to failure. Ultimately, the court stables built in 1607 were adapted and turned into a festival house and the architecture of the festival quarter was dominated by Clemens Holzmeister. The Utopia was realised within the city and its surrounding mountains and the myth revived of the « city as a stage » . In Salzburg, the recurring picture of the Baroque culture of prestigious events meant : the Great World Theatre - « that builds-up an auditorium for the world » , « the metaphor carrying the whole » (Hugo von Hofmannsthal, 1922) . To a certain extent, Salzburg's most important secular and religious locations were linked to each other, and the entire city, in accordance with the Baroque idea of « world theatre » was made into a stage (see : Schuler, 2007) . In his « Salzburger großes Welttheater » , premiered in 1922 in the « Kollegienkirche » , Hugo von Hofmannsthal stylized the metaphor as a mystery play. Thomas Bernhard, the writer with the most polarising impact in the 1970's and 1980's, who also caused uproar in Salzburg, paraphrased it 60 years later as follows :

« Everything in the world is a play, isn't it ? The Pope is also a great actor. Irrespective of whether he has learned a very low play, he is of course now one of the greatest actors. This is such a world play. I do not appear in the world

theatre. - Somewhere up in the grid, perhaps. Somehow, I am pulled along. They are not even pulling at a piece of scenery but, perhaps, some millions or billions are pulling there ? And there, the background moves. But these few figures at the front, they perform their salon play. And the Pope creates the dignity - with his white robe. The one who is inscrutable usually comes from the East. In other words, the red one, the dark one, the feared one. Then, the comic figure. These things do happen. Then, there are the drinking companions, young journeymen who appear, fat cousins. That is a " Jedermann " play. And the stage is roundly flattened-out, like the globe. »

(Thomas Bernhard. Monologe auf Mallorca, recorded by Krista Fleischmann, ORF, 1981.)

Thanks to the international charisma of the artists Max Reinhardt brought to Salzburg, and the visions of the founding fathers, as well as the excellent contacts abroad, especially of Max Reinhardt, the Salzburg Festival very quickly became established :

« All at once, the Salzburg Festival became a world attraction, as it were the Olympic Games of Art in the modern era, in which all nations competed to present their best achievements. Kings and princes, American millionaires and film stars, music enthusiasts, artists, writers and snobs all met in Salzburg. »

(Stefan Zweig. « Die Welt von Gestern » , 1944.)

The relationship of the Salzburger to the « foreigners » , who soon made the pilgrimage in large numbers to the city on the Salzach, was, however, not free of friction. It was not long before the boom in cultural tourism was criticized, and local residents often felt they had been degraded to the role of mere accessories :

« They grumbled because they felt threatened, and fought in advance the foreigners who would come, and proved that despite the revolution Austria had remained what it was, by reflecting on the old Austrian election slogan that one wanted to have peace and quiet. »

(Dopsch. « Geschichte » , 1996.)

Finally, from the beginning of the 1930's, the worst form of xenophobia, anti-Semitism, became unbearable under the influence of the Nazis. It became increasingly difficult for Max Reinhardt, who was Jewish, to work in Salzburg. From 1938, Jewish artists were prohibited from performing in Salzburg. Hugo von Hofmannsthal's « Jedermann » disappeared from the programme, as did many other works by Jewish artist colleagues. Salzburg was also no longer the stage for an international public. The festival degenerated into insignificance and became a wheel in the propaganda machine of the Nazis, a « place where politics could be staged » .

(See : Robert Kriechbaumer. « Salzburger Festspiele. Ihre Geschichte von 1960 bis 1989 » , 2010.)

...

The Salzburg Festival's popularity suffered a major blow as a consequence of the « Anschluß » , the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany in 1938. Arturo Toscanini resigned in protest, artists of Jewish descent like Max Reinhardt and Georg Solti had to emigrate, and « Jedermann » , last performed by Attila Hörbiger, had to be dropped. Nevertheless, the Festival remained in operation until it was cancelled in 1944 by the order of « Reich » Minister Josef Gœbbels in reaction to the 20th « July Plot » . At the end of World War II, the Salzburg Festival re-opened in summer 1945 immediately after the Allied victory in Europe.

...

On 12 March 1938, German troops marched into Salzburg. The « Anschluß » (annexation of Austria by Germany) was now complete, and Nazi ideology immediately began to affect the Festival. Many artists who had left a deep imprint in previous years (we need only think of Max Reinhardt, Bruno Walter and Arturo Toscanini) were no longer welcome. The works of the Festival's co-founder Hugo von Hofmannsthal, especially « Jedermann » (but not his librettos for Richard Strauß) , were struck from the repertoire. Also discarded was Max Reinhardt's spectacular « Faust » in the « « Felsenreitschule » » , which had to give way to a production of Gœthe's « Egmont » . Henceforth, the Ministry of Propaganda in Berlin proclaimed : the Festival programmes were to be dominated by « German art » . Nor was Salzburg allowed to be a meeting place for an international audience. The majority of foreign visitors stayed away and were replaced by thousands of Germans from the programme known as « Kraft durch Freude » (Strength through Joy) . Most of them were workers with modest incomes who were given heavily subsidized tickets to the Festival.

The city was misappropriated and transformed into a huge propaganda vehicle for those in power. It was festooned with Nazi flags and even received a visit from Adolf Hitler himself in 1939. At the onset of the War, the Festival's programmes were sharply reduced. The performances were meant to bolster morale on the home front, and they were attended mainly by soldiers on leave or recovering from wounds or by workers from the armaments industry. In 1943, the term « Festival » was banned by the Propaganda Ministry and replaced by « Salzburger Theater- und Musiksommer » (Salzburg Summer of Theatre and Music) . After the failed attempt to assassinate Hitler, on 20 July 1944, and the proclamation of « Total War » shortly thereafter, Minister of Propaganda Gœbbels cancelled every Festival in the « Reich » . All that finally remained in Salzburg were one orchestral concert and the dress rehearsal for Richard Strauß's most recent Opera, « Die Liebe der Danaë » , whose world-premiere had already been scheduled. Among the artists who kept the Festival going beneath the Swastika were Clemens Krauß, who was appointed General Artistic Director in 1942, his fellow-conductors Karl Böhm and Hans Knappertsbusch, and the pianist Edwin Fischer.

...

In the 1930's, 2 forces made their impact on the Salzburg Festival : the early movement of the Nazi Party, and the Italian conductor Arturo Toscanini. The Depression was the political backdrop that led to the rise of Adolf Hitler. Many Jewish musicians from Germany fled to Salzburg, where they could perform in freedom. When the Nazis tried to establish influence, the Party was banned both in Salzburg and in all of Austria. The German response was to levy a 1,000 Reichsmark tax on any German citizen travelling to Austria, resulting in decreased attendance in the 1933 Festival.

Toscanini's arrival at the Festival, in 1934, did much to counteract the negative impact of the Nazis. He was the spotlighted conductor just when the Germans convinced Richard Strauß and Wilhelm Furtwängler to cancel their appearances in Salzburg. The Maestro also took a political stand : he would not conduct in Bayreuth when Jewish musicians were being mistreated. Bayreuth's loss was Salzburg's gain. Over the next several years, the Festival was a financial as well as a critical success.

After the « Anshluß » , the Nazis tried to infuse Salzburg with Germanic history. Josef Goebbels' bust was installed where Franz Rehr's once was, street names were changed, and the Germans took-over the Festival as a propaganda tool. One of their goals was to remove the international flavour that had flourished during the Toscanini years. Still, except for no production of « Jedermann » , the 1938 Festival was little changed from what it would have been without the « Anshluß » . Adolf Hitler attended the 1939 Festival, and the War-time Festivals were smaller and less ambitious. The Ministry of Propaganda even renamed the event as « Salzburger Theater- und Musiksommer » (Salzburg Summer of Music and Theater » .

...

When the Salzburg Festival ended its 1st decade in the 1920's, it had grown to an established international tradition of music and theater arts for Austria. Co-founded by Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Max Reinhardt, with additional support from Alfred Roller, Richard Strauß, and Franz Schalk, it expanded from a few days to the entire month of August, and featured artists from Salzburg, Vienna and other European cities. However, throughout the 1930's, the Festival faced increased economic and political obstacles despite its cultural success. The decade ended with the beginning of World War II.

The Festival celebrated 2 anniversaries in the early 1930's. One was the event's 10th anniversary in 1930. That celebration included the naming of the Max Reinhardt Square in front of the « Festspeilhaus » . The other was in 1931 for the 175th anniversary of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's birth. The program included 5 Mozart Operas, a ballet premiere, and chamber and orchestral concerts. The children of Salzburg presented their version of the morality play, « Jedermann » , and the Budapest Philharmonic accepted the invitation to mark the 1st performance of a foreign orchestra. The length of the Festival extended to 5 weeks, from 25 July to 31 August, and the radio broadcasts of the performances reached the United States.

Economic problems forced the 1932 Festival to work around budgetary constraints. The Great Depression was in the United States but its effects were felt in Salzburg. A further economic blow implemented by Adolf Hitler, in 1933, was the 1,000 Mark Ban (« Tausendmarksperre ») . This meant that German citizens had to pay 1,000 « Reichsmarks » if they wanted to travel to Austria from 1933-1936. As a result, the number of Festival attendees from Germany dropped from almost 13,000 in 1932 to less than 800 in 1933.

With the drop in tourism, event organizers aimed their advertising to attract new audiences and to encourage wealthy Americans and Europeans to enjoy the Alpine scenery and architecture as well as the concerts. The Salzburg Festival

was promoted as the Austrian counterpart of the Bayreuth Festival in Germany. During the mid-1930's, Salzburg native, Herbert von Karajan, made his conducting debut at the 1933 Festival. Arturo Toscanini and Bruno Walter conducted many of the new and revived Operatic productions until the « Anschluß » , in 1938, when Nazi Germany annexed Austria.

The Salzburg Festival saw many changes following the « Anschluß » . Nazi presence was visible with Hitler's troops and flags. Hofmannsthal's play, « Jedermann » , was pulled from the program even though it had been a part of the Festival since the beginning. Many of the artists who had been mainstays of the Festival left Austria because they were either Jewish or were unwilling to participate under the Nazi regime. Among those who left were co-founder Max Reinhardt, and conductors Bruno Walter and Arturo Toscanini.

World War II began on September 1st, 1939, the day following the close of that year's Festival. Each year during the War, the original, positive intent of the Festival eroded. Names of some of the venues were changed and the Festival was used for Nazi propaganda. Soldiers made-up the majority of the audience. The Salzburg Festival Society was disbanded in 1942 and replaced by a general artistic director, conductor Clemens Krauß.

In 1943, Adolf Hitler ordered that the word « Festival » was no longer allowed as part of the Salzburg Festival name. The new name was « Salzburg Summer of Theatre and Music » . The event was for wounded soldiers and workers in armament factories. The next year, 1944, all of the various music and theater Festivals were canceled throughout the « Reich » by order of the propaganda minister. Krauß, as artistic director, used his connections with Berlin to get permission to go ahead with a dress-rehearsal of a new Opera by Richard Strauß. Had the Festival taken place, the world-premiere of this Opera, « Die Liebe der Danaë » , was to honour the composer's 80th birthday.

The unconditional surrendered of Germany on May 7th, 1945, marked the end of World War II in Europe. American troops were in Salzburg and some artists who had been in exile during Nazi occupation returned. The Festival would revive its original purpose of serving as a place where people of various nations could celebrate the arts. Works that had been banned since 1938 were re-instated. Mozart's Opera, « The Abduction from the Seraglio » , was broadcast to the United States. The audience consisted of Austrians and members of the armed forces. It was a scaled-down Festival, only lasting 2 weeks, but an important step in bringing-back the atmosphere before 1938.

New artists were welcomed while those who had been Nazi sympathizers were black-listed pending investigation. Building names were restored to their originals. Bruno Walter returned to conduct in 1949. Theater productions honoured the 200th anniversary of Goethe's birth. The year and decade closed with the Salzburg Festival not only surviving but with innovative plans on the horizon.

...

The great names of the Salzburg music Festival (Richard Strauß, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Herbert von Karajan) sit uneasily alongside a great horror : Adolf Hitler, the Nazis, anti-Semitism. Now, a film by the director Tony Palmer tells the full story.

The Salzburg Festival : the name alone is pure magic. This annual cornucopia of artistic thrills, with its cocktail of world-class music, theatre and glorious Alpine landscapes, has inspired countless festivals the world over, but its legendary status remains unique. Its history, though, is anything but unchequered. Now, a powerful portrait by the film director Tony Palmer is revealing its full story, warts and all, for the 1st time.

Controversy has never been far from Palmer's films, but the ructions in Salzburg over this one may yet take the biscuit. Palmer, ever determined to confront difficult issues, has revealed sides of its history that many would rather forget, epitomized by rare archive footage of Hitler sweeping into Salzburg against the background of the city's famous castle, his henchmen arriving in state at Swastika-bedecked Festival performances, and cheering crowds welcoming the German invaders in 1938.

One could argue that Festivals are about art, not politics ; that the past has to be laid to rest. But for the Salzburg Festival, this is a fraught issue, 1st because of the titanic stature of so many musicians embroiled in those and subsequent years ; and also because of the resonances that have rebounded through the decades up to the present-day.

Palmer says :

« The Festival authorities are divided about the film. Nobody has spoken publicly against it, but some who were supportive at 1st have changed their tune, because one pressure lobby has been getting at them about the Nazi material, saying, “ We can't say all this again, cut it out, it's not relevant. ” Again ? It's never been said before ! And it's absolutely crucial to understanding what this Festival has achieved. And I do say virtually at the beginning and end of every sentence that what they have achieved is absolutely wonderful ; there's nothing like it on the planet. Even so ... »

Salzburg's reputation for anti-Semitism was probably set by the city's original status as an independent, ecclesiastical State run by its archbishop. Until the 17th Century, Jews were burnt at the stake at a site that is now one of Salzburg's biggest breweries. Protestants, too, were thrown-out in the mid-18th Century. The law was changed by Emperor Franz-Josef, in 1868, to allow a quota of Jews into Land Salzburg.

Palmer says :

« Until the First World War, there were never more than 600 Jews living in Salzburg at any time, and the reason is now clear : it was one of the most anti-Semitic towns in Europe. Was, and maybe still is ; we can't prove it, but Helga Rabl-Stadler, the president of the Salzburg Festival, says in an extensive interview in the film that “ there are people around today who wish that Hitler and the Nazis were still here now ”. »

Yet, ironically, the Festival was spearheaded by 2 Jews : Max Reinhardt, the visionary, idealistic theatre director ; and Hugo von Hofmannsthal, poet and librettist to Richard Strauß. Festivals had been held occasionally in Salzburg since

1856 ; but after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Reinhardt and Hofmannsthal, together with a local businessman, Friedrich Gehmacher, and Strauß himself as father figure, saw the opportunity that an annual Festival there offered to revitalize the soul of a State ravaged by War, hardship and identity crisis.

In the 1st Festival, in 1920, Reinhardt initiated the annual performance of the English Protestant morality play « Everyman » (« Jedermann ») , a tradition that persists today.

Palmer recounts :

« The Archbishop, Ignaz Reider, had seen Reinhardt's production of “ Jedermann ” in Berlin, and he suggested that they perform it on the steps of the Cathedral. Huge protests. But the Archbishop declared that he owned the cathedral square and nobody could stop it ! So there's the irony of the Catholic archbishop protecting these 2 Jewish artists and this Protestant, traditional version of the “ Everyman ” story, and, what's more, translating it so that it clearly referred to the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It's a work of genius, and it's no accident that it's still there. »

The Festival quickly became a magnet to the intellectual elite of Europe, besides the high-society that still frequents it. Musically, it attracted the finest performers of the day, notably the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra and conductors such as Arturo Toscanini, Wilhelm Furtwängler and Richard Strauß himself conducting his own Operas. But calamity was not far away.

Palmer says :

« Even English history books talk of the Nazis “ invading' Austria ”. Actually, they were welcomed. Within a week of the “ Anschluß ”, there was a plebiscite and 97 % of the population voted in favour. I interviewed many eye-witnesses of the time, including Maria von Trapp of “ Sound of Music ” fame.”

The invaders had big plans for Salzburg. They intended to build a monstrous new Festival theatre on the hillside across the river (« the brief was that it must be higher than the castle » , says Palmer) and a parallel building on the opposite hill as the « Wehrmacht » headquarters for « Ostmark » , as the Nazis euphemistically called Austria. Fortunately, those plans came to nothing, although Palmer has unearthed for the 1st time the actual architectural drawings. Still, the effects of the power vice in which the Nazis soon held the Festival were far-reaching, for the musicians responded to them in ways that affected their reputations for the rest of their lives and have continued to dog them after death.

Arturo Toscanini, among others, refused to perform under the regime. But for some, that was not the case. Controversy was especially rife over why Wilhelm Furtwängler did not leave. Palmer interviewed Furtwängler's nonagenarian widow Elisabeth, who reveals how her husband was coerced into staying in Germany.

Palmer explains :

« By 1938, Wilhelm Furtwängler had had enough and he let the Berlin Philharmonic know that he intended to leave. This got back to the authorities. He was then told that, the Nazis having arrived in Austria, Josef Goebbels was threatening to disband the Vienna Philharmonic and send all its members into the army. Goebbels wanted to establish the supremacy of the Berlin Orchestra over Vienna ; but Berlin was in Prussia, the fiefdom of Hermann Göring, whom he hated. Furthermore, in Goebbels' view, Vienna was infested with Jews ; Gustav Mahler, the great inspiration to the Vienna Philharmonic, was Jewish, as was that other great conductor, Bruno Walter, who had fled. When Furtwängler heard that the Vienna Philharmonic was in effect to be abolished, according to Elisabeth, he went to the “ Führer ” and said : “ If you do that, I am definitely leaving. ” He'd been thinking about it, but hadn't said it until then. And the “ Führer ” said : “ No, you can't possibly do that. ” So, he stayed and, thus, he saved the Vienna Philharmonic. Mrs Furtwängler says that, after the War, he finally recognized everything that had happened, and said to her : “ Germans did this ! Happiness is no longer possible in our life. ” That's incredibly moving. »

Furtwängler was not the only conductor caught in the Nazi stranglehold. The young Karl Böhm was likewise manipulated : Böhm's son, the actor Karlheinz Böhm, recounts in another interview that his father was warned that if he left, every member of his family would be sent to a concentration camp.

Richard Strauß himself accepted the post of president of the « Reich » Music Chamber. Palmer interviews Strauß's great-granddaughter Madeleine Rohla-Strauß, who offers a near-apology for her forebear's action. It was a move made not out of conviction, she confesses, but extraordinary political naivety and egoism.

Palmer says :

« First, he thought he could be a force for good, which was too stupid for words. Next, he'd made a fortune before the First World War, especially from “ Salome ” and “ Der Rosenkavalier ”, but, thinking that the Austro-Hungarian Empire looked dodgy in the run-up to 1914, he'd put all his money into the Bank of England. The whole lot was seized as part of the reparations following the Treaty of Versailles, so in 1919, he was virtually bankrupt. This memory weighed heavily when the Nazis came along - he was determined that it wouldn't happen again.

So, to some extent, his accepting that post was understandable. Besides, it flattered his ego to be told he was Mr. Big. Last but not least, he'd had a personal mission to try to establish a system of musical education in the Weimar Republic ; it had failed, and now he thought he could achieve it under the Nazis. You can understand that kind of naivety, even if you can't approve of it. »

There was a further twist in Salzburg's political tale. In 1945, when the city had been heavily bombed and people were reduced to begging in the streets, the Festival nevertheless went ahead. Palmer discovered that it was financed by the Americans, who were using it as Cold War propaganda.

Palmer recounts :

« The Russians had got to Vienna in February. Mrs Furtwängler told us this : the Russians had already imported as

many great Russian conductors and orchestras as they could to play in Vienna. So, the Americans thought, “ Anything they can do, we can do better. ” Therefore, they needed the Salzburg Festival. It was re-established after the Second World War as a direct result of American military policy, and the Americans paid for it for several years. »

Meanwhile, a young conductor had been rising through the ranks : Herbert von Karajan, a native of Salzburg. Later, as director, he built the Festival to such a peak that on his death, in 1989, fears abounded not only for what would happen to it, but even what would happen to the city itself, where the Festival had become the largest source of income.

Karajan had joined the Nazi Party not once but twice, the first time while it was still illegal in Austria.

Palmer :

« Without the Salzburg Festival, the careers of many musicians who had suffered by their association with the Nazi Party would not have revived as quickly as they did, Karajan being the obvious example, but Elisabeth Schwarzkopf too. Many managed to find a niche in a city which certainly had had a love-affair, and some would say continues to have a love-affair, with that time. »

Palmer points out that 2 eminent sopranos, Schwarzkopf and Kirsten Flagstad, had both been card-carrying Party members ; Flagstad's stellar Wagnerian career never fully-recovered.

« But Schwarzkopf, who stayed in Austria and performed often in Salzburg, somehow managed to survive. »

Nevertheless, the film presents a balanced portrait of Karajan, emphasizing his vital role as not only legendary conductor and Festival director but also as patron to other musicians.

Palmer :

« He was always willing to invite and recommend younger conductors. Very few conductors do that ! »

Among those Karajan helped to launch in Salzburg were Riccardo Muti, Seiji Ozawa and Mariss Jansons, plus the violinist Anne-Sophie Mutter, all of whom pay tribute to his influence in the film. Extracts from home movies show him as a devoted family man leading an unpretentious existence, while anecdotes abound about his quiet financial generosity. For Karajan, then, redemption did lie to a considerable extent in art.

But the legacy of the War years proved long-lasting - manifesting, according to Palmer, as an ingrained conservatism that he regards as closely linked to anti-Semitism.

Palmer :

« Gérard Mortier, under whose directorship the Festival achieved unprecedented audience levels, fell foul of this many times. »

The Belgian-born arts manager raised hackles by up-ending tired traditions that were ossifying the Festival's artistic outlook.

Palmer :

« He felt he was simply trying to re-establish the ideals on which Max Reinhardt had founded the Festival, to put it back on the intellectual map. »

Though some critics felt that certain productions went too far, including a drug-crazed « Don Giovanni » and a brothel-set production of « Die Fledermaus » that, even today, reduces Salzburg's citizens to a state of spluttering frenzy.

One of Mortier's collaborators, the provocative Opera director Peter Sellars, tellingly comments :

« We all have our moment where the door opens and you step in and you do anything you can do before they figure out what you're doing and throw you out again. »

Palmer :

« An earlier crunch point, ironically during Karajan's regime, had been the 1st production in Salzburg of “ Moses und Aron ”. One of many things I didn't include was some footage of the director Jean-Pierre Ponnelle and the conductor James Levine being booed off the stage. »

Levine talked to him at length about the problems surrounding the work :

« It's Schönberg ; it's the most in-your-face Jewish Opera there is ; and, at the time, Kurt Waldheim was president of Austria. Nothing was ever proved against Waldheim except that he had lied about his Nazi past, but when he came to the Salzburg Festival, there were riots. And everybody denied it. Riots ? Never ! They said it had never happened ! Quite extraordinary. There's film of it and I've included that. »

27 January 2006 marked the 250th anniversary of the birth of Mozart. The date is also the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. Mozart year in Salzburg opened that day with a gala at the « Mozarteum » .

Palmer was there :

« The President of Austria, Heinz Fischer, was the last to speak. Everyone else had been saying : “ Wonderful place, wonderful Mozart. ” Fischer spoke very quietly. His 1st line was : “ Today is Mozart's birthday. Never forget that this

day is also the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz.” The audience gave a sharp intake of breath. And in front of me 32 ladies in furs and jewellery got-up and walked-out. »

The film closes with President Fischer's words :

« How incredible it is, and how difficult to understand that the human being is able to write such wonderful, heavenly music, and that the very same human being is able to behave like those who are responsible for the murders and crimes in a concentration camp like Auschwitz. And I, personally, am touched because my father-in-law was in the concentration camp, and so, this 27 January is really indicating the wide, wide space between heaven and hell. »

Le Festival de Salzbourg (1933-1949)

1933

Adolf Hitler's accession to power in Germany harboured further dangers for the Festival. The so-called « Thousand Mark Tariff » forced every German entering Austria to pay 1,000 Marks, effectively sealing the borders. There were only 796 visitors from Germany in 1933 as compared to 12,983 in 1932, and many artists were forced to cancel their engagements. The Festival struck-out on new paths and presented its 1st Wagner Opera : « Tristan und Isolde » , in a new production marking the 50th anniversary of the composer's death. There was also a veritable Operatic world-premiere as Richard Strauß's « Die ägyptische Helena » was mounted for the 1st time in its new Vienna version. The spectacular « Faust City » in the Summer Riding School, designed by Clemens Holzmeister for Goethe's Masterpiece, caused a sensation. The production team contained a name that would bulk large in the city's history : Herbert von Karajan, in his debut appearance, conducted the incidental music.

1934

It was a year of assassinations. On 17 May, a bomb exploded in the Festival Theatre, severely damaging the valuable mosaics by Anton Kolig. Then, the Austrian chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss was murdered in July ; his official funeral caused the opening of the Festival to be postponed to the next day. An architectural improvement, the partial roofing of the Summer Riding School, was carried-out in the spring. Despite the raging nationalism threatening to spill-over from Germany, Bruno Walter managed to have Mozart's « Don Giovanni » performed for the 1st time in the original Italian, thereby, ushering in a new era in Opera performance. A Richard Strauß cycle was given in honour of the composer's 70th birthday, and Arturo Toscanini, the great Italian conductor, finally made his Salzburg debut with 3 orchestral concerts.

1935

Alfred Roller, whose stage-designs set the tone for the Festival's aesthetics from its inception, died on 21 June. His sets, however, remained in use as late as 1953. Along with Bruno Walter, the musical programme was now dominated by Arturo Toscanini. Josef Krips made his Festival debut with a performance of « Der Rosenkavalier » . Attila Hörbiger

played « Jedermann » for the 1st time, lending the part an entirely new shape. His reading, with its characteristic tenor inflection, influenced later actors in the role for generations.

1936

In March, at the suggestion of provincial governor Franz Rehr, the Salzburg Parliament passed the « Law for the Protection of the Salzburg Festival ». As a result, outside events scheduled at the same time as the Festival now required special permission from the provincial government. This regulation remained in effect until 1970. Joseph Meßner's « Fanfare » was heard for the 1st time at the opening of the Festival, on 25 July ; since then, it has served as a signature tune in radio broadcasts. The construction of the Festival Theatre continued to pile-up deficits, and Clemens Holzmeister was again commissioned to remodel the building. The artistic high-point of the Festival was a new production of Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » conducted by Arturo Toscanini.

1937

Clemens Holzmeister began work on enlarging the Festival Theatre. The main novelty was the 180 degrees rotation of the stage and auditorium. The stage area was, thus, shifted to the side of Saint-Peter's Abbey while the auditorium points in the direction of the Faistauer Foyer. The stage itself now became identical in size to that of the Vienna « Staatsoper », which made it possible for the 2 theatres to exchange sets. Wilhelm Furtwängler, principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, visited the Festival for the 1st time and conducted an orchestral concert. The rear fore-court of the theatre was renamed Toscanini Court, in honour of the conductor's 70th birthday. Another commemoration deserves to be mentioned : memorial plaques for Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Anton Faistauer were unveiled in the antechamber to the Faistauer Foyer. They were destined to remain there for no more than 1 year, for another age was about to dawn ...

1938

The influx of Adolf Hitler's troops into Austria led to severe interference in the Festival's programmes. Hugo von Hofmannsthal's « Jedermann », the heart of the Festival since 1920, was struck from the repertoire, as was Max Reinhardt's legendary production of « Faust ». The Festival's supporting institution, the Salzburg Festival Association, was placed beneath the auspices of the local « Gauleiter », and its president, Baron Heinrich Puthon, was removed from office. The new potentates were still able to profit from the work of the former directors : the re-modelled Festival Theatre was inaugurated with a performance of Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg », now conducted by Wilhelm Furtwängler. Many of the artists who helped to establish the Festival's fame were unwilling or forbidden to take part in it, above all Max Reinhardt, Bruno Walter and Arturo Toscanini. Their place was taken by new names on the Festival's playbills, most notably that of Karl Böhm, who made his debut with « Don Giovanni » .

The ideology and rabid racism of the Nazi regime were manifest in the exhibition of « Entartete Kunst » (Degenerate Art) that was displayed in the Festival Theatre, from 4 September to 2 October.

1939

The new regime ordered Anton Faistauer's frescoes to be removed from the entrance foyer, arguing that they were gloomy and out of date. The re-decoration of the rooms was entrusted to « " Reich " Set Designer » Benno von Arent. Nazi celebrities arrived punctually for the opening ceremonies : Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels attended the performance of « Der Rosenkavalier » and, a few days later, Adolf Hitler himself, flanked by Martin Bormann and Albert Speer, made an appearance at 2 Mozart Operas : « Don Giovanni » , on 9 August ; and « Die Entführung aus dem Serail » , on 14 August. Shortly thereafter, the general management made a surprise announcement that the Festival would terminate on 31 August, a week ahead of the scheduled finale on 8 September. The reason was, supposedly, that the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra were required to perform « Die Meistersinger » at the Nuremberg Party Convention. The true reason became apparent on 1 September when the German army invaded Poland and unleashed the Second World War.

1940

The year 1940 was marked by War, and the Festival was pared down to a 14 day « Salzburg Summer of Culture » . The programme consisted entirely of a concert-series presented by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra under the batons of Hans Knappertsbusch, Karl Böhm, Wilhelm Furtwängler and Franz Lehár. Culture had become a State monopoly manipulated from above. This became evident in the new name assigned to one of the major venues : Salzburg « Stadttheater » was elevated to the rank of « Landestheater » .

1941

Although hostilities continued to mount and the German army invaded the Soviet Union, the Festival returned to its regular programme. The 150th anniversary of Mozart's death was honoured with productions of 3 of his Operas. Admittedly, little remained of the Festival's former glory and international stature : the audiences consisted mainly of soldiers, whether on leave or recovering from wounds, and workers from German and Italian munitions factories. The Festival functioned as a sort of psychological weapon of domestic warfare and manipulation : as catastrophe loomed ever larger on the horizon, the people's morale had to be shored-up and their worries dispelled. One important administrative appointment was made on 13 September as Clemens Krauß was named the Festival's artistic director.

1942

The organizational structure envisaged for the Festival by its founders was thrown overboard with the dissolution of the Salzburg « Festspielhaus » Association on 1 April. In its place, came a General Artistic Director's position, which went to Clemens Krauß with a 10 year contract. Realizing that the gap left by the cancellation of « Jedermann » was still unclosed, the Festival commissioned Richard Billinger to write a Paracelsus Play as a successor to Hofmannsthal's Masterpiece.

1943

According to Hitler's decree of 8 March 1943, the scheduled events were no longer allowed to take place under the name of « Festival ». They were re-named the « Salzburg Summer of Theatre and Music » and set aside primarily for armaments workers and War invalids from the Salzburg region. The programme consisted of 3 productions of spoken theatre and 2 of Opera. Richard Strauß's 2nd Horn Concerto received its world-premiere at one of the orchestral concerts.

The Festival's co-founder, Max Reinhardt, died on 31 October in his American exile.

1944

The « Salzburger Theater- und Musiksommer » is cancelled.

On 29 July, a week before the « Summer of Theatre and Music » was to begin, an order arrived from Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels cancelling every festival in the « Reich ». Clemens Krauß exploited his close ties to the Berlin regime in order to salvage at least the dress-rehearsal for the scheduled world-premiere of Richard Strauß's « Die Liebe der Danæ ». The rehearsal duly took place on 16 August, with Viorica Ursuleac and Hans Hotter in the leading roles. The premiere was meant to honour the composer on his 80th birthday.

Deeply moved after the performance, Strauß uttered his famous words to the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra :

« I hope we shall see each other again in a better world. »

Wilhelm Furtwängler also received special dispensation from Berlin to conduct Anton Bruckner's 8th Symphony with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, on 14 August.

1945

On 4 May, 2 days before the Second World War officially came to an end, American troops took control of Salzburg. Before the spring was over a decision was made to revive the Festival : Otto von Pasetti, an Austrian-born tenor who spent the Nazi years in exile and returned as a member of the occupying forces, was entrusted with the organizational work, and Baron Puthon returned to his office as president. On 12 August, the Festival opened with an official ceremony in the Town Room (« Stadtsaal ») at which speeches were held by Puthon and the American general Mark Clark. Hugo von Hofmannsthal, whose works had been banned 7 years before (except for his libretti for Richard Strauß), returned to the repertoire. Mozart's « Entführung aus dem Serail » was broadcast on radio, even to the United States, and there were many concerts, most of which were given by the « Mozarteum » Orchestra. 23 of the visitors were members of the armed forces ; the rest of the tickets were distributed among Austrians. It was a rebirth, but far removed from normalcy.

1946

Hugo von Hofmannsthal's « Jedermann » returned in Max Reinhardt's original conception, adapted by Heinz Hilpert. The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra returned as well, both as an Opera Orchestra and with its own cycle of concerts. To be sure, the conductors on the playbills of the Nazi years gave way to new names : Hans Swarowsky, Felix Prohaska, John Barbirolli, Charles Münch, Carl Schuricht and Ernest Ansermet were now placed in charge of the music while artists such as Wilhelm Furtwängler, Karl Böhm, Clemens Krauß and Herbert von Karajan were black-listed pending their denazification. Oscar Fritz Schuh created his 1st production at the Festival, a new staging of « Figaro » and, once again, the programme featured a Strauß Opera, « Der Rosenkavalier » . Hofmannsthal, Reinhardt, Strauß : the Festival's founding triumvirate had returned to Salzburg. Finally, the Festival's administration also had news to report, as Tassilo Nekola, formerly hired as a general secretary, took charge of the artistic management.

1947

The desire to give the Festival a new image led to a number of remarkable « débuts » . Gottfried von Einem, a 29 year old Austrian composer who had joined the Festival's board of directors the previous year, achieved a resounding success with the world-premiere of his Opera « Dantons Tod » . Equally responsible for its success were Oscar Fritz Schuh (director) , Caspar Neher (designer) and the young Hungarian conductor Ferenc Fricsay. Elisabeth Schwarzkopf gave her Salzburg « début » as Susanna in « Figaro » , Sena Jurinac did the same as Dorabella in « Così fan tutte » , and Lisa Della Casa made her 1st appearance in an Opera that would later establish her world fame : Strauß's « Arabella » , this time however as Zdenka. The production was the work of another Salzburg debutant, Günther Rennert. Jubilation greeted the return of Wilhelm Furtwängler, who conducted 2 concerts with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, including one with violinist Yehudi Menuhin.

1948

The 1948 Festival amounted to a summit meeting between 2 conductors. Wilhelm Furtwängler conducted a new « Fidelio » in the « Festspielhaus » , while Herbert von Karajan brought-out Gluck's « Orfeo ed Euridice » in the « Felsenreitschule » - the 1st Opera ever performed in this venue. The covert rivalry between these 2 Mæstros prevented them from jointly taking part in the Festival, a solution that would doubtless have been preferred by audiences and critics alike. Apart from 2 orchestral concerts, in 1949, it was not until after Furtwängler's death that Karajan would return to Salzburg. In contrast, Ferenc Fricsay's star remained in the ascendant. This year, he presented the 1st staged performance of Frank Martin's « Le vin herbé » , thereby, extending the Festival's series of contemporary music theatre. In the spoken theatre, the era of Ernst Lothar commenced with a staging of Grillparzer's « Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen » .

1949

2 deaths cast their shadow upon the Festival : Maria Cebotari, the celebrated Countess, Constanze, Zerlina and Euridice of the Festival's recent years, died on 9 June at the age of 39 ; and, on 8 September, the world took leave of Richard Strauß, and with him the last of the Festival's 3 co-founders. Bruno Walter returned to the Festival after a 12 year

absence to perform Mozart's « Great » G minor Symphony and Mahler's « Lied von der Erde » with Kathleen Ferrier and Julius Patzak. Another famous « émigré », George Szell, made his 1st appearance at the Festival to conduct « Der Rosenkavalier ». Carl Orff's « Antigone » received its world-premiere in the « Felsenreitschule », an event that, once again, brought together the successful team of Fricsay, Schuh and Neher. From now on, it will not only be Mozart's well-known Operas that enliven the programmes but also, thanks to the tireless commitment of Bernhard Paumgartner, rarities from the Mozart repertoire. Paumgartner founded the Mozart « matinées », in which many forgotten gems would later be unearthed.

Spoken theatre was dominated by the great Goethe bicentenary as new productions of « Clavigo » and « Iphigenie auf Tauris » were mounted to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the great poet's birth.

...

The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, which regularly played in Salzburg, was told to dismiss all Jewish musicians after the « Anschluß ». Suitably, Aryan replacements were quickly engaged, and the Orchestra fulfilled all its commitments in Salzburg, in 1938 and 1939, and continued to play regularly at the behest of the Nazi authorities throughout the War in Salzburg, Vienna and in Germany.

Foreign music-critics who covered the 1938 Festival disliked its « aryianisation », but seemed more concerned by the lax dress-code and the extensive beer drinking among the spectators brought in by the Nazis from Bavaria. They missed the elegance of past Festivals.

Nazi functionaries now took control of the Festival, a bust of Josef Goebbels was put-up, and anyone suspected of being of Jewish extraction was dismissed. The Nazis used music for propaganda purposes. Mozart's Operas, a staple at the Salzburg Festival, were recruited to call Austria's youth to arms.

Austria's Nazi Governor, Baldur von Schirach declared :

« In Mozart's name, we call the young to arms. »

Adolf Hitler, accompanied by Martin Bormann and Albert Speer, came to the premiere of « Don Giovanni » to open the 1939 Festival. They were feted with endless salvos of « Bravo » and Nazi salutes. The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, which would normally have played throughout the Festival, was abruptly ordered to go instead to Nuremberg to perform Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » .

The Nazis were determined to maintain the annual Salzburg Festival during the War and « restore its German character », as Hermann Göring put it. Programmes were narrowed to concentrate on Beethoven, Richard Strauss, Mozart, Richard Wagner, Johannes Brahms. High-ranking Nazi visitors who came to Festival performances were accommodated at « Schloß Leopoldskron », which had been sanitized of all traces of Max Reinhardt. Many of the great names of the music-world who had been regulars in Salzburg or Vienna were missing as well as Arturo Toscanini

and Bruno Walter, there was Vladimir Horowitz, all of whom had emigrated to the United States. Karl Böhm and Clemens Krauß, however, had no scruples about working in Salzburg under the Nazis, insisting that they were safeguarding the Festival's traditions. Krauß remained directorship until 1944. Böhm went to Vienna in 1942, to be head of the State Opera. Both men were able to attract the best singers available in Germany and the German occupied territories. They included Hans Hotter, Erich Kunz, Anton Dermota, Irmgard Seefried, Hilde Güden and several other young artists whose fame spread after the War. Their willingness to perform under the Nazis attracted little attention. But Böhm's and Krauß's collaboration with the Nazis was far more problematical. Like Austrian-born Herbert von Karajan, who had joined the Nazi Party as early as 1933, and Germany's Elizabeth Schwarzkopf, who justified Party membership as a passport to performance similar to trade-union membership, their records were closely examined before the 2 conductors were allowed to perform again after the War's end.

The 4 Occupation powers in Austria did not attempt to define a common cultural policy for the country. The gulf between the Soviet concept of culture as a propaganda tool and the Western belief in freedom of speech was unbridgeable, even during the euphoria of victory. But the absence of a common attitude to the restoration of Austria's cultural life also meant that there was little cooperation in handling the sensitive matter of denazification in the performing arts.

Salzburg was under U.S. occupation. The Americans were keen to revitalize the Festival as a way of demonstrating America's commitment to Austria's cultural regeneration. They tried but failed to persuade Toscanini, Walter or Yehudi Menuhin to participate in the 1st post-War Festival. Obligated to rely on the talent available to them inside Austria, the Americans gave no clear directives about the engagement of artists who had compromised themselves with the Nazis. Festival administrators were left guessing about American intentions, and there was much agonizing over the acceptability of several outstanding musicians whose record under the Nazis was considered controversial. The Festival succeeded in opening its doors in 1945, using many singers who had also been prepared to perform under the Nazis.

The Americans made an unsatisfactory attempt to operate the same points system for the performing arts, which the 3 other occupying powers were also haphazardly administering. Artists had to complete questionnaires about their War-time activities, and these were used to score penalty points to determine whether they should be put onto black, grey or white lists. 3 penalty points were sufficient for the black-list. But there were no clear criteria for defining pro-Nazi transgressions. Most of the artists in question were popular figures in Austria. Austrians, already convinced that the country, as a whole, had been victimized by the Nazis, wanted to see and hear their favourites on the stage. Whitewash was liberally applied : it sufficed to argue that those who had flirted with the Nazis had done so only in order to be able to perform and remain true to their art. Henry Alter, an Austrian « émigré », noted in November 1945 that 90 % of Austria's artists would have had to be disqualified from performing if the Allies insisted on the observation of strict denazification procedures. Tacitly, the Allies accepted the argument that European artists had always felt free to accept honours ...

« Aryanisation »

Le processus d'aryanisation a commencé en même temps que l'entrée des troupes allemandes en Autriche. Les

exactions contre la population juive et les pillages ont débuté avec l'« Anschluß ». Selon des témoignages, la terreur règne dans les rues et on entend « Juda verrecke » (Grève sale juif) ou « Jaden heraus » (Les juifs dehors). On assiste alors à des aryanisations sauvages menées par des employés des sociétés, des concurrents, des membres du NSDAP, des Cellules d'entreprises nationales-socialistes, des SA ou d'autres personnages ne songeant qu'à s'enrichir qui s'auto-proclament « commissaires ». Les transferts de propriété se font de manière arbitraire sous la pression psychologique en recourant à la violence. Les « commissaires » obtiennent des propriétaires juifs que ceux-ci cèdent leur entreprise ou leur logement à vils prix. Sur les 33,000 entreprises juives, 7,000 auraient été victimes d'aryanisations sauvages.

La loi du 13 avril 1938 sur les aryanisations a pour but de faire passer les aryanisations sauvages sous le contrôle de l'État et de légaliser les commissaires. À partir de la fin avril, les aryanisations doivent être soumises à autorisation préalable. Pour empêcher tout détournement ou fraude, la population juive doit déclarer ses biens entre le 27 avril et le 31 juillet 1938. Le principal bénéficiaire de ce processus d'aryanisation est l'État national-socialiste qui profite non seulement des biens confisqués, mais de toutes les ressources fiscales résultant du transfert de propriété. Le 14 juin 1938, une loi définit exactement ce qu'est une « entreprise juive », son propriétaire est juif selon la définition de l'article 5 de la « Reichsbürgergesetz », en fait des fameux articles aryens. Certaines entreprises peuvent être considérées comme « juives » si l'influence juive est « trop évidente ». Le 18 mai, est créé un Département pour le transfert de fortune, qui intègre quelques semaines plus tard, le nouveau ministre du Travail et de l'Économie. Les candidats à l'achat de tout bien juif doivent être « contrôlés », quant aux commissaires, leur appartenance au Parti ou à ses organisations, leur origine sociale comptent bien plus que leurs compétences professionnelles, ceux-ci sont soit le plus souvent incompetents et étrangers à la branche dont relève l'entreprise qu'ils doivent « aryaniser » soit ils sont impliqués de très près dans cette branche. Les militants « illégaux » du Parti sont largement privilégiés dans ces transactions.

Hermann Göring se dit satisfait de la politique menée à Vienne en matière d'aryanisation, en raison de la rapidité et de la « radicalité » de l'entreprise. En l'espace de quelques mois, 50 % des magasins de commerce, 83 % de l'artisanat, 26 % de l'industrie, 82 % des services ont été aryanisés. Des 86 banques, il n'en reste plus que 8. Quant à l'aryanisation de quelque 70,000 logements, elle évite aux nouveaux maîtres d'entreprendre de nouveaux programmes de construction à Vienne.

Les travaux de la Commission historique ont mis en lumière à quel point la politique d'aryanisation a touché certaines branches comme l'industrie textile, l'industrie de la chaussure et du cuir, l'industrie du bois et du papier, l'agro-alimentaire et les entreprises sucrières. Parmi les grandes entreprises aryanisées, on peut citer le grand magasin Gemgroß, la chaîne de chaussures Del-Ka ou la brasserie d'Ottakring.

La question de l'aryanisation empoisonnera la vie politique et économique autrichienne jusqu'au milieu des années 1920. Que cela soit à propos des tableaux de Gustav Klimt ou Egon Schiele ou de Jörg Haider qui a hérité de son oncle le domaine de Bärental, en Carinthie, que celui-ci avait « acheté » à vil prix dans le cadre de l'aryanisation des biens juifs ou bien lorsque Thomas Klestil, président de la République, désire acheter une villa à Vienne et qu'il s'avère que celle-ci a été « aryanisée », ce passé resurgira sans cesse.

Les travaux de la Commission historique ont aussi mis en évidence tous les préjudices et toutes les discriminations que l'« Anschluß » a provoqués dans le monde professionnel. Tout d'abord, dès le 15 mars 1938, tous les fonctionnaires doivent prêter serment à Adolf Hitler. Les Juifs et les soi-disant « Mischling » (sang mêlés) sont exclus du service public sur la base des lois de Nuremberg. Celles et ceux qui refusent de prêter serment pour des raisons politiques ou idéologiques sont licenciés ou, pour les plus âgés, mis à la retraite avec une pension largement amputée. Dans les autres branches professionnelles, dans les entreprises privées, il faut attendre le mois de juin pour que la chasse aux Juifs et aux « Mischlinge » ou aux personnels mariés à des Juifs ou des Juives soit enclenchée. Un dédommagement relevant d'un contrat privé n'excédant pas 10,000 « Reichsmarks » et englobant les droits à la retraite peut alors être envisagé. Les sources ne permettent malheureusement pas de savoir combien de personnes ont été touchées par ces mesures.

Unser Wien : « Arisierung » auf Österreichisch, Aufbau-Verlag, Berlin (2001) .

Notre Vienne : Aryanisation de l'Autriche est un livre co-écrit par Stephan Templ et Tina Walzer qui précise comment des centaines d'entreprises juives de Vienne ont été saisies par les Nazis et jamais restituées.

Tina Walzer est une historienne d'art, qui s'est spécialisée dans l'étude de la spoliation à grande échelle et de la vente forcée à des prix dérisoires des œuvres d'art détenus par les Juifs.

Stephan Templ est un journaliste basé à Prague et travaillant pour le « Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung » .

Publié en 2001, le livre répertorie pour la 1re fois les centaines de biens importants appartenant à des Juifs, saisis par les Nazis et qui n'ont jamais été rendus à leurs propriétaires d'avant la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Le livre donne les noms de ces fameux bénéficiaires.

La 1re partie du livre, écrite par Walzer, décrit les différentes méthodes de pillage employé par les Nazis et le destin des victimes juives, avec des références pour des cas particuliers et des exemples qui fourniront un contexte historique et politique à la seconde partie du livre.

Le « New York Times » note que ce qui différencie ce livre, ce n'est pas tant l'histoire qui est déjà largement connue, mais les détails de la seconde partie du livre, appelée « La topographie du vol » , qui liste plus de 500 entreprises avec leur adresse, leur ancien propriétaire et leur propriétaire actuel.

La seconde moitié du livre, compilée par le co-auteur Templ, s'apparente à un parcours guidé présentant l'ampleur des confiscations de biens juifs à Vienne sous le Nazisme, et les histoires s'y attachant.

Un grand nombre de politiciens, avocats, juges, docteurs, artistes ou sportifs ont pu améliorer leurs standards de vie après 1938. Le livre cite entre autres, parmi ces profiteurs :

Adolf Schärff (1890-1965) : Avocat, membre du Parti social-démocrate d'Autriche et président d'Autriche de 1957 à 1965 : il s'installe avec sa famille à l'automne 1938, quelques mois après l' « Anschluß » , au n° 1 de la « Skodagasse » , dans la maison d'Arnold Eisler, un avocat et ancien collègue en fuite.

Franz Vranitzky : Membre du Parti social-démocrate d'Autriche, chancelier fédéral d'Autriche de 1986 à 1997 : le père de sa femme, Karl Clemens Kristen, a acquis en 1938, pour la somme de 3,220 « Reichsmarks » , la société orthopédique Normalia propriété d'Ernst et Fanny Fürth. Le paiement est fait sur un compte bloqué au nom d'Ernst Israel Fürth. Le prix est égal à 1 mois de bénéfice de Normalia. Madame Christine Vranitzky, femme du chancelier, hérite de l'entreprise à la mort de son père et possède toujours des parts dans l'entreprise. Aucune compensation financière n'a été offerte aux héritiers Fürth.

Franz (« Ferry ») Dusika (1908-1984) : Un des plus célèbres cyclistes autrichiens des années 1930 : déjà Nazi avant l' « Anschluß » , il « aryanise » en 1938 l'entreprise de bicyclettes d'Adolf Blum, sis au n° 45 de la « Brünnerstraße » ; ainsi que les entreprises de commercialisation de radios de Walter Liechtenstein, sis au n° 106 de la « Währingerstraße » , et de Risa Mohr, sis au n° 20 de la « Meidlinger-Hauptstraße » ; celle de Walter Mandl, sis au n° 22 de la « Klosterneuburgerstraße » ; et la cordonnerie de Naftali Pluznik, sis au n° 8 de la « Kleine-Sperlgasse » .

Malgré ce sombre passé, le plus grand hall multi-fonctionnel de sport intérieur d'Autriche porte le nom de « Ferry-Dusika-Hallenstadion » .

En 1942, le célèbre chef d'orchestre autrichien Karl Böhm achète (« aryanise ») à un prix dérisoire la Villa Geßner située au n° 70 de la « Sternwartestraße » , dans le 18e district de Vienne. La maison fut saisie par les Nazis, en 1938, au moment de l' « Anschluß » . Elle appartenait alors au Juif Paul Regenstreif. De style « Jugendstil » , elle fut construite en 1907 « par et pour » l'architecte Hubert Geßner rattaché à la firme d'Otto Wagner. Ce dernier fut le principal architecte de « Vienne, la rouge » (« das rote Wien » ou « rotes Wien ») : surnom de la capitale autrichienne de 1918 à 1934, alors qu'elle est dirigée par une coalition de Sociaux-Démocrates et de Chrétiens-Sociaux influencés par l'Austro-marxisme.

Böhm déclare au moment de l'annexion de son pays à l'Allemagne nazie :

« Solange noch ein Jude in der Ostmark lebt, werde ich nicht zum Taktstock greifen. »

(Aussi longtemps qu'un Juif vit dans l' « Ostmark » , je ne prendrai pas mon bâton de chef d'orchestre.)

...

Le Festival de Salzbourg a annoncé la pose d'une plaque dans la salle Karl Böhm pour expliquer le rôle du chef d'orchestre pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

C'est un « passé qui ne passe pas » , régulièrement ressuscité par les institutions concernées et par les autorités

publiques : les liens entre le monde musical et le régime nazi sont une nouvelle fois questionnés alors que le Festival de Salzbourg a décidé de faire poser une plaque dans la salle Karl Böhm explicitant le rôle du chef d'orchestre pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Selon le quotidien autrichien « Kurier », la future plaque, acceptée à l'unanimité par le conseil d'administration du Festival de Salzbourg, reflétera l'opinion selon laquelle Karl Böhm a « profité » du régime nazi et son ascension s'est trouvée « favorisée » par l'expulsion de ses collègues juifs et opposants au régime, sans pour autant qu'il n'adhère au parti ni qu'il ne fasse publiquement de remarque antisémite. La salle ne sera néanmoins pas rebaptisée, en raison des « qualités artistiques exceptionnelles » du chef d'orchestre, mais ladite plaque le décrira « tel qu'il était », à savoir « un grand artiste, mais ayant commis une erreur politique fatale » .

La place de Karl Böhm dans le paysage musical autrichien s'est trouvée interrogée par le « Kurier » en mars 2015, alors que le « Land » de Styrie attribuait le prix Karl Böhm d'interprétation au chef de l'Opéra de Graz, Dirk Kaftan. Le journaliste Thomas Trenkler rappelait alors que Karl Böhm devait sa nomination au « Semperoper » de Dresde (1934) à la démission de Fritz Busch (opposé au régime) et à l'intercession d'Adolf Hitler. Le dictateur influence également sa nomination à l'Opéra d'État de Vienne (1943) et fait figurer son nom sur la « Gottbegnadeten-Liste », liste des artistes jugés les plus importants du régime, établie en 1944, et parmi lesquels figurent également Richard Strauß, Carl Orff, Herbert von Karajan, ou encore Wilhelm Furtwängler (dont le nom fut rayé de la liste en raison des soupçons sur sa participation à l'attentat raté contre Adolf Hitler) . Après la Guerre et son procès en dénazification, Karl Böhm fut interdit de représentation pendant 2 ans. Il reprit son poste à Vienne en 1954.

Ce n'est pas la 1^{re} initiative de ce type en Autriche. En mars 2013, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne avait demandé à des historiens d'explorer son passé nazi. Cette enquête avait alors débouché sur des conclusions accablantes : outre une surreprésentation de membres du Parti nazi NSDAP, la prestigieuse phalange a découvert qu'elle fut dirigée, de 1954 à 1968, par Helmut Wobisch, ancien membre de la « Waffen-SS » et collaborateur de la « Gestapo » .

...

Parmi les établissements célèbres arianisés, Templ cite entre autres :

La Grande Roue de Vienne et le café au « Prater » qui étaient détenus par le Juif Eduard Steiner. En 1938, il est forcé de céder la grande roue, une des attractions majeures de Vienne, à un consortium, avant d'être déporté et assassiné à Auschwitz, en 1944. Le consortium était la propriété d'Alfons Wilfert (à 40 %) , de Johann Michna (à 20 %) , de Franz Öhlwein (à 20 %) et de Josef Örtel (à 20 %) .

La Grande Roue panoramique de Vienne est située dans le parc du « Prater » , une ancienne réserve de chasse Impériale qui a été rendue accessible au grand public par l'Empereur Joseph II, en 1766. Quand l'Empereur annonça de vouloir ouvrir les portes du « Prater » au peuple, les nobles de Vienne protestaient en disant qu'ils « voulaient se promener entre leurs pairs » .

Joseph leur répondit alors :

« Si je voulais me balader exclusivement entre mes pairs, je devrais faire mes promenades à la crypte Impériale ! »

Le « Prater » devint en peu de temps une zone de récréation populaire pour les habitants de Vienne, et le parc d'amusement « Wurstelprater » se développa en ce lieu qui existe toujours et dont la Grande Roue est la plus célèbre attraction.

La Grande Roue du « Prater » a été construite en 1897 pour célébrer le 50^e anniversaire du gouvernement de l'Empereur François-Joseph I, ses architectes étaient les ingénieurs anglais Walter Basset et Harry Hitchins. Basset restait propriétaire de la Grand Roue du « Prater » jusqu'à ce qu'il fût exproprié en 1916 à cause de sa nationalité britannique, mal vue à Vienne pendant la Première Guerre mondiale. La Grande Roue aurait alors dû être démontée, mais il n'y eut pas suffisamment de fonds pour couvrir les frais des travaux nécessaires à ce but. Ce n'est que pour cela que la Grande Roue de Vienne existe toujours ! Après la fin de la Guerre, l'homme d'affaires juif Eduard Steiner acheta aux enchères la Grande Roue de Vienne et il la opérait jusqu'à l'« aryanisation » de ses biens en 1938. Eduard Steiner fut meurtri au KZ Auschwitz en 1944, dans la même année la Grande Roue prit feu et s'écrasa. Entre 1945 et 1947, la Grande Roue a été reconstruite et équipée de la moitié de ses 30 wagons originaux.

Aujourd'hui, la Grande Roue panoramique de Vienne offre à ses visiteurs l'occasion de se réjouir à une hauteur d'environ 65 mètres d'un panorama magnifique de Vienne lors d'un tour panoramique sur la Grande Roue de Vienne. En outre, l'on peut louer les wagons de la Grande Roue pour fêtes, mariages et autres événements particuliers à Vienne, éventuellement en combinaison avec un service de restauration événementielle à bord de la Grande Roue de Vienne.

...

Les 2 hôtels de luxe, le Bristol et l'Imperial Hotel, détenus partiellement avant-guerre par le Juif Samuel Schallinger, déporté et assassiné en 1942 au camp de concentration de Theresienstadt, ont été « aryanisés » et non restitués aux héritiers.

Il en est de même du Café « Bräunerhof » , connu avant-guerre sous le nom de « Sans Souci » , ainsi que de nombreux autres cafés et restaurants comme le fameux « Zu Den Drei Husaren » .

Le bâtiment de la maison de couture Goldman & Salatsch sur la « Michælerplatz » , construit dans la vieille ville par l'architecte Adolf Loos, a été saisi en 1938 par la société Opel. Une photo du livre montre le bâtiment avec le nom Opel et un immense drapeau nazi à croix gammée entre les 4 piliers centraux.

La fameuse Majolica Haus, conçue par l'architecte Otto Wagner en pur style « Jugendstil » , appartenait avant-guerre au Juif Wilhem Frankl. Elle est saisie par les Nazis après que les autorités ont certifié que son propriétaire était fou.

Le « Neue Kronen-Zeitung », journal qui a soutenu le politicien d'extrême-droite Jörg Haider, était avant-guerre détenu partiellement par l'éditeur juif Leopold Lipschütz. Ses héritiers n'ont reçu qu'une très faible indemnisation.

Un tiers des emplacements du marché à l'air libre Nasch de Vienne ont été « aryanisés », ainsi que la moitié des pharmacies de la ville, 74 cinémas, la chaîne de boulangerie Anker, le tailleur sur mesure Knize et les boutiques de lingerie Palmers. La liste inclut aussi 70,000 appartements et des milliers d'œuvres d'art.

Bien que plusieurs gouvernements autrichiens, y compris l'actuel, se soient penchés sur le problème de la restitution des biens spoliés, de nombreux cas restent non résolus, car les biens ont changé de mains de nombreuses fois. Les survivants qui essaient de réclamer les biens de parents décédés sont souvent bloqués car ils ne sont pas les anciens propriétaires ou leurs parents proches, ou parce qu'ils n'ont pas assez d'argent pour engager un bon avocat ou pour rembourser le nouveau propriétaire.

Walter Pollak, le fils d'Arthur Pollak, co-propriétaire d'une usine d'allumettes, a été obligé d'abandonner des bureaux dans le centre de Vienne. Il décrit la dérisoire compensation qu'il a reçue :

« En 1946, Papa a reçu une compensation pour sa part d'un tiers dans l'affaire. C'était juste assez pour acheter une Buick de seconde main, la seule voiture qu'il ait jamais possédée. »

Hans Peter Manz, conseiller diplomatique à la chancellerie, a accueilli favorablement le livre. Il souligne les efforts du gouvernement pour fournir une compensation financière. Le gouvernement a mis de côté une somme d'environ 130 millions d'euros pour la restitution des biens, avec jusqu'à présent environ 18,000 demandes reçues.

« Ce n'est que de l'argent, c'est tard et ce n'est pas assez, et cela doit être distribué aussi vite que possible, car le nombre de demandeurs diminue rapidement, mais notre but est de donner à autant de gens que possible, y compris les héritiers, une vraie chance d'obtenir ce qui est à eux. »

Notre Vienne : Aryanisation de l'Autriche donne des précisions sur les lieux où sont détenus les archives et autres documents pouvant aider ceux qui désirent rechercher leurs biens familiaux. Comme résultat, les archives d'État ont été inondées par des demandes de recherche.

« Du monde entier, ils viennent ici ou écrivent ou téléphonent. », dit Hubert Steiner, l'archiviste chargé des documents concernant les biens « aryanisés » .

Les auteurs sont en train de préparer un livre qui couvrira le reste de l'Autriche et, entre autres, les confiscations des stations thermales et des stations de sport d'hiver détenues avant-guerre par des Juifs. Ce livre mentionnera aussi la propriété du populiste d'extrême-droite Jörg Haider, qui vivait sur un domaine de 1,600 hectares, qui appartenait à un couple juif et que sa famille a acquis légalement pour une bouchée de pain.

Le livre expose des secrets de longue date concernant la période nazie en Autriche, et a permis d'initier de très

nombreuses demandes légales de restitution.

« Les Autrichiens se sont, pendant de nombreuses années, considérés comme les Ires victimes d'Adolf Hitler, qui a occupé son Autriche natale en mars 1938. Mais 2 historiens ont, à présent, montré dans quelle mesure les Autrichiens étaient les Iers profiteurs de la Guerre, agissant rapidement pour exproprier les biens des Juifs de Vienne. »

« Dans le pillage de leurs voisins juifs, les Viennois ont joué un rôle prépondérant pour le Reich de 1,000 ans. » , écrivent Tina Walzer et Stephan Templ dans leur nouveau livre acerbe concernant la soi-disant « aryanisation » des biens juifs à Vienne, où 200,000 Juifs vivaient autrefois.

La communauté juive a bien sûr été satisfaite de voir le livre publié. Néanmoins, Erika Jakobowitz, directrice générale du bureau du président de la communauté juive autrichienne, Ariel Muzicant, doute que le livre ai une réelle signification pratique :

« Je pense qu'il sera difficile de restituer ces biens à leurs propriétaires, car tous les dossiers afférents devront être présentés. Les propriétaires devront prouver qu'il n'y a pas eu d'accords antérieurs concernant ces biens, et que s'il y en a eu, ils étaient extrêmement injustes. Le principe en question ici est extrêmement important, mais entre celui-ci et gagner un procès, il y a un long chemin. »

Peter Moser, l'ambassadeur autrichien aux États-Unis a traité le livre de tintamarre congelé et isolé d'un autre âge !

Le co-auteur Templ est lui-même impliqué, en 2005, dans une affaire de restitution qui va se poursuivre pendant une décennie en procédures judiciaires.

En 2015, Templ est condamné à 1 an de prison pour avoir omis de mentionner le nom d'une tante éloignée dans une demande au nom de sa mère pour la restitution de biens spoliés en 1938 à ses parents juifs. La « BBC News » notent que les journalistes sont persuadés que la peine de prison est liée aux critiques faites par l'auteur concernant l'action du gouvernement en matière de restitution des biens juifs.

Le 21 septembre 2015, 75 historiens spécialistes de la Shoah, adressent une lettre à l'ambassadeur d'Autriche à Washington, protestant contre l'imminente incarcération de Templ et lui demandant d'intervenir auprès du président autrichien :

« En tant que chercheurs qui avons écrit ou enseigné la Shoah ou d'autres génocides, nous sommes profondément troublés par l'emprisonnement imminent d'un historien et journaliste juif autrichien qui a dénoncé les défaillances de l'Autriche concernant le retour des biens juifs saisis pendant la période nazie.

Le crime pour lequel Templ a été accusé et condamné à 1 an de prison, concerne l'omission du nom d'une parente éloignée dans sa demande pour la retour des biens saisis de sa famille. Cette affaire aurait pu être résolue par la famille Templ devant une cour civile. La décision du gouvernement autrichien d'intervenir en poursuivant et en mettant

en prison Templ est perçue comme une réaction excessive extrême à l'important livre de Templ, “ Our Vienna : Aryanization Austrian-Style ”, qui critique la politique autrichienne concernant la restitution des biens juifs.

S'il-vous-plaît, veuillez transmettre au président Heinz Fischer notre demande urgente afin qu'il reconsidère son rejet de l'appel de monsieur Templ contre sa sentence de prison. »

Cette lettre est signée, entre autres, par : Navras Jaat Aafreedi, professeur à l'Université Gautam Buddha de l'Inde ; Irving Abella, professeur à l'Université York en Ontario ; Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida, professeur à l'Université Complutense de Madrid ; Docteur Edyta Gawron de l'Université Jagiellonia à Cracovie, en Pologne ; David Kilgour ; Claudia Koonz, professeur à l'Université Duke en Caroline du Nord ; Moïse Postone, professeur à l'Université de Chicago ; David S. Wyman, professeur à l'Université du Massachusetts ; Efraïm Zuroff, directeur du Centre Simon-Wiesenthal à Jérusalem.

Our Vienna : « Aryanisation » the Austrian Way

Unser Wien : « Arisierung » auf Österreichisch, Aufbau-Verlag, Berlin (2001) .

Author : Tina Walzer and Stephan Templ.

« Aryanisation » is the term used to refer to the expropriation of Jewish property on racial grounds in the Nazi era. After the « Anschluß » (the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany) , in March 1938, also Jews in Austria were victims of the persecution policy pursued by the Nazis. At present, these events are again the subject of public discussions, especially in connection with spectacular cases of looted works of art. However, the looting organized by the State did not stop at objects of daily use in Jewish households in Vienna : cutlery from kitchen drawers or photographs on walls - nothing was safe.

« Seized for the benefit of the Austrian State. » - This note appears in the files on the « Aryanisation » of 8 Jewish households in Vienna whose furnishings were confiscated and stored in the State-owned Depot of Movable. These cases are the historical starting-point of the exhibition. In 1938, about 5,000 objects were painstakingly listed, about 600 of them were entered in the inventory from 1939 onwards and, thus, the State took possession of these objects. Pieces of furniture from among these objects were lent (in conformity with the basic function of the Depot of Movable) to State offices and other borrowers. Until recently, such pieces of furniture were used in government offices or Austrian embassies abroad, without the new users being aware of where these objects came from.

Only few pieces were restored to their owners after 1945. A few years ago, the Depot of Movable started to do research work on these objects. Since 1998, on the basis of the Austrian Federal Law on the Restitution of Works of Art, objects that are still available have been returned to the families of their former owners.

Unser Wien : « Arisierung » auf Österreichisch is a book co-authored by Stephan Templ and Tina Walzer that details how hundreds of Jewish businesses in Vienna were seized by the Nazis and never given back.

...

Published in 2001, the book catalogued for the 1st time the hundreds of prominent Jewish-owned properties seized by the Nazis that were never returned, and details the names of famous beneficiaries.

The 1st section of the book, written by Walzer, describes the various methods of looting employed by the Nazis and the fate of the Jewish victims, with references to specific cases and examples which provides historical and political context for the 2nd section of the book.

« The New York Times » notes that what distinguishes the book is not the history, which was broadly known, but rather the details in the 2nd half of the book, called « The Topography of Robbery » which lists businesses, addresses and former and current owners.

The 2nd half of the book, compiled by co-author Templ, acts as a guided tour of the extent of Jewish property confiscations in Vienna under Nazism and the stories attached to them. The book details properties seized by Jewish owners such as Samuel Schallinger who co-owned the Imperial and the Bristol hotels, which today are still among the city of Vienna's grandest hotels.

The book exposed long-held secrets about the Nazi era in Austria, and helped initiate numerous restitution legal claims. Co-author Templ himself became involved in a restitution case, in 2005, which evolved in to a decade of legal entanglement.

In 2015, Templ received a 1 year sentence as punishment for having omitted the name of an estranged aunt in an application on behalf of his mother for the return of property seized from his Jewish relatives in 1938. It has since emerged that he had declared the existence of the aunt. The BBC News notes that critics have suggested that the jailing may be linked to the author's criticism of the government's restitution record.

...

The book has sparked debate in Austria and is a useful resource for looted property research. It is divided into 2 sections.

In the 1st section, Tina Walzer describes the processes of confiscation and persecution in Vienna. She details the various methods of looting employed by the Nazis and the fate of the victims, with frequent reference to specific cases and examples. Walzer also turns her gaze on the post-War situation and is strongly critical of post-War attitudes and the restitution process in Austria. In the final chapter of this section, she focuses on confiscated Egon Schiele paintings in Austrian museums and collections, describing the seizure of the Grünbaum, Steiner, Heinrich Rieger, and Lea Jaray collections which all included works by the artist, and their return (or not) in post-War Austria.

Walzer's text provides the historical and political context for the 2nd section of the book, a « Topography of Looting

» compiled by her co-author, the architectural historian Stephan Templ. To illustrate the scope and impact of Nazi confiscations, Templ organizes his documentation by professional categories, which range from pharmacies to theatre and dance. Within each profession, the entries are organized by district, and alphabetically by address within each district. Templ typically provides the name and address of a business or organisation, the former owner(s) , and the « aryaniser » , as well as listing the sources. There is a brief introductory text to each section (profession) and many entries include a couple of sentences of background information. The documentation works like a guided tour, exposing the extent of property confiscations in Vienna under Nazism by dint of its buildings and the stories attached to them. The format chosen lays open a wealth of archival sources and makes them « speak » .

In the appendix, the authors provide a useful guide to Viennese archival resources on looted property. The volume also includes an index of primary sources, a bibliography and a register of all names mentioned in the book.

Part of the book's appeal lies in its direct and clear language, so different from the cautious tone employed by museums, restitution commissions and other official bodies. Its accusatory stance has provoked debate, while the information it provides on archival sources has inspired further research.

Vienna skewered as a Nazi-Era Pillager of its Jews

The Austrians had a good run, for many years, as the « 1st victim » of Adolf Hitler, who occupied his native Austria in March 1938. But 2 historians have now documented the extent to which the Austrians were among the 1st War-profiteers, moving quickly to expropriate the property of Vienna's Jews.

« In the pillaging of their Jewish neighbours, the Viennese played a leading role for the entire 1,000 Year “ Reich ” » , write Tina Walzer and Stephan Templ in their acerbic new book about the so-called « Aryanization of Jewish property in Vienna » , where some 200,000 Jews once lived.

What distinguishes the book is less its history, which was broadly known, than its details : a long section, called « The Topography of Robbery » , lists businesses, addresses and former and current owners.

The book provides a bizarre walking guide to one of Europe's great cities. The Bristol and Imperial Hotels, 2 of Vienna's proudest, were partly-owned before the War by a Jew, Samuel Schallinger, who died in 1942 at the Theresienstadt camp near Prague. The « Café Bräunerhof » , known before 1938 as the « Sans Souci » , was among the many « cafés » that were « Aryanized » , as was the famous restaurant « Zu Den Drei Husaren » .

The Ferris wheel and « café » on the « Prater » were owned by a Jew, Eduard Steiner, who was murdered at Auschwitz.

The authors write :

« But the fun went on, Vienna was again a bit more Aryan. »

One of the finest buildings of the architect Adolf Loos, the Goldman and Salatsch building on the « Michælerplatz », was taken-over by the Opel company in 1938. A photo in the book shows the building with the Opel name, its 4 front pillars covered with Nazi flags.

The famous Majolica House, designed by Otto Wagner and on many tour agendas, was seized from a Jew named Wilhelm Frankl after the Nazis declared him mad.

Most of the cinemas and half of the pharmacies were Aryanized, and 136 of the tobacco-shops in Vienna. All Jewish doctors stopped working, their offices taken-over quickly. The « Neue Kronen-Zeitung », which now regularly supports the far-Right Austrian politician Jörg Haider, was partly owned in 1938 by the Jewish chief-editor, Leopold Lipschütz, whose heirs received little.

Mr. Haider, the governor of the State of Carinthia, lives there on 4,000 acres that once belonged to a Jewish family, Giorgio and Mathilde Roifer, purchased by Mr. Haider's great uncle for a small sum. That has long been known in Vienna, but Mr. Templ notes how common this is :

« He's a typical case ; he lives on stolen Jewish property. »

Mr. Haider says the property was legally acquired.

A well-known writer, Heimito von Doderer, and the conductor Karl Böhm both « Aryanized » their houses, according to the book.

Mr. Templ, aged 41, said :

« Our goal was to show how broad it was, and to name people, which is taboo here. »

He added :

« The Austrians were the 1st to systematically loot Jewish property in Vienna, before the government had even set the rules. The Austrians did in 6 months, from March to September 1938, what the Germans didn't do in 6 years. »

Ms. Walzer broke in :

« You see why we wrote the book. Otherwise we'd explode. »

They named their book « Unser Wien » (Our Vienna) after the city of Vienna's official tourist-information newsletter.

Mr. Templ said :

« Vienna lives on tourism. But the truth about our Vienna is that all the biggest attractions in Vienna were looted from the Jews. »

The book, published in Berlin last November, has already changed things, said Ms. Walzer, aged 33 :

« We wanted to alter people's views of themselves and their identity - to create a discussion, so everyone should ask their parents and grandparents : “ What happened ? What did you know then ? ” »

Ms. Walzer trained as an art-historian and came to the topic from her interest in the wide-spread theft, or forced sale at derisory prices, of art owned by Jews. Mr. Templ, a Prague-based journalist for the « Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung », trained as an architect, fascinated by the work of the early modernists like Mr. Loos.

Some 65,000 Austrian Jews were killed in Adolf Hitler's camps. Most of the rest sold cheaply and fled. Some 16,000 survive, most of them abroad. Today, many of Vienna's 13,000 Jews (8,000 of whom are officially registered) are recent arrivals from the former Soviet Union.

Restitution of property is a kind of answer, Ms. Walzer says, but it is complex :

« If your house was seized and “ Aryanized ”, the new owner had to pay a small amount to a frozen account in your name. After the War, if the Jewish owner or heirs survived, often no one knew of the money or it was gone. To get the property back, the owner or heir had to repay the new owner. »

Various Austrian governments have made belated but serious efforts at restitution to a generation that is dying away. Pressed by morality and law suits, the current government, a coalition of the conservative People's Party and Mr. Haider's Freedom Party, agreed to a further \$ 360 million in compensation for Austrian victims of Nazi persecution and their heirs.

According to Hannah Lessing, the director of the National Fund for Victims of National-Socialism, \$ 130 million committed by the previous Socialist-led government has already been paid-out. The government has also agreed to try to compensate for non-property losses, like the rights to businesses and rented apartments.

Elisabeth Gehrler, minister for education and culture, apparently stung by the scandal over 2 Egon Schiele paintings seized in New York in 1998 because of their dubious provenance, ordered all federally sponsored museums to review their holdings. In 1999, some 250 artworks and objects were returned to the Rothschild family.

The government will also provide land for the re-establishment of a famous Jewish sporting-club, « Hakoah », and provide more cash to maintain Jewish cemeteries.

Hans Winkler, a senior official of the Foreign Ministry who negotiated compensation agreements, said :

« What's new is a consensus of moral responsibility. There is a consensus that we shouldn't look at the issue as purely a question of legal responsibility. »

Part of the shock over the book comes from Austria's weak teaching of its own Nazi history. Since Austria elected Kurt Waldheim president, in 1986, despite disclosures that he had concealed his service in the German Army near sites of Nazi atrocities in the Balkans, the country has edged away from its perception of itself as victim. In 1991, Chancellor Franz Vranitzky officially acknowledged that Austrians were perpetrators of Nazi crimes, as well as victims.

The Education Ministry is now working with Yad Vashem, the Holocaust museum in Israel, on a program to show what Austria's Jews (from Sigmund Freud to Gustav Mahler ; Arnold Schönberg to Stefan Zweig) gave their country, how Vienna became a birthplace of modern anti-Semitism and how badly Austria's Jews were treated during the Nazi period.

Sigmund Freud's flat

The Freuds lived at No. 19 « Berggasse » Apartment 5 for 47 years. They were able to escape the country, as did Sigmund Kornmehl, who ran a kosher butcher shop in the house, and Emil Humburger, an exporter. The neighbours Adolf and Stephanie Mathias and Victor and Antoinette John perished in the camps.

After the « Anschluß » , Sigmund Freud's apartment was soon occupied by Hertha Pfeifer. In 1986, she recalled :

« My God, the apartment was vacant. We saw that the apartment was vacant. The apartment was completely empty. Completely empty. No one at all was there. That's how it was then. It was so easy. There was no problem at all. »

In 1986, Herta Pfeifer received 1.5 million Shillings (roughly, \$ 100, 000 USD) for the rented apartment when she handed it over the society that installed the Sigmund Freud Museum, there. Sigmund Freud never received any compensation. For her handsome country house in Hochrotherd, outside Vienna, Anna, Freud's daughter, received 2,000 Schillings (about \$ 135 USD) in a post-War settlement with the « Aryanizer » .

Sigmund Freud's sisters (Rosa Graf, Paula Winternitz, Marie Freud, Freud Adolfine) were deported during the War. None survived.

The Ferris Wheel

Another Vienna landmark, the Ferris wheel of the « Prater » was owned by Eduard Steiner (born on 1884 in Blatna, Bohemia ; murdered on 1944 in Auschwitz) . It was taken as loot (« Aryanized ») in 1938 by Alfons Wilfert (40 %) ; Johann Michna (20 %) ; Franz Öhlwein (20 %) ; and Josef Örtel (20 %) .

Steiner's heirs lived in Prague. To their restitution claim, they attached a valid, notarized translation of their Czech

certificate of inheritance. Nevertheless, the Provincial Revenue Office demanded that his will should be probated again, this time on « home » turf, in Austria. Shortly afterwards, in late-February 1948, the Communists took power in Czechoslovakia, and the claimants were no longer able to leave the country and could, henceforth, pay their lawyer only in Czechoslovak crowns. It now became even harder, almost impossible, for them to pursue their claims.

In the course of the proceedings at the People's Court of Justice (in which 3 of the 4 « Aryanizers » were sentenced) 80 % of the shares in the Ferris wheel were forfeited to the Republic of Austria. The lawyer of the heirs, Doctor Karl Lamac, under the Second Act on Restitution, sued to have this 80 % handed over together with the land it was on and the profits earned from it. The Provincial Revenue Office defended itself, saying that although the Republic of Austria had an 80 % share in the Ferris wheel company (Riesenrad OHG) , it was not a co-owner of the Ferris wheel itself and, consequently, could not be sued for it to be handed over under the Second Act on Restitution. For 6 years, the heirs, living in Communist Prague, fought against the chicanery of the Republic of Austria. They would never see the profits from the Ferris wheel. The Provincial Revenue Office of Vienna commented on it quite unperturbed : the money was simply gone.

« The public administrator (State-appointed trustee) Karl Hauffe, Ingénieur, had registered a claim of 40,000 Schillings on the estate of the former public administrator Rudolf Dworaczek, since this money had been unjustly taken from the coffers of the Ferris wheel company (Prater Riesenrad OHG) . Mr. Hauffe, who managed the business on behalf of the State, from November 1950 to 15 June 1953, had also embezzled a sum of 25,000 Schillings and, in addition, unjustly withdrew a sum of about 50,000 Schillings, which is why he was being held in remand. »

Rudolf Leopold, collector of looted art

Property of Otto and Irene Klein at No. 16 « Cobenzlgasse » , Döbling, 19th district of Vienna. Looted in 1938 by Rudolf Leopold, Juliane Leopold, Karl Eckling, and Maria Eckling. The stolen house became the headquarters of the local Nazi Party organization (Ortsstelle Grinzing) . The Klein family, who owned the well-known Viennese tailor-shop Heinrich Grünbaum, at No. 26 « Graben » , escaped in 1939 to Australia.

The son of the « Aryanizer » Rudolf Leopold Senoir (1898-1980) , Rudolf Leopold Junior (1925-2010) , bought and sold looted art. In an Austrian daily newspaper, he was called a « collector of looted art » . His collection, comprising 5,265 items, primarily works of Viennese Modernism (by Egon Schiele, Gustav Klimt, Richard Gerstl, and many others), was bought by the Republic of Austria in 1994. Since 2001, the collection has been shown in the Leopold Museum.

Hotel Imperial

The Hotel Imperial at No. 16 « Kärntner-Ring » was built in the style of the Italian Renaissance, between 1862 and 1865, as a palais for Duke Philipp of Württemberg. It was adapted as a hotel for the 1873 Vienna World's Fair.

On 14 March 1938, Adolf Hitler rented Apartment No. 103.

On 21 March 1938, the names of the « Jewish » members of the Board (Leopold Langer, chairman ; Paul Abel, lawyer ; Samuel Schallinger, « Kommerzialrat » ; and Heinrich Löwinger, « Kommerzialrat ») were deleted from the commercial register. And the names of the new, « Aryan » board members (Friedrich von Schöller ; Ernst Hoffmann, lawyer ; Hermann Klimpfinger ; and Günther Rustler) were entered.

Samuel Schallinger (born in Brno, Moravia, in 1867) was deported in 1942, and did not survive internment in the Theresienstadt ghetto.

Adolf Schärf, President of Austria

The President of Austria from 1957 to 1965, and leader of the Socialist Party of Austria, Adolf Scharf (1890-1965) , « moved » with his family, in autumn 1938, into the home of his fugitive lawyer and colleague, Arnold Eisler, located at No. 1 « Skodagasse » , just months after Adolf Hitler marched into Vienna.

A marble plaque on the façade of the house reads :

« Adolf Schärf, an architect of the new democratic Austria, lived here from 1938 to 1965. »

Schärf « took-over » the firm of Doctor Eisler, though not his clients, for Schärf had a very different clientele (including the « SS Untersturmführer » Erich Loos) , in his efforts to « Aryanize » the house located at No. 19a « Schüttelstraße » , Vienna.

After the War, Schärf was, among other things, vehemently opposed to his former members returning to Austria, for instance former client Hugo Breitner, into the Socialist Party. Nor did Arnold Eisler return. Remaining in the United States, he was, true to his principles, Chairman of the Socialists of Austria. In 1957, Schärf ran for the office of President of Austria.

In order to get the votes of former Nazis, he used the rhyming slogan :

« Wer einmal schon für Adolf war, wählt Adolf auch in diesem Jahr ! »

(Who ever was once for Adolf will vote for him again this year !)

Normalia's Orthopedic Medical Aids

Normalia's Orthopedic Medical Aids (« Normalias Orthopädische Heilbehelfe ») was owned until 1938 by Ernst and Fanny Fürth. Profiteer : Karl Clemens Kristen.

Whenever he was on his 1,600-hectare « Aryanised » Estate, Jörg Haider, a 2 time Governor of Carinthia, pointed to the « Aryanization » case in the family of the, then, Chancellor Franz Vranitzky.

« The “ Aryanizer ” Karl Clemens Kristen was the father of Mrs. Christine Vranitzky, the wife of the former chancellor. She still has a share in the Normalia company, which was not returned to the heirs of the Fürth family under restitution legislation nor was any compensation offered. »

In 1938, the purchase price was set at 3,220 « Reichsmark » to be paid into an escrow account under the name of Ernst Israel Fürth. The price was equal to 1 month's net profits of Normalia.

Karl Böhm, conductor

The Salzburg Festival board has decided to affix a plaque to the « Karl Böhm Saal », specifying that the conductor, while musically gifted, was an enthusiastic Nazi who used the inhumanities of the Hitler regime to advance his career. The plaque will be engraved in German and English.

« He was a great artist but fatally flawed politically » , said Festival president Helga Rabl-Stadler.

There is nothing new in that statement. Böhm was an outright Nazi who in 1938 told the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra that anyone who did not vote for Hitler's « Anschluß » could not be considered a proper German.

In 1938, the ardent Nazi conductor Karl Böhm announced in Vienna :

« Solange noch ein Jude in der Ostmark lebt, werde ich nicht zum Taktstock greifen. »

« As long as a single Jew still lives in the “ Ostmark ” (annexed Austria) , I won't pick-up my conductor's baton. »

However, the decision to out Böhm as a virulent Nazi leaves Salzburg with a major headache. Will local hero Herbert von Karajan, who profited no less than Böhm, receive a plaque of his own ?

The Swiss pianist Edwin Fischer, a career opportunist, declared after Jewish musicians were banned from performing :

« Now that the Jews are no longer allowed to play, the golden era begins for us. »

NS-Vergangenheit : Erklärung im Karl-Böhm-Saal

Der Karl-Böhm-Saal im Salzburger Festspielhaus soll jetzt mit einer Tafel ausgestattet werden, die auf die Rolle des Dirigenten in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus hinweist. Das Festspielkuratorium beschloß das laut « Kurier » .

Der entsprechende Antrag wurde laut der Tageszeitung vom Festspielkuratorium einstimmig angenommen. Karl Böhm (1894-1981) war im Gegensatz zu Herbert von Karajan kein NSDAP-Mitglied, er gilt aber als Profiteur des Dritten Reichs. Das Festspielkuratorium vertrat die Meinung, daß der Saal aufgrund der « außergewöhnlichen künstlerischen

Verdienste » des Dirigenten nicht umbenannt werden solle.

Das Direktorium habe dem Festspielkuratorium jedoch vorgeschlagen, beim Eingang zum Saal eine Erläuterungstafel anzubringen - « analog zur Vorgehensweise der Stadt bei belasteten Straßennamen » , erklärte Festspielpräsidentin Helga Rabl-Stadler. Auf der Tafel werde auf eine Internetadresse verwiesen, « wo in Deutsch und Englisch die Persönlichkeit Karl Böhms dargestellt wird als das, was er war : Ein großer Künstler, aber politisch fatal Irrender » .

Eine Tafel soll jetzt auf die NS-Verstrickung des Dirigenten Karl Böhm (hier auf eine Aufnahme aus dem Jahr 1979) hinweisen.

In der Stellungnahme zur Entscheidung hieß es weiters :

« Böhm war ein Profiteur des Dritten Reichs und arrangierte sich für die Karriere mit dem System. Sein Aufstieg wurde durch die Vertreibung jüdischer und politisch missliebiger Kollegen begünstigt. »

Doch Böhm habe zumindest « keine antisemitischen Äußerungen getätigt » .

Als Opernchef wegen Nazi-Nähe entfernt

Im April 1945 wurde Böhm, damals Direktor der Wiener Staatsoper, von den Alliierten wegen zu großer Nähe zum Nazi-Regime von seinem Posten entfernt und bis 1947 mit einem Auftrittsverbot belegt. Nach Karl Böhm ist im Salzburger Stadtteil Parsch auch ein Gehweg benannt. Der Dirigent stand bei den Salzburger Festspielen insgesamt 338 Mal am Pult.

Erst kurz vor Weihnachten holte die NS-Vergangenheit eine andere bekannte Persönlichkeit der Nachkriegszeit ein : Die Universität Salzburg erkannte dem Naturforscher Konrad Lorenz wegen dessen NS-Verstrickungen den Ehrendokortitel ab - mehr dazu in Uni widerruft Ehrendoktorat für Konrad Lorenz.

...

The Villa Geßner, built in 1907, is located at No. 70 « Sternwartestraße » in the 18th District. It was owned until 1938 by Paul Regenstreif. In 1942, Karl and Thea Böhm « Aryanized » the house.

Hubert Geßner, who worked in the practice of Otto Wagner, was the main architect of the « Red Vienna » .

Hubert Geßner (geboren 20. Oktober 1871 in Walachisch Klobouk ; gestorben 24. April 1943 in Wien) war ein österreichischer Architekt.

Hubert Geßner arbeitete und lernte in den Jahren 1898 und 1899 im Büro von Otto Wagner. In den Jahren 1907 bis 1912 arbeitete er vor allem mit seinem Bruder Franz Geßner zusammen. Nach Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges wurde er

bald einer der führenden Architekten für Wohnbauten in Wien. In dieser Zeit entstanden unter anderem der Karl-Seitz-Hof und der Reumannhof. Mit dem « Anschluß » Österreichs an das Deutsche Reich im Jahre 1938 erhielt er jedoch Berufsverbot und verstarb noch während des Zweiten Weltkrieges.

Zu den berühmtesten Werken von Hubert Geßner gehört unter anderem das im Jugendstil in den Jahren 1901 bis 1902 errichtete Arbeiterheim Favoriten. Während dieser Tätigkeit freundete er sich mit Victor Adler an. Mitglied der Sozialdemokratischen Partei wurde er allerdings nicht.

Funktionen und Mitgliedschaften :

Ordentliches Mitglied der Architektenkammer (ab 1923) .

Vizepräsident der Zentralvereinigung der Architekten Österreichs.

Mitglied des Niederösterreichischen Gewerbevereins.

...

Hubert Geßner wurde 1871 in Wallachisch Klobouk, Mähren, als Sohn eines Schönfärbers geboren. Nach dem Besuch der Bürgerschule in seinem Heimatort trat er in die höhere Gewerbeschule in Brünn, Abteilung Baufach, ein. Die Brünnener Gewerbeschule war damals Anziehungspunkt für etliche Schüler, die später als äußerst renommierte Architekten Bedeutung erlangen sollten : Adolf Loos war Geßners Klassenkamerad, und Leopold Bauer sowie Josef Hoffmann besuchten zwei Jahre später diese Anstalt. Nach der Reifeprüfung im Jahr 1889 praktizierte Geßner in verschiedenen Baubüros, wie etwa bei Otto Zeman in Bistritz, später bei einem Baumeister in Troppau und schließlich als Bauleiter im Büro des Baumeisters Ernst Zuber.

Im Jahr 1894 trat Geßner in Wien in die Meisterschule von Otto Wagner an der Akademie der bildenden Künste ein, wo er mit Josef Plecnik und Jan Kotera wiederum zwei in weiterer Folge bedeutende Architekten als Studienkollegen hatte. Nach Abschluß des Studiums arbeitete Geßner ein Jahr in Wagners Atelier, und anschließend war er durch dessen Vermittlung im mährischen Landesbauamt in Brünn tätig. Geßners Hauptaufgabe in diesem Amt war die Errichtung der Landesnervenheilanstalt in Kremsier (1905) . Gleichzeitig beteiligte er sich erfolgreich an etlichen Wettbewerben und errichtete etwa das Sparkassengebäude in Czernowitz im Jahr 1902 sowie das Krankenkassengebäude in Brünn (1903-1904) .

Noch während seiner Tätigkeit in Brünn beteiligte sich Geßner im Jahr 1902 am Wettbewerb für das « Arbeiterheim Favoriten » Wien 10, für dessen Entwurf er den I.Preis und den Auftrag zur Ausführung erhielt. Dieses Gebäude markiert den Beginn der Freundschaft mit Viktor Adler, dem Führer der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei (SDAP) , sowie den Beginn seiner Karriere gleichsam als « Hausarchitekt » dieser Partei, was ihm zahlreiche bedeutende Aufträge einbrachte, wie etwa die Errichtung von Arbeiterheimen, diversen Gebäuden für den Wiener Konsum-Verein, Wohnhäusern, Lagerhäusern und sogar Fabriksanlagen, wie etwa die « Hammerbrotwerke » , die « ein wichtiges Symbol

für den Aufstieg und die Stärke der proletarischen Verbrauchergenossenschaften darstellten » . (www.dasrotewien.at)

Nachdem Geßner im Jahr 1904 sein erstes eigenes Atelier eröffnet hatte, nahm er seinen jüngeren Bruder Franz, der zu diesem Zeitpunkt noch bei Otto Wagner studierte, als Partner auf. Auf Grund der vielen und umfangreichen Aufträge stellte Geßner in der Folge auch weitere Mitarbeiter in seinem Büro ein, so daß zum Teil bis zu zehn Architekten bei ihm beschäftigt waren (und andere Hans Paar, Rudolf Perco, Alfons Hetmanek und Franz Kaym) .

Im Jahr 1912 endete aus « familiären Gründen » die Zusammenarbeit der beiden Brüder. Hubert Geßner war weiter als erfolgreicher Architekt tätig, wobei er sich in der Zwischenkriegszeit vor allem als Erbauer etlicher groß dimensionierter Wohnhausanlagen für die Gemeinde Wien (die so genannten « Superblocks ») einen Namen machte. Daneben entstanden weitere Fabriken sowie kleinere Wohnbauten, und selbst der Brückenbau zählte zu seinem Repertoire (Wien 2, Augartenbrücke über den Donaukanal, 1928-1931) .

Unter dem nationalsozialistischen Regime wurde Geßner zeitweilig mit Berufsverbot belegt. Hubert Geßner verstarb noch während des Zweiten Weltkriegs im 72.Lebensjahr an Herzschlag in Wien und wurde am Neustifter Friedhof beigesetzt.

Hubert Geßner war ein viel beschäftigter und äußerst universeller Architekt. Der Bogen seiner Bauausführungen spannte sich vom Villenbau über den « Superblock-Gemeindebau » , vom Arbeiterheim über die ausgedehnte Fabrikanlage, bis hin zum Sparkassengebäude, zur Irrenanstalt, zum Hotel sowie Kinosaal und zum Brückenbau. So unterschiedlich diese Bauaufgaben auch waren, erweist sich Geßner bei der Konzeption seiner Gebäude doch stets unverkennbar als Schüler Otto Wagners. Symmetrie, ausgewogene Proportionalität, klare Grundrissdispositionen sowie die Betonung der Konstruktion blieben Zeit seines Lebens die bestimmenden Kriterien seiner Entwurfspraxis.

Geßners frühe Bauten zeigen mit der Verwendung von secessionistischem Formenvokabular, glasierten Ziegeln sowie auskragenden Dächern (Villa Geßner, Wien 18, Sternwartestraße 70, 1907) auch bei der Außengestaltung noch den Einfluß seines Lehrers. Auch das Druckerei- und Verlagsgebäude « Vorwärts » , Wien 5, Rechte Wienzeile 97 (1909-1910) weist Geßner in der gesamten formalen Gestaltung als typischen « Jugendstilarchitekten » aus. Bei dem markanten, abgetreppten Giebel, der sich über die ganze Hausbreite erstreckt, zeigt sich indessen schon eine typische Intention in Geßners Gestaltungsweise, nämlich den Gebäuden vor allem im Dachbereich unverwechselbare Individualität zu verleihen.

Unerachtet der grundlegenden Kontinuität seiner Gestaltungsprinzipien griff Geßner bei der formalen Ausführung der Gebäude doch auch jeweils aktuelle Trends im Baugeschehen auf, und so finden sich etwa durchaus auch barockisierende Motive bei der im Jahr 1896 entstandenen Villa Bratmann in Wallachisch-Klobouk. In der Folge läßt Geßner auch klassizierende Tendenzen erkennen, wie etwa bei der Versicherungsanstalt der Österreichischen Eisenbahner, Wien 4, Linke Wienzeile 48-52 (1912) , die Geßner durch Lisenen, Halbsäulen und pilasterartige Bänderungen einer ausgeprägten Vertikalisierung unterwarf.

Mit geometrischem Dekor, das meist die gesamte Fassadenfläche überzieht und teils mittels Kacheln, teils mittels Terrakottaziegeln oder im rechten Winkel verlaufenden Putzlinien erzielt wird, entwickelte Geßner jedoch auch eine sehr

persönliche gestalterische Handschrift (Bezirkskrankenkasse Floridsdorf, Wien 21, Holzmeistergasse 9, 1904-1905) .

Bei den Bauten der 30er Jahre ist auch bei Geßner sodann die allgemein üblich gewordene Versachlichung der Formensprache feststellbar. Ein beeindruckendes Beispiel dafür verkörpert die « Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte Steiermark » in Graz, Hans Resel-Gasse 6, Steiermark (1929-1930) . Die dekorlosen Fassaden sind durch markante Gesimsbänderungen deutlich horizontalisiert und an der Ecke durch eine dynamisch gekurvte Ecklösung charakterisiert. Das Haus Geßner-Slupetzky, Wien 18, Gersthoferstraße 147 / Scheibenberggasse 52 (1934) , in dem Geßner vor seinem Tod lebte, erhielt zwar eine unpräntiöse Fassade, zugleich aber durch einen markanten Rundturm an der Ecke doch wiederum individuelle Signifikanz.

Die bedeutendsten Arbeiten schuf Geßner zweifellos als Architekt der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei. Vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg errichtete er im Auftrag dieser Partei diverse Genossenschaftsbauten, Arbeiterheime, Krankenkassen und Fabriksbauten, wobei der Schwerpunkt auf der Errichtung von Brotfabriken lag, die im Zuge der steigenden Verbraucherpreise mit kostengünstigen Grundnahrungsmitteln vor allem die Versorgung der Arbeiterschaft sicherstellen sollten. In den 20er Jahren lag Geßners Bedeutung vor allem im Volkswohnungsbau.

Geßner folgte auch bei den Fabriksbauten seinem grundsätzlichen Anspruch, Zweckmäßigkeit mit künstlerischer Gestaltung zu verbinden. Funktionale Anordnungen der Innenräume korrespondieren den jeweils individuell und unverwechselbar strukturierten Außenfassaden. Kennzeichnend für die Fabriksanlagen, die als Solitäre auf freiem Feld entstanden, ist eine Zusammenfügung von unterschiedlich dimensionierten und gestalteten Baublocks zu dynamisch-plastischen Objekten. Dieser Eindruck wird verstärkt durch eine Betonung der Dachlandschaften, sodaß die Gebäude auch aus der Fernsicht eine markante Unverkennbarkeit ausstrahlen. Die Akzentuierung der Silhouette erfolgte etwa durch überbetonte Schornsteine (Hammerbrotwerke Wien 21, Schwaigergasse 1918) oder durch Ausbildung von Türmen, die sich über flache Dächer erheben (Hammerbrot-Werke, Schwechat, Innerbergstraße 28, Niederösterreich, 1908-1909).

Die diversen öffentlichen Gebäude der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei erhielten mittels Dekor auffallende Fassaden, sodaß sich diese Bauten deutlich von den umgebenden Miethäusern abheben. Beim (heute stark veränderten) Gebäude des Ersten Niederösterreichischen Arbeiter Konsum-Vereins, Wien 12, Wolfganggasse 58-60 (1908-1909) etwa war die Fassade zur Gänze mit quadratischem sowie noppenförmigem Terrakottadekor überzogen.

Nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg war Geßner vor allem als Erbauer von Wohnhausanlagen für die Gemeinde Wien aktiv. Als Wagner-Schüler mit der Bewältigung von monumentalen Prestigebauten und urbaner Gestik vertraut, zählt er neben Schmidt/Aichinger, Karl Ehn und Rudolf Perco zu den wichtigsten Gestaltern der so genannten « Superblocks » . Die monumentalen, bis zu achtgeschoßigen Wohnblocks sind stets um begrünte Höfe gruppiert (« Reumann-Hof » , Wien 5, Margaretengürtel 100-112, 1924. Ursprünglich hatte Geßner hier sogar einen 12 Stockwerke hohen Baublock geplant) . Fast immer variieren romantische Rundbogenloggien, Klinkerbänderungen oder farbiger Edelputz mit expressiven, dreieckförmig vorspringende Erkern, Loggien oder Balkonen und mildern damit die Wucht der Fassadenausdehnungen. Sozioökonomisch stellten die Superblocks quasi eine Stadt in der Stadt dar. Die Zugänge zu den Stiegenhäusern erfolgen (von den umlaufenden Straßen abgeschirmt) von den Höfen aus. Immer sind Geschäfte, Waschküchen, Kindergärten, Büchereien, Mutterberatungsstellen etc. vorgesehen.

Der « Karl Seitz-Hof » in Wien 21, Jedleseerstraße 66-94, den Geßner nach einem Wettbewerbssieg in den Jahren 1926-1932 erbaute, bildet mit 1169 Wohnungen eine der größten Anlagen. Paradigmatisch demonstriert hier die weit ausladende halbrunde Hauptfassade, die einen großen Platz umfasst, den expressiven Pathos der Gemeindebauarchitektur der 20er Jahre, und ein hoch über die Dächer aufragender Uhrturm erinnert an die signifikanten Aufbauten bei Geßners Fabriken der Vorkriegszeit. Im Hof hingegen bedient sich Geßner mit der Ausbildung von Rundtürmen und Rundbogenarkaden allerdings durchaus wiederum einer romantisierenden Gestik, um wohnliche Geborgenheit und gemeinschaftliche Idylle zu evozieren.

Hubert Geßner zählt zu den bedeutendsten Architekten, die aus der Wagner-Schule hervorgegangen sind. Seine Leistung besteht insbesondere darin, daß er als Architekt der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei für « seine » Klientel, die Arbeiterklasse, neue architektonische Lösungen schuf. Indem er nicht nur funktionale, sondern auch repräsentative, ästhetisch ansprechende Industriebauten gestaltete, ästhetisierte er gleichsam auch die Tätigkeit der Menschen, die in diesen Gebäuden arbeiteten. Die selbstbewußte Gestik der Fabriksbauten setzte am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts aber auch einen wesentlichen Impuls für eine Neubewertung von Arbeitsstätten insgesamt.

Auch die sorgfältig geplanten Gebäude der Arbeiterwohnheime beziehungsweise Krankenkassen sowie die monumentalen « Wohnpaläste » der Gemeinde Wien lassen eine analoge Intention erkennen. Immer ging es darum, die Arbeits- und die Wohnbedingungen der Menschen gleichermaßen zu verbessern und gleichzeitig innerhalb dieses sozioökonomischen Zusammenhangs durch die Erzielung einer ostentativen Repräsentanz (Borsi-Godoli spricht von « bürgerlicher Eleganz ») das Lebensgefühl der Menschen zu heben. Allerdings stießen diese « Volkswohnungspaläste » in der zeitgenössischen Rezension teilweise auch auf Kritik, da kleinbürgerliche Ideale fortgeschrieben wurden, statt für das Proletariat neue und womöglich adäquatere Ausdrucksmittel gefunden zu haben. Insgesamt demonstrieren Geßners Bauten aber vielleicht gerade auf Grund ihres sozialen und ihres ästhetischen Anspruchs eindrucksvoll das machtvolle Selbstverständnis der dynamisch aufstrebenden « Arbeiterpartei » .

Franz « Ferry » Dusika

Ferry Dusika (1908-1984) was Austria's most successful cyclist in the 1930's. Already an « underground » Nazi, Dusika « Aryanized » in 1938 the bicycle business of Adolf Blum, located at No. 45 of the « Brünnerstraße » . Dusika also tried to « Aryanize » the companies of Walter Liechtenstern, located at No. 106 of the « Währingerstraße » , and the one of Risa Mohr, located at No. 20 of the « Meidlinger-Hauptstraße » (both selling radios) ; the company of Walter Mandl, located at No. 20 of the « Klosterneuburgerstraße » ; and the shoe-maker's shop of Naftali Pluznik, located at No. 8 of the « Kleine-Sperlgasse » .

Austria's biggest in-door arena (for track cycling, tennis, and athletics) is named after Ferry Dusika.

The fate of the art collection of the industrialist Rudolf Kraus

The writer Karl Kraus (born in 1872 in Jičín, Bohemia ; died in 1943 in Auschwitz) had several brothers, all of whom

were successful industrialists, financial backers of Kraus's literary work, and clients of the architect Adolf Loos. A large part of the Kraus family died in Nazi concentration camps. After the War, the survivors sought restitution of a painting by Georg Ferdinand Waldmüller (1793-1865), an important Biedermeier painter. They ran-up against the open resistance of the Austrian financial offices. Not until they had bought their property back from the Austrian Republic at the current market price could they, again, take possession of it. The bureaucrats had acted properly and conscientiously - with maximum loyalty to the authorities. In the restitution case of Helene Schanz and Francis H. Kraus, it was found that :

« Under Article 276 of the Civil Code, a trusteeship would be established for the German " Reich " and Doctor Anton Z. to protect the interests of the absent party concerning the restitution of a painting assigned to the trustee who was to represent the absent party until he himself (the absent party) or someone with his power of attorney appeared again. »

In 1950, were these authorities really waiting for the restoration of the German « Reich » ? Rudolf Kraus owned the painting « The Geymüller Family in the Park ». He gave it to a certain Hermann Flürschein for safe-keeping, but Flürschein sold the picture in 1939 to the art-dealer August Eymer. Rudolf Kraus did not recognize the sale as legitimate. But that was of little use to Kraus. The painting was sold again. This time by Eymer to the « Galerie Halberstock » in Berlin and, from there, to the « Führer Museum », in Linz.

After the War, the painting was placed in the custody of the Austrian Republic. Absurdly, in the restitution proceedings people who were once persecuted had now to demonstrate that the German « Reich », the buyer for Adolf Hitler's Museum, had not been a bonafide purchaser. Since the Krauses could not deliver the demanded documents, the competent court refused restitution 3 years later. Only after another 7 years of fighting against this Austrian legal standpoint could the heirs take possession of the painting, but first, the Republic of Austria forced them to a settlement : within 3 weeks, they had to deposit 60,000 Schillings in an account called :

« The Forfeiture of Adolf Hitler's Assets ; the Restitution Case of Rudolf Kraus's Heirs, and the Settlement Amount. »

That was in 1960.

...

The Nazification of the rich cultural life of Vienna after the « Anschluß » initially had disastrous effects, particularly on the theatre, since the exclusion of Jews meant that audiences dropped by a 3rd. Plays involving Jewish playwrights were banned and Jewish actors and directors dismissed or harassed-out of office. The resultant financial difficulties meant that several theatres had to close down over the summer of 1938.

In May 1939, the tour of « degenerate art » reached Vienna, purporting to show people the debased nature of « Bolshevik and Jewish » artists. Although popular, it seems some visitors came to enjoy the works rather than condemn them. The painter Rudolf Hausner, for example, said : « We would sit there enraptured by what we saw until someone

else walked by. Then, we would fire-off all the Nazi invective about degeneracy until the danger had passed. » (Weyr, 2005 ; page 136.)

But culture in Vienna, albeit reflecting Nazi values and aesthetics, was important in legitimating the regime. « Kraft durch Freude » (Strength through Joy) was a programme that promoted all kinds of activities, including subsidies to music, so that, by 1940, most audiences for concerts and Opera in Vienna were sold-out, with people queuing for tickets.

After the performance of Odilo Globocnik and Josef Bürckel as « Gauleiters » of Vienna were judged inadequate by the Nazi hierarchy in Germany, Baldur von Schirach was appointed to the position in August 1940, a position he was to hold until the end of the War. Von Schirach was judged by Hitler to have the necessary tact and cultural know-how to win the hearts and minds of the Viennese while, at the same time, being a reliable servant in such matters as the deportation of remaining Jews to concentration and death camps (for which crime he received a sentence of 20 years at the Nuremberg trials) .

Von Schirach presided over a cultural programme that was somewhat more Liberal than in the rest of the « Reich » , and he got into conflict with Josef Gœbbels as a result. He appointed the relatively young, somewhat anti-Nazi Walther Thomas, to run the arts scene for him. Thomas was eventually ousted after relentless pressure from Gœbbels against him, but for 2 years, protected by von Schirach, pursued a cultural policy in Vienna that was significantly at variance with that in the rest of the « Reich » . He also attempted to save and protect individual Jews threatened with deportation.

In art, a degree of non-realism was acceptable, deviating from strict Nazi aesthetics. Some Theatre and Opera performances contained themes of oppression by one people of another, which made Nazi bosses in Berlin fret. A Mozart Festival was deemed by Gœbbels to represent an unwelcome opportunity for Austrian nationalists to demonstrate opposition to the German regime (something that already happened too much at football matches, working-class Viennese being harder to control than the middle-classes) and Gœbbels banned the broadcasting of the performances.

But, by 1943, with Thomas dismissed and von Schirach, though still in charge, out of favour, cultural life went downhill. Nazi historical pageants and Richard Strauß Operas became standard fare. Shakespeare's « Merchant of Venice » was staged, emphasising its anti-Semitic elements. People went to see films if they could, however bad or propagandising they were.

In the later months of 1944, theatres and concert-halls were closed by order of Gœbbels, to free people for War work. The Vienna Symphony Orchestra was disbanded in October. Musicians of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra were sent round armament factories to play musical interludes to encourage the workers. The Vienna Boys Choir performed at Christmas and, in January 1945, there were a few Classical music concerts. After that, the cultural life of the city ceased until the Russians (who, like the Nazis, attached enormous importance to cultural activities for their propaganda value) sought to revive it by sponsoring performances in surviving theatre and music venues.

The Austrian Copyright Society and black-listing during the Nazi Era

(Carla Shapreau)

After the March 13, 1938, « Anschluß », Jewish members of Austria's Society of authors, composers, and music-publishers (« Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger »), known as the « AKM », were black-listed. The nature, scope, and ramifications of the AKM's 1938-1945 history are the subject of new research in Austria, with the publication of a study expected soon. (1) This study follows on the heels of the 1st public exhibition of a recently discovered AKM black-list in the Vienna City Library in 2012. (2) Name by name, this diminutive, yet, chilling red-lined Nazi-era artifact was a prelude to evolving persecution in Austria for those in the musical world.

Catalogued as « A91314 », the 1937 AKM membership directory was annotated with bold red-lines neatly hand-drawn through the names of Jewish AKM members, along with what appears to be a hand-written date in red of February 10, 1939, on the title-page. It is not known who prepared this Nazi-era black-list or how it ended-up on the library's shelves. Nor is it generally known whether similar lists of expelled AKM members from successive years up until 1945 are today in the AKM's archive. Austrian scholar, Doctor Christoph Lind, found the red-lined directory in 2010 among the printed works in the Vienna City Library while he and Doctor Georg Traska were conducting research for their 2012 biography of pianist, composer, and cabaret performer, Hermann Leopoldi, who survived internment in Dachau and Buchenwald. (4)

Founded in 1897, the AKM is a performing rights Society engaged in the business of granting licenses and collecting copyright royalties for the public performance of the musical works of its members, and distributing such royalties. After Austria's incorporation into the « Reich », its cultural institutions rapidly implemented anti-Semitic policies. In 1938, the AKM was placed under the control of the German performing rights Society, STAGMA (« Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung Musikalischer Urheberrechte »). (5) During the Nazi era, STAGMA generally banned Jews from membership and was administered by the « Reich » Culture Chamber (« Reichskulturkammer »), and its « Reich » Music Chamber (« Reichsmusikkammer »), all under the direction of Josef Goebbels and the Ministry of Propaganda. (6)

« On 17 March 1938, just 4 days after annexation, AKM's council had been dismissed, a Commissar Chairman appointed, and a questionnaire sent to all members asking, among other matters, racial and religious questions. » (7) Béla Bartók, a member of the AKM, wrote from Budapest on April 13, 1938, regarding the changed conditions in Austria :

« As regards my own affairs, I must say that things are not very good at the moment because not only has my publishing house (Universal-Edition) gone Nazi (the proprietors and directors were simply turned out) but also the AKM, the Viennese Society for performing rights, to which I belong (and Kodály, too), is also being " nazified ". Only the

day before yesterday, I received the notorious questionnaire about grandfathers, etc. , then :“ Are you of German blood, of kindred race, or non-Aryan ? ” Naturally, neither I nor Kodály will fill in the form : our opinion is that such questions are wrong and illegal. We must insist on having nothing to do with this unlawful questionnaire, which therefore must remain unanswered ... » (8)

Universal-Edition was one of many music-publishers Aryanized or, otherwise, misappropriated during the Nazi era. (9)

« After the “ Anschluß ”, a State Commissar was appointed by the German Ministry of Propaganda for Universal-Edition and Mrs. (Jella) Hertzka (a member of the EU Board of Trustees) was compelled to sell her shares to him. » (10)

A hand-written note inside the AKM directory found in the Vienna City Library explains that some members had not yet been crossed-off the list because they had not submitted their completed questionnaires. The missing information was reportedly later provided by Heinrich Damisch and Helmut Wobisch, who identified Jewish AKM members. (11) Heinrich Damisch, music-critic, writer, and former director of the « Wiener Mozartgemeinde » , despite his authorship of the 1938 anti-Semitic article « Die Verjudung des österreichischen Musiklebens » and other efforts, was honoured post-War in Austria. (12) Helmut Wobisch, an ardent Nazi Party member, was a trumpeter with the Vienna Philharmonic during and, after the Nazi era, as well as managing director of the Vienna Philharmonic, from 1953 to 1969. (13)

According to one estimate, those persecuted by the AKM constituted approximately 42 % of the membership. (14) Throughout the « Reich » , musicians were similarly the subject of black-listing in the « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » , edited by Nazi musicologist and head of the Nazi « Sonderstab Musik » (a plundering task-force) , Doctor Herbert Gerigk and his co-editor Doctor Theo Stengel. (15)

The 1935 Nuremberg racial laws were adopted in Austria on May 20, 1938. Performances of compositions by Jewish composers and authors were generally banned under the « Reich » .

Until 1942, catalogues that featured Jewish composers, along with printed scores by Jewish composers, were either consigned to be pulped, or marked as unavailable for sale or performance. Sales of scores by Jewish composers from antiquarian shops were to be restricted to music historians, and clearly marked with the letter « J » along with a visible explanation as to its meaning. However, most publishers had taken the precaution of producing multiple copies, so that when some 30,000 printed scores and books were confiscated from Universal-Edition, almost everything could be recovered later. (16)

Copyright royalties due to persecuted AKM members or their heirs would primarily have resulted from performances outside Axis and occupied nations. Copyright royalties due to black-listed AKM members and collected by the AKM inured to the benefit of the « Reich » under the 11th Decree to the « Reich » Citizenship Law, passed on November 25, 1941. This legislation provided the « Reich » with legal authority to seize the assets of persecutees living outside the « Reich » 's borders, including those who had been deported or gone into exile.

Post-war claim files in the United States National Archive provide evidence reflecting alleged AKM copyright losses, amid

claims for a vast range of confiscated property. This was the case with Viennese librettist and playwright Alfred Grünwald, who stated :

« When Hitler marched into Vienna, I was taken into “ security-custody ” - which means imprisoned and released only under the condition that I leave Austria in 4 weeks ! »

Among his many losses, Grünwald said of the « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger » :

« I was member of the directorium of the AKM (Österreichische Autoren-gesellschaft, Wien III. Baumann-gasse Nr. 8) and, in this capacity, co-owner of the whole assets of this great Society and entitled to a lifelong pension. One day before my arrest, they forced me to renounce my membership and to declare my disinterest in the AKM. » (17)

Grünwald fled from Vienna to Paris where he « had to escape in the middle of the night » , his residence plundered, then, to Morocco and eventually to the United States. After « a life long full of work and thriftiness » , Grünwald reported on November 23, 1945, all his property had been stolen, confiscated, or forcibly sold.

Song-writer and playwright Hans Jan Lengsfelder similarly wrote to the U.S. War Department Headquarters in Vienna, on June 7, 1946, making a claim against the « Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger (AKM) , Vienna III, Baumannstraße Nr. 8, for royalties collected for public performances of my works plus claims against the pension fund and a share in the assets of the Society » . Lengsfelder also sought from « Austromechana royalties collected for records of my works » . (18)

Music-publisher Franz Sobotka, who owned several music publishing houses in Vienna, which he identified as « Edition Bristol » , « Europaton Verlag » , and « Sirius Verlag » , fled Austria in mid-May 1938 with his wife, immigrating to New York, after he learned he was at risk of imminent arrest by the « Gestapo » . He reported to the U.S. Military Government, Headquarters in Vienna, « my entire fortune was confiscated » , claiming that his music-publishing houses and proceeds due to him from the AKM had been misappropriated. (19)

In an effort to recover lost AKM copyright royalties, on June 9, 1941, Franz Sobotka filed suit in New York for royalties collected by the American Society of Composers Authors & Publishers (ASCAP) for the AKM, resulting from U.S. performances. Sobotka alleged that, under a contract between the AKM and ASCAP, which ran from January 1, 1933, to December 31, 1938, \$ 62,809.85 had accrued to AKM's account. The AKM had granted to ASCAP the exclusive right to license in the United States the public performance rights in certain musical works.

Sobotka's claim was complicated by the fact that the AKM had allegedly been liquidated during the Nazi era, that AKM royalties in the United States had been tied-up as « blocked assets » and characterized as « alien property » under U.S. law in light of a War-time order freezing such assets under the Trading With the Enemy Act. (20) Although the outcome of Sobotka's claim against the AKM is unclear, his lawsuit and the post-War claims of other persecuted AKM members raise a host of unanswered questions, including whether, and to what extent, uncompensated royalties accrued

to persecuted composers, authors, and music-publishers on U.S. soil, and elsewhere, during the Nazi era.

The AKM was re-established in Austria as a new institution after World War II. The content of the AKM archive is not generally known. The study of the AKM's 1938-1945 history, and its aftermath, currently under preparation by musicologist Hartmut Krones and commissioned by the AKM in 2013, (21) will be a welcome addition to the evolving literature regarding music suppressed during the 3rd « Reich » and the many lives of those tethered to it.

Carla Shapreau teaches art and cultural property law at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law, and is a Research Associate in the Institute of European Studies at U.C. Berkeley, where she is conducting research regarding music-related losses during the Nazi era and their 21st Century ramifications. Doctor Shapreau is co-author of *Violin Fraud - Deception, Forgery, Theft and Lawsuits in England and America*, Oxford University Press, and has written and lectured broadly on the topic of cultural property. She is also a violin-maker.

Notes

(1) 75 Jahre « Anschluß » : ein Thema, dem sich auch die AKM stellt, AKM beauftragt wissenschaftliche Studie, http://www.akm.at/index.php?subsection=Service_-_Aktuell&parent=1219&back=%2Findex.php%2Fsubsection%3DService_-_Aktuell. The author contacted Professor Hartmut Krones (who is preparing this history) and the AKM on May 23, 2014, requesting information regarding the status of this research and report, but has not yet received a response.

(2) Vienna City Library, exhibition information, March 2012, <http://www.wienbibliothek.at/aktuelles/objekt-des-monats-maerz-12.html>

(3) Special thanks to the Vienna City Library and Magister Christian Mertens for providing the author with a copy of the AKM « Verzeichnis » discussed herein.

(4) March 6, 2014, and July 22, 2014, e-mail communications with Doctor Georg Traska and Doctor Christoph Lind. See also : Hermann Leopoldi, *Hersch Kohn : eine Biographie*, Vienna : Mandelbaum, 2012 (English translation by Dennis McCort, Riverside : Ariadne Press, 2013) ; Vienna City Library exhibition, Hermann Leopoldi's 3 Viennas, <http://www.wienbibliothek.at/veranstaltungen-und-ausstellungen/veranstaltungen/die-drei-wien-des-hermann-leopoldi.html>

(5) After World War II, STAGMA was renamed GEMA (« Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte ») . David Monod, *Settling Scores : German Music, Denazification, & the Americans, 1945-1953*, Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 2005, pages 116-117 ; « GEMA ist an allem schuld » , *Der Spiegel*, July 4, 1951, <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-29194282.html>

(6) Michæl Haas, *Forbidden Music : The Jewish Composers Banned by the Nazis*, New Haven : Yale University Press, 2013, page 228 ; Eric Levi, *Music in the 3rd « Reich »* , London : Macmillan Press, 1994, pages 24-34.

(7) Malcolm Gilles, « Bartók and Boosey & Hawkes : The European Years » , Tempo, New Series, No. 200, Cambridge University Press, April 1997, page 4.

(8) János Demény, editor, Béla Bartók Letters, New York : Saint-Martin's Press 1971, pages 267-268 (writing to Annie Müller-Widmann in Basle, Switzerland) .

(9) Schenker Documents Online, Profile Universal-Edition,
<http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/profiles/organization/entity-002408.html>

(10) Robert Montgomery and Robert Threlfall, Music and Copyright : The Case of Delius and his Publishers, Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, Vermont : Ashgatem 2007, page 396, Appendix 22 (May 19, 1950, letter by Ernst Roth to Philip Emanuel explaining the history of Universal-Edition under the Nazi regime) . Jella Hertzka (« née » Fuchs) was, in 1938, the widow of Emil Hertzka, former Director of Universal-Edition Vienna, from 1907 to 1932.

(11) Elisabeth Theresia Fritz-Hilscher and Helmut Kretschmer, editors, Wien, Musikgeschichte : Von der Prähistorie bis zur Gegenwart, Volume 2, « H. Das 20 und 21 Jahrhundert (vom Ersten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart) » , Hartmut Krones, Vienna : Literatur, 2011, page 461.

(12) Eric Levi, Mozart and the Nazis : How the 3rd « Reich » Abused a Cultural Icon, New Haven : Yale University Press 2010, page 245.

(13) Oliver Rathkolb, « Observations on Nazification and Denazification » , The Vienna Philharmonic under National-Socialism (1938-1945) , posted in 2013, <http://www.wienerphilharmoniker.at/orchestra/history/national-sozialism>.

(14) Supra, end-note 2.

(15) Theo Stengel and Herbert Gerigk, editors, « Lexikon Der Juden in Der Musik : Mit einem Titelverzeichnis jüdischer Werke » , Berlin : Bernd Hahnefeld, 1940.

(16) Michæl Haas, supra, end-note 6, page 228.

(17) November 23, 1945, letter from Alfred Grünwald to the Property Control Officer, American Military Government, Austria, Records of the Property Control Branch of the U.S. Allied Commission for Austria, 1945-1950, DN 1929, Roll 152, U.S. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) .

(18) June 7, 1946, letter from Hans Jan Lengsfelder to the U.S. War Department, Vienna, Attention : I.P. Nelson, Junior, 1st Lieut., F.A., United States Allied Command Austria, DN 1929, Roll 217, NARA. Lengsfelder also listed claims for royalties against Verlag Max Pfeffer ; Georg Marton Verlag ; Verlag Ludwig Döblinger ; Edition Bristol, Europaton Musikverlag and Adolf Robitschek (some of these publishing houses were also black-listed) .

(19) April 15, 1946, letter by Franz (aka : Frank) Sobotka to U.S. Military Government, Property Control, Vienna Headquarters, United States Allied Command Austria, DN 1929, Roll 158, NARA.

(20) See : Markham von Taylor, 70 F. Supp. 202, (S.D.N.Y. 1947) ; Propper von Clark, 69 S. Ct. 1333 (1949) .

(21) Supra, end-note 1. After Christoph Lind discovered the red-lined AKM directory in the Vienna City Library, he and Georg Traska started a project on the history of the AKM and Austro Mechana, and they hope to gain access to the AKM's historical records for their research soon. March 7, 2014, email communication with Doctor Georg Traska.

Les maisons d'édition viennoises menacées par les Nazis

The Music Business

The « Aryanisation » of music-publishers was a slow process. Nevertheless, the voluntary organisation of publishers and music-sellers (« Deutsche Musikalien Verleger Verein » , or DMVV) was incorporated into the « Reichsmusikkammer » (RMK) , in January 1934. Before that, as early as April 1933, the « Deutsche Musikalien Verleger Verein » had declared itself supportive of the new government, and although it initially did not explicitly ban Jews, Viktor Albertis, Wilhelm Zimmermann, Henri Hinrichsen, Gustav Bock and Kurt Eulenburg found themselves removed from the executive committee of the « Deutsche Musikalien Verleger Verein » and replaced with supporters of the new regime. Once incorporated into the « Reichsmusikkammer » , membership of the « Deutsche Musikalien Verleger Verein » became compulsory for all music-dealers and publishers. Between 1933 and 1938, about 40 publishers were run by Jewish owners or employed Jews in key executive positions. This amounted to a mere 10 % of music-publishers, but had a severe impact on publishers of serious music. Peters, Benjamin, Bote & Bock, Eulenburg, Fürstner and Alrobi were the leading German publishers most severely affected, and with the annexation of Austria, a further 24 publishers were added including such prestigious houses as Universal-Edition, Ludwig Döblinger and Josef Weinberger. Though there were no direct anti-Semitic attacks aimed specifically against Jews in the various trade magazines that served music-publishers, there were clear instructions coming from above that Aryanisation should proceed apace and that, under no circumstances, should German publishers collaborate with non-Aryan publishers newly-relocated abroad.

Hermann Göring, who had been granted dictatorial powers in the implementation of a draconian « 4 Year Plan » , started large-scale expropriation of Jewish businesses in 1936. Such powers allowed him to justify this as an « economic necessity » and the removal of the last legal obstacles before the total economic disenfranchisement of all German Jews. Following the Austrian annexation, publishing houses such as Josef Weinberger - Gustav Mahler's 1st publisher, and the publisher of many important Operetta composers, managed ...

...

... them confrontationally anti-Semitic. By the time of the officially unleashed overnight pogroms of 9-10 November 1938 (« Reichskristallnacht » or « Kristallnacht ») , and the stipulation the following month forbidding non-Aryans from attending any public events, Jews found themselves effectively removed from every means of social, economic or

cultural interaction in what had formerly been their native country.

The concert-agency Wolff & Sachs in Berlin, formerly the representative for nearly all major performers in Germany and providing day-to-day management for the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, since its foundation in 1882, was dissolved in 1935. In Vienna, the publisher Hugo Knepler (brother of the librettist Paul Knepler, who had written texts for Leo Fall and Robert Stolz as well as for Franz Lehár's « Giuditta ») took-over Vienna's Emil Gutmann concert-agency in 1907 and became the city's most powerful concert promoter, mounting over 2,000 events and managing such important artists as Maria Jeritza, Arthur Nikisch, Pablo Casals, Jascha Heifetz, Bronisław Huberman, Artur Schnabel and many others until the company crashed in 1931. After Austria's annexation, Knepler fled to France but was captured and deported by the French Vichy Regime and murdered in Auschwitz, in 1944. Smaller Jewish agencies in Germany and Austria were broken-up, dissolved, subsumed or Aryanised under the « Reichsmusikkammer » .

The purging of musical life of all elements not deemed Aryan was fraught with complexities. As late as 1936 and 1937, Berlin Radio had compiled a black-list of artists who were to be banned from engagement or performance. This included musicians who were not remotely Jewish such as the Austrian composers Julius Bittner and Wilhelm Kienzl, while the Jewish Erich Wolfgang Korngold is conspicuous by his absence. Against such blatant and obvious inconsistencies, the idiosyncratic infringements of other musical « Gauleiters » , such as those who banned the non-Jewish Manfred Gurlitt while allowing the premiere of « Concertante Musik » by the partially Jewish Boris Blacher by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra under Carl Schuricht, in 1937, come across as arbitrary at best, or incompetent at worst.

An acute problem was caused by one of the mainstays of German literature, the Jewish writer Heinrich Heine, who died in 1856. Hardly any other poet had been set so enthusiastically by so many of the great German composers of the 19th Century. Karl Blessinger in « Judentum und Musik » (one of the most astounding anti-Semitic tracts of the Nazi era) makes the paranoid observation that Jews had camouflaged themselves through a clever use of language to conceal their ambitions for world domination. He even goes so far as to suggest that Robert Schumann was able to stop Jewish subterfuges by setting a sufficient number of Heine texts to nip Jewish plots ...

...

... tacit admission of the utter futility of such an undertaking - the name of Heinrich Heine is absent. This is a silent acknowledgment that the authorities could not expect singers to forgo such classics as Franz Schubert's « Die Lorelei » or Robert Schumann's « Dichterliebe » and « Liederkreis » - and even Richard Wagner's « Flying Dutchman » was based on a Heine source. In recital programmes featuring Heine settings by the likes of Brahms, Schumann, Schubert and Liszt, the solution chosen by most was not to mention the poet's name at all or, more iniquitously, to use alternative « Aryanised » texts provided by the « Reichsmusikbearbeitungen » . Failing this, they simply inserted someone else's name. Heine, more than anyone, proved the futility of trying to disentangle German and Jewish culture, though tragically, this did not stop the Nazis from continuing to try.

Emil Hertzka

The Musical Chronicle of Change : « Anbruch »

With the end of the War, in 1918, it was clear that society had changed. As early as 1905, the playwright and essayist Hans Müller was referring to « morbus Austriacus ». By 1919, this had turned into a self-fulfilled prophecy. Universal-Edition, publishers of such major figures as Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schönberg, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Franz Schreker, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Egon Wellesz, Joseph Matthias Hauer, Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály, along with Alfredo Casella, Leoš Janáček, Karol Szymanowski, Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler, Ernst Křenek, Darius Milhaud and Gian Francesco Malipiero, decided to launch a magazine devoted to new music symbolically entitled « Musikblätter des Anbruch » (Music Leaves from a New Dawn) .

The « Jewishness » of Universal-Edition was described by Ernst Křenek :

« “ Fraulein ” Rothe (assistant to Director Emil Hertzka) was the only highly-placed employee of Universal-Edition who was not Jewish. Immediately under Director Hertzka was Doctor Kalmus, a relative of Hertzka's, if I'm not mistaken, and a good-natured oaf with lovely Old-Testament features. Peter Winter was the principal head of accounts, a fine, good-hearted person who was a genius in financial matters. Among the many projects that Universal-Edition supported was the monthly musical publication “ Musikblätter des Anbruch ”, an admittedly lame title that only made it clear that it was an artistic movement that wished to be called “ Anbruch ” (Dawn - a typically Expressionist term for “ beginning ”) , which was edited originally by Otto Schneider, a smooth roguish character who in all likelihood personified the revolutionary prototype of the coming age. I didn't much care for him. »

Theodor Adorno, Paul Pisk, Rudolf Réti and Paul Stefan were just some of the prominent Jewish musicians and thinkers who would join its editorial staff. The magazine's 1st issue, in January 1919, starts with an introduction by Guido Adler, followed by articles on a variety of subjects by Béla Bartók, Frederick Delius, Oskar Fried, Hugo Kauder, Rudolf Hoffmann (one of the founding members of the « Vereinigung schaffender Tonkünstler ») , Egon Lustgarten, Egon Wellesz, Rudolf Réti and Franz Schreker. As with the « Neue Freie Presse » , this was a publication that was dominated by assimilated, secular Jews and it quickly became one of the most influential musical chronicles of the period. It lasted for 19 years and 165 issues. Even more than its rival « Melos » , published by Schott, « Anbruch » (its title from 1929) would not so much reflect Jewish assimilation as Jewish dominance in matters of new music. Seen in the context of a 70 year progression starting from Richard Wagner's anti-Semitic pamphleteering of 1850, « Anbruch » appeared to represent the pinnacle of Jewish musical assimilation. The National-Socialists, unsurprisingly, would see things differently and Universal-Edition, along with « Anbruch » , would become Exhibit A in their propaganda campaign against the Jewish infiltration of German culture.

...

The influential and pioneering music-publisher Emil Hertzka was born on 3 August 1869 in Pest, Austria-Hungary ; and died on 9 May 1932 in Vienna. He was responsible for printing and promoting some of the most important European musical works of the 20th Century.

Hertzka studied chemistry and music at the University of Vienna. In 1901, he joined the Vienna-based music-publishing house Universal-Edition, which had only just been founded. In 1907, he became its Director and remained in that position until his death. It was due to Hertzka's efforts that Universal-Edition came increasingly to concentrate upon the publication of new music, and his voluminous correspondence with many of Europe's leading composers is a valuable resource for modern scholars. By the time of his death in Vienna, in 1932, Universal-Edition's catalogue comprised almost 10,000 items, including works by Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schœnberg, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Franz Schreker, Alfredo Casella, Leoš Janáček, Karol Szymanowski, Béla Bartók, Zoltán Kodály, Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler, Ernst Křenek, Darius Milhaud, and Gian Francesco Malipiero.

Between 1932 and 1938, the Emil Hertzka Foundation offered an annual Composition Prize. This was 1st awarded in 1933, when it was shared between 5 composers, namely Roberto Gerhard, Norbert von Hannenheim, Julius Schloß, Ludwig Zenk and Leopold Spinner. The prize went to Joseph Matthias Hauer in 1934 ; to Viktor Ullmann in 1936 ; to Hans Erich Apostel in 1937 ; and to Karl Amadeus Hartmann in 1938. In 1934, Luigi Dallapiccola and Paul Dessau each received a « Special Acknowledgement » .

Hertzka and Universal-Edition

As Director of Universal-Edition from 1907 to 1932, Viennese music-publisher Emil Hertzka fashioned the company into one of the leading music publishing-houses of the 20th Century, his fame resting primarily on his advocacy of the more progressive composers at the turn of the 20th Century, and especially of the members of the Second Viennese School (Arnold Schœnberg, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern) , Kurt Weill, Béla Bartók, and Leoš Janáček.

...

Born in Budapest, Emil Hertzka studied chemistry, and also music and literature, at the University of Vienna. In 1893, he joined the music-publishing firm of Weinberger (some sources say that he 1st joined the publisher and concert agency Gustav Léwy, which sold out to Weinberger in 1897) , the proprietor of which, Josef Weinberger, was one of the founding subscribers of Universal-Edition, Vienna. Universal-Edition was formed in 1901 through the collaboration of 3 existing publishers, Josef Weinberger, Adolf Robitschek, and Bernhard Herzmannsky (of Ludwig Döblinger) , with the aim of creating Austrian editions of Classical composers, and providing educational materials for schools. After 6 years, the company was on the brink of failing when, in 1907, Hertzka was brought in to rescue it. While maintaining the 2 original lines, he moved contemporary music to the center of its enterprise. By sound judgement, a keen sense of publishing politics, and skillful negotiation, he identified many of the leading progressive and avant-garde composers. By entering into agreements with other companies (e.g. , Josef Eberle, Josef Aibl, Adolph Fürstner, Bote & Bock, Nikolaus Simrock) in the 1st few years, offering contracts to progressive composers (e.g. , Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schœnberg, Franz Schreker, Josef Bohuslav Fœrster) , with many of whom he forged strong personal bonds, and adopting aggressive advertising strategies, Hertzka brought to Universal-Edition the profile that it has had ever since as the leading publisher of contemporary music.

Later, Emil Hertzka launched in-house journals : « Musikpädagogische Zeitschrift » (1911) ; « Musica divina » (1913) ;

« Musikblätter des Anbruch » (1919) ; « Pult und Taktstock » (1924) ; and « Schrifftanz » (1927) . They offered publicity and forums for discussion of Universal-Edition's catalog, and by acquiring the publishers Albert J. Gutmann in 1920 and « Philharmonischer Verlag » in 1927, he extended Universal-Edition's range significantly. As a result of all these developments, Universal-Edition became a principal publisher of the music of Max Reger, Richard Strauß, Gustav Mahler, Anton Bruckner, Karol Szymanowski, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Franz Schreker, Josef Marx, Leopold Godowsky, Frederick Delius, Darius Milhaud, Ottorino Respighi, Ernst Křenek, Kurt Weill and other late- 19th and early- 20th Century composers, in addition to almost all of the leading « modern » composers (with the notable exceptions of Igor Stravinsky and Paul Hindemith) .

Ernst Roth, who worked with him at Universal-Edition for 7 years, has the following description of the man : Emil Hertzka was a strange man, a mixture of commercial astuteness and rash idealism. His appearance seemed to contradict his actions : he looked as old-fashioned as any « fin-de-siècle » artist, with his long hair, long beard, brown velvet jacket and large black tie - a majestic figure, half Wotan and half Brahms, who contrasted strangely with the revolutionary music ; his thin, sharp voice seemed not to belong to his imposing figure. He was not a kindly or genial man but displayed a biting and often cynical sarcasm. He did what no other music-publisher at that time dared to do, and considerable sums of money were spent not only on engraving, printing, paper, binding and publicity but also on supporting financially the struggling prophets of the new art. All this was done without charm, grace or warmheartedness, without any evident generosity - and yet it was still a unique undertaking.

Heinrich Schenker was recruited as an editor in 1901 to Universal-Edition, with whom he published his edition of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach keyboard pieces and « Beitrag zur Ornamentik » (1903) . His 1st publication under Hertzka was the « Instrumentations-Tabelle » (pseudonymous author : Artur Niloff) (1908) , followed by his edition of Johann Sebastian Bach's Chromatic Fantasy & Fugue (1910) . Hertzka's arrival in 1907 rapidly created an environment wholly inimical to Schenker, and it was inevitable that the 2 men would come into conflict. Schenker goaded Hertzka with such remarks as that Universal-Edition was a publisher « that places its main emphasis these days on anti-musical music » (WSLB 52, 7 February 1910) . Hertzka's driven management style and use of modern publishing techniques (of which the typewriter was a symbol) irked Schenker, and it was perhaps the advertising of Arnold Schœnberg's 2nd String Quartet and « Klavierstücke » , Opus 11, in the 1910 catalog that marked the 1st decisive moment at which Schenker turned against the Director. Hertzka clearly valued Schenker's work, and was unfailingly courteous in his dealings with him ; nevertheless, Schenker showed increasing acrimony toward him throughout the 1910's, alternating with brief reconciliations during which Schenker articulated his vision for Universal-Edition as the leading music-publisher in Europe. At the same time, Schenker always insisted on corresponding only with Hertzka rather than with other officials of Universal-Edition.

Hertzka's slowness to take-up Schenker's planned « Kleine Bibliothek » (1st mooted in 1912) brought the 2 men to another crisis point in 1914 (diary, OJ 2/9-10, pages 821-823, 24 December 1914) . When the project eventually came to publication in 1921-1924 as « Der Tonwille » , Hertzka used Albert J. Gutmann as a shield for Universal-Edition, employing the fictional imprint « Tonwille-Flugblätterverlag » . Schenker resented this and Hertzka's exerting of editorial control, calling him « wrong, biased, and terroristic » (OC 52/574, 20 February 1923) , and accusing him of censorship as well as of administrative incompetence and falsifying accounts. Schenker resorted to an attorney in Fall

1924 in preparation for legal proceedings against Universal-Edition, but after a year of recriminations, a settlement was agreed on 10 December 1925 that resulted in « Der Tonwille » being continued with « Drei Masken Verlag » of Munich under the title « Das Meisterwerk in der Musik » (1925, 1926, 1930) . After a 4 year silence between the 2 men, correspondence began again in December 1928, and eventually normal civilities were restored ; Universal-Edition became Schenker's principal publisher again, issuing « Der freie Satz » posthumously in 1935, 3 years after Hertzka's death.

Hertzka was Jewish. Like Schenker, and most Viennese Jews at the time, he sought to assimilate into German culture. He was, however, a cosmopolitan Jew, nurturing an international network of business and cultural relationships within and beyond Europe, and traveling frequently to forge deals, develop personal contacts, and attend important performances ; Schenker, conversely, was a German nationalist, detested the Romance and Anglo-Saxon nations, and saw commerce and trade as detrimental to the world of the mind and to the arts. Hertzka was a pacifist and believed in democracy ; Schenker had militaristic tendencies and believed in rule by an enlightened aristocracy. Hertzka was optimistic about the future of music ; Schenker saw all about him only signs of its downfall.

Correspondence between Hertzka and Schenker is one of the largest exchanges of letters among Schenker's papers. It covers 1908 to 1931, and survives as most of the items from Schenker to Universal-Edition, WSLB I-444, and much of correspondence from Universal-Edition to Schenker, OC 52/I-939.

Alban Berg's commemorative address following the death of Emil Hertzka, director of the Viennese publishing house Universal-Edition is one of his most skillful public statements. He avoids the typical eulogy of Hertzka as an individual and focuses instead on the more complex issue of Hertzka's achievement in a world in which commerce intermingled with art. He stresses that idealism can successfully exist in the real world of business. Berg also returns to a theme that he addressed in other essays and lectures : that there exists in the world of modern music only a single movement, and that owing in part to Hertzka's nurturing it had grown from an early phase of interest groups and cliques to world-wide dominance.

...

Emil Hertzka (geboren 3. August 1869 in Pest, Österreich-Ungarn ; gestorben 9. Mai 1932 in Wien) war ein österreichischer Verleger. Er war von 1907 bis 1932 Direktor des Wiener Musikverlages Universal-Edition.

Emil Hertzka studierte zunächst Chemie und daneben Musik und Literatur an der Universität Wien, bis er das Chemiestudium aus gesundheitlichen Gründen aufgeben mußte. 1893 begann er beim Musikverlag Josef Weinberger zu arbeiten, war dann Geschäftsleiter des Verlages Gustav Lewy & Co und wechselte 1901 zu dem im selben Jahr gegründeten Musikverlag Universal-Edition-AG (UE) , einer Aktiengesellschaft, an der sich neben Josef Weinberger unter anderen auch der Musikverleger Bernhard Herzmannsky (Ludwig Döblinger) beteiligte. 1907 wurde Hertzka Direktor und blieb es bis zu seinem Tod im Jahr 1932. Hatte die Universal-Edition in den ersten Jahren ein eher traditionelles und klassisches Verlagsprogramm, wurde die Universal-Edition unter seiner Leitung zu einem der wichtigsten Verlage für zeitgenössische europäische Musik und prägte damit die Firma bis in die heutige Zeit.

1909 schloß er die ersten Verträge mit zeitgenössischen Komponisten, und zwar mit Gustav Mahler, Franz Schreker und Arnold Schönberg, dessen Oper « Der ferne Klang » das erste Bühnenwerk der Universal-Edition war. Außerdem übernahm er einen Großteil der Werke von Anton Bruckner aus dem Verlag Albert J. Gutmann. Nach und nach konnte er die damals bedeutendsten lebenden Komponisten, wie Karol Szymanowski, Franz Schmidt, Egon Wellesz, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Alfredo Casella, Leoš Janáček, Béla Bartók, Zoltán Kodály, Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler, Ernst Křenek, Josef Matthias Hauer, Darius Milhaud oder Gian Francesco Malipiero an den Verlag binden.

Aber auch bei den Notenausgaben beschritt er neue Wege : ab 1912 arbeitete man im Verlag an der Herausgabe der Prachtedition « Klassiker der Tonkunst » . Von 1919 bis 1938 gab der Verlag die 1894 begründete Reihe der « Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich » und betreute sie mit dem Herausgeber Guido Adler bis zum 83. Band im Jahr 1938. Eine weitere Neuerung war die Sparte Buchverlag, wo neben einzelnen musiktheoretischen Veröffentlichungen, wie die « Harmonielehre » Arnold Schönbergs oder die Werkanalysen von Wöb und Specht, wichtige Periodika erschienen : die « Musikblätter des Anbruch » (1919-1937) oder « Pult und Taktstock » (1924-1930) .

Zum Zeitpunkt von Hertzkas Tod, er starb nach kurzer, schwerer Krankheit an einem Herzleiden, umfasste der Verlagskatalog rund 10.000 Titel. Sein Grab befindet sich auf dem Döblinger Friedhof (Israelitische Abteilung ; Gruppe I4, Reihe 3, Nr. IA) .

Zur Erinnerung an Hertzka wurde von 1933 bis 1937 ein jährlicher Kompositionspreis vergeben. Seine Frau Yella Hertzka (1873-1948) , geborene Fuchs, führte den Verlag nach seinem Tod bis zum Anschluß Österreichs 1938 und nach der Rückkehr aus dem erzwungenen Exil ab 1946 bis zu ihrem Tod.

Im Jahr 1959 wurde in Wien Favoriten (10. Bezirk) der Emil-Hertzka-Platz nach ihm benannt.

Im Vorwort zum Jahrbuch 1926 der Universal-Edition, das unter dem Titel « 25 Jahre Neue Musik » erschien, schrieb Emil Hertzka im Vorwort :

« Ein Vierteljahrhundert rastloser Arbeit liegt hinter uns. Der Rückschau gelte eine Atempause. Unser Ziel liegt noch fern und der Weg dahin ist weit. Wir gehen ihn aber leichten Schrittes, unbeschwert, denn wir gehen mit der Jugend. Von ihr lassen wir uns führen und irren mit ihr auch ohne Bedenken auf ungegangene, dornige Pfade. Wir fühlen, sie findet immer den rechten Weg vorwärts. Der Glaube an die Jugend, die Freude, daß wir für sie schon etwas geworden sind, und die Hoffnung, ihr noch viel mehr werden zu dürfen, geben uns die Kraft, unbeirrt weiter zu schreiten. »

...

Emil Hertzka, Musikverleger. Verbrachte seine Jugend in Pest, Österreich-Ungarn, wo sein Vater Leiter einer Textilfabrik war, studiert dann an der Universität Wien Chemie, nebenbei Musikwissenschaft und Literatur. Als er krankheitshalber das Chemiestudium aufgeben mußte, ging er für einige Zeit nach Italien. 1893 trat er in den Verlag Josef Weinberger in Wien ein, 1907 übernahm er die Leitung des 1901 gegründeten Musikverlages Universal-Edition A.G. , der durch die

intensive Pflege zeitgenössische Musik eine führende Stellung im europäischen Musikleben einnahmen. Hertzka übernahm die Bestände des deutschen Aibl-Verlages, der durch die Herausgeber der Werke Max Regers und Richard Strauß zugrunde gerichtet worden war, gab Gustav Mahlers Symphonien heraus und trat für junge Komponisten ein, so für Franz Schreker, Arnold Schönberg, Alfredo Casella, Gian Francesco Malipiero, Anton von Webern, Joseph Marx und Josef Weinberger, dessen Oper « Schwanda der Dudelsackpfeifer » ebenfalls von Hertzka verlegt wurde.

Alfred Schlee

« Musik Salon » section of the Universal-Edition website : online article dedicated to the work of the influential and pioneering music-publisher Emil Hertzka.

<http://musiksalon.universaledition.com/en/article/hertzka-had-an-instinctive-way-of-thinking-like-a-divining-rod>

Picture dating from 1929 - We see musicologist Alfred Schlee (3rd from left) at work with colleagues in the iconic « Bruckner Room » where Anton Bruckner taught and composed. The mezzanine level was, then, home to the « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde Konservatorium ». This is presumably also where the young Gustav Mahler was given his (only !) 2 music-lessons by the Master of Saint-Florian - which Mahler called with passion : « artistic father » and « protagonist » of new music. Between 1875 and 1878, Mahler was a pupil at the Conservatory in the composition class of Franz Krenn, a rather distinguished (and pedantic !) teacher, nicknamed « Old Krenn » !

Picture dating from 1929 - We see musicologist Alfred Schlee (3rd from left) at work with colleagues in the iconic « Bruckner Room » where Anton Bruckner taught and composed. The mezzanine level was, then, home to the « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde Konservatorium ». This is presumably also where the young student Gustav Mahler was given his (only !) 2 music-lessons by the Master of Saint-Florian - which Mahler called with passion : « artistic father » and « protagonist » of new music. Between 1875 and 1878, Mahler was a pupil at the Conservatory in the composition class of Franz Krenn, a rather distinguished (and pedantic !) teacher, nicknamed « Old Krenn » !

About Alfred Schlee ...

The Austrian-German musicologist, theatre scholar and music-publisher Alfred Schlee was born on 19 November 1901 in Dresden. He married Margarethe Molner in 1960. They had 2 sons. He died on 16 February 1999 in Vienna. Known as a very private individual, his funeral was over and done with before the world knew he had gone.

After completing his studies at Vizthumschen High-School, in his hometown of Dresden, Schlee attended for half a year, in the Dresden suburb of Hellerau, the experimental school (promoting music and rhythm) founded by Émile Jaques-Dalcroze - an old student of Anton Bruckner at the Vienna Conservatory. He studied music theory, violoncello, and took piano lessons with Erwin Schulhoff. Then, he moved to Leipzig and Munich to study musicology (Adolf Sandberger) , composition (August Reuss) , philosophy and theater.

Schlee was already showing a deep interest in modern art : he was in close contact with the « Bauhaus » circle in

Dessau and the architect Oskar Schlemmer, and, in 1925, he got to know the conductor Erich Kleiber, then busy preparing for the premiere of Alban Berg's Opera « Wozzeck » .

His 1st important job was as Universal's representative in Berlin, where the Nazis' cultural policies were putting large sections of the Universal catalogue out of bounds : Arnold Schœnberg and Alban Berg were both Jewish ; so, too, were Gustav Mahler, Darius Milhaud, Ernst Křenek, Karol Rathaus and many others ; and Anton von Webern, though an enthusiastic National-Socialist, also wrote « degenerate » music. For the Nazis, indeed, Universal was a « Jewish publisher » . Schlee watched the exodus of his friends with a heavy heart, bolstered by his conviction that Adolf Hitler's regime couldn't last ...

Schlee returned to Vienna in 1938, and his finest hour began, as Germany's swallowing of Austria (« Anschluß ») was repeated in music-publishing microcosm. With the weight of Hermann Göring behind them, the German publishers Schott bought-up Universal ; the prize was passed to another firm, Peters, when it was decided that Schott wasn't reliable either.

Schlee decided he would have to act if Universal-Edition was to survive.

From 1938 to 1945, Schlee was working for Universal-Edition in Vienna under the supervision of the « aryanised » shareholder John Petschull. With the support of Robert Kraus, Schlee was put in charge of the cultural department of the City of Vienna. The relocation of the publishing house at the « Altreich » (« Old Reich » : i.e. , Germany without Austria and the Sudetenland) helped to secure an invaluable amount of material.

With the help of some of the more humane officials in charge of Vienna (including the mother of composer Gottfried von Einem) , Schlee set about preserving the Universal catalogue. The mayor at the time, Hanns Blaschke (1943-1945) , the first deputy Mayor of Vienna responsible for cultural affairs, was of course a Nazi, but he was also a Austrian nationalist, and Schlee saw that he would be useful in preventing the wholesale loss of Universal to Germany. Highly-placed helpers made sure the « Gestapo » were kept-off Schlee's back - they called on Universal only once, confiscating music by Kurt Weill and Franz Schreker.

But Schlee saw the danger and immediately began removing scores and instrumental parts (printings, engravings, templates and manuscripts of works by Jewish « degenerate » composers, including the archives of Gustav Mahler) to safe havens inland or abroad, often in semi-official transport, on the grounds that the material had to be protected from bombing but, more essentially, from Nazi destruction.

Works of Arnold Schœnberg and Kurt Weill were hidden behind organs in country churches ; Schlee's own house in Semmering was used to secrete scores ; and, until the War was over, Schlee did what he could to export his forbidden music, correctly reckoning that the Nazis were even more interested in gaining foreign currency than in suppressing Jewish composers.

...

Alfred Schlee was one of the most important and least prominent arbiters of taste in 20th Century music. The enthusiasms of the conductors and pundits fill the headlines ; Schlee, head of the Vienna-based music-publishers Universal-Edition for 40 years, was more concerned with filling his catalogue, and he chose his composers with an impeccable ear for their likely development.

The list of Universal composers testifies to the acuity of his judgement : it bristles with names like Luciano Berio, Harrison Birtwistle, Mauricio Kagel, Olivier Messiaen, Arvo Pärt, Wolfgang Rihm, Kurt Schwertsik and Rodion Schtschedrin. The basis of his success was his unfailing intellectual curiosity.

Pierre Boulez, one of the modernist jewels in the Universal crown, said of Schlee :

« He always has his nose in the wind. »

Alfred Schlee studied piano, cello and music theory at school before moving on to Munich University to take courses in musicology with Adolf Sandberger and composition with August Reuss. Schlee was already showing a deep interest in modern art : he was in close contact with the « Bauhaus » circle in Dessau and the architect Oskar Schlemmer, and, in 1925, he got to know the conductor Erich Kleiber, then busy preparing for the premiere of Alban Berg's Opera « Wozzeck » .

Schlee had intended to go on to a Ph.D. in Vienna, but the combination of 2 factors - his father's sudden illness and the hyper-inflation that was then beginning to bite - put further study beyond his financial means. He took to the keyboard and the pen, acting as accompanist to the singers Mary Wigman and Yvonne Georgi and writing ballet-criticism. In 1924, he took-up a post as Dramaturg at the « Stadttheater » in Münster, where he also worked as « répétiteur » . It was now that he 1st came into contact with Universal-Edition (which, founded in 1901, was exactly the same age as he was) ; among the jobs he was given was the editing of a special number of « Anbruch » , the periodical of Vienna's musical avant-garde. In 1927, Hans Heinsheimer, the visionary head of the Operatic section of Universal-Edition, offered Schlee a job. Universal became his life - and he saved its.

His 1st important job was as Universal's representative in Berlin, where the Nazis' cultural policies were putting large sections of the Universal catalogue out of bounds : Arnold Schœnberg and Alban Berg were both Jewish ; so, too, were Gustav Mahler, Darius Milhaud, Ernst Křenek, Karol Rathaus and many others ; and Anton von Webern, though an enthusiastic National-Socialist, also wrote « degenerate » music. For the Nazis, indeed, Universal was a « Jewish publisher » . Schlee watched the exodus of his friends with a heavy heart, bolstered by his conviction that Adolf Hitler's regime couldn't last ...

Schlee returned to Vienna in 1938, and his finest hour began, as Germany's swallowing of Austria was repeated in music-publishing microcosm. With the weight of Hermann Göring behind them, the German publishers Schott bought-up Universal ; the prize was passed to another firm, Peters, when it was decided that Schott wasn't reliable either. Schlee decided he would have to act if Universal was to survive.

With the help of some of the more humane officials in charge of Vienna, Schlee set about preserving the Universal catalogue. The mayor of Vienna was, of course, a Nazi, but he was also an Austrian nationalist, and Schlee saw that he would be useful in preventing the wholesale loss of Universal to Germany. Highly-placed helpers made sure the « Gestapo » were kept off Schlee's back - they called on Universal only once, confiscating music by Kurt Weill and Franz Schreker.

But Schlee saw the danger and immediately began removing scores and instrumental parts to safe havens, often in semi-official transport, on the grounds that the material had to be protected from bombing. Works of Arnold Schoenberg and Kurt Weill were hidden behind organs in country churches ; Schlee's own house in Semmering was used to secrete scores ; and, until the War was over, Schlee did what he could to export his forbidden music, correctly reckoning that the Nazis were even more interested in gaining foreign currency than in suppressing Jewish composers.

After the War, and with Universal re-established as an Austrian, not a German, business, Schlee now began to expand the company. He had already contracted Rolf Liebermann and Frank Martin to Universal, with a view to publishing them « when that Hitler is out of the way » . Gottfried von Einem, whose mother had been instrumental in safeguarding condemned music, became a Universal composer ; so, too, did Luigi Dallapiccola, Bohuslav Martinů, and Mario Peragallo.

Schlee enthusiastically embraced the avant-garde, bringing into his fold Karlheinz Stockhausen, Roman Haubenstock-Ramati, Mauricio Kagel, Friedrich Cerha, Sylvano Bussotti and others, and extended his helping hand to Eastern bloc composers (György Kurtág, György Ligeti, Edison Denisov, Alfred Schnittke) being given the official cold shoulder by the Communists who had taken-over their homelands.

Schlee was an intensely private man. Pierre Boulez, who knew him for nearly 50 years, confessed :

« If you want to know something about him, you have to ask someone else. »

That privacy was maintained even in death : Schlee's funeral was over and done with before the world knew he had gone.

...

We usually think of music-publishers as functionaries at best. They are facilitators rather than creators, and they occupy the one role in the creation of new music that is seemingly motivated by finance rather than art. All that is grossly unfair, of course, and role of music-publishers in distributing and disseminating new music is all too easily overlooked.

Even so, the War-time activities of Alfred Schlee are truly extraordinary and deserve to be better-known. Schlee found himself at the head of Universal-Edition, Austria's leading new music-publisher at the « Anshluß » in 1938. Difficult

times for all concerned, but Universal-Edition found themselves in deeper trouble than most, as the Nazis were in the process of banning a large section of the Universal-Edition roster. Taking Darius Milhaud and Ernst Křenek out of circulation was one thing, but banning performances of Gustav Mahler was really going to have an impact on the company's bottom-line. Worse still, the Nazis wanted Universal-Edition in German hands, so Herman Göring personally oversaw its take-over by Schott and, later, Peters.

So, what did Schlee do while all this was going on ? Well, he didn't panic. He was a personal friend of the mayor of Vienna, who, while a member of the Nazi Party, was also an Austrian nationalist. The mayor made sure that the « Gestapo » was kept at arm's length while Schlee did what he had to do. He began salting away all the company's « entarten » scores (which included large chunks of the output of Arnold Schönberg and Kurt Weill) pretty much anywhere he could think of. Apparently, the organs of village churches around Austria were filled with the manuscripts, as was Schlee's own house.

Then, there was Anton von Webern. The ascetic composer did himself no favours in terms of the financial viability of his lifestyle, but Schlee ensured him an income throughout the War by employing him as an arranger and reader. After the War, Universal-Edition was re-established as an Austrian company, and then began the 2nd heroic phase of Schlee's career. From the late-1940's onwards, the company, under Schlee's directorship, became a heaven for Soviet bloc composers who were having a hard time at home. So, names like György Ligeti, György Kurtág, Alfred Schnittke and Edison Denisov appeared on the international scene thanks largely to his single-handed support.

Alfred Schlee's name is known today mainly through the many works that were written in 1991 to mark his 90th birthday. The composers included Olivier Messiaen, Alfred Schnittke, György Kurtág, and Harrison Birtwistle - quite a line-up.

He was by all accounts a very private man. Pierre Boulez, another high-profile signing to Universal-Edition, said :

« If you want to know something about him, you have to ask someone else. »

That privacy might explain why there is no photograph of him to be found on the internet.

There aren't many publishers in the history of music who would warrant the biography treatment, but Alfred Schlee is surely the exception.

...

Alfred Schlee was initially Universal-Edition's representative in Berlin before moving to Vienna in 1938. During the Nazi dictatorship, Schlee hid scores in hideaways such as churches and at his house in Semmering, or he sent them to safe places abroad. This enabled pieces by those composers who are today regarded as having written the classic works of modernism to be played after 1945. From 1951 onward, he was a member of the Executive Board together with Alfred Kalmus and Ernst Hartmann. He attracted composers such as Karlheinz Stockhausen, Pierre Boulez, Luciano Berio, Arvo

Pärt and Wolfgang Rihm to the publishing house.

« The future was always our top priority » (Alfred Schlee)

In 1927, when I asked Hans Heinsheimer, whom I already knew quite well, if he could find a position for me at Universal-Edition, I certainly did not intend to stay there for the rest of my life. My admiration for the high-risk, international, modern production department at the publishing house and for its director, Emil Hertzka, had aroused my curiosity and I wanted to know how an institution like this functioned. I originally planned to spend 2 or 3 years finding this out, but it was not long before I was offered the post as representative of Universal-Edition in Berlin, a position I was more than happy to accept. In those days, Berlin was the centre of the world, particularly the musical world.

Nobody was bothered about whether or not Universal-Edition was a Jewish publisher. Unfortunately, the situation changed rapidly when Adolf Hitler unexpectedly assumed power in Germany with the Nazi Party, which had been considered in decline. My opinion of National-Socialism was unequivocal. As a student, I had once heard one of Hitler's speeches and thought it impossible that this person could ever pose any kind of threat. However, not even this terrible delusion prevented me from remaining unfailingly convinced, even in the worst hours and through the most tragic affairs, that this regime could only last for a short period of time.

My work now took on a new focus. The majority of my newly-found friends were gradually leaving Berlin. Most of the important works in the publishing house catalogue had been affected by the boycott imposed by Nazi racial or cultural laws. Even Universal-Edition itself came under fire, and its Jewish directors, employees and authors in Vienna were also subjected to targeted persecution. I went to the Austrian embassy in Berlin to obtain advice and gained the impression that they wanted to warn me against becoming too committed to the publishing house ; this filled me with terror. Alarm signals of this kind meant that I began to concentrate my thoughts on the survival of the publishing house. My suggestion that we should set-up an alternative company in Switzerland, was not, however, approved by my Viennese superiors. They felt safe in Austria and believed me to be a pessimist who had been frightened by the Nazis.

« Please, give me exclusive rights to your works. I promise you that I will print them when this terrible situation has passed. Please, send your scores to our friend Kurt Hirschfeld from Zürich Theatre ; they will reach me from there. I am naturally unable to print them now, but a little trust goes a long way. »

(Alfred Schlee to Rolf Liebermann, in 1943 or 1944. Liebermann latter recorded these recollections in 1998.)

However, in 1938-1939, things got nasty for Universal-Edition. The Viennese publishers were bought-out by the German publishing house Schott. However, an employee at Schott who had « Aryanised » the publishing house Peters convinced the relevant ministry that Schott was not « reliable » enough. Ownership of Universal-Edition was, therefore, passed on to Peters, who acquired it using capital released by Hermann Göring. Provisional administrators took-over the management in Vienna. We enjoyed a certain degree of protection ; they were civilized people who acted decently even towards Heinsheimer and Director Winter, whose emigration was facilitated by them.

It was now important for us to make sure that nothing happened that would make Universal-Edition unable to resume its international activities « once everything was over ». In other words, we needed to ensure that our core stock survived, that our manuscripts did not disappear, that banned and unperformed works were not lost, that any reproducible documents for these works were preserved and that these things would remain in our possession, even if they had to be moved owing to the risk of being bombed if the War was lost. It goes without saying that we had arguments with Peters over this.

With extensive help from Gottfried von Einem, and above all his mother, valuable material was taken to Ramsau. Even among the Nazis, there was a kind of Austrian patriotism that resisted the looting that was going on. The mayor of Vienna at the time (Hanns Blaschke) , who was a National-Socialist, helped me a great deal, as did an official at the Department of Culture. The « Gestapo » only came to the Universal-Edition offices once and, strangely, only confiscated Kurt Weill and Franz Schenker. After that, the Universal-Edition manuscripts were taken away in a sort of semi-official manoeuvre described as « bomb protection ». Most of them were hidden in churches ; works by Weill and Schönberg were stowed away in Zwettl, behind the organ, for example. I had rented a private house in Semmering and we used one of its rooms to store scores, manuscripts and instrumental parts. This enabled us to reproduce new material without too much trouble. Before War broke-out, we were also able to send material abroad. The Nazis' interest in foreign currency was greater than their concern that exports were helping the survival of the cultural assets which they were attempting to destroy.

I didn't think overly much about what was going on around me, but focused more on the future. It was always our top priority. Even when the Russians came, a great deal could be achieved if you weren't afraid. And so, with the help of a good many friends, we managed to preserve the existence of the publishing house in Vienna and could prepare to operate freely again following liberation. Once the shooting had stopped in Vienna, the best period in my life began. When Universal-Edition was in danger of being sold-off as « German property » while the company was being re-established immediately after the end of the War, Egon Seefehlner saved the day. Alfred Kalmus was able to restore the company's status as a joint-stock company, and he, then, concentrated on its publishing activities together with Ernst Hartmann, me and a host of enthusiastic young workers.

...

Alfred Schlee (geboren 19. November 1901 in Dresden ; gestorben 16. Februar 1999 in Wien) war ein österreichisch-deutscher Musikwissenschaftler, Theaterwissenschaftler und Musikverleger.

Nach Absolvierung des Vizthumschen Gymnasiums in seiner Geburtsstadt Dresden besuchte Alfred Schlee für ein halbes Jahr die von Émile Jaques-Dalcroze gegründete Bildungsanstalt für Musik und Rhythmus im Dresdner Vorort Hellerau. Schon während seiner Jugend privat in mehreren musikalischen Fächern (Klavier bei Erwin Schulhoff, Violoncello, Musiktheorie) unterrichtet, betrieb er in der Folge Studien in Musikwissenschaft, Komposition, Philosophie und Theaterwissenschaft in München und Leipzig. Der Studienabschluß an der Universität Wien mit einer geplanten Dissertation zur Programmentwicklung von Wanderbühnen wurde durch eine schwere Erkrankung seines Vaters und

daraus resultierende finanzielle Schwierigkeiten verhindert. In der Folge arbeitete er als Pianist auf Tourneen der Tänzerinnen Mary Wigman und Yvonne Georgi, für die er teils auch selbst die Musik komponierte. Daneben betätigte er sich als Kritiker im Tanzbereich. 1924 wurde er Dramaturg und Korrepetitor am Stadttheater Münster, im Herbst 1925 Regieassistent am Fürstlich Reußischen Theater in Gera, wohin Yvonne Georgi mit ihrer Gruppe engagiert wurde und sie und andere mit Werken von Egon Wellesz, Darius Milhaud und Vittorio Rieti Akzente im Bereich des modernen Balletts setzten. Das Engagement endete bereits nach einer Spielzeit aufgrund mangelnden Publikumsinteresses an diesen Aktivitäten. 1927 organisierte Schlee mit Hanns Niedecken-Gebhard den ersten Deutschen Tänzerkongress in Magdeburg, in der Folge gemeinsam mit Rudolf Laban den zweiten und dritten Kongress.

Sein Interesse an neuesten Trends in der zeitgenössischen Kunst und Musik brachte Schlee und andere in Kontakt mit dem Dessauer Bauhaus-Kreis, dem Dirigenten Erich Kleiber, den er anlässlich der Uraufführung von Alban Bergs « Wozzeck » 1925 in Berlin kennenlernte, dem Tänzer Harald Kreutzberg und dem Maler und Bühnenbildner Oskar Schlemmer, bei dessen Pariser Produktion des « Triadischen Balletts » er 1932 den Klavierpart innehatte.

Schlees erster Kontakt mit dem Wiener Verlag Universal-Edition bestand ab 1927, zunächst in redaktioneller Mitarbeit für ein Sonderheft der Zeitschrift « Musikblätter des Anbruch ». 1928-1931 erfolgte auf seine Initiative in der Universal-Edition die Publikation der von der Gesellschaft für Schrifttanz herausgegebenen und von ihm als Schriftleiter betreuten Vierteljahresschrift « Schrifttanz ». Schlee hielt darin die damals neu entwickelte « Kinetographie Laban » als Notation aktueller Choreographien des modernen Tanzes fest. Parallel zu Schlees allmählichem Rückzug aus dem Tanzbereich bekam er Gelegenheit, sich in Wien intensiv ins Musikverlagswesen einzuarbeiten. Ab Beginn der 1930er-Jahre wurde er auf Initiative von Hans Heinsheimer Repräsentant der Universal-Edition in Berlin. Nach der Machtergreifung der Nationalsozialisten im Deutschen Reich konnte Schlee ab 1933 vielfach zwischen den Interessen des Verlags und den Ansprüchen der NS-Kulturpolitik vermitteln. 1937 sucht Schlee, zunächst erfolglos, bei der Österreichischen Botschaft in Berlin um die Österreichische Staatsbürgerschaft an. Diese wurde ihm am 22. Oktober 1946 zuerkannt.

1938-1945 arbeitete Schlee zunächst neben dem offiziell bestellten kommissarischen Leiter Ernst Geutebrück, dann unter dem neuen Hauptgesellschafter Johannes Petschull im arisierten Stammhaus der Universal-Edition in Wien. In dieser Zeit konnte er zum einen mit Hilfe von Robert Kraus, dem Leiter des Kulturamtes der Stadt Wien, die Verlegung des Verlags ins so bezeichnete « Altreich » verhindern, zum anderen war er entscheidend für die Rettung wesentlicher Bestände des Unternehmens verantwortlich. Gemeinsam mit Gleichgesinnten, darunter insbesondere dem Komponisten Gottfried von Einem, verbrachte er eine Vielzahl an Drucken, Stichvorlagen und Manuskripten von Werken jüdischer beziehungsweise damals als « entartet » bezeichneter Komponisten, darunter die im Verlagsarchiv befindlichen Autographen Gustav Mahlers, in Privathäuser und verschiedene andere Verstecke, wo sie bis zum Kriegsende vor der Vernichtung durch die Nationalsozialisten bewahrt blieben. Ein enger Kontakt verband Schlee während der Kriegsjahre mit Anton von Webern, nachdem es ihm gelungen war, dessen Freistellung vom Kriegsdienst zugunsten einer Mitarbeit in der Universal-Edition zu erreichen. Schon ab den frühen 1940er-Jahren machte sich Schlee Gedanken über die Neugestaltung des Verlagsprogramms, indem er etwa mündliche Vereinbarungen mit den Schweizern Frank Martin und Rolf Liebermann über deren spätere (während der faschistischen Herrschaft noch unmögliche) Inverlagnahme traf und Mitarbeiter für den Neubeginn nach Beendigung der Kämpfe um und in Wien auswählte.

Nach Kriegsende übernahm Schlee als öffentlicher Verwalter bis 1947 die Leitung des Verlags. Als prominente Persönlichkeit im Wiener Musikleben gehörte er seit Februar 1946 auch der Direktion der Wiener Konzerthausgesellschaft an, eine Position, in der er sich ebenfalls mit Nachdruck für die Förderung des zeitgenössischen Schaffens einsetzte. Im selben Jahr wurde er Vorstandsmitglied der Urheberrechtsgesellschaft AKM. Ab 1951 bildete er mit Alfred Kalmus und Ernst Hartmann den Verlagsvorstand der Universal-Edition. Bis zu seinem Rückzug ins Privatleben 1985 galt sein primärer Aufgabenbereich dem Produktionsprogramm. Während vier Jahrzehnten bestimmte er maßgeblich, welche Namen dabei betreut wurden, wobei es ihm gelang, eine ausgewogene Balance zwischen österreichischen und ausländischen Komponisten zu schaffen. Besonderes Augenmerk wandte er auch jenen aufstrebenden Persönlichkeiten zu, die durch die Änderung der politischen Situation in Europa im kommunistischen Einflussbereich wirkten und teilweise von den Kontakten zu « westlichen » Ländern abgeschnitten. Durch ihre Bindung an die Universal-Edition wurde vielen von ihnen die Einbindung in die internationale Musikszene ermöglicht. Nicht zuletzt damit erhöhte sich damit auch markant das seit der Verlagsgründung 1901 angestrebte internationale Gewicht des Verlags.

Stellvertretend für die durch Schlees Initiative dem Verlag verbundenen Komponisten sind etwa zu nennen Gilbert Amy, Hans Erich Apostel, Theodor Berger, Luciano Berio, Harrison Birtwistle, Pierre Boulez, Francis Burt, Friedrich Cerha, Luigi Dallapiccola, Edison Denissow, Gottfried von Einem, Beat Furrer, Cristóbal Halffter, Roman Haubenstock-Ramati, Anton Heiller, Mauricio Kagel, Ernst Křenek, Ladislav Kupkovič, György Kurtág, Rolf Liebermann, György Ligeti, Frank Martin, Bohuslav Martinů, Olivier Messiaen, Arvo Pärt, Mario Peragallo, Henri Pousseur, Wolfgang Rihm, Karl Schiske, Alfred Schnittke, Rodion Schtschedrin, Kurt Schwertsik, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Jenő Takács, Alfred Uhl und Hans Zender. Zu den herauszuhebenden Einzelereignissen während seiner Arbeit gehören seine Initiativen zu wissenschaftlichen Gesamtausgaben von Arnold Schönberg und Alban Berg, die gegen einige Widerstände durchgesetzte, 1979 von Friedrich Cerha vorgenommene Fertigstellung des dritten Aktes und Publikation der vollständigen Fassung von Alban Bergs « Lulu » sowie das Bemühen um die Wiederentdeckung der 1938-1945 im Einflussbereich des Deutschen Reichs verbotenen und in der Folge vergessenen Komponisten Franz Schreker und Alexander von Zemlinsky. Weitere Schwerpunkte des Verlags während Schlees späterer Jahre waren und andere die Wiener Urtext Edition, die pädagogisch ausgerichtete « Rote Reihe », der mit Karl Scheit erfolgte Aufbau eines Gitarre-Katalogs sowie repräsentative Bildbiographien etwa zu Beethoven, Wagner und Mahler.

Zu den Alfred Schlee gewidmeten Werken zählen « Sonata pian' e forte » von Gilbert Amy ; « Fünf Bagatellen » Opus 20 von Hans Erich Apostel ; « Epifanie G », « Concertino » und « Formazioni » von Luciano Berio ; « Répons » von Pierre Boulez ; « Exercises » und « Netzwerk » von Friedrich Cerha ; « Areæ sonantes » von Paul-Heinz Dittrich ; « Cantiuunculæ amoris » von Karl Heinz Füssl ; « Mizar » von Cristóbal Halffter ; « Credentials » von Roman Haubenstock-Ramati ; « Bardo-Puls » von Günter Kahowez ; « Ludwig van » von Mauricio Kagel ; « Fragment » von György Ligeti ; « Und die Zeiger seiner Augen ... » von Bo Nilsson ; « Te Deum » von Arvo Pärt ; « Madrigal II » von Henri Pousseur ; « Im Innersten von » und « Zwiesprache » von Wolfgang Rihm ; « Khouang » von Tona Scherchen-Hsiao ; sowie die Symphonie Nr. 2 « Sankt Florian » von Alfred Schnittke. Schlees 90. Geburtstag wurde am 18. November 1991 mit einem Festabend mit dem Arditti Quartet im Wiener Konzerthaus gewürdigt, bei dem Gratulationsstücke von 37 Komponisten erklangen. Am 8. Dezember 2001 fand im Wiener Arnold Schönberg Center auf

Initiative der Familie, von Pierre Boulez und Nuri Schœnberg-Nono ein Gedächtniskonzert anlässlich des 100. Geburtstages von Alfred Schlee statt. Unter der Leitung von Boulez brachten Mitglieder des « Ensemble intercontemporain » Werke von Schœnberg, Messiaen, Boulez, Rihm, Stockhausen, Kurtág, Cerha, Webern und Berio zur Aufführung.

Nach früheren Ehen mit Anna Taussig und Maria Bertha Hegner heiratete Schlee 1960 Margarethe Molner. Der Verbindung entstammen die Söhne Thomas Daniel Schlee und Alexander Schlee.

Universal-Edition

Universal-Edition (or UE) is a Classical music publishing firm. Founded in 1901 in Vienna, and originally intended to provide the core Classical works and educational works to the Austrian market (which had until then been dominated by Leipzig-based publishers) . The firm soon expanded to become one of the most important publishers of modern music.

In 1904, Universal-Edition acquired Josef Aibl publishers, and so acquired the rights to many works by Richard Strauß and Max Reger, but it was the arrival of Emil Hertzka as managing director in 1907 (who remained until his death in 1932) which really pushed the firm towards new music. Under Hertzka, Universal-Edition signed contracts with a number of important contemporary composers, including Béla Bartók and Frederick Delius in 1908 ; Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schœnberg in 1909 (Mahler's Symphony No. 8 was the 1st work Universal-Edition acquired an original copyright to) ; Anton von Webern and Alexander von Zemlinsky in 1910 ; Karol Szymanowski in 1912 ; Leoš Janáček in 1917 ; and Kurt Weill in 1924. Through their association with Schœnberg, they also published many works by Alban Berg.

The firm's avant-garde directions continued after World War II, when Universal-Edition published works by a number of significant composers, among them Luciano Berio, Pierre Boulez, Morton Feldman, Mauricio Kagel, György Kurtág, György Ligeti and Karlheinz Stockhausen. Later important additions to the catalogue include Georg Friedrich Haas, Wolfgang Rihm, Cristóbal Halffter, Robert Aitken, Richard Rodney Bennett, Harrison Birtwistle, Georges Lentz, Vyckintas Baltakas, Johannes Maria Staud, John Rea, Jay Schwartz, Arvo Pärt and Friedrich Cerha.

Universal-Edition have also published several significant historical editions, including the complete works of Claudio Monteverdi. In collaboration with Verlag B. Schott's Söhne, Mainz, they have published the « Wiener Urtext Edition » series since 1972. Originally consisting of works for 1 or 2 performers by composers from Johann Sebastian Bach to Johannes Brahms, the series was later expanded to include a limited number of later works, such as the « Ludus Tonalis » of Paul Hindemith.

...

Universal-Edition AG (häufig mit UE abgekürzt) ist der Name eines 1901 gegründeten österreichischen Musikverlages mit Hauptsitz am Karlsplatz 6 in Wien.

Hauptgrund der 1901 in Wien unter dem Namen « Universal-Edition Actiengesellschaft » erfolgte Verlagsgründung war die Intention Österreich-Ungarns, von Notenimporten, insbesondere der dominierenden Musikverlage in Leipzig, unabhängig zu werden. Die Gründer waren Adolf Robitschek, Josef Weinberger und Bernhard Herzmann von Döbblingen.

Stand zunächst Musik der klassischen und romantischen Epoche im Vordergrund, verlagerte sich der Schwerpunkt der Publikationen schon nach wenigen Jahren auf die jeweils zeitgenössische Musik. 1906 übernahm die Universal-Edition beispielsweise von anderen Verlagen die Rechte an Gustav Mahlers Sinfonien I bis 4, und schloß 1908 einen direkten Vertrag mit dem Komponisten über den Druck der 8. Sinfonie. Unter Emil Hertzka (Direktor von 1907 bis 1932) folgten Namen wie Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Joseph Marx, Leoš Janáček, Karol Szymanowski, Béla Bartók, Zoltán Kodály, Kurt Weill, Egon Wellesz, Erwin Schulhoff, Franz Schreker oder Hanns Eisler. 1932 umfasste der Katalog der Universal-Edition rund 10.000 Nummern.

1919 gab der Verlag die Musikzeitschrift Musikblätter des Anbruch heraus, die bis 1937 erschienen. 1924-1930 gesellte sich Pult und Taktstock hinzu. Beide Organe nutzte der Verlag erfolgreich, um durch Artikel, Berichte und Rezensionen seine Verlagskomponisten international in die Diskussion zu bringen. Ein weiterer « Verkaufsschlager » wurde die 1939 ins Leben gerufene und von Karl Scheit herausgegebene Reihe Musik für Gitarre.

Im Dritten Reich erwirkte der Verleger Alfred Schlee durch Diplomatie bei den Nationalsozialisten, daß diese die Schulden des hochverschuldeten Verlags in Hinsicht auf die Erhaltung eines Denkmals Entarteter Musik beglichen und rettete dadurch den Verlag und zahlreiche Manuskripte vor dem Untergang. Der jüdische Teil der Verlagsredakteure wurde gezwungen, das Schicksal zahlreicher verlegter Komponisten zu teilen und mit Berufsverboten versehen, ins Exil getrieben oder deportiert.

Während des Zweiten Weltkrieges war die Firma in deutscher Hand und publizierte auch Werke wie Franz Schmidts Deutsche Auferstehung (1940) . Sie ging nach 1945 wieder in österreichischen Besitz über und setzte die Tradition der Aufnahme von Musik der Gegenwart in ihr Programm fort. Die ab 1955 von Herbert Eimert unter Mitwirkung von Karlheinz Stockhausen in der Universal-Edition publizierte Heftenfolge « die reihe » informierte über serielle und elektronische Musik. Zum Verlagsprogramm, das im Jahr 2000 rund 32.000 Titel umfasste, zählen neben weiteren Zeitschriften und Lehrbüchern auch Taschenpartituren, seit 1972 unter dem Titel « Wiener Urtext Edition » auch zahlreiche Urtextausgaben von Musik der Vorklassik bis zur Romantik, später auch des 20. Jahrhunderts (gemeinsam mit dem Verlag B. Schott's Söhne, Mainz) .

Zu den zeitgenössischen Komponisten im Verlagsprogramm der Universal-Edition zählen etwa Wolfgang Rihm, Pierre Boulez, Arvo Pärt, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Friedrich Cerha, Luciano Berio, Johannes Maria Staud, Georg Friedrich Haas, Georges Lentz, Daniel Schnyder oder Vykintas Baltakas.

Heinrich Strecker

The Austrian composer of Operettas and popular Viennese music Heinrich Strecker was born on 24 February 1893 in Vienna and died, aged 88, on 28 June 1981, in Baden near Vienna. He was married to Erika Strecker.

As a young child, Strecker was sent to Theux, in Belgium, where he was educated on a boarding school run by Lazarists. His talent for music was noticed here, and his interest nurtured. At the completion of his schooling, he could play 12 instruments. He professed a preference for the violin, in which he completed a Master-class. In 1907, Strecker made his public performance debut with his own composition, the Violin Concerto in A major, and, in the same year, he was asked to play it for the Belgian King Leopold II, and was honoured for doing so.

He returned to Vienna in 1910, at the age of 17, to study law at the University of Vienna. His studies were interrupted by the First World War, in which he was an army officer. After the War, he devoted himself solely to his music, studying with Professor Camillo Horn and beginning to compose Classical pieces.

Between commissioned pieces, such as dance and film music, he discovered Viennese songs. He became famous for this type of popular music, as well as for his « Singspiel ». He often collaborated with Fritz Gerold, Joe Grebitz and Bruno Hardt-Walden, who wrote the song-texts and libretti.

On 21 December 1931, his Operetta « Mädel aus Wien » (Girl from Vienna) premiered at the Vienna « Bürgertheater » and, immediately following the « Anschluß » of Austria by the 3rd « Reich », his Operetta « Der ewige Walzer » (The Eternal Waltz) premiered on 18 May 1938 at the « Volksoper ». His « Singspiel » « Ännchen von Tharau » (Little Ann from Tharau), which he wrote with Hardt-Walden, premiered at the « Raimund Theater », on 8 February 1940.

Strecker became a member of the Nazi Party in 1933, and was the regional representative of the cultural community of Vienna. In addition to the « Excelsior » and « Stage » publishers, which he founded in Vienna in 1926, he took-over the « Bristol, Sirius and Europaton » music-publishers under the guise of Aryanization.

The complete catalogue of Heinrich Strecker's works comprises more than 350 individual pieces. During his career, he composed many popular songs, Walzes, Marches, Operettas, and film-scores. His music is still popular in Austria, and concerts are sometimes given in his old home in the Viennese suburb of « Baden bei Wien ».

...

Heinrich Strecker (1893-1981) is an Austrian composer. He was born in Vienna but was educated in Belgium in a Catholic school run by German brothers. Strecker would later remember his school years :

« Given my extraordinary musical talent, my teachers gave me free lessons in piano, cello, tenor horn, trumpet, flugelhorn, horn, trombone and organ. Besides, I was trained to play the violin upon a Master level. I was soon regarded not only as the best musician but also as the best singer of the school. No feast day went by without me singing Gregorian chants as a soloist in Church or performing before the highest ecclesiastical and secular dignitaries like the King of the Belgians for whom I played, as a climax, my own composition, a Violin Concerto. »

In 1910, Strecker returned to Vienna and would become the self-proclaimed saviour of the « Wienerlieder » (Viennese Songs) . « Wienerlieder » were critical, ironic, funny songs about life in and around Vienna, sung in the local dialect and blending humour with melancholy. These popular songs had known their heyday in the 19th Century's last quarter. According to Strecker, the « Wienerlied » had little chance against the modern foxtrot :

« Publishers had only a pitying smile for my futile struggle for the dying “ Wienerlied ”. »

Still, Heinrich Strecker sensed the financial potential of its revival and, in 1922, founded his own music publishing company, the « Wiener Excelsior Verlag » . He composed Operettas and hundreds of songs which « glorified Vienna and began their triumphal march throughout the world » .

We are coming to the gist of our story. In 1933, Strecker became member of the NSDAP, the German Nazi Party. At that time, the Austrian government tried to suppress National-Socialism, and his Nazi affiliation cost Heinrich Strecker 6 months of detention in 1936. After his release, he conveniently made an extended tour in Germany. Strecker returned to his homeland in 1938, right after the « Anschluß » . Our composer welcomed this annexation of Austria to the German « Reich » with 2 songs : « Deutsch-Österreich ist frei ! » and « Wach auf Deutsche Wachau » . This last song became also known as the « Ostmarklied » , « Ostmark » being the new Nazi name for Austria. The words of the song allow little doubt as to Strecker's sympathies :

Von Burg zu Burg die Frage geht,
wann denn die Ostmark aufersteht,
ob auch der Bruder endlich heimwärts fand,
heim in das große Vaterland ?

From castle to castle the question spreads,
when will Ostmark rise again,
whether the brother finally found home,
back into the great fatherland ?

No wonder that this « Ostmarklied » became a Nazi battle song. The same « honour » also « befell Heimat » , another one of Strecker's successes.

Tellingly, it was in Bremen (Germany) that his Operetta « The Eternal Waltz » premiered in February 1938. Not until 3 months later, after the « Anschluß » , could Strecker triumph its premiere at the Vienna « Volksoper » . By that time, Nazi rules already had started the persecution in the Austrian musical world. Jews were prohibited to own commercial enterprises. The work of Jewish composers and authors were banned : performances were prohibited as was the sale of their sheet music. Their printed scores were destroyed or marked as unavailable.

Barely 3 months after the annexation, Heinrich Strecker became vice-president of AKM (« Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger ») , the music copyright agency. It was then already fully

compliant with Nazi rules. Earlier, in March 1938, AKM's council had been dismissed and a Commissar Chairman appointed. Immediately, a questionnaire had been sent to all members asking racial and religious questions. In June of the same year, the AKM was replaced by STAGMA, the Society for musical performing rights from Nazi Germany. STAGMA was administered by the « Reichsmusikkammer » directed by Josef Gæbbels.

In 1939, in a booklet containing an AKM membership directory, someone deleted the names of Jewish members by hand with a neat red-line. The legend written on the booklet reads :

« ... = Jüden. »

These were to be black-listed ! A hand-written note inside this booklet chillingly explains that some members had not yet been crossed-off because they had not submitted their completed questionnaires, asking them about their race.

« According to a notice from STAGMA, some of the persons whose name is deleted with a red-line are Jews. The crossing-out did not take place because these persons did not submit the questionnaire. »

Franz Sobotka, a Viennese music-publisher owning several companies, was part of the list but his name was not deleted. Nonetheless, in mid-May, the month in which Strecker was attending the premiere of his Operetta, Sobotka fled Vienna with Hermine, his Jewish wife. He had heard that his family was at risk of imminent arrest by the « Gestapo » . They crossed the border to Czechoslovakia and reached the safety of Karlsbad (Karlovy Vary) . Later, Strecker will do away with the Sobotka's refuge as a « health cure » .

From Karlsbad, the family emigrated to New York. Sobotka's car was confiscated and he was expropriated of a great deal of his assets. In 1939, Heinrich Strecker acquired the publishing companies (Bristol Verlag, Sirius and Europaton) which belonged to his « long-time friend » Franz Sobotka for a paltry sum. At that time, the companies had 18 employees and totalled a significant revenue. Strecker merged Sobotka's companies together with his own to form the « Am Schubertring Verlag » .

While Sobotka was forced to rebuild his life in New York, Strecker was successfully performing in Austria, with many sold-out evenings. In 1942, he was able to buy a castle-like villa.

Villa Strecker, located in Baden about 26 kilometers south of Vienna. The villa boasts a cast-iron veranda porch, coming from the Austrian Pavilion in the Paris Exposition.

At the end of the War, Strecker fled from Vienna. In 1946, he was accused of high-treason for illegal activity, abusive enrichment and insult to the dignity of the librettist Alfred Steinberg-Frank. Strecker's publishing house was placed in the custody of the American Property Control : Franz Sobotka, now a U.S. citizen, reclaimed his properties and accused Strecker of taking-over his editions under the guise of aryanisation. Aryanisation meant confiscation or forced sale far below the real value. The exchange of letters between Strecker, Sobotka and the American Property Control is made public by Fold3, an online collection of original U.S. military records. The scanned, typewritten letters make a

fascinating read.

Strecker's defence is a litany of self-pity, presenting himself as a victim of the German « occupation » and of unfortunate circumstances. Like so many other Austrians, he refused to acknowledge that he had participated in the persecution of Jews. He denied ever being a member of the Nazi Party : it was his father, conveniently also called Heinrich, who had been a member. He himself « was persecuted by the Nazis » . Strecker enumerated his countless successes as a composer and blamed slander by jealous people for his present situation :

« Viennese art was my goal, glory my companion, and I was envied by the yapping pack of incompetents as is often the case for successful artists. »

In his defence, Strecker recounts how, in 1944, he got into trouble with a Nazi rival and, subsequently, his business was closed down. He also argues that he worked closely together with Jewish artists. Which is true : he created for example several songs together with Alfred Steinberg-Frank, who would later accuse him in 1946. Strecker also argues that Goebbels wanted to destroy the « Wienerlied » . Thus, Strecker having been its « pioneer, front-runner and king, he also had to fall » .

Strecker declared that after hearing about the aryanisation by Josef Goebbels of several music-publishers (Universal-Edition, Josef Blaha Verlag, Figaro Verlag, Josef Weinberger Verlag and Friedrich Hofmeister Verlag) , he wanted to save at least one Viennese publishing house, namely Bristol Verlag. The perfidious argument of Strecker was that he couldn't be accused of aryanisation because Sobotka wasn't a Jew, but an « Aryan » . Also, part of his defence was his allegation that due to Sobotka's manipulations he had bought an almost worthless business. Or, in Strecker's words : « by being so magnanimous, I had suffered a terrible ordeal » .

Declassified document concerning the USA Property Control case Strecker-Sobotka.

Never in all the letters and accounts did Strecker show a hint of empathy with the Sobotka family who had been forced to flee and had been stripped of its possessions. He was ultimately convicted for high-treason. Heinrich Strecker asked for clemency and, in 1950, after a few years of being ostracised, he was re-integrated and re-habilitated. For 3 decades, he continued his work, public activity and lived in the Villa Strecker with his 3rd wife Erika, who is 45 years his junior.

Austria gradually comes to terms with its Nazi past.

In 2013, Austrian president Heinz Fischer said :

« The crimes of Hitler's 3rd Reich could not have taken place without the help of the “ countless perpetrators, accomplices, informants and Aryanisers ” who worked as cogs in the Nazi machine. »

...

Heinrich Strecker (geboren 24. Februar 1893 in Wien ; gestorben 28. Juni 1981 in Baden bei Wien) war ein österreichischer Komponist von Operetten und Wienerliedern.

Heinrich Strecker war der Sohn des aus Laibach stammenden Heinrich Georg Strecker, Schneidermeister in Wien-Margareten, und dessen aus Wien gebürtigen Ehefrau Theresia. Ab dem sechsten Lebensjahr wuchs Strecker bei seiner Großmutter in Wien auf, von wo er nach deren Tod zu seinem Vater nach Aachen zog, der dort eine Stellung als Schneidermeister gefunden hatte. Strecker senior schickte seinen Sohn 1903 nach Theux (Belgien) in das Internat des Lazaristenordens, wo er sieben Jahre zur Schule ging. Dort wurde auch seine Begabung für Musik erkannt und sein Interesse dafür geweckt. Am Ende seiner Schulzeit beherrschte Strecker zwölf Instrumente.

Nach eigenem Bekunden, war die Violine sein Lieblingsinstrument, für das er auch die Meisterklasse absolvierte. 1907 konnte Strecker mit seiner ersten Komposition, einem Violinkonzert in A-Dur debütieren. Dieses Stück durfte er noch im selben Jahr dem belgischen König Leopold II. vortragen und wurde dafür auch ausgezeichnet.

1910 kehrte Strecker nach Wien zurück und begann nach der Externisten-Matura in Wels ein Jurastudium an der Universität Wien. Der Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkriegs unterbrach Streckers Studium. Danach widmete sich Strecker ausschließlich der Musik ; er studierte zwei Jahre bei Camillo Horn und komponierte zunächst klassische Werke.

Über Auftragsarbeiten, wie Tanz- und Filmmusik kam er aber schon bald zu den Wienerliedern. Für diese Art von Volksliedern wurde er bekannt ; ebenso für seine Singspiele. Dabei arbeitete er häufig mit Fritz Löhner-Beda, Fritz Gerold, Alfred Steinberg-Frank, Joe Gribitz und Bruno Hardt-Warden zusammen, welche ihm die Liedtexte und die Libretti lieferten.

Am 20. Jänner 1932 erfolgte die Uraufführung seiner Operette Mädel aus Wien am Wiener Bürgertheater. Sein Singspiel Ännchen von Tharau, das Strecker zusammen mit Bruno Hardt-Warden geschaffen hatte, wurde am 21. September 1933 in Breslau uraufgeführt. Auch das Lied Drunt' in der Lobau ... entstammt seiner Feder.

Strecker war 1934 Gauobmann und Landeskulturleiter der im Austrofaschismus verbotenen NSDAP und der Nationalsozialistischen Kulturgemeinde Österreichs und somit « von Amts wegen » Mitglied der österreichischen NSDAP. In dieser Funktion wurde er 1936 kurzfristig inhaftiert. Seine Operette Der ewige Walzer kam am 5. Februar 1938 im Staatstheater Bremen zur Uraufführung. Erst nach dem « Anschluß » Österreichs an das Deutsche Reich erfolgte am 18. Mai 1938 die österreichische Erstaufführung der Operette an der Wiener Volksoper.

Nach dem « Anschluß » Österreichs 1938 komponierte Strecker ein Lied mit Klavierbegleitung Deutsch-Österreich ist frei ! und das Lied für Chor und Orchester Wach auf, deutsche Wachau ! Im selben Jahr wurde er Vizepräsident der österreichischen Urheberrechtsgesellschaft AKM. Zu dem von ihm im Jahr 1926 gegründeten Wiener Excelsior-Verlag und den Wiener Bühnenverlag konnte er sich nach 1938 auch noch die Musikverlage Edition Bristol (1941) , Sirius und Europaton durch « Arisierung » aneignen.

Heinrich Strecker lebte ab 1940 in Baden (mit Ausnahme der unmittelbaren Nachkriegszeit) und besaß seit 5. September 1942 in der Marchetstraße 76 die 1846 erbaute Villa, in der heute (2014) die Heinrich-Strecker-Gesellschaft sowie der Musikverlag Heinrich Strecker, Notenantiquariat ihren Sitz haben. Streckers dritte Ehe, mit (der 45 Jahre jüngeren) Erika Eszler, Tochter eines Badener Schuhmachers, ging auf die Bekanntschaft im Jahr 1956 zurück und konnte wegen Streckers laufendem Scheidungsverfahren erst 1978 legitimiert werden. Die Witwe veranstaltet im Park der Villa Strecker jährlich ein an ihren Ehemann erinnerndes Konzert.

Eine der letzten Würdigungen Streckers durch die Stadt Baden war die Einrichtung eines in das Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Museum (Hochstraße Nr. 51) integrierten Heinrich-Strecker-Stüberls, das unter diesem Namen bis März 2013 Bestand hatte.

Heinrich Streckers Grabstätte befindet sich auf dem Helenenfriedhof in Baden.

...

Heinrich Strecker wurde am 24. Februar 1893 im 5. Wiener Gemeindebezirk geboren, im Lazaristenkloster in Theux in Belgien erzogen. An dieser Schule wurde der Grundstein zu seiner musikalischen Laufbahn gelegt. Er erlernte 12 Musikinstrumente, absolvierte an der Musikschule die Meisterklasse für Violine, schrieb mit 14 Jahren sein erstes Violinkonzert in A-Dur, das er dem damaligen belgischen König vortragen durfte und dafür eine hohe Auszeichnung erhielt. 1910 nach Wien zurückgekehrt, begann er Jura zu studieren, nachdem er vorher in Wels die Externistenmatura abgelegt hatte.

Danach widmete sich Strecker ausschliesslich der Musik, studierte zwei Jahre bei Professor Camillo Horn, komponierte anfänglich Klassisches, aber die Wiener Musik, besonders das Wiener Lied, die Operette und das Singspiel haben seinen Ruf geschaffen.

Das Gesamtschaffen von Heinrich Strecker umfasst nicht weniger als über 350, mit Opus-Zahlen versehene Werke, der Grossteil davon sind Volkskompositionen, das heißt Lieder der verschiedensten Genres. Seine größten Erfolge feierte er auf dem Gebiet des Wienerliedes und der Operette. Melodien wie « Drunt in der Lobau » , « Das war in Petersdorf » , « Ja, ja der Wein ist gut » , « Ja, hätt ma's net, so tät ma's net » , « Sing mir das Lied noch einmal » sind weltbekannte Beispiele dieses Genres. Die Operetten « Mädels aus Wien » , « Der ewige Walzer » , « Ännchen von Tharau » erlebten und erleben hunderte Aufführungen.

Über 20 Revuen wie « Lorelei » , « Erzherzog Johann » , « Die Kleine vom Zirkus » entstammen seiner Feder. Filmmusik « Narren im Schnee » , « Meine Tochter lebt in Wien » , « Vier Mädels aus der Wachau » und jede Art von Wiener Tanzweisen vom Marsch bis zum Walzer runden seinen musikalischen Einfallsreichtum ab.

Die Fertigstellung seiner letzten Operette « Honeymoon » , durfte Strecker noch erleben. « Honeymoon » ist die vollständige Überarbeitung einer alten Vorlage, der Operette « Küsse im Mai » , die in der Welt eines Bienenstaates spielt. Auf Initiative der Witwe des Komponisten, Frau Regulares Rat Erika Strecker, fand die Uraufführung am 30. Juni

2002 in Baden bei Wien, 21 Jahre nach dem Ableben des Komponisten, statt. Für sein Schaffen erhielt Strecker hohe Auszeichnungen und viele Ehrenmitgliedschaften. Nach einem Herzinfarkt verstarb Prof. Heinrich Strecker am 28. Juni 1981 in Baden.

Nach eigenem Bekunden war Heinrich Strecker seit 1933, also noch vor dem « Anschluß » Österreichs, Mitglied der NSDAP und bekleidete in der Folgezeit und andere den Posten des « Gau-Obmanns der N.S. Kulturgemeinde Wien » . In dieser Funktion wurde er 1936 kurzfristig inhaftiert. Von seiner damaligen politischen Gesinnung zeugen von ihm als « Kampflieder » bezeichnete Werke wie « Wach auf, deutsche Wachau » , « Deutsche Frau » und « Deutsch-Österreich ist frei » .

Wie viele andere Künstler seiner Generation bemühte sich auch Heinrich Strecker um Erfolg im nationalsozialistischen Kulturbetrieb, was ihm mit seiner dem Zeitgeist der 1930er Jahre entsprechenden Operette « Ännchen von Tharau » (1933) am ehesten gelang.

Seine wirtschaftliche Absicherung über seine (Neben-)Tätigkeit als Musikverleger (« Wiener Excelsior-Verlag » und « Wiener Bühnenverlag ») versuchte Strecker durch den Ankauf anderer Verlage auszubauen. Bei der Übernahme der Konkurrenzunternehmen « Edition Bristol » , « Sirius » und « Europaton » ist nach derzeitiger Quellenlage von einem Erwerb im Rahmen der sogenannten « Arisierung » auszugehen.

Seit Jahren bemüht sich die Heinrich Strecker Gesellschaft um eine möglichst genaue Aufarbeitung des Zeitabschnittes zwischen 1933 und 1945 in Streckers Biographie und nimmt wissenschaftlich abgesicherte Ergänzungen gerne entgegen. Um dabei gleichzeitig Streckers künstlerischen Beitrag zum österreichischen Kulturerbe zu erhalten, plädiert die Heinrich Strecker Gesellschaft für eine sachliche Trennung von Person und Werk des Komponisten, so wie diese auch bei vergleichbaren Künstlerpersönlichkeiten jener Jahre akzeptiert worden ist. Insbesondere soll Streckers Leistung um die formale und inhaltliche Weiterentwicklung der Musik-Gattungen « Operette » und « Wiener Musik/Wienerlied » gewürdigt und weitergegeben werden.

Maison d'édition Josef Weinberger

Josef Weinberger is synonymous with popular musical theater. In 1885, Josef Weinberger and Carl Hofbauer started an art and music store in Vienna, but 5 years later, Weinberger set-up on his own. He saw the potential, in publishing and licensing, of the craze for Operetta, and made a connection with Johann Strauß II. Within a few years, all the great Operetta composers were his clients : Johann Strauß II, Carl Millöcker, Carl Zeller, Emmerich Kálmán, Oscar Straus, Robert Stolz, and Leo Fall. He even provided licensing services for the last great Viennese Operetta composer, Franz Lehár, who published through his own company, « Glocken Verlag » .

The firm expanded quickly, opening branches in Paris (1885) and Leipzig (1889) where they worked with Friedrich Hofmeister. They took an active part in setting-up a trade association, « AKM » (Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger » ; Society of authors, composers and publishers) in 1897. Then, in 1901, they participated in the founding of Universal-Edition in Vienna, providing them space in their premises until 1914.

The founder died in 1928 leaving the firm to his daughters Katharina and Margarethe Weinberger, for whom the founder's nephew Otto Blau (1893-1980) acted as manager. Blau could see the worsening situation for Jewish businesses in central Europe and, wisely, set-up a branch in London in 1936. After Adolf Hitler's « Anschluß » , in 1938, the firm was confiscated and given to Sikorski of Berlin, with the name « Doktor Hans C. Sikorski KG Berlin » , as was Anton J. Benjamin in Hamburg. Blau had an eventful war, being interned for a time in United Kingdom as an « enemy alien on the Isle of Man » (as were 2 members of the future Amadeus String Quartet) and, later, being deported to Australia. Fortunately, Blau survived the War, although both Katharina and Margarethe Weinberger died in 1941. Blau rebuilt the firm from 1947, and even continued to expand, opening a branch in Frankfurt and taking-over Octavia Music Co., Ltd.

In the last 70 years, each branch of the firm has independently found opportunities in its local market. For example, the British branch has gone into music for the media, opening a production music library, JW Media Music, Ltd. , and it also represents the Broadway publisher Music Theatre International, licensing their shows in Europe.

...

Josef Weinberger founded his publishing business in Vienna in 1885. Through an association with Johann Strauß II, he began licensing performances of Strauß's Operettas. Licensing stage-works has been a vital part of our work ever since and the principal Viennese Operetta composers are represented in our catalogue : Strauß II, Millöcker, Zeller, Kálmán, Oscar Straus, Stolz and Fall. We have administered the copyrights of Franz Lehár for many years for Lehár's own company, « Glocken Verlag » .

We have expanded into several other musical genres over the years : contemporary classical, light orchestral, educational, brass and military band, and religious. Our associated production music library, JW Media Music Ltd, is a leader in its field, while our sister companies in Vienna and Frankfurt have developed repertoire for their own respective markets.

Today, our theatre catalogue spans the Century, from Viennese Operettas to British musicals of the 1990's. It spans the globe too, through our representation for the United Kingdom and other European territories of the prestigious Broadway show catalogues of Music Theatre International. 1998 saw another development, our expansion into the arena of the play with the acquisition of rights in the stage-works of the Hungarian playwright Ferenc Molnár.

...

1885 eröffnete Josef Weinberger in Wien eine « Kunst- und Musikalienhandlung » . Wenig später folgten Verlagsgründungen in Leipzig und Paris. 1897 schloß er den ersten Verlagsvertrag mit dem jungen Gustav Mahler. In den folgenden Jahren erschienen Mahlers Symphonien Nr. 1-3, das « Klagende Lied » und die « Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen » im Druck. 1901 war Josef Weinberger entscheidend an der Gründung des Wiener Verlages Universal-Edition beteiligt.

Bis zu seinem Tod 1928 konnte Weinberger den Verlagskatalogen weitere klingende Namen hinzufügen, darunter Johann Strauß II, Emmerich Kálmán, Franz Lehár, Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari, Erich Wolfgang Korngold.

Im « Dritten Reich » wurden Verlage jüdischer Eigentümer systematisch enteignet, « arische » Werke anderen Verlagen einverleibt. Otto Blau, der Neffe des Verlagsgründers, hatte zwar 1936 eine Firma in London gegründet, doch die « Arisierung » führte unweigerlich zur Zerschlagung des Wiener und des Leipziger Hauses. Nach Kriegsende stellte Blau sich zusammen mit dem Wiener Johann Michel der mühevollen Aufgabe, das Verlagsgeschäft auf dem Kontinent neu aufzubauen. Neben Wien nahm man 1953 auch in Deutschland wieder die Arbeit auf, neuer Verlagssitz wurde hier Frankfurt-am-Main.

Von herausragender Bedeutung ist die enge Partnerschaft mit dem Glocken Verlag, die 1964 begründet werden konnte. Seither ist Weinberger weltweit mit der Administration und Auswertung nahezu aller Werke des Komponisten Franz Lehár betraut.

Operette, Oper und Musical sind bis heute die Säulen unseres Verlagsprogramms, doch auch konzertante Werke von Mahler bis Tarkmann nehmen einen wichtigen Platz ein. In Kooperation mit Weinberger London werten wir die amerikanischen Concert Libraries von Music Theatre International (MTI) und der « amerikanischen » Werke Kurt Weills aus. Unsere Frankfurter Tochter Heros Musikverlag verlegt Instrumentalschulen wie die « Schule der Rockgitarre » und vertritt den italienischen Traditionsverlag Casa Musicale Sonzogno. Mit Ring Musik betreiben wir zudem seit 1964 eine eigene Musikproduktion für Film, Fernsehen und Werbung.

Otto Blau

In January 1940, Doctor Otto Blau, a director of the firm Josef Weinberger, musical publishers, had written to K. A. Wright, then, Assisrant Director of Music, suggesting that Gustav Mahler's « Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen » should be broadcast that summer for, if Mahler had been alive on 7 July 1940, he would have been 80 years old. (Letter of 30 January 1940.)

Wright replied on 8 February 1940 :

« I am afraid that we cannot keep pace with birthdays under War-time conditions - let alone hypothetical ones, i.e. , birthdays people would have had had they remained alive. But Sir Adrian Boult tells me to say that he, among others, is very fond of these songs and that some time or other we shall certainly be doing them again, but at the moment we cannor say when. »

...

Otto Blau, Musikverleger, Jurist : geboren am 1. März 1893 in Wien, Österreich-Ungarn (heute : Österreich) ; gestorben am 27. Januar 1980 in Lugano (Tessin) , Schweiz.

Otto Blau nahm 1914 bis zu seiner Verwundung am Ersten Weltkrieg teil. Sein Jurastudium an der Universität Wien schloß er 1919 mit der Promotion ab. Nachdem er zunächst als Jurist in einem Chemiewerk gearbeitet hatte, holte sein Onkel, Josef Weinberger, der selbst keinen Nachfolger in der Firma hatte, ihn 1922 als Leiter der Bühnenabteilung und bald darauf als Einzelprokuristen in den auf Operetten spezialisierten Bühnen- und Musikalienverlag Josef Weinberger. Nach dem Tod des Onkels übernahm er 1928 die alleinige Leitung des Verlags. Er setzte sich für die Verlängerung der Urheberschutzfrist auf 50 Jahre ein und wurde Vorstandsmitglied in der AKM (Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger) sowie Vertreter der Sektion Musik-, Bühnenverlag und -vertrieb in der seit Anfang 1937 bestehenden berufsständischen Organisation Zwangsgilde der Wiener Buch-, Kunst- und Musikalienhändler.

Kurz nach dem « Anschluß » 1938 wurde die AKM « gleichgeschaltet » und Otto Blau seines Vorstandspostens enthoben. Der Weinberger Verlag wurde im Juni 1938 durch die Cautio Treuhand GmbH und Hans C. Sikorski als deren Treuhänder « arisiert ». Der Versuch, einen Scheinverkauf der Firma an Carl Günther in Leipzig zu arrangieren, scheiterte. Bereits an die 1936 in London gegründete Firma Josef Weinberger Ltd. übertragene Rechte mußten nach Abschluß des « Arisierungsvertrags » an die Wiener Firma zurückübertragen werden. Otto Blau ging im September 1938 nach Großbritannien ins Exil. Es gelang ihm nicht, die beiden Töchter des Firmengründers Josef Weinberger, Margarethe und Katharina Weinberger, ebenfalls nach Großbritannien zu bringen. Durch ihre Krankheit war ihnen vermutlich die Aufnahme in einem Asylland verwehrt. Sie wurden 1941 in der Wiener Heil- und Pflegeanstalt Am Steinhof Opfer der Euthanasie. Otto Blau erhielt in Großbritannien als « feindlicher Ausländer » keine Arbeitserlaubnis. Nach einer zeitweisen Internierung auf der Isle of Man wurde er im September 1940 nach Australien deportiert, wo er als Dolmetscher arbeitete und versuchte, mit der Musikverlagsbranche in Kontakt zu bleiben. Auf telegraphischem Wege gelang es ihm, Verhandlungen über Bühnen- und Filmproduktionen in den USA zu führen, so etwa über eine Bearbeitung der « Fledermaus » durch Max Reinhardt und Erich Wolfgang Korngold, die unter dem Titel « Rosalinda » 1942 im New Yorker 44th Street Theatre sowie an anderen Bühnen aufgeführt wurde. In London realisierte Blau später noch weitere Bearbeitungen von Erich Wolfgang Korngold (« A Night in Venice », 1944 ; « Gay Rosalind », 1945) . Darüber hinaus nahm er 1943 mit dem aus Leipzig nach London geflohenen Musikverleger Adolf Aber, der für den britischen Musikverlag Novello arbeitete, Kontakt auf. Er machte den Vorschlag, die Vertretung von Novello für Australien zu übernehmen. Der britische Verlag lehnte das Ansuchen allerdings ab.

Nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs ging Otto Blau nach Großbritannien zurück. Die Ausgangslage für den Bühnen- und Musikalienverlag Weinberger war jedoch schwierig. Der Wiener Verlag wurde erst 1949 nach einem Restitutionsverfahren zurückgegeben, Tantiemen waren während des Kriegs nicht ausgezahlt worden, und es gab kaum finanzielle Reserven. Auch waren Wiener Operetten im Vergleich zu US-amerikanischen Musicals in Großbritannien wenig gefragt. Dennoch begann Otto Blau parallel zum Wiederaufbau der Wiener Firma damit, Weinberger in London zu etablieren. Diese Aufbauarbeit beinhaltete vor allem eine Anpassung des Repertoires an die Musikkultur des Gastlandes. Die von Weinberger verlegten Operetten mußten nicht nur ins Englische übersetzt, sondern auch an die orchestralen sowie stimmlichen Gegebenheiten der Amateurbühnen, von denen in Großbritannien Operetten aufgeführt wurden, angepasst werden. Weinberger übernahm daneben die Vertretung zahlreicher US-amerikanischer und britischer Musicals und baute einen Katalog in ganz unterschiedlichen Bereichen auf. Dazu zählten Unterhaltungsmusik für Rundfunkorchester, liturgische Musik, ernste Konzertmusik, aber auch Backgroundmusiken für Film und Fernsehen auf

Schallplatten. Darüber hinaus übernahm Otto Blau in Großbritannien für die Erben Viktor Albertis die Leitung von Octava Music Co. Ltd. sowie für Franz Lehár die Leitung des Glocken-Verlags. Otto Blau zog sich 1962 aus dem aktiven Geschäft zurück und lebte anschließend in der Schweiz. Er starb am 27. Januar 1980 in Lugano.

Maison d'édition Friedrich Hofmeister

Friedrich Hofmeister opened a music-shop in March 1807, and started selling music by 1808. (« Franz Liszt and His World », Gibbs & Gooley, Princeton University Press, 2006 ; page 256.) It later purchased Whistling of Leipzig (1829) (apparently different from F. Whistling) , Laue & Christiani of Berlin (1832 and 1840) and Brüggemann of Halberstadt (1832) .

« Hoffmeister Monatsbericht » - Monthly publication started in 1829 giving details of publisher issues of over 330,000 titles. The portion through 1900 is now available online, as are all or most more recent volumes through 1947 (the latter through Google Books and at « Hofmeister Monatsberichte » , online at the Austrian National Library) .

In the 20th Century, it bought the rights to many publications of Ernst Chailier and Carl Merseburger.

...

« Friedrich Hofmeister Musikverlag » (abbreviated to Hofmeister) is a publisher of Classical music, founded by Friedrich Hofmeister in Leipzig, in 1807. Early listings included composers Ludwig van Beethoven, Frédéric Chopin and Franz Liszt. Hofmeister was the 1st to publish Gustav Mahler's 2nd Symphony. Pedagogical works, such as a « Violinenschule » of Hubert Ries (1841) , are still in use. The company sells sheet music internationally, including Asia and America.

Friedrich Hofmeister, born in 1787, 1st founded a music-store in Leipzig in April, 1807. Early listings include composers : Ludwig van Beethoven, Luigi Cherubini, Franz Anton Hoffmeister, Carl Maria von Weber, Johann Nepomuk Hummel, John Field and Franz Liszt.

In the early years, he published a balance of music by popular composers, pedagogical material, and young composers such as : Robert Schumann, Frédéric Chopin, Clara Wieck-Schumann and Hector Berlioz. Pedagogical volumes included a « Gitarrenschule » (guitar) by Johann Traugott Lehmann (1811) ; the « Violinenschule » (violin) of Hubert Ries (1841) is still in use, and several volumes of etudes published in the 19th Century.

Hofmeister's early publishing practices sometimes brought him into conflict with composers. In 1833, Hector Berlioz objected to publication by Hofmeister of an un-authorized 4 handed piano version of his « les Franc-Juges » Overture, saying :

« Your arranger has butchered my score, clipped its wings, and sewn it back-up again such that I find a ridiculous monster. »

Although Hofmeister maintained friendly as well as professional relations with Franz Liszt for many years, in 1839, his company published a pirated edition of 12 « Études » by Liszt, which led to later disputes with the composer.

After 1847, control of the company largely devolved onto Hofmeister's 2 sons, Adolph Moritz Hofmeister and Wilhelm Hofmeister.

Hofmeister was one of 4 major publishers to disseminate the music of Gustav Mahler and the 1st to publish Mahler's 2nd Symphony. Hofmeister also published several songs in the early 20th Century by composer Eugen Haile.

In the 20th Century, the company had various owners until its appropriation by East-Germany after World War II. It remains in operation today, with branches in Frankfurt and Leipzig.

The company supports projects of regional importance, such as « Edition Denkmäler Mitteldeutscher Barockmusik » . The collection of works by composers from Saxony, Thuringia and Saxony-Anhalt started with a « Passion » Cantata as a « pasticcio » of Johann Christoph Altnikol, Johann Sebastian Bach, Carl Heinrich Graun, Johann Kuhnau and Georg Philipp Telemann in 1997, and includes Gottfried Heinrich Stölzel's « Christmas » Cantatas (2007) and the « Bockes-Passion » (2011) .

Hofmeister kept the tradition of the publishing the works of new composers, including :

Harald Banter, Vytautas Barkauskas, Árni Egilsson, Elisenda Fábregas, Christoph Förster, Bernd Franke, Patrick Hagen, Walter Thomas Heyn, C. René Hirschfeld, Stephan König, Ralf Kubicek, Claus Kühnl, Martin Kürschner, Rainer Lischka, Rafael Lukjanik, Peter Mai, Cecilia McDowall, Kelly-Marie Murphy, Gisbert Näther, Loretta K. Notareschi, Lorenzo Palomo, Hannes Pohlit, Kateřina Růžičková, Stefan Schäfer, Kurt Schwaen, Siegfried Thiele, Karl Ottomar Treibmann, Siegfried Tiefensee and Graham Waterhouse.

...

On 20th April 1807, Friedrich Hofmeister (1782-1864) announced the founding of a music dealership and, at the same time, opened a music lending library and a music publishing house, associated with a book publishers. In the same year, Hofmeister founded a copyright office, through which he became the Leipzig representative to such eminent foreign publishers as Hug & Co (Zürich) , Ricordi & Co. (Milan) as well as August Cranz (Hamburg) . A few years later, he announced he would additionally be dealing with portraits of musicians as well as with pianos from his own workshops.

Friedrich Hofmeister gained his 1st experience in the field of publishing serving as apprentice to Breitkopf & Härtel and, subsequently, as assistant in the « Bureau de Musique » which was founded in 1800 by Franz Anton Hoffmeister and Ambrosius Kühnel. In February 1852, Friedrich Hofmeister transferred the publishing house to his sons Adolph Moritz (1802-1870) and Wilhelm Friedrich Benedict (1824-1877) , who had already been helping him for a number of years. It was mainly Adolph Hofmeister who continued the business, whilst Wilhelm became increasingly involved in natural sciences, leaving Leipzig in 1863 to take-up a professorial post in botany in Heidelberg and, in 1872, a similar post in Tübingen. He went on to become one of the leading natural scientists of his day.

The business was handed down through Wilhelm Hofmeister to the grandson of the founder, Carl Wilhelm Günther

(1878-1956) . In 1952, illegally dispossessed of the business by the SED government, he fled East-Germany and set about re-establishing the publishing house in Frankfurt. The business continued to operate in Leipzig as a « Volkseigener Betrieb » (« VEB Friedrich Hofmeister Musikverlag ») , a so-called « publicly owned company » .

Following the death of Eva Günther, in 1964, the direction of the publishing house passed to Karl Heinz Schwarze. Initially, he ran the business from Frankfurt and, from 1964, from Hofheim in Taunus.

In July 1996, he definitively re-established Leipzig as the headquarters of the publishing house.

Since 1998, this traditional Leipzig-based firm has been led by his daughter Stefanie Clement.

Friedrich Hofmeister : a versatile individual

Friedrich Hofmeister was an exceptionally versatile individual and he became a spokesman for the general interests of publishers and music-dealers. He was an energetic protagonist in the enforcement of copyright laws. It was on his initiative that the so-called Conventional-Acte came into being, a safeguard against illegal re-prints. It was signed by all the leading music-publishers of the day. At the same time, he founded the Union of Music Publishers against Musical Reprints, which later developed into the « Deutsche Musikverleger-Verband » (Union of German Publishers) or DMV. Friedrich Hofmeister became secretary of the Union.

The name Hofmeister is closely linked with developments in the field of German bibliography. In 1819, he published a few additions to the « Handbook of Musical Literature » , which was edited by Carl Friedrich Whistling. From 1829 onwards, he published monthly reports, together with abstracts, as well as the yearly catalogues of printed music and musical literature, which continued to appear up to 1990 (from 1943 in partnership with the « Deutsche Bücherei, Leipzig ») . Thus, it was thanks to Friedrich Hofmeister that Leipzig became a centre of musical bibliography.

Any assessment of Hofmeister would be incomplete without a consideration of his personal qualities. Beyond his business associations, he built-up friendships with composers which often lasted over a period of many years. In publishing their early works, he provided younger composers with the means for achieving wider recognition. In his free time, Hofmeister found relaxation in his botanical garden which he personally laid-out in Reudnitz and which was later opened to the public.

Core areas of the Hofmeister Music-Publisher

Even in the early publisher's catalogues, virtually all the eminent composers of the day were represented - among them : Ludwig van Beethoven, Luigi Cherubini, Franz Anton Hoffmeister, Carl Maria von Weber, Johann Nepomuk Hummel, John Field, Frédéric Chopin, Antonín Dvořák and Franz Liszt. Among the lesser-known composers also represented are names such as : Albert Gottlieb Methfessel, Friedrich Kuhlau, Franz Wieck, Carl Czerny, Friedrich Kalkbrenner, Ignaz Moscheles, Theodor Kirchner and Heinrich Marschner.

The early works of Robert Schumann, Clara Wieck-Schumann, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Charles Bériot, Hector Berlioz

and, at a later date, of Antonín Dvořák appeared for the 1st time in Germany with the Friedrich Hofmeister Publishers.

From its very beginnings, Hofmeister Publishers placed particular emphasis on the publishing of special editions for educational purposes, other priorities being chamber music and domestic music making. Numerous tutors and volumes of studies bear witness to this, many of which date from the earliest times of the publishers. The 1st Guitar tutor of Johann Traugott Lehmann appeared as early as 1811. Tutors for other instruments followed and appeared in numerous editions. The « Violin Tutor » of Hubert Ries, which 1st appeared in 1841, is still in use today. Many sets of studies published in the 19th Century still form part of the standard teaching literature.

Founder shows foresight

The fact that the profile of Hofmeister Publishers has never significantly changed testifies to the foresight of the founder. The repertoire has since widened, whereby the respective fashions of the age have always influenced the type and selection of the editions and the attempts have always been made to realize new ideas.

Songs accompanied by plucked instruments, for instance, enjoyed great popularity during the 1st 10 years of the 20th Century. So also did collections of folk-dances, arrangements for orchestras of folk-instruments as well as collections of songs. Probably the most popular collection, one that is still known today, is « Der Zupfgeigenhansl ». In 1920 alone, the print run reached 120,000 copies.

Today, the catalogue covers virtually every instrument of the orchestra as well as piano, organ, recorder, guitar, mandoline, accordion and a wide selection of choral literature.

Critical 1st editions or new publications take their place beside publications prepared from a didactic point of view for pedagogical purposes and a wide variety of performing literature for domestic music making and for the concert-hall.

Among the editors and arrangers associated with the publishing house are eminent instrumentalists, pedagogues and musicologists, amongst others, Günter Angerhöfer, Sergio Azzolini, Peter Bruns, Peter Damm, Tobias Glöckler, Ludwig Güttler, Klaus Hertel, Werner Seltmann, Klaus Trumpf and William Waterhouse.

Particular emphasis has been placed on orchestral studies for all instruments. For many decades, these have been known in the musical world as « Hofmeister Orchesterstudien » (Hofmeister Orchestral Studies) . Recently, a new project within this field has been initiated : a chronologically arranged collection of orchestral studies for bassoon taken from works from the international repertoire from Bach up to the present-day, hitherto unique in scale and conception.

Press and releases

Since 1997, Hofmeister has published the series « Denkmäler mitteldeutscher Barockmusik » (monuments of Baroque music central Germany) , edited by the « Ständigen Konferenz Mitteldeutsche Barockmusik in Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt und Thüringen » (commission for central German Baroque music in Saxony, Saxon-Anhalt, and Thuringia) . These

representative editions contribute to the dissemination of hitherto un-published works from central Germany and are intended to stimulate musicological and practical activities within the cultural heritage.

A similar project is the series « Music from the Court of Rheinsberg », which was begun in 1999. The aim of this series is to make publicly available compositions from the musical life of the Court of Rheinsberg in « Urtext » editions. The series began with the works of Christoph Schaffrath.

It is not just the musical past, however, which characterizes the latest work of the publishers. Just as the founder of the publishing house once represented the composers of his day, so Hofmeister publishers are actively involved with music of the present-day.

...

Friedrich Hofmeister (geboren 24. Januar 1782 in Strehla ; gestorben 30. September 1864 in Reudnitz) war ein deutscher Verleger. Er eröffnete im Jahr 1807 eine Musikalienhandlung aus der ein eigener Musikverlag in Leipzig hervorging. In den 1950er Jahren wurde aus dem Verlag ein Volkseigener Betrieb (VEB) .

Kenntnisse über die Verlagstätigkeit hatte Hofmeister als Lehrling bei Breitkopf & Härtel und anschließend als Gehilfe im Bureau de Musique, das 1800 von Franz Anton Hoffmeister (1754-1812) und Ambrosius Kühnel gegründet worden war, erworben.

Friedrich Hofmeister setzte sich nachdrücklich für allgemeine Belange der Verleger und Musikalienhändler ein. Er war ein energischer Verfechter des Urheberschutzes. Auf sein Betreiben wurde im Jahr 1829 die « Conventional-Acte » zum Schutz gegen unerlaubten Nachdruck von allen führenden Musikverlegern der Zeit unterzeichnet und gleichzeitig der Verein der Musikverleger gegen musikalischen Nachdruck gegründet, aus dem später der Deutsche Musikverleger-Verband (DMV) hervorging. Friedrich Hofmeister wurde Sekretär des Vereins.

Untrennbar verbunden ist der Name Hofmeister auch mit der Herausbildung des deutschen Bibliophileswesens : Seit 1819 druckte er zunächst einige Nachträge zu dem von Carl Friedrich Whistling herausgegebenen Handbuch der musikalischen Literatur, und (anknüpfend daran) publizierte er seit 1829 die Musikalisch-Literarischen Monatsberichte sowie deren Zusammenfassungen, die Jahresverzeichnisse der Musikalien und Musikschriften, die noch bis 1990 erschienen sind (ab 1943 in Partnerschaft mit der Deutschen Bücherei, Leipzig) . Leipzig wurde somit durch Friedrich Hofmeister zum Zentrum der Musikbibliographie.

Der Verlag gab ab der vierten Auflage das Liederbuch Der Zupfgeigenhansl heraus, dessen 10. Auflage von 1913 heute noch die Grundlage von Nachdrucken darstellt.

Zu vielen Komponisten baute Hofmeister über die geschäftlichen Kontakte hinaus Freundschaften auf, die jahrelang währten ; jungen Komponisten gab er durch die Veröffentlichung ihrer Frühwerke die Chance, bekannt zu werden. Hofmeister legte in Reudnitz einen Botanischen Garten an, den er der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich machte. Sein Sohn ist der Botaniker Wilhelm Hofmeister (1824-1877) , nach dem in Leipzig die Hofmeisterstraße benannt ist. Wie später auch

der Sohn wurde Friedrich Hofmeister 1825 in die Leipziger Freimaurerloge « Apollo » aufgenommen.

...

Der Friedrich Hofmeister Musikverlag ist ein Verlag für klassische Musik, der 1807 von Friedrich Hofmeister in Leipzig gegründet wurde. Der Verlag ist bis heute in den Händen der Familie des Firmengründers geblieben. Zum Verlag gehört ein Musiklabel für klassische Musik. Außer in Deutschland ist der Verlag im Musikalienhandel auch international tätig, und andere in Europa, Asien oder Amerika.

Am 20. April 1807 gründete Friedrich Hofmeister im Graphischen Viertel von Leipzig eine Musikalienhandlung und eröffnete gleichzeitig ein Musikalien-Leihinstitut und einen Musikverlag mit angegliedertem Buchverlag. Im gleichen Jahr gründete Hofmeister eine Kommissionsabteilung, durch die er Verlage des In- und Auslandes wie Hug & Co. (Zürich) , Ricordi & Co. (Mailand) , August Cranz (Hamburg) in Leipzig vertreten konnte. Einige Jahre kam der Handel mit Musikerporträts und Klavieren aus eigener Fabrikation hinzu.

Kenntnisse über die Verlagstätigkeit hatte Hofmeister als Lehrling bei Breitkopf & Härtel und anschließend als Gehilfe im « Bureau de Musique » , das 1800 von Franz Anton Hoffmeister und Ambrosius Kühnel gegründet worden war, erworben. 1852 übertrug er den Verlag seinen Söhnen Adolph Moritz (1802-1870) und Wilhelm Friedrich Benedict (1824-1877) . Vor allem Adolph Hofmeister führte in der Zukunft den Verlag weiter, während sich Wilhelm zunehmend den Naturwissenschaften widmete, 1863 Leipzig verließ, um eine Professur für Botanik in Heidelberg und ab 1872 in Tübingen anzunehmen. Er wurde zu einem der führenden Naturwissenschaftler seiner Zeit.

Über die Nachkommen Wilhelm Hofmeisters vererbte sich das Geschäft an den Urenkel seines Gründers, an Carl Wilhelm Günther (1878-1956) . Günther wurde 1952 durch die DDR-Regierung enteignet, floh in den Westen und begann in Frankfurt-am-Main mit dem Wiederaufbau des Verlages. Gleichzeitig bestand die Firma in Leipzig als Volkseigener Betrieb (VEB) Friedrich Hofmeister Musikverlag weiter.

Der westdeutsche Zweig des Hofmeisterverlags wurde in Hofheim am Taunus weitergeführt. 1964 ging der Verlag an den Erben Karl Heinz Schwarze über, der ihn zunächst in Frankfurt und ab 1964 in Hofheim am Taunus weiterführte. 1992 erfolgte die Restitution des ehemaligen VEB-Verlages. 1996 kehrte der Verlag wieder an seinen Gründungsort Leipzig (Graphisches Viertel) zurück. Seit 1998 ist Stefanie Clement (« née » Schwarze) Geschäftsführerin des Verlages.

In den frühesten Verlagsverzeichnissen sind Ludwig van Beethoven, Luigi Cherubini, Franz Anton Hoffmeister, Carl Maria von Weber, Johann Nepomuk Hummel, John Field, Frédéric Chopin, Antonín Dvořák oder Franz Liszt sowie Albert Gottlieb Methfessel, Friedrich Kuhlau, Franz Wieck, Carl Czerny, Friedrich Kalkbrenner, Ignaz Moscheles, Theodor Kirchner oder Heinrich Marschner zu finden.

Erstmals in Deutschland erschienen hier und andere die Frühwerke von Robert Schumann, Clara Wieck-Schumann, Friedrich Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Charles Bériot, Hector Berlioz und später Antonín Dvořák. Von Anfang an war ein Verlagsschwerpunkt (neben der Edition von Werken der Haus- und Kammermusik) spezielle Ausgaben für den Unterricht

zu veröffentlichen. Bereits 1811 erschien die erste Gitarrenscheule von Johann Traugott Lehmann. Weitere Schulen für andere Instrumente folgten und erschienen in zahlreichen Auflagen. Die Violinenscheule von Hubert Ries, Erstaussgabe 1841, ist noch heute in Gebrauch. Auch zahlreiche Etüdenwerke, die im 19. Jahrhundert verlegt wurden, gehören noch immer zur Standardliteratur für die Instrumentalausbildung.

In ersten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jahrhunderts wurde das Verlagsprogramm um Lieder mit Begleitung von Zupfinstrumenten erweitert, ebenso kamen Volkstanzsammlungen, Arrangements für Volksinstrumentenorchester und Liedersammlungen hinzu. Die bekannteste Sammlung ist « Der Zupfgeigenhansl », der in der Jugendbewegung einen großen Stellenwert einnahm. Allein 1920 wurde er in einer Auflage von 120.000 Exemplaren gedruckt.

Heute umfasst das Verlagsprogramm Ausgaben für Orchesterinstrumente sowie für Klavier, Orgel, Blockflöte, Gitarre, Mandoline und Akkordeon und Chorliteratur. Quellenkritische Erst- beziehungsweise Neudrucke stehen neben didaktisch aufbereiteten Publikationen für den Unterricht und Spielliteratur für das häusliche Musizieren und zum Konzertieren. Einen Schwerpunkt bilden die Orchesterstudien für alle Instrumente, die als « Hofmeister Orchesterstudien » erscheinen. Weiterhin erschien eine chronologisch geordnete Sammlung von Orchesterstudien für Fagott aus Werken der Weltliteratur von Johann Sebastian Bach bis zur Gegenwart.

Seit 1997 erscheint im Hofmeister Verlag die von der « Ständigen Konferenz Mitteldeutsche Barockmusik in Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt und Thüringen eingetragener Verein » herausgegebene Reihe « Denkmäler mitteldeutscher Barockmusik ». Ein ähnliches Projekt ist die seit 1999 erscheinende Ausgabenreihe « Rheinsberger Hofmusik », die Kompositionen aus dem Rheinsberger Musikleben in Urtext-Editionen allgemein zugänglich macht. Begonnen wurde mit Werken von Christoph Schaffrath.

Hofmeister verlegt zeitgenössische Musik von Komponisten wie Harald Banter, Vytautas Barkauskas, Árni Egilsson, Elisenda Fábregas, Christoph Förster, Bernd Franke, Patrick Hagen, Walter Thomas Heyn, C. René Hirschfeld, Stephan König, Ralf Kubicek, Claus Kühnl, Martin Kürschner, Rainer Lischka, Rafael Lukjanik, Peter Mai, Cecilia McDowall, Kelly-Marie Murphy, Gisbert Näther, Loretta K. Notareschi, Lorenzo Palomo, Hannes Pohlit, Kateřina Růžicková, Stefan Schäfer, Kurt Schwaen, Siegfried Thiele, Karl Ottomar Treibmann, Siegfried Tiefensee and Graham Waterhouse.

Maison d'édition Bristol

Der Stifter Herbert Uhl wurde am 9. Dezember 1907 in Hamburg geboren und verstarb am 9. November 1997 in Baden-Baden (Baden-Württemberg). Sein Vater Conrad Uhl war ein bekannter Hotelier, seine Mutter eine gebürtige US-Amerikanerin. Nach Kinder- und Jugendjahren in Berlin, Hamburg, in den USA und in der Schweiz (während des I. Weltkrieges), ging Herbert Uhl 1921 nach dem Tode seines Vaters mit seiner Mutter in die Vereinigten Staaten. Er besuchte in Amerika die Highschool und das Dartmouth College in Hanover NH USA. Später zog die Mutter wieder in die Schweiz, wo Herbert Uhl an der Handelshochschule Sankt Gallen studierte und später in London in einer Bank volontierte. Ab 1928 lebte er in Berlin, wo er seine Frau Ruth Lenzian kennen lernte und 1932 heiratete. Und andere war Herbert Uhl in dieser Zeit auch als Verleger tätig (zum Beispiel für Riccarda Huch). Dort lebte das Ehepaar bis 1939. Die Kriegereignisse führten zu mehreren Wohnungswechseln, so nach Zürich und 1941 nach Liechtenstein. Nach

vielen Jahren mit grösseren Pass-Problemen (weil ihm die Amerikaner seinen Pass nicht mehr verlängerten) konnte er sich in Liechtenstein einbürgern. Er kaufte in Schaan ein Grundstück, baute sein Haus in einem von ihm gepflanzten Park. Er sollte es dann bis zu seinem Lebensende behalten. Später lebte er in Wien und wieder in Zürich, 1979 kehrte er aus Altersgründen in das Land seiner Geburt zurück und wohnte in Baden-Baden, wo seine Frau im Jahre 1988 verstarb.

Bereits 1951 wurde Herbert Uhl Hauptgesellschafter und Geschäftsführer einer 1848 gegründeten Brauerei in Rastatt (Baden-Württemberg). Die nach dem II. Weltkrieg wieder aufgebaute und unter Denkmalschutz stehende Anlage war der Mittelpunkt im Leben des Stifters und ist laut testamentarischer Verfügung Bestandteil der Stiftung. Herbert Uhl hat die bewegte Zeit, in der er lebte, in einer Schrift « Dreimal Brandenburger Tor », 1991 im Battert-Verlag, Baden-Baden erschienen, beschrieben. Das Ehepaar Uhl war besonders tierliebend und wollte mit dieser Stiftung für die Natur etwas Gutes tun.

La maison d'édition Franz Ernst Christoph Leuckart

F.E.C. Leuckart was founded 1782 in Breslau (now, Wrocław) by Franz Ernst Christoph Leuckart (1748-1817). After Leuckart's death in 1817, his widow continued running the business, followed by their 2 children Carl August Ferdinand and Auguste Henriette. They were being supported by the latter's husband Johann Carl Wilhelm Sander (1786-1859). The son Constantin Sander (1826-1905) continued the business, and his name appeared on scores until the 1890's. Throughout the 19th Century, production was vigorous; HMB notes 3,217 items between 1829 and 1900. During the Breslau years, the catalog contained both church music (Hahn) and dances (Lanner), piano pieces (Spindler), violin pieces (Schœn) and songs (Abt, Gumbert, Genee).

The company moved to Leipzig in 1870. Publication of songs (Jael, Franz), piano pieces (Jadassohn, Bendix, Wilm, Hiller) and violin pieces (Schœn, Dont, Becker, Michælis, Ferdinand Ries, Sauret, Saran) continued. In the 20th Century, members of the Sander family managed the company. 1907 saw the acquisition of Heinrich vom Ende's publishing company (of Trier). In 1941, under the Nazi Aryanization policy, the firm took-over Eulenburg. Horst Sander died in captivity in 1945, and his family moved to Munich that year. Despite damage in the War, the firm continued until 1994, although the Sander connection ceased practically in 1945, and legally in 1956.

La maison d'édition Hans C. Sikorski

The corner-stone of the publishing company was laid by Doctor Hans C. Sikorski (1899-1972) in the year 1935, following activities as principle managing director of the « Deutsches Studentenwerk » in Dresden, which he helped to found, as publishing director of the press concern Mosse as well as editor of the renowned journal « Die geistige Arbeit » (The Spiritual Work) published by Walter de Gruyter with the « Neuer Theaterverlag » in Berlin. Already within just a few years, the new theatre and music publishing company had already attained considerable weight in the areas of dance and entertainment music as well as in dramatic and music-dramatic literature. During this period of ever-present political repression, in the cultural sector as well, the young enterprise nonetheless grew rapidly. An additional factor was that numerous, mostly Jewish, owners of publishing companies were forced to sell their

enterprises by the National-Socialist regime, some of which were continued by Sikorski (whilst continuing to employ the former owners abroad, in some cases) and were considerably expanded in their catalogues during the course of the ensuing years.

The most serious destruction of the publishers' possessions in Berlin and Leipzig was caused by the bombings of the year 1943. Following interim stations in Bad Aussee and Bad Kissingen, Sikorski set-up its new headquarters in Hamburg in 1946, where, along with Johann August Böhme (Germany's oldest music assortment, founded in 1795), the only part of the enterprise that had remained halfway intact was located. Following detention by the Allies, continuous de-nazification procedures and recovery of its publishing license, Sikorski gave-back the « Aryanized » publishing companies during the course of various restitution procedures and / or re-imbursed their original owners. Many composers of the pre-War period remained true to the publishers ; emigrants such as Hugo Hirsch (« Wer wird denn weinen, wenn man auseinander geht ») and Kurt Schwabach entrusted their works to the publishing company after their return.

STAGMA et GEMA

The « Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte » (Society for musical performing and mechanical reproduction rights), or GEMA, is a State-authorized collecting society and performance rights organization based in Germany, with administrative offices in Berlin and Munich. GEMA represents the usage rights stemming from authors' rights (e.g., mechanical licensing, broadcast licensing, synchronization licensing) for the musical works of those composers, lyricists, and publishers who are members in the organization. It is the only such institution in Germany. Other collecting societies include the « Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger » (AKM) in Austria and SUISA in Switzerland.

Upon coming into effect in January 1902, the Law Concerning Author's Rights to Works of Literature and Musical Art (« Gesetz betreffend das Urheberrecht an Werken der Literatur und der Tonkunst ») set-down in law that the public performance of a musical work required the permission of the author.

The Consortium of German Composers (« Genossenschaft Deutscher Tonsetzer », or GDT) subsequently founded the Institute for Musical Performing Rights (« Anstalt für musikalische Aufführungsrechte », or AFMA) in 1903. This came much later than in other States such as France, where the collecting society SACEM had already been founded in 1851, having its roots in the Agence Centrale, an interest group of musicians and publishers. Founders of the AFMA included Richard Strauß, Hans Sommer and Friedrich Rösch. The GDT was headed by some of the most successful composers of the time, including Engelbert Humperdinck, Georg Schumann and most notably Richard Strauß.

In 1904, the GDT published a memorandum on the spirit and purpose of the AFMA, as there remained a great deal of confusion - as much among musicians as among event promoters and users. A central point of the memo was the following paragraph, most of whose contents now appear in the association rules of GEMA :

« The Institute pursues absolutely no private business purposes. It is only an intermediary agency. It does not collect

reserve funds. A trade profit is out of the question. Administrative costs will be deducted from incoming fees, along with a further 10 % contribution to the co-operative's relief fund. All remaining income, down to the last penny, will be distributed to the beneficiary composers, lyricists, and publishers. »

The time after the foundation of the AFMA was quite turbulent.

In 1909, the GDT founded a 2nd society focused exclusively on the exploitation of mechanical reproduction for vinyl records, the Institute for Mechanical-Musical Rights LLC (« Anstalt für mechanisch-musikalische Rechte GmbH », or AMMRE) .

In 1913, the Austrian Society of Authors, Composers, and Music Publishers (« Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger », or AKM) entered the German market and opened a German branch-office.

In 1915, a few members of the GDT split off from the organization and founded GEMA (« Genossenschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte », which is not identical to the present-day GEMA) . One of the founding members was composer Leon Jessel. In 1916, GEMA and AKM's German branch merged into the Association for the Protection of Musical Performing Rights in Germany (« Verband zum Schutze musikalischer Aufführungsrechte für Deutschland ») .

All of this resulted in a situation that had effects contrary to the original interests of authors and promoters as well as users - that is, 2 competing collecting societies.

In 1930, the GDT (in the form of the AFMA) joined with the « Verband » under the label « Verband zum Schutze musikalischer Aufführungsrechte für Deutschland » . However, the business units and facilities of both societies were not impacted by the consolidation. Both collecting societies continued to operate separately - all the while pretending to operate under a unified corporate name.

This came to an end during the 3rd « Reich » with the « Reich » Law regarding the Intermediation of Musical Performance Rights (« Reichsgesetz über die Vermittlung von Musikaufführungsrechten ») . The legislator responsible for this law, Josef Goebbels, did so with the aim of bringing all collecting societies into line and granting them a monopoly position.

On September 28, 1933, the State-Approved Society for the Exploitation of Musical Performing Rights (« Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte », or STAGMA) arose-out of the « Verband zum Schutze musikalischer Aufführungsrechte für Deutschland » and was issued a monopoly on the exercise of musical performing rights. The still-existing AMMRE was annexed into STAGMA, in 1938. The « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Music, or RMK) , under the direction of then-president Richard Strauß, stipulated in its guide-lines that, « non-Aryans are categorically not to be viewed as bearers and stewards of German cultural goods » . This amounted to an occupational ban on the approximately 8,000 Jews active in the « Reichsmusikkammer » . STAGMA was tightly enmeshed in the Nazi power structure, and the leading members of STAGMA were die-hard and voluntary Nazis. The

CEO of STAGMA was Leo Ritter, who occupied the same position in the original GEMA and was in the habit of giving Adolf Hitler's « Mein Kampf » as a prize to worthy employees.

STAGMA continued its work after the Second World War, but under the title of GEMA (« Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte ») starting from August 24, 1947. Erich Schulze was the chairman and general director from 1947 to 1989, to whom was dedicated the Erich Schulze Fountain in front of the GEMA headquarters in Munich. Starting in 1950, the chairman of the board of directors was Werner Egk. Both Schulze and Egk already occupied leading positions in STAGMA. Albrecht Dümling's book, « Musik hat ihren Wert » (Music has its Value) was published to mark the 100-year anniversary of the 1st collecting society in Germany. This book shed light on the role of the collecting society after the Nazi era.

In 1950, after the founding of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and the partition of Germany (and as a consequence of the division in currencies) , a society with comparable functions came into being in the GDR, the Institute for the Preservation of Performing and Reproduction Rights in the Area of Music (« Anstalt zur Wahrung der Aufführungs- und Vervielfältigungsrechte auf dem Gebiet der Musik » , or AWA) .

...

Die Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte (GEMA) ist eine staatlich legitimierte Verwertungsgesellschaft, die in Deutschland mit ihren Generaldirektionen in Berlin und München die Nutzungsrechte aus dem Urheberrecht von denjenigen Komponisten, Textdichtern und Verlegern von Musikwerken wahrnimmt, die als Mitglied in ihr organisiert sind. Gegründet wurde die GEMA 1903, allerdings hatten ihre Vorläuferorganisationen noch wechselnde Namen, weshalb ihr namentlicher Start auf 1933 zurückzuführen ist.

Mit dem Inkrafttreten des Gesetzes betreffend das Urheberrecht an Werken der Literatur und Tonkunst im Januar 1902 wurde niedergeschrieben, daß es zur öffentlichen Aufführung eines musikalischen Werkes der Genehmigung eines jeden Autors bedarf.

In der Folge wurde von der Genossenschaft Deutscher Tonsetzer (GDT) am 1. Juli 1903 die Anstalt für musikalisches Aufführungsrecht (AFMA) gegründet. Dies ist deutlich später als zum Beispiel in Frankreich, wo bereits 1851 die Verwertungsgesellschaft SACEM gegründet wurde, deren Ursprünge in einem Interessenverband aus Musikern und Verlegern, der Agence Centrale, zu finden sind.

Initiatoren des Gründungsprozesses in Deutschland waren Richard Strauß, Hans Sommer und Friedrich Rösch. Geführt wurde die GDT von den erfolgreichsten Komponisten der Ersten Musik (E-Musik) der damaligen Zeit, unter anderem von Engelbert Humperdinck, Georg Schumann und vor allem von Richard Strauß. Der Vorstand der GDT war gleichzeitig der Vorstand der AFMA.

1904 wurde von der GDT eine Denkschrift zum Zweck und Sinn der AFMA veröffentlicht, da sowohl unter Musikern als auch unter Veranstaltern und Nutzern noch große Verwirrung bestand. Zentraler Punkt der Schrift ist folgender Abschnitt,

dessen Sinngehalt zum Großteil auch heute noch in der Vereinssatzung der GEMA zu finden ist :

« Die Anstalt verfolgt keinerlei privatwirtschaftliche Zwecke. Sie ist nur eine Vermittlungsstelle. Einen Reservefonds sammelt sie nicht. Ein Geschäftsgewinn ist für sie ausgeschlossen. Von den eingegangenen Gebühren werden die Verwaltungskosten abgezogen, ferner ein Betrag von 10 % für die Unterstützungskasse der Genossenschaft. Sämtliche übrigen Einnahmen werden bis auf den letzten Pfennig an die bezugsberechtigten Tonsetzer, Textdichter und Verleger verteilt. »

Nach Gründung der AFMA wurde es in Deutschland recht turbulent. Die GDT/AFMA schloß im Herbst 1903 einen Gegenseitigkeitsvertrag mit der österreichischen « Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musik-Verleger » (AKM) , der eine Vereinbarung zwischen AFMA und AKM darstellte.

1909 gründete die GDT eine zweite Gesellschaft, welche sich ausschließlich mit der Verwertung mechanischer Vervielfältigungsrechte für Schallplatten befasste, die Anstalt für mechanisch-musikalische Rechte GmbH (AMMRE) .

Am 1. Januar 1911 löste die AKM den Gegenseitigkeitsvertrag mit der GDT/AFMA. 1913 kündigten 51 Verleger und Komponisten ihren Berechtigungsvertrag mit der GDT/AFMA. Der Berechtigungsvertrag der AFMA wurde durch das Reichsgericht als « nichtig » angesehen. Daraufhin wurde eine Zusatzvereinbarung durch die E-Musik-Komponisten verfasst, die der AFMA beziehungsweise dem Vorstand der GDT die Weiterführung des AFMA-Berechtigungsvertrages erlaubte.

Am 16. Dezember 1915 wurde die Genossenschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte GEMA gegründet, deren Vorstand und Aufsichtsrat vorwiegend aus Komponisten, Textdichtern und Verlegern der Unterhaltungsmusik (U-Musik) bestand. Zum Vorstand wählte man die Verleger Hermann Rauh und Robert Lienau sowie die Komponisten Heinrich G. Noren und Victor Holländer. Der Aufsichtsrat bestand aus 9 Mitgliedern : Als Verleger Volkmann, Örtel, Hoffmann, Stahl ; als Komponisten Edgar Istel, Johannes Dölber, Walter Kollo ; als Textdichter Robert David Winterfeld (Robert Gilbert) und Max Reichardt.

Am 20. Februar 1916 verband sich die GEMA mit der AKM zu einem « Verband zum Schutze musikalischer Aufführungsrechte für Deutschland » . Damit war in Deutschland eine Situation geschaffen, die völlig entgegen den ursprünglichen Interessen von Urhebern und Veranstaltern beziehungsweise Nutzern wirkte - zwei konkurrierende Verwertungsgesellschaften. AFMA = E-Musikautoren /GEMA/AKM = U-Musikautoren.

Nun wurde der bereits spätestens seit Gründung der GDT durch Richard Strauß und Friedrich Rösch betriebene Kampf gegen die von ihnen als « Afterkunst » bezeichneten U-Musik-Autoren erst richtig schädigend. Es folgte ein jahrelanger wütender Kampf, den Richard Bars, der 1924 Mitglied im Aufsichtsrat der GEMA wurde, wie folgt beschrieb :

« Es war nicht bloß eine Sturm-und-Drang-Periode, sondern ein echter Kampfeszustand. » = E-Musik gegen U-Musik.

Am 22. Juli 1930 unterzeichneten Leo Ritter, Gustav Bock, Fritz Oliven, Eduard Künneke und Jean Gilbert (GEMA) , Max

Butting, Arnold Ebel und Heinz Tiessen (GDT/AFMA) sowie Bernhard Herzmansky und Alfred Kalmus (AKM) in Berlin den Vertrag über den neuen « Verband zum Schutze musikalischer Aufführungsrechte für Deutschland » . Die Geschäftsstelle blieb unter der GEMA-Adresse in der Linkstraße 16 unter der Bezeichnung GEMA-AKM-Organisation. Die GDT war nun nur noch eine von mehreren Komponistenorganisationen. Richard Strauß übernahm den ihm angebotenen Ehrenvorsitz der GDT.

Die Partner GDT/AFMA, GEMA und AKM hatten mit dem Schutzverband (GEMA-AKM-Organisation) eine gemeinsame Inkassostelle gegründet, existierten sonst aber selbstständig weiter. So fungierte die GDT weiterhin als Interessenvertretung vor allem der ernstesten Komponisten. Arnold Schönberg hatte es strikt abgelehnt, mit Unterhaltungskomponisten gemeinsame Sache zu machen. Ausgelöst durch einen Artikel im « Schaffenden Musiker » kritisierte er 1931 in einem Brief an Max Butting heftig das Nebeneinander von E- und U-Musik in einer Verwertungsgesellschaft :

« Es ist unmöglich im gleichen Geschäft Perlen, Diamanten, Radium und sonstige teure Dinge zu handeln, wo auch Stecknadeln, alte Hosen und Ramschware verkauft werden. Und es wird nie möglich sein, eine Arbeit, die so viel Zeit erfordert wie die Kontrolle der Schlager und Versageraufführungen zu verrichten, und daneben die Genauigkeit und feine Abschätzung für seltenere Ware zu haben, wie sie die ernste Musik beansprucht. »

Anfang 1932 konnte die AFMA auf ein erstes Jahr gemeinsamer Zusammenarbeit mit GEMA und AKM zurückblicken. Dieses erste normale Jahr nach der Krise verlief, wie der Geschäftsbericht der AFMA vermerkte, reibungslos nach innen, und gemeinsam mit der GEMA wurde der Vertrag mit der ASCAP (USA) getätigt.

Am 24. März 1933 fand auf Betreiben der GEMA eine außerordentliche Generalversammlung statt. Auch auf Seiten der GEMA erkannte man jetzt die Notwendigkeit einer einzigen reichsdeutschen Aufführungsrechtsgesellschaft. Bei ausdrücklicher Betonung der Verbundenheit und Freundschaft zu den österreichischen Kollegen und der österreichischen Schwestergesellschaft erklärte Leo Ritter für die GEMA und Max Butting für die AFMA die Bereitschaft zur Vereinigung der beiden Gesellschaften und zur Gründung einer neuen einzigen reichsdeutschen Aufführungsgesellschaft. Eine mit großer Mehrheit verabschiedete Resolution, die der Komponist Hans Bullerian formuliert hatte, lobte die Umgestaltung der GEMA im Sinne der neuen Regierung und forderte Entsprechendes für die GDT/AFMA. Es solle in Zukunft nur noch eine einzige Standesorganisation der Komponisten geben, nämlich die GDT, und eine einzige Wirtschaftsorganisation, die GEMA.

Am 28. September 1933 wurde der Staatlich genehmigten Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte (STAGMA) , hervorgegangen aus dem Verband zum Schutze musikalischer Aufführungsrechte für Deutschland (GEMA-AFMA) , das Monopol zur Wahrnehmung von Musikaufführungsrechten erteilt. Die zu dieser Zeit immer noch existierende Anstalt für mechanisch-musikalische Rechte von 1909 (AMMRE) wurde 1938 an die STAGMA angegliedert. Die Reichsmusikkammer unter ihrem Präsidenten Richard Strauß hatte 1934 in ihren Richtlinien festgelegt, daß « Nichtarier grundsätzlich nicht als geeignete Träger und Verwalter deutschen Kulturguts anzusehen » seien. Dies bedeutete das Berufsverbot für die damals etwa 8.000 in der Reichsmusikkammer organisierten Juden. Die STAGMA war fest in das nationalsozialistische Machtgefüge eingebunden und die leitenden Mitglieder der STAGMA waren eingeffleischte und

freiwillige Nationalsozialisten. Geschäftsführer der Stagma wurde Leo Ritter, der dieses Amt schon seit 1928 bei der ursprünglichen GEMA innehatte und Hitlers « Mein Kampf » als Prämie für verdiente Mitarbeiter zu verschenken pflegte.

Nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg führte die STAGMA ihre Arbeit fort, ab dem 24. August 1947 allerdings unter der Bezeichnung GEMA, Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte. Vorstand und Generaldirektor von 1947 bis 1989 war Erich Schulze, ihm widmete die GEMA den gleichnamigen Brunnen vor der Generaldirektion in München. Aufsichtsratsvorsitzender war ab 1950 der Komponist Werner Ekg. Sowohl Schulze als auch Ekg hatten schon in der STAGMA führende Positionen bekleidet. Zum 100-jährigen Bestehen der musikalischen Verwertungsgesellschaft in Deutschland erschien das wissenschaftlich belegte Buch Musik hat ihren Wert von Albrecht Dümling. Dieses stellt ausführlich den Werdegang der urheberrechtlichen Verwertung seit der Gründung des « Gesetzes betreffend das Urheberrecht an Werken der Literatur und der Tonkunst » im Jahr 1902 dar und es beleuchtet die Rolle der Verwertungsgesellschaft nach der Zeit der nationalsozialistischen Diktatur.

Nach Gründung der DDR und der Spaltung Deutschlands sowie als Folge der Währungsspaltung, entstand am 1. April 1951 in der DDR die AWA (Anstalt zur Wahrung der Aufführungs- und Vervielfältigungsrechte auf dem Gebiet der Musik) , eine Gesellschaft mit vergleichbaren Aufgaben.

L' « Anschluß » à Vienne

L' « Anschluß » est l'annexion de l'Autriche par l'Allemagne nazie, le 12 mars 1938.

Les événements de 1938 ont marqué le point culminant des pressions transnationales pour unifier les populations allemandes et autrichiennes au sein d'une même nation. Dans les années qui précédèrent l' « Anschluß » , l'Allemagne nazie avait soutenu le Parti Nazi autrichien dans sa tentative de conquérir le pouvoir et de doter l'Autriche d'un gouvernement nazi. Totalement attaché à l'indépendance de son pays, mais soumis à des pressions grandissantes, le chancelier autrichien, Kurt von Schuschnigg, tenta d'organiser un référendum pour demander à la population autrichienne si elle souhaitait rester indépendante ou être incorporée à l'Allemagne.

Alors que le chancelier espérait un résultat favorable au maintien de l'indépendance de l'Autriche, le Parti Nazi autrichien organisa un coup d'État, planifié de longue date, le 11 mars 1938, peu avant le référendum qui fut annulé. Le pouvoir ayant été transféré à l'Allemagne, les troupes de la « Wehrmacht » entrèrent en Autriche pour soutenir l'annexion, sans rencontrer la moindre opposition. Au cours du mois suivant, les Nazis organisèrent un plébiscite, demandant au peuple de ratifier le rattachement de l'Autriche au « Reich » , qui, de facto, avait déjà eu lieu : 99 % des votes furent favorables à l'annexion.

Si les Alliés de la Première Guerre mondiale étaient, en théorie, responsables du respect des termes du traité de Versailles et du traité de Saint-Germain-en-Laye, qui prohibaient une union entre l'Allemagne et l'Autriche, l' « Anschluß » ne suscita que peu de protestations de la France ou du Royaume-Uni, protestations qui furent d'ailleurs uniquement diplomatiques et n'eurent aucun effet.

L'« Anschluss » fut une des étapes majeures dans la création, voulue depuis longtemps par Adolf Hitler, d'un « Reich » regroupant les pays et territoires germanophones. Avant l'« Anschluss », l'Allemagne avait déjà récupéré la Rhénanie et la Sarre, après 15 années d'occupation par les troupes françaises ; après l'annexion de l'Autriche, elle s'empara du territoire des Sudètes, en Tchécoslovaquie, le reste du pays étant transformé en protectorat, en 1939. Au cours de la même année, l'Allemagne annexa également le territoire de Memel, en Lituanie, ce qui constitua le dernier agrandissement territorial du 3e « Reich » sans recours aux armes, avant le déclenchement de la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

L'« Anschluss » entraîna une profonde « nazification » de la société autrichienne, qui laissa encore des traces dans l'histoire politique récente du pays, et l'Autriche cessa d'exister en tant qu'État indépendant jusqu'en 1945. Considérée comme « la 1re victime du Nazisme » par les Alliés, l'Autriche fut dotée d'un gouvernement provisoire, le 27 avril 1945, lors de sa libération par l'Armée rouge. Elle retrouva sa pleine souveraineté en 1955.

Le projet de regrouper tous les Allemands au sein d'un seul État fait l'objet de débats sans suite concrète depuis la fin du Saint-Empire germanique, en 1806. En 1848, le parlement de Francfort émet le vœu de rassembler tous les Allemands en un seul État national homogène, intégrant les Allemands autrichiens et rejetant la monarchie multi-nationale des Habsbourgs. En 1850, l'Autriche rejoint la confédération germanique dont elle est exclue par Otto von Bismarck, en 1866, à la suite de la guerre austro-prussienne.

Dans les années qui suivent, le rattachement à l'Allemagne n'est soutenu en Autriche que par le Parti national allemand, qui reste minoritaire et n'est pas soutenu par l'Allemagne : craignant que l'Autriche ne cherche à fonder une coalition anti-allemande, Bismarck adopte, à partir de 1870, une politique qui vise à rassurer Vienne et déclare, le 7 février 1871, que les aspirations de la fraction qui œuvre à l'intégration des territoires allemands de la couronne autrichienne à l'Allemagne ne correspondent pas aux objectifs de sa politique. L'Autriche se rapproche à nouveau de l'Allemagne, en octobre 1879, lorsqu'elle conclut avec celle-ci un traité d'alliance militaire défensive :

« François-Joseph devenait l'allié de Guillaume Ier en attendant d'être, en 1914, “ le brillant second ” de Guillaume II. »

Cette « confédération germanique sous une forme actualisée » suscite des réserves en Autriche, à cause de la prépondérance de Berlin.

Du point de vue des idées, par contre, les idéologues « Völkisch », opposés à Bismarck, appellent de leurs vœux le rattachement de l'Autriche à l'Allemagne : ainsi, Paul de Lagarde voit dans l'« Anschluss » la 1re étape de la réalisation de la « Mitteleuropa » germanique, il propose même un plan précis d'union entre le « Reich » et la Double Monarchie, dont les 1res étapes seraient un traité d'alliance indissoluble ; ensuite, le plan de Lagarde prévoit l'expulsion des populations non germaniques, envoyées dans des zones où elles seront confinées, la mise en place d'institutions communes, d'inspiration conservatrices, une union douanière et la possibilité d'une union personnelle.

Lorsque l'Empire austro-hongrois éclate à la suite de sa défaite lors de la Première Guerre mondiale, de nombreux Allemands et Autrichiens germanophones espèrent une unification des 2 États, dans le cadre de la réorganisation de l'Europe : les traités de Versailles et celui de Saint-Germain, en son article 80, excluent explicitement la possibilité d'une unification entre l'Autriche et l'Allemagne sauf à obtenir l'accord de la Société des Nations, les vainqueurs voulant maintenir les vaincus dans une situation d'impuissance militaire.

Toujours sous la pression des Alliés, le nom du nouvel État initialement dénommé, en octobre 1918, « Deutsch-Österreich » (République d'Autriche allemande) est transformé en « Republik Österreich ». Les milieux politiques autrichiens sont divisés sur la question de l'unification : si certains Sociaux-Démocrates, emmenés par Otto Bauer, souhaitent une unification, les Sociaux-Chrétiens y sont opposés, notamment par crainte du protestantisme allemand. En Allemagne, dès 1920, le programme du Parti Nazi exige la fusion de tous les Allemands dans une grande Allemagne, ce qui préfigure implicitement l'« Anschluß » ; en 1925, dans « Mein Kampf », Adolf Hitler est nettement plus explicite :

« L'Autriche allemande doit revenir à la grande patrie allemande et ceci, non pas en vertu de quelconques raisons économiques. Non, non : même si cette fusion, économiquement parlant, est indifférente ou même nuisible, elle doit avoir lieu quand même. Un seul sang exige un seul " Reich ". » (Adolf Hitler, « Mein Kampf » .)

Le 18 mars 1931, le projet d'union douanière dit « plan Schober-Curtius », du nom des Ministres des affaires étrangères autrichien, Johann Schober, et allemand, Julius Curtius, est signé entre l'Allemagne et l'Autriche. La France s'y oppose. Le 3 septembre, les 2 Ministres annoncent officiellement à la Commission des affaires européennes de la Société des Nations qu'ils y renoncent. Le 5 septembre 1931, la Cour internationale de justice de La Haye, s'appuyant sur l'article 88 du traité de Saint-Germain-en-Laye et sur le protocole de Genève du 4 octobre 1922, condamne cette union douanière par 8 voix contre 711.

Au cours des années 1930, les Nazis autrichiens connaissent une notable progression sur le plan électoral, en passant de 112,000 voix aux élections de 1930 à 230,000 voix lors des élections partielles de 1932, dans les « Länder » de Vienne, Salzbourg et Styrie. Maintenus dans l'opposition, ils se lancent dans une stratégie de tension et recourent au terrorisme, ce qui débouche, le 19 juin 1933, sur l'interdiction du Parti Nazi à la suite d'un attentat meurtrier contre des gymnastes catholiques. Face aux tensions entre les Socialistes, appuyés par leur milice, le « Schutzbund », et les catholiques, eux aussi appuyés par une milice, les « Heimwehren », le Chancelier chrétien-social Engelbert Dollfuß établit, en mars 1933, une dictature clérico-fasciste à parti unique, connue sous le nom d'Austro-fascisme : il ajourne le parlement, dissout le Parti communiste et le Parti Nazi, et utilise les « Heimwehren » comme police auxiliaire pour écraser le soulèvement des Socialistes viennois, en mars 1934 ; la répression fait un millier de morts et 3,000 à 4,000 blessés.

Le 25 juillet 1934, les Nazis autrichiens tentent un coup d'État lors duquel ils assassinent Dollfuß, assassinat vraisemblablement commandité par Adolf Hitler ; la tentative de prise de pouvoir échoue, au grand dam de celui-ci, qui n'ose cependant intervenir en raison de la position de l'Italie fasciste, Benito Mussolini garantissant l'indépendance de l'Autriche.

Bien qu'il ait affirmé, lors de la parution du 1er volume de « Mein Kampf », en 1925, que l'union de l'Allemagne et de l'Autriche était, pour les Allemands, « une tâche que les Allemands devaient s'employer à accomplir, par tous les moyens et tout au long de leur vie », l'échec du « Putsch » et l'attitude de l'Italie forcent Adolf Hitler à adopter une position publique conciliante et rassurante : dans l'important discours qu'il prononce devant les membres du « Reichstag », le 21 mai 1935, Hitler affirme que « l'Allemagne n'a ni l'intention, ni le désir de se mêler des affaires intérieures de l'Autriche, d'annexer l'Autriche ou de réaliser l'« Anschluß » ». L'absence de réaction des puissances alliées, à l'entrée des troupes allemandes en Rhénanie, en mars 1936, permet à Hitler de renforcer la pression sur l'Autriche et de contraindre le successeur de Dolfuss, Kurt von Schuschnigg, à entamer avec Franz von Papen, ambassadeur à Vienne, des négociations visant à rapprocher les 2 pays sous l'égide allemande.

De 1934 à 1938, Schuschnigg mène une intense mais prudente activité diplomatique afin de faire garantir l'indépendance de son pays par l'Italie, la France et la Grande-Bretagne pendant que le chef d'état-major de l'armée autrichienne, Alfred Jansa, dresse des plans pour s'opposer militairement à une éventuelle agression allemande.

Si l'accord du 11 juillet 1936 réaffirme le maintien de l'indépendance de l'Autriche, celle-ci est désignée comme « le second État allemand » et elle s'engage à « mener une politique extérieure conforme aux intérêts pan-germaniques » et à autoriser l'activité politique du Parti Nazi. Au cours de l'été 1937, Adolf Hitler fait part à Josef Goebbels de sa volonté de résoudre le problème autrichien par la force, non seulement pour des raisons idéologiques, stratégiques et militaires, mais aussi pour des motifs économiques, l'Autriche disposant d'importantes réserves d'or et de devises, de main-d'œuvre et de matières premières ; ces motifs économiques expliquent le rôle majeur joué par Hermann Göring, Ministre du plan quadriennal, dans la préparation et l'exécution de l'« Anschluß ». Lors de la signature par Benito Mussolini du pacte anti-Komintern, le 6 novembre 1937, le Duce déclare à Joachim von Ribbentrop que les événements en Autriche peuvent suivre leur cours naturel : la souveraineté de l'Autriche a perdu son dernier garant, la France et la Grande-Bretagne n'ayant pas montré d'intérêt pour la défense de l'indépendance autrichienne.

Début 1938, Adolf Hitler a consolidé son pouvoir en Allemagne, notamment avec la mise à l'écart de Werner von Blomberg et de Werner von Fritsch, et il est prêt à atteindre l'un des objectifs qu'il s'est fixé de longue date : l'expansion du « Reich » .

Adolf Hitler rencontre le Chancelier autrichien Kurt von Schuschnigg, le 12 février 1938, à Berchtesgaden, en Bavière. Schuschnigg est accueilli à la frontière par Franz von Papen, pourtant limogé de son poste à Vienne depuis le 4 février, qui lui annonce que la rencontre se déroulera en présence de Wilhelm Keitel, le nouveau chef de l'OKW, de Walter von Reichenau, commandant des forces terrestres dans la zone austro-bavaroise, et de Hugo Sperrle, responsable de la « Luftwaffe » dans la même région, « arrivés par hasard ». Hitler accueille Schuschnigg avec une courtoisie minimale et se lance, dès le début de leur tête-à-tête, dans une diatribe cinglante. Ses vitupérations durent toute la matinée et mettent le Chancelier autrichien sous une forte pression.

« Vous avez tout fait pour empêcher une politique amicale. L'histoire de l'Autriche n'est qu'un acte ininterrompu de haute-trahison. Ce paradoxe historique doit maintenant parvenir à son terme, qui devrait être depuis longtemps échu.

Et je puis vous l'affirmer ici, monsieur Schuschnigg : je suis absolument résolu à ce que cela cesse. Le " Reich " allemand est l'une des grandes puissances et personne n'osera élever la voix s'il décide de régler le problème de ses frontières. » (Adolf Hitler au chancelier Schuschnigg.)

Dans l'après-midi, Joachim von Ribbentrop et von Papen présentent à Schuschnigg un projet d' « accord » , en lui précisant qu'il n'est pas négociable. L'interdiction des activités du Parti Nazi autrichien doit être levée et ses membres en prison amnistiés. Arthur Seyß-Inquart, un avocat membre du Parti Nazi, doit être nommé Ministre de l'Intérieur ayant l'autorité sur les services de police et de sécurité, et Edmund Glaise-Horstenau, Ministre sans portefeuille. Les armées allemande et autrichienne doivent établir des relations étroites, et le système économique autrichien doit être intégré à celui de l'Allemagne. Lors de la seconde entrevue du Chancelier autrichien avec Adolf Hitler, celui-ci le menace explicitement d'une intervention militaire en cas de refus : Schuschnigg finit par céder, ce qui inspire à Hitler le commentaire que « les canons parlent toujours le bon langage » .

De retour à Vienne, Schuschnigg fait part au Président de la République autrichienne, Wilhelm Miklas, des exigences allemandes, qui doivent être officiellement acceptées, au plus tard le 15 février, et mises en œuvre le 18 ; devant le refus de Miklas de mettre Seyß-Inquart à la tête des forces de police et de sécurité, Adolf Hitler, informé par von Papen, fait organiser des manœuvres militaires le long de la frontière. Miklas cède à son tour et, le 16 février, le gouvernement autrichien annonce l'amnistie générale des Nazis emprisonnés, y compris des assassins d'Engelbert Dollfuß, et la nomination de Seyß-Inquart comme ministre de la Sûreté.

Le 18 février, les SA défilent en uniforme à Linz avec d'immenses drapeaux à croix gammée. Le 1er mars, Arthur Seyß-Inquart se rend à Graz et, selon un journaliste britannique, on croirait entrer dans une ville de l'Allemagne nazie : la majorité des gens dans les rues portent des emblèmes à croix gammée, soit des insignes en métal, soit le sigle officiel du NSDAP, et les jeunes gens échangent des saluts hitlériens et certains chantent le « Horst-Wessel Lied » .

Malgré l'acceptation de l' « accord » , Adolf Hitler durcit encore le ton lors d'un discours devant les membres du « Reichstag » , le 20 février 1938.

« Plus de 10 millions d'Allemands vivent dans 2 des États qui ont une frontière commune avec nous. Pour une puissance mondiale, il est intolérable de savoir qu'à ses côtés des frères de race subissent à chaque instant les plus cruelles souffrances parce qu'ils se sentent solidaires de la nation tout entière, en union avec elle, avec sa destinée et son " Weltanschauung ". C'est au " Reich " allemand de protéger les peuples germaniques qui ne sont pas en mesure d'assurer, par leur propre effort, le long de nos frontières, leur liberté politique et spirituelle. » (Adolf Hitler)

4 jours plus tard, dans un discours au « Bundestag » , le parlement autrichien, Schuschnigg réplique en déclarant que « l'Autriche s'est engagée sur la voie des concessions jusqu'au point où nous devons nous arrêter, nous n'irons pas plus loin » et en affirmant que l'Autriche ne renoncera jamais à son indépendance. La radiodiffusion du discours de Schuschnigg suscite de violentes réactions des Nazis autrichiens : à Graz, 20,000 Nazis envahissent la place de l'Hôtel de ville, détruisent les haut-parleurs et remplacent le drapeau autrichien par la bannière allemande à croix gammée, sans que la police, soumise à l'autorité de Seyß-Inquart, n'intervienne.

Au cours des semaines qui suivent, le Chancelier autrichien recherche le soutien de la classe ouvrière au travers des syndicats et du Parti Social-Démocrate, dont il a pourtant maintenu l'interdiction prononcée par Dollfuß, après la répression de 1934 ; cela n'empêche pas les Socialistes de proclamer leur soutien au gouvernement pour préserver l'indépendance du pays et d'organiser un rassemblement populaire, le 4 mars, leur seule demande étant que leur activité politique soit à nouveau autorisée, comme cela a déjà été le cas pour celle du Parti Nazi autrichien.

Le 9 mars 1938, Schuschnigg fait une dernière tentative pour préserver l'indépendance de l'Autriche : il annonce, lors d'un discours à Innsbruck, sans avoir prévenu ses Ministres, la tenue d'un référendum pour le 13 mars, appelant les électeurs à soutenir « une Autriche libre et allemande, indépendante et sociale, chrétienne et unie, pour la liberté et le travail, et pour l'égalité de tous ceux qui se déclarent pour la race et la patrie », formulation qui laisse augurer d'un vote largement positif. Afin de s'assurer une large majorité, il fixe l'âge minimum pour voter à 24 ans, afin d'exclure les électeurs plus jeunes, largement acquis au Nazisme. L'organisation de ce référendum constitue un pari risqué pour Schuschnigg : selon Alfred Jodl, « le “ Führer ” est résolu à ne pas tolérer cela ». Dans la soirée du 9 et dans la nuit du 9 au 10, Adolf Hitler consulte de nombreux dignitaires politiques et militaires nazis, et ordonne à Wilhelm Keitel, dès le matin du 10 mars, d'envahir l'Autriche, le samedi 12. Au cours des journées des 10 et 11 mars, Keitel, Ludwig Beck, et Erich von Manstein préparent l'opération et arrivent à envoyer les ordres de mobilisation aux unités concernées, dès le 11 mars vers 18 heures. Pendant ce temps, Adolf Hitler envoie un courrier à Benito Mussolini, par lequel il lui fait part de sa décision « de rétablir la loi et l'ordre dans son pays natal », faisant état de la situation d'anarchie qui règne en Autriche et du fait que l'Autriche et la Tchécoslovaquie se préparent à lancer 20,000,000 hommes à l'assaut de l'Allemagne, assertions qui sont, selon William L. Shirer, « un tissu de mensonges » .

Le vendredi 11 mars, Schuschnigg est réveillé à 5h30 du matin, par un appel téléphonique du chef de la police autrichienne, qui lui annonce la fermeture de la frontière à Salzbourg, l'arrêt des transports ferroviaires entre l'Allemagne et l'Autriche et des concentrations de troupes allemandes ; à 10 heures, Arthur Seyß-Inquart et Edmund Glaise-Horstenau font part au Chancelier autrichien de l'exigence d'Adolf Hitler de voir le plébiscite annulé sous peine d'invasion militaire. Expirant normalement à midi, l'ultimatum est reporté jusqu'à 2h30, heure à laquelle Schuschnigg accepte d'annuler le plébiscite. Prévenu de cette décision par Seyß-Inquart, et après avoir conféré avec Hitler, Hermann Göring formule de nouvelles exigences : la démission de Schuschnigg et son remplacement par Seyß-Inquart. Il demande également à ce dernier d'envoyer, dès sa nomination, un télégramme demandant aux autorités allemandes d'envoyer des troupes en Autriche pour y maintenir l'ordre.

Dans un 1er temps, le Président autrichien, Wilhelm Miklas, refuse la démission du Chancelier, ce dont Göring est immédiatement averti par téléphone par Seyß-Inquart. À la suite de cette nouvelle, Göring se rend chez Hitler, dont il obtient, après 30 minutes de discussion, qu'il donne l'ordre à la 8e Armée d'entrer en Autriche, à l'aube du 12 mars. Soumis à des pressions de plus en plus fortes, Miklas accepte finalement la démission de Schuschnigg, mais refuse de désigner Seyß-Inquart comme Chancelier.

Schuschnigg annonce sa démission peu après 19h30, dans un communiqué radiophonique :

« Le gouvernement allemand a remis aujourd'hui au Président Miklas un ultimatum lui ordonnant, dans un délai imposé, de nommer au poste de Chancelier une personnalité désignée par le gouvernement allemand ; en cas de refus, les troupes allemandes envahiraient l'Autriche. Le Président Miklas m'a demandé de faire savoir au peuple d'Autriche que nous avons cédé à la force parce que nous refusons, même en cette heure terrible, de verser le sang. Nous avons donc décidé d'ordonner aux troupes autrichiennes de n'opposer aucune résistance. Je prends donc congé du peuple autrichien, en lui adressant cette formule d'adieu allemande, prononcée du plus profond de mon cœur : que Dieu protège l'Autriche. » (Kurt Schuschnigg, le 11 mars 1938.)

À cette annonce, la foule se déchaîne à Vienne, brisant les vitrines des commerces appartenant à des Juifs ou molestant ceux-ci. Un journaliste, témoin des faits, décrit la scène :

« La ville se transforme en un cauchemar peint par Jérôme Bosch. Ce qui se déchaîne à Vienne est un torrent d'envie, de jalousie, d'amertume, d'aveuglement, une malveillante envie de revanche. »

Bien organisés, les Nazis autrichiens prennent le pouvoir en Carinthie et en Styrie, et occupent des bâtiments publics et des gares ferroviaires à Innsbruck, Linz, Salzbourg, Graz, Klagenfurt et Vienne. Le refus du président Miklas de constituer un gouvernement nazi dirigé par Seyß-Inquart, et l'absence d'un télégramme d'appel à l'aide venant de celui-ci, mettent Adolf Hitler hors de lui : à 20h45, il donne formellement l'ordre d'invasion ; 3 minutes plus tard, il fait transmettre à Seyß-Inquart le texte du télégramme, en précisant qu'il n'est plus nécessaire de l'envoyer mais simplement de marquer son accord sur son contenu. Dans la nuit, le texte du télégramme est envoyé à la presse allemande qui le publie le lendemain matin : la 1^{re} page du « Völkischer Beobachter » porte comme manchette « L'AUTRICHE ALLEMANDE SAUVÉE DU CHAOS ». Vers minuit, après que les principaux centres du pouvoir à Vienne sont tombés entre les mains des Nazis autrichiens et que la plupart des membres du gouvernement a été arrêtée, et vu l'absence de réaction de la France, de la Grande-Bretagne, de l'Italie et de la Tchécoslovaquie, le président Miklas accepte de nommer Seyß-Inquart comme Chancelier. Celui-ci tente, en vain, d'empêcher l'arrivée des troupes allemandes, en appelant la Chancellerie du « Reich » et l'OKW :

« Hitler avait pris l'une de ses décisions inébranlables ; il ne pensait pas seulement qu'il était immoral de laisser une telle armée désœuvrée, il considérait également que les Nazis autrichiens n'étaient pas dignes de confiance. »

Le matin du 12 mars 1938, la 8^e Armée de la « Wehrmacht » franchit la frontière austro-allemande. Les troupes allemandes ne rencontrent aucune résistance de la part de l'armée autrichienne, bien au contraire : elles sont accueillies par des acclamations, des « Heil Hitler », des drapeaux nazis et des fleurs, ce qui explique que cette invasion soit parfois nommée « Blumenkrieg » (« la guerre des fleurs »). Après les unités motorisées, c'est à l'infanterie d'entrer en Autriche, non en formation de combat, mais en défilant avec drapeaux et musique militaire. Pour un officier :

« Jamais des troupes allemandes n'ont été accueillies aussi chaleureusement depuis le défilé triomphal de Bismarck lors de la fondation du « Reich ». »

Peu avant midi, la 2e division blindée, commandée par Heinz Guderian, arrive à Linz. Guderian y est rejoint par Heinrich Himmler, Arthur Seyß-Inquart et Edmund Glaise-Horstenau qui lui annoncent que l'arrivée d'Adolf Hitler est prévue vers 15 heures. La « Wehrmacht » révèle cependant son impréparation puisque pas moins de 70 % de ses véhicules tombent en panne sur la route de Vienne.

Adolf Hitler pénètre en Autriche peu avant 16 heures à Braunau, son village natal. En raison de la foule amassée sur son passage, il n'arrive à Linz que vers 19h30, où il reçoit un accueil enthousiaste ; lorsqu'il y prend la parole d'un balcon de l'Hôtel de ville, il est acclamé par 60,000 à 80,000 personnes.

L'occupation systématique de la totalité du territoire autrichien se poursuit méthodiquement : à Salzbourg, les troupes de montagne allemandes découvrent une ville pavoisée de drapeaux nazis et à son arrivée à Vienne, vers minuit, Guderian reçoit un accueil enthousiaste. S'il n'était pas prévu, à l'origine, d'envoyer des troupes en Styrie et en Carinthie, Adolf Hitler modifie ses plans au vu de l'accueil réservé aux soldats allemands par la population autrichienne : dans la journée du 13 mars, les hommes du 2e régiment de parachutistes atterrissent à Graz ; dans ces 2 provinces, les unités sont à nouveau « bombardées de fleurs, même dans les hameaux slovènes à la frontière avec la Yougoslavie » . Dans la soirée du 14 mars, toute l'Autriche est occupée.

Le 14 mars 1938, Adolf Hitler quitte Linz pour se diriger vers Vienne en faisant une étape à Melk, puis à Sankt Pölten : de cette ville, il poursuit son trajet vers la capitale, à 20 kilomètres par heure, afin de satisfaire la foule. Peu avant 18 heures, le « Führer » pénètre à Vienne par la « Ringstraße » et se rend à l'Hôtel Impérial pour y rencontrer les membres du nouveau gouvernement, dirigé par Seyß-Inquart. Bien que la foule ait été avertie que Hitler était trop fatigué pour prendre la parole, des milliers de personnes restent massées à l'extérieur de l'Hôtel : Hitler adresse cependant à la population un bref discours qu'il conclut par « personne ne pourra jamais diviser à nouveau le “ Reich ” allemand tel qu'il existe aujourd'hui » .

Le lendemain, au milieu de la matinée, près de 250,000 personnes se dirigent vers la « Heldenplatz » , où Adolf Hitler arrive vers 11 heures et reçoit un accueil triomphal de la foule, rassemblée sur la place et à ses alentours. « Elle est composée de personnes issues de toutes les classes sociales. Pour une fois, ouvriers et bourgeois se tiennent côte à côte, avec un enthousiasme indivisible. Mon impression prédominante est qu'elle est composée de jeunes plutôt mal habillés. Il ne s'agit pas d'un rassemblement de réactionnaires réunis pour célébrer leur triomphe. Quelle que soit sa motivation, c'est le peuple de Vienne qui emplit les rues. »

Par la suite, Adolf Hitler commente cet épisode comme suit :

« Certains journaux étrangers ont prétendu que nous nous sommes abattus sur l'Autriche en employant des méthodes brutales. Quand j'ai franchi la frontière, j'ai été submergé par un flot d'amour tel que je n'en avais jamais connu. Nous ne sommes pas arrivés en tyrans mais en libérateurs. »

Dans la soirée du 15 mars, comme lors de celle du 11, une partie de la foule s'en prend aux Juifs, forçant les familles à sortir de chez elles et à s'agenouiller dans les rues, sous les cris de « Mort aux Juifs » .

Selon Ewan Burr Bukey, l'enthousiasme d'une grande partie de la population à l'égard de l' « Anschluß » est spontané et tient essentiellement à 4 facteurs : l'annexion s'est déroulée sans effusion de sang ; les troupes allemandes sont perçues à la fois comme le moyen d'éviter une guerre civile et comme une protection contre une agression extérieure ; l'essor économique de l'Allemagne devrait également améliorer la situation en Autriche ; enfin, il n'y a que peu de doutes sur le fait que des millions de personnes ont soutenu l' « Anschluß » en y voyant une chance de mettre fin à ce que l'on appelle la question juive.

Dès leur entrée en Autriche, les Allemands recherchent et obtiennent le soutien de 12 piliers de la société autrichienne, à savoir : la hiérarchie catholique et les dirigeants Sociaux-Démocrates.

Le cardinal Theodor Innitzer qui est, en outre, une des personnalités du mouvement Social-Chrétien, déclare dès le 12 mars :

« Les Catholiques viennois devraient remercier le Seigneur pour le fait que ce grand changement politique se soit déroulé sans effusion de sang, et prier pour un grand avenir pour l'Autriche. Il va de soi que tout le monde devrait obéir aux ordres des nouvelles institutions. »

Les autres évêques autrichiens adoptent la même position dans les jours qui suivent et remercient l'Allemagne d'avoir « sauvé l'Autriche du péril bolchévique ». Le 27 mars suivant, une déclaration collective de l'épiscopat d'Autriche est lue dans toutes les Églises :

« Nous reconnaissons avec joie que le mouvement national-socialiste a fait et fait encore œuvre éminente dans le domaine de la construction nationale et économique comme aussi dans le domaine de la politique sociale pour le “ Reich ” et la nation allemande, et notamment pour les couches les plus pauvres de la population. Au jour du plébiscite, il va sans dire que c'est pour nous un devoir national, en tant qu'Allemands, de nous déclarer pour le “ Reich ” allemand, et nous attendons également de tous les chrétiens croyants qu'ils sauront ce qu'ils doivent à leur nation. »

À Rome, Radio Vatican dénonce aussitôt la diffusion de ce texte, et le pape Pie XI et le cardinal secrétaire d'État Pacelli, demandent à Innitzer de venir s'expliquer devant eux. Le 6 avril, avant de rencontrer le pape, Innitzer s'entretient avec le secrétaire d'État Pacelli, qui lui ordonne de rédiger un document, au nom de tous les évêques d'Autriche, à paraître dans « L'Osservatore Romano », affirmant que :

« La déclaration solennelle des évêques autrichiens n'avait pas pour but d'être une approbation de quelque chose qui est incompatible avec la loi de Dieu », et précisant également que cette Ire déclaration avait été faite sans l'accord de Rome.

Même le Social-Démocrate Karl Renner, père fondateur de la Ire République, annonce son soutien à l' « Anschluß » et appelle tous les Autrichiens à voter favorablement lors du plébiscite. Pendant l'été et l'automne 1938, il écrit un ouvrage de 80 pages au titre révélateur : « Die Gründung der Republik Deutschösterreich, der “ Anschluß ” und die

Sudetendeutschen » (La fondation de la République austro-allemande, l' « Anschluß » et les Allemands des Sudètes) .

Les réactions à l'étranger peuvent être considérées comme modérées. Pour le « Times » de Londres, l' « Anschluß » n'est pas tellement différent de la réunion de l'Écosse à l'Angleterre accomplie 2 siècles auparavant. La position officielle de la Grande-Bretagne est exprimée par le Premier ministre Neville Chamberlain, à la Chambre des communes, le 14 mars 1938 :

« J'imagine que, suivant les tempéraments des uns et des autres, les événements que nous avons à l'esprit aujourd'hui peuvent susciter des regrets, de la tristesse et peut-être de l'indignation. Ils ne peuvent être vus par le gouvernement de Sa Majesté avec indifférence ou sérénité. Ils auront des conséquences qui ne peuvent encore être mesurées. Leur résultat immédiat est l'intensification du sentiment d'insécurité en Europe. Ce n'est pas le moment de prendre des décisions hâtives ou de prononcer des mots imprudents. Nous devons analyser la nouvelle situation rapidement, mais de sang-froid. » (Neville Chamberlain)

La réaction modérée de la Grande-Bretagne, partagée par les États-Unis, est l'une des lres conséquences majeures de la politique d'apaisement strictement observée par le Royaume-Uni.

C'est de l'étranger que s'élèvent des voix autrichiennes contre l' « Anschluß » : un groupe d'artistes cosmopolites, dont Joseph Roth à Paris, Oskar Kokoschka à Londres et Stefan Zweig à Bath, fondent le mouvement « Autriche libre » , qui regroupe, en 1943, 27 organisations comptant plus de 7,000 membres.

L' « Anschluß » produit ses effets juridiques, dès le lendemain de l'entrée des troupes allemandes, de par la loi du 13 mars, soumise à ratification par plébiscite : l'Autriche devient la province d'Ostmark du « Reich » et Seyß-Inquart en est nommé gouverneur. Le même jour, Adolf Hitler charge le « Gauleiter » de Saare-Palatinat, Josef Bürckel, d'organiser un plébiscite « libre et au vote secret » , le 10 avril 1938.

Bürckel lance officiellement la campagne au Concert Hall de Vienne, en émaillant son discours de nombreuses attaques antisémites, qui sont applaudies avec beaucoup d'enthousiasme ; dans les jours qui suivent, les principaux dirigeants nazis, dont Hitler, Hermann Göring, Josef Goebbels et Heinrich Himmler, sillonnent l'Autriche pour soutenir l'annexion. Les Nazis jouent sur un double registre, alliant propagande et répression. Pour influencer favorablement le vote des Autrichiens, Göring annonce, le 26 mars, un investissement de 60 millions de Marks dans le développement de l'industrie et la modernisation de l'agriculture autrichienne ; dans les jours qui suivent, le système de sécurité sociale allemand est étendu à l'Autriche ; le paiement d'allocations aux chômeurs est repris par l'Allemagne ; 100,000 écoliers et 25,000 adultes y sont envoyés en vacances ; des distributions de nourriture sont organisées pour les plus pauvres.

Les méthodes brutales utilisées par Adolf Hitler pour éliminer toute opposition en Allemagne sont immédiatement mises en place en Autriche, dans les semaines qui précèdent le plébiscite. Avant même l'intervention de la « Wehrmacht » , Heinrich Himmler et quelques officiers SS arrivent à Vienne dès le 12 mars, bientôt rejoints par 40,000 membres des forces de sécurité allemandes. Durant les quelques semaines qui séparent l' « Anschluß » du plébiscite, 70,000 personnes, Sociaux-Démocrates, Démocrates-Chrétiens, comme Richard Schmitz et Leopold Figl, communistes et autres

opposants politiques, Juifs, sont arrêtés et emprisonnés ou envoyés en camp de concentration.

Bulletin de vote du plébiscite du 10 avril 1938, il est écrit :

« Es-tu d'accord avec la réunification de l'Autriche avec le " Reich " allemand qui fut décrétée le 13 mars 1938, et votes-tu pour le parti de notre chef Adolf Hitler ? »

Le grand cercle est marqué « Oui » et le plus petit « Non » . Le résultat officiel est un vote favorable à 99,08 % , en Allemagne ; et à 99,75 % , en Autriche.

Si les historiens s'accordent sur le fait que le résultat du plébiscite n'a pas été truqué, le processus de vote n'a été ni libre, ni secret : des officiels sont présents à côté des isolements et reçoivent le bulletin de vote de la main à la main, contrairement aux pratiques du vote secret, au cours duquel les bulletins sont déposés par les électeurs dans une urne scellée ; de larges fentes sont en outre aménagées dans les isolements afin de pouvoir constater comment votent les électeurs.

L'Autriche fait désormais partie du 3e « Reich » et le restera jusqu'à la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Le 27 avril 1945, le gouvernement provisoire autrichien déclare l'« Anschluß » nul et non avenue. Après guerre, l'Autriche, occupée par les Alliés, est reconnue et traitée comme un pays indépendant de l'Allemagne ; elle retrouve sa souveraineté, en 1955, avec le Traité sur l'État autrichien et la déclaration autrichienne de neutralité, en grande partie à cause du développement rapide de la « Guerre froide » .

La faiblesse des réactions à l'étranger à la suite de l'« Anschluß » conduisent Adolf Hitler à conclure qu'il peut utiliser des méthodes plus agressives dans sa marche pour élargir le 3e « Reich » , ce qu'il fera plus tard lors de l'annexion du territoire des Sudètes. En confirmant que la Grande-Bretagne a décidé qu'une logique d'apaisement est la bonne manière de négocier avec Hitler, et que la France est incapable d'intervenir, l'« Anschluß » ouvre la voie aux accords de Munich, en septembre 1938, puis à l'invasion de la Tchécoslovaquie, en 1939.

L'« Anschluß » se traduit également par une profonde « Nazification » de la société autrichienne : lorsqu'en 1945, les anciens Nazis doivent se faire enregistrer, ils sont 600,000 à s'inscrire, et avec leurs familles, ils représentent un tiers de la population du pays ; si la population autrichienne ne représente que 8 % de la population de la Grande Allemagne, les Autrichiens constituent 14 % des membres de la SS et 40 % du personnel lié à la mise en œuvre de l'assassinat des malades mentaux et de la « Shoah » . Parmi les Autrichiens ayant occupé de hauts-postes au sein du 3e « Reich » , outre Adolf Hitler lui-même, on peut citer Franz Böhme, Lothar Rendulic, Julius Ringel et Alexander Löhr : généraux dans la « Wehrmacht » et la « Luftwaffe » ; Adolf Eichmann, l'un des principaux organisateurs de la « Shoah » ; Odilo Globocnik, lui aussi impliqué dans la « Shoah » ; Amon Göth, commandant du camp de concentration de Plaszow ; Franz Stangl, commandant des camps d'extermination de Sobibor et Treblinka ; Ernst Kaltenbrunner, successeur de Reinhard Heydrich à la tête du RSHA ; Otto Skorzeny, qui organisa notamment l'évasion de Benito Mussolini du Gran Sasso. Quant à Arthur Seyß-Inquart, après avoir été l'adjoint de Hans Frank en Pologne, il fut Commissaire du « Reich » , aux Pays-Bas. Quant aux Juifs autrichiens, 128,000 d'entre eux sont contraints de s'exiler

et 65,459 sont victimes de la « Shoah » .

L'héritage historique de l' « Anschluß » : rattachement ou annexion ?

Le dictionnaire en ligne franco-allemand Larousse traduit le terme « Anschluß » , dans le contexte politique, par rattachement. Selon le dictionnaire en ligne Leo, la traduction allemande d'annexion est : « Annektierung » ou Annexion, ; celle d'incorporation : « Eingliederung » .

« L'Encyclopædia Britannica » décrit l' « Anschluß » comme une annexion plutôt que comme un rattachement. Cette traduction est reprise par la quasi-totalité des auteurs cités dans l'article.

Comme le relève Ewan Burr Bukey, lors du départ des troupes alliés d'occupation, le 25 octobre 1955 :

« La plupart des citoyens autrichiens se réjouit que se termine enfin une période de 17 années d'occupation. »

Englobant sous le même terme, la période de 1938 à 1945 et celle de 1945 à 1955.

La Déclaration de Moscou de la création de la Seconde République, signée en 1943 par les gouvernements de l'Union soviétique, des États-Unis et de Grande-Bretagne, comprend une déclaration sur l'Autriche :

« Les gouvernements du Royaume-Uni, de l'Union soviétique et des États-Unis d'Amérique sont d'accord sur le fait que l'Autriche, le 1er pays libre tombé à la suite de l'agression hitlérienne, sera libéré de la domination allemande. Ils considèrent l'annexion imposée à l'Autriche, le 15 mars 1938, comme nulle et non avenue. Ils affirment leur souhait de voir la liberté et l'indépendance de l'Autriche restaurées, ouvrant ainsi la voie au peuple autrichien, ainsi qu'à ceux des autres états confrontés aux mêmes problèmes, pour créer la sécurité économique et politique, seule base d'une paix durable. Cependant, l'Autriche a une responsabilité, qu'elle ne peut éluder, dans sa participation au conflit aux côtés de l'Allemagne hitlérienne. Au moment du jugement final, il sera inévitablement tenu compte de sa propre contribution à sa libération. »

Le dernier paragraphe de la déclaration relève de la propagande et vise à susciter les premiers signes d'une résistance autrichienne. Bien que des Autrichiens aient été reconnus comme « Justes » parmi les nations, il n'y eut jamais en Autriche de résistance armée comme celle qui s'est manifestée dans d'autres pays occupés. La déclaration de Moscou est suivie, le 27 avril 1945, par une déclaration sur l'indépendance de l'Autriche, qui stipule en son article 2 que :

« L' « Anschluß », imposé au peuple autrichien en 1938, est nul et non avenue. »

Et, en son article 4, que :

« Tous les serments militaires, officiels, ou individuels, prêtés par des Autrichiens à l'égard du « Reich » allemand et de son gouvernement, sont considérés comme nuls et non avenues. »

La vision des événements de 1938 a de profondes racines dans les 10 années d'occupation par les Alliés et dans la lutte de l'Autriche pour retrouver sa souveraineté. La « victimisation » joue un rôle essentiel lors des négociations avec les Soviétiques à propos du Traité d'État autrichien. S'appuyant sur la Déclaration de Moscou, les hommes politiques autrichiens, hantés par le souvenir de la guerre civile qui a détruit la Ire République, n'ont d'autre choix, afin de favoriser la reconstruction économique et la recomposition de la société, que de « créer une fiction historique qui n'a que peu de rapport avec la réalité ». Le traité sur l'État autrichien et la déclaration de neutralité permanente, qui lui fait suite, constituent des étapes fondamentales pour la consolidation de l'indépendance et de l'identité nationale autrichienne au cours des décennies qui suivent.

Le processus de dénazification est lancé à la suite de la loi sur les Nationaux-Socialistes du 25 juillet 1945 qui oblige, notamment, les anciens membres du Parti Nazi à se faire enregistrer et les prive temporairement de leur droit de vote :

« Devant l'inscription de près de 600,000 personnes dans ces registres, les Partis politiques, devant cette masse d'enregistrés, pensèrent que bien des gens allaient retrouver leur droit de vote un jour ; aussi, au lieu de mener une lutte idéologique contre le National-Socialisme et les crimes hitlériens, ils évitèrent la discussion sur le passé en flattant la masse des anciens Nazis promus au rang de doubles victimes. »

Le contexte de la « Guerre Froide » et la volonté de l'Autriche de bénéficier du plan Marshall jouent également un rôle important dans l'occultation du débat sur l' « Anschluß » et sur le passé nazi de l'Autriche. En présentant l'Union soviétique comme l'ennemi principal de l'Autriche, ses dirigeants ont esquivé « certains problèmes fondamentaux comme la véritable prise de conscience des crimes nazis, l'élimination des responsables Nazis de la vie publique, la liquidation sérieuse de l'idéologie National-Socialiste. »

Pour Ernst Bruchmüller : « Le rôle de victime (" Opferrolle ") est devenu un pré-requis pour la formation d'une identité nationale contemporaine. » .

De 1945 à 1948, les tribunaux autrichiens condamnent 10,694 personnes pour crime de guerre, essentiellement commis sur le sol autrichien, dont 43 sont condamnées à la peine capitale ; mais, dès 1948, le processus de dénazification s'éteint et tant le SPÖ que l'ÖVP cherchent à gagner les votes des anciens Nazis. Une Ire loi amnistiant les Nazis n'ayant pas occupé de postes importants (« die Minderbelasten ») est votée le 21 avril 1948 suivie, en 1953, d'une 2e amnistie, nettement plus large, qui permet aux anciens Nazis « de peser lourdement dans la balance des forces politiques » .

En 1952, le FPÖ, issu de la VdU (« Verband der Unabhängigen » : Fédération des indépendants) dans la droite ligne de l' « Anschluß », affirme que les Autrichiens font partie du peuple allemand, avec tous les droits et tous les devoirs résultant de cette appartenance.

Pendant des décennies, la théorie de la « victimisation » établie dans l'opinion publique autrichienne reste largement

incontestée ; la population est rarement forcée de se confronter à l'héritage laissé par le 3^e « Reich ». En 1964, la déclaration du directeur de l'institut pédagogique de Graz, le Docteur Franz Göbhart, qui, en réponse à une invitation du « Deutsches Kulturwerk für europäische Geister », affirme que les machinations nationalistes allemandes n'ont pas leur place dans les écoles autrichiennes, suscite une vaste polémique relayée au parlement par le FPÖ ; en 1965, les déclarations ouvertement antisémites et nationalistes du professeur d'histoire économique Taras Borodajkewycz déclenchent des manifestations de protestation au cours desquelles un rescapé des camps de concentration, Ernst Kirchweger, est assassiné par un militant de droite lors d'émeutes. Ce n'est qu'au cours des années 1980 que l'Autriche doit massivement faire face à son passé sous le régime nazi. Le catalyseur de cette remise en question, connue sous le terme « Vergangenheitsbewältigung », est l'affaire Kurt Waldheim. Lorsque celui-ci est accusé, lors de sa candidature au poste de secrétaire-général de l'ONU (poste qu'il obtiendra), d'avoir été membre du Parti Nazi et de la SA, et de crimes de guerre (accusation dont il sera disculpé), la seule réponse du gouvernement autrichien consiste à affirmer que ces accusations constituent des interventions inamicales dans les affaires intérieures du pays. Malgré les réactions politiques face aux critiques internationales, l'affaire Waldheim marque le début d'une discussion de fond sur le passé nazi de l'Autriche et l'« Anschluß », et la remise en cause fondamentale du « mythe du 1^{er} pays libre victime de l'agression hitlérienne ».

Un autre facteur influençant la relation de l'Autriche à son passé nazi est l'émergence, au cours des années 1980, de Jörg Haider et de son Parti, le FPÖ, qui forme une coalition gouvernementale avec l'ÖVP, le 4 février 2004. Le programme de celui-ci, fondé en 1955, combine des éléments de la droite pan-germaniste avec des éléments du libéralisme ; lorsque Haider accède à la présidence du Parti, les aspects libéraux deviennent marginaux, au profit d'une rhétorique nationaliste et anti-immigrants. Haider est souvent critiqué pour sa définition de l'intérêt national autrichien sur une base ethnique (« Völkisch »), avec un slogan comme « l'Autriche aux Autrichiens », et pour son apologie du passé, notamment lorsqu'il définit les membres de la « Waffen SS » comme des « hommes d'honneur ». Haider va jusqu'à affirmer que l'existence de la seconde République autrichienne est « une anomalie idéologique congénitale ». Selon Megan Green, le succès du FPÖ provient de l'échec de l'Autriche à analyser en profondeur son passé nazi et à en tirer les leçons, et le FPÖ trouve ses racines idéologiques dans le Nazisme.

Haider n'est pas le seul à émettre des avis controversés sur le passé de l'Autriche. En 2000, son ancien partenaire au gouvernement, le Chancelier Wolfgang Schäussel, déclare au « Jerusalem Post » que l'Autriche a été la 1^{re} victime de l'Allemagne.

Dénonçant le simplisme de la théorie de la « victimisation » et l'époque de l'austro-fascisme, la pièce de Thomas Bernhard Heldenplatz, fait l'objet de controverses avant même sa 1^{re} représentation, en 1988, 50 ans après l'« Anschluß ». De nombreux hommes politiques de toutes tendances demandent que la pièce ne soit pas jouée au « Burgtheater » de Vienne. Kurt Waldheim, à cette époque Président de la république, qualifie l'œuvre d'insulte grossière au peuple autrichien. Toujours en 1988, lors du 50^e anniversaire de l'« Anschluß », le Président Waldheim et le Chancelier Franz Vranitzky reconnaissent pourtant, lors d'une cérémonie regardée par des millions de téléspectateurs, la complicité de l'Autriche dans l'Holocauste ; quelques mois plus tard, à l'occasion de l'anniversaire de la « Nuit de Cristal », le Chancelier rappelle à ses concitoyens la longue histoire de l'antisémitisme autrichien.

Dans le contexte de l'après-guerre, la République fédérale d'Allemagne est confrontée à un véritable combat pour en finir avec le passé : le « Vergangenheitsbewältigung ». En partie institutionnalisé, ce processus concerne les domaines de la littérature, de la culture, de la politique et de l'enseignement, et suscite des débats parfois vifs, comme dans le cadre de l'« Historikerstreit » (querelle des historiens). Dans un cadre similaire, mais plus tardivement, l'Autriche crée, en novembre 1998, une Commission d'historiens, la « Historikerkommission ». Son mandat est d'analyser le rôle de l'Autriche dans la confiscation des biens juifs opérée par le régime nazi et dans la mise en place d'un système de travail forcé, sous un angle plus historique que juridique. Comme son nom l'indique, il s'agit d'une commission historique, sans pouvoir particulier, à la différence d'une commission d'enquête parlementaire, et sans capacité de dépasser le stade de l'analyse et des recommandations. Cette mission est notamment définie pour répondre aux critiques dont le pays fait l'objet pour son traitement des plaintes des ayants droit des biens confisqués. Cette nouvelle impulsion, donnée en 1998, est confirmée, 10 ans après, lors de la visite d'État du Président autrichien Heinz Fischer, en Israël : durant son séjour, il déclare notamment « que la conscience du problème que représentent les questions liées à l'Holocauste s'est accrue dans les 10 dernières années » et que « depuis le milieu des années 1990, de vraies mesures ont été prises par le gouvernement ».

Cependant, le centre Simon Wiesenthal maintient ses critiques quant à la réticence persistante de l'Autriche, depuis les années 1970, à mener des enquêtes et à traduire devant les tribunaux des Nazis pour crimes de guerre et crimes contre l'humanité :

« Compte tenu du fait des très faibles résultats de l'Autriche en ce qui concerne la poursuites des exécutants de la “ Shoah ”, un fait clairement établi dans notre dernier rapport sur la situation mondiale en ce qui concerne les enquêtes et les poursuites de criminels de guerre nazis, je crois que la visite du Ministre des affaires étrangères d'Autriche en Israël constitue une opportunité unique pour que le gouvernement autrichien annonce son intention de s'occuper sérieusement, pour la 1re fois depuis des décennies, du problème des criminels de guerre nazis autrichiens impunis. C'est le bon moment pour que l'Autriche déclare qu'elle est prête à créer une unité d'enquête spécialisée pour traiter ces dossiers et pour établir clairement que sa volonté politique de traduire les Nazis devant la justice s'est finalement concrétisée à Vienne. » (Communiqué du Centre Simon-Wiesenthal, du 28 juillet 2003)

En 2003, le centre Wiesenthal lance une campagne mondiale, l'Opération de la dernière chance, pour rassembler des informations sur les Nazis encore en vie et qui pourraient faire l'objet de poursuites. Lors de cette campagne, le centre Wiesenthal met en évidence, en 2005, le cas de Milivoj Ašner, un Croate âgé de 92 ans qui fait partie des 10 Nazis les plus recherchés ; Ašner s'est réfugié en Autriche, en 2004, après que la Croatie a annoncé l'ouverture d'une enquête sur les crimes de guerre dans lesquels il aurait pu être impliqué. Malgré les critiques quant à la liberté dont jouit Ašner, le gouvernement fédéral autrichien retarde, « sine die », tant le traitement de la demande d'extradition formulée par la Croatie que le déclenchement de poursuites par le parquet de Klagenfurt. Ayant vécu en Autriche de 1946 à 1991, Ašner en a acquis la nationalité et ne peut donc être extradé.

...

The « Anschluß » (German for " connection " or union, political annexation) , also known as the « “ Anschluß ”

Österreichs » , was the occupation and annexation of Austria into Nazi Germany, in 1938. This was in contrast with the « Anschluß » movement (Austria and Germany united as one country) , which had been attempted since as early as 1918 when the Republic of German-Austria attempted union with Germany which was forbidden by the Treaty of Saint-Germain and Treaty of Versailles peace treaties.

Austria was annexed into the German 3rd « Reich » , on 12 March 1938. There had been several years of pressure by supporters in both Austria and Germany (by both Nazis and non-Nazis) for the « Heim ins “ Reich ” » movement. Earlier, Nazi Germany had provided support for the Austrian National-Socialist Party (Austrian Nazi Party) in its bid to seize power from Austria's Austrofascist leadership.

Under considerable pressure from both Austrian and German Nazis, Austria's Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg tried to hold a referendum for a vote on the issue. Although Schuschnigg expected Austria to vote in favour of maintaining autonomy, a well-planned « coup d'état » by the Austrian Nazi Party of Austria's State institutions in Vienna took place on 11 March 1938, prior to the referendum, which they canceled.

They transferred power to Germany, and « Wehrmacht » troops entered Austria to enforce the « Anschluß » . The Nazis held a plebiscite within the following month, asking the people to ratify the « fait accompli » . They claimed to have received 99.7 % of the vote, in favor.

Although the Allies were committed to upholding the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and Saint-Germain, which specifically prohibited the union of Austria and the German Empire, their reaction was only verbal and moderate. No military confrontation took place and even the strongest voices against the annexation, particularly Fascist Italy, France and Britain (the « Stresa Front ») remained at peace.

The « Anschluß » was among the 1st major steps of Adolf Hitler's creation of a Greater German « Reich » which was to include all ethnic German and all the lands and territories which the German Empire had lost after World War I. Although Austria had never been a part of 20th Century Germany (the unification of Germany, of the mid to late 1800's, created a Prussian dominated nation State, in 1871, leaving Austria as a part of « Lesser Germany ») , it was seen as a German State. Prior to the 1938 annexation, the 3rd « Reich » had re-militarized the Rhineland, and the Saar region was returned to Germany after 15 years of occupation through a plebiscite. After the « Anschluß » , Hitler targeted Czechoslovakia, provoking an international crisis which led to the Munich Agreement, in September 1938, giving the 3rd « Reich » control of the industrial Sudetenland, which had a predominantly ethnic German population. In March 1939, Adolf Hitler then ended Czechoslovakia by recognizing the independence of Slovakia and making the rest of the nation a protectorate. That same year, Memelland was returned from Lithuania.

With the « Anschluß » , the German speaking Republic of Austria ceased to exist as a fully independent State. At the end of World War II, a Provisional Austrian Government was set-up, on 27 April 1945, and was legally recognized by the Allies in the following months. It was not until 1955 that Austria regained full sovereignty.

The idea of grouping all Germans into a nation State country had been the subject of debate in the 19th Century,

from the ending of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation until the ending of the German Confederation. By 1871, the decision was to form a « kleindeutsch » German Empire based on Prussia and excluding Austria. Austria had its own Empire at the time, comprising Hungarians, Slavs and other ethnic groups ruled by a German minority. Austria had wanted a « Großdeutsche Lösung » (greater Germany solution) , whereby the German States would be united under the leadership of the Austrian Germans (the Habsburgs) . This solution would include all the German States (including the non German regions of Austria) , but Prussia would have to take 2nd place. This controversy, called dualism, dominated Prusso-Austrian diplomacy and the politics of the German States, for the next 20 years.

Elite and popular opinion in Austria after 1918 largely favoured some sort of union with Germany, but it was explicitly forbidden by the peace treaties. The Austro-Hungarian Empire broke-up in 1918, and, on 12 November that year, German Austria was officially declared a republic. The provisional national assembly drafted a provisional constitution that stated that « German Austria is a democratic republic » (Article 1) and « German Austria is a component of the German Republic » (Article 2) . Later, plebiscites in the German border provinces of Tyrol and Salzburg yielded majorities of 98 % and 99 % , in favor of a unification with the German Republic.

The Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Saint-Germain (both signed in 1919) explicitly prohibited the inclusion of Austria to politically join the German State. This measure was criticized by Hugo Preuss, the drafter of the German Weimar Constitution, who saw the prohibition as a contradiction of the Wilsonian principle of self-determination of peoples, intended to help bring peace to Europe. Following the destruction of World War I, however, France and Britain feared the power of a larger Germany and had begun to disempower the current one. Austrian particularism, especially among the nobility, also played a role in the decisions ; Austria was Roman Catholic, while Germany was dominated by Protestants, especially in government (the Prussian nobility, for example, was Lutheran) . The constitutions of the Weimar Republic and the 1st Austrian Republic included the political goal of unification, which was widely supported by Democratic Parties. In the early 1930's, popular support in Austria for union with German Empire remained overwhelming, and the Austrian government looked to a possible customs union with German Republic, in 1931.

The rise of the Nazis led by Adolf Hitler to power in the Weimar Republic initially caused the Austrian government to withdraw from such economic ties. Hitler, an Austrian German by birth, picked-up his patriotic German nationalist ideas whilst serving in the German army during WWI. In accordance to this, one of the Nazi's ideologies was to reunite all Germans either born or living outside of the « Reich » , in order to create an « all German “ Reich ” » . From the early beginning of his leadership in the Nazi Party, Hitler had publicly stated in his 1924 autobiography (« Mein Kampf ») that he would create a union between his birth country and Germany, by any means possible :

« German-Austria must be restored to the great German Motherland. » ; « People of the same blood should be in the same “ Reich ”. »

Austria shared the economic turbulence of the Great Depression, with a high unemployment rate and unstable commerce and industry. During the 1920's, it was a target for German investment capital. By 1937, rapid German rearmament increased Berlin's interest in annexation, because Austria was rich in raw materials and labor. It supplied Germany with magnesium and the products of the iron, textile and machine industries. It had gold and foreign

currency reserves, many unemployed skilled workers and hundreds of idle factories, and large potential hydro-electric resources.

The 1st Republic, dominated from the late- 1920's by the anti- « Anschluß » Catholic nationalist Christian-Social Party (CS) , gradually disintegrated from 1933 (dissolution of parliament and ban of the Austrian National-Socialists) to 1934 (Austrian Civil War, in February, and ban of all remaining Parties, except the CS) . The government evolved into a pseudo fascist, corporatist model of one Party government, which combined the CS and the para-military « Heimwehr » with absolute State domination of labour relations and no freedom of the press.

Power was centralized in the office of the Chancellor, who was empowered to rule by decree. The predominance of the Christian-Social Party (whose economic policies were based on the papal Encyclical « Rerum Novarum ») was an Austrian phenomenon. Austria's national identity had strong Catholic elements that were incorporated into the movement, by way of clerical authoritarian tendencies not found in Nazism. Both Engelbert Dollfuß and his successor, Kurt Schuschnigg, turned to Austria's other fascist neighbour, Italy, for inspiration and support. The statist corporatism often referred to as Austrofascism bore much more resemblance to Italian Fascism than German National-Socialism. For his part, Benito Mussolini supported the independence of Austria, largely due to concern that Adolf Hitler would eventually press for the return of Italian territories once ruled by Austria. However, Mussolini needed German support in Ethiopia. After receiving a personal assurance from Hitler that Germany would not seek territorial concessions from Italy, Mussolini began a client relationship with Berlin that began with the 1937 Berlin - Rome Axis.

On 25 July 1934, Chancellor Dollfuß was assassinated by Austrian Nazis in a failed coup. The 2nd civil war followed, lasting until August 1934. Afterward, leading Austrian Nazis fled to Germany but they continued to push for unification from there. The remaining Austrian Nazis started to make use of terrorist attacks against Austrian governmental institutions, causing a death toll of more than 800, between 1934 and 1938.

Following Dollfuß' assassination, his successor was Kurt Schuschnigg, who followed a similar political course. In 1935, Schuschnigg used the police to suppress the Nazi supporters in Austria. Police actions under Schuschnigg included gathering Nazis (and Social-Democrats) and holding them in internment camps. The Austro-Fascism of Austria between 1934-1938 focused on the history of Austria and opposed the absorption of Austria into the 3rd « Reich » (according to the philosophy Austrians were « better Germans ») . Schuschnigg called Austria the « better German State » but struggled to keep Austria independent. Eventually, Schuschnigg gave-up his anti-Nazi program and, in July 1936, he signed the Austro-German Agreement, which, among other concessions, allowed the release of Nazis imprisoned in Austria and the inclusion of National-Socialists in his Cabinet. This did not satisfy Hitler and the pro-Germany Austrian Nazis grew in strength.

Following increasing violence and demands from Adolf Hitler that Austria agree to a union, Schuschnigg met with Hitler, on 12 February, at Berchtesgaden, in an attempt to avoid the take-over of Austria. Hitler presented Schuschnigg with a set of demands which included appointing known Austrian Nazi sympathizers to positions of great power in the Austrian government. The key appointment was that of Arthur Seyß-Inquart who would take-over as Minister of Public Security, with full and unlimited control of the police forces in Austria. In return, Hitler would publicly reaffirm the

treaty of 11 July 1936 and reaffirm his support for Austria's national sovereignty. Schuschnigg accepted Hitler's « deal », returned to Vienna and made the changes to his government.

Arthur Seyß-Inquart was a long time Nazi who sought the union of all Germans in one State. Leopold argues he was a moderate who favoured an evolutionary approach to union. He opposed the violent tactics of the Austrian Nazis, collaborated with Catholic groups, and wanted to preserve a measure of Austrian identity within the 3rd « Reich » .

1 week later, Adolf Hitler made a speech in which he stated :

« The German “ Reich ” is no longer willing to tolerate the suppression of 10 million Germans across its borders. »

This was clearly directed at Austria and Czechoslovakia.

On 9 March 1938, in an effort to preserve Austria's independence, Schuschnigg scheduled a plebiscite on the issue of unification for 13 March. To secure a large majority in the referendum, Schuschnigg set the minimum voting age at 24, as he believed younger voters were now supporters of the German Nazi ideology. This was a risk and, the next day, it became apparent that Hitler would not simply stand by while Austria declared its independence by public vote. Hitler declared that the referendum would be subject to major fraud and that Germany would not accept it. In addition, the German ministry of propaganda issued press reports that riots had broken-out in Austria and that large parts of the Austrian population were calling for German troops to restore order. Schuschnigg immediately responded publicly that reports of riots were false.

On 11 March, Adolf Hitler sent an ultimatum to Schuschnigg demanding that he hand-over all power to the Austrian National-Socialists or face an invasion. The ultimatum was set to expire at noon, but was extended by 2 hours. Without waiting for an answer, Hitler had already signed the order to send troops into Austria at 1 o'clock.

Schuschnigg desperately sought support for Austrian independence, in the hours following the ultimatum. Realizing that neither France nor Britain was willing to take steps, he resigned as Chancellor that evening. In the radio broadcast, in which he announced his resignation, he argued that he accepted the changes and allowed the Nazis to take-over the government « to avoid the shedding of fraternal blood » (« Bruderblut ») .

It is said that, after listening to Bruckner's 7th Symphony, Adolf Hitler cried :

« How can anyone say that Austria is not German ! Is there anything more German than our old pure Austrianness ? »

On the morning of 12 March, the 8th Army of the German « Wehrmacht » crossed the border to Austria. The troops were greeted by cheering German-Austrians with Nazi salutes, Nazi flags and flowers. Because of this, the Nazi annexing is also-called the « Blumenkrieg » (War of flowers) , but its official name was « Unternehmen Otto » . For the « Wehrmacht » , the invasion was the 1st big test of its machinery. Although the invading forces were badly organized

and coordination among the units was poor, it mattered little because no fighting took place.

Adolf Hitler's Mercedes crossed the border in the afternoon, at Braunau, his birthplace. In the evening, he arrived at Linz and was given an enthusiastic welcome at City Hall.

Adolf Hitler's travel through Austria became a triumphal tour that climaxed in Vienna, on 15 March 1938, when around 200,000 German-Austrians gathered around the « Heldenplatz » (Square of Heroes) to hear Hitler say, in front of tens of thousands of cheering people, that :

« The oldest eastern province of the German people shall be, from this point on, the newest bastion of the German “ Reich ”. » ; followed by his « greatest accomplishment » (completing the annexing of Austria to form a Greater German “ Reich ”) by saying : « Als “ Führer ” und Kanzler der deutschen Nation und des Reiches melde ich vor der deutschen Geschichte nunmehr den Eintritt meiner Heimat in das Deutsche “ Reich ”. »

Translation :

« As leader and chancellor of the German nation and “ Reich ”, I announce to German history now the entry of my homeland into the German “ Reich ”. »

Hitler later commented :

« Certain foreign newspapers have said that we fell on Austria with brutal methods. I can only say : even in death, they cannot stop lying. I have, in the course of my political struggle, won much love from my people but when I crossed the former frontier (into Austria) there met me such a stream of love as I have never experienced. Not as tyrants have we come, but as liberators. »

The « Anschluß » was given immediate effect by legislative act, on 13 March, subject to ratification by a plebiscite. Austria became the province of Ostmark, and Arthur Seyß-Inquart was appointed governor. The plebiscite was held on 10 April and officially recorded a support of 99.7 % of the voters.

Adolf Hitler's forces worked to suppress any opposition. Before the 1st German soldier crossed the border, Heinrich Himmler and a few SS officers landed in Vienna to arrest prominent representatives of the 1st Republic, such as Richard Schmitz, Leopold Figl, Friedrich Hillegeist and Franz Olah. During the few weeks between the « Anschluß » and the plebiscite, authorities rounded-up Social-Democrats, Communists and other potential political dissenters, as well as Jews, and imprisoned them or sent them to concentration camps. Within only a few days of 12 March, 70,000 people had been arrested. The plebiscite was subject to large scale propaganda and to the abrogation of the voting rights of around 400,000 people (nearly 10 % of the eligible voting population) , mainly former members of Left-wing Parties and Jews.

While historians concur that the result was not manipulated, the voting process was neither free nor secret. Officials

were present directly beside the voting booths and received the voting ballot by hand (in contrast to a secret vote where the voting ballot is inserted into a closed box) . In some remote areas of Austria, people voted to preserve the independence of Austria, on 13 March (in Schuschnigg's planned but officially cancelled plebiscite) , despite the « Wehrmacht » 's presence. For instance, in the village of Innervillgraten, a majority of 95 % voted for Austria's independence. However, in the plebiscite, on 10 April, 73.3 % of votes in Innervillgraten were in favor of the « Anschluß » , which was still the lowest number of all Austrian municipalities.

A largely unhindered voting process occurred in the Italian harbour city of Gaeta, where an extra-territorial vote of German and Austrian clerics, studying at the German college of Santa Maria dell'Anima, took place. The vote was concluded on board the German cruiser Admiral Scheer, which was anchored in the harbour. Contrary to the overall result, these clerical votes rejected the « Anschluß » by over 90 % , an incident which became known, at the time, as the « Shame of Gaeta » (« Vergogna di Gaeta, Schande von Gaeta ») .

Austria remained part of the 3rd « Reich » until the end of World War II, when a preliminary Austrian government declared the « “ Anschluß ” null und nichtig » (« null and void ») , on 27 April 1945. After the War, then Allied occupied Austria was recognized and treated as a separate country. It was not restored to sovereignty until the Austrian State Treaty and Austrian Declaration of Neutrality, both of 1955, largely due to the rapid development of the Cold War and disputes between the Soviet Union and its former allies over foreign policy.

Austria, in the 1st days of the 3rd « Reich » , had many contradictions : at one and the same time, Adolf Hitler's terror regime began to tighten its grip in every area of society, beginning with mass arrests as thousands of Austrians tried to escape ; yet, other Austrians cheered and welcomed the German troops entering their territory. Many Austrian political figures announced their support of the « Anschluß » and relief that it happened without violence.

Cardinal Theodor Innitzer (a political figure of the CS) declared as early as 12 March :

« The Viennese Catholics should thank the Lord for the bloodless way this great political change has occurred, and they should pray for a great future for Austria. Needless to say, everyone should obey the orders of the new institutions. »

The other Austrian bishops followed suit, some days later. Vatican Radio, however, broadcast a strong denunciation of the German action, and Cardinal Pacelli, the Vatican Secretary of State, ordered Innitzer to report to Rome. Before meeting the Pope, Innitzer met Pacelli, who had been outraged by Innitzer's statement. He told Innitzer that he needed to retract his statement ; he was made to sign a new statement, issued on behalf of all the Austrian bishops, which provided :

« The solemn declaration of the Austrian bishops was clearly not intended to be an approval of something that was not and is not compatible with God's law. »

The Vatican newspaper reported that the German bishops' earlier statement had been issued without approval from

Rome.

Robert Kauer, president of the minority Lutheran Church in Austria, greeted Adolf Hitler on 13 March as « Saviour of the 350,000 German Protestants in Austria and liberator from a 5 year hardship » .

Karl Renner, the most famous Social-Democrat of the 1st Republic, announced his support for the « Anschluß » and appealed to all Austrians to vote in favour of it, on 10 April.

The international response to the « Anschluß » was publicly moderate. « The Times » commented that, 300 years before, Scotland had joined England as well, and that this event would not really differ much. On 14 March, the British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, noted in the House of Commons :

« His Majesty's Government have throughout been in the closest touch with the situation. The Foreign Secretary saw the German Foreign Minister on the 10th of March and addressed to him a grave warning on the Austrian situation and upon what appeared to be the policy of the German Government in regard to it. Late on the 11th of March, our Ambassador in Berlin registered a protest in strong terms with the German Government against such use of coercion, backed by force, against an independent State in order to create a situation incompatible with its national independence. »

However, the speech concluded :

« I imagine that, according to the temperament of the individual, the events which are in our minds today will be the cause of regret, of sorrow, perhaps of indignation. They cannot be regarded by His Majesty's Government with indifference or equanimity. They are bound to have effects which cannot, yet, be measured. The immediate result must be to intensify the sense of uncertainty and insecurity in Europe. Unfortunately, while the policy of appeasement would lead to a relaxation of the economic pressure under which many countries are suffering today, what has just occurred must inevitably retard economic recovery and, indeed, increased care will be required to ensure that marked deterioration does not set in. This is not a moment for hasty decisions or for careless words. We must consider the new situation quickly, but with cool judgement. As regards our defence programmes, we have always made it clear that they were flexible and that they would have to be reviewed, from time to time, in the light of any development in the international situation. It would be idle to pretend that recent events do not constitute a change of the kind that we had in mind. Accordingly, we have decided to make a fresh review and, in due course, we shall announce what further steps we may think it necessary to take. »

Within this speech, Neville Chamberlain also said :

« The hard fact is that nothing could have arrested what has actually happened in Austria, unless this country and other countries had been prepared to use force. »

The subdued reaction to the « Anschluß » (the United States issued a similar statement) led to Adolf Hitler's

conclusion that he could use more aggressive tactics in his « road map » to expand the 3rd « Reich » , as he would later in annexing the Sudetenland.

The « Anschluß » : annexation or union ?

The word « Anschluß » , outside the context of March 1938, is properly translated as « joinder » , « connection » , « unification » , or « political union » . In contrast, the German word « Annektierung » , that would mean military annexation unambiguously, was and is not commonly used in this context. The usage of the term « Anschluß » has been widespread before and, in 1938, describing an incorporation of Austria into Germany. Calling the incorporation of Austria into Nazi Germany an « Anschluß » , that is a unification or joinder, was also part of the propaganda used, in 1938, by Adolf Hitler and the Nazis to create the impression the events of March 1938 were not backed and enforced by military pressure. Hitler described the incorporation of Austria as its return to its original home (« Heimkehr ») . The word « Anschluß » has endured during and following World War II, despite being a euphemism for what took place.

Some historical sources, like the « Encyclopædia Britannica » , describe the « Anschluß » as an « annexation » rather than a union. Neither word captures the differences between the « Anschluß » and other Nazi annexations backed by force : that much of the Austrian population either supported or were indifferent to the incorporation of Austria into the 3rd « Reich » .

The 2nd Republic :

The Moscow Declaration of 1943, signed by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, included a « Declaration on Austria » , which stated the following :

« The governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the 1st free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination. They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany, on 15 March 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as, in no way, bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see re-established a free and independent Austria and, thereby, to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighbouring States which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace. Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the War at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation. »

The declaration was mostly intended to serve as propaganda aimed at stirring Austrian resistance. Although some Austrians aided Jews and are counted as Righteous among the Nations, there never was an effective Austrian armed resistance of the sort found in other countries under German occupation. The declaration is said to have a somewhat complex drafting history. At Nuremberg, Arthur Seyß-Inquart and Franz von Papen, in particular, were both indicted under count one (conspiracy to commit crimes against peace) specifically for their activities in support of the Austrian

Nazi Party and the « Anschluß » , but neither was convicted of this count. In acquitting von Papen, the Court noted that his actions were in its view political immoralities but not crimes under its charter. Seyß-Inquart was convicted of other serious War crimes, most of which took place in Poland and the Netherlands, was sentenced to death and executed.

Austrian identity and the « victim theory » :

After World War II, many Austrians sought comfort in the idea of Austria as « the Nazis' 1st victim » . Although the Nazi Party was promptly banned, Austria did not have the same thorough process of de-Nazification at the top of government which was imposed on Germany for a time. Lacking outside pressure for political reform, factions of Austrian society tried for a long time to advance the view that the « Anschluß » was only an annexation at the point of a bayonet.

This view of the events of 1938 has deep roots in the 10 years of Allied occupation and the struggle to regain Austrian sovereignty : the « victim theory » played an essential role in the negotiations on the Austrian State Treaty with the Soviets, and, by pointing to the Moscow Declaration, Austrian politicians heavily relied on it to achieve a solution for Austria different from the division of Germany into separate Eastern and Western States. The State Treaty, alongside the subsequent Austrian declaration of permanent neutrality, marked important milestones for the solidification of Austria's independent national identity during the course of the following decades.

As Austrian politicians of the left and right attempted to reconcile their differences in order to avoid the violent conflict that had dominated the 1st Republic, discussions of both Austrian Nazism and Austria's role during the Nazi era were largely avoided. Still, the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP) had advanced, and still advances, the argument that the establishment of the Dollfuß dictatorship was necessary in order to maintain Austrian independence. On the other hand, the Austrian Social-Democratic Party (SPÖ) argues that the Dollfuß dictatorship stripped the country of the democratic resources necessary to repel Adolf Hitler ; yet, it ignores the fact that Hitler himself was a native to Austria.

In contrast with the 1st victim theory, it has also helped the Austrians develop their own national identity as before. After World War II and the fall of the 3rd « Reich » , the political ideology Pan-Germanism massively declined and is now seen by the vast majority of German speaking people as taboo. Unlike earlier in the 20th Century era when there was no Austrian identity separate from a German one, in 1987, only 6 % of the Austrians identified themselves as « Germans » . Today, over 90 % of the Austrians see themselves as an independent nation. The logic of the existence of an independent Austrian State is no longer questioned as it was in the inter War period.

For decades, the victim theory remained largely undisputed. The Austrian public was rarely forced to confront the legacy of the 3rd « Reich » ; most notably, it had to face issues during the events of 1965, when Taras Borodajkewycz, a professor of economic history, made anti-Semitic remarks following the death of Ernst Kirchweyer, a concentration camp survivor killed by a Right-wing protester during riots. It was not until the 1980's that Austrians confronted their mixed past. The catalyst for the « Vergangenheitsbewältigung » was the Waldheim affair. When Kurt

Waldheim, the successful candidate of a presidential election and former UN Secretary General, was accused of having been a member of the Nazi Party and of the infamous SA (he was later absolved of direct involvement in War crimes), Austrians said that scrutiny was an unwelcome intervention in the country's internal affairs. Despite the politicians' reactions to international criticism, the Waldheim affair started the 1st serious discussions about Austria's past and the « Anschluß » .

Another factor was the rise of Jörg Haider and the Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) , in the 1980's. The Party had combined elements of the pan-German right with free-market Liberalism since its foundation in 1955, but after Haider ascended to the Party chairmanship, in 1986, the Liberal elements became increasingly marginalized. Haider began to openly use nationalist and anti-immigrant rhetoric. He was criticised for using the « völkisch » (ethnic) definition of national interest (« Austria for Austrians ») and his apologetics for Austria's past, notably calling members of the Waffen SS « men of honour » . Following a dramatic rise in electoral support, in the 1990's, that peaked in the 1999 elections, the FPÖ entered a coalition with the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP) , led by Wolfgang Schüssel. This was condemned in 2000. The coalition prompted the regular « Donnerstagsdemonstrationen » (Thursday demonstrations) in protest against the government, which took place on the « Heldenplatz » where Adolf Hitler had greeted the masses during the « Anschluß » . Haider's tactics and rhetoric, often criticised as sympathetic to Nazism, forced Austrians to reconsider their relationship to the past. Haider's coalition partner, former Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel, in a 2000 interview with the « Jerusalem Post » , stated that Austria was the 1st victim of Adolf Hitler's Germany, repeating the victim story.

The political discussions and soul searching were reflected in other aspects of culture. Thomas Bernhard's last play, « Heldenplatz » (1988) , generated controversy even before it was produced, 50 years after Adolf Hitler's entrance in Vienna. Bernhard made the historic elimination of references to Hitler's reception in Vienna emblematic of Austrian attempts to claim its history and culture under questionable criteria. Many politicians called Bernhard a « Nestbeschmutzer » (damaging the reputation of his country) and openly demanded that the play should not be staged in Vienna's « Burgtheater » . Waldheim, still president, called the play « a crude insult to the Austrian people » .

Historical Commission and outstanding legal issues :

In the context of the post-War Federal Republic of Germany, one encounters a « Vergangenheitsbewältigung » (struggle to come to terms with the past) that has been partially institutionalised, variably in literary, cultural, political, and educational contexts (its development and difficulties have not been trivial) . In 1988, Austria formed a « Historikerkommission » (Historian's Commission or Historical Commission) with a mandate to review Austria's role in the Nazi expropriation of Jewish property from a scholarly rather than legal perspective, partly in response to continuing criticism of its handling of property claims. Its membership was based on recommendations from various quarters, including Simon Wiesenthal and Yad Vashem. The Commission delivered its report, in 2003. Noted Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg refused to participate in the Commission and, in an interview, stated his strenuous objections in terms both personal and in reference to larger questions about Austrian culpability and liability, comparing what he thought to be relative inattention to the settlement governing the Swiss bank holdings of those who died or were displaced by the Holocaust :

« I personally would like to know why the WJC has hardly put any pressure on Austria, even as leading Nazis and SS leaders were Austrians, Adolf Hitler included. Immediately after the War, the U.S. wanted to make the Russians withdraw from Austria, and the Russians wanted to keep Austria neutral, therefore, there was a common interest to grant Austria victim status. And later, Austria could cry poor ; though its per capita income is as high as Germany's. And, most importantly, the Austrian PR machinery works better. Austria has the Opera ball, the Imperial castle, the “ Mozartkugeln ” chocolate. Americans like that. And Austrians invest and export relatively little to the U.S. , therefore, they are less vulnerable to blackmail. In the meantime, they set-up a commission in Austria to clarify what happened to Jewish property. Victor Klima, the former chancellor, has asked me to join. My father fought for Austria in the 1st World War and, in 1939, he was kicked-out of Austria. After the War, they offered him 10 \$ per month, as compensation. For this reason, I told Klima, no thank you, this makes me sick. »

The Simon Wiesenthal Center continues to criticise Austria (as recently as June 2005) for its alleged historical and ongoing unwillingness aggressively to pursue investigations and trials against Nazis for War crimes and crimes against humanity from the 1970's onwards. Its 2001 report offered the following characterization :

« Given the extensive participation of numerous Austrians, including at the highest levels, in the implementation of the “ Final Solution ” and other Nazi crimes, Austria should have been a leader in the prosecution of Holocaust perpetrators over the course of the past 4 decades, as has been the case in Germany. Unfortunately, relatively little has been achieved by the Austrian authorities in this regard and, in fact, with the exception of the case of Doctor Heinrich Groß which was suspended this year under highly-suspicious circumstances (he claimed to be medically unfit, but, outside the Court, proved to be healthy) not a single Nazi War crimes prosecution has been conducted in Austria since the mid 1970's. »

In 2003, the Center launched a world-wide effort named « Operation : Last Chance » , in order to collect further information about those Nazis still alive that are potentially subject to prosecution. Although reports issued shortly thereafter credited Austria for initiating large scale investigations, there has been 1 case where criticism of Austrian authorities arose recently : The Center has put 92 year old Croatian, Milivoj Asner, on its 2005 « Top 10 » list. Asner fled to Austria, in 2004, after Croatia announced it would start investigations in the case of War crimes he may have been involved in. In response to objections about Asner's continued freedom, Austria's federal government has deferred to either extradition requests from Croatia or prosecutorial actions from Klagenfurt, neither of which appears forthcoming (as of June 2005) . Extradition is not an option since Asner also holds Austrian citizenship, having lived in the country, from 1946 to 1991.

Austrian political and military leaders in Nazi Germany :

Adolf Hitler ; Ernst Kaltenbrunner ; Arthur Seyß-Inquart ; Odilo Globocnik ; Amon Göth ; Lothar Rendulic ; Alfred Ritter von Hubicki ; Alexander Löhr ; Franz Böhme ; Otto Skorzeny ; Julius Ringel ; Adolf Eichmann ; Erhard Raus ; Hans Fischböck.

Maire nazi de Vienne : Hermann Neubacher (1938-1940)

The Austrian Nazi politician Hermann Neubacher was born on 24 June 1893 in Wels and died, aged 67, on 1 July 1960 in Vienna. He held a number of diplomatic posts in the 3rd « Reich ». During the Second World War, he was appointed as the leading German foreign ministry official for the Balkans (including Greece, Serbia, Albania and Montenegro) .

Neubacher was educated in Kremsmünster and Vienna before seeing service in Italy in World War I. Initially connected to the Social-Democratic Party of Austria through his friendship with a number of leading members whilst in charge of a housing project in Vienna, he became attracted to Pan-Germanism and, in 1925, founded his own « Österreichisch-Deutscher Volksbund » as a society for this school of thought. He was also a member of the « Deutsche Gemeinschaft » secret society and, in this group, he built-up friendships with fellow members Engelbert Dollfuß and Arthur Seyß-Inquart.

Neubacher became a member of the Nazi Party in Austria because he felt it was the best way to bring about « Anschluß », although he was more in tune with the Anton Reinthaller led moderate faction than the extremists under Theodor Habicht. After a spell as assistant to Josef Leopold, he became « Landesleiter » of the Austrian Nazi Party in 1935, attempting to restructure the banned group. His tenure came to an end the same year when he was imprisoned for distributing illegal material and upon his release he dropped-out of politics to take-up a role with « IG Farben » .

Under the Nazis, he was chosen to serve as Mayor of Vienna, although he soon incurred disfavour for his habit of working with former Social-Democrats and his lax attitude towards the Jews and, before long, he was downgraded to the role of general representative of Josef Bürckel.

When War broke-out, Neubacher took on the role of a special plenipotentiary envoy in the Balkans and Greece, initially serving as an economic adviser in Romania before taking on the role of ambassador to the same country and, afterwards, Greece as well. In Greece, he was joined by Italian Alberto D'Agostino, with the 2 men given full-authority over economic and financial matters after discussions between the Greek government and the occupiers aimed at reducing occupation costs. During the final days of the occupation of Greece, the more moderate Neubacher became embroiled in a struggle with « Sicherheitspolizei » chief Walter Blume, after Blume suggested that the Nazis should undertake a policy of executing all members of the political elite suspected of having links to the United Kingdom, so as to leave the country leaderless (the so-called « Chaos thesis ») . Neubacher rejected this as counter-productive, arguing that, as long as politicians opposed the work of the Communist-controlled National Liberation Front and the Greek People's Liberation Army, their British links should be ignored. In the end, Neubacher's line was approved and Blume was withdrawn, a move that ultimately left in place a strong pro-British Right-wing governing class in post-liberation Greece.

In 1943, he devised the Neubacher Plan as a means to improve German occupation in the Balkans. In a wide ranging raft of reforms, Neubacher suggested 5 main ideas to Joachim von Ribbentrop. These were :

The return of Montenegro to Serbia.

Installing General Milan Nedić as President of the resulting Greater Serbia.

Autonomy in Montenegro.

The re-opening of the University of Belgrade and an end to German supervision of cultural life.

Reduction in German military presence and the establishment of a gendarmerie controlled by the new government.

Ultimately, only point 4 of his proposals was approved, although he did succeed in ending German military reprisals and, in combating to an extent, the Ustaše reprisals against Serbs.

After the War, Neubacher faced trial in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and, in 1946, a military court in Belgrade sentenced him to 20 years of hard labour, although he was not ultimately required to serve the full-sentence. He served his prison term in Belgrade, in the building of the former « Gestapo » headquarters. He was released from prison in November 1952 due to poor health. Back in Austria, he worked as a building constructor in Salzburg, and from 1954-1956, he worked in Ethiopia as a consultant to Emperor Haile Selasie.

...

Hermann Neubacher, economics expert and politician. From 1920, worked in the wood industry, managing director of the GESIBA (communal housing projects in Vienna) . From 1933, member of the illegal NSDAP. From March 13, 1938 until May 1939, Mayor of Vienna. From 1940, envoy to Bucharest and Athens. For his activities as « special commissioner South-East » (from 1940 to 1945) and as the authorized representative with the military command in Serbia (from 1943) , he was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment in Yugoslavia in 1951, but released in 1952 on grounds of ill health. Later, he worked as a building contractor in Salzburg and, from 1954 to 1956, was charged with the expansion of Ethiopia's administration.

...

Hermann Neubacher (geboren 24. Juni 1893 in Wels, Oberösterreich ; gestorben 1. Juli 1960 in Wien) war ein österreichischer Wirtschaftsfachmann und Politiker der Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei. Von 13. März 1938 bis 14. Dezember 1940 war er Bürgermeister von Wien.

Hermann Neubacher war Kriegsteilnehmer und hatte als Kaiserlich und Königlich Offizier eine kroatische Kompanie geführt. Im Jahr 1919 legte er an der damaligen Hochschule für Bodenkultur eine Dissertation zu einem forstwirtschaftlichen Thema vor. Seit seinem Studium war er Mitglied im Wiener Akademischen Turnverein. Neubacher war ab dem Jahre 1920 in der Holzindustrie tätig. Außerdem fungierte er in Wien als Generaldirektor der GESIBA (Gemeinnützige Siedlungs- und Baustoffanstalt) , die maßgeblich am sozialen Wohnungsbau in Wien beteiligt war. Als

Mitglied des « Österreichisch-Deutschen Volksbundes » agitierte Neubacher zusammen mit Arthur Seyß-Inquart und anderen großdeutsch eingestellten Politikern für den « Anschluß » Österreichs an Deutschland und wurde nach der « Machtergreifung » Adolf Hitlers am 30. Januar 1933 im Deutschen Reich Mitglied der Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei in Österreich.

Als österreichische Nationalsozialisten am 25. Juli 1934 den Versuch unternahmen, den austrofaschistischen Ständestaat durch einen Putsch zu beseitigen (Juliputsch) , und dabei Bundeskanzler Engelbert Dollfuß ermordeten, tauchte die Partei unter ; in dieser Phase der Illegalität übernahm zeitweilig Neubacher die Führung der mittlerweile verbotenen österreichischen NSDAP, wurde aber im Juni 1935 zusammen mit seinem innerparteilichen Widersacher Josef Leopold verhaftet. Beide wurden aufgrund des Juliabkommens von 1936 amnestiert, Neubacher war fortan « für die reichsdeutschen IG-Farben als Balkanexperte (unter Einschluß Österreichs) tätig » .

Nachdem der Anschluß Österreichs an das Deutsche Reich tatsächlich mit dem Einmarsch der Wehrmacht am 12. März 1938 vollzogen wurde, löste Neubacher bereits am folgenden Tag Richard Schmitz als Bürgermeister Wiens ab ; diese Position behielt er bis zum 14. Dezember 1940. Anschließend wurde Hermann Neubacher Abgesandter in Bukarest und Athen.

Am 15. Oktober 1942 wurde Neubacher zum « Sonderbeauftragten des Reiches für wirtschaftliche und finanzielle Fragen in Griechenland » berufen, dem die monopolistische DEGRIGES direkt unterstand. Zum Finanz- und Superminister über alle « produktiven Resorts » bestimmte er Hektor Tsironikos, von dem er sagte, daß dessen « Deutschfreundlichkeit über jeden Zweifel erhaben » sei.

Vom 24. August 1943 bis Kriegsende war Neubacher Sonderbevollmächtigter des Auswärtigen Amtes für den Südosten und dem Militärbefehlshaber Südost in Serbien gleichgestellt. Nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges wurde er in Jugoslawien im Jahr 1951 zu 20 Jahren Gefängnis verurteilt, jedoch bereits nach wenigen Monaten schwer krank entlassen. In den Jahren 1954 bis 1956 war Neubacher von der Regierung des Kaiserreichs Äthiopien als « Berater und Verwaltungskommissar der Stadt Addis Abeba » eingesetzt. Während des zweieinhalbjährigen Aufenthalts in Äthiopien lernte er das Land kennen und verfasste ein Buch über diese Zeit.

Hermann Neubacher kehrte zurück nach Österreich und war vor allem als Bauunternehmer in Salzburg tätig.

Marcus J. Carney versuchte in einer Dokumentation Film Projekt Neubacher die Geschichte seines Onkels sowie seiner Familie und deren Aufarbeitung nach dem Weltkrieg darzustellen und legte es auf die österreichische Nachkriegsgeneration um, der er den « morbus austriacus » (die österreichische Krankheit) attestierte.

...

Hermann Neubacher, Wirtschaftsfachmann und Politiker. Ab 1920 in der Holzindustrie tätig, Generaldirektor der GESIBA (kommunale Wohnbauten in Wien) . Ab 1933 Mitglied der illegalen NSDAP, von 13. März 1938 bis Mai 1939 Bürgermeister von Wien, ab 1940 Gesandter in Bukarest und Athen. Neubacher wurde wegen seiner Tätigkeit als «

Sonderbeauftragter Südost » 1940-1945 und als Bevollmächtigter beim Militärbefehlshaber in Serbien (ab 1943) 1951 in Jugoslawien zu 20 Jahren Gefängnis verurteilt, aber 1952 schwer krank entlassen. Danach war er Bauunternehmer in Salzburg und wurde 1954-1956 mit dem Ausbau der Verwaltung Äthiopiens betraut.

Schriften

Die forstliche Rente. Ein kritischer Beitrag zum Reinertragsproblem in der Forstwirtschaft, Dissertation (1919) .

Kampf um Mitteleuropa (1932) .

Sonderauftrag Südost, 1940-1945. Bericht eines fliegenden Diplomaten. Musterschmidt, Göttingen (1956) .

Die Festung der Löwen. Äthiopien von Salomon bis zur Gegenwart, Walter-Verlag, Olten und Freiburg im Breisgau (1959)

Maire nazi de Vienne : Philipp Wilhelm Jung (1940-1943)

The German Nazi politician Philipp Wilhelm Jung was born on 16 September 1884 in Nieder-Flörsheim, in the Grand Duchy of Heße ; and died on 9 September 1965 in Worms, West Germany.

Jung was the son of an elementary school teacher. He earned a doctoral degree in law. He joined the SA in 1927 and the Nazi Party in 1930. In 1933, after the Nazi « Machtergreifung » , he became president of the Hessian parliament. After the dismissal of Wilhelm Ehrhard by the Nazis, Jung was appointed provisional mayor of the city of Mainz. Already, in May 1933, he was displaced by Robert Barth. He was prime minister of the People's State of Heße from September 1933 until March 1935 when this function was taken over by Jakob Sprenger. During World War II, Jung was the mayor of Vienna from 1940 to 1943.

...

Philipp Wilhelm Jung (geboren 16. September 1884 in Nieder-Flörsheim ; gestorben 9. September 1965 in Worms) war ein deutscher nationalsozialistischer Politiker.

Philipp Wilhelm Jung war der Sohn des Volksschullehrers Adam Jung und dessen Frau Katharina geborene Weyerhäuser. Er besuchte das Gymnasium in Worms und studierte ab 1906 Rechtswissenschaften in Heidelberg, München und Gießen. Während seines Studiums wurde er 1903 Mitglied der Burschenschaft Frankonia Heidelberg. 1906 legte er das erste und nach dem Referendariat am 9. Dezember 1912 das zweite Staatsexamen ab und arbeitete danach als Rechtsanwalt in Worms. Am 30. September 1911 heiratete er in Heidelberg Stefanie Sofie, geborene Muxel.

Ab August 1914 war Jung Soldat im Deutschen Heer. Zunächst war er als Zugführer im 2. Badischen Feld-Artillerie-Regiment Nr. 30 eingesetzt. Danach war er Adjutant bei einer Feldartillerie-Abteilung und bei einem

Artilleriekommandeur an der Westfront. Ende 1916 bis zum Ende des Krieges am 11. November 1918 war er Batterieführer. Er wurde mit beiden Eisernen Kreuzen und der Hessischen Tapferkeitsmedaille ausgezeichnet.

Nach dem Krieg arbeitete er wieder als Rechtsanwalt. 1926 wurde er in den Stadtrat von Worms gewählt. Seit 1927 war er ständiger Verteidiger des NSDAP-Gauleiters der Rheinpfalz, Josef Bürckel und Mitglied der SA, in der er später bis zum Brigadeführer aufstieg. 1930 trat er in die NSDAP ein und wurde 1931 NSDAP-Kreisleiter von Worms.

1931 wurde er in den Landtag des Volksstaates Hessen gewählt, in dem er 1931 bis 1933 die NSDAP-Fraktion führte.

Nach der « Machtergreifung » der Nationalsozialisten wurde er 1933 Präsident des Hessischen Landtages. Nach der Absetzung von Wilhelm Ehrhard durch die Nationalsozialisten, denen dieser kritisch gegenüberstand, wurde Jung zum kommissarischen Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Mainz berufen. Während seiner Zeit als kommissarischer Oberbürgermeister erfolgte die Entfernung des Befreiungsdenkmals vom Schillerplatz.

Bereits im Mai 1933 wurde er in diesem Amt von Robert Barth abgelöst. Jung war ab März 1933 Staatsrat und anschließend ab 20. September 1933 ernannter Ministerpräsident des Volksstaates Hessen. Er löste in dieser Funktion Ferdinand Werner ab, der ebenfalls Mitglied der NSDAP war. Philipp Wilhelm Jung blieb bis zum 1. März 1935 Ministerpräsident, als der « Reichsstatthalter des Volksstaates Hessen » Jakob Sprenger diese Funktion mitübernahm.

Anschließend war er Regierungspräsident der Saarpfalz, ehe er während des Zweiten Weltkrieges am 16. Mai 1940 als Bürgermeister Wiens eingesetzt wurde. Er löste in dieser Funktion am 14. Dezember 1940 Hermann Neubacher ab und wurde selbst am 30. Dezember 1943 durch Hanns Blaschke ersetzt. Vorausgegangen waren Konflikte Jungs mit dem Gauleiter Baldur von Schirach. Jung beantragte eine Versetzung als Offizier an die Front. Dies erfolgte jedoch nicht. Über die Tätigkeit Jungs 1943 bis Kriegsende ist nichts bekannt.

Philipp Wilhelm Jung und seine Frau wurden nach dem Kriegsende im Lager Kornwestheim inhaftiert und ihr Vermögen gesperrt. Seine Frau wurde im Rahmen der Weihnachtsamnestie am 12. November 1947, er selbst am 17. Juni 1948 aus der Haft entlassen. Im Spruchkammerverfahren wurde er als « Minderbelasteter » eingestuft. Nachdem das Land Hessen ihm keine Pension als Regierungsrat hatte zahlen wollen, kam es zu einem Gerichtsverfahren beim Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt, das mit einem Vergleich beendet wurde, der das Land zur Zahlung verpflichtete. Die Vermögenssperre wurde am 5. Juli 1950 aufgehoben. Mit Entscheidung des Ehrengerichtes der Rechtsanwaltskammer Frankfurt am Main vom 16. Mai 1951 wurde er wieder als Rechtsanwalt und Notar zugelassen und arbeitete in der Folge in diesem Beruf in Wald-Michelbach.

Maire nazi de Vienne : Hanns Blaschke (1943-1945)

The Austrian patent lawyer and politician Hanns (or Johann) Blaschke was born on 1 April 1896 in Vienna and died on 25 October 1971 in Salzburg. Illegal National-Socialist functionary. After 1938 (« Anschluß »), he became town councillor. 1st deputy Mayor of Vienna responsible for cultural affairs. Was Mayor from 30 December 1943 to 6 April 1945. Member of the Nazi Party (NSDAP), he was sentenced to 6 years in prison in 1948.

...

Hanns Blaschke, auch Johann Blaschke (geboren 1. April 1896 in Wien ; gestorben 25. Oktober 1971 in Salzburg) war ein österreichischer Patentanwalt und Politiker der NSDAP.

Hanns Blaschke war der Sohn eines Steuerbeamten. Er absolvierte seine Schullaufbahn an der Volksschule und dem Gymnasium. Er begann 1914 an der Technischen Hochschule Wien ein Studium der Elektrotechnik, das er nach Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges unterbrach. Als Soldat der Kaiserlich und Königlich Armee nahm er durchgehend am Ersten Weltkrieg teil und wurde mehrfach ausgezeichnet als Leutnant der Reserve aus der Armee entlassen. Danach nahm er sein Studium wieder auf, das er 1922 abschloß.

Ab 1926 war er als niedergelassener Patentanwalt tätig. Bereits 1931 war er als illegaler Funktionär in der österreichischen NSDAP (Nummer 614.686) tätig. Nach seiner Beteiligung am Juliputsch 1934 wurde er zu lebenslangem Kerker verurteilt, doch nach zwei Jahren (aufgrund der Bestimmungen des Juliabkommens) wieder begnadigt. 1938 nahm er am Sturm auf das Gebäude der Vaterländischen Front am Platz am Hof teil. Nach dem Anschluß Österreichs trat er der SS bei (Nummer 292.790) . Er wurde Beigeordneter und Ratsherr in Wien, sowie Leiter der Betreuungsstelle für Alte Kämpfer des « Gau Wien » . Zunächst als dritter, dann als erster Vizebürgermeister war er für das Kulturamt verantwortlich. Am 30. Dezember 1943 übernahm er schließlich das Amt des Bürgermeisters von Wien von Philipp Wilhelm Jung, das er bis zum 6. April 1945 behielt. Im April 1944 wurde er zum SS-Brigadeführer befördert.

1948 wurde Blaschke in Wien wegen Hochverrats zu sechs Jahren Haft und Vermögensentzug verurteilt. Er verlor die Staatsbürgerschaft und ihm wurden sämtliche akademische Titel aberkannt. Dieses Urteil wurde jedoch auf sein Betreiben im März 1958 aufgehoben.

Blaschkes Tochter, Gertrud Barna, war Schauspielerin am Deutschen Volkstheater in Wien.

...

Hanns Blaschke, patentanwalt und Politiker (NS) . Illegaler nationalsozialistischer Funktionär, nach 1938 Beigeordneter und Ratsherr in Wien (3. , dann 1. Vizebürgermeister, verantwortlich für das Kulturamt) , 30. Dezember 1943 - 6. April 1945 Bürgermeister von Wien. 1948 zu 6 Jahren Haft verurteilt.

La Bataille de Vienne

L'Autriche avait été annexé par l'Allemagne nazie en mars 1938 (« Anschluß ») et Adolf Hitler s'était fait acclamer au balcon de la « Hofburg » , le célèbre palais impérial de Vienne. Le peuple autrichien s'était lui-même prononcé par référendum à 99 % pour le rattachement au « Reich » .

Réduit à l'état de simple province sous le nom d' « Ostmark » (marche de l'Est) , le pays avait, dès lors, accompagné

le cours tragique du Nazisme.

1er avril 1945 : L'intégralité du territoire hongrois se retrouve sous le contrôle des Soviétiques qui poussent leur avantage en direction de Graz et de « Wiener Neustadt ». La défense de l'« Ostmark » (l'Autriche nazi) n'existe que sur le papier et sa mise en œuvre s'avère très tardive. Le 2 avril, c'est au tour de la 2e « SS-Panzer-Armee » de se retrouver en grande difficulté sous la poussée de l'aile gauche du 3e front d'Ukraine (26e, 27e et 57e armées russes, 1re armée bulgare) . La 6e « Armee » reste incapable de rétablir le contact avec elle.

La 6e « SS-Panzer-Armee » essaye avec difficulté d'établir un front homogène dans la région boisée qui s'étend au sud de Vienne. Le général Rudolf von Bünau prend le commandement de la ville dont la garnison est composée des restes de diverses unités de la Heer ou même de l'armée hongroise, soutenus par les bataillons lourds de la 24e « Flak-Division » de la « Luftwaffe » et la 1re « Donau-Flotille » (flottille du Danube) de la « Kriegsmarine » . À partir du 6, le 3e front d'Ukraine se contente de fixer les 2 armées allemandes plus au sud et concentre ses moyens sur Vienne. Le 18e corps blindé russe est re-déployé pour rompre le front toujours tenu par les 1re et 2e « SS-Panzer-Korps » . L'essentiel de la « Führer-Grenadier-Division » (39 trains sur 48) arrive en renfort juste à temps pour les 1ers combats dans les faubourgs de la capitale autrichienne. Ce n'est que le lendemain que le « Generaloberst » Lothar Rendulic prend effectivement le commandement du « Heeresgruppe Süd » . La 6e « SS-Panzer-Armee » est maintenant à bout de souffle malgré la destruction de 197 chars ennemis pendant la 1re semaine d'avril. Il faut y ajouter 45 chars, 18 canons anti-chars et 7 avions détruits par la 24e « Flak-Division » . L'ennemi intensifie sa pression. De violents combats se déroulent pendant la nuit du 8 au 9 avril. Le lendemain, l'ennemi perd 39 chars face à la défense déterminée des hommes de la « Das Reich » dans les rues de Vienne. La plupart sont détruits à bout portant avec des « Panzerfaust » et des « Panzerschrek » . Les pertes sont aussi élevées dans les autres secteurs, mais les assaillants sont déterminés à prendre la ville au plus tôt et avancent vers son centre. Le même jour, les 1ers éléments de la 710e « Infanterie-Division » , de la 261e « Sturmgeschütze-Brigade » et du « SS-Kampfgruppe » de August Wilhelm Trabant arrivent en renforts.

10 avril 1945 : Les unités allemandes commencent cependant à traverser le Danube. Au nord, la 8e « Armee » fait face à une vingtaine de divisions de fusiliers soutenues par 2 corps mécanisés. Dans la nuit du 13 avril, des éléments de la « Das Reich » sont les derniers à évacuer Vienne. Les Soviétiques entrent à Vienne.

11-14 avril 1945 : La poussée russe se poursuit malgré la perte de 80 chars face à la 6e « SS-Panzer-Armee » .

13 avril 1945 : L'armée ukrainienne capture Vienne, la capitale de l'Autriche. 7 ans après l'« Anschluß » de 1938 qui a transformé l'Autriche en satellite du « Reich » allemand, le pays est libéré. Sortant de la clandestinité, le Docteur Karl Renner, ancien président de l'Assemblée nationale autrichienne, forme alors un gouvernement de coalition comprenant des Sociaux-Démocrates, des Communistes et des Socialistes-Chrétiens, de même que des indépendants. Ce gouvernement est créé sous les auspices de l'occupant soviétique et reçoit la faveur du commandant en chef à Vienne, le maréchal Feodor Tolboukhine.

14 avril 1945 : La 4e « Luftflotte » effectue encore 270 sorties avec même le soutien de quelques appareils hongrois.

Pendant toute la durée de l'offensive soviétique, elle a continué à supporter avec efficacité les troupes au sol avec des chasseurs-bombardiers et ses derniers bombardiers, disputant même la supériorité aérienne à un ennemi très largement supérieur en nombre. Mais le manque de carburant et l'arrivée des appareils américains au-dessus de ses bases vont progressivement paralyser son action.

La 6e « Panzer-Division » rejoint le secteur de la 8e « Armée » menacée par plusieurs pénétrations ennemies. Le 509e « Tiger-Abteilung » la rejoint tandis que la 10e « Fallschirmjäger-Division » est attachée au 1er « SS-Panzer-Korps » .

16-18 avril 1945 : Celui-ci détruit 42 chars dont 24 pour le seul « Kampfgruppe » Joachim Peiper.

22 avril 1945 : Adolf Hitler décide de rester dans Berlin pratiquement encerclée et de ne pas rejoindre ses dernières armées dans le sud. La situation se stabilise sur l'ensemble du front tenu par le « Heeresgruppe Süd » qui devient le « Heeresgruppe Ostmark » , le 24. La « Das Reich » est mise en réserve pour prévenir l'arrivée de troupes alliées par l'ouest. Mais elle reçoit l'ordre avec la « Hohenstaufen » de se préparer à un transfert vers le « Heeresgruppe Mitte » pour une contre-attaque en direction de Berlin. Au sud, la 8e armée britannique profite de la capitulation rapide des troupes allemandes en Italie pour menacer les arrières de la 2e « Panzer-Armée » .

Cette colonne de SdKfz 251 de la « Leibstandarte » route vers l'ouest pour se rendre aux Américains.

Seuls des éléments de la « Totenkopf » seront remis aux Russes et connaîtront une longue captivité et une mortalité importante comme tous les prisonniers des camps soviétiques.

27 avril 1945 : La fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale permet à l'Autriche de retrouver son indépendance. Restauration de la République d'Autriche.

S'appuyant sur la Déclaration de Moscou, un document signé en 1943 par le Royaume-Uni, l'Union soviétique (URSS) et les États-Unis, reconnaissant la neutralité de l'Autriche et niant tout pouvoir légal au gouvernement autrichien nazi d'Arthur Seyß-Inquart, le gouvernement provisoire de Renner proclame l'indépendance de l'Autriche. La proclamation a lieu le même jour où l'armée américaine pénètre en Autriche pour capturer les bastions de Gengenbach et de Schwarzenberg. L'activisme de Renner permet à l'État autrichien d'être rapidement restauré, puisque le gouvernement provisoire est vite reconnu comme le seul interlocuteur valable par les 4 armées d'occupation : française, américaine, britannique et soviétique.

7 mai 1945 : Le « Generaloberst » Rendulic ordonne à ses hommes de gagner l'ouest pour se rendre aux Américains. Le « Heeresgruppe Süd » compte encore 450,000 hommes et occupe une ligne de front continue. Il a fallu à l'Armée Rouge une offensive continue de 46 jours pour repousser les troupes allemandes au-delà de Vienne. Pendant presque toute cette période, la 6e « SS-Panzer-Armée » a occupé le secteur du front le plus large en plein centre du dispositif allemand avec des effectifs non seulement insuffisants mais également amputés au profit des armées voisines. La performance catastrophique de l'état-major de la 6e « Armée » s'est ajouté au refus de l'OKH et de Hitler d'autoriser

suffisamment tôt les replis nécessaires pour raccourcir la ligne de front tout en conservant les matériels lourds. Aggravée par le manque de carburant et de pièces de rechange pour les matériels endommagés, cette rigidité habituelle a accéléré l'usure de divisions allemandes déjà affaiblies.

L'engagement de la 6e « SS-Panzer-Armee » en Hongrie pour une offensive sans espoir, plutôt qu'en Pologne pour barrer la route de l'Oder et de Berlin aux Russes, est un non-sens stratégique. Mais l'usure de cette unité dans un combat défensif qui ne lui a pas permis d'utiliser des moyens encore importants pour manœuvrer et frapper encore plus durement l'ennemi, démontre le manque de qualité du commandement exercé par le « Heeresgruppe Süd » qui va manquer les rares opportunités qui s'offrent à lui, notamment lors de la percée initiale russe dans les Montagnes vertes. C'est l'abandon trop lent du saillant de la 6e « Armee » à l'Est du lac Balaton, pourtant autorisé par le haut-commandement allemand, qui va déséquilibrer définitivement le dispositif allemand. La 6e « SS-Panzer-Armee », transférée de ce saillant qu'elle vient de conquérir, est engagée trop tard vers le nord. Puis, elle doit tenir le terrain, faute d'obtenir les divisions dont elle a besoin pour se dégager une marge de manœuvre pour une contre-attaque d'envergure. Le 1er « Kavallerie-Korps », la 9e « SS-Panzer-Division Hohenstaufen » et même, pendant de longues journées, une partie de la 1re « SS-Panzer-Division Leibstandarte » restent sous le commandement de la 6e « Armee » qui couvre pourtant un front d'une quinzaine de kilomètres seulement. Le transfert tardif de divisions de la 2e « Panzer-Armee » au sud et le retrait tout aussi tardif des « Infanterie-Divisionen » allemandes de la poche le long du Danube au nord aggravent encore la situation. En face, le haut-commandement soviétique analyse parfaitement la situation et exécute à la perfection son plan.

...

Malgré son implication dans le 3e « Reich », l'Autriche est considérée comme une victime de Adolf Hitler. Les Alliés veulent, ce faisant, couper les liens affectifs entre les Allemands et les Autrichiens. Ils craignent qu'un commun ressentiment ne les rapproche une nouvelle fois. Dès l'entrée des Soviétiques à Vienne, le pays retrouve son indépendance et le leader socialiste Karl Renner restaure la démocratie.

2 semaines après la libération de Vienne par l'armée soviétique, le gouvernement intérimaire du Docteur Karl Renner, s'appuyant sur la Déclaration de Moscou, proclame l'indépendance de l'Autriche et la tenue d'élections libres dès que possible.

Les troupes d'occupation se retireront 10 ans après la fin de la Guerre, après que les Soviétiques auront obtenu une solide garantie de neutralité pour ce pays mitoyen de leur zone d'influence.

...

The city of Vienna was bombed 52 times during World War II, and 87,000 houses of the city were lost (20 % of the entire city) . Only 41 civilian vehicles survived the raids, more than 3,000 bomb craters were counted. And the Schwarzenberg Palace was bombed but later rebuilt.

After a lone Soviet air-raid, conducted on 4 September 1942, Vienna was finally reached by western Allied bombers in 1944, when the Allied invasion of Italy allowed them to establish an air-base at Foggia. Following the Normandy Invasion, the greater part of the German Air Force (« Luftwaffe ») was transferred to the West. The remaining « Luftwaffe » shot-down 10 % of the 550 bombers, in June 1944.

The air-defenses of Vienna were aided by a ring of anti-aircraft batteries set-up around the city and 3 pairs of Flak towers. These were large anti-aircraft gun block-houses built in the city. Due to the increasing lack of fuel, by autumn 1944, artillery on the ground was the only defence against air-raids. It typically took some 5,000 small-calibre and 3,400 large-calibre shells to bring-down 1 bomber. During the day, one out of 125 planes was shot-down on average. During the night, this dropped to only one out of 145. However, roughly 1/3 of the bombers and escorts suffered heavy damage. Some Vienna factories were moved to bomb-proof sites such as caves (like the « Seegrotte » near Hinterbrühl) or hidden in other ways. The military industry even boosted its production, also by use of forced labour of concentration camp inmates and POWs. By-passes for traffic junctions had been established before the bombings and traffic did not come to a halt until the very last days of the War.

By early 1945, Vienna had already faced 1,800 bombs. In February and March 1945, 80,000 tons of bombs were dropped by U.S. and British aircraft, destroying more than 12,000 buildings, and 270,000 people were left homeless.

« Offensive Vienne »

L'« Offensive Vienne » est une opération militaire lancée par le 3e front ukrainien afin de capturer la ville de Vienne. L'offensive a duré du 2 au 13 avril 1945, lors de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. La ville de Vienne a été encerclée et assiégée.

Joseph Staline conclut un accord avec les Alliés occidentaux en février 1945 concernant l'influence politique relative de chaque partie après-Guerre, en Europe de l'Est et en Europe centrale. Il avait été ainsi conclu que la Tchécoslovaquie et la Hongrie seraient sous la botte soviétique. Ces accords ne déclaraient cependant rien sur l'Autriche, étant alors une partie intégrante annexée au 3e « Reich » après l'« Anschluß » de 1938. Staline a donc décidé de reporter son offensive en direction de Berlin (l'Armée Rouge était prête dès février 1945) pour se garantir à la fois les flancs nécessaires pour cette offensive et le territoire autrichien, un atout précieux pour la suite des négociations d'après-Guerre avec les Alliés occidentaux.

Après l'échec de l'opération « Frühlingserwachen » (réveil du printemps) , qui visait à mener une contre-offensive contre les troupes soviétiques stationnées en Hongrie, en mars 1945, la 6e « SS Panzer Armee » du général Josef Dietrich bat alors en retraite sur le territoire autrichien. Les Allemands ont alors tenté de préparer des positions défensives dans l'espoir de conserver la ville entre leurs mains. Ces positions ont été préparées en partie avec le travail forcé de Juifs de rafles à Budapest : partis 50,000, abattus lors d'une marche de la mort, les survivants érigent des fortifications destinées à soutenir un siège.

Le 2 avril 1945, l'Armée Rouge, divisée en 85 divisions et 3 brigades (formant un total de 745,600 hommes) , lance

l'offensive sur la ville alors déclarée « ville ouverte » . La défense de la capitale autrichienne était assurée par le général Rudolf von Bünau avec des unités du 2e « SS-Panzerkorps » sous les ordres du général Wilhelm Bittrich.

Vienne est le théâtre d'intenses combats urbains et voit la participation active de la résistance autrichienne dans des actes de sabotages contre les défenses et la logistique allemandes.

Le 13 avril 1945, les garnisons allemandes, à court de munitions et dépassées numériquement, se rendent à l'Armée rouge.

L'ensemble du territoire autrichien est libéré dans les jours suivants, Karl Renner proclame un gouvernement provisoire autrichien avec l'autorisation des Soviétiques et déclare alors la sécession de l'Autriche du 3e « Reich » .

Après leurs victoires en Autriche, ces derniers peuvent dès lors se concentrer sur leur objectif final : la prise de Berlin et la chute du régime nazi, dont le point culminant est la capitulation du 8 mai 1945, qui marque la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale en Europe.

...

The « Vienna Offensive » was launched by the Soviet 3rd Ukrainian Front in order to capture the city of Vienna. The offensive lasted from 2 to 13 April 1945. The city of Vienna was surrounded and under siege for most of the offensive until its capture.

Joseph Stalin reached an agreement with the Western Allies prior to April 1945 concerning the relative post-War political influence of each party in much of Eastern and Central Europe ; however, these agreements said virtually nothing about the fate of Austria, then, officially considered to be merely the « Ostmark » area of Greater Germany after the « Anschluß » . As a result, the victory of a Soviet offensive toward Austria and the liberation by the Red Army of a large part of this country would have been very beneficial for subsequent post-War negotiations with the Western Allies.

After the failure of Operation Spring Awakening (« Unternehmen Frühlingserwachen ») , Sepp Dietrich's 6th SS-Panzer Army retreated in stages to the Vienna area. The Germans desperately prepared defensive positions in an attempt to guard the city against the rapidly arriving Soviets.

In spring 1945, the advance of Soviet General Fyodor Tolbukhin's 3rd Ukrainian Front through western Hungary gathered momentum on both sides of the Danube.

On 30 March, the advancing Soviets crossed the Hron and Nitra Rivers and, after they took Sopron and Nagykanizsa, crossed the border between Hungary and Austria. Tolbukhin was now ready to advance into Austria and take Vienna.

On 2 April, Vienna Radio denied that the Austrian capital had been declared an open city. On the same day, Soviet

troops approached Vienna from the south after they overran Wiener Neustadt, Eisenstadt, Neunkirchen and Gloggnitz. Baden and Bratislava were overrun on 4 April.

After arriving in the Vienna area, the armies of the Soviet 3rd Ukrainian Front surrounded, besieged, and attacked the city. Involved in this action were the Soviet 4th Guards Army, the Soviet 6th Guards Tank Army, the Soviet 9th Guards Army, and the Soviet 46th Army. The « O-5 Resistance Group », Austrians led by Carl Szokoll wanting to spare Vienna destruction, actively attempted to sabotage the German defenses and to aid the entry of the Red Army.

The only major German force facing the Soviet attackers was the German II SS-Panzer Corps of the 6th SS-Panzer Army, along with « ad hoc » forces made-up of garrison and anti-aircraft units. Declared a defensive region, Vienna's defense was commanded by General Rudolf von Bünau, with the 2nd SS-Panzer Corps units under the command of SS General Wilhelm Bittrich.

The battle for the Austrian capital was characterized in some cases by fierce urban combat, but there were also parts of the city the Soviets advanced into with little opposition. Defending in the « Prater » Park was the 6th Panzer Division, along the south-side of the city were the 2nd and 3rd SS-Panzer Divisions and, in the north, was the « Führer-Grenadier » Division. The Soviets assaulted Vienna's eastern and southern suburbs with the 4th Guards Army and part of the 9th Guards Army. The German defenders kept the Soviets out of the city's southern suburbs until 7 April. However, after successfully achieving several footholds in the southern suburbs, the Soviets then moved into the western suburbs of the city, on 8 April, with the 6th Guards Tank Army and the bulk of the 9th Guards Army. The western suburbs were especially important to the Soviets because they included Vienna's main railway station. The Soviet success in the western suburbs was followed quickly by infiltration of the eastern and northern suburbs later the same day. North of the Danube River, the 46th Army pushed westward through Vienna's northern suburbs. Central Vienna was now cut-off from the rest of Austria.

By the 9th of April, the Soviet troops began to infiltrate the center of the city, but the street-fighting continued for several days more. On the night of 11 April, the 4th Guards Army stormed the Danube canals, with the 20th Guards Rifle Corps and 1st Mechanized Corps moving on the « Reichsbrücke » Bridge. In a « coup de main », on 13 April, the Danube Flotilla landed troops of the 80th Guards Rifle Division and 7th Guards Airborne Division on both sides of the bridge, cutting demolition cables and securing the bridge. However, other important bridges were destroyed. Vienna finally fell when the last defenders in the city surrendered on the same day. Bittrich's 2nd SS-Panzer Corps, however, pulled-out to the west on the evening of 13 April to avoid encirclement. The same day, the 46th Army took Essling and the Danube Flotilla landed naval infantry up the river by Klosterneuburg.

While the street-fighting was still intensifying in the southern and western suburbs of Vienna, on 8 April, other troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front by-passed Vienna altogether and advanced on Linz and Graz.

On the 10th, all but 2 of the bridges in the city had been destroyed. The Floridsdorf bridge had been left intact by a « Führer » Order dictating that the bridge be held at all costs. The 2nd SS-Panzer, « Das Reich » left a dozen artillery pieces including 37 mm anti-aircraft guns to hold-off enemy attacks. That night, the « Das Reich », including

their last remaining 3 dozen armored vehicles, pulled-out of the city for the last time. Vienna had fallen, and the Germans now moved northwest to hold a next defensive line.

By 15 April, armies of the Soviet 3rd Ukrainian Front pushed even further into Austria. The completely exhausted remnants of what had been the 6th SS-Panzer Army were forced to flee to the area between Vienna and Linz. Just behind the retreating Germans were elements of the Soviet 9th Guards Army and the Soviet 46th Army. The 26th Army and 27th Armies advanced towards the area north of Graz just behind the retreating 6th Army. The 57th Army and the Bulgarian 1st Army advanced towards the area south of Graz (near Maribor) just behind the retreating 2nd Panzer Army. None of these German armies was in any shape to do more than temporarily stall the advancing Soviet forces.

Some of Vienna's finest buildings lay in ruins after the battle. There was no water, electricity, or gas - and bands of people, both foreigners and Austrians, plundered and assaulted the helpless residents in the absence of a police force. While the Soviet assault forces generally behaved well, the 2nd wave of Soviet troops to arrive in the city were badly disciplined, looting and raping in a several week orgy of violence that has been compared to the worst aspects of the Thirty Years War.

Like Bittrich, General von Bünau left Vienna before it fell to avoid capture by the Soviets. From 16 April until the War's end, he led « Generalkommando » von Bünau, surrendering to the Americans on VE-Day, von Bünau was held as a POW until April 1947. Bittrich also surrendered to U.S. forces and was held as a prisoner by the Allies until 1954. Fyodor Tolbukhin went on to command the Soviet Southern Group of Forces and the Trans-caucasian Military District prior to his untimely death in 1949, reportedly from heart problems.

Austrian politician Karl Renner astutely set-up a Provisional Government in Vienna, sometime in April, with the tacit approval of the victorious Soviet forces, and declared Austria's secession from the 3rd « Reich » .

On 30 April, the following order of battle was recorded by the German Army High-Command (« Oberkommando der Wehrmacht » , or OKW) . From 20 April to 2 May, OKW moved from Zossen (near Berlin) to Mürwik (part of Flensburg in north Germany, near Denmark) . This order of battle shows what remained « on paper » of the German armies that fought in Hungary and Austria.

Occupation de Vienne à partir de 1945

Although French and American troops had been in Austria since April, and British since early May, it took until June 3rd before an advance Party of the Western Allies went to Vienna to meet the Russians. Their vehicles were spotted by Viennese who gave them a jubilant reception. In July, the borders of the occupation zones in the country as a whole were agreed. Vienna would be in the middle of the Russian zone.

The British, it seems, were responsible for some of the subsequent delay by the Western Allies in taking-up the occupation of Vienna. They were annoyed that the Russians had appointed Karl Renner as head of State, along with others who were felt to be too much under the thumb of the Communists, and so they played hard to get.

Towards the end of July, American occupation troops began arriving in Vienna and, in September, after the Russians had issued an ultimatum that they would be withdrawing from the Western sectors from the 1st of the month leaving the population to fend for themselves, the Western Allies took-up their positions, with the British arriving in numbers. The 1st formal meeting of the 4 powers who would govern Vienna was on September 12th, 5 months after the Russians had taken the city.

During those 5 months, conditions for the civilian population were very hard. Aside from Viennese, the city contained half a million foreign workers, refugees and « Reich » Germans. Battalions of Austrians were formed in Yugoslavia from 1944 to fight alongside Josip Broz Tito against the Germans. These opponents of the Nazis came to Vienna after the fall of the city and were allowed by the Russians to carry arms and to police the city, the regular police having all been disarmed. Some of the men who joined this police force had been in concentration camps and they took it out on any Nazis they found by beating them up.

An eye witness reports on conditions in early July 1945 :

« “ American technical accomplishments, Persian culture and Russian lack of taste ” is the description given to the many Russian-driven jeeps covered with the most expensive Persian rugs and lavish drapes.

The looting and raping in Vienna itself has ceased completely, according to [my anonymous] informant. Punishment for looting and raping is death, and while there was no enforcement up to recently, a number of Russian soldiers and even officers have been shot for these crimes.

The food shortage in Vienna is serious and acute. The bread situation is getting worse. There is no gas or coal in the city, and to get the existing wood from the Wienerwald, the city lacks the necessary vehicles.

The black market is flourishing, although every attempt is now being made to eliminate it. Thus, the trading on the “ Karlsplatz ”, in the Resselpark, is subject to frequent joint raids by Russian MPs and the Austrian police, (who are armed) . A watch brings about 4 to 6 pounds of fat ; the Austrians are anxiously waiting the Americans. »

(Paul Sweet, in a report dated 10 July 1945, in : Oliver Rathkolb, 1985 ; pages 281-283.)

Because Russians would often requisition trucks going to get supplies from the country-side the city authorities only had 12 trucks at their disposal and supplies of basic necessities (food and fuel) were chaotic and inadequate to feed the city. Although banned at 1st, people therefore went-out into the country-side to forage, the so-called « Rucksackverkehr » (rucksack traffic) .

An eyewitness describes this :

« The lack of transport is so acute that some people hike 20 miles into the country to buy potatoes and vegetables

from farmers. Every day, in the beautiful Vienna woods, thousands of aged people are collecting wood for stoves and painfully trudging the miles back home with towering loads on their backs. People also may be seen rummaging through rubbish piles in the streets for useful junk. »

(Ira Freeman, in : « This is Vienna » , Yank magazine, 5 October 1945.)

Martin Herz described a family of 3 (a mother and 2 children under 5) who he visited on September 14th, 1945, living in the Russian zone. The father was missing in action since January 1945. Their rations include bread, sugar, peas, salt and coffee surrogate. There are no potatoes, fat, butter, vegetables or milk. The mother has lost 20 kilos since April. Their apartment consists of a single room with kitchen. The window panes were broken by concussion so are patched-up with cardboard. A wire strung across the court-yard from a friendly neighbour means they now have electric light to burn one bulb. Health of children is « good, except that children frequently get diarrhea » . She has nothing to trade on the black market.

(Martin F. Herz in : Reinhold Wagnleiter, 1985 ; page 42.)

Another visitor describes Vienna in October 1945 :

« The shivering misery of the people on the streets, the burnt-out filigree of Saint Stephen's Cathedral, the shattered Baroque façades, the boarded-up shops, the grassgrown ruins. The parks and squares have been dug-up for air-raid shelters. Wherever there is a patch of grass, you see a scattering of the white crosses of the graves of the Russians who died in their assault on the city.

[Yet,] the life that is starting-up again in the ruins takes on the semblance of the old pattern. Though many of the auditoriums are ruined, all the theaters are open. Concert programs offer more good music in a week than you could hear in a month in New York. In " cafés ", uncleaned and unheated, people sit reading the newspapers over cups of the moldy tasting dark gruel called coffee that has become truly the national drink of the European Continent.

" What do you eat ? ", you ask people.

" Bread and dried peas. ", they answer.

" How do you get the money to buy the rations ? "

By selling furniture or extra clothes or themselves, they answer. »

(John Dos Passos, 1946.)

As in Germany, the Russians were keen to ship industrial equipment back to Russia to rebuild their own devastated economy. They also wanted the oil that Austria at that time produced, particularly from oil wells in the Soviet zone.

These things led to tensions between the Russians and the Western Allies, whose priorities were to restore order, seek-out Nazis, and feed the population, all of which were made more difficult if the transport and production infrastructure was being stripped bare by the Russians.

These early tensions were precursors of a much deeper-seated hostility and suspicion, being early harbingers of what was to become known as the Cold War.

...

Within days of the end of the fighting (in April 1945 still) , the provisional city government was constituted and the political parties re-emerged. The situation of the city was far from encouraging. More than 20 % of the housing stock was partly or completely destroyed, almost 87,000 flats had become uninhabitable. In the urban area, more than 3,000 bomb craters were counted, many bridges were in shambles, sewers, gas and water pipes had suffered severe damage. The imperative of the immediate after-War period was to solve the most basic problems and get the city back to some degree of working order. The political context was no less complicated. The Allied Occupation Forces refused to accept the Nazis' territorial expansion. The bottom line was that those districts which had existed until 1938 were divided into 4 Allied zones. The inner-city district was administered by all 4 powers, as the so-called « Inter-allied Zone » . Districts 22-26, namely the 97 Lower-Austrian communities which had been merged with Vienna, in October 1938, were considered to form part of Lower-Austria and came under Soviet control.

In November 1945, the 1st City Council elections were held in Vienna, and the city was restored to democracy. The 100 seats of the Vienna City Council were divided among the Socialists (58 seats) , the People's Party, or Conservatives (36 seats) , and the Communists (6 seats) . The 1st and foremost priorities of the new city government were to ensure welfare programmes for the young and the elderly, to repair the city-owned utilities and rebuild the city - altogether, a programme that continued essentially until the early 1960's.

As early as 1946, the so-called « Territorial Review Act » (« Gebietsänderungsgesetz ») was passed, aimed at more or less repealing the 1938 expansion of the city. Approval by the Allied Occupation Forces was withheld for 8 years, since the Soviet forces in particular balked, so that it did not come into effect until 1954. Since then, the urban area has comprised 23 districts. Compared to the pre-1938 situation, the territory that now forms the 22nd district north of the Danube and the 23rd district at the southern extremity of the urban area has been part of Vienna. 1 year later, in May 1955, the country was restored to freedom through the conclusion of the « Austrian State Treaty » (« Staatsvertrag ») . In Vienna, the economy took a decisive turn for the better, not least as a result of assistance granted under the Marshall Plan but also because confiscations of industrial property by the Soviets ceased.

Occupation de l'Autriche après la Seconde Guerre mondiale

L'occupation de l'Autriche après la Seconde Guerre mondiale commença dès avril 1945, juste avant la capitulation du 3e « Reich » , et se termina officiellement avec le traité d'État autrichien en 1955.

2 types de monnaies étaient en circulation à la fin de la Guerre, le « Reichsmark » et le Schilling des forces alliées jusqu'au rétablissement du Schilling autrichien en novembre 1945.

Après l'intégration de l'Autriche au 3e « Reich » en 1938, la déclaration de Moscou proclamait en 1943 que l' « Anschluß » était nul et non avenu. Elle affirmait le rétablissement d'un État autrichien indépendant après la Guerre comme étant le but commun des Alliés.

Après la prise de Vienne, le 13 avril 1945, à la suite de l'offensive soviétique sur la ville, les forces alliées occidentales pénètrent en Autriche environ 2 semaines plus tard. Le 27 avril 1945 (presque 2 semaines avant la reddition nazie du 8 mai) , le gouvernement provisoire autrichien constitué le même jour par Karl Renner proclama l'indépendance de l'Autriche vis-à-vis du 3e « Reich » et instaura la 2e République autrichienne.

Après la capitulation et d'après les termes de la conférence de Potsdam, l'Autriche fut quand même divisée en 4 zones d'occupation alliées et Vienne, incluse dans la zone soviétique, était tout comme Berlin, elle-même divisée en 4 secteurs d'occupation, avec une « zone internationale » supplémentaire en son centre.

Cette situation perdura jusqu'à la signature du traité d'État autrichien en 1955.

Les 4 zones d'occupation alliées de Autriche entre 1945 et 1955.

La zone soviétique est constituée par : le « Burgenland » , la Basse-Autriche et la Haute-Autriche au nord du Danube (« Mühlviertel ») et à l'est de l'Enns ; son quartier-général étant à Baden.

La zone américaine est constituée par : la Haute-Autriche au sud du Danube et à l'ouest de l'Enns, ainsi que la région de Salzbourg ; son quartier-général étant à Salzkammergut.

La zone britannique est constituée par : la Carinthie, le Tyrol oriental et la Styrie ; son quartier-général étant également à Salzkammergut.

La zone française est constituée par : le Tyrol du nord et le Vorarlberg ; son quartier-général étant à Innsbruck.

Le passage des lignes de démarcation entre les zones d'occupation, nécessitait la détention d'une carte d'identité alliée qui était traduite dans 4 langues (allemand, anglais, russe, français) et portait des avis de confirmation de chacune des 4 forces d'occupation (soit en tout 11 cachets) . Cependant, les forces occidentales libéralisèrent très rapidement les procédures : ainsi, le fait de dépasser la ligne de démarcation à destination de la zone russe ou en provenance de celle-ci s'apparentait alors à un voyage à l'étranger. Les Soviétiques supprimèrent ces contrôles seulement en juin 1954.

Les 4 secteurs d'occupation à Vienne. Les zones en rouge clair, bleu clair et vert clair désignent les secteurs annexés à Vienne depuis 1954, mais placés à l'époque respectivement sous occupation soviétique, américaine, britannique et

française.

Comme Berlin, Vienne fut occupée uniquement dans un 1er temps par les soldats soviétiques. En application de la convention de Potsdam, les autres Alliés installèrent leurs troupes dans la capitale autrichienne à partir d'août 1945. La répartition des secteurs d'occupation se fit par districts, dans les limites administratives que la ville connaissait avant 1937.

Un régime administration commune aux 4 forces d'occupation était appliqué pour le 1er district (« Innere Stadt », soit la ville-centre) : la gestion de la zone était ainsi confiée tous les mois par roulement à chacune des forces occupantes :

Secteur américain constitué par les : 7e, 8e, 9e, 17e, 18e et 19e districts.

Secteur britannique constitué par les : 3e, 5e, 11e, 12e et 13e districts.

Secteur français constitué par les : 6e, 14e, 15e et 16e districts.

Secteur soviétique constitué par les : 2e, 4e, 10e, 20e, 21e et 22e districts.

Les districts viennois créés postérieurement à 1938 (à partir du 23e district) se trouvaient donc en dehors des limites de la ville et dépendaient ainsi de la zone d'occupation soviétique.

Les quartiers-généraux de chacune de ces forces étaient :

Pour les Américains : siège de la « Österreichische Nationalbank », sur la « Otto-Wagner-Platz » .

Pour les Britanniques : château de Schönbrunn.

Pour les Français : hôtel Kummer à Mariahilf.

Pour les Soviétiques : palais Epstein, annexe du Parlement autrichien.

Le 11 septembre 1945 se constituait le Conseil allié composé des 4 commandants en chef qui, plus tard, devinrent haut-commissaires. Les 1ers membres de ce conseil furent :

Le général de corps d'armée américain Mark Wayne Clark.

Le maréchal soviétique Ivan Koniev.

Le lieutenant-général britannique Richard McCreery.

Le général de corps d'armée français Antoine Béthouart.

Toutes les lois votées par le Parlement autrichien et présentées par le gouvernement fédéral au conseil allié nécessitaient l'aval de celui-ci pour leurs publications. Si le consentement n'était pas donné, la loi ne pouvait entrer en vigueur. Ainsi, en 1946, il arriva par exemple qu'une loi sur le changement des limites administratives de Vienne au profit de la Basse-Autriche (en fait, un retour à la situation antérieure à 1938) ne fut pas appliquée, par le simple refus des représentants soviétiques qui usèrent de leur veto sur ce sujet jusqu'en 1954.

Ainsi, le veto apposé par 1 seul des 4 représentants suffisait au début pour bloquer l'application d'une loi. Plus tard, le veto devint collectif : l'ensemble des représentants alliés devaient tous se mettre d'accord pour bloquer la procédure. En conséquence, les objections alliées devinrent alors très rares.

Les effectifs des armées d'occupation étaient initialement de 700,000 hommes, en 1955, les puissances occidentales ont réduites à environ leurs forces à 20,000 hommes et les forces soviétiques à 40,000. Les coûts d'occupation devaient être couverts par l'Autriche (initialement jusqu'à 35 % de son budget ; au 3 décembre 1946, le quota est descendu à 15 %) . En 1947, les États-Unis ont déclaré qu'il paierait ses propres coûts d'occupation ; les 3 autres puissances ont fait de même en 1953.

Le Conseil allié fut également chargé de la dénazification. Toutefois, dès 1946, les priorités se modifièrent, celle-ci étant transférée au gouvernement autrichien en février 1946, le « Counter Intelligence Corps » (CIC) américain ne conservant qu'un rôle général de supervision, qui s'acheva en mai 1947. Le 430e détachement du CIC américain, auparavant consacré à la dénazification, mit au rang de priorité la surveillance des organisations communistes. Celui-ci devait employer, à cette fin, le SS flamand Robert Jan Verbelen.

Après la mort de Joseph Staline, le 5 mars 1953, Ivan Ilyitchev, conseiller politique adjoint de la Commission de Contrôle de la Zone d'occupation soviétique en Allemagne et maître-espion du GRU rejoint Vienne et remplace le Haut-Commissaire Vladimir Petrovich Sviridov.

Son arrivée est interprétée à l'Ouest comme un pas vers la pleine indépendance de l'Autriche, d'autant que le contrôle des personnes aux frontières du secteur soviétique est abrogé le 8 juin 1953.

Ilyitchev mène ensuite, pendant l'été 1953, les négociations avec les représentants de l'Autriche (le chancelier Julius Raab, le ministre des Affaires étrangères Leopold Figl et le secrétaire Bruno Kreisky) . Un des points de désaccord : le versement annuel de 151 millions de Shillings autrichiens à l'URSS (coût de l'entretien des troupes d'occupation soviétiques) et le statut de neutralité de l'Autriche. Comme le souligne Julius Raab : ou bien l'Autriche est neutre, et elle ne peut pas payer ; ou bien l'Autriche peut commercer librement avec l'Occident, et alors elle peut payer.

Le 1er août 1953, l'Union soviétique renonce à percevoir en Autriche le prix de son occupation. Cette mesure est assimilée par beaucoup à une autorisation donnée à l'Autriche de s'allier à nouveau à l'Allemagne, de reformer l' «

Anschluß » , et les protestations s'élèvent en URSS, et même en France. Le 17 mai 1954, lors d'une réunion à l'ambassade soviétique de Vienne, l'ambassadeur Ilitchev obtient du chancelier Raab et du ministre des Affaires étrangères autrichien Figl des garanties formelles quant à leur absence d'arrière-pensées, et un télégramme du secrétaire d'État John Foster Dulles appuie les négociations.

Le 15 mai 1955, l'ambassadeur plénipotentiaire d'URSS en Autriche Ilitchev, en poste jusqu'en mars 1956, appose sa signature, sous celle de Molotov, au bas du Traité d'État autrichien avalisant l'indépendance de l'Autriche.

Le 5 juillet 1945, le 15e groupe d'armées qui a effectué l'offensive de printemps 1945 en Italie est réorganisé et désigné comme « United States Occupational Forces Austria » (forces d'occupation des États-Unis en Autriche) , puis comme « United States Forces in Austria » (USFA) ; la compagnie de quartier-général du IIe corps d'armée, la 11e division blindée (dissoute le 31 août 1945) , la 42e division d'infanterie et la 65e division d'infanterie sont affectées à cette formation à sa création.

Il y avait 70,000 militaires américains stationnés en Autriche à l'automne 1945, mais dès janvier 1946, la force d'occupation a été réduite à 41,000 puis à mi-1946 à 29 000 personnes, principalement du personnel de soutien et administratif. La seule grande unité de combat étant la 42e division d'infanterie.

En 1948, le « 16th Infantry Regiment » restant la principale unité de combat américaine en Autriche est relevé par le « 350th Infantry Regiment » qui forme l'ossature d'un commandement tactique (« Tactical Command, U.S. Forces Austria ») de taille divisionnaire créé le 31 octobre 1950 à partir de la 88e division d'infanterie.

Les forces britanniques entrent en Autriche à partir du col du Monte Croce Carnico, le 7 mai 1945, devançant tout juste les forces yougoslaves. Les forces partisans yougoslaves ont défilé en Carinthie, la déclarant sous leur contrôle, mais une présence accrue britannique met un terme à cela. La Yougoslavie a continué de plaider cette revendication jusqu'en 1949.

Les « British Troops Austria » (BTA) , indépendantes de la « British Army of the Rhine » comptent à l'origine 2 divisions. La 78e division d'infanterie en Carinthie, son quartier-général à Klagenfurt étant couplée à celui de la « British Army of the Rhine » , et la 46e division d'infanterie dans la état de Styrie avec son quartier-général à Graz. Le contingent à Vienne est une unité indépendante.

Antoine Béthouart nommé au commandement en chef des forces françaises en Autriche avant de devenir haut-commissaire de 1946 à 1950, avec 5 étoiles à partir de 1948. La zone d'occupation française en Autriche comprenait une partie du Tyrol et le « Land » de Vorarlberg. Dans le secteur français de Vienne, il fonde le lycée français de Vienne. Afin de résider dans la capitale, il réquisitionne à Hütteldorf la villa de la princesse de Windischgrätz (1883-1963) , dite l' « archiduchesse rouge » , petite-fille de l'Empereur François-Joseph.

Le traité d'État autrichien est signé le 15 mai 1955 au palais du Belvédère à Vienne, en Autriche, entre les forces occupantes alliées (les États-Unis, l'URSS, la France et la Grande-Bretagne) et le gouvernement autrichien, et est entré

en vigueur le 27 juillet 1955. Les forces d'occupation quittent l'Autriche le 25 octobre 1955. Le 26 octobre, le conseil national de l'Autriche signe la Neutralité autrichienne, faisant du pays un État indépendant.

...

The Allied occupation of Austria lasted from 1945 to 1955. Austria had been regarded by Nazi Germany as a constituent part of the German State but, in 1943, during World War II, the Allied powers agreed in the Declaration of Moscow that it would be regarded as the 1st victim of Nazi aggression, and treated as a liberated and independent country after the War.

In the immediate aftermath of the War, Austria, like Germany, was divided into 4 occupation zones and jointly occupied by the United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom and France. Vienna, like Berlin, was similarly subdivided but the central district was administered jointly by the Allied Control Council.

Whereas Germany was divided into East and West Germany in 1949, Austria remained under joint occupation of the Soviet Union until 1955 ; its status became a controversial subject in the Cold War until the warming of relations known as the Khrushchev Thaw. After Austrian promises of perpetual neutrality, Austria was accorded full independence on 12 May 1955 and the last occupation troops left on 25 October that year.

At the 1943 Moscow Conference, the allies had jointly decided that the German annexation of Austria in 1938 would be considered « null and void » . As well, all administrative and legal measures since 1938 would be ignored. The conference declared the intent to create a free and independent Austria after the War, but also stated that Austria had a responsibility for « participation in the War at the side of Hitlerite Germany » which could not be evaded.

On 29 March 1945, the Soviet commander Fyodor Tolbukhin's troops crossed the former Austrian border at Klostermarienberg, in Burgenland. On 3 April, at the beginning of the Vienna Offensive, the Austrian politician Karl Renner, then living in southern Lower-Austria, established contact with the Soviets. Joseph Stalin had already established a would-be future Austrian cabinet from the country's communists in exile, but Tolbukhin's telegram changed Stalin's mind in favour of Renner.

On 20 April 1945, the Soviets, without asking their Western allies, instructed Renner to form the provisional government. 7 days later, Renner's cabinet took office, declared the independence of Austria from Nazi Germany and called for the creation of a democratic State along the lines of the 1st Austrian Republic. Soviet acceptance of Renner was not an isolated episode ; their officers re-established district administrations and appointed local mayors, frequently following the advice of the locals, even before the battle was over.

Renner and his ministers were guarded and watched by NKVD body-guards. 1/3 of State Chancellor Renner's cabinet, including crucial seats of the Secretary of State of the Interior and the Secretary of State for Education, was staffed by Austrian Communists. The Western allies suspected the usual Soviet pattern of setting-up puppet States and did not recognize Renner. The British were particularly hostile ; even Harry Truman, who believed that Renner was a

trustworthy politician rather than a token front for the Kremlin, denied him recognition. But Renner had secured inter-Party control by designating 2 Under-Secretaries of State in each of the ministries, appointed by the 2 Parties not placing the Secretary of State.

As soon as Adolf Hitler's armies were pushed-back into Germany, the Red Army and the NKVD began to comb the captured territories. By 23 May, they reported arrests of 268 former Red Army men, 1,208 « Wehrmacht » men and 1,655 civilians. In the following weeks, the British surrendered over 40,000 Cossacks who had fled to Western Austria to the Soviet authorities and certain death. In July and August, the Soviets brought in 4 regiments of NKVD troops to « mop-up » Vienna and seal the Czechoslovak border.

The Red Army lost 17,000 lives in the Battle of Vienna. But the reputation of the Soviet soldiers was immediately ruined by the vast amount of sexual violence against women, which occurred in the 1st days and weeks after the Soviet victory. Repressions against civilians harmed Red Army reputation to such an extent that, on 28 September 1945, Moscow issued an order forbidding violent interrogations. Red Army morale fell as soldiers prepared to be sent home ; replacement of combat units with Ivan Konev's permanent occupation force only marginally reduced the Austrians' suffering. Throughout 1945 and 1946, all levels of Soviet command tried, in vain, to contain desertion and plunder by rank and file. According to Austrian police records for 1946, « men in Soviet uniform », usually drunk, accounted for more than 90 % of registered crime (American soldiers : 5 to 7 %) . At the same time, the Soviet governors resisted the expansion and arming of the Austrian police force.

French troops crossed the Austrian border on 29 April, followed by the Americans and finally the British on 8 May. Until the end of July 1945, none of the Western allies had 1st hand intelligence from Eastern Austria (likewise, Renner's cabinet knew practically nothing about conditions in the West) .

On 9 July 1945, the Allies agreed on the borders of their occupation zones. Vorarlberg and North Tyrol were assigned to the French Zone ; Salzburg and Upper-Austria south of the Danube to the American Zone ; East Tyrol, Carinthia and Styria to the British Zone ; and Burgenland, Lower-Austria, and the Mühlviertel area of Upper-Austria, north of the Danube, to the Soviet Zone. The French and American zones bordered those countries' zones in Germany, and the Soviet zone bordered future Warsaw Pact States. Vienna was divided among all 4 Allies. The historical center of Vienna was declared an international zone, in which occupation forces changed every month. Movement of occupation troops (« zone swap ») continued until the end of July.

The 1st Americans arrived in Vienna in the end of July 1945, when the Soviets were pressing Renner to surrender Austrian oil fields. Americans objected and blocked the deal but, ultimately, the Soviets assumed control over Austrian oil in their zone. The British arrived only in September. The Allied Council of 4 military governors convened for its 1st meeting in Vienna, on 12 September 1945. It refused to recognize Renner's claim of a national government but did not prevent him from extending influence into the Western zones. Renner appointed vocal anti-Communist Karl Gruber as Foreign Minister and tried to reduce Communist influence. On 20 October 1945, Renner's reformed cabinet was recognized by the Western allies and received a go-ahead for the 1st legislative election.

The election held on 25 November 1945 was a blow for the Communist Party of Austria which received less than 5 % of the vote. The coalition of Christian Democrats (ÖVP) and Social Democrats (SPÖ) , backed by 90 % of the votes, assumed control over the cabinet and offered the position of Federal Chancellor to Christian Democrat Julius Raab. The Soviets vetoed Raab, due to his political role in the 1930's. Instead, President Karl Renner, with the consent of parliament, appointed Leopold Figl, who was just barely acceptable to the Soviets. They responded with massive and coordinated expropriation of Austrian economic potential.

The Potsdam Agreement allowed confiscation of « German external assets » in Austria, and the Soviets used the vagueness of this definition to the full. In less than 1 year, they dismantled and shipped to the East industrial equipment valued at around \$ 500 U.S. million. American High-Commissioner Mark W. Clark vocally resisted Soviet expansionist intentions, and his reports to Washington, along with George F. Kennan's « The Long Telegram » , supported Truman's tough stance against the Soviets. Thus, according to Bischof, the Cold War in Austria began in the spring of 1946, 1 year before the outbreak of the global Cold War.

On 28 June 1946, the Allies signed the Second Control Agreement, that loosened their dominance over the Austrian government. The Parliament was « de facto » relieved of Allied control. From now on, its decision could be overturned only by unanimous vote by all 4 Allies. Soviet vetoes were routinely voided by the Western opposition. For the next 9 years, the country was gradually emancipated from foreign control, and evolved from a « nation under tutelage » to full independence. The government possessed its own independent vision of the future, reacting to adverse circumstances and, at times, turning them to their own benefit. 1st allied talks on Austrian independence were held in January 1947, and dead-locked over the issue of « German assets » in Soviet possession.

In late-1945 and early-1946, the Allied occupation force peaked at around 150,000 Soviet, 55,000 British, 40,000 American and 15,000 French troops. The costs of keeping these troops were levied on the Austrian government. At 1st, Austria had to pay the whole occupation bill ; in 1946, occupation costs were capped at 35 % of Austrian State expenditures, equally split between the Soviets and the Western allies.

Coincidentally, with the Second Control Agreement, the Soviets changed their economic policy from outright plunder to running expropriated Austrian businesses for a profit. Austrian communists advised Stalin to nationalize the whole economy, but he deemed the proposal to be too radical. Between February and June 1946, the Soviets expropriated hundreds of businesses left in their zone. On 27 June 1946, they amalgamated these assets into the USIA, a conglomerate of over 400 enterprises. It controlled not more than 5 % of Austrian economic output but possessed a substantial, or even monopolistic, share in glass, steel, oil and transportation industries. The USIA was weakly integrated with the rest of Austrian economy : its products were primarily shipped to the East, its profits « de facto » confiscated and its taxes left unpaid by the Soviets. The Austrian government refused to recognize USIA legal title over its possessions ; in retaliation, the USIA refused to pay Austrian taxes and tariffs. This competitive advantage helped to keep USIA enterprises afloat despite their mounting obsolescence. The Soviets had no intention to reinvest their profits, and USIA assets gradually decayed and lost their competitive edge. The Austrian government feared para-military communist gangs sheltered by the USIA and scorned it for being « an economy of exploitation in colonial style » . The economy of the Soviet zone eventually reunited with the rest of the country.

South Tyrol, a disputed territory in the Alps, was returned to Italy. The « 30 second decision » of the Council of Foreign Ministers to grant South Tyrol to Italy (4 September 1945) disregarded popular opinion in Austria and the possible effects of a forced repatriation of 200,000 German-speaking Tyroleans. The decision was motivated largely by the British desire to reward Italy, a country far more important for the containment of world communism. Renner's objections came in too late and carried too little weight to have effect. Popular and official protests continued through 1946. The signatures of 150,000 South Tyroleans did not alter the decision. South Tyrol is today an Italian autonomous province (Bolzano/Bozen) with a German-speaking majority.

In 1947, the Austrian economy, including USIA enterprises, reached 61 % of pre-War level, but it was disproportionately weak in consumer goods production (42 % of pre-War level) . Food remained the worst problem. The country, according to American reports, survived 1945 and 1946 on « a near-starvation diet » with daily rations remaining below 2,000 calories until the end of 1947. 65 % of Austrian agricultural output and nearly all oil was concentrated in the Soviet zone, complicating the Western Allies' task of feeding the population in their own zones.

From March 1946 to June 1947, 64 % of these rations were provided by the UNRRA. Heating depended on supplies of German coal shipped by the U.S. on lax credit terms. Drought of 1946 further depressed farm output and hydro-electric power generation. Figl's government, the Chambers of Labour, Trade and Agriculture, and the Austrian Trade Union Federation (ÖGB) temporarily resolved the crisis in favour of tight regulation of food and labour markets. Wage increases were limited and locked to commodity prices through annual price-wage agreements. The negotiations set a model of building consensus between elected and non-elected political elites that became the basis of post-War Austrian democracy, known as Austrian Social Partnership and Austro-corporatism.

The severe winter of 1946-1947 was followed by the disastrous summer of 1947, when the potato harvest barely made 30 % of pre-War output. Food shortages of 1947 were aggravated by the withdrawal of UNRRA aid, spiraling inflation and the demoralizing failure of State Treaty talks. In April 1947, the government was unable to distribute any rations and, on 5 May, Vienna was shaken by a violent food riot. Unlike earlier popular protests, the demonstrators, led by the Communists, called to curb the westernization of Austrian politics. In August, a food riot in Bad Ischl turned into a pogrom of local Jews. In November, food shortage sparked workers' strikes in British-occupied Styria. Figl's government declared that the food riots were a failed communist putsch, although later historians said this was an exaggeration.

In June 1947, the month when the UNRRA stopped shipments of food to Austria, the extent of the food crisis compelled the U.S. government to issue \$ 300 million in food aid. In the same month, Austria was invited to discuss its participation in the Marshall Plan. Direct aid and subsidies helped Austria to survive the hunger of 1947. On the other hand, they depressed food prices and, thus, discouraged local farmers, delaying the rebirth of Austrian agriculture.

Austria finalized its Marshall Plan program in the end of 1947 and received the 1st « tranche » of Marshall Plan aid in March 1948. Heavy industry (or what was left of it) was concentrated around Linz, in the American zone, and in British-occupied Styria. Their products were in high-demand in post-War Europe. Naturally, the administrators of the

Marshall Plan channeled available financial aid into heavy industry controlled by the American and British forces. American military and political leaders made no secret of their intentions : Geoffrey Keyes said that « we cannot afford to let this key-area (Austria) fall under exclusive influence of the Soviet Union » . The Marshall Plan was deployed primarily against the Soviet zone but it was not completely excluded : it received 8 % of Marshall plan investments (compared to 25 % of food and other physical commodities) . The Austrian government regarded financial aid to the Soviet zone as a lifeline holding the country together. This was the only case when Marshall Plan funds were distributed in Soviet-occupied territories.

The Marshall Plan was not universally popular, especially in its initial phase. It benefited some trades such as metallurgy but depressed others such as agriculture. Heavy industries quickly recovered, from 74.7 % of pre-War output in 1948 to 150.7 % in 1951. American planners deliberately neglected consumer goods industries, construction trades and small business. Their workers, almost half of the industrial work-force, suffered from rising unemployment. In 1948-1949, a substantial share of Marshall Plan funds was used to subsidize imports of food. American money effectively raised real wages : the grain price was about 1/3 of the world price, while agriculture remained in ruins. Marshall Plan aid gradually removed many of the causes of popular unrest that shook the country in 1947, but Austria remained dependent on food imports.

The 2nd stage of the Marshall Plan, which began in 1950, concentrated on productivity of the economy.

According to Michæl J. Hogan :

« In the most profound sense, it involved the transfer of attitudes, habits and values as well, indeed a whole way of life that Marshall planners associated with progress in the market-place of politics and social relationships as much as they did with industry and agriculture. »

The program, as instructed by American law-makers, targeted improvement in factory-level productivity, labour-management relations, free-trade-unions and introduction of modern business practices. The Economic Cooperation Administration, which operated until December 1951, distributed around \$ 300 million in technical assistance and attempted steering the Austrian social partnership (political Parties, labour unions, business associations and executive government) in favour of productivity and growth instead of redistribution and consumption.

Their efforts were thwarted by the Austrian practice of making decisions behind closed doors. The Americans struggled to change it in favour of open, public discussion. They took a strong anti-cartel stance, appreciated by the Socialists, and pressed the government to remove anti-competition legislation. But, ultimately, they were responsible for the creation of the vast monopolistic public sector of the economy (and, thus, politically benefiting the Socialists) .

According to Bischof, « no European nation benefited more from Marshall Plan than Austria » . Austria received nearly a \$ 1 billion through Marshall Plan, and half a billion in humanitarian aid. The Americans also refunded all occupation costs charged in 1945-1946, around \$ 300 million. In 1948-1949, Marshall Plan aid contributed 14 % of national income, the highest ratio of all involved countries. Per capita, aid amounted to \$ 132 compared to \$ 19 for the

Germans. But Austria also paid more War reparations per capita than any other Axis State or territory. « Total War » reparations taken by the Soviet Union including withdrawn USIA profits, looted property and the final settlement agreed in 1955, are estimated between \$ 1.54 billion and \$ 2.65 billion (Eisterer : 2 to 2.5 billion) .

The British had been quietly arming gendarmes since 1945 and discussed the creation of a proper Austrian military in 1947. The Americans feared that Vienna could be the scene of another Berlin Blockade. They set-up and filled emergency food dumps, and prepared to airlift supplies to Vienna while the government created a back-up base in Salzburg. The American command secretly trained the soldiers of an underground Austrian military at a rate of 200 men a week. The « Gendarmerie » knowingly hired « Wehrmacht » veterans and VdU members ; the denazification of Austria's 537,000 registered Nazis had largely ended in 1948.

Austrian communists appealed to Stalin to partition their country along the German model but, in February 1948, Andrei Zhdanov vetoed the idea : Austria had more value as a bargaining chip than as another unstable client state. The continuing talks on Austrian independence stalled in 1948 but progressed to a « near breakthrough » in 1949 : the Soviets lifted most of their objections, and the Americans suspected foul-play. The Pentagon was convinced that the withdrawal of Western troops would leave the country open to Soviet invasion of the Czechoslovak model. Clark insisted that, before their departure, the United States must secretly train and arm the core of a future military. Serious secret training of the B-Gendarmerie began in 1950 but soon stalled due to U.S. defense budget cuts in 1951. « Gendarmes » were trained primarily as an anti-coup police force, but they also studied Soviet combat practice and counted on cooperation with the Yugoslavs in case of a Soviet invasion.

Although, in the fall of 1950, the Western powers replaced their military representatives with civilian diplomats, strategically, the situation became gloomier than ever. The Korean War experience persuaded Washington that Austria might become « Europe's Korea » and speed-up re-armament of the « secret ally » . International tension was coincident with a severe internal economic and social crisis. The planned withdrawal of American food subsidies spelled a sharp drop in real wages. The government and the unions dead-locked in negotiations, and gave the communists the opportunity to organize the 1950 Austrian general strikes which became the gravest threat since the 1947 food riots. The communists stormed and took-over ÖGB offices and disrupted railroad traffic but failed to recruit sufficient public support and had to admit defeat. The Soviets and the Western allies did not dare to actively intervene in the strikes. The strike intensified the militarization of Western Austria, with active input from France and the CIA. Despite the strain of the Korean War, by the end of 1952, the American « Stockpile A » (A for Austria) in France and Germany amassed 227 thousand tons of materiel ear-marked for Austrian armed forces.

The end of the Korean War and the death of Joseph Stalin defused the standoff, and the country was rapidly, but not completely, demilitarized. After the Soviet Union had relieved Austria of the need to pay for the cost of their reduced army of 40,000 men, the British and French followed suit and reduced their forces to a token presence. Finally, the Soviets replaced their military governor with a civilian ambassador. The former border between Eastern and Western Austria became a demarcation line.

Chancellor Julius Raab, elected in April 1953, removed pro-Western foreign minister Karl Gruber and steered Austria to

a more neutral policy. Raab carefully probed the Soviets about resuming the talks on independence but, until February 1955, it remained contingent on a solution to the larger German problem. The Western strategy of re-arming West Germany, formulated in the Paris Agreement, was unacceptable to the Soviets. They responded with a counter-proposal for a pan-European security system that, they said, could speed-up reunification of Germany and, again, the West suspected foul-play. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in particular, had « an utter lack of confidence in the reliability and integrity of the men in the Kremlin ... the Kremlin is pre-empting the right to speak for the small nations of the world » .

In January 1955, Soviet diplomats Andrey Gromyko, Vladimir Semenov and Georgy Pushkin secretly advised Vyacheslav Molotov to unlink the Austrian and German issues, expecting that the new talks on Austria would delay ratification of the Paris Agreement. Molotov publicly announced the new Soviet initiative on 8 February. He put forward 3 conditions for Austrian independence : neutrality, no foreign military bases, and guarantees against a new « Anschluß » .

In March, Molotov clarified his plan through a series of consultations with ambassador Norbert Bischoff : Austria was no longer a hostage of the German issue. Molotov invited Raab to Moscow for bilateral negotiations that, if successful, had to be followed by a 4 Powers conference. By this time, the Paris Agreements were ratified by France and Germany, although the British and Americans suspected a trap of the same sort that Adolf Hitler had set for Kurt Schuschnigg in 1938. Anthony Eden and others wrote that the Moscow initiative was merely a cover-up for another incursion into German matters. The West erroneously thought that the Soviets valued Austria primarily as a military asset when, in reality, it was a purely political issue. Austria's military significance has been largely devalued by the end of the Soviet-Yugoslav conflict and the upcoming signing of the Warsaw Pact.

These fears did not materialize, and Raab's visit to Moscow (12 to 15 April) was a breakthrough. Moscow agreed that Austria would be free no later than 31 December. Austrians agreed to pay for the « German assets » and oil fields left by the Soviets, mostly in kind ; « the real prize was to be neutrality on the Swiss model » . Molotov also promised release and repatriation of Austrians imprisoned in the Soviet Union.

Western powers were stunned ; Frank Wallinger reported to London that the deal « was far too good to be true, to be honest » . But it proceeded as had been agreed in Moscow and, on 15 May 1955, Antoine Pinay, Harold MacMillan, Molotov, John Foster Dulles and Figl signed the Austrian State Treaty. It came into force on 27 July and, on 25 October, the country was free of occupying troops. The Soviets left in Vienna the large Soviet War Memorial and to the new government a symbolic cache of small arms, artillery and T-34 tanks ; the Americans left a far greater gift of « Stockpile A » assets. The only political spokesman who has been publicly upset about the outcome was Konrad Adenauer, who called the affair « die ganze österreichische Schweinerei » (the whole Austrian scandal) and threatened the Austrians with « sending Hitler's remains home to Austria » .

Dénazification

La dénazification (« Entnazifizierung ») est un processus dirigé par les Alliés au sortir de la Seconde Guerre mondiale et destiné à éradiquer le Nazisme dans les institutions et la vie publique allemandes. Il avait aussi pour objectif de

permettre la reconstruction de la vie politique allemande sur une base démocratique. Ainsi, il faut voir dans ce processus 2 volets : un volet punitif et un volet préventif.

Proclamée à Londres en janvier 1942, renforcée par l'accord de Potsdam en août 1945, la dénazification désigne une « épuration » de la société, de la culture, de la presse, de l'économie, du pouvoir judiciaire et de la politique allemandes et autrichiennes de toute influence nazie. Après la Seconde Guerre mondiale, une grande partie de l'Europe, surtout l'Allemagne, était en ruines. Ceci était particulièrement vrai pour l'administration de l'État. Les Alliés ont entrepris une politique de démocratisation, de démilitarisation, de décartellisation (rapidement arrêtée à l'Ouest à cause de l'influence communiste, car créant du chômage) et de dénazification.

Il était notamment prévu dans les zones d'occupations occidentales des questionnaires auxquels chaque Allemand ayant détenu une petite fonction civile ou militaire devait répondre. Les réponses furent fréquemment peu sincères, frauduleuses ou fantaisistes. Le romancier Ernst von Salomon publia en 1951 un texte célèbre intitulé « Le Questionnaire » (« Der Fragebogen ») .

À partir du 20 septembre 1945, le Conseil de contrôle allié siégeant à Berlin adopta la Loi n° 1 du Conseil de contrôle allié portant abrogation du droit nazi, première d'un grand nombre de directives de dénazification qui seront appliquées plus ou moins scrupuleusement selon les zones d'occupation (les Soviétiques étant les plus radicaux) . Ces directives allaient permettre de désigner certains groupes de personnes pour lesquelles une enquête judiciaire a été entamée. Le corps professoral est profondément et rapidement renouvelé, ainsi que la majeure partie des professions juridiques, journalistiques et sportives.

La « loi d'élimination du National-Socialisme et du militarisme » du 5 mars 1946 définit dans son article 4 les niveaux de responsabilité : « Hauptschuldige » (principaux coupables) ; « Belastete » (charges importantes) ; « Minderbelastete » (charges mineures) ; « Mitläufer » (suiivistes) ; « Entlastete » (libérés, les procès en dénazification pouvant déclarer les prévenus « nicht betroffen », « non concernés » par cette loi) .

Le 23 juin 1950, sous l'influence d'Otto Küster, une loi de « reconnaissance des unions libres des (personnes) persécutées (pour raisons) raciales et politiques » est promulguée afin de mettre un terme aux errements de la politique raciale du « Reich » nazi en termes de mariages.

Cependant, derrière l'apparente univocité du terme, la dénazification connut des déploiements différents selon les zones d'occupation :

« Une fois admis qu'on châtierait les grands chefs, les conceptions des vainqueurs divergeaient déjà sur la nature du phénomène national-socialiste, donc nécessairement sur les meilleurs moyens d'en éliminer jusqu'aux ferments. Pour les dirigeants britanniques, il s'agissait d'une sorte de maladie. L'élimination des porteurs de germes suffirait à rendre au corps sa santé. Pour les Français, il y avait une sorte de ligne continue de Bismarck à Hitler. Le Nazisme était lié au « prussianisme dont Hitler a été la plus dangereuse incarnation » . L'État unitaire allemand et l'État totalitaire étaient liés. La punition resterait sans effet si, par ailleurs, on n'assurait pas la destruction de la Prusse et celle de l'unité

allemande. Du côté américain, on était partagé entre la vision anglaise et la vision française. Les Soviétiques, eux, attribuaient la victoire du Nazisme en Allemagne aux structures de la société allemande, en particulier à la répartition du pouvoir économique au sein de la société : la punition était donc accessoire, la révolution sociale prioritaire. »

(Alfred Großer, L'Allemagne de notre temps ; page 80.)

Le conseil de contrôle allié n'édicte la directive 24 qu'en janvier 1946, et, dès lors, la dénazification se déroule différemment dans chaque zone d'occupation. 186,000 suspects sont détenus dans les 3 zones d'occupation occidentales, dont 86,000 sont libérés au 1er janvier 1947.

Sont ainsi détenus jusqu'en 1947 :

En zone britannique : 64,500 personnes (dont 34,000 sont libérées ; soit 53 %) .

En zone américaine : 95,250 personnes (dont 44,244 libérées ; soit 46 %) .

En zone française : 18,963 personnes (dont 8,040 libérées ; soit 42 %) .

En zone soviétique : 67,179 personnes (dont 8,214 libérées ; soit 12 %) .

5,025 condamnations sont prononcées dans les zones occidentales, dont 806 condamnations à mort.

D'autres historiens relèvent, eux aussi, la disparité de traitement selon la zone d'occupation :

« De plus, leur armée (celle des Américains) de Texans, de Noirs, de “ Middle-Westerners ” abonde aussi de réfugiés allemands qui savent la langue et expliquent tout. Le rôle de ceux-là sera important pendant la Ire phase de l'occupation. L'ignorance et la bonne conscience des uns, les sentiments de retrouvailles mêlés de désir de vengeance des autres feront de la dénazification américaine un chef-d'œuvre de précision, de bureaucratie et d'incohérence. Mais s'il faut choisir sa zone, c'est chez les Américains que cela fera le moins mal d'être allemand. »

(Joseph Rován, Histoire de l'Allemagne ; page 768.)

La description que Rován donne de l'administration du secteur français est également très critique :

« Quant aux Français, à qui les Américains ont cédé une partie de leur zone, les régions sud des futurs “ Länder ” de Bade et de Wurtemberg, et les Anglais le sud de la Rhénanie, ils sont placés sous le règne du tripartisme qui, de Gaulle parti, sera surtout celui de l'impuissance, chaque parti bandant ses forces pour anéantir les efforts des autres. En « zone », la divergence profonde et sans cesse plus approfondie entre occupants communistes, socialistes et démocrates-chrétiens a pour conséquence un haut-niveau d'autonomie pour les responsables de tout genre qui peuvent toujours court-circuiter leurs supérieurs hiérarchiques en cherchant l'appui de leur soutien politique à Paris. La zone

française ressemble au Saint-Empire des derniers siècles de son existence, c'est une justification de territoires et de secteurs administratifs semi-autonomes. L'ordre y est maintenu par une sorte d'armée des Indes, une armée de type colonial métissée de FTP et de FFI. Comme partout, on retrouve chez les Français des idéalistes de la réconciliation avec une Allemagne démocratique et des profiteurs, mais ceux-là aussi ont dans notre petite zone, assez pauvre et restée relativement à l'abri de la Guerre et de ses mouvements de population, un degré d'indépendance bien plus grand qu'ailleurs. »

(Joseph Rovin, Histoire de l'Allemagne ; page 768.)

Après le 5 mars 1946, la responsabilité de la dénazification en zone américaine est confiée aux autorités allemandes, qui mettent en place des chambres d'épuration composées de juges intérimaires. Après la fondation de la République fédérale d'Allemagne, le « Bundestag » met officiellement fin à la dénazification par le vote de la loi du 1er juillet 1951. Dans la zone soviétique, en revanche, les camps d'internement restent jusqu'en janvier 1950 administrés par les Soviétiques. Les conditions de vie y sont très difficiles, et 42,800 prisonniers y décèdent, selon les autorités soviétiques, plus de 80,000 selon d'autres sources.

Le procès de Nuremberg (du 20 novembre 1945 au 1er octobre 1946) déclare criminelles 4 organisations nazies : le NSDAP, la SS, la SD et la « Gestapo ». Cela implique que le simple fait d'en avoir fait partie est un crime. En ce qui concerne le NSDAP, seul le corps de chefs nazis est déclaré criminel à savoir, le « Führer », la « Reichsleitung », les « Gauleiter » et leurs principaux collaborateurs, les « Kreisleiter » et leurs collaborateurs, les « Ortsgruppenleiter », les « Zellenleiter » et les « Blockleiter ». Les simples membres ne sont pas inquiétés s'ils se sont bornés à avoir une carte du NSDAP.

Dans l'immédiat d'après-Guerre, beaucoup de Nazis, et en particulier de SS, furent ainsi détenus dans des camps de prisonniers ou/et exécutés, soit par la Résistance, soit après procès. Une partie, cependant, échappa à toute condamnation. Si, dès 1943, les Alliés avaient mis en place la Commission des crimes de guerre des Nations unies (UNWCS) chargée de dresser une liste des criminels de guerre nazis, celle-ci, ainsi que d'autres organismes nationaux, durent faire face à d'importants problèmes pratiques d'organisation, en particulier après 1947 et le déclenchement officiel de la Guerre Froide. L'échec du CROWCASS (Registre central des criminels de guerre et des suspects pour la sécurité), créé en mars 1945, est symptomatique de ce changement de priorité politique. De leur côté, certains d'entre eux s'organisaient, par exemple dans l'association d'entre-aide des ex-membres de la « Waffen-SS », la « Hilfsgemeinschaft auf Gegenseitigkeit der ehemaligen Angehörigen der Waffen-SS », créée en 1951 et dissoute en 1992.

Les Nazis qui échappèrent à la justice dans l'immédiat après-Guerre peuvent ainsi être classés en plusieurs catégories :

Ceux qui se sont suicidés.

Ceux qui ont été condamnés à mort mais ont réussi à ne pas être exécutés d'une manière ou d'une autre.

Ceux qui n'ont pas fait l'objet de procès ni de condamnation, pour une raison ou une autre (non-inscrit au CROWCASS,

non arrêté, etc.) . Ceux-ci ont pu parfois continuer à vivre dans leur pays, soit sous la même identité, soit sous une fausse-identité, étant parfois employés par les services de renseignements de l'Ouest comme de l'Est (par exemple, Horst Kopkow, qui travailla pour le MI5 ; le chef du contre-espionnage Wilhelm Hötzl, qui travailla pour le « Counter Intelligence Corps » (CIC) américain ; nombre de membres de l'Organisation Gehlen, ancêtre du BND allemand, etc.) . D'autres, comme le SS letton Viktors Arājs, chef du tristement célèbre « Sonderkommando » Arājs, fut mystérieusement libéré par les Britanniques en 1946, pour n'être condamné à perpétuité qu'en 1979. Walter Rauff, un des inventeurs de la chambre à gaz mobile qui a tué des milliers de handicapés mentaux et de Juifs, fut employé par les services secrets de la RFA et protégé contre les poursuites en justice.

D'autres, parmi ceux-ci, se sont enfuis, en s'appuyant parfois sur des réseaux d'exfiltration des criminels de guerre. Ces réseaux ont fait l'objet d'une intense spéculation historique depuis la publication du roman ODESSA par Frederick Forsyth, en 1972, qui tenait la plupart de ses sources du chasseur de nazis controversé Simon Wiesenthal. Au-delà d'ODESSA, l'un des réseaux avérés fut celui de l'évêque catholique Alois Hudal, qui était proche du prêtre croate Krunoslav Draganović. Ces 2 prêtres firent beaucoup pour aider des fugitifs, dont Adolf Eichmann ou Klaus Barbie, à s'enfuir, souvent pour l'Amérique latine (en premier lieu, l'Argentine) .

Parmi ces fugitifs nazis, on peut citer, parmi les plus connus, Josef Mengele (mort en 1979) , Klaus Barbie (qui travailla pour la dictature bolivienne avant d'être rattrapé par la justice française) , Adolf Eichmann (jugé à Jérusalem) , Alois Brunner, Aribert Heim (recherché jusqu'à sa mort en 1992 au Caire, en Égypte) , le commandant de Treblinka Franz Stangl, l'aviateur letton Herberts Cukurs (exécuté par le Mossad) , le botaniste SS Heinz Brücher (devenu professeur en Argentine) , etc. Seule une partie de ces fugitifs ont été rattrapés par la justice.

Enfin, une partie, certes marginale, des anciens nazis, réussit à dissimuler son passé et à obtenir des postes politiques plus ou moins importants après la Guerre. Ceci a souvent suscité des scandales et leur démission quand leur fonction pendant le Nazisme fut révélée. On peut ainsi citer :

Kurt Georg Kiesinger, membre du NSDAP depuis 1933, qui travaillait au service de propagande de l'Office des Affaires étrangères, chargé de faire le lien avec le Ministère du « Reich » à l'Éducation du peuple et à la Propagande, et qui fut Chancelier fédéral de la RFA de 1966 à 1969.

Heinz Reinefarth, lieutenant-général (« Gruppenführer ») de la « Waffen-SS » et chef des SS et de la police (« Höherer der SS und Polizeiführer ») en Pologne, officier nazi important donc, qui échappa toutefois à toute inculpation et devint maire de Westerland (1951-1964) et député du Bloc des réfugiés au « Landtag » de Schleswig-Holstein à partir de 1958.

L'ex- « Gruppenführer » Wilhelm Harster, officiel important du ministère bavarois de l'Intérieur, qui dut démissionner après avoir pris la défense du criminel de guerre Erich Rajakowitsch, jugé à Vienne en 1965, puis fut lui-même à nouveau jugé et condamné en 1967.

Kurt Waldheim, secrétaire-général des Nations unies et président fédéral de l'Autriche de 1986 à 1992, est sans doute

l'ex-nazi ayant eu les fonctions les plus importantes après-Guerre. Waldheim, qui avait été inscrit comme suspect sur la liste de l'UNWCS, était membre de la SA et fut « Oberleutnant » de la « Wehrmacht » sur le front de l'Est, et on s'intéressa beaucoup à son rôle lors de la bataille de Kozara en Bosnie, dans la 714e division d'infanterie dirigée par le général Friedrich Stahl. Bien que l'unité militaire dont il fit partie se fût rendue coupable d'exactions nombreuses, aucune preuve ne l'impliquant directement dans des crimes de guerre n'a pu cependant être fournie. Le Département de la Justice des États-Unis refusa toutefois, en 1987, de le laisser entrer sur le territoire national, en affirmant qu'il avait pris part à la déportation, au mauvais traitement et à l'exécution de civils et de soldats alliés durant la Guerre.

Le cas d'Hanns Martin Schleyer, « Untersturmführer-SS » puis représentant du patronat allemand est à part, dans la mesure où il fut assassiné par la RAF en 1977.

En 1953, le « Sozialistische Reichspartei », qui se présente comme successeur du NSDAP, est interdit. En 1964, le NPD (« Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands ») est créé. Malgré des propos racistes et d'extrême-droite, le Parti n'est toujours pas interdit, même si cette question occupe régulièrement la classe politique allemande.

Dans les années 1980, l'affaire Klaus Barbie a suscité, aux États-Unis, l'« amendement Holtzman », voté entre autres par Ted Kennedy, et qui ajoutait la question sur le formulaire d'exemption de visa :

« Le visiteur étranger a-t-il été impliqué dans les persécutions nazies ? »

La justice américaine n'avait, en effet, aucune compétence juridictionnelle, au pénal, sur les étrangers. Aussi, dans le sillage de l'affaire Barbie, un service spécial fut créé à l'ICS (« Immigration and Custom Service ») chargé d'enquêter sur les suspects de crimes de guerre. Le cas échéant, et après procès, ceux-ci étaient expulsés du territoire. Des années plus tard, le président démocrate Bill Clinton signa, en 1998, le « Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act » qui a permis l'ouverture d'archives concernant les anciens membres du NSDAP, en particulier ceux employés ou contactés par la CIA (Opération « Paper-clip », etc.) ou d'autres agences de renseignement (notamment le « Counter Intelligence Corps »).

Le Royaume-Uni, également, vota, après un long débat, le « War Crimes Act 1991 », qui accordait à ses tribunaux une compétence juridictionnelle sur les personnes soupçonnées de crimes de guerre commis lors de la Guerre et ayant par la suite acquis la citoyenneté britannique. La seule personne jugée (et condamnée) en vertu de cette loi fut l'ex-SS Anthony Sawoniuk d'origine polonaise ou biélorusse.

Les Européens ne parviennent pas à s'entendre sur une loi commune à propos du Nazisme. En janvier 2007, le projet d'interdiction des symboles nazis par tous les pays membres de l'Union européenne a été rejeté. En effet, pour la communauté hindoue britannique, le svastika est avant tout un symbole de paix, et ceci depuis 5,000 ans.

L'incitation à la haine raciale et à la xénophobie sont passibles des délits punis de la même manière dans les 27 États membres, par des peines de 1 à 3 ans de prison. Mais le négationnisme n'est délictueux qu'en France, en Allemagne et en Autriche.

Pour l'historien spécialiste de la Shoah, Georges Bensoussan, la dénazification est une « farce » et une « illusion ». La grande majorité des Nazis coupables de crimes de guerre n'ont pas été jugés, seule une poignée de dignitaires ont comparu sous les pressions entre autres des autorités françaises. La dénazification s'est arrêtée très vite à cause de la Guerre Froide et de l'anti-communisme. Il donne l'exemple de criminels comme Adolf Eichmann jamais inquiété par l'Allemagne fédérale (qui savait où il était en 1951) et finalement arrêté par le Mossad, ou les 200 responsables du ghetto de Łódź dont seuls 4 ont été jugés. Bensoussan ne remet pas en cause la sincérité du mea-culpa officiel de l'Allemagne ; mais, pour lui, une partie importante des Allemands, difficile à quantifier, comprenant les « corps intermédiaires » et « une grande partie des élites », le plus souvent très éduqués, tels les membres de la « Gestapo » et les SS, est restée hitlérienne (mais pas forcément nazie) jusqu'au bout. C'est cependant méconnaître l'action du procureur général du « Land » de HeBe, Fritz Bauer, dans la poursuite des anciens Nazis et son rôle dans l'arrestation d'Eichmann.

...

Le projet de dénazification, destiné à éradiquer toute influence nazi des institutions, de la société, de l'économie et de la politique allemande, s'amorce dès 1943 avec la constitution d'une liste de criminels de guerre nazis susceptibles d'être jugés après-guerre.

La haine à l'égard des Allemands se focalise sur les soldats de la « Waffen-SS », « soldats politiques » fanatisés par des années d'endoctrinement. Le choc moral provoqué par la découverte des camps de concentrations et des camps d'exterminations renforce alors la détermination à punir les Nazis. À l'Ouest de l'Allemagne, les armées alliées capturent des centaines de milliers de prisonniers et appliquent la convention de Genève qui leur reconnaît des droits.

À l'Est, les armées soviétiques vouent une haine idéologique viscérale à la doctrine nazie et veulent se venger des massacres commis par les armées nazies sur leur territoire. N'appliquant pas la convention de Genève, ils déportent beaucoup de Nazis dans les Goulags de Sibérie, d'où très peu reviendront après la Guerre.

La conférence de Potsdam (juillet-août 1945) réunit les pays vainqueurs de l'Allemagne nazie. Ils décident alors d'appliquer les « 4 D » : Démocratiser ; Démilitariser ; Décartelliser l'économie ; et Dénazifier l'Allemagne. Il s'agit d'interdire le Parti nazi (8,5 millions de membres) et de punir les principaux cadres du régime hitlérien sans provoquer d'épuration massive. Le procès de Nuremberg juge 24 responsables du 3e « Reich », accusés de crimes contre l'humanité (terme créé spécialement pour la situation), de crimes contre la paix et de crimes de guerre.

Presque toutes les élites allemandes ont plus ou moins collaboré avec le régime hitlérien. Les résistants allemands anti-nazis, minoritaires, sont trop peu nombreux pour pouvoir gérer le pays. Français et Britanniques, après avoir épuré les principaux responsables, vont donc utiliser industriels et ingénieurs, même anciennement associés au Parti nazi, pour relancer la machine économique allemande. Dans la zone d'occupation américaine, les autorités veulent procéder à une dénazification administrative à l'aide d'un questionnaire, rapidement abandonné à cause de sa complexité.

Dans la zone soviétique, outre une traque féroce contre les Nazis, la dénazification est un prétexte pour arrêter les personnes jugées hostiles aux Communistes ; mais, rapidement, Staline ralentit la traque pour ménager les masses populaires qu'il espère faire adhérer au Communisme.

La dénazification est vécue en Allemagne comme une « punition injuste ». La loi de décembre 1949 prévoit une amnistie. La plupart sont innocentés et réhabilités. Parmi les 2,5 millions de Nazis jugés, seul 1,4 % sont reconnus coupables. Un tiers des dossiers n'aboutissent pas. De plus, beaucoup d'anciens Nazis échappent à la justice. Certains fuient vers l'Amérique latine, d'autres entrent en clandestinité. Seuls les « chasseurs de Nazis » ou le Mossad (Services secrets israéliens) traquent sans relâche les anciens responsables nazis.

La Guerre Froide met fin à la dénazification : la menace soviétique et la crise de Berlin provoquent la création de 2 États allemands et les alliés occidentaux redoutent une invasion soviétique. Ils autorisent donc la création d'associations d'anciens combattants allemands, qui pourraient, en cas d'invasion, constituer des réseaux de résistance. De ce fait, quelques Nazis sortent de prison.

Finalement, en 1968, le code pénal allemand provoque l'arrêt des enquêtes judiciaires. La société allemande tente alors de tourner la page sans pour autant oublier cette période douloureuse.

L'idée de juger les principaux responsables nazis s'impose pendant la Guerre. Cette idée, sans précédent dans l'histoire, s'explique par le caractère total du conflit. Le procès commence officiellement le 20 novembre 1945 et se termine le 1er octobre 1946. Il est alors suivi par le monde entier.

En juin 1945, à San Francisco pour la fondation de l'ONU, les pays vainqueurs décident de traduire les grands criminels de guerre devant un tribunal international avec des juges américains, français, anglais et soviétiques. Le choix de la ville est symbolique : en 1935, elle avait été le lieu du triomphe du Parti nazi et de la proclamation des lois qui avaient déchu les Juifs de la citoyenneté allemande et les avaient exclus de la communauté nationale. Les États-Unis sont les initiateurs des chefs d'accusation de complot et de crime contre la paix. Les Français et les Soviétiques, encore traumatisés par les massacres commis par les Nazis sur les populations civiles, ajoutent le crime de guerre et le crime contre l'humanité. Le terme génocide est employé pour définir l'extermination de 6 millions de Juifs, de Tsiganes, d'homosexuels et d'handicapés mentaux.

Le procès concerne 24 responsables politiques (dont le numéro 2 du régime hitlérien, Hermann Göring, chef de la « Luftwaffe »), militaires et économiques. Il concerne aussi 4 organisations : les SS et le SD (service de sécurité de la SS). À l'annonce des accusations, tous plaident non-coupables, invoquant soit leur absence de responsabilité personnelle, soit leur devoir d'obéissance aux ordres. La « solution finale » est alors évoquée, appuyée sur des témoignages des victimes qui avaient réussi à survivre à l'Holocauste. Au cours du procès, d'innombrables atrocités sont présentées devant un public choqué. Un nombre considérable de documents incontestables signés par les accusés prouve leur responsabilité.

La plupart des Nazis nient l'évidence et la réalité des faits. À propos de la Shoah, certains Nazis « ne savaient pas

qu'il existait une politique visant à l'extermination des Juifs » et se contentent de reconnaître les « abus » de cette période. Les Soviétiques cherchent à faire porter la responsabilité du massacre de Katyn aux responsables nazis (22,000 officiers polonais y furent exécutés au printemps de 1940 par le NKVD) . Ce n'est qu'en novembre 2010 que la Russie en reconnaît la responsabilité.

Les sentences sont rendues le 1er octobre 1946 : 12 condamnations à mort par pendaison (Göring échappe à l'exécution en se suicidant la veille) ; des peines de prison variant de 10 ans à la perpétuité pour la plupart ; 3 acquittements. Le NSDAP, la « Gestapo », les SS et le SD sont jugés « organisations criminelles » la réalité incontestable du génocide est remise en cause par les révisionnistes qui s'efforcent de décrédibiliser la valeur des témoignages des survivants ou encore par les négationnistes qui nient l'existence même du génocide.

Malgré tout, l'« esprit » de Nuremberg a survécu : impossible à mettre en place pendant la Guerre Froide, 2 tribunaux internationaux ont été créés depuis la fin de cette période. Ils ont jugés les criminels de guerre de l'ex-Yougoslavie en 1993, et du génocide rwandais en 1994. La Cour pénale internationale a été créée en 2002 à la Haye.

Politique culturelle et dénazification dans la zone d'occupation française en Autriche (Tyrol et Vorarlberg) et à Vienne de 1945 à 1955 (1)

Extirper toute trace de ferveur et de soutien à l'idéologie nationale-socialiste, tel était le grand objectif de la France dans sa zone d'occupation en Autriche entre 1945 et 1955. Étant donné que les Français considéraient les Autrichiens comme des victimes du Nazisme, et non les promoteurs de cette idéologie, leur politique culturelle et leur tentative de dénazification n'ont obtenu qu'un succès limité. En condamnant trop vivement ceux qui avaient collaboré avec les Nazis, les Français risquaient de provoquer une grave crise sociale en Autriche, qui risquait de déstabiliser toute l'Europe centrale. Quant à la politique culturelle française, elle n'a pas permis de rattraper le terrain perdu par la langue française après 7 ans d'occupation nazie.

...

Lors de l'arrivée d'Adolf Hitler en Autriche, le 13 avril 1938, à Linz comme à Vienne, la foule criait :

« Un seul peuple, un seul " Reich ", un seul " Führer ". » (2)

L'idéologie nationale-socialiste a rencontré une très large audience en Autriche avec, pour résultat, que les 7 années d'occupation nazie ont profondément marqué les cœurs et les esprits. Extirper toute trace de ferveur et de soutien à cette idéologie extrémiste, tel était le mandat des troupes d'occupation françaises entre 1945 et 1955. Mais pour y parvenir, le général Antoine Béthouart (le commandant en chef des troupes françaises d'occupation en Autriche, de 1945 à 1950) et ses subalternes ont choisi d'agir avant tout dans le secteur culturel, afin de ne pas imposer la démocratie aux Autrichiens, mais de les convaincre de ses bienfaits. Une tâche de cette ampleur relevait plus de l'utopie que de la conviction profonde qu'une fois les troupes d'occupation de retour chez elles, plus aucune trace du national-socialisme n'allait subsister :

« Il est certainement plus aisé de rétablir une frontière que d'exorciser un peuple. La dénazification devait apparaître comme l'œuvre du gouvernement autrichien lui-même. Si les Nazis avaient été châtiés directement par les Alliés, ils seraient apparus comme des martyrs de l'occupation étrangère. Le résultat aurait été contraire au but recherché. » (3)

Les Autrichiens étaient considérés par les autorités françaises comme des victimes du Nazisme, et non les promoteurs de cette idéologie. C'est le désir de s'assurer la reconnaissance et la faveur des Autrichiens qui a prévalu sur une réelle prise en compte de la participation autrichienne dans le second conflit mondial. En se présentant comme des amis sincères, les Français voulaient s'assurer d'une meilleure pénétration de leur influence en Autriche. Convaincre et persuader plutôt qu'imposer, c'était le mot d'ordre de la France en Autriche.

UNE DÉNAZIFICATION RATÉE DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT ET LES ARTS

Une fois que les Alliés sont arrivés en Autriche, ils se sont attaqués à l'épuration du personnel enseignant ayant soutenu ou appartenu au Parti nazi. Le Service Éducation a suivi 3 étapes distinctes dans cette opération d'épuration : une période empirique, une période intermédiaire et une période finale. (4)

La 1re période consistait à examiner l'ensemble des dossiers du personnel en fonction avant la rentrée scolaire d'octobre 1945. Le travail était effectué par une commission autrichienne, supervisée par un officier français n'ayant que le simple statut d'observateur. Ceux dont on étudiait le dossier étaient classés en 3 catégories : ceux qui n'avaient jamais été inscrits sur les listes du Parti nazi ou qui étaient publiquement hostiles aux Nazis (liste blanche) ; ceux qui avaient demandé leur adhésion au Parti mais qui étaient suspectés d'avoir agi sous la contrainte ou par crainte de perdre « leur situation » (liste grise) ; enfin, ceux qui étaient connus pour leur attachement au Parti nazi (liste noire). Les membres de la 1re catégorie conservaient leurs fonctions ; ceux de la seconde étaient provisoirement maintenus en poste, le temps qu'une autre commission procède à une enquête plus poussée devant déterminer leurs liens réels avec le Parti nazi. Les plus compromis, ceux de la dernière catégorie, étaient immédiatement licenciés. (5)

La période intermédiaire s'est appuyée sur la loi d'interdiction du Parti nazi, adoptée en 1945, et l'épuration a duré jusqu'au mois de février 1947. Les commissions d'épuration étaient composées d'un juriste président, d'un représentant du « Landeschulrat » et de 2 membres du personnel de la même catégorie que la personne qui était jugée. Les décisions de ces commissions devaient être approuvées par une commission supérieure qui siégeait auprès du chancelier fédéral. Le ministre de l'Instruction publique avait, dans un délai de 15 jours, le droit d'appel si les décisions ne lui apparaissaient pas tout à fait justifiées. (6)

La dernière période d'épuration a débuté avec l'adoption de la loi de dénazification de 1947 qui tenait désormais compte des fonctions qu'avait exercées le personnel enseignant au sein du Parti nazi, peu importe le moment, jusqu'à l'arrivée des Alliés en Autriche. (7)

Le ministre de France à Vienne, Louis de Monicault, a constaté que l'effet immédiat de cette loi a été de mettre un frein presque total aux travaux des commissions d'épuration administrative : (8)

« On peut se demander si les autorités autrichiennes sont, en réalité, aussi pressées qu'elles le prétendent d'utiliser l'instrument législatif qu'elles ont élaboré. D'autre part, certaines décisions judiciaires scandaleuses ont montré que les magistrats et les jurés sont de plus en plus enclins à l'indulgence, sinon à la faiblesse, en matière de dénazification. L'évasion de plusieurs Nazis " lourdement chargés " incarcérés à la prison centrale de Vienne, et parmi lesquels figurait au moins un criminel de guerre, a mis en lumière, non seulement le traitement bienveillant réservé aux plus fidèles partisans du régime hitlérien, mais également les complicités que ceux-ci sont toujours assurés de trouver dans la police et dans l'administration pénitentiaire. Diverses manifestations ont enfin dévoilé les multiples sympathies que le National-Socialisme conserve encore en Autriche. À Vienne comme dans plusieurs agglomérations de province, des inscriptions nazies ont été peintes sur les murs et des croix gammées répandues dans les rues. » (9)

Selon Louis de Monicault, le président Karl Renner aurait affirmé à la radio que sa fonction lui donnait le droit de gracier les Autrichiens les plus coupables, étant donné que la nouvelle loi de dénazification ne reposait sur aucun fondement juridique. (10)

La population autrichienne, quant à elle, considérait que, puisqu'il y avait 536,000 Nazis enregistrés après la Guerre, et qu'avec les membres de leur famille, ils représentaient le quart de la population, on ne pouvait pas tenir tous ces gens à l'écart de la vie politique et économique sans courir de grands risques. (11)

Même le Comité central du Parti communiste avait adopté une résolution en faveur des candidatures des petits Nazis. (12)

Louis de Monicault disait craindre que l'Élément soviétique tente de convaincre les autres Éléments du Conseil allié de mettre la loi en veilleuse. (13)

L'épuration a officiellement été complétée en 1948. (14)

Mais les organes de presse d'allégeance communiste étaient très critiques à l'égard de la dénazification en zone française d'occupation et accusaient l'Université d'Innsbruck d'être « un repaire de fascistes étrangers », puisque plusieurs anciens membres du Parti nazi continuaient d'y enseigner. Les autorités françaises se défendaient d'être responsables de la lenteur dans l'exécution des sanctions infligées aux membres du Parti nazi. Ils affirmaient qu'à plusieurs reprises, les décisions du Comité français d'épuration avaient été ajournées à la suite de l'intervention du ministère fédéral de l'Éducation. C'est ainsi que les 11 professeurs de l'Université d'Innsbruck, qui avaient été suspendus de façon immédiate ou conditionnelle, ont pu demeurer en poste, le temps que leur dossier soit envoyé à Vienne « pour complément d'information ». (15)

L'épuration du personnel de l'Université d'Innsbruck était effectuée par 3 organismes : le Conseil rectoral, qui était composé de professeurs autrichiens et d'un observateur français ; le Comité supérieur d'épuration, présidé par un représentant du gouvernement militaire français et qui devait statuer en cas de désaccord au sein du Conseil rectoral ; enfin, le Comité d'épuration du ministère fédéral de l'Éducation prenait des décisions qui étaient indépendantes des 2

autres organismes. (16)

C'était justement le mode de décision de ce dernier comité qui expliquait les dérapages évoqués par Louis de Monicault :

« Cet exemple, pris entre d'autres, traduit la faiblesse des autorités autrichiennes, dont l'attitude entrave souvent l'exécution normale de l'épuration et risque même de prêter à des soupçons de duplicité. » (17)

Préoccupation que partageait le ministre français des Affaires étrangères :

« J'ai l'honneur d'attirer votre attention sur les conséquences fâcheuses que pourrait avoir la prolongation d'un tel état des choses. C'est, en effet, une des tâches essentielles de la Mission française de contrôle de veiller à l'application des mesures de dénazification dans la zone française d'occupation. » (18)

Le cas du professeur du lycée de Fulpmes, monsieur Descotes, illustre très bien le fait que les autorités françaises étaient très susceptibles sur la question de la dénazification des Autrichiens. Monsieur Descotes a publié un petit livre intitulé « Le Nazisme et l'enseignement secondaire en Autriche ». Les autorités françaises étaient outrées de ne pas avoir été informées de la réalisation de cette étude, ni d'avoir été consultées durant sa réalisation. On reprochait aussi à monsieur Descotes de ne pas avoir respecté son devoir de fonctionnaire, celui d'informer ses supérieurs qu'il réalisait une étude, avant la publication des résultats obtenus. Nous n'avons trouvé aucune trace de cette étude dans les archives. Nous croyons toutefois que même si l'étude avait des lacunes, comme le prétendaient les autorités françaises, les constatations qu'elle contenait étaient révélatrices. C'est du moins la conclusion à laquelle nous arrivons après avoir consulté une quantité importante d'archives. Conclusion qu'a confirmée André Malavoy, ancien attaché culturel et professeur à Innsbruck, dans l'entretien qu'il nous a accordé en 2003 :

« J'ai profité de plusieurs séjours à la campagne, et là, je sentais un certain regret, une certaine nostalgie. Cela m'a moins marqué qu'à Berlin, chose curieuse, j'y ai trouvé moins de traces, de rémanences du Nazisme, que j'en ai trouvées au Tyrol. Cela, j'en ai l'expérience directe. Peut-être parce que Berlin était cosmopolite. Le Tyrol, pour sa part, était un peu renfermé sur lui-même. La dénazification a existé, mais on ne peut extirper par la force ce qu'il y a dans la tête de quelqu'un. Le plan de dénazification devait être appliqué par la persuasion, non par la force. » (19)

Dans le secteur culturel, la dénazification n'a pas été plus facile. Étant donné que la dénazification de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne était incomplète, les Services français d'action culturelle ont annulé une grande manifestation culturelle franco-autrichienne. Lorsque le temps est venu d'accorder les passeports aux musiciens autrichiens, le ministre de l'Intérieur s'est aperçu que 30 des 91 musiciens de l'Orchestre avaient été membres du Parti nazi et que l'un d'eux avait adhéré aux « Hitler-Jugend ». (20)

L'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne avait aussi refusé de participer aux cérémonies d'inauguration de l'exposition anti-fasciste « Niemals vergessen », ce qui n'a pas aidé sa cause auprès de la Commission quadripartite de dénazification. Le général Chérière, l'adjoint du général Béthouart, a néanmoins donné des instructions à son personnel

pour « porter remède au préjudice financier ainsi causé à l'Orchestre par ce fâcheux incident » . (21)

Ce qui suppose que le général Chérière n'était pas tout à fait d'accord avec la décision d'annuler l'événement culturel franco-autrichien ci-dessus mentionné, parce qu'elle risquait de compromettre les relations diplomatiques franco-autrichiennes.

Le général Béthouart écrit dans ses mémoires que les Nazis les plus compromis ont été sanctionnés par des saisies pouvant atteindre 40 % de leurs biens. On leur imposait aussi une majoration d'impôts de 10 % pendant un certain nombre d'années. Ces mesures auraient été imposées à 42,000 Autrichiens dont 6,000 qui se trouvaient en zone française d'occupation. Les moins compromis (481,000 dans l'ensemble du pays et 80,000 en zone française d'occupation) étaient beaucoup moins sévèrement sanctionnés, et dans certains cas pas du tout. Un total de 72,000 agents de l'administration et des services publics aurait été révoqué par le gouvernement autrichien. (22)

Mais comme le général Béthouart craignait que ces condamnations sèment les germes de la révolte et renforce l'hitlérisme, lors du Conseil allié du 25 septembre 1947, il a proposé et obtenu que le Conseil prescrive au gouvernement autrichien d'adopter une loi d'amnistie pour gracier les plus jeunes des moins compromis. (23)

Le 21 avril 1948, 487,000 anciens nazis sur 524,000 ont été amnistiés. (24)

QUELQUES ELÉMENTS DE LA POLITIQUE CULTURELLE FRANÇAISE

Les troupes d'occupation françaises ont fait leur entrée dans le Vorarlberg le 29 avril 1945 et, le 10 juillet, dans le Tyrol à la suite des Américains. Le général Béthouart a fait part de ses objectifs le 7 décembre 1945 et ils sont demeurés les mêmes durant les 5 années de son commandement en Autriche et après son départ. Les troupes d'occupation françaises devaient contribuer à l'établissement d'une Autriche libre et indépendante, faire disparaître les idéologies pan-germaniste et national-socialiste, en mettant en valeur tout ce qui était spécifiquement autrichien par opposition à ce qui était allemand, renforcer la dénazification par une action sur les esprits, orienter la jeunesse vers une formation plus humaine et atteindre les masses directement ou à travers leurs élites, afin de donner un caractère durable à l'action de la France en Autriche, enfin, ne pas limiter la propagande française aux secteurs culturel et artistique, mais aussi aux questions sociales et économiques. (25)

Les Instituts français de Vienne et d'Innsbruck étaient au centre de l'action culturelle française en Autriche. S'ajoutaient les différentes Sociétés France-Autriche que l'on retrouvait dans toutes les provinces autrichiennes, ainsi que l'Union des amis de l'Autriche. Les subventions du ministère des Affaires étrangères étaient principalement destinées aux échanges culturels, à l'enseignement et aux œuvres, à la propagande et aux services de presse et de documentation. Les principales dépenses étaient consacrées à l'enseignement du français et aux œuvres, aux échanges culturels, à la documentation, à l'information et à l'édition. Le ministère des Affaires étrangères accordait aussi de l'importance aux bourses, aux rencontres internationales, aux camps de jeunesse et aux échanges d'étudiants et de professeurs. (26)

Le 15 mars 1947, un accord culturel franco-autrichien a été signé. Il visait 2 grands objectifs officiels : développer la

collaboration entre la France et l'Autriche dans le domaine éducatif, pédagogique, universitaire, littéraire, scientifique et artistique. En second lieu, il devait compléter celui signé entre les 2 pays le 2 avril 1936, en tenant compte des nouvelles circonstances. (27)

Une des clauses les plus importantes de cet accord était l'article 9 stipulant que le gouvernement autrichien s'engageait, à tous les niveaux, à réserver une place de 1er rang à l'étude de la langue et de la civilisation françaises, de manière à ce que cette étude ne soit placée en aucun cas dans une situation d'infériorité par rapport à aucune autre langue vivante. (28)

Même si cette clause représentait en théorie un très grand succès diplomatique des négociateurs français, dans les faits, cet article a constamment été violé. Sans contraintes juridiques, il ne s'agissait que de bonnes intentions.

Un rapport daté du 7 avril 1955 sur l'enseignement du français en Autriche est d'ailleurs accablant : la plupart des établissements scolaires primaires enseignaient seulement l'anglais, alors que, dans l'enseignement secondaire, la place de l'anglais demeurait prédominante et le français y était enseigné à titre facultatif. Pourtant, cette situation n'a pas empêché le français de gagner un peu de terrain. Quant à l'enseignement supérieur, des cours de français étaient offerts dans toutes les institutions, alors que, dans l'enseignement technique, le français était facultatif dans presque tous les cas. C'est dans l'enseignement commercial (dans 12 établissements sur 14, soit quelque 8,000 élèves) que le français avait le plus de succès. Enfin, dans le secteur de l'enseignement populaire, qui était très développé en Autriche, les adultes habitant la Styrie, Vienne, le Tyrol et le Vorarlberg bénéficiaient de cours de français, alors que ceux des autres régions se heurtaient à des difficultés locales. En 1955, 436 professeurs enseignaient le français en Autriche. (29)

Un professeur de français dans les lycées autrichiens d'Innsbruck, Otto Maleczek, était très pessimiste sur l'avenir du français dans son allocution prononcée au Congrès international des professeurs de langues vivantes à Paris :

« Tout d'abord, je tiens à exprimer un regret. Personne n'est venu dire un mot sur la situation précaire où se trouve le français - au moins dans certains pays. Le français est nettement en régression chez nous en Autriche et en Allemagne. Je n'y comprends plus rien. Les Français choisissent l'allemand ou l'anglais, les Anglais, le français et nous autres, Autrichiens et Allemands, pourquoi hésitons-nous à faire le choix qui s'impose ? » (30)

Voilà qui démontre bien la difficulté rencontrée par la France pour faire de nouveau du français une langue influente en Autriche. Les Français étaient en constante concurrence avec leurs Alliés occidentaux, notamment américains, qui, eux, étaient dotés de fonds et de moyens beaucoup plus importants pour promouvoir leur langue.

LES SECRETS DE LA POLITIQUE CULTURELLE FRANÇAISE

Notre recherche a permis de découvrir que le gouvernement français détenait des participations financières secrètes dans le secteur culturel par le biais de personnes qui étaient à la solde des troupes d'occupation françaises. La librairie Kosmos avait le mandat de vendre des livres français aux Autrichiens ; le trio « Abendland Verlag », Service d'édition et « Golf Verlag » devaient éditer et diffuser des ouvrages susceptibles de favoriser directement ou

indirectement l'influence française ; la Librairie Hirn d'Innsbruck vendait des livres français fournis par la Direction de l'Information. Enfin, les Français détenaient une participation dans la « Wagnerische Universitäts Buchdruckerei » (WUB), une des plus importantes imprimeries de l'ouest de l'Autriche. (31)

Le cas de la radiodiffusion est particulièrement intéressant à analyser, en raison du caractère secret de certaines de ses activités. Les stations de Dornbirn et d'Innsbruck appartenaient aux provinces du Tyrol et du Vorarlberg, mais elles avaient été remises en service par les autorités françaises d'occupation, qui assuraient la direction des programmes, de même que le contrôle administratif et financier des émetteurs, du moins jusqu'à la signature de l'accord de contrôle de 1946. Par la suite, le contrôle administratif a été remis aux Autrichiens et les Français n'ont conservé que le contrôle sur les émissions et les participations au programme. (32)

Étant donné que les 2 radios ne pouvaient fonctionner que grâce à l'équipement prêté par les autorités françaises (d'une valeur de 668,000 Francs), ces dernières voulaient négocier la cession du matériel en échange de contrats de publicité d'assez longue durée avec les 2 stations, afin de conserver leur influence dans leurs 2 provinces d'occupation. (33)

Finalement, un accord de principe est intervenu, entre le délégué de la Radiodiffusion française et le directeur de Radio-Vorarlberg, pour une somme de 400,000 Francs. En ce qui concerne Radio-Dornbirn, le chef de l'Information, monsieur Gallifet, était d'avis que la Radiodiffusion française devait renoncer à ses droits sur le matériel (400,000 Francs), à condition que Radio-Dornbirn s'engage à consacrer 1 heure par semaine à une émission culturelle française après l'Occupation. (34)

D'autre part, le général Béthouart a pris la décision secrète d'augmenter la puissance des stations de radio d'Aldrans et de Dornbirn, en collaboration avec les PTT autrichiens. Aucune information concernant ce projet ne devait être communiquée aux milieux autrichiens extra-gouvernementaux et étrangers. En cas de brouillages, la puissance des stations d'Aldrans et de Dornbirn devait être immédiatement diminuée. (35)

En agissant ainsi, les Services de l'Information voulaient résoudre les problèmes liés au caractère montagneux du Tyrol, qui empêchait la population des 4/5 du pays d'obtenir une bonne réception. Les émissions françaises étaient, par ailleurs, difficilement captées à Vienne à cause de l'insuffisance des récepteurs que possédaient les Viennois. Il a donc fallu compléter le système de radiodiffusion par l'installation d'émetteurs relais synchronisés à Mayerhofen, Kufstein et Landeck. (36)

Conclusion

L'histoire de l'occupation française en Autriche se termine avec la signature du traité d'État le 15 mai 1955 et l'adoption de la loi constitutionnelle relative à la neutralité de l'Autriche, adoptée à l'unanimité le 26 octobre, ce qui a permis aux autorités du pays de récupérer le plein contrôle de leurs affaires intérieures et extérieures. Nous croyons avoir démontré que la dénazification totale des Autrichiens fut un échec. L'Est et l'Ouest étaient en pleine Guerre Froide, la France connaissait de graves crises gouvernementales, la Légion étrangère avait besoin de soldats pour la

guerre d'Indochine et pour défendre les acquis coloniaux. Les Français ne pouvaient donc se passer du soutien des Autrichiens et de leur contribution directe dans les combats qu'ils menaient contre le Communisme et le mouvement de décolonisation. L'occupant français ne pouvait donc pas se permettre d'être trop dur avec les Nazis autrichiens : les Français avaient besoin d'eux, autant économiquement que militairement. En condamnant trop vivement ceux qui avaient collaboré avec les Nazis, les Français risquaient de provoquer une grave crise sociale en Autriche, ce qui n'aurait pas manqué de déstabiliser toute l'Europe centrale.

Quant à la politique culturelle française, elle n'a pas permis de rattraper le terrain perdu par la langue française après 7 ans d'occupation nazie. Le faible attrait des Autrichiens pour la langue française a grandement limité l'influence française dans ce pays. Par contre, les Instituts français existent toujours et continuent de faire rayonner la culture française. Celui d'Innsbruck a fêté son 50e anniversaire en 1996 et a publié ses actes de colloque la même année. On ne doit donc pas parler d'échec complet.

Par ailleurs, l'occupant français souhaitait contribuer à l'établissement d'une Autriche libre et indépendante, ce qui était chose faite avec la signature du traité d'État et l'adoption de la loi constitutionnelle relative à la neutralité de l'Autriche. Les Français voulaient aussi faire disparaître les idéologies pan-germaniste et nationale-socialiste en valorisant ce qui était spécifiquement autrichien par rapport à ce qui était allemand dans la culture autrichienne. En 1955, l'Autriche et l'Allemagne étaient bel et bien 2 pays distincts.

N'ayant obtenu sa zone d'occupation que le 10 avril 1945, la France n'a visiblement pas eu le temps de concevoir une politique culturelle à la hauteur de ses ambitions et a souvent été appelée à improviser. Le fait qu'elle ne s'attendait pas à rester si longtemps en Autriche, a aussi contribué à donner un caractère éphémère à son action culturelle, puisqu'elle ne savait pas de combien de temps elle disposait. Le général Béthouart en fait d'ailleurs mention dans ses mémoires. Il faut tout de même reconnaître le pragmatisme du haut-commissariat dans le secteur de la radiodiffusion, puisqu'il a secrètement et considérablement augmenté la puissance d'émission des radios francophiles du Tyrol et du Vorarlberg afin que les Viennois puissent eux aussi bénéficier des émissions françaises. De même, il faut reconnaître l'audace et le risque qu'il a couru en utilisant des Autrichiens à son service pour se porter acquéreur de participations dans un certain nombre d'organes de presse ou d'entreprises chargées de faire la promotion du « génie français » .

Notes

(1) Cet article est tiré d'un mémoire de maîtrise, dirigé par le Professeur Paul Létourneau et soutenu à l'Université de Montréal, sur La politique culturelle de la France dans sa zone d'occupation en Autriche (Tyrol et Vorarlberg) et à Vienne entre 1945 et 1955, qui sera publié par les Presses de l'Université Laval (Québec) à l'automne 2005 au Canada et, en Europe, avec une préface de Corine Defrance et une postface d'André Malavoy.

(2) Ian Kershaw. « Hitler 1936-1945 : Némésis », Flammarion, Paris (2000) ; pages 129-130.

(3) Général Antoine Béthouart. « Où va l'Autriche ? », Cahiers de politique étrangère du journal des nations

américaines, nouvelle série, cahier XXV (février-mars 1948) ; page 213.

(4) Ministère des Relations extérieures, Archives diplomatiques, Paris, ci-après MAE, AOFAA, Autriche, zone d'occupation française en Autriche, éducation, 1945-1954, AUT 3111 d.10B, Rapport sur l'œuvre accomplie par le Service Éducation depuis septembre 1945, daté du 11 juillet 1950 ; pages 9-11.

(5) Ibid. ; pages 9-10.

(6) Ibid. ; page 10.

(7) Ibid. ; page 11.

(8) MAE, AOFAA, Autriche, Vienne, Bilan de l'occupation française en Autriche, etc. , 1945-1947, AUT 329/6, note de Louis de Monicault, ministre de France à Vienne au ministre des Affaires étrangères Georges Bidault, le 23 mai 1947 ; page 1.

(9) Ibid. ; pages 1-2.

(10) Ibid. ; page 4.

(11) Ibid. ; page 5.

(12) La récupération des petits Nazis a aussi été effectuée en Allemagne par tous les occupants, en zones occidentales d'occupation, comme en zone soviétique.

(13) Ibid. ; page 5.

(14) AUT 3111 d.10B, loco Citato ; page 11.

(15) MAE, série Z Europe, Autriche 1944-1949, août 1945 à juin 1949, n° 127, note de Louis de Monicault, représentant politique en Autriche, datée du 17 septembre 1946.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Ibid. , note du ministre des Affaires étrangères au commissaire général pour les Affaires allemandes et autrichiennes, le 30 septembre 1946.

(19) Entretien avec André Malavoy, attaché culturel français en Allemagne (1947-1948) et en Autriche (1948-1949) ,

réalisé le 16 décembre 2003.

(20) L'adhésion aux « Hitler-Jugend » était obligatoire pour tous les jeunes à partir du mois de mars 1939. Les Alliés et le gouvernement autrichien ne pouvaient donc pas reprocher aux jeunes Autrichiens d'avoir rejoint les rangs de l'organisation.

(21) Archives rapatriées de l'ambassade de France à Vienne, questions culturelles autrichiennes, musique : concerts, chorales, philharmonique, etc. , 1945-1956, Vienne 199/2, le général Chèrière adjoint du haut-commissaire de la République française en Autriche au ministre fédéral de l'Instruction publique, le 25 septembre 1946.

(22) Général Antoine Béthouart. « La bataille pour l'Autriche » , Presses de la Cité, Paris (1966) ; page 119.

(23) Une amnistie des plus jeunes a aussi été prononcée dans les zones occidentales d'occupation en Allemagne.

(24) Ibid. ; pages 120-121.

(25) MAE, AOFAA, Archives rapatriées de l'ambassade de France à Vienne, questions culturelles, expansion culturelle, organisation générale, 1945-1955, 189/1, Béthouart, le 7 décembre 1945.

(26) Selon les chiffres et les priorités identifiées dans les budgets des Instituts français de Vienne et d'Innsbruck, de l'Association française d'action artistique, du ministère des Affaires étrangères, du haut-commissariat aux Affaires allemandes et autrichiennes, entre 1945-1955. Ces archives proviennent des fonds suivants : Occupation française en Allemagne et en Autriche, Direction générale des relations culturelles et artistiques et enfin des archives diplomatiques.

(27) MAE, série Z Europe, Autriche 1944-1949, août 1945 à juin 1949, n° 127, 15 mars 1947, « Accord culturel entre la République française et la République d'Autriche » ; pages 248-250.

(28) Ibid.

(29) Dossiers rapatriés, ambassade de France à Vienne, Culturel, Diffusion et enseignement du français en Autriche, émissions éducatives de la radiodiffusion française, 1946-1955, Vienne, 176/4, 7 avril 1955, Rapport concernant l'enseignement du français en Autriche, signé E. Chastel.

(30) Ibid. , 16 avril 1953, texte de l'allocation du Docteur Otto Maleczek.

(31) MAE, AOFAA, État des travaux de la Commission inter-ministérielle chargée de la liquidation des gestions d'intérêt français d'occupation en Allemagne et en Autriche à la date du 1er mars 1953, 2e partie, Autriche, 8 avril 1953, de l'ambassadeur de France et haut-commissaire de la République en Autriche à l'attention de monsieur Haulpetit-Fourichon.

(32) Vienne, Carton 113, radiodiffusion autrichienne, 1945-1955, fiche radio Tyrol et Vorarlberg, 1947-1949, note non signée adressée au ministre de France à Vienne, le 11 février 1948.

(33) Ibid. , et note non signée pour le haut-commissaire adjoint, le 19 février 1948.

(34) MAE, AOFAA, Autriche, Direction de la Mission pour les provinces du Tyrol et du Vorarlberg, Information, 1945-1955, AUT 3129, d.35, note de monsieur Gallifet au haut-commissaire Béthouart, le 25 mai 1949.

(35) Ibid. , décision confidentielle du haut-commissaire de la République française en Autriche relative à l'augmentation de la puissance des postes d'Aldrans et de Dornbirn situés dans la zone française d'occupation, le 23 avril 1948.

(36) MAE, AOFAA, Autriche, Direction de la Mission pour les provinces du Tyrol et du Vorarlberg, radio et télévision, revue de presse tyrolienne, 1945-1955, AUT 3129, d.35/1, note de Gallifet au chef de la Mission pour les provinces du Tyrol et du Vorarlberg, le 11 décembre 1950. Aussi Vienne, carton 113, radiodiffusion autrichienne, 1945-1955, fiche radio, émissions françaises, note rédigée par le ministre plénipotentiaire représentant politique de la République française en Autriche au ministre des Affaires étrangères Bidault datant probablement du 31 mai 1946.

...

Denazification (« Entnazifizierung ») was an Allied initiative to rid German and Austrian society, culture, press, economy, judiciary, and politics of any remnants of the National-Socialist ideology (Nazism) . It was carried-out specifically by removing from positions of power and influence those who had been Nazi Party members and by disbanding or rendering impotent the organizations associated with Nazism. The program of denazification was launched after the end of the Second World War and was solidified by the Potsdam Agreement.

The term denazification was first coined as a legal term in 1943, in the Pentagon, intended to be applied in a narrow sense with reference to the post-War German legal system. Soon afterward, it took on the more general meaning.

Denazification in Germany was attempted through a series of directives issued by the Allied Control Council, seated in Berlin, beginning in January 1946. « Denazification directives » identified specific people and groups and outlined judicial procedures and guide-lines for handling them. Though all the occupying forces had agreed on the initiative, the methods used for denazification and the intensity with which they were applied differed between the occupation zones.

Denazification also refers to the removal of the physical symbols of the Nazi regime. For example, in 1957, the West German government re-issued World War II Iron Cross medals, among other decorations, without the swastika in the center.

About 8.5 million Germans, or 10 % of the population, had been members of the Nazi Party. Nazi-related organizations also had huge memberships, such as the German Labour Front (25 million) ; the National-Socialists People's Welfare organization (17 million) ; the League of German Women ; Hitler Youth ; the Doctors' League ; and

others. It was through the Party and these organizations that the Nazi State was run, involving as many as 45 million Germans in total. In addition, Nazism found significant support among industrialists, who produced weapons or used slave labour, and large landowners, especially the « Junkers » in Prussia. Denazification after the surrender of Germany was, thus, an enormous undertaking, fraught with many difficulties.

The 1st difficulty was the enormous number of Germans who might have to be 1st investigated, then, penalized if found to have supported the Nazi State to an unacceptable degree. In the early months of denazification, there was a great will to be utterly thorough, to investigate everyone and hold every supporter of Nazism to account ; however, it turned-out that the numbers simply made that goal impractical. It soon became evident, too, that pursuing denazification too scrupulously would make it impossible to create a functioning, democratic society in Germany, one that would be able to support itself economically and not become a burden on the victorious nations. Enforcing the strictest sanctions against lesser offenders would prevent too many talented people from participating in the reconstruction process. The Morgenthau Plan had recommended that the Allies create a post-War Germany with all its industrial capacity destroyed, reduced to a level of subsistence farming ; however, that plan was soon abandoned as unrealistic and too likely, because of its punitiveness, to give rise to German anger and aggressiveness. As time went on, another consideration that moderated the denazification effort in the West was the concern to keep enough good will of the German population to prevent the growth of Communism.

The denazification process was often completely disregarded by both the Soviets and the Western powers for German rocket scientists and other technical experts, who were taken-out of Germany to work on projects in the victor's own country or simply seized in order to prevent the other side from taking them. The U.S. sent 785 scientists and engineers from Germany to the United States, some of whom formed the back-bone of the U.S. space program.

In the case of the top-ranking Nazis, such as Hermann Göring, Rudolf Heß, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Julius Streicher, and Albert Speer, the initial proposal by the British was to simply arrest them and shoot them, but that course of action was replaced by putting them on trial for War crimes at the Nuremberg Trials in order to publicize their crimes while demonstrating that the trials and the sentences were just, especially to the German people. However, the legal foundations of the trials were questioned, and the German people were not convinced that the trials were anything more than « victors' justice » .

Many refugees from Nazism were Germans and Austrians, and some had fought for Britain in the Second World War. Some were transferred into the Intelligence Corps and sent-back to Germany and Austria in British uniform. However, German-speakers were small in number in the British zone, which was hampered by the language deficit. The Americans were able to bring a larger number of German-speakers to the task of working in the Allied Military Government, although many were poorly trained. They were assigned to all aspects of military administration, the interrogation of POWs, collecting evidence for the War Crimes Investigation Unit and the search for war criminals.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff Directive 1067 directed U.S. Army General Dwight D. Eisenhower's policy of denazification.

A report of the Institute on Re-education of the Axis Countries in June 1945 recommended :

« Only an inflexible long-term occupation authority will be able to lead the Germans to a fundamental revision of their recent political philosophy. »

The United States military pursued denazification in a zealous, albeit bureaucratic, fashion, especially during the 1st months of the occupation. It had been agreed among the Allies that denazification would begin by requiring Germans to fill-out a questionnaire (« Fragebogen ») about their activities and memberships during the 3rd « Reich ». 5 categories were established : Major Offenders, Offenders, Lesser Offenders, Followers, and Exonerated Persons. The Americans, unlike the British, French, and Soviets, interpreted this to apply to every German over the age of 18 in their zone. Eisenhower initially estimated that the denazification process would take 50 years.

When the nearly complete list of Nazi Party memberships was turned-over to the Allies (by a German anti-Nazi who had rescued it from destruction in April 1945, as American troops advanced on Munich) , it became possible to verify claims about participation or non-participation in the Party. The 1.5 million Germans who had joined before Adolf Hitler came to power were deemed to be hard-core Nazis.

Progress was slowed by the overwhelming numbers of Germans to be processed, but also by difficulties such as incompatible power systems and power outages, with the Hollerith IBM data machine that held the American vetting list in Paris. As many as 40,000 forms could arrive in a single-day to await processing. By December 1945, even though a full 500,000 forms had been processed, there remained a back-log of 4,000,000 forms from POWs and a potential case load of 7,000,000. The « Fragebogen » were, of course, filled-out in German. The number of Americans working on denazification was inadequate to handle the work-load, partly as a result of the demand in the U.S. by families to have soldiers returned home. Replacements were mostly unskilled and poorly trained. In addition, there was too much work to be done to complete the process of denazification by 1947, the year American troops were expected to be completely withdrawn from Europe.

Pressure also came from the need to find Germans to run their own country. In January 1946, a directive came from the Control Council entitled « Removal from Office and from Positions of Responsibility of Nazis and Persons Hostile to Allied Purposes ». One of the punishments for Nazi involvement was to be barred from public office and/or restricted to manual labour or « simple work ». At the end of 1945, 3.5 million former Nazis awaited classification, many of them barred from work in the meantime. By the end of the winter of 1945-1946, 42 % of public officials had been dismissed. Malnutrition was wide-spread, and the economy needed leaders and workers to help clear away debris, rebuild infrastructure, and get foreign exchange to buy food and other essential resources.

Another concern leading to the Americans relinquishing responsibility for denazification and handing it over to the Germans arose from the fact that many of the American denazifiers were German Jews, former refugees returning to administer justice against the tormentors and killers of their relatives. It was felt, both among Germans and top-American officials, that their objectivity might be contaminated by a desire for revenge.

As a result of these various pressures, and following a 15 January 1946 a report of the Military Government decrying

the efficiency of denazification, saying, « The present procedure fails in practice to reach a substantial number of persons who supported or assisted the Nazis », it was decided to involve Germans in the process. In March 1946, The Law for Liberation from National-Socialism and Militarism (« Befreiungsgesetz ») came into effect, turning-over responsibility for denazification to the Germans. Each zone had a Minister of Denazification. On 1 April 1946, a special law established 545 civilian tribunals under German administration (« Spruchkammern ») , with a staff of 22,000 of mostly lay judges, enough, perhaps, to start to work but too many for all the staff themselves to be thoroughly investigated and cleared. They had a case load of 900,000. Several new regulations came into effect in the setting-up of the German-run tribunals, including the idea that the aim of denazification was now rehabilitation rather than merely punishment, and that someone whose guilt might meet the formal criteria could also have their specific actions taken into consideration for mitigation. Efficiency thus improved, while rigour declined.

Many people had to fill in a new background form, called a « Meldebogen » (replacing the widely-disliked « Fragebogen ») , and were given over to justice under a « Spruchkammer » , which assigned them to one of 5 categories :

V. Persons Exonerated (« Entlastete ») . No sanctions.

IV. Followers (« Mitläufer ») . Possible restrictions on travel, employment, political rights, plus fines.

III. Lesser Offenders (« Minderbelastete ») . Placed on probation for 2 or 3 years with a list of restrictions. No internment.

II. Offenders : Activists, Militants, and Profiteers, or Incriminated Persons (« Belastete ») . Subject to immediate arrest and imprisonment up to 10 years performing reparation or reconstruction work plus a list of other restrictions.

I. Major Offenders (« Hauptschuldige ») . Subject to immediate arrest, death, imprisonment with or without hard labour, plus a list of lesser sanctions.

Again, because the caseload was impossibly large, the German tribunals began to look for ways to speed-up the process. Unless their crimes were serious, members of the Nazi Party, born after 1919, were exempted on the grounds that they had been brain-washed. Disabled veterans were also exempted. To avoid the necessity of a slow trial in open court, which was required for those belonging to the most serious categories, more than 90 % of cases were judged not to belong to the serious categories and, therefore, were dealt with more quickly. More « efficiencies » followed. The tribunals accepted statements from other people regarding the accused's involvement in National-Socialism. These statements earned the nickname of « Persilscheine » , after advertisements for the laundry and whitening detergent « Persil » . There was corruption in the system, with Nazis buying and selling denazification certificates on the black-market. Nazis who were found guilty were often punished with fines assessed in « Deutsche Marks » , which had become nearly worthless. In Bavaria, the Denazification Minister, Anton Pfeiffer, bridled under the « victor's justice » , and presided over a system that re-instated 75 % of officials the Americans had dismissed, and re-classified 60 % of senior Nazis. The denazification process lost a great deal of credibility, and there was often local hostility against

Germans who helped administer the tribunals.

By early 1947, the Allies held 90,000 Nazis in detention ; another 1,900,000 were forbidden to work as anything but manual labourers.

By 1948, the Cold War was clearly in progress and the United States began to worry more about a threat from the Eastern Bloc rather than the latent Nazism within occupied Germany. The remaining cases were tried through summary proceedings that left insufficient time to thoroughly investigate the accused, so that many of the judgments of this period have questionable judicial value. For example, by 1952, members of the SS like Otto Skorzeny could be declared formally denazified (« entnazifiziert ») « in absentia » by a German government arbitration board and without any proof that this was true.

The delicate task of distinguishing those truly complicit in or responsible for Nazi activities from mere « followers » made the work of the courts, yet, more difficult.

U.S. President Harry S. Truman alluded to this problem :

« Though all Germans might not be guilty for the War, it would be too difficult to try to single-out for better treatment those who had nothing to do with the Nazi regime and its crimes. »

Denazification was, from then on, supervised by special German ministers, like the Social-Democrat Gottlob Kamm in Baden-Württemberg, with the support of the U.S. occupation forces.

Contemporary American critics of denazification denounced it as a « counter-productive witch-hunt » and a failure ; in 1951, the provisional West German government granted amnesties to lesser offenders and ended the program.

While judicial efforts were handed-over to German authorities, the U.S. Army continued its efforts to denazify Germany through control of German media. The Information Control Division of the U.S. Army had, by July 1946, taken control of 37 German newspapers, 6 radio stations, 314 theaters, 642 cinemas, 101 magazines, 237 book-publishers, and 7,384 book-dealers and printers. Its main mission was democratization but part of the agenda was also the prohibition of any criticism of the Allied occupation forces. In addition, on May 13, 1946, the Allied Control Council issued a directive for the confiscation of all media that could contribute to Nazism or militarism. As a consequence, a list was drawn-up of over 30,000 book-titles, ranging from school text-books to poetry, which were then banned. All copies of books on the list were confiscated and destroyed ; the possession of a book on the list was made a punishable offense. All the millions of copies of these books were to be confiscated and destroyed. The representative of the Military Directorate admitted that the order was in principle no different from the Nazi book-burnings.

The censorship in the U.S. zone was regulated by the occupation directive JCS 1067 (valid until July 1947) and, in the May 1946 order valid for all zones (re-scinded in 1950) , Allied Control Authority Order No. 4, « No. 4 - Confiscation of Literature and Material of a Nazi and Militarist Nature » . All confiscated literature was reduced to pulp instead of

burning. It was also directed by Directive No. 30, « Liquidation of German Military and Nazi Memorials and Museums » . An exception was made for tombstones « erected at the places where members of regular formations died on the field of battle » .

Artworks were under the same censorship as other media ; all collections of works of art related or dedicated to the perpetuation of German militarism or Nazism will be closed permanently and taken into custody.

The directives were very broadly interpreted, leading to the destruction of thousands of paintings and thousands more were shipped to deposits in the United States. Those confiscated paintings still surviving in U.S. custody include for example a painting « depicting a couple of middle-aged women talking in a sunlit street in a small town » . Artists were also restricted in which new art they were allowed to create ; « Office of the Military Government, United States was setting explicit political limits on art and representation » .

The publication « Der Ruf » (The Call) was a popular literary magazine 1st published in 1945 by Alfred Andersch and edited by Hans Werner Richter. « Der Ruf » , also called Independent Pages of the New Generation, claimed to have the aim of educating the German people about democracy. In 1947, its publication was blocked by the American forces for being overly critical of occupational government. Richter attempted to print many of the controversial pieces in a volume entitled « Der Skorpion » . The occupational government blocked publication of « Der Skorpion » before it began, saying that the volume was too « nihilistic » .

Publication of « Der Ruf » resumed in 1948 under a new publisher, but « Der Skorpion » was blocked and not widely distributed. Unable to publish his works, Richter founded « Group 47 » .

The Allied costs for occupation were charged to the German people. A newspaper which revealed the charges (including, among other things, 30,000 bras) was banned by the occupation authorities for revealing this information.

From the beginning, denazification in the Soviet zone took-on the political tone of class-warfare. As they moved into Prussia, amid the invasion, the Soviets expelled, arrested, or put in internment camps the « Junkers » and other large landowners, not only for their reputation of being supporters of militarism and Nazism but also in order to seize their lands and re-distribute it to small farmers. Many industries were expropriated, with entire factories moved to the Soviet Union as reparations, or nationalized.

In July 1945, the Soviets were the 1st of the Allies to install State (« Länder ») governments and the 1st to allow political Parties. These were later either disbanded, or absorbed into the Communist Party, which was then renamed the Socialist Unity Party.

The Soviet secret service, NKVD, set-up a number of « special camps » where (among others) alleged Nazis were interned. People were sometimes arrested arbitrarily and did not receive a fair trial, with some not even receiving any trial. At least 43,000 died in the camps. Doing special tasks for the Soviet government could protect Nazi members from prosecution, enabling them to continue working. Having special connections with the occupiers, in order to have

someone vouch for them, could also shield a person from the denazification laws.

The abandonment of stringent denazification in the West became a major theme of East German government propaganda, which claimed that the West German government was an extension of the old Nazi regime. Such allegations appeared frequently in the official Socialist Unity Party of Germany newspaper, the « Neues Deutschland ». The 1953 « June 17 » riots in Berlin were officially blamed on Nazi agents provocateurs from West-Berlin, who the « Neues Deutschland » alleged were, then, working in collaboration with the Western government with the ultimate aim of restoring Nazi rule throughout Germany. The Berlin Wall was officially called the Anti-Fascist Security Wall (« Antifaschistischer Schutzwall ») by the East German government.

The British prepared a plan from 1942 onwards, assigning a number of quite junior civil servants to head the administration of liberated territory in the rear of the Armies, with draconian powers to remove from their post, in both public and private domains, anyone suspected, usually on behavioural grounds, of harbouring Nazi sympathies. For the British government, the rebuilding of German economic power was more important than the imprisonment of Nazi criminals. Economically hard pressed at home after the War, they did not want the burden of feeding and otherwise administering Germany.

In October 1945, in order to constitute a working legal system, and given that 90 % of German lawyers had been members of the Nazi Party, the British decided that 50 % of the German Legal Civil Service could be staffed by « nominal » Nazis. Similar pressures caused them to relax the restriction even further in April 1946. In industry, especially in the economically crucial Ruhr area, the British began by being lenient about who owned or operated businesses, turning stricter by autumn of 1945. In order to reduce the power of industrialists, the British expanded the role of trade-unions, giving them some decision-making powers.

They were, however, especially zealous during the early months of occupation in bringing to justice anyone, soldiers or civilians, who committed war crimes against POWs or captured Allied air-crew. In June 1945, an interrogation centre at Bad Nenndorf was opened, where ex-Nazis and suspected Communist agents were tortured with beatings, whippings, thumb-screws, cold, starvation, etc. A public scandal ensued but only one person was found guilty of neglect.

The British, to some extent, avoided being overwhelmed by the potential numbers of denazification investigations by requiring that no one need fill-out the « Fragebogen » unless they were applying for an official or responsible position. This difference between American and British policy was decried by the Americans and caused some Nazis to seek shelter in the British zone.

In January 1946, the British handed-over their denazification panels to the Germans.

The French were less vigorous, for a number of reasons, than the Americans, not even using the term « denazification », instead calling it « épuration » (purification) . They did not view it as critical to distinguish Nazis from non-Nazis, since in their eyes all Germans were to blame. At the same time, some French occupational commanders had served in the collaborationist Vichy regime during the War where they had formed friendly relationships with Germans. As a

result, in the French zone mere membership in the Nazi Party was much less important than in the other zones.

Because teachers had been strongly Nazified, the French began by removing 3/4 of all teachers from their jobs. However, finding that the schools could not be run without them, they were soon rehired, although subject to easy dismissal. A similar process governed technical experts. The French were the 1st to turn-over the vetting process to Germans, while maintaining French power to reverse any German decision. Overall, the business of denazification in the French zone was considered a « golden mean between an excessive degree of severity and an inadequate standard of leniency », laying the ground-work for an enduring reconciliation between France and Germany. In the French zone, only 13 Germans were categorized as « major offenders » .

In 1965, the National Front of the German Democratic Republic published what became known as the « Brown Book : War and Nazi Criminals in West Germany : State, Economy, Administration, Army, Justice, Science » . As the title would indicate, the presence of former « Gestapo » members in the « Volkspolizei » and ex-Nazis at all levels of the Socialist Unity Party was not covered. The book, among other things, mentioned 1,800 names of former Nazis who held positions of authority in West Germany. These included 15 ministers and deputy ministers ; 100 generals and admirals of the armed forces ; 828 senior judges and prosecutors ; 245 leading members of the Foreign Ministry, embassies and consulates officials ; and 297 senior police officers and Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution officials. The listing was inaccurate ; many of the military names had not been Party members, as the armed forces did not permit its officers to join, while many low level Party members in other groups were over-looked altogether. As revealed by BKA official Dieter Senk, in 1989, « today, we know that the Brown Book didn't contain, even approximately, all the relevant names. For example, it mentions only 3 names from the BKA » . The book had a controversial impact in West Germany. Reflecting this, a judge ordered the seizure of the volume from the Frankfurt Book Fair, in 1967.

The culture of denazification strongly influenced the parliamentary council charged with drawing-up a constitution for those occupation zones that would become West Germany.

This Constitution (« Grundgesetz », meaning Basic Law) , was completed on May 8, 1949, ratified on May 23, and came into effect the next-day. This date effectively marks the foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The end of denazification saw the « ad hoc » creation initially of the Western Union (not to be confused with the commercial operation of that name) which would be institutionalised as the Western European Union, in 1947 and 1955, with a broad socio-economic remit actually implemented in the strict domain of arms control.

After the defeat of Nazi Germany, German civilians were sometimes forced to tour concentration camps and, in some cases, to exhume mass graves of Nazi victims.

The ideas of collective guilt and collective punishment originated not with the American and British people, but on higher policy levels. Not until late in the War did the U.S. public assign collective responsibility to the German people. The most notable policy document containing elements of collective guilt and collective punishment is JCS 1067, from

early 1945. Eventually, horrific footage from the concentration camps would serve to harden public opinion and bring it more in line with that of policy-makers.

Already in 1944, prominent U.S. opinion-makers had initiated a domestic propaganda campaign (which was to continue until 1948) arguing for a harsh peace for Germany, with a particular aim to end the apparent habit in the United States of viewing the Nazis and the German people as separate entities.

Statements made by the British and U.S. governments, both before and immediately after Germany's surrender, indicate that the German nation, as a whole, was to be held responsible for the actions of the Nazi regime, often using the terms « collective guilt » and « collective responsibility » .

To that end, as the Allies began their post-War denazification efforts, the Psychological Warfare Division (PWD) of Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force undertook a psychological propaganda campaign for the purpose of developing a German sense of collective responsibility.

The Public Relations and Information Services Control Group of the British Element (CCG/BE) of the Allied Control Commission for Germany began in 1945 to issue directives to officers in charge of producing newspapers and radio broadcasts for the German population to emphasize « the moral responsibility of all Germans for Nazi crimes » . Similarly, among U.S. authorities, such a sense of collective guilt was « considered a prerequisite to any long-term education of the German people » .

Using the German press, which was under Allied control, as well as posters and pamphlets, a program was conducted to acquaint ordinary Germans with what had taken place in the concentration camps. For example, using posters with images of concentration camp victims coupled to text such as « YOU ARE GUILTY OF THIS ! » or « These atrocities : Your Fault ! » .

A number of films showing the concentration camps were made and screened to the German public, such as « Die Todesmühlen » , released in the U.S. zone, in January 1946, and « Welt im Film No. 5 » in June 1945. A film that was never finished due partly to delays and the existence of the other films was « Memory of the Camps » . According to Sidney Bernstein, chief of PWD, the object of the film was to :

« Shake and humiliate the Germans and prove to them, beyond any possible challenge, that these German crimes against humanity were committed and that the German people (and not just the Nazis and SS) bore responsibility. »

English writer James Stern recounted an example in a German town, soon after the German surrender :

« A crowd is gathered around a series of photographs which though initially seeming to depict garbage instead reveal dead human bodies. Each photograph has a heading “ WHO IS GUILTY ? ”. The spectators are silent, appearing hypnotised and eventually retreat one by one. The placards are later replaced with clearer photographs and placards proclaiming “ THIS TOWN IS GUILTY ! YOU ARE GUILTY ! ”. »

Immediately upon the liberation of the concentration camps, many German civilians were forced to see the conditions in the camps, bury rotting corpses and exhume mass graves. In some instances, civilians were also made to provide items for former concentration camp inmates.

The United States conducted opinion surveys in occupied Germany. Tony Judt in his book « Postwar : a History of Europe since 1945 » extracted and used some of them.

A majority, in the years 1945-1949, stated National-Socialism to have been a good idea but badly applied.

In 1946, 6 % of Germans said the Nuremberg trials had been unfair.

In 1946, 37 % in the U.S. occupation zone said about the Holocaust that « the extermination of the Jews and Poles and other non-Aryans was necessary for the security of Germans » .

In 1946, 1 in 3 in the U.S. occupation zone said that Jews should not have the same rights as those belonging to the Aryan race.

In 1950, 1 in 3 said the Nuremberg trials had been unfair.

In 1952, 37 % said Germany was better-off without the Jews.

In 1952, 25 % had a good opinion of Adolf Hitler.

However, in « Hitler, Germans, and the “ Jewish Question ” » , Sarah Ann Gordon notes the difficulty of drawing conclusions from the surveys. For example, respondents were given 3 alternatives from which to choose, as in question No. 1 :

Hitler was right in his treatment of the Jews : 0 %

Hitler went too far in his treatment of the Jews, but something had to be done to keep them in bounds : 19 %

The actions against the Jews were in no way justified : 77 %

To the question of whether an Aryan who marries a Jew should be condemned, 91 % responded « No » . To the question of whether « All those who ordered the murder of civilians or participated in the murdering should be made to stand trial » , 94 % responded « Yes » .

Gordon singles-out the question « Extermination of the Jews and Poles and other non-Aryans was not necessary for the security of the Germans » , which included an implicit double negative to which the response was either yes or

no. She concludes that this question was confusingly phrased (given that in the German language the affirmative answer to a question containing a negative statement is « no ») :

Some interviewees may have responded « no » they did not agree with the statement, when they actually did agree that the extermination was not necessary.

She further highlights the discrepancy between the anti-Semitic implications of the survey results (such as those later identified by Judd) with the 77 % of interviewees who responded that actions against Jews were in no way justified.

Gordon states that if the 77 % result is to be believed then an « overwhelming majority » of Germans disapproved of extermination, and if the 37 % result is believed to be correct, then, over 1/3 of Germans were willing to exterminate Poles and Jews and others for German security. She concludes that the phrasing of the question on German security lowers the confidence in the later interpretation.

Gordon follows this with another survey where interviewees were asked if Nazism was good or bad (53 % chose bad) and reasons for their answer. Among the 9 possible choices on why it was bad, 21 % chose the effects on the German people before the War, while 3 to 4 % chose the answer « race policy, atrocities, pogroms ». However, Gordon highlights the issue that it is difficult to pin-down at which point in time respondents became aware of the exterminations, before or after they were interviewed : questionnaire reports indicate that a significant minority had no knowledge until the Nuremberg trials.

She also notes that when confronted with the exterminations there was an element of denial, disbelief, and confusion. Asked about concentration camps, very few Germans associated them with the Jews, leading to the conclusion that they did not understand how they had been used against the Jews during the War and, instead, continued to think of them as they were before the War, the place where political opponents to the Nazis were kept :

« This “ naïveté ” is only understandable if large numbers of Germans were truly ignorant of the existence of these camps. »

A British study on the same attitudes concluded that :

« Those who said National-Socialism was a good idea pointed to social welfare plans, the lack of unemployment, the great construction plans of the Nazis. Nearly all those who thought it a good idea nevertheless rejected Nazi racial theories and disagreed with the inhumanity of the concentration camps and the “ SS ”. »

Sarah Gordon writes that a majority of Germans appeared to approve of non-violent removal of Jews from civil service and professions and German life. The German public also accepted the Nuremberg laws because they thought they would act as stabilizers and end violence against Jews. The German public had, as a result of the Nazi anti-Semitic propaganda, hardened their attitudes between 1935 and 1938 from the originally favorable stance. By 1938, the propaganda had taken effect and anti-Semitic policies were accepted, provided no violence was involved. « Kristallnacht

» caused German opposition to anti-Semitism to peak, with the vast majority of Germans rejecting the violence and destruction, and many Germans aiding the Jews.

The Nazis responded by intimidation in order to discourage opposition, those aiding Jews being victims of large-scale arrests and intimidation. With the start of the War, the anti-Semitic minority that approved of restrictions on Jewish domestic activities was growing, but there is no evidence that the general public had any acceptance for labour camps or extermination. As the number of anti-Semites grew, so too did the number of Germans opposed to racial persecution, and rumours of deportations and shootings in the east led to snow-balling criticism of the Nazis.

Gordon states that :

« One can probably conclude that labour camps, concentration camps, and extermination were opposed by a majority of Germans. »

Gordon concludes in her analysis on German public opinion based German SD-reports during the War and the Allied questionnaires during the occupation :

« It would appear that a majority of Germans supported elimination of Jews from the civil service ; quotas on Jews in professions, academic institutions, and commercial fields ; restrictions on inter-marriage ; and voluntary emigration of Jews. However, the rabid anti-Semites' demands for violent boycotts, illegal expropriation, destruction of Jewish property, pogroms, deportation, and extermination were probably rejected by a majority of Germans. They apparently wanted to restrict Jewish rights substantially, but not to annihilate Jews. »

The West German political system, as it emerged from the occupation, was increasingly opposed to the Allied denazification policy. As denazification was deemed ineffective and counter-productive by the Americans, they did not oppose the plans of the German chancellor Konrad Adenauer to end the denazification efforts. Adenauer's intention was to switch government policy to reparations and compensation for the victims of Nazi rule (« Wiedergutmachung ») , stating that the main culprits had been persecuted. In 1951, several laws were passed, ending the denazification. Officials were allowed to retake jobs in the civil service, with the exception of people assigned to Group I (Major Offenders) and II (Offenders) during the denazification review process.

Several amnesty laws were also passed which affected about 792,176 people. Those pardoned included people with 6 month sentences, 35,000 people with sentences of up to 1 year and include more than 3,000 functionaries of the SA, the SS, and the Nazi Party who participated in dragging victims to jails and camps ; 20,000 other Nazis sentenced for « deeds against life » (presumably murder) ; 30,000 sentenced for causing bodily injury, and 5,200 who committed « crimes and misdemeanors in office » . As a result, several people with a former Nazi past ended-up again in the political apparatus of Western Germany.

Because the Cold War had curtailed the process of denazification in the West, certain radical Leftist groups such as the Red Army Faction tried to justify their use of violence against the West German government based on the notion that

the West German establishment had benefited from the Nazi period, and that, while having officially renounced the Holocaust and the War crimes of the « Wehrmacht », it was still supposedly Fascist in outlook in all other aspects. They pointed-out that many former Nazis held government posts, while the German Communist Party was illegal. They argued that « What did you do in the War, daddy ? » was not a question that many of the leaders of the generation who fought World War II and prospered in the post-War « Wirtschaftswunder » (German Economic Miracle) encouraged their children to ask.

One of the major justifications that the Red Army Faction gave in 1977 for murdering Hanns-Martin Schleyer, President of the Confederation of German Employers' Associations (BDA) and perceived as one of the most powerful industrialists in West Germany, was that, as a former member of the SS, he was part of an informal network of ex-Nazis who still had great economic power and political influence in West Germany.

Even today, membership in Nazi organizations is still not an open topic of discussion among most Germans. It was not until 2006 that famous German writer Günter Grass, often viewed as a spokesman of « the nation's moral conscience », spoke publicly about the fact that he had been a member of the « Waffen-SS » (even though his involvement appears to have been less than criminal ; he was conscripted into the « Waffen-SS » while barely 17 years old and his duties were strictly military in nature) . Joseph Ratzinger (later, Pope Benedict XVI) , on the other hand, has been open about his membership at the age of 14 in Hitler Youth, when his church youth group was forced to merge with them. Statistically, it is likely that there are many more Germans of Grass's generation (also called the « Flakhelfer-Generation ») with biographies similar to his.

In practice, denazification was not limited to Germany and Austria ; in every European country with a vigorous Nazi or Fascist Party, measures of denazification were carried-out. In France, the process was called « épuration légale » (legal cleansing) . Prisoners of War held in detention in Allied countries were also subject to denazification qualifications before their repatriation.

Denazification was also practised in many countries which came under German occupation, including Belgium, Norway, Greece and Yugoslavia, because satellite regimes had been established in these countries with the support of local collaborators.

In Greece, for instance, Special Courts of Collaborators were created after 1945 to try former collaborators. The 3 Greek « quisling » prime ministers were convicted and sentenced to death or life imprisonment. Other Greek collaborators after German withdrawal underwent repression and public humiliation, besides being tried (mostly on treason charges) . In the context of the emerging Greek Civil War however, most War-time figures from the civil service, the Greek Gendarmerie and the notorious Security Battalions were quickly integrated into the strongly anti-Communist post-War establishment.

...

Denazification is a term used to describe the efforts made by the Allies to remove active members of the former

National-Socialist (Nazi) Party from official public office and influential positions in Germany after World War II.

At the Yalta Conference, U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin proclaimed their desire to wipe-out the Nazi Party, institutions, organizations, laws and cultural influences from German public and cultural life once they secured the surrender of Germany. This pledge was re-affirmed in the Potsdam Declaration, which stated that :

« All members of the Nazi Party who have been more than nominal participants are to be removed from public or semi-public office and from positions of responsibility in important private undertakings. »

No guide-lines were issued and the procedures and criteria were not clearly enunciated.

Denazification was carried-out on the basis of questionnaires about activities during the period of Nazi rule that the suspects had to fill-out. The 4 Powers occupying Germany (the United States, Soviet Union, Britain and France) determined varied proceedings in each area of occupation, and the results were accordingly inconsistent and served national purposes. The French used this policy to weaken their traditional enemy Germany. The British were more pragmatic and, thus, more lenient in their enforcement of denazification. The Americans had 2 conflicting tendencies. First, they had a general suspicion of all Germans and because of a sense of collective guilt, they could not easily distinguish between Nazis and others. Second, they sought to re-educate Germans for democracy, which took on added importance as the Cold War began. In the Soviet zone, the goal was to consolidate Communist rule and to eliminate capitalists and even take the property of the middle-class.

The results were diverse policies serving divergent goals. At 1st, denazification had important consequences as those who were not « rehabilitated » were not appointed to important offices or granted specific licenses (for example, to publish newspapers) . To consolidate the policies 5 categories were established in 1946 : (1) major offenders ; (2) offenders ; (3) lesser offenders ; (4) followers ; (5) persons exonerated. As political conditions and political needs changed the commitment to denazification diminished, amnesties were declared, and enforcement was transferred to the Germans themselves.

The extent of denazification was criticized in view of the multitude of cases of people who were « rehabilitated » in spite of their Nazi past. Among them were many who were active in the War against the Jews in a variety of ways, e.g. , professors : Doctor P. H. Seraphim (active in the « Final Solution ») ; Hans Friedrich Karl Günther (the outstanding racial scholar of the Nazi period) , who published anti-Semitic literature, and Doctor Hans Globke, co-author of the leading commentary on the Nuremberg Laws.

Still, despite the criticism, in the aftermath of the collapse of a totalitarian regime, occupying powers or successor governments look for ways to preserve the social, economic, cultural, and governmental structures of the given society while condemning the deeds and actors of a previous regime, and denazification is looked upon as an inviting precedent. It just could be that a fig leaf of procedural decontamination, however inadequate, is needed for a society to be rebuilt.

Dénazification des musiciens

All 4 War-time Allies occupied Germany with a commitment to getting rid of Nazi, militarist, and pan-German music from the repertoire. To a greater or lesser extent, they were also all committed to the exclusion of former Nazis from musical activities in the public sphere. Both goals were fraught with complications, which, more than half a Century later, are still unresolved. The recent academic interest in the relationship between music, musicians, and Nazism has served more to heighten awareness of the complexity of these relationships and of the moral issues which arise from them, than to produce any consensus on some of the most contested cases. The debate on whether Carl Orff's « Carmina Burana », by far, the most significant single musical work composed during the 3rd « Reich », is « Nazi music » (or, in more recent terms, has « Fascistoid traits ») continues, as do popular performances of the work itself, in and outside Germany. Arguments about whether Wilhelm Furtwängler and Richard Strauß were collaborators or resisters are still highly-polarized. Attitudes towards the nature and role of Richard Wagner's anti-Semitism, and the extent to which it is embodied in his music are still very divided. When we try to analyze the multi-faceted processes in Germany that are subsumed under the heading of « denazification », we encounter further difficulties.

The documentary record on denazification is scattered in many different archives and, unlike most of the material relating to the occupation of Germany, much of the material relating to the denazification of musicians is still classified. Many professional musicians in Germany after 1945 had practical reasons to deny, conceal, or mis-represent aspects of their behaviour before and during the 3rd « Reich » and, frequently, it suited one or other of the occupiers to collude with this. After 1948, when denazification petered-out, there was a general sense of dissatisfaction and embarrassment about the whole process, and it appears to have suited all involved to draw a veil over it. The analysis here will focus 1st on the Allied effort to pursue a collective policy on denazification in music and, then, proceed to consider in greater depth the policies pursued separately in individual Zones of occupation. As we shall see, this was an area where none of the Allies was prepared to renounce its jurisdiction within the area of Germany it controlled.

In accordance with War-time plans, the Allies in 1945 established an « Allied Control Council » in Berlin, which took-over executive authority in Germany from the government of the 3rd « Reich ». For the next 3 years, this council provided a forum in which the Soviets, Americans, British, and French were represented, and in which, with growing difficulty, they attempted to create a common legal framework for all Zones of occupation. Laws passed by the Control Council were published from October 1945, and were intended to have binding authority in all Zones. During late-1945 and early-1946, the Control Council grew, spawning committees and sub-committees dealing with individual issues. As far as the media (or « information services » as they were called by all the occupiers) and the arts were concerned, it was the Americans who showed the greatest commitment to 4-Power coordination, and it was largely at the instigation of Brigadier General Robert A. McClure that an Information Services Directorate was set-up within the Control Council, in April 1946, following which, a Theatre and Music sub-committee was also created. In the process, McClure brought to Germany a figure who would play a number of different roles in later years, the « émigré » Russian composer Nicolas Nabokov. Nabokov was brought to Berlin in 1945 specifically to coordinate Allied approaches to music control. It was felt that he would be helped in this by his command of English, French, Russian, and German.

McClure's most pressing concern in music control was with the denazification of musicians, and with securing a common Allied approach to this. He was a dedicated anti-Nazi, and he viewed the purging of Nazis from German cultural life as a mission, believing that a higher-standard should prevail there than in other areas of public life. McClure, and others in the American ICD, viewed the public performance of music as an act of great ritual significance, and they did not want to see former Nazis, regardless of the music they played, being applauded by German audiences. They went further than the other Allies in wishing, also, to exclude many who had been professionally successful under Adolf Hitler, arguing that they were compromised solely because of this. The other occupiers balanced their fierce hostility to former Nazis with a pragmatic desire to employ gifted and popular musicians in their own Zones, and all were sensitive to the enormous benefits that might accrue from allowing them to perform in public. The Americans also realized one implication of this, the opprobrium that would fall on them if they were perceived to be harsher than other occupiers, particularly when intervening in the hallowed area of « German music ». Very soon after the cessation of hostilities, the Americans started what was to be a long experience with major musical figures, excluded from work in the American Zone, who then went to other Zones to take-up prestigious appointments. The 1st high-profile case of this sort was that of Eugen Jochum, who was in Munich, in May and June 1945.

Jochum had conducted the Hamburg Philharmonic Orchestra during the War, with great success, earning ever-larger sums in the process. He was profiled in a War-time documentary film, and conducted in occupied France as a representative of the 3rd « Reich ». In July 1945, Jochum was invited by the British, who had no sense that he might be compromised, to return to his former post in Hamburg. Jack Bomoff, the « Music Controller » of the NWDR, travelled to Munich, where he met Jochum ; together, they went on to Linz, where Bomoff also recruited a number of musicians from the now disbanded « Reich » Bruckner Orchestra, previously conducted by Jochum's brother, Georg Ludwig. Eugen Jochum, and the musicians from Linz returned to Hamburg to help in the British-sponsored musical reconstruction there. The subsequent dispute over Jochum between the British and the Americans was a difference of perception. The Americans felt that Jochum had been a beneficiary of Nazism. The British regarded him 1st and foremost as a very talented conductor inspired by a deep Roman Catholicism.

The debates about music in the 4-Power Information Directorate followed a consistent pattern. The agenda was set by the Americans, who could usually count on support from the British, reluctant acquiescence from the French, and, after much quibbling, some kind of formal Soviet agreement. All sides jealously guarded their exclusive jurisdiction in their own Zones, and were often unwilling to reveal too clearly what policies they were pursuing there. There are points in the minutes of the Directorate's meetings where individual « Allies » misrepresented what was going on in their Zones, or represented the situation in such an obscure way that their statements were misleading or even contradictory. Under a veneer of diplomatic courtesy, each occupier went its own way, following 1st and foremost its own interests in the area of Germany it controlled. At a lower-level, there was, between 1945 and 1949, considerable cooperation between the Americans and the British, rather less between these 2 and the French, and very little between these 3 and the Soviets.

The Control Council did concern itself with the prohibition and destruction of Nazi and militarist music. Its Order No. 4, « Confiscation of Literature and Material of a Nazi and Militarist Nature », specifically referred to « song and music books », held by « circulating libraries, book-shops, book-stores and publishing houses » ; it ordered directors

of all educational institutions to remove « from libraries in their charge » all « Nazi and military literature » , and deliver this to « specially allocated places » . It seems that, by 1946, this order was hardly necessary. All over Germany, as the hostilities drew to an end, Nazi literature of all kinds, including music, was thrown away and destroyed by Germans themselves. Typically, for whatever reasons, libraries, schools, universities, publishers, and bookshops collected all the most obviously incriminating material they could find on their premises, and put it out to be pulped or destroyed. Most of those who had been involved in producing this material, if they survived the War, were keen to cooperate in this act of self-censorship, and to get rid of potentially compromising evidence. The cantatas glorifying Hitler, the « heroic festive music » of the 3rd « Reich » , and the hundreds of Nazi songs written before 1945, all largely disappeared. What remained was a larger spectrum of material with less obvious Nazi connotations and connections, much of which proved harder to judge.

There was virtually no problem created by the continued performance of Nazi music. There is no known example of professional musicians gathering publicly, or even privately, with the intention of performing Nazi music as some kind of gesture. Doubtless, individuals hummed to themselves the tunes they had learnt and sung before 1945. Groups may, in maudlin reflection, have sung together the « Horst-Wessel-Lied » , or the Hitler Youth's favourite song, « Es zittern die morschen Knochen » (The Brittle Bones are Shaking) , while they remembered torch lit parades, camp-fires, and evenings of alcoholic comradeship, but there are only isolated instances of this being done in a consciously oppositional manner. Music was not used, as Van Cutsem had feared, to rally resistance, or to mobilise a resurgent Nazism.

Just as with printed material, there remained a problem with the censorship of live music that had potential Nazi, militarist, or nationalist connotations, but this was not something that the Control Council or its Information Directorate attempted to rule on. It did, repeatedly and on American insistence, debate the denazification of musicians. The legal framework for the Allied denazification of civil society in post-War Germany was provided by Control Council Directive No. 24, « Removal from Office and from Positions of Responsibility of Nazis and of Persons Hostile to Allied Purposes » , which was not ready until January 1946 and was only published in March 1946. Had this Directive been rigorously and consistently implemented, many of those who ended-up playing a significant role in post-War German musical life would have been prevented from doing so. Paragraph 10 of the Directive specified several « Compulsory removal and exclusion categories » from positions of responsibility in public life. Amongst those to be removed and excluded, it specified all NSDAP members who joined before 1937, « all officials at any time » of the « “ Reichskulturkammer ” and subsidiary bodies » , and « persons who have denounced or contributed to the seizure of opponents of the Nazi regime » . The Directive also allowed for « discretionary removals or exclusions » . Paragraph 12, which gave advice on how to judge whether an individual was more than a « nominal » Nazi, had several sections that might relate to musicians. Membership of the German Christian Movement (« Deutsche Christenbewegung ») or the German Faith Movement (« Deutsche Glaubensbewegung ») , for example, raised « strong presumption of Nazi sympathy » . Paragraph 12 also identified « Persons who have received financial favoritism from the Nazis » , and stated that this might constitute grounds for exclusion.

The Directive, thus, left the Allies with wide discretion. It also raised several other problems, which were left to individual tribunals and investigators to resolve. The requirement that all who had joined the NSDAP before 1937 be

excluded, however, was clear and unequivocal. Given that the Americans, in 1945, had captured virtually intact the NSDAP membership card index, it was even, in theory, enforceable. We know now, though, that the circumstances in which individuals joined the Nazi Party, and their motivations for so doing, before and after 1937, were enormously varied, and that Party membership alone was not necessarily proof of any particular commitment to Nazism. Nor did the Directive define what was meant by a « position of responsibility ». Did this include conductors or choir Masters ? What of other professional musicians and singers, or teachers of music, many of whom worked privately ? Additionally, the Allies in 1945 and 1946 did not state precisely for how long any exclusions were to last.

...

« Herr Generalmusikdirektor » , Otto Klemperer replied :

« I am not in command of an army, nor am I the director of a bank. My name is Klemperer. »

The American commitment to denazification in music brought them frustration, and the profound hostility of the German population in their Zone. Those canying-out the purges were criticized by their own press, and faced constant obstruction from the newly-created German authorities. That procedures in other Zones were « so much more superficial, disorganized, and haphazard » was small consolation to U.S. music officers, who had to live with the spectacle of musicians they were trying to punish basking in public acclaim there. The Americans arrived in Germany with a sense of righteous anger, greatly intensified by the discovery of concentration camps at Ohrdruf, Nordhausen, Buchenwald, Dachau, and elsewhere, in April 1945. They were determined to reform all aspects of civilian life in Germany, and were not disposed to argue the finer points of individual cases.

Young and completely inexperienced officers had responsibility for immediately vetting the personnel of probably the most highly-developed musical culture in the world, and censoring its repertoire. These men knew that music had been inextricably linked with Nazism, and that it played a significant role in public life in Germany. They objected particularly to the appearance in public of musicians who had been popular under the Nazis, even if there was no clear proof that they had been Nazi sympathisers. Unfortunately, this became confused with the punishment of ex-Nazis, and often fostered the impression that American policy was driven by vindictiveness and a lack of cultural understanding.

This confusion was particularly apparent in the « discouragement » of certain kinds of music. Richard Wagner was singled-out, not because the Americans thought it was Nazi music, but because the Nazis had liked it so much. By the same token, Ludwig van Beethoven or Anton Bruckner might have been « crowded-out » , but were not. No performances of Wagner were permitted in the American Zone once the early confusion at Bayreuth had been sorted-out ; the Festival there did not resume until 1951. The situation at Bayreuth, in May 1945, was particularly ironic, since the manager of the Festival Hall, Raymond Lutz, was actually an American citizen. Through the summer, performances by un-licensed German orchestras to U.S. troops in Bayreuth vexed the Music Control Section in Munich. Not until September did denazification begin in earnest. The Bayreuth Symphony Orchestra had to close-down temporarily because so many of its members were excluded. Lutz himself was dismissed because of his War-time work

in Posen and Gablonz. Symbolically, the 1st official performance of Wagner was given by an American singer, Marjorie Lawrence, in Berlin in December 1946, and this served as a clear signal of a relaxation of the existing policy. In quick succession, « Tannhäuser » was performed in Coburg ; « Die Walküre » in Munich ; and « Parsifal » in Regensburg. The audience in Munich made its feelings clear by continuing its applause after « Die Walküre » for a full 30 minutes.

There was equal confusion in the censorship of music by living composers. The Bavarian State Opera was told, in December 1945, that performance of Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari's Opera « The Secret of Suzanne » was « not desirable at this time » , although it was « itself quite innocent » . Apparently, it was « too early to produce an Opera of someone as prominently involved with the Nazis as this composer » . Wolf-Ferrari had been named as a popular composer in the 3rd « Reich » in the Germany-Basic-Handbook, produced by the Americans during the War, as had Hans Pfitzner. Ironically, pieces by Pfitzner were included in the 1st concerts allowed by the Americans in Frankfurt and in Bremen but, by May 1946, they were concerned about Soviet plans to broadcast a Pfitzner series, and by an invitation for him to appear in Düsseldorf, in the British Zone. After 2 concerts in Munich, that Pfitzner attended in person, turned into a public display of support for the black-listed local composer, performance of his music there was banned. In a gesture certain to provoke comment, Joseph Haas, Director of the Music Academy, was « advised » not to include any pieces by Pfitzner in a commemorative Centenary concert of the Academy in Munich, in October 1946. The Americans had moved a long way from their earlier position of not wanting to be seen « to regiment culture » .

The exclusion of performers from professional life by the Americans was taken much further than their censorship of music, and challenges any assumption that denazification of musicians was lenient or superficial. We can distinguish here 4 phases before the Americans reluctantly abandoned their effort in 1948. In the early weeks of the occupation, they were concerned to restart concerts in major cities. This meant finding local officials who could be licensed to produce concerts, and then, carrying-out a quick purge of selected ensembles before they could perform in public and on radio. All over the American Zone, music officers were instructed to draw-up black-lists of musicians, and to send these to Brigadier General McClure's headquarters at Bad Homburg. The Americans relied, at this stage, on locally captured documents, or on information received from Germans, which might or might not be reliable. This explains why they initially employed a number of musicians, such as Eugen Jochum and Hans Knappertsbusch, who were subsequently black-listed, and, by November 1945, described as « Nazi parade horses » . Inevitably, the early purges appeared arbitrary and unfair. Already, tensions between different branches of the Military Government were apparent. The Intelligence Branch of ICD, headed by Colonel Alfred Toombs, demanded that all NSDAP members be excluded. Music officers were aware that were this to be enforced, few orchestras would be able to play.

In July 1945, Arthur Vogel in Munich protested :

« The recent wholesale dismissal of Nazi Party members from the State Opera, and the paralysing effects this policy will have on musical life if pursued throughout Bavaria, force me to state my opinion of this policy. »

3 days later, he wrote :

« Schmitt and Altmann of the Philharmonic dropped-in, visibly trembling, unless we should fall on the 19 Nazis in

their Orchestra. I sent a note over to Captain Busey telling him this office favours retention of all musicians save the outright stinkers and trouble-makers. »

From papers drawn-up by the Orchestra, it would appear that 16 of its musicians were dismissed. Vogel subsequently reported that if all who had been NSDAP members prior to 1 May 1937 were excluded, there would be no Orchestras left in Nuremberg, Bayreuth, Augsburg, or Regensburg, and that in Munich, the Orchestra of the Bavarian State Opera would have to merge with the Philharmonic.

This situation was mirrored in cities all over the American Zone. In Karlsruhe, provisional screening of the Symphony Orchestra resulted in « several severe musical losses » . In Stuttgart, the Americans began a long struggle with the municipal authorities to denazify the Opera and the Philharmonic. In Bremen, which the Americans took-over from the British, in June 1945, a preliminary survey noted :

« Music and Theatre activities, in Bremen and the Enclave, are less advanced than in any other of the key-cities selected as initial targets. This is a very critical area, since the adjoining areas, under British control, are extremely active, and the contrast results in comparisons highly-unfavourable to the American occupation and control agencies. The report went on to state that if Party members in the Bremen Philharmonic were excluded, the Orchestra would be temporarily crippled, and argued that they should be retained, particularly as in surrounding areas (under British control) nominal Nazis were permitted to work “ in subordinate positions ”. »

Surviving black-lists drawn-up by American officers, in southern and central Germany, in this 1st phase of occupation give a vivid picture of the chaotic situation prevailing then. They are hastily typed, and whole pages are now illegible. This 1st phase of American denazification was draconian, inevitably arbitrary, and partial. It left hundreds of professional musicians out of work, and facing an uncertain future.

A 2nd, intensified phase began in October 1945 with the completion of the 1st post-War « Black, Grey, and White lists » for the whole of the American Zone. Alongside hundreds of lesser musicians, the leading lights of German musical life, including Furtwängler, Knappertsbusch, and Walter Gieseking, were named as Nazi collaborators, causing wide-spread comment. The Americans were now using the « Reich » Chamber of Culture files held by the British, and, in the next few months, were thus able to extend their purges. Analysis of these lists is complicated by changes in the way they were drawn-up between 1944 and 1947. As well as 3 categories defined by colour, there were further sub-divisions. On the 1st post-War lists, there were distinctions between white « A » and « B » , and black « O » and « E » . Later lists dropped these distinctions, but introduced a new one, between grey « acceptable » and « unacceptable » . As Ulrich Bausch has pointed-out, there were many discrepancies between lists drawn-up by ICD centrally, and by detachments in individual areas. Changing directives from McClure's headquarters further undermined any hope music officers might have had of achieving consistency.

The new climate, in the autumn of 1945, was heralded in Munich by the dismissal of Hans Knappertsbusch. Behind the scenes, his case also revealed difficulties with communication. Knappertsbusch, after « exhaustive investigation » by the Intelligence Branch, had been appointed temporary « Intendant » at the Bavarian State Opera, and allowed to direct

the Munich Philharmonic. He even conducted a Beethoven Piano Concerto in September, in which Edward Kilenyi, an American music officer, played the solo part. Evidently, Toombs, the head of the ICD's Intelligence Branch, had heard that Knappertsbusch was conducting in public again, and he angrily demanded that the Munich detachment should carry-out its responsibilities with more urgency. Knappertsbusch was « summarily dismissed ». Vogel and Kilenyi, in Munich, were apparently unaware at the time that he had been black-listed, claiming to have learnt this only later from the magazine « Stars and Stripes ». The case was widely-reported, and discussed all over Germany. The effect was calamitous, and not just in Munich. Fragile relationships between music officers and German musicians were undermined, and the exodus of musicians from the American Zone gathered pace.

Settling Scores : German Music, Denazification, and The Americans (1945-1953)

By David Monod, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (2005) .

Given its title, historian David Monod's book « Settling Scores » runs the unfortunate danger of being confused with « Settling the Score » (Ned Rorem, 1988) , or « Settling the Score » (Kathryn Kalinak, 1992) , or « Settling New Scores » (Felix Meyer, editor, 1998) and, perhaps also, « Settling the Score » (Michæl Oliver, editor, 1999) . But Monod's subtitle, « German Music, Denazification, and the Americans, 1945-1953 » , places it firmly in the company of works like Michæl H. Kater's « The Twisted Muse : Musicians and Their Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” » (1997) , and Pamela Potter's « Most German of the Arts : Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's “ Reich ” » (1998) , or alongside recent work that overlaps Monod's, like Toby Thacker's « Music After Hitler, 1945-1955 » (2007) , or Amy C. Beal's « New Music, New Allies » (2006) .

The nature of the book's rich thesis is multifold : addressing the day-to-day reality of military government's staggering bureaucracy ; the seriously confused procedures of « denazification » and « re-education » ; the ineffectiveness of promoting American music ; the dangerous temptation of censorship in a post-dictatorship situation ; the tension between American and European values regarding culture versus entertainment ; and much more. Monod's story adds to the politicized biographies of its prominent protagonists (in particular, well-known figures like : Wilhelm Furtwängler, Richard Strauß, Herbert von Karajan, Carl Orff, Georg Solti, Paul Hindemith, Leonard Bernstein, Walter Gieseking, Karl Böhm, Winifred and Wieland Wagner) as well as lesser-known but equally important players like John Bitter, Edward Kilenyi, Robert McClure, John Evarts, Hans Rosbaud, Leo Borchard, Sergiù Celibidache, Harrison Kerr, Everett Helm, and Carlos Moseley.

In writing on music politics during the post-War American occupation of West Germany, the author operates convincingly from the premise that ours is a time of the politicization of the arts, and explains that his « interests lie in exploring the debate over what should have been done with Germany's tainted generation of musicians and its debased culture » . In turn, he asks his readers « to confront the question of the culpability of the artist » and, at the same time, to re-examine what the Americans actually achieved in the 1st few years after World War II in cities under their control like Munich, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden, Frankfurt, and West-Berlin.

Monod gives somewhat scant treatment to the contemporary music culture that experienced such a remarkable rebirth

in the years following the « Zero Hour » , and his insistence on connecting the idea of « revolution » with re-education leaves this reader only marginally convinced. Several misspellings and minor mechanical errors should have been caught during final proof-reading but, overall, the book is expertly designed and beautifully produced. Most significantly, the quality of this book's scholarship is impeccable. Monod's research is based on myriad materials in 10 German and 6 American archives, over a dozen sets of additional private papers, eyewitness interviews, and the citation of nearly 200 published sources. Furthermore, despite the complexity of the topic and the tangled web of tales, the author is simultaneously trying to unravel and explain, this insightful book is clearly organized and elegantly written. Monod's engaging, authoritative « Settling Scores » is poised to become required reading for all historians and musicologists interested in cultural rebirth amidst the post-War ruins of occupied Germany.

Re-educating the Public

(From Chapter 3 : « Reforming Music Culture, 1945-1946 »)

Information Control Division's Music Branch did not limit its reformist efforts to containing the influence of the State but also sought to change attitudes among the public. « The basic objective of the occupation requires the democratization of the German government and people » , declared one directive, an approach that involved « teaching democracy to the individual German » . Where denazification would force each person to « renounce the doctrines of Nazism and militarism by making him aware of the moral issues involved in German aggression and of his personal share in the collective German responsibility for the acts of the Nazis and militarists » , cultural products might be employed to « strip away German misconceptions about Germany and its relationship to the world » . Initially, « music, opera and ballet will be given preference over other forms of entertainment » in this public re-education program, as these forms provided few « opportunities for subversive propaganda » and might be « designed to restore the exchange of ideas between Germany and the world outside it » . (30) Just as Information Control Division directives suggested that there was a salvageable core to German music culture and that State-subsidized institutions could be democratized through reform rather than revolution, they also implied the existence of a receptive public that could be made to appreciate new and foreign music. Effort had to be made to humanize and demote the country's cultural titans and show the local population that central Europe was not the repository of all that was best in music history. In particular, concert-goers had to be taught that, during the preceding 12 years, far more interesting music was composed outside Germany's borders than within.

The branch declared :

« Adolf Hitler had succeeded in transforming the lush field of musical creativity into a barren waste. »

During the 3rd « Reich » , the occupiers believed, most of Germany's best artists were abroad, the country was « completely isolated from international development » and its own composers were « producing nothing but works psychologically effective to the Nazi cause » . Under these circumstances, pressing a new and internationalized musical repertoire on German audiences was considered good therapy. « There is still a strong feeling of arrogance and superiority among Germans in regard to their own music » , the Americans concluded, which a broader repertoire

would help to destroy. Listening to the modern music of different countries « will introduce breadth of outlook, international understanding and non-political attitudes » . Music Branch officers were fairly broad-minded in the repertoire they suggested, as promoting the music of all of the Allied nations (and they included in this group the works of « émigrés » such as Ernst Toch, Bohuslav Martinů, Gian Carlo Menotti and Béla Bartók) was seen as important in « helping to stress the significance of an unpolitical art in Germany » . (31)

But before this could be done, a functioning agency for the collection of royalties had to be established. The American League of Composers and the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, which policed copyrights in the United States, made very clear that they would not allow unauthorized or unrecompensed performances of works, no matter what their presumed educational value. The institution that handled copyright in Germany, « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » (STAGMA) , had been a Nazi organization attached to the « Reichskulturkammer » (RKK) and under the direct control of the Propaganda Ministry. The Party paid a lump sum each year for rights to perform any music it wanted in propaganda films or at official functions, and the « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » , in turn, was required to use the Party's contribution to subsidize musicians and organizations specially selected for it by the Propaganda Ministry. Although a servant of Nazi racial policy, the agency was such a cash cow that, when the War ended, everyone from the city of Berlin to the GDB to the « Kammer für Kunstschaffenden » lobbied to take it over. While the Allies decided what to do, 2 senior executives of the Nazi period, Erich Schulze and Pierre Cretin, maintained « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » 's operations, though they were generally unsuccessful in their effort to convince artists and theater directors to pay them for performed material. The actions of Schulze and Cretin did, however, help ensure that « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » rather than a new agency would continue to collect fees, and the Americans temporarily backed them as alternatives to State control. The whole process of negotiating a structure for the new agency lasted months, in large measure because the Soviets had little use for a private collection agency and were unsure whether to support it. So, it was not until late-summer 1946 that all 4 powers agreed to recognize the private organization's exclusive right to administer royalties. In the meantime, the Information Control Division needed another solution if it were to launch Germany's cultural re-education. In December 1945, therefore, the division opted to act alone : it appointed a director of the « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » for the American zone, established branch agencies in different cities, and ordered all performers and theaters to pay royalties only to that agency. By Christmas, the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers had negotiated terms of payment with the American zone « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » (renamed, in 1949 : « Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte » or GEMA) , clearing the way to performances of U.S.-copyrighted works. In addition to this function, the German agency was charged with collecting all royalties for the performances of works by black-listed composers and holding them in a closed account until such time as the individuals were cleared. (32)

With copyright now protected, musical material began to flow into Germany in January 1946, but it came in strange packages. OWI's former overseas offices, now being liquidated or absorbed by the Department of State's IIA, contributed a large number of scores and recordings, but this arrangement changed when the army took control and the Information Control Division was placed under the operational control of the Civil Affairs Division. Unfortunately, the

Civil Affairs Division, which stood at the head of the Office of the Military Government, United States' supply line, did not appoint a music administrator until March 1946, further delaying the Information Control Division's field operations. When the scores and parts did arrive, they came as microfilm, requiring enlargement and photo-duplication at the headquarters of the Information Control Division's Film Branch, in Munich. The process proved time-consuming and some of the material was unreadable, requiring new photographing. All of this served to slow the dissemination of American music in Germany, and, by July 1946, the Information Control Division had only about 100 compositions, as compared with 600 made available by the Russians and 300 by the British. One important advance in facilitating the use of Military Government's supply of scores came with the creation of an Inter-allied Music Lending Library in Berlin, in September 1946. Located in the State library in the Russian sector, it provided a central lending point for music supplied by the occupation powers. (33)

As most of the 1st generation of music officers had studied in Europe and lived in the northeastern United States, they included in Germany's cultural tonic works by Igor Stravinsky and Darius Milhaud, Dmitri Shostakovich, Paul Hindemith, and Béla Bartók. This was the modern music the officers heard in Boston and Philadelphia and New York performed by such European conductors as Serge Koussevitsky and Artur Rodziński, Arturo Toscanini and Leopold Stokowski. A few, like John Evarts and John Bitter, were knowledgeable about American composers, but to others, like Newell Jenkins and Edward Kilenyi, it was unfamiliar terrain. Still, the music officers were all fairly catholic in their tastes and through their supplier in IIA, they secured scores by Sergei Prokofiev, Béla Bartók, Arthur Honegger, and a host of others for their German licensees.

American music, in the eyes of senior planning officials was, however, always thought to have a special role to play in Germany. This was especially true for State Department authorities, who saw American culture as the vanguard of democratization. According to an influential report on re-education activities :

« Germans, weak in their political tradition, tend to judge American political democracy by the kind of cultural life they imagine it to produce, and as they are convinced that it produces nothing of value, their minds are for the most part closed to the suggestion that they adopt it for themselves. If Germans are once convinced that America does have a culture of its own, and moreover one that has progressed beyond theirs in certain fields in which they have prided themselves, they will begin to listen with more interest to talk of political democracy. » (34)

Breaking down the Germans' sense of cultural superiority would, therefore, be more effectively achieved through American music than through the works of other nations.

The music officers agreed with this and promoted works by Walter Piston and Aaron Copland and Roy Harris and William Schuman, without abandoning their more internationalist goals. But, by the summer of 1946, their effort to supply modern music, as opposed to narrowly American works, had run into a major obstacle. When the War Department finally assumed full-responsibility for Information Control Division, it appointed Harrison Kerr as its music administrator in its New York field office and the job of supplying scores was transferred from IIA to the Civil Affairs Division. Kerr was a composer and former administrator of the American Music Library, and he had a far narrower concept of the Military Government's mission in Germany than the field officers or his predecessors in IIA. His job was

to purchase the supplies needed for re-education purposes and he, not the music officers, controlled the budget and exercised final decision-making authority. Kern refused to authorize the dispatch of music by non-Americans or even of « émigrés » such as Paul Hindemith, Bohuslav Martinů, and Ernst Křenek, even when asked to do so by the field officers. In Kerr's opinion, works by these composers were not sufficiently representative of America and would have no re-educational value. The branch officers did not agree with Kerr, but they had no official alternative to the New York office. Whenever they could, they ordered scores from Switzerland and England, and one of them, who had previously been in charge of IIA's music program, continued to use the old channel and had material shipped through the Music Division of the Library of Congress. But the American officers had to pay for much of this material themselves or make use of friends and donors in the United States. (35)

Information Control Division's officers worked hard to provide German performers with music from Europe and the United States, but they were not always so selfless in their actions. On a number of occasions, they took advantage of their positions to showcase their own work or ability. John Bitter led the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 3 times and his 3rd String Quartet premiered in the city while he was still a music officer ; Jerome Pastene conducted frequently in Heidelberg ; and John Evarts started writing a chamber piece for a Munich ensemble until ordered to stop by Kilenyi, his fastidious superior. Harrison Kerr shipped a disproportionate number of his own works to Germany, including big ones like his forgettable 1st Symphony. William Castello, who worked with Jenkins in Stuttgart, was reportedly heavily involved in the black market. Activities like these do not reflect well on the Information Control Division's officers, though the urge of musicians to make music and of composers to promote their wares is not unusual. Still, like so many others, they were hoping to lay the foundations of their post-MG careers by enhancing their resumes with some European credits. A great number of Americans did exactly the same thing, including army officers who used their authority to conduct leading orchestras ; amateurs who ordered Europe's top-musicians to give them lessons ; musicians with stalled or stillborn careers who moved to Switzerland in the hopes of descending on Germany or Austria the moment travel restrictions were lifted. Not all of these were artistically unworthy ; Erich Leinsdorf, for example, a gifted if hard-driving Opera conductor, whose career in America had been derailed by military service, slipped into Vienna in the hopes of landing a top-job. On the scale of things, the abuse of power shown by those Information Control Division officers who conducted or pushed their compositions was relatively inconsequential, if nonetheless inexcusable. (36)

Directing an orchestra oneself did have the advantage of allowing a music officer to choose his repertoire, and it is noteworthy that Jerome Pastene, for one, performed American pieces whenever conducting in Heidelberg. The 1st American works performed in Germany were played before Allied service personnel : in early September 1945, the black activist, composer, and clarinetist Rudolph Dunbar led the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra on invitation of Leo Borchard, and conducted William Grant Still's « Afro-American » Symphony in an Armed Forces concert. In a subsequent concert, early in December, John Bitter and the same Orchestra performed Samuel Barber's « Adagio » . But convincing German licensees to try-out an American composition was never easy, even when the musician was as cooperative a person as Hans Rosbaud or Sergiù Celibidache. American music was, at the time, virtually unknown in Germany, and most artists shared the national bias that it could not be very good. Even friendly musicians complained that the style of American music was too unfamiliar or that they could not induce their Orchestras to give it a try. Consequently, it was not until spring 1947 that Georg Solti performed his 1st American works, Barber's « Essays for Orchestra » , and

Rosbaud only directed his 1st (Copland's « An Outdoor » Overture) , in September 1946, 5 months after Celibidache conducted Barber's « Adagio » in Berlin. The less prominent Orchestras proved more forthcoming : what appears to have been the 1st orchestral work presented to a German audience was Walter Piston's « Incredible Flutist Suite » , offered in Heidelberg, on 8 March 1946 ; a few days later, the 1st American Symphony, Howard Hanson's Third, was heard by concert-goers in Wiesbaden ; and, shortly thereafter, the 1st ballet danced to an American score was staged before a local audience in Karlsruhe. Chamber works were also easier to get performed and the 1st American work presented to Germans during the occupation was Quincy Porter's « Music for Strings » . By June 1946, there had been 47 performances of 25 American works in the occupation zone and, 9 months later, the total had reached 173 performances of 57 pieces. Many of these works had, however, been played by orchestras under direct Information Control Division control, such as Radio Frankfurt's. (37)

Although some of the music the Information Control Division promoted might rest comfortably among the finest of the Century (Virgil Thompson's 2nd and William Schuman's 3rd Symphonies, for example, or Aaron Copland's « Quiet City ») and some stood, like Samuel Barber's « School for Scandal » Overture or George Gershwin's « Rhapsody in Blue » , among the most fun, much of what they had to offer was not very memorable. When Otto Matzerath presented Robert McBride's « Strawberry Jam » Overture, the greater part of the audience was « completely horrified by what some Germans referred to as “ Eine amerikanische Schweinerei ” » . This hostile reaction should not be entirely taken as a sign of anti-Americanism, for when Paul Hindemith, 4 years before, had been asked to review the work, he described it as a « sloppy, tossed-off piece of crap » . Piston's « Incredible Flutist » was also received with « puzzlement » by a Mannheim audience, while his « Concertino for Piano and Orchestra » was greeted in Heidelberg with « energetic whistling » (a sign of disapproval) . Some of this negativity was due to the problems German Orchestras had with the American musical idiom and with poor preparation and a lack of enthusiasm among artists who only mounted the work in order « to keep in good graces with the Americans » . But the results could be horrific. A performance of Gershwin's « Rhapsody » in Karlsruhe was mangled so badly that intelligence officers took it as criticism of the occupation and suggested the military police close down the theater. A few months earlier, « confused » choreography meant to seem broadly American, together with dancers dressed-up like cowboys and scenery that looked as though the whole thing were « laid-out in New Mexico » , badly distorted a production of Copland's ballet « Appalachian Spring » . (38)

The Information Control Division did score some real hits in Germany. Barber's « Adagio » was everywhere well-received, as was Menotti's « The Old Maid and the Thief » . But the problem of overcoming German apathy toward American Classical music remained.

As Newell Jenkins conceded :

« The trouble involved in placing an American work is tremendous. »

In an attempt to overcome some of that resistance, in March 1947, Jenkins established a series of chamber concerts of American works preceded by lectures and followed by group discussions. He borrowed the idea from the American composer Virgil Thomson and called the gatherings « The Friends and Enemies of Modern Music Society Concerts » .

The concerts « worked amazingly well » attendance was good, and « precious few enemies » showed-up. This inspired John Evarts, who founded similar Societies in Karlsruhe in April, and in Munich in May. By the end of 1947, « Friends and Enemies » were meeting in all the major cities where American cultural officials were stationed. Attendance at these concerts remained strong and positive because the Information Control Division passed-out free tickets to music students and local artists, and it managed to press such pro-American notables as Hans Rosbaud, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, and the music-critic Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt into service as lecturers. The concerts did much to familiarize the next generation of German musicians with American Classical music and helped remove some of the prejudices with which they had been raised. (39)

When it came to indigenous, as opposed to American or other European music, politics strongly influenced official tastes. The Americans in Bavaria regarded Carl Orff with considerable disdain because they saw him as overly « bayerisch » ; he was much more popular among the authorities in Stuttgart, where his regionalism carried fewer political implications. In Munich, the control officers favoured Hartmann, a composer of solid political credentials who seemed delighted by the American presence in his city. Hartmann's « Musica Viva » series got the Office of the Military Government, United States' support, through block ticket purchase, a subsidy for concerts featuring American works, and free performance space in the « Amerika Haus » . In Berlin, the Americans' darling was Boris Blacher, for whom John Bitter managed to secure extra-food rations and who became acquainted with a number of wealthy American patrons and influential musicians. In Heidelberg, Jerome Pastene befriended and pushed a young Wolfgang Fortner student, Hans Werner Henze. No one gave Werner Egk or Ernst Pepping much thought ; Richard Strauß and Hans Pfitzner, rightly or wrongly, were regarded as tainted relics from the past. By and large, local governments echoed American preferences so long as the occupiers were watching. Carl Orff was offered a job in Stuttgart, but Munich officials only talked to him in secret ; Hartmann's « Musica Viva » organization received strong backing from the Bavarian and Munich governments, but Strauß and Pfitzner were snubbed. Blacher was the best connected and one of the most performed composers living in the American sector of Berlin. But the man everyone talked about, the dominant composer in both American and German eyes, Paul Hindemith, remained the absent hero in these years. Although politicians and artists begged for his return and his Operas and works were performed in his absence as events (as a kind of ritual act of invocation and contrition) , Hindemith did not visit until 1947 and, then, quietly and on private business.

For 2 years, Hindemith maintained that he would only return if the Military Government sent him on tour as a visiting expert, something the War Department refused to allow as it considered his « connections with the Nazi Party closer than had been supposed in the early days » . Unaware of the blemishes on his record, the field officers continued to promote Hindemith as a symbol of resistance. The Americans urged local musicians to perform his works, especially those composed in America, but the position the composer adopted was that if musicians wanted them, they knew where they could get them : from Schott, his publisher (something they had been able to do throughout the Nazi period) . (40) At one and the same time a symbol of Weimar and of America, of resistance to Nazism and of the « émigrés' » abandonment of their homeland, of new music and old, Hindemith was, in his public image and private dealings, the most complex of composers. And yet, like the others, only more so, he was celebrated by the occupation and the State as a contemporary composer conservative music-lovers might appreciate.

Interestingly, although a great many of the American and modern European composers the Information Control Division

promoted were Jewish, the division never specifically advertised the fact. Nor did it ever insist that musicians perform works by Felix Mendelssohn or Gustav Mahler simply because they had previously been banned on « racial » grounds. No one in the Information Control Division ever explained why this was, but one can easily imagine. How would the division have singled-out the works of Jewish composers without re-inforcing Nazi assertions that « race » mattered ? A German population that thought of Jews as different and foreign, and which was now being made to feel guilty for those feelings, would only find re-assurance in an Allied program that racially identified its subjects. Moreover, since many of the American and contemporary European works performed were received unfavorably, one risked re-inforcing stereotypes by drawing attention to the fact that their composers were Jews. And so, even though a number of the regional branch officers and both deputy chiefs Benno Frank and Walter Hinrichsen were Jews, the Information Control Division policy pointedly overlooked the issue. Apparently, the music officers believed the case for tolerance was more powerfully made by presenting Ernst Toch and Boris Blacher as equally German and Aaron Copland, Charles Ives, Igor Stravinsky, and Gian Carlo Menotti as equally American.

As John Evarts maintained in one of his lectures to German audiences :

« America has opened its doors to every type of music from all over the world, and many powerful works have emerged. »

Pointedly, he added, U.S. music was charting « a new direction, one absolutely American, one that draws as much from African rhythms as from the dissonant chords of Claude Debussy, as much from Negro Spirituals as from Jewish liturgical chants ? » (41)

What did tend to unite the composers whom the Music Branch advanced was that they were among the more accessible modernists. Although dissonance was part of their 20th Century musical language, these composers tended to express it without casting away from the traditional tonal moorings ; Darius Milhaud and Paul Hindemith and Roy Harris all shared an interest in polytonal, polymodal, and polyrhythmic effects together with an adherence to the tonic. It is notable that the Americans did little until 1949 to promote the more avant-garde music of their time, whether Henry Cowell's or Arnold Schœnberg's or Olivier Messiaen's. Consequently, the avenues of the avant-garde remained unexplored in the concert-halls in 1945-1946, and it was not only German conservatism that was to blame. American officials were no more fond of 12 tone or politically engaged music than were most Germans. Furthermore, neither Americans nor Germans believed popular music belonged in the concert-hall, and the only Broadway work the Information Control Division reproduced for German use was Kurt Weill's hit « Knickerbocker Holiday » . Some groups, like Hartmann's « Musica Viva » or Wolfgang Steinecke's « Darmstadt Ferienkurse » , did present some of the more adventurous contemporary works, and they did receive the Information Control Division's financial patronage, but the Americans also bemoaned their repertoire. The fact is that the field officers were interested in pushing the boundaries of public taste, not alienating musical conservatives. Although they advanced music they believed would be challenging for audiences, they remained reformers in the concert-hall and not revolutionaries.

Without question, however, the Americans seriously misunderstood the recent history of modern music in Germany. Although it is never a bad thing to attack cultural prejudices, and many people must have profited from their

exposure to the new music being composed in the United States and other European countries, the principles on which the field officers based their initiatives were flawed. The Americans were convinced that Nazi Germany had been a cultural desert and that the public needed and appreciated them for supplying the refreshing waters of hitherto unavailable music. What they failed to realize was that much good contemporary music was performed in Hitler's Germany and that, until the War, the country was not closed to the works of British or French or other European composers. Although modern composers like Honegger and Stravinsky were periodically denounced in the Nazi Party press, their compositions continued to be sporadically performed in the 1930's, and some, like Bartók's, never suffered any type of official proscription.

As Jenkins remarked a half-Century later :

« It was ridiculous thinking that we could teach the Germans anything about contemporary music, because they were very good in that themselves. They were very aware of what goes on. Because I remember, even in the early Nazi days, when I was a student in Germany, that the contemporary music festivals used to take place in Baden-Baden and they still had a very powerful bunch of people associated with them and performances from international artists. »

(42)

Unfortunately, not only did the Americans fail to realize that that portion of the concert-going public that was most likely to react favourably to their efforts (students, musicians, and those already interested in contemporary music) was more knowledgeable than they had imagined, but they also made an error in believing that they could force-feed the rest of the audience a diet of contemporary, albeit tonal, music. Ironically, they were attempting to build in Germany what had not developed anywhere : a mass audience for modern music. The field officers were sensible enough to favour in their work composers like Shostakovich and Britten and Copland who were on the more conservative side of the compositional spectrum, but that decision also carried a cost. What the Americans ultimately did was to alienate both the more conservative music-lovers, who avoided concerts featuring American and modern works, and many of the new music cognoscenti, who thought the pieces being offered were too old-fashioned. As a result, although commendable in myriad ways, the branch's efforts on the part of new music were pre-destined to enjoy only modest popularity.

Notes

(30) « Working program for Democratization in Bavaria » , 6 May 1947, file : Bavaria, box 201, Records of the Cultural Exchange Programme, Civil Affairs Division, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Headquarters U.S. Forces, European Theater, « Priority of Information Control Activities » , 28 August 1945, Speech by Brigadier General Robert A. McClure, 27 August 1945, and Information Control Division Standing Directive No. 1, 20 July 1945, entry 172, box 330, War Department, Registry 165, National Archives.

(31) « Re-orientation Activities of ODIC, Theater and Music » , 15 April 1947, and « Reconstruction of Musical Activity in U.S. Zone of Germany since June 1945 » , box 248, General Records, Cultural Relations Branch, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government, United States.

(32) J.F. Edney to Hans Aldenhoff, 18 February 1947, 4/12-2/23, B Rep 36, Landesarchiv Berlin ; G.K. Schueller, « Staatlich genehmigte Gesellschaft zur Verwertung musikalischer Aufführungsrechte » , 24 October 1945, 4/8-3/12, B Rep 36, Landesarchiv Berlin ; Control Officer, « History : Information Services Division, 8 May 1945 - 30 June 1946 » , file : History, box 454, Executive Office, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Film, Theatre and Music Report, April 1946, file : Film, Theatre and Music, box 77, Historical Office, Divisional Headquarters, Information Control Division, Office of the Military Government, United States.

(33) Thacker, « Playing Beethoven Like an Indian » , pages 370-371 ; « Minutes of Preliminary Meeting of Theater and Music Officers » , 20 October 1946, file : Meetings, box 3100, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government Württemberg-Baden, Office of the Military Government, United States ; « History : Information Services Division, 8 May 1945 - 30 June 1946 » , file : History, box 454, Executive Office, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Minutes, ICSG, 7 January 1946, and Minutes of Quadripartite Meeting, 10 May 1946, file : Quadripartite, box 77, Historical Office, Divisional Headquarters, Information Control Division, Office of the Military Government, United States.

(34) « Report to the Department of State of the USIE Survey Mission on the Office of the Military Government, United States Re-orientation Program in Germany » , 21 July 1949, box 205, LOT 53D311, Department of State, Registry 59, National Archives.

(35) For the assistance the officers provided orchestras, see : John Bitter to Virgil Thomson, 2 October 1946, 25/35, Virgil Thomson Papers, Yale University Archives ; Carlos Moseley to Harrison Kerr, 26 February 1948, and Carlos Moseley to Arthur Vogel, 2 March 1948, file : American Personnel, box 18, Cultural Relations Branch, Education and Cultural Relations, OMGB, Office of the Military Government, United States ; interview with Carlos Moseley, 18 March 1996.

(36) John Bitter Scrapbooks, 1945-1948, Private Archive John Bitter, Miami Heidelberg Detachment, Semi-Monthly Report, 10 December 1947, file : Württemberg-Baden, box 240, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government, United States ; John Evarts's Diary, 28 November 1945, Jeremiah Evarts Private Archive, Cornish, New Hampshire ; Weekly report, 15 April 1946, file, Theater and Music, box 20, Administrative Records, Director's Office, Education and Cultural Relations, OMGB, Office of the Military Government, United States ; interview with Newell Jenkins, 6 July 1996 ; Peter Heyworth, Otto Klemperer, Volume 2 : pages 146-147 and 158 ; Ernst Legal to Otto Klemperer, 29 July 1946, C Rep 167/16, Landesarchiv Berlin ; Frederic Mellinger, Weekly Report, 26 June, 3 July, and 5 February 1946, file : Berlin Reports, box 238, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government, United States ; interview with Virginia Pleasants, 19 May 1996 ; Erich Leinsdorf to Harold Spivacke, 25 February 1944, box 9, Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation : Sub-Committee on Music, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. ; Semi-Monthly Report, 31 December 1947, box 20, General Records, Executive Office, ISB, United States Allied Command Austria.

(37) Rudolph Dunbar was born in British Guyana and grew-up in London. Trained as a band musician, he played in music hall and jazz orchestras and, in the late-1930's, briefly lived in the United States, in Harlem ; see interview with

Rudolph Dunbar, 29 November 1938, Federal Writers' Project, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. ; Bi-Weekly Report, 5 September 1945, file : Berlin reports, box 75, Historical Office, Divisional Headquarters, Information Control Division, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Dody Bitter to Virgil Thomson, 12 December 1945, 25/35, Thomson Papers, Yale University Archives ; for Georg Solti : Evarts's Diary, spring-summer 1947, 6, Jeremiah Evarts Private Archive, Cornish, New Hampshire ; I am grateful to Doctor Joan Evarts for providing the date of Hans Rosbaud's 1st performance of an American work ; Württemberg-Baden Theater and Music Weekly Situation Report, 9 March 1946, file ; Weekly Reports, box 239, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government HeBe, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Film, Theater & Music Consolidated Report, March 1946, file : Reports Historical Office, Divisional Headquarters, Information Control Division, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Holger Hagen to William Dubensky, 11 November 1946, file : American Plays and Music, box 727, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government HeBe, Office of the Military Government, United States ; « Re-orientation Activities of ODIC, Theater and Music » , 15 April 1947, file : Re-orientation, box 248, General Records, Cultural Relations Branch, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government, United States.

(38) Weekly Report, 23 November 1946, file : Württemberg-Baden, box 240, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Paul Hindemith to Ernst Schleich, 19 July 1942, 16/296, Paul Hindemith Papers, Yale University Archives ; Weekly Report, 25 January 1947, file : Karlsruhe Outpost, box 599, Theater and Music, Field Relations Division, Office of the Military Government Württemberg-Baden, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Weekly Report, 2 April 1946, file : Bavaria: Weekly Reports, box 239, and Weekly Report, 16 November 1946, file : Württemberg-Baden, box 240, Theater and Music, Education and Cultural Relations, Office of the Military Government, United States.

(39) Interview with Newell Jenkins, 6 July 1996 ; « History of Information Control Division, Württemberg-Baden, to 1 July 1946 » , 29, file : Historical, box 309, Correspondence and General Records, Information Services Division, Office of the Military Government, United States ; Evarts's Diary, spring-summer 1947, 2, Jeremiah Evarts Private Archive, Cornish, New Hampshire.

(40) I am grateful to Toby Thacker for providing the quote regarding Paul Hindemith's dubious past ; on his interest in making sales, see : Paul Hindemith to Willy Strecker, 15 July 1946, in Skelton, Selected Letters, pages 196-200 ; on the availability of his works in the 3rd « Reich » , Kowalke, « Music Publishing and the Nazis » , pages 181-182 ; for a balanced treatment of Hindemith, see : Michæl H. Kater, « Composers of the Nazi Era » , chapter 2.

(41) Evarts, « Von Musikleben in Amerika » , pages 84-85.

(42) Interview with Newell Jenkins, 6 July 1996 ; for new music in Nazi Germany, see : Evans, « International with National Emphasis » and « Die Rezeption der Musik Igor Stravinskys » .

Dénazification du Philharmonique de Berlin

« It was never a Nazi Orchestra » : The American Re-education of the Berlin Philharmonic (I)

(Abby Anderton)

By the conclusion of World War II, Germany had been reduced to a pre-modern society. The brutality of the Nazi Regime, in conjunction with the aerial bombing of the Allies, exacted an inconceivable material and human toll. (2) Berlin, the former « Hauptstadt » of the 3rd « Reich », was little more than a crater whose ruins provided an eerie, phantasmagorical landscape through which survivors could wander. But while rubble could be cleared away and cities rebuilt, how would the Allies monitor German cultural reconstruction to ensure there would not be a revival of Nazism ?

American occupation authorities firmly believed that the Nazis had manipulated German high-culture, and especially music, to serve as a propaganda tool. Consequently, the American Military Government made special provisions for the treatment of culture in the post-War era by creating the Information Control Division (ICD), an organization with branches designed to monitor German radio, literature, film, theater, and music. The Americans, more than any other ally, considered the German musical establishment's relationship to Fascism a dangerous problem and designed their cultural re-education programs with this in mind. As Chief of the Theater and Music section, Benno Frank, contended even 2 years after Germany's surrender :

« Only a few people outside of Germany were familiar with political leaders like Rudolf Heß, Robert Ley, Joachim von Ribbentrop, etc., but artists like Richard Strauß, Gerhard Hauptmann, and Wilhelm Furtwängler were internationally known and recognized. Today, it may be said that Hitler's success in using these prominent cultural figures has decisively contributed to the prestige of the Nazi Regime. » (3)

The American occupiers were well-aware of the regime's former « prestige ». By using Classical music as a re-education tool, American authorities hoped to prove that American high-culture was as refined as Germany's and set about constructing fairly elaborate guide-lines for Classical rather than popular music. (4)

Ultimately, how would the American occupiers perceive their role as re-educators in Berlin, a city whose Classical music culture had been the most highly-politicized in all of the 3rd « Reich » ? At the center of American cultural reconstruction efforts was the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, the most illustrious ensemble residing in the American sector. Beginning in July of 1945, military government authorities regulated the ensemble's repertoire, musicians, and management in accordance with denazification procedures, as the Philharmonic's former role as the « Reich's » chosen Orchestra (« Reichsorchester ») made the Orchestra particularly symbolic for American efforts in post-War Germany.

Still, American authorities would use the Philharmonic in much the same way the National-Socialists had : as an Orchestra for the re-education of audiences. Just as the Philharmonic had once concertized in support of the Nazi War effort, giving lengthy tours throughout occupied Europe, the ensemble was also the sound of the Allied occupation. Of the 70 concerts the Philharmonic played from May until December of 1945, more than 1/3 (28 concerts) were performed especially for Allied soldiers. (5) Whereas the National-Socialists had controlled the Philharmonic's personnel on the basis of race, dismissing the Orchestra's 4 Jewish members in 1935, by 1945, the Americans had black-listed 6

players who were former Nazi Party members. (6) The Berlin Philharmonic's music was as highly-politicized during the War as after, as musicians were subjected to the restrictions of the reigning regime in order to maintain their positions.

In order to investigate why American occupation authorities were so invested in the Philharmonic's rehabilitation, it is essential to understand the Orchestra's cultural context in pre-World War II Germany. The ensemble was created in 1882 as a private corporation, with each musician buying into the Orchestra at 600 « Reichsmarks », giving the Philharmonic complete autonomy. Unfortunately, the Orchestra's business model was unsustainable and the Philharmonic began to have financial difficulties as early as 1912. The Orchestra's dire economic hardships continued throughout the 1920's as conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler and the ensemble's management fiercely campaigned to have the Prussian, « Reich », and Berlin city governments become the Philharmonic's primary shareholders to save the Orchestra from financial ruin. The proposed re-organization ultimately fell through, however, and the Philharmonic's finances remained precarious. (7)

By 1933, as the National-Socialists rose to power, the Philharmonic was 74,000 « Reichsmarks » in debt. But with the creation of the Propaganda Ministry, in 1933, the Philharmonic had found a valuable financial ally, albeit at the price of the Orchestra's artistic autonomy. In January of 1934, Furtwängler made a Faustian bargain with Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels, agreeing to turn the ownership of the Philharmonic solely over to the « Reich ». (8) Philharmonic members were subsequently required to join the « Reichsmusikkammer » (« Reich » Chamber of Music), the organization that coordinated the 3rd « Reich's » musical culture, then headed by President Richard Strauß and Vice-President Wilhelm Furtwängler. (9)

But with governmental funding came an increasingly politicized framework in which the Philharmonic had to perform. The National-Socialists wanted to exploit the Orchestra's reputation to lend a patina of respectability to the regime. Between 1934 and 1945, the Orchestra played at « Reichsparteitage » (Nazi Party rallies), Adolf Hitler's birthday celebrations, the « Reichsmusiktage », and Hitler Youth gatherings. During the War, when it was nearly impossible to obtain travel papers to leave Germany, the musicians toured throughout Nazi-occupied Europe, including Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, France, Holland, Italy, Poland, Romania, Serbia, and Spain. (10) At the close of each concert tour, Orchestra members could bring back food and other materials that had grown scarce in Germany. (11) Not only were they the highest-paid musicians in Germany, Philharmonic musicians were also exempt from military service because Goebbels considered concert tours just as vital as armed combat. (12)

But there were, of course, more sinister undercurrents within the Philharmonic during the 1930's and 1940's. (13) The 4 Jewish members of the Orchestra (Concert-Master Szymon Goldberg, 1st violinist Gilbert Back, and cellists Nicolai Graudan and Joseph Schuster) left Germany by 1935 under mounting pressure from Nazi authorities. (14) 3 more Philharmonic players with Jewish wives immigrated to ensure their safety. (15) By the close of 1935, « Aryanization cards » were required of all Philharmonic players, in order to keep their positions. (16) Furtwängler's long-time secretary, Berta Gießmar, also Jewish, left Germany to work with Sir Thomas Beecham and the London Philharmonic. (17)

Apart from an increasingly hostile political environment, the remaining Philharmonic musicians also witnessed the destruction of their city. From 1943 until 1945, Berlin became the most heavily bombarded city in all of World War II, enduring 363 aerial attacks. (18) To avoid American and British night-time bombing raids, Philharmonic evening concerts were rescheduled for 3:00 pm. As attacks became more frequent, all programs were printed with instructions on how to proceed in the event of an air-raid, urging audience members to take shelter in the coat-rooms and hallways of the 1st floor. Lastly, as a special privilege, members of the Philharmonic and their families received Bunker Identification Cards that ensured them a place below ground. (19)

Precautions aside, however, the Philharmonic's hall was hit by British phosphorus bombs on January 29th, 1944, and burned to the ground within a few hours. (21) Even without a home to concertize in, the Orchestra kept performing throughout Germany. The image of Nero fiddling while Rome burned seemed remarkably apt ; even as military defeat became imminent, the Philharmonic's resilience made German cultural achievement appear unflagging. (22) The Philharmonic's final concerts under the 3rd « Reich » took place on April 15th and 16th, 1945, in the « Beethovensaal », next to the ruins of the « Alte Philharmonie ». (23) Robert Heger and George Schumann conducted the ensemble ; Wilhelm Furtwängler had already left for refuge in Switzerland, several months earlier. (24) The Orchestra performed Carl Maria von Weber's « Oberon » Overture, Johannes Brahms's Double Concerto for violin, cello and orchestra, and appropriately enough, Richard Strauß's Tone-Poem « Tod und Verklärung » (Death and Transfiguration) . (25) The last work was an apt choice ; Strauß had written the tone poem to depict an artist on his deathbed contemplating his impending demise.

The 1st post-War Philharmonic concert was given on May 26th, 1945, less than 1 month after Germany's surrender. Hardly any concert venues remained intact, and the Philharmonic's performance was given at the « Titania-Palast » movie theater, in Steglitz, a western suburb of Berlin. Leo Borchard, an extremely capable musician whom the Soviets had found hiding in a cellar during the Battle of Berlin, conducted the ensemble. (In the eyes of the Russians, it did not hurt that Borchard spoke fluent Russian from his childhood spent in Moscow, nor that he had been marginally active in Onkel Emil, a small, underground Communist resistance group that hid Jews and provided them with falsified documents.) (26) At the inaugural post-War performance, Soviet officers entered with pistols brandished in the middle of Felix Mendelssohn's « Midsummer Night's Dream » Overture, conversed loudly during Mozart's Violin Concerto in A major, and left during the final movement of Tchaikovsky's 4th Symphony. The German audience was powerless to protest. (27) The repertoire was undoubtedly chosen to reflect the Orchestra's and the nation's break with National-Socialism ; Mendelssohn to re-introduce a work by a formerly « entartete » (degenerate) Jewish composer, and Tchaikovsky to please the Russians. While the German nation may have been defeated militarily, as one post-War music-critic noted :

« In the midst of such shambles, only the Germans could produce a magnificent full-orchestra and a crowded house of music-lovers. » (28)

For just over 2 months, the Philharmonic was under Russian jurisdiction before the Americans arrived in Berlin, on July 7th. (29) The Philharmonic's temporary concert-hall was then taken-over by the American 2nd Panzer Division, which intended to use the « Titania-Palast » for troop variety shows. (30) The American Military's Information Control

Division (ICD) was staffed with civilian experts tasked with re-educating the German people through music, theater, film, radio, and literature. Although the pairing of « Kultur » and military rule would seem to be an odd one, at the height of the re-education project, the ICD employed 35 cultural officers and 150 German employees to monitor culture in Berlin. (31) Although massively understaffed, the « klein, aber fein » (small but fine) music officers were entrusted with an ambitious plan : to re-educate and re-orient the local population by altering the performative context around German Classical music. Effectively, this meant that there would no longer be musical performances to commemorate former Nazi holidays and that no marches or songs with patriotic themes would be performed at any time. « Horst-Wessel-Lied » , the Nazi Party anthem, would no longer open concerts ; and music that had been particularly favoured by the regime would be carefully monitored to ensure it was not misappropriated.

The officer most instrumental in the city's cultural « Wiederaufbau » was John Bitter, head of Berlin's Theater and Music section from 1945 to 1948. After graduating from the Curtis Institute in the 1930's with a degree in conducting, he lived for 1 year in Vienna, free-lancing as a saxophonist and learning German. He led various Florida Orchestras before becoming an Intelligence Officer with the 9th Army in 1942, (32) and at the War's conclusion, he decided to remain in post-War Germany as a music officer. His 1st and last assignment was in Berlin. Music officers took music control seriously because the ICD's perception, in 1945, was that musical life in Germany from 1933 to 1945 had been culturally barren, its very essence tainted and manipulated by Nazism. (33)

On July 31st, British and American cultural officers met to discuss an 8 week plan for the Berlin Philharmonic with Leo Borchard and the Orchestra's business managers. The Americans and British decided that Philharmonic concerts would take place every week-end, at the very least, and would alternate between the American sector's « Titania-Palast » and the British's « Theater des Westens » . The Philharmonic would also be expected to give separate concerts for British and American troops and, as late as January 6th, 1947, fortnightly Monday night concerts were open only to Allied soldiers. (34) Now that the Philharmonic was the resident ensemble of the American sector, it concertized in an exhausting number of venues (including « Zinnwald Saal » in Zehlendorf, « Cosmos-Kino » in Tegel, « Quick Theater » in Neukölln, « Theatre des Westens » , « Titania-Palast » , and the « Deutsches Opernhaus » on « Kantstraße ») while rehearsing primarily in Dahlem's « Jesus-Christus-Gemeinde » church.

Having the most prestigious ensemble in all of Hitler's « Reich » under American control was a boon to cultural and intelligence officers ; what the cultural re-education program lacked in terms of numbers of ensembles could be tempered by the Philharmonic's world-wide renown. (35) According to regulations set forth by the ICD, each West-Berlin ensemble was required to have a license supervised by an American cultural officer. The license was jointly issued in the name of the officer and principal conductor, who were also responsible for the ensemble's artistic integrity. All musicians had to be registered with the ICD in order to ensure they had passed the denazification screening, and repertoire had to be approved 10 days in advance by cultural officers, a policy stringently enforced from September 6th, 1945, until May 31st, 1947. (36)

John Bitter, as the supervisor and military license holder for the Berlin Philharmonic, was involved in everything from locating scores and practice venues to conducting the Orchestra himself on more than 30 occasions, blurring his professional relationship to the ensemble even as he worked tirelessly to ensure the Philharmonic's survival. (37) Bitter

understood that the Orchestra was a valuable asset in the game of cultural diplomacy, not only between the Americans and the Germans but also in relation to the other Allies. By mid-August, with the help of Bitter and cultural officer Frederic Mellinger, the Philharmonic had already amassed 100 musicians, and was short by only 10 members. (38)

Apart from shortages of musicians, however, musical scores were also difficult to find. Not only had countless scores been destroyed in the city's fire bombing, but it was nearly impossible to print new music due to a paper shortage that persisted until 1947. (The American Military Government even resorted to reusing certain Nazi Party office supplies for inter-office communication.) (39) Although some of the Philharmonic's music had been moved from Berlin to a basement in Bayreuth, it would take American cultural officers over 1 year to arrange for its return. Significantly, American Military documents make note only of the music's weight (250 pounds), rather than what scores were actually in the cache. According to one music officer, the re-acquisition was especially fortunate for the Philharmonic, as their programs were « increasingly cramped » (40) due to the absence of the scores. Furthermore, many of the Berlin Philharmonic's instruments were gone, having either been stolen from their hiding place in the Plaßenburg, a Renaissance fortress outside Bayreuth, or looted from the Philharmonic's basement and bunker.

Erich Hartmann writes :

« Likewise, the instruments that had survived the fire bombing in the basement of the “ Alte Philharmonie ” fell into the enemies' hands as booty, and were taken East. » (41)

Note that Hartmann makes certain to use « Feinden » or enemies, when referring to the Russians.

Although the Americans may have been victorious militarily, cultural re-education was still an arena in which they were at a decided disadvantage. Especially when compared to the Soviet occupiers, who well understood the value of music, art, and theater in promoting a political agenda, the Americans had difficulty implementing consistent policies in regard to denazification and re-education. While cultural officers were generally specialists in their respective fields, their superiors, like Military Governor Lucius Clay, were career military men who had difficulty grasping that high-culture could provide anything more than mere entertainment. Consequently, the denazification and re-education agendas often pitted cultural officers against their military superiors.

Bitter did not appreciate his inferiors' lax attitudes toward the Philharmonic ; he was fully aware that the Orchestra could choose to move to the British, or worse yet, Russian zone. Infuriated that other military branches could not see the benefits of the ICD's German re-education program, Bitter complained that military personnel would use the « Titania-Palast » for mere variety shows, as he felt these trivial offerings had « a disastrous effect » on the re-orientation program.

He explained :

« It is of the utmost importance, that we get the ear of a high-authority in this matter so that the “ Titania ”, our best U.S. sector theatre, is not used for 2nd rate variety shows. » (42)

Bitter was not the only person annoyed by the variety shows ; when violinist Yehudi Menuhin came to Berlin to perform with the Philharmonic, in 1947, he had to plead with the military police on duty to allow the rehearsal to continue a few minutes past 5 o'clock. In the photographs, Furtwängler, leaning on the podium railing, is silently and uneasily observing the exchange. (43)

But the gravest error made by the American Military, in terms of cultural re-education, was the accidental shooting of the Philharmonic's conductor. Around midnight, on August 23rd, 1945, Leo Borchard was killed immediately when a young American soldier opened fire on the car in which Borchard was traveling after the vehicle's driver had failed to stop at a mandatory check-point. According to eyewitness testimony, Borchard's final words, uttered moments before the accident, were simply :

« Next time, I will play Bach for you. » (44)

As one might imagine, Borchard's death, only 6 weeks after the American arrival, did little to endear the occupiers to German musicians. An untimely 4 days after his death, « Newsweek » ran an article on Borchard that made no mention of his death. Instead of his shooting, the magazine cheerily reported :

« The problem of German music involves not only what to play - but who can be trusted to play it. Leo Borchard, 46 year old conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic is the only man, according to many critics, around whom the Orchestra can hope to rebuild. » (45)

The story continued that Borchard couldn't leave Berlin because the Nazis had prevented his wife from fleeing ; the entire article was a fabrication - doubly so, now that the article's protagonist was dead. It was not until 1955, 10 years after the shooting, that the American military government declared Borchard's death a « Besatzungsschaden » (occupation casualty) , placing the blame on the British. (46)

For the 1st time in its history, the Philharmonic was now without a clear successor for its conductorship. On August 25th, 2 days after Borchard's death, Robert Heger led the Philharmonic in a performance that opened with the Funeral March of Beethoven's « Eroica » Symphony, dedicated to Borchard. (47) Only 3 months earlier, the same movement had been used to mourn Adolf Hitler's death. But American authorities refused to consider Heger, who had been an active Nazi Party member, to be a legitimate replacement for Borchard. (48) Cultural officers wanted desperately to find a new director who was free from the political trappings of Nazi Party membership when an unexpected solution appeared in the form of a 28 year old Romanian musician with dapper good looks and excellent timing.

In May of 1945, Sergiu Celibidache turned-down the chance to flee Berlin as it fell to the Russians. When a group of fellow Romanians offered him a spot in their car heading West, Celibidache declined, reluctant to leave his composition manuscripts behind in Berlin. (49) His fortuitous decision to remain in the city would shape his future career path as a conductor, rather than as a composer. On August 29th, the very day of Borchard's funeral, Celibidache conducted the Philharmonic for the 1st time. While Bitter is usually credited with finding Celibidache to lead the Philharmonic, it was

actually violinist Hermann Bethmann, who had studied with Celibidache at the « Berlin Hochschule für Musik », who recommended « Celi » (as he would quickly be nicknamed) to lead the Orchestra. (50) To the Americans, Celibidache appeared to be the perfect fit for the Philharmonic : he had lived in Berlin since 1936, but had not been a Nazi Party member nor had he served in the « Wehrmacht ». Apart from these qualifications, he was young, energetic, and non-German. By installing a foreigner as principal conductor of the Philharmonic, American authorities hoped to dispel any lingering Nazi claims of German cultural superiority, once and for all. (51)

Ultimately, one might wonder why Philharmonic musicians and management accepted American occupation policies within Germany's cultural sphere. Undoubtedly, the lengthy denazification process that lasted from 1945 until 1947 was one indisputable reason why German musicians acquiesced to American restrictions. Although Nazi Party membership had not been rampant within the Berlin Philharmonic, each musician still needed to obtain American approval to continuing working in or obtain ration cards for the American sector. It is estimated that around 10 of the 110 musicians in the Berlin Philharmonic were members of the Nazi Party. By comparison, 45 of the Vienna Philharmonic's 117 musicians had been Party members. (52) This disparity did not go un-noticed, as Bitter admitted in an April 1947 report :

« In contrast to the Berlin Philharmonic, the Vienna Philharmonic has always gotten away with murder in its prodigal use of Nazi members. » (53)

Party members in the Vienna Philharmonic faced few consequences as Austria had already been declared the « 1st victim » of National-Socialism.

The ICD did fire 6 Berlin Philharmonic musicians for their Nazi Party membership, most notably violinist Joseph Stöhr and violist Lorenz Höber, in December of 1945. Höber had been responsible for many of the Philharmonic's administrative tasks and was particularly reluctant to relinquish his position.

As Music and Theater officer, Edward Hogan wrote in May of 1946 :

« We are told that Höber, the former business manager whom we fired on order of Public Safety, still can't get it through his head that the Americans can get rid of him even though he was hired by the city of Berlin. » (54)

Both Höber and Stöhr were hired by the Russian-controlled « Staatsoper » in the Spring of 1946. (55) Höber, however, remained devastated over his dismissal from the Philharmonic, an ensemble to which he had dedicated half of his life ; he died shortly thereafter, on December 1st, 1947. (56) Several other musicians fired by the Americans for their Party membership found work elsewhere : cellist Wolfram Kleber moved to the British-controlled « Städtisches Oper » Orchestra, and horn player George Hedler joined the « RIAS » Orchestra in 1947. (This is particularly surprising as the « RIAS » Orchestra was founded and funded by the Americans.) (57) Violinist Alfred Graupner and double bassist Arno Burkhardt were also fired by American authorities for their Nazi Party memberships, but were rehired in 1947 when denazification was halted. (58)

The sub-text of the American denazification efforts revolved around one question : When would the Philharmonic's former conductor, Wilhelm Furtwängler, be allowed to return ? Since February of 1945, Furtwängler had been living in self-imposed exile in Clarens, Switzerland. As the conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic since 1922, he led the Orchestra at countless Nazi Party functions throughout the 1930's and 1940's, although he was not a Nazi Party member. Despite Furtwängler's insistence that his music could be separate from Nazi politics, his post-War reputation was severely compromised and, in February of 1946, ICD Chief Robert McClure announced Furtwängler's black-listing to be enforced across all zones and sectors of Germany :

« It is an indisputable fact that through his activities, Furtwängler was prominently identified with Nazi Germany. By allowing himself to become a tool of the Party, he lent an aura of respectability to the circle of men who are now on trial at Nuremberg for crimes against humanity. He not only held office under the Nazis, but also was an advisor to the Propaganda Ministry and lent his name to tours abroad sponsored by Gœbbels. It is inconceivable that he should be allowed to occupy a leading position in Germany, at a time when we are attempting to wipe-out every trace of Nazism. » (59)

The conductor had, indeed, served as Vice-President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » , although he resigned the position in 1934, in support of Paul Hindemith, whose Opera « Mathis der Maler » was deemed unfit by the National-Socialists. (Apart from his « Reichsmusikkammer » Vice-Presidency, he also temporarily gave-up his conductorship of the Berlin Philharmonic and musical directorship of the « Staatsoper » .) (60) But his resistance to the Nazis only lasted so long and, in the spring of 1935, Furtwängler issued a letter of apology to the regime. Although he did not resume his position as Vice-President, he returned to conducting the Philharmonic at the close of April. (61) Still, contrary to McClure's claim that Furtwängler had « lent his name to tours abroad » , it was Hans Knappertsbusch who led most of the Philharmonic's concert tours in occupied countries, (62) although Furtwängler had toured with the Vienna Philharmonic in occupied Hungary and Czechoslovakia. He also conducted in neutral Switzerland at a concert sponsored by the National-Socialists. (63)

Furtwängler's denazification process dragged on for nearly 2 years, as American authorities vacillated between wanting to punish National-Socialism's most decorated conductor and still retaining his services in West-Berlin. Meanwhile, the Soviets openly campaigned for Furtwängler's return, tempting him with offers to conduct at the « Staatsoper » rather than waiting for American clearance to return to the Philharmonic. (64) The Russians were more than willing to overlook Furtwängler's recent past for a chance to have him working in their sector. But Furtwängler remained steadfast ; he only wanted to be re-instated to conduct his beloved Philharmonic. He knew it would be a symbolic victory if he could resume his former post rather than accepting the Soviets' offer. So, he decided to wait.

His denazification trial date was finally arranged for December of 1946.

As Bitter wrote in an October 1946 report :

« Furtwängler will be permitted the use of a lawyer, but for advice only. He must do all the talking himself. » (65)

The conductor's trial took place on December 11th and 17th, 1946, in front of a packed hall and was led by intelligence officer Alex Vogel. Various witnesses were called, including Philharmonic clarinetist Ernst Fischer, who claimed the conductor saved his Jewish wife from deportation. (66) After 4 months of deliberation, on April 29th, 1947, the American Military Government classified Furtwängler as a « Mitläufer » (follower) and placed him in Category IV, which meant he could still hold a leadership position and return to the Philharmonic. (67)

Ultimately, Furtwängler's crime was not that he was a Fascist, but rather that he failed to or did not want to recognize the dangerously politicized role the Philharmonic had taken on during the 3rd « Reich ». Although Furtwängler claimed to have found the Nazis' cultural politics distasteful, they still provided a platform from which he could conduct in front of packed concert-halls. And he was duly compensated for his work under the 3rd « Reich » ; in 1939 alone, he made 200,000 « Reichsmarks ». (68)

Furtwängler was, of course, not the only famous musician to undergo post-War scrutiny ; Herbert von Karajan, Eugen Jochum, Hans Knappertsbusch, Richard Strauß, Heinz Tietjen, and countless others faced denazification proceedings conducted by the Allies. Conductor Herbert von Karajan had joined the Nazi Party in 1933 while living in Salzburg, where he quickly became a rising star. (Just to make sure, he joined the Party again, in 1935, when he relocated to Ulm.) Karajan, like Furtwängler, had been black-listed by the ICD in 1945, but was re-instated in October of 1947. (69) Music officer Henry Alter, stationed in Vienna after his initial months in Berlin, admitted of the denazification of both Karajan and Furtwängler :

« It was an unsolvable problem. Every person who had heard Karajan once make music knew that if one did not allow such a person to make music, one would be punishing oneself and not him. Under these conditions, it was really not possible to handle Karajan in any way fairly or justly. Actually, it was similar with Furtwängler. » (70)

Alter's comments underscore the seemingly contradictory manner in which the ICD handled these denazification proceedings, as both men returned to the stage within 2 years of the War's end. Ultimately, the Americans did not want to lose Karajan or Furtwängler from their zone. The ICD recognized that 2 of the most famous musicians in Germany would make better allies than enemies.

Despite Furtwängler's re-instatement, the Philharmonic's working conditions were still dire. As Bitter wrote in an August 1947 report :

« The Philharmonic is in a bad way. 5 of its best 1st violinists have left the Orchestra. In fact, it is about 20 players shy of full-strength. The morale is low and because of low-wage scale, the coming winter, the political situation, etc. , the prospects for the future are poor. However, the plans for the next season are ambitious and energetic steps are being taken to right the situation. » (71)

But the situation in 1948 would prove to be even more difficult, as the Americans barred the Philharmonic from concertizing in the Soviet sector. Residing in the American sector not only required that the Orchestra would be at the disposal of American and British authorities ; it also meant that as the Cold War became increasingly hot, the

ensemble could not openly support the Soviet's « Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands » (Socialist Unity Party of Germany) . (72)

In a later interview, Bitter recalled his impetus to work in post-War Germany :

« I said to myself, now the War is over ; now, I would like to help rebuild the good Germany ; that of Beethoven, Schiller, Gœthe, and Brahms. One cannot always continue to conduct War. » (73)

So, instead, he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic some 30 times during his tenure (1945-1948) . Bitter's statement was somewhat disingenuous : rather than simply working with the ensemble, he was also interested in using his military connections to further his musical career by gaining valuable experience for his return to civilian life. For his 1st performance for American troops, on December 10th, 1945, he opened with John Phillip Sousa's « The Stars and Stripes Forever » in a program that also included the German premiere of Samuel Barber's « Adagio for Strings » . (74)

Note that a waltz from Richard Strauß's « Der Rosenkavalier » is penciled in at the bottom of the program, serving as the encore. Strauß, of course, was one of the very composers the ICD had planned to downplay in post-War Germany. (76)

Ultimately, the Philharmonic's music in German post-War society was re-politicized, with the primary difference being the regime for whom they performed. Near the end of his memoir about the Berlin Philharmonic, in the early post-War years, double-bassist Erich Hartmann contends that the ensemble « belonged to the privileged in the Nazi era, though it was never a Nazi Orchestra. » (77) Hartmann's observations raise far more questions than they answer, highlighting the contradictory and uncomfortable cultural politics of the post-War period. Although American authorities viewed the Philharmonic's survival a success for American re-education efforts, the Orchestra's own role during National-Socialism went un-mentioned. After all, the ensemble was already in the service of another patron.

Notes

(1) The quotation is taken from Erich Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker in der Stunde Null : Erinnerungen an die Zeit des Untergangs der alten Philharmonie vor 50 Jahren » , Werner Feja, Berlin (1996) ; pages 49-50.

(2) For more on the destruction wrought by Allied bombing, see : Paul Steege, *Black Market, Cold War : Everyday Life in Berlin, 1946-1949*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2007) , page 20 ; Tony Judt, *Postwar : A History of Europe since 1945*, Penguin Books, New York (2005) , pages 13-40 ; Eric Rentschler, « The Place of Rubble in the Trümmerfilm » , in : *The Ruins of Modernity*, edited by Julia Hell and Andreas Schönle, Duke University Press, Durham (2010) , pages 418-438, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822390749-024> ; Brewster Chamberlain, « Kultur auf Trümmern : Berliner Berichte der amerikanischen Information Control Section, Juli-Dezember 1945 » , Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Stuttgart (1979) , pages 1-20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1524/9783486703412.fm> ; and Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *In a Cold Crater : Cultural and Intellectual Life in Berlin 1945-1948*, translated by Kelly Barry, University of California Press,

Berkeley (1998) , pages 20-48.

(3) Benno Frank, « Theater and Music as a Principle Part of Re-orientation in Germany » , September 16, 1947, RG 260, Box 241, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division (E&CR) : Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(4) Early military government documents outlining cultural re-education plans made no secret of the fact that American authorities hoped to wage a kind of cultural warfare by promoting American cultural achievements. Music and theater officer John Bitter admitted, « The re-orientation of German cultural life is an important part of the War Department's policy towards present-day Germany. No factor can be healthier or more stabilizing than a vital re-adjustment of the theatre and music world enabling new plays and music, particularly American, to be presented freely and according to the finest tradition. » , in : « Travel Orders for Prominent Artists » , April 8, 1947, RG 260, Box 238, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division : Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(5) I am grateful to Berlin Philharmonic archivists Franziska Gulde-Druet and Claudia Mohr for sharing this unpublished list of concerts.

(6) Gerhard Forck, editor, « Variationen mit Orchester : 125 Jahre Berliner Philharmoniker » , Henschel, Berlin (2007) ; 2:20, page 43.

(7) In 1931, the city even merged the Berlin Symphony Orchestra with the Philharmonic in order to re-allocate additional funds. Unfortunately, the additional funds were not enough to sustain the Philharmonic. Pamela Potter, « The Nazi ' Seizure ' of the Berlin Philharmonic » , in : National-Socialist Cultural Policy, edited by Glenn Cuomo, Saint-Martin's Press, New York (2005) ; pages 42-47.

(8) Ibid. , pages 50-51.

(9) Although Richard Strauß's relationship to the Nazi Regime has long been maligned, he was also greatly concerned with protecting his Jewish daughter-in-law and his 2 grandsons. Josef Goebbels eventually fired him in 1935 when the « Gestapo » intercepted Strauß's letter to his librettist Stephan Zweig, in which Strauß wrote he was merely « play-acting » as « Reichsmusikkammer » president. For more, see : Michæl H. Kater, *The Twisted Muse : Musicians and Their Music in the 3rd « Reich »* , Oxford University Press, New York (1997) ; pages 18-21, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195096200.001.0001> ; Erik Levi, *Music in the 3rd « Reich »* , Saint-Martin's Press, Basingstoke (1994) , pages 30-31 ; and Pamela Potter, « Strauß and the National-Socialists : The Debate and Its Relevance » , in : *Richard Strauß : New Perspectives on the Composer and His Work*, edited by Bryan Gilliam, Duke University Press, Durham (1992) , pages 93-113.

(10) See : Potter, « Nazi ' Seizure ' » , page 58 ; and Misha Aster, « Das Reichsorchester : Die Berliner Philharmoniker und der Nationalsozialismus » , Siedler, Munich (2007) , pages 181-234. Aster writes that, at the August 1936 «

Parteitage » in Nuremberg, in 1 day alone, the Philharmonic managed to play for a larger audience than had comprised their entire previous season.

(11) Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker » ; pages 16-24.

(12) Wolf Lepenies, « Eine (fast) alltägliche deutsche Geschichte » , foreword to « Das Reichsorchester : Die Berliner Philharmoniker und der Nationalsozialismus » , by Misha Aster, Siedler, Munich (2007) ; page 19. Philharmonic members earned 10 % more than any other musicians in Germany. See, also : Potter, « Nazi ‘ Seizure ’ » ; page 58.

(13) Approximately 10 Philharmonic musicians were casualties of the War, killed either by bombing raids or during voluntary military service. Aster, « Das Reichsorchester » ; page 327.

(14) Although the musicians were not openly dismissed, the Propaganda Ministry placed increasing pressure on the Philharmonic management and Furtwängler to « aryanize » the Orchestra. In a 1985 interview, Elizabeth Furtwängler, the conductor's 2nd wife, vehemently denied that it was the Orchestra's decision to force-out its Jewish members. Ultimately, none of the Jewish musicians who had left the Berlin Philharmonic would resume their positions in the post-War period, although Joseph Schuster did return as a guest-artist for Antonín Dvořák's Cello Concerto, in 1963. For more information, see : Aster, « Das Reichsorchester » , pages 95, 99-104 ; Klaus Lang, « Celibidache und Furtwängler : Der große philharmonische Konflikt in der Berliner Nachkriegszeit » , Wissner, Augsburg (2010) , page 53 ; Enrique Sánchez Lansch, « Das Reichsorchester » , DVD, Arthaus Musik, Leipzig (2008) ; and Boris Schwarz, « Szymon Goldberg » , in : Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com> .

(15) Potter, « Nazi ‘ Seizure ’ » ; page 53.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Berta Gießmar, 2 Worlds of Music, Da Capo Press, New York (1975) ; and Gießmar, « The Baton and the Jackboot » , H. Hamilton, London (1946) .

(18) Steege, Black Market, Cold War ; page 20.

(19) Forck, « Variationen mit Orchester » ; 2:166.

(20) « In an air-raid, all listeners must adjourn to the coat-rooms and breezeways located on the ground-floor. » Concert Program from June 27, 1943, B 30 1942-1943, Courtesy of the Berlin Philharmonic Archive.

(21) Prior to the hall's destruction, the ensemble concertized in a converted roller-skating rink located at No. 21 « Bernburger-Straße » , not far from the Philharmonic's home today, at Potsdamer Platz. Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker » ; pages 16-17.

(22) German concert life continued even as Opera Houses in Berlin, Munich, Dresden, Leipzig, Frankfurt, and Hamburg were destroyed ; the frequency of performances began to slow only with Josef Gœbbels' August 1944 declaration of « Total War » . See : Kater, *Twisted Muse*, pages 1-42, 200 ; Levi, *Music in the 3rd « Reich »* , pages 130-182 ; and Alan Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics : The « Reich » Chambers of Music, Theater and the Visual Arts*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (1993) ; pages 32-69.

(23) Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker » , pages 27-28, and Aster, « Das Reichsorchester » , page 326. There are some discrepancies concerning when the last concert before the « Zusammenbruch » (Collapse) took place ; a 1956 pamphlet produced by the Philharmonic, « Das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg » gives April 8, 1945 as the date of the final concert. The Philharmonic Online Archive does not list the concert at all, and shows only a concert on March 19 as the final performance (<http://www.berliner-philharmoniker.de/konzerte/kalender/von/1944-08/>) . Potter (« Nazi ' Seizure ' » , page 58) lists the final performance, « a concert for Mister Speer » , as occurring on April 11.

(24) David Monod, *Settling Scores : German Music, Denazification, and the Americans 1945-1954*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill (2005) ; page 128.

(25) The soloists that evening were violinist Siegfried Borries and cellist Tibor de Machula.

(26) Thomas Eickhoff, « Politischen Dimensionen einer Komponisten-Biographie im 20.Jahrhundert-Gottfried von Einem » , Steiner, Stuttgart (1998) ; page 76. See, also : Matthias Sträßner, « Der Dirigent Leo Borchard : Eine unvollendete Karriere » , Transit Buchverlag, Berlin (1999) ; page 213. Although the Philharmonic would become an American-licensed ensemble, the Soviets had control of the entire city until early July.

(27) For an eyewitness account of the 1st post-War concert, see : Peter Muck, « Einhundert Jahre Berliner Philharmonisches Orchester, Zweiter Band : 1922-1982 » , Hans Schneider, Tutzing (1982) ; page 190.

(28) Solly Zuckermann, *From Apes to Warlords : The Autobiography (1904-1946) of Solly Zuckerman*, Hamish Hamilton, London (1978) ; page 192.

(29) Berlin was divided according to the agreement made at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, and once the other Allies arrived, the Soviets receded to their own sector of the city.

(30) It was standard practice for the Americans to seize theaters throughout occupied Germany ; according to Circular 120, Headquarters, U.S. Forces, European Theater, « In localities where only one such facility exists in useful condition, a sharing of time between troops and civilians will be arranged. » Quoted in : J.H. Hills, « Use of Deutsches Theater, Wiesbaden » , January 4, 1946, RG 260, Box 134, Records of the Information Control Division : Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-1949, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(31) « Application for Employment, John Bitter » , June 25, 1949, RG 260, Box 18, Records of the Education and

Cultural Relations Division, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(32) Monod, Settling Scores ; pages 13, 38. In the 1930's, Bitter conducted the Jacksonville Orchestra, the Florida Federal Orchestra, and the Miami Symphony Orchestra.

(33) For more on this misconception, see : Pamela Potter, « What is ' Nazi Music ' ? » , The Musical Quarterly, Volume 88, No. 3 (2005) ; pages 428-455, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/musqtl/gdi019>.

(34) John Bitter, « Theater and Music Weekly Report » , RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch, Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(35) The matter of where the Philharmonic would reside was not decided until 1946 ; the British also hoped to woo the Orchestra into making Charlottenburg's « Theater des Westens » their home. Sträßner, « Der Dirigent Leo Borchard » ; page 230.

(36) « Discontinuance of Information Control Registration of Actors, Performers, Musicians, and Certain Other Persons » , May 27, 1947, RG 260, Box 238, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division : Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(37) Jan-Holger Hanke, « Doch Nikolai schaut weg. » Interview with John Bitter, « Junge Welt » , December 17, 1990.

(38) Sträßner, « Der Dirigent Leo Borchard » ; page 230.

(39) Toby Thacker, « Playing Beethoven like an Indian » , in : The Post-War Challenge : Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945-1958, edited by Dominick Geppert, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003) , pages 369-371 ; and Alex Ross, The Rest is Noise : Listening to the 20th Century, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, New York (2007) , page 349.

(40) « Weekly Reports » , Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch. Records Relating to Music and Theater. RG 260, Box 239, and « Music Material of the Berlin Philharmonic » , April 10, 1946, Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division. Bavaria : The Music Section, 1945-1949. RG 260, Box 19. In his May 23, 1946, report, Berlin music officer Edward Hogan remarks of the Philharmonic's busy schedule, not without a touch of sarcasm : « It was a particularly strenuous week-end for the band. »

(41) « Ebenso fielen die Instrumente, die in den Kellern der alten Philharmonie das Bombenfeuer überstanden hatten, den Feinden als Beute in die Hände und wurden nach Osten mitgenommen. » Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker » ; page 34.

(42) John Bitter, « 16-30 November 1947 » , National Archives Records : Shipment 4, Box 8-1, Folder 2, May 1946 to November 1948, B Rep. 036 Nummer 4/8-1/2, Landesarchiv, Berlin.

(43) « Tumult um Karten » , « Der Spiegel » , October 4, 1947.

(44) Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, « Der Schattenmann : Tagebuchaufzeichnungen von Ruth Andreas-Friedrich » , Suhrkamp, Berlin (2000) ; page 291.

(45) « Leo Borchard » , Newsweek, August 27, 1945.

(46) Lang, « Celibidache und Furtwängler » ; page 19.

(47) Sträßner, « Der Dirigent Leo Borchard » ; page 235.

(48) According to initial American denazification policies, Berlin's orchestral conductors, soloists, and managers were not considered « ordinary labour » , and were, therefore, held to a higher-denazification standard. In practice, however, the Americans would soon realize that it was precisely the leaders of these organizations who were the most compromised. Eric Clarke, « Military Government Regulation 23.331-Section 2-d, Ordinary Labour » , May 21, 1946, RG 260, Box 237, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division : Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II. See, also : Toby Thacker, Music after Hitler, 1945-1955, Ashgate Publishing, Hampshire (2007) ; pages 51-63.

(49) Quoted in Lang, « Celibidache und Furtwängler » ; page 26.

(50) See : Monod, Settling Scores, page 38 ; and Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker » , pages 42-45.

(51) One of the primary goals of the re-orientation program in Germany was to broaden the range of musical activity, and « to increase respect for cultural attainments of other nations » , in : « Directive on United States Objectives and Basic Policy in Germany » , July 15, 1947, RG 260, Box 133, Records of the Information Control Division, Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(52) Fritz Trümpi, « Politisierte Orchester : Die Wiener Philharmoniker und das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester im Nationalsozialismus » , Böhlau Verlag, Vienna (2011) , page 113 ; Judt, Post-War, page 52 ; and Lepenies, « Eine (fast) alltägliche deutsche Geschichte » , page 18.

(53) John Bitter, « Weekly Theater and Music Report, 30 April 1947 » , RG 260, Box 241, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division : Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(54) Edward Hogan, « Weekly Report » , May 23, 1946, RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch, Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(55) Walter Hinrichsen, « Members of the Philharmonic Orchestra Berlin being discharged in Accordance with

Denazification Policy in the U.S. Zone » , June 25, 1946, RG 260, Box 237, Records of the Education and Cultural Affairs Division : Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(56) Forck, « Variationen mit Orchester » , 2:54. The Americans then appointed Paul Schrör and Ernst Fuhr as the new managers (« Geschäftsführung ») of the Philharmonic. The following year, the Philharmonic decided to replace Schrör with Richard Wolff, as Wolff was a senior Orchestra member. John Bitter, « Theater and Music Weekly Report » , November 20, 1946, RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch, Records Relating to Music and Theater, National Archives and Records Administration II. See, also : Lang, « Celibidache und Furtwängler » , page 77 ; and Muck, « Einhundert Jahre » , page 205.

(57) Ibid. , pages 48, 67-108.

(58) Forck, « Variationen mit Orchester » ; 2:20, page 43.

(59) Robert McClure, « For Release February 21, 1946 » , RG 260, Box 43, Records of the Information Control Division : Records of Division Headquarters, 1945-1949, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(60) Susanne Stähr, « Die Ära Furtwängler, das Dritte Reich und der Krieg » , in : Forck, « Variationen mit Orchester » , 1:156. Stähr claims Hitler forbade Furtwängler to travel outside of Germany (« Ausreiseverbot ») shortly before Christmas in 1934.

(61) Karen Painter, *Symphonic Aspirations : German Music and Politics, 1900-1945*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (2007) , pages 209-220 ; Levi, *Music in the 3rd « Reich »* , pages 112-113 ; Stähr, « Die Ära Furtwängler » , 1:159.

(62) Stähr, « Die Ära Furtwängler » , 1:160.

(63) Kater, *Twisted Muse* ; page 201.

(64) Elizabeth Janik, *Recomposing German Music : Political and Musical Tradition in Cold War Berlin*, Brill, Leiden (2005) ; pages 134-139.

(65) John Bitter, « Theater and Munich Report » , October 24, 1946, RG 260, Box 239, Records of the Education and Cultural Resources Branch, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(66) Aster, « Das Reichsorchester » ; page 106.

(67) Stähr, « Die Ära Furtwängler » ; 1:195-196.

(68) Kater, *Twisted Muse* ; pages 8-11.

(69) Ibid. , 209.

(70) Interview with Henry Alter conducted by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel, May 11, 1981. B Rep. 037, Nummer 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin.

(71) John Bitter, « August 15-31, 1947 Report » , National Archives Records : Shipment 4, Box 8-1, Folder 2, May 1946 to November 1948, B Rep. 036, Nummer 4/8-1/2, Landesarchiv, Berlin.

(72) Ibid.

(73) John Bitter, interview by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel, November 6, 1981, B Rep. 037, Nummer 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin.

(74) Henry Alter, interview by Brewster Chamberlain and Jürgen Wetzel, May 11, 1981, B Rep. 037, Nummer 79-82, Landesarchiv, Berlin. I am grateful to Professor Steven Whiting for pointing-out the elegiac connotations of Samuel Barber's « Adagio » in relation to Arturo Toscanini's radio broadcast marking Franklin Delano Roosevelt's death. Whether Bitter had this performance in mind when he selected the « Adagio » is unknown.

(75) P 1945 XII 10, Berlin Philharmonic Archive. The Tchaikovsky and Sibelius selections were broadcast by Soviet-controlled Berlin Radio, as indicated by the marginal annotations « Funk » (Radio) .

(76) In the earliest American music control document from June of 1945, the Information Control Division admitted, « We cannot ban performances containing works by Richard Strauß or Hans Pfitzner. We should, however, not allow such composers to be “ built-up ” by special concerts devoted entirely to their works or conducted by them. » In « Draft Guidance on the Control of Music » , June 8, 1945, RG 260, Box 134, Records of the Information Control Division : Central Decimal File of the Executive Office, 1944-1949, National Archives and Records Administration II.

(77) Hartmann, « Die Berliner Philharmoniker » ; pages 49-50.

Le Philharmonique de Vienne sous le « Reich »

À la suite de la demande par l'historien Harald Walser, député autrichien du parti des Verts, de l'examen, par une commission indépendante, de l'histoire de l'Orchestre entre 1938 (« Anschluß ») et 1945 (effondrement du 3e « Reich ») , l'Orchestre, après un 1er refus, ouvre finalement ses archives en janvier 2013 à 3 historiens.

À l'origine de cette décision se trouve la révélation par Harald Walser et Oliver Rathkolb de l'attribution à Arthur Seyß-Inquart, en 1942, et Baldur von Schirach, en 1966, de l' « Anneau d'honneur » , la plus haute distinction décernée par l'Orchestre. Harald Walser considère en outre que le « Concert du Nouvel An » de 1939 était non un « hommage sublime à l'Autriche » , ainsi que le présente le site internet de l'Orchestre, mais l'une des « facettes de la

politique culturelle Nazie » et regrette que la mémoire des musiciens de l'Orchestre d'origine juive « déportés et assassinés par les Nazis » ne soit pas honorée.

Selon Clemens Hellsberg, 1er violon et président du Conseil d'administration des « Wiener Philharmoniker », la remise de l'anneau au « Gauleiter » de Vienne von Schirach est une initiative individuelle et il n'en existe « aucune trace dans les archives » dont il rappelle qu'elles sont totalement et librement accessibles aux historiens. Il précise que l'ouvrage de l'historien Fritz Trümpi, publié en 2011, témoigne de la transparence à ce sujet.

Oliver Rathkolb, professeur à l'Université de Vienne, à l'origine de la découverte récente d'informations relatives à la proximité d'Herbert von Karajan avec le régime Nazi, est responsable de l'étude. Il est associé à Fritz Trümpi (orchestres politisés : l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Vienne et l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin sous le National-Socialisme) et Bernadette Mayrhofer, historienne dont la recherche porte sur l'exclusion et la déportation des musiciens juifs.

Les 3 historiens sont chargés de rendre un rapport sur « la politisation de l'Orchestre sous le Nazisme », « les biographies des musiciens exclus, persécutés et, éventuellement, assassinés pour des raisons racistes et politiques » et « les archives disponibles sur la Nazification et la dénazification » .

L'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne, au « Musikverein », constituait bien entendu un autre haut lieu de la culture viennoise sinon autrichienne. Là aussi, l'anti-sémitisme se développait rapidement. En 1938, avec l'« Anschluss », l'aryanisation de l'orchestre est totale : 12 musiciens sont exclus pour des raisons « raciales » ou « politiques ». Dès le 22 avril 1938, le Philharmonique de Vienne joue à Berlin devant les plus hauts dignitaires Nazis. Partant avec un taux exceptionnel, par rapport à d'autres formations, de 36 % de membres du NSDAP au moment de l'« Anschluss », l'Orchestre parvient à 42 % en 1945 (contre 7 % pour le Philharmonique de Berlin). Wilhelm Jerger (1902-1978) est nommé dès 1938 à la tête du Wiener Philharmoniker. L'homme était membre du NSDAP depuis 1932, de la SS depuis 1938. En 1942, il publie « Erbe und Sendung » (Héritage et mission - divine, Wien : Wiener Verlag Ernst Sopper & Karl Bauer), ouvrage dans lequel il donne libre cours à un anti-sémitisme virulent, accablant notamment Gustav Mahler. Dans la description de l'école des violonistes du Philharmonique, Jerger place des étoiles sur quelques noms et explique en note (page 108), « Pour les noms avec des geboren il s'agit de violonistes non-aryens. » (« Bei den mit geboren versehenen Namen handelt es sich um Nichtarier »). Après guerre, il poursuit sa formation en Suisse (à Lucerne en 1948 puis à Fribourg où il soutient une thèse, en 1952). En 1958, il rentre en Autriche pour prendre la direction de l'Université privée Anton Bruckner de Linz, alors appelée « Bruckner-Konservatorium » (et ce, jusqu'à sa retraite, en 1973). Sur le site de l'Orchestre, on ne trouve aujourd'hui aucune trace des musiciens assassinés, qu'il s'agisse du hautboïste Armin Tyroler ou des 4 violonistes Moritz Glattauer, mort à Theresienstadt ; Viktor Robitsek, mort dans le ghetto de Łódź ; ou Max Starkmann, déporté à Minsk puis exécuté. Si le 1er violon Julius Stwertka est mentionné, ce n'est pas pour rappeler qu'il est mort lui aussi à Theresienstadt. En 1947, lors de répétitions de l'Orchestre à Londres, l'un des anciens membres du philharmonique, Friedrich Buxbaum, lui-même persécuté et exilé, pouvait dire à ses collègues non sans une pointe d'ironie mordante : « Je vous ai entendu vous accorder, cela sonnait très bien, complètement sans juiverie (« judenrein ») ». Enfin, mauvaise nouvelle pour les historiens intéressés, les archives du « Staatsorchester » ne sont pas encore ouvertes et restent déposées aux archives nationales.

Concernant la famille Strauß qui est à l'honneur depuis 1939 pour ces concerts, il apparaît que les origines juives du fils Johann (1825-1899) ont été complètement occultées. Le maire anti-sémite de Vienne, Karl Lueger (1844-1910), connu pour l'influence qu'il a exercée sur Hitler pendant sa période viennoise (1907-1913), avait su s'accommoder de cette ascendance et déclarait : « C'est moi qui décide qui est juif ou pas. ». Pendant la guerre, Josef Goebbels a été jusqu'à envoyer des hommes de main pour subtiliser les registres de baptêmes de la cathédrale Saint-Étienne et les remplacer par des faux, faisant disparaître le fait que l'arrière grand-père de Strauß était un Juif converti au catholicisme.

Adèle Strauß, la 3e femme de Strauß, était juive. Sa fille, Alice Strauß-Meyszner, vécut à Vienne jusqu'en 1939, régulièrement traînée dans la boue par la presse antisémite (elle meurt en Suisse en avril 1945). Légataires de Strauß, son beau-frère et sa nièce ne purent récupérer que quelques biens en 1952 et c'est en 1998 que des procédures de restitution débutèrent (parallèlement à « l'affaire Schiele »).

La célèbre statue dorée de Johann Strauß, au Stadtpark, mériterait sans doute une petite pancarte sur l'héritage de Strauß. Après tout, l'un des biographes de Strauß, Robert Dachs, a pu retrouver des lettres dans lesquelles Strauß se disait avant tout Juif (« Dans mon cœur, je suis plus juif que protestant. »). De la même façon, l'histoire du Wiener Philharmoniker mériterait elle aussi quelques précisions, au sujet de ce concert du Nouvel an, encore bien silencieux sur son passé.

Wilhelm Jerger

Le compositeur autrichien, chef d'orchestre et historien de la musique Wilhelm Jerger est né le 27 septembre 1902 à Vienne et est mort le 24 avril 1978 à Linz. En 1916, il étudie la contrebasse à l'Académie de musique et d'art dramatique avec Edward Madensky. Il étudie aussi la théorie musicale avec Eusèbe Mandyczewski et la direction d'orchestre avec Franz Schalk. En 1922, il termine ses études par l'examen du baccalauréat. La même année, il est engagé comme contrebassiste à l'Orchestre de l'Opéra d'État de Vienne. Dans les années 1922-1923 et 1925-1927, Jerger étudie la musicologie à l'Université de Vienne auprès de Guido Adler. Outre son travail à l'Orchestre de l'Opéra, Jerger enseigne, à partir de 1936, au Conservatoire de Vienne et, en 1938, à l'Académie Impériale de Musique de Vienne.

Jerger était, depuis le 1er mai 1932, un membre du Parti Nazi (n° de membre : 1207001) et, depuis 1938, un membre des SS. En 1938, Jerger est également le responsable culturel pour l'Autriche du NSDAP à Vienne, aux côtés d'Hermann Stuppäck qui agit comme secrétaire. Il devient chef par intérim de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne. Le 22 décembre 1939, il est nommé par Josef Goebbels, en accord avec le « Gauleiter » Baldur von Schirach, au conseil d'administration de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne. Le 20 avril 1938, il est nommé (par Adolf Hitler) musicien de chambre. En 1939, il devient « conseiller de la Ville de Vienne » et, en 1942, il est nommé professeur.

Après la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, Wilhelm Jerger doit passer par la dénazification. Il est démis de ses fonctions et se rend à Salzbourg. En 1948, il s'installe à Lucerne (Suisse) et fréquente l'Université de Fribourg où il

entreprind des études. En 1952, il obtient un Doctorat en philosophie. En 1958, il retourne en Autriche et reprend le 15 août de la même année, la direction du Conservatoire Bruckner qu'il va occuper jusqu'en 1973.

...

Quoi de plus emblématique pour Vienne que la grande roue du parc du « Prater », les « Mozartkugeln », l'école espagnole d'équitation et le Concert du Nouvel An donné par l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne ? Voilà sans doute 4 caractéristiques majeures de la capitale autrichienne, du moins d'un point de vue purement touristique. Ce Concert du Nouvel An (« Neujahrskonzert »), généralement consacré à l'œuvre de la famille Strauß, est devenu l'événement le plus diffusé au monde dans le domaine de la musique Classique, retransmis dans plus de 70 pays.

Dans la présentation des origines de ce concert, on trouve souvent mention du fait que le 1er concert eut lieu le 31 décembre 1939, sans pour autant que les auteurs s'attardent sur le contexte de la période.

Extrait de journal, paru la veille du 1er concert, permet de se replonger dans l'atmosphère de l'époque (« Das Kleine Blatt », 30.12.1939). Le titre : « Les faux documents du spectateur juif ».

« Le Juif Friedrich Israel Wenger se rendait le 23 octobre à une pièce qui se jouait à la " Rolandbühne ". Il savait bien que les représentations théâtrales étaient interdites aux Juifs, mais il est entré la tête haute et la démarche assurée dans les allées du théâtre. Il déclara être aryen et pour " preuve " présenta un certificat de naissance et un acte de baptême. Le policier ne tomba pas dans le panneau. L'accusé fut reconnu coupable et condamné pour fraude à 2 mois de cachot. »

Au sujet du « Neujahrskonzert », 2 points au moins méritent d'être soulignés : d'une part, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne faisait l'objet, dès les années 1920, d'une politique explicitement antisémite et, d'autre part, les origines juives d'une partie de la famille Strauß ont été cachées suite à des décisions prises au plus haut niveau de l'appareil nazi.

Pendant l'hiver 2009-2010, dans une exposition intitulée « Un combat pour la ville » portant sur la culture viennoise de l'entre-2-guerres, on pouvait voir une affiche. Elle était placardée, il y a exactement 83 ans, début janvier 1928 (!). Les Nazis s'en prenaient à l'Opéra de Ernst Křenek, « Jonny spielt auf », programmé au « Staatsoper ». Ce symbole de la « fierté de tous les Viennois » était, selon eux, « victime d'une profanation négro-juive »

(« Unsere Staatsoper, die erste Kunst- und Bildungsstätte der Welt, der Stolz aller Wiener, ist einer frechen jüdisch-negerischen Besudelung zum Opfer gefallen. Das Schundwerk eines tschechischen Halbjuden, " Jonny spielt auf ", in welchem Volk und Heimat, Sitte, Moral und Kultur brutal zertreten werden soll, wurde der Staatsoper aufgezwungen. »)

L'Orchestre philharmonique, au « Musikverein », constituait bien entendu un autre haut-lieu de la culture viennoise, sinon autrichienne. Là aussi, l'antisémitisme se développait rapidement. En 1938, avec l'« Anschluß », l'aryanisation de l'Orchestre est totale : 12 musiciens sont exclus pour des raisons « raciales » ou « politiques ». Dès le 22 avril 1938, le Philharmonique de Vienne joue à Berlin devant les plus hauts dignitaires nazis. Partant avec un taux exceptionnel,

par rapport à d'autres formations, de 36 % de membres du NSDAP au moment de l'« Anschluß », l'Orchestre parvient à 42 %, en 1945, (contre 7 % pour le Philharmonique de Berlin). Wilhelm Jerger (1902-1978) est nommé, dès 1938, à la tête du « Wiener Philharmoniker ». L'homme était membre du NSDAP, depuis 1932 ; de la SS, depuis 1938. En 1942, il publie « Erbe und Sendung » (Héritage et mission - divine), « Wien : Wiener Verlag Ernst Sopper & Karl Bauer », ouvrage dans lequel il donne libre cours à un antisémitisme virulent, accablant notamment Gustav Mahler. Dans la description de l'école des violonistes du Philharmonique, Jerger place des étoiles sur quelques noms et explique en note (page 108), « Pour les noms avec des *, il s'agit de violonistes non-aryens » (« Bei den mit * versehenen Namen handelt es sich um Nichtarier »). Après la guerre, il poursuit sa formation en Suisse (à Lucerne, en 1948, puis à Fribourg où il soutient une thèse en 1952). En 1958, Jerger rentre en Autriche pour prendre la direction de l'Université privée Anton Bruckner de Linz, alors appelée « Bruckner-Konservatorium » (et ce, jusqu'à sa retraite en 1973). Sur le site de l'Orchestre, on ne trouve aujourd'hui aucune trace des musiciens assassinés, qu'il s'agisse du hautboïste Armin Tyroler ou des 3 violonistes : Moritz Glattauer, mort à Theresienstadt ; Viktor Robitsek, mort dans le ghetto de Łódź ; ou Max Starkmann, déporté à Minsk puis exécuté. Si le 1er violon Julius Stwertka est mentionné, ce n'est pas pour rappeler qu'il est mort, lui aussi à Theresienstadt. En 1947, lors de répétitions de l'Orchestre à Londres, l'un des anciens membres du Philharmonique, Friedrich Buxbaum, lui-même persécuté et exilé, pouvait dire à ses collègues, non sans une pointe d'ironie mordante :

« Je vous ai entendu vous accorder, cela sonnait très bien, complètement sans juiverie (" judenrein ") . »

Enfin, mauvaise nouvelle pour les historiens intéressés, les archives du « Staatsorchester » ne sont pas encore ouvertes et restent déposées aux archives nationales.

Concernant la famille Strauß, qui est à l'honneur depuis 1939 pour ces concerts, il apparaît que les origines juives du fils Johann (1825-1899) ont été complètement occultées. Le maire antisémite de Vienne, Karl Lueger (1844-1910), connu pour l'influence qu'il a exercée sur Adolf Hitler pendant sa période viennoise (1907-1913), avait su s'accommoder de cette ascendance et déclarait : « C'est moi qui décide qui est juif ou pas. ». Pendant la guerre, Josef Göbbels a été jusqu'à envoyer des hommes de main pour subtiliser les registres de baptêmes de la cathédrale Saint-Étienne et les remplacer par des faux, faisant disparaître le fait que l'arrière-grand-père de Strauß était un Juif converti au catholicisme.

Adèle Strauß, la 3e femme de Strauß, était juive. Sa fille, Alice Strauß-Meyszner, vécut à Vienne jusqu'en 1939, régulièrement traînée dans la boue par la presse antisémite (elle meurt en Suisse, en avril 1945). Légataires de Strauß, son beau-frère et sa nièce ne purent récupérer que quelques biens, en 1952, et c'est en 1998 que des procédures de restitution débutèrent.

La célèbre statue dorée de Johann Strauß, au « Stadtpark », mériterait sans doute une petite pancarte sur l'héritage de Strauß. Après tout, l'un des biographes de Strauß, Robert Dachs, a pu retrouver des lettres dans lesquelles Strauß se disait avant tout Juif (« Dans mon cœur, je suis plus juif que protestant. »). De la même façon, l'histoire du « Wiener Philharmoniker » mériterait, elle aussi, quelques précisions, au sujet de ce Concert du Nouvel An ... encore bien silencieux sur son passé.

...

The arrest in Vienna of discredited British historian David Irving for lying about the Holocaust got us to thinking : Is good news finally breaking out somewhere ? Austrian authorities are holding him without bail, pending trial, for breaking a 1947 law that criminalizes Holocaust denial. His lawyer now says he's changed his views - that gas chambers were, in fact, used in Auschwitz, contrary to a 1989 speech he gave in Austria 16 years ago, and that the Holocaust did indeed happen.

This also got us to thinking about our recent item on the hidebound circle jerks of the Vienna Philharmonic, whose long-buried historical relationship with the Holocaust still has contemporary echoes. For instance, at Anton Bruckner Private University (formerly the « Bruckner-Konservatorium ») in Linz (Adolf Hitler's home-town) , not far from Vienna, the big concert-hall is named for Wilhelm Jerger, who was director of the Conservatory, until 1973.

(Photo) Jerger, on the right (a contrabassist in the Vienna Philharmonic, and a Lieutenant in the « Schutzstaffel » , or SS) became the chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1938, when a program was set in motion to « Aryanize » Austrian culture after Austria was made part of Germany through the « Anschluß » . Musicologist William Osborne tells us :

During Jerger's leadership, 6 Jewish members of the Vienna Philharmonic died in the concentration camps. 11 were able to save their lives by timely migration. 9 additional members were found to be of « mixed race » or « contaminated by kinship » (« Versippte ») and reduced to secondary status within the Orchestra. 26 « non-Aryans » were thus either murdered, exiled or reduced in status while SS Lieutenant Jerger led the Orchestra.

See : Doktor Clemens Hellsberg. « Demokratie der Koenige : Die Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker, Zürich : Schweizer Verlagshaus, Wien : Kremayr & Scheriau, Mainz : Musikverlag Schott » (1992) , page 505.

Hellsberg, who has a Ph.D. in musicology, is the current chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic. His book contains numerous discussions of Jerger's activities.

In 1942, Wilhelm Jerger wrote a book celebrating the Vienna Philharmonic's centennial which illustrates his devotion to Nazi ideologies : « Erbe und Sendung, Wien : Wiener Verlag Ernst Sopper & Karl Bauer » (1942) . Jerger's book illustrates his devotion to Nazi ideologies. He includes the genealogies of several prominent father-to-son generations that formed a historical continuum within the ranks of the Philharmonic. Jerger places an asterisk by the name of every « non-Aryan » listed in the tables. Jerger explains that the Aryan stock of these Philharmonic families was so « tough » that the purity of their « blood » was never notably damaged by what racists refer to as « dysgenic influences » :

« And here, it is demonstrated that, in spite of manifold influences of blood from elsewhere, this Mind (" Geist ") continues to implant itself with great toughness through the ancestral lineage, and that it is often very sharply imprinted. It is understandable, that such an inheritance must beget outstanding musicians, who in their stylistic education and in their experience of orchestral playing are already extraordinarily schooled. This is Mind from Old

Mind, which helps tradition and inheritance, a dominant trait (" überkommene Anlage ") to a special development and fulfillment. » (Page 87, translated from the German.)

Schooling is acknowledged as important, but only in the context of a special « blood » inheritance that transmits « Mind ». This follows National-Socialism's ideology of « Ahnenerbe », which asserts that cultural traits are genetically inherited. Jerger also presents a racist portrayal of Gustav Mahler, who became the General Music Director of the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1898, replacing Hans Richter, who had led the Orchestra for the previous 23 years. (The Vienna Philharmonic refers to the Richter years as its « golden age ».) Mahler's tenure was troubled, in part, by a continual pattern of anti-Semitic harassment and he left the Orchestra after 3 years. Using his own words and quoting those of Max Kalbeck (a famous critic at the time), Jerger draws a comparison of Richter and Mahler that reveals the anti-Semitic attitudes Mahler confronted :

« A completely different type of personality entered with Mahler, " as there " (to speak with Max Kalbeck's vivid words) " instead of the tall blond bearded Hun, who placed himself wide and calm before the Orchestra like an unshakable, solidly walled tower, there was a gifted shape (" begabte Gestalt ") balancing over the podium, thin, nervous, and with extraordinarily gangly limbs ". In fact, a greater contrast was really not possible. There the patriarchal Hans Richter in his stolidity and goodness, and his extremely hearty and collegial solidarity with the Orchestra, and here Gustav Mahler, oriented to the new objectivity (" neue Sachlichkeit ") - nervous, hasty, scatty, intellectualish - the music a pure matter of his overbred intellect. » (Page 57, translated from the German.)

Racist views are apparent in the language (« intellectualish », « overbred », « new objectivity » (a new aesthetic associated with Jews), « gangly limbs », « scatty » vs. « blond », « stolid », and so on). They reflect anti-Semitism and National-Socialist aesthetics. The transparent sub-text is one of chauvinistic masculinity and genetic superiority. It illustrates that Jerger was not an innocent by-stander caught-up in historical events. He was an active and avid cultural leader of the Nazi movement.

Osborne adds :

« Linz is, by no means, the only " Musikhochschule " with this problem. In Munich, Germany, the " Musik Hochschule " is housed in Hitler's personal office building. It was called the " Fuehrerbau ", and was designed by Paul Ludwig Troost, the same architect who designed Munich's " Haus der Kunst ". »

Osborne continues :

The « Fuehrerbau » is considered to be one of the most perfect stylizations of Nazi architecture still in existence. A lot of people get the creeps just walking into the place. There are stories still in circulation that people were tortured in the basement where the student cafeteria now is. Across the street is a sister building that looks identical and was a Nazi administration building. Much of Munich was destroyed by Allied bombing, but, ironically, these 2 buildings survived almost unscratched.

Yes, we know, much has changed in both Austria and Germany. But so much apparently has not.

...

The Vienna Philharmonic's official website was using quotations by an SS Officer, Wilhelm Jerger, to substantiate the ensemble's claim of cultural authenticity. Jerger, a former chairman of the Philharmonic and a Lieutenant in the SS, published a highly-racist book, in 1942, including the father-to-son genealogies that comprise the Orchestra's history. The tables contain asterisks (*) by the names of all non-Aryan members. Jerger goes on to explain that the Aryan stock of these Philharmonic families was so « tough » that the purity of their « blood » was never notably damaged by what racists refer to as « dysgenic influences » .

...

In late December 1999, the Vienna Philharmonic added quotes to its website by Wilhelm Jerger to substantiate the Orchestra's claims about its unique style. Jerger was the Chairman of the Orchestra during the 3rd « Reich » and a Lieutenant in the SS. In 1942, he wrote a book about the Orchestra which contained long father / son genealogical tables of some of the major String players. Jerger placed asterisks (*) by the names of all individuals who were « non-Aryan » and explained that the genetic stock of the Philharmonic was so « tough » that the purity of their « blood » and style was not notably damaged by such dysgenic influences. On January 1st, 2000, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra quickly removed all references to him, from their website. The Orchestra, of course, had no illusions about who Jerger was.

...

To document the Orchestra's unusual String sound, Schuster quotes former orchestra Chairman, Wilhelm Jerger, who wrote a book about the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1942, and who was also a Lieutenant in the SS.

...

It is astounding that the Vienna Philharmonic would quote Jerger, an SS Lieutenant, on its website. His racist views are so uncomfortably close to the Vienna Philharmonic's recent comments about the special qualities of the « central European soul » , their attitude toward Asians, and music-making revolving exclusively around white males.

...

The Vienna Philharmonic revealed that almost half of its musicians were Nazis in World War II, after it fired Jewish members.

The Orchestra published research uncovered by a panel of historians who mined its archives.

A total of 60 out of 123 Orchestra members were members of the Nazi Party, in 1942, according to the report, released as Austria marks the 75th anniversary of the « Anschluß » , the country's annexation by Adolf Hitler's Germany. Only 10 Vienna Philharmonic players had to leave as a result of their Nazi affiliations after 1945. 2 returned.

The Orchestra has kept silent about its past for decades. Its chairman, Clemens Hellsberg, wrote a 1992 history titled « Democracy of Kings » which was later criticized for not chronicling many misdeeds. The report published yesterday, supported by the Orchestra, was the work of a panel led by Oliver Rathkolb, a history professor at the University of Vienna.

All the Orchestra's Jewish musicians were dismissed in 1938. 5 died in concentration camps ; 1 died after being thrown out of his apartment, and another before being deported. Some Jewish Orchestra members managed to escape. The panel's research also revealed that Wilhelm Jerger, a member of the Nazi Party and the SS and the executive director of the Orchestra, rescued the Jewish 1st violinist Josef Geringer from Dachau concentration camp. Jerger failed to protect 5 more Orchestra members from deportation.

Another case analyzed by the historians is the one of trumpet player Helmut Wobisch, who joined the Nazi Party, in 1933, and the SS, in 1934. During World War II, he produced reports on people in the music scene for the Nazi intelligence service. He was fired in 1945, only to return 2 years later as 1st trumpeter, becoming director of the Orchestra, in 1953.

Wobisch successfully hid his Nazi past during the process of denazification, « even making use of Jewish musicians such as the well-known conductor Leonard Bernstein », the report says. Eyewitnesses reported the conductor once calling Wobusch : « my dearest Nazi » .

It was also Wobisch who gave the Philharmonic's ring of honour to Baldur von Schirach, an indicted war criminal, as recently as 1966 or 1967, Rathkolb found. The Orchestra had awarded the ring to von Schirach, who was responsible for deporting Vienna's Jews, in 1942. It was allegedly taken by an American soldier, 3 years later.

Shortly after his release from prison on war crime charges, for which he was sentenced during the Nuremberg Trials, von Schirach was given a replacement. The identity of the donor was previously unknown and revealed by a witness named Wilhelm Bettelheim, who wrote a letter to Rathkolb, in January, and is interviewed in a movie about the historian's work being aired today by Austrian television channel « ORF » .

Philharmonic director Hellsberg was recently criticized by Harald Walser, a member of the Austrian Green Party, for suppressing this part of the Orchestra's history. Dominique Meyer, the director of Vienna's State Opera, defended Hellsberg at the presentation of the findings :

« He was the 1st to write about the Nazi past, in 1988, and in his book, in 1992. Of course, there were unsettling things that surfaced after that and there probably will be more. »

The Orchestra also allowed itself to be used for propaganda purposes, according to archive material. Pictures show the Vienna Philharmonic, under Wilhelm Furtwängler, playing in a Berlin armaments factory. 2 swastika banners hang behind. Much of the Orchestra's music has also been used in propaganda films produced in the Nazi era.

Some of the Jewish musicians that were fired, in 1938, and were able to emigrate were invited back after the War, according to the film, which was shown to journalists. None of the musicians returned.

...

Wilhelm Jerger (geboren 27. September 1902 in Wien ; gestorben 24. April 1978 in Linz) war ein österreichischer Komponist, Dirigent und Musikhistoriker.

Wilhelm Jerger begann 1916 ein Musikstudium an der Kaiserlich-Königlich Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst mit Hauptfach Kontrabass bei Eduard Madensky, zusätzlich studierte er bei Eusebius Mandyczewski Musiktheorie und bei Franz Schalk Dirigieren. 1922 beendete er das Studium mit der Reifeprüfung und wurde im gleichen Jahr als Kontrabassist vom Wiener Staatsopernorchester engagiert. In den Jahren 1922-1923 und von 1925 bis 1927 studierte Jerger Musikwissenschaft an der Universität Wien bei Guido Adler. Neben seiner Tätigkeit beim Staatsopernorchester unterrichtete Jerger ab 1936 am Wiener Volkskonservatorium und erhielt 1938 einen Lehrauftrag für Instrumentenkunde an der Reichshochschule für Musik in Wien.

Jerger war seit 1. Mai 1932 NSDAP-Mitglied (Mitgliedsnummer : 1.207.001) und seit 1938 Angehöriger der SS. 1938 wurde Jerger auch vom Landeskulturverwalter der NSDAP in Wien, Staatssekretär Hermann Stuppäck, zum kommissarischen Leiter der Wiener Philharmoniker bestellt. Am 22. Dezember 1939 ernannte ihn Goebbels im Einvernehmen mit dem Gauleiter Schirach zum Vorstand des Vereins Wiener Philharmoniker. Am 20. April 1938 wurde er von Adolf Hitler zum Kammermusiker ernannt ; 1939 wurde er « Ratsherr der Stadt Wien » und 1942 folgte die Ernennung zum Professor.

Nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges wurde er im Rahmen der Entnazifizierung seines Postens enthoben und ging nach Salzburg. 1948 übersiedelte er nach Luzern und nahm an der Universität Freiburg (Schweiz) das Studium wieder auf ; 1952 beendete er es mit der Erlangung des Doktorates der Philosophie. 1958 kehrte er nach Österreich zurück und übernahm am 15. August desselben Jahres die Direktion des Bruckner-Konservatoriums, die er bis 1973 innehatte. Jergers bekannteste Komposition ist die « Salzburger Hof- und Barockmusik », ein kammermusikalisches Werk in vier Sätzen im Stil des Barock.

Ehrenring der Wiener Philharmoniker.

Franz-Schalk-Medaille der Wiener Philharmoniker in Silber.

Werkliste

Concerto grosso, für Streichorchester, Klavier und Orgel ad lib.

Hymnen an den Herrn, Volksoratorium, für Solostimmen, Knabenchor, gemischten Chor, Orchester und Orgel.

Theresianische Feste, für Orchester.

I. Symphonie, Klassische Symphonie, für Orchester.

Symphonische Variationen über ein Choralthema, für Orchester.

Österreichische Bauernlieder, für Orchester.

« Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität »

L'Université privée Anton Bruckner, ouverte en 2004, est dédiée à la musique, au théâtre et à la danse. Elle accueille plus de 850 étudiants pour près de 200 professeurs venant du monde entier.

...

Anton Bruckner Private University for Music, Drama, and Dance is one of 4 Universities in Linz, the capital of Upper-Austria. The University opens to approximately 800 students and was granted accredited private university status in 2004 (its name from 1932 to 2004 was Bruckner Conservatory Linz, but the roots of the institution go back to 1823 or even to 1799) .

...

Die Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität für Musik, Schauspiel und Tanz (Bruckneruni) ist eine Privatuniversität in Linz. Sie befindet sich im Stadtteil Urfahr nördlich der Donau.

Die Bruckneruni ging aus dem Anton Bruckner Konservatorium des Landes Oberösterreich hervor und wurde im Februar 2004 vom österreichischen Akkreditierungsrat als Privatuniversität akkreditiert und im Jahre 2009 reakkreditiert.

Bereits im Jahre 1799 wurde in Linz eine Musikschule gegründet, von Franz Xaver Glöggel (1764-1839) , dem damaligen Direktor der Stadtmusikschule, einem Freund Mozarts und Beethovens. Anton Bruckner, der Namensgeber der heutigen Universität, war nie Direktor der Vorgängereinrichtung.

1896 studierten an der Musikschule bereits 500 Studenten, unter dem damaligen Direktor August Göllerich sowie dessen Nachfolger Wilhelm Jerger. Ab 1995 war Reinhart von Gutzeit Rektor der Universität. Im Sommer 2006 hat von Gutzeit die Universität allerdings Richtung Salzburg verlassen, wo er Rektor der Musikuniversität Mozarteum wurde. Seit September 2007 leitet Marianne Betz die Privatuniversität. Im Juni 2012 wurde Ursula Brandstätter als neue Rektorin gewählt und sollte ihr Amt zum 1. September 2012 antreten. Das ist inzwischen geschehen.

Am 4. Dezember 2006 fiel die Entscheidung, ein neues Universitätsgebäude auf dem Grundstück des ehemaligen Schloß Hagen am Fuße des Pöstlingbergs zu errichten.

Es besteht die Möglichkeit, die Studienrichtungen (die sowohl als Konzertfach als auch pädagogische Studienrichtungen

angeboten werden) als Bachelor oder Master abzuschließen. Es werden aber auch Vorbereitungslehrgänge angeboten - Künstlerisches Basis-Studium (KBS) , Konzertfach light.

Anfänge : Gründung der « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Linz » (1821)

Zwei Jahre vor dem Wiener Kongress wurde 1812 in der musikliebenden Metropole des alten Österreich jene « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » gegründet, die für das Musikleben des Habsburgerreiches bis an dessen Ende die führende Initiatorin für das entstehende bürgerliche Musikleben blieb. Dem Vorbilde Wiens konnten sich die Provinzen des Reiches nicht entziehen, und als 1820 eine Aufführung von Beethovens Oratorium « Christus am Ölberg » dem Linzer Schullehrer-Fond beträchtliche Einnahmen erbrachte, entschloss man sich auch im Lande ob der Enns zur Gründung einer « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Linz » . In den Statuten dieses 1821, nach Kaiser Franz I. « allerhöchster Genehmigung » , ins Leben gerufenen Vereins aller « bisher getrennten Musikliebhaber » wurde neben der « Aufführung größerer Musikstücke » vor allem die Absicht zur Gründung und Führung einer Musikschule an erster Stelle genannt. Und mit der am 1. März 1823 eröffneten « Gesangsschule für Knaben und Mädchen » für eine « systemisierte Anzahl von 12 Schülern und 6 Lehrstunden pro Woche » wurde der Grundstein für das hundert Jahre später daraus hervorgehende Bruckner-Konservatorium gelegt. Die verschiedenen Versuche, in Linz ein überregional wirksames Musikleben zu begründen, denen sich vor allem der Linzer Dom- und Stadtkapellmeister Franz Xaver Glögg gewidmet hatte, konnten nun erfolgversprechend fortgeführt werden.

Aufschwung des Linzer Musiklebens zur Jahrhundertwende

1863 versuchte der Musik-Verein Anton Bruckner, der als Domorganist und Chorleiter des Sängerbundes « Frohsinn » lokalen Ruhm erlangt hatte, als Direktor der Musikschule zu gewinnen.

Die von Anton Bruckner selbstbewusst eingeforderten Reformen verhinderten dies jedoch. Unter dem Dirigenten, Pianisten, Liszt-Schüler und Bruckner-Biographen August Göllerich, der 1896 zum Leiter berufen worden war, nahm die Musikschule einen beträchtlichen Aufschwung im bereits florierenden Musikleben Oberösterreichs. Linz wurde zu einem Zentrum der Liszt- und Brucknerpflege. Die Musikschule erhielt erstmals Statuten für Lehrpläne, Prüfungsordnungen und Schulverwaltung. Im Schuljahr 1913-1914 zählte der Lehrkörper 21 Personen, die 445 Studierende zu betreuen hatten.

Das Bruckner-Konservatorium erhält seinen Namen

Unter der Leitung von Robert Keldorfer wurde der ehemaligen « Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Jubiläums-Musikschule des Linzer Musikvereins » 1932 der Titel « Bruckner-Konservatorium » verliehen. 1935 erhielt das Konservatorium auch das Öffentlichkeitsrecht (bis Ende des Schuljahres 1938-1939) . Die Reifeprüfungen des neuen Konservatoriums wurden bereits seit 1934 staatlich anerkannt und damit den Reifeprüfungen der Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Wien gleichgestellt. Den Gesangsklassen war eine Klasse für den dramatischen Unterricht angegliedert worden, eine Orgelklasse wurde eingerichtet und der Fächerkanon wurde mit den Theoriefächern Harmonielehre, Formenlehre, Instrumentenkunde und Musikgeschichte ergänzt.

Im 2. Weltkrieg

Die politische Entwicklung, die in Europa den 1930er-Jahren das Leben zunehmend verdüsterte und im Zweiten Weltkrieg mündete, blieb auch für das Bruckner-Konservatorium nicht folgenlos. Bereits 1939 wurde das Konservatorium in die Verwaltungsmacht des « Landes Oberdonau » übergeben, neuer Leiter wurde der Stiftsorganist von Sankt Florian, Adolf Trittinger. Gegen Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges mußte der Schulbetrieb im Gebäude in der Waltherstraße, von dem bereits etliche Räume für anstaltsfremde Zwecke beschlagnahmt worden waren, nach schwerwiegenden Einwirkungen durch Bombentreffer eingestellt werden.

Schwierige Aufbauarbeit und kulturpolitische Einbindung

1945 wurde Carl Steiner von der oberösterreichischen Landesregierung zum Leiter des Konservatoriums bestellt. In seiner Ära (1945 bis 1957) war die schwierige Aufbauarbeit der Nachkriegsjahre zu bewältigen, das Schulgebäude in der Waltherstraße wurde erneuert und der Status einer Ausbildungsstätte für Musikliebhaber überwunden. Die Oberösterreichische Landesregierung als Eigentümer und die Stadt Linz als Unterstützerin, repräsentiert durch Landeshauptmann Heinrich Gleißner und Bürgermeister Ernst Koref, förderten nun das Bruckner-Konservatorium im Namen einer musikinteressierten Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft. Dadurch wurde eine Tradition der kulturpolitischen Einbindung des oberösterreichischen Musiklebens eingeleitet, die bis heute anhält und mit der Gründung des « Landesmusikschulwerkes für Oberösterreich » (Kultureinrichtungen des Landes Oberösterreich) 1977 ihren vorläufigen Höhepunkt erlangte. 1948 hatte das Bundesministerium für Unterricht das bis heute bestehende Öffentlichkeitsrecht erteilt, und 1951 wurde auch das Statut des Bruckner-Konservatoriums durch die Landesregierung behördlich genehmigt.

Reformen, Umstrukturierungen und Bezug des Gebäudes in der Wildbergstraße

Unter der Leitung von Wilhelm Jerger wurden von 1958-1973 umfassende Reformen eingeleitet, die seitens des Amtes der Oberösterreichische Landesregierung großzügige Unterstützung erfuhren. Umstrukturierungen des Lehrplanes, die Betonung der musica practica, die Einführung neuer Ergänzungsfächer erfolgten ebenso wie die Institutionalisierung eines (Kammer)Orchesters des Bruckner-Konservatoriums und der Veranstaltungsreihe « Wochen des Bruckner-Konservatoriums ». Als zukunftsbestimmend erwies sich auch die Einführung einer Vielzahl von Musiziergemeinschaften, die Berufung von Fachgruppenvorständen und die Fixierung obligater Kontrollprüfungen. Da das solcherart gewachsene Konservatorium in den alten Räumen in der Waltherstraße nicht mehr das Auslangen finden konnte, wurde ein Neubau beschlossen - 1970 bezog das Bruckner-Konservatorium das nach zweijähriger Bauzeit errichtete Gebäude an der Wildbergstraße, in dem es noch heute residiert.

Studienrichtung für Instrumental- und Gesangspädagogik und Initiierung des Musikgymnasiums

Unter Gerhard Dallinger, der das Konservatorium von 1973 bis 1990 leitete, wurde die Zahl der Musiziergemeinschaften (Symphonisches Blasorchester, Doppelrohrblattensemble, Salonorchester und andere) erweitert und ein neues Statut erarbeitet. Wichtig waren auch grundlegende Neuerungen im Bereich des Dienstrechts. Eine besondere Initiative führte zur Einrichtung des « Musikgymnasiums ». Neue Studienfächer wurden eingeführt : « Elementare Musikerziehung », « Tanzpädagogik » und Jazz (auch für IGP) . Die « Wochen des Bruckner-Konservatoriums », alljährlich mit einem Konzert und Rahmenprogramm im Stift Sankt Florian eröffnet, erfuhren eine Ausweitung zusammen mit Hörerziehungen

und Konzerttourneen in ganz Oberösterreich. Auch die Einführung einer Studierenden-Vertretung geht auf die Ära Dallinger zurück. Das Seminar B, die Vorgängereinrichtung des IGP (Studienrichtung für Instrumental- und Gesangspädagogik), konnte 1973 den Unterricht aufnehmen; im Schuljahr 1988-1989, nach einer Einigung mit den damaligen Musikhochschulen, wurde es durch das Fach IGP (Instrumental- und Gesangspädagogik) ersetzt. Helmut Schiff, Schüler Johann Nepomuk Davids, dessen Nachlaß die Bibliothek des Bruckner-Konservatoriums verwaltet, leitete das Seminar B bis 1981; das Fach erlebte danach unter der Leitung von Johannes Mastnak einen Aufschwung, der bis heute anhält.

Aufstockung des Lehrkörpers, neue Studieneinrichtungen und verstärkte Öffentlichkeitsarbeit

Unter Hans Maria Kneihls, Leiter des Bruckner-Konservatoriums von 1990 bis 1995, erfolgte eine bedeutende Aufstockung des Lehrkörpers infolge neuer Studieneinrichtungen wie Elementarerziehung, Modern Dance, Ausbau der Abteilung für Jazz- und Populärmusik und des Studio SAMT (Studio for Advanced Music and Media Technology). Ein eigenes Veranstaltungsreferat ist nun für eine professionelle Öffentlichkeitsarbeit verantwortlich. Moderne computergestützte Systeme wurden zunehmend in den Dienst der Verwaltung gestellt. Die « Ständige Studienkonferenz », betraut mit der Erarbeitung von Konzepten für das Organigramm des Konservatoriums sowie der permanent zu aktualisierenden Studienpläne und ihrer Abstimmung mit anderen musikalischen Ausbildungsstätten, wurde zur ständigen Einrichtung. Erstmals wurden Workshops veranstaltet und prominente Dirigenten und Musiker zu Produktionen und Workshops an das Bruckner-Konservatorium eingeladen.

Akute Raumprobleme und Einrichtung eines künstlerischen Basisstudiums

Unter dem seit 1995 amtierenden Direktor Reinhart von Gutzeit werden die Anforderungen der musikalischen Berufsausbildung und das Profil des Bruckner-Konservatoriums im Musikleben von Linz und Oberösterreich den rasch sich ändernden gesellschaftlichen Bedingungen angepasst. Die akuten Raumprobleme an der Wildbergstraße führten zur Dislozierung einiger Abteilungen in ein Gebäude in der Sandgasse und in das Petrinum. Zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt verfügt das Bruckner-Konservatorium über drei Standorte: Wildbergstraße (Haupthaus); Sandgasse (Jazz, Gesang, Oper, Schauspiel, Elementarerziehung); und Petrinum (Allgemeiner Tanz und Kindertanz).

Die Einrichtung eines « Künstlerischen Basisstudiums » (KBS) ermöglicht besonders talentierten Studierenden bereits ab dem 12. Lebensjahr beste Einstiegsmöglichkeiten in das ordentliche Studium und in eine spätere berufliche Karriere. Die Vernetzung des Konservatoriums mit den Institutionen des Musiklebens in Linz und Oberösterreich schreitet voran (Bruckner-Orchester, LIVA, Kultureinrichtungen des Landes Oberösterreich, Landesmusikdirektion) und auch die internationale Vernetzung wird durch Austauschkonzerttourneen, etwa mit dem Glinka-Konservatorium in Nischninowgorod (Russland) und Orchestern in Finnland (Tampere) erfolgreich vertieft. Intern wurden Beiräte für Direktion, Orchester und andere Abteilungen eingerichtet, um die stets dichter und vielfältiger werdenden Organisationsaufgaben am Bruckner-Konservatorium bewältigen zu können.

Die Bibliothek verfügt nun über akzeptable Lese- und Phonoräume. Eine Kantine im Haupthaus sorgt für Speise und Trank.

Zukunftsweisend ist auch die Gründung eines « Vereins der Freunde des Bruckner-Konservatoriums » - KONSpirito (seit 2004 UNIso) - , dem Frau Landtagspräsidentin im Ruhestand Angela Ortner als Ehrenpräsidentin vorsteht. Seit März 2000 beteiligt sich das Bruckner-Konservatorium auch mit einer eigenen Sendeleiste - KONSradio (seit 2004 UNIsounds) - am Angebot des freien Senders Radio FRO.

Das Bruckner-Konservatorium wird zur Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität (ABPU)

Am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts sah sich das Bruckner-Konservatorium zunehmend mit drängenden kulturellen und gesellschaftlichen Veränderungen konfrontiert. Das Modell des herkömmlichen Konservatoriums wurde zunehmend in Frage gestellt, - nicht zuletzt durch die Vereinigung Europas, die auch im Gebiet der Musikausbildung die Beachtung

gesamteuropäischer Strukturen erfordert. Unter Reinhart von Gutzeit wurden daher intensive Anstrengungen unternommen, das Bruckner-Konservatorium in eine Privatuniversität zu erheben. In zwei Jahren intensivster Arbeit mußten die Voraussetzungen geschaffen werden, um den Anforderungen einer Privatuniversität zu entsprechen. Im Zentrum stand neben der Angleichung der Studienpläne die Ausgliederung aus dem Anstaltenbereich des Landes Oberösterreich ; die Erstellung eines eigenen Statuts sowie die entsprechenden akademischen Erfordernisse wie Habilitationsfähigkeit, Aufbau von Forschung etc.

Bereits im Dezember 2003 erfolgte die Zustimmung des Universitäts-Akkreditierungsrates in Wien, und im Februar 2004 genehmigte ein offizielles Dekret des Bundesministeriums für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur die Umwandlung des Bruckner-Konservatoriums in eine Musikuniversität. Als « Privatuniversität » ist die Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität eine Körperschaft öffentlichen Rechts, mit allen Möglichkeiten, wie sie die Universitäten des Bundes bieten. Dies ermöglicht den Studierenden Abschlüsse als Bachelor of Arts oder Master of Arts, die den Abschlüssen an europäischen Kunsthochschulen und -universitäten gleichgestellt sind. Der universitäre Lehr- und Forschungsbetrieb wurde 2004 mit zwölf verschiedenen Studienrichtungen sowie drei Universitätslehrgängen in den Bereichen Musik, Jazz, Schauspiel und Zeitgenössischer Tanz aufgenommen. Die ersten 39 Bachelor-AbsolventInnen und 5 Master-AbsolventInnen schlossen ihr Studium bereits im Sommersemester 2004 erfolgreich ab.

Die Entscheidung zum Neubau fällt

Das Land Oberösterreich unterstützt das Projekt Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität von Beginn an sehr großzügig ; Landeshauptmann Doktor Josef Pühringer, der dem Universitätsrat als Vorsitzender vorsteht, nahm sich zügig der Agenda eines An- oder Neubaus der neuen (vierten) Universität in Linz an. Nach gründlicher Prüfung zahlreicher Alternativen durch das Land Oberösterreich fiel der Universitätsrat Dezember 2006 die Entscheidung zum Neubau des Universitätsgebäudes auf dem Areal der Hagengründe am Fuße des Linzer Pöstlingbergs. Das neue Gebäude wird ermöglichen, alle drei Sparten der ABPU (Musik, Schauspiel und Tanz) an einem einzigen Standort anzubieten.

Im Juli 2008 wurde ein EU-weiter einstufiger Architektenwettbewerb für den Neubau ausgeschrieben, aus dem der Entwurf des Linzer Architektenteams Matthias Seyfert, Dietmar Moser, Susanne Seyfert und Jörn Besser als Sieger hervorging.

Im April 2010 beschlossen die Oberösterreich Landesregierung und der Oberösterreich Landtag die Errichtung und Finanzierung des Neubaus mit einem Gesamtkostenrahmen von 42,9 Mio. Euro (inklusive Mehrkosten für die Passivbauweise und Bühnen-, Licht- und Tontechnischer Spezialausstattung). Der Spatenstich erfolgte im Mai 2011.

Erfolgreiche Re-Akkreditierungen 2009 und 2014

Unter Professor Doktor Marianne Betz, die von 2008 bis 2012 als Rektorin wirkte, wurde ein neues Corporate Design für die ABPU erarbeitet und verstärkt in die Öffentlichkeitsarbeit investiert. Im Jahre 2009 wurde die ABPU durch den Österreichischen Akkreditierungsrat (ÖAR) als Privatuniversität re-akkreditiert. Im November 2012 trat Universität-Professor Doktor Ursula Brandstätter ihren Dienst als Rektorin an der ABPU an. Unter ihrer Leitung erfolgte 2014 die zweite Reakkreditierung durch die Agentur für Qualitätssicherung und Akkreditierung Austria (AQ Austria).

Die ersten 10 Universitätsjahre brachten einen deutlichen Zuwachs an ausländischen Studierenden, laufende Veränderungen in den Studienplänen (zum Beispiel Einführung der ECTS-Punkte) und positive Entwicklungen im Bereich der internationalen Beziehungen, wo durch entsprechende Vorgaben (Bologna) und Partnerschaften (Erasmus) laufend Anpassungsmaßnahmen erforderlich wurden.

Nach ihrer nunmehr zweiten Re-Akkreditierung spielt die Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität als anerkannte Ausbildungsstätte im künstlerischen und künstlerisch-pädagogischen Bereich in der akademischen Landschaft Österreichs eine wichtige Rolle, sie tritt aber auch als Veranstalter und Kooperationspartner entsprechend in Erscheinung.

Rund 970 AbsolventInnen schlossen bisher ihre Bachelor- und Masterstudien erfolgreich ab. Derzeit unterrichten circa 200 Lehrende 850 Studierende.

Zeittafel

1812 : Gründung der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien.

1817 : Errichtung der Singschule der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde.

1821 : Gründung des Musikvereines in Linz auf Initiative von Kapellmeister Anton Mayer.

1823 : Errichtung einer Gesangsschule des Linzer Musikvereines, Leitung: Stadtorganist Johann B. Schiedermayr.

1825 : Angliederung einer Violinschule.

1836 : Schulleiter : Johann Klepsch und Karl Zappe.

1856 : August M. Storch, (Chormeister des Wiener Männergesangvereines) Leiter der Musikschule.

1860 : Violinschule geschlossen bis 1863.

- 1863** : Erfolgreiche Verhandlungen mit Anton Bruckner über eine Übernahme der Musikschulleitung.
- 1868** : Übernahme von Unterrichtsräumen im Nordico.
- 1869** : Erste Schulordnung unter Rudolf Prohaska.
- 1874** : Max Brava, Musikdirektor und Musikschulleiter.
- 1883** : Adalbert Schreyer, Musikdirektor und Musikschulleiter.
- 1892** : Einrichtung von Klassen für Kontrabass, Flöte, Klarinette und Horn.
- 1893** : Einrichtung von Klassen für Oboe, Fagott und Trompete.
- 1893** : Gründung einer Klasse für Streichorchester.
- 1896** : August Göllerich Nachfolger Adalbert Schreyers.
- 1897** : Erster Klassenabend im Redoutensaal.
- 1900** : Übersiedlung der meisten Klassen in das Gebäude der Herrenstraße 39.
- 1900** : Weniger als zwanzig Lehrkräfte unterrichten rund fünfhundert Studierende.
- 1908** : Überraschende Kündigung der Vereins- und Schulräume in der Herrenstraße.
- 1908** : Der Großindustrielle Karl Frank widmet aus Anlass des 60jährigen Regierungsjubiläums Kaiser Franz I. dem Musikverein das Spiegelfeld'sche Haus Waltherstraße 24.
- 1909** : Das Kaiserlich-Königlich Ministerium für Kultur und Unterricht genehmigt den Titel : « Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Jubiläums - Musikschule des Linzer Musikvereins » .
- 1914** : 21 Lehrkräfte unterrichten 445 Schüler.
- 1923** : Alfred Klietmann Nachfolger August Göllerichs.
- 1930** : Robert Keldorfer, Schul- und Musikdirektor.
- 1932** : Die Musikvereinsschule wird Bruckner-Konservatorium.
- 1934** : Anerkennung der Abschlussprüfungen.
- 1935** : Erteilung des Öffentlichkeitsrechtes für ein Jahr.

1936 : Erneuerung des Öffentlichkeitsrechtes bis 1939.

1939 : Robert Keldorfer wird « beurlaubt » .

1939 : Der Musikverein beschließt seine Auflösung, Adolf Trittinger Leiter des Bruckner-Konservatoriums.

1940 : In der Folge drastische Einschränkungen des Unterrichtsbetriebes.

1943 : Adolf Trittinger wird « beurlaubt » ; Ablösung durch Anton Schulz, später abgelöst durch A. Schön.

1945 : Carl Steiner, Direktor des Bruckner-Konservatoriums.

1945 : Eingliederung der Städtischen Musikschule bis 1950.

1951 : Genehmigung des Statuts des Bruckner-Konservatoriums.

1952 : Umbau und Adaptierung des Schulgebäudes in der Waltherstraße.

1953 : Genehmigung der neuen Schul- und Unterrichtsordnung durch das Land Oberösterreich.

1958 : Hans Winterberger, interimistischer Leiter. Wilhelm Jerger, Direktor, Umorganisation des Schulbetriebes.

1970 : Umzug des Konservatoriums von der Waltherstraße in das Gebäude an der Wildbergstraße 18.

1973 : Seminar B institutionalisiert.

1973 : Gerhard Dallinger, Direktor.

1977 : Musikschulwerk für Oberösterreich gegründet.

1988 : IGP (Instrumental-und Gesangspädagogik) institutionalisiert.

1990 : Hans Maria Kneih, Direktor.

1990 : Dislozierung : Sandgasse.

1995 : Reinhart von Gutzeit, Direktor.

1999 : Dislozierung : Petrinum.

2000 : 170 Lehrkräfte unterrichten etwa 1.000 Studierende.

2000 : Gründung des Fördervereins KONspirito (heute UNIsono) .

2004 : Einrichtung eines « Künstlerischen Basisstudiums » KBS/ Akademie für Begabtenförderung.

2004 : Umwandlung des Bruckner-Konservatoriums in die Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität (ABPU) .

2004 : Die ersten 39 Bachelor-AbsolventInnen und 5 Master-AbsolventInnen feiern im Sommersemester Sponion.

2004 : Umbenennung des Vereins KONspirito in UNIsono.

2006 : Anton Voigt, kommissarischer Rektor.

2007 : Marianne Betz, Rektorin.

2009 : Erste Re-Akkreditierung als Privatuniversität durch den Österreichischen Akkreditierungsrat (ÖAR) .

2011 : Spatenstich für den Neubau der ABPU am Fuße des Linzer Pöstlingbergs.

2012 : Ursula Brandstätter, Rektorin.

2012 : Dachgleiche beim Neubau.

2014 : Zweite Re-Akkreditierung als Privatuniversität durch die Agentur für Qualitätssicherung und Akkreditierung Austria (AQ Austria) .

2014 : Rund 200 Lehrende unterrichten 850 Studierende, 970 AbsolventInnen schlossen bisher ihre Bachelor- und Masterstudien erfolgreich ab.

2014 : Festakt anlässlich 10 Jahre Universitätswerdung.

The Annexion of Anton Bruckner : Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation

(By Bryan Gilliam.)

The infamous photograph of 1937 in Regensburg is difficult to forget : Adolf Hitler, in full Nazi military dress, stands gazing reverently at a marble bust of the Austrian composer, Anton Bruckner. This likeness created by Adolf Rothenberger, in a style consonant with National-Socialist realism, is placed on a dark pedestal bordered in gold and topped with the Nazi seal, an eagle clutching the swastika. Bruckner had, at long last, joined the other luminaries of German culture in Regensburg's « Walhalla » , a marble replica of the Parthenon, completed in 1841, under the direction of King Ludwig I of Bavaria and filled with images of German cultural heroes of the past. A central goal of the Bruckner occasion was the Austrian composer's « elevation » to the status of a full-fledged German composer brought into the embrace of the 3rd « Reich » , a step that no doubt foreshadowed (and helped prepare for) the « Anschluß » of Austria, 8 months later.

The Regensburg ceremony which included speeches and remarks by Peter Raabe (President of the « Reichsmusikkammer ») ; Max Auer (President of the « Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft ») ; Josef Gœbbels, and others served as a centerpiece for various musical political events, including a series of concerts, a convention of the « Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft » , and a meeting of the Bavarian District Nazi Party Congress. Through the narrow lens of « Bruckneriana » , this celebration could be interpreted merely as an event capping the festivities of the previous year commemorating the 40th anniversary of Bruckner's death. But, from the wider perspective of Nazi political strategies of the late- 1930's, this event should, more correctly, be recognized as a launching point.

Beyond the Bruckner anniversary, the year 1936 marked a time when, according to Gœbbels, the « chains » of Versailles had finally been « stripped-off » ; Germany had, once again, become a formidable military power, and it was time to expand toward Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Though it may seem far-fetched to mention Nazi military strategy within the context of a Bruckner essay, we shall see how the image of the composer was manipulated in a complex domestic propaganda campaign synchronized with the post-1936 era, a period of mobilization that Gœbbels himself characterized as the « danger zone » .

Bruckner's importance as a cultural icon for National-Socialism goes far beyond marble statuary, banners, swastikas, or even Teutonic cultural chauvinism. 40 years after his death, he had become an integral part of a re-invigorated « Gleichschaltung » for post-1936 German culture, a campaign launched in the press and sustained through concerts, music festivals, and even political rallies. The threads that connect Bruckner to the cultural-political aims of the 3rd « Reich » are manifold, ranging from the openly banal to the artfully subtle, where words sounding innocent enough to present-day ears were encoded with different meanings to audiences of the 1930's and 1940's.

Hitler's personal interest

The Nazi propaganda campaign glorifying Bruckner would never have taken place were it not for Hitler's personal interest in and identification with Bruckner as a man, a composer, and a fellow Upper-Austrian. Indeed, the future dictator had been infatuated with Bruckner's music from the days of his youth. Hitler's early struggles as an artist are well-known : the young, mediocre artist from Braunau had tried and failed to enter the Viennese artistic establishment, and he doubtless identified with Bruckner who, decades earlier, found himself outside the Viennese « bourgeois » musical mainstream.

Hitler twice tried to enter the Academy of Fine-Arts in Vienna (1907-1908) . He also sought admission to the Vienna Architectural School but did not have sufficient credentials. He would remain in the Austrian capital for another 5 years, years that Hitler himself discussed in « Mein Kampf » (« Hitler and the Artists » , Holmes and Meier, New York, 1983) . Henry Grobßhans surveys this Viennese period as an important context for his later artistic opinions and political policies (« The Viennese Experience » ; pages 31-46) .

An excerpt from Gœbbels's diary, from 13 March 1941, suggests both the longevity of Hitler's wounded feelings with regard to Vienna and the direct connection with Bruckner :

« Drive to Saint-Florian. To the monastery where Bruckner used to compose. What a beautiful Baroque building. We intend to turn the priests out of here and found a music college and a home for the Bruckner Society. A marvelous plan. A farm boy who conquered the world with his music. How rich this district is in culture, history, and artistic power even today. Hitler intends to establish a center of culture here. As a counter-weight to Vienna, which will have to be gradually phased-out of the picture. He does not like Vienna. Linz is his darling. He intends to make alterations to Saint-Florian at his own expense. »

An illuminating monograph by Hanns Kreczi chronicles Hitler's preoccupation with Bruckner up to the end of the War - specifically, the plan (dating from around 1941) to convert Saint-Florian into a « Bruckner-Stiftung » under the personal protection of the « Führer ». This so-called « Brucknerian Bayreuth » would serve a threefold purpose : Saint-Florian would become a « sacred shrine for the immortal works of Bruckner » (to promote and to maintain a « Bruckner tradition ») ; it would be the site of an annual Bruckner Festival not unlike Bayreuth ; and it would become the site of a music institute.

But beyond the « Bruckner-Stiftung » project, the composer's music was exploited ceremonially, both in live-concert and on the radio. Albert Speer recalled how a movement from a Bruckner Symphony preceded « each of his “ cultural speeches ” at the Nuremberg Party Rallies ». The infamous 30 June 1937 « Tag der deutschen Kunst », a massive Nazi-organized parade celebrating « healthy » German art, opened with a fanfare from Bruckner's 3rd Symphony. Granted, the Bruckner melody displays a certain solemn, ceremonial quality ; more importantly, it was the very theme cited by Richard Wagner himself in connection with the dedication of the 3rd Symphony to the Bayreuth Master. Wagner and Bayreuth had been politicized by the new regime within the 1st year of Hitler's take-over, and the Nazis saw much to gain by re-enforcing the « cliché » of Bruckner as « Wagner-Symphonist ». Such a view is exemplified by a critique of an SS concert that appeared in « Die Musik », in 1934 ; the commentator even managed to include Beethoven as a precursor to the 3rd « Reich » :

« The Bayreuth Master, one of the most important pioneers of the German transformation and one of the boldest oracles of the 3rd “ Reich ”, was represented by the Overture to the “ Flying Dutchman ”, the “ Grail Monologue ”, and “ Am stillen Herd ”. And Bruckner's monumental 7th, which could be called his “ Eroica ”, is heroically related to Beethoven's 3rd Symphony, not only in the tone of the entire work but also in the “ Trauermusik ” of the slow movement. It (Bruckner's slow movement) also has as its subject the lament over the death of a hero - in this case, it relates to Richard Wagner. »

In April 1945, Bruckner's music would be used to commemorate the death of another « hero » when the Adagio of the 7th Symphony followed the news of Adolf Hitler's death on German radio.

Bruckner, Wagner, and the International Bruckner Society

The early, close relationship between Bayreuth and the 3rd « Reich » drew minor friction between the International Bruckner Society (IBS) and the National-Socialists, despite their friendly ties. Before Hitler's take-over, the aims of the Society were simple enough : to promote the works of Anton Bruckner and to argue for authentic editions of those

works. But there was an un-official two-fold agenda as well : to present Bruckner as a rational, logical composer along the lines of the prevailing Brahmsian paradigm and to counter the stereotype of Bruckner as a « Wagner-Symphonist » . The International Bruckner Society was delighted with promises of financial support by the Nazis (Josef Gœbbels openly pledged money for authentic Bruckner editions in his Regensburg speech) , yet, beneath this surface of mutual satisfaction, lay an un-resolved element of tension with regard to Bruckner and Wagner.

This tension would surface in the May 1937 issue of the « Zeitschrift für Musik » , just 1 month before the Regensburg ceremony, when Max Auer published an article drawing clear stylistic distinctions between the 2 composers. Auer's goal was to contrast Wagner's roots in the world of the theater from Bruckner's as a church organist.

« It is unthinkable to ponder Bach's entire output excluding his experience as an organist, Haydn's and Mozart's music without their courtly collaborations. Beethoven's work without his Liberal ideals, and Wagner's creations without the role of the theater in his formative years. Bruckner's earliest musical experience was that of the organ at Saint-Florian. »

(Max Auer. « Anton Bruckner, die Orgel und Richard Wagner » , in : « Zeitschrift für Musik » , Nr. 104 (1937) ; pages 477-481.)

The fundamental difference concerned orchestration ; the « Bruckner-Klang » grew-out of his experience as an organist - a sound far removed from Wagner, notwithstanding the Wagner tubas in Bruckner's late Symphonies. Most curious in Auer's article is a odd footnote that asserts (in letters double-spaced for emphasis) that neither he nor the International Bruckner Society « had or have » anti-Wagnerian aims. The political overtones to this disclaimer are obvious, for music commentators who criticized Wagner during the 3rd « Reich » risked running afoul of the regime itself. Auer was admittedly swimming against the stream in his effort to separate Bruckner and Wagner, an effort undercut by a report in the very same issue in which a contributor suggested that the Bayreuth Festival might well incorporate a Bruckner Festival by performing his Symphonies on the days when Operas were not being staged.

Auer replied to Lemacher's suggestion in the next issue (« Zeitschrift für Musik » Nr. 104, 1937 ; page 675) . The diplomacy of the reply still reflects Auer's desire not to be confused with anti-Wagnerians. Without getting bogged down in the substance and meaning of such a suggestion, Auer merely pointed to practical problems : the sunken orchestra-pit and the excessive fatigue it would cause musicians who might need a break on those days when an Opera was not being performed. (Heinrich Lemacher. « Bruckner in Bayreuth » , in : « Zeitschrift für Musik » , Nr. 104, 1937 ; pages 530-531.)

Gœbbels straddled the fence in his Regensburg address, for he neither wanted to insult the International Bruckner Society, who cosponsored the event, nor did he want to undermine prevailing National-Socialist cultural views which sought to link the 2 composers. He twice alluded to Wagner in his address. Early in his speech, he criticized those who viewed Bruckner's music as a « Symphonic distortion of Wagner's art » - a remark that few could gainsay. But Auer, promoter of the Bruckner organist-orchestrator paradigm, must have swallowed hard when Gœbbels continued :

« Bruckner's Wagner experience had an almost revolutionary effect on the sanctity of his musical language (" die klangliche Gestalt seiner Tonsprache ") , which only then assumed " that " character that we recognize as the true Brucknerian style. From that moment onwards, the church musician, at once, retreats almost entirely and, out of him, emerges the distinctive Symphonist. »

What Gœbbels suggests is a metamorphosis (galvanized by Wagner) from church musician to Symphonist, from « Kantor » to « Symphoniker » . This image of Bruckner's elevation to the loftier « secular » realm was integral to Gœbbels's post-1936 domestic propaganda campaign.

Bruckner's music and National-Socialist « æsthetics »

Beyond Hitler's personal interest and the Wagner connection, what was Bruckner's musical attraction for the Nazis ? Was there anything inherently German about his works ? The question of « Germanness » in music preoccupied music commentators throughout the 3rd « Reich » . It is a question with a significant history in German culture, an issue inseparable from its racial sub-text, and with roots in the anti-Mendelssohn campaign around the mid- 19th Century and the Brahms-Bruckner controversy, later on in the Century. The issue re-surfaced in a slightly different form at the end of the First World War, when wounded national pride catalyzed a search among scholars and journalists alike for cultural identity. And though some of this early post-War nationalism was benign and unreflective, most of it had become strongly ideological and openly racial by the 1930's. By then, the conclusions were fairly easy to summarize : Aryan music was heroic, lofty, organic, up-lifting, philosophical, and spiritual ; non-Aryan music (foreign or domestic) was viewed as trivial, superficial, epigonic (considered a particularly Jewish trait) , ornamental without substance, eclectic, and rootless.

Friedrich W. Herzog (in : « Was ist deutsche Musik ? ») offers specific examples for the Teutonic paradigm : Bach's « Well-Tempered Clavier » and « Art of Fugue » ; Beethoven's 9th Symphony and 3rd « Leonore » Overture ; Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » ; and Bruckner's 5th and 9th Symphonies. He specifically cites the fugal Finale of the 5th and the slow movement of the 9th. Herzog's essay lays particular emphasis on fugue, which had had such a noble German history and which, after the First World War, had allegedly lost its « heroic character » . Fugue and chorale, the twin-towers of Holy German Art, had been degraded during the « Golden 1920's » ; they had even been parodied in such works as Kurt Weill's « Die Dreigroschenoper » . Against this perceived back-drop of Weimar pessimism, even cynicism, where cultural values of the metropolis seemed to prevail over those of the village, where the Chamber Symphony became the new orchestral paradigm, Bruckner's music must have appeared as an enormous anachronism. Bruckner, the school teacher from Upper-Austria, served as an ideal symbol for « Blut and Boden » ; fugue and chorale were essential to his musical expression, and his epic Symphonic designs were conceived on a scale unprecedented even for their ...

The victim of Jewish criticism

The 2nd part of Gœbbels's speech, the image of Bruckner as a victim of vicious Viennese criticism, served broader cultural ends. Lashing-out at Eduard Hanslick and others, allowed Gœbbels to address a recently formulated ideological

tenet, namely the intolerability of music-criticism (or, more generally, art-criticism) . In fall of 1936, the Propaganda Minister made a public proclamation against « Kunstkritik » , a decree widely circulated in journals on music, art, and film. Art-criticism would be appropriate only along ideological grounds ; otherwise, art commentary (« Kunstbetrachtung ») would be the only permissible form of journalism. Gœbbels acknowledges Bruckner with regard to the formation of this new decree :

« If the public practice of “ Kunstbetrachtung ” has been restricted by law to official channels in the new Germany, then, we believe we have also resolved a debt of gratitude to Bruckner who has struggled in solitude, tortured-up to his death by his tormentors. »

The anti-Semitic flavour of these remarks, though less resonant today, was not lost on his audience : such remarks were fully in line with National-Socialist ideology condemning Jews as unproductive, even parasitic. Eduard Hanslick and Max Kalbeck could not compose, they could only write about, and possibly destroy, the honest, creative artists who did. And if Gœbbels’s speech is vague about the connection between Bruckner, criticism, and international Jewry, Fritz Skorzeny leaves nothing to the imagination :

« As Bruckner began his artistic career, international Jewry, in the guise of European Liberalism, had already taken-up the fight against the German spirit which, in the arts, had begun to stir. »

This ugly stereotype of the Jew as carpet-bagger appeared in sharpest profile shortly thereafter in the 1941 propaganda film by Fritz Hippler, « Der ewige Jude » (The Eternal Jew) , a project personally supervised by Gœbbels. The film juxtaposes carefully crafted shots of muscular Aryan workers toiling in factories with thin, bearded ghetto Jews haggling-over merchandise no doubt wrought by the sweat of the Aryan brow.

Bruckner and « Gottgläubigkeit »

The Propaganda Minister, however, saved the most important element of Bruckner revisionism for last - a clever biographical sleight of hand whereby Bruckner, after becoming acquainted with the work of Richard Wagner, « retreats » from the role of church musician and « out of him emerges the distinctive Symphonist » . After Bruckner’s engagement with the realm of Wagner, he is elevated to the absolute Symphonic sphere, a realm beyond liturgical obligation :

« Here, his creative genius frees itself of all ties to the church. He is filled with the victorious intoxication of form-giving, and a boundless feeling of freedom roars through his soul. »

Intentionally ignored, of course, were later sacred works such as the « Te Deum » and the « 150th Psalm » , an omission unchallenged both by German music scholars and by critics no doubt practicing « Musikbetrachtung » .

That Bruckner was a devout Roman Catholic, or even a Christian, is omitted entirely from the Regensburg address. His religious faith is described simply as « God-believing » (« Gottgläubig ») , a Nazi political construction with

unmistakable pagan overtones. To understand the context of « Gottgläubigkeit » , we need to focus briefly on church-related events from 1933 to 1936. For 1936, not only marked a Bruckner anniversary and a ban on art-criticism but also signaled a significant souring of relations between the National-Socialists and the Catholic Church, exemplified by the July 1936 Papal Encyclical « Mir brennender Sorge » (With Burning Concern) and the establishment of the term « Gottgläubig » as an official alternative religious confession, only 4 months later.

The relationship between the Nazis and the Church is a vast, complex topic further complicated by Hitler's personal desire publicly to avoid the problem ; even « Mein Kampf » skirts the issue. But Hitler's anti-clerical beliefs were no secret to those in the inner-circle, and the subject of religion came-up, now and again, during the Führer's table talks. Herrmann Rauschnig reports Hitler's private remark that :

« German Christianity is a distortion ; one is either a German or a Christian. You cannot be both. We need free men who feel and know God in themselves. »

Implicit in this statement is the perception that a belief in a doubtful hereafter is not only futile but a sign of weakness. This antagonism toward organized religion, particularly Christianity, was rooted in the view that ancient Greece served as an important model for modern Germany, a conviction held by German artists and intellectuals of the mid- to late- 19th Century, particularly Friedrich Nietzsche and Richard Wagner.

Hitler chose appeasement as his initial strategy with regard to organized religion, and he succeeded early-on with the Protestants who, after the downfall of the « Kaiser » , were without political direction. For these German Protestants, anti-Semitism was no real obstacle. Nor did it largely disturb the Catholic Church for whom it was the Nazi's putative « socialist » orientation that presented a more serious road-block to formal relations. The Vatican, moreover, perceived Bolshevism as a far graver international threat than Fascism, as exemplified by their 1929 Lateran Treaty with Benito Mussolini, which served as a model for Hitler's « Reichskoncordat » of 1933.

After the German November Revolution, the Holy-See tried and failed to ratify a formal treaty with the Weimar Republic, but they were able to succeed with Hitler, who saw much to gain. This national agreement of 1933 clarified a number of issues for Rome : financial subsidies to the church, legal status for the clergy, and a Nazi pledge to interfere neither with the work of the Catholic Church nor with its direct link to the Vatican. But a high-price would be paid, for the church would have to stay-out of national politics at every level. Moreover, it soon became clear that the Nazis would not stay-out of Catholic affairs. They mounted a skillful strategy of un-official intimidation whereby sermons were monitored, priests were harassed, and, of course, a propaganda effort designed to undermine the authority of the Catholic Church was launched by Nazi Youth organizations.

By 1936, ties between Germany and the Vatican became irreparably frayed ; the culmination was « Mir brennender Sorge » , a papal document that criticized Nazi anti-Semitism, anti-Christian political indoctrination in youth organizations, the erosion of civil liberties, and the deification of the « Führer » . The National-Socialists immediately realized that their church policy, especially with regard to the Vatican, had failed. There was no choice but to recognize Nazism (or, more specifically, « German-nature ») . This non-Christian, if not pagan, designation thus allowed those who

had left the church to consider themselves still religious, yet, it also insured that Jews who left their faith could not be included. The importance of retaining one's spirituality outside of the church was essential given that opposition to Bolshevism (materialistic and atheistic) was an immutable component of Nazi dogma.

In short, the 3rd « Reich » made official something that it had believed all along : that the National-Socialist « revolution » was as much spiritual as it was political. German art became a Holy Art, and music its most sacred manifestation. The view of music as a sacred art was hardly a Nazi construct ; the notion prevailed throughout late-19th Century Germany and was held by composers and philosophers alike. Major voices of the Weimar era may have called this philosophy into question, but music, as a « Heilige Kunst » , was soon resurrected in the 1930's with a disturbing political spin. The 1937 Regensburg ceremony placed Bruckner as a God in the Holy-Temple of « Walhalla » . His music would be the sacred language and Nazism the mystical religion. The link between the Sunday-morning Bruckner ceremony and the « Reich » 's new religious strategy was made concrete by a mass-rally that very afternoon. Speaking to some 200,000 people gathered in Regensburg, Hitler (with heated pre- « Anschluß » rhetoric) used the term « Gottgläubigkeit » in public, for the 1st time :

« I will never allow anyone to ever again tear this “ Volk ” asunder, to reduce it to a heap of warring religious camps. Generation after generation of our “ Volk ” will march on thus in our history, with this banner always in mind, this banner that places us under an obligation to our “ Volk ”, its honour, its freedom, and our community. We, therefore, go our way into the future with the deepest belief in God (“ Gottgläubigkeit ”) . Would all that we have achieved been possible had Providence not helped us ? »

The pious Bruckner would be the messenger of that « divine Providence » . His Symphonies, especially in those spiritual slow movements that surpassed even Franz Schubert's « heavenly lengths » , were deemed a religious experience, and only those who shared the same blood and soil could fully-comprehend the message.

A German review of non-Aryan Eugene Ormandy's interpretation of Bruckner's 5th Symphony in Linz, in 1937, dismissed the performance in 3 sentences :

« His art of conducting, which focuses on superficiality, is naturally foreign to Bruckner's Aryan form of art. Technically, the “ 5th ” was realized with great verve but, inwardly, he glossed over Bruckner's greatness. »

Nowhere is this phenomenon better exemplified than in the Viennese « Dunkelkonzerte » of the early 1940's, in which the darkened « Wiener Konzerthaus » was transformed into a sacred space where listening to Bruckner became tantamount to attending church.

(It is perhaps futile to find one specific model for the « dark-concert » ; beyond the obvious Bayreuth - « Parsifal » parallel, one should remember the force of darkness for various Nazi ceremonies, where focused light cut through the night : evening book-burnings ; torch processions ; night-time political rallies with a spotlight on the « Führer » , and the like.)

Other composers might be featured on the program, but the highlight was always a Symphony by Bruckner.

(The 1st « Dunkelkonzert » was staged on November 17th, 1939. It offered the Prelude to the Opera « Parsifal » by Richard Wagner ; an organ work by Max Reger, and the 7th Symphony by Anton Bruckner.)

A fac-simile of one such program (the concert celebrating the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Vienna Symphony Orchestra) suggests these strong religious overtones : before intermission (in a partially-darkened hall) , Mozart's « Regina cœli » ; after intermission (in a fully-darkened hall) , Bruckner's 9th, the only Symphony that Bruckner dedicated to God himself.

(These « Dunkelkonzert » by the Vienna Symphony Orchestra were all under the direction of Hans Weisbach.)

But the composer would have to be separated from Christianity, in order for the National-Socialists to make him « God's messenger » ; Bruckner, the church composer, had to be ignored. No doubt in synchrony with Regensburg, a host of articles appeared in 1937 attempting to downplay Bruckner's Catholicism. Peter Raabe stressed Bruckner's « deafness » to the material world.

He declared :

« Blessed are the pure of heart, for they shall see God ! »

Raabe described a Symphonist who « talks to God » , yet, who writes church music of little importance. This paradox cannot be appreciated outside the context of « Gottgläubigkeit » .

Werner Korte acknowledged Bruckner's Catholic roots, citing them as a reason for Hanslick's vehement criticism, but rejected the notion of Bruckner as a « martyr of the Catholic idea » or the perception of his music as an « apology for Christianity » .

Walter Schilling, likewise, uses Eduard Hanslick as a foil to downplay Bruckner's Catholicism :

« Bruckner's music smacks neither of the Jesuit (jesuitisch) nor of the heretical as the poor scribes Eduard Hanslick and Gustav Dömpke have complained. It is religious in the broadest sense ; it is not a manifestation of a religious formula or dogma. Rather, it is solemn (" weihvoll ") and elevated as is any true art. »

Reinhold Zimmermann got to the real issue, namely that « Catholic » and « Aryan » are contradictory terms :

« It would be fundamentally wrong to view Bruckner, solely or even primarily, as a Catholic. Rather, it is the racially-oriented consideration of his life and works that claims incontestable prerogative in the assessment of Bruckner's personality and achievement. »

Zimmermann's notion is reminiscent of Hitler's private comment to Herrmann Rauschning that one is either German or Christian.

At face value, Goebbels's Regensburg speech commemorated a solemn, ceremonial moment, with obvious connections to the ultimate annexation of Austria but, as we have seen, his strategy served far wider purposes, fueling a domestic propaganda mechanism for years to come. Hitler's well-documented plans for Saint-Florian, in the 1940's, further ...

...

In 1948, the Bruckner Society of America relaunched its journal, « Chord and Discord » . The journal ran, albeit with gaps in publication, through 1969, and, by then, Bruckner performances were no longer novelties. Eugen Jochum, and later-on, Bernard Haitink, Daniel Barenboim, Herbert von Karajan, Klaus Tennstedt, and others would undertake ambitious Bruckner recording projects. More recently, with the advent of compact discs, projects have included such rarities as the original versions of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 8th Symphonies.

Articles on Bruckner continued to appear in German and Austrian journals immediately after the War, though not nearly as many as had appeared during the heyday of the Nazi campaign. Post-War studies took on a more positivistic tone ; references to race and soil gave way to editorial issues and analytical problems. German scholars felt unobliged to apologize for Bruckner, the man, given the fact that he was neither an ardent German nationalist nor anti-Semitic. But neither did they nor their editors feel compelled to repudiate fabrications concerning Bruckner, race, and religion in Nazi-era issues of those very journals. The National-Socialist problem remained largely unaddressed, a policy ultimately in dialogue with the broader « Nullpunkt » strategy of rebuilding rather than reflecting. But this code of silence has itself extended well beyond the post-War, as is exemplified by Leopold Nowak's Bruckner bibliography for the « New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians » . The abundant ideological, propagandistic articles of the Nazi period are excluded from his list of sources. Those relatively few Nazi-vintage writings, that managed to make the list, are mostly ones devoid of any overt political content (a catalogue, published letters, memoirs, and the like) .

The year after the end of the Second World War marked the 50th anniversary of Bruckner's death, an event celebrated by a meeting of the International Bruckner Society, in Linz. There, on 27 July 1946, Max Auer, president of the re-organized Society, gave an address noteworthy for its silence about the previous dozen years. His speech opens with the lines :

« We have gathered here to pay tribute to Anton Bruckner on the 50th anniversary of his death. But we do not observe his death in mourning, rather, we celebrate life and resurrection ! And with joy, we unite in the call : The king is dead, long live the king ! And Bruckner is a king ! A king of absolute music. »

Though unmentioned, the apparitions of Hitler and Wagner haunt Auer's words. On the surface, Auer celebrates Bruckner's death (« the king is dead ») , and he looks to a new era of Bruckner research and reception. But, beneath that surface, lurk other ghosts : another king has died, and, in the wake of the « Führer » 's death, Bruckner the Austrian composer has been resurrected from the ashes of Nazi propaganda ; the « king of absolute music » has been

freed from the fetters of his musico-political association with Richard Wagner.

How different Auer's un-recorded remarks must have been in 1937, as he awarded the Bruckner medal to the « Führer », in Regensburg. Might they have echoed comments he published only a year earlier ? Then, in a preface to the final volume of the August Göllerich / Max Auer biography, he mounted a thinly veiled attack against Weimar-era « materialism », when « artistic Bolshevism was carried-out to extremes », and where Bruckner's « God-consecrated art » served as a guide (« Führer ») to a better world - the world of 1936. A decade later, Auer's Linz address stressed both Bruckner's Austrian roots and his international appeal, assertions that admittedly contradicted Nazi doctrine ; but did this later speech successfully offset Auer's own earlier remarks ? Is it enough that he vaguely alluded to a new era, saying nothing about the old ? Clearly not, but as someone trying to launch a reformulated Bruckner Society, to encourage more performances, and to win over larger audiences, who would want to re-open old wounds ?

It could be argued that Bruckner and German politics were never discussed in « Chord and Discord » either before, during, or after the War years. Of course, in the United States, Bruckner was not a domestic political issue. He was marginalized not because of National-Socialist activities but because his compositional style was alien to the Brahmsian paradigm of logic, balance, and economy so prevalent in the American academy at that time. His music may be better represented in current concert repertoires and record catalogues, but the man and his work still remain at the fringe of the American musicological discourse, albeit a discourse in transition. And though important issues (editorial, historical, cultural, and analytical) are discussed for the 1st time or in fresh contexts, it is equally clear that much remains to be explored with respect to how our present image of Bruckner has been consciously or unconsciously affected by the Nazi appropriation of the composer. Could one argue, for example, that important post-War Bruckner interpretations (exemplified by slow tempi and lush harmonies) have unwittingly carried over this phenomenon of Bruckner as Nazi religious icon to the contemporary Symphony-hall or recording studio ? Can we edit or analyze Bruckner today ignoring the fact that such words as « authenticity », « purity », and « organicism » were encoded with distinct political meanings in Nazi-era Bruckner discourse ? Admittedly, such questions suggest broader issues well beyond the scope of this essay, yet, they must ultimately be addressed, for Bruckner research cannot move forward without confronting its past, especially the dark chapter of Bruckner reception during the 3rd « Reich » .

La musique de Bruckner après 1945

What were the post-War consequences, if any, of the Nazi appropriation of Anton Bruckner's music ? Or, is this properly a misappropriation ? One could conceivably argue that music, especially if untexted and non-programmatic, resists misappropriation, regardless of its time. But music was merely one strand in a complex network of biographical revisionism wherein Bruckner's life was re-written in order to sustain racial policies, to validate an attack on « Kunstkritik », and to create a religious icon for a political mythology. Whether or not contemporary German audiences believed the Nazi propaganda, whether or not they sensed their common soil upon hearing a rustic Scherzo, communed with God during an Adagio, or even perceived Teutonic heroism in a fugal Finale is another large, complex issue yet to be sorted out.

Whatever the case, immediate post-War domestic consequences of the Nazi Bruckner campaign seem to have been short-lived. True, the « Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester » was re-named the Philharmonica Broadcasting Orchestra in May 1945, during Allied occupation. But it regained its « Bruckner » designation (as the Bruckner Philharmonica Orchestra) just 1 month later without raising eyebrows. This admittedly small, isolated event sheds light on post-War Bruckner reception in general ; unlike Richard Wagner, Bruckner remained generally untainted by the immediate Nazi past. His works continued to thrive in Austrian and German repertoires without external opposition, and his music was never boycotted in Israel.

Yet, Bruckner reception beyond the Axis orbit was not monolithic : for much of Europe, especially occupied Europe, Bruckner's music would inevitably recall German occupation, especially throughout the late 1940's and 1950's. In post-War America, Bruckner's music did not resonate in quite the same way ; his music was largely unknown to concert audiences, no doubt equally ignorant of any Nazi cultural campaign. Indeed, the late 1940's saw something of a Bruckner renaissance in the United States when, in 1948, the Bruckner Society of America relaunched its journal, « Chord and Discord » . The journal ran, albeit with gaps in publication, through 1969, and, by then, Bruckner performances were no longer novelties. Eugen Jochum, and, later on, Bernard Haitink, Daniel Barenboim, Herbert von Karajan, Klaus Tennstedt, and others would undertake ambitious Bruckner recording projects. More recently, with the advent of compact discs, projects have included such rarities as the original versions of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 8th Symphonies.

Articles on Bruckner continued to appear in German and Austrian journals immediately after the War, though not nearly as many as had appeared during the heyday of the Nazi campaign. Post-War studies took on a more positivistic tone ; references to race and soil gave way to editorial issues and analytical problems. German scholars felt unobliged to apologize for Bruckner the man, given the fact that he was neither an ardent German nationalist nor anti-Semitic. But neither did they nor their editors feel compelled to repudiate fabrications concerning Bruckner, race, and religion in Nazi-era issues of those very journals. The National-Socialist problem remained largely unaddressed, a policy ultimately in dialogue with the broader « Nullpunkt » strategy of rebuilding rather than reflecting. But this code of silence has itself extended well beyond the post-War, as is exemplified by Leopold Nowak's Bruckner bibliography for the « New Grove Dictionary » . The abundant ideological, propagandistic articles of the Nazi period are excluded from his list of sources. Those relatively few Nazi-vintage writings that managed to make the list are mostly ones devoid of any overt political content (a catalogue, published letters, memoirs, and the like) .

The year after the end of the Second World War marked the 50th anniversary of Bruckner's death, an event celebrated by a meeting of the International Bruckner Society in Linz. There, on 27 July 1946, Max Auer, president of the re-organized Society, gave an address noteworthy for its silence about the previous dozen years. His speech opens with the lines :

« We have gathered here to pay tribute to Anton Bruckner on the 50th anniversary of his death. But we do not observe his death in mourning, rather we celebrate life and resurrection ! And with joy, we unite in the call : The King is dead, long live the King ! And Bruckner is a King ! A King of absolute music. »

Though unmentioned, the apparitions of Adolf Hitler and Richard Wagner haunt Auer's words. On the surface, Auer celebrates Bruckner's death (« the King is dead ») , and he looks to a new era of Bruckner research and reception. But, beneath that surface, lurk other ghosts : another King has died, and, in the wake of the « Führer's » death, Bruckner the Austrian composer has been resurrected from the ashes of Nazi propaganda ; the « King of absolute music » has been freed from the fetters of his musico-political association with Wagner.

How different Auer's unrecorded remarks must have been in 1937, as he awarded the Bruckner medal to the « Führer » in Regensburg. Might they have echoed comments he published only 1 year earlier ? Then, in a preface to the final volume of the Göllicherich-Auer biography, he mounted a thinly veiled attack against Weimar-era « materialism » , when « artistic Bolshevism was carried-out to extremes » , and where Bruckner's « God-consecrated art » served as a guide (« Führer ») to a better world : the world of 1936. A decade later, Auer's Linz address stressed both Bruckner's Austrian roots and his international appeal, assertions that admittedly contradicted Nazi doctrine ; but did this later speech successfully offset Auer's own earlier remarks ? Is it enough that he vaguely alluded to a new era, saying nothing about the old ? Clearly not, but as someone trying to launch a reformulated Bruckner Society, to encourage more performances, and to win over larger audiences, who would want to re-open old wounds ?

It could be argued that Bruckner and German politics were never discussed in « Chord and Discord » either before, during, or after the War years. Of course, in the United States, Bruckner was not a domestic political issue. He was marginalized not because of National-Socialist activities but because his compositional style was alien to the Brahmsian paradigm of logic, balance, and economy so prevalent in the American academy at that time. His music may be better represented in current concert repertoires and record catalogues, but the man and his work still remain at the fringe of the American musicological discourse, albeit a discourse in transition. Indeed, this present volume on Bruckner suggests just such a shift in direction. And though important issues (editorial, historical, cultural, and analytical) are discussed here for the 1st time or in fresh contexts, it is equally clear that much remains to be explored with respect to how our present image of Bruckner has been consciously or unconsciously affected by the Nazi appropriation of the composer. Could one argue, for example, that important post-War Bruckner interpretations (exemplified by slow tempi and lush harmonies) have unwittingly carried over this phenomenon of Bruckner as Nazi religious icon to the contemporary Symphony hall or recording studio ? Can we edit or analyze Bruckner today ignoring the fact that such words as « authenticity » , « purity » , and « organicism » were encoded with distinct political ...

For Anton Bruckner, a vague Nazi aura persists

100 years after his death, Anton Bruckner is still positioned on the fringe of the American Symphonic canon, despite having a loyal core of enthusiasts. When Gustav Mahler's time came in the 1960's, many believed that Bruckner's would soon follow, but that moment never quite arrived. Beyond the concert-hall, Bruckner was shunned by musicologists and theorists. Mere mention of his name at an academic conference inevitably produced a curled lip or a condescending smile.

Musicology has relaxed a bit, in recent years, and so, it seems, has the curled lip. One result has been a burst of scholarly interest in Bruckner, with 2 international conferences in the last 2 years. Still, public opinion remains heavily

influenced by an image of Bruckner fostered by the Nazis, who appropriated him as one of their own in the 1930's. Scholars have only recently begun to explore this dark chapter in Bruckner's posthumous career, and how it has affected the way we view his personality and interpret his music.

Like it or not, the popular perception of Bruckner and his music is inescapably connected to this legacy. The National-Socialists made a conscious effort to link Bruckner's music with the religious aura of Wagner's Bayreuth, thus deifying both Opera House and Symphony Hall as Sacred settings for German music.

By exploiting the old « cliché » of Bruckner as Wagner-Symphonist, though with an unprecedented political spin, they gave the Symphonies a heightened sense of monumentality, a metaphysical meaning. The opening of Bruckner's 3rd Symphony consecrated a massive parade celebrating German art in Munich. Vienna audiences communed with Bruckner Symphonies in total darkness during the early 1940's.

Old habits die hard, and a residue of the « German » Bruckner may linger in performances today, in the form of solemn, ponderous tempos and a monumental sonic weight and solidity. What tends to be lost in the juxtaposition of Bruckner's music with Wagner's is the close relationship it actually bears to the lighter, fleeter style of Franz Schubert, a fellow Austrian.

The official Nazi campaign, which downplayed Bruckner's Austrian heritage, began in 1937, when National-Socialists and members of the International Bruckner Society gathered in Regensburg to consecrate a Bruckner bust installed in the « Walhalla », an 1841 replica of the Parthenon, filled with statues commemorating Teutonic cultural heroes. Photographs of the highly-publicized event show Adolf Hitler, Josef Gœbbels, Heinrich Himmler and others in full military regalia, gazing reverently at the Bruckner likeness. Hitler was awarded the Bruckner Society's 1st medal of honour, and Gœbbels delivered a keynote address on the meaning of Bruckner to the new Nazi order.

The message of the event was clear. The Austrian Bruckner had been « elevated » to the status of German composer brought into the embrace of the 3rd « Reich », a move that foreshadowed Germany's annexation of Austria, just 8 months later.

Germany always played a significant role in determining how Bruckner's music was received, even during his lifetime. Germany, not Austria, gave him the crucial early recognition that galvanized his career in Vienna, in the 1880's. Paradoxically, it was the musical economy and contrapuntal sophistication of the German Brahms that was synonymous with the values of the Viennese musical establishment. Bruckner's Symphonies were deemed lavish, even incoherent, and their counterpoint was hardly subtle. Curiously, the Austrian Catholic Bruckner remained foreign to his own cultural realm, little more than « a Symphonist living in Vienna », as the English musicologist Paul Banks once observed. But with the premiere of his 7th Symphony (in Leipzig, in 1884), the tide turned for Bruckner, and he gained his long-awaited fame, 1st in Germany, then in Austria.

The Leipzig « Gewandhaus » Orchestra undertook a complete cycle of Bruckner's Symphonies, in 1919 ; 23 years after his death. But in the wake of German and Austrian military defeat in World War I, this was a time of political and

economic instability, of uneasiness with the immediate cultural past. The Bruckner Cycle was a painful reminder of the ill-fated era of Emperor Wilhelm II. Younger composers, performers and audiences of the new age of the Weimar Republic rejected the old guard, embracing modern technology (radio, film, recordings) , exploring more remote periods of music and celebrating popular music. Bruckner's monumental Symphonic designs seemed especially anachronistic to Weimar modernists, who had adopted the Chamber Symphony as the the new orchestral ideal.

Yet, this sense of anachronism only enhanced Bruckner's value for certain anti-liberal voices. The composer, though deemed a progressive force at the turn of the Century, became an emblem for conservatism during the 1920's. Max Auer, President of the International Bruckner Society, which was founded in Leipzig, in 1927, and moved to Vienna in 1929, decried the false « prophets » of a new age in which materialism and Bolshevism threatened German art. Bruckner's « divinely consecrated art » , he suggested, could serve as a guide to a better world.

During his lifetime, the apolitical Bruckner allowed himself to be supported in part by a dubious pan-Germanic fringe element. It would, however, be a distortion to link him or his music directly with the political goals of that group. Such reactionary views were voiced with greater stridency, in the 1920's, when, after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Austria was experiencing a painful crisis of identity.

Indeed, during the 20's, Hitler's devotion to Bruckner the man, composer and fellow Upper-Austrian intensified significantly. Hitler's involvement with Bruckner's music dated back to his youth, when, as a young, mediocre painter from Braunau, he tried and failed to enter the Viennese artistic establishment.

Hitler made no secret of the solidarity he felt with the rural Bruckner, who, decades earlier, had also found himself outside the Viennese cultural mainstream. In 1941, Hitler planned to phase Vienna out of the cultural picture and promote Linz, the seat of Upper-Austria. Saint-Florian, the monastery near Linz that had been Bruckner's spiritual sanctuary, was to be converted into a Bruckner Foundation. This so-called « Brucknerian Bayreuth » would promote and maintain a Bruckner tradition for the 3rd « Reich » .

Years before the Saint-Florian project, which was never fully implemented, the National-Socialists sought to exploit the image of Bruckner as part of a propaganda campaign linked with a new military mobilization. 1936, the 40th anniversary of Bruckner's death, was also the year the Rhineland was remilitarized. The Nazis devised a 3 part propaganda strategy that was woven into Goebbels's address at the Regensburg Bruckner ceremony in 1937. 1st, Bruckner's Upper-Austrian peasant roots were sentimentalized with the familiar naive, « rustic genius » portrayal that persists today. By coupling his « love for his native soil and for the German fatherland » with strong « blood and soil » imagery, Goebbels set forth a cultural rationale for the Austrian « Anschluß » .

2nd, the « cliché » of Bruckner as the small-town « outsider » victimized by a conspiracy of Viennese critics would be exploited in conjunction with Goebbels's official policy banning art criticism, a field that had allegedly been dominated by cynical, liberal Jews for decades.

3rd, the image of the devout Bruckner as a « visionary mystic » was exploited after the breakdown of relations

between Berlin and the Vatican, in 1936. The National-Socialists formulated a new religious confession, called « God Believing » (« Gottglaubig ») , which recognized German nationalist identity as a religion in itself. Bruckner's Symphonies were to be its Sacred language, though his important religious works and, indeed, the very identity of Bruckner as Catholic had to be ignored. The Symphonies, especially the slow movements, which surpassed even Schubert's heavenly lengths, were deemed a religious experience, and only those who shared the same blood and soil could fully comprehend the message.

So, it is no coincidence that only hours after the Regensburg ceremony Hitler used the word « Gottglaubig » , for the 1st time at a large political rally, cleverly connecting a National-Socialist religion with German expansionism.

The strong role music played in Nazi politics may strike some as unusual ; contemporary political and cultural wars have more to do with sex and violence than with atonality and dissonance. But, in the Germany of the 1930's, music was seen as the most Sacred manifestation of what Hans Sachs, in Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » , calls « holy German art » , and the stakes were high.

A remarkable line from Josef Gœbbels's speech promised a « considerable annual contribution to the International Bruckner Society for editions of the original versions of his Symphonies, until the Master's complete works are available in the form he envisioned » . Gœbbels, the politician, sounds strangely like a musicologist. But if Bruckner was to assume an oracle-like status for the new Nazi religion, the scores to his Symphonies were the Sacred texts, and the clear implication was that these texts had been corrupted by outside Jewish influences.

Max Auer, the Society's President, who had decried the cultural corruption of the Weimar Republic, described Bruckner's music as a « return to the pure sources » , and the search for purity formed the ideological basis for the 1st Bruckner Edition, edited by Robert Haas. That purist legacy, which rejected early printed editions of Bruckner's works as inauthentic and deemed manuscript sources the only authentic texts for the composer's music, lingers even today. Only recently, have young American and German scholars, like Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt and Christa Brüstle, begun to challenge this simplistic principle.

The Nazi propaganda campaign was also fought in German music journals, where a vast body of ideological literature on Bruckner was generated. This literature was all but ignored after World War II, and the code of silence extended even into the Bruckner bibliography in « The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians » , of 1980. During the years just after the War, articles in German-language journals changed drastically in tone. References to race and soil gave way to editorial problems, documentary studies and analytical issues. Such positivistic concerns offered a refuge for scholars who wished to forget the recent past, but this neglect only extended the Nazi shadow, beyond the 12 years of actual dictatorship.

Can we, now, a half Century later, edit, analyze, perform or listen to Bruckner ignoring the fact that terms like « authenticity » , « purity » and « organicism » were encoded with distinct political meanings ? Could one argue that the Nazi-deified « German » Bruckner, removed from his Austrian heritage and placed alongside Wagner, became the model for a modern Bruckner performing tradition ? Have post-War Bruckner interpretations, exemplified by slow

tempos and lush sonorities, unwittingly carried over the phenomenon of Bruckner as Nazi religious icon into the contemporary concert-hall and recording studio ?

Moreover, given this legacy, shouldn't we re-evaluate the tired notions of Bruckner as « peasant genius » , « visionary mystic » , « Wagner-Symphonist » , « insecure neurotic » prone to manipulation by zealous colleagues ? Although each of these labels predated the 1930's, the political spin imparted by the Nazis continues to resonate.

A new generation of scholars has made significant strides in addressing these issues. Decades from now, we may look back to this Centennial Year as a major turning-point toward a proper understanding and just appreciation of a composer who has, for too long, borne an ideological burden not of his own choosing.

Bruckner : coupable ou non coupable ?

100 years after his death, the reputation of the composer Anton Bruckner remains tarnished by his appropriation by Adolf Hitler.

Beyond the 40th anniversary of the death of Anton Bruckner, the year 1936 marked a time when according to Doctor Josef Gœbbels :

« The chains of Versailles had finally been stripped-off. »

Germany had, once again, become a formidable military machine.

(Audio) June 6, 1937 - Speech by Josef Gœbbels at Regensburg upon the installation of Bruckner's bust at « Walhalla » .

A bust Anton Bruckner was placed in the « Walhalla » Shrine, in Regensburg, Germany. Adolf Hitler was present at the ceremony since Bruckner was one of his favourite composers, and one with whom he shared an Upper-Austrian heritage. Josef Gœbbels used this occasion to present a speech which skillfully linked Bruckner's life and work to the National-Socialist agenda of creating German Art.

(Photo) « Walhalla » , Regensburg, Germany ; June 7, 1937 - The President of the Bruckner Society, Professor Max Auer, presented Adolf Hitler (during an act of State, on the occasion of the revelation of an Anton Bruckner bust) the Bruckner medal.

Anlaëblich der Enthuellung einer Anton Bruckner Bueste wurde Adolf Hitler vom Praesidenten der Bruckner-Gesellschaft Professor Max Auer bei einem Staatsakt die Bruckner-Medaille ueberreicht. « Walhalla » , Regensburg, Deutschland.

(Photo) Adolf Hitler admires a newly installed bust of Anton Bruckner at « Walhalla » , near Regensburg, in 1937.

Oddly, Bruckner's bust was the only one added at « Walhalla » , an 1842 shrine to distinguished figures from 2,000 years of Germanic history, during the a period of National-Socialism.

...

One Sunday morning in 1937, a bizarre ceremony took place in the medieval Bavarian city of Regensburg. Within the Regensburg « Walhalla » , a replica of the Parthenon built by King Ludwig I to house images of his German cultural heroes, a marble bust of the Austrian composer Anton Bruckner (who died in 1896) was placed on a pedestal adorned with the Nazi insignia of an eagle gripping a swastika. Hitler himself was photographed standing to one side, bareheaded, hands folded, gazing with solemn reverence at his great compatriot.

The image is, at once, comical and chilling. But why should it concern us now, in the composer's Centenary Year ? In fact, that ceremony, or rather what it represents, may have a profound bearing on questions about performing Bruckner today, questions that have already begun to be asked in very different musical quarters. For one thing, there's the lingering question of the relation of Bruckner's music to Hitler's musical and ideological hero, Wagner. Bruckner's reverence for Wagner is legendary, the theme of many colourful anecdotes. But Bruckner's interest in Wagner seems to have been exclusively musical : he didn't discover Wagner until he was 38. Up till then, his musical diet had centred on the Rococo Masses of Mozart, Franz-Joseph and Johann Michael Haydn, Franz Schubert's songs, short concert works by Rossini, Mendelssohn, Beethoven and Weber, and the keyboard works of Johann Sebastian Bach ; to say nothing of the village dance bands he played in to supplement his meagre income as a teacher. The 2 supposedly « seminal » artistic experiences (Richard Wagner's revolutionary « Tristan und Isolde » and Beethoven's huge, world embracing « Choral Symphony ») came when Bruckner was in his 40's, his transition from church composer to Symphonist already begun.

Conductor Daniel Barenboim has boldly steered the Bruckner performance question into much deeper water. Could there be a darker, political dimension ? He told an interviewer :

« There's the whole tradition not only with Bruckner but with Wagner too, a tradition which, curiously enough, was taken over by the Nazis as the artistic expression of a particular ideology. What I'm saying is that, each time you get a great climax, it has to be taken slower, more “ feierlich ”, more majestic, to the glory of the 3rd “ Reich ”. »

So, was the Bruckner performing tradition hijacked by the Nazis ? The answers are not so simple. But there can be no doubting Adolf Hitler's veneration for Bruckner, amounting almost to identification. Both grew-up in or near the Upper-Austrian capital, Linz. Both loved the landscapes of the Danube valley ; for many Austrians, Bruckner's music is powerfully associated with his countryside. Hitler also drew comfort from Bruckner's rejection by the Viennese intelligentsia of his day ; close parallels with his own experience in Vienna, he felt. In his last years, when his health was declining, Bruckner was taken-up as a special cause by the newly emergent Austrian Christian-Social Party (« Christlichsoziale Partei ») , whose Right-wing, nationalist views, championship of « the little man » , anti-Semitism, and its leader, Karl Lueger, Hitler strongly admired. The unworldly Bruckner is unlikely to have felt any special sympathy with Lueger's views, but that doesn't seem to have bothered Hitler overmuch.

A high-point (perhaps, « the » high-point) in Hitler's ideological appropriation of Bruckner came at that Regensburg ceremony, in June 1937. The festivities also included speeches by Max Auer, President of the International Bruckner Society, and Josef Goebbels. The full-text of Goebbels's speech is included at the end of an article by Bryan Gilliam (« The Annexation of Anton Bruckner : Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation ») , in a recent edition of « The Musical Quarterly » . Goebbels stresses the « Wagnerian » element in Bruckner. Bruckner's discovery of Wagner's music-dramas, he asserts, caused a total personal and artistic revolution. « From that moment onwards » , says Goebbels, « the church musician, at once, retreats almost entirely, and out of him emerges the distinctive Symphonist. » Max Auer is known to have disagreed passionately : for him, the gulf that separated the Theatre centred Wagner and the church trained Bruckner was more important than superficial resemblances. As Gilliam says, Auer must have « swallowed hard » when he heard what Goebbels had to say at Regensburg, but, on this occasion at least, he kept his counsel.

It is difficult to say who, aesthetically speaking, was in the right. There may be an element of truth on both sides. Bruckner's understanding of Wagner was certainly narrow and selective. On the other hand, the Wagnerian influence can't be ignored ; it is the nature of Bruckner's Wagnerianism that remains a matter for dispute. What really matters is that at a key point in the history of Bruckner performance, the « Wagnerian » argument was asserted, if not actually enforced, by a totalitarian regime. As Max Auer found, dissension became increasingly difficult, even perilous. Conductors whose view of Bruckner accorded with the Nazis' ideas (the still controversial Wilhelm Furtwängler, for instance) were encouraged, and their influence remains strong today. Furtwängler's example, in particular, cannot be ignored ; to dismiss it outright for political reasons would be simply crass. But it may well represent a one sided view of Bruckner, one which, for a whole complex of reasons, has been given an unfair advantage.

The problems caused by the Nazi's annexation of Bruckner extend to the notoriously vexed question of Bruckner editions. The 1st set of « original » editions of the Symphonies appeared in the 1930's, under the editorship of Robert Haas. In its later stages, this project was directly supported by the Nazis. After the War, that association was inevitably an uncomfortable one, especially after Haas was officially condemned for complicity with Adolf Hitler's regime (the justice of that allegation remains debatable) . Another editor, Leopold Nowak (a rival of Haas) , was appointed, and the whole project was begun again.

Nowak's prefaces to his new editions are full of criticism of Haas's musicological methods, and these criticisms have been generally accepted as factual ; even by those who (like many Brucknerians today) still find Haas's results more musically satisfying. Thus, in the 8th Symphony, just about every English language commentary reasserts Nowak's allegation that Haas arbitrarily added passages from the earlier (1887) version of the Symphony to the later (1890) score. Unacceptable, says Nowak :

« You must not mix your sources. » But, on examining the newly published microfilm of the manuscript of the 8th, I was astonished to find that what Haas did was quite different. The passages he allegedly added are virtually all there, in the 1890 manuscript score. What Haas actually did was to restore certain passages that Bruckner had crossed-out. Why ? He must have seen a letter Bruckner wrote to the conductor Felix Weingartner, in which the composer mentions the cut passages, and expresses the hope that they will prove « valid for posterity, and for a circle of friends

and connoisseurs » .

Did Nowak take advantage of the political blackening of Robert Haas to further his own ends ? Were his reasons for attacking Haas's methods more personal than musicological ? The issues are still cloudy, and even now, 3 years after Nowak's death, there is a strange reluctance on the part of musical Vienna to talk about them. What is certain is that, as regards performance and textual fidelity, and maybe much else, Bruckner's music stands in urgent need of reassessment. This, his Centenary Year, provides the ideal opportunity. Let's hope that this time it can be done with something like impartiality.

Bruckner : A Non-Nazi Perspective

A picture of Adolf Hitler in an uncharacteristically reverential pose was posted outside the Dana Concert Hall at Connecticut College here recently. Dressed in full Nazi regalia, with hat in hands, Hitler was standing a respectful distance from a giant white bust of Anton Bruckner.

The photograph was taken in 1937 during meetings of the International Bruckner Society and the Bavarian Nazi Party Congress. The Austrian composer was being posthumously inducted into the Nazi equivalent of the Hall of Fame, a marble replica of the Parthenon that was called : « Walhalla » .

There were times when it seemed peculiar that this photograph was associated with a 4 day scholarly conference in which 80 attendees (27 of them giving papers) gathered to share the latest research in Bruckneriana. It was often business as usual, with references to " thematic chromatic 3rd relationships " and the " tremendous holistic motivic cohesion " in Bruckner's Symphonies.

But gradually, the importance of that photograph became clear : one hypothesis of the conference, which ended on February 24th, was that assumptions about the grandeur and mysticism of Bruckner's music, knowledge about his life and even the condition of Bruckner scholarship have been drastically affected by Nazi worship of Bruckner. We still listen to Bruckner as if we were in « Walhalla » , peering over Hitler's shoulder.

The Nazi connection was profound, as Bryan Gilliam, a professor at Duke University, pointed out. Hitler saw Bruckner as his musical counterpart, a fellow Austrian from peasant stock. Bruckner was " a farm boy who conquered the world with his music ", Goebbels said ; he had a " mystical affinity with nature " that tapped the " elemental forces of blood and race ". Hitler planned to establish a Brucknerian Bayreuth at a monastery where Bruckner had taught. Movements from Bruckner Symphonies were heard at the Nuremberg rallies. German radio even honoured Hitler's death with the Adagio from the 7th Symphony.

This adoration of Bruckner helped inspire the 1st critical edition of Bruckner's music, edited by Robert Haas and partly financed by the Nazi government. Bruckner's scores are notorious for their textual problems ; he revised them until his death in 1896, with many changes urged by colleagues and students.

But Nazi scholarship, described in papers by Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt of the University of Pennsylvania and Christa Brüstle of the Free University of Berlin, had a strong ideological component. It attempted to invalidate all of Bruckner's published scores, suggesting that they had been distorted by "alien elements" and "overly refined city-dwellers" (as 2 writers referred to the Jews who had influenced Bruckner).

The new editions often made things worse, sometimes conflated various sources and tended to serve the grandiose sonic world the Nazis preferred. After the 2nd World War, Leopold Nowak took-over the critical project. But Nazi-era judgments about the invalidity of early published scores have long been accepted, even by the New Grove Dictionary; at this conference, they were not.

The symposium, entitled "Perspectives on Anton Bruckner", was partly meant, in fact, to be a declaration of independence from the Nazi esthetic and scholarly tradition. The gathering was organized by Timothy L. Jackson, an assistant professor of music at Connecticut College who has already made distinguished contributions to understandings of both Bruckner and Richard Strauss, and Paul Hawkshaw, the associate dean of the Yale School of Music, who has worked closely with Bruckner manuscripts.

A Catholic Composer in the Age of Bismarck

Psychology and environment

Within the last 2 decades, the study of Bruckner and his music has begun to change radically. For long, a generalized picture was current that depicted a simple religious man, ill at ease in society, an anachronism in his age who suffered neglect, misunderstanding, and the malice of critics. The martyrdom of the life bred the mysticism of the artist; the social anachronism became the timeless prophet. Much of this rested on flimsy evidence and critical misunderstanding. When the Bruckner number of « Musik-Konzepte » appeared in 1982, Norbert Nagler could still bemoan the tendency of anecdotes to swamp analysis. The evidence of recent Bruckner scholarship suggests that criticism and analysis of his music is now flourishing as never before, and with the full arsenal of modern techniques. Anecdotes have also, to some extent, given way to more complex questions in the area of biographical study. As a result, interpretation has acquired new directions that are not simply to be traced in specialized Bruckner scholarship.

That Bruckner's life and times impinged upon his music is now a given of scholarship, and is reflected in the attention devoted specifically to his personality in recent conferences. At least one distinguished scholar has noted that this was not always the case. It is arguable that what has changed is the need to subscribe to one or other of the myths about Bruckner that enrolled him either as a mystic or as a simpleton. Such constructs lead to value judgements about the work; embarrassment at their inadequacy was just as likely to lead to an exclusion of the life from critical accounts.

A decisive moment came when modern psychological and sociological criticism began to suggest that, beneath the standard picture, there lay a deeply fractured personality, torn by neuroses that were different from, but hardly less striking than, those of Gustav Mahler, with whom for long Bruckner seemed to stand in a musico-biographical comparison. Constantin Floros documents a moment at a symposium, in 1977, when a speaker raised the possibility of

mental illness in Bruckner, as indicative of a change in the way that he was regarded. Within 5 years, more sophisticated analysis began to appear that related Bruckner's mental life to the world of his music.

Norbert Nagler's essay of 1982 sparked-off a re-interpretation that extended to the writings of Peter Gülke and Martin Geck. While it would be inaccurate to say that they share a consistent point of view, they do form a kind of unity, in which biographical, ideological, and critical factors have come together to consider what kind of Bruckner picture should be dominant, at least in the German-speaking world. Factors of historical and sociological provenance shaped Bruckner's personality towards a decisive moment marked by his nervous breakdown of 1867. The transition to psychological analysis does not entirely throw-off the world of the Bruckner anecdote, since the new interpretative tradition could hardly exist without the stories that emphasise his « tendency to necrophilia, counting mania and compulsion to control, and fanatical observation of religion » . Even within this tradition, there are misgivings, a fear of « greedy demands from the psychological or sociological viewpoints » . There is little doubt, however, that Bruckner interpretation has to account for such phenomena, which have passed into general knowledge through the increasing emphasis on late- 19th Century Vienna as city of « nervous splendour » . Equally, it has to consider how far the old picture served an agenda that had much to do with « German-ness » in the decades after Bismarck excluded Austria from the new « Reich » .

The circumstances of Bruckner's upbringing, Catholic education, and attitude to Vienna underline the necessity of seeing that his upbringing in the period of the « Vormärz » (before the Revolution of 1848) , his exposure to patriarchal « despotic-feudal » interaction, the resulting « subservient mentality » , and the « codified asceticism » of his Catholic education have their place in the new picture of the neurotically driven Bruckner. If these generated a compulsion to over-achieve, coupled with fantasies of power, then the effect on his artistic personality must have been considerable. In its most remarkable expression, there is the idea that Bruckner « strangled » his personality, in order to realize his inner life in music.

Born into the world of Mettemich and Biedermeier, Bruckner passed through the years of Revolution, and arrived in Vienna at the point when Liberalism approached its climax. By his death, however, Liberalism had collapsed in Vienna before the forces of what is often regarded as « irrationalism » in the all too real forms of anti-Semitic Christian-Socialism and German Nationalism. This journey from a quasi-feudal world to the verge of the 20th Century is illuminated retrospectively by the widely influential interpretation of Carl Schorske, the representative of a view of the Viennese « fin-de-siècle » as revolt of the sons against the fathers : crudely expressed, the deflection of failed political Liberalism into an artistic avant-garde. In recent years, this picture from the history of ideas has been increasingly adjusted in the light of research by students of sociology and politics.

Such changing perspectives were not really available to Nagler or Gülke when they began their seismic shift in perspectives on Bruckner. For Nagler, there is a clear break between the world of the 1st compositions, with their emphasis on choral Society and church, and the works that followed 1867. In the light of recent research into the phenomenon of « voluntary association » , it may be that Bruckner research has too unthinkingly accepted the Biedermeier image of Bruckner's earliest creative phase. Although social organizations (including choral Societies) were nationally apolitical (but nevertheless « patriotic ») before the « Ausgleich » of 1867, it has been suggested that «

voluntary association » in the form of social Societies formed the basis for discussions that contained implicitly « moral and political goals ». Since, it was a dogma of Nagler's interpretation that the composer's complete lack of political involvement was a relic of his upbringing in the « Vormärz » and determined his later subservience and social repression, a more sophisticated picture of the social circumstances in Austria, after 1849, would have considerable impact on our estimate of Bruckner's personality. Here is one area where the fluidity of current research into Austrian circumstances may inflect our picture of Bruckner.

The moment of Nagler's break, around 1867, is more likely to require interpretation. Andrea Harrantd show clearly the hesitations and personal ambitions which warred within Bruckner at this fateful point in his career. The Nagler-Gülke interpretation, however, has seen this as also an inner artistic crisis that may reflect the assimilation of Richard Wagner (and of Hector Berlioz and Franz Liszt) . When Martin Geck refers in disparagement to a « Wagner irritation » , he may be attempting to create a purely artistic crisis out of what, in reality, was a combination of personal and artistic factors. More interesting is the idea of a crisis after the 1st Symphony's composition that arose from an « unresolved conflict between creativity and the compulsion to conform » .

At this junction, the student of Bruckner is confronted with 3 strands to interpret the change that came over Bruckner's compositions. The psychological strand, that the later Symphonies arose from a brilliant compromise between creative genius and the ritualizing of formal and technical procedures, goes alongside the socio-historical strand of Bruckner's « gründerzeitliche Monumentale Symphonie » : Bruckner's type of Symphony after the « Nullte » was formed in the heady days of the Liberal upswing, shared characteristics with Vienna's rebuilding, and represented a kind of compromise of the « new » Vienna with older monarchical impulses that still continued and were fundamental to Bruckner's world-view. Slightly apart from this is the brilliantly provocative view of Gülke : if we are to accept any truth in the interpretation of Bruckner as mystic (and each of the 3 interpreters has misgivings here) , then we must recognize the plebeian insurrectionary element in all mysticism and acknowledge its essentially heretical character : « Bruckner's heresy lay in his composing Symphonies » .

Conflation of these ideas is really an attempt to answer why Bruckner emerged from his crisis with a radically new style of Symphony. The psychological and sociological nexus that scholars sought to explain, in the 1980's and 1990's, revolved round the perception that such personality traits as Bruckner's counting mania corresponded to features of his music. The compromise between creativity and ritualizing was a matter of replacing « endless melody » with « metrical pre-determination » (the equation of counting mania with quadratic phrasing is a theme that constantly recurs in more recent Bruckner studies) . Bruckner, thus, was disturbed at a deeply personal level by the experience of Wagner but did not emerge from his crisis as a Wagnerian Symphonist. In place of the seamless rhetoric of music-drama came the juxtaposition of contrasts, for which literary and architectural comparisons quickly suggested themselves, and an element of violence that stood opposed to the religious elements in Bruckner's Symphonies ; for the creators of the new Bruckner picture did not reject the religious interpretation of Bruckner (represented by Derek Scott's re-interpretation) but placed it in neurotic tension with socio-psychological factors. In the face of such an interpretation, the old certainties of the Bruckner anecdotes crumbled. Even Bruckner's notorious gaucheness amidst the Liberal « bourgeoisie » of Vienna began to look like a strategy ; moral cowardice and servility became peasant cunning. In short, Bruckner ceased to seem like an anachronism in pre-Freudian Vienna.

Political implications of a non-political life

If Bruckner became a man of his time, however, there is now considerable debate as to what kind of time he represented. Scholars have revalued the picture of late- 19th Century Vienna from two angles that impinge on Bruckner studies. The school that sees a strong interpenetration of artistic factors with social and political history, the descendants of Schorske, has begun a process of self-criticism that may yet trickle into ideas of Bruckner. At the same time, the study of the circumstances of Viennese musical life has advanced to the point that Bruckner studies must start to take account of it. This point of view, more directly related to Bruckner the musician, has remained in the background by comparison with the historico-political complexities of the 1st.

The picture painted by Nagler of a « monarchist » Bruckner in a Liberal age had the advantage of fitting the little that was known about Bruckner's political views. It also rendered Bruckner relatively easy to locate in Vienna's intellectual map, defined as a gradual substitution of « an aristocratically based "Gefühlkultur" for the Liberal culture of reason and law » which « was a decisive symptom of Austrian society's sickness unto death ». The Bruckner whose upbringing took place in the « Vormärz » instinctively and without need of revolution anticipated Carl Schorske's elevation of art and culture over rationality ; it was hardly surprising that in the half-Century after his death, Bruckner interpretation should have been overgrown by the irrationality documented by Christa Brüstle.

Some of the most striking research into aspects of Bruckner, in recent years, has concerned this irrationalism in the form of the use made of his music in the 3rd « Reich ». Various scholars have considered a number of ways in which Bruckner's life and works were coordinated with the cultural policy of the Nazis. Inevitably, this has led to some consideration of the extent to which Bruckner's career had prepared this nemesis. The degree to which he was infected with anti-Semitism is central to this, and follows naturally from the Nagler-Gülke interpretation. Already in their writings, it was noted that he was no stranger to religious anti-Semitism, though it is surprising how grudgingly this has trickled into general accounts. In practice, it would have been surprising, given Bruckner's connections, if he had not been anti-Semitic. This is less a matter of his Wagnerian associations and visits to Bayreuth than of specifically Austrian circumstances.

The question of the origins and nature of Viennese anti-Semitism is peculiarly complex. Although it found a characteristic home in Karl Lueger's Christian-Socialism, it was also present within the Liberal movement. The traditional view of Austria's socio-political development has been to stress the manner in which the question of the Habsburg Empire's various nationalities destroyed the Liberal dominance. More recent research has tended to show that Liberalism was compatible with Nationalism, which could and intermittently did advocate a Liberal agenda. Since Nationalism in this form stressed inclusiveness, both anti-Semites and Jews could find places within movements that promoted Liberal ideas and programmes. The unfortunate effect was to legitimize anti-Semitism even within Liberalism. To place Bruckner within a kind of aristocratic-monarchical « Gefühlkultur » or to emphasize his connections to German Nationalism does not really differentiate him sufficiently from his Liberal contemporaries, in such a shifting political landscape. An additional problem is that, under close examination, Schorske's thesis of a revolt by Vienna's artists, at the turn of the 20th Century, began to appear implausible. The constitutional monarchy mostly contained the

strains, largely because of the extent to which it was involved in artistic life and decision-making. Bruckner may be said to have anticipated this without any particular effort on his part. His recognition in Vienna extended to rewards from official circles.

Yet, the sense of Bruckner's marginality within Vienna has always been strong, whatever the point of view of the writer. Marginality in the wider sense has been defined in terms of « different social backgrounds and positions, different religions and political affiliations » ; at its most extreme, this could become « multiple marginality » , a growing alienation from the threatening reality of Vienna. Bruckner's admirers laid particular weight on the degree to which he, the authentic German, had been rejected by the Liberal (with more than undertones of Jewish) opinion makers. Even without this extreme formulation, there is a sense in which Bruckner represented something marginal to the more intellectual classes of the capital city. This lay in his Catholicism.

The most authoritative look at the rise of Liberalism's nemesis, the Christian-Socialist movement, has revealed the degree to which anti-Semitism grew-out of the mixture of « racial hatred » and « economic protest » of the artisan class, but has also noted the manner in which a radicalized clergy gave it a helping hand. In Bruckner studies, there is little need to place excessive weight on the « sub-culture of crackpot journalists and district political leaders » that underlay movements such as Georg Ritter von Schönerer's Pan-Germanism. The church provided him with a model closer to hand.

That Liberalism of an anti-clerical kind and anti-Semitism were at logger-heads within Vienna was part of the peculiarly poisonous circumstances of Bruckner's society. Among Liberal voices, the charge that the church was anti-Semitic was virtually a topos and inspired much animus within the world of Vienna's press. This was a particularly critical issue in the light of the restored position of Catholicism and its hierarchy within society and education as a result of the Concordat of 1855 ; Catholicism and the role of the clergy were of critical importance in Austria (in contrast to the situation in Germany, where the « Catholic " bourgeoisie " was slowly driven to a sort of internal exile, out of disappointment with the conservative attitude of the clergy » .) . The suggestion that this became a canker within the Liberal outlook and contributed substantially to its eventual downfall is a central part of the argument put forward by John Boyer. In one of the most striking, yet, « ineffective and degrading » episodes of the conflict between State and Bishops, Bruckner's patron Bishop Franz-Josef Rüdiger of Linz was sentenced to 14 days imprisonment (subsequently commuted by Emperor Franz-Joseph) for his contribution to a « wave of Episcopal anarchism » .

This dramatic confrontation between Church and State on the question of (« inter alia ») the supervision of schools took place in the year that Bruckner moved to Vienna. It is hard to imagine that Bruckner, however unpolitical, had no opinion on this matter. Unfortunately, even in the most recent treatment of the Rüdiger episode, it is difficult to find substantial evidence that bears directly on Bruckner's life ; a strong element of supposition, therefore, marks the conclusion that to speak of his religious anti-Semitism is to overlook that it carried a distinct political charge. In the German « Reich » , anti-Semitism became a means for Catholics to prove their national credentials in the face of a Protestant ascendancy. The Austrian way was less « political » , in a modern sense, but no less destructive. From Rüdiger at the mercy of the Liberals to the radicalized Clergy of a generation later was a short step once the Church

entered the political arena. It was also to shape the political mainstream far more than the Pan-Germans whose anti-Semitism was combined with, rather than opposed to, anti-clericalism.

Bruckner's Catholic background was augmented by the German-National activities of his various admirers referred to by Andrea Harrandt and dealt with by her more fully elsewhere. How this made the leap from specifically Viennese circumstances through such channels as the « mystic » and the « German » Bruckner to the era of the 3rd « Reich » is explained by Christa Brüstle. The full extent of the taking over of Bruckner in a full Party- and State-promoted ritual, in 1937, was made clear to an English readership by Bryan Gilliam in a twice-published essay. In an unexpected way, this also made an impact on Bruckner's music.

Ethics, editions, and performing styles

Since the 1960's, the issue of which versions of Bruckner's Symphonies to sanction had tended to run in favour of the 1st « Gesamtausgabe » of Robert Haas, for reasons that are reviewed by Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt. Although few Bruckner specialists were unaware of individual oddities in that « Gesamtausgabe » from the purely musicological point of view, Gilliam stressed to a greater extent than before its entanglement with the cultural politics of Germany, Austria, and the approaching « Anschluß ». Whereas an earlier Bruckner biographer like Erwin Doernberg had noted regretfully that Robert Haas' achievements had been threatened by « the political events of the last 25 years », it quickly became apparent that Haas' reputation had more than musicological sins to expiate. The unity of Bruckner's life and works was once more revealed in an all too startling manner.

The 1st publication of Gilliam's essay prompted a controversy in the pages of « The Musical Quarterly » that was side-tracked, to some degree, by allegations of lack of communication between German- and English-speaking Bruckner specialists, which may have been true of earlier generations but could hardly apply to the highly-impressive work done by American scholars, in the last 10 years. Manfred Wagner raised an objection that the speech by Josef Gœbbels marking the State ceremony of 1937 was of minor significance because it had merely reassembled a ragbag of « clichés » already present in Bruckner's own time and stated particularly forcefully in obituaries. That the continuity or revival of this « intellectual tradition » in the 1930's was of some interest to Bruckner scholars seemed to be bypassed by Richard Wagner.

In his introduction to the controversy, Leon Botstein acknowledged this by accusing Wagner of pushing to the margin the question of the continuity of an Austro-German tradition in the origins and development of National-Socialism, and it is precisely in this area that one important « Bruckner problem » lies : why Bruckner's career attracted a German-National mentality that, in the larger historical framework, proved ruinous for Austria. Austrian treatment of the problem seems, as yet, not to have made-up its mind about this. In a recent essay by Monika Glettler, we meet again Bruckner as friend of Franz-Josef Rüdiger, as composer of choral works oriented towards a German-National standpoint, and as, perhaps, more deeply implicated in cultural politics through his relationship to the « Wiener Akademischer Gesangverein ». She draws to a close, however, by noting that « open politicization » did not make significant advances before 1914, and by repeating Wagner's objection against the « American » thesis that seemed to claim that Josef Gœbbels had some priority in assimilating Bruckner to a « German » image : again, the « clichés » of the obituaries stood against consideration of issues that Gilliam had only implicitly raised (as his reply to Wagner noted,

continuity had not been his primary concern ; nor was he in any sense describing Gœbbels as a pioneer in the politicization of Bruckner) .

Gilliam's article, as he pointed-out, had as underlying issues the myths of martyrdom and religion that underlay the old Bruckner picture ; by religion, he was thinking specifically of the Nazi concept of « Gottgläubigkeit » , but there is a more general sense of this issue, in that religion in Bruckner studies is an extensible concept. Far from leading to Biblical hermeneutics and sophisticated deconstruction, earlier concepts had a flavour compounded of German Romantic mysticism and nationalism of which the banalities of « Gottgläubigkeit » are only one dimension. Perhaps, the non-comprehension which Wagner and Glettler displayed towards Gilliam came from the belated manner in which German musicology had addressed these. Underlying the controversy, however, was not the degree to which Bruckner could be considered a « Nationalist » or a « forerunner » . There was also the problem of how to perform Bruckner.

In this context, it is hardly surprising that there is both an ethical and an æsthetic dimension. In the course of the « Musical Quarterly » controversy, Leon Botstein referred to his fears that to perform Bruckner in the « original versions » was to risk « perpetuating a set of aural signifiers closely linked with radical evil » . In itself, this is worrying both as a possibility and for what it implies about musical texts. It would be easy to dismiss it for purely « common sense » reasons (one instinctively, perhaps mistakenly, recoils from the idea that musical texts can be implicated of themselves in the kind of evil to which Botstein refers) , but, if it is to be refuted, it really has to be done on solid theoretical grounds. I suspect that musicology, sooner rather than later, will make such an attempt. For the moment, however, Botstein has presented a problem that would be rich in comic potential were it not so serious. Calling for « a new scholarly methodology » , he advocated the resurrection of the versions in which « the contemporaries of Mahler, and later Schœnberg and Hartmann, got to know Bruckner in the 1st place » with the object of « re-inventing » a « new but oddly traditional pre-Nazi Bruckner » .

Most major Orchestras, nowadays, hold copies of both Robert Haas and Leopold Nowak editions. Whichever is performed, audiences or buyers are assured that they are hearing « original » Bruckner. For musicology to step in and say that, on reflection, it should have thought a little longer and harder about endorsing these « originals » risks the wrath of too many interested parties. But a re-consideration of the supposedly discredited and now seldom performed versions associated with Bruckner's friends and disciples is precisely what musicology is currently doing, both in Austria, through Thomas Leibnitz's careful re-evaluation of the relationship of Bruckner and his disciples, and in America. A by-product has been to muddy the pool even further by revealing that some of the disciples, notably Josef Schalk, had made their own contribution to « evil » by spreading the image of the « German Bruckner » in the composer's lifetime. That Bruckner's image can be re-invented in quite the way that Botstein advocates seems doubtful ; nonetheless, true to his word, Botstein subsequently recorded the now rarely heard Schalk score of the 5th Symphony.

If the ethical issue is, as yet unresolved, the æsthetic argument (which is, by no means, independent) is also open and goes beyond the question of which versions should be played. Here, it is a matter of how the versions are to be played. An argument against the disciples' scores had always been that they represented « Wagnerized » versions that distorted the block sonorities and contrasts of the originals. American scholarship, in particular, has pointed-out that this is a simplification, perhaps even a misconception. Their implication is that a « Wagnerized » way of performing

Bruckner now exists, even among conductors who have used the « original' scores » . Has the legacy of the Nazi reading of Bruckner been the recordings and performances of the post-War era ? Oddly enough, some of those German conductors who lived through the Nazi period have left recorded evidence of a more « mercurial » style. In such a subjective area, it is only to be expected that inconsistencies in argument occasionally arise. Wilhelm Furtwängler appears among the « Wagnerized » in Botstein's list (though he does not use the term) , but represents the « mercurial » tradition for Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt (which may reflect how complex an interpreter he was) . The demand for a new, lighter style of Bruckner performance is already being met, though whether this should be attributed to specific features of Bruckner reception or to trends in 20th Century performance practice is, as yet, an open question.

The problems of Bruckner's relationship to his own time and of its dangerous legacy will not go away. In the case of performance, however, their status is more than usually metaphorical. All of the contributors to the controversy raise it in some way, though it would be possible to relate it to aspects that are already present in the literature and which return to the « Gründerzeit » to which Nagler referred. Manfred Wagner compared the relationship of Wagner reception in Vienna to the architectural « megalomania » of the « Ringstraße » . The environment and musical culture in which Bruckner was first performed are moving towards the centre of music historiography of the late- 19th Century. It would be easy to forget, in considering the religious in Bruckner, that, at least, a few of his major works were designed for church performance in liturgical context. The manner in which Bruckner's musical language sought to make the leap from church to concert-hall was another likely factor in the crisis of the 1860's. It bears on how contemporaries viewed the Symphony and what audiences expected of Bruckner's music.

Historicism

At the heart of the question of Bruckner and his relationship to his own time is the degree to which he can be said to have departed from the mainstream of musical modernism, usually defined in largely harmonic-contrapuntal terms from Richard Wagner to Arnold Schönberg. That he did depart is a theme common to interpreters of quite different approaches. Thus, what is considered anachronistic in one theory is defined as « ossification » in another ; where one writer tended to see an irreconcilable gulf between « composing with symbols » and modern « absolute » theories of art, another felt that it was more of a tangential relationship ; essentially, they are talking about similar things, the elevation of æsthetic categories to thematic material (the « sublime ») , the ritualized use of Choral, Song, and March, simplified metre and rhythm, stereotyped successions, pre-Classical cadences. These seem to be the characteristics of a style with a strong historicizing tendency analogous to the dominant style in the architecture of the time.

That this is not a random comparison is suggested by the widespread prevalence of the idea of the Gothic cathedral as metaphor for Bruckner's Symphonic music. A recent essay has drawn attention to the degree to which the 19th Century accepted equations (raised by no less a figure than Goethe) between Gothic and German and between Gothic and the organic reflection of nature. The impetus for the Gothic revival in Germany and (to a lesser extent) in Austria in part came from that identification. The romanticized picture of the mediaeval cathedral became a baffling æsthetic touchstone for the appearance of buildings in « a Century of mechanization, industrialization, and technical progress » . Yet, without the appearance of an industrialized society in the aftermath of Bismarck's Wars, the great religious

buildings of the 2nd half of the 19th Century would hardly have come into being with such impressive speed. The anachronistic, « pre-fabricated » aspects of Bruckner's music were essentially an aspect of this historicizing tendency transformed by the increasingly large-scale Symphony Orchestra in the concert-hall, as temple of art. Even in his religious music, a strain developed between its external material splendour and claims to mystic insight ; of Psalm 150, it has been noted that the « reality of the music changes to irrational statements » .

It has been claimed that the modernist direction taken by Viennese religious art, after 1900, was towards the cultic. The religious note detected in Bruckner's music, the priestly devotion of his « disciples » , stand together in this field of tension between historicism and cult. The cult, however, saw the universal in Bruckner's Symphonies, as Margaret Notley has demonstrated : a heady compound of popular oration, monumentality, and the religious sublime. This aspect was intensified by the manner in which certain institutions in Vienna seemed to his admirers to be closed to his music. There appeared to be a strong contrast between the praise bestowed upon him in Germany from the mid-1880's onwards and the « carping and narrow-minded » reviews that sometimes appeared in the Viennese press. As Andrea Harrandt shows, this was a one-sided picture of Bruckner's Viennese reception, but such is the nature of artistic cults. The tendencies in Bruckner interpretation towards the monumental, solemn, « Wagnerized » , and priestly grew-out of this desire for his music to embrace a universality that was, in reality, a passing aspect of a fashion of his time towards historicism and neo-Romanticism. That it did not die finally after 1945 may be a reflection of a rather different and no less questionable cult, that of the great conductor. But no cult should inhibit us from playing Bruckner's well-defined repertory in styles which seem appropriate to our age. Essays can only be a snapshot of how Bruckner was received at a specific point, in the history of his reception. If they do not completely answer the « Bruckner problems » , it is because the solutions involve a deeper understanding of the man and his time, and the evolution of performance style in an age that has rediscovered historicism without overcoming the need for « authenticity » of experience. Bruckner problems are persistently alive.

Bruckner et une Vienne politiquement divisée

(By Leon Botstein.)

Written for the concert entitled « Bruckner's Divided Vienna » , performed on 1 December 1999 at Avery Fisher Hall, at Lincoln Center, NYC.

Rarely have politics and music engaged each other with such tenacious consistency as in the case of late- 19th Century and 20th Century Vienna and German-speaking Austria. The recent elections in Austria that have enlarged the power of Jorg Haider and his People's Party may seem, at 1st glance, to have little to do with tonight's concert. But as the politics of the Salzburg Festival in recent months have shown (in large measure through the insightful commentary by Cornell historical Michaël Steinberg) culture, particularly surrounding music, has long been political in Austrian life. The president of Austria, Thomas Klestil, and Haider have all attacked the current leadership of Salzburg in terms strikingly similar to the critical vocabulary used at the turn of the Century against Gustav Mahler and his innovations at the Vienna Opera.

The consistent politicization of music stems from the divisions that occurred in the rapidly growing metropolis which Vienna was after 1867, when constitutional reform made migration to the city from within the Empire much freer. The 1860's and early 1870's had been a time of rapid economic expansion and massive physical reconstruction in the city. But the stock market crash of May 1873 ushered in a long era of disillusionment and decline. By the time, the Ferdinand Löwe version of Bruckner's 4th Symphony was first heard, a new radical politics was in the ascendancy, marked by a nostalgia for pre-industrial artisan economy, anti-Semitism, and the aggressive assertion of the superiority of Germanic culture and people. Despite the fact that Vienna was a multi-ethnic and polyglot capital, by the end of the 19th Century, it had become a place that mixed an open and creative cosmopolitanism with a narrow-minded provincial rigidity most often expressed in rabid anti-Semitism. Jews were the city's most visible and significant minority. Their visible and extraordinary contribution to cultural life was widely understood.

The political divisions between Liberal traditions and a new radical political conservatism which was nativist and reactionary had their musical mirror. Johannes Brahms who settled in the city in the early 1860's was identified with the Liberal tradition. He was north German and Protestant, and his friends were predominantly Liberals and included many Jews. Ignaz Brüll was one of Brahms's closest friends. What linked them was not only Brahms's admiration for Brüll's spectacular pianism and Brüll's allegiance to an anti-Wagnerian compositional tradition, but a shared outlook which was open to progress and to tolerance. It should be noted that Brüll's music was more successful and is more compelling than recent scholarship suggests. More of his music deserves a hearing. Even though Karl Goldmark absorbed many Wagnerian habits and was an enthusiastic admirer of Wagner's, in the politics of Vienna, Goldmark and Brahms were allies and friends, despite differences in compositional and aesthetic outlook. Goldmark, a Hungarian Jew, was an outsider in the terrible racial politics which engulfed the city.

The career of Anton Bruckner denotes the other side of the story. Brought to Vienna from Linz as an organist and teacher of counterpoint and legendary as an improviser, Bruckner was anything but cosmopolitan. Unlike Brahms, Brüll, or Goldmark, he remained true to his local roots, resisted the pleasures and blandishments of elegant urban life, proudly displayed his regional dialect and remained devoutly Catholic. His rise to fame among a younger generation of students and musicians in the 1870's and 1880's was only in part due to his embrace of the Wagnerian. Bruckner seemed the true heir to Schubert - a genuinely local genius whose strength appeared to derive from things decidedly Austrian and Catholic. Although Ferdinand Löwe was himself of Jewish birth, an important source of support for Bruckner as an antipode to Brahms and, later, even to Mahler (who deeply admired Bruckner and performed his Symphonies, albeit with cuts) came from Bruckner's willingness to be used as a cultural symbol against what was perceived to be the growing influence of foreign elements in Viennese culture. In this debate, cosmopolitanism took on the negative connotation which it has retained to this day as a code word for « Jewish » and the influence of the « other ». Bruckner permitted himself to be the honorary head of a new academic Wagner society in Vienna, distinct from the one Goldmark helped create, which had as one of its bylaws the explicit provision that no Jew could be a member. The Right-wing press and politicians lauded Bruckner, and he developed the aura of a local Wagnerian Master whose genius was underestimated and unrecognized as the result of a conspiracy of Jews and cosmopolitans who controlled public opinion and who failed to understand the spiritual essence and greatness of Bruckner's music. Bruckner became the embattled, marginalized Master, struggling against people like Eduard Hanslick, institutions such as the « Neue Freie Presse » and an apparent cabal of influence peddlers and 2nd rate foreign artists including Brüll

and Goldmark, who were supported behind the scenes by Brahms. Brahms did not think much of Bruckner's music, and there was little fondness between the 2 men, who ended-up dominating the musical life of the 1880's and 1890's.

This was the ugly world into which Gustav Mahler stepped, in 1897, and in which the young Arnold Schönberg struggled to make a career. This was the environment in which psychoanalysis was branded as a Jewish science and alliances on behalf of new art, literature, and music, were constantly threatened by provincial politics, anti-Semitism and intolerance. As Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt makes clear in his essay, Bruckner, who was genuinely a spiritual and harmless figure surrounded by intense and loyal admirers, was deeply uncertain about the final form his Symphonies should take. It is true that this insecurity may have derived from the difficulties he encountered among Viennese critics and with Viennese audiences.

But some of Bruckner's uncertainties were compositional in nature and not political. He had relatively little experience with orchestration. As a result, Bruckner, like any other composer, shared his work with loyal admirers and, often, took their advice. He was grateful for the support he received, given that he was, by no means, an unqualified public success. Among his 1st supporters was the Viennese publisher Albert J. Gutmann and Ferdinand Löwe, both of whom were of Jewish origin. In the case of the 4th Symphony, he clearly agreed to and endorsed the 1st publication and the changes it contains from earlier versions. But the contemporary suspicion that foreigners had meddled with the true Aryan and Austrian Master who was helpless against the « evil whisperings » of people really incapable of understanding his true essence, survived in Brucknerian circles and among Wagnerians well into the 1920's. It should therefore come as no surprise that when a new critical edition of Bruckner came into being under the aegis of the Nazis, that Löwe's version of the 4th would be discredited. Bruckner was probably Adolf Hitler's favourite composer, and his music was, as Bryan Gilliam has convincingly argued, considered a source for an alternative to both Christian and cosmopolitan spirituality. Bruckner's music provided the sounds of a new Aryan religion.

The restoration of the original versions in the critical edition had the effect of bringing back to the stage an often more austere Orchestral sound and less concise forms of many of the Symphonies. Only a few conductors, out of instinct, championed the versions published in Bruckner's lifetime, the versions which had helped make many of the Symphonies including the 4th world famous. These included Eugene Ormandy and Hans Knappertsbusch. A new generation of scholars including Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt (whose pathbreaking scholarly work on the 4th Symphony) and Christa Brüstle, have pierced the veneer of objectivity and scholarly care associated with the work of Robert Haas and Leopold Nowak, the editors of the critical edition. The fingerprints of Nazi cultural politics have now been exposed. The irony is that, in this case, the Nazis did not invent history ; they simply extended and augmented an attitude spawned during Bruckner's lifetime.

With Ignaz Brüll, we see the irony of an alliance between musical conservatism and progressive Liberal politics. And Karl Goldmark managed a synthesis between Johannes Brahms and Richard Wagner. The modern, represented by the figure of Wagner, was linked to reactionary nationalist politics. In Goldmark's career, art and politics become separate. Aesthetically, he was more inclined to Wagner but, socially and politically, he kept his distance from Wagner's political implications. In Anton Bruckner, we hear a profound religious conviction, a brilliant and inspired appropriation of Wagnerian techniques and new impulses within Symphonic form. Although he seemed a naïve individual, « grandeur »,

profundity and subtlety have legitimately become the hallmarks of Bruckner's music. For most of the 20th Century, outside of Austria and Germany, the tensions between Brucknerians and Brahmsians which seemed sharp and unbridgeable to their contemporaries in the 1880's disappeared long ago. Conductors, from Mahler on, have performed the works of both composers with equal conviction and allegiance. It is tragic, however, that as the memory of World War II and the Holocaust recede, the Viennese political discourse is still relevant and continues to wreak its havoc.

Bruckner et la politique

(By Paul Hawkshaw, Yale School of Music.)

Written for the concert entitled « Bruckner and 20th Century Politics », performed on January 13, 1995, in Avery Fisher Hall at Lincoln Center, NYC.

No composer has suffered more at the hands of special interest groups than Anton Bruckner (1824-1896) . Generations of supporters and adversaries have involved his name in furthering their own political or personal agendas, often coloring and negatively impacting the perception of Bruckner as a person and composer and hindering the dissemination of his music. As early as 1867, when Kapellmeister Johann Herbeck and the powerful critic, Eduard Hanslick, fought in the face of heavy odds to bring Bruckner from the provincial capital of Linz to Imperial Vienna, they thought they had found the contemporary Austrian Symphonist who could serve as a suitable counterweight to the pernicious modernist influence of Richard Wagner. The composer's unabashed admiration for Wagner's music soon turned Hanslick into Bruckner's most powerful adversary. For the next 30 years, the critic and his followers, in a segment of the Viennese press representing a strange combination of political Liberalism and musical conservatism, vituperatively condemned what they described as the uncontrolled Wagnerism and decadence of Bruckner's « music of the future » .

Eduard Hanslick's reaction played perfectly into the hands of Viennese Wagnerites. The Academic Wagner Society of Vienna propped Bruckner up on a pedestal, and he became the darling of the local anti-Brahms, politically conservative, and often anti-semitic press. Young Wagnerites including Gustav Mahler, Hugo Wolf, August Göllerich, Ferdinand Löwe, and the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk were among his staunchest supporters and were often responsible for the publication and performance of his music. Bruckner received much of his contemporary critical acclaim from Wagnerian fundamentalists, many of whom belonged to what Margaret Notely has described as « the most extreme part of the " völkisch " fringe » of Vienna.

Wagnerian ideology and contemporary politics controlled Bruckner's legacy well into the 20th Century. Realizing that his young editors were not always scrupulous and sometimes even tried to make his music sound more like that of Wagner, he left the autograph manuscripts of most of his major works to the Imperial Library. His wish was to have accurate scores available for posterity. If he had expected these to appear in public soon after he passed away, he was mistaken. Powerful Viennese families with vested interests in the early editions (not to mention a few skeletons in the closet) intervened and, for 40 years, most of the manuscript versions remained relegated to the library shelf.

One of the great ironies of the history of the Bruckner legacy is that a major impetus for the 1st officially sanctioned attempt to address the « edition problem » came as a result of a far greater political evil. In 1937, Adolf Hitler consecrated a bust of the composer in Regensburg's palace of « Walhalla » . Bruckner had become a paragon of Wagnerian virtue and prototypical German composer. As Bryan Gilliam observed in a recent essay, this native son of Hitler's own province of Upper-Austria and hero of the Viennese conservative press (which Germany needed to support the « Anschluß ») had become a cultural icon of the Nazi Party. An Austrian peasant genius victimized by Jewish (i.e. Eduard Hanslick's) criticism admirably served the National Socialists' agenda ; it didn't matter that Bruckner was a devout Roman Catholic : a fact very much down-played by the Nazis. In any event, by now, it was propitious to publish the pure « Original Versions » of this German Master in a new musically and politically correct Collected Works Edition prepared by Robert Haas and Alfred Orel.

Any benefits which accrued as a result of the appearance of the new scores were more than offset in many parts of the world by the negative implications of Bruckner's adoption by the 3rd « Reich » . After the Second World War, public sentiment demanded the expurgation of Nazi influences on the preparation of the Collected Edition. Leopold Nowak began a new one with his own agenda. His policy for more than 30 years as Director of the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library was to shield the primary sources from outside scrutiny even more rigorously and effectively than his predecessors at the beginning of the 20th Century. Only in the past 15 years have performers and scholars from the International community been allowed consistent access to surviving materials and begun to participate in a systematic investigation of the sources for Bruckner's major works.

As a result of their work, a major reassessment of Bruckner, his music, and its editions is taking place. For example, Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt and William Carragan have pointed out that questionable editorial practices, sometimes inspired by political ideologies, caused editors of the 1st Collected Edition to mislead performers and scholars by rejecting out of hand valuable evidence provided by some of the earliest printed scores. On a broader scale, that Bruckner remains cloaked in an almost exclusively Wagnerian mantle is no longer justifiable. There is no question he admired Richard Wagner and often made references to his music ; the « Meister aller Meister » certainly influenced his harmonic language and orchestration. Yet, aesthetically, politically, and philosophically, the 2 men could not have been further apart. Wagnerism has clouded the more pervasive traditional roots of Bruckner's Symphonic and choral styles. As Timothy L. Jackson has demonstrated in his study of the Mass in F minor, Bruckner knew his Bach ; he was well-versed in the Viennese Classics : Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert ; and spent considerable time with the music of more contemporary figures such as Hector Berlioz and Robert Schumann. All surviving evidence indicates that, during periods of self-analysis, he turned to these composers ; not to Wagner.

All of the factors which played a role in the vagaries of the dissemination of Bruckner's music are in evidence on this evening's program, beginning with the two works for male chorus. The men's Choral Society was an important musical and social institution in German speaking lands during the 19th Century. Any number of composers including Franz Schubert, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Robert Schumann, Johannes Brahms, as well as Anton Bruckner wrote for it. Texts varied from rustic, often nostalgic, poems such as « Abendzauber » , to drinking songs, to fervent patriotic expressions like « Germanenzug » . Their sentiments served to fan the rising flames of German nationalism to such an extent that the great Austrian statesman, Klemens von Metternich (1773-1859) , banned male Choral Societies, referring

to them as the « German poison ». Their attraction for the National-Socialists of the 1930's and 1940's is self-explanatory.

Anton Bruckner composed « Germanenzug » during the winter of 1863-1864, in Linz. He regarded it as his 1st work as a professional composer. He had just completed his studies with Simon Sechter and Otto Kitzler and wrote it for a composition competition held in conjunction with the inaugural Upper-Austrian Male Chorus Festival scheduled to take place in Linz, in July, 1864. Bruckner's piece was one of the winners (only 2nd place, much to his chagrin) and received its premiere at the Festival. The prize included publication by the local firm of Josef Kränzl (Ried, 1865) that same year. « Germanenzug » achieved considerable popularity during the composer's lifetime, so much so that, of all his works, the middle-section was chosen for performance at his funeral. It is another of the many ironies of the Bruckner legacy that this piece, at the height of its popularity and since almost forgotten, was selected to honour the death of its composer who's fame was only beginning to rise.

To the best of our knowledge, « Abendzauber » was never performed during Bruckner's lifetime, perhaps because of the difficulty of co-ordinating the Alpine yodelers with the traditional male chorus. It was composed in Vienna, in 1878. Special vocal effects were not uncommon in the 19th Century male-chorus literature, particularly in the nature songs. Nevertheless, the use of yodelers is somewhat of a curiosity.

« Psalm 146 » is an enigma. When it was written, why, and for whom are all unanswered questions. It survives in 2 manuscript scores : an incomplete autograph and a complete copy with autograph entrances. Neither could have been used for a performance ; there are too many mistakes. The hand-writing in the autograph suggests it is a relatively early work, probably from the 1850's. Perhaps, because it has never served the needs of any of the special interest groups promoting Bruckner's music, to date « Psalm 146 » remains unpublished. The score was printed in Vienna, as part of the Bruckner Collected Works Edition. Evident throughout are many formal and stylistic influences of the Bach cantata.

If « Psalm 146 » suffered neglect as a result of its lack of value as grist for some social, political, or musical propaganda mill, Bruckner's 5th Symphony has paid a very different price for other reasons. He composed the work between 1875 and 1878. During this period, in the face of stern opposition from Eduard Hanslick, he was dying for and eventually appointed to a post as lecturer in harmony and counterpoint at the University of Vienna. It has been speculated that his particular concern with these learned musical matters at this time explains the often extreme contrapuntal textures in the Symphony ; especially the massive double fugue of the Finale.

Anton Bruckner only heard his 5th Symphony performed on 2 pianos. He was too sick to attend the orchestral premiere under the baton of his student, Franz Schalk, in Graz, on 8 April, 1894. For the performance, Schalk had prepared a much-abbreviated new score with a massive re-orchestration including the addition of an extra brass ensemble to accompany the chorale in the Coda of the last movement. This score was printed by Ludwig Döblinger, in 1896, and remained in use until 1935 when Robert Haas published the « Original Version » as it is preserved in the autograph manuscript. Because the editors of the new score were able to demonstrate that Bruckner was not involved in preparations for 1896 edition, the 5th Symphony was held-up as conclusive evidence that the manuscript versions

more accurately represented Bruckner's intentions and were, therefore, far superior to the 1st prints. Even though, as research has since shown, the evidence is not nearly so conclusive for many of his other works, the new edition of the 5th Symphony served as a prototype of the « pure » Bruckner score. By extension, according to Christa Brüstle, it became a musical symbol of uncontaminated « innate (German) artistic genius » perfectly suited for National-Socialist propaganda of the 1930's. The new score was performed after the consecration ceremony in Regensburg, in June 1937, and again, that same year, at the closing of the Nazi Party convention. Schalk's version has all but disappeared.

At least 1 major conductor, Hans Knappertsbusch, refused to learn the work any other way, continuing to perform the Franz Schalk version until his death in 1965. Referring to the Finale which he heard only in this version, the critic Theodor Helm wrote : « Not Bach, not Beethoven, not Wagner had such an inspiration. It is as though the genius of these 3 Masters has been remolded into a new artistic personality which could be none other than Anton Bruckner. » .

Bruckner et la vision du 20e siècle

During the 2nd half of the 20th Century, the authenticity process has been accomplished most dramatically for Baroque and Classical music. Efforts to utilize the instruments and performance styles, in use at the time the composers were alive, have altered the surface of what was once seemingly unchanging and familiar music. The Mozart we accept today just is not quite the same as the Mozart Bruno Walter was accustomed to thinking about and performing. We rarely, if ever, will hear Bach, Händel, Mozart, or Haydn performed in a manner resembling the approach Mendelssohn, Wagner, Brahms, or Bartók took in performing the works of these composers.

The balance between what remains the same and what is different can be exaggerated, of course. There is possibly more sameness than difference, but the differences are constant and play a decisive role. Perhaps, the fetish of so-called « authentic » performances has run its course. The obsession with « historical authenticity » has a tendency to obscure the competing and equally valid questions regarding the range of possible meanings and interpretations that can be associated with any text, irrespective of what the composer may have « intended » (if one could ever really establish what that was in terms of a musical performance) .

The case of Bruckner, as Paul Hawkshaw has so elegantly argued, is even more daunting. The texts themselves have been, from the beginning, in disarray. The kind of certainty about what the 5th Symphony of Bruckner « is » (by comparison with the Beethoven 5th, the Mahler 5th, or the Shostakovich 5th) simply eludes us. There are, no doubt, passionate and close-minded advocates of this or that version, but an inflexible claim to certainty and expertise in Bruckner must always remain suspect. Richard Osborne wrote in « Gramophone » , in August 1991, that, in the case of the Bruckner 5th, the matter is « simple » ; and that « once we have scotched the validity of Franz Schalk's 1893 version, it is relatively plain sailing » .

Unfortunately, the Schalk version, which dates from 1896, not 1893 (the 1st orchestral premiere was in 1894) has, as the work of Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt and other scholars suggests, more claims to authenticity, respectability, and to reflecting Bruckner's wishes than heretofore suspected. Bruckner actually may have approved of the version of the

Symphony whose printing took place in 1896, the year of his death. Not only was the 5th known for the 1st 3rd of the 20th Century in the Schalk version, but that version may have reflected the composer's own revisions, even though some of the suggestions may have come from a loyal disciple.

Bruckner was not the only composer to reconsider aspects of a work after the 1st performance and at the urging of trusted colleagues and students. Korstvedt has shown that the revisions of Symphony Nos. 2 and 4 and of the String Quintet did reflect Bruckner's wishes. We do not know what version he heard in the 1st 4 hand piano performance of the 5th. Schalk maintained that Bruckner explicitly approved of the additional brass (the famous « 11 Disciples »), at the end of the work. The 1896 edition may be a perfectly valid representation of the 5th.

We are so accustomed to respecting « true » painstaking scholarship that we fail to retain a healthy skepticism. Every music student has had the experience of looking for the « Urtext » edition - the uncorrupted « real » unedited and distorted text. In Bruckner's case, the motivation and the procedures behind the creation of the « Urtext » (the meticulous scholarship begun in the 1930's, particularly on the 5th Symphony) was National-Socialist ideology, masquerading as « neutral » scholarship. « Facts » simply did not speak for themselves. Even anti-fascists and Jews of that era were unwittingly influenced by a view of Bruckner encouraged by the Nazis. After all, the tainted « Critical Edition » of the 5th was published in 1935, deceptively, as a « neutral » scholarly achievement.

For the listener, however, there is a larger question at stake. We have fallen into the habit, in the United States, of thinking about Bruckner too much in terms of the Nazi appropriation of him and his music. No doubt, in his lifetime and afterwards, Bruckner was the darling of those who championed the worst form of reactionary and intolerant politics, particularly anti-Semitism. But the popularity of Bruckner during the Nazi era was not an obvious legacy for the composer or the music.

Most important, the Nazi embrace took its toll on the way the music was played. The spirit, tempos, and timbres of practically all Bruckner performances (especially, those praised by critics and Bruckner enthusiasts) are based on models that date from before 1945. Contemporary conductors thoughtlessly turn to Herbert von Karajan or Wilhelm Furtwängler or examples set by other German and Austrian contemporaries, between 1930 and 1945, to find the true approach to Bruckner. But Karajan and Furtwängler (and too many of their colleagues) were more a part of the world of Nazism and its ambitions to present Bruckner as essential and true Aryan culture than should make us comfortable. The easy disclaimers (interpretation is just a matter of looking at the « same » music, and doing what somehow is « objectively » in it) won't work. Given the importance of Bruckner to the Nazis, why do we assume that the « German » performance tradition of the mid- 20th Century is the place to begin ? After all, Bruckner's music has never quite achieved the popularity it deserves. In the United States, the 5th (perhaps, because it was Adolf Hitler's favourite Bruckner Symphony) is one of the lesser-known Symphonies. Perhaps, a fresh approach to the texts and a distancing from received performance traditions will help.

The early and strikingly patriotic song « Germanenzug » - Bruckner's sympathies were perhaps more congruent with his unattractive reactionary pan-German patrons in Vienna than many scholars are willing to admit. But the distance between mid- 19th Century patriotism and Nazism should not be passed over lightly. We move to some lighter

material, the « Abendzauber » , written for the same male chorus for which Johann Strauß's « Blue Danube » was written a decade earlier, in 1867 ; an organization that, as Paul Hawkshaw correctly points-out, was feared in the 1840's by Metternich because its leaders were in the forefront of Liberalism and the movement to democratize the Habsburg Monarchy.

Among those who lost their lives in the 1848 Vienna Revolution were organizers of the Vienna Men's Choral Society. We then turn, in « Psalm 146 » , to the most powerful aspect of Bruckner's personality : his devout Catholicism. Bruckner was an unassuming, provincial Austrian genius with few pretensions. He was loved by his students. His use of dialect, his simple mode of dress, and his manners were the source of much humor and may have offended some of his more cosmopolitan colleagues. But, above all, he was truly a man of God.

The 5th Symphony may not be the stirring, War-like work that was performed, in 1937, to illustrate Aryan masculinity, spirituality, power, and « grandeur » . The cruelest fate has been the extent to which Bruckner, the devout and brilliant organist, counterpoint teacher, and composer was tarnished posthumously by the Nazis. Unlike Richard Wagner, Bruckner was not a rabble-rousing anti-Semitic polemicist. What in his works can be interpreted plausibly as politically nefarious, as might be done in the case of Wagner ? The 5th may be about theology and faith as music, as are other works.

The question posed, therefore, is : Can we listen to and appreciate Bruckner in a way that puts the Nazi era behind us ? To do so, not only requires that we play repertoire and use editions that are less laden with the Nazi legacy. It also demands that we perform Bruckner differently : independently of the suspect traditions that have come down to us.

Spirituality in the Concert Hall : Reflections on the Music of Anton Bruckner

If the spirit of Protestantism finds superlative musical expression in the works of Johann Sebastian Bach then, perhaps, the same claim could be made for the spirit of Catholicism in the music of Josef Anton Bruckner (1824-1896) . Though, not as popularly celebrated as his German predecessor, the music of Bruckner is equally sincere and just as moving in its evocation of Christian spirituality. And just as Johann Sebastian Bach's music is able to transcend its historical context, so too the music of Bruckner, though located in a particular time and reflective of the æsthetic trends of its moment, continues to speak in a relevant and inspiring manner.

This impression of Bruckner's music was recently confirmed in a concert, given in January of 2003, by the New York based American Symphony Orchestra. In a program entitled « Bruckner's Journey » , artistic director Leon Botstein led the Orchestra in a fine execution of 2 of Bruckner's early works (although, Bruckner was already in his 40's, at the time of their composition) , namely the Mass in F minor and the 1st Symphony. From a retrospective point of view, both works reveal a man in progress, confident but still developing his own voice, desperately aware of an imposing musical tradition behind him that he seeks to both emulate and take to a new level.

The performance of the Mass and the Symphony exposed listeners to the 2 main aspects of Bruckner's œuvre, the

generally religious choral works and the 9 Symphonies. In this way, the program provided a helpful insight into the craft of Bruckner's music, and a wonderful reminder of why he is still worth listening to today.

In the Mass, key features of Bruckner's spirituality are found that characterize his music in general. One is his expression of the human condition. Bruckner was deeply aware of the precariousness of human existence, how humanity finds itself bound in by both the finitude of secular existence, and by its unworthiness before the Sacred reality. This is beautifully expressed, for example, in his treatment of the words « Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us » , in the « Gloria » . The choir sings nearly unaccompanied, bereft, as it were, of all support. With faint, pleading lines in the high-strings, the choir repeats imploringly for grace and assurance. « Miserere nobis » ! In a day when North American Christian spirituality eschews perhaps too great a degree of presumption and self-assurance, Bruckner's music reminds us, in the old words of the great Protestant divine Jonathan Edwards, that « if God should let you go, you would immediately sink and swiftly descend and plunge into the bottomless Gulf, and your healthy Constitution, and your own Care and Prudence, and best Contrivance, and all your Righteousness, would have no more Influence to uphold you and keep you out of Hell, than a Spider's Web would have to stop a falling Rock » . Bruckner was aware of this condition, and his music captures this spider's web of human existence.

2ndly, there is expressed within Bruckner's music a deep note of Marian piety. The lyrical highlight of the entire Mass occurs at the « Et incarnates est » of the « Credo » . Here, Bruckner, if one may so put it, romances the Virgin as the tenor soloist, accompanied with solo viola and violin obbligato, relate the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Blessed Mother. It is a moment of poignant tenderness in an otherwise muscular exposition of the Creed. Bruckner will continue with this sense of devotion with a Motet setting of the « Ave Maria » and his treatment of similar texts.

But if Bruckner is so aware of the abyss around which self-confident Man treads, and of the motherly warmth provided in the image of the Virgin, he is finally aware of the truthfulness of the Gospel, and of its triumph in the world. This is expressed in his strong, forthright presentation of the Mass text. The utter transparency, the complete lack of any trace of irony, characterize not only this but all of Bruckner's works. This alone makes listening to Bruckner's music a refreshing and edifying experience.

The Mass, along with his other choral works, including 2 other Mass settings, a « Requiem » , as well as Motets and other choral pieces, most notably the magnificent « Te Deum » for chorus and large orchestra, express the obviously Catholic aspect of Bruckner's music. Many of these works are still in the active repertoire, and some of them are simply among the best settings of these texts that exist.

It is with his mid-life turn to the Symphony, which became his almost exclusive artistic medium, that Bruckner produced the works for which he is most popularly associated. In Bruckner's hands, the Symphony as a musical convention takes on new depth of meaning. While clearly taking musical cues from Haydn, Beethoven and Schubert, Bruckner instills a uniquely religious significance into the Symphonic format. With Bruckner, the Symphony is transformed into an ascent narrative, beginning in mystery and uncertainty, moving through considerations of both the beauty and suffering of the world, conversely smiling and weeping with it, but always concluding with a victorious arrival, a conquering of a challenging mountain peak.

A few comments about his musical technique may help explain how Bruckner achieves this effect for the listener. We could begin by considering the element of form. In terms of both his religious choral works and, in particular, the orchestral music with which he is most identified, Bruckner adopted and basically remained true to received musical forms. To the Sonata - Allegro form of the Symphonic tradition, however, Bruckner added new episodes, introduced daring harmonic relationships, and stretched the form through feats of thematic development. In doing so, Bruckner nearly doubled the length of the concert performance of the Symphony, and thus heightened the demands upon the listener. To listen appreciatively to Bruckner is to enter into an arduous journey with him.

Bruckner's development of the Symphonic form is particularly captured in his Adagios, or slow movements. From the Romance-like interludes of the earlier Symphonic tradition, Bruckner constructed miracles of contemplative and worshipful magnificence. Here, the suspension of hurried modernity is most completely achieved, and Bruckner's melodic and improvisational gifts are fully displayed. The spirit of the « Kyrie » is transformed into pure orchestral expression.

Bruckner's musical language is characterized by both short, pregnant motifs and long, lyrical lines, by signature octave leaps and broad, sustained chorale like passages. Bruckner's was the art of juxtaposition and improvisation, placing opposites in direct contact, taking ideas and inverting them. Bruckner saw the Symphony as the vehicle in which he could best express his perception of the world, a world where both the Sacred and secular were drawn together and drawn toward Heaven. As one commentator observes :

« It is just as natural for him to employ the cadence of his Motet " Ave Maria " in the Adagio movement of his Symphony as it is to confront a merry Polka melody in the Finale with a chorale in the background. »

Bruckner also enlarged the scope of the concert Orchestra, with woodwind doubling and augmentation of the brass section, especially in his last 3 Symphonies. Bruckner wields these forces to impressive effect, characteristically alternating between shimmering pianissimo string passages with shattering brass entrances, or combing the 2 sonorities into some of the greatest orchestral crescendos in the literature.

The outcome of these stylistic techniques is the communication of a religious sensitivity and a personal self effacement that are the hallmarks of all of Bruckner's music. Absent is the theatricality of Richard Wagner, from whom Bruckner learned much but with whom there could not be greater personal contrast. Absent also is the strained self assertion that characterizes Romanticism in any age. Rather than « I have to be me » , it is « I want to love Thee » that is expressed in Bruckner's works. And it is this aspect of Bruckner's music, this attitude, couched though it is in the musical idioms of the late-Romantic Period, that transcends the historical moment and expresses Christian spirituality across time, perhaps more so now than before.

Many people are put-off, even intimidated, in their initial contact with Bruckner's music, in much the same way as some are put-off by their initial contact with Roman Catholicism. Like certain aspects of Catholic liturgy and theology, Bruckner's music is complex, densely textured, and lengthy. It does not yield itself to casual encounters. Bruckner's music is usually an acquired taste, almost requiring a kind of æsthetic conversion, especially for those accustomed to

more familiar, « listener-friendly » fare. Appreciating Bruckner requires attention, repeated listening, respect for slow development, and above all, patience. For many, a satisfying introduction to Bruckner is found in the rustic exuberance of the 4th Symphony, or in the exquisite lyricism of the 7th. For those oriented toward vocal-music, the Mass in F minor, or the plainsong inspired « Te Deum » , are great places to begin.

It is often said that Anton Bruckner's Symphonies are like « cathedrals of sound » . There is truth in this analogy. Like the architectural foundations of a great cathedral, the Symphonies rely on certain structural patterns that support the whole edifice, giving rise to elaborate and ornate development. Cathedrals are the creation of Sacred space, wherein humans assume their proper significance before the reality of God. Bruckner's music can have a similar effect upon the listener. In cathedrals, common elements of light and sound are captured and reconfigured through the interaction with the structure and content of the building. The same effect is true in Bruckner's handling of musical elements. In a great cathedral, the worshipful are drawn toward something beyond the structure and beauty of the building. This too is true in Bruckner's case. Like a great cathedral, Bruckner's music irresistibly eventuates in only one direction : « up » .

AB 116 : Linz, capitale culturelle d'Hitler

Women in Linz (1938-1945)

The success of National-Socialism can be only partly explained by economic improvements and social promises. The addition of the now familiar main features of authoritarian regimes and of an model to identify with, communicated to women using all forms of propaganda, contributed at least as much to finding acceptance as did marriage loans, child support and employment prospects.

Although with very few exceptions women were kept from leading positions within the regime, the importance of women as « part of society » was continually emphasized. Not a few women gained a previously unknown self-confidence from this. They were empty words, however, for those who fell short of « racial » , moral or political requirements. Empty words also, for those women who starved on the « Home Front » , who lost loved ones, or died in the nightly air-raids.

The article describes the living conditions of women in Linz during under the NS-regime - based on newspaper articles from the daily papers in Linz, court judgments, interviews and memoirs of women who spent the years between 1938 and 1945 as school girls, employees or foreign workers in Linz.

The 3 Mayors of Linz under the Nazi regime

Following the Nazi take-over and the annexation of Austria into the German « Reich » (« Anschluß ») German local government practice was introduced, bound solely to Nazi ideology. Linz became a city with county status, headed by a National-Socialist head-mayor. Below him was a mayor (as his deputy mayor) , 6 deputies (councillors) as well as council members in place of a city council. The head-mayor was solely responsible and the final decision-maker,

according to the « Führer » model, although he was subordinate to the governor and « Gauleiter » of Oberdonau. The National-Socialist head-mayors' actions contributed considerably to Nazi persecution of political opponents as well as of social and ethnic minorities.

1938-1939 : Josef Wolkerstorfer (NSDAP) .

1940-1943 : Leo Sturma (NSDAP) .

1944-1945 : Franz Langoth (NSDAP) .

Josef Wolkerstorfer

Josef Wolkerstorfer (1 September 1905 - 20 May 1990) : Temporary mayor and head-mayor of Linz from 12 March 1938 to 7 December 1939.

...

Josef Wolkerstorfer, též Sepp Wolkerstorfer (1. září 1905 Linec - 20. května 1990 Linec) , byl rakouský politik a nacistický funkcionář z Horních Rakous, za nacistického režimu starosta Lince.

Vystudoval národní a měšťanskou školu v Linci. Působil jako kloboučník. Složil učňovské zkoušky ve Welsu a Štýrském Hradci. V Linci si zřídil živnost a od roku 1930 zde měl obchod s pánskou módou na Landstraße.

Byl politicky aktivní. Od 1. května 1933 byl členem organizace NSDAP v Linci. Byl organizátorem nacistických akcí. Podílel se na distribuci ilegálního nacistického listu Österreichischer Beobachter. V letech 1935-1938 byl krajským vedoucím tehdy stále ještě ilegální nacistické strany v Linci. V roce 1938 se stal členem jednotek SS, v nichž v srpnu 1939 dosáhl hodnosti Obersturmbannführera.

Po anšlusu Rakouska zaznamenal kariérní postup. Od roku 1938 zastával významné posty v NSDAP. Zasedal v představenstvu Volkskreditbank Oberösterreich, v letech 1941-1945 byl prokuristou a náměstkem ředitele velkého průmyslového podniku Reichswerke Hermann Göring v Linci. Starostou města Linec byl od počátku německé anexe Rakouska, tedy od 12. března 1938 (bylo mu tehdy necelých 33 let) . Funkci zastával do 7. prosince 1939. Podle jiného zdroje byl starostou až do 15. června 1940. Do funkce ho jmenoval Arthur Seyß-Inquart coby starostu-komisaře. S účinností od 27. května 1938 byl vrchním starostou města (Oberbürgermeister) . Poté, co ve funkci v červnu 1940 skončil, působil ještě do 31. prosince 1940 na městské radnici pod starostenstvím Leopolda Sturmy.

Po válce byl zadržen a souzen ve čtyřech kauzách. V kauze vraždy byl v dubnu 1948 zproštěn viny. V další kauze byl 30. července 1948 soudem Wolkerstorfer uznán vinným z velezrady a odsouzen na 36 měsíců. Později působil jako obchodník s vínem.

Leo Sturma

Doctor Leo Sturma (13 June 1896 - 18 February 1965) : Head-mayor of Linz from 15 June 1940 to 31 December 1943.

...

Leo Sturma wurde am 13. Juni 1894 in Wels als Sohn eines Finanzwachebeamten geboren. Er besuchte die Gymnasien in Linz und Wels und legte 1913 seine Matura ab. Er diente 1913/1914 als Einjährig-Freiwilliger beim Feldhauptzenregiment 14 und nahm bis 1918 am Ersten Weltkrieg teil. Mehrfach ausgezeichnet kam er 1918 in italienische Gefangenschaft. 1919 wurde er entlassen und kehrte nach Österreich zurück.

Sturma studierte in Innsbruck Rechtswissenschaften und promovierte 1923 zum Doktor juris. Sein Gerichtspraktikum absolvierte er in Wels. Als Rechtsanwaltsanwärter war er in der Kanzlei von Doktor Schmotzer tätig. Ab 1925 arbeitete Sturma als selbständiger Rechtsanwalt.

Sturmas Eintritt in die NSDAP, Ortsgruppe Wels, erfolgte im Herbst 1934. Seine Mitgliedsnummer lautete 6.372.061. Zwischen 1934 und 1938 nahm er die Funktion eines Rechtsverwahrers der Kreise Hausruck und Salzkammergut ein. Weiters hatte er die Kreisleiterstellvertretung der NSBO inne. Sturma verfasste Schulungsbriefe der NSDAP und war Mitarbeiter beim Arbeitersturm und beim Österreichischen Beobachter. Er übernahm bei fast allen beim Kreisgericht Wels anhängigen Strafprozessen gegen Nationalsozialisten die Verteidigung.

Seit 1. Mai 1938 war Sturma unter der Nummer 309.485 Angehöriger der SS. Ende des Krieges bekleidete er den Rang eines SS-Standartenführers. Von 1938 bis Mitte 1943 gehörte Sturma auch der SA an.

Weitere von Sturma ausgeübte Funktionen waren :

Kreiswarter des NSRB von Juni 1938 bis 1940.

Gauführer des NSRB von Februar 1944 bis Kriegsende.

Kreisamtsleiter für Rechts- und Kommunalpolitik von Mitte 1938 bis Mitte 1940.

Gauhauptstellenleiter (Rechtsbetreuer) von Februar 1944 bis Kriegsende.

Aufsichtsrat der Oberbank (Bestellung 1941) .

Zwischen März 1938 und Februar 1939 hatte er das Amt des Bürgermeisters von Wels inne. Danach arbeitete er wieder als Rechtsanwalt. Seit 1940 betätigte sich Sturma als ehrenamtlicher Mitarbeiter des SD.

Am 8. März 1940 wurde Sturma zum Oberbürgermeister von Linz ernannt. Ende 1943 trat er wegen politischen Spannungen aus diesem Amt zurück. Nach seinem Rücktritt als Oberbürgermeister erfolgte am 30. Januar 1944 die Ernennung Sturmas zum Präsidenten des Oberlandesgerichts Linz. In dieser Funktion blieb er bis 1945.

Nach Kriegsende wurde das Verfahren gegen ihn wegen §§ 10 und 11 VG und §§ 2 und 8 KVG eingeleitet. Später wurde das Verfahren unter einer neuen Gerichtszahl auch auf die §§ 4 und 6 KVG ausgedehnt. Am 10. Dezember 1949 wurde Sturma schließlich wegen §§ 10 und 11 VG und § 58 Strafgesetzes (StG) vor dem Volksgericht Linz angeklagt. Ein Jahr später, am 19. Dezember 1950, kam es zur Niederschlagung des Prozesses nach Entschließung durch den Bundespräsidenten.

1951 nahm Sturma wieder seine Tätigkeit als Rechtsanwalt in Wels auf. Leo Sturma starb 1965.

...

Leopold Sturma, též Leo Sturma (13. června 1896 Wels - 18. února 1965 Wels) , byl rakouský právník, politik a nacistický funkcionář z Horních Rakous, za nacistického režimu starosta Lince.

Studoval na gymnáziu ve Welsu a Linci. Maturoval roku 1913. Od roku 1920 studoval práva na Univerzitě v Innsbrucku, kde byl roku 1923 promován na doktora práv. Působil na soudní praxi u okresního a krajského soudu ve Welsu, od roku 1922 pracoval v advokátní kanceláři Schmutzer-Slama. Od roku 1925 byl samostatným advokátem ve Welsu. K advokátní činnosti ve Welsu se ještě vrátil v roce 1951.

Byl politicky aktivní. Od roku 1934 byl členem organizace NSDAP ve Welsu. Ve 30. letech byl stranickým právním zmocněncem pro kraje Hausruck a Salzkammergut. Po anšlusu vykonával od poloviny roku 1938 do poloviny roku 1940 funkci vedoucího krajského úřadu pro právo a komunální politiku. Zastával vysoké posty v Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation (NSRB) jako zástupce jejího krajského předsedy. V letech 1944-1945 byl župním vedoucím NSRB. V letech 1938-1943 byl členem SA. 1. května 1938 se rovněž stal členem jednotek SS jako Standartenführer.

Od března 1938 do března 1939 zastával úřad starosty rodného Welsu. Starostou města Linec byl od 15. června 1940 do 31. prosince 1943. Od ledna 1944 do května 1945 byl prezidentem vrchního zemského soudu v Linci.

Franz Langoth

Franz Langoth (20 August 1877 - 17 April 1953) : Head-mayor of Linz from 1 January 1944 to 7 May 1945.

...

The Austrian nationalist politician Franz Langoth was born on 20 August 1877 in Linz and died on 17 April 1953 in Linz. He later became a leading figure in the country's Nazi movement.

A native of Linz, Langoth was the son of a miller and a flour merchant and qualified as a teacher in 1896. He began his political career as a nationalist member of the « Landtag » of Upper-Austria in 1909. He served in the Austro-Hungarian Army as a lieutenant during the First World War and, subsequently, with the « Landsturm » .

In the immediate aftermath of the World War I, Langoth became head of the provincial security committee in Linz and, although he became noted for his hard-line « völkisch » beliefs and his strong support for the « Anschluß » , he also worked closely with Johann Nepomuk Hauser, the governor of Upper-Austria who was noted for his Christian-Socialist beliefs. As deputy « Laundeshauptmann » , Langoth gained a reputation as a strong, albeit even-handed, upholder of law and order in the province. In particular, Langoth clashed regularly with Emil Fey, particularly as he had banned marches by the « Heimwehr » in Upper-Austria. Langoth's reputation as law enforcer even saw Engelbert Dollfuss offer him the post of Federal Minister of Public Security in May 1932 but the offer was rejected.

He became leader of the Greater German People's Party after the First World War, leading the Party on a strongly anti-Semitic and racist course. However, whilst the Party initially enjoyed a following, it soon lost-out to the Nazi Party and Langoth joined this group in 1933. He also joined the « Schutzstaffel » at the same time. Under the « Ständestaat » , Langoth established the « Hilfswerk Langoth » which provided welfare payments to Nazi activists and played an important role in ensuring the continuation of the Nazi movement. Although the Nazi Party was banned in Austria after the attempted Putsch of 1934, Kurt Schuschnigg allowed Langoth's group to be active due to his high-standing. Langoth, along with Ernst Kaltenbrunner and Anton Reinthaller, even met with Schuschnigg in 1935 in an attempt to get the ban on the Nazis lifted in return for a guarantee of co-operation with the regime.

Langoth was a strong supporter of the « Anschluß » and he argued that :

« The election on 10 April 1938 in Austria had been an example of a true, democratic plebiscite and would be recorded as a pure and clean vote in future history. »

Following the « Anschluß » , Langoth became head of the « Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt » for Austria and the Upper-Danube. He also served as a judge in the « Volksgerichtshof » where he passed 41 death sentences and obtained the rank of « Brigadeführer » in the « Schutzstaffel » . Towards the end of the Second World War, he also served as Mayor of Linz and as the Allies advanced Langoth sought-out the Austrian resistance and negotiated with them the transfer of Linz to their administration.

Langoth was arrested by the United States forces and interned at Glasenbach until 1947, although he surprisingly faced no charges under the Denazification process and was amnestied in 1950. He became an advisor to the founders of the Federation of Independents and was an honorary member of the Party. His 1951 autobiography, « Kampf um Österreich » , was characterized by its continuing support for Nazism.

In the post-War era, Langoth was, for some time, considered a « good » Nazi who bore no responsibility for the excesses of the regime, to the extent that, in 1972, a street in Linz was renamed « Langothstraße » . The name continued in use until 1986 when the street was restored to its original name of « Kaisergasse » .

...

Franz Langoth (geboren 20. August 1877 in Linz ; gestorben 17. April 1953 ebenda) war ein österreichischer Lehrer, Unteroffizier und Politiker. Er war vom 1. Jänner 1944 bis zum 7. Mai 1945 Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Linz.

Franz Langoth wurde als Sohn eines Mehlhändlers und Müllers in Linz geboren und hatte sechs Brüder. In seiner Heimatstadt besuchte er die Volks- und Hauptschule und absolvierte nach dem Ende seiner Schullaufbahn eine Lehrerausbildung. Nach dem Besuch der Linzer Lehrerbildungsanstalt und der 1898 bestandenen Volksschullehrerprüfung wurde er Volksschullehrer in Windischgarsten, Hinterstoder und Kirchdorf an der Krems. Nach der Fachlehrerprüfung 1903 in Linz wurde er Bürgerschullehrer. Zuletzt war er Hauptschuldirektor.

Er wurde 1896 Mitglied im Oberösterreichischen Lehrerverein. Von 1909 bis 1934 war Langoth deutschnationaler Abgeordneter im oberösterreichischen Landtag. Von 1911 bis 1938 war er Obmann des Deutschen Volksbundes für Oberösterreich. Unterbrochen wurden diese Tätigkeiten von 1914 bis 1918, als er als Soldat der Kaiserlich und Königlich Armee im Ersten Weltkrieg diente. Nach dem Krieg war er bis 1934 Mitglied der oberösterreichischen Landesregierung (1918-1931 Landeshauptmannstellvertreter, 1931-1934 Landesrat) und bis 1933 Sicherheitsreferent in der oberösterreichischen Landesregierung. Daneben war er von 1919 bis 1934 Mitglied des Landesschulrates und 1920 bis 1934 Landesparteiobmann der Großdeutschen Volkspartei in Oberösterreich. Bereits 1933 (die NSDAP war in Österreich zu dieser Zeit verboten worden) war er Mitinitiator des « Kampfbündnisses » zwischen Großdeutscher Volkspartei und NSDAP.

Von 1934 bis 1938 war er Leiter des « Hilfswerkes Langoth » für NS-Parteigänger. Nach dem Anschluß Österreichs wurde er im Rang eines SS-Oberführers in die SS übernommen und am 1. Mai 1938 förmlich in die NSDAP aufgenommen. Von 1938 bis 1939 war er Leiter der Nationalsozialistischen Volkswohlfahrt (NSV) in Österreich, die unter dem Deckmantel der Wohlfahrtspflege nur die Menschen unterstützte, die die « richtige » politische Meinung vertraten und der richtigen « Rasse » angehörten. Von 1938 bis 1943 leitete er den NSV in Oberdonau. Von 1938 bis 1945 war er außerdem Mitglied des « Großdeutschen Reichstags » . Durch Hermann Göring bürgerte sich sein Spitzname « Vater Langgoth » ein. Langoth war von 1940 bis 1944 Richter beim Volksgerichtshof und fällte in 51 Verfahren mit insgesamt 125 Angeklagten, 118 Schuldsprüche, davon 41 Todesurteile. Ende Januar 1944 wurde er zum SS-Brigadeführer befördert und war bereits seit November 1943 Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Linz.

Bei Kriegsende wurde er am 7. Mai 1945 als Bürgermeister abgesetzt und war bis zu seiner krankheitsbedingten Entlassung im Mai 1947 durch die US-Besatzungsmacht in Glasenbach interniert. Obwohl Erhebungen nach dem Kriegsverbrecher- und Verbotsgesetz stattfanden, kam es zu keiner Anklage. 1950 wurde er vom Bundespräsidenten amnestiert. Seiner Gesinnung treu, initiierte er 1949 das « Soziale Friedenswerk » für belastete Nationalsozialisten. 1951 erschienen seinen Memoiren Kampf um Österreich, Erinnerungen eines Politikers. Er wurde im Dezember 1951 erstes Ehrenmitglied des Verbandes der Unabhängigen.

Nach seinem Tod hielt am 20. April 1954 Bürgermeister Ernst Koref eine Gedenkrede im Linzer Gemeinderat. Er galt

als « guter Nazi » - 1973 wurde gar eine Straße in Linz nach ihm benannt. Erst in den 1980er Jahren wurde begonnen dieses Bild zu revidieren. 1986 wurde die Langothstraße in Kaisergasse umbenannt.

Langoth war seit 1910 verheiratet und hatte zwei Kinder.

...

Als am 5. Mai 1945 Einheiten der dritten US-Armee mit Jeeps und Panzern am Linzer Hauptplatz einfuhren und von den Passanten freundlich empfangen wurden, machte sich nach Jahren der Angst, des Mangels und der Bombardements Erleichterung breit.

Schnell wurde damals ein Gerücht gestreut, das über Jahrzehnte zur Legende wurde. Der Linzer Oberbürgermeister Franz Langoth (seit Ende 1944), so wurde erzählt, habe mit seiner Initiative die kampflose Übergabe der Stadt erreicht und vielen Bewohnern das Leben gerettet.

Das war, wie der Chef des Linzer Stadtarchivs, der Historiker Walter Schuster, erforscht hat, nicht so. Nachträgliche Eintragungen in den Notizen von Langoths Sekretär sollten den Eindruck einer Rettung erwecken - und taten das auch erfolgreich für den Nationalsozialisten.

Langoth war ob seiner väterlichen Art (er war zu Kriegsende schon 68) und seiner angenehmen Umgangsformen beliebt. Und er hatte sich in Kriegszeiten für seinen späteren Nachfolger, den langjährigen sozialdemokratischen Bürgermeister Ernst Koref, eingesetzt, als dieser im Konzentrationslager Dachau interniert werden sollte. Die US-Besatzer verhafteten den NS-Amtsinhaber vorerst dennoch und brachten ihn nach Glöcknerbach in der Stadt Salzburg, wo ein Großteil der österreichischen NS-Funktionäre festgehalten wurde.

Zwei Jahre später kam Langoth frei, und es wurde trotz seiner hohen Funktionen im NS-Regime nie Anklage gegen ihn erhoben. Für heutige Historiker wie Walter Schuster ist das nur mit Langoths aus langjährigem Politikerleben rührenden Verbindungen und der Haltung der demokratischen Nachfolger zu verstehen :

« Selbst integre Männer wie Ernst Koref wollten sich als NS-Täter eher SA-Schläger und KZ-Bewacher als den Bildungsbürger vom Typus des Franz Langoth vorstellen. »

Der Hauptschullehrer, langjährige Landesobmann der Großdeutschen Volkspartei und Landtagsabgeordnete war schon fünf Jahre vor dem Anschluß an Deutschland Verbindungsmann zur illegalen NSDAP und hatte über ein Hilfswerk, geduldet von der autoritären Regierung Kurt Schuschnigg, illegale Nazis in Österreich unterstützt. Mit dem Anschluß wurde Langoth SS-Oberführer (am Schluß Brigadeführer), leitete die Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt (NSV) und saß bis zum Ende des Regimes im Reichstag in Berlin. Von 1940 bis 1944 war er Richter beim Volksgerichtshof und fällte in 51 Verfahren 118 Schuldsprüche, in 41 Fällen waren das Todesurteile. Ein Fall war jener der Linzer Ordensschwester Camilla Estermann, die Zwangsarbeitern Lebensmittel und Kleider geschenkt hatte.

Bis Mitte der 1980er Jahre wirkte die Legende vom « guten Nazi » , unter Bürgermeister Franz Hillinger wurde sogar eine Straße nach ihm benannt. Dann begannen Forschungsergebnisse das Bild zu revidieren, und seither hat Linz wieder eine Kaisergasse.

...

Franz Langoth wurde am 20. August 1877 als Sohn eines Müllers und Mehlhändlers in Linz geboren. Er besuchte von 1892-1896 die Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Linz. Seit 1896 war er Mitglied des Oberösterreichischen Lehrervereins. Nach seiner Reifeprüfung wurde er als Aushilfslehrer in Windischgarsten angestellt. Danach folgten Verpflichtungen als Lehrer in Innerstoder und Kirchdorf an der Krems. 1898 wirkte er an der Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Knabenschule (heute Goetheschule) in Linz.

Nachdem Langoth 1898 die Lehrbefähigungsprüfung für Volksschulen abgelegt hatte, unterrichtete er von 1899-1903 in der Knabenvolksschule Baumbachstraße Nummer 10 in Linz. 1903 (Langoth machte in diesem Jahr die Prüfung für Bürgerschullehrer) begann er als provisorischer Fachlehrer an der Linzer Kaiser-Franz-Josefs-Knabenbürgerschule in der Schützenstraße Nummer 13 in Linz zu arbeiten. Ab 1908 war Langoth definitiver Fachlehrer der Knabenbürgerschule in der Figulystraße in Linz. 1909 kareziert, wurde er 1934 Direktor der Knaben-Hauptschule I an der Spittelwiese in Linz. 1935 erfolgte die Versetzung Langoths in den Ruhestand. Langoth nahm von 1914 bis 1918 am Ersten Weltkrieg teil (ab 1915 Rechnungsführer-Leutnant beim II. Reservebataillon des Kaiserlich und Königlich Infanterieregiments Nummer 29 an der italienischen Front) .

Langoths politische Karriere begann 1909. Er wurde deutschnationaler Abgeordneter im oberösterreichischen Landtag. 1918-1919 gehörte er der provisorischen Landesversammlung an und war anschließend Abgeordneter der nachfolgenden drei Legislaturperioden (XII. , XIII. und XIV.) . Bereits 1918 als Mitglied der provisorischen Landesregierung vereidigt, blieb Langoth bis 1934 Abgeordneter und Regierungsmitglied im Oberösterreich Landtag. Von 1918-1931 hatte er die Funktion des Landeshauptmannstellvertreters, von 1931-1934 die Funktion eines Landesrats inne. Als Landesparteiobmann der Großdeutschen Volkspartei (1920-1934) kann Langoth als der maßgebliche Vertreter des nationalen Lagers in Oberösterreich angesehen werden.

Weiters war Langoth Obmann des Deutschen Volksbundes für Oberösterreich (1911-1938) und Mitglied des Landeschulrates (1919-1934) . Er nahm außerdem Einfluß auf folgende Bereiche der Öffentlichkeit, da er Obmann des Linzer Mietvereins, Verwaltungsrat der Bank für Oberösterreich und Salzburg, Mitglied des Verwaltungsrates der Wolfsegg-Traunthaler Kohlenwerks-AG, Mitglied des Verwaltungsrates der Oberösterreichischen Wasserkraft- und Elektrizitäts-AG und stellvertretender Vorsitzender beziehungsweise Mitglied des Landeseisenbahnrates (1919-1925) war.

Von 1918 bis 1933 hatte Langoth das Aufgabengebiet eines Sicherheitsreferenten in der Oberösterreich Landesregierung inne. Langoth wandte sich 1933 der nationalsozialistischen Ideologie zu. Da er Mitinitiator des « Kampfbündnisses » zwischen Großdeutscher Volkspartei und NSDAP (15. Mai 1933) gewesen war, wurde er in der Sitzung der Landesregierung vom 13. Juni 1933 als Sicherheitsreferent ersetzt. Am 1. März 1934 nahm Langoth zum letzten Mal an einer Landtagsitzung teil. Er stimmte der Wahl Gleißners als Landeshauptmann zu. Der neue Landtag (ab 28. November

1934) sah ihn nicht mehr als Vertreter der Großdeutschen Volkspartei.

Er schuf 1934 das « Hilfswerk Langoth » , dessen Leiter er bis 1938 blieb. Dieses Hilfswerk unterstützte NS-Aktivisten in Österreich, wurde aber von der Regierung Schuschnigg geduldet. 1938 erhielt Langoth den Rang eines SS-Oberführers. Seine SS-Nummer lautete 292.795. Am 1. Mai desselben Jahres kam es zu seiner förmlichen Aufnahme in die NSDAP (Mitgliedsnummer 6.250.313) . Langoth gelang nach dem Anschluß (er war bereits 60 Jahre alt) eine erstaunliche Karriere. Von 1938 bis 1943 wurde ihm die Leitung der NSV in Oberdonau übertragen. 1938-1939 leitete er die NSV in Österreich. Er gehörte von 1938 bis 1945 dem « Großdeutschen Reichstag » an und war von 1940-1944 Richter beim NS-Volksgeschichtshof. In dieser Funktion fällte er in 51 Verfahren mit insgesamt 125 Angeklagten 41 Todesurteile. 77 weitere Regimegegner wurden von ihm zu Zuchthausstrafen verurteilt. Am 8. Januar 1944 kam es zur Bestellung Langoths zum Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Linz. In diesem Jahr erhielt er den Rang eines SS-Brigadeführers.

Nach der Verhaftung Langoths durch die US-Besatzungsmacht wurde er in Glasenbach interniert. Er kam am 15. Mai 1947 in Gewahrsam der Polizeidirektion Linz. Von dort wurde er in das Spital der Strafanstalt Garsten überstellt, kurz darauf aber in häusliche Pflege nach Goisern entlassen. Die Staatsanwaltschaft Linz erhob nie Anklage gegen Langoth. Im Dezember 1950 erfolgte seine Amnestierung durch den Bundespräsidenten.

1949 initiierte Langoth die Stiftung « Soziales Friedenswerk » für belastete Nationalsozialisten. 1951 erhielt er die Ehrenmitgliedschaft des VDU. Er schrieb seine Memoiren « Kampf um Österreich, Erinnerungen eines Politikers » , die 1951 publiziert wurden. Langoth galt lange Zeit als « guter Nationalsozialist » . 1973 kam es in Linz zur Benennung einer Straßennach ihm. 1986 wurde diese Straße in Kaisergasse umbenannt.

Franz Langoth starb am 17. April 1953 in Linz.

Der Fall Langoth

In Österreich glaubte man nach 1945 die Souveränität rascher wieder zu erlangen, indem man das Land zum ersten Opfer Adolf Hitlers stilisierte, den Jubel im März 1938 negierte und die Mitverantwortung von ÖsterreicherInnen an den nationalsozialistischen Verbrechen in den Hintergrund rückte. Im beginnenden Kalten Krieg folgten die Großmächte ihren eigenen Interessen, Österreich gewann dadurch mit seiner Position Spielraum. Ehemalige NationalsozialistInnen wurden in diesem Zusammenhang mitunter rasch pardonierte, insbesondere, wenn sie freundlich waren oder über Beziehungen verfügten. In diese Kategorie gehörte Franz Langoth (1877 bis 1953) , illegales NSDAP-Mitglied vor 1938, SS-Brigadeführer und Mitglied des Großdeutschen Reichstages. Der Jurist war Richter beim Volksgeschichtshof gewesen und hatte 118 Schuldsprüche gefällt, davon 41 Todesurteile. Zu nennen ist in diesem Zusammenhang die damals 63 Jahre alte, in Linz geborene Ordensschwester Camilla Estermann. In einer Linzer Bekleidungsfirma hatte sie an französische Zwangsarbeiter Lebensmittel und Kleidungsstücke verschenkt und war deshalb von der Gestapo verhaftet worden. Von einem Richtersenat des Volksgeschichtshofes, dem Oberbürgermeister Franz Langoth angehörte, wurden sie und der 74-jährige Franz Heger zum Tode verurteilt. Der pensionierte Gendarmerie-Inspektor Heger wurde letztlich wegen der Verbreitung von Weissagungen verurteilt, die den Zusammenbruch des nationalsozialistischen Regimes prophezeiten. Beide wurden am 21. November 1944 in Wien enthauptet.

(Vergleiche Schuster, 1999 ; Seiten 154-156.)

Franz Langoth war vom 1. Jänner 1944 bis Kriegsende Oberbürgermeister von Linz. In seinen Memoiren hielt Langoth dazu fest :

« Natürlich galt auch in der Stadtverwaltung das Führerprinzip [...] die Entscheidung stand schließlich bei mir allein. »

(Vergleiche Langoth, 1951 ; Seite 267.)

Im Stadtbereich wurden damals viele ZwangsarbeiterInnen und KZ-Häftlinge festgehalten, misshandelt oder getötet. Vom US-Militär wurde Langoth festgenommen und in ein Internierungslager verbracht. Für Aufregung hatte gesorgt, daß der von den Amerikanern eingesetzte Bürgermeister Ernst Koref sich vom NS-Bürgermeister mit Handschlag verabschiedete. Langoth hatte eingegriffen, als Koref in das KZ-Dachau verschickt werden sollte und ihm damit möglicherweise das Leben gerettet. Im Gegenzug übernahm Koref Langoths Sekretär der Jahre 1944-1945, Hans Kreczi, und setzte ihn in hohen Funktionen, und andere als Kulturverwaltungsdirektor ein. Obwohl gegen Langoth Erhebungen nach dem Kriegsverbrecher- und Verbotsgesetz stattfanden, kam es zu keiner Anklage. Er galt aufgrund seiner väterlichen Art als Prototyp des « guten Nazi » . Langoth blieb bei seiner politischen Haltung. In seinen Memoiren präsentierte er sich noch 1951 als überzeugter Nationalsozialist. Langoth war kein Einzelfall. In der Stadt Linz ebenso wie im Land Oberösterreich waren nach 1945 viele ehemalige NationalsozialistInnen in Verwaltung, Jurisdiktion und Politik tätig.

(Vergleiche dazu und A. Schuster, 1996 ; Seite 87ff.)

Langoth war als ehemaliger Linzer Oberbürgermeister allerdings ein sehr prominentes Beispiel.

Walter Schuster, der nunmehriger Leiter des Archivs der Stadt Linz, hat die Fallgeschichte des Franz Langoth sehr detailliert dokumentiert und analysiert. In seiner Biografie des letzten nationalsozialistischen Oberbürgermeisters von Linz heißt es abschließend :

« In Österreich hatte man eine besondere “ Gabe ” entwickelt : Man verstand es, zwischen “ guten ” und “ schlechten ” Nationalsozialisten zu unterscheiden und war rasch zu glauben bereit, jemand sei zwar NSDAP-Mitglied, aber kein Nazi gewesen. In diese Kategorie ehemaliger Nationalsozialisten, die man allzu schnell zu exkulpien bereit war, gehörte auch Franz Langoth. Politiker und Behörden taten sich schwer, eine allseits respektierte Persönlichkeit wie ihn zu verurteilen. Selbst integre Männer wie Ernst Koref wollten sich als NS-Täter eher SA-Schläger und KZ-Bewacher als den Bildungsbürger vom Typus eines Franz Langoth vorstellen. Jemandem (!) wie ihm (!) , dem stetig und bereitwillig attestiert wurde, auch in der NS-Zeit persönlich “ anständig ” geblieben zu sein, wollte man nicht für die Verbrechen des NS-Regimes mitverantwortlich machen. »

(Schuster, 1999 ; Seite 291.)

...

Adolf Hitler projette de faire de Linz une métropole et, à cette fin, il envisage la construction de nouveaux édifices :

Une série d'immeubles d'apparat sur les 2 rives du Danube ; un pont suspendu devant relier les 2 rives de celle-ci ; une maison du « NSDAP », énorme bâtiment avec une salle de réunion gigantesque et un campanile comprenant une crypte dans laquelle il voulait avoir sa sépulture ; un nouvel hôtel de ville ; un grand hôtel de luxe ; une série d'édifices culturels : un grand théâtre, une bibliothèque, un musée des armes, une galerie de tableaux (le « Führermuseum » consacré à l'art germanique) , un bâtiment d'exposition ; et de 2 monuments : l'un à la gloire de l'« Anschluß », l'autre d'Anton Bruckner.

Non loin de là, sur les hauteurs, devait s'élever la résidence où Hitler souhaitait se retirer dans sa vieillesse. Hitler rêvait de reproduire à Linz le panorama qu'à Budapest les siècles avaient modelé sur les 2 rives du Danube (Vienne était mal orientée selon lui, car tournant le dos au Danube) .

...

La spoliation d'œuvres d'art sous le 3e « Reich », désignée aussi en allemand par le terme « Raubkunst », est la dépossession massive et planifiée d'œuvres d'art par des agents du Parti nazi sous le 3e « Reich », en Allemagne et à travers l'Europe de 1933 à la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Des services nazis de confiscation spécialement institués (telles les agences « Einsatzstab », « Reichsleiter », « Rosenberg ») , entreprennent, à partir de listes établies bien avant le déclenchement de la guerre, le pillage et la confiscation de collections publiques et privées dans tous les pays qu'ils occupent ainsi que la spoliation des Juifs qui commence en Allemagne, dès 1933. Des petites équipes en France, en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas vident entièrement tous les appartements juifs (au total 70,000 logements dont 38,000 à Paris) dans le cadre de la « Möbelaktion » : leurs objets sans valeur sont brûlés, leurs livres servant à alimenter la bibliothèque de la Haute-École de la « NSDAP » .

Organisée par le théoricien nazi Alfred Rosenberg, cette spoliation concerne les Juifs (la 1re collection visée en France est celle des Rothschild) mais aussi des musées et des collections privées dans tous les pays occupés. Les Nazis justifient ce pillage par le « Kunstschutz », principe de préservation du patrimoine artistique qui va de pair avec un projet de musée allemand gigantesque, le « Führermuseum » . Adolf Hitler souhaite le faire construire à Linz, ville qu'il considère comme la capitale de l'Empire. En fin de compte, ce projet ne verra pas le jour.

Certains États ou particuliers prennent des mesures pour évacuer leurs chefs-d'œuvre avant l'invasion des forces de l'Axe, tel le musée du Louvre, dont les collections sont en partie transférées au château de Valençay. Les Nazis utilisent le musée du « Jeu de Paume » comme dépôt central avant d'orienter les œuvres vers différentes destinations en Allemagne. Une grande partie de ce butin est transférée à la fin de la guerre dans 3 mines près de Salzbourg, la plus connue étant la mine de sel d'Altaussee avec plus de 2,000 pièces.

Rose Valland, attachée de conservation du musée du « Jeu de Paume », dresse un inventaire précis des œuvres qui transitent par le musée et essaye de connaître leurs destinations (en tête de liste, Hitler et son « Führermuseum », ainsi que la collection personnelle d'Hermann Göring), le nom des responsables des transferts, ainsi que le numéro des convois et des transporteurs. Le conservateur d'art, George L. Stout, persuade le commandement militaire allié de créer le « Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives program », organisme américain qui est fondé en 1943. Ses membres, les « Monuments men », hommes ayant une formation de conservateur de musée, d'historien de l'art, d'architecte ou d'archiviste, sont initialement chargés de préserver des combats, les églises, musées et monuments nationaux au cours de la progression des Alliés puis, à la fin de la guerre, de retrouver les biens pillés par les Nazis et de les expertiser. La spoliation par le 3^e « Reich » est évaluée à plus de 5 millions de tableaux et de sculptures.

La destruction totale de l'art polonais est estimée à 20 milliards de dollars, ou 43 % de l'héritage culturel polonais.

La chute de Berlin se traduit par le pillage systématique de l'Allemagne occupée et des anciens territoires orientaux du « Reich » allemand par les Soviétiques, en guise d'indemnité de guerre.

En 1945, le capitaine Walter Farmer considéra que 20 % de l'art en Europe fut pillé par les Nazis et que 100,000 pièces ne furent pas retournées à leur propriétaire.

Les nombreuses destructions de patrimoine au cours de ce conflit sont à l'origine de la Convention pour la protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé, en 1954.

...

One of the last photographs of Adolf Hitler depicts him shortly before his suicide as he sits in the bunker of his Chancellery. While the Red Army advanced into the ruins of Berlin outside, he pondered a pompous architectural model of the Upper-Austrian provincial capital of Linz, the gigantic buildings illuminated by a sophisticated arrangement of spotlights : Linz in the morning sun, at midday, at sunset glow, and at night.

« No matter at what time, whether during the day or at night, whenever he had the opportunity during those weeks, he was sitting in front of this model », the architect Hermann Giesler reported, saying that Hitler stared at it as if at « a promised land into which we would gain entrance » .

Visitors to whom he showed the model, often at the most unusual hours of the night, were confused and horrified : the man who had reduced Europe to ashes and ruins had clearly lost his sense of reality and hardly noticed how many people were still dying in these last weeks, in his name, and according to his will, as he continued to refuse to capitulate and end the horror.

Hitler dreamed of Linz, his hometown, which he had appointed « the “ Führer's ” sister city » and had wanted to make the Greater German « Reich » 's cultural capital, the « most beautiful city on the Danube », the « metropolis », the petrified glorification of his person and his policies :

« Linz owes everything it has, and is yet to obtain to the “ Reich ”. Therefore, this city must become the carrier of the idea of the “ Reich ”. Every building in Linz should have the inscription : “ Gift from the German ' Reich ' ” » .

On the left-bank of the Danube, in Urfahr, opposite the old-part of town, a Party and administration center had been planned with an assembly area for 100,000 and grounds for celebrations accommodating 30,000 people, an exposition area with a Bismarck monument, and a Technical University. According to the plan, a « District center » (with a new City Hall ; the « Reich » Governor’s House ; the District and Party center ; and the Linz Community center) was to be built around a national commemorative site : Hitler’s parents’ tomb, with its steeple, visible from far away, whose chimes were to play (albeit not every day) a motif from Anton Bruckner’s « Romantic » Symphony (Symphony No. 4) . This steeple was planned to be higher than that of Vienna’s Saint-Stephen’s Cathedral. Thus, Hitler said, he was making-up for an old injustice ; for, to the Linzers’ vexation, during the construction of the neo-Gothic Linz cathedral, Vienna had reduced the height of the steeple « so that the Stephen’s Tower would remain the highest steeple in the country » . A monument « to the foundation of the Greater German Empire » was to be built too, along with a large stadium. Hitler told the Upper-Danube District director, August Eigruber :

« The stones for this will be shipped by the Mauthausen concentration camp. »

On the opposite side of the Danube, in « Alt-Linz » (the old-part of town) , a boulevard was to be built under arcades, « wider than the “ Ring ” Boulevard, in Vienna » . A hotel was to be constructed for more than 2,000 guests, with a direct subway connection to the train station ; there were also to be built the most modern hospitals and schools, among them an « Adolf Hitler School » , a District Music School, and a « Reich » Motor Flying School for the « Luftwaffe » . There were projects for model settlements for workers and artists, 2 homes for SS and SA invalids, new streets, and an access road to the « autobahn » . In order to make Linz rich, Hitler advanced industrialization, bringing steel and chemical factories to Linz. Transforming the farm-town into an industrial city was almost the only thing that was actually realized. The « Hermann Göring Factory » still exists as the Vöest factory.

The planned cultural center was to have metropolitan proportions, in particular the Linz Art Museum, which Hitler mentioned in his last will the day before his death :

« I collected the paintings in the collections I have bought over the years, never for private purposes, but always exclusively for enlarging a gallery in my hometown of Linz on the Danube. It would be my most fervent wish for this legacy to be realized. »

In fact, money for this project was always available, even when there was a shortage of foreign currency during the War. From April 1943 to March 1944 alone, Hitler purchased 881 works of art, among them 395 Dutch pieces from the 17th and 18th Centuries. By the end of June 1944, the Museum had cost 92.6 million « Reichsmark » .

Josef Gœbbels wrote in his diary :

« Linz costs us a lot of money. But it means so much to the “ Führer ”. And it probably is good too to support Linz as a cultural competitor to Vienna. »

For, as Hitler remarked emphatically :

« I won't give Vienna a pfennig, and the “ Reich ” won't give it anything either. »

The most distinguished pieces for the Linz Museum were requisitioned from private galleries, museums, and churches in the parts of Europe Hitler's army had occupied - for example, the « Veit Stoß Altar » in Cracow, or the « Van Eyck Altar » in the cathedral of Ghent. Hitler derived particular satisfaction from transferring holdings from Vienna, for example from such « un-German » Viennese collections as those of Baron Nathaniel Rothschild. The formerly Imperial Art History Museum also gave pieces to Linz, which, as Hitler remarked in 1942 :

« His dear Viennese didn't like at all ; his dear Viennese, whom he knows so well after all, were so stodgy that when he was looking at some of the requisitioned Rembrandts, they tried to let him know in their genial way that all genuine paintings should really remain in Vienna, but that they would be glad to let galleries in Linz or Innsbruck have paintings by anonymous Masters. When he decided differently, it hit the Viennese between the eyes. »

Hitler planned to spend his retirement on Mount Frein above the old-part of town in a building modeled after an Upper-Austrian farm :

« I climbed these rocks when I was young. On this hill-top, looking over the Danube, I day-dreamed. This is where I want to live when I'm old. And : I won't take anyone along except Miss Braun ; Miss Braun and my dog. »

Albert Speer (after 1945, to be sure) ironically characterized Hitler's exaggerated love for Vienna as a « provincial mentality » , adding that :

« Hitler always remained one of the small-town people, an insecure stranger in the large metropolises. While he was almost obsessively thinking and planning in huge proportions, it was in a town like Linz, where he had gone to school and where everything was on a manageable scale, that he felt at home socially. »

The nature of this love, Speer claimed, was « one of escape » .

Yet, the point here is a lot more than the contrast between province and capital : it is the nationally homogenous, « German » Linz on the one side, and multi-national Vienna on the other. Furthermore, Hitler experienced the rural character of the provincial town as honest and rooted in the soil compared to the sophisticated, intellectual, and self-confident metropolis. Thus, Gœbbels, functioning as his Master's mouth-piece, tee marked after a visit to Linz :

« Genuine German men. Not Viennese scoundrels. »

From a biographical perspective, Linz represented for Hitler the back-drop for an orderly, clean, « petit bourgeois » time of his youth, which he spent with his beloved mother, whereas Vienna was witness to lonely, unsuccessful, and wretched years. However, most important from a political angle was Hitler's goal to dethrone the Hapsburg Empire's old capital and to subjugate it to the German capital of Berlin. Vienna, he said, « exuded a huge, even gigantic fluidum ». Therefore, it was « a tremendous task to break Vienna's cultural preponderance in the Alpine and Danube districts » .

...

Nazi plunder refers to art theft and other items stolen as a result of the organized looting of European countries during the time of the 3rd « Reich » by agents acting on behalf of the ruling Nazi Party of Germany. Plundering occurred from 1933 until the end of World War II, particularly by military units known as the « Kunstschutz » , although most plunder was acquired during the War. In addition to gold, silver and currency, cultural items of great significance were stolen, including paintings, ceramics, books, and religious treasures. Although most of these items were recovered by agents of the « Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives program » (MFAA) , affectionately referred to as the « Monuments Men » , on behalf of the Allies immediately following the War, many are still missing. There is an international effort under way to identify Nazi plunder that still remains unaccounted for, with the aim of ultimately returning the items to the rightful owners, their families or their respective countries.

Adolf Hitler was an unsuccessful artist who was denied admission to the Vienna Academy of Fine-Arts. Nonetheless, he thought of himself as a connoisseur of the arts and, in « Mein Kampf » , he ferociously attacked modern art as degenerate, including : Cubism ; Futurism ; and Dadaism ; all of which he considered the product of a decadent 20th Century society. When, in 1933, Hitler became Chancellor of Germany, he enforced his æsthetic ideal on the nation. The types of art that were favored amongst the Nazi Party were Classical portraits and landscapes by Old Masters, particularly those of Germanic origin. Modern art that did not match this was dubbed degenerate art by the 3rd « Reich » , and all that was found in Germany's State museums was to be sold or destroyed. With the sums raised, the « Führer » 's objective was to establish the European Art Museum, in Linz. Other Nazi dignitaries, like « Reichsmarschall » Hermann Göring and Foreign Affairs minister von Ribbentrop, were also intent on taking advantage of German military conquests to increase their private art collections.

The art dealers Hildebrand Gurlitt, Karl Buchholz, Ferdinand Moeller and Bernhard Boehmer set-up shop in « Schloß Niederschonhausen » , just outside Berlin, to sell the near 16,000 cache of paintings and sculptures which Hitler and Göring removed from the walls of German museums, in 1937-1938. They were 1st put on display in the « Haus der Kunst » , in Munich, on 19 July 1937, with the Nazi leaders inviting public mockery by 2 million visitors who came to view the condemned modern art in the Degenerate art exhibition. Propagandist Josef Göbbels in a radio broadcast called Germany's degenerate artists « garbage » . Hitler opened the « Haus der Kunst » exhibition with a speech. In it, he described German art as suffering « a great and fatal illness » .

Hildebrand Gurlitt and his colleagues did not have much success with their sales, mainly because art labelled « rubbish » had small appeal. So, on 20 March 1939, they set fire to 1,004 paintings and sculptures and 3,825 water-

colours, drawings and prints in the courtyard of the Berlin Fire Department, an act of infamy similar to their earlier well-known book burnings. The propaganda act raised the attention they hoped. The Basel Museum, in Switzerland, arrived with 50,000 Swiss francs to spend. Shocked art-lovers came to buy. What is unknown after these sales is how many paintings were kept by Gurlitt, Buchholz, Moeller and Boehmer and sold by them to Switzerland and America (ships crossed the Atlantic from Lisbon) for personal gain.

While the Nazis were in power, they plundered cultural property from every territory they occupied. This was conducted in a systematic manner with organizations specifically created to determine which public and private collections were most valuable to the Nazi Regime. Some of the objects were ear-marked for Hitler's never realized the « Führermuseum », some objects went to other high-ranking officials such as Hermann Göring, while other objects were traded to fund Nazi activities.

In 1940, an organization known as the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg für die Besetzten Gebiete » (The « Reichsleiter » Rosenberg Institute for the Occupied Territories) , or ERR, was formed, headed for Alfred Rosenberg by Gerhard Utikal. The 1st operating unit, the western branch for France, Belgium and the Netherlands, called the « Dienststelle Westen » (Western Agency) , was located in Paris. The chief of this « Dienststelle » was Kurt von Behr. Its original purpose was to collect Jewish and Free-masonic books and documents, either for destruction, or for removal to Germany for further « study » . However, late in 1940, Hermann Göring, who in fact controlled the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , issued an order that effectively changed the mission of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , mandating it to seize « Jewish » art collections and other objects. The War loot had to be collected in a central place in Paris, the Museum « Jeu de Paume » . At this collection point worked art historians and other personnel who inventoried the loot before sending it to Germany. Göring also commanded that the loot would 1st be divided between Hitler and himself. Hitler later ordered that all confiscated works of art were to be made directly available to him. From the end of 1940 to the end of 1942, Göring traveled 20 times to Paris. In the Museum « Jeu de Paume » , art dealer Bruno Lohse staged 20 expositions of the newly looted art objects, especially for Göring, from which Göring selected at least 594 pieces for his own collection. Göring made Lohse his liaison-officer and installed him in the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , in March 1941, as the deputy leader of this unit. Items which Hitler and Göring did not want were made available to other Nazi leaders. Under Rosenberg and Göring's leadership, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » seized 21,903 art objects from German-occupied countries.

Other Nazi looting organizations included the « Sonderauftrag Linz » , the organization run by the art historian Hans Posse, which was particularly in charge of assembling the works for the « Führermuseum » , the « Dienststelle Mühlmann » , operated by Kajetan Mühlmann, which Göring also controlled and operated primarily in the Netherlands, Belgium, and a « Sonderkommando » Kuensberg connected to the minister of foreign affairs Joachim von Ribbentrop, which operated 1st in France, then in Russia and North-Africa. In Western Europe, with the advancing German troops, were elements of the « von Ribbentrop Battalion » , named after Joachim von Ribbentrop. These men were responsible for entering private and institutional libraries in the occupied countries and removing any materials of interest to the Germans, especially items of scientific, technical or other informational value.

Art collections from prominent Jewish families, including the Rothschilds, the Rosenbergs, the Wildensteins and the

Schloß Family were the targets of confiscations because of their significant value. Also, Jewish art dealers sold art to German organizations - often under duress, e.g. the art dealerships of Jacques Goudstikker, Benjamin and Nathan Katz and Kurt Walter Bachstiz. Also, non-Jewish art dealers sold art to the Germans, e.g. the art dealers De Boer and Hoogendijk, in the Netherlands.

By the end of the war, the 3rd « Reich » amassed hundreds of thousands of cultural objects.

To investigate and estimate Nazi plunder in the USSR, during 1941 through 1945, the « Soviet State Extraordinary Commission for Ascertaining and Investigating the Crimes Committed by the German-Fascist Invaders and Their Accomplices » was formed on 2 November 1942.

Alfred Rosenberg commanded the so-called « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) für die Besetzten Gebiete », which was responsible for collecting art, books, and cultural objects from invaded countries, and also transferred their captured library collections back to Berlin during the retreat from Russia. « In their search for “ research materials ” « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » teams and the “ Wehrmacht ” visited 375 archival institutions, 402 museums, 531 institutes, and 957 libraries in Eastern Europe alone. » The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » also operated in the early days of the « blitzkrieg » of the Low-Countries. This caused some confusion about authority, priority, and the chain of command among the German Army, the von Rippentropp Battalion and the « Gestapo », and as a result of personal looting among the Army officers and troops. These « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » teams were, however, very effective. One account estimates that, from the Soviet Union alone, « 100,000 geographical maps were taken on ideological grounds, for academic research, as means for political, geographical and economic information on Soviet cities and regions, or as collector's items ».

After the occupation of Poland by German forces, in September 1939, the Nazi regime attempted to exterminate its upper-classes as well as its culture. Thousands of art objects were looted, as the Nazis systematically carried-out a plan of looting prepared even before the start of hostilities. 25 museums and many other facilities were destroyed. The total cost of German Nazi theft and destruction of Polish art is estimated at 20 billion dollars, or an estimated 43 % of Polish cultural heritage ; over 516,000 individual art pieces were looted, including 2,800 paintings by European painters ; 11,000 paintings by Polish painters ; 1,400 sculptures ; 75,000 manuscripts ; 25,000 maps ; 90,000 books, including over 20,000 printed before 1800 ; and hundreds of thousands of other items of artistic and historical value. Germany still has much Polish material looted during World War II. For decades, there have been mostly futile negotiations between Poland and Germany concerning the return of the looted property.

After Hitler became Chancellor, he made plans to transform his home city of Linz, Austria into the 3rd « Reich » 's capital city for the arts. Hitler hired architects to work from his own designs to build several galleries and museums, which would collectively be known as the « Führermuseum ». Hitler wanted to fill his museum with the greatest art treasures in the world, and believed that most of the world's finest art belonged to Germany after having been looted during the Napoleonic and 1st World wars.

The Hermann Göring collection, a personal collection of « Reichsmarschall » Hermann Göring, was another large

collection including confiscated property, consisted of approximately 50 % of works of art confiscated from the enemies of the « Reich » . Assembled in large measure by art dealer Bruno Lohse, Göring's adviser and « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » representative in Paris, in 1945, the collection included over 2,000 individual pieces including more than 300 paintings. The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration's Consolidated Interrogation Report No. 2 states that Göring never crudely looted, instead he always managed « to find a way of giving at least the appearance of honesty, by a token payment or promise thereof to the confiscation authorities. Although he and his agents never had an official connection with the German confiscation organizations, they nevertheless used them to the fullest extent possible. »

The 3rd « Reich » amassed hundreds of thousands of objects from occupied nations and stored them in several key locations, such as the « Musée du Jeu de Paume » , in Paris, and the Nazi headquarters in Munich. As the Allied forces gained advantage in the War and bombed Germany's cities and historic institutions, Germany « began storing the artworks in salt mines and caves for protection from Allied bombing raids. These mines and caves offered the appropriate humidity and temperature conditions for artworks. » Well-known repositories of this kind were mines in Merkers, Altaussee and Siegen. These mines were not only used for the storage of looted art but also of art that had been in Germany and Austria before the beginning of the Nazi rule. Degenerate art was legally banned by the Nazis from entering Germany, and so, ones designated were held in what was called the « Martyr's Room » at the « Jeu de Paume » . Much of Paul Rosenberg's professional dealership and personal collection were so subsequently designated by the Nazis. Following Josef Goebels earlier private decree to sell these degenerate works for foreign currency to fund the building of the « Führermuseum » and the wider War effort, Hermann Göring personally appointed a series of « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » approved dealers to liquidate these assets and, then, pass the funds to swell his personal art collection, including Hildebrand Gurlitt. With the looted degenerate art sold onwards via Switzerland, Rosenberg's collection was scattered across Europe. Today, some 70 of his paintings are missing.

The Allies created special commissions, such as the « Monuments, Fine-Arts and Archives » (MFAA) organization to help protect famous European monuments from destruction and, after the War, to travel to once-Nazi-occupied territories to find Nazi art repositories. In 1944 and 1945, one of the greatest challenges for the « Monuments Men » was to keep Allied forces from plundering and « taking artworks and sending them home to friends and family » . When « off-limits » warning signs failed to protect the artworks, the « Monuments Men » started to mark the storage places with white tape, which was used by Allied troops as a warning sign for unexploded mines. They recovered thousands of objects, many of which were pillaged by the Nazis.

The Allies found these artworks in over 1,050 repositories, in Germany and Austria, at the end of World War II. In summer 1945, Captain Walter Farmer became the collecting point's 1st director. The 1st shipment of artworks arriving at Wiesbaden Collection Point included cases of antiquities, Egyptian art, Islamic artefacts, and paintings from the « Kaiser Friedrich Museum » . The collecting point also received materials from the « Reichsbank » and Nazi-looted, Polish, liturgical collections. At its height, Wiesbaden stored, identified, and restituted approximately 700,000 individual objects including paintings and sculptures, mainly to keep them away from the Soviet Army and War-time reparations.

The Allies collected the artworks and stored them in collecting points, in particular, the Central Collection Point in

Munich, until they could be returned. The identifiable works of art, that had been acquired by the Germans during the Nazi rule, were returned to the countries from which they were taken. It was up to the governments of each nation if and under which circumstances they would return the objects to the original owners.

The Linz File : Hitler's Plunder of Europe's Art

The story of the looting and recovery of thousands of works of art from European galleries and private collections, all to fulfill Adolf Hitler's dream of building a great art gallery in his home-town of Linz, Austria.

Author : Charles De Jaeger.

Hard-cover : 240 pages, photos.

Publisher : John Wiley & Sons Canada, Limited (1 January 1981) .

ISBN-10 : 0471799408

ISBN-13 : 978-0471799405

ASIN : B00A2MVJRY

Publisher : Webb & Bower, Exeter, England (1981) .

Description : 24 cm ; 192 pages ; illustrations.

Bibliography : pages 181-185.

ISBN : 9780906671306, 9780906671302

Publisher : Magnolia (5 October 1981) .

ISBN-10 : 0906671302

ISBN-13 : 978-0906671306

Product Dimensions : 23.4 x 16.2 x 2.6 cm.

Shipping Weight : 540 g

...

Albert Speer :

« Now that he was giving the orders, Hitler said, he would help his native city win its proper place. His program for the transformation of Linz into a “ metropolis ” envisioned a number of impressive public buildings, on both sides of the Danube. A suspension bridge was to connect the 2 banks. The apex of his plan was a large “ Gau-Haus ” (District Headquarters) for the National-Socialist Party, with a huge meeting-hall and a bell tower (playing Bruckner’s 4th) . There would be a crypt in this tower for his own burial place. Other impressive monuments along the shore were to be a town-hall, 1 large theater, 3 military headquarters, 1 stadium, 1 picture gallery, 1 library, 1 museum of armaments, and 1 exhibition building, as well as a monument celebrating the liberation of Austria, in 1938, and another glorifying Anton Bruckner. The design for the picture gallery and the stadium was to be assigned to me. The stadium would be situated on a hill overlooking the city. Hitler’s residence for his old age would be located nearby, also on a height.

Hitler sometimes went into raptures over the shorelines in Budapest which had grown-up on both sides of the Danube, in the course of Centuries. It was his ambition to transform Linz into a German Budapest. Vienna was oriented all wrong, he would comment in this connection, since it merely turned its back to the Danube. The planners had neglected to incorporate the river in their design. Thanks to what he would be doing with the river in Linz, the city might, some day, rival Vienna. No doubt, he was not altogether serious in making such remarks ; he would be tempted into them by his dislike for Vienna, which would spontaneously break-out from time to time. But there were many other times when he would exclaim over the brilliant stroke of city planning accomplished in Vienna, by the use of the former fortifications. »

...

Adolf Hitler had ambitious plans for Linz, the city where he grew-up.

He wanted to make the town on the Danube into one of the 5 « Führer » cities of the 3rd « Reich » , along with Berlin, Hamburg, Nuremberg and Munich.

Linz is now examining this page of its past in an exhibition called the « “ Führer ” 's Capital of Culture » . Martin Heller, the artistic director of « Linz 2009 » , says there was an obligation to tackle the city's Nazi history.

« We want to reflect back and show how cultural and political ambitions went together in the Nazi time. » , he says. « Talking about culture always means talking about politics. »

During the Nazi era, Linz was transformed from a small-town into an industrial city, but Hitler's ambitions for his home-town went far beyond that.

Exhibits at the Castle Museum (« Linzer Schloß Museum ») show some of the detailed designs commissioned by Hitler :

A series of grandiose buildings, including a monumental Theatre, an Opera House and an Adolf Hitler Hotel, all surrounded by huge boulevards and a parade ground.

Few of these extravagant plans were realized, but the fantasy stayed with Hitler, right-up to his final days in the Berlin « Bunker » , in 1945.

Photographs in the exhibition show Hitler poring over intricate models of the city.

On display are plans and diagrams, but the organisers (who are concerned not to encourage nostalgia for the Nazi regime) have not recreated the models, which are believed to have been burnt in 1945.

However, there are some items that are not often on display, including some Nazi propaganda material and portraits of Hitler.

The director of the Upper-Austrian State Museums, Peter Assmann, acknowledges the exhibit treads a fine line, but he rejects charges of glorifying Hitler's memory.

« I don't see any glorification of Hitler in the exhibition. Hitler is fact, so we just face this fact and we face it with many arguments, with a lot of information about that time. »

« People walk through the exhibition and they get impulses for discussion. » , Mr Assmann says.

The high-point of Hitler's Linz was to be a huge Art Museum to rival galleries like the « Louvre » or the « Uffizi » .

The organisers say they want to spark a debate about Linz's Nazi past.

It was to be filled with artworks looted across Europe by the Nazis from museums and private collections, many of them Jewish.

Historian Tina Walzer is concerned that the exhibition has not tackled this subject in enough detail :

« The Nazis looted art from all over Europe, from France, from the Netherlands, from Poland, from Italy, from Austria, from Hungary, gathering this huge mass of very valuable paintings, but you don't see any of this in the exhibition and I think that is a pity. »

« This is a missed chance. » , Ms. Walzer says.

While the 1st part of the exhibition focuses on Hitler's cultural and political planning for Linz, the 2nd part looks at the impact of National-Socialism on art, music and literature in the region.

It explores the cult of Anton Bruckner and shows costumes from productions of Operas by Richard Wagner and Operettas by Franz Lehár - favourites with Hitler.

For some local visitors, confronting the past can be unsettling :

« I am upset by the delusional madness of these plans. It would have been a catastrophe. The culture that is encouraged now is free - the culture back then was dictatorship » , says Heinz, after visiting the exhibition with his wife.

Ingrid, who was a child in Linz during the 3rd « Reich » , says the exhibition reflects her own memories of the period :

« I found the exhibition to be very informative and correct. It objectively shows the period as it was back then, because, up to now, many inaccuracies have been put about. »

The organizers say they want to spark debate, but more than 60 years on, Hitler's legacy is still a very difficult and sensitive topic.

...

Linz is the 3rd largest city of Austria and capital of the State of Upper-Austria (« Oberösterreich ») . Adolf Hitler was born in the border town of « Braunau am Inn » but moved to Linz in his childhood. Hitler spent most of his youth in the Linz area, from 1898 until 1907, when he left for Vienna. The family lived 1st in the village of Leonding on the outskirts of town, and then on the « Humboldtstraße » , in Linz. After elementary education in Leonding, Hitler was enrolled in the « Realschule » (High-School) in Linz with the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein. To the end of his life, Hitler considered Linz to be his « Home Town » , and envisioned extensive architectural schemes for it, wanting it to become the main cultural centre of the 3rd « Reich » .

...

Adolf Hitler va esquisser un monument (une espèce de colonne de Trajan) en l'honneur de Bruckner à Linz, sa future capitale culturelle. Il rêvait aussi d'y construire un carillon (clocher) qui ne jouerait qu'un thème de la 4e Symphonie. Il va créer le « Bruckner Orchester » du « Reich » , déterminé à en faire l'un des meilleurs du monde.

Adolf Hitler projette de faire de Linz une métropole et, à cette fin, il envisage la construction de nouveaux édifices : une série d'immeubles d'apparat sur les 2 rives du Danube (un pont suspendu devant relier les 2 rives de celle-ci) , d'une maison du NSDAP : un énorme bâtiment avec une salle de réunion gigantesque et un campanile comprenant une crypte dans laquelle il voulait avoir sa sépulture, un nouvel Hôtel de ville, un grand hôtel de luxe, un grand théâtre, une bibliothèque, un musée des armes, une galerie de tableaux (le « Führermuseum ») , un gigantesque musée

consacré à l'art germanique) , un bâtiment d'exposition et de 2 monuments, l'un à la gloire de l' « Anschluß » , l'autre d'Anton Bruckner ; non loin de là, sur les hauteurs, devait s'élever la résidence où Hitler souhaitait se retirer dans sa vieillesse. Hitler rêvait de reproduire à Linz le panorama qu'à Budapest les siècles avaient modelé sur les 2 rives du Danube (Vienne était mal orientée selon lui car tournait le dos au Danube) .

Pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, Linz était un centre industriel majeur, qui produisait des composés chimiques et de l'acier pour la machine de guerre nazie. Plusieurs usines avaient été démontées et transférées depuis la Tchécoslovaquie récemment occupée et ré-assemblées à Linz. Le complexe de camps de Mauthausen-Gusen, le dernier camp de concentration nazi à être libéré, est localisé autour de Linz, avec pour principal camp Mauthausen à peine à 30 kilomètres.

Après la guerre, le Danube, qui traverse l'est de la ville, séparant le district Urfahr du nord du reste de Linz, sert de frontière entre les zones d'occupation soviétique et américaine.

Linz : la Cité parrainée par le « Führer »

(Linz - « Patenstadt des Führers »)

Warum hat Linz im Nationalsozialismus eine besondere Bedeutung ?

Adolf Hitler ist in Oberösterreich geboren und aufgewachsen. Deshalb spielt Oberdonau als « Heimatgau des Führers » in der nationalsozialistischen Ideologie, Propaganda und Politik eine wichtige Rolle. Besonders viel liegt Hitler an den Plänen, die Landeshauptstadt Linz sowohl wirtschaftlich als auch kulturell zu einer der bedeutendsten Städte des Deutschen Reiches auszubauen.

« Heimatgau des Führers »

Nach dem « Anschluß » 1938 wird die oberösterreichische Volkskunde-Zeitschrift « Heimatgaue » in « Heimatgau » umgetauft, aus Stolz darüber, daß der « Führer » in diesem Gau « dem deutschen Volk geschenkt wurde » . « Eine wahrhaft weltgeschichtliche Stunde für Heimat und Welt schlug, als Adolf Hitler auf unserem Boden ins Leben trat » , schreibt Rudolf Lenk, der oberösterreichische Landesrat für Erziehung, 1940 in einem Band über Oberdonau. Hinter dem Kult um die « Heimat des Führers » stehen politische Absichten :

Das Land erhofft sich mehr Fördermittel, und die oberösterreichische Bevölkerung soll sich ganz besonders mit dem Nationalsozialismus identifizieren. Im Kunst- und Literaturgeschichtsbuch « Unser Oberdonau » wird die innige Verbundenheit der Oberösterreicher und Oberösterreicherinnen mit ihrem Boden und dem deutschen Volk beschworen ; sie folgen, so wird behauptet, dem « Geheimnis ihres Blutes » und spüren, daß ein Leben « außerhalb der Volksgemeinschaft » « nicht denkbar und nicht möglich » ist. Adalbert Stifter, Franz Stelzhamer und Anton Bruckner erscheinen im Buch als die großen, heimatverbundenen « Söhne » des Landes, bevor die Lebensstationen des bewunderten « Führers » nachgezeichnet werden : Braunau, Fischlham, Lambach, Leonding, Linz und Steyr. Insbesondere

die Geburtsstadt Braunau und Leonding, wo sich das Grab von Hitlers Eltern befindet, gelten als Pilgerstätten. « Das Geburtshaus des „ Führers „ : ein Heiligtum wie Mariazell und so. Sie glauben gar net, wie verrückt das war » , erinnert sich der Braunauer Stadtpfarrer Johann Ludwig nach 1945.

Provinzstadt - « Patenstadt » - « Führerstadt »

Viel mehr jedoch als seiner Geburtsstadt Braunau fühlt sich Adolf Hitler der Landeshauptstadt Linz nahe, in der er einen wichtigen Abschnitt seiner Jugend verbracht hat. Die Stadt beeinflusst um die Wende vom 19. zum 20. Jahrhundert die politische Einstellung des heranwachsenden Hitler. In Linz ist der Deutschnationalismus stark vertreten, und der Realschüler begeistert sich, wie viele seiner Mitschüler, für die Alldeutschen. Sie verlangen den Zusammenschluß der deutschsprachigen Gebiete der Monarchie mit dem Deutschen Reich. Angeheizt wird die deutschnationale Stimmung in Linz durch die geschürte Angst vor dem Zustrom tschechischer Saisonarbeiter. Linz, eine « fast einheitlich deutschsprachige Stadt » , führt in diesen Jahren einen propagandistischen « Kampf gegen die Slawisierung » . Beim jungen Adolf Hitler setzt sich das positive Bild von Linz als « deutscher » und bodenständiger Provinzstadt fest - im Gegensatz zur multinationalen und intellektuellen Hauptstadt Wien, die er später verabscheut. In Linz nehmen auch die Lebensträume des Jugendlichen ihren Anfang. Nach dem gescheiterten Besuch der Realschule lebt er in Linz zwei Jahre lang nur für seine künstlerischen Neigungen. Im Linzer Landestheater erfasst ihn die Faszination für die Opern Richard Wagners, in denen er deutsches Nationalbewußtsein mit musikalischer Wucht ausgedrückt findet. Sich selbst sieht der junge Adolf Hitler als bildenden Künstler, dem eine große Zukunft bevorsteht.

Nach dem « Anschluß » hegt Hitler den persönlichen Ehrgeiz, die Stadt seines politischen Erwachens und seiner Jugendträume zu einer nationalsozialistischen Musterstadt umzugestalten. Bereits am 13. März 1938 übernimmt er die Patenschaft für Linz. Sofort beginnen die Planungen für einen gigantischen Ausbau der Stadt. 1940 wird Linz, neben Berlin, München, Nürnberg und Hamburg, als « Jugendstadt des Führers » zu einer der fünf bevorzugten « Führerstädte » des Deutschen Reiches ernannt.

Welche Pläne verfolgt Adolf Hitler mit Linz ?

Durch die Gründung von Großindustrie, die Schaffung eines Verkehrsknotenpunktes und die Errichtung von Wohnbauten soll die Stadt florieren und wachsen. Doch das Herzstück von Adolf Hitlers Linz-Phantasien ist der Wunsch, aus Linz « die schönste Stadt an der Donau » zu machen, wie Propagandaminister Josef Goebbels 1941 in seinem Tagebuch festhält. Linz soll zu einer kulturellen Metropole im Großdeutschen Reich aufsteigen, die mit ihren Kunstschätzen und ihrer monumentalen nationalsozialistischen Architektur Wien in den Schatten stellt.

Architektonische Träume und Alpträume

Die Planungen zur Neugestaltung von Linz konzentrieren sich auf die Donauufer und auf den Süden der Stadt. Auf vorhandene Gebäude wird dabei kaum Rücksicht genommen. Adolf Hitler selbst gibt die Ideen vor, prüft die Pläne in allen Details und trifft die Entscheidungen. Er bedient sich vieler berühmter Architekten des Deutschen Reiches. Führende Rollen, oft in Konkurrenz zueinander, spielen Albert Speer, der als Hitlers Lieblingsarchitekt gilt und mächtige

Ämter bekleidet, Roderich Fick, der 1939 Reichsbaurat für Linz wird, und Hermann Giesler, dem Hitler ab 1943 den Großteil der Planungen überträgt. Im Streit um Flächenwidmung, Baustoffe und architektonische Gestaltung mischt sich immer stärker Gauleiter August Eigruber ein. Die Stadt Linz hingegen bleibt in ihrem Mitspracherecht sehr beschränkt.

Hitler möchte, daß Linz beiderseits des Flusses eine überwältigende Kulisse in nationalsozialistischer Monumental- und Blockbauweise bietet, mit der « die Macht des Staates in all seinen Belangen wie Partei, Militär, Wissenschaft, Freizeit und nationalem Geschichtsbewusstsein demonstriert » wird. Die einzelnen Menschen sollen sich angesichts dieser Bauten wie kleine und unbedeutende Ameisen vorkommen.

An Stelle des Schlosses erhebt sich nach den Plänen Hitlers Alterssitz in Form eines mächtigen Vierkanthofes. Von dort bietet sich ein freier Blick hinunter auf die Donau, auf die Nibelungenbrücke und die Brückenkopfgebäude, die bis Anfang der 1940er Jahre tatsächlich errichtet werden. Am Linzer Flußufer sind weiter ein vornehmes Donauhotel, ein langgestrecktes Einkaufszentrum und ein KdF-Hotelurm vorgesehen, um den Fremdenverkehr anzukurbeln. Bei diesem Hotel soll eine Hängebrücke die Donau überspannen. Das Ufer flußabwärts zwischen der Hängebrücke und der dritten geplanten Donaubrücke, der Bismarckbrücke, ist den riesigen Vierkantern für die Verwaltung der Hermann-Göring-Werke und der Technischen Universität vorbehalten. Weiter donauabwärts entsteht nach der Flußbiegung der neue Donauhafen. Überquert man bei der Universität (so die Planung) die Bismarckbrücke Richtung Urfahr, gelangt man zu einem gewaltigen runden Kuppelbau, der Otto von Bismarck, dem Gründer des Deutschen Kaiserreiches, gewidmet ist. Auf der Urfahrer Seite flußaufwärts reihen sich die eintönigen Blöcke eines Heereskommandos und eines Militärmuseums aneinander, ehe man, an einer großen Veranstaltungshalle vorbei, eine terrassierte Parkanlage mit Ausstellungspavillons betritt. Nach der Hängebrücke folgt am Urfahrer Ufer das politische Zentrum von Linz und Oberdonau : die gigantische Gauanlage. Die Gauhalle, « eine Art nationalsozialistische Basilika » , soll 30.000 Menschen fassen. An ihrer Seite ragt direkt am Fluß ein 160 meters hoher Glockenturm in den Himmel, das neue Wahrzeichen von Linz. Im Sockel soll er das Grab von Hitlers Eltern beherbergen. Daneben öffnet sich zur Donau hin ein Platz, auf dem sich 100.000 Menschen versammeln können. Begrenzt wird der Platz vom Herrschaftssitz des Reichstatthalters nahe der Nibelungenbrücke. Ein turmartiges NSDAP-Gebäude und das Rathaus ergänzen den Urfahrer Brückenkopf. Flußaufwärts ziehen sich Wohnblöcke bis zu den Urfahrer Höhen, wo hoch über der Donau der ausgedehnte Komplex einer Adolf-Hitler-Schule, einer Internatsschule für künftige Parteifunktionäre, thront.

Am südlichen Ende der Landstraße, auf der Blumau, befindet sich der zweite Brennpunkt der Planung. Dort sollen ein Opernhaus, ein Kunstmuseum, eine Bibliothek und eine Konzerthalle entstehen. Von diesem Kulturzentrum führt nach den Entwürfen die etwa einen Kilometer lange und 60 meters breite Prachtstraße « Zu den Lauben » Richtung Süden zum Verkehrszentrum, wo der neue Personenbahnhof und die Einmündung des Autobahnzubringers geplant sind. Für den Bahnhof verlangt Hitler eine Anlage mit 16 Gleisen und mit einer Station für die Breitspurbahn, die die Atlantikküste mit dem Ural verbinden soll. Auch entlang dieser neuen Achse von Linz sehen die Pläne mächtige Baublöcke vor. Durch breite Gehsteige unter Arkaden gelangt man zu Restaurants, Museen, Geschäften und Büros. Flankiert wird die Prunkstraße von einem Schauspielhaus und einem weitläufigen Park bis zum Froschberg.

Eine Untergrundbahn soll vom Bahnhof zum KdF-Hotel an der Donau verkehren. Ungelöst bleibt jedoch die Straßenverbindung zwischen beiden monumentalen Anlagen am Donauufer und im Süden. Erwogen wird neben

Ringstraßen beiderseits des Zentrums auch der direkte Durchbruch von der Nibelungenbrücke zur Blumau, der die Zerstörung der historischen Landstraße nach sich ziehen würde.

Auswirkungen auf das Linzer Umland

Wegen der überdimensionalen Planungen für Industrie, Verkehr, Wohnbau, Verwaltung und Kultur und der beabsichtigten Verdreifachung der Stadtbevölkerung auf 350.000 Menschen ist eine Vergrößerung des Stadtgebietes notwendig. Sankt Magdalena im Norden und Ebelsberg im Süden werden eingemeindet, doch die weitere Ausdehnung der Stadt nach Westen und nach Süden kommt nicht zustande. Persönliche Bezüge Adolf Hitlers zu Nachbargemeinden bilden Hindernisse. Leonding soll als Hitler-Gedenkstätte erhalten bleiben, und Hitler stoppt die Planungen für einen Industriegürtel von Linz bis Asten, weil er das idyllische Hügelland um Sankt Florian, wo der von ihm verehrte Komponist Anton Bruckner gewirkt hat, nicht verbauen will. 1941 wird das Stift Sankt Florian beschlagnahmt. Heinrich Glasmeier, der Reichsintendant des Deutschen Rundfunks, übernimmt das Stift, um dort im Sinne Hitlers eine « Bruckner-Weihestätte » als « Mittelpunkt ernster musikalischer Kultur nicht nur für Oberdonau, sondern für das Großdeutsche Reich, ja für ganz Europa » einzurichten. Sankt Florian ist für die Zeit nach dem Krieg als Reichssender für ernste Musik vorgesehen. Zu diesem Zweck wird 1943 unter der Aufsicht Glasmeiers ein Bruckner-Orchester mit hervorragenden deutschen Musikern gegründet. Trotz der kriegsbedingten Engpässe stellt Hitler viel Geld dafür zur Verfügung, da er dieses Orchester als zukünftigen Bestandteil der Linzer Hochkultur betrachtet. 1944 tritt das Bruckner-Orchester erstmals in Wien auf. Der Rundfunk überträgt, das Publikum ist begeistert und Hitler läßt daraufhin den Namen in « Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester des Großdeutschen Rundfunks » ändern. Das Orchester aus Sankt Florian konzertiert, teilweise unter der Leitung Wilhelm Furtwänglers und Herbert von Karajans, bis Anfang April 1945 in Wien, Graz, Salzburg, Sankt Florian und Linz und nimmt insgesamt fast 100 Werke auf Band auf. Einige Monate nach Kriegsende wird das Orchester aufgelöst.

« Sonderauftrag Linz »

Während sich das bereits bestehende oberösterreichische Landesmuseum der regionalen Kunst und der Volkskunde widmen soll, ist für das geplante neue Kunstmuseum, auch Linzer « Führermuseum » genannt, eine Gemäldesammlung von Weltgeltung vorgesehen. 1939 erteilt Adolf Hitler dem Dresdner Museumsdirektor Hans Posse den « Sonderauftrag Linz » zur Sammlung auserlesener Kunstwerke. « Während einer Dreiviertelstunde entwickelt er seinen Plan für das neue Linzer Museum. Das Museum seiner Heimatstadt, das er als Gegengewicht zu den großen industriellen Plänen von Linz neben anderen kulturellen Einrichtungen schaffen will », notiert Posse nach dem Gespräch mit Hitler in sein Tagebuch. Posse und sein Nachfolger Hermann Voß bauen die Sammlung vor allem mittels Kunstraub auf. Sie bedienen sich bei den 1938 in Wien enteigneten Kunstsammlungen aus jüdischem Besitz und bei geraubten Kunstwerken in Frankreich. Für den Erwerb von Gemälden im Kunsthandel stehen enorme Summen zur Verfügung, noch 1944 mehrere Millionen Reichsmark im Monat. Tausende Bilder werden gesammelt. Da jedoch das Museumsgebäude nie gebaut wird, lagern die Gemälde in Depots, unter anderem im Stift Kremsmünster. Schließlich werden sie zum Schutz vor dem Bombenkrieg ins Salzbergwerk von Altaussee gebracht. Dort stoßen die US-Amerikaner bei Kriegsende auf die ungeheuren Kunstschatze.

Wahn und Wirklichkeit

Die Errichtung von Großindustrie, der Wohnbau und die wegen des Bevölkerungswachstums steigende Wohnungsnot, die im Bombenkrieg zerstörte Stadt und die unzureichenden Luftschutzbauten, das Elend der Zwangsarbeiter und Zwangsarbeiterinnen sowie der KZ-Häftlinge prägen das tatsächliche Antlitz der Stadt Linz im Nationalsozialismus. Der zunehmende Mangel an Arbeitskräften und Baustoffen während des Krieges verhindert eine Umsetzung der großen Pläne für Linz. Nur die Nibelungenbrücke und die Brückenkopfgebäude entstehen. Doch unbeirrt von den fehlenden Voraussetzungen arbeiten Architekten, Fachleute und Politiker weiter eifrig an den größtenwahnsinnigen Plänen von der Kulturmetropole Linz. Hitler ist die treibende Kraft. Noch im Februar 1945 läßt er sich vom Architekten Hermann Giesler ein neues Modell der Gebäude am Linzer Donauufer in den Keller der Reichskanzlei in Berlin bringen. Mit Scheinwerfern wird die Wirkung der Bauten zu verschiedenen Tageszeiten simuliert. Stundenlang erklärt Hitler Besuchern die Einzelheiten. Bei der Betrachtung des Modells von Linz entspannt er sich im näherrollenden Kriegstosen und flüchtet in Machtphantasien - und er kann sich an dem Gedanken festhalten, daß auch unausgeführte Baupläne « ihr Eigenleben in der Welt der Architektur » entwickeln und die Nachwelt beschäftigen werden.

Lebensgeschichten

Adolf Hitler : Jugendjahre eines Diktators

Bereits als Heranwachsender identifiziert sich Adolf Hitler mit dem Deutschnationalismus. Künstlerische und architektonische Vorlieben bilden sich aus. Obwohl er mit dem tyrannischen Vater im Konflikt liegt, ahmt er dessen Verhalten nach und entwickelt sich zu einem unduldsamen, herrschsüchtigen Menschen. Als Mittel, mit dem er andere beherrschen kann, entdeckt er die Sprache.

Von Braunau nach Leonding

Adolf Hitler kommt 1889 in Braunau am Inn zur Welt. Sein Vater Alois Hitler, der wie seine Mutter Klara aus dem niederösterreichischen Waldviertel stammt, arbeitet dort als Zollinspektor. Adolf ist das vierte Kind seiner Eltern, die ersten drei sind im Kindesalter gestorben. Zwei Kinder hat der Vater in die Ehe mitgebracht. Adolfs jüngerer Bruder Edmund stirbt mit sechs Jahren. Das jüngste Kind ist die Schwester Paula. Nach drei Jahren in Passau lebt die Familie Hitler ab 1895 zwei Jahre auf einem Bauernhof in Fischlham bei Lambach. In Fischlham und Lambach besucht Adolf die ersten Volksschulklassen. 1898 übersiedelt die Familie nach Leonding bei Linz. Der neunjährige Volksschüler findet größten Gefallen am Kriegsspielen mit den Freunden. Er begeistert sich für den deutsch-französischen Krieg und den deutschen Reichsgründer Bismarck, besonders aber für den gerade stattfindenden Kampf der südafrikanischen Buren gegen die englischen Eroberer.

Der Konflikt mit dem Vater

Ab Herbst 1900 schickt Alois Hitler seinen Sohn, für den er die Beamtenlaufbahn vorsieht, an die Realschule in Linz. Der elfjährige Landbub kommt dort nicht zurecht. Gleich das erste Schuljahr muß er wiederholen. In Adolf Hitler wächst

die Abneigung gegen die Schule ebenso wie gegen den Vater. Er verachtet die Beamtenkarriere des Vaters, verweigert Fleiß und Strebsamkeit und beschäftigt sich lieber mit Zeichnen und Träumen. Gerne läßt er sich von seinem Lieblingsautor Karl May in exotische Abenteuerwelten entführen. Auch politisch ist er mit dem Vater uneins : Während der Vater ein Habsburg-treuer Deutschnationaler ist, wünscht sich der Sohn mit den Alldeutschen die Auflösung der Habsburgermonarchie und den Anschluß der deutschsprachigen Gebiete an das Deutsche Kaiserreich.

1903 setzt der Tod des tyrannischen Vaters dem Konflikt ein Ende. « Meinen Vater habe ich nicht geliebt » , erzählt Hitler später seiner Sekretärin, « dafür aber um so mehr gefürchtet. Er war jähzornig und schlug sofort zu. Meine arme Mutter hatte dann immer Angst um mich. » Wegen seines Misserfolges muß Adolf die Linzer Realschule verlassen. Nach einem Schuljahr in Steyr schafft er 1905 mit Mühe den Abschluß der niederen Realschule. Dann beendet er seine Schullaufbahn.

Müßiggänger in Linz

1905 übersiedelt Klara Hitler mit den Kindern und mit ihrer Schwester von Leonding in eine Wohnung in der Linzer Humboldtstraße. Dank Witwenpension und Rücklagen hält die Mutter die Familie über Wasser. Ihren geliebten Sohn Adolf, der nun weder eine Schule besucht noch einer Arbeit nachgeht, verwöhnt sie nach Kräften. Zwei Jahre lang führt er in Linz das ziellose Leben eines Müßiggängers mit künstlerischen Neigungen. Der Jugendliche zeichnet, malt, liest, schreibt, geht ins Theater, in Opern und Konzerte. Oft wird er dabei von seinem einzigen Freund August Kubizek begleitet. Die beiden ergänzen sich : Der dominante Hitler spricht, Kubizek hört beeindruckt zu. Auf langen abendlichen Spaziergängen legt Hitler dem Freund seine Ansichten über Politik und Kunst dar. Beide träumen von einer Zukunft als große Künstler, Hitler als Maler, Kubizek als Musiker. Hitler ist ein leidenschaftlicher Bewunderer Richard Wagners, dessen Opern « Lohengrin » und « Rienzi » er im Linzer Landestheater sieht. Außerdem fasziniert ihn Architektur. Er zeigt Kubizek Skizzen zur Neugestaltung von Linz.

In « Mein Kampf » heißt es über diese Zeit :

« Es waren die glücklichsten Tage, die mir nahezu als ein schöner Traum erschienen ; und ein Traum sollte es ja auch nur sein. Zwei Jahre später machte der Tod der Mutter all den schönen Plänen ein jähes Ende. »

Der Tod der Mutter und der Umzug nach Wien

Klara Hitler erkrankt an Brustkrebs. Ihr Zustand verschlechtert sich 1907. Im selben Jahr nimmt sich Adolf Hitler vor, an der Akademie für Bildende Künste in Wien zu studieren. Doch er scheitert, für ihn völlig überraschend, an der Aufnahmeprüfung. Niedergeschlagen kehrt er nach Linz zurück, wo er erfährt, daß für die Mutter keine Aussicht auf Heilung besteht. Der Sohn ist tief betroffen. Er kümmert sich in der Urfahrer Wohnung, in welche die Familie umgezogen ist, hingebungsvoll um die Mutter. Sie stirbt Ende 1907. « Ich habe noch nie einen vom Schmerz so gebrochenen Menschen gesehen wie Adolf Hitler » , berichtet Eduard Bloch, der jüdische Hausarzt der Familie Hitler. Adolf Hitler bleibt dem Arzt für die Betreuung der Mutter immer dankbar und schützt ihn 1938 vor antisemitischer Verfolgung.

Wenige Wochen nach dem Tod der Mutter übersiedelt der knapp 19-Jährige nach Wien, um seine künstlerischen Pläne zu verwirklichen. Doch alle Versuche misslingen. Hitler führt eine kümmerliche Existenz als Postkartenmaler und Bewohner von Obdachlosenheimen. In Wien saugt er rassistische und antisemitische Ideologien in sich auf. Besonders den Antisemitismus der Alldeutschen, den er in Linz schon kennen gelernt hat, nimmt er sich zum Vorbild. Die mächtige Arbeiterbewegung erfährt er in Wien als Bedrohung.

1913 verläßt Adolf Hitler den verhassten Vielvölkerstaat und geht nach München. Im Ersten Weltkrieg kämpft er für das Deutsche Kaiserreich.

Der ersehnte « Führer »

Drei Jahrzehnte lang verläuft Adolf Hitlers Leben unscheinbar. Doch nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg erkennt er, daß er mit seiner faschistischen und rassistischen Weltanschauung einen politischen Nerv der Zeit trifft. Viele Menschen sehnen sich nach einem Anführer, auf den sie nach der Niederlage alle Hoffnung setzen können, und nach Sündenböcken, die an allem Elend schuld sind. Hitler kann reden, er preist sich mit der NSDAP als Erlöser der erniedrigten Deutschen an und stellt « die Juden » als die Verursacher aller Probleme hin. So erfüllt er, was die Menschenmassen von ihm erwarten. Sie machen die NSDAP bei den Wahlen zur stärksten Partei, und Hitler wird Reichskanzler. Ein großer Teil der deutschen und österreichischen Bevölkerung gibt ihm bereitwillig die Rolle des verherrlichten « Führers » - in die weltgeschichtliche Katastrophe.

Franz Kinzl : Vom Nationalsozialisten zum Kommunisten

Franz Kinzl ist bis heute ein klingender Name in der oberösterreichischen Blasmusikkultur. Bei genauerem Hinsehen übertönt sein bisher weniger beachtetes politisches Wirken jedoch sein künstlerisches Talent.

Illegale Tätigkeit für NSDAP

Franz Kinzl wird am 2. Juli 1895 in Mettmach geboren. So wie sein älterer Bruder entscheidet er sich für den Lehrberuf - und begeistert sich wie er schon bald nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg für die Ideen der National sozialisten. Als Komponist und Kapellmeister macht er sich einen Namen. Im April 1933 tritt er der NSDAP, bald darauf dem NS-Lehrerbund, den sein Bruder gründet, bei. Franz Kinzl ist als Nationalsozialist höchst aktiv, wegen seiner illegalen Tätigkeiten verhängt der Landesschulrat mehrere Disziplinarverfahren gegen ihn, schließlich erfolgt seine Strafversetzung. Er muß von Atzbach bei Schwanenstadt nach Hirschbach bei Freistadt wechseln ; und gründet an seiner neuen Wirkstätte sogleich eine illegale Ortsgruppe der NSDAP.

Reichsmusikkammer und Wehrmacht

Nach dem « Anschluß » wächst seine Macht als neu ernannter Ortsgruppenleiter. Kinzl setzt den Bürgermeister ab, veranlasst seine Verhaftung und übernimmt selbst für kurze Zeit das Amt. Im Juni 1938 wird er an eine Schule nach

Linz versetzt - als « Wiedergutmachung » , wie er es selbst bezeichnet. Oberbürgermeister Sepp Wolkerstorfer schlägt den bekannten Komponisten Kinzl für einen Posten in der Reichsmusikkammer vor. Zwar steigt er zum Musikbeauftragten der Reichsmusikkammer auf, doch interne Rivalitäten veranlassen Kinzl dazu, sich freiwillig zur Wehrmacht zu melden. Doch schon im August 1940 wird er bis zum 1. September 1941 « uk » (unabkömmlich) gestellt und zum Landesleiter der Reichsmusikkammer ernannt. Er beteiligt sich maßgeblich an den Verfolgungsmaßnahmen gegen jüdische Musiker und verantwortet das Erscheinen des Heftes « Judentum und Musik (Liste der jüdischen Komponisten als Unterlage für die Säuberungsaktionen auf dem Gebiete der Musik) » . Mehrfach kommt es zu Konflikten mit Kollegen, weil er gegen sie intrigiert oder sich in Bereiche einmischt, die über seinen Tätigkeitsbereich hinausgehen. Im Herbst 1941 rückt Kinzl erneut zur Wehrmacht ein. Ob freiwillig oder nicht, ist unbekannt.

Gefangenschaft und Kehrtwendung

Am 3. Mai 1945 kommt Kinzl in Haft, bis 6. März 1946 bleibt er in Glasenbach in US-amerikanischer Gefangenschaft. Danach zieht er mit seiner Frau und seinem Bruder Fritz nach Stadl-Paura. Kurz darauf, im Juli 1946, verhaften ihn die österreichischen Justizbehörden und klagen ihn wegen seiner illegalen Tätigkeit für die NSDAP und des Tatbestandes der Denunziation an. Kinzl bestreitet alles. Im Mai 1947 wird er entlassen und « außer Verfolgung gesetzt » , weil die gegen ihn erhobenen Vorwürfe weder bewiesen noch entkräftet werden können.

In Freiheit arbeitet Kinzl als Maler und Komponist, seine Werke sind bei den Blasmusikkapellen sehr beliebt. Er betätigt sich aber auch weiterhin politisch - und vollzieht eine kaum zu glaubende Kehrtwendung. Er tritt der Kommunistische Partei Österreichs (KPÖ) bei und sitzt für sie von 1949 bis 1953 im Gemeinderat von Stadl-Paura. In der kommunistischen « Neuen Zeit » verfaßt Kinzl zahlreiche Beiträge.

Preise und Auszeichnungen

Sein musikalisches Engagement bringen Kinzl eine Reihe von Preisen und Auszeichnungen ein, 1965 wird ihm der Professorentitel verliehen. Franz Kinzl stirbt 1978 im 80. Lebensjahr. 2008 huldigt die « Landeschronik Oberösterreich » dem allseits « beliebten » Musiker, « Original » und « begnadeten Künstler » Franz Kinzl in einer biographischen Skizze. Seine politischen und ideologischen Anschauungen und Aktivitäten werden mit keinem Wort erwähnt. Auch die vom oberösterreichischen Blasmusikverband und der Landesregierung verliehene « Professor-Franz-Kinzl-Medaille » gilt bis heute als besondere Ehrung in Blasmusikkreisen, auf welche die ausgezeichneten Vereine stolz verweisen.

Franz Langoth : Der Mythos vom « guten Nazi »

In seiner langen politischen Laufbahn prägt Franz Langoth die Geschichte seiner Heimatstadt Linz über Jahrzehnte hinweg. Diese feiert und würdigt den « guten Nazi » Langoth bis lange nach seinem Tod hinaus.

Deutschnational und nationalsozialistisch

Franz Langoth wird 1877 in Linz geboren. Er besucht die Lehrerbildungsanstalt und arbeitet ab 1896 als Volksschullehrer. Schon als junger Mensch betätigt er sich politisch. Er ist deutschnational eingestellt und von den radikalen antisemitischen und rassistischen Anschauungen Georg von Schönerers angetan. Nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg wird Langoth Mitglied der oberösterreichischen Landesregierung und sogar Landeshauptmannstellvertreter. Ab den 1920er Jahren engagiert er sich in der Großdeutschen Volkspartei. Diese Bewegung schwört auf die deutsche « Volksgemeinschaft », von der alle « volksfremden » und « schädlichen » Einflüsse entfernt werden müssen. Auch die Nationalsozialisten, denen sich Langoth mehr und mehr zuwendet, stellen die « Volksgemeinschaft » ins Zentrum ihrer Ideologie.

1934 gründet er das « legale Hilfswerk Langoth ». Nationalsozialisten, die durch die Illegalität in Bedrängnis geraten, wenden sich an Langoth und dürfen auf Unterstützung hoffen. Diese umfangreiche Tätigkeit, die sich über ganz Österreich erstreckt, bringt ihm den Beinamen « Vater Langoth » ein. Nach dem « Anschluß » wird Langoth für diesen Einsatz belohnt und mit Angeboten überhäuft.

Karriere im Nationalsozialismus

Am 13. März 1938 lädt Hitler die « Treuesten der Treuen » zum Mittagessen ins Linzer Hotel Weininger. Dort verkündet Hitler zunächst den « Anschluß » im kleinen Kreis.

Langoth ruft euphorisch :

« Mein Führer, das ist die größte Stunde der deutschen Geschichte. »

Seine Gesinnungstreue wird belohnt. Hermann Göring ernennt ihn kurzerhand zum SS-Oberführer. Mit dem Totenkopfring und dem Ehrendegen werden ihm die höchsten SSAuszeichnungen verliehen. Franz Langoth wird außerdem Mitglied des Volksgerichtshofes und verantwortet in dieser Funktion die Verkündung und Vollstreckung von Todesurteilen für Gegner und Gegnerinnen des Regimes.

Er sei von dieser Bestellung zum Richter « unangenehm überrascht » gewesen, behauptet Langoth in seiner Rechtfertigungsschrift nach 1945 :

« Ich konnte aber nicht ablehnen. »

Tatsächlich steht der ehrgeizige Politiker unter keinerlei Druck, möchte aber seiner Karriere nicht schaden. Denn immerhin hat er es unter anderem zum Leiter der Nationalsozialistischen Volkswohlfahrt (NSV) in der Ostmark gebracht. Die NSV ist vor allem in der Familien- und Jugendfürsorge tätig. Sie unterstützt viele Menschen - aber nur jene, die zur nationalsozialistischen « Volksgemeinschaft » gehören. In den von der NSV geführten « fremdvölkischen Kinderheimen » werden zahllose Babys und Kleinkinder dem Sterben überlassen.

Oberbürgermeister von Linz

Gegen Ende 1943 ist Gauleiter Eigruber auf der Suche nach einem neuen Oberbürgermeister für Linz und bietet diesen Posten dem allseits geschätzten Franz Langoth an. Der sagt zu und übernimmt sein nächstes prestigeträchtiges Amt. In seiner neuen Funktion verantwortet er unter anderem die Tätigkeiten des Jugend- und Fürsorgeamtes, das « Asoziale » verfolgt, oder des Gesundheitsamtes, das Zwangssterilisierungen anordnet. Anfang Mai 1945 muß Langoth den US-amerikanischen Streitkräften weichen - seine Rolle bei der kampflosen Übergabe der Stadt Linz überhöht er, indem er den zeitgenössischen Bericht seines Sekretärs im Nachhinein fälscht.

Unverbesserlicher Nationalsozialist

Nach Kriegsende wird Franz Langoth verhaftet und kommt in das Lager Glasenbach bei Salzburg. Die Tatsache, daß sein Name auf der Kriegsverbrecherliste steht, empfindet er als große Ungerechtigkeit. Auch sonst erweist er sich in den Nachkriegsjahren als unverbesserlicher Nationalsozialist. In seinen Memoiren stellt sich Langoth als sozialer Wohltäter dar. Er beklagt die fehlende Anerkennung seiner Arbeit und der « gewaltigen Leistung, die die NSV vollbrachte » . 1949 gründet er gemeinsam mit dem Salzburger Erzbischof Andreas Rohrer die Stiftung « Soziales Friedenswerk » , das nationalsozialistisch schwer Belastete (vor allem ehemalige « Glasenbacher ») finanziell, politisch und rechtlich unterstützt. So fordern ihre Mitglieder eine Amnestie der Verbrecher der « Mühlviertler Hasenjagd » , der unzählige Häftlinge des KZ-Mauthausen zum Opfer gefallen waren. Franz Langoth betätigt sich bald wieder politisch und wird das erste Ehrenmitglied des Verbandes der Unabhängigen (VdU) , der Vorgängerpartei der Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs (FPÖ) .

In der Linzer Nachkriegsgeschichte gilt er lange als der « gute Nazi » , der vielen Menschen geholfen hat. 1950 wird Franz Langoth vom Bundespräsidenten amnestiert. Nach seinem Tod 1953 erscheinen eine Reihe verherrlichender Nachrufe. In den 1970er Jahren benennt die Stadt Linz eine Straße nach ihm. Erst nach jahrelangen Protesten (vor allem von kommunistischer Seite) wird 1986 die Benennung wieder rückgängig gemacht. Rolle und Bedeutung des Nationalsozialisten Franz Langoth werden seitdem kritischer beleuchtet.

La collection d'art de Linz

Parmi les nombreux projets fous d'Hitler, le dictateur caressait celui d'accueillir à Linz, sa ville natale, la plus grande collection d'art germanique ainsi que des chefs-d'œuvre étrangers. Si le projet n'a jamais abouti, la liste des pièces amassées, connue sous le nom de « Lintersammlung » (collection de Linz) a, elle, été rendue publique et mise en ligne par le Musée de l'Histoire allemande (« Deutsches Historische Museum ») en collaboration avec le bureau fédéral pour les services centraux et les questions de propriété non résolues. Pour la Ire fois, un document exhaustif répertoriant les pièces du Dictateur ainsi que toute l'information connue à leur propos est rendu publique.

La collection de Linz comprend 4,731 toiles, tapisseries, sculptures, porcelaines et meubles. Tous ces objets étaient destinés à un musée qui devait être terminé avant 1950 afin de faire rayonner le « Reich » . Que découvre-t-on dans cette collection ? Des œuvres de Rembrandt, de Watteau et de Canaletto, un goût prononcé pour les scènes bucoliques et le Romantisme allemand. Les artistes contemporains et « dégénérés' » tels que Emil Nolde, qu'Hitler a censuré

pendant son pouvoir, sont absents.

La collection officielle s'est construite sur les acquisitions qu'Hitler avait fait à titre privé. Le chef du Parti Nazi avait mis sur pied une force spéciale chargée de rassembler les œuvres, la « Sonderauftrag Linz », ou « Projet spécial Linz », en 1939. Cette unité a bâti la collection jusqu'en 1945.

Afin de protéger les œuvres des bombardements alliés, elles avaient été cachés dans des mines de sel à proximité de la ville du nord de l'Autriche. C'est là qu'ils ont été retrouvés par les Américains à la fin de la guerre. Elles figurent depuis dans le « Central Collecting Point Archive », une base de données concernant toutes les œuvres des Nazis retrouvées après leur défaite.

La coordinatrice du projet du « Deutsche Historische Museum », Monika Flake, révèle au Spiegel que le catalogue de 1945 comprend environ 50,000 photos de la « Linzersammlung » mais que certaines informations telles que le nom de l'artiste ou la provenance de l'œuvre ont dû être déterminés par son équipe. Un travail d'identification avait déjà été entamé par l'historien Christian Lohr, dans un livre publié en 2005, « La Maison brune de l'Art », en référence à la tristement célèbre « Maison brune » des SA à Munich.

Les éléments pillés ont été restitués à leurs propriétaires quand cela était possible. Ceux dont on ne pouvait pas identifier l'origine ont été remis en état et sont éparpillés dans divers musées nationaux. D'autres auraient été vendus illégalement.

Depuis leur découverte, l'origine des œuvres de la « Linzersammlung » occupe les historiens. Combien d'œuvres ont été volées par la « Gestapo » ? Parmi les pièces que possède aujourd'hui le gouvernement, combien devraient être rendues à des familles encore vivantes ? Aucune réponse définitive pour l'instant, mais Flake estime que « la proportion de pièces volées ou confisquées est relativement peu importante » .

En rendant accessible la liste, les chercheurs allemands espèrent recueillir de nouvelles indications sur les œuvres dont la source est incertaine.

...

21 juin 1939 : Adolf Hitler met en place le projet spécial Linz (« Sonderauftrag Linz ») , à Dresde, et nomme le docteur Hans Posse directeur de la « Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister » (Galerie de peintures de Dresde) , en tant qu'envoyé spécial. Le « Sonderauftrag » est chargé de collecter des œuvres d'art pour le futur « Führermuseum » . Basé à Dresde, il se compose d'historiens de l'art travaillant normalement pour la galerie de peintures, par exemple Robert Oertel and Gottfried Reimer. Posse décède d'un cancer en décembre 1942 ; en mars 1943, Hermann Voß, un historien de l'art et directeur de la galerie de Wiesbaden, reprend la direction du « Sonderauftrag » .

Les méthodes d'acquisition vont de la confiscation à l'achat et comprennent aussi de nombreux cas de vente forcée, par l'utilisation des fonds provenant des ventes de « Mein Kampf » et de timbres à l'effigie d'Hitler. Les achats sont

principalement enregistrés depuis le « Führerbau » (bureaux d'Hitler) à Munich ; les œuvres d'art acquises sont stockées dans des dépôts en Haute-Autriche. L'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiters Rosenberg » (E.R.R.), créé en 1940 et dirigé par Alfred Rosenberg, qui « lutte contre le judaïsme et la franc-maçonnerie » et se charge également de confisquer les œuvres d'arts appartenant aux familles incriminées, dans toute l'Europe ; dès le 17 septembre 1940, Hitler somme la « Wehrmacht » d'aider ce nouveau service à « transférer en Allemagne les biens culturels qui lui paraissent précieux et à les sauvegarder dans ce pays » .

L'Agneau mystique de Hubert et Jan Van Eyck aurait été une pièce centrale du musée : cachée au Vatican puis à Pau, le régime de Vichy l'offre aux Allemands avec regret pendant l'été 1942.

En novembre 2013 sont retrouvées à Munich 1,406 œuvres d'arts appartenant au descendant du marchand d'art Hildebrand Gurlitt. Parmi celles-ci, de nombreuses toiles avaient été considérées comme de l'« Art dégénéré » par Adolf Hitler et donc retirées des collections officielles, d'autres de propriétaires juifs spoliés par le 3e « Reich » et enfin d'œuvres réunis pour le projet du « Führermuseum » . Dans ce dernier cas, il s'agit de tableaux de Maîtres provenant de collections privées et publiques, françaises, néerlandaises, belges et suisses.

Exemples d'œuvres :

Intérieur avec femme et piano, d'Emanuel de Witte.

Portrait de Jacoba Bicker, de Caspar Netscher.

Vue du sud de l'Oude Kerk d'Amsterdam, de Jan van der Heyden.

L'Astronome, de Johannes Vermeer.

À la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les Américains retrouvent les œuvres entreposées dans des mines de sels aménagées, non loin de la ville : elles y avaient été cachées pour les protéger des bombardements. La récupération des œuvres d'arts et leur restitution par le gouvernement américain était prévu depuis 1943 et la création de la Roberts Commission (American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas) et de leur agents sur place, les M.F.A.A. Officers (Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Officers) . Une unité de l'OSS, Art Looting Investigation Unit (Unité d'enquête sur les spoliations d'œuvres d'art) est également chargée de récupérer des œuvres en France volées. Des interrogatoires seront menés et des dépôts seront créés le 20 mai 1945 par un ordre du S.H.A.E.F. (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force) .

Devant l'avancée des Alliés, August Eigruber, « Gauleiter » de Haute-Autriche, donne l'ordre de faire sauter les mines ; Hitler annule l'ordre, confirmé le 3 mai, par le gradé SS Kaltenbrunner. Hermann Göring de son côté transfère vers la Bavière les œuvres d'arts de sa résidence de Carinhall, qu'il a fait faire détruire. Certaines œuvres de l'E.R.R. stockées au château de Neuschwanstein sont récupérées par les Américains, le 28 avril 1945, ainsi que les archives complètes de l'organisation ; plus tard, on saisira également des œuvres auparavant déposées dans l'abbaye de Buxheim et dans des

dépôts à Chiemsee ainsi que les œuvres d'arts cachées par Göring à Berchtesgaden. Les œuvres furent listées dans le Central Collecting Point Archive, une base de données sur les œuvres d'arts récupérées aux Nazis après la guerre, mais ce n'est qu'en 2008 que le musée de l'histoire allemande (« Deutsche historische Museum ») a communiqué le détail de la « Linzersammlung » (collection de Linz) . Certaines œuvres n'ont néanmoins pas été retrouvées et se trouveraient dans certains musées ou collections privées dans le monde entier. Cette question est abordée dans le documentaire « The Rape of Europa » .

Il y a débat quant à savoir la proportion d'œuvres achetées ou volées pour le musée. Hanns Christian Lohr affirme dans « La Maison brune de l'Art » que seule une petite partie de la collection (peut-être 12 %) est issue de pillage. Un autre historien réduit même ce chiffre à 2,5 % . Toutefois, Jonathan Petropoulos, un historien au collège Loyola, à Baltimore et un expert dans le pillage en temps de guerre, ont fait valoir que la plupart des achats n'avaient pas été forcément réalisés dans des conditions normales. Aalders Gerard, un historien néerlandais, a déclaré que ces ventes étaient somme toute un pillage : par exemple, aux Pays-Bas ou dans d'autres pays occupés qui ont été contraints d'accepter des Reichsmarks qui se sont finalement avérés inutile. Aalders fait valoir que : « Si l'agent d'art d'Hitler ou de Göring était à votre porte et vous offrait 10,000 dollars pour une toile qui en valait 100,000, il était assez difficile de refuser. » . Aalders ajoute que les Nazis n'ont pas hésité à menacer de confisquer malgré tous les œuvres d'art ou d'en arrêter le propriétaire. Birgit Schwarz, une experte sur le « Führermuseum » , dans une critique du livre de Lohr, a fait remarquer que l'auteur s'est axé sur les achats depuis le « Führerbau » à Munich et a ignoré les dépôts d'art pillées en Haute-Autriche (Thürntal, Kremsmünster et Hohenfurt / Vyssi Brod) .

Pour l'Autriche, la Seconde Guerre mondiale prend fin le 27 avril 1945. Dans les années qui suivront, la nation entière devra faire un bilan des conséquences de leur alliance avec le 3e « Reich » , notamment en matière de culture. Même si beaucoup de jeunes Autrichiens envisageaient des jours meilleurs, plusieurs devront vivre dans un climat de grande morosité.

Le « Führermuseum »

Entre autres délires, Adolf Hitler entendait prouver au monde la supériorité de l'art aryen. Dès 1939, il avait conçu le projet de construire un immense musée à Linz et chargé l'historien de l'art Hans Posse de dresser la liste des œuvres qui devaient idéalement y être montrées. Un peu partout en Europe, les musées s'organisaient pour mettre leurs chefs d'œuvre à l'abri. Fuyant un peu tard devant l'avancée Nazie dans l'espoir de mettre sous la protection du pape au Vatican, l'Agneau Mystique, un polyptyque des frères van Eyck dont la valeur est inestimable, ceux qui en avaient la charge parvinrent jusqu'à Pau, dans les Pyrénées, où le régime de Vichy abandonna l'œuvre aux Allemands.

...

Le « Führermuseum » est un projet de musée allemand gigantesque situé à Linz et imaginé par Adolf Hitler pour accueillir les plus grandes œuvres dites de l'« Art véritable » , par opposition à l'« Art dégénéré » de la modernité.

Adolf Hitler mûrit pendant plusieurs l'année l'idée de créer un grand musée. Il choisit pour site la ville de Linz, située

non loin de sa ville natale et où il avait lui-même étudié. Le projet comprenait une maison d'Opéra, dont Hitler dressa lui-même les plans. La construction devait s'échelonner jusque vers 1950. Le site choisi est alors occupé par la gare de Linz, qui aurait été déplacée 4 kilomètres au sud.

La majorité des plans sont dessinés par Albert Speer. Le complexe comprend un Théâtre monumental, un Opéra et un Hôtel, le tout entouré par des boulevards et une esplanade pour les parades. Une bibliothèque devait accueillir 250,000 livres. Le musée devait avoir une face de 150 mètres de long et correspondre plus ou moins à la « Haus der Kunst » érigée à Munich.

...

Le « Führermuseum » est un projet de musée allemand gigantesque situé à Linz, en Autriche, imaginé par Adolf Hitler pour accueillir les plus grandes œuvres dites de l'« art véritable », par opposition à l'« art dégénéré » de la modernité.

Adolf Hitler mûrit pendant plusieurs années l'idée de créer un grand musée. Il choisit pour site la ville de Linz, située non loin de sa ville natale et où il avait lui-même étudié. Le projet comprenait une maison d'Opéra, dont Hitler dressa lui-même les plans. La construction devait s'échelonner jusque vers 1950. Le site choisi est alors occupé par la gare de Linz, qui aurait été déplacée 4 kilomètres au sud.

La majorité des plans sont dessinés par Albert Speer. Le complexe comprend un théâtre monumental, une maison d'Opéra et un hôtel ; le tout entouré par des boulevards et une esplanade pour les parades. Une bibliothèque devait accueillir 250,000 livres. Le musée devait avoir une face de 150 mètres de long et correspondre plus ou moins à la « Haus der Kunst » érigée à Munich.

Le 21 juin 1939, Hitler met en place le projet spécial Linz (« Sonderauftrag Linz »), à Dresde, et nomme le docteur Hans Posse directeur de la « Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister » (Galerie de peintures de Dresde), en tant qu'envoyé spécial. Le « Sonderauftrag » est chargé de collecter des œuvres d'art pour le futur « Führermuseum ». Basé à Dresde, il se compose d'historiens de l'art travaillant normalement pour la galerie de peintures, par exemple Robert Örtel et Gottfried Reimer. Posse décède d'un cancer en décembre 1942 ; en mars 1943, Hermann Voß, un historien de l'art et directeur de la galerie de Wiesbaden, reprend la direction du « Sonderauftrag ».

Les méthodes d'acquisition vont de la confiscation à l'achat et comprennent aussi de nombreux cas de vente forcée, par l'utilisation des fonds provenant des ventes du « Mein Kampf » et de timbres à l'effigie d'Hitler. Les achats sont principalement enregistrés depuis le « Führerbau » (bureaux d'Hitler) à Munich ; les œuvres d'art acquises sont stockées dans des dépôts en Haute-Autriche. L'« Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (E.R.R.), créé en 1940 et dirigé par Alfred Rosenberg, qui « lutte contre le judaïsme et la franc-maçonnerie » et se charge également de confisquer les œuvres d'arts appartenant aux familles incriminées, dans toute l'Europe ; dès le 17 septembre 1940, Hitler somme la « Wehrmacht » d'aider ce nouveau service à « transférer en Allemagne les biens culturels qui lui paraissent précieux et à les sauvegarder dans ce pays ».

« L'Agneau mystique » de Hubert et Jan Van Eyck aurait été une pièce centrale du musée : cachée au Vatican puis à Pau, le régime de Vichy l'offre aux Allemands, avec regret, pendant l'été 1942.

...

The « Führermuseum » (Leader's Museum) , also referred to as the Linz Art Gallery, was an un-realized Art Museum within a cultural complex planned by Adolf Hitler for his hometown, the Austrian city of Linz, near his birthplace of Braunau. Its purpose was to display a selection of the art bought, confiscated or stolen by the Nazis from throughout Europe during World War II. The cultural district was to be part of an overall plan to recreate Linz, turning it into a cultural capital of the 3rd « Reich » and one of the greatest Art Centers of Europe, over-shadowing Vienna, for which Hitler had a personal distaste. He wanted to make the city more beautiful than Budapest, so it would be the most beautiful on the Danube River, as well as an industrial power-house and a hub of trade ; the Museum was planned to be one of the greatest in Europe.

The expected completion date for the project was 1950, but neither the « Führermuseum » nor the cultural center it was to be the anchor of were ever built. The only part of the elaborate plan which was constructed was the Nibelungen Bridge, which is still extant.

As early as 1925, Hitler had conceived of a « German National Gallery » to be built in Berlin with himself as director. His plan, drawn-out in a sketch-book, may have been influenced by the « Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum » (now, the Bode Museum) , and consisted of a building with 2 sections : one with 28 rooms, and the other with 32. Hitler denoted which of his favourite 19th Century German artists were to be collected, and in what rooms their work would hang. Among his favourite painters were Hans Makart, Franz Defregger, Eduard Grützner, Franz von Stuck, Franz von Lenbach, Anselm Feuerbach, Heinrich Zügel and Carl Spitzweg, and he had extolled « Aryan art » by Moritz von Schwind and Arnold Böcklin in « Mein Kampf » . At one time in his planning, he dedicated 5 of the rooms in the Museum to the work of Adolph von Menzel, and 3 rooms to both Schwind and Böcklin. Carl Rottmann, Edouard von Engerth, and Anton von Werner were to share a single room, as were Makart and Karl von Piloty ; Wilhelm Trübner and Fritz von Uhde ; Grützner and Defregger ; and the artists of the Nazarene movement. Other painters who would enjoy their own room in Hitler's original plans were Peter von Cornelius, Hans von Marées, Bonaventura Genelli, Anselm Feuerbach and Wilhelm Leibl. These choices reflected Hitler's taste at the time, which was a preference for sentimental 19th Century Germanic Romantic painters, including « both “ schmaltzy ” genre pictures and heroic, idyllic, allegorical. historical-patriotic themes, the visual equivalent of Wagner, without the genius » .

It was after the « Anschluß » with Austria, with the House of German Art in Munich already completed, that Hitler conceived of having his dream Museum not in any of the premiere cities in Germany, where it could be over-shadowed, but in his « hometown » of Linz in Austria, and discussed his plans with the director of the local Provincial Museum, Theodor Kerschner, while visiting there.

Additionally, after a State trip to Rome, Florence and Naples in 1938 (between the « Anschluß » with Austria and the

taking of the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia) , Hitler (« overwhelmed and challenged by the riches of the Italian museums ») expanded the conception of his planned gallery. It would now be the un-surpassed Art Gallery in all of Europe, indeed « the greatest Museum in the world » , featuring the finest of all European Art.

The idea and overall design concept for a new cultural district in Linz anchored by the « Führermuseum » was Hitler's own. He intended Linz to be one of the future cultural capitals of the « Reich » , to have its own University, and to overshadow Vienna, a city in which he had spent some years as a struggling artist, and about which he felt considerable distaste, not only because of the Jewish influence on the city, but because of his own failure to gain admission to the Vienna Academy of Fine-Arts.

« Hitler envisaged Linz as the future seat of the new German “ Kultur ”, and lavished all his limited pictorial talent and architectural training on a vast project which would realize this ambition. He devoted a disproportionate amount of time and energy, for a Chief of State, to the plans for Linz, personally creating the architectural scheme for an imposing array of public buildings, and setting the formula for an art-collection which was to specialize heavily in his beloved, mawkish German School of the 19th Century. His private library, discovered by the American Army deep in Austria, contained scores of completed architectural renderings for the Linz project. »

According to one of Hitler's secretaries, he never tired of talking about his planned Museum, and it was often the subject at his regular afternoon teas. He would expound on how the paintings were to be hung : with plenty of space between them, in rooms decorated with furniture and furnishings appropriate to the period, and how they were to be lit. No detail of the presentation of the artworks was too small for his consideration. He said of the Museum, in 1942 :

« Anyone who wants to study 19th Century painting will, sooner or later, find it necessary to go to the Linz Gallery, because only there will it be possible to find complete collections. »

In Autumn 1940, Hitler commissioned architect Hermann Giesler, a devout Nazi, to be in overall charge of the re-building of Linz, one of the 5 designated « Führerstädte » (« Führer » cities) , along with Berlin, Hamburg, Nuremberg and Munich, which were to be redeveloped drastically. Linz was to become a major cultural center, an art capital of Europe, a hub of trade and commerce, and the most beautiful city on the Danube, surpassing Budapest. It would have a new City Hall, new Nazi Party headquarters and a new railway station, a stadium, a community hall, a Technical University, an institute of metallurgy, a planetarium, a suspension bridge, and 2 new towers, one of them with a carillon and a mausoleum for Hitler's parents. The city would also have Hitler's own retirement residence, designed by Giesler. In addition to all this, the Vienna facilities of the « Hermann-Göring-Werks » steel-plant were to be moved to Linz as well, over the objections of officials of the city, the architects, and Fritz Todt, who thought the industrial facilities were incompatible with a city of art, architecture and culture. Hitler, though, wanted to provide the city with an ongoing means of income after he was dead and could no longer subsidize it.

The cultural center at the heart of the re-development, the buildings for which were based on Hitler's ideas and rough designs, came to be referred to as the « European Culture Center » . It included a monumental Theatre, a Concert

-Hall, a library with over 250,000 volumes, an Opera House as well as an Operetta House, a cinema, a collection of armor and an « Adolf Hitler Hotel » , all surrounded by huge boulevards and a parade ground. Located south of the historic section of Linz, the main-buildings, including the « Führermuseum » , were to be aligned along one main-avenue, « In den Lauben » which, after the War, was called : « a typical National-Socialist axis street » . It would be anchored at the other end by the new railway station.

The design of the many buildings of the cultural center were assigned to various architects Hitler favoured. The Museum itself was designed by Roderich Fick based closely on Hitler's sketches and specifications, modeled somewhat after Paul Ludwig Troost's « Haus der Deutschen Kunst » (House of German Art) in Munich (itself strongly influenced by Hitler's participation in the design process) and would feature a colonnaded facade about 500 feet (150 meters) long. It would stand on the site of the Linz railroad station, which was to be moved 4 kilometers to the south. Should the volume of German art bought, confiscated and plundered for the Museum be such that expansion was needed, an additional building could easily be integrated into the planned district.

By January 1945, Hitler became obsessed with seeing a model of the planned cultural complex ; he had his adjutants and Martin Bormann, his personal secretary and head of the Nazi Party, call Giesler's office repeatedly, to ask when the « Führer » could view the model. Giesler's office worked around the clock to finish it. The model was finally set-up in the cellar of the new « Reich » Chancellery, and was ready for viewing on 9 February. Hitler was apparently entranced by what he saw :

« Bent over the model, he viewed it from all angles, and in different kinds of lighting. He asked for a seat. He checked the proportions of the different buildings. He asked about the details of the bridges. He studied the model for a long time, apparently lost in thought. While Geisler stayed in Berlin, Hitler accompanied him twice daily to view the model, in the afternoon and again during the night. Others in his entourage were taken-down to have his building plans explained to them as they pored over the model. Looking down on the model of a city which, he knew, would never be built, Hitler could fall in « rêverie » , revisiting the fantasies of his youth, when he would dream with his friend August Kubizek about re-building Linz. »

Hitler visited the model frequently during his time living in the « bunker » under the « Reich » Chancellery. The closer Germany came to military defeat, the more viewing the model became Hitler's only relief ; being invited to view it with him was an indication of the « Führer » 's esteem.

Near the end of the War, when American forces over-ran Hitler's private library, which was hidden deep in Austria, it contained « scores » of plans and renderings for the Museum and the complex as a whole. They also found « The Future Economic Status of the City of Linz » : a 78 page bound volume prepared for Hitler by the Economic and Research Section of the Oberdonau Department of the Interior, which outlined in detail how the revitalization of Linz would take place. The entire Linz project was treated as a State secret on Hitler's order.

The collection for the planned Museum in Linz was accumulated through several methods. Hitler himself sent Heinrich Heim, one of Martin Bormann's adjutants who had expertise in paintings and graphics, on trips to Italy and France to

buy artworks, which Hitler paid for with his own money, which came from sales of his « Mein Kampf » , real estate speculation on land in the area of the « Berghof » , Hitler's mountain retreat on the Obersalzberg, and royalties from Hitler's image used on postage stamps. The latter, which was divided with his official photographer Heinrich Hoffmann, amounted to at least 75 million « Reichsmarks » over the course of Hitler's reign.

This, however, was not the primary method used to build up the collection.

In Nazi Germany, Adolf Hitler's birthday was celebrated nationally on April 20 beginning in 1933 (the year Hitler became Chancellor) through 1944. For his 50th birthday, in 1939, the day was declared a National Holiday. As part of these celebrations, Hitler would receive numerous presents, among which were paintings and other art objects. These were set aside for use in the planned « Führermuseum » in Linz.

Adolf Hitler's 56th birthday, in 1945, was a private celebration held in the « bunker » under the « Reich » Chancellery, in Berlin, as the Red Army battled to take the city ; even under those circumstances, Hitler would frequently spend hours in the basement of the Chancellery looking at the scale-model of the proposed rebuilding of Linz, which centered on the cultural district around the « Führermuseum » . 9 days after his birthday, Hitler married Eva Braun, and they committed suicide together the next day.

In the 1st weeks after the « Anschluß » , in March 1938, which brought Austria into the German « Reich » , both the « Gestapo » and the Nazi Party confiscated numerous artworks for themselves. In response, on 18 June 1938, Hitler issued a decree placing all artwork that had been seized in Austria under the personal prerogative of the « Führer » :

« As part of the seizure of assets hostile to the State (especially, Jewish assets) in Austria, paintings and other artwork of great value, among other things, have been confiscated. The “ Führer ” requests that this artwork, for the most part from Jewish hands, be neither used as furnishings of administration offices or senior bureaucrats' official residences nor purchased by leading State and Party leaders. The “ Führer ” plans to personally decide on the use of the property after its seizure. He is considering putting artwork 1st and foremost at the disposal of small Austrian towns for their collections. »

The intent of the order was to guarantee that Hitler would have 1st choice of the plundered art for his planned « Führermuseum » and for other Museums in the « Reich » . This later became a standard procedure for all purloined or confiscated art, and was known as the « Führer-Reserve » .

On 21 June 1939, Hitler set-up the « Sonderauftrag Linz » (Linz Special Commission) , in Dresden, and appointed Doctor Hans Posse, director of the « Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister » (the Dresden Picture Gallery) , as special envoy. A few days later, on 26 June, Hitler signed a letter intended to give Posse the authority he would need to do this job.

He wrote :

« I commission Doctor Hans Posse, Director of Dresden Gallery, to build-up the new Art Museum for “ Linz an der Donau ”. All Party and State services are ordered to assist Doctor Posse in fulfillment of his mission. »

Posse had a checkered relationship with the National-Socialists. His wife had joined the Nazi Party in 1932, but when Posse himself tried to join in 1933, his application was rejected 1 year later. He was later accused of having promoted so-called « Degenerate art » , and of having Jewish ancestry. In 1938, he was asked to resign as director (a position he had held since 1910, from the age of 31) but refused, taking a leave of absence instead. He was nevertheless fired, only to be restored to the position on Hitler's orders, possibly through the influence of art-dealer Karl Haberstock.

Although Hitler had favoured German and Austrian paintings from the 19th Century, Posse's focus was on early-German, Dutch, French, and Italian paintings. Posse wrote in his diary that Hitler intended the Museum to hold « only the best of all periods from the pre-historic beginnings of art to the 19th Century, and recent times » . Hitler told Posse that he was only to answer to him.

The « Sonderauftrag » not only collected art for the « Führermuseum » , but also for other Museums in the German « Reich » , especially in the Eastern territories. The artworks would have been distributed to these Museums after the War. The « Sonderauftrag » , located in Dresden, had approximately 20 specialists attached to it :

« Curators of paintings, prints, coins, and armor, a librarian, an architect, an administrator, photographers, and restorers. »

The staff included : Robert Örtel and Gottfried Reimer (of the Dresden Gallery) , and SS officer Friedrich Wolffhardt, as curator of books and autographs ; Leopold Rupprecht of the « Kunsthistorisches Museum » as curator for armour ; and Fritz Dworschak, also of that Museum, as curator for coins.

In the late-summer and autumn of 1939, Posse traveled a number of times to Vienna to the Central Depot for confiscated art in the « Neue Burg » to pick-out art pieces for the Linz Museum and, in October, he gave to Martin Bormann, for Hitler's approval, the list of artworks confiscated from the Vienna Rothschilds which Posse had selected for the Museum. These included works by Hans Holbein the Elder, van Dyck, Rembrandt, Frans Hals, Tintoretto, Gerard ter Borch and Francesco Guardi, among others. These 182 pieces were also included in Posse's July 1940 list of 324 paintings he had chosen for the Museum's collection. Posse also went to Poland to examine confiscated artworks there, selecting works by Leonardo, Raphael, and Rembrandt for the Museum in Linz, although these pieces never actually left the control of the General Government, the rump of Poland left after Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union took the territory they wanted.

On 10 June 1940, Posse wrote to Bormann :

« The special delegate for the safe-guarding of art and cultural properties has just returned from Holland. He notified me today that there exists at the moment a particularly favourable opportunity to purchase valuable works of art from Dutch dealers and private owners in German currency. Even though a large number of important works have

doubtless been removed recently from Holland, I believe that the trade still contains many objects which are desirable for the " Führer " 's collection, and which may be acquired without foreign exchange. »

As a result of this, accounts of about 500,000 « Reichsmarks » were opened in Paris and Rome for Posse's personal use, and, around July 1940, he expanded the scope of the « Sonderauftrag Linz » into Belgium and the Netherlands when he established an office in The Hague, as « Referent für Sonderfragen » (Adviser on « Special Questions ») . Posse was able to report to Bormann that, as of March 1941, he had spent 8,522,348 « Reichsmarks » on artworks for the « Führermuseum » . He later bought most of the Mannheimer Collection, in 1944, including Rembrandt's « Jewish Doctor » (assisted by the threat of confiscation from the Nazi government of Arthur Seyß-Inquart) with the remainder of the collection being purchased in the same manner in France, later on. The collecting of the « Sonderauftrag Linz » includes many such cases of forced sale, using funds from sales of Hitler's book, « Mein Kampf » , and stamps showing his portrait. Members of the « Sonderauftrag Linz » made a considerable number of purchasing trips throughout Europe, acquiring a significant number of artworks, and also arranged purchases through art-dealers.

Hitler was pleased with Posse's work and, in 1940, awarded him the honorific of « Professor » , something the « Führer » did for many of his favourites in the arts, such as Leni Riefenstahl, the actress and film director ; architects Albert Speer and Hermann Giesler ; sculptors Arno Breker and Josef Thorak ; Wilhelm Furtwängler, conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra ; actor Emil Jannings ; and photographer Heinrich Hoffmann, among others.

In October 1939, Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini had made an agreement that any Germanic artworks in public museums in the South Tyrol (a traditionally German-speaking area which had been given to Italy after the First World War, in return for entering the War on the side of the « Triple Entente ») could be removed and returned to Germany, but when Posse attempted to do so, with the assistance of Heinrich Himmler's « Ahnenerbe » , the Italians managed to keep putting things off, and no repatriations ever took place.

Posse died in December 1942 of cancer. His funeral was a high State event to which Hitler invited the directors of all Art Museums in the « Reich » ; Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels delivered the eulogy, although there was no mention made of the Linz Museum project, since it was a State secret Posse had gathered more than 2,500 artworks for the Linz Museum in the 3 years he was head of the « Sonderauftrag Linz » .

In March 1943, Hermann Voß, an art-historian, director of the Wiesbaden Gallery and former Deputy director of the « Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum » , in Berlin, took-over the Special Commission. His appointment was considered odd by some, since he was known to be an anti-Nazi with a considerable number of Jewish friends and colleagues, but Hitler was known to overlook political factors when dealing with matters of art, and Voß's knowledge of southern German artwork, as well as French and Italian painting, may have decided the matter for him. Voß was not nearly as active or energetic as Posse had been, and was prone to send-out agents rather than to travel himself to make purchases, or to make dealers bring works to him.

Hitler's relationship with Voß was not as warm as with Posse. The 2 men met only on several occasions, and Voß was not given authority over books, armour and coins, as Posse had been.

Voß is said to have remarked after one meeting with the « Führer » :

« He's even worse than I thought. »

Voß attempted to mend his fences with Hitler with an elaborate gift for his birthday in 1944, accompanied by a list of his acquisitions in which he claimed to have bought 881 items, compared to 122 paintings that Posse had collected the year before. Voß did, indeed, spend money more profligately than Posse had, and his budget was later reduced near the end of the War. Under interrogation after the War, he claimed to have acquired 3,000 paintings for the « Führermuseum » , between 1943 and 1944, although the records do not support this figure, and many of the artworks were of distinctly secondary importance.

In April 1943, the German public first heard about the Linz project in a special edition of Heinrich Hoffmann's art-magazine, « Kunst dem Volk » (Art to the People) . It revealed both the intention to build a great art-gallery in Linz and the existence of the collection which had been amassed for it, although, of course, nothing was said about the methods used to acquire many of the pieces. The magazine featured coloured plates of works in the collection by Rembrandt, Leonardo da Vinci, Breughel and Vermeer, among others. Up to that time, only 2 works which had been collected for the Linz Museum had been seen by the public (but without disclosure of where they were eventually designated to go) . The first was Myron's sculpture « Discobolus » (The Discus Thrower) , which Hitler obtained surreptitiously in 1938 through the Berlin State Museum, but ordered to be displayed at the Glyptothek in Munich, where he proudly told his invited guests at the unveiling :

« May you all then realize how glorious man already was back then in his physical beauty. »

The other work was Makart's triptych, « The Plague in Florence » , which Hitler acquired as a gift from Benito Mussolini, who, when the owners refused to sell it, seized their villa and confiscated the painting, which he presented to the « Führer » at the train station in Florence.

The legal authority for the collection of artworks for the « Führermuseum » began with Hitler himself, who, after the Enabling Act of 1933, had the power to enact laws without involving the « Reichstag » . In effect, whatever Hitler directed to be done had the force of law. It was his personal desire for the creation of a Museum and the revitalization of Linz which began the collection program. Martin Bormann, the head of the Nazi Party and, later, also Hitler's private secretary, was also closely connected to the program from the beginning, in particular as a conduit through which to access Hitler. He acted as the Chief of Staff for the « Sonderauftrag Linz » .

On the next level of hierarchy, « Reichsminister » Hans Lammers, who was President of the « Reich » Chancellery, and Doctor Helmut von Hummel, Bormann's « Special Assistant » and « a particularly vicious Nazi » , actually drew-up the directives which set-out the policies and procedures which governed the collecting process, both for confiscations and purchases. The financing and administration of the Linz program was their responsibility. Von Hummel had replaced Kurt Hanssen.

Other Nazi officials involved in the confiscation of art, but not specifically with collection for the Linz Museum, included the « Reich » Minister for Science, Education, and Culture, Bernhard Rust ; the Governor General for Poland, Hans Frank ; and Heinrich Himmler, the Head of the SS.

In 2004, Birgit Schwarz published 19 photograph-albums as documents of the intended gallery holdings. These « “ Führer ” albums » , which were created between autumn 1940 and autumn 1944, were presented to Hitler every Christmas and on his birthday, 20 April. Originally, 31 volumes existed, but only 19 have been preserved in Germany, and 11 are considered to be lost. The albums are documents of the intended gallery holdings and are the most important historical and visual sources relating to the gallery of the « Führermuseum » . Notably, the collection included : 3 Rembrandts ; « la Danse » by Watteau ; the « Memling portrait » by Corsini ; Rubens' « Ganymede » ; and Vermeer's « The Artist in His Studio » , a forced sale at a knock-down price.

In the « authoritarian anarchy » and « administrative chaos » that was typical of the way the 3rd « Reich » operated, the « Sonderauftrag Linz » was not the only Nazi agency collecting artworks. In France, as in many other countries in Europe, the office of « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (Special Purposes « Reich » Leader, Rosenberg) , or ERR, was the primary agency. On 5 November 1940, a directive from « Reichsmarchall » Hermann Göring to Alfred Rosenberg, the head of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » , and to the Chief of Military Administration in Paris outlines the several categories of « ownerless » art confiscated from Jews for « safe-guarding » . One of the categories were « Those art objects for the further disposition of which the “ Führer ” has reserved for himself the right of decision. » , while other categories were those works desired by Göring himself, those destined for German Museums other than the « Führermuseum » . Although the directive was intended to be effective immediately, Göring indicates that he had, yet, to clear it with Hitler, but intended to do so.

Hitler, then, issued on 18 November his own directive, a « Führerbefehl » similar to the ones he had issued for Poland and Austria, announcing his prerogative over all confiscated art in the occupied Western territories. Rosenberg, thus, became a formal procurement agent for the « Führermuseum » , except when Göring intervened. This apparently brought about some internecine squabbling, as Doctor Posse had been given the authority to act on Hitler's behalf, and the German commanders of occupied countries were required to keep him regularly informed about their confiscations of artwork. Probably because of Göring's interference, Posse formally requested that the « Reich » Chancellery reiterate his power to act for the « Führer » . The result was a « general high-level directive » confirming Hitler's primacy through Posse, and a direction to Posse to review the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » 's inventory, in regard to the needs of the planned Museum in Linz.

On 20 March 1941, Rosenberg reported that his unit had proceeded to follow the directive, having « collected » over 4,000 items ; those personally selected by Göring had already been shipped by train to the air-raid shelters of the « Führer » Building, in Munich. Several years later, on 16 April 1943, Rosenberg sent Hitler photographs of some of the more valuable paintings confiscated from the Western Occupied Territories, to add to the 53 photographs he had sent earlier. Rosenberg asked for permission to see Hitler personally, to present a catalog of works seized, as well as 20 additional folders of photographs.

By one conservative estimate, about 21,903 objects were confiscated from France. Of these, about 700 went to Göring. 53 were ear-marked for the « Führermuseum » in Linz. Rosenberg kept the rest under his own control until 1945. In 2008, the German Historic Museum of Berlin published a data-base with paintings collected for the « Führermuseum » and for other Museums in the German « Reich » .

The German occupation of Paris began on 14 June 1940 and, on 30 June, Hitler ordered that artworks in the French national collection be « safe-guarded » and, in particular, « ownerless » art and historical documents (meaning works which were the property of Jews and could, therefore, be confiscated from them) be « protected » as well. 3 days later, the German ambassador in France, Otto Abetz, ordered the confiscation of the collections of the 15 most important art-dealers in the city, most of whom were Jewish. These pieces were, then, brought to the German Embassy. Through the actions of Count Franz von Wolff-Metternich, the head of the « Kunstschutz » (Art Protection) (an agency which dated from World War I, and which had a mission which was superficially similar to that of the Allied Monuments, Fine-Arts, and Archives program - MFAA) , Nazi military authorities intervened and stopped Abetz from making any more confiscations. Most of the artwork in the Embassy was, then, transferred for storage to the Louvre, at the suggestion of Jacques Jaujard, the Director of French National Museums.

Wolff-Metternich continued in his efforts to protect the artworks, which what he saw as the proper role of his agency. In particular, he was able to fend-off Josef Gœbbels' demand that almost a thousand pieces of « Germanic » art, held in the collection of confiscated pieces, be shipped immediately to Germany. Wolff-Metternich did not disagree that the artworks properly belonged in the « Reich » , but did not think that sending them at the time was the correct course of action, and held-off Gœbbels with bureaucratic maneuvers and strict interpretation of Hitler's directive, which specified that artwork in France should not be moved until a peace treaty between France and German had been signed, which had not as yet occurred.

The collection of artwork in the Louvre was destined to survive the War, and was not subjected to predation from the various Nazi entities confiscating and collecting artwork for shipment back to Germany, including those doing so for Hitler's planned Museum in Linz. Wolff-Metternich was eventually removed from his office, as he was not pliable enough to provide the veneer of legality that was wanted by the Nazi authorities. Jaujard was fired as well after his vehement protest over the German theft of the Ghent Altarpiece in 1942, but when the staffs of every French Museum resigned, in protest over his dismissal, the Nazis were forced to restore him to his office, where he was able to continue to safe-guard the French national collection, and provide assistance to the « Résistance » .

Jaujard, however, could do very little to protect the private art-collections of Paris and France from the predations of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » . These collections (those of the French Rothschilds ; Paul Rosenberg, the art-dealer ; Georges and Daniel Wildenstein ; the investment banker Pierre David-Weill ; Germain Seligman, the art-historian and dealer ; Alphonse Kann ; and the other great collectors of the time) were systematically subjected to confiscations under various bureaucratically outlined pretenses of « protection » , and were then brought to the « Jeu de Paume » Museum, where they were cataloged and divided-up for Adolf Hitler's collection, for Hermann Göring's, for the use of Alfred Rosenberg's « scholarly » institutions which were attempting to prove the inferiority of Jews, as well

as for other purposes. Fortunately, Rose Valland (at the time, an un-paid museum employee, later the Museum's « attaché » and « assistante ») was a member of the French « Résistance », and had remained working at the Museum on Jaujard's orders. Valland kept lists of all the works which came in, the secret storehouses where they were stock-piled when they left the Museum, and the numbers of the train cars when the last of the paintings were shipped to Germany just before the Allied recapturing of Paris. Using Valland's information, the « Résistance » was able to delay the train sufficiently so that it never reached Germany.

Although the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg », in theory, was part of Alfred Rosenberg's Nazi Empire, Rosenberg was an ideologue who had no interest in art, and did not appreciate the value to Germany of looting the patrimony of the occupied countries. « Reichsmarschall » Hermann Göring, on the other hand, Hitler's anointed successor and the head of the « Luftwaffe », was an avid collector of confiscated artworks, with an unquenchable appetite for jewels and finery as well. As a result, the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » in France became, in large part, « Göring's personal looting organization ». During the course of the War, Göring paid 20 visits to the « Jeu de Paume », in Paris, to view the results of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg »'s confiscations.

On occasion, Göring's desires conflicted with those of Hitler and Hitler's agents. When this occurred, Göring gave way, not wanting to provoke trouble with the « Führer ». Several times, he also made « gifts » to the collection of the « Führermuseum ». He sent 53 pieces from the French Rothschild Collection, which had been confiscated in Paris for him by the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg », to Munich to be held for the Linz Museum, including Vermeer's « The Astronomer », sent in November 1940, and which became Hitler's most cherished painting in his collection. Later on, in 1945, Göring gave Hitler 17 paintings and 4 bronzes from the Naples Museum. These had been confiscated by the Hermann Göring « Panzer » Division while they were being shipped to safety from Monte Cassino to the Vatican, and were later presented to the « Reichsmarschall » at Carinhall, his « Hunting Lodge / Art Gallery / Imperial Palace ».

At its peak, Göring's art-collection included 1,375 paintings, 250 sculptures and 168 tapestries. Its value has been estimated at several 100 million « Marks ».

When the Russian Army was about to cross the Oder River into Germany, in February 1945, threatening Carinhall, Göring began to evacuate his art-collection by train, sending it to his other residences in the south of Germany. A 2nd train-load went-out in March, and a 3rd in April. The contents of the shipments were personally chosen by Göring, who, at 1st, was inclined not to take the artwork he had acquired through the confiscations of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg », in case there might be questions of provenance in the future, but he was dissuaded from this course by Walter Andreas Hoffer, who was in charge of Göring's collection. Even after the contents of 3 long trains had left, Carinhall still had a considerable amount of art left in it, statues buried around the grounds, and looted furniture still in the rooms. Göring had « Luftwaffe » demolition experts wire the estate for destruction, so the treasures he had left behind would not fall into the hands of the Russians.

A number of art-dealers and private individuals profited greatly from Hitler's campaign to stock his planned Museum. Primary among them was Karl Haberstock, who operated a wide network of German agents in Paris, the south of

France, the Netherlands and Switzerland, but also at least 75 French collaborators. Haberstock declined to take a commission on the major purchases for the Museum, but took his regular fee otherwise, amassing a fortune. Thanks to his relationships with Hans Posse and with Hitler, he sold over 100 paintings designated for the Linz collection. When Posse went to France under Hitler's orders, he took the unscrupulous Haberstock with him, and the dealer, working through 82 local agents, purchased 62 pieces for the Linz collection, including works by Rembrandt, Brueghel, Watteau and Rubens.

Maria Almas Dietrich was another art-dealer who did well by the Nazi obsession with obtaining art. An acquaintance of Hitler through his official photographer, Heinrich Hoffmann, Dietrich sold 80 paintings to the Linz Museum collection, and a further 270 for Hitler's personal collection, as well as over 300 for other German Museums and Nazi Party functionaries. Prolific rather than knowledgeable, Dietrich still managed to make a considerable amount of money from the Linz program. She also managed to avoid being sent to a concentration camp, despite having a Jewish father, bearing a child with her Jewish lover, and marrying a Jew from Turkey, although she renounced Judaism after divorcing him. Hitler, despite his rabid anti-Semitism, was frequently, but not consistently, an un-conventional Nazi when it came to Jews involved in the arts. It may also have helped that Hitler's mistress Eva Braun was a friend of Dietrich's daughter.

Unlike Dietrich, « S.A. Gruppenführer » Prince Philipp of Hessen was a connoisseur of the arts and architecture and acted as Posse's principal agent in Italy, where he lived with his wife, a daughter of King Victor Emmanuel. A grandson of the German Emperor Frederick III, and a great-grandson of Queen Victoria, Philipp provided « a veneer of aristocratic elegance which facilitated important purchases from the Italian nobility » . Philipp assisted Posse in purchasing 90 paintings from Italy, and bought several more for the Linz collection on his own account.

Another dealer used by Hans Posse was Hildebrand Gurlitt, through whom he made expensive purchases of tapestries, paintings and drawings.

Other Nazi agents in the Linz program included Kajetan Mühlmann, a high SS official whose territories were Poland and the Netherlands ; Baron Kurt von Behr, the head of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » in France ; and Hitler's photographer Heinrich Hoffmann, an early art-adviser who fell from Hitler's favour after 1941, due to Martin Bormann's dislike of him, but who had acted as an intermediary between some German art-dealers and the Linz program, and possibly did the same in the Netherlands as well.

There is some debate about whether art for the « Führermuseum » was primarily stolen or purchased. Hanns Christian Löhr argues in « Das Braune Haus der Kunst : Hitler und der “ Sonderauftrag Linz ” » (The Brown House of Art : Hitler and the « Sonderauftrag Linz ») that only a small portion of the collection (possibly, 12 %) came from seizures or expropriation. Moreover, another 2.5 % was derived from forced sales. However, Jonathan Petropoulos, a historian at Loyola College in Baltimore and an expert in War-time looting, argues that most of the purchases were not « arm's length » in nature. Gerard Aalders, a Dutch historian, said those sales amounted to « technical looting » , since the Netherlands and other occupied countries were forced to accept German « Reichsmarks » that ultimately proved worthless.

Aalders argues that :

« If Hitler's or Göring's art-agent stood on your doorstep and offered \$ 10,000 for the painting instead of the \$ 100,000 it was really worth, it was pretty hard to refuse. »

He adds that Nazis who encountered reluctant sellers threatened to confiscate the art, or arrest the owner. Birgit Schwarz, an expert on the « Führermuseum », in her review of Löhr's book, pointed-out that the author focused on the purchases which were held in the « Führerbau », in Munich, and ignored the deposits of looted art in Upper-Austria : in Thürntal, Kremsmünster and Hohenfurth (Vyšší Brod) .

On the subject of purchases versus confiscations, Doctor Cris Whetton, the author of « Hitler's Fortune » , commented :

« I had expected to find that Hitler was directly responsible for looting and stealing of paintings that he wanted for himself, and I couldn't find any evidence of it, I found evidence that he paid for them ; sometimes at knock-down prices, but not direct theft in any way. I was quite surprised by this, and I have to say in all honesty that's what I found. »

The Dutch Advisory Committee on the Assessment of Restitution Applications for Items of Cultural Value and the Second World War assesses sales by Dutch Jews to the « Sonderauftrag Linz » . At least 2 restitution claims were rejected because the Committee argued that there were not enough indications showing coercion as the cause of the sale. For example, in 2009, the Restitution Committee rejected the application for the restitution of 12 works sold by the Jewish art-dealer Kurt Walter Bachstitz to the « Sonderauftrag Linz » , between 1940 and 1941. The Committee argued that Bachstitz had been « undisturbed » in the 1st years of the occupation and said it had not found signs of coercion. In 2012, the Commission rejected a claim of the heirs of Benjamin and Nathan Katz, former Jewish art-dealers in the Netherlands. The claim related inter alia to 64 works that the art-dealership Katz sold to the « Sonderauftrag Linz » . The Commission came to the conclusion that there were not enough indications demonstrating that the sales were made under duress.

Works which Hans Posse purchased in Vienna for the Linz collection included : Vermeer's « The Artist in his Studio » ; Titian's « The Toilet of Venus » ; Antonio Canova's « Polyhymnia » ; and several works by Rembrandt. Among the many painting, Karl Haberstock sold to the collection were 2 Rembrandts, one of which, « Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels » is now thought to be from the Rembrandt work-shop and not a work of the Master. Oddly, Hitler purchased these for an inflated price, despite the fact that seller was a partly Jewish woman and the paintings could have been confiscated. Posse also purchased over 200 pieces which Jewish owners had managed to get into Switzerland, where they were safe from confiscation. On the other hand, Posse did not shy away from confiscation either, particular in the former Czechoslovakia and Poland, where all property was subject to it, but also in the Netherlands.

It is not possible to determine with any accuracy the size of the collection which had been amassed for Hitler's planned Museum in Linz, but Frederick Spotts suggests that something around 7,000 pieces had been confiscated,

bought or purloined specifically for the « Führermuseum » , and that others from the many other art repositories scattered around Germany would most probably have been added had Hitler won the War and he and his art-experts had the opportunity to sort through the artworks and assign them to various museums. According to Spotts, the figure of 7,000 accords well with the data released by the Art Looting Investigation Unit. Other experts quote higher-figures of up to 8,500 for the ultimate size of the collection.

Despite its size, and the unprecedented access Hitler' agents had to artworks throughout Occupied Europe, the Linz collection had noticeable flaws. According to Spotts, its « gaps » included English art, Spanish art and art of the Northern Renaissance ; major artists were missing from the Italian part of the collection as well.

Whatever its size and quality, near the end of the War, Hitler wanted (it is understood) that he meant the collection to be for the public - even though there were hundreds of artworks that were specifically marked for use in the « Berghof » , his mountain retreat, and for a castle in Posen which Hitler intended as another residence. Still, in the « Private Testament » , he drew-up the day before his death, he specified that the collection should go to the Museum when it was built, writing that they were « never collected for private purposes, but always only for the expansion of a gallery in my hometown of Linz on the Danube » .

The artworks collected for the « Führermuseum » were originally stored in a number of places. The purchases were mostly kept in the air-raid shelters of the « Führerbau » in Munich (one of a number of large buildings Hitler had built in the birthplace of the Nazi Party) where they were under the control of the Nazi Party Chancellery ; Hitler would often come to visit them and indulge in long discussions on art as one of his tasks when coming to Munich, even during the War. Confiscated artworks were stored in deposits in the area of Upper-Austria, located in the middle of forests or in the mountains. The « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » alone requisitioned 6 estates for storage, including Neuschwanstein Castle, in the Bavarian Alps, in which items from France were stored ; the Benedictine monastery on the island of Frauenchiemsee, in the Chiemsee lake, halfway between Munich and Salzburg ; an estate in the Salzkammergut hills, which had been a summer residence for the Austrian royal family ; and the Grand Duke of Luxembourg's hunting lodge.

Rose Valland eventually shared the trove of information she had gathered at the « Jeu de Paume » Museum, while the Nazis were using it as a way-station for confiscated art, with 1st Lieutenant James Rorimer, one of the « Monuments Men » of the MFAA, who would be attached to the U.S. 7th Army. It would overrun the places in southern Germany (Heilbronn, Baxheim, Hohenschwangau and Neuschwanstein Castle) which Valland was certain were the locations of the repositories of much of the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » -looted art which had been shipped back to Germany. Captain Walker Hancock, the Monuments officer for the U.S. 1st Army, learned the locations of 109 art-repositories in Germany, east of the Rhine, from the former assistant of Count Wolff-Metternich of the « Kunstschutz » , thereby, doubling the number of repositories known at that time. Additional information came to « Monuments Men » Captain Robert Posey and Private Lincoln Kirstein, who were attached to the U.S. 3rd Army, from Hermann Bunjes, a corrupted art-scholar and former SS Captain who had been deeply involved in the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » 's « Jeu de Paume » operation on behalf of Hermann Göring. From Bunjes came the information that Hermann Göring had moved his collection out of Carinhall, and, most importantly, the revelation of the existence of a massive

repository in the Altaussee salt mines, which included much of Hitler's collection intended for the « Führermuseum » in Linz.

Despite the fact that the original storage locations, which had no military purpose and were culturally important in any case, would have been extremely unlikely to have been the subject of an Allied air-attack, in 1943, Hitler ordered that these collections be moved. Beginning in February 1944, the artworks were relocated to the 14th Century Steinberg salt mines above the village of Altaussee, code-named « Dora » , in which the holdings of various Viennese museums had earlier been transferred. The transfer of Hitler's Linz collection from the repositories to the salt mine took 13 months to complete, and utilized both tanks and oxen when the trucks could not navigate the steep, narrow and winding roads because of the winter weather. The final convoy of purloined art arrived at the mine, in April 1945, just weeks before V-E Day.

The labyrinthine salt mine has a single entrance, and a small gasoline-powered narrow-gauge engine pulling a flat car was utilized to navigate to the various caverns created by Centuries of salt mining. Into these spaces, workmen built storage-rooms which boasted wooden floors, racks specifically designed to hold the paintings and other artworks, up-to-date lighting, and dehumidification equipment. Despite the fact that the salt was mined using pipes and sluices through which flowed gravity-fed water from the mountain, which carried dissolved salt 17 miles away to Bad Ischl, where the water was evaporated, leaving behind the salt, the mine was not naturally humid, as the salt in the mine's walls absorbed excess moisture, keeping the chambers at a constant 65 % humidity, while the temperature only varied from a low of 40 degrees Fahrenheit in the winter to 47 degrees in the summer. Mining operations continued as the artwork was loaded into the mines, with the miners occasionally dragooned into helping to unload.

According to James S. Plaut, who from November 1944 to April 1946 was Director of the Art Looting Investigation Unit of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) , the salt mines held :

6,755 Old Master paintings, of which 5,350 were destined for Linz, 230 drawings, 1,039 prints, 95 tapestries, 68 sculptures, 43 cases of « objets d'art » , and innumerable pieces of furniture ; in addition, 119 cases of books from Hitler's library in Berlin, and 237 cases of books for the Linz library.

The noted Ghent Altarpiece (the stealing of which had caused Jacques Jaujard to protest vehemently and temporarily lose his job) arrived in the salt mine from Neuschwanstein, in the autumn of 1944 ; and Michelangelo's « Bruges Madonna » , in October of that year. Detailed records were kept at Dresden and moved to « Schloß Weißenstein » at the end of the War, where they were confiscated by the Russians, but these were primarily of the paintings stored in Munich in the « Führerbau » .

Also in the Altaussee repository was « The Plague in Florence » by Hans Makart, a favourite of Hitler's. It had been given to him by Benito Mussolini after Hitler had asked for it numerous times.

In April 1945, Supreme Allied Commander Dwight D. Eisenhower gave-up Berlin as a « prestige objective » that would not be worth the troops killed in order to take it (the death toll was estimated at 100,000) and ordered the 3rd

and 7th Armies to turn south, towards what the Allies feared might be an « Alpine Redoubt » from which Hitler or fanatical Nazis could operate a harassing guerilla campaign. The area was known to have hidden caches of arms and supplies, and intelligence reports had told of SS units moving from Berlin into that area. This new strategy meant that Neuschwanstein and Altausee would be overrun, and the « Monuments Men » would be able to verify and recover the important art-repositories that their information said were located in those places.

As the Allied troops approached the salt mines, August Eigruber, the « Gauleiter » of Upper-Austria, gave orders to blow it up and destroy the artwork using the 8 crates of 500 kilogram bombs he had stored in the mine, on 10 and 13 April 1945. Hitler, through Martin Bormann, counter-manded this order, and Albert Speer, the Minister of Armaments and War Production, had « clarified » Hitler's scorched earth « Nero Decree », but Eigruber felt he knew what Hitler's actual intent was. He ignored the pleas from the managers of the mine that it be saved as a vital resource - in Heilbronn, another salt mine which was used to store art had been ordered to be blown-up, but the miners refused to do so, as the mine was vital to their lives and livelihoods. After the « Führer » 's suicide, Eigruber ignored the conflicting and confusing orders coming from Berlin and again ordered the destruction of the mine and all the artwork in it. The managers of the mine attempted to remove the crates of bombs, but were headed-off by Eigruber's adjutant, who placed armed guards loyal to the « Gauleiter » at the entrance. The bombs were, then, wired for detonation by a demolition team.

Eigruber fled with an elite SS body-guard, fully expecting his order of destruction to be carried-out. Nevertheless, this did not happen. Instead, between 1 and 7 May 1945, before the arrival of U.S. Army troops, on 8 May, the 8 500 kilogram bombs were removed from the mine, and the tunnels near the mine entrance were blown-up, blocking the mine and protecting it from intrusion without doing damage to the irreplaceable and priceless art-collection inside.

Who, exactly, was responsible for saving the artwork took many years to determine, and was finally unravelled in the 1980's by Austrian historian Ernst Kubin. The plan was devised by Doctor Emmerich Pöchmüller, the general director of the mine, Eberhard Mayerhoffer, the technical director, and Otto Högler, the mine's foreman. It was sanctioned by Ernst Kaltenbrunner, an SS officer of high-rank in the « Gestapo » who had grown-up in the area, and was later convicted of mass-murder and hanged. The plan was carried-out by the miners, with the tacit approval of Eigruber's guards, several of whom had been persuaded by Karl Sieber, an art-restorer who had worked on paintings stored in the mine, that destroying the artwork and the mine was not a good idea. The entire operation took 3 weeks to implement. On 5 May, the signal was given, and 6 tons of explosives with 386 detonators and 502 timing switches were activated, causing 66 blasts which closed-off 137 tunnels. The blockages took about 1 month to clear away totally, although a hole big enough for a man to sidle through was completed by the miners overnight after the Americans arrived.

Due to geo-political considerations, U.S. forces were ordered to pull-back from the territory which included Altausee, as it had been determined that it would be part of the Russian zone of occupation. Because of this, the paintings and artworks in the mine were removed and transferred elsewhere in about 2 weeks, rather than the year which had originally been planned.

Most of the approximately 12,000 pieces of art in the mine were recovered. The Altausee trove included both works

meant specifically for the « Führermuseum » and other looted artwork as well. Other caches of art not intended for Linz were recovered in places throughout the « Reich » ; there were over 1,000 repositories in southern Germany alone, although some of the artworks in them came from the collections of German Museums - these were eventually returned. Much of Hermann Göring's collection from his estate at Carinhall was discovered in a cave at Berchtesgaden, where he had a summer home near Hitler's « Berghof » retreat, part of it was also left in his private train, which was found in Unterstein, and had been looted by the local residents.

Part of the collection designated for the Linz Museum was stored in the air-raid shelters of the « Führer » Building in Munich, part of the Nazi complex there. The building was broken into by a mob before American troops arrived in the city, and most of the 723 paintings still there were looted, with others were taken by American soldiers. Only 148 paintings were eventually recovered.

...

Before World War II's start, Adolf Hitler was driven to create his dream museum containing all his favourite Aryan-approved art. Noah Charney on how the « Monuments Men » had to unravel the thousands of objects plundered by the « Führer » 's minions and what they learned from Napoleon.

When « Monuments Men » Robert Posey and Lincoln Kirstein walked into the white-washed cottage in the German forest that housed Hermann Bunjes, the Harvard-educated one-time SS officer and art advisor to Hermann Göring, they learned of an elaborate plan involving the wholesale looting of Europe's art treasures. Bunjes, hiding in fear of reprisals against SS officers by angry German citizens, told these fellow art historians about the « Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg » (the Nazi art theft unit) and about Hitler's plan to create a city-wide museum in his boyhood town of Linz, in Austria : a « super museum » that would contain every important artwork in the world, including a wing of « degenerate art » , a sort of chamber of horrors to demonstrate from what monstrosities the Nazis had saved the world. It was news to Posey and Kirstein, who had to restrain their shock. The « Monuments Men » had heard rumors of art theft and looting throughout the War, but had no idea of the scale (some estimate that around 5 million cultural objects were looted, lost, or mis-handled during the War) , the advanced level of organization (scores of Nazi officers and hundreds of soldiers were assigned exclusively to the confiscation, transport, and maintenance of looted art and archival material) , and the ultimate destination of the choicest pieces : the « Führermuseum » . It was years into the War, when this encounter took place, and only then did the « Monuments Men » finally realized what they were up against. Bunjes further detailed a number of hiding places for looted art, including the famous salt mine at Altaussee, in the Austrian Alps, which contained some 12,000 stolen artworks, the mother-load destined for the Linz museum. Posey and Kirstein were on the hunt for « The Ghent Altarpiece » by Jan van Eyck, the most influential painting ever made and the most-frequently stolen, but could hardly believe what they were hearing. Yes, « The Ghent Altarpiece » was the number one target that Hitler wanted as the centerpiece for his museum, both because of its beauty, fame, and importance but also because it had been forcibly repatriated to Belgium from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles, and seizing it back would right this perceived wrong against the German people. But here was the chance to save not just this painting, but tens of thousands of artworks.

Course contre la montre

Adolf Hitler's plan for his museum been on his mind for more than a decade, at least since 1934 ; for Hitler had long stewed upon the idea of capturing « The Ghent Altarpiece » for Germany, and had even dispatched a Nazi art detective (and Hitler look-alike) , Heinrich Köhn, to find the « Righteous Judges » panel, one of the 12 that comprises « The Ghent Altarpiece » , which was stolen from Saint-Bavo Cathedral in Ghent, in 1934, and has never been recovered. Köhn was sent to Ghent to find it before the Nazis stole the rest of the altarpiece. The only reason why they would bother hunting for the one missing panel is if they intended to capture the rest of it as soon as the opportunity arose.

The museum was to have occupied the majority of the city center of Linz, turning the working-class town into Vienna's cultural superior, a concept that Hitler had relished ever since his failed attempt to become an art student in Vienna, a city that made him feel like a rejected, 2nd class citizen, prior to his political career. A joke went that while Munich was the city of the Nazi « Bewegung » (the Nazi movement) , Linz would be the city of the Nazi « Bodenbewegung » (the Nazi earthquake) , by the time the contractors got underway. Designed by architect Albert Speer, the museum complex was to include an Opera House, a hotel, a parade ground, a theatre, a library with a quarter-million volumes, and a museum with a 500 feet colonnaded façade in the terrifyingly grand Fascist Neo-Classical style. An estimated 36 kilometers of galleries were included in the plan ; to put that in perspective, the enormous and labyrinthine Victoria and Albert Museum, in London, has about 8 kilometers of galleries, to display some 27,000 objects. On 21 June 1939, Adolf Hitler set-up a special Commission to oversee the Linz project ; long before he had managed to annex, loot, and steal the art to fill it. From the fall of 1940 on, Hitler regularly received (often as a Christmas present) annotated photo albums full of confiscated art that could be featured in the « Führermuseum » . A total of 31 albums were prepared, of which 19 survive today. Hitler found great pleasure and comfort in poring over these albums, as well as the blueprints for the Linz project. He had the blueprints with him in his Berlin « bunker » when he killed himself, and was said to have studied them even near his end.

The German Historical Museum began a project, in 2008, to create a virtual version of the « Führermuseum » collection, an online database of art looted between 1930 and 1945, which gives a sense of what was taken. Though the methods were abominable, as a professor of art history, I admit to a dark and curious appeal to the concept that Hitler tried to bring about : a single « super museum » containing all of the world's most important art.

Adolf Hitler was, by no means, the 1st person to try to create such a museum. Jean-Dominique Vivant Denon, the 1st director of the Louvre Museum, had the same plan. He was Napoleon's chief art advisor, and made a wish-list of art that he would quite like to have for the Louvre, should it fall into the path of Napoleon's forces. Napoleon was the 1st general to have a dedicated art theft unit in his army, and to require the forfeit of artworks as a term of armistice ; if you wanted him to stop shooting at you, you had to give him your art. His art theft unit was responsible for the capture of thousands of works, particularly from Italy. Adding insult to injury, Napoleon obliged those he defeated to pay for the shipping of the art he stole from them back to Paris. The Vatican had to fork-out the equivalent of 2.3 million dollars in today's currency to cover shipping for the 100 plus artworks that Napoleon's team had chosen, after the Treaty of Tolentine, for removal to the Louvre. Hitler's plan for Linz was merely a more

elaborate attempt to create what Denon had envisioned for the Louvre, a 150 years prior.

Imagine walking through Hitler's museum. What would we have seen ? The Nazis strongly favored artists and subject matter that they considered Teutonic or Scandinavian ; the artists of choice were the likes of Dürer, Cranach, Friedrich, and van Eyck (Rembrandt shifted in popularity ; some Nazis deemed him « too Jewish » , while others felt that he was the ultimate Aryan artist) , but the scope of the collection was to have been universal, across eras and nations, but with the Northern Renaissance, Teutonic tradition clearly understood to be the « best » . Naturalism was dramatically favored over abstraction. The « degenerate wing » would have housed abstract, Minimalist, Cubist, Impressionist, and Post-Impressionist works ; even by German artists, a number of whom were considered as « bad » as their foreign, often Jewish, counterparts. The scale of the collection would have been tremendous, and it would have been curated in a moralistic, pedantic manner, indicating what one should, or even must, like.

At its center « The Ghent Altarpiece » would have stood, proof that Adolf Hitler had saved Germany after the humiliation of the 1st World War, and the ideal expression of naturalistic, Northern Renaissance painting by an artist of Teutonic lineage.

A stroll through the « Führermuseum » would be harrowing, terrifying, and fascinating. We have the Allied heroes (« Monuments Men » , soldiers, officers, and countless under-sung citizens) to thank for saving Europe's art, and the world. But the haunting concept of a « super museum » remains.

Nazis looted priceless violins

Rare musical instruments were among the loot confiscated by Nazis during World War II, recently unearthed documents reveal.

Violins including dozens of Stradivari, Guarneri and Amati (now worth hundreds of thousands of pounds each) were taken from the homes of musicians who fled or were sent to concentration camps.

The instruments, confiscated by a special team who followed German troops, were to be used in a proposed University in Hitler's home-town of Linz, Austria, after the War.

The lootings have been uncovered by recently released American military documents.

The instruments could join works of art as the focus of compensation claims for stolen artefacts, the « Chicago Tribune » reported.

« This is right now in the earliest phase of our work, but it may be one of the most fascinating areas of exploration. », said Elan Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress.

The Congress has been at the forefront of compensation claims for Holocaust-era lootings.

Adolf Hitler ordered a music « action team » (« M-Aktion ») to confiscate and catalogue any instruments of importance, which were then sent to Berlin.

The team followed German troops around Europe, moving in on the homes of those who had fled the Nazis' advance or who were taken to concentration camps.

Experts say looted instruments could be harder to track down than works of art, which are more easy to identify and are more likely to have associated documents.

Many survivors and families of those whose art was looted or sold under the duress during the War have pressed for compensation or the return of their works, with some success.

AB 117 : Cultural Death - Music under Tyranny

Lost artifacts by 3 musicians have resurfaced out of Adolf Hitler's Germany and Joseph Stalin's Soviet Union, each of whom arrived at a horrid end. The Nazis had implemented a program of bringing forcible-coordination to all their ideas and goals, known as « gleichschaltung », an electrical term that involves the « switching » of elements to be compatible within a circuit, or power system : this concept is an apt description of Nazification. It fueled conductor Oswald Kabasta's success whereas Alfred Hœhn and Oskar Fried were unadaptable outsiders whose artistic and personal integrity remain with us, living on in the deep spirituality evident in their recorded performances. The Nazis' broad rise on the cultural front began in 1920 when they relaunched the failed « Völkischer Beobachter » newspaper. A respectable pseudo-intellectual facade lured the German public into accepting an ideology that viewed the past through a pathologically distorted lens, while imposing their National-Socialist revisionism onto a millennial chain of disparate historic events and personages. Their articles progressively manipulated every well-known protagonist, past or present, German or otherwise. The paper's pompous and elevated language instilled in its credulous readers the perception that the illustrious icons of their common past had actually sacrificed their individuality for a greater common good. Of course, their readers were expected to adopt these same values. The Nazi method of parsing history, science, art, and religious investigation before a historic fun-house mirror was to prove their claim of having uncovered hidden patterns in their subjects' unconscious chronology, finally setting aright, so they believed, an enormous historical misperception. In their hands, Rembrandt's deeply expressive art was put forth as « visionary fanaticism », the painter warped from being a creator of contemplative self-portraits into an artist who harbored no patience for any « stagnation of the soul ». One by one, Shakespeare, Bach, Mozart, Schiller, Goethe, Byron, Beethoven, culminating in Richard Wagner, were recast as purveyors of revisionist correctness and early prophets of the Nazi political philosophy. This variety of propagandistic noise replaced a disappearing free press, a crucial step in their relentless and all-encompassing manipulation of society.

Oswald Kabasta

In this new environment, the Austrian conductor Oswald Kabasta was perfectly suited to abet Nazi cultural projects

while thriving on the smug satisfaction he gained from their approval. Oswald Kabasta's name denotes ancestors who originated in German-speaking Prague after that language forcibly supplanted the native Czech tongue and culture, relegating Czech-speaking citizens to a minority status. This writer experienced a fleeting account of an evolving Kabasta when meeting Hermann Broch de Rothermann at the home of his relative, the writer Gregor von Rezzori, in 1985. « Pitz », as he was known, asked if I had ever heard of his 1st Viennese piano teacher - Kabasta : « He was a monster ! » (In 2013, Pitz's widow Sachiko Broch de Rothermann stated that Kabasta would beat the boy.) Their contact took place in 1921 when his father, the writer Hermann Broch, engaged Kabasta to teach his 11 year old son while, at the same time, securing a teaching position for Kabasta at the « Traiskirchen School », where he led the orchestra.

In 1926, on Karl Muck's recommendation, Oswald Kabasta became conductor of the Graz State Opera Orchestra. A review from November of that year points out that :

« Herr Kabasta is a man of the phrase. He doesn't seem to stretch the tempos but neither does he exaggerate them. Streams of revolutionary blood roll in his veins. The music that he makes resounds in his heart and therefore sounds good to the ear. »

4 years later, he secured the « RAVAG » (Austrian Radio) Orchestra and, in 1933, he added the Vienna Symphony to his duties. Kabasta was a foil to the conservative conventions of the Vienna Philharmonic, as he championed new and daring works at every possibility. His « Wiener Symphoniker » toured Europe, in 1936, to much acclaim. A London stopover included a live « BBC » broadcast on 19 January, playing Strauß's « Die Schweigsame Frau », Schubert's Symphony No. 3, Enescu's 1st Romanian Rhapsody, Beethoven's « Leonore 2 » Overture, and Stravinsky's « Petrushka » Suite, the latter a work recently banned in Germany. Following Kabasta's return engagement in London that autumn, Benjamin Britten noted in his diary for 28 October 1936 :

« After (Franz) Schmidt's, we go to Vienna Symphony Concert at Queens Hall under Kabasta. This is a really great Orchestra, and it is a miracle to hear real orchestral playing. Perfect ensemble and intonation in the " Leonore 2 " and " Haffner " Mozart Symphony. A most thrilling virtuoso show of " Til Eulenspiegel " - a wonderful show. Bruckner's 7th does not convert me. »

A 1936 Prague review describes how « the voicing and the sound of the orchestra are equally excellent, with a bit more bite in the strings than in our local orchestras. The woodwinds also seem to have a different tone color over all, extremely bright and sonorous » .

During a visit to Munich, in the 1935-1936 season, Oswald Kabasta took part in an evening of contemporary music which so impressed the Munich Philharmonic's directors that he was considered to be a worthy replacement for their old-fashioned Sigmund von Hausegger, an earlier Brucknerian who did not follow Kabasta's forward-looking custom of keeping-up with and Mastering new music, a direction the management sought to develop, with the object of making the Munich orchestra a rival to the Berliners.

The orchestra also attained a greater role in Germany by representing the city where the Nazi Party originated. In « Music in the 3rd " Reich " : National-Socialist Æsthetic Theory as Government Policy » , Donald Wesley Ellis writes :

« Reviews of von Hausegger's concerts were uniformly favourable if reserved. He seemed even to inspire respect in the music editors of the " Völkischer Beobachter " , who said of him that he kept Munich from being a hot-bed of international atonality. »

Oswald Kabasta's candidacy initially posed a problem due to his lack of concern for Nazi cultural priorities by his seeking to include composers such as Igor Stravinsky, who was proscribed by the regime. Nonetheless, his appointment was confirmed. During Kabasta's 1st season with the orchestra, in 1938, he gained the backing of a certain functionary who allowed him to smuggle into his programs the French composers Claude Debussy and Maurice Ravel, the decadent Alexander Scriabin, and even Béla Bartók's « Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta » . The latter work amazed Willi Graf (1918-1943) , a member of the anti-Nazi « White Rose » resistance group who was tortured and executed for not informing on his colleagues, noting in his diary that amidst standard offerings such as Beethoven's 8th Symphony and the 2nd « Leonore » Overture came a composer not yet officially banned but hardly tolerated. Bartók's final appearance in Germany came early in 1933 when Frankfurt Radio's conductor Hans Rosbaud featured the composer as soloist in his 2nd Piano Concerto. Rosbaud was denounced for « spreading the Jewish spirit » . Graf pointed-out that as someone who generally avoided risks, Kabasta's inclusion of the Bartók later kept many listeners awake as they wondered about his defiance. In light of such actions, another functionary, one « Herr Mayerhofer » , reported to the Munich Philharmonic's board on Kabasta's proposals for their upcoming season :

« At the end of March 1939, Kabasta presented the customary list of works which he wished to perform in the winter season of that year. The suggestion included Prokofiev's " Classical Symphony " , Igor Stravinsky's " Petrushka " , Bartók's " Music for String, Percussion and Celesta " , Ravel's " Boléro " and Debussy's " 3 Nocturnes " , the traditional artillery of Beethoven, Bruckner, Brahms, Haydn and Mozart. This will, I am sure, put Munich in the center of the international limelight. He could certainly have gotten some advice from the Foreign Office. Prokofiev, who traces his lineage to Stravinsky, is himself international and Western and of no concern at all for German culture. We could certainly do without Ravel, that stylish composer of countless radio broadcast works. In short, we must ask ourselves a basic question : Would it not be well advised to present a group of no less popular recent German works in the stead of this foreign offering ? At least before, we include recent foreign composers, we ought to get the opinion of the Foreign Office concerning the presentation of the right foreign composers in order to advance the purposes of German foreign policy and to maintain good relations with the " Reich " authorities. »

As Kabasta became indispensable due to a dearth of visiting musicians and the availability of a restricted pool of lesser locals, his intransigence is recounted in another briefing :

« In connection with my recent judgment of the Philharmonic season, let me add this not un-important post-script. Gottfried Ruedinger has had his compositions published by the firm of Anton Böhm, in Augsburg. When Böhm recently contacted Kabasta for his judgment of Ruedinger's works, Kabasta refused even to look at the work in question. As far as I can see, Kabasta has busied himself with the old war horses and foreign musicians that are contrary to the

precepts of National-Socialist " musikpolitik ". It is of utmost concern to the board of the Philharmonic Society that incidents like the above will circulate in the " Reich " and give the Munich Philharmonic a bad reputation. »

Kabasta, on learning of his criticism, formally responded :

« I don't understand why the Society presented my suggestions for the 1939-1940 season to Mayerhofer in the 1st place. I can only assume that this criticism was extended in his capacity as music librarian. In my 1st year as conductor of the Munich Philharmonic, I have proved that I'm trustworthy and loyal to both the Cultural Office and to Mayor Fiehler. But I insist that I will not allow any meddling in artistic matters nor will I accept anyone's tutelage. »

An indignant Mayerhofer stated that Kabasta was apparently unaware of the membership of the board and the powers vested in Mayerhofer's position, and left it to « Oberbürgermeister » Fiehler to decide « whose position is correct in the era of National-Socialism » in so far as Kabasta « thinks himself that he is some sort of sovereign in his post » . After the « Tonhalle » (« Kaim-Saal ») , Munich's main concert-hall, fell victim to Allied bombs in 1944, Kabasta held on but, 1 year later, was hospitalized with a heart condition. While convalescing, he learned that he had been stripped of his duties as a conductor after being categorized as a « borderline » case by the victorious Allies, initially as someone who was not a « bona fide » Party member but one who had been an applicant. It was deemed inappropriate for Kabasta to retain a position under American control as he had under the Nazis ; return could only come about if an « extensive investigation » would clear him.

According to David Monod in « Settling Scores » :

« The city of Munich continued to pay Kabasta's salary and to negotiate with the Americans for his re-instatement. But this became a virtual impossibility when Kabasta admitted to having applied to join the Nazi Party as a pre-condition for getting his job, even though he added that he had never been issued a membership number and had always been " inwardly " anti-Nazi. (The conductor neglected to tell the American that, 6 years before, in 1939, he had also applied for membership in the Austrian Nazi Party.) . And so, despite his appeals in October 1945, the conductor's name appeared on the Intelligence Section's black-list, and Edward Kilenyi (a Hungarian-American pianist serving in the military) ordered the city to discontinue his pay. An impulsive musician with a bad heart and an unsteady temperament, Kabasta's dismissal left him devastated : " From his hospital room, he issued mournful appeals to Americans and the city for rehabilitation ; but the officials remained firm." »

Holed-up in a hotel room for several months in Kufstein (Austria) , Kabasta sat down and penned a vainglorious farewell note to his former Orchestra :

« As it is known, my career is finished ; I, who in all my life never engaged in politics, have now fallen under the wheel of politics. I thank Destiny for having led me to Munich, where I was able to live for years in marvelous artistic work. I thank the people of Munich for their ability to excite themselves and for their loyalty. I thank with my heart the Orchestra for its artistic contribution and collaboration. Oh, how up-lifting were those experiences with them ! I wish, I beg of you, that you watch over the Philharmonic, for whom I wish the most happy future, crowned with

success. The next time, they will play (my !) Bruckner 8th, that they would think of me and my wife in silence. »

2 days later, the 50 year old Kabasta and his wife ingested lethal doses of veronal, a barbiturate, the very same method used by German Jews when wishing to quickly die before possible capture by the Nazis. His wife survived for some months and, when the day of their 25th wedding anniversary arrived, she succeeded in taking her life.

Kabasta, the musician, had an irrepressible urge to perform contemporary Masterpieces, taking great risks to smuggle them in. Alban Berg had been annoyed when he learned that Kabasta was to premier his « Lulu Suite », as he, Erich Kleiber, and Ernst Křenek regarded him with contempt for both musical and personal reasons.

Kabasta's performance of Beethoven's « Leonore 2 » Overture, a work frequently appearing on his programs, displays a high-strung level of musicality. Our discovery of surviving test discs made in Wartime Munich around 1942-1944, provides riveting and fascinating listening. A critic who heard Kabasta conduct the work in London noted :

« A fine performance of Beethoven's " Leonora II " Overture, clear-cut in every detail, yet filled with the warm romance of the drama, began the concert. No doubt the pundits are right in saying that Beethoven refined away the dross from this Overture to make the perfect version of it in " Leonora III ", but what a lot of lovely dross he had to sacrifice ! The playing made us glad to have it restored. »

Alfred Hœhn

Alfred Hœhn's concert reviews often refer to him as a poetic musician. Schumann's Piano Concerto led by Hans Weisbach featured « brilliant piano technique, always supported by a very attractive, warm singing melody in the foreground that is in harmony with this passionate soulful music. The same impression was confirmed in his solo piano recital. » A Beethoven 4th Concerto in Dortmund was « outstanding, as was a recital that showed him to be a craftsman of the finest stature in memory ». Hœhn's Amsterdam recital (24 XI 1921) came at a time when Bach was primarily offered in transcriptions. He played the Prelude, Fugue, and Allegro, along with Couperin, Scarlatti, Beethoven's last Sonata, Chopin, Liszt, Debussy, and Reger :

« Hœhn himself is so subtle ; the conviction and understanding he demonstrated in Debussy were greater than I had ever experienced. »

Debussy's « Hommage à Rameau » evinces genius in a « special precise clarity and elegance of conception, so pure and richly multi-colored, so intimate and reverently played as I have yet to hear from a German pianist ». Hœhn's Liszt indicated « a great virtuoso who reached the highest of spiritual realms, particularly in the Mephisto Waltz and Feux Follets. Such pieces, in my opinion, had something of a demonic Mastery ; the bravado sounded firm with a rare magic, through its variety of rhythms and tones, all masterfully calibrated. His varied tempos have a boundless energy, increased by the freedom of life it sows. »

Claude Debussy resounds in a preface that Hœhn contributed to a pupil's book, published in the Germany of 1938,

one that slights the regime's agenda through its focus on a French musical practice that fails to acknowledge the Nazis' æsthetic or aims :

(Preface)

« In May 1907, I heard for the 1st time the magical sounds of the Opera " Pelleas et Mélisande ". Deeply impressed by a then newly appearing creative form of a somewhat revolutionary style which seemed to break with tradition, I tried bit by bit to fathom the nature of what its music-historical precedents could be. Already, in Mussorgsky, we experience directly great moments of impressionistic manifestations of sound, as, for example, in " Boris Godunov " (Coronation Scene, Forest Clearing at Kromy, Clock Scene with Glockenspiel) . Here, we quickly discover the roots of such a compositional manner (Debussy's) : the rendering on stage of musically illustrative programmatic passages.

Even French impressionism by no means discredits the primary origin of pictorial expression, which certainly illustrates the " titles " of each work such that we can be led experientially through the domain of " impressionism ". It is clear that in these musical expressions, the intellect, in a spiritually rich form, brings one closer to the composer's intended effect. Naturally, to the creator, interpreter and listener, this indicates a withdrawal from the true center of the musical soul.

It is a credit to my former student " Herr Doktor H.-G. Schulz that, in a completely unorthodox manner, he has reported the problem of impressionism in a clearer light. Ignorance of the style is far greater than one might admit ; even a Busoni is under the mistaken impression that the A minor Prelude No. 20 of Book 2 of The Well-Tempered Clavier bears " impressionistic " traits ; Bach's linear art and figurative style reveals such an interpretation anachronistic. Accordingly, the study of the present book, in which I grapple especially with the impressionistic keyboard style, is meant not only as a welcome stimulus for knowledgeable and interested music circles, but also for pianists and keyboard teachers. »

Alfred Høehn, Preface, in « Doktor Heinz-Günther Schulz. Musikalischer Impressionismus und Impressionistischer Klavierstil » , Konrad Tritsch Verlag, Würzburg (1938) . Translated by Doctor Kenneth Cooper (2013) .

When Høehn appeared in London, a critic writes :

« He commands a full tone, never pressed to the point of hardness, and singularly beautiful in sustained and lyrical passages. Herr Høehn's principal works in this programme were Brahms's early Piano Sonata in F minor, Schumann's " Carnaval " , both of which, particularly the Scherzo and Finale of the former, amply displayed the brilliance of his execution. »

A rare musical nugget is embedded in an otherwise pro-forma account that inadvertently reveals a critic's displeasure when confronted by a bygone Brahmsian practice that survived in Høehn's playing :

« The very wayward rubato used in Brahms's slow movement suggested that the moonlight Romance of Sternau's verse

attracted him more than the shapeliness of Brahms's melody. »

Hans Rosbaud, one of Høehn's star piano pupils who became an eminent conductor, partnered his teacher on several occasions. A 1930 Stuttgart program finds Høehn as his soloist in the Brahms 2nd Piano Concerto and, several years later, they gave Rachmaninoff's 2nd Concerto in Frankfurt. Høehn also appeared with Hermann Abendroth, Wilhelm Fürtwängler, and Ernst von Dohnányi. Felix-Eberhard von Cube's letter to the music theorist Heinrich Schenker, on 2 June 1934, after his Hamburg lecture on Schenkerian analysis mentions Høehn's interest in an approach out of favor with the regime :

« I have also enclosed for you the review of a lecture that I gave recently, with the courage of despair. It seemed to me the only possible way of giving voice to the truth, without meeting an a priori objection. The success exceeded my expectation, and even the review (lightly drawing inspiration from me) shows that there are still people who are prepared to bear intellectual responsibility. Strangely enough, the lecture received an echo from, of all places, Frankfurt ! From there, a Professor Alfred Høehn (do you know him ?) wrote to me, saying that he wanted to learn more about these things. I shall send him a few related notices and a " self-drawn Ursatz ". »

Alfred Høehn suffered a paralytic stroke while on stage in Leipzig, in 1940, during the 2nd movement of Brahms's 2nd Piano Concerto : our published excerpt came months earlier, an allusion to the last music-making of his life. He died in 1945, from a heart attack, possibly after witnessing his piano hurled down a stairway by an American soldier billeted in his home.

Oskar Fried

Try as one can to follow a wandering conductor who boasted of lacking ties with any one orchestra, **Oskar Fried's** activities and life pose a thorny puzzle. His shadowy footsteps land one into a labyrinth of countries, stumbling across gaps of lost years. Aside from sporadic interviews, we lack access to his inner world, as much was concealed by both temperament and by choice, unlike his many colleagues who did their all to leave behind their legacies. A casual note in Count Harry Kessler's diary, on 14 December 1905, describes the chatting when Kessler and Fried dropped by to visit their close friend, the decadent Hamburg writer Richard Dehmel and his wife :

« About (Richard) Strauß and Fried. Where Strauß intends to be sensitive, he regularly becomes banal. His strength is in the witty, in the subtle. Mrs. Dehmel said that Fried was superior to him because he naturally commanded a hot passion. Dehmel contradicted quickly ; even though perhaps the race agrees with you that " Frau " Dehmel feels drawn to peace, he, Dehmel, joined in with the totally opposite reaction, I daresay, the dissimilarity of the race from his wife. Furthermore, one must admit, " Thank God ", for the cool art arising in the world is due to Strauß. We had played on the nerves much too much. »

Oskar Fried's uncanny knack for turning-up at crucial moments presents a succession of close-ups at historic balances in transition and their consequences. 1 year after Fried's debut as a conductor, in 1905, he toured Russia, visiting Moscow, Kiev, and Odessa. Fried introduced Saint-Petersburg audiences to the Mahler 2nd Symphony. On 10 November

1906, he conducted the private orchestra of Count Cheremetyev along with members of the Opera chorus and the alto Otilie Metzger-Froitzheim. Fried had not seen Saint-Petersburg since his youthful vagabondage as an itinerant horn player. Along with the Mahler premiere came « Verklärte Nacht » - Fried's own Cantata. In private, Rimsky-Korsakov and his camp rated Mahler's Symphony as « very bad », one that « contained absolutely nothing of genius, far worse than Richard Strauß ». Fried recorded a revelatory « Scheherazade » with the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1928.

One Saint-Petersburg critic appraised Fried's performance as being perfect whereas another spelled-out a large number of the Symphony's serious faults :

« In the 1st place, the lack of style, and despite the originality of the design and procedures, the lack of musical personality. The remarkable technical procedures become an end in themselves. The orchestration is really exceptional, but, at the same time, its monstrous musical content, this sonorous column of pure delirium, this alternation of exaltation and absurd platitude, the absence of artistic logic, consistency, and perhaps even sincerity, all this pretentiousness, this affectation, useless emphasis and crushing power of the sonority, without a defined musical physiognomy, all this simply exhausts and overwhelms without offering one single genuinely artistic moment. Of course, this Symphony is, in every sense of the word, an exceptional work, but is everything exceptional good ? »

Oskar Fried is termed « an artist full of temperament, guilty of mannerisms and agitation ». A 1907 performance of excerpts from Rimsky Korsakov's « Christmas Eve », sung by Antonina Nezhdanova, was held with the composer in attendance. In 1909, Fried returned for a triumphant performance of Alexander Scriabin's Symphony No. 3 that coincided with the composer's long-awaited return to Russia, after several years abroad. In a successive Berlin reading, the painter Max Beckmann described « a dreadfully boring piece by Scriabin, " le Poème divin " », followed by « a beautiful Aria by Mozart sung by a magnificent soprano, and the evening ended with the " Meistersinger " Overture played at the worst possible tempo. I had to sit aside " Frau " Kolbe. She was very strongly perfumed. »

Soon after giving the 1st German performance of Modest Mussorgsky's « Night on Bald Mountain » with the world-premiere of Frederick Delius' « Dance of Life » with the Berlin Philharmonic, Fried left for Paris to attend the « Ballets Russes », in December of 1912, for Igor Stravinsky's « Petrushka ». He joined Harry Kessler, who later dined-out with Vaslav Nijinsky, Sergei Diaghilev, and Hugo Hofmannsthal. Some months later, Fried returned to Paris just after conducting 2 evenings at La Scala in Milan that included Hector Berlioz's « Symphonie fantastique », a work he kept close at hand, one with which he identified with throughout his life, along with works by Weber, Liszt, and Busoni. On the night of Wednesday, 28 May 1913, Fried and Kessler met at Larue's to eat and chat with Diaghilev, Nijinsky, Stravinsky, Ravel, Joseph Werth, Misia Edwards (later, Sert), André Gide, Léon Bakst, and others, where, Kessler noted, « the common opinion was that tomorrow evening, the premiere would be a scandal ».

Count Harry Kessler's diary entry on the « Rite of Spring »'s debut :

« A completely new choreography and music. Nijinsky's dancing style as different from Fokine's as Gauguin's from ... A thoroughly new vision, something never before seen, enthralling, persuasive, is suddenly there, a new kind of wildness, both un-art and art, at the same time. All forms laid waste and new ones emerging suddenly from the chaos. The

public, the most elegant house I have ever seen in Paris (aristocracy, diplomats, the demi-monde) , was from the beginning restless, laughing, whistling, making jokes. Here and there, some stood up. Stravinsky, who sat with his wife behind us, raced outside like one possessed after scarcely 5 minutes. Suddenly, a stentorian voice cried-out from the gallery, " Okay, whores of the 16th (the " 16e arrondissement ", that of the elegant world) , are you going to shut up soon ! " The reply came from a loge : " Voilà, those who are ripe to be annexed. " At the same moment, D'Annunzio and Debussy in Gabriel Astruc's both got into a quarrel with a neighboring loge, screaming into their faces, " What a bunch of imbeciles ! " Now, the commotion became general. Astruc was heard crying, " Wait for the end, you can whistle afterward ! " and, as a reply from the orchestra : " How long ? " , whereupon Diaghilev replied, " In 5 minutes." Pautrier behind me shouted, " Play a tango for them " ; Marie Murat had a loud argument with her brother Gide, Ghéon, the entire " Nouvelle Revue Française " stood like a phalanx at the entrance to the loges, bottling-up with shouts, the orchestra and loges of the Polignacs, Rohans, Murtas, etc. And above this crazy din, there continued the storm of salvos of laughter and scornful clapping while the music raged and on the stage the dancers, without flinching, danced fervently in a prehistoric fashion. At the end of the performance, the " monde and demi-monde " went at it until a frenetic applause triumphed so that Stravinsky and Nijinsky had to come on stage and take repeated bows. »

« We went to Larue's and had a late supper, the usual crowd, and in addition, Diaghilev, Nijinsky, Bakst, Cocteau, and I took a taxi and did a wild tour through the city at night, looking almost dead under the moonlight, Bakst waving his handkerchief on a walking stick like a flag, Nijinsky in tails and a top hat, silently and happily smiling to himself. The dawn was breaking as the wild, merry party set me down at my " Tour d'Argent ". »

Oskar Fried, an ardent Bolshevik, spent part of World War I in Switzerland where he may have met Lenin in Zürich. Harry Kessler was engaged as a diplomat by the Germans and he briefed Fried to carry-out political missions under the guise of cultural activities. Kessler notes the mingling of his conductor-friend with the writer Fritz Unruh and René Schickele, an Alsatian poet who would document the conflict between France and Germany, in 1918, at a lunch in Bern on January 6 of that year :

« Schickle said that it was time that a great offensive be undertaken in all countries against the military. What he chiefly accuses them of is their misuse of spiritual values (that is, artists, writers, luminaries) for their ends and thereby devaluing them, by throwing dust in their eyes, somehow bribing them, and directing them into false paths. He, Schickele, does not want to be misused in this fashion because he believes that he could offer something more worthwhile precisely because he has a firm confidence in Germany's future leading role intellectually speaking. »

Lenin invited Fried to be the 1st visiting artist to appear in the new Soviet Union. Upon Fried's arrival on a Berlin-Moscow express, in 1922, he was met at the train station by the leader himself. Fried's only documented trip to the United States, in February 1928, coincided with Maurice Ravel's. Both Fried and Ravel were engaged to conduct the New York Symphony. At Eva Gauthier's, they gathered to celebrate Ravel's birthday ; an eager George Gershwin had also been invited. A curious reporter with the « Christian Science Monitor » got more than he expected from Fried, as his story is among the most informal glimpses we find in the media, displaying Fried's off-hand spontaneity and barbed wit, while he casually larded his patter with insightful observations.

(Photo) Ann Gautier's birthday party for Maurice Ravel at her New York apartment, in 1928 (seated) ; Oskar Fried with monocle and cigar (on the left) ; George Gershwin (on far right) .

Oskar Fried is confessedly temperamental, being susceptible to all sorts of things of the actual now, even to the temperature. From the passing instant, he tackles instances, and from the immediate moment catches momentum. « This is fine weather. » , he remarked to me the day after his arrival here, and he had more ways of expressing the idea (attitude, gesture, laughter, sparkle of eye and ring of voice) than I could count. « Beautiful » , I admitted, « the best time of the year in this part of the world » .

« Brilliant sun » , he added : « invigorating air » .

« Glorious » , I conceded ; « but I'm not interested in the weather. I want you to talk to me about conducting. » .

« But I'm not interested in conducting. »

« As you like. Down it goes. »

« When I sailed into New York harbor yesterday morning, the scene, as I looked toward town from the deck of the ship was a perfect " Fata Morgana " . The city, hidden in mist, was a fairy picture. After a time, the contours of the shore and the outlines of the buildings began to emerge in fantastic forms. It was like a drawing by Gustave Doré. I never would have believed that what I saw was reality there, and I would not have been surprised if it had all disappeared from before my eyes. And now, let me tell you what happened. The moment I stepped upon the pier, the illusion was gone. »

« What » , interrupted I, « are you talking about, if not music ? Go right on, please ! » .

« Yes ; romance and fact ; and lately, I illustrated the contrast by presenting the 9th Symphony of Beethoven and the " Sacre du Printemps " of Stravinsky on the same program. In Paris, they shook their heads. The 9th Symphony has an epic quality ; it has idealism and it has passion. The " Sacre " , on the contrary, makes no epic discourse and it conveys no epic disclosure and it conveys no notion of idealism or of passion. And still, the 2 works, though opposite in what they express, are together in what they accomplish. The 9th Symphony is a preparation for all the music that has followed until today, and the " Sacre " is a preparation for what will come until we cannot tell when. Beethoven opens the door for Wagner and Strauß ; Stravinsky for the next composers. I should like an opportunity to make this Beethoven-Stravinsky illustration before an American audience, and I may yet have it. »

« What will you offer, when you direct the New York Symphony ? »

« An all-Romantic program. I have just arranged it in consultation with Walter Damrosch (the Symphony's conductor) . A great chance Mister Damrosch gives visiting conductors ; an orchestra perfectly trained, audiences alert and

hospitable. »

« And your all-Romantic program comprises what ? »

« Weber's " Euryanthe " Overture, nature seen ecstatically ; Brahms's Symphony No.1 - nature comprehended by effort ; Stravinsky's " Firebird " - nature in eccentric, exaggerated, distorted view : and Ravel's " Daphnis et Chloé " - nature serenely contemplated. All the different manifestations of Romanticism. Weber, born to it ; Brahms, fighting to subdue it ; Stravinsky, picturing Russian life and thought by means of it ; Ravel, refining it and getting at its essence. »

« You have almost made a definition of Romanticism. »

« Then, let me stop. I don't like to define the Romantic ; nor could I if I tried. For Romanticism is universal. It is sun, air, light. It is felt, not explained ; and the same is true of the Classic, if we were to go into that subject. »

« All right, thanks, for what the composers say, from Beethoven to Stravinsky. Would you mind giving me a word or 2 on their means of saying it ? To think of the matter from the quantitative standpoint does the expanded orchestra belong, in your opinion, to the past, and will a reduced scheme of instruments be the rule hereafter ? »

« The orchestra in recent years has been developing backward ; that is growing smaller. But that was for economic reasons chiefly. Nevertheless, I think the necessity has proved beneficial. We have seen that an amateur at composing may write with some success for a big aggregation of sonorities, and that only a great composer can write with effect for a little group. »

« Thanks again, Mister Fried ; but now, the brass tacks of your profession. Does conducting progress ? Has it a technique that improves ? »

« If you look at conducting on the average, the answer to that would be " Yes ". Look at it, however, in its higher aspects, and the question hardly arises at all. Every conductor of extraordinary gifts forms his own technique. So you ought not, really, to call this man's conducting good and that man's better ; rather, you should make distinction between good and not good. You would never think, in that case, of describing the conducting of a Mahler, as better or worse, than that of a Nikisch ; you would only remark that the conducting of the one type was different from that of the other. Nor would you speak of the Mahler school or the Nikisch school of conducting. »

« Can conducting be taught ? »

« It both can and should be. I have long hoped to take part in the establishment of conducting as a craft. »

« Masters and apprentices ? »

« By class methods ; 20 or 30 students, the teacher and an orchestra to work with. Show them directly how to do

things. Under present conditions, those who want to learn seldom have a chance to do so except by hearing and observing from a distance. »

(Winthrop P. Tryon, 10 March 1928.)

Oskar Fried spoke to « The New York Times » about Igor Stravinsky's recent « Œdipus Rex » as the most significant and important composition of recent years :

It opens-up tremendous new possibilities in Opera, for in it, Stravinsky has utilized modern technique and orchestration to revivify the old Opera forms. He has breathed a new spirit into an old body, creating something that is refreshingly different without being eccentric. I feel it cannot help but influence future Operatic composition. »

Fried then insisted on the importance of Alban Berg's new « Wozzeck » .

« The new conductor has for many years appeared exclusively in Europe as a guest, a position which he points-out, prevents any given public of ' tiring of him ' . »

« The Times » covered Fried's debut :

« When a German conductor of long reputation in his native land comes to America and opens a program with the Brahms C minor Symphony, the common supposition is that he will prove a tried and true interpreter of the Classics. Last night, at the concert given by the New York Symphony Orchestra in Carnegie Hall, Oskar Fried, guest-conductor for a pair of concerts of that body, proved to be nearly everything which is the reverse of the characteristics just mentioned. By the testimony of a single concert, he had all the qualities of the virtuoso or, it might be better to say, " prima donna " conductor, who has showmanship of a personal kind, experience and authority over the players, the passion for effects at any cost to more substantial musical qualities, and the unquestionable ability to make an orchestra " sound " .

It is due Mister Fried to say that he made the New York Symphony sound as no one of a half dozen predecessors has done this season. For all that, and in spite of the remarkable demonstration of the audience at the end of the Brahms Symphony (an ovation that lasted for minutes and brought conductor and orchestra to their feet) , the interpretation of that familiar work was as a whole mannered and superficial. The 1st movement, from the interpretive standpoint, was the strongest. When Mister Fried treated details in ways of his own they had logic and, above all, saliency. In the slow movement, he fell short, not only of its mood, but its musical breath, its sustained lyricism, and its inherent Classic balance. The movement became episodic and lost in significance. The 3rd movement was not better. The Finale, with the wondrous introduction and the victorious conclusion, told, and roused the audience to one of the greatest ovations that has been witnessed this season. Not to detract from the conductor's accomplishment, it is a movement that tells anyway, even when played less precipitately and at a pace more just to its form and content than the prevailing tempi of the conductor.

Perhaps, the cloven hoof of tendencies not wholly Classic and sacrosanct might have been suspected in advance from the fact that Mister Fried followed Brahms' epic Symphony with a suite from Stravinsky's " l'Oiseau de feu " and another orchestral suite from Ravel's " Daphnis et Chloé ", which seems to have become the popular orchestral show piece of the season. Some may have predicted, also, that the restlessness of much of the Brahms interpretation would find its outlet in the modern spirit and scoring of a Stravinsky. But Stravinsky, on the whole, was worse than Brahms. There is poetry and Romantic feeling, as well as color, in the Russians core. It was distorted in tempi and its phrases and " jazzed-up " to make a virtuoso's holiday. Most of the music rushed by at a pace so breathless that it was all but unintelligible, and, as in the Brahms Symphony, the lyrical passages were mainly conspicuous for the unlyrical and unpoetic manner in which they were played.

If this reading was not intentionally impertinent to the composer, it was one which failed in comprehension of his mood, to say nothing of nice adjustment of details. The sunrise music of Ravel's Suite, which is all color, and so instrumentated as to yield the richest returns to the conductor of picturesque inclinations, was considerably better, and fascinating to the ear. The impression of this concert was of a conductor whose musical conception is of a highly-debatable nature, who can, however, gain brilliant and striking effects, at short notice, with a band as competent as the New York Symphony. »

(Olin Downes, 17 March 1928.)

Not one to stay put even in good times, Fried's hurried escape from Berlin came immediately after the Nazis assumed power in 1933. Where would this itinerant soul land ? To throw people off his trail, he announced that the Tbilisi Opera, in Georgia, had engaged him to conduct there ; most references offer this unverified tale as fact.

An eyewitness account of Fried's plight comes from Verdina Shlomsky (1905-1990) , Israel's 1st woman composer, in Shlosa Profilm's « 3 Profiles » :

What shall I do ? I'll go to the Chagalls', the house that's the nest of the " émigrés ". Near the " Bois de Boulogne ", there is Chagall's beautiful Villa with an enormous garden. Birds are singing, and Mrs. Chagall, may she rest in peace, is covering a table in the garden with a lot of flowers while Chagall walks there, in the garden, feeding his beloved cats. Upstairs, in the atelier, are canvasses waiting to be painted.

To Mrs. Chagall :

« It's very pleasant here and my thoughts are uneasy, about what will be, what started before I came there. I hope you're not waiting for someone, some important guests and that I'm not in your way. »

Often, when his wife and I sit with him, Chagall talks about his life :

« We're not waiting for anybody ! Don't worry ! Only for Oskar Fried. »

The garden door opens again and, slowly, the conductor Oskar Fried approaches. « Are you here ? » , he whispers into my ear. « It's good that you're here ! Your presence is very reassuring to me because I feel that you are someone I can rely on. » All of us were thinking in those times about a plan : We have to arrange to get an invitation to Palestine for Oskar Fried. The question is « How ? » .

Paying attention to details, Chagall brought over the meal that he served in a diligent, precise fashion and Oskar Fried systematically wolfed down his portion. I looked at him all the time, only at him, as if by some electrical current I sensed in him, like a telepathy, his feelings of worry and anxiety. Oskar Fried ! The great Mæstro, the very famous man, the name who's known in all the music world yesterday and the day before, when they would hold special receptions for him in the most elegant salons and arrange his concerts at the " Salle Pleyel ", to which many of the Parisian elite came and it was impossible to even approach him, to even talk to him, he was like a Duke in his Court. One time, when I came to meet him at the house of the Princess de Polignac, where he was staying, I had to wait a number of hours, because the house barber was laboring all that time to give him a head massage. And now, here he is, frightened and fidgeting, full of anxieties, and in complete confidence he tells me about his ongoing problems, and I felt the horror of homelessness in his heart and the fear of poverty in his eyes.

As the sun set into the horizon's pink hue, stars began to appear in a secretive way over the dusk, growing into a darkness that covered the garden. In confidence, Oskar Fried suggested that we should walk through the « Champs-Élysées » . Paris was shining, bestowing something special on all her people walking along her streets, the feeling of a desire to float in this special atmosphere. « Paris Soir ! Paris Soir ! » , shouted the paperboys, but there was no desire to stop this great feeling in walking there by looking into the future through the newspapers while Paris dresses herself for the evening. So Oskar Fried and I slowly walked along the « Boulevards » and we continued to speak and our conversation went on endlessly and we talked, almost whispering, especially he, as if trying to be careful not to disturb the noise of the « Champs-Élysées » and the « Boulevards » . He told me it's now a bargain market - dirt cheap :

« Today, you can buy for half-price in an end-of-season sale. That's the way we are. That's what we've become. It's a great season in History that's coming, most probably, to an end. And do you know what's my wish now ? I would like to go to the land of Israel, to get-up and go, but right away. I'll agree in advance to the most minimal conditions. I want to form an Orchestra and settle-down there and I'll find a way in Palestine, I'm sure I will find a way and I will also conduct the Orchestra. »

And with a sudden movement, he took-out his wallet and quickly pulled-out a few bank notes and in an irritated voice, demanded of me :

« Please, break them into small coins but all the coins should be new, shiny, not soiled in any way. Do me a favor : I am collecting new coins. »

Oskar Fried loved to visit my studio at which there were always friends present. They all came from the music world but never talked about music. This was a thing that got on his nerves : he didn't like it when people talked about

music. What they did was they ate and this gave him real pleasure. One day he said :

« I will not move from here. I will stay here only until I'm able to move to Palestine. »

Then, he sat down and decided to write a letter to my brother (the prominent poet Avraham Shlonksky) in Palestine and among other things he wrote :

« Ich war immer ein Jude, ohne darauf Wort zu wegen. » (« I was always a Jew, without giving it any importance. »)

The cramped atmosphere in Paris pushed, even drove people and made them run away. Where to ? It was difficult to focus. The view in Paris was soothing, making it easier to bear unpleasant thoughts and I was walking along the " Boulevards " and the little streets until I got tired and arrived at the feet of the Eiffel Tower and suddenly, what do I see under the tower but a Parisian policeman with a palette, busily painting, and when he saw that I was uneasy he covered the picture, but was very nice in his tone and he started a pleasant conversation :

« Where are you from ? » , and when I told him and he said :

« Ah, the Jews. The Jews have to stop being Jews and mix, to stop existing (apart from others) . It will put an end to their horrible suffering. It's something terrible that's going on, it's unbelievable, everything that's happening, and the Rule of the Money. I don't want to talk about Money : " Salauds ! ", " Argent ? ". »

I asked him with a smile :

« " Argent " (Silver) is a part of Nature. " Argent " is inside the earth. »

And from one thing to another, suddenly the man said :

« I wish that all people would understand that the health of the world is metaphysics, that religion is the daughter of Fear, and due to that, we have to educate ourselves to change fear into courage and the hope that people have in religion will have to be transformed into the security of being sure. Perhaps, only then, will the bright light of Justice shine through the darkness in which the esprit sank. »

With a great deal of conviction, he took-off his painting from the easel and showed it to me, saying :

« Look how beautiful this is. »

Along wide boulevards with buildings on the sides and in good spirit, my heart slowly came to my working place. She wonders about this Greek philosopher standing there, reviewing his life, then continues :

« How lucky it was for me that I could think about the possibility of coming home, to Palestine, to the heat ("

khamsin ") , to be useful there. Others didn't have it. »

And then, I remembered Oskar Fried, I don't know why he appeared suddenly. We are in Tel Aviv, in 1934, and there is a Symphony concert at the " Ohel Shem " (God's Tent) Theatre and who is among the personnel ? In the days before Bronisław Huberman and Arturo Toscanini, a few people who knew how to play, a few mediocrities, and a few amateurs playing a Beethoven Symphony and all the defects, not a small number of them, were accepted and forgiven. And suddenly, a very mistuned chord shook me and I turned back to the left and a few chairs away, I see Oskar Fried sitting among the public. Oskar Fried ! And he says :

« Didn't I tell you that I was going to conduct an Orchestra in Palestine and here is the Orchestra that I will conduct ! »

And I remember that it looked like a mirage to me when shortly afterwards the Beethoven 5th was played in the same place by the same group of people with him conducting. Who could have predicted that such a thing is possible ? I was soon meeting him very frequently. His presence alone elevated a high-spirit in the music world but Tel Aviv didn't reciprocate, but he visited Jerusalem and was enchanted, he would caress all kinds of donkeys, camels, and he always said :

« Don't you dare desecrate the ancient ! Don't bring over Europe's leprosy. Leave it the way it is now. Don't add anything ! Stop reading papers - there's nothing left there (in Europe) , nothing except headlines, lies, destruction ! »

After that, he went to Moscow. Why didn't we keep him, Oskar Fried, so that he will sit here among us ? Not a long time passed and he died there, may his memory be blessed. So, whenever I am walking in an Autumn garden and step on the last season's wet leaves, I am sending my old fishing boat to the great sea of the past that will live forever in our selves in the continuing future.

(Al Hamishmar, 1945. Translated by Oded Regev.)

Chagall wrote Tel Aviv's mayor Dizengoff about « the 1st rate German musical artists that have been hurled into France and could find an application for their talents in Palestine » . On learning that Dizengoff was close to the Philharmonic Society, he mentions it is ... « headed by a young conductor. We don't know him, perhaps he is a talented man, but surely, even for his youth, is not as experienced as Oskar Fried. The latter wants to go to Palestine anyway. We are trying hard to convince him to do so. Though he is 60 years old, he is in full possession of his strength, which he is eager to give to Palestine. »

Oskar Fried stayed for a month of concerts in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem with a local Orchestra, one soon to be expanded by Huberman's creation of the Palestine Symphony. In Russia, some 75 concerts were reported and by the 24 year old Kurt Sanderling arrived in Moscow from Berlin (in 1936) he met Fried, whom he termed kaput. Fried's new Russian wife was a descendant of Mikhail Glinka. He became irate about the interest in Gustav Mahler that snubbed him. Concerts became fewer due to Fried's declining health : he died in 1941 during the week when the « Molotov -

Ribbentrop Pact » was abrogated and Stalin began murdering all nearby Germans. One report claims that he passed away in a hospital during a bombing, his last words were curses hurled at the overhead German warplanes. Fried's passing remains unsubstantiated as the deathbed defiance betrays the style of a Soviet cover-up. Fried acquired Russian citizenship in 1939, yet, his Finale and place of burial still remain obscure.

AB 118 : Vienne

Capitale de l'Autriche (que ce pays ait été Duché, Empire ou République) depuis le XIIe siècle, siège du gouvernement des Habsbourg de 1278 à 1918, Vienne jouit sur le plan musical d'un prestige qu'elle doit essentiellement, pour ce qui est de la création, à la période allant de la fin du XVIIIe au début du XXe siècle, c'est-à-dire de Haydn à Webern. Durant cette période, la ville abrita ou vit naître beaucoup des plus grands compositeurs européens, et développa une tradition d'interprétation qui ne s'est pas perdue.

Son histoire musicale, qui est celle d'une cité-carrefour faisant la jonction à la fois entre le Nord et le Sud et entre l'Est et l'Ouest, ne s'en étend pas moins sur 8 siècles. La cour des 4 derniers ducs Babenberg (1177-1246) fut un important foyer du « Minnesang », et la Maîtrise de la cathédrale Saint-Étienne, dont devait faire partie Haydn, est mentionnée pour la 1re fois dans un document de 1237. L'Université fut fondée en 1365, et la musique, selon les usages du temps, y faisait partie du « Quadrivium ». Mais les périodes fastes ne débutèrent qu'avec le règne de Maximilien Ier (1459-1519), qui, en 1496, installa officiellement à Vienne la chapelle qu'il possédait en Allemagne du Sud (sans doute à Augsbourg), jetant ainsi les bases de la Chapelle Impériale. Le chef de cette chapelle s'appelait alors Hans Kerner, et elle comptait parmi ses membres Heinrich Isaac. Elle fut ré-organisée en 1498, avec à sa tête Georg Slatkonja. Mais ses membres, parmi lesquels Ludwig Senfl, Heinrich Finck ou encore l'organiste Paul Hofhaimer, étaient loin de passer tout leur temps à Vienne. Pendant le XVIe siècle et les toutes premières années du XVIIe, les Maîtres de chapelle Impériaux furent essentiellement des Franco-Flamands : Arnold von Bruck (1527-1545), Petrus Massenus ou Pieter Maessens (1546-1562), natif de Gand, Jean Guyot, appelé aussi Castileti, Jakob Vaet, Philippe de Monte (de 1568 à sa mort en 1603). Œuvrèrent également à la chapelle le ténor Alard du Gaucquier, originaire de Lille et jusqu'en 1576 adjoint de Philippe de Monte, Jakob Regnart ou Charles Luyton, originaire d'Anvers.

Avec Ferdinand II, Empereur de 1619 à 1637, commencèrent à Vienne l'époque Baroque et le règne de la musique et des musiciens italiens. Les Maîtres de chapelle Impériaux eurent comme noms Giovanni Priolo (1619-1629) et Giovanni Valentini (1629-1649) : élèves de Giovanni Gabrieli, ils furent les 1ers d'une longue lignée d'Italiens, dont le dernier devait être Antonio Salieri (1788-1824). Vienne entendit alors ses 1ers Opéras et ses 1ers Oratorios italiens. Sous les 3 Empereurs-compositeurs : Ferdinand III (1637-1657), Léopold Ier (1657-1705) et Joseph Ier (1705-1711), l'Opéra italien fut un élément déterminant de la vie musicale, ce que symbolisèrent les noms d'Antonio Draghi (1635-1700), pendant 30 ans Maître absolu de la musique à la Cour, puis de Francesco Conti (1682-1732). Une école instrumentale se développa cependant, représentée par des compositeurs d'abord italiens (Valentini, Bertali, Buonamente), puis allemands ou autrichiens (Ebner, Schmelzer, Pachelbel, Kerll, auxquels on peut ajouter Muffat). Le Baroque atteignit son apogée avec le règne de Charles VI (1711-1740), non seulement en musique, mais aussi en architecture : reconstruction des abbayes de Saint-Florian, Melk ou Kremsmünster sous la direction de Jakob Prandtauer, achèvement à Vienne de la « Karlskirche », œuvre de Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach poursuivie par son fils Joseph Emanuel,

en 1737. Johann Joseph Fux (1660-1741) , la plus grande personnalité du Baroque autrichien en musique, fut Maître de chapelle Impérial de 1715 à sa mort, avec comme vice- Maître de chapelle l'Italien Antonio Caldara (1670-1736) .

La mort de Charles VI (auquel succéda sa fille Marie-Thérèse) et celle de Johann Joseph Fux, survenue l an plus tard, furent suivies de profonds changements. Occupèrent le devant de la scène, comme compositeurs, les prédécesseurs de Haydn, puis (à partir de 1760 environ) Haydn lui-même. Parallèlement, la Cour perdit de son importance dans la vie musicale viennoise (les Maîtres de chapelle Impériaux furent : Antonio Predieri jusqu'en 1769 ; Georg Reutter jusqu'en 1772 ; Florian Gassmann de 1772 à 1774 ; Giuseppe Bonno de 1774 à 1788 ; et Antonio Salieri de 1788 à 1824) . Jouèrent un rôle de plus en plus important, d'une part, les grandes familles nobles ou princières (les Lichnowsky, Lobkowitz, Schwarzenberg, Esterházy) et, d'autre part, les théâtres (« Burgtheater » , théâtre de la Porte-de-Carinthie, théâtre du château de Schönbrunn, « Theater auf der Wieden » , « Theater an der Wien ») et lieux de concerts (« Augarten » , Grande Salle de la Redoute, « Mehlgrube ») ouverts au public, ainsi que de nouvelles institutions musicales (« Tonkünstler Sozietät » fondée en 1772 par Gassmann et où fut créé, en 1775, « le Retour de Tobie » de Haydn ; Société des associés de Gottfried Van Swieten ; « Liebhaber Konzerte » de 1807-1808, qui prirent fin le 27 mars 1808 avec une célèbre exécution de « la Création » de Haydn) . À noter également le développement à Vienne, durant cette période, de l'édition musicale, avec pour commencer la maison Artaria. Ces nouveautés intervinrent tandis que la ville devenait, aux yeux de l'Europe, celle de Haydn et de Mozart, puis aussi de Beethoven.

Après 1815, alors que débutait la vie créatrice de Schubert et la dernière partie de celle de Beethoven, les familles nobles et princières, ruinées par les guerres napoléoniennes, cessèrent de jouer leurs rôles de mécènes. Ce fut une des raisons de la fondation de la « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » (Société des Amis de la Musique) en 1812, puis, surtout, de la Philharmonie par Otto Nicolai en 1842. La Philharmonie de Vienne ne donna des saisons régulières qu'à partir de 1860 : depuis 1870, elles ont lieu dans la « Grosser Musikvereinsaal » . Ses chefs permanents ont été jusqu'en 1945 Otto Dessooff (1860-1875) , Hans Richter (1875-1898) , Gustav Mahler (1898-1901) , Josef Hellmesberger (1901-1908) , Felix Weingartner (1908-1927) , Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1927-1928) , Clemens Krauß (1928-1933) , Wilhelm Fürtwängler et Bruno Walter (1933-1938) et, enfin, Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1938-1945) . L'Orchestre symphonique de Vienne, fondé en 1900 comme « Wiener Concert-Vereinorchester » , porte son nom actuel depuis 1933. Outre la « Grosser Musikvereinsaal » (1,654 places assises et 300 debout) , construite en 1870 avec comme salle adjacente la « Brahmsaal » (679 places assises et 95 debout) , Vienne possède depuis 1913, comme autre lieu important de concerts, les 3 auditoriums du « Konzerthaus » : la « Grosser Konzerthausaal » , la « Mozartsaal » et la « Schubertsaal » (1,840, 700 et 340 places, respectivement) .

À la fin du XVIIIe siècle, l'Opéra se donnait notamment dans les 2 théâtres de la Cour, c'est-à-dire au « Burgtheater » (ouvert jusqu'en 1888) et de plus en plus au théâtre de la Porte-de-Carinthie, et également au « Theater auf der Wieden » (ensuite au « Theater an der Wien ») . En 1857, l'Opéra Impérial (« Hofoper ») eut pour la 1re fois comme directeur, en la personne de Karl Eckert, un musicien de profession. Il eut comme successeurs d'abord un Italien, Matteo Salvi (1861-1867) , puis Franz von Dingelstedt (1867-1870) . De 1861 à 1869, dans le cadre du percement du « Ring » consécutif à la destruction des anciennes fortifications, un nouvel Opéra fut édifié, tout près de l'ancien théâtre de la Porte-de-Carinthie (qui n'existe plus) . Inauguré le 25 mai 1869 avec le « Don Giovanni » de Mozart chanté en allemand, il eut, après Dingelstedt, comme directeurs, jusqu'en 1945, Johann Herbeck (1870-1875) ,

Franz Jauner (1875-1880) , Wilhelm Jahn (1881-1897) , Gustav Mahler (1897-1907) , Felix Weingartner (1908-1911) , Hans Gregor (1911-1918) , Franz Schalk et Richard Strauß (1919-1924) , Franz Schalk (1924-1929) , Clemens Krauß (1929-1934) , Felix Weingartner (1935-1936) , Erwin Kerber (1936-1940) , H. K. Strohm (1940-1941) , E. A. Schneider (1941-1943) et, enfin, Karl Böhm (1943-1945) . Le 12 mars 1945, un bombardement détruit l'édifice à l'exception de la façade, de la loggia et du grand escalier. Le « Volksoper » , inauguré en 1898, est propriété municipale (« Städtische Volksoper ») depuis 1938.

De 1945 à 1955, l'Opéra sur le « Ring » étant hors d'usage, les représentations eurent lieu au « Volksoper » et au « Theater an der Wien » sous la direction artistique de Egon Hilbert : ces 10 années, sur le plan artistique, furent une période faste, avec notamment des chanteurs et chanteuses comme Anton Dermota, Erich Kunz, Paul Schöffler, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Irmgard Seefried, Wilma Lipp. L'Opéra reconstruit fut inauguré le 5 novembre 1955 avec « Fidelio » sous la direction de Karl Böhm. Ce dernier, nommé directeur, démissionna l'année suivante. Il eut comme successeur Herbert von Karajan, seul jusqu'en 1962, avec des directeurs associés jusqu'en 1964. Les directeurs furent ensuite des administratifs : Egon Hilbert (jusqu'en 1967) , Heinrich Reiff-Gintl, Rudolf Gamsjäger, Egon Seefehlner. La nomination de Lorin Maazel comme chef d'orchestre, annoncée en 1979, a pris effet de 1982 à 1984. Ses successeurs ont été notamment Claudio Abbado, directeur général de la musique de 1986 à 1991, Eberhard Waechter, intendant en 1991-1992, et Joan Holender, intendant depuis 1992.

L'Orchestre de l'Opéra n'est autre que le Philharmonique. Les concerts de cette dernière ont donc lieu non pas en soirée, mais le samedi après-midi et le dimanche matin. L'Orchestre symphonique, qui ne se consacre qu'au concert, est le véritable orchestre de la ville. Citons encore le « Niederösterreichisches Tonkünstlerorchester » (fondé en 1947, il couvre la province de Basse-Autriche, dont Vienne est la capitale) et l'Orchestre de la radio, fondé en 1945 et qui, beaucoup plus que les autres, se consacre à la musique contemporaine. Sur ce dernier plan, l'ensemble « Die Reihe » , fondé en 1958 par Friedrich Cerha, a joué à Vienne à peu près le même rôle que le Domaine musical à Paris. Existe aussi pour la musique contemporaine l'ensemble « Kontrapunkte » fondé en 1967 par Peter Keuschnig. Les Petits Chanteurs de Vienne (« Wiener Sängerknaben ») font partie de la « Hofmusikkapelle » , cette dernière étant le principal ensemble de musique sacrée de la ville. Les quatuors Schneiderhan, du « Wiener Konzerthaus » , Barylli, Weller, de la Philharmonie, Alban-Berg, ont poursuivi depuis la dernière guerre la tradition établie par les quatuors Schuppanzigh, Hellmesberger, Rosé ou Kolisch, et, depuis 1950 environ, Vienne a été un centre de recherches important pour la musique ancienne, grâce, notamment, à la fondation du « Concentus musicus » par Nikolaus Harnoncourt en 1952, de la « Capella academica » par Eduard Melkus en 1965 et du « Clemencic Consort » par René Clemencic en 1968. Des maisons d'édition actives à Vienne, les plus importantes sont Universal-Edition et Ludwig Döblinger. Le Festival de Vienne (« Wiener Festwochen ») a lieu tous les ans en mai et juin depuis 1951.

...

Vienne est la capitale de l'Autriche. Elle est aussi « Land » (État fédéré) , en allemand « Bundesland Wien » . Elle est située dans l'est du pays, et traversée par le Danube (« Donau ») . Elle fut la capitale du Saint-Empire Romain germanique ainsi que de l'Archiduché d'Autriche, de l'Empire d'Autriche (1804-1866) et, plus tard, de la double monarchie, communément appelée Autriche-Hongrie (1867-1918) , en ayant été le centre du « krach » mondial de

1873.

La ville est située dans le bassin de Vienne, au cœur de l'Europe centrale. Traversée par la Vienne qui a donné son nom à la ville et surtout par le Danube, des collines (qui marquent les contreforts des Alpes) bordent la ville à l'ouest. La vallée du Danube et le relief plus plat de l'est offrent un accès à la Grande plaine hongroise. Le massif des Carpates commence également à proximité au nord et à l'est. À l'échelle des capitales européennes, Vienne est située à 1,243 kilomètres de Paris, à 651 kilomètres de Berlin et à 1,112 kilomètres de Bruxelles. Vienne est un carrefour de communications, à 70 kilomètres de Bratislava, à 250 kilomètres de Budapest, à 400 kilomètres de Prague et de Munich.

Le climat de la ville est continental, du même type que dans la plaine hongroise. Les hivers sont froids (-1°C), avec de faibles chutes de neige contribuant au charme des monuments de la ville vêtus de blanc. Les étés ont une moyenne de 20°C , mais peuvent être très chauds et orageux.

La pluviométrie est de 620 millimètres par an, avec un maximum en été et un minimum en hiver. Enfin, à la croisée de plusieurs ensembles géographiques (Alpes, Carpates, Plaine hongroise), la ville est bien exposée aux vents.

L'origine de Vienne remonte au VI^e siècle avant l'ère chrétienne, lorsque des Celtes y fondent une cité sous le nom « Vindobona » (ville blanche). En l'an 15 avant Jésus-Christ, Vindobona devient un important fort Romain de la province de Pannonie, défendant le limes, la frontière de l'Empire Romain, qui fait face aux peuples germaniques situés plus au nord. Les vestiges archéologiques de la période Romaine de Vienne sont néanmoins extrêmement modestes.

Au cours du Moyen-âge, Vienne devient successivement le siège des Babenberg (comtes puis ducs d'Autriche), puis des Habsbourg. Lorsque ces derniers accèdent au statut d'Empereur, la ville devient la capitale du Saint-Empire Romain germanique. Elle est cependant rapidement confrontée à la montée en puissance de l'Empire Ottoman dont les troupes l'assiègent à 2 reprises :

En 1529, lors du 1^{er} siège de Vienne par les troupes du sultan Soliman le Magnifique, la résistance des Viennois et des 20,000 soldats permit de sauver la ville.

En 1683, lors du second siège, Vienne dut son salut à Charles V de Lorraine et à l'intervention des troupes polonaises de Jean III Sobieski lors de la bataille de Vienne. Pour avoir échoué, le grand vizir Kara Mustafa, commandant les troupes turques, fut décapité par le sultan Mehmed IV.

En 1815, grâce au talent de Metternich, la ville est le siège du Congrès de Vienne, qui définit la géopolitique pour un demi-siècle d'une Europe juste sortie des guerres napoléoniennes. Vienne est alors capitale d'un Empire d'Autriche qui s'étend de Milan à Lwow et de Prague à Raguse, incluant Venise, Zagreb, Cracovie et Budapest. En 1873, la ville accueille une Exposition universelle au cours de laquelle démarre la crise bancaire de mai 1873, appelé aussi « Krach de Vienne », le plus grand de l'histoire boursière.

La Première Guerre mondiale met fin à l'Empire d'Autriche-Hongrie, dont Vienne était la capitale depuis 1867. De 1918 à 1934, Vienne est surnommée Vienne la rouge, en raison de l'arrivée au pouvoir d'une coalition de sociaux-démocrates et de chrétiens-sociaux.

En 1938, Vienne et toute l'Autriche sont rattachées à l'Allemagne Nazie lors de l' « Anschluss » . Après la défaite du régime Nazi, Vienne est découpée en 4 secteurs d'occupation répartis entre les vainqueurs, de la même façon que Berlin.

En 1955, en pleine Guerre froide, l'Autriche obtient son indépendance par le traité d'État autrichien et devient neutre sur le plan international. Vienne se modernise alors et devient, grâce notamment à la neutralité autrichienne, le siège d'organisations internationales comme l'ONU (Vienna International Centre) ou encore l'OPEP.

Plusieurs fois ville frontière du monde de la chrétienté, Vienne est longtemps restée enserrée au sein de fortifications qui expliquent la densité de son tissu urbain central. Sa dernière enceinte, démantelée au milieu du XIXe siècle, fut remplacée par un boulevard circulaire connu sous le nom de « Ring » (anneau, en allemand) .

Établie à quelques kilomètres du Danube sur la rive droite du fleuve, Vienne en est longtemps restée éloignée, notamment pour se protéger des crues. La canalisation du fleuve aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles a permis à la ville de se rapprocher, puis de s'étendre sur la rive gauche du Danube. Mais une importante dissymétrie subsiste, puisque la rive gauche n'accueille environ que 200,000 habitants.

Vienne (le « Land » comme la ville) est subdivisée en 23 arrondissements, les « Gemeindebezirke » , désignés par un n° et par un nom. Les codes postaux attribués à la ville de Vienne vont de 1010 à 1230, le 1er chiffre 1 désignant la ville et les 2 chiffres centraux mentionnant l'arrondissement. Ainsi, l'adresse du château de Schönbrunn, par exemple, comporte le code 1130.

Le centre proprement dit (« Innere Stadt ») est le 1er arrondissement, c'est l'emplacement de la Vienne historique, sur la rive droite du Danube. Il est entouré du « Ring » , 1er et 2e boulevards circulaires, un dans chaque sens de circulation. Il comprend en son sein, entre autres, le Palais Impérial de la « Hofburg » qui, avec ses dépendances, occupe une grande partie de la superficie de l'arrondissement. On circule peu en voiture dans le 1er arrondissement, la progression dans les rues étroites et le stationnement étant difficiles.

Les arrondissements 2 à 9 entourent le 1er dans le sens des aiguilles d'une montre et lui sont adjacents (sauf le 5e) . Ces arrondissements, tous densément peuplés, sont considérés comme le centre de la ville (avec le 1er) . Ils sont à l'extérieur du « Ring » mais entourés à l'ouest et au sud par la « Gürtel » (ceinture, en allemand) , autre boulevard circulaire ouvert à la circulation dans les 2 sens et surmonté sur une grande partie par la ligne de métro aérien U6.

Les arrondissements 10 à 20 ainsi que le 23e, qui bordent Vienne à l'ouest et au sud, sont moins densément peuplés. Certains sont davantage des zones de bureaux, d'autres (comme les arrondissements 16 à 19) des zones résidentielles assez vertes. Le château de Schönbrunn occupe une grande partie du 13e arrondissement.

Les arrondissements 21 et 22, plus récents, plus populaires historiquement et beaucoup moins denses, sont sur l'autre rive du Danube. La tendance actuelle (surtout depuis 2004) est au développement de ces zones ; de nombreuses habitations plus aérées, notamment de « standing » sur les rives du fleuve, sont en construction dans ces arrondissements.

Contrairement à la plupart des autres métropoles européennes et mondiales, la population de Vienne a longtemps diminué au XXe siècle, le nombre maximum d'habitants ayant été atteint en 1916. À l'époque, Vienne rivalisait avec Paris et Londres. Cela s'explique par la disparition de l'Autriche-Hongrie en 1918, la ville n'exerçant plus son attraction que sur une portion congrue de sa zone d'influence originelle, et cette situation s'est renforcée avec la Guerre froide. Mais la chute du « rideau de fer » a permis à la ville de retrouver son attraction depuis 1990. Aujourd'hui encore, Vienne reste une capitale surdimensionnée pour l'Autriche, dont elle abrite plus de 20 % de la population totale et 30 % en comptant l'agglomération.

La mixité sociale et ethnique est réelle, même s'il existe de grandes disparités selon les quartiers. Le caractère populaire ou bourgeois d'un quartier est indépendant de sa distance du centre historique. De plus, certains quartiers regroupent plus d'habitants de même origine ou culture, Serbes principalement, plus de 180,000 en 2001, la « Diaspora » serbe envisage d'ailleurs demander le statut de minorité étant donné que sa présence sur le territoire autrichien remonte à plus de 150 ans, on trouve aussi des diasporas italienne, asiatique, juive, hongroise, mais en plus petit nombre, on compte aussi une importante population turque mais elle n'est présente dans le pays que depuis une période plus récente. Indépendamment du niveau social des habitants, on n'observe pas de réel découpage par communautés, comme dans d'autres capitales européennes comme Londres ou Berlin.

Vienne est une ville culturelle majeure dans un grand nombre de domaines. Par son histoire très riche, sa situation géographique et politique, elle est un carrefour majeur en Europe.

Dès le Moyen-âge, parallèlement au chant religieux diffusé par la cathédrale Saint-Étienne et la Chapelle Impériale, se développe l'art profane des « Minnesänger », dont le plus célèbre représentant au XVIIIe siècle se nomme Walther von der Vogelweide. Des musiciens étrangers s'attachent à la chapelle de la Cour, réorganisée en 1495 par Maximilien Ier : le Flamand Heinrich Isaac (vers 1450-1517), compositeur de Maximilien Ier ; le Suisse Ludwig Senfl (vers 1490-1543) ; son élève et successeur l'Allemand Heinrich Finck (vers 1444-1527) ; des Autrichiens comme l'organiste Paul von Hofhaimer (1459-1537) ou Arnold von Bruck. En 1568, le Flamand Philippus de Monte, après un long séjour en Italie, devient Maître de chapelle de la Cour. Leurs œuvres font la synthèse d'éléments franco-flamands et italiens.

Au XVIIe siècle, l'influence personnelle des Empereurs Ferdinand III, Léopold Ier et Joseph Ier, compositeurs à leurs heures, amateurs d'art lyrique, permet le développement de celui-ci. Ils attirent des Italiens à la Cour : Pier Francesco Cavalli y donne son « Egisto » en 1643 ; Antonio Cesti (1623-1669), au service de Léopold Ier, fait représenter ses œuvres (dont « Il Pomo d'oro », 1666 ou 1667) ; Antonio Bertali (1605-1669) transmet à Vienne, où il est musicien de la Cour, la tradition vénitienne d'un Claudio Monteverdi et d'un Cavalli ; Antonio Draghi (1635-1700) fournit des livrets d'Opéras à Léopold Ier et écrit Oratorios et Opéras destinés à la musique Impériale. L'Autrichien Johann

Heinrich Schmelzer (vers 1623-1680) fonde avec Heinrich Biber (1644-1704) une école de violonistes, tandis que l'Allemand Johann Jacob Froberger un temps organiste de la Cour, apporte les techniques de Girolamo Frescobaldi son Maître, et celles des musiciens français, connues lors de son voyage à Paris en 1652. À la même époque, Vienne devient un centre réputé pour l'enseignement musical : Johann Kaspar von Kerll (1627-1693) , Allemand qui a pris à Rome des leçons de Giacomo Carissimi, professe l'orgue et la composition ; Johann Joseph Fux (1660-1741) , Maître d'une renommée internationale, forme Georg Christoph Wagenseil (1715-1777) , Georg Muffat (1653-1704) , Ignaz Holzbauer (1711-1783) . En 1725, il publie un traité de contrepoint célèbre jusqu'à nos jours, le « Gradus ad Parnassum » .

Le XVIIIe siècle consacre Vienne comme capitale européenne du Classicisme. Une école pré-Classique contribue au développement formel de la Symphonie, parallèlement aux écoles étrangères (Italie, Allemagne, France) . Ses principaux représentants, Georg Matthias Monn (1717-1750) , Georg Christoph Wagenseil, Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf (1739-1799) , annoncent les Maîtres de la Symphonie Classique, tandis qu'Ignaz Umlauff (1746-1796) crée le « singspiel » avec « Die Bergknappen » (1778) . La même année, un nouveau théâtre ouvre, le « Schikanedertheater » , sur la scène duquel seront joués les Opéras mozartiens. Christoph Willibald Gluck entreprend sa réforme de l'Opéra italien à Vienne avec « Orfeo ed Euridice » (1762) et « Alceste » (1767) . Franz-Joseph Haydn y termine sa vie dans la gloire. La majorité des ouvrages dramatiques des dernières années de la vie de Mozart, installé à Vienne en 1781, seront créés dans cette ville (l'Enlèvement au sérail, 1782 ; les Noces de Figaro, 1786 ; Così fan tutte, 1790 ; la Flûte enchantée, 1791) . Beethoven se fixe également dans la capitale autrichienne, aidé financièrement par la haute société. C'est là que ses œuvres seront conçues, exécutées, publiées. Franz Schubert, né près de Vienne, vivra une existence difficile dans cette ville, sans y rencontrer beaucoup de compréhension pour ses œuvres. À la même époque, l'enseignement pianistique de Karl Czerny (1791-1857) conduit à Vienne de nombreux pianistes (Sigismund Thalberg, 1812-1871, et Franz Liszt) .

En 1842, Otto Nicolai (1810-1849) , Maître de chapelle de la Cour, fonde l'Orchestre philharmonique, qui, avec l'Opéra, acquiert une renommée mondiale.

Ce climat, créé tant par la présence de compositeurs célèbres que par des institutions musicales de 1er ordre, continue d'attirer à Vienne l'élite du monde musical dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. Richard Wagner donne « Tannhäuser » (1857) , « Lohengrin » (1858) , le « Vaisseau fantôme » (1860) et travaille aux « Maîtres-chanteurs » pendant son séjour viennois. Les 3 noms du post-Romantisme se retrouvent à Vienne, où ils s'établissent définitivement : Johannes Brahms dirige la « Singakademie » (1862) , puis la « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » (1872) ; Anton Bruckner mène une carrière de professeur au Conservatoire de Vienne (fondé en 1817) , où il enseigne l'harmonie, le contrepoint et la fugue en 1868 ; Gustav Mahler dirige l'Opéra de la Cour (1897-1907) , où il se révèle comme un très grand chef. C'est également à Vienne que vit Hugo Wolf, le plus grand représentant du lied à la fin du XIXe siècle.

Dans le domaine de la musique légère, Vienne connut un rayonnement tout aussi grand. Franz von Suppé (1819-1895) , Josef Lanner (1801-1843) , Karl Ziehrer (1843-1922) et, surtout, la dynastie des Strauß brillèrent dans la composition de valses et d'opérettes.

L'apogée de la culture viennoise correspond au début du XXe siècle : c'est l'époque de certaines avancées majeures

dans le domaine scientifique (invention de la psychanalyse par Sigmund Freud) , mais également d'un renouveau important dans le domaine des arts (Sécession viennoise, peinture de Gustav Klimt, d'Oskar Kokoschka et d'Egon Schiele) ou encore dans le domaine de la littérature (œuvres d'Arthur Schnitzler, Joseph Roth, Hermann Broch, Stefan Zweig et Robert Musil) .

La renommée culturelle internationale de Vienne repose surtout sur sa vie musicale. Il existe peu d'autres villes dans lesquelles autant de compositeurs célèbres ont vécu. Les valse de Vienne, son chœur d'enfants (« Wiener Sängerknaben ») , d'importants événements musicaux tels que le « Concert du Nouvel an » ou le bal de l'Opéra de Vienne, de même que les bâtiments dédiés à l'Opéra et au Théâtre sont mondialement connus. Vienne est également réputée pour sa cuisine et sa culture des cafés.

Vienne a longtemps été considérée comme la capitale mondiale de la musique. De nombreux compositeurs de renommée mondiale s'y sont succédé pendant des siècles, les plus connus étant les Classiques Franz-Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven, suivis par Franz Schubert, Franz Liszt, Johannes Brahms, Johann Strauß I, Johann Strauß II, Franz Lehár, Joseph Lanner, Anton Bruckner, Gustav Mahler, ainsi qu'au début du XXe siècle les membres de la Seconde école de Vienne (Arnold Schönberg, Anton von Webern, Alban Berg) et Ernst Krěenek.

Le Lied est, par exemple, un genre musical qui doit beaucoup à l'influence viennoise, au point qu'il en existe même une variante locale, le « Wienerlied » , un « Volkslied » chanté dans le dialecte viennois.

Les frontières de la musique autrichienne ont été très variables au fil de l'histoire. Malgré l'exiguïté de son territoire aujourd'hui, l'Autriche a laissé une forte empreinte dans l'histoire de la musique, notamment du temps du Saint-Empire Romain germanique, de l'Empire d'Autriche et de l'Autriche-Hongrie. Elle a naturellement des liens très forts avec ses voisines germanophones, les musiques allemande et suisse, mais aussi avec la musique hongroise ou slovène. Vienne semble avoir été, bien plus que Salzbourg, le pôle d'attraction de bien des musiciens et le lieu de bien des créations musicales, en rivalité avec Berlin ou Munich.

La musique vocale profane fait de timides débuts à la période de la musique médiévale avec le « Minnesang » , art courtois dont Oswald von Wolkenstein est le digne représentant auprès des cours d'Europe orientale.

Il faut attendre la musique Baroque avec Heinrich Ignaz Franz Biber et surtout la Ire école de Vienne pour voir le véritable éveil de la musique Classique en Autriche (Johann Joseph Fux, Florian Leopold Gassmann, Gottlieb Muffat) .

C'est avec les nouvelles formes de compositions mises en place par Franz-Joseph Haydn, que les cercles viennois initient le « Classique » . À la rigueur mathématique du Baroque succède une musique plus vivante, aux mélodies prononcées, plus à même de divertir. La Symphonie et la musique de chambre (pour piano notamment) prennent un essor majeur. Plusieurs des compositeurs qui s'y sont illustrés ne sont pas Viennois ou « Autrichiens » d'origine, mais se sont installés plus moins durablement dans la ville :

Ludwig van Beethoven, Carl Czerny, Anton Diabelli, Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf, Christoph Willibald Gluck, Franz-Joseph

Haydn, Johann Michaël Haydn, Franz Xaver Wolfgang Mozart, Leopold Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Sigismond von Neukomm, Ignace Joseph Pleyel, Franz Schubert, Gustav Mahler, Antonio Salieri, Franz Xaver Süßmayr.

Après le foisonnement de compositeurs importants au début du siècle, la période Biedermeier ouvre la voie à une musique plus « facile ». Joseph Lanner, Johann Strauß père et fils ou Hugo Wolf enrichissent le répertoire de leurs compositions : des Lieder, des valse ou des opérettes pour l'essentiel.

Isolé et méconnu malgré une œuvre dense et abondante, Anton Bruckner offre au Romantisme autrichien des Symphonies majeures, mais il est déjà, de par ses audaces tonales, proche des modernes à qui il ouvre la voie.

Comme à la fin du siècle précédent, une révolution musicale se prépare avec la Seconde école de Vienne qui clôture des siècles de musique tonale. Gustav Mahler en est l'ultime représentant avec ses Symphonies extrêmes. Il invite le folklore d'Europe centrale au cœur de son œuvre qui renvoie ainsi des accents grinçants entre 2 mélodées. On sent chez lui dans son hésitation et son balancement entre des formes magistrales et d'autres plus minimalistes, les prémisses des créations atonales aux dimensions réduites. C'est Arnold Schönberg qui devait donner le coup de grâce à la musique passée en inventant le dodécaphonisme, soit une musique « hasardeuse » n'étant plus ni mathématique ni dramatique.

Quelques compositeurs : Alban Berg, Gustav Mahler, Franz Schmidt, Arnold Schönberg, Franz Schreker, Anton von Webern, Alexander von Zemlinsky.

Il faut attendre le XXe siècle pour voir à nouveau les compositeurs autrichiens s'intéresser à l'Opéra, abandonné depuis Mozart. Toutefois, malgré l'abondance des œuvres, peut-être parce qu'elles ont encore des traces tonales, la renommée n'a guère touché les compositeurs contemporains :

Gottfried von Einem, Ernst Křenek, Schrammel quartet, Egon Wellesz.

L'Autriche a non seulement un passé riche de compositeurs de renom, mais elle a abrité aussi des orchestres et des chefs d'orchestre illustres tels Herbert von Karajan, Karl Böhm, Erich Kleiber, Bruno Walter, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, René Clemencic.

En marge de son important patrimoine Classique, l'Autriche fait aussi partie des pays couverts par la musique pastorale alpine. Des régions comme le Tyrol ou la Styrie (« Blossmusik ») ont ainsi su conserver un folklore très riche.

Le Tyrol est une région alpine où l'activité paysanne est encore importante. Nombre de traditions y ont été préservées. On trouve essentiellement 2 types de musique :

La musique vocale d'alpage inclut les « Weihnachtslieder » (chants de Noël) , les « Almlieder » (chants de pâturage) , les « Liebeslieder » (chants d'amour) , les « Vierzeiler » (quatrains) et les « Jodl » (tyrolienne) .

La musique instrumentale : à danser ou « tanzmusik », incluant boarischer et « Ländler » en plus des valse ou mazurkas ; elle est jouée sur des cuivres d'où le nom aussi de « blossmusik », à écouter ou « stubenmusik », initiée par Tobi Reiser comme un prolongement folk de la musique de chambre.

La musique folklorique (« Volksmusik » ; musique populaire) se retrouve tout autant dans les milieux campagnards qu'urbains.

« Schrammel » : la « schrammelmusik » est née dans les bas quartiers de Vienne à la fin du XIXe siècle, lors de réunions d'immigrés hongrois, slovènes, tchèques, et d'Autrichiens. Les frères Joann et Josef Schrammel inventèrent une nouvelle guitare (« Contraguitar ») et un nouveau concept de musique populaire en fondant un petit quartet avec guitare, violon et clarinette (et accordéon), et en y interprétant des valse.

« Gstanzl » : il s'agit de courts chants satyriques réservés aux hommes et parfois dansés sur des « Ländler ».

« Anklopfelweise » : c'est un chant de quête de l'Avent.

L'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne, qui recrute ses membres parmi ceux de l'Orchestre de l'Opéra national, est également une référence mondiale. De nombreux concerts de musique Classique sont organisés au « Musikverein » (avec la célèbre salle dorée) et au « Konzerthaus ».

Le « Konzerthaus » de Vienne fut construit entre 1911 et 1913 d'après les plans des architectes Ferdinand Fellner et Hermann Helmer, avec la collaboration de Ludwig Baumann. Il sera inauguré le 19 octobre 1913 par le compositeur Richard Strauß.

Le « Konzerthaus » possède 4 salles :

La « Großer Saal » de 1,840 places. Dès sa création, elle va accueillir un orgue du facteur Rieger Orgelbau.

La « Mozartsaal » de 704 places.

La « Schubertsaal » de 336 places.

La « Beriosaal » construite lors des dernières rénovations (de 1997 à 2000) pouvant accueillir 400 personnes.

Chaque soir, 10,000 personnes en moyenne assistent à des concerts de musique Classique.

Tant l'art que la culture disposent à Vienne d'une très longue tradition dans les domaines du Théâtre et de l'Opéra.

Le « Burgtheater », ainsi que sa 2e scène (le Théâtre académique), passent pour figurer parmi les Théâtres les plus

importants au monde. Vienne dispose également du Théâtre populaire (« Volkstheater ») et du Théâtre de Josefstadt. Une multitude de plus petites scènes renforce l'offre de Théâtre de la capitale, petites scènes qui n'ont guère à envier aux plus grandes du point de vue qualité. Celles-ci sont souvent consacrées à des pièces modernes et expérimentales, ainsi qu'au cabaret ou à l'art mineur.

Les amateurs d'Opéra bénéficient également une offre très riche : l'Opéra national (« Staatsoper ») et l'Opéra populaire (« Volksoper ») proposent une offre variée, ce dernier, en plus des représentations d'Opéras (souvent transcrits en langue allemande), donnant aussi à voir des opérettes et des comédies musicales.

Le Théâtre sur la Vienne (« Theater an der Wien ») s'est distingué ces dernières années par de très belles représentations de comédies musicales. La plus appréciée d'entre elles fut « Elisabeth », qui fut ensuite traduite en plusieurs langues et jouée dans le monde entier. La maison dans laquelle Beethoven présenta son « Fidelio » pour la 1^{re} fois est depuis 2006 de nouveau consacrée uniquement à l'Opéra.

La maison de la musique (« Haus der Musik ») de Vienne propose aux enfants et adultes depuis l'an 2000 un musée du son (« Klangmuseum »).

Le Théâtre de marionnettes du château de Schönbrunn (« Marionettentheater Schloß Schönbrunn ») propose à tous un spectacle de marionnettes sous forme de pièces et d'Opéras.

La « Hofburg » abrite le musée de « Sissi », les appartements de l'Empereur (« Kaiserappartements ») et la chambre du trésor d'argent de la Cour (« Hofsilber und Tafelkammer ») où la couronne du Saint-Empire est exposée avec d'autres regalia. Directement à côté de la « Hofburg » se trouvent 2 bâtiments identiques qui se font face : le musée de l'histoire de l'art (« Kunsthistorisches Museum »), qui abrite de nombreuses peintures de Maîtres, ainsi que le musée de Vienne (« Naturhistorisches Museum Wien »), aussi appelé musée de l'histoire naturelle de Vienne.

De là, on accède directement au « Museumsquartier » (le quartier des musées), un complexe de musées érigé dans les années 1990 dans les anciennes écuries Impériales. Ce quartier abrite le musée d'art moderne de la Fondation Ludwig (« Museum moderner Kunst - Stiftung Ludwig »), le musée Léopold (« Leopold-Museum »), où se trouve la plus grande collection du monde des peintures de Egon Schiele et qui propose principalement des œuvres du style de la Sécession viennoise, des œuvres modernes viennoises et de l'expressionnisme autrichien, plusieurs salles servant à des expositions temporaires, la « Kunsthalle de Vienne » (« Kunsthalle Wien »), le « AzW » (« Architekturzentrum Wien »), le musée d'architecture moderne et contemporaine, ainsi que le quartier de la danse (« Tanzquartier Wien »). Le « Liechtenstein Museum », le musée de l'art Baroque, abrite l'une des collections d'art privées les plus importantes au monde.

Le Musée des Beaux-arts de Vienne (« Kunsthistorisches Museum ») possède une exceptionnelle collection de peinture européenne, notamment des écoles flamandes (avec notamment le plus grand ensemble d'œuvres de Pieter Bruegel au monde), italiennes et allemandes. Il présente aussi d'importantes collections de sculptures, d'arts décoratifs et d'antiquités grecques, Romaines et égyptiennes.

Un autre musée majeur est l' « Albertina », dédié principalement aux arts graphiques (dessins et gravures), et qui possède une collection unique dans ce domaine, avec par exemple un ensemble remarquable de dessins et aquarelles d'Albrecht Dürer.

La capitale autrichienne propose également d'autres curiosités atypiques comme le Palais de la Sécession, bâtiment emblématique du style de la Sécession viennoise, le Palais Impérial du Haut-Belvédère, le Forum d'art de la Banque autrichienne (« BA-CA Kunstforum ») au centre-ville sur la place Freyung ou encore la célèbre « Hundertwasserhaus » de l'architecte Friedensreich Hundertwasser.

Viennent encore s'ajouter de nombreux autres musées, du Musée d'histoire de l'armée (« Heeresgeschichtliches Museum ») au Musée des techniques de Vienne (« Technisches Museum Wien ») en passant par le Musée de l'horlogerie (« Wiener Uhrenmuseum ») ou le musée des pompes funèbres (« Bestattungsmuseum Wien »), sans oublier les musées d'arrondissements, qui se concentrent sur l'histoire propre à chaque arrondissement.

...

Centre administratif, culturel (Université) et commercial, Vienne est de loin la plus grande ville d'Autriche. Elle possède de nombreux bâtiments remarquables : cathédrale reconstruite aux XIVe-XVIe siècles ; nombreux édifices Baroques, dus notamment à Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach et à Johann Lukas von Hildebrandt ; œuvres de Otto Wagner et de Josef Hoffmann, nombreux musées, dont le « Kunsthistorisches Museum », l'Albertina, le « Leopold Museum » (importante collection d'œuvres d'Egon Schiele) et le MUMOK (musée d'Art moderne de la Fondation Ludwig) dans le « Museums Quartier », et le musée du Baroque et la galerie d'Art autrichien des XIXe-XXe siècles (œuvres de Klimt, Kokoschka et autres artistes de l'école de Vienne) dans les 2 palais du Belvédère.

Forteresse romaine à la frontière de la Pannonie, Vienne se développa au Moyen-âge grâce aux Babenberg, puis aux Habsbourg, qui l'acquirent en 1276. Résidence des Empereurs du Saint-Empire (partiellement après 1438, définitivement à partir de 1611), elle fut assiégée par les Turcs (1529, 1683). De nombreux traités y furent signés, celui de 1738 qui mit fin à la guerre de la Succession de Pologne. Vienne fut au XIXe siècle l'un des principaux foyers culturels de l'Europe. Après l'effondrement de l'Empire austro-hongrois (1918), elle devint la capitale de la République autrichienne.

Situation et site

Vienne s'est développée à un carrefour de voies naturelles qui correspond également à un carrefour géologique. En effet, c'est sur les derniers (ou les Iers) contreforts alpins que s'est installée la ville. Toutefois, les Romains, qui marquèrent de leur empreinte les pays au sud du Danube, avaient d'abord donné la préférence à « Carnuntum », un peu plus à l'est de la capitale actuelle. Mais, les Barbares ayant facilement emporté la place, ils préférèrent un site plus facile à défendre. Située sur une petite rivière, la « Wien », « Vindobona » a été implantée sur le dernier bourrelet alpin, avant l'actuel bassin de Vienne. La situation de carrefour était sauvegardée. Les Alpes favorisent, le long

du Danube, la circulation longitudinale ; grâce au bassin géologique de Vienne, à la Morava et au couloir de Moravie, Vienne se situe sur la grande route Venise - République tchèque - Allemagne - Scandinavie. L'histoire et la politique, sans doute, expliquent qu'un des plus remarquables carrefours de l'Europe centrale n'ait connu qu'un essor relativement tardif.

Le site n'est pas comparable à celui de Linz ou de Passau, où le passage du fleuve a donné naissance à une ville-pont. À la hauteur de Vienne, le Danube est violent et, jadis, il divaguait au milieu de prairies parsemées d'aulnes. Aussi a-t-on pu dire que Vienne n'est pas située sur le Danube.

Les relations de Vienne avec le Danube, selon les Viennois, sont nonchalantes, un « schlampertes Verhältnis ». La ville cache le Danube à l'étranger, si bien que celui-ci peut se promener des heures durant à travers l'organisme urbain sans jamais voir le fleuve : rien de comparable à Paris et à Londres, où Seine et Tamise ont été intégrées dans le paysage urbain en donnant naissance à des fronts de fleuve accompagnant le cours d'eau. Le touriste débarquant d'un paquebot danubien sera accueilli par des gazomètres, des installations industrielles, des « casernes d'habitations », des gares de marchandises et les espaces verts destinés à recevoir les eaux du fleuve lors des crues. Avec quelque chance, il apercevra le toit de la cathédrale Saint-Étienne ; les charmes de la ville sont ailleurs. Ce n'est qu'à une date récente que des efforts, gigantesques, ont été faits pour intégrer le fleuve dans l'organisme urbain. La branche principale du fleuve coulait immédiatement aux pieds de l'enceinte urbaine jusqu'au XVIIIe siècle. Inondations, difficultés de navigation, marécages, foyers d'infection étaient autant d'obstacles à l'utilisation du fleuve.

Les grandes phases du développement urbain

Du XVIe au XIXe siècle

Au cours du XVIe siècle, les Habsbourg choisissent Vienne, en raison de sa remarquable situation géographique, comme résidence principale de leurs possessions ; l'urbanisation de la noblesse, gagnant alors l'Europe centrale, accentuera l'essor de la ville. Cet événement se place 4 ans après une 1re alerte : Soliman le Magnifique, avec une armée de 250,000 hommes, avait essayé, en 1529, de prendre la ville.

La Vienne du XVIe siècle est encore peu développée ; pendant tout le Moyen-âge, elle dépendait, sur le plan religieux, de l'évêché de Passau. Ce n'est qu'en 1469 qu'un évêché y a été créé. La « Klosteroffensive » (offensive des cloîtres), en relation avec la Contre-Réforme, entraîne l'essor des couvents, des abbayes et des autres édifices religieux. De ce fait, la classe bourgeoise, notamment les marchands, voit son importance décliner. Cela se répercutera sur le cadre architectural de la ville : la propriété foncière changera de nature.

La victoire sur les Turcs devant les portes de Vienne, en 1683, est un tournant capital dans le développement de la ville. À partir de cette date, l'expansion des Habsbourg dans le sud de l'Europe centrale fait disparaître la crainte d'une occupation turque qui pesait sur Vienne depuis 1529.

La période Baroque (1683-1770) est une ère de construction active qui voit doubler la population de la ville. Les

maisons Gothiques, aux façades étroites, sont démolies par rues entières. Sur les parcelles remembrées, on construit des palais, des églises, des couvents ou des maisons de rapport. La rénovation du centre entraîne l'expulsion de l'artisanat vers la périphérie. Les faubourgs se développent rapidement, alors que, pendant toute la période des menaces turques, ils ont connu une stagnation permanente. Une nouvelle enceinte, correspondant à l'actuel Gürtel, est édifée en 1706. Très rapidement, la ville franchit l'enceinte, en direction de l'ouest, avec les faubourgs de Fünfhaus et de Neulerchenfeld.

Vers 1770 débute une autre période d'expansion : l' « ère des manufactures » (« Manufakturzeitalter ») . Elle se terminera vers 1840. De nouvelles couches sociales font leur apparition : entrepreneurs, directeurs de manufactures, banquiers, commerçants en gros et fonctionnaires supérieurs. L'époque des grands palais nobiliaires approche de sa fin. Cette période est caractérisée par des aspects architecturaux plus bourgeois. La crise financière, qui atteint la noblesse, fait que, dans le paysage urbain, les grands édifices administratifs, aux allures sobres, les habitations bourgeoises et les immeubles locatifs se côtoient de plus en plus.

La période décisive : la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle

La seconde moitié du XIXe siècle voit l'ascension progressive mais rapide de Vienne au niveau d'une métropole mondiale. En 1840, toute l'agglomération viennoise comptait 440,000 habitants ; en 1910, le chiffre de 2 millions est dépassé. De nouveaux faubourgs se développent à l'extérieur de l'enceinte. Mais près des 3/4 des maisons d'habitation d'avant 1840 sont démolies dans la vieille ville et la 1re ceinture des faubourgs. Un nouvel exode de population vers la périphérie en est la conséquence directe. À partir de 1857, les autorités font procéder à la démolition des fortifications, ce qui permet d'accroître la circulation par l'intermédiaire du « Ring » . Une partie des terrains récupérés est occupée par de grandioses bâtiments publics, faisant renaître les splendeurs de l'époque des palais Baroques.

Le chemin de fer est amené par des gares terminales à proximité de ce qui a été l'enceinte du XVIIIe siècle. La gare du Sud (« Südbahnhof ») est ouverte en 1841. La gare François-Joseph (« Franz-Josef-Bahnhof ») , à proximité du canal du Danube, est commencée à partir de 1867. Toutefois, c'est la gare du Nord (« Nordbahnhof ») , construite en 1837, qui a été la 1re gare viennoise. La ligne qui la dessert, la « Nordbahn » , reliant « Deutsch-Wagram » à Vienne, en passant par « Floridsdorf » , qui devait en être le principal bénéficiaire sur le plan du démarrage industriel, est une des principales voies menant à Vienne.

L'implantation des voies ferrées et des gares ne s'est pas faite au hasard : l'intention était de faciliter le ravitaillement des casernes et de faire venir rapidement de province des troupes en cas de révolution. En effet, les principales gares étaient couplées avec des complexes militaires (casernes, entrepôts) , si bien que la stratégie militaire ne perdait pas ses droits dans l'urbanisme du XIXe siècle. Le développement de l'arsenal, à proximité des gares du Sud et de l'Est, s'explique de la même façon. Pendant longtemps, l'État fut souverain dans le domaine architectural et urbanistique. La municipalité exerça pour la 1re fois son influence en 1890, lorsqu'il fallut remplacer le « Linienwall » par une nouvelle ceinture. Jusque-là, ses compétences se limitèrent essentiellement à l'assurance du ravitaillement et au développement du système d'enseignement primaire. Lors des élections de 1895, le Parti petit-bourgeois «

Christlichsoziale Partei » conquist la majorité au conseil municipal. Le maire Karl Lueger fut à l'origine du « socialisme municipal », tant admiré en Europe. Il réussit à municipaliser les sociétés, souvent étrangères, qui contrôlaient la production de gaz et d'électricité. En 1903, les entreprises de transports urbains sont municipalisées ; 70 écoles furent édifiées en 15 ans. Des hôpitaux municipaux furent construits dans la partie ouest de la ville (« Lainzer Krankenhaus ») . La municipalité créa et développa les caisses d'épargne, des sociétés d'assurance municipales.

La régularisation du Danube (1869-1875) fut une des grandes réalisations de l'époque. Les crues répétées nécessitèrent de grands travaux. Le fleuve fut installé dans un lit rectiligne qui recoupait la « Auenlandschaft », c'est-à-dire toute une zone amphibie de bras et d'îles occupés par l'eau, les prés, les marécages et de petits bois. Le Danube fut accompagné sur la rive gauche d'un ruban de près de 500 mètres de large servant à recueillir les eaux de crue. En période normale, cette zone donne l'aspect d'espaces verts, mais introduit néanmoins une coupure dans l'espace urbain. La « Alte Donau » et quelques autres plans d'eau dans la zone du « Prater » sont les témoins du passage désordonné du fleuve à travers Vienne. La régularisation n'entraîna de construction de quais que sur la rive droite. La construction de la « Donauferbahn » permit de relier les bords du fleuve avec les gares urbaines. Ce n'est qu'en 1902 qu'on entreprit, en utilisant un bras abandonné du Danube, de construire un port « d'hiver » à Freudenau (extrémité sud-est du « Prater ») . Le port d'Albern, situé au sud-est du précédent, n'a connu qu'un début de réalisation. La reprise de l'extension est en relation avec la réalisation du canal Main-Danube, qui laisse de grands espoirs à la navigation danubienne. Le port de Lobau a été spécialisé dans le trafic pétrolier. Le développement de la raffinerie de Schwechat est en relation avec ce dernier.

Le XXe siècle

La 3e grande époque de l'expansion de Vienne fut marquée en 1904 par la traversée du Danube en direction de « Floridsdorf » . Le passage de la voie ferrée, l'existence d'un pont avaient fait de cette localité la « tête de pont industrielle » . Les projets grandioses d'un canal Danube - Oder formaient l'arrière-plan de la politique d'extension sur la rive gauche. La décennie précédant la Première Guerre mondiale ne suffit pas pour donner aux responsables le temps de réaliser les plans ambitieux. La guerre et le démembrement de l'Empire, consécutif à sa défaite, laissèrent la rive gauche dans une situation d'inachèvement. Des maisons de rapport de plusieurs étages, implantées aux carrefours, contrastèrent avec l'énormité des surfaces agricoles du « Marchfeld » .

L'année 1918 marque pour Vienne une coupure beaucoup plus importante que pour les autres capitales européennes. Ancienne métropole d'un Empire de plus de 50 millions d'habitants, Vienne ne fut plus, dès lors, que la capitale d'un territoire de 6,5 millions d'habitants. Les bases de l'existence urbaine étaient atteintes dans leur profondeur. D'une position centrale, au sein de l'Empire, la ville se vit repoussée dans une situation périphérique, dans le cadre purement autrichien. En plus, Vienne « la rouge », la socialiste, ne fut pas totalement reconnue par le reste de l'Autriche, plus conservateur. Les problèmes étaient graves, car l'industrie lourde avait été, dans le cadre de l'Empire austro-hongrois, établie en Bohême-Silésie. L'industrie textile viennoise vivait en partie en symbiose avec celle des pays sudètes. La disparition de l'Empire amena celle d'une clientèle de luxe qui avait suscité le développement de nombre d'industries à Vienne.

La chute de la monarchie entraîna une émigration importante. Au moins 340,000 non-Autrichiens, surtout des Tchèques, quittèrent Vienne après 1918. La population tomba de 2,275,000 habitants, en 1915, à 1,842,000, en 1919. Le repli sur les territoires purement allemands, après 1918, amena une restriction de la zone de recrutement de la population de la ville.

La conception urbanistique changea complètement après 1918. L'administration social-démocrate n'avait plus à affronter le pouvoir Impérial. La construction de logements devint le 1er problème de la municipalité. C'est uniquement à travers les options socialistes qu'on peut comprendre le développement de Vienne après 1918. La municipalité acheta des terrains afin de limiter la spéculation foncière. De 5,504 hectares, en 1914, les propriétés foncières municipales passèrent à 6,689 hectares, en 1926. L'innovation anglaise de cité-jardin fut introduite. Mais on fit appel également à l'idée allemande de coopératives de construction (système « Raiffeisen »).

L'urbanisme évoluant, on construisit entre les 2 guerres, des ensembles collectifs comportant des équipements sociaux. Ce fut le type des « Hof », où les jardins intérieurs devaient constituer des aires de calme : « Karl-Marx-Hof », « Karl-Seitz-Hof » et « Reumannhof » symbolisent l'urbanisme de la Ire République d'Autriche.

La Seconde Guerre mondiale entraîna des destructions importantes. Sur 706,000 logements, 87,000 furent totalement ou partiellement détruits. La reconstruction amena une nouvelle phase dans l'urbanisme viennois. Entre les 2 guerres, la municipalité avait fait construire près de 60,000 logements, ce qui avait amené l'élargissement de la ceinture d'habitations pavillonnaires et des immeubles collectifs. Cette tendance a continué après 1945. À côté de la construction de logements, l'aménagement de « sub-centres », avec équipements commerciaux et collectifs, intéresse surtout les zones périphériques, les quartiers du XIXe siècle ayant souvent leurs rues commerçantes. Le sous-développement commercial était plus aigu sur la rive gauche dans la « Donaustadt » ; mais l'étendue des espaces non bâtis a permis d'y aménager, selon les normes urbanistiques, les équipements nécessaires et souhaitables. Vienne a retrouvé un rayonnement nouveau : elle est le siège de nombreux organismes internationaux. Depuis 1960, la ville remplit des fonctions internationales importantes. L'ONU-city, complexe achevé en 1979, est le siège de l'Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique et de l'Organisation des Nations unies pour le développement industriel. Sur le plan de l'architecture, de l'urbanisme, Vienne est le résultat d'un héritage complexe et de plusieurs idéologies. C'est dans cet esprit qu'il faut comprendre le caractère de chaque quartier.

Les activités

L'industrie ne fournit qu'une faible partie du produit intérieur brut de la ville. Parmi les branches les plus importantes, on trouve : l'électro-technique, la construction de machines, l'alimentation, la métallurgie, la confection, la chimie, la construction de véhicules, le textile, le papier, le bois. Grâce à la raffinerie de Schwechat, l'industrie pétrolière joue un rôle important pour l'approvisionnement de tout le pays. L'aéroport international a un trafic supérieur à 3 millions de passagers.

Les différents quartiers de Vienne

Si Vienne, politiquement, correspond à une province autonome, elle est, administrativement, divisée en 23 arrondissements, ou « Bezirke ». La taille de ces derniers varie considérablement ; elle est fonction des périodes de croissance, c'est-à-dire d'annexion.

L'arrondissement le plus peuplé est le 10e, au sud (« Favoriten », « Oberlaa », « Rothneusiedl », « Unterlaa »), qui a aussi la plus forte population active industrielle. Suit le 3e arrondissement, au sud-est du centre-ville, correspondant au quartier de la « Landstraße ». Sa situation stratégique sur la route menant vers la Hongrie lui a valu, très tôt, un rôle décisif. Plus de la moitié des actifs sont employés dans l'industrie, mais le commerce et les services administratifs y sont bien représentés.

Le 16e arrondissement, ou « Ottakring », déborde déjà sur les collines de l'ouest. Il est encore à majorité industrielle. Il est suivi par le 2e arrondissement (« Leopoldstadt »), à l'est, entre la vieille ville et le Danube. Les grandes gares sont proches, et cela explique la prédominance des actifs industriels. Toutefois, proportionnellement à la population des autres arrondissements, cet arrondissement est un de ceux qui comptent le plus fort pourcentage de travailleurs dans la distribution (commerce de gros, entrepôts).

Sur le plan des densités, les différences sont considérables d'un arrondissement à l'autre. Ainsi, le 1er arrondissement (le centre) totalise encore plus de 100 habitants à l'hectare. Il est pourtant dépassé, et de loin, par le 4e (« Wieden »), avec environ 250 habitants, le 5e (« Margareten »), avec environ 350, le 6e (« Mariahilf ») et le 7e (« Neubau »), approchant tous les 2 le chiffre de 3,000 habitants, le 8e (« Josefstadt »), dépassant légèrement ce chiffre. Il s'agit essentiellement des quartiers entourant immédiatement le noyau historique. Le 15e (« Rudolfsheim-Fünfhaus ») fait partie de cette ceinture de fortes densités. Par contre, dans les quartiers de l'ouest, les densités sont généralement moins élevées. Les 2 arrondissements de la rive gauche du Danube ont une densité moyenne faible. Ces chiffres laissent entrevoir les possibilités d'expansion de la ville.

Sur le plan typologique et fonctionnel, on peut dégager une demi-douzaine de types de quartiers.

Le centre

Il conserve un maximum de bâtiments anciens. Les bâtiments administratifs sont nombreux, surtout à proximité du « Ring ». Les palais aristocratiques sont fréquents. La fonction culturelle est importante : on compte au moins une dizaine de théâtres, et les musées sont nombreux. Le centre est le cœur de Vienne avec ses vieilles rues et ses petites places. Le commerce de détail occupe une place de choix.

Les quartiers à l'ouest du centre

Leur aménagement a été largement déterminé par les vallées parallèles, issues de la « Wienerwald » et dont la vallée de la « Wien » est l'élément le plus important. Il existe donc comme un système de grandes voies radiales se branchant d'abord sur le « Gürtel » et ensuite sur le « Ring ». À l'époque Baroque, certaines de ces voies furent transformées en allées plantées d'arbres. La route de Linz est la voie radiale la plus importante. À l'approche du «

Ring » , les quartiers sont mixtes, unissant les fonctions résidentielles et administratives, voire commerciales. L'allure géométrique prédomine encore plus dans la forme des blocs de maisons en hauteur des quartiers situés plus à l'ouest.

Les anciens villages du rebord de la « Wienerwald »

Ceux de la partie nord (« Nussdorf » , « Grinzing » , « Sievering ») sont profondément marqués par la viticulture, qui, ici, remonte au Moyen-âge. Ce sont souvent des marchés aux vins, établis en bordure de la forêt viennoise. L'urbanisation est ancienne. On y trouve beaucoup de propriétés religieuses, bourgeoises et nobiliaires. Nombre de vignes sont clôturées d'un mur de pierre. Les demeures sont pittoresques, et la topographie ajoute aux charmes d'un habitat bien conservé. Les villas ont tendance à envahir ces coteaux, qui passent pour fournir les plus beaux sites de Vienne.

Les quartiers du sud-ouest

Il s'agit souvent de quartiers issus d'agglomérations villageoises établies le long des routes menant vers le sud. Le long de la « Blätterstraße » , l'ancienne route du vin, s'étaient développés des villages viticoles ; à l'époque de la « Gründerzeit » , la « Triesterstraße » avait vu se développer des tuileries (vers 1870) , en partie abandonnées de nos jours. Entre les 2 s'enchevêtrent les habitations modestes, les zones maraîchères, les friches et les établissements industriels. L'ensemble n'est pas encore très bien intégré dans le corps urbain.

Les quartiers du sud

La partie méridionale de la ville présente des possibilités presque idéales pour un développement de celle-ci, en forme d'éventail. La zone entièrement bâtie va du « Ring » au « Gürtel » . La « Favoritenstraße » , plus au sud, est l'axe principal d'une 2e zone densément occupée. Les gares du Sud et de l'Est introduisent une barrière entre le quartier de « Wieden » , qui présente encore des caractères des quartiers résidentiels coûteux, et « Favoriten » , où les types d'habitations sont plus variés. Les constructions récentes sont aussi plus nombreuses dans « Favoriten » . Au début du XIXe siècle, cette zone était encore consacrée à l'agriculture ; l'immigration tchèque et slovaque y avait donné des caractères originaux.

Le quartier de « Wienerberg » abritait, à la fin du XIXe siècle, la plus grande briqueterie d'Europe. Les façades monotones, en brique, des maisons ouvrières sont l'héritage d'une activité quasi disparue. Quant à la colline du « Laaerberg » , peut-être à cause de la proximité des briqueteries, les essais d'y implanter des résidences secondaires ont échoué constamment. Les surfaces agricoles ont mieux résisté à l'urbanisation qu'ailleurs.

Les quartiers du sud-est

Ils présentent quelques caractères communs. Avant l'apparition du chemin de fer, ils étaient axés sur une voie de communication unique. Le développement urbanistique y a été plus hésitant. Enfin, la région du sud-est a connu un développement par stades successifs.

La construction des ponts sur le Danube, plus au nord, a donné à l'ensemble de ces quartiers une impulsion considérable, permettant des liaisons ferroviaires entre les pays tchèques et slovaques, d'une part, et la Hongrie, d'autre part.

La « Ungarische Landstraße », l'axe routier principal, avait pour objet fondamental, jusqu'à l'avènement de la voie ferrée, de ravitailler la ville en produits alimentaires. La construction des chemins de fer et des gares amena dans cette région de la ville un cloisonnement qui fractionne et isole un certain nombre de quartiers. « Simmering » a été longtemps une aire purement agricole, avant de recueillir les maraîchers chassés par l'expansion urbaine. Puis la commune a utilisé une partie des terrains pour y implanter des abattoirs ainsi que des usines à gaz et à électricité ; s'y ajoutent l'arsenal et d'autres entreprises, qui font de la partie extérieure du sud-est de la ville une zone essentiellement industrielle. La proximité de « Schwechat », le centre autrichien du raffinage du pétrole, ne fait qu'accroître cette orientation.

Les quartiers de la rive gauche ; l'exemple de Floridsdorf

Au nord du Danube, les quartiers ne sont pas homogènes, mais celui de « Floridsdorf », véritable ville, est le plus expressif. La localité a été créée en 1786. Sa fonction de passage dominait, mais les prés servaient d'embouche aux marchands de bestiaux de Vienne. L'industrie s'y installa d'abord sous la forme d'ateliers de constructions ferroviaires. Puis ce fut l'époque de l'industrie mécanique et chimique. La population ouvrière domine. Les demeures luxueuses sont rares. Aussi, « Floridsdorf » a-t-elle des aspects plus prolétaires que d'autres quartiers. Il s'y ajoute un certain caractère d'inachevé du fait de l'avortement des plans d'expansion en 1918. Ce caractère est encore assez visible dans la « Brünner » et la « Pragerstraße ». Un effort d'adaptation est cependant fait. Depuis 1945, « Floridsdorf » est un des quartiers où la construction est la plus active.

Espaces verts et héritage historique

Le charme de Vienne tient moins au Danube qu'à la ville proprement dite. Les espaces verts représentent en partie les restes des parcs des propriétés féodales. Certains gardent leur style historique, tel le Belvédère, qui allie les aspects de la Renaissance italienne et du Baroque français. Le parc de « Schönbrunn » est d'inspiration française. C'est sous Joseph II, le despote éclairé, que nombre de parcs furent rendus accessibles à la population. Le début d'une politique des espaces verts est indiscutablement lié à cet Empereur : ce dernier non seulement ouvrit au public (en 1766) les immenses espaces verts du « Prater », mais encore transforma le glacis de fortifications en une ceinture d'espaces verts ouverte au peuple. En mettant en place une administration communale, il préparait l'avenir. En effet, la municipalité acquit nombre de parcs aristocratiques (« Esterházy », « Schönborn », « Arenberg »), qui, autrement, eussent été victimes des promoteurs immobiliers. Cette politique fut imitée par des communes alors encore autonomes, comme « Döbling » et « Währing », au nord-ouest de la ville (« Türkenschanzpark »). Les autorités communales laissèrent en parc certaines parcelles rectangulaires au milieu des blocs construits au XIXe siècle.

Après la Première Guerre mondiale, la commune, dans le cadre des « constructions sociales », envisagea également

des « espaces verts sociaux » . La politique municipale visait à introduire dans le noyau urbain ancien des espaces verts en nombre suffisant, en fonction des possibilités d'achats de terrains ou d'immeubles.

La mise en place de terrains de sport s'est opérée selon la même politique. Le quartier du « Prater » a servi, dès le XIXe siècle, au sport noble par excellence : l'équitation. Depuis, il est devenu le quartier des loisirs pour Vienne, voire pour l'Autriche entière : terrains de sport (dont le grand stade) , zones de loisirs, expositions, etc. Avec l'aménagement tardif du « Prater » , les rives du Danube sont intégrées dans l'espace fonctionnel de la ville.

Il y a une grande différence entre les 2 rives du Danube. Si la ville de rive droite est l'expression historique de l'Autriche, la rive gauche est d'aménagement récent. Les espaces verts sont, ici, plus liés à la politique de construction récente et à l'utilisation de terrains adéquats (méandre recoupé de la « Alte Donau ») qu'à la mise en valeur et à la conservation d'héritages historiques.

Le 1er centre intellectuel des pays allemands du Danube

Pendant longtemps, la capitale culturelle et intellectuelle de la civilisation germanique se trouvait sur les bords du Danube et non pas sur la Sprée. Ce n'est qu'à la veille de la Première Guerre mondiale que Berlin a éclipsé Vienne. L'Université de Vienne, fondée en 1365, a longtemps été la plus importante de l'Empire. L'Université technique (« Technische Hochschule ») , fondée en 1872, a des effectifs moins importants que l'Université Classique, mais elle joue un rôle de 1er ordre pour l'économie urbaine et nationale.

Une des originalités est l'École supérieure pour le commerce mondial (« Hochschule für Welthandel ») , créée en 1898, qui marque la tradition commerciale de la ville. Parmi les autres écoles supérieures, on peut citer l'Institut d'agronomie (« Hochschule für Bodenkultur ») , l'École vétérinaire (« Tierärztliche Hochschule ») , l'Académie des Beaux-arts, l'Académie des arts appliqués et l'Académie de musique. Il y a une étroite imbrication entre la vie intellectuelle et la vie économique. En y ajoutant le cosmopolitisme viennois, on a peut-être là le fond de l'âme viennoise, qui baigne dans un environnement culturel que très peu de grandes métropoles possèdent. Quant au « Wiener Witz » (l' « humour viennois ») , il en est l'expression parlée de l'homme de la rue.

Le 1er centre touristique autrichien

Vienne reste une ville cosmopolite, au passé d'une extraordinaire richesse. Les contacts avec les civilisations allemande, tchèque, slovaque, magyare, slave du Sud, pour ne parler que des contacts essentiels, ont laissé des traces profondes dans l'histoire, l'architecture, la culture, en un mot dans la civilisation viennoise. C'est ce dépaysement, agrémenté des charmes d'un milieu urbain différencié, qui attire le touriste. Le tourisme culturel se traduit par la visite des innombrables palais et constructions des 3 derniers siècles. Les églises de la vieille ville sont les plus anciennes. Le château de « Schönbrunn » (le « Versailles viennois ») , avec ses salles d'apparat, sa collection de carrosses historiques, son parc et son jardin zoologique, est une attraction majeure. Englobés dans la ville actuelle, ses parcs servent aussi d'aire de détente pour les Viennois. Le Belvédère, flanqué de parcs, n'est pas loin du centre historique. Il renferme les musées d'art autrichien, du Moyen-âge à nos jours. L'ancienne et la nouvelle « Hofburg » possèdent des salles

d'apparat, des musées, mais aussi la célèbre École d'équitation espagnole. Les musées sont nombreux dans la vieille ville. Une certaine homogénéité de l'architecture donne l'impression de puissance, qui fut celle de l'Empire autrichien. Le principal problème est d'« actualiser » ou de « fonctionnaliser » l'énorme héritage monarchique et Impérial : d'où l'organisation de manifestations de niveau international. La Foire internationale de Vienne se tient en mars et en septembre. Le parc d'attractions du « Prater » ouvre ses portes chaque 1er mai. Le Festival de Vienne, consacré à la musique et au théâtre, se tient en mai-juin. D'autres spectacles de valeur sont organisés en juillet et en août, en utilisant un cadre architectural approprié. L'automne voit l'ouverture de la saison de l'Opéra. Mais on reste loin des splendeurs Impériales, lorsque Empereur et Cour constituaient autant d'attractions que les artistes sur scène. Vienne, à la tradition si riche, reste une des capitales mondiales de la musique. Le cosmopolitisme culturel a subi un rude coup avec le démembrement de l'Empire, mais il faut souligner les efforts faits pour maintenir l'ouverture sur le monde extérieur.

Les environs de Vienne ne sont pas moins attrayants. Le « Weinviertel », au nord du Danube, s'orne de villages viticoles, où les viticulteurs offrent le « Heuriger » (vin nouveau) . Les caves creusées dans le lœss ajoutent au pittoresque. La « Wienerwald » pourrait raconter des pages entières de la civilisation viennoise. Fuyant les chaleurs de l'été viennois, les membres de la Cour, les nobles et les bourgeois ont cherché la « Sommerfrische » dans la forêt, dernière expression qui devait être plus tard synonyme de vacances d'été.

L'histoire de Vienne

Les origines, le Moyen-âge

Le noyau de la cité (1er arrondissement, die « Innere Stadt ») occupe une terrasse surplombant de peu un bras de fleuve, l'actuel « canal du Danube » (« Donaukanal ») . Cette terrasse, à l'abri des inondations, fut sans doute déjà occupée par les Celtes et même par les Illyriens. En tout cas, les Romains y établirent, au 1er siècle de notre ère, un camp de légionnaires. Détruite par les Quades et les Marcomans, en 166, « Vindobona » (nom d'origine celtique) est reconstruite en l'an 170 par l'Empereur Marc-Aurèle et élevée en 213 au rang de « municipium » . Le site semble avoir été abandonné en 395, après la rupture du limes.

La fondation des Ires églises Saint-Rupert (« Ruprechtskirche ») et Saint-Pierre (« Peterskirche ») remonte sans doute au VIIIe siècle. Au XIIe siècle, la ville devient résidence des ducs d'Autriche de la maison de Babenberg et connaît une Ire période de prospérité ; elle est un centre commercial important grâce à sa situation sur la voie fluviale, d'une part, et sur la route de l'ambre, qui relie la Méditerranée à la Baltique, de l'autre. Cette prospérité se maintient sous la domination du roi de Bohême, Otakar II Přemysl, héritier des Babenberg. En 1276, l'Empereur Rodolphe de Hasbourg, vainqueur d'Otakar, s'empare de la ville, qui, économiquement, souffre de ces guerres successorales. De l'essor économique de la ville, au XIVe siècle, témoignent un certain nombre d'édifices Gothiques conservés malgré les guerres et les sièges dont la ville aura à souffrir : cathédrale Saint-Étienne (« Stephansdom ») , église « Maria am Gestade » , noyau du « château » (« Burg ») . Au XVe siècle et au début du XVIe siècle (en particulier sous la domination du roi de Hongrie, Mathias 1er Corvin) , Vienne continue de prospérer.

Les temps modernes

Au début du XVI^e siècle, la poussée turque interrompt les voies de communication de l'Est : Vienne, qui ne peut plus jouer son rôle de relais économique, devient le centre administratif de l'Empire des Habsbourg, qui héritent des couronnes de Hongrie et de Bohême. En 1529, un 1^{er} assaut turc est repoussé. La ville, passée à la Réforme, est ramenée au catholicisme avec l'aide des Jésuites. L'influence culturelle espagnole et italienne devient prépondérante et marque d'une façon indélébile le « Baroque » autrichien. En 1683, l'armée turque assiège de nouveau la ville ; elle est repoussée après la victoire (sur les pentes du « Kahlenberg ») des troupes alliées commandées par le roi de Pologne, Jean Sobieski. La ville, en grande partie démolie, est reconstruite dans le nouveau style Baroque à la mode. En 1704-1708, devant la menace d'incursions des insurgés kuruc, est édifée une nouvelle enceinte, protégeant cette fois-ci les faubourgs : les actuels arrondissements 2 à 9. Au XVIII^e siècle, la ville profite de la consolidation de l'État autrichien, réorganisé et modernisé sous Marie-Thérèse et Joseph II. Pendant les guerres napoléoniennes, elle est assiégée et occupée à 2 reprises : en 1805 et en 1809. Après la défaite de Napoléon, le « Congrès » de paix se tient à Vienne, qui, malgré une crise financière aiguë, connaît alors un de ses moments les plus glorieux. Sous le régime du prince-chancelier Metternich (qui gouverne l'Empire, de 1809 à 1848), la ville et le pays commencent à s'industrialiser.

Révolutions européennes de 1848

En 1848, Vienne est le théâtre de sévères combats de rues, jusqu'à l'entrée des troupes d'Alfred Windischgrätz (1787-1862). Après les journées de 1848, on décide de raser l'enceinte fortifiée. Les terrains ainsi dégagés permettent de tracer un boulevard circulaire (l'actuel « Ring ») que bordent de pompeux édifices et monuments officiels ou privés. Sous le règne de l'Empereur François-Joseph (1848-1916), la ville se modernise : intégration administrative des faubourgs proches (c'est-à-dire des actuels arrondissements 2 à 9), canalisation du Danube, adduction d'eau potable depuis le massif alpin. Une brillante Exposition universelle est organisée en 1873.

L'industrialisation accélérée provoque une augmentation rapide de la population ouvrière, surtout dans les faubourgs : en 1891, les actuels arrondissements 11 à 19 sont, à leur tour, inclus dans la cité (le 10^e arrondissement ayant été incorporé en 1874). Le même développement de l'industrialisation, l'appauvrissement de l'ancien artisanat et la constitution d'un prolétariat, en partie tchèque, entraînent l'apparition de nouveaux Partis politiques : le Parti Social-Démocrate et le Parti Chrétien-Social (de tendance xénophobe et antisémite). Le chef de ce dernier Parti, Karl Lueger (1844-1910), l'emporte lors des élections de 1895. Confirmé dans ses fonctions de bourgmestre par l'Empereur, en 1897, Lueger se révèle un administrateur efficace. En 1904, de nouveaux quartiers, les 20^e et 21^e arrondissements, qui se sont développés sur l'autre rive du Danube, sont à leur tour rattachés à la ville, dont la population dépasse alors les 2 millions d'habitants.

Une capitale culturelle

Capitale, jusqu'au début de ce siècle, d'un des grands États européens, Vienne devient très tôt un centre culturel important. La cour des Babenberg attire les grands Minnesänger, dont Reinmar et Walther von der Vogelweide. De

nombreux monuments dans la ville ou dans le proche voisinage (abbaye de Klosterneuburg, où l'on conserve les panneaux d'autel, datant de 1181, de Nicolas de Verdun ; abbaye de Heiligenkreuz, fondée en 1135) témoignent de ce 1er apogée. Au service successivement des Empereurs Frédéric III et Maximilien Ier, l'humaniste Konrad Celtis (1459-1508) organise à Vienne une sodalité savante (« Sodalitas Danubiana ») . Après la victoire sur les Turcs, Vienne se couvre d'édifices luxueux.

La réforme jésuite de l'État entraîne la constitution d'un fonctionariat bourgeois, éclairé et Libéral : cette classe sociale devient le support de la culture autrichienne. Sous Marie-Thérèse, l'Université est soustraite à l'autorité des Jésuites ; la faculté de médecine est réorganisée sur le modèle de celle de Leyde et devient rapidement l'une des plus célèbres d'Europe. En 1776 est fondé le « Burgtheater », à la fois théâtre de Cour (du « château ») et théâtre « national » allemand. Dans les faubourgs prospèrent des théâtres populaires réputés. La musique, que les grandes maisons nobles continuent à favoriser, atteint un public de plus en plus vaste et connaît un essor remarquable. Il en est de même de la littérature et de l'art, en particulier dans la bourgeoisie juive.

À la fin du XIXe siècle, Vienne devient le carrefour de la modernité : la Sécession architecturale est fondée en 1897, Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg et Anton von Webern constituent la « trinité viennoise » et Sigmund Freud invente la psychanalyse.

Vienne après 1918

L'effondrement de l'Empire austro-hongrois, en 1918, entraîne une crise majeure : la capitale d'un des grands États européens doit s'adapter à son nouveau rôle de métropole d'une petite république comptant un peu plus de 6 millions d'habitants. La municipalité socialiste (1919-1934) fait construire de vastes complexes d'habitations à bon marché et procède à une réforme scolaire et hospitalière.

Le conflit, d'abord latent, entre les Partis de gauche, avec leurs formations para-militaires, et le gouvernement fédéral, qui s'appuie sur la province, paysanne et conservatrice, éclate une 1re fois, en 1927 (démonstrations de rue, incendie du Palais de Justice, le 15 juillet) , puis en 1934 (combats de février, au cours desquels est bombardé le « Karl-Marx-Hof ») . Un nouveau réseau routier réalisé à cette époque assure un accès facile du « Wienerwald » . Après l' « Anschluß » de 1938, de nouveaux faubourgs et quelques communes adjacentes sont à leur tour rattachés administrativement à la cité.

Les bombardements alliés et les combats qui précèdent la prise de la ville par les troupes russes, en avril 1945, entraînent la ruine d'à peu près 13 % des maisons d'habitation et 25 % des installations industrielles. De 1945 à 1955, Vienne, enclavée dans la zone d'occupation soviétique, est placée sous contrôle inter-allié.

En 1954, une partie des territoires englobés après 1938 sont de nouveau rattachés au « Land » de Basse-Autriche, la ville comptant désormais 23 arrondissements. Les ruines réparées, dont celles de la cathédrale, de l'Opéra, du « Burgtheater », on met en œuvre un vaste programme de constructions : nouveaux ensembles d'habitations « municipaux », notamment sur l' « autre » rive du Danube, nouvelles voies de communication.

Vienne, ville d'art

Introduction

L'aspect que présente Vienne au visiteur hâtif est celui d'une grande ville avenante, sur laquelle un XIX^e siècle quelque peu pompeux (celui de l'Empereur François-Joseph) a imprimé sa marque en aménageant, à partir de 1857, sa ceinture verdoyante de boulevards, le « Ring », appuyé par ses 2 extrémités au canal du Danube et bordé par des monuments plus recommandables par leur majesté que par leur style, qui assurent les fonctions essentielles d'une capitale : Opéra (si important dans la ville de la musique) , musée d'Histoire de l'art, musée d'Histoire naturelle, Parlement (auquel l'architecte Theophil von Hansen a su donner de la grandeur) , Hôtel-de-ville, « Burgtheater » , Université, voire église Votive (« Votivkirche ») .

Le musée d'Histoire de l'art (« Kunsthistorisches Museum ») , construit selon des normes généreuses, de 1872 à 1881, a reçu les anciennes collections Impériales. À l'entresol, un des plus riches ensembles de tapisseries du monde, les camées, l'illustre trésor de métaux précieux provenant des fouilles de Hongrie ainsi que la remarquable série des portraits funéraires égyptiens du Fayoum. Au 1^{er} étage, la richesse de la Galerie de peinture a permis de consacrer des salles entières à tel artiste ou à telle école (Rubens, les Vénitiens) . L'école espagnole abonde en portraits princiers de la famille Impériale. Entre les œuvres les plus réputées de ce musée brillent celles de Dürer, dont l'Empereur Rodolphe II était un amateur passionné, et celles de Bruegel l'Ancien, dont il n'existe nulle part ailleurs un ensemble pareil.

Vienne médiévale

Alors que la cathédrale (« Stephansdom ») , située au cœur de la ville ancienne, n'a gardé que peu de souvenirs de son passé Roman (édifices des XII^e et XIII^e siècles) , c'est en 1340 que fut consacré son chœur Gothique, suivi de la tour sud, magnifique clocher de 137 mètres, et de la nef. Dans le fond du chœur s'élève le tombeau monumental de l'Empereur Frédéric III et de sa femme, entrepris en 1467 par le sculpteur Nikolaus Gerhaert de Leyde (vers 1430-1473) . Au début du XVI^e siècle s'illustre Anton Pilgram (vers 1460 - vers 1515) , qui s'est représenté 2 fois sur ses œuvres avec une verve toute populaire : à la chaire et à la base de l'orgue.

Tout aussi aimée des Viennois, l'église « Maria am Gestade » (XIV^e siècle - début du XV^e siècle) , dont le chœur conserve une riche vitrerie Gothique, est située plus au nord, dans un quartier qui a gardé son aspect ancien et familial.

Vienne Baroque

Sans doute est-ce en qualité de métropole du Baroque que Vienne a conquis sa célébrité, presque exclusivement à partir de la mémorable victoire du Kahlenberg, en 1683.

2 très grands architectes surtout ont été les artisans de la mutation Baroque : Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach

(1656-1723) , aidé de son fils Joseph Emanuel (1693-1742) , et Johann Lukas von Hildebrandt (1668-1745) , ingénieur militaire de naissance italienne. L'un et l'autre travaillent aux édifices religieux et profanes de la 1re moitié du XVIIIe siècle à Vienne. On les trouve tous 2 au Palais Impérial, à la « Hofburg » , où Fischer le fils construit le chef-d'œuvre qu'est la Bibliothèque nationale, dont les beaux volumes architecturaux surmontés d'un dôme sont décorés par les trompe-l'œil du peintre Daniel Gran (1694-1757) . C'est encore Fischer, le fils, qui est l'auteur du manège où des écuyers impeccables présentent toujours la célèbre parade de leurs chevaux de race espagnole. Dans l'église toute voisine des Augustins, Antonio Casanova a sculpté l'un de ses plus beaux tombeaux, celui de l'archiduchesse Marie-Christine, femme de l'archiduc Albert de Saxe-Teschen (1738-1822) , le fondateur de l' « Albertina » - la plus belle au monde, peut-être, des collections de dessins, d'aquarelles et de gravures (célèbre, notamment, pour ses Dürer, ses Rubens, ses Rembrandt) .

Dans la vieille ville, dès le XVIIe siècle, la vénérable église des Neuf-Chœurs-des-Anges (« Am Hof ») Gothique d'origine, avait reçu une façade Baroque. Non loin de la cathédrale, c'est probablement à Hildebrandt qu'est attribuable la reconstruction de la « Peterskirche » , de forme ovale et dont le grand axe est perpendiculaire à la longue place du « Graben » , ponctuée par la colonne tarabiscotée de la Sainte-Trinité.

Au sud du « Ring » se trouvent les monuments majeurs de l'architecture Baroque de Vienne, et d'abord la « Karlskirche » (église Saint-Charles-Borromée) , que le grand Fischer von Erlach éleva avec sa colonnade antique précédant une coupole et accostée de 2 ailes qui sont comme creusées pour recevoir 2 colonnes du type de la colonne Trajane. Une autre église, des plus originales, est la « Piaristenkirche » , qui a reçu une très belle décoration à fresque du peintre Franz Anton Maulbertsch (1724-1796) .

Beaucoup de palais de la noblesse viennoise sont ornés d'atlantes grandioses adossés aux colonnes des escaliers, supportant à grand effort des balcons, encadrant des portails. Le plus exemplaire de ces palais est probablement le Belvédère, construit par Hildebrandt pour le prince Eugène de Savoie sur 2 niveaux comprenant chacun un édifice. Le Belvédère supérieur est séparé du Belvédère inférieur par un long parterre aux eaux jaillissantes. Les atlantes du 1er sont parmi les plus tumultueux de Vienne. Le second a été transformé en musée d'Art Baroque autrichien sous la tutelle d'un groupe sculpté aux singulières torsions, l' « Apo théose du Prince Eugène » (1721) , par Balthasar Permoser (1651-1732) ; la génération suivante des sculpteurs, d'une pureté presque Classique, est représentée par Georg Raphael Donner (1693-1741) , dont les statues des affluents du Danube (remplacées par des copies à la belle fontaine du « Neuer Markt ») ont été transportées ici, faisant contraste avec les bustes grimaçants par lesquels l'étrange Franz Xaver Messerschmidt (1736-1783) a prétendu représenter les divers caractères humains. Institution unique que ce musée du Baroque, où ne manque point non plus la peinture avec l'étrincelant décorateur Maulbertsch.

Les palais à atlantes sont nombreux : palais Trautson, de la Chancellerie de Bohême, palais d'hiver du Prince Eugène, palais Daun-Kinsky, Liechtenstein. Le palais Schwarzenberg est célèbre par ses jardins. Mais le plus vaste et le plus connu de ces ensembles civils est le château Impérial de Schönbrunn, construit sur les plans de Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, de 1695 à 1713, à l'emplacement d'un pavillon de chasse, et remanié ensuite par Nikolaus Pacassi (1716 - après 1796) .

Vienne, ville de musées

Outre les appartements et collections de la « Hofburg » (trésor Impérial, musée d'Éphèse, armes et armures, instruments de musique, etc.) et de Schönbrunn, l'« Albertina » et le « Kunsthistorisches Museum », la capitale possède de nombreux autres musées importants. La galerie de l'Académie des Beaux-arts conserve un millier de tableaux des écoles européennes. Le musée d'Art Baroque autrichien, le musée d'Art médiéval autrichien et la galerie d'art autrichien du XIXe et du XXe siècles sont abrités dans l'ensemble du Belvédère. Le musée archiépiscopal d'art sacré renferme, notamment, une partie du trésor de la cathédrale Saint-Étienne. Le musée des Arts appliqués, fondé dès 1864, possède des tapis d'Orient, des tapisseries, des meubles, des porcelaines, de la verrerie, etc. Le Musée historique de la ville illustre l'histoire et les arts à Vienne des origines à nos jours. Un musée d'Art moderne a été créé en 1979, dans l'ancien palais Liechtenstein. Depuis 1999, un musée d'Art contemporain abrite la collection Karlheinz et Agnes Essl à Klosterneuburg, dans la banlieue de Vienne. L'important musée des Techniques jouxte le parc de Schönbrunn. Les maisons de Franz Schubert et de Sigmund Freud, enfin, constituent des musées consacrés à ces illustres Viennois. Inauguré en 2001, le Quartier des musées (« MuseumsQuartier ») constitue le plus grand centre culturel européen consacré à l'art moderne et à l'art contemporain ; il réunit notamment le « Leopold Museum » (collection de Ludwig Leopold ; peintures d'Egon Schiele, de Gustav Klimt, d'Oskar Kokoschka, de Richard Gertsl, d'Albin Egger-Lienz, etc.) , et le « Mumok » (musée d'art moderne de la Fondation Ludwig) , qui rassemble les collections, jusque-là conservées au Musée du XXe siècle ainsi qu'au palais Liechtenstein.

L'école architecturale de Vienne

Capitale internationale d'un Empire cosmopolite, Vienne est, à l'extrême fin du XIXe siècle, l'un des carrefours de la pensée européenne : le conflit permanent qui existe entre le pouvoir dictatorial de l'administration Impériale et le réveil des nationalités dans l'Europe centrale crée cette fermentation favorable à l'éclosion d'une pensée nouvelle qu'on ne trouve nulle part ailleurs sur le continent, sinon en Russie. L'explosion démographique de ce centre industriel en plein essor n'est pas moins considérable, puisque la ville passe de 632,000 habitants en 1869 à plus de 2 millions en 1910 : la fièvre des affaires surchauffe des esprits en pleine révolution.

L'explosion urbaine de Vienne est marquée dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle par la démolition des fortifications et l'aménagement du « Ring », qui prend leur place. La forte personnalité de l'architecte Theophil von Hansen (1813-1891) et celle de l'Allemand Gottfried Semper expriment, dans cette période, les opinions vigoureusement contradictoires des tenants de l'académisme et du rationalisme - face à l'éclectisme florissant de Karl von Hasenauer (1833-1894) , de Heinrich von Ferstel (1828-1883) , d'August Siccard von Siccardsburg (1813-1868) et d'Eduard Van der Nüll (1812-1868) , les 2 derniers auteurs de l'Opéra de Vienne, dont le mauvais accueil par le public et par la presse provoqua le double suicide.

Élève de Hansen, puis de Siccardsburg et de Van der Nüll, Otto Wagner (1841-1918) , fondateur de cette école architecturale de Vienne, en reste la plus forte personnalité par sa foudroyante progression. La Ire moitié de sa carrière est celle d'un architecte académique qui verse dans l'éclectisme. En 1893, Wagner dessine un plan général d'aménagement de la ville de Vienne, qui comprend la création du chemin de fer urbain et la régulation des cours du

Danube et de la Vienne - travaux considérables qui seront aussitôt entrepris sous sa direction. En 1894, il succède à Hasenauer comme professeur à l'Académie des Beaux-arts : sa leçon inaugurale pose les fondements d'une pensée fonctionnaliste inspirée par Semper. Ces théories architecturales et urbanistiques aboutiront à la publication de « Moderne Architektur » (1895) , puis de « Die Grossstadt » (1911) . Chef de file des modernistes, Wagner évolue alors de façon spectaculaire : la « Majolika Haus » (1898-1899) , couverte d'un magnifique décor de faïence polychrome, est l'un des monuments de l'Art nouveau européen. Mais Wagner saura dépasser cette expérience : la caisse d'épargne (1904-1906) , puis l'église « Am Steinhof » (1904-1907) acquièrent dans leur monumentalisme une retenue toute moderne, dont les dernières œuvres du Maître (projet de l'hôtel « Wien » , 1910 ; seconde villa Wagner, 1912-1913) exaspèrent l'élégance.

Autour de Wagner, c'est le mouvement de la « Sécession » viennoise qui est d'abord florissant : Josef Maria Olbrich (1867-1908) et Joseph Hoffmann (1870-1956) , les 2 assistants de Wagner, fondent le mouvement en 1897 avec d'autres artistes, notamment le peintre Gustav Klimt (1862-1918) et le graphiste Koloman Moser (1868-1918) . La Sécession publie jusqu'en 1904 une revue littéraire et artistique, « Ver Sacrum » , et organise de multiples expositions dans le bâtiment qu'Olbrich lui a construit, en 1898. Se réclamant dès l'origine de Charles Rennie Mackintosh et de l'Art nouveau bruxellois, c'est autour de ces expositions que le mouvement définit l'originalité du « Jugendstil » viennois, qui cède moins au symbolisme et à l'exaspération lyrique de la courbe qu'à une forme de modernisme, orienté comme il est vers une géométrie hiératique et précieuse, riche en matériaux raffinés et en élégance de couleurs.

Josef Maria Olbrich, co-fondateur en 1899 de la « colonie » artistique de la « Mathildenhöhe » à Darmstadt, y laissera l'essentiel de son œuvre, trop tôt interrompue. Quant à Josef Hoffmann, il sera surtout l'auteur de l'admirable palais Stoclet de Bruxelles (1905-1911) ; mais, dès 1903, il avait fondé avec Koloman Moser les « Wiener Werkstätte » , ateliers d'artisanat d'art qui fonctionneront jusqu'en 1933. À partir de 1905, Hoffmann est à la tête du mouvement dissident de la Sécession (fondation du « Kunstschau » avec Gustav Klimt) , qui accuse celle-ci de rester d'esprit trop ornemental et de ne pas acquérir le dépouillement indispensable à un art moderne. Après la Première Guerre mondiale, il sera l'architecte en chef de la ville de Vienne : il construira, en 1924-1925, des ensembles d'habitat populaire et, en 1932, une partie du quartier pour l'Exposition du « Werkbund » , tardive manifestation d'esthétique puriste chez l'un des grands précurseurs de l'art moderne.

La personnalité la plus en marge de l'école de Vienne est Adolf Loos (1870-1933) , ennemi juré de l'ornement. Après un séjour aux États-Unis, de 1893 à 1896 (il y fait la découverte de la pensée et des œuvres de Louis Henri Sullivan) , il rentre à Vienne et, pendant 3 ans, dans une série d'articles pour la « Neue Freie Presse » (rassemblés en 1921 sous le titre d' « Ins Leere gesprochen » , « prononcé dans le vide ») , lance des attaques acerbes contre la Sécession. Son activité de théoricien se complétera par la publication, en 1908, d' « Ornament und Verbrechen » (« Ornement et crime ») et par la création d'une école libre d'architecture. Son œuvre, qui a été d'abord celle d'un décorateur au purisme élégant (« Kärtner Bar » , Vienne, 1907) , devient peu à peu celle d'un architecte : villa Karma à Montreux, Suisse (1904-1906) ; maison Steiner, Vienne (1910) ; maison Tristan Tzara, Paris (1926-1927) ; etc. Dans toutes ces œuvres, le luxe des matières, la simplicité de leur traitement et l'élégance des proportions forcent l'admiration, mais il n'est pas sûr que le langage spatial puisse être considéré comme aussi riche et aussi novateur

que celui de l'école moderne de l'époque : le radicalisme anti-ornemental de Loos se ressent quelquefois d'une certaine sécheresse d'intentions, qui n'existait pas dans les débordements généreux d'un Otto Wagner.

La musique à Vienne

Introduction

La situation géographique de Vienne, à mi-chemin entre les pays germaniques et l'Italie, devait faire de cette ville le lieu de rencontre idéal pour les musiciens venus de ces régions. De plus, l'activité musicale qui s'y manifesta très tôt, puis l'intérêt des Habsbourg et de la noblesse pour la musique attirèrent à Vienne, à chaque époque, nombre de compositeurs célèbres, qui s'y fixèrent.

Du Moyen-âge à la fin du XIXe siècle

Dès le Moyen-âge, parallèlement au chant religieux diffusé par la cathédrale Saint-Étienne et la chapelle Impériale, se développe l'art profane des « Minnesänger », dont le plus célèbre représentant au XIIIe siècle se nomme Walther von der Vogelweide. Des musiciens étrangers s'attachent à la Chapelle de la Cour, ré-organisée en 1495 par Maximilien Ier : le Flamand Heinrich Isaac (vers 1450-1517), compositeur de Maximilien Ier ; le Suisse Ludwig Senfl (vers 1490-1543) ; son élève et successeur l'Allemand Heinrich Finck (vers 1444-1527) ; des Autrichiens comme l'organiste Paul von Hofhaimer (1459-1537) ou Arnold von Bruck. En 1568, le Flamand Philippus de Monte, après un long séjour en Italie, devient Maître de chapelle de la Cour. Leurs œuvres font la synthèse d'éléments franco-flamands et italiens.

Au XVIIe siècle, l'influence personnelle des Empereurs Ferdinand III, Léopold Ier et Joseph Ier, compositeurs à leurs heures, amateurs d'art lyrique, permet le développement de celui-ci. Ils attirent des Italiens à la Cour : Pietro Francesco Cavalli y donne son « Egisto », en 1643 ; Antonio Cesti (1623-1669), au service de Léopold Ier, fait représenter ses œuvres (dont « Il Pomo d'oro », 1666 ou 1667) ; Antonio Bertali (1605-1669) transmet à Vienne, où il est musicien de la Cour, la tradition vénitienne d'un Claudio Monteverdi et d'un Cavalli ; Antonio Draghi (1635-1700) fournit des livrets d'Opéras à Léopold Ier et écrit Oratorios et Opéras destinés à la musique Impériale. L'Autrichien Johann Heinrich Schmelzer (vers 1623-1680) fonde avec Heinrich Biber (1644-1704) une école de violonistes, tandis que l'Allemand Johann Jacob Froberger un temps organiste de la Cour, apporte les techniques de Girolamo Frescobaldi son Maître, et celles des musiciens français, connues lors de son voyage à Paris, en 1652. À la même époque, Vienne devient un centre réputé pour l'enseignement musical : Johann Kaspar von Kerll (1627-1693), Allemand qui a pris à Rome des leçons de Giacomo Carissimi, professe l'orgue et la composition ; Johann Joseph Fux (1660-1741), Maître d'une renommée internationale, forme Georg Christoph Wagenseil (1715-1777), Georg Muffat (1653-1704), Ignaz Holzbauer (1711-1783). En 1725, il publie un traité de contrepoint célèbre jusqu'à nos jours, le « Gradus ad Parnassum ».

Le XVIIIe siècle consacre Vienne capitale européenne du Classicisme. Une école pré-Classique contribue au développement formel de la Symphonie, parallèlement aux écoles étrangères (Italie, Allemagne, France). Ses principaux représentants, Georg Matthias Monn (1717-1750), Georg Christoph Wagenseil, Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf (1739-1799), annoncent les

Maîtres de la Symphonie Classique, tandis qu'Ignaz Umlauff (1746-1796) crée le « singspiel » avec « Die Bergknappen » (1778) . La même année, un nouveau théâtre ouvre, le « Schikanedertheater » , sur la scène duquel seront joués les Opéras mozartiens. Christoph Willibald Gluck entreprend sa réforme de l'Opéra italien à Vienne avec « Orfeo ed Euridice » (1762) et « Alceste » (1767) . Franz-Joseph Haydn y termine sa vie dans la gloire. La majorité des ouvrages dramatiques des dernières années de la vie de Mozart, installé à Vienne en 1781, seront créés dans cette ville (« l'Enlèvement au sérail » , 1782 ; « les Noces de Figaro » , 1786 ; « Così fan tutte » , 1790 ; « la Flûte enchantée » , 1791) . Ludwig van Beethoven se fixe également dans la capitale autrichienne, aidé financièrement par la haute société. C'est là que ses œuvres seront conçues, exécutées, publiées. Franz Schubert, né près de Vienne, vivra une existence difficile dans cette ville, sans y rencontrer beaucoup de compréhension pour ses œuvres. À la même époque, l'enseignement pianistique de Karl Czerny (1791-1857) conduit à Vienne de nombreux pianistes (Sigismund Thalberg, 1812-1871 ; Franz Liszt) .

En 1842, Otto Nicolai (1810-1849) , Maître de chapelle de la Cour, fonde l'Orchestre philharmonique, qui, avec l'Opéra, acquiert une renommée mondiale.

Ce climat, créé tant par la présence de compositeurs célèbres que par des institutions musicales de 1er ordre, continue d'attirer à Vienne l'élite du monde musical dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. Richard Wagner donne « Tannhäuser » (1857) , « Lohengrin » (1858) , « le Vaisseau fantôme » (1860) et travaille aux « Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg » pendant son séjour viennois. Les 3 noms du post-Romantisme se retrouvent à Vienne, où ils s'établissent définitivement : Johannes Brahms dirige la « Singakademie » (1862) , puis la « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » (1872) ; Anton Bruckner mène une carrière de professeur au Conservatoire de Vienne (fondé en 1817) , où il enseigne l'harmonie, le contrepoint et la fugue, en 1868 ; Gustav Mahler dirige l'Opéra de la Cour (1897-1907) , où il se révèle comme un très grand chef. C'est également à Vienne que vit Hugo Wolf, le plus grand représentant du lied, à la fin du XIXe siècle.

Dans le domaine de la musique légère, Vienne connut un rayonnement tout aussi grand. Franz von Suppé (1819-1895) , Josef Lanner (1801-1843) , Karl Ziehrer (1843-1922) et, surtout, la dynastie des Strauß brillèrent dans la composition de valses et d'Opérettes.

L'école de Vienne

La Vienne du début du XXe siècle fut certainement, sur le plan des arts et de la pensée, l'une des métropoles les plus actives de notre civilisation. Les noms de Sigmund Freud, de Stefan George, de Hugo von Hofmannsthal, de Otto Wagner, de Peter Altenberg, de Oskar Kokoschka et, un peu plus tard, ceux de Robert von Musil et de Hermann Broch l'attestent. Mais cette Vienne si créatrice, en éveil aux frémissements encore imperceptibles d'une sensibilité nouvelle, était aussi celle d'une des sociétés les plus réactionnaires d'Europe ; et la société viennoise constituait un public et s'exprimait en une critique fort peu préparée à la hardiesse de conception des artistes qui vivaient en marge d'elle.

Aussi l'histoire de la « trinité viennoise » (Arnold Schœnberg - Alban Berg - Anton von Webern) est-elle, sur le plan social, celle de l'indignation que suscitérent les œuvres de ces artistes. La 1re audition des Lieder, Opus 1, 2 et 3

d'Arnold Schönberg, en 1898, choqua le public ; « et, dès lors, commentait plaisamment Schönberg, le scandale n'a jamais cessé ». Quelques semaines avant celui du « Sacre du printemps », un autre scandale, presque aussi célèbre, marqua la création des « Cartes postales », Opus 4 (mars 1913) d'Alban Berg. Rétrospectivement, nous nous demandons aujourd'hui comment il se fait que Schönberg, poussé par la nécessité, ait participé à des concours de composition sans en obtenir le prix, que, 5 ans avant l'« Anschluß », il ait dû s'expatrier (ce qui en dit long sur l'ambiance de sa ville natale), que Berg soit mort pauvre et Webern inconnu. La faute en incombe à une critique aussi aveugle que celle qui avait formulé, un siècle plus tôt, sur Beethoven et Schubert, d'étranges jugements.

À travers l'œuvre de ces 3 Maîtres, l'École de Vienne fut le berceau de la musique atonale et du dodécaphonisme sériel ; elle a également remis en honneur l'esprit d'analyse, que les préoccupations littéraires post-Romantiques avaient laissées se perdre. La polémique qui opposa Hans Pfitzner (1869-1949) à Berg en est un exemple. Le 1er, commentant la « Rêverie » de Robert Schumann, concluait qu'une telle page décourageait l'analyste et que celui-ci en était réduit à s'écrier : « Que c'est beau ! ». Dans sa réponse, restée fameuse, Berg démontre que le fait musical a une existence concrète et que la beauté dont il est porteur peut être éclairée par l'analyse. Cet esprit d'investigation et de réflexion est dû à la rigueur de l'enseignement de Schönberg, que l'aîné des Viennois prodigua dès le début du XXe siècle, et particulièrement, de 1917 à 1920, lorsque son séminaire de composition musicale réunissait de nombreux élèves, qu'il entourait d'une vigilance despotique.

À la même époque fut fondé le « Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen » (Association d'exécutions privées d'œuvres musicales), dont le règlement prévoyait qu'une même œuvre « serait entendue plusieurs fois » et que le programme des concerts, « afin d'assurer l'assiduité des auditeurs, ne serait pas annoncé ». Rédigé par Berg, en 1919, le manifeste de l'Association proclamait la nécessité de « soustraire les concerts à l'influence corruptrice de la musique officielle » et exigeait de la part du créateur « l'indifférence envers toute forme d'échec ou de succès ». Il a souvent été comparé au « Coq et l'Arlequin », qui lui est légèrement antérieur. Il n'en a pas la verve insolente ; mais une vision plus noble de l'art musical s'y exprime. On ne s'étonne pas que l'importance historique des œuvres que ce manifeste recouvre ait été capitale. Après une période d'effacement, qui a coïncidé avec les succès du Nazisme (les thuriféraires de l'ordre nouveau considéraient la musique non tonale comme une manifestation de dégénérescence culturelle due à l'influence juive), un très vif courant d'intérêt s'est manifesté dans tout l'Occident, immédiatement après la guerre, envers l'École de Vienne. En France, notamment, les écrits théoriques de René Leibowitz et de Pierre Boulez ont étudié l'apport des Maîtres viennois ; les œuvres de Pierre Boulez, de Jean Barraqué, de Michel Philippot ont prolongé leurs acquisitions.

AB 119 : Le Philharmonique de Vienne

Historique

L'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne (« Wiener Philharmoniker ») est considéré comme l'un des plus prestigieux au monde. Il est un symbole de la culture et de l'histoire viennoises. Le « son » de l'Orchestre est raffiné, soyeux et coloré avec une tendance à la prédominance des sonorités graves, une sonorité unique et facilement discernable.

Il est fondé en 1842 et, après des débuts difficiles, devient l'un des meilleurs orchestres de Vienne. Les chefs les plus illustres vont en perfectionner l'excellence. L'Orchestre a compté dans son effectif des membres prestigieux comme Hans Richter, Arthur Nikisch, Franz Schmidt, Willi Boskovsky. Ses membres sont recrutés exclusivement parmi ceux de l'Orchestre de l'Opéra d'État de Vienne.

La résidence principale de l'Orchestre est le « Musikverein », une salle de concert rectangulaire magnifique, aux tons ivoires et dorés et à l'acoustique exceptionnelle. Il se produit chaque été au Festival de Salzbourg. Depuis 1941, l'Orchestre donne chaque 1er janvier un concert consacré à la musique de la famille Strauß : le célèbre « Concert du Nouvel An » .

L'origine de l'Orchestre remonte à 1842, lorsque Otto Nicolai forme ce qui s'appelait alors l'Académie philharmonique. C'était un Orchestre totalement indépendant qui prenait ses décisions à partir d'un vote démocratique de tous ses membres : ce sont ces mêmes principes qui régissent l'Orchestre encore aujourd'hui.

Quand Nicolai quitte Vienne en 1847, l'Orchestre est quasiment démantelé et peu actif jusqu'en 1860, quand Carl Eckert prend la direction. Il donne une série de 4 concerts d'abonnement et, depuis lors, l'Orchestre n'a cessé de jouer. Suivront Felix Otto Dessoff, de 1860 à 1875, et Wilhelm Jahn, en 1882 et 1883. Le Philharmonique de Vienne va alors attirer nombre de chefs célèbres et acclamés.

Le Philharmonique de Vienne n'a pas de chef permanent. Tous les ans, un artiste est choisi pour diriger tous les concerts de la saison au « Musikverein » de Vienne. Ces chefs sont nommés « Abonnementdirigenten » tout simplement parce que les concerts qu'ils doivent diriger sont inclus dans l'abonnement au « Musikverein » . Certains de ces engagements sont renouvelés pendant de nombreuses années, d'autres se terminent au bout de peu de temps.

De 1875 à 1898 (excepté lors de la saison 1882-1883 où il était en conflit avec le comité orchestral) , Hans Richter est chef principal.

Sous sa direction l'Orchestre va être reconnu, jouer les grands compositeurs contemporains, Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt, Giuseppe Verdi, créer des œuvres importantes comme les Variations sur un thème de Haydn (1873) , les 2e et 3e Symphonies (1877-1883) et l'Ouverture tragique (1880) de Johannes Brahms, les 3e (1877) , 4e (1888) , 6e (1899) et 8e (1892) Symphonies d'Anton Bruckner.

Gustav Mahler occupe le poste de 1898 à 1901 et c'est avec lui que l'Orchestre joue pour la 1re fois à l'étranger lors de l'Exposition universelle de 1900, à Paris.

Les chefs suivants seront Josef Hellmesberger, de 1901 à 1903, Felix Weingartner, de 1908 à 1927, Wilhelm Fürtwängler, de 1927 à 1930, Clemens Krauß de, 1929 à 1933.

Avec l' « Anschluß » de 1938, les autorités allemandes voulurent supprimer définitivement l'Orchestre et évidemment exclure les instrumentistes juifs de l'orchestre : il faudra l'intervention de Wilhelm Fürtwängler pour sauver l'existence de l'Orchestre et pour que les demi-Juifs puissent continuer à jouer dans l'Orchestre.

Dans le même temps, le Philharmonique travaille avec d'autres chefs, au Festival de Salzbourg, pour des enregistrements ou des occasions particulières. Avec l'élargissement de ses activités, l'Orchestre décide d'abandonner ce système en 1933. Depuis, seuls des chefs invités sont engagés pour chaque concert, tant à Vienne que dans les autres lieux.

Depuis 1933, l'Orchestre n'a donc plus de chef permanent mais des chefs invités, parmi les plus grands et les plus réputés :

Bruno Walter, de 1933 à 1938.

Karl Böhm, de 1954 à 1956 et de 1971 à 1981.

Herbert von Karajan, de 1956 à 1964.

Claudio Abbado, de 1971 à 1982.

Lorin Maazel, de 1982 à 1987.

La liste des chefs invités est longue et prestigieuse : Richard Strauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, John Barbirolli, Josef Krips, Willi Boskovsky, Hermann Scherchen, Georg Solti, Erich Kleiber, James Levine, Leonard Bernstein, Pierre Boulez, Carlos Kleiber, Bernard Haitink, Zubin Mehta, Simon Rattle, Mariss Jansons, Valery Gergiev, Seiji Ozawa, Riccardo Muti, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Georges Prêtre, Charles Mackerras, Daniele Gatti, Christian Thielemann, Ingo Metzmacher, Philippe Jordan, Franz Welser-Möst, Daniel Barenboim, Markus Stenz, Daniel Harding, Paavo Järvi.

Parmi les chefs illustres qui l'ont dirigé à d'autres titres, se détachent Arturo Toscanini, de 1933 à 1937, et à nouveau Wilhelm Furtwängler, de 1933 à 1945, puis, après la Seconde Guerre mondiale, de 1947 à sa mort en 1954.

Les noms de 3 de ces chefs sont plus particulièrement associés à la période d'après-guerre : Herbert von Karajan et Karl Böhm, qui furent nommés chefs honoraires, et Leonard Bernstein, distingué en qualité de membre honoraire de l'Orchestre .

La personnalité de Wilhelm Furtwängler marqua aussi beaucoup l'Orchestre. Les musiciens se plaignirent toujours que Furtwängler donnait la priorité à l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et pas au leur. Néanmoins, Furtwängler enregistra certains de ses concerts les plus extraordinaires avec l'Orchestre de Vienne comme l' « Eroica » (la 3e Symphonie de Beethoven) , daté de décembre 1944, qualifié de « la plus grande interprétation de tous les temps de la plus grande Symphonie de tous les temps » dans le « Guide de la Musique Classique, Diapason » (éditions Robert Laffont) ; la 8e Symphonie de Bruckner de 1944 qui impressionna fortement le chef Arturo Toscanini ; les 2 légendaires concerts de janvier 1945 soit la Symphonie en ré mineur de César Franck et la 2e Symphonie de Johannes Brahms juste avant que Furtwängler ne s'enfuit en Suisse, les Nazis voulant l'arrêter pour le tuer. Après la guerre, il dirigea souvent l'Orchestre à Vienne ; entre autres, le 5e des Concertos Brandebourgeois de Jean-Sébastien Bach, en 1950, dans le cadre des célébrations pour le 200e anniversaire de la mort du compositeur. Il dirigea aussi l'Orchestre au Festival de Salzbourg : en 1950, l'Opéra « Fidelio » de Beethoven avec, entre autres, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf et

Kirsten Flagstad ; en 1951, l' « Otello » de Giuseppe Verdi qui fut considéré comme le principal événement du Festival cette année-là ; et, en 1953 et 1954, des « Don Giovanni » de Mozart légendaires (dont une version filmée) avec, entre autres, les solistes Cesare Siepi, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Anton Dermota, Otto Edelmann et Elisabeth Grümmer.

Ses membres sont recrutés exclusivement parmi ceux de l'Orchestre de l'Opéra d'État de Vienne, ce qui permet non seulement d'assurer la qualité artistique de l'ensemble, mais aussi de garantir l'équilibre financier de la formation (puisque c'est l'Opéra qui prend, par exemple, en charge les retraites) et d'augmenter les revenus des musiciens concernés, qui se partagent les recettes des concerts et des enregistrements.

Le processus d'intégration est très long : les musiciens doivent d'abord prouver leurs capacités en jouant pour l'Opéra et le Ballet durant un minimum de 3 ans. Ce n'est qu'ensuite qu'ils peuvent présenter leur candidature auprès du Conseil d'administration du « Wiener Philharmoniker » .

L'Orchestre a un fonctionnement autogéré qui n'exclut cependant pas une tendance au conservatisme (il n'a accepté des femmes dans ses rangs qu'en 1997) et une tendance à rechigner à s'ouvrir aux instrumentistes étrangers, particulièrement les non-continentaux.

Auprès des chefs d'orchestre, il est réputé pour son caractère rétif mais aussi son excellence technique et artistique.

Le son caractéristique de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne peut être attribué d'une part à l'utilisation d'instruments et d'un style de jeu fondamentalement différents de ceux des autres grands orchestres.

La clarinette a un système de doigté spécial.

Le basson a une anche et un doigté spécial.

La trompette a un système de valves rotatives et une dimension moindre.

Le trombone et le tuba ont un doigté et un système de valves différents.

Les timbales utilisent des peaux de chèvre naturelles au lieu de peaux synthétiques.

Les contrebasses retrouvent le placement traditionnel en ligne derrière les cuivres.

Le hautbois viennois a une perce, une taille, une anche et un système de doigté spéciaux. Il est très différent du « hautbois français » utilisé généralement.

Le cor viennois est une variante du cor naturel avec plusieurs « tons » (tubes de différentes longueurs) reliés afin de pouvoir jouer l'échelle chromatique. De perce plus fine mais plus longue, il est doté d'un système à palettes qui a l'avantage de produire des attaques plus souples et des notes liées plus coulées. En outre, le cor viennois est fabriqué dans un alliage plus résistant que le cor d'harmonie traditionnel (double cor en fa / si bémol) .

Ces instruments et leur couleur sonore caractéristique ont fait l'objet d'une vaste étude scientifique menée par le Professeur Gregor Widholm de l'Institut pour la culture du son viennois à l'Académie de musique et des arts de la scène.

Bien que l'Orchestre soit largement reconnu comme l'un des meilleurs au monde, depuis les années 1990, il fait l'objet de critiques de la part de groupes féministes parce que, jusqu'en 1997, il n'admettait pas de femmes dans ses rangs en qualité de membre à part entière. Seules quelques femmes avaient pu jouer en supplémentaires.

En 1997, une Ire femme, Anna Lelkes, harpiste, devient membre après avoir joué avec l'Orchestre hors statut pendant quelque 20 ans. Après le départ à la retraite de mademoiselle Lelke, une autre harpiste Charlotte Balzereit devient à son tour la seule femme membre de l'Orchestre.

Aucune femme n'avait, non plus, jamais dirigé l'Orchestre. En janvier 2005, la chef d'orchestre australienne Simone Young devient la Ire femme de l'histoire à diriger le Philharmonique de Vienne.

Par ailleurs, historiquement, l'Orchestre n'acceptait pas non plus de membres d'ethnies visiblement différentes. Un violoniste demi-asiatique n'en devient membre qu'en 2001. Des responsables de l'Orchestre font l'objet de critiques pour avoir soutenu que le maintien de son uniformité ethnique, blanche, européenne, était nécessaire pour préserver la haute qualité d'exécution.

En 1970, Otto Straßer, ancien président de la Philharmonie de Vienne, écrit dans ses mémoires :

« Je tiens pour incorrect qu'aujourd'hui les candidats jouent derrière paravent, un arrangement apporté après la Seconde Guerre mondiale pour assurer des jugements objectifs. J'ai continuellement combattu cette mesure, en particulier à partir de ma nomination à la fonction de président du Philharmonique, parce que je suis convaincu que l'artiste fait aussi partie de la personne, que l'on doit non seulement entendre mais également voir, afin de juger sa personnalité entière. Une situation grotesque que même mon départ n'a pas été en mesure de faire changer. Après qu'un candidat se fut qualifié comme étant le meilleur, lorsque le paravent fut retiré, se tenait là un Japonais, devant le jury médusé. Il ne fut par conséquent pas engagé, sa physionomie n'étant pas adaptée à la Pizzicato Polka du Concert du Nouvel An. »

La Ire flûte du Philharmonique de Vienne déclarait lors d'une interview pour une station de radio en 1996 :

« Depuis le début, nous avons parlé des qualités viennoises particulières, de la manière dont la musique se fait ici. La façon dont nous faisons de la musique ici n'est pas liée seulement à une capacité technique, mais aussi avec quelque chose qui a beaucoup à voir avec l'âme. L'âme ne se sépare pas des racines culturelles que nous avons ici en Europe centrale. Elle n'admet pas non plus d'être séparée du genre. Ainsi, si l'on pense que le monde devrait fonctionner avec des quotas, il est naturel d'être irrité par le fait que nous soyons un groupe de musiciens mâles blancs, qui joue exclusivement de la musique de compositeurs mâles blancs. C'est une irritation d'ordre raciste et sexiste. Je crois que cela peut se poser ainsi. Si l'on établit un égalitarisme superficiel, on perdra quelque chose d'essentiel. Toutefois, je suis convaincu que cela vaut la peine d'accepter cette irritation raciste et sexiste, parce que quelque chose produit par une

compréhension superficielle des droits de l'homme ne pourrait avoir les mêmes standards. »

En 2003, un membre de l'Orchestre déclarait dans une interview pour un magazine :

« 3 femmes c'est déjà trop. Lorsque nous en aurons 20 % , l'Orchestre sera ruiné. Nous avons fait une grosse erreur, et nous le regretterons amèrement. »

En 2007, l'Orchestre compte dans ses rangs 4 femmes, soit 2 % de l'effectif : une harpiste, une violoniste, une altiste et une violoncelliste. Un conflit subsiste concernant la non titularisation d'une violoniste.

Helene Kenyeri et Konstanze Brosch, qui avaient intégré le pupitre de hautbois de l'Orchestre de l'Opéra d'État de Vienne en janvier 2007, avaient de fortes chances d'être admises rapidement aux 2 postes vacants ou en passe de l'être de Walter Lehmayr et Günter Lorenz au Philharmonique dans la mesure où la classe de hautbois du Conservatoire ne comptait que 3 garçons pour 17 filles et que le hautbois viennois n'est enseigné nulle part ailleurs. Tel ne fut pas le cas pour Helene Kenyeri qui fut licenciée en mars 2008.

...

The Vienna Philharmonic (VPO) (« Wiener Philharmoniker ») , founded in 1842, is an orchestra, regularly considered one of the finest in the world.

The Vienna Philharmonic is based in the « Musikverein » , in Vienna. The members of the Orchestra are chosen from the Orchestra of the Vienna State Opera. This process is a long one, with each musician having to prove his or her capability for a minimum of 3 years' playing for the Opera and ballet. Once this is achieved, the musician can then ask the board of the Vienna Philharmonic to consider an application for a position in the Orchestra.

Until the 1830's, orchestral performance in Vienna was done by « ad hoc » Orchestras, consisting of professional and (often) amateur musicians brought together for specific performances. In 1833, Franz Lachner formed the forerunner of the Vienna Philharmonic, the « Künstlerverein » - an Orchestra of professional musicians from the Vienna Court Opera (« Wiener Hofoper » , now, the Vienna State Opera) ; it gave 4 concerts, each including a Beethoven Symphony. The Vienna Philharmonic, itself, arose 9 years later, in 1842, hatched by « a group who met regularly at the inn “ Zum Amor ” including the poet Nikolaus Lenau ; newspaper editor August Schmidt ; critic Alfred Becker ; violinist Karl Holz ; Count Laurencin ; and Otto Nicolai » (the composer, also the principal conductor of a standing Orchestra at a Viennese theatre) . Mosco Carner wrote in « The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians » that « Nicolai was the least enthusiastic about the idea, and had to be persuaded by the others ; he conducted the 1st concert, on 28 March 1842 » . The Orchestra was fully independent, consisted of members of the « Hofoper » Orchestra, and made all of its decisions by a democratic vote of its members ; it had its day-to-day management handled by a democratically elected body, the administrative committee. The Orchestra still follows these principles, today.

Nicolai and the Orchestra gave only 11 concerts in the ensuing 5 years, and when Nicolai left Vienna in 1847, the Orchestra nearly folded (« New Grove » notes the disruption caused by the Revolution of 1848 as a hindrance) .

Between 1854 and 1857, Karl Eckert, the 1st permanent conductor of the Vienna Court Opera (« Wiener Hofoper », now, the Vienna State Opera), led the associated Vienna Philharmonic in a few concerts. In 1857, Eckert was made Director of the « Hofoper » (the 1st musician to have been given the post); in 1860, he conducted 4 subscription concerts of the Vienna Philharmonic. Since that time, writes Vienna Philharmonic violinist and president Clemens Hellsberg, « the “ Philharmonic Concerts ” have been staged without interruption » .

In 1860, the Orchestra elected Otto Dessoff to be permanent conductor. According to Max Kalbeck, the Vienna-based music-critic, newspaper-editor, and biographer, the fame and excellence of the Vienna Philharmonic resulted from Dessoff's « energy and sense of purpose ». Clemens Hellsberg gives specifics, writing that during the Dessoff years, the Vienna Philharmonic's « repertoire was consistently enlarged, important organizational principles (music archives, rules of procedure) were introduced and the Orchestra moved to its 3rd new home (in 1870), the newly built “ Goldener Saal ” in the “ Musikvereinhaus ” in Vienna (in which it still performs), which has proved to be the ideal venue, with its acoustical characteristics influencing the Orchestra's style and sound ». After 15 years, in 1875, Dessoff was « pushed-out of his position in Vienna through intrigue », and he left Vienna to become conductor (« Hofkapellmeister ») of the « Badische Staatskapelle » in Karlsruhe, Germany. In Karlsruhe, the next year, he fulfilled the request of his friend Johannes Brahms to conduct the 1st performance of his 1st Symphony; in 1873, Brahms had conducted the premiere of his « Variations on a Theme by Haydn » with Dessoff's Vienna Philharmonic.

In 1875, the Orchestra chose Hans Richter to take Dessoff's place as subscription conductor. He remained until 1898, except for the season 1882-1883 when he was in dispute with the orchestral committee (during this hiatus, Wilhelm Jahn of the Vienna Court Opera served as subscription conductor). Richter led the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra in the world-premieres of Brahms's 2nd Symphony, in 1877; « Tragic » Overture, in 1880; and 3rd Symphony, in 1883; the Violin Concerto of Tchaïkovsky, in 1881; and the 8th Symphony of Anton Bruckner, in 1892. It was Richter who, in 1881, appointed Arnold Rosé as Concert Master, who was to become Gustav Mahler's brother-in-law and was Concert Master until the « Anschluß », in 1938. In order to be eligible for a pension, Richter intended to remain in his position for 25 years (until 1900), and might have done so, given that the Orchestra unanimously re-elected him in May 1898. But he resigned on September 22, citing health reasons, although biographer Christopher Fifield argues that the real reasons were that he wanted to tour, and that « he was uneasy as claque in the audience formed in favour of Gustav Mahler » (who was triumphing as director of the « Hofoper »). Richter recommended Mahler or Ferdinand Löwe to the Orchestra as his replacement.

In 1898, on September 24, the Orchestra elected Gustav Mahler. (On 30 May 1899, pro-Mahler and pro-Richter factions had a « heated committee meeting »; matters were finally resolved in August when Richter wrote to his supporters « gently refusing their offer ».) Under Mahler's baton, the Vienna Philharmonic played abroad for the 1st time at the 1900 Paris World Exposition. While Mahler had strong supporters in the Orchestra, he faced dissension from other orchestral members (an unreconstructed pro-Richter faction plus an anti-Semitic one, according to Jens Malte Fischer), criticism of his re-touchings of Beethoven, and arguments with the Orchestra and over new policies he imposed; ultimately, « his working relationship with the Vienna Philharmonic continued to be fueled by resentment and broke down completely in November 1900 ». He resigned on 1 April 1901, like Richter, citing health concerns as a pretext, but continuing to conduct actively elsewhere (he remained director of the associated « Hofoper », until 1907).

In 1901, Joseph Hellmesberger, Junior briefly took his place ; he remained only until 1903.

In 1908, after an interval with no official subscription conductor, the Orchestra elected Felix Weingartner to the post ; he was to remain in it until 1927, and conducted at least 432 concerts with them in total, including the Vienna Orchestra's 1st tour of South America, in 1922. Weingartner's interpretive stance was opposite to Mahler's (Mahler employed marked tempo fluctuations in Beethoven, whereas Weingartner decried « tempo rubato conductors ») ; but, like Mahler, he considered himself primarily a composer and, between 1910 and 1923, led the Orchestra in, at least, 1 piece of his own music per season. He was most renowned for his Beethoven : he programmed, at least, 2 Symphonies per season, and complete cycles in 1916-1917 and 1926-1927. It was Weingartner who led the Orchestra's 1st concert devoted to entirely to the music of Johann Strauß, Junior (for the composer's Centennial) , on October 25, 1925.

In 1927, when Weingartner resigned, the Orchestra elected Wilhelm Furtwängler. He resigned at the end of the 1929-1930 season because of increased professional demands in Berlin.

In 1930, the Orchestra chose Clemens Krauß, for the position. At the Salzburg Festival, in the summers of 1929-1933, he led the Orchestra in an annual Strauß, waltz concert, the forerunners of the New Year's Day concerts he was later to institute. Krauß, left in 1933 to become director of the Berlin State Opera (after Erich Kleiber resigned that position to protest Nazi rule) .

Since 1933, the Orchestra has had no single subscription conductor but, according to « New Grove » (volume 19, page 723) , « between 1933 and 1938, Bruno Walter and Wilhelm Furtwängler shared the Philharmonic concerts between them and, during the Nazi period, Furtwängler was the permanent conductor » ; by contrast, the Vienna Philharmonic's website history says, « Furtwängler was in actuality the main conductor of the Orchestra, from 1933 to 1945, and, again, from 1947 to 1954 » . In support of « New Grove » 's assertion of Walter's role, it might be noted that he made Vienna his home, from 1933 until 1938 (after being driven from Germany by the 3rd « Reich ») , was Artistic Director of the Vienna State Opera, from 1936 until 1938, and conducted the Vienna Philharmonic frequently, making a number of major recordings with the Orchestra (including Richard Wagner's « Die Walküre » Act I and parts of Act 2, the 1st recordings of Mahler's « Das Lied von der Erde » and of his 9th Symphony, and numerous Symphonic recordings) and taking the Orchestra on tour to England and France, in 1935. In support of the Vienna Philharmonic website, Otto Straßer (who played in the Orchestra, from 1922 until 1967, and was the VPO chairman who procured Furtwängler's War-time services) said, Furtwängler « influenced us so much that we became the true “ Furtwängler Orchestra ” » .

Among other conductors to work with the Orchestra in the mid- 1930's before the « Anschluß » were Arturo Toscanini, Felix Weingartner, Hans Knappertsbusch, Otto Klemperer, Adrian Boult, Victor de Sabata and George Szell. Bruno Walter conducted the last concert before the « Anschluß » , on February 20, 1938, featuring the world-premiere of Egon Wellesz's « Prosperos Beschwörungen » and Anton Bruckner's 4th Symphony (« Romantic ») .

After the « Anschluß » and during World War II, the roster included Wilhelm Furtwängler, Clemens Krauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Willem Mengelberg, and Karl Böhm. The Orchestra's history, during this period, has been a topic of ongoing discussion and research, including a large amount commissioned by the Orchestra.

In 1946, when these conductors were undergoing denazification (successfully in the case of Furtwängler, unsuccessfully in the case of Mengelberg) , the Orchestra was led primarily by conductors untainted by Nazi association, including Josef Krips, Erich Leinsdorf, Volkmar Andreae, Paul Paray, and Charles Munch. An exception was Herbert von Karajan, who made his debut with the Orchestra with 2 concerts in January, but was unable to conduct a 3rd scheduled concert when occupying authorities required him to undergo denazification (his tribunal in Vienna was in February, 1947) . After clearance, he resumed conducting in late 1947 and developed a significant association with the Orchestra.

In 1947, Bruno Walter re-united with the Orchestra to conduct it when it appeared at the 1st Edinburgh Festival ; one work they performed was Mahler's « Das Lied von der Erde » .

In the post-War era, scores of the world's best-known conductors have led the Orchestra. Among them, were not only Walter, Furtwängler, Knappertsbusch, Krauß, Szell, Klemperer, and Krips, but also John Barbirolli, Carlo Maria Giulini, Erich Kleiber, James Levine, Zubin Mehta, Fritz Reiner, Georg Solti, Claudio Abbado, Riccardo Muti, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Lorin Maazel, Daniel Barenboim, and Franz Welser-Möst. The Orchestra made their first U.S. tour in 1956, under the batons of Carl Schuricht and André Cluytens. 3 conductors were given honorific titles by the Orchestra, in the later-20th century : Herbert von Karajan and Karl Böhm, who were made Honorary Conductors, and Leonard Bernstein, who was made an Honorary Member of the Orchestra. Pierre Boulez, who has conducted the Orchestra often, was made an Honorary Member in 2007. Another significant relationship was with the famously reclusive conductor Carlos Kleiber, who appeared with the Orchestra, 1st in 1974 and last in 1994, his longest association with any ensemble, even if it included only 30 appearances ; Clemens Hellsberg wrote of the « contrast between those dry numbers and the defining experience which each encounter with this brilliant interpreter represented » . Finally, István Kertész' Gramophone recordings with the Vienna Philharmonic, during the 1960's and the 1970's, represent a highlight in the Orchestra's history.

On May 7, 2000, the Orchestra performed Beethoven's 9th Symphony at the site of the concentration camp at Mauthausen, Austria, in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of its liberation. Simon Rattle conducted, and soloists were Ruth Ziesak, Angelika Kirchschrager, Vinson Cole, and Thomas Quasthoff ; all artists and the Orchestra performed without fee and without applause at the end. The Symphony was preceded by recitation of the Kaddish, the prayer of mourning, by Paul Chaim Eisenberg, the Chief Rabbi of Austria, and the funeral prayer « El male rachamim » sung by Shmuel Barzilai, the chief cantor of the « Israelitische Kulturgemeinde Wien » (Viennese Israelite Community) , accompanied by members of the Orchestra and the « Wiener Singverein » ; the orchestral arrangement was by Erich Schagerl, a violinist in the Orchestra.

In 2005, the Orchestra was named Goodwill Ambassador of the World Health Organisation. In 2013, Clemens Hellsberg received the Marietta and Friedrich Torberg Medal from the « Israelitische Kulturgemeinde Wien » (Viennese Israelite Community) .

Each New Year's Day, since 1 January 1941, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra has sponsored the Vienna New Year's Concerts, dedicated to the music of the Strauß family composers and, particularly, that of Johann Strauß II ; the 1st such concert was given on December 31, 1939, by Clemens Krauß, and led subsequent concerts on New Year's Day, from 1941 until 1945. The post-War series of concerts was inaugurated in 1946 by Josef Krips. They were led by

Krauß, then, by Concert Master Willi Boskovsky, from 1955-1979, and, since 1980, have been led by a variety of leading conductors invited by the Orchestra.

In 2006, the Vienna Philharmonic was chosen as Europe's finest in a survey of 7 leading trade publications, 2 radio stations and a daily newspaper. In 2008, an international jury of music-critics polled by « Gramophone » magazine ranked it 3rd in the world (after the Royal « Concertgebouw » Orchestra and the Berlin Philharmonic) .

Subscription ticket demand for the Vienna Philharmonic at their home, the « Musikverein » , is currently listed on the Orchestra's website as being on a waiting-list. The waiting-list for weekday concert subscriptions is 6 years, and 13 years for week-end subscriptions. Casual tickets, however, are available in small numbers and can be bought via links from the official website, to various ticket resellers. It is also possible to book package deals which include transport, hotel accommodation and meals and tickets to concerts.

The Orchestra has been the motive of one of the world's most famous bullion coins : the Vienna Philharmonic coin. The coin is struck in pure gold, 999.9 fine (24 carats) . It is issued every year, in 4 different face values, sizes and weights. It is used as an investment product, although it finishes almost always in the hands of collectors. According to the World Gold Council, this coin was the best-selling gold coin in 1992, 1995 and 1996 world-wide.

In 2006, Austrian Airlines was outfitted with a livery featuring the gold coin and logo of the « Wiener Philharmoniker » . The long-range Airbus A340 aircraft was flown primarily between Vienna and Tokyo for approximately 1 year serving as promotional tool for the Orchestra and the « Philharmoniker » , 24 karat gold coin issued by the Austrian Mint.

The Vienna Philharmonic was already observed to have a characteristic sound by the turn of the last Century. David Hurwitz notes that Bruno Walter told an interviewer on Austrian Radio, in 1960, that hearing the Vienna Philharmonic for the 1st time, in 1897, was for Walter :

« A life-altering impression, because it was this sound of the Orchestra that I have experienced ever since. I have the feeling : this is the way an Orchestra should sound ; the way it should play. I had never heard the beauty, this calmness of the sound, that sort of glissando, the manner of vibrato, the string sound, the blend of woodwinds with the strings, with the brass, the balance of the brass in combination with the percussion contributing together to the overall sonority of the Orchestra. For me, this impression was definitive and, now, I would like to anticipate a point and tell you this : this sound, 1897, is the same today. »

The Vienna Philharmonic's sound has been attributed, in part, to the VPO's instruments and, in part, to its playing styles.

Instruments : At least, a part of the characteristic sound of the Vienna Philharmonic has been attributed to the use of instruments that differ from those used by other major Orchestras :

The Orchestra's standard tuning pitch is $A4 = 443 \text{ Hz}$; the tuning standard for $A4$ is generally considered at a

frequency of 440 Hz.

The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra uses the German-system (Öhler system) clarinet. By comparison, the Böhm-system clarinet is favored in non-German speaking countries.

Likewise, while the Heckel bassoon is now the norm for most Orchestras around the world, in the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, the Heckel bassoon is played almost completely without vibrato.

The rotary-valve trumpet is used but, unlike most other Germanic Orchestras, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra prefers smaller bore rotary trumpets from makers such as Heckel and Lechner.

Like its counterparts elsewhere in Austria, Germany and Russia, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra favors the F bass and B-flat contrabass rotary-valve tuba, whereas the CC piston-valve tuba is preferred in most American and some British Orchestras.

The trombone has a somewhat smaller bore, but this is also true of the trombone used in many German Orchestras.

The timpani have the Schnellar System in which the kettle pushed-up, as opposed to the head being pulled-down. Hans Schnellar was the timpanist in the early- 20th Century, and personally made these drums. They also use goat skin heads as opposed to calf skin or plastic heads.

The double bass retains the traditional theatre-placement in a row behind the brass. The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra uses 4 as well as 5 string double basses, with the bow always being held underhand (German bow) .

The « Wiener » oboe is, along with the Vienna horn, perhaps, the most distinctive member of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra « instrumentarium » . It has a special bore, reed and fingering-system and is very different from the, otherwise, internationally used Conservatoire (French) oboe.

The Vienna horn in F uses a « Pumpenventil » . Unlike the rotary valves used on most other orchestral horns, the « Pumpenventil » contributes to the liquid legato that is one of the trademarks of the Viennese school. The bore of the Vienna horn is also smaller than more modern horns - actually, very close to that of the valveless natural horn. The Vienna horn has remained virtually unchanged since the mid- 19th Century - as a result, it is arguably well-suited to the Classical and Romantic repertoire at the core of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra's programming.

On the other hand, at least 2 instruments or instrument families are like those in other Orchestras. According to the Vienna Philharmonic's website, « the flute is largely the same as the conventional Böhm flute, which is widely-used all over the world. However, it did not replace the wooden flute in Vienna until the 1920's » . Also, the Viennese string sound should not be attributed to unique attributes of the instruments, according to the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, which writes on its website, « There can be no doubt that the Viennese string instruments themselves, unlike the winds, are not of prime importance in producing the Orchestra's unique sound. With a few exceptions, the quality of the instruments of the string section is not particularly outstanding » . To be sure, the instruments are of high-

quality ; the National Bank of Austria currently loans 4 violins made by Antonio Stradivari to the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra.

The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra's instruments and their characteristic tone-colors have been the subject of extensive scientific studies by Gregor Widholm and others at the Institute of Music Acoustics (« Wiener Klangstil » : Viennese Tone Style) at the University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna. The Vienna Philharmonic's website generalizes about its wind and brass instruments in terms of overtones :

« With the exception of the flute and, to some extent, the bassoon, the typical differences in tone of Viennese wind and brass instruments can be described as follows : they are richer in overtones, i.e. , the sound tone is brighter. »

Playing Styles : the Orchestra, in 2004, began offering a summer institute, the International Orchestra Institute Attergau for « Wiener Klangstil » , to instruct other musicians in the Viennese playing style.

Hurwitz notes that the 1960 Bruno Walter interview indicates that the strings's vibrato (as of 1960) was audibly like that of 1897, and also quotes music critic Richard Specht, in 1919, writing of « something inimitable in the vibrato and the passionate virtuosity of the violins » of the Vienna Philharmonic.

As for other instruments, using early recordings, the musicologist Robert Philip has documented some changes in how Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra players used vibrato during the mid- 20th Century, although he also notes differences between the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra and other Orchestras of the era. As was typical of the era, the pre- 1945 flutes show « very little vibrato » in recordings « until after World War II, even in the long solo in Mahler's “ Das Lied von der Erde ”, the flautist (under Bruno Walter, in 1936) plays almost without vibrato » , except on « a few long notes with a delicate medium-speed vibrato » ; but, « by the late- 1940's, the flautists had adopted a gentle medium-speed vibrato » . The oboes, before the 1940's, show « little or no vibrato » but, by the late- 1940's, « the principal oboist had adopted a very delicate fast vibrato but he uses it very sparingly » . (The « cor anglais » is, he notes, even in the late- 1940's, still played « without any vibrato ») . The bassoonists « show virtually no bassoon vibrato, up to the 1950's » .

The Vienna Philharmonic website states that, today, with the flute, « as in all wind and brass instruments in the Viennese Classics, vibrato is used very sparingly » .

Philipps notes that, by 1931, the Vienna Philharmonic strings were reported to use uniform bowing, which was still unusual in Britain. As for portamento (sliding audibly from one note to another, a prominent effect among pre-War string players) , the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra strings' sliding, in the early 1930's, « sounds more deliberately expressive, and less a matter of routine, than that of British Orchestras. This is partly because of the firmer dynamic shaping of the melodic line, partly because of the warmer and fuller string tone. » Further, he hears « strong evidence of a free approach to portamento » - that is, of « different players shifting at different points » within the same phrase (which, he shows, was standard internationally in pre-War orchestral playing) . He notices a reduced use of portamento in recordings, from 1931 to 1936, but, in 1936, also notes that the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra strings still make « conspicuous » use of portamento in Mozart, where British Orchestras, by this time, were using less of it in

Classical-era composers. Finally, he hears a « trend towards greater subtlety in the use of portamento » post-War, with « only discreet portamento » , in a recording under Herbert von Karajan, in 1949.

The Vienna Philharmonic did not accept women to permanent membership until 1997, far later than comparable Orchestras (of the other Orchestras ranked among the world's Top 5 by « Gramophone » magazine, in 2008, the last to appoint a woman to a permanent position was the Berlin Philharmonic, which did so in 1982) . As late as February 1996, 1st flautist Dieter Flury told « Westdeutscher Rundfunk » that accepting women would be « gambling with the emotional unity (“ emotionelle Geschlossenheit ”) that this organism currently has » . In April 1996, the Orchestra's press secretary wrote that « compensating for the expected leaves of absence » of maternity leave was a problem that they « do not yet see how to get a grip on » in ongoing consultations with the Women's Ministry of the Austrian Republic about women in the Orchestra.

In February, 1997, Austrian Chancellor Viktor Klima told the Orchestra « , at an awards ceremony, that there was “ creative potential in the other-half of humanity and this should be used ” » . The Orchestra, wrote « The New York Times » , was « facing protests during a U.S. Tour » by the National Organization for Women and International Association of Women in Music. Finally, « after being held-up to increasing ridicule even in socially conservative Austria, members of the Orchestra gathered (on February 28, 1997) in an extraordinary meeting on the eve of their departure and agreed to admit a woman, Anna Lelkes, as harpist » . According to Lelkes, who had played as an adjunct with the Orchestra, since 1974, the Orchestra was « terribly frightened by the possibility of demonstrations by American women's rights activists. I believe that this pressure was decisive » ; she adds that the Orchestra voted to accept her not unanimously but « by a large majority » , and that the vote showed generational differences, with retired members voting against her but « quite a few (younger players) got together and even got organized and said this can't go on any longer. The younger generation stood-up for me » .

As of 2013, the Orchestra has 6 female members ; one of them, violinist Albena Danailova became one of the Orchestra's Concert Masters, in 2008, the 1st woman to hold that position. In January 2005, Australian conductor Simone Young became the 1st woman to conduct the Vienna Philharmonic. In late December, 2012, the issue of gender balance remained a concern in Austria : Austrian Radio « ORF » (broadcaster) noted that women still made-up just 6 % of the Orchestra's membership, compared to 14 % in the Berlin Philharmonic, 30 % in the London Symphony Orchestra, and 36 % in the New York Philharmonic ; it acknowledged progress but raised concerns that it was too slow. On the other hand, it quoted Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra president Clemens Hellsberg as saying that the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra now uses completely blind auditions, simply chooses « the best we get » , implying that full-gender equity would take time as older members retire and new ones audition under gender-neutral conditions. (The Vienna Philharmonic will hire no musician over 35 years of age, and has a mandatory retirement age of 65 ; 30 years of service are required to receive a full-pension.)

There have also been claims that the Orchestra has not always accepted members who are visibly members of ethnic minorities. In 1970, Otto Straßer, the former chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, wrote in his memoirs :

« I hold it incorrect that, today, the applicants play behind a screen ; an arrangement that was brought in after the Second World War in order to assure objective judgments. I continuously fought against it because I am convinced that

to the artist also belongs the person, that one must not only hear, but also see, in order to judge him in his entire personality. Even a grotesque situation that played itself out after my retirement was not able to change the situation. An applicant qualified himself as the best, and as the screen was raised, there stood a Japanese before the stunned jury. He was, however, not engaged, because his face did not fit with the “ Pizzicato-Polka ” of the New Year's Concert.
»

In 1996, flautist Flury still expressed the view that :

« The soul does not let itself be separated from the cultural roots that we have here, in central Europe. »

In 2001, a violinist who was half-Asian became a member. The full-list of musicians, men and women, including those playing with the Vienna Philharmonic but are not members of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra association, is accessible on the website of the Vienna Philharmonic.

Subscription conductors (1842-1933)

The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra has never had principal conductors. Each year, they chose an artist to conduct all concerts of the respective season at Vienna's « Musikverein » . These conductors were called « Abonnementdirigenten » (subscription conductors) as they were to conduct all the concerts included in the Philharmonic's subscription at the « Musikverein » . Some of these annual hirings were renewed for many years, others lasted only for a few years. At the same time, the Vienna Philharmonic also worked with other conductors, e.g. , at the Salzburg Festival, for recordings or special occasions. With the widening of the Philharmonic's activities, the Orchestra decided to abandon this system in 1933. From then on, there were only guest-conductors hired for each concert, both in Vienna and elsewhere.

Otto Nicolai (1842-1848) .

Karl Anton Eckert (1854-1857) .

Otto Dessoff (1860-1875) .

Hans Richter (1875-1882) .

Wilhelm Jahn (1882-1883) .

Hans Richter (1883-1898)

Gustav Mahler (1898-1901) .

Joseph Hellmesberger, Junior (1901-1903) .

Felix Weingartner (1908-1927) .

Wilhelm Furtwängler (1927-1930) .

Clemens Krauß (1930-1933) .

The « Golden Era » of Hans Richter

There has been no other conductor in the history of the Vienna Philharmonic who left such a long-lasting impression on the Orchestra as Hans Richter (1843-1916) , the legendary conductor of the premiere of Wagner's tetralogy « The Ring of the Nibelungen » , in Bayreuth. This is not only an appraisal in hindsight, but was also the predominant opinion of the musicians of that time. Richter conducted at least 243 concerts and presided over the organization with a 1 year interruption from 1875-1898.

The artistic partnership between Richter and the Philharmonic was characterized by the fervor of individuals of flesh and blood. The era of Hans Richter, which is referred to as the « Golden Era » was not a time of static complacency, but rather the constant give-and-take between a head-strong group of musicians and an outstanding conductor, who was, in fact, a member of the ensemble as the 1st among equals.

Under Hans Richter, the ensemble attained the status of a world-class Orchestra with an incomparable tradition. Also contributing to this aura were encounters with Wagner, Verdi, Bruckner, Brahms, Liszt and others who performed with the Orchestra as conductors and soloists. During the « Golden Era » of Hans Richter, Brahms' 2nd and 3rd Symphonies ; Anton Bruckner's 4th and 8th Symphonies, as well as the Tchaïkovsky Violin Concerto were premiered.

The Early 20th Century

The Vienna Philharmonic performed abroad for the 1st time at the World Exhibition in Paris, in 1900, with Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) conducting. The Orchestra, officially recognized by the Austrian government as an association in 1908, did not start touring with any regularity until 1922 under Felix von Weingartner, who led the Orchestra as far afield as South America.

The Philharmonic's close relationship to Richard Strauß, of course, is of great historical importance, and represents one of the many high-points in the rich history of the Orchestra.

Further musical highlights were artistic collaborations with Arturo Toscanini, from 1933 to 1937, and Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886-1954) who, despite the departure from the one subscription concert conductor system, was in actuality the main conductor of the Orchestra, from 1933 to 1945, and, again, from 1947 to 1954.

The Modern Era

After World War II, the Orchestra continued the policy it began, in 1933, of working with every conductor of repute. Especially important in the history of the Orchestra, after 1945, were the artistic collaborations with its 2 honorary conductors, Karl Böhm and Herbert von Karajan, and with its honorary member, Leonard Bernstein.

Through its busy concert schedule, recordings on film and record, tours all over the world, and regular appearances at major international Festivals, the Vienna Philharmonic meets all the requirements of the modern multi-media music business while still managing to emphasize its unique individuality, perhaps, best exemplified in the annual New Year's Concert, and in the pivotal role it plays each summer at the Salzburg Festival. Although the Orchestra has moved with the times, it remains faithful to traditional principles by retaining its autonomy and the subscription concert series as the artistic, organizational and financial basis of its work.

The Vienna Philharmonic is not only Austria's most highly-coveted « cultural export », it is also an ambassador of peace, humanity and reconciliation, concepts which are inseparably linked to the message of music itself. In 2005, the Vienna Philharmonic was named Goodwill Ambassador of the World Health Organisation (WHO) . For its artistic achievements, the Orchestra has received numerous awards, gold and platinum disks, national honours, and honorary membership in many cultural institutions.

Le Philharmonique de Vienne sous le National-Socialisme

10 years is a long time, in which a lot can happen. It has been 10 years ago to the month since I 1st tried to embark on research into the National-Socialist history of the Vienna Philharmonic, which culminated this week in revelations about the famous Orchestra's darker secrets.

At the time, I was rebuffed by the management of the Orchestra with a firm « no ». In its defence, the Vienna Philharmonic had made sure that a previous official history by the archivist Clemens Hellberg, from the early 1990's contained a chapter about the Nazi period. But the idea that external researchers could come and root around in their archive was long considered taboo.

In many ways, this attitude was symptomatic of Austrian society at large. For decades, the Austrian public struggled to get its head around the importance of historical research that focused explicitly on the country's National-Socialist past. When allied forces liberated Austria from National-Socialism at the end of the War, the decision had already been taken to remember the « Anschluß » with Nazi Germany, in March 1938, as an occupation rather than a voluntary annexation.

The 2nd Republic successfully fashioned itself in the image of a victim : Austria was to be remembered as the 1st victim of Adolf Hitler's expansion plans. According to the historian Oliver Rathkolb, this had been only one possible interpretation of events in 1945. But the victim thesis was politically and diplomatically useful and soon dominated Austrians' image of themselves. A process of consciously engaging with the past (as it was practised in Germany, at least, on the surface) never really happened in Austria.

The same veil of deliberate ignorance was drawn over the history of the Vienna Philharmonic. This is hardly surprising, you might say, considering that the Orchestra contained an extremely high-percentage of Nazi Party members in 1945 : almost 50 % of the musicians were card-carrying members of the NSDAP, compared with barely 20 % in the Berlin Philharmonic. That most of them were allowed to stay in the Orchestra helps to explain why the fervent Nazi Helmut Wobisch (a member of the SS who had taken part in the 1934 Nazi « Putsch » against the Dollfuss regime) was

voted in as the director and remained in that position until the end of the 1960's. At the very least, it explains the long-lasting resistance to letting people from outside into the archives.

Only during the course of the 1980's did Austria develop a sense of itself as a historical culprit. One by one, the archives opened-up. In 2007, I managed to convince the management of the Orchestra how important it was to become more transparent and, eventually, they took the unprecedented step of commissioning me and 2 other historians to write a detailed history of the Orchestra. Critics of the Orchestra have accused this of being a mere public relation job, rather than a full-on facing-up to the facts. But, in a way, this doesn't make a difference : for the Vienna Philharmonic, and Austrian history, it heralds a new direction.

What moved me most during our research was the story of the 16 musicians who were expelled from the Orchestra because of the Nazis' racist doctrine : 6 of them were murdered in concentration camps, and 2 musicians died in Vienna even before they were deported. Their stories make it clear that there was an anti-Semitic climate in the Orchestra even before the « Anschluß » .

Roger Salander, the grandchild of one of those musicians who emigrated, told my colleague Bernadette Mayrhofer :

« The consensus was that the Jews were somehow always cut-off from the rest. So, it was always “ them ” and “ the others ”. And, then, there were a few who stood somewhere in between, who didn't quite count as anti-Semites. »

After the War, only 2 of the 9 who had emigrated returned to Vienna. But they never rejoined the Philharmonic. Only recently, once the story of the Jewish members of the Orchestra began to be told, did their relatives start to get in touch again - this too is a new chapter for the Orchestra. What practical consequences it will draw from these lessons remains to be seen.

...

The Vienna Philharmonic was, for decades, accused of withholding or suppressing information about its connections in the mid- 20th Century to the Nazi Party. The 1st orchestral representative to discuss the issue was Clemens Hellsberg (also trained as a musicologist) , when he wrote the Orchestra's official sesquicentennial history, « Demokratie der Könige » (Democracy of Kings) . In it, he determined that, at the end of World War II, 47 % of Orchestra members belong to the Nazi Party or affiliates (the total number is now known to be 49 %) that, upon the « Anschluß » , 13 Jewish players were fired, that 6 of them were murdered (the number is now known to be 7) , and « that the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra once gave a concert in an SS barracks » . But more remained to be investigated and made public, and access to relevant material in the Orchestra's archives was highly-restricted. Hellsberg, who became the Orchestra's president in 1997, did not have full-access to the archives until 2000-2001, and the historian Fritz Trümpi reports that, when he began researching the orchestra's 3rd « Reich » activities, in 2003, and requested access, he « was rebuffed by the management of the Orchestra with a firm “ no ”. The idea that external researchers could come and root around in their archive was long considered taboo » . Trümpi was granted access in 2007, but other researchers reported continued exclusion, such as Bernadette Mayrhofer, in 2008 ; the Austrian newspaper « Die Presse » reported in 2008 (in Sebastian Huebel's summary) that « scholars have had difficulties investigating the Vienna

Philharmonic as they were not allowed access to the archives, or sources were delivered reluctantly and with timely delays » .

The 2013 New Year's Day concert evoked critical discussion of the issue in the Austrian press and from Austrian parliamentarian, Harald Walser. Shortly thereafter, Hellsberg commissioned an independent panel of 3 historians (Trümpi, his dissertation adviser Oliver Rathkolb (a professor at the University of Vienna) , and Bernadette Mayrhofer) to fully investigate the Orchestra's 3rd « Reich » activities and (to quote the Orchestra's Facebook feed) , « in the spirit of transparency » , publish the results on the Orchestra's website. The panel was given unrestricted access to the archives. Rathkolb told an interviewer :

« We were able to find new documents in a cellar, which normally contained archived music. It was an Orchestra member who directed us to it. »

On March 10, 2013 (a date chosen to precede March 12, the 75th anniversary of the 3rd « Reich » 's union with Austria, the « Anschluß ») , the panel published its findings in a set of reports posted on the Orchestra's website. Among the panel's findings are :

Before the « Anschluß » , in the mid- 1930's, Rathkolb writes in the introduction to the main webpage :

« 20 % of the members of the Orchestra belonged to the Nazi Party. »

Former Vienna State Opera Secretary-General, Ioan Holender, notes that these members joined-out of conviction, rather than for professional advancement, as Party membership was illegal in Austria, at the time.

By the Orchestra's Centennial, in 1942, Rathkolb writes :

« 60 of the 123 active Vienna Philharmonic orchestral musicians had become members of the Nazi Party. » , that is, 48.8 % .

2 were members of the SS. By contrast, in the other major German-speaking Orchestra, the Berlin Philharmonic, Trümpi found that :

« Barely 20 % » were Party members. For further comparison, Party membership in Austria as a whole was 10 % .

The 13 Jewish members of the Orchestra were expelled upon the « Anschluß » . 6 of them escaped into exile ; the other 7 were killed : 5 in concentration camps, and 2 while still in Vienna, writes Rathkolb, « as a direct result of attempted deportation and persecution » .

Rathkolb writes :

« A total of 9 Orchestra members were driven into exile (including the 6 Jewish members noted above) . The 11 remaining Orchestra members who were married to Jewish women or stigmatized as “ half-Jewish ” lived under the

constant threat of revocation of their “ special permission ”. It was only the intervention of Wilhelm Furtwängler and other individuals which, with 2 exceptions, saved these 11 remaining “ half-Jews ” and “ closely-related ” from dismissal from the Vienna State Opera Orchestra. »

Of the musicians hired to replace the 13 dismissed Jewish members, about half were Nazi Party members, Rathkolb says.

The panel revealed in new detail how the New Year's concerts began during the Nazi era. The 1st concert, given on New Year's Eve, in 1939, was proposed by conductor Clemens Krauß and enthusiastically approved by Nazi Propaganda Minister, Josef Goebbels, because it served the « Reich » 's purposes of « propaganda through entertainment » . (The concert was moved to New Year's Day for the concerts held from 1941 to 1945 ; it was revived in 1947 when it was conducted by Josef Krips, who had not been able to conduct during the War years because he was half-Jewish.) Further, the profits from the 1939 concert were « donated entirely to the National-Socialistic fund-raising campaign “ Kriegswinterhilfswerk ” » . The reports also note that Goebbels privately decided to ignore information about the partial Jewish ancestry of the Strauß family (Johann Strauß I's grandfather was Jewish by birth) partly because « it was not proven » , and partly because he did « not want to undermine the entire German cultural heritage » .

At the War's end, in 1945, the Orchestra expelled 10 of its members for Nazi activity ; 2 were re-hired in ensuing years. One of them, trumpeter Helmut Wobisch, had joined the Nazi Party in 1933 and the SS in 1934, and, during the War, served as a spy for the « Gestapo » . He was re-hired to the Orchestra in 1950, and appointed executive director of the Orchestra, in 1953, remaining in the position until 1967.

The panel determined that it was Wobisch who, in 1966, privately gave a replacement copy of the Orchestra's « Ring of Honour » to Baldur von Schirach after the latter's release from Spandau Prison. As a result of the panel's reports, the Carinthian Summer Festival in Klagenfurt, Austria, cancelled its annual concert in honour of Wobisch (who was co-founder of the Festival) .

The panel details how the Orchestra gave « a great number of honorific awards to Nazi potentates, including Arthur Seyß-Inquart (who was sentenced to death for his crimes against humanity, in 1946) and Baldur von Schirach (who was sentenced to 20 years in Spandau Prison for his) » . The Orchestra also planned internally to give its highest-award (the Nicolai Gold Medal) to Adolf Hitler, in 1942, but there is no evidence that this award was ever given.. (Rathkolb has told the press that Hellsberg « has asked the Orchestra to revoke the Rings of Honour to these people » .)

At its annual meeting on 23 October 2013, the Orchestra voted to revoke all the honours bestowed to Nazi officials ; it took the vote after hearing a presentation by Rathkolb of the panel's findings. Clemens Helmsberg is quoted in « The New York Times » as saying that after Rathkolb's presentation, the Orchestra needed no further discussion before revoking the honours, since « it was such an obvious thing » .

...

In 1938, politics encroached upon the Vienna Philharmonic in the most brutal manner. The National-Socialists dismissed all Jewish artists from the Vienna State Opera and disbanded the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic. It was only the intervention of Wilhelm Furtwängler and other individuals which achieved the nullification of the disbandment order and, with 2 exceptions, saved the « half-Jews » and « closely-related » from dismissal from the Vienna State Opera Orchestra. However, 5 members of the Orchestra perished in concentration camps, despite the intervention of the new Nazi chairman of the Orchestra, who attempted to rescue them from deportation. Another 2 members died in Vienna, as a direct result of attempted deportation and persecution.

A total of 9 Orchestra members were driven into exile. The 11 remaining Orchestra members who were married to Jewish women or stigmatized as « half-Jewish » lived under the constant threat of revocation of their « special permission » .

Yet, also within the Orchestra, as part of the National-Socialist Personnel Organization State Opera (NSBO) , there was an active illegal cell, so that, even before 1938, when the ban of the NSDAP was in effect, 20 % of the members of the Orchestra belonged to the Nazi Party. In 1942, 60 of the 123 active orchestral musicians had become members of the NSDAP.

The Project « Vienna Philharmonic - A Historical Overview of the NS Era »

Since April 2011, Professor Doctor Oliver Rathkolb has collected new material on members of the Vienna Philharmonic who fell victim to the Nazis and / or were forced into exile. This material now appears here on the Orchestra's website. Much of it is derived from primary sources regarding the lives of the 2 murdered members of the Orchestra, of the 5 who died following persecution and / or imprisonment in concentration camps and of the 9 who were driven into exile. The stories of the 11 members of the Orchestra who had Jewish wives or were branded « half-Jews » also receive close study and analysis.

In January 2013, the former chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, Professor Doctor Clemens Hellsberg, commissioned an independent group of historians (Professor Doctor Oliver Rathkolb, Director ; Magistera Bernadette Mayrhofer ; Doctor Fritz Trümpi) to integrate the results of their research and publications, including newly-found documents in the Vienna Philharmonic archives, into the Orchestra's website.

Magistera Bernadette Mayrhofer has written biographical sketches of those members of the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and the Vienna Philharmonic who were either forced into exile by the Nazis or lost their lives as a result of Nazi persecution. As far as the sources so far available have allowed this, these sketches highlight a great number of biographical « facettes » in their quest to do justice to the diversity and complexity of the biographies of the exiled or murdered members of the Philharmonic. Her sketches address both the traumas and the achievements of the 9 exiles.

Doctor Fritz Trümpi provides an overview of the Orchestra's politicization during and after WWI and of how this process developed in the 1st Republic and in the era of Austro-Fascism. Doctor Trümpi deals in detail with the relationship between the Nazi regime and the Vienna Philharmonic's newly-appointed governing body. Newly discovered

sources form the basis for a study of the history of the Orchestra as an association. He interprets the Philharmonic repertoire in political terms and studies the Orchestra's media presence in the Nazi era.

New sources play a similar part in Professor Doctor Oliver Rathkolb's analysis of the marginalization and exclusion of Jewish sponsors and sections of the audience. The 2nd focus in his contribution is on the great number of honorary awards made to Nazi potentates, including Arthur Seyß-Inquart and Baldur von Schirach. The re-awarding, in 1966-1967, of the Vienna Philharmonic's Honorary Ring to Baldur von Schirach shortly after his release from Spandau (the 1st award had been made in 1942) will be discussed in this context and the veil of mystery that surrounds this incident will be, at least, partly lifted. Another focus of Rathkolb's work is the genesis of the New Year's Concerts. A chapter on the goals and the implementation of denazification focuses on continuities, both in regard to personnel and content. In both cases, these continuities stretch-back to before the Nazi era. Out of the 123 members of the association of the Vienna Philharmonic, 60 were either members of the NSDAP or candidates for membership, 2 were members of the SS. After 1945, 4 musicians were dismissed immediately and 6 were pensioned-off. Of this group, 2 were later re-admitted to the State Opera Orchestra and the Vienna Philharmonic.

Fritz Trümpi and Bernadette Mayrhofer. « Orchestrierte Vertreibung. Unerwünschte Wiener Philharmoniker - Verfolgung, Ermordung und Exil »

The presentation of the book « Orchestrierte Vertreibung - Unerwünschte Wiener Philharmoniker - Verfolgung, Ermordung und Exil » (Orchestrated Displacement - Unwanted Members of the Vienna Philharmonic - Persecution, Murder and Exile) , which took place on November 6, 2014, in the Jewish Museum of Vienna was accompanied by a memorial concert in which compositions by displaced members of the Vienna Philharmonic were played. Among these, members of the Vienna Philharmonic performed the premiere of the Serenade by the violinist Josef Geringer.

Chairman Andreas Großbauer declared at the presentation that :

With this volume, Mrs. Mayrhofer and Mr. Trümpi have made an important contribution to the ongoing documentation of the darkest chapter of the Orchestra's history. I take a great personal interest in this issue and we are grateful for the work which has been done. We deeply regret the manner in which our colleagues, at that time, were persecuted. In the future, the Vienna Philharmonic will continue to take steps to further document its past. We place high-value on transparency of the historical and scholarly documentation. »

The Politicization Process of the Vienna Philharmonic from World War I until 1945

Surge in Politicization during World War I

(Fritz Trümpi)

During the First World War, the Orchestra saw itself confronted for the 1st time with diverse politically motivated attempts at exploitation, some of which it tried to resist, others which it supported and promoted.

...

The First World War represented a turning-point in the politicization process of the Vienna Philharmonic. The term « politicization » will be used for the reason that the systematic inscription of the Orchestra within a political context should not be understood as a passive « political instrumentalization » , but rather the result of a virulent interchange between political authorities and the Orchestra, which led to the active acceptance of a politically-oriented operational thinking on the part of the Vienna Philharmonic.

During the First World War, the Orchestra saw itself confronted for the 1st time with diverse, politically motivated attempts at exploitation, some of which it tried to resist, others which it supported and promoted. At 1st, the Orchestra Concert Program, from October 3, 1914, attempted to avoid any concrete political appropriation. This was not motivated by political or ideological opposition however, as without a doubt the majority of the Orchestra members belonged to the political spectrum of pro-War German nationalism. The attitude of opposition toward individual measures of governmental and military authorities was due to economic restrictions and personnel cuts affecting the organization of concerts. In general, the First World War contributed to an expansion of the Orchestra's concert activities.

Not even 2 months after the German-Austrian War mobilization had passed, the War Relief Office of the Imperial Ministry of War presented a concert « for the benefit of soldiers on the battlefield and the widows and orphans of the fallen » , for which the Vienna Philharmonic assented to « perform without compensation » . (1) This was followed by approximately 30 such concerts motivated by the politics of War, in the course of the next 4 years. (2) This fact alone places the concert practice of the Vienna Philharmonic in an explicitly political context.

The Orchestra reacted to the call of governmental and military authorities to perform « charity » events with skepticism and, in some cases, emphatic refusal. In April 1915, one Orchestra member suggested that :

« In the event of further invitations for charity events, the committee should deny such requests. » (3)

In January 1916, the committee followed this advice and answered requests for political and War-related events, as far as possible in the negative. Affected by this decision were, among others, the celebration of homage on the occasion of the birthday of the German Emperor and Philharmonic participation in a performance of Franz-Josef Haydn's « Creation » for the benefit of the Bulgarian Red Cross. In both cases, the Orchestra decided not to participate, apparently without suffering any consequences. The Orchestra cited the administration of the Opera House, which refused to give permission because of the daily Opera performances. (4)

The negative attitude regarding such new types of concerts was apparently due primarily to the considerable increase in time and effort, on the part of active orchestra members - and this on top of the fact that the Orchestra was already operating with fewer personnel, since a significant number of musicians had been drafted into military service. In September 1914, soon after the beginning of the War, « 26 members of the association were activated at the same time » , (5) almost a quarter of the entire membership. At 1st, the committee appeared to be unperturbed. There were « no qualms about being able to find enough musicians through the use of substitutes » . (6) 1 year later,

disillusionment had begun to set in. It was noted in a meeting of the administrative committee that :

« 37 members of the Orchestra have entered military service and positions are at the current time unfilled. » (7)

The financial pressure upon the Orchestra increased, due to the benefit concerts performed without compensation and, also, the signing of War bonds and charitable contributions. The question was soon raised if the Orchestra could continue to pay compensation to the members in the military for concerts, in which they had not participated. At the business meeting of September 4, 1915, a decision was made against the musicians in the military. Last year's practice « regarding the colleagues in the military is, at the current time, no longer possible. The share of earnings can only be allotted to those who are in a position to play the concerts » . This stipulation was moderated by the annotation that « a final decision cannot be made at the present time, and the shares for those not performing will be suspended » . (8) Economic considerations clashed with a sense of responsibility towards colleagues and, until the end of the War, disagreement about how earnings should be dispersed persisted within the Orchestra.

Yet, despite the Orchestra's antagonistic attitude towards the forced participation in such charity and War concerts, which was primarily a reaction to the profound changes within the music business and, as such, a turning-point in Philharmonic concert practice, the interlacing of culture and politics served as a catalyst for the Vienna Philharmonic by causing an abrupt increase in concert activity. Even in the 1st season of the War, between October 1914 and May 1915, the Vienna Philharmonic participated in 11 War-related concerts and, thus, performed in this capacity more often than in their own subscription concerts. Despite the increased number of concerts, due to the War-related concerts, the Orchestra decided to expand its concert activity even more during the course of the War. The committee introduced the practice of holding a public dress rehearsal of the subscription concerts effective December 1, 1917, (9) which effectively doubled the number of these concerts. With this decision, the Orchestra departed somewhat from the previous concept of the exclusivity of the Philharmonic concerts. The double performances of the subscription concerts enhanced the status of the traditional concert activities « vis-à-vis » the benefit concerts, which had dominated the concert calendar for the 3 previous years.

Returning to the resistance of the Orchestra toward the War-related charity concerts, it should be noted that this should, in no way, be interpreted as opposition to German-Austrian War policies. With few exceptions, the enthusiasm for the War was specifically among Austrian (and German) artists and intellectuals very pronounced. (10) The majority of the Vienna Philharmonic also belonged to the political spectrum of pro-War German nationalism.

An incident which took place shortly before the outbreak of the War is exemplary of this position. In an Orchestra meeting, on June 12, 1914, an Orchestra member of Czech heritage, Karl Jeraj, expressed his displeasure over the mention in the orchestral report of the participation of some members in a German nationalistic event. (11) Consequently, a solid majority of 81 members requested the removal of Jeraj from the Orchestra. (12) An adept mediation, on the part of the chairman, enabled this expulsion to be rescinded, (13) but the incident demonstrates clearly the German nationalistic climate within the Orchestra. This was evident not only in an anti-Czech, but especially in an anti-French attitude :

« Heinrich (a committee member) alluded to the spiteful behavior of the French composer Camille Saint-Saëns who, in

Germany, has aroused wide-spread resentment and demonstrations. Under these circumstances, the Golden Oak Leaf Crown, which was awarded to the Vienna Philharmonic by the Commission of Performances at the Paris Exhibition, in 1900, under the chairmanship of President Camille Saint-Saëns, has lost its value as an award, and assuming the approval of the Orchestra, should be donated to the Austrian Red Cross to be melted-down. The proposal was approved with applause. » (14)

The fact that concert activity was also strongly infused with nationalistic overtones is best demonstrated by a propaganda tour which the Orchestra made to Switzerland, in 1917. Immediately noticeable is the close connection of the tour with the interests of Austrian and German foreign policy. (15) The establishment of amicable relationships with neutral countries played an increasingly important role in this stage of the War, and cultural propaganda was directed toward these countries accordingly. It is hardly coincidental that, both the Vienna and the Berlin Philharmonic, made major tours to neutral States at nearly the same time. Whereas the Vienna Philharmonic traveled to Switzerland, in May 1917, the Berlin Philharmonic embarked on a « Northern Country Tour » to the neutral Scandinavian countries, in May 1917. (16)

Martina Nußbaumer has demonstrated convincingly that this Vienna Philharmonic tour to Switzerland had as its basis a broadly conceived Austro-Hungarian publicity campaign which attempted to cast music and Austria's intermediary role therein as a way of peace-making and bringing peoples together. (17) Also recognizable in the nearly simultaneous tours of the 2 Orchestras is a type of coordinated communication initiative of the Central Powers toward neutral foreign countries. (18)

In the Vienna Philharmonic tour to Switzerland, the foreign policy postulation of « nations coming together » is enmeshed with the « symbolic politics » which the Orchestra carried-out in its concert programming. (19) For the concert in Lausanne, in French-speaking Switzerland, the Vienna Philharmonic performed only compositions of Beethoven, whereas, in other cities, also Berlioz and Tchaïkovsky were played. According to Felix Weingartner, who conducted the Orchestra on this tour, the impression was to be avoided that tribute was being made to nearby France. (20) The fact that this tactic aroused numerous protests from audiences in western Switzerland demonstrates clearly that the concerts were perceived in foreign countries as intended - as governmental propaganda events in the context of the War.

Thus, by the end of the War, the Vienna Philharmonic was more politically involved than ever before. This was due primarily to its participation in charity concerts and tours which stood in close connection with State-run War propaganda intended for both domestic and foreign consumption. Furthermore, however, although reluctantly at first, the Orchestra increasingly shaped its general concert programming in a political context and, in so doing, began to incorporate such factors into its own self-image.

Notes

(1) Protokolle AHV (11 September 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018.

(2) See the concert listings, in : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » ; page 388 f.

- (3) Protokolle AHV (24 April 1915) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-019, page 10.
- (4) Protokolle KS (13 January 1916) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-019, page 24.
- (5) Protokolle KS (5 September 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018, page 42.
- (6) Protokolle KS (5 September 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018, page 42.
- (7) Protokolle KS (30 August 1915) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-019, page 15.
- (8) Protokolle AHV (4 September 1915) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-019, page 17.
- (9) Protokolle KS (3 November 1917) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-019, page 64.
- (10) For a representative discussion of the question of the behavior of intellectuals and artists during World War I, which has been thoroughly researched in the meanwhile, see the anthology (although pertaining only to Germany) of : « Kultur und Krieg. Die Rolle der Intellektuellen, Künstler und Schriftsteller im Ersten Weltkrieg » , edited by Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Munich (1996) .
- (11) Protokolle HV (12 June 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018, page 39. A detailed account of this incident can be found, in : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » ; page 386 f.
- (12) Protokolle KS (15 June 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018, page 40.
- (13) Protokolle AHV (11 August 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018, page 43.
- (14) Protokolle KS (24 October 1914) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-018, page 47.
- (15) On the purpose of these tours, see also : Nußbaumer. « Musik » ; pages 299-317.
- (16) Cities visited : Copenhagen (9-11 May 1917) ; Malmö (14-15 May 1917) ; Stockholm (16 May 1917) ; Gothenburg (18 May 1917) . The conductor was Arthur Nikisch.
- (17) Nußbaumer. « Musik » ; page 310.
- (18) This unity of « comrades in arms » was emphasized by the guest appearances of the Berlin Philharmonic and the Imperial Ottoman Palace Orchestra, in the 1st half of 1918 in Vienna, as well as the concert tour of the Vienna Philharmonic to Berlin, in June 1918. See, also : Nußbaumer. « Musik » ; page 309.
- (19) Nußbaumer. « Musik » ; page 310.
- (20) Felix Weingartner. « Die Wiener Philharmoniker in der Schweiz » , in : « Neue Freie Presse » (20. Juli 1917) , «

Morgenblatt » , Seite 4. Quoted in : Nußbaumer. « Musik » ; page 310.

The 1st Republic and Austro-Fascism : Enhancing References to Vienna as the « City of Music » and Strengthening Internal Authoritarian Structures

(Fritz Trümpi)

Unlike the time before World War I, when musical events were primarily initiated by private committees, there was a considerable degree of politicization after 1919.

...

During the period of the 1st Republic and Austro-Fascism, the « politicization » of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra did not imply unilateral exploitation for national political purposes, but rather the establishment of inter-dependencies between political authorities and the Orchestra. (1) This interdependent relationship demonstrates a close link to the term « Musikstadt Wien » (« City of Music ») as an expression of the increased efforts to impregnate Vienna with a certain « city branding ». Unlike the time before World War I, when musical events were primarily initiated by private committees, there was a considerable degree of politicization after 1919. (2) This reflected a general development in music life - not only in Austria but also in Germany. The renowned contemporary music-critic Paul Bekker described the state of musical life in the early 1920's, as follows :

« Es kommt lediglich darauf an, festzustellen, daß die öffentliche Kunstpflege durch den Krieg und seine Folgeerscheinungen in den letzten Jahren in eine Abhängigkeit von politischen Gesichtspunkten geraten ist, die jeder Ernstmeinende, gleichviel welcher Parteirichtung er angehören mag, tief bedauern muß. » (3)

« It is worth noting that, due to the War and its consequences, the world of public art has become dependent on political aspects - a fact that anyone in their right minds, regardless of their political orientation, cannot but deeply regret. »

The Vienna Philharmonic's activities were also largely influenced by that trend, with an increasing number of regional and national policy interfaces. And Vienna's enhanced image as a « City of Music » provided the Orchestra with an excellent basis for operation for that purpose. Furthermore, immediately upon the establishment of the authoritarian Dollfuß regime, in 1933, it radically changed its internal structures, gearing them to the authoritarian rule and adapting itself to the dominant political doctrine.

The number of concerts performed by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra increased continuously after World War I : whereas there were reportedly 31 concerts in the season of 1919-1920, 5 years later, there were 65. (4) And with regard to the range of events, there too was a significant increase in the 1920's. The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra frequently played before ever wider audiences, with explicitly political events as well as international concerts forming an increasingly significant part of the Orchestra's daily business. There was a time when the Vienna Philharmonic barely turned-down any requests - in the early 1920's, inviting the Orchestra to perform was not a question of

artistic quality but, rather, an indication of the financial circumstances of the organizer. (5) Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the Philharmonic did not appear to have any serious reservations when agreeing to hold concerts in the framework of the « Organisation geistiger Arbeiter und öffentlich Angestellter ». (6) By engaging in this practice (even if only for a few seasons) , the Orchestra began to sell its services to official and municipal bodies, for the 1st time ; a fact that can only be interpreted as a political concession to a radically changed society. From the early 1920's, the Vienna Philharmonic also participated in the Salzburg Festival, gradually increasing the number of their international concerts : unlike the period between the Orchestra's foundation, in 1842, and the end of World War I during which it only toured 6 times, the Orchestra toured 9 times in the short period, between 1919 and 1933. In 2 of those instances, in 1922 and 1923, the Philharmonic even travelled to South America where it held as many as 40 concerts each time. (7) It is that international travel activity that particularly reflects the growing political importance of the Orchestra - both nationally and internationally . According to the minutes of a committee meeting, in 1924, the Philharmonic Orchestra was welcomed by the provincial governor and the mayor of Graz upon arriving in the city. It is said that both of them stressed in their speeches :

« ... daß unsere Reisen zum politischen Verständnis beitragen, indem sie nicht nur die Bundesländer, sondern auch das Ausland uns näher bringen, was besonders unsere Erfolge in Südamerika und Paris bewiesen haben. » (8)

« ... that our tours contribute to strengthening political understanding by developing closer ties to both the provinces and foreign countries ; this has been particularly proven by the success we had in South America and Paris. »

Moreover, the minutes of the meeting also clearly record the fact that the Orchestra was encouraged by public authorities to undertake such tours. For example :

« Wunderer und Weiß berichten über einen Besuch bei Unterrichtsminister Schneider, der eine Konzertreise nach Vorarlberg im Juli. »

« Wunderer and Weiß mentioned a conversation with Schneider, Minister of Education, who suggested that a concert tour to Vorarlberg be organized in July. »

With regards to foreign policy interests, the Vienna Philharmonic provided its services in that respect too. The Orchestra's 1925 tour of Germany, for instance, displayed Austria's annexation efforts to the, then, democratically constituted Germany. That tour of the Philharmonic undoubtedly had a diplomatic function, which is also reflected in the reporting of the daily newspaper « Neues Wiener Abendblatt ». The Orchestra was received in Munich's City Hall, in the presence of the city's mayor, town councillors, the Austrian Consul General as well as several political and cultural representatives. In his address, the mayor pointed-out that he welcomed the Orchestra ...

« als Sendboten der Zusammengehörigkeit aller deutschfühlenden und deutschgesinnten Volksteile ; ob sie nun diesseits oder jenseits dieser unnatürlichen Grenzen wohnen, ob auch die Vereinigung, die unausbleiblich ist, früher oder später kommt, nichts wird die Kulturzusammengehörigkeit trennen können, zu der wir uns bekennen. »

« as a messenger reflecting the unity of all people who feel German and are Germanophile ; whether they live within

or beyond these unnatural borders, whether unification will take place sooner or later, which is inevitable - nothing whatsoever will be able to break the bond of the common culture we share. »

The director of the Munich Music Academy stated just as clearly :

« Diese Konzertreise ist nicht eine Frage der Musik, sondern eine Frage des ganzen deutschen Geisteslebens und der ganzen deutschen Zukunft. »

« This concert tour is not a question of music, but a question of the whole German intellectual life and of the German future. »

In his response, the Orchestra's chairman spoke of his intention to take home his impressions of Germany and tell people about them, saying :

« mit nach Österreich nehmen und davon erzählen » , which, according to him, was the only thing poor musicians could do. Indeed, it was not unusual at all for the Vienna Philharmonic's management to refrain from casting too political a light on the Orchestra in public. Instead of making any direct references to politics, during the 1st Republic, the Orchestra preferred to underline its role as a representative of the « City of Music » with all that that implied. On the occasion of the Vienna Philharmonic's 85th anniversary, Wilhelm Jerger, then simply a member of the Orchestra until appointed « kommissarischer Leiter » by the National-Socialists, illustrated this in an unpretentious but nevertheless very self-confident way :

« So sind die Philharmoniker im Ausland die geschätztesten Vertreter des kostbarsten Wiener Kunstbesitzes, der Wiener vorschlägt (9) (10) (11) (12) : Musik, geworden. » (13)

« The Philharmonic has become the most valued international representative of Vienna's most precious piece of art : its music. »

In the course of the 1920's, the Orchestra increasingly represented an integral part of the « City of Music » . Likewise, it made sure to have this connection rhetorically highlighted in the media. However, the Orchestra also invented another way of enhancing that image by introducing the « Philharmonikerball » (Vienna Philharmonic Ball) , in 1925, for instance. By choosing the « Musikverein » as its venue, the Orchestra, once again, emphasized its claim of representing the « City of Music » - not only when giving concerts. In addition, the Ball received protection at the highest-political level : in 1925, for example, the Austrian Federal President, Michaël Hainisch, from the Christian-Social Party, and the mayor of Vienna, Karl Seitz, from the Social-Democrats, were members of the « Honorary Committee » . The fact that the Committee was represented by more than one political Party clearly shows that it was not so much a Party political orientation that guided the Vienna Philharmonic but, rather, the national cross-political context.

Through the organization of such a festive event, the Vienna Philharmonic managed to create a more tangible reflection of its attachment to Vienna which, before then, had been primarily achieved through media coverage. Furthermore, it was able to project its status as a private association : balls were a private matter and, therefore,

organized by associations, political groups, clubs, etc. (14) Being such an association (and certainly no institution subjected to political control or administration), the Vienna Philharmonic contributed to the strengthening of the concept of Vienna as a « City of Music » - and not only by means of its musical performance. Conversely, it was that concept that provided the base for its legitimacy as an autonomous Orchestra. In this way, the Orchestra's activities did, indeed, fulfill political functions without the need of even the slightest intervention on the part of political authorities that would affect its organizational structure. (15)

Even after the establishment of the authoritarian Dollfuß regime, this kind of indirect politicization did not seem to change : political interference in the Orchestra's institutional structures proved non-existent. However, the general rise of authoritarianism started to affect its internal organization, in the early 1930's. At its general meeting on July 9, 1933, and only a few months after Federal Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuß had dissolved parliament, the Vienna Philharmonic decided « mit allen gegen 2 Stimmen » (approved by all but 2 votes) to strengthen the Board's position which, consequently, entailed enhancing the association's authoritarian structures :

« Dem Vorstande steht das Recht zu im Einvernehmen mit dem Dirigenten, diejenigen Mitglieder, welche solistisch hervortreten, für alle philharmonischen Veranstaltungen zu bestimmen und es darf sich kein Mitglied weigern eine ihm zugeteilte Stimme zu übernehmen. » (16)

« The Board is, in agreement with the conductor, entitled to appoint those members for all the events of the Philharmonic who are outstanding soloists, and not a single member may object to take on their allocated part. »

In fact, the present practice of hiring guest conductors, which remains controversial even today, can be traced back to the early days of « Austro-Fascism » : the transition from a system of subscription conductors to one of guest-conductors was a consequence of said decision, which entailed a growth in power for the Orchestra's board. Furthermore, it is striking that Gustav Hawranek, who was elected director in 1932, resigned only 1 year later, in 1933, and was replaced by Hugo Burghauser as the Vienna Philharmonic's new leader. Of course, Burghauser's appointment was no coincidence at all. He maintained close contacts with prominent political leaders of the « Austro-fascist » movement as well as with the « Vaterländische Front » (Fatherland Front), founded by Dollfuß, in May 1933. Moreover, he was appointed « Erster Vorsitzender des Ringes der österreichischen Musiker » by the Ministry of Education, for the period between 1934 and 1938, and, in 1935, by decision of the « Wiener Landesgericht » (Regional Court of Vienna), he became « Sachverständiger für Musik » (musical consultant) . (17)

Burghauser's political stance and his close links to the regime did, in fact, have an impact on both the association's and the assembly's management, despite the fact that the general meeting, being the sovereign institution of the association, prevented the Board's Executive Office from becoming too powerful. Nevertheless, Burghauser knew very-well how to influence the political course of the Philharmonic's meetings by using the leverage of his political arguments, for instance. (18) This is exactly what Heinrich Kralik praised in his « Orchestermonographie » (monograph for Orchestra) on the Vienna Philharmonic that was published shortly before the « Anschluß », in 1938 ; he underlined the chairman's growing power, saying :

« Die Machtbefugnisse, die der Vorstand erhält, sind nicht gering. Und wenn er Talent und Temperament dazu hat, kann

er ein wirklicher Führer sein. Etwa wie heutigen Tags Professor Hugo Burghauser, der auf diesem Posten eine außerordentliche philharmonische Vitalität entfaltet, idealistisch und realpolitisch. » (19)

« The powers that the chairman is endowed with are significant indeed ; and if he has both the talent and temperament, he could be a real leader such as Professor Hugo Burghauser is today, displaying an extraordinary Philharmonic vigor in this post - being both, idealistic and politically pragmatic. »

Hence, the regime had no reason to urge the Orchestra towards closer cooperation between its institutions and the State as this was (as regards political content, at least) warranted anyway. It must not be forgotten either that the importance of music for shaping the political base of the Austrian image had increased considerably over the years, since the 1920's, (20) being frequently used as a reference that helped Austria assert itself as an independent German State alongside National-Socialist Germany. (21) As one of the most effective musical institutions in Austria, the Vienna Philharmonic pursued its political ambition through a number of concerts, at home and abroad. Finally, one of the 1st large-scale propaganda campaigns promoting the Dollfuß regime was the Philharmonic's journey to Italy, in May 1933, where it visited Benito Mussolini's « Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista » and was the 1st Orchestra to play secular music before the Holy-See. That journey, however, not only reflects Austria's efforts of annexation to Fascist Italy, which were officially recorded in the « Rome Protocols » , shortly afterwards, but also served as a testimony of the clerical and Catholic aspect firmly promoted by the regime. (22) Still, the Vienna Philharmonic's sphere of action during the period of « Austro-Fascism » was much wider than that : it participated in the World Exposition of Paris, in 1937, (23) and was involved in concerts aimed at strengthening domestic support for the regime, such as the « Geistliche Festkonzert im Rahmen des Deutschen Katholikentages zugunsten der Dr.-Ignaz-Seipel-Gedächtnisstiftung » , in September 1933, or the « Festversammlung anlässlich der 400-Jahr-Feier des Ordens der “ Barmherzigen Brüder ” » of October 1937, among other things.

Through the strengthened power of the Board's position and the Orchestra's multi-faceted representation of Austria that effectively promoted national policy, its configuration in 1938 only facilitated the National-Socialists' political encroachment on the Vienna Philharmonic in the aftermath of the « Anschluß » . Furthermore, the fact that the Orchestra had, since 1933, already consisted of numerous illegal Party members even further facilitated its integration into Nazi cultural policy.

Notes

(1) See, also : the introduction of the text, « Die Wiener Philharmoniker im Ersten Weltkrieg » .

(2) See : Nußbaumer. « Musikstadt » , page 358 ; Eder. « Musikfeste » , page 20 ; Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 96-97.

(3) Paul Bekker. « Zeitwende » , in : « Die Musik » , Volume XV, No. 1 (1 October 1922) , pages 1-9.

(4) Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 66.

(5) Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 408.

(6) Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 67.

(7) For further details, see : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , pages 396-398 ; Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 68.

(8) Protokolle KS, 6/17 (1924) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-024, page 13.

(9) Protokolle KS, 5/22 (1924) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-024, page 11.

(10) « Neues Wiener Abendblatt » , Volume 7, No. 4 (1925) , page 2.

(11) « Neues Wiener Abendblatt » , Volume 7, No. 4 (1925) , page 2.

(12) « Neues Wiener Abendblatt » , Volume 7, No. 4 (1925) , page 2. With regard to the Orchestra's point of view on this tour, see : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 418 ; Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 101-102.

(13) Wilhelm Jerger. « Aus der Geschichte einer Wiener Musikervereinigung. 85 Jahre Wiener Philharmonisches Orchester. » in : « Reichspost » , Volume 11, No. 5 (1927) , pages 1-2.

(14) Monika Kus. « Das Wiener Ballwesen aus geschichtlicher, sozialer und wirtschaftlicher Sicht. » , Thesis at the Vienna University of Economics and Business (1987) , page 1.

(15) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 99-100.

(16) « Neufassung des § 35 der Geschäftsordnung. » , Protokolle OHV, 7/9 (1933) ; HAWPh, A-Pr-029, page 2a.

(17) See : Mayrhofer. « Angelegenheit » , pages 73-74 ; Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 118-120.

(18) For more details, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 120-122.

(19) Heinrich von Kralik. « Die Wiener Philharmoniker. Monographie eines Orchesters. » , Vienna (1938) , page 108.

(20) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 123.

(21) For further details, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 123-125.

(22) For further details, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 126.

(23) With regard to the political importance of music for Austria's representation at World Expositions, see : Mayer-Hirzberger. « Voting for Shifts in Austria : How the " Ständestaat " (1934-1938) Used Musical Clichés to Improve the Country's Image Abroad » , in : Ports of Call. « Central European and Hertz American Cultures in Motion. » , edited by Ingram Susan et al. , Frankfurt am Main (2003) , pages 199-209 - here, page 202.

An Association Based on National-Socialist Principles

(Fritz Trümpi)

Having been spared disbandment, the Association was charged with implementing far-reaching changes in its statutes : important personnel decisions now required the consent of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry and, later, that of the « Reichsstatthalter » in Vienna.

...

After a brief period of uncertainty whether the « Verein der Wiener Philharmoniker » , the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic, would be dissolved and the Orchestra administered henceforth by the « Verwaltung der Staatstheater » (Administration of the State Theatres) , the so-called « Stillhaltekommissar » (a term variously rendered in English as Commissioner for Suspensions, Liquidation Commissar or Repression Officer) , acting in accordance with Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels, decided against dissolution. Having been spared disbandment, the Association was charged with implementing far-reaching changes in its statutes : important personnel decisions now required the consent of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry and, later, that of the « Reichsstatthalter » in Vienna. The statutes had to include the « Aryan » and « Führer » principles. In its negotiations with the « Dienststelle Stillhaltekommissar für Vereine, Organisationen und Verbände » , the Office of the Repression Officer for Associations, Organisations and Clubs, the governing body of the Orchestra showed itself extremely cooperative. In 1940, they even agreed to co-opt a functionary of the Vienna « Reichspropagandaamt » into the governing body of the Orchestra. This meant that, on the institutional level, the Orchestra's connections to the State and to the Party were re-inforced several times over. Despite their status as an association, the Vienna Philharmonic assumed in the Nazi era distinctive characteristics of a « Reich » organisation close to the regime.

From 1908 onward, the Vienna Philharmonic had been a registered association. (1) Associations had to meet stringent political criteria after the « Anschluß » . (2) In March 1938, the Vienna Philharmonic fell within the remit of the « Repression Officer for Associations, Organisations and Clubs » , (3) whose task it was to « suppress » all kinds of associations through to the referendum, on 10 April 1938, and to make sure they were incapable of taking any kind of initiative in the intervening time. (4) At the same time, the « Stillhaltekommissar » was entitled to implement measures resulting in the « gleichschaltung » of associations and organizations in Austria. (5) The vast majority of Austria's associations and organizations fell victim to « total liquidation » : of the country's 115,000 associations and clubs, only some 5,000 escaped that fate. (6) The standard reasons given for the associations' liquidation were either their political and / or religious orientation or their allegedly « utterly superfluous character » . (7)

It appears, however, that the processing of high-profile cultural institutions caused a certain irritation. In a letter, dated 17 March 1938, from the « Office of the “ Landeskulturleiter der N.S.D.A.P. / Hitlerbewegung / Österreich ” » to « Gauleiter » Bürckel, the Vienna Philharmonic is already referred to as a « National-Socialist cultural association » . The letter raises the question whether Bürckel's repression directive (« “ Stillhalte ” -Weisung ») applied to « events of a cultural character » . (8) The « Landeskulturleiter » requests permission for several concerts to take place and, in particular, for a « Philharmonic concert, on 21 March, under Knappertsbusch in the “ Großer Musikvereinsaal ” » .

Designed presumably to pre-empt possible reservations on the part of « Gauleiter » Bürckel against these concerts, a remark at the end of the letter presents the Vienna Philharmonic in the guise of indirect National-Socialist election campaign aides :

« We guarantee that the realization of the planned events will not result in the National-Socialist cultural associations referred to in our submission losing any of the fire-power that you, “ Herr Gauleiter ”, may yet demand from them in the course of the election campaign. » (9)

The dealings of the « Stillhaltekommissar » with the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic are, nevertheless, full of contradictions. A 1st decision, of which the Philharmonic was notified on 16 September 1938, provided for the « liquidation » and « integration » of the Association into the « Staatstheater und Bühnenakademie » (State Theatre and Stage Academy) . (10) Even if the Association had, in fact, been dissolved, the decision would have been administrative rather than political in nature. However, only 3 months later, on 12 December, the preliminary decision was « repealed by a telephone call » after the Ministry for Propaganda and the « Stillhaltekommissar » had agreed not to interfere with the existence of the Association. This was confirmed in writing, on 19 December, (11) without it being made clear at that stage what organizational form the Vienna Philharmonic were to assume, henceforth. The « Stillhaltekommissariat » initially submitted 2 proposals to the minister of propaganda :

« 1. The Association retains its independence and is placed under the supervision of the “ Reich ” Ministry for Propaganda. This means that the Association is dependent in practical terms on the Ministry’s directives in personnel questions and in all other matters. »

« 2. The Association is liquidated and a limited liability company is simultaneously formed as in Berlin, whose shares are the sole property of the “ Reich ” as represented by the Ministry. In this case, the Vienna Philharmonic would be stripped to being no more than an Orchestra and the musicians would have to be regarded as employees of the company. Management would be in the hands of representatives appointed by the Reich. » (12)

Tellingly, the 1st scenario was chosen, which meant that the « Reich » or, to be more precise, the Ministry for Propaganda was spared having to pay for the Vienna Philharmonic. Gœbbels opted for the opposite of what he had done with the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1934 : he had made them a « Reich » Orchestra financed from the national budget ; now, he refrained from formally interfering with the Vienna Philharmonic’s status as an association. It is conceivable that the decision was based on financial considerations. Gœbbels had presumably realized, in the meantime, how cost intensive an Orchestra of this kind was - he was repeatedly reprimanded by the « Reich » finance minister for the expenditure the Berlin Philharmonic continued to cause. (13) Gœbbels told the « Stillhaltekommissar » in Vienna, on 13 June 1939, that he had no objections against the « continued independence under association law of the “ Vienna Philharmonic ”, provided the statutes are changed in accordance with National-Socialist principles and the association is placed under my direct supervision » . (14) In the « Stillhaltekommissar » ’s final report, dated 20 July 1939, the Orchestra’s definitive status is defined as follows :

« 1. The organization retains its independence and is placed under the supervision of the “ Reichs-minister für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda ” (the “ Reich ” Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda) , Berlin. »

« 2. The assets are released.

The following changes in the statutes have to be made : “ Arierprinzip ” , “ Führerprinzip ” .

The head of the Association is nominated by the “ Reich ” Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, Berlin, in accordance with the “ Gauleiter ” of the NSDAP in Vienna ; the general assembly is entitled only to a right of proposal. Resolutions passed by the members require the consent of the “ Reich ” Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda to enter into force. The statutes, which are about to be newly-promulgated, require the consent of the “ Reich ” Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda and will ensure the rights of Aryan members. » (15)

Despite the enforced changes, the statutes differed in one key-respect from those of the Berlin Philharmonic : even though the Vienna Philharmonic were placed under Gœbbels’s supervision, they were not collectively integrated into his ministry. And, shortly after Gœbbels had officially appointed Wilhelm Jerger « for the duration of 3 years » as « head of the Association and chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic » , (16) the relevant competencies were re-shuffled in the statutes approved on 7 March 1940 : the right to nominate the « head of the Association » now moved from the Ministry for Propaganda to the « Reichsstatthalter » in Vienna. (17) The statutes also enshrined the « Reichsstatthalter » ’s right to « dismiss the head of the Association and / or his deputy without prior notice » . « Alterations of the statutes and the dissolution of the Association after the passing of a pertinent resolution by the general assembly » were contingent on the « Reichsstatthalter » ’s consent ; the agenda, likewise, required the approval of the « Reichsstatthalter » . (18) § IX of the revised statutes contains the provision that the award of honorary memberships requires « the written approval of the competent N.S.D.A.P. representative » - an explicit reference to the function of the « Gauleiter » rather than to that of the « Reichsstatthalter » . (19) Similarly, it was, functionally speaking, the representative of the Party rather than the « Reich » representative who decided questions of the revocation of membership in the Orchestra. (20) Membership in the Orchestra was tied to « racial » criteria, in any case :

« Only Aryans of German or of closely related blood are eligible for membership according to the legal provisions. » (21)

The new statutes seem on the whole to have been to the liking of the Vienna Philharmonic - the mandated introduction of the « Aryan » and the « Führer » principles into the statutes does not seem to have irked the Philharmonic negotiators : on 28 October 1938, Committee member Otto Straßer appealed to Kajetan Mühlmann, who had been appointed Undersecretary (« Staatssekretär ») for the Arts, in 1938, to « exempt » from control the Association Vienna Philharmonic and, by the same token, to convert the Vienna State Opera Orchestra into a « Reich » Orchestra. (22) What is especially remarkable is the offer of collaboration Straßer extends in his letter :

« And we beg you, “ Herr Staatssekretär ”, to implement re-organization in the sense we have indicated and to give us an opportunity in this way to contribute with all our strength to the construction of the pan-German “ Reich ” (“ Großdeutsches Reich ”) and, notably, of Vienna as a “ City of Music ”. » (23)

In a Vienna Philharmonic position paper entitled, « Proposals regarding the re-organization of the Vienna Philharmonic and the Orchestra of the “ Wiener Staatsoper ” » , Straßer, speaking on behalf of the Orchestra, announced the

intention to implement the « re-organization of the Association's governing body, in accordance with the demands of the National-Socialist State » and proposed that the Orchestra's power of decision, regarding its musical activities, the choice of conductors, its welfare institutions and the assets of the Association should be exempt from outside interference. He also proposed that the Orchestra voluntarily forego subsidies :

« As it may be assumed that the Philharmonic concerts, once the present audience crisis has blown-over, will revert to being exceedingly profitable as always used to be the case, subsidies will not be needed. » (24)

During the remainder of its War-time existence, the Orchestra continued to decline, according to the minutes of its general assemblies, subsidies from Berlin even if the treatment of the matter showed a certain ambivalence. On one occasion, Jerger argued for the « necessity to manage without subsidies from Berlin » and for the Orchestra « to get-back on its feet under its own power » , (25) on another, the Philharmonic eschewed any large-scale subsidization by the Ministry for Propaganda and the office of the « Reich » governor on the occasion of the Orchestra's Centenary, with a view to avoiding « any form of the Propaganda Ministry's tutelage » and to ensuring « the independence of the Association » ; (26) at the same time, however, they made sure potential losses were underwritten by the « Reich » governor in Vienna. (27) During the preparatory stage of a tour of Sweden, in 1943, a new situation arose whose remedy, as was clear to everyone concerned, could not be a return to the options presented to the Orchestra, in 1938, of « discretionary subsidies » or a guaranteed annual grant to subsidize tours. (28) What was at issue was Wilhelm Furtwängler's fee, which Gœbbels's ministry refused to pay : (29)

« The tour is to be regarded as a done deal. What is unclear, at this stage, is who is going to pay Doctor Furtwängler's fee (if it had been the Berlin Philharmonic's turn to go to Sweden, the Ministry for Propaganda would have paid ; as it is, we're supposed to pay the fee out of our own pocket) . » (30) (31)

(Furtwängler is said, elsewhere, to have waived fees of 12,000 RM for subscription concerts when he was told that the Philharmonic was not eligible for subsidies. In its subsidization policy, the Orchestra seems to have tacked and veered as the situation demanded.)

In the context of the postulate of « independence » , which (in view of the changes in the Statutes discussed above) was a gross misrepresentation anyway, attention is to be paid to the composition of the Committee, the governing body of the Association. While the Committee outwardly continued to be manned in the traditional way after the « Anschluß » , a representative of the « Reich » Propaganda Office took part, from May 1940, in the meetings of the Executive Council (« Vorstandsrat ») - as the Committee was now called for a time. Aurel Wolfram was installed immediately after the « Anschluß » as an advisor in the Cultural Department of the « Reich » Propaganda Office, explicitly charged with the « special task » of « establishing a connection with Berlin » . (32) Wolfram had been cultivating contacts with the Vienna Philharmonic, for some time in the past ; these were now intensified considerably through his participation in the committee meetings (between May 1940 and his dismissal from the Propaganda Office [33] in October of the same year) ; shortly after his dismissal, Wolfram opted, in December 1940, for joining the ranks of the « founders » of the Vienna Philharmonic, which involved an annual fee of 333 RM (« Reichsmark ») . (34)

Wolfram's entry into the Executive Committee (« Vorstandsrat ») of the Vienna Philharmonic was not, on the evidence

of the minutes, ordained from above ; on the contrary, the National-Socialist propaganda functionary was unanimously co-opted by that body :

« Doctor Aurel Wolfram is Viennese and a sincere and faithful friend of the Vienna Philharmonic, who has always been prepared to stand-up for the Vienna Philharmonic. His co-optation into the Executive Committee would consolidate this valuable friendship and would create a favourable impression in the outside world for the Vienna Philharmonic by virtue of the position that Doctor Wolfram occupies as the 1st cultural advisor at the “ Reich ” Propaganda Office in Vienna. Straßer and Kainz are also in favour of co-opting Doctor Wolfram to the Executive Committee. His admittance was unanimously passed. » (35)

This act meant that the Vienna Philharmonic were strengthening, yet again (and in an unprecedented manner) , their ties to the State and to the NSDAP. (36) Their status as an association would have left them a certain latitude in their choice of emphasis. The changes in the Statutes and the composition of the Executive Committee based on Party political criteria made the Vienna Philharmonic assume distinct characteristics of a « Reich » organisation close to the regime.

Notes

(1) Statutes of the association « Wiener Philharmoniker » (1908) . Vereinsakt, WSL, Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : Gelöschte Vereine (Liquidated associations) , pages 4602-4621, 4629. For the story of the association's foundation, see : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 368 ff. ; and Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 48-49.

(2) See : Gertrude Rothkappl. « Die Zerschlagung österreichischer Vereine, Organisationen, Verbände, Stiftungen und Fonds » , Ph.D. thesis, University of Vienna (1996) ; and : « Vereine im Nationalsozialismus. Vermögensentzug durch den Stillhaltekommissar für Vereine, Organisationen und Verbände und Aspekte der Restitution in Österreich nach 1945. » , edited by Verena Pawlowsky / Edith Leisch-Prost / Christian Klösch, Vienna and Munich (2004) .

(3) For more details, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 133-138.

(4) Rothkappl. « Zerschlagung » , page 28.

(5) Rothkappl. « Zerschlagung » , page 1.

(6) Rothkappl. « Zerschlagung » , page 52.

(7) Rothkappl. « Zerschlagung » , page 52.

(8) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, 04, « Bürckel » / Materie, 2420 Katalog 160, Nr. 56. (The « Stillhaltekommissar » reported directly to Bürckel and was obviously less concerned with deciding vital matters than with executing decisions that were made elsewhere.)

(9) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, 04, « Bürckel » / Materie, 2420 Katalog 160, Nr. 56. All 4 concerts were

approved. ÖStA, AdR, 04, « Bürckel » / Materie, 2420, Katalog 160, Nr. 55.

(10) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, Reichsstatthalterei III, Box 7683, Zl. 202.816/38.

(11) See : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 468.

(12) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, Reichsstatthalterei III, Box 7681, Zl. 201.666/38.

(13) For a detailed discussion of the financial debates concerning the Berlin Philharmonic, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 147-163.

(14) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR / Gruppe 04, « Bürckel » / Materie, 161/2425-5.

(15) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR / Gruppe 04, « Bürckel » / Materie, 161/2425-5.

(16) Letter from Gæbbels to Jerger (22 December 1939) . « Österreichisches Staatsarchiv » , AVA / Unterricht / Sign. 15 : Katalog 161, 2425/5 (Wiener Philharmoniker) .

(17) Statutes of the Association « Wiener Philharmoniker » (1940) , § V. « Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv » , Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : « Gelöschte Vereine » (Liquidated associations) , 4602/21.

(18) Statutes of the Association « Wiener Philharmoniker » (1940) , § VI. e) « Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv » , Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : « Gelöschte Vereine » (Liquidated associations) , 4602/21.

(19) Statutes of the Association « Wiener Philharmoniker » (1940) , § IX. « Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv » , Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : « Gelöschte Vereine » (Liquidated associations) , 4602/21.

(20) Statutes of the Association « Wiener Philharmoniker » (1940) , § XI. « Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv » , Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : « Gelöschte Vereine » (Liquidated associations) , 4602/21.

(21) Statutes of the Association « Wiener Philharmoniker » (1940) , § III. « Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv » , Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : « Gelöschte Vereine » (Liquidated associations) , 4602/21.

(22) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, BKA / RStiÖ III, Katalog 7681, Zl. 201.666/38.

(23) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, BKA / RStiÖ III, Katalog 7681, Zl. 201.666/38.

(24) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, BKA / RStiÖ III, Box 7681, Zl. 202.666/1938.

(25) Protokolle KS (21 October 1939) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030 : Protokolle 1938-1944, page 7.

(26) Protokolle KS (6 September 1941) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030 : Protokolle 1938-1944, page 26.

(27) Protokolle KS (26 March 1941) and Protokolle KS (6 September 1941) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030 : Protokolle 1938-1944, pages 24 and 26.

(28) ÖStA (Austrian State Archive) , AdR, BKA / RStiÖ III, Box 7681, Zl. 202.666/1938.

(29) For the background, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 305-306.

(30) Protokolle KS (3 April 1943) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030 : Protokolle 1938-1944, page 41.

(31) Protokolle OHV (14 January 1943) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030 : Protokolle 1938-1944, page 37.

(32) Short-hand minutes, meeting of the Advisory Board of the « Kulturamt der Stadt Wien » (17 June 1939) . WSL, Ratsherren, B4, Sitzungsniederschriften ; Tagesordnungen, Verhandlungsschriften aus dem Bereich des Kulturamts 1939-1945.

(33) Zu den Hintergründen der Entlassung vergleiche : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 169 ff.

(34) Buch « Vereinsmitglieder » , G Nr. 162. HAWPh, Depot Staatsoper. Der Kontakt Wolframs zu den Wiener Philharmonikern dürfte über rein berufliche Beziehungen deutlich hinausgegangen sein. In einer politischen Beurteilung der « Gestapo » zuhanden der Gauleitung Vienna vom 21. Februar 1941 heißt es : « Besonders engen Kontakt hat Wolfram. Mit den Vienna ern Philharmonikern (sic) . » ÖStA, Gauakt Wolfram, Nr. 312.291.

(35) Protokolle KS, 6. Mai 1940. HAWPh, A-Pr-30.

(36) Zu Wolframs NSDAP-Biographie vergleiche : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 169-170.

Increased References to Vienna in the Vienna Philharmonic's Media Presence under the National-Socialist Regime

(Fritz Trümpi)

The Vienna Philharmonic has always had a multi-faceted media presence. It remained at a steady high under the National-Socialist regime. Media attention for the Vienna Philharmonic peaked around the « Centennial Celebrations » , in 1942. For that occasion, Baldur von Schirach granted the Orchestra a monopolist position in the Viennese music scene, which he achieved by simply banning all other Orchestra and major soloist performances during the Philharmonic's anniversary celebrations (1) : the Orchestra was the subject of many articles in newspapers, magazines and books, and was widely referenced in speeches and commemorative publications, even in novels. In addition, the Vienna Philharmonic's anniversary also inspired a film project : in early 1943, Willi Seibert, the former « advertising director » of the Berlin Philharmonic, approached the Vienna Philharmonic with a science-fiction themed movie project about the Orchestra. However, this project never came to fruition, while a feature film about the Berlin Philharmonic was produced at the same time and was shown at German movie theatres, before the War even ended. (2)

The main attributes that authors from widely different backgrounds ascribed to the Vienna Philharmonic were usually

inspired by « national » sentiments and notions of « blood and land » . References to Vienna, the « City of Music » , were ubiquitous, but the Orchestra was rarely characterized as being directly linked to the German « Reich » .

The main attributes that different media outlets used to describe the Vienna Philharmonic on the occasion of the Orchestra's « Centennial Celebrations » , in 1942, (3) often relied on an unequivocal language inspired by notions of « blood and land » . (4) This paper will present an exemplary analysis of said attributes. For instance, the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, during his speech on the occasion of the Orchestra's anniversary, described the Philharmonic as « representatives of the entire German territory » and addressed its « uniform national composition » , which made « the Vienna Philharmonic the model of a true “ People's Orchestra ” in every sense of the word » . (5)

Aurel Wolfram, a National-Socialist official and journalist who was one of the most devoted Philharmonic propagandists, between 1938 and 1945, was also partial to this line of thinking. In his article for the Philharmonic's commemorative publication dedicated to the Philharmonic's anniversary, he used a « race-oriented » approach to describe the Orchestra's special features, stating that he wanted to « analyze the prerequisites that allowed this one-of-a-kind Orchestra to exist and to flourish, all the more because the powers of blood and land have such decisive relevance, especially in our time » . (6) However, Aurel Wolfram subsequently abandoned his « race-oriented » line of thinking in favour of attributes associated with the ethereal and the sacred. In this sense, he highlighted that the Vienna Philharmonic were « not fighters, conquerors, pioneers on uncharted musical territory, but priests and hierophants, preservers of the best-kept secrets of great music-making » . According to Wolfram, the Vienna Philharmonic reached this status by « preserving a unique sound, which is equivalent to the spiritual substratum of music » , which they considered to be superior to « the Mastery of technique » . (7)

Considering that Furtwängler was one of the Philharmonic's main conductors, it is quite striking that his anniversary remarks clearly echo Aurel Wolfram's analysis regarding the Orchestra's relationship to « technique » . Wilhelm Furtwängler also interpreted the Philharmonic's sound as a « natural product » that could certainly not be created « by way of technical drills » . According to him, neither « the instruments » nor « the instruction » or « the skills » set the Vienna Philharmonic apart from other Orchestras. (8) He postulated that it was not primarily its musical expertise that earned the Philharmonic its « extraordinary position » , but rather the fact that it was a « purely Viennese Orchestra » , a « group of high-profile virtuosos » , all of them « sons of one land, of one city » . (9) With this description, Wilhelm Furtwängler acknowledged the Vienna Philharmonic not as representatives of the « Reich » (this position was reserved for the Berlin Philharmonic) , but as representatives of a part of Germany's territory : Vienna.

The Vienna Philharmonic used strikingly similar language to the one used by Aurel Wolfram and Wilhelm Furtwängler when describing itself to the public at large. This is evidenced by a brief Orchestra monograph published by Wilhelm Jerger, the Orchestra's executive director, on the occasion of the 1942 Anniversary. (10) He too views the Philharmonic as a unit and emphasizes the « intimate connection » that « grew from this gifted soil » . (11) Wilhelm Jerger takes the Vienna references one step further than Aurel Wolfram and Wilhelm Furtwängler. He went so far as to define the connection to « German art » as inherently Viennese :

« The Philharmonic will remain and will have to remain the most extraordinary ambassador of this city's world

standing. Its liveliness and determination makes it both keeper and preserver of the major heritage of the truest German art. » (12)

He postulates that the Philharmonic played an important part in Vienna's ascent to « world capital of music ». Also, he believes that « the city of Vienna was always loyal and devoted to its Philharmonic - and it still is ». (13) Even in the 1st sentence of the commemorative publication, Wilhelm Jerger writes :

« In its artistic relevance, the Vienna Philharmonic, along with other local musical institutions, embodies the essence of Vienna, the “ City of Music ” ». (14)

Even though the aforementioned Orchestra descriptions come from a wide variety of sources, their most striking common denominator is the unmistakably strong connection between the Orchestra and the city of Vienna. As a matter of fact, the topos of the Philharmonic and the « City of Music » intensified after 1938. The reasons behind this intensification are multi-faceted and will be addressed elsewhere. (15)

Strikingly enough, it was Baldur von Schirach, the Viennese « Gauleiter » and « Reich » governor, who, in his speech on the occasion of the Orchestra's anniversary, clearly diverged from the traditional interpretation of the Vienna Philharmonic. Unlike the descriptions provided by Furtwängler, Wolfram and Jerger, Baldur von Schirach makes few or no references to Vienna or the « City of Music ». It seems that he used the occasion to express his general views on music and music policy by lecturing about the practice of music of the « German people », the relationship between « light » and « serious » music and the opportunities and risks of the technical reproduction of music. He only mentioned the Orchestra itself towards the end of his speech and praised the Philharmonic with a few words. His references to Vienna were few and far between. However, Baldur von Schirach explicitly established a direct connection between the Orchestra and the « Reich », which is a highly-unusual event in the Philharmonic's media presence, between 1938 and 1945 :

« In the Great German “ Reich ” of music, there were no eternal names that were not related to its history. They served the “ Reich ” wherever they played. » (16)

It is safe to assume that Baldur von Schirach deliberately used the occasion of the Philharmonic's anniversary to modify his usual politico-cultural approach, at least verbally. As a matter of fact, his previous speeches that addressed the Philharmonic included the usual patterns of interpretation that were inherently intertwined with the « City of Music ». (17)

However, beginning in 1941, Josef Gœbbels, the Minister of Propaganda, became increasingly critical of Baldur von Schirach's cultural policy, even though he was torn between suspicion and envious acknowledgment. (18) A mere 2 weeks before Baldur von Schirach's above-mentioned Philharmonic speech, on March 15, 1942, Josef Gœbbels wrote in his diary that Baldur von Schirach would « now show greater restraint and do his very best to create the highest-possible maximum consistency between Viennese cultural policy and the “ Reich ” 's cultural policy ». (19) It was probably against this background that Baldur von Schirach decided to focus his Philharmonic speech on the « Reich » as much as possible. However, that did not help matters much. Josef Gœbbels was irritated that Baldur von Schirach

had, in his speech, once again interfered with the direction of German cultural policy. He, Josef Goebbels, would make sure that such remarks would come to an end. (20) This example vividly illustrates that the Vienna Philharmonic's image, as presented by the media, had underpinnings in actual politics. Sometimes, high-ranking decision-makers of the National-Socialist propaganda apparatus made modification attempts on short notice.

An unambiguous memo written by Walter Thomas, Baldur von Schirach's cultural advisor, proves that the Philharmonic was aware of the persisting conflict between Josef Goebbels and Baldur von Schirach. (21)

In « Eine Schicksalssymphonie » (A Symphony of Fate) , an epic Viennese family novel by Friedrich Schreyvogel published in 1941, the Vienna Philharmonic is presented as deeply intertwined with Vienna. (22) Fictional Philharmonic-related episodes abound in this chronologically narrated story that starts in the late- 19th Century and ends after World War I. These episodes re-inforce the « City of Music » ambience, presented against the background of a technology and progress-averse and anticapitalist « old Vienna » scenery. Especially, the passages about the relationship between music and War are worth mentioning, for they are clearly related to War-specific cultural propaganda. Even though Friedrich Schreyvogel had set his story during World War I, it is apparent that he also had World War II in mind. His thoughts about the heroic relationship between music and War legitimize the entertainment program targeted at soldiers and workers implemented by the « Wehrmacht » via the « Kraft durch Freude » (KdF) organizations.

One of the novel's characters, Kronawetter, is a cellist with the Philharmonic and does not oppose the Orchestra's participation in the War:

« If they will have us, we will go all the way to the front. » (23)

Author Schreyvogel creates a connection between the activities of musicians and soldiers :

« Musicians are fearless. Those who have understood the simplest of counterpoints will know that nothing in this world is achieved without a fight. » (24)

The author lets his Philharmonic cellist describe the relevance of music for War as follows :

« Those who grasp the meaning of a Beethoven Symphony will eventually be better soldiers, I swear ! » (25)

In this sentence, the author's intention of exploiting music for War through the Philharmonic becomes apparent. Baldur von Schirach, in his speech on the occasion of the « Mozart week of the German “ Reich ” » , in 1941, (26) claimed that Mozart is an inherent part of the strength that allows Germans to fight wars in the 1st place. (27) This idea is consistent with Friedrich Schreyvogel's statement that those who understand Beethoven are better soldiers. Against that background, it can be said that, by weaving the Vienna Philharmonic into his story, the author successfully re-activated the « City of Music » topos hitherto focused on the past. His novel (which was republished in 1944 and 1952) also contributed to the National-Socialist War propaganda via the Vienna Philharmonic. (28)

Notes

- (1) This regulation was issued upon request of the Orchestra. On April 3, 1941, Walter Thomas, who was Baldur von Schirach's « cultural advisor », addressed Franz Schütz, the president of « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde », to confirm that « no other large music performances may take place as they could interfere with the Centennial celebrations and, adversely, affect the Philharmonic ». Archive of « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde », documents of association 1940-1941, Exhibit No. 34. Quoted in : Trümpi. « Orchester », page 198.
- (2) See : Trümpi. « Orchester », pages 225-231 about the Vienna Philharmonic film project and the « Philharmonic » feature film.
- (3) See : Trümpi. « Orchester », pages 192-200, for a detailed analysis of the Centennial celebrations.
- (4) See : Cornelia Schmitz-Berning. « Vokabular des Nationalsozialismus », Berlin / New York (2000) [1998], page 110 ff, for the general relevance of the « blood and land » figure of speech under the National-Socialist regime.
- (5) Wilhelm Furtwängler. « Die Wiener Philharmoniker. Rede anlässlich ihrer Hundertjahrfeier 1942 », in : Wilhelm Furtwängler. « Ton und Wort. Aufsätze und Vorträge 1918 bis 1954 », Wiesbaden (1982), page 175-183 - quote on page 179.
- (6) Aurel Wolfram. « Wien und die Philharmoniker », in : « Wiener Philharmoniker 1842-1942 », edited by the « Wiener Philharmoniker », Wien-Leipzig (1942), page 28.
- (7) Wolfram. « Wien », page 44 f ; see : Trümpi. « Orchester », page 201ff, for a detailed analysis of these attributes and references to major differences in the media presentation of the Berlin Philharmonic.
- (8) Furtwängler. « Philharmoniker », page 178.
- (9) Furtwängler. « Philharmoniker », page 178.
- (10) Wilhelm Jerger. « Die Wiener Philharmoniker. Erbe und Sendung. », Vienna (1942) .
- (11) Jerger. « Philharmoniker », page 9.
- (12) Jerger. « Philharmoniker », page 12.
- (13) Jerger. « Philharmoniker », page 45.
- (14) Jerger. « Philharmoniker », page 9.
- (15) See : Fritz Trümpi. « Programmpolitik im Nationalsozialismus » .
- (16) « Rede des Reichsleiters von Schirach am 28. März 1942 anlässlich der Hundertjahrfeier der Wiener Philharmoniker. » Unpublished manuscript. ÖStA (Austrian State Archive), 04 AdR, Katalog 49a, No. 258, page 8.

(17) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 221 f.

(18) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 163-179, for information about the pronounced rivalry between Gæbbels and Schirach regarding cultural policy.

(19) « Die Tagebücher von Josef Gæbbels. Teil II, Diktate 1941-1945 » , Volume 3, edited by Elke Fröhlich, Munich / New Providence / London / Paris (1996) , page 474.

(20) « Die Tagebücher von Josef Gæbbels. Teil II, Diktate 1941-1945 » , Volume 3, edited by Elke Fröhlich, Munich / New Providence / London / Paris (1995) , page 65 - entry dated April 8, 1942.

(21) Memo by Walther Thomas, cultural advisor, for his superior Müller (15 March 1943) , unregistered document.

(22) Friedrich Schreyvogel. « Eine Schicksalssymphonie. Roman der Wiener Jahrhundertwende. » , Berlin (1941) .

(23) Schreyvogel. « Schicksalssymphonie » , page 443.

(24) Schreyvogel. « Schicksalssymphonie » , page 443.

(25) Schreyvogel. « Schicksalssymphonie » , page 443.

(26) Baldur von Schirach. « Rede zur Eröffnung der Mozartwoche 1941 » , Weimar (1943) .

(27) Baldur von Schirach. « Rede zur Eröffnung der Mozartwoche 1941 » , Weimar (1943) , page 8.

(28) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 223 ff.

The Repertoire of the Vienna Philharmonic in the Nazi Era

(Fritz Trümpi)

The Vienna Philharmonic's concert performance during National-Socialism was marked by a high-degree of continuity in terms of its repertoire - but only concerning the subscription concerts.

...

The programming of the Vienna Philharmonic was traditionally oriented less towards unknown novelties and more towards already established and canonized works and composers - also, according to their self-definition. Already, the « founding decree » of the « Philharmonic concerts » , in 1842, records that the concerts would « only bring Classical and interesting works » . (1) And Clemens Hellberg notes the « most careful selection of the works to be performed » as an essential element of the « Philharmonic idea » . (2) In plain terms, this meant since the end of the 19th Century : little contemporary music and only exceptionally works of low-profile. In 1939, the Vienna Philharmonic,

furthermore, officially set this out in writing in their new association rules :

« The purpose of the association is to foster orchestral music in highest-perfection. Classical music is to be especially considered. » (3) (See, also : « An Association Based on National-Socialist Principles » .) The Vienna Philharmonic's concert performance during National-Socialism, thus, is marked by a high-degree of continuity in terms of its repertoire - but only concerning the subscription concerts. This distinction between subscription concerts and other concert and performance forms is central with a view to National-Socialist cultural policy, because a multitude of concert forms was introduced in National-Socialism with which the Vienna Philharmonic were only slightly familiar, if not at all unfamiliar, before 1938 : « KdF » -events (« Kraft durch Freude » : i.e. , Strength through joy) , for example, but also « Wehrmacht » and factory concerts as well as radio broadcasting concerts or sound film recordings, which occasionally entailed significant deviations from the traditional repertoire.

Concerning 1st of all the subscription concerts, the previously mentioned standing rule of 1939 (the purpose of the association being to foster orchestral music in its highest-perfection, under special consideration of Classical music) can, on an empirical level, be largely verified : a significant change after 1938 in the general repertoire of this form of concert is not ascertained. (4) Already before 1938, the Vienna Philharmonic would, in their evening concerts, only sporadically perform music of composers extensively prohibited in National-Socialism, such as Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy or Gustav Mahler. (5)

Also, the variously mentioned medial consolidation of the Orchestra's relationship to Vienna is not reflected in the repertoire : an increased « Austrification » of the repertoire is not found in the Vienna Philharmonic's traditional subscription concerts - just as little, by the way, as an increase of the rate of « Reich » German composers after the « annexation » . The traditionally minor presence of Robert Schumann Symphonies did not change even after 1938, (6) even though Schumann was increasingly received in National-Socialism on the whole. (7) Nevertheless, there selectively are some noticeable changes in the repertoire, also concerning the subscription concerts. One item on the programme that underwent considerable extension was the works of Bruckner. In this manifests not primarily a relationship to Vienna or Austria, rather this fact may be read as the consequence of a generally forced reception of the composer in National-Socialism (a similar increase in Bruckner's works can be observed in the repertoire of the Berlin Philharmonic since 1933) . (8) It may also be supposed that the Catholic-National attitude of the Nazi chairman Wilhelm Jerger was jointly responsible for this increase in the Vienna Philharmonic's reception of Bruckner. Additionally remarkable is the considerably increased presence of Richard Wagner's music since the « annexation » . This is due to the great and politically connoted popularity of the composer in the Nazi State (9) and starts immediately following the « annexation » : the rate of Wagner works on the programme in the subscription programme after 1938 doubles from barely 5 % before 1938. (10) In this respect, the concert repertoire of the Vienna Philharmonic is in conflict with the presence of Wagner's works on German Opera stages. (11)

Much more severe, as in the case of the subscription concerts, was the change in repertoire in the other concerts of the Orchestra ; these constituted the main part of its activity outside of the performance of Operas and often stood in close relation to the Nazi propaganda, in direct or indirect ways. (12) Especially to be emphasized here are those concerts which the Philharmonic recorded for the broadcasting corporation or, at least, those that were broadcast : the

formation of the Orchestra as a decidedly Viennese one is for the main part associated with this broadcasting presence in National-Socialism. (13) The Vienna Philharmonic were quasi-contractually obliged to broadcast a « Viennese note » . One of the main protagonists of this Richard Strauß renaissance would have likely been the conductor Clemens Krauß. (14) He informed the Vienna Philharmonic, in January 1940, that the Broadcasting Corporation Administration had, for the coming season, given the green light for a broadcast of « 4 evening concerts of the Vienna Philharmonic under Clemens Krauß » and, at the same time, he stressed :

« In order to give the events a pronounced Viennese character, the soloists should preferably be selected from the circle of the Orchestra or, at least, from the circle of artists emerging from the Vienna school. » (15)

Building on Krauß' academies, the Orchestra was presented with, yet, another chance for broadcasting production. A report, from October 1940, records the plan « to produce “ Schwarzplatten ” recordings of Viennese music for the Greater German Broadcasting, predominantly of course the works of Johann Strauß, with a conductor especially mastered in the Viennese note. The conductor Wacek could be won as conductor for the recording of these gramophone records who, despite his age, is still very agile and, without a doubt, the best conductor for this kind of music. » (16)

The resonance of this « Viennese note » can be assessed from the « situation reports of the Security Service of the SS » , writings of an informant enterprise that, with dubious methods, attempted to identify different moods in the population. According to these reports, the Berlin Philharmonic were ahead by more than a nose in the reception of symphonic works, (17) whereas only the Vienna Philharmonic came into question for works of the Strauß dynasty :

« Especially, the broadcast of the concert of the Vienna Philharmonic, on August 6, was received with special appreciation by all in the audience. The music-experts were delighted about the exceptional rendering of the played works (especially, the “ Geschichten aus dem Wiener Wald ”) which, otherwise, were run through rather like pop-songs, and the general audience approved of the selection of simple melodies (such as Kiel) . » (18)

With music of the Strauß family, the Broadcasting Corporation reached the « experts » as well as the general audience. This audience was fond of melodies as such, the experts however especially of its precise rendering by one of Germany's finest Orchestras, which allegedly emancipated Strauß' works of their entertaining nature and brought them in proximity of « Viennese Classical Music » . « Popular Music » , thus, through the Vienna Philharmonic became socially acceptable also with the « experts » . (19)

The fact that, during National-Socialism, the works of Johann and Josef Strauß found increased entrance into the concert programme of the Vienna Philharmonic is not only attested in reference to the broadcasting concerts, but also on the whole : in the last year of War, 1944-1945, the works of the Strauß dynasty amounted to about 50 % of the entire repertoire outside of the subscription concerts. (20) This was part of the political calculations of the National-Socialists. After all, even Josef Gœbbels was convinced that Vienna had to, again, become « a city of culture, of optimism, of music and sociability » . (21) In this context is also to be located the establishment and the sustained success of the New Year's concert. (See also : « From the Johann Strauß Concert in 1939 to the New Year's Concert in 1946 » .) The fact that explicit resentment was repeatedly voiced against this development of the repertoire from

within the Orchestra (22) indicates that this truly represented a radical change in the programming of the Orchestra, but the conservative line of the subscription concerts could only be politically and financially sustained by an opening of the Vienna Philharmonic to the musical entertainment sector - and this was a clearly changed situation for the Orchestra. The Strauß waltzes were especially qualified for this task, because they allowed to be as easily linked to the topos of the « music city » as to the myth of « Old Vienna », which was likewise forced by National-Socialism of Viennese character ; thereby, the dominating position of the Orchestra in the municipal enterprise of « high-culture » was, in no way, compromised.

The same is true for the Vienna Philharmonic's intense participation in sound film recordings, which, just like the waltz-renaissance, was in service of the past-oriented image campaign of the city. (23) These sound film recordings, which had already been maintained by the Orchestra during « Austrofascism », again meant a repeated opening of the Orchestra to the entertainment sector, which did not remain unopposed - and this resistance was put-up even by the orchestral chairman :

« Straßer advocates a rejection by all means of all sound film recordings and insignificant concerts on the basis of artistic reasons and due to work overload. Chairman Jerger aligns himself with Straßer's view. » (24)

Encouragement for the sound film recordings, however, came from the committee. General Manager Jelinek disagreed with Straßer's opinion and pointed-out « that also church music, trumpet choir events or the like very often are inartistic, and the works of private assemblies such as string quartets and wind player assemblies also contribute to work overload. The only difference is that, with sound film work and smaller concert events, the whole Orchestra has a financial profit, whereas with string quartets and similar assemblies only a selected few are financially involved. After all (to be honest with you) , we did not only choose to become musicians to be artists exclusively, but also to be able to make money with it, such as all the other men also do. We know from experience that the greatest artists are also the greatest users. » (25) The discussion about the continuation of sound film recordings was postponed.

While the Orchestra frequently declined requests for waltzes and sound film recordings, but then most often reluctantly executed these orders, it was wilfully obstructive towards requests for a more frequent performance of contemporary music. Schirach's general cultural adviser, Walter Thomas, requested the Orchestra, in 1942, to incorporate contemporary works into the subscription concerts, but the committee promptly refused. The task of the subscription concerts would not consist in « promoting contemporaries, but to perform the greatest and most beautiful complete orchestral literature in its most accomplished form. It would amount to a breach in the Philharmonic tradition and a decline in class if contemporaries would have their say in the Philharmonic subscription concerts. » (26) At the same time, probably due to political reasons, some accommodation was signalled :

« In order not to be completely unapproachable to Gen. Ref. [Thomas] , it has been decided to conduct 3 extraordinary concerts with mainly contemporary works in the programme. » (27)

Beginning in 1943, then, single items with contemporary works are found on the programme for extraordinary concerts, like a dance suite of Paul Constantinescu, or Maurice Ravel's « Boléro », but also Hans Pfitzner's « Palestrina » prelude, or orchestral variations by Zoltán Kodály. The demand for more contemporary music in the programmes of

the Vienna Philharmonic obviously proceeded directly from Schirach : in May 1942, he acted as the organizer of a « Week of Contemporary Music » , to which also the Vienna Philharmonic was obliged. Wilhelm Jerger, the chairman of the Orchestra, made use of Schirach's open-minded attitude towards contemporary music and, occasionally, made the Philharmonic perform his own works, which the Orchestra had partly also recorded for the Broadcast Corporation. (28) In the subscription concerts, however, the Vienna Philharmonic continued to largely keep away from contemporary music.

This example of the dealings with requests for more contemporary music shows the considerable scope of action that the Vienna Philharmonic managed to retain even during National-Socialism. In politically sensitive cases, however, the Orchestra in its programming made efforts at accommodation towards the Nazi regime. For example, the committee, on January 4, 1943, decided « due to considerations of the State Police » to decline a requested composition evening with works of Raimund Weissensteiner : Weissensteiner was chaplain and professor at the Vienna College of Music and, in 1938, received a warning « because of utterances hostile to the “ Reich ” » . He was arrested and sentenced to 3 years of prison only a short while after the committee had decided to decline a performance of his works. (29) In another example, the repertoire decision of the committee is directed against a member of the Philharmonic themselves : Richard Krotschak. Krotschak, solo cellist of the Orchestra since 1934, was married to a Jewish woman and could remain in the Orchestra only on basis of a « special permit » . Despite his numerous activities also during National-Socialism as a soloist in and with the Orchestra, Jerger went back on him with an anti-Semitic tirade :

« At this point, the chairman Jerger opposes the performance of Brahms's Double Concerto because of Krotschak's kin-relation (“ Versippung ”) . » (30)

About 1 year later though, the committee, at short notice, resorted to his skills as a soloist for Brahms's Double Concerto, as evident from a request of the committee as well as a « thank you » letter - the designated soloist in a Piano Concerto, Alfred Cortot, had cancelled due to illness. (31)

The maintenance of these privileges certainly had its price, especially in the case of the so-called « UK-Stellung » , which saved the Philharmonic from being called into the « Wehrmacht » , and which Schirach had secured for the Orchestra since his assumption of office as regional leader and « Reich » governor in Vienna, in August 1940. (32) On the one side, the Orchestra (with more or less enthusiasm) , at irregular intervals, complimentary played music in Schirach's villa, in Döbling, at the « Hohe Warte » and in the « Hofburg » ; (33) on the other side, the maintenance of the diverse privileges was also connected to performing « Wehrmacht » and factory concerts (« Werkskonzert ») . Sense and purpose of these « Wehrmacht » concerts was to offer amusement to the soldiers and to brand them with « German cultural assets » , whereby the aspect of national representation in these concerts becomes clearly manifest. (34) The Vienna Philharmonic performed about 20 concerts for members of the « Wehrmacht » and, in one case, « in the context of troop entertainment of the “ Waffen-SS ” » . (35) With reference to the programme, a clear dominance of works of the Strauß dynasty is confirmed also in these concerts and, in addition Mozart, Schubert and Wagner were played (proportionally, in this order) . (36) Most of these concerts were held in Vienna, only rarely did the Orchestra travel to the soldiers - still, in March 1945 for example, there was a « soldier concert » in the « SS-barracks Glasenbach » . (37) While major general Paul Winter, in a heroic article on « The cultivation of music in the

Wehrmacht » , (38) comments upon the musical « troop entertainment » and holds that the Vienna Philharmonic « spare no effort and danger to provide the whole wealth of music to our soldiers, from Murmansk to Africa, from the Atlantic Coast to deep into the East, in hours of relaxation and concentration » , this statement cannot be confirmed in face of their obvious avoidance of War zones. Less numerous were the factory concerts of the Vienna Philharmonic : 1st in 1943, they performed 3 and, from September 1944 to the end of War, 9 more - in total, they thus performed a dozen factory concerts during National-Socialism. (39) Next to aspects of entertainment and the representation of « German music creation » , their aim must have been not least the sublimation of defence production as such : the presence of the elite of « German » representational arts in the factory hall meant for the German War production, as it were, a consecration by the « German Arts » , which took place in front of the eyes and ears of the « German people's community » . (40)

Travel concerts abroad were also relatively rare for the Vienna Philharmonic during National-Socialism : after 1938, these were in sharp decline, (41) while orchestral trips to Germany were still relatively numerous. This decline in concerts abroad is due to the fact that the external musical representation was provided mainly by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. (42) The relatively frequent performances in Germany, however, manifest as the urge to represent the newly-created « Ostmark » respectively Vienna within the new State structure and, in addition, to secure a most favourable position in the German music enterprise. (43) There were, however, still a few trips abroad which exhibited a highly-propagandistic nature and which were received in coverage, less in a Viennese and much more in a Reich-context. For example, in the case of both concerts in Kraków, in December 1939, on occasion of the « re-opening » of the « German Theatre » and, in April 1940, on occasion of the « Birthday of the “ Führer ” » . On the occasion of the « re-opening » of the « German Theatre » , the « Governor General » , Hans Frank, personally invited the Orchestra. His speech, at the opening of the « German Theatre » , was, at the same time, a Nazi laudation on the Vienna Philharmonic. Frank stressed that they were « the representatives of this glorious, indestructible, 1,000 year old cultural asset of German artistic production, artistic work and German artistic reproduction » . (44) It should not have been a coincidence that it was the Vienna Philharmonic who were selected to represent German « high-culture » in the occupied Kraków - Vienna was the former central authority of the « Kingdom Galicia and Lodomeria » , to which belonged also the « Duchy Kraków » . Frank proclaimed in his speech that « the Polish here was but a historical attempt of forgery » . He also directly stated what the Polish and Jewish population had to expect of this « German town » :

« We will strive, for justice of effort, to again raise the German character of this town. Soldiers live here who carry still their wounds from the battles in Poland, and these will be your guests tonight. Men live here, who strive to bring German order into this area, placed alone in their position, facing thousands of difficulties in life and office, dependent on their vigour ; these will today be delighted by you ; and here, in and around us, also live the spirits of the Germans who had here formerly worked. » (45)

The opening concert, thus, must be viewed as a musical prelude to the persecution and murder of thousands and thousands of people, the key-word of which is delivered in the head-line to the opening ceremony in the « Krakauer Nachrichten » :

« Kraków, again, German cultural centre. » (46)

During National-Socialism, the Vienna Philharmonic, in all, also strengthened their already close relationship to Vienna, in terms of the programme - but this is not to be read as an act of resistance against the German supremacy, as long-term attempts at representation on behalf of the Orchestra itself would have wanted to make us believe. The repeatedly increased enrolment of the Philharmonic in the top of the « Music city Vienna », since 1938, served to establish the consolidation of Nazi rule in Vienna. According to the situation's demand, the Orchestra, as well as political entities, were readily willing to temporarily drop the Vienna reference in favour of a « Reich » context, as has been exemplarily demonstrated by the Philharmonic's Kraków concerts. In light of the highly-diverse concert practice and the flexible programming during National-Socialism, multiple connections between the Philharmonic and political entities may be recognized which, never before in the history of the Orchestra, were as numerous as during the time between 1938 and 1945.

Notes

(1) Cited in : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 22.

(2) Cited in : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 24.

(3) « Der Zweck des Vereines ist die Pflege der Orchestermusik in höchster Vollendung. Die klassische Musik soll besonders berücksichtigt werden. » Satzung des Vereins Wiener Philharmoniker. Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv, Vereinsakt, Musik Abteilung 119, A 32 : Gelöschte Vereine, Seiten 4602-4621.

(4) For details, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 233-249. Concerning the entire repertoire of the Vienna Philharmonicists, see the electronic database of the Orchestra itself, in the historical archives of the Vienna Philharmonicists.

(5) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 242 f.

(6) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 319 f.

(7) See, for example : Helmut Loos. « Schumann-Rezeption im “ Dritten Reich ” » , in : « Musik in Diktaturen des 20. Jahrhunderts. Tagungsband zum Internationalen Symposium an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal. (28. - 29. Februar 2004) » , edited by Michæla G. Grochulski, Oliver Kautny, Helmke Jan Keden, Wiesbaden (2006) , pages 57-70.

(8) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 235. Concerning the Bruckner reception in the Nazi era, see, for example : Albrecht Dümling. « Der deutsche Michel erwacht. Zur Bruckner-Rezeption im NS-Staat » , in : « Bruckner-Probleme. Beiheft zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft » , Volume XLV, same editors, Stuttgart (1999) , pages 20-214.

(9) A statistical survey of the American cultural scientist David B. Dennis revealed that, in National-Socialism, Richard Wagner was not only widely received in expert circles, but was also, by far, the composer mostly addressed in the media. Albrecht Dümling. « “ Honour Your German Masters. ” The Use and Abuse of “ Classical ” Composers in Nazi

Propaganda. » , in : « Journal of Political & Military Sociology, 202 » , Volume 30, No. 2, pages 273-295 - here : page 276. Cited in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 235 f.

(10) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 321.

(11) Concerning the performance of the Operas of Wagner in National-Socialism, see, for example : Jens Malte Fischer. « Richard Wagner und seine Wirkung » , Wien (2013) , page 261 ff.

(12) An overview of the concerts with obvious propagandistic nature is found in : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 476 ff.

(13) Details in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 263-275.

(14) This may be assumed on the basis of the different grades of the presence of Strauß' works in the programme of the Vienna Philharmonists, since the years of the 1920's : these were tendentially higher in those years Krauß conducted the Orchestra, than in those phases in which Krauß did not conduct in Vienna. See, also : the chart on the Strauß repertoire of the Orchestra, between 1920 and 1945, in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 256.

(15) Krauß to Vienna Philharmonists (12 January 12 1940) . HAWPh, Korrespondenzmappen, K/51 - Clemens Krauß, page 6.

(16) « Protocol Vorstandsrat-Sitzung » (7 October 1940) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030 : Protokolle 1938-1944, page 17.

(17) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 274.

(18) « Meldungen aus dem Reich 1938-1945. Die geheimen Lageberichte des Sicherheitsdienstes der SS. » , Volume 5, No. 102 (4 July 1940) to No. 141 (14 November 1940) , edited by Heinz Boberach, Hesching (1984) - here : No. 115 (15 August 1940) , page 1472/II.

(19) Concerning the problem of the classification of the music of the Strauß dynasty, see : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 255 f.

(20) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 256.

(21) « Eine Stadt der Kultur, des Optimismus, der Musik und der Geselligkeit. » , « Die Tagebücher von Josef Goebbels » , Teil I, Aufzeichnungen 1924-1941, Band 4, München / New York / London / Paris (1987) , page 471 - entry of 19 January 1941.

(22) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 257 f.

(23) A selection of the film music recorded by the Vienna Philharmonists can be found in : Franz Bartolomey. « Was zählt, ist der Augenblick. » , in : « Die Bartolomeys. 120 Jahre an der Wiener Staatsoper. » , Wien (2012) , page 117.

(24) « Straßer tritt für unbedingte Ablehnung aller Tonfilmmusikaufnahmen und unbedeutender Konzerte aus künstlerischen Gründen und Arbeitsüberlastung ein. Vorstand Jerger schliesst sich der Anschauung Strassers an. » Protocol KS (2 September 1940) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030, page 16.

(25) « Daß auch Kirchenmusiken, Trompeterchorveranstaltungen und Ähnliches sehr oft unkünstlerisch sind und die Arbeiten der privaten Vereinigungen wie Streichquartette, Bläservereinigung, ebenso zur Arbeitsüberlastung beitragen und der Unterschied nur darin besteht, daß bei der Tonfilmarbeit und kleineren Konzertveranstaltungen das ganze Orchester einen finanziellen Nutzen hat, während bei den Streichquartetten und ähnlichen Vereinigungen nur ganz wenige finanziell beteiligt sind. Schliesslich sind wir (um ganz ehrlich zu sein) nicht nur Musiker geworden, um ausschließlich Künstler zu sein, sondern um damit auch Geld verdienen zu können, wie das ja alle anderen Herren auch tun. Wir wissen aus Erfahrung, daß gerade die grössten Künstler auch die grössten Geldwucherer sind. » Protocol KS (2 September 1940) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030, page 16.

(26) « Zeitgenossen zu fördern, sondern das Beste und Schönste der Gesamtorchesterliteratur in vollendetster Form zur Aufführung zu bringen. Es würde einen Bruch der philharmonischen Tradition und zugleich einen Niveauabstieg bedeuten, wenn in den philharmonischen Abonnement-Konzerten in erster Linie Zeitgenossen zu Worte kämen. » Protocol KS (10 September 1942) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030, page 33.

(27) « Um aber dem Gen. Ref. (Thomas) gegenüber nicht ganz abweisend zu sein, wird beschlossen, drei außerordentliche Konzerte mit hauptsächlich zeitgenössischen Werken im Programm zur Durchführung zu bringen. » Protocol KS (10 September 1942) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030, page 33.

(28) See : the programme-database in the historical archive of the Vienna Philharmonists.

(29) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 244.

(30) « Bei dieser Gelegenheit wird vom Vorstand Jerger gegen die Aufführung von Brahms' Doppelkonzert wegen Krottschaks Versippung Stellung genommen. » Protocol KS (11 July 1942) . HAWPh, A-Pr-030, page 32.

(31) Letter of the committee (Kainz) to Krottschak, from 8 October and 20 October 1943. Historical archive of the Vienna Philharmonists, « Depot Staatsoper » (Ordner 1) .

(32) Details in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 189-192.

(33) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 192 f.

(34) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 275 ff.

(35) « Im Rahmen der Truppenbetreuung der Waffen-SS » , see : Hellsberg. « Demokratie » , page 476 ff.

(36) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 279 f.

(37) An overview of the « Wehrmacht » concerts of the Vienna Philharmonicists, during National-Socialism, can be found in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 276.

(38) See, for example : Paul Winter. « Musikpflege in der Wehrmacht » , in : « Jahrbuch der deutschen Musik 1943. Im Auftrage der Abteilung Musik des Reichsministeriums für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda herausgegeben von Hellmuth von Hase. » , Leipzig / Berlin (undated) , pages 54-57 - here : page 57. Cited in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 276.

(39) According to the catalogue of the concert programme of the Vienna Philharmonicists. Cited in : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 283.

(40) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 283 f.

(41) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 298 f.

(42) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , pages 287-298.

(43) See : Trümpi. « Orchester » , page 298 f.

(44) « Die Repräsentanten dieses herrlichen unzerstörbaren 1.000jährigen Kulturgutes deutschen Kunstschaffens, deutschen Kunstwaltens und deutscher Kunstwiedergabe. » , in : « Krakauer Zeitung » (17-18 December 1939) , page 1.

(45) « Wir werden uns bemühen, um der Gerechtigkeit der Leistung willen den deutschen Charakter dieses Ortes wieder emporzusteigern. Hier leben Soldaten, die aus den Kämpfen in Polen noch ihre Wunden tragen, sie werden heute Ihre Gäste sein, hier leben die Männer, die sich bemühen, deutsche Ordnung in dieses Gebiet zu bringen, einsam auf ihre Positionen gestellt, tausend Schwierigkeiten des Lebens und Amtes gegenüber, nur auf ihre Tatkraft angewiesen ; sie werden heute durch Sie beglückt werden ; und hier leben in uns und um uns die Geister der Deutschen, die hier gewirkt haben. » , in : « Krakauer Zeitung » (17-18 December 1939) , page 1.

(46) « Krakau wieder deutsches Kulturzentrum » , in : « Krakauer Zeitung » (17-18 December 1939) , page 1.

From the Johann Strauß Concert in 1939 to the New Year's Concert in 1946

(Oliver Rathkolb)

One thing needs to be made quite clear from the outset : the tradition of New Year's concerts given by the Vienna Philharmonic with works by Johann Strauß, broadcast on the radio and later on television, dates back to the National-Socialist era. Such concerts were held on 31 December 1939 (a Johann Strauß Concert) , and on 1 January 1941 (the 2nd « Philharmonische Akademie ») . Both were jointly organized by the Vienna Philharmonic and the « Reich » Broadcasting Company, a cooperation that was to become the norm.

It is also obvious that concerts devoted to the works of the Straußes were already part of the repertoire of the Vienna Philharmonic, though they had not previously been given over the New Year period. A brief glance at the performance

data bank in the Archive of the Vienna Philharmonic is enough to see that such concerts were already a firmly embedded tradition, promoted with particular vigour by the conductor Clemens Krauß. A check of the works performed at the « Johann Strauß Concert » and / or the New Year « Philharmonische Akademie », on 31 December 1939 and 1 January 1941, respectively, yields the following previous performances under the conductor Clemens Krauß. (1) The result is highly-significant, which is the reason why it is, here, reprinted in full :

« Annen-Polka » , Opus 117

26 June 1927 : Frankfurt am Main.

11 August 1929 : Salzburg.

3 August 1930 : Bad Gastein.

16 February 1931 : Vienna.

16 August 1931 : Salzburg.

« Egyptischer Marsch » , Opus 335

5 August 1932 : Salzburg.

« Geschichten aus dem Wienerwald » , Waltz, Opus 325

11 August 1929 : Salzburg.

3 August 1930 : Bad Gastein.

4 December 1930 : Brno.

5 December 1930 : Prague.

16 August 1931 : Salzburg.

7 May 1933 : Rome.

« Kaiser-Walzer » , Opus 437

5 August 1932 : Salzburg.

13 August 1933 : Salzburg.

« Leichtes Blut, Polka schnell » , Opus 319

11 August 1929 : Salzburg.

10 August 1930 : Salzburg.

16 February 1931 : Vienna.

16 August 1931 : Salzburg.

13 August 1933 : Salzburg.

« Morgenblätter » Waltz, Opus 279

11 August 1929 : Salzburg.

11 November 1929 : Vienna.

3 August 1931 : Salzburg.

16 February 1931 : Vienna.

5 August 1932 : Vienna.

Overture « Die Fledermaus »

27 June 1927 : Frankfurt am Main.

11 August 1929 : Salzburg.

3 August 1930 : Bad Gastein.

10 August 1930 : Salzburg.

4 December 1930 : Brno.

5 December 1930 : Prague.

16 February 1931 : Vienna.

16 August 1931 : Salzburg.

5 August 1932 : Salzburg.

6 May 1933 : Bologna.

7 May 1933 : Rome.

13 August 1933 : Salzburg.

« Perpetuum mobile, musikalischer Scherzo », Opus 257

27 June 1927 : Frankfurt am Main.

11 August 1929 : Salzburg.

3 August 1930 : Bad Gastein.

10 August 1930 : Salzburg.

4 December 1930 : Brno.

5 December 1930 : Prague.

16 February 1931 : Vienna.

16 August 1931 : Salzburg.

5 August 1932 : Salzburg.

7 May 1933 : Rome.

« Pizzicato-Polka »

10 August 1930 : Salzburg.

16 February 1931 : Vienna.

16 August 1931 : Salzburg.

5 August 1932 : Salzburg.

7 May 1933 : Rome.

13 August 1933 : Salzburg.

« Ritter Pázmán Csárdás », Opus 441

5 August 1932 : Salzburg.

13 August 1933 : Salzburg.

What is remarkable, here, is the clear rupture in the repertoire, between 1934 and 1938. It is to be accounted for by reference to the conflict between Clemens Krauß and the Vienna Philharmonic and Krauß's exodus as Opera director, from Vienna to Berlin. He was the driving force behind the Strauß concerts, before 1934 and after 1938.

In 2011, Fritz Trümpi (2) (and Clemens Hellsberg, in 1992) (3) expressed their belief that the conductor Clemens Krauß was the driving force behind the Johann Strauß concerts, from 1939-1941.

Trümpi :

« It is conceivable that the paternity of the idea lay with Clemens Krauß, who had been performing concerts consisting solely of works by Johann Strauß with the Vienna Philharmonic, since 1929. » (4)

This was the case, above all, at the Salzburg Festival. Contracts and correspondence with the « Reich » Broadcasting Company have recently discovered in a file, found in a basement-room housing the Vienna Philharmonic archive of sheet-music. These give substance both to this thesis and to 2 claims, for which only insufficient evidence had previously been identified : the initiative for the concerts and the negotiations came from Clemens Krauß and it was he who paved the way for the 1st talks with the « Reich » Broadcasting Company, in Berlin.

The unique position that the New Year's Concert may claim today as a global « music brand » was still a thing of the distant future during WWII. Clemens Krauß (and Wilhelm Jerger, after him) were primarily interested in a special cycle of a total of « 4 Philharmonische Akademien », as is evident from the contract dated 2 November 1940 (5) :

« 4 “ Philharmonische Akademien ” in the “ Großer Saal ” of the “ Musikverein ”, in Vienna, performed for the pan-German Broadcasting Company : 13 December ; 1 January (Johann Strauß Concert) ; 25 January and 15 March 1941 - conducted by “ Professor Clemens Krauß ”. »

The entertainment effect of « waltz-music », which detracted from the increasingly dispiriting effects of WWII, made it of course perfectly suited to be one of the many jigsaw pieces needed to bolster Nazi propaganda and, above all, to instantiate the Nazi broadcasting policy, which Berlin saw encompassing Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart as much as Franz Léhar and Johann Strauß. The review by the « Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt » (3 January 1940) of the 1st Johann Strauß Concert illustrates this reception very clearly.

On top of this, Trümpi has described in detail, in his analysis of the Philharmonic repertoire, the resistance put-up by the Orchestra against this specific form of « Unterhaltungsmusik » (easy listening) , even though the Johann Strauß pieces provide a challenge to any Orchestra.

These concerts were, by no means, professions of allegiance to Austria - even though several contemporary witnesses, such as the late historian Fritz Fellner (6) and, most recently, former Ambassador Wolfgang Schallenberg have testified that they seemed that way to certain individual concert-goers, particularly towards the end of the War. The programme

booklet for the 1st 4 broadcasts in this series from Vienna extols both the intended reach of the broadcasts and Strauß's contribution to « German music ». Much ideology was pinned to the music that, over time, evolved into the waltz, which was performed in « pubs on the outskirts of the city » and, as the Nazis claimed, had been an integral part of the « self-expression of the East Bavarian people standing guard in exposed advance posts at the border » .

It cannot be denied that music associated with the Straußes was harnessed to the Nazi ideology, despite Johann Strauß's partly Jewish descent - an inconvenient truth that Josef Gœbbels sought to conceal by falsifying the baptismal register in Vienna. The evidence for this is an entry in his diary that reveals the absurdity of his anti-Semitic racism :

« Some smart alec has found-out that Johann Strauß is 1/8 Jewish. This must not be made public. 1st, there is as yet no definitive proof and, 2nd, I do not want to see the German cultural legacy being gradually undermined. Otherwise, all we will have left of our history, at the end of the day, is Widukind, Heinrich der Löwe and Rosenberg. That is not really very much. Mussolini sets about the whole matter much more circumspectly. He arrogates all Roman history for himself, starting from the 1st stirrings of Antiquity. Compared with him, we are mere upstarts. I am doing everything in my power to counter this. This is also the will of the " Führer ". » (7)

The Johann Strauß Concert is part of the Nazi regime's propaganda-by-entertainment strategy. All programme items were subjected to a detailed analysis to determine their possible psychological and political effects. Even if an analysis of the minutes of the weekly meetings dealing with the « Radio Programme, 1940-1941 » (8) under the supervision of Hans Hinkel, a key-Nazi functionary in the « Reich » Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda and the « Reich » Chamber of Culture, has proved negative with regard to specific debates on the Johann Strauß Concert, there are, at least, general references to the concert cycle of the Vienna Philharmonic. No evidence has been found in this source of actual outside political interference in the programming of the Johann Strauß Concerts. The term « Viennese music » (« Wiener Musik ») is used for comparable programmes with works by Johann Strauß, such as that performed in August 1940. (9)

In 1946, the former Johann Strauß Concert was already credited with a long « tradition », and Professor Josef Krips, the conductor of the Philharmonic Concert of 1 January 1946, which was now dubbed « New Year's Concert » for the 1st time, noted succinctly :

« I began 1946 with the 1st New Year's Concert, in the time of peace. » (10)

Krips, who had been branded a half-Jew and banned from conducting in the Nazi era, obviously had no problem with the continuation of a series of concerts whose latest performance, on 1 January 1945, took place in an apocalyptic atmosphere - as is vividly suggested by its austere programme sheet. In 1946, the print-media, such as the Social-Democratic « Arbeiter-Zeitung », in an article by one Doctor Ruff, (11) saw the New Year's Concert as a Strauß Concert and « as a hopeful musical salute to the New Year, which was welcomed with enthusiastic applause by the audience ». In 1947, the New Year's Concert which was, of course, still a long way away from the globally syndicated phenomenon we know today, had already morphed into « a fixture we have grown fond of » in the « Österreichische Volkspartei » daily, « Das Kleine Volksblatt ». (12)

It was only in recent years that a critical reflection on the part played in National-Socialism by the functionalization of light-music, in general, and of the Johann Strauß Concerts, in particular, has been attempted. Claims like the one advanced by journalist and senior-editor Jacob Heilbrunn, on 1 March 2013, in « National Interest » that :

« The New Year's Concert was originally devised to celebrate the 1938 union with the 3rd Reich, a fact that the Orchestra apparently disguises on its website. » (13)

This affirmation may be devoid of any documented basis in the sources but they do highlight how important it is to be as accurate and comprehensive as possible when analyzing the Johann Strauß Concerts, from 1939 to 1945, and to augment such analysis with a study of what went before and what came after this period.

Notes

(1) E-mail from Silvia Kargl to Oliver Rathkolb (5 February 2013) .

(2) Fritz Trümpi. « Politisierte Orchester. Die Wiener Philharmoniker und das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester », Vienna (2011) ; page 257.

(3) Clemens Hellsberg. « Demokratie der Könige », Zürich (1992) ; page 570.

(4) Trümpi. « Politisierte Orchester » ; page 257.

(5) Archive of the Vienna Philharmonic : « Depot Staatsoper », « Rundfunk » file.

(6) Letter from Fritz Fellner to the author (2011) , and letter to the Editor from Ambassador Wolfgang Schallenberg to « Der Standard » (January 2013) .

(7) Josef Gœbbels. Diary entry of 5 June 1938 , in : « Nationalsozialismus, Holocaust, Widerstand und Exil 1933-1945 » .

Online-Datenbank, De Gruyter (10 March 2013) :

<http://db.saur.de/DGO/basicFullCitationView.jsf?documentId=TJG-3954>

See, also :

http://www.musikverein.at/monatszeitung/show_artikel.php?artikel_id=1197 (retrieved on 10 March 2013) .

(8) « Bundesarchiv Berlin, R55/695, Abteilung Rundfunk, Protokolle wöchentlicher Sitzungen über das Rundfunkprogramm » (Minutes of the weekly meetings to discuss the radio programme) , Volume 1 (October 1941 to May 1942) ; and R55/696, « Abteilung Rundfunk », Volume 2 (June 1942 to August 1943) .

(9) « Bundesarchiv Berlin », R 78, 2340 : Pictures, pages 1190-1193.

(10) Josef Krips. « Ohne Liebe kann man keine Musik machen. Erinnerungen », edited and documented by Harrietta Krips, Vienna (1994) ; page 170.

(11) « Arbeiter-Zeitung » (3 January 1946) ; page 4.

(12) « Das Kleine Volksblatt » (8 January 1947) .

(13) <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/jacob-heilbrunn/nazism-the-vienna-philharmonic-8174>

Expulsion and Murder of Vienna Philharmonic Musicians after 1938

(Bernadette Mayrhofer)

« Why can I not play music with them ? I belong ! I'm the Concert Master ! » (1)

(Arnold Rosé upon his expulsion from the orchestra immediately after the « Anschluß » .)

13 active musicians were expelled from the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1938. 3 additional musicians who were already in retirement also became victims of the holocaust. A total of 7 musicians were not able to escape in time into exile. Of these, 5 were deported and murdered in concentration camps, while 1 musician died as a result of the eviction from his apartment, and another died in Vienna while awaiting his impending deportation.

Expulsion from the Orchestra

As in all musical ensembles, immediately after the « Anschluß » key positions within the Vienna Philharmonic were immediately re-staffed with National-Socialist sympathizers. Most cultural institutions implemented the anti-Semitic Nazi dogma within Austria even before the adoption of the Nuremberg racial laws of May 20, 1938, and the « Reichskulturkammergesetz » of May 31, 1938, which went into effect on June 11, 1938. Whether or not a member of the Orchestra had Jewish ancestors, or was married to a woman of Jewish heritage, was known before 1938. Even before the « Anschluß », this racial factor affected the social boundaries within the Orchestra. The grandson of one of the exiled musicians described this phenomenon as follows :

« The gist of it was that the Jews were always somehow marginalized. So there were “ us ” and “ them ”. And, then, there were those somewhere in between who did not consider themselves anti-Semites. » (2)

The 1st large wave of expulsion of musicians from the State Opera, in the days after March 11th, affected primarily prominent artists who, according to the National-Socialistic racial doctrine, were considered Jewish, as was the case with the Concert Master and soloist Arnold Rosé and his colleague, principal cellist and soloist Siegfried Friedrich Buxbaum. (3)

This was followed, only a few days later, by the next stage of expulsions of those orchestral members who were designated as Jewish according to Nazi terminology. Philharmonic musicians Paul Fischer, Max Starkmann, Josef Geringer, Berthold Salander, Doctor Daniel Falk, Viktor Robitsek and Ludwig Wittels were barred from further service in the Orchestra, and were informed of their compulsory suspension in writing by the administration of the State Opera, on March 23, 1938. (4)

Another consequence of the implementation of the Nuremberg racial laws in Austria as of May 20, 1938, and particularly by means of the « Regulations for the Re-Organization of Austrian Professional Civil Servants of May 31, 1938 », which were used as a « legal » justification for the expulsion of civil servants of Jewish heritage, was a 3rd wave of expulsions which threatened those Orchestra members of « mixed heritage » or who were « related by marriage » (« jüdisch Versippte »), according to Nazi terminology. The administration of the State (SThV) attempted to stem the further loss of artistic personnel by way of a special arrangement which consisted of submitting Applications for Exemption, the so-called « Belassungsanträge ». Paragraph 3, Section 3 of the Civil Service Decree of May 31, 1938, according to which employees « can, in exceptional cases, remain in their positions with the special approval of a representative of the “ Führer ” or an office appointed by him provided the legal basis for these exceptions ». (5) The individual directors were prompted to submit such exemption requests. (6) The administration of the State Opera, with the support of the prominent conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, 1st submitted requests for « special permission » for 9 orchestra musicians. (7) Specifically excluded from this privilege were the musicians Leopold Föderl and Arthur Schurig who, according to Nazi terminology, were « related by marriage ». (8) Hugo Burghauser, who had been removed from his position as Philharmonic chairman, was included in the list for special permission. For political considerations, however, he chose to go into exile. Burghauser's wife, the well-known choreographer, ballet mistress and director Margarethe Wallmann, who was of Jewish heritage, was already at this time in Buenos Aires. (9) The Argentine Concert Master and soloist Ricardo Odnoposoff also escaped, 1st to Brussels, then (after the outbreak of War, in 1939) to Buenos Aires, when he was unable to satisfactorily document his ancestry.

Persecution, Deportation and Murder of Philharmonic Musicians

13 active musicians were expelled from the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1938. 3 additional musicians, who were already retired, fell victim to the holocaust. A total of 7 Philharmonic musicians were not able to escape into exile in time, with 5 of them (Moriz Glattauer, Viktor Robitsek, Max Starkmann, Julius Stwertka und Armin Tyroler) being deported and murdered in concentration camps. 2 additional Philharmonic musicians died under dramatic circumstances while still in Vienna : Anton Weiß died on December 1, 1940, as the result of a stroke suffered while being evicted from his apartment. The violinist Paul Fischer died on November 4, 1942, at the age of 66 years in the Jewish Hospital in Vienna - after having suffered dismissal from his position, forced eviction and relocation, financial hardship, illness, miserable living conditions, etc. (10)

The arduous living conditions in Vienna for the musicians expelled from the Philharmonic until their escape into exile or forced deportation and murder in the concentration camps were characterized by large-scale waves of arrest beginning in March 1938, pogrom-style demonstrations against the Jewish populace, brutal disappropriation, forced relocation into Jewish living areas, plundering and intimidation in many shapes and forms.

Escape into Exile

9 Philharmonic musicians were able to escape into exile in time. Arnold Rosé and Friedrich Buxbaum escaped to London, England. They were already advanced in years and, despite having many advantageous contacts, it was difficult for them to gain a foothold in the British musical scene. Hugo Burghauser escaped 1st to Toronto, Canada, moving later to New York, in the United States. Daniel Falk, Josef Geringer, Berthold Salander and Ludwig Wittels successfully escaped to New York. The violonist Leopold Föderl escaped to Chicago, in the United States, while Ricardo Odnoposoff emigrated by way of Brussels, Belgium, to Buenos Aires, Argentina and, later, to New York. (11)

Failed Opportunity to Re-integrate Expelled Musicians into Austrian Cultural Life

Only 2 of these musicians returned to Austria. After several delays, Leopold Föderl re-emigrated to Austria in 1953. After numerous international concert tours, Ricardo Odnoposoff returned to Vienna in 1956. Neither Föderl nor Odnoposoff ever rejoined the Vienna Philharmonic after their return to Austria. (12)

Research in Progress

In the course of this research work, numerous historical sources have been utilized. Nevertheless, these sources manifest, both qualitatively and quantitatively, a high-degree of disparity. The amount of data on the lives of the musicians Leopold Föderl and Arnold Rosé is quite good, whereas the amount of information available on the violinist Ludwig Wittels is, at this time, very modest. Accordingly, varied in length and detail are the texts concerning the individual Philharmonic musicians who were driven-out of the Orchestra. The project's research, consolidation and augmentation of the biographical portraits of the victims will be continued until August 2013.

Notes

(1) Richard Newman. « Alma Rosé. Wien 1906 / Auschwitz 1944. Eine Biographie » , Bonn (2003) ; page 105.

(2) « Interview Bernadette Mayrhofer mit Roger Salander » , Vienna (30 May 2005) .

(3) Letter from Kerber / Vienna State Opera administration to the BthV (18 March 1938) - AdR, SThV 886 (1938) .

(4) Letter from Kerber / Vienna State Opera administration to the SthV (24 March 1938) , AdR, SThV 886 (1938) , writing by SthV (25 March 1938) - AdR, SThV 886 (1938) .

(5) Report by Kosak (21 June 1938) - AdR, SThV 2312 (1938) ; page 11.

(6) Report by Kosak (21 June 1938) - AdR, SThV 2312 (1938) ; page 12f.

(7) Letter of the « Reich » Propaganda Ministry in Berlin to Opera director Erwin Kerber (20 July 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte 1939-1940 » , « Bundestheater Administrationsakten » , page 958 (1938) .

(8) Report by Kerber to the SthV (21 October 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte 1939-1940 » .

(9) « Wiener Staatsoper, 70 Jahre danach. Die Wiener Staatsoper und der “ Anschluß ” 1938, Opfer, Täter, Zuschauer, Katalog zur Ausstellung im Gustav Mahler-Saal der Wiener Staatsoper » (10 March - 30 June 2008) ; page 46.

(10) Sources from the Historical Archives of the Vienna Philharmonic (HadWPh) ; Clemens Hellsberg. « Demokratie der Könige. Die Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker » , Zürich (1992) ; page 504.

(11) Bernadette Mayrhofer. « Die Angelegenheit des Judenabbaus geht jetzt ganz ruhig vor sich. » , in : « Vertreibung von Wiener Philharmonikern nach 1938 und ihr Leben im Exil » , Thesis, Vienna (2005) .

(12) Ibid.

Deportation and Murder

Persecution and Murder of Members of the Vienna Philharmonic

A total of 5 members of the Philharmonic were killed in the course of racist cleansings. One member of the Philharmonic died as a result of the eviction from his apartment, and another died in Vienna before his impending deportation.

Moriz Glattauer (Violin I)

On July 14, 1942, Moriz Glattauer, a retired 1st violinist with the Vienna Philharmonic, was deported to Theresienstadt along with his wife, Anna Schidlof Glattauer.

Viktor Robitsek (Violin II)

After 35 years of service in the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and Vienna Philharmonic, Viktor Robitsek received notice from the management of the State Opera informing him of his compulsory suspension.

Max Starkmann (Violin I, Viola)

On October 5, 1942, Max und Elsa Starkmann were forced under the most demeaning of conditions to board a train as part of a mass-transport to Maly Trostinec (about 18 kilometers from Minsk) .

Julius Stwertka (Concertmaster, Solo Violinist)

Julius Stwertka was recruited from Hamburg as Concert Master by Gustav Mahler and was engaged for this position with the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and Vienna Philharmonic from 1902-1936.

Armin Tyroler (Oboe II)

« It has always been my aim to lighten the struggle for existence faced by my less fortunate colleagues and to make their lives more bearable. There is no more to it than that. »

« Died in Vienna »

Paul Fischer (Violin I, Section Leader)

Paul Fischer had played 1st violin for 39 years with the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and the Vienna Philharmonic. Additionally, he was a long-time member of the internationally renowned Rosé Quartet.

Anton Weiß (Violin I, Section Leader)

Anton Weiß was a victim of the brutal expulsion policies of the National-Socialists ; and this, even before the systematic mass-murder of the Jewish population had begun.

Vienna Philharmonic Musicians in Exile

9 members of the Vienna Philharmonic managed to flee into exile.

Hugo Burghauser (Bassoon I, Chairman)

And of your former students no one apart from Hugo Burghauser, the poor man, who is so utterly lost on the asphalt of Manhattan.

Friedrich Siegfried Buxbaum (Principal Cellist)

Friedrich Buxbaum, who had held the exposed position of principal cellist, was expelled from the orchestral association immediately after Austria's annexation to Nazi Germany.

Daniel Falk (Violin II)

« Since leaving Vienna, I have experienced years of wandering and the tragic fate of losing my entire family (mother, brothers and all other relatives) in the concentration camps and gas-chambers, as well as years of becoming acquainted with a highly-interesting new country. »

Leopold Othmar Förderl (Violin II)

However, Förderl's expectations were soon to be shattered : in the summer of 1948, he received a 2nd letter from Salmhofer feigning false kindness that affronted him.

Josef Geringer (Violin I)

Josef Geringer was among the most impressive musicians of the Vienna Philharmonic in terms of his artistic qualities.

Ricardo Odnoposoff (Violin I, Concertmaster)

« He established himself as one of the outstanding violinists of the day. The Argentine artist, who came here virtually unknown to the general public, took his audience by storm by the virtuosity, power and fire of his performance. »

Arnold Rosé (Concert Master, Violin I, Viola soloist)

« As you correctly assume, after 57 years in the Opera, 56 years with the Quartet and 44 years in the “ Hofmusikkapelle ”, I have now disappeared into retirement without further ado. »

Berthold Salander (Violin II)

For Berthold Salander, it was like the end of the world when he was, virtually by force, driven from the Orchestra. At 51 years of age, he was suddenly excluded from his familiar and very successful professional life.

Ludwig Wittels (Violin I)

Wittels was able to save himself physically, but he was permanently traumatized by his experience of persecution and the murder of his mother :

« He spoke about it, over and over again. It ate him up inside all these years. He took it with him to bed at night and got-up with it in the morning. »

Impending Expulsion of Those Declared in Nazi Terminology as « Closely Related » (Versippte) , « Half-breeds » (Mischlinge) and Foreigners Lacking a « Certificate of Aryan Descent » (Ariernachweis)

(Bernadette Mayrhofer)

Gottfried Freiberg, Josef Hadraba, Theodor Heß, Rudolf Jettel, Richard Krotschak, Karl Maurer, Ernst Moravec, Otto Rieger, Arthur Schurig, Erich Weis, Otto Fieck.

...

1. Hugo Burghauser (« Fagott, Vorstand ») .

2. Leopold Förderl (« Violine II ») .

3. Gottfried Freiberg (« Horn I ») .

4. Josef Hadraba (« Posaune ») .

5. Theodor Heß (« Violine I ») .
6. Rudolf Jettel (« Klarinette ») .
7. Richard Krotschak (« Solocellist ») .
8. Karl Maurer (« Cellist ») .
9. Ernst Moravec (« Solobratschist ») .
10. Ricardo Odnoposoff (« Violine I, Konzertmeister ») .
11. Otto Rieger (« Solobratschist ») .
12. Arthur Schurig (« Pauke ») .
13. Erich Weis (« Viola ») .
14. Otto Fieck (« Trompete II und III ») (I) .

After those musicians who, according to the racist Nazi elocution, were classified as « full Jews » (« Volljude ») were expelled from the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and, therefore, also automatically from the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic (« Verein Wiener Philharmoniker ») , there still remained a set of artists in the Orchestra who now became the primary targets of political and anti-Semitic attacks. Those orchestral members who, according to Nazi terminology, were considered « half-breeds » (« Mischlinge ») and « closely Jewish related » (« jüdisch Versippte ») were now threatened by a harsh expulsion from the Orchestra. The danger of removal was also highly-acute for those who were politically unacceptable, foreigners without « proof of ancestry » (« Ahnenpass ») or those undesired for other reasons.

On June 21, 1938, a 22 page report was put together by Ernst Kosak, the Deputy Director (« stellvertretender Leiter ») of the State Theatre Administration (« Staatstheaterverwaltung » , SThV) , which had attached several black-lists of the SThV2 and included detailed recommendations on the further administrative procedure towards the practical implementation of the new and cruel provisions. This report reflects the (un)lawful zigzag policy that prevailed after the « Anschluß » . The range of measures included decommissioning, leave of absence, retirement, dismissal and retroactive termination. This reflects, on one side, the utterly inconsistent juridical and bureaucratic strategies of action and argumentation on behalf of the SThV, on the other side, it allowed for humane gestures. By pursuing immediate retirement instead of termination, Kosak made use of the legal chaos to, at least financially, provide for those displaced. However, his judicial efforts ultimately proved ineffective and, by the end of December 1938, those forced into retirement had to be subsequently dismissed by order of the « Reich » Governor (« Reichsstatthalter ») . (3)

« Special Permission » to Remain in the Orchestra

A key-section of Kosak's report of June 21 defined the procedures of the SThV in light of a 3rd, acutely imminent round of dismissals which affected mainly those who according to Nazi elocution were considered « closely Jewish related » (« jüdisch Versippte ») and « half or quarter Jews » (« Halb- oder Vierteljuden ») . The objective was to avert the disastrous artistic consequences of further expulsions through the use of so-called « retention requests » (« Belassungsanträge ») . The SThV spotted a legal possibility in § 3, section 3 of the Legal Ordinance of Officials (« Beamtenverordnung ») of May 31, 1938, in which employees and labourers « could, in exceptional cases, be allowed to remain in service with the approval of the deputy of the “ Führer ” or of an office designated by him » . (4) Requests were especially considered of those who in Nazi elocution were classified as « closely Jewish related » - i.e. , those musicians who were married to women of Jewish descent. A further group of orchestral members with « merit for request » were the so-called « Jewish half-breeds » (« jüdische Mischlinge ») who had been employed since August 1, 1914, or who had fought in the First World War. Special exceptions could, then, only be made by the « “ Reich ” Minister of the Interior (“ Reichsminister des Inneren ”) , in agreement with the Deputy of the “ Führer ” (“ Stellvertreter des Führers ”) » . Divorce was recognized only as long as it had been carried-out legally valid before June 1, 1938. (5)

It further proceeds from the report that the individual directorates were prompted to issue retention requests. (6) 2 weeks later, on July 5, 1938, the State Opera Directorate (« Staatsoperndirektion ») forwarded the SThV a list of those members designated for continued retention at the Opera House. On this 1st list of requests for continued retention in the Orchestra, the name of Leopold Förderl, whose 2nd wife in Nazi elocution was a « full Jew » (« Volljüdin ») , and who, therefore, was considered « fully Jewish related » (« volljüdisch versippt ») , was missing. Hugo Burghauser was included on the list. (7) By order of the Ministry of Information (« Propagandaministerium ») , on July 13, 1938, Burghauser, along with the other « retention candidates » , was requested by the State Opera Directorate (« Staatsoperndirektion ») to « immediately provide a birth certificate, birth certificates of your parents and 4 grandparents, the same documents on your wife's side, and furthermore a “ résumé ” and photograph » . (8) On July 23, State Opera Director, Erwin Kerber, settled verbally and in writing with Robert Valberg, the Provisional Leader (« kommissarische Leiter ») of the « Ring of Austrian Stage Artists » (« Ring der österreichischen Bühnenkünstler ») , for an extension of the submission deadline for the documents necessary for the retention to the beginning of September. (9) Valberg had distinguished himself as an exemplary Nazi and « Aryaniser » (« Ariseur ») in his close collaboration with the Ministry of Information concerning the inspection of « closely related » Philharmonic musicians and the examination of their « political soundness » (« politische Zuverlässigkeit ») .

In the meantime, Kerber had received a communication from the « “ Reich ” Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda » (« Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda ») , which had been drafted by Doctor Heinz Drewes (10) , in Salzburg :

« The minister has decided that the assembly of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra will remain unchanged in its present form and that the final assembly will be arranged in accordance with Doctor Furtwängler and Doctor Kerber, after the Festivals. » (11)

The result of this discussion was a written request addressed to director Kerber and signed by Doctor Wilhelm

Furtwängler in the name of the Vienna Philharmonic (dated August 20, 1938) « to request and enforce at the appropriate authority the special permit for the 9 members of our Orchestra recorded in the attached list » . (12) The request for an exception regulation was justified by a pragmatic argument : the continued retention of the listed musicians in the Orchestra should serve to :

« Maintain the artistic performance capability and, therefore, of the distinction of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. » (13)

Explicitly excluded from the privilege of this « special permission » were Leopold Föderl and Arthur Schurig who, according to Nazi racial ideology, were « closely related » (« versippt ») musicians. (14) A total of 9 musicians were on Furtwängler's list :

Theodor Heß (1st violin) ; Otto Rieger (solo viola player) ; Ernst Moravec (solo viola player) ; Richard Krotschak (solo cellist) ; Karl Maurer (cellist) ; Rudolf Jettel (clarinet) ; Hugo Burghauser (bassoon) ; Gottfried Freiberg (horn) ; and Josef Hadraba (trombone) .

The « retention procedure » obviously was deferred considerably, because it was only on December 27, 1939, more than 1 year later, that the « “ Reich ” Governor's Office » (« Reichsstatthaltereie ») « finally, also on its part, grants approval of these retentions » . (15) The State Opera Directorate forwarded the « retention requests » (« Belassungsgesuche ») to the « “ Reich ” Chamber of Music » (« Reichsmusikkammer ») , Berlin SW 11. , « Bernburgerstraße 19 » , with the plead to « officially issue a respective order » . (16) The list had been reduced by 1 person, because Hugo Burghauser had, at that time, already made his escape. About 1 month later, on January 30, 1940, the requested set of musicians again had changed. Rudolf Jettel was missing on this new list and, instead, he was replaced by Erich Weis (« viola, presumably half-breed of the 1st degree ») . (17)

There are few sources regarding the procedure of the « Reich » Chamber of Music, in Berlin, in respect to these requests for special permits. The principal violist, Otto Rieger, was considered, in racist Nazi terminology, a « half-Jew » , nevertheless, he was allowed to become a member of the « “ Reich ” Chamber of Culture » (« Reichskulturkammer ») . In the summer of 1942, the « Reich » Chamber of Music, in Berlin, suddenly denied his request for a special permit - despite his membership in the « Reich » Chamber of Culture. In a written response of November 19, 1942, to the « Reich » Chamber of Music, in Berlin, the SThV notes that the denial was not « connected to a professional prohibition » . (18)

The SThV additionally appealed to the « Reich » Chamber of Music : the « State Theatre Administration supports the request for Rieger's continued retention, because his withdraw would lead to a serious gap which would cause great damage to the Orchestra » . (19) The special permit of Rieger's colleague, the cellist Richard Krotschak who, according to the Nazi jargon, was considered « closely Jewish related » was « revoked » , in 1942. (20)

There is also the possibility that, up to 1942, his request was never authorized and that his continued retention in the Orchestra (as with other colleagues) was simply silently accepted. Allegedly, only an intervention of Karl Böhm, Wilhelm Furtwängler and Wilhelm Jerger could avert the renewed danger of Krotschak's exclusion from the Vienna Philharmonic

and the Vienna State Opera Orchestra. This danger could be sustainably contained only after Krotschak and his wife could supply evidence that Mister Krotschak was « Half-breed in the 1st degree » (« Mischling I. Grades ») . Now, Richard Krotschak could even apply for membership in the « Reich » Chamber of Culture as a pre-condition for « free » exercise of his artistic profession. (21) In this context, questions arise about the « Jewish » wives and the remaining family members of the retention candidates. To this day, outstanding questions concern their exemption of persecution and murder by the Nazis, in the case of a special permit, or if, for example, they needed to wear Jewish badges (22) or were allowed to take-up a profession. From April 1942, « Non-Jews » (« Nichtjuden ») married to « Jews » (« Juden ») were forced to move to Jewish residential areas. Except for the case of the cellist Richard Krotschak (his wife was classified as : « 1st degree half-breed » , and managed to survive the Nazi era) (23) , it remains unclear in how far a special permit would have had an effect on the protection of the (private) life of the families or the Jewish wives.

Excluded from the Saving List for Continued Retention in the Orchestra : Arthur Schurig and Leopold Förderl

The anti-Semitic motivated expulsion also served as an instrument to cast-off undesired members.

« This number was further reduced to 9 candidates for continued retention in the Orchestra, because the directorate adhered to its request to retire Arthur SCHURIG. SCHURIG is not on Furtwängler's list. » (24)

The question why the musicians Arthur Schurig and Leopold Förderl, who both were classified as « fully-Jewish related » , (25) were consequently factored-out of the retention lists is not be fully-clarified by the documents available to the author. It proceeds from the correspondence that, in Förderl's case, the initiative lay on the side of the State Opera Directorate, (26) in Schurig's case, it was the resistance of the « Reich » Chamber of Music. It also becomes clear that both musicians struggled against this discrimination with great effort.

The answer to the question of possible political reasons for Schurig's exclusion from the Orchestra increases the mystery. The 2 political assessments requested by the « Gestapo » , on August 1, 1939, and January 23, 1940, establish Schurig's « political soundness » (« politische Zuverlässigkeit ») . (27) Just as little clarification of facts and circumstances is offered by the request for a special permit written personally by the disgraced Schurig to the « laudable “ Reich ” Chamber of Theatre, in Berlin » , (28) dated November 13, 1939. The content of this letter concerns mainly biographic information, his career in the « old “ Reich ” » (« Altreich ») , and his « impeccable » (« tadellos ») service at the State Opera. Schurig's request proved ineffective, and a corresponding note on Schurig's letter leaves no doubt that his retirement (December 31, 1939) was adhered to because of a telephone consultation with Valberg. (29) Another communication of the « Reich » Music Chamber, in Berlin, from October 2, 1942, addressed to the State Opera in Vienna, illustrates that Schurig was definitely not admitted to the « Reich » Music Chamber :

« The request for admission into the “ Reich ” Music Chamber of this Jewish related, previous member of your Orchestra had already been declined by binding ruling, on July 8, 1940. On the occasion of an inspection in the Vienna State Opera, on September 29, 1942, it was ascertained that, in spite of that, he was employed in your Orchestra. » (30)

Although he was banned from his profession, Schurig continued to be called-on by the « Wiener Philharmoniker » for substitution services in accord with the SThV and the « Reich » Governor's Office of Vienna. In his appeal against the subsequently imposed fine of 500 RM (« Reichsmark ») , Schurig was supported by the SThV. It does not proceed from the sources whether he eventually paid the fine. What is clear though is that the « Wiener Philharmoniker » - especially, in the person of Leopold Kainz, player's representative (« Betriebsobmann ») of the Orchestra and member of the NSDAP, since 1931 - supported Schurig's further involvement as timpanist and argued for this with artistic shortages, amongst others. As the pressure from Berlin became too strong, the State Opera gave in. On October 19, 1942, the State Opera Director, Ernst August Schneider, confirmed towards the « Reich » Music Chamber, in Berlin, « that Mister Schurig is no longer employed in the State Opera Orchestra » . (31)

On June 21, 1938, Leopold Förderl was still treated as a possible candidate for « continued retention » on the level of the SThV, but on July 5, 1938, he was missing from the list of the Opera Directorate addressed to the SThV which, for the 1st time, definitely determined the candidates for « special permits » . (32) Förderl, likewise, does not appear on Wilhelm Furtwängler's list of August 20, 1938. It proceeds from a document of August 17, 1938, that Förderl « currently carries-out his duty, in Salzburg » . (33) He may, therefore, have performed regularly in the Orchestra, up to his « retirement » (expulsion) .

This, obviously, deliberate exclusion of Förderl on the part of the directorate and, presumably also, on the part of the Orchestra might well have been a case of intrigue and mobbing. Förderl's directness in not being afraid to speak his mind and his Liberal attitude obviously provoked great aversion towards him, as a person. In fall-winter of 1937, a massive conflict occurred between Förderl and the chairman (« Vorstand ») of the Vienna Philharmonic, Hugo Burghauser, in which were involved also the Orchestra and even the conductor, Wilhelm Furtwängler. The quarrel escalated, in the beginning of December 1937, and, as a result, Förderl was expelled from the Vienna Philharmonic for 4 months. (34)

Little information on the issue is gained from Förderl's official letters to the State Theatre Administration, in which he takes a stand on the inconsistencies involved in his dismissal and in which he opposes his compulsory retirement or later subsequent dismissal :

« According to the letter of the State Theatre Administration, from September 16, 1938, (Zl.2782) , I was transferred to lasting retirement in September 1, 1938. Since, at that time and even today, a significant number of Jewish half-breeds and Jewish related are active as members of the Orchestra, it likely follows that artistic reasons were decisive in my transfer to lasting retirement. Now, as warrantor for my artistic qualification, I am able to name none other than University Professor Doctor Victor Junk, Vienna 3rd District, on “ Hainburgerstraße ” (!) 19, who is the responsible referent in public position of the NSDAP. » (35)

In his official, written statement, Förderl makes no mention, not even a word, of the previous conflict with Burghauser and the other people in the Orchestra but, presumably, it is exactly here where the motives for Förderl's final expulsion from the Orchestra are to be found. Thus, a deeply inhuman legal order is made use of for the ability to dispose of a (politically) inconvenient colleague. (36)

« Politically Unacceptable » : the Christian-Social (« christsozial ») Hugo Burghauser

With respect to Hugo Burghauser, there were concrete political reasons that (beside his immediate removal from his office as chairman - « Vorstand ») also endangered his stay in the Orchestra. Burghauser, who was married to the (according to Nazi elocution) « fully Jewish » ballet mistress of the Opera, Margarethe Wallmann, stood on the often-quoted list of continued retention for the time being and (as he himself notes in his memoirs, in 1979) could for a limited time count on the protection by the Opera director (« Operndirektor ») Kerber. His disapproval of National-Socialism, his political affinity to Austro-facism, and his associated career in the « Fatherland's Front » (« Vaterländische Front ») (37) are indicative of the fact that political reasons had brought Burghauser into a serious situation. Burghauser's assessment that his situation became increasingly threatening, that the atmosphere in the Orchestra towards him was (subliminally) aggressive, and that his « immunity » (« Immunität ») in the Orchestra was of limited duration, is confirmed by another document. In mid-July 1938, director Kerber received a written complaint composed by Doctor Albert Reitter, the « Deputy State Governor » (« Landesstatthalter ») of Salzburg, which leaves no doubt about the fact that Burghauser stood on the Nazi's « hit list » and had to be seriously concerned about his safety :

« To my surprise, I see Mister Burghauser performing with the Philharmonic Orchestra as part of the Festival. This person is politically unacceptable and, thus, I request to arrange the necessary steps. “ Heil ” Hitler ! » (38)

Burghauser struggled against this threat and, from April 1938 onward, tried to fight a case for divorce of his « Jewish » spouse who had already escaped to Buenos Aires by resorting to anti-Semitic « reasoning » . He accused his wife and her family of deception concerning her « ancestral relations » (« Abstammungsverhältnis ») . (39) In this respect, it has to be added that adapting to the « language » of the Nazis was an essential survival strategy for victims of the regime, be it as a diversion (which might have been the case with Burghauser, namely Burghauser as « political person ») , be it to render more bearable the discriminations and prevent a deterioration of the situation, or be it not to jeopardize the already precarious escape plans by risking an arrest.

« Concerns : Proof of Aryan Ancestry » : Ricardo Odnoposoff

« Consider it as a developmental step to assist those in your organization to acquire the necessary “ Proof of Aryan Descent ”. Make sure that the attention of every “ compatriot ” (“ Volksgenosse ”) who turns to you for advice is directed towards our office, because not everyone is aware of the fact that there has been an office for “ Foreign Genealogy Research ” (“ Auslandssippenforschung ”) , ever since the “ upheaval ” (“ Umbruch ”) . » (40)

Starting with early summer 1938, foreign artists also were affected by « racial-biological cleansings » (« rassenbiologischen Säuberungen ») , as was the case with the Concert Master and violin virtuoso, Ricardo Odnoposoff. Odnoposoff, a descendant of Argentina, was a member of the Vienna State Opera Orchestra and Vienna Philharmonic, from 1934 to 1938. His father's family originally stemmed from Russia, which meant additional harassment for Odnoposoff, in the already tedious and degrading procedure of the acquisition of the « Proof of Aryan Descent » . Odnoposoff's status as foreigner is only a peripheral issue in the extensive correspondence of the SThV and the Opera Directorate. Intense pressure was primarily put on him for providing « Proof of Aryan Descent » . In an interview, in

1996, Odnoposoff recounts that he was summoned by the « Gestapo » who made it clear to him that his security was of limited duration. In this interview, Odnoposoff does not comment on his efforts to procure the documents necessary for « Proof of Ancestry » (« Ahnenpass ») from Russia, which could have practically been viewed as a strategic attempt at diversion, in order to gain time and self-protection. (41)

Intimidation and Hostility towards Those with « Continued Retention » in the Orchestra

The « privilege » of « continued retention » in the Orchestra neither granted the declassified members an existence in the Orchestra with equal rights, nor did it guarantee security and stability. The threatening pattern of everyday life, in the professional surroundings of these ostracized musicians, is expressed by the grandson of the expelled musician Berthold Salander, in an interview with the author : his orchestral colleague Rudolf Jettel, who was in possession of a special permit, « did not speak much about this time », but « what he had to say was very negative, what he said about his colleagues should not be put in print. Jettel, himself, told me that it was suggested to him to divorce the “ Jewish pig ” (“ Saujüdin ”), otherwise, he would be sent to the concentration camp with her ». (42)

The Nazi monitoring bodies had in their sights those orchestral musicians placed on the list of « special permits ». Thus, the « overall assessment of the district leader » (« Gesamturteil des Kreisleiter »), from July 1, 1939, concerning Josef Hadraba, states :

« The person inquired about is married to a Jew and currently rated indifferent. The very same person, therefore, seems sustainable only with greatest caution. » (43)

There are different « assessments » also, in the case of the principal cellist Richard Krotschak. (44) Particularly, in connection with his « Jewish » wife, Krotschak was under political surveillance, again and again ; a remark of his wife critical of the regime uttered in a grocery store, for example, was cited word for word in the « regional files » (« Gauakten ») and, again and again, great mistrust was expressed toward the married couple Krotschak. Their files were requested by various agencies (« Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers-SS ; NSDAP-Gauleitung Wien ; Rassenpolitisches Amt ; Gauamt für Sippenforschung »). The regional files ascribed « political unreliability » (« politische Unzuverlässigkeit »), as well as a lack of political interest to the musician, Gottfried von Freiberg. (45) A similar case was the political assessment of the violin player, Theodor Heß. According to the « Leader of the District Office » (« Kreisamtsleiter »), Alois Barnet, Freiberg was « indifferent towards political issues. Politically, and, in terms of character, not free from faults. » (46) The leader of the « Regional Group » (« Ortsgruppenleiter »), Laimgrube, attested him disinterested « for the movement », « no dedication and sacrifice » and political unreliability. (47) These, above cited, political assessments of those musicians designated for special permits illustrate how real the threat and how intense the political pressure was under which they permanently stood.

Notes

(1) The Philharmonic member, Otto Fieck, was, according to the racist Nazi terminology, considered as « fully Jewish related » (« volljüdisch versippt »). He had already been retired, since September 1, 1937, and, therefore, does not appear on the lists of special permits. Fieck and his wife died in Vienna, on July 14, 1945. Letter to the « Office of

the Reich Governor » (« Reichsstatthalterei ») , composed on March 20, 1942, membership list with reference to the « racial origin » (« rassische Herkunft ») of the wives. Vienna Philharmonic Depot State Opera, folder I ; membership book of the « Wiener Philharmoniker » ; page I. « Kaiserlich-Königlich Hofoper » , HadWPh ; historical Viennese registration records concerning Otto Fieck, « Vienna City and “ Land ” Archives » (« Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv »)

(2) Kosak's report (21 June 1938) , including attachments (mostly, « black-lists ») - AdR, SThV, page 2312 (1938) .

(3) « Holiday correspondence » (« Urlaubskorrespondenz ») , Kosak to director Kerber (30 July 1938) - AdR, SThV 2980 (1938) ; ibid. , director Kerber to Kosak (4 August 1938) ; ibid. , Kosak to Eckmann (19 August 1938) ; Report of Eckmann (12 December 1938) - AdR, SThV, page 4219 (1938) .

(4) « Ausnahmsweise mit Zustimmung des Stellvertreters des Führers oder der von ihm bestimmten Stelle im Dienste belassen werden können. » Kosak's report (21 June 1938) ; page 11 - AdR, SThV, page 2312 (1938) .

(5) (21 June 1938) - AdR, SThV, page 2367 (1938) .

(6) Kosak's report (21 June 1938) ; page 12f. - AdR, SThV, page 2312 (1938) .

(7) (5 July 1938) - AdR, « State Opera Directorate » (« Staatsoperndirektion ») ; pages 844-845 (1938) .

(8) « Umgehend die eigene Geburtsurkunde, die Geburtsurkunden Ihrer Eltern und Ihrer 4 Großeltern (sic) , die selben Dokumente von Ihrer Gattin, ferner einen Lebenslauf und ein Lichtbild. »

(9) (13 July 1938) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, pages 844-845 (1938) ; Director Kerber to Robert Valberg, Vienna (23 July 23 1938) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 2664 (1938) . Robert Valberg was a member of the NSDAP since 1932 and, in 1938, was appointed provisional leader of the « Josefstadt » . He was the provisional leader of the « Ring of Austrian Stagecraft Artist and the Association of Directors » (« kommissarischer Leiter des Ringes österreichischer Bühnenkünstler und des Direktorenverbandes ») and distinguished himself, especially, in his role of investigator of « Proofs of Aryan Descent » (« Ariernachweise ») and political soundness (« politischen Zuverlässigkeit ») . Oliver Rathkolb. « Führertreu und gottbegnadet. Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich » , Vienna (1991) ; pages 55, 58, 60.

(10) Doctor Heinz Drewes, « Music Referent » (« Musikreferent ») of the « “ Reich ” Ministry of Information » (« Reichsministerium für Propaganda ») , acted as an important contact person for the « Reich » Ministry of Information, in Berlin, for the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra.

(11) « Der Herr Minister hat entschieden, daß die Zusammenstellung des Wiener Philharmonischen Orchesters in der augenblicklichen Form unverändert bleibt, und daß die endgültige Zusammensetzung nach den Festspielen im Einvernehmen mit Doktor Furtwängler und Doktor Kerber geregelt wird. » Writing of the « Reich » Ministry of Information, in Berlin, to Opera Director Kerber (20 July 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte 1939-1940 » , «

Administrative files of the State Theater » (« Bundestheater Administrationsakten ») ; page 958 (1938) .

(12) « Die Sonderbewilligung für die in beiliegender Liste verzeichneten neun Mitglieder unseres Orchesters an zuständiger Stelle beantragen und durchsetzen zu wollen. »

(13) « ... zur Aufrechterhaltung der künstlerischen Leistungsfähigkeit und damit des Ranges und Namens der Wiener Philharmoniker » . Director Kerber to the SThV (21 October 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte » , 3399 (1938) ; Oliver Rathkolb. « Dokumentensammlung “ Wiener Philharmoniker ”, 1938-1947 » (unpublished) page 7 ; Kerber's report to the SThV (21 October 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte 1939-1940 » .

(14) Kerber's report to the SThV (21 October 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte 1939-1940 » .

(15) « Nun endlich auch ihrerseits die Zustimmung zu diesen Belassungen erteilte. »

(16) « Eine bezügliche Verfügung offiziell erlassen. » Writing of the directorate to the « “ Reich ” Music Chamber » (« Reichsmusikkammer ») , in Berlin (27 December 1939) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 1263 (1939) .

(17) « Viola, vermutlich Mischling I. Grades. » Letter of the directorate to the « Reich » Music Chamber, in Berlin, (Vienna, 30 January 1940) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 1263 (1939) .

(18) « Verbot der Berufsausübung verbunden (war) . »

(19) « Staatstheaterverwaltung befürwortet das Ansuchen um weiterverbleiben (sic) Riegers, da sein Ausscheiden eine empfindliche Lücke hervorbringen würde, die dem Orchester grossen Schaden bringen würde. » Letter of the SThV to the « Reich » Music Chamber, in Berlin (composed on 19 November 1942) . Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra Depot State Opera.

(20) « Wieder entzogen. » « Wolfram Ziegler, Richard Krotschak (1904-1989) - Cellist und Pädagoge » , in : « Verein für Geschichte der Stadt Wien » , « Wiener Geschichtsblätter » , Volume 63, No. 3 (2008) ; page 14.

(21) Letter of Doctor Vollguth, from the « Department of Racial Policies » (« Rassepolitisches Amt ») to the « Reich » Governor in Vienna (from 30 April 1942) - AdR, GA 97.704. Richard Krotschak. Opus citatum ibid. ; page 18.

(22) On September 1, 1941, the police released an order concerning the « identification » of « Jewish » people by means of a « Star of David » (« Judenstern ») , and this order attained validity with October 19, 1941. Only very few exceptions to the duty of « wearing the star » (« Sterntragen ») were declared :

« Those “ privileged ” by marriage are not subject to the duty of identification. Exceptions are made for :

a) Jewish husbands living in an mixed marriage, insofar as there are descendants from the marriage and these are not considered Jews, and also if the marriage no longer persists or the only son has died in the current War.

b) For the Jewish wife in childless mixed marriage for the period of the marriage. »

(« Der Kennzeichnungspflicht unterlagen nicht die über die Ehe “ Privilegierten ”. Ausgenommen seien :

a) In einer Mischehe lebende jüdische Ehegatten, sofern Abkömmlinge aus der Ehe vorhanden sind und diese nicht als Juden gelten, und zwar auch dann, wenn die Ehe nicht mehr besteht oder der einzige Sohn im gegenwärtigen Krieg gefallen ist.

b) Auf die jüdische Ehefrau bei kinderloser Mischehe während der Dauer der Ehe. »)

Cornelia Essner. « Die “ Nürnberger Gesetze ” oder die Verwaltung des Rassenwahns 1933-1945 » , Paderborn (2002) ; pages 270-274.

(23) Mrs. Krottschak managed to be saved by the classification as « 1st degree half-breed » , which was effected, in April 1942, by the « Department of Racial Policies » at the « District Leader » (« Gauleiter ») . Richard Krottschak was able to remain professionally active. Writing of Doctor Vollguth of the Department of Racial Policies to the « Reich » Governor, in Vienna (from 30 April 1942) - AdR, GA 97.704. Richard Krottschak. Opus citatum based on : « Wolfram Ziegler, Richard Krottschak (1904-1989) » (as in note 16) ; page 18.

(24) « Diese Zahl reduziert sich weiter auf 9 [Kandidaten für die “ Weiterbelassung ” im Orchester, Anm. d. Verf.] , da die Direktion an ihrem Antrag, den Philharmoniker Arthur SCHURIG zu pensionieren festhält. SCHURIG ist nicht auf der Liste Furtwänglers. » (21 October 1938) . Emphasis in the original - AdR, Karton « Judenakte » , 3.399 (1938) .

(25) Report of Eckmann (21 June 1938) , attachment - AdR, SThV ; page 2312 (1938) .

(26) (13 February 1939) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 278 (1939) ; (4 July 1939) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 881 (1939) ; (8 February 1940) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 254 (1940) .

(27) Artur Schurig - AdR, GA 97.520.

(28) « Löblichen Reichstheaterkammer in Berlin. »

(29) Request of Artur Schurig for a special permit (13 November 1939) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 1263 (1939) .

(30) « Der Aufnahmeantrag in die Reichsmusikkammer dieses jüdisch versippten früheren Mitgliedes Ihres Orchesters ist durch rechtskräftige Entscheidung bereits am 8. Juli 1940 abgelehnt worden. Anlässlich einer Kontrolle in der Wiener Staatsoper am 29. September 1942 wurde festgestellt, daß er trotzdem in Ihrem Orchester beschäftigt worden ist. »

The President of the « Reich » Music Chamber (substitute) to the « General Manager » (« Generalintendanten ») of the Vienna State Opera (Berlin, 2 October 1942) . Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra Depot State Opera, personnel file : Schurig.

(31) « Daß Herr Schurog (sic) nicht mehr im Verbands des Staatsopernorchesters beschäftigt wird. »

Letter of Doctor Jarosch, « Head Dramaturg » (« Chefdramaturg ») of the State Opera to State Opera Director, Ernst August Schneider (Vienna, 9 October 1942) ; letter of Doctor Jarosch to the « Chief Advisor » (« Generalreferent ») Walter Thomas (Vienna, 30 November 1942) ; « Reich » Music Chamber, in Berlin, to Arthur Schurig (Berlin, 2 October 1942) ; Arthur Schurig to the « Reich » Music Chamber, in Berlin (Vienna, 9 October 1942) . All mentioned sources, in : Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra Depot State Opera, personnel file : Schurig.

(32) « Regarding the assignment of those Jewish related » ; « Betreff Verwendung der jüdischen Versippten » (5 July 1938) - AdR, State Opera Directorate ; pages 844-845 (1938) .

(33) « Zur Zeit in Salzburg seinen Dienst versieht. » Report of 17 August 1938 - AdR, SThV ; page 2782 (1938) .

(34) Letter of Leopold Förderl to Burghauser (dated : 14 December 1937) , No. 13 - HAdWPh, correspondence Burghauser, Briefe 40. In response to Förderl's threat, « to put forward, as a supplement to the fine Philharmonic book by Heinrich Kralik, a small “ chronique scandaleuse ” » , the plenum and the committee reacted by excluding Förderl from the association for a period of 5 months. « Wiener Philharmoniker » . ibid. ; Clemens Hellsberg. « Demokratie der Könige » , in : « Die Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker » , Zürich (1992) ; page 458.

(35) « Ich wurde laut Schreiben der Staatstheaterverwaltung vom 16. September 1938, Zl. 2782 mit 1. September 1938 in den dauernden Ruhestand versetzt. Nachdem sowohl zu diesem Zeitpunkt als auch heute noch eine bedeutende Anzahl jüdischer Mischlinge und jüdisch Versippter als Orchestermmitglieder aktiv im Dienst sind, ergibt sich der logische Schluß, daß für meine Versetzung in den dauernden Ruhestand wohl künstlerische Gründe maßgebend waren. Nun : als Bürgen für meine künstlerischen Befähigungen kann ich Ihnen keinen Geringeren als den in öffentlicher Stellung der NSDAP verantwortlichen Referenten, Herrn Universitätsprofessor Doktor Victor Junk, Wien III. , Hainburgerstraße (!) 19, namhaft machen. »

Letter of Förderl to the SThV (Vienna, 2 December 1938) - AdR, SThV ; page 4093 (1938) .

(36) For details on the conflicts between Förderl and Burghauser, in fall-winter 1937, see the available portrait of Leopold Förderl, on the homepage of the « Wiener Philharmoniker » .

(37) Burghauser was « appointed Chairman of the “ Musicians Ring ” within the Corporate Union » (« Vorsitzenden des “ Musiker-Rings ” innerhalb der ständischen Gewerkschaft ernannt ») by the « Ministry of Education » (« Unterrichtsministerium ») , from 1934 to 1938. In 1935, he was additionally appointed « Expert Witness » (« Sachverständiger ») for Music at the « Vienna State Court » (« Wiener Landesgericht ») . Hugo Burghauser. « Philharmonische Begegnungen. Erinnerungen eines Wiener Philharmonikers » , Zürich (1997) , pages 101 and 121 ; Otto Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt. Mein Leben mit den Wiener Philharmonikern » , Vienna (1974) ; page 154. See also Burghauser's « résumé » , attachment to Burghauser's letter to the State Opera on 20 June 1938 - AdR, State Opera Directorate ; page 498 (1939) .

(38) « Zu meinem Erstaunen sehe ich, daß Herr Burghauser im Rahmen der Festspiele bei den Philharmonikern mitwirkt. Der Genannte ist politisch untragbar, ich bitte daher, das Erforderliche zu veranlassen. Heil Hitler ! »

The « Deputy State Governor » (« Landesstatthalter ») , in Salzburg, to Salzburg « Festspielhausgemeinde » , at the attention of « Herrn » Doctor Erwin Kerber (Salzburg, 14 July 1938) - AdR, Karton « Judenakte 1939-1940 » , « Bundestheater Administrationsakten » .

(39) (Vienna, 9 August 1938) - AdR, State Opera Directorate, page 498 (1939) ; (22 September 1938) , ÖBThV, page 3322 (1938) .

(40) « Betrachten Sie es als ein Stück Aufbauarbeit, wenn Sie Ihrer Gefolgschaft dazu verhelfen, daß jeder in den Besitze des so notwendigen “ Ariernachweise ” gelangt. Tragen Sie dazu bei, daß jeder Volksgenosse auf unsere Stelle aufmerksam gemacht wird, der sich um Rat an Sie wendet, denn nicht jeder weiss, daß es schon seit dem Umbruch eine Stelle für Auslandssippenforschung gibt. »

AdR, ÖSThV, page 3141 (1938) . « Foreign Genealogy Research » (« Auslandssippenforschung ») (Leader Pg. Ludwig Adamus) to the « Betriebsführer » , received by the SThV (14 September 1938) .

(41) Because of his Jewish roots, Ricardo Odnoposoff had good reasons to flee from « Austria » . Gdal Saleski. « Famous Musicians of Jewish Origin » , New York (1949) , pages 384-385 ; Stengel/Gerigk. « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » (1940-1941) ; Burhard Laugwitz. « Ein sehr starker Geiger in Wien » . Ricardo Odnoposoff. « Interview » , in : « Das Orchester. Zeitschrift für Orchesterkultur und Rundfunk-Chorwesen » , Band 9 (1996) , page 21 ; ÖBThV (27 September 1938) , page 3322 (1938) .

(42) « Nicht viel über diese Zeit gesprochen » , allerdings « was er gesagt hat, war sehr negativ, was er von seinen Kollegen gesagt hat, kann man nicht drucken. Jettel hat mir selber gesagt, man hat ihm nahegelegt, er soll sich von der “ Saujüdin ” scheiden lassen, sonst würde man ihn mit ihr zusammen in KZ schicken. » Interview of Bernadette Mayrhofer with Roger Salander (30 May 2005) .

(43) « Der Angefragte ist mit einer Jüdin verheiratet und dzt. indifferent eingestellt. Derselbe erscheint daher nur mit allergrösster (sic) Vorsicht tragbar. » Josef Hadraba - AdR, Regional Personal Department of the District of Vienna, GA 97.564.

(44) Richard Krottschak - AdR, GA 97.704.

(45) Gottfried von Freiberg - AdR, GA 97.620.

(46) Theodor Heß - AdR, GA 97.603.

(47) « An der Bewegung » , « keinen Opferwillen » . Theodor Heß - AdR, GA 97.603.

The Vienna Philharmonic's « Cancelled » Subscription Audience (Founders, Supporters and Contributors)

In the course of his research, the author of this article, together with the Vienna Philharmonic's archivist, found a hand-written register of accounts in a basement store-room of the Vienna State Opera which is used today as a sheet-music archive.

Observations on Nazification and Denazification

From the Organization Cell-Group (« Betriebszelle ») State Opera to the Managing Committee (« Vereinsführung »)

(Oliver Rathkolb)

The core-group of NSDAP sympathisers in the Vienna Philharmonic had, in 1931-1932, already organized themselves in the framework of the NSBO - the NS Organization Cell-Group State Opera.

To this day, there has been no successful assessment of the exact percentage of « Nazification » of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. Clemens Hellsberg has, in 1992, addressed the fact that, at the end of the War, 42 % were NSDAP-members, and he also pointed-out that this rate rises to 47 % if affiliated organizations are included. (1) He has further calculated the « group differences » of the formal Nazification, at the time of 1938 - and found differences between string players with 30 % NSDAP members ; woodwind players with 45 % ; as well as brass players and percussion with 43 % . I, myself, on the basis of Austrian and U.S. American documents, arrived in 1991 at a rate of 40 % former NSDAP-members in the Orchestra - about 20 % of these were « illegal » members (2) , i.e. , those who, during the prohibition of the NSDAP, between « July 1, 1933 and March 13, 1938, after attaining the age of 18, have, at one point, belonged to the NSDAP or one of its para-military forces (« Wehrverbände, SA, SS, NSKK, NSFK ») » - so the wording in § 10 of the Prohibitive Law (« Verbotsgesetz ») of May 8, 1945.

The core-group of NSDAP sympathisers in the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra had, in 1931-1932, already organized themselves in the framework of the NSBO - the National-Socialist Organization Cell-Group State Opera. The NSBO did not do the Classic work of a labour union, but rather as a political organization caused agitation for the NSDAP in the labour force of an enterprise. Its driving forces, in this case, were Leopold Kainz (horn) , Karl Swoboda (oboe) , and Wilhelm Jerger (contrabass) , among others. Wilhelm Jerger subsequently served as the organization cell chairman (« Betriebszellenobmann ») and Leopold Kainz was his deputy - also, during the time of the prohibition of the NSDAP (which included the NSBO) . Kainz had become a member of the Philharmonic, only on September 1, 1932 ; Swoboda, 1 year earlier. Jerger, however, had been a member of the State Opera Orchestra since October 1, 1922, and member of the Vienna Philharmonic since 1924.

These men very skilfully motivated other colleagues to make monetary contributions and marketed prohibited National-Socialist propagandistic publications such as the « Österreichischer Beobachter » . With the great economical problems of the time as a back-drop and, while really only being a pseudo labour union, the success of the « cell-work » (« Zellenarbeit ») is attested by the high-number of « illegals » . After the suppression of independent labour unions by the authoritarian Dollfuß regime, the influence of the National-Socialist Organization Cell-Group increased notably, even though they had been outlawed since July 1, 1933. (3)

The group outwardly acted very « loyal to the government » (« regierungstreu ») , which is indicated, for example, by Kainz' participation in the chamber music evenings attended by « Federal Chancellor » (« Bundeskanzler ») , Kurt Schuschnigg, the successor to Chancellor Dollfuß, who had been murdered by the National-Socialists. (4) This illegal NS cell-group had perfectly prepared the take-over of power after the « Anschluß » and had, on March 12, 1938, brought Jerger into the position of provisional leader of the Orchestra. Jerger was formally commissioned, on March 12, 1938, by the « State Secretary of National Culture Leader » (« Landeskultur-Leiter Staatssekretär ») , Hermann Stuppäck, with the provisional leadership of the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic, Vienna, 1st District, « Canovagasse 4 » . (5) On the basis also of newer sources - such as the registration records of former NSDAP members in the « Vienna City and State Archives » (« Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv ») , the records of the former Berlin Document Center in the « Federal Archives Berlin » (« Bundesarchiv Berlin ») , NSDAP membership records, SS records) , as well as « Regional Files » (« Gauakte ») , in the « Austrian Federal Archives » (« Österreichisches Staatsarchiv ») - I have, once again, verified all available names.

On the basis of a list of Vienna Philharmonic members, released on the occasion of the 100 year anniversary celebrations, in 1942, I could ascertain an initial number of 123 active members and 27 retirees.

Up to this point, 60 NSDAP memberships (including their respective identification numbers and accession dates) could be documented - that is to say, in 1942, about 49 % of active Vienna Philharmonic musicians were members of the NSDAP. Up to the end of the War, only 1 more musician who was not a member of the NSDAP was admitted. In Mai 1945, the Austrian authorities at 1st classified 24 memberships as « illegal » , whereby not only membership in the NSDAP, but also active membership in the NSBO was an issue. On average, the « illegals » are born after 1900 (Kainz and Jerger, for example, born in 1902, and Swoboda are of one generation) which is atypical considering the usual age pattern of the NSDAP but, collectively, there is a broad distribution of age. The average age for the base-year 1938, however, (around 37 years) corresponds well with the approximate age of the core-group of the basic cell, Jerger and Kainz. Both lacked being shaped by the First World War and, thus, « frontline experience » (« Fronterlebnis ») is not a general element in the explanation of motives for joining the NSDAP.

In the following, I will give a brief profile of the 2 dominating activists of the NSBO cell-group and try to analyze their character with regard to their socialization and their role, from 1938 to 1945, while also illustrating differences in their actual conduct towards persecuted orchestral members and the NS regime.

Wilhelm Jerger's actual name was Jerabek, (6) and he was born in Vienna, in 1902. It could not be determined when the name change (obviously to delete the Czech traces) was effected. His father, a hair-dresser, had come from Komotau (Chomutov) in Bohemia to Vienna, but had kept his name. Jerger studied music theory and conducting at the « Academy of Music and Performing Arts » (« Akademie für Musik und Darstellende Kunst ») . It was here, where he studied with the renowned musicologist Guido Adler, who, as a Jew, after 1938, was persecuted and whose daughter, Melanie, was murdered in Maly Trostinec, in 1942. Adler, himself, died in Vienna in 1941.

According to his son, Veit, Jerger was evidently deeply-influenced by his Catholic upbringing in the « Schottengymnasium » , in Vienna. (7) In his enrolment volume at the University of Vienna, he lists « German » as his « ethnicity » and not « German-Aryan » , as did the radical German nationalists. Politically, he fits well into the so-called « Catholic-

National interlayer » (« Katholisch-nationale Zwischenschicht ») of the NSDAP - from which came also Arthur Seyß-Inquart, for example. (8)

He was engaged as contrabassist in the State Opera Orchestra, in 1922, and, 2 years later, he became a member of the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic. Jerger was also active as a composer and, after 1938, he repeatedly took a stand for Jewish colleagues and orchestral members with Jewish wives, as illustrated in the contributions of Bernadette Mayrhofer. After he had already intervened for Robitsek, Tyroler, Starkmann, Glattauer and Stwertka, on October 23, 1941, he continued to make efforts to avert the deportation of Viktor Robitsek until the day before, October 27, 1941. (9) He emphatically called the attention of Walter Thomas, « chief advisor » (« Generalreferent ») to « Reich Gauleiter » Schirach, to the poor state of health of Robitsek and his wife, Elsa. She died on May 20, 1942, and her husband, on June 10, 1942, in the ghetto of « Litzmannstadt », as a result of the inhumane living conditions. In both cases, his intervention failed because of Baldur von Schirach, despite having been successful in 1938, in the case of Geringer, who was released from the concentration camp of Dachau, after Jerger's repeated interventions at the request of Mrs. Geringer.

Surrounding Baldur von Schirach to this day is the nimbus of the « different type » of National-Socialist top-official with good middle-class roots, an interest in culture, whose father was the artistic director of the National Theatre of Weimar, from 1909 to 1918, and his mother a U.S. American. In actual fact though, in a closed meeting of « councilmen » (« Ratsherr »), on June 6, 1942, in which Jerger's participation as councilman is highly-likely, Baldur von Schirach « prided himself » « that, by late- autumn or autumn of this year, all Jews will be removed from the city and the removal of the Czechs will be commenced, since this is the necessary and proper response to the criminal act committed upon the deputy « “ Reich ” Protectorate » (« Stellvertretender Reichsprotector »), in Bohemia and Moravia. (10) Just weeks after that, the 4 remaining Philharmonic musicians of Jewish descent were deported and murdered, or died as a result of the extreme conditions of imprisonment.

The horn player, Leopold Kainz, had arrived at the Vienna State Opera Orchestra at about the same time as Jerger (1921) and joined the NSDAP in the 1st district, already in February 1931. Subsequently, during the time of the ban on the Party, he acted as « Deputy Cell-Group Chairman » (« Zellenobmannstellvertreter ») of the Organization Cell-Group State Opera. (11) As his special merits for the NSDAP before 1938, Kainz lists « house searches, interrogations of the State Police and, for some time, was under surveillance by the State Police ». It is noteworthy, by the way, that « Police High-Commissioner » (« Polizeioberkommissar »), Doctor Roman Loos, (12) who was a sponsor of the Vienna Philharmonic, prevented his arrest by the timely disposal of incriminating evidence. In addition, it was confirmed to Kainz, in May 1938, that he had established the Organization Cell-Group State Opera, already in 1931.

In his memoirs, Burghauser describes (without mentioning any names) one of the « most uncontrolled defiers of the old regime, the same horn player, who, in most recently bygone times, used to play along in the chamber music evenings that were arranged by Austrian aristocrats in their apartments, and that were regularly attended by Doctor Kurt Schuschnigg. The fresh-baked spokesman for greater Germany later prided himself with the appropriate authorities by reporting and denouncing the notable personages in attendance ». (13)

Another former member of the Orchestra who was forced to emigrate to the United States also vividly describes the

political atmosphere of the days following the « Anschluß » :

He could « well-remember these men, as they ran around Vienna with Swastika arm-bands and treated the remaining members of the Orchestra with the arrogance and brashness typical of Nazis. » (14)

Towards the end of the War, however, his enthusiasm vanished, and, in February 1945, the NSDAP Party offices negatively noted his refusal to participate in the « local group » (« Ortsgruppe ») . In further consequence, Kainz, as chairman of the State Opera Orchestra, vigorously pursued the financial betterment of the orchestral members - also, towards the « Reich » offices in the « Ministry of Information » (« Propagandaministerium ») .

The new leadership of the Vienna Philharmonic, under « general manager » (« Geschäftsführer ») Otto Straßer (candidate for NSDAP membership since July 1, 1938 ; member since April 1, 1940) and « provisional leader » (« kommissarischer Leiter ») Wilhelm Jerger (NSDAP-member since 1932, and member of the SS) , had already, since June 2, 1938, tried to achieve an improvement in the payments to the State Opera, in terms of « Reich » legal provisions. The intended raise to the status of « “ Reich ” Orchestra » (« Reichsorchester ») was, for the time being, denied by the « “ Reich ” Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda » (« Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda ») , because the tariff regulation of cultural Orchestras « for the country of Austria » should only subsequently come into effect.

It is impossible, at this point, to determine with certainty how far membership in the NSDAP could have facilitated an admission to the Orchestra, especially in the days after « March 1938 » . There is 1 documented case, that of viola player Adolf Löffler. In 1935, he was punished with a 3 month detention for the collection of NSDAP membership dues. (15) Löffler was, at that time, engaged in the Vienna Symphony Orchestra. A total of 13 out of 26 musicians who were hired after the « Anschluß » joined the NSDAP or were already members. There was political intervention only in the case of Löffler.

In many aspects, a special case is that of trumpet player Helmut Wobisch, who was admitted in 1939. He had already joined the NSDAP, in 1933, participated in the unsuccessful « July “ Putsch ” » , in 1934, and was a member of the SS since November 1934, (16) where he attained the rank of « Sergeant » (« Unterscharführer ») , in 1944. Since 1940, he also acted as member of the « “ Reich ” Security Head Office » 's (« Reichssicherheitshauptamt ») Security Service (« Sicherheitsdienst » , or SD) , but also as teacher at the « College of Music » (« Musikhochschule ») , in Vienna, as well as leader of the education of wind players in the « Hitler Youth » (« Hitlerjugend ») . As a member of the SD, he also authored political informant reports concerning other musicians, which have partly survived. (17)

Especially unusual is the case of the trumpet player Franz Dengler. He joined the NSDAP 1 month before the « Anschluß » , but for 16 years had been in a long-term relationship with a Jewish woman. In October 1945, she confirmed that he had supported her, in 1942-1943, when she went underground and hid from deportation. He had been in the NSDAP to protect her. (18)

Another case is Franz Bartolomey (the 2nd) , who was the only Party member of the Vienna Philharmonic who was expelled from the NSDAP, in 1942, for hiring a painter who was married to a Jewish woman. (19) At the end of the

War, he stayed after a short holiday with his family in western Austria and was immediately expelled as a « renegade Nazi », even though, in contrast to his 55 remaining colleagues, he no longer belonged to the NSDAP. Obviously, there was, here, a strong group within the Vienna Philharmonic that « de facto » accused him of treason for not returning to Vienna at the end of the War.

These examples indicate how manifold the concrete modes of behaviour could be and that, only today, an individual assessment of specific actions during National-Socialism is actually possible. Exactly such an assessment, however, did not take place after 1945, because (with 4 exceptions) the Orchestra was collectively denazified as quickly as possible, against allied resistance, without considering concrete, individual behaviour.

Notes

(1) Clemens Hellsberg. « Demokratie der Könige », Zürich (1992) ; page 464.

(2) Oliver Rathkolb. « Führertreu und Gottbegnadet. Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich », Vienna (1991) .

(3) This is indicated by the numerous questionnaires for admission to the NSDAP in the « Vienna City and State Archives » (« Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv ») that have survived in the « Archives of the Republic » (« Archiv der Republik ») , in Vienna, or the « Federal Archive Berlin » (« Bundesarchiv Berlin ») .

(4) Hugo Burghauser. « Philharmonische Begegnungen », Zürich (1979) ; page 120.

(5) Archive of the Republic, Vienna, « Stillhaltekommissar », 37-C2/8 (1) , questionnaire of March 31, 1938.

(6) Ist discovered by Maren Seliger. « Scheinparlamentarismus im Führerstaat “ Gemeindevertretung ” im Austrofaschismus und Nationalsozialismus. Funktionen und politische Profile Wiener Räte und Ratsherren 1934-1945 im Vergleich », in : « Politik und Zeitgeschichte », Volume 6, Münster (2012) ; page 576.

(7) Veit Jerger. « Journal » (written before 2006) ; page 9. I thank Ms. Saskia Kuhlmann for providing me with extracts of the journal.

(8) Brigitte Behal. « Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten deutsch-nationaler katholischer Eliten im Zeitraum 1930-1965 : ihr Weg und Wandel in diesen Jahren am Beispiel Doktor Anton Böhm, Doktor Theodor Veiters und ihrer katholischen und politischen Netzwerke », dissertation, Vienna (2009) .

(9) AdWPh, folder : Wilhelm Jerger. Letter to Walter Thomas (27 October 1941) .

(10) Vienna City and State Archives, « Bürgermeisterakten » ; page 349 (1946) .

(11) Archive of the Republic, Vienna, « regional file » (« Gauakt ») . Josef Kainz, personnel questionnaire, filled in in hand-writing (24 May 1938) .

(12) <http://www.towson.edu/nurembergpapers/Volume%20X/366Volume%20X%20Document142.htm>

Interrogation Summary, Nürnberg (10 February 1947) . Loos joined the NSDAP in 1933 and was promoted to « Lieutenant Colonel » (« Oberstleutnant ») of the « Military Police » (« Feldpolizei ») in the Balkans, in 1943.

(13) Hugo Burghauser. « Philharmonische Begegnungen. Erinnerungen eines Wiener Philharmonikers » , Zürich / Freiburg (1979) ; page 120.

(14) « Wiener Kurier » (13 September 1946) ; page 4.

(15) Archives of the Republic, « regional file » (« Gauakt ») . Adolf Löffler (19 March 1903) .

(16) Federal Archives Berlin, « SS-Personalakte » Helmut Wobisch, hand-written « résumé » .

(17) Oliver Rathkolb. « Führertreu und Gotbegnadet. Künstlereliten im Dritten reich » , Vienna (1991) ; page 19.

(18) Vienna City and State Archive, « NS-Registrierungsakten » , Franz Dengler.

(19) See : Franz Bartolomey. « Was zählt, ist der Augenblick. Die Bartolomeys. 120 Jahre an der Wiener Staatsoper » , Vienna (2012) .

Honours and Awards (Honorary Members, Rings of Honour, the Nicolai Medal and the « Yellow » List)

(Oliver Rathkolb)

A compilation of the bearers of rings of honour was produced in preparation for the Vienna Philharmonic's Centennial celebrations. (1) It can not currently be reconstructed when exactly the 1st rings were awarded. In the archive of the Vienna Philharmonic, there are clues to a ring from 1928, (2) and it follows from an undated index « Ehrenmitglieder, Träger des Ehrenrings, Nicolai Medaillen » (3) that the 2nd ring bearer, the « Kammersänger » Richard Mayr, had received the ring in 1929.

Below, the list of the 1st ring bearers (dates of the bestowal are not explicitly noted in the original) :

Doctor Felix von Weingartner (honorary member) .

Richard Mayr (« Kammersänger » , honorary member) .

« Staatsrat » Doctor Wilhelm Furtwängler (honorary member) .

« Medizinalrat » Doctor Josef Neubauer (honorary member) .

Lotte Lehmann (« Kammersängerin ») .

Elisabeth Schumann (« Kammersängerin ») .

« Generalmusikdirektor » Professor Hans Knappertsbusch (March 12, 1938, on the occasion of his 50th birthday) .

In the Nazi era, for the 1st time (apart from « Medizinalrat » Doctor Josef Neubauer) , not only artists were distinguished, but also « General Feldmarschall » Wilhelm List (unclear when the ring was presented) ; Baldur von Schirach (30 March 1942) ; Doctor Arthur Seyß-Inquart (30 March 1942) .

Especially, the presentation of the ring to Schirach, in the context of the Centennial celebration, was openly propagated in the newspapers. On March 27, 1942, the chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, Wilhelm Jerger, presented the ring of honour to the « Reichsleiter » , in his bureau at the « Ballhausplatz » :

« Your concern always was that the Orchestra remains in place also during the War. » (4)

Furthermore, Schirach received the Nicolai Medal which, in this case, was awarded for the very 1st time. In return, he decreed the renaming of a part of the « Augustinerstraße » in « Philharmonikerstraße » . Jerger had already meticulously coordinated the overall design of the Centennial celebration in detail with Schirach's general commissioner, Walter Thomas, (5) who himself, on March 27, 1942, received the silver Nicolai Medal. Fritz Trümpi, in his contribution on the association of the Vienna Philharmonic in this project, also referred to the super-intendence of the regional leader (« Gauleiter ») over the association of the Vienna Philharmonic which, by the way, was obviously effective also in the case of the State Opera.

Arthur Seyß-Inquart received the ring on the occasion of a later visit of a delegation of the Vienna Philharmonic, in the occupied Netherlands, and he was distinguished for his merits as regional leader of Vienna and his « active support » for the Vienna Philharmonic, at that time, but also for the funding of a concert of the « Concertgebouw » Orchestra, Amsterdam, in the context of the Centennial celebration.

In 1950, these clearly political bestowals are no longer brought-up, and also Professor Wilhelm Jerger who had received the ring of honour on March 30, 1942, is not mentioned any longer - « Generalintendant » Professor Clemens Krauß (March 31, 1943) however, as well as Doctor Hans Pfitzner (March 5, 1949) are still mentioned. (6)

Below, some additional ring bearers of the early Second Republic : (7)

Doctor Volkmar Andreæ (19 November 1949) .

Doctor Karl Renner (1950, on the occasion of his 80th birthday) .

Bruno Walter (16 September 1951, on the occasion of his 75th birthday) .

Doctor Karl Böhm (24 August 1954, on the occasion of his 60th birthday) .

« Ministerialrat Diplom-Ingenieur » Ernst Marboe (8 October 1955) .

« Präsident Doktor honoris causa Ingenieur » Manfred Mautner-Markhof (October 1959) .

« Botschafter » Doctor Franz Helmut Leitner (October 1959) .

Wilhelm Backhaus (1961) .

Josef Geringer (25 November 1961) .

Professor Hugo Burghauser (25 November 1961) .

« Ministerialrat » Doctor Alfred Weikert (February 1963) .

Doctor Daniel Falk (May 1963) .

Doctor Otto Mayr (September 1963) .

Professor Doctor Wilhelm Peter (April 1964) .

Franz Bartolomey II (1964) .

Among the honoured persons was I politician, but there were several officials, artists, the lawyer Otto Mayr who had represented many Philharmonic members in the denazification procedures, and the expelled emigrants Burghauser, Geringer and Falk.

A search in this index, however, for the 2nd presentation of the Vienna Philharmonic's ring of honour to Baldur von Schirach, a convicted War criminal released from detention at Spandau, is in vain. One of Schirach's sons, Richard von Schirach, published already, in 2004, a passage on the 2nd presentation of the ring of honour in his book, « Der Schatten meines Vaters » (Munich 2005) , because the 1st ring had, in 1945, supposedly been stolen by a U.S. soldier :

« A professor from Vienna » , according to the now 70 year old, should have conveyed the musicians' highest-honour to his father, after he was, in 1966, discharged from the prison for War criminals in Spandau :

« He came as secret emissary of the Vienna Philharmonic, in order to present the Vienna Philharmonic's ring of honour. » (8)

I have via e-mail attempted to motivate Richard von Schirach to announce the deliverer but have failed, just like the journalist Doctor Marianne Enigl from the « Profil » , or the chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, Professor Clemens Hellsberg. Schirach meant that he, himself, as well as his brother, had back then promised absolute confidentiality to the emissary and that the political debate triggered by member of parliament Harald Walser had only re-inforced his decision. He did also not respond to my proposal of a one-on-one conversation.

While I was still intensively searching for the « Nachlaß » of Wilhelm Jerger, I received a surprising letter from

Wilhelm Bettelheim. Without being asked, he informed me in a hand-written letter from January 19, 2013 :

« The man who had presented the Vienna Philharmonic's ring of honour to Baldur von Schirach was “ Tromptengruppe der Wiener Philharmoniker ” Helmut Wobisch. Professor Wobisch was a “ SS-Mann ” and manager of the Vienna Philharmonic, in the year 1966. Professor Krips, an old friend of the family, had related this fact to me, in 1968, on the grounds of the Vienna AKH, on the “ Alserstraße ” at that time. » (9)

I have passed this information on only to the film director Robert Neumüller and have asked him to interview Mister Bettelheim for his TV documentary, « Im Schatten der Vergangenheit - Die Wiener Philharmoniker im Nationalsozialismus » :

Wilhelm Bettelheim seems to me to be a very trustworthy witness. He was born in Vienna, in the last year of War, into a Jewish family which lived in concealment, and he personally knew the conductor Josef Krips.

I have, in further consequence, established contact with the widow of Josef Krips, Harrietta Krips, who lives in Montreux. She could not find any further confirmation in the « Nachlaß » of her husband, but she did however find a correspondence between Wobisch and Krips, in the period in question. After an argument with Krips, Wobisch is also supposed to have given him (quasi as reconciliation) , as manager of the Vienna Philharmonic, a leading-role in the film, « Die Unvollendete. Franz Schubert, Symphonie Nr. 8, D 759, in H-Moll » , produced by Hugo Käch, in April 1969. (10) Krip's 1st wife, Mitzi Krips, was already sick in 1968 ; she returned to Vienna with her husband, in March 1969, and was brought to the hospital on April 3, 1969, where she passed-away 5 days later. (11) Despite numerous investigations into the protocols of the Vienna Philharmonic, as well as at the jeweller who traditionally manufactures the ring, it was not possible to find additional hints to the deliverer. Investigations in the Spandau Prison Records, in the National Archives, College Park, did likewise not bring any results.

Therefore, Wobisch could have indeed been the deliverer. As demonstrated by his SS-file, in the State Archive in Berlin, he was an ardent National-Socialist already prior to 1938 who, after 1945, was a very skilful manager and successful musician. At the same time, he had a great tendency toward conspiracy and, after 1945, skilfully denied his participation in the attempted « July “ Putsch ” » of the National-Socialists. After he was in a tumultuous general assembly, in 1953, elected provisory manager, he requested Federal President Theodor Körner for « hindsight of the atonement consequences according to the prohibitive law of 1947 » . (12) In his request, he claims « to have contributed to the retention during the Nazi era of the Jewish kin and half breeds in the Association of the State Opera Orchestra and, thereby, also as part of the Vienna Philharmonic » . On the basis of the ... , in the meantime, extensive insights into this issue, which have also been analyzed in Bernadette Mayrhofer's contribution, there is no evidence for such a support. Wobisch also did not, in the Nazi era, have the capacity such as Jerger or Kainz to prepare the special permits that were ultimately decided upon in the « Reich » Ministry of Information in Berlin. The highly-energetic Wobisch was, however, known as manager for his authoritarian decisions.

Furthermore, there are no clues of a decision of the chairman - as revealed by inquiries of contemporary witnesses such as Walter Barylli and other retired Philharmonic members, from the time of the presentation of the ring around 1966-1967.

While the private and individual action, in 1966-1967, to present Baldur von Schirach with a duplicate of the ring of honour is about to be clarified, another honour of the Nazi era has to be left open. A recently rediscovered internal plan on the Centennial celebration (13) mentions a Nicolai Medal in gold, engraved with « Dem Führer ». This golden Nicolai Medal, then, is also mentioned in the already quoted index :

« Adolf Hitler with the dedication “ Dem Führer ”. »

This golden medal also appears on the balance sheet to the Centennial celebration. (14) The media then, however, only report on the presentation of the silver Nicolai Medal to Schirach and Thomas, as well as on the ring of honour to Schirach. In the digitized press- and speech- documents of Baldur von Schirach, which were gathered in the context of a project on the digitalization of the Regional Press Archive, there are also no clues on this originally intended presentation.

Unfortunately, there is a lack in the protocols of the extraordinary general assembly from March 25, 1942, in which these honours were decided. Arthus Seyß-Inquart, then « Reich » commissioner for the occupied Netherlands, thus, also received the ring of honour. Furthermore, the Nicolai Medal was awarded to numerous other persons :

With name engraving in silver :

Baldur von Schirach.

Doctor Artur Seyß-Inquart.

Doctor Friedrich Rainer.

Doctor Albert Reitter.

Doctor Erwin Kerber.

« Stadtrat Diplom-Ingenieur » Hanns Blaschke.

Schirach, Seyß-Inquart, Reitter and Blaschke were high-ranking representatives of the Nazi State who, after 1945, were in most cases also classified as War criminals. Reitter had, by the way, at the Salzburg Festival in 1938, denounced Hugo Burghauser while he was still performing with the Orchestra.

Further Nicolai Medals were received in 1942 by amongst others :

Contributors to the Festschrift

Professor Joseph Marx.

Doctor Gerhard Hauptmann.

Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer.

Doctor Josef Weinheber.

Max Mell.

Heinrich Ritter von Srbik.

Doctor Aurel Wolfram.

In the media were mentioned also :

« Diplom-Ingenieur » Rudolf Töpfer (« Reichsbahnpräsident ») .

Doctor Willem Mengelberg.

Conductors of the Vienna Philharmonic

Doctor Richard Strauß.

« Staatsrat » Doctor Wilhelm Furtwängler.

« Generalmusikdirektor » Hans Knappertsbusch.

Clemens Krauß, « Intendant München » .

Doctor Karl Böhm, « Generalmusikdirektor Dresden » .

« Generalmusikdirektor » Leopold Reichwein.

Doctor Ernst von Dohnányi.

« Staatskapellmeister » Rudolf Moralt.

Franz Léhar.

Wilhelm Wacek.

Added in a different writing

Bruno Walter (presented in 1947) .

On January 14, 1943, additional Nicolai Medals in silver, and without a date, were awarded to : Heinrich Damisch

(Vienna) , Wilhelm Altmann and Georg Richard Kruse (both in Berlin) , as well as Gustav Bosse (Regensburg) .

The Vienna Philharmonic kept their distance from the Nazi regime only in the case of honorary memberships, which were defined as follows :

« The honorary membership for all those founders, sponsors, subscribers, friends and members, who by their quite extraordinary achievements have contributed an essential part to the great artistic, economic or social success of the Orchestra. » (15)

Honorary membership awarded to

Doctor Hans Richter.

« Fürstin » Pauline Metternich-Sándor.

Doctor Arthur von Krupp.

Maria von Thielen.

« Diplom-Ingenieur » Magnus Taeklind.

Doctor Jerome Stoneborough.

Doctor Felix von Weingartner.

Richard Mayr, « Kammersänger » .

Professor Robert Fuchs.

« Gräfin » Johanna Hartenau-Battenberg.

Ritter von Aichried Emil Sauer.

Doctor Josef Neubauer.

Doctor Richard Strauß.

« Staatsrat » Doctor Wilhelm Furtwängler.

« Gesandter » Doctor Emil Junkar.

« Hofrat » Professor Arnold Rosé.

« Hofrat » Doctor Franz Schmidt.

Mæstro Arturo Toscanini.

Professor Wilhelm Backhaus.

Envoy Baron Georg Frankenstein (in retrospect, delayed by the War events, 1939-1945 ; presented by Professor Fritz Sedlak, in December 1945 - thus, the note in the index) .

« Generalmusikdirektor » Professor Bruno Walter.

Professor Rudolf Jettmar.

Vera de Villiers.

Professor Franz Schütz, « Präsident der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » .

Doctor Friedrich Werner, « Vizepräsident der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » .

Doctor Hedwig Kraus, « Archivarin der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » .

Professor Doctor Nikolaus Jagic.

Hermine Kittel, « Kammersängerin » .

Anny Konetzny, « Kammersängerin » .

Georg Maikl, « Kammersänger » .

Hans Pernter, « Minister außer Dienst » ; due to political events presented upon the libarion of Austria by Professor Fritz Sedlak, in January 1946.

1942 : « Generalmusikdirektor » Professor Hans Knappertsbusch.

1949 : Doctor Hans Pfitzner.

1951 : Professor Clemens Krauß.

1955 : Doctor Karl Böhm.

1960 : Maria Mautner-Markhof.

1960 : Karl Schuricht.

1962 : Doctor Heinrich Drimmel.

1962 : Doctor Josef Klaus.

1963 : « Präsident-Ingenieur » Manfred Mautner-Markhof.

1967 : Fritz Sedlak.

1967 : Hugo Burghauser.

In summary, it can be noted that the bestowal of rings of honour and Nicolai Medals to high-ranking NSDAP-functionaries and the unresolved Nicolai Medal in gold for Adolf Hitler constitutes a highly-inglorious ingratiating to the totalitarian and inhuman Nazi regime. These honours, to my knowledge, have hitherto never been officially nullified.

The « Yellow List »

In stark contrast stands the racial stigmatisation of Jewish artists in the comprehensive statistics, on the occasion of the Centennial anniversary in 1942. On a « yellow leaflet », a list of « Jews or half breeds » is given, which was prepared on the basis of the « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » of Theo Stengel and Herbert Gerigk (Berlin, 1940) . According to oral tradition, the publication was otherwise in danger of being withdrawn. (16) A just recently discovered work list shows (17) that this « labelling » ultimately remained incomplete - Daniel Falk, Paul Fischer, Josef Geringer, Moriz Glattauer, Viktor Robitsek, Berthold Salander, Max Starkmann and Ludwig Wittels were « forgotten » . Friedrich Buxbaum, Armin Tyroler, Anton Weiß, on the other hand, are listed as well as Alma and Arnold Rosé.

What is peculiar, however, is that the internal anti-Semitic work list is, in fact, complete but, in the case of individual former Vienna Philharmonic as well as for more than 50 « Non-Aryans » , these additions do not appear on the printed list - the « work list » thus contains also non-Philharmonic, artists that have performed together with the Philharmonic. The stigmatization is, in the end, limited for the most part to those who were quoted in the « Lexikon der Juden in der Musik » . No clear reply may be given to the question why the stigmatization was at first omitted, as in other publications but, then still, the leaflet (albeit incomplete) was produced. Also, the concerned people's very correct form of address at first as « personalities » (« Persönlichkeiten ») in order to, then, clearly exclude them racially as « Non-Aryans » , raises more questions than answers. The editors of this volume obviously felt uncomfortable with the per se mandatory stigmatization of Jews in books. At the same time, it becomes evident how strongly the attribution of Jewish descent had become burnt into the minds of people far beyond the official Nazi lexica.

Judged on the whole, this « yellow list » of exclusion remains the extreme opposite to the flood of honours of Nazi potentates and supports of the Nazi regime in the cultural sphere, in the year 1942.

Notes

(1) Archive of the Vienna Philharmonic, Depot State Opera. Folder on the Centennial celebrations 1942, list of the

honorary members.

(2) Information from Doctor Silvia Kargl, AdWPh.

(3) This undated booklet was discovered in the Archive of the Vienna Philharmonic during its investigation by Doctor Silvia Kargl for possibly new documents for this project, in February 2013.

(4) « Neues Wiener Tagblatt » (28 March 1942) .

(5) Archive Vienna Philharmonic, Depot State Opera. Folder I, file memo (15 January 1942) .

(6) « Schweizerische Musikzeitung » : « Revue musicale suisse » , volume 90 (1950) ; page 28.

(7) Unpaginated index « Ehrenmitglieder, Träger des Ehrenrings, Nicolai Medaillen » , heading « Träger des Ehrenrings » .

(8) Marianne Engil. « Götterdämmerung, profil » (19 January 2013) :
http://www.profil.at/articles/1303/560/353783_s3/goetterdaemmerung-wiener-philharmonikern

(9) « Der Mensch, der Baldur von Schirach den Ehrenring der Philharmoniker überreichte, war Helmut Wobisch. Professor Wobisch war SS-Mann und im Jahre 1966 Geschäftsführer der Wiener Philharmoniker. Professor Krips, ein alter Freund der Familie, hat mir diese Tatsache 1968 auf dem Gelände des damaligen Wiener AKHs in der Alserstraße erzählt. »

(10) Telephone conversation of the author with Harrietta Krips (2 March 2013) . In this respect, see also : Josef Krips. « Ohne Liebe kann man keine Musik machen. » , « Erinnerungen, herausgegeben und kommentiert von Harrietta Krips » , Vienna (1994) ; page 548.

(11) Krips. « Ohne Liebe » ; page 419.

(12) « Archiv der Republik, Wien, Bestand Präsidentschaftskanzlei, Zl. 8022 (1953) . »

(13) Archive of the Vienna Philharmonic, Depot State Opera. Folder I, internal plan.

(14) Archive of the Vienna Philharmonic, Depot State Opera. Folder I, balance sheet, Centennial celebration.

(15) « Die Ehrenmitgliedschaft für all jene Gründer, Förderer, Abonnenten, Freunde und Mitglieder, die durch ihre ganz außerordentlichen Leistungen einen wesentlichen Teil zu großen künstlerischen, wirtschaftlichen oder sozialen Erfolgen des Orchesters beigetragen haben. »

Denazification and the Long Shadow of the Past in the 1950's and 1960's

(Oliver Rathkolb) (1)

The most distinctive example of the insurmountable conflict of priorities in cultural denazification (namely, the demand of artistic performance while simultaneously eliminating National-Socialist thought by rigorous personnel cleansing) was represented by the political classification of a collective Orchestra such as the Vienna Philharmonic.

While especially British and U.S.-American cultural affairs officers initially had clear instructions and various « black lists » for individual cultural performers to prevent all artists charged with National-Socialism from public appearance (in order to completely eliminate National-Socialist ideology by means of a kind of « cool down » period and an eventual « exchange of elites ») , they could not assert themselves with this Orchestra. The Vienna Philharmonic formed a unified Orchestra that was well-known internationally and especially in Europe but, at the same time, had the « technical » drawback of a disproportionately high-rate of former National-Socialist Party members - amongst them, numerous « illegals » (« Illegale » : i.e. , Party members during the Party ban, from 1933 to 1938) . Such a difficulty was not presented to the Americans in the former « Reich » capital, Berlin : there, only 20 of around 110 musicians had belonged to the NSDAP. (2) By comparison, in the beginning of 1943, out of 123 Philharmonic in Vienna, 60 or about 50 % had belonged to the NSDAP ; (3) at least 22 of these, in turn, were « illegals » , and 2 were members of the « Schutzstaffel » (SS) . (4)

1st tangible contact with U.S. cultural affairs officers was made in September 1945, when contact talks about the Philharmonic were held with the provisional leader of the Philharmonic, Fritz Sedlak, and the director of the Vienna State Opera. (5) There had originally been rumours that 70 to 85 % of the orchestral members were supposed to have been NSDAP members, but Sedlak claimed that, out of 135 members of the State Opera orchestra (not all orchestral musicians of the State Opera are automatically also members of the Vienna Philharmonic) , only 34 had been Party members. (6) Also, in their struggle against a further denazification of the Orchestra, the musicians attempted to win the Americans over with the help of the Opera's administrative director, Matthäus Flitsch. (7)

A special characteristic in the negotiations with the Concert Master of the Philharmonic was that the U.S. cultural affairs officer, Otte de Pasetti, who as the life partner of Lotte Lenya-Weill had, for private reasons, gone to the USA already before 1938, was faced with a « fait accompli » and had to adapt to the present circumstances. It was still in the last days of the War that the former chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, the contrabassist Wilhelm Jerger, who also was a member of the SS and the « Ahnenerbe » , (8) made his position available. (9) According to Philharmonic member Otto Straßer who, already in 1938, had played a central part in the transition of power, there were secret talks with Wilhelm Furtwängler, 10 months before the end of the War, in order to quickly conduct the imminent internal « transition of power » . Jerger had, in 1938, assumed the leading position from Hugo Burghauser who, after the « annexation » , as sympathizer of the Fatherland's Front and as « Jewish kin » (« jüdisch versippt ») was declared politically unsustainable and, later, had to withdraw from the State Opera Orchestra. (11)

The successor to Jerger, Fritz Sedlak, was successful in holding the Orchestra together and bringing it safely through the final turmoil of War. Due to his knowledge of Russian, which he had acquired as prisoner during the First World War, he could lead the talks with Soviet occupation officers himself. (12)

The Soviet cultural policy was entirely oriented towards an immediate resumption of cultural life and, therefore, it was not difficult for him to win many a help for his Orchestra which, under Clemens Krauß and Robert Fanta and without extensive denazification, again gave its 1st concerts. (13)

The denazification measures, themselves, were kept within limits, because Sedlak (a politically integer man) successfully intervened at the State Secretary for National Edification, Schooling and Education as well as Religious Affairs in the provisional State government Renner, Ernst Fischer, a communist official who had returned from Moscow ; he unreservedly took a stand for the conservation of this unique Orchestra. (14) Formal NSDAP Party membership alone should not be reason for a discharge. An internal « denazification commission » , next to ministry officials, was staffed also by a Philharmonic, (15) and this orchestral member was one of those « rescued half breeds and Jewish kin » who, in 1938, was spared discharge after Furtwängler's intervention. (16) During a press conference, in April 1946, Sedlak attempted to justify the fact that discharges or retirements of Party members in the Orchestra were only handled reservedly. (17) After the end of War, 4 heavily charged musicians were immediately discharged - 2 men of the SS, an illegal, and allegedly a former Blockwart-helper. (18) 14 further orchestral members were retired - in which were included also some not National-Socialist.

Rudolf Kalmar, local head of the all-Party newspaper « Neues Österreich » , who had survived the concentration camps of Dachau and Flossenbürg, took Sedlak's press conference as an occasion to plead for a milder persecution of former National-Socialists, using the example of the Philharmonic. (19) In an editorial article, he reckoned that the Orchestra has to be conceded a higher-degree of « world-otherness » (« Weltfremdheit ») and that an example has to be set, which should constitute an « open and resolute confession of one's own error of yesterday » and could also amount to a justification of a sort in front of the abroad countries. At this press conference, Fritz Sedlak had given the legality declaration to federal president Renner, (20) condemned the past with harsh words, and announced concerts, the net yield of which should flow-back to the relatives of those earlier orchestral colleagues who, after 1938, had fallen victim to National-Socialism.

Up to this point, the 2 great occupying powers deliberately practiced restraint in this issue. The chief-editor of the « Wiener Kurier » , Hendric J. Burns, (21) as well as the « Austriacus » in the « Österreichische Zeitung » (22) reckoned that a temporarily less well-equipped Orchestra would be much more in line with the tradition of the Vienna Philharmonic. Protest from within the ranks of the Philharmonic reached to the address of the U.S. theatre officer, Henry C. Alters, a Viennese emigrant who, at that time, was solely responsible for theatre and music in Vienna, because the pianist and music-officer Margot Pinter had left the Information Services Branch (ISB) . (23) Mrs. Pinter had been completely in line with Sedlak, because she herself as pianist placed the issue of the performative quality far above the issue of the political responsibility of the musicians. (24) Moreover, she did not attach great importance to the formal Party membership or candidature, with the rational that musicians were deeply apolitical people. She was, furthermore, incapable of compensating an additional emotional handicap : she had already performed with the Philharmonic, in Vienna, and suddenly saw herself being pressed into the role of a judge of denazification, who (at least, according to the views of general McChrystal) was supposed to discharge as many Party members as possible and maintain but a rudimentary orchestration with only the most important instruments. (25)

The 6 musicians who had complained towards « Alter » revealed a certain weakness in the numeral reasoning of Sedlak, because out of the total of 14 retired colleagues, 4 were permanently retired not due to their Party membership, but due to their age ; another group of 6 artists should have been retired years ago, but precisely because of their membership in the NSDAP could retain their position in the Orchestra. (26) Doubts were raised also towards the claim of the provisional chairman that insufficient other musicians of suitable artistic skills were available. (27)

The discussion concerning the Philharmonic fell silent during the following months due to the Salzburg Festival and because the denazification of Herbert von Karajan and Wilhelm Furtwängler was prioritized. The Philharmonic did, indeed, perform at the Salzburg Festival, but 3 charged orchestral members were denied solo performance by U.S. cultural affairs officer, Ernst Lothar, who had returned from exile. (28) A repeated review of this music ensemble on the level of the Allied Denazification Bureau of the Allied Commission started in September. The American representative of this council, Maximilian Wallach, put forward the publicly voiced concerns about the Nazi members in the Orchestra and demanded a meeting with the responsible Austrians, because it had so far been impossible to receive detailed documents from them. (29)

Occasion for this investigation was a planned abroad trip of the Philharmonic ; in the issuance of « travel permits » , the attention of French offices was, again, called to the political past of individual Philharmonic members. At the conference of members of the Allied Denazification Bureau and representatives of the Federal Ministry of Education as well as the Federal Theatre Administration, it was especially the head of the Federal Theatre Administration, Egon Hilbert, detained as political prisoner in the « KZ-Dachau » , from 1938 to 1945, who wanted to substantiate the view of the former State secretary Fischer that artists are to be judged by different criteria in terms of politics. (30) Furthermore, efforts would have shown that it was impossible to find appropriate substitutions. In response to the specific question about the exact number of former National-Socialists in the Orchestra, Hilbert responded :

« Out of 133 members of the State Opera, 45 are former Party members, and 13 former Party members had been excluded from the Philharmonic Orchestra, including the ones who resigned, and the ones who had been pensioned with a reduction of pay. » (31)

Towards the end of the briefing, the representative of the Ministry of Education admitted that the Philharmonic Orchestra was the only institution in his ministry's responsibility in which « illegals » were employed. (32) In further consequence, the Allied Denazification Bureau demanded a more intense cooperation and further information in the form of questionnaires.

The charged members of the Orchestra could not be taken on a tour to France and Switzerland, because they had not received travel permits. Substitutes took their place and, despite these improvisations, the guest performances were conducted without any damage to the Orchestra's image. (33) In this case, as in other cultural denazification measures, the Information Services Branch had lost its decisive function and was only approached as a consultant. Concerning the stage ban of « illegal » ensemble members, there was principally no discussion between the Special Branch and the Information Services Branch. (34) It was especially in the United States that the high-rate of former National-Socialists, in the ranks of the Vienna Philharmonic, was criticized. (35) Also, the world-famous solo violinist, Bronisław Huberman,

declared not to come to Vienna « before the last Nazi has disappeared from Viennese musical life » . (36)

Illegal musicians (i.e. , those who were NSDAP-members during the Party ban, from 1933 to 1938) should originally be immediately discharged, according to the beliefs of all members in the Allied Denazification Bureau - without regard of their artistic irreplaceability in view of the entire Orchestra. (37) To this group of « illegals » were counted also those Nazi Party members who had faked allied questionnaires and concealed their political past. For this reason, the U.S. representative in the Allied Denazification Bureau prompted the ISB Information Service Branch to, at 1st, submit their « technical opinion » on only 23 « less incriminated » (« minder belastet ») orchestral members. (38) For the time being, he did not want to discuss the case of the 28 musicians who were to be immediately discharged. This stance, however, was opposed by the British cultural officer and Austrian political emigrant, Peter Schnabel. (39) He requested that the Vienna Philharmonic should be preserved in their entirety and that only 2 to 3 politically unacceptable artists should be discharged (40) - thereby, he was fully in line with the official Austrian standpoint. Moreover, he pointed to the new National-Socialist law (« Nationalsozialistengesetz ») which would come into effect 2 months later and provide new guide-lines and legal possibilities to the Austrians.

A further delay was declined in the joint meeting of the Denazification Bureau and the Quadripartite Press and Entertainment Sub-Committee primarily by the Soviet representative Aristowa, but also by the French and Americans. A total number of 23 cases came-up for discussion, and the ISB-representative Albert van Eerden began with an extensive statement about Concert Master Wolfgang Scheiderhan, whom he described as a « never more than lukewarm member of the Nazi Party » ; (41) an unanimous positive decision was subsequently achieved. In 13 further cases, all cultural and denazification officers voted for a stage permission. (42) Only twice was a discharge decided upon unanimously, whereas the Austrians had in their documents denied political acceptability only in the case of a violinist. The U.S. denazification officer abided closely by the recommendations of van Eerden, who had taken-over the responsibility of the denazification of the Philharmonic from Ernst Lothar ; only in 2 cases, the Americans voted for the removal of charged musicians and, in 2 further ones, no judgement could be delivered concerning the « substitutability » for a lack of documents. In the case of 6 musicians, the Soviet representatives, lieutenant Shour for the Denazification Department and Miss Aristowa for the Soviet Information Service, demanded a discharge without immediate discharge, and, only once, the French and the Soviets agreed on a veto.

In this debate, the alteration in the Soviet denazification policy in cultural issues is clearly illustrated. Shortly after the end of the Second World War, conductor Josef Krips, who for racial reasons was imposed with a stage ban during the Nazi era, (43) was ultimately prompted by the cultural officers of the Red Army to perform with the entire Orchestra of the Vienna Philharmonic - including those members charged with National-Socialism. (44)

While the Western Allies agreed that only a gradual denazification of the Orchestra was possible (a point on which most emphasis was placed by the Americans) , the Soviet representative in the Sub-Committee for Press and Entertainment meant that an immediate discharge should follow also in the case of those unacceptable and « less incriminated » . (45)

Already a month later, however, the Allied Denazification Bureau was forced to ask for an expert opinion from the ISB Information Service Branch also on those illegals immediately to be discharged. (46) 19 were denoted as artistically

irreplaceable while, in the case of the remaining 9 musicians, a replacement could be found on short notice. (47) In the view of the State Theatre Administration and the Representation of the State Opera Orchestra, however, all 28 were irreplaceable. Even though the Allied Denazification Office of the department 2N in the Office of the Federal Chancellor had, in June 1947, conveyed a definite list of the 28 members of the State Opera and Philharmonic Orchestra to be immediately discharged, (48) a corresponding reaction on the side of the Austrians remained absent.

Characteristic, although possibly not deliberately planned, was the Philharmonic's 1st big post-War tour to Great Britain, (49) whose representatives in the Cultural Department as well as in the Foreign Office had already very early on argued in support of an omission of the denazification, in order to preserve the homogeneity of the Orchestra. (50)

The U.S. experts could not assert themselves in any stage, because the Soviets themselves who, until the involvement of the Western Allies in the administration of Vienna, were completely in line with their idea of cultural reconciliation, had taken almost no denazification measures and, in the suspension of legal regulations, showed great leniency towards the relevant Austrian authorities. The Americans did attempt to revise this « fait accompli » on the level of the Allied Commission, but the Austrians had already established their position to such an extent that even a joint decision of the Allies to discharge the « illegal » Philharmonic could not have change the situation.

According to the views of the author, it is inaccurate to denote the factual sacrifice of the Vienna Philharmonic's denazification as an unintended failure of the U.S. cultural denazification policy which, in 1945-1946, was oriented solely towards individual cases. On the one hand, it was only in 1946-1947 that the discussion of the political assessment of the Orchestra was held in specific terms on an Allied level, on the other hand, in the eyes of the U.S. cultural officers the Philharmonic represented a primarily cultural instrument of international importance. Within the Information Services Branch and in the United States, there had however also been discussions about whether the retention of such a high-number of Party members would not damage the Orchestra. In the end, a formal Allied Resolution was passed in 1947 to discharge a majority of the illegals, in practice though enforcement against Austrian resistance was eschewed.

The priorities were redefined after, in January 1947, 52 % of the respondents in an American opinion survey in Vienna spoke-out in favour for the retention of the Orchestra in its « nazified » form. The Americans and the Allies obviously wanted to avoid a scandal in this issue which, by no means, was any longer amongst the main concerns of the occupation administration - not least because the Austrians, despite not knowing the Philharmonic personally, perceived the denazification of the Orchestra as an allied intervention and violation of national pride. (51)

How inaccurate the specific « denazification » could ultimately be (initially also due to a lack of appropriate NSDAP-documents, such as the SS-records of Wilhelm Jerger and Helmut Wobisch, for example) is exemplified by the special case of Franz Bartolomey. (52) Was he a « top-Nazi », like Wilhelm Jerger, the chairman of the Orchestra, Helmut Wobisch and Adolf Löffler, since he was discharged together with these colleagues immediately after the liberation in 1945 ? In recent years, a new source in the Vienna City and State Archive on the denazification procedures has become available, i.e. , those procedures which decided whether an illegal membership existed during the Party ban of the NSDAP, from 1933 to 1938. Furthermore, the various denazification commissions decided upon active and passive voting rights as well as in the professional domain in the case of officials upon discharge and retirement or

suspension and atonement payments. Advanced and enhanced by means of documents from Bartolomey's correspondence provided to me by his son, suddenly a completely different picture emerged.

Even though Bartolomey (and this is an important difference to all of the other re-integrated former NSDAP-members) had been excluded from the NSDAP in 1942, some colleagues in the Orchestra made use of his absence towards the end of the War to talk him up as « top-Nazi », which surely was not the case. He was indeed German-nationally socialized in the context of the « Gymnastics Club » (« Turnverein ») and the « Youth League » (« Jugendbund »), but, as compared to 36 % of the orchestral members, he was not active for the NSDAP already before the « annexation », in 1938. He was engaged as a substitute, already in 1937, and, in 1938, profited from the racially motivated discharges - amongst them, 11 string players who as Jews were excluded and discharged. As early as May-June 1938, he should succeed in an audition in which, out of 97 applicants, 7 string players were engaged for the State Opera and, already in July, he requested the NSDAP-membership. On November 4, 1939, he was with retroactive effect of November 1, 1938, accepted in the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic. This contract of 1938 also meant for Bartolomey an end to his great existential anxiety, which had haunted him since the death of his father, in 1920. He joined the NSDAP already in 1938 but, for the time being, was accepted only as Party candidate and, on June 1, 1940, received the membership number 7.676.908. In 1942, however, he was excluded due to being denounced for having engaged a painter who was married to a Jewish woman.

What was lacking in the case of Franz Bartolomey II though was the « air-raid shelter experience » of the last days of War because, after an approved holiday, he stayed on with his family and was suddenly branded a quitter and outsider. Obviously, some decision-makers, in 1945, were quite happy to find former NSDAP-members who (without a chance to react) could quickly be excluded in order to signalize a symbolic denazification. In the end, it also turned out to be a group of former hardcore-Nazis who almost managed to prevent his return. The « case Bartolomey » demonstrates how complex group-dynamic processes affected the denazification policy, especially in the case of the State Opera Orchestra or the Vienna Philharmonic, and how great Nazis could be created from followers (« Mitläufer »), and vice-versa.

At least, Helmut Wobisch was, in 1953, appointed manager of the Vienna Philharmonic and kept this position until 1969. I have described Wobisch's case in detail in my contribution on the honours. In his (tumultuous) election, as manager in 1953, he was actually not entitled to actively vote, because he had still not been amnestied by the federal president from the « atonement consequences » of his participation in the attempted « coup d'État », in July 1934. In an express procedure, this amnesty was, then, made-up for, whereby in contortion of the facts, Wobisch's past was interpreted completely on the contrary.

Wilhelm Jerger, on the other hand, escaped a trial for illegality (53) in front of the People's Court (« Volksgericht »), because he was in U.S. custody, in Glasenbach. His intended denazification procedure (54) for a possible return to the State Opera Orchestra and, thereby also, to the Vienna Philharmonic is especially interesting and, not yet, extensively evaluated, but this will first have to be analyzed on the basis of other source materials. While Jerger's role was rudimentarily addressed by Clemens Hellsberg in his book, « Demokratie der Könige » (1992) - the account of which was taken note of with partial displeasure (55) by his son, Veit Jerger - the Anton Bruckner Private University, the

former Bruckner-Conservatory, needed until the year 2009 to attend to the question of Jerger's past, even though he had acted as its director, from 1958 to 1973. (56) And yet, as can be seen by the contributions to this project of Bernadette Mayrhofer and myself, such a pursuit would have yielded quite an ambivalent picture.

Jerger was appointed director of the Bruckner-Conservatory, on August 15, 1958, after he had gone to Switzerland, in 1948, and started to establish himself a 2nd life as musicologist. According to Jerger's son, there had supposedly also been accusations about his father's Nazi-past at the time of his appointment which, however, were invalidated by Simon Wiesenthal. (57) Incidentally, Wilhelm Jerger later received the « Franz-Schalk-Medal » in silver from the Vienna Philharmonic. Also, in this case, it would be important to investigate the circumstances of this bestowal.

Taken as a whole, the single cases that, here, were only briefly outlined document the fact that it is absolutely necessary to consult a wide-range of sources in an assessment of the behaviour of single orchestral members. A 1st evaluation of the initially mentioned documents from the Nazi era in various Viennese archives, corresponding denazification documents, and files from the State Archive in Berlin allow for a clearer appraisal which, however, includes all the possibilities of political behaviour and which can ultimately only be achieved with academic accuracy by case studies such as the ones on Franz Bartolomey or Wilhelm Jerger, as well as Helmut Wobisch.

Notes

(1) This follows a partially updated and revised version of a chapter of my unpublished dissertation, « Politische Propaganda der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht in Österreich 1945 bis 1950 : Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kalten Krieges in der Presse-, Kultur- und Rundfunkpolitik », Vienna (1981) ; pages 395-406.

(2) Fritz Trümpi. « Politisierte Orchester. Die Wiener Philharmoniker und das Berliner Philharmonische Orchester », Vienna (2011) ; page 189.

(3) Rudolf Kalmar. « Die Philharmoniker », in : « Neues Österreich » (7 March 1946) . Egon Hilbert, in his draft for a lecture in the cabinet by the minister of education, Felix Hurdes, mentions a slightly higher number : 48 (BW Zl. 1265/1946) .

(4) « Archiv der Republik, Bestand Bundeskanzleramt (BKA) -Verbindungsstelle », Zl. 2153/XXXIII, page 2 ; and Rudolf Kalmar. « Die Philharmoniker », in : « Neues Österreich » (7 March 1946) ; page 2.

(5) National Archives (NA) , College Park, Maryland, Record Group (RG) 260/35/Folder : Theatre & Music Section, Otto de Pasetti - Vienna activities report (13-14 September 1945) ; page 2.

(6) Ibid.

(7) In this respect, see most recently : Tamara Ehs. « Innerlich stets austrophil », in : « Die Presse » (18 January 2013 - <http://diepresse.com/home/spectrum/zeichenderzeit/1334505/Innerlich-stets-austrophil>, accessed on 10 March 2013) .

(8) « Bundesarchiv Berlin », formerly : Berlin Document Center, personal file : Wilhelm Jerger.

(9) Otto Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt. Mein Leben mit den Wiener Philharmonikern », Vienna (1974) ; page 218.

(10) « Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv », National-Socialist registration, Otto Straßer ; the original writing of Wilhelm Furtwängler, which confirms this information by Straßer, is unfortunately no longer enclosed, but it is however quoted in the file.

(11) Hugo Burghauser. « Philharmonische Begegnungen. Erinnerungen eines Wiener Philharmonikers », Zürich (1997) ; page 111ff.

(12) Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » ; page 218.

(13) Erwin Mittag. « Aus der Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker », Vienna (1950) ; page 96 ff.

(14) Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » , page 222 ; Ernst Fischer. « Das Ende einer Illusion. Erinnerungen 1945-1955 » ; page 138.

(15) Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » ; page 222.

(16) This would have probably been the trombone player Professor Josef Hadraba (Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » ; page 222 - in connection with : National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/95/Folder : Music & Theatre, Furtwängler to Kerber, 20 August 1938, and BW Zl. 2647/1945, supplement) .

(17) « Wiener Kurier » (9 March 1946) , page 2 ; « Österreichische Zeitung » (12 March 1946) , page 6.

(18) Rudolf Kalmar. « Die Philharmoniker » , in : « Neues Österreich » (7 March 1946) ; page 2.

(19) Ibid. The later executive editor of the « Neuen Österreich » could convincingly communicate such serious and conciliatory statements, because he had been incarcerated in the concentration camps of Dachau and Flossenbürg, from 1938 to 1945 (in this respect, see : Rudolf Kalmar. « Zeit ohne Gnade » , Vienna 1946) .

(20) Rudolf Kalmar. « Die Philharmoniker » , in : « Neues Österreich » (7 March 1946) ; page 2. The legality declaration read :

« All members wholeheartedly confess themselves to the new Austria, utterly disaffirm the past, and also are at any time willing to confirm this confession in deeds. » (BWV Zl. 1246/1946) .

(21) « Wiener Kurier » (9 March 1946) ; page 2.

(22) « Österreichische Zeitung » (12 March 1946) ; page 6.

(23) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/892/Folder : Music & Theatre Reports 1945-1947, « Alter an Theater » and Music Officer - Semi-Monthly Report No. 9 (15 April 1946) ; page 2ff.

(24) Communication of Professor Margot Voigt-Pinter to the author (28 July 1979) . Anton Voigt. « Nicht Richter, sondern Helfer. Die Pianistin Margot Pinter als Cultural Officer der amerikanischen Militärverwaltung. Zur “ Entnazifizierung von Musik ” » , in : « “ Kulturhauptstadt des Führers ”. Kunst und Nationalsozialismus in Linz und Oberösterreich. Ein Projekt der Oberösterreichischen Landesmuseen in Kooperation mit Linz 2009 Kulturhauptstadt Europas » . [« Zur Ausstellung im Schloßmuseum, Linz 17. September 2008 bis 22. März 2009] (« Kataloge der Oberösterreichischen Landesmuseen Neue Serie, Nr. 78) ; pages 261-268.

(25) Ibid.

(26) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/892/Folder : Music & Theatre Reports 1945-1947, « Alter an Theater » and Music Officer - Semi-Monthly Report, No. 9 (15 April 1946) ; page 2.

(27) Ibid. ; page 3. While already in the summer of 1945, in the course of a temporary consolidation of the orchestras of the State Opera and the « Volksoper » , also other musicians had successfully performed together with the Philharmonicists, these were then, again, discharged as soon as a sufficient number of « old » Philharmonicists were available, who partially were politically charged.

(28) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/892/Folder : Music & Theatre Reports 1945-1947, Lothar to Chief, ISB Semi-Monthly Report (15 August 1946) ; page 3.

(29) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/547/7, Hefti - Record of Work (27 September 1946) .

(30) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/44/29, Wallach - Record of Work (3 October 1945) ; page 1.

(31) Ibid.

(32) Ibid. ; page 3.

(33) Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » ; page 234.

(34) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/547/7, Joint Minutes of the Denazification Bureau and Quadripartite Press and Entertainment Sub-Committee (19 December 1946) .

(35) « Wiener Kurier » (13 September 1946) ; page 4.

(36) « Österreichische Zeitung » (12 March 1946) ; page 6.

(37) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/547/7 Joint Minutes of the Denazification Bureau and Quadripartite Press and Entertainment Sub-Committee (19 December 1946) ; page 1.

(38) Ibid. ; page 3ff. In connection with National Archives, Washington, D.C. 260/44/29, Allen an van Eerden - Philharmonic Orchestra (27 November 1946) .

(39) Peter Schnabel fled to Great Britain, in 1938, because, as former battalion commander in the « Heimwehr » , he feared political restrictions by the National-Socialists. After the outbreak of the Second World War, he joined the British army and was, in 1945, deployed as information officer in Hannover and Düsseldorf. In 1946, he returned to Austria on his own terms. (Communication by Major a. D. Peter Schnabel to the author, 20 May 1981.)

(40) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/54/7, Joint Minutes of the Denazification Bureau and Quadripartite Press and Entertainment Sub-Committee (19 December 1946) ; page 1f.

(41) Ibid. ; page 3.

(42) Ibid. ; page 3ff.

(43) Krips was initially discharged as general musical director at the « Landestheater Karlsruhe » , in 1933. Concerning his stage ban, in 1938, see : « Arbeiter-Zeitung » (21 July 1950) ; page 3. Extensive coverage in : Josef Krips. « Ohne Liebe kann man keine Musik machen. Erinnerungen » , edited by Harrietta Krips, Vienna and others (1994) .

(44) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/54/7, Joint Minutes of the Denazification Bureau and Quadripartite Press and Entertainment Sub-Committee (19 December 1946) ; page 6.

(45) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/44/29, Sub-Committee for Press and Entertainment an Political Directorate - Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra (28 January 1947) ; page 1.

(46) National Archives, Washington, D.C.-RG 260/550/Folder : Letters, Hefti to Chairman, Internal Affairs Directorate - State Opera Orchestra (25 January 1947) .

(47) Ibid. ; Annex A.

(48) « Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Archiv der Republik, BKA-Verbindungsstelle, Zl. 2153/XXXIII. »

(49) Straßer. « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt » ; page 236.

(50) Dieter Stiefel. « Entnazifizierung » ; page 275.

(51) Public Opinion in Occupied Germany, edited by Anna J. and Richard L. Merritt. The OMGUS Surveys, 1945-1949. With a Foreword by Frederick W. Williams, University of Illinois Press, Urbana / Chicago / London (1970) ; page 129f. It is especially interesting that the musical connoisseurs of the Vienna Philharmonists took a much stronger stance for a denazification of the Orchestra.

(52) This partially follows my contribution in the book of Franz Bartolomey. « “ Was zählt, ist der Augenblick. ” Die Bartolomeys. 120 Jahre an der Wiener Staatsoper », Vienna (2012) ; pages 129-136 : « Der Fall Bartolomey : Ein Philharmoniker zwischen Politik und Intrigen 1938 bis 1950. »

(53) Telephone information by Doctor Winfried Garscha, DÖW, on the basis of his research files (5 March 2013) .

(54) In this respect, see the corresponding clues in the Archive of the Vienna Philharmonists, Depot State Opera, folder Jerger. Statements concerning his conduct during the Nazi era were also accessed.

(55) Diary. « Veit Jerger » (written before 2006) ; page 9. I am thankful to Miss Saskia Kuhlmann for providing me with excerpts of the diary.

(56) Regina Thumser. « Musikpolitik in Oberösterreich 1938-1955 », in : « Klänge der Macht. Nationalsozialistische Musikpolitik in Oberösterreich », edited by Regina Thumser and Klaus Petermayr, « Oberösterreichische Schriften zur Volksmusik », Band 9, Linz (2010) ; pages 11-28 - on Jerger, see : pages 20-21.

(57) Diary. « Veit Jerger » ; page 10.

The Historical Archives of the Vienna Philharmonic

An extensive collection of programmes and a concert database are at the heart of the historical archives.

...

The most distinctive example of the insurmountable conflict of priorities in cultural denazification (namely, the demand of artistic performance while simultaneously eliminating National-Socialist thought by rigorous personnel cleansing) was represented by the political classification of a collective Orchestra such as the Vienna Philharmonic. While especially British and U.S. American cultural affairs officers initially had clear instructions and various « black lists » for individual cultural performers to prevent all artists charged with National-Socialism from public appearance (in order to completely eliminate National-Socialist ideology by means of a kind of « cool down » period and an eventual « exchange of elites ») they could not assert themselves with this Orchestra. The Vienna Philharmonic formed a unified Orchestra that was well-known internationally and, especially, in Europe, but, at the same time, had the « technical » drawback of a disproportionately high-rate of former National-Socialist Party members - amongst them, numerous « illegals » (« Illegale », i.e., Party members during the Party ban, from 1933 to 1938) . Such a difficulty was not presented to the Americans in the former « Reich » capital, Berlin. There, only 20 of around 110 musicians had belonged to the NSDAP. By comparison, in the beginning of 1943, out of 123 Philharmonic in Vienna, 60 or about 50 % had belonged to the NSDAP ; at least 22 of these, in turn, were « illegals », and 2 were members of the « Schutzstaffel » (SS) .

Ist tangible contact with U.S. cultural affairs officers was made in September 1945, when contact talks about the Philharmonic were held with the provisional leader of the Philharmonic, Fritz Sedlak, and the director of the Vienna

State Opera. There had originally been rumours that 70 to 85 % of the Orchestral members were supposed to have been NSDAP members, but Sedlak claimed that out of 135 members of the State Opera Orchestra (not all Orchestral musicians of the State Opera are automatically also members of the Vienna Philharmonic) only 34 had been Party members. Also, in their struggle against a further denazification of the Orchestra, the musicians attempted to win the Americans over with the help of the Opera's administrative director, Matthäus Flitsch.

A special characteristic in the negotiations with the concert Master of the Philharmonic was that the U.S. cultural affairs officer, Otte de Pasetti, who, as the life partner of Lotte Lenya-Weill, had for private reasons gone to the United States already before 1938, was faced with a « fait accompli » and had to adapt to the present circumstances. It was still, in the last days of War, that the former chairman of the Vienna Philharmonic, the contrabassist Wilhelm Jerger, who also was a member of the SS and the « Ahnenerbe », made his position available. According to Philharmonic member, Otto Straßer, who already in 1938 had played a central part in the transition of power, there were secret talks with Wilhelm Furtwängler, months before the end of the War, in order to quickly conduct the imminent internal « transition of power ». Jerger had, in 1938, assumed the leading position from Hugo Burghauser, who, after the « annexation » as sympathizer of the Fatherland's Front and as « Jewish kin » (« jüdisch versippt »), was declared politically unsustainable and, later, had to withdraw from the State Opera Orchestra.

The successor to Jerger, Fritz Sedlak, was successful in holding the Orchestra together and bringing it safely through the final turmoil of War. Due to his knowledge of Russian, which he had acquired as prisoner during the First World War, he could lead the talks with Soviet occupation officers himself.

The Soviet cultural policy was entirely oriented towards an immediate resumption of cultural life, and, therefore, it was not difficult for him to win many a help for his Orchestra, which, under Clemens Krauß and Robert Fanta and without extensive denazification, again gave its 1st concerts.

The denazification measures themselves were kept within limits, because Sedlak (a politically integer man) successfully intervened at the State Secretary for National Edification, Schooling and Education as well as Religious Affairs in the provisional State government of Karl Renner, Ernst Fischer, a communist official who had returned from Moscow ; he unreservedly took a stand for the conservation of this unique Orchestra. Formal NSDAP Party membership alone should not be reason for a discharge. An internal « denazification commission », next to ministry officials, was staffed also by a Philharmonic, and this Orchestral member was one of those « rescued half breeds and Jewish kin » who, in 1938, was spared discharge after Furtwängler's intervention. During a press conference, in April 1946, Sedlak attempted to justify the fact that discharges or retirements of Party members in the Orchestra were only handled reservedly. After the end of War, 4 heavily charged musicians were immediately discharged : 2 men of the SS, an illegal, and allegedly a former Blockwart helper. Further Orchestral members were retired - in which were included also some not National-Socialist.

Rudolf Kalmar, local head of the all Party newspaper « Neues Österreich », who had survived the concentration camps in Dachau and in Flossenbürg, took Sedlak's press conference as an occasion to plead for a milder persecution of former National-Socialists, using the example of the Philharmonic. In an editorial article, he reckoned that the

Orchestra has to be conceded a higher degree of « world-otherness » (« Weltfremdheit ») and that an example has to be set, which should constitute an « open and resolute confession of one's own error of yesterday » and could also amount to a justification of a sort in front of the abroad countries. At this press conference, Fritz Sedlak had given the legality declaration to federal president Renner, condemned the past with harsh words, and announced concerts, the net yield of which should flow back to the relatives of those earlier Orchestral colleagues who, after 1938, had fallen victim to National-Socialism.

Up to this point, the 2 great occupying powers deliberately practiced restraint in this issue. The chief editor of the « Wiener Kurier », Hendric J. Burns, as well as the « Austriacus » in the « Österreichische Zeitung » reckoned that a temporarily less well-equipped Orchestra would be much more in line with the tradition of the Vienna Philharmonic. Protest from within the ranks of the Philharmonic reached to the address of the U.S. theatre officer, Henry C. Alters, a Viennese emigrant who, at that time, was solely responsible for theatre and music in Vienna, because the pianist and music officer Margot Pinter had left the Information Services Branch (ISB). Mrs. Pinter had been completely in line with Sedlak, because she, herself as pianist, placed the issue of the performative quality far above the issue of the political responsibility of the musicians. Moreover, she did not attach great importance to the formal Party membership or candidature, with the rationale that musicians were deeply apolitical people. She was furthermore incapable of compensating an additional emotional handicap. She had already performed with the Philharmonic in Vienna and, suddenly, saw herself being pressed into the role of a judge of denazification, who (at least, according to the views of general McChrystal) was supposed to discharge as many Party members as possible and maintain but a rudimentary orchestration with only the most important instruments.

The 6 musicians who had complained towards Alter revealed a certain weakness in the numeral reasoning of Sedlak, because out of the total of 14 retired colleagues, 4 were permanently retired not due to their Party membership, but due to their age ; another group of 6 artists should have been retired years ago, but precisely because of their membership in the NSDAP could retain their position in the Orchestra. Doubts were raised also towards the claim of the provisional chairman that insufficient other musicians of suitable artistic skills were available.

The discussion concerning the Philharmonic fell silent during the following months due to the Salzburg Festival and because the denazification of Herbert von Karajan and Wilhelm Furtwängler was prioritised. The Philharmonic did indeed perform at the Salzburg Festival, but 3 charged Orchestral members were denied solo performance by U.S. cultural affairs officer, Ernst Lothar, who had returned from exile. A repeated review of this music ensemble, on the level of the Allied Denazification Bureau of the Allied Commission, started in September. The American representative of this council, Maximilian Wallach, put forward the publicly voiced concerns about the Nazi members in the Orchestra and demanded a meeting with the responsible Austrians, because it had so far been impossible to receive detailed documents from them.

Occasion for this investigation was a planned abroad trip of the Philharmonic ; in the issuance of « travel permits », the attention of French offices was again called to the political past of individual Philharmonic members. At the conference of members of the Allied Denazification Bureau and representatives of the Federal Ministry of Education as well as the Federal Theatre Administration, it was especially the head of the Federal Theatre Administration, Egon

Hilbert, detained as political prisoner in the KZ-Dachau, from 1938 to 1945, who wanted to substantiate the view of the former State secretary Fischer that artists are to be judged by different criteria in terms of politics. Furthermore, efforts would have shown that it was impossible to find appropriate substitutions. In response to the specific question about the exact number of former National-Socialists in the Orchestra, Hilbert responded :

« Out of 133 members of the State Opera, 45 are former Party members, and 13 former Party members had been excluded from the Philharmonic Orchestra, including the ones who resigned, and the ones who had been pensioned with a reduction of pay. »

Towards the end of the briefing, the representative of the Ministry of Education admitted that the Philharmonic Orchestra was the only institution in his ministry's responsibility in which « illegals » were employed. In further consequence, the Allied Denazification Bureau demanded a more intense cooperation and further information in the form of questionnaires.

The charged members of the Orchestra could not be taken on a tour to France and Switzerland, because they had not received travel permits. Substitutes took their place, and, despite these improvisations, the guest performances were conducted without any damage to the Orchestra's image. In this case, as in other cultural denazification measures, the Information Services Branch had lost its decisive function and was only approached as a consultant. Concerning the stage ban of « illegal » ensemble members, there was principally no discussion between the Special Branch and the Information Services Branch. It was especially in the United States that the high-rate of former National-Socialists in the ranks of the Vienna Philharmonic was criticised. Also the world-famous solo violinist, Bronisław Hubermann, declared not to come to Vienna « before the last Nazi has disappeared from Viennese musical life » .

Illegal musicians (i.e. , those who were NSDAP members during the Party ban, from 1933 to 1938) should originally be immediately discharged, according to the beliefs of all members in the Allied Denazification Bureau - without regard of their artistic irreplaceability in view of the entire Orchestra. To this group of « illegals » were counted also those Nazi Party members who had faked allied questionnaires and concealed their political past. For this reason, the U.S. representative in the Allied Denazification Bureau prompted the ISB Information Service Branch to, at 1st, submit their « technical opinion » on only 23 « less incriminated » (« minder belastet ») Orchestral members. For the time being, he did not want to discuss the case of the 28 musicians who were to be immediately discharged. This stance, however, was opposed by the British cultural officer and Austrian political emigrant, Peter Schnabel. He requested that the Vienna Philharmonic should be preserved in their entirety and that only 2 to 3 politically unacceptable artists should be discharged - thereby, he was fully in line with the official Austrian standpoint. Moreover, he pointed to the new National-Socialist law (« Nationalsozialistengesetz ») which would come into effect 2 months later and provide new guidelines and legal possibilities to the Austrians.

A further delay was declined in the joint meeting of the Denazification Bureau and the Quadripartite Press and Entertainment Sub-Committee primarily by the Soviet representative Aristowa, but also by the French and Americans. A total number of 23 cases came-up for discussion, and the ISB representative, Albert van Eerden, began with an extensive statement about concert Master Wolfgang Scheiderhan, whom he described as a « never more than lukewarm

member of the Nazi Party » ; an unanimous positive decision was subsequently achieved. In 13 further cases, all cultural and denazification officers voted for a stage permission. Only twice was a discharge decided upon unanimously, whereas the Austrians had in their documents denied political acceptability only in the case of a violinist. The U.S. denazification officer abided closely by the recommendations of van Eerden, who had taken-over the responsibility of the denazification of the Philharmonic from Ernst Lothar ; only in 2 cases, the Americans voted for the removal of charged musicians, and, in 2 further ones, no judgement could be delivered concerning the « substitutability » for a lack of documents. In the case of 6 musicians, the Soviet representatives, lieutenant Shour for the Denazification Department and Miss Aristowa for the Soviet Information Service, demanded a discharge without immediate discharge, and only once the French and the Soviets agreed on a veto.

In this debate, the alteration in the Soviet denazification policy in cultural issues is clearly illustrated. Shortly after the end of the Second World War, conductor Josef Krips, who, for racial reasons, was imposed with a stage ban during the Nazi era, was ultimately prompted by the cultural officers of the Red Army to perform with the entire Orchestra of the Vienna Philharmonic - including those members charged with National-Socialism.

While the Western Allies agreed that only a gradual denazification of the Orchestra was possible (a point on which most emphasis was placed by the Americans) the Soviet representative in the Sub-Committee for Press and Entertainment meant that an immediate discharge should follow also in the case of those unacceptable and « less incriminated » .

Already a month later however, the Allied Denazification Bureau was forced to ask for an expert opinion from the ISB Information Service Branch also on those illegals immediately to be discharged. 19 were denoted as artistically irreplaceable, while, in the case of the remaining 9 musicians, a replacement could be found on short notice. In the view of the State Theatre Administration and the Representation of the State Opera Orchestra however, all 28 were irreplaceable. Even though the Allied Denazification Office of the department 2N in the Office of the Federal Chancellor had, in June 1947, conveyed a definite list of the 28 members of the State Opera and Philharmonic Orchestra to be immediately discharged, a corresponding reaction on the side of the Austrians remained absent.

Characteristic, although possibly not deliberately planned, was the Philharmonic's 1st big post-War tour to Great Britain, whose representatives in the Cultural Department as well as in the Foreign Office had already very early on argued in support of an omission of the denazification in order to preserve the homogeneity of the Orchestra.

The U.S. experts could not assert themselves in any stage, because the Soviets themselves, who until the involvement of the Western Allies in the administration of Vienna were completely in line with their idea of cultural reconciliation, had taken almost no denazification measures and in the suspension of legal regulations showed great leniency towards the relevant Austrian authorities. The Americans did attempt to revise this « fait accompli » on the level of the Allied Commission, but the Austrians had already established their position to such an extent that even a joint decision of the Allies to discharge the « illegal » Philharmonic could not have change the situation.

According to the views of the author, it is inaccurate to denote the factual sacrifice of the Vienna Philharmonic's

denazification as an unintended failure of the U.S. cultural denazification policy, which, in 1945-1946, was oriented solely towards individual cases. On the one hand, it was only in 1946-1947 that the discussion of the political assessment of the Orchestra was held in specific terms on an Allied level, on the other hand, in the eyes of the U.S. cultural officers the Philharmonic represented a primarily cultural instrument of international importance. Within the Information Services Branch and in the United States, there had however also been discussions about whether the retention of such a high number of Party members would not damage the Orchestra. In the end, a formal Allied Resolution was passed in 1947 to discharge a majority of the illegals, in practice though enforcement against Austrian resistance was eschewed.

The priorities were redefined after, in January 1947, 52 % of the respondents in an American opinion survey in Vienna spoke-out in favour for the retention of the Orchestra in its « nazified » form. The Americans and the Allies obviously wanted to avoid a scandal in this issue, which, by no means, was any longer amongst the main concerns of the occupation administration - not least because the Austrians, despite not knowing the Philharmonic personally, perceived the denazification of the Orchestra as an allied intervention and violation of national pride.

How inaccurate the specific « denazification » could ultimately be (initially, also due to a lack of appropriate NSDAP documents, such as the SS records of Wilhelm Jerger and Helmut Wobisch, for example) is exemplified by the special case of Franz Bartolomey. Was he a « top-Nazi », like Wilhelm Jerger, the chairman of the Orchestra, Helmut Wobisch and Adolf Löffler, since he was discharged together with these colleagues immediately after the liberation in 1945 ? In recent years, a new source in the Vienna City and State Archive on the denazification procedures has become available, i.e. , those procedures which decided whether an illegal membership existed during the Party ban of the NSDAP, from 1933 to 1938. Furthermore, the various denazification commissions decided upon active and passive voting rights as well as in the professional domain in the case of officials upon discharge and retirement or suspension and atonement payments. Advanced and enhanced by means of documents from Bartolomey's correspondence provided to me by his son, suddenly, a completely different picture emerged.

Even though Bartolomey (and this is an important difference to all of the other re-integrated former NSDAP members) had been excluded from the NSDAP, in 1942, some colleagues in the Orchestra made use of his absence, towards the end of the War, to talk him up as « top-Nazi », which surely was not the case. He was indeed German-nationally socialized in the context of the Gymnastics Club (« Turnverein ») and the Youth League (« Jugendbund ») , but, as compared to 36 % of the Orchestral members, he was not active for the NSDAP already before the « annexation » , in 1938. He was engaged as a substitute, already in 1937, and, in 1938, profited from the racially motivated discharges - amongst them, 11 string players who as Jews were excluded and discharged. As early as May / June 1938, he should succeed in an audition in which, out of 97 applicants, 7 string players were engaged for the State Opera, and, already in July, he requested the NSDAP membership. On November 4, 1939, he was with retroactive effect of November 1, 1938, accepted in the Association of the Vienna Philharmonic. This contract of 1938 also meant for Bartolomey an end to his great existential anxiety, which had haunted him, since the death of his father in 1920. He joined the NSDAP already in 1938, but, for the time being, was accepted only as Party candidate and, on June 1, 1940, received the membership number 7.676.908. In 1942, however, he was excluded due to being denounced for having engaged a painter who was married to a Jewish woman.

What was lacking in the case of Franz Bartolomey II. though was the « air-raided shelter experience » of the last days of War because, after an approved holiday, he stayed on with his family and was suddenly branded a quitter and outsider. Obviously, some decision makers, in 1945, were quite happy to find former NSDAP members who (without a chance to react) could quickly be excluded in order to signalize a symbolic denazification. In the end, it also turned-out to be a group of former hardcore Nazis who almost managed to prevent his return. The « case Bartolomey » demonstrates how complex group dynamic processes affected the denazification policy, especially in the case of the State Opera Orchestra or the Vienna Philharmonic, and how great Nazis could be created from followers (« Mitläufer »), and vice-versa.

At least, Helmut Wobisch was, in 1953, appointed manager of the Vienna Philharmonic and kept this position until 1969. I have described Wobisch's case in detail in my contribution on the honours. In his (tumultuous) election as manager, in 1953, he was actually not entitled to actively vote, because he had still not been amnestied by the federal president from the « atonement consequences » of his participation in the attempted « coup d'État », in July 1934. In an express procedure, this amnesty was then made-up for, whereby in contortion of the facts Wobisch's past was interpreted completely on the contrary.

Wilhelm Jerger, on the other hand, escaped a trial for illegality in front of the People's Court (« Volksgericht »), because he was in U.S. Custody, in Glasenbach. His intended denazification procedure for a possible return to the State Opera Orchestra and, thereby also, to the Vienna Philharmonic, is especially interesting and not yet extensively evaluated, but this will first have to be analyzed on the basis of other source materials. While Jerger's role was rudimentarily addressed by Clemens Hellsberg in his book, « Demokratie der Könige » (1992) (the account of which was taken note of with partial displeasure by his son, Veit Jerger), the Anton Bruckner Private University, the former Bruckner-Conservatory, needed until the year 2009 to attend to the question of Jerger's past, even though he had acted as its director, from 1958 to 1973. And yet, as can be seen by the contributions to this project of Bernadette Mayrhofer and myself, such a pursuit would have yielded quite an ambivalent picture.

Jerger was appointed director of the Bruckner-Conservatory, on August 15, 1958, after he had gone to Switzerland, in 1948, and started to establish himself a 2nd life as musicologist. According to Jerger's son, there had supposedly also been accusations about his father's Nazi past at the time of his appointment, which, however, were invalidated by Simon Wiesenthal. Incidentally, Wilhelm Jerger later received the « Franz-Schalk-Medal » in silver from the Vienna Philharmonic. Also, in this case, it would be important to investigate the circumstances of this bestowal.

Taken as a whole, the single cases that here were only briefly outlined document the fact that it is absolutely necessary to consult a wide-range of sources in an assessment of the behaviour of single Orchestral members. A first evaluation of the initially mentioned documents from the Nazi era in various Viennese archives, corresponding denazification documents, and files from the State Archive in Berlin allow for a clearer appraisal, which, however, includes all the possibilities of political behaviour and which can ultimately only be achieved with academic accuracy by case studies such as the ones on Franz Bartolomey or Wilhelm Jerger as well as Helmut Wobisch.

Historique

L'Orchestre est fondé en 1882 par Joachim Andersen, Ludwig von Brenner et 52 autres musiciens transfuges de l'Orchestre dirigé par Benjamin Bilse. Les Ires années sont difficiles et l'Orchestre manque plusieurs fois de disparaître. En 1887, Hermann Wolff en devient l'agent et engage le chef d'orchestre Hans von Bülow, qui est considéré par la plupart des musicologues comme le 1er chef d'orchestre de métier. Hans von Bülow fut un ami de Franz Liszt, Johannes Brahms et Richard Wagner et dirigea la première mondiale de nombreuses œuvres majeures de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, souvent en présence des compositeurs. Brahms lui dit que ses interprétations correspondaient exactement à ce qu'il avait composé. Dès lors, l'Orchestre devient rapidement célèbre. Il est dirigé, au cours des années suivantes, par nombre de chefs invités prestigieux, parmi lesquels Hans Richter, Felix Weingartner, Richard Strauß, Gustav Mahler, Johannes Brahms et Edvard Grieg.

En 1895, sur le conseil de Liszt, Arthur Nikisch en devient le chef permanent et domina la vie musicale en Allemagne pendant une longue période, faisant de l'Orchestre le plus prestigieux au monde. Wilhelm Furtwängler lui succède en 1922. La conjonction entre l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et Wilhelm Furtwängler est très souvent considérée comme le sommet de l'histoire de l'Orchestre, et même de toute l'histoire de la direction orchestrale. Klaus Geitel raconte dans son histoire de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin :

« L'autorité musicale de Furtwängler, la conscience qu'il avait de son propre charisme, son art expressif parvenu à un niveau extrêmement élevé firent de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin le vicaire terrestre de la musique symphonique occidentale. L'idéalisme allemand y trouva, ainsi, son compte puisqu'il cultivait continuellement une telle préoccupation de grandeur. Les membres du Philharmonique de Berlin semblaient faire plus que de la musique ; ils donnaient l'impression de jouer pour exprimer une conception du monde, la "Weltanschauung" des philosophes. »

Pendant cette période, l'Orchestre réalisa de nombreux enregistrements parmi les plus importants du XXe siècle, souvent considérés par la critique comme des sommets encore inégalés. Par exemple, le Concerto pour violon n° 2 de Béla Bartók avec Yehudi Menuhin (en 1953) ; la 5e Symphonie (1943), la 7e Symphonie (1943), la 9e Symphonie (1942) de Beethoven ; la 4e Symphonie et le Concerto pour piano n° 2 de Brahms avec Edwin Fischer (les 2, en 1942) ; la 9e Symphonie de Bruckner (en 1944) ; la 9e Symphonie de Schubert (en 1942) ; la 4e Symphonie de Schumann (en 1953) ; les « Metamorphosen » de Strauß (en 1947) ; la 6e Symphonie (« Pathétique ») de Tchaïkovsky (en 1938). La portée symbolique de ces enregistrements était telle que les soviétiques s'en emparèrent en 1945 comme « réparation de guerre » avec des originaux de la Grèce antique, des œuvres de la Renaissance italienne, des tableaux impressionnistes français. Ces enregistrements ne seront rendus officiellement par l'Union soviétique qu'à la fin des années 1980. Depuis cette époque, la position de directeur musical de cet Orchestre exerça une forte fascination sur le monde de la direction musicale. Cette fascination ne diminua pas avec le chef Herbert von Karajan à cause de son immense poids médiatique et du fait qu'il inonda littéralement le monde de ses enregistrements avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin.

L'Orchestre continue de se produire durant la Seconde Guerre mondiale et, après la fin des hostilités, est dirigé durant

3 mois par Leo Borchard. À la suite de sa disparition brutale, en août 1945, Sergiù Celibidache le remplace. Furtwängler revient diriger l'ensemble en 1947, en co-direction avec Celibidache jusqu'en 1952, puis comme 1er chef, jusqu'à son décès en 1954. Son successeur est le charismatique Herbert von Karajan, nommé chef à vie, en 1955, et qui restera à la tête de l'Orchestre durant 34 ans. Durant cette période, l'Orchestre effectue de nombreux enregistrements et tournées et acquiert une renommée médiatique considérable. En 1963, il s'installe à la nouvelle « Philharmonie » de Berlin, conçue pour lui par l'architecte Hans Scharoun. Le grand auditorium est considéré comme un modèle de perfection acoustique. Karajan quitte son poste quelques mois seulement avant sa mort, en 1989.

C'est par un vote que les musiciens du Philharmonique de Berlin choisissent leur chef d'orchestre à l'exception notable de Herbert von Karajan nommé à vie, en 1955.

...

The Berlin Philharmonic was founded in Berlin, in 1882, by 54 musicians under the name « Frühere Bilsesche Kapelle » (literally, Former Bilses's Band) ; the group broke-away from their previous conductor Benjamin Bilses after he announced his intention of taking the band on a 4th class train to Warsaw for a concert. The Orchestra was renamed and re-organized under the financial management of Hermann Wolff, in 1882. Their new conductor was Ludwig von Brenner ; in 1887, Hans von Bülow, one of the most esteemed conductors in the world, took-over the post. This helped to establish the Orchestra's international reputation, and guests Hans Richter, Felix von Weingartner, Richard Strauß, Gustav Mahler, Johannes Brahms and Edvard Grieg conducted the Orchestra, over the next few years. Programmes of this period show that the Orchestra possessed only 46 strings, much less than the Wagnerian ideal of 64.

In 1895, Arthur Nikisch became chief conductor, and was succeeded in 1923 by Wilhelm Furtwängler. Despite several changes in leadership, the Orchestra continued to perform throughout World War II. After Furtwängler fled to Switzerland, in 1945, Leo Borchard became chief conductor. This arrangement lasted only a few months, as Borchard was accidentally shot and killed by the American forces occupying Berlin. Sergiù Celibidache, then, took-over as chief conductor for 7 years, from 1945 to 1952. Furtwängler returned in 1952 and conducted the Orchestra until his death, in 1954.

His successor was Herbert von Karajan, who led the Orchestra from 1955 until his resignation in April 1989, only months before his death. Under him, the Orchestra made a vast number of recordings and toured widely, growing and gaining fame. When Karajan stepped-down, the post was offered to Carlos Kleiber, but he declined.

...

The Orchestra's 1st concert-hall, the « Alte Philharmonie » situated on the « Bernburger Straße » in Berlin Kreuzberg, was inaugurated in 1882 in a building previously used as an ice-rink and converted by the architect Franz Schwechten. In 1898, a smaller concert-hall, the « Beethovensaal » on « Köthener Straße » , was also inaugurated for chamber music and chamber ensembles. The « Alte Philharmonie » was used until British bombers destroyed it, on 30 January 1944, the anniversary of Hitler becoming Chancellor. The Orchestra played until the end of the War at the « Staatsoper, Unter den Linden » . The « Staatsoper » was also destroyed, on 3 February 1945. In need of a venue, the

Berlin Philharmonic played during the years following the War in the « Titania-Palast », an old movie theatre converted in a concert-hall, and still used the « Beethovensaal » for smaller concerts. During the 1950's, the Orchestra moved its concerts at the « Musikhochschule » (today, part of the Berlin University of the Arts) , in the « Joseph-Joachim-Konzertsaal » . However, most of the recordings were done at the « Jesus-Christus-Kirche » , in Berlin-Dahlem, celebrated for its acoustics.

The need for a new « Philharmonie » was expressed since 1949, when the « Gesellschaft der Freunde der Berliner Philharmonie eingetragener Verein » (Friends of the Berliner Philharmonie Society) was created to gather funds. The building of the new « Philharmonie » started in 1961, following the design of architect Hans Scharoun, and it was inaugurated on 15 October 1963, with a performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony, conducted by Herbert von Karajan. Its location made it part of the « Kulturforum » , and the « Großer Saal » (2,440 seats) was, then, complemented by a chamber-music hall, the « Kammermusiksaal » (1,180 seats) , built in 1987, following the design of architect Edgar Wisniewski, after a project by Hans Scharoun.

The initial phase

An Orchestra becomes independent

It started with an act of rebellion : in March 1882, 50 members of the ensemble run by the popular musical director Benjamin Bilde refused to sign their new contracts - they found the working conditions too unfavourable : they were to earn hardly more than day labourers. The musicians decided to set-up on their own and, from then on, to work at their own risk. The new Orchestra 1st called itself (referring to their origin) « The Former Bilde's Ensemble » and they pursued programming concepts similar to those of their former employer : at so-called « Popular Concerts » , they usually relied more on entertaining works, while presenting more challenging works and « novelties » , i.e. , new pieces by contemporary composers, in their « Symphony Concerts » .

Musical rebels

Back then, Berlin was, by no means, a prominent European musical capital. Other cities, namely Leipzig and Vienna, set the tone. They had a highly-sophisticated concert scene and, thus, correspondingly imposing concert halls. In contrast, the 1st performances of the « Philharmonisches Orchester » (as the ensemble was soon called) took place in an open-air restaurant. Starting in the summer of 1882, the Orchestra played in the hall of a former roller-skating rink, on « Bernburger Straße » , with 2,000 seats. After renovations and improvements, this developed into Berlin's most important concert-hall : the « Philharmonie » .

Struggle for existence

The ambitious young Orchestra had high-aspirations. The Philharmonic musicians enjoyed their 1st major successes under conductors like Ludwig von Brenner, Ernst Rudorff and, particularly, Franz Wüllner. However, their independence harboured financial risks : to be sure, the musicians received administrative support from the start from the enterprising concert agent Hermann Wolff, who organized a subscription series for them and provided them with

professional advice. But, very soon after their founding, the Orchestra was buffeted by a difficult crisis that threatened their existence.

To secure their existence in the long term, they entered into a co-operation with the Royal Music Conservatory, run by the famous violinist Joseph Joachim. The members of the Philharmonic Orchestra committed to making themselves available to the Conservatory for a certain number of concerts. But Joseph Joachim and Hermann Wolff were personages with different musical world-views. Rivalry and competition arose between the 2 of them. Hermann Wolff succeeded in more strongly expanding his influence on the Orchestra and in winning-over one of the most significant conductors of his time as the principal conductor of his subscription concerts : Hans von Bülow.

The era of Hans von Bülow

In his day, Hans von Bülow, who conducted the premiere of « Tristan und Isolde » and was known as a brilliant Beethoven and Brahms interpreter, embodied the modern type of conductor : eccentric in his gestures, uncompromising, analytical in his musical work, expressive in his musical results. Not outwardly attractive but possessed of a consummate elegance (he always conducted wearing white kid gloves) , he had a compelling, magical charisma. His lordly attitudes and extravagancies were known - and forgiven, because he was one thing above all : an orchestral educator to the « nth » degree.

Beyond uninspired mediocrity

Bülow had already made a 1st class Orchestra out of the provincial Meiningen Court Orchestra. Now, he hoisted the Berlin Philharmonic, to whom he attested a great artistic intelligence, out of their « uninspired mediocrity » (« Allgemeine Musikzeitung ») and established standards that formed the basis for the Orchestra's later international fame. Despite his severity and his unrelenting passion for rehearsing, the « Philharmoniker » felt deeply attached to him as a person. Their collaboration lasted 5 years, before Bülow, who had suffered from nervous disorders since his childhood, retired from the concert business for health reasons. He died on 12 February 1894.

Intermezzo with Richard Strauß

His departure left a grievous void in Berlin's musical life. The concert agent Hermann Wolff tried, in vain, to engage great conductors like Hans Richter and Felix Mottl ; finally, he handed-over the musical direction of his subscription concerts to the young Richard Strauß, one of Bülow's pupils. Strauß, still at the beginning of his career and hoping to succeed Bülow, was not able to attract the Berlin audience into the « Philharmonie » with his progressive programmes. And Hermann Wolff soon had his eye on another conductor : Arthur Nikisch.

The era of Arthur Nikisch

When Hans von Bülow took-over the direction of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, in 1887, he was considered among the most important conductors of his time. In contrast, his successor's name was hardly-known : Arthur Nikisch. Born in Hungary, he had just returned from America, where he had conducted the Boston Symphony Orchestra for 4 years.

Nikisch, who began his musical career as a violinist in the Viennese Court Opera Orchestra, and was also head of the « Leipziger Gewandhausorchester », was possessed of a great sensitivity and intuition and he captured the musicians' hearts. They let themselves be led by him unquestioningly ; they gave their all for him. « It can be asserted unhesitatingly that, in a 1st class Orchestra, every single member deserves the designation “ artist ”. » , Nikisch once wrote. With this credo, he made an essential contribution to the Berlin musicians' « soloistic » self-image. Through the present day, it has remained one of the distinct qualities of the Philharmonic musicians.

Specialized in the æsthetics of sound

The contrast to Bülow could not have been greater : while the former's interpretations were characterized by intellectual depth and Classical rigour, Nikisch, who conducted with quiet and sparing gestures, banked on Romantic, sensual colouring and a rhapsodic breadth which felt improvised. He shifted the programmatic emphasis, not only launching German repertoire, but also conducting compositions by Tchaïkovsky, Berlioz, Liszt, Strauß, Mahler - and, particularly, Bruckner. He was, however, unsympathetic about new compositional ideas from Arnold Schœnberg, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Igor Stravinsky and Maurice Ravel. Unlike Bülow, he was not fanatical about rehearsals ; instead, he relied on the intuition of the moment and considered himself re-creator of the works at concerts.

Under his direction, the Orchestra became increasingly prominent on the international scene ; any and all soloists of distinction came to Berlin to perform with the « Philharmoniker » . But that was not all. Nikisch took many trips with the Orchestra and, in this way, enhanced their international reputation. At the request of « Kaiser » Wilhelm II, he travelled to Moscow to the coronation of Tsar Nicholas II, in 1896, and, in the following year, captured the hearts of the French audience at a legendary guest concert in Paris - the French had, at 1st, harboured a certain resentment towards the Berlin ensemble after losing the Franco-Prussian War. Nikisch conducted the Philharmonic for 27 years. In this time period, he conducted more than 600 concerts before dying of influenza in 1922, at the age of 67 - surprising many.

The era of Wilhelm Furtwängler

When Arthur Nikisch (principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, starting in 1895) died in 1922, 36 year old Wilhelm Furtwängler applied to become his successor, convincing both the members of the Orchestra and the management. He was a musical personality who built on the accomplishments of his predecessors Hans von Bülow and Nikisch and helped the Orchestra continue to expand its renown. Like Nikisch, Furtwängler also considered himself the re-creator of works. His unconventional conducting technique was fabled : it required great personal responsibility and sensitivity from the musicians. Furtwängler formed the « Berliner Philharmoniker » into his very own instrument, one that ingeniously realized his interpretation ideas. Beethoven, Brahms and Bruckner were the corner-stones of his repertoire, but he also championed contemporary composers like Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Bartók, Schœnberg and Hindemith - not always to the liking of the audience. And, starting in 1933, even less in accordance with the wishes of the National-Socialist leaders. In 1934, things came to a head : after the Nazi government forbade the world-premiere of Paul Hindemith's Opera « Mathis der Maler » , Furtwängler stepped-down from his position as principal conductor. 1 year later, he returned to the « Philharmoniker » (he who called himself an apolitical artist, who never belonged to the NSDAP and who spoke-up for many Jewish musicians) , only as conductor of the Philharmonic Concerts, however,

without assuming an official position. Nonetheless, he continued to consider the Philharmonic musicians « his » Orchestra. Unlike his predecessors, he exerted a strong influence on artistic and organisational matters. After 1945, Furtwängler was banned from working. He was cleared in 1947, in a denazification process, and conducted the Philharmonic, again, in May of that year. However, he officially regained the position of principal conductor only in 1952, 2 years before he died.

The « Reich's » Orchestra

Even triumphant successes with Wilhelm Furtwängler could not improve the « Berliner Philharmoniker »'s precarious financial situation. In 1933, the Orchestra was in a particularly difficult existential crisis and saw only one way out : transforming into a national Orchestra. The National-Socialist leadership willingly took-over financing the famous Orchestra so as to adorn their events with them. For the Orchestra, the years of the 3rd « Reich » were a balancing act between complying with cultural-political and ideological guide-lines and preserving artistic autonomy. While they enjoyed a privileged position (the musicians were exempted from military service) , they, nonetheless, repeatedly defied artistic and political pressures from the National-Socialist ruling powers. The concert agency Wolff, a company run by Jews and an important partner of the Berlin Philharmonic from the onset, was not able to withstand the regime's repressive measures and dissolved in 1935. On 30 January 1944, the « Alte Philharmonie » was destroyed during a bombing raid. The Orchestra, now without a home, continued to play : particularly, in the State Opera, at the « Admiralspalast » , in the Berlin Cathedral. When Germany surrendered, in May 1945, a new era began for the « Berliner Philharmoniker » as well.

« Zero hour » and a new beginning

Concert life was quickly resumed after the War ended, despite difficult conditions : the traditional hall destroyed, Furtwängler banned at Ist from performing and with an insecure material future. But, in Leo Borchard, who had conducted them many times since 1933, the « Philharmoniker » quickly found a conductor for the difficult new beginning. The « Orchester » played in various temporary quarters : in cinemas and community centres, in the « Titaniapalast » and the « Admiralspalast » , as well as at the City Opera. The fruitful cooperation between Borchard and the « Philharmoniker » ended suddenly and tragically when the conductor was accidentally shot and killed, one August evening, by an American soldier. That was the moment for the young, unknown and still inexperienced Rumanian conductor Sergiu Celibidache. He was entrusted with conducting the Orchestra, and proved to be a « genius with the baton » who conducted the « Philharmoniker » in a calm artistic manner through the turbulent post-War years - at Ist, hoping to succeed Furtwängler. Besides this, a new young generation of conductors became frequent guests of the Orchestra : Georg Solti, Ferenc Fricsay and André Cluytens. Over the years, the material situation was also remedied. At Ist supported by the Magistrate of the American sector, the « Berliner Philharmoniker » became a municipal institution in 1949. In the same year, committed Berlin citizens founded the « Society of the Friends of the “ Philharmonie ” » (now, « Friends of the “ Berliner Philharmoniker ” ») with the goal of helping the Orchestra have its own concert-hall, once again.

The era of Herbert von Karajan

Herbert von Karajan's 1st performance with the « Berliner Philharmoniker », in April 1938, was a sensation - and aroused the jealousy of principal conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler who, from then on, considered the young star his rival. Furtwängler died in 1954, and the direction of an America tour, the year thereafter, that had already been planned devolved to Karajan. After successful completion of the tour, Karajan was appointed principal conductor in 1956. It was the beginning of a new era. Karajan embodied the 20th Century type of conductor : energetic, charismatic, visionary, dedicated not only to music but to the other finer things of life. He was an enthusiastic pilot, sports car-driver, skier and sailor. He admired and revered Arturo Toscanini and Wilhelm Furtwängler, 2 musical personalities who could not have been more different, and made it his ambition to merge the best of both to his own style.

AB 121 : Wilhelm Fürtwängler (I)

Few other musicians are more intertwined in debates around collaboration, passive resistance, and the relationship between art and politics as the German conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler. 47 years old when the Nazis came to power, Furtwängler was at the peak of his career, perceiving himself (and perceived by others) as a representative and defender of Germany's glorious musical heritage. The son of a renowned archæologist, he was born to a conservative bourgeois Berlin family, in 1886. He was raised to believe in the supremacy of « German-ness », a supremacy not linked to race but rather to spiritual and artistic creativity. Like many elites of his time, he saw the « Jewish Question » as one of culture rather than of race. Having studied music in Munich, the young Furtwängler acquired increasingly illustrious positions through the early part of the 20th Century. In 1922, he was named music-director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, and during the inter-War years, he conducted regularly at the top Opera Houses in Europe. By the time of Adolf Hitler's ascent to power, he was perceived by many to be Germany's greatest conductor.

The initial rise to power of the Nazis was welcomed by Furtwängler, as by many other conservatives in Germany. Opposed to the perceived radicalism and immorality of the Weimar Republic, and drawn to the order and « German values » that the Nazis promised to provide, the conductor hoped that the Nazi Party would increase pay and job security for the nation's musicians, and focus on developing the prestige and pre-eminence of the German musical tradition. As the director of the bankrupt Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, he welcomed the Nazis' sense of urgency over the State of the nation's arts.

Furtwängler was, by no means, an ideal or self-evident puppet for the Nazis ; throughout his career, he made it clear that it was his desire for beautiful music, not the desire to gain political favour, that motivated his decisions. On the one hand, he was in many ways a conservative man, something that found favour with the Party. In the midst of the experimental and avant-garde 1920's, he publicly avowed his distaste for modern music such as swing, jazz, and atonal music. On the other hand, he did not ignore musical talent for the sake of these convictions. Thus, he agreed to premiere Arnold Schœnberg's modernist « Variations for Orchestra », Opus 31, in Berlin in 1928. He employed many Jewish musicians in his Orchestra, and maintained friendships with members of the Jewish German elite. In 1933, however, an era began in which the separation of art and politics became simply impossible.

It was only months after Hitler was made Chancellor of Germany that Furtwängler 1st came into conflict with the new

totalitarian State. He wrote a bold letter on 7 April 1933 to Josef Gœbbels in response to rumours that Jews were to be banned from all performances. This letter exchange, printed in the major Nazi newspapers at Gœbbels' request, epitomised Furtwängler's attempts to negotiate with Nazi anti-Semitism for the protection of his musical realm. While openly supporting a policy of eliminating « degeneration » and « uprootedness », he nonetheless asserted that :

« I only recognize one line of separation : between good and bad art. At present, the division is drawn between Jew and non-Jew, while the separation between good and bad music is neglected. The question of the quality of music is a question of life and death. »

Gœbbels countered that :

« Art must be good : but beyond that, it must be responsible, professional, popular and aggressive. »

This exchange (from which Gœbbels emerged the clear winner, yet, which also allowed Furtwängler his pride) tied the composer to the regime. It also, ironically, improved Furtwängler's international reputation : he was one of the few major public figures to have made any sort of complaint.

Furtwängler's belief, however, that he had successfully established a working relationship with the Party was challenged almost immediately. That same year, 1933, while on a tour with his Orchestra, local Nazis threatened to protest if several Jews in the Orchestra were not replaced with Nazi-sympathetic musicians. Furtwängler threatened to cancel the performance if this happened. When the Orchestra arrived in Paris, anti-Nazi activists condemned the conductor and demanded the cancellation of the performances. The activists were finally persuaded to limit their activities to distributing flyers, but this was Furtwängler's first glimpse of the new ascendancy of politics over art. Toward the end of the year, he invited several Jewish and anti-Fascist artists to perform as soloists in his 1933-1934 season. Not only did the « Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur » rebuke him, but all of those whom he had invited turned him down. Despite these tensions with the Party, Hitler and other leading officials realised early on the value for the « Reich » of Furtwängler as an internationally respected artist.

In November 1933, Josef Gœbbels announced the formation of the « Reich » Music Chamber (« Reichsmusikkammer » , or RMK) ; the composer Richard Strauß was to serve as president, with Furtwängler directly beneath him as vice-president. Soon afterwards, Furtwängler signed a contract for a directorship of the National Opera in Berlin. Furtwängler accepted the position on the (false) understanding that Jewish performers would be retained. Nonetheless, this gesture of accommodation with the Nazis led to an increased negative response by « émigrés » and anti-Nazis abroad.

Perhaps, his most famous conflict was the so-called « Hindemith affair » . He had planned to premiere the modernist composer Paul Hindemith's Opera « Mathis der Maler » (Mathis the Painter) for the 1934-1935 season. However, Nazi official Hermann Göring prohibited the performance. Furtwängler threatened to resign unless the boycott of Hindemith was lifted, and wrote open-letters to the press defending the composer. However, he sought to avoid conflict with the Nazi Party by avoiding all but the most mild critique, and was ultimately pressured to resign from his position at the

« Reichsmusikkammer » .

The Nazi Alfred Rosenberg said of this conflict :

« It is regrettable that an artist of Furtwängler's stature had to enter the dispute, believing himself to be compelled to identify himself with Hindemith in as much as " Herr " Furtwängler maintained the 19th Century mentality and shows no appreciation of the great people's struggle of our time, he drew the proper consequences. »

In his post as leader of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra until early in 1945, Furtwängler participated frequently in festivals and concerts in Nazi Germany. From the perspective of the Nazi leadership, as Germany's military situation grew more and more threatening, Furtwängler became increasingly valuable as a cultural ambassador who could promote German music throughout the Axis and occupied lands. Furtwängler toured throughout Europe, despite being boycotted in The Hague and Belgium and protested in many other cities, trying to preserve the reputation of his homeland. In 1936, he was offered a position with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, but Nazi pressure along with U.S. protests discouraged him.

At the same time, Furtwängler never completely bowed to Nazi authority. He consistently protested the presence of flags and the Hitler salute in concert-halls. After the annexation of Austria, at the request of the members of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, he took-over leadership in an attempt to use his influence to protect its Jewish and Leftist members (he managed to assist several of them) . He frequently tried to avoid playing for Hitler's birthday, although he was eventually forced to. In 1944, he was the only prominent German artist not to sign the brochure « We Stand and Fall with Adolf Hitler » . However, it was not until the War grew close to an end, and German defeat was certain, that he finally left the 3rd « Reich » , fleeing to safety in Switzerland.

After the War, like most artists who had continued their work with Nazi support, he was initially subject to a performance ban. However, in one of the most controversial denazification trials, he successfully claimed to have remained in Germany in order to resist totalitarianism, to preserve German music and to affect Nazi policy to the interests of individual Jews, anti-Nazis and artists. Firm in the belief that he had done the right thing, the elderly conductor asserted that he had ...

« tried to test myself carefully. I am no better than others, although I did attempt to remain loyal to my basic inclination which motivated me : the love for my homeland and my people, a physical and spiritual concept, and the feeling of responsibility toward the prevention of injustice. Only here, could I struggle for the soul of the German people. Outside, people can only protest ; anyone can do that. »

Ultimately, his allegiance lay with his art, not with the people involved in that art-making. By claiming that he remained in Nazi Germany not as a Nazi, but as a German, Furtwängler managed to convince denazification experts of his « conviction that art has nothing to do with politics, with political power, with the hatred of others or with that which arises from a hatred of others » . His success and popularity during the 3rd « Reich » should, he claimed, be seen as a sort of resistance or defiance.

Moral judgment on the conductor remains divided. Many musicians, both German and Jewish, have forgiven him, but many could not. Berthold Goldschmidt publicly condemned him, calling him ...

« a great conductor with a weak character, a man who should have left, and who had to have been aware of how much prestige his work gave the Nazis. »

For Goldschmidt and others, his performances for Nazi audiences did not protect German culture - they defaced German culture. Fully-cleared of all collaboration by the Allied Courts, Furtwängler resumed a successful international career after the end of the War. He died on 30 November 1954, but the debates surrounding his name continue to this day.

The Furtwängler Case

(Harvey Sachs)

The conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886-1954) was one of Germany's most celebrated performing musicians, and his reputation has grown to almost mythical proportions in the 5 and a half decades since his death. But the controversy surrounding his political behaviour during the 1930's and 1940's has never let-up. There are those who declare that Furtwängler (who was principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and State Opera when Adolf Hitler's National-Socialists came to power in 1933, and who continued to work in Germany until 3 months before the end of the Second World War) approved of the Nazis ; according to others, he merely used them to further his career ; and many claim that he actively opposed them.

Furtwängler came from an intellectually distinguished family and was educated by private tutors. He began to play the piano at the age of 4 and to compose at the age of 7. In 1922, after having served a long apprenticeship at major and minor German Opera Houses, he persuaded Louise Wolff, Germany's most powerful concert agent, to support his candidacy for the conductorship of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, which had just been orphaned by the death of its great conductor, Arthur Nikisch. Other contenders for the job included such celebrities as Felix von Weingartner, Richard Strauß, Willem Mengelberg and Bruno Walter (all significantly older than Furtwängler) and such gifted members of his own generation as Carl Schuricht, Otto Klemperer, Fritz Busch and Erich Kleiber. « Frau » Wolff, nicknamed « Queen Louise » , obtained for Furtwängler not only the Berlin job but also another much sought-after position that Nikisch's death had left vacant : the conductorship of the « Gewandhaus » Orchestra of Leipzig. At the age of 36, Furtwängler had become Germany's most successful Symphonic conductor. By the end of the 1920's, he had made much-praised debuts with the Vienna Philharmonic, the Orchestra of La Scala, the New York Philharmonic, and other major ensembles. In 1927, he accepted an invitation from the self-governing Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra to be its principal conductor (he gave-up his position in Leipzig, the following year) but, after 3 years, he left Vienna and began to concentrate on further consolidating his position in Germany. He obtained an appointment as music-director of the Bayreuth Festival, effective from the summer of 1931, but conflicts with the Festival's other administrators caused him to resign after only 1 season. In January 1933, however, he won a major victory by becoming principal conductor of

Berlin's main Opera House, the « Staatsoper » . Combined with his Philharmonic position, the new job made him the most powerful figure in Germany's musical life.

Someone else won a major victory in Berlin, in January 1933 : shortly after Furtwängler signed his « Staatsoper » contract, Adolf Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. Furtwängler seems to have been exceptionally ignorant of politics (party politics, that is, as distinguished from musical politics) , even by the appallingly low-standards set by most of his fellow performing artists throughout history. He believed in music as a force for the spiritual redemption of humanity ; although he must have understood that the survival of modern society (including musical institutions) depended upon the existence of some sort of political superstructure, he did not much care about the details. But Germany's new leaders, Furtwängler quickly discovered, were not garden-variety politicians. They planned to re-create their fellow citizens along the lines established in « Mein Kampf » , and they regarded Furtwängler as a valuable commodity. Thus, for the following 12 years, he found himself contending not only with the « 3 B's » , but also with the « 2 G's » : Hermann Göring, who controlled the Prussian State Theaters, including the « Staatsoper » , and Josef Goebbels, who, as Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, would have liked to administer the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra by decree. Both ensembles depended on government subsidies for their economic survival.

Had Furtwängler been merely a national celebrity, and not an international one, his political case would not have remained controversial for so many decades. For more than 60 years, anyone who has cared to know has indeed known that Furtwängler was never a member of the Nazi Party, or fond of the Nazis, or inclined to be anti-Semitic or authoritarian. But Furtwängler was an international celebrity, and this fact led and continues to lead people to ask why he did not make a stronger protest by exiling himself from Germany, as did his « Aryan » colleagues Fritz Busch and Erich Kleiber, and other « Aryan » cultural celebrities like Thomas Mann and Lotte Lehmann.

The issue is not only the nature of Furtwängler's relationship with Hitler's regime, but also how what happened was perceived, outside as well as within Germany. From the outside, there appeared to be an ambiguous phase that lasted through the regime's 1st year, a heroic phase that began early in 1934, another ambiguous phase that began early in 1935 and a disastrously negative phase that lasted from March 1936 until Furtwängler's denazification trial in December 1946. A final phase (from 1947 to the present) defies summary characterization, for different observers have reached different conclusions about the pro- and anti-Furtwängler testimony that surfaced at the trial and afterward. Some have admired him, others have had ambivalent feelings on the matter, and still others have viewed his case with disgust and hostility. But within Germany, there were no such phases : the majority of persecuted Jews and other opponents of the Nazis who were aware of or directly affected by Furtwängler's relationship with the regime regarded his conduct as selfless and at times heroic, albeit camouflaged by ambiguous public deeds and statements ; a minority viewed him as a waverer or even an opportunist.

There is plenty of evidence to support all points of view. Less than 2 months after the Nazis came to power, Thomas Mann, who was already in exile, wrote in his diary :

« Indignant that Richard Strauß has taken-over the concert from which Bruno Walter was barred. Furtwängler conducted the government's command performance of “ Die Meistersinger ” on this day of jubilation. Lacks. »

(The « command performance » in question was considered the inaugural event of the 3rd « Reich » .)

But, in another diary entry, written less than a month later, Mann noted :

« Yesterday, in the “ Frankfurter Zeitung ”, Furtwängler's highly-discreet but nevertheless admonitory letter to Goebbels on cultural policy, and the idiot's lengthy reply. »

Parts of Furtwängler's admonition seem « discreet » to the point of ambiguity. The conductor was forthright in telling Goebbels that « the quality of music is not a matter of ideology » , a notion that went against the Nazi grain. But he seemed to support the theory, held by some lukewarm Nazis and even by many non-Nazis, that one had to distinguish between good Jews and bad Jews - in this case, between Jewish artists who were likely to make a « positive » contribution to art and those who were not. Furtwängler also distinguished, in his letter, between Jews and Germans, as if he accepted the Nazis' theory that German-born Jews could not be authentic Germans.

« If the fight against Jewry is focused upon those artists who are rootless and destructive, if it is waged against those who would profit through rubbish and empty virtuosity, the fight is justified. The struggle against such individuals and the spirit they personify (and the spirit has its German adherents too) cannot be waged vigorously and thoroughly enough. But if this attack is directed against real artists, too, it is not in the best interests of our culture.

Plainly, it must be said that men like Walter, Klemperer, Reinhardt and others must be enabled in the future to practice their art in Germany. »

The last sentence I have quoted was futile but courageous, under the circumstances. But who was to determine what constituted « rubbish and empty virtuosity » and what constituted « the best interests of our culture » ? Furtwängler himself ? Goebbels ? And what was to happen to the practitioners, Jewish or otherwise, of « empty virtuosity » ? Obviously, Furtwängler was not suggesting that they be imprisoned, let alone sent to extermination camps, which, in 1933, were a mere gleam in the « Führer » 's eye. But just how was Germany to be made « virtuosenrein » - cleansed of virtuosos ? Would there be a government-enforced prohibition of the production and consumption of those types of art deemed insufficiently profound for the German people ? And if « good » Jewish artists were to be kept in the country and allowed to work while « bad » ones were to be exiled or herded into ghettos and left to face unindemnified un-employment, was the same principle to be applied to « good » and « bad » Jewish merchants and shoe-makers and street-sweepers ?

The Nazis, we know, were not interested in making such fine distinctions. Nevertheless, the weakness in Furtwängler's logic grew-out of his unshakeable beliefs in the superiority of artistic and intellectual pursuits to other areas of endeavor and in the superiority of Germanic musical culture to other musical cultures - beliefs held by some of the persecuted, too, including Arnold Schönberg. Crude Nazi dogma was one thing ; the fundamental rightness of German aspirations to cultural hegemony (benevolent, of course) was something else.

Even among Germanic musicians, however, there were people to whom it seemed, early in the Hitler era, that Furtwängler had been contaminated by Nazi doctrine.

Alban Berg (as « pure Aryan » an Austrian as the « Führer ») wrote to his wife, on May 17, 1933, about a ceremony that had been held that day in Vienna to commemorate the Centenary of Johannes Brahms's birth :

« Furtwängler actually delivered the great address, which made me very depressed all day. It was a Nazi-inspired speech on German music, which, he implied, had found its last representative in Brahms. Without mentioning any names, he betrayed the whole of post-Brahmsian music, especially Mahler and the younger generation (like Hindemith) . There was no reference at all to the Schönberg circle as even existing.

It was horrible having to put-up with all this and witness the frenzied enthusiasm of an idiotic audience. Idiotic not to realize how the Brahms a cappella choral songs which followed made nonsense of Furtwängler's tendentious twaddle. »

Touché ? The fact is that Berg, in characterizing Furtwängler's speech as « Nazi-inspired » , was off the mark. The conductor's æsthetics were merely nationalistic and conservative, thus, they corresponded to some aspects of National-Socialist cultural policy. Inevitably, however, outsiders (even those who, like Berg, were Furtwängler's ethnic next-of-kin and geographic neighbours) interpreted the similarity as evidence of collusion. Not many weeks after the incident reported by Berg, Furtwängler did stick his neck out, futilely, on behalf of Schönberg, whose « Variations for Orchestra » he had premiered in 1928. « Arnold Schönberg is considered by the Jewish International as the most significant musician of the present » , he wrote to Bernhard Rust, the Minister of Culture, on July 4, 1933, when the composer was about to be relieved, officially, of the teaching position he had already been forced to abandon at the Prussian Academy of Arts in Berlin.

« It must be recommended that he not be made a martyr. And if he is suspended now (I would not indeed consider this right) to [sic] treat the question of indemnity with generosity. »

When Furtwängler was questioned, at his denazification trial, about his use of the term « Jewish International » (possibly a mistranslation ; « International Jewry » may have been meant) in this letter, he replied that he had had to fight the Nazis using their weapons (their terminology, in this case) « otherwise, I could not have achieved anything » . And indeed, Georg Gerullis, Under-secretary of Culture, had written, disgustedly, to another functionary :

« Can you give me the name of a Jew who is not backed by Furtwängler ? »

In 1933, Furtwängler attempted to persuade government officials to continue to allow celebrated Jewish performing artists to appear in Germany and to persuade the artists not to boycott Germany ; both attempts failed, but Furtwängler had openly demonstrated his opposition to the regime's policies. Later that year, however, Hermann Göring, without consulting him, conferred on him the title of State counselor, and Furtwängler was made vice-president of Goebbels' « Reichsmusikkammer » - a sort of national music council. Many observers wondered whether he was making

his peace with the Nazis.

Early in 1934, Furtwängler decided to put Paul Hindemith's Opera « Mathis der Maler » , which was still unfinished, on the « Staatsoper » 's 1934-1935 production schedule. Hindemith was no anti-Nazi firebrand, but his wife and many of his associates were Jews, and the Nazis did not approve of his music. Göring struck « Mathis » from the « Staatsoper » 's program ; Furtwängler protested, and while awaiting an answer to his protest he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in the Symphony that Hindemith had created from some of the Opera's completed scenes. The performances were enthusiastically received by the public but condemned by the Nazi press. In the autumn, the Nazi « Kulturgemeinde » (Culture Corporation) announced a boycott of Hindemith's music. Furtwängler's letter of protest, published in the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , won him even more public approval. Attacks against Hindemith and Furtwängler appeared in the Nazi press ; in the end, the composer immigrated to the United States, and the conductor resigned from the « Staatsoper » and the Philharmonic and gave-up all his official titles except that of State counselor. The episode received considerable international attention and made Furtwängler, for a time, a symbol of internal opposition to the regime. « News that Wilhelm Furtwängler has been relieved of all his posts - very significant, since it demonstrates that no person of any superiority can work with these people. » , wrote Thomas Mann in his diary, on December 5th.

But then, in February 1935, Furtwängler signed a statement, prepared for him by Goebbels, in which he recognized Hitler and his ministers as « entirely and solely responsible for cultural policy » in Germany. In a post-War conversation with his biographer, Curt Rieß, Furtwängler offered the remarkable explanation that he had simply been admitting a « fait accompli » , and that, in so doing, he had been absolving himself of any responsibility for what was happening to musical life in Germany ! What had already happened by then included the black-listing of Jewish and other « degenerate » composers and solo artists, the removal of Jewish and other un-approved singers and musicians from the rosters of Opera companies and Orchestras, the ex-propriation of Jewish-owned music publishing houses and concert agencies (including that of Louise Wolff, who had brought Furtwängler's career to its apex) , and the use of intimidation, ghettoization, imprisonment, violence and compulsory exile against the racially « impure » . In exchange for his show of submission, Furtwängler was allowed to work as a free-lance, « non-political » musician in Germany.

The tale of this particular deal is hard to stomach. And the deal marked the beginning of another ambiguous, tug-of-war phase in Furtwängler's relations with the regime. Hitler attended a Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra concert conducted by Furtwängler in the spring of 1935 ; Furtwängler refused to greet the « Führer » with the Nazi salute. Hitler attended another Philharmonic concert, in October 1935 ; this time, he went-up to the stage at the end of the performance and extended his hand to Furtwängler, who shook it. Furtwängler agreed to take the Philharmonic on tour to England, but cancelled when he learned that the tour was to be State-sponsored. The Nazis put pressure on him to drop his long-time secretary and personal manager, Berta Geißmar, who was Jewish, and he gave in. He tried to protect the few remaining Jewish and part-Jewish members in the Philharmonic, and he couldn't understand why most of them left Germany at the 1st opportunity.

He wrote to Carl Flesch, a celebrated violinist, to complain that :

« All his best musicians were Jewish and they were abandoning him ! » , recalled Flesch's son.

« The man was like a child who can only see his own way. The Jews' departure was not only hurting his work but somehow a betrayal of art ! But while he was many things one might never like, he was never in any sense a Nazi. »

A letter of recommendation from Furtwängler prevented Flesch, Senior, and his wife from being sent to a concentration camp in 1940.

In February 1936, Arturo Toscanini retired from the conductorship of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra and recommended that the Orchestra's board of directors invite Furtwängler to succeed him. Furtwängler accepted the board's invitation, which included the condition that he would take on no concurrent permanent position in Germany. When news of the appointment was published, an infuriated Hermann Göring leaked false information that appeared on the front-page of « The New York Times » :

The complete professional rehabilitation of Wilhelm Furtwängler was forecast today in an official announcement that he would shortly resume his activities as « guest-conductor of the Berlin State Operas » . Göring's tactic worked. Musicians, critics, and members of the public in New York protested the hiring of a man who was compromising himself with the Nazis, and Furtwängler (who was vacationing in Egypt and did not, yet, know that Göring was responsible for the leak) assumed that the scandal had been orchestrated in America.

He sent an angry cable to the Philharmonic :

« I am not a politician, but an exponent of German music, which belongs to all mankind and is independent of politics. I suggest, in the interests of the Philharmonic Company, that I postpone my appearances in the U.S.A. until the public realizes that music and politics have nothing to do with each other. »

That summer, Furtwängler returned to Bayreuth for the 1st time in 5 years, to conduct at a fully-nazified Wagner Festival. During the Festival, however, at a reception given by the Wagner family, Furtwängler was « cornered » by Goebbels, Göring, and Hitler, who attempted « to threaten him into again accepting an official position, to no avail » , re-called Friedelind Wagner, the composer's anti-Nazi granddaughter, who would flee Germany in 1939. The attempt ended with « Hitler's shrill threat that he would send him to a concentration camp - and Furtwängler's calm answer :

« “ Herr Reichskanzler ”, I will find myself there only in the very best company ! »

This so surprised Hitler that he couldn't answer, but vanished from the room.

But internal protests of this sort were no longer audible outside Germany. In an open letter to German intellectuals (a letter printed in the « Manchester Guardian » , on March 7, 1936) , the great violinist Bronisław Huberman, a Polish Jew, referred to Furtwängler as « one of the most representative leaders of spiritual Germany » , and went on :

« It will be recalled that Doctor Furtwängler endeavoured to prevent me from publishing my refusal of his invitation (in 1933) to play with his Orchestra in Germany. His astonishing argument was that such a publication would close Germany to me, for many years, and, perhaps, for ever.

Doctor Furtwängler was profoundly revolted not only at the Nuremberg incidents (violent physical attacks on Jews, and on non-Jews who associated with Jews) , which he assured me he and all “ real Germans ” condemned as indignantly as I, but also against me because of my reference to the brutalisation of large sections of the German population. He felt himself compelled to regard this as a “ monstrous generalization which had nothing to do with reality ”.

In the meantime, 2 and a half years have passed. Countless people have been thrown into gaols and concentration camps, exiled, killed, and driven to suicide. Catholic and Pro-testant ministers, Jews, Democrats, Socialists, Communists, army generals became the victims of a like fate. I am not familiar with Doctor Furtwängler's attitude to these happenings, but he expressed clearly enough his own opinion of all “ real Germans ” concerning the shamefulness of the so-called race-ravishing pillories ; and I have not the slightest doubt of the genuineness of his consternation, and believe firmly that many, perhaps the majority of Germans, share his feelings.

Well then, what have you, the “ real Germans ”, done to rid conscience and Germany and humanity of this ignominy ?

Before the whole world I accuse you, German intellectuals, you non-Nazis, as those truly guilty of all these Nazi crimes.
»

At Salzburg, in the summer of 1937, Toscanini, who had previously defended Furtwängler, broke with him over what he saw as Furtwängler's political wishy-washiness, and he told the Festival's administrators that he would no longer return to Salzburg if Furtwängler were invited back. But the crunch never came : in February 1938, Austrian Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg made his Ist compromises with Hitler, and Toscanini immediately announced his withdrawal from the Salzburg Festival. The following month, Austria voted to annex itself to Germany, and at the nazified 1938 Salzburg Festival Furtwängler conducted what had been Toscanini's production of « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » . On the other hand, as long as Hitler's regime lasted, Furtwängler fought a rear-guard action against Nazi barbarity. There are approximately 80 traceable cases of Jews and others, musicians and non-musicians, whom Furtwängler tried (often successfully) to assist, in a variety of ways ; there must have been many more such cases of which traces have been lost. At the same time, Furtwängler was trying to maintain his position as Germany's leading conductor, despite Göring's partially successful attempts to provide the public with an alternative in the person of young Herbert von Karajan. « Der Wunder Karajan » , as the press began to call the new idol, had joined the Nazi Party early on, both in his native Austria and in Germany, and was busy creating a new dimension for the term « opportunism » . Furtwängler took advantage of Gœbbels' rivalry with Göring in order to strike back at his own new rival.

On December 14, 1940, while the War raged, Gœbbels noted in his diary :

« Furtwängler has objections about Karajan, who is getting too much coverage in the press. I put a stop to this. In

other respects, Furtwängler is behaving very decently. And when all is said, he is our greatest conductor. »

One of Furtwängler's « decent » acts was to play a pre-Christmas piano recital for Hitler at the Chancellery. (So much for the conductor's principle of separating art from politics !) Furtwängler was also decent enough to conduct a birthday concert for Hitler - only once, in 1942, according to some sources. But Sir Ernst Gombrich, the eminent art-historian who was a refugee from Nazi Austria, maintained that the event was annual.

In 1987, Gombrich wrote in a letter to this writer :

« My War work in England was that of a Radio Monitor, and so, I heard him conduct Beethoven's 9th on every eve of Hitler's birthday, April 19th. The oration was 1st held by Gœbbels, who regularly ended with the words : “ Er soll uns bleiben, was er immer war, unser Hitler ! ” (May he remain what he has always been, our Hitler !) after which the strains of the 9th began, most incongruously. »

Gombrich, who had met Furtwängler before the War, described him as « a man of devouring ambition ; I know he was not really a Nazi, but he certainly was a committed German nationalist and assured friends that he could not possibly leave his fatherland » .

The conflicting evidence seems endless. There is, for instance, the November 16th, 1943, entry in Marie Vassiltchikov's « Berlin Diaries (1940-1945) » , which were published in 1987 :

« Dined tonight at Gottfried Bismarck's in Potsdam with Adam Trott, the Hassells and Furtwängler. The latter [sic] , who is terrified of the possible arrival of the Russians, disappointed me. From a musical genius, I had somehow expected more “ class ”. »

The interesting bit is not the passage that reveals the diarist's « naïveté » with regard to the behaviour of geniuses, but the revelation about the company Furtwängler was keeping. Count Gottfried von Bismarck, Doctor Adam von Trott zu Solz, Ambassador Ulrich von Hassell, and young Princess Vassiltchikov herself were all profoundly involved in the secret anti-Nazi movement and in the ultimately unsuccessful plans to assassinate Hitler. Was Furtwängler merely odd man out at a dinner party, or was he aware of the others' doings ? His widow maintained that he knew very well what sort of company he was keeping.

On the other hand, in reflecting on Igor Stravinsky in one of his private note-books, Furtwängler wrote :

« The Russian revolutionary devotion to the machine finds a voice in him. Germany has got beyond this. Germany is struggling from the machine to life, and, therefore, it much prefers Bruckner's “ stupid ” music to the “ clever ” music of Stravinsky. »

One may ignore the absurdity of Furtwängler's view of the politically ultra-conservative Stravinsky as a representative of the Bolshevik revolution, and one may ignore the conductor's incomprehension of Stravinsky's music ; but one can

hardly ignore the wrong-headedness and the nearly incredible level of self-delusion implicit in Furtwängler's belief that the Germans, as a nation, were spiritually superior to anyone or anything, in 1944, when this comment was written.

In January 1945, Albert Speer, Hitler's Minister of Armaments, managed to let Furtwängler know that the « Gestapo » was going to try to do him in before the quickly approaching end of the War. The conductor's wife and family were already living in Switzerland, and he succeeded in joining them there. No sooner did he attempt to conduct, however, than he found himself the object of Swiss anti-Nazi protests. He was acquitted at his denazification trial in December 1946 (the testimony of Jewish colleagues and other witnesses was overwhelmingly in his favour) and he was soon conducting all over Europe, including Britain. But his nomination to the principal conductorship of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra for the 1949-1950 season was vociferously opposed by Arthur Rubinstein, Vladimir Horowitz and other Jewish and/or anti-Fascist artists who had previously been forced to abandon Europe.

The conductor and teacher Felix Lederer to the Orchestra's board wrote :

« It is incomprehensible to me that Furtwängler should be tainted with an anti-Semitic attitude.

I am Jewish and was associated with Furtwängler in Mannheim (1915-1920) and in Berlin during the Nazi period. He always wholeheartedly supported Jewish artists with his whole being. He remained loyal to me in spite of being watched by the “ Gestapo ”, and always addressed me as “ my very dear friend ” in his letters even at a time when such familiarity (with a Jew) could have cost him his head. Only those artists who are falsely informed could refuse to play under his leadership. Anybody who endured the terrible Nazi period knows how bravely and selflessly Furtwängler intervened in behalf of Jewish artists. »

It may have been unfortunate, for Chicago and for Furtwängler, that the anti-Furtwängler boycott worked ; and yet, given the enormity of what had just happened in Europe, the protest was only to be expected. Rubinstein, Horowitz and all the others knew, after all, that they would have been murdered, not merely boycotted, if Germany had won the War.

Through recordings, Furtwängler's music-making continues to fascinate generations of listeners, and his behaviour under the Nazis continues to divide those familiar with the story into camps of admirers and detractors. But the plain fact is that Furtwängler's political history is a disconcerting mixture of noble generosity, childish opportunism and nearly imbecilic short-sightedness, and there's no sense in trying to cast him as either a defender of virtue or the devil incarnate. His principle of keeping art separate from politics may be a good one under democratic regimes and in peace time, but it cannot function in a reign of terror, brutality and war.

This is a condensed and updated version of an article, « Furtwängler and the “ Führer ” », that was published in « The Yale Review » , Volume 81 No. 3, July 1993.

...

Le chef d'orchestre et compositeur allemand Wilhelm (Gustav Heinrich Ernst Martin) Fürtwängler est né le 25 janvier 1886 à Berlin et est mort le 30 novembre 1954 à Baden-Baden.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler fut l'un des plus importants chefs d'orchestre de l'histoire de la musique Classique occidentale, notamment grâce à ses interprétations de la musique Symphonique allemande et autrichienne qui font encore référence pour les musicologues et les interprètes actuels.

Il mena à son apogée l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin auquel il s'identifia toute sa vie. Fürtwängler synthétisa la tradition d'interprétation germanique initiée par Richard Wagner et poursuivie par les 2 premiers chefs d'orchestre permanents de l'Orchestre philharmonique : Hans von Bülow et Arthur Nikisch.

Son style « subjectif » d'interprétation, profondément influencé par les théories du musicologue juif viennois Heinrich Schenker, a souvent été comparé et opposé à celui plus « objectif » du chef Arturo Toscanini, son rival de toujours. Il a eu une influence considérable sur tous les chefs d'orchestre de l'après-guerre.

Son rôle, son image et certains de ses choix dans le contexte de l'Allemagne Nazie lui valurent de nombreuses critiques. Toutefois, il n'apparaît pas qu'il ait jamais eu la moindre sympathie pour l'idéologie nazie.

(Photo) Plaque commémorative sur la Nollendorfplatz, à Berlin-Schöneberg où est né Fürtwängler.

Le père de Wilhelm, Adolf Fürtwängler (cousin du mathématicien Philipp Fürtwängler), était un éminent archéologue qui dirigea les fouilles allemandes à Égine, Mycènes et à Olympie (une salle porte son nom au musée d'Olympie) et dont certains des ouvrages sur la céramique grecque antique font encore autorité. Sa mère, Adelheid (née Wendt), dont le père avait été un ami de Johannes Brahms, était peintre. Son oncle maternel était le zoologue Anton Dohrn qui avait fondé l'institut de zoologie de Naples. Wilhelm était l'aîné de 4 enfants, ses frères et sœurs se prénommant Walternote, Märit et Annele. Il passa la plus grande partie de son enfance proche de Munich, où son père enseignait à l'université. Il reçut une éducation musicale dès son plus jeune âge, développant très tôt une prédilection pour Ludwig van Beethoven, compositeur qui l'accompagna artistiquement toute sa vie.

(Photo) Statue du Temple d'Aphaïa (fin du VIe ou du début du Ve siècle avant Jésus-Christ) d'Égine. Fürtwängler, adolescent, se rendit sur le site d'Égine où son père dirigeait les fouilles archéologiques. Cette statue est conservée actuellement à la Glyptothèque de Munich dont le père de Fürtwängler était le conservateur.

Elisabeth Fürtwängler, son épouse, témoigne ainsi de cette proximité intellectuelle entre Beethoven et le jeune Fürtwängler : « Wilhelm m'a raconté qu'adolescent il avait accompagné son père à Égine (en 1901), où ce dernier dirigeait des fouilles archéologiques. Là, le jeune Fürtwängler montait dès le matin dans les forêts de pins et les collines, et lisait les Quatuors de Beethoven dans l'immensité solitaire de la nature. »

Il décida à 7 ans de devenir compositeur, vocation qui ne le quitta jamais. Il commença à composer dès cet âge, mais la composition lui déclenchait des crises de nervosité et de nombreuses insomnies. Bien que très brillant, le jeune

homme s'ennuyait à l'école et fut donc retiré du système scolaire tôt. Il eut les archéologues Ludwig Curtius, Walter Riezler, les compositeurs Anton Beer-Walbrunn et Josef Rheinberger comme précepteurs. En 1902-1903, Fürtwängler étudia la composition avec le chef d'orchestre et compositeur Max von Schillings.

Ludwig Curtius amena le jeune Fürtwängler en Toscane, en 1902. La découverte de l'art de la Renaissance italienne eut sur lui un impact dont l'importance ne peut être exagérée : dans la chapelle des Médicis, entouré des statues de Michel-Ange, l'adolescent demeura assis des heures refusant d'être dérangé par les adultes, composant le début de son « Te Deum » .

Début de carrière

À l'époque où Fürtwängler fit ses débuts comme chef d'orchestre, à l'âge de 20 ans, il avait déjà écrit diverses œuvres, notamment sa 1re Symphonie en ré majeur 3 ans plus tôt, créée par la « Schlesische Philharmonie » de Breslau en 1903. Toutefois, elles avaient reçu un accueil très mitigé. Craignant l'insécurité matérielle liée à une carrière de compositeur, il préféra se consacrer à la direction d'orchestre. Lors de son 1er concert à Munich, le 19 février 1906, il dirigea la « Consécration de la maison » de Beethoven, un poème symphonique en si mineur de sa composition et la 9e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner. Les musiciens de l'Orchestre furent irrités qu'un si jeune débutant choisisse une œuvre aussi difficile que la 9e Symphonie de Bruckner pour son 1er concert. Lors de la 1re répétition, sa technique de direction était tellement catastrophique qu'ils furent persuadés que le concert n'aurait jamais lieu. Mais, curieusement, Fürtwängler sut leur transmettre, par delà ses gestes incontrôlés, sa conception de cette Symphonie. Après le concert, les musiciens furent enthousiastes et la réaction du public et des critiques encourageante. Il fut répétiteur et assura des directions d'orchestres temporaires à Breslau, en 1905, Zürich, durant la saison 1906-1907, Munich, de 1907 à 1909, et à Strasbourg, de 1910 à 1911, où il travailla sous la direction du compositeur Hans Pfitzner. Ce dernier eut une grande influence sur Fürtwängler : il dirigea et loua les compositions de Pfitzner jusqu'à la fin de sa vie.

En 1911, le chef Hermann Abendroth démissionna de son poste de directeur musical de l'Orchestre municipal de Lübeck. En avril 1911, la ville organisa un concours pour trouver son remplaçant. En fait, l'Orchestre avait déjà choisi officieusement le successeur mais devait organiser un concours pour la forme et Fürtwängler se présenta. Ce dernier ne fut pas pris au sérieux par le jury : il n'avait presque aucune expérience et sa technique de direction était dramatique, il bougeait les mains dans tous les sens sans raison. Cependant, pendant les répétitions et durant l'audition, les musiciens de l'Orchestre furent bouleversés par ce jeune candidat qui semblait possédé par la musique et qui leur transmettait sa passion à travers un « 6e sens » : ils exigèrent Fürtwängler. Ce dernier devint donc le chef d'orchestre de la ville hanséatique où la vie culturelle jouait un rôle très important. C'est à Lübeck, le 28 avril 1913, qu'il dirigea pour la 1re fois de sa vie la 9e. Cette 9e n'a évidemment pas été enregistrée mais ceux qui l'entendirent déclarèrent n'en avoir jamais entendue d'aussi extraordinaire et allèrent jusqu'à prétendre que l'on ne pourrait jamais en entendre de meilleures. Des commentaires similaires furent rapportés lorsqu'il dirigea l' « Eroica » (2 janvier 1915) ainsi que pour l'Adagio de la 8e Symphonie de Bruckner (28 mars 1914) . Cependant, conscient de la nécessité d'améliorer sa technique de direction, Fürtwängler se rendit à Hambourg, en février 1912, pour assister à un concert sous la direction d'Arthur Nikisch le directeur de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, considéré à l'époque comme le

plus grand chef d'orchestre d'Allemagne, voire du monde. Alors que Fürtwängler fut toujours très critique vis-à-vis de ses confrères, il fut ce soir-là bouleversé. Après le concert, une amie le présenta à Nikisch mais le jeune homme fut tellement ému qu'il ne put dire un mot. Néanmoins, Fürtwängler continua à aller assister à de nombreux concerts dirigés par Nikisch à Hambourg pour essayer de découvrir ce qu'il considérait comme le « secret » du vieux Maître et qui correspondait exactement à ce qui lui manquait : la capacité qu'avait Nikisch à obtenir des sons magnifiques en utilisant un nombre très réduit de gestes simples. Ce dernier invitait systématiquement Fürtwängler aux dîners qu'il organisait après ses concerts. Un convive demanda un soir à Nikisch qui était ce jeune homme mal habillé et qui était si timide qu'il ne parlait presque pas. Il lui répondit simplement : « Il est sûr qu'il est destiné à de grandes choses » et prophétisa « ce sera probablement mon successeur ». Fürtwängler considéra toujours Nikisch comme son unique modèle pour la direction orchestrale.

Il fut ensuite nommé à l'Opéra de Mannheim en 1915. C'était son 1er poste important et le début de sa fulgurante carrière : le 7 septembre 1915, pour son 1er concert à Mannheim il dirigea « Fidelio » qui demeura toujours son opéra favori. Les critiques ne tarissaient plus d'éloges : on parla dans toute l'Allemagne du « miracle Fürtwängler ». Le poste à Mannheim a aussi une forte valeur symbolique : c'est là, en effet, qu'un groupe de musiciens du milieu du XVIIIe siècle, que l'on dénomme l'École de Mannheim, développa la forme sonate dans sa confection Classique, laquelle devint ensuite celle de la Symphonie. Son épouse Elisabeth rapporte que sa nomination à Mannheim fut la plus grande joie de sa carrière, plus encore que celle à Berlin, qui intervint plus tard.

Fürtwängler a raconté à de nombreuses reprises comment s'était déroulée l'audition. Friedrich Schnapp, qui était chargé des enregistrements de Fürtwängler pendant une longue période, en fit également le récit : il fallait remplacer le chef d'orchestre Arthur Bodansky, lequel devait décider, avec un jury de 3 personnes, qui allait être son successeur. Fürtwängler dirigea « Fidelio » mais commit de nombreuses erreurs techniques alors que ses concurrents dirigèrent sans le moindre accroc. Schnapp raconta que Fürtwängler était totalement déprimé et absolument sûr qu'il ne serait pas retenu. Mais, contre toute attente, Bodansky l'invita à dîner et, pendant le repas, il lui demanda quand il voulait commencer. Fürtwängler fut très surpris et lui fit remarquer qu'il avait fait de nombreuses erreurs et pas les autres candidats. Schnapp raconta : « Bodansky (dit) : « Cela ne m'intéresse pas du tout. Vous étiez de loin le meilleur ! Les autres ne font pas le poids, c'est certain. » Et Fürtwängler me dit alors : « Voyez-vous, et c'était un Juif, et il faut ... je devrais écrire un jour tout ce que je dois aux Juifs ! Ils avaient effectivement un sens de la qualité qui est unique » Et ce fut le début de l'ascension de Fürtwängler. » .

Le plus grand chef d'orchestre d'Allemagne

En 1920-1922, Fürtwängler travailla tour à tour à Francfort-sur-le-Main, à Vienne, à la Staatskapelle de Berlin, à l'Orchestre du Gewandhaus de Leipzig en 1922, où il succéda à Arthur Nikisch et, simultanément, au prestigieux Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. En 1922, à 36 ans seulement, il devint le principal chef d'orchestre en Allemagne. George Schneider raconta : « Au mois d'octobre 1922, dans la vieille salle de la Philharmonie, un jeune homme de 36 ans dirige l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. Il vient d'être choisi pour prendre la tête du plus prestigieux orchestre du monde. Dans une loge, Marie von Bülow, seconde femme du grand chef d'orchestre Hans von Bülow, ami de Liszt, Brahms et Wagner, remarqua : « C'est la Ire fois que, depuis Bülow, j'ai retrouvé cette impression de chair de poule

dans le dos » . » .

Fürtwängler naquit 11 ans avant la mort de Johannes Brahms. Fürtwängler eut toute sa vie une forte affinité pour la musique de Brahms. Son grand-père maternel fut l'ami du compositeur.

Ultérieurement, il participa régulièrement au Festival de Salzbourg et au Festival de Bayreuth. Plus précisément, il dirigea à Bayreuth à partir de 1931 et à Salzbourg à partir de 1937. Il travailla très souvent avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne qui avait été celui de Gustav Mahler. Fürtwängler succéda à Felix Weingartner à la direction de cet Orchestre en 1927. En 1930, il abandonna ce poste sous la pression du Sénat allemand qui voulait le conserver par tous les moyens en Allemagne. Clemens Krauß lui succéda et, à partir de 1933, l'Orchestre n'eut que des chefs invités. Cependant, Clemens Hellsberg expliqua « qu'entre 1927 et 1954, le véritable chef principal de l'Orchestre de Vienne fut Wilhelm Fürtwängler qui s'est produit plus de 500 fois à la tête de l'orchestre. » Mais Fürtwängler déclara toujours que l'Orchestre de Berlin avait la priorité par rapport à celui de Vienne. Il s'identifia toute sa vie à l'Orchestre de Berlin, ce qui est une des raisons principales pour lesquelles il ne quitta jamais l'Allemagne. Les musiciens de l'Orchestre de Vienne se plaignirent toujours que leur Orchestre n'était que la « maîtresse » de l'illustre chef d'orchestre alors que celui de Berlin était sa « femme » . Fürtwängler considérait que tous les musiciens de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin étaient sa famille, les traitant toujours avec grande affection, voire les protégeant durant la période Nazie.

S'intéressant au plus haut point au travail de création des œuvres, pendant la 1re partie de sa carrière, Fürtwängler programma régulièrement des œuvres de compositeurs qui lui étaient contemporains. Parmi beaucoup d'autres, il joua régulièrement Arthur Honegger, Hans Pfitzner, Igor Stravinsky, Arnold Schönberg, Béla Bartók, Gustav Mahler, Sergueï Prokofiev, Carl Nielsen, Maurice Ravel et Richard Strauß. Son compositeur préféré de cette période était Béla Bartók. En outre, il dirigea la création mondiale de plusieurs œuvres importantes du répertoire contemporain. À partir de 1920, Fürtwängler travailla avec le musicologue Heinrich Schenker dont les théories font souvent encore aujourd'hui autorité pour l'interprétation de la musique tonale. Jusqu'à la mort de Schenker, en 1935, ils étudièrent ensemble en profondeur les partitions des œuvres que Fürtwängler dirigeait ensuite et Schenker venait assister à ses concerts, commentant et corrigeant ses interprétations.

La République de Weimar

(Photo de 1930) Stravinsky et Fürtwängler. Sous la République de Weimar, Fürtwängler joua un rôle important dans la mise en valeur de la musique contemporaine, en particulier celle de Stravinsky.

À la suite des accords de Locarno, Fürtwängler joua un rôle de 1er plan dans le rapprochement culturel avec la France, où il dirigea souvent. Il continua d'ailleurs à diriger de la musique française durant la Première Guerre mondiale : ainsi, le « Carmen » de Bizet apparaît à de nombreuses reprises dans les programmes des concerts de Fürtwängler pendant cette période, malgré le contexte peu favorable.

Tous les éléments biographiques concordent pour indiquer que Fürtwängler ne tomba jamais dans la haine des Français

et l'utilisation des Juifs comme boucs-émissaires, idées qui traversèrent toute la société allemande pendant son existence. Il reçut la Légion d'honneur, le 20 février 1939. Ce geste du gouvernement français tend à prouver que les chancelleries des démocraties occidentales savaient parfaitement que Fürtwängler ne soutenait pas politiquement le régime Nazi. Adolf Hitler fit d'ailleurs interdire la publication de cette nouvelle en Allemagne. D'autre part, comme Fürtwängler refusa de mettre les pieds sur le territoire français durant l'Occupation, sa relation privilégiée avec la France reprit vite après la guerre : c'est la France qui fut le 1er pays étranger à l'inviter après qu'il eut repris ses fonctions au Philharmonique de Berlin en 1947 (les 24 et 25 janvier 1948, à Paris) .

Durant la République de Weimar, l'Allemagne connut une grande effervescence culturelle, non seulement dans le domaine de la musique Classique, mais aussi en architecture (le « Bauhaus ») , dans le cinéma, la peinture (l'expressionnisme allemand) . Fürtwängler, qui était devenu un symbole vivant de la grande tradition musicale germanique, joua un rôle important dans cet univers artistique. Que ce soit pour sa carrière ou pour les influences musicales qui façonnèrent son style de direction, Fürtwängler ne devait donc rien à la période Nazie.

1933-1945 : Un chef d'orchestre apolitique ?

Article détaillé : Wilhelm Fürtwängler et ses relations avec le régime Nazi.

Les rapports de Fürtwängler avec Adolf Hitler, et son attitude envers les Nazis, ont occasionné de nombreuses polémiques. Lors de leur arrivée au pouvoir en 1933, le chef d'orchestre était très critique à leur rencontre (voir la section « Relations tendues avec le pouvoir Nazi ») . Après s'être opposé publiquement aux mesures raciales d'Hitler, Fürtwängler se retrouva en situation d'affrontement direct avec les dirigeants Nazis, en particulier lorsqu'il prit la défense de l'œuvre de Paul Hindemith (voir la section sur « le cas Hindemith ») .

Les dirigeants Nazis cherchaient, par tous les moyens, à le garder en Allemagne car ils souhaitaient l'utiliser comme symbole de la culture allemande (voir la section « La volonté de récupération ») . D'autre part, comme Fürtwängler pensait que son rôle était de rester en Allemagne pour protéger cette même culture et pour aider les Allemands menacés par le régime, il décida de rester dans son pays comme artiste « apolitique » (voir la section sur l' « accord » de 1935) . Toutefois, rester en Allemagne sans aucun lien avec les dirigeants Nazis se révéla très vite impossible, comme en témoigne le concert consacré à Beethoven, le 2 mai 1935, où Hitler et tous les dirigeants Nazis vinrent sans prévenir Fürtwängler. Le fait de rester en Allemagne permit au chef d'orchestre de protéger certaines formations musicales (l'existence de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne) et d'aider de nombreuses personnes juives ou non juives (voir la section « La résistance à la volonté des Nazis ») .

Josef Gœbbels en avait conscience, il écrivit à plusieurs reprises dans son journal personnel que Fürtwängler aidait sans arrêt des Juifs, « demi-Juifs » et « son petit Hindemith » mais il ferma volontairement les yeux. En effet, il réussit à obtenir en échange sa participation à quelques manifestations importantes : un concert des « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » en 1938 à Nuremberg, la veille des journées du parti Nazi (voir la section « Les chocs de l'année 1938 ») , et plusieurs concerts de Beethoven pour l'anniversaire d'Hitler, comme celui de 1942 à Berlin (voir la section « Le grand concert de 1942 ») . Ces concerts furent vivement reprochés à Fürtwängler après la guerre. Pendant la

guerre, Fürtwängler essaya systématiquement d'éviter de jouer dans les pays occupés. En particulier, il refusa catégoriquement de mettre les pieds en France sous l'Occupation. Il se rendit cependant, en 1940 et 1944, à Prague, où il joua de la musique slave, et à Oslo, en 1943, où il aida le chef d'orchestre d'origine juive Issay Dobrowen à s'enfuir en Suède (voir la section « Attitude face aux exigences du pouvoir ») .

Les dirigeants Nazis fermèrent les yeux sur de nombreux faits concernant Fürtwängler : entre autres, il refusa toujours de faire le salut Nazi, de diriger les hymnes Nazis et refusa de participer au grand film de propagande « les Philharmoniker » où il devait jouer le rôle principal. Mais la situation changea après l'attentat manqué du 20 juillet 1944 contre Hitler, quand il devint évident que Fürtwängler avait des liens avec les membres de la résistance allemande au Nazisme qui avait organisé l'attentat (voir la section « La condamnation à mort et la fuite ») . Ayant appris que la « Gestapo » était sur le point de l'arrêter, il s'enfuit précipitamment en Suisse au début du mois de février 1945.

Iers grands enregistrements

Les discographies de Wilhelm Fürtwängler sont légion, en particulier celles de John Hunt qui en publia pas moins de 6, entre 1982 et 1999 (soit une tous les 3 ans) . En 1997, la maison TAHRA publia un document chronologique, inspiré de la discographie de H. Schmidt Olsen, parue en 1973, et qui, selon de nombreux spécialistes, reste une référence à plus d'un titre malgré ses lacunes, compréhensibles pour l'époque.

Les labels autorisés ont eu accès légalement aux bandes originales : avant tout, les 2 éditeurs du chef allemand, « Deutsche Grammophon » et « EMI » , mais aussi les indépendants « Orfeo » , « Tahra » et les Sociétés Fürtwängler, principalement française et allemande.

...

La discographie de Wilhelm Fürtwängler est très importante et ses enregistrements légendaires sont régulièrement ré-édités par les maisons de disques. Tous les enregistrements sont en son monophonique. Comme les techniques d'enregistrement étaient encore expérimentales, la qualité du « remastering » est extrêmement importante. Certaines maisons de disque cherchent à filtrer les bruits du public ou les bruits provenant de la bande originale : le résultat peut être catastrophique. Cela peut écraser le « relief » du son obtenu par la battue « fluide » de Fürtwängler et donner une impression de lourdeur. Il faut aussi faire attention car Fürtwängler est probablement le seul interprète de musique classique avec Maria Callas dont tous les enregistrements, sans exception, sont ré-édités en permanence même ceux dont la bande sonore est dans un état catastrophique. Il y a aussi de nombreux « faux » Fürtwängler (Gérard Gefen dans son livre sur le chef d'orchestre en donne une liste) .

Quelques observations sur la philosophie musicale de Fürtwängler et son impact à un moment tragique de notre histoire : l'esquisse d'une pensée artistique aussi riche que celle d'un tel artiste nous est apparue comme terriblement actuelle. À l'heure où les formations orchestrales manquent de grands esprits pour les guider, le legs de Wilhelm Fürtwängler est un vivant espoir pour la prochaine génération musicale.

Homme d'une extrême sensibilité et d'un tempérament incandescent, âme fragile et tourmentée, il a été un de ces esprits magnifiques qui passent parfois au milieu des masses. Mais son art, ne l'a pas pour autant préservé des difficultés de son époque. Fürtwängler avait pour habitude de noter ses réflexions sur la musique ainsi que des observations diverses sur le monde qui l'entourait. De ce fait, pénétrer la vision artistique du chef sans connaître l'homme est plus délicat. Mais il suffit d'en être conscient et de laisser de côté, pour le moment, l'aspect essentiellement politique et inhérent (bien malgré lui d'ailleurs) à sa personnalité. C'est assez que d'examiner sa position quant au rôle presque religieux qu'il accorde à la performance musicale.

À travers ses écrits personnels, ses carnets ou bien encore sa correspondance, Fürtwängler n'a cessé d'exposer et de défendre l'idée de la création musicale comme un tout organique. Pour lui, le Concerto doit en quelque sorte incarner son étymologie en rendant possible l'accord des âmes à travers l'expérience collective. Le contact entre le public et l'artiste est le relais pour atteindre cet état de conscience partagée qui renseigne l'Homme sur lui-même. Voilà pourquoi il est, à nos yeux du moins, si important d'écouter les enregistrements publics réalisés par Fürtwängler. Certes, il n'aimait pas le disque qui entraverait selon lui la communion entre l'auditeur et l'interprète et détruirait le message artistique par excellence. Mais, il n'en demeure pas moins qu'à l'écoute d'un document sonore pris sur le vif, l'amateur de musique achète de nos jours (avec tous les bruits parasites de l'assistance) une petite part du miracle. La question reste invariable dans la bouche du grand homme durant toute sa vie : « le public marche-t-il ou non ? » .

En définitive, par-delà les raisons techniques, l'enregistrement est pour lui un cas de conscience face à l'aspect vivant qu'incarne la musique. Selon lui, le micro enferme l'interprète dans son désir de perfection. À cela s'ajoute la peur des tempos (sic) extrêmement lents, des grands contrastes, des pauses, l'angoisse de tout ce qui est poussé à l'extrême, mais aussi de tout ce qui articule, façonne, produit la forme au sens le plus profond du terme. Cela implique une modification décisive dans notre façon de jouer. La musique risque de se retrouver de plus en plus dépouillée de son caractère immédiat de vie, le rythme, la pulsation vivante du cœur de se rapprocher de la cadence mécanique et impersonnelle de la machine, la constitution organique d'être privée d'une partie de sa chaleur, de sa vie, de son opulence et de son tempérament, jusque dans le moindre accent de son chant.

On comprend le souci permanent de Fürtwängler de conserver la force vive de la musique en préservant l'aspect naturel de sa création. En effet, cette « pulsation vivante » est le propre même de la création artistique, ce que l'on peut appeler l'interprétation. Car pour le chef allemand, la musique (bien qu'elle contienne en elle-même toute sa force artistique) se présente sous une forme abstraite qui libère toute son expression à travers l'artiste. Celui-ci a donc la responsabilité de transmettre ce « caractère immédiat de vie » que le micro détruit. Ainsi, interpréter n'est pas fixer avec minutie une multitude de détails (techniques ou musicaux) mais libérer l'inspiration du moment comme le veut la loi de l'improvisation. C'est sans doute là que réside le génie de Fürtwängler - dans la volonté de faire primer l'instant sur l'habitude. Lorsque l'on écoute ses lers enregistrements de 1926, et plus généralement ceux des années 1930, on sent déjà combien son expression musicale contient de variables : rythme, tempo, crescendo, sforzando, rupture. Autant de modes d'expression qui ont attendu le moment adéquat pour s'exprimer à un niveau paroxystique et révéler toute la violence d'une époque.

...

Fürtwängler attachait beaucoup d'importance à la sonorité d'ensemble, à ce qu'on appelle la couleur orchestrale. De plus, sa conception très architecturale de l'interprétation l'amena à jouer au maximum de la dynamique sonore - son grand Crescendo dans la 5e Symphonie de Beethoven, enregistrée en 1943, en est un exemple typique. Pour apprécier pleinement les qualités de ses enregistrements, il faut donc rechercher les disques dont les sources sonores ont été traitées avec soin.

Les meilleurs CD sont édités par les Associations ; les grandes labels, « EMI » et « DGG » , produisent généralement des disques peu satisfaisants, du fait d'une filtration des bruits souvent excessive. On leur préférera « Naxos » , « Testament » et « Orfeo » , qui font appel aux meilleurs ingénieurs du son pour leurs enregistrements historiques. Parmi les petites marques, « Tahra » , « Audite » , « Opus Kura » , « Andante » et « Biddulph » font un très bon travail de restauration. En revanche, la qualité est le plus souvent médiocre chez les autres éditeurs tels que « Andromède » , « Archipel » , « Arkadia » , « Gebhardt » , « Nuova Era » , « Rodolphe » , habitués à recopier des sources non originales et de mauvaise qualité. « Music & Arts » a édité un grand nombre d'enregistrements de Fürtwängler, le plus souvent d'une qualité sonore médiocre, avec un registre médium agressif, résultant d'un filtrage excessif des graves et des aigus. Il faut toutefois noter une amélioration de leurs productions depuis qu'ils font un travail de restauration.

Les enregistrements édités par la Société Wilhelm Fürtwängler (SWF) , la « Wilhelm Fürtwängler Gesellschaft » (WFG) , le « Wilhelm Fürtwängler Centre of Japan » (WFCJ) et la « Wilhelm Fürtwängler Society of Japan » (WFSJ) sont fort recommandés.

...

(Photo) Kirsten Flagstad. Elle fut une des plus grandes sopranos wagnériennes du siècle dernier. Elle enregistra sous étiquette « EMI » « Tristan und Isolde » en 1952, avec Fürtwängler.

En 1937, Fürtwängler réalisa une grande tournée en Angleterre pendant laquelle fut enregistrée sa le interprétation importante de la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven ainsi que de nombreux extraits d'Opéras de Richard Wagner avec notamment Kirsten Flagstad et Lauritz Melchior. Il existe même quelques enregistrements dans lesquels ils jouent tous les 3 ensemble : ces enregistrements sont particulièrement importants car ils réunissent ceux qui furent probablement les 3 plus grands interprètes wagnériens du XXe siècle.

En 1938, Fürtwängler fut très affecté par les exactions systématiques contre les Juifs qui s'organisèrent et qui menèrent à la « nuit de Cristal » . Le témoignage le plus poignant de l'état dans lequel il était durant cette période est l'enregistrement qu'il fit de la 6e Symphonie de Tchaïkovski, cette année là. La critique unanime estime que jamais le pathétique et le tragique n'ont été poussés aussi profondément. Fürtwängler était alors dans un état de pleine dépression et proche du suicide. Dans les enregistrements de « Parsifal » de 1938, on ressent la même impression de profonde dépression. Sami Habra déclara à propos de l'enregistrement de la 6e Symphonie de Tchaïkovski : « Le

dernier mouvement aurait probablement contenu quelque lueur d'espoir, n'eût été les événements tragiques qui allaient plonger le monde dans ses heures les plus noires. Nombre d'observateurs ont fait observer que Fürtwängler avait prévu ce qui allait se passer. »

L' « émigration intérieure »

À partir de 1938, Adolf Hitler mit en place en Allemagne un régime qui devait amener la Seconde Guerre mondiale et des crimes contre l'humanité à très grande échelle. Mais Fürtwängler ne tomba pas dans le désespoir. Dans son interprétation de 1938 de la « Pathétique » de Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovski, il parut toucher le fond, mais il semble que quelque chose se transforma complètement dans son esprit au tournant de la guerre. En témoigne un enregistrement de 1940 d'une version orchestrée de la « Cavatina » du 13e quatuor de Ludwig van Beethoven qui, au lieu d'exprimer un désespoir absolu, semble totalement hors du temps. Il n'est pas possible, en écoutant cet enregistrement, de ne pas se rappeler que Fürtwängler apprenait par cœur, très jeune, les Quatuors de Beethoven en Grèce, alors que son père dirigeait les fouilles dans les plus grands sanctuaires de la Grèce antique. Fürtwängler sembla, à partir de ce moment, atteindre une dimension spirituelle qui prenait racine dans la plus haute tradition idéaliste grecque et dont la musique Symphonique germanique se voulait l'héritière, dimension qui lui servit de « refuge intérieur ». Josef Goebbels se rendit compte que Fürtwängler s'était enfermé dans une émigration intérieure, utilisant ce terme bien avant que les intellectuels allemands ne le définissent après la guerre. Il écrivit, en avril 1944 :

« Fürtwängler n'a jamais été National-Socialiste. Et il n'a jamais fait de mystère là-dessus. Et les Juifs et les émigrés ont trouvé cela suffisant pour le considérer comme un des leurs, lui qui était dans une sorte d' « émigration intérieure » ; il n'a jamais changé d'avis sur nous. »

Les enregistrements de la suite de la guerre, s'ils sont toujours en 1942 et 1943 marqués par le sceau du tragique, ne finissent pas dans le désespoir comme la 6e Symphonie de Tchaïkovski de 1938. Au contraire, ils semblent s'ouvrir sur une dimension transcendante. Cette tendance va en s'accroissant alors que le monde s'effondre de plus en plus autour de lui pour culminer dans les versions de 1944-1945, dans lesquelles le tragique disparaît définitivement.

(Photo) Rembrandt, « Philosophe en méditation ». Tout comme dans les œuvres principales du peintre, il se dégage des interprétations de guerre de Fürtwängler une forte présence spirituelle qui a été soulignée par de nombreux critiques comme André Tubeuf, Sami Habra ou Harry Halbreich. Fürtwängler a comparé explicitement sa direction « floue » avec l'art de Rembrandt.

Cette transformation apparaît si l'on compare le dernier mouvement de la 6e Symphonie de Tchaïkovski de 1938, l'Adagio de la 7e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner de 1942 et l'Adagio de la 9e Symphonie de Bruckner de 1944. Alors que l'enregistrement de 1938 se finit sur un vide immense, celui de 1942 est tragique mais la grandeur du discours est telle qu'en arrière-plan, une présence surnaturelle transparait. Dans l'Adagio de 1944, le processus d'anéantissement et de mort semble pleinement accepté par le chef d'orchestre et, à la fin du mouvement, « au bout du tunnel », cette présence surnaturelle, qui n'était qu'en arrière plan en 1942, se révèle clairement porteuse d'un espoir infini. Cette dimension spirituelle est encore plus claire dans le célèbre enregistrement de l' « Eroica », la 3e Symphonie de

Beethoven, daté de décembre 1944, qualifié de « la plus grande interprétation de tous les temps de la plus grande Symphonie de tous les temps ». Fürtwängler réalisa la plus grande « Marcia funebre », le 2e mouvement de la Symphonie, jamais enregistrée. Mais, s'il s'agit toujours d'un dialogue avec la mort, cela n'a plus rien à voir avec l'expressionnisme allemand. On est beaucoup plus proche des plus grands chefs-d'œuvre de Rembrandt où la peinture semble « habitée » par une présence surnaturelle et où les décors semblent sortir du cadre du tableau pour occuper un espace sans limite. André Tubeuf écrivit dans son commentaire sur cet enregistrement de 1944 : « Un fabuleux Classicisme, figures que l'on dirait de pierre par leur noblesse, de feu par leur urgence : mais qui libèrent soudain, sur l'aile d'un Scherzo, dans le pas d'une Marche, « donné en acte », l'Infini. »

Les enregistrements de 1942-1943

En 1942, les techniques d'enregistrement s'étant améliorées, Fürtwängler commença à accepter d'être enregistré un peu plus souvent. S'ensuivirent des enregistrements qui comptent parmi les documents sonores les plus importants du XXe siècle : par exemple, le mythique Adagio de la 7e Symphonie de Bruckner, le 2e Concerto pour piano de Brahms avec Edwin Fischer, la 5e Symphonie de Bruckner, une 9e Symphonie de Schubert (intitulée « la Grande »), Till l'Espiegle de Richard Strauß et, surtout, la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven. À propos de cette version Dantesque, Harry Halbreich déclara concernant le 1er mouvement : « Nul n'a jamais approché Fürtwängler dans l'évocation de ce terrifiant déchaînement de forces cosmiques. »

(Photo) « Le Jugement dernier » de Michel Ange, dans la chapelle Sixtine. La 9e de Beethoven de 1942 par Fürtwängler a été comparée, par la critique, à la chapelle Sixtine de Michel Ange.

L'Adagio a toujours été considéré par la critique comme un « sommet » de l'art de Fürtwängler. René Trémine déclara en effet : « Quant à l'Adagio, ne serait-il pas, en sa surhumaine ampleur, le plus haut sommet atteint par Fürtwängler - avec la Marche funèbre de l'Eroica (à Vienne, en 1944) ? ». En ce qui concerne le fortissimo de la mesure 330 du Finale, suivi d'un point d'orgue démesuré, Harry Halbreich ajouta : « Il s'agit d'une vision de Dieu où Beethoven, grâce à un interprète digne de lui, rejoint et égale en puissance le Michel-Ange de la chapelle Sixtine. »

En 1943, il enregistra l'ouverture de « Coriolan », une 4e Symphonie de Brahms, les Variations sur un thème de Haydn de Johannes Brahms et, surtout, la 5e Symphonie de Beethoven. En ce qui concerne cette dernière, la transition du 3e au 4e mouvement est probablement l'un des plus grands moments de l'histoire de la musique.

4 mois après cette 5e de Beethoven, il enregistra la 7e Symphonie de Beethoven. Harry Halbreich écrivit à propos du second mouvement de cet enregistrement : « Dès les Ires mesures, la perfection nous subjuge par son évidence : comment en douter, c'est là le tempo juste, humainement, organiquement juste, de cette musique. Qui décrira la beauté incroyable du phrasé de la sonorité du chant des altos et violoncelles ? L'expression sublime des violons dans l'aigu ? Quant au second thème, à son retour, il apparaît encore plus émouvant et plus expressif (plus Brahmsien aussi !) que la Ire fois ». Pour le Finale : « Ce finale fut toujours l'un des grands chevaux de bataille de Fürtwängler. Fürtwängler, rééditant l'incroyable performance de la conclusion de la « 5e » de juin 1943, se lance dans une gradation finale défiant toute description, un « maelström » d'enfer qui coupe le souffle sans que ce déchaînement

échappe un seul instant à la poigne de fer du génial meneur d'hommes. « Je suis le Bacchus qui broie le délicieux nectar pour l'humanité. C'est moi qui donne aux hommes la divine frénésie de l'esprit » : ainsi s'exprimait Beethoven. Il fallait un géant, comme le Fürtwängler de ce jour d'automne 1943, pour faire vivre la réalité sonore de cette divine frénésie ! » En 1943, Fürtwängler dirigea aussi, au Festival de Bayreuth, « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » avec Max Lorenz.

L'année 1944

Fin 1944, Berlin et Vienne étaient sous les bombardements alliés. Les salles de concert étaient détruites les unes après les autres. Fürtwängler réalisa une dernière série de concerts souvent « sans public », pour être ensuite retransmis à la radio. Il est difficile de se représenter ce qu'il se passe dans son esprit, dirigeant ses derniers musiciens dans des salles vides, dans un univers complètement apocalyptique. Toujours est-il que Fürtwängler, particulièrement inspiré par l'effondrement du 3e « Reich », enregistra une série d'œuvres de tout 1er plan : une 3e Symphonie de Beethoven, l'« Eroica », le 1er mouvement de la 8e Symphonie de Schubert, l'ouverture de Léonore III et la 6e Symphonie de Beethoven, une 8e Symphonie Bruckner, une 9e Symphonie de Bruckner, elle aussi considérée par certains critiques comme le « plus extraordinaire enregistrement Symphonique du XXe siècle » et, in extremis, début 1945 à Vienne alors qu'il s'enfuyait en Suisse, poursuivi par la « Gestapo », la Symphonie en ré mineur de César Franck et une ultime 2e Symphonie de Brahms.

Les Soviétiques occupèrent Berlin dès 1945 et s'emparèrent des enregistrements de Fürtwängler avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. Ces derniers ne furent rendus officiellement par l'Union soviétique qu'à la fin des années 1980.

Histoire de la vie musicale à Berlin

L'année 1570 est l'année où l'Orchestre de Berlin est apparu pour la 1re fois sur les registres : la « Kurfürstliche Hofkapelle », qui fait ainsi partie des plus anciens Orchestres du monde. Il a fallu cependant attendre encore un peu pour que la musique berlinoise connaisse son apogée.

Au début du XVIIe siècle, Berlin entra dans l'histoire de la musique avec des musiciens tels Johannes Eccard et Nikolaus Zangius, Maîtres de chapelle à la Cour du prince électeur. La musique protestante fut représentée dans la 1re moitié du XVIIe siècle par Johann Crüger. Pendant la guerre de Trente Ans, l'activité musicale connut un ralentissement comme dans le reste de l'Allemagne. En 1701, Berlin prit rang de résidence royale. C'est sous le règne de Frédéric II (1740-1786) que la ville devint un foyer musical important, les artistes se partageant entre la capitale de la Prusse et le séjour royal de Potsdam. On y rencontre Johann Joachim Quantz, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, les Benda, Carl Heinrich et Johann Gottlieb Graun, Johann Friedrich Reichardt, Christoph Nichelmann, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg et Carl Friedrich Zelter. Les compositeurs de l'école de Berlin se sont illustrés dans les domaines de la Symphonie, de la musique instrumentale, du lied et de l'Opéra.

En 1742, Frédéric le Grand créa le « Königliche Hofoper » (l'Opéra de la Cour royale « Unter den Linden »), pour

que Berlin ait aussi un Opéra à la mesure de l'Opéra « Semper » de Dresde. C'est Frédéric II, qui jouait lui-même de la flûte et composa d'innombrables sonates pour flûte et clavecin, qui a formé l'Orchestre et l'Opéra de la Cour. C'est ainsi qu'est né le nouvel Orchestre composé d'environ 50 musiciens, un nombre honorable, et qui fut bientôt admiré et apprécié dans toute l'Europe. Berlin était également réputé à cette époque comme centre de théorie musicale.

Au XIXe siècle et dans la 1re moitié du XXe régna une activité intense : les Orchestres, les Sociétés chorales, les Académies de musique religieuse, les Opéras et les Écoles de musique se multiplièrent, en particulier, de 1800 à 1832, sous l'impulsion de Carl Friedrich Zelter. La musique orchestrale se développa particulièrement dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. De nombreuses formations furent créées : la « Musikausübende Gesellschaft », fondée par Johann Philipp Sack, en 1752, l'« Orchestervereinigung Berliner Musikfreunde », devenue ensuite le « Berliner Orchesterverein », le « Königliches Hoforchester », devenu ensuite la « Staatskapelle », qui compta parmi ses chefs Felix Weingartner et Richard Strauß, et, enfin, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin qui, fondé en 1882, est alors considéré depuis plusieurs dizaines d'années comme l'un des meilleurs Orchestres du monde ; il a eu notamment pour chefs Hans von Bülow (1887-1892), Arthur Nikisch (1897-1922), Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1922-1945 ; 1947-1954), Sergiù Celibidache (1945-1947) et Herbert von Karajan (depuis 1954). Au XXe siècle, sont venus s'ajouter les Orchestres de la Radio : « Berliner Rundfunk » pour Berlin-Est, « Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk » et « RIAS » pour Berlin-Ouest. L'Orchestre RIAS a connu une période de grande notoriété lorsque Ferenc Fricsay en était le directeur (1948-1954).

Parmi les Sociétés chorales figurent le Chœur philharmonique, le Chœur de la cathédrale Sainte-Hedwige et la célèbre « Singakademie », fondée, en 1791, par Christian Fasch et dirigée ensuite par Zelter ; c'est avec le concours de cette formation que Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy dirigea, en 1828, la « Passion selon saint Matthieu » de Jean-Sébastien Bach, tombée dans l'oubli depuis près d'un siècle. Les Académies de musique religieuse les plus importantes sont l'« Akademie für Kirchenmusik », fondée en 1822, la « Gesellschaft zur Förderung der kirchlichen Tonkunst » et le « Caecilienverein ».

Plusieurs grandes scènes d'Opéra ont valu à Berlin sa renommée dans le domaine lyrique. Inaugurée en 1742, la « Hofoper » a vu la création du « Freischütz » de Carl Maria von Weber, en 1821, et l'opposition entre les partisans de cette œuvre de style nouveau et ceux du style de Gaspare Spontini, qui était alors directeur musical du Théâtre. « Les Joyeuses Commères de Windsor » d'Otto Nicolai y furent créées en 1849. Baptisée, après 1918, « Staatsoper » (Opéra d'État), cette scène a eu pour intendants ou directeurs de la musique Richard Strauß, Felix Weingartner, Karl Muck, Max von Schillings, Heinz Tietjen. Les créations de « Wozzeck » d'Alban Berg (1925), « Christophe Colomb » de Darius Milhaud (1930), « Das Herz » de Hans Pfitzner (1931) et « Peer Gynt » de Werner Egek (1938) s'y sont, entre autres, déroulées. Située dans l'ancien secteur Est, la « Staatsoper » a eu pour directeurs musicaux, après la guerre, Franz Konwitschny (1955-1961) et Otmar Suitner, de 1964 à 1975.

Le « Deutsches Opernhaus », inauguré en 1912 et appelé après 1918 « Städtische Oper » (Opéra municipal), a compté parmi ses intendants Carl Ebert et parmi ses directeurs musicaux Bruno Walter et Ferenc Fricsay. Détruit en 1944, lors d'un bombardement aérien, il a repris en 1961 le nom de « Deutsche Oper ».

Inaugurée en 1924, le « Kroll Oper » devint rapidement célèbre par son orientation très particulière ; notamment sous la direction d'Otto Klemperer (1927-1931) , ce fut un Théâtre de créations (Opéras de Paul Hindemith, etc.) et une scène d'avant-garde en ce qui concerne les décors et la mise-en-scène du répertoire. Une position comparable, dans le domaine de l'interprétation scénique, a été occupée après la dernière guerre par le « Komische Oper » , qui, ouverte en 1947, a appuyé sa célébrité sur les mises-en-scène de son intendant Walter Felsenstein.

Dans le domaine de l'enseignement de la musique, les institutions les plus importantes sont l'Université, où ont professé Philipp Spitta et Arnold Schering, la « Hochschule für Musik » , fondée en 1869, le Conservatoire municipal (autrefois, « Stern'sches Konservatorium ») , le Conservatoire « Klindworth-Scharwenka » , l' « Institut für Musikforschung » et la « Berliner Kirchenmusikschule » .

L' « Alte Philharmonie » de Berlin (1898-1944)

In spring 1882, Benjamin Bilse announced plans to take his already underpaid orchestra to Warsaw travelling in 4th class. 50 of his musicians reached breaking point. Calling themselves the « former Bilse Kapelle » , they declared their independence. Right from the start, the young ensemble received administrative support from the Berlin concert agent Hermann Wolff. On his advice, the group changed its name to « Berliner Philharmonisches Orchester » . In search of a suitable concert-hall, Wolff turned a renovated roller-skating rink into the 1st « Philharmonie » ; he organized subscription concerts and sought-out the best conductor at the time for his musicians.

Hans von Bülow had already turned the Meiningen Court Orchestra into a 1st class ensemble when he took-over the « Berliner Philharmoniker » . In only 5 years at the helm, he laid the foundation of the special musical qualities that were to become inseparably linked with the Orchestra's name. Bülow's successors, on the other hand, came to stay. Arthur Nikisch, who took-up his post in 1895, went on to influence the Orchestra's style decisively for the next 27 years. Nikisch once claimed that, « each and every member of a 1st class Orchestra has earned the title of " artist " » , and, with this credo, he gave the « Berliner Philharmoniker » the virtuosity and self-confidence that have become the Orchestra's hallmark.

If Bülow's interpretations tended towards a somewhat analytical brilliance, Nikisch's performances were full of sustained splendour and rich, warm sonorities, which he achieved with the most economical gestures, and by a rhapsodic, almost improvisatory breadth. So, it is unsurprising that the corner stones of his repertoire were Tchaïkovsky, Berlioz, Liszt, Strauß, and Mahler along with a special devotion to Bruckner. Under his leadership, the Orchestra attained its international stature, and major soloists flocked to Berlin to appear with the « Philharmoniker » .

When Arthur Nikisch died in 1922, Wilhelm Fürtwängler became his successor. The young conductor built on Nikisch's achievements. His idiosyncratic beat and impassioned music-making demanded an extremely high-level of autonomy and sensitivity from the musicians. He and his Berlin Orchestra became legendary interpreters of Beethoven, Brahms and Bruckner. At the same time, Fürtwängler expanded the repertoire to include contemporary pieces by Schœnberg, Hindemith, Prokofiev and Stravinsky. Through tours abroad, the « Philharmoniker » established their international reputation as one of the finest Orchestras in the world.

The National-Socialist dictatorship and the war did irreparable damage to the German cultural landscape ; and, with it, the « Berliner Philharmoniker » . The regime's maniacal racial policy led to the loss of valuable musicians, and the Orchestra was isolated from the international exchange of soloists and conductors. At the same time, the National-Socialists turned Germany's representative ensemble into an instrument of official cultural politics. Nevertheless, Fürtwängler and the Orchestra managed to carry the ensemble's artistic substance through the war.

On 26 May 1945, the « Philharmoniker » gave their 1st post-War concert under Leo Borchard. The performance took place at the « Titania Palast » , a converted cinema. In August, Borchard was mistakenly shot by an occupying soldier, and an unknown young conductor, the Rumanian Sergiu Celibidache, was appointed ; more or less fresh from the music Academy. The orchestra's choice proved prescient. Celibidache's passionate temperament and wide-ranging programming were inspirational. Wilhelm Fürtwängler was not allowed to direct the « Philharmoniker » again until after his denazification, in 1947. He resumed leadership of the Orchestra in 1952.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler died in November 1954. In the following year, Herbert von Karajan took-over as principal conductor. He would remain with the ensemble longer than any other conductor to date. He worked with the Orchestra to cultivate a specific sound, an unprecedented perfection and virtuosity which laid the groundwork for its national and international successes : both in the concert-hall and on countless recordings. Moreover, Karajan expanded the ensemble's activities in a number of new directions. With the founding of the Salzburg Easter Festival, in 1967, the Orchestra gained its own major international Festival and an opportunity to make its mark in Operatic circles. The founding of the « Orchester-Akademie der Berliner Philharmoniker » , in which young and talented instrumentalists are prepared to meet the stringent demands of a top-flight Orchestra through practical experience, provided yet more room for development. The new « Philharmonie » was also constructed during the Karajan era ; the Orchestra has made its home in the concert-hall designed by Hans Scharoun since October 1963.

...

Chief recorder Fred Gaisberg 1st heard Arthur Nikisch in concert with the London Symphony Orchestra, in 1912. Gaisberg had master-minded the Caruso sessions in Milan, in 1902, which had been the making of the gramophone artistically and commercially. Undeterred by the need to huddle a reduced 40 piece band in front of an acoustic horn, he recorded Beethoven's « Egmont » Overture with Nikisch and the London Symphony Orchestra in Hayes, in June 1913. He must have been pleased with the results. That November, in collaboration with the company's German cousin « Deutsche Grammophon » , he oversaw the 1st ever complete recording of a Symphony, Beethoven's 5th, with Nikisch and the Berlin Philharmonic.

The Berlin Philharmonic had been founded in 1882 by a band of disaffected musicians from the city's « Bilsch'schen Kapelle » . They were an odd mix of expert instrumentalists (the strings were especially fine) and lesser talents reportedly of dubious repute. The rebels formed a self-governing cooperative, though in reality, it was Berlin concert agent Hermann Wolff who secured them work, provided a bespoke concert venue, and after 5 difficult years engaged the revered Hans von Bülow to drill the ensemble into shape.

It was Bülow, it is said, who gave the Orchestra its discipline, Nikisch who gave it its sound. consistently emotive in Western musical culture. The mindset of rebel musicians hell-bent on doing their own thing is one possibility, though Nikisch himself is the more probable source. Tchaïkovsky, who fell in love with Nikisch's music-making and, possibly, with Nikisch himself, wrote after a concert in Leipzig in 1887 : « This chief, a small, very pale man of about 30, with beautiful radiant eyes, must indeed have some sort of magic power, making the Orchestra thunder like a 1,000 trumpets of Jericho, now coo like a dove, and now die away with breathtaking mystery. » .

Sustaining such a tradition was not easy, which explains why after Nikisch's death, in 1922, Wolff's widow, Louise, recommended the 36 year old Wilhelm Fürtwängler to lead the Orchestra's prestigious annual season of « Philharmonischen Konzerte » . As one musician observed, « With Fürtwängler, ecstasy was the norm of feeling. » . When the Berliners visited England, in 1927, « The Times » attributed the quality of their music-making to « a concentration on the art of Symphonic playing which the conditions of the great continental Orchestras make possible and which conditions of orchestral engagement in this country render unattainable » . Some criticised the Orchestra for an over-reliance on « its » German repertoire. Neville Cardus disagreed. « For my part, I hope that Fürtwängler will go through the whole gallery of the Classics. The fact is, we have not half-heard most of them. »

It would have helped if Berlin music-making had been more widely disseminated but, curiously for an Orchestra that, by the late- 1920's, was virtually bankrupt, recordings were not seen as a useful source of income or publicity. Nor were they after 1934, when live concerts and radio were the preferred platforms for Josef Goebbels as he went about preserving the Orchestra's « elite » status while, at the same time, pursuing his government's new « accessibility » targets. Fürtwängler concerts and Fürtwängler-led foreign tours had long been the Orchestra's trump card, which is why, during the financial meltdown of 1929, in defiance of the Orchestra's constitution, he was named « Dirigent » and given unprecedented new powers over its artistic direction.

That said, some important repertoire was preserved on record. A 1928 recording of Bruckner's 7th Symphony under the young Jascha Horenstein gives us a marvellous sense of what it must have been like to hear the Berliners playing Bruckner under Nikisch, who had conducted the premiere of the Symphony in Leipzig, in 1884. And though only 3 of Beethoven's 9 Symphonies were allocated to the « Berliners » as part of Polydor's 1927 Beethoven Centenary cycle, the performances of the 1st, 3rd and 8th Symphonies under Hans Pfitzner were in a class of their own. For the rest, it was mainly bits and pieces : the Orchestra dripping « schmaltz » under Bruno Walter in Waltzes from « Der Rosenkavalier » sight-reading their way (badly) through Igor Stravinsky's « Firebird » Suite with Oskar Fried, or jumping through the hoops of Erich Kleiber's humourless reading of Stauß's « Till Eulenspiegel » . In the end, it was indefatigable who, after years of patient negotiation, persuaded Fürtwängler to record what proved to be the 2 great mementos of this era : a fine 1937 account of Beethoven's 5th Symphony and the unforgettable Tchaïkovsky « Pathétique » , the following year.

During the British air-raid of the « Alte Philharmonie » (they used phosphorus bombs) , on January 30th 1944, the Orchestra lost its hall, its archive, most of its instruments and much of its music library. Most players survived the war but their situation was parlous. Many orchestral musicians in Austro-Germany worked-out of Opera houses ; it was their

« day job » . Unlike their colleagues in Vienna (the city to which « EMI » 's Walter Legge would travel in 1946 to recruit musicians - the 37 year old Herbert von Karajan, his principal quarry - and resume recording with the Vienna Philharmonic) , the « Berliners » had no such Opera house employment.

A potential saviour was Leo Borchard, the Russian-born anti-Fascist who as a young man had worked with Otto Klemperer at Berlin's « Kroll Oper » . On May 28, 1945, he led a concert of Mendelssohn, Mozart and Tchaïkovsky. 3 months later, he was dead, shot by a jittery soldier at a U.S. checkpoint in occupied Berlin. Desperate to find a replacement, the Orchestra turned to a musician with connections to the city, if not to the Orchestra or its culture, the 33 year old Romanian Sergiu Celibidache. The Americans liked the look of him and on December 1, 1945, Celibidache became the Berlin Philharmonic's official « licensee » . Fürtwängler himself returned to the beleaguered city, in May 1947. His programme began with a performance of the « Egmont » Overture which spoke, and still speaks, volumes. However, it was not until the early 1950's that he resumed regular work with the Orchestra.

With the advent of the long-playing record, in 1948, there began a recording activity « that came upon us like an intoxication : it was the 2nd, the great period of the gramophone » . The words are Karajan's but, by now, even Fürtwängler was beginning to think better of the medium. He died in 1954, but his late « Deutsche Grammophon » studio recordings (Haydn No. 88, Schubert No. 9, Schumann No. 4, his own 2nd Symphony) tell us why, for more than 30 years, he and his Orchestra had bestrode the central European musical stage.

The transition to the Karajan era was fairly seamless. « When Karajan came there was no breach » , recalls cellist Eberhard Finke. « He listened to the Orchestra from within and knew what it had to offer. » A naturally gifted musician who had observed at 1st hand the work of most of the Century's great conductors, Karajan was also extraordinarily patient. Nowadays, few people think of a job for life ; back then, it was different. Over the next 27 years, until the traumas of the winter of 1982-1983, the Orchestra an unprecedented period of stability which old values were preserved even as the Orchestra's was developed.

...

Le Philharmonique de Berlin fut fondé, en 1882, comme communauté autonome puis, à partir de 1903, comme Société à responsabilité limitée, une GmbH dont chaque musicien en activité était actionnaire, dirigée par un Comité élu de 3 membres, le « Vorstand » (titre du président de ce Comité) . Les difficultés financières croissantes de l'Orchestre après 1918, malgré sa réputation internationale, le poussèrent à accepter en 1929, en échange d'un financement régulier eu égard à « son importance pour toute l'Allemagne » , le principe d'une participation majoritaire de la Ville de Berlin, du « Land » et du « Reich » .

La rue « Bernauerstraße » existait déjà depuis longtemps. Elle était une voie commerciale et militaire entre Berlin et les localités de la Marche de Brandebourg, un ancien État du Saint-Empire Romain germanique. Elle se voit attribuer ce nom le 29 mai 1862. Lors de la planification pour la ré-organisation de Berlin par James Hobrecht (le « Hobrecht-Plan ») , elle est désignée sous les noms « Straße 50 » et « Straße 80 » , « Abteilung IX » (rue 50 et rue 80, division 9) . Sa partie nord-est reliait alors la « Bergstraße » au croisement « Schwedter / Oderberger Straße » . Le 4

juillet 1904, la prolongation vers le sud-ouest entre la « Bergstraße » et la « Gartenstraße » est intégrée à la « Bernauerstraße » .

L'« Alte Philharmonie » était située sur la « Bernauerstraße » entre la « Köthenerstraße » et la « Dessauerstraße » , dans le secteur délimité par la gare de Potsdam (« Potsdamer Bahnhof ») et celle d'Anhalter (« Anhalter Bahnhof » , où se trouvait l'immense « Askanischer Platz ») . Il s'agissait à l'origine d'une ancienne patinoire intérieure (pour la pratique du patin à roulettes) construite en 1876 par l'architecte Franz Schwechten qui (grâce au flair du nouvel agent de l'Orchestre, Hermann Wolff) sera transformée, en 1898, en salle pouvant accueillir des concerts, du théâtre et des bals (ne possédant pas de sièges fixes, on utilisera donc des chaises droites) . Cette enceinte pourvue d'une acoustique exceptionnelle devient la « maison » de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin : ensemble de renommée mondiale, fondée en 1882 par Joachim Andersen, Ludwig von Brenner et 52 autres musiciens transfuges de l'Orchestre dirigé par le chef Johann Ernst Benjamin Bilse (après que ce dernier eut annoncé son intention de prendre un train de 4e classe pour un concert prévue à Varsovie) . Nom original alors donné au nouvel orchestre : « Frühere Bilsesche Kapelle » (l'ancienne bande de Bilse) .

En mars 1882, 54 musiciens de l'Orchestre Bilse de Berlin (Benjamin Bilse, 1816-1902) , outrés des lamentables conditions dans lesquelles leur chef entendait les emmener en tournée à Varsovie, firent sécession et fondèrent un nouvel ensemble : « l'Ancien Orchestre Bilse » , à la tête duquel ils élurent Ludwig von Brenner (1833-1902) . Ce nouvel « Ancien Orchestre » trouva rapidement sa place dans la vie musicale berlinoise, en particulier grâce à l'impresario Hermann Wolff (1845-1902) qui sut trouver un grand nombre d'engagements prestigieux à cet excellent ensemble. Benjamin Bilse tenta bien de leur mettre des bâtons dans les roues, en laissant sous-entendre que l'Ancien Orchestre Bilse se produisait sous le nom d'Orchestre Bilse mais d'article fielleux en droit de réponse, les musiciens eurent gain de cause.

...

À Berlin, en 1882, et malgré sa réelle renommée, la formation orchestrale de Benjamin Bilse se dispersa. Violoniste, chef d'orchestre et compositeur allemand (1816-1902) , élève du Conservatoire de Vienne, Bilse avait joué jadis dans l'Orchestre de Johann Strauß, père, avant de fonder cette formation en 1867. Plusieurs tournées avaient conduit l'Orchestre à Saint-Petersbourg, Riga, Varsovie, Amsterdam, Vienne et à l'Exposition Universelle de Paris en 1867. Là, Johann Strauß II avait interprété le fameux « Danube Bleu » , tandis que Richard Wagner le conduisit en 1873 en présence de l'Empereur Wilhelm I.

À la suite d'un profond différend, 54 musiciens de la formation font dissidence et fondent, en 1882, « les anciens de l'Orchestre Bilse » . Les sécessionnistes dirigés par un des leurs, Ludwig von Brenner, renomment leur Orchestre : le Philharmonique de Berlin, qui allait devenir l'un des meilleurs orchestres du monde.

Après des débuts difficiles menant la phalange à plusieurs reprises au bord de la disparition, les destinées de l'Orchestre sont confiées, en 1887, à Hermann Wolff qui, génialement, engage le 1er grand chef de métier, Hans von Bülow, personnage exceptionnel, ami de Franz Liszt, Johannes Brahms et Richard Wagner dont il dirigera, souvent en

leur présence, nombre de leurs chefs-d'œuvre. Ses dons remarquables hissent cet Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin à une célébrité unique, plus tard entretenue voire amplifiée par des talents comme Arthur Nikisch, Wilhelm Fürtwängler et Herbert von Karajan. Des chefs invités prestigieux tels que Felix Weingartner, Richard Strauß, Gustav Mahler, sans oublier Johannes Brahms et Edvard Grieg, contribuèrent aussi à sa réputation.

Un des acteurs principaux de la création du « Berliner Philharmoniker », bien qu'injustement oublié par la postérité, joua un rôle qui s'avéra majeur. Il se nomme Joachim Andersen (1847-1909), un Danois alors très célèbre et célébré comme un des Iers flûtistes virtuoses de son temps (il fut surnommé : « le Chopin de la flûte »), un très honorable chef d'orchestre et un compositeur fécond essentiellement dévoué à son instrument. Après avoir été membre de l'Orchestre royal de Copenhague (1869-1877), il s'installe à Berlin en 1881 et co-fonde le futur fameux Orchestre de Berlin où, pendant plus d'une dizaine d'années, il tient les postes de flûte solo et de chef assistant ménageant une place confortable à la musique de son temps. Il reviendra à Copenhague, en 1893, et prendra la direction de l'Orchestre du Palais royal, une maladie de la langue l'obligeant à abandonner son instrument.

Tant au Danemark qu'en Allemagne, il jouissait d'une notoriété remarquable mais la dure loi de l'oubli opéra également à son encontre tant et si bien qu'il ne reste rien ou pas grand-chose de ses activités dans la mémoire collective du monde musical.

Benjamin Bilse

Le Maître de chapelle, directeur musical et compositeur allemand Johann Ernst Benjamin Bilse est né le 17 août 1816 à Liegnitz, en Silésie (aujourd'hui Legnica, en Pologne), et est mort dans la même ville le 13 juillet 1902.

Benjamin Bilse apprend son métier à l'École de musique municipale au sein de laquelle il se forme à la pratique de tous les instruments de l'orchestre. À Vienne, il prend des leçons auprès du célèbre violoniste Josef Böhm et joue dans l'Orchestre de Johann Strauß, père. En 1842, il est nommé Maître de chapelle de la ville de Liegnitz. En 1867, il crée l'Orchestre Bilse au « Berliner Konzerthaus » de la « Leipzigerstraße » de Berlin. C'est là que sont donnés les légendaires « Bilse-Konzerte » (il y en aura plus de 3,000) immortalisés par Adolph Menzel dans un tableau datant de 1871. Des tournées de concerts entraînent les musiciens dans toute l'Europe : Saint-Pétersbourg, Riga, Varsovie, Amsterdam et Vienne et, en 1867, Paris, à l'occasion de l'Exposition universelle où Johann Strauß, fils, dirige la valse du « Beau Danube bleu ». Parmi les grands virtuoses qui composent l'Orchestre, on trouve notamment César Thomson, en 1879, et le 1er violon Eugène Ysaÿe, en 1880.

En 1882, un différend avec les musiciens conduit Joachim Andersen, Ludwig von Brenner et 52 autres, parmi les meilleurs, à se séparer de Bilse. Ils fondent l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. Bilse ne reste pas inactif et crée immédiatement un nouvel orchestre.

Benjamin Bilse a composé de nombreuses Valses, Polkas, Quadrilles et Marches dont 42 ont été publiées.

...

The German conductor and composer Benjamin Bilse was born on 17 August 1816 in Liegnitz (present-day Legnica), in the Prussian Silesia Province, and died on 13 July 1902. He obtained a rich musical education, as at the Vienna Conservatory under violinist Joseph Böhm, and played in the orchestra of Johann Strauß I. He returned to Liegnitz where he became municipal « Kapellmeister » in 1842.

From 1867, he regularly performed with the « Bilse'sche Kapelle » (Bilse's Band) at the « Konzerthaus » on « Leipzigerstraße », in Berlin. The Orchestra became increasingly popular, Bilse toured Europe and gave guest concerts in Saint-Petersburg, Riga, Warsaw, Amsterdam, Vienna, as well as at the 1867 Exposition universelle in Paris, where his band performed « the Blue Danube » together with Johann Strauß II. In 1873, Richard Wagner conducted the Orchestra in the presence of Emperor Wilhelm I.

After a fierce quarrel with Bilse about another 4th class concert trip to Warsaw, 54 musicians split, in 1882, to found the « Former Bilse's Band » under conductorship of Ludwig von Brenner, shortly afterwards renamed Berlin Philharmonic, today one of the world's leading Orchestras. Bilse retired a few years later and returned to Liegnitz, where he also died.

...

Benjamin Bilse learned his craft from the bottom up. Born in 1816, in the Silesian town of Liegnitz, received his training as a town musician at the age of 14, during the course of which he learned « the practical handling of almost all orchestral instruments ». He then set-out into the world, including to Vienna, where he played violin in the orchestra of Johann Strauß, the elder. In 1842, he returned to his home-town, where he conducted the town band. Bilse proved to be a good conductor and marketing strategist. He improved his ensemble's artistic standard, ensured that young people were qualified to play with them by giving gifted young people without means music lessons free of charge, and toured extensively with his orchestra.

When he left Liegnitz, in 1865, because the town council intended to reduce the musicians' fees, the orchestra had already borne his name for a long time : « Bilsesche Kapelle ». In 1867, Benjamin Bilse and his musicians took-up residence in Berlin and became both an artistic and a society institution with the concerts they held daily in the « Konzerthaus » at « Leipzigerstraße » during the winter season. People went to Bilse to hear good music, but also to initiate marriages. Bilse made use of various programme structures, catering to both intellectual and popular taste. Besides works of great Masters and popular pieces, he enjoyed presenting the creations of young, unknown composers.

The secession of the 54 founding members of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in 1882 was a major professional setback for him. Though he did put together a new orchestra, he left Berlin 3 years later, returning to his native town of Liegnitz, where he died in 1902.

Hermann Wolff

Hermann Wolff, who was born in Cologne, in 1845, and lived in Berlin from the age of 10, combined various talents in one : entrepreneurial spirit, business acumen and musicality. He had excellent contacts, knew many artists and had a sure feeling for promising composers. In short, he possessed all the prerequisites to become one of the most important and influential concert agents of his day. In 1880, he opened his own « Concert Bureau » in Berlin ; from then on, he dominated the music market of the time. No one else in his line of work had so many innovative ideas and such entrepreneurial spirit.

The Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra also profited from his business acumen. Not just that Hermann Wolff procured the most famous soloists and best conductors of his day for them, as well as engaging the services of Hans von Bülow and Arthur Nikisch as musical heads of the subscription concerts he mounted, he was constantly showing the Orchestra new ways out of existential crises. His « Philharmonic dinners » were legendary : Sunday meals to which he and his wife Luise, who had been an actress, invited the most important musical personages to their home. When Hermann Wolff, who had been so restless and driven, died surprisingly at the age of 56, on 3 February 1902, Luise Wolff took-over the concert agency and managed it as he would have done.

Erich Sachs joined the business as a partner during the First World War. The agency continued to dominate the market. The end came for the Jewish company when the National-Socialists seized power. Luise Wolff initiated the liquidation process in 1934, in order not to be subject to the repressive measures of the new rulers. She died in 1935 at the age of 80.

...

The German concert agent, journalist, and impresario Hermann Wolff was born on 4 September 1845 in Cologne and died on 3 February 1902 in Berlin.

The Wolff family was of Jewish ancestry and had lived in the Rhineland for many generations. In 1855, Hermann's father, a businessman, decided to move with his whole family to Berlin. Hermann was trained to follow his father into business, but his real passion had always been music and he was allowed to study the piano and music theory in his spare time. In order to supplement his income as a trader at the Berlin Stock Exchange, he began writing newspaper articles. When the Franco-Prussian War broke-out in 1870, Wolff was called-up and, because he was fluent in French, he was detailed as an interpreter for an army doctor treating wounded prisoners of war.

An early admirer of Richard Wagner's music, Wolff travelled to Bayreuth in 1872 to attend the laying of the foundation stone of the new Festival Theatre. While still continuing to do business on the Berlin Stock Exchange in the mornings, Wolff began to work for the music publishing firm of Bote & Bock. His new job involved gathering musical news from English, German, French, and Italian newspapers and condensing these into brief summaries. In 1875, he met the young Austrian-born actress Louise Schwarz (1855-1935) , and they were married 3 years later. They had 2 daughters, Edith and Lili ; and a son, Werner, who became a conductor.

During one of his visits to Berlin, in 1880, Anton Rubinstein happened to tell Hugo Bock (the head of Bote & Bock,

who were the publishers of his works in Germany) that he was looking for a reliable assistant to organize his forthcoming concert tour to Spain and Portugal. Bock recommended Wolff, and the latter travelled to Spain in December to familiarize himself with the local conditions. Rubinstein's tour of Spain began in January 1881 and took him and Wolff, who acted as his manager and press secretary, to the following cities : Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia, Toledo, Seville, Cordoba, Granada, Jerez, and Cadiz. Spanish audiences were not well-versed in the Classical repertoire, but they welcomed the great pianist with open arms and styled him « Don Antonio » . Rubinstein was greatly impressed by Wolff's efforts and invited him to accompany him on his tour of Great Britain that summer.

Already before travelling to Spain with Rubinstein, Wolff had started to offer his services to other musicians (such as Sophie Menter) , carrying-out negotiations on their behalf with concert-hall managers in various countries. Then, in 1880, he set-up his own agency in Berlin, the « Concert Direction Hermann Wolff » . Its activities included organizing concerts on behalf of musicians, or on Wolff's own initiative, as well as securing engagements for them. Very soon, such venerable societies as the « Leipzig Gewandhaus » and the « Frankfurt Museums-gesellschaft » were enlisting the services of Wolff's agency to engage guest soloists and conductors, attracted by his wide-ranging international contacts. Because the firm's telegraphic address was MUSIKWOLFF-BERLIN, its founder was given the nickname of « Musikwolff » . There was nothing rapacious about his business dealings, though, as he generously supported both established and upcoming artists and was willing to take risks for them.

In 1882, when the members of Benjamin Bille's orchestra in Berlin (an ensemble whose concerts were very popular and had often featured Tchaïkovsky's works) fell-out with their conductor, Wolff stepped in and re-organized the players under the new name of « Philharmonic Orchestra » . The Orchestra's 1st conductors, among them Karl Klindworth, were unable to attract sufficiently large audiences, however, and the Berlin Philharmonic Society decided to dissolve itself in 1887. Wolff again intervened to save the Orchestra, taking over its financial management. Most importantly, he got in touch with Hans von Bülow (whom he had known since 1880, when he organized his recital tour to Scandinavia) and persuaded him to accept the post of principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic. Bülow's 1st concert with the Orchestra, on 21 October 1887, heralded the swift rise of Berlin to become the most important music centre in Germany (surpassing Leipzig) . Wolff played a vital role in this, thanks to his association with Bülow and his enterprising spirit. Thus, he had a new concert venue built in Berlin : the Bechstein Hall, which was designed for chamber music concerts and solo recitals. The Hall was inaugurated in October 1892 with a series of recitals given in the course of that month by Bülow, Johannes Brahms with the Joachim Quartet, and Anton Rubinstein.

Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovsky met Hermann and Louise Wolff in Berlin, in January 1888, during his 1st concert tour to Western Europe. He enjoyed their warm hospitality on this and subsequent visits to the German capital. Wolff's daughter, Edith, later recalled that meeting Tchaïkovsky was for her father « one of the most interesting encounters of his life, which was so rich in acquaintances with individuals of genius. My mother said of Tchaïkovsky, when he visited her in Berlin soon afterwards, that he was the most delightful and charming guest she had ever welcomed to her house » . Wolff and his associate, Hermann Fernow, organized Tchaïkovsky's concert tours of Germany, Switzerland and America during the late- 1880's and early 1890's.

Hans von Bülow's death in 1894 was a bitter blow for Wolff, but he rallied his spirits and set about looking for

someone worthy of succeeding Bülow at the helm of the Berlin Philharmonic. This was to be Arthur Nikisch, whose 1st concert with the Orchestra, on 14 October 1895, featured Tchaïkovsky's Symphony No. 5, a work that Nikisch was championing across Europe. Wolff organized the Berlin Philharmonic's tours under Nikisch to Russia, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Switzerland, and France. In 1896, Emperor Wilhelm II appointed Wolff to head the delegation of German musicians who attended the Coronation festivities in Moscow for Nicholas II, the new Tsar of Russia.

Many renowned composers and musicians visited Hermann and Louise Wolff's house in Berlin, especially in conjunction with the so-called « Philharmonic dinners » given there on Sunday afternoons after rehearsals with the Philharmonic Orchestra. In some cases, these musicians became close friends of the family. Apart from Anton Rubinstein and Tchaïkovsky, another notable guest was Brahms, who once sang his « Wiegenlied » for little Edith.

Hermann Wolff died on 3 February 1902, aged just 56. All the leading German newspapers hastened to pay tribute to his untiring efforts in turning Berlin into one of the music capitals of the world. Nikisch conducted the Philharmonic Orchestra at a concert held in his memory.

After Hermann Wolff's death, his widow Louise took charge of the concert agency, and she was soon popularly known as « Königin Louise » (in allusion to the beloved Queen of Prussia during the Napoleonic Wars) because of the way she dominated music life in Berlin. She continued her husband's close collaboration with Arthur Nikisch and the Philharmonic Orchestra, as well as inviting many foreign artists, including Serguei Rachmaninoff and Fedor Chaliapin, to perform in Berlin. When her loyal assistant Hermann Fernow died in 1917, Louise had to look for a new associate and eventually chose Erich Sachs, the owner of a smaller concert agency. A merger took place, and the firm was now known as the « Concert Direction Wolff & Sachs », although Louise continued to exercise sole responsibility for the Berlin Philharmonic's concerts. After Nikisch's death, in 1923, she established a good relationship with his young successor, Wilhelm Fürtwängler, with whom she jointly drew-up the Orchestra's programmes. One highlight of Louise's last years was her organization of Yehudi Menuhin's triumphant début in Berlin on 12 April 1929, a few days before the boy's 13th birthday.

Very soon after Adolf Hitler came to power in January 1933, it became clear that the days of the concert agency founded by Hermann Wolff were numbered. Thus, the Nazi government prohibited Bruno Walter from conducting a scheduled concert with the Berlin Philharmonic. Shortly afterwards, Louise's associate Erich Sachs emigrated from Germany, and the firm again came to be known by the old name of « Concert Direction Hermann Wolff ». But already, by the end of 1934, Louise had decided to dissolve the agency, since she realized that her daughters, Edith and Lili, on account of their Jewish ancestry, would not be allowed to carry on their work for the family firm undisturbed. When she announced her decision, in April 1935, many famous musicians wrote to Louise to express their sadness over the loss of this institution. A few weeks later, on 25 June 1935, Louise herself died.

Edith and Lili still remained proprietors of the Bechstein Hall built by their father, but the Nazis forced them to remove the busts of Anton Rubinstein and Josef Joachim from the foyer (they had been erected there by Hermann Wolff alongside those of Bülow and Brahms, to commemorate the 4 great musicians who inaugurated the Concert Hall, in 1892) . Detectives sent by the « Reichsmusikkammer » ransacked the offices of Edith and Lili in 1936 and carried

away many valuable documents (letters, autographs, programme notes) in which the whole fruitful history of the « Concert Direction Hermann Wolff » was reflected. In 1942, Edith was interned in the concentration camp of Theresienstadt (« Terezín ») , but, unlike some of her friends who were later deported to Auschwitz, she survived the war.

In 1954, Edith published a very interesting book : « Wegbereiter großer Musiker » (Path-breakers for Great Musicians) , in which she gave an account of the activities of her father's concert agency, replete with lively anecdotes about the composers and musicians whom her parents had worked with.

...

Mais pourquoi, demanderez-vous fort judicieusement, vous entretenir de cet « Ancien Orchestre Bilsé » ? Le 4 juin de cette même année 1882, l'Orchestre (qui jouait jusque-là dans des salles avec tables et chaises, comme un « juke-box » géant) s'installa dans une ancienne patinoire transformée en salle de concerts, avec fauteuils sans table ; la patinoire s'appellerait dorénavant : la « Philharmonie » .

Article du 4 juin 1882 dans le « Berliner Tageblatt » : « La patinoire surnommée " Skating Rink ", qui, dès l'automne, ne doit plus servir qu'à un usage artistique et qui sera dûment remaniée à cet effet, perd son ancien nom assez peu musical et sera rebaptisée " Philharmonie ". Les " Philharmoniker ", comme s'appellera désormais l' " Ancien Orchestre Bilsé ", y seront rattachés. » . C'est là l'acte de baptême de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin, les « Berliner Philharmoniker » .

Programme du 1er concert de l' « Ancien Orchestre Bilsé » après sa sécession, le 5 mai 1882, dans la salle de la « Sing-Akademie » :

Beethoven, « les Ruines d'Athènes » et la création de « Schwestertreue » (Fidélité sororale) d'Arno Kleffel. Suit une courte tournée de l'Orchestre à travers l'Allemagne du Nord (Magdebourg, le 6 mai ; Braunschweig, le 7 en matinée ; Schöningen, le 7 au soir ; Brême, du 8 au 12) , avant qu'il ne prenne ses quartiers d'été provisoires au Flora de Charlottenbourg, à Berlin, un gigantesque établissement d'attractions avec palmeraie, zoo humain, tableaux vivants, et une salle de spectacles.

Le concert du 5 août 1882, sous la direction de Ludwig von Brenner, comporte : l'Ouverture de Phèdre (1876) de Jules Massenet ; une Marche de Franz Schubert, orchestrée par Franz Liszt ; un extrait d'un Quatuor à cordes de Ludwig van Beethoven, joué par toutes les cordes ; une Polonaise de Liszt (à la demande du public !) , orchestrée par Franz Müller ; entracte ; la Ire Symphonie de Beethoven ; entracte ; Ouverture Coriolan de Beethoven ; 4e Concerto de d'Henri Vieuxtemps et l'interlude de l'Opéra « Lohengrin » de Richard Wagner. Ce programme est redonné tous les soirs jusqu'au 4 septembre.

Le 12 août, il sera couronné d'un brillant feu d'artifice tiré par célèbre funambule Blondin, celui-là même qui traversa plusieurs fois sur un fil les Chutes du Niagara : les yeux bandés, poussant une brouette, et même en transportant un

réchaud sur lequel il se fit cuire une omelette à mi-chemin. L'affiche insiste bien sur cette attraction, tout aussi importante, semble-t-il, que le concert lui-même !

1er programme du Philharmonique de Berlin sous ce nom, le 17 octobre 1882 :

Ludwig van Beethoven : Ouverture « Leonore III » ; Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovski : Andante d'un Quatuor (joué par toutes les cordes) ; « Non più mesta » : variations pour violon de Niccolò Paganini ; Ouverture des « Maîtres-chanteurs » de Richard Wagner ; entracte ; Ouverture du « Roi Manfred » de Carl Reinecke ; « Carnaval russe » : fantaisie pour flûte et orchestre de Cesare Ciardi ; Nocturne de Frédéric Chopin pour violoncelle et harpe ; Antonín Dvořák : Rapsodie slave n° 2 ; entracte ; Gioachino Rossini : Ouverture de « Guillaume Tell » ; création de la « Danse suédoise » de Louis Théodore Gouvy ; Polonaise en mi de Franz Liszt, orchestrée par Franz Müller.

Un programme très éclectique, destiné à accompagner le repas de Ire qualité à 1,50 Mark : soupe, poisson ou légumes (!), rôti, compote, fromage ou entremets, bière locale pour 20 Pfennig. Pour son concert de baptême, le Philharmonique de Berlin a donc servi d'orchestre d'accompagnement à des agapes. Il était quand même interdit de se servir des tables comme garde-robe, et les portes devaient rester fermées pendant l'exécution des morceaux. Pour ne pas déranger la musique, ou les dîneurs.

Les Ires années seront difficiles et l'Orchestre manque plusieurs fois de disparaître.

En 1887, Hermann Wolff devient le gestionnaire financier de la Philharmonie de Berlin. Il engage le très estimé chef d'orchestre Hans von Bülow pour succéder au chef fondateur, Ludwig von Brenner. Bülow est considéré par la plupart des musicologues comme le 1er chef d'orchestre de métier, poste qu'il conservera jusqu'en 1895. Hans von Bülow fut un ami de Franz Liszt, Johannes Brahms et Richard Wagner. Il dirigea la première mondiale de nombreuses œuvres majeures de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, souvent en présence des compositeurs. Brahms lui dit que ses interprétations correspondaient exactement à ce qu'il avait composé. Dès lors, l'Orchestre devient rapidement célèbre.

Les programmes de cette période nous montrent que l'Orchestre n'était constitué que de 46 musiciens (en deçà de l'idéal wagnérien de 64) .

17 octobre 1882 : La Philharmonie de Berlin donne son 1er concert.

4 décembre 1882 : Le soliste (violoniste) Pablo de Sarasate est invité par la Philharmonie de Berlin.

4 janvier 1884 : La Philharmonie de Berlin crée la 3e Symphonie de Johannes Brahms.

28 janvier 1884 : Brahms joue son 1er Concerto pour piano avec la Philharmonie de Berlin.

1er février 1886 : La Philharmonie de Berlin crée la 4e Symphonie de Brahms.

8 février 1888 : Tchaïkovski dirige un concert de la Société philharmonique de Berlin.

14 octobre 1895 : Sur le conseil de Franz Liszt, Arthur Nikisch prend la relève comme chef permanent. Il va dominer la vie musicale en Allemagne jusqu'à sa mort en 1922, faisant de l'Orchestre le plus prestigieux au monde un ensemble de très haute qualité artistique. (Au moment de sa nomination, Nikisch sera aussi appelé à conduire la destinée de l'Orchestre du « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig.)

En 1898, on greffera à l' « Alte Philharmonie » la « Beethovensaal » conçue selon les plans du Commissaire royal de l'urbanisme, Ludwig Heim. Cette 2e salle de concert sera érigée sur le terrain de la grande cour intérieure, jusqu'alors occupée par un jardin que fréquentent assidûment les résidents des maisons de la « Bernauerstraße » et de la rue voisine, la « Köthenerstraße » .

L' « Alte Philharmonie » se trouvait cachée derrière des bâtiments résidentiels à plusieurs étages. La « Bernauerstraße » ne jouissait d'aucune place publique d'envergure. D'ailleurs, le site n'était pas le résultat d'une planification urbaine comme ce sera le cas, en 1911, pour le nouveau théâtre de divertissement de l' « Admiralspalast » , érigé sur la « Friedrichstraße » . (Ce qui explique probablement pourquoi aucune photo extérieure de l'ensemble n'existe.)

La Philharmonie de Berlin sera ensuite dirigée successivement par Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1922-1944) , Leo Borchard (1945) , Sergiù Celibidache (1945-1952) et, de nouveau (de retour du purgatoire de dénazification) , Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1952-1954) . Parmi les chefs invités prestigieux, citons : Hans Richter, Felix Weingartner, Richard Strauß, Gustav Mahler, Johannes Brahms et Edvard Grieg.

14 décembre 1917 : Wilhelm Fürtwängler se trouve, pour la 1re fois, à la tête de la Philharmonie de Berlin pour un concert dédié à la musique de Richard Strauß et Richard Wagner.

25 mars 1922 : Fürtwängler dirige pour la 1re fois la Philharmonie de Vienne dans un concert célébrant le 25e anniversaire de la mort de Brahms.

29 mars 1922 : Fürtwängler aboutit à la conclusion de son contrat avec la Philharmonie de Berlin.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler succède au chef Hans von Bülow en 1922. La conjonction entre l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et Wilhelm Fürtwängler est très souvent considérée comme le sommet de l'histoire de l'Orchestre et même de toute l'histoire de la direction orchestrale. Klaus Geitel raconte, à ce propos, dans son histoire de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin :

« L'autorité musicale de Fürtwängler, la conscience qu'il avait de son propre charisme, son art expressif parvenu à un niveau extrêmement élevé firent de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin le vicaire terrestre de la musique symphonique occidentale. L'idéalisme allemand y trouva, ainsi, son compte puisqu'il cultivait continuellement une telle préoccupation de grandeur. Les membres du Philharmonique de Berlin semblaient faire plus que de la musique ; ils

donnaient l'impression de jouer pour exprimer une conception du monde, la " Weltanschauung " des philosophes. »

9 octobre 1922 : Fürtwängler donne son 1er concert à titre de chef titulaire de la Philharmonie de Berlin avec au programme la 7e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner.

La crise de 1929 fit échouer le principe de Société à responsabilité limitée et aggrava la situation financière de l'Orchestre. En 1933, l'Orchestre joua une nouvelle fois la carte du nationalisme, faisant ainsi le jeu du nouveau ministre de l'Instruction populaire et de la Propagande, Josef Gœbbels, dans sa lutte contre le ministère de l'Intérieur.

Il est enfin un dernier domaine où l'exigence idéologique et politique d'une exaltation de certaines valeurs musicales joua : le choix des chefs d'orchestre et des solistes. En mars 1933, avant la transformation en « Reichsorchester », les Nazis n'interdirent pas un concert de Bruno Walter mais mirent en gardent contre de possibles perturbations et l'impossibilité pour l'État d'assurer le service d'ordre, et proposèrent de remplacer Walter par un chef moins « controversé ». Walter annula lui-même le concert et fut remplacé par Richard Strauß paré dès lors de l'image du « sauveur » .

La même méthode fut utilisée contre Otto Klemperer (autre chef d'orchestre juif) , remplacé par Carl Schuricht, l'un des représentants de cette génération de brillants chefs d'orchestre qui se firent un nom durant la période nazie : Eugen Jochum, Hermann Abendroth, Karl Böhm, Clemens Krauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Herbert von Karajan. Très peu de chefs mineurs dirigèrent l'Orchestre à la suite d'un « lobbying » personnel acharné ou d'intrigues politiques.

Reste le cas Wilhelm Fürtwängler, la véritable « star » de l'Orchestre, dont la figure domine le livre de Misha Aster. Il n'y apparaît pas comme quelqu'un qui était idéologiquement proche des Nazis mais comme un homme « qui croyait vraiment au pouvoir transcendant de la musique » et estimait que « la véritable mission de l'art » était « d'élever l'humanité au-dessus d'une réalité morcelée ». Néanmoins, il sous-estimait gravement la portée de la rupture instaurée par Adolf Hitler. Confronté aux empiètements de l'idéologie, Fürtwängler réagit en luttant pour préserver les acquis, pour défendre sa liberté artistique et donc l'autonomie de son Orchestre. Cependant, les Nazis ne lui concédaient ces avantages qu'en échange de la légitimation de leurs conceptions pernicieuses ». (pages 258-259) Dans cette partie d'échecs avec les Nazis, Fürtwängler joua habilement de son prestige. En 1934, il devait diriger la création de « Mathis le peintre », Opéra de Paul Hindemith, à l'Opéra d'État de Berlin. Considéré comme une œuvre dissidente, l'Opéra fut interdit. Fürtwängler démissionna de ses fonctions. Il ne fut plus jamais le chef principal officiel du Philharmonique de Berlin, mais il s'était rendu indispensable, de nombreux mélomanes ayant exigé le remboursement de leurs abonnements aux séries de concerts philharmoniques qu'il dirigeait. Les Nazis lui demandèrent de revenir, mais il dirigea dorénavant de l'extérieur, avec les honoraires d'un chef invité. Ce geste facilita sa posture visant à s'abstenir autant que possible de diriger des concerts liés de trop près au « NSDAP », même s'il y eut des exceptions. Fürtwängler utilisa souvent ses relations personnelles avec Josef Gœbbels au profit de l'Orchestre (en défendant des artistes juifs, par exemple, ou en négociant des contrats) et à son profit, dans un contexte de favoritisme généralisé et de rivalités entre Gœbbels et Hermann Göring.

En janvier 1934, le « Reich » obtint le monopole au sein de la GmbH, rachetant les parts des musiciens qui devinrent

des fonctionnaires, l'Orchestre devenant un « Reichsorchester » protégé par Goebbels (y compris contre les formations concurrentes protégées par Hermann Göring). Ainsi, par exemple, les efforts financiers (salaires, primes, retraites) et matériels (logements) furent faits pour engager et garder les meilleurs musiciens allemands, pour fournir à l'Orchestre les meilleurs instruments (beaucoup de pièces historiques venant de pillages), et, surtout, les musiciens obtinrent un statut les rendant non disponibles pour les obligations militaires, qui fut respecté jusqu'à la fin de la guerre. Le « Reich » versa des sommes colossales pour soutenir l'Orchestre ou, au moins, minimiser ses pertes, et l'Orchestre joua constamment la défense de son statut exceptionnel.

25 avril 1934 : Lors d'une tournée de la Philharmonie, Fürtwängler fait la rencontre de Benito Mussolini à Rome.

4 décembre 1934 : Fürtwängler se démet de toutes ses fonctions officielles (au « Berliner Philharmoniker », à la « Staatsoper » et à la « Reichsmusikkammer ») pour se retirer dans les Alpes bavaroises.

Le Philharmonique joua régulièrement devant la quasi-totalité de l'élite nazie, y compris Adolf Hitler, Josef Goebbels et Hermann Göring, ainsi que lors du congrès du NSDAP à Nuremberg en 1936, 1938 et 1939 et pour d'autres cérémonies officielles (Jeux Olympiques de Berlin de 1936 ; anniversaires d'Adolf Hitler à partir de 1937 ; Journées de l'art allemand ; concerts pour la « Hitlerjugend » ; concerts prônant « l'amitié entre les nations » avec des partenaires étrangers pour montrer en fait la supériorité des musiciens allemands), et enfin collaboration avec « Kraft durch Freude » (qui élargit le succès croissant de l'Orchestre, lui offrant, au-delà de son traditionnel public bourgeois, un public plus populaire) ou concerts dans des usines, pour la « Wehrmacht », pour la Croix-Rouge allemande et des organisations de charité (« Wintershilfewerk », par exemple), ainsi que des concerts radiodiffusés (émissions régulières contribuant à l'effort de guerre) à partir de 1939.

Sur la centaine de membres de l'Orchestre, Misha Aster estime à une vingtaine le nombre d'inscrits au « NSDAP » et à moins le nombre de Nazis convaincus, dont les tentatives pour réorganiser l'Orchestre selon les principes idéologiques nazis furent diversement couronnés de succès. Ainsi, la fusion avec le « Berliner Sinfonie-Orchester » fut-elle annulée en 1933, sous la pression de Wilhelm Fürtwängler, aboutissant au départ de membres du « NSDAP » et de vétérans de la guerre, alors que, selon un exclu « des étrangers et des Juifs restent dans l'Orchestre ». Fürtwängler fit tout pour garder les 4 membres juifs de l'Orchestre, qui partirent après que la formation devint un Orchestre d'État, et pour protéger les épouses juives de musiciens. La communauté des musiciens resta très silencieuse sur ces sujets. Entre 1933 et 1935, la direction annula les abonnements des mélomanes juifs. À partir de 1938, le Philharmonique fut représenté par Lorenz Höber, un « Vorstand » non nazi, principal responsable des activités de l'Orchestre, mais aussi par un conseil élu composé de musiciens membres du « NSDAP ». Pour Misha Aster, « dès sa création, la culture de l'Orchestre philharmonique avait privilégié la recherche d'un consensus réaliste. En un sens, c'est là l'essence même d'une communauté démocratique ; y compris quand elle cède à des extrémistes. L'essentiel restait de pouvoir faire de la musique à un niveau exceptionnel et dans un environnement à la fois protégé et créatif. Comme quelques années plus tôt face au destin de leurs collègues juifs, les musiciens de l'Orchestre, en 1937-1938, avaient encore une certaine liberté de choix, même limitée. En se pliant extérieurement aux exigences du Nazisme, ils pouvaient espérer s'attirer les bonnes grâces du régime et conserver leurs privilèges tout en sauvegardant ce qui subsistait des valeurs du " Gemeinschaftsgeist ". » (pages 98-99). À partir de la fin 1938, les musiciens durent prêter serment au « Führer »,

et, en 1939, sortit un nouveau règlement de service très autoritaire, conçu par l'Orchestre.

8 avril 1938 : Grâce au soutien de Hermann Göring, le jeune Herbert von Karajan est invité à diriger l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

21 octobre 1941 : Le chef Herbert von Karajan dirige un concert symphonique avec l'Orchestre de la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » .

14-16 décembre 1941 : Le chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirige la 4e Symphonie de Bruckner et les 3 lers mouvements de la 7e avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Ce concert est enregistré.

Février 1942 : Fürtwängler effectue une tournée en Suède avec la Philharmonie de Berlin.

22-24 mars 1942 : Fürtwängler dirige la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven avec le Philharmonique de Berlin,, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Ce concert fut enregistré. (CD : Archipel, Classica d'Oro, Music & Arts, Opus Kura, Tahra, SWF.)

25-26-28 octobre 1942 : Le chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirige l'Adagio de la 7e Symphonie et la 5e Symphonie de Bruckner (version de 1875-1876 et 1878, éditée par Robert Haas) avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Le concert est enregistré par la « Sender Freies » .

8-9 novembre 1942 : Fürtwängler dirige le 2e Concerto pour piano de Brahms avec Edwin Fischer et le Philharmonique de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Ce concert fut enregistré. (CD : Testament.)

7-8 février 1943 : Fürtwängler dirige le poème symphonique « En saga » (Opus 9) de Sibelius avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Ce concert fut enregistré. (CD : SWF.)

27-30 juin 1943 : Fürtwängler dirige l'Ouverture de « Coriolan » et les 4e et 5e Symphonies de Beethoven avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Ce concert fut enregistré. (CD de la 5e seulement : Classica d'Oro, DG, Music & Arts, Opus Kura, Tahra) .

31 octobre et 3 novembre 1943 : Fürtwängler dirige la 7e Symphonie de Beethoven avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, à l' « Alte Philharmonie » . Ce concert fut enregistré. (CD : Classica d'Oro, DG, Music & Arts, Opus Kura, SWF.)

Dans les dernières années de la guerre, se rendre à l' « Alte Philharmonie » n'était pas chose facile et, aux dires des musiciens eux-mêmes, les gens se demandaient s'ils n'allaient pas assister à leur dernier concert. Ces craintes étaient du reste tout à fait justifiées, puisque cette salle (tout comme le « Staatsoper » et l' « Admiralspalast ») a fini sous les bombes. Les concerts se déroulaient avec des interruptions fréquentes dues aux alertes nocturnes et contraignaient public et musiciens à attendre pour voir si la soirée pouvait continuer. On imagine certainement avec peine combien venir au concert, en ces instants, était un acte de foi, excluant toute autre motivation en dehors de l'art. Cette très forte tension a imprégné les performances artistiques du chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler, au point qu'il est aujourd'hui

difficile de les comprendre avec une grille interprétative habituelle. Sans doute est-ce là une marque de la puissance de l'art véritable, capable de soulever l'homme pour le libérer (ne fût-ce qu'un instant) de son ordinaire. Un idéal que le grand chef allemand a recherché toute sa vie.

Bombardement de l' « Alte Philharmonie »

30 janvier 1944 : L' « Alte Philharmonie » de Berlin, située sur la « Bernburgerstraße », est complètement détruite par un raid aérien (on utilise des bombes incendiaires au phosphore) dirigé par les forces Britanniques, coïncidant ainsi avec le 11^e anniversaire de l'accession d'Adolf Hitler comme Chancelier du « Reich ». L'Orchestre perd donc sa salle, ses archives, la plupart de ses instruments et presque toute sa bibliothèque musicale.

Les concerts, qui ont lieu l'après-midi, en raison des bombardements nocturnes, sont transférés à l' « Admiralspalast » ou à la « Beethoven-Saal » de la « Köthenerstraße » (juste à côté de l' « Alte Philharmonie ») qui, heureusement, n'aura pas été touchée.

Aujourd'hui, des immeubles résidentiels modernes (aux numéros 21, 22 et 23a de la « Bernauerstraße ») dans l'arrondissement de Kreuzberg, occupent le site de la mythique « Alte Philharmonie ». Une allée pour piétons entre 2 immeubles, pourvue d'une entrée stylisée en forme d'arche nous mène directement à un espace vert qui représente le point exact, comme en témoigne une plaque commémorative en fer, de forme carrée (environ 60 centimètres par 60 centimètres), qui orne le pavé uni. L'édifice de la « Berliner Technische Kunsthochschule » se trouve tout prêt, au 24 - 25 (10963), entre la « Dessauerstraße » et la « Köthenerstraße ».

Suite à la destruction de l' « Alte Philharmonie », les concerts symphoniques sont transférés au « Staatsoper » de Berlin jusqu'en 1945.

7-8 février 1944 : Fürtwängler dirige la 6^e Symphonie de Beethoven avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Staatsoper ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : SWF, Tahra.)

20-22 mars 1944 : Fürtwängler dirige l'Ouverture « Der Freischütz » de Weber, le Concerto Grosso n° 10 de Händel et les 2 Suites tirées du « Daphnis et Chloé » de Ravel avec la Philharmonie de Berlin au « Staatsoper ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : Melodiya pour Händel et Ravel ; SWF pour Weber.)

28 mars 1945 : Dernier concert de la Philharmonie de Berlin (avant la capitulation du 3^e « Reich ») dirigé par le chef Robert Heger. Au programme : la scène finale du « Götterdämmerung » de Richard Wagner. L'histoire de cet événement est raconté dans « The Philharmonic's darkest hour ».

Les concerts de la période de guerre sont relatés dans « Fürtwängler and the forgotten new music ».

Après la guerre, la Philharmonie de Berlin sera obligé d'investir des salles de moindre importance :

Le « Titania Palast »

Tour à tour, salle de cinéma (les Iers films présentés étaient muets mais accompagnés par un orchestre de 60 musiciens) ; salle de concert symphonique ; salle de « music-hall » ; et finalement centre commercial, le « Titania Palast » (sis au 5 de la « Schloßstraße ») aura traversé le XXe siècle berlinois et partagé sa gloire et ses vicissitudes.

25 mai 1947 : Fürtwängler dirige un programme tout Beethoven (dont la 5e Symphonie) avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Titania Palast ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD de la 5e : Tahra.)

27 octobre 1947 : Fürtwängler dirige les « Metamorphosen » de Richard Strauß avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Titania Palast ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : SWF.)

24 octobre 1948 : Fürtwängler dirige la 3e Suite pour orchestre de Jean-Sébastien Bach avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Titania Palast ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : Tahra.)

14-15 mars 1949 : Le chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirige la 8e Symphonie de Bruckner (version établie par Fürtwängler sur le texte de Robert Haas et les anciennes versions dont celle de 1892, éditée par Robert Lienau - coupure mesures 209 à 218 qui étaient ré-introduites par Haas dans l'Adagio et légères ré-orchestrations) avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, au « Titania Palast » (« Gemeindehaus Berlin-Dalhem ») . Le concert radio est enregistré par la « RIAS » ; sans public, le 15 mars.

18 octobre 1949 : Le chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirige la 7e Symphonie de Bruckner (version de 1885 avec des modifications du compositeur, éditée par Albert J. Gutmann) avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, au « Titania Palast » (« Gemeindehaus Berlin-Dalhem ») . Le concert est enregistré par la « RIAS » .

18 décembre 1949 : Fürtwängler dirige la 3e Symphonie de Brahms avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Titania Palast ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : « EMI » .)

10 février 1952 : Fürtwängler dirige la 1re Symphonie de Brahms avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Titania Palast ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : SWF, DG.)

23 mai 1954 : Fürtwängler dirige la 5e Symphonie de Beethoven avec la Philharmonie de Berlin, au « Titania Palast ». Le concert fut enregistré. (CD : Audite, Tahra.)

Le « Titania », une salle encore utilisable pouvant accueillir 2,000 personnes deviendra officiellement le « Centre Culturel » de Berlin. Elle accueillera le chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler et son Philharmonique. Le 1er Festival international du film de Berlin (« Berlinale ») va s'y dérouler en 1951.

Malgré plusieurs changements de chef, l'Orchestre réussira à poursuivre ses activités tout au long de la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Sur les conseils pressants d'Albert Speer, Wilhelm Fürtwängler (dont la vie est maintenant en danger) décide, en février 1945, de s'exiler vers la Suisse en attendant d'être jugé pour son attitude sous le régime nazi puisque toute apparition publique lui était alors interdite.

Un quasi-inconnu, le russe Lew Ljewitsch (Leo) Borchard va lui succéder au podium.

L' « Admiralspalast »

Le théâtre « Admiralspalast » est situé au 101-102 de la « Friedrichstraße » à Berlin (« Mitte ») . Ouvert en 1911, il va accueillir les représentations d'Opéra après le bombardement du « Staatsoper » , le 3 février 1945.

31 octobre 1879 : Création au « Theater an der Wien » de « Gräfin Dubarry » , opéra comique en 3 Actes de Carl Millöcker sur un livret de F. Zell et Richard Genée. L'Opérette sera remaniée par Theo Mackeben, pour la musique, et Paul Knepler et Ignaz Michaël Welleminsky, pour le livret. La re-création se fera sous le titre « Die Dubarry » , le 14 août 1931, à l' « Admiralspalast » . C'est cette version qui est la plus jouée de nos jours.

Octobre 1947 : 3 représentations de « Tristan und Isolde » de Richard Wagner dirigées par Wilhelm Fürtwängler à la tête de l'Orchestre du « Staatsoper » .

Ludwig Suthaus (Tristan) .

Gottlob Frick (King Marke) .

Ema Schlüter (Isolde) .

Jaro Prohaska (Kurwenal) .

Kurt Rehm (Melot) .

Margarete Klose (Brangäne) .

Gerhard Witting (Shepherd) .

Hasso Eschert (Steersman) .

Paul Schmidtman (Sailor) .

Acts 2 and 3 complete, with a cut in the performance of Scene 2 of Act 2 of the lines from « Dem Tage ! Dem Tage ! Dem ttikischen Tage » (Tristan) to « daß nachtsichtig mein Auge wahres zu sehen tauge » (Tristan) .

L'Opéra fut enregistré au complet. Rien du 1er Acte n'a survécu. Aujourd'hui, de larges extraits sont disponibles sur CD (Radio Years RY 103.04) .

Who would not have liked to be at the « Admiralspalast » in Berlin, temporary home of the « Berlin Staatsoper » , on 3 October 1947, whatever conditions in the city might have been ? Fürtwängler returned to his Operatic base to conduct « Tristan und Isolde » , with Frida Leider, no less, as producer. Maddeningly, only sections of the performance survive on tape (nothing of Act 1) , but enough to confirm what a great occasion it must have been. In the theatre Fürtwängler, as ever, gives a more dramatic reading than he did 5 years later in the studio, where his reading for the « EMI » label is a noble philosophical tract, while in the Opera House it is living theatre.

Nobody since has had the pulse of this work so firmly in his bones as Fürtwängler ; I defy anyone to listen to Act 2 from King Mark's monologue to the end without being deeply moved. However, many magnificent interpreters you may have heard, I urge you to hear Gottlob Frick, unrivalled in vocal terms and indescribably searing in his uncomprehending grief ; the passage from « Die kein Himmel erl Ost » to the end of Mark's outpouring is sung with an inward emotion that calls for the equally searing response given by the Tristan of Ludwig Suthaus, a favourite with this conductor and no wonder, since he must surely be the most complete interpreter of the part ever, here (like his conductor) even more involved than on the « EMI » studio performance. Fürtwängler himself never makes the present-day mistake of prolonging Mark's agony : the whole passage proceeds on a single line, the « Hauptstimme » to the fore.

Most of the opening scene of Act 2 survives, minus (sadly) the dousing of the light, as does the whole of the love duet apart from the traditional cut. Act 3, lacking the 1st scene after the Prelude between Tristan and Kurwenal, finds Suthaus's Tristan even more unsettling, more agonized than on « EMI » . As Isolde, Erna Schlüter is not, vocally speaking, in the Flagstad or Nilsson class, but she knows about words and in what is left of her part conveys all Isolde's elation, desire and eventually heartbreak. Listen to her soft-grained accent on the word « chele » at the start of what proves to be an elevated « Liebestod » . Margarete Klose is a generous-voiced, concerned Brangäne, Jaro Prohaska an aging Kurwenal. The sound is a shade restricted, distorts momentarily, and is disfigured by intrusive coughs, but it is good enough to enjoy (if that's the word in this context) an unforgettable experience.

Des concerts symphoniques par Fürtwängler et ses « Philharmoniker » seront également présentés à l' « Admiralspalast » :

After Fürtwängler's enthusiastic championing of Kurt Hessenberg's Concerto for Orchestra, the great Mæstro kept in close contact with the young composer, offering him advice and encouragement and being watchful of his artistic development. When Fürtwängler saw the score of the composer's 2nd Symphony, 4 years later, he became even more impressed than before, and expressed an overwhelming interest not only in presenting the World premiere of this work, but also in conducting it « everywhere I have an opportunity of doing so - primarily, that is, in Berlin and Vienna » . The bulk of the composition for this work was completed in 1943.

Fürtwängler's missive to Hessenberg on the 2d Symphony (English translation by Miriam Schmitthenner) :

21. V. 44

Dear Mr. Hessenberg,

The great expectations I was entertaining for your further career on the strength of the Concerto for Orchestra have not merely been completely fulfilled but, in fact, far exceeded by your Symphony, which I have now got to know. I shall be writing to you about it again at greater length shortly. Now, I just want to tell you it will give me particular pleasure to perform the work everywhere I have an opportunity of doing so - primarily, that is, in Berlin and Vienna. As I am committed to performing at the 1st Berlin concert a new work by Westermann which was cancelled in the spring owing to destruction of the « Philharmonie », your work will be put on at the 2nd concert - still early enough, I hope. I suppose that will be the premiere, won't it ? By then, will the material be ready ?

I really must congratulate you. You have left far behind you the modish non-descript semi-tonal style that is of interest to nobody but those who happen to be critics or publishers or have to do with such people.

Have you not written some chamber music, too, lately ? Could I get to know that as well ?

With best regards for today,
in haste, yours

Wilhelm Fürtwängler

Achleiten, Post Rohr an der Krems
Oberdonau (12b)

The premiere by Fürtwängler and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra took place, in spite of War-time difficulties, on December 10, 1944. The program was repeated the next day, at the « Admiralspalast » in Berlin.

11 décembre 1944 : Fürtwängler dirige la 2e Symphonie en la majeur, Opus 29 (1943) de Kurt Hessenberg (1908-1994) avec la Philharmonie de Berlin à l' « Admiralspalast » .

The critical reception was overwhelming in praise of the new work. The performance was recorded for broadcast, but the tape has never surfaced over the years and is presumed lost. Sadly, Fürtwängler's intention of further performances of the Symphony never came to fruition. The work received a 2nd interpretation by Otto Winkler, in 1947, in Koblenz. Besides these, the work's publisher Schott has no record of other performances, although it notes that its records from that period are far from being complete. Therefore, this Masterpiece may have lain dormant for more than half a Century.

12 décembre 1944 : Le chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirige la 8e Symphonie de Schubert et la 8e Symphonie de Bruckner avec le Philharmonique de Berlin, à l' « Admiralspalast » (« Gemeindehaus Berlin-Dalhem ») . Le concert est enregistré par la « Sender Freies » . (CD du 1er mouvement du Schubert : SWF.)

22-23 janvier 1945 : Fürtwängler dirige la Philharmonie de Berlin à l' « Admiralspalast » , au programme :

Mozart : Overture zu « Die Zauberflöte » .

Mozart : Symphonie Nr. 40 in G-Moll, KV 550.

Brahms : Symphonie Nr. I in C-Moll, Opus 68.

23 janvier 1945 : Dernier concert de Fürtwängler à Berlin avant son départ pour Vienne et sa fuite pour la Suisse. Il dirige l'Ouverture de « la Flûte enchantée » , la 40e Symphonie de Mozart, KV 550 (seulement les 2 1ers mouvements, sans doute à cause d'un raid aérien au même moment) , et la 1re Symphonie de Brahms avec la Philharmonie de Berlin à l' « Admiralspalast » . Le concert fut enregistré. (CD du 4e mouvement : SWF.)

It appears that the near miss in the Mozart Symphony was the final straw for Wilhelm Fürtwängler, because this concert was the last that he conducted in Wartime Berlin before fleeing to Switzerland via Vienna.

It is impossible to imagine what concert going was like for the audience and musicians at the time. On a 1944 British intelligence map used by Allied bomber airmen for their night raids, we can see that the « Admiralspalast » is in a vulnerable position : directly across the « Friedrichstraße » is a major railway terminus, to the East, the complex marked 14B is the Berlin military garrison's headquarters, while 53 to the West, on « Unter den Linden » , is the « Reich » Ministry of the Interior.

21 et 22 avril 1946 : L' « Admiralspalast » tient le Congrès fondateur du Parti socialiste unifié d'Allemagne, parti du pouvoir en Allemagne de l'Est jusqu'à la réunification.

...

Le légendaire lieu de spectacles des années '20 attire encore aujourd'hui les spectateurs grâce à son programme varié, proposant théâtre et concerts, comédies musicales et soirées : l' « Admiralspalast » fut ré-ouvert en 2006, après une importante rénovation, et propose dans plusieurs lieux de manifestation des divertissements variés sous un même toit.

Dans la grande salle du théâtre, de grandes productions de comédies musicales célèbrent régulièrement des succès honorables. « L'opéra de quat' sous » de Bertolt Brecht mis-en-scène par Klaus Maria Brandauer, avec Campino, le chanteur des « Toten Hosen » dans le rôle de « Mackie, le Surineur » , a ouvert la nouvelle saison de ce théâtre traditionnel. Ont suivi des temps forts tels que « My Fair Lady » , « The Rocky Horror Show » et, à l'été 2009, la comédie-culte controversée de Mel Brooks, « The Producers » .

Les concerts et les comédies ont aussi une place bien méritée dans la grande salle. Des artistes tels que Max Raabe (et son « Palast Orchester ») ou Helge Schneider reviennent régulièrement sur la scène de l' « Admiralspalast » pour captiver le public berlinois avec leurs nouveaux programmes.

La musique prend aussi de plus en plus d'importance à l' « Admiralspalast ». On peut y entendre tout un éventail musical, de la légende de la « soul Solomon Burke » en passant par Jan Delay jusqu'aux nouvelles découvertes de la scène locale. De temps à autre, on rabat les chaises de la grande salle du théâtre - on y danse et on y fait la fête jusqu'au petit matin.

...

(Friedrichstraße 101, 10117 Berlin, + 49 30 47997499.)

The « Admiralspalast » Theatre, in the Mitte district of Berlin, is located on « Friedrichstraße Nr. 101 ». Opened in 1910, it is one of the few preserved variety venues of the pre-World War II era in the city.

As a place of amusement, the « Admiralspalast » originally included a skating rink, a public bath, bowling alleys, a café and a cinema, open day and night. After World War I, it turned to a revue theatre, starting with the show « Drunter und drüber » by Walter Kollo, later continued by the performance of Operettas.

As the building suffered little damage from World War II bombing, it was home to the « Berlin Staatsoper » until the reconstruction of the Opera House, in 1955. On 21-22 April 1946, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Germany, in the Soviet occupation zone, held a convention at the « Admiralspalast » where they merged to become the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

...

The « Admiralspalast » can look back on a more than 100 years old moving history, coined by different cultural influences and historical developments.

Whether an « Eisarena » (Ice arena) , a « Revuetheater » (Revue theatre) or an « Operettenhaus » (Operetta house) , the « Admiralspalast » stood and stands always synonym for the cultural and amusement frenzy of Berlin.

In 1873, an artesian salt water spring is uncovered by chance in the middle of downtown Berlin during construction work at « Friedrichstraße Nr. 101-102 », the grounds of the former « Admiral's Quarters ». With its opening, the « Admiralsgartenbad » becomes one of Berlin's 1st public baths. It is built by the architects Walter Kyllmann and Adolf Heyden, who found a company specifically for the purpose, the « Admiralsgartenbad Aktiengesellschaft » .

1889-1890 : The « Admiralsgartenbad » is expanded into a 3 story bath facility designed by the government architect

Carl Gause. With its remodeling, the bath boasts being « Europe's most modern » and one of the 1st in Berlin.

1911 : After the « Admiralsgartenbad » is pulled down and a new building raised on the « Friedrichstraße Nr. 101 » property, the « Admiralspalast » opens on April 20 as a « new, cosmopolitan etablissement » . Beneath the roof of the « Admiralspalast » (one of the very 1st amusement palaces) are now an ice skating rink, the 2,600 square meter exclusive Russian-Roman luxury thermal baths, opened day and night, a Roman café, 4 bowling alleys, and a plush cinema. Ice hockey games and boxing matches are also held in the great hall.

1913 : The « Admiralspalast » is the world's only ice palace.

1922 : Conversion to « world vaudeville » in « Art Déco » style, designed by Oskar Kaufmann and Richard Wolfenstein.

1923 : The Operetta director Herrmann Haller is named the new director. The theatre is remodeled as a revue theatre and is given the name « Theater im Admiralspalast » .

1939 : Fusion with the « Metropoltheater » in Behrenstraße (today, the home of the « Komische Oper ») under Heinz Hentschke.

1939 : By order of « Reichsminister » Josef Gæbbels, remodeling of the theatre into a « festively appealing recreation center » begins on December 20.

1941 : A « “ Führer ” ’s loge » is built into the center of the 1st balcony.

1944 : On September 1, all Berlin theatres are closed by order of the NSDAP Party due to the declaration of (« Total War - Shortest War » (« Totaler Krieg - Kürzester Krieg ») on August.

1945 : The « Berlin Deutsche Staatsoper » moves into the « Admiralspalast » and uses it as an interim location until 1955. On August 23, the 1st season is opened with a gala concert.

21-22 April 1946 : During the « Party Union Congress » at the « Admiralspalast » , the German Communist Party and the Socialist Democratic Party are forcibly merged to make the « Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands » (SED) . The hand-shake between Otto Grotewohl and Wilhelm Pieck takes place in the Grand Hall.

3 October 1947 : The Jewish virtuoso violinist Yehudi Menuhin plays Richard Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » in the Grand Hall of the the « Admiralspalast » .

1948 : Bertolt Brecht participates with Helene Weigel in a peace rally in the « Admiralspalast » sponsored by the Cultural Association of the German Democratic Republic (« GDR ») .

24 March 1950 : With a formal ceremony in the « Admiralspalast », the « GDR » founds the German Academy of Arts (« DAK ») in East-Berlin.

1953 : The cabaret « Die Distel » is opened in the former « casino / cinema », in the front house of the « Admiralspalast » .

1955 : On December 21, the « METROPOL-Theater im Admiralspalast » is opened with Johann Strauß' Operetta « Die Fledermaus » . Besides Classic Operettas, the Operetta and musical theatre presents Broadway musicals.

The « GDR Presse-Café » is installed in the « Admiralspalast » 's front building. It becomes the place for the « GDR » 's bohemia to meet.

...

Die Admiralspalast Aktien-Gesellschaft wurde im Jahre 1909 gegründet. Gegenstand des Unternehmens war die Nutzung und Verwertung der eigenen Grundstücke Friedrichstraße 101 und 102 und Prinz Louis-Ferdinand-Straße 10. Die Geschichte der auf dem Grundstück errichteten Gebäude war und ist ein Stück Kulturgeschichte Berlins. Auf den Grundstücken wurde bereits im Jahre 1873-1874 nach den Plänen der Baumeister Kylmann & Heyden das Admiralsgartenbad errichtet, das im Jahre 1887 umgebaut und erweitert wurde, weil an dieser Stelle eine starke Solequelle entdeckt wurde. Im Gebäude befanden sich nach diesem Umbau eine Schwimmhalle, ein Salonbad, 62 Wannenbäder erster und zweiter Klasse, 2 elektrische Bäder, ein russisch-römisches Bad, eine Naturheilstätte sowie 41 Solebäder.

Der Admiralspalast - das Theater Im Jahre 1910 wurde das Admiralsgartenbad nochmals erweitert, es entstanden ein Cafe, Kino, Eisarena und Luxusbad. Nach Plänen der Architekten Cremer und Wolfenstein wurde im Jahre 1922 die Eisarena in ein Theater umgebaut.

Wie durch ein Wunder wurde das Gebäude des Admiralspalastes im 2. Weltkrieg nur wenig beschädigt, so daß auch heute noch die architektonisch reich geschmückte Fassade zur Friedrichstraße, aber auch die rückwärtige Fassade zur Planckstraße bewundert werden können. Der sich im Gebäude befindende intakte und repräsentative Saal wurde nach 1945 sowohl von der sowjetischen Besatzungsmacht als auch von den deutschen Behörden für politische und kulturelle Veranstaltungen genutzt. Auf Initiative des sowjetischen Militärkommandanten Bersarin diente gleich nach Beendigung des Krieges der Admiralspalast als Spielstätte für die Staatsoper, deren Gebäude durch Bombentreffer nicht mehr benutzbar waren. Am 23.08.1945 fand das große Eröffnungskonzert statt, zwei Wochen später wurde Glucks « Orpheus und Eurydike » aufgeführt. Zehn Jahre spielte die Staatsoper im Admiralspalast und brachte insgesamt 59 Inszenierungen heraus. Am 29.01.1946 fand im Admiralspalast der Festakt aus Anlass der Wiedereröffnung der Berliner Universität statt, allerdings auch am 21. - 22. 04.1946 der Vereinigungsparteitag zwischen KPD und SPD. Es war demzufolge nur folgerichtig, daß es dem Verständnis des damaligen Ostberliner Magistrats entsprach, den Admiralspalast als « volkseigen » zu betrachten. Die Grundstücke der Admiralspalast AG wurden auf Enteignungslisten gesetzt, obwohl die Aktien der Admiralspalast AG zu über 90 % Auslandsvermögen darstellten, das unter dem besonderen Schutz der

Alliierten und somit auch der sowjetischen Besatzungsmacht stand, die die Gesellschaft in einer ihrer Schutzlisten aufführte. Der Vorstand der Admiralspalast AG, Herr Breitkopf, legte zwar Beschwerde gegen die Listenenteignung im Jahre 1949 ein, aber ohne Abschluß des Beschwerdeverfahrens wurde im Jahre 1952 im Grundbuch Volkseigentum eingetragen.

Der AdmiralspalastIm Admiralspalast spielte im Vorderhaus im ehemaligen Admiralskino seit 1953 das Ostberliner Kabarett « Die Distel » . Auch in den 20er Jahren befand sich hier schon ein Kabarett « Roland von Berlin » , ab 1951 das Kabarett « Frischer Wind » .

Ab 1955 wurde der Admiralspalast Heimat des Metropol-Theatres, das vorher im heutigen Filmtheater « Colosseum » in der Schönhauser Allee spielen mußte. Mit dem Motto « Wieder mal ins Metropol » war es nicht nur in Berlin bekannt, es lockte viele Besucher in die Inszenierungen klassischer und auch zeitgenössischer Operetten und moderner Musicals. Nach der Wende kämpfte das Ensemble gegen eine Abwicklung des Theatres. Im Jahre 1996 vergab es der Senat von Berlin an den Tenor René Kollo als Alleingesellschafter und Intendant. Ein Jahr später beantragte der Senat für das Metropol-Theater die Liquidation und schrieb das Haus erneut zum Verkauf aus. Derzeit ist ein Bieterkonsortium um die Betreiber der Kulturhalle « Arena » in Treptow « am Ball » .

Die Admiralspalast AG, seit ihrer Gründung und bis heute im Handelsregister eingetragen, hat nach 1990 für ihre enteigneten Grundstücke vermögensrechtliche Ansprüche angemeldet, da sie die Enteignung für rechtsunwirksam hält. Das Verfahren ist beim Europäischen Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte anhängig.

Der Admiralspalast - Innenansicht Der Aufsichtsrat und der Vorstand der Admiralspalast AG möchten, daß die schönen Gebäude im Herzen von Berlin wieder so vielfältig genutzt werden wie in früheren Zeiten und als architektonisches Kleinod erhalten werden. Sie möchten zugleich die Geschichte des Admiralspalastes anhand von historischen Bildern und Dokumenten sowie durch Berichte aufarbeiten und bitten deshalb um Kontaktaufnahme mit Zeitzeugen auf ihrer Homepage. Diese Homepage soll ein Forum für alle an der Geschichte und weiteren Entwicklung des Admiralspalastes Interessierten werden.

...

Erbaut als Admiralsgartenbad zwischen 1873 und 1875. Nach Entdeckung einer heißen Quelle unter dem Gebäude im Jahr 1890 von Carl Gause (er war auch der Architekt des Hotel Adlon) zu einem Spaßbad erweitert : In den Vergnügungs-Tempel am Bahnhof Friedrichstraße sollten Gäste nicht allein mit Hallen- und Dampfbad und 62 Planschwannen ins Haus gelockt werden : 1910 kamen noch eine Eisbahn, ein Café und ein Kino dazu. Das ehrgeizige Freizeitobjekt war am Markt vorbeikonzipiert und ging pleite. Seit 1922 wurde das Hinterhaus als Theater genutzt. Nach der Zerstörung von Knobelsdorffs Opernhaus Unter den Linden am 3. Februar 1945 diente der Admiralspalast seit dem 6. September 1945 mit der Premiere von Glucks Orpheus und Eurydike bis zum 14. Juni 1955 als Ausweichquartier für die Berliner Staatsoper.

Ostern 1946, am 21. und 22. April, wurde der Palast Schauplatz deutscher Geschichte. Hier fand der

Vereinigungsparteitag von SPD und KPD statt. Nach den Klängen der Fidelio-Ouvertüre gaben sich unter den Augen von 548 SPD-Delegierten und 507 KPD-Delegierten deren Vorsitzende Otto Grotewohl (1894 bis 1964) und Wilhelm Pieck (1876 bis 1960) feierlich die Hand. Im Parkett klatschte Jugendfunktionär Erich Honecker, einst Dachdecker in Wiebelskirchen, begeistert Beifall. In den Jahren danach quartierten sich Institutionen wie der Journalistenverband der DDR in dem Komplex ein. Im Vorderhaus, dem alten Admiralskino, spielt seit 1953 das Kabarett Distel. Im Hofgebäude agierten seit Weihnachten 1955 die Tenöre und Soubretten des Metropol-Theatres mit diversen Operetten und Musicals. Solange, bis die wiedervereinten Kultur-Oberen des Senats Intendant René Kollo am 18. Februar 1997 den Subventionshahn zudrehten. Dessen Großvater, der Komponist Walter Kollo (1878 bis 1940), hatte dort 1913 in der Posse Filmzauber das Lied Solang noch Untern Linden ... uraufgeführt, Berlins inoffizielle Hymne.

...

1860 bestand an der Stelle des heutigen Gebäudekomplexes Friedrichstraße Nr. 101-102 bereits ein Kaffee- und Biergarten - der « Admiralsgarten ». 1873 wurde an der Stelle des Biergartens das « Admirals-Gartenbad » nach Plänen von Kyllmann & Heyden errichtet. Das Bad war eine der ersten öffentlichen Badeanstalten und wurde wegen seiner vornehmen Einrichtung viel gelobt. Die 1887 entdeckte Solquelle ließ fortan sogar eine Nutzung als Heilbad zu. 1910 wurde das Bad abgebrochen und der Admiralspalast nach Plänen von Heinrich Schweitzer errichtet. Hier gab es eine Eislaufarena, russisch-römische Luxus-Thermen, die Tag und Nacht geöffnet waren, ein Römisches Café, vier Kegelbahnen und ein Lichtbild-Theater. In der Halle der Eisarena wurde nicht nur Eisballett aufgeführt sondern auch Boxkämpfe und Eishockeyspiele ausgetragen. Zur Friedrichstraße präsentierte sich das neue Gebäude mit einer prächtigen Fassade, reich geschmückt mit dorische Säulen und Reliefs von namhaften Bildhauern, zum Beispiel Franz Naager und Ernst Westphal. Die rückwärtige Fassade zur heutigen Planckstraße war nicht minder aufwändig gestaltet worden und wurde in der Presse wegen ihrer exotischen Ornamente als « Märchenschlossfassade » bezeichnet.

1922 wurde der Admiralspalast durch die Architekten Erich Kaufmann und Albert Wolffenstein zu einem Theater im Art-deco-Stil umgebaut und als « Welt-Variété » eröffnet.

Nach einer längeren Zeit des Leerstandes übernahm der Kultur-Unternehmer Falk Walter 2005 den Gebäudekomplex mit der Absicht den Unterhaltungsbetrieb mit Theater, Bad und Gastronomie wieder zu beleben. Nach kurzer Umbauzeit wurde 2006 das Theater mit der Dreigroschenoper unter der Regie von Klaus Maria Brandauer wiedereröffnet. In der Folgezeit gab es zahlreiche Theatergastspiele und Konzerte und andere mit Max Raabe und seinem Palast-Orchester oder mit dem damals 104-jährigen Johannes Heesters.

Das seit 1979 unter Denkmalschutz stehende Gebäude ist heute wieder ein lebendiger Kulturort am Bahnhof Friedrichstraße.

...

Das Metropol-Theater im Berliner Ortsteil Mitte war ein bekanntes Revue- und Operettentheater, das von 1898 bis 1998 existierte.

Das Metropoltheater wurde 1898 von Richard Schultz in der Behrenstraße 55-57 eröffnet (dem heutigen Haus der Komischen Oper) und diente dem gut verdienenden Berliner Bürgertum sowie dem Adel als musikalisches Unterhaltungsetablisement. Auf dem Spielplan standen Revuen und andere Werke der « leichten Muse » mit bekannten Sängern und Sängerinnen wie Lizzi Waldmüller, Richard Tauber und Fritzi Massary. Für das Metropol lieferten in jener Zeit vor allem Komponisten wie Paul Lincke, Jean Gilbert, Rudolf Nelson und Victor Hollaender die Musik. Eine erste wirtschaftliche Krise erlebte das Metropol während der Inflation Anfang der 1920er Jahre.

In den « Goldenen Zwanziger Jahren » entwickelte sich das Metropol zu einer weltbekannten Operettenbühne, die auch neuartige Musik aus den USA mit gastierenden Ensembles spielte. Doch eine nächste Pleite kam infolge des Schwarzen Freitags von 1929, als die erste Weltwirtschaftskrise ihren Anfang nahm. Die Direktoren wechselten sehr oft ; zuletzt leitete seit 1928 Fritz Friedmann-Frederich das Theater, der bereits 1919 künstlerischer Leiter und Oberregisseur des Theatres geworden war. Er setzte auf leichte Muse und große Namen wie Käthe Dorsch und Richard Tauber. Ein weiterer Konkurs erfolgte 1932, als der Theaterkonzern der Gebrüder Fritz und Alfred Rotter zusammenbrach.

In der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus lief der Betrieb des Metropols wie gewohnt weiter, außer daß jüdische Ensemblemitglieder, wie an allen deutschen Bühnen, nicht mehr auftreten durften. Das Programm des Theatres war durch das gespielte Genre unpolitisch, sodaß es keine nennenswerten Repressalien durch die Staatsmacht gab, die braunen Machthaber erkannten diese Unterhaltungskultur als nützlich für ihre Zwecke. Seit 1934 fungierte hier Werner Schmidt-Boelcke als I. Kapellmeister. Eine neue, heute vergessene Generation junger Komponisten trat an die Stelle der alten, wie beispielsweise Fred Raymond mit den Operetten Ball der Nationen und Maske in Blau sowie Ludwig Schmidseher mit den Operetten Die oder keine ! und Frauen im Metropol. Das Metropoltheater büßte aber langsam seinen alten, fast feudalen Glanz ein, der drohende Zweite Weltkrieg drückte, anders als 1914, auf die Stimmung der Vergnügungswilligen. Ende 1944 wurde der Betrieb des Theatres nach der Premiere von Will Meisels Revue Wiederseh'n macht Freude eingestellt. Im März 1945 zerstörten Bomben das Theater in der Behrenstraße bis auf den Zuschauerraum, der erhalten blieb und seit 1947 der Komischen Oper dient.

In der gerade gegründeten DDR entstand das Metropol-Theater, jetzt in einem Kinosaal in der Schönhauser Allee untergebracht, neu. Franz Léhars Operette Paganini war die erste Nachkriegspremiere. 1955 gab es einen Umzug in den Admiralspalast, der dann bis zum Ende 1997 das Domizil blieb. In der damals einsetzenden Zeit des Aufbaus und des Aufbruchs gab es im Programm auch bekannte Broadway-Musicals wie My Fair Lady, Annie Get Your Gun, Kiss Me, Kate, Hello, Dolly ! (mit Gisela May) , Cabaret, aber auch DDR-spezifische Werke, wie beispielsweise Messeschlager Gisela. Das Metropol-Theater war die führende Unterhaltungsmusikbühne der DDR, was insbesondere seinem langjährigen Intendanten Hans Pitra zu verdanken ist. Nach dessen Tod übernahm der Komponist Gerd Natschinski die Leitung des Hauses. Der 1984 neu eröffnete modernere Friedrichstadtpalast machte dem Metropol zunächst keine Konkurrenz, er diente in erster Linie dazu, aufwändig inszenierte personalintensive Musikrevuen, Shows und Gastspiele zu zeigen.

Nach der Wende geriet das Metropol in finanzielle Schwierigkeiten, verursacht durch die Subventionspolitik des Berliner Senats, die im Kulturbereich andere Prioritäten zugunsten der drei Opernhäuser setzte.

Auch mehrere Investoren, die das Haus übernehmen wollten (und andere eine Gruppe um den damaligen Leiter des Deutschen Theatres München, Heiko Plapperer) wurden abgelehnt, da der Senat grundsätzlich nicht bereit war, das Metropol-Theater weiterhin zu subventionieren und das denkmalgeschützte historische Gebäude des Admiralspalastes zu renovieren. Die letzte Intendanz unter dem Sänger René Kollo scheiterte 1998, das Ensemble wurde aufgelöst.

Seit 2005 wird das Haus unter der Leitung von Falk Walter (Arena, Badeschiff, Hoppetosse, etc.) und anderen Teilhabern unter dem Namen Admiralspalast betrieben und eröffnete nach einer Renovierungsphase 2006 mit einer Inszenierung der Dreigroschenoper in der Regie von Klaus Maria Brandauer mit Campino in der Rolle des Mackie Messer. Neben dem großen Saal, der überwiegend durch Musical- und Showacts auf Tournee bespielt wird, werden auch zwei weitere Spielstätten unter dem Dach regelmäßig, aber nicht täglich bespielt.

...

Metropol-Theater, Friedrichstraße (ehemals Theater im Admiralspalast) .

Die originelle Fassade des ehemaligen Admiralspalastes, seit 1955 Metropol-Theater, beherrscht die Straßenfront an der Nordseite des Bahnhofs Friedrichstraße. Heinrich Schweitzer entwarf den mehrflügeligen Gebäudekomplex 1910-1911 auf dem weitläufigen Grundstück des früheren « Admiralsgartenbades » als Vergnügungspalast mit luxuriösen Bädern, Eislaufbahn und Restaurants. Im Sinne antiker Thermenanlagen wollte man Sport- und Freizeiteinrichtungen mit dem Badebetrieb verbinden und dem Vergnügungsviertel rund um den Bahnhof Friedrichstraße eine neue Attraktion hinzufügen. Die Eisbahn im hinteren Gebäudeteil an der Planckstraße, zu dem man durch das Vorderhaus über einen repräsentativ in neobarocken Formen gestalteten Hof gelangte, wurde 1922 von den Architekten Kaufmann und Wolfenstein zu einem Variété-Theater umgebaut, die darüber liegenden Bäder blieben zunächst unangetastet. Nach mehreren Umgestaltungen des Theaterraumes in den 1930er Jahren erfolgte 1939-1940 ein durchgreifender Umbau nach Plänen von Paul Baumgarten zu einem Operettentheater, einer « festlich schönen Erholungsstätte » . Dieser Umbau prägt trotz späterer Veränderungen das Theater bis heute.

Die der ursprünglichen Nutzung entsprechende Gestaltung der Straßenfassaden an Friedrichstraße und Planckstraße mit verspielt pompösem Schmuck in freier Adaption antiker Formen ist weitgehend erhalten. Für die Front an der Friedrichstraße, die zugleich ganz plakativ Werbung für das Etablissement machen sollte, schuf Schweitzer eine Gliederung mit kolossalen dorischen Halbsäulen aus Granit und Relieftafeln von Franz Naager aus istrischem Kalkstein. Die Tafeln füllen die Wandflächen zwischen Fenstern und Säulen und wirken wie eine Sammlung klassisch-antiker Fundstücke. Die Fassade an der Planckstraße mit ihrem eigenwilligen Klinkerdekor unter Verwendung von römischen und maurischen Motiven stammt von dem Bildhauer Ernst Westphal.

Am 21. und 22. April 1946 fand im Theatersaal der sogenannte Vereinigungsparteitag statt. Unter dem Druck der sowjetischen Besatzungsmacht wurden SPD und KPD zur SED (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands) zusammengeführt, ein Symptom der beginnenden Spaltung Deutschlands.

La « Guerre totale » de Josef Goebbels

The « Sportpalast » speech (« Sportpalastrede speech ») or « Total War speech » was a speech delivered by Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels at the « Berlin Sportpalast » to a large but « carefully selected » audience on 18 February 1943 calling for a total war, as the tide of World War II had turned against Nazi Germany and its Axis allies.

It is considered the most famous of Josef Goebbels's speeches. The speech was the 1st public admission by the Nazi leadership that Germany faced serious dangers. Goebbels exhorted the German people to continue the war even though it would be long and difficult because (as he asserted) both Germany's survival and the survival of a non-Bolshevist Europe were at stake.

Compared to the previous year, 1943 started inauspiciously for Germany, with major military problems on all fronts. On 2 February, the Battle of Stalingrad ended with the surrender of Field Marshal Paulus and the German 6th Army to the Soviets. At the Casablanca Conference, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill demanded Germany's unconditional surrender, and the Soviets, spurred by their victory, were beginning to retake territory, including « Kursk » (8 February) , « Rostov » (14 February) , and « Kharkiv » (16 February) . In North Africa, the « Afrika Korps » under Field Marshal Erwin Rommel was being brought close to defeat, when German supply ships sailing to Tripoli were sunk by the Allies during January. The « Western Desert Campaign » had ended with British victory at El Alamein and the Axis were in Tunisia between 2 Allied forces - one advancing from Algeria and one from Libya. The fortunes of Germany's Axis allies were turning as well. Italy's military collapse had made the war in Africa a largely German operation, and in the Pacific, the Americans had just completed their months-long reconquest of Guadalcanal after their victories against Japanese forces at Midway and the Coral Sea.

Adolf Hitler responded with the 1st measures that would lead to the all-out mobilization of Germany. On 2 February, 100,000 restaurants and clubs were closed throughout the country so that the civilian population could contribute more to the war.

The setting of the speech in the « Sportpalast » placed the audience behind and under a big banner bearing the all-capitals words « TOTALER KRIEG - KÜRZESTER KRIEG » (Total War - Briefest War) along with Nazi banners and Nazi swastikas.

Although Goebbels claimed that the audience included people from « all classes and occupations » (including « soldiers, doctors, scientists, artists, engineers and architects, teachers, white collars ») it was evident to outsiders that the propagandist had carefully selected his listeners. After the speech, Goebbels said to Albert Speer that it was the best-trained audience one could find in Germany.

Goebbels cited 3 theses in the speech :

If the « Wehrmacht » was not in a position to break the danger from the Eastern front, then the German « Reich » would fall to Bolshevism, and all of Europe shortly afterwards.

The « Wehrmacht », the German people, and the Axis Powers alone had the strength to save Europe from this threat ; danger was at hand. Germany had to act quickly and decisively, or it would be too late.

Göebbels concluded that « 2,000 years of Western history are in danger », and blamed Germany's failures on the Jews. While Göebbels referred to Soviet mobilization nationwide as « devilish », he explained that « We cannot overcome the Bolshevik danger unless we use equivalent, though not identical, methods in a total war. ». He then justified the austerity measures enacted, explaining them as temporary measures.

Historically, the speech is important in that it marks the 1st admission by the Party leadership that they were facing problems, and launched the mobilization campaign that, arguably, prolonged the war, under the slogan :

« Und Sturm, brich los ! » (« And storm, break loose ! »)

Göebbels claimed that no German was thinking of any compromise and instead that « the entire nation is only thinking about a hard war » .

Göebbels attempted to counter reports in the Allied press that German civilians had lost faith in victory by asking the audience a number of questions at the end, such as :

« Do you believe with the " Führer " and us in the final total victory of the German people ? Are you and the German people willing to work, if the " Führer " orders, 10, 12 and if necessary 14 hours a day and to give everything for victory ? Do you want total war ? If necessary, do you want a war more total and radical than anything that we can even imagine today ? »

(The recorded oral version of the speech differed in some ways from the written record. The enthusiastic and unified crowd response recorded in the written version is, at times, less than fully supported by the recording.)

Especially significant is that in the oral (vs. written) record of the speech, Göebbels actually begins to mention the « extermination » of the Jews, rather than the less harsh terms used in the written version to describe the « solution », but catches himself in the middle of the word.

Quotes :

« Ich frage euch: Wollt ihr den totalen Krieg ? Wollt ihr ihn, wenn nötig, totaler und radikaler, als wir ihn uns heute überhaupt erst vorstellen können ? »

(« I ask you : Do you want total war ? If necessary, do you want a war more total and radical than anything that we can even yet imagine ? »)

« Nun, Volk, steh auf und Sturm brich los ! »

« Now, people, rise-up, and let the storm break loose ! »)

The last line originated in the poem « Männer und Buben » (Men and Boys) by Carl Theodor Körner during the Napoleonic Wars. Körner's words had been quoted by Adolf Hitler in his 1920 speech « What We Want » delivered at Munich's « Hofbräuhaus », but also by Goebbels himself in older speeches, including his 6 July 1932 campaign speech before the Nazis took power in Germany.

Millions of Germans listened to Josef Goebbels on the radio as he delivered this speech about the « misfortune of the past weeks » and an « unvarnished picture of the situation ». The audience reacted fanatically, causing an even bigger impact ; they were selected by Goebbels to perform appropriately, showing one of his many skills as Propaganda minister. Goebbels also wanted, by amassing such popular enthusiasm, to convince Adolf Hitler to give him greater powers in running the war economy.

...

On February 18, 1943, as the tide of World War II was turning against Germany, Josef Goebbels gave his « Total War » speech at the « Berlin Sportpalast » to a carefully selected audience of 14,000 Party officials, war veterans, workers, and women. While millions more Germans listened on the radio, Goebbels spoke about the « misfortune of the past weeks » and offered an « unvarnished picture of the situation » amid so-called spontaneous cheers from the audience.

The Nazis faced a grim reality. They had lost Stalingrad to the Soviets who, spurred by the victory, were beginning to retake territory. In North Africa, the Allies had sunk supply ships and dealt General Erwin Rommel another set-back. In Italy, Benito Mussolini had fired his administration and assumed personal responsibility for the war. At an Allies' conference in Casablanca, United States President Franklin Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill had demanded Germany's unconditional surrender. But Adolf Hitler and Josef Goebbels, perhaps knowing that the war could not be won, promoted a different idea : a homefront mobilization campaign that prolonged the war for another 2 and a half years under the slogan : « Let the storm break loose ! » .

Even as Goebbels acknowledged recent losses, he was crafting a new myth of national strength, assuring his audience that, « The German people, educated, indoctrinated, and disciplined by National-Socialism, can stand the full truth. » . He argued that only the Germany army stood between Europe and the onslaught of Bolshevism and that Germany alone could save Europe from this threat. He then explained that Germany could not « overcome the Bolshevist danger unless we use equivalent ... methods in a total war » . His argument justified austerity measures Hitler had enacted, including the conscription of civilians for war work and the closing of 100,000 restaurants and clubs throughout the country. Goebbels led the audience through a series of 10 questions that whipped them into a frenzy of fanatic applause. Reaching his final question, he demanded, « I ask you : Do you want total war ? If necessary, do you want a war more total and radical than anything that we can even imagine today ? » . After the speech, Nazi leader Albert

Speer reported : « Except for Hitler's most successful public meetings, I had never seen an audience so effectively roused to fanaticism. » . Gœbbels had succeeded in re-invigorating the German war effort - at least temporarily.

...

On February 18, 1943, Doctor Josef Gœbbels gave his famous « Total War » speech at the « Berlin Sportpalast » . Meant to shore-up popular support at home in World War II as Germany's military situation deteriorated, the speech was perhaps the most successful of Gœbbels' career.

A leg slightly crippled from birth prevented the diminutive (Paul) Josef Gœbbels from fighting in the trenches of World War I. After the war, he had been an early supporter of the Nazi Party in Germany and, as a part of the northern branch of the Party, had challenged the dominance of the Bavarian wing, led by Adolf Hitler, in 1926. The 2 soon reconciled and Gœbbels quickly became one of Hitler's most trusted lieutenants and was awarded with the post of Nazi Party leader for Berlin.

Not long after Hitler came to power, in 1933, Gœbbels was appointed to the post of Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment. From this position, Gœbbels manipulated the German media and arts and ensured that the radical Nazi messages of German racial superiority and anti-Semitic conspiracy theory became commonplace and accepted. Gœbbels was also the foremost Nazi leader responsible for the 1938 « Kristallnacht » (the Night of Broken Glass) , which saw devastating anti-Semitic programs launched throughout Germany.

Josef Gœbbels' propaganda was not limited to attacks on the Jews, however. Socialists, communists, Free Masons, Christian churches and foreigners all felt the sting of Gœbbels' vitriol, all meeting with the general approval and support of the « Führer » . When World War II broke-out, Gœbbels turned his persuasive powers toward the war effort, constantly trumpeting German success in the early years of the war.

The 1st years of the war made Gœbbels' job easy, as the « Wehrmacht » did indeed meet with victory after victory. In 1939, Poland fell, followed by Norway, Denmark and Low-Countries the following year. It was the fall of France, in June 1940, that provided Gœbbels with his biggest propaganda boon of all, however. Paris, the city that had held-out for 4 years against the Imperial German army in World War I, had fallen to the armies of Adolf Hitler. Gœbbels sent his own army of photographers and writers to accompany Hitler to the « City of Lights » during his victory tour, and public support for the Nazi leadership soared to new heights.

German popular feelings were mixed with the June 1941 invasion of the Soviet Union, so Gœbbels worked hard to paint the conflict as one between Germanic civilization and Bolshevik destruction. Again, Gœbbels' propaganda reaped the benefit of initial « Wehrmacht » victories over the Soviets until Hitler's army was ground to a halt before Moscow, in November and December of 1941. Re-equipped and refreshed, the summer 1942 offensive against the Soviets had every appearance of succeeding, and Gœbbels once again trumpeted initial victories that year.

However, 1942 ended in disaster for Germany. The August 1942 - February 1943 Battle of Stalingrad was a game-

changer for the « Reich » . The battle saw the destruction and capture of the 6th Army, the « Wehrmacht » 's largest fighting formation. During the battle, the trickster Gœbbels had produced a radio broadcast, reportedly from the front lines of Stalingrad, of German soldiers singing Christmas carols. In fact, the chorus came from a studio in Berlin. By Christmas 1942, the German soldiers defending the Stalingrad pocket were scarecrows who could barely fight for lack of food, let alone sing joyfully.

The fall of the 6th Army was a disaster of such magnitude that even the skilled Gœbbels could not ignore it or play down its significance. Suddenly, Gœbbels had to adopt a new tactic in order to maintain popular support for the war effort, which was slipping every day.

On February 18, 1943, only a few weeks after the German surrender at Stalingrad, Gœbbels staged a massive rally at the « Berlin Sportpalast » with an audience carefully chosen from among the Nazi Party's die-hard supporters. In his book « Landmark Speeches of National-Socialism » , historian Randall L. Bytwerk wrote :

« Gœbbels, for months, had been trying to increase his control over the war effort, and the defeat at Stalingrad was his opportunity. He prepared a vivid speech to rouse the German resistance and persuade Hitler to give him more power. He chose the Berlin Sport Palace, the site of many previous Nazi rallies. It held about 14,000 people. Gœbbels selected them carefully, securing the most fanatic audience he could find. It was a media event. »

In the speech, Gœbbels stated :

« We currently face a military challenge in the East. There is no point in disputing the seriousness of the situation. I refuse to give you a false impression of the situation that could lead to false conclusions, perhaps giving the German people a false sense of security that is altogether inappropriate for the present situation. It is understandable that, as a result of wide-ranging deceptions and bluffs by the Bolshevik government, we did not properly evaluate the Soviet Union's war potential. Only now, do we see its true scale. That is why the battle our soldiers face in the East exceeds in its hardness, dangers and difficulties all human imagining. It demands our full national strength. »

This was an unprecedented admission by the Nazi government that it had failed to correctly judge its enemy's ability. It is also the 1st time that such horrible news was not sugar-coated for the German people. Gœbbels' usually rose-tinted prognostications were nowhere to be found. Gœbbels went on to paint Germany as the only thing standing between the Soviet Union and a Bolshevised Europe, perhaps intimating that Britain should come to terms in the West, lest it face a powerful Soviet threat to replace its Nazi enemy.

The speech further details Gœbbels' and the Nazi leadership's obsession with the supposed Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy. Gœbbels stated :

« We see Jewry as a direct threat to every nation. Jewry is a contagious infection. Germany, in any event, has no intention of bowing before this Jewish threat, but rather intends to act at the right moment, using if necessary the most total and radical measures to deal with Jewry. Terrorist Jewry had 200 million people to serve it in Russia. »

Göebbels concluded the speech by asking his audience if they would support the most radical means to win the war, to which the audience shouted in the affirmative. He asked several specific questions to the audience, including whether or not war shirkers and black marketeers should be executed, women be fully mobilized for the war effort, and workers put in up to 16 hours a day to support the war effort.

One of the most important questions Göebbels asked, one which encompassed all of the other ideas of the speech and more, was this :

« Do you want total war ? If necessary, do you want a war more total and radical than anything that we can even imagine today ? »

To this, as to the questions posed before and after it, the audience cheered wildly. The idea of « Total War » , completely mobilizing everything in the nation for the war effort, was nothing new, going back as far as the French Revolution. In World War I, the German government talked constantly of « Total War » as well. Göebbels' passionate appeal, however, promised that Nazi radicalism would be taken even further. And now, with a carefully staged mandate from the « people » , Göebbels was going to push the limits in of power in the 3rd « Reich » as never before.

The last line of the speech was a call to arms :

« People, rise-up, and storm, break loose ! »

Albert Speer, Hitler's Minister for Armaments and War Production, noted later in his memoirs « Inside the 3rd “ Reich ” » , that Göebbels had many motivations for the speech beyond addressing the obvious military defeat and calling for more government control. Göebbels saw in this event a way to push through his own radical agenda against entrenched Nazi bureaucrats who enjoyed Hitler's favor. Also, Speer noted, Göebbels had longed to replace Joachim von Ribbentrop as Hitler's foreign minister. By addressing the international situation and appealing to the West to wake-up to the Bolshevik threat, Göebbels was trying to sell himself to Hitler himself as a man with a foreign policy plan. In large part, the « Total War » speech was Göebbels' personal power play.

Albert Speer wrote :

« Except for Hitler's most successful public meetings, I had never seen an audience so effectively roused to fanaticism. Back in his home, Göebbels astonished me by analyzing what had seemed to be a purely emotional outburst in terms of its psychological effects - much as an experienced actor might have done. He was also satisfied with his audience that evening. »

Speer also noted that Göebbels said to him that « it was the politically best-trained audience you can find in Germany » .

Bytwerk noted that, after the initial radio broadcast of the speech, it was aired a 2nd time in its entirety, and the text was soon published in newspapers and pamphlets. Newsreels of the speech appeared before movies. « No one in the 3rd “ Reich ” escaped this speech » , Bytwerk noted.

In his biography of the Propaganda minister, « Josef Gœbbels : Life and Death » , Toby Thacker wrote :

« Gœbbels had ordered his propaganda departments around Germany to report back urgently to him on reaction to the speech, and in the preliminary response which reached him the next day his " handling of the Jewish question " was signaled out for praise. »

By the end of the month, renewed actions to deport Jews still working in Germany began. Just under 11,000 were sent to death camps in Poland in an operation launched on February 27.

After the speech, Hitler did award Gœbbels new powers over the economy and German public life, though he retained the inept Ribbentrop as foreign minister, to Gœbbels' chagrin. Whatever success Gœbbels had with his speech, the die was already cast, however, and Germany's days were numbered.

With the Red Army invested in Berlin and closing in on the « Reich » Chancellery building, in April 1945, Adolf Hitler committed suicide. On May 1, Gœbbels and his wife shot themselves after poisoning their 6 children.

...

The battle of Stalingrad had ended, and the true seriousness of the war was evident to everyone. Josef Gœbbels wanted this speech to build popular enthusiasm for the war, and also to convince Adolf Hitler to give him greater powers in running the war economy.

Gœbbels had used the concluding quotation of the speech (« Now, people rise-up, and let the storm break loose ! ») in earlier speeches, for example a campaign speech before the Nazi takeover of power on 6 July 1932.

There are significant differences between the oral et the written version of the speech. The most striking is that in the oral version, Gœbbels begins to mention the extermination of the Jews, then catches himself in the middle of the word. It's also interesting to note that the audience reactions reported in the text below are sometimes stronger than the recording justifies.

The source : « Nun, Volk steh auf, und Sturm brich los ! Rede im Berliner Sportpalast » , « Der steile Aufstieg » , « Zentralverlag der NSDAP, München » (1944) , pages 167-204.

Nation, Rise-Up, and Let the Storm Break Loose !

Only 3 weeks ago, I stood in this place to read the « Führer » 's proclamation on the 10th anniversary of the seizure

of power, and to speak to you and to the German people. The crisis we now face on the Eastern Front was at its height. In the midst of the hard misfortunes the nation faced in the battle on the Volga, we gathered together in a mass meeting on the 30th of January to display our unity, our unanimity and our strong will to overcome the difficulties we faced in the 4th year of the war.

It was a moving experience for me, and probably also for all of you, to be bound by radio with the last heroic fighters in Stalingrad during our powerful meeting here in the Sport Palace. They radioed to us that they had heard the « Führer » 's proclamation and, perhaps for the last time in their lives, joined us in raising their hands to sing the national anthems. What an example German soldiers have set in this great age ! And what an obligation it puts on us all, particularly the entire German homeland ! Stalingrad was and is fate's great alarm call to the German nation ! A nation that has the strength to survive and overcome such a disaster, even to draw from it additional strength, is unbeatable. In my speech to you and the German people, I shall remember the heroes of Stalingrad, who put me and all of us under a deep obligation.

I do not know how many millions of people are listening to me over the radio tonight, at home and at the front. I want to speak to all of you from the depths of my heart to the depths of yours. I believe that the entire German people has a passionate interest in what I have to say tonight. I will therefore speak with holy seriousness and openness, as the hour demands. The German people, raised, educated and disciplined by National-Socialism, can bear the whole truth. It knows the gravity of the situation, and its leadership can therefore demand the necessary hard measures, yes even the hardest measures. We Germans are armed against weakness and uncertainty. The blows and misfortunes of the war only give us additional strength, firm resolve, and a spiritual and fighting will to overcome all difficulties and obstacles with revolutionary élan.

Now is not the time to ask how it all happened. That can wait until later, when the German people and the whole world will learn the full truth about the misfortune of the past weeks, and its deep and fateful significance. The heroic sacrifices of heroism of our soldiers in Stalingrad has had vast historical significance for the whole Eastern Front. It was not in vain. The future will make clear why.

When I jump over the past to look ahead, I do it intentionally. The time is short ! There is no time for fruitless debates. We must act, immediately, thoroughly, and decisively, as has always been the National-Socialist way.

The movement has from its beginning acted in that way to master the many crises it faced and overcame. The National-Socialist State also acted decisively when faced by a threat. We are not like the ostrich that sticks its head in the sand so as not to see danger. We are brave enough to look danger in the face, to coolly and ruthlessly take its measure, then act decisively with our heads held high. Both as a movement and as a nation, we have always been at our best when we needed fanatic, determined wills to overcome and eliminate danger, or a strength of character sufficient to overcome every obstacle, or bitter determination to reach our goal, or an iron heart capable of withstanding every internal and external battle. So it will be today. My task is to give you an unvarnished picture of the situation, and to draw the hard conclusions that will guide the actions of the German government, but also of the German people.

We face a serious military challenge in the East. The crisis is at the moment a broad one, similar but not identical in many ways to that of the previous winter. Later, we will discuss the causes. Now, we must accept things as they are and discover and apply the ways and means to turn things again in our favor. There is no point in disputing the seriousness of the situation. I do not want to give you a false impression of the situation that could lead to false conclusions, perhaps giving the German people a false sense of security that is altogether inappropriate in the present situation.

The storm raging against our venerable continent from the steppes this winter overshadows all previous human and historical experience. The German army and its allies are the only possible defense. In his proclamation, on 30 January, the « Führer » asked in a grave and compelling way what would have become of Germany and Europe if, on 30 January 1933, a bourgeois or democratic government had taken power instead of the National-Socialists ! What dangers would have followed, faster than we could then have suspected, and what powers of defense would we have had to meet them ? 10 years of National-Socialism have been enough to make plain to the German people the seriousness of the danger posed by Bolshevism from the East. Now, one can understand why we spoke so often of the fight against Bolshevism at our Nuremberg Party rallies. We raised our voices in warning to our German people and the world, hoping to awaken Western humanity from the paralysis of will and spirit into which it had fallen. We tried to open their eyes to the horrible danger from Eastern Bolshevism, which had subjected a nation of nearly 200 million people to the terror of the Jews and was preparing an aggressive war against Europe.

When the « Führer » ordered the army to attack the East, on 22 June 1941, we all knew that this would be the decisive battle of this great struggle. We knew the dangers and difficulties. But we also knew that dangers and difficulties always grow over time, they never diminish. It was 2 minutes before midnight. Waiting any longer could easily have led to the destruction of the « Reich » and a total Bolshevization of the European continent.

It is understandable that, as a result of broad concealment and misleading actions by the Bolshevist government, we did not properly evaluate the Soviet Union's war potential. Only now do we see its true scale. That is why the battle our soldiers face in the East exceeds in its hardness, dangers and difficulties all human imagining. It demands our full national strength. This is a threat to the « Reich » and to the European continent that casts all previous dangers into the shadows. If we fail, we will have failed our historic mission. Everything we have built and done in the past pales in the face of this gigantic task that the German army directly and the German people less directly face.

I speak 1st to the world, and proclaim three theses regarding our fight against the Bolshevist danger in the East.

This 1st thesis : Were the German army not in a position to break the danger from the East, the « Reich » would fall to Bolshevism, and all Europe shortly afterwards.

2nd : The German army, the German people and their allies alone have the strength to save Europe from this threat.

3rd : Danger faces us. We must act quickly and decisively, or it will be too late.

I turn to the 1st thesis.

Bolshevism has always proclaimed its goal openly : to bring revolution not only to Europe, but to the entire world, and plunge it into Bolshevik chaos. This goal has been evident from the beginning of the Bolshevik Soviet Union, and has been the ideological and practical goal of the Kremlin's policies. Clearly, the nearer Stalin and the other Soviet leaders believe they are to realizing their world-destroying objectives, the more they attempt to hide and conceal them. We cannot be fooled. We are not like those timid souls who wait like the hypnotized rabbit until the serpent devours them. We prefer to recognize the danger in good time and take effective action. We see through not only the ideology of Bolshevism, but also its practice, for we had great success with that in our domestic struggles. The Kremlin cannot deceive us. We had 14 years of our struggle for power, and 10 years thereafter, to unmask its intentions and its infamous deceptions.

The goal of Bolshevism is Jewish world revolution. They want to bring chaos to the « Reich » and Europe, using the resulting hopelessness and desperation to establish their international, Bolshevik-concealed capitalist tyranny.

I do not need to say what that would mean for the German people. A Bolshevization of the « Reich » would mean the liquidation of our entire intelligentsia and leadership, and the descent of our workers into Bolshevik-Jewish slavery. In Moscow, they find workers for forced labor battalions in the Siberian tundra, as the « Führer » said in his proclamation on 30 January. The revolt of the steppes is readying itself at the front, and the storm from the East that breaks against our lines daily in increasing strength is nothing other than a repetition of the historical devastation that has so often in the past endangered our part of the world.

That is a direct threat to the existence of every European power. No one should believe that Bolshevism would stop at the borders of the « Reich » , were it to be victorious. The goal of its aggressive policies and wars is the Bolshevization of every land and people in the world. In the face of such undeniable intentions, we are not impressed by paper declarations from the Kremlin or guarantees from London or Washington. We know that we are dealing in the East with an infernal political devilishness that does not recognize the norms governing relations between people and nations. When, for example, the English Lord Beaverbrook says that Europe must be given over to the Soviets or when the leading American Jewish journalist Brown cynically adds that a Bolshevization of Europe might solve all of the continent's problems, we know what they have in mind. The European powers are facing the most critical question. The West is in danger. It makes no difference whether or not their governments and intellectuals realize it or not.

The German people, in any event, is unwilling to bow to this danger. Behind the oncoming Soviet divisions, we see the Jewish liquidation commandos, and behind them terror, the specter of mass starvation and complete anarchy. International Jewry is the devilish ferment of decomposition that finds cynical satisfaction in plunging the world into the deepest chaos and destroying ancient cultures that it played no role in building.

We also know our historic responsibility. 2,000 years of Western civilization are in danger. One cannot overestimate the danger. It is indicative that when one names it as it is, International Jewry throughout the world protests loudly.

Things have gone so far in Europe that one cannot call a danger a danger when it is caused by the Jews.

That does not stop us from drawing the necessary conclusions. That is what we did in our earlier domestic battles. The democratic Jewry of the « Berliner Tageblatt » and the « Vossischen Zeitung » served communist Jewry by minimizing and downplaying a growing danger, and by lulling our threatened people to sleep and reducing their ability to resist. We could see, if the danger were not overcome, the specter of hunger, misery, and forced labor by millions of Germans. We could see our venerable part of the world collapse, and bury in its ruins the ancient inheritance of the West. That is the danger we face today.

My 2nd thesis :

Only the German « Reich » and its allies are in the position to resist this danger. The European nations, including England, believe that they are strong enough to resist effectively the Bolshevization of Europe, should it come to that. This belief is childish and not even worth refuting. If the strongest military force in the world is not able to break the threat of Bolshevism, who else could do it ? (The crowd in the « Sportpalast » shouts « No one ! ») . The neutral European nations have neither the potential nor the military means nor the spiritual strength to provide even the least resistance to Bolshevism. Bolshevism's robotic divisions would roll over them within a few days. In the capitals of the mid-sized and smaller European States, they console themselves with the idea that one must be spiritually armed against Bolshevism (laughter) . That reminds us of the statements by bourgeois Parties in 1932, who thought they could fight and win the battle against communism with spiritual weapons. That was too stupid even then to be worth refuting. Eastern Bolshevism is not only a doctrine of terrorism, it is also the practice of terrorism. It strives for its goals with an infernal thoroughness, using every resource at its disposal, regardless of the welfare, prosperity or peace of the peoples it ruthlessly oppresses. What would England and America do if, in the worst case, Europe fell into Bolshevism's arms ? Will London perhaps persuade Bolshevism to stop at the English Channel ? I have already said that Bolshevism has its foreign legions in the form of Communist Parties in every democratic nation. None of these States can think it is immune to domestic Bolshevism. In a recent by-election for the House of Commons, the independent, that is communist candidate got 10,741 of the 22,371 votes cast. This was in a district that had formerly been a conservative stronghold. Within a short time, 10,000 voters, nearly half, had been lost to the communists.

That is proof that the Bolshevik danger exists in England too, and that it will not go away simply because it is ignored. We place no faith in any territorial promises that the Soviet Union may make. Bolshevism set ideological as well as military boundaries, which poses a danger to every nation. The world no longer has the choice between falling back into its old fragmentation or accepting a new order for Europe under Axis leadership. The only choice now is between living under Axis protection or in a Bolshevik Europe.

I am firmly convinced that the lamenting Lords and archbishops in London have not the slightest intention of resisting the Bolshevik danger that would result were the Soviet army to enter Europe. Jewry has so deeply infected the Anglo-Saxon States, both spiritually and politically, that they are no longer have the ability to see the danger. It conceals itself as Bolshevism in the Soviet Union, and plutocratic-capitalism in the Anglo-Saxon States. The Jewish race is an

expert at mimicry. They put their host peoples to sleep, paralyzing their defensive abilities. (Shouts from the crowd : « We have experienced it ! ») . Our insight into the matter led us to the early realization that cooperation between international plutocracy and international Bolshevism was not a contradiction, but rather a sign of deep commonalities. The hand of the pseudo-civilized Jewry of Western Europe shakes the hand of the Jewry of the Eastern ghettos over Germany. Europe is in deadly danger.

I do not flatter myself into believing that my remarks will influence public opinion in the neutral, much less the enemy, states. That is also not my goal or intention. I know that, given our problems on the Eastern Front, the English press tomorrow will furiously attack me with the accusation that I have made the 1st peace feelers (loud laughter) . That is certainly not so. No one in Germany thinks any longer of a cowardly compromise. The entire people thinks only of a hard war. As a spokesman for the leading nation of the continent, however, I claim the right to call a danger a danger if it threatens not only our own land, but our entire continent. We, National-Socialists, have the duty to sound the alarm against International Jewry's attempt to plunge the European continent into chaos, and to warn that Jewry has in Bolshevism a terroristic military power whose danger cannot be overestimated.

My 3rd thesis is that the danger is immediate. The paralysis of the Western European democracies before their deadliest threat is frightening. International Jewry is doing all it can to encourage such paralysis. During our struggle for power in Germany, Jewish newspapers tried to conceal the danger, until National-Socialism awakened the people. It is just the same today in other nations. Jewry once again reveals itself as the incarnation of evil, as the plastic demon of decay and the bearer of an international culture-destroying chaos.

This explains, by the way, our consistent Jewish policies. We see Jewry as a direct threat to every nation. We do not care what other peoples do about the danger. What we do to defend ourselves is our own business, however, and we will not tolerate objections from others. Jewry is a contagious infection. Enemy nations may raise hypocritical protests against our measures against Jewry and cry crocodile tears, but that will not stop us from doing that which is necessary. Germany, in any event, has no intention of bowing before this threat, but rather intends to take the most radical measures, if necessary, in good time (After this sentence, the chants of the audience prevent the Minister from going on for several minutes) .

The military challenges of the « Reich » in the East are at the center of everything. The war of mechanized robots against Germany and Europe has reached its high-point. In resisting the grave and direct threat with its weapons, the German people and its Axis allies are fulfilling in the truest sense of the word a European mission. Our courageous and just battle against this world-wide plague will not be hindered by the world-wide outcry of International Jewry. It can and must end only with victory (Here, there are loud shouts : « German men, to arms ! German women, to work ! ») .

The tragic battle of Stalingrad is a symbol of heroic, manly resistance to the revolt of the steppes. It has not only a military, but also an intellectual and spiritual significance for the German people. Here, for the 1st time, our eyes have been opened to the true nature of the war. We want no more false hopes and illusions. We want bravely to look the facts in the face, however hard and dreadful they may be. The history of our Party and our State has proven that a

danger recognized is a danger defeated. Our coming hard battles in the East will be under the sign of this heroic resistance. It will require previously undreamed of efforts by our soldiers and our weapons. A merciless war is raging in the East. The « Führer » was right when he said that in the end there will not be winners and losers, but the living and the dead.

The German nation knows that. Its healthy instincts have led it through the daily confusion of intellectual and spiritual difficulties. We know today that the « Blitzkrieg » in Poland and the campaign in the West have only limited significance to the battle in the East. The German nation is fighting for everything it has. We know that the German people are defending their holiest possessions : their families, women and children, the beautiful and untouched countryside, their cities and villages, their 2,000 year old culture, everything indeed that makes life worth living.

Bolshevism, of course, has not the slightest appreciation for our nation's treasures, and would take no heed of them whatsoever if it came to that. It did not do so even for its own people. The Soviet Union over the last 25 years built-up Bolshevism's military potential to an unimaginable degree, and one we falsely evaluated. Terrorist Jewry had 200 million people to serve it in Russia. It cynically used its methods on to create out of the stolid toughness of the Russian people a grave danger for the civilized nations of Europe. A whole nation in the East was driven to battle. Men, women, and even children are employed not only in armaments factories, but in the war itself. 200 million live under the terror of the GPU, partially captives of a devilish viewpoint, partially of absolute stupidity. The masses of tanks we have faced on the Eastern Front are the result of 25 years of social misfortune and misery of the Bolshevik people. We have to respond with similar measures if we do not want to give-up the game as lost.

My firm conviction is that we cannot overcome the Bolshevik danger unless we use equivalent, though not identical, methods. The German people face the gravest demand of the war, namely of finding the determination to use all our resources to protect everything we have and everything we will need in the future.

Total war is the demand of the hour. We must put an end to the bourgeois attitude that we have also seen in this war : « Wash my back, but don't get me wet ! » (Every sentence is met with growing applause and agreement.) The danger facing us is enormous. The efforts we take to meet it must be just as enormous. The time has come to remove the kid gloves and use our fists. (A cry of elemental agreement rises. Chants from the galleries and seats testify to the full approval of the crowd.) We can no longer make only partial and careless use of the war potential at home and in the significant parts of Europe that we control. We must use our full resources, as quickly and thoroughly as it is organizationally and practically possible. Unnecessary concern is wholly out of place. The future of Europe hangs on our success in the East. We are ready to defend it. The German people are shedding their most valuable national blood in this battle. The rest of Europe should at least work to support us. There are many serious voices in Europe that have already realized this. Others still resist. That cannot influence us. If danger faced them alone, we could view their reluctance as literary non-sense of no significance. But the danger faces us all, and we must all do our share. Those who today do not understand that will thank us tomorrow on bended knees that we courageously and firmly took on the task.

It bothers us not in the least that our enemies abroad claim that our total war measures resemble those of

Bolshevism. They claim hypocritically that that means there is no need to fight Bolshevism. The question here is not one of method, but of the goal, namely eliminating the danger. (Applause for several minutes.) The question is not whether the methods are good or bad, but whether they are successful. The National-Socialist government is ready to use every means. We do not care if anyone objects. We are not willing to weaken Germany's war potential by measures that maintain a high, almost peace-time standard of living for a certain class, thereby endangering our war effort. We are voluntarily giving-up a significant part of our living standard to increase our war effort as quickly and completely as possible. This is not an end in itself, but rather a means to an end. Our social standard of living will be even higher after the war. We do not need to imitate Bolshevik methods, because we have better people and leaders, which gives us a great advantage. But things have shown that we must do much more than we have done so far to turn the war in the East decisively in our favor.

As countless letters from the homeland and the front have shown, by the way, the entire German people agrees. Everyone knows that if we lose, all will be destroyed. The people and leadership are determined to take the most radical measures. The broad working masses of our people are not unhappy because the government is too ruthless. If anything, they are unhappy because it is too considerate. Ask anyone in Germany, and he will say : The most radical is just radical enough, and the most total is just total enough to gain victory.

The total war effort has become a matter of the entire German people. No one has any excuse for ignoring its demands. A storm of applause greeted my call on 30 January for total war. I can therefore assure you that the leadership's measures are in full agreement with the desires of the German people at home and at the front. The people are willing to bear any burden, even the heaviest, to make any sacrifice, if it leads to the great goal of victory. (Lively applause.)

This naturally assumes that the burdens are shared equally. (Loud approval.) We cannot tolerate a situation in which most people carry the burden of the war, while a small, passive portion attempts to escape its burdens and responsibilities. The measures we have taken, and the ones we will yet take, will be characterized by the spirit of National-Socialist justice. We pay no heed to class or standing. Rich and poor, high and low must share the burdens equally. Everyone must do his duty in this grave hour, whether by choice or otherwise. We know this has the full support of the people. We would rather do too much rather than too little to achieve victory. No war in history has ever been lost because of too many soldiers or weapons. Many, however, have been lost because the opposite was true.

It is time to get the slackers moving. (Stormy agreement.) They must be shaken out of their comfortable ease. We cannot wait until they come to their senses. That might be too late. The alarm must sound throughout the nation. Millions of hands must get to work throughout the country. The measures we have taken, and the ones we will now take, and which I shall discuss later in this speech, are critical for our whole public and private life. The individual may have to make great sacrifices, but they are tiny when compared to the sacrifices he would have to make if his refusal brought down on us the greatest national disaster. It is better to operate at the right time than to wait until the disease has taken root. One may not complain to the doctor or sue him for bodily injury. He cuts not to kill, but to save the patient's life.

Again let me say that the heavier the sacrifices the German people must make, the more urgent it is that they be fairly shared. The people want it that way. No one resists even the heaviest burdens of war. But it angers people when a few always try to escape the burdens. The National-Socialist government has both the moral and political duty to oppose such attempts, if necessary with draconian penalties. (Agreement.) Leniency here would be completely out of place, leading in time to a confusion in the people's emotions and attitudes that would be a grave danger to our public morale.

We are, therefore, compelled to adopt a series of measures that are not essential for the war effort in themselves, but seem necessary to maintain moral at home and at the front. The optics of the war, that is, how things outwardly appear, is of decisive importance in this 4th year of war. In view of the super-human sacrifices that the front makes each day, it has a basic right to expect that no one at home claims the right to ignore the war and its demands. And not only the front demands this, but the overwhelming part of the homeland. The industrious have a right to expect that if they work 10 or 12 or 14 hours a day, a lazy person does not stand next to them who thinks them foolish. The homeland must stay pure and intact in its entirety. Nothing may disturb the picture.

There are therefore a series of measures that take account of the war's optics. We have ordered, for example, the closing of bars and night-clubs. I cannot imagine that people who are doing their duty for the war effort still have the energy to stay-out late into the night in such places. I can only conclude that they are not taking their responsibilities seriously. We have closed these establishments because they began to offend us, and because they disturb the image of the war. We have nothing against amusements as such. After the war, we will happily go by the rule « Live and let live » . But during a war, the slogan must be « Fight and let fight ! » .

We have also closed luxury restaurants that demand far more resources than is reasonable. It may be that an occasional person thinks that, even during war, his stomach is the most important thing. We cannot pay him any heed. At the front, everyone, from the simple soldier to the general field marshal, eats from the field kitchen. I do not believe that it is asking too much to insist that we in the homeland pay heed to at least the basic laws of community thinking. We can become gourmets once again when the war is over. Right now, we have more important things to do than worry about our stomachs.

Countless luxury stores have also been closed. They often offended the buying public. There was generally nothing to buy, unless perhaps, one paid here and there with butter or eggs instead of money. What good do shops do that no longer have anything to sell, but only use electricity, heating, and human labor that is lacking everywhere else, particularly in the armaments industry.

It is no excuse to say that keeping some of these shops open gives a lovely impression to foreigners. Foreigners will be impressed only by a German victory ! (Stormy applause.) . Everyone will want to be our friend if we win the war. But if we lose, we will be able to count our friends on the fingers of one hand. We have put an end to such illusions. We want to put these people standing in empty shops to useful work in the war economy. This process is already in motion, and will be completed by 15 March. It is, of course, a major transformation in our entire economic life. We are following a plan. We do not want to accuse anyone unjustly or open them to complaints and accusations from every

side. We are only doing what is necessary. But we are doing it quickly and thoroughly.

We would rather wear worn clothing for a few years than have our people wear rags for a few Centuries. What good are fashion salons today ? They only use light, heat and workers. They will reappear when the war is over. What good are beauty shops that encourage a cult of beauty and take enormous time and energy ? In peace, they are wonderful, but a waste of time during war. Our women and girls will be able to greet our victorious returning soldiers without their peacetime finery. (Applause.)

Government offices will work faster and less bureaucratically. It does not leave a good impression when the office closes on the dot after 8 hours. The people are not there for the offices, the offices are there for the people. One has to work until the work is done. That is a requirement of the war. If the « Führer » can do that, so can his paid employees. If there is not enough work to fill the extended hours, 10 or 20 or 30 % of the workers can be transferred to war production and replace other men for service at the front. That applies to all offices in the homeland. That, by itself, may make the work in some offices go more quickly and easily. We must learn from the war to operate quickly, not only thoroughly. The soldier at the front does not have weeks to think things over, to pass his thoughts up the line or let them sit in dusty files. He must act immediately or lose his life. In the homeland, we do not lose our lives if we work slowly, but we do endanger the life of our people.

Everyone must learn to pay heed to war morale, and pay attention to the just demands of working and fighting people. We are not spoilsports, but neither will we tolerate those who hinder our efforts.

It is, for example, intolerable that certain men and women stay for weeks in spas and trade rumors, taking places away from soldiers on leave or from workers who are entitled to a vacation after a year of hard work. That is intolerable, and we have put an end to it. The war is not a time for amusement. Until it is over, we take our deepest satisfaction in work and battle. Those who do not understand that by themselves must be taught to understand it, and forced if need be. The harshest measures may be needed.

It does not look good, for example, when we devote enormous propaganda to the theme : « Wheels must roll for victory ! » , with the result that people avoid unnecessary travel only to see unemployed pleasure-seekers find more room for themselves in the trains. The railroad serves to transport war goods and travelers on war business. Only those who need a rest from hard work deserve a vacation. The « Führer » has not had a day of vacation since the war began. Since the 1st man of the country takes his duty so seriously and responsibly, it must be expected that every citizen will follow his example.

On the other hand, the government is doing all it can to give working people the relaxation they need in these trying times. Theatres, movie houses, and music-halls remain in full operation. The radio is working to expand and improve its programming. We have no intention of inflicting a gray winter mood on our people. That which serves the people and keeps up its fighting and working strength is good and essential to the war effort. We want to eliminate the opposite. To balance the measures, I have already discussed, I have therefore ordered that cultural and spiritual establishments that serve the people not be decreased, but increased. As long as they aid rather than harm the war effort, they must

be supported by the government. That applies to sports as well. Sports are not only for particular circles today, but a matter for the entire people. Military exemptions for athletes are out of place. The purpose of sports is to steel the body, certainly with the goal of using it appropriately in time of the people's greatest need.

The front shares our desires. The entire German people agrees passionately. It is no longer willing to put-up with efforts that only waste time and resources. It will not put-up with complicated questionnaires on every possible issue. It does not want to worry about a 1,000 minor matters that may have been important in peace, but are entirely unimportant during war. It also does not need to be constantly reminded of its duty by references to the great sacrifices of our soldiers at Stalingrad. It knows what it has to do. It wants everyone, high and low, rich and poor, to share a spartan life style. The « Führer » gives us all an example, one that must be followed by everyone. He knows only work and care. We do not want to leave it all to him, but rather we want to take that part of it from him which we are able to bear.

The present day has a remarkable resemblance for every genuine National-Socialist to the period of struggle. We have always acted in the same way. We were with the people through thick and thin, and that is why the people followed us. We have always carried our burdens together with the people and, therefore, they did not seem heavy to us, but rather light. The people want to be led. Never in history has the people failed a brave and determined leadership a critical hour.

Let me say a few words in this regard about practical measures in our total war effort that we have already taken.

The problem is freeing soldiers for the front, and freeing workers for the armaments industry. These are the primary goals, even at the cost of our standard of social life. This does not mean a permanent decline in our standard of living. It is only a means to reaching an end, that of total war.

As part of this campaign, hundreds of thousands of military exemptions have been canceled. These exemptions were given because we did not have enough skilled labor to fill the positions that would have been left open by revoking them. The reason for our current measures is to mobilize the necessary workers. That is why we have appealed to men not working in the war economy, and to women who were not working at all. They will not and cannot ignore our call. The duty for women to work is broad. That does not however mean that only those included in the law have to work. Anyone is welcome. The more who join the war effort, the more soldiers we can free for the front.

Our enemies maintain that German women are not able to replace men in the war economy. That may be true for certain fields of heavy labor. But I am convinced that the German woman is determined to fill the spot left by the man leaving for the front, and to do so as soon as possible. We do not need to point-out Bolshevism's example. For years, millions of the best German women have been working successfully in war production, and they wait impatiently to be joined and assisted by others. All those who join in the work are only giving the proper thanks to those at the front. Hundreds of thousands have already joined, and hundreds of thousands more will join. We hope soon to free-up armies of workers who will in turn free-up armies of fighting front soldiers.

I would think little of German women if I believed that they do not want to listen to my appeal. They will not seek to follow the letter of the law, or to slip through its loopholes. They few who may try will not succeed. We will not accept a doctor's excuse. Nor will we accept the alibi that one must help one's husband or relative or good friend as a way of avoiding work. We will respond appropriately. The few who may attempt it will only lose the respect of those around them. The people will despise them. No one expects a woman lacking the requisite physical strength to go to work in a tank factory. There are however numerous jobs in war production that do not demand great physical strength, and which a woman can do even if she comes from the better circles. No one is too good to work, and we all have the choice to give-up what we have, or to lose everything.

It is also time to ask women with household help if they really need it. One can take care of the house and children oneself, freeing the servant for other tasks, or leave the house and children in care of the servant or the « NSV » (Party Welfare Organization) , and go to work oneself. Life may not be as pleasant as it is during peace. But we are not at peace, we are at war. We can be comfortable after we have won the war. Now, we must sacrifice our comforts to gain victory.

Soldiers' wives surely understand this. They know it is their duty to their husbands to support them by doing work that is important to the war effort. That is true above all in agriculture. The wives of farmers must set a good example. Both men and women must be sure that no one does less during war than they did in peace ; more work must instead be done in every area.

One may not, by the way, make the mistake of leaving everything to the government. The government can only set the broad guidelines. To give life to those guidelines is the job of working people, under the inspiring leadership of the Party. Fast action is essential.

One must go beyond the legal requirements. « Volunteer ! » is the slogan. As « Gauleiter » of Berlin, I appeal here above all to my fellow Berliners. They have given enough good examples of noble behavior and bravery during the war such that they will not fail here. Their practical behavior and good cheer even during war have earned them a good name throughout the world. This good name must be maintained and strengthened ! If I appeal to my fellow Berliners to do some important work quickly, thoroughly, and without complaint, I know they will all obey. We do not want to complain about the difficulties of the day or grump to one another. Rather, we want to behave not only like Berliners, but like Germans, by getting to work, acting, seizing the initiative and doing something, not leaving it to someone else.

What German woman would want to ignore my appeal on behalf of those fighting at the front ? Who would want to put personal comfort above national duty ? Who, in view of the serious threat we face, would want to consider his private needs instead of the requirements of the war ?

I reject with contempt the enemy's claim that we are imitating Bolshevism. We do not want to imitate Bolshevism, we want to defeat it, with whatever means are necessary. The German woman will best understand what I mean, for she has long known that the war our men are fighting today above all is a war to protect her children. Her holiest possession is guarded by our people's most valuable blood. The German woman must spontaneously proclaim her

solidarity with her fighting men. She had better join the ranks of millions of workers in the homeland's army, and do it tomorrow rather than the day after tomorrow. A river of readiness must flow through the German people. I expect that countless women and above all men who are not doing essential war work will report to the authorities. He who gives quickly gives twice as much.

Our general economy is consolidating. That particularly affects the insurance and banking systems, the tax system, newspapers and magazines that are not essential for the war effort, and non-essential Party and government activities, and also requires a further simplification of our life style.

I know that many of our people are making great sacrifices. I understand their sacrifices, and the government is trying to keep them to the necessary minimum. But some must remain, and must be borne. When the war is over, we will build-up that which we now are eliminating, more generously and more beautifully, and the State will lend its hand.

I energetically reject the charge that our measures will eliminate the middle-class or result in a monopoly economy. The middle-class will regain its economic and social position after the war. The current measures are necessary for the war effort. They aim not at a structural transformation of the economy, but merely at winning the war as quickly as possible.

I do not dispute the fact that these measures will cause worry in the coming weeks. They will give us breathing room. We are laying the groundwork for the coming summer, without paying heed to the threats and boasting of the enemy. I am happy to reveal this plan for victory (Stormy applause.) to the German people. They not only accept these measures, they have demanded them, demanded them more strongly than ever before during the war. The people want action ! It is time for it ! We must use our time to prepare for coming surprises.

I turn now to the entire German people, and particularly to the Party, as the leader of the totalization of our domestic war effort. This is not the 1st major task you have faced. You will bring the usual revolutionary élan to bear on it. You will deal with the laziness and indolence that may occasionally show-up. The government has issued general regulations, and will issue further ones in coming weeks. The minor issues not dealt with in these regulations must be taken care of by the people, under the Party's leadership. One moral law stands above everything for each of us : to do nothing that harms the war effort, and to do everything that brings victory nearer.

In past years, we have often recalled the example of Frederick the Great in newspapers and on the radio. We did not have the right to do so. For a while during the 3rd Silesian War, Frederick II had 5 million Prussians, according to Schlieffen, standing against 90 million enemies. In the 2nd of 7 hellish years, he suffered a defeat that shook Prussia's foundations. He never had enough soldiers and weapons to fight without risking everything. His strategy was always one of improvisation. But his principle was to attack the enemy whenever it was possible. He suffered defeats, but that was not decisive. What was decisive is that the Great King remained unbroken, that he was unshaken by the changing fortunes of war, that his strong heart overcame every danger. At the end of 7 years of war, he was 51 years old, he had no teeth, he suffered from gout, and was tortured by a thousand pains, but he stood above the devastated

battlefield as the victor. How does our situation compare with his ?! Let us show the same will and decisiveness as he, and when the time comes do as he did, remaining unshakable through all the twists of fate, and like him win the battle even under the most unfavorable circumstances. Let us never doubt our great cause.

I am firmly convinced that the German people have been deeply moved by the blow of fate at Stalingrad. It has looked into the face of hard and pitiless war. It knows now the awful truth, and is resolved to follow the « Führer » through thick and thin. (The crowd rises and like the roaring ocean chants : « “ Führer ” command, we follow ! Heil our “ Führer ” ! » . The Minister is unable to continue for several minutes.)

The English and American press, in recent days, has been writing at length about the attitude of the German people during this crisis. The English seem to think that they know the German people much better than we do, its own leadership. They give hypocritical advice on what we should do and not do. They believe that the German people today is the same as the German people of November 1918 that fell victim to their persuasive wiles. I do not need to disprove their assertions. That will come from the fighting and working German people.

To make the truth plain, however, my German comrades, I want to ask you a series of questions. I want you to answer them to the best of your knowledge, according to your conscience. When my audience cheered on 30 January, the English press reported the next day that it was all a propaganda show that did not represent the true opinion of the German people. (Spontaneous shouts of « Pfui ! » , « Lies ! » , « Let them come here ! They will learn differently ! » .) I have invited to today's meeting a cross-section of the German people in the best sense of the word. (The Minister's words were accompanied by stormy applause that increased in intensity as he came to the representatives of the army present at the meeting.) In front of me are rows of wounded German soldiers from the Eastern Front, missing legs and arms, with wounded bodies, those who have lost their sight, those who have come with nurses, men in the blush of youth who stand with crutches. Among them are 50 who bear the Knight's Cross with Oak Leaves, shining examples of our fighting front. Behind them are armaments workers from Berlin tank factories. Behind them are Party officials, soldiers from the fighting army, doctors, scientists, artists, engineers and architects, teachers, officials and employees from offices, proud representatives of every area of our intellectual life that even in the midst of war produce miracles of human genius. Throughout the « Sportpalast » , I see thousands of German women. The youth is here, as are the aged. No class, no occupation, no age remained uninvited. I can rightly say that before me is gathered a representative sample of the German population, both from the homeland and the front. Is that true ? Yes or no ? (The « Sportpalast » experiences something seen only rarely even in this old fighting locale of National-Socialism. The masses spring to their feet. A hurricane of thousands of voices shouts « yes » . The participants experience a spontaneous popular referendum and expression of will.) You, my hearers, at this moment, represent the whole nation. I wish to ask you 10 questions that you will answer for the German people throughout the world, but especially for our enemies, who are listening to us on the radio. (Only with difficulty can the Minister be heard. The crowd is at the peak of excitement. The individual questions are razor sharp. Each individual feels as if he is being spoken to personally. With full participation and enthusiasm, the crowd answers each question. The « Sportpalast » rings with a single shout of agreement.)

Ist, the English maintain that the German people has lost faith in victory.

I ask you : Do you believe with the « Führer » and us in the final total victory of the German people ?

I ask you : Are you resolved to follow the « Führer » through thick and thin to victory, and are you willing to accept the heaviest personal burdens ?

2nd, The English say that the German people are tired of fighting.

I ask you : Are you ready to follow the « Führer » as the phalanx of the homeland, standing behind the fighting army and to wage war with wild determination through all the turns of fate until victory is ours ?

3rd, the English maintain that the German people have no desire any longer to accept the government's growing demands for war work.

I ask you : Are you and the German people willing to work, if the « Führer » orders, 10, 12 and, if necessary, 14 hours a day and to give everything for victory ?

4th, the English maintain that the German people is resisting the government's total war measures. It does not want total war, but capitulation ! (Shouts : « Never ! Never ! Never ! » .)

I ask you : Do you want total war ? If necessary, do you want a war more total and radical than anything that we can even imagine today ?

5th, the English maintain that the German people have lost faith in the « Führer » .

I ask you : Is your confidence in the « Führer » greater, more faithful and more unshakable than ever before ? Are you absolutely and completely ready to follow him wherever he goes and do all that is necessary to bring the war to a victorious end ? (The crowd rises as one man. It displays unprecedented enthusiasm. Thousands of voices join in shouting : « “ Führer ” command, we follow ! » . A wave of shouts of « Heil » flows through the hall. As if by command, the flags and standards are raised as the highest expression of the sacred moment in which the crowd honours the « Führer » .)

6th, I ask you : Are you ready, from now on, to give your full strength to provide the Eastern Front with the men and munitions it needs to give Bolshevism the death blow ?

7th, I ask you : Do you take a holy oath to the front that the homeland stands firm behind them, and that you will give them everything they need to win the victory ?

8th, I ask you : Do you, especially you women, want the government to do all it can to encourage German women to put their full strength at work to support the war effort, and to release men for the front whenever possible, thereby

helping the men at the front ?

9th, I ask you : Do you approve, if necessary, the most radical measures against a small group of shirkers and black marketers who pretend there is peace in the middle of war and use the need of the nation for their own selfish purposes ? Do you agree that those who harm the war effort should lose their heads ?

10th and lastly, I ask you : Do you agree that above all in war, according to the National-Socialist Party platform, the same rights and duties should apply to all, that the homeland should bear the heavy burdens of the war together, and that the burdens should be shared equally between high and low and rich and poor ?

I have asked ; you have given me your answers. You are part of the people, and your answers are those of the German people. You have told our enemies what they needed to hear so that they will have no illusions or false ideas.

Now, just as in the 1st hours of our rule and through the 10 years that followed, we are bound firmly in brotherhood with the German people. The most powerful ally on earth, the people itself, stands behind us and is determined to follow the « Führer » , come what may. They will accept the heaviest burdens to gain victory. What power on earth can hinder us from reaching our goal. Now we must and will succeed ! I stand before you, not only as the spokesman of the government, but as the spokesman of the people. My old Party friends are here around me, clothed with the high offices of the people and the government. Party comrade Speer sits next to me. The « Führer » has given him the great task of mobilizing the German armaments industry and supplying the front with all the weapons it needs. Party comrade Doctor Ley sits next to me. The « Führer » has charged him with the leadership of the German work force, with schooling and training them in untiring work for the war effort. We feel deeply indebted to our Party comrade Sauckel, who has been charged by the « Führer » to bring hundreds of thousands of workers to the « Reich » to support our national economy, something the enemy cannot do. All the leaders of the Party, the army, and government join with us as well.

We are all children of our people, forged together by this most critical hour of our national history. We promise you, we promise the front, we promise the « Führer » , that we will mold together the homeland into a force on which the « Führer » and his fighting soldiers can rely on absolutely and blindly. We pledge to do all in our life and work that is necessary for victory. We will fill our hearts with the political passion, with the ever-burning fire that blazed during the great struggles of the Party and the State. Never, during this war, will we fall prey to the false and hypocritical objectivism that has brought the German nation so much misfortune over its history.

When the war began, we turned our eyes to the nation alone. That which serves its struggle for life is good and must be encouraged. What harms its struggle for life is bad and must be eliminated and cut-out. With burning hearts and cool heads, we will overcome the major problems of this phase of the war. We are on the way to final victory. That victory rests on our faith in the « Führer » .

This evening, I once again remind the whole nation of its duty. The « Führer » expects us to do that which will throw all we have done in the past into the shadows. We do not want to fail him. As we are proud of him, he should be

proud of us.

The great crises and upsets of national life show who the true men and women are. We have no right any longer to speak of the weaker sex, for both sexes are displaying the same determination and spiritual strength. The nation is ready for anything. The « Führer » has commanded, and we will follow him. In this hour of national reflection and contemplation, we believe firmly and unshakably in victory. We see it before us, we need only reach for it. We must resolve to subordinate everything to it. That is the duty of the hour. Let the slogan be :

« Now, people rise-up and let the storm break loose ! »

(The Minister's final words were lost in unending stormy applause.)

Nun, Volk, steh auf, und Sturm brich los !

Rede im Berliner Sportpalast 18. Februar 1943 von Doktor Josef Goebbels :

Es ist jetzt knapp drei Wochen her, daß ich das letzte Mal bei Gelegenheit der Verlesung der Proklamation des Führers zum Zehnjahrestag der Machtergreifung von dieser Stelle aus zu Ihnen und zum deutschen Volke gesprochen habe. Die Krise, in der sich unsere Ostfront augenblicklich befindet, stand damals auf dem Höhepunkt. Wir hatten uns im Zeichen des harten Unglücksschlages, von dem die Nation im Kampf um die Wolga betroffen wurde, am 30. Januar dieses Jahres zusammengefunden zu einer Kundgebung der Einheit, der Geschlossenheit, aber auch der festen Willenskraft, mit den Schwierigkeiten, die dieser Krieg in seinem vierten Jahre vor uns aufbürdet, fertig zu werden.

Es war für mich und wohl auch für Sie alle erschütternd, einige Tage später zu vernehmen, daß die letzten heldenhaften Kämpfer von Stalingrad, in dieser Stunde durch die Ätherwellen mit uns verbunden, an unserer erhebenden Sportpalastkundgebung teilgenommen haben. Sie funkten in ihrem Schlußbericht, daß sie die Proklamation des Führers vernommen und vielleicht zum letzten Male in ihrem Leben mit uns zusammen mit erhobenen Händen die Nationalhymnen gesungen hätten. Welch eine Haltung deutschen Soldatentums in dieser großen Zeit ! Welche Verpflichtung aber schließt diese Haltung auch für uns alle, insbesondere für die ganze deutsche Heimat in sich ein ! Stalingrad war und ist der große Alarmruf des Schicksals an die deutsche Nation. Ein Volk, das die Stärke besitzt, ein solches Unglück zu ertragen und auch zu überwinden, ja, daraus noch zusätzliche Kraft zu schöpfen, ist unbesiegbar. Das Gedächtnis an die Helden von Stalingrad soll also auch heute bei meiner Rede vor Ihnen und vor dem deutschen Volke eine tiefe Verpflichtung mich und für uns alle sein.

Ich weiß nicht, wie viele Millionen Menschen, über die Ätherwellen mit uns verbunden, heute Abend an der Front und in der Heimat an dieser Kundgebung teilnehmen und meine Zuhörer sind. Ich möchte zu Ihnen allen aus tiefstem Herzen zum tiefsten Herzen sprechen. Ich glaube, das gesamte deutsche Volk ist mit heißer Leidenschaft bei der Sache, die ich Ihnen heute Abend vorzutragen habe. Ich will deshalb meine Ausführungen auch mit dem ganzen heiligen Ernst und dem offenen Freimut, den die Stunde von uns erfordert, ausstatten. Das im Nationalsozialismus erzogene, geschulte und disziplinierte deutsche Volk kann die volle Wahrheit vertragen. Es weiß, wie schwierig es um die Lage des Reiches

bestellt ist, und seine Führung kann es deshalb gerade auch auffordern, aus der Bedrängtheit der Situation die nötigen harten, ja auch härtesten Folgerungen zu ziehen. Wir Deutschen sind gewappnet gegen Schwäche und Anfälligkeit, und Schläge und Unglücksfälle des Krieges verleihen uns nur zusätzliche Kraft, feste Entschlossenheit und eine seelische und kämpferische Aktivität, die bereit ist, alle Schwierigkeiten und Hindernisse mit revolutionärem Elan zu überwinden.

Es ist jetzt nicht der Augenblick, danach zu fragen, wie alles gekommen ist. Das wird einer späteren Rechenschaftslegung überlassen bleiben, die in voller Offenheit erfolgen soll und dem deutschen Volke und der Weltöffentlichkeit zeigen wird, daß das Unglück, das uns in den letzten Wochen betroffen hat, seine tiefe, schicksalhafte Bedeutung besitzt. Das große Heldenopfer, das unsere Soldaten in Stalingrad brachten, ist für die ganze Ostfront von einer auschlaggebenden geschichtlichen Bedeutung gewesen. Es war nicht umsonst. Warum, das wird die Zukunft beweisen.

Wenn ich nunmehr über die jüngste Vergangenheit hinaus den Blick wieder nach vorne lenke, so tue ich das mit voller Absicht. Die Stunde drängt ! Sie läßt keine Zeit mehr offen für fruchtlose Debatten. Wir müssen handeln, und zwar unverzüglich, schnell und gründlich, so wie es seit jeher nationalsozialistische Art gewesen ist.

Von ihrem Anfang an ist die Bewegung in den vielen Krisen, die sie durchzustehen und durchzukämpfen hatte, so verfahren. Und auch der nationalsozialistische Staat hat sich, wenn eine Bedrohung vor ihm auftauchte, ihr mit entschlossener Willenskraft entgegen geworfen. Wir gleichen nicht dem Vogel Strauß, der den Kopf in den Sand steckt, um die Gefahr nicht zu sehen. Wir sind mutig genug, sie unmittelbar ins Auge zu nehmen, sie kühl und rücksichtslos abzumessen und ihr dann erhobenen Hauptes und mit fester Entschlusskraft entgegenzutreten. Erst dann entwickelten wir als Bewegung und als Volk immer auch unsere höchsten Tugenden, nämlich einen wilden und entschloßenen Willen, die Gefahr zu brechen und zu bannen, eine Stärke des Charakters, die alle Hindernisse überwindet, zähe Verbissenheit in der Verfolgung des einmal erkannten Zieles und ein ehernes Herz, das gegen alle inneren und äußeren Anfechtungen gewappnet ist. So soll es auch heute sein. Ich habe die Aufgabe, Ihnen ein ungeschminktes Bild der Lage zu entwerfen und daraus die harten Konsequenzen für das Handeln der deutschen Führung, aber auch für das Handeln des deutschen Volkes zu ziehen.

Wir durchleben im Osten augenblicklich eine schwere militärische Belastung. Diese Belastung hat zeitweilig größere Ausmaße angenommen und gleicht, wenn nicht in der Art der Anlage, so doch in ihrem Umfang der des vergangenen Winters. Über ihre Ursachen wird später einmal zu sprechen sein. Heute bleibt uns nichts anderes übrig, als ihr Vorhandensein festzustellen und die Mittel und Wege zu überprüfen und anzuwenden beziehungsweise einzuschlagen, die zu ihrer Behebung führen. Es hat deshalb auch gar keinen Zweck, diese Belastung selbst zu bestreiten. Ich bin mir zu gut dazu, Ihnen ein täuschendes Bild der Lage zu geben, das nur zu falschen Folgerungen führen könnte und geeignet wäre, das deutsche Volk in eine Sicherheit seiner Lebensführung und seines Handelns einzuwiegen, die der gegenwärtigen Situation durchaus unangepasst wäre.

Der Ansturm der Steppe gegen unseren ehrwürdigen Kontinent ist in diesem Winter mit einer Wucht losgebrochen, die alle menschlichen und geschichtlichen Vorstellungen in den Schatten stellt. Die deutsche Wehrmacht bildet dagegen mit ihren Verbündeten den einzigen überhaupt in Frage kommenden Schutzwall. Der « Führer » hat schon in seiner

Proklamation zum 30. Januar mit ernsten und eindringlichen Worten die Frage aufgeworfen, was aus Deutschland und aus Europa geworden wäre, wenn am 30. Januar 1933 statt der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung ein bürgerliches oder ein demokratisches Regime die Macht übernommen hätte ! Welche Gefahren wären dann, schneller als wir es damals ahnen konnten, über das Reich hereingebrochen, und welche Abwehrkräfte hätten uns noch zur Verfügung gestanden, um ihnen zu begegnen ?

Zehn Jahre Nationalsozialismus haben genügt, das deutsche Volk über den Ernst der schicksalhaften Problematik, die aus dem östlichen Bolschewismus entspringt, vollkommen aufzuklären. Man wird jetzt auch verstehen, warum wir unsere Nürnberger Parteitage so oft unter das Signum des Kampfes gegen den Bolschewismus gestellt haben. Wir erhoben damals unsere warnende Stimme vor dem deutschen Volk und vor der Weltöffentlichkeit, um die von einer Willens- und Geisteslähmung ohnegleichen befallene abendländische Menschheit zum Erwachen zu bringen und ihr die Augen zu öffnen für die grauenerregenden geschichtlichen Gefahren, die aus dem Vorhandensein des östlichen Bolschewismus erwachsen, der ein Volk von fast 200 Millionen dem jüdischen Terror dienstbar gemacht hatte und es zum Angriffskrieg gegen Europa vorbereitete. Als der « Führer » die deutsche Wehrmacht am 22. Juni 1941 im Osten zum Angriff antreten ließ, waren wir uns alle im Klaren darüber, daß damit überhaupt der entscheidende Kampf dieses gigantischen Weltringens anbrach. Wir wussten, welche Gefahren und Schwierigkeiten er für uns mit sich bringen würde. Wir waren uns aber auch klar darüber, daß die Gefahren und Schwierigkeiten bei längerem Zuwarten nur wachsen, niemals aber abnehmen könnten. Es war zwei Minuten vor zwölf. Ein weiteres Zögern hätte leicht zur Vernichtung des Reiches und zur vollkommenen Bolschewisierung des europäischen Kontinents geführt.

Es ist verständlich, daß wir bei den groß angelegten Tarnungs- und Bluffmanövern des bolschewistischen Regimes das Kriegspotential der Sowjetunion nicht richtig eingeschätzt haben. Erst jetzt offenbart es sich uns in seiner ganzen wilden Größe. Dementsprechend ist auch der Kampf, den unsere Soldaten im Osten zu bestehen haben, über alle menschlichen Vorstellungen hinaus hart, schwer und gefährlich. Er erfordert die Aufbietung unserer ganzen nationalen Kraft. Hier ist eine Bedrohung des Reiches und des europäischen Kontinents gegeben, die alle bisherigen Gefahren des Abendlandes weit in den Schatten stellt. Würden wir in diesem Kampf versagen, so verspielten wir damit überhaupt unsere geschichtliche Mission. Alles, was wir bisher aufgebaut und geleistet haben, verblasst angesichts der gigantischen Aufgabe, die hier der deutschen Wehrmacht unmittelbar und dem deutschen Volke mittelbar gestellt ist.

Ich wende mich in meinen Ausführungen zuerst an die Weltöffentlichkeit und proklamiere ihr gegenüber drei Thesen unseres Kampfes gegen die bolschewistische Gefahr im Osten. Die erste dieser drei Thesen lautet : Wäre die deutsche Wehrmacht nicht in der Lage, die Gefahr aus dem Osten zu brechen, so wäre damit das Reich und in kurzer Folge ganz Europa dem Bolschewismus verfallen.

Die zweite dieser Thesen lautet : Die deutsche Wehrmacht und das deutsche Volk allein besitzen mit ihren Verbündeten die Kraft, eine grundlegende Rettung Europas aus dieser Bedrohung durchzuführen.

Die dritte dieser Thesen lautet : Gefahr ist im Verzuge. Es muß schnell und gründlich gehandelt werden, sonst ist es zu spät.

Zur ersten These habe ich im Einzelnen zu bemerken : Der Bolschewismus hat seit jeher ganz offen das Ziel proklamiert, nicht nur Europa, sondern die ganze Welt zu revolutionieren und sie in ein bolschewistisches Chaos zu stürzen. Dieses Ziel ist seit Beginn der bolschewistischen Sowjetunion seitens des Kremls ideologisch vertreten und praktisch verfochten worden. Es ist klar, daß Stalin und die anderen Sowjetgrößen, je mehr sie glauben, sich der Verwirklichung ihrer weltzerstörerischen Absichten zu nähern, umso mehr auch bestrebt sind, diese zu tarnen und zu verschleiern. Das kann uns nicht beirren. Wir gehören nicht zu jenen furchtsamen Gemütern, die wie das hypnotisierte Kaninchen auf die Schlange schauen, bis sie es verschlingt. Wir wollen die Gefahr rechtzeitig erkennen und ihr auch rechtzeitig mit wirksamen Mitteln entgegentreten. Wir durchschauen nicht nur die Ideologie, sondern auch die Praktiken des Bolschewismus, denn wir haben uns schon einmal mit ihnen, und zwar mit denkbar größtem Erfolg, auf innerpolitischem Felde auseinandergesetzt. Uns kann der Kreml nichts vormachen. Wir haben in einem vierzehnjährigen Kampf vor der Machtübernahme und in einem zehnjährigen Kampf nach der Machtübernahme seine Absichten und infamen Weltbetrugsmanöver demaskiert.

Das Ziel des Bolschewismus ist die Weltrevolution der Juden. Sie wollen das Chaos über das Reich und über Europa hereinführen, um in der daraus entstehenden Hoffnungslosigkeit und Verzweiflung der Völker ihre internationale, bolschewistisch verschleierte kapitalistische Tyrannei aufzurichten.

Was das für das deutsche Volk bedeuten würde, braucht nicht näher erläutert zu werden. Es würde mit der Bolschewisierung des Reiches eine Liquidierung unserer gesamten Intelligenz- und Führungsschicht und als Folge davon die Überführung der arbeitenden Massen in die bolschewistisch-jüdische Sklaverei nach sich ziehen. Man sucht in Moskau Zwangsarbeitsbataillone, wie der « Führer » in seiner Proklamation zum 30. Januar schon sagte, für die sibirischen Tundren. Der Aufstand der Steppe macht sich vor unseren Fronten bereit, und der Ansturm des Ostens, der in täglich sich steigender Stärke gegen unsere Linien anbrandet, ist nichts anderes als die versuchte Wiederholung der geschichtlichen Verheerungen, die früher schon so oft unseren Erdteil gefährdet haben.

Damit aber ist auch eine unmittelbare akute Lebensbedrohung für alle europäischen Mächte gegeben. Man soll nicht glauben, daß der Bolschewismus, hätte er die Gelegenheit, seinen Siegeszug über das Reich anzutreten, irgendwo an unseren Grenzen Halt machen würde. Er treibt eine Aggressionspolitik und Aggressionskriegführung, die ausgesprochen auf die Bolschewisierung aller Länder und Völker ausgeht. Papierene Erklärungen, die von Seiten des Kremls oder als Garantieverpflichtungen von Seiten Londons oder Washingtons gegen diese nicht zu bestreitenden Absichten abgegeben werden, imponieren uns nicht. Wir wissen, daß wir es im Osten mit einer infernalischen politischen Teufelei zu tun haben, die die sonst unter Menschen und Staaten üblichen Beziehungen nicht anerkennt. Wenn beispielsweise der englische Lord Beaverbrook erklärt, daß Europa dem Sowjetismus zur Führung überantwortet werden müße, wenn ein maßgeblicher amerikanisch-jüdischer Journalist Brown diese These durch die zynische Verlautbarung ergänzt, daß eine Bolschewisierung Europas vielleicht überhaupt die Lösung unseres kontinentalen Problems darstellte, so wissen wir genau, was damit gemeint ist. Die europäischen Mächte stehen hier vor ihrer entscheidenden Lebensfrage. Das Abendland ist in Gefahr. Ob ihre Regierungen und ihre Intelligenzschichten das einsehen wollen oder nicht, ist dabei gänzlich unerheblich.

Das deutsche Volk jedenfalls ist nicht gewillt, sich dieser Gefahr auch nur versuchsweise preiszugeben. Hinter den

anstürmenden Sowjetdivisionen sehen wir schon die jüdischen Liquidationskommandos, hinter diesen aber erhebt sich der Terror, das Gespenst des Millionenhungers und einer vollkommenen Anarchie. Hier erweist sich wiederum das internationale Judentum als das teuflische Ferment der Dekomposition, das eine geradezu zynische Genugtuung dabei empfindet, die Welt in ihre tiefste Unordnung zu stürzen und damit den Untergang jahrtausendealter Kulturen, an denen es niemals einen inneren Anteil hatte, herbeizuführen. Wir wissen damit also, vor welcher geschichtlichen Aufgabe wir stehen. Eine zweitausendjährige Aufbauarbeit der abendländischen Menschheit ist in Gefahr. Man kann diese Gefahr gar nicht ernst genug schildern, aber es ist auch bezeichnend, daß wenn man sie nur beim Namen nennt, das internationale Judentum in allen Ländern dagegen mit lärmenden Ausführungen Protest erhebt. So weit also ist es in Europa schon gekommen, daß man eine Gefahr nicht mehr eine Gefahr nennen darf, wenn sie eben vom Judentum ausgeht.

Das aber hindert uns nicht daran, die dazu notwendigen Feststellungen zu treffen. Wir haben das auch früher in unserem innerpolitischen Kampfe getan, als das kommunistische Judentum sich des demokratischen Judentums im « Berliner Tageblatt » und in der « Vossischen Zeitung » bediente, um eine Gefahr, die von Tag zu Tag drohender wurde, zu verniedlichen und zu bagatellisieren, um damit die von ihr bedrohten Teile unseres Volkes in Sicherheit einzuwiegen und ihre Abwehrkräfte einzuschläfern. Wir sähen, wenn wir dieser Gefahr nicht Herr würden, im Geiste schon das Gespenst des Hungers, des Elends und einer Millionenzwangsarbeit für das deutsche Volk heraufziehen, sähen den ehrwürdigsten Erdteil in seinen Grundfesten wanken und unter seinen Trümmern das geschichtliche Erbe der abendländischen Menschheit begraben. Das ist das Problem, vor dem wir stehen.

Meine zweite These lautet : Allein das Deutsche Reich mit seinen Verbündeten ist in der Lage, die eben geschilderte Gefahr zu bannen. Die europäischen Staaten einschließlich Englands behaupten, stark genug zu sein, einer Bolschewisierung des europäischen Kontinents, sollte sie einmal praktisch gegeben sein, rechtzeitig und wirksam entgegenzutreten. Diese Erklärung ist kindisch und verdient überhaupt keine Widerlegung. Sollte die stärkste Militärmacht der Welt nicht in der Lage sein, die Drohung des Bolschewismus zu brechen, wer brächte dann noch die Kraft dazu auf ? (Hier antworten stürmische Rufe aus der im Sportpalast versammelten Menge : « Niemand ! ») Die neutralen europäischen Staaten besitzen weder das Potential noch die militärischen Machtmittel noch die geistige Einstellung ihrer Völker, um dem Bolschewismus auch nur den geringsten Widerstand entgegenzusetzen. Sie würden im Bedarfsfall von seinen motorisierten Roboterdivisionen in wenigen Tagen überfahren werden. In den Hauptstädten der mittleren und kleinen europäischen Staaten tröstet man sich mit der Absicht, man müße sich gegen die bolschewistische Gefahr seelisch rüsten. (Heiterkeit.) Das erinnert verzweifelt an die Erklärungen der bürgerlichen Mittelparteien aus dem Jahre 1932, daß der Kampf gegen den Kommunismus nur mit geistigen Waffen ausgefochten und gewonnen werden könne. Diese Behauptung war uns auch damals zu albern, als daß wir uns damit auseinandergesetzt hätten. Der östliche Bolschewismus ist nicht nur eine terroristische Lehre, sondern auch eine terroristische Praxis. Er verfolgt seine Ziele und Zwecke mit einer infernalischen Gründlichkeit, unter restloser Ausschöpfung seines inneren Potentials und ohne jede Rücksichtnahme auf Glück, Wohlstand und Frieden der von ihm unterjochten Völkerschaften. Was wollten England und Amerika tun, wenn der europäische Kontinent im größten Unglücksfall dem Bolschewismus in die Arme fiel ? Will man Europa von London aus vielleicht einreden, daß eine solche Entwicklung an der Kanalgrenze Halt machen würde ?

Ich habe schon einmal darauf hingewiesen, daß der Bolschewismus seine Fremdenlegionen auf dem Boden aller demokratischen Staaten bereits in den kommunistischen Parteien stehen hat. Keiner dieser Staaten kann von sich behaupten, gegen eine innere Bolschewisierung immun zu sein. Eine jüngst vorgenommene Nachwahl zum englischen Unterhaus ergab, daß der unabhängige, das heißt kommunistische Kandidat in einem Wahlkreis, der bisher unumschränkte Domäne der Konservativen war, von insgesamt 22371 Stimmen 10741 erhielt, das heißt, daß die Rechtsparteien allein in diesem einen Kreise im Verlaufe von nur kurzer Zeit rund 10000, also die Hälfte aller Wählerstimmen an die Kommunisten verloren, ein Beweis mehr dafür, daß die bolschewistische Gefahr auch in England gegeben ist und daß sie nicht dadurch gebannt wird, daß man sie nicht sehen will. Alle territorialen Verpflichtungen, die die Sowjetunion auf sich nimmt, besitzen in unseren Augen keinen effektiven Wert. Der Bolschewismus pflegt seine Grenzen auch ideologisch und nicht nur militärisch zu ziehen, und darin ist eben seine über die Grenzen der Völker hinwegspringende Gefahr gegeben. Die Welt hat also nicht die Wahl zwischen einem in seine alte Zersplitterung zurückfallenden und einem unter der Achsenführung sich neu ordnenden Europa, sondern nur die zwischen einem unter dem militärischen Schutz der Achse stehenden und einem bolschewistischen Europa.

Darüber hinaus bin ich der festen Überzeugung, daß die lamentierenden Lords und Erzbischöfe in London überhaupt nicht einmal die Absicht haben, der bolschewistischen Gefahr, die bei einem weiteren Vordringen der Sowjetarmeen für die europäischen Staaten gegeben wäre, praktisch entgegenzutreten. Das Judentum hat die angelsächsischen Staaten geistig und politisch schon so tief durchdrungen, daß sie diese Gefahr überhaupt nicht mehr sehen und wahr haben wollen. Wie es sich in der Sowjetunion bolschewistisch tarnt, so tarnt es sich in den angelsächsischen Staaten plutokratisch-kapitalistisch. Die Methoden der Mimikry sind bei der jüdischen Rasse bekannt. Sie geht seit jeher darauf aus, ihre Gastvölker einzuschläfern und damit ihre Abwehrkräfte gegen von ihr stammende akute und lebensgefährdende Bedrohungen zu lähmen. (Zurufe aus der Menge : « Wir haben sie erlebt ! ») Unsere Einsicht in diese Problematik hat uns schon früh die Erkenntnis vermittelt, daß das Zusammengehen zwischen internationaler Plutokratie und internationalem Bolschewismus durchaus keinen Widersinn, sondern einen tiefen und ursächlichen Sinn darstellt. Über unser Land hinweg reichen sich bereits das westeuropäische scheinzivilisierte Judentum und das Judentum des östlichen Ghettos die Hände. Damit ist Europa in Todesgefahr.

Ich schmeichle mir nicht, mit diesen Ausführungen die öffentliche Meinung in den neutralen oder gar in den feindlichen Staaten alarmieren zu können. Das ist auch nicht ihr Zweck und ihre Absicht. Ich weiß, daß die englische Presse morgen mit einem wütenden Gekläff über mich herfallen wird, ich hätte angesichts unserer Belastung an der Ostfront die ersten Friedensfühler ausgestreckt. (Stürmisches Gelächter.) Davon kann überhaupt keine Rede sein. In Deutschland denkt heute kein Mensch an einen faulen Kompromiss, das ganze Volk denkt nur an einen harten Krieg. Ich beanspruche aber als ein verantwortlicher Sprecher des führenden Landes dieses Kontinents für mich das souveräne Recht, eine Gefahr eine Gefahr zu nennen, wenn sie nicht nur unser eigenes Land, sondern unseren ganzen Erdteil bedroht. Als Nationalsozialisten haben wir die Pflicht, Alarm zu schlagen gegen die versuchte Chaotisierung des europäischen Kontinents durch das internationale Judentum, das sich im Bolschewismus eine terroristische Militärmacht aufgebaut hat, deren Bedrohlichkeit überhaupt nicht überschätzt werden kann.

Die dritte These, die ich hier näher erläutern will, ist die, daß Gefahr unmittelbar im Verzuge ist. Die Lähmungserscheinungen der westeuropäischen Demokratien gegen ihre tödlichste Bedrohung sind herzbeklemmend. Das

internationale Judentum fördert sie mit allen Kräften. Genau so, wie der Widerstand gegen den Kommunismus in unserem Kampf um die Macht in unserem eigenen Lande von den jüdischen Zeitungen künstlich eingeschlafert und nur durch den Nationalsozialismus wieder erweckt wurde, genau so ist das heute bei den anderen Völkern der Fall. Das Judentum erweist sich hier wieder einmal als die Inkarnation des Bösen, als plastischer Dämon des Verfalls und als Träger eines internationalen kulturzerstörerischen Chaos.

Man wird, um das hier nur zu erwähnen, in diesem Zusammenhang auch unsere konsequente Judenpolitik verstehen können. Wir sehen im Judentum für jedes Land eine unmittelbare Gefahr gegeben. Wie andere Völker sich gegen diese Gefahr zur Wehr setzen, ist uns gleichgültig. Wie wir uns aber dagegen zur Wehr setzen, das ist unsere eigene Sache, in die wir keinerlei Einsprüche dulden. Das Judentum stellt eine infektiöse Erscheinung dar, die ansteckend wirkt. Wenn das feindliche Ausland gegen unsere antijüdische Politik scheinheilig Protest einlegt und über unsere Maßnahmen gegen das Judentum heuchlerische Krokodilstränen vergießt, so kann uns das nicht daran hindern, das Notwendige zu tun. Deutschland jedenfalls hat nicht die Absicht, sich dieser Bedrohung zu beugen, sondern vielmehr die, ihr rechtzeitig und wenn nötig mit den radikalsten Gegenmaßnahmen entgegenzutreten. (Minutenlang hindern nach diesen Sätzen zustimmende Sprechchöre den Minister am Weiterreden.)

Im Zeichen all dieser Überlegungen steht die militärische Belastung des Reiches im Osten. Der Krieg der mechanisierten Roboter gegen Deutschland und gegen Europa ist auf seinen Höhepunkt gestiegen. Das deutsche Volk erfüllt mit seinen Achsenpartnern im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes eine europäische Mission, wenn es dieser unmittelbaren und ersten Lebensbedrohung mit den Waffen entgegentritt. Wir laßen uns nicht durch das Geschrei des internationalen Judentums in aller Welt in der mutigen und aufrechten Fortführung des gigantischen Kampfes gegen diese Weltpest beirren. Er kann und darf nur mit Sieg enden. (Hier ertönen laute Zwischenrufe : « Deutsche Männer, ans Gewehr ! Deutsche Frauen, an die Arbeit ! »)

Das Ringen um Stalingrad wurde in seiner tragischen Verwicklung geradezu zu einem Symbol dieses heroischen, männlichen Widerstandes gegen den Aufruhr der Steppe. Es hatte deshalb nicht nur eine militärische, sondern auch eine geistige und seelische Bedeutung für das deutsche Volk von tiefstgreifender Wirkung. Erst hier sind uns unsere Augen für die aus diesem Kriege erwachsende Problematik vollkommen geöffnet worden. Wir wollen jetzt gar nichts mehr von falschen Hoffnungen und Illusionen hören. Wir wollen den Tatsachen, und wenn sie noch so hart und grausam sind, mutig in die Augen schauen. Denn jedes Mal noch hat es sich in der Geschichte unserer Partei und unseres Staates erwiesen, daß eine erkannte Gefahr bald schon auch eine gebannte Gefahr ist. Im Zeichen dieses heroischen Widerstandes stehen unsere weiteren schwersten Abwehrkämpfe im Osten. Sie beanspruchen unsere Soldaten und ihre Waffen in einem Umfange, der uns bei allen bisherigen Feldzügen vollkommen unbekannt gewesen ist. Im Osten tobt ein Krieg ohne Gnade. Der « Führer » hat ihn richtig charakterisiert, als er erklärte, es werden aus ihm nicht Sieger und Besiegte, sondern nur noch Überlebende und Vernichtete hervorgehen.

Das deutsche Volk hat das ganz klar erkannt. Mit seinem gesunden Instinkt hat es sich auf eigene Weise einen Weg durch das Gestrüpp der tagesaktuell bedingten geistigen und seelischen Schwierigkeiten dieses Krieges gebahnt. Wir wissen heute genau, daß der Blitzkrieg des Polen- und Wesfeldzuges für den Osten nur noch eine bedingte Gültigkeit hat. Hier kämpft die deutsche Nation um ihr alles. Wir sind in diesem Kampf zu der Erkenntnis gekommen, daß das

deutsche Volk hier seine heiligsten Güter, seine Familien, seine Frauen und seine Kinder, die Schönheit und Unberührtheit seiner Landschaft, seine Städte und Dörfer, das zweitausendjährige Erbe seiner Kultur und alles, was uns das Leben lebenswert macht, zu verteidigen hat.

Für diese Schätze unseres reichen Volkstums hat der Bolschewismus natürlich nicht das geringste Verständnis, und er würde auch im Bedarfsfalle darauf nicht die geringste Rücksicht nehmen. Er tut das ja nicht einmal seinem eigenen Volke gegenüber. Die Sowjetunion hat das bolschewistische Kriegspotential seit 25 Jahren in einem Umfange ausgeschöpft, der für uns gänzlich unvorstellbar war und deshalb von uns auch falsch eingeschätzt wurde. Das terroristische Judentum hat sich in Russland 200 Millionen Menschen dienstbar gemacht, dabei seine zynischen Methoden und Praktiken mit der stumpfen Zähigkeit der russischen Rasse vermählt, die deshalb eine um so größere Gefahr für die europäischen Kulturvölker darstellt. Im Osten wird ein ganzes Volk zum Kampf gezwungen. Hier werden Männer, Frauen, ja Kinder nicht nur in die Rüstungsfabriken, sondern auch in den Krieg getrieben. 200 Millionen stehen uns hier teils unter dem Terror der GPU, teils befangen in einer teuflischen Anschauung, mit wilder Stumpfheit gegenüber. Die Massen von Panzern, die in diesem Winter unsere östliche Front berennen, sind das Ergebnis eines 25jährigen sozialen Unglücks und Elends des bolschewistischen Volkes. Dagegen müßen wir mit entsprechenden Gegenmaßnahmen antreten, wenn wir nicht das Spiel als verloren aufgeben wollen.

Ich gebe meiner festen Überzeugung Ausdruck, daß wir die bolschewistische Gefahr auf die Dauer nur niederringen können, wenn wir ihr, wenn auch nicht mit gleichen, so doch mit gleichwertigen Methoden entgegentreten. Die deutsche Nation steht damit vor der ernstesten Frage dieses Krieges, nämlich der, die Entschloßenheit aufzubringen, alles einzusetzen, um alles, was sie besitzt, zu erhalten, und alles, was sie zum späteren Leben nötig hat, dazu zu gewinnen. Der totale Krieg also ist das Gebot der Stunde. Es muß jetzt zu Ende sein mit den bürgerlichen Zimperlichkeiten, die auch in diesem Schicksalskampf nach dem Grundsatz verfahren wollen : Wasch mir den Pelz, aber mach mich nicht nass ! (Jeder Satz des Ministers wird von wachsendem Beifall und stärkster Zustimmung begleitet.) Die Gefahr, vor der wir stehen, ist riesengroß.

Riesengroß müßen deshalb auch die Anstrengungen sein, mit denen wir ihr entgegentreten. Es ist also jetzt die Stunde gekommen, die Glacehandschuhe auszuziehen und die Faust zu bandagieren. (Wie ein einziger Schrei erbebt sich ein orkanartiger Beifall. Sprechchöre von den Galerien und Rängen bestätigen die volle Zustimmung der Menge.) Es geht nicht mehr an, das reiche Kriegspotential nicht nur unseres eigenen Landes, sondern der uns zur Verfügung stehenden bedeutenden Teile Europas nur flüchtig und an der Oberfläche auszuschöpfen. Es muß ganz zur Ausschöpfung gelangen, und zwar so schnell und so gründlich, als das organisatorisch und sachlich überhaupt nur denkbar ist. Hier wäre eine falsche Rücksichtnahme vollkommen fehl am Orte. Europas Zukunft hängt von unserem Kampf im Osten ab. Wir stehen zu seinem Schutze bereit. Das deutsche Volk stellt sein kostbarstes nationales Blut für diesen Kampf zur Verfügung. Der übrige Teil Europas sollte hierfür wenigstens seine Arbeit zur Verfügung stellen. Es gibt viele ernsthafte Kritiker auch in anderen Ländern, die diese zwingende Pflicht bereits einsehen. Andere wieder bestreiten sie noch. Das aber kann für uns nicht ausschlaggebend sein. Wenn die Gefahr für sie allein gegeben wäre, so könnte man ihre Auslassungen als literarischen Unsinn bewerten, der keinerlei Bedeutung besitzt. Aber die Gefahr ist für uns alle gegeben, und deshalb müßen wir uns auch alle dagegen zur Wehr setzen. Wer diesen Kampf im übrigen Europa heute noch nicht versteht, wird uns morgen auf den Knien danken, daß wir ihn mutig und unbeirrt auf uns genommen haben.

Es ärgert uns nicht einmal, wenn unsere Feinde im Ausland behaupten, die Maßnahmen, die wir jetzt zur Totalisierung des Krieges durchführten, kämen denen des Bolschewismus ziemlich nahe. Scheinheilig erklären sie, daraus müße man also folgern, daß sich unter diesen Umständen der Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus überhaupt erübrige. Es geht hier nicht um die Methode, mit der man den Bolschewismus zu Boden schlägt sondern um das Ziel, nämlich um die Beseitigung der Gefahr. (Minutenlanger Beifall.) Die Frage ist also nicht die, ob die Methoden, die wir anwenden, gut oder schlecht sind, sondern ob sie zum Erfolge führen. Jedenfalls sind wir als nationalsozialistische Volksführung jetzt zu allem entschlossen. Wir packen zu, ohne Rücksicht auf die Einsprüche des einen oder des anderen. Wir wollen nicht mehr im Interesse der Aufrechterhaltung eines hohen, manchmal fast friedensmäßigen inneren Lebensstandards für eine bestimmte Volksschicht das deutsche Kriegspotential schwächen und damit unsere Kriegführung gefährden. Im Gegenteil, wir verzichten freiwillig auf einen bedeutenden Teil dieses Lebensstandards, um das Kriegspotential so schnell und so gründlich wie möglich zu erhöhen. Diese Aktion stellt keinen Selbstzweck, sondern nur ein Mittel zum Zweck dar. Umso höher wird nach dem Siege wieder der soziale Lebensstandard unseres Volkes steigen. Wir brauchen die bolschewistischen Methoden schon deshalb nicht nachzuahmen, weil wir über das bessere Menschen- und Führungsmaterial verfügen und damit einen großen Vorsprung besitzen. Aber wir müssen, wie die Entwicklung zeigt, viel mehr tun, als wir bisher getan haben, um dem Krieg im Osten eine entscheidende Wendung zum Besseren zu geben.

Im Übrigen herrscht darüber, wie mir aus ungezählten Briefen aus der Heimat und Zustimmungskundgebungen von der Front mitgeteilt wird, im ganzen deutschen Volke überhaupt nur eine Meinung. Jedermann weiß, daß dieser Krieg, wenn wir ihn verlieren, uns aber vernichten würde. Und darum ist das Volk mit seiner Führung entschlossen, nunmehr zur radikalsten Selbsthilfe zu greifen. Die breiten arbeitenden Massen unseres Volkes machen der Regierung nicht zum Vorwurf, daß sie zu rücksichtslos, sondern höchstens, daß sie zu rücksichtsvoll vorgeht. Man frage landauf, landab das deutsche Volk ; nun wird überall nur die eine Antwort erhalten : Das Radikalste ist heute eben radikal, und das Totalste ist heute eben total genug, um den Sieg zu erringen.

Darum ist die totale Kriegführung eine Sache des ganzen deutschen Volkes. Niemand kann sich auch nur mit einem Schein von Berechtigung an ihren Forderungen vorbeidrücken. Als ich in meiner Rede vom 30. Januar von dieser Stelle aus den totalen Krieg proklamierte, schollen mir aus den um reich versammelten Menschenmassen Orkane der Zustimmung zu. Ich kann also feststellen, daß die Führung sich in ihren Maßnahmen in vollkommener Übereinstimmung mit dem ganzen deutschen Volk in der Heimat und an der Front befindet. Das Volk will alle, auch die schwersten Belastungen auf sich nehmen und ist bereit, jedes Opfer zu bringen, wenn damit dem großen Ziel des Sieges gedient wird. (Lebhafte Zurufe.)

Die Voraussetzung dazu aber ist selbstverständlich die, daß die Lasten gerecht verteilt werden. (Lauteste Zustimmung.) Es darf nicht geduldet werden, daß der weitaus größte Teil des Volkes die ganze Bürde des Krieges trägt, und ein kleiner passiver Teil sich an den Lasten und an der Verantwortung des Krieges vorbeizudrücken versucht. Die Maßnahmen, die wir getroffen haben und noch treffen müssen, werden deshalb vom Geiste einer nationalsozialistischen Gerechtigkeit erfüllt sein. Wir nehmen keine Rücksicht auf Stand und Beruf. Arm und Reich und Hoch und Niedrig müssen in gleicher Weise beansprucht werden. Jedermann wird in dieser ernstesten Phase unseres Schicksalskampfes zur Erfüllung seiner Pflicht der Nation gegenüber angehalten, wenn nötig, gezwungen werden. Wir wissen uns auch dabei in

voller Übereinstimmung mit dem nationalen Willen unseres Volkes. Wir wollen lieber zuviel als zu wenig Kraft zur Erringung des Sieges anwenden. Noch niemals ist ein Krieg in der Geschichte der Völker verloren gegangen, weil die Führung zuviel Soldaten und Waffen hatte. Sehr viele aber gingen verloren, weil das Umgekehrte der Fall war.

Es ist also an der Zeit, den Säumigen Beine zu machen. (Stürmische Bravorufe.) Sie müßen aus ihrer bequemen Ruhe aufgerüttelt werden. Wir können nicht warten, bis sie von selbst zur Besinnung kommen und es dann vielleicht zu spät ist. Es muß wie ein Alarmruf durch das ganze Volk gehen. Eine Arbeit von Millionen Händen hat einzusetzen, und zwar landauf, landab. Die Maßnahmen, die wir bereits getroffen haben und noch treffen müßen und die ich im weiteren Teil meiner Ausführungen des näheren erläutern werde, sind einschneidend für das gesamte private und öffentliche Leben. Die Opfer, die der einzelne Bürger dabei zu bringen hat, sind manchmal schwer ; aber sie bedeuten nur wenig den Opfern gegenüber, die er bringen müßte, wenn er sich zu diesen Opfern weigerte und damit das größte nationale Unglück über unser Volk heraufbeschwörte. Es ist besser, zur rechten Zeit einen Schnitt zu tun, als zuzuwarten und die Krankheit sich erst richtig festsetzen zu lassen. Man darf aber dem Operateur, der den Schnitt tut, nicht in den Arm fallen oder ihn gar wegen Körperverletzung anklagen. Er schneidet nicht, um zu töten, sondern um das Leben des Patienten zu retten.

Wiederum muß ich hier betonen, daß, je schwerer die Opfer sind, die das deutsche Volk zu bringen hat, umso dringender die Forderung erhoben werden muß, daß sie gerecht verteilt werden. Das will auch das Volk. Niemand sträubt sich heute gegen die Übernahme von auch schwersten Kriegslasten. Aber es muß natürlich auf jeden aufreizend wirken, wenn gewisse Leute immer wieder versuchen, sich an den Lasten überhaupt vorbeizudrücken. Die nationalsozialistische Staatsführung hat die moralische, aber auch staatspolitische Pflicht, solchen Versuchen mannhaft, wenn nötig mit drakonischen Strafen entgegenzutreten. (Zustimmung.) Schonung wäre hier vollkommen fehl am Platze und würde allmählich zu einer Verwirrung der Gefühle und Ansichten unseres Volkes führen, die eine schwere Gefährdung unserer öffentlichen Kriegsmoral nach sich ziehen müßte.

Wir sind somit auch gezwungen, eine Reihe von Maßnahmen zu treffen, die zwar für die Kriegführung an sich nicht von lebenswichtiger Bedeutung sind, die aber für die Aufrechterhaltung der Kriegsmoral in der Heimat und an der Front erforderlich erscheinen. Auch die Optik des Krieges, das heißt das äußere Bild der Kriegführung ist im vierten Kriegsjahr von ausschlaggebender Wichtigkeit. Die Front hat angesichts der übermenschlichen Opfer, die sie täglich zu bringen hat, ein elementares Anrecht darauf, daß auch nicht ein Einziger in der Heimat das Recht für sich in Anspruch nimmt, am Kriege und seinen Pflichten vorbeizuleben. Aber nicht nur die Front fordert das, sondern auch der weitaus überwiegende anständige Teil der Heimat. (Stürmischer Beifall.) Die Fleißigen besitzen einen Anspruch darauf, daß, wenn sie zehn und zwölf und manchmal vierzehn Stunden täglich arbeiten, sich direkt neben ihnen nicht die Faulenzer räkeln und gar noch die anderen für dumm und nicht raffiniert genug halten. Die Heimat muß in ihrer Gesamtheit sauber und intakt bleiben. Nichts darf ihr kriegsgemäßes Bild trüben.

Es sind deshalb eine Reihe von Maßnahmen getroffen worden, die dieser neuen Optik des Krieges Rechnung tragen. Wir haben beispielsweise die Schließung der Bars und Nachtlokale angeordnet. Ich kann mir nicht vorstellen, daß es heute noch Menschen gibt, die ihre Kriegspflichten voll erfüllen und gleichzeitig bis tief in die Nacht in Amüsierlokalen herumsitzen. Ich muß daraus nur folgern, daß sie es mit ihren Kriegspflichten nicht allzu genau nehmen. Wir haben

diese Amüsierlokale geschlossen, weil sie anfangen, uns lästig zu fallen, und das Bild des Krieges trübten. Wir verfolgen damit durchaus keine muckerischen Ziele. Nach dem Kriege wollen wir gern wieder nach dem Grundsatz verfahren: Leben und leben lassen. Während des Krieges aber gilt der Grundsatz : Kämpfen und kämpfen lassen !

Auch Luxusrestaurants, deren Aufwand in keinem Verhältnis zum erzielten Effekt steht, sind der Schließung verfallen. Es mag sein, daß der eine oder der andere auch während des Krieges noch in der Pflege des Magens eine Hauptaufgabe sieht. Auf ihn können wir dabei keine Rücksicht nehmen. Wenn an der Front unsere kämpfenden Truppen vom Grenadier bis zum Generalfeldmarschall aus der Feldküche essen, so glaube ich, ist es nicht zu viel verlangt, wenn wir in der Heimat jeden zwingen, wenigstens auf die elementarsten Gebote des Gemeinschaftsdenkens Rücksicht zu nehmen. Feinschmecker wollen wir wieder nach dem Kriege werden. Heute haben wir Wichtigeres zu tun, als den Magen zu pflegen.

Auch ungezählte Luxus- und Repräsentationsgeschäfte sind mittlerweile zur Auflösung gekommen. Sie waren für das kaufende Publikum vielfach ein ständiger Stein des Anstoßes. Zu kaufen gab es dort praktisch kaum noch etwas, höchstens einmal, wenn man hier und da statt mit Geld, mit Butter oder mit Eiern bezahlte. Was haben Geschäfte für einen Zweck, die keine Waren mehr verkaufen und nur elektrisches Licht, Heizung und menschliche Arbeitskraft verbrauchen, die uns anderswo, vor allem in der Rüstungsproduktion, an allen Ecken und Enden fehlen.

Man wende hier nicht ein, die Aufrechterhaltung eines holden Friedensscheines imponiere dem Ausland. Dem Ausland imponiert nur ein deutscher Sieg ! (Stürmische Zustimmung.) Wenn wir gesiegt haben, wird jedermann unser Freund sein wollen. Würden wir aber einmal unterliegen, so könnten wir unsere Freunde an den Fingern einer Hand abzählen. Wir haben deshalb mit diesen falschen Illusionen, die das Kriegsbild verwischen, Schluss gemacht. Wir werden die Menschen, die dort untätig in den leeren Geschäften herumstanden, einer nutzbringenderen Tätigkeit in der öffentlichen Kriegswirtschaft zuführen. Dieser Prozess ist eben im Gange und wird bis zum 15. März abgeschlossen sein. Er stellt natürlich eine riesige Umorganisation unseres ganzen wirtschaftlichen Lebens dar. Wir gehen dabei nicht planlos vor. Wir wollen auch niemanden zu Unrecht anklagen oder Tadel und Vorwurf nach allen Seiten verteilen. Wir tun lediglich das, was notwendig ist. Das aber tun wir schnell und gründlich.

Wir wollen lieber ein paar Jahre geflickte Kleider tragen, als einen Zustand heraufbeschwören, in dem unser Volk ein paar Jahrhunderte in Lumpen herumlaufen müßte. Was sollen heute noch Modesalons, die Licht, Heizung und menschliche Arbeitskraft verbrauchen. Sie werden nach dem Kriege, wenn wir wieder Zeit und Lust dazu haben, neu erstehen. Was sollen Frisiersalons, in denen ein Schönheitskult gepflegt wird, der ungeheuer viel Zeit und Arbeitskraft beansprucht, der für den Frieden zwar sehr schön und angenehm, für den Krieg aber überflüssig ist. Unsere Frauen und Mädchen werden einmal unseren siegreich heimkehrenden Soldaten auch ohne friedensmäßige Aufmachung gefallen. (Beifall.)

In den öffentlichen Ämtern wird in Zukunft etwas schneller und unbürokratischer gearbeitet werden. Es ergibt durchaus kein gutes Bild, wenn dort nach achtstündiger Arbeitszeit auf die Minute genau Schluss gemacht wird. Nicht das Volk ist für die Ämter, sondern die Ämter sind für das Volk da. Man arbeite also so lange, bis die Arbeit erledigt ist. Das ist das Gebot des Krieges. Wenn der « Führer » das kann, so werden auch die Diener des Staates das können. Ist für eine

längere Arbeitszeit nicht genügend Arbeit da, so gibt man 10 oder 20 oder 30 Prozent der Mitarbeiter an die kriegswichtige Wirtschaft ab und stellt damit wieder eine entsprechende Anzahl Männer für die Front frei. Das gilt für alle Dienststellen in der Heimat. Vielleicht wird geradedadurch auch die Arbeit in den Ämtern etwas schneller und etwas weniger schwerfällig vor sich gehen. Wir müßen im Kriege lernen, nicht nur gründlich, sondern auch prompt zu arbeiten. Der Soldat an der Front hat auch nicht wochenlang Zeit, sich eine Maßnahme zu überlegen, sie von Hand zu Hand weiterzugeben oder in den Akten verstauben zu lassen. Er muß sofort handeln, weil er sonst sein Leben verliert. Wir in der Heimat verlieren zwar durch schwerfälliges Arbeiten nicht unser eigenes Leben, aber wir gefährden damit auf die Dauer das Leben unseres Volkes. Überhaupt muß jeder es sich zu einem selbstverständlichen Gebot der Kriegsmoral machen, auf die berechtigten Forderungen des arbeitenden und kämpfenden Volkes die größte Rücksicht zu nehmen. Wir sind keine Spielverderber, aber wir lassen uns auch nicht das Spiel verderben.

Wenn beispielsweise gewisse Männer und Frauen sich wochenlang in den Kurorten herumräkeln, sich dort Gerüchte zutratschen und schwer Kriegsversehrten und Arbeitern and Arbeiterinnen, die nach einjährigem, hartem Einsatz Anspruch auf Urlaub haben, den Platz wegnehmen, so ist das unerträglich und deshalb abgestellt worden. Der Krieg ist nicht die richtige Zeit für einen gewissen Amüsierpöbel. Unsere Freude ist bis zu seinem Ende die Arbeit und der Kampf, darin finden wir unsere tiefe innere Genugtuung. Wer das nicht aus eigenem Pflichtgefühl versteht, der muß zu diesem Pflichtgefühl erzogen, wenn nötig auch gezwungen werden. Hier hilft nur hartes Durchgreifen.

Es macht zum Beispiel auf das Volk keinen guten Eindruck, wenn wir mit einer Riesenpropaganda die Parole ausgeben : « Räder müßen rollen für den Sieg ! » , das ganze Volk daraus die Folgerung zieht und keine unnützen Reisen antritt, dagegen arbeitslose Vergnügungsreisende dadurch nur mehr Platz in der Eisenbahn bekommen. Die Eisenbahn dient heute kriegswichtigen Transporten und kriegsnotwendigen Geschäftsreisen. Urlaub hat nur der zu beanspruchen, der sonst in seiner Arbeits- oder Kampfkraft schwer gefährdet würde. Der « Führer » hat seit Beginn des Krieges und lange vorher nicht einen Tag Urlaub gehabt. Wenn also der erste Mann im Staate seine Pflicht so ernst und so verantwortungsvoll auffasst, dann muß das für jeden Bürger und jede Bürgerin des Staates eine stumme, aber doch unüberhörbare Aufforderung sein, sich auch danach zu richten. Die Regierung tut andererseits alles, um dem arbeitenden Volke in dieser schweren Zeit die nötigen Entspannungsmöglichkeiten zu erhalten. Theater, Kinos, Musiksäle bleiben voll im Betrieb. Der Rundfunk wird bestrebt sein, sein Programm noch zu erweitern und zu vervollkommen. Wir haben durchaus nicht die Absicht, über unser Volk eine graue Winterstimmung heraufzubeschwören. Was dem Volke dient, was seine Kampf- und Arbeitskraft erhält, stählt und vermehrt, das ist gut und kriegswichtig. Das Gegenteil ist abzuschaffen. Ich habe deshalb als Ausgleich gegen die eben geschilderten Maßnahmen angeordnet, daß die geistigen und seelischen Erholungsstätten des Volkes nicht vermindert, sondern vermehrt werden. Soweit sie unseren Kriegsanstrengungen nicht schaden, sondern sie fördern, müßen sie auch von Seiten der Staats- und Volksführung eine entsprechende Förderung erfahren. Das gilt auch für den Sport. Der Sport ist heute keine Angelegenheit bevorzugter Kreise, sondern eine Angelegenheit des ganzen Volkes. U.K-Stellungen sind auf dem Sportgebiet gänzlich sinnlos. Der Sport hat ja die Aufgabe, die Körperkraft zu stählen, doch wohl in der Hauptsache zu dem Zweck, sie wenigstens in der schlimmsten Notzeit des Volkes zum Einsatz zu bringen.

Das alles will auch die Front. Das fordert mit stürmischer Zustimmung das ganze deutsche Volk. Es will jetzt nichts mehr hören von kriegsunwichtiger Betriebsamkeit und ähnlichen Wichtigtuereien, die nur Zeit und Aufwand erfordern. Es

will nichts mehr hören von einem überspannten umständlichen Fragebogenunwesen für jeden Unsinn. Es will sich nicht in tausend Kleinigkeiten verzetteln, die für den Frieden vielleicht wichtig waren, für den Krieg aber keine Bedeutung besitzen. Es braucht auch nicht unter dauernder Erinnerung an das schwere Opfer unserer Soldaten in Stalingrad an seine Pflicht gemahnt zu werden. Es weiß, was es zu tun und was es zu lassen hat. Es will eine spartanische Lebensführung für alle, für Hoch und Niedrig, und Arm und Reich. So wie der « Führer » dem ganzen Volke ein Beispiel gibt, so muß das ganze Volk in allen seinen Schichten sich dieses Beispiel auch zum Vorbild nehmen. Wenn er nur Arbeit und Sorgen kennt, so wollen wir ihm Arbeit und Sorgen nicht allein überlassen, sondern den Teil, den wir ihm abnehmen können, auch auf uns nehmen.

Die Zeit, die wir heute durchleben, hat in ihrer ganzen Anlage für jeden echten Nationalsozialisten eine verblüffende Ähnlichkeit mit der Kampfzeit. Da und immer haben wir so gehandelt. Wir sind immer mit dem Volke durch dick und dünn gegangen, und darum ist das Volk uns auch auf allen Wegen gefolgt. Wir haben immer mit dem Volke gemeinsam alle Lasten getragen, und deshalb schienen uns die Lasten nicht schwer, sondern leicht zu sein. Das Volk will geführt werden. Noch niemals gab es in der Geschichte ein Beispiel dafür, daß in einer kritischen Stunde des nationalen Lebens das Volk einer tapferen und entschlossenen Führung die Gefolgschaft versagt hätte. Ich möchte in diesem Zusammenhang auch über einige praktische Maßnahmen des totalen Krieges, die wir bereits getroffen haben, ein paar Worte verlieren.

Das Problem, um das es sich dabei handelt, heißt: Freimachung von Soldaten für die Front, Freimachung von Arbeitern und Arbeiterinnen für die Rüstungswirtschaft. Diesen beiden Zielen müssen alle anderen Bedürfnisse untergeordnet werden, selbst auf Kosten unseres sozialen Lebensniveaus während des Krieges. Das soll nicht eine endgültige Stabilisierung unseres Lebensstandards darstellen, sondern gilt nur als Mittel zur Erreichung des Zweckes, nämlich des eines totalen Sieges.

Es müssen im Rahmen dieser Aktion hunderttausende von U.K-Stellungen in der Heimat aufgehoben werden. Diese U.K-Stellungen waren bisher notwendig, weil wir nicht ausreichend Fach- und Schlüsselkräfte zur Verfügung hatten, die die durch Aufhebung der U.K-Stellungen leer werdenden Plätze besetzen konnten. Es ist der Sinn der getroffenen und noch zu treffenden Maßnahmen, die dafür benötigten Arbeitskräfte zu mobilisieren. Darum geht unser Appell an die noch außerhalb der Kriegswirtschaft stehenden Männer und die bisher noch außerhalb des Arbeitsprozesses stehenden Frauen. Sie werden sich diesem Appell nicht versagen wollen und auch nicht versagen können. Die Arbeitspflicht für Frauen ist sehr weitschichtig gefasst worden. Das heißt aber nicht, daß nur diejenigen, die im Gesetz genannt worden sind, arbeiten dürfen. Jeder ist uns willkommen, und je mehr sich für den großen Umschichtungsprozess in der inneren Wirtschaft zur Verfügung stellen, umso mehr Soldaten können wir für die Front freimachen. Unsere Feinde behaupten, die deutschen Frauen seien nicht in der Lage, den Mann in der Kriegswirtschaft zu ersetzen. Das mag für bestimmte schwere körperliche Arbeiten unserer Kriegsfertigung zutreffen. Darüber hinaus aber bin ich der Überzeugung, daß die deutsche Frau fest entschlossen ist, den Platz, den der Mann, der an die Front geht, freimacht, in kürzester Frist voll auszufüllen. Wir brauchen uns da gar nicht auf bolschewistische Beispiele zu berufen. Auch in der deutschen Kriegswirtschaft sind seit Jahren schon Millionen bester deutscher Frauen mit größtem Erfolg tätig, und sie warten mit Ungeduld darauf, daß ihre Reihen baldigst durch neuen Zuzug vermehrt und ergänzt werden. Alle die, die sich für diese Arbeit zur Verfügung stellen, erfüllen damit nur eine Dankespflicht der Front gegenüber. Hunderttausende sind schon

gekommen, hunderttausende werden noch kommen. In kürzester Zeit hoffen wir damit Armeen von Arbeitskräften freizumachen, die ihrerseits wieder Armeen von kämpfenden Frontsoldaten freistellen werden.

Ich müßte mich sehr in den deutschen Frauen täuschen, wenn ich annehmen sollte, daß sie den hiermit an sie ergehenden Appell überhören wollten. Sie werden sich nicht in engherzigster Weise an das Gesetz anklammern oder gar noch versuchen, durch seine Maschen zu entschlüpfen. ImÜbrigen würden die wenigen, die solche Absichten verfolgen, damit bei uns nicht landen. Ärztliche Atteste werden statt der aufgerufenen Arbeitskraft nicht als vollwertig angenommen. Auch eine etwaige Alibi-Arbeit, die man sich beim Mann oder beim Schwager oder bei einem guten Bekannten verschafft, um sich unbeaufsichtigt weiter an der Arbeit vorbeidrücken zu können, wird von uns mit entsprechenden Gegenmaßnahmen beantwortet werden. Die wenigen, die solche Pläne verfolgen, können sich damit in der öffentlichen Wertung nur selbst erledigen. Das Volk wird ihnen die größte Verachtung zollen. Niemand verlangt, daß eine Frau, die dazu nicht die nötigen körperlichen Voraussetzungen mitbringt, in die schwere Fertigung einer Panzerfabrik geht. Es gibt aber eine Unmenge von Fertigungen auch in der Kriegsindustrie, die ohne allzu starke körperliche Anstrengung geleistet werden können und für die sich eine Frau, auch wenn sie aus bevorzugten Kreisen stammt, ruhig zur Verfügung stellen kann. Niemand ist dafür zu gut, und wir haben ja nur die Wahl, hier etwas Ganzes zu tun oder das Ganze zu verlieren.

Es wäre auch angebracht, daß Frauen, die Dienstpersonal beschäftigen, jetzt schon diese Frage einer Überprüfung unterzögen. Man kann sehr wohl sich selbst dem Haushalt und den Kindern widmen und sein Dienstmädchen freigeben oder den Haushalt und die Kinder dem Dienstmädchen oder der NSV. überantworten und sich selbst zur Arbeit melden. Allerdings ist dann das Leben nicht mehr so gemütlich wie im Frieden. Aber wir leben ja auch nicht im Frieden, sondern im Kriege. Gemütlich werden wir es uns wieder machen, wenn wir den Sieg in Händen halten. Jetzt aber müßen wir für den Sieg unter weitestgehender Aufopferung unserer Bequemlichkeit kämpfen.

Auch und gerade die Kriegerfrauen werden das verstehen. Sie werden es für ihre höchste Verpflichtung halten, ihren Männern draußen an der Front dadurch zur Seite zu treten, daß sie sich einer kriegswichtigen Arbeit zur Verfügung stellen. Das betrifft vor allem die Landwirtschaft. Die Frauen der Landarbeiter haben hier ein gutes Beispiel zu geben. Es gilt für alle Männer und Frauen der Grundsatz, daß es für niemanden angebracht ist, im Kriege sogar noch weniger zu tun als im Frieden ; die Arbeit muß auf allen Gebieten vermehrt werden.

Man darf übrigens nicht den Fehler machen, alles, was jetzt nötig ist, auf die Regierung zu schieben. Die Regierung kann nur die großen Rahmengesetze schaffen. Den Rahmengesetzen Leben und Inhalt zu geben, ist Aufgabe des arbeitenden Volkes ; und zwar soll das unter der befeuernden Führung der Partei geschehen. Schnelles Handeln ist hier erstes Gebot.

Über die gesetzliche Verpflichtung hinaus also gilt jetzt die Parole : Freiwillige vor ! Hier appelliere ich vor allem als Berliner Gauleiter an meine Berliner Mitbürgerinnen. Sie haben im Verlaufe dieses Krieges schon so viele edle Beispiele einer tapferen Lebensgesinnung gegeben, daß sie sich gewiss auch dieser Forderung gegenüber nicht beschämen lassen wollen. Sie haben sich durch ihre praktische Lebensart, sowie durch die Frische ihrer Lebensauffassung auch im Kriege in der ganzen Welt einen guten Namen erworben. Diesen guten Namen gilt es jetzt durch eine großzügige

Handlungsweise zu erhalten und zu verstärken. Wenn ich also meine Berliner Mitbürgerinnen aufrufe, sich schnell, prompt und ohne viel Einwendungen einer kriegswichtigen Arbeit zur Verfügung zu stellen, so weiß ich, daß alle diesem Appell Folge leisten werden. Wir wollen jetzt nicht über die Schwere der Zeit klagen oder uns einander etwas vorrätsonnieren, wir wollen, wie das nicht nur Berliner, sondern deutsche Art ist, zupacken, handeln, die Initiative ergreifen, selbst etwas tun und nicht alles den anderen zu tun überlassen.

Welche deutsche Frau wollte es übers Herz bringen, sich einem solchen Appell, den ich vor allem für die kämpfende Front an die deutsche Frauenwelt richte, zu entziehen? Wer wollte jetzt eine spießige Bequemlichkeit über das nationale Pflichtgebot stellen? Wer wollte jetzt noch angesichts der schweren Bedrohung, der wir alle ausgesetzt sind, an seine egoistischen privaten Bedürfnisse denken und nicht an die über alledem stehenden Notwendigkeiten des Krieges?

Ich weise mit Verachtung den Vorwurf, den uns unsere Feinde machen, zurück, daß das eine Nachahmung des Bolschewismus sei. Wir wollen den Bolschewismus nicht nachahmen, wir wollen ihn besiegen, und zwar mit Mitteln und Methoden, die ihm gewachsen sind. Die deutsche Frau wird das am ehesten verstehen, denn sie hat längst erkannt, daß der Krieg, den heute unsere Männer führen, ein Krieg vor allem zum Schutze ihrer Kinder ist. Ihr heiligstes Gut wird also in diesem Kriege durch den Einsatz des kostbarsten Blutes unseres Volkes beschirmt. Mit diesem Kampf der Männer muß die deutsche Frau auch nach außen hin spontan ihre Solidarität bekunden. Sie muß sich lieber morgen als übermorgen in die Reihen der Millionen schaffender Angestellten und Arbeiterinnen einreihen und das Heer der arbeitenden Heimat auch durch ihre eigene Person vermehren. Es muß wie ein Strom der Bereitschaft durch das deutsche Volk gehen. Ich erwarte, daß sich nun ungezählte Frauen und vor allem auch Männer, die bisher noch keine kriegswichtige Arbeit taten, bei den Meldestellen melden. Wer sich schnell gibt, der gibt sich doppelt.

Daneben vollziehen sich großzügige Zusammenlegungen in unserer allgemeinen Wirtschaft. Das betrifft vor allem unser Versicherungs- und Bankenwesen, das Steuerwesen, unser nicht kriegs- und lebensnotwendiges Zeitschriften und Zeitungswesen, das betrifft für den Krieg entbehrliche Partei- und Verwaltungsbetriebe, aber auch eine weitere Vereinfachung der Lebensführung unseres Volkes.

Ich weiß, daß große Teile unseres Volkes dabei schwere Opfer bringen müßen. Ich habe Verständnis für diese Opfer, und die Volksführung ist bemüht, diese auf ein Mindestmaß zu beschränken. Aber ein gewisser Rest wird übrig bleiben, der getragen werden muß. Nach dem Kriege werden wir das, was wir heute auflösen, größer und schöner denn je wieder neu aufbauen, und der Staat wird dazu seine helfende Hand leihen.

Ich wende mich in diesem Zusammenhang eindringlich gegen die Behauptung, daß mit unseren Maßnahmen eine Stilllegung des Mittelstandes oder eine Monopolisierung unserer Wirtschaft bezweckt würde. Nach dem Kriege wird der Mittelstand sofort wieder in größtem Umfange wirtschaftlich and sozial wiederhergestellt. Die augenblicklichen Maßnahmen sind ausschließlich Notmaßnahmen für die Kriegszwecke und Kriegsbedürfnisse. Sie streben nicht eine strukturelle Veränderung der Wirtschaft an, sondern sind lediglich auf das Ziel ausgerichtet, den Sieg so schnell und so gründlich wie möglich erkämpfen zu helfen.

Ich streite nicht ab, daß uns auch angesichts der Durchführung der eben geschilderten Maßnahmen noch sorgenvolle Wochen bevorstehen. Aber damit schaffen wir jetzt endgültig Luft. Wir stellen diese Maßnahmen auf die Aktionen des kommenden Sommers ein und begeben uns heute, ohne den Drohungen und Großsprechereien des Feindes irgendeine Beachtung zu schenken, an die Arbeit. Ich bin glücklich, dieses Programm des Sieges (Stürmischer Beifall) einem deutschen Volke vortragen zu dürfen, das diese Maßnahmen nicht nur willig auf sich nimmt, sondern sie fordert, und zwar dringender, als das je im Verlaufe dieses Krieges der Fall gewesen ist. Das Volk will, daß durchgreifend und schnell gehandelt wird. Es ist Zeit ! Wir müssen den Augenblick und die Stunde nützen, damit wir vor kommenden Überraschungen gesichert sind.

Ich wende mich bei diesem Appell an das ganze deutsche Volk, besonders aber an die Partei als die berufene Führerin der Totalisierung unserer inneren Kriegführung. Sie steht nicht zum ersten Male vor einer derartig gigantischen Aufgabe. Sie wird diese Aufgabe mit dem an ihr gewohnten revolutionären Elan zur Lösung bringen. Sie wird am ehesten mit Trägheit und Indolenz, die sich hier oder da zeigen mögen, fertig werden. Der Staat hat seine Rahmengesetze erlassen und wird deren in den nächsten Tagen und Wochen weitere erlassen. Die Nebensächlichkeiten, die in diesen Rahmengesetzen unbeachtet bleiben, müssen vom Volke selbst unter der Führung der Partei durchgeführt werden. Über allem aber, was wir jetzt unternehmen und lassen, steht für jeden gültig das moralische Gesetz, nichts zu tun, was dem Kriege schadet, und alles zu tun, was dem Siege nützt.

Wir haben uns in den vergangenen Jahren oft in unseren Zeitungen und Reden auf das friderizianische Beispiel berufen. Wir hatten gar keine Berechtigung dazu. Friedrich II. stand im 3. Schlesischen Krieg zeitweilig mit fünf Millionen Preußen, wie Schlieffen berechnet, 90 Millionen Europäern gegenüber. Und schon im zweiten der sieben höllischen Jahre erlitt er eine Niederlage, die den ganzen preußischen Staat ins Wanken brachte. Er hat niemals genug Soldaten und Waffen gehabt, um seine Schlachten ohne größtes Risiko zu schlagen. Er betrieb seine Strategie immer als ein System der Aushilfen. Aber er verfolgte dabei den Grundsatz, den Feind anzugreifen, wo sich ihm eine Gelegenheit dazu bot, und ihn zu schlagen, wo er sich ihm stellte. Daß er Niederlagen erlitt, ist nicht das Entscheidende. Entscheidend ist vielmehr, daß der große König in allen Schicksalsschlägen ungebrochen blieb, daß er unerschütterlich das schwankende Kriegsglück auf sich nahm und sein ehernes Herz jede Gefahr überwand. Am Ende der sieben Jahre stand er, 51jährig, ein zahnloser, gichtkranker und von tausend Schmerzen gepeinigter Greis, doch als Sieger auf dem verwüsteten Schlachtfeld. Was haben wir denn dem entgegenzusetzen ?! Höchstens nur den Willen und die Entschlußkraft, es ihm, wenn die Stunde das gebietet, gleichzutun, wie er unerschütterlich zu bleiben in allen Fügungen des Schicksals, wie er den Sieg auch unter den ungünstigsten Umständen herbeizuzwingen und niemals an der großen Sache, die wir verfechten, zu verzweifeln.

Ich gebe meiner tiefen Überzeugung Ausdruck, daß das deutsche Volk durch den tragischen Schicksalsschlag von Stalingrad innerlich auf das tiefste geläutert worden ist. Es hat dem Krieg in sein hartes und erbarmungsloses Antlitz hineingeschaut. Es weiß nun die grausame Wahrheit und ist entschlossen, mit dem « Führer » durch dick und dünn zu gehen. (Begeistert erhebt sich die Menge bei diesen Worten, und wie des Branden eines Meeres klingen nicht enden wollende Sprechchöre : « “ Führer ” befehl, wir folgen ! » , « Heil unserem “ Führer ” ! » . Minutenlang ist der Minister am Weiterreden gehindert.)

In diesen Tagen hat sich die englische und amerikanische Presse sehr ausgiebig mit der Haltung des deutschen Volkes in der gegenwärtigen Krise befaßt. Die Engländer kennen das deutsche Volk nach Ihren Angebereien bekanntlich viel besser, als wir, seine eigene Führung. Sie geben uns scheinheilig Ratschläge, was wir zu tun und zu lassen hätten, immer in der irrigen Ansicht, das deutsche Volk von heute gleiche dem deutschen Volk vom November 1918, das auf ihre Verführungskünste hereinflie. Ich habe es nicht nötig, gegen diese Annahme den Gegenbeweis zu führen. Der Gegenbeweis wird vom kämpfenden und arbeitenden deutschen Volke jeden Tag aufs Neue erhärtet.

Ich möchte aber zur Steuer der Wahrheit an Euch, meine deutschen Volksgenossen und Volksgenossinnen, eine Reihe von Fragen richten, die Ihr mir nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen beantworten müßt. Als mir meine Zuhörer auf meine Forderungen vom 30. Januar spontan ihre Zustimmung bekundeten, behauptete die englische Presse am anderen Tag, das sei ein Propagandatheater gewesen und entspreche in keiner Weise der wahren Stimmung des deutschen Volkes. (Spontane Rufe : « Pfui ! » , « Lüge ! » , « Sie sollen nur herkommen ! Die werden uns kennen lernen ! » .) Ich habe heute zu dieser Versammlung nun einen Ausschnitt des deutschen Volkes im besten Sinne des Wortes eingeladen. (Die Aufzählung des Ministers wird von stürmischen Kundgebungen begleitet, die sich in einem nicht enden wollenden Beifall und stärkster Zustimmung für die im Sportpalast anwesenden Vertreter der Wehrmacht kundtun.) Vor mir sitzen reihenweise deutsche Verwundete von der Ostfront, Bein- und Armamputierte, mit zerschossenen Gliedern, Kriegsblinde, die mit ihren Rotkreuzschwestern gekommen sind, Männer in der Blüte ihrer Jahre, die vor sich ihre Krücken stehen haben. Dazwischen zähle ich an die fünfzig Träger des Eichenlaubes und des Ritterkreuzes, eine glänzende Abordnung unserer kämpfenden Front.

Hinter ihnen erhebt sich ein Block von Rüstungsarbeitern und -arbeiterinnen aus den Berliner Panzerwerken. Wieder hinter ihnen sitzen Männer aus der Parteiorganisation, Soldaten aus der kämpfenden Wehrmacht, Ärzte, Wissenschaftler, Künstler, Ingenieure und Architekten, Lehrer, Beamte and Angestellte aus den Ämtern und Büros, eine stolze Vertreterschaft unseres geistigen Lebens in all seinen Schichtungen, dem das Reich gerade jetzt im Kriege Wunder der Erfindung und des menschlichen Genies verdankt. Über das ganze Rund des Sportpalastes verteilt sehe ich Tausende von deutschen Frauen Die Jugend ist hier vertreten und das Greisenalter. Kein Stand, kein Beruf und kein Lebensjahr blieb bei der Einladung unberücksichtigt. Ich kann also mit Fug und Recht sagen : Was hier vor mir sitzt, ist ein Ausschnitt aus dem ganzen deutschen Volk an der Front und in der Heimat. Stimmt das ? Ja oder Nein ! (Der Sportpalast erlebt im Augenblick dieser Fragenstellung eine Kundgebung, wie sie selbst diese alte Kampfstätte des Nationalsozialismus nur an besonderen Höhepunkten nationalen Geschehens erlebt hat. Die Masse springt wie elektrisiert von ihren Plätzen. Wie ein Orkan braust ein vieltausendstimmiges Ja durch das weite Rund. Was die Teilnehmer dieser Kundgebung erleben, ist eine Volksabstimmung und Willensäußerung, wie sie spontaner keinen Ausdruck finden kann.) Ihr also, meine Zuhörer, repräsentiert in diesem Augenblick die Nation. Und an Euch möchte ich zehn Fragen richten, die Ihr mir mit dem deutschen Volke vor der ganzen Welt, insbesondere aber vor unseren Feinden, die uns auch an ihrem Rundfunk zuhören, beantworten sollt. (Nur mit Mühe kann sich der Minister für die nun folgenden Fragen Gehör verschaffen. Die Masse befindet sich in einem Zustand äußerster Hochstimmung. Messerscharf fallen die einzelnen Fragen. Jeder einzelne fühlt sich persönlich angesprochen. Mit letzter Anteilnahme und Begeisterung gibt die Masse auf jede einzelne Frage die Antwort. Der Sportpalast hallt wider von einem einzigen Schrei der Zustimmung.)

Die Engländer behaupten, das deutsche Volk habe den Glauben an den Sieg verloren. Ich frage Euch : Glaubt Ihr mit dem « Führer » und mit uns an den endgültigen totalen Sieg des deutschen Volkes ?

Ich frage Euch : Seid Ihr entschloßen, dem « Führer » in der Erkämpfung des Sieges durch dick und dünn und unter Aufnahme auch der schwersten persönlichen Belastungen zu folgen ?

Zweitens : Die Engländer behaupten, das deutsche Volk ist des Kampfes müde.

Ich frage Euch : Seid Ihr bereit, mit dem « Führer » als Phalanx der Heimat hinter der kämpfenden Wehrmacht stehend diesen Kampf mit wilder Entschloßenheit und unbeirrt durch alle Schicksalsfügungen fortzusetzen, bis der Sieg in unseren Händen ist ?

Drittens : Die Engländer behaupten, das deutsche Volk hat keine Lust mehr, sich der überhand nehmenden Kriegsarbeit, die die Regierung von ihm fordert, zu unterziehen.

Ich frage Euch : Seid Ihr und ist das deutsche Volk entschloßen, wenn der « Führer » es befiehlt, zehn, zwölf, und wenn nötig vierzehn und sechzehn Stunden täglich zu arbeiten und das Letzte herzugeben für den Sieg ?

Viertens : Die Engländer behaupten, das deutsche Volk wehrt sich gegen die totalen Kriegsmaßnahmen der Regierung. Es will nicht den totalen Krieg, sondern die Kapitulation. (Zurufe : Niemals ! Niemals ! Niemals ! .)

Ich frage Euch : Wollt Ihr den totalen Krieg ? Wollt Ihr ihn wenn nötig totaler und radikaler, als wir ihn uns heute überhaupt noch vorstellen können ?

Fünftens : Die Engländer behaupten, das deutsche Volk hat sein Vertrauen zum « Führer » verloren.

Ich frage Euch : Ist Euer Vertrauen zum « Führer » heute größer, gläubiger und unerschütterlicher denn je ?

Ist Eure Bereitschaft, ihm auf allen seinen Wegen zu folgen und alles zu tun, was nötig ist, um den Krieg zum siegreichen Ende zu führen, eine absolute und uneingeschränkte ? (Die Menge erhebt sich wie ein Mann. Die Begeisterung der Masse entlädt sich in einer Kundgebung nicht dagewesenen Ausmaßes. Vieltausendstimmige Sprechchöre brausen durch die Halle : « “ Führer ” befiehl, wir folgen ! » . Eine nicht abebbende Woge von Heilrufen auf den « Führer » braust auf. Wie auf ein Kommando erheben sich nun die Fahnen und Standarten, höchster Ausdruck des weihevollen Augenblicks, in dem die Masse dem « Führer » huldigt.)

Ich frage Euch als sechstes : Seid Ihr bereit, von nun ab Eure ganze Kraft einzusetzen und der Ostfront die Menschen und Waffen zur Verfügung zu stellen, die sie braucht, um dem Bolschewismus den tödlichen Schlag zu versetzen ?

Ich frage Euch siebentens : Gelobt Ihr mit heiligem Eid der Front, daß die Heimat mit starker Moral hinter ihr steht und ihr alles geben wird, was sie nötig hat, um den Sieg zu erkämpfen ?

Ich frage Euch achtens : Wollt Ihr, insbesondere Ihr Frauen selbst, daß die Regierung dafür sorgt, daß auch die deutsche Frau ihre ganze Kraft der Kriegführung zur Verfügung stellt und überall da, wo es nur möglich ist, einspringt, um Männer für die Front frei zu machen und damit ihren Männern an der Front zu helfen ?

Ich frage Euch neuntens : Billigt Ihr wenn nötig die radikalsten Maßnahmen gegen einen kleinen Kreis von Drückebergern und Schiebern, die mitten im Kriege Frieden spielen und die Not des Volkes zu eigensüchtigen Zwecken ausnutzen wollen ? Seid Ihr damit einverstanden, daß, wer sich am Krieg vergeht, den Kopf verliert ?

Ich frage Euch zehntens und zuletzt : Wollt Ihr, daß, wie das nationalsozialistische Parteiprogramm es gebietet, gerade im Kriege gleiche Rechte und gleiche Pflichten vorherrschen, daß die Heimat die schweren Belastungen des Krieges solidarisch auf ihre Schultern nimmt und daß sie für Hoch und Niedrig und Arm und Reich in gleicher Weise verteilt werden ?

Ich habe Euch gefragt ; Ihr habt mir Eure Antwort gegeben. Ihr seid ein Stück Volk, durch Euren Mund hat sich damit die Stellungnahme des deutschen Volkes manifestiert. Ihr habt unseren Feinden das zugerufen, was sie wissen müssen, damit sie sich keinen Illusionen und falschen Vorstellungen hingeben. Somit sind wir, wie von der ersten Stunde unserer Macht an und durch all die zehn Jahre hindurch, fest und brüderlich mit dem deutschen Volk vereint. Der mächtigste Bundesgenosse, den es auf dieser Welt gibt, das Volk selbst, steht hinter uns und ist entschlossen, mit dem « Führer » , koste es, was es wolle, und unter Aufnahme auch der schwersten Opfer den Sieg kämpfend zu erstreben. Welche Macht der Welt könnte uns jetzt noch hindern, alles das durchzusetzen und zu erfüllen, was wir uns als Ziel gesteckt haben. Jetzt wird und muß es uns gelingen !

Ich stehe hier vor Euch nicht nur als Sprecher der Regierung, sondern auch als Sprecher des Volkes. Um mich herum sitzen meine alten Freunde aus der Partei, die hohe Ämter in der Führung von Volk und Staat bekleiden. Neben mir sitzt Parteigenosse Speer, der vom « Führer » den geschichtlichen Auftrag erhalten hat, die deutsche Rüstungswirtschaft zu mobilisieren und der Front Waffen in Hülle und Fülle zu liefern. Neben mir sitzt Parteigenosse Doktor Ley, der vom « Führer » den Auftrag erhalten hat, die Führung der deutschen Arbeiterschaft durchzuführen und sie in unermüdlichem Einsatz für ihre Kriegspflichten zu schulen und zu erziehen. Wir fühlen uns verbunden mit unserem Parteigenossen Sauckel, der vom « Führer » den Auftrag erhalten hat, ungezählte Hunderttausende von Arbeitskräften ins Reich zu bringen, die einen Zuschuß an die nationale Wirtschaft darstellen, der vom Feind überhaupt nicht eingeholt werden kann. Darüber hinaus sind mit uns vereinigt alle « Führer » der Partei, der Wehrmacht und des Staates.

Wir alle, Kinder unseres Volkes, zusammengeschweißt mit dem Volke in der größten Schicksalsstunde unserer nationalen Geschichte, wir geloben Euch, wir geloben der Front, und wir geloben dem « Führer » , daß wir die Heimat zu einem Willensblock zusammenschweißen wollen, auf den sich der « Führer » und seine kämpfenden Soldaten unbedingt und blindlings verlassen können.

Wir verpflichten uns, in unserem Leben und Arbeiten alles zu tun, was zum Siege nötig ist. Unsere Herzen wollen wir erfüllen mit jener politischen Leidenschaft, die uns immer in den großen Kampfzeiten der Partei und des Staates wie

ein ewig brennendes Feuer verzehrte. Nie wollen wir in diesem Kriege jener falschen und scheinheiligen Objektivitätsdusselei verfallen, der die deutsche Nation in ihrer Geschichte schon so viel Unglück zu verdanken hat.

Als dieser Krieg begann, haben wir unsere Augen einzig und allein auf die Nation gerichtet. Was ihr und ihrem Lebenskampf dient, das ist gut und muß erhalten und gefördert werden. Was ihr und ihrem Lebenskampfe schadet, das ist schlecht und muß beseitigt und abgeschnitten werden. Mit heißem Herzen und kühlem Kopf wollen wir an die Bewältigung der großen Probleme dieses Zeitabschnittes des Krieges herantreten. Wir beschreiten damit den Weg zum endgültigen Sieg. Er liegt begründet im Glauben an den « Führer » .

So stelle ich denn an diesem Abend der ganzen Nation noch einmal ihre große Pflicht vor Augen. Der « Führer » erwartet von uns eine Leistung, die alles bisher Dagewesene in den Schatten stellt. Wir wollen uns seiner Forderung nicht versagen. Wie wir stolz auf ihn sind, so soll er stolz auf uns sein können.

In den größten Krisen und Erschütterungen des nationalen Lebens erst bewähren sich die wahren Männer, aber auch die wahren Frauen. Da hat man nicht mehr das Recht, vom schwachen Geschlecht zu sprechen, da beweisen beide Geschlechter die gleiche Kampfeentschlossenheit und Seelenstärke. Die Nation ist zu allem bereit. Der « Führer » hat befohlen, wir werden ihm folgen. Wenn wir je treu und unverbrüchlich an den Sieg geglaubt haben, dann in dieser Stunde der nationalen Besinnung und der inneren Aufrichtung. Wir sehen ihn greifbar nahe vor uns liegen ; wir müssen nur zufassen. Wir müssen nur die Entschlusskraft aufbringen, alles andere seinem Dienst unterzuordnen. Das ist das Gebot der Stunde. Und darum lautet die Parole :

Nun, Volk, steh auf und Sturm brich los !

(Die letzten Worte des Ministers gehen in nicht enden wollenden stürmischen Beifallskundgebungen unter.)

Leo Borchard

Né le 31 mars 1899 à Moscou, de parents russes d'origine allemande, Leo Borchard passe son enfance à Saint-Pétersbourg où il reçoit une solide formation musicale en plus d'être un assidu du Théâtre Stanislavski.

En 1920, après la Révolution russe, il émigre définitivement en Allemagne où il étudie auprès de Hermann Scherchen et de Eduard Erdmann. À Berlin, Il devient co-répétiteur pour Bruno Walter et gagne l'amitié de Gottfried von Einem et de Boris Blacher. À Berlin, il devient l'assistant d'Otto Klemperer à l'Opéra « Kroll » . Ce dernier critiquera la technique de direction de Borchard qui semble manquer de confiance en ses propres moyens. En janvier 1933, il dirige la Philharmonie pour une Ire fois.

Leo Borchard fait la promotion de la musique de jeunes compositeurs. Il protège les musiciens juifs de la discrimination systématique (il donnera des leçons de conduite privées à un étudiant juif) . Pour ces raisons, il est interdit d'activité par le régime nazi, en 1935, pour « manque de fiabilité politique » . Il continue de donner des leçons de musique privées à son appartement et reçoit Blacher et von Einem.

En 1938, Borchard choisit de demeurer à Berlin pour entrer, à son tour, dans la clandestinité (utilisant le nom de code : Andrik Krassnow) . Il participe activement à la Résistance allemande en se joignant au « Cercle de Kreisau » qui transmettra des informations aux Alliés. Il collabore avec Ludwig Lichtwitz, un faussaire spécialisé dans les papiers d'identité dans le but d'émettre de faux certificats médicaux assurant à ses propriétaires d'éviter le service militaire.

En compagnie de sa jolie partenaire, l'auteur Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, Leo Borchard va former un groupe humanitaire sous le nom de code « Onkel Emil » : un réseau secret spécialisé dans le sabotage qui réussira à détruire du matériel de propagande nazi et, en retour, à diffuser leurs propres tracts de même que ceux de la tragique « Rose blanche » . Ils vont sauver des résistants, des ennemis politiques du régime et, surtout, les Juifs à qui ils trouveront des cachettes, procureront de la nourriture, fourniront de fausses cartes d'identité, et soutiendront les familles qui, autrement, seraient sans ressources ni protection.

12 avril 1945 : L'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin donne un concert.

Malgré les risques considérables, Leo Borchard ne quitte pas Berlin, même aux derniers jours de la guerre. Le 26 mai 1945, 2 semaines et demi après la capitulation sans conditions de l'Allemagne et la signature de l'armistice, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et son chef se produisent au cinéma du « Titania Palast » . Au programme : l'Ouverture du « Songe d'une nuit d'été » de Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, le Concerto pour violon en la majeur de Mozart et la 4e Symphonie de Tchaïkovsky. Le concert aura un grand succès auprès du public ; la population traumatisée de Berlin lui vouera une très grande affection. Une semaine plus tard, Borchard est nommé directeur musical du Philharmonique par le fonctionnaire soviétique Nikolai Berzarin, pour succéder à Wilhelm Fürtwängler, en exil en Suisse. Son engagement anti-nazi et son statut de russophone lui ont permis d'engager une relation étroite avec les Occupants. Mais son règne sera de courte durée donnant au total 22 concerts en tant que chef de la phalange berlinoise.

Après la libération de Berlin (pour comble de malheur ou de hasard) , le chef Leo Borchard sera atteint par erreur, le 23 août 1945, d'une balle provenant d'une sentinelle montant la garde à un poste de contrôle des forces américaines d'occupation lors du retour à la maison en automobile, après le concert du Philharmonique. Le chauffeur britannique a mal interprété le signal de la main de la sentinelle qui lui ordonnait d'immobiliser son véhicule. Le chauffeur et la conjointe de Borchard, Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, survivront à l'accident. À partir de ce moment, les signes de la main seront exclus des points de contrôle militaires.

Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, l'épouse de Borchard, rédigera 2 ouvrages sur ses mémoires : l'un relate la période de la guerre et l'autre, le Berlin de l'après-guerre. Borchard ne fut pas la seule victime des forces de sécurité américaines en Europe, cette année-là. 3 semaines plus tard à Mittersill, près de Salzbourg, soit le 15 septembre 1945, le compositeur autrichien Anton von Webern va sortir en fin de soirée sur la terrasse de la résidence de sa sœur (sa maison d'accueil) pour fumer tranquillement un cigare, oubliant les restrictions du couvre-feu militaire. Il est abattu par méprise par une sentinelle américaine nerveuse et en état d'ébriété (il s'agit de Raymond Norwood Bell) qui vit, au loin, un point lumineux suspect.

La discographie de Leo Borchard se résume à très peu. Si bien que l'on a longtemps cru que l'enregistrement du Poème symphonique « Stenka Razin » en si mineur, Opus 13, d'Alexander Glazunov avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne était sous la direction du chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler. La liberté, la puissance, la souplesse, l'élasticité mélodique et le sens dramatique laissaient penser au grand chef. Mais il s'agissait plutôt de Leo Borchard. Son « Roméo et Juliette » de Sergueï Prokofiev, sombre et sans exubérance, atteint un sommet d'introspection et de drame. Dès 1934, il avait déjà montré son talent en enregistrant pour la firme « Telefunken », le « Casse-Noisette » de Tchaïkovsky : seul témoignage commercial sur disque. Nous pouvons raisonnablement affirmer que, malgré une fin cruelle, Leo Borchard réussit à prendre sa place dans le paysage musical allemand de l'après-guerre.

Les 5 et 6 septembre 1995, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et son chef attitré, Claudio Abbado, ont marqué l'anniversaire de la mort de Leo Borchard en programmant la 6e Symphonie, dite « Tragique », de Gustav Mahler.

Les derniers concerts du Philharmonique furent donnés en mars-avril de 1945 pour des soldats puis, de façon privée, pour le ministre de l'Armement, Albert Speer. Dans ses tournées internationales, l'Orchestre fut utilisé comme un instrument de propagande, jouant pour les publics locaux mais aussi pendant la guerre pour la « Wehrmacht ». Les concerts à l'étranger donnèrent parfois lieu à des protestations anti-fascistes qui n'assimilaient pas l'Orchestre au Nazisme avant guerre, mais avec la guerre l'Orchestre (transporté par des moyens militaires souvent) fut surnommé « l'avant-garde des parachutistes » et ses concerts donnèrent lieu à des manifestations qui restaient cependant minoritaires. Quant au répertoire interprété, l'influence nazie fut réduite (même si d'emblée certains compositeurs étaient exclus d'office pour des raisons raciales ou politiques, comme Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schönberg ou Erich Wolfgang Korngold, mais Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy fut joué jusqu'en 1936 et Igor Stravinsky jusqu'en 1939), selon Misha Aster : « Le " canon " des musiciens allemands resta la source principale du répertoire. Même après que l'État eut pris le contrôle de l'Orchestre, le ministère n'eut donc guère besoin de se mêler de la programmation : les choix musicaux des Nazis et le noyau du répertoire de l'Orchestre philharmonique s'harmonisaient dès le départ. » (page 225), soit par goût du public, soit par goût des chefs d'orchestre, et ce dès avant l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir. Plus de 70 % de toute la musique interprétée par l'Orchestre sous le 3e « Reich » étaient constitués d'œuvres de Ludwig van Beethoven, Johannes Brahms, Anton Bruckner, Franz-Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Richard Strauß, puis d'œuvres de Jean-Sébastien Bach, Franz Schubert, Robert Schumann et Carl Maria von Weber, les étrangers les plus joués étant Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovski et Hector Berlioz.

Que devint l'Orchestre à la fin de la guerre ? Les musiciens firent une fois de plus preuve de leur sens politique. Le « Vorstand Lorenz Höber » (suspendu par les autorités américaines en 1946, bien que non nazi, pour avoir été le « Vorstand » de l'ère nazie, et réhabilité longuement par Misha Aster) négocia les autorisations de réunion puis la garantie financière de la Ville de Berlin (jusqu'en 2002). Les musiciens demandèrent à Gerhart von Westerman, leur administrateur membre du NSDAP nommé par Josef Goebbels, de négocier avec les Russes dans leur propre langue (il devint intendant officiellement en 1952). Ils choisirent comme chef d'orchestre un autre russophone, Leo Borchard, qui était entré dans la résistance allemande après avoir été mis à l'index par les Nazis en 1943, puis, Borchard ayant été tué par un G.I., un jeune chef roumain, Sergiu Celibidache (avant le retour de Fürtwängler en 1947, et, après sa mort en 1954, le choix de Karajan). Certains musiciens trop liés aux Nazis partirent, d'autres furent suspendus lors de la dénazification. Le dernier concert de l'ère nazie, en avril 1945, s'était terminé par le poème symphonique « Mort et

transfiguration » de Richard Strauß. Le 1er concert de l'ère nouvelle, le 26 mai 1945, donna à entendre des œuvres de Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy et Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovski.

Leo Borchard, le chaînon manquant entre Furtwängler, Celibidache et Karajan

Quelle étrange et triste destin que celui de Leo Borchard : né le 21 mars 1899 à Moscou de parents allemands, il acquiert une solide formation musicale à Saint-Petersbourg, ville de son enfance. Mais la Révolution Russe contraint la famille Borchard à revenir définitivement en Allemagne, dès 1920. C'est là que le jeune musicien parfait sa formation de chef-d'orchestre avec Hermann Scherchen, Bruno Walter et Otto Klemperer, se liant parallèlement à de jeunes compositeurs allemands tels que Boris Blacher ou Gottfried von Einem. Les années '30 voient Leo Borchard dans les studios d'enregistrement où il grave environ 35 faces de 78 tours pour la firme « Telefunken », essentiellement avec l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin. Mais le régime nazi l'interdit bien vite de direction sous prétexte « d'absence de fiabilité politique », ce qui l'amène, dès 1938, à faire partie du groupe de résistants anti-nazi « Onkel Emil », sous le nom de résistance d'Andrik Krassnow. Après la chute du Nazisme, Borchard dirigera les 1ers concerts de la Philharmonie de Berlin pendant que Wilhelm Furtwängler était inquiété dans les procès de dénazification. C'est au retour de l'un de ces concerts, le 23 août 1945, que Leo Borchard sera absurdement tué par une sentinelle américaine, lui qui avait toujours été farouche adversaire du Nazisme, en actes comme en propos .

On peut toujours imaginer quel aurait été le futur musical si cet acte stupide n'avait pas eu lieu : sans doute Sergiù Celibidache ne lui aurait-il pas succédé à la Philharmonie de Berlin, mais, surtout, la carrière d'Herbert von Karajan aurait-elle été sensiblement différente de celle que l'on connaît. Il n'en est pas moins vrai que le nombre de documents sonores légués par Leo Borchard est assez restreint, ce qui est fort déplorable si l'on envisage leurs qualités artistiques : l'essentiel du CD « Tahra » est constitué d'interprétations remarquablement nuancées et convaincantes de l'Ouverture d' « Obéron » de Weber, de Roméo et Juliette de Tchaïkovsky et du poème symphonique « Stenka Razin » de Glazounov, captées par la Radio berlinoise, en juin 1945 - le Glazounov ayant longtemps été attribué par erreur à Wilhelm Furtwängler (qui ne l'a jamais dirigé) , ce qui démontre à suffisance les qualités interprétatives : grandeur, noblesse et sens de l'architecture musicale. La présence en complément de la Suite de ballet « Casse-Noisette » dans un enregistrement commercial « Telefunken » de 1934-1935, est vraiment adéquate car, non seulement, elle confirme les affinités de Leo Borchard avec la musique russe, mais de plus, sa version est d'une délicatesse et d'une subtilité rares, et l'on comprend vraiment à l'audition pourquoi Mozart était le compositeur favori de Tchaïkovsky.

Au total, les interprétations proposées sur le disque nous révèlent un musicien sympathique et remarquablement doué, trop tôt arraché à notre monde par l'absurdité humaine. Nous ne savons si d'autres bandes-radio du chef ont survécu, mais en tout cas, « Tahra » serait bien inspiré en publiant un « Leo Borchard, volume 2 » contenant d'autres gravures commerciales « Telefunken » : l'Ouverture « Banditenstreich » (Les joyeux bandits) de Franz von Suppé, une Symphonie de Franz-Josef Haydn, la musique de « Peer » Gynt d'Edvard Grieg, le Concertino pour piano de Jean Françaix (avec le compositeur en soliste) , sans compter les divers accompagnements à l'orchestre de chanteurs tels que le baryton viennois Hans Reinmar (1895-1961) - dans « les Adieux de Wotan » ; le ténor allemand Marcel Wittrisch (1901-1955) ; et la soprano finlandaise Aulikki Rautawaara (1906-1990) .

Signalons que les textes de la plaquette ont été rédigés par Karin Friedrich, fille de la compagne de Leo Borchard, et que les transferts sont les meilleurs possible pour ce genre de documents sonores, tout en prévenant que la bande originale de « Roméo et Juliette » était légèrement mais irrémédiablement détériorée en plusieurs endroits de son début.

Sergiu Celibidache

Août 1945 : Après avoir étudié la philosophie et les mathématiques à Bucarest, le jeune Sergiu Celibidache étudiait tranquillement la musique à Berlin auprès de Fritz Gmeind et Heinz Tiessen (lesquels exercent une profonde influence sur lui) . La suite de coïncidences fortuites l'amènent à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique. Il semble qu'aucun autre chef expérimenté n'était disponible à cette époque ou en mesure d'être accepté par les autorités des 4 puissances qui occupaient désormais le territoire de Berlin.

Fin août 1945 : Celibidache dirige à Berlin un retentissant concert. Le succès est tel que l'Orchestre le prend immédiatement comme chef principal (attitré) .

Celibidache dirige 108 concerts à la tête de la Philharmonie de Berlin au cours de la seule saison 1945-1946.

Février 1946 : Sergiu Celibidache prend officiellement le relais du défunt chef Leo Borchard. Il dirige un total de 128 concerts en 1946-1947 !

Wilhelm Fürtwängler écrit 22 lettres à Celibidache, entre avril 1946 et octobre 1952. Fürtwängler est toujours là, au moins dans le cœur des musiciens, qui y voient le seul garant de la tradition du grand Orchestre allemand. Bien qu'adulé par le public et très cher au cœur de l'Orchestre, il doit néanmoins attendre d'être passé devant la Commission de dénazification avant d'être de nouveau autorisé à diriger. Pendant ce temps, Sergiu Celibidache est donc le chef le plus souvent requis par les musiciens mais c'est en vérité une solution d'attente. Comme l'illustrent les échanges de lettres entre les 2 hommes, leurs rapports sont alors cordiaux et pleins de respect l'un pour l'autre : tandis que Fürtwängler se replie sur la composition (principalement, la difficile gestation de sa 2e Symphonie) , Celibidache profite à plein de son statut de « directeur artistique et chef autorisé depuis le 1er décembre 1945 » .

La volonté de Celibidache de faire du Philharmonique un orchestre « moderne » , au sens américain du terme, ne convient ni au public, ni aux critiques, ni même aux musiciens. (Il présente beaucoup d'œuvres nouvelles de compositeurs tels que Boris Blacher, Heinz Tiessen, Paul Hindemith et Egon Wellesz.) Même si le chef Roumain donne 414 concerts à la tête de l'Orchestre, entre 1945 et 1954, il n'en dirige que 40 au cours de la saison 1948-1949. Il faut dire, qu'entre-temps, le contexte a évolué. En avril 1947, Fürtwängler dirige pour la 1re fois depuis la guerre, à Rome, l'Orchestre de l'Académie Sainte-Cécile et, après son acquittement définitif, reprend le dessus aussi bien en Allemagne qu'en Autriche.

25 mai 1947 : Fürtwängler donne son 1er concert avec la Philharmonie de Berlin depuis la fin de la guerre ; le programme étant tout entier consacré à Beethoven. Celibidache doit alors partager la direction de l'Orchestre jusqu'à

la mort de ce dernier en 1954. Il multipliera les tournées avec d'autres Orchestres, notamment en Amérique latine.

Les 2 hommes se retrouvent néanmoins sur un accord commun : empêcher l'ascension de Herbert von Karajan. Ainsi, en juillet 1947, Fürtwängler exige du directeur du Festival de Salzbourg que « monsieur K » (comme l'un et l'autre le surnomment) n'y dirige jamais de son vivant, faute de quoi lui-même n'y viendrait pas. L'interdiction de diriger qui pesait sur Karajan est levée en octobre 1947 et, dès cette époque, ses engagements se multiplient aussi bien à Londres qu'à Vienne. Assistant à certains de ses concerts, Celibidache tient Fürtwängler informé de ses impressions le concernant mais leur « ennemi commun » ne suffit pas à les réunir de nouveau.

1948 : Celibidache fait ses débuts londoniens pour ensuite enregistrer quelques disques pour la firme « Decca » .

Avril 1951 : Fürtwängler emmène la Philharmonie de Berlin pour une tournée égyptienne de 10 concerts, au Caire et à Alexandrie.

7 décembre 1951 : Fürtwängler renoue avec la Philharmonie à Berlin.

Janvier 1952 : Fürtwängler redevient le chef attitré de la Philharmonie de Berlin.

Les critiques de Celibidache à l'égard de la Philharmonie de Berlin, les atermoiements de Fürtwängler, les transactions administratives marquent alors une période compliquée pour l'Orchestre. Les rapports avec Celibidache sont alors très tendus (Fürtwängler qualifiant même, dans une lettre, son attitude de « caprice de Prima Donna ») , au point que celui-ci jette définitivement l'éponge.

Celibidache entame alors une carrière de chef itinérant au Danemark, notamment, en Suède, en Amérique du Sud et maintes fois en France, mais surtout en Italie où il dirigera les Orchestres de La Scala à Milan, l'Orchestre de l'Académie nationale de Sainte-Cécile à Rome et, entre autres, les Orchestres de la radio italienne (RAI) à Rome, Milan, Naples et Turin. Ses exigences pour de longues séances intensives de répétition seront enfin plus facilement satisfaites à la radio qu'aux concerts présentés dans les grandes salles de concerts symphoniques.

Sergiu Celibidache ne redirigera la Philharmonie de Berlin qu'une seule fois, en 1994, sur l'intervention du Président de la République Fédérale d'Allemagne pour un ultime concert consacré à la 7e Symphonie de Bruckner.

« Pour l'homme normal, le temps c'est ce qui vient après le début ; le temps de Bruckner, c'est ce qui vient après la fin. Je suis heureux de pouvoir encore aujourd'hui lire les lignes qu'il nous a laissées. » (Sergiu Celibidache)

Contrairement à ce que l'on peut voir souvent écrit, Celibidache n'a jamais été l' « assistant » de Fürtwängler, mais le chef « associé » de l'Orchestre. Cette méprise est due à Karajan qui fit purement et simplement effacer son nom de la liste des chefs titulaires et il faut donc rendre hommage au chef actuel de la Philharmonie, sir Simon Rattle, pour avoir rétabli le nom de Celibidache sur cette liste lors de son entrée en fonction.

8 septembre 1953 : Karajan dirige l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin pour la 1re fois depuis 1945.

20 septembre 1954 : Furtwängler donne son dernier concert à une époque où son jeune rival autrichien dirige le Philharmonique pour la 2e fois seulement depuis la guerre. Alors que certains pressentent Karl Münchinger pour lui succéder, c'est Herbert von Karajan qui l'emporte finalement à l'unanimité. La candidature de Celibidache sera rejetée. Ce dernier quittera prestement Berlin.

...

Le chef d'orchestre roumain Sergiu Celibidache est né le 28 juin 1912 à Roman, près de Jassy (capitale de la Moldavie), au nord-est de la Roumanie ; et est mort le 14 août 1996 à La Neuville-sur-Essonne, dans l'arrondissement de Pithiviers, près de Paris.

Il étudiera la philosophie et les mathématiques à Bucarest, puis la musique à Berlin auprès de Fritz Gmeind et Heinz Tiessen lesquels exerceront une profonde influence sur lui.

En août 1945, alors qu'il était tout jeune chef d'orchestre, une suite de coïncidences fortuites l'amèneront à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. Wilhelm Furtwängler, le chef titulaire qu'il admirait beaucoup avait préféré s'exiler en Suisse en attendant d'être « dénazifié » puisque toute apparition publique lui était alors interdite. Pour comble de malheur ou de hasard, le chef Leo Borchard qui devait alors le remplacer fut accidentellement tué par une sentinelle américaine. Or, il semble qu'aucun autre chef expérimenté n'était disponible à cette époque ou en mesure d'être accepté par les autorités des 4 puissances qui occupaient désormais le territoire de Berlin.

Celibidache fut ainsi nommé chef du Philharmonique de Berlin, en février 1946. Mais, au retour de Furtwängler, en 1947, il dut partager la direction de l'Orchestre jusqu'à la mort de ce dernier, en 1954. Jusqu'alors, le jeune chef roumain avait dirigé l'Orchestre 414 fois, présentant beaucoup d'œuvres nouvelles de compositeurs tels que Boris Blacher, Heinz Tiessen, Paul Hindemith et Egon Wellesz. À la mort de Furtwängler, l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin choisira Herbert von Karajan pour lui succéder et rejettera la candidature de Celibidache qui quittera prestement Berlin. Il ne redirigera le Philharmonique de Berlin qu'une seule fois, en 1992, sur l'intervention du Président de la République Fédérale d'Allemagne. Contrairement à ce que l'on peut voir souvent écrit, Celibidache n'a jamais été l'assistant de Furtwängler, mais le chef associé du Philharmonique de Berlin. Cette méprise est due à Karajan qui fit purement et simplement effacer son nom de la liste des chefs titulaires et il faut donc rendre hommage au chef actuel de la Philharmonie, Simon Rattle, pour avoir rétabli le nom de Celibidache sur cette liste lors de son entrée en fonction.

En 1948, Celibidache fera ses débuts londoniens pour ensuite enregistrer quelques disques sous étiquette « Decca ». Après son départ de Berlin, il entamera une carrière de chef itinérant au Danemark, notamment, en Suède, en Amérique du Sud et maintes fois en France, mais surtout en Italie où il dirigera les Orchestres de La Scala, à Milan, l'Orchestre de l'Académie nationale de Sainte-Cécile, à Rome et, entre autres, les Orchestres de la radio italienne (« RAI ») à Rome, Milan, Naples et Turin. Ses exigences pour de longues séances intensives de répétition seront enfin plus

facilement satisfaites à la radio qu'aux concerts présentés dans les grandes salles de concerts symphoniques.

À partir de 1959, il travaillera avec l'Orchestre symphonique de la radio de Stuttgart et, en 1960, commencera à donner des classes de Maître en direction d'orchestre à l'Académie musicale Chigiana de Sienne qui lui valurent un statut légendaire.

Entre 1960 et 1963, Celibidache travaille intensément et assidûment avec l'Orchestre royal du Danemark et, de 1962 à 1971, deviendra directeur en chef de l'Orchestre symphonique de la Radio suédoise qu'il rebâtit totalement. De 1972 à 1977, il sera ensuite nommé chef titulaire de l'Orchestre symphonique de la radio de Stuttgart et, de 1973 à 1975, celui de l'Orchestre national de France, période qui restera gravée dans la mémoire de plus d'un mélomane français. Malheureusement, son désir de réformer cet Orchestre et certaines dissensions syndicales l'amèneront à renoncer au travail amorcé en France.

Ainsi, de 1979 jusqu'à sa mort, il sera nommé chef titulaire de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Munich dont il fera l'un des meilleurs ensembles au monde. Il y tiendra des classes de Maître en direction d'orchestre et ne cessera plus de diriger et d'enseigner, particulièrement la phénoménologie de la musique à l'Université de Mayence (1978-1992) et au « Curtis Institute » de Philadelphie. Il mettra alors à profit ce qu'il avait découvert et étudié dans sa jeunesse : la phénoménologie (philosophie) d'Edmund Husserl. Il donnera bénévolement, aussi, des classes de direction d'orchestre en France à la « Schola Cantorum » et dans sa propriété de La Neuville-sur-Essonne.

Disciple du Maître spirituel Sathya Sai Baba, Sergiù Celibidache appartenait à une école de pensée qui contestait que les mots ou le raisonnement fussent vraiment capables de rendre la réalité accessible. Ainsi, il affirmait qu'un concert enregistré sur disque ne pourrait jamais rendre la totalité de l'expérience et des « épiphénomènes » vécus lors d'un concert donné en salle, allant jusqu'à assimiler un concert enregistré à une nuit d'amour passée avec une photographie de Brigitte Bardot !

Heureusement, toutefois, pour ceux qui n'auront pu assister à ses concerts, les diffusions de ses concerts radiophoniques furent souvent enregistrées car la radio permettait de plus longues séances de répétitions, en particulier en Italie, en Suède et en Allemagne. Hélas, de son vivant, plusieurs de ces enregistrements seront édités et paraîtront sous des étiquettes non officielles et de qualité sonore médiocre. Après sa mort, son fils Serge Ioan Celebidachi, réalisateur de cinéma, autorisera la « Deutsche Grammophon » à publier et distribuer les enregistrements de Stuttgart (1971-1977, de même qu'à « EMI Classics », ceux de Munich (1979-1996) enregistrés par la Radiodiffusion Bavaroise. Ce qui mettra définitivement un terme à la diffusion de plus en plus importante de bandes pirates de qualité exécrationnelle.

Les copies CD éditées mettront particulièrement en valeur ces interprétations des Symphonies d'Anton Bruckner, la musique française de Debussy, Ravel, Roussel et Milhaud, des Symphonies n° 1 et n° 9 de Chostakovitch de même que des extraits wagnériens proprement stupéfiants. Les revenus de la vente de ces disques sont intégralement reversés à 2 fondations créées par Serge Ioan Celebidachi : l'une pour la musique (« Sergiù Celibidache Stiftung »), l'autre humanitaire (« SC Help »).

Plusieurs enregistrements vidéos de Celibidache sont également disponibles, dont ceux avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Munich et Daniel Barenboim au piano. Celibidache avait alors accepté de se laisser filmer à condition que tous les bénéfices de la vente fussent toutefois ultérieurement remis à l'UNICEF.

Avec le recul, Sergiù Celibidache, qui était membre de l'Académie roumaine, aura fait partie des musiciens qui auront beaucoup réfléchi sur la musique et la phénoménologie de la musique ; réflexions qu'il transmettait volontiers mais uniquement oralement et lesquelles furent tenues pour importantes et considérables. Sa conception de la technique de direction d'orchestre aura aussi eu une très grande portée et l'on se rappellera, qu'à ce propos, il répétait et dirigeait presque toujours de mémoire et sans partition aucune.

Il appréciait tout particulièrement les musiques allemande, russe et française, n'ayant pas ou très peu dirigé d'Opéras. Il aura dirigé, par contre, plusieurs œuvres de musique vocale non mises-en-scène : les « Passions » de Bach, le « Requiem » de Mozart, celui de Fauré, de Verdi. Pour ce qui est de la musique allemande, il vouait un culte tout à fait particulier à la musique symphonique du compositeur autrichien Anton Bruckner. Au chapitre de la musique française, il se révéla être un interprète de 1er ordre de Claude Debussy et de Maurice Ravel. Son soliste préféré fut le pianiste italien Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli avec lequel il aura notamment interprété le 5e Concerto pour piano (« Empereur ») de Ludwig van Beethoven et le Concerto en sol de Maurice Ravel dont il existe un enregistrement public filmé à Londres, en 1982.

La dépouille de Sergiù Celibidache repose désormais en paix dans le très petit cimetière de La Neuville-sur-Essonne. Sa tombe est toujours régulièrement visitée par sa famille et des admirateurs de passage.

Sur le tempo :

« Mon Dieu, que je serais heureux si Furtwängler était parmi nous aujourd'hui et montrait au monde ce qu'est un tempo large ! »

Sur la direction d'Opéra :

« Vous savez combien de difficultés les chefs doivent affronter lorsqu'ils travaillent avec simplement l'Orchestre. Alors imaginez la somme de soucis supplémentaires qui vous tomberaient dessus s'il s'agissait d'Opéra : chanteurs arrogants, metteurs en scène ayant peu de connaissances musicales mais jamais à court d'idées à faire trembler la terre, corps de ballet gambadant tout autour de la scène. Sans parler des choristes qui ne vous suivent pas parce qu'on leur a imposé de regarder du mauvais côté. Que devient la musique dans tout cela ? »

Sur le compositeur Tchaïkovski :

« Dès qu'il pose la main sur l'Orchestre, cela sonne ! »

Sur Anton Bruckner et la profondeur de sa musique :

« Pour l'homme normal, le temps c'est ce qui vient après le début ; le temps de Bruckner, c'est ce qui vient après la fin. Je suis heureux de pouvoir encore aujourd'hui lire les lignes qu'il nous a laissées. »

...

À une époque où les personnalités artistiques tendent à se couler dans des moules identiques, Sergiù Celibidache avait systématiquement refusé une évolution dictée par les moyens de reproduction et de communication. À sa façon, il était resté un homme d'une autre époque en refusant d'enregistrer le moindre disque en studio, la musique exigeant un renouvellement permanent et ne pouvant s'entendre qu'une seule fois, dans un cadre précis. Elle ne pouvait donc être reproduite. D'ailleurs, le commerce de la musique, entravé à sa quête de l'absolu, ne l'intéressait pas. Le cérémonial du concert, événement sacré, avait beaucoup plus d'importance. Il était considéré comme un mythe de la direction d'orchestre.

Il naît à Roman, près de Jassy, en Roumanie, le 28 juin 1912. Après avoir fait des études de philosophie et de mathématiques à l'université de Bucarest, il se fixe à Berlin en 1936 et parfait sa formation en se spécialisant dans la mécanique ondulatoire. Il étudie la musicologie à l'Université Friedrich-Wilhelm avec Arnold Schering et Georg Schünemann et soutient une thèse de doctorat consacrée à Josquin des Prés. Parallèlement, il s'inscrit à la « Musikhochschule », où il est l'élève de Fritz Stein, de Heinz Gmeindl et de Kurt Thomas (1939-1945). Il est toujours à Berlin, en 1945, lorsque Wilhelm Furtwängler se trouve interdit de direction en attendant de passer devant la commission de dénazification. L'Orchestre philharmonique, qui venait de trouver un chef intérimaire en la personne de Leo Borchard, se trouve de nouveau orphelin à la mort de celui-ci. Celibidache est alors nommé, malgré son inexpérience. On sait peu de chose sur lui à cette époque. La légende commence à se forger : exigence, mémoire fabuleuse, volonté intraitable. Mais certains prétendent qu'il maîtrise mal les grandes œuvres du répertoire. Néanmoins, ses lers pas dans la carrière se déroulent dans des conditions exceptionnelles car il semble évident qu'il apprend beaucoup au contact d'un tel Orchestre.

Sergiù Celibidache : « La musique n'est rien »

C'est le titre d'un livre qui vient d'être publié par les éditions Actes Sud : textes et entretiens pour une phénoménologie de la musique - avec un seul texte écrit en fait, et de circonstance, puisqu'il était destiné à soutenir une conférence prononcée à Munich, en 1985. Celibidache, né en 1912, disparu en 1996, d'origine roumaine mais suivant ses propres déclarations « berlinois » de cœur, était d'abord et avant tout musicien et chef d'orchestre. Toute sa vie, il s'est déclaré partisan d'un style de communication directe, vivante, de l'instant unique, qui ne peut ni se reproduire ni se transmettre par les moyens techniques de l'enregistrement, de la conservation ou de la reproduction. Vers la fin de sa vie, il a consenti à quelques enregistrements (cd et dvd) de quelques concerts, destinés sans doute à une demande de plus en plus pressante au fil des années, à conserver sûrement la mémoire de ses interprétations, particulièrement celles des Symphonies d'Anton Bruckner. Mais il a maintenu en le répétant maintes fois qu'il se désolidarisait complètement de telles techniques. Pour preuve, il a stipulé finalement que le bénéfice des ventes de tels enregistrements reviendraient tous et entièrement à ses fondations qui sont actuellement gérées par ses héritiers. Alors,

si « la musique n'est rien », qu'est-ce donc ? J'avais terminé un 1er article, il y a 2 jours, que j'avais soigneusement sauvegardé comme à l'habitude, et une panne d'ordinateur me l'a sabré dans la nuit, inexplicablement. J'avais pris la peine de citer longuement Celibidache, en ajoutant peu de commentaires. Cette fois, contraint de reprendre mon ouvrage, je citerai moins Celibidache et je m'exprimerai davantage à titre personnel, non pour le critiquer mais pour livrer des réflexions nées d'un certain recul provoqué par l'empêchement de ma 1re publication.

Mon interprétation d'abord, je la dirai d'emblée. « La musique n'est rien » : il faut comprendre « la musique n'est rien de matériel ; la musique n'est pas quelque chose » et Celibidache le dit lui-même mot pour mot. Dans sa conférence sur la Phénoménologie musicale, il distingue entre le son matériel (l'équivalent d'un simple bruit) qu'il appelle en allemand « Klang », et le son musical, en allemand « Ton ». Celui-ci a été produit par l'homme, il y a fort longtemps : c'est l'homme préhistorique même, dont j'ai déjà écrit qu'il avait inventé l'art pictural, pariétaire à cette époque, qui invente ce son particulier qu'il tire d'un simple tuyau taillé dans un roseau, voire d'un tibia préalablement évidé.

« Qu'est-ce que le son (“ Klang ”) ? Le son est mouvement. Le son est vibration. Qu'est-ce qui se meut ? La matière brute : une corde, une masse d'air ou de métal. Nous savons que tout est mouvement. Si le son est mouvement, qu'est-ce qui distingue le son pouvant devenir musique des autres formes de mouvement ? C'est la structure spécifique et à nulle autre semblable qui est à sa base : les vibrations égales et qui demeurent égales. Pour une unité temporelle déterminée, le même nombre de vibrations : voilà l'essence du son (“ Ton ”) musical. » (page 38)

Ce son régulier a ceci de particulier qu'il se prolonge d'harmoniques si nombreuses et si riches qu'elles parviennent ainsi à créer littéralement ce qu'il convient alors d'appeler « musique », celle-ci ayant, quant à elle, la particularité d'entrer en consonance avec les affects humains, la propriété même de révéler à l'homme ce qu'il est lui-même, si subtilement dissimulé par la vulgarité d'une condition naturelle soumise aux aléas d'une existence bien périlleuse : un être spirituel au fond de lui-même. La phénoménologie exposée par Celibidache (il le précise également) est bien loin de la phénoménologie husserlienne. Elle en garde les 2 principaux concepts. L'intention, qui est devenue ici l'intention d'advenir à cette part plus intime de soi-même, à un inconnu qui nous porte et qui s'appelle Vie ou Dieu même, intention donc de créer d'autres « conditions ». Mieux encore : ce concept de réduction qui cette fois désigne un mouvement d'unification, de réduction à l'Un comme Dieu est Un. L'homme, conçu à l'image de Dieu, va créer ce geste qui n'est plus de nature mais de culture, de réduire en unité ce qui se trouve donné en l'état de multiplicité d'expériences par la nature. Mais en musique, c'est tout à fait exceptionnel, ce produit de culture ne trouve sa réalité, son accomplissement, que dans un phénomène, un « épiphénomène » même à peine perceptible. En musique, ce sera l'octave, la quinte, et autant de subdivisions du son principal, originaire (Celibidache en a même fait une démonstration durant sa conférence, avec son piano, et en même temps sur un tableau !) et c'est bien ce qui fait que la « musique n'est rien », ni la partition, c'est bien évident, ni même le « beau son » qui nous caresse les oreilles comme s'appliquent à le cultiver les musiciens contemporains. La musique naît plus haut, à l'instant de cet évanouissement du son matériellement perceptible, chant si subtil et si spécifiquement humain qui s'adresse à l'âme humaine, qui la révèle à elle-même, la renforce et la nourrit. Il faut lire ce livre pour apprécier tous les exemples donnés par son auteur, et aussi les contre-exemples : « ce que la musique n'est pas » ! Je reviendrai un peu plus loin sur cette notion de tempo au cœur de toutes les polémiques qui l'ont opposé à la plupart des critiques musicaux.

Mais je lui laisse la parole maintenant pour nous dire à sa façon, avec l'exemple pris de Beethoven et Bruckner, pourquoi il estime que la « musique n'est rien ». Il y a un accent polémique qui donne toute sa force au témoignage. De même, comment il peut dire que « la musique n'est pas (que) belle » - et encore, c'est moi qui ajoute « que » entre parenthèses ! « La musique n'est pas quelque chose qui, dans une définition, se laisserait saisir par des symboles intellectuels et des conventions du langage. Elle ne correspond à aucune forme d'existence perceptible. La musique n'est pas quelque chose ..." (page 36) « La musique n'est pas belle, elle est vraie. » (page 71) et ceci plus précis :

« La musique n'est pas belle. Si elle reste à l'état de " belle ", vous n'avez encore rien fait. La musique est vraie. Toute beauté qui se détache de l'être humain est permanente. C'est cette soif de permanence qui nous anime pour être derrière le son. Pourquoi le son m'attache-t-il ? Pourquoi me touche-t-il à ce point ? Celui qui arrive à savoir que la musique est vraie a dépassé la beauté. Cette dernière beauté est, au fond, la vérité. Rien n'est plus beau que la vérité. » (page 83)

Je retrouve bien ici, explicitement, un thème qui me rappelle les intentions du peintre soufi que j'évoquais dernièrement, Behzâd de Herât. Ce n'est pas non plus la belle image qui me ravissait, qui me bouleversait : c'est la vérité morale et spirituelle qu'elle désignait, en direction de laquelle elle faisait signe. En musique, qui plus est, il n'y a aucune trace, aucune matérialité de la composition qui désigne directement cette beauté qui s'appelle vérité.

« Il y a un système pour apprendre une partition, comme on apprend à conduire un avion. Mais la musique n'a rien à faire avec la mémoire. Un musicien qui joue tout de mémoire peut être totalement privé de musicalité ... Qu'est-ce que la partition ? La 5e Symphonie de Beethoven, où est-elle ? Sur la partition ? Pas du tout. La partition n'est qu'une paire de béquilles pour éliminer ce qui l'empêche d'être. Rien d'autre. C'est un mode d'emploi que l'on utilise pour arriver à une réalité dont on n'a aucune idée. » (page 88)

Nous allons voir maintenant comment ces idées se lient à l'interprétation, à la compréhension de la musique de Bruckner.

« Anton Bruckner est le plus grand Symphoniste de tous les temps ... Bruckner a créé de nouvelles formes symphoniques. Au lieu de l'opposition entre 2 thèmes, comme dans la Sonate, il a conçu la triangulation. Pour aborder cette triangulation, il nous faut d'abord découvrir d'où vient l'opposition quand on se trouve en présence de 2 thèmes. Qui crée cette opposition ? C'est cette force intérieure, la vitalité du monde affectif de l'homme qui se met en mouvement. L'opposition ne se situe pas dans l'attachement de l'homme au son, qui n'est d'ailleurs pas de nature symbolique comme le langage. La liaison entre l'intervalle et le monde affectif est directe ... Il (Bruckner) n'est pas aussi immédiat, aussi clair, aussi présent que Ravel. Les réalités qui animent ses textes musicaux sont presque inaccessibles. Dans quel sens est-il le plus grand ? Le langage ne peut pas accéder aux réalités esthétiques musicales. La musique est absolument la dernière réalité. Il n'y a pas d'alternative à la musique ... C'est une méditation. Il n'existe pas de moyen plus court pour arriver à la transcendance que le son ... La musique peut être belle, ça ne dérange pas. Mais elle n'est pas que la sensation de beauté. La beauté qui se matérialise dans la musique est le

résultat, la conséquence d'une vérité : la nature divine de l'homme. » (page 95)

Cette profession de foi s'inspire de la philosophie (je devrais dire la spiritualité) orientale, c'est évident. Bouddhiste en particulier, et Celibidache n'en fait pas mystère, bien au contraire. J'en trouve une preuve supplémentaire quelques pages plus loin, cet abandon de soi qui délivre la transcendance et son chant propre :

« Lorsque je dirige, je ne fais rien. Si vous pensez pendant l'acte musical, vous êtes foutu, perdu. Votre savoir n'a un rôle que dans la phase où vous vous appropriez les éléments ... Je crée seulement les conditions pour que les musiciens puissent faire de la musique. La musique n'est pas le son, le son peut devenir musique, et lorsqu'il deviendra musique, il ne sera pas musique ... La musique est un devenir qui n'arrive jamais à l'objectivation ... En transcendant le son, je n'arrive nulle part. Je ne suis plus dans le monde physique, et je ne pourrais pas répondre à la question : “ et si vous n'êtes pas là, où êtes-vous ? ” . En disant : “ Je suis nulle part ”, j'hypostasie. La logique et la pensée s'arrêtent là. » (page 98)

Parlant de Furtwängler, Celibidache nous dit qu'il lui avait révélé en quelques mots que le tempo se trouve lui-même lorsqu'on sent cette vérité enfouie derrière les notes : « ça dépend comment ça sonne » - pas de règles, pas de recommandations, cela vient, juste ou pas ! Beaucoup d'objections peuvent être émises lorsque ces catégories « orientales » sont affirmées aussi abruptement. Certes, Celibidache reconnaît son travail préparatoire, cette « voie négative » qui opère en musique comme en toute catharsis :

« La phénoménologie musicale est un énorme “ non ” devant le “ oui ” de la musique ... » Mais n'y-a-t-il vraiment pas d'interprétation, et je l'écrirai ainsi : « d'interprétations également bonnes ? révélatrices de la même vérité ? »

L'interprète, le musicien doit-il à ce point s'absenter pour délivrer cette « vérité de musique » qui ne lui appartient pas ? Lorsque j'ai longtemps et longuement parler de mes peintres, était-ce pour dire ou prouver qu'il n'y en avait qu'un seul, ou qu'une seule école ? Poussin ou Chardin ? Courbet ou Cézanne ? Et ces portraits que je reproduisais dernièrement : Renoir ou Soutine ? Manet ou Derain ? Tous si différents et capables également de pointer vers cette unique « vérité de peinture » révélatrice d'humanité. Y-a-t-il une seule « version » comme on dit, de la 5e Symphonie - des centaines d'enregistrements, et un seul bon ? Il a été plus facile au Maître de dénoncer les plus mauvais et, notamment, cette manie d'aller de plus en plus vite, d'exécuter des versions éclatantes qui passent bien au microphone ! Je me rappelle avoir entendu une interprétation par des étudiants, dans la rue, du Quatuor « La jeune fille et la mort » de Schubert : c'était maladroit, presque un massacre, et j'ai pourtant été bouleversé. Pourquoi ? Parce que j'avais reconnu le thème, ressenti une nouvelle fois (mais par l'intermédiaire du souvenir) ce sommet d'émotion sans pareille ? Ou alors y aurait-il une vérité plus profonde encore, plus inaccessible ou indicible, de Vie à laquelle l'art nous entraîne, nous fait approcher pour s'éprouver soi-même dans l'absoluité de son être irréductible, ce que j'ai appelé la « splendeur de notre condition » ? Mais il y a quelqu'un pour cela. Et, heureusement, les mots le disent :

« Un comme Dieu est Un » , nous confiait Maître Eckhart. Mais Celibidache aurait été d'accord sur ce point.

Je veux attirer l'attention des lecteurs sur la réussite exceptionnelle d'un enregistrement (je l'ai d'ailleurs déjà signalé)

celui de la 4e Symphonie de Bruckner (daté de 1989) avec les « Münchener ». Vous entendez, à la fin, cette battue d'archets qui accompagne la plus longue Coda de toute l'histoire de la Symphonie. C'est inouï : on l'appelle aussi une « échelle céleste », une référence qui nous vient du Haut Moyen-âge chrétien pour symboliser une extase. Mais puisque nous sommes sous influence d'une philosophie orientale (influence reconnue, je le répète, par Celibidache), je voudrais citer une autre 4e, celle de Sibelius, plus courte, plus incisive, une succession de tableaux à peine esquissés comme en peinture chinoise - quelques traits jamais achevés, un art de suggestion. Bruckner, Celibidache le dit lui-même, ne cherchait pas Dieu, il l'avait trouvé et ne pensait qu'à Lui, mais en mystique chrétien. Et la créature, dans cet élan ou cet échange, ne disparaît pas, jamais, elle demeure témoin de lumière et de perfection, témoin conjoint du Seul en co-naissance. C'est, à mon avis, la réalisation la plus haute. Bruckner y est tout le temps. Et s'il n'achève pas sa 9e Symphonie dédiée au « Bon Dieu », c'est que Celui-ci n'a pas voulu. Tout était dit néanmoins. Et les cors, à la fin du mouvement lent, de moduler la fin d'un monde : un exceptionnel accomplissement - mais au scénario de la création ! Bruckner avouait ne pas savoir « à quoi il pensait » en composant cette Coda. Moi-même, je ne sais pas ce que j'ai voulu dire par cette conclusion.

Sergiu Celibidache et l'héritage de Furtwängler

Karl Schumann has observed that Furtwängler had no direct successors, since his personality, experiences and subjective outlook were truly unique. Thus, while the specific approach of a Toscanini could be copied (and was, quite extensively), the highly-personal vision of a Furtwängler could only be caricatured. And, yet, Toscanini's vast former popularity has waned, while Furtwängler has become the inspiration of a host of performers willing to trust their vision and artistic instincts above tradition and the written score.

Foremost among these is Sergiu Celibidache, who was as close as Furtwängler ever came to having a « protégé ». His career, like Furtwängler's, has been seeped in mystique and controversy. Fans laud his eccentricities as the hallmarks of genius ; others condemn them as the signs of a charlatan.

During the long wait for Furtwängler's trial and rehabilitation, the leadership of the Berlin Philharmonic fell to this unknown Rumanian music student who had won a contest and apparently was one of the very few conductors whose politics and War-time activities were above suspicion. Upon his return, Furtwängler retained Celibidache as his assistant. Several of Celibidache's Berlin Philharmonic concerts, from 1948 to 1953, are preserved on « Hunt » 734 (3 CDs) and are quite similar in style to Furtwängler.

Celibidache's recording career is surely the shortest in modern history, having both begun and ended in 1948, when he cut records of Tchaïkovsky's 5th Symphony and the « Nutcracker » Suite (now, on « London » 425 958-2). Their passion, impulse and freshness already mark Celibidache daring to take his Master's qualities to the extreme. Among the conductors' other shared values was their aversion toward recordings. But Celibidache magnified his mentor's mere distaste into abject hatred, proclaiming recordings to be obscene, like a photograph of love-making (with Brigitte Bardot). Lacking Furtwängler's practical willingness to accommodate, following his early venture, Celibidache has steadfastly refused to set foot ever again in a recording studio.

Another quirk which Celibidache refused to compromise was his insistence upon a dozen or more rehearsals for every concert, many times the number any commercially responsible Orchestra could possibly afford. Consequently, Celibidache's activities were effectively limited to occasional projects with heavily subsidized European radio ensembles. His immense talent is preserved on tapes of some of those broadcasts. The results are truly awesome and prove the value of his unorthodox approach : under his baton and attention, even the most provincial group plays with the assurance and subtlety of the Vienna Philharmonic.

A further benefit of Celibidache's rehearsal mania was that, by solving performance problems beforehand, he was free to explore unconventional interpretations that enthralled audiences bored with safe and indifferent run-throughs of familiar repertoire. Like Furtwängler, Celibidache prefers slow tempos, but unlike his mentor, rarely opts for extreme speed as well. He also eschews Furtwängler's sense of melodrama in favor of blending dynamics and sonority into a continuous emotional flow.

Fortunately, many of Celibidache's concerts, through the years, were recorded and have emerged on import CDs. Of those from his years as a musical nomad, the most fascinating were taped, in 1959 and 1960, with various Italian radio Orchestras : a solid Brahms cycle on « Arkadia » (CDGI 764.3) , a glorious Ravel program on « Arkadia » (CDGI 741) , an exquisitely subtle Wagner « Siegfried Idyll » on Arkadia (CDGI 750.1) , a gloriously profound Tchaïkovsky « Romeo and Juliet » Overture on Arkadia (CDM 402) or « Fonit Cetra » (CDAR 2013) , a reverential Mozart « Requiem » on « Arkadia » (CDMP 425.1) , a heartfelt Mozart Mass in C minor on « Fonit Cetra » (CDAR 2007) , and a magnificent Brahms « German Requiem » on « Hunt » (CD : 546) .

In the late- 1970's, Celibidache began to settle down, gravitating first toward the Stuttgart Radio Orchestra and, then, the Munich Philharmonic, of which he has now become the permanent conductor. The « Exclusive » , « Artists Live » and « Originals » labels have all released concerts that evidence even a finer sheen than Celibidache was able to achieve with the earlier Italian ensembles. His artistic temperament is ideally suited to Bruckner, and concerts of the Mass No. 3 (on « Exclusive » 37/38) , the Symphony No. 3 (on « Exclusive » 59) , the Symphonies Nos. 4 and 9 (on « Exclusive » 23/24) , the Symphonies Nos. 5 and 8 (on « Exclusive » 44/46) and the Symphony No. 6 (on « Artists Live » , FED 063) shine a uniquely mesmerizing light on their sprawling structures.

Among Celibidache's other superb concerts released so far are a deeply felt but surprisingly stylish Bach Mass in B minor on « Exclusive » (33/34) and Mozart « Requiem » on « Artists Live » (FED 039) , a languorous Debussy program on « Artists Live » (FED 031) , profoundly meditative accounts of the Franck Symphony in D on « Artists Live » (FED 034) and Moussorgsky's « Pictures at an Exhibition » on « Artists Live » (FED 017) , a swooningly sensual Rimsky-Korsakov « Scheherazade » on « Exclusive » (CD : 85) , seething and passionate Tchaïkovsky Symphonies Nos. 4 and 5 on « Artists Live » (FED 022/023) and ravishing Wagner Overtures on « Artists Live » (FED 026) .

If you want only a single example of Celibidache's magic, grab his Ravel « Daphnis et Chloé » Suites on « Originals » (SH 803) . With absolutely breathtaking dynamics, balances, ensemble and overall polish, this is quite simply one of the most gorgeous examples of orchestral playing ever recorded.

1999 Update - Although little has changed and so I felt comfortable leaving the rest of this 1996 article intact, it should be noted that (a) Celibidache died late that year and (b) « EMI » launched a posthumous CD series featuring his late Munich Philharmonic concerts. Of the bootlegs mentioned above, all the Bruckner works, as well as the Debussy program, Tchaïkovsky 5th, « Romeo and Juliet » and « Pictures at an Exhibition » , are superseded, both sonically and artistically, by the new CDs. For a review of the new « EMI » series, see : « Life After Death » .

For having scorned the expected role of the congenial, cosmopolitan, well-recorded modern Mæstro, Celibidache is often dismissed by the musical establishment as an insignificant kook. But his work is utterly unique and, in our days of boring perfunctory standardization, that, in itself, makes him invaluable.

Celibidache apparently refuses to discuss his feelings toward Furtwängler. But he doesn't have to. Furtwängler's artistic soul and spirit clearly infuse his work and endure through his talent.

...

The Romanian conductor, composer, and teacher Sergiù Celibidache was born on 28 June or 11 July 1912 in Roman, near Iași, a small-town in North-East Romania ; and died on 14 August 1996 in La Neuville-sur-Essonne, near Pithiviers (Paris) .

Educated in his native Romania, and later in Paris and Berlin, Celibidache's career in music spanned over 5 decades, including tenures as principal conductor for the Munich Philharmonic, Berlin Philharmonic and several European Orchestras. Later in life, he taught at Mainz University in Germany and the Curtis Institute of Music in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Celibidache frequently refused to release his performances on commercial recordings during his lifetime claiming that a listener could not obtain a « transcendental experience » outside of the concert-hall. Many of the recordings of his performances were released posthumously. Nonetheless, he earned international acclaim for celebrated interpretations of Classical music repertoire and was known for a spirited performance style informed by his study and experiences in « Zen » Buddhism. His later career was marred by controversy and accusations of sexism and discrimination that came to light during a 12 year legal battle that dominated his tenure at the Munich Philharmonic.

Sergiù Celibidache was born in Roman, where his father was a government official. Early in his youth, he began studying piano and, after traditional schooling in Romania, he was sent by his father to Bucharest and, then, to Paris where he studied music, philosophy and mathematics. His father had expected him to pursue a political career in Romania. However, Celibidache chose to enroll in the « Hochschule für Musik » (Academy of Music) in Berlin, in 1936, where he studied composition under Heinz Thiessen and, later, conducting under Kurt Thomas, Walter Gmeindl and Fritz Stein. He continued with doctoral studies at the Friedrich Wilhelm University (« Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität ») , in Berlin, where he studied philosophy with Nicolai Hartmann and Eduard Spranger and musicology with Arnold Schering and Georg Schünemann. He submitted a dissertation on Franco-Flemish composer Josquin des Prez (circa 1450-1521)

and his work during the Renaissance. He received his degree in 1944. During his studies in Berlin, Celibidache was introduced to « Zen » Buddhism through the influence of his teacher, Martin Steinke, and the tenets of Buddhism informed Celibidache's world-view and work for the rest of his life.

Sergiu Celibidache studied in Berlin and, from 1945 to 1952, he was principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic. He later worked with Radio Orchestras in Stockholm, Stuttgart and Paris. He also worked in Britain, in the late- 1940's and 1950's, due partly to the promotional efforts of the pianist Eileen Joyce and her partner, an artists' agent. Joyce said that Celibidache was the greatest conductor she had ever worked with :

« He was the only one who got inside my soul. »

In 1970, he was awarded Denmark's Sonning Award. From 1979 until his death, he was music director of the Munich Philharmonic. He regularly taught at Mainz University, in Germany, and, in 1984, taught at the Curtis Institute in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Teaching was a major focus throughout his life and his courses were frequently open to all without fee. Among his notable students are François Bernier, Jordi Mora, Peter Perret, Markand Thakar, Konrad von Abel, and Nils-Göran Areskoug, as well as the « Danish Wind Quintet » .

He appeared in the film « Botschafter der Musik » where he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic in a complete performance of Ludwig van Beethoven's « Egmont » Overture.

One controversial incident during his tenure with the Munich Philharmonic was a protracted legal battle to oust principal trombonist Abbie Conant that lasted 12 years, with Conant ultimately prevailing. Judge Angela Mack ruled that the City of Munich through the Orchestra had broken the law concerning the equal treatment of employees. A detailed description of the case and the sexism Ms. Conant had to endure can be found in an internet article published by her husband, William Osbourne. Her audition and controversy is discussed in Malcolm Gladwell's book entitled, « Blink » .

Celibidache died at the age of 84 on 14 August 1996 at La Neuville-sur-Essonne, in the « arrondissement de » Pithiviers, near Paris. He was buried in the Cimetière de Neuville-sur-Essone.

In 1965, Celibidache married Ioana Procopie Dimitrescu. They had 1 son, Sergiu Ioan Celibidache (« Serge ») , born on 19 June 1968.

Celibidache's approach to music-making is often described more by what he did not do instead of what he did. For example, much has been made of Celibidache's « refusal » to make recordings even though almost all of his concert activity actually was recorded with many released posthumously by major labels such as « EMI » and « Deutsche Grammophon » with consent of his family. Nevertheless, Celibidache did pay little attention to making these recordings, which he viewed merely as by-products of his orchestral concerts.

Celibidache's focus was instead on creating, during each concert, the optimal conditions for what he called a « transcendent experience » . Aspects of « Zen » Buddhism, such as ichi-go ichi-e, were strongly influential on him. He

believed that musical experiences were extremely unlikely to ensue when listening to recorded music, so he eschewed them. As a result, some of his concerts did provide audiences with exceptional and sometimes life-altering experiences, including, for example, a 1984 concert in Carnegie Hall by the Orchestra of the Curtis Institute that « The New York Times » critic, John Rockwell, touted as the best of his 25 years of concert-going.

Celibidache was well-known for his demands for extensive rehearsal time with Orchestras. An oft-mentioned feature of many of his concerts, captured in the live recordings of them, is a slower tempo than what is considered the norm, while, in fast passages, his tempos often exceeded expectations. In Celibidache's own view, however, criticism of a recording's tempo is irrelevant, as it is not (and cannot be) a critique of the performance but rather of a transcription of it, without the ambience of the moment - for him, a key factor in any musical performance. As Celibidache explained, the acoustic space in which one hears a concert directly affects the likelihood of the emergence of his sought-after transcendent experience. The acoustic space within which one hears a recording of one of his performances, on the other hand, has no impact on the performance, as it is impossible for the acoustic features of that space to stimulate musicians to play slower or faster.

That his recorded performances differ so widely from the majority of other recordings has led them to be seen by some as collectors' items rather than mainstream releases, « one-offs » rather than reference recordings.

Honours and awards :

1970 : Léonie Sonning Music Prize (Denmark) .

1992 : Honorary Citizen of the City of Munich (« Ehrenbürgerrecht von München ») .

1992 : Grand Officers Cross with star, Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany (« Großes Verdienstkreuz mit Stern, Verdienstorden der Bundesrepublik Deutschland ») .

1992 : Honorary Member of the Romanian Academy.

1992 : Doctor honoris causa, Iași Academy of Art and University of Iași.

1993 : Member of the Bavarian Maximilian Order for Science and Art (« Bayerische Maximiliansorden für Wissenschaft und Kunst ») .

Bavarian Order of Merit (« Bayerischer Verdienstorden ») .

Honorary Citizen (« Cetățean de Onoare ») of Iași, Romania.

...

Romanian-born conductor Sergiu Celibidache spent his early life in Roman, a small-town in North-East Romania, near Iași (capital of Moldavia) , and, in 1936, commenced music studies at the « Hochschule für Musik » , in Berlin. At age 33, after winning a conducting competition organized by the Berlin Radio, he became conductor of the reconstituted post-War Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, and toured with it to the British and American sectors of occupied Germany. In 1952, he shared the podium with the exiled Furtwängler, the Berlin Philharmonic's general music director, on a tour of the United States. Later that year, when Furtwängler was cleared of allegations of being a Nazi sympathizer and he returned to Germany, Celibidache's appointment with the Berlin Philharmonic was terminated.

Thereafter, the larger part of his career was with the Radio Orchestras of Stockholm (1964-1971) , Stuttgart (1971-1977) , and Paris (1973-1975) . From 1979 until his death, he was music director of the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra and general music director of the City of Munich. Between 1983 and 1984, he conducted the student Orchestra at the Curtis Institute, in Philadelphia.

When a music student in Berlin, Celibidache also attended Berlin University where he studied philosophy and formed the Buddhist beliefs he retained throughout his life. He preferred the immediacy of a live performance rather than recordings and, according to his son, felt that recordings prevented the listener's spontaneous involvement with the music and gave a distorted representation of reality. Thus, though widely admired as an outstanding conductor, many of Celibidache's recordings were unauthorized, and some were of poor sound quality. It was not until after his death that, with the cooperation of his family, « EMI Classics » and « Deutsche Grammophon » released a substantial number of recordings, mainly of broadcast performances with the Stuttgart and Munich Orchestras, but also with the Mannheim Philharmonic and London Philharmonic Orchestra. The repertoire is almost entirely Romantic and post-Romantic, including Beethoven, Bruckner, Brahms, Richard Strauß, Debussy, Ravel, Tchaikowsky, Respighi, and Berlioz.

It is perhaps ironic that Celibidache should have received his widest exposure through a medium he did not approve. Yet, his intense, finely balanced and deeply felt interpretations made him one of the greatest names in 20th Century orchestral conducting. Above all, he was a superb technician. Celibidache could not have asked for a better memorial than the current library of recordings, especially those in « The Celibidache Edition » , which includes lengthy rehearsal recordings (one lasts for 45 minutes, complete with English translations) . « Deutsche Grammophon » 's selection is mainly from earlier recordings made with the Stuttgart Radio Orchestra. Proceeds from both labels are given to the Celibidache Foundation for the encouragement of young musicians and a humanitarian organization he set-up to assist needy people in Tibet, Romania, and other parts of the world. His own compositions include 4 Symphonies, I Piano Concerto, and an orchestral suite which he recorded for UNICEF with the Stuttgart Radio Symphony Orchestra.

...

Sergiu Celibidache grew-up in the capital of Moldavia, Iași, where his father held an official position. He was already improvising at the piano by the age of 4 and, after a traditional schooling, he studied music, philosophy and mathematics in Bucharest and Paris. His father wished him to pursue a political career in Romania but, instead, Celibidache left for Berlin, in 1936, motivated to study composition at the Berlin Academy of Music with Heinz Thiessen

by having heard a String Quartet of his on Romanian radio. 2 years later, he enrolled to study conducting with Kurt Thomas and Walter Gmeindl, while simultaneously attending the Friedrich Wilhelm University to study musicology with Arnold Schering and Georg Schünemann, and philosophy with Nicolai Hartmann and Eduard Spranger. During this period, he became increasingly attracted to Buddhism and « Zen » Buddhism : through his teacher Martin Steinke, he was exposed to Buddhist ideas as to the limits of thought, including what was translatable into music and what was not. Celibidache completed his education, in 1944, with a doctorate on Josquin Desprez. During this period, he was also active as a conductor of student ensembles, attended Furtwängler's rehearsals with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, and composed. His works included Concertos, Masses and 4 Symphonies, all of which remained unheard.

With the end of World War II, Celibidache won a conducting competition and began to conduct professionally with the Berlin Radio Symphony Orchestra, based in the Russian sector of occupied Berlin. He went on to make his debut with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, in August 1945, as a result of several related coincidences : the Orchestra's War-time conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler was awaiting de-Nazification procedures in Switzerland ; the Orchestra's 1st post-War conductor, Leo Borchard, had been accidentally killed by an American sentry ; and no other well-known conductors were either available or acceptable to the 4 Great Powers occupying Berlin. In February 1946, he was appointed as chief conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. Furtwängler returned to the Orchestra, in 1947, and, henceforth, shared the direction of the Orchestra with Celibidache, up until his death in 1954. By this time, Celibidache had led the Orchestra in 414 concerts, presenting many new works by composers such as Blacher, Tiessen, Hindemith and Wellesz. With the selection of Herbert von Karajan, as the new chief conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic, Celibidache left Berlin, conducting the Orchestra only once again, in 1992.

Celibidache had made his London debut, in 1948, followed by some recording sessions for « Decca » , and after his departure from Berlin, he began a nomadic period, conducting in Italy, in particular. He worked with the Orchestras of La Scala, Milan and the « Accademia di Santa Cecilia » , in Rome, as well as with the Radio Orchestras of Rome, Milan, Naples and Turin, amongst others. His extreme demands for extensive rehearsal time made radio conducting more feasible than with normal concert-giving Symphony Orchestras. From 1959, he began to work with the Stuttgart Radio Symphony Orchestra and, from 1960, he held Master-classes in conducting at the « Accademia Chigiana » , in Siena, that soon achieved legendary status.

Between 1960 and 1963, Celibidache worked intensively with the Royal Danish Orchestra and, from 1962 until 1971, he was chief conductor of the Stockholm Radio Symphony Orchestra, which he completely rebuilt. This was followed by a period as chief conductor of the Stuttgart Radio Symphony Orchestra, from 1972 to 1977, and 2 seasons as the chief conductor of the « Orchestre National de Radio France » , from 1973 to 1975, which remain a potent memory for many in France. In 1979, he accepted the post of chief conductor of the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra, which he made into one of the best Orchestras in the world. In Munich, he held Master-classes in orchestral conducting, continuing to conduct and to teach, including the subject of phenomenology at the University of Mainz (1978-1992) , right up until his death.

Sergiu Celibidache was a follower of the religious mystic Sai Baba, and he belonged to a school of thought which denied that the spoken or written word or reasoning may make reality accessible. He believed that, when conducting,

it was necessary to let the complexity of sounds from a passage develop and be heard in a concert-hall (an occurrence known as « epiphenomena ») . He went on to maintain that the « epiphenomena » , which added to the total experience of a « live » performance in a concert-hall, could never be captured on record. Hence, the particular magic and uniqueness of a « live » performance would be lost in a recording, the artificiality of which he went so far as likening to going to bed with a photograph of Brigitte Bardot !

Fortunately, his preference for working with Radio Orchestras, because of the extensive rehearsal time permitted, also resulted in many of his performances being committed to tape in Italy, Sweden and Germany, in particular. During his lifetime, many of these recordings were circulated in un-official editions. Since his death, numerous radio recordings have been authorised for commercial release by his family, to ensure the highest possible standards of reproduction. Several video recordings of Celibidache conducting, especially with the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra, have also been released. Strangely, Celibidache did not object to these in the way that he did to sound recordings.

Whatever their provenance, recordings of Celibidache conducting demonstrate a complete Master at work. His pursuit of the idea of « epiphenomena » suggested that the richer the music, the slower the tempo required ; and, especially in his later years, his generous tempi helped to broaden the vision of the works that he performed. With the music of certain composers, this approach was extremely successful : Celibidache's interpretations of Anton Bruckner, for instance, possessed a transcendental quality that was very powerful. Performances of Brahms, although very different, were equally as successful. His Mastery of orchestral balance, intonation and dynamics, when combined with his deliberate tempi, gave his readings of French music, and of composers such as Ravel and Debussy, in particular, a refinement that was exceptional. By contrast, his interpretations of Russian music such as Mussorgsky's « Pictures at an Exhibition » and Tchaïkovsky's « Romeo and Juliet » possessed an unusual weight and « grandeur » . Celibidache may have been described as one of the last of the « mad genius » conductors (David Hurwitz) but, in truth, little that he conducted was without the greatest musical interest.

...

Sergiu Celibidache (geboren 28. Juni / 11. Juli 1912 greg. in Roman, Region Moldau, Rumänien ; gestorben 14. August 1996 in La Neuville-sur-Essonne bei Paris) war ein rumänischer Dirigent und Musiklehrer mit deutschem Pass.

Celibidache war der Sohn eines Kavallerieoffiziers griechischer Herkunft, sein Geburtsname lautete Celebidachi. Jedoch waren irrtümlicherweise von den deutschen Behörden zwei Buchstaben ausgetauscht worden, und er führte fortan den « falschen » Namen sein Leben lang weiter.

Celibidache studierte zunächst in Bukarest, dann in Berlin Philosophie, Mathematik und Musik (Komposition bei Heinz Tiessen, Kontrapunkt bei Hugo Distler, Dirigieren bei Walter Gmeindl an der Staatlichen Hochschule für Musik Berlin und Philosophie bei Eduard Spranger) , wo er schließlich eine Dissertation über Josquin Desprez vorlegte, aber kriegsbedingt nicht promoviert wurde.

Von 1945 bis 1952 leitete er als Nachfolger Wilhelm Furtwänglers ad interim die Berliner Philharmoniker. Als es um

die offizielle Nachfolge des Chefdirigenten ging, entschieden sich die Berliner Philharmoniker für Herbert von Karajan. Es kam zum Bruch mit Celibidache. Erst nach 40 Jahren, am 31. März 1992, dirigierte er (auf bittende Einladung des damaligen Bundespräsidenten Richard von Weizsäcker) mit Anton Bruckners 7. Sinfonie wieder die Berliner Philharmoniker. Auch danach blieb sein Verhältnis zu diesem Orchester schwierig, er hatte auf sechs Proben bestanden und zeigte sich danach enttäuscht.

Nach seinem Bruch mit den Berliner Philharmonikern arbeitete Celibidache mit einer ganzen Reihe von Orchestern in Südamerika, in Stockholm, Kopenhagen, Italien und Paris. Von 1972 bis 1977 übernahm er die Leitung des Radio-Sinfonieorchesters Stuttgart. Von 1979 bis zu seinem Tod war Celibidache Generalmusikdirektor der Münchner Philharmoniker, mit denen er international große Erfolge erzielte, insbesondere mit Werken Anton Bruckners, die er auch in der Stiftskirche Sankt Florian (Bruckners Grab) bei Linz spielte. In München eröffnete er 1985 den neuen Konzertsaal am Gasteig und wurde dort liebevoll « Celi » genannt.

Anders als Herbert von Karajan lehnte er die Musik-Vermarktung per Schallplatte oder CD ab und fühlte sich als Antipode zu Karajan. Seine Erklärung für diese Einstellung war philosophisch : Musik sei keine Konserve, die man festhalten könne, sie lebe im Augenblick der Entstehung, quasi « in statu nascendi » . Musik sei auch an den speziellen Raum ihrer Aufführung (etwa an einen speziellen Konzertsaal) gebunden, der Reichtum der Musik, der sich nur im Raum entfalten könne, werde durch jegliche Aufnahme und Lautsprecher-Wiedergabe beschnitten. Er lehnte daher Aufnahmen ab, so daß die ersten CDs (Konzertmitschnitte) erst nach seinem Tod veröffentlicht wurden. Der Penguin Guide schreibt zu Celibidaches Bruckner-Mitschnitten aus dieser Zeit :

« Für andere stellen (seine) Exzentritäten ein unüberwindliches Hindernis zwischen dem Komponisten und dem Hörer dar. Diese Einspielungen sind schwierig einzuschätzen : für Celibidache-Anhänger sind sie drei Sterne wert, andere, verärgert über seine begräbnishaften Tempi, würden nicht einen einzigen vergeben ! »

Celibidache entwickelte im Kielwasser des Buches Die Grundlagen der Musik im menschlichen Bewusstsein von Ernest Ansermet eine Phänomenologie der Musik.

In den letzten Jahren war Celibidache bekannt für seine langsamen Tempi. Nach seiner Auffassung ließ die Interpretation der von ihm dirigierten Werke keine selbtherrlichen, harten und unbegründeten Effekte in der Musik zu. Er hatte ein großes Publikum weltweit, die Reaktionen auf seinen Dirigierstil waren jedoch zwiespältig und reichten von enthusiastischen Jubelstürmen bis hin zu verständnisloser Kritik. Einer seiner schärfsten Kritiker war der bekannte Münchner Musikkritiker Joachim Kaiser. Dieser warf ihm mangelnde Innenspannung in seinen Interpretationen vor. Celibidache war für seine vielen Proben berüchtigt. Deshalb konnte es auch vorkommen, daß die Interpretation schon bei den Proben ihren Höhepunkt und Transzendenz erreichte und während des Konzerts (aufgrund der starren vorherigen Festlegung der Orchesterstimmen und Phrasierungen durch Celibidache mit wenig Spontanität) eher spannungsarm erklang.

Auf die Frage, was ein Dirigent eigentlich sei, antwortete er einmal :

« Jeder Dirigent ist ein verkappter Diktator, der sich glücklicherweise mit der Musik begnügt. »

Außer der Arbeit von Ernest Ansermet und von Edmund Husserl spielte der Unterricht von Heinz Tiessen und fernöstliche Weisheitslehren wie Zen-Buddhismus eine große Rolle für Celibidache. Er war Anhänger des indischen Gurus Sathya Sai Baba und versuchte, seine daraus gewonnene Erkenntnis und sein spirituelles Bewusstsein direkt in das Musizieren einzubringen und an seine Schüler zu vermitteln. Er hatte die Absicht, jegliches Ego des Interpreten aus den Werken zu verbannen und allein die Musik klingen zu lassen. Er wehrte sich auch gegen den Begriff « Interpretation », da dieser Begriff ja wieder die Individualität und somit das Ego des Dirigenten impliziere, und das hatte seiner Meinung nach im organischen Werdepzess des Werkes nichts verloren. Somit erklangen unter seiner Stabführung vielgespielte Werke, allen voran die Sinfonien von Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner, auf eine völlig neue und transzendente Weise.

Celibidache war ein begnadeter Lehrer und unterrichtete in Seminaren und Kursen an den Universitäten Trier, Mainz, München und Paris, sowie in seinem Domizil. Er arbeitete mit Studentenorchestern und der Orchesterakademie Schleswig-Holstein. Sein Unterricht war kostenlos. Bereits zur Zeit seiner Berliner Tätigkeit war er von 1946 bis 1949 Dozent am Internationalen Musikinstitut Berlin, einem der Vorgänger der Universität der Künste Berlin, und unterrichtete etwa fünf Studenten. Ein bekannter Schüler aus dieser Zeit ist Carl August Bunte. Ein weiterer bekannter Schüler von Sergiù ist der rumänische Musiker Cristian Mandeal.

1953 und noch einmal 1988 wurde Celibidache mit dem Deutschen Kritikerpreis ausgezeichnet, 1970 mit dem internationalen Léonie-Sonning-Musikpreis. Am 28. November 1954 erhielt er das Bundesverdienstkreuz für seine « Verdienste beim Wiederaufbau des Berliner Philharmonischen Orchesters nach dem Krieg », 1992 folgte das Große Verdienstkreuz mit Stern. Im gleichen Jahr wurde Sergiù Celibidache mit der Ehrenbürgerschaft der Stadt München ausgezeichnet. Oft wird behauptet, daß er diese Ehre als erster Ausländer erhielt - tatsächlich besaß Celibidache zu dieser Zeit schon die deutsche Staatsbürgerschaft. Allerdings besaß er aus Verbundenheit zu Berlin, wo er von 1936 bis 1954 lebte, bis zur Wiedervereinigung lediglich den « behelfsmäßigen West-Berliner Personalausweis » .

Celibidache starb in seiner alten Mühle in der Gemeinde La Neuville-sur-Essonne in der Nähe von Paris, wo er mit seiner Frau Ioana, einer rumänischen Malerin, lebte. Er ist auf dem kleinen Friedhof des Dorfes begraben. Er hinterließ einen Sohn, Serge Ioan Celibidachi (geboren 1968) .

Am 23. Dezember 1999 wurde die Sergiù-Celibidache-Stiftung gegründet, die sich dem Aufbau eines musikalischen Archivs, insbesondere der Kompositionen von Sergiù Celibidache, widmet. Im Oktober 2002 fand in München das 1. Sergiù Celibidache Festival statt, im Jahre 2004, ebenfalls in München, das 2. Festival. Veranstaltungsort für das 3. Sergiù Celibidache Festival 2006 war Iași in Rumänien.

Im November 2011 wurde das Celibidache Center anlässlich des 100. Geburtstags von Sergiù Celibidache in München gegründet. Der Verein trägt dazu bei, das musikalische Erbe des Mæstro zu pflegen und weiter in die Welt zu tragen und feierte Celibidache im Oktober 2012 mit dem Festival « 100 Jahre Celibidache - Das Fest » .

Une autre étape dans l'histoire de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin va commencer ...

27 février 1955 : Karajan prend la relève lors de la tournée annoncée de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin aux États-Unis et au Canada (avec un arrêt prévu au « vieux Forum » de Montréal dans la tourmente de l' « émeute Maurice Richard ») .

1er avril 1955 : Karajan achève sa tournée nord-américaine de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

La situation de l'Orchestre demeure précaire, et l'idée s'impose qu'une nouvelle salle doit être construite pour accueillir la phalange la plus prestigieuse d'Allemagne. En attendant, les enregistrements des firmes « EMI » et « DGG » sur disque se déroulent régulièrement dans l'église à l'architecture moderne et dépouillée (tapissée de vitraux multicolores) de la « Jesus-Christus-Kirche », située sur la « Hittorfstraße », dans l'arrondissement de Dahlem à Berlin.

5 avril 1955 : Le Sénat de Berlin confirme l' « élection à vie » de Karajan à la tête de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

25 mai 1955 : Karajan signe un « contrat à vie » comme directeur artistique et chef principal de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

5 juin 1956 : Karajan dirige le Philharmonique de Berlin à Vienne.

7 octobre 1956 : Karajan débute une seconde tournée de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin aux États-Unis.

19 novembre 1956 : Karajan achève sa 2e tournée américaine de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

3 novembre 1957 : Karajan débute sa 1re tournée au Japon avec l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

22 novembre 1957 : Karajan achève sa 1re tournée nipponne avec l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

27 octobre 1961 : Karajan entreprend une 3e tournée de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin en sol américain.

8 novembre 1961 : Karajan achève sa 3 tournée étatsunienne de l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin.

L'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin recevra une nouvelle résidence près du « Tiergarten », en 1963. La construction asymétrique de l'architecte Hans Scharoun, rappelant une grande tente, reçut le surnom populaire de « Cirque Karajani », en référence au cirque Sarasani. La Philharmonie de Berlin est devenue un emblème de Berlin-Ouest et fait aujourd'hui partie du Forum culturel de Berlin.

15 octobre 1963 : Karajan dirige le concert inaugural du nouveau bâtiment de la Philharmonie in Berlin avec

l'exécution de la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven.

Capacité de la nouvelle « Philharmonie » : 2,440 places ; celle de la salle de musique de chambre : 1,180 places.

La « Bernauerstraße » et le Mur de Berlin

Le 13 août 1961, la fermeture brutale de la frontière, au niveau de la « Bernauerstraße », entre les secteurs d'occupation a connu des conséquences particulièrement dramatiques pour les citoyens.

Ces derniers se sont vus refuser l'accès à leur proche voisinage du jour au lendemain. Familles, amis et voisins furent séparés. Soudain, la maison d'en face faisait partie d'un autre système politique. C'est ainsi que les habitants de la « Bernauerstraße » sont devenus malgré eux témoins et acteurs de l'histoire d'après-guerre à Berlin. Gagnés par la panique et le désespoir, certains n'hésitèrent pas à sauter de leurs fenêtres pour essayer de gagner Berlin-Ouest et payèrent ce geste de leur vie. Certaines tentatives de fuite des riverains de la « Bernauerstraße » réussirent, sous les objectifs et caméras des médias du monde entier. La violente séparation de la « Bernauerstraße » a laissé derrière elle de profondes cicatrices, encore visibles aujourd'hui. L'ancien « No Man's Land » n'a toujours pas complètement disparu. Une portion du dispositif de démarcation a été conservée entre l'« Ackerstraße » et la « Gartenstraße ». Ce lieu donne une idée précise de l'ampleur et de la largeur du dispositif.

Situé au cœur de la capitale, le « mémorial » du mur de Berlin est le centre principal de commémoration de la division de l'Allemagne. Sur le lieu historique qu'est la « Bernauerstraße », il a été aménagé sur l'ancienne zone frontalière et devrait bientôt s'étendre sur 1,4 kilomètres de long. Sur le site se dresse le dernier tronçon du Mur de Berlin encore conservé dans son intégralité, c'est-à-dire dans sa largeur, avec le mur intérieur, le chemin de ronde, les pylônes d'éclairage, le « No Man's Land », la clôture de signalisation et le mur extérieur. L'ensemble permet de donner une idée de la configuration des installations frontalières à la fin des années 1980. Les vestiges et les traces des dispositifs frontaliers ainsi que des événements dramatiques survenus à cet endroit permettent de mieux appréhender l'histoire de la partition de l'Allemagne.

Le « mémorial » du mur de Berlin fut érigé à l'initiative de la République fédérale d'Allemagne, en 1998, et porte l'inscription suivante : « À la mémoire de la division de Berlin, du 13 août 1961 au 9 novembre 1989, et aux victimes du règne par la violence de la dictature communiste ». Le mémorial comprend un tronçon du dispositif frontalier long de 60 mètres, conservé dans sa configuration originelle, mais avec une interprétation artistique. Le projet a été conçu et réalisé par le cabinet d'architectes de Stuttgart Kohlhoff & Kohlhoff. Avec le centre de documentation du mur de Berlin, la « Kapelle der Versöhnung » (la chapelle de la réconciliation) et les segments de mur conservés sur le cimetière « Sophien-Friedhof » et sur le terrain de la gare du nord, le mémorial du mur de Berlin constitue un ensemble de témoignages historiques qui sera transformé en un vaste lieu de mémoire au cours de ces prochaines années.

Durant la partition, le mur de Berlin longeait le côté sud de la rue sur toute sa longueur. Les portes d'entrée et fenêtres des maisons orientées vers le nord-ouest furent successivement condamnées et murées, et les toits obstrués. À

l'automne 1961, les dernières maisons longeant la frontière furent évacuées de force. Après 1963, les bâtiments furent détruits à l'exception des façades du rez-de-chaussée, afin d'offrir une vue dégagée aux militaires à la frontière. Les ruines des maisons furent par la suite dissimulées derrière le mur de béton agrémenté de fil barbelé qui fut érigé.

Les images qui rendirent la « Bernauerstraße » célèbre sont notamment celles de personnes fuyant Berlin-Est en sautant par les fenêtres des maisons pour atterrir sur le trottoir, qui était déjà le territoire de Berlin-Ouest. Une autre photo extrêmement connue est celle du jeune soldat volontaire est-allemand Conrad Schumann, qui saute par-dessus des fils barbelés, le 15 août 1961, pour rejoindre le secteur français de Berlin-Ouest, en jetant au loin son arme. Cette scène se déroula au croisement entre la « Bernauerstraße » et la « Ruppinerstraße ». En raison de la configuration propice de la rue pendant les 1res années d'existence du mur de Berlin, la « Bernauerstraße » était un lieu d'échanges entre les soldats surveillant la frontière côté RDA, les policiers de Berlin-Ouest, et les douaniers ; on a ainsi vu des soldats discuter par-dessus le tracé du mur ou s'échanger des cigarettes.

À partir de cave de certaines maisons de la « Bernauerstraße », des tunnels furent creusés dans le sol argileux pour faire passer des fuyards vers l'Ouest. En 1962, le tunnel n° 29 se terminait au n° 7 de la « Schönholzerstraße ». Des Berlinois de l'Est, du petit enfant à la grand-mère, ont emprunté ce tunnel en rampant pour rejoindre Berlin-Ouest, sans être vus par les garde-frontières. En 1964, un drame se joua lors de la traversée d'un autre tunnel, le tunnel n° 57, dont l'entrée se trouvait au n° 55 de la « Strelitzerstraße » à l'Est. En 2 nuits, 57 Berlinois de l'Est purent s'enfuir en l'empruntant. Cependant, il y eut des échanges de tirs avec les garde-frontières, durant lesquels le soldat Egon Schultz fut mortellement touché.

Entre les intersections avec la « Schwedterstraße » et la « Strelitzerstraße », la « Bernauerstraße » est jalonnée de 4 panneaux, qui font partie du parcours historique du mur de Berlin. Chaque plaque indique l'endroit d'une tentative de fuite, comme celle qui est consacrée à Ida Siekmann, qui fut abattue le 22 août 1961. Ou encore celle dédiée à la tentative de passage en force spectaculaire du garde-frontière de la « RDA », Conrad Schumann. La 3e plaque commémorative rend hommage à une tentative de fuite à l'Ouest réussie, au cours de laquelle 57 personnes traversèrent la frontière en sous-sol, en empruntant un tunnel long de 140 mètres pour gagner Berlin-Ouest.

Sites

Bernauer Straße, n° 48.

Bernauer Straße, n° 78.

Angle Ruppiner Straße / Bernauer Straße.

Angle Strelitzer Straße / Bernauer Straße.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CsqACUvNSgY>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYWx-DSXSq4>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gAme6EcOAf4>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rvtGhhnDBzw>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w8Gds92-L34>

Sous la baguette du « Reich »

Il a fallu attendre 62 ans pour que les fonds de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin concernant la période entre 1933-1945 soient enfin ouverts aux historiens. Misha Aster, un très jeune historien et musicologue canadien, a relevé le redoutable défi posé par ces nouvelles archives en publiant un ouvrage particulièrement méticuleux intitulé :

« Sous la baguette du “ Reich ”. Le Philharmonique de Berlin et le National-Socialisme » : traduction française de « Das Reichsorchester » aux Éditions Héloïse d'Ormesson, Paris (2009) , 414 pages.

Né en 1978 au Canada, installé à Berlin, le jeune musicologue, scénographe et historien Misha Aster a eu accès aux archives du ministère de l'Instruction populaire et de la propagande de Josef Goebbels, au peu qu'il subsiste des archives de l'Orchestre philharmonique, et à des archives privées venant d'anciens membres de l'Orchestre pour écrire cette étude d'ensemble, la Ire jamais écrite sur les rapports entre le Philharmonique de Berlin et l'État national-socialiste. L'Orchestre fut couvert de lauriers et protégé par les Nazis, et son chef, Wilhelm Fürtwängler, fut accusé de l'avoir dirigé lors de manifestations nazies comme les anniversaires d'Adolf Hitler. Misha Aster s'interroge sur la transformation de l'Orchestre en instrument de propagande « sous la baguette du “ Reich ” » ou sur ses éventuelles marges d'autonomie de l'Orchestre en se plaçant, dans le débat entre les interprétations « intentionalistes » et « fonctionnalistes » des activités de l'État nazi, plutôt du côté des « fonctionnalistes ». L'ouvrage est organisé en 6 chapitres. Misha Aster retrace d'abord l'histoire administrative de l'Orchestre. Les 5 autres chapitres sont thématiques, qui traitent de ses membres, des aléas de sa situation financière, de ses concerts et des publics qui les fréquentèrent, de sa programmation musicale et de ses tournées internationales. Le Philharmonique de Berlin fut fondé en 1882 comme communauté autonome puis, à partir de 1903, comme Société à responsabilité limitée, une « GmbH » dont chaque musicien en activité était actionnaire, dirigée par un comité élu de 3 membres, le « Vorstand » (titre du président de ce comité) . Les difficultés financières croissantes de l'Orchestre après 1918, malgré sa réputation internationale, le poussèrent à accepter en 1929, en échange d'un financement régulier eu égard à « son importance pour toute l'Allemagne » , le principe d'une participation majoritaire de la Ville de Berlin, du « Land » et du « Reich » .

Le jeu du nationalisme

La crise de 1929 fit échouer cet accord et aggrava la situation financière de l'Orchestre. En 1933, l'Orchestre joua une nouvelle fois la carte du nationalisme, faisant ainsi le jeu du nouveau ministre de l'Instruction populaire et de la

Propagande, Josef Goebbels, dans sa lutte contre le ministère de l'Intérieur. En janvier 1934, le « Reich » obtint le monopole au sein de la « GmbH », rachetant les parts des musiciens qui devinrent des fonctionnaires, l'Orchestre devenant un « Reichsorchester » protégé par Goebbels (y compris contre les formations concurrentes protégées par Hermann Göring). Ainsi, par exemple, les efforts financiers (salaires, primes, retraites) et matériels (logements) furent faits pour engager et garder les meilleurs musiciens allemands, pour fournir à l'Orchestre les meilleurs instruments (beaucoup de pièces historiques venant de pillages) et, surtout, les musiciens obtinrent un statut les rendant non disponibles pour les obligations militaires, qui fut respecté jusqu'à la fin de la guerre. Le « Reich » versa des sommes colossales pour soutenir l'Orchestre ou, au moins, minimiser ses pertes, et l'Orchestre joua constamment la défense de son statut exceptionnel. En échange, le Philharmonique joua régulièrement devant la quasi-totalité de l'élite nazie, y compris Hitler, Goebbels et Göring, ainsi que lors du congrès du NSDAP à Nuremberg en 1936, 1938 et 1939 et pour d'autres cérémonies officielles (Jeux Olympiques de Berlin en 1936, anniversaires d'Hitler à partir de 1937, Journées de l'art allemand, concerts pour la « Hitlerjugend », concerts prônant « l'amitié entre les nations » avec des partenaires étrangers pour montrer en fait la supériorité des musiciens allemands) et, enfin, collaboration avec le « KdF » (« Kraft durch Freude » ; qui élargit le succès croissant de l'Orchestre, lui offrant, au-delà de son traditionnel public bourgeois, un public plus populaire) ou concerts dans des usines, pour la « Wehrmacht », pour la Croix-Rouge allemande et des organisations de charité (« Wintershilfswerk », par exemple), ainsi que des concerts radiodiffusés (émissions régulières contribuant à l'effort de guerre) à partir de 1939.

Des choix de compositeurs sur critères raciaux

Les derniers concerts furent donnés en mars-avril 1945 pour des soldats puis, de façon privée, pour le ministre de l'Armement, Albert Speer. Dans ses tournées internationales, l'Orchestre fut utilisé comme un instrument de propagande, jouant pour les publics locaux mais aussi pendant la guerre pour la « Wehrmacht ». Les concerts à l'étranger donnèrent parfois lieu à des protestations anti-fascistes qui n'assimilaient pas l'Orchestre au Nazisme avant-guerre, mais avec la guerre l'Orchestre (transporté par des moyens militaires souvent) fut surnommé « l'avant-garde des parachutistes » et ses concerts donnèrent lieu à des manifestations qui restaient cependant minoritaires. Quant au répertoire interprété, l'influence nazie fut réduite (même si, d'emblée, certains compositeurs étaient exclus d'office pour des raisons raciales ou politiques, comme Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schönberg ou Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, mais Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy fut joué jusqu'en 1936 et Igor Stravinsky jusqu'en 1939).

Selon Misha Aster :

« Le " canon " des musiciens allemands resta la source principale du répertoire. Même après que l'État eut pris le contrôle de l'Orchestre, le ministère n'eut donc guère besoin de se mêler de la programmation : les choix musicaux des Nazis et le noyau du répertoire de l'Orchestre philharmonique s'harmonisaient dès le départ. » (page 225),

... soit par goût du public, soit par goût des chefs d'orchestre, et ce dès avant l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir. Plus de 70 % de toute la musique interprétée par l'Orchestre sous le 3e « Reich » étaient constitués d'œuvres de Beethoven, Brahms, Bruckner, Haydn, Mozart, Richard Strauss, puis d'œuvres de Bach, Schubert, Schumann et Weber, les étrangers les plus joués étant Tchaïkovski et Berlioz. Sur la centaine de membres de l'Orchestre, Misha Aster estime à une vingtaine

le nombre d'inscrits au NSDAP et à moins le nombre de Nazis convaincus, dont les tentatives pour réorganiser l'Orchestre selon les principes idéologiques nazis furent diversement couronnés de succès. Ainsi, la fusion avec le « Berliner Sinfonie-Orchester » fut-elle annulée en 1933, sous la pression de Wilhelm Fürtwängler, aboutissant au départ de membres du NSDAP et de vétérans de la guerre, alors que, selon un exclu « des étrangers et des Juifs restent dans l'orchestre ». Fürtwängler fit tout pour garder les 4 membres juifs de l'Orchestre, qui partirent après que la formation devint un Orchestre d'État, et pour protéger les épouses juives de musiciens. La communauté des musiciens resta très silencieuse sur ces sujets. Entre 1933 et 1935, la direction annula les abonnements des mélomanes juifs. À partir de 1938, le Philharmonique fut représenté par un « Vorstand » (Lorenz Höber) non nazi, principal responsable des activités de l'Orchestre, mais aussi par un conseil élu composé de musiciens membres du NSDAP.

Pour Misha Aster : « Dès sa création, la culture de l'Orchestre philharmonique avait privilégié la recherche d'un consensus réaliste. En un sens, c'est là l'essence même d'une communauté démocratique - y compris quand elle cède à des extrémistes. L'essentiel restait de pouvoir faire de la musique à un niveau exceptionnel et dans un environnement à la fois protégé et créatif. Comme quelques années plus tôt face au destin de leurs collègues juifs, en 1937-1938, les musiciens de l'Orchestre avaient encore une certaine liberté de choix, même limitée. En se pliant extérieurement aux exigences du Nazisme, ils pouvaient espérer s'attirer les bonnes grâces du régime et conserver leurs privilèges tout en sauvegardant ce qui subsistait des valeurs du " Gemeinschaftsgeist ". » (pages 98-99)

À partir de la fin de 1938, les musiciens durent prêter serment au « Führer » et, en 1939, sortit un nouveau règlement de service très autoritaire, conçu par l'Orchestre. Il est enfin un dernier domaine où l'exigence idéologique et politique d'une exaltation de certaines valeurs musicales joua : le choix des chefs d'orchestre et des solistes. En mars 1933, avant la transformation en « Reichsorchester », les Nazis n'interdirent pas un concert de Bruno Walter mais mirent en gardent contre de possibles perturbations et l'impossibilité pour l'État d'assurer le service d'ordre, et proposèrent de remplacer Walter par un chef moins « controversé ». Walter annula lui-même le concert et fut remplacé par Richard Strauß paré dès lors de l'image du « sauveur » .

Wilhelm Fürtwängler, la « star » de l'Orchestre

La même méthode fut utilisée contre Otto Klemperer (autre chef d'orchestre juif) , remplacé par Carl Schuricht, l'un des représentants de cette génération de brillants chefs d'orchestre qui se firent un nom durant la période nazie : Eugen Jochum, Hermann Abendroth, Karl Böhm, Clemens Krauß, Hans Knappertsbusch, Herbert von Karajan. Très peu de chefs mineurs dirigèrent l'Orchestre à la suite d'un « lobbying » personnel acharné ou d'intrigues politiques. Reste le cas Wilhelm Fürtwängler, la véritable « star » de l'Orchestre, dont la figure domine le livre de Misha Aster.

Il n'y apparaît pas comme quelqu'un qui était idéologiquement proche des Nazis mais comme un homme « qui croyait vraiment au pouvoir transcendant de la musique » et estimait que « la véritable mission de l'art » était « d'élever l'humanité au-dessus d'une réalité morcelée ». Néanmoins, il sous-estimait gravement la portée de la rupture instaurée par Hitler. Confronté aux empiètements de l'idéologie, Fürtwängler réagit en luttant pour préserver les acquis, pour défendre sa liberté artistique et donc l'autonomie de son Orchestre. Cependant, les Nazis ne lui concédaient ces avantages qu'en échange de la légitimation de leurs conceptions pernicieuses. (pages 258-259)

Dans cette partie d'échecs avec les Nazis, Fürtwängler joua habilement de son prestige. En 1934, il devait diriger la création de « Mathis le peintre », Opéra de Paul Hindemith, à l'Opéra d'État de Berlin. Considéré comme une œuvre dissidente, l'Opéra fut interdit. Fürtwängler démissionna de ses fonctions. Il ne fut plus jamais le chef principal officiel du Philharmonique de Berlin, mais il s'était rendu indispensable, de nombreux mélomanes ayant exigé le remboursement de leurs abonnements aux séries de concerts philharmoniques qu'il dirigeait. Les Nazis lui demandèrent de revenir, mais il dirigea dorénavant de l'extérieur, avec les honoraires d'un chef invité. Ce geste facilita sa posture visant à s'abstenir autant que possible de diriger des concerts liés de trop près au NSDAP, même s'il y eut des exceptions. Fürtwängler utilisa souvent ses relations personnelles avec Josef Gœbbels au profit de l'Orchestre (en défendant des artistes juifs par exemple, ou en négociant des contrats) et, à son profit, dans un contexte de favoritisme généralisé et de rivalités entre Gœbbels et Göring.

Que devint l'Orchestre à la fin de la guerre ?

Les musiciens firent une fois de plus preuve de leur sens politique. Le « Vorstand » Lorenz Höber (suspendu par les autorités américaines en 1946, bien que non nazi, pour avoir été le « Vorstand » de l'ère nazie, et réhabilité longuement par Misha Aster) négocia les autorisations de réunion puis la garantie financière de la Ville de Berlin (jusqu'en 2002). Les musiciens demandèrent à Gerhart von Westerman, leur administrateur membre du NSDAP nommé par Gœbbels, de négocier avec les Russes dans leur propre langue (il devint intendant officiellement en 1952). Ils choisirent comme chef d'orchestre un autre russophone, Leo Borchard, qui était entré dans la résistance allemande après avoir été mis à l'index par les Nazis en 1943, puis, Borchard ayant été tué par un « G. I. », un jeune chef roumain, Sergiu Celibidache (avant le retour de Fürtwängler en 1947, et, après sa mort en 1954, le choix de Karajan). Certains musiciens trop liés aux Nazis partirent, d'autres furent suspendus lors de la dénazification. Le dernier concert de l'ère nazie, en avril 1945, s'était terminé par « Mort et transfiguration » de Richard Strauß. Le 1er concert de l'ère nouvelle, le 26 mai 1945, donna à entendre des œuvres de Mendelssohn et Tchaïkovski.

...

Il était temps que le Philharmonique de Berlin, l'une des formations les plus réputées au monde, fasse le point sur son rôle sous le 3e « Reich ». Question tabou pendant le « règne » de Herbert von Karajan (1955-1989), les fonds ont pu être enfin confiés à un historien, maintenant que la formation est dirigée par le Britannique sir Simon Rattle et que le 1er violon est l'Israélien Guy Braunstein. L'ouvrage d'Aster, dont la parution a coïncidé avec le 125e anniversaire de la fondation du Philharmonique, s'appuie presque exclusivement sur des archives et des collections privées, puisqu'il n'y a jamais eu d'étude consacrée à l'Orchestre. En 6 chapitres, Aster étudie la naissance du Philharmonique et sa mise-au-pas par les Nazis ; puis, les relations entre l'Orchestre et le ministère de la Propagande ; la question financière ; la contribution de l'Orchestre à la vie musicale dans l'Allemagne nazie ; la programmation musicale et le choix des chefs d'orchestre et des solistes ; et, enfin, les tournées de l'Orchestre dans les pays alliés ou occupés ainsi que les réactions des publics de ces pays.

Entre idéologie, principes et pragmatisme

Bien avant l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir, en pleine crise économique, le Philharmonique de Berlin se présentait, afin de réclamer des subsides, comme « un outil de propagande efficace capable de rassembler les Allemands et d'offrir au monde le meilleur de l'Allemagne » (page 264) . Au bord de la faillite, l'Orchestre est sauvé par le ministère de la Propagande en la personne de Josef Gœbbels, qui en fit l' « Orchestre du " Reich " » , en novembre 1933. L'Orchestre ayant été racheté par l'État, les musiciens devinrent des simples fonctionnaires. « Lorsque l'Orchestre tomba sous le joug du ministère de Gœbbels, ce qui n'était qu'une affaire de fierté et de nécessité se transforma en devoir. » (page 264) Le reste du livre est l'histoire d'une extraordinaire « exploitation mutuelle » (page 307) et celle, pas toujours glorieuse, de l'instinct de survie d'un Orchestre.

Conscients de la réputation internationale du Philharmonique, les Nazis choisirent de ne pas trop bousculer le Mæstro Wilhelm Fürtwängler, le « Führer » de l'Orchestre. (page 37) « L'essentiel n'était d'ailleurs pas d'avoir des convictions politiques, mais de répondre à des critères indispensables de talent, d'ambition et de nationalité. Ces hommes représentaient " le meilleur de l'Allemagne ". » (page 246) Il convient de noter que les goûts musicaux de Fürtwängler, les soucis commerciaux de la direction de l'Orchestre et la tendance à l'auto-censure permirent à l'Orchestre de ne pas subir l'ingérence des Nazis dans la programmation musicale ou le choix des solistes. Le Philharmonique sut s'adapter à merveille à l'interdiction des compositeurs juifs et au licenciement de ses quelques musiciens juifs. En de rares occasions, Fürtwängler défia Gœbbels. Mais il le fit pour protéger sa liberté artistique et non pour protester contre la ligne idéologique nazie. De son côté, Gœbbels le laissa faire, ou plutôt, fit semblant de le laisser faire en échange des services si précieux qu'il rendait à l'image du 3e « Reich » en Allemagne (les Congrès de Nuremberg, l'anniversaire de Hitler, l'ouverture des Jeux olympiques de 1936) et à l'étranger (les tournées, l'Exposition universelle de Paris de 1937) . « En acceptant de participer à des manifestations servant ouvertement la propagande nazie, l'Orchestre philharmonique par son excellence même fournissait pour ainsi dire une garantie de qualité au régime. » (page 181) En effet, l'approvisionnement du Philharmonique de Berlin fut l'un des meilleurs coups de « propagande indirecte » de Gœbbels. Tout le monde était content : « L'Orchestre philharmonique était ravi de l'attention des dignitaires, lesquels de leur côté se plaisaient à jouer avec cette " boîte à musique " exceptionnelle. » (page 174)

Membres de l'Orchestre du « Reich » , les musiciens jouirent de la sécurité financière mais aussi d'un prestige sans précédent. (page 108) En outre, le Philharmonique bénéficia d'innombrables privilèges, entre autres, l'acquisition des instruments de musique par le biais du ministère de la Propagande. « Certains instruments furent achetés, d'autres probablement volés » à leurs propriétaires juifs. (pages 109-110) Cela dit, le suprême privilège fut l' « Uk-Stellung » : dès 1939, les musiciens du Philharmonique furent déclarés non disponibles pour les obligations militaires. Grâce à Gœbbels, ce statut particulier fut maintenu jusqu'à la fin du conflit mondial. Celui-ci paracheva l'identification du Philharmonique au 3e « Reich » , au point d'être surnommé « l'avant-garde des parachutistes » . (page 295) Pendant les tournées dans la France de Vichy et en Suisse neutre, ses concerts furent perturbés par des manifestations. (pages 296-298) Malheureusement, le récit de Misha Aster ne donne aucun éclaircissement sur les réactions de Wilhelm Fürtwängler ou des musiciens face à cette méfiance, voire à cette hostilité grandissante.

Des détails musicaux négligés

« J'ai tenté d'éviter autant que possible de prendre position sur le comportement éthique de Fürtwängler et de me concentrer plutôt sur son rôle à l'égard de l'Orchestre », précise Aster dès l'introduction. (page 15) Cette phrase décevra surtout les lecteurs curieux du « cas Fürtwängler », tout comme ceux qui connaissent le film d'István Szabó, « Taking Sides » (2001), mettant-en-scène le Mæstro mythique (joué par Stellan Skarsgård) et l'enquêteur américain chargé d'étudier son cas, le commandant Steve Arnold (joué par Harvey Keitel), inculte et moralisateur. Mais la déception devrait être de courte durée, car, après tout, le titre même de son livre justifie la démarche d'Aster : il s'agit d'étudier les relations entre le Philharmonique de Berlin et le Nazisme, et non entre Fürtwängler et le Nazisme. Fürtwängler ayant été le chef d'orchestre emblématique du Philharmonique de 1922 à 1944, puis de 1952 à 1954, il n'est pas surprenant qu'il soit au cœur du livre. On ne saurait cependant pardonner à Aster d'en faire le seul personnage vivant et nuancé de son récit et de congédier tous les autres après de très brèves esquisses biographiques. Ainsi, à côté de Fürtwängler, Aster évoque d'autres Maestros très connus tels que Karl Böhm, Hans Knappertsbusch et Hermann Abendroth.

Karl Böhm, l'illustre interprète des œuvres de Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart et de Richard Wagner, fut un National-Socialiste convaincu.

Hans Knappertsbusch, peut-être le meilleur interprète de « Parsifal », refusa d'adhérer au « Nationalsozialistische Deutsch Arbeiterpartei » (NSDAP : Parti national-socialiste des travailleurs allemands), se brouilla avec Josef Goebbels à cause d'une plaisanterie déplacée aux Pays-Bas, et choisit finalement de diriger le « Wiener Staatsoper » pour s'éloigner de l'Allemagne. (Knappertsbusch refusa catégoriquement de jouer le « Horst-Wessel-Lied » avant chaque concert comme cela était stipulé par le régime nazi. D'après les rapports, Knappertsbusch était « politiquement non fiable » (« politisch unzuverlässig »).

Hermann Abendroth fut arrêté par la police à cause de ses convictions libérales d'avant 1933. Il finit par adhérer au NSDAP pour pouvoir exercer son métier. Comble de l'ironie, Abendroth devint l'un des Maestros les plus appréciés de la République démocratique allemande (RDA) après la guerre.

Ces éléments ayant été totalement omis dans le livre d'Aster, tous ces personnages hauts en couleur sont réduits au rôle de simples figurants derrière Fürtwängler.

Par ailleurs, il est regrettable qu'Aster ne développe pas certains détails pourtant susceptibles d'intéresser ses lecteurs, tant profanes qu'initiés. Même s'il éclaircit quelque peu le « cas Mendelssohn » (pages 238-239), il ne prend pas la peine d'expliquer comment les œuvres de Franz Schubert et de Max Bruch purent être exécutées sous le 3^e « Reich », malgré les rumeurs sur l'homosexualité supposée du premier et sur les origines juives du second. Examinant l'affaire « Mathis le peintre », l'Opéra de Paul Hindemith, Aster n'explique pas comment les dignitaires nazis se débrouillèrent avec les Opéras dont les livrets avaient été écrits par des écrivains juifs tels que Lorenzo Da Ponte, librettiste de 3 Opéras de Mozart, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, librettiste de 6 Opéras de Richard Strauß, et Stefan Zweig, librettiste de 2 opéras du même compositeur. Aster qui, à maintes reprises, souligne la place spéciale accordée aux œuvres de Beethoven par les Nazis, aurait pu au moins expliquer dans une note en bas de page comment l'appropriation, à

partir de 1941, des 2 Ires mesures emblématiques de la 5e Symphonie par la « BBC » comme indicatif musical des bulletins d'informations devint un problème politique pour Gœbbels. (Parallèlement à la campagne de « V » pour victoire, les 2 Ires mesures de la 5e Symphonie devinrent un symbole de résistance dans les pays occupés par les Nazis. En effet, certains enseignants appelaient leurs élèves en battant des mains d'après le tempo de ces 2 mesures.

Un récit focalisé exclusivement sur l'aspect administratif

S'il est possible de rétorquer que le livre s'intéresse aux relations entre le Philharmonique et le Nazisme, et non pas à la politique musicale des Nazis, une petite mise-au-point n'aurait pas été complètement hors sujet. Rédigé pourtant par un musicologue et metteur-en-scène, le récit d'Aster est étonnement pauvre en détails musicaux. Ce qui donne à l'ouvrage l'aspect d'une thèse de doctorat : vigoureux, austère et soporifique.

Aster a bénéficié d'une aide financière de la part de la Société des amis de la Philharmonie de Berlin. Après la publication du livre, il affirma que ce soutien financier n'avait eu aucune conséquence sur ses conclusions. Une telle déclaration parle d'elle-même. En effet, certains critiques lui ont reproché d'être complaisant avec le Philharmonique. Aster donne un compte rendu presque idyllique de la renaissance du Philharmonique après 1945 : « Malgré toutes les pressions, l'Orchestre fit une nouvelle fois un choix moralement discutable (l'élection de Herbert von Karajan, en 1954, comme chef d'orchestre principal par les membres de l'Orchestre) mais remarquable d'intelligence politique, commerciale et musicale. Sur les décombres de " l'ambassadeur de la culture allemande " de Josef Gœbbels, l'Orchestre avait su se reconstruire en assimilant son passé et en se réformant si vite et avec tant d'habileté qu'il avait réussi à préserver son prestige incomparable. En tant qu'institution, il avait acquis une telle maturité qu'il lui était possible de choisir impunément même un ancien membre du NSDAP comme chef d'orchestre principal. Avec son sens de la solidarité et son habileté politique, il était resté fidèle malgré tout à la coopération musicale de ses débuts et à sa glorieuse tradition artistique. » . (pages 328-329) Les éloges d'Aster sont déplacés puisque que le Philharmonique se laissa manipuler en connaissance de cause comme instrument de propagande et que la plupart de ses membres préférèrent se réfugier dans une sorte de tour d'ivoire, prétendument apolitique, alors que d'autres musiciens allemands (juifs ou non juifs) eurent le courage de résister. Pour donner quelques exemples, le Mæstro Fritz Busch quitta l'Allemagne en 1933 tandis que son frère Adolf, violoniste et compositeur, fermement opposé aux Nazis, s'installa en Suisse dès 1927. Le pianiste Helmut Roloff fut membre de l'Orchestre rouge (« Rote Kapelle ») , réseau d'informateurs opérant sous contrôle et pour l'URSS. Karlrobert Kreiten, l'élève de Claudio Arrau et l'un des meilleurs pianistes de l'Allemagne à l'époque, fut exécuté pour des propos défaitistes en 1943, à l'âge de 27 ans. Autre exemple, les violonistes Fritz Kreisler et Bronisław Huberman rejetèrent tous les 2 l'invitation de Fürtwängler à se produire avec le Philharmonique de Berlin. Huberman signala dans sa lettre à Fürtwängler qu'il s'agissait de bien plus que d'une simple « interprétation plus ou moins compétente d'un Concerto pour violon » . (page 258) En se contentant ainsi de mettre en lumière le rôle de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin sous le 3e « Reich » , le livre d'Aster évite soigneusement d'analyser son objet à travers le prisme de l'éthique et de la responsabilité artistique. Un tel débat n'aurait pas forcément débouché sur une condamnation pure et simple du Philharmonique pour complicité avec les Nazis, comme Aster semble le redouter, mais plutôt sur des conclusions davantage réfléchies et nuancées. Il aurait alors participé à ce qui s'apparente à un véritable travail d'exorcisme.

Les années de silence (1945-1946)

Article détaillé : Wilhelm Fürtwängler et ses relations avec le régime Nazi.

Ayant appris qu'il allait être arrêté par la « Gestapo », Fürtwängler s'était enfui en Suisse au début de l'année 1945. Après l'effondrement du 3^e « Reich » et la découverte des crimes contre l'humanité d'une échelle sans précédent commis par les Nazis, une partie de la presse helvétique se déchaîna contre Fürtwängler lui reprochant d'être resté en Allemagne (voir la section « La solitude et le soutien de grands musiciens juifs ») . En dépit du fait qu'il n'avait jamais été membre d'une organisation Nazie et que des musiciens juifs de haut niveau comme Yehudi Menuhin, Nathan Milstein et Arnold Schönberg prirent publiquement sa défense, Fürtwängler dut passer par une commission de dénazification sur fond de Guerre froide. En effet, les Soviétiques souhaitaient le récupérer pour Berlin-Est, mais Fürtwängler souhaitait reprendre la direction de l'Orchestre de la ville, situé en zone américaine. Sa défense fut préparée en grande partie par 2 Juifs allemands qui avaient fui le régime Nazi (voir la section « Curt Rieß, Berta Geißmar, le procès et l'acquittement ») . La 1^{re} de ces 2 personnes était Berta Geißmar, qui avait été son assistante jusqu'en 1935. Elle avait préparé un grand nombre de documents prouvant l'aide apportée par Fürtwängler à de nombreuses personnes. Ces documents disparurent mystérieusement lors de leur transfert à la Commission de dénazification. La 2^e était Curt Rieß, écrivain et journaliste qui croyait au départ que Fürtwängler avait été un collaborateur Nazi. Après l'avoir rencontré, Curt Rieß passa l'année 1946 à aider Fürtwängler.

Lors du procès, on reprocha à Fürtwängler 2 concerts officiels pendant la période 1933-1945, son titre honorifique de « Staatsrat » de Prusse (il avait démissionné de ce titre en 1934 mais sa démission avait été refusée) et une réflexion antisémite contre le « demi-Juif » Victor de Sabata. Des musiciens vinrent pour témoigner en sa faveur, comme Hugo Strelitzer qui déclara à la fin du procès : « Si je suis vivant aujourd'hui, c'est grâce à ce grand homme. Fürtwängler a aidé et protégé de nombreux musiciens juifs et cette attitude prouve un grand courage car il le faisait sous les yeux des Nazis, en Allemagne même. L'histoire jugera cet homme. » . La Commission blanchit Fürtwängler. En dépit de cela, certains reprochèrent toujours à Fürtwängler d'être resté en Allemagne et d'avoir dirigé de la musique en présence d'Hitler, comme en témoigne le « boycott » de l'Orchestre symphonique de Chicago, organisé en 1948, par des musiciens américains pour empêcher sa venue aux États-Unis.

Interdit de diriger tant que la Commission de dénazification ne s'était pas prononcée, Fürtwängler passa les années 1945-1946 à composer : il termina sa 2^e symphonie et commença sa 3^e.

L'apogée

(Photo) En 1947, Maria Callas venait régulièrement aux concerts de Fürtwängler, en Italie.

En 1947, Fürtwängler reprit sa carrière tout d'abord en Italie. Maria Callas raconta en août 1968 qu'elle assistait régulièrement à ses concerts à cette époque et, après s'être plainte de la baisse du niveau des chefs d'orchestre depuis la mort de Fürtwängler, elle conclut : « Pour moi, il était Beethoven. » . Fürtwängler enchaîna les concerts avec beaucoup de succès.

Le 25 mai 1947, il revint au Philharmonique de Berlin où il dirigea les 5e et 6e Symphonies de Ludwig van Beethoven. La presse parla d'un triomphe, de 16 rappels et surtout d'un public « international ». En effet, de nombreuses personnes que Fürtwängler avait aidées pendant la période Nazie étaient venues pour le remercier. La même chose se reproduisit durant sa tournée à Londres, en 1948, où de nombreuses personnes d'origine juive que Fürtwängler avait aidées vinrent lui faire un triomphe. Le fait que de « nombreux Juifs » étaient allés aux concerts de Fürtwängler à Londres, en 1948, fut rapporté même dans la presse américaine.

Yehudi Menuhin et le message d'amour

En septembre 1947, Yehudi Menuhin, qui considérait que le comportement de Fürtwängler pendant la période Nazie avait été irréprochable, vint à Berlin pour jouer le Concerto pour violon de Beethoven avec lui. La photographie prise à la fin du concert où le chef allemand et le violoniste juif se tiennent chaleureusement la main et font face au public fit le tour du monde et eut une grande portée symbolique. Le visage de Fürtwängler, rayonnant de bonheur, contrastait fortement avec celui, extrêmement crispé, des photographies de la période Nazie. Il s'ensuivit une longue amitié entre les 2 musiciens et des enregistrements de 1er plan, comme celui du Concerto de Beethoven à Lucerne en 1947 et à Londres en 1953, ou encore le Concerto pour violon de Brahms de 1949, de Béla Bartók (le 2e) enregistré en 1953, et celui, tout particulièrement symbolique, de Felix Mendelssohn enregistré en 1952. Cette série de Concertos fut vite considérée comme l'un des sommets de la carrière du violoniste. Yehudi Menuhin écrivit en juillet 1989 :

« À une époque où chacun était entouré de dangers, il a su offrir son aide à beaucoup de musiciens et compositeurs. Hindemith disait qu'il était devenu l'exemple du monde musical. J'ai eu le bonheur, peu après la guerre, de rencontrer en lui un homme qui semblait incarner ce que la tradition allemande a de plus grand et de plus noble. Il était formidable de découvrir avec lui, dans la musique, les prémisses d'une nouvelle Allemagne au milieu des ruines de Berlin. Il a vraiment « racheté » le temps au sens Biblique du terme ; pour lui, le temps signifiait faire de la musique. À travers son interprétation, une œuvre devenait vivante et libre, et il en était de même pour les musiciens auxquels il insufflait une nouvelle inspiration. »

Yehudi Menuhin fut scandalisé par le « boycott » de l'Orchestre symphonique de Chicago de 1948 contre la venue de Fürtwängler aux États-Unis car certains de ses principaux organisateurs lui avouèrent avoir eu pour seul but d'éliminer la concurrence de Fürtwängler en Amérique du Nord.

Richard Strauß et les années 1947-1949

Fürtwängler avait souvent dirigé Richard Strauß mais avait toujours émis certaines réserves sur ses compositions. Strauß était, en 1947, proche de la mort et avait vécu une situation similaire à celle de Fürtwängler : il était resté en Allemagne malgré son aversion pour le Nazisme. Fürtwängler apprécia sans réserves les 2 dernières œuvres qu'il composa. La Ire, les Métamorphoses (« Metamorphosen »), est certainement l'œuvre Symphonique la plus aboutie de Strauß : Fürtwängler en dirigea une version prodigieuse en 1947 à Berlin qui montre à quel point les 2 musiciens étaient unis désormais. La même année, il enregistra aussi un « Don Juan » du même niveau. Peu de temps après la

mort du compositeur, survenue en septembre 1949, c'est Fürtwängler qui eut l'honneur de diriger la première mondiale de la dernière composition de Richard Strauß : les Quatre derniers lieder (« Vier letzte Lieder ») . Cette première eut lieu à Londres, le 22 mai 1950, avec Kirsten Flagstad et l'Orchestre du Philharmonia.

En 1948, il fit une tournée en Angleterre où fut filmée une répétition de la fin de la 4e Symphonie de Brahms. Une vidéo de l'enregistrement est toujours disponible. Il enregistra à Hambourg sa 2e Symphonie : cet enregistrement prouve que Fürtwängler sut être un grand compositeur. L'influence d'Anton Bruckner est évidente mais sa façon de structurer sa Symphonie relève de la pure tradition allemande plutôt que de celle autrichienne. Le compositeur Arthur Honegger déclara à propos de cette composition : « Il n'y a pas à discuter d'un homme qui peut écrire une partition aussi riche. Il est de la race des grands musiciens. » .

Cette même année, il enregistra 2 fois la 3e des Suites pour orchestre de Jean-Sébastien Bach : dans le célèbre « air » (le 2e mouvement de cette Suite) , Fürtwängler adopta un tempo incroyablement lent. En 1949, il enregistra une ouverture de Leonore II qui est un monument de l'interprétation beethovénienne et une 3e Symphonie de Brahms du même niveau.

La Scala et le Festival de Salzbourg

En 1950, Fürtwängler dirigea un « Ring » de Richard Wagner à la Scala de Milan avec Kirsten Flagstad, qui fut un triomphe. Fürtwängler montra clairement que Wagner avait su articuler à la perfection la musique avec ses innombrables inventions scéniques. Dans son texte sur la Tétralogie daté de 1919 et publié dans « Musique et Verbe » , Fürtwängler expliqua qu'il y avait une grande différence entre « Tristan und Isolde » et le « Ring » : du 1er Opéra se dégageait une grande unité, que Fürtwängler révéla de façon exemplaire dans son enregistrement de 1952, mais non dans le « Ring » où, déclara-t-il, « La musique est entièrement liée au détail et au moment. Tout est assujéti à la tâche d'expliquer. » . Il conclut qu' « il n'existe pas de plus fidèle musique de théâtre » . Ses enregistrements du « Ring » sont, à ce sujet, une véritable mine d'informations pour les interprètes wagnériens tant le chef d'orchestre a compris les moindres subtilités musicales qu'avait inventées Wagner pour colorer cet univers mythologique. Lors des concerts de 1950, sa vision de la musique wagnérienne impressionna 2 jeunes musiciens qui étaient présents : Carlos Kleiber et Claudio Abbado.

Pendant le Festival de Salzbourg de 1950, on demanda à Fürtwängler d'auditioner un jeune baryton de 25 ans du nom de Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau. Fürtwängler fut subjugué et le prit sous son aile. Ils jouèrent ensemble, durant le Festival de Salzbourg de 1951, les « Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen » (Chants d'un compagnon errant) de Gustav Mahler qui lança sa carrière internationale. Il le fit ensuite chanter dans le Requiem allemand de Brahms en 1951, dans « Tristan und Isolde » en 1952 et dans la Passion selon Saint-Matthieu de Jean-Sébastien Bach, en 1954. Elisabeth Fürtwängler, la femme du chef d'orchestre, rapporta qu' « après la mort de Fürtwängler, Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau m'écrivit qu'il s'était senti un peu comme son fils. » . Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau déclara beaucoup plus tard que Fürtwängler était le chef d'orchestre qui avait eu sur lui la plus grande influence.

C'est durant le même Festival de Salzbourg de 1950 que Fürtwängler enregistra son meilleur « Fidelio » avec

l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne en compagnie, entre autres, de Kirsten Flagstad et Elisabeth Schwarzkopf. Peu de temps après, il dirigea, à Vienne, toujours avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de la ville, un concert pour célébrer le 200^e anniversaire de la mort de Jean-Sébastien Bach. Le point d'orgue du concert fut le 5^e des Concertos Brandebourgeois où Fürtwängler joua, lui-même, au piano. Le musicologue Joachim Kaiser, qui a toujours considéré Fürtwängler comme « le plus grand interprète qui ait jamais », fut tellement impressionné qu'il écrivit immédiatement un article pour le « Süddeutsche Zeitung » : « Lorsque Fürtwängler joue c'est d'une telle monumentalité qu'il se pare de traits mystiques. Rien ne demeure inhabité. Chaque détail respandit et sonne extraordinairement beau, libre et Romantique. Là où d'autres ne voient que des notes les unes à côté des autres, autant d'étoiles isolées, le regard de Fürtwängler découvre des constellations. » . La même année, il enregistra un Concerto grosso n° 10 de Händel. Il se rendit aussi cette année-là à Buenos Aires. Ce voyage eut un impact important sur 2 futurs chefs d'orchestre. Le 1^{er} était Carlos Kleiber qui vint à tous les concerts et répétitions du Maître ce qui l'impressionna profondément. Le second était Daniel Barenboim : il fut tellement bouleversé par la Passion selon Saint-Matthieu que dirigea Fürtwängler qu'il décida de devenir chef d'orchestre durant le concert.

L'accomplissement à Bayreuth

Le 29 juillet 1951, Fürtwängler inaugura le 1^{er} Festival de Bayreuth d'après-guerre avec la 9^e Symphonie de Beethoven avec Elisabeth Schwarzkopf comme soliste dans le Finale. Ce concert symbolisa la renaissance de la culture allemande et un grand nombre de personnalités du monde artistique et de la politique étaient présentes. La direction du Festival fut confiée à Wieland et Wolfgang Wagner qui modernisèrent la mise-en-scène. Herbert von Karajan dirigea « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » et Hans Knappertsbusch un « Parsifal » exemplaire. Mais, comme le dit André Tubeuf :

« L'acte solennel, l'accomplissement sublime, c'est Fürtwängler qui l'assuma : comme Wagner, en 1876, avant d'inaugurer son Palais des Festivals, qui serait voué à sa propre musique, avait sollicité l'auguste parrainage de Beethoven, dirigeant lui-même la 9^e Symphonie au théâtre de la Margravine, ainsi, la veille du grand jour (et 3 quarts de siècle tout juste après Wagner) , Fürtwängler bénissait Bayreuth renaissant en dirigeant la 9^e Symphonie. De l'œuvre immense, il a donné des lectures plus incandescentes et plus furieusement sublimées. Mais aucune fois la circonstance n'avait été si vénérablement solennelle. Le disque était là. Ce qu'il a fixé, c'est un instant mystique de l'histoire de l'Occident. »

Contrairement à 1942, la « joie » fut plus présente que jamais. Dans l'hymne, Fürtwängler commença par un pianissimo quasiment inaudible semblant surgir du lointain. Il réalisa ensuite un gigantesque crescendo où le rubato (c'est-à-dire les variations du tempo) accompagna à la perfection le déploiement de l'émotion de bonheur qui se dégage de la musique de Beethoven. Pour le Finale, il demanda aux chœurs de s'approcher le plus possible du public : il voulait que le texte de Friedrich von Schiller retentisse comme un immense message d'espoir pour l'humanité qui venait de sortir de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Ce concert avait une portée symbolique importante pour Fürtwängler. Il déclara explicitement, à la fin de son procès en dénazification, qu'il était resté en Allemagne pour « assurer la pérennité de la musique allemande » et Arnold Schönberg lui avait quasiment donné l'ordre de rester en Allemagne pour « sauver l'honneur de la musique allemande » . Fürtwängler devait prouver au monde entier, par ce concert de

réouverture du Festival de Bayreuth, que l'Allemagne de Beethoven, Goethe et Schiller n'avait été détruite ni par les Nazis ni par les Alliés.

Les derniers grands enregistrements

(Photo) Elisabeth Schwarzkopf fut très proche de Fürtwängler après la guerre.

Durant les 4 dernières années de sa vie, les interprétations majeures de Fürtwängler se succédèrent : en 1951, la Ire Symphonie de Brahms à Hambourg et le 5e Concerto pour piano de Beethoven (intitulé « l'Empereur ») avec Edwin Fischer. La même année, il participa au Festival de Salzbourg où il joua, avec Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau, les « Lieder eines Farhenden Gesellen » qui lança la carrière du baryton. Mais Fürtwängler décida de programmer, au Festival, contre toute attente, l' « Otello » de Giuseppe Verdi. La décision était périlleuse : il se lançait en effet « sur le terrain » d'Arturo Toscanini. L'affaire fit grand bruit et tous les experts de Verdi attendaient le chef allemand au tournant. Alexander Witeschnik était l'un deux ; il écrivit juste après avoir assisté à tout le Festival :

« On connaissait l'insurpassable 9e de Fürtwängler, on connaissait son « Fidelio » et son « Tristan », mais Fürtwängler et Verdi ? Le 1er Verdi de Fürtwängler constitua le sommet du Festival de Salzbourg de 1951. Fürtwängler vint, dirigea et vainquit. L'Orchestre Verdi de Fürtwängler est d'une éloquence capable d'exprimer l'inouï et de dire l'ineffable. »

Gottfried Kraus, qui assista lui aussi au Festival, écrivit en 1995 : « Nul n'a été en mesure de rendre aussi nettement saisissable que le fit Wilhelm Fürtwängler toutes les caractéristiques musicales du génial chef-d'œuvre de la dernière phase créatrice de Verdi. » . Fürtwängler prouva, comme lorsqu'il dirigea des œuvres du répertoire slave ou français, que, pour lui, la musique n'avait pas de frontières.

En 1952, Fürtwängler enregistra un « Tristan und Isolde » légendaire avec Ludwig Suthaus et Kirsten Flagstad. Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau était Kurnewal, alors qu'Elisabeth Schwarzkopf était présente pour aider Kirsten Flagstad dans les aigus si nécessaire. Kirsten Flagstad fut vexée que l'information ait été diffusée. La diva le reprocha au chef d'orchestre, le tenant pour responsable de la « fuite » . Kirsten Flagstad fut, peut-être, la plus grande soprano wagnérienne de tous les temps mais, en 1952, sa carrière, comme celle de Fürtwängler, touchait à sa fin. Ce dernier sut donner une unité exceptionnelle à l'œuvre et la mort d'Isolde par Kirsten Flagstad, accompagnée par l'Orchestre du Philharmonia dirigé par Fürtwängler, resta comme l'un des plus grands moments de l'histoire de la musique.

Aux Festivals de Salzbourg de 1953 et 1954, Fürtwängler enregistra plusieurs « Don Giovanni » (dont une version filmée) avec une distribution idéale comprenant, entre autres, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Cesare Siepi et Elisabeth Grümmer. Fürtwängler structura tout l'Opéra de Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart autour de sa fin tragique : la scène du Commandeur atteignit une grandeur dramatique exceptionnelle. En 1953, il accompagna au piano Elisabeth Schwarzkopf dans les Lieder d'Hugo Wolf.

Le 14 mai 1953, il enregistra en studio la 4e Symphonie de Robert Schumann avec son orchestre, celui de Berlin. Sami

Habra écrit en février 2005 :

« Cette 4e de Schumann fut longtemps considérée comme l'enregistrement du siècle. Avant le joyeux Finale, il y a la célèbre transition durant laquelle Fürtwängler réalise le crescendo le plus impressionnant jamais entendu. Cette manière de faire du grand chef est citée en référence par les professeurs de Conservatoire et les chefs d'orchestre comme étant la perfection même, et ce en dépit de son apparente impossibilité. Celibidache et Karajan ont bien tenté, à plusieurs occasions, d'imiter Fürtwängler dans ce passage, mais tous les 2 se sont retrouvés à bout de souffle vers le milieu du crescendo. Cette interprétation de Fürtwängler n'est pas encore égalee. »

À la fin de sa vie, Fürtwängler devint souvent malade et commença à perdre l'ouïe, comme son père à la fin de sa vie et comme Beethoven, le musicien auquel il s'identifiait depuis toujours. Cette découverte de cette surdité déclencha en lui de grandes inquiétudes et des états semi-dépressifs. Le 23 janvier 1953, il s'effondra en dirigeant l'Adagio de la 9e de Beethoven.

Le chant du cygne et la mort dans la sérénité

En 1954, Fürtwängler enregistra un « Freischütz » de Carl Maria von Weber, une ouverture de l' « Alceste » de Christoph Willibald Gluck et, surtout, il dirigea son ultime 9e à Lucerne avec l'Orchestre du Philharmonia, de nouveau avec Elisabeth Schwarzkopf. Cette version sublimement équilibrée est pleine de retenue et d'acceptation face à la mort qu'il sent venir. L'Adagio, le 3e mouvement, atteignit une beauté ineffable du même niveau que celui de la version de 1942. Il est certain que le Maître de Fürtwängler, Heinrich Schenker, aurait été fier de lui tant cette version atteint la perfection sur le plan musicologique. Bradshaw, le timbalier de l'orchestre, confia à Sami Habra que jouer le 1er mouvement de cette Symphonie avec Fürtwängler fut l'expérience la plus éprouvante et la plus enrichissante de toute sa carrière. Denis Vaughan, qui était l'un des contrebassistes de l'Orchestre du Philharmonia, ajouta : « La manière dont Fürtwängler employait les notes de Beethoven pour nous décrire la vérité a été pour moi une expérience indélébile. » .

Cette année-là, Fürtwängler et l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin furent invités de nouveau aux États-Unis. Fürtwängler, qui avait été très échaudé en 1936 et 1948, ne souhaitait pas y aller. Le gouvernement américain finit par envoyer une invitation officielle et le chancelier Konrad Adenauer déclara qu'il engageait sa « responsabilité personnelle » dans cette affaire. La tournée du plus grand chef d'orchestre allemand devenait une affaire politique, au plus haut niveau, qui devait symboliser la réconciliation entre l'Allemagne de l'Ouest et les États-Unis. Fürtwängler accepta et la tournée fut prévue pour 1955.

En septembre, juste après une ultime « Walkyrie » , lors d'une répétition de sa 2e Symphonie, Fürtwängler se rendit compte qu'il n'entendait plus du tout la ligne de basson initiale. Il semble que le chef d'orchestre, qui n'avait vécu que pour la musique, n'avait plus tellement goût à la vie. Les événements se déroulèrent alors très vite : il attrapa une pneumonie qui se guérissait bien à l'époque comme les médecins le déclarèrent à sa femme. Mais il déclara à cette dernière, avant d'entrer dans l'hôpital à Baden-Baden : « De cette maladie, je vais mourir et ce sera une mort facile. Ne me quitte pas un seul instant. Tu sais, ils croient tous que je suis venu ici pour guérir. Moi, je sais que je

suis venu pour mourir. » . Le médecin de l'hôpital déclara à sa femme après l'avoir vu : « Je dois reconnaître que, quand je suis entré dans sa chambre, il n'avait plus envie de vivre. Il avait compris qu'il perdait l'ouïe, et il avait certainement peur de connaître le destin de Beethoven. Je suis certain qu'aucun médecin ne peut guérir un malade qui a perdu la volonté de vivre. »

Wilhelm Fürtwängler mourut le 30 novembre 1954 de cette pneumonie, à Baden-Baden, dans la sérénité la plus profonde. Il fut enterré au cimetière de Heidelberg, le « Bergfriedhof », dans le caveau de sa mère. Un grand nombre de personnalités du monde artistique et de la politique étaient présentes dont le chancelier Konrad Adenauer.

Après sa mort, l'écrivain et metteur-en-scène Ernst Lothar déclara :

« Il était allemand totalement et il l'est resté, en dépit des attaques. C'est pour cela qu'il n'a pas quitté son pays souillé, ce qui par la suite lui a été compté comme une souillure par ceux qui ne le connaissaient pas assez. Mais il n'est pas resté auprès de Hitler et de Himmler, mais auprès de Beethoven et de Brahms. »

Personnalité

« La musique n'est ni intellectuelle, ni abstraite, mais organique, immédiate et comme jaillie des mains de la nature. »

Le « cas » Fürtwängler

(Photo) Richard Wagner. Malgré ses réserves sur la personnalité du compositeur allemand, Fürtwängler prit de plus en plus la défense de ce dernier contre Nietzsche dans son journal personnel.

Fürtwängler était connu pour ses grandes difficultés à s'exprimer. Sergiù Celibidache se rappelait que son argument favori était : « Bien, contentez-vous d'écouter la musique. » . Durant les répétitions avec un orchestre, Fürtwängler parlait peu, parfois fredonnait seulement. Fürtwängler a laissé de nombreux textes qui révèlent une grande profondeur mais qui ne s'expriment pas sous la forme d'un discours philosophique structuré. Les difficultés d'expression de Fürtwängler sont même soulignées par les traducteurs de « Musique et Verbe » . Ils déclarent, en effet, que le chef d'orchestre utilise souvent des structures extrêmement compliquées pour exprimer des truismes voire des choses qui n'ont pas un sens rationnel très clair. Ils écrivent : « Il faut bien en effet se rendre à l'évidence que Fürtwängler n'est pas un « penseur » . Il ne le prétendait d'ailleurs pas. Son discours ici comme ailleurs est plutôt répétitif, voire tautologique. » .

Non seulement il ne le prétendait pas, mais il se méfiait de la spéculation intellectuelle, préférant l'action à travers la créativité artistique. Cela explique que la relation entre Richard Wagner et Friedrich Nietzsche semble l'avoir beaucoup préoccupé, et que la critique du philosophe allemand à l'encontre du musicien, que Nietzsche formula dans son livre « le Cas Wagner » l'ait beaucoup tourmenté. Il écrivit, en effet, un long texte sur ce livre publié dans « Musique et Verbe » . Il était d'autant plus touché par ces critiques qu'il percevait les faiblesses humaines du compositeur (au début de sa vie, Fürtwängler n'aimait pas du tout Wagner même en tant que compositeur) . Mais, progressivement,

Fürtwängler, dans ses carnets personnels, défendit de plus en plus le musicien. Il écrivit en 1951 : « La lutte de Friedrich Nietzsche contre Richard Wagner, dans sa volonté de puissance, est la lutte de l'intellect contre l'homme de l'imaginaire. » . La sentence tombe à la fin du texte sur « le Cas Wagner » dans « Musique et Verbe » : « Richard Wagner est un homme d'imagination. C'est-à-dire un être bien plus « profond » que le penseur Nietzsche. » .

Il déclara que la valeur artistique de Wagner est finalement plus importante que ses faiblesses humaines. On comprend que Fürtwängler se soit senti directement concerné par les critiques de Nietzsche contre Richard Wagner. L'intérêt qu'il portait à cette relation révèle que la créativité artistique jouait un rôle, dans l'esprit de Fürtwängler, bien plus important que la spéculation intellectuelle et le langage, mais aussi que Fürtwängler se sentait dans la même situation que Wagner. Ce dernier fut un musicien génial mais à la personnalité très contestée. Or, Fürtwängler fut un interprète exceptionnel mais il savait que sa décision de rester en Allemagne était aussi violemment critiquée par les intellectuels. Il y a même un parallèle direct entre les critiques de Nietzsche vis-à-vis de Richard Wagner et celles de Thomas Mann vis-à-vis de Fürtwängler. L'écrivain allemand, qui considérait Fürtwängler comme le plus grand chef d'orchestre du monde, s'était en effet érigé en « inquisiteur » du chef d'orchestre et ce depuis 1933, en particulier juste après la guerre. Fürtwängler essaya de lui expliquer sa décision de rester en Allemagne et de retrouver un lien d'amitié à travers une relation épistolaire en 1946 et 1947. Mais ces lettres ne menèrent à rien : Thomas Mann ne pardonna jamais à Fürtwängler de ne pas s'être engagé activement politiquement dans la lutte contre le Nazisme. Thomas Mann écrivit à Fürtwängler cette phrase restée célèbre : « Il n'est pas permis de jouer Beethoven dans l'Allemagne de Himmler. » . En fait, Fürtwängler avait répondu clairement, par avance, aux critiques de Thomas Mann dans son texte sur « le cas Wagner » : « L'attitude de Richard Wagner ce en quoi il se différencie le plus de Nietzsche est celle de l'homme qui agit, comme tous les hommes qui ont une action à accomplir, il est lié à son milieu immédiat. Il doit tenir compte des « données » du monde réel. C'est qu'il sait que son travail artistique est étroitement lié à l'action, qu'il est un artiste véritable. Pour Nietzsche, au contraire, aucune possibilité d'agir ainsi : simplement ; directement. Le penseur ne peut fabriquer quelque chose avec un matériau de son choix ni surtout avec lui-même, mais seulement réfléchir sur d'autres êtres ; sur un monde où des hommes s'affirment par des actes. » .

Ce texte, écrit en 1941, concerne non seulement la créativité artistique mais aussi, directement, l'attitude de Fürtwängler durant le 3e « Reich » . Fürtwängler n'a cessé de répéter que c'est dans l'action, dans les gestes concrets, et pas dans une posture intellectuelle, qu'il a combattu le régime hitlérien.

Ses textes sur Wagner et Nietzsche en disent encore plus long sur sa personnalité et sur son rapport à l'art et, en particulier, sur son immense différence par rapport aux Nazis. En effet, Fürtwängler remarqua, toujours dans le texte de 1941, que Nietzsche finit par dire que Wagner n'est qu'un « comédien » . Ce qu'il lui reproche le plus c'est d'être retourné au christianisme avec son « Parsifal » . Il n'est qu'un « comédien » puisqu'il peut passer sans complexe des mythes germaniques au christianisme. Nietzsche aimait les Opéras de Wagner, justement à cause de son intérêt pour ce qui était pré-chrétien (de même qu'il s'intéressait aux pré-socratiques) . Fürtwängler répondit clairement : « Où est (dirait le philosophe) le « vrai » Wagner ? Eh bien justement, l'artiste et le poète est toujours « vrai » . Toujours et partout : dans « Parsifal » comme dans « Siegfried » . Il n'y a d'une œuvre à l'autre, aucune contradiction. » .

Fürtwängler était résolument du côté de l'artiste, pour lequel le contenu intellectuel de l'œuvre n'est pas important

mais uniquement la dimension artistique de celle-ci. Adolf Hitler avait une immense fascination pour Wagner. Outre l'antisémitisme du compositeur, c'était surtout pour son retour aux mythes germaniques pré-chrétiens. Les Nazis voulaient retourner au paganisme germanique (en particulier Alfred Rosenberg, le théoricien du Parti Nazi) et considéraient certains Opéras de Wagner comme de vraies cérémonies païennes. Il semble qu'Hitler n'aimait pas Jean-Sébastien Bach probablement en raison de la dimension chrétienne de son œuvre alors que Fürtwängler le considérait comme le plus grand des musiciens. Les Nazis limitèrent même les représentations de certaines œuvres de Bach en raison de leurs nombreuses références à l'Ancien Testament et, donc, au peuple juif ainsi que pour les nombreux mots hébraïques que l'on y trouvait. Pour Fürtwängler, tout cela n'avait aucun sens. C'est, précisément, pour cela qu'il s'était toujours identifié à Ludwig van Beethoven. Il a toujours dit que ce dernier était le compositeur par excellence, de la « musique pure », c'est-à-dire d'une musique qui exprime des choses d'une force extrême mais indépendamment du langage et de tout contenu rationnel explicite.

La musique au centre de tout

Si Fürtwängler eut toujours du mal à s'exprimer, la musique semblait accaparer l'essentiel de son esprit. Le musicien Werner Thärichen expliqua la différence de personnalité entre Herbert von Karajan et Fürtwängler : alors que le 1er passait tous ses temps libres à essayer de battre ses records sportifs, Fürtwängler les passait à jouer de la musique et à composer. Fürtwängler avait, en effet, 2 grands regrets dans sa vie : le 1er, le plus important, était celui de ne pas avoir été compositeur à plein temps ; le 2e, de ne pas avoir été pianiste à plein temps. Il jouait de nombreuses œuvres au piano, en particulier, les Sonates de Beethoven et Frédéric Chopin qu'il adorait. À ce propos, Fürtwängler déclara un jour à Karla Höcker, que « Jean-Sébastien Bach est l'Ancien Testament de la musique, Beethoven le Nouveau Testament ; sinon, il ne reste que Chopin. ». Elisabeth Fürtwängler raconta que son mari était constamment en train de chanter et de diriger avec les bras un orchestre invisible. Cela en était même gênant : les observateurs extérieurs croyaient que le Maître avait un sérieux tic professionnel. Fürtwängler ne cessa de diriger cet orchestre imaginaire que très peu de temps avant sa mort alors qu'il était dans un hôpital à Baden-Baden. Sa femme comprit immédiatement que cela annonçait sa mort imminente.

Cette psychologie particulière explique pourquoi Fürtwängler réussit à rester en Allemagne malgré la forte aversion que lui inspirait le Nazisme : il avait une forte capacité à s'abstraire du monde extérieur et à se réfugier dans son monde musical. Fürtwängler n'a pas quitté l'Allemagne mais a « émigré intérieurement » : c'est exactement ce que Josef Gœbbels reconnut en avril 1944 quand il dit : « Il était dans une sorte d'émigration intérieure. » .

La gestique de la direction

La gestique de direction de Fürtwängler était très inhabituelle. Le bras gauche jouait un rôle anormalement important, semblant exprimer les émotions du chef d'orchestre. Le bras droit, qui est le plus important pour la direction d'orchestre puisque c'est lui qui doit battre la mesure, faisait des gestes flous : c'est la célèbre battue « fluide » de Fürtwängler. Le caractère flou de cette battue est à mettre en relation avec le caractère souvent difficilement compréhensible du langage et de la pensée intellectuelle du chef d'orchestre. Osso Straßer raconta : « Sa gestique était totalement différente de celle des autres chefs. Sa main gauche et l'expression de son visage nous indiquaient avec

quelle émotion il fallait jouer. Le plus souvent sa main droite ne battait pas la mesure mais façonnait la phrase musicale et notre concentration aidant, la précision venait le plus souvent d'elle-même. » .

Yehudi Menuhin s'est prononcé sur la battue fluide de Fürtwängler expliquant qu'elle était plus difficile mais plus profonde que celle de Toscanini. Cette battue fluide donnait, en effet, un son d'une très grande richesse. La 1re raison est la suivante : comme Fürtwängler ne donnait pas d'indications précises ni par la battue ni par le langage (lors des répétitions) , la communication devait passer par un canal plus profond et exigeait une concentration extrême des musiciens. Il existe un grand nombre de témoignages de musiciens d'orchestre, dont certains ne jouèrent qu'une seule fois avec Fürtwängler et parfois dans les pupitres les plus éloignés du chef d'orchestre, qui rapportèrent l'effet « hypnotique » et « télépathique » de la direction du chef allemand. Ils se retrouvaient, en concert, avec lui, sachant exactement quand et comment ils devaient jouer sans pouvoir donner d'explications puisque les gestes n'étaient pas plus clairs que les explications en répétitions. Une anecdote célèbre, qui révèle que la simple présence de Fürtwängler pouvait suffire, a été rapportée par Werner Thärichen, l'un des musiciens de l'orchestre de Berlin : un jour qu'ils répétaient seuls sans leur chef, ils se mirent brusquement à jouer de façon « extraordinaire » sans comprendre pourquoi. Puis ils virent qu'une seule chose s'était produite : Fürtwängler venait juste de rentrer, sans rien dire, ni rien faire, sauf les écouter. Yehudi Menuhin rapporta que Fürtwängler lui avait dit la chose suivante : « Les gens se moquent de ma manière de battre la musique, ils disent qu'elle est difficile et embrouillée. Peut-être, c'est ainsi mais elle a un grand avantage : c'est qu'elle retient tout le monde collé sur son siège, réagissant par un 6e sens, de manière instinctive, intuitive, et en tant qu'unité. » .

La 2e explication est la suivante : la battue fluide de Fürtwängler pouvait parfois donner une impression d'amateurisme car les musiciens pouvaient ne pas jouer ensemble. Un exemple bien connu est le 1er mouvement de la 3e Symphonie de Johannes Brahms en 1949 : si certains critiques considèrent que cette interprétation de cette Symphonie est un monument de la direction Symphonique, d'autres considèrent que cet enregistrement a un fort caractère expérimental. C'est le 1er mouvement qui pose problème. En effet, les variations du tempo sont tellement grandes que les musiciens de l'Orchestre de Berlin ont du mal à suivre et ne jouent pas vraiment ensemble. Cependant, en général, les musiciens jouaient ensemble mais toujours avec un petit décalage à cause de la battue fluide de Fürtwängler. C'est ce petit décalage qui permet au cerveau de l'auditeur de bien distinguer tous les timbres de l'Orchestre, donnant ainsi une richesse sonore inouïe même dans les tutti. 2 enregistrements, particulièrement significatifs, révèlent ce « relief » sonore : les 1ers accords gigantesques dans la 1re Symphonie de Brahms à Hambourg, en 1951, ou tous les tutti dans le 1er mouvement de la 7e Symphonie de Beethoven de 1943, à Berlin. Fürtwängler ne voulait, de toute façon, pas battre la mesure. Il écrivit dans son journal personnel en 1936 : « Faut-il battre la mesure ? La battue détruit le sentiment du flux mélodique. » .

Une anecdote montre, qu'avec Fürtwängler, la battue était inutile. En 1927, durant les 1ers jours où il remplaça Felix Weingartner à l'Orchestre de Vienne, les musiciens les plus âgés se plainquirent qu'ils n'arrivaient pas à le suivre. Fürtwängler s'arrêta et s'installa au clavecin pour diriger le 5e des Concertos Brandebourgeois de Jean-Sébastien Bach en jouant de cet instrument. Les musiciens furent tellement subjugués que plus jamais une seule critique ne fut émise sur la battue fluide du chef d'orchestre jusqu'à sa mort en 1954.

L' « au-delà des notes »

Lorsqu'il dirigeait, Fürtwängler semblait littéralement « possédé » par la musique. Son style de direction était comparé à celui d'un « pantin » dont les gestes étaient guidés par des fils invisibles. Tout se passait comme si quelque chose de transcendant était présent : Fürtwängler n'était plus que la marionnette de cette présence transcendante et n'était là que pour transmettre à l'orchestre ses indications. Alexandre Pham expliqua en 2004 : « Stature de commandeur, géant visionnaire, « Jupiter chauve » descendu de l'Olympe : l'évidence crève l'écran. Fürtwängler n'avait rien de commun avec ses semblables. Le voir diriger, à pleines mains, s'agitant comme possédé par une vision intérieure, le regard fixe et pénétrant, nous laisse encore déconcertés. » .

Contrairement à un chef d'orchestre comme Carlos Kleiber, Fürtwängler répétait peu et ne cherchait pas la perfection dans les moindres détails. Un exemple bien connu est le fait qu'il ne donnait même pas d'indication précise pour démarrer ce qui fait que le début de ses concerts était vécu comme un cauchemar par les musiciens. Même dans la célèbre 5e de Beethoven de Berlin de 1943, on entend que, dans l' « attaque » du 1er mouvement, les musiciens ne sont pas ensemble. Il semble que les musiciens de l'orchestre de Berlin, à la fin de la carrière du chef d'orchestre, s'étaient donnés le mot d'ordre suivant : ils avaient désigné l'un des contrebassistes de l'orchestre (son nom était Goedecke) pour donner l'indication de départ. Lorsque ce dernier croyait détecter la volonté du chef d'orchestre de démarrer dans ses gestes bizarres, il osait se lancer et tous les autres musiciens le suivaient. La raison du comportement de Fürtwängler est la suivante. Il ne dirigeait pas pour remplir son contrat et délivrer un produit bien fini mais pour créer quelque chose d'extraordinaire et pour unir tous les musiciens et le public. Au départ, il cherchait à créer une tension nerveuse et émotionnelle palpable par tous indiquant que quelque chose d'exceptionnel allait se produire.

À ce propos, le chef d'orchestre Bernard Haitink raconta qu'il s'était rendu à Salzbourg lorsqu'il était jeune pour assister à des concerts de Fürtwängler. Lors du 1er concert, il vit arriver un personnage à l'allure « bizarre » et les musiciens ne jouaient même pas en même temps. Il pensa : « Mais c'est ça le grand Fürtwängler ? » . Puis, il rapporta que, durant le concert, il sentit une espèce de « courant électrique » traversant tout son corps et tout son esprit. Le même phénomène se reproduisit durant tous les concerts : il se sentit, pendant tout son séjour à Salzbourg, complètement bouleversé émotionnellement. Le fait que Fürtwängler ne cherchait pas la perfection des détails mais plutôt l' « extraordinaire » semble être au cœur de sa personnalité. C'est pourquoi il improvisait souvent. Pour Fürtwängler, faire des erreurs n'était pas grave, du moment qu'il arrivait, parfois, à atteindre quelque chose de tout à fait hors norme : ce qu'il appelait l' « au-delà des notes » . Ce trait de caractère se retrouve chez de nombreux artistes. On a reproché toute sa vie à Claude Monet d'être incapable de finir un seul tableau. La plupart des œuvres de Michel-Ange ou de Léonard de Vinci sont considérées comme inachevées. Parfois, il semble qu'ils le faisaient exprès pour laisser une part d'imaginaire ouvrant sur ce qui est au-delà du sensible, sur le « spirituel » . On peut multiplier les exemples : le clair-obscur de Rembrandt, la touche impressionniste de Diego Vélasquez. À ce propos, Fürtwängler adorait l'Italie où les œuvres d'art sont partout. Or, il avait, justement, une fascination prononcée pour les statues inachevées de Michel-Ange, comme la « Pietà Rondanini » , « les esclaves » de la Galleria dell'Accademia de Florence. Il déclara, en effet :

« J'entends dire que, plus on fait de répétitions, mieux on joue. C'est une erreur. Il faut seulement réduire l'imprévu à sa juste mesure, c'est-à-dire à l'impulsion soudaine qui échappe au contrôle de la volonté mais qui répond à un désir obscur. Gardons à l'improvisation sa place et son rôle. Il me semble que le vrai interprète est celui qui improvise. On a terriblement mécanisé l'art de diriger en cherchant la perfection plus que le rêve. Dès que le rubato est scientifiquement calculé, il cesse d'être vrai : l'exercice de la musique est autre chose que la recherche d'une réussite. Ce qui est bien, c'est d'essayer. Voyez les sculptures de Michel-Ange, il en est de parfaites, d'autres sont seulement ébauchées. Ces dernières me touchent plus que les autres car j'y sens la marque du désir, le rêve en marche. C'est cela qui me passionne : fixer sans figer, jouer le jeu en respectant le hasard, concevoir une musique dans sa cohérence suprême, c'est-à-dire accorder les mouvements de l'âme à l'équilibre architectural. »

La musique comme un acte de « communion »

Fürtwängler plaçait la relation à l'autre au centre de son art. Comme il avait du mal à communiquer par le langage, c'est par la musique qu'il échangeait avec les autres. Il conçut toujours la composition ainsi que le partage de la musique en concert comme, avant tout, un acte de communication, plus précisément comme un acte de « communion ». Fürtwängler utilisa souvent ce terme en référence directe à sa signification chrétienne. Sa femme écrivit : « Son désir de vivre en communauté était grand. Aucune note de musique n'aurait jamais été écrite, me disait-il, s'il n'y avait eu derrière le désir de s'adresser à autrui. Tout ce verbiage sur le fait que l'on compose avant tout pour soi-même est faux, ajoutait-il. » .

C'est pourquoi Fürtwängler attachait une importance considérable au concert et à la relation directe avec le public. Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau déclara : « Il a dit une fois que la chose la plus importante pour un artiste de scène était de constituer avec le public une communauté d'amour pour la musique, de créer un sentiment commun entre des personnes venues de tellement d'endroits différents et avec des sentiments aussi divers. En tant qu'interprète, j'ai vécu toute ma vie avec cet idéal. » .

C'est pourquoi il ne s'intéressa jamais aux enregistrements alors que ces derniers permettaient de le faire connaître à un public beaucoup plus large. Il ne se mit aux enregistrements en studio, qu'il appelait des « conserves musicales », qu'à l'extrême fin de sa vie. Ce fut uniquement parce que le producteur musical Walter Legge le harcelait sans arrêt pour enregistrer avec lui. Mais, même pour ces enregistrements en studio, il dirigeait parfois, comme pour la 4^e Symphonie de Robert Schumann de 1953, « d'une traite », refusant toute interruption des techniciens ou de recommencer des parties du morceau.

Cette importance qu'il attachait à la communication par la musique explique qu'alors qu'il avait été dans la 1^{re} partie de sa carrière un grand promoteur de la musique contemporaine il finit par refuser la musique atonale à la fin de sa vie. Il écrivit, en effet, dans son journal personnel en 1945 : « Le passage de Wagner à Schönberg n'est pas un progrès mais une catastrophe. » .

(Photo) Tombe de Fürtwängler à Heidelberg.

Il soupçonnait fortement que ce qui est à l'origine de la musique atonale est un refus de communiquer pleinement. En témoigne un texte important qu'il écrivit sur Artur Schnabel en 1954. Il y nota que Schnabel est un très grand interprète du répertoire Classique. Mais, alors que son répertoire ne dépasse pas l'époque de Johannes Brahms, il ne compose que de la musique atonale et refuse même de la jouer lui-même pour les autres. La musique tonale, et particulièrement la forme sonate, demeurait au cœur de l'univers mental de Fürtwängler, que ce soit dans le domaine de la composition que dans celui de l'interprétation. À ce sujet, il faut se rappeler qu'il débuta sa carrière à Mannheim où un groupe de musiciens du milieu du 18e siècle, l'« École de Mannheim », développa la sonate dans sa forme Classique. D'autre part, il déclara à de nombreuses reprises que Beethoven, son musicien préféré, était le compositeur qui revenait toujours à cette forme sonate et la porta à son apogée. Comme le dit le musicologue Walter Riezler : « C'est en l'idée de forme sonate, et seulement en elle, que croit Fürtwängler au plus profond de lui-même. »

Plus qu'un acte de communication, Fürtwängler considérait que faire de la musique est, avant tout, un acte d'amour. Un DVD mettant en scène Elisabeth Fürtwängler est entièrement consacré à cette thématique. On y entend de nombreuses citations de Fürtwängler comparant le fait de partager la musique avec d'autres avec l'amour qui unit 2 êtres. À ce propos, il est important de noter qu'il fit graver sur sa plaque tombale toujours visible au cimetière de Heidelberg : « Nun aber bleibt Glaube Hoffnung Liebe diese drei aber die Liebe ist die grösste unter ihnen », c'est-à-dire : « Et maintenant demeurent la foi, l'espoir et l'amour. Mais parmi les 3 c'est l'amour qui est le plus grand. » . D'autre part, Elisabeth Fürtwängler rapporta que son ultime conversation avec son mari, juste avant sa mort, porta sur le message d'amour du Christ. Il écrivit dans son carnet personnel en 1937 : « À l'égard d'une œuvre d'art, il faut une approche particulière. C'est un monde clos, un monde en soi. Cette approche a pour nom amour. Elle est le contraire des évaluations des comparaisons. Elle voit l'incomparable, l'unique. Le monde du visible, le monde de la raison qui raisonne, ne rendra jamais justice à une seule œuvre d'art. » . Et dans son texte sur Anton Bruckner de 1939 : « L'art est de la même famille que l'amour. » .

Interprétation, répertoire

« L'art au sens habituel est expression de la vie. Le « grand art » est orientation de la vie. »

Impact Wilhelm Fürtwängler

Fürtwängler est considéré par de nombreux critiques musicaux comme le plus grand interprète du répertoire Symphonique allemand et autrichien. Les musiciens qui ont exprimé la plus haute opinion concernant Fürtwängler comptent parmi les plus importants du 20e siècle comme Arnold Schœnberg, Paul Hindemith, Arthur Honegger, Richard Strauß, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf (qui a déclaré durant une interview que Fürtwängler était le plus grand chef d'orchestre avec qui elle avait chanté) , Kirsten Flagstad, Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau, Yehudi Menuhin, Edwin Fischer, Ernest Ansermet, Walter Gieseking et même Maria Callas.

Paul Hindemith a raconté : « Ce qui le démarquait de tous les autres, ce n'était pas seulement sa musicalité ; il y eut de nombreux chefs talentueux depuis Bülow, et dans l'art de la musique jouée dans sa simplicité même, l'inoubliable

Arthur Nikisch était sans doute sans égal. Ce que notre ami avait de bien particulier, c'était une droiture indicible, avec laquelle il faisait de la musique, une droiture du type de Bruckner. Même ceux qui le critiquaient ou l'enviaient, savaient, qu'à l'instant où il prenait la baguette, rien ne comptait plus alors que l'âme de la musique qui nous envahissait, par lui, son médiateur, lui qui, par un tempo, un mouvement d'expression, un développement structurel, avait le pouvoir de la présenter différemment à chaque fois. Il possédait le grand secret de la proportion. La manière dont il comprenait les phrases, les thèmes, les mouvements, les parties, les Symphonies dans leur entier, et même l'ensemble des programmes, la manière dont il les traitait dans leur unité artistique, toute son existence de musicien était marquée par ce sens de la proportion, ce sens de l'harmonie. » .

Plusieurs anecdotes rapportent que même ses principaux concurrents ont été impressionnés par certaines interprétations de Furtwängler : Arturo Toscanini (la 6e Symphonie de Piotr Ilitch Tchaïkovski de 1938) , Herbert von Karajan (la 4e de Robert Schumann) , ou Otto Klemperer (« J'avais découvert le musicien idéal. ») .

Ses interprétations en concert comme au disque de Ludwig van Beethoven, Johannes Brahms, Anton Bruckner et de Richard Wagner ou d'œuvres comme, par exemple, la 4e Symphonie de Robert Schumann ou la 9e de Franz Schubert, sont considérées par de nombreux critiques comme des références incontournables, voire inégalées.

Lorsque Furtwängler mourut, la qualité de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin était telle que Karajan, qui prit sa place en 1955, confia à ses nouveaux musiciens qu'« il avait l'impression de s'appuyer contre un mur épais lorsqu'il les dirigeait. » .

L'impact de l'art de Furtwängler sur les générations suivantes de chefs d'orchestre fut immense. Une anecdote suffit à montrer le respect qu'inspirait le nom de Furtwängler. En 1954, Furtwängler écrivit une lettre de recommandation à Daniel Barenboim. Ce dernier raconta qu'il utilisa la lettre portant la signature de Furtwängler pendant 20 ans et qu'elle lui ouvrit immédiatement toutes les portes en Israël où il vivait alors avec sa famille. D'autre part, Carlos Kleiber considérait que « nul ne pouvait égaler Furtwängler » . Simon Rattle, l'actuel chef d'orchestre de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, résuma : « À mes yeux, Furtwängler est de tous les chefs celui dont l'influence reste la plus déterminante. » et expliqua, en 2003 : « Il n'existe aucun grand chef qui n'ait été inspiré par le chef allemand. » . Patrick Szersnovicz écrivit en introduction de son article du « Monde de la musique » sur Furtwängler de décembre 2004 :

« Il y a 50 ans disparaissait celui qui fut peut-être le plus grand chef d'orchestre de l'histoire. Aucun autre interprète n'aura marqué la musique d'une telle présence. »

Outre Sergiù Celibidache, Furtwängler eut, parmi ses protégés, le pianiste Karlrobert Kreiten qui fut assassiné par les Nazis pendant la guerre. Il eut également une grande influence sur le pianiste et chef d'orchestre Daniel Barenboim, à propos duquel la veuve de Furtwängler, Elisabeth Furtwängler, disait qu'il « furtwänglisait » (« Er furtwänglert ») . Barenboim a enregistré la 2e Symphonie de Furtwängler avec l'Orchestre symphonique de Chicago. Sergiù Celibidache remplaça Furtwängler durant la période 1945-1947. Durant la période 1947-1952, ils assurèrent ensemble la co-direction de l'Orchestre. Il a été tellement impressionné par Furtwängler qu'il vécut dans le culte du chef d'orchestre

allemand toute sa vie. Néanmoins, leur relation s'était dégradée à la fin. Ce n'était ni un problème personnel ni musical c'est simplement que Sergiu Celibidache avait critiqué les musiciens de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, ce qui était un sacrilège pour Furtwängler.

L'art de Furtwängler

Furtwängler a synthétisé et mené à l'apogée la tradition d'interprétation germanique initiée par Richard Wagner, qui concevait les œuvres comme des « tout » organiques et modifiait continuellement le tempo, tradition qui fut poursuivie par les 2 Iers chefs d'orchestre permanents de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin : Hans von Bülow, qui tendait à mettre en lumière la structure de l'œuvre, et Arthur Nikisch qui privilégiait l'expression et plaçait au 1er plan la splendeur des sonorités.

Les variations du tempo et l'importance de Richard Wagner

En ce qui concerne Richard Wagner et les variations de tempo si caractéristiques de la direction de Furtwängler, Elisabeth Furtwängler déclara : « Furtwängler a toujours regretté de n'avoir pas pu voir diriger Wagner. À en juger par ses écrits sur la direction et les témoignages de ses contemporains sur le chef d'orchestre, il estimait que Wagner avait dû être un chef unique. En 1918, dans un essai sur Beethoven, Furtwängler écrit que Wagner avait été le 1er « à préconiser cette modification infime mais constante du tempo, seule capable de faire d'un morceau unique figé, Classique, joué pour ainsi dire d'après le modèle imprimé, ce qu'il est à proprement parler : une origine et un développement, un processus vivant » . » .

Contrairement à Arturo Toscanini, Furtwängler ne considérait pas le tempo indiqué sur la partition comme sacré. En cela, il suivait les recommandations de Ludwig van Beethoven, lui-même, qui a écrit dans ses lettres : « Mes tempi ne sont valables que pour les Ires mesures, car n'oublions pas que le sentiment et l'expression doivent avoir leurs propres tempi » ou encore : « Pourquoi m'ennuient-ils en me demandant mes tempi ? S'ils sont bons musiciens, ils devraient savoir comment jouer ma musique. S'ils ne sont pas bons musiciens, aucune indication ne saurait être utile. » . Plusieurs disciples de Beethoven, dont Anton Felix Schindler, ont témoigné que Beethoven faisait de légères variations constamment lorsqu'il dirigeait ses œuvres.

Cette tendance fut fortement accentuée par Richard Wagner, initiant ce que les spécialistes appellent « la tradition germanique de direction orchestrale » . Cette tradition s'opposait à celle initiée par Felix Mendelssohn, à la même époque. Alors que ce dernier utilisait des tempi stables, rapides et faisait jouer un rôle central à la mesure et à la précision de la direction orchestrale, Richard Wagner faisait varier continuellement le tempo, qui était souvent plus lent sauf à certains moments où il pouvait devenir très rapide et accordait une importance beaucoup plus grande à l'expressivité et à la construction d'ensemble de l'œuvre qu'à la mesure. Pour Wagner, l'interprétation d'une œuvre était conçue comme une re-création et laissait de la place à l'improvisation.

Wilhelm Furtwängler fut attiré par l'approche de Wagner. D'autre part, il fut l'élève du chef d'orchestre Felix Mottl, un disciple direct du compositeur allemand, durant la période 1907-1909 où il travailla à Munich. John Ardoin alla même

plus loin : il déclara que si le style de direction de Fürtwängler est bien hérité de Richard Wagner, il précisa, en plus, que celui d'Arturo Toscanini prendrait racine dans celui de Mendelssohn. Il expliqua ainsi l'origine des styles qualifiés, par la suite, de « subjectif » et d' « objectif » de Fürtwängler et Toscanini, respectivement, qui serviront de modèles à tous les chefs d'orchestre par la suite.

En fait, Fürtwängler pouvait aussi diriger et mener un mouvement de bout en bout sur une pulsation ne variant pas (pour les épisodes dits « masculins ») ou au contraire laisser le tempo beaucoup plus libre (pour les épisodes dits « féminins ») . Harry Halbreich expliqua : « Pour Fürtwängler, tout morceau possède 2 tempi fondamentaux, un tempo métrique s'appliquant aux épisodes rythmiques, aux épisodes dits masculins, et un tempo mélodique réservé aux périodes chantantes, lyriques, féminines. Ces 2 tempi peuvent être en réalité très voisins du point de vue strictement métronomique mais le phrasé veillera à ce que la diversité règne dans l'unité. C'est ainsi que l'on réalise une architecture musicale, par l'équilibre complémentaire et harmonieux des contrastes biologiques. » .

David Cairns expliqua à propos des variations de tempo de Fürtwängler : « L'unité d'un mouvement Symphonique, loin d'être affaiblie par des fluctuations de tempo, pouvait au contraire en exiger l'application, de sorte que chaque moment expressif pût pleinement s'épanouir, et que tout fût porté au maximum d'intensité. » .

On avait reproché à Richard Wagner que ses variations de tempo avaient un aspect fortement arbitraire qui pouvaient mener à un résultat différent de ce que le compositeur avait voulu.

L'unité de l'œuvre et les théories de Heinrich Schenker

(Photo) Le chef d'orchestre Hans von Bülow. Il fut le 1er chef permanent de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin et l'ami personnel de Franz Liszt, Richard Wagner et Johannes Brahms. Richard Wagner, Hans von Bülow et Arthur Nikisch sont les 3 principaux chefs d'orchestre de la « tradition allemande de direction orchestrale » dont Fürtwängler allait hériter.

Mais la mise en valeur de la structure des œuvres musicales telle que le compositeur l'avait souhaitée était au centre de l'art de Fürtwängler. En cela, il était l'héritier de Hans von Bülow qui travaillait en profondeur les partitions des musiciens contemporains dont il dirigeait les œuvres. Hans von Bülow entretenait une relation personnelle avec des compositeurs majeurs comme Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt ou Johannes Brahms, ce qui lui donnait un accès direct au travail de composition. On sait, par ailleurs, que von Bülow faisait souvent des variations de tempo comme Richard Wagner. De la même façon, Fürtwängler avait passé toute sa jeunesse à étudier la composition car jusqu'à la fin de sa vie il se considéra, avant tout, comme un compositeur. D'autre part, la femme d'Arnold Schœnberg rapporta que Fürtwängler voulait absolument respecter ce que son mari avait voulu dire avant de diriger l'une de ses œuvres, le harcelant sans arrêt de questions : « Son souci était de respecter absolument l'intention du compositeur, Schœnberg en l'occurrence. » .

En 1902-1903, Fürtwängler étudia la composition avec le chef d'orchestre et compositeur Max von Schillings. Comme le remarqua Pierre Brunel, pour Fürtwängler : « Création et interprétation vont de pair. » . Günther Birkner ajouta : «

Dès le début, Fürtwängler est un créateur et se définit comme tel. Cet aspect de sa personnalité déborde le cadre de la composition et inspire l'activité du chef, comme le montrent ses interprétations, véritablement marquées par une volonté de recréation de l'œuvre. Même si le destin lui réserve un rôle exceptionnel d'exécutant, son aspiration la plus profonde tend à la création. » .

En plus de sa formation solide en composition, sa compréhension de la structure des œuvres du répertoire Symphonique austro-allemand a été très fortement enrichie et élargie par les théories du musicologue juif viennois Heinrich Schenker. On doit à Heinrich Schenker une théorie de la musique tonale fondée sur une lecture extrêmement attentive des partitions appelée « Analyse schenkérienne » . Il est considéré comme le fondateur de l'analyse musicale moderne. Fürtwängler lut pour la 1^{re} fois la monographie d'Heinrich Schenker sur la 9^e Symphonie de Beethoven, en 1911, qui l'impressionna au plus haut point. Dès cette époque, il chercha à acquérir tous les ouvrages du musicologue. Avant même sa rencontre avec Fürtwängler, Schenker avait perçu le caractère exceptionnel de Fürtwängler comme chef d'orchestre. Schenker écrit, en effet, dans son journal personnel après avoir assisté à un concert de la 5^e de Beethoven par Fürtwängler : « Aucun doute que ce jeune chef l'emporte sur Felix Weingartner, Arthur Nikisch et Richard Strauß ; il faut simplement regretter qu'il n'ait pas encore exploré davantage le domaine de la composition. » .

Fürtwängler eut tout le temps d'étudier la composition avec Schenker qu'il rencontra enfin en mai 1919. Ils entretenirent une longue relation jusqu'à la disparition du musicologue en 1935 ce qui permit à Fürtwängler d'étudier auprès de lui régulièrement et de travailler ensemble les partitions que Fürtwängler dirigeait peu après. Il semble que leur relation eut des hauts et des bas mais ne s'arrêta jamais même après l'arrivée d' Adolf Hitler au pouvoir (Schenker était juif et vivait à Vienne) . Fürtwängler resta longtemps en contact avec la femme de Schenker et certains de ses disciples après la mort du musicologue, en 1935. En raison de ses idées musicologiques très novatrices pour l'époque, Schenker ne réussit jamais à obtenir un poste académique malgré les efforts de Fürtwängler dans ce sens. Schenker vécut surtout grâce à des mécènes dont Fürtwängler faisait partie. Elisabeth Fürtwängler témoigna de l'importance de la pensée de Schenker sur son mari même bien après la guerre : « Fürtwängler se passionnait pour le concept d' « écoute structurelle » (« Fernhörennote ») que Heinrich Schenker, comme l'écrivit Fürtwängler en 1947, situe au centre de toutes ses considérations. L' « écoute structurelle » , c'est-à-dire le fait d'entendre ou de percevoir sur une longue distance une grande continuité dont les éléments partent souvent dans de nombreuses directions est, pour Schenker, le signe distinctif de la grande musique Classique allemande. » .

Fürtwängler était, en effet, l' « héritier d'une tradition philosophique cherchant avant tout à retrouver l'idée (ce que Schenker appelle l'« écoute structurelle » d'un point de vue musicologique) dans la multitude des phénomènes, l'œuvre n'est pas qu'une succession d'éléments (le tempo, les variations d'intensité) dont le rendu suppose la résolution de problèmes techniques. » .

C'est en raison de l'importance que Fürtwängler attachait à la mise en valeur de la cohérence des œuvres, qu'il faisait jouer un rôle central aux « transitions » car c'est elles qui permettaient d'articuler clairement les différentes parties du morceau. Daniel Barenboïm, qui assista à de nombreuses répétitions avec Fürtwängler, déclara qu'il avait l'impression qu'il ne travaillait que les transitions. Fürtwängler excellait à conserver la ligne mélodique et la cohérence

de la Symphonie (l' « écoute structurelle ») même si le nombre d'instruments était très important et que la ligne mélodique pouvait passer d'un pupitre à l'autre très rapidement, c'est-à-dire « dans de nombreuses directions » pour reprendre l'expression de Heinrich Schenker à propos de la musique allemande. Sami Habra déclara en effet : « La beauté de Fürtwängler des fortissimo dans le discours musical, la continuité dans le discours mélodique qui part d'un bout à l'autre de l'orchestre, qui séjourne dans un pupitre, passe dans les autres et revient à la source, c'est admirable. On ne la perd jamais. » .

L'expressivité et l'importance d'Arthur Nikisch

En outre, les interprétations de Fürtwängler se caractérisent par une richesse sonore exceptionnelle : tous les instruments et tous les timbres de l'orchestre sont parfaitement audibles. Patrick Szersnovicz expliqua : « Mais on ne parle jamais de ce qui semble le plus évident (à propos de la musique de Fürtwängler) : l'incroyable intensité sonore, la luminosité des couleurs, une sonorité orchestrale inouïe, fondées sur des basses puissantes, notamment un pupitre de violoncelles sans égal dans le monde entier. » .

David Cairns ajouta : « On reconnaît un trait typique de Fürtwängler dans la manière dont se distingue si clairement la section des bois, comme par exemple dans la « grande » Symphonie en ut majeur de Schubert. Écoutez comment, à la fin du développement du 1er mouvement de cette même œuvre, le léger motif du cor, d'importance capitale, vient rappeler le rythme pointé omniprésent jusque-là mais absent des 20 mesures précédentes, et indiquer l'imminence de la ré-exposition. Les chefs d'orchestre sont bien souvent incapables de faire en sorte que ce motif soit parfaitement audible. Aux mains de Fürtwängler, aucun danger qu'il ne le soit pas. » .

D'autre part, contrairement à un chef d'orchestre comme Otto Klemperer qui se déclarait « pas du tout Romantique » , Fürtwängler ne refoulait pas les émotions dans ses interprétations. Au contraire, l'intensité émotionnelle qui se dégage de ses enregistrements est tellement forte qu'elle devient presque insoutenable dans les interprétations entre 1938 et 1945, période durant laquelle Fürtwängler vit une crise émotionnelle extrême. Mais, chose tout à fait exceptionnelle, même lorsque l'intensité émotionnelle atteint son paroxysme, Fürtwängler gardait toujours un contrôle parfait de la structure de l'œuvre qu'il dirigeait. Comme le dit Patrick Szersnovicz : « C'est ce potentiel dramatique qui lui permettait de prendre d'extravagantes libertés avec une partition tout en lui donnant une unité qu'aucun autre chef n'a obtenu. » .

La mise en valeur des sonorités fut héritée en partie d'Arthur Nikisch. Elisabeth Fürtwängler raconta : « Fürtwängler affirmait qu'il n'avait appris que d'Arthur Nikisch. Bien sûr, l'immense personnalité de Hans Pfitzner, son Maître à Strasbourg, avait beaucoup compté, mais sur un autre plan. À ses yeux, parmi les chefs d'orchestre, nul autre qu'Arthur Nikisch n'était digne de considération. « De lui j'ai appris le son, la façon d'obtenir le son. » . » .

Chez Fürtwängler, qui, « mieux que quiconque, sait conjuguer les dimensions apollinienne et dionysiaque » de la musique (au sens Nietzscheen) , l'aspect émotif et la compréhension intellectuelle de la structure des œuvres sont toujours complètement liés. Daniel Barenboim déclara : « Je ne sais pas précisément jusqu'à quel point il réfléchissait aux choses de façon rationnelle, ni quelle dose de sentiments il investissait. Ces 2 éléments sont parfois si étroitement

liés chez lui qu'on a l'impression qu'il avait établi un équilibre idéal : penser avec le cœur et sentir avec l'esprit. » .

La dimension « hyper Romantique » de l'art de Fürtwängler était pleinement assumée par le chef d'orchestre qui écrivit en 1951 : « Je prends le risque de m'attirer la pire injure que l'on puisse lancer à un musicien de l'Allemagne d'aujourd'hui. Je prends le risque d'être « Romantique » . » . Mais s'il exaltait les émotions à l'extrême ce n'était pas pour suivre les humeurs de l'ego. Comme le dit Pierre Brunel, Fürtwängler était « Romantique, oui, mais dans la tradition la plus haute du Romantisme allemand ; de Goethe déjà, de Höderlin, de Novalis. Fürtwängler ne cherche pas à se prendre pour sujet (il le déteste, et il le refuse) , il ne veut pas parler de soi (mais de faits et de travaux) . » . « Wilhelm Fürtwängler, pèlerin de l'absolu, à la fois dans son temps et hors du temps » ne cherchait pas à suivre la subjectivité de l'ego mais au contraire à la dépasser.

La dimension spirituelle

Une conception idéaliste de l'art

Tous les éléments précédents : la construction rationnelle de l'œuvre, ses aspects émotifs, la richesse des sonorités qui en découlent participent tous à cette « écoute structurelle » (« Fernhören ») dont parlait Heinrich Schenker, qui peut se traduire, d'un point de vue philosophique, par l'« idée » au sens platonicien que se fit l'artiste de son œuvre. Cette « idée » dépasse nécessairement les plans rationnels, émotifs ou liés aux perceptions de l'ouïe puisque justement elle leur donne naissance. Elle les « transcende » et cela amène à l'aspect le plus élevé de l'art d'interprétation de Fürtwängler : sa recherche de la transcendance et de la spiritualité qui a été soulignée par de nombreux commentateurs.

Paul Hindemith disait, en effet : « Il savait transformer les expériences musicales en quasi-connaissances religieuses. » . André Tubeuf déclara : « Un mysticisme inné en Wilhelm Fürtwängler lui faisait trouver dans la musique le souffle même dont vit l'Univers ; Dieu qui se fait sensible. » . Et Yehudi Menuhin : « Lorsqu'on interprétait la grande musique allemande avec Fürtwängler, on éprouvait un sentiment d'une intensité quasi religieuse. » . Le chef d'orchestre Paul Kletzki déclara quant à lui : « Le plus important pour lui était la valeur spirituelle de la musique et, par dessus tout, il accordait la plus grande importance à ce qui est derrière la note écrite. Il était toujours en quête de la grande structure, de l'idée. Dans les transitions d'un passage à l'autre, c'était précisément cela qui comptait, bien plus que le flux continu et consistant de la musique. » .

De même, Sergiù Celibidache expliqua que le vrai but de Fürtwängler était d'atteindre des dimensions spirituelles transcendantes et que ceux qui étaient hermétiques à ces dimensions ne pouvaient pas comprendre son art. Il déclara, en effet : « Tout le monde était influencé par Arturo Toscanini. Ce qu'il faisait était perceptible immédiatement, sans aucune référence aux dimensions spirituelles. Il y avait un certain ordre dans la matière musicale. Mais chez Arturo Toscanini, je n'ai rien perçu de spirituel. Chez Fürtwängler, par contre, j'ai compris qu'il s'agissait de tout autre chose : de la métaphysique, de la transcendance, des rapports entre les sons et les sonorités. Un jour, je lui ai demandé : « Cher Monsieur, à quelle vitesse se fait ce passage, cette transition ? » . Fürtwängler me répondit : « Cela dépend de la manière dont ça sonne. » . Donc, j'ai compris qu'il ne s'agissait pas d'une discipline extérieure comme le temps

physique, qui n'a rien à voir avec la musique. Le tempo est une condition afin que ce qui doit résonner, puisse résonner. Mais qu'est-ce qu'il se passe si vous n'entendez pas ces résonances ? Alors chaque tempo est trop lent pour vous. Car la lenteur ou la rapidité sont déterminées par la complexité de ces manifestations. Fürtwängler avait cette oreille-là : mais l'oreille en soi n'est même pas essentielle, il s'agit d'une oreille spirituelle capable de percevoir ces apparitions parallèles. » .

Fürtwängler essayait d'atteindre cette dimension transcendante dans laquelle l'artiste avait puisé l' « idée » qui avait donné naissance à son œuvre et à toutes ses manifestations (rationnelles, émotives) . Il s'agissait de la retrouver par un acte de recréation lors du concert et de la partager avec le public dans un acte de « communion » . Tout cela était conçu de façon dynamique et non pas statique : l'œuvre apparaissant comme un tout organique, un être vivant. Si avec certains chefs d'orchestre, les musiciens semblent jouer de façon géniale, il se passe quelque chose de tout à fait différent avec Fürtwängler : les musiciens et le chef d'orchestre disparaissent complètement et la musique semble vivre par elle-même. Elle semble même respirer. Sergiù Celibidache et Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau ont fait référence de nombreuses fois à cette « respiration » de la musique chez Fürtwängler. Cette impression de vie est liée aux continues variations du tempo bien sûr, mais aussi, et surtout, au fait que Fürtwängler garde une parfaite Maîtrise de l' « écoute structurelle » , c'est-à-dire de sa cohérence qui en fait un tout. Un être vivant ne peut pas vivre sans cette unité, cette cohérence permanente, son « essence » d'un point de vue philosophique.

On comprend que si Fürtwängler a été admiré par les chefs d'orchestre des générations suivantes, ces derniers se sont réclamés beaucoup plus souvent d'Arturo Toscanini qui gardait le tempo indiqué au début de la partition. Car, si on commence à faire varier le tempo mais que l'on n'a pas une compréhension très profonde de l' « écoute structurelle » de l'œuvre, on ne peut faire que n'importe quoi. D'ailleurs, Fürtwängler lui-même se trompait souvent et Celibidache disait qu'il était souvent déçu par ses propres interprétations.

Un sacerdoce

Dans sa conception de l'art, Fürtwängler pouvait être considéré comme l'héritier de la tradition philosophique idéaliste de la Grèce antique, dans la lignée de laquelle la philosophie allemande et la musique Symphonique germanique se situaient. Dans ce contexte, il faut se rappeler que Fürtwängler était le fils aîné du plus grand spécialiste de la Grèce antique de son époque, l'archéologue Adolf Fürtwängler. Klaus Geitel le dit explicitement dans son histoire de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin :

« L'autorité musicale de Fürtwängler, la conscience qu'il avait de son propre charisme, son art expressif parvenu à un niveau extrêmement élevé firent de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin le vicaire terrestre de la musique Symphonique occidentale. L'idéalisme allemand y trouva, ainsi, son compte puisqu'il cultivait continuellement une telle préoccupation de grandeur. Les membres du Philharmonique de Berlin semblaient faire plus que de la musique ; ils donnaient l'impression de jouer pour exprimer une conception du monde, la « Weltanschauung » des philosophes. »

Si Fürtwängler fut considéré par certains comme le « vicaire » de la musique Symphonique germanique, il est absolument certain qu'il ne s'est jamais considéré comme tel. Fürtwängler s'est toujours considéré, avant tout, comme

un compositeur contrarié et raté. Il écrivit à son ancien précepteur, Ludwig Curtius, en 1946 : « En fait, la direction d'orchestre a été le refuge qui m'a sauvé la vie, car j'étais sur le point de périr compositeur. ». Son père et sa femme notèrent qu'il était constamment en proie à l'auto-critique.

Plusieurs anecdotes célèbres illustrent la modestie du chef d'orchestre. On lui proposa un jour de jouer au piano de Ludwig van Beethoven, il refusa se considérant indigne d'utiliser l'instrument. D'autre part, jeune, il refusa de diriger la « Missa solemnis » de Beethoven qu'il considérait, pourtant, comme le sommet de l'œuvre du compositeur. Il déclara qu'il ne l'avait pas assez bien comprise et donc qu'il n'était pas digne de la jouer bien qu'il rajouta qu'il la connaissait. Cette humilité était, probablement, nécessaire pour que son ego n'interfère pas avec l'« idée » que le compositeur s'était faite de son œuvre : Fürtwängler se considérait comme le « serviteur » de musiciens qu'il savait infiniment supérieurs à lui. Tous les musiciens qui ont connu Fürtwängler, même ceux qui comme Gregor Piatigorsky lui ont reproché d'être resté en Allemagne, sont unanimes pour dire que Fürtwängler ne fut jamais un carriériste. Il n'est pas resté en Allemagne pour sa carrière. Comme il l'a dit lui-même, s'il était allé à New York en 1936, sa carrière aurait été bien plus facile. En effet, le poste de New York était un vrai pont d'or : il aurait régné en Maître sur la vie musicale américaine et aurait été considéré jusqu'à sa mort comme un héros. Plus important, tous les musiciens qui l'ont approché déclarèrent qu'il ne vivait que pour servir la musique et que jamais il n'utilisa la musique pour le servir. C'est ce qui ressort de l'autobiographie de Gregor Piatigorsky, même si ce dernier critique les faiblesses psychologiques de Fürtwängler.

Cette recherche du spirituel est à mettre en relation directe avec l'importance considérable que Fürtwängler attachait au Finale des œuvres qu'il dirigeait, importance soulignée par de nombreux critiques surtout pour les principales Symphonies de Beethoven (la 3e, la 5e, la 7e et surtout la 9e) ainsi que pour la Passion selon Saint-Matthieu de Jean-Sébastien Bach. Toute l'interprétation devait tendre vers ce point ultime : le silence qui s'en suivait devait, lui, ouvrir sur une dimension réellement illimitée. Cela est particulièrement évident dans le Finale de la 9e de 1942 où Fürtwängler semble donner la clef de la plus grande de toutes les Symphonies. On a souvent dit, en effet, que Beethoven n'avait pas su comment finir cette Symphonie. Dans la version de 1942, l'impression de transcendance est telle, au moment où la musique s'arrête, que Fürtwängler nous montre que si cette Symphonie semble ne pas avoir été finie c'est que, justement, elle s'ouvre sur l'« Infini ». Elisabeth Fürtwängler rapporta, à ce propos, qu'à la fin de la « Marcia funebre » (le 2e mouvement de la 3e Symphonie de Beethoven), Fürtwängler s'arrêtait et faisait une longue pause. Elle regrette que l'on ne puisse plus revivre l'impression que produisait ce silence. Le son ne semblait avoir été là que pour « souligner l'infinité du silence », pour reprendre une expression commune à de nombreux mystiques.

L'importance de la dimension spirituelle chez Fürtwängler explique aussi pourquoi Anton Bruckner joua un rôle très important dans sa vie : il dirigea la 9e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner, même durant son tout 1er concert, en 1906. Dans son texte sur Bruckner, daté de 1939, Fürtwängler compara la vie du compositeur à celle des plus grands mystiques comme Maître Eckhart ou Jakob Böhme. Fürtwängler déclara : « Il ne travaillait pas pour le présent ; dans sa créativité artistique, il ne pensait qu'à l'éternité et il œuvrait pour l'éternité. ». Fürtwängler fut l'interprète privilégié de l'Adagio des Symphonies de Bruckner où la dimension spirituelle est particulièrement marquée.

La musique comme « catharsis »

Si Furtwängler fut un chef d'orchestre « Romantique » en raison de l'importance considérable qu'il accordait à l'émotivité et à l'expressivité, il fut tout autant un chef d'orchestre « Classique » par sa compréhension profonde de la structure formelle des œuvres. S'il sait conjuguer les dimensions dionysiaques et apolliniennes de l'art, il dépasse ces plans par sa capacité à atteindre le spirituel. Beethoven est le musicien par excellence qui synthétise tous ces aspects. Furtwängler déclara, en effet, en 1951 : « Dans la musique, derrière les rythmes non-rationnels, il y a l'« ivresse » primitive définitivement rebelle à toute articulation ; derrière l'articulation rationnelle, il y a la « forme » qui, de son côté, a la volonté et la force d'absorber et d'ordonner toute vie, et donc finalement l'ivresse elle-même ! C'est Nietzsche qui a, pour la 1^{re} fois, formulé de façon grandiose cette dualité grâce aux concepts de Dionysiaque et d'Apollinien. Mais pour nous, aujourd'hui, qui considérons la musique de Beethoven, il s'agit de nous rendre compte que ces 2 éléments ne sont pas contradictoires ; ou, plutôt, qu'ils ne doivent pas l'être nécessairement. Cela semble être la tâche de l'art, de l'art au sens de Beethoven de les concilier. » .

Tous les aspects du psychisme humain (pensée rationnelle, sensations, émotions) qui sont normalement désunis et en conflit les uns avec les autres sont unifiés dans une dimension transcendante par Beethoven. Furtwängler écrivit, en effet, en 1942 : « Beethoven renferme en lui-même toute la nature de l'homme. Il n'est pas essentiellement chantant comme Mozart, il n'a pas l'élan architectural de Bach, ni le sensualisme dramatique de Wagner. Il unit tout cela en lui, chaque chose étant à sa place : là est l'essence de son originalité. Jamais un musicien n'a mieux ressenti et exprimé l'harmonie des sphères, le chant de la Nature Divine. » .

Cela explique pourquoi la musique et surtout celle de Beethoven a pu lui servir de refuge intérieur pendant la période Nazie. L'âme anxieuse de l'homme moderne, perdue dans un monde hostile, peut, grâce à la musique, rentrer en contact avec une réalité supérieure qui lui permet de sortir de son isolement et de son fractionnement. Furtwängler déclara, en effet, en 1951 : « Ainsi la musique de Beethoven reste pour nous un grand exemple d'accord unanime où se rejoignent toutes les tendances, un exemple d'harmonie entre la langue de l'âme, entre l'architecture musicale et le déroulement d'un drame enraciné dans la vie psychique, mais surtout entre le Moi et l'Humanité, entre l'âme anxieuse de l'individu isolé, et la communauté dans son universalité. Les paroles de Schiller : « Frères, au-dessus de la voûte des étoiles doit régner un père aimant. » , que Beethoven a proclamées avec une clarté divinatoire dans le message de sa dernière Symphonie n'étaient pas dans sa bouche paroles de prédicateur ou de démagogue ; c'est ce que lui-même a vécu concrètement tout au long de sa vie, depuis le début de son activité artistique. » .

Dans les « Entretiens sur la musique » réalisés avec Walter Abendroth, Furtwängler souligna longuement la dimension spirituelle de l'art de Beethoven. Ce dernier détruit, dans un 1^{er} temps, le psychisme de l'auditeur mais c'est dans le sens d'une catharsis au sens aristotélicien du terme. C'est-à-dire, qu'au lieu de laisser l'individu déstructuré, Beethoven « rassemble ce qui est éparé » pour réunir le psychisme sur un plan supérieur « non-duel » où les oppositions sont surmontées : « C'est à partir de Beethoven que la musique sera à même d'exprimer, dans l'ordre de l'art, ce qui, dans l'ordre de la nature, prend la forme de la catastrophe qui n'est qu'une autre forme de la nature. La musique accède maintenant au dramatique car la catastrophe, destruction des forces qui s'entrechoquent, exalte l'âme, donnant le sens de la catharsis et après la catastrophe l'harmonie est reconquise sur un plan supérieur. Beethoven possède, au plus

haut degré, le sens des contrastes qui, par leur synthèse, amènent l'unité supérieure et c'est cette hantise de la synthèse qui engendre la diversité inouïe de Beethoven qui recherche délibérément des contrastes semblant inconciliables, en déchaînant dans toute leur véhémence Beethovénienne, les forces tragiques et dionysiaques de la musique. » .

La 9e Symphonie de Beethoven et la culture européenne

Fürtwängler s'identifia toujours à la 9e Symphonie. La plupart des critiques considèrent, encore aujourd'hui, qu'il est le plus grand interprète de cette œuvre. Fürtwängler ne dirigeait cette Symphonie que dans certaines circonstances jugées importantes et l'interprétation de cette œuvre devenait, sous ses mains, un acte quasi-religieux. Il déclara : « La 9e Symphonie est assurément l'aboutissement et le couronnement des Symphonies de Beethoven. Contrairement à ce que pensait Wagner, elle n'est aucunement la fin de la production Symphonique, comme le développement ultérieur de la Symphonie l'a montré. » . Fürtwängler s'opposait à l'idée de Wagner selon laquelle cette Symphonie aurait été la fin de la production Symphonique. De plus, par sa profonde compréhension de l'œuvre qu'il avait acquise grâce à Schenker, il montrait clairement dans ses interprétations le « lien de filiation » de la 9e avec les grandes compositions Symphoniques ultérieures. Le musicologue Harry Halbreich écrivit, en effet, à propos de l'interprétation de cette Symphonie, que « Fürtwängler a toujours marqué le fossé séparant la 9e des autres Symphonies et n'hésitait pas à la projeter dans l'avenir de la Musique. Les morceaux les plus lourds d'avenir de l'œuvre sont le 1er mouvement et surtout l'Adagio. Cet avenir s'appelle Anton Bruckner, dans le 1er cas (9e Symphonie de Bruckner) , et Gustav Mahler, dans le second (3e et 4e Symphonies de Mahler) . » .

Pour Fürtwängler, Beethoven était le compositeur de la musique pure par excellence. De la musique pure dans le sens d'une musique qui s'exprime indépendamment de tout contenu explicite. Même dans l' « Hymne à la Joie » , Beethoven ne cherche pas à accompagner l'idée de joie comme on le ferait dans une musique à programme mais de la traduire directement sous forme de son. Fürtwängler déclara, en effet : « Beethoven n'a jamais songé à écrire une œuvre d'inspiration populaire. S'il était quelqu'un qui avait une véritable personnalité, c'était bien Beethoven. Mais il était conscient de la valeur que prenait pour lui, dans son isolement, son interprétation dans la grande confraternité humaine et c'est précisément pour se délivrer de cet isolement qu'il eut recours à l'union spirituelle qui le liait aux autres hommes. C'est dans la recherche de l'humain que se révèle le véritable Beethoven que nous vénérons comme un Saint. Comme le montre l'analyse de l'œuvre, la 9e Symphonie est constamment une œuvre de musique pure. » . Plus précisément, il dit : « Si Beethoven fut amené à utiliser la voix humaine, il le fut par des considérations purement musicales, parce que les 3 1ers mouvements avaient en quelque sorte préparé le terrain. La voix humaine n'est que le timbre qui vient fournir son instrumentation à cette mélodie parfaite. Dans toute l'histoire de la Musique, je ne vois guère d'exemple montrant plus clairement jusqu'où peut aller l'autonomie formelle de la musique pure. Ce qui informe ce Finale, ce n'est pas l'idée de célébrer la joie, mais la puissante imagination musicale de Beethoven capable de métamorphoser cette idée en musique. » .

Le chef d'orchestre voyait en cette Symphonie le sommet le plus élevé de la civilisation européenne, le symbole de cette culture. Il écrivit, semblant même anticiper son utilisation comme hymne de l'Union européenne : « Autant que je sache, la 9e ne fut exécutée qu'une seule fois du vivant de Beethoven et ce n'est qu'avec un certain recul du temps

qu'on a pu saisir quels problèmes cette œuvre nouvelle posait aux exécutants. Son exécution par Richard Wagner fut un évènement décisif et il ne faut pas oublier que la tradition n'a de sens que si elle reste vivante et se renouvelle. On ne peut conserver en vase clos des œuvres telles que les Symphonies de Beethoven car, comme toute œuvre d'art, celles-ci deviennent lettre morte là où la confraternité humaine à laquelle elles s'adressent, aurait cessé d'exister. Une musique représentative du génie européen n'existera qu'autant que l'Europe elle-même sera réalité. » .

Comme le souligne Pierre Brunel dans sa post-face de « Carnets 1924-1954 » , Fürtwängler n'était pas seulement un porte-parole de la culture germanique, il était aussi un homme profondément européen comme Gœthe et Beethoven. Européen, il l'était par sa culture : il adorait l'Italie, son attachement à la France était sincère, il se passionnait depuis l'enfance pour la littérature anglaise, la Grèce antique dont son père fut le plus grand spécialiste de son temps demeura toujours sa référence. Mais, plus important, Fürtwängler était européen dans sa conception de l'art occidental comme un moyen de dépasser les conflits entre les peuples du vieux continent, dont il fut le témoin tragique. Comme son ami de toujours, Yehudi Menuhin, il concevait l'art avant tout comme un acte de réconciliation, de paix et de communion. Son attachement à la culture européenne était tel que Pierre Brunel conclut « Carnets 1924-1954 » par ces mots : « Se souvenant de ce que le Maître a dit de Wagner, de Beethoven et de Michel-Ange, il ne peut s'empêcher de se demander et de demander au lecteur de ces pages si Wilhelm Fürtwängler n'a pas été un de ces hommes « qui appartiennent au destin de l'Occident » . » .

Fürtwängler et Jean-Sébastien Bach

Contrairement à ce que l'on pourrait facilement penser, Fürtwängler ne considérait pas que Ludwig van Beethoven était le plus grand compositeur du monde occidental. Il plaçait Jean-Sébastien Bach encore plus haut. Il écrivit en 1951 : « Aujourd'hui comme autrefois, Bach est le Saint qui trône, inaccessible, au-dessus des nuages. » . Il expliqua également : « Bach fut le plus grand des musiciens, l'Homère de la musique, dont la lumière resplendit au ciel de l'Europe musicale et, qu'en un sens, nous n'avons toujours pas dépassé. » .

Fürtwängler déclara, à plusieurs reprises, que la Passion selon Saint-Matthieu de Bach était, de très loin, la plus grande œuvre jamais composée. Il fut bouleversé en l'entendant pour la 1^{re} fois alors qu'il n'avait que 12 ans. Il n'existe que peu d'enregistrements de Bach par Fürtwängler et souvent dans un très mauvais état. Pourtant, Fürtwängler l'a souvent dirigé. Il semble qu'Adolf Hitler n'aimait pas ce compositeur et que, durant la période Nazie, les concerts de Bach n'ont pas été enregistrés pour cette raison.

3 enregistrements de la Passion selon Saint-Matthieu nous sont cependant parvenus. Le 1^{er}, celui de 1950, à Buenos Aires est dans un état catastrophique, ce qui est d'autant plus regrettable que l'interprétation semble du plus haut niveau. On y entend de façon à peu près audible tous les airs de la 2^e partie et le Finale. Le 2^e est le plus important : c'est l'enregistrement de Vienne en 1952. Malgré quelques accidents de concert et quelques saturations dans les chœurs, la bande sonore est bien meilleure que dans l'enregistrement de 1950. La valeur intrinsèque de l'œuvre et la qualité de l'interprétation particulièrement élevée rendent absolument catastrophique que seule la 1^{re} moitié du concert ait été conservée. Le dernier enregistrement, celui de 1954 avec l'Orchestre de Vienne, est le seul à être en parfait état. Malheureusement, la qualité de l'interprétation (à l'exception du Finale et des interventions de

Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau) est bien inférieure aux 2 Ires. Toujours est-il que le Finale des versions de 1954 et 1950 et la version de 1952 sont du même niveau que les plus grands enregistrements de Beethoven par Fürtwängler.

Critique

Après la guerre, et pendant une assez longue période, une partie de la critique britannique et américaine n'apprécia pas le style de direction de Fürtwängler. Ils prétendaient que Fürtwängler, par sa « subjectivité », déformait les œuvres et brisait leur unité formelle, mettant en avant des chefs d'orchestre de 1er plan comme Arturo Toscanini ou Otto Klemperer jugés plus « objectifs ». Ce qu'ils appelaient la « subjectivité » de Fürtwängler était, en fait, l'apogée et la synthèse de la plus grande tradition allemande de direction orchestrale (Richard Wagner, Hans von Bülow et Arthur Nikisch), le tout couronné par les théories du grand musicologue Heinrich Schenker qui portaient précisément sur une compréhension très profonde de l'unité des œuvres Symphoniques. Ce « malentendu » a plusieurs explications.

Premièrement, les relations de Fürtwängler avec les États-Unis ont toujours posé problème : elles ont été étudiées en détail par D. Gillis. Fürtwängler a réalisé une série de tournées en Amérique du Nord durant les années 1925-1927 qui furent un grand succès auprès du public mais pas du tout auprès de la critique. En fait, une vraie cabale avait été organisée par une partie du monde musical contre Fürtwängler : de nombreux critiques s'étaient donné le mot d'ordre d'attaquer, sans concession, le chef d'orchestre allemand. Les raisons de cette cabale n'avaient rien de politique et ne concernaient pas le contenu réel de l'art de Fürtwängler. Cette cabale provenait de la peur de la concurrence gigantesque que représentait la personnalité de Fürtwängler. Ce dernier aurait dû essayer d'être accepté par ce monde musical très fermé mais, comme l'expliqua sa femme, Fürtwängler n'avait aucun goût pour les mondanités et les intrigues. Comme souvent, il préféra se dérober et ce qui explique probablement pourquoi il ne retourna pas aux États-Unis entre 1927 et 1933. En 1936, il accepta le poste à New York que lui proposait Arturo Toscanini mais la fausse annonce d'Hermann Göring déclencha un immense tollé qui l'en dissuada. Les historiens ont montré que ce sont les mêmes milieux musicaux qui, en 1925-1927, amplifièrent le « tollé » en question, toujours pour empêcher la venue du chef d'orchestre allemand, surtout à un poste aussi prestigieux que celui de directeur musical de l'Orchestre philharmonique de New York. Fürtwängler faillit revenir en 1949 mais un « boycott » fut organisé contre sa venue (en 1948). En 1949, l'aspect politique était plus important : la guerre n'était finie que depuis 4 ans et Fürtwängler n'avait retrouvé son poste que depuis 1947. Mais, comme l'a dit à de nombreuses reprises Yehudi Menuhin, la vraie raison était toujours la volonté d'empêcher la venue du chef allemand en raison de son poids artistique écrasant. La tournée prévue pour 1955 bénéficiait d'un fort soutien politique des gouvernements allemand et américain ce qui aurait certainement empêché toute nouvelle cabale. Cette tournée aurait, certainement, profondément changé la perception des Américains à propos de Fürtwängler, l'homme mais surtout l'interprète. Mais Fürtwängler mourut juste avant.

Deuxièmement, les théories d'Heinrich Schenker étaient probablement peu connues. Elles font souvent aujourd'hui autorité dans les universités américaines pour l'interprétation des Symphonies. Mais il fallut probablement beaucoup de temps aux critiques pour les assimiler et surtout pour réaliser que l'art de Fürtwängler se basait en grande partie sur les théories de Schenker. Comme l'a expliqué Elisabeth Fürtwängler, Schenker était extrêmement critique et détectait les moindres petites erreurs dans l'interprétation des Symphonies. Or, Heinrich Schenker disait que Fürtwängler était « le

seul chef d'orchestre à avoir compris Beethoven » (ce point est d'autant plus remarquable que Schenker avait dû forcément assister à de nombreux concerts d'Arturo Toscanini, d'Arthur Nikisch et de Gustav Mahler) et il fit dans son journal personnel des compliments de la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven par Fürtwängler après avoir assisté à ses concerts. Ces compliments, venant d'un musicologue de ce niveau et aussi exigeant, prouvent que la « subjectivité » de Fürtwängler ne détruisait en aucune façon l'unité formelle des œuvres.

Troisièmement, Fürtwängler était l'héritier de la grande tradition allemande de direction orchestrale. Mais, après la guerre, les Nazis avaient rendu tout ce qui était allemand suspect. Le fait de mettre en avant des chefs d'orchestre comme Arturo Toscanini ou Otto Klemperer avait, outre leurs qualités musicales indiscutables, aussi un caractère clairement « politique ». Toscanini avait été un modèle parfait d'anti-fascisme. En particulier, il avait dirigé la première américaine de la 7e Symphonie de Dmitri Chostakovitch diffusée pendant le siège de Leningrad sur toutes les radios alliées. Ce concert eut une forte portée symbolique. Sur bien des aspects, Toscanini apparaissait comme un musicien « porte-drapeau » des forces alliées dans leur lutte contre les forces de l'axe. Or, du point de vue américain, Fürtwängler pouvait sembler jouer un rôle symétrique mais du mauvais côté, Josef Gœbbels diffusant ses enregistrements sur les radios du « Reich ». En fait, cette symétrie n'a jamais existé car Fürtwängler n'a jamais soutenu politiquement le régime hitlérien alors que Toscanini joua un rôle volontaire et actif dans la lutte politique contre le fascisme. En ce qui concerne Otto Klemperer, ce dernier avait commencé une carrière brillante jouant un rôle décisif dans la mise en valeur de la musique contemporaine mais sa carrière avait été brusquement brisée par l'arrivée des Nazis et en raison de ses origines juives. Après la guerre, il prit la direction de l'Orchestre du Philharmonia de Londres, cet Orchestre jouant, à partir de cette époque, un rôle central dans la vie musicale anglo-saxonne. De fait, certains spécialistes considèrent, qu'après la mort de Fürtwängler, c'est Otto Klemperer avec son Orchestre du Philharmonia qui devint le plus grand interprète au monde de la musique Symphonique germanique.

Mais la tradition dans laquelle s'enracinait Fürtwängler était beaucoup trop profonde et ces critiques finirent par disparaître complètement. Ainsi, la « BBC » a consacré une série d'émissions à Fürtwängler, en 2004, où les critiques parlaient « du plus grand chef d'orchestre de tous les temps » (« The greatest conductor of all time. ») .

On parle aujourd'hui encore de tradition « subjective » pour l'art de Fürtwängler, non plus dans un sens péjoratif mais dans le sens d'une interprétation qui se place dans la longue tradition germanique et qui tient compte de l'exégèse des œuvres par les musicologues, par opposition à la tradition « objective » de Toscanini qui préconisait une relation directe avec la partition. L'enracinement de l'art de Fürtwängler au cœur même de la tradition qui a donné naissance à la musique Symphonique explique qu'Alain Pâris ait pu écrire dans l' « Encyclopædia Universalis » :

« Dans le monde de la direction d'orchestre, Wilhelm Fürtwängler fait figure d'exception : plus d'un siècle après sa naissance, il est le seul chef dont les témoignages sonores n'ont connu aucune éclipse, continuant à susciter l'admiration ou à provoquer la discussion. Il reste celui dont Fred Goldbeck a dit qu'il était « l'art de diriger fait homme » . » .

« Musik ist nicht ein Ablaufen von Tonfolgen sondern ein Ringen von Kräften. » : La musique n'est pas une suite de sons mais une lutte entre des forces. (Wilhelm Fürtwängler)

« Fürtwängler avait une nature contradictoire. Il était ambitieux et jaloux, généreux et vaniteux, un lâche et un héros, fort et faible, un enfant et un sage, très allemand et homme du monde. En musique, il était unique et sans partage. » (Gregor Piatigorsky, violoncelliste. Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1965.)

Le 23 janvier 1886, au 25 de la Maassenstraße de Berlin naquit, de Adolf Fürtwängler (1851-1907), archéologue réputé et de sa femme Adelheid, née Wendt, un fils prénommé Gustav Heinrich Ernst Martin Wilhelm et qui fut baptisé dans la foi luthérienne. 3 autres enfants naquirent de cette union : Walter, Märit et Annele. La famille Fürtwängler était originaire du cœur de la Forêt noire alors que les Wendt étaient des allemands du Nord (Adelheid était une grande amie d'une fille de Johannes Brahms). Les 2 familles étaient musiciennes et la mère de Fürtwängler était aussi un peintre de talent qui fit de nombreux portraits de ses enfants.

Le père détestait l'atmosphère des grandes villes et chercha toujours à se rapprocher de la nature. C'est ainsi qu'en 1894, la famille habita Schwabing (banlieue de Munich) et plus tard, acquit une maison, baptisée « Tanneck » (au coin du sapin), située sur une péninsule du lac Tegernsee, près de Bad Wiessee. Là, les enfants pouvaient se consacrer à la natation et à toutes sortes de jeux et de sports. Dans sa prime jeunesse, Fürtwängler fut un solitaire et un introverti dont toutes les pensées étaient concentrées sur la musique et les valeurs artistiques, la littérature et la philosophie. Durant toute sa vie, il resta un ardent sportif, aimant pratiquer le cheval, la natation, le tennis, le patinage et les escalades en montagne.

À l'âge de 6 ans, Fürtwängler commença des études à Munich mais il fut un mauvais élève, non pas en raison d'une incapacité intellectuelle mais parce qu'il trouvait qu'il perdait son temps et qu'il avait mieux à faire avec ses choix artistiques. L'année suivante, il demanda à sa mère de lui apprendre le piano et les principes de l'écriture musicale. Le 30 juin 1893, il composa sa 1^{re} œuvre, « Ein Stückchen von den Tieren ». Le père qui avait un dédain prononcé pour le système éducatif et ses professeurs, sortit son fils de la routine scolaire et se mit à la recherche d'un précepteur : ce furent Ludwig Curtius et Walter Riezler, remarquables tous les 2 mais très opposés dans leurs mentalités. À l'âge de 7 ans, Fürtwängler décida de devenir compositeur (il restera toute sa vie un auteur frustré) et, à 12 ans, entendit pour la 1^{re} fois la « Passion selon Saint Matthieu » de Bach qui l'émut profondément. Peu après eut lieu le choc de la découverte de Beethoven : la rencontre Fürtwängler - Beethoven restera pour longtemps l'exemple d'une convergence d'esprit rare entre un compositeur et un interprète et l'œuvre de Beethoven aura été pour Fürtwängler la consécration de toute une vie. Son approche de l'univers beethovénien dépasse les limites esthétiques de l'époque : le Beethoven de Fürtwängler est intemporel.

En septembre 1901, le père emmena son fils à Egine, en Grèce. Wilhelm avait dans ses poches les poèmes de Goethe et les Quatuors de Beethoven. Fürtwängler ne fut jamais élève d'un quelconque Conservatoire et c'est sa mère qui lui donna ses 1^{res} leçons de piano, bientôt suivies par la tante Minna, excellente professeur de piano. Son 1^{er} véritable précepteur en matière musicale fut l'organiste et compositeur Anton Beer-Walbrunn (1864-1929) (dont Fürtwängler dirigea sa « Sinfonia » le 24 février 1912, à Lübeck) qui reconnut rapidement les talents extraordinairement précoces

de son élève et qui le recommanda à son propre professeur, Joseph Rheinberger (1839-1901), à l'époque directeur du Conservatoire de Munich. Rheinberger étant un réactionnaire pour qui toute la musique s'arrêtait à Beethoven, Fürtwängler chercha un autre précepteur qui serait à même de lui faire découvrir le chemin menant à Wagner et au Romantisme allemand au tournant du siècle : ce fut Max von Schillings (1868-1933), compositeur et chef d'orchestre avec qui Fürtwängler étudia en 1902-1903.

1905 est certainement l'année charnière de la vie de Fürtwängler. Il avait 19 ans et savait comment il voulait façonner son avenir. D'un autre côté, il avait une claire vision de ce qui lui restait à apprendre et ressentait le besoin de pratique dans les domaines de l'Opéra et des concerts, choses qu'il ignorait totalement. Grâce à un cousin de sa mère, le chef d'orchestre Georg Dohrn qui avait en charge toute l'activité musicale de Breslau, il devint répétiteur au Théâtre municipal pour la saison 1905-1906. Ce travail n'était pas vraiment enthousiasmant car il devait seulement faire répéter le chœur et les chanteurs mais chacun remarqua sa capacité impressionnante à déchiffrer à vue les plus difficiles réductions pour piano des partitions d'Opéra. C'est à Breslau que sa 1^{re} composition pour orchestre (une Symphonie) fut jouée. Le concert ressembla à un désastre car public et critiques condamnèrent cette œuvre, ce qui affecta profondément le père et son fils. Fürtwängler décida que le meilleur moyen de tirer profit du désastre était de diriger lui-même un concert.

Si Adolphe était un archéologue célèbre, il n'était pas riche, mais dans ses relations se trouvait Franz Kaim qui avait créé son propre orchestre qui portait son nom. C'est ainsi que, le 19 février 1906, Fürtwängler dirigea à Munich son 1^{er} concert dont le programme comportait : la « Consécration de la maison » de Beethoven, un Poème symphonique en si mineur de sa composition et, en seconde partie, rien moins que la 9^e Symphonie de Bruckner. Le « Bayerische Kurier » du 23 janvier écrivit :

« Naturellement, on peut penser que ce programme a été adapté au public actuel après avoir entendu le concert de ce très jeune chef, Wilhelm Fürtwängler, qui choisit comme 1^{re} victime la 9^e de Bruckner. Talentueux ? Assurément, mais il n'y a aucune raison à débiter au top niveau si l'on est toujours en lutte avec sa propre gestique de débutant. Si l'introduction de l'Ouverture de Beethoven fut acceptable malgré l'énorme énergie déployée, le Bruckner donna une impression grise et froide. Le Scherzo en souffrit le plus et il sonna comme un voyage au milieu de dangereux récifs après des jours de pluie incessante. Heureusement, son propre Poème symphonique sembla prometteur mais, très vite, il se transforma en quelque chose de vide et d'informe où on pouvait constater comment de petits thèmes étaient soumis à des tortures harmoniques. Le public surprit totalement par ses applaudissements répétés. »

Fürtwängler écrivit à son mentor Curtius :

« La direction d'orchestre a été le refuge qui m'a sauvé la vie car j'étais sur le point de périr compositeur. Toute ma vie, je me suis considéré comme un compositeur qui dirige mais jamais comme un chef qui compose. »

Wilhelm Fürtwängler souffrit d'un mal commun à de nombreux post-Romantiques : l'enflure, la démesure, mais chez lui la nécessité musicale était totalement sincère. Si certaines œuvres de jeunesse ne dépassent pas une honnête moyenne, certains voient dans le « Te Deum », un chef-d'œuvre méconnu. Quoi qu'il en soit, Fürtwängler n'est pas passé à la

postérité par ses compositions mais il aura au moins été un créateur sincère d'où le talent, à défaut de génie, n'est pas absent.

Après ce 1er concert, Wilhelm Fürtwängler entra au Théâtre de Zürich pour la saison 1906-1907. Le directeur l'autorisa à diriger quelques opérettes, en particulier « la Veuve joyeuse » qui était à l'affiche cette saison-là. Il en dirigera 9 représentations, entre le 3 février et le 21 avril 1907. Il avait dirigé comme 1re œuvre, le 10 octobre, le ballet « Tanzbilder » et, le 31 du mois, « das Fest auf Sollhaug » de Hans Pfitzner, puis 10 représentations de « Rübezahl » sur une musique de Bertrand Sängler. L'étape suivante se situa à Munich où il devint répétiteur à l'Opéra sous la direction de Felix Mottl, durant 2 saisons (1907-1909) . Puis, il fut engagé comme 3e chef à l'Opéra de Strasbourg. Le 8 septembre 1910, il quitta Munich et séjourna à Strasbourg jusqu'au 1er avril 1911. L'activité musicale de la ville (allemande à cette époque) était entièrement sous la coupe du compositeur-chef d'orchestre Hans Pfitzner et de ses 2 assistants, Richard Fried et Hermann Büchel. Fürtwängler dirigea 16 fois, jouant 6 œuvres qu'il n'inscrira plus à ses programmes par la suite : « Martha » de Friedrich von Flotow, « l'Élixir d'Amour » de Gaetano Donizetti, « les Dragons » de Villars de Maillart, « les P'tites Michus » d'André Messager, « Flotte Bursche » de Franz von Suppé et une unique représentation de « Rigoletto » de Giuseppe Verdi (11 mars 1911) . Les critiques de la presse furent très controversées : l'une parla de sa direction des « P'tites Michus » comme étant d'une « légèreté éléphantinesque » , l'autre affirma que son interprétation de « Martha » laissa beaucoup à désirer ... Il lui fallut aussi se déguiser en tzigane avec une barbe noire collée sur le visage pour jouer du piano dans la « Chauve Souris » de Johann Strauß, lors de la fête chez le prince Orłowsky, ce qui l'amusa beaucoup. Ceci se passa les 27 et 28 février 1911.

C'est durant son séjour à Strasbourg qu'il fit la connaissance de Bruno Walter qui, le 22 février 1911, dirigea la création d'une Symphonie de sa composition. Fürtwängler reviendra à Strasbourg, le 6 décembre de la même année, pour diriger son « Te Deum » qui avait été créé à Breslau en novembre 1910 par Georg Dohrn et qu'il avait commencé à écrire lors de son séjour à Florence. La critique du « Allgemeine Musik Zeitung » avait été très négative, affirmant que : « Fürtwängler avait fait preuve de bonne volonté et uniquement de cela. » . De son côté, le « Schlesische Zeitung » écrivit : « Il se peut que des motivations personnelles aient été à l'origine de la création du « Te Deum » de Fürtwängler ; quant aux motivations musicales, il n'en existe aucune. » .

Une amie de la mère de Fürtwängler, Ida Boy-Ed, informa le jeune musicien que le poste de chef d'orchestre à Lübeck était devenu vacant depuis le départ de Hermann Abendroth pour Essen. Cependant, cette information atteignit trop tard Fürtwängler car la Société des Amis de la Musique (« Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde ») avait déjà choisi 4 candidats (Paul Scheinpflug, Karl Mennicke, Walter Unger et Rudolf Siegel) parmi les 97 postulants et chacun d'entre eux avait déjà dirigé son concert à titre de test. Tout semblait indiquer que le vainqueur de la compétition était Rudolf Siegel. Néanmoins, après le retrait de Paul Scheinpflug, la Société décida de choisir un 4e candidat et Madame Boy-Ed demanda à Fürtwängler de poser d'urgence sa candidature qui fut acceptée par les autorités musicales et par Abendroth. C'est ainsi qu'il dirigea, le 5 avril 1911, son concert probatoire (devant plus de 4,000 personnes !) . Il fallut peu de temps au public et aux membres de la Société pour être captivés par la passion qui émanait du jeune candidat, en dépit de sa grande différence avec Abendroth dont la virilité, l'assurance et l'économie de moyens avaient été appréciées. Fürtwängler, avec ses gestes nerveux et parfois excités, était à l'opposé et, sur le podium, il semblait

combattre un ennemi invisible mais le public reconnut très vite en lui d'exceptionnelles capacités. Le 13 avril, il fut choisi à l'unanimité comme successeur d'Abendroth.

Le chef de la Société des Amis de la Musique ne dirigeait que les concerts, c'est-à-dire les 8 concerts symphoniques de chaque saison, plus 2 concerts avec le chœur philharmonique dédiés principalement aux Oratorios. Il y avait également les concerts populaires, au nombre d'environ 30 par saison (celle de 1905-1906 en compta exceptionnellement 56) . Les répétitions avaient lieu le mercredi soir et les membres de la Société y venaient avec leur famille et leurs amis. Fürtwängler n'était pas très enchanté par ces concerts qui se tenaient dans la salle du « Kolosseum » et qui étaient structurés de la manière suivante : une 1re partie symphonique où il était interdit de fumer mais où les gens buvaient de la bière, une seconde partie dédiée à des œuvres légères (fantaisies pour orchestre, etc.) et une 3e consacrée à des œuvres populaires (marches, etc.) . On peut affirmer que les 32 concerts symphoniques, les 104 concerts populaires et les 9 exécutions chorales représentent l'apprentissage de Fürtwängler. En tant que chef invité, il dirigea également 3 opéras : « Fidelio » (23.03.1915) , « les Joyeuses commères de Windsor » (16.04.1915) et les « Meistersinger von Nürnberg » (20.11.1913) . Les critiques musicaux de la capitale hanséatique saisirent rapidement la personnalité de Fürtwängler On put ainsi lire dans le « Eisenbahnzeitung » : « Fürtwängler est un talent musical qui, si les circonstances sont favorables, deviendra sans aucun doute un génie. » . Quant à Ida Boy-Ed, elle couvrit d'éloges son protégé.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler alla souvent à Hambourg en compagnie de son amie Lilly Dieckmann pour assister aux concerts de Arthur Nikisch qui était pour lui le « roi » des chefs d'orchestre (il fera officiellement sa connaissance en février 1912) . Au cours de son séjour à Lübeck, il donna son 1er concert en dehors de l'Allemagne, le 26 janvier 1913, à Vienne. Il donna également, avec le 1er violon de l'Orchestre Szanto, des soirées de musique de chambre dont un cycle de Sonates de Beethoven. Durant la dernière saison, il joua la partie de piano du Triple Concerto de Beethoven (3 février 1915) et celle du 5e Concerto brandebourgeois de Bach (2 janvier 1915) . Son successeur à Lübeck sera Georg Göhler.

Pour ce qui concerne la « montée en pression » de son répertoire, Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirigea à Lübeck toutes les Symphonies de Beethoven (sauf la seconde) , les 4e, 5e et 6e de Tchaïkovski, les 39e et 40e de Mozart, les 1re, 2e et 4e de Brahms, les 7e et 9e de Franz Schubert, le Concerto pour violon de Brahms, les 4e, 7e et 8e de Anton Bruckner, les « Kindertotenlieder » de Gustav Mahler, la Suite romantique de Max Reger, « l'Apprenti sorcier » de Paul Dukas, la « Sinfonia domestica » de Richard Strauß, la « Faust-Symphonie » de Franz Liszt, le 2e Concerto pour piano de Brahms, la 1re de Robert Schumann. Quant au programme des concerts populaires, on y trouve des œuvres de Jacques Offenbach (« les Contes d'Hoffmann ») Gilbert and Sullivan (« le Mikado ») , Georges Bizet (« l'Arlésienne » , « Carmen ») , Léo Delibes (« Sylvia » , « Coppelia ») , Charles Gounod (ballet de « Faust ») , Jean Sibelius (« Valse triste ») , Edvard Grieg (« Peer Gynt ») des valse de Johann Strauß et Émile Waldteufel et quantité de pots-pourris.

Au début de 1915, le « Kapellmeister » de Mannheim, Artur Bodanzky, décida de partir pour l'Amérique. Le choix de son successeur s'avéra des plus difficiles et les plus fameux chefs de l'époque posèrent leur candidature. Le public de Mannheim aurait aimé avoir Arthur Nikisch. A l'opposé de Lübeck, la principale activité musicale de Mannheim concernait l'Opéra, le 1er chef ayant en charge les représentations d'Opéra et seulement 8 concerts annuels de

l'Académie de musique. Un comité de 5 membres se rendit à Lübeck, le 23 mars 1915, pour assister à la représentation de « Fidelio » dirigée par Fürtwängler. Ils furent tellement impressionnés qu'ils décidèrent de l'appeler au poste de « Kapellmeister » à Mannheim qui hérita ainsi d'un chef jeune et quasiment inconnu. La ville accueillit Fürtwängler avec enthousiasme et sa future secrétaire Bertha Geißmar écrivit dans ses Mémoires :

« Les citoyens de Mannheim avaient l'habitude de considérer leur " Kapellmeister " comme un demi-dieu dont les faits et gestes étaient le sujet de conversation du jour. Fürtwängler qui était timide, trouvait cette popularité très pénible et avait l'habitude de se cacher dans le dos de Oskar Grohé, qui avait pris le jeune débutant sous son aile protectrice. »

Wilhelm Fürtwängler était assisté par Felix Lederer qui dirigeait les premières des Opéras italiens et du « Rosenkavalier » (à la différence de Karl Böhm, Clemens Krauß et Hans Knappertsbusch, il ne trouvait pas cette œuvre à son goût et ne la dirigea jamais) . Il joua des Opéras depuis longtemps écartés du répertoire, tels « Violanta » d'Erich Korngold, « Monna Lisa » de Max von Schillings, « Shéhérazade » de Bernhard Sekles, « Klein Idas Blumen » de Paul von Klenau. « Fidelio » de Beethoven fut le 1er Opéra qu'il dirigea à Mannheim, le 7 septembre 1915, dans une interprétation très appréciée, en particulier l'Ouverture Leonore III. Il dirigea 232 représentations de 39 Opéras. Dans le répertoire symphonique, il joua pour la 1re fois la Symphonie fantastique de Berlioz (1 février 1916) , le 1er Concerto pour piano de Brahms avec Artur Schnabel, la « Symphonie alpestre » de Richard Strauß, « le Chant de la terre » de Gustav Mahler (21 novembre 1916) , la 4e de Schumann, la 4e de Mahler (28 janvier 1919) , « la Nuit transfigurée » d'Arnold Schœnberg (18 février 1919) , la 5e d'Anton Bruckner (9 décembre 1919) , « Pelléas et Mélisande » de Schœnberg (2 mars 1921) .

Durant son séjour à Mannheim commença véritablement sa carrière de chef-invité et de chef-itinérant. Ainsi, en septembre 1917, il fut invité au « Kurhaus » de Baden-Baden pour diriger le « Ring » puis, le 14 décembre, il se trouva pour la 1re fois à la tête du Philharmonique de Berlin : les critiques furent stupéfiés et l'un d'entre eux évoqua même le « miracle Fürtwängler » (« das Wunder Fürtwängler ») . Le 15 novembre 1918, il dirigea pour la 1re fois les concerts de la « Frankfurter Museumsgesellschaft » et, le 30 novembre, il était à Vienne avec le « Wiener Tonkünstler Orchester » à la suite du retrait du chef Ferdinand Löwe. Toujours à Vienne, le 29 novembre 1919, il dirigea la 3e de Mahler ; le 2 avril 1920, il dirigea pour la 1re fois la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin, prenant la succession de Richard Strauß. Le 30 juin 1920, il donna son dernier concert en tant que « Kapellmeister » de Mannheim et fit ses adieux avec une représentation de « l'Enlèvement au sérail » de Mozart.

À partir de la saison 1920-1921, il fut de plus en plus sollicité à l'étranger tout en poursuivant ses concerts à Frankfurt, comme successeur de Wilhelm Mengelberg et à la « Staatskapelle » de Berlin. Ainsi, en octobre 1920, il alla à Stockholm, jouant la « Symphonie sérieuse » de Franz Berwald. Le 19 novembre, il dirigea la 2e Symphonie de Mahler au « Staatsoper » puis, en décembre, ce furent 7 concerts à Stockholm et, à la fin de la saison, il participa aux 4es « Fêtes Brahms de Wiesbaden. La saison 1921-1922 débuta par son 1er concert avec le « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig. Son activité était alors partagée entre Vienne, Frankfurt et Berlin. Le 30 novembre 1920, il dirigea sa 1re « Missa solemnis » de Beethoven, à Vienne. Arthur Nikisch mourut le 23 janvier 1922. La prédiction de Fürtwängler à Hambourg (« Je deviendrai le successeur de Nikisch. ») se trouva vérifiée : il hérita du Philharmonique de Berlin et du

« Gewandhaus » de Leipzig.

Les 6 saisons passées avec le « Gewandhaus » ne compteront pas parmi les plus heureuses de sa carrière. D'abord, l'orchestre voulait Hermann Abendroth comme « Gewandhauskapellmeister » et Fürtwängler sera nommé sur intervention de Max Brockhaus. Ensuite, ses programmes faisant la part trop belle à la musique du temps, déplaisaient au public conservateur de Leipzig qui aurait voulu, en outre, que son « Kapellmeister » demeure en permanence à Leipzig.

Le 25 mars 1922, il dirigea pour la 1re fois le Philharmonique de Vienne dans un concert célébrant le 25e anniversaire de la mort de Johannes Brahms. En avril, il fut invité par l'« Accademia Santa Cecilia » de Rome et, en mai, participa aux 5es « Fêtes Brahms » de Hambourg. Le 22 du même mois, il épousa la danoise Zitla Lund, élégante jeune femme de 3 ans son aînée : le mariage restera sans descendance et sera une erreur. En avril 1923, il partit avec le « Gewandhaus » pour une tournée en Suisse et acheva la saison par 2 concerts à la Scala de Milan. Durant l'hiver 1923, il fit l'acquisition d'un chalet à Saint-Moritz (qui est toujours la propriété de sa famille) . En janvier 1924, il se rendit en Angleterre et en avril-mai 1924 partit pour la 1re fois en tournée avec le Philharmonique de Berlin. Depuis son départ de Mannheim, il continua néanmoins à y diriger régulièrement des Opéras. En juillet 1924, il participa au Festival de Munich, dirigeant les « Noces de Figaro », « Tristan und Isolde », les « Meistersinger von Nürnberg » et « l'Enlèvement au sérail ». En janvier 1925, il franchit l'Atlantique pour sa 1re tournée américaine (10 concerts avec le New York Philharmonic) . Son activité était désormais circonscrite entre Leipzig, Berlin et Vienne. En février 1926 eut lieu la seconde tournée américaine (32 concerts) et, de retour en Europe, il entama une tournée européenne de 20 concerts avec le Philharmonique de Berlin et termina la saison par les « Fêtes Brahms » de Heidelberg. En octobre, il réalisa, à l'âge de 40 ans, ses 1ers enregistrements discographiques pour la firme Polydor (l'Ouverture du « Freischütz » de Weber et la 5e de Beethoven) .

Février 1927 : 3e et ultime tournée américaine (33 concerts) qui s'acheva par le « Requiem allemand » de Brahms, le 4 avril. Fürtwängler quitta l'Amérique, quelque peu exaspéré par la politique musicale américaine. Il fut jalouxé par ses confrères, mal reçu par la critique (surtout par Olin Downes, le critique du New York Times) mais acclamé par le public. Le 19 novembre, il dirigea le Philharmonique de Vienne en tant que directeur musical de l'Orchestre et successeur de Felix Weingartner (poste qu'il abandonna en mai 1930) . Le 29 mars 1928, il dirigea son dernier concert en tant que « Gewandhauskapellmeister » par l'exécution de la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven et la saison prit fin, après une tournée européenne du Philharmonique de Berlin, aux Festivals de Heidelberg et Görlitz.

La saison 1928-1929 fut celle où son activité de chef d'Opéra prit un nouvel essor : en effet, le 17 octobre, il dirigea pour la 1re fois à l'Opéra de Vienne (le « Rheingold ») et après les Festivals de Heidelberg et de Jena, dirigea pour la 1re fois un Opéra à Berlin, non pas au « Staatsoper unter den Linden » mais au « Schauspielhaus am Gendarmenmarkt » (« les Noces de Figaro ») . En automne, on le nomma « Directeur général de la Musique » et, en mai 1929, il fut décoré de l'ordre « pour le Mérite » .

Les tournées succédèrent aux tournées et, en avril 1930, c'est avec le Philharmonique de Vienne qu'il partit pour la 1re fois. Le 2 juin, il dirigea sa 7e et dernière « Missa solemnis » de Beethoven. (Fürtwängler en jouait la partition au

piano et considérait l'œuvre comme la plus grande création de Beethoven. Il reconnaissait néanmoins qu'il n'avait jamais réussi à exprimer totalement ce qu'elle portait en elle. Selon lui, il aurait fallu ré-instrumenter la partition et c'est pourquoi il se résolut, à regret, à ne plus la jouer.) . En juillet-août 1931, il participa pour la 1re fois au Festival de Bayreuth (avec « Tristan ») et au Mémorial Siegfried-Wagner. En 1932 tombait le 50e anniversaire du Philharmonique de Berlin : cet événement fut marqué par 4 concerts exceptionnels en avril, suivis par une grande tournée européenne de 26 concerts. À cette occasion, Paul von Hindenburg lui remit la Médaille Goethe en raison des services rendus à la musique allemande.

Les 7 et 9 juin 1932, il dirigea pour la 1re fois à l'Opéra de Paris (« Tristan » avec une distribution de rêve : Frida Leider, Lauritz Melchior, Igor Kipnis.) . Le 30 janvier 1933, Adolf Hitler arriva au pouvoir et avec lui, le harcèlement contre tout ce qui était juif. Le 11 avril, Wilhelm Fürtwängler publia dans le « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » une lettre ouverte au Ministre de la propagande, Josef Goebbels, reconnaissant uniquement une distinction entre l'art jugé « bon » et celui jugé « mauvais » . Cette lettre qui fut publiée dans la presse mondiale, eut un énorme écho et Goebbels répliqua à Fürtwängler que la politique était aussi un Art (« peut-être le plus élevé ») , que la musique ne pouvait être séparée de la politique et qu'il était nécessaire de chasser tous les éléments étrangers (sous-entendu : juifs) .

Peu après, l'exode de grands artistes allemands juifs commença : Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, Artur Schnabel, Bronisław Huberman. Fürtwängler continua de diriger au « Staatsoper » (dont Hermann Göring était le Maître absolu) des Opéras tels que « Arabella » ou « Elektra » de Richard Strauß. Lors d'une tournée du Philharmonique de Berlin, un concert « monstre » eut lieu à Mannheim, réunissant sur le podium la Philharmonie et l'Orchestre de Mannheim, soit 170 musiciens. Un « clash » se produisit, les Nazis ayant demandé à Fürtwängler qu'il se sépare de son 1er violon juif, Szymon Goldberg. Ayant refusé, il décida de ne plus revenir dans la ville. (Il n'y reviendra que 21 ans plus tard.) Il termina la saison 1932-1933 à l'Opéra de Paris (« Tristan » et « Walkyrie ») et fut nommé en juin par Göring, chef principal du « Staatsoper » de Berlin. Le même Göring le nomma « Staatsrat » (Conseiller d'État) , le 8 juillet 1933, et, le 15 septembre, Erich Kleiber dirigea une représentation de gala de « Lohengrin » en l'honneur de Fürtwängler. Il fut également nommé au poste honorifique de vice-Président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » . En août 1933, il rencontra Adolf Hitler dans son repaire de l'Obersalzberg, à Berchtesgaden, et affirma à ses proches, à son retour : « Jamais ce camelot chuintant ne jouera le moindre rôle en Allemagne. » . L'avenir allait, hélas, lui prouver le contraire.

Le 11 mars 1934, il dirigea la première de l'œuvre de Paul Hindemith, « Mathis der Maler » , et publia dans le « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , du 25 novembre, le célèbre article « der Fall Hindemith » en réponse aux attaques nazies contre le compositeur accusé d'écrire de la musique « dégénérée » . Le 25 avril, lors d'une tournée du Philharmonique de Berlin, il rencontra à Rome Benito Mussolini, ce qui mit le chef Arturo Toscanini en fureur. (« Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » du 25 novembre 1934.)

La saison 1934-1935 sera brève : après 2 « Ring » au « Staatsoper » , en octobre et novembre, et l'article sur Paul Hindemith, Fürtwängler se démit de toutes ses fonctions officielles le 4 décembre et se retira dans les Alpes bavaroises où il commença à écrire son Concerto symphonique pour piano. Son passeport lui fut retiré. Le chef Erich Kleiber

soutint son action en démissionnant lui aussi de son poste à l'Opéra d'État de Berlin (« Städtische Oper ») et prit le chemin de l'exil.

La nouvelle du départ de Wilhelm Fürtwängler fit sensation mais eut comme conséquence que les frontières de l'Allemagne lui furent fermées. Pour compliquer la situation, le Philharmonique de Berlin devait effectuer une tournée en Grande Bretagne, en janvier 1935, et Fürtwängler déclara qu'il était hors de question qu'il la dirige. On proposa à Thomas Beecham de l'assurer mais celui-ci ayant refusé, la tournée fut purement et simplement annulée. La situation devint de plus en plus pénible pour Fürtwängler qui décida de se séparer de sa secrétaire juive, Bertha Geißmar. Finalement, après une entrevue avec Josef Gœbbels, le 28 février 1935, un compromis fut trouvé et on autorisa Fürtwängler à poursuivre son activité musicale, à diriger en Allemagne sans aucun titre ni poste officiel et à laisser les questions politiques à Adolf Hitler et à ses sbires. Le « Führer » donna son accord et Fürtwängler put à nouveau voyager à sa guise. Il retrouva son orchestre, le 25 avril 1935 à Berlin, dans un programme entièrement consacré à son cher Beethoven : Adolf Hitler, Josef Gœbbels et Hermann Göring assistèrent au concert et, à la fin de celui-ci, Hitler lui serra chaleureusement la main. Fürtwängler acheva la saison par des représentations d'Opéra au Covent Garden de Londres (« Tristan ») , à l'Opéra de Paris (« Tristan » et la « Walkyrie ») , au National Theatre de Munich (« Tristan ») , à l'Opéra de Vienne (« Tristan ») et à l'Opéra de Hambourg (« Die Meistersinger ») . Hitler, Gœbbels et Joachim von Ribbentrop assistèrent à la représentation de Hambourg, le 23 juin 1935.

La saison 1935-1936 débuta à Nuremberg par les « Meistersinger » et par « Tannhäuser » , à l'Opéra de Vienne. Le 7 novembre, il dirigea « Egmont » de Beethoven au « Schauspielhaus » de Berlin, dans une mise-en-scène du célèbre acteur Gustav Gründgens (personnage controversé et opportuniste notoire) . Hitler, Göring, Gœbbels et Rudolph Heß étaient encore présents. Après une tournée du Philharmonique en novembre-décembre, il finit l'année au National Theatre de Munich (« Die Meistersinger » , le 25 décembre, et « Tristan » , le 1 janvier) . Le 27 février, il partit pour l'Égypte avec son ami John Knittel. Arrivé à Alexandrie, le 5 mars, il était de retour à Naples, le 31 mars. La saison s'acheva par des représentations d'Opéra à Paris (« Die Meistersinger ») , à Zürich (« Tristan ») , à Vienne (« Tannhäuser ») et au Festival de Bayreuth où il dirigea « Lohengrin » , « Parsifal » et le « Ring » .

En novembre 1936, le chef Thomas Beecham fit une tournée allemande avec son Orchestre londonien et demanda à Fürtwängler de partager avec lui les prochaines festivités prévues à Covent Garden, à l'occasion du couronnement du roi Georges VI. Auparavant, Fürtwängler, en accord avec Hitler, avait décidé d'annuler toute activité publique durant l'hiver 1936-1937, souhaitant passer cette période dans une paix absolue afin de se consacrer à la composition. Il retrouva son Orchestre, le 10 février 1937, à Berlin, lors d'un concert où, une fois encore, Hitler, Göring et Gœbbels étaient présents. En mars, il effectua une tournée de musique de chambre avec le violoniste Hugo Kolberg, tournée autour de laquelle il créa à Leipzig, le 4 mars, sa Sonate en ré mineur.

Après une magnifique performance de la 9e de Beethoven à Londres (25 mars) , il dirigea le « Ring » au « Staatsoper » de Berlin, effectua une courte tournée avec le Philharmonique et partit pour Londres afin de commencer les répétitions du « Ring » qui sera donné en 2 cycles. La sensation du second cycle fut la 1re apparition de Kirsten Flagstad en Brunnhilde. Puis, la saison s'acheva aux Festivals de Bayreuth (« Parsifal » , « Ring ») et Salzbourg (9e de Beethoven) . La saison 1937-1938 débuta à Paris, le 7 septembre, par la 9e de Beethoven, suivie par

2 représentations de « la Walkyrie » avec la troupe du « Staatsoper » de Berlin. Lors de la tournée du Philharmonique, il créa avec le pianiste Edwin Fischer (à qui l'œuvre est dédiée) son Concerto symphonique, le 26 octobre, à Munich. À la même époque, il enregistra pour « His Master's Voice » (HMV) quelques-uns de ses disques qui seront acclamés dans le monde entier (la 5e de Beethoven et, en 1938, la « Symphonie Pathétique » et des extraits wagnériens) . Les 22 et 23 avril 1938, Fürtwängler dirigea à Berlin le Philharmonique de Vienne (la « Symphonie inachevée » de Schubert et la 7e de Bruckner) , concerts auxquels assistèrent les inévitables Adolf Hitler et Josef Gœbbels. Il se rendit à nouveau à Covent Garden, en mai-juin, pour 2 nouveaux cycles du « Ring » et la saison s'acheva à Munich avec « Fidelio » , à l'Opéra de Paris avec « Tristan » et au Festival de Salzbourg avec « Die Meistersinger » .

Le 5 septembre, il était à Nuremberg avec le Philharmonique de Vienne (« Die Meistersinger ») . Le 20 février 1939, il fut nommé Commandeur de la Légion d'Honneur par le gouvernement français mais Adolf Hitler interdit la diffusion de cette nouvelle en Allemagne. En mai, il dirigea 2 représentations de la « Passion selon Saint-Matthieu » de Bach à Munich et Florence et acheva sa saison à l'Opéra de Zürich (« Die Meistersinger » , la « Walkyrie » et un concert à la Villa Wesendonck avec Kirsten Flagstad remplaçant Germaine Lubin) . Les représentations de « la Walkyrie » , prévues à l'Opéra de Paris en juin, furent annulées par le gouvernement français pour des raisons politiques. Après l'invasion de la Pologne par l'Allemagne, l'activité de Fürtwängler se limita à l'Autriche (annexée depuis le 13 mars 1938) et l'Allemagne. En avril 1940, il était néanmoins en Scandinavie mais le concert prévu à Copenhague, le 10 avril, fut annulé en raison de l'occupation du Danemark par les Nazis. En mai, il rencontra à Berlin celle qui deviendra sa seconde femme, Elisabeth Ackermann, mariée à un avocat qui sera tué peu de temps après en France.

Si Wilhelm Fürtwängler ne donna aucun concert en France durant la guerre et refusa de jouer dans les pays occupés par les Nazis, il dirigea pourtant dans des villes « annexées » (par exemple, Prague) . En décembre 1940, il fit une seconde tournée de concerts de musique de chambre, cette fois avec Georg Kulenkampff. Au début de mars 1941, skiant dans le « Vorarlberg » (« Sankt Anton » , en Autriche) , il fut victime d'un grave accident qui lui occasionna de nombreuses lésions et l'obligea à suspendre toute activité durant 9 mois. En février 1942, il effectua une tournée scandinave avec Berlin et, fin mars, était à Vienne pour les festivités du centenaire du Philharmonique : à cette occasion, le 28 mars, il dirigea pour l'unique fois de sa vie la 3e Symphonie de Franz Schubert. De retour à Berlin, il dirigea le 19 avril un concert pour l'anniversaire de Adolf Hitler, au cours duquel Josef Gœbbels fit un discours fleuve sur « l'œuvre gigantesque » du « Führer » .

En novembre-décembre, il se rendit de nouveau en Scandinavie où il dirigea 2 représentations de « la Walkyrie » à l'Opéra de Stockholm et un concert avec l'orchestre de Göteborg. Le 12 décembre, il dirigea « Die Meistersinger » pour la ré-ouverture du « Staatsoper » de Berlin et, en janvier 1943, donna des concerts en Suisse avec les orchestres de Winterthur, de la « Tonhalle » et de Berne. Le 2 janvier 1943, il dirigea « Tristan » au « Staatsoper » de Vienne : c'est la seule mise-en-scène qu'il réalisa pendant sa carrière. Après la tournée scandinave du Philharmonique de Vienne en mai, il épousa civilement à Potsdam Elisabeth Ackermann, le 26 juin : il avait 57 ans et sa femme 25 de moins. (Fürtwängler vivait à la Fasanerie dans le parc de Sans-Souci, à Potsdam. Ils se marièrent religieusement à la fin de 1945, dans l'église de Montreux, en Suisse.) . En juillet, il participa au Festival de Bayreuth, dirigeant « Die Meistersinger » , en alternance avec Hermann Abendroth.

Le 7 septembre 1943, à la suite d'une dénonciation, les Nazis pendirent le pianiste prodige Karl Robert Kreiten, élève de Claudio Arrau. Ce drame est à l'origine d'une pièce de théâtre écrite par Heinrich Riemenschneider, « Requiem pour K. R. Kreiten », qui fut représentée pour la 1^{re} fois en Allemagne, en 1987. Les principaux personnages en sont Kreiten et sa mère, Fürtwängler, Gøebels et 2 dénonciateurs. En décembre, il était à nouveau en Scandinavie (Stockholm et Göteborg) et, en janvier, la Suisse l'accueillit (Orchestres de la Suisse Romande et de Berne) .

Le 30 janvier, la vieille salle de la Philharmonie de Berlin située sur la « Bernburgerstraße » fut réduite en cendres par les bombardements. La saison se termina à Bayreuth avec « Die Meistersinger » et aux Festivals de Salzbourg et de Lucerne. Le 11 octobre 1944, Fürtwängler dirigea pour la seule et unique fois de sa vie le « Bruckner Orchester » de Linz, également appelé « Orchestre du “ Führer ” » dont le chef attitré était Georg-Ludwig Jochum, l'un des 3 frères Jochum. Le 7 novembre, sa mère mourut à Heidelberg et, 4 jours plus tard, sa femme, établie en Suisse, donna naissance à un fils, Andreas, qu'il ne verra qu'en février 1945.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler était devenu un traître aux yeux des Nazis en raison de ses incessantes critiques contre la politique menée par Adolf Hitler. Il avait même été accusé d'avoir participé au complot du 20 juillet 1944, destiné à éliminer physiquement Hitler. La situation était devenue intolérable et les Nazis ne souhaitaient pas que Fürtwängler survive à la guerre. Selon la transcription sténographique de son procès en dénazification, qui eut lieu à Berlin le 17 décembre 1946, Fürtwängler déclara :

« En octobre 1944, je reçus la visite du médecin personnel de Madame Himmler qui m'informa de l'état d'esprit de Himmler et des SS. Depuis le début, Himmler était un ennemi personnel, cette dame me le confirma. Elle revint en novembre. En janvier 1945, alors que j'étais à Berlin pour la dernière fois, elle vint tôt le matin à l'improviste, resta quelques minutes et me dit : " Monsieur Fürtwängler, personne ne doit apprendre ma visite ici. Je dois vous aviser que les SS parlent d'une mise en quarantaine à votre sujet. Aucun Nazi ne doit plus vous adresser la parole. Chacun de vos gestes, ainsi que votre téléphone vont être surveillés. Vous êtes accusé d'avoir été un complice de l'attentat contre Hitler. Tirez-en les conséquences." . Elle partit. La conséquence que j'en ai tirée, c'est de ne plus revenir à Berlin après mes concerts à Vienne mais de me cacher durant 3 jours près de la frontière suisse. La veille et le jour où j'ai franchi la frontière, des agents de la Gestapo étaient venus voir ma secrétaire, Mademoiselle von Tiedemann et lui dirent à son grand étonnement que j'étais parti. J'ai alors fait tout ce qu'il fallait pour clarifier ma situation en Suisse. »

Lors du concert du 11 décembre 1944, à Berlin, Albert Speer avait également avisé Fürtwängler qu'il courait un danger mortel de la part de Gestapo de Himmler et conseillé de ne pas revenir de sa prochaine tournée en Suisse. En effet, après avoir fêté le 25 janvier son 59 anniversaire à l'Hôtel Impérial de Vienne, en compagnie de son ami l'ingénieur du son Friedrich Schnapp, il adressa le 30 un message au Philharmonique de Berlin par lequel il avisait son Orchestre qu'il ne pouvait diriger les concerts prévus les 4 et 5 février, « en raison d'une chute sur le verglas » . À partir du 1 février, il organisa sa fuite en Suisse à l'occasion des concerts qu'il devait diriger à Lausanne, Genève et Winterthur. Du 1 au 6 février, il se cacha dans la petite localité de Dornbirn, proche de Bregenz et de la frontière suisse. De Dornbirn précisément, il écrivit à Irme Schwab :

« Je suis en route pour la Suisse. Je ne sais pas encore si, en raison de la situation politique, on me laissera passer. Dans la négative, j'irai à Tanneck. »

Le 6, il écrivit à Hélène Matschenz : « Si on m'en laisse la possibilité, je franchis demain la frontière. » .

Le 7, il franchit effectivement la frontière et rejoignit sa femme et son fils. Le 23 février, il dirigea son dernier concert à Winterthur (la 8e de Bruckner) et fut empêché de diriger 2 concerts de la « Tonhalle » qui furent annulés par le Conseil municipal. À cette occasion, un énorme scandale qui dura tout le mois, éclata dans la presse suisse d'extrême-gauche (il fut accusé d'être un suppôt du Nazisme) , dans des journaux tels « Volksrecht » , etc.

Le Journal de Genève résuma fort bien ce qu'on appela « l'Affaire Fürtwängler » :

« L'interdiction, par le Conseil d'État, des 2 concerts que Wilhelm Fürtwängler devait donner cette semaine à la " Tonhalle ", a soulevé une vive émotion. Il semble que, d'une manière générale, on regrette cette mesure suggérée au gouvernement par le Conseil exécutif de la ville et arrachée à ces 2 autorités par les menaces indirectes du Parti des Travailleurs. Le Département cantonal de la Police avait en effet commencé par autoriser les concerts et n'est revenu sur sa décision que sous la pression du " Stadtrat ", poussé lui-même par l'extrême-gauche. Aussi les protestations n'ont-elles pas tardé. " La Nouvelle Gazette de Zürich " et " die Tat " , organe des indépendants, se sont immédiatement insurgés contre cette immixtion des passions partisans dans la vie de l'esprit, déplorant que Zürich donne un si fâcheux exemple d'intolérance. »

« Comme l'a fort bien dit le Comité central du Parti radical de Zürich, dans une protestation rendue publique, il est regrettable que les autorités suisses aient paru céder aux entreprises de démagogues désireux d'exploiter, dans un but évident de surenchère, l'aversion générale et justifiée de la population pour un régime politique étranger. " L'Affaire Fürtwängler " a connu un 1er épilogue mercredi au Conseil municipal, la discussion ayant été aussi instructive que mouvementée. 2 groupes d'orateurs se sont affrontés : d'un côté, les radicaux et les indépendants qui ont pris la défense de Fürtwängler auquel, estiment-ils, il est un peu tard de reprocher sa qualité de " Staatsrat " (Conseiller d'État) prussien et la décoration qu'il a acceptée du " Führer "; de l'autre, les communistes, les socialistes et un membre de la fraction de la Monnaie franche qui reprochent au musicien allemand de se laisser ravalé au rang d'agent d'une propagande camouflée. »

Quant au concert de Winterthur (8e de Bruckner) , il sera son dernier avant la chute du « Reich » nazi et donna lieu à des manifestations à l'appel de l'Union ouvrière et du Parti des travailleurs. Des manifestants essayèrent d'empêcher le public de se rendre au concert et un détachement de gendarmes, utilisant des lances à incendie, dut intervenir mais le concert se déroula sans incident devant une salle comble. (Manifeste anti-Fürtwängler, paru dans les journaux suisses le 5 juin 1948.)

Au cours de février, Wilhelm Fürtwängler s'établit à Clarens, à la « Clinique la Prairie » , propriété du Docteur Niehans et qui sera sa résidence jusqu'en juin 1947.

Mais qui était ce Docteur Niehans que l'on surnomma « Docteur Miracle » ? Certains voyaient en lui un charlatan - abusant de la crédulité publique et faisant payer à des prix astronomiques des traitements qui ne servaient à rien ; d'autres, un véritable pionnier des thérapies de rajeunissement. Père de la « cellulothérapie », Paul Niehans, né en 1882, avait de prestigieux « clients » : Konrad Adenauer, Somerset Maugham, Gloria Swanson, Charles Chaplin, la duchesse de Windsor. Après avoir été un chirurgien de réputation internationale, il allait devenir pour les uns, un génie, pour les autres, un illuminé, un faux démiurge guidé uniquement par l'appât du gain.

Une fois en sécurité en Suisse, Fürtwängler et sa famille attendirent la fin de la guerre. Finalement, l'annonce de la mort d'Adolf Hitler, le 30 avril 1945, marqua la fin des hostilités et ceci signifiait surtout pour lui qu'il devait être « dénazifié » par les Alliés. Cette « purification » se résuma dans son cas, à savoir pourquoi il était resté en Allemagne sous la dictature hitlérienne et à étudier son comportement durant cette période, principalement par rapport à l'antisémitisme officiel. Les procès eurent lieu à Vienne, en janvier 1946, et à Berlin, les 11 et 17 décembre de la même année. Fürtwängler fut blanchi et autorisé à diriger de nouveau. Contrairement à d'autres chefs allemands (Herbert von Karajan, Oswald Kabasta, Hermann Abendroth), Fürtwängler n'adhéra jamais au Parti nazi, ne fit jamais le salut hitlérien, ne signa jamais son courrier « Heil Hitler » et aida autant qu'il put les musiciens juifs. Pour être resté en Allemagne, Fürtwängler donna la raison suivante :

« Je ne suis pas resté parce que j'étais nazi, je suis resté parce que je suis allemand ! »

Il fut aidé dans sa défense par son ami le metteur-en-scène de théâtre, Boleslav Barlog, par le chef par intérim du Philharmonique de Berlin, le roumain Sergiu Celibidache, et par des musiciens comme Hugo Strelitzer qui déclara :

« Si je suis vivant aujourd'hui c'est grâce à ce grand homme. Fürtwängler a aidé et protégé de nombreux musiciens juifs et cette attitude prouve un grand courage car il le faisait sous les yeux des Nazis, en Allemagne même. L'histoire jugera cet homme. »

À la fin du procès, Fürtwängler fit la déclaration suivante :

« L'Art n'a rien à voir avec la politique et avec la guerre. Je me sentais responsable de la musique allemande et il était de mon devoir d'aider à surmonter cette crise autant que je le pouvais. Je ne regrette pas d'être resté parmi les allemands qui devaient vivre sous la terreur de Himmler. »

Dans ses « Cahiers » de 1946, il nota :

« J'ai essayé de juger mon attitude. Je ne suis pas meilleur que d'autres mais je dois exprimer ce que me dictait mon instinct. Il y a 2 choses : l'amour pour ma patrie et mon peuple, et le sentiment d'avoir ici la tâche de réparer un tort. Le souci d'être abusivement utilisé par la propagande nazie a dû, pour moi, s'effacer devant une préoccupation plus grande, c'est-à-dire savoir conserver la musique allemande autant que possible dans sa permanence et continuer à faire de la musique avec des musiciens allemands pour des auditeurs allemands. »

Wilhelm Fürtwängler fut acquitté le 17 décembre 1946 mais ne put diriger le Philharmonique de Berlin que le 25 mai 1947 dans un programme tout Beethoven. Très rapidement, son activité s'intensifia et il reprit le chemin des tournées et des Festivals (Salzbourg, Lucerne) . Les 24 et 25 janvier 1948, il donna 2 concerts à Paris avec l'Orchestre de la société des Concerts du Conservatoire. En février, ce furent 10 concerts à Londres et, le 22, il dirigea à Berlin la création de sa 2e Symphonie, écrite à la fin de la guerre. En avril, il partit pour l'Argentine où il dirigea 8 concerts au « Teatro Colon » de Buenos Aires ; puis, l'Italie l'accueillit pour 6 concerts et il emmena le Philharmonique de Vienne dans une tournée en Suisse et la saison s'acheva aux Festivals de Salzbourg (« Fidelio ») et Lucerne.

En août, un triste événement perturba les relations de Wilhelm Fürtwängler avec l'Amérique : il avait été contacté par les dirigeants du « Chicago Symphony » afin qu'il dirige 22 des 28 concerts de la saison à venir. En décembre, il donna son accord pour 8 concerts et, le 6 janvier 1949, un article de Howard Taubmann parut dans le « Times » , article qui faisait mention d'un veto « des musiciens » afin de mettre un terme au contrat de Fürtwängler. Ces fameux « musiciens » se nommaient Vladimir Horowitz, Arthur Rubinstein, Alexandre Brailowsky, Isaac Stern, Lily Pons et André Kostelanetz qui déclarèrent qu'ils ne joueraient plus à Chicago si Fürtwängler devenait le chef principal de l'Orchestre. Face à cette campagne de dénigrement, soigneusement organisée et orchestrée par certains milieux juifs, Fürtwängler préféra renoncer au poste. L'un des plus acharnés fut Rubinstein qui avait perdu une grande partie de sa famille dans l'Holocauste et qui déclara :

« Je refuse d'être associé avec quiconque sympathise avec Hitler, Göring et Gœbbels. Si Fürtwängler avait été un vrai démocrate, il aurait tourné le dos à l'Allemagne comme fit Thomas Mann. Fürtwängler est resté parce qu'il pensait que l'Allemagne gagnerait la guerre et maintenant, il est en quête de dollars et de prestige en Amérique. »

Des artistes comme le chef Bruno Walter, les violonistes Yehudi Menuhin ou Nathan Milstein ne s'associèrent pas à cette campagne hystérique. Menuhin fit d'ailleurs paraître dans la presse la mise au point suivante :

« Je n'ai jamais rencontré d'attitude plus insolente que celle de ces 3 ou 4 meneurs qui déploient des efforts frénétiques pour exclure de leur terrain de chasse de prédilection un illustre collègue. Leur comportement m'inspire plus que du mépris. »

Nathan Milstein déclara de son côté :

« Fürtwängler est un grand musicien et absolument pas un Nazi et si la campagne de protestations réussit, le grand perdant sera le " Chicago Symphony ". »

C'est exactement ce qui se passa.

Dans ses « Cahiers » de 1949, Wilhelm Fürtwängler évoqua cette pénible affaire :

« Nombre d'artistes américains renommés ont protesté contre ma venue en Amérique. Cette protestation est une hérésie dans l'histoire de la musique. Quelle est la raison de cette machination ? Il s'agit d'un " boycott " préparé

dans un but précis et on se demande quelles sont les vraies raisons de cette manière d'agir, de cet ostracisme, de cette diffamation envers un artiste estimé. Serait-ce parce que je suis allemand ? »

En 1948, Wilhelm Fürtwängler avait 62 ans. Il était partout réclamé comme chef-invité, assurait les tournées des Philharmoniques de Berlin et de Vienne et se retrouvait fréquemment dans les studios de « His Master's Voice » (HMV) pour des séances d'enregistrement à Vienne ou à Londres. En septembre-octobre, il donna à Londres un cycle complet des Symphonies de Beethoven avec le Philharmonique de Vienne, cycle qui fut retransmis en direct à la télévision mais dont malheureusement plus aucune image ne subsiste. Chaque année, il honora de sa présence les Festivals et, en août 1949, rendit visite à Richard Strauß hospitalisé dans une clinique de Montreux. L'année suivante, le 22 mai 1950 à Londres, il créait avec Kirsten Flagstad « les Quatre derniers Lieder » .

En septembre 1949, Fürtwängler participa au Festival de Besançon et, en mars-avril 1950, dirigea 3 cycles du « Ring » à la Scala de Milan. Flagstad faisait partie de la distribution. Une nouvelle série de concerts au « Teatro Colon » fut programmée en avril-mai 1950 et en mars-avril 1951 ; il était à nouveau à la Scala pour 5 représentations de « Parsifal » de Wagner et 4 de « Orphée et Eurydice » de Gluck. En avril, il emmena le Philharmonique de Berlin pour une tournée de 10 concerts en Égypte (le Caire, Alexandrie) , et, le 29 juillet, il fut choisi pour la ré-ouverture officielle du Festival de Bayreuth, dirigeant une 9e de Beethoven restée mythique.

Le 18 octobre, Rudolph Bing, directeur du « MET » de New York, écrit à Fürtwängler, lui demandant d'ouvrir la saison 1952 avec une nouvelle production de « Lohengrin » et un autre Opéra de son choix. Fürtwängler apprit que Arturo Toscanini s'opposait à sa venue de toutes les manières possibles. Une fois de plus, ce projet américain fut réduit à néant, ainsi qu'une tournée du Philharmonique de Vienne outre-atlantique. En mars 1952, il retrouva la Scala pour 6 représentations de « Die Meistersinger » et, après une longue tournée avec Berlin, il réalisa en juin, à Londres, un magnifique et célèbre enregistrement de « Tristan und Isolde » avec Kirsten Flagstad et le « Philharmonia Orchestra » de Londres.

Après une représentation de « la Walkyrie' à Zürich, le 29 juin, il partit pour les répétitions du Festival de Salzbourg au cours desquelles il contracta une double pneumonie. Il dut interrompre ses activités et se soigner durant plusieurs mois dans un sanatorium des Alpes bavaroises. S'étant peu reposé depuis 1947, il dormait peu et ce manque de sommeil affecta sa santé. En outre, il prenait de fortes doses d'antibiotiques et, en particulier, de Tétracycline qui avait des effets secondaires, notamment sur l'ouïe. Fürtwängler se rétablit, retrouva le Philharmonique le 7 décembre, à Berlin, mais le 23 janvier 1953, à Vienne, il s'évanouit durant l'Adagio de la 9e de Beethoven. Une nouvelle fois et malgré son opposition, les médecins lui prescrivirent de grandes quantités d'antibiotiques et son ouïe, en particulier l'oreille droite, commença à se détériorer. Cette perte de l'audition lui causa des sentiments dépressifs et, malgré ce handicap, il continua sa tâche, reprit ses tournées et revint à Salzbourg et Lucerne.

La saison 1953-1954 débuta par 4 concerts au Festival d'Edimbourg avec le Philharmonique de Vienne puis, en octobre-novembre, il donna le « Ring » à la « RAI » de Rome, à raison d'un acte par jour. Durant ce séjour dans la capitale romaine, il donnera même 2 concerts privés pour le Pape Pie XII, au Vatican et à Castel Gandolfo, résidence d'été du Souverain Pontife. En décembre, il attrapa la grippe qui l'immobilisa durant plus de 2 mois, et, en mars,

partit pour Caracas donner 2 concerts avec l'Orchestre symphonique du Venezuela. De retour en Suisse, il acheta une propriété sur les hauteurs de Montreux, à Clarens, baptisée le Basset Coulon où malheureusement, il ne passera que peu de temps.

La saison 1954-1955 sera la plus courte et la dernière. Après 2 ultimes interprétations de la 9e de Beethoven au Festival de Lucerne (21 et 22 août) , un concert au Festival de Besançon, le 6 septembre, et 2 concerts à Berlin, les 19 et 20, où il joua sa 2e Symphonie, il partit pour Vienne où il enregistra « la Walkyrie » , du 28 septembre au 6 octobre. Les disques témoignent du jeu radieux du Philharmonique de Vienne. Ce sera la dernière fois où il dirigera un orchestre.

De Vienne, il se rendit à Gastein pour soigner son ouïe. Sur le chemin de retour à Clarens, il ne se sentit pas très bien et prit froid. Sa femme essaya de le persuader de garder le lit mais il préféra effectuer des marches en montagne au grand air. Dans la nuit du 6 novembre, il avoua à sa femme : « De cette maladie, je vais mourir et ce sera une mort facile. Ne me quitte pas un seul instant. » . Il lut la copie de sa 3e Symphonie et écouta les épreuves de son enregistrement de « Fidelio » qui venaient d'arriver. Les médecins ayant diagnostiqué une broncho-pneumonie, sa femme décida de l'hospitaliser à Ebersteinburg, près de Baden-Baden, dans la clinique de son médecin, le Docteur von Löwenstein. Le voyage eut lieu le 12 novembre par un radieux soleil de fin d'automne. À la clinique, Fürtwängler fit cette confession à sa femme : « Tu sais, ils croient tous que je suis venu ici pour guérir. Moi, je sais que je suis venu pour mourir. » . Ce qui frappa le plus sa femme, c'est qu'il ne dirigeait plus pour soi. Il s'était complètement concentré sur la mort, sur sa mort. Il fit venir l'intendant du Philharmonique de Berlin, Gerhardt von Westermann et prit congé de lui : « Saluez aussi mon Orchestre pour moi, je vous prie. » . Son état de santé s'aggrava et, le matin du 30 novembre, on lui fit une transfusion sanguine. Il mourut le jour même dans une absolue sérénité et fut inhumé au cimetière de Heidelberg auprès de sa mère, le 4 décembre. Au cours du service funèbre, le chef Karl Böhm rendit hommage à son collègue :

« Bouleversé comme jamais auparavant, je me trouve aujourd'hui devant le cercueil de l'homme qui était mon ami depuis 20 ans. Pour moi et pour tous ceux qui vous aimaient, cher Fürtwängler, on ne peut pas encore évaluer les conséquences de votre mort parce qu'elle laisse un vide qui ne pourra jamais plus être comblé. Que Dieu vous accueille dans un monde meilleur et qu'il vous paye en retour pour toute la Beauté inoubliable que vous nous avez donnée en cadeau dans le domaine de l'Art le plus divin. »

Le Philharmonique de Berlin sous la direction du chef Eugen Jochum interpréta la « Maurerische Trauermusik » de Mozart et l'Aria de la Suite en ré de Bach.

De retour à Clarens, sa veuve confia à l'ami Ernest Ansermet :

« Le départ de Fürtwängler m'a appris qu'une mort acceptée était un but vers lequel on doit tendre. Fürtwängler l'a pu. »

Pourquoi n'y a-t-il plus de Fürtwängler aujourd'hui ? Était-il unique ? Doit-on répondre en invoquant le rôle actuel

des médias et la culture de masse ? N'est-on pas en pleine décadence de la direction d'orchestre où les chefs ne sont plus que des techniciens sans âme ? Qu'en est-il réellement de tous ces chefs médiatiques créés et portés à bout de bras par leurs maisons de disques toutes puissantes ? Il est certain que le « show business » d'aujourd'hui et son corollaire, le « star system » à outrance mènent tout droit à un phénomène de réification. Mais l'imagination n'est-elle pas aussi la manière dont nous déformons les images ? Fürtwängler était une légende de son vivant et le mythe n'a fait que s'amplifier.

Le violoniste Yehudi Menuhin déclara :

« Il existe beaucoup de chefs d'orchestre mais très peu d'entre eux laissent entrevoir la chapelle secrète qui réside au cœur même de tout chef d'œuvre. Au-delà des notes s'étalent des visions et au-delà des visions, cette chapelle invisible et silencieuse car c'est une musique intérieure qui se répand là, la musique de notre âme dont les échos ne sont que des ombres pâles. Tel fut le génie de Fürtwängler car il s'approcha de toute œuvre en pèlerin afin de revivre cet état d'existence qui rappelle la Création, le mystère qui est au cœur de toute cellule. Avec ses gestes fluides et évocateurs, il transportait ses orchestres et ses solistes dans cet endroit sacré. »

La juste réponse fut peut-être donnée par le chef Eliahu Inbal quand il affirma :

« Pourquoi n'y a-t-il pas de Fürtwängler aujourd'hui ? Je ne pense pas que cela s'explique par l'absence de talents mais personne ne peut se métamorphoser en Fürtwängler alors qu'on vit au rythme des mécanismes actuels de l'organisation des concerts et des enregistrements qui suivent les mêmes schémas que ceux utilisés pour produire des savons ou des automobiles. La manière dont sont réalisés les enregistrements, en plaçant une foule de micros, suffirait à détruire tout le mystère et le climat que savait si bien créer Fürtwängler. Nous, musiciens de la jeune génération, devrions tenter de suivre l'exemple de Fürtwängler : cela n'a rien à voir avec le tempo mais plutôt avec l'imagination, dans une totale soumission à la musique. »

Se situant aux antipodes de la vision d'un Arturo Toscanini pour qui il n'y avait aucune part de « création » dans l'interprétation, Fürtwängler avait écrit en 1927 :

« La véritable éthique du chef d'orchestre ne réside pas dans la perfection technique mais dans l'attitude spirituelle. »

Cherchant « l'au-delà des notes », Fürtwängler aura sans cesse été en quête d' « Absolu ». Qu'importe les modes, et même s'il est vrai que le Romantisme exacerbé de Fürtwängler et l'idée quasi-religieuse qu'il se faisait de la musique et du rôle de médium qu'il attribuait au chef d'orchestre dans la communion mystique entre le compositeur et le public, peuvent irriter, « l'Art de Fürtwängler » est éternel.

AB 123 : Wilhelm Fürtwängler et ses relations avec le régime nazi

Une grande partie de la vie personnelle et professionnelle du compositeur et chef d'orchestre allemand Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1886-1954) fut marquée par le contexte historique de la montée puis de l'apogée du Nazisme. Sa

renommée lui permit de bénéficier d'une réelle protection de la part des dignitaires nazis, mais cela lui valut également de faire face à des accusations de compromissions avec le régime. Il fut toutefois lavé de ces accusations en 1946 après avoir démontré qu'il n'avait jamais approuvé la politique nazie et qu'il avait soutenu de nombreuses personnes d'origine juive.

La montée du pouvoir nazi

La volonté de récupération

Wilhelm Fürtwängler était devenu, bien avant l'arrivée des Nazis au pouvoir, le plus grand chef d'orchestre d'Allemagne et le principal symbole de la grande tradition musicale allemande. Bien que Fürtwängler ne s'intéressât que très peu à la politique, il participa, avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, à certains concerts officiels de la République de Weimar, par exemple en juillet 1927 et 1928 pour l'anniversaire de la constitution organisé surtout par les socio-démocrates. Il refusa néanmoins de participer à l'anniversaire de la fondation du « Reich » prussien dans la galerie des glaces à Versailles organisée par les conservateurs le 18 janvier 1928. De façon générale, il répétait, en privé, sans arrêt, que politique et art n'ont rien à voir ensemble, formule qu'il reprendra souvent lorsqu'il s'opposera aux mesures prises par les Nazis dans le domaine culturel.

Bien qu'il s'opposât très rapidement à la politique raciale des Nazis, Fürtwängler fut relativement bien traité et occupa une position enviable dans les milieux culturels du 3e « Reich » . Il était, en effet, le chef d'orchestre préféré d'Adolf Hitler et de Josef Gœbbels et ce, bien avant leur arrivée au pouvoir. Fürtwängler était, comme Richard Strauß, considéré par les Nazis comme un « trésor national » et à ce titre devait absolument être protégé et utilisé pour glorifier le peuple allemand. Comme Strauß, il bénéficiait d'un statut très particulier : Gœbbels choisit de fermer les yeux sur certaines positions qu'il n'aurait jamais acceptées venant d'autres personnes. Ainsi en 1938, peu de temps après l' « Anschluss » , lorsque Fürtwängler arriva dans le hall d'entrée du « Musikverein » de Vienne, il vit qu'un drapeau avec une énorme croix gammée avait été ajouté. Il refusa de diriger tant qu'il n'avait pas été enlevé, ce qui fut fait. Les actes de ce genre étaient normalement passibles de la peine de mort, mais il ne fut pas inquiété. Ce statut particulier provient également du fait qu'au-delà des qualités artistiques de Fürtwängler ou Strauß, les Nazis les considéraient suivant leurs critères raciaux comme de « purs aryens » .

Parmi les idées circulant chez les Nazis, on trouve le culte de la grande musique allemande accompagné de la théorie selon laquelle il y avait une incompatibilité absolue entre cette musique et les Juifs : d'après eux, les Juifs ne pourraient jamais comprendre la musique allemande et ne pouvaient que la « polluer » . Cette théorie avait déjà été formulée par Richard Wagner dans ses écrits antisémites. Sa belle-fille, Winifred Wagner, qui reprit la direction du Festival de Bayreuth en 1930, y croyait sérieusement et se fâcha avec Fürtwängler à ce propos durant le Festival de 1931. Elle déclara en 1933 : « Le fait que Monsieur Fürtwängler ait des sympathies pour les juifs est clairement prouvé par la lettre qu'il a écrite au Docteur Gœbbels (en 1933) . De plus, il collabore depuis 16 ans avec Berta Geißmar, qui est juive, et nos lers désaccords à Bayreuth en 1931 eurent comme trame de fond la presse contrôlée par la Juiverie. » . Or, si Hitler et les dirigeants nazis voyaient en Fürtwängler le Maître de la musique allemande dans la pure tradition aryenne, ils ne savaient pas qu'une grande part de la compréhension que Fürtwängler avait acquise

de cette musique allemande provenait de sa collaboration avec le musicologue Juif viennois Heinrich Schenker.

Fürtwängler travaillait directement avec des musiciens juifs comme Arnold Schönberg, Yehudi Menuhin, Artur Schnabel ou encore Gregor Piatigorsky et plusieurs musiciens de son orchestre dont son lier violon. Fred Prieberg a retrouvé le carnet d'adresses que Fürtwängler utilisait constamment durant la période 1922-1933 révélant ainsi toutes les relations du chef d'orchestre. Le carnet contenait la liste de tous les magasins, médecins, centres de sport, tailleurs, etc. fréquentés par Fürtwängler ainsi qu'une très longue liste de personnes du monde de la musique, du théâtre, de l'université, de la politique et même les banquiers de Fürtwängler. Fred Prieberg a remarqué que, curieusement, le chef d'orchestre arrêta brutalement l'utilisation de son carnet en 1933 ne rajoutant plus que les références des principaux dirigeants nazis par la suite. L'historien a décortiqué en détail tout le carnet trouvant un très grand nombre de noms d'origine juive, non seulement dans le domaine des arts mais aussi dans la vie quotidienne. Il semble même avoir bien connu plusieurs membres de la famille Warburg (dont Paul, Erich et Felix), les banquiers juifs les plus haïs des Nazis avec les Rothschild. Fred Prieberg en a déduit que Fürtwängler a cessé d'utiliser et de porter constamment ce carnet en 1933 tant il prouvait clairement ce que les Nazis prétendaient dès cette époque, à savoir que « Fürtwängler était un ami des Juifs ». Les formules telles que « Fürtwängler est bien disposé vis-à-vis des Juifs », « Fürtwängler est anti-national » ou « Fürtwängler n'est pas fiable politiquement » se retrouvent dans plusieurs rapports réalisés par les Nazis vers 1933 et retrouvés par Prieberg.

La secrétaire de Fürtwängler pendant la période 1915-1935, Berta Geißmar, était d'origine juive. Elle était tellement proche de Fürtwängler qu'elle raconta que les Nazis menèrent une enquête en 1933 pour savoir si elle était sa maîtresse. Berta Geißmar n'était pas qu'une secrétaire au sens ordinaire du terme. Elle venait d'une famille très cultivée qui avait eu des liens avec les familles Brahms et Strauß. Après une thèse en philosophie, elle était devenue l'assistante de Fürtwängler. C'est elle qui organisait toute la vie de l'Orchestre de Berlin traitant d'égal à égal avec les ambassadeurs et les plus grands chefs d'orchestre. En particulier, c'est elle qui organisa l'entretien entre Mussolini et Fürtwängler en 1934, lors de la tournée de ce dernier en Italie ce qui déclencha la fureur des dirigeants nazis. D'après Berta Geißmar, Mussolini et Fürtwängler passèrent leur temps à dire tout le mal qu'ils pensaient d'Hitler. Fürtwängler réussit à la protéger jusqu'en 1935. Il l'aida ensuite à partir d'Allemagne et la recommanda à Thomas Beecham dont elle devint la secrétaire. Berta Geißmar écrivit en 1943 à Londres dans son livre sur Fürtwängler : « Bien qu'il ait décidé de rester en Allemagne, il est certain que Fürtwängler n'était pas un Nazi. Nous avions une ligne privée pour nous téléphoner. Il m'appelait souvent avant de se coucher et je lui racontais des histoires pour le détendre ou nous parlions parfois de politique. L'une des principales charges utilisées plus tard par les Nazis contre Fürtwängler et moi-même est le fait qu'ils prétendaient avoir enregistré ces conversations. Je n'aurais jamais pensé une telle chose possible. Si ils ont fait ça, leurs oreilles ont dû exploser et ce n'est pas surprenant qu'ils l'aient mis sur la liste noire et l'aient séparé de moi. »

Dès l'arrivée au pouvoir des nazis en 1933, Fürtwängler se montra très critique à leur encontre.

Fürtwängler rencontra pour la Ire fois Adolf Hitler à l'hôtel Kaiserhof en 1932. Hitler, comme Josef Goebbels, avait une très haute opinion de Fürtwängler en tant que chef d'orchestre et souhaitait discuter avec lui du Festival de Bayreuth. En effet, Hitler voulait absolument le convaincre d'être le principal chef d'orchestre au Festival de Bayreuth de 1932

comme il l'avait été en 1931. Fürtwängler ne voulait pas car il s'était fâché avec Winifred Wagner. La dispute avec elle provenait entre autres de ses positions antisémites et ultra-nationalistes. Fürtwängler finira par rejouer à Bayreuth par la suite mais sera toujours en termes exécrables avec elle.

Après cette rencontre, Fürtwängler déclara à propos d'Hitler :

« Cet homme a une multitude d'idées marginales et fort conventionnelles sur l'art. Sa médiocrité m'aurait effrayé, si je n'avais pas été persuadé que jamais (il) ne parviendrait au pouvoir. »

André François-Poncet, l'ambassadeur de France à Berlin le rencontra peu de temps après et lui demanda : « Vous lui avez parlé ? ». Fürtwängler lui répondit d'un air surpris : « Vous le connaissez ? ». François-Poncet sourit et lui répondit : « Oui, je l'ai rencontré. Un homme étrange. Il m'a donné l'impression d'un croisement entre Jeanne d'Arc et Charlie Chaplin ! Et vous, quelle impression vous a fait Hitler ? ». Fürtwängler répondit : « Lui ? En fait, il ne m'a fait aucune impression du tout. ». Fürtwängler ajouta, début 1933, toujours à propos d'Hitler : « Jamais ce camelot chuintant ne jouera un quelconque rôle important en Allemagne. » Pourtant Hitler venait déjà d'être nommé Chancelier.

Fred Prieberg décrivit longuement Fürtwängler comme un « idéaliste » vivant en grande partie déconnecté de la réalité. Ceci est confirmé par Berta Geißmar qui écrivit qu'elle et lui ne vivaient que pour l'art et n'avaient jamais pris au sérieux Hitler. Lorsque ce dernier arriva au pouvoir, elle raconta que jamais Fürtwängler n'aurait pensé qu'Hitler allait se mêler de son travail d'artiste et que pendant longtemps Fürtwängler était persuadé que le régime nazi allait disparaître et ne serait qu'un épisode de courte durée dans l'histoire de l'Allemagne.

Fürtwängler assista à l'arrivée au pouvoir d'Hitler sans changer quoi que ce soit à ses concerts. En particulier, il continua à programmer de la musique de compositeurs juifs comme Mendelssohn et à faire jouer des solistes juifs allemands comme si de rien n'était. Il dirigea « les Maîtres-chanteurs de Nuremberg », le 21 mars 1933, devant le « Führer » et le maréchal Hindenburg le lendemain de l'annonce de la fondation du nouveau « Reich » par Hitler. À la fin du concert, Fürtwängler, « pâle comme un mort », serra la main du nouveau Chancelier. Le concert eut lieu en présence de représentants de nombreux partis et, comme l'expliqua Fred Prieberg, n'avait pas plus de dimension politique que les concerts officiels sous la République de Weimar. Pour souligner la totale inconscience dans laquelle se trouvaient Fürtwängler et Berta Geißmar à ce moment, cette dernière a expliqué qu'elle s'était assise comme d'habitude aux Ires loges très proche d'Hitler alors qu'elle était juive.

Le 7 août, Hitler organisa une très grande cérémonie à Tannenberg pour y enterrer Hindenburg, ce qui lui permit aussi de faire un coup d'état en refusant de lui trouver un successeur. Hitler voulait absolument que Fürtwängler vienne pour y diriger l'« Eroica » ce qui aurait été le clou de l'événement. Mais les dirigeants nazis s'aperçurent que Fürtwängler avait complètement disparu. La presse fit courir le bruit que Fürtwängler vivait une aventure avec une aristocrate polonaise mais la vérité était qu'il s'était caché pour ne pas revivre la situation du 21 mars.

Fred Prieberg a expliqué qu'en 1933, l'Orchestre de Berlin était en faillite complète avec d'énormes déficits qui

n'étaient acceptés par l'État allemand que parce qu'il s'agissait du plus grand orchestre d'Allemagne. Cela donnait une marge de manœuvre très faible pour Fürtwängler car il avait besoin de l'argent du pouvoir en place pour son orchestre et donc des Nazis désormais.

Les Nazis se mirent très rapidement à intervenir dans le domaine de la musique. Ils annulèrent une tournée importante de l'Orchestre de Berlin avec Bruno Walter en raison de ses origines juives. Il leur fallait trouver un remplaçant qui devait prouver que l'Allemagne n'avait pas besoin d'artistes juifs comme Walter. Les Nazis demandèrent donc à Fürtwängler de le remplacer pour cette tournée ce qu'il refusa catégoriquement en dépit des graves problèmes financiers de l'Orchestre. C'est Richard Strauß qui finalement accepta de prendre la place de Walter et profita de la tournée pour mettre en valeur sa « Sinfonia Domestica » .

Comme les Nazis prirent des mesures contre ses collègues comme Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer et Max Reinhardt, Fürtwängler prit publiquement leur défense. Il écrivit une lettre ouverte à Goebbels pour s'opposer aux mesures raciales dans le domaine des arts :

« Je ne reconnais, au fond, qu'une seule ligne de séparation : celle qui existe entre l'art de qualité et l'art sans qualité ! Mais, tandis que l'on trace maintenant des lignes de séparation entre juifs et non-juifs, même là où l'attitude politique des intéressés ne donne lieu à aucune objection, que ces traits sont tirés de façon théorique et implacable, on finit par oublier l'autre ligne de séparation, décisive, celle-là, entre la qualité et l'absence de qualité. »

Il insista, en conclusion, sur le fait que des musiciens Juifs Josef Joachim ou Mendelssohn faisaient pleinement partie de la grande tradition musicale allemande. Mais la distinction qu'il sembla établir entre « bons Juifs et mauvais Juifs » a parfois été perçue comme un signe d'antisémitisme chez Fürtwängler, même s'il dit ne parler qu'en tant qu'artiste et qu'il dit explicitement que la même distinction est valable pour les non-Juifs. Il expliqua précisément que si le départ d'Allemagne des « artistes (Juifs) déracinés et destructeurs qui ne cherchent à se faire valoir que par le kitsch ou la virtuosité » (formulation qui lui sera reprochée après la guerre) est souhaitable pour l'Allemagne (il rajoute juste après « comme malheureusement, le font de nombreux non-Juifs ») , celui des musiciens Juifs de qualité sera une catastrophe pour le pays. Fürtwängler reçut un très grand nombre de lettres de soutien, beaucoup d'Allemands espérant qu'il allait pouvoir stopper la politique antisémite dans le domaine musical.

Fürtwängler pensait pouvoir agir concrètement pour infléchir la politique culturelle allemande et cherchait à protéger des musiciens Juifs, comme ses collègues qu'il cita explicitement dans la lettre ou les musiciens Juifs de son orchestre. En ce qui concerne les musiciens Juifs en général son point de vue fut clairement exprimé dans un autre texte de la même année : « La vie des concerts ne peut se faire sans les gens d'origine juive, dans tous les cas. (Les faire partir d'Allemagne) serait comme opérer un patient et le faire mourir. » . La lettre de Fürtwängler fut d'ailleurs interprétée par les Nazis comme le plaçant du côté des Juifs (voir, entre autres, la citation de Winifred Wagner ci-dessus qui fait explicitement référence à la lettre de 1933) . Goebbels fut embarrassé par la prise de position de Fürtwängler et y répondit publiquement.

En 1933, Fürtwängler invita des musiciens juifs de très haut niveau, comme Artur Schnabel, Gregor Piatigorsky ou

Yehudi Menuhin, pour jouer avec lui en Allemagne. Ils refusèrent tous. Ces invitations n'avaient pas qu'un caractère symbolique pour Fürtwängler : il pensait pouvoir ainsi infléchir la politique culturelle du nouveau régime. C'est pour cette raison qu'il accepta de nombreux postes en 1933 : par exemple, « Staasrat » (conseiller d'état) de Prusse, conseil créé par Göring et vice-président du « Reichsmusikkammer » (Chambre de la musique du « Reich ») créé par Goebbels et dont Richard Strauß était le président. Berta Geißmar confirma que Fürtwängler accepta ces postes uniquement pour essayer d'infléchir la politique culturelle et de protéger les musiciens juifs et elle déclara que cela aurait été une grave erreur de les refuser. Il nota, cette année-là, dans son carnet personnel : « Hitler. Comme il y a des postes à pourvoir à nouveau maintenant, l'afflux des fâcheux est très grand. C'est dangereux pour la musique. L'appartenance politique introduit une fausse relation dans le jugement artistique. La beauté doit rester le seul critère ! Je ne puis être efficace que dans l'action. Les Juifs ont tout de suite compris la raison de mon attitude. »

En effet, à partir de la période 1933-1934, Fürtwängler offrit son soutien à de nombreuses personnes menacées, comme son épouse raconta par la suite :

« À partir de 1933, sa loge commença à s'emplir de gens qui ne venaient pas seulement pour le congratuler, mais aussi pour lui demander des conseils, de l'aide, et cela constamment. Parmi eux, nombre d'étrangers dont il ignorait tout. Son aide profitait essentiellement aux petites gens, aux obscurs frappés par les persécutions raciales ou politiques, et qui ne peuvent bénéficier d'aucun autre appui. »

Les Nazis en avaient parfaitement conscience. Un courrier du ministre-directeur Georg Gerullis envoyé à Goebbels en 1934 contenait cette phrase : « Pouvez-vous me citer un seul Juif pour lequel Fürtwängler n'intervienne pas ? » . Un des membres de la direction du département de musique de la « BBC » confirma avoir vu arriver en Angleterre un très grand nombre de musiciens juifs, quel que soit leur niveau, avec tous des lettres de recommandation de Fürtwängler. Mais les dirigeants nazis avaient peur que Fürtwängler ne parte ce qui aurait été une perte considérable pour la vie musicale allemande. Hitler et Goebbels donnèrent des ordres précis pour « ménager » le chef d'orchestre et pour écouter poliment toutes ses requêtes en faveur de personnes juives. Les clauses d' « aryanisation » de la vie culturelle ne furent pas appliquées à l'Orchestre de Fürtwängler ni à son entourage dans un 1er temps. Cela eut pour effet que Fürtwängler eut l'illusion durant la période 1933-1934 qu'il pouvait encore réorienter la politique culturelle allemande.

Fürtwängler demanda donc une audience à Hitler en 1933. Il prépara un « plan » avec Berta Geißmar pour essayer de convaincre Hitler de changer sa politique culturelle. Ils préparèrent un texte ensemble qui devait servir de base de discussion avec Hitler et qui fut envoyé au dictateur. Le titre du texte, « comment combattre les Juifs dans le domaine de la musique » , avait pour seul but d'appâter Hitler. Comme le dit Fred Prieberg, le texte était tout sauf une lutte contre les Juifs mais au contraire un plaidoyer pour les garder dans le monde de la musique allemande. Fürtwängler développait le raisonnement suivant : si les Juifs avaient pu dénigrer la grandeur du peuple allemand par le passé, il fallait par tous les moyens leur montrer, ainsi qu'au monde entier, que dans le domaine des Arts, ils n'avaient rien à envier aux autres. En conséquence, ils devaient reconnaître la qualité des artistes juifs et les conserver en Allemagne pour mener une grande politique culturelle. Il s'ensuivit une longue liste de musiciens juifs incluant le violoniste Carl Flesch, le compositeur Arnold Schönberg, l'historien de l'art Curt Sachs, les musiciens juifs de l'Orchestre de Berlin (6

Juifs et 2 « demi-Juifs ») etc. qu'il fallait absolument garder en Allemagne. Fürtwängler ne cessera d'utiliser l'argument de l'image de l'Allemagne à l'étranger pour essayer de faire changer d'avis les dirigeants nazis par la suite. Bien que les Nazis savaient, en plus, que Fürtwängler soutenait de nombreuses personnes juives qui n'étaient pas de grands artistes, l'entretien eut bien lieu le 9 août 1933. Hitler n'écouta rien du raisonnement de Fürtwängler et se lança dans un interminable monologue expliquant qu'il n'avait plus le pouvoir d'arrêter le « train de l'antisémitisme » qui s'était emparé du parti nazi. Fürtwängler perdant patience, le volume augmenta rapidement. Berta Geißmar déclara, dans son livre, que Fürtwängler et Hitler « s'hurlèrent dessus pendant plus de 2 heures », Fürtwängler oubliant complètement son stratagème. Elle écrivit, qu'après l'entretien, « Fürtwängler m'a dit qu'il savait maintenant ce qu'il se trouvait derrière les mesures bornées d'Hitler : ce n'était pas seulement l'antisémitisme, mais le rejet de toute forme de pensée artistique, philosophique, le rejet de toute forme de culture libre. »

Le « cas » Hindemith

La défense publique de Fürtwängler de l'art d'Hindemith considéré comme un dégénéré par les Nazis prit une tournure très politique. Josef Goebbels note à de nombreuses reprises dans son journal personnel que Fürtwängler aide « toujours et toujours » les Juifs, les demi-Juifs et « son petit Hindemith » .

En 1934, Fürtwängler déclara publiquement que Hitler était un « ennemi du genre humain » et qualifia de « Schweinerei » (littéralement « porcherie » , mot courant en allemand désignant une situation abjecte) la situation politique en Allemagne. Durant cette période, Fürtwängler fut néanmoins invité à Mannheim avec l'Orchestre de Berlin. Les autorités musicales de la ville lui firent remarquer que Szymon Goldberg, son 1er violon, était juif et qu'il devait le renvoyer. Fürtwängler ne céda pas et le 1er concert se déroula avec son 1er violon. Mais après le 1er concert, un banquet était organisé et des Nazis lui reprochèrent son manque de « sentiment national » . Fürtwängler se mit en grande colère et déclara qu'il ne remettrait plus jamais les pieds à Mannheim alors que cette ville avait joué un rôle très important dans sa carrière ce qu'il confirma le lendemain par courrier. Il alla rejoindre sa secrétaire Berta Geißmar et la mère de sa secrétaire qui vivait à Mannheim au lieu d'assister au banquet. D'après Berta Geißmar, la décision de Fürtwängler et le fait qu'il avait préféré passer la soirée avec « ses amis juifs » (Berta Geißmar et sa mère) plutôt que d'assister au banquet avec les autorités de la ville fit grand bruit dans toute l'Allemagne. Fürtwängler ne retourna dans cette ville qu'après la guerre après que le monde musical eut été « dénazifié » le 20 mai 1954.

Dès cette époque, Heinrich Himmler souhaita éliminer Fürtwängler et jusqu'en 1945 réclama sans arrêt qu'on envoie le chef d'orchestre dans les camps. D'autre part, Fürtwängler continua à diriger de la musique de Mendelssohn comme les 12 et 13 février 1934 à Berlin alors que la musique du compositeur était totalement interdite par les Nazis. La tension atteignit son point critique lorsqu'il dirigea le 11 mars 1934 l'œuvre « Mathis Sinfonie » de Paul Hindemith, alors qu'Hitler, qui considérait Hindemith comme un artiste « dégénéré » , voulait interdire ses œuvres. En outre, Fürtwängler soutint publiquement l'art d'Hindemith dans un article du 25 novembre du « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » : « Le cas Hindemith » . Le 2 décembre, Fürtwängler dirigea un concert : à son entrée et en présence de Goebbels et Hermann Göring, il fut applaudi pendant 25 minutes. L'affaire devint politique. Les Nazis, qui comprirent que Fürtwängler devenait un symbole pour leurs opposants politiques, se déchaînèrent contre lui et exigèrent qu'il se

rétracte. La personne la plus remontée contre Fürtwängler était Alfred Rosenberg, l'idéologue du parti nazi qui était bien décidé à remettre à sa place ce chef d'orchestre qui refusait de se plier au nouvel ordre allemand. Fürtwängler ne se rétracta pas et démissionna de toutes ses fonctions officielles. Göring refusa toutefois sa démission de « Staatsrat » de Prusse, arguant qu'il ne s'agissait pas d'un poste mais d'un titre et que ce titre n'était enlevé qu'aux criminels et aux voleurs. Gœbbels obligea Fürtwängler à démissionner de tous ses postes musicaux. Ainsi, Fürtwängler ne fut plus le chef d'orchestre permanent de l'Orchestre de Berlin durant la période 1934-1945 même si, après l'« accord » de 1935, il se remit à diriger l'Orchestre. Fürtwängler étant sur le point de quitter l'Allemagne pour la Suisse, mais les dirigeants nazis souhaitant toujours qu'il reste en Allemagne, il se vit interdire de quitter son pays.

Il avait toujours son passeport, contrairement à ce qui a été souvent dit, mais il n'était plus valable et il lui en fallait un nouveau avec l'autorisation des dirigeants nazis pour quitter son pays. D'après Berta Geißmar, Fürtwängler se sentit presque soulagé et envisageait de travailler en Autriche et aux États-Unis. Mais, outre le fait que les Nazis l'empêchaient de partir d'Allemagne, un très grand nombre d'Allemands lui envoyèrent des lettres de soutien et le suppliaient de ne pas les laisser seuls avec les Nazis. Une partie du public boycotta les concerts de l'Orchestre de Berlin en signe de protestation. La comtesse Marion von Dönhoff qui fut une résistante anti-nazie confirma après la guerre que la décision de rester en Allemagne fut une grande consolation pour tous ceux qui s'opposaient au régime nazi.

...

A grim portrait of modern American music was presented in issue No. 120 of « The New Order ». How could it have been otherwise, given the Jews' domination of our culture ? It was no coincidence that fine-art in the United States was trashed at the same moment National-Socialism triumphed in Germany. The kosher corrupters who scurried away from Europe, beginning in 1933, were the same alleged artists who poisoned our musical life. We need only look around at the laughably deplorable state of modern American composition and performance to appreciate the magnitude of their disastrous impact.

Elsewhere, Aryan culture was suddenly freed from Jewish domination and blossomed into a late- 2nd Millennium Renaissance. Naturally, the source of that Western revival was Adolf Hitler's Germany. It is nothing short of miraculous that during the brief 12 year period of peace allowed the 3rd « Reich », such an incredible burst of dynamically creative musical achievement took place. The spirit of Aryan genius could at last express its genuine instinct, un-coloured by the alien agendas of Jews hostile to everything German.

Generally regarded as the greatest Symphonic composer of the 20th Century, Richard Strauß was urged by « émigré » Jew impresarios to join them at New York's Metropolitan Opera. They dangled lucrative performance fees to entice him, but he answered them indirectly by writing a public statement in support of the National-Socialist Revolution, signing it in his own hand, « Heil Hitler ! ». With the invention of the 1st sound tape recorder by 3rd « Reich » scientists, Strauß conducted performances of all his major symphonic works, recordings still prized as the best of their kind. During World War II, he composed a concert Overture dedicated to the Japanese Royal House on the occasion of its

500th anniversary and to simultaneously commemorate the signing in 1940 of the Axis pact between Germany and Japan. His « Metamorphosen » , a tone-poem lament for the devastation wrought by the duped Allies on Germany, will forever serve as a deeply moving memorial to the worst tragedy in human history.

Strauß's contemporary, Hans Pfitzner, although not well-known outside of his homeland, was among the most important figures in neo-Romantic music, and composed what many listeners consider his greatest works, a pair of Symphonies in 1939 and 1940, respectively. 4 years earlier, Pfitzner became the 1st « " Reich " Cultural Senator » . The reputations of these 2 musical titans were so established in the world of art that not even the hysterical hatred of the Jews could destroy them, and their compositions are presently available to a larger audience than ever before, thanks to Aryan man's technological advances in audio reproduction.

But what the Jews cannot destroy they poison. A case in point is, perhaps, the greatest orchestral director ever to take up the conductor's baton, Wilhelm Furtwängler.

It would be untrue to suggest that he was a dedicated National-Socialist. His life was music. Furtwängler was favourably inclined to our « Idea » , but he was too busy with his art for much of the outside world. As a musician who profoundly cherished traditional compositional values and no less deeply despised the cultural rot of the Weimar Republic, he often expressed his gratitude, both publicly and privately, to Adolf Hitler for kicking-out the Schœnbergs, Shapiros, et al. , of the 1920's. Less than 1 year after the National-Socialist seizure of power, however, Furtwängler found himself embroiled in an extra-musical controversy. He agreed to stage « Matthias the Painter » by Paul Hindemith. Oblivious to and totally disinterested in both the story of the Opera and the political identity of its composer, the innocent music-director found his rehearsals being picketed by battalions of angry « Stormtroopers » .

It seems Hindemith, although Aryan, was a loud-mouthed Communist and his « Matthias the Painter » , a blatant propaganda piece urging its audience to take-up arms against the government « even if it had been elected » - a transparent reference to the recent National-Socialist electoral victories.

Furtwängler dismissed the work's proletarian politics as so much out-dated flummery, especially in view of National-Socialism's on-going popularity, but insisted the music was good. Performances would proceed as planned, he announced. In a short time, whatever artistic merits or demerits Hindemith's piece might have had were utterly eclipsed by a violent ideological storm gathering over the Berlin Opera House.

Assuming that the last of such Marxist drivel had been cleaned out after January 30th, 1933, the public in general and National-Socialists in particular were outraged at news of the up-coming Red Opera. Meanwhile, scattered remnants of the country's enfeebled, dwindling Communists suddenly began to suck a reviving breath of life into their moribund movement and vowed to pack the Opera House on opening night, just as they used to in the 1920's. Even more than the Communists, the « Stormtroopers » wanted « Matthias the Painter » to be staged, because they relished the opportunity of busting-up the performance and exterminating the last of the Red vermin. Not without cause, the city police feared a serious ideological confrontation of the kind so common up until only a few years before. Indeed, it was to bring peace and order to public life that the voters had put Adolf Hitler in power. Even so, the National-

Socialist authorities were inclined to allow the performance, no matter what came to pass, if only out of respect for Furtwängler, who was, by then, an icon throughout the whole cultural world.

Doubtless, Hindemith's music would have been heard, the old Reds would have had their last hurrah and the controversy passed as a foot-note in the history of the 3rd « Reich ». Instead, America's and England's Jew-dominated newspapers turned the premiere into a « cause célèbre » of international proportions. With that, Doctor Josef Gœbbels, as « Reich » Cultural Minister, decided to act. He addressed a long, polite letter to Furtwängler. The situation, he explained, had gotten-out of hand, so much so that the enemies of National-Socialism, to whom music was only as good as it was politically expedient, were using the impending performance for obvious, non-artistic purposes : namely, to incite hatred and violence against the new regime. Doctor Gœbbels added that Hindemith belonged to a by-gone era when national greatness had been despised. The German people, after 14 long years of difficult struggle, had overcome that shame « now » was the time for art to extol the folk-genius of our Race, not down-grade it. He asked that the troublesome Opera be shelved for the sake of present peace and future cultural development. But, if the conductor considered its music worthwhile, performance of an orchestral suite from « Matthias the Painter » could take place.

To the great disappointment of all, save the general Opera-going public, Furtwängler responded with his own public letter, in which he heartily subscribed to each of Doctor Gœbbels' objections, including his own observation :

« There are moments when even art must make room for the good of something greater. »

Coming from such a fanatic musician, it was a deeply generous statement. With the cancellation of Hindemith's 1st and last chance at fame, the defunct Reds were disappointed because their own last chance for a big political demonstration evaporated, and the « Stormtroopers » were disappointed because they missed their chance to whip Germany's last Communists.

In all the hateful hullabaloo turned-up by the Jews ever since, and whenever Hindemith's name is mentioned today, conveniently forgotten was the concert performance of « Matthias the Painter », which did indeed take place in 1934, as Doctor Gœbbels promised. The piece was even recorded in a 3rd « Reich » sound studio under Furtwängler's direction in 1934 ! That this concert version of musical highlights was not much performed thereafter only means that it failed to generate any lasting hold on concert-goers' imaginations, a failure which persists to this day, since it is not often heard, even though it is still touted as some kind of anti-Nazi Masterpiece. Indeed, the Opera which was supposed to have been too wonderful for the Nazis to appreciate or tolerate, was a huge flop when ostentatiously performed in New York. Since then, it has never again seen the light of day.

It turns-out that Hindemith was not such an interesting composer after all, and the controversy surrounding his name had more to do with his obnoxious politics than his own music. Overlooked, too, is the fact that, despite his Red identity, he was allowed to compose, perform and even record in the 3rd « Reich », hardly the tyrannical system the Jews would lead us to believe existed. Hindemith grabbed the United States Jews' offer of cash and fled with sheaves of his useless scores. Apparently, New York's kosher environment was less inspiring than that of evil old Nazi Germany,

and his artificial reputation withered away into virtual oblivion. Happily, he lived long enough to see his life's work savaged by Jew music-critics in the 1950's, when they ridiculed him as « hopelessly obsolete ». True to character, his one-time kosher benefactors eventually turned on their « righteous Gentile » .

Only the newspaper Jews overseas manipulated by the « Matthias the Painter » situation to their advantage, portraying it to gullible goy readers as proof positive that great music was being suppressed by the Nazis, to whom Furtwängler had weakly capitulated. However, they, too, were soon disappointed when, sure he would defect following the Hindemith affair, they offered him (as they had offered Richard Strauß) large performance fees with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

He turned them down and, after War came, was personally active in donating a great deal of concert time to soldiers and factory workers. Audiophiles for decades considered his greatest recorded achievement to have been a performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony, the « Choral » , given in the presence of Adolf Hitler on the occasion of the « Führer » 's 55th birthday, on April 20th, 1944. Until the very end, Furtwängler was still giving public concerts in Berlin. His last « Reich » recording (the César Franck Symphony in D minor) is the best performance ever made of that work. It took place in the cataclysmic days of January, 1945.

The Jews castigated Germany's « Nazi dictatorship » for censorship, a lie, as cited above, when Hindemith was allowed to perform. But immediately after the War, German artists were prevented by the occupation forces from working. Only those who could suck-up to the Allies by loudly proclaiming their anti-Nazi sentiments stood a chance of employing their craft. The very censorship the Jewized Allies falsely condemned in National-Socialism they practised themselves when the chance came along. Among the proscribed was Wilhelm Furtwängler, even though he never held any post in the « Reich » government. He was not a Party member, and had never even voted for a National-Socialist candidate.

The occupation authorities promised he could resume his conducting career if he agreed to sign a public statement begging them for forgiveness for his past participation « in the criminal Hitler regime » . He refused, declaring his life then, as always, had been entirely musical, not political, and he objected to the accusation that he had ever been part of anything « criminal » . The ban against him was upheld and he had to subsist on the charity of friends.

The Jews and their Gentile dupes in uniform tried to show the Germans that their culture was better off under Allied occupation than with their own, elected, National-Socialist government. Trouble was, with all the country's real artists dead, jailed or censored, there wasn't much culture to go around. Desperate to maintain their facade of democratic civilisation, they returned to Furtwängler with a watered-down version of the statement presented for his endorsement 2 years earlier. This time, it read something to the effect that he publicly condemned « totalitarianism » in all its forms, without mentioning National-Socialism. He unhesitatingly signed the document and was allowed to resume his musical duties.

Although Furtwängler's return to the podium was greeted with universal acclaim, his performances mostly lacked the greatness of his War-time and pre-War conducting. Many concerts he held were surprisingly disappointing. The old fire seemed to have died-out in him. Only occasionally, was it seen to flare to life. While a few appearances, such as his

performance of the Choral Symphony by Beethoven, at the re-opening of the Bayreuth Festival, exemplified the full-scope of his genius, more typical were his lack-lustre renditions of Beethoven's and Bruckner's works, his long-time favourites. He had been a Wagner specialist, too, but his post-War recordings of « Tristan und Isolde » and the « Ring » are indistinguishable from any average interpretations. Clearly, the man was not inspired by post-War democracy. Yet, he was no different than artists of all kinds who reached heights of their greatness from 1933 to 1945. Immediately thereafter, Germany and the West fell into their steep decline toward cultural sterility and extinction from which they still have not pulled-out.

Artists depend for their supreme achievement on high-inspiration. The 3rd « Reich » was the most inspiring epoch in all of history, and its artists thereby felt their talents lifted by the greatness of the times. In the dismal, hypocritical world of the Allies sham « victory » , there was only despair, not inspiration. This is no idle speculation. Proof may be found in the very audio legacy left by Furtwängler himself. His 3rd « Reich » recordings are today widely prized for their universal excellence. It is well-known among collectors that any Furtwängler performance dated before 1946 will be guaranteed for its high-value, even if the technical quality is inferior by later standards, while his post-War recordings are largely shunned for their reputation as mediocre. Recording companies make sure that the date of a Furtwängler appearance is displayed prominently on the disc-cover - if the performance occurred during the « Reich » . The dates of his post-War performances are virtually never printed, a sure sign to knowledgeable collectors that the concert was made under a democracy and consequently of relatively slight artistic merit.

Furtwängler's death in 1954 was followed by decades of common-place conductors who consistently rendered the great music of the past in uniformly colourless renditions. Almost by chance, after decades of middling music-directors, audiophiles rediscovered Furtwängler's old recordings. For a generation oblivious to his art, his preserved performances came as nothing less than a revelation. Sharply contrasting with the common-place output of Leonard Bernstein, Seiji Ozawa, Dean Dixon and other non-White non-entities from the 1960's to the present, his concerts were regarded as, by far, the best interpretations of great music on record. The international Furtwängler resurgence which began some 20 years ago not only continues today, but has broadened and intensified. Whenever another lost recording of his is discovered, it instantly shoots to die top of the best-seller lists.

It was only a matter of time, of course, before the Jews were alerted to the popular renaissance of this recalcitrant « Nazi musician » . Banning his recordings or even making them quietly disappear by pressuring CD companies into discontinuing them would have lost the shrewd shysters new revenues generated by such sales. Instinctually unable to forego a financial profit, they took-over the Furtwängler revival themselves.

In an irony typical only of unscrupulous Jews, the same clique who fulminated against him in the 1930's and banned him in the 1940's are peddling his recordings today. As the most politicised creatures on the planet, however, they are not content with the vast revenues his CD's net them. They must distort his memory to conform with their own perverse notions of political correctness. In justifying sales of his music and using their twisted image of him to propagandise their Gentile customers, the Great Masters of the Lie are now depicting Furtwängler as an anti-Nazi who secretly hated Hitler and stayed in Germany only to help save Jews from being gassed ! While such a bald-faced misrepresentation would have flabbergasted the Allied Occupation authorities who banned him from performing, it is

just one more piece of the deceitful chutzpah for which the Jews have long been infamous.

No one should then be surprised that the loudest spokesman on behalf of a de-Nazified Furtwängler is Hebrew Henry Fogel. He laments that this « righteous goy, oops, Gentile » was mistaken for a Fascist. The conductor actually loved Jews and risked his life to save them from Hitler, before whom Furtwängler gave his best performance on the « Führer » 's birthday ! Such demented « logic » could only come from the profit-fevered brain of a crazed Jew. Now that his reputation has been sanitized in the mikvah of political correctness, we no longer need trouble our conscience when buying a Furtwängler recording. The past has been re-arranged to make things work for the Jews in the present. Such insidious duplicity recalls one of the brain-washing slogans concocted by Big Brother in George Orwell's prophetic novel, « 1984 » :

« Who controls the present, controls the past ; who controls the past, controls the future. »

But the revival of Aryan music under National-Socialism spread through the 1930's and early 1940's beyond the borders of the 3rd « Reich » . Helga Rosswänge, Askel Schlotz and Thorsten Raif, who made their careers in Hitler's Germany, were, bar none, the greatest tenors Denmark ever produced, before and especially since the end of World War II. Years before the War, Belgium's greatest tenor, Marcel Wittrich, cut a recording of the concert aria « God Bless our " Führer " ! » , which topped the best-seller charts for most of the 1930's. Kirstin Flagstad, among the most important Wagnerian sopranos of the 20th Century, left the Metropolitan Opera, where her success in « Die Walküre » had been nothing short of stupendous, to join her husband in Norway. He was not only the country's leading conductor, but a high-ranking officer in the « Nasional Samlung » , the Norwegian National-Socialist Movement. When a post-War return engagement at the MET was scheduled for her, Flagstad was prevented from performing by hysterical mobs of incensed New York Jews. They openly and successfully prevented a world-class artist from publicly performing for ideological reasons, the very thing for which they had so long falsely condemned the Nazis.

...

Not only during his lifetime, but also in the decades since his death in 1954, Wilhelm Furtwängler has been globally recognized as one of the greatest musicians of the 20th Century, above all as the brilliant primary conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, which he led from 1922 to 1945, and again after 1950.

On his death, the Encyclopædia Britannica commented :

« By temperament a Wagnerian, his restrained dynamism, superb control of his Orchestra and Mastery of sweeping rhythms also made him an outstanding exponent of Beethoven. »

Furtwängler was also a composer of merit.

Following the National-Socialist seizure of power in 1933, some prominent musicians (most notably such Jewish artists as Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer and Arnold Schönberg) left Germany. Most of the nation's musicians, however,

including the great majority of its most gifted musical talents, remained - and even flourished. With the possible exception of the composer Richard Strauß, Furtwängler was the most prominent musician to stay and « collaborate » .

Consequently, discussion of his life (even today) still provokes heated debate about the role of art and artists under Hitler and, on a more fundamental level, about the relationship of art and politics.

Wilhelm Furtwängler drew great inspiration from his homeland's rich cultural heritage, and his world revolved around music, especially German music. Although essentially non-political, he was an ardent patriot, and leaving his fatherland was simply out of the question.

Ideologically, he may perhaps be best characterized as a man of the « old » Germany - a Wilhelmine conservative and an authoritarian elitist. Along with the great majority of his countrymen, he welcomed the demise of the ineffectual democratic regime of Germany's « Weimar Republic » (1918-1933) . Indeed, he was the conductor chosen to direct the gala-performance of Richard Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » for the « Day of Potsdam » , a solemn State ceremony on March 21, 1933, at which President von Hindenburg, the youthful new Chancellor Adolf Hitler and the newly-elected « Reichstag » formally ushered in the new government of « national awakening » . All the same, Furtwängler never joined the National-Socialist Party (unlike his chief musical rival, fellow conductor Herbert von Karajan) .

It wasn't long before Furtwängler came into conflict with the new authorities. In a public dispute in late-1934 with Propaganda Minister Josef Gœbbels over artistic direction and independence, he resigned his positions as director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, and as head of the Berlin State Opera. Soon, however, a compromise agreement was reached whereby he resumed his posts, along with a measure of artistic independence. He was also able to exploit both his prestigious position and the artistic and jurisdictional rivalries between Gœbbels and Hermann Göring to play a greater and more independent role in the cultural life of 3rd « Reich » Germany.

From then on, until the « Reich » 's defeat in the spring of 1945, he continued to conduct to much acclaim both at home and abroad (including, for example, a highly-successful concert tour of Britain in 1935) . He was also a guest-conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, 1939-1940, and at the Bayreuth Festival. On several occasions, he led concerts in support of the German War effort. He also nominally served as a member of the Prussian State Council and as vice-president of the « Reich » Music Chamber, the State-sponsored professional musicians' association.

...

Throughout the 3rd « Reich » era, Furtwängler's eminent influence on Europe's musical life never diminished.

For Americans conditioned to believe that nothing of real cultural or artistic merit was produced in Germany during the Hitler era, the phrase « Nazi art » is an oxymoron : a contradiction in terms. The reality, though, is not so simple, and it is gratifying to note that some progress is being made to set straight the historical record.

This is manifest, for example, in the publication of 2 studies that deal extensively with Furtwängler, and which generally defend his conduct during the 3rd « Reich » : « The Devil's Music Master » by Sam Shirakawa and « Trial of Strength » by Fred K. Prieberg. These revisionist works not only contest the widely accepted perception of the place of artists and arts in the 3rd « Reich » , they express a healthy striving for a more factual and objective understanding of the reality of National-Socialist Germany.

Prieberg's « Trial of Strength » concentrates almost entirely on Furtwängler's intricate dealings with Josef Goebbels, Hermann Göring, Adolf Hitler and various other figures in the cultural life of the 3rd « Reich » . In so doing, he demonstrates that in spite of official measures to « coordinate » the arts, the regime also permitted a surprising degree of artistic freedom. Even the anti-Jewish racial laws and regulations were not always applied with rigour, and exceptions were frequent. (Among many instances that could be cited, Leo Blech retained his conducting post until 1937, in spite of his Jewish ancestry.) Furtwängler exploited this situation to intervene successfully in a number of cases on behalf of artists, including Jews, who were out of favour with the regime. He also championed Paul Hindemith, a « modern » composer whose music was regarded as degenerate.

The artists and musicians who left the country (especially the Jewish ones) contended that without them, Germany's cultural life would collapse. High-culture, they and other critics of Hitler and his regime arrogantly believed, would wither in an ardently nationalist and authoritarian state.

As Prieberg notes :

« The musicians who emigrated or were thrown-out of Germany from 1933 onwards indeed felt they were irreplaceable and in consequence believed firmly that Hitler's Germany would, following their departure, become a dreary and empty cultural wasteland. This would inevitably cause the rapid collapse of the regime. »

Time would prove the critics wrong. While it is true that the departure of such artists as Fritz Busch and Bruno Walter did hurt initially (and dealt a blow to German prestige) , the nation's most renowned musicians -(including Richard Strauß, Carl Orff, Karl Böhm, Hans Pfitzner, Wilhelm Kempff, Elizabeth Schwarzkopf, Herbert von Karajan, Anton von Webern, as well as Wilhelm Furtwängler) remained to produce musical art of the highest-standards. Regardless of the emigration of a number of Jewish and a few non-Jewish artists, as well as the promulgation of sweeping anti-Jewish restrictions, Germany's cultural life not only continued at a high-level, it flourished.

The National-Socialists regarded art, and especially music, as an expression of a society's soul, character and ideals. A wide-spread appreciation of Germany's cultural achievements, they believed, encouraged a joyful national pride and fostered a healthy sense of national unity and mission. Because they regarded themselves as guardians of their nation's cultural heritage, they opposed Liberal, modernistic trends in music and the other arts, as degenerate assaults against the cultural-spiritual traditions of Germany and the West.

Acting swiftly to promote a broad revival of the nation's cultural life, the new National-Socialist government made prodigious efforts to further the arts and, in particular, music. As detailed in 2 recent studies (Michæl H. Kater's « The

Twisted Muse » and Erik Levi's « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” »), not only did the new leadership greatly increase state funding for such important cultural institutions as the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and the Bayreuth Wagner Festival, it used radio, recordings and other means to make Germany's musical heritage as accessible as possible to all its citizens.

As part of its efforts to bring art to the people, it strove to erase Classical music's snobbish and « class » image, and to make it widely familiar and enjoyable, especially to the working-class. At the same time, the new regime's leaders were mindful of popular musical tastes. Thus, by far most of the music heard during the 3rd « Reich » era on the radio or in films was neither Classical nor even traditional. Light-music with catchy tunes (similar to those popular with listeners elsewhere in Europe and in the United States) predominated on radio and in motion pictures, especially during the War years.

The person primarily responsible for implementing the new cultural policies was Josef Gœbbels. In his positions as Propaganda Minister and head of the « Reich » Culture Chamber, the umbrella association for professionals in cultural life, he promoted music, literature, painting and film in keeping with German values and traditions while, at the same time, consistent with popular tastes.

No political leader had a keener interest in art, or was a more enthusiastic booster of his nation's musical heritage than Adolf Hitler, who regarded the compositions of Ludwig van Beethoven, Richard Wagner, Anton Bruckner and the other German Masters as sublime expressions of the Germanic « soul » .

Hitler's reputation as a bitter, 2nd rate « failed artist » is undeserved. As John Lukacs acknowledges in his recently published work, « The Hitler of History » , the German leader was a man of real artistic talent and considerable artistic discernment.

We perhaps can never fully understand Hitler and the spirit behind his political movement without knowing that he drew great inspiration from, and identified with, the heroic figures of European legend who fought to liberate their peoples from tyranny, and whose stories are immortalized in the great musical dramas of Wagner and others.

This was vividly brought out by August Kubizek, Hitler's closest friend as a teenager and young man, in his post-War memoir (published in the United States under the title « The Young Hitler I Knew ») . Kubizek describes how, after the 2 young men together attended for the 1st time a performance in Linz of Wagner's Opera « Rienzi » , Hitler spoke passionately and at length about how this work's inspiring story of a popular Roman tribune had so deeply moved him. Years later, after he had become Chancellor, he related to Kubizek how that performance of « Rienzi » had radically changed his life. « In that hour it began » , he confided.

Hitler, of course, recognized Furtwängler's greatness and understood his significance for Germany and German music. Thus, when other officials (including Heinrich Himmler) complained of the conductor's non-conformity, Hitler overrode their objections. Until the end, Furtwängler remained his favourite conductor. He was similarly indulgent toward his favourite « Heldentenor » , Max Lorenz, and Wagnerian soprano Frida Leider, each of whom was married to a Jew.

Their cultural importance trumped racial or political considerations.

A year and a half after the end of the War in Europe, Furtwängler was brought before a humiliating « denazification » tribunal. Staged by American occupation authorities and headed by a Communist, it was a farce. So much vital information was withheld from both the tribunal and the defendant that, Shirakawa suggests, the occupation authorities may well have been determined to « get » the conductor.

In his closing remarks at the hearing, Furtwängler defiantly defended his record :

« The fear of being misused for propaganda purposes was wiped-out by the greater concern for preserving German music as far as was possible. I could not leave Germany in her deepest misery. To get-out would have been a shameful flight. After all, I am a German, whatever may be thought of that abroad, and I do not regret having done it for the German people. »

Even with a prejudiced judge and serious gaps in the record, the tribunal was still unable to establish a credible case against the conductor, and he was, in effect, cleared.

A short time later, Furtwängler was invited to assume direction of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. (He was no stranger to the United States : in 1927-1929, he had served as visiting conductor of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.)

On learning of the invitation, America's Jewish cultural establishment launched an intense campaign (spear-headed by « The New York Times » , musicians Arthur Rubinstein and Vladimir Horowitz, and New York critic Ira Hirschmann) to scuttle Furtwängler's appointment. As described in detail by Shirakawa and writer Daniel Gillis (in « Furtwängler and America ») , the campaigners used falsehoods, innuendos and even death threats.

Typical of its emotionally charged rhetoric was the bitter reproach of Chicago Rabbi Morton Berman :

« Furtwängler preferred to swear fealty to Hitler. He accepted at Hitler's hands his re-appointment as director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. He was unflinching in his service to Goebbels' Ministry of Culture and Propaganda. The token saving of a few Jewish lives does not excuse Mister Furtwängler from official, active participation in a regime which murdered 6 million Jews and millions of non-Jews. Furtwängler is a symbol of all those hateful things for the defeat of which the youth of our city and nation paid an ineffable price. »

Among prominent Jews in Classical music, only the famous violinist Yehudi Menuhin defended the German artist. After Furtwängler was finally obliged to withdraw his name from consideration for the Chicago post, a disillusioned Moshe Menuhin, Yehudi's father, scathingly denounced his co-religionists. Furtwängler, he declared :

« ... was a victim of envious and jealous rivals who had to resort to publicity, to smear, to calumny, in order to keep him out of America so it could remain their private bailiwick. He was the victim of the small fry and puny souls

among concert artists, who, in order to get a bit of national publicity, joined the band-wagon of professional idealists, the professional Jews and hired hands who irresponsibly assaulted an innocent and humane and broad-minded man. »

3rd « Reich » Germany is so routinely demonized in our society that any acknowledgment of its cultural achievements is regarded as tantamount to defending « Fascism » and that most unpardonable of sins, anti-Semitism. But as Professor John London suggests (in an essay in « The Jewish Quarterly » : « Why Bother about Fascist Culture ? » , Autumn 1995) , this simplistic attitude can present awkward problems :

« Far from being a totally ugly, unpopular, destructive entity, culture under Fascism was sometimes accomplished, indeed beautiful. If you admit the presence and, in some instances, the richness, of a culture produced under fascist regimes, then you are not defending their ethos. On the other hand, once you start dismissing elements, where do you stop ? »

In this regard, is it worth comparing the way that many media and cultural leaders treat artists of National-Socialist Germany with their treatment of the artists of Soviet Russia. Whereas Furtwängler and other artists who performed in Germany during the Hitler era are castigated for their cooperation with the regime, Soviet-era musicians, such as composers Aram Khachaturian and Sergei Prokofiev, and conductors Evgeny Svetlanov and Evgeny Mravinsky (all of whom toadied to the Communist regime in varying degrees) are rarely, if ever, chastised for their « collaboration » . The double standard that is clearly at work here is, of course, a reflection of our society's obligatory concern for Jewish sensitivities.

The artist and his work occupy a unique place in society and history. Although great art can never be entirely divorced from its political or social environment, it must be considered apart from that. In short, art transcends politics.

No reasonable person would denigrate the artists and sculptors of ancient Greece because they glorified a society that, by today's standards, was hardly democratic. Similarly, no one belittles the builders of medieval Europe's great cathedrals on the grounds that the social order of the Middle-Ages was dogmatic and hierarchical. No cultured person would disparage William Shakespeare because he flourished during England's fervently nationalistic and anti-Jewish Elizabethan age. Nor does anyone chastise the magnificent composers of Russia's Tsarist era because they prospered under an autocratic regime. In truth, mankind's greatest cultural achievements have most often been the products not of Liberal or egalitarian societies, but rather of quite un-democratic ones.

A close look at the life and career of Wilhelm Furtwängler reveals « politically incorrect » facts about the role of art and artists in 3rd « Reich » Germany, and reminds us that great artistic creativity and achievement are by no means the exclusive products of democratic societies.

L' « accord » de 1935

Les dirigeants nazis laissèrent volontairement Fürtwängler un bon moment dans une situation incertaine, refusant de le

voir et de l'autoriser à quitter l'Allemagne. Goebbels profita de l'absence de Fürtwängler à la tête de l'Orchestre de Berlin pour éliminer tous les « non-aryens » qui y travaillaient encore et que Fürtwängler avait pu préserver jusqu'à là. En particulier, il réussit à faire partir Berta Geißmar d'Allemagne après un harcèlement moral continu depuis deux ans. Les dirigeants nazis avaient tout fait pour les séparer car ils avaient compris que sa fidèle assistante avait une très grande influence sur lui prenant souvent les décisions matérielles à sa place. Comme Winifred Wagner l'avait explicitement prévu, Fürtwängler se sentait perdu sans elle et avait énormément de mal à prendre une quelconque décision.

Le 28 février 1935, Fürtwängler obtint enfin de Goebbels une entrevue. Fürtwängler était viscéralement attaché à son pays. À ce propos, sa femme rapporta plus tard que Fürtwängler fut extrêmement choqué lorsqu'il apprit le suicide de Stefan Zweig en exil au Brésil en 1942 : il dit qu'« il le comprenait et qu'il aurait fait pareil ». D'autre part, les musiciens de son Orchestre et son public ne cessaient de le supplier de rester. De son côté, Goebbels savait parfaitement que Fürtwängler était opposé à la politique d'Hitler mais, comme le dictateur, il considérait que Fürtwängler, au même titre que Hans Pfitzner et Richard Strauß, était un « trésor national » qu'il fallait conserver absolument en Allemagne (les 3 musiciens apparaîtront dans la « Gottbegnadeten-Liste » en 1944 au plus haut niveau). Durant l'entretien, Goebbels exigea que Fürtwängler fasse publiquement acte d'allégeance à la politique culturelle d'Hitler, ce qu'il refusa catégoriquement, ce qui est prouvé par plusieurs documents écrits de cette période retrouvés par Fred Prieberg. Goebbels accepta finalement un compromis : Fürtwängler resterait en Allemagne comme musicien apolitique, n'occupant aucun poste officiel. Précisément, au moment où Fürtwängler, furieux, allait partir, Goebbels le retint et lui demanda s'il était prêt à reconnaître publiquement que c'était Hitler qui dirigeait la politique culturelle en Allemagne et que cela lui suffirait. Fürtwängler lui dit qu'oui car c'était une évidence puisqu'Hitler était le dictateur qui dirigeait l'Allemagne. Mais comprenant que cela pouvait être dangereux, Fürtwängler exigea que le communiqué soit clair sur le fait qu'il ne voulait avoir affaire en aucune façon à cette politique culturelle. L'accord oral fut conclu. Le plus grand chef d'orchestre allemand allait donc rester en Allemagne : Goebbels fut très satisfait de cet accord, et se gaussa de l'incroyable naïveté politique des artistes. Ce dernier fit publier une annonce dans laquelle Fürtwängler déclarait n'avoir eu aucune intention politique dans son article sur Hindemith. Fürtwängler, inconscient de l'importance symbolique, n'insista pas pour qu'un autre communiqué public soit publié indiquant explicitement que Goebbels lui garantissait qu'il n'aurait pas à participer aux concerts officiels. L'« accord » fut cependant bien respecté car la cours en dénazification de Fürtwängler ne compta en 1946 que 2 concerts « officiels » sur toute la période nazie. Comme Berta Geißmar le déclara l'annonce de Goebbels pouvait paraître, vis-à-vis de l'extérieur, comme une ré-édition du chef d'orchestre mais, en fait, correspondait à la volonté de Fürtwängler de séparer art et politique et de rester en Allemagne pour aider les nombreuses personnes qui le lui demandaient. Alfred Rosenberg fut, d'ailleurs, furieux du communiqué. Il écrivit une lettre où il déclara qu'il s'agissait d'une provocation directe contre le National-Socialisme car Fürtwängler ne s'était pas du tout excusé pour ses nombreuses critiques contre la politique nazie. Rosenberg chercha, en vain, à obtenir des excuses publiques du chef d'orchestre.

Fürtwängler, qui pensait dès lors être dégagé de toute relation avec le régime, déchantait très rapidement. Le 25 avril 1935, il donna un concert à Berlin consacré à Beethoven. Le 3 mai, il dirigea le même concert. Goebbels lui fit annoncer très peu de temps avant le début du concert, et alors qu'il était déjà dans sa loge, qu'Hitler allait y assister. Un témoin rapporta qu'en apprenant la nouvelle, Fürtwängler jeta le radiateur de sa loge contre un mur en hurlant.

On lui transmit l'ordre qu'il devait faire le salut nazi. La discussion porta ensuite sur la façon de l'éviter à tout prix, Franz Jastrau l'intendant de l'Orchestre lui conseillant de garder en permanence sa baguette dans la main droite. Hitler entra dans la salle et Fürtwängler juste après sous un tonnerre d'applaudissement la baguette dans sa main droite. Alors que quelques allemands faisaient bruyamment le salut nazi, Fürtwängler commença le concert comme si de rien n'était. Hitler n'aurait jamais pu penser un tel affront possible mais fit bonne figure. Les quelques photos qui ont été conservées montrent Fürtwängler, à la fin du concert, dans un état de confusion complète et ne sachant pas quoi faire de sa main droite qui gardait toujours sa baguette. Hitler, comprenant la situation, se jeta sur le podium la main tendue. La photo de la « poignée de main », qui lui permettait de ne pas faire le salut nazi, fut largement diffusée par Goebbels. Ce dernier atteignit son objectif de laisser entendre que Fürtwängler était un allié du pouvoir nazi.

En septembre 1935, Oskar Jölli, un baryton membre du Parti Nazi envoya une lettre à la « Gestapo » dénonçant les propos suivants de Fürtwängler : « Ceux qui sont au pouvoir doivent tous être fusillés, les choses ne changeront pas en Allemagne tant que cela ne sera pas fait. » . Ces propos de Fürtwängler furent rapportés à Goebbels et Hitler. Ce dernier supprima pour cette raison les engagements du chef d'orchestre jusqu'en janvier 1936 lors de l'anniversaire des 50 ans du chef d'orchestre. Pour se « réconcilier » avec le chef d'orchestre, Goebbels et Hitler voulurent lui offrir une baguette d'ivoire et d'or ainsi qu'une rente annuelle à vie de 40,000 Reichsmarks pour son anniversaire ce qu'il refusa.

Début 1936, Fürtwängler réussit à récupérer un passeport en règle. Les Nazis, cherchant par tous les moyens à garder Fürtwängler en Allemagne, ne le lui rendirent qu'au dernier moment en dépit de son insistance. Goebbels lui remit en mains propres le document, en lui disant explicitement qu'il pouvait partir mais que, dans ce cas, il ne remettrait plus jamais les pieds en Allemagne. Cela joua un rôle très important dans sa décision de rester, car cela signifiait qu'il ne pourrait plus jamais revoir les siens. Sa famille, surtout sa mère, qui mourut le 7 novembre 1944, ont été très souvent évoquées pour expliquer le fait qu'il soit resté en Allemagne. D'autre part, Fürtwängler avait déjà 5 enfants, tous hors mariage, en 1935.

Le poste à New York et le piège de Hermann Göring

L'occasion de s'exiler se présenta toutefois, mais il fut piégé une seconde fois. En effet, on lui proposa de devenir chef principal de l'Orchestre philharmonique de New York, fonction à laquelle il aurait succédé à Arturo Toscanini à la condition qu'il ne joue plus en Allemagne que comme chef invité. C'est Toscanini qui proposa Fürtwängler pour lui succéder à la tête du prestigieux Orchestre, montrant ainsi toute l'estime qu'il avait pour Fürtwängler en tant que chef d'orchestre. Fürtwängler accepta d'abord mais il était mis sous écoute par la « Gestapo » et Göring fut mis au courant. Alors que Fürtwängler avait pris un bateau pour partir en vacances en Égypte, Göring fit paraître une dépêche annonçant que Fürtwängler avait repris le poste de directeur musical à la « Staatsoper » . L'annonce déclencha un tollé aux États-Unis. La presse américaine se déchaîna contre lui, estimant que le chef d'orchestre allemand avait fait semblant d'accepter le poste à New York pour faire « monter les enchères » et obtenir une meilleure situation en Allemagne. Fürtwängler, qui n'était au courant de rien et qui découvrit la presse américaine déchaînée contre lui, préféra rompre son contrat avec New York à son arrivée au Caire. Il n'accepta aucun nouveau

poste, contrairement à ce qu'avait annoncé Göring.

Pour beaucoup, à l'extérieur de l'Allemagne, Fürtwängler était devenu un partisan des Nazis. En fait, comme il le répéta tout le reste de sa vie, Fürtwängler n'avait en rien changé. Il était, alors, plutôt au bord du suicide : il écrivit, en effet, cette année-là dans son journal personnel : « La vie est aujourd'hui plus que jamais une question de courage. » .

Il participa, en 1936, pour la Ire fois depuis 1931 au Festival de Bayreuth. Il rencontra à nouveau Goebbels et Hitler qui vinrent assister aux concerts et voulaient le convaincre de jouer un rôle officiel en Allemagne. Friedelind Wagner était présente et raconta plus tard :

« Je me souviens qu'Hitler avait demandé à voir Fürtwängler, et qu'il lui a dit sèchement qu'il devait dorénavant obéir au Parti et servir la propagande, et Fürtwängler refusa très explicitement. Hitler devint fou de rage et fit savoir à Fürtwängler que, dans ce cas, il y aurait une place pour lui dans un camp de concentration. Fürtwängler dit : « Herr Reichskanzler, au moins là-bas je serai en bonne compagnie. » . Le « Führer » se mit hors de lui et quitta la pièce. »

Il s'échappa ensuite dans les montagnes pour composer, alors que les Jeux olympiques d'été de 1936 se déroulaient à Munich. Pendant l'hiver 1936-1937, il cessa toute activité publique et se concentra à nouveau sur la composition, souhaitant demeurer dans un repos absolu. Il ne retrouva son Orchestre que le 10 février 1937.

Les prémisses de la guerre

La résistance à la volonté des Nazis

Josef Goebbels chercha par tous les moyens à conserver Fürtwängler en Allemagne et à l'utiliser pour glorifier le peuple allemand.

Hitler et Goebbels savaient qu'il n'était pas fidèle à leur ligne politique : on trouve ainsi dans 2 entrées du journal personnel de Goebbels datées de 1937, parmi d'autres :

« Fürtwängler prend toujours parti pour les Juifs, et pour Hindemith. J'en ai assez. Ça m'agace vraiment et je m'énerve face à lui. Mais ça ne change rien. Encore avec ces Juifs de demi-sang. Il en a toujours et toujours sous sa protection. »

De plus, Fürtwängler incluait des musiciens juifs ou d'autres « non-aryens » durant ses tournées à l'étranger dans les années 1930. Ce fut le cas en France en avril 1934 où il dirigea des Opéras de Wagner. Hans Mayer, un professeur en littérature, juif communiste exilé d'Allemagne, rapporta après la guerre que Fürtwängler avait volontairement choisi une distribution constituée presque entièrement de Juifs ou de personnes chassées d'Allemagne durant ces concerts. De la même façon, durant l'Exposition universelle de Paris de 1937, Fürtwängler réalisa une série de concerts wagnériens qui

furent un triomphe. Goebbels fit annoncer dans la presse allemande que Fürtwängler et Wagner avaient été plébiscités à Paris. En fait, ceux qui firent un triomphe à Fürtwängler étaient précisément des exilés allemands, dont de nombreux Juifs, qui vivaient à Paris et qui considéraient Fürtwängler comme un symbole de l'Allemagne anti-nazie. D'autre part, Fürtwängler y refusa de diriger l'Hymne allemand des Nazis et exigea que tous les « swastikas » soient enlevés de ses salles de concert. D'autre part, une délégation allemande se rendit sous l'Arc de triomphe pour rendre hommage au soldat inconnu. Sur la photo prise pour l'occasion, on peut voir que Fürtwängler est le seul allemand à ne pas faire le salut nazi (il a la main posée sur l'épaule) . La photo fut d'ailleurs soigneusement conservée par la « Gestapo » apportant une nouvelle preuve que Fürtwängler s'opposait à la politique nazie. D'autre part, les Nazis se rendirent compte et se plaignirent que Fürtwängler ne rapportait de ses tournées à l'étranger pas d'argent ; ils crurent d'abord que Fürtwängler dépensait tout pour lui puis réalisèrent qu'il donnait tout l'argent aux émigrés allemands. Ces derniers confirmèrent après la guerre que le chef d'orchestre leur donnait tout ce qu'il avait « jusqu'au dernier centime » lorsqu'il les rencontrait.

Fürtwängler se refusa toujours à pratiquer le salut nazi et à diriger les Hymnes nazis. Lorsque l'Orchestre de Berlin jouait à l'étranger, il devait commencer le concert par l'Hymne nazi « Horst-Wessel-Lied » . Comme purent le constater les Anglais et les Français durant la période 1935-1939, Fürtwängler se faisait remplacer par l'intendant Hans von Benda et n'entrait qu'après dans la salle. Il refusa aussi systématiquement de signer ses lettres par « Heil Hitler » même lorsqu'il s'adressait directement à Hitler. Fred Prieberg a retrouvé toutes les lettres du chef d'orchestre au dictateur : il s'agit toujours de demandes d'audience pour défendre des musiciens juifs ou considérés comme « dégénérés » . Le fait qu'il refusait de signer par « Heil Hitler » fut considéré comme un affront majeur par les dirigeants nazis et explique que beaucoup de ces demandes d'audience ont été refusées. Il aida de nombreuses personnes d'origine juive à échapper aux persécutions du régime : certaines ont d'ailleurs déclaré que Fürtwängler leur avait sauvé la vie. Fürtwängler parvint aussi à protéger partiellement son Orchestre de l'influence du National-Socialisme : on y comptait relativement peu de membres du Parti et il fut beaucoup moins utilisé à des fins idéologiques que d'autres formations.

Depuis l'arrivée d'Hitler, le Festival de Salzbourg avait beaucoup de succès et devenait le centre des musiciens anti-nazis par opposition à celui de Bayreuth. Arturo Toscanini et Bruno Walter s'y produisaient très souvent. Hitler ne voulait pas que les musiciens allemands s'y rendent. Cependant, Fürtwängler fut invité en 1937 pour diriger la 9e de Beethoven. Fürtwängler accepta malgré l'opposition très ferme d'Hitler et de Goebbels. Arturo Toscanini, que Fürtwängler rencontra au Festival de Salzbourg de 1937 et qui ne lui avait pas pardonné de ne pas être allé à New-York en 1936, lui reprocha le contraire de ce que lui reprochaient les Nazis en disant : « Quiconque dirige dans le 3e “ Reich ” est un Nazi. » . Fürtwängler lui répondit : « Je suis le même qu'avant. La musique va dans des contrées où la « Gestapo » ne peut pas espérer un seul instant se trouver. Vous supposez que l'Art n'est rien d'autre que de la propagande pour le régime qui est déjà au pouvoir. Si je vous comprends bien, le régime nazi étant au pouvoir, je suis donc un chef nazi, sous un régime communiste, je serais un chef communiste, sous un régime démocrate, un chef démocrate. Non, mille fois non ! L'Art appartient au monde entier. » .

Fürtwängler jouait au Festival de Bayreuth depuis 1936 mais était encore en termes excécrables avec Winifred Wagner qui était très proche d'Hitler. Le 17 novembre 1937, il écrivit à Winifred Wagner une lettre très virulente

l'accusant d'avoir trahi l'idéal artistique de Wagner en ayant appliqué des considérations raciales plutôt qu'artistiques dans le choix des musiciens du Festival et en ayant « placé toute sa confiance dans les pouvoirs d'un régime dictatorial ». Il envoya une copie à Hitler, Goebbels et Göring de cette lettre. L'accusation était extrêmement grave pour celle qui se considérait comme l'héritière spirituelle de Wagner et attaquait aussi directement Hitler. Goebbels écrivit dans son journal qu'Hitler se mit dans une fureur considérable contre Fürtwängler et qu'il voulait l'éliminer définitivement du Festival de Bayreuth. Goebbels ajouta que ce serait une perte considérable pour Bayreuth. Comme Fred Prieberg le dit, fin 1937, Fürtwängler n'avait en aucune façon cédé sur le fond face au nouveau régime et seules des personnes très mal informées pouvaient l'accuser de travailler pour les Nazis. Pour les dirigeants nazis, dont la présence culturelle de Fürtwängler semblait indispensable à l'époque, le seul moyen de trouver une parade contre lui était de lui trouver un « remplaçant » .

L'apparition de « monsieur K » : Herbert von Karajan

(Photo) Herbert von Karajan en 1938. Il fut utilisé et lancé par Göring pour contrebalancer le poids culturel de Fürtwängler.

Son 1er combat en 1938 fut donc celui l'opposant à Herbert von Karajan. Les dirigeants nazis voyant que Fürtwängler refusait de se plier à la nouvelle politique du régime, Göring chercha à cette époque à trouver un chef d'orchestre « idéal » qui aurait pu lui faire contrepoids : ce fut Karajan. Ce dernier, extrêmement brillant, était prêt à beaucoup plus de compromis que son aîné, même s'il faut garder à l'esprit que Fürtwängler avait plus de marge de manœuvres que Karajan en raison de son immense prestige et de l'admiration que Goebbels et Hitler lui vouaient. Göring organisa une grande campagne pour Karajan et contre Fürtwängler. Un journaliste, Edwin van der Nüll, fut chargé d'écrire des articles pour glorifier le jeune chef d'orchestre. Il intitula l'un d'eux « le miracle Karajan » (« das Wunder Karajan ») en référence directe à l'article qui avait fait connaître Fürtwängler lorsqu'il était jeune chef d'orchestre à Mannheim. D'autre part, la presse nazie reprochait à Fürtwängler de ne pas adhérer aux nouvelles orientations politiques de l'Allemagne. Cette affaire faisait aussi partie d'une rivalité entre Göring et Goebbels, le 1er souhaitant utiliser Karajan pour reprendre la main sur la vie culturelle allemande. Cependant comme Fred Prieberg l'expliqua, le point principal n'était pas l'opposition entre Göring et Goebbels mais la nécessité pour les dirigeants nazis, Hitler compris, de trouver un contrepoids à ce vieux chef d'orchestre qui s'opposait obstinément à la politique du nouveau régime. Fürtwängler finit par se plaindre directement à Goebbels qui parvint à arrêter la campagne de dénigrement dont il faisait l'objet. 1938 marqua le début de l'apparition de Karajan au tout 1er plan de la scène musicale allemande et le début de la haine et du mépris obsessionnels que Fürtwängler lui voua jusqu'à sa mort (il refusait souvent de l'appeler de son vrai nom, l'appelant « Herr K ») .

Le choc de l'année 1938

L'année 1938 fut un tournant majeur dans l'histoire du 3e « Reich » avec la succession des Accords de Munich, de l'« Anschluss », et la radicalisation des lois raciales. Hitler mit en place un régime criminel à grande échelle qui allait mener à la Seconde Guerre mondiale et à des crimes contre l'humanité d'une ampleur sans précédent.

Fürtwängler comme l'immense majorité des Allemands et des Autrichiens approuva l'union de l'Allemagne et de l'Autriche mais il fut très affecté par les exactions qui s'organisèrent contre les Juifs et menèrent à la sinistre « nuit de Cristal ». Audrey Roncigli rapporte que l'agent Andrew Schulhof le rencontra alors à Budapest :

« Il n'avait plus un sou en poche, il était perdu, j'ai même dû payer son billet de train. On aurait dit, après la nuit de pogrom et des synagogues réduites en cendres, qu'il avait le sentiment d'avoir perdu tout ce qu'il avait fait pour ses amis juifs jusqu'alors. »

Berta Geißmar le rencontra à Paris cette année et écrit qu'il était « grandement déprimé ». Friedelind Wagner le rencontra en décembre de la même année toujours à Paris : ils discutèrent de savoir s'il devait rester ou quitter l'Allemagne, elle décrit Fürtwängler comme « un homme très malheureux ». La brutalité du comportement des Nazis cette année-là explique l'état de confusion dans lequel se trouvait le chef d'orchestre et le fait qu'il accepta quelques concerts ayant un caractère plus politique pour essayer de sauver ce qui était encore possible. Alors que durant la période 1935-1937, ses concerts n'avaient aucun caractère politique suivant l'« accord » conclu avec Goebbels en 1935, il accepta un peu plus de concerts que lui demandait Goebbels à partir de 1938. Fred Prieberg a prouvé en détail que Fürtwängler accepta ces rares concerts avec pour objectif d'obtenir en compensation la protection de personnes ou de formations musicales. Il obtint, par exemple, la sauvegarde de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne et parvint à garder les musiciens « demi-juifs » de cet Orchestre. Le Philharmonique de Vienne disposait d'un statut particulier qui lui garantissait une très grande indépendance politique. Les Nazis ne le supportaient pas et souhaitaient l'éliminer : ils voulaient que les musiciens de l'Orchestre devinssent tous des soldats. L'Orchestre appela à l'aide Fürtwängler. Ce dernier essaya de trouver des appuis politiques et organisa 2 grands concerts du Philharmonique de Vienne avec un programme purement autrichien devant Hitler à Berlin, les 22 et 23 avril. Fürtwängler réussit à faire changer d'avis Hitler et l'Orchestre fut préservé : ce dernier en conserva toujours une reconnaissance infinie vis-à-vis du chef d'orchestre. En revanche, il ne réussit pas à sauver les musiciens considérés comme « purs juifs » par les Nazis qui moururent tous plus tard dans des camps d'extermination.

Goebbels voyait parfaitement le double jeu de Fürtwängler : il en parle à plusieurs reprises dans son journal personnel. Mais il fermait les yeux car il considérait que le fait que Fürtwängler joue à Vienne en 1938, à Prague ou Oslo plus tard, donnait une « légitimité culturelle » à l'annexion de ces villes. Hitler s'en rendait compte également : il déclara que même si Fürtwängler était infiniment supérieur à Karajan comme chef d'orchestre, il fallait garder ce dernier « en réserve » car Fürtwängler n'était pas sûr politiquement. De son côté, non seulement Fürtwängler ne dirigeait ces concerts que pour préserver certaines personnes ou formations musicales, mais ses programmes de concert avaient souvent un caractère « militant ». De même que pendant les années 1930, il faisait exprès de faire jouer des musiciens juifs dans ses tournées à l'étranger, il programma systématiquement de la musique autrichienne à Vienne alors qu'Hitler voulait précisément éliminer la spécificité culturelle de l'Autriche, prétendant qu'elle n'avait toujours été qu'une partie de l'Allemagne. À Prague, il joua systématiquement de la musique slave : « Má Vlast » en 1939 et 1940 et la 9^e Symphonie de Dvořák en 1944.

Le « Musikverein », la résidence de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne

Fürtwängler dirigea « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne à Nuremberg, le 5 septembre, la veille de l'ouverture des journées du Parti Nazi et ne fit donc pas parti du Congrès Nazi comme cela a souvent été écrit. En effet, Fürtwängler a exigé que le concert n'ait aucun caractère officiel ce qui a été accepté. Le concert a eu lieu et c'est seulement le lendemain matin que le Congrès a été ouvert. D'un point de vue historique, Fürtwängler n'a donc jamais dirigé un seul concert pour le Parti Nazi. Ce concert est l'un des 2 (avec celui de l'anniversaire d'Hitler en 1942) qui lui seront reprochés le plus vivement après la guerre. En fait, Fürtwängler dirigea ce concert uniquement dans le but de préserver ce qui pouvait l'être de la culture autrichienne. Outre l'existence de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Vienne (qui joua précisément à Nuremberg), Fürtwängler cherchait des appuis politiques pour préserver le Festival de Salzbourg et en faire un contrepoids à celui de Bayreuth qui devenait un sanctuaire du Nazisme. En ce qui concerne ce dernier point, Goebbels s'y opposa et le projet de Fürtwängler n'aboutit pas.

Fürtwängler réussit à préserver l'indépendance de l'Opéra de Vienne et à y faire placer Karl Böhm comme directeur, les Nazis voulant subordonner complètement l'Opéra de Vienne à celui de Berlin. Il intervint pour préserver la très prestigieuse collection d'instruments de la Société philharmonique de Vienne que Goebbels voulait faire transporter à Berlin. Pendant l'année 1938, Fürtwängler sauva plusieurs musiciens juifs durant les nombreuses rafles qui eurent lieu comme Carl Fleisch et sa femme ou Heinrich Wollheim, un musicien de l'Opéra de Berlin.

La légion d'honneur

Le 20 février 1939, Fürtwängler reçut la Légion d'honneur en France. Ce geste du gouvernement français tend à prouver que les Chancelleries des démocraties occidentales savaient parfaitement que Fürtwängler ne soutenait pas politiquement le régime nazi. Hitler fit d'ailleurs interdire la publication de cette nouvelle en Allemagne.

Au cœur de la guerre

Le « Reich » qui devait durer 1,000 ans se retrouve, en 1943, dangereusement chancelant. Le 2 février, la reddition de la 6e armée du maréchal Paulus à Stalingrad met fin à la bataille la plus meurtrière de toute l'histoire militaire. Elle a coûté la vie à près de 1,000,000 de personnes (soldats et civiles) et considérablement affecté les troupes allemandes. Préoccupé par sa crédibilité et conscient que l'Allemagne est en train de perdre la guerre, Adolf Hitler envoie son ministre de la Propagande pour galvaniser le peuple allemand. Le 18 février 1943, à Berlin, Josef Goebbels lance ces paroles apocalyptiques de la tribune nazie du « Sportpalast » et déchaîne la foule :

« Ich frage euch : Wollt ihr den totalen Krieg ? Wollt ihr ihn, wenn nötig, totaler und radikaler, als wir ihn uns heute überhaupt erst vorstellen können ? Nun, Volk, steh auf und Sturm brich los ! »

(« Je vous demande, voulez-vous la guerre totale ? La voulez-vous, une guerre encore plus totale et radicale que tout ce que nous pouvons imaginer ? Peuple, lève toi ! Tempête déchaîne-toi ! »)

Les conséquences ne se font pas attendre et le pays subit de plus en plus régulièrement les bombardements alliés. Plus touchée que la plupart des autres villes allemandes, la capitale paye le prix de sa valeur symbolique aux yeux du

National-Socialisme. L'inversion du rapport de forces au cœur du conflit oblige les dirigeants allemands à privilégier l'effort de guerre aux affaires culturelles. L'année 1943 marque donc la fin de la politique culturelle du « Reich », diminuant brutalement le nombre de concerts. Beaucoup de musiciens perdent leur statut privilégié qui les dispensait du service militaire, et sont envoyés au combat sur les différents fronts d'Europe. Goebbels établit à ce moment-là une liste de 36 pages contenant les noms des « Gottbegnadet » (les protégés de Dieu) que la nation a comme rôle de protéger. Parmi les plus célèbres, on y trouve Carl Orff, Clemens Krauß, Max Lorenz et Karl Böhm. 3 noms font l'objet d'une liste spéciale : Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner et Wilhelm Fürtwängler qui, selon les termes mêmes du document, représentent un « capital immense pour la nation ». Mais la suite est connue, les mois qui suivent plongent le pays dans le chaos jusqu'à la chute du 3^e « Reich », le 8 mai 1945.

Bien que la quasi-totalité de Berlin ait été détruite, les bandes d'enregistrement de la « Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft » (Radio du « Reich ») sont trouvées par l'Armée Rouge après la prise de Berlin et emmenées en Russie. Par la suite, ces enregistrements sont édités peu à peu et dans des proportions très restreintes en URSS. Commence alors un véritable marché noir avec les documents sonores de l'époque de guerre, dont certains passent le mur sous le manteau et restent, pour cette raison, longtemps méconnus des mélomanes. Finalement, lors de l'explosion du bloc de l'Est (soit 50 ans après avoir été gravées), la « Deutsche Grammophon » publie enfin ces bandes par l'intermédiaire de la « Radio Libre » de Berlin. Ce que l'on peut appeler aujourd'hui, à juste titre, le « style de guerre » de Fürtwängler a été, au moment de la découverte des enregistrements de cette période, un choc terrible. Il suffit d'écouter un des concerts peut-être le plus significatif pour en mesurer l'impact : celui du 30 juin 1943 avec la Philharmonie de Berlin. Ce soir-là précisément, avec la « Coriolan » et les Symphonies n° 4 et 5, Beethoven et Fürtwängler donnent un « Requiem » pour une Allemagne dénaturée par la barbarie nazie. Ce qui est remarquable à l'écoute de ce concert, c'est qu'il réussit à « communiquer un peu de l'atmosphère qui régnait à l'époque », comme le dit sa femme Elisabeth Fürtwängler. Effectivement, dans les dernières années de la guerre, se rendre à la vieille « Philharmonie » n'était pas chose facile et aux dires des musiciens eux-mêmes, les gens se demandaient s'ils n'allaient pas assister à leur dernier concert. Ces craintes étaient du reste tout à fait justifiées, puisque l'« Alte Philharmonie » (tout comme le « Staatsoper » et l'« Admiralspalast ») a fini sous les bombes. Les concerts se déroulaient avec des interruptions fréquentes dues aux alertes nocturnes et contraignaient public et musiciens à attendre pour voir si la soirée pouvait continuer. On imagine certainement avec peine combien venir au concert en ces instants était un acte de foi, excluant toute autre motivation en dehors de l'art. Cette très forte tension a imprégné les performances artistiques de Fürtwängler, au point qu'il est aujourd'hui difficile de les comprendre avec une grille interprétative habituelle. Sans doute est-ce là une marque de la puissance de l'art véritable, capable de soulever l'homme pour le libérer (ne fût-ce qu'un instant) de son ordinaire. Un idéal que le grand chef allemand a recherché toute sa vie.

Attitude face aux exigences du pouvoir

En 1939, la Seconde Guerre mondiale commença et l'Allemagne envahit différents pays. Fürtwängler n'a dirigé aucun concert aux Pays-Bas, en Belgique, en Pologne ni en France durant l'occupation. Il déclara après la capitulation française :

« Je ne jouerai jamais dans un pays comme la France, auquel je suis tant attaché, en me considérant comme un »

vainqueur ". Je dirigerai à nouveau là-bas uniquement quand le pays sera libéré. »

Gœbbels essaya, à de nombreuses reprises, de faire jouer Fürtwängler dans les territoires occupés. Comme Fürtwängler avait déclaré qu'il ne dirigerait que s'il était invité et jamais pour des raisons de propagande, les Nazis obligèrent le chef d'orchestre français Charles Munch à lui envoyer une lettre d'invitation. Mais, ce dernier glissa en bas de la lettre « en accord avec les autorités d'occupation » qui permit à Fürtwängler de comprendre la situation et qui refusa poliment l'invitation de Munch.

Il dirigea néanmoins dans d'autres pays occupés, comme à Prague le 7 novembre 1940 et le 26 mars 1944, à Oslo et à Copenhague en mai 1943. Il choisit toutefois de commencer son concert à Prague du 7 novembre 1940 par « Má Vlast » de Bedřich Smetana. Audrey Roncigli commente :

« Cette œuvre, composée au cours de la 2e moitié du XIXe siècle, était destinée à célébrer la résistance du peuple tchèque face aux Autrichiens. En 1940, l'envahisseur se nomme Hitler. Que Fürtwängler programme cette œuvre en début de concert est considéré par Fred Prieberg, comme " une réelle prise de position pour les Tchèques opprimés ". »

À Prague, le 26 mars 1944, il dirigea la 9e Symphonie de Dvořák. Ce chef-d'œuvre absolu de la musique slave contient des airs inspirés des « negro spirituals » afro-américains. Jouer des musiques afro-américaines était interdit sous peine de mort à l'époque. Enfin, Fürtwängler profita de son séjour à Oslo en mai 1943 pour écrire une lettre de recommandation adressée à Luschek, chef de la Sécurité de la ville d'Oslo qui permit à Issay Dobrowen, chef d'orchestre russe d'origine juive travaillant à Oslo, d'émigrer en Suède.

Pendant la période 1940-1941, Fürtwängler dirigea peu. Une des raisons tient au fait qu'il eut un accident en février 1941 en allant skier comme tous les ans. Fürtwängler fut toute sa vie un grand sportif et un grand skieur. Mais en 1941, pour la seule fois de sa vie, il eut un grave accident de ski. Pendant 8 mois, il ne parvint plus à lever le bras droit. Hitler lui-même se plaignit que Fürtwängler ne pouvait plus rien diriger. Cet accident arrangea bien le musicien qui put reprendre de la distance par rapport au régime nazi.

La tension augmentant de plus en plus (la Guerre mondiale, l'invasion de l'Union soviétique, la « guerre totale »), Fürtwängler fut même contraint de participer à quelques concerts ayant clairement un caractère de propagande. Par exemple, il dirigea 2 concerts dans 2 usines dont l'un a été filmé. On y voit Fürtwängler, entouré de gigantesques croix gammées, dirigeant l'ouverture « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » devant des ouvriers semblant admiratifs. Il faut cependant fortement relativiser la participation de Fürtwängler à la propagande nazie. Le 3e « Reich » a produit des films de propagande dans des proportions gigantesques. Or Fürtwängler n'apparaît que dans 2 bandes de moins de 5 et 10 minutes, respectivement. En particulier, Josef Gœbbels avait pour projet, dès 1941, de réaliser un film gigantesque de propagande et il voulait absolument que Fürtwängler y joue le rôle principal, estimant qu'il était le seul à pouvoir donner une dimension artistique transcendante. Fürtwängler s'y opposa catégoriquement. Le film parut en 1944 sous le titre de « Philharmoniker » avec Richard Strauß, Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm, et Hans Knappertsbusch mais sans Fürtwängler. Le refus de Fürtwängler contraria, une nouvelle fois, fortement Hitler. Gœbbels avait un autre

projet de film sur Beethoven où le chef d'orchestre devait jouer une nouvelle fois un rôle central mais comme Fürtwängler lui répondit violemment : « Vous avez tort, Monsieur le Ministre, si vous croyez pouvoir exploiter Beethoven pour faire un film de propagande. » , Goebbels abandonna définitivement le projet. D'autre part, Fürtwängler avait parfaitement conscience d'être utilisé, parfois, contre son gré, à des fins de propagande. Il écrit dans son carnet personnel en 1945 :

« C'est dans le concret (c'est-à-dire dans les cas particuliers) que j'œuvrais constamment contre la terreur National-Socialiste et la politique de racisme. Ce que j'ai pu faire là justifie seul, à mes yeux, que je sois resté en Allemagne. Il y a une chose dont j'ai dû m'accommoder, et que j'ai dû accepter de subir, c'est la propagande National-Socialiste. Plus que d'autres, j'y étais exposé. Car malgré toute son arrogance, le National-Socialisme avait peu confiance en lui : il aimait utiliser pour son compte la grandeur d'autrui ou d'autres temps. On a fait de la propagande en mon nom parce que j'étais célèbre auparavant, de même que Wagner et Beethoven ont été récupérés. »

Il écrit dès 1940, à propos de la propagande de Goebbels : « Goebbels diffuse une propagande culturelle ouvertement et uniquement adaptée aux besoins du Parti. Elle déchaîne une médiocrité sans bornes. Par là, une lutte contre toute tradition saine. » . En ce qui concerne les doctrines raciales des Nazis, Fürtwängler ne changera pas d'un iota toute sa vie comme en témoigne, parmi bien d'autres, cette phrase qu'il écrit dans son journal personnel sur le cas Wagner, en 1941 : « Avons-nous le droit de mettre dans nos balances des qualités données par Dieu, telles que les différences de peuples et de races ? » .

Dans un texte de son carnet personnel daté de 1941, Fürtwängler dépeint certains des allemands de l'époque de façon terrifiante : « Dans l'un de ses écrits, Paul Ernst parle de ce phénomène singulier que la scolastique du Moyen-âge appelait " mort spirituelle " , à savoir que dans un corps parfaitement sain l'âme peut mourir. Paul Ernst prend pour exemple le destin d'un peuple, l'ascension, l'apogée et le déclin de la civilisation. Or une telle évolution se rencontre aussi chez l'homme. Nous avons autour de nous des êtres qui nous regardent, mais dont les yeux sont vides ; leur âme est morte sans qu'ils le sachent. Seuls s'aperçoivent de ce manque ceux qui ont conservé la leur, qui ont gardé la faculté de sentir si, dans les multiples occasions de la vie, dans les événements de l'histoire, dans les actions privées ou publiques de chacun, l'âme, c'est-à-dire l'homme dans sa globalité, est présente ou non. » .

Winifred Wagner se rendit en Suisse au début de la guerre pour persuader sa fille Friedelind de revenir en Allemagne. Cette dernière était comme son père : elle détestait Hitler. Elle avait quitté l'Allemagne depuis longtemps. Elle rapporta que sa mère lui déclara qu'Hitler n'avait aucune confiance en Fürtwängler et continuait depuis des années à ne pas l'aimer. Elle déclara que Goering et Goebbels étaient exaspérés à cause de ses efforts continuels pour aider « ses amis indésirables » .

D'une façon générale, malgré les pressions très fortes du régime pour faire jouer les musiciens préférés d'Hitler, Fürtwängler a volontairement diversifié les compositeurs qu'il a dirigés en Allemagne comme durant ses tournées à l'étranger pour contrecarrer la politique culturelle nazie. Audrey Roncigli a réalisé une étude statistique des compositeurs choisis par Fürtwängler : ce dernier a clairement diminué la proportion de concerts de Beethoven, Brahms, Strauß, Bruckner, Weber, Schubert durant la période nazie par rapport à la période de Weimar ou l'après-

guerre pour introduire une proportion plus importante des compositeurs comme Ravel, Debussy, ou Stravinsky. Audrey Roncigli conclut :

« L'image de Furtwängler vu après-guerre comme le chantre des compositeurs favoris du " Reich " est, dans l'ensemble, une erreur. »

Furtwängler et la musique contemporaine oubliée

When, in November 1943, Wilhelm Furtwängler returned to Berlin from a concert tour abroad, he was informed that the « Alte Philharmonie » concert-hall had been bombed during an attack on the night of November 22-23. The facade had been badly damaged, and so, had the front rooms in which the irreplaceable music library had been kept. Important letters, files, documents, original scores - everything had been destroyed.

The concert-hall itself remained intact, but the windows had been blown-out, and glass, at the time, was not available. Besides, concerts could no longer be given there because high-piles of rubble cut-off the hall from the outside world. And, before it could be cleared away, more bombs fell on the « Philharmonie », on January 30, 1944, when the « Anhalter » train station, near the hall, was the target. This time, the « Philharmonie » was completely wrecked.

(From : « Wilhelm Furtwängler, a biography » , by Curt Riess, 1955.)

Following the destruction of the « Philharmonie » , Wilhelm Furtwängler conducted the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in 9 more concerts before the Nazi forces surrendered. 6 were in the « Staatsoper » , and when this was damaged by bombing the last 3 were held in the « Admiralpalast » . The last concerts under Nazi rule were held on 22nd and 23rd January with a programme of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's « Die Zauberflöte » Overture, Mozart's Symphony No. 40 (1st 2 movements only for reasons not given) , and Johannes Brahms' 1st Symphony.

Those final 2 concerts took place just 4 months before the collapse of Berlin. Allied forces were closing in on the stricken city, and air-raids continued night and day. Remember that Adolf Hitler was not a democratically elected leader, and many of those, musicians and others, trapped in the beleaguered city were not rabid Nazis. Like those in the London Underground history dictated that many were simply in the wrong place at the wrong time. The predicament faced by the performing arts in the 21st Century palls into insignificance compared with the conditions that the inhabitants, and musicians, of Berlin faced in the final months of the War.

Yet, not only did the music continue, but quite remarkably the final 9 concerts in those last torrid months included the 1st performance of one new work (by Gerhart von Westerman, and played in 2 successive concerts) , and one Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance (Kurt Hessenberg's 2nd Symphony) .

Today, Wilhelm Furtwängler's name is irrevocably linked to the Nazis. It is not the purpose of this article to cover that ground again, too many apologies have already been written. The fact is he remained in Germany as Director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra through the darkest hours of the Nazis. But a lot of great music was performed in the

years between 1922 and 1954 when Furtwängler led the Orchestra. Although his political compromises were deplorable, they should not prevent study of the music that was an integral part of the culture during those turbulent years.

Furtwängler is remembered today as an important interpreter of the Austro-Germanic repertoire, from Mozart through Beethoven to Bruckner. He is also known as a composer ; the very last work he conducted with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in concert was his own 2nd Symphony, on 20th September 1954. He died just 3 months later in December 1954.

During his 32 years as Director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, a surprising amount of 20th Century music was performed under his baton. (Don't forget his tenure at the Orchestra only covered the 1st half of the Century) . Some the new music has endured. There was much Arnold Schönberg (including the 1st performance of the Variations for Orchestra, Opus 31, 2nd version in 1928) , much Hans Pfitzner and Paul Hindemith (the Nazi banning of his Opera « Mathis der Maler » provoked Furtwängler's resignation from the Berlin Opera, in 1934) , plus Béla Bartók, Sergei Prokofiev and more.

But he also performed a large amount of 20th Century music that has not stood the test of time. For research purposes, I have taken a subjective definition of a « forgotten composer » as one whose work is not performed with any regularity today. Using this definition, I researched every one of the four 473 concerts Furtwängler conducted with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. This identified 45 « 20th Century » works, from 30 composers who have subsequently slipped into varying degrees of obscurity.

The results of my research are given below (more details of the research are given as a foot-note) . The history of these composers varies. Many remained in Germany through the Nazi period and beyond. Some such as Ernst Toch fled to the United States when the Nazis came to power. There are very few non-Germans, but these include the Italian Alfredo Casella, who was a known Fascist sympathiser. Interestingly, one fellow conductor-composer is included, the Polish-born Paul Kletzki. Some works remain in print, if not in performance. These include the 2 works performed in 1944 after the destruction of the old « Philharmonie » ; Gerhart von Westerman's « Divertimento » and Kurt Hessenberg's 2nd Symphony, Opus 29.

Looking at frequency of performance, the name that jumps-out is Max Trapp. 6 of his compositions were given over a 28 year period, 3 of these in 1st performances. His works were performed both during the Nazi period (1935 and 1939) , and after the War in 1951. Trapp lived from 1887 to 1971, and taught in various positions in Berlin throughout his life. His works included 7 Symphonies, and chamber music. The only one known at all today is his Piano Concerto, and he is largely forgotten. Why ?

There is no suggestion that a body of 45 neglected Masterpieces awaits discovery in Berlin archives. (But how many perished in the fall of Berlin ?) But what was this music like ? Furtwängler was a brilliant conductor and accomplished composer - does his programming of these composers bestow some merit on them ? Or, were many of them politically convenient commissions ? (This argument falls on the fact that many of the performances were pre-1933) . Is the comparative obscurity (I can find no information at all on 2) of these composers simply typical of the

casualty rate among new works ? Have I misrepresented these artists who lived through such difficult times ? Do any readers know more about these 30 forgotten composers ?

More questions than answers, but an over-grown path that is well worth exploring. Please add further information and views using the comments (or e-mail) feature at the foot of the article.

Furtwängler's performances of forgotten modern music :

Max Trapp

28-29 January 1923 : Symphony No. 2 in B minor, Opus 15 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

14-15 December 1930 : Symphony No. 4 in B-flat minor, Opus 24 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

3-4 December 1933 : Symphonic Suite, Opus 30 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

29-30 September 1935 : Concert for orchestra, Opus 32 (world-premiere) .

3-5 December 1939 : Concert No. 2 for orchestra, Opus 36 (world-premiere) .

25-26 February 1951 : Symphony No. 6, Opus 45 (world-premiere) .

Walter Braunfels

16-17 November 1924 : « “ Don Juan ”, eine klassisch-romantische Phantasmagorie » , Opus 34 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

20-21 December 1925 : Prelude and Prologue from « Die Vogel » .

Georg Schumann

22-23 February 1925 : Variations and Gigue on a theme by Georg Friedrich Händel, Opus 72 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

2-3 February 1930 : Variations on « Gerstern abend war Vetter Michel » , Opus 74 (world-premiere) .

Philipp Jarnach

7-8 November 1926 : « Morgenklangspiel » , Opus 19 (world-premiere) .

15-17 February 1942 : Symphonic Variations for orchestra on music by Mozart, Opus 25 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Ernst Toch

13-14 November 1927 : Comedy for orchestra, Opus 42 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

8-9 February 1931 : Small Theater Suite, Opus 54 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Karl Marx

30 November - 1 December 1930 : Concert for 2 violins and orchestra, Opus 5 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

18-19 December 1932 : Passacaglia (world-premiere) .

Heinrich Kaminsky

25-26 November 1934 : Doric Music.

28-29 November 1937 : Concert for piano and orchestra (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance with the composer conducting ; Furtwängler conducted the balance of the programme) .

Gottfried Müller

5-6 February 1933 : Variations and Fugue on a German folk-song (« Morgenrot Morgenrot ») , Opus 2 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

17-19 December 1939 : Concert for large orchestra, Opus 5 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Theodor Berger

15-17 December 1940 : « Rondino giocoso » (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

2-4 November 1941 : Ballad for orchestra, Opus 10 (world-premiere) .

Karl Holler

16-21 October 1949 : Concerto for violincello and orchestra, Opus 26 (world-premiere) .

Heinz Schubert

5-7 February 1939 : Prelude and Toccata for string orchestra (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

6-8 December 1942 : Hymnic Concert for organ, soprano and tenor (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Bernhard Sekles

11-12 November 1923 : « Gesichte » , Fantastic miniature for small orchestra, Opus 29 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Alfredo Casella

19-20 December 1926 : Partita for piano and orchestra (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Karol Rathaus

4-5 March 1928 : Overture for large orchestra, Opus 22 (world-premiere) .

Gunther Raphael

24-25 March 1929 : Theme, Variations and Rondo for orchestra, Opus 19 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Paul Kletzki

19-20 January 1930 : Variations for orchestra (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Botho Sigwart

2-3 February 1930 : « Hektors Bestattung » , Melodrama, Opus 15.

Wladimir Vogel

25-26 October 1931 : 2 Etudes for orchestra (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Paul Græner

20-21 December 1931 : « Die Flöte von Sans-souci » , Suite for chamber orchestra, Opus 88 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Max Ettinger

3-4 April 1932 : Old English Suite, Opus 30 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Hugo Reichenberger

18-19 December 1932 : 2 « Mariensbilder » .

Max von Schillings

15-16 October 1933 : Symphonic Prologue for large orchestra from « König Œdipus » , Opus 11.

Siegfried Walter Müller

14-15 January 1934 : Happy Music for orchestra, Opus 43 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Hans Brehme

26-28 November 1938 : « Triptychon » (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Heinrich Zilcher (Hermann Zilcher, 1881-1948 ?)

2-4 February 1941 : Concerto in A major for violin and orchestra, Opus 92 (world-premiere) .

Paul Höffer

1-3 March 1942 : Symphonic Variations on a bass-theme by Johann Sebastian Bach, Opus 47 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Gerhard Frommel

8-10 November 1942 : Symphony in E major, Opus 13 (world-premiere) .

Ernst Pepping

31 October - 3 November 1943 : Symphony No. 2 in F minor for orchestra (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

Gerhart von Westerman

22-23 October 1944 : « Divertimento » for large orchestra, Opus 16 (world-premiere) .

Kurt Hessenberg

11 December 1944 : Symphony No. 2 in A major, Opus 29 (Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra 1st performance) .

The analysis was carried-out specifically for this article using « Wilhelm Furtwängler. Die Programme. Der Konzert Mit Dem Berliner Philharmonischen Orchester (1922-1954) » , published in 1965 by Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, Wiesbaden.

Le grand concert de 1942

En 1942, Furtwängler apparut dans le 2e concert qui lui fut le plus reproché après la guerre, le 1er étant celui de Nuremberg en 1938 : la 9e de Beethoven dans le cadre des festivités pour l'anniversaire d'Adolf Hitler (le concert a eu lieu le 19 avril) . Il existe 2 documents de cet événement : un film de la fin du concert ainsi qu'un enregistrement complet de la Symphonie. En avril 1942, à l'apogée du pouvoir nazi, Goebbels voulut organiser des festivités gigantesques pour fêter l'œuvre d'Hitler. Il appela par téléphone Furtwängler, peu de temps avant, lui demandant de jouer la 9e avec l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin. Furtwängler prétextait qu'il n'avait pas assez de temps pour répéter. L'Orchestre de Berlin connaissant très bien l'œuvre, l'argument n'était pas valable et la proposition de Goebbels se transforma en ordre. Furtwängler était alors à Vienne car il avait planifié des concerts tout le mois d'avril en Autriche pour éviter l'anniversaire d'Hitler. Mais Goebbels fit annuler de force les concerts de Vienne autour du 19 et revenir à Berlin le chef d'orchestre. La vision de Goebbels était très claire : il allait faire un discours gigantesque sur l'œuvre d'Hitler annonçant un avenir extraordinaire au peuple allemand, le tout se finirait par la « Neuvième » qui symboliserait la « joie » du peuple allemand devant cet horizon. Seul Furtwängler pouvait diriger une 9e extraordinaire, ce qu'il fit, mais dans un sens totalement opposé à ce que Goebbels avait imaginé et sans que ce dernier semble s'en rendre compte. En effet, si on a pu comparer cette « Neuvième » à la Chapelle Sixtine de Michel-Ange, c'est à la fresque appelée « Le Jugement dernier » qu'il faut penser. Comme le dit Sami Habra dans l'analyse qu'il fit de cette interprétation :

« Ce concert est l'une des preuves flagrantes de la révolte de Furtwängler pendant les heures tragiques de l'Allemagne, quand les Nazis essayaient d'enterrer le grand héritage musical allemand en tentant de l'utiliser pour leurs sinistres desseins. »

Comme l'ont souligné les critiques, cette version de la « Neuvième » loin de célébrer la Joie du peuple allemande prit une dimension apocalyptique où le chef d'orchestre annonça aux dirigeants nazis le « Jugement dernier » . Que le message de Friedrich von Schiller et Beethoven soit à l'opposé absolu de l'idéologie nazie, non seulement Furtwängler en avait parfaitement conscience, mais il l'écrivit explicitement dans son carnet personnel en 1935 :

« Quand on refuse le " Brüder, über'm Sternenzelt " (Frères au plus haut des cieux) ou " Seid umschlungen, Millionen

" (Soyez unis par millions) de Schiller et de Beethoven pour une raison raciste, on refuse le meilleur de la germanité.
»

Josef Goebbels, que la haine raciale avait rendu sourd au message explicite de fraternité entre les peuples du texte de Schiller, ne comprit rien. Dans le film, il semble très content de lui et de Fürtwängler, applaudissant à tout rompre et allant ensuite serrer chaleureusement la main du chef d'orchestre. Il était devenu en effet traditionnel, depuis le concert avec Hitler de 1935, que le plus haut dignitaire nazi présent dans un concert de Fürtwängler lui serre la main, ce qui permettait à ce dernier de ne pas faire le salut nazi obligatoire pour tous les musiciens. À la fin, Fürtwängler semble s'essuyer discrètement la main droite avec un mouchoir. Ce geste, qui a fait couler beaucoup d'encre, était-il conscient, Fürtwängler se sachant filmé ? Il existe peut-être un lien inconscient entre ce geste qui a été diffusé dans le monde entier et le fait que Yehudi Menuhin répéta toute sa vie que Fürtwängler « avait les mains propres » . Toujours est-il que Fürtwängler fut tellement traumatisé par sa participation à cet événement qu'il multiplia les certificats médicaux le mois d'avril de l'année suivante pour disparaître ; c'est le Docteur Johannes Ludwig Schmitt, un résistant membre du « Cercle de Kreisau » qui lui écrivit un faux certificat médical. Cela lui permit d'éviter infiniment pire : non seulement l'anniversaire d'Hitler de 1943 mais un gigantesque « Congrès » organisé par Goebbels en Turquie pour organiser une « force culturelle antijuive » où tous les artistes allemands furent mobilisés de force. Il semble que l'absence de Fürtwängler à ce Congrès scandalisa Heinrich Himmler et Hermann Göring au plus haut point. Fürtwängler recommença en 1944 : il déclara dès le mois de mars à Goebbels qu'il était « mal portant » . Goebbels comprit qu'il se moquait de lui. Il accepta qu'il ne joue pas pour l'anniversaire du dictateur mais lui demanda de jouer à Prague en échange, pour le 5e « anniversaire » de l'annexion de la ville. Fürtwängler accepta mais Goebbels n'avait pas prévu qu'il y jouerait la 9e Symphonie de Dvořák.

La condamnation à mort et la fuite

Claus Schenk von Stauffenberg. Il fut l'organisateur de l'attentat contre Hitler du 20 juillet 1944 et l'un des symboles de la résistance allemande au Nazisme.

En 1944, la pression nazie devint insupportable et Fürtwängler était en danger de mort. Il avait en effet des liens personnels avec des membres de la résistance allemande au Nazisme : il connaissait bien Claus Schenk von Stauffenberg et son médecin, le Docteur Johannes Ludwig Schmitt, qui lui avait fourni de nombreux faux certificats médicaux pour éviter le plus possible les représentations officielles durant le 3e « Reich » , était membre du « Cercle de Kreisau » . Rudolf Pechel, qui fut l'un des rares survivants des camps de concentration de la résistance allemande au Nazisme, déclara que les résistants allemands étaient nombreux à se réunir pendant les concerts de Fürtwängler durant la guerre. Graf Kaunitz, un autre résistant, le confirma après la guerre et déclara que « durant les concerts de Fürtwängler, nous nous sentions comme la grande famille unie de la résistance » . Fürtwängler fut soupçonné par les Nazis d'avoir participé à l'attentat du 20 juillet 1944 contre Hitler. Fürtwängler était en effet au courant de l'organisation de cet attentat mais n'y participa pas, comme il le déclara lors de son procès en dénazification. Goebbels, qui l'avait utilisé et protégé jusqu'à ce moment, reconnut la vérité sur Fürtwängler en avril 1944 :

« Fürtwängler n'a jamais été National-Socialiste. Et il n'a jamais fait de mystère là-dessus. Et les Juifs et les émigrés

ont trouvé cela suffisant pour le considérer comme un des leurs, lui qui était dans une sorte d' " émigration intérieure " ; il n'a jamais changé d'avis sur nous. »

Fürtwängler refusa catégoriquement de signer la pétition envoyée à tous les artistes allemands par Hans Hinkel sous les ordres de Goebbels pour soutenir sans condition Hitler après l'attentat manqué de juillet. Après la mort sur le front de Richard Geyer, un jeune compositeur extrêmement doué, il écrivit une lettre très violente à Goebbels l'accusant de détruire la véritable culture allemande à cause de ses doctrines raciales. L'accusation était très grave mais le chef d'orchestre s'était exprimé plusieurs fois en ce sens par le passé (en particulier dans la lettre de 1937 à Winifred Wagner) . La lettre confirme une nouvelle fois que Fürtwängler a toujours considéré depuis l'arrivée d'Hitler sur la scène politique jusqu'à la fin de la guerre qu'il y avait incompatibilité complète entre les doctrines nazies et ce qu'il considérait être la vraie culture allemande. Son comportement fut compris d'ailleurs dans ce sens par les Nazis car il fut rayé de la « Gottbegnadeten-Liste » le 7 décembre 1944.

Il fut donc décidé qu'il ne survivrait pas à la fin du « Reich » . Fin janvier 1945, on laissa carte blanche à Himmler pour qu'il fasse arrêter le chef d'orchestre par ses Waffen-SS, ce qu'il attendait avec impatience depuis 1933. Himmler et la « Gestapo » avaient, d'ailleurs, constitué un très long dossier sur Fürtwängler listant toutes ses actions prouvant qu'il avait aidé des Juifs et s'était opposé à la politique nazie. Le dossier a, en grande partie, été perdu mais certains éléments ont pu être retrouvés comme le fait que Fürtwängler transmettait de l'argent à ses amis Juifs émigrés avant la guerre ou le fait que Fürtwängler posait souvent les questions qu'il ne fallait pas poser comme « que pensez vous de la bataille de Stalingrad ? » et, surtout, « que deviennent les Juifs qui sont transportés ? » , « que se passe-t-il dans les camps de concentration ? » .

Mais Albert Speer prévint Fürtwängler le 11 décembre 1944 que sa vie était en danger et lui conseilla de quitter l'Allemagne. La seule réaction de Fürtwängler à Speer fut de dire : « Mais comment le pourrais-je ? Que vont devenir mes Philharmoniker ? Je suis responsable d'eux. » . Speer lui déclara que l'Orchestre de Berlin n'était pas en danger. Toutefois, ce n'est pas Speer qui a « sauvé » Fürtwängler. Il lui a donné le conseil de partir et lui a expliqué qu'Hitler avait l'intention de tout détruire en Allemagne (palais, églises, châteaux et toutes les usines que Speer avait fait enterrer pour les protéger des bombardements) ce qui horrifia Fürtwängler au plus haut point. C'est la doctoresse de la femme d'Himmler (Docteur Richter) qui vint voir Fürtwängler dans la plus grande discrétion et le prévint, fin janvier 1945, qu'Himmler allait le faire arrêter par ses SS. C'est à ce moment qu'il décida de partir pour Vienne et ensuite d'aller rejoindre sa femme en Suisse. Il déclara à son entourage à Vienne (précisément à Friedrich Schnapp, qui était chargé des enregistrements de Fürtwängler pendant la guerre) qu'il reviendrait prochainement, en insistant si lourdement sur le fait qu'il allait revenir très bientôt que ses amis comprirent qu'il n'avait pas l'intention de revenir. Fürtwängler se réfugia donc en Suisse, mais à l'arrivée à la frontière le 7 février 1945, ses papiers n'étaient évidemment pas en règle, les Nazis ne souhaitant pas qu'il s'échappe : le douanier sembla s'en rendre compte mais laissa passer le chef d'orchestre. Fürtwängler considéra toute sa vie que ce douanier lui avait sauvé la vie.

Le 30 avril 1945, Hitler se suicida. Les derniers Nazis présents à Berlin cherchèrent, dans les archives de la ville, la musique la plus extraordinaire possible pour accompagner à la radio l'annonce de la mort du dictateur : ce fut l'adagio de la 7e de Bruckner enregistré par Fürtwängler en 1942, ainsi qu'un extrait du « Götterdämmerung » de

Richard Wagner lui aussi enregistré en 1942 par Fürtwängler.

L'après-guerre et l'acquittement

Grâce à la presse de l'époque, en particulier le « New York Times », il est possible de suivre quasiment au jour le jour les péripéties des 2 procès en dénazification de Wilhelm Furtwängler qui eurent lieu en 1946 à Vienne et Berlin. Les extraits que nous publions permettent de suivre les débats de ce véritable feuilleton judiciaire et de se faire une idée de la personnalité des différents protagonistes, en 1er lieu Furtwängler et le Général américain McClure.

I. Dénazification à Vienne

4 décembre 1945

Le violoniste virtuose Yehudi Menuhin qui vient d'achever une tournée de concerts sur le continent (y compris à Moscou) a demandé hier que les Alliés reconsidèrent le cas de Furtwängler, ancien chef d'orchestre de la Philharmonie de Berlin. En 1936, il déclina une offre de devenir le chef de la Philharmonie de New York après avoir été accusé de relations avec les Nazis par des organisations et des journaux new-yorkais. Il vit actuellement en Suisse.

« S'il existe un musicien qui mérite d'être réhabilité, affirma Menuhin à l'Hôtel Plaza, c'est Furtwängler. Durant tout le temps où il dirigea à Berlin, il refusa de faire le salut nazi aux concerts et il est bien connu qu'il aida les musiciens juifs de son orchestre autant qu'il le put. Il n'a jamais permis d'être utilisé comme un moyen de propagande dans les pays occupés. Il n'a pas accompagné la Philharmonie de Berlin lors de ses tournées. Quand vous êtes citoyen d'un pays comme il le fut, son opposition fut celle qu'on était en droit d'attendre de lui. »

11 décembre 1945

Une déclaration du violoniste Yehudi Menuhin soutenant que Wilhelm Furtwängler n'était pas un collabo, a donné lieu à une violente protestation de Ira Hirschmann, fondateur et directeur des « New Friends of Music » :

« Au moment même où les patrons de Monsieur Furtwängler sont confrontés à un procès international pour massacres de masse, vouloir donner une patente à l'un de leurs conspirateurs paraît incroyable. La mémoire des américains n'est pas si courte, en particulier celle de ceux qui ont donné leur fils en Allemagne pour détruire les patrons de Furtwängler. »

Monsieur Hirschmann fit remarquer que, lorsque Hitler et Göring prirent la vie musicale allemande, ils éliminèrent tous les musiciens non nazis et qu'un certain nombre d'artistes célèbres qui refusèrent de se plier, quittèrent le pays.

Monsieur Hirschmann poursuivit :

« En tant qu'attaché du Département d'État durant la Guerre, j'étais en possession d'éléments prouvant sans aucun

doute possible le lien de Furtwängler avec les leaders nazis. Furtwängler faisait partie des officiels du 3e " Reich ", cette information m'était connue mais était trop connue par tous pour qu'on s'étende sur le sujet. Monsieur Menuhin choisit un moment crucial dans l'Histoire pour suggérer le retour de l'un des satellites nazis. Le peuple américain dans sa totalité ne tolérera pas la pollution de notre air par un musicien qui a servi avec dévotion les leaders nazis. Si des tentatives sont faites pour amener le nazi Furtwängler en Amérique, celui-ci devra faire face à une résistance et à une opposition des organismes. La vie musicale américaine peut prospérer sans Furtwängler. Nous sommes outragés à l'idée de ce Nazi envahissant l'Amérique. »

En réponse à la protestation de Monsieur Hirschmann, Monsieur Menuhin a affirmé hier soir qu'il n'avait jamais dit que Furtwängler viendrait dans ce pays. Du moins pas encore, ajouta-t-il. Il critiqua également Hirschmann de parler au nom du peuple américain.

8 février 1946

Wilhelm Furtwängler, ancien chef de la Philharmonie de Berlin dont les relations avec les Nazis ont fait l'objet d'une controverse internationale, a été arrêté par la Police française en Autriche, a-t-on appris aujourd'hui. Un journal russe affirma que Furtwängler a été mis en état d'arrestation alors qu'il traversait la frontière autrichienne, venant de Suisse et se rendant à Vienne.

9 février 1946

Une commission autrichienne de 7 membres commencera la semaine prochaine à examiner le cas Furtwängler, à propos de ses rapports avec le Nazisme et Hitler. Egon Hilbert (*), directeur des Théâtres viennois, a exprimé aujourd'hui le souhait que le dossier décharge Furtwängler et qu'il soit possible de lui demander d'accepter un poste à Vienne où il fut par le passé chef invité à l'Opéra. Monsieur Hilbert qui a invité le Docteur Furtwängler à quitter la Suisse et à venir ici, a passé 7 années au camp de concentration de Dachau comme ennemi du régime. Il affirma qu'il ne prenait pas au sérieux la politique des musiciens. Sauf dans le cas de musiciens qui étaient des Nazis actifs, dit-il, il était d'avis que Furtwängler soit traité comme « politiquement irresponsable » .

Le Docteur Furtwängler qui se trouve actuellement à Salzbourg, doit venir demain à Vienne en voiture. Son arrestation provisoire par la Police française quand il est entré en Autriche mercredi dernier était due au fait qu'il n'avait pas de laissez-passer pour entrer en zone française, dit-on ici.

* Egon Hilbert fut pour un temps bref Secrétaire Général de la « Bundestheater Verwaltung » qui regroupait le « Staatsoper », le « Volksoper », le « Burgtheater » et l' « Akademie-Theater » . Il était également le Président des « Wiener Festwochen », puis devint le Directeur de l' « Österreichisches Kultur-Institut » de Rome. Il fut appelé par Erbert von Karajan en tant que co-Directeur du « Staatsoper » de Vienne et devint Directeur de l'Opéra après le départ de celui-ci pour Berlin, durant l saison.

11 février 1946

Le Docteur Furtwängler a eu une conversation ce midi avec un groupe d'officiers russes représentant les forces d'occupation russes, à propos de l'éventualité d'être accepté comme chef de la Philharmonie de Vienne malgré sa longue collaboration avec la Philharmonie de Berlin sous le régime hitlérien. Le Docteur Furtwängler est arrivé hier soir à Vienne en provenance de Salzbourg. Ce matin, Furtwängler a visité les bureaux de la Philharmonie et l'administration de l'Opéra où il fut accueilli par Egon Hilbert. Il affirma ne pas pouvoir faire de déclaration publique sur son cas tant qu'il n'aura pas pris connaissance des charges contre lui. Des représentants des 4 puissances occupantes attendent de parler avec Furtwängler avant que les investigations de la commission autrichienne ne soient achevées.

Les socialistes et les communistes autrichiens sont opposés à ce que Furtwängler reste à Vienne. Les amis de Furtwängler insistent sur le fait qu'il ne fut jamais nazi et que, jusqu'à la chute du régime nazi, il protégea les Juifs contre les Nazis et tout particulièrement ceux de son Orchestre. Ils affirment également que, en une occasion, il insista pour que les drapeaux nazis soient retirés des murs de la salle où son Orchestre jouait.

13 février 1946

Un éditorial dans le numéro de ce midi du « Neues Österreich » dont le Président était encore récemment Karl Renner (*), demande que Wilhelm Furtwängler avoue publiquement ses fautes et avoir travaillé pour Hitler, avant d'être accepté comme Directeur de la Philharmonie de Vienne. L'éditorial ajoutait que le Docteur Furtwängler devrait déclarer qu'il ne voulait plus travailler sous les nazis. L'examen du cas Furtwängler par une commission autrichienne spéciale n'est pas encore achevé. On sait que l'administration des Théâtres est impatiente de voir Furtwängler disculpé politiquement.

* Renner fut Chancelier de l'Autriche et était membre du Parti socialiste (SPÖ).

14 février 1946

Le Docteur Furtwängler a dit à des amis viennois qui attendaient l'issue de sa déposition devant le comité d'investigation politique, qu'il s'était enfui de l'Allemagne nazie en 1945 parce que le docteur qui soignait l'épouse de Heinrich Himmler l'avait informé que les Nazis allaient le tuer. Cette doctoresse, selon ce qu'en raconte Furtwängler, vint le voir secrètement en janvier 1945 et l'informa qu'il était sur la liste noire des Nazis et qu'il avait été épargné jusqu'à maintenant, uniquement parce que son prestige était utile mais que, lorsque le régime nazi s'écroulerait, il serait assassiné.

Les 7 membres de la commission autrichienne interrogeront demain le Docteur Furtwängler. Celui-ci a refusé de faire des déclarations publiques avant que l'examen ne soit achevé. Des personnes liées à la Philharmonie de Vienne indiquent que sa défense sera basée sur la preuve qu'il n'a jamais eu de position officielle après qu'il ait démissionné en 1934 de la direction du « Staatsoper » et de la Philharmonie de Berlin, lors de l'affaire de l'antisémitisme en musique.

20 février 1946

Le Général Robert McClure assimila aujourd'hui le Docteur Furtwängler à un « instrument du Parti nazi » et dit que le célèbre chef allemand ne sera pas autorisé à retourner à son ancien poste de directeur de la Philharmonie de Berlin. Le Général McClure affirma que le Docteur Furtwängler était interdit, d'un commun accord avec les Alliés et rejeta les appels publics de nombreux Berlinoises importants demandant que le chef soit autorisé à retourner dans sa ville natale et à ses succès inoubliables.

En annonçant cette décision, McClure dit :

« Il est indiscutable que le Docteur Furtwängler était identifié de manière importante avec l'Allemagne nazie. En s'autorisant lui-même à devenir un instrument du Parti, il donnait une aura de respectabilité au cercle de ceux qui sont actuellement en procès à Nuremberg pour crimes contre l'humanité. Il est inconcevable qu'il lui soit permis d'occuper un poste en Allemagne à un moment où nous essayons d'effacer toute trace de Nazisme. »

McClure ajouta que Furtwängler fut nommé Conseiller d'État (« Staatsrat ») par Göring en 1933 et qu'il ne renonça jamais à ce titre. L'accord des Alliés met au ban quiconque a été membre du Conseil d'État après le 1 janvier 1934. McClure ajouta que « Furtwängler était vice-président de la “ Chambre de Musique du ' Reich ' ”, autre organisation sur la liste noire, jusqu'à sa dispute avec le Parti nazi en décembre 1934. »

Les relations de Furtwängler avec les Nazis ont précipité la controverse internationale. Ses supporters affirment qu'il était anti-nazi, rappelant sa lettre à Goebbels en 1933 par laquelle il protestait contre le boycott des artistes juifs. Ils citent également la correspondance de Furtwängler avec Göring où le chef d'orchestre demande à être soulagé de diriger des représentations d'Opéra à Berlin en raison de divergences avec Heinz Tietjen alors en charge du « Staatsoper » .

En décembre dernier, Yehudi Menuhin tenta en vain de faire lever le boycott. À Vienne, la commission spéciale fait des investigations pour déterminer si Furtwängler est responsable de collaboration avec les Nazis. Un poste est prévu pour lui dans la capitale s'il est blanchi.

Commentaire

Après avoir pris connaissance de cette interdiction, Yehudi Menuhin (qui ne connaissait pas Furtwängler) envoya immédiatement le message suivant au Général McClure :

« À moins d'avoir des preuves secrètes venant confirmer vos accusations selon lesquelles Furtwängler fut un instrument du Parti nazi, je m'élève violemment contre votre décision de le mettre au ban. Cet homme n'adhéra jamais au Parti ; en de nombreuses occasions, il risqua sa vie et sa réputation pour aider et protéger amis et collègues. Ne croyez pas que le fait de rester dans son propre pays soit suffisant pour condamner un homme. Au contraire, en tant que

militaire, vous devriez savoir que rester à son poste nécessite plus de courage que le fait de fuir. Il sauva la part la meilleure de sa propre culture allemande, et de cela, nous lui sommes reconnaissants. Quant à “ donner une part de respectabilité au Parti ”, nous les Alliés, ne sommes-nous pas infiniment plus coupables et de notre plein gré, d'avoir pactisé avec ces monstres jusqu'à la dernière minute quand, presque malgré nous, nous fûmes littéralement entraînés de force et de manière peu courtoise, dans cette bataille, sauf l'Angleterre qui déclara la Guerre avant d'être directement attaquée ? Souvenez-vous de Munich et de Berchtesgaden, quand nous abandonnions de façon dévergondée à leur destin cruel tous ces cœurs courageux et toutes ces nations vaillantes. Je considère comme manifestement injuste et éminemment lâche de faire de Furtwängler le bouc-émissaire de nos propres crimes. Si cet homme est coupable de crimes précis, accusez-le et déclarez-le coupable. D'après ce que je peux voir, ce n'est pas une punition d'être banni de ce Berlin sordide et sale, et si l'homme vieux et malade veut y retourner maintenant et attend de reprendre sa tâche si exigeante et ses responsabilités, on devrait l'encourager car c'est là où il doit être : à Berlin. Si cette nation malade doit pouvoir mûrir pour devenir un membre de la communauté des nations qui se respecte, ce sera grâce aux efforts d'hommes tels que Furtwängler, d'hommes qui ont démontré qu'ils sont capables de sauver de la Guerre au moins une partie de leur âme. La Philharmonie de Berlin en est un témoignage. Seuls ces hommes sont capables de bâtir sur cette base saine une société meilleure. Ce n'est pas en réprimant de tels hommes que vous atteindrez votre but. Bien au contraire, vous ne réveillerez qu'un ressentiment justifié contre un vandalisme aussi vrai que l'autre vandalisme plus évident qui détruit les églises et les tableaux, un ressentiment auquel s'uniront les voix outragées de musiciens, de collègues, d'écrivains et d'hommes intègres dans le monde entier, indépendamment de leur nationalité ou de leur foi, y compris votre soussigné, Yehudi Menuhin. »

21 février 1946

Le Général américain dit que Furtwängler a offert ses services à Goebbels après sa démission

Le fondement de l'interdiction du retour de Furtwängler comme chef de la Philharmonie de Berlin, a-t-on expliqué aujourd'hui, fut sa capitulation devant la domination nazie après son opposition énergique. McClure affirma que, tout de suite après s'être retiré dans sa maison de campagne, Furtwängler avait commencé à négocier par l'entremise du Ministre de la Propagande, Josef Goebbels, ce qui modifia complètement sa position.

L'un de ses concerts marquants pour le compte du Parti nazi se situa en 1937 (*) lors d'un rassemblement à Nuremberg. En 1942, il dirigea un concert en Tchécoslovaquie pour l'anniversaire de Hitler (***) et fit de nombreuses tournées approuvées par Goebbels, à l'étranger dans des pays à la fois neutres et occupés. Il resta dans les bonnes grâces de la hiérarchie nazie jusqu'à la chute du régime.

* Le concert en question eut lieu le 8 septembre 1937. Il s'agissait d'une représentation des « Meistersinger » avec la Philharmonie de Vienne.

*** Cette affirmation est fautive : le jour de l'anniversaire du « Führer », c'est-à-dire le 19 avril, Furtwängler donnait un concert à Berlin, interprétant la 9e de Beethoven.

La descendante de Wagner le soutient : Friedelind Wagner, petite fille du compositeur Richard Wagner, est entrée hier dans la controverse sur Furtwängler, en affirmant qu'elle l'avait entendu en 1936, défier la menace de Hitler d'être enfermé dans un camp de concentration. Madame Wagner qui s'est installée en Angleterre avant la Guerre après avoir fait part de ses sentiments anti-nazis, fut questionnée sur Furtwängler. « Le chef d'orchestre était un être faible, dit-elle, mais il s'est toujours opposé au Nazisme. » Elle parla de la réunion, il y a 12 ans à Bayreuth, entre Hitler et Furtwängler, dans la maison de sa mère. Madame Wagner avait 16 ans à l'époque :

« Je me souviens de Hitler se tournant vers Furtwängler et lui disant qu'il devrait s'autoriser lui-même à être utilisé par le Parti à des fins de propagande. Je me souviens du refus de Furtwängler. Hitler se fâcha et dit à Furtwängler que, dans ce cas, il y aurait un camp de concentration pour lui. Furtwängler resta silencieux durant un moment et répondit : “ Dans ce cas, Monsieur le Chancelier, je serai en bonne compagnie. ” »

22 février 1946

L'autorisation donnée à Furtwängler retirée par les Autrichiens

La commission autrichienne de 7 membres qui statuait sur le fait de savoir s'il fallait autoriser Furtwängler à diriger la Philharmonie de Vienne, est arrivée à une décision affirmative mais on a appris aujourd'hui que toute l'affaire était à nouveau venue devant la commission berlinoise en vue de la décision des Alliés selon laquelle Furtwängler ne pouvait pas diriger la Philharmonie là-bas. Cette annonce prématurée faite par la Commission autrichienne a provoqué une crise. La décision finale doit être prise par le comité inter-Allié.

23 février 1946

L'affaire Furtwängler en Autriche en pleine pagaille

Les chances pour Furtwängler d'avoir la possibilité immédiate de diriger la Philharmonie de Vienne ont probablement été anéanties par la déclaration du commandement américain en Allemagne, selon laquelle il ne peut pas diriger à Berlin. Les américains refuseront d'aller à l'encontre de la décision prise en Allemagne acceptant toute décision des Alliés qui pourrait permettre à Furtwängler de travailler à Vienne. La situation est ici terriblement confuse. Selon la décision en faveur de Furtwängler prise par le comité de 7 membres, l'affaire était supposée aller la semaine prochaine devant un comité spécial des 4 Alliés. Un tel comité n'a pas encore été mis sur pied. Entre temps, les autrichiens ne sont pas sûrs de vouloir que leur décision vienne prochainement devant un comité allié. Les autrichiens et les américains indiquèrent qu'ils préféreraient mettre cette affaire en sommeil pour un temps si une solution en ce sens pouvait être trouvée.

25 février 1946

Furtwängler mis « au rancart »

La commission autrichienne qui examinait le dossier politique de Furtwängler comme une base pour l'inviter à diriger la Philharmonie de Vienne, a protesté aujourd'hui contre des rumeurs selon lesquelles sa décision favorable avait été définitivement cassée et que Furtwängler avait été interdit de diriger en Autriche.

Toute l'affaire a été reconsidérée, disent les autrichiens, et aucun rapport sur Furtwängler ne sera envoyé au Conseil allié. Les autrichiens vont probablement essayer de laisser traîner l'affaire pour éviter un litige avec les américains, à la suite du refus des autorités militaires américaines de laisser Furtwängler diriger à Berlin.

7 mars 1946

Furtwängler proteste

Le Docteur Furtwängler affirma aujourd'hui dans une lettre au Maire de Berlin, Arthur Werner, que les Alliés ne lui avaient pas donné la possibilité de se défendre contre la radiation dans le cadre des statuts de la dénazification.

Furtwängler fut récemment interdit par les Alliés de retrouver son poste de directeur de la Philharmonie de Berlin. Les Alliés ont agi après que le Docteur Werner et des responsables de divers groupes d'artistes aient écrit une lettre ouverte au musicien pour « revenir à Berlin et aider à la restauration de la musique allemande ». La lettre publiée aujourd'hui était une réponse et apparut en 1re page du « Berliner Zeitung », qui est sous contrôle de la censure russe. Furtwängler affirma que, durant les 12 années de l'ère Hitler, il avait travaillé pour l'art et la culture allemands et non pas pour les Nazis.

10 mars 1946

Le comité allié des affaires culturelles en Autriche commencera à délibérer cette semaine, sur le vote secret de la commission permettant à Furtwängler de diriger la Philharmonie de Vienne. La commission autrichienne a usé de faux-fuyants depuis plus de 2 semaines depuis le 1er vote en faveur de Furtwängler qui fut connu au même moment comme étant la décision des autorités américaines stipulant qu'il ne pouvait être autorisé à diriger la Philharmonie de Berlin. Les membres de la commission veulent de la part des Alliés la permission que Furtwängler soit considéré comme chef-invité n'ayant aucun lien officiel avec l'Orchestre.

11 mars 1946

Berlin : Wilhelm Furtwängler, le chef allemand accusé d'activités nazies, est arrivé dimanche de Vienne par avion mais les officiels américains ont réitéré leur déclaration selon laquelle il figure sur la liste noire dans les 4 zones de l'Allemagne.

16 mars 1946

Furtwängler fait appel de son interdiction

Wilhelm Furtwängler a affirmé aujourd'hui qu'il avait soumis aux autorités alliées et à la Cour d'appel les preuves de son innocence de sympathies et d'activités nazies, afin qu'elles soient examinées. La preuve a été apportée aux 2 instances, a-t-il dit aux reporters, qu'il a agi sous le régime hitlérien comme un dissident et qu'il réussit, malgré de fortes pressions, à maintenir son statut en dehors de l'organisation nazie. Il insista pour être considéré seulement comme chef-invité chaque fois qu'il dirigeait un concert en Allemagne après 1935, et évita avec succès d'être utilisé pour les concerts de la propagande nazie, en particulier ceux à l'occasion de l'anniversaire de Hitler. En une seule occasion, au moment où son nom était si exploité, il fut piégé par les circonstances. Les Nazis lui avaient donné un délai de 2 jours pour diriger à l'occasion de l'anniversaire de Hitler en 1942 et, compte tenu du fait qu'on savait qu'il répétait à Vienne avant l'ouverture de la nouvelle saison, il fut impossible d'éluder le problème et il fut obligé d'apparaître comme obéissant aux ordres. Les documents originaux qu'il a préservés et transmis à la Cour, affirme-t-il, convaincront le monde entier que sa cause n'a pas bénéficié du juste éclairage et qu'une décision favorable l'innocentera.

26 mai 1946

Furtwängler approuvé par la commission autrichienne

La commission autrichienne d'investigation a déclaré qu'il serait « politiquement correct » pour Furtwängler et Herbert von Karajan, de diriger en Autriche, a-t-on annoncé aujourd'hui. La décision de la commission qui, en effet, exonère Furtwängler des charges de collaboration avec les Nazis, doit maintenant être approuvée par un sous-comité allié en charge de l'activité des artistes. L'affaire est à l'examen depuis de nombreux mois. Le 20 février, le Docteur Furtwängler avait été interdit de direction à Berlin par le Général Robert McClure en fonction des charges selon lesquelles il s'était autorisé lui-même à être un instrument des Nazis.

14 juin 1946

L'Affaire Furtwängler a embarrassé Berlin

Sans avertissement préliminaire, la Radio de Berlin a annoncé hier soir que Wilhelm Furtwängler dirigerait le concert de la Philharmonie. Le programme de ce soir fut précédé par une re-diffusion des nouvelles figurant dans le « Berliner Zeitung » de ce jour, selon lesquelles le Docteur Furtwängler avait été blanchi par une commission quadri-partite et qu'il reviendrait diriger à Berlin la saison prochaine au « Staatsoper » où il avait régné si longtemps. « Tristan und Isolde » (*) était cité comme étant le 1er Opéra qu'il dirigerait.

À la suite des nouvelles, un démenti fut publié par une « source alliée » selon laquelle Furtwängler n'était jamais apparu pour un examen de son cas par la commission de dénazification quadri-partite. Depuis que la permission de revenir à Berlin dépendait de son blanchiment, les faits rapportés dans le journal étaient incorrects, indiquait le démenti. La situation se trouva encore plus confuse du fait de la récente résidence de Furtwängler en Suisse. Un américain de Berlin qui est une ancienne connaissance, affirma avoir parlé au téléphone avec le chef d'orchestre qui se

trouve en Suisse. Le musicien dit qu'il irait probablement à Vienne prochainement mais ne mentionna aucun projet de voyage en Allemagne. Cependant, il est établi qu'il a occupé à plusieurs reprises son ancienne résidence de Potsdam.

Les tentatives pour atteindre la radio berlinoise afin de confirmer que Furtwängler avait participé en personne au programme de ce soir, s'avèrent vaines en raison du vent et des orages qui ont « brouillé » le service téléphonique. (!!!!)

* « Tristan » est effectivement le 1er Opéra qu'il dirigera après la Guerre, les 3, 24 et 30 octobre 1947.

15 juin 1946

l'Affaire Furtwängler « off »

Les officiels militaires américains ont affirmé aujourd'hui que Furtwängler n'apparaîtrait probablement pas devant le comité de dénazification à Berlin avant plusieurs mois. Ils démentirent une nouvelle parue dans les journaux allemands sous contrôle russe selon laquelle il avait été blanchi des charges de sympathie envers les Nazis. Le Colonel F.N. Leonard, représentant des États-Unis pour les affaires culturelles alliées, dit que le comité de dénazification a trop de dossiers en cours pour examiner celui de Furtwängler. Malgré des rumeurs que Furtwängler est arrivé à Berlin hier, des sources sérieuses affirment qu'il se trouve toujours en Suisse.

16 juin 1946

À Berlin, la confusion touche à sa fin

Comme conséquence du tumulte créé à Berlin ces derniers jours par des informations parues dans la presse russe et contredites par les journaux paraissant dans les secteurs anglais et américains et selon lesquelles la commission inter-alliée de dénazification avait acquitté Wilhelm Furtwängler des charges de collaboration avec le régime hitlérien, on indiquait aujourd'hui que Furtwängler apparaîtra ici dans un jour ou deux, pour clarification de son cas. Il vit actuellement en Suisse.

La semaine dernière, une annonce qui a jeté la confusion donna l'impression que le Docteur Furtwängler dirigeait en personne la Philharmonie de Berlin, alors que la musique provenait d'un enregistrement.

2. Dénazification à Berlin

10 décembre 1946

Furtwängler en procès

Wilhelm Furtwängler doit comparaître demain devant une cour de dénazification de 9 membres pour être blanchi afin

de reprendre son activité à Berlin. L'affaire contre l'ancien directeur de la Philharmonie de Berlin, âgé de 61 ans, a été très fortement discutée par les officiels du Gouvernement militaire américain qui ont fait remarquer qu'il avait exercé la fonction de Conseiller d'État prussien, nommé par Hermann Göring pour l'informer des affaires musicales, qu'il reçut un salaire pour ce travail et qu'il dirigea à l'étranger des tournées que les Nazis organisèrent à des fins de propagande. Les autorités russes d'occupation ont donné leur accord tacite à des campagnes organisées par des groupes culturels allemands afin de « faire revenir » Furtwängler.

11 décembre 1946

Les liens avec les Nazis niés par Furtwängler

(Delbert Clark)

Wilhelm Furtwängler comparait aujourd'hui devant un tribunal allemand. Dans une petite pièce bondée et surchauffée située en secteur britannique de Berlin, 150 personnes ont écouté le chef d'orchestre allemand essayer de prouver l'inexactitude des jugements de ses pairs.

Les charges contre lui sont nombreuses. Il avait accepté le poste de Conseiller d'État proposé par Hermann Göring, avait été Président de la Chambre de Musique du « Reich » et directeur de la Philharmonie de Berlin sous le régime nazi. Il avait aussi obtenu la démission et le retrait d'un critique qui avait osé dire du bien d'un chef d'orchestre plus jeune. À toutes les charges sauf la dernière, Furtwängler répondit par des excuses ou des éclaircissements. En ce qui concerne la dernière, il fit un démenti général sans justifier l'évidence. À la fin de la séance de ce jour, le procès fut suspendu afin de trouver un témoin oculaire qui pourrait éclairer la dernière accusation. Tout au long de son audition, Furtwängler parut nerveux et peu sûr de lui. Au fur et à mesure que le procès avançait, ses réponses devenaient de moins en moins rapides, comme s'il cherchait ses mots et parfois, il bégaya presque. À l'opposé, l'attitude du Président du Tribunal parut correcte.

L'accusé expliqua qu'il lui était impossible de se démettre de son poste de Conseiller, Hermann Göring l'ayant nommé et étant seul apte à l'écartier. Il affirma qu'il s'était démis des postes de Président de la Chambre de Musique et de directeur de la Philharmonie après une discussion avec Josef Goebbels à propos des musiciens juifs. Quelques minutes plus tard cependant, Hans von Bendar (sic), ancien administrateur de la Philharmonie et témoin de la défense, lâcha une affirmation selon laquelle Furtwängler s'était démis car ses nombreuses absences comme chef-invité dans d'autres pays l'avaient mis dans l'impossibilité de poursuivre comme chef-permanent de la Philharmonie.

Le procès atteignit son paroxysme lorsque Monsieur von Bendar (sic), soutenu par l'intendant du « Staatsoper », fit une déposition selon laquelle, lorsque le critique von der Müll (sic) avait loué exagérément Herbert von Karajan comme chef de cette maison d'Opéra, le Docteur Furtwängler avait demandé que l'Opéra et la direction de l'Orchestre punissent Monsieur von der Müll. Après qu'ils aient refusé d'agir ainsi, il fut témoigné sous serment que le Docteur Furtwängler intervint personnellement, avec comme conséquence que le critique fut enrôlé dans l'armée.

L'accusé nia que le critique ait été incorporé. Il insista sur le fait que l'incident n'était pas grave et accusa l'article en question d'avoir fait partie d'une campagne officielle organisée pour le discréditer. D'autres témoins furent en désaccord sur ce point.

17 décembre 1946

Furtwängler est blanchi de l'accusation de corruption nazie

Le Docteur Furtwängler a été acquitté ce soir de l'accusation de Nazisme par un tribunal d'artistes de son propre pays. Le verdict du tribunal de dénazification doit être confirmé par les autorités alliées avant que Furtwängler puisse reprendre sa carrière de chef de la Philharmonie de Berlin.

Mettant en évidence le fait que Furtwängler avait aidé des artistes juifs pour ne pas aller en camp de concentration, le tribunal affirma que Furtwängler avait volontairement renoncé au titre honorifique de Conseiller d'État prussien en 1934 et avait plus tard évité de prêter sa notoriété aux fonctions nazies.

L'audition débuta la semaine dernière par une déclaration du tribunal selon laquelle Furtwängler n'avait jamais été membre du Part nazi mais qu'il ferait des investigations pour savoir s'il avait permis à la propagande nazie d'abuser de sa notoriété. En refusant de permettre au chef d'orchestre de reprendre sa carrière sans procès en dénazification, les autorités culturelles américaines affirmèrent que les Nazis avaient utilisé ses tournées à l'étranger comme un moyen de propagande. D'un autre côté, les Russes avaient montré de la partialité envers Furtwängler et avaient soutenu les organismes culturels locaux demandant qu'il soit autorisé à reprendre son travail.

3 Juifs ont certifié aujourd'hui que Furtwängler avait risqué sa vie pour les protéger. L'un d'eux était Paul Heizberg, ancien directeur d'Opéra. Les 2 autres étaient des membres de la Philharmonie. Furtwängler certifia qu'il avait fui Berlin en janvier 1945, après avoir été averti qu'il était suspecté de complicité dans l'attentat à la bombe contre Adolf Hitler.

Dans une défense passionnée, il déclara :

« L'Art doit se placer au-dessus de la politique. »

29 décembre 1946

Bien qu'acquitté, la position morale du chef d'orchestre laisse des doutes sur son dossier

(Delbert Clark)

Le mardi 17 décembre 1946, Wilhelm Furtwängler fut acquitté d'activités nazies par le tribunal de dénazification de Berlin. Ce fut un grand jour pour le Docteur Furtwängler, si l'on n'est pas trop précis dans l'appréciation des valeurs

morales. Le tribunal l'a acquitté sur la base de preuves insuffisantes mais, peut-être inconsciemment, le déclara coupable d'une autre faute qui n'est pas punissable par la Loi.

Cette faute se situait dans la même catégorie que celle commise par Beniamino Gigli en Italie et Richard Strauß en Allemagne : une infraction aux valeurs morales et aux principes établis qu'il voulait utiliser un régime qu'il prétendait lui être odieux pour le maintenir dans un état de confort et de sécurité et pour éloigner tout concurrent potentiel pour ce poste. Une authentique activité nazie est passible des lois de ces tribunaux mais un manque de sens moral n'est pas encore un crime.

Dans ce procès qui dura 2 jours, les charges avec preuves étaient les suivantes : le Docteur Furtwängler qui avait coutume d'être acclamé comme le plus grand chef d'orchestre allemand, avait été nommé Conseiller d'État honorifique par Hermann Göring et avait continué son activité comme Président de la Chambre de Musique de Berlin durant une partie du régime hitlérien. Dans les charges sans preuves, il avait été intime avec le Ministère de la Propagande, si ce n'est avec Goebbels lui-même, et avait utilisé cette intimité pour punir un critique berlinois qui avait osé encenser le jeune chef d'orchestre Herbert von Karajan.

Pour ce qui concerne les charges avec preuve, Furtwängler affirma qu'il lui était manifestement impossible de démissionner de son poste de Conseiller puisque Göring l'avait nommé et que lui seul pouvait le relever de ses fonctions.

Il prétendit qu'il avait abandonné cette fonction à la suite d'une discussion avec Goebbels à propos du maintien des musiciens juifs. Mais l'ancien administrateur de la Philharmonie qui avait témoigné comme témoin de la défense et qui n'avait pas entendu la déposition de Furtwängler, lui rendit un bien mauvais service en affirmant que le chef d'orchestre était dans l'impossibilité de poursuivre son activité administrative à cause de la pression de ses engagements en dehors de l'Allemagne comme chef-invité.

Il n'est pas clair s'il a protégé quelques musiciens pour des raisons d'amitié personnelle ou d'opposition au régime nazi. Cependant, le fait de dire d'un allemand : « Quelques-uns de ses meilleurs amis étaient juifs » est souvent considéré comme une preuve formelle qu'il n'était pas nazi.

Pour ce qui concerne la charge sans preuve, le fond était que von der Nüll, critique musical du « Berliner Zeitung », avait en 1938 porté Karajan aux nues et suggéré que les chefs d'orchestre de 50 ans devraient apprendre de lui. La référence à Furtwängler était inévitable. Parce qu'elle était extravagante et évoquait « le miracle Karajan », cette critique fut connue dans les cercles musicaux berlinois sous le sobriquet de « Wunderkritik » et devint une cause célèbre.

Il fut définitivement établi que Furtwängler demanda à la direction de l'Orchestre et du « Staatsoper » de faire quelque chose pour punir von der Nüll mais les 2 refusèrent. Après une journée de dénégations, Furtwängler admit en fin de compte avoir demandé au Ministère de la Propagande de mettre un frein à l'activité de von der Nüll. Furtwängler prétendit avoir agi ainsi parce que la critique de von der Nüll faisait partie de la campagne de

persécution machinée par Hermann Göring qui voulait se débarrasser de lui. Il fut clairement établi que von der Nüll, qui n'était pas blanc comme neige, était un ami personnel de Göring. Le procès tourna alors autour d'un débat sur 2 questions :

1) Furtwängler a-t-il réussi à ce que von der Nüll soit puni ?

2) Est-ce que son comportement avait été celui d'un artiste hypersensible qui s'était senti insulté ou bien celui d'une homme très puissant qui désirait annihiler toute rivalité, cependant légitime ?

Il apparut très vite que le seul témoin qui pouvait répondre à ces questions était von der Nüll en personne mais il était prisonnier de guerre en Belgique, prétendument parce que Furtwängler l'avait fait enrôler dans l'armée. Cependant, l'un des derniers témoins fut une grassouillette et attendrissante femme de ménage, l'épouse de von der Nüll, qui n'avait pas eu de nouvelles de son mari depuis la fin de la Guerre et qui ne savait pas s'il était vivant ou mort. De manière timide, presque inaudible, elle affirma avoir entendu parler du « Wunderkritik » mais ceci ayant été écrit avant son mariage, elle ne connaissait aucun détail de l'affaire. Non, elle ne voyait aucun lien entre la colère olympienne de Furtwängler et l'enrôlement de son mari car un délai de 2 ans s'était écoulé entre les 2 incidents et entre temps, le « Berliner Zeitung » avait cessé de paraître.

C'est ainsi que le volet principal du procès contre Furtwängler s'effondra parce qu'un homme, vivant ou mort, qui aurait pu défendre la dénazification était introuvable et que personne d'autre ne connaissait les faits. Vers la fin du procès, il sembla que le tribunal accepta la thèse selon laquelle Furtwängler fut infructueux dans ses tentatives pour punir le critique, par conséquent, il était innocent, et que si Karajan n'était pas un aussi grand chef que le critique l'affirma, les tentatives n'étaient donc pas justifiées. Il devint manifeste que ce grand et vieil homme chauve, aux rares cheveux blancs, serait acquitté. Selon les stricts critères de preuve d'une Cour des États-Unis, il est plus que probable qu'il aurait été acquitté. Pourtant, d'un bout à l'autre du procès, son attitude fut rarement celle d'un opposant au régime, en dépit de ses déclarations. Il mentionnait le « Führer » et utilisait l'épithète officiel nazi en référence, la République de Weimar. Le terme de « République de Weimar » était interdit par Hitler et remplacé par le mot « Systemzeit » . (*)

Et c'est ce mot que Furtwängler utilisait jusqu'à ce qu'un membre de la Cour ne lance vertement :

« Pourriez-vous arrêter d'utiliser ce mot ? C'est quelque chose que nous voulons tous oublier. »

Furtwängler répondit :

« Oh. Était-ce une phrase nazie ? Je n'en étais pas informé. »

Une autre fois, sur un ton presque sarcastique, il cita les mots « République de Weimar » , ce qui parut amuser le public qui remplissait la salle d'audience.

Un autre membre de la Cour chercha à savoir avec emportement la raison de sa gaieté :

« Quelle est la raison de ce rire idiot ? »

Les témoins de moralité fournirent de nombreuses dépositions sur le refus de Furtwängler de figurer dans un film de propagande. Un critique, Werner Fiedler, ayant écrit un article défavorable au film en question où Richard Strauß remplaçait Furtwängler, immédiatement, il affirma qu'il fut appelé par le chef d'orchestre pour discuter de la nécessité de la critique en général. Cependant, dit-il, Furtwängler, en fin de compte, reconnut que la critique est nécessaire si l'art veut survivre.

À la fin du procès, Furtwängler se leva, de grande taille, mince, sûr de lui, avec l'air d'un Jésus gothique et s'adressa à ses admirateurs :

« Je ne regrette pas d'avoir agi ainsi pour les allemands et l'Allemagne. Je savais que cela valait la peine d'agir ainsi. »

Ce discours final donna lieu à des applaudissements enthousiastes pour lesquels il manifesta sa gratitude en saluant comme au bon vieux temps.

Il est parti en Suisse pour attendre la décision de la « Kommandantur » alliée. Auparavant, il avait dit que son désir était de voir son nom blanchi et non pas de diriger. Selon des collègues, cela signifiait qu'il ne souhaitait pas être le chef permanent de la Philharmonie de Berlin, seulement de diriger 10 concerts par an comme chef-invité.

* « Systemzeit » : terme négatif utilisé par les Nazis pour désigner la République de Weimar dont ils combattaient la jeune démocratie allemande.

Commentaire

Clark se trompe quand il affirme que Hans von Benda était un témoin de la défense ; au contraire, il était un témoin de l'accusation en sa qualité de membre du Parti nazi !

En ce qui concerne l'assistance de Furtwängler aux musiciens juifs, plusieurs d'entre eux et des membres de leurs familles étaient présents le second jour du procès et tous témoignèrent en sa faveur. Un membre du tribunal avait essayé d'établir que Furtwängler n'était intervenu qu'en faveur de musiciens fameux, tels Otto Klemperer, Bruno Walter, Arnold Schönberg, etc. Cette affirmation fut contredite par des membres du personnel de la Philharmonie de Berlin et de leurs familles et, plus particulièrement, par le violoniste Mark Leuschner qui déclara :

« Furtwängler est intervenu à ma demande bien avant d'avoir eu des informations sur moi comme artiste. Il a continué à me protéger durant 4 années ; en fait, il m'a protégé sans répit. Après chaque répétition et chaque concert, il était assailli par des gens dans ma situation. C'était très dangereux pour lui mais il nous a aidés malgré cela. »

Dans l'affaire du critique von der Nüll, il ne fut nullement prouvé qu'il était prisonnier de guerre en Belgique. Il fut prouvé, par contre, qu'il n'y avait aucune relation entre la protestation de Furtwängler en mai 1939 et l'incorporation du critique dans l'armée. C'est l'attaché de presse du « Staatsoper », le Docteur Julius Kapp, qui donna la véritable raison de la campagne anti-Furtwängler. Il affirma qu'un ami personnel de von der Nüll, le Docteur Westphal, lui avait dit que c'était le ministre Göring qui était à l'origine de cette campagne, ce qui fut confirmé par un fameux critique de théâtre berlinois, Werner Fiedler. Mais le témoignage le plus important et le plus détaillé vint d'une collègue du critique, Madame Anneliese Wiener (qui n'était pas « aryenne »).

Elle déclara :

« Von der Nüll souhaitait non seulement écrire des articles mais influencer la vie musicale par ses opinions controversées. Dans le 3e « Reich », cela était quasiment impossible si l'on n'était pas protégé « d'en haut ». Il me parlait sans cesse de Furtwängler comme d'un chef « appartenant à la génération passée », « que son temps était fini » et que c'était au tour de gens comme Karajan de le remplacer. Von der Nüll me dit souvent que « ses combats pour Karajan et contre Furtwängler » étaient inséparables et avaient le soutien des milieux proches de Göring. Ce qui signifie que lui, von der Nüll, était encouragé par ces milieux et que le projet de Göring consistait à « jouer Karajan contre Furtwängler ». Dans une telle situation, il est compréhensible que Furtwängler fut obligé d'interpréter comme un affront personnel les attaques dirigées contre lui. Faire taire un critique local était éloigné de ses pensées et en raison de sa réputation internationale, il n'avait pas besoin d'agir ainsi. Tout ceci n'était pas le fait d'un critique isolé mais d'un groupe agissant contre lui de manière dictatoriale. »

Madame Wiener ajoute :

« Von der Nüll n'est pas allé au front mais a pris la direction d'un service de la « Luftwaffe ». Son travail consistait à organiser des spectacles pour les troupes. Il a occupé ce poste à Berlin durant pratiquement toute la durée de la Guerre et est allé volontairement au front en 1945. »

Elle cita également l'agent de concerts Körtling qui avait découvert von der Nüll mort à la suite des combats de Potsdam. Quant au terme « Systemzeit », Madame Wiener affirma :

« Ce mot est beaucoup plus ancien que l'ère nazie. Je me souviens très bien avoir entendu ce mot prononcé par des gens âgés après la Première Guerre mondiale. C'était un terme populaire et automatique. »

Enfin, le film de Verhøven, réalisé sous le patronage de Goebbels, est une histoire falsifiée de la Philharmonie de Berlin. Werner Fiedler avait fait une critique négative de ce film, à tel point que Verhøven demanda que Fiedler soit arrêté. Furtwängler fut tellement enchanté par cet article qu'il souhaita rencontrer son auteur : la rencontre eut lieu à la fin de décembre 1944, à une époque où la vie des 2 hommes était en danger.

20 avril 1947

Les Allemands absolvent Furtwängler

(Kathleen McLaughlin)

Seules les signatures officielles manquent à l'heure actuelle en vue du retour sur le podium du célèbre chef d'orchestre, le Docteur Wilhelm Furtwängler, à la suite de son acquittement comme collaborateur nazi. Son acquittement par une commission allemande a été ratifié il y a 2 jours par une « Kommandantur » alliée, a-t-on appris ce soir. Le 1er concert de Furtwängler en tant qu'ancien chef de la Philharmonie de Berlin aura lieu sous les auspices des Nations Unies, plus avant dans la saison, probablement en juillet. Yehudi Menuhin donnera le 1er d'une série de concerts sous la direction de Furtwängler. Selon des sources de bonne foi, Monsieur Menuhin en a fait la condition de son accord. (*)

Aucune personnalité publique plus controversée que le Docteur Furtwängler n'a encore été impliquée dans le programme chargé de dénazification en Allemagne. Ses adversaires des 2 côtés de l'Atlantique ont été nombreux et agressifs. Des protestations se sont élevées contre sa future venue aux États-Unis.

Tandis qu'une considérable amertume s'est faite jour en Allemagne comme issue de son procès devant un tribunal allemand de dénazification, la majorité des allemands préconisait son retour à son ancien poste. Son éminente position dans les milieux musicaux allemands et son importante réputation internationale le rendirent cher aux yeux du public qui répugnait à perdre son leadership, sans se soucier de son association reconnue avec le régime nazi.

Ses adversaires étaient principalement des éléments anti-nazis. Ils prétendent que son retour à la vie publique en tant que chef d'orchestre aura un résultat opposé sur le tout le programme de poursuites judiciaires contre les activistes nazis et créera une atmosphère faite d'un manque de sincérité qui ne peut être justifiée. Le Docteur Furtwängler a déjà été avisé en privé de son acquittement futur et a admis qu'il n'attendait que ce mot avant d'accepter de juteux contrats avec la BBC de Londres et l'Amérique.

* Yehudi Menuhin jouera le Concerto de Beethoven sous la direction de Furtwängler, d'abord au Festival de Lucerne (30 août 1947) , puis à Berlin (28 et 29 septembre 1947) .

29 avril 1947

Furtwängler blanchi

La « Kommandantur » alliée quadri-partite a déclaré aujourd'hui que Wilhelm Furtwängler pouvait reprendre immédiatement ses activités musicales. Le comité de dénazification a approuvé le verdict d'une Cour allemande qui, en décembre dernier, a blanchi le chef de 61 ans, de l'accusation de coopération avec les Nazis. Monsieur Furtwängler a déclaré vivre en Suisse où il a passé la majeure partie de son temps depuis la fin de la Guerre. La décision mit un terme à 18 mois de chahut autour du droit de Furtwängler à reprendre les concerts. Les autorités russes ont

annoncé sa relaxe à plusieurs reprises, simplement pour que le gouvernement militaire des États-Unis fasse en sorte que son procès se déroule sans irrégularité. Le veto des États-Unis prit fin quand un tribunal de dénazification de Berlin le déclara innocent, il y a 4 mois de cela.

Conclusion

S'il fallait brièvement résumer les péripéties des 2 procès en dénazification que Furtwängler dut endurer, nous pourrions dire ceci : à Vienne, le Gouvernement autrichien recommanda sa réhabilitation en mars 1946, ce qui fut totalement ignoré par le Gouvernement militaire américain. La promesse de McClure selon laquelle l'affaire Furtwängler serait réglée « en quelques semaines », ne fut jamais tenue : l'affaire s'éternisa et dura 18 mois, c'est-à-dire bien après que la majorité de ses collègues aient repris leur carrière (*). En juin 1946, une seconde commission fut créée par les Alliés à Berlin afin de faire des investigations sur le cas Furtwängler. Cette seconde commission demanda également la réhabilitation immédiate du chef allemand qui fut rejetée par les services du Général McClure et transformée en une commission de dénazification, pour laquelle il n'y avait aucun fondement légal. En effet, cette procédure ne concernait que les membres du Parti nazi cherchant un emploi. Furtwängler n'aurait jamais dû être appelé devant une telle juridiction. Les mois passèrent. En Suisse où il résidait, la presse de gauche continua ses attaques contre lui malgré la défense publique de l'ami Ernest Ansermet. Furtwängler écrivit à son ancien collègue Fritz Zweig qui vivait à Los Angeles :

« En raison de pressions venues de New York, les décisions de la commission d'investigation ne seront pas rendues publiques. Je suis empêché de diriger en Allemagne et à l'étranger. Qui a réellement intérêt à cette situation ? C'est la question que je suis obligé de me poser. »

Comme dans le cas de Willem Mengelberg qui, après la Guerre, fut banni et exilé dans son chalet en Suisse, Furtwängler dut faire face à une justice « 2 poids, 2 mesures ». Il ne pourra de nouveau diriger qu'en avril 1947 (c'est-à-dire après plus de 2 ans d'inactivité), non pas en Allemagne mais en Italie. Son retour à Berlin aura lieu le 25 mai, dans un programme entièrement dédié à son « cher » Beethoven, et sera triomphal.

* Ainsi, Herbert von Karajan, qui avait possédé 2 cartes de membre du Parti nazi, dirigea de nouveau en septembre-octobre 1945 à Trieste, et en janvier 1946 à Vienne.

La solitude et le soutien de grands musiciens juifs

Arrivé en Suisse, la situation de Furtwängler était très difficile. Tout d'abord, lui et sa famille étaient totalement dépendants matériellement d'amis qui les accueillirent durant les mois suivants. En effet, contrairement à une rumeur qui fut propagée dès cette époque par une partie de la presse helvétique, Furtwängler ne s'était pas du tout enrichi « colossalement » grâce aux Nazis. Bien au contraire, comme il n'avait plus de poste officiel, il touchait peu d'honoraires. D'autre part, Furtwängler refusa systématiquement les « cadeaux » qu'Adolf Hitler et Josef Goebbels voulurent faire à « leur Dirigent ». Entre autres, Goebbels voulut lui offrir une bague d'ivoire et d'or ainsi qu'une rente annuelle à vie de 40,000 Reichsmarks en 1936 pour ses 50 ans et Hitler voulut offrir une maison à Furtwängler en 1943 pour

son second mariage avec Elisabeth, le 26 juin 1943 à Potsdam. Les problèmes financiers sont évoqués dans le livre de cette dernière sur son mari. Ces amis semblèrent toutefois très heureux de subvenir aux besoins matériels d'un si illustre invité. Il se rendit d'abord dans la clinique du controversé docteur Paul Niehans. D'autre part, alors que Fürtwängler avait dû lutter depuis 1933 contre le régime hitlérien et que les Nazis souhaitaient à l'époque le tuer comme traître, une partie de la presse helvétique se déchaîna immédiatement contre la venue de Fürtwängler qui était considéré par eux désormais, et alors qu'il était très souvent venu en Suisse les années précédentes, comme un collaborateur nazi indésirable. Comme sa femme Elisabeth le raconta, le 2e combat de sa vie débuta, interminable, celui pour sa réhabilitation. Les autorités helvétiques acceptèrent qu'il reste en Suisse mais à la condition expresse qu'il ne s'exprime pas publiquement. Cela l'empêcha de répondre aux attaques très violentes, et souvent calomnieuses, dont il faisait l'objet désormais dans le monde entier surtout depuis que l'horreur absolue des camps d'extermination avait été révélée. Cette annonce rendait tout ce qui touchait de près ou de loin au régime nazi désormais insupportable. Elisabeth Fürtwängler raconta le choc que représenta la découverte de ces camps par Fürtwängler en 1945 : il en comprit d'autant plus l'extrême gravité qu'ils avaient clairement été organisés « au nom de l'Allemagne » comme il le dit et, donc, que cela touchait le cœur de son univers spirituel. Fürtwängler se retrouva alors dans une situation dramatique car il se rendit compte que les Nazis, après avoir voulu usurper l'héritage de la « vraie Allemagne », celle de Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Friedrich von Schiller et Ludwig van Beethoven, avaient commis de tels crimes que les « vrais Allemands » auxquels il s'était toujours identifié, qui n'étaient pas nazis et étaient les héritiers de la « vraie Allemagne », allaient devoir porter eux aussi la responsabilité de ces actes. Cette question l'obséda en 1945 comme on le voit dans plusieurs pages de ses carnets personnels datées de cette année :

« L'Allemagne n'était pas une Allemagne nazie, mais une Allemagne dominée par les Nazis. Rendre un peuple tout entier responsable des crimes commis dans les camps de concentration, c'est utiliser le schéma de pensée des Nazis. Eux qui, pour la 1re fois, ont défini et appliqué la notion de responsabilité collective dans la question juive. Je n'ai jamais compris la responsabilité collective. L'antisémitisme m'est aussi incompréhensible que le Nazisme. À l'extérieur de notre pays, on n'a pas idée de l'aversion que ce système politique provoquait chez les hommes droits, en Allemagne depuis longtemps déjà. Je connais le National-Socialisme réellement. Je sais ce dont ce système de violence et de terreur était capable. Et je sais combien le peuple allemand était en réalité loin de ce phénomène horrible, sorti de ses propres entrailles. Sinon je ne serais pas resté en Allemagne. Le fait que je sois resté est la meilleure preuve qu'il y a une autre Allemagne. »

Comme dans toutes les périodes de désespoir, Fürtwängler se réfugia dans la composition : il finit sa 2e Symphonie et commença sa 3e. Cependant, plusieurs musiciens du plus haut niveau le comprirent immédiatement et prirent sa défense : en 1945, Yehudi Menuhin envoya un télégramme, resté très célèbre, au général Robert A. McClure qui était représentant du gouvernement américain dans Berlin occupé :

Conscient de l'aide que Fürtwängler avait apporté à de nombreux juifs et de son opposition au Nazisme, Yehudi Menuhin vint dès 1947 à Berlin pour jouer avec Fürtwängler les plus grands Concertos du répertoire pour violon. Arnold Schönberg demanda à Fürtwängler en 1933 de rester en Allemagne « pour sauver l'honneur de la musique allemande » .

« À moins que vous ne déteniez des documents compromettants vous permettant d'étayer vos accusations à l'encontre de Fürtwängler, je me verrai forcé d'exprimer avec véhémence mon désaccord quant à la décision que vous avez prise de lui interdire de diriger. Cet homme n'a jamais été membre du Parti, n'a occupé aucune fonction officielle après avoir démissionné de sa propre initiative de ses fonctions directoriales auprès de son orchestre. En de nombreuses occasions, il a risqué sa vie et sa réputation en intervenant pour protéger amis et musiciens de son orchestre. Je ne crois pas que le fait de rester dans son pays, surtout pour se consacrer au travail qui était le sien et qui ressemblait à une sorte de « croix rouge » spirituelle ou à une mission pastorale, soit de nature à justifier une condamnation. Bien au contraire. En tant que militaire, vous devriez savoir que rester à son poste requiert parfois davantage de courage que prendre la fuite. Il a sauvé la meilleure part qui puisse être de rédemption dans la culture allemande. Ne sommes-nous pas, nous les Alliés, infiniment plus responsables d'avoir consenti, et cela de notre plein gré, à pactiser avec ces monstres jusqu'à la dernière minute, quand finalement nous nous sommes précipités sans grand esprit chevaleresque dans ce combat, sauf bien sûr, la France et l'Angleterre qui ont eu le courage de déclarer la guerre avant d'être elles-mêmes attaquées ? Je suis convaincu qu'il est gravement injuste et lâche de notre part de faire de Fürtwängler la victime expiatoire de nos propres crimes. Si cet homme dorénavant vieux et malade est prêt et impatient de se réatteler à sa tâche et à ses lourdes responsabilités, il devrait y être encouragé, car c'est précisément dans ce Berlin dont il est l'enfant qu'il peut être le plus utile. Si ce pays moribond parvenait à redevenir un membre honorable de la communauté des nations civilisées, ce serait grâce à des hommes, comme Fürtwängler, qui ont prouvé qu'ils étaient capables de sauver au moins une partie de leur âme. Ce n'est pas en les étouffant que vous parviendrez à vos fins. Vous auriez alors commis un acte de vandalisme aussi réel que celui de nature plus évidente qui consiste à lacérer des tableaux ou à massacrer des églises. »

De même, Arnold Schönberg, qui avait lui-même conseillé à Fürtwängler de rester en Allemagne pour « sauver l'honneur de la musique allemande », écrivit dans une lettre du 24 janvier 1946 à Kurt List un résumé de la psychologie de Fürtwängler d'une déconcertante pertinence :

« Je suis d'accord avec vous sur Fürtwängler. Je suis sûr qu'il n'a jamais été Nazi. Il était l'un de ces vieux « Deutsche-nationale » de l'époque de Turvater Jahn, où l'on était nationaliste à cause de ces pays occidentaux qui s'étaient alliés à Napoléon. C'est plutôt une affaire de « Studenten-nationalismus » qui diffère beaucoup de l'époque de Bismarck et des suivantes où l'Allemagne n'était plus sur la défensive, mais un conquérant. Je suis également sûr qu'il n'était pas antisémite, du moins pas plus que tout autre non-Juif. Et c'est certainement un meilleur musicien que tous ces Toscanini, Ormandy, Koussevitzky et tous les autres. Il a un véritable talent et il AIME la musique. »

Curt Rieß, Berta Geißmar, le procès et l'acquittement

Fürtwängler ne relevait pas des « commissions de dénazification ». En effet, il n'avait jamais été membre du Parti Nazi et avait démissionné en 1934 de toute fonction officielle. Le seul titre qui lui restait était celui purement honorifique de « Staatsrat » de Prusse. Herman Göring l'avait nommé à ce titre, le 8 juillet 1933, sans lui demander son avis. Fürtwängler avait démissionné de ce poste en 1934 mais Göring avait refusé sa démission.

Février 1946, Fürtwängler rencontra à Vienne un juif allemand du nom de Curt Rieß qui avait fui l'Allemagne en 1933.

Ce dernier était musicien et écrivain, il écrivit d'ailleurs plus tard un livre sur Fürtwängler. Rieß était alors journaliste et correspondant en Suisse pour des journaux américains. Il pensait que Fürtwängler était un collaborateur nazi et s'était opposé à ce que Fürtwängler dirige en Suisse en 1945. Fürtwängler demanda à le rencontrer et lorsque Rieß eut étudié tous les documents concernant Fürtwängler, il changea totalement d'avis. Comprenant que Fürtwängler n'avait jamais été Nazi et qu'il avait aidé de nombreuses personnes d'origine juive, il devint son « conseiller en dénazification ». Il s'ensuivit une longue amitié et Curt Rieß passa les 2 années suivantes à tout faire pour faire blanchir Fürtwängler. Comme Roger Smithson l'écrit en conclusion de son article « Fürtwängler, Les années de silence (1945-1947) » : « Finalement le retour de Fürtwängler à la direction d'orchestre fut très largement le résultat de l'habileté et de l'obstination de Curt Rieß. Les admirateurs de Fürtwängler ont envers lui une grande dette. » .

Fürtwängler voulait, au départ que Curt Rieß écrive des articles sur lui se fondant sur les nombreux documents qu'il lui avait fournis car Curt Rieß était journaliste. Cependant, Curt Rieß préféra aller lui-même rencontrer le général Robert A. McClure qui était chargé du dossier de Fürtwängler. Le général, après avoir rencontré Rieß et avoir fait traduire en anglais tous les documents reconnut qu'aucune charge sérieuse ne pouvait être retenue contre Fürtwängler et qu'ils avaient fait une erreur concernant le chef d'orchestre qui était quelqu'un de très bien. Il demanda à Rieß de bien dire à Fürtwängler de ne surtout pas parler à la presse pour ne pas donner l'impression qu'il exerçait des pressions sur les forces alliées. Il déclara que l'affaire serait classée en quelques semaines. Rieß envoya un télégramme à Fürtwängler dans ce sens mais le télégramme mit énormément de temps à arriver à destination et arriva trop tard.

En effet, entretemps, Fürtwängler avait réalisé un impair très grave : il s'était rendu à Berlin qui était occupé par les Soviétiques. Ces derniers le reçurent comme un chef d'État car ils souhaitaient récupérer celui qu'Arsenyi Gouliga, le représentant de l'Union soviétique au procès Fürtwängler, appelait le « plus grand chef du monde » pour mener une grande politique culturelle à Berlin-Est sur fond de rivalité avec les États-Unis. Précisément, les Soviétiques proposèrent le poste de direction du « Staatsoper Unter den Linden » qui était en zone soviétique à Fürtwängler. Le général Robert A. McClure fut obligé de faire passer Fürtwängler par la procédure normale de dénazification. Il expliqua, en effet, à Curt Rieß, par téléphone, que sinon cela donnait l'impression que les Américains avaient cédé aux Soviétiques sur le dossier de Fürtwängler. Les autorités américaines savaient que le chef d'orchestre serait forcément blanchi par la cour de dénazification. D'autre part, les autorités soviétiques déclarèrent que ce procès n'avait aucun sens et était « ridicule ». Ainsi, sur fond de Guerre froide, Fürtwängler, qui souhaitait absolument récupérer l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin qui était en zone d'occupation britannique, fut obligé de passer par la cour de dénazification.

Lors de son procès, les charges d'accusations étaient très faibles : on lui reprochait une réflexion antisémite dirigée contre le chef d'orchestre Victor de Sabata. L'accusation lui reprocha, en effet, d'avoir dit lors d'une dispute avec un autre musicien allemand qu' « un Juif comme Sabata ne peut pas jouer de la musique de Brahms ». Cette histoire tourna vite au ridicule : Fürtwängler avait joué de la musique de Brahms avec de nombreux musiciens juifs (en particulier ceux de son orchestre) . Il s'agissait soit d'une erreur soit d'un malentendu : Fürtwängler avait probablement aucun sentiment antisémite vis-à-vis de Sabata. On lui reprochait son titre de « Staatsrat » dont les autorités alliées avaient compris très vite qu'il était vide de contenu pour Fürtwängler.

L'accusation lui reprocha aussi 2 concerts officiels. Fürtwängler déclara que pour 2 concerts qu'on lui avait « extorqués », il en avait évité 60. Le 1er concert est celui de Nuremberg du 5 septembre 1938. En fait, ce concert avait justement eu lieu la veille des journées du Parti Nazi car Fürtwängler avait exigé qu'il ne fasse pas partie officielle de l'évènement politique qui fut ouvert formellement le lendemain. Le 2e concert eut lieu le 3 février 1938 pour la jeunesse hitlérienne. Il s'agissait d'une longue série de concerts présentés à Fürtwängler comme un moyen d'intéresser la jeunesse à la musique Classique. Mais quand Fürtwängler réalisa que le concert prit une tournure officielle et que le public n'était pas formé que d'écoliers en uniforme mais de tous les dirigeants de la jeunesse hitlérienne, il refusa de diriger un second concert. Dans tous les cas, 2 concerts officiels reprochés par la cour de dénazification sur la période 1933-1945 représentaient très peu.

L'accusation avait cru détenir quelque chose de plus consistant car Hans von Benda, un ancien membre du Parti Nazi qui fut le directeur artistique de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin pendant la période nazie et donc fut en contact permanent avec Fürtwängler durant de nombreuses années, voulait absolument témoigner prétendant détenir des preuves irréfutables attestant que le chef d'orchestre avait été antisémite. Il se rétracta durant le procès, avouant avoir tout inventé et finissant par défendre Fürtwängler en disant qu'il n'avait jamais été antisémite. La raison du comportement de Hans von Benda était la suivante : il avait été renvoyé de son poste de directeur artistique de l'Orchestre de Berlin, le 22 décembre 1939, pour de nombreuses graves fautes professionnelles. Il avait souhaité saisir l'occasion du procès pour se venger de Fürtwängler l'estimant responsable de son renvoi car il aurait soutenu Karajan, version très vivement contestée par Fürtwängler et sa femme. De plus, l'historien Fred Prieberg a prouvé, qu'au contraire, Hans von Benda, à la différence de Heinz Tietjen, le directeur du Palais des Festivals de Bayreuth qui soutenait Fürtwängler dans sa lutte contre les Nazis, n'avait cessé d'envoyer des informations aux Nazis (pour le dénoncer) prouvant que Fürtwängler aidait des Juifs et s'opposait à leur politique. Le juge, Alex Vogel, un homme connu pour être un communiste, débuta le procès, le 12 décembre 1946, par ces phrases : « Les investigations ont montré que Fürtwängler n'a été membre d'aucune organisation nazie, qu'il a essayé d'aider les gens persécutés à cause de leur race, et qu'il a évité les formalités telles que le salut à Hitler. » .

L'accusation n'ayant pas beaucoup d'arguments, elle lança le procès sur une question annexe : l'affaire Van der Nüll. Ce dernier était le journaliste téléguidé par Göring qui avait écrit des articles sur Herbert von Karajan en 1938 pour faire de l'ombre à Fürtwängler. L'accusation émit l'hypothèse que Fürtwängler avait demandé à Gœbbels de punir Van der Nüll en l'envoyant sur le front russe où il serait mort. L'affaire épuisa une grande partie du temps des 2 jours du procès, mais ne mena à rien de concluant : Van der Nüll n'était pas mort mais prisonnier en Belgique et comme il s'était écoulé au moins 2 ans entre les articles et son séjour sur le front russe (l'opération « Barbarossa » débuta le 22 juin 1941) , il n'y avait probablement aucun rapport entre les articles sur Karajan de 1938 et le fait que Van der Nüll soit allé sur ce front. En fait, Van der Nüll ne s'était même pas battu sur le front russe : il avait volontairement demandé à aller en Russie où il avait organisé des concerts pour les soldats allemands.

2 des personnes principales qui préparèrent la défense de Fürtwängler pour son procès en dénazification étaient 2 juifs allemands qui avaient dû fuir le régime nazi : sa secrétaire Berta Geißmar et Curt Rieß. Les 2 avaient un parcours très différent. Berta Geißmar connaissait personnellement Fürtwängler et avait assisté à tous ses faits et gestes au début de la période nazie ; elle avait quitté l'Allemagne en 1936 mais était revenue d'exil. Curt Rieß ne

connaissait pas du tout Fürtwängler et avait, au départ, un a priori très négatif sur le chef d'orchestre. Geißmar avait rassemblé des centaines de dossiers pour préparer la défense du chef d'orchestre, dossiers qui contenaient une liste de plus de 80 personnes juives ou non-juives qui avaient déclaré avoir été aidées ou sauvées par lui. Cette liste n'était pas exhaustive, mais elle concernait des cas où Geißmar avait réussi à trouver des preuves concrètes indiscutables. Parmi les nombreuses personnes concernées, il y avait des Communistes, des Sociaux-Démocrates, ainsi que d'anciens Nazis contre lesquels le régime s'était retourné. La liste contenait tous les musiciens juifs de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, Max Zweig, le neveu du chef d'orchestre Fritz Zweig, des solistes comme Carl Fleisch, dont le fils déclarera que c'était Fürtwängler qui avait prévenu sa famille des rafles vers les camps de concentration, Josef Krips, Arnold Schönberg, Otto Klemperer, Bruno Walter, Max Reinhardt, Hans Knappertsbusch. Berta Geißmar avait transmis les documents au général Robert A. McClure chargé du procès Fürtwängler, mais les pièces ont mystérieusement disparu à Berlin, alors qu'elles devaient être remises au général de la zone d'occupation américaine. Curt Rieß ne retrouva pas non plus ces documents dans les archives de Washington. Fürtwängler se trouva donc sans moyen de prouver l'aide qu'il avait apporté à de nombreuses personnes. Néanmoins, 3 personnes d'origine juive avaient fait le déplacement à Berlin et ont certifié le 17 décembre 1946, 2e jour du procès, que Fürtwängler avait risqué sa vie pour les protéger. L'un d'eux était Paul Heizberg, ancien directeur d'Opéra. Les 2 autres étaient des membres de la Philharmonie.

Il fut aussi aidé dans sa défense par son ami le metteur-en-scène de théâtre Boleslaw Barlog, par le chef d'orchestre roumain Sergiù Celibidache et par des musiciens comme Hugo Strelitzer qui déclara :

« Si je suis vivant aujourd'hui, c'est grâce à ce grand homme. Fürtwängler a aidé et protégé de nombreux musiciens juifs et cette attitude prouve un grand courage car il le faisait sous les yeux des Nazis, en Allemagne même. L'histoire jugera cet homme. »

À la fin du procès, Fürtwängler déclara notamment :

« Ma répugnance d'être utilisé contre mon gré par la propagande National-Socialiste a dû pour moi s'effacer devant une préoccupation plus haute, qui était, dans la mesure de mes moyens, d'assurer la pérennité de la musique allemande et de continuer à faire de la musique avec des musiciens allemands, pour des auditeurs allemands. Ce peuple, celui de Bach et Beethoven, Mozart et Schubert, vivait sous un régime exclusivement voué à la guerre. Nul ne peut se permettre de juger ce qu'il se passait alors en Allemagne qui n'y aurait vécu à cette époque. Thomas Mann (qui était à l'époque très critique à l'encontre de Fürtwängler) pense-t-il réellement que Beethoven n'aurait plus dû être joué dans l'Allemagne de Himmler ? Ne peut-il comprendre que jamais désir et même besoin n'avaient été plus ardents et plus douloureux d'entendre Beethoven et son message de liberté et d'amour fraternel, de le vivre, que celui des Allemands placés sous la terreur de Himmler ? Je ne regrette pas d'être resté avec eux. »

L'accusation elle-même reconnaissant qu'aucune charge d'antisémitisme ou de sympathie pour l'idéologie nazie ne pouvait être retenue contre le chef d'orchestre, Fürtwängler fut acquitté le 17 décembre 1946. Précisément, il fut classé dans la catégorie, c'est-à-dire la catégorie « suivisme » qui ne donnait lieu à aucune poursuite.

Fürtwängler n'a jamais réussi à exprimer clairement les raisons pour lesquelles il resta en Allemagne, même au cours

de son procès en dénazification car il eut, toute sa vie, des difficultés insurmontables à exprimer clairement sa pensée et à tenir un discours rationnel très cohérent. Elisabeth Fürtwängler a fourni nombre d'explications à ce sujet dans son livre sur son mari. Outre son attachement viscéral à l'Allemagne et à l'Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin, elle expliqua que de nombreux Allemands qui s'opposaient au régime nazi le suppliaient de rester en Allemagne. Si tous les grands personnages allemands qui n'étaient pas Nazis partaient, les chances qu'un changement politique se produise de l'intérieur devenaient impossibles. Certes, des personnalités comme Thomas Mann lui reprochèrent de rester sur place. Mais Fürtwängler se sentait totalement lié à ceux qu'il appelait sans arrêt les « vrais Allemands ». Berta Geißmar utilise ces mêmes termes avec la même signification à de nombreuses reprises dans son livre. Le fait qu'il soit resté pour les soutenir et les aider concrètement en sauvant même la vie de certains d'entre eux, juifs ou non-juifs, était infiniment plus important, à ses yeux, que de protester de l'extérieur. Il écrivit dans son journal personnel, en 1946, pour expliquer sa décision de rester dans son pays :

« Il y a 2 choses : l'amour de mon pays et de mon peuple, qui est un élément affectif et viscéral ; et le sentiment d'avoir ici une tâche à accomplir : remédier à l'injustice. C'est ici seulement que l'on combat pour l'âme allemande. Dehors, on ne fait que protester. Ce qui est à la portée de chacun. »

Le « boycott » de Chicago en 1948

Yehudi Menuhin considéra toujours que l'attitude de Fürtwängler pendant la période nazie avait été irréprochable.

L'année 1948 fut assombrie par un événement qui blessa vivement Fürtwängler. Il fut invité pour diriger l'Orchestre symphonique de Chicago, la tournée étant prévue pour 1949 : il allait enfin pouvoir retourner pour la 1^{ère} fois aux États-Unis depuis 1927. En fait, Fürtwängler, qui avait été échaudé par les États-Unis en 1925-1927 et 1936 refusait d'y aller : c'est l'Orchestre de Chicago qui insista longuement pour qu'il vienne, promettant que tout se passerait bien. Il finit donc par accepter après de nombreuses hésitations. Mais un groupe de musiciens de 1^{er} plan incluant les principaux chefs d'orchestre actifs en Amérique du Nord comme Arturo Toscanini, George Szell, Eugene Ormandy, ou des musiciens tels que Jascha Heifetz, Isaac Stern, Vladimir Horowitz, Gregor Piatigorsky et Arthur Rubinstein organisèrent une campagne pour empêcher la venue de Fürtwängler et menacèrent de boycotter l'Orchestre de Chicago, car ils reprochaient à Fürtwängler d'être resté en Allemagne durant la période nazie. Arthur Rubinstein, qui avait perdu une grande partie de sa famille dans les camps d'extermination, déclara ainsi : « Si Fürtwängler avait été un vrai démocrate, il aurait tourné le dos à l'Allemagne comme le fit Thomas Mann. Fürtwängler est resté parce qu'il pensait que l'Allemagne gagnerait la guerre et, maintenant, il est en quête de dollars et de prestige en Amérique, et il ne mérite rien de tout cela. » .

Comme le violoniste Nathan Milstein ou d'autres musiciens juifs comme Bruno Walter ou Heinz Unger, Yehudi Menuhin fut scandalisé par cette cabale : « Je n'ai jamais rencontré d'attitude plus insolente que celle de ces 3 ou 4 meneurs qui déploient des efforts frénétiques pour exclure de leur terrain de chasse de prédilection un illustre collègue. Leur comportement m'inspire plus que du mépris. De tous les musiciens allemands, Fürtwängler est celui qui a opposé au Nazisme le plus de résistance. Il a été dénazifié, on n'a pas le droit de le juger encore et encore. » . Menuhin raconta, beaucoup plus tard, que certains des principaux meneurs lui avaient avoué qu'ils savaient parfaitement que

Fürtwängler n'avait jamais été Nazi et qu'ils avaient organisé ce boycott par peur de la concurrence que représentait sa venue en Amérique. C'est également ce que pensait Curt Rieß à l'époque, qui écrivit : « On a peur de Fürtwängler, car on sait que, s'il revient aux États-Unis, on lui fera les meilleures offres. Les autres chefs d'orchestre savent qu'ils ont tout à perdre de sa venue ici. » .

Wilhelm Fürtwängler, qui dut annuler son voyage, fut profondément blessé par cette affaire comme en témoigne le texte qu'il écrivit dans ses carnets personnels en 1949 : « Cette protestation d'artistes contre un autre artiste est chose tout à fait nouvelle, une hérésie dans l'histoire de la musique. Elle bafoue la fonction d'un art unissant les peuples et servant la paix. Arthur Rubinstein ne me connaît pas car il saurait que c'est moi l'artiste resté en Allemagne, qui suis intervenu jusqu'à la fin en faveur de Juifs. »

Il fut particulièrement affecté par la participation de Gregor Piatigorsky qui avait fait ses débuts auprès de lui dans l'Orchestre de Berlin et avec qui il avait gardé une relation amicale jusqu'à la fin des années 1930, par courrier ou en le voyant hors d'Allemagne. En fait, c'est Fürtwängler qui avait lancé sa carrière internationale. Il l'avait rencontré dans un café russe de Berlin ; reconnaissant tout de suite son génie, il lui proposa le poste de 1er violoncelle de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, poste qu'il occupa de 1924 à 1929. Piatigorsky revint, en partie, sur sa position sur Fürtwängler dans son autobiographie, reconnaissant que Fürtwängler était un musicien hors norme.

Le « bouc émissaire »

Aucun artiste allemand n'a été autant critiqué que Fürtwängler pour être resté en Allemagne durant la période nazie. Fred Prieberg a analysé les nombreuses attaques contre Fürtwängler expliquant que le phénomène était particulièrement étonnant : Fürtwängler fut infiniment moins compromis avec le régime nazi que des musiciens comme Richard Strauß et surtout Herbert von Karajan. D'autre part, toutes les sources, en particulier celles provenant de Juifs allemands ou des dirigeants nazis, prouvent que Fürtwängler a combattu sans arrêt la politique raciale des Nazis et aidé de nombreuses personnes juives. Fred Prieberg a expliqué que Fürtwängler a fait l'objet d'un phénomène de « bouc émissaire » .

Yehudi Menuhin avait déjà parfaitement pressenti ce qui allait se passer lorsqu'il avait déclaré dans son télégramme en 1945 au général Robert A. McClure qu'il serait « gravement injuste » que Fürtwängler serve de « victime expiatoire de nos propres crimes » . Comme Fred K. Prieberg, Audrey Roncigli et Yehudi Menuhin l'ont remarqué : on a reproché à Fürtwängler d'avoir « pactisé avec le diable » , or c'est exactement ce qu'ont fait les puissances alliées (démocraties occidentales et Union soviétique) avant d'être précipitées de force dans le conflit. Alors que ces dernières avaient le pouvoir d'arrêter Hitler, Fürtwängler a fait ce qui était possible à son échelle c'est-à-dire en protégeant et aidant des musiciens allemands.

Fred Prieberg a analysé de nombreux exemples d'attaques très virulentes contre Fürtwängler dans le 1er chapitre de son livre. Ces attaques révèlent une totale ignorance des faits historiques, les critiques se fixant sur certains détails sortis de leur contexte. On lui a reproché, par exemple, son titre de « Staatsrat » de Prusse faisant de Fürtwängler « le grand ami de Göring » . Or, Göring l'a nommé à ce titre purement honorifique sans lui demander son avis en

1933. Fürtwängler l'a accepté uniquement pour avoir un peu plus de poids en Allemagne justement pour essayer d'infléchir la politique raciale du moment. Comme Berta Geißmar, la secrétaire juive de Fürtwängler elle-même l'a dit, cela aurait été une grave erreur de le refuser. Fürtwängler a démissionné de ce poste en 1934, mais sa démission a été refusée. Ainsi, il a traîné jusqu'à la fin de la guerre ce titre qui était vide de tout contenu. De plus, non seulement Göring n'était pas son ami mais c'est lui qui a précisément monté la campagne contre Fürtwängler en 1938 en mettant au 1er plan Karajan. Un autre exemple est donné par l'historien Ludolf Herbst qui dans son histoire de la Seconde Guerre mondiale écrivit une seule phrase sur Fürtwängler : « Fürtwängler a dirigé des concerts dans des usines pour soutenir l'idéologie National-Socialiste. » . Fred K. Prieberg et Audrey Roncigli déclarèrent que si la phrase est historiquement correcte (il s'agit de 2 concerts ; l'un le 21 décembre 1939 et l'autre le 26 février 1942 dont il existe un petit film) , ils déclarent que mentionner uniquement cette information est une grave falsification historique. Fürtwängler fut aussi présenté comme la figure de proue de la propagande nazie. Or, il n'apparaît que dans 2 films de moins de 5 et 10 minutes alors que l'Allemagne a produit des films de propagande dans des proportions gigantesques et que Fürtwängler a tout fait pour les éviter (avec succès dans le cas du grand film « les Philharmoniker ») .

Un autre exemple trahit la culpabilité de ses critiques et leur volonté de l'utiliser pour l'exorciser : le chef d'orchestre suisse Ernest Ansermet fut très étonné de constater, en 1945, que les attaques contre Fürtwängler vinrent surtout de la Suisse alémanique c'est-à-dire de la partie de la Suisse qui se sentait la plus proche culturellement de l'Allemagne et qui avait toujours fait un triomphe à Fürtwängler jusqu'alors. La presse alémanique lui reprocha de s' « être enrichi colossalement pendant la période nazie » et de ne rien avoir fait pour aider les Juifs, ce qui, d'un point de vue historique, est faux. C'est donc Ernest Ansermet, un Suisse Romand qui, selon les biographes, avait « bouffé du boche » pendant toute sa jeunesse, qui prit publiquement sa défense et qui intervint auprès du gouvernement helvétique pour que le chef d'orchestre allemand puisse rester dans son pays.

Les raisons pour lesquelles, les attaques se sont centrées sur Fürtwängler ont été expliquées en détail par Fred Prieberg. Tout d'abord, Fürtwängler ne contre-attaquait jamais. Il n'a jamais attaqué personne en justice même quand les accusations étaient très grossièrement fausses. D'autre part, il faisait savoir sans arrêt qu'il était profondément blessé par ces attaques. Beaucoup plus important, est le fait que Fürtwängler « était un symbole » . Aucun musicien de symbolisait plus que lui la musique et donc la culture allemande. On le considérait et il se considérait comme l'incarnation, la conscience morale, de la culture allemande de Goethe, Schiller et Beethoven. Il considérait les Nazis comme des usurpateurs et se considérait comme le gardien de la « vraie Allemagne » et des « vrais allemands » . Prieberg expliqua que cela faisait la force et la faiblesse du chef d'orchestre. Il fut, pour cela, le plus grand interprète de la musique allemande mais c'est aussi l'une des raisons principales pour lesquelles, il s'obstina à rester le plus longtemps possible dans son pays.

André Tubeuf le résuma très bien :

« C'est sur Fürtwängler que pesa l'interdit le plus lourdement et douloureusement que sur aucun musicien allemand. Mais c'est justice, au fond : il était plus musicien allemand qu'aucun musicien. Substantif et qualificatif, dans ce cas, étaient indissociables. Il dut expier d'autant plus. »

Outre le fait, qu'à travers Fürtwängler c'est le procès de la culture allemande que l'on faisait et que l'on projetait sur lui et sur son pays toute responsabilité des autres pays, Menuhin a témoigné que certains musiciens, surtout aux États-Unis, amplifièrent les critiques pour éliminer la concurrence de ce chef d'orchestre à la présence artistique écrasante. L'impact de ces campagnes en Amérique joua un rôle très important dans l'image de Fürtwängler dans les pays anglo-saxons jusqu'à présent.

Après la guerre, lors d'une réception à New York, quelqu'un demanda à Toscanini qui était le plus grand chef d'orchestre au monde à part lui-même. Le Mæstro hésita puis essaya de changer de sujet. Mais comme la personne insista, il se mit très en colère et cria : « Fürtwängler » et quitta immédiatement la salle.

À la fin de sa vie, Yehudi Menuhin résuma toutes les critiques contre son ami de la façon suivante :

« Ce fut sa grandeur qui attira la haine. »

Fürtwängler, une illusion face au Nazisme

Qui se souvient, aujourd'hui, que Fürtwängler fut un brillant compositeur qui laissa à la postérité, entre autres, 3 Symphonies, I « Te Deum », et I Concerto symphonique pour piano et orchestre ? Qui se souvient que Fürtwängler, en tant que chef d'orchestre, créa le 1er Concerto pour piano de Béla Bartók à Francfort en 1927, et le 5e de Sergueï Prokofiev à Berlin en 1932 ? Qui se souvient que Fürtwängler participa activement au rapprochement culturel franco-allemand initié après les accords de Locarno, dirigeant des concerts avec le « Berliner Philharmoniker » à Paris, Lyon, Strasbourg et Nice, à tel point que la France le remercia par l'Ordre du Mérite en 1929 et la Légion d'honneur en 1939 ? Personne ne s'en souvient, parce que l'image qui demeure aujourd'hui dans les esprits, c'est celle de Fürtwängler chef d'orchestre sous le 3e « Reich ». Ayant refusé d'émigrer et ayant continué à se produire en Allemagne, il se verra ad vitam lié au Nazisme. Et ce, « à torts et à raisons » (1) .

Si Fürtwängler intéresse encore aujourd'hui les historiens, c'est en grande partie parce qu'il a connu la plénitude de son art durant les années les plus sombres de l'Allemagne, et qu'il s'y voit lié politiquement et culturellement. Il n'aurait en effet jamais soulevé autant de controverses s'il n'avait été ce chef reconnu mondialement dès le milieu des années 1920 et représentant à ce titre, pour les Nazis, une sorte de gloire nationale, comme le relate Albert Speer à Gitta Sereny, dans les années 1970 :

« On considérait les gens comme Fürtwängler, Kempff et Strauß comme des trésors nationaux. S'ils exprimaient leur désapprobation ou des doutes, Goebbels essayait de les convaincre par la discussion. S'il n'y parvenait pas, ils étaient avertis et mis sous surveillance. Ce que l'on n'aurait jamais accepté, dans le Nazisme, quelles que soient les circonstances, c'était de les laisser partir ; jamais on n'aurait permis quelque chose d'aussi préjudiciable à la réputation de l'Allemagne. » (2)

Tous ceux qui s'intéressent à l'« affaire Fürtwängler » savent cependant que le chef n'a jamais été membre du NSDAP,

ni n'a eu de sympathies pour les thèses du Parti, comme le prouve cette remarque du ministre de la Propagande, Josef Gœbbels :

« Fürtwängler n'a jamais été National-Socialiste. Et il n'a jamais fait de mystère là-dessus. Et les Juifs et les émigrés ont trouvé cela suffisant pour le considérer comme un des leurs, lui qui était dans une sorte d' " émigration intérieure " ; il n'a jamais changé d'avis sur nous. » (3)

Ce qui est donc reproché à Fürtwängler après-guerre, et qui alimente le « cas Fürtwängler » depuis plus de 50 ans, c'est finalement d'être resté en Allemagne, au contraire de nombre de ses collègues, comme Fritz Busch, Bruno Walter, ou Erich Kleiber, et d'avoir implicitement accepté d'être utilisé comme un « trésor national » par le régime hitlérien, alors qu'il n'était Nazi, ni dans la conviction, ni dans les actes.

Lorsque Hitler arrive au pouvoir le 30 janvier 1933, Wilhelm Fürtwängler a 46 ans et il est le chef titulaire des « Berliner Philharmoniker » et « Staatsopernorchester » . « Generalmusikdirektor » de Berlin depuis 1928, il semble être totalement apolitique, au sens le plus noble du terme ; il croit en la complétude de l'Homme par le pouvoir de la Musique, en « la vérité fondamentale du Beau » , par laquelle, selon Paul Hindemith, « il sait transformer les expériences musicales en quasi-connaissances religieuses » (4) .

Il est certes conscient qu'une société ne peut survivre et se développer sans l'exercice d'un pouvoir politique, mais il ne mesure pas complètement l'enjeu qui se présente à l'Allemagne en 1933. Car le nouveau régime qui s'installe amène au pouvoir non seulement des politiciens quelque peu différents de ceux de la République de Weimar, mais aussi et surtout une pléiade de fonctionnaires zélés, prêts à appliquer à la lettre les idées du « Mein Kampf » de leur « Führer » . Un « Führer » sur lequel Fürtwängler a une opinion très tranchée ; en témoigne cette analyse laissée après leur rencontre à l'Hôtel « Kaiserhof » de Berlin, en 1932 :

« Cet homme a une multitude d'idées marginales et fort conventionnelles sur l'art. Sa médiocrité m'aurait effrayé, si je n'avais pas été persuadé que jamais il ne parviendrait au pouvoir ! » (5)

Cette entrevue est probablement apolitique, puisque le président du NSDAP veut rencontrer le Mæstro au sujet du Festival de Bayreuth, qui deviendra au fil du temps un temple du National-Socialisme, et auquel il avait renoncé l'année précédente en raison d'une mésentente avec Winifred Wagner et avec son grand rival de l'époque, Arturo Toscanini. Mais Fürtwängler se trompe sur Adolf Hitler, et assiste impuissant à l'avènement d'un « " Reich " millénaire » .

Thomas Mann, intellectuel émigré, écrit, 2 mois à peine après l'arrivée au pouvoir des Nazis :

« Fürtwängler dirige pour ce jour de fête du nouveau régime. Laquais du " Reich " . » (6)

Le 21 mars 1933, en effet, à la demande d'Hermann Göring, responsable de la « Staatsoper unter den Linden » en sa qualité de « Preuischer Ministerpräsident » , Fürtwängler dirige les « Meistersinger » devant Adolf Hitler, le maréchal

Hindenburg, Hermann Göring, Wilhelm Frick et Alfred Hugenberg, entre autres ; à la fin de la représentation, « pâle comme la mort » (7), il serre la main du nouveau Chancelier. Le choix de Fürtwängler et des « Meistersinger » n'était, bien entendu, pas anodin : un Opéra national de Richard Wagner, un chef reconnu à l'étranger et « capable d'exprimer à chaque concert la force de la vraie Allemagne, de rassembler dans ses interprétations tout le meilleur de la musique allemande » (8), ces 2 éléments réunis permettaient à Göring une réussite à coup sûr pour le concert du « Regierungsanordnung ».

Quelques jours plus tard, après la mise en application de la loi « zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums », qui empêche toute personne d'origine juive d'exercer un poste de fonctionnaire dans le nouveau « Reich », Fürtwängler exprime sa Ire opposition à la politique culturelle de Gœbbels, lequel profite du vide institutionnel laissé par Hitler pour prendre progressivement le contrôle de la vie musicale. Le 11 avril 1933, dans la « Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung », est publié un article de Fürtwängler et la réponse du « Reichsminister ». Le Mæstro y affirme qu'il ne peut tolérer « qu'une seule ligne de séparation dans l'Art, celle qui existe entre l'art de qualité et l'art sans qualité » (9), et il regrette que, désormais, soit appliquée une séparation « théorique et implacable » (10) entre Juifs et non-Juifs. Gœbbels répond :

« En tant qu'homme politique allemand, je ne peux pas reconnaître cette unique ligne de séparation qui existerait selon vous. L'art ne doit pas être seulement de qualité, il doit aussi surgir du peuple, ou, plus exactement, seul un art qui puise dans le " Volkstum " tout entier peut être de qualité en fin de compte et signifier quelque chose pour le peuple auquel il est destiné. Les artistes qui peuvent vraiment faire quelque chose, et dont l'action dans les domaines extérieurs à l'art ne va pas à l'encontre des normes élémentaires de l'État, de la politique et de la société, trouveront à l'avenir, comme par le passé, l'aide et les encouragements les plus chaleureux de notre part. » (11)

Le ministre de la Propagande, dans cette même réponse, blâme Fürtwängler qui prend publiquement la défense de Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer et Max Reinhardt, artistes bannis par le régime et forcés à émigrer, et qui devront, selon Fürtwängler, « encore dans l'avenir pouvoir s'exprimer par leur art en Allemagne ». Lors du passage du chef devant la Commission de dénazification de Berlin, en décembre 1946, on ne retiendra de cette lettre ouverte que la distinction plus ou moins ambiguë que Fürtwängler fait entre « bons » et « mauvais Juifs », quand il parle d'une lutte justifiée contre les « artistes déracinés et destructeurs qui ne cherchent à se faire valoir que par le kitsch ou la virtuosité ». Mais peu importe la signification qu'on donne aujourd'hui à ces lignes, car, en 1933, Gœbbels est embarrassé par cette Ire réaction du « Generalmusikdirektor », qui rencontre le « Führer » quelques semaines plus tard, dans son repaire de l'Obersalzberg. Fürtwängler en revient avec ces paroles :

« Jamais ce camelot chuintant ne jouera un quelconque rôle important en Allemagne. » (12)

Berta Geimar, sa secrétaire d'origine juive, note également :

« En revenant de l'entretien, il m'a dit qu'il savait maintenant ce qui se trouvait derrière les mesures bornées d'Hitler : ce n'était pas seulement l'antisémitisme, mais le rejet de toute forme de pensée artistique, philosophique, le rejet de toute forme de culture libre. » (13)

Entre 1933 et 1945, Fürtwängler prendra la défense ou aidera à émigrer de nombreux musiciens considérés par le régime comme « Entartete » (dégénérés) , des amis juifs, ou encore des personnes recherchées pour leurs opinions politiques, comme il l'explique dans son plaidoyer aux Alliés en 1946 :

« Par-dessus tout, je me suis sans relâche opposé aux persécutions subies par des individus, qui étaient personnellement, politiquement, ou racialement, divergents du régime et de son idéologie. Par principe, j'intervins dans chaque cas de persécution contre les Juifs qui fut porté à ma connaissance et pour lequel je pensais pouvoir être utile. Je ne me suis pas laissé détourner de cette position. Je pus être utile dans de nombreux cas. » (14)

Lors de son passage en dénazification, Fürtwängler présente une liste (15) de plus de 80 personnes qui ont déclaré avoir été aidées ou sauvées par lui, au nombre desquelles on compte des musiciens d'orchestre comme Heinrich Wollheim (16) , des chefs célèbres comme Bruno Walter, Arnold Schœnberg, Otto Klemperer, Hans Knappertsbusch, ou encore des solistes comme Carl Flesch, dont le fils déclarera que c'était Fürtwängler qui avait prévenu sa famille des rafles vers les camps de concentration. Berta Geimar avait rassemblé des centaines de dossiers qu'elle avait ensuite, à la demande de Fürtwängler, transmis au général Robert McClure, chargé du « procès » de 1946. Les pièces ont mystérieusement disparu à Berlin, alors qu'elles devaient être remises au général-commandant de la Zone d'occupation américaine. Curt Rieß a affirmé que les pièces ne se trouvaient pas non plus aux Archives fédérales de Washington ; elles ne furent donc pas prises en considération, et la liste établie de mémoire par Fürtwängler n'avait aucune valeur légale aux yeux des Alliés.

Dès 1933, le chef titulaire du « Berliner » s'oppose également à l'épuration au sein de son Orchestre, menaçant le « Staatskommissar » Hafemann, dépêché par Gœbbels, de démissionner de tous ses postes si la politique raciale devait s'appliquer à ses Orchestres. Bruno Stenzel témoignera ainsi, après la guerre :

« C'était Fürtwängler qui arrangeait à sa manière l'application de la politique concernant l'Orchestre. On nous enviait pour être une sorte d'enclave dans le 3e " Reich ". Le pourcentage de membres du NSDAP au sein du " Berliner " était le plus bas de tous les Orchestres d'Allemagne, ce qui rendait son influence quasi nulle. » (17)

Le « Berliner » est en effet le seul orchestre où la politique raciale n'est appliquée qu'en 1934, après la démission de Fürtwängler de ses postes ; dès avril 1933, cependant, cette implication pour les Juifs ne plaît guère à Gœbbels, surtout qu'Hans Hinckel lui fournit une missive du « Kulturstaatssekretär » Georg Gerullis contenant cette phrase devenue célèbre :

« Pouvez-vous me citer un seul Juif pour lequel Fürtwängler ne prenne pas parti ? » (18)

1933 marque aussi une grande déconvenue pour Fürtwängler : en juin, il prend personnellement l'initiative d'inviter des musiciens juifs émigrés, les solistes Bronisław Huberman, Fritz Kreisler, Yehudi Menuhin, ou encore Gregor Piatigorski, en précisant :

« Si vous acceptez ma proposition, vous prouverez au monde que l'Allemagne de la musique ne doit pas être bannie. Nous, artistes, nous devons nous distinguer de la politique, quand bien même les hommes politiques essaient de nous en empêcher. » (19)

Malheureusement, tous les musiciens refusent, et s'expriment par la voix d'Artur Schnabel :

« Nous reviendrons jouer en Allemagne, quand tous les musiciens qui, pour des raisons politiques ou raciales, ont perdu leurs emplois, les recouvreront. » (20)

Fürtwängler est déçu et remplace les solistes par des artistes (re)commandés par Goebbels, parmi lesquels on compte la pianiste nazie Elly Ney, surnommée « die Reichsklaviergromutter », ou encore Wilhelm Backhaus. Le régime profite de cette phase difficile pour lier Fürtwängler plus fortement à sa politique culturelle : de France, où il se produit à l'Opéra de Paris, il apprend sa nomination par Bernhardt Rust à la « Ministerkommission für Programmfrage » (Commission de contrôle des programmes) avec Max von Schillings, Wilhelm Backhaus et Georg Kulenkampff. Parallèlement, Göring le nomme 1er « Staatskapellmeister » à la « Staatsoper unter den Linden » et, 1 an plus tard, il en devient son directeur général. Sans avoir été prévenu, Fürtwängler est nommé par Göring, le 8 juillet 1933, « Staatsrat » de Prusse, aux côtés du « SS-Reichsführer » Himmler, du « SA-Oberführer » le Prince August Wilhelm de Prusse, ou encore du juge Roland Freisler et du chef d'entreprise Fritz Thyssen. Fürtwängler expliquera à ce sujet, en 1946 :

« La fonction de conseiller d'État ne donnait aucune sorte de pouvoir ni la moindre autorité. On me donna ce poste, car je venais d'être approuvé dans ma position de chef de la " Staatsoper ", dont Göring assumait dès lors la direction. Je n'ai participé qu'à une seule réunion de ce Conseil d'État : la réunion d'ouverture. Je ne sais même pas s'il y a eu d'autres réunions par la suite. » (21)

Goebbels, très jaloux de l'influence que prend son rival Göring sur son « Dirigent », nomme Fürtwängler « Reichskultursenator », le 10 juillet, puis vice-président de la « Reichsmusikkammer » (« RMK ») qu'il crée le 1er novembre, et dont il confie la présidence à Richard Strauß. La « RMK », à laquelle l'adhésion était obligatoire pour exercer un emploi dans le domaine musical en Allemagne, avait des prérogatives diverses et assez imprécises : examen des adhésions, publications variées dans les « Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer » (tant sur le contenu des programmes que sur l'incorporation d'organisations ou d'associations musicales à la Chambre), ordonnances visant à limiter la liberté des musiciens, soumettant à examen le droit de voyager à l'étranger (7 mai 1934), demandant à ce que les programmes de concert soient présentés à l'avance pour approbation (16 juillet 1934), interdisant l'usage de pseudonymes aux consonances étrangères (29 septembre 1934), ou encore, obligeant à utiliser un piano allemand en concert (2 juillet 1934). (22)

Fürtwängler ne siégera que moins de 1 an à cette Chambre, symbole, selon Erik Levi, des « inconstances et contradictions politiques caractérisant la vie musicale sous le 3e " Reich " » (23)

Au début de l'année 1934, Fürtwängler décide de programmer à la « Staatsoper » l'Opéra de Paul Hindemith

« Mathis der Mahler » . Hindemith n'a pas de sympathies anti-nazies, mais sa femme et nombre de ses amis sont d'origine juive ; de plus, sa musique ne plaît guère à certains dignitaires du régime. En 1929, au « Kroll Oper », Hitler avait été très choqué par la musique et le synopsis de son « Neues von Tage », et, comme la majorité des compositeurs de musique moderne, Hindemith avait été classé comme promoteur de l'« Entartete Musik » et mis au ban des scènes allemandes par Alfred Rosenberg. Göring refuse la programmation envisagée par Fürtwängler ; ce dernier proteste et réussit alors un coup de génie : profitant de la relative liberté dont il jouit au « Berliner Philharmoniker », bien que l'Orchestre soit passé sous contrôle du « ProMi » (ministère de la Propagande) représenté par Rudolf von Schmidtseck, « Orchesterkommissar » chargé de lier l'Orchestre au Parti, et de Walther Funk, nouveau directeur général, il y programme la « Mathis-Symphonie », composée d'extraits de l'Opéra du même nom et arrangés pour Orchestre Symphonique. L'accueil fait par le public à cette œuvre, le 11 mars 1934, est excellent ; Fürtwängler s'attend à une réaction opposée et immédiate du régime, mais elle n'intervient que quelques mois plus tard, après une nouvelle prise de position publique de Fürtwängler contre la politique culturelle nazie.

Hindemith est, encore une fois, le noyau du désaccord. En 1re page de la « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung », le 25 novembre 1934, Fürtwängler fait publier l'article intitulé « Der Fall Hindemith » :

« Hindemith ne s'est jamais engagé en politique. Vers quel avenir allons-nous, si les méthodes de dénonciation politique sont appliquées au domaine de la musique ? Plus encore, et cela doit être très clair : nous ne pouvons pas nous permettre de renoncer à un talent comme Hindemith. »

La presse nazie réplique dès le 27 novembre contre Hindemith et Fürtwängler. Le compositeur choisit d'émigrer, alors que le 2 décembre 1934, lors d'une représentation de « Tristan und Isolde » à la « Staatsoper », Fürtwängler est applaudi pendant 25 minutes à son entrée dans la fosse, puis à chaque salut d'acte, et ce en présence de Goebbels et de Göring ; la portée politique de cette manifestation du public est évidente, et Göring en comprend l'enjeu. Après un entretien sur la « question Fürtwängler » avec le « Führer » le lendemain, il explique au chef que sa démission immédiate est clairement attendue. Fürtwängler s'exécute, renonçant à toutes ses fonctions le 4 décembre 1934, au « Berliner », à la « Staatsoper » et à la « Reichsmusikkammer », mais il ne peut abandonner son titre de « Staatsrat », qui ne peut être retiré que par le « Führer » lui-même en cas de trahison ou de meurtre. Son passeport lui est aussi confisqué. Erich Kleiber soutient son action en démissionnant de son poste à la « Städtische Oper » de Berlin, et prend le chemin de l'exil. Göring écrit au Mæstro déchu, non sans ironie :

« Je voudrais saisir l'occasion, pour vous dire combien cette séparation m'attriste. J'aurais espéré que nous puissions clarifier les problèmes et arriver à une sorte d'accord par lequel nous aurions pu continuer à collaborer. Cela n'a pas pu se faire. Je vous remercie personnellement pour toutes les nombreuses heures merveilleuses de musique que vous m'avez données en tant qu'artiste et chef d'orchestre. Aujourd'hui, je me reconforte en me disant que je vous reverrai encore, probablement en tant que chef invité, diriger dans mon Opéra. Rien dans la vie n'est définitif : tout peut être changé. Tout en espérant que votre carrière artistique sera pleine de réussite, je reste convaincu que votre chemin ne peut qu'être lié à celui de l'Allemagne nazie. » (24)

Fürtwängler se retire alors dans les Alpes bavaroises où il commence à écrire son Concerto symphonique pour piano.

Göring lui substitue Clemens Krauß à la « Staatsoper », et la tournée du Philharmonique de Berlin, prévue en Angleterre en janvier 1935 et proposée à Sir Thomas Beecham, est annulée suite au refus du chef anglais. La nouvelle du départ de Fürtwängler provoque un nombre important de réactions à l'étranger, notamment aux États-Unis ; de plus, il reçoit le soutien de nombreux artistes et de son public, mais le régime nazi continue les attaques contre lui, et notamment contre sa secrétaire Berta Geimar, à qui il conseille d'émigrer en Angleterre et qu'il recommande à Sir Thomas Beecham. Rosenberg écrit, dans le « Völkischer Beobachter » du 6 décembre 1934 :

« Fürtwängler s'obstine à demeurer dans ses pensées du XIXe siècle. Il ne ressent plus rien pour le combat de NOTRE temps, il en assumera donc les conséquences. » (25)

Par sa démission, Fürtwängler retrouve une part de l'estime d'Arturo Toscanini, qui s'est prononcé contre toute forme de fascisme, et tout particulièrement contre celui du « Duce ». Fürtwängler est alors pressenti à sa succession à la tête du « New York Philharmonic », ainsi qu'à celle de Leopold Stokowski à Philadelphie. Arthur Judson, directeur de « Columbia Records », contacte le Mæstro afin de lui faire part de sa proposition. Fürtwängler, qui ne souhaite pas quitter son pays, peut vivre et composer en Allemagne, mais ne diriger qu'à l'étranger. Fürtwängler est enthousiaste, mais encore lui faut-il récupérer son passeport ! À sa demande, il obtient une entrevue avec Gœbbels, le 28 février 1935, rencontre qu'il décrira en 1946 pour son plaidoyer devant la Commission de dénazification : Fürtwängler refuse la Ire condition posée par Gœbbels, sa « subordination publique et explicite à la politique culturelle d'Adolf Hitler ». Considérant qu'en tant qu'artiste il ne peut accepter aucune autorité au-dessus de son art, il rejette, devant Gœbbels, toute l'utilisation faite de l'Art par les Nazis. La discussion se clôt sur un compromis, qu'Herbert Haffner qualifie de « prodige goebbelsien » (26), et que le chef résume ainsi :

« Finalement, Gœbbels me dit : " Vous ne pouvez pas renier que dans l'Allemagne d'aujourd'hui, c'est Hitler qui mène la politique culturelle. " J'ai répondu : " Je ne le contredis pas. C'est un lieu commun ... tout le monde le sait. " Gœbbels : " Si je vous demandais de me le confirmer, je ne vous demanderais pas de trahir vos convictions ? " Ma réponse : " J'en serais vraiment ravi. La responsabilité en termes de politique culturelle dans le " Reich " ressort entièrement et exclusivement d'Adolf Hitler, et je dois m'y résoudre. Personnellement, pour autant que j'y suis concerné, je ne veux rien avoir à faire avec cela. " » (27)

Par cet accord, Fürtwängler n'occupera plus aucun poste de directeur musical jusque 1945 ; il ne dirigera plus non plus le traditionnel cycle de 11 concerts à la Philharmonie, et se contentera d'engagements limités à la « Staatsoper ». Mais le régime a retrouvé son « Dirigent », et Gœbbels jubile :

« Fürtwängler est revenu. Quelle grande réussite pour nous ! Ces artistes sont vraiment les gens les plus bizarres que je connaisse. Sans aucun raisonnement politique. » (28)

Fürtwängler est persuadé, quant à lui, d'avoir obtenu la garantie de pouvoir mener sa carrière comme un musicien libre et hors de la politique. Mais la déconvenue ne tarde pas : le 25 avril, à Berlin, il retrouve son Orchestre, dans un programme entièrement consacré à Beethoven ; Gœbbels, Göring et Hitler sont présents et, à la fin de la représentation, le « Führer », qui lui a rendu son passeport, serre la main de Fürtwängler (29) :

La photo sera publiée dans les journaux du monde entier. Il dirige aussi les « Meistersinger » la veille des « Reichsparteitage » de 1935 à Nuremberg : cet argument sera utilisé à charge contre lui par les représentants américains en 1946, alors qu'il clamera que cette représentation était indépendante de la manifestation du Parti, selon la promesse faite par le ministre de la Propagande.

Fin 1935, il fait savoir à Goebbels qu'il refuse de diriger toute tournée financée par le régime nazi, comme celle prévue en Angleterre pour le « Berliner Philharmoniker ». Fürtwängler expliquera ainsi, en 1946, que « ses tournées étaient uniquement artistiques, sans aucun autre but ». En conséquence, qu'il a refusé, tout naturellement, de jouer dans les pays qui avaient été conquis pendant la guerre, c'est-à-dire la Norvège, la Hollande, la Belgique, et la France. (30)

Arturo Toscanini renonce définitivement à son poste new-yorkais en février 1936 et demande à Fürtwängler de lui succéder, à condition de ne plus diriger en Allemagne. Celui-ci accepte le contrat, et prend quelques semaines de vacances au Caire et en Italie. Il ne se doute pas que Göring, alerté par les écoutes téléphoniques faites par la Gestapo, vient d'apprendre sa nomination américaine, et échafaude une riposte implacable. Le 28 février, il fait publier dans la presse allemande un communiqué annonçant que Fürtwängler a repris tous ses postes et toutes ses fonctions en Allemagne. La nouvelle se propage aux États-Unis, où un tollé général s'élève contre Fürtwängler, qui ne peut que rompre son contrat, par télégramme :

« Controverses politiques tellement désagréables. Ne suis pas un homme politique, juste un représentant de la Musique allemande, qui appartient à l'humanité tout entière. Propose de rompre mon engagement auprès de la " Philharmonic Society ", jusqu'à ce que le public comprenne que musique et politique n'ont rien à voir ensemble. Si publication de ce télégramme, publiez-le avec mes propres mots. Louxor, 13 mai 1936, Fürtwängler. » (31)

C'est au cours de l'été 1936 qu'il retrouve Bayreuth et son Festival Wagner, après plusieurs années d'absence. À cette occasion, Hitler, Göring et Goebbels tentent de le convaincre de reprendre une position officielle dans la vie musicale allemande. Celui-ci refuse, devant Friedelind Wagner, la nièce du compositeur qui émigrera 3 ans plus tard, et qui racontera une anecdote stupéfiante :

« Je me souviens qu'Hitler avait demandé à voir Fürtwängler, et qu'il lui a dit très sèchement qu'il devait dorénavant obéir au Parti et servir la propagande, et Fürtwängler refusa très explicitement. Hitler devint fou de rage et fit savoir à Fürtwängler que, dans ce cas, il y aurait une place pour lui en camp de concentration. Fürtwängler se tut un instant et dit, très calmement : " Herr Reichskanzler, au moins là-bas je serai en bonne compagnie. " Le " Führer " se mit hors de lui et quitta la pièce. » (32)

Excédé par les controverses politiques, Fürtwängler décide d'annuler toute activité publique durant l'hiver 1936-1937, souhaitant passer cette période dans une paix absolue afin de se consacrer à la composition. Alors que les Jeux olympiques battent leur plein à Berlin, Fürtwängler se réfugie dans les montagnes, où il travaille à sa Sonate pour violon et à son Concerto pour piano. En décembre 1936, Goebbels le prie de diriger un concert pour le

« Wintershilfswerk » (œuvre de charité) et il retrouve officiellement son Orchestre, le 10 février 1937 à Berlin, lors d'un concert où, une fois encore, Hitler, Göring et Goebbels, ainsi que de nombreux ambassadeurs, sont présents ; le ministre de la Propagande note :

« Fürtwängler est fêté comme un dieu. Le “ Führer ” et moi sommes ravis. » (33)

Le « Führer », qui, selon les dires d'un soldat américain, aurait reçu un télégramme d'anniversaire le 20 avril 1937, signé Wilhelm Fürtwängler, « Generalmusikdirektor » et « Preuischer Staatsrat » ; cet argument est également utilisé en 1946, à charge contre Fürtwängler, sans que la preuve ou un fac-similé ne soient présentés. Fred K. Prieberg (34) démontre que l'argument avancé par le « GI » Sonnenfeld est pure invention : d'abord, l'original n'est présent dans aucun centre d'archives allemand ; ensuite, 2 éléments techniques amènent à cette conclusion : Fürtwängler n'a jamais signé de son titre « Staatsrat », et celui de « Generalmusikdirektor » n'était pas reconnu officiellement dans la nouvelle hiérarchie nazie, car antérieur à 1933 ; sur son agenda du 19 avril 1937, enfin, figurent 3 noms auxquels il se doit de répondre : Ribbentrop, Goebbels et Madame Hindemith. Mais aucune mention d'Adolf Hitler.

1937 voit également les débuts de Fürtwängler au Festival de Salzbourg, où il rencontre Toscanini, qui lui reproche d'être devenu un Nazi. Curt Rieß rapporte la discussion, dans la version de Fürtwängler :

Fürtwängler : « Quand je dirige de la musique, dans un pays conquis par Hitler, est-ce que cela signifie que je suis son représentant ? Cela ne fait-il pas plutôt de moi son adversaire, car la musique est un parfait démenti à l'abrutissement et à l'anéantissement causé par le Nazisme ? »

Toscanini : « Quiconque dirige dans le 3e “ Reich ” est un Nazi. »

Fürtwängler : « Alors, vous supposez que l'Art n'est rien d'autre que de la propagande pour le régime qui est déjà au pouvoir. Si je vous comprends bien, le régime nazi étant au pouvoir, je suis donc un chef nazi ; sous un régime communiste, je serais un chef communiste ; sous un régime démocrate, un chef démocrate ... Non, 1,000 fois non ! L'Art appartient au monde entier » (35)

Goebbels s'en mêle (« Quelle insolence de Toscanini, d'interdire à un artiste allemand de jouer en Autriche ! ») (36) et l'avocat nazi Arthur Sey-Inquart, devenu ministre de l'Intérieur et de la Sécurité, s'occupe de barrer le chemin à Toscanini. Le chef italien ne reviendra plus jouer à Salzbourg, ville qui deviendra, quelques semaines après cette rencontre, une nouvelle « terre intérieure » pour le 3e « Reich ». Avec l'« Anschluß », Fürtwängler voit le danger de la politique culturelle nazie menacer Vienne ; Otto Straßer, représentant du « Wiener Philharmoniker » dont Fürtwängler avait été chef titulaire, de 1927 à 1930, s'adresse à lui pour faire protéger le statut de l'Orchestre, ainsi que ses musiciens juifs (parmi lesquels Arnold Rosé et Friedrich Buxbaum) ou de demi-sang juif (comme Hugo Burghauser) (37). Fürtwängler décide alors, après l'anniversaire du « Führer » le 20 avril 1938 où il donne les « Meistersinger » au « Wiener Staatsoper », de faire jouer le « Wiener Philharmoniker » à Berlin, dans un programme exclusivement autrichien Franz Schubert, Anton Bruckner et Johann Strauß. Impressionnés, Hitler et Goebbels accordent une indépendance relative à l'Orchestre, ce qui permettra à Fürtwängler certains actes audacieux, comme le

mentionne Boheslaw Barlog :

« Lors d'un concert en 1938, à Vienne, la salle était décorée, pour des raisons politiques, de drapeaux à croix gammée. Fürtwängler arriva sur le podium, salua les musiciens, regarda à gauche, à droite, vit les drapeaux, et retourna en coulisses. Après une dizaine de minutes, des gens arrivèrent avec des échelles, enlevèrent les drapeaux à droite et à gauche, sous les applaudissements du public, et le concert reprit. Il fallait être courageux comme un lion pour faire ça en 1938 ! » (38)

En assurant que l'Orchestre continuerait à vivre de sa pleine autorité, Fürtwängler voulait aussi détourner les vues de Goebbels de faire de Vienne « une ville de province du " Reich " » ; il permet aussi au « Gauleiter » de Vienne de conserver une certaine autonomie face au ministre de la Propagande. En décembre 1939, Joseph Bürckel (39) est nommé « Gauleiter » de Vienne et « Reichskommissar für die Wiedervereinigung Österreichs mit dem Deutschen Reich » (Commissaire à la réunification de l'Autriche avec le « Reich ») ; Seyß-Inquart lui confiant également les tâches culturelles, pour lesquelles il n'a que peu d'intérêt, il se tourne vers Fürtwängler. Celui-ci accepte, sans contrat et sans honoraires, de devenir une sorte de conseiller musical de la ville de Vienne, « pour y préserver l'indépendance de la vie musicale » . (40)

Autant que faire se peut, il limitera jusqu'en 1944 l'influence des Nazis sur l'Orchestre, comme en témoigne son discours de mars 1942 pour le centenaire du « Wiener » , devant le « Gauleiter » Baldur von Schirach :

« Comme vous le savez, le " Wiener Philharmoniker " élit toujours son chef : c'est quelque chose d'unique dans le contexte de l'État autoritaire qui est le nôtre. » (41)

Dès 1938, Göring, avide de faire plier Fürtwängler et conseillé par l'opportuniste intendant de la « Staatsoper » , Heinz Tietjen, essaie une nouvelle tactique : si le « chef idéal » ne veut pas se conformer au régime, le régime créera un autre « chef idéal » . Le « Berliner Philharmoniker » a déjà reçu à ce titre quelques jeunes talents, parmi lesquels le « Generalmusikdirektor » d'Aix-la-Chapelle, âgé de 30 ans seulement, Herbert von Karajan. Membre du NSDAP, conseillé par l'agent de concert et « SS-Obersturmführer » Rudolf Vedder, Karajan semble être le parfait candidat pour contrecarrer Fürtwängler ou, du moins, l'abaisser. Le 21 octobre 1938, Karajan dirige sans partition « Tristan und Isolde » à la « Staatsoper » ; le lendemain, un article paraît en page 5 dans la « Berliner Mittagszeitung » , « In der Staatsoper, das Wunder Karajan » , écrit par le critique Edwin von der Nüll. Fürtwängler le perçoit comme une offense envers sa personne, et s'en plaint à Goebbels, qui note :

« Longue conversation avec Fürtwängler. Toujours la même rengaine. Il a des milliers de réclamations. Mais il a raison, quand il s'inquiète de ce que ce Karajan de 30 ans monopolise la presse. Je veillerai à empêcher cela dans le futur. » (42)

Cette rivalité naissante entre Karajan et Fürtwängler, qui ira crescendo jusqu'à la fin de la guerre, est aussi le reflet de la rivalité Göring-Goebbels pour le contrôle de la vie musicale. Oliver Rathkolb, docteur de l'Institut d'histoire contemporaine de l'Université de Vienne, résume assez bien la situation :

« On n'a toujours pas bien établi à quel point Karajan a servi à éliminer, ou tout au moins, à neutraliser, l'assise artistique de Fürtwängler, devenu encombrant politiquement. Karajan servit de contrepoids. » (43)

Karajan lui-même expliquera plus tard à Roger Vaughan (44), un de ses biographes, que c'est Tietjen qui avait organisé en grande partie la rivalité entre lui et Fürtwängler. Il ira même jusqu'à mentionner que « Gœbbels se foutait de ce que Fürtwängler pensait des Nazis. Il l'aimait beaucoup. » (45)

Gœbbels et Hitler lui-même n'apprécient que peu Karajan, et essaieront jusqu'en 1944 de privilégier Fürtwängler sur les scènes allemandes. Mais Fürtwängler se montrera jusqu'à sa mort, et particulièrement avant 1945, obsédé par « Herr K » (il refusera pendant de longues années de prononcer son nom), ce rival plus jeune que lui, et qu'il verra conquérir progressivement toutes les scènes du monde après guerre.

1939, la guerre éclate, et Fürtwängler, qui vient de recevoir la Croix de Commandeur dans l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur (46), en février, des mains de Robert Coulondre, ambassadeur de France à Berlin, voit progressivement se réduire son champ d'activités. Avec le début de la guerre, Fürtwängler se focalise en grande partie sur Vienne et Berlin. Il relatera, en 1946 :

« Ma position concernant la guerre en elle-même peut se résumer par le fait que, dès le début, j'ai catégoriquement refusé de diriger en pays occupé. Dès 1939, je ne me suis plus rendu ni en Hollande, ni en Belgique, ni en Pologne, et encore moins en France. Toute affirmation contraire est pure invention. J'ai refusé, par principe, de venir dans un pays y jouer de la musique après que les tanks y soient passés. » (47)

En avril 1940, Fürtwängler se trouve à Copenhague où il doit diriger le Philharmonique d'Oslo et décide d'annuler son concert du 10 en protestation à l'invasion allemande. Mais il se voit forcé de diriger à Prague, en novembre 1939, pour l'ouverture du « Deutsches Opernhaus ». Gœbbels note :

« Cette soirée musicale fut le couronnement de notre volonté de former des relations de paix avec Hácha ... Une " Moldau indescriptible ", un " Eulenspiegel " intéressant. La 7e, œuvre grandiose. Public exalté. » (48)

L'année 1941 amène une nouvelle opposition entre le Mæstro et le ministre de la Propagande, qui, envieux du film « Fantasia » de Walt Disney avec Leopold Stokowski, décide d'utiliser Fürtwängler en commandant à Paul Verhœven un film sur le « Berliner », intitulé « Philharmoniker » :

« Ça va être un chef-d'œuvre, Fürtwängler doit y participer, j'ai tout le scénario en tête. » (49)

Mais Fürtwängler refuse catégoriquement d'apparaître dans le film de propagande, et « Philharmoniker » sortira finalement en décembre 1944 au « Tauentzien-Palast », sans Fürtwängler mais avec Richard Strauß, Karl Böhm, Hans Knappertsbusch et Eugen Jochum. En avril, alors que la « Staatsoper » est détruite par un bombardement, Fürtwängler chute à ski dans le Vorarlberg, près de Sankt-Anton, en Suisse, ce qui lui occasionne de nombreuses lésions (on craint

même une paralysie du bras droit) et l'oblige à cesser toute activité pendant 9 mois. Il revient sur le podium en octobre 1941, avec cette pointe :

« Vous allez rire, mais je ne peux plus lever mon bras droit. »

Il termine l'année, invité par Baldur von Schirach, en dirigeant le Requiem pour le 150^e anniversaire de la mort de Mozart, à Vienne.

Au début de l'année 1942, il est dans la capitale autrichienne pour « Tristan » et « Fidelio », puis effectue une courte tournée scandinave avec le « Berliner ». Fin février, il dirige un concert dans l'usine « AEG » avec la « Symphonie Inachevée », « Till Eulenspiegel » et l'Ouverture des « Meistersinger », concert filmé pour la « Wochenschau ». Ces concerts sont considérés par le gouvernement nazi comme une « offrande au peuple combattant des musiciens au statut privilégié ». Mais c'est au printemps qu'intervient un événement important : en avril, il reçoit un coup de téléphone de Goebbels l'invitant à venir diriger, à la demande du « Führer », le concert de célébration de son anniversaire, à Berlin. Furtwängler, cherchant à éviter cette manifestation, prétexte un manque de répétitions, puis devoir rester en poste à Vienne, mais Goebbels clôt la discussion en transformant l'invitation en ordre catégorique. Le concert a lieu le 19 avril 1942, Goebbels en profitant pour faire un discours fleuve :

« Nous avons tous conscience de la force éternelle qui nous guide, celle qu'on l'appelle le Tout-Puissant, Dieu, notre Destin ou Notre Père, celle qui, comme dans le Finale de la 9^e Symphonie, vit au plus haut des cieux. Nous prions le Tout-Puissant de nous laisser notre " Führer ", de lui donner la force et la joie de poursuivre son œuvre ... et de mener notre Peuple, après la lutte et les souffrances, vers la Victoire ! » (50)

Ce concert, filmé pour la propagande nazie, a engendré une archive devenue très célèbre, tant par le cortège de dignitaires nazis présents au concert que par l'attitude de Furtwängler lui-même. Ce dernier, serrant la main à un Goebbels enchanté, ne lui offre qu'un sourire crispé, avant d'essuyer très discrètement sa main droite avec un mouchoir.

Le 2 janvier 1943, Furtwängler est à Vienne où il dirige « Tristan » dans sa propre mise-en-scène : après les 5 heures de représentation, il obtient 32 minutes de rappel ! Mais la situation de l'armée allemande se dégrade et, après l'échec de l'« Opération Braunschweig » et la capitulation de la 6^e Armée à Stalingrad, Goebbels déclare la « guerre totale » : les concerts se feront de plus en plus rares après 1943, le « Reich » privilégiant la lutte contre les ennemis et n'ayant plus que peu d'intérêt pour les affaires culturelles. De ce fait, tous les musiciens sont priés de participer à l'effort de guerre ; certains font cependant exception, et une liste de 36 pages contenant le nom des « Gottbegnadet » (protégés de Dieu) est publiée, les dispensant de service militaire. On y trouve les compositeurs Carl Orff et Werner Egek, les chefs Karl Böhm et Clemens Krauß, le ténor favori d'Hitler Max Lorenz (bien qu'homosexuel et marié à une femme juive), mais aussi la majorité des musiciens du « Berliner », du « Wiener », du « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig et du « Prager Deutsche Orchester », l'Orchestre allemand fondé par Goebbels dans la capitale tchécoslovaque. Une liste « spéciale » est établie pour 3 noms : Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner et Wilhelm Furtwängler. Ils sont, dans cet ordre, à protéger à tout prix, car ils représentent un « capital immense pour la nation

» . (51)

De retour de sa tournée scandinave avec le « Berliner » , Fürtwängler cherche un moyen de se faire « dispenser » du concert d'anniversaire du « Führer » : le Docteur Johannes Ludwig Schmitt, un Résistant au régime, lui fournit un certificat attestant une spondylarthrite ankylosante, ce qui ne lui permet pas de diriger - pas même le 20 avril ... Gæbbels rend visite au « malade Fürtwängler » , et le trouve très affaibli :

« Il est très malade et fait peine à voir. Mais il ne peut pas s'empêcher de penser à ce jeune Karajan. Je vais essayer de trouver un moyen de les faire cohabiter. Je veux quand même garder ce Karajan à Berlin, au cas où ... même s'il n'est pas comparable à Fürtwängler. » (52)

Mais le 6 mai, déjà, Fürtwängler est totalement « rétabli » , et dirige le « Wiener » dans une tournée en Europe du Nord, puis le « Berliner » pour un concert dans les usines « Siemens » , et, enfin, un programme Beethoven avec Elly Ney. Les bombardements sur Berlin se faisant de plus en plus dangereux, Fürtwängler, qui vient de se marier en 2es noces avec Élisabeth Ackermann, cherche à protéger sa famille et s'installe avec sa femme et ses enfants dans le Kremstal, à Achleiten : Hitler est mis au courant, et propose à Fürtwängler la maison de son choix. Celui-ci répond :

« En ces temps où de nombreux Allemands perdent leurs demeures et leurs foyers sous les bombardements, je ne peux accepter de me voir offrir une maison. » (53)

Hitler tient tête et décide alors de construire un « bunker » pour ces musiciens protégés, Hans Pfitzner, Richard Strauß et Wilhelm Fürtwängler, qui s'oppose à cette proposition :

« Bien entendu, je serais ravi, si je me trouvais face à une attaque aérienne, de pouvoir utiliser un abri anti-bombes dans une ville dangereuse comme Berlin. Mais cependant, au jour d'aujourd'hui, où tout Allemand doit supporter le fardeau de la guerre, et je n'y fais pas exception, je ne peux pas et je ne veux pas engager une telle inégalité pour ma famille et moi. Ce serait hors de propos, surtout dans cette petite ville hors de danger. » (54)

Mais la réalisation des travaux, confiés à Albert Speer et à l'organisation « Todt » , ira bel et bien jusqu'à son terme, dans la demeure de Fürtwängler à Potsdam : pour un total de « 52,092 " Reichsmark " au titre des bâtiments du " Führer ", 1,000 briques et 215 mètres (55) de poutres » (56) sont installés, rendant ce « bunker » , découvert en avril 1945 par l'Armée rouge, quasi indestructible.

Le 30 janvier 1944, la salle de la Philharmonie de Berlin, située sur la « Bernburgerstrasse » , est réduite en cendres, et les concerts, qui ont lieu l'après-midi en raison des bombardements nocturnes, sont transférés à l' « Admiralspalast » ou à la « Beethoven-Saal » de la « Köthener-Strasse » . Durant la saison, Fürtwängler dirige à Berlin, à Potsdam (57) , à Prague, en Espagne, au Portugal, mais tombe « malade » , début avril. Il obtient un certificat médical, et échappe au concert d'anniversaire d'Hitler, mais aussi à une tournée prévue en Turquie et, chose exceptionnelle, au Congrès Rosenberg sur la « construction d'une force culturelle anti-juive » , où 400 délégués sont conviés, dont Fürtwängler et les « Berliner » (57) . Himmler et Göring sont exaspérés par l'attitude de Fürtwängler ;

mais Goebbels soutient son « Dirigeant » qui, dès le 4 mai, est de nouveau en pleine forme et reprend les enregistrements.

Brutalement cependant, après le 20 juillet 1944, Fürtwängler passe du statut de protégé à celui d'indésirable du régime. Au moment où l'Opération « Tristan und Isolde » aurait pu tuer le « Führer », Fürtwängler dirige à Bayreuth, et il ignore que son nom est cité dans la liste des conspirateurs. Fürtwängler a, en effet, des liens avec la Résistance : il a bien connu Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg, car ils ont fréquenté les mêmes cercles munichois, dont le « Wolfskehl ». Son médecin, le Docteur Schmitt, qui lui a fourni de nombreux faux-certificats médicaux, appartient au « Cercle de Kreisau ». Fürtwängler apportera, en 1946, un élément supplémentaire dans l'explication de sa brutale disgrâce liée au complot du 20 juillet :

« J'avais été informé qu'un plan était envisagé, mais je n'étais au courant d'aucun point de détail. À une manifestation du Parti, à Potsdam, peu avant l'attentat, j'avais discuté avec des personnes que je connaissais bien, et qui s'avèrent impliquées dans le plan. » (58)

Si, aujourd'hui, la participation active de Fürtwängler à une conspiration est hors de propos, l'avis du régime nazi en 1944 est tout autre, et Fürtwängler ne se doute pas un instant du danger qui pèse sur ses épaules. Dès le 11 août 1944, Goebbels ferme tous les Festivals de musique et de théâtre en Allemagne, privant Fürtwängler d'un rôle de 1er plan dans la vie musicale du pays ; en septembre, la « Gestapo » ouvre une enquête sur son rôle dans la conspiration du 20 juillet et, 1 mois plus tard, il est prévenu de ces investigations. Maria Daelen, sa belle-sœur et interne en médecine, raconte que quelques semaines après l'attentat contre le « Führer », la « Gestapo » vient fouiller aussi bien son cabinet que sa maison de campagne. En janvier 1945, elle est soumise à de nombreux interrogatoires, où elle doit répondre du rôle présumé de Fürtwängler dans l'attentat contre Hitler (59), et particulièrement des liens du chef avec Otto Hübener, Hans Oster, Ulrich von Hassel, Erwin Blank, Adam von Trott zu Solz et Hans Bernd Giesevisu, tous liés à la conspiration. (60)

Une découverte récente tend à confirmer la présence de Fürtwängler dans les Cercles d'opposition à Hitler : dans une entrée du journal berlinois de Marie « Missie » Wassiltschikow, du 16 novembre 1943, l'auteur raconte avoir dîné chez Gottfried von Bismarck à Potsdam, avec Adam von Trott zu Solz, Monsieur et Madame Hassel, et Fürtwängler. À de nombreuses reprises, Elisabeth Fürtwängler, la veuve du chef, a confirmé l'information, qui donne un aperçu de la société que fréquentait Fürtwängler durant les années 1930 et 1940. Il n'est donc pas étonnant, compte tenu des preuves multiples de liens entre Fürtwängler et la Résistance allemande à Hitler, que le régime, et particulièrement Goebbels, fasse déchoir le Mæstro de son auréole de gloire et de son statut privilégié. Himmler, l'ennemi de toujours, en profite simplement pour faire appliquer une décision radicale, l'arrestation par la « Gestapo », en février 1945.

Ainsi, le 7 décembre 1944, Fürtwängler est déchu de son statut de « Gottbegnadet » et incorporé à la réserve militaire de Berlin, déclaré « Dienstpflichtiger ». Quelques jours plus tard, Adolf Hitler confie à son « ami » Albert Speer que les « SS » ont à charge de surveiller Fürtwängler et que la « Gestapo » va l'arrêter et l'emprisonner. Dans les derniers temps de la guerre, ce même Speer est le seul dignitaire nazi qui côtoie Fürtwängler. Lors d'un concert commandé par le ministre de l'Armement pour ses ouvriers, le 11 décembre 1944, Speer entre dans la loge du chef. Il

relate cette rencontre :

« Il me dit : " Quelle est la situation ? " En décembre 1944, poser cette question était très risqué, je dois l'avouer, parce que la ligne officielle était que vous deviez croire en la victoire et montrer que vous en étiez convaincu. Sa question montrait qu'il avait plus que des doutes sur l'issue finale de la guerre. Fürtwängler, par son attitude, plaçait donc son destin entre mes mains, ce qui me poussa à lui dire clairement et franchement qu'il n'y avait plus d'espoir, que la fin était proche. Je lui ai conseillé de partir en Suisse et de ne pas revenir. Il m'a alors dit : " Mais comment le pourrais-je ? Que vont devenir mes Philharmoniker ? Je suis responsable d'eux. " » (61)

Speer déclare alors prendre l'Orchestre sous sa responsabilité jusqu'à la fin de la guerre, rôle qu'il assumera pleinement, en protégeant les musiciens jusqu'au 12 avril 1945, date du dernier concert du « Berliner » avant la reddition sans condition de l'Allemagne nazie. Fürtwängler, averti des risques qui pèsent sur lui, organise alors sa fuite en Suisse, où se trouve déjà sa famille.

Le 23 janvier 1945, après avoir donné son dernier concert à Berlin, interrompu par un bombardement, le chef voyage en train jusque Vienne avec l'ingénieur du son Friedrich Schnapp, « voyage de nuit durant lequel il est suivi par 2 jeunes hommes en noir » . (62)

Les 2 hommes stationnent nuit et jour devant l'Hôtel Imperial où il réside. Le 5 février 1945, après son dernier concert à Vienne, il travaille avec sa secrétaire Agathe von Thiedemann jusque 2 heures du matin, sans l'informer de ses plans de fuite. À 5 heures, il quitte sans encombre l'Hôtel et se rend à la gare, direction Bregenz. À 6 heures, la « Gestapo » entre dans la chambre d'Agathe von Thiedemann et demande à voir Fürtwängler.

Ayant échappé au régime nazi, de nouvelles batailles s'ouvrent après guerre pour Fürtwängler : alors qu'il tente de reprendre ses activités, une opposition anti-nazie s'élève en Suisse contre lui. Puis, vient le temps de la dénazification, à Vienne puis à Berlin : grâce aux témoignages de nombreux amis juifs ou bannis du régime, Fürtwängler est classé en « Kategorie 4, Mitläufer » , et autorisé à reprendre ses activités. Il dirige alors à nouveau sur les plus grandes scènes du monde, et ce dans toute l'Europe. Cependant, nommé à Chicago, il doit faire face à un lobby de musiciens contre lui, dont Arthur Rubinstein et Wladimir Horowitz, ainsi qu'au comité « Israël Stern » ; malgré le soutien de Yehudi Menuhin, Fürtwängler doit renoncer à tout nouvel engagement aux États-Unis. Déjà profondément affaibli moralement par la dénazification et par la montée en puissance de son grand rival Karajan, Fürtwängler perd progressivement l'ouïe dès 1952. Souffrant d'infection pulmonaire, il renonce à toute volonté de vivre, comme il le dit à sa femme, le 12 novembre 1954, à la clinique d'Ebersteinburg :

« Tu sais, ils croient tous que je suis venu ici pour guérir. Moi, je sais que je suis venu ici pour mourir. » (63)

Pour certains, Fürtwängler doit encore aujourd'hui demeurer au purgatoire, mais que peut-on réellement lui reprocher ? D'être resté en Allemagne, d'avoir joué pour Hitler et ses sbires ? Ce serait oublier qu'il y a sauvé des musiciens juifs ou bannis par le régime. D'avoir participé à l'idée nazie d'une « supériorité culturelle allemande » , en jouant Wagner, Bruckner et Beethoven ? C'est pourtant ce même Beethoven qui clame, avec Schiller : « Alle Menschen

werden Brüder » , comme le plus cinglant démenti à l'antisémitisme nazi. Dans ses Mémoires, le cardinal de Retz écrit :

« Il est des temps où il est impossible de bien faire. »

Passer des compromis avec le Mal pour éviter le pire, cela nous semble bien vain, mais qu'il nous est aujourd'hui facile de juger ... Peut-être est-il finalement et simplement vain de vouloir absolument faire de Fürtwängler un Ange ou un Démon, car il me semble que sa seule véritable erreur date de 1933 : c'est celle d'avoir cru à sa propre illusion, cette illusion d'un Art totalement distant de la Politique, et d'un Artiste totalement apolitique. Déjà limitée, quand bien même techniquement réalisable, en temps de paix et de démocratie, elle n'était qu'une utopie sous le régime de la terreur, de la barbarie et de la guerre instauré par Hitler.

Notes

(1) « À torts et à raisons » est le titre de l'adaptation française de la pièce de Ronald Harwood, consacrée à la dénazification berlinoise de Fürtwängler : « Taking Sides » , Londres, Faber & Faber, 1995. L'adaptation cinématographique d'István Szabo date de 2002.

(2) Gitta Sereny - « Albert Speer : son combat avec la vérité » , Paris, Le Seuil (1997) , page 180.

(3) Wilfried von Oven - « Finale furioso. Mit Gœbbels bis zum Ende, Tübingen » , Grabert Verlag (1974) , page 268.

(4) Paul Hindemith - « Wilhelm Fürtwängler, in Diener der Musik » , herausgeber von Martin Müller und Wolfgang Mertz, Rainer Wunderlich Verlag, Tübingen (1965) , page 180-187.

Ire traduction française : Audrey Roncigli, Société Wilhelm Fürtwängler, Paris (2007) .

http://www.furtwangler.net/doc/Paul_Hindemith.pdf

(5) Curt RieB - « Fürtwängler, Musik und Politik » , Scherz, Berne (1953) , page 129.

(6) Thomas Mann - « Tagebücher » , volume 2, Fischer Verlag, Francfort (1977) , page 15.

(7) Herbert Haffner - « Fürtwängler » , Parthas Verlag, Berlin (2006) , page 150.

(8) Josef Gœbbels - « Reden 1932-1939 » , herausgeber von Helmut Heiber, Droste Verlag, Düsseldorf (1972) , page 282.

(9) Les lettres sont citées dans leur intégralité dans l'ouvrage d'Hildegard Brenner : « La politique artistique du National-Socialisme » , Maspero, Paris (1980) , annexes.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Wilhelm Fürtwängler - « Aufzeichnungen, 1924-1954 » , herausgeber von Elisabeth Fürtwängler und Günter Birkner, Wiesbaden, Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, 1980, page 119.

(13) Berta Geimar - « Musik im Schatten der Politik » , Atlantis Verlag, Zürich (1985) , page 96.

(14) Wilhelm Fürtwängler - « Über meine Beziehungen zum Nationalsozialismus. Undatierte Denkschrift für das Spruchkammerverfahren 1946 » , Bundesarchiv « Reichskulturkammer » , Berlin (2301/00003/01) , pages 10 à 26 (Beziehungen) .

Ire traduction française : Audrey Roncigli, Société Wilhelm Fürtwängler, Paris (2006) .

http://www.furtwangler.net/doc/Furtwaengler_face_au_national_socialisme.pdf

(15) Fred K. Prieberg - « Trial of Strength : Wilhelm Fürtwängler and the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Quartet Books, Londres (1991) , page 344.

(16) Le cas d'Heinrich Wollheim est particulièrement intéressant : de demi-sang juif, musicien à la « Staatskapelle » , il aide des amis recherchés par les Nazis à rejoindre la Suisse. Arrêté par la « Gestapo » , il clame être le copiste personnel de Fürtwängler, qui le connaît de nom mais, bien entendu, pas personnellement. Ce dernier vient cependant le chercher alors que Wollheim est sur le point d'être mené à « Dachau » , et confirme sa version ; libéré sur ordre d'Heinrich Himmler, il devient le copiste à vie de Fürtwängler.

(17) Peter Muck - « Einhundert Jahre Berliner Philharmoniker Orchester » , volume 2, Hans Schneider, Tutzing (1982) , page 202.

(18) Fred K. Prieberg - « Kraftprobe. Wilhelm Fürtwängler im Dritten Reich » , Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, Wiesbaden (1986) , page 133.

(19) Mosche Menuhin - « Die Menuhins » , Schweizer Verlaghaus, Zürich (1984) , page 212.

(20) Artur Schnabel - « Aus dir wird nie ein Pianist » , Wolke Verlag, Hofheim (1991) , page 141.

(21) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(22) Audrey Roncigli - « Musicien sous le 3e “ Reich ” » , mémoire de Maîtrise I, Université de Nancy 2 (2006) ,

pages 35-37.

(23) Erik Levi - « Musik in the 3rd “ Reich ” », MacMillan Press, Londres (1984) , page 38.

(24) Fred K. Prieberg - « Trial of Strength : Wilhelm Fürtwängler and the 3rd “ Reich ” », Quartet Books, Londres (1991) , page 144.

(25) Alfred Rosenberg - « Ästhetik oder Volkskampf » , Völkischer Beobachter, 6 décembre 1934.

(26) Herbert Haffner, opus cité, page 206.

(27) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(28) Josef Gœbbels - « Tagebücher 1924-1945 » , volume 3, herausgeber von Georg Reuth, Reinhard Piper Verlag, Munich (1992) , page 857.

(29) Wilhelm Fürtwängler a exploité le ressort de cette photographie, lors de son passage devant la Commission de dénazification, en expliquant qu'il n'a jamais effectué le salut hitlérien alors que celui-ci était exigé en public.

(30) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(31) Wilhelm Fürtwängler - « Briefe » , herausgeber von Franck Thiess, Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, Wiesbaden (1965) , page 87.

(32) Friedelind Wagner - « Nacht über Bayreuth. Die Geschichte der Enkelin Richard Wagners » , Dittrich Verlag, Cologne (1994) , page 84.

(33) Josef Gœbbels - « Die Tagebücher » , volume 3, herausgeber von Elke Fröhlich, De Gruyter Saur, Munich (1993-2000) , page 369.

(34) Fred K. Prieberg - « Trial of Strength : Wilhelm Fürtwängler and the 3rd “ Reich ” », Quartet Books, Londres (1991) , page 211.

(35) Curt Rieß, opus cité, page 226.

(36) Josef Gœbbels - « Tagebücher » , volume 4, page 356.

(37) Otto Straßer - « Und dafür wird man noch bezahlt. Mein Leben mit den Wiener Philharmonikern » , Paul Neff Verlag, Munich (1978) , page 135.

(38) Transcription du témoignage de Boheslaw Barlog dans le documentaire de Lothar Seehaus : « Wilhelm Fürtwängler - ein Künstler zwischen den Mahlsteinen der Politik » , Zweite Deutsche Fernsehse (1979) .

(39) Ayant un fort penchant pour l'alcool, il était connu sous le nom de Bierleiter Gauckel parmi les Nazis.

(40) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(41) Wilhelm Fürtwängler - « Ton und Wort. Aufsätze und Vorträge 1918 bis 1954 » , Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, Wiesbaden (1966) , page 176.

Ire traduction française du discours de 1942 : Audrey Roncigli, Société Wilhelm Fürtwängler, Paris (2007) .

http://www.furtwangler.net/doc/Centenaire_Wiener.pdf

(42) Josef Gœbbels - « Tagebücher » , volume 6, page 344.

(43) Olivier Rathkolb in Roger Vaughan - « Karajan » , Belfond, Paris (1988) , page 122.

(44) Roger Vaughan, opus cité, page 125.

(45) Ibid. , page 126.

(46) See : René Tremine - « La Légion d'honneur de Fürtwängler » , Société Wilhelm Fürtwängler, Paris (1986) .

<http://www.furtwangler.net/doc/honneur.rtf>

(47) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(48) Josef Gœbbels - « Tagebücher » , volume 8, page 410.

(49) Ibid. , volume 9, page 296.

(50) Josef Gœbbels - « Reden » , page 118.

(51) Oliver Rathkolb - « Führertreu und Gottbegnadet, Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich » , Österreichischer Bundesverlag, Vienne (1991) , page 166.

(52) Josef Gœbbels - « Tagebücher » , volume 8, page 386.

(53) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(54) Lettre de Wilhelm Fürtwängler à Adolf Hitler (Achleiten, le 21 mai 1944) , Bundesarchiv R 3/1578, Coblenz, page 242-243 ; dans Fred K. Prieberg - « Trial of Strength : Wilhelm Fürtwängler and the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Quartet Books, Londres (1991) , page 308.

(55) Fred K. Prieberg - « Trial of Strength : Wilhelm Fürtwängler and the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Quartet Books, Londres (1991) , page 309.

(56) Dans un programme Ravel, alors que Goebbels avait interdit la musique française le 3 novembre 1943 !

(57) Joseph Wulf, Martin Bormann - « Hitlers Schatten » , Sigbert Mohn Verlag, Gütersloh (1962) , page 92.

(58) Wilhelm Fürtwängler (Beziehungen) .

(59) Herbert Haffner, opus cité, page 316.

(60) Fred K. Prieberg - « Trial of Strength : Wilhelm Fürtwängler and the 3rd “ Reich ” » , Quartet Books, Londres (1991) , page 323.

(61) Transcription du témoignage d'Albert Speer dans l'interview de Lothar Seehaus : Zweite Deutsche Fernseh, 27 février 1979.

(62) Herbert Haffner, opus cité, page 318.

(63) Ibid.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1886-1954) , le chef d'orchestre mythique du « Berliner Philharmoniker » dans les années 1920 et 1930, choisit de ne pas quitter l'Allemagne à l'arrivée au pouvoir des Nazis. Pour certains, il fut l'ambassadeur musical du 3e « Reich » . Pour d'autres, le choix de rester dans son pays se justifia par le fait qu'il essaya, autant que faire se peut, de protéger certains musiciens et la vie musicale allemande et autrichienne en général. Dès 1933, cependant, ce choix marquait la naissance du « cas Fürtwängler » .

AB 124 : Philosophie musicale de Fürtwängler

30 juin 1943 : Enregistrement historique réalisé à l' « Alte Philharmonie » de Berlin. Ce jour-là, le grand chef d'orchestre allemand Wilhelm Fürtwängler dirigeait la célèbre phalange, dans un programme comprenant l'Ouverture de Coriolan et les Symphonies nos. 4 et 5 de Beethoven.

Homme d'une extrême sensibilité et d'un tempérament incandescent, âme fragile et tourmentée, Wilhelm Fürtwängler a été un de ces esprits magnifiques qui passent parfois au milieu des masses. Mais son art, ne l'a pas pour autant

préservé des difficultés de son époque. Fürtwängler avait pour habitude de noter ses réflexions sur la musique ainsi que des observations diverses sur le monde qui l'entourait. De ce fait, pénétrer la vision artistique du chef sans connaître l'homme est plus délicat. Mais il suffit d'en être conscient et de laisser de côté, pour le moment, l'aspect essentiellement politique et inhérent (bien malgré lui d'ailleurs) à sa personnalité. C'est assez que d'examiner sa position quant au rôle presque religieux qu'il accorde à la performance musicale.

À travers ses écrits personnels, ses carnets ou bien encore sa correspondance, Fürtwängler n'a cessé d'exposer et de défendre l'idée de la création musicale comme un tout organique. Pour lui, le Concerto doit, en quelque sorte, incarner son étymologie en rendant possible l'accord des âmes à travers l'expérience collective. Le contact entre le public et l'artiste est le relais pour atteindre cet état de conscience partagée qui renseigne l'Homme sur lui-même. Voilà pourquoi il est, à nos yeux du moins, si important d'écouter les enregistrements publics réalisés par Fürtwängler. Certes, il n'aimait pas le disque qui entraverait selon lui la communion entre l'auditeur et l'interprète et détruirait le message artistique par excellence. Mais, il n'en demeure pas moins qu'à l'écoute d'un document sonore pris sur le vif, l'amateur de musique achète de nos jours (avec tous les bruits parasites de l'assistance) une petite part du miracle. La question reste invariable dans la bouche du grand homme durant toute sa vie : « le public marche-t-il ou non ? » .

En définitive, par-delà les raisons techniques, l'enregistrement est pour lui un cas de conscience face à l'aspect vivant qu'incarne la musique. Selon lui, le micro enferme l'interprète dans son désir de perfection. À cela s'ajoute la peur des tempos extrêmement lents, des grands contrastes, des pauses, l'angoisse de tout ce qui est poussé à l'extrême, mais aussi de tout ce qui articule, façonne, produit la forme au sens le plus profond du terme. Cela implique une modification décisive dans notre façon de jouer. La musique risque de se retrouver de plus en plus dépouillée de son caractère immédiat de vie, le rythme, la pulsation vivante du cœur de se rapprocher de la cadence mécanique et impersonnelle de la machine, la constitution organique d'être privée d'une partie de sa chaleur, de sa vie, de son opulence et de son tempérament, jusque dans le moindre accent de son chant.

On comprend le souci permanent de Fürtwängler de conserver la force vive de la musique en préservant l'aspect naturel de sa création. En effet, cette « pulsation vivante » est le propre même de la création artistique, ce que l'on peut appeler : l'interprétation. Car pour le chef allemand, la musique (bien qu'elle contienne en elle-même toute sa force artistique) se présente sous une forme abstraite qui libère toute son expression à travers l'artiste. Celui-ci a donc la responsabilité de transmettre ce « caractère immédiat de vie » que le micro détruit. Ainsi, interpréter n'est pas fixer avec minutie une multitude de détails (techniques ou musicaux) mais libérer l'inspiration du moment comme le veut la loi de l'improvisation. C'est sans doute là que réside le génie de Fürtwängler : dans la volonté de faire primer l'instant sur l'habitude. Lorsque l'on écoute ses lers enregistrements de 1926, et, plus généralement, ceux des années 1930, on sent déjà combien son expression musicale contient de variables : rythme, tempo, crescendo, sforzando, rupture. Autant de modes d'expression qui ont attendu le moment adéquat pour s'exprimer à un niveau paroxystique et révéler toute la violence d'une époque.

Un « style de guerre »

Le « Reich » qui devait durer 1,000 ans se retrouve, en 1943, dangereusement chancelant. Le 2 février, la reddition

de la 6e armée du maréchal Paulus, à Stalingrad, met fin à la bataille la plus meurtrière de toute l'histoire militaire. Elle a coûté la vie à près de 1,000,000 de personnes (soldats et civiles) et considérablement affecté les troupes allemandes. Préoccupé par sa crédibilité et conscient que l'Allemagne est en train de perdre la guerre, Adolf Hitler envoie son ministre de la Propagande pour galvaniser le peuple allemand. Le 18 février 1943, à Berlin, Josef Goebbels lance ces paroles apocalyptiques de la tribune nazie du « Sportpalast » et déchaîne la foule : « Ich frage euch : Wollt ihr den totalen Krieg ? Wollt ihr ihn, wenn nötig, totaler und radikaler, als wir ihn uns heute überhaupt erst vorstellen können ? Nun, Volk, steh auf und Sturm brich los ! » (Je vous demande, voulez-vous la guerre totale ? La voulez-vous, une guerre encore plus totale et radicale que tout ce que nous pouvons imaginer ? Peuple, lève toi ! Tempête déchaîne-toi !) .

Les conséquences ne se font pas attendre et le pays subit, de plus en plus régulièrement, les bombardements alliés. Plus touchée que la plupart des autres villes allemandes, la capitale paye le prix de sa valeur symbolique aux yeux du National-Socialisme. L'inversion du rapport de forces au cœur du conflit oblige les dirigeants allemands à privilégier l'effort de guerre aux affaires culturelles. L'année 1943 marque donc la fin de la politique culturelle du « Reich », diminuant brutalement le nombre de concerts. Beaucoup de musiciens perdent leur statut privilégié qui les dispensait du service militaire, et sont envoyés au combat sur les différents fronts d'Europe. Josef Goebbels établit à ce moment-là une liste de 36 pages contenant les noms des « Gottbegnadet » (les protégés de Dieu) que la nation a comme rôle de protéger. Parmi les plus célèbres, on y trouve Carl Orff, Clemens Krauß, Max Lorenz et Karl Böhm. 3 noms font l'objet d'une liste spéciale : Richard Strauß, Hans Pfitzner et Wilhelm Fürtwängler qui, selon les termes mêmes du document, représentent un « capital immense pour la nation ». Mais la suite est connue, les mois qui suivent plongent le pays dans le chaos jusqu'à la chute du 3e « Reich », le 8 mai 1945.

Bien que la quasi-totalité de Berlin ait été détruite, les bandes d'enregistrement de la « Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft » (Radio du « Reich ») sont trouvées par l'Armée Rouge après la prise de Berlin et emmenées en Russie. Par la suite, ces enregistrements sont édités peu à peu et dans des proportions très restreintes en URSS. Commence alors un véritable marché noir avec les documents sonores de l'époque de guerre, dont certains passent le mur sous le manteau et restent, pour cette raison, longtemps méconnus des mélomanes. Finalement, lors de l'explosion du bloc de l'Est (soit 50 ans après avoir été gravées), la « Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft » publie enfin ces bandes par l'intermédiaire de la Radio Libre de Berlin. Ce que l'on peut appeler aujourd'hui, à juste titre, le « style de guerre » de Fürtwängler a été, au moment de la découverte des enregistrements de cette période, un choc terrible. Il suffit d'écouter un des concerts peut-être le plus significatif pour en mesurer l'impact : celui du 30 juin 1943 avec la Philharmonie de Berlin. Ce soir-là précisément, avec l'Ouverture Coriolan et les Symphonies nos. 4 et 5, Beethoven et Fürtwängler donnent un « Requiem » pour une Allemagne dénaturée par la barbarie nazie. Ce qui est remarquable à l'écoute de ce concert, c'est qu'il réussit à « communiquer un peu de l'atmosphère qui régnait à l'époque », comme le dit sa femme Elisabeth Fürtwängler. Effectivement, dans les dernières années de la guerre, se rendre à l'« Alte Philharmonie » n'était pas chose facile et, aux dires des musiciens eux-mêmes, les gens se demandaient s'ils n'allaient pas assister à leur dernier concert. Ces craintes étaient du reste tout à fait justifiées, puisque cette salle (tout comme le « Staatsoper » et l'« Admiralspalast ») a fini sous les bombes. Les concerts se déroulaient avec des interruptions fréquentes dues aux alertes nocturnes et contraignaient public et musiciens à attendre pour voir si la soirée pouvait continuer. On imagine certainement avec peine venir au concert, en ces instants, était un acte de foi, excluant

toute autre motivation en dehors de l'art. Cette très forte tension a imprégné les performances artistiques du chef Wilhelm Fürtwängler, au point qu'il est aujourd'hui difficile de les comprendre avec une grille interprétative habituelle. Sans doute est-ce là une marque de la puissance de l'art véritable, capable de soulever l'homme pour le libérer (ne fût-ce qu'un instant) de son ordinaire. Un idéal que le grand chef allemand a recherché toute sa vie.

AB 125 : Principe créateur dans la musique

Introduction

« Est-ce qu'on sait bien ce qu'est l'âme humaine ? Elle n'est pas un modèle en carton sur lequel le musicien viendrait broder des points d'or ; elle n'est même pas explorée tout entière. Et dans tous les cas, il se produit souvent en elle, pour nous servir du langage musical, des changements de clef qui transforment les sentiments et les états les plus connus. Or, cette vie flottante de l'âme n'est pas d'un côté et la musique de l'autre. La musique ne la traduit pas seulement, elle la crée. » (Jean Jaurès : De la réalité du monde sensible.)

Cette citation de Jean Jaurès, qui fut confronté en son temps à la nécessité d'un sursaut collectif (malheureusement sans succès, comme l'a confirmé l'arrivée de la Première Guerre mondiale) montre qu'il avait, si ce n'est compris, du moins senti, le rôle fondamental que doit revêtir la musique, ou plutôt un certain type de musique. Selon lui, l'art en question ne doit en aucun cas se suffire à refléter un état d'âme, qu'il soit nostalgique, rageur, cynique ou même gai : car ce serait réduire l'âme, qui « s'ignore elle-même plus qu'à moitié ». Ajoutons que l'âme humaine (et c'est ce qui fait sa singularité) est en devenir, et qu'elle doit se nourrir de tout ce qui peut l'aider à imaginer ce qui n'existe pas encore, afin de s'assurer, en le créant, un futur.

Pénétrons dans l'univers de Wilhelm Fürtwängler (1886-1954), grand chef d'orchestre allemand du XXe siècle, grâce aux écrits qu'il a laissés et aux nombreux entretiens (notamment retransmis dans l'ouvrage « Musique et verbe »). À travers son combat devenu « politique » et sa conception de ce qu'est véritablement l'art qu'il dirige, musique et préoccupation pour l'âme humaine (et son sort) ne font qu'un.

Le principe de Fürtwängler : défier l'esclavage de la certitude des sens

Wilhelm Fürtwängler est un chef d'orchestre de la première moitié du XXe siècle, et il faut préciser que son approche n'a rien à voir avec la façon dont nous concevons la musique Classique aujourd'hui, c'est-à-dire comme un simple divertissement. Son approche est rigoureusement scientifique, chose qui a malheureusement disparu dans notre culture. Après 2 ou 3 générations d'une véritable dé-génération, la plupart des gens ne comprennent plus et n'ont plus un sens vivant de ce qu'on peut appeler le principe de Fürtwängler.

Ce principe, qu'il a constamment exprimé, non seulement dans ses interprétations mais également dans ses écrits, ne se borne pas à nous informer de la manière dont la musique devrait être interprétée et comprise ; c'est un principe physique universel, qui doit nous amener à repenser et redéfinir notre conception ontologique de l'univers physique.

Entre les notes

Qu'est-ce qui rend les interprétations de Fürtwängler aussi uniques ? Prenons comme exemple une œuvre dirigée par Fürtwängler, en l'occurrence une Symphonie de Tchaïkovski. C'était à la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, alors qu'il se trouvait dans une base militaire près de Calcutta : ce fut pour lui un véritable choc, quelque chose qui ne ressemblait en rien à tout ce qu'il avait expérimenté jusqu'alors. Il décrit un sentiment de suspense, maintenu sans relâche du début à la fin, qui le fit presque littéralement tomber de sa chaise : une cohérence remarquable du tout, en tant qu'unité, du début jusqu'à la fin. C'est ce qu'un autre chef d'orchestre a décrit, ayant eu l'occasion d'assister à des répétitions de Fürtwängler à Milan, comme une « tension électrique » imprégnant tout l'orchestre, dès le moment où Fürtwängler entrait dans la salle. Omniprésente, cette tension imprégnait non seulement les notes en tant que telles, mais également les silences entre les notes audibles, là où il n'y a aucun son. Décrivons cela comme « la pré-note » et « l'après-note » que l'on entend dans notre esprit, tandis que les notes audibles sont entendues par l'oreille.

C'est surtout grâce à son Maître Arthur Nikisch (1895-1922) que Fürtwängler a compris comment faire vivre la musique.

Le prédécesseur et mentor de Fürtwängler fut le chef d'orchestre Arthur Nikisch. C'est principalement grâce à lui, en l'entendant diriger, qu'il a développé un sens vivant de ce principe. On disait de Nikisch qu'il était capable de donner un sentiment ineffable, indéfinissable, de quelque chose « entre les notes ». Cette idée de ce qui se passe « entre les notes » est exactement le genre de phénomène qui a lieu quand on écoute la musique de Fürtwängler. Toute personne sensible, pourvu qu'elle ne soit pas devenue mentalement sourde et que son âme n'ait pas été asséchée par la musique populaire et la culture généralement cynique dans laquelle nous baignons aujourd'hui, serait immédiatement saisie en écoutant un enregistrement d'une interprétation de Wilhelm Fürtwängler ; et vous le seriez aussi !

C'est ce « mystère » qui nous rend capables de jeter un œil sur ce monde au-delà des murs de la prison où nous enferme notre expérience sensorielle.

Voici ce qu'était le secret de Fürtwängler : si l'esprit peut expérimenter quelque chose de différent et d'indépendant des sensations en tant que telles, quelque chose qui les précède, alors cela signifie qu'il ne dépend pas de l'expérience sensorielle. L'esprit n'est pas la somme de toutes les expériences sensorielles qu'il a connues jusqu'à ce moment. Au contraire, du fait qu'elle appartient à un domaine chimique ou physique inférieur, l'expérience sensorielle devient subordonnée à la nature plus substantielle de l'esprit, dont elle dépend. Cette idée nous permet d'inverser cette conception de l'univers partant du bas vers le haut, et d'établir une hiérarchie ontologique d'un univers créateur engendrant de haut en bas tout ce qui est.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler comprenait cette idée, avec toutes ses implications universelles. Il l'a découverte de l'intérieur du monde de la musique, tout en comprenant qu'il s'agissait d'un principe universel de l'esprit humain créateur, et de l'univers créateur.

Voici un court passage d'un écrit de Fürtwängler où il traite de la façon dont l'interprète doit s'élever des multiples

notes d'une partition vers l'unicité initiale de l'œuvre conçue par le compositeur :

« Considérons l'acte de création artistique. Lorsque l'on regarde ce processus de plus près, on remarque que 2 niveaux se distinguent. À un 1er niveau, la combinaison de chaque élément avec ceux qui lui sont proches forme des éléments plus grands. Puis, ces éléments plus grands se combinent avec d'autres, et ainsi de suite, dans une croissance logique en expansion, des parties vers le « Tout ». Mais à un autre niveau, la situation est inversée. L'unité donnée par le « Tout » contrôle le comportement des éléments qu'il contient, jusqu'au moindre petit détail. Le fait essentiel notable est que dans toute œuvre d'art authentique, ces 2 niveaux se complètent l'un l'autre, de telle sorte que l'un ne devient effectif que lorsqu'il est associé à l'autre. »

Musique Classique et science physique

Cette citation constitue l'affirmation ontologique (d'un processus unique ayant donné naissance à ce qui est) la plus précise faite au cours du XXe siècle. Le fait qu'elle fasse écho aux préoccupations de certains des plus grands scientifiques de l'époque n'est pas une coïncidence : plus spécifiquement Albert Einstein et Max Planck. Ce n'est pas non plus un hasard que durant leurs loisirs (moment où, en réalité, ils réalisaient leurs plus grandes découvertes, comme le disait Einstein à sa manière) ces 2 scientifiques aient pratiqué l'interprétation musicale Classique. Planck était un pianiste et organiste très doué, Einstein un violoniste talentueux qui joua dans des Quatuors à cordes.

Ainsi, le musicien Fürtwängler s'avère être un grand scientifique. Car le véritable domaine où l'esprit humain découvre sa propre identité en tant que substance créatrice, et où il en voit le reflet dans l'univers, est la science physique. C'est ce à quoi l'on prend part lorsque l'on interprète et que l'on comprend le grand art Classique.

Il n'est pas étonnant non plus que Fürtwängler, dans le passage « l'unité du " Tout " animant le processus de transformation de chacune de ses parties » fasse écho à celui qui est certainement le plus grand philosophe des 3 derniers siècles :

Gottfried Leibniz, qui a exprimé à plusieurs reprises exactement la même idée dans des écrits tels que le « Discours de métaphysique » (1686) , « La monadologie » (1714) , ou encore son « De l'origine radicale des choses » (1697) : il n'existe nulle part d'entité finie en tant que telle, ou de somme d'entités finies, pour laquelle on ne puisse trouver de raison suffisante à son existence. Au contraire, c'est dans le domaine de la substance supérieure, le « Un » , lequel se situe nécessairement au-delà de l'entité finie ou de la somme d'entités finies, qu'on peut trouver la raison suffisante à l'existence de cette entité finie ou de cette somme d'entités finies.

Ce n'est donc absolument pas un hasard que Fürtwängler ait découvert un principe ne se cantonnant pas au domaine de la musique en soi, un principe physique universel, contenant en son sein l'ontologie de l'univers tout entier. Et ceci renvoie à l'importance de la pensée de Leibniz. C'est en partant de l'existence d'un processus créateur, en tant que substance nécessaire ayant engendré toutes les choses d'ordre fini, et d'un homme créateur à son image, et seulement ainsi, que l'on peut comprendre la puissance de ce que l'on expérimente en découvrant une composition musicale réellement Classique.

AB 126 : Wilhelm Fürtwängler : un combat culturel contre le fascisme

Introduction

Il est des hommes, dans la longue lignée de l'histoire humaine, dont la beauté et la justesse du combat peuvent se mesurer à l'aune de l'opprobre et de la calomnie qu'ils ont subies. Il en est ainsi du grand chef d'orchestre allemand Wilhelm Fürtwängler. Cet homme souffrit d'avoir courageusement tenté de protéger la véritable culture Classique allemande de la destruction orchestrée par les Nazis, puis par l'oligarchie financière.

Pour comprendre son combat, il faut comprendre dans quel milieu il baigna, et ce dès son enfance. Sa famille fut en effet un terrain propice à la réflexion, à l'art et à la philosophie. Sa mère, Adelheid Wendt, dont le père avait été ami de Johannes Brahms, était peintre et son père, Adolf Fürtwängler, cousin du mathématicien Philipp Fürtwängler (professeur de mathématiques de Kurt Gödel), fut un éminent archéologue, qui dirigea les fouilles allemandes à Egine, Mycènes et Olympie, et dont certains ouvrages sur la céramique grecque font encore autorité.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler était des voyages de son père, et Elizabeth Fürtwängler, sa future épouse, témoigne de son intérêt pour Beethoven déjà à cette époque : « Wilhelm m'a raconté qu'adolescent il avait accompagné son père à Egine, en 1901. Là, le jeune Fürtwängler montait dès le matin dans les forêts de pins et les collines, et lisait les Quatuors de Beethoven dans l'immensité solitaire de la nature. » .

Genèse d'un chef d'orchestre d'exception

De fait, la manière dont Fürtwängler concevra sa vocation d'artiste est imprégnée de l'idéalisme de la Grèce antique. Elizabeth Fürtwängler témoignera de l'importance de la pensée de Schenker pour son mari, même bien après la guerre : « Wilhelm se passionnait pour le concept du " fernhören " que le musicologue juif viennois Heinrich Schenker situe au cœur de toutes ses considérations. L'écoute à distance, c'est-à-dire le fait d'entendre ou de percevoir sur une longue distance une grande continuité, est, pour Schenker, le signe distinctif de la grande musique Classique. » . Sa collaboration avec Schenker durera jusqu'en 1935, année de disparition du musicologue.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler fut retiré très tôt du système scolaire. Il eut alors pour précepteurs l'archéologue Ludwig Curtis, les compositeurs Anton Beer-Walbrunn, Josef Rheinberger et Max von Schillings, ainsi que Conrad Ansorge, ami de Franz Liszt, pour le piano. Il devint chef d'orchestre à l'âge de 20 ans. Son 1er concert eut lieu, le 19 février 1906, à Munich lors duquel il dirigea « la Consécration de la maison » de Beethoven, un Poème symphonique en si mineur de sa propre composition et la 9e Symphonie d'Anton Bruckner. En février 1912, il rencontra le chef d'orchestre Arthur Nikisch. Elizabeth Fürtwängler dira plus tard : « Fürtwängler affirmait qu'il n'avait appris que d'Arthur Nikisch. À ses yeux, parmi les chefs d'orchestre, nul autre qu'Arthur Nikisch n'était digne de considération. » . En 1922, il prit sa succession à la tête des Orchestres du « Gewandhaus » de Leipzig et du Philharmonique de Berlin.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler s'affirmera donc comme le plus grand représentant de l'héritage Classique allemand. Bien que ne

refusant pas de jouer des œuvres de musique moderne (atonale) comme celles d'Arnold Schönberg, Béla Bartók ou Igor Stravinsky, il défendra toute sa vie durant, et surtout vers la fin, la musique tonale comme seul moyen d'exprimer des « Idées » en musique.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler milita aussi pour la paix entre les nations à travers les relations artistiques et culturelles. Par exemple, il continua à diriger de la musique française en Allemagne pendant la Première Guerre mondiale, dont « Carmen » de Georges Bizet. Il joua également un rôle de 1er plan dans le rapprochement culturel avec la France, suite aux accords de Locarno.

Or c'est à cette époque que les attaques commencent. Lors de sa 1re représentation à New York, en 1925, il dirige la 5e symphonie de Beethoven, qui fut accueillie par 15 minutes de « standing ovation ». Les membres de l'Orchestre, ainsi que d'autres musiciens, le proposent alors comme chef d'orchestre régulier à New York, ou au Philharmonique de la ville. Or, cette initiative n'est pas du goût d'un certain Olin Downes, correspondant du New York Times, qui, par ses critiques calomnieuses, réussit à saboter l'initiative. Rappelons que c'est le New York « Times » qui louera la politique d'apaisement de Neville Chamberlain vis-à-vis d'Adolf Hitler. C'est donc bel et bien l'« establishment » de la côte Est qui contrôle les institutions musicales de New York, et son but est clair, comme nous le verrons plus tard : remplacer l'héritage Classique de Beethoven par de la « musique moderne ». À la place de Fürtwängler est affecté l'« anti-fasciste » auto-proclamé Arturo Toscanini, pur produit de la culture vénitienne et ancien candidat du Parti fasciste italien à Milan aux élections parlementaires de 1919.

Un humaniste Classique contre le 3e « Reich »

Mais le combat de Wilhelm Fürtwängler prend un tour plus dramatique en 1933. Le régime nazi arrive au pouvoir, et les relations amicales du musicien avec de nombreuses personnalités juives comme Heinrich Schenker et surtout Paul Hindemith, sont sujet de querelle avec le régime. On reprochera plusieurs fois à Fürtwängler d'être resté en Allemagne pendant cette période. Mais c'est précisément durant cette période que son combat en défense de l'héritage Classique allemand s'affirme véritablement. En effet, bien que les Nazis prétendent défendre l'art allemand en interdisant totalement la musique atonale, leur volonté de destruction de tout produit culturel remettant en cause leur hégémonie, les pousse à attaquer la culture Classique allemande elle-même, de par son amour « dérangeant » pour le vrai. Le poète Heinrich Heine subit les autodafés de 1933, le « Guillaume Tell » de Schiller est interdit par Adolf Hitler lui-même, le 3 juin 1941, en tant que « drame de la liberté », et la politique d'aryanisation du répertoire aboutit à l'interdiction des œuvres de Jean-Sébastien Bach à Königsberg, en 1944, à cause de ses soi-disant « textes infestés par les Juifs ».

C'est en 1934 que s'amorce le véritable affrontement entre Fürtwängler et le régime, et il ne cessera de s'intensifier. En effet, le Maître persiste à diriger les œuvres de Félix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, comme le 12 et 13 février 1934 où il présente le « Songe d'une nuit d'été » à Berlin, alors que la musique du compositeur juif a été totalement interdite par le régime. La tension atteint un point critique lorsqu'il dirige « Mathis le peintre » de Paul Hindemith, le 11 mars 1934, alors qu'Hitler veut interdire les compositions de ce dernier. Excédé par les attaques de la presse nazie, Fürtwängler publie un article dans le « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » le 25 novembre 1934, intitulé : « Le cas

Hindemith » . L'affaire prend alors une tournure politique, et les attaques venant de partout, aussi bien d'Heinrich Himmler que d'Alfred Rosenberg (principal théoricien du Nazisme) , Fürtwängler démissionne le 4 décembre 1934 de ses postes de chef du Philharmonique de Berlin, directeur du « Staatsoper » de Berlin, vice-président de la Chambre de la musique du « Reich » et Conseiller d'État de Prusse.

En 1936, le cours de sa vie est sur le point d'être bouleversé : la direction de l'Orchestre philharmonique de New York lui propose en effet de succéder à Arturo Toscanini. Fürtwängler accepte, mais une mystérieuse dépêche de l'agence berlinoise de l' « Associated Press » annonce que le chef d'orchestre est rétabli dans ses fonctions de directeur de l'Opéra de Berlin. Les milieux de l' « establishment » hostiles à Fürtwängler utiliseront plus tard cet événement pour donner de lui l'image d'un Nazi camouflé. Devant l'intense polémique déclenchée outre-Atlantique, il renonce à la proposition new-yorkaise, par un télégramme rendu public le 15 mars 1936.

En 1937, le chef d'orchestre se rend au Festival de Salzbourg, devenu centre des musiciens anti-Nazis, Adolf Hitler ayant interdit aux musiciens allemands de s'y produire, pour diriger la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven. Toscanini, présent à ce Festival, se rachète une virginité en attaquant violemment Fürtwängler en raison de sa présence en Allemagne. Par la suite, les relations avec le régime ne font qu'empirer, pour atteindre un point de non-retour en 1938, quand Hermann Göring sort de son chapeau un chef d'orchestre dont le style « fanfare » n'a d'égal que sa capacité à faire des compromis avec le régime : il s'agit d'Herbert von Karajan, que le Ministre de la propagande Josef Gœbbels fait tout pour placer à la tête de l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, à la place de Fürtwängler. Cette période devient de fait une source de profond désespoir pour notre chef d'orchestre. Cette année-là, qui voit la sanglante « Nuit de cristal » , il sauve la vie de plusieurs musiciens juifs comme Carl Flesch et son épouse, ou Heinrich Wollheim, musicien de l'Opéra de Berlin.

En 1942, il apparaît dans le concert qui lui sera le plus reproché après-guerre, dirigeant la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven, jouée dans le cadre de l'anniversaire d'Adolf Hitler. Il faut savoir que notre chef d'orchestre avait justement planifié une série de concerts à Vienne pour éviter de se produire lors de cet anniversaire.

Mais Gœbbels annule les concerts pour faire revenir Fürtwängler de force à Berlin. Traumatisé par sa participation à cet événement, il va multiplier les certificats médicaux en avril 1943 pour pouvoir disparaître ; celui qu'il obtient lui vient du docteur Johannes Ludwig Schmitt, résistant membre du « Cercle de Kreisau » . Cela lui permet d'éviter non seulement l'anniversaire d'Adolf Hitler de 1943 mais aussi un congrès gigantesque organisé par Gœbbels en Turquie pour manifester une « force culturelle anti-juive » .

En janvier de cette année-là, Heinrich Himmler obtient ce qu'il cherchait depuis 1933 : l'autorisation de faire arrêter Fürtwängler par ses Waffen SS. Mais Fürtwängler parvient à rejoindre sa femme en Suisse. D'après Elizabeth, c'est là que va débiter le second combat culturel de Wilhelm Fürtwängler, qui se confond avec celui de sa réhabilitation.

Contre l'oligarchie financière !

En 1946, Wilhelm Fürtwängler passe en procès devant le Tribunal de dénazification. 3 personnes d'origine juive

viennent témoigner en sa faveur et certifient, le 17 décembre 1946, que le chef d'orchestre a risqué sa vie pour les protéger. L'un d'entre eux est Paul Heitzberg, ancien directeur d'Opéra. Fürtwängler est innocenté le jour même.

Maintenant, pour comprendre la seconde phase du combat politique de Fürtwängler, il faut nous attarder sur le sinistre John McCloy. Né en 1895 à Philadelphie, McCloy est juriste et banquier au service des « Sept Sœurs », compagnies pétrolières les plus puissantes au monde, comptant la Royal Dutch « Shell », la British Petroleum (BP) ou encore la Standard Oil (John D. Rockefeller). McCloy est assistant du secrétaire d'État à la Guerre de 1941 à 1945, et il occupera aussi le poste de Haut-commissaire américain pour l'Allemagne d'après-guerre.

En 1948, les ennuis recommencent. Fürtwängler est invité à diriger l'Orchestre symphonique de Chicago, avec une tournée prévue pour 1949. Mais un groupe de musiciens de 1er plan, incluant les principaux chefs d'orchestre actifs en Amérique du Nord comme Arturo Toscanini, George Szell, Eugène Ormandy et les musiciens Jascha Heifetz, Isaac Stern, Vladimir Horowitz, Gregor Piatigorsky et Arthur Rubinstein, organisent une campagne diffamatoire envers Fürtwängler, le faisant passer pour un Nazi. Nous n'apprendrons que bien plus tard, lors d'une entrevue donnée par son épouse à l'« Executive Intelligence Review » (EIR), le 24 janvier 1986, le rôle de John McCloy dans les actions de ce groupe.

John McCloy était-il anti-Nazi ? En 1950, il fera relâcher les industriels nazis Alfried Krupp et Friedrich Flick, qui avaient utilisé la main d'œuvre des camps de concentration pour leurs usines, en vue de doper la production d'acier allemand pour fabriquer les armes de la guerre de Corée.

Et dans le domaine intellectuel, il fera partie, avec Bertrand Russell et Théodore Adorno, entre autres, et via les fondations Ford et Rockefeller, des instigateurs du Congrès pour la liberté de la culture. Contrôlé par la CIA, ce dernier, promouvant l'art contemporain ainsi que la culture « sexe - drogue - rock'n roll », aura, à l'époque de la guerre froide et du MacCarthysme, et sous prétexte de « liberté culturelle », pour but d'exercer sur les peuples un véritable contrôle social.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler ne sera pas cependant la victime expiatoire des crimes nazis. Atteint d'une surdité partielle, il se laissera mourir d'une pneumonie à l'hôpital de Baden-Baden, le 30 novembre 1954, dans une profonde sérénité. Sur sa pierre tombale, toujours visible au cimetière de Heidelberg, il a fait graver une citation de la Ire épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens (Chapitre 13) : « Nun aber bleibt Glaube Hoffnung Liebe diese drei aber die Liebe ist die grösste unter ihnen » : Et maintenant, demeurent la foi, l'espoir et l'amour. Mais parmi les 3, c'est l'amour qui est le plus grand.

Quand Fürtwängler parle de la musique comme étant située entre les notes, quand il exige que la conception de l'ensemble de l'œuvre guide chacun de ses développements, et qu'il demande aux interprètes de remonter du cahier noirci par les notes, à la totalité de l'œuvre telle qu'elle a été conçue par l'intelligence de son auteur, il se situe dans la droite ligne de 2 grands penseurs de la musique, Platon et Saint Augustin qui dans « la République » et « de Musica » respectivement, disent que les sons ne constituent que l'empreinte sonore, tant de l'ordre harmonique de l'univers que de la pensée des compositeurs.

AB 127 : Faire jaillir l'étincelle créatrice de l'homme

1er entretien de Wilhelm Fürtwängler avec Walter Abendroth extrait de « Musique et verbe »

Walter Abendroth : Je vous ai aperçu hier, au concert de l'Orchestre philharmonique, à une place qui ne vous est pas habituelle : dans la salle. Vous étiez venu écouter votre confrère.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : En effet, je m'intéresse à présent à des questions que pendant longtemps, faute de loisirs, il m'a fallu écarter. J'ai grand plaisir à aller au concert, à écouter de la musique. Et j'en tire avantage : cela me permet d'observer objectivement, et comme du dehors, ma propre activité d'interprète, et de me rendre compte de pas mal de choses auxquelles je ne pense guère lorsque j'y suis mêlé comme acteur. Et ne serait-ce que pour apprendre ce qu'il ne faut pas faire.

Walter Abendroth : Comme hier soir, par exemple, car je ne pense pas que vous ayez approuvé l'enthousiasme du public.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Évidemment non. Et pourtant j'ai compris ce succès : le concert d'hier soir faisait indubitablement « de l'effet » ; un effet, il est vrai, sans rapport avec le caractère et la valeur de ce qui fut joué. Effet tout extérieur, d'un genre que j'appelle « illicite » . C'est que le public ne se rend pas compte si un effet est au fond (au niveau de l'art) valable ou non. Tous les publics (même, et surtout, notre public berlinois qui est typiquement un « public de grande ville ») commencent par être des foules passablement amorphes qui réagissent sans discrimination, et comme automatiquement, à tout ce qui les frappe. Leur réaction lre peut être la bonne ; mais elle peut aussi être absolument mal fondée. Ajoutez à cela que telles lres impressions dépendent de circonstances particulières et fortuites ; à tel point que, souvent, ceux-là mêmes qui les ont les plus vivement ressenties ne sont pas longs à ne plus comprendre qu'ils aient pu ainsi réagir. Comment se fait-il, par exemple, que non seulement des musiques de concert, mais même des Opéras comme « Carmen » , « Aïda » ou « la Bohème » , soient « tombés » à leur réaction pour rencontrer, par la suite, le succès le plus complet et le plus durable ?

Walter Abendroth : C'est une question à laquelle on n'a jamais, que je sache, répondu de façon tout à fait satisfaisante.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Je crois bien que non. Mais c'est parce que tout ce qui se passe en public se passe dans un domaine où règnent des forces instinctives, inconscientes et imprévisibles. Dans la vie musicale, ce que l'on nomme « le public » est une entité qui est loin de voir clair en soi-même ; loin de connaître son propre goût. Pour savoir ce qu'il aime et ce qu'il désapprouve, il faut au public (de même qu'à l'auditeur isolé) avant tout une chose : il lui faut un certain temps. Le temps est indispensable pour faire vraiment connaissance avec une œuvre, surtout lorsqu'il s'agit de musiques sans texte ni « programme » . Or, il est difficile de prédire combien de temps il faudra pour connaître, pour comprendre telle musique ou tel musicien. Parfois il y faut des dizaines d'années, voire plusieurs générations : pensez à Jean-Sébastien Bach, aux dernières œuvres de Beethoven, à des cas comme celui de Bruckner.

Cependant (il ne faut pas l'oublier) dans un grand nombre de ces cas, ce sont les mauvaises exécutions qui retardent ou empêchent la compréhension ; car, outre la qualité de la musique et la réceptivité de l'auditoire, il faut toujours compter avec un 3^e facteur (très souvent inconnu) : la qualité de l'exécution. C'est que la musique dépend de ses intermédiaires. Elle ne peut pas, comme les arts plastiques, s'extérioriser elle-même ; il est évident que c'est de l'exécutant (chanteur, chef d'orchestre) que dépend (en 1^{er} lieu et pour une bonne part) le sort d'une musique inconnue de l'auditeur. Si, dans ces cas-là, il arrive rarement qu'un interprète rende un morceau meilleur qu'il n'est, il est au contraire fréquent que de la bonne musique soit mal interprétée. Mais, à l'auditeur qui ne connaît pas, ou pas assez, l'œuvre qui le laisse froid, il est absolument impossible de discerner si c'est à l'ouvrage ou à l'interprète que ce manque d'effet doit être imputé.

Walter Abendroth : La direction de l'Orchestre philharmonique a publié récemment une liste des ouvrages favoris du public de Berlin, un catalogue des morceaux qui « font recette ». On en peut tirer d'intéressantes conclusions sur la psychologie du public.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Je sais ce que vous voulez dire ; c'est la vieille histoire du public « paresseux » qui veut toujours ré-entendre les mêmes « succès » et ne veut (ou même ne peut) affronter les œuvres nouvelles. Mais à mon tour, je demanderai d'où vient que les belles œuvres finissent, à la longue, par percer ; par s'imposer sans réplique, avec une logique tranquille et mystérieusement infaillible. Sur quoi repose le jugement rendu par la « postérité » que nous avons pris l'habitude de considérer comme la dernière instance ?

Walter Abendroth : D'ailleurs, quant aux célèbres « favoris » du public (d'après la statistique de l'Orchestre philharmonique), ce seraient notamment les Symphonies « impaires » de Beethoven, l'« Inachevée » de Schubert, certaines œuvres de Tchaïkovski ; cette préférence pourrait avoir, en partie, des raisons pratiques.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Ces œuvres se distinguent en effet par une grande clarté, par un dessin dont on suit aisément les lignes, par le relief des idées musicales ; ainsi elles résistent même à une exécution faible ou confuse. Elles sont moins dépendantes de la valeur de l'exécution. À être maniées par des interprètes incapables, elles souffrent moins que d'autres œuvres, moins populaires, mais non de moindre valeur. Mais au lieu de nous demander la raison de la popularité actuelle de telle œuvre, il serait bien plus intéressant, me semble-t-il, de savoir comment certaines partitions s'y prennent pour conserver leur place si longtemps et avec tant de continuité ; et pourquoi leur efficacité, pourtant si évidente qu'elle risque de manquer de mystère, s'use si peu avec le temps. Il y a un grand nombre d'œuvres qui ont « fait de l'effet » (peut-être, sur le moment, plus d'effet que celles que j'ai citées), mais qui, par la suite, se sont étioilées, et dont quelques-unes ont même complètement disparu. Et il semble que parmi ces œuvres-là, figurent justement celles qui ont visé à l'effet avec le moins de vergogne.

Telles œuvres du grand virtuose Liszt, une partie de celles de Berlioz, Wagner, Strauß, Tchaïkovski, et autres. C'est que « l'effet immédiat » est une chose et « l'effet à la longue », une autre. On pourrait même dire qu'un effet trop grand, trop voulu, trop pressé de réussir, contrarie l'action profonde et durable ; il l'a souvent même tout à fait empêchée.

Walter Abendroth : N'avez-vous pas remarqué que, dans la vie courante, vous pouvez être « impressionné » par

quelque chose et que pourtant, à l'instant même, vous vous rendiez compte que cette impression était peu valable ? La réaction du public, étant inconsciente, sera toujours adéquate, d'une manière ou d'une autre, à l'effet qui la suscite. Aussi y a-t-il des œuvres qui déclenchent des applaudissements en quelque sorte vides et insignifiants, pour bruyants et tumultueux qu'ils soient.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Et c'est là exactement le genre de succès qu'elles méritent. Il en est d'autres qui font réagir le public d'une façon moins éclatante, et dont non seulement la valeur est incomparablement plus grande, mais encore l'effet incomparablement plus profond. C'est une erreur certaine que de conclure de l'action sur le public, c'est-à-dire du succès extérieur, à la qualité véritable de l'effet produit. Il est évidemment encore plus trompeur d'en conclure à la valeur d'une œuvre d'art. Le public lui-même (cet être bizarre) ignore comment et pourquoi il réagit ; il réagit inconsciemment, automatiquement, à peu près comme un baromètre. Il importe de savoir bien lire ce baromètre.

Le public lui-même en est incapable. À tel point que l'individu, fût-il des plus intelligents (j'en ai fait 100 fois l'expérience) , est incapable de voir clair dans son propre jugement. Si on le questionne, sa réponse, c'est-à-dire son jugement conscient, reflète toute sorte de préjugés, toute sorte d'associations d'idées qui encombrant sa conscience, plutôt que l'impression réelle qu'il a reçue. C'est seulement avec celle-ci (et non pas avec les idées et préjugés qui font partie de son individualité limitée) qu'il contribue à former l'authentique « opinion publique » ; laquelle se forme inconsciemment, et selon certaines lois. Aussi Dingelstedt, vieux routier du théâtre, disait-il, à peu près, et non sans raison : « Mille spectateurs, parmi lesquels chacun juge de travers, font, tous ensemble, un public fichtrement intelligent. »

Walter Abendroth : Ne serait-ce pas le devoir de la critique que d'expliquer l'idée que se fait le public, et de soi-même, et de ses propres jugements ?

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Elle ne le peut pas ; quand bien même elle le voudrait et s'imaginerait le pouvoir. Car elle-même fait partie du public.

Si la réaction immédiate du public est souvent injuste, son jugement définitif est pourtant fondé. J'ai donné déjà la raison de ce paradoxe : c'est qu'il faut du temps pour entendre un artiste et répondre à son œuvre. Et il en faut d'autant plus que l'artiste sera plus original et l'œuvre profonde. Il est tout naturel que, de prime abord, le public oppose de la résistance à ce qu'il ignore. Et pourtant, il est absolument certain qu'à la longue, il sera vaincu par la nouveauté ; si toutefois elle est vraiment de qualité.

Tâchons donc de nous rendre compte de ce qui se passe entre l'artiste et le public. D'abord, l'un et l'autre ne deviennent vraiment « eux-mêmes » que dans leur rencontre, et par cette rencontre. Tant que l'artiste n'a pas dompté son public, tant qu'il n'a su en réveiller et aiguiller les inconscientes aspirations vers l'œuvre d'art, ce public (et au lieu de dire : « le public » , on dirait aussi bien « le peuple ») ne prend ni conscience de soi-même, ni de sa qualité de public, mais reste ce qu'il était tout d'abord : une foule quelconque indéfinie.

Walter Abendroth : Qu'en serait-il, par exemple, de toute notre « Vie musicale » si (supposition paradoxale) Beethoven

n'avait pas écrit ses symphonies ? Prédécesseurs et successeurs de Beethoven, et surtout Beethoven lui-même, ont, en fait, créé, par l'action de leurs œuvres, ce que nous avons depuis appelé « le public de concert ». Ce public-là est sans doute autre chose qu'une foule amorphe et passive. Depuis que des maîtres l'ont formé, il porte en lui une échelle de valeurs. Il a des exigences ; l'artiste devra y pouvoir. Et l'artiste, à son tour, a des exigences envers le public, exigences auxquelles le public ne demande qu'à répondre : car c'est d'elles qu'il tire sa véritable dignité. C'est qu'il y a public et public : il y a une grande différence selon qu'une foule « devient un public » à l'occasion d'une course de chevaux ou d'un combat de boxe, ou à l'occasion d'une Symphonie de Beethoven. La qualité (qui seule importe) de son « unanimité de public » ne sera pas, dans le cas sportif, la même que dans le cas musical.

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Mais encore : même lorsqu'il s'agit du seul domaine des événements artistiques, nous constatons des différences de cette sorte. Wagner appelle « Effekte » (effets extérieurs) les effets qui ne visent qu'à « frapper » la foule et qui peut-être l'emballeront momentanément, mais n'en feront pas une véritable communauté. L'« Effekt », disait-il, est par définition « effet sans cause », et c'était précisément à l'époque de Wagner, à l'époque de l'avènement des grands virtuoses, que les musiciens se mirent à rechercher ces « effets sans cause » et à s'en servir. Mais ainsi, pour la Ire fois, les rapports du public avec l'artiste devinrent le problème qu'ils sont aujourd'hui : c'est alors que commença, de l'un à l'autre, cette progressive aliénation qui, à présent, met en question toute notre « vie musicale ». Vouloir faire de l'effet à tout prix : ce fut là, dès l'époque de Wagner et de Liszt, le signe que l'on allait vers la désaffection. Et, par la surenchère de l'effet, on cherchait éperdument à garder un contact qui menaçait rupture, et à maintenir entre les musiciens sur l'estrade et les auditeurs la « vraie communauté » .

Mais voilà : transformer un public en « vraie communauté », ne fût-ce que momentanément, il faut pour cela des œuvres qui sachent empoigner l'individu, non pas en tant qu'individu isolé, mais comme faisant partie d'un peuple, comme faisant partie de l'humanité, comme créature habitée par une étincelle divine. C'est seulement grâce à de telles œuvres qu'un public prend pleine conscience des forces latentes qu'il porte en lui ; et ce n'est que de ces œuvres-là qu'au plus profond d'eux-mêmes les hommes ont vraiment besoin, en dépit de leurs réactions superficielles, de leurs arbitraires entraînements et de leurs prédilections momentanées. Ce qui n'empêche pas que, dans la vie musicale de tous les jours, toutes les fois qu'il les rencontre, le public oppose la plus vive résistance à de telles œuvres, et ne s'abandonne que de mauvaise grâce. En quoi le public ressemble à une femme qui ne trouve son bonheur qu'à céder à la contrainte.

Walter Abendroth : Voulez-vous dire par là que l'effet produit sur le public serait plutôt un argument contre une œuvre ?

Wilhelm Fürtwängler : Ce serait raisonner de façon hâtive et simpliste. Qui nierait, par exemple, la valeur des œuvres d'un Beethoven à cause de leur effet sur le public ? Au contraire, c'est précisément « le fait Beethoven » qui nous permet le mieux de comprendre ce qu'est l'effet authentique et « légitime ». C'est que les œuvres de Beethoven produisent leur effet absolument et exclusivement par ce qu'elles sont : par leur essence, non par leur façade. Et encore : si Beethoven a cette efficacité, c'est grâce à la clarté avec laquelle il exprime ce qu'il a à dire. Le maximum de clarté dans l'expression est, pour l'artiste, la manière (la seule bonne manière) de tenir compte de son public. Gœthe l'a bien dit : « Si quelqu'un a quelque chose à dire, qu'il me le dise clair et net. Pour ce qui est des choses

problématiques, celles que je porte en moi me suffisent. » .

Mais pour répondre à cette exigence, il faut que tout d'abord on ait vraiment quelque chose à dire ; et que l'on puisse oser se montrer sans apprêt ni voile, tel que l'on est ; et cela n'est évidemment pas donné à tout le monde. Et tous ceux qui dans la vie, et même (et surtout) dans leur art, s'expriment de façon tarabiscotée, j'ai peur qu'ils n'aient, le plus souvent, de bonnes raisons pour éviter la manière simple et directe.

Il y a des œuvres qui font de l'effet parce qu'elles visent à en faire et s'y efforcent. Il en est d'autres qui, pour faire de l'effet, n'ont qu'à exister. Et c'est pourquoi l'action des unes à la longue s'exténue, alors que le temps ne semble point entamer l'efficacité des autres.

AB 128 : L'œuvre musicale de Fürtwängler

Créations

Fürtwängler s'inspira toute sa vie de Bruckner pour ses compositions. Fürtwängler joua un rôle capital dans la mise en valeur de sa musique qui était très peu connue au début du XXe siècle.

La liste qui suit n'est pas exhaustive.

Bartók - Concerto pour piano n° 1, le compositeur comme soliste, Francfort-sur-le-Main, le 1er juillet 1927.

Schœnberg - Variations pour Orchestre, Opus 31, Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin, Berlin, 2 décembre 1928.

Prokofiev - Concerto pour piano n° 5, le compositeur comme soliste, Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin, 31 octobre 1932.

Hindemith - Suite tirée de Mathis le peintre, Orchestre Philharmonique de Berlin, Berlin, 11 mars 1934.

Richard Strauß - « Vier letzte Lieder » , avec Kirsten Flagstad, Orchestre Philharmonia, Londres, 22 mai 1950.

Compositions

Œuvres orchestrales

Ouverture en mi bémol majeur, Opus 3 (1899) .

Symphonie en ré majeur (1903) .

Symphonie n° 1 en si mineur (1938-1941) .

Symphonie n° 2 en mi mineur (1944-1945) .

Symphonie n° 3 en ut dièse mineur (1947-1954) .

Concerto Symphonique pour piano et orchestre (1924-1936) .

Musique de chambre

Sonate pour violon et piano en fa majeur (1896) .

Petite Sonate pour violoncelle et piano en mi majeur (1886) .

Trio avec piano en fa majeur (1896) .

Quatuor à cordes n° 1 « Quartetto quasi una fantasia » (1896) .

Trio à cordes (2 violons et 1 violoncelle) (1896-1897) .

Variations pour quatuor à cordes (1897) .

Sonate pour violon et piano en la mineur (1898-1899) .

Quintette avec piano en ut majeur (1899) .

Quatuor avec piano en ut mineur (1899) .

Trio avec piano en mi majeur (1900) .

Quatuor à cordes n° 2 en fa dièse mineur (1901) .

Trio avec piano en sol majeur (1902) .

Quintette avec piano en ut majeur (1924-1935) .

Sonate pour violon et piano n° 1 en ré mineur (1935) .

Sonate pour violon et piano n° 2 en ré majeur (1938) .

Musique vocale

« Te Deum » pour chœur et orchestre.

AB 129 : Wilhelm Furtwängler (textes anglais)

The Conqueror (1906-1934)

« Musik ist nicht ein Ablaufen von Tonfolgen sondern ein Ringen von Kräften. » (Wilhelm Furtwängler)

(Music is not a succession of sounds but a struggle between forces.)

« Furtwängler was so full of contradictions. He was both ambitious and jealous, noble and vain, coward and hero, strong and weak, a child yet also a man of wisdom, both very German, and yet, a man of the world. But when it came to music, all these contradictions disappeared : his attention was undivided and focused only on the music. »

(Gregor Piatigorsky, Cellist ; Doubleday and Co. , inc. 1965.)

Gustav Heinrich Ernst Martin Wilhelm Furtwängler was born on 23 January 1886, at Number 25 « Maassenstraße » in Berlin to Adolf Furtwängler (1851-1907) , a well-known archaeologist, and his wife Adelheid, « née » Wendt. Their son was baptized into the Lutheran faith. The couple subsequently had 3 more children : Walter, Märit and Annele. The Furtwängler family originally came from the heart of the Black Forest; the Wendts from North Germany (Adelheid was a great friend of one of Johannes Brahms's daughters) . Both families were musical and Furtwängler's mother was also a talented artist who painted a number of portraits of her children.

The father hated big cities and always wanted to get-back to nature. So, in 1894, the family moved to Schwabing (on the outskirts of Munich) and later bought a house called Tanneck (« at the edge of the pine trees ») , on a peninsula on the Tegernsee, near Bad Wiessee. There, the children learnt to swim and play every conceivable game and sport. In his childhood, Furtwängler was a lonely and introverted child and already his life revolved around music, art, literature and philosophy. Throughout his whole life, he remained an avid sportsman, fond of riding, swimming, playing tennis, ice-skating and mountain climbing.

At the age of 6, Furtwängler went to school in Munich, but he wasn't a very good pupil, not because he wasn't clever but because he thought he was wasting his time and that he had better things to do. At the age of 7, he asked his mother to teach him to play the piano and the basic principles of writing music. On 30 June 1893, still aged 7, he composed his first work, « ein Stückchen von den Tieren » . His father who was openly scornful of public schools and their methods of teaching, withdrew his son and started looking for a tutor : his choice fell on Ludwig Curtius and Walter Riezler, both remarkable in their own ways, but with very different minds. There and then, Furtwängler decided he would be a composer (all his life he remained a frustrated composer) . When he was 12, he heard Johann Sebastian Bach's « Saint-Matthew Passion » for the 1st time and was deeply moved. Soon afterwards, he discovered the music of Ludwig van Beethoven - a momentous event. Furtwängler and Beethoven was, for a long time, the archetypal

meeting of minds between a composer and his interpreter, and interpreting Beethoven became Furtwängler's goal in life. His approach to Beethoven's mind went well beyond the æsthetic boundaries of the early 20th Century.

In September 1901, Furtwängler father took his son to Egina, in Greece. Wilhelm brought along a poem by Goethe and Beethoven's String Quartets. Furtwängler never attended a music school ; it was his mother who gave him his 1st piano lessons, followed by Auntie Minna, an excellent piano teacher. His 1st real music teacher was the organist and composer Anton Beer-Walbrunn (1864-1929) (whose « Sinfonia » Furtwängler conducted on 24 February 1912, in Lübeck) . Beer-Walbrunn quickly recognized the extraordinary gifts of his pupil and recommended him to his own teacher, Joseph Rheinberger (1839-1901) , at the time director of the Academy of Music of Munich. But Rheinberger was a reactionary : music ended at Beethoven ; so, Furtwängler looked for another tutor who would be able to open-up the rest of the 19th Century, especially Richard Wagner and the German Romantics : Anton Bruckner and Johannes Brahms. That man was Max von Schillings (1868-1933) , the composer and conductor with whom Furtwängler studied from 1902 to 1903.

The year 1905 marked a turning-point in Furtwängler's life. He was only 19 years old when he decided he wanted to be a conductor. But, at least, he realized he still had much to learn ; for example, Opera and Symphonic music ; he was totally ignorant of both of them. Thanks to a cousin of his mother's, the conductor Georg Dohrn, who was the driving force of musical life in Breslau, he became repetitor at the Municipal Theatre during the season 1905-1906. This work was not really very exciting : it meant rehearsing with the choir and the singers and his impressive capacity of sight-reading even the most difficult piano accompaniments to Opera scores went largely un-noticed. In Breslau, his 1st orchestral work, a Symphony, was performed. The concert was a disaster ; both the public and the critics rejected this work. Father and son were deeply affected by this « débacle » . So, Furtwängler decided the best way to profit from disaster was to actually conduct a concert.

Although he was a famous archæologist, Adolph wasn't a rich man : however, he had a friend, Franz Kaim, who had founded his own Orchestra which was named after him. So, on 19 February 1906, in Munich, Furtwängler conducted his 1st concert which included Beethoven's « Consecration of the House » , his own Symphonic poem in B minor, and after the interval, Anton Bruckner's 9th Symphony.

The « Bayerische Kurier » of January 23 wrote :

« After attending the concert of this very young conductor, Wilhelm Furtwängler, one might assume the program was chosen with the public in mind. He chose as his 1st victim Bruckner's 9th Symphony. Is Furtwängler talented ? Probably, but that's still no reason to present a Masterpiece, especially if one doesn't yet know how to conduct ! The Bruckner left a greyish and cold impression. The Scherzo was particularly dreary and sounded like a voyage through dangerous reefs after days of endless rain. His own Symphonic poem seemed to be promising but, all too quickly, it turned into something empty and without shape or character, in which the shorter themes seemed to be living through harmonic torture. The audience quite surprisingly greeted him with repeated applause. »

Furtwängler wrote to his tutor Curtius :

« Conducting is the lifeline that has saved me. I was about to die as a composer. Until now, I considered myself a composer who also conducts : never a conductor who also composes. »

Furtwängler suffered from a defect shared by many post-Romantics : a lack of discipline that led to elephantine compositions ; but the need to compose was genuine and sincere. Although most of his youthful compositions are just average, for some people, the « Te Deum » is a misunderstood Masterpiece. Of course, today Furtwängler isn't really remembered for his compositions, but he was a sincere composer, who had some talent even if he wasn't really gifted.

After this 1st concert, Furtwängler got a job at the Zürich Theatre for the 1906-1907 season. The director allowed him to conduct some Operettas, for example the « Merry Widow » which was being played that season. He conducted it 9 times between February 3 and April 21 1907. He made his conducting debut on October 10th, conducting the ballet « Tanzbilder » and, on October 31st, Hans Pfitzner's « Fest auf Sollhaug » , and, then, 10 performances of « Rübezahl » set to music by Bertrand Sängler. The next stop was Munich where he became, once again, repetitor at the Opera, under Felix Mottl, for 2 seasons (1907-1909) . Then, he was appointed 3rd conductor at the Opera in Strasburg. On 8 September 1910, he left Munich and remained in Strasburg until April 1911. The musical activity of Strasburg, at the time German, was entirely dominated by the composer and conductor Hans Pfitzner and his 2 assistants Richard Fried and Hermann Büchel. Furtwängler gave 16 concerts, conducting 6 works that he never again conducted : Friedrich von Flotow's « Martha » ; Gaetano Donizetti's « Elisir d'amore » ; Villars de Maillart's « Dragons de Villars » ; André Messager's « P'tites Michus » ; Franz von Suppé's « Flotte Bursche » , and one performance of Giuseppe Verdi's « Rigoletto » (11 March 1911) . The critics' were far from unanimous : one described him as « having the lightness of an elephant » in « P'tites Michus » , another complained that his interpretation of « Martha » was quite unsatisfactory. He also had to dress-up like a gipsy, with a black beard stuck onto his face and play the piano in the « Fledermaus » , in a « soirée » at prince Orlowsky's, which amused him very much (27-28 February 1911) .

During his stay in Strasburg, he met Bruno Walter who, on 22 February 1911, had premiered one of his own Symphonies. Furtwängler returned to Strasburg on 6 December of that same year to conduct his own « Te Deum » , that had been premiered in Breslau in November 1910 by G. Dohrn and that he had started composing during his stay in Florence. The « Allgemeine Musik Zeitung » was very negative about it and wrote that :

« Furtwängler's composition is full of good intentions, and nothing more ! The Schlesische Zeitung wrote :

“ Maybe there were some personal reasons for the premiere of Furtwängler's “ Te Deum ” ; because there were surely no music ones. »

A friend of Furtwängler's mother, Ida Boy-Ed, told the young musician that the post of conductor had become vacant in Lübeck because Hermann Abendroth had left for Essen. However, the news reached Furtwängler too late : the Society of the Friends of Music had already chosen four candidates (Paul Scheinpflug, Karl Mennicke, Walter Unger and Rudolf Siegel) out of 97 competitors and each of these 4 had already conducted a test concert. Everything seemed to indicate that Rudolf Siegel would be the winner. But Paul Scheinpflug withdrew from the competition, so the Society

decided to select a 4th candidate and Mrs. Boy-Ed asked Furtwängler to submit his candidacy, which was accepted by the musical authorities and by Abendroth. Thus, he conducted on 5 April 1911 his test concert (in front of over 4,000 people !). It didn't take either audience or the members of the Society long to be entirely won over by the passion that emanated from the young candidate, despite the great difference that existed between him and Abendroth whose virility, assurance and economy of gestures were highly-appreciated. Furtwängler, with his nervous and sometimes excited gestures, was quite the opposite and on the podium he seemed to be battling against an invisible enemy - yet, the public recognized very quickly his extraordinary capacities. On 13 April, he was unanimously chosen to succeed Abendroth.

The conductor of the Society of the Friends of Music (« Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde ») conducted only concerts, each season 8 Symphonic concerts plus 2 concerts with the Philharmonic Choir (mainly devoted to oratorios). Then, there were also the popular concerts, about 30 each season (the 1905-1906 season exceptionally had 56 concerts). Rehearsals took place on Wednesday evenings and the members of the Society came with their families and friends. Furtwängler was not very happy about these concerts which took place in the hall of the « Kolosseum » and followed the same pattern : in the 1st part Symphonic music, during which smoking was not allowed but people could drink beer ; a 2nd part devoted to light-orchestra Classics ; and a 3rd part devoted to popular music (such as military marches). During his stay in Lübeck, he conducted 32 Symphonic concerts, 104 Popular concerts and 9 Choral performances : this was Furtwängler's apprenticeship. He also conducted 3 Operas as guest-conductor : « Fidelio » (23 March 1915) ; the « Merry Wives of Windsor » (16 April 1915) ; and the « Meistersinger von Nürnberg » (20 November 1913). The town's critics soon appreciated Furtwängler's personality.

The « Eisenbahnzeitung », for example, wrote :

« Furtwängler is a genius musical talent, who in favourable circumstances, could become a genius. »

Ida Boy-Ed continued to praise her « protégé » to all concerned.

Furtwängler often went down to Hamburg with his friend Lilly Dieckmann to attend the concerts conducted by Arthur Nikisch who, in his eyes, was the « King » of conductors (they didn't officially meet until February 1912). During his stay in Lübeck, he gave his 1st concert outside Germany (in Vienna), on 26 January 1913. Along with the Lübeck Orchestra's 1st violinist Szanto, he gave a series of chamber music evenings, including a cycle of Beethoven Piano Sonatas. In his final season, he played the piano part in Beethoven's Triple Concerto (3 February 1915) and in Bach's 5th Brandenburg Concerto (2 January 1915). His successor in Lübeck was Georg Göhler.

As far as the development of his repertoire is concerned, in Lübeck, Furtwängler conducted all the Beethoven Symphonies (except the 2nd) ; the 4th, 5th and 6th of Tchaikovsky ; Symphonies Nos. 39 and 40 of Mozart ; Symphonies Nos. 1, 3 and 4 of Brahms ; Nos. 8 and 9 of Schubert ; the Brahms Violin Concerto ; Symphonies Nos. 4, 7 and 8 of Bruckner ; Mahler's « Kindertotenlieder » ; Reger's « Romantic Suite » ; Dukas' « Sorcerer's Apprentice » ; Richard Strauß' « Sinfonia Domestica » ; Liszt's « Faust Symphony » ; the 2nd Piano Concerto of Brahms ; Schumann's 1st. The popular concerts included works by Offenbach (Hoffmann's « Erzählungen ») ; Gilbert and Sullivan (« Mikado

») ; Bizet (« *Arlésienne* » , « *Carmen* ») ; Delibes (« *Sylvia* » , « *Coppelia* ») ; Gounod (« *Faust* » Ballet) ; Sibelius (« *Valse triste* ») ; Grieg (« *Peer Gynt* ») ; and waltzes by Johann Strauß and Waldteufel ; and endless medleys.

At the beginning of 1915, the « *Kapellmeister* » in Mannheim, Arthur Bodanzky, decided to go America. The choice of a successor turned-out to be a very difficult one and many famous conductors submitted their candidacies. The Mannheim public would have loved to have Nikisch. Contrary to Lübeck, Mannheim's main musical activity centered round the Opera, and the chief-conductor was in charge of all the Opera performances and of only 8 subscription concerts at the Academy of Music. A committee of 5 members went to Lübeck, on 23 March 1915, to attend a performance of « *Fidelio* » conducted by Furtwängler. They were so impressed that they decided to invite him to take on the post of « *Kapellmeister* » . So, Mannheim gained a young and almost unknown conductor. The town welcomed Furtwängler enthusiastically and his future secretary Bertha Geißmar wrote in her memoirs :

« The citizens of Mannheim were used to considering their “ *Kapellmeister* ” as a demi-God whose actions and deeds were the talk of the day. Furtwängler, who was quite timid, found this kind of public attention rather gruesome and sought shelter with Oskar Grohé, who took the young conductor under his wing. »

Furtwängler's assistant was Felix Lederer who conducted the 1st performances of all the Italian Operas and of « *Der Rosenkavalier* » (unlike Böhm, Clemens Krauß and Knappertsbusch, Furtwängler didn't like this Opera and never conducted it) . He conducted Operas that have since fallen-out of the repertoire, such as « *Violanta* » (Korngold) ; « *Monna Lisa* » (Schillings) ; « *Shéhérazade* » (Sekles) ; « *Klein Idas Blumen* » (von Klenau) . « *Fidelio* » was the 1st Opera he conducted in Mannheim, on 7 September 1915, in a greatly appreciated performance, particularly the Overture « *Leonore III* » . He conducted 232 performances of 39 Operas. In the Symphonic repertoire, he conducted for the 1st time the « *Symphonie fantastique* » (1 February 1916) ; the 1st Brahms Piano Concerto with Artur Schnabel ; Richard Strauß' « *Alpine Symphony* » ; Mahler's « *Das Lied von der Erde* » (21 November 1916) ; Schumann's 4th ; Mahler's 4th (28 January 1919) ; Schönbergs « *Verklärte Nacht* » (18 February 1919) ; Bruckner's 5th (9 December 1919) ; and Schönberg's « *Pelleas und Melisande* » (2 March 1921) .

During his Mannheim period, he also began his lifelong career as a guest-conductor. In September 1917, he was invited to the « *Kurhaus* » in Baden-Baden to conduct the « *Ring* » , then, on 14 December, for the 1st time, the Berlin Philharmonic : the critics were thrilled and stunned : for the 1st time, one heard the phrase « the Furtwängler Miracle » (« *Das Wunder Furtwängler* ») . On 15 November 1918, he conducted for the 1st time the concerts of the « *Frankfurter Museumsgesellschaft* » and, on 30 November, he was in Vienna with the « *Wiener Tonkünstler Orchester* » after Ferdinand Löwe's retirement. Still in Vienna, on 29 November 1919, he conducted Mahler's 3rd ; on 2 April 1920, he conducted for the 1st time the « *Berlin Staatskapelle* » succeeding Richard Strauß. On 30 June 1920, he gave his last concert as « *Kapellmeister* » of Mannheim and said farewell with a performance of the « *Entführung aus dem Serail* » .

From the 1920-1921 season onwards, he was invited more and more abroad, but kept on conducting in Frankfurt, where he had succeeded Willem Mengelberg, and at the « *Berlin Staatskapelle* » . So, in October 1920, he went to Stockholm, where he conducted Franz Berwald's « *Symphony serioso* » . On 19 November, he conducted Mahler's 2nd

Symphony at the « Staatsoper » and, then, in December, he gave 7 concerts in Stockholm and, at the end of the season, he was in Wiesbaden for the Brahms Festival. The season 1921-1922 began with his 1st concert with the « Leipzig Gewandhaus ». He split his time between Vienna, Frankfurt and Berlin. On 30 November 1920, he conducted his 1st « Missa solemnis » in Vienna. Nikisch died on 23 January 1922. Furtwängler's prediction that he'd made in Hamburg became true (« I'll be the successor of Nikisch ») : he inherited both the Berlin Philharmonic and the « Leipzig Gewandhaus » .

The 6 seasons he spent with the « Gewandhaus » are not the happiest ones of his career. 1st, the Orchestra would have liked to have Hermann Abendroth as « Gewandhauskapellmeister » and Furtwängler was appointed only after the intervention of Max Brockhaus. Then, his programs included too much contemporary music, to the dislike of the rather conservative public of Leipzig which would also have preferred to have its « Kapellmeister » live permanently in Leipzig.

On 25 March 1922, he conducted the Vienna Philharmonic for the 1st time, in a concert celebrating the 25th anniversary of Brahms' death. In April, he was invited by the « Accademia Santa Cecilia » of Rome and, in May, he participated in the Brahms Festival in Hamburg. On 22 April, he married Zitla Lund, a young and elegant Danish woman 3 years older than him : they had no children and their marriage was a mistake. In April 1923, he left with the « Gewandhaus » on tour for Switzerland and ended the season giving 2 concerts at la Scala in Milan. In Winter 1923, he bought a « chalet » in Saint-Moritz (which still belongs to the family today) . In January 1924, he went to England, and, in April-May 1924, he left for the 1st time on tour with the Berlin Philharmonic. After he left Mannheim, he continued conducting regularly Operas in Mannheim. In July 1924, he participated in the Munich Festival, conducted « Le nozze di Figaro », « Tristan », « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg », and the « Entführung aus dem Serail » . In January 1925, he crossed the Atlantic for his 1st American tour (10 concerts with the New York Philharmonic) . His activity was now divided between Leipzig, Berlin and Vienna. In February 1926, he made his 2nd American tour (32 concerts) and, back in Europe, he started a European tour giving 20 concerts with the Berlin Philharmonic and ended the season with the Brahms Festival in Heidelberg. In October, aged 40, he made his 1st recordings for the « Polydor » label (« Der Freischütz » Overture and Beethoven's 5th) .

In February 1927, he began his 3rd and final American tour (33 concerts) that ended with the Brahms « Requiem » on 4 April. Furtwängler left America somewhat exasperated by American musical culture. His fellow musicians were jealous of him, the press was negative (above all, Olin Downes, the music-critic of « The New York Times ») but he was adored by the public. On 19 November, he conducted the Vienna Philharmonic as its new musical director in succession to Felix von Weingartner (who had resigned from his post in 1930) . On 29 March 1928, he conducted his last concert as « Gewandhauskapellmeister » with the Beethoven 9th and the season ended with a European tour with the Berlin Philharmonic, at the Heidelberg and Görlitz Festivals.

The 1928-1929 season marked a new beginning for him as an Opera conductor : on 17 October, he conducted for the 1st time at the Vienna Opera (« Das Rheingold ») and after the Festivals of Heidelberg and Jena, he conducted for the 1st time an Opera in Berlin, not at the « Staatsoper unter den Linden » but at the « Schauspielhaus am Gendarmenmarkt » (« Le nozze di Figaro ») . In Autumn, he was nominated « Generalmusikdirektor » and, in May

1929, he was awarded the Order of Merit.

One tour succeeded another, and, in April 1930, he went on tour for the 1st time with the Vienna Philharmonic. On 2 June, he conducted his 7th and last performance of the « Missa solemnis » (Furtwängler played the piano score and thought that the work was Beethoven's greatest work of art. But he also felt he never managed to entirely express all that the music contained. He thought that the score should have been re-orchestrated and that is why he regretfully decided never to play it again) . In July-August 1931, he took part for the 1st time in the Bayreuth Festival (« Tristan und Isolde ») and conducted the « Siegfried Wagner » Memorial concert. In 1932, the Berlin Philharmonic celebrated its 50th anniversary : this event was marked by 4 superb concerts in April, followed by a grand European tour with 26 concerts. On this occasion, Hindenburg awarded him the Gœthe Medal for services rendered to German music.

On 7 and 9 June 1932, he conducted for the 1st time at the Opera in Paris (« Tristan » with a magnificent cast : Frida Leider, Lauritz Melchior, Igor Kipnis, etc.) . On 30 January 1933, Hitler came to power, and, with him, began anti-Jewish activity. On 11 April, Furtwängler published in the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » an open letter to the Minister of propaganda, Josef Gœbbels, in which he declared that there was only one distinction, that between « good » art and « bad » art. This letter reached the world-press and Gœbbels replied that politics was also an Art (« maybe the greatest of all arts ») , and that music could not be separated from politics. So, it was necessary to expel all foreign elements (meaning, of course, the Jews) .

Shortly afterwards, the great exodus of German Jews began : Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, Artur Schnabel, Bronisław Huberman, and many others. Furtwängler carried-on conducting at the « Staatsoper » (this fell under Hermann Göring's absolute control) Operas such as « Arabella » and « Elektra » . During a tour with the Berlin Philharmonic, he gave a mammoth concert in Mannheim, that brought together under one conductor the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra and the Mannheim Orchestra : 170 musicians in all ! Furtwängler had a confrontation with the Nazis : they asked Furtwängler to dismiss Szymon Goldberg, his Jewish 1st violin. Furtwängler refused and decided never again to come-back to Mannheim (he only returned 21 years later, in 1954) . He ended the season 1932-1933 at the « Opéra de Paris » (« Tristan » and « Die Walküre ») and, in June, was appointed by Göring conductor-in-chief of the « Berlin Staatsoper » . Göring, then, nominated him « Staatsrat » (Council of State) on 8 July 1933 and, on 15 September, Erich Kleiber conducted a gala-performance of « Lohengrin » in honour of Furtwängler. He was also given the honorary title of Vice-President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » . In August 1933, he met Hitler in his house at the Obersalzberg in Berchtesgaden and when he got-back home, told his entourage :

« This hissing chameleon will never get anywhere in Germany. »

However, things turned-out quite differently.

On 11 March 1934, Furtwängler conducted the premiere of Hindemith's « Mathis der Maler » and published his famous article « The Hindemith Case » in the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , November 25th, in answer to Nazi attacks on the composer, whom they accused of writing « degenerate » music. On 25 April, during a tour with the Philharmonic, he met in Rome Benito Mussolini, which infuriated Arturo Toscanini.

(« Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung » , 25 November 1934.)

The season 1934-1935 was very short : after 2 « Ring » performances at the « Staatsoper » , in October and November, and his article on Hindemith, Furtwängler resigned from all his official functions and, on 4 December, retired to the Bavarian Alps where he started writing his Symphonic Piano Concerto. His passport was confiscated. Erich Kleiber supported his action, resigning from his position at the « Städtische Oper » of Berlin and going into exile.

The Tragic (1934-1945)

The news of Furtwängler's resignation created a sensation, but it also meant he could no longer leave Germany. The situation got even more complicated because the Berlin Philharmonic was due to tour Great Britain in January 1935 and Furtwängler declared that it was out of question that he should conduct. Thomas Beecham was asked to take-over, but when he refused, the tour was simply cancelled. The situation became increasingly difficult for Furtwängler, who decided to dismiss his Jewish secretary Bertha Geißmar. Finally, Gœbbels and Furtwängler met on 28 February 1935 and hammered-out a compromise : Furtwängler was allowed to continue conducting in Germany, but with no title or official position, provided he stayed-away from all politics. The « Führer » approved and Furtwängler was allowed to travel abroad again. He rejoined his Orchestra on 25 April 1935 in Berlin in an all-Beethoven program : Hitler, Gœbbels and Göring attended the concert and, at the end, Hitler went and warmly shook hands with Furtwängler. Furtwängler ended the season with some performances at Covent Garden in London (« Tristan ») , at the « Opéra de Paris » (« Tristan » and « Walküre ») , at the National Theatre of Munich (« Tristan ») , at the Opera of Vienna (« Tristan ») and at the Hamburg Opera (« Meistersinger ») . Hitler, Gœbbels and Ribbentrop attended the performance in Hamburg, on 23 June 1935.

The 1935-1936 season began in Nuremberg with « Die Meistersinger » , and « Tannhäuser » followed at the Vienna Opera. On 7 November, he conducted « Egmont » at the « Berlin Schauspielhaus » , staged by the famous actor Gustav Gründgens (a controversial personality) . Hitler, Göring, Gœbbels and Rudolph Heß were, again, all present. After touring with the Philharmonic in November-December, he ended the year at the National Theater in Munich (« Meistersinger » on 25 December, and « Tristan » on 1 January) . On 27 February, he left for Egypt with his friend John Knittel. He arrived in Alexandria on March 5th, and got-back to Naples on 31 March. The season ended with a few Operatic performances in Paris (« Die Meistersinger ») , in Zürich (« Tristan ») , in Vienna (« Tannhäuser ») , and at the Bayreuth Festival where he conducted « Lohengrin » , « Parsifal » and the « Ring » .

In November 1936, Thoams Beecham toured Germany with his London Orchestra and invited Furtwängler to share the upcoming Covent Garden Festival planned for the coronation of King Georges VI. But Furtwängler had decided, with Hitler's permission, to cancel all his public engagements during the winter season 1936-1937, because he wanted to spend some time in absolute peace to compose. He returned to his Orchestra on 10 February 1937, in Berlin, for a concert again attended by Hitler, Göring and Gœbbels. In March, he embarked on another tour, but this time of chamber music with the violinist Hugo Kolberg. During it, he gave the premiere of his own Violin Sonata in D minor in Leipzig, on March 4th.

After a magnificent Beethoven 9th in London (25 March) , he conducted the « Ring » at the « Berlin Staatsoper » , made a short tour with the Philharmonic and left for London to start rehearsing the « Ring » that was to be given in 2 cycles. The sensation of the 2nd cycle was the 1st appearance of Kirsten Flagstad as Brunnhilde. The season ended at the Bayreuth Festival (« Parsifal » , « Ring ») and the Salzburg Festival (Beethoven's 9th) . The 1937-1938 season started in Paris on September 7th with Beethoven's 9th, followed by 2 performances of « Die Walküre » with the cast of the « Berlin Staatsoper » . During a tour with the Philharmonic, he conducted the premiere of his Symphonic Piano Concerto with soloist Edwin Fischer (to whom the work is dedicated) on October 26th, in Munich. At the same time, he made a few recordings for « His Master's Voice » that were praised internationally (Beethoven's 5th and, in 1938, Tchaikovsky's « Symphonie Pathétique » and some excerpts of Richard Wagner) . On 22 and 23 April 1938, Furtwängler conducted the Vienna Philharmonic in Berlin (Franz Schubert's « Unfinished Symphony » and Anton Bruckner's 7th Symphony) , concerts attended as always by Hitler and Gœbbels. He went-back again to Covent Garden, in May and June, for 2 more « Ring » cycles and ended the season in Munich (« Fidelio ») , at the « Opéra de Paris » (« Tristan ») , and at the Salzburg Festival (« Die Meistersinger ») .

On 5 September, he was in Nuremberg with the Vienna Philharmonic (« Die Meistersinger ») . On 20 February 1939, the French government awarded him the « Légion d'Honneur » but Hitler made sure news of this never reached the German public. In May, he conducted 2 performances of Bach's « Saint-Matthew Passion » in Munich and Florence, and ended the season at the Zürich Opera (« Meistersinger » , « Walküre ») and a concert at the « Wesendonck-Haus » with Flagstad replacing Germaine Lubin) . The performances of the « Die Walküre » , planned at the « Opéra de Paris » , in June, were eventually cancelled by the French government for political reasons. After the German invasion of Poland, Furtwängler's activity was restricted to Austria (annexed by the « Reich » on 13 March 1938) and Germany. In April 1940 however, he made a trip to Scandinavia but the concert planned in Copenhagen, on April 10th, was cancelled following Denmark's occupation by the Nazis. In May, in Berlin, he met Elisabeth Ackermann, who eventually became his 2nd wife. She was married at the time to a lawyer who was killed in France a few months later.

Although Furtwängler gave no concerts in France during the War and refused to conduct in countries occupied by the Nazis, he did conduct in some « annexed » cities (such as Prague) . In December 1940, he made a 2nd chamber music tour, this time with Georg Kulenkampff. At the beginning of March 1941, while skiing in the Vorarlberg (Sankt Anton, in Austria) , he fell badly and suffered injuries serious enough that he couldn't conduct for 9 months while in convalescence. In February 1942, he toured Scandinavia with the Berlin Philharmonic, and, at the end of March, was in Vienna for the celebration of the Vienna Philharmonic's Centenary : on that occasion, on March 28th, he conducted Schubert's 3rd Symphony for the only time in his life. Back in Berlin, on April 19th, he conducted a concert for Hitler's birthday, that was preceded by an endless speech of Josef Gœbbels about the « Führer's » « stupendous visionary plans » .

In November and December, he returned to Scandinavia and gave 2 performances of « Die Walküre » at the Stockholm Opera and a concert with the Orchestra of Göteborg. On 12 December, he conducted « Die Meistersinger » at the re-opening of the « Berlin Staatsoper » and, in January 1943, he gave some concerts in Switzerland with the Winterthur Orchestra at the « Tonhalle » in Zürich, and in Bern. On 2 January 1943, he conducted « Tristan » at the

Vienna « Staatsoper » : that was the only and one time he staged an Opera himself. After a tour of Scandinavia with the Vienna Philharmonic, in May, he married Elisabeth Ackermann in a civil ceremony in Potsdam, on June 26th : he was 57 years old and his wife, 25 years younger (he was living at the Faisanerie in the park of Sans-Souci, in Potsdam) . They had a church wedding at the end of 1945 in Montreux, Switzerland) . In July, he took part in the Bayreuth Festival and conducted « Die Meistersinger » alternately with Hermann Abendroth.

On 7 September 1943, the pianist Karl Robert Kreiten (a child prodigy and pupil of Claudio Arrau) was hung by the Nazis after he had been denounced. This drama became the subject matter of a play written by Heinrich Riemenschneider, « Requiem for K.R. Kreiten » , that was premiered in Germany in 1987. The main-characters are Kreiten and his mother, Furtwängler, Gœbbels and 2 men who denounce Kreiten. In December, Furtwängler was again in Scandinavia (Stockholm and Göteborg) and, in January, he returned to Switzerland (with the « Orchestre de la Suisse Romande » and the Bern Orchestra) .

On 30 January, the old concert-hall (« Alte Philharmonie ») of the Berlin Philharmonic, on « Bernburgerstraße » , was bombed to ashes. The season ended in Bayreuth (« Die Meistersinger ») and at the Festivals of Salzburg and Lucerne. On 11 October 1944, Furtwängler conducted for the only time in his life the « Bruckner Orchester » of Linz, also called the « Orchestra of the “ Führer ” » whose official conductor was one of the 3 Jochum brothers, Georg-Ludwig. On 7 November, his mother died in Heidelberg and, 4 days later, his wife who was already in Switzerland bore him a son, Andreas, that he saw only in February 1945.

Furtwängler had become a traitor in the eyes of the Nazis due to his repeated criticism of Hitler's policies. He was even accused of having taken part in the conspiracy of 20 July 1944 for which Hitler was the target. The situation became quite intolerable and the Nazis made it clear they would be happy if Furtwängler failed to survive the War. According to transcripts at his denazification trial, which took place in Berlin, on 17 December 1946, Furtwängler declared :

« In October 1944, Mrs. Himmler's personal doctor came to see me and told me of Himmler's and the SS' intentions. From the start, Himmler personally considered me an enemy of the State, this lady confirmed to me. She came-back in November. In January 1945, when I was in Berlin for the last time, she came suddenly early one morning, and told me :

“ ' Herr ' Furtwängler, nobody is to know that I have come to see you. Let me inform you that the SS are talking of putting you in quarantine. No Nazi is supposed to talk to you any more. Everything you do, all your telephone calls are under surveillance. You are accused of having participated in the attack against Hitler. It's up to you to draw your own conclusions. ”

Then, she left. I decided I should not go back to Berlin after my concerts in Vienna, and so, I hid-out for 3 days near the Swiss border. The evening before I crossed the border, some “ Gestapo ” agents came to see my secretary, Miss von Tiedemann, and told her to her great surprise that I had left. Thereafter, I did everything necessary to clarify my position in Switzerland. »

During a concert of 11 December 1944, in Berlin, Albert Speer also told Furtwängler that his life was in danger and that Heinrich Himmler's « Gestapo » was after him. Speer advised him not to return after his next tour to Switzerland. So, after having celebrated his 59th birthday at the Hotel Imperial, in Vienna, with his friend the sound-engineer Friedrich Schnapp, on December 30th, he sent a message to the Berlin Philharmonic saying that he could not conduct the concerts of February 4th and 5th, « due to the fact that he had slipped on ice ». From February onwards, he organized his escape to Switzerland to coincide with concerts he was to conduct in Lausanne, Geneva and Winterthur. From February 1 to 6, he hid in the small village of Dornbirn, near Bregenz and the Swiss border.

From Dornbirn, he wrote to Irme Schwab :

« I am heading for Switzerland. I still don't know if, due to the political situation, I will manage to get through, otherwise I will go to Tanneck. »

On 6 February, he wrote to Hélène Matschenz :

« If I am allowed to do so, I will cross the border tomorrow. »

On 7 February, he managed to cross the border and joined his wife and their son. On 23 February, he conducted his last concert in Winterthur (Anton Bruckner's 8th Symphony) but the 2 concerts at the « Tonhalle » were cancelled by the Town Hall. An enormous scandal that lasted an entire month broke-out in the Left-wing press, (he was accused of being a Nazi stooge) , in papers like the « Volksrecht » .

The « Journal de Genève » summarized the so-called « Furtwängler Affair » quite accurately :

« The 2 concerts that Furtwängler was due to conduct at the “ Tonhalle ” , this week, were cancelled by the Council of State and created quite a stir. It seems the Zürich Municipal Executive Council had suggested the cancellation to the government, and they also received threats from the Labour Party. But the Cantonal Police Department had already given permission for these concerts, and had to reverse itself under pressure from the Municipal Council. Protests quickly broke-out. “ La Nouvelle Gazette de Zürich ” and “ die Tat ” , an independent paper, immediately reacted negatively to this intrusion of partisan passions into the realm of artistic freedom, and deplored the fact that Zürich had set such a poor example of intolerance.

As the Zürich Radical Party's central Committee rightly said in a public protest, it is regrettable that the Swiss authorities seemed to give in to such demagoguery which sought only to take advantage of the wide-spread and justified dislike by the Swiss public of the Nazis. The “ Furtwängler Affair ” had its 1st epilogue last Wednesday at the Town Hall, and the discussion was both instructive and explosive. 2 groups of speakers faced-off against each other: on one side, the radicals and the independents, who defended Furtwängler saying that it was a bit late to blame him for accepting a post in the “ Staatsrat ” (Prussian State Council) and the decoration that he had accepted from the “ Führer ” ; on the other side, the Communists, the Socialists and one member of the Fraction of the “ Monnaie franche

» accused Furtwängler of becoming a pawn of the Nazi propaganda campaign. »

As for the Winterthur concert (Bruckner's 8th) , it was the last one before the fall of the German « Reich » and a number of demonstrations were organized by the Labour Trade-Union and its political wing. The demonstrators tried to prevent the public from attending the concert and a detachment of the police with water-cannons had to intervene. In the end, the concert took place without any incidents and the house was full.

In February, he settled in Clarens, at the « Clinique la Prairie » run and owned by Doctor Niehans, where he stayed until June 1947.

(Who was this Doctor Niehans, nicknamed « Docteur Miracle » ? Some said he was a charlatan ; someone who profited from the credulity of people and asked astronomical fees for treatments that did absolutely nothing. Others said that he was a true pioneer of rejuvenation therapy. Paul Niehans, who invented « cell-therapy » , was born in 1882 and counted among his clients some famous names including Konrad Adenauer, Somerset Maugham, Gloria Swanson, Charles Chaplin and the Duchess of Windsor. He was internationally famous as a surgeon ; later, he became for some a genius ; for others, a crazy visionary and a false « Messiah » inspired only by a thirst for money.)

Once safely in Switzerland, Furtwängler and his family waited-out the end of the War. When Hitler's death was announced on 30 April 1945, bringing the War to an end, Furtwängler had to undergo denazification by the Allies (not having been a member of the Nazi Party, it actually shouldn't have been necessary) . In his case, this « purification » process revolved around the question why he had remained in Germany under the Hitler dictatorship, and his behaviour during that period, especially in the light of the regime's official anti-Semitism. 2 trials were held : one in Vienna, in January 1946 ; and one in Berlin, on December 11th and 17th of that same year. Furtwängler was exonerated and allowed to take-up conducting again. Contrary to other conductors (Herbert von Karajan, Oswald Kabasta or Hermann Abendroth) , Furtwängler was never a Party member, never made the Hitler salute, never signed his letters « Heil Hitler ! » and, as much as he could, helped Jewish musicians.

Furtwängler explained the reason why he remained in Germany as follows :

« I didn't stay because I was a Nazi, I remained because I am German ! »

He was supported by his friend, the producer Boleslav Barlog, by the Romanian conductor Sergiu Celibidache and by musicians such as Hugo Strelitzer who declared :

« If I am alive today, I owe this to this great man. Furtwängler helped and protected a great number of Jewish musicians and this attitude shows a great deal of courage since he did it under the eyes of the Nazis, in Germany itself. History will be his judge. »

At the end of the trial, Furtwängler declared :

« Art has nothing to do with politics nor with War. I felt responsible of the German music and it was my duty to get through this crisis as best as I could. I have no regrets that I stayed on in Germany alongside fellow-Germans who had to live under Himmler's reign of terror. »

In his « Diary » for 1946, he wrote :

« I try to look at my behaviour objectively. I am no better than any other, but I had to do what my instinct and conscience dictated. I love my country and my people, and I felt it was my duty to right a terrible wrong. Any worry that my presence could be manipulated by the Nazi propaganda machine had to take a back-seat to my major preoccupation, to save the soul of German music as far as possible, and continue to make music with German musicians for a German public. »

Serenity (1947-1954)

Furtwängler was acquitted on 17 December 1946 but wasn't allowed to conduct the Berlin Philharmonic until 25 May 1947 again, in an all-Beethoven program. Very quickly, his career returned to its previous frenetic pace, and he resumed his tours and Festivals (Salzburg, Lucerne) . On 24 and 25 January 1948, he gave 2 concerts in Paris with « l'Orchestre de la Société des Concerts du Conservatoire » . In February, he gave 10 concerts in London and, on 22 February, he premiered his 2nd Symphony (composed at the end of the War) in Berlin. In April, he left for Argentina where he gave 8 concerts at the « Teatro Colón » in Buenos Aires ; Italy invited him for 6 concerts and, then, he took the Vienna Philharmonic on a tour to Switzerland and ended the season at the Salzburg (« Fidelio ») and Lucerne Festivals.

In August, a sad incident compromised his relationship with America : the management of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra invited him to conduct 22 of the 28 concerts the following season. In December, he agreed to conduct 8 concerts. But, on 6 January 1949, an article by Henry Taubmann in « The New York Times » said some famous musicians wanted Chicago to back-out of the contract. Among these musicians were Vladimir Horowitz, Arthur Rubinstein, Alexander Brailowsky, Isaac Stern, Lily Pons and André Kostelanetz who declared that they would never again play in Chicago if Furtwängler became the Orchestra's conductor in chief. Faced with this extremely hostile campaign, organized by some Jewish groups, Furtwängler decided to reject the contract.

Arthur Rubinstein, who had lost many of his family in the holocaust, said :

« I don't want to be on the same concert platform with someone associated with Hitler, Göring and Gœbbels. Had Furtwängler been a true democrat, he would have left Germany like Thomas Mann. Furtwängler remained because he thought that Germany would win the War, and now, he is looking for dollars and fame in America. »

Other artists such as Bruno Walter, Yehudi Menuhin and Nathan Milstein refused to turn their backs on Furtwängler.

Yehudi Menuhin issued the following statement to the press :

« I have never met a more insolent attitude than that of 3 or 4 trouble-shooters who do everything they can to prevent a famous colleague coming to make music in this country. I find this behaviour despicable. »

Nathan Milstein declared :

« Furtwängler is a great musician and absolutely not a Nazi and if this campaign succeeds the great loser will be the Chicago Symphony. »

And that's exactly what happened.

In his « Diary » for 1949, Furtwängler wrote the following about this painful episode :

« A number of famous American artists protested against my coming to America. This protest is heresy in musical history. What is the real reason behind this campaign ? It is a boycott that has a very precise aim. The real reason for this slanderous ostracism of a famous musician is simply because he is German. »

In 1948, Furtwängler was 62 years old and was invited to conduct literally everywhere else in the world ; he toured with both the Vienna and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestras and made a number of recordings for « His Master's Voice » , in Vienna and in London. In September and October, he conducted a complete cycle of the Beethoven Symphonies in London with the Vienna Philharmonic, a cycle that was broadcast Live on television, but which unfortunately no longer exists. Every year, he took part in Music Festivals and, in August 1949, went to visit Richard Strauß who was hospitalized in a clinic in Montreux. The following year, on 22 May 1950, he premiered the « 4 Last Songs » with soprano Kirsten Flagstad.

In September 1949, he took part in the « Festival de Besançon » and, in March and April 1950, conducted 3 « Ring » cycles at la Scala in Milan. Flagstad was in the cast. He gave a series of concerts at the « Teatro Colón » and, in April and May 1950 and March and April 1951, he was again at la Scala for 5 performances of « Parsifal » and 4 of « Orfeo ed Euridice » . In April, he took the Berlin Philharmonic on tour for 10 concerts in Egypt (Cairo, Alexandria) , and, on 29 July, he was chosen to conduct the official re-opening of the Bayreuth Festival, with a Beethoven 9th that is still a myth today.

On 18 October, Rudolph Bing, director of the New York Metropolitan Opera House, wrote to Furtwängler asking him to open the 1952 season with a new production of « Lohengrin » and another Opera of his choice. Furtwängler learned that Arturo Toscanini was madly against his coming. Once again, the American project was cancelled along with a tour by the Vienna Philharmonic in the United States. In March 1952, he went back to la Scala for 6 performances of « Die Meistersinger » and, after a long tour with the Berlin Philharmonic, he made the magnificent famous recording of « Tristan und Isolde » with Flagstad and the « Philharmonia » Orchestra, in London.

After a performance of « Die Walküre » in Zürich, on 29 June, he left to rehearse for the Salzburg Festival : during

rehearsals, he caught double pneumonia. He had to give-up his activities and retire for several months to a sanatorium in the Bavarian Alps. Not having taken any time off since 1947, he slept very little and this lack of sleep affected his health. The heavy doses of antibiotics, particularly Tetracycline with its side-effects, affected his hearing. But Furtwängler recovered, and, on 7 December, was on the podium with the Berlin Philharmonic. But, on 23 January 1953, he fainted during the Adagio of Beethoven's 9th in Vienna. Once again, and over his protests, doctors prescribed heavy dose of antibiotics and his hearing, specially in the right ear, began to deteriorate. This loss of hearing made him very depressed but, despite this handicap, he continued working, resumed his concert tours and returned to Salzburg and Lucerne.

The 1953-1954 season began with 4 concerts at the Edinburgh Festival with the Vienna Philharmonic, then, in October and November, he recorded the « Ring » at la « RAI » in Rome, 1 Act per day. During his stay in Rome, he gave 2 private concerts for Pope Pius XII, at the Vatican and at Castel Gandolfo, his Summer residence. In December, he caught the flu, which prevented him traveling 2 months ; by March, he was well enough to leave for Caracas for 2 concerts with the Venezuelan Symphonic Orchestra. Back in Switzerland, he bought a property on the heights of Montreux, in Clarens, called Basset Coulon where sadly he was to live only for a very short time.

The season 1954-1955 was his shortest and final one. After 2 performances of Beethoven's 9th at the Festival of Lucerne (21 and 22 August) , a concert at the « Festival de Besançon » , on 6 September, and 2 concerts in Berlin, on 19 and 20 September, including his 2nd Symphony, he left for Vienna to record « Die Walküre » for « His Master's Voice » , between 28 September and 6 October. The Vienna Philharmonic played radiantly. That was the last time he ever conducted an Orchestra.

He left Vienna for Gastein to get treatment for his hearing. On his journey back to Clarens, he didn't feel well and caught a cold. His wife tried to persuade him to stay in bed but he wanted to take long walks in the open-air and in the mountains.

In the night of 6 November, he told his wife :

« I'll die of this illness, and it will be easy. Don't leave me alone, not even for a moment. »

He read the proofs of his 3rd Symphony and listened to the test pressings of his recording of « Fidelio » , that had just arrived. The doctors diagnosed bronchial pneumonia, and his wife decided to have him hospitalized in Ebersteinburg, near Baden-Baden, in the clinic of his doctor, « Herr » von Löwenstein. They left on a sunny Autumn day on November 12th.

At the clinic, Furtwängler said to his wife :

« You know, they all think that I have come here to recover. I know that I am here to die. »

What hit his wife was the fact that his mind was no longer on conducting, but on death, his own death.

He asked the Intendant Gerhardt von Westermann of the Berlin Philharmonic to come and see him and made his farewells :

« Please say my goodbyes to the Orchestra. »

His state of health worsened and, on the morning of 30 November, he was given a blood transfusion. He died that same day in absolute peace and was buried at the cemetery of Heidelberg next to his mother, on December 4th.

During the funeral service, Karl Böhm said :

« Shattered as I have never been before in my life, I stand today in front of a coffin in which lies a man who was my friend for over 20 years. For all those who love you, dear Furtwängler, it is still not possible to value the consequences of your death because it will leave a void that can never be filled. May God welcome you into a better world and may he give you back all the unforgettable Beauty that you bestowed on the most divine Art. »

Eugen Jochum and the Berlin Philharmonic played Mozart's « Maurerische Trauermusik » and the Aria from Bach's Suite in D.

Back in Clarens, his widow told his friend conductor Ernest Ansermet :

« Furtwängler's departure has taught me that to accept death is something we should all aim for. Furtwängler reached that goal. »

Why are there no more Furtwänglers today ? Was he really unique ? Does an answer lie the role of media and mass-culture today ? Is conducting today decadent ? So many good technicians but with nothing to say ? Look at conductors created by the media, and promoted by huge recording companies ? Show-business and it's corollary, the star-system - lead directly to the phenomenon of deification. But isn't imagination also the way we deform our images ? Furtwängler was a legend in his lifetime and the myth is still growing.

Yehudi Menuhin said :

« There are many conductors but very few of them seem to reveal that secret chapel that lies at the very heart of all Masterpieces. Beyond the notes, there are visions, and beyond those visions, there is this invisible and silent chapel, where an inner-music plays, the music of our soul, whose echoes are but pale shadows. That was the genius of Furtwängler because he approached every work like a pilgrim who strives to experience this state of being that reminds us of Creation, the mystery which is at the heart of every cell. With his fluid hand-movements, so full of meaning, he took his Orchestras and his soloists to this sacred place. »

The conductor Eliahu Inbal gave, perhaps, the best answer :

« Why are there no Furtwänglers today ? I don't think that this can be explained solely by the absence of talent. Nobody can metamorphose himself into a Furtwängler living at today's pace, giving concerts and making records as if they were on a conveyor belt producing soap or cars. The manner in which recordings are made today, with a bevy of microphones, is able to destroy all the mystery and the ambiance that Furtwängler knew how to create so well. We, musicians of the younger generation, should try and follow Furtwängler's example : that has nothing to do with tempo but rather with imagination, and total surrender to music. »

Furtwängler was the complete opposite of Arturo Toscanini who thought there was nothing left to « create » in an interpretation.

Furtwängler wrote in 1927 :

« The conductor's true ethics are not a perfect technique but his spiritual attitude. »

Looking « beyond the notes » , Furtwängler was always looking for the « absolute » . Forget the trends and fashions. And even if Furtwängler's exacerbated Romanticism, his almost religious perception of music and of the role of the medium that he attributed to the conductor in the mystical communion between the composer and his public, may be somewhat irritating, Furtwängler's Art was and remains immortal.

...

Berlin. October 7, 1944. A typical day toward the end of the 3rd « Reich » . Soldiers die. Civilians suffer. Jews are murdered. Nothing special.

In the « Beethovensaal » , a concert is about to begin, Wilhelm Furtwängler conducting but the theatre is empty, relieved of its usual audience studded with Nazi elite seeking a brief cultured respite from the stresses of War. The Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra is on stage, awaiting its cue. Conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler stands awkwardly on the podium. The vague meandering of his baton summons the 1st shadowy note of Bruckner's 9th Symphony. A Radio Berlin engineer starts his « Magnetophon » . The most extraordinary orchestral recording of the Century has just begun.

Genuinely transcendent musical events are rare. Their advent is hard to foresee. They often arise in improbable places and at chance times. And so, it was on a grim fall afternoon in War-time Berlin that a lone Nazi technician bore witness to one of the most impassioned performances ever put on record.

Like all truly great artistic achievements, the intensity and conviction of Furtwängler's War-time work was distilled from hard earned experience. In our era of pampered socialite Classical superstars, it seems hard to conceive of a famous conductor genuinely torn by anguish. And yet, Furtwängler endured such extreme torment and pain that he was able to fully identify with the profound suffering from which the greatest composers wrested their most heart-felt

and enduring Masterpieces. Under pressure designed to crush any sensitive artist, he transmuted his distress into a vision of unprecedented insight and power.

The saga of how Furtwängler's incomparable artistry arose within the appalling abyss of Nazi Germany forces us to confront the terrible collision of art, society and morality.

Before the War

The 1st 2/3's of Furtwängler's life held few clues of what was to come. He was born in Berlin, in 1886, into an enviably comfortable environment. « Furtwängler - the Early Recordings » (« Koch » CD) . His father was a famed archeologist and his mother a gifted painter. Educated at home, the youngster was nurtured in German culture by tutors and family friends who included philosophers and artists.

Furtwängler's musical talent surfaced early. His deepest love was Beethoven. By age 12, Furtwängler reportedly had memorized most of the Master's works and could play them on the piano. But, above all else, Furtwängler aspired to be a composer and, by age 10, had written Trios, Quartets and 6 Piano Sonatas. Following his father's death, though, he turned to conducting, primarily to support the family but also with the hope of fostering performances of his own works. The gesture was characteristic, and was but the 1st of many instances when Furtwängler would temper his ideals with practicality.

Furtwängler followed the usual route of a musical journeyman by serving as assistant and ultimately conductor in increasingly prestigious German musical posts. His mentors included Felix Mottl, a close associate of Wagner who had led the world-premieres of several of his Operas, Hans Pfitzner, one of Germany's foremost composers, and especially Artur Nikish, the greatest orchestral conductor of the era, known for mesmerizing musicians and audiences alike with his galvanizing fervor, deeply personal inflections and a unique orchestral sound.

Furtwängler's rise was meteoric, conquering Breslau, Zürich, Munich, Strasbourg, Lubeck, Mannheim and Frankfurt. He was touted by the press as « Das Wunder Furtwängler » . In 1922, he succeeded Arthur Nikish both at the helm of the Berlin Philharmonic, the most prestigious Orchestra in Germany, and at the venerable « Leipzig Gewandhaus » , whose unmatched Century long tradition of excellence had begun with Mendelssohn. By 1928, Furtwängler also held the top spot in Vienna, the musical capitol of Europe. In 1930, he became Music Director of the Bayreuth Festival, established by Wagner and regarded as the crown of German culture.

Furtwängler's only set-back had been in America, at the helm of the New York Philharmonic, where he had dazzled audiences for 3 seasons but, then, was edged-out by a furiously jealous Toscanini, who cruelly exploited Furtwängler's solemnity, social awkwardness and refusal to grovel to the society sponsors who controlled the pursestrings. But no matter : oblivious to the political storm that was gathering, by 1932, Furtwängler stood at the pinnacle of artistic success and his future, in Europe at least, seemed limitless.

Furtwängler's recording career began in 1926. Over the following decade, he recorded for « Polydor » mostly

German / Austrian fare from Bach to Wagner, but with some uncharacteristic Rossini and Johann Strauß as well. The full series is available on « Koch » 3-7059-2 K2 and 3-7073-2 K2 (2 CDs each) and is highlighted on « Symposium » 1046. While evidencing little of the visionary insight of his later readings, each of the records displays the unified ensemble of a great Orchestra under a leader solidly versed in Germanic musical culture. Thus, the Bach is heavy and committed, the Mozart weighty and severe, the Weber mystical and ecstatic, the Wagner dark and brooding and the Beethoven noble and solid.

Furtwängler's early recordings clearly evidence an artist at the top of his professional world, a self-assured, solid exemplar of the rich German performing tradition. As the entry in the authoritative Grove's « Dictionary of Music » aptly put it at the time :

« Control and balance are prominent characteristics of his conducting ; his interpretations, though full of vitality, are not impulsive and his personal manner at the conductor's desk is usually restrained. »

Then, came Hitler.

The War Years

The prolific German Classical music scene soon became a vacuum. Among conductors alone, Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer and Erich Kleiber (Furtwängler's chief rivals) all left. Some fled as a matter of conscience, but others had no choice ; as Jews, they were barred by the new racial laws from performing, teaching and, ultimately, living. Soon after Hitler's ascent, Furtwängler was the only notable conductor left. He clearly bore no malice toward the horde of emigrants, as he naively invited many to return and appear with him, in future seasons, and seemed genuinely hurt when they all declined. Nearly all Furtwängler's former associates begged him to take a stand and join them ; when he refused to leave, they branded him a traitor to humanity and shunned further contact.

The crucial question which would plague Furtwängler for the rest of his life was why he stayed behind when all the other great artists fled. The standard explanation is that he lacked moral fortitude. But, as so often emerges with ethical issues, the full story is far more complex. If anything, the opposite is true : Furtwängler stayed primarily out of a sincere, albeit naive, conviction.

Out of the depths of his cultural and intellectual roots, Furtwängler regarded Hitler and Nazism as a passing phase in German politics. Indeed, many observers, at the time, found it hard to take seriously the short, dark, brown eyed Austrian's ranting about tall, blond Aryan supremacy. From the very outset, Furtwängler saw 2 Germanies : the permanent, cultural one of which he remained a proud member, and an irrelevant, political one which was a temporary nuisance. To Furtwängler, there was no such thing as Nazi Germany, but rather a Germany raped by Nazis. Furtwängler truly believed that, by maintaining his artistic convictions, he would succeed in resisting Hitler and upholding the everlasting purity of great German culture. All of his War-time activities were bent upon achieving this goal.

Furtwängler believed to the depth of his soul that music was a force for moral good, a route out of chaos that would assist the cause of humanity. In 1943, he wrote :

« The message Beethoven gave mankind in his works seems to me never to have been more urgent than it is today. »

He later told the Chicago Daily Tribune :

« It would have been much easier to emigrate, but there had to be a spiritual center of integrity for all the good and real Germans who had to stay behind. I felt that a really great work of music was a stronger and more essential contradiction of the spirit of Buchenwald and Auschwitz than words could be. »

Richard Wolff, the 1st violinist of the Berlin Philharmonic (whose Jewish wife remained unharmed during the War through Furtwängler's protection) agreed :

« Furtwängler could have enjoyed a secure and comfortable life abroad during the dreadful years of the Nazi regime, but he felt it his responsibility to stay behind and help educate the younger German generation and to keep alive spiritual values in Germany in her darkest hour. »

But all of these noble thoughts can be dismissed as facile rationalization by a gutless pawn and, indeed, there were more practical reasons why Furtwängler remained. The Nazis reportedly threatened to imprison his mother. They harassed and ultimately expelled his Jewish personal secretary. Knowing Furtwängler's attachment to the Berlin Philharmonic, they hinted that they would disband and conscript the group, in favor of a more loyal ensemble. Above all, they exploited Furtwängler's fear that his art would not be understood outside Germany. When Furtwängler was offered conducting posts abroad the government readily agreed, but subject to a new emigration law that would forever bar his return to Germany - a condition they knew Furtwängler could never accept. Thus, Furtwängler found himself effectively imprisoned in his homeland.

And the Nazis intended to keep it that way by poisoning Furtwängler's image abroad. Thus, when Furtwängler refused to join the Nazi Party, he was made a « Staatsrat » (State Councilor) for life, an official sounding but purely honorary title he could not legally refuse and which Nazi news releases often invoked to brand him with a rank outside his choice. When he refused to salute Hitler at a concert, the crafty « Führer » leaped to the stage and warmly grasped Furtwängler's hand, a moment captured by photographers and circulated world-wide as alleged evidence of capitulation. And when faced with Furtwängler's public silence, the Nazis routinely generated false news items proclaiming his support, enhanced by fabricated quotations in praise of Nazi policies and leadership.

The perverse efficiency of the Nazi propaganda machine was displayed in 1935, when Furtwängler was offered the helm of the New York Philharmonic upon Toscanini's retirement. His candidacy came with a seemingly ironclad guarantee of success - the insistence of the Mæstro himself, acknowledged by an adoring American public to be the world's greatest conductor, that only Furtwängler was worthy to succeed him. The timing of the offer was propitious,

as Furtwängler was upset with the Nazi regime and this once was sorely tempted. But, as the heir apparent savored his options, Prime Minister Hermann Göring announced that Furtwängler's rehabilitation was complete and that he would resume his duties at the Berlin State Opera. With that, the damage was done : despite Furtwängler's attempts to clarify his position, both the New York press and the Philharmonic subscribers now would have nothing to do with bringing an officially reconfirmed Nazi to their shores. Furtwängler tried to bow-out graciously with a telegram postponing his U.S. appearances until the public realizes that music and politics have nothing to do with each other, but this was hardly a message apt to placate an isolationist America alarmed over reports of Nazi outrages.

As a final measure of insurance, the Nazis seized upon the most terrible and effective weapon of all. Herbert von Karajan was a brilliant and ambitious Austrian conductor who was everything Furtwängler was not : handsome, energetic, charismatic, young and utterly compliant and unprincipled. Throughout the War, the Nazis played the 2 against each other with diabolical brilliance, denying von Karajan the ultimate praise with which the State controlled press kept showering Furtwängler while keeping the older man in perpetual fear that his rival might supplant him even going so far as to tout him as « Das Wunder Karajan » , a cruel echo of Furtwängler's own earlier « moniker »

The fabricated rivalry with von Karajan hit Furtwängler at the very core of his being. Furtwängler lived and breathed music so thoroughly that he constantly conducted imaginary Orchestras as he walked. Furtwängler had dedicated his entire life to perpetuating the traditions of German culture in which he had been immersed from his earliest youth and of which he had become the most visible champion. German music was the sole reason for his existence. Indeed, in 1938, after the annexation of Austria, the already over-worked conductor doubled his duties by taking charge of all musical activity in Vienna, as he felt compelled to preserve that city's proud tradition and, in particular, the independence and excellence of its famed Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, which was threatened with State control.

The Nazis needed Furtwängler as much as he needed Germany. Hitler deeply admired his artistry. The Party itself was keenly aware that Furtwängler was the foremost symbol of the past glory of German culture and that his loss would be a final blow to national prestige which would validate all the foreign criticism.

Throughout the era, Furtwängler took consistent advantage of the respect the Nazis were forced to accord him. When presented with contracts having Aryan only clauses, he refused to sign and went on to tweak the promoters by spotlighting Jewish Orchestra members as soloists. When ordered to replace his Jewish concert Master, he threatened to cancel his concerts. When a ban was imposed on further performances by Jewish artists, Furtwängler demanded a meeting with Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels to get it rescinded. When the Berlin Philharmonic was to be aryanised, he personally met with Hitler to reverse the decree. (Ultimately, of course, these measures of relief all were to be over-turned, but that hardly diminishes their import, at the time.)

Despite the appearances to the outside world, Furtwängler did not collaborate. Thus, he never gave the Nazi salute, even when Hitler was present at a concert. He generally refused to perform in halls in which swastikas were displayed. He avoided appearing at official government functions. He would not conduct Orchestras in overrun countries. He never began concerts with the Nazi anthem. And he never played the fawning socialist themed patriotic works that flooded

other concert programs. That Furtwängler got away with such treasonous conduct attests to the esteem in which he was held by both the Party and the people.

Furtwängler's relationship to the Nazis was defined in 1934 when he programmed Paul Hindemith's new Opera « Mathis der Maler » . The composer's wife was Jewish and, therefore, his music, as yet unheard, was automatically condemned as degenerate. The libretto (also by Hindemith) probably didn't help matters either. The title character is a visionary painter caught-up in a civil War, desperately seeking a way to apply his talents to better mankind. Despite the Opera's medieval setting, its central theme of an artist's duty to constructively embrace social issues was painfully modern, and the Nazis surely grasped its challenging parallels with current history - perhaps, the very reason why Furtwängler resolved to champion a work that spoke so directly to his own gnawing concerns.

When Göring banned the work, Furtwängler scheduled an orchestral suite of the Opera's music instead. The concert received enormous acclaim as a rallying point for anti-Nazi frustrations. Furtwängler then published a lengthy article in defense of Hindemith in which he insisted that ideology was irrelevant and that the only valid æsthetic criterion was the quality of the artistry itself. He was attacked by the State press, led by Goebbels, who insisted with equal vigor that only ardent Nazis could be true artists. Sickened over the regime's repressive ideology, Furtwängler resigned all his positions (except, of course, the permanent « Staatsrat ») , devoted himself to composition and gazed wistfully overseas. (It was at this point that the opportune New York Philharmonic offer was made.)

During the following months, the conductor was miserable, torn from the means of promoting great German music of which he considered himself the guardian. The government was upset as well : substitute concerts were sparsely attended, subscribers demanded refunds, the Orchestra was plunged into deficit and the foreign press exploited the incident to denounce the oppression of a regime that apparently had to silence its foremost artist.

The stand-off finally was resolved when Furtwängler agreed to publicly acknowledge Hitler's dominance of artistic policies (which could hardly be denied) in exchange for being allowed to work freelance and never to have to accept a political position or perform at any State function. True to form, the State press reported the matter as Furtwängler's full capitulation and never mentioned the rest of the deal.

But Furtwängler did not simply retreat into himself or the sanctum of art. Rather, according to numerous testimonials, he displayed enormous moral courage, constantly placing his life and reputation in jeopardy. For the next decade, he spent much of his time intervening with Party officials in nearly impossible tasks of protection and rescue for potential victims who sought his assistance, including strangers and even professional enemies. Although the evidence is often anecdotal, archivist Fred Prieberg claims that his research alone has documented over 80 people at risk who were saved by Furtwängler's efforts.

While Furtwängler's outward passivity (quashed beneath distorted Nazi news reports) was interpreted abroad as collaboration, we now know that his quiet heroism saved far more lives than abrasive ranting or symbolic emigration. As Paul Minchin, Chairman of the English Furtwängler Society, has aptly observed :

« It takes far more courage to oppose a totalitarian regime from within. »

It is clear that Furtwängler had, at least, as much courage as the self-proclaimed champions of humanity who branded him a coward but who lobbed all their verbal grenades from the safe harbor of the free world.

So was Furtwängler a neglected Saint ? Not quite. There is, unfortunately, a less laudable side to his War-time activities.

Notwithstanding his courage, Furtwängler did not act out of pure altruism. Nearly everything he did was intended to preserve the integrity of German music. But since Furtwängler considered himself the foremost exemplar of that art, his activity served to solidify his status and gratify his ego. Furtwängler can hardly be compared to Raoul Wallenberg, Oskar Schindler and other heroes who had nothing to gain and acted purely as a matter of conscience, ultimately sacrificing all they had in order to oppose Nazi genocide. Focussed solely on art, Furtwängler simply did not concern himself with the larger social context.

This narrow focus produced mixed results. Inextricably tied to each of Furtwängler's laudable goals and achievements was an unintended drawback. Despite his valid cultural intentions, he unwittingly bolstered the German War effort.

For example, Furtwängler accepted the vice-Presidency of the mandatory performers' union and served on a commission that approved the programs of all public concerts. He assumed these positions of leadership, in order to maximize his impact upon preserving cultural integrity and assuring exposure to composers and artists of quality. But his constant visibility also served to legitimize and lend credibility to the Nazi regime, not only in the eyes of foreign observers, but to the citizenry as well : after all, how could the Nazis be thoroughly depraved barbarians if someone like Furtwängler could coexist with them ?

Similarly, after the War, many asserted that Furtwängler concerts had served to rally Resistance members. These events succeeded in assembling a core-group of cultural leaders for a post-War Germany who would vaunt humanism over militarism. Even outside Germany, many emigrants were inspired by Furtwängler as a symbol of their dissent. Thus, Furtwängler's War-time activities may have produced lasting humanitarian benefits. In the short run, though, they had the opposite effect.

As biographer Sam Shirakawa aptly notes, Furtwängler may have offered his art for the sake of true Germans, but he had no control over its dissemination. Thus, his concerts were broadcast to bolster troop morale. Worse, Hitler and his top henchmen often attended Furtwängler concerts to bask in his musical balm. That same balm may have lulled the frustrations of intellectuals and artists into indifference and diverted their energies from actively opposing the ongoing War and genocide. Furtwängler only saw music as a force for moral redemption. He once told Toscanini :

« Human beings are free wherever Wagner and Beethoven are played and if they are not free at Ist, they are freed while listening to these works. »

But the hearts of Nazi soldiers did not melt and the souls of their leaders proved impervious to æsthetic redemption. Were those responsible for (or, at best, indifferent toward) the liquidation of innocent millions really entitled to have their consciences set free by the liberating glory of music ?

Nor was Furtwängler's personal outlook free of paradox. Indeed, even his attitude toward Jews was inconsistent. One of the axioms of Nazi social engineering was that Jews were incapable of being true spiritual Germans and, therefore, were less than fully human and a social pollution. Nowhere was the absurdity of this assumption more apparent than in Classical music, as many of Germany's finest performers were Jews. Indeed, the pianist Artur Schnabel, a Jew, was universally hailed as the pre-eminent exponent of Mozart, Schubert and especially Beethoven, the quintessential German musicians. And yet, although he was ideally equipped to reject the Nazi racist view, Furtwängler often drew distinctions between 2 classes of Jews.

On the one hand, he ardently supported Jews who had arrived at the top of their musical, artistic, scientific or academic professions. Furtwängler vehemently opposed Nazi efforts to oust such individuals, as they had become an integral part of, and significant contributors to, German culture. The vast majority of Jews whom Furtwängler assisted were professionals (or their families or acquaintances) .

On the other hand, though, Furtwängler apparently felt that Jews outside these exalted ranks were potentially subversive and, therefore, expendable. He endorsed attacks upon alleged Jewish domination of newspapers because, in his view, this supplanted the development of a truly German press. Similarly, he seemed to indulge boycotts of Jewish commerce, protesting only the resultant adverse foreign publicity and the threat of a spill-over that could deplete the arts.

Even as late as May 1945, Furtwängler did not seem to fully grasp the consequence of Nazi racism. From the geographic and historical perspective of sanctuary in Switzerland, he had ample time to reflect upon the prior decade. His principal concern, though, became a fear that, in the aftermath of defeat, the now publicized atrocities would be blamed upon the entire German people, thus, unfairly ignoring their cultural greatness and inner nobility. Despite all he had witnessed, Furtwängler simply could not accept that the culture which once had produced Gøethe and Beethoven had now rotted into a mire of jackboots and crematoria. Fred Prieberg calls this a protective mythology which Furtwängler created to shield himself from accountability in a real world in which civilizations do fail, in which people are held responsible for their leaders, and in which art cannot be so conveniently isolated from politics. Furtwängler's tragedy was that he had to believe this illusion of permanent German cultural merit, in order to justify his life's work. Concludes Prieberg : « Furtwängler sacrificed himself to his own fiction. »

In recent years, we have been regaled by a pathetic parade of aged German artists claiming dewy eyed ignorance of the Holocaust. Would Furtwängler have been one of these ? Other than a few post-War expressions of shame, there is no evidence that he ever took a stand against the awful culmination of his casual tolerance of anti-Semitism. Indeed, it seems inconceivable that a man who spent so much of his time closely studying political leaders and social trends and successfully manipulating them to his professional benefit could have been genuinely ignorant of this corner-stone of Nazi activity and policy. Or, knowing, did he view the world through artistic blinders and simply not care ?

Speculation as to Furtwängler's state of mind is confusing and inconclusive. Fortunately, though, there is a far more reliable index to his conscience. When we listen to War-time performances by Strauß, Böhm, von Karajan, Krauß, Mengelberg and other Axis amorologists, we hear conductors utterly at peace with themselves, blissfully oblivious to the horrors around them, comfortably nestled in their insular worlds of abstract artistic contentment.

But Furtwängler's output of the time is of a wholly different dimension, ranging far beyond the bounds of accepted Classical tradition, distended by brutally twisted structures, outrageous tempos, jagged phrasing, bizarre balances and violent dynamics. This is simply not the expression of a cold hearted Nazi. Rather, it clearly and irrefutably signifies a sensitive but deeply troubled man torn by inner-conflict and soul wrenching doubt, constantly on the verge of exploding with torment.

Debate over Furtwängler's War-time politics may continue to swirl among academics, historians and social philosophers, but his artistry confers the ultimate proof of his humanity. There is no room for subtlety or doubt. No one sensitive to the interpretation of music can possibly mistake it.

Von Karajan

The degradation of Furtwängler's reputation stands in shameful contrast to the glorious career of Herbert von Karajan, whose authorized biographies tend to make only passing mention of his War years, and with very good reason. While von Karajan's apologists cloak his activities in the heady mantles of artistry and at worst opportunism, the facts decree otherwise.

Von Karajan later insisted he was apolitical, and claimed to have had no enthusiasm for the Nazis. And, yet, while no other musician of note ever bothered to join the National-Socialist Party (not even Richard Strauß, Hitler's favourite living composer), von Karajan joined not just once, but twice ! The dates were of particular significance. Von Karajan 1st registered on April 8, 1933 - 1 day after enactment of a new civil service law that removed Jews from State organizations. He re-enlisted on May 1, 1933 - the very day before a freeze on new Party members. As Norman Lebrecht observed in « The Maestro Myth » :

« For ambitious and unprincipled musicians, Party affiliation in 1933 offered a rapid route to the plum jobs suddenly vacated by Jewish outcasts. »

Von Karajan soon catapulted himself to prominence. He was appointed music director at Aachen and stepped-up to the Berlin State Opera following Furtwängler's resignation over the Hindemith episode. He ingratiated himself with Orchestras in Berlin and Vienna and was trotted-out to conduct in occupied countries when Furtwängler refused to do so. He proudly led Oratorios in praise of Hitler, scheduled special performances for Nazi brass to commemorate military victories and routinely opened his concerts with the « Horst Wessel Nazi » anthem, which included in its rousing lyrics the boast that « Jewish blood spurts from our knives » .

To give his claim of political indifference some credence, though, von Karajan wilfully destroyed his reputation in 1942, by marrying a woman of quarter Jewish ancestry (the Nazis were so precise about such calculations) and was, then, relieved of his posts and relegated to occasional freelance jobs until the end of the War.

But beyond everything else, while claiming to embody the highest ideals of an artist, von Karajan consistently lied about his Nazi Party membership after the War. That worked until 1957, when his membership certificates belatedly surfaced from War-time archives. Even when confronted with this seemingly undeniable evidence, von Karajan insisted that the documents must have been forged, since they lacked his signature. Fatal to that stand, though, was the fact that the cards never required the signature of the member, but only of the registering Party official.

While Furtwängler was vilified as an unrepentant old Nazi to the end of his days, von Karajan successfully buried his far more sensitive past to become the most prosperous musician in history, leaving an Estate estimated at a half billion dollars.

Furtwängler's Artistry

Several critics have explained Furtwängler's art as melding 2 often conflicting principles. Furtwängler conducts : 1st, a structural logic, sense of proportion and intellectual probing, was derived from Furtwängler's upbringing and is clearly evident in his early « Polydors » ; 2nd, unbridled emotion and improvisation was forged in the hideous caldron of Nazi Germany.

Great music never emerges from comfort, well being and privilege. Rather, throughout the history of music, the finest work arises from the most trying of circumstances. All of the great artists (composers and performers) were tortured souls. Even Beethoven was a gifted but largely derivative composer until driven to the brink of suicide by deafness, the cruellest blow of all for a budding musician. Like his idol, Furtwängler's art was fueled by the loss of his own most treasured possession : the stability of an absolute artist, sheltered from sordid social and political reality.

All conductors take their music seriously, but Furtwängler was driven by a deeper urge : he saw music as a moral force which had the power to impel listeners toward the good. He believed that music was a biological index that reinforced the ideals of humanity, its sonic struggles between tension and relaxation moving the listener toward an objective understanding of one's position in the universe. Music to Furtwängler was nothing less than a search for the meaning of existence.

Furtwängler's spirituality lent a deeply religious aura to his concerts. Some reportedly ended in meditative silence, the audience quietly leaving without daring to break the rarified mood with applause. This phenomenon is suggested by a recording of a 1950 Stockholm concert (on « Music & Arts » , CD : 799) in which a smattering of hesitant clapping begins a full 20 seconds after the final sustained note of Sibelius's « En Saga » evaporates.

Furtwängler's method was the antithesis of the typical autocratic conductor who forces himself upon an Orchestra. Henry Holst, who played under both leaders, recalled that Toscanini demanded, whereas Furtwängler persuaded. Rather

than imposing a rigid frame on his musicians, Furtwängler wanted to cultivate an organic performance by nurturing his Orchestra's inspiration. Furtwängler explained the conductor's role as the outpouring of spiritual energy into a body of instrumentalists which creates the material quality of the sound produced, together with its rhythmical, harmonic and tonal life.

To achieve this partnership, Furtwängler used the most unconventional baton technique ever known. He refused to give the types of precise cues upon which musicians rely for cohesion and ensemble. Rather, as Holst observed :

« Furtwängler wanted a precision that grew-out of the players' own initiative, as in chamber music. »

Hans Peter Schmitz, a flutist in the Berlin Philharmonic, recalled that Furtwängler never beat time as such, but rather drew melodic shapes in an effort to depict the organic cohesion of a piece. Karl Schumann described Furtwängler's bizarre gestures as agogic, concerned only with flow, continuity and expression.

Music works best as an autonomous form of art. While music occasionally can blend well with certain other art forms such as dance (to produce ballet) and poetry (to create song) , the most affecting musical experiences have no need of such linkage. The greatest music, like all great performing art, rarely translates well into verbiage. The mere fact that Furtwängler's technique was so often described, both by himself and by others, in such vague and abstract terms serves as powerful testimony to the depth of his intrinsically musical quality. And, yet, such obtuse language carries with it an underlying frustration in denying us the ability to envision and to understand just how Furtwängler achieved what he did.

Attempts to crystallize such nebulous accounts into a visual image would be all but impossible were it not for a few precious newsreel clips of Furtwängler rehearsals. Several are contained in a recent video, « The Art of Conducting : Great Conductors of the Past » (« Teldec » 4504-95038-3) . The most intriguing clip shows Furtwängler in the throes of eliciting an emotion drenched account of the last 3 minutes of the Brahms 4th Symphony.

Words can barely convey the bizarre spectacle of Furtwängler's technique, which violinist Hugh Bean once described as « a puppet on a string » (to which, perhaps, should be added : « held by a spastic puppeteer ») . His right-hand and baton roughly keep the beat, his left-hand weaves round, flowing patterns having no apparent connection with the music, and his head and torso constantly jerk convulsively. How any Orchestra could derive meaningful, much less expressive, cues from such seemingly random movements is amazing ; that the Berlin Philharmonic could produce readings of compelling unity and power is simply miraculous.

But despite our natural fascination with seeing the process of artistic creation, of far greater significance is an artist's success in translating his technique into valid musical terms. For that, we have the resource of Furtwängler's recorded legacy.

Furtwängler flatly rejected the modernist notion of a standardized process by which a conductor simply assures the accurate playing of the written score. Legend has it that he once stormed-out of a Toscanini concert, cursing the

Mæstro as a mere time beater. Furtwängler felt that a valid performance required him to internalize a score, completely identify with the composer and, then, vicariously repeat the act of creation, transmitting anew the tonal conception he heard inwardly. In the process, Furtwängler sought to master all the unique gestures and details of a work and, then, weave them into an organic whole. His vision, although deeply personal, was never arbitrary, but always sought inspiration in the mind of the composer.

One of the clearest examples of the validity of his unusual approach is found in the opening of Beethoven's 7th Symphony. The work begins with 4 full orchestral chords, separated by increasingly complex wind figures. There is nothing in the score to indicate anything other than a sharp attack ; indeed, every other known recording presents the chords with as much precision as the Orchestra can muster - a rapt call to attention and nothing more. In each Furtwängler recording, though, the chords are blurred and rough, each instrument emerging tentatively and out of synch. The impression is one of great effort, as if the chords had to struggle to overcome the smothering silence.

This is no mere empty rhetorical flourish. Rather, it reflects Furtwängler's re-thinking of the entire work. Most conductors adhere to Berlioz's famous characterization of the 7th Symphony as an apotheosis of the dance and emphasize its abundant grace and rhythmic drive. Furtwängler, though, placed the work in a far deeper region of Beethoven's psyche and performs it as a profound meditation on the elemental struggle between energy and fatigue, lightness and dark, motion and stasis. His opening chords are both the introduction to and the distillation of his vision.

Another extraordinary example of Furtwängler's art can be heard in his very last recording. The 3rd Act of Wagner's « Die Walküre » begins with the famous « Ride of the Valkyries » (often heard as an orchestral excerpt) in which the swirling excitement builds to wave after wave of thrilling climaxes. As 8 warrior sisters arrive at a rocky summit and boast of their exploits, the effect is indeed thrilling, with the sopranos belting out their ecstatic lines over the thrashing full Orchestra. But Furtwängler recognized the inherent problem with playing this scene at full boil, a temptation which no other conductor seems able to resist : the remaining hour of the Act, in which all of the important thematic action occurs, can seem awfully lax by comparison.

To Furtwängler, the « Ride of the Valkyries » , as exciting as it can be, must yield to the far more serious business of Act 3 : the battle of wills between Brunhilde, the errant oldest daughter, and her father Wotan, the head of the gods. In a long, deeply moving scene, she begs forgiveness which he cannot grant without destroying his own authority and, ultimately, is punished with banishment and mortality. Furtwängler deliberately forgoes the initial thrill for a more valid overall dramatic progression.

His recording heralds the drama perfectly, both in tempo and in texture. He begins the Ride at a brisk pace but, then, gradually decelerates so that Brunhilde arrives not on a buoyant note of ecstasy but crushed by impending tragedy. The feeling is re-inforced by the orchestral balances : shimmering and nearly devoid of bass at the outset but, then, gradually deepening so that the climax is mired in a heavy sludge of sound. As with the Beethoven, there is nothing in the score to suggest this ; rather, Furtwängler re-conceives the score in highly-individual terms in order to elicit Wagner's overall meaning.

Furtwängler is often described as a slow conductor, but that reputation is only half true. Furtwängler favored extreme tempos, both slow and fast. The overall feeling of torpor is due far more to the bass heavy sonority and reverberant concert halls Furtwängler favored than to the pulse itself.

Perhaps, the most striking instance of Furtwängler's exaggerated tempos is found at the very end of Beethoven's 9th Symphony (Choral) , which Furtwängler regarded as the greatest of Masterworks. Right before the end, the final words of the chorus are slow and stately. This passage leads abruptly to an orchestral Coda, marked « presto » , which most conductors indeed take at a healthy clip. In each of his recordings, though, Furtwängler brings the pulse to a near halt and, then, plunges into the Coda at a superhuman pace more than twice as fast as any other recording, so fast that the musicians cannot possibly play the notes accurately. The musical sense becomes utterly lost and the work invariably ends in a jumble of confusion.

Why mangle the final sublime moment of the ultimate orchestral work of the greatest composer in this way ? Because Furtwängler reminds us just who Beethoven was - not a gentle genius but the great rebel who constantly pushed music into uncharted territory. Thus, Furtwängler ends the Symphony, not with a refined and satisfying æsthetic touch, but with an uncontrolled explosive outburst, blowing away the bounds of musicianship and culture just as the composer himself had done. In a single gesture, Furtwängler transcends the immediate moment and even the Symphony itself to integrate the Coda into the entire life, personality and outlook of its composer. At the same time, his daring approach empowers the modern listener to relive the shock felt by Beethoven's own audiences.

Furtwängler was a conceptual artist: his why is far more important than his what. Furtwängler's conducting often seems mannered, quixotic and even arbitrary until we discern his reasons and then recognize that his artistry is driven by genius.

Hearing inspired Furtwängler interpretations like these is revelatory, leaving other performances to sound flat and routine. The depth of his thought is simply staggering. Furtwängler's true magic was his ability to convey worlds of new meaning within even the most familiar pieces.

The War-time Recordings

In 1937, Furtwängler and the Berlin Philharmonic switched labels to « HMV » and recorded a Beethoven 5th Symphony .Wilhelm Furtwängler conducting aside from richer sound and a 1st movement repeat, the performance is virtually identical to their earlier 1926 « Polydor » reading. The next year, they returned to the studio for a solid Tchaïkovsky 6th Symphony (« Pathétique ») and several Wagner excerpts. All the « HMV » 's are now on « Biddulph » WHL 006-7 (2 CDs) . During the War itself, they recorded only Gluck's « Alceste » Overture, the Adagio from Bruckner's 7th Symphony and an orchestration of the « Cavatina » from Beethoven's Quartet in B-flat, Opus 130. All 3 are collected on « Teldec » , CD 9031-76435-2, and are far more remarkable for the unrelieved somberness of the repertoire than for any particular musical insight.

In purely artistic terms, the War-time studio recordings are barely significant. But, from a psychological perspective, it seems amazing that such a sensitive artist was able to so fully suppress the turmoil and anguish that buffeted his personal and professional life. Perhaps, this was an instinctive aversion to the unnatural mechanics of the recording process in which music was chopped into 4 minute fragments and often recorded out of sequence, a system utterly repugnant to Furtwängler's organic approach to music. Or, perhaps, it was a measure of the extreme will power by which Furtwängler was able to erect a shield of artistic purity against which he refused to allow even the most intense outside political forces to intrude.

Whatever the reason, Furtwängler's emotional dam burst in concert. The 1st documentation of this change is heard in 2 marvelous London performances from May, 1937. Act 3 from Wagner's « Die Walküre » (on « Myto » , MCD 914.43) boasts a magnificent sense of headstrong flow and inevitability, while Beethoven's 9th Symphony (on « Music & Arts » , CD 818) is gripping and highly-inflected. While lacking the ultimate abandon that would emerge during the War itself, these live renditions are far more intense and overtly dramatic than the Wagner and Beethoven pieces Furtwängler was recording in the studio for « HMV » .

Other than his own Symphonic Concerto and some snippets from Wagner Operas, we seem to have no further live Furtwängler recordings until 1942 to 1944, when Radio Berlin taped 20 concerts. By then, Furtwängler's artistry had become completely transformed.

The pick-up consisted of a principal microphone at the podium, mixed at the back of the hall with 3 others ; all were omni-directional and picked-up a lot of audience noise. The sound was relayed by telephone line to Radio Berlin headquarters, where it was recorded on machines, in 20 minute segments, on 14 inch reels of iron oxide tape running at 30 inches per second. Although 49 pieces reportedly were recorded, many of the tapes were lost, damaged or erased for re-use. The survivors were removed by Soviet occupation forces. After generating decades of Russian LP bootlegs, 22 were returned to Berlin in 1987. 19 were issued on 10 « DGG » Cds, in 1989. Now out of print, many have emerged on the American « Music & Arts » label.

Admittedly, it is rather difficult to listen to them today, knowing that the recordings originally were made to boost combat morale and that the highly-audible audience coughs arose from the pampered throats of Nazi military and government elite. But such perverse uses of art aside, perhaps, we can take some comfort in Furtwängler's hope that these broadcasts would also bolster the courage and humanity of civilian listeners. In any event, our ears know little of political correctness ; none of the performances is less than fascinating, and more than a few are among the most intense of all time.

If there is a single common quality to all of these performances, it is the extreme cohesion between conductor and Orchestra, hard enough to find in standard readings but nearly impossible to achieve when the interpretation is impulsive and radically re-conceived. This remarkable quality arose from the symbiosis between Furtwängler and the Berlin Philharmonic, whose mutual needs were both artistic and practical. The Orchestra needed Furtwängler, without whose adoration by Adolf Hitler they would have lost their government subsidy and faced disbandment ; indeed, the intensity of their playing has been ascribed to the fear that each performance might have been their last. And

Furtwängler equally needed his players, his self-described right arm, whose 20 year association enabled the musicians to understand and respond meaningfully to his bizarre gestures in a way that no other ensemble ever approached.

The magic bond is confirmed by both records and anecdotes. War-time concerts have recently surfaced featuring Furtwängler conducting the Beethoven 9th Symphony with the Stockholm Philharmonic (on « Music & Arts », CD : 2002) and the Bruckner 8th Symphony with the Vienna Philharmonic (on « Music & Arts », CD : 764) . Both works were Furtwängler specialties, but the readings lack even a hint of the gripping tension he regularly achieved with the Berlin Philharmonic. Also indicative of the Berlin players' unique understanding of their leader are the abundant tales from other Orchestras, ranging from the Italian concert Master who mistook Furtwängler's incomprehensible baton motions for nervousness and sought to reassure him, to the quip of a German musician that he knew when to start playing only by sitting down and counting to 10.

Among the highlights of the « DGG » series is a Strauß « Sinfonia Domestica » (on 427 781-2) that actually makes structural and dramatic sense of this diffuse, sprawling drivel ; a frighteningly intense Beethoven 7th Symphony (on 427 775-2) in which the Finale accelerates completely out of control ; a deeply felt Brahms 2nd Piano Concerto (on 427 776-2) with Furtwängler's philosophical soul mate Edwin Fischer as soloist ; a haunting Sibelius « En Saga » (on 421 783-2, the effect of which unfortunately is compromised by extreme audience noise) ; a boldly impassioned Bruckner 5th Symphony (on 427 774-2) ; a deeply mystical Beethoven 4th Symphony (on 421 777-2) ; and, perhaps most surprising, a soaring Ravel « Daphnis et Chloé » Suite (on 427 783-2) . Perhaps, the best « DGG » disc of all is 427 781-2, which combines a powerful Schubert 9th Symphony with a Weber « Freischütz » Overture that ranks as the finest example on record of Furtwängler's acclaimed ability to color and shape each individual phrase with a world of expressive insight.

The very best of the War-time performances, though, are found outside the « DGG » series. A December 1944 Beethoven 3rd Symphony (« Eroica ») (« Music & Arts », CD : 814) is massive but with a sharp nervous undertone unmatched in any other recording. A 1943 performance of the Sibelius Violin Concerto with George Kulenkampf transforms the usual fleet virtuosic display piece into a mournful study of mystery and menace. There is also an emphatic 1942 Prelude and « Leibstod » from Wagner's « Tristan und Isolde » (« Music & Arts », CD : 730) and ecstatic Brahms Symphonies Nos. 2 and 4 from January 1945 and November 1943 (« Music & Arts », CD : 804) . An absolutely staggering January 1945 account of the Finale of the Brahms 1st Symphony (« Music & Arts », CD : 805) was recorded at the Berlin concert Furtwängler knew would be his last and fully reflects the unbearable emotions of that occasion.

Even more startling is a March 1942 performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony on « Music & Arts » (CD : 653) . John Ardoin's fine notes aptly describe it as a reading : « of cyclonic fury, frightening and exhausting, drenched with torment, anger and a sense of struggle » . Ardoin attributes this approach to Furtwängler's « acute awareness that one of the noblest utterances of the human spirit was being voiced in a country engaged in some of the most appalling atrocities to be committed in the 20th Century » , which led Furtwängler to « somehow attempt through the music to alter or reverse the events surrounding him » . Regardless of whether this performance qualifies as idiomatic Beethoven, it is an astounding example of Furtwängler's ability to fully internalize and then regenerate a

work as his own.

But even these extraordinary achievements pale beside the miracle of the 1944 Bruckner 9th Symphony which, after mediocre LP transfers, has been restored to remarkably decent sound on « Music & Arts » (CD : 730) . Unlike the other War-time performances, on this particular occasion, there was no audience to intrude upon the intensely private communion between conductor and Orchestra. The sole witnesses were the microphones, to preserve the event for broadcast. But in a deeper sense there was another essential participant : Bruckner himself.

Traditional Classical music is a recreative art : a composer writes down his musical thoughts, which artists of other cultures and generations must revitalize. All musicians struggle to wrest from the cold notation their understanding of what the composer wanted to communicate, but the gulf of years and unique personalities are formidable barriers. Throughout the 19th Century, the performer reigned supreme, and fidelity to creators' intentions was a foreign concept, at best of purely academic interest.

Furtwängler inherited this outlook. Even though he labored to find the inner-meaning of each work, he had such an overwhelming personality that his approach, despite the validity of his musical thought, was not necessarily on the same wavelength as the composers themselves. All the more remarkable, then, that for one critical moment his personal torment coincided so precisely with that of Bruckner that it yielded a performance that is as close as we will ever come to a perfect melding of composer and performer.

The composition of the 9th Symphony consumed the last agonized decade of Bruckner's life. He was a peasant who craved acceptance but was crushed by the snubs of society and the critical establishment. His music was strikingly original, but the cultural gate-keepers of the time insisted on editing and re-orchestrating it to conform to their own artistic norms. He was obsessed with morbidity, and was increasingly terrified by his own imminent end. He was deeply religious and dedicated his final work to God, but could not comprehend how God could refuse him the strength and inspiration to finish it.

The Symphony is incomplete in far more than the immediate sense of lacking a final movement ; Bruckner clearly struggled for something new and far reaching but ultimately died unable to realize it. The 1st movement, in particular, seems fragmentary and rough. Every other conductor tries to smooth the score into a cohesive whole. Furtwängler's approach, though, is far, far different.

Furtwängler once said that « an interpreter can render only what he has 1st lived through » . Of all the conductors who have grappled with the complex challenges of the Bruckner 9th, Furtwängler was best positioned to understand what Bruckner had achieved. Bruno Walter had hinted at this when he observed that he never understood Bruckner until he became mortally ill. The 9th Symphony is not a failed attempt at a cohesive artistic statement. Rather, it is a complete and perfect musical depiction of a tortured mind : a desperate snatch at a vision that grew ever more elusive, a vain quest for understanding and fulfillment in a world that would not provide it, a fevered groping for fragments of life in the lengthening shadow of death. As he wrestled with his 9th Symphony, Bruckner stood at the very edge of that abyss. By late 1944, Furtwängler stood there too.

The climax of the 1st movement heralds his emotion. The Berlin Philharmonic is fully controlled and its ensemble perfectly together and, yet, the tempo is so unstable and dynamically alive that no note falls quite where its predecessors would suggest, as if to reflect the entire Orchestra's heaving, nervous desperation. Furtwängler often spent entire rehearsals polishing crucial transitions, but not here ; he chops the 1st movement into dozens of inconclusive fragments, deliberately wrenching the mood from lilting lyricism to raw savagery, the tempos from standstill to runaway, and dynamics from inaudible to heavily overloaded. The movement ends in screaming trumpets, a primordial burst of sheer abject terror as both Bruckner and Furtwängler confronted the most horrifying fear of all : that, at the very end of their struggles, there would be only a void.

Although nothing could eclipse the unparalleled power of the opening, the wonders of this radical reworking of the Bruckner 9th do not end with the shattering climax of the 1st movement. Furtwängler whips the Scherzo and Trio from a slightly menacing waltz and bucolic « pastorale » into a furiously driven, vertiginous ride to damnation. He then gradually builds the unintended Adagio Finale to a terrifying dissonance, after which the exhausted fragments wither into eternal silence.

None of this is explicit in the score. It took Furtwängler to recognize and recreate an absolutely perfect depiction of a single mind and, by extension, an entire world on the brink of collapse.

After the War

Furtwängler may have been pushed to the very edge by the pressure and ambivalence of his role but, by early 1945, Nazi tolerance of Furtwängler's insolence had reached the breaking point as well. As the 1,000 year « Reich » lurched toward its early end, SS Chief Heinrich Himmler prepared to launch a grim final legacy : improving the world by ridding it of disloyal Germans who had thwarted faultless leadership and betrayed their nation's destiny of global domination.

The « Gestapo » had compiled a huge dossier on Furtwängler, who was near the top of their black-list ; as Himmler so delicately put it :

« There is no Jew, filthy as he may be, for whom Furtwängler does not stretch-out a helping hand. »

Under pretext of complicity in a failed July 1944 plot to assassinate Hitler, Furtwängler was targeted for liquidation. Albert Speer, chief architect of the « Reich » and an ardent admirer, warned Furtwängler that he had to flee for his life.

After conducting in Vienna, Furtwängler claimed to have fallen and suffered a concussion and informed Berlin that his return would have to be delayed until he recuperated. On February 7, 1945, he escaped to Switzerland. There, he reunited with his wife, who had gone earlier to give birth to his only legitimate child. (Furtwängler had fathered at least 4 other children, all of whom he acknowledged and supported.)

In Switzerland, he was in limbo. German sympathizers considered him a traitor, while others deemed him a collaborator. In a sense, Furtwängler's predicament was fundamentally unfair. We rarely condemn doctors or clergymen who stay behind to attend to the medical or spiritual needs of the civilian population in War-time. Why, then, should an artist who tries to preserve the cultural health of the populace be held to a different humanitarian standard ?

In any event, Furtwängler was unable to work pending a denazification investigation, which was delayed until the conclusion of the Nuremberg War crimes trial, a proceeding that ultimately consumed an entire year. The Allied command was not to be rushed, as they considered Furtwängler's celebrity to be a useful symbol of defeated Germany.

During this period, Furtwängler composed his 2nd Symphony, which he intended as his artistic testament. But instead of the seething, emotional catharsis suggested by the circumstances of its composition, or a beleaguered artist's visionary escape into new tonal territory, the sprawling work is a pastiche of older styles, meandering among glimmers of Brahms, Strauß, Sibelius and Bruckner without ever asserting an identity of its own. Admittedly, its virtues are obscured by the blandness of Furtwängler's own indifferent 1951 « DGG » studio run-through with the Berlin Philharmonic. Far more convincing is his blazing 1953 Vienna concert version (on « Orfeo » , CD : 375 941) . Even so, it is clear that Furtwängler sought refuge in the past and that his talent lay in interpretation rather than innovation.

Perhaps, more revealing of Furtwängler's post-War psyche and æsthetic outlook is his last composition, his 3rd Symphony in C-sharp minor. Although lacking Bruckner's assertive themes or wide emotional range, its massive, sprawling, thickly scored sobriety evoke that composer, yet ironically, they share more than fundamental style - like Bruckner's 9th, despite intensive effort Furtwängler died unable to achieve the Finale. Noting that Furtwängler always considered himself primarily a composer for whom conducting was a practicality, Gottfried Kraus felt that the work was a creative means to overcome the crises in his life. In his diary, Furtwängler stated :

« I wanted to make neither a mystical and mathematical construction, nor an ironical and skeptical consideration of the time but nothing more and nothing less than a tragedy. »

The 3 completed movements, marked Largo, Allegro and Adagio, were entitled : « Disaster » , « Under compulsion to life » and « Beyond » . (The Finale was to have been « the conflict continues » .) A fine realization is a 1980 concert (« Orfeo » , CD : 406 961) by the « Bayerisches Staatsorchester » conducted by Wolfgang Sawallich, who sees the 3rd as reflecting strong personal values in an introverted, confessional work that extends the general mourning of the time into deeply spiritual spheres.

Furtwängler's trial began on December 11, 1946. Based on its preliminary investigation, the tribunal conceded that Furtwängler was not part of any National-Socialist organization, that he avoided outward obeisance to the Nazis and that he tried to help persecuted people because of their race. Even so, Furtwängler stood accused of holding one official position (the nettlesome « Staatsrat ») , performing at one Nazi function, uttering one anti Semitic slur, and generally serving the purposes of the Nazi regime. The 1st 3 were readily rebutted or explained, but the last was troublesome. It was, quite simply, guilt by association.

Furtwängler had no attorney and was ill prepared to defend himself. As Yehudi Menuhin observed :

« Furtwängler was the last of an age that did not expect a man to be both a creator and a salesman at the same time. He explained himself badly. »

Even so, Furtwängler tried to convince the tribunal that he had to cooperate with the government to some extent in order to work against it from within the system. This, of course, is the principle of all underground movements. Thus, Furtwängler conceded that he had to couch correspondence in the Nazis' preferred racial language :

« To a certain degree, I had to fight with their weapons ; otherwise, I could not have achieved anything. »

After a week long recess, Furtwängler presented several persuasive character witnesses who swore to his unstinting rescue efforts. Furtwängler's summation proudly defended his record :

« The fear of being misused for propaganda purposes was wiped-out by the greater concern for preserving German music as far as this was possible. I could not leave Germany in her deepest misery. To get out at that moment would have been a shameful flight. I am a German, whatever may be thought of that abroad. I do not regret having done it for the German people. »

Furtwängler was fully acquitted. « The New York Times » , though, published a distorted account of the trial and its outcome, implying that the charges against Furtwängler essentially had been proven. This influential report was picked-up by wire services, spread throughout the free world, and hardened public opinion against Furtwängler.

The persistence of this cruel fiction throughout the rest of Furtwängler's life is preserved in 2 reference books, published in 1954, his final year. David Ewen's « Encyclopædia of Concert Music » refers to Furtwängler's intimate associations with the Nazi regime, and the updated Grove's « Dictionary of Music » noted :

« Under the Nazi regime in Germany, and particularly during the 2nd World War, Furtwängler seems to have enjoyed a privileged position. »

Only in recent times has such innuendo been superseded by a more balanced view. Thus, the current edition of Compton's « Encyclopædia » reports :

« He had difficulties with the Nazi government in the early 1930's but an uneasy truce was made. In Germany, he was generally considered anti Nazi, but elsewhere a conspirator. »

Encarta goes even further :

« Although he remained in Germany through most of World War II, he opposed the Nazi regime and was exonerated

of charges of collaboration. »

Even though he had been completely absolved, Furtwängler still could not work until the Allied Command certified to his normalization, a procedure that dragged on for 5 months. At long last, the papers were issued and the final phase of Furtwängler's career was at hand.

Furtwängler's Post-War Career

For his 1st concert in over 2 years, Furtwängler chose an all Beethoven program with the Berlin Philharmonic, « Deutsche Grammophon » U.S. LP release of Furtwängler's 1st post-War concert of the Beethoven 5th which was hurriedly scheduled for May 25, 1947. Fittingly, the program duplicated the 1st concert Furtwängler had led upon resuming activity after the Hindemith affair.

Throughout the War, to minimize friction over his refusal to give the Nazi salute, Furtwängler had briskly strode to the podium, baton in hand, and immediately began conducting. This time, he made a normal entrance. The audience understood the gesture and gave him a 15 minute ovation. Furtwängler then proceeded to pour into Beethoven all of the repressed emotions he had withheld from his own 2nd Symphony. The 5th Symphony progresses from a grimly powerful opening to an ecstatic explosion of triumph. And the transition from the thunderstorm to the pastoral hymn of thanksgiving in the 6th Symphony has never been rendered with such exquisite earnestness. The event is preserved on « Music & Arts » (CD : 789) .

Clearly, Furtwängler seized upon the deep symbolism of these works and through them recreated his own personal odyssey from misery to freedom. The symbolism was extended 2 weeks later, when Furtwängler devoted his 1st post-War concert with the Vienna Philharmonic to an all Mendelssohn program, whose works had been among the 1st to have been banned by the Nazis.

Furtwängler quickly re-established his reputation in most of Europe. Even Arturo Toscanini, who had demonized Furtwängler throughout the War, was quoted in 1948 as considering him the 2nd best conductor in the world (Toscanini, of course, being the 1st) .

But much of the rest of the world did not forget as quickly. Furtwängler concerts outside of German speaking countries were protested, especially in England and Holland. Plagued with guilt over his country's misdeeds, Furtwängler refused to challenge misperceptions over his past and backed away from confrontation. As a sad indication of this extreme post-War sensitivity, Joachim Kaiser recalls how Furtwängler was greatly impressed at a 1950 Leonard Bernstein concert in Amsterdam but resisted any attempt to express his admiration for fear that even a passing contact could damage the young American's career.

America remained especially elusive. In 1949, Furtwängler was offered the helm of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, but the announcement provoked a firestorm of protests, fueled by rumors of collaboration and fanned by jealous rival conductors. The most sought after soloists, including Arthur Rubinstein, Vladimir Horowitz and Jascha Heifetz, all warned

that they would boycott any Orchestra that engaged Furtwängler. Yehudi Menuhin, who had heard many testimonials among the displaced people for whom he played in Europe, following the War, and who was the 1st Jew to perform again with Furtwängler, attempted to air the facts, but to little avail. Bruno Walter accurately summed-up the problem as the one which would haunt Furtwängler for the rest of his life : as Germany's most prominent musician, he became an unwitting magnet for anti-German frustrations. The matter was concluded when the Chicago musicians union refused Furtwängler a work permit.

Furtwängler settled in Switzerland and wanted to remain freelance, but his hand was forced by von Karajan, who desperately coveted the helm of the Berlin Philharmonic. Largely as a defensive measure, Furtwängler agreed to become the Orchestra's Music Director for life, in January 1952, on condition that he have full and exclusive control over all its activities.

But rather than settle into the contented life of a tenured Master, Furtwängler remained pursued by demons. His hearing had declined to the point where he wore headphones at rehearsals and feared that the impairment would soon compromise his integrity. He felt mired in a golden culture of the past which history had left behind. He was still tarred by the very politics he had abhorred. And an upcoming Berlin Philharmonic tour of the United States promised a repeat of the bitter Chicago protests of 1949.

In late October 1954, exhausted from completing a Vienna studio version of Wagner's massive Opera « Die Walküre » , Furtwängler was diagnosed with pneumonia. His doctors were confident of his full recovery, but his depression grew. He confided to his wife that he no longer wanted to live. For the 1st time in 2 decades, Furtwängler got what he wanted. But so did von Karajan, who eagerly replaced him, led the Berlin Philharmonic on a triumphant U.S. tour, and in appreciation for his services was made the Orchestra's new permanent conductor, a power base to which he would cling for the remaining 34 years of his life and parlay into the most profitable career in the history of music.

The Post-War Recordings

Furtwängler hated the recording process as freezing an art that should constantly evolve and be recreated anew. And yet, after the War, he succumbed to the studio, waxing dozens of works with the Vienna Philharmonic. Among the best are exquisitely polished accounts of the Beethoven Symphonies No. 3 (« Eroica ») and No. 6 (« Pastorale ») on « EMI » (CDH 7 63033 2 ; CDH 7 63034 2) . Only a handful have been converted to CD, but the loss is not that severe. All display a fine sense of architecture and are well-played but lack the inspiration of his prime work. Perhaps, Furtwängler knew that only the Berlin Philharmonic could respond with instinctive precision to his impulses and, therefore, didn't even attempt spontaneous wonders with other ensembles. Or, perhaps, Furtwängler sensed that he could discharge his distasteful studio assignments most efficiently by avoiding any unusual interpretive features that might produce flaws and require retakes.

Furtwängler also recorded a few works in the studio with the Berlin Philharmonic, including a noble 1951 Schubert 9th Symphony (on « DGG » , CD : 427 405-2) and a powerful 1953 Schumann 4th Symphony (on « DGG » , CD : 427 404-2) . While preferable to the Vienna readings, they still seem somewhat reserved and lack the spontaneity of

his live performances. Perhaps, his finest studio recording was a complete Wagner « Tristan und Isolde » (on « EMI », CDS 7 47322 8 - 4 CDs), recorded in London, in 1952, with Kirsten Flagstad, Ludwig Suthaus and the « Philharmonia » Orchestra, each LP side registered in a single take to preserve continuity. But Furtwängler's truly great and lasting work was all achieved in the concert-hall.

LP collectors enjoyed a wide choice of Furtwängler concert releases, including an extensive Furtwängler Edition on « Arkadia's Fonit / Cetra » label, a more limited official series on « Unicorn »'s Furtwängler Society imprint, and further choices on « DGG », « Heliodor », « Discocorp » and « Turnabout ». The most comprehensive CD edition is on the Italian « Virtuoso » label, but the selections are all post-War, sound quality is often rough and documentation is non-existent; even so, these are well worth their super budget price, but you may have to search in off-beat outlets, as many music stores shun them. The growing series on the full-price American « Music & Arts » label boasts far better transfers, and their catalogue is selective of Furtwängler's best work. Also worthwhile are CDs on the « DGG », « Arkadia », « Ermitage », « AS Disc » and « Tahra » labels.

Every few months, nowadays, seems to yield a bumper crop of new Furtwängler CDs. But the sheer number of discs and labels is deceptive; despite occasionally improved sources and restoration techniques, most of the new recordings duplicate previous releases.

(Please note: In all candor, I haven't acquired most of the rereleases if I already have an earlier edition and, consequently, I haven't tried to update the labels and CD numbers cited here, in order to take new or superceding transfers into account. To minimize confusion, I've tried to identify each recording by location and / or date to enable readers to distinguish it from other versions in various incarnations.)

Although dozens of tantalizing concerts reportedly hide in private archives, we are fortunate that, with only a few serious gaps, we have fine examples of nearly all of Furtwängler's core repertoire - and most in multiple versions that permit fascinating comparisons, including 5 Beethoven 5th's, 5 Brahms 1st's and 7 Beethoven 9th's.

Furtwängler poured into his concerts an artistic vision that had become transformed through his life experiences. As John Ardoin aptly observes in « The Furtwängler Record », the pre-War recordings found Furtwängler at the height of technical achievement, recreating sound through the combined resources of mind and heart; during the War Years, his technique was tempered by a powerful sense of history and rage; and, finally, all that had gone before was recast through a hard won serenity and sense of perspective. The post-War concerts are monumental, the power of the past now embedded in pride and dignity.

Furtwängler's most famous post-War concert took place on July 29, 1951, at the re-dedication of the Festival Hall at Bayreuth and fully exemplifies his transformed outlook. Inaugurated 75 years earlier by Richard Wagner for the presentation of his Operas, Bayreuth had become the embodiment of German musical culture. Furtwängler, himself, the paradigm of German Classical tradition, was the obvious choice to re-open the Theatre. To Furtwängler, the occasion had deep personal significance, as it symbolized the re-emergence of German culture from the ashes of War-time politics and, thus, reflected and vindicated the very philosophy to which he had adhered during the War and for which

he had suffered so greatly.

To Furtwängler, only one work in all of music could possibly suffice for such a momentous event : Beethoven's 9th Symphony. The performance stands in striking contrast to his astounding 1942 Berlin performance. The timings of the movements are virtually identical, but there all similarity ends. Each reading is overwhelmingly passionate, but conceived in utterly divergent terms. The War-time performance is organized around slashing, brutal climaxes, while the Bayreuth concert builds its power subtly into a seething continuum. Fury has yielded to spirituality. Animal ferocity has evolved into human emotion. If the Berlin performance was a cry of desperation, the Bayreuth concert was a valedictory confirmation of the ultimate triumph of the artistic spirit. Furtwängler's achievement, both personal and æsthetic, is absolutely magnificent.

Furtwängler could never bring himself to make a studio recording of this favourite work, and so, after his death his widow arranged for release of the tape of the Bayreuth concert. It became a best-seller when 1st issued in 1955, on « RCA » (LM-6043) , and has remained in print for succeeding generations through reissues on « Angel's Great Recordings of the Century » (COLH 78-79) , « Seraphim » budget LP's (IB-6068) and, now, « EMI » CD : 7 69801 2. It is hard to imagine a more fitting and lasting tribute to the man and to his art.

Furtwängler's other great post-War achievement was in Opera. Furtwängler avoided the silly, contrived fluff that leads to ridicule of the genre, turning instead to works that have something profound to say about the human condition. « Virtuoso » CDs present magnificent Salzburg Festival performances of Verdi's « Otello » (on 2697382) , Mozart's « Magic Flute » (2699192) , Mozart's « Don Giovanni » (2699052) and Weber's « Der Freischütz » (2697222) . These performances are of particular appeal to those who tend to shy away from Opera, since Furtwängler took a Symphonic approach to the music and de-emphasized the libretto.

Furtwängler's closest identification in the public mind was with Richard Wagner, who had transformed German music with an æsthetic that was as revolutionary and brilliant as his racist political writings were reactionary and depraved. The summit of Wagner's art was the « Ring of the Nibelung » , a series of 4 Operas lasting over 15 hours which tell a sweeping mythological tale of mortal and godly creation, evolution, love, greed, betrayal and downfall. Extraordinary vocal and scenic demands render the mounting of even a single « Ring » Opera rare enough, but Furtwängler led 2 complete post-War cycles in Italy. (It is a true testament to the Italians' love of Opera that they would lavish their resources on the revival of this summit of German art !)

The 1st Furtwängler « Ring » was recorded live, in 1950, at the famous La Scala Opera House, in Milan. Originally unlistenable on « Murray Hill » records, which in a gesture of false economy had crammed-up to 45 minutes onto each LP side, the entire set has been successfully restored on « Virtuoso » 2699082 (14 super-budget CDs) , « Fonit Cetra » ECDC 1000 (14 mid-priced CDs) and « Arkadia » CDWFE 351.12 (12 premium priced CDs) . The 2nd « Ring » was broadcast from Rome over Italian radio, in 1953, 1 Act per night. After years of haggling over rights, it emerged on « Seraphim » LP's , in 1972, and is now on « EMI CZS 7 67123 2 (13 budget CDs) or « Arkadia » CDWFE 359.12 (12 premium CDs) . A 1952 Rome sampler of Act 1 of « Die Walküre » and Act 3 of « Gotterdammerung » is on « Music & Arts » 2 CDs (CD : 866) .

Opera fanatics will forever debate the relative merits of the 2 full cycles. The La Scala set is swifter and boasts the spontaneous excitement (as well as the flaws, noise, awkward balances and grueling exhaustion) of a real Opera performance, while the Rome broadcasts are more relaxed and better recorded. For some fans, the choice is dictated by the female lead : the icy beauty of Kirsten Flagstad, in 1950, or the rougher drama of Martha Mödl, in 1953. True Opera buffs would never part with either set and rank both among the finest Wagner ever recorded.

But it was *Fidelio* to which Furtwängler kept returning. Not only was this the sole Opera of his beloved Beethoven, but its theme of fidelity and love triumphing over political repression struck a deep chord within Furtwängler's own experiences.

The entire Opera takes place in the courtyard and dungeon of a political prison. The admittedly absurd plot premise finds the female title character disguised as a young man trying to ingratiate himself to the jailer guarding her husband Florestan. Opportunity finally arrives when the evil governor asks her to help dispose of Florestan prior to the visit of the benevolent minister. At the crucial moment, she reveals herself and holds the governor at bay until the minister arrives to restore social and moral order by liberating the prisoners, punishing the despot and reuniting the faithful wife and husband.

The final Act, in particular, throbs with heartfelt commitment under Furtwängler's baton, from its opening in the dungeon as Florestan hallucinates hope, through his devoted wife's daring rescue, the thwarting of the murder scheme, the lovers' fervent embrace, a sublime orchestral undertone which blends all of these themes, and the final cathartic choruses in praise of love, devotion and liberty.

Furtwängler viewed « *Fidelio* » more as a Mass than a mere Opera. As he wrote, in 1950 :

« What Beethoven was trying to express in “ *Fidelio* ” extends beyond the narrow limits of a musical composition ; it touches the heart of every human being and will always appeal directly to the conscience of Europe. The emotions expressed in the whole of this music are the constituents of a religion of humanity. After all that we have experienced and suffered in recent times, this religious faith has never seemed so essential as it does today. »

Furtwängler led post-War performances of « *Fidelio* » as a moral imperative. It is no coincidence that the truly great recordings of « *Fidelio* » by Toscanini (« RCA » 60273) , Furtwängler and Bernstein (« DGG » 419 436) were all crafted by men of deep social and political conscience.

Fortunately, beyond a bland 1953 studio version, we have 3 recordings of Furtwängler « *Fidelios* » : a 1948 Salzburg performance, incomplete and in rotten sound but the most fleet and overtly dramatic (on « *Melodram* » , CDM 25009) , a glowing 1950 Salzburg version with a dream cast (on « EMI » , CDM 7 64901 2) and a profound 1953 Vienna performance (on « *Virtuoso* » 2697272 ; or « EMI » CDHB 64496) .

Furtwängler's post-War orchestral repertoire ranged from Bach and Händel through Hoeller, Blacher, Fortner and other

contemporaries. But his most memorable interpretations were of the 19th Century German Symphonic literature (especially Beethoven, Brahms and Bruckner) , to which he brought unique insight. As a general rule, though, it's hard to go far wrong with any Furtwängler concert.

In a 1948 « BBC » interview, Furtwängler insisted that

« The conductor has one arch enemy to fight : routine. »

While he may ultimately have succumbed to the wounds of life's other battles, this was the one fight that Furtwängler undeniably won. As « New York Times » critic Harold Schœnberg concluded :

« It is safe to say that, never in his life, did Furtwängler give a routine performance. »

A Final Note

It has been said that the truest measure of a man often lies in the esteem of his enemies. And so it is that the most intriguing pendant to the Furtwängler saga summons once again his younger nemesis.

After taking the helm of the Berlin Philharmonic upon Furtwängler's death, Herbert von Karajan won unprecedented fame and fortune by polishing his performances to a super-human precision, purging the music of any vestige of human emotion, as if to deliberately suppress memories of the approach of his predecessor. And, yet, decades after Furtwängler's tortured demise, toward the end of his own charmed life, the wealthiest and most successful musician of all time seems to have become haunted with a most peculiar concern. Reportedly, even while bathed in constant public adulation by legions of sycophants and forever ecstatic audiences, von Karajan would privately despair and scowl at all the acclaim.

What doubt possibly could have troubled the mind of the world's greatest musician ? That Furtwängler wouldn't have approved !

Further Reading

In view of the geographic focus and international controversy surrounding his career, it is not surprising that much writing on (and by) Furtwängler remains in untranslated German. The most comprehensive English language resource is Sam H. Shirakawa's « The Devil's Music Master » (Oxford University Press, 1992) which dwells upon the War-time period and its aftermath with considerably more sympathy than its title suggests. Even more sympathetic (indeed, outright apologist at times) is Fred Prieberg's « Tower of Strength : Wilhelm Furtwängler in the 3rd “ Reich ” » (Christopher Dolan, translator) (Northeastern University Press, 1994) , which analyzes rare archival and private documents to assess Furtwängler's activities and attitudes during the War.

After contributing fine liner notes for many of the « Music & Arts » CDs, John Ardoin expanded his observations into

the excellent « The Furtwängler Record » (Amadeus Press, 1994) , which includes a helpful (although already outdated) discography. Ardoin's analysis of every known shred of Furtwängler's recorded legacy is comprehensive but, perhaps, too detailed for most readers. Worthy but briefer overviews include a chapter in Harold Schœnberg's « The Great Conductors » (Simon & Schuster, 1967) , Karl Schumann's essay « Furtwängler : The Myth and Personality of a Musician » (included in the LP box of « Fidelio » (« Seraphim » IC-6022) , and occasional insights in the « DGG » Furtwängler CD liners.

Testimonials to Furtwängler's life, artistry and War-time courage are collected in David Gillis's « Furtwängler Remembered » (Meredith Press, 1965) . Furtwängler expounded his own philosophy in « Concerning Music » (T. J. Lawrence, translator) (Boosey & Hawkes, 1953) . He can be heard in a brief English language interview on « Music & Arts » (CD : 792) and can be glimpsed, in rehearsal and in performance, on « The Art of Conducting » (« Teldec » video 4504-95038-3) . The rivalry with von Karajan is recounted in Roger Vaughan's « Herbert von Karajan » (Norton & Co. , 1986) and more skeptically in Norman Lebrecht's « The Maestro Myth » (Birch Lane Press, 1991) .

Furtwängler's Greatest Hits

If there is one immutable truth in art it is that taste and fashion do not evolve in a linear, orderly way ; rather, they constantly shift unpredictably. The relics of the past invariably become the inspiration of the future.

When he died 2 generations ago, Wilhelm Furtwängler was considered an ancient curiosity beyond whose egotistical distortions of the score Toscanini and his legions of followers had progressed. Furtwängler's deeply personal, mystical groping for metaphysical insight seemed irrelevant and even ridiculous when compared with the clear objective vision of the new approach, which echoed the emerging modern drive in all the arts toward simplicity, brevity and conformity. But the fickle sands of taste continue to shift and Furtwängler has become meaningful once more.

In the years since Furtwängler's death, we have wandered through a musical desert. Boredom has set in with a vengeance. Record shelves and CD browsers bulge with dozens of nearly identical objective performances of the standard repertoire. The prospect of, yet, another is worth barely a yawn. Who really cares to hear conductor X and Orchestra Y mechanically translate a well-worn score into sound ? What could such an exercise ever add to what we already know ?

Modern electronic convenience, too, has exacted a heavy cultural toll. Furtwängler was part of an era in which Classical music really mattered. It had to. Music could not be taken for granted. Performances were not conjured or dismissed with the push of a button. Listening required a genuine personal commitment of a trip to the concert-hall or actually playing the music yourself. Music was not relegated to the background but was heard in settings which demanded full attention and in return yielded deep insight.

Listening to a Furtwängler performance requires an atmosphere free of distractions. Only then, can the magnitude of his art be understood and appreciated. Furtwängler did not merely produce patterned sound from written directions. He created meaning far beyond the notes. He strove to communicate something ineffably profound about the human

condition. Although nominally anchored in the ethos of a specific era, his approach transcends time.

It is, of course, ironic that Furtwängler's posthumous fame rests largely upon the very medium he had so disdained. In selecting Furtwängler recordings, there are 2 cardinal rules. 1st, choose concerts over studio readings. 2nd, choose the Berlin Philharmonic over the Vienna Philharmonic, and those 2 over any other Orchestras.

Of the available Furtwängler performances, none is less than interesting. The best are absolutely compelling and rank among the greatest achievements of the phonographic era. Here is a highly-subjective list of personal favourites :

Beethoven : Symphony No. 7

Furtwängler conducts the Beethoven 7th (« DGG » CD) Berlin Philharmonic (October 3, 1943) , (« DGG » 427 775-2 ; or « Music & Arts » , CD : 823) . Furtwängler's Beethoven output was uniformly excellent. But, while his accustomed brilliance with the other major Beethoven Symphonies has been justly praised, perhaps, his greatest achievement lies here, a radical and deeply personal re-thinking which wrests profound truth from a work in which others are content to find only lyrical grace.

Beethoven : Symphony No. 9 (Choral)

Furtwängler conducts the Beethoven 9th (« EMI » CD) (1) Berlin Philharmonic (March 22, 1942) ; « Music & Arts » (CD : 653) . (2) Bayreuth Festival Orchestra (July 29, 1951) , (« EMI » , CDH 7 69801 2) . Each of these magnificent performances embodied Furtwängler's artistic outlook at the time. That a single conductor could produce such radically different but equally convincing interpretations of the same work speaks not only to the depth of his talent but the enormity of the emotional journey he had traversed. According to his widow, Furtwängler's own favourite performance of the 9th was his last, given August 21, 1954, with the « Philharmonia » Orchestra, in Lucerne (on « Tahra » 1003) , after which he told her :

« This time, I had one foot in the other world. »

Beethoven : « Fidelio »

Furtwängler conducts « Fidelio » (« EMI » CD) Kirsten Flagstad, Julius Patzak, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Anton Dermota, Joseph Greindl, Paul Schöffler, Vienna Philharmonic (Salzburg Festival, August 5, 1950) , (« EMI » 2 CDs : CDMB 7 64901 2) . In Furtwängler's hands, Beethoven's only Opera transcends its dated libretto to become an urgent contemporary morality play of eternal love and faith defeating the temporary evils of politics and vengeance. Every musical phrase and every word, even the formulaic Romantic distractions and insipid dialogue, pulses with heartfelt meaning, a fervent prayer for humanity rising directly from Furtwängler's very soul.

Beethoven : Violin Concerto

Furtwängler and Menuhin play the Beethoven Violin Concerto (« Music & Arts » CD) Berlin Philharmonic, with Yehudi Menuhin (September 30, 1947) , « Music & Arts » (CD : 708) . This was both a beautiful performance and a magnificent gesture of conscience. Despite Allied findings of non-collaboration, much of the world music community continued to spurn Furtwängler after the War. Having heard 1st hand accounts of Furtwängler's valor from survivors, Yehudi Menuhin, a Jewish American virtuoso, risked his reputation by travelling to Berlin and there, in the proverbial lion's den, effected an artistic reconciliation. The intense bond between the scorned conductor and his ardent young champion produced a performance of consummate feeling. The marvel was repeated at the 1949 Lucerne Festival with an equally fine reading of the Brahms Violin Concerto on « EMI » (CD : 63496) .

Brahms : The 4 Symphonies & Haydn Variations

Furtwängler conducts the Brahms Symphonies (« Virtuoso » CD box) Berlin Philharmonic (1948-1952) . « Virtuoso » 2699072 (3 CDs) . Just as Brahms revitalized traditional musical form through his own resourcefulness, so Furtwängler re-conceived Brahms, in deeply personal terms. Every one of these readings is a knock-out, inspiringly conducted, brilliantly played, well-recorded and at a super-budget price. If you can't find this set, an alternative can be pieced together. « Music & Arts » 804 (4 CDs priced as 3) boasts even finer War-time Symphonies Nos. 2 and 4 but decidedly lesser versions of the others, further hampered by wow and thin sonics. A 1951 Hamburg Symphony No. 1 is on « Memories » 4531 or « Tahra » 1001, abetted by superb sound (albeit in fake stereo on the « Memories » version) . An excellent 1954 Symphony No. 3 is on « DGG » 423592-2. And that astounding Finale of the Symphony No. 1 from January, 1945 is on « Music & Arts » 805.

Brahms : « German Requiem »

Furtwängler conducts the Brahms « German Requiem » (« Music & Arts » CD) Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra and Chorus (November 19, 1948) . « Music & Arts » CD : 289 (2 CDs) . Most of Furtwängler's work away from Berlin or Vienna tends to sound pretty rough, but he achieved a miracle of cohesion in Stockholm ; perhaps, the special rapport stemmed from his War-time visits to the neutral Sweden, which provided his only contact with music and emissaries of the free world. Furtwängler slows the pace to a crawl and blends the sonorities to an exquisite subtlety. The result lends wonder, awe, and a deep reverential feeling to this gorgeous work.

Bruckner : Symphony No. 8 in C minor

Furtwängler conducts the Bruckner 8th (« Music & Arts » CD) Berlin Philharmonic (March 15, 1949) . « Music & Arts » , CD : 624. Any Furtwängler Bruckner performance is a safe bet, but this is a wild, reckless and utterly astounding reading that manages to blend War-time tension with a new found repose and in the process demonstrates what truly committed conducting (and playing) is all about. Unfortunately, the climaxes are severely over-loaded and some quiet sections are plagued by extreme audience noise. Equally ecstatic are a 1943 Symphony No. 6 (of which the 1st movement is missing) on « Music & Arts » , CD : 805 and a 1951 Symphony No. 4 on « Virtuoso » , CD : 2697372.

Bruckner : Symphony No. 9 in D minor

Furtwängler conducts the Bruckner 9th (« Music & Arts » CD) Berlin Philharmonic (October 7, 1944) . « Music & Arts » , CD : 730. The wonder of this concert is described in the main article. The Bruckner 9th was the 1st work Furtwängler ever conducted in public and remained one of his favourites but, after this staggeringly intense performance, he never touched it again ; how could he ? The CD sound is a considerable improvement over previous « DGG » and « Heliodor » LP's.

Furtwängler : Symphonic Concerto for Piano and Orchestra

Edwin Fischer, piano, Berlin Philharmonic (January 19, 1939) . « Pilz » , CD : 78 004. All conductors strive for immortality through composition but, to Furtwängler, composing had a deeper purpose : Furtwängler conducts his Symphonic Concerto (« Pilz » CD) , it was an outlet to which he turned during the most frustrating and tempestuous times of his life. Although both the recording and the CD transfer are mediocre, this sprawling work from the agonizing period of 1936 is as close as he ever got to a self-portrait. Equally revealing, but in a far different way, is his Symphony No. 2 (Vienna Philharmonic, 1953, on « Orfeo » 375 941) . Written while awaiting his rehabilitation in 1946, this serves as a compendium of Furtwängler's musical influences and proclivities. Together, these works document more about Furtwängler's artistic outlook than words can ever convey. They also display the unique nature of Furtwängler's talent since, in other hands, they sound boring and diffuse but here they pulse with commitment and power.

Mendelssohn : « Hebrides » Overture

Vienna Philharmonic (October 29, 1951) . Furtwängler conducts Mendelssohn's « Hebrides » Overture (« Fonit » LP ; « Recital Records » 351 ; or, « Fonit / Cetra » , FE 35. The vast majority of Furtwängler's concerts with the Vienna Philharmonic are polished but dry. In the summer of 1951, though, they briefly caught fire and produced some thrilling results. The menacing atmosphere, seething mysticism and palpable tension of this performance are breathtaking, but as of this writing it is only on LP. Other incendiary Vienna concerts, from the same season, include a Schumann Symphony No. 1 « Spring » (on « Virtuoso » 2697402 or « London » 417 287-2) and Bruckner Symphonies Nos. 4 and 5 (on « Virtuoso » 2697372 and 2697342 ; or, « Music & Arts » 796) .

Schubert : Symphony No. 9 « The Great »

Furtwängler conducts the Schubert « Great Symphony » on « RCA » LP (box CD) . It's impossible to choose a single Furtwängler recording of this favourite work, as each illuminates a different aspect of the same fundamental interpretation. A 1942 Berlin concert (on « DGG » 427 781-2) is impulsive and overtly dramatic, a 1951 Vienna studio reading (on « DGG » 427 405-2) is lyric and gentle, a 1952 Vienna concert (on « Virtuoso » 2697362) boasts breathtakingly smooth transitions, and a 1953 Berlin concert (on « Music & Arts » , CD : 795) is massive and noble. Furtwängler's profound exposition of Schubert's Symphony No. 8 « Unfinished » is on « DGG » 423 572-2.

Tchaïkovsky : Symphony No. 5

Turin Radio Orchestra (June 9, 1952) . Furtwängler conducts Tchaïkovsky's Symphony No. 5 (« Music & Arts » , CD : 712 ; or, « AS Disc » 371. The composer's fiery emotion and the conductor's probing insight were a natural match, but, unfortunately, this is the only available Furtwängler concert of a Tchaïkovsky Symphony. The interpretation is quintessential Furtwängler, deeply impassioned but without the flaming excess of some other Maestros. The ragged playing, though, documents the problems which arose when an unfamiliar ensemble had to decipher Furtwängler's unconventional gestures. A superb 1951 Berlin Philharmonic concert of the Symphony No. 6 in which such lapses are absent has eluded CDs so far and was last on « DGG » , LP 2535 165.

Wagner : « Tristan und Isolde »

Furtwängler conducts « Tristan und Isolde » (« RCA » LP box cover, featuring a specially commissioned painting by Federico Castellon) Kirsten Flagstad, Ludwig Suthaus, Blanche Thebom, Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau, « Philharmonia » Orchestra (June, 1952) . « EMI » CHS 7 473222 8 (4 CDs) . Elizabeth Furtwängler recalled that this recording first prompted her husband to realize the potential of the medium, whose permanence he had considered improper and whose editing he had condemned as dishonest. Critics agree that this is one of the greatest Opera recordings ever made, in which the vast spaces of Wagner are unified with compelling vision. Furtwängler's only other studio Wagner project, « Die Walküre » , « EMI » CHS 7 63045 2 (3 CDs) was his last endeavor and is nearly as good. Excellent orchestral Wagner concert excerpts are on « Music & Arts » CD : 794 ; and « DGG » 427 406-2.

Weber : Overture to « Der Freischütz »

Furtwängler conducts the Weber's « Der Freischütz » Overture (« Music & Arts » , CD : 784) . Furtwängler's performances of this work span his recording career and document his evolving artistry. The Overture was his debut recording, in 1926 (on « Koch » 3-7059-2) . It and the nearly identical 1935 reading (on « Koch » 3-7073-2) explode with youthful energy, the 1944 Berlin concert (on « DGG » 427 781-2) quivers with tension, and the 1952 Berlin and 1954 Vienna concerts (on « Music & Arts » , CD : 795 ; and « Virtuoso » 2697222, respectively) achieve a rarefied calm of nobility and pride. Furtwängler's affinity for this piece seems especially fitting, as it introduces an Opera that, more than any other, embodies the very essence of German themes, outlook and music. And that, of course, was also the essence of Furtwängler.

Wilhelm Furtwängler and Music in the 3rd « Reich »

(By Antony Charles.)

Not only during his lifetime, but also in the decades since his death, in 1954, Wilhelm Furtwängler has been globally recognized as one of the greatest musicians of the 20th Century, above all as the brilliant primary conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, which he led from 1922 to 1945, and again after 1950. On his death, the « Encyclopaedia Britannica » commented :

« By temperament a Wagnerian, his restrained dynamism, superb control of his Orchestra and Mastery of sweeping rhythms also made him an outstanding exponent of Beethoven. »

Furtwängler was also a composer of merit.

Underscoring his enduring greatness have been several recent in depth biographies and a successful 1996 Broadway play, « Taking Sides », that portrays his post-War denazification purgatory, as well as steadily strong sales of CD recordings of his performances (some of them available only in recent years) . Furtwängler Societies are active in the United States, France, Britain, Germany and other countries. His overall reputation, however, especially in America, is still a controversial one.

Following the National-Socialist seizure of power, in 1933, some prominent musicians (most notably, such Jewish artists as Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer and Arnold Schönberg) left Germany. Most of the nation's musicians, however, including the great majority of its most gifted musical talents, remained (and even flourished) . With the possible exception of the composer Richard Strauß, Furtwängler was the most prominent musician to stay and collaborate.

Consequently, discussion of his life (even today) still provokes heated debate about the role of art and artists under Hitler and, on a more fundamental level, about the relationship of art and politics.

A Non-Political Patriot

Wilhelm Furtwängler drew great inspiration from his homeland's rich cultural heritage, and his world revolved around music, especially German music. Although essentially non political, he was an ardent patriot, and leaving his fatherland was simply out of the question.

Ideologically, he may, perhaps, be best characterized as a man of the old Germany (a Wilhelmine conservative and an authoritarian elitist) . Along with the great majority of his countrymen, he welcomed the demise of the ineffectual democratic regime of Germany's Weimar Republic (1918-1933) . Indeed, he was the conductor chosen to direct the gala performance of Wagner's « Die Meistersinger » for the Day of Potsdam, a solemn State ceremony on March 21, 1933, at which President von Hindenburg, the youthful new Chancellor Adolf Hitler and the newly elected « Reichstag » formally ushered in the new government of national awakening. All the same, Furtwängler never joined the National-Socialist Party (unlike his chief musical rival, fellow conductor Herbert von Karajan) .

It wasn't long before Furtwängler came into conflict with the new authorities. In a public dispute, in late 1934, with Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels over artistic direction and independence, he resigned his positions as director of the Berlin Philharmonic and as head of the Berlin State Opera. Soon, however, a compromise agreement was reached whereby he resumed his posts, along with a measure of artistic independence. He was also able to exploit both his prestigious position and the artistic and jurisdictional rivalries between Goebbels and Göring to play a greater and more independent role in the cultural life of 3rd « Reich » Germany.

From then on, until the « Reich » 's defeat, in the spring of 1945, he continued to conduct, to much acclaim, both at home and abroad (including, for example, a highly-successful concert tour of Britain, in 1935) . He was also a guest-conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1939-1940, and at the Bayreuth Festival. On several occasions, he led concerts in support of the German War effort. He also nominally served as a member of the Prussian State Council and as vice-President of the « Reich » Music Chamber, the State sponsored professional musicians' association.

Throughout the 3rd « Reich » era, Furtwängler's eminent influence on Europe's musical life never diminished.

Cultural Vitality

For Americans conditioned to believe that nothing of real cultural or artistic merit was produced in Germany during the Hitler era, the phrase Nazi art is an oxymoron (a contradiction in terms) . The reality, though, is not so simple, and it is gratifying to note that some progress is being made to set straight the historical record.

This is manifest, for example, in the publication in recent years of 2 studies that deal extensively with Furtwängler, and which generally defend his conduct during the 3rd « Reich » : « The Devil's Music Master » by Sam H. Shirakawa (reviewed in the January - February 1994 « Journal » , pages 41-43) and « Trial of Strength » by Fred K. Prieberg. These revisionist works not only contest the widely accepted perception of the place of artists and arts in the 3rd « Reich » , they express a healthy striving for a more factual and objective understanding of the reality of National-Socialist Germany.

Prieberg's « Trial of Strength » concentrates almost entirely on Furtwängler's intricate dealings with Gœbbels, Göring, Hitler and various other figures in the cultural life of the 3rd « Reich » . In so doing, he demonstrates that, in spite of official measures to coordinate the arts, the regime also permitted a surprising degree of artistic freedom. Even the anti-Jewish racial laws and regulations were not always applied with rigour, and exceptions were frequent. (Among many instances that could be cited, Leo Blech retained his conducting post until 1937, in spite of his Jewish ancestry.) Furtwängler exploited this situation to intervene successfully in a number of cases on behalf of artists, including Jews, who were out of favor with the regime. He also championed Paul Hindemith, a modern composer whose music was regarded as degenerate.

The artists and musicians who left the country (especially, the Jewish ones) contended that without them, Germany's cultural life would collapse. High-culture, they and other critics of Adolf Hitler and his regime arrogantly believed, would wither in an ardently nationalist and authoritarian State. As Prieberg notes :

« The musicians who emigrated or were thrown-out of Germany from 1933 onwards indeed felt they were irreplaceable and in, consequence, believed firmly that Hitler's Germany would, following their departure, become a dreary and empty cultural wasteland. This would inevitably cause the rapid collapse of the regime. »

Time would prove the critics wrong. While it is true that the departure of such artists as Fritz Busch and Bruno Walter did hurt initially (and dealt a blow to German prestige) , the nation's most renowned musicians (including

Richard Strauß, Carl Orff, Karl Böhm, Hans Pfitzner, Wilhelm Kempff, Elizabeth Schwarzkopf, Herbert von Karajan, Anton von Webern, as well as Furtwängler) remained to produce musical art of the highest standards. Regardless of the emigration of a number of Jewish and a few non Jewish artists, as well as the promulgation of sweeping anti-Jewish restrictions, Germany's cultural life not only continued at a high-level, it flourished.

The National-Socialists regarded art, and especially music, as an expression of a society's soul, character and ideals. A widespread appreciation of Germany's cultural achievements, they believed, encouraged a joyful national pride and fostered a healthy sense of national unity and mission. Because they regarded themselves as guardians of their nation's cultural heritage, they opposed Liberal, modernistic trends in music and the other arts, as degenerate assaults against the cultural spiritual traditions of Germany and the West.

Acting swiftly to promote a broad revival of the nation's cultural life, the new National-Socialist government made prodigious efforts to further the arts and, in particular, music. As detailed in 2 recent studies (Michaël Kater's « The Twisted Muse » and Erik Levi's « Music in the 3rd “ Reich ” ») , not only did the new leadership greatly increase State funding for such important cultural institutions as the Berlin Philharmonic and the Bayreuth Wagner Festival, it used radio, recordings and other means to make Germany's musical heritage as accessible as possible to all its citizens.

As part of its efforts to bring art to the people, it strove to erase Classical music's snobbish and class image, and to make it widely familiar and enjoyable, especially to the working-class. At the same time, the new regime's leaders were mindful of popular musical tastes. Thus, by far most of the music heard during the 3rd « Reich » era, on the radio or in films, was neither Classical nor even traditional. Light music with catchy tunes (similar to those popular with listeners elsewhere in Europe and in the United States) predominated on radio and in motion pictures, especially during the War years.

The person primarily responsible for implementing the new cultural policies was Josef Gœbbels. In his positions as Propaganda Minister and head of the « Reich » Culture Chamber, the umbrella association for professionals in cultural life, he promoted music, literature, painting and film in keeping with German values and traditions while, at the same time, consistent with popular tastes.

Hitler's Attitude

No political leader had a keener interest in art, or was a more enthusiastic booster of his nation's musical heritage than Adolf Hitler, who regarded the compositions of Beethoven, Wagner, Bruckner and the other German Masters as sublime expressions of the Germanic soul.

Hitler's reputation as a bitter, 2nd rate failed artist is undeserved. As John Lukacs acknowledges in his recently published work, « The Hitler of History » (pages 70-72) , the German leader was a man of real artistic talent and considerable artistic discernment.

We, perhaps, can never fully understand Hitler and the spirit behind his political movement without knowing that he drew great inspiration from, and identified with, the heroic figures of European legend who fought to liberate their peoples from tyranny, and whose stories are immortalized in the great musical dramas of Wagner and others.

This was vividly brought out by August Kubizek, Hitler's closest friend as a teenager and young man, in his post-War memoir (published in the United States under the title « The Young Hitler I Knew ») . Kubizek describes how, after the 2 young men together attended for the 1st time a performance in Linz of Wagner's Opera « Rienzi » , Hitler spoke passionately, and at length, about how this work's inspiring story of a popular Roman tribune had so deeply moved him. Years later, after he had become Chancellor, he related to Kubizek how that performance of « Rienzi » had radically changed his life.

« In that hour, it began. » , he confided.

Hitler, of course, recognized Furtwängler's greatness and understood his significance for Germany and German music. Thus, when other officials (including Heinrich Himmler) complained of the conductor's non conformity, Hitler overrode their objections. Until the end, Furtwängler remained his favourite conductor. He was similarly indulgent toward his favourite « Heldentenor » , Max Lorenz, and Wagnerian soprano Frida Leider, each of whom was married to a Jew. Their cultural importance trumped racial or political considerations.

Post-War Humiliations

A year and a half after the end of the War in Europe, Furtwängler was brought before a humiliating denazification tribunal. Staged by American occupation authorities and headed by a Communist, it was a farce. So much vital information was withheld from both the tribunal and the defendant that, Shirakawa suggests, the occupation authorities may well have been determined to get the conductor.

In his closing remarks at the hearing, Furtwängler defiantly defended his record :

« The fear of being misused for propaganda purposes was wiped-out by the greater concern for preserving German music, as far as was possible. I could not leave Germany in her deepest misery. To get-out would have been a shameful flight. After all, I am a German, whatever may be thought of that abroad, and I do not regret having done it for the German people. »

Even with a prejudiced judge and serious gaps in the record, the tribunal was still unable to establish a credible case against the conductor, and he was, in effect, cleared.

A short time later, Furtwängler was invited to assume direction of the Chicago Symphony. (He was no stranger to the United States : in 1927-1929, he had served as visiting conductor of the New York Philharmonic.)

On learning of the invitation, America's Jewish cultural establishment launched an intense campaign (spear-headed by «

The New York Times » , musicians Arthur Rubinstein and Vladimir Horowitz, and New York critic Ira Hirschmann) to scuttle Furtwängler's appointment. As described in detail by Shirakawa and writer Daniel Gillis (in « Furtwängler and America ») the campaigners used falsehoods, innuendos and even death threats.

Typical of its emotionally charged rhetoric was the bitter reproach of Chicago Rabbi, Morton Berman :

« Furtwängler preferred to swear fealty to Hitler. He accepted at Hitler's hands his re-appointment as director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. He was unflinching in his service to Goebbels' ministry of culture and propaganda. The token saving of a few Jewish lives does not excuse Mister Furtwängler from official, active participation in a regime which murdered 6 million Jews and millions of non Jews. Furtwängler is a symbol of all those hateful things for the defeat of which the youth of our city and nation paid an ineffable price.

Among prominent Jews in Classical music, only the famous violinist Yehudi Menuhin defended the German artist. After Furtwängler was finally obliged to withdraw his name from consideration for the Chicago post, a disillusioned Moshe Menuhin, Yehudi's father, scathingly denounced his co-religionists. Furtwängler, he declared :

« I was a victim of envious and jealous rivals who had to resort to publicity, to smear, to calumny, in order to keep him out of America so it could remain their private bailiwick. He was the victim of the small fry and puny souls among concert artists, who, in order to get a bit of national publicity, joined the band-wagon of professional idealists, the professional Jews and hired hands who irresponsibly assaulted an innocent and humane and broad-minded man. »

A Double Standard

3rd « Reich » Germany is so routinely demonized in our society that any acknowledgment of its cultural achievements is regarded as tantamount to defending Fascism and that most unpardonable of sins, anti-Semitism. But as Professor John London suggests (in an essay in « The Jewish Quarterly » entitled « Why Bother about Fascist Culture ? » , Autumn 1995) , this simplistic attitude can present awkward problems :

« Far from being a totally ugly, unpopular, destructive entity, culture under Fascism was sometimes accomplished, indeed beautiful. If you admit the presence and, in some instances, the richness of a culture produced under fascist regimes, then, you are not defending their ethos. On the other hand, once you start dismissing elements, where do you stop ? »

In this regard, is it worth comparing the way that many media and cultural leaders treat artists of National-Socialist Germany with their treatment of the artists of Soviet Russia. Whereas Furtwängler and other artists, who performed in Germany during the Hitler era, are castigated for their cooperation with the regime, Soviet era musicians, such as composers Aram Khachaturian and Sergei Prokofiev, and conductors Evgeny Svetlanov and Evgeny Mravinsky (all of whom toadied to the Communist regime in varying degrees) are rarely, if ever, chastised for their collaboration. The double standard that is clearly at work here is, of course, a reflection of our society's obligatory concern for Jewish sensitivities.

The artist and his work occupy a unique place in society and history. Although great art can never be entirely divorced from its political or social environment, it must be considered apart from that. In short, art transcends politics.

No reasonable person would denigrate the artists and sculptors of ancient Greece because they glorified a society that, by today's standards, was hardly democratic. Similarly, no one belittles the builders of medieval Europe's great cathedrals on the grounds that the social order of the Middle-Ages was dogmatic and hierarchical. No cultured person would disparage William Shakespeare because he flourished during England's fervently nationalistic and anti-Jewish Elizabethan age. Nor does anyone chastise the magnificent composers of Russia's Tsarist era because they prospered under an autocratic regime. In truth, mankind's greatest cultural achievements have most often been the products not of liberal or egalitarian societies, but rather of quite un-democratic ones.

A close look at the life and career of Wilhelm Furtwängler reveals politically incorrect facts about the role of art and artists in 3rd « Reich » Germany, and reminds us that great artistic creativity and achievement are, by no means, the exclusive products of democratic societies.

A Note on War-time Recordings

Among the most historically fascinating and sought after recordings of Wilhelm Furtwängler performances are his live War-time concerts with the Berlin and Vienna Philharmonic Orchestras. Many were recorded by the « Reich » Broadcasting Company on magnetophonic tape with comparatively good sound quality. « Music & Arts » (Berkeley, California) and « Tahra » (France) have specialized in releasing good quality CD recordings of these performances. Among the most noteworthy are :

Beethoven, 3rd « Eroica » Symphony (1944) : « Tahra » 1031 ; or, « Music & Arts » , CD : 814.

Beethoven, 5th Symphony (1943) : « Tahra » set 1032 / 33, which also includes Furtwängler's performances of this same Symphony, from 1937 and 1954.

Beethoven, 9th Choral Symphony (1942) : « Music & Arts » , CD : 653 ; or, « Tahra » 1004 / 7.

Brahms, 4 Symphonies : « Music & Arts » set CD : 941 (includes 2 x January 1945 performances, Furtwängler's last during the War) .

Bruckner, 5th Symphony (1942) : « Music & Arts » , CD : 538.

Bruckner, 9th Symphony (1944) : « Music & Arts » , CD : 730 (also available in Europe on « Deutsche Gramophon » CD, and in the United States, as an import item) .

Richard Strauß, « Don Juan » (1942) , and the « 4 Last Songs » , with Peter Anders (1942) : « Music & Arts » , CD : 829.

Wagner, « Die Meistersinger » : Act I, Prelude (1943) , and « Tristan und Isolde » : Prelude and « Liebestod » (1942) : « Music & Arts » , CD : 794.

Wagner, « Der Ring des Nibelungen » , excerpts from « Die Walküre » and « Götterdämmerung » : « Music & Arts » set, CD : 1035 (although not from the War years, these 1937 Covent Garden performances are legendary) .

« Great Conductors of the 3rd “ Reich ” : Art in the Service of Evil » is a worthwhile 53 minute VHS video-cassette produced by the « Bel Canto » Society (New York) . Released in 1997, it is distributed by « Allegro » (Portland, Oregon) . It features footage of Furtwängler conducting Beethoven's 9th Symphony for Hitler's birthday celebration, in April 1942. He is also shown conducting at Bayreuth, and leading a concert for wounded soldiers and workers at an AEG factory during the War. Although the notes are highly-tendentious, the rare film footage is fascinating.

...

The German conductor and composer Wilhelm Furtwängler was born on 25 January 1886 and died on 30 November 1954. He is considered to be one of the greatest Symphonic and Operatic conductors of the 20th Century.

Furtwängler was principal conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic, between 1922 and 1945, and from 1952 until 1954. He was also principal conductor of the « Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchester » (1922-1926) , and was a guest-conductor of other major Orchestras including the Vienna Philharmonic.

He was the leading conductor to remain in Germany during the Second World War, although he was not an adherent to the Nazi regime. This decision caused lasting controversy, and the extent to which his presence lent prestige to the 3rd « Reich » is still debated.

Furtwängler's conducting is well-documented in commercial and broadcast recordings and has contributed to his lasting reputation. He had a major influence on many later conductors, and his name is often mentioned when discussing their interpretive styles.

Gustav Heinrich Ernst Martin Wilhelm Furtwängler was born in Schöneberg (now, a locality of Berlin) into a prominent family. His father Adolf was an archaeologist, his mother a painter. Most of his childhood was spent in Munich, where his father taught at the city's Ludwig Maximilian University. He was given a musical education from an early age, and developed an early love of Ludwig van Beethoven, a composer with whose works he remained closely associated throughout his life.

Although Furtwängler achieved fame chiefly from his conducting, he regarded himself foremost as a composer. He began conducting, in order to perform his own works. By the age of 20, he had composed several works. However, they

were not well-received, and that, combined with the financial insecurity of a career as a composer, led him to concentrate on conducting. He made his conducting debut with the Kaim Orchestra (now, the Munich Philharmonic) in Anton Bruckner's 9th Symphony. He subsequently held conducting posts at Munich, Strasbourg, Lübeck, Mannheim, Frankfurt, and Vienna.

Furtwängler succeeded Artur Bodanzky as principal conductor of the Mannheim Opera and Music Academy, in 1915, remaining until 1920. As a boy, he had sometimes stayed with his grandmother in Mannheim. Through her family, he met the Geissmars, a Jewish family who were leading lawyers and amateur musicians in the town. Berta Geißmar wrote :

« Furtwängler became so good at skiing as to attain almost professional skill. Almost every sport appealed to him : he loved tennis, sailing and swimming. He was a good horseman. »

She also reports that he was a strong mountain climber and hiker.

Berta Geißmar subsequently became his secretary and business manager, in Mannheim and later in Berlin, until she was forced to leave Germany in 1934. From 1921 onwards, Furtwängler shared holidays in the Engadin with Berta and her mother. In 1924, he bought a house there. After he married, the house was open to a wide circle of friends.

In 1920, he was appointed conductor of the « Berlin Staatskapelle » succeeding Richard Strauß. In January 1922, following the sudden death of Arthur Nikisch, he was appointed to the « Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchester » . Shortly afterwards, he was appointed to the prestigious Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, again in succession to Nikisch. Furtwängler made his London debut, in 1924, and continued to appear there as late as 1938, when he conducted Richard Wagner's « Ring » . In 1925, he appeared as guest-conductor of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, making return visits in the following 2 years.

In January 1945, Furtwängler fled to Switzerland. It was during this period that he completed what is considered his most significant composition, the Symphony No. 2 in E minor. It was given its premiere, in 1948, by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra under Furtwängler's direction and was recorded for « Deutsche Grammophon » .

Following the War, he resumed performing and recording, and remained a popular conductor in Europe, although his actions in the 1930's and 1940's were a subject of ongoing criticism. He died in 1954, in Ebersteinburg, close to Baden-Baden. He is buried in the Heidelberg « Bergfriedhof » .

Furtwängler's relationship with and attitudes towards Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party were a matter of much controversy.

Furtwängler was very critical of Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany, and was convinced that Hitler would not stay in power for long. He had said of Hitler, in 1932 :

« This hissing street pedlar will never get anywhere in Germany. »

As the anti-Semitic policies of the 3rd « Reich » took effect, Jewish musicians were forced-out of work and began to leave Germany. The Nazis were aware that Furtwängler was opposed to the policies and might also decide to go abroad, so the Berlin Philharmonic, which employed many Jews, was exempted from the policies. In 1933, when Bruno Walter was dismissed from his position as principal conductor of the « Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchester » , the Nazis asked Furtwängler to replace him for an international tour. Their goal was to show to the world that Germany did not need Jewish musicians. Furtwängler refused, and it was Richard Strauß who replaced Walter.

On April 10, 1933, Furtwängler wrote a public letter to Goebbels to denounce the new rulers' anti-Semitism :

« Ultimately, there is only one dividing line I recognize : that between good and bad art. However, while the dividing line between Jews and non-Jews is being drawn with a downright merciless theoretical precision, that other dividing line, the one which in the long run is so important for our music life, yes, the decisive dividing line between good and bad, seems to have far too little significance attributed to it. If concerts offer nothing, then, people will not attend ; that is why the QUALITY is not just an idea : it is of vital importance. If the fight against Judaism concentrates on those artists who are themselves rootless and destructive and who seek to succeed in kitsch, sterile virtuosity and the like, then it is quite acceptable ; the fight against these people and the attitude they embody (as, unfortunately, do many non-Jews) cannot be pursued thoroughly or systematically enough. If, however, this campaign is also directed at truly great artists, then it ceases to be in the interests of Germany's cultural life. It must, therefore, be stated that men such as Walter, Klemperer, Reinhardt, etc. must be allowed to exercise their talents in Germany, in the future as well, in exactly the same way as Kreisler, Huberman, Schnabel and other great instrumentalists of the Jewish race. It is only just that, we, Germans should bear in mind that, in the past, we had Joseph Joachim, one of the greatest violinists and teachers in the German Classical tradition and, in Mendelssohn, even a great German composer - for Mendelssohn is a part of Germany's musical history. »

In June 1933, for a text which was to be the basis for a discussion with Goebbels, Furtwängler went further, writing :

« The Jewish question in musical spheres : a race of brilliant people ! »

He threatened that if boycotts against Jews were extended to artistic activities, he would resign all his posts immediately, concluding that :

« At any rate, to continue giving concerts would be quite impossible without the Jews. To remove them would be an operation which would result in the death of the patient. »

Because of his high-profile, Furtwängler's public opposition prompted a mixed reaction from the Nazi leadership. Heinrich Himmler wished to send Furtwängler to a concentration camp. Goebbels and Göring ordered their administration to listen to Furtwängler's requests and to give him the impression that they would do what he asked. This led him to believe that he had some positive influence to stop the racial policy. He subsequently invited several

Jewish and anti-Fascist artists (such as Yehudi Menuhin, Artur Schnabel, and Pablo Casals) to perform, as soloists, in his 1933-1934 season, but they refused to come to Nazi Germany. Furtwängler subsequently invited Jewish musicians from his Orchestra such as Szymon Goldberg to play as soloists.

The « Gestapo » built a case against Furtwängler, noting that he was providing assistance to Jews. Furtwängler gave all his fees to German emigrants during his concerts outside Germany. The German literary scholar Hans Mayer was one of these emigrants. Mayer later observed that, for performances of Wagner Operas in Paris, prior to the War, Furtwängler cast only German emigrants (Jews or political opponents to the 3rd « Reich ») to sing. Georg Gerullis, a director at the Ministry of Culture, remarked in a letter to Goebbels :

« Can you name me a Jew on whose behalf Furtwängler has not intervened ? »

Furtwängler never joined the Nazi Party. He refused to give the Nazi salute, to conduct the « Horst-Wessel-Lied » , or to sign his letters with « Heil Hitler » , even those he wrote to Hitler. However, Furtwängler was appointed as the first vice-President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » and « Staatsrat » of Prussia, and accepted these honorary positions to try to bend the racial policy of Nazis in music and to support Jewish musicians. For concerts in London and Paris before the War, Furtwängler refused to conduct the Nazi anthems or to play music in halls adorned with swastikas. During the Universal Exposition held in Paris, in 1937, a picture of the German delegation was taken in front of the « Arc de Triomphe » . In the picture, Furtwängler is the only German not giving the Nazi salute. This picture was suppressed at the time.

In 1933, Furtwängler met with Hitler to try to stop the new anti-Semitic policy in the domain of music. He had prepared a list of significant Jewish musicians : these included the composer Arnold Schönberg, the musicologist Curt Sachs, the violinist Carl Flesch, and Jewish members of the Berlin Philharmonic. Hitler did not listen to Furtwängler, who lost patience, and the meeting became a shouting match. Berta Geißmar wrote :

« After the audience, he told me that he knew now what was behind Hitler's narrow-minded measures. This is not only anti-Semitism, but the rejection of any form of artistic, philosophical thought, the rejection of any form of free culture. »

On April 26, 1933, Furtwängler and the Berlin Philharmonic performed a joint concert in Mannheim with the local Orchestra to mark the 50th anniversary of Wagner's death and to raise money for the Mannheim Orchestra. The concert had been organized before the Nazis came to power. The Nazified Mannheim Orchestra Committee demanded that the Jewish leader of the Berlin Orchestra, Szymon Goldberg, give way to the leader of the Mannheim Orchestra for the evening. Furtwängler refused, and the concert took place as planned. Before the banquet organized for the evening, members of the Mannheim Orchestra Committee came to remonstrate with Furtwängler, accusing him of « a lack of national sentiment » . Furtwängler furiously left before the banquet to rejoin Berta Geißmar and her mother. The fact that Furtwängler had preferred to spend the evening with his « Jewish friends » rather than with Nazi authorities caused a controversy. He subsequently refused to conduct again in Mannheim, only returning 21 years later, in 1954.

In 1934, Furtwängler publicly described Hitler as an « enemy of the human race » and the political situation in Germany as a « Schweinerei » (pigsty) .

On November 25, 1934, he wrote a letter in the « Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung », entitled « Der Fall Hindemith » (The Hindemith Case) , in support of the composer Paul Hindemith. Hindemith had been labelled a degenerate artist by the Nazis. Furtwängler also conducted a piece of Hindemith's, « Mathis der Maler » although the work had been banned by the Nazis. The concert received enormous acclaim and unleashed a political storm. The Nazis (especially, Alfred Rosenberg, the Nazi Party's chief racial theorist) formed a violent conspiracy against the conductor, who resigned from his official positions, including his titles as vice-President of the « Reichsmusikkammer » and of « Staatsrat » of Prussia. His resignation from the latter position was refused by Hermann Göring. He was also forced by Josef Goebbels to give-up all his artistic positions.

Furtwängler decided to leave Germany, but the Nazis prevented him. They seized the opportunity to « aryanize » the Orchestra and its administrative staff. Most of the Jewish musicians of the Orchestra had already left the country and found positions outside Germany, with Furtwängler's assistance.

The main target of the Nazis was Berta Geißmar. She was so close to the conductor that she wrote in her book about Furtwängler that the Nazis had begun an investigation to know if she was his mistress. After having harassed her for a period of 2 years, she moved to London when she became Sir Thomas Beecham's main assistant. In the book, she wrote on Furtwängler in England, in 1943, she said :

« Furtwängler, although he had decided to remain in Germany, was certainly no Nazi. He had a private telephone line to me which was not connected via the exchange. Before going to bed, he used to chat with me over telephone. Sometimes, I told him amusing stories to cheer him up, sometimes we talked about politics. One of the main threats the Nazis used against Furtwängler, and myself later on, was the assertion that they had recorded all these conversations. I should not have thought that it was possible ! Was there enough shellac ? If the Nazis really did this, their ears must certainly have burnt, and it was not surprising that Furtwängler was eventually put on their black-list, let alone myself.

Goebbels refused to meet Furtwängler to clarify his situation for several months. During the same period, many members of the Orchestra and of his public were begging him not to emigrate and desert them. In addition, Goebbels sent him a clear signal that if he left Germany he would never be allowed back, frightening him with the prospect of permanent separation from his mother (to whom he was very close) and his children. Furtwängler considered himself responsible for the Berlin Philharmonic and for his family, and decided to stay.

On February 28, 1935, Furtwängler met Goebbels, who wanted to keep Furtwängler in Germany, since he considered him, like Richard Strauß and Hans Pfitzner, a « national treasure » . Goebbels asked him to pledge allegiance publicly to the new regime. Furtwängler refused. Goebbels then proposed that Furtwängler acknowledge publicly that Hitler was in charge of cultural policy. Furtwängler accepted : Hitler was a dictator and controlled everything in the country. But he added that it must be clear that he wanted nothing to do with the policy and that he would remain as a non-

political artist, without any official position. The agreement was reached. Goebbels made an announcement declaring that Furtwängler's article on Hindemith was not political : Furtwängler had spoken only from an artistic point of view, and it was Hitler who was in charge of the cultural policy in Germany.

Goebbels did not reveal the 2nd part of the deal. However, the agreement between was largely respected. At his subsequent denazification trial, Furtwängler was charged with conducting only 2 official concerts for the period 1933-1945. Furtwängler appeared in only 2 short propaganda films.

Other Nazi leaders were not satisfied with the compromise, since they believed that Furtwängler had not capitulated : Rosenberg demanded, in vain, that Furtwängler apologise to the regime. Goebbels, who wanted to keep Furtwängler in Germany, wrote in his diary that he was satisfied with the deal and laughed at « the incredible naïvety of artists » .

Hitler now allowed him to have a new passport. When they met again, in April, Hitler attacked Furtwängler for his support of modern music, and made him withdraw from regular conducting for the time being, save for his scheduled appearance at Bayreuth. However, Hitler confirmed that Furtwängler would not be given any official titles, and would be treated as a private individual. But Hitler refused Furtwängler's request to announce this, saying that it would be harmful for the « prestige of the State » .

Furtwängler resumed conducting. On April 25, 1935, he returned to the Berlin Philharmonic with a program dedicated to Beethoven. The concert was a huge success, since a large part of the public had boycotted the Orchestra during his absence. He was called out 17 times. On May 3, in his dressing-room before conducting the same program, he was informed that Hitler and his entire staff would attend the concert. He was given the order to welcome Hitler with the Nazi salute. Furtwängler was so furious that he ripped the wooden panelling off a radiator. Franz Jastrau, the manager of the Orchestra, suggested that he keep his baton in his right-hand all the time. When he entered the hall, all the Nazi leaders were present making the Hitler salute, but Furtwängler kept hold of his baton and began the concert immediately. Hitler probably could not have imagined that such an affront was possible but decided to put-up a good show : he sat down and the concert went on.

At the end of the concert, Furtwängler continued to keep his baton in his right-hand. Hitler understood the situation and jumped-up and demonstratively held-out his right-hand to him. The same situation occurred during another concert, later on, when a photographer had been mobilized by the Nazis for the occasion : the photo of the famous hand-shake between Furtwängler and Hitler was distributed everywhere by Goebbels. Goebbels had obtained what he desired : to keep Furtwängler in Germany and to give the impression to those who were not well-informed (especially, outside the country) that Furtwängler was now a supporter of the regime.

Furtwängler wrote in his diary, in 1935, that there was a complete contradiction between the racial ideology of the Nazis and the true German culture, the one of Schiller, Goethe and Beethoven. He added in 1936 :

« Living today is more than ever a question of courage. »

On September 1935, the baritone Oskar Jölli, a member of the Nazi Party, reported to the « Gestapo » that Furtwängler had said :

« Those in power should all be shot, and things in Germany would not change until this was done. »

Hitler forbade him to conduct for several months, until Furtwängler's 50th birthday, in January 1936. Hitler and Goebbels allowed him to conduct again and offered him presents : Hitler, an annual pension of 40,000 « Reichsmarks » ; and Goebbels, an ornate baton made of gold and ivory. Furtwängler refused them.

Furtwängler was offered the principal conductor's post at the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, which was then the most desirable and best paid position in international musical life. He was to have followed Arturo Toscanini, who had declared that Furtwängler was the only man to succeed him. Furtwängler accepted the post, but his telephone conversations were recorded by the « Gestapo » .

While Furtwängler was travelling, the Berlin branch of the Associated Press leaked a news story on Hermann Göring's orders. It suggested Furtwängler would probably be re-appointed as director of the Berlin State Opera and of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. This caused the mood in New York to turn against him : it seemed that Furtwängler was now a supporter of the Nazi Party. On reading the American press reaction, Furtwängler chose not to accept the position in New York. Nor did he accept any position at the Berlin Opera.

Furtwängler conducted at the Bayreuth Festival, in 1936, for the 1st time since 1931, in spite of his poor relationship with Winifred Wagner. Hitler and Goebbels attended the Festival and attempted to force him to accept an official position. Friedelind Wagner, the composer's anti-Nazi granddaughter, witnessed a meeting between Hitler and Furtwängler at her mother's Bayreuth home :

« I remember Hitler turning to Furtwängler and telling him that he would now have to allow himself to be used by the Party for propaganda purposes, and I remember that Furtwängler refused categorically. Hitler flew into a fury and told Furtwängler that, in that case, there would be a concentration camp ready for him. Furtwängler quietly replied :“ In that case, ' Herr Reichschancellor ' , at least, I will be in very good company. ” » Hitler couldn't even answer, and vanished from the room.

Furtwängler avoided the 1936 Summer Olympics in Berlin, and cancelled all his public engagements during the following winter season, in order to compose. He returned to the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1937, performing with them in London for the coronation of George VI and, in Paris, for the Universal Exposition, where he, again, refused to conduct the « Horst-Wessel-Lied » , or to attend the political speeches of German officials.

The Salzburg Festival was considered to be a Festival of the « free world » and a centre for anti-Fascist artists. Hitler had forbidden all German musicians from performing there. In 1937, Furtwängler was asked to conduct Beethoven's 9th Symphony, in Salzburg. Despite strong opposition from Hitler and Goebbels, he accepted the invitation.

Arturo Toscanini, a prominent anti-Fascist, was furious to learn that Furtwängler would be at the Festival. He accepted his engagement in Salzburg, on the condition that he would not have to meet Furtwängler. But the 2 did meet, and argued over Furtwängler's actions. Toscanini argued :

« I know quite well that you are not a member of the Party. I am also aware that you have helped your Jewish friends. But everyone who conducts in the 3rd " Reich " is a Nazi ! »

Furtwängler emphatically denied this and said :

« By that, you imply that art and music are merely propaganda, a false front, as it were, for any Government which happens to be in power. If a Nazi Government is in power, then, as a conductor, I am a Nazi ; under the communists, I would be a Communist ; under the democrats, a Democrat. No, a thousand times no ! Music belongs to a different world, and is above chance political events. »

Toscanini disagreed and that ended the discussion.

Furtwängler returned to the Bayreuth Festival, his relationship with Winifred Wagner worse than ever. He did not appear again in Bayreuth, until 1943. He wrote a letter to Winifred Wagner, sending copies to Hitler, Göring and Goebbels, accusing her of having betrayed Wagner's heritage by applying racial and not artistic rules in the choice of the artists, and of putting her « trust in the powers of an authoritarian State » . This clear attack on Hitler caused a sharp reaction : Hitler wanted to drop Furtwängler from Bayreuth after all. In the event, Furtwängler did conduct. Goebbels wrote in 2 entries of his diary, in 1937, that Furtwängler was constantly helping Jews, « half-Jews » and « his small Hindemith » .

According to the historian Fred K. Prieberg, by the end of 1937, nobody who was correctly informed could accuse Furtwängler of working for the Nazis. For the Nazi leadership, especially for Hitler, it became necessary to prove to him that he was not irreplaceable.

The Nazi leaders searched for another conductor to counter-balance Furtwängler. A young, gifted Austrian conductor now appeared in the 3rd « Reich » : Herbert von Karajan. Karajan had joined the Nazi Party early and was much more willing to participate in the propaganda of the new regime than Furtwängler.

Furtwängler had attended several of his concerts, praising his technical gifts but criticizing his conducting style ; he did not consider him a serious competitor. However, when Karajan conducted « Fidelio » and « Tristan und Isolde » in Berlin on the 30th. In late 1938, Göring decided to take the initiative. The music-critic Edwin von der Nüll wrote a review of these concerts with the support of Göring. Its title, « The Karajan Miracle » , was a reference to the famous article « The Furtwängler Miracle » that had made Furtwängler famous as a young conductor in Mannheim. Von der Nüll championed Karajan saying :

« A 30 year old man creates a performance for which our great 50 year olds can justifiably envy him. »

(Furtwängler's photo was printed next to the article, making the reference clear.)

The article was part of a broader attack made against Furtwängler. The Nazi press criticized him of being « a man of the 19th Century » whose political ideas were obsolete and who did not understand and accept the new changes in Germany. The situation became intolerable for Furtwängler. He obtained from Goebbels an undertaking that this bashing would be stopped.

However, Furtwängler's position was weakened : he knew that, if he left Germany, Karajan would immediately become the conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic. It was the beginning of an obsessive hate and contempt for Karajan that never left him until his death. He often refused to call Karajan by his name, calling him simply « Herr K » . Hitler's opinion was that, even if Furtwängler was infinitely better than Karajan as a conductor, it was necessary to keep Karajan « in reserve » since Furtwängler was « not politically trustworthy » .

Furtwängler was very affected by the events of the « Kristallnacht » . Berta Geißmar, who met him in Paris, described him as « greatly depressed » . Friedelind Wagner, who saw him also in Paris, wrote that he was a « very unhappy man » . Andrew Schulhof, who met him in Budapest, said that :

« He had the impression that what he had done before for his Jewish friends had been lost. »

Furtwängler approved of the « Anschluß » that had occurred on 12 March 1938. But he quickly disagreed with the Nazi leaders' decision to « annex Austrian culture » by abolishing independent cultural activity in Austria and subordinating it to Berlin. Just after the « Anschluß » , Furtwängler discovered that a huge Swastika flag was displayed in the hall of the « Musikverein » . He refused to conduct the Vienna Philharmonic « as long as the rag is visible » . The flag was finally removed.

Goebbels wanted to eliminate the Vienna Philharmonic and to convert the Vienna Opera and the Salzburg Festival into branches of the Berlin Opera and the Bayreuth Festival, respectively. In addition, he wished to confiscate the largest musical collection in the world, belonging to the « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » , in Vienna, and to move it to Berlin. Hitler's goal was to deny that Austria had developed its own culture independently of Germany. Austrian musical circles asked Furtwängler, who was the honorary president of the Vienna « Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde » , to help them.

Furtwängler campaigned to convince Nazi leaders to abandon their plans. According to historian Fred K. Prieberg, he conducted concerts (often with the Vienna Philharmonic) in the presence of German leaders during this period, in exchange for the conservation of the Orchestra. He organized several concerts of Austrian music, in Berlin and Vienna, for Hitler, to highlight Austrian culture. The Nazi leadership, who wanted to take advantage of this situation, invited Furtwängler, in 1938, to conduct « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » with the Vienna Philharmonic, in Nürnberg, for the Nazi Party congress. Furtwängler accepted to conduct, as long as the performance was not during the Party congress. Hitler eventually accepted Furtwängler's conditions : the concert took place on 5 September and the political

event was formally opened the following morning. This concert, along with one given in Berlin, in 1942, for Hitler's birthday, led to heavy criticism of Furtwängler after the War. However, Furtwängler had managed not to participate in the Party congress. He had also succeeded in conserving the Vienna Philharmonic, and the musical collections of Vienna and the Vienna Opera, where he persuaded Hitler and Goebbels to agree to the appointment of Karl Böhm as artistic director. At the Vienna Philharmonic, as at the Berlin Philharmonic, Furtwängler succeeded in protecting « half-Jews » or members with « non-Aryan » wives until the end of the War (these were exceptional cases in Germany, during the Nazi period) . However, in contrast to his experience with the Berlin Philharmonic, he could not save the lives of « full-blooded » Jews : they were persecuted, with a number dying in concentration camps.

Goebbels was satisfied that Furtwängler had conducted the concerts in Vienna, Prague and Nürnberg, thinking that these concerts gave a « cultural » justification to the annexation of Austria and Czechoslovakia. During this period, he said that Furtwängler was « willing to place himself at my disposal for any of my activities » , describing him as « an out-and-out chauvinist » . However, he regularly complained that Furtwängler was helping Jews and « half-Jews » , and his complaints continued during the War. Goebbels wrote in his diary that Furtwängler's goal was to by-pass Nazi cultural policy. For instance, Goebbels wrote that Furtwängler supported the Salzburg Festival to counter-balance the Bayreuth Festival, a keystone of the Nazi regime.

Furtwängler was very affected by the events of the 1930's. Fred K. Prieberg describes Furtwängler, in 1939, as a « broken man » . The French government awarded him the Legion of Honour, in 1939, which may support the theory that western diplomatic services knew Furtwängler was not a supporter of the Nazi regime. Hitler forbade news of the award to be spread in Germany.

During the War, Furtwängler tried to avoid conducting in occupied Europe. He said :

« I will never play in a country such as France, which I am so much attached to, considering myself a “ vanquisher ”. I will conduct there, again, only when the country has been liberated. »

He refused to go to France during its occupation, although the Nazis tried to force him to conduct there. Since he had said that he would conduct there, only at the invitation of the French, Goebbels forced the French conductor Charles Munch to send him a personal invitation. But Munch wrote, in small characters, at the bottom of his letter : « in agreement with the German occupation authorities » . Furtwängler declined the invitation.

Furtwängler did conduct in Prague, in November 1940 and March 1944. The 1940 program, chosen by Furtwängler, included Smetana's « Moldau » . According to Prieberg :

« This piece is part of the cycle in which the Czech Master celebrated “ Má vlast ” (My Country) , and was intended to support his compatriots' fight for the independence from Austrian domination. When Furtwängler began with the “ Moldau ” , it was not a deliberate risk, but a statement of his stance towards the oppressed Czechs. »

The 1944 concert marked the 5th anniversary of the German occupation and was the result of a deal between

Furtwängler and Gœbbels : Furtwängler did not want to perform, in April, for Hitler's birthday in Berlin. He said to Gœbbels, in March (as he had in April 1943) , that he was sick. Gœbbels asked him to perform in Prague instead, where he conducted the Symphony No. 9 of Antonín Dvořák. He conducted in Oslo, in 1943, where he helped the Jewish conductor Issay Dobrowen to flee to Sweden.

Furtwängler conducted in Denmark and in unoccupied countries such as Sweden and Switzerland. His concerts were often broadcast to German troops to raise morale, though he was limited in what he was allowed to perform. He later said that he had tried to protect German culture from the Nazis. It is now known that he continued to use his influence to help Jewish musicians and non-musicians escape the 3rd « Reich » . He managed to have Max Zweig, a nephew of conductor Fritz Zweig, released from Dachau concentration camp. Others, from an extensive list of Jews he helped, included Carl Flesch, Josef Krips and the composer Arnold Schönberg.

Furtwängler refused to participate in the propaganda film « Philharmoniker » . Gœbbels wanted Furtwängler as to feature in it, but Furtwängler declined to take part. The film was finished in December 1943 showing many conductors connected with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, including Eugen Jochum, Karl Böhm, Hans Knappertsbusch, and Richard Strauß, but not Furtwängler. Gœbbels also asked Furtwängler to direct the music in a film about Beethoven, again for propaganda purposes. They quarrelled violently about this project. Furtwängler told him :

« You are wrong, Herr Minister, if you think you can exploit Beethoven in a film. »

Gœbbels gave-up his plans for the film.

In April 1944, Gœbbels wrote :

« Furtwängler has never been a National-Socialist. Nor has he ever made any bones about it. Which Jews and emigrants thought was sufficient to consider him as one of them, a key representative of so-called “ inner emigration ”. Furtwängler stance towards us has not changed in the least. »

Friedelind Wagner (an outspoken opponent of the 3rd « Reich ») reported a conversation with her mother Winifred Wagner during the War, to the effect that Hitler did not trust or like Furtwängler, and that Göring and Gœbbels were upset with Furtwängler's continuous support for his « undesirable friends » . Yet, Hitler, in gratitude for Furtwängler's refusal to leave Berlin even when it was being bombed, ordered Albert Speer to build a special air raid shelter for the conductor and his family. Furtwängler refused it, but the shelter was nevertheless built in the house against his will. Speer related that, in December 1944, Furtwängler asked whether Germany had any chance of winning the War. Speer replied in the negative, and advised him to flee to Switzerland from possible Nazi retribution. In 1944, he was the only prominent German artist who refused to sign the brochure « We Stand and Fall with Adolf Hitler » .

Furtwängler's name was included on the « Gottbegnadeten » list (God-gifted List) of September 1944, but was removed on December 7, 1944, because of his relationships with German Resistance. Furtwängler had strong links to the German resistance which organized the 20th « July Plot » . He stated during his denazification trial that he knew

an attack was being organized against Hitler, although he did not participate in its organization. He knew Klaus von Stauffenberg very-well and his doctor, Johannes Ludwig Schmitt, who wrote him many false health prescriptions to by-pass official requirements, was a member of the « Kreisau Circle » . Furtwängler's concerts were sometimes chosen by the members of the German resistance as a meeting point. Rudolf Pechel, a member of the Resistance group which organized the 20th « July Plot » said to Furtwängler, after the War :

« In the Circle of our Resistance movement, it was an accepted fact that you were the only one in the whole of our musical world who really resisted, and you were one of us. »

Graf Kaunitz, also a member of that Circle, stated :

« In Furtwängler's concerts, we were one big family of the Resistance. »

« Grove Online » states that Furtwängler was « within a few hours of being arrested » by the « Gestapo » when he fled to Switzerland, following a concert in Vienna with the Vienna Philharmonic on January 28, 1945. The Nazis had begun to crack-down on German Liberals. At the concert, he conducted Brahms's 2nd Symphony, which was recorded and is considered one of his greatest performances.

Furtwängler was required to submit to a process of denazification. He was charged with having conducted 2 Nazi concerts during the period 1933-1945. The 1st was for the « Hitler Youth » , on 3 February 1938. It was presented to Furtwängler as a way to acquaint younger generations with Classical music. According to Fred K. Prieberg :

« When he looked at the audience, he realized that this was more than just a concert for school kids in uniform ; a whole collection of prominent political figures were sitting there, as well, and it was the last time he raised his baton for this purpose. »

The 2nd concert was the performance of Wagner's « Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg » with the Vienna Philharmonic, on 5 September 1938, on the evening before the Nazi Congress, in Nüremberg. Furtwängler had agreed to conduct this concert to help preserve the Vienna Philharmonic and, at his insistence, the concert was not part of the Congress.

He was charged for his honorary title of « Staatsrat » of Prussia (he had resigned from this title, in 1934, but the Nazis had refused his resignation) and with making an anti-Semitic remark against the part-Jewish conductor Victor de Sabata. The chair of the Commission, Alex Vogel, started the trial with the following statement :

« The investigations showed that Furtwängler had not been a member of any Nazi organization, that he tried to help people persecuted because of their race, and that he also avoided formalities such as giving the Hitler salute. »

At the end of the trial, musicians certified that Furtwängler helped many people during Nazi era such as Hugo Strelitzer, who declared :

« If I am alive today, I owe this to this great man. Furtwängler helped and protected a great number of Jewish musicians and this attitude shows a great deal of courage since he did it under the eyes of the Nazis, in Germany itself. History will be his judge. »

As part of his closing remarks at his denazification trial, Furtwängler said :

« I knew Germany was in a terrible crisis ; I felt responsible for German music, and it was my task to survive this crisis, as much as I could. The concern that my art was misused for propaganda had to yield to the greater concern that German music be preserved, that music be given to the German people by its own musicians. These people, the compatriots of Bach and Beethoven, of Mozart and Schubert, still had to go on living under the control of a regime obsessed with Total War. No one who did not live here himself, in those days, can possibly judge what it was like. Does Thomas Mann (who was critical of Furtwängler's actions) really believe that in “ the Germany of Himmler ” one should not be permitted to play Beethoven ? Could he not realize that people never needed more, never yearned more to hear Beethoven and his message of freedom and human love, than precisely these Germans, who had to live under Himmler's terror ? I do not regret having stayed with them. »

He was eventually cleared on all the counts.

The violinist Yehudi Menuhin was, with Arnold Schönberg, Bronisław Huberman and Nathan Milstein, among the Jewish musicians who had a positive view of Furtwängler. In 1933, Menuhin had refused to play with him, but in the late-1940's, after a personal investigation of Furtwängler, he changed his opinion, and performed and recorded alongside him.

Yehudi Menuhin sent a wire to General Robert A. McClure, in February 1946 :

« Unless you have secret incriminating evidence against Furtwängler supporting your accusation that he was a tool of Nazi Party, I beg to take violent issue with your decision to ban him. The man never was a Party member. Upon numerous occasions, he risked his own safety and reputation to protect friends and colleagues. Do not believe that the fact of remaining in one's own country is alone sufficient to condemn a man. On the contrary, as a military man, you would know that remaining at one's post often requires greater courage than running away. He saved, and for that we are deeply his debtors, the best part of his own German culture. I believe it patently unjust and most cowardly for us to make of Furtwängler a scapegoat for our own crimes. If the man is guilty of specific crimes, accuse him and convict him. As far as I can see, it is no punishment to be banned from sordid, filthy Berlin and if the man now old and ill is willing and anxious to return to his exacting task and responsibilities, he should be encouraged for that is where he belongs, right in Berlin. »

In 1949, Furtwängler accepted the position of principal conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. However, the Orchestra was forced to rescind the offer under the threat of a boycott from several prominent musicians including Arturo Toscanini, George Szell, Vladimir Horowitz, Arthur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern and Alexander Brailowsky. According to a « New York Times » report, Horowitz said that he « was prepared to forgive the small fry who had no alternative but

to remain and work in Germany » . But Furtwängler « was out of the country on several occasions and could have elected to keep-out » . Rubinstein, likewise, wrote in a telegram :

« Had Furtwängler been firm in his democratic convictions, he would have left Germany. »

Yehudi Menuhin was upset with this boycott, declaring that some of the main organizers had admitted to him that they had organized it only to eliminate Furtwängler's presence in North America.

British playwright Ronald Harwood's play « Taking Sides » (1995) , set in 1946 in the American zone of occupied Berlin, is about U.S. accusations against Furtwängler of having served the Nazi regime. In 2001, the play was made into a motion picture directed by István Szabó and starring Harvey Keitel and featuring Stellan Skarsgård, in the role of Furtwängler.

Furtwängler is most famous for his performances of Beethoven, Brahms, Bruckner, and Wagner. He was a champion of modern music, notably the works of Paul Hindemith and Arnold Schönberg, and conducted the world-premiere of Sergei Prokofiev's 5th Piano Concerto (with the composer at the piano) on October 31, 1932, as well as performances of Béla Bartók's « Concerto for Orchestra » .

Furtwängler had a unique philosophy of music. He saw Symphonic music as creations of nature that could only be realized subjectively into sound. Composers such as Beethoven, Brahms and Bruckner were central to Furtwängler's repertoire, and he identified them as great forces of nature.

Neville Cardus wrote in the « Manchester Guardian » , in 1954, of Furtwängler's conducting style :

He did not regard the printed notes of the score as a final statement, but rather as so many symbols of an imaginative conception, ever changing and always to be felt and realized subjectively. Not since Nikisch, of whom he was a disciple, has a greater personal interpreter of orchestral and Opera music than Furtwängler been heard. »

And the conductor Henry Lewis :

« I admire Furtwängler for his originality and honesty. He liberated himself from slavery to the score ; he realized that notes printed in the score, are nothing but SYMBOLS. The score is neither the essence nor the spirit of the music. Furtwängler had this very rare and great gift of going beyond the printed score and showing what music really was. »

Many commentators and critics regard him as the greatest conductor in history. In his book on the Symphonies of Johannes Brahms, musicologist Walter Frisch writes that Furtwängler's recordings show him to be « the finest Brahms conductor of his generation, perhaps of all time » , demonstrating « at once, a greater attention to detail and to Brahms' markings than his contemporaries and, at the same time, a larger sense of rhythmic-temporal flow that is never deflected by the individual nuances. He has an ability not only to respect, but to make musical sense of, dynamic markings and the indications of crescendo and diminuendo. What comes through amply is the rare

combination of a conductor who understands both sound and structure. » He notes Vladimir Ashkenazy who says that his sound « is never rough. It's very weighty but, at the same time, is never heavy. In his fortissimo, you always feel every voice. I have never heard so beautiful a fortissimo in an Orchestra » , and Daniel Barenboim says he « had a subtlety of tone color that was extremely rare. His sound was always “ rounded ”, and incomparably more interesting than that of the great German conductors of his generation. »

On the other hand, the critic David Hurwitz, a spokesman for modern literalism and precision, sharply criticizes what he terms « the Furtwängler wackos » who « will forgive him virtually any lapse, no matter how severe » , and characterizes the conductor himself as « occasionally incandescent but criminally sloppy » .

Unlike conductors such as Carlos Kleiber or Sergiù Celibidache, Furtwängler did not try to reach the perfection in details, and the number of rehearsals with him was small. He said :

« I am told that the more you rehearse, the better you play. This is wrong. We often try to reduce the unforeseen to a controllable level, to prevent a sudden impulse that escapes our ability to control, yet, also responds to an obscure desire. Let's allow improvisation to have its place and play its role. I think that the true interpreter is the one who improvises. We have mechanized the art of conducting to an awful degree, in the quest of perfection rather than of dream. As soon as rubato is obtained and calculated scientifically, it ceases to be true. Music-making is something else than searching to achieve an accomplishment. But striving to attain it is beautiful. Some of Michelangelo's sculptures are perfect, others are just outlined and the latter ones move me more than the 1st perfect ones because, here, I find the essence of desire, of the wakening dream. That's what really moves me : fixing without freezing in cement, allowing chance its opportunity. »

His style is often contrasted with that of his contemporary Arturo Toscanini. Instead of perfection in details, Furtwängler was looking for the spiritual in art. Sergiù Celibidache explained :

« Everybody was influenced at the time by Arturo Toscanini - it was easy to understand what he was trying to do : you didn't need any reference to spiritual dimension. There was a certain order in the way the music was presented. With Toscanini, I never felt anything spiritual. With Furtwängler, on the other hand, I understood that, there, I was confronted by something completely different : metaphysics, transcendence, the relationship between sounds and sonorities. Furtwängler was not only a musician, he was a creator. What happens to those who don't understand the manifold variety of musical performance ? Who are unable to hear that famous astral octave because they are deaf to music ? Then, their integration is related only to a part of a musical score, to the least important one, the raw material. But that's precisely what music is not about. Then, you find each tempo too slow. Because the slowness or fastness are determined by the complexity of these musical manifestations. Furtwängler had the ear for it : not the physical ear, but the spiritual ear that captures these parallel movements. »

Conductor and pianist Christoph Eschenbach has said of Furtwängler that he was a « formidable magician, a man capable of setting an entire ensemble of musicians on fire, sending them into a state of ecstasy. »

Furtwängler was famous for his exceptional inarticulacy when speaking about music. His pupil Sergiù Celibidache remembered that the best he could say was, « Well, just listen. ». Carl Brinitzer from the German « BBC » service tried to interview him, and thought he had an imbecile before him. A live recording of a rehearsal with a Stockholm Orchestra documents hardly anything intelligible, only hums and mumbling. On the other hand, a collection of his essays, « On Music », reveals deep thought. Furtwängler remained highly-respected amongst musicians. Even Arturo Toscanini, usually regarded as Furtwängler's complete antithesis (and sharply critical of Furtwängler on political grounds), once said, when asked to name the World's greatest conductor apart from himself : « Furtwängler ! » .

Furtwängler's art of conducting is considered as the synthesis and the peak of the so-called « Germanic school of conducting ». This « school » was initiated by Richard Wagner. Unlike Mendelssohn's conducting style, which was « characterized by quick, even tempos and imbued with what many people regarded as model logic and precision, Wagner's way was broad, hyper-Romantic and embraced the idea of tempo modulation ». Wagner considered an interpretation as a re-creation and put more emphasis on the phrase than on the measure. The fact that the tempo was changing was not something new ; Beethoven, himself, interpreted his own music with a lot of freedom. Beethoven wrote :

« My tempi are valid only for the 1st bars, as feeling and expression must have their own tempo »

And :

« Why do they annoy me by asking for my tempi ? Either they are good musicians and ought to know how to play my music, or they are bad musicians and, in that case, my indications would be of no avail. »

Beethoven's disciples, such as Anton Schindler, testified that the composer varied the tempo when he conducted his works. Wagner's tradition was followed by the 1st 2 permanent conductors of the Berlin Philharmonic. Hans von Bülow highlighted more the unitary structure of Symphonic works, while Arthur Nikisch stressed the magnificence of tone. The styles of these 2 conductors were synthesized by Furtwängler.

In Munich (1907-1909), Furtwängler studied with Felix Mottl, a disciple of Wagner. He considered Arthur Nikisch as his model. According to John Ardoin, Wagner's subjective style of conducting led to Furtwängler, and Mendelssohn's objective style of conducting led to Toscanini.

Furtwängler's art was deeply influenced by the great Jewish music theorist Heinrich Schenker with whom he worked between 1920 and Schenker's death, in 1935. Schenker was the founder of musical analysis (called the Schenkerian analysis), emphasizing underlying long-range harmonic tensions and resolutions in a piece of music. Furtwängler read Schenker's famous monograph on Beethoven's 9th Symphony, in 1911, subsequently trying to find and read all his books. Furtwängler met Schenker, in 1920, and they continuously worked together on the repertoire which Furtwängler conducted. Schenker never secured an academic position in Austria and Germany, in spite of Furtwängler's efforts to support him. Schenker depended on several patrons including Furtwängler. Furtwängler's 2nd wife certified much later that Schenker had an immense influence on her husband. Schenker considered Furtwängler as the greatest conductor in

the world and as the « only conductor who truly understood Beethoven » .

Furtwängler's recordings are characterized by an « extraordinary sound wealth » , special emphasis being placed on cellos, double basses, percussion and woodwind instruments. According to Furtwängler, he learned how to obtain this kind of sound from Arthur Nikisch. This richness of sound is partly due to his « vague » beat, often called a « fluid beat » . This fluid beat created slight gaps between the sounds made by the musicians, allowing listeners to distinguish all the instruments in the Orchestra, even in tutti sections. Vladimir Ashkenazy once said :

« I never heard such beautiful fortissimi as Furtwängler's. »

According to Yehudi Menuhin, Furtwängler's fluid beat was more difficult but superior than Toscanini's very precise beat. Unlike Otto Klemperer, Furtwängler did not try to suppress emotion in performance, instead giving a hyper-Romantic aspect to his interpretations. The emotional intensity of his World War II recordings is particularly famous. He desired to retain an element of improvisation and of the unexpected in his concerts, each interpretation being conceived as a re-creation. However, melodic line as well as the global unity were never lost with Furtwängler, even in the most dramatic interpretations, partly due to the influence of Heinrich Schenker and to the fact that Furtwängler was a composer and had studied composition during his whole life.

One of Furtwängler's « protégés » was the pianist prodigy Karlrobert Kreiten who was killed by the Nazis, in 1943, because he had criticized Hitler. He was an important influence on the pianist-conductor Daniel Barenboim, of whom Furtwängler's widow, Elisabeth Furtwängler, said : « Er furtwänglert. » (He furtwänglers.) Barenboim has conducted a recording of Furtwängler's 2nd Symphony, with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. Other conductors known to speak admiringly of Furtwängler include Valery Gergiev, Claudio Abbado, Carlos Kleiber, Carlo Maria Giulini, Simon Rattle, Sergiu Celibidache, Otto Klemperer, Karl Böhm, Christoph Eschenbach, Alexander Frey, Eugen Jochum, Zubin Mehta, Kurt Masur and Christian Thielemann. For instance, Carlos Kleiber thought that « nobody could equal Furtwängler » . George Szell, whose precise musicianship was in many ways antithetical to Furtwängler's, always kept a picture of Furtwängler in his dressing-room. Herbert von Karajan, who in his early years was Furtwängler's rival, maintained throughout his life that Furtwängler was one of the great influences on his music making, even though his cool, objective, modern style had little in common with Furtwängler's white-hot Romanticism. Karajan said :

« He certainly had an enormous influence on me. I remember that when I was “ Generalmusikdirektor ” in Aachen, a friend invited me to a concert that Furtwängler gave in Cologne. Furtwängler's performance of the Robert Schumann's 4th, which I didn't know at the time, opened-up a new world for me. I was deeply impressed. I didn't want to forget this concert, so I immediately returned to Aachen. »

The conductor who most clearly represented a continuity with Furtwängler's incandescent style was Jascha Horenstein ; he had worked as an assistant to Furtwängler in Berlin, during the 1920's.

Furtwängler's performances of Beethoven, Wagner, Bruckner, and Brahms remain important reference points today, as do his interpretations of other works such as Haydn's 88th Symphony, Schubert's 9th Symphony, and Schumann's 4th

Symphony. His performances are grounded in the spontaneous flexibility that Wagner referred to as the « elastic phrase » .

The musicians who have expressed the highest opinion about Furtwängler are some of the most prominent ones of the 20th Century such as Arnold Schönberg, Paul Hindemith, or Arthur Honegger. Soloists such as Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau, Yehudi Menuhin, Pablo Casals, and Elisabeth Schwarzkopf who have played music with almost all the major conductors of the 20th Century have clearly declared upon several occasions that, for them, Furtwängler was the most important one. John Ardoin has reported the following discussion he has had with Maria Callas, in August 1968, after having listened to Beethoven's 8th with the Cleveland Orchestra conducted by George Szell. She sighed :

« Well, you see what we have been reduced to. We are now in a time when a Szell is considered a Master. How small he was next to Furtwängler. »

Reeling this disbelief (not at her verdict, with which I agreed, but from the unvarnished acuteness of it) , I stammered :

« But how do you know Furtwängler ? You never sang with him. »

« How do you think ? » , she stared at me with equal disbelief.

« He started his career after the War, in Italy (in 1947) . I heard dozens of his concerts there. To me, he was Beethoven. »

There are a huge number of Furtwängler recordings currently available, mostly live. Many of these were made during World War II, using experimental tape technology. After the War, they were confiscated by the Soviet Union for decades, and have only recently become widely available, often on multiple legitimate and illegitimate labels. In spite of their limitations, the recordings from this era are widely admired by Furtwängler devotees.

This is only a small selection of some of Furtwängler's most famed recordings. For more information, see his discography and list of currently available recordings. The French Wilhelm Furtwängler Society also has a list of recommended recordings.

Johann Sebastian Bach : « Saint-Matthew Passion » (1st half only) , live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, 1952 (« SWF ») .

Béla Bartók : Violin Concerto No. 2, studio recording with Yehudi Menuhin and with the « Philharmonia » Orchestra, 1953 (« EMI ») .

Ludwig van Beethoven : 3rd Symphony (« Eroica ») , live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, December 1944 (« Music & Arts » , « Preiser Records » , « Tahra ») .

About this recording, often considered as one of the most important ones of the 20th Century, John Ardoin wrote :

« The magnificent 1944 performance with the Vienna Philharmonic is an authenticated performance that is not only Furtwängler's noblest and most compelling “ Eroica ”, but one unrivalled on disc. »

And André Tubeuf :

« A performance of prodigious Classicism, it presents us with figures that seem to us to be made of stone by virtue of their nobility and of fire because of their compelling urgency, but which, on the wings of a Scherzo, at the pace of a March, suddenly releases the infinite - placed on record. »

Beethoven : 3rd Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, December 1952 (« Tahra ») .

Beethoven : 5th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, June 1943 (« Classica d'Oro » , « Deutsche Grammophon » , « Enterprise » , « Music & Arts » , « Opus Kura » , « Tahra ») .

Beethoven : 5th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, Mai 1954 (« Tahra ») .

Beethoven : 6th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, March 1944 (« Tahra ») .

Beethoven : 7th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, October 1943 (« Classica d'Oro » , « Deutsche Grammophon » , « Music & Arts » , « Opus Kura ») .

Harry Halbreich wrote in his analysis of this performance :

« Does the 2nd movement remain an Allegretto under Furtwängler's baton ? Many critics have raised this question, troubled by the spaciousness even more than in Berlin than in Vienna (in 1950) . And, yet, why hesitate ? From the 1st bars, this perfection overrules us - beyond doubt, this is humanely, organically the right tempo and it would be completely insensitive and unmusical to argue otherwise. Who could describe the incredible beauty of phrasing of the song of violas and cellos, the sublime expressiveness of the violins ? The 2nd theme, on its re-appearance, seems still more moving and expressive. This Finale was always one of Furtwängler's great war-horses and, undoubtedly, the summit of this interpretation. Furtwängler relives his unbelievable performance of the end of the 5th Symphony, in June 1943, 4 months before, launching into a break-taking acceleration without the unleashed forces ever escaping the control of the brilliant leader : “ I am the Bacchus who distils the delicious nectar for mankind, and brings them to divine frenzy of the spirit. ” - thus, Beethoven explained himself. But it takes a demiurge like Furtwängler, that autumn day, in 1943, to bring that frenzy to life in sound ! »

Beethoven : 9th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, March 1942 (« Classica d'Oro » , « Music & Arts » , « Opus Kura » , « Tahra » , « SWF ») .

Harry Halbreich wrote in his analysis of this performance that, for the 1st movement :

« Nobody has ever approached Furtwängler in the evocation of this terrifying release of cosmic forces. »

And about the Adagio :

« In its superhuman spaciousness, which seems to seek to renounce human time and to align itself with that of creation, was not this Adagio the highest achievement of Wilhelm Furtwängler's art ? Certainly, no other conductor allowed himself such interpretative scope, and none put himself so much at risk. Yet, on actual hearing, the tempi prove so right, so natural lending themselves so perfectly to the whole presentation of the musical thought that one can hardly imagine anything different. »

For the Finale, he says :

« From bar 321, Furtwängler imperiously asserts his presence with a gradual allargando building-up to the colossal fortissimo of bar 330, followed by a timeless pause, a divine vision in which Beethoven, thanks to an interpreter worthy of him, equals the stature of the Michelangelo of the Sistine Chapel. »

And Sami Habra wrote :

« The 1942 performance, in Berlin, is one of the most convincing proofs of Furtwängler's rebellion during Germany's tragic era, while the Nazis tried, in vain, to bury the great German musical heritage by using it for their sinister ends. Furtwängler fought for it and strived to save it from their clutches. »

Beethoven : 9th Symphony, live performance at the July 29, 1951 re-opening of the « Bayreuther Festspiele » (not to be confused with « EMI » 's release) with Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Elisabeth Höngen, Hans Hopf and Otto Edelmann. (« Orfeo d'Or » , 2008) .

Sami Habra wrote regarding this very famous concert :

« Yet, after the War, he had to prove to the world that German musical art had, indeed, survived that fateful period, as well as some attempts by the Allies to ignore or undermine German culture. The whole musical world retained its breath while Beethoven was universally re-born when Furtwängler conducted the 9th for the re-opening of Bayreuth, in 1951. »

Beethoven : 9th Symphony, ostensibly a live performance at the July 29, 1951, re-opening of the « Bayreuther Festspiele » but purported by the President of the Wilhelm Furtwängler Society of America to actually be dress rehearsal takes edited by « EMI » into 1 recording, all performed prior to the actual public performance. (« EMI » , 1955) .

Beethoven : 9th Symphony, live performance at the 1954 Lucerne Festival with the London « Philharmonia » , Lucerne Festival Choir, Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Elsa Cavelti, Ernst Häfliger and Otto Edelmann (« Music & Arts » , « Tahra ») .

Sami Habra said :

« The Lucerne 1954 concert, Furtwängler's last performance of the 9th, allowed the listener an even deeper insight into the great conductor's art, the most important impression being that of abyssal depths that permeate this Swan song : no doubt, Furtwängler sensed his end was near. »

Beethoven : Violin Concerto, studio recording with Yehudi Menuhin and with the Lucerne Festival Orchestra, in 1947 (« Testament ») .

Beethoven : Piano Concerto No. 5, studio recording with Edwin Fischer and with the « Philharmonia » Orchestra, in 1951 (« Naxos ») .

Beethoven : « Fidelio » , live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic with Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, Kirsten Flagstad, Anton Dermota, Julius Patzak, Paul Schoeffler, Josef Greindl, and Hans Braun, in August 1950 (« Opus Kura ») .

Beethoven : « Fidelio » , both live and studio recordings, with Martha Mödl (his preferred soprano, in the title role) , and Wolfgang Windgassen, Otto Edelmann, Gottlob Frick, Sena Jurinac, Rudolf Schock, Alfred Poell, Alwin Hendriks, Franz Bierbach, and the Vienna Philharmonic.

Brahms : 1st Symphony, live performance with the North German Radio Symphony Orchestra, Hamburg, in October 1951 (« Music & Arts » , « Tahra ») .

Sami Habra wrote :

« This Brahms 1st turned-out to be Furtwängler's best version. More than ever, the broad opening, with the hammering of Friedrich Weber on the timpani and the soaring strings of that magnificent ensemble, impress the listener. The special quality of the string section, miraculously dense and transparent, at the same time, permeates the whole work. The 4 great fortissimi of the 1st movement have an irresistible “ élan ”, the long lyrical phrases of the 2nd movement enchant the listener with their intensity. The 3rd movement is Furtwängler at his most feverish here, and full of serenity is reached only after the repeated trumpet calls. The 4th movement is played with unmistakable “ grandeur ” and solemnity, as indeed, the whole work is. While keeping Brahms' personality in mind, Furtwängler nevertheless brings-out Beethoven's influence on Brahms. No wonder the French critics bestowed upon this recording the “ Diapason d'Or of the Century ”. »

Brahms : 2nd Symphony, live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, in January 1945 (« Deutsche Grammophon » , « Music & Arts ») .

Brahms : 3rd Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in December 1949 (« EMI ») .

Sigurd Schimpf wrote :

« Furtwängler's interpretations of Brahms go beyond the merely “ composed ” notation and realise the vision of the organic form that hovered before Brahms but can no longer be attained. Herein lies the explanation of the flawless formal architecture of his interpretations, as well as the psychical compulsion of their musical performance that never becomes lost in detail but, to the contrary, always keeps the work as a whole in view. In this recording, notwithstanding his traditional interpretative style, Furtwängler, unlike many a younger composer, lays more stress on the characteristics beyond the Classical model Symphony that herald the new trend :“ Spiritual life ” which Furtwängler traces and creates anew in each work. In this Symphony, energetic and vigorous though it is, spiritual life is not concentrated on the dualism of the themes, the dramatic development and the intensity of the Finale, but above all, on the variety of tone-colours which are here formative energy that puts a constantly changing complexion on the scarcely modulated themes and motifs and becomes the favourite means of musical expression. »

Brahms : 4th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in December 1943 (« Tahra » , « SWF ») .

Brahms : 4th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in October 1948 (« EMI ») .

Brahms : Violin Concerto, studio recording with Yehudi Menuhin and with the Lucerne Festival Orchestra, in 1949 (« Tahra » , « Naxos ») .

Brahms : Piano Concerto No. 2, live performance with Edwin Fischer and with the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1942 (« Testament ») .

Bruckner : 4th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in October 1941 (« WFCJ ») .

Bruckner : 5th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in October 1942 (« Classica d'Oro » , « Deutsche Grammophon » , « Music & Arts » , « Testament ») .

David Hurwitz wrote of this recording :

« The interpretation is typically manic : very fast, and very slow. It lurches about impulsively and has thrilling moments - but also, some pretty distressing examples of shoddy ensemble, particularly in the Scherzo and Finale. It was all too seldom that Furtwängler managed to keep his band together to allow him to time his climaxes optimally. A classic case of “ overshoot ” occurs at the end of the 1st movement, which sounds terribly rushed. The Adagio, though, is magnificent. »

Bruckner : 6th Symphony (the 1st movement is missing) , live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in November

1943 (« Music & Arts ») .

Bruckner : 7th Symphony (Adagio only) , live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in April 1942 (« Tahra ») .

Sami Habra wrote, in 2005 :

« Furtwängler has always been Bruckner's greatest exponent. Again, the tragic element and grandeur are unequalled here. This is a " desert island " recording, fortunately restored for music-lovers of this world to cherish all their life. »

Bruckner : 8th Symphony, live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, in October 1944 (« Deutsche Grammophon m » , « Music & Arts ») .

Bruckner : 9th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in October 1944 (« Deutsche Grammophon ») .

Franck : Symphony, live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1945 (« SWF ») .

Furtwängler : 2nd Symphony, live performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, in February 1953 (« Orfeo ») .

Gluck : « Alceste » Overture, studio recording with the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1954 (« SWF ») .

Händel : Concerto Grosso, Opus 6, No. 10, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in February 1944 (« Melodiya ») .

Händel : Concerto Grosso, Opus 6, No. 10, live performance with the « Teatro Colón » Orchestra, in 1950 (« Disques Refrain ») .

Haydn : 88th Symphony, studio recording with the Berlin Philharmonic, on 5 December 1951 (« Deutsche Grammophon ») .

Mahler : « Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen » , live performance with Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau and the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1951 (« Orfeo ») .

Mahler : « Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen » , studio recording with Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau and the « Philharmonia » Orchestra, in 1952 (« Naxos » , « EMI ») .

Mendelssohn : Violin Concerto, studio recording with Yehudi Menuhin and with the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1952 (« Naxos » , « EMI ») .

Mozart : « Don Giovanni » , the 1950, 1953 and 1954 Salzburg Festival recordings (in live performance) . These have

been made available on several labels, but mostly on « EMI » . A videotaped performance of « Don Giovanni » is also available, featuring Cesare Siepi, Otto Edelmann, Lisa Della Casa, Elisabeth Grümmer, and Anton Dermota.

Mozart : « Die Zauberflöte » , a live performance from August 27, 1949, featuring Walther Ludwig, Irmgard Seefried, Wilma Lipp, Gertrude Grob-Prandl, Ernst Häfliger, Hermann Uhde, and Josef Greindl.

Schubert : 8th Symphony (1st movement only) , live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in December 1944 (« SWF ») .

Schubert : 9th Symphony, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1942 (« Deutsche Grammophon » , « Magic Master » , « Music & Arts » , « Opus Kura ») .

Schubert : « Die Zauberharfe » Overture, live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, in September 1953 (« Deutsche Grammophon ») .

Schumann : 4th Symphony, studio recording with the Berlin Philharmonic, in May 1953 (« Deutsche Grammophon ») .

Sami Habra wrote, in 2005 :

« Schumann's 4th has long been regarded as the recording of the Century (along with the “ HMV ” “ Tristan und Isolde ”) . Before the boisterous last movement starts, there is the famous transitional passage in which Furtwängler builds-up the most impressive Crescendo ever heard. This Crescendo is referred to, by Conservatoire teachers and conductors, as being the very perfection, in spite of its infeasibility. Celibidache and Karajan have tried to imitate Furtwängler in this part, on some occasions, but both conductors run-out of breath towards the middle of the Crescendo. This Furtwängler performance has, yet, to be equalled. »

Sibelius : « En Saga » , live performance with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, in February 1943 (« SWF ») .

Tchaïkovsky : 4th Symphony, studio recording with the Vienna Philharmonic, in 1951 (« Tahra ») .

Tchaïkovsky : 6th Symphony (« Pathétique ») , studio recording with the Berlin Philharmonic, in 1938 (« EMI » , « Naxos ») .

Sami Habra wrote, in 2005 :

« According to Friedland Wagner, this 1938 performance of the “ Pathétique ” by Furtwängler was so overwhelming that Toscanini, in his house at Riverdale, played this recording, again and again, to his guests on a memorable day, pointing-out with enthusiasm all its fine points. We can safely say that no one has probed as deeply as Furtwängler into the abyss of the tragic contents and pessimistic forebodings of the “ Pathétique ”. The last movement would probably have contained a glimmer of hope, had it not been for the fateful events that were to plunge the world into

its darkest hours. Many observers have asserted that Furtwängler had foreseen what was to happen. »

Wagner : « Tristan und Isolde » , studio recording with Kirsten Flagstad, in June 1952 (« EMI » , « Naxos ») .

Gerhard Brunner said about this recording :

« Produced in 1952, this recording, now re-issued, has long been something of a landmark in recent history - rightly so, for its importance and its uniqueness are unquestionable. Wilhelm Furtwängler's architectural greatness is communicated so directly, so forcefully from the very 1st bar that one immediately forgets the small imperfections of the mono recording. The most striking thing is, certainly, the cogency of this interpretation. Nowhere are there hiatuses, breaks in the music's flow. Furtwängler, though far from being a perfectionist in individual detail, invariably seems to see the entire conception before him, so grippingly does he span the work's long arches, so magnificently does he weld together the various components. His feeling for form is so compelling in its certainty that one does not stop to consider for a moment that it is not the only way of interpreting a particular phrase or sequence. The idea of Furtwängler seeking effect from a series of “ purple passages ” is unthinkable ; and, yet, the great emotional crescendi, the great climaxes, have a dramatic power scarcely matched elsewhere. »

Wagner : « Der Ring des Nibelungen » , live recording from La Scala, in Milan, with Kirsten Flagstad, in 1950.

Wagner : « Der Ring des Nibelungen » with Wolfgang Windgassen, Ludwig Suthaus, and Martha Mödl, recorded live in the « RAI » (« Radiotelevisione Italiana ») studios, in 1953 (« EMI ») .

Wagner : « Die Walküre » , his last recording in 1954. « EMI » planned to record « Der Ring des Nibelungen » in studio under Furtwängler, but he only finished this work shortly before his death. The cast includes Martha Mödl (Brünnhilde) , Leonie Rysanek (Sieglinde) , Ludwig Suthaus (Siegmund) , Gottlob Frick (Hunding) , and Ferdinand Frantz (Wotan) .

Furtwängler walked-out of a Toscanini concert once (it was Beethoven's 9th) , calling him « a mere time-beater ! » . Unlike Toscanini, Furtwängler sought a weighty, less rhythmically strict, more bass-oriented orchestral sound, with a more conspicuous use of tempo changes not indicated in the printed score.